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Abstract. We extend our work on difference randomness. Each component of a difference test is a Boolean combination of two r.e. open sets; here we consider tests in which the $k^{th}$ component is a Boolean combination of $g(k)$ r.e. open sets for a given recursive function $g$. We use this method to produce an alternate characterization of weak Demuth randomness in terms of these tests and further show that a real is weakly Demuth random if and only if it is Martin-Löf random and cannot compute a strongly prompt r.e. set. We conclude with a study of related lowness notions and obtain as a corollary that lowness for balanced randomness is equivalent to being recursive.

1. Introduction

In [9], we introduced a new kind of randomness based on the difference hierarchy. We defined this notion, difference randomness, by altering the definition of a Martin-Löf test so each component of the test was the difference of two r.e. open sets in the Cantor space instead of simply a single r.e. open set. We showed that the difference random reals are precisely the Turing incomplete Martin-Löf random reals; since every Martin-Löf random real is Turing incomplete if and only if it cannot compute a complete extension of Peano arithmetic [16], this is a natural class of random reals to study. In particular, this class satisfies our intuition that a random real should not have high computational strength.

In this paper, we extend our analysis to a form of randomness defined by tests where the $k^{th}$ component is not a difference of two r.e. open sets but is instead the Boolean combination of $g(k)$ many r.e. open sets for some recursive function $g$. We also discuss variants on weak Demuth randomness in which particular recursive bounds on the mind-change functions are used and describe the relationship of these variants to the $g$-change randomness notions. Then we give an alternate characterization of weak Demuth randomness in terms of $\omega$-change randomness and go on to characterize weak Demuth randomness using only Martin-Löf randomness and computational strength. This has been done for a number of strong randomness notions (see Table 1). We mentioned above that difference randomness is equivalent to Martin-Löf randomness combined with an inability to compute $0'$, and, for instance, it is also true that a real is weakly 2-random if and only if it is Martin-Löf random and does not compute any promptly simple r.e. set (this follows from [11]). In contrast, each $\Delta^0_2$ Martin-Löf random real computes a promptly simple r.e. set. We continue this program by showing that weak Demuth randomness is equivalent to Martin-Löf randomness plus the inability to compute a strongly prompt r.e. set. Strongly prompt r.e. sets were introduced by Diamondstone and Ng [5] as a natural way to strengthen the classical notion of prompt simplicity. They showed that strongly prompt r.e. sets are intimately related to cupping in the r.e. degrees,
extending the study of promptness and cupping in the well-known paper of Ambos-Spies, Jockusch, Shore, and Soare [1]. Once more, we have found a characterization of a randomness class in terms of computational strength that seems very natural.

Finally, we describe the lowness classes for these variants on weak Demuth randomness. We obtain as a corollary that there is no nonrecursive set which is low for balanced randomness.

1.1. Notation and terminology. In general, our notation follows that of [15]; for a basic discussion of randomness, we refer the reader to [7, 13]. We will work within the Cantor space equipped with the usual clopen topology. Given a finite binary string $\sigma$, we will write $[\sigma]$ for the basic open subset of the Cantor space formed by all the infinite extensions of $\sigma$. We will extend this notation to a subset $U$ of $2^{<\omega}$ and write $[U]$ for $\cup_{\sigma \in U}[\sigma]$. We use the Lebesgue measure $\mu$, where $\mu([\sigma]) = 2^{-|\sigma|}$. For ease of notation we will often write $\sigma$ and $U$ instead of $[\sigma]$ and $[U]$. All functions mentioned in this paper, unless otherwise stated, will be recursive functions from $\omega$ to $\omega$.

We will be interested in the Borel subsets of $2^\omega$ that are $g$-change for some recursive function $g$. A set $X \subseteq \omega$ is $g$-change if there is a recursive approximation to $X$ whose mind-change function is bounded by $g$. More formally, we say that $X$ is $g$-change if there is a recursive approximation $X(n, s)$ to $X$ such that $\#\{s \mid X(n, s) \neq X(n, s + 1)\} \leq g(n)$ for all $n$. We will write $n$-change for $g$-change when $g(i) = n$ for every $i$. We wish to extend this notion to subsets of $2^\omega$ and consider sets of the form $\cap_i V_i$ where each $V_i$ is $g(i)$-r.e. The most obvious way to define a set $V_i \subseteq 2^\omega$ to be $k$-r.e. is to require that $V_i = [W]$ where $W$ is a $k$-r.e. set presenting $V_i$. Unfortunately, it is easy to see that for every $k > 1$ and every $k$-r.e. set $W$, there is a set $\widehat{W} \leq_T \emptyset'$ such that $[W] = [\widehat{W}]$ and vice versa. Therefore the randomness notion generated by looking at either “$k$-r.e. tests” or “$g$-r.e. tests” defined in this way coincides with 2-randomness.

To get around this problem, we observe that in our naive approach to $k$-r.e. tests, we had allowed a neighbourhood $[\sigma]$ to be put into and removed from $V_i$ unboundedly (even infinitely) many times. It is therefore necessary to consider the enumerability of neighbourhoods rather than the enumerability of the presenting set. As in [9], we will write $D(U, V)$ for $[U] - [V]$ when $U$ and $V$ are subsets of $2^{<\omega}$. For an $n$-element collection $U^1, U^2, \ldots, U^n$ of subsets of $2^{<\omega}$, we will write $D(U^1, U^2, \ldots, U^n)$ for $(\{U^1\} - \{U^2\}) \cup (\{U^3\} - \{U^4\}) \cup \ldots \cup (\{U^{n-1}\} - \{U^n\})$ when $n$ is even and $(\{U^1\} - \{U^2\}) \cup (\{U^3\} - \{U^4\}) \cup \ldots \cup (\{U^{n-2}\} - \{U^{n-1}\}) \cup \{U^n\}$ when $n$ is odd. We will sometimes simplify this definition for the purpose of our proofs and consider only the “even” case, padding with $\{U^{n+1}\} = \emptyset$ if $n$ is actually odd.

This allows us to extend the notion of a Martin-Löf test to that of a test whose components are Boolean combinations of open sets. Most randomness notions are generated by tests whose components are open subsets of $2^\omega$; it is by varying the effectivity of the presentation of the tests that we get varying randomness notions. Here we consider a randomness notion where the test components are not open sets, but are instead $\Delta^0_2$ subsets of $2^\omega$ with recursively bounded mind-change functions.

Definition 1.1. Let $f$ be a recursive function. We say that an $f$-change test is a sequence $\left\langle D(U^i_1, \ldots, U^i_f) \right\rangle_{i \in \omega}$ where the sets $U^i_n$ are uniformly $\Sigma^0_1$ such that $\mu(D(U^i_1, \ldots, U^i_f)) \leq 2^{-i}$ for all $i$ and that a real $A$ is $f$-change random if for all $f$-change tests $\left\langle D(U^i_1, \ldots, U^i_f) \right\rangle_{i \in \omega}$, $A \notin \cap_i D(U^i_1, \ldots, U^i_f)$. 


In [9], we considered \( n \)-change tests for fixed \( n \) and found that \( n \)-change randomness was equivalent to difference randomness for every \( n > 1 \) (clearly, 1-change randomness is equivalent to Martin-Löf randomness). \( f \)-change randomness is a natural extension of difference randomness. We also consider an even stronger notion:

**Definition 1.2.** A real \( A \) is \( \omega \)-change random if it is \( f \)-change random for every recursive function \( f \).

In Section 2, we discuss \( f \)-change randomness for a fixed recursive \( f \) as well as a parallel notion based on weak Demuth randomness, and in Section 3, we discuss \( \omega \)-change randomness and its relationships to other strong randomness notions, in particular, weak Demuth randomness. We also give a characterization of weakly Demuth random reals based on their low computational strength. In Section 4, we consider one of the corresponding lowness notions as well as lowness for balanced randomness.

### 2. \( f \)-CHANGE RANDOMNESS

In this section, we will “calibrate” \( \omega \)-change randomness as well as weak Demuth randomness. We begin by recalling the definition of weak Demuth randomness and then presenting our variant of it.

**Definition 2.1.** [4, 12] A *Demuth test* is a sequence \( \langle W_{g(i)} \rangle_{i \in \omega} \) of r.e. open sets where \( g \) is an \( \omega \)-r.e. function and \( \mu(W_{g(i)}) \leq 2^{-i} \) for every \( i \). A real \( A \) is weakly Demuth random (WDR) if for every Demuth test \( \langle W_{g(i)} \rangle_{i \in \omega} \), \( A \notin \cap_i W_{g(i)} \).

**Definition 2.2.** If \( h \) is a recursive function, an \( h \)-Demuth test is a sequence \( \langle W_{g(i)} \rangle_{i \in \omega} \) of r.e. open sets where \( g \) is an \( \omega \)-r.e. function with mind-change function bounded by \( h \) and \( \mu(W_{g(i)}) \leq 2^{-i} \) for every \( i \). A real \( A \) is \( h \)-weakly Demuth random (\( h \)-WDR) if for every \( h \)-Demuth test \( \langle W_{g(i)} \rangle_{i \in \omega} \), \( A \notin \cap_i W_{g(i)} \).

We note that \( A \) is weakly Demuth random if \( A \) is \( h \)-WDR for every recursive function \( h \).

There is one very important way in which \( f \)-change randomness and \( h \)-WDR differ from Martin-Löf randomness. When a Martin-Löf test is defined, the rate of decrease of the measure of the test components is always recursively bounded, usually by \( 2^{-k} \); however, the precise recursive bound does not matter because we can always take a subsequence of a test if we would like this rate of decrease to be faster. However, the function bounding the rate of decrease of the measure of an \( f \)-change test is as important as the function \( f \) itself because the different components of an \( f \)-change test may have to satisfy different requirements. We can no longer be sure, for instance, that the seventeenth component of an \( f \)-change test can be the fifth component of an \( f \)-change test because it may be that the seventeenth component may have more than \( f(5) \) mind changes.

A similar statement holds for \( h \)-Demuth tests. Therefore, we will restrict our attention to the tests whose \( k^{th} \) components have a measure bounded by \( 2^{-k} \) (the precise bound will not matter, but we fix this for convenience). This issue was also considered in Figueira, Hirschfeldt, Miller, Nies, and Ng [8] and is one of their main motivations for considering balanced randomness.

Our first task will be to explore these gradations of weak Demuth randomness: given recursive \( f \) and \( g \), under what circumstances do \( f \)-WDR and \( g \)-WDR differ? Then we will use similar techniques to explore the relationship between \( f \)-change randomness and \( g \)-change randomness.
We now consider $f$-WDR for various recursive functions $f$. If $f = o(2^n)$ is a recursive function, then it is easy to see that $f$-WDR is equivalent to Martin-Löf randomness: Each $f$-WDR test $\langle W_{g(n)} \rangle_{i \in \omega}$ is covered by the Martin-Löf test $\langle \cup_i W_{g(f(i),s)} \rangle_{i \in \omega}$, where $f(i)$ is the least number $j$ such that $f(j) < 2^{j-i}$. Thus it makes sense to consider $2^n f(n)$-WDR for an arbitrary recursive (not necessarily unbounded) function $f$. We note that $2^n$-WDR is the same as balanced randomness. We first show that different choices of $f$ can give rise to different randomness notions. In fact, we can specify exactly how far apart $f$ and $g$ have to be in order for $2^n f(n)$-WDR and $2^n g(n)$-WDR to be different.

**Theorem 2.3.** Suppose that $f$ and $g$ are recursive nondecreasing functions.

(i) If $\limsup_n |f(n) − g(n)| < \infty$, then $2^n f(n)$-WDR and $2^n g(n)$-WDR are the same.

(ii) If $\limsup_n (f(n) − g(n)) = \infty$, then there is an $A$ so that $A$ is $2^n g(n)$-WDR but not $2^n f(n)$-WDR.

**Proof.** (i): We first observe that for any constant $M$, any recursive subsequence of an $M2^n$-Demuth test is covered by an $M2^n$-Demuth test. To see this, fix $M$, a strictly increasing recursive function $u$, and an $M2^n$-Demuth test $\langle W_{k(n)} \rangle_{n \in \omega}$. Define $g(n,s)$ by letting $W_{g(n,s)}$ copy (all the different versions of) $W_{k(u(n),s)}$ until a stage is found such that $k(u(n),s)$ has changed its mind $2^{n−n}$ many times. We then change $g(n,s)$ to a new index and copy the next $2^{n−n}$ many different versions of $W_{k(u(n),s)}$, and so on. Clearly $\langle W_{\lim_s g(n,s)} \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ is an $M2^n$-Demuth test, and for every $n$, $W_{k(u(n))} \subseteq W_{\lim_s g(n,s)}$.

Now assume that $\langle W_{k(n)} \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ is a $2^n f(n)$-Demuth test. Define the partial recursive function $u$ by letting $u(n+1)$ be the first number $u$ greater than $u(n)$ found such that $k(u)$ has $2^n f(u) − 1$ many mind changes. Either $u$ is partial, in which case $\langle W_{k(n)} \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ is covered by a $2^n f(n)$-Demuth test, or else $u$ is total, in which case $\cap_n [W_{k(n)}] \subseteq \cap_n [W_{k(u(n))}]$. Furthermore, the latter can be viewed as a subsequence of some $2^n$-Demuth test, and by the comments in the preceding paragraph, it is covered by a $2^n$-Demuth test. The statement follows after sufficiently many iterations. We note that the statement holds even if $f$ and $g$ are bounded.

(ii): We fix some uniform enumeration of all $2^n g(n)$-Demuth tests. Let $\langle W_{k_e(n)} \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ be the $e^{th}$ test in this enumeration. We begin by fixing a recursive sequence $(n_k)_{k \in \omega}$ as follows. Let $n_0$ be the least such that $f(n_0) > g(n_0)$. Assume we have defined $n_k$ such that $f(n_k) > \sum_{j \leq k} g(n_j)$. Find the least number $m > n_k$ such that $f(m) > 4 \sum_{j \leq k} g(n_j)$. Now choose $n_{k+1} > m$ large enough so that for every $m \geq i \geq n_k$,

$$f(n_k) > \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{2^{n_{k+1}}} \sum_{j \leq k} g(n_j)},$$

and that $f(n_{k+1}) > \sum_{j \leq k+1} g(n_j)$. The reason for our choice of $(n_k)_{k \in \omega}$ will become clear later.

We will build the Demuth test $\langle U_k \rangle_{k \in \omega}$ and argue at the end that this is a $2^n f(n)$-Demuth test. Henceforth, we will write $G_e[s]$ for $W_{k_e(n_e,s)}[s]$ and say that $G_e$ switches version at $s$ if $k_e(n_e,s − 1) \neq k_e(n_e,s)$. For each $i$, we let $k(i)$ be the largest $k$ such that $n_k \leq i$.

The intuition is that we will kill off the $e^{th}$ $2^n g(n)$-Demuth test at the $n_e^{th}$ component; that is, we wish to produce a real which is covered by each $U_i$ and such that the real is not captured by $W_{k_e(n_e)}$ for every $e$. The sequence $(n_e)_{e \in \omega}$ is chosen such that each $n_{e+1}$ is much larger than $n_e$ and that $f(n_e)$ is much larger than $g(n_e)$. This will allow us to be able to change $U_{n_e}$ enough that...
\[ U_{n_k} \] avoids being covered by the various \([G_j]\)s. For \( n_k \leq i < n_{k+1} \) we always ensure that \([U_i]\) contains some basic open neighbourhood \([\sigma]\) such that \([\sigma] \not\subseteq \cup G_j \). If ever during the construction we find that \([U_i] \subseteq \cup G_j \) we will switch version for \( U_i \). Each time \( U_i \) fills up in measure and we are forced to switch version for \( U_i \), we will argue that a large proportion of this measure corresponds to the measure in \( \cup_{j \leq k} G_j \). In this way we will be able to bound the number of changes to \( U_i \) by a multiple of \( g(n_0) + \cdots + g(n_k) \).

During the construction, when we update \( U_i \) at stage \( s \) for some \( i \geq n_0 \), we enumerate into \( U_i \) every string \( \sigma \) of length \( s \) such that \([\sigma] \subseteq \cap_{j < i} [U_j] \) such that \([\sigma] \cap \cup_{j \leq k(i)} [G_j[s]] = \emptyset \). If the measure of all such \( \sigma \) is greater than \( 2^{-i} \), we put in the first \( 2^{-i} \) much of these \( \sigma \) (in the lexicographic ordering). For \( i < n_0 \), \( k(i) \) is undefined, and we permanently set \( U_i = 2^\omega \). This means that \((U_i)_{i \in \omega}\) will not be a \( 2^n f(n) \) Demuth test since the measure of the first \( n_0 - 1 \) components will be too large. However, we will show that the measure is correct for almost every \( i \) and that the number of mind-changes is bounded by \( 2^f(i) \) for every \( i \), making it possible to construct an actual \( 2^n f(n) \) Demuth test with the same intersection from \((U_i)_{i \in \omega}\).

Construction of \((U_k)_{k \in \omega}\). At stage \( s = 0 \), we update \( U_1 \) if possible. At a stage \( s > 0 \), we search for the least \( i < s \) such that \( \cap_{j \leq i} [U_j] \subseteq \cup j < s [G_j[s]] \) and \( \mu(U_i) = 2^{-i} \). Now we switch version for \( U_i \) and enumerate into the new version of \( U_i \) all the \( \sigma \) such that \([\sigma] \) is contained in the old version, \([\sigma] \subseteq \cap_{j < i} [U_j] \), and \([\sigma] \cap \cup_{j \leq k(i)} [G_j[s]] = \emptyset \). (The reason we have to do this is that these strings may be lexicographically very far on the right and may not be enumerated into the new version of \( U_i \) by the updating procedure.) Update \( U_0, U_1, \ldots, U_s \). This ends the construction.

Verification. We assume each \( U_i \) changes version finitely often (this will be verified later). Hence for each \( i \), \( \mu(U_i) \leq 2^{-i} \). It is easy to see that each \([U_i] \) is clopen: when we build \( U_i \), we are only considering finitely many \( G_j \)s, which will each have a final, stable version. At the point when each of these \( G_j \)s are stable, \( U_i \) will be stable as well by the nature of the construction. We now argue inductively that for each \( i \), \( \cap_{j \leq i} [U_j] \not\subseteq \cup j < \omega [G_j] \). This is certainly true for \( i < n_0 \) because \( U_i = 2^\omega \), which can never be covered by \( \cup j < s [G_j[s]] \) at any stage \( s \). Assume this is true for \( i \). If \( \mu(U_i) \) is ever \( 2^{-i} \), then \( \cap_{j \leq i} [U_j] \not\subseteq \cup j < \omega [G_j] \) by compactness. Therefore, we may assume that \( \mu(U_i) < 2^{-i} \) at almost every stage. Then \( \cap_{j < i} [U_j] = [U_i] \) must be covered by the final version of \( \cup j \leq k(i) [G_j] \): otherwise, the construction would enumerate some suitably long extension of \( \cap_{j < i} [U_j] \) into \( U_i \). Thus by the induction hypothesis, \( \cap_{j \leq i} [U_j] \not\subseteq \cup j < \omega [G_j] \), so for every \( i \), \( \cap_{j < i} [U_j] \not\subseteq \cup j < \omega [G_j] \). Then each \( \cap_{j \leq i} [U_j] \) is clopen and nested, and by König’s Lemma, \( \cap_{i < \omega} [U_i] \not\subseteq \cup j < \omega [G_j] \).

Now we only have to bound the number of version changes to each \( U_i \). We argue that each \( U_i \) changes version at most \( \varepsilon_i 2^i \sum_{j \leq k(i)} g(n_j) \) times, where \( \varepsilon_i = \frac{1}{1 - 2^{i+1-n_k(i)+1}} \) (it is easy to see that for every \( i, \varepsilon_i \leq 4 \)). Fix \( i \geq n_0 \), and let \( t_0 < t_1 \) be two consecutive stages where \( U_i \) has a version switch. Between \( t_0 \) and \( t_1 \), the strings enumerated in \( U_i \) have measure \( 2^{-i} \). Let \( \sigma \) be enumerated in \( U_i \) at some stage \( t \) between \( t_0 \) and \( t_1 \). Certainly \([\sigma] \cap \cup j \leq k(i) [G_j[t]] = \emptyset \). We argue that \([\sigma] \subseteq \chi_1 \cup \chi_2 \), where

\[
\chi_1 = \bigcup_{j \leq k(i), t < t' \leq t_1} [G_j[t']] \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2 = \bigcup_{j < t_1} [G_j[t]].
\]

Let \( X \supseteq \sigma \). We work towards a contradiction and assume that \( X \not\subseteq \chi_2 \). Then between \( t \) and \( t_1 \) some \( U_j \) for \( j < i \) must switch version, since otherwise \([\sigma] \subseteq \cap_{j \leq i} [U_j[t_1]] \subseteq \chi_2 \). We now assume that \( X \not\subseteq \chi_1 \). Let \( t' > t \) be the first stage where some \( j' < i \) switches version. We have \( X \in \cap_{j \leq k(j')} [G_j[t']] \subseteq \cup j < t' [G_j[t']] \). This means that we must have \([X,t'] \cap \cup j \leq k(j') [G_j[t']] = \emptyset \), and so by construction we
Theorem 2.8. Suppose that different classes of random reals.

In [9], we noted that there is a standard form for

Remark 2.7. In [9], we noted that there is a standard form for \( n \)-change tests: we called an \( n \)-change test \( \langle D(U_1^1, U_2^2, \ldots, U_n^n) \rangle_{i \in \omega} \) canonical if each \( U_i^k \) was prefix-free and for every \( i, \sigma, \) and \( k \) such that \( 1 < k \leq n \) and \( \sigma \in U_i^k \), there was a \( \tau \) in \( U_i^{k-1} \) that is an initial segment of \( \sigma \). This means that after the first element of a test component, we only “remove” (or “add”) neighborhoods that we “added” (or “removed”) in the previous element. We note without ceremony that the same form can be found for an \( f \)-change test for any \( f \) (see Lemma 2.5 of [9]).

In contrast to the situation for \( n \)-change randomness, different functions \( f \) may give rise to different classes of random reals.

Theorem 2.8. Suppose that \( f \) and \( g \) are recursive nondecreasing functions.
(i) If \( \limsup_n |f(n) - g(n)| < \infty \), then \( f \)-change randomness is the same as \( g \)-change randomness.

(ii) If \( \limsup_n (f(n) - g(n)) = \infty \), then there is an \( A \) such that \( A \) is \( g \)-change but not \( f \)-change random.

**Proof.** The proof of (i) is similar to that of Theorem 2.8 in [9]. Suppose there is a \( f \)-change test \( \left< D(U_i^1, \ldots, U_i^{f(i)}) \right> \) in canonical form such that \( A \in \cap_i D(U_i^1, \ldots, U_i^{f(i)}) \). Since we can pad the test with \( \emptyset \), we may assume that for every \( i \), \( f(i) \) is an even number larger than 2. Let \( \limsup_n |f(n) - g(n)| = k \). Let \( V_i = \bigcup_{j>i+1} U_j^{f(j)-1} \) and \( W_i = \bigcup_{j>i+1} U_j^{f(j)} \). Since \( \mu(D(V_i, W_i)) \leq \mu \left( \bigcup_{j>i+1} D(U_j^{f(j)-1}, U_j^{f(j)}) \right) < 2^{-i} \), it follows that \( \left< D(V_i, W_i) \right>_{i \in \omega} \) is a difference test. By canonicity, \( A \not\in W_i \) for every \( i \). Therefore either \( A \) is in \( D(U_1^1, \ldots, U_i^{f(i)-3}, U_i^{f(i)-2}) \) for almost every \( i \) or \( A \in D(V_i, W_i) \) for almost every \( i \). Repeating this \( \frac{1}{2} \) times yields that \( A \) is either not \( g \)-change random or not difference random.

The proof of (ii) is similar to that of Theorem 2.3(ii) and contains no new ideas, so we will simply sketch the proof. Suppose that we have an enumeration of the \( g \)-change tests. We will denote the \( k \)th \( g \)-change test by \( U^k = \left< U^k_i \right>_{i \in \omega} \). We will construct an \( f \)-change test \( \left< V_i \right>_{i \in \omega} \) and a real \( A \) such that \( A \in \cap_i V_i \) but \( A \not\in U^k \) for some \( k \) for every \( j \).

We begin by choosing a recursive sequence \( \langle n_k \rangle_{k \in \omega} \) such that for every \( k \), \( f(n_k) > \sum_{i \leq k} g(n_k) \) and \( n_k \geq 2k \). The general idea behind our construction is this: for every \( i \) and \( s \), we will approximate an initial segment \( a_{i,s} \) of \( A \) at stage \( s \) such that \( a_{i,s} \subseteq a_{i+1,s} \) for every \( i \) and let \( A = \bigcup_i \lim_s a_{i,s} \). We must keep \( a_{i,s} \) out of \( U^k \) for every \( k \) (henceforth, we will drop the superscript). At the same time, we will construct our \( V_i \) so for every \( i \) and \( s \), \( a_{i,s} \in V_i \).

Consider \( i \geq n_0 \). (For \( i < n_0 \), we will simply “hardwire” \( a_i \) to be \( A \mid i \) and \( V_i \) to be \( \{a_i\} \).) For each such \( i \), we will choose a very large length \( \ell_i \) that \( a_{i,s} \) will have at every stage \( s \). We initialize by defining \( a_{i,0} \) to be \( 0^{\ell_i} \) and \( V_i,0 = \{a_{i,0}\} \) for every \( i \).

At each stage \( s > 0 \), we find the smallest \( i \) such that \( [a_{i,s}] \subseteq \bigcup_{n_k \leq s} [U_{n_k,s}] \). If there is no such \( i \), we say that \( a_{i,s} = a_{i,s-1} \) for every \( i \) and go on to stage \( s+1 \). We begin by identifying the set of strings \( \sigma \) such that \( |\sigma| = \ell_i \) and \( \sigma \not\in \bigcup [U_{n_k,s}] \), that is, the set of candidates for \( a_{i,s} \). We know this set must be nonempty because we have required that \( n_k \geq 2k \) for every \( k \), so \( \mu(\bigcup_k [U_{n_k,s}]) \leq \frac{1}{2} \) (we can assume that at any stage \( s \), \( \mu([U_{n_k,s}]) \leq \frac{1}{2^k} \) by speeding up the enumerations of the sets that count “removals” from \( U_{n_k} \)). Now we choose the element of that set that has been chosen least often as \( a_{i,s} \). If there is more than one that has been chosen the minimum number of times, we choose the lexicographically least such string.

Now that we have found \( a_{i,s} \) such that \( [a_{i,s}] \not\subseteq [U_{n_k,s}] \) for all \( n_k \leq s \), we must ensure that \( a_{i,s} \in V_i \) by adding \( a_{i,s} \) to \( V_i \). However, we must also ensure that the measure of \( V_{i,s} \) is appropriately small.

If the smallest \( n_k \) such that \( [a_{i,s-1}] \subseteq [U_{n_k,s}] \) is no bigger than \( i \), we remove \( a_{i,s-1} \) from \( V_i \) and add \( a_{i,s} \) to it. Since there can only be \( \sum_{i \leq k} g(n_k) < f(n_k) \leq f(i) \) stages where this happens, this will not prevent \( \left< V_i \right>_{i \in \omega} \) from being an \( f \)-change test.

On the other hand, if the smallest \( n_k \) such that \( [a_{i,s-1}] \subseteq [U_{n_k,s}] \) is larger than \( i \), we cannot remove \( a_{i,s-1} \) from \( V_i \) and be certain that \( \left< V_i \right>_{i \in \omega} \) will be an \( f \)-change test in the end. However, we can arrange for \( V_i \) to be large enough that we can have as many different “versions” of \( a_i \) in \( V_i \) as we need to make sure that \( a_i \not\in U_{n_k} \) for any \( k \).
Now we repeat this procedure for each \( i \leq s \) such that \( [a_{i,s}] \in \bigcup_{n_k \leq s} [U_{n_k,s}] \) in increasing order, making sure that \( a_{j,s} \subseteq a_{j+1,s} \) for all \( j \). For \( i > s \), we simply let \( a_{i,s} = a_{s,s} \circ \eta_i \).

The following two corollaries are immediate.

**Corollary 2.9.** For any order function \( f \), difference randomness is strictly weaker than \( f \)-change randomness.

**Corollary 2.10.** There is no single order function \( f \) such that \( f \)-change randomness is the same as \( \omega \)-change randomness.

We observe once again that although these notions are distinguishable, this does not result in a linear hierarchy.

## 3. \( \omega \)-CHANGE RANDOMNESS

We begin by observing that for \( \omega \)-change randomness, the rate of convergence of the measures of the components of the tests no longer matters: since failing to be \( \omega \)-change random is equivalent to failing an \( f \)-change test for some \( f \), we can simply convert our \( f \)-change test with rate of convergence \( p \) to a \( g \)-change test with some other rate of convergence \( q \) if necessary. However, if we do not specify a rate of convergence, it should be assumed that it is the standard \( 2^{-k} \) rate.

We now consider the way the class of \( \omega \)-change random reals is related to other classes of random reals. We show that the natural extension of difference randomness to \( \omega \)-change randomness coincides with a well-known existing notion of randomness—weak Demuth randomness. That is, we can interpret each \( f \)-change test where the test components are \( \Delta^0_2 \) sets of reals as a \( g \)-Demuth test where the test components are open sets of reals and vice versa.

For each order function \( f \), \( O(f) \)-change tests are significantly more powerful than \( O(f) \)-Demuth tests. We show that each \( f \)-Demuth test can be covered by a \( 2f \)-change test, while each \( f \)-change test can only be covered by a \( 2^{i+1}f(i) \)-Demuth test. This is because each \( D(U,V) \) can pretend to cover all of \( 2^\omega \) before finally settling down on a small subset.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( f \) be an order function.

(i) Each \( 2f \)-change random real is \( f \)-WDR.

(ii) Each \( 2f(i+1) \)-WDR real is \( f \)-change random.

**Proof.** (i): Let \( \langle W_{g(i)}(i) \rangle_{i \in \omega} \) be a \( f \)-Demuth test. Let

\[
\begin{align*}
U^0_i &= \bigcup \{ W_{g(i,s)}(i) \mid \#\{ t < s \mid g(i,t) \neq g(i,t+1) \} = k \}, \\
U^{2k+1}_i &= W_{g(i,s)}, \text{ where } \#\{ t < s \mid g(i,t) \neq g(i,t+1) \} = k \text{ and } g(i,s) \neq g(i,s+1).
\end{align*}
\]

Then \( \langle D(U^0_i,\ldots, U^{2f(i)}_i) \rangle_{i \in \omega} \) is a \( 2f \)-change test covering \( \langle W_{g(i)}(i) \rangle_{i \in \omega} \).

(ii): Now we consider a canonical \( f \)-change-test \( \langle D(U^1_i,\ldots, U^{f(i)}_i) \rangle_{i \in \omega} \). By padding, we may assume that \( f(n) \) is even for every \( n \). We fix \( i \) and describe how to get \( W_{\lim_{j} g(i,s)} \) covering \( G_i = D(U^1_i,\ldots, U^{f(i)}_i) \). For \( \sigma \in 2^{<\omega} \) and \( s \in \omega \), we say that \( \sigma \in G_{i,s} \) if there exists some odd \( k \) such that \( [\sigma] \subseteq [U_{i,s}^k] \) and \( [\sigma] \cap [U_{i,s}^{k+1}] = \emptyset \). We assume by the \( s \)-m-n Theorem that we are building \( W_m \) for an infinite recursive set of indices for \( m \). By speeding up the enumerations for the \( U_i^k \)s, we
can assume that for every \(i\) and \(s\), \(\mu(G_{i,s}) < 2^{-i}\). For each \(i\), we reserve \(2^{i} f(i + 1)\) many indices \(m_1, \ldots, m_{2^{i} f(i + 1)}\) for building \(W_{g(i)}\).

We start by letting \(g(i, s)\) equal the first index \(m_1\) and call this the first version. For the \(k^{th}\) version, we keep \(g(i, s) = m_k\) and enumerate into \(W_{m_k}\) every string \(\sigma\) found such that \(\sigma \in G_{i+1,s}\) until a stage \(s_k > s_{k-1}\) is found such that \(\mu(W_{m_k,s_k}) > 2^{-i}\). When this happens we move to the next index \(m_{k+1}\) and repeat the process.

It is clear that \([G_{i+1}] \subseteq [W_{\lim_s g(i,s)}]\) if the limit \(\lim_s g(i, s)\) exists because \(U^{k}_{i+1,s}\) is a finite set of neighborhoods for each \(k\) and \(s\). Now we argue that we will not run out of indices \(m_k\). We claim that for each \(k\), if we find \(s_k\), then \(\mu(\bigcup_j (U^{2j+1}_{i+1,s_k} - U^{2j+1}_{i+1,s_{k-1}})) \geq 2^{-i-1}\). To see this, we suppose not for a contradiction and fix a counterexample \(k\). Then it is easy to see that at least \(2^{-i-1}\) much measure of the strings in \(W_{m_k,s_k}\) must be in \(G_{i+1,s_k}\), since any \(\sigma\) with \(\sigma \in W_{m_k,s_k}\) and \(\sigma \notin G_{i+1,s_k}\) must have some extension in \(U^{2j+1}_{i+1,s_k} - U^{2j+1}_{i+1,s_{k-1}}\) for some \(j\). This is a contradiction to our assumption that \(\mu(G_{i+1,s_k}) < 2^{-i-1}\) for every \(s\).

Now it is easy to see that the number of different indices we need is at most \(2^{i} f(i + 1)\). Once more, we suppose not. By a simple combinatorial argument, we see that there must be some \(\sigma\) where \(\sigma\) appears in \(\bigcup_j (U^{2j+1}_{i+1,s_k} - U^{2j+1}_{i+1,s_{k-1}})\) for at least \(2^{-f(i+1)}\) many different \(k\). This is a contradiction. Hence \(\langle W_{\lim_s g(i,s)} \rangle_{i \in \omega}\) is a \(2^{i} f(i + 1)\)-Demuth test covering \(\langle D(U^1_i, \ldots, U^{f(i)}_i) \rangle_{i \in \omega}\). \(\square\)

From this we immediately get the equivalence of \(\omega\)-change randomness and weak Demuth randomness.

**Corollary 3.2.** For any real \(A\), \(A\) is \(\omega\)-change random if and only if \(A\) is weakly Demuth random.

Next, we investigate the hypothesis that stronger randomness notions correlate with lower computational power. Many results, which we summarize in Table 1, support this hypothesis: several stronger randomness notions have been characterized as Martin-Löf randomness together with a property asserting computational feebleness. The property we consider here is strong promptness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randomness notion</th>
<th>Martin-Löf random and cannot compute...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>difference randomness</td>
<td>• 0' [9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• any PA-degree [16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberwolfach randomness</td>
<td>• every (\bar{K})-trivial set [3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak Demuth randomness</td>
<td>• any strongly prompt r.e. set (this paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demuth randomness</td>
<td>• any r.e. set that is not strongly jump traceable [12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak 2-randomness</td>
<td>• any nonrecursive r.e. set [6, 11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• any promptly simple r.e. set [11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-randomness</td>
<td>• any set that is not low for (\Omega) [14]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Strong randomness notions and computational weakness

**Definition 3.3** (Diamondstone and Ng [5]). An r.e. set \(B\) is **strongly prompt** if there is an enumeration \(\langle B_s \rangle_{s \in \omega}\) of \(B\), an increasing recursive function \(p : \omega \rightarrow \omega\), called the “promptness function,”
and an ω-r.e. function \( g : \omega \to \omega \), such that the following holds:

\[ |W_e| \geq g(e) \to (\exists x)(\exists s)[x \in W_e \land s \land B_s[x \neq B_{p(s)}[x]]. \]

Here each time some large \( x \) enters \( B \), either \( B \) must permit promptly below \( x \) or \( g(e, s) \) must increase. Hence the intuition behind Definition 3.3 is that a strongly prompt set has an r.e. enumeration where there is a recursive bound on the number of times a request for a prompt change can be denied. In contrast, an r.e. set of promptly simple degree can be viewed as having an r.e. enumeration where the number of times a request for a prompt change can be denied is finite. For more information we refer the reader to [5].

We noted above that being weakly 2-random can be characterized as being Martin-Löf random and computing no promptly simple r.e. set. Our next result is a pleasing analogue of this result. Since the proof makes heavy use of cost functions, we recall their definition for the reader:

**Definition 3.4.** [10, 13] A monotone cost function is a computable function \( c : \omega \times \omega \to \mathbb{Q}^+ \) such that for every \( n \), the sequence \( c(n, 0), c(n, 1), \ldots \) is nondecreasing and converges to a limit and for every \( s \), the sequence \( c(0, s), c(1, s), \ldots \) is nonincreasing. A monotone cost function \( c \) is benign if there is a computable function \( g : \mathbb{Q}^+ \to \omega \) such that whenever \( q \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \) and \( I \) is a set of pairwise disjoint intervals of \( \omega \) such that \( c(n, s) \geq q \) for all \( [n, s) \in I \), \#I \leq g(q).

**Theorem 3.5.** A is weakly Demuth random if and only if \( A \) is Martin-Löf random and \( A \) does not compute a strongly prompt r.e. set.

**Proof.** In this proof, to avoid confusion, we let \( V_e \) be the \( e^{th} \) r.e. set of strings and \( W_e \) be the \( e^{th} \) r.e. subset of \( \omega \). We first prove the easier direction. Assume that \( A \) is Martin-Löf random and not weakly Demuth random. We claim that there is a benign cost function \( c(x, s) \) such that if \( B \) is a r.e. set obeying \( c \), then \( B \leq_T A \). Let \( g(i, s) \) be a recursive function such that \( A \in \cap_{i}[V_{g(i)}] \), where \( g(i) = \lim_s g(i, s) \) with a recursively bounded number of mind changes. We define the recursive sequence \( b^s_i \) as follows. Initially, we set \( b_0^i = i \) for every \( i \). At stage \( s \), find the least \( i < s \) such that \( b^s_i < s \) and \( g(i, s - 1) \neq g(i, s) \). Set \( b_s^{i+2} = s + j \) for every \( j \geq 0 \). Now let \( c(x, s) = 2^{-i} \) for the largest \( i \) where \( b_i^s \leq x \). It is easy to see that \( c \) is monotonic and benign.

Now take an r.e. set \( B \) obeying \( c \). We claim that \( B \leq_T A \). First define \( Z \) to contain \( V_{g(j,s)} \) for every \( j \) and \( s \) such that \( x \) is enumerated into \( B \) at stage \( s \) and \( c(x, s) = 2^{-j} \). Then, since \( B \) obeys \( c \), \( Z \) is a Solovay test. We fix \( x \) and wait for a stage \( s \) such that \( c(x, s) = 2^{-i} \) and \( A \in \cap_{j \leq i}[V_{g(j,s)}] \). We claim that for almost every \( x, x \in B \) if and only if \( x \in B_s \). If this fails for \( x \), then there must be a \( t \) such that \( x \in B_t \setminus B_s \). Let \( j \leq i \) be such that \( c(x, t) = 2^{-j} \). Hence we have \( g(j, s) = g(j, t) \), which means that \( A \) is put into \( Z \). Since \( A \) can extend only finitely many strings in \( Z \), this means that our computation can fail for only finitely many \( x \). Finally, if \( c \) is a benign cost function, then by Diamondstone and Ng there is a strongly prompt r.e. set obeying \( c \) [5]. This completes one direction.\(^1\)

Now suppose that \( B = \Gamma^A \) where \( B \) is strongly prompt via the enumeration \( \langle B_s \rangle_{s \in \omega} \) as witnessed by the function \( b(x) = \lim_s b(x, s) \) and the promptness function \( p. \) To utilize the strong promptness of \( B \) we will (uniformly) define an array of r.e. sets \( U_{e, c} \). By the recursion theorem and the slowdown lemma, there is a recursive function \( q \) such that for all \( e \) and \( c \), we have \( W_{q(e,c)} = U_{e,c} \) and every element enumerated into \( U_{e,c} \) appears strictly later in \( W_{q(e,c)} \). For more information on the use of the recursion theorem here we refer the reader to [5].

\(^1\)The authors thank Andrée Nies for pointing out that this proof can be presented using cost functions.
Fix \( \varepsilon \). We describe a procedure that is uniform in \( \varepsilon \) to build \( V_{g(e)} \), which will be the \( e \)-th component of a Demuth test \( \langle V_{g(e)} \rangle_{e \in \omega} \) which catches \( A \). To this end we assume that we are building \( V_{m_1}, V_{m_2}, \ldots \). Let \( m \) be the current index. We define a nondecreasing sequence of numbers \( \{b_s\} \) and keep \( c \) as a parameter which initially starts off as \( c = 1 \). It will be incremented by one each time we get a prompt permission from \( U_{e,c} \).

Initially we let \( c = 1 \) and \( b_0 = \frac{b(q(e,c)) + 1}{1} \). At each stage \( s \), we copy \( \Gamma^{-1}(B_s | b_s) = \{ \sigma | \Gamma^\sigma = B_s | b_s \} \) into \( V_m \) until we find that \( \mu(V_m) \geq 2^{-\varepsilon} \). If this happens, then we challenge \( B|b_s \) to change by enumerating all elements less than \( b_s \) into \( U_{e,c} \). We then wait for \( b(q(e,c)) \) to increase beyond \( b_s \) or for \( B \) to permit below \( b_s \) (one of the two must happen due to the recursion theorem and the fact that \( B \) is strongly prompt). If \( b(q(e,c)) \) increases, then we increase \( b_{s+1} \) to match \( b(q(e,c)) + 1 \) and go on to the next index for \( m \). If \( B \) has permitted below \( b_s \), we increment \( c \) by 1, set \( b_{s+1} = b(q(e,c)) + 1 \) for this new \( c \), and go on to the next index for \( m \).

Clearly, if we only use finitely many indices, then \( \mu(V_{\lim m_i}) < 2^{-\varepsilon} \) and \( A \in [V_{\lim m_i}] \). It remains to verify that we use at most \( \sum_{c \leq 2^\varepsilon} \lceil b(q(e,c)) + 1 \rceil \) many indices \( m \), where \( b(k) \) is the mind-change bound for \( b(k) \). First observe that if \( V_m \) and \( V_{m'} \) were assigned to copy \( \Gamma^{-1} \) under different values of \( c \), then \( [V_m] \cap [V_{m'}] = \emptyset \). Since we only abandon an index when \( \mu(V_m) \geq 2^{-\varepsilon} \), this means that \( c \) can be no larger than \( 2^\varepsilon \). Each time we abandon an index we either increment \( c \) or force an increase in \( b(q(e,c)) \) (since new values of \( b_s \) are picked to be larger than the current \( b(q(e,c)) \) value). Hence we get a recursive bound on the number of indices used.

**Remark 3.6.** We could have studied \( \Delta^0_2 \)-change randomness by requiring a real \( A \) to pass every \( f \)-change test for every total \( \Delta^0_2 \) function \( f \) instead of only the recursive ones. To ensure that the tests are presentable by Boolean combinations of effective open sets instead of allowing the tests to be defined using access to an oracle \( f \), we may consider each \( \Delta^0_2 \)-change test to be a recursive double sequence of r.e. open sets \( \langle D(U_1^i, U_2^i, \ldots) \rangle_{i \in \omega} \) such that for every \( i \) and every \( j > f(i), U_j^i = \emptyset \). Of course, we also require the usual measure restriction \( \mu(D(U_1^i, \ldots)) \leq 2^{-i} \) for all \( i \). By the correspondence in Theorem 3.1 which can be easily generalized, we see that \( A \) is \( \Delta^0_2 \)-change random if and only if for every limit test \( \langle W_{g(i)} \rangle_{i \in \omega} \), \( A \not\in \bigcap_i W_{g(i)} \). Here a limit test is identical to a Demuth test except that we allow \( g \leq_T \emptyset \). The latter notion is easily seen to be equivalent to weak randomness. We note that a stronger notion called limit randomness was studied in Barmpalias, Miller and Nies [2] and Kučera and Nies [12], where \( A \) is limit random if and only if for every limit test \( \langle W_{g(i)} \rangle_{i \in \omega} \), \( A \not\in W_{g(i)} \) for almost every \( i \).

### 4. Lowness

We now investigate the associated lowness notions. Recall that for randomness notions \( C \) and \( D \), the class \( \text{Low}(C,D) \) is the class of all reals \( A \) such that every \( C \)-random real is \( D \)-random relative to \( A \); that is, \( C \subseteq D^A \). Every \( K \)-trivial is low for Martin-Lof randomness and hence in the class \( \text{Low}(WDR,ML) \), while \( \text{Low}(WDR,ML) \) is contained in the class \( \text{Low}(W2R,ML) \). The work of Downey, Nies, Weber, and Yu shows that the class \( \text{Low}(WDR,ML) \) is exactly the \( K \)-trivial sets [6].

We consider the corresponding lowness notions for \( f \)-WDR. For a fixed recursive nondecreasing function \( f \), an \( f \)-Demuth test relative to \( A \) is a sequence \( \langle W_{g^A(i)} \rangle_{i \in \omega} \) of \( A \)-r.e. open sets where \( g^A \) has an \( A \)-recursive approximation with mind-change function bounded by \( f \) and \( \mu(W_{g^A(i)}^A) \leq 2^{-i} \).
for every $i$. As usual, we define a real $X$ to be $f$-WDR relative to $A$ if it passes every $f$-Demuth test relative to $A$. A real $A$ is low for $f$-WDR if every real that is $f$-WDR is $f$-WDR relative to $A$.

For each fixed recursive nondecreasing function $f$, every low for $f$-WDR is in $\text{Low}(WDR, ML)$ and hence $K$-trivial. If $f = o(2^n)$, then the sets that are low for $f$-WDR are exactly the $K$-trivial sets. We show that the class of sets that are low for $2^n f(n)$-WDR is the class of recursive sets.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let $f$ be a recursive nondecreasing (possibly bounded) function. If $A$ is low for $2^n f(n)$-WDR, then $A$ is recursive.

**Proof.** In the remarks in the preceding paragraph, it is enough to show that $A$ is of hyperimmune-free degree. We fix an arbitrary real $A$ of hyperimmune degree and build a $2^n f(n)$-Demuth test relative to $A$ which is not covered by any unrelativized $2^n f(n)$-Demuth test. We follow the proof of Theorem 2.3(ii). Fix an $A$-recursive function $F$ which is not dominated by any recursive function and a uniform enumeration of all unrelativized $2^n f(n)$-Demuth tests. Let $\langle W_{k_e(n)} \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ be the $e^{th}$ test in this enumeration. During the construction, we will approximate the sequence $\langle n_k \rangle_{k \in \omega}$ by $\langle n_{k,s} \rangle_{k,s \in \omega}$. We ensure that for every $k$ and $s$, $n_{k+1,s} > n_{k,s}$ and $n_{k,s} \leq n_{k,s+1}$. At stage $s$, to redefine $n_k$ means to reset the values of $n_j$ for $j \geq k$. To do this, we assume that $n_j$ has been (re)defined for $j \geq k - 1$ and find the least number $m > n_j$ such that $f(m) > 5 \sum_{i \leq j} f(n_i)$. Now we choose $n_{j+1} > \max\{m, s\}$ large enough so that for every $m \geq i \geq n_j$,

$$\frac{1}{1 - \frac{3}{4} 2^{-i-n_{j+1}}} + 2^{-i+1} < \frac{3}{2}$$

and $f(n_{j+1}) > \frac{3}{4} \sum_{i \leq j+1} f(n_i)$. Hence this action moves (or lifts) the markers $n_{k+j}$ beyond $s$ for every $j \in \omega$ and spreads them out sufficiently sparsely. Finally, we speed up the construction until stage $F(s)$.

We will write $G_e[s]$ for $W_{k_e(n_{e,s}, s)}[s]$ and say that $G_e$ changes version at $s$ if $k_e(n_{e,s}, s - 1) \neq k_e(n_{e,s}, s)$ and $n_{e,s-1} = n_{e,s}$. For each $i$, we let $k(i, s)$ be the largest $k$ such that $n_{k,s} \leq i$. We will not mention $s$ where it causes no confusion. We build the $A$-relative Demuth test $\langle U_k \rangle_{k \in \omega}$ and argue at the end that this is a $2^n f(n)$-Demuth test relative to $A$.

As before, when we update $U_i$ during the construction, we enumerate into $U_i$ every string $\sigma$ of length $s$ extending some string in $\cap_{j<i} U_j$ such that $[\sigma] \cap \cup_{j \leq k(i)} [G_j] = \emptyset$. If the measure of all such $\sigma$ is greater than $2^{-i}$ we put it in the first $2^{-i}$ much $\sigma$ in the lexicographic ordering.

**Construction of $\langle U_k \rangle_{k \in \omega}$.** At stage $s = 0$, we update $U_0$. At a stage $s > 0$, we find the least $j < s$ such that $G_j$ has changed version exactly $2^{n_j - 1} f(n_j)$ times and the final change took place strictly after $n_j$ was last moved; that is, $s$ is the least such that $\# \{ t < s \mid k_j(n_{j,s}, t - 1) \neq k_j(n_{j,s}, t) \} = 2^{n_j - 1} f(n_j)$ and $n_j$ was not moved at $s$. Redefine $n_j$ and then search for the least $i < s$ such that $\cap_{j \leq i} [U_j] \subseteq \cup_{j < s} [G_j[s]]$ and $\mu(U_i) = 2^{-i}$. Switch version for $U_i$ and enumerate into the new version of $U_i$ all the $[\sigma]$ contained in the old version such that $[\sigma] \cap \cup_{j < k(i)} [G_j] = \emptyset$. Update $U_0, U_1, \ldots, U_s$. This ends the construction.

**Verification.** First we argue that each $n_j$ is moved finitely often. Suppose $n_j$ is moved infinitely often and that this movement takes place at the stages $s_1 < s_2 < \cdots$. We may assume that $n_0, \ldots, n_{j-1}$ are never moved after $s_1$. For each $i$, after $n_j$ is moved at $s_i$, we must have that $\# \{ t < F(s_i) \mid k_j(n_{j,s_i}, t - 1) \neq k_j(n_{j,s_i}, t) \} < 2^{n_j - 1} f(n_j)$ because otherwise $n_j$ cannot be moved again. Since $s_{i+1}$ has to be the first stage larger than $s_i$ such that $k_j(n_j)$ changes its mind exactly $2^{n_j - 1} f(n_j)$ times, from $s_i$ we can compute $s_{i+1}$ and hence the next value of $n_j$. This can be done
without knowledge of $F$ or the construction. Therefore $\langle s_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}$ is a recursive sequence dominating $F(s_i)$ and hence $F(i)$, which results in a contradiction.

We assume each $U_i$ changes version finitely often (this will be verified later). By the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 2.3(ii), we have for each $i$, $\mu(U_i) \leq 2^{-i}$, $[U_i]$ is clopen and $\cap_{i \in \omega}[U_i] \not\subseteq \cup_{j \in \omega}[G_j]$.

Again it remains to bound the number of version changes to each $U_i$. We argue that each $U_i$ changes version at most $(\varepsilon_i 2^{i-1} + 1) \sum_{j \leq k(i,i)} f(n_{j,i})$ times, where $\varepsilon_i = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2} 2^{-nk(i,i)+1}}$. Note that we only begin building $U_i$ at stage $i$. Again we have $\varepsilon_i \leq 4$. Fix $i \in \omega$ and let $t_0 < t_1$ be two consecutive stages where $U_i$ has a version switch and assume that no $n_k$ below $i$ is moved between $t_0$ and $t_1$. The same argument as before (in the proof of Theorem 2.3(ii)) shows that the strings enumerated in $U_i$ between $t_0$ and $t_1$ is covered by $\chi_1 \cup \chi_2$, where $\chi_1$ and $\chi_2$ are defined exactly as before.

Now the measure of $\chi_2 - \chi_1$ is at most $\frac{3}{2} 2^{-n_k(t_0)+1}$. Note that $n_k(t_0)+1 \geq n_k(i,i)+1$. Therefore the measure of the set of reals $X$ in $\chi_1$ is at least $2^{-i} - \frac{3}{2} 2^{-n_k(t_0)+1} = 2^{-i} (1 - \frac{3}{2^i} 2^{-nk(i,t_0)+1}) \geq \frac{1}{4} 2^{-i}$. But when $X$ was enumerated in $U_i$, $X \not\subseteq \cup_{j \leq k(i,t_0)}[G_j[t]]$. Each $G_j$ can change version at most $2^{n_j-1} f(n_j)$ times before it is redefined and removed from the calculation. Hence the total number of version changes for $U_i$ is bounded by $\varepsilon_i 2^{-i} \sum_{j \leq k(i,i)} f(n_{j,i})$. This calculation did not include those stages $[t_0, t_1]$ where some $n_k$ below $i$ was moved. There are at most $k(i,i) \leq \sum_{j \leq k(i,i)} f(n_{j,i})$ many of those stages. Adding these, we get the promised upper bound of $(\varepsilon_i 2^{i-1} + 1) \sum_{j \leq k(i,i)} f(n_{j,i})$.

We now argue that our choice of $\langle n_k \rangle_{k \in \omega}$ guarantees that for almost every $i$, $f(i) > (\frac{\varepsilon_i}{2} + 2^{-i}) \sum_{j \leq k(i,i)} f(n_{j,i})$, which will complete the proof of the theorem. To see this, fix $k$ and $i$ such that $n_k \leq i < n_{k+1}$ (hence $k = k(i,i)$) at the largest stage less than $i$ where $k(i,i)$ was redefined. If $i \leq m$ (in the choice of $n_k$), then $f(i) \geq f(n_k,i) > \frac{3}{4} \sum_{j \leq k} f(n_{j,i})$. It is easy to see that $\frac{3}{4} > \frac{\varepsilon_i}{2} + 2^{-i}$. On the other hand, if $i > m$, then $f(i) \geq f(m) > 5 \sum_{j \leq k} f(n_{j,i}) \geq (\frac{\varepsilon_i}{2} + 2^{-i}) \sum_{j \leq k} f(n_{j,i})$. \hfill \square

As a corollary we obtain that there no nonrecursive real that is low for balanced randomness. Recall that a real is balanced random if it passes every balanced test; i.e., every sequence $\langle W_{f(m)} \rangle_{m \in \omega}$ of r.e. sets such that $f$ is a $2^m$-change function and $\mu([W_{f(m)}]) \leq 2^{-m}$ for every $m$ [8].

**Corollary 4.2.** Every real that is low for balanced randomness is recursive.

5. Questions

At this point, we have only analyzed the differences between $f$-change randomness and $g$-change randomness at the level of individual reals. It is now natural to ask when, if at all, these notions can be separated at the level of degrees as well and, if so, for which type of degree.

**Question 5.1.** If a Turing degree $a$ contains a difference random real, does it contain an $f$-change random real for every recursive function $f$? More generally, if there is an $f$-change random real that is not $g$-change random, is there a Turing degree $a$ that contains an $f$-change random real but not a $g$-change random real?

The above question can be phrased naturally in terms of $h$-WDR as well.

**Question 5.2.** If it turns out that the answer to the second part of Question 5.1 is negative, is there a weak truth table degree or a truth table degree for which the answer is positive?
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