Computable Model Theory*

Ekaterina B. Fokina
Kurt Gödel Research Center
University of Vienna
Vienna, Austria
efokina@logic.univie.ac.at

Valentina Harizanov
Department of Mathematics
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052
harizanv@gwu.edu

Alexander G. Melnikov
Division of Mathematical Sciences
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798
AMelnikov@ntu.edu.sg

January 7, 2013

1 Introduction and preliminaries

In the last few decades there has been increasing interest in computable model theory. Computable model theory uses the tools of computability theory to explores algorithmic content (effectiveness) of notions, theorems, and constructions in various areas of ordinary mathematics. In algebra this investigation dates back to van der Waerden who in his 1930 book *Modern Algebra* defined an *explicitly* given field as one the elements of which are uniquely represented by distinguishable symbols with which we can perform the field operations algorithmically. In his pioneering paper on non-factorability of polynomials from 1930, van der Waerden essentially proved that an explicit field $(F, +, \cdot)$ does not necessarily have an algorithm for splitting polynomials in $F[x]$ into their irreducible factors. Gödel's incompleteness theorem from 1931 is an astonishing early result of computable model theory. Gödel showed that "there are in fact relatively simple problems in the theory of ordinary whole numbers which cannot be *decided* from the axioms." The work of Turing, Gödel, Kleene, Church, Post, and others in the mid-1930's established the rigorous mathematical foundations for the computability theory. In the 1950's, Fröhlich and Shepherdson used the precise notion of a computable function to obtain a collection of results and examples about explicit rings and fields. For example, Fröhlich and

*Harizanov was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1202328 and by GWU Columbian College Facilitating Fund.

Shepherdson proved that “there are two explicit fields that are isomorphic but not explicitly isomorphic.” Several years later, Rabin and Mal’tsev studied more extensively computable groups and other *computable* (also called *recursive* or *constructive*) algebras.

In the 1970’s, Nerode and his students [228, 229, 230, 280, 279, 278] initiated a systematic study of computability in mathematical structures and constructions by using modern computability theoretic tools, such as the priority method and various coding techniques. At the same time and independently, computable model theory was developed by the Soviet school of constructive mathematics led by Ershov and his students [86]. While we can replace some constructions by effective ones, for others such replacement is impossible in principle. For example, from the point of view of computable model theory, isomorphic structures may have very different properties.

Several different notions of effectiveness of structures have been investigated. The generalization and formalization of van der Waerden’s intuitive notion of an explicitly given field led to the notion of a *computable structure*, which is one of the main notions in computable model theory. Further generalization led to a countable structure of a certain Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$, which is the degree of its atomic diagram. Hence computable structures are of degree $\mathbf{0}$. Henkin’s construction of a model for a complete decidable theory is effective and produces a structure the elementary diagram of which is decidable. Such a structure is called *decidable*. In the case of a computable structure, the starting point is semantic, while in the case of a decidable structure, the starting point is syntactic. It is easy to see that not every decidable structure is computable. We can assign Turing degree or some other computability theoretic degree to isomorphisms, as well as to various relations on structures. We can also investigate structures, their theories, fragments of diagrams, relations, and isomorphisms within arithmetic and hyperarithmetic hierarchies.

In this paper, we will not consider structures that are computable with bounds on the resources that an algorithm can use, such as time and memory constraints. For a survey of polynomial time structures see a chapter by Cenzer and Remmel [46]. Another approach that turned out to be very interesting, which is beyond the scope of this paper, is to consider functions representable by various types of finite automata. For instance, a function presented by a finite string automaton can be computed in linear time using a constant amount of memory. A seminal paper in this field is the paper by Khoussainov and Nerode [193]. The most interesting property of automatic structures is that they have decidable model checking problems. We can use this property to prove the decidability of first-order theories for many structures, e.g., of Presburger arithmetic. There is also a class of tree automatic structures (see [191, 286]), which is richer than the class of automatic structures. Tree automatic structures have nice algorithmic properties, in particular, decidable model checking problem. Many problems in this area remain open.

Computability theoretic notation is standard and as in [302]. We review some basic notions. For $X \subseteq \omega$, let $\varphi_0^X, \varphi_1^X, \varphi_2^X, \dots$ be a fixed effective enumeration of all unary X-computable functions. For $e \in \omega$, let $W_e^X = dom(\varphi_e^X)$.

Hence $W_0, W_1, W_2, \ldots$ is an effective enumeration of all computably enumerable (c.e.) sets. By $X \leq_T Y$ ($X \equiv_T Y$, respectively) we denote that X is Turing reducible to Y (X is Turing equivalent to Y, respectively). By $X <_T Y$ we denote that $X \leq_T Y$ but $Y \not\leq_T X$. We write $\mathbf{x} = \deg(X)$ for the Turing degree of X. Thus, $\mathbf{0} = \deg(\emptyset)$. Let $n \geq 1$. Then $\mathbf{x}^{(n)} = \deg(X^{(n)})$, where $X^{(n)}$ is the n-th jump of X. A set is Σ^0_n if it is c.e. relative to $\mathbf{0}^{(n-1)}$. A set is Π^0_n if its negation is Σ^0_n, and it is Δ^0_n if it is both Σ^0_n and Π^0_n. Let $\Delta^0_0 =_{def} \Delta^0_1$. A set X is *arithmetic* if $X \leq \emptyset^{(k)}$ for some $k \geq 0$.

An ordinal is *computable* if it is finite or is the order type of a computable well ordering on ω. The computable ordinals form a countable initial segment of the ordinals. *Kleene's* $\mathcal{O}$ is the set of notations for computable ordinals, with the corresponding partial order $<_{\mathcal{O}}$ (see [284, 287]). The ordinal 0 gets notation 1. If a is a notation for α, then 2^a is a notation for $\alpha + 1$. Then $a <_{\mathcal{O}} 2^a$, and also, if $b <_{\mathcal{O}} a$, then $b <_{\mathcal{O}} 2^a$. Suppose α is a limit ordinal. If φ_e is a total function, giving notations for an increasing sequence of ordinals with limit α, then $3 \cdot 5^e$ is a notation for α. For all n, $\varphi_e(n) <_{\mathcal{O}} 3 \cdot 5^e$, and if $b <_{\mathcal{O}} \varphi_e(n)$, then $b <_{\mathcal{O}} 3 \cdot 5^e$. Let $|a|$ denote the ordinal with notation a. If $a \in \mathcal{O}$, then the restriction of $<_{\mathcal{O}}$ to the set $pred(a) = \{b \in O : b <_{\mathcal{O}} a\}$ is a well order of type $|a|$. For $a \in \mathcal{O}$, $pred(a)$ is c.e., uniformly in a. The set $\mathcal{O}$ is Π^1_1 complete.

The least noncomputable ordinal is denoted by ω_1^{CK}, where CK stands for Church-Kleene. To extend the arithmetic hierarchy, we define the representative sets in the hyperarithmetic hierarchy, H_a for $a \in \mathcal{O}$. The definition is recursive, and is based on iterating Turing jump: $H_1 = \emptyset$, $H_{2^a} = (H_a)'$, and $H_{3 \cdot 5^e} = \{2^x \cdot 3^n : x \in H_{\varphi_e(n)}\}$. Let β be an infinite computable ordinal. Then a set is Σ^0_β if it is c.e. relative to some H_a such that β is represented by notation a. A set is Π^0_β if its negation is Σ^0_β, and it is Δ^0_β if it is both Σ^0_β and Π^0_β. A set is *hyperarithmetic* if it is Δ^0_α for some computable α. Hence, a set X is hyperarithmetic if $(\exists a \in \mathcal{O})[X \leq_T H_a]$. The hyperarithmetic sets coincide with Δ^1_1 sets.

Ershov classified Δ^0_2 sets as follows. Let α be a computable ordinal. A set $C \subseteq \omega$ is α-c.e. if there are a computable function $f : \omega^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and a computable function $o : \omega \times \omega \rightarrow \alpha + 1$ with the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\forall x)[\lim_{s \to \infty} f(x, s) &= C(x) \wedge f(x, 0) = 0], \\
(\forall x)(\forall s)[o(x, s+1) &\leq o(x, s) \wedge o(x, 0) = \alpha], \text{ and} \\
(\forall x)(\forall s)[f(x, s+1) &\neq f(x, s) \Rightarrow o(x, s+1) < o(x, s)].
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, 1-c.e. sets are c.e. sets, and 2-c.e. sets are d.c.e. sets.

Several important notions of computability on effective structures have syntactic characterizations, which involve computable infinitary formulas introduced by Ash. Roughly speaking, these are infinitary formulas involving infinite conjunctions and disjunctions over c.e. sets. More precisely, let α be a computable ordinal. Ash defined computable Σ_α and Π_α formulas of $L_{\omega_1 \omega}$, recursively and simultaneously, and together with their Gödel numbers. The computable Σ_0 and Π_0 formulas are the finitary quantifier-free formulas. The computable $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ formulas are of the form

$$\bigvee_{n \in W_e} \exists \overline{y_n} \psi_n(\overline{x}, \overline{y_n}),$$

where for $n \in W_e$, ψ_n is a Π_α formula indexed by its Gödel number, and $\exists \overline{y_n}$ is a finite block of existential quantifiers. That is, $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ formulas are c.e. disjunctions of $\exists \Pi_\alpha$ formulas. Similarly, $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$ formulas are c.e. conjunctions of $\forall \Sigma_\alpha$ formulas. It can be shown that a computable Σ_1 formula is of the form

$$\bigvee_{n \in \omega} \exists \overline{y_n} \theta_n(\overline{x}, \overline{y_n}),$$

where $(\theta_n(\overline{x}, \overline{y_n}))_{n \in \omega}$ is a computable sequence of quantifier-free formulas. If α is a limit ordinal, then the Σ_α (Π_α, respectively) formulas are of the form $\bigvee\limits_{n \in W_e} \psi_n$ ($\bigwedge\limits_{n \in W_e} \psi_n$, respectively), such that there is a sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n \in W_e}$ of ordinals having limit α, given by the ordinal notation for α, and every ψ_n is a Σ_{α_n} (Π_{α_n}, respectively) formula. For a more precise definition of computable Σ_α and Π_α formulas see [13]. The important property of these formulas, due to Ash, is the following: *For a structure A, if $\theta(\overline{x})$ is a computable Σ_α formula, then the set $\{\overline{a} : A \models \theta(\overline{a})\}$ is Σ^0_α relative to A.* An analogous property holds for computable Π_α formulas. The following is a compactness theorem due to Kreisel and Barwise.

Theorem 1. *Let Γ be a Π^1_1 set of computable infinitary sentences. If every Δ^1_1 subset of Γ has a model, then Γ has a model.*

As a corollary we obtain that if Γ be a Π^1_1 set of computable infinitary sentences, and if every Δ^1_1 set $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ has a computable model, then Γ has a computable model (see [13]).

Complexity of a countable structure $\mathcal{A}$ can be measured by its ranks, such as *Barwise rank* [128] or *Scott rank*. There are several different definitions of *Scott rank* and we will use one in [13] (also see [39]). We first define a family of equivalence relations for finite tuples $\overline{a}$ and $\overline{b}$ of elements in $\mathcal{A}$, of the same length.

1. We say that $\overline{a} \equiv^0 \overline{b}$ if $\overline{a}$ and $\overline{b}$ satisfy the same quantifier-free formulas.

2. For $\alpha > 0$, we say that $\overline{a} \equiv^\alpha \overline{b}$ if for all $\beta < \alpha$, for each $\overline{c}$, there exists $\overline{d}$, and for each $\overline{d}$, there exists $\overline{c}$, such that $\overline{a}, \overline{c} \equiv^\beta \overline{b}, \overline{d}$.

The *Scott rank of a tuple* $\overline{a}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is the least β such that for all $\overline{b}$, the relation $\overline{a} \equiv^\beta \overline{b}$ implies $(\mathcal{A}, \overline{a}) \cong (\mathcal{A}, \overline{b})$. The *Scott rank of* $\mathcal{A}$, $SR(\mathcal{A})$, is the least ordinal α greater than the ranks of all tuples in $\mathcal{A}$. For example, if $\mathcal{L}$ is a linear order of type ω, then $SR(\mathcal{L}) = 2$. For a hyperarithmetic structure, the Scott rank is at most $\omega_1^{CK} + 1$. It can be shown (see [13, 39]) that for a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$:

(i) $SR(\mathcal{A}) < \omega_1^{CK}$ if there is some computable ordinal β such that the orbits of all tuples are defined by computable Π_β formulas;

(ii) $SR(\mathcal{A}) = \omega_1^{CK}$ if the orbits of all tuples are defined by computable infinitary formulas, but there is no bound on the complexity of these formulas;

(iii) $SR(\mathcal{A}) = \omega_1^{CK}+1$ if there is some tuple the orbit of which is not defined by any computable infinitary formula.

There are structures in natural classes, for example, abelian p-groups, with arbitrarily large computable ranks, and of rank $\omega_1^{CK}+1$, but none of rank ω_1^{CK} (see [24]). Makkai [217] was first to prove the existence of an arithmetic structure of Scott rank ω_1^{CK}, and in [201] J. Millar and Knight showed that such a structure can be made computable. Through the recent work of Calvert, Knight and J. Millar [40] and Calvert, Goncharov, and Knight [37], and Freer [100], we started to better understand the structures of Scott rank ω_1^{CK}. They were obtained in familiar classes such as trees, undirected graphs, fields of any fixed characteristic, and linear orders [40, 37]. Sacks asked whether for known examples of computable structures of Scott rank ω_1^{CK}, the computable infinitary theories are $\aleph_0$-categorical. In [38], Calvert, Goncharov, J. Millar, and Knight gave an affirmative answer for known examples. In [231], J. Millar and Sacks introduced an innovative technique that produced a countable structure $\mathcal{A}$ of Scott rank ω_1^{CK} such that $\omega_1^{\mathcal{A}} = \omega_1^{CK}$ and the $L_{\omega_1^{CK},\omega}$-theory of $\mathcal{A}$ is *not* $\aleph_0$-categorical. It is not known whether such a structure can be computable.

2 Degrees and jump degrees of structures and their isomorphism types

We will assume that all structures are at most countable and their languages are computable. Clearly, finite structures are computable. Let $\mathbf{d}$ be a Turing degree. An infinite structure $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathbf{d}$-*computable* if its universe can be identified with the set of natural numbers ω in such a way that the relations and operations of $\mathcal{M}$ are uniformly $\mathbf{d}$-computable. For example, we may consider structures computable in the halting problem, such as Σ_1^0 and Π_1^0 structures. See Ershov and Goncharov [89], Higman [157], Feiner [90], Metakides and Nerode [230], Cenzer, Harizanov, and Remmel [43] for more on Σ_1^0 structures, and Remmel [281], Khoussainov, Slaman, and Semukhin [197], Cenzer, Harizanov, and Remmel [43] for more on Π_1^0 structures.

If an algebraic structure is not computable, then it is natural to ask how close it is to a computable one. This property can be captured by the collection of all Turing degrees relative to which a given structure has a computable isomorphic copy. Thus, we have the following definition.

Definition 1. The *degree spectrum* of a structure $\mathcal{A}$ is

$$DgSp(\mathcal{A}) = \{\mathbf{d} : \deg(D(\mathcal{B})) : \mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}\},$$

where $D(\mathcal{B})$ is the the atomic diagram of $\mathcal{B}$.

Knight proved the following fundamental result about degree spectra of structures.

Theorem 2. *([200]) The degree spectrum of any structure is either a singleton or is upward closed.*

A structure $\mathcal{A}$ is *automorphically trivial* if there is a finite subset C of its domain such that every permutation of the domain, which fixes C pointwise, is an automorphism of $\mathcal{A}$. Automorphically trivial structures include all finite structures, of course, and also some infinite structures, such as the complete graph on countably many vertices. If the structure is automorphically nontrivial, the degree spectrum is upward closed [200]. The degree spectrum of an automorphically trivial structure always contains exactly one Turing degree, and if the language is finite, that degree must be $\mathbf{0}$ (see [147]). Richter introduced the following notion in her dissertation.

Definition 2. ([283]) If the degree spectrum of a structure $\mathcal{A}$ has a least element, then this element is called the *degree of the isomorphism type* of $\mathcal{A}$.

Richter initiated the systematic study of such degrees. She [283] proved that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a structure without a computable copy and satisfies the effective extendability condition, then the isomorphism type of $\mathcal{A}$ has no degree. A structure $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies the *effective extendability condition* if for every finite structure $\mathcal{M}$ isomorphic to a substructure of $\mathcal{A}$, and every embedding f of $\mathcal{M}$ into $\mathcal{A}$, there is an algorithm that determines whether a given finite structure $\mathcal{F}$ extending $\mathcal{M}$ can be embedded into $\mathcal{A}$ by an embedding extending f. Richter [283] showed that every linear order, and every tree, as a partially ordered set, satisfy the effective extendability condition. More recently, A. Khisamiev [185] proved that every abelian p-group, where p is a prime number, satisfies the effective extendability condition. Hence the isomorphism type of a countable linear order, a tree, or an abelian p-group, which is not isomorphic to a computable one, does not have a degree of its isomorphism type. Richter also showed for any Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$, there is a torsion abelian group the isomorphism type of which has the degree $\mathbf{d}$, as well as that there is such a group the isomorphism type of which does not have a degree. Results of Richter motivated the study of jump degrees of structures.

Definition 3. (Jockusch and Richter) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a structure, and α a computable ordinal. We say that a Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$ is the α^{th} *jump degree* of $\mathcal{A}$ if it is the least degree in

$$\{\mathbf{d}^{(\alpha)} : \mathbf{d} \in DgSp(\mathcal{A})\},$$

under Turing reducibility. The degree $\mathbf{d}$ is said to be the *proper* α^{th} *jump degree* of $\mathcal{A}$ if for every computable ordinal $\beta < \alpha$, the structure $\mathcal{A}$ has no β^{th} jump degree.

Given a class of structures, we may ask for which computable ordinals α there exist representatives of this class having (proper) α^{th} jump degrees.

The following theorem summarizes results for linear orders due to Knight [200], Ash, Jockusch, and Knight [12], Jockusch and Soare [171], and Downey and Knight [76].

Theorem 3. *([200, 12, 171, 76]) If a linear order has first jump degree, it must be* $\mathbf{0}'$*. In contrast, for each computable ordinal* $\alpha \geq 2$ *and every Turing degree* $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$*, there exists a linear order having proper* α^{th} *jump degree* $\mathbf{d}$*.*

Ordinal jump degrees of Boolean algebras are well-understood as well, but the results differ from the ones for linear orders. Jockusch and Soare established the following result.

Theorem 4. *([170]) For* $n \in \omega$*, if a Boolean algebra has* n^{th} *jump degree, then it is* $\mathbf{0}^{(n)}$*. In contrast, for each* $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{0}^{(\omega)}$*, there exists a Boolean algebra with proper* ω^{th} *jump degree* $\mathbf{d}$*.*

Oates investigated jump degrees of torsion abelian groups.

Theorem 5. *([268]) For every computable* α*, there is a torsion abelian group having a proper* α^{th} *jump degree.*

The proof relies on algebraic properties of countable abelian p-groups, which are well-undestood. The situation becomes more complex in the case of countable, torsion-free, abelian groups, where there is no suitable algebraic classification theory. Nevertheless, there has been a significant progress in this area. If $\mathcal{G} = (G, +)$ is a torsion-free abelian group, a set of nonzero elements $\{g_i : i \in I\} \subset G$ is *linearly independent* if $\alpha_1 g_{i_1} + \cdots + \alpha_k g_{i_k} = 0$ has no solution with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for each i, $\{i_1, ..., i_k\} \subseteq I$, and $\alpha_i \neq 0$ for some i. A basis for $\mathcal{G}$ is a maximal linearly independent set and the *rank* of $\mathcal{G}$ is the cardinality of a *basis.* Calvert, Harizanov, and Schlapentokh proved a result about Turing degrees of isomorphism types fore various classes, including torsion-free abelian groups of finite rank.

Theorem 6. *([35]) There are countable fields and torsion-free abelian groups of any finite rank* > 1*, the isomorphism types of which have arbitrary Turing degrees. There are structures in each of these classes the isomorphism types of which do not have Turing degrees.*

For rank 1, torsion-free, abelian groups the result was previously obtained by Knight, Downey, and Jockusch (see [70]). These groups are isomorphic to subgroups of $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$, and there is a known classification for these groups due to Baer.

Melnikov [227] showed that not every infinite rank, torsion-free, abelian group has first jump degree. Results about the existence of proper jump degrees for torsion-free abelian groups were resolved by Downey and Jockusch for the first jump, and by Melnikov for the second and the third jump.

Theorem 7. *([70, 227] For* $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ *and every degree* $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{0}^{(n)}$*, there is a torsion-free group having proper* n^{th} *jump degree* $\mathbf{d}$*.*

The case of higher ordinals remained unresolved until the recent work of Anderson, Kach, Melnikov, and Solomon who obtained the following general result.

Theorem 8. *([2]) For every computable $\alpha > 3$, every $\mathbf{d} > 0^{(\alpha)}$ can be realized as a proper α^{th} jump degree of a torsion-free abelian group.*

It is not known if the result can be strengthened to $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha > 2$.

The groups from Theorem 7 above are of the form $\bigoplus_i \mathcal{H}_i$, where $\mathcal{H}_i \leqq (\mathbb{Q}, +)$. Such groups, introduced by Baer in 1937, are called *completely decomposable* and have nice algebraic properties. In the case of only one summand, Coles, Downey, and Slaman [56] established the following theorem, as a consequence of their pure computability theoretic result that for every set $C \subseteq \omega$, there is a Turing degree that is the least degree of the jumps of all sets X for which C is computably enumerable in X.

Theorem 9. *([56]) Every subgroup of the additive group of rational numbers has first jump degree.*

Theorem 9 can be extended to additive subgroups of finite direct products of the rationals (finite rank groups), as was observed in [227] and [35]. It is not known which ordinals are realized as proper jump degrees of groups of the form $\bigoplus_{i\in\omega} \mathcal{H}_i$.

For certain classes of structures, we can use computable functors to translate results from one class of countable structures to another. A functor $\Phi : \mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{K}_1$ is *computable* if, given an enumeration of an open diagram of $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{K}$, we can enumerate the open diagram of $\Phi(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathcal{K}_1$, in a uniform fashion.

Computable functors are also called effective transformations. Hirschfeldt, Khoussainov, Shore, and Slinko used injective effective transformations to transfer various computability theoretic results from graphs to structures in other familiar algebraic classes.

Theorem 10. *([166]) For every automorphically nontrivial structure $\mathcal{A}$, there is a symmetric irreflexive graph, a partial order, a lattice, a ring, an integral domain of arbitrary characteristic, a commutative semigroup, or a 2-step nilpotent group the degree spectrum of which coincides with $DgSp(\mathcal{A})$.*

As a consequence of the theorem, we obtain that these classes have structures with (proper) α^{th} jump degrees for all computable ordinals α.

Frolov, Kalimullin, and R. Miller [105] investigated degree spectra of algebraic extensions of prime fields.

Theorem 11. *([105]) Every algebraic extension of a prime field has the first jump degree of its isomorphism class. Every upper cone of Turing degrees is the degree spectrum of an algebraic field.*

Not much is known about groups that are far from abelian. There are centerless groups that have arbitrary Turing degrees for their isomorphism classes, as well as no Turing degrees [65]. Recently, Calvert, Harizanov, and Shlapentokh [36] started to investigate effective content of geometric objects, such as ringed spaces and schemes. In particular, they showed that ringed spaces corresponding to unions of varieties, ringed spaces corresponding to unions of subvarieties of certain fixed varieties, and schemes over a fixed field can have arbitrary Turing degrees for their isomorphism classes, as well as no Turing degrees.

Lempp asked if there is a nontrivial sufficient condition on a structure, which will guarantee that its degree spectrum contains **0**. Slaman [300] and Wehner [316] independently obtained the following result, with different proofs.

Theorem 12. *([300, 316]) There exists a structure the degree spectrum of which is the set of all noncomputable Turing degrees.*

Wehner [316] constructed a family of sets that yields a structure with isomorphic copies in exactly the noncomputable Turing degrees. While Wehner's structure is elementarily equivalent to a computable structure, Slaman's is not. We will say that a structure such as one in Theorem 12 has Slaman-Wehner degree spectrum. More recently, Hirschfeldt [161] proved that there is a structure with Slaman-Wehner degree spectrum, which is a prime model of a complete decidable theory. This also gives another proof of Theorem 12. Hirschfeldt structure is elementarily equivalent to a decidable structure.

Downey asked if there exists a structure in a natural algebraic class of structures, such as a linear order or an abelian group, which has Slaman-Wehner spectrum. We can also ask which sets of degrees can be realized as degree spectra of structures. Since co-null collections of degrees are of a particular interest, we have the following definition due to Kalimullin.

Definition 4. ([179]) An automorphically nontrivial structure $\mathcal{M}$ is *almost computable* if the measure of $DegSp(\mathcal{M})$ is equal to 1 under the standard uniform measure on the Cantor space.

For example, every structure with Slaman-Wehner spectrum is almost computable. More examples have been obtained recently. Kalimullin [178, 176, 177] investigated the relativization of Slaman-Wehner theorem to nonzero degrees. He showed that such a relativization holds for every low Turing degree, as well as every c.e. degree, but not for every Δ_3^0 Turing degree. Using the enumeration result of Wehner, also relativized, Goncharov, Harizanov, Knight, McCoy, R. Miller, and Solomon [126] showed that for every computable successor ordinal α, there is a structure with copies in just the degrees of sets X such that $\Delta_\alpha^0(X)$ is not Δ_α^0. As a consequence, they obtained the following result.

Theorem 13. *([126]) For each finite n, there is a structure with the degree spectrum consisting of exactly all non-low$_n$ Turing degrees.*

Consequently, there are almost computable structures without arithmetic isomorphic copies. Csima and Kalimullin provided another interesting example of a possible degree spectrum.

Theorem 14. *([60]) The set of hyperimmune degrees is the degree spectrum of a structure.*

We could ask the following analogue of Lemmp's question for almost computable structures. If a structure is almost computable, must it contain a hyperarithmetic or a Π^1_1 degree? Greenberg, Montalbán, and Slaman [137] and independently Kalimullin and Nies (unpublished) obtained the following positive result.

Theorem 15. *([137]) Any co-null degree spectrum must include the Turing degree of the Π^1_1 complete set.*

This bound cannot be improved to be hyperarithmetic. Recently, Greenberg, Montalbán, and Slaman [136] constructed a linear order the degree spectrum of which is the set of all non-hyperarithmetic degrees. There are other examples of almost computable structures in various natural algebraic classes and we will discuss some of them.

Although the degree spectra of linear orders have been intensively studied, the following question remains open. Is there a linear order the degree spectrum of which is the set of all nonzero degrees? R. Miller [241] constructed a noncomputable linear order with the spectrum containing all nonzero Δ^0_2 degrees. Recently, Frolov, Harizanov, Kalimullin, Kudinov, and R. Miller obtained the following example.

Theorem 16. *([104]) For every $n > 1$, and a Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$, there is a linear order having a $\mathbf{d}$-computable isomorphic copy iff $\mathbf{d}$ is non-low_n.*

For a survey of related results on linear orders see [104].

Slaman-Wehner's result fails when restricted to the class of countable Boolean algebras. Knight and Stob [203] established the following result about low_4 Boolean algebras, extending a result of Downey and Jockusch [73] for *low* Boolean algebras and of Thurber [313] for low_2 Boolean algebras.

Theorem 17. *([203]) Every low_4 Boolean algebra has a computable isomorphic copy.*

One of the main open questions in this area is the following. Is every low_5 Boolean algebra isomorphic to a computable one? The affirmative answer to this question is known as the low_5 Boolean algebra conjecture.
There is some evidence that if every low_5 Boolean algebra has a computable copy, then the proof of that statement should be different from the proof for low_4 Boolean algebra. This follows from work of Harris and Montalbán in [152] where they showed that there are over 1000 invariants that have to be considered for low_5 case, as well as from work of Harris and Montalbán on the complexity of isomorphisms in [153].

Similarly to linear orders, the following question is open. Is there an abelian group having Slaman-Wehner spectrum? Recently, Khoussainov, Kalimullin, and Melnikov proved the following result about abelian p-groups.

Theorem 18. *([180]) There exists an abelian p-group, which has an $\mathbf{x}$-computable copy relative to every noncomputable Δ^0_2 degree $\mathbf{x}$, but it has no computable isomorphic copy.*

In addition, Khoussainov, Kalimullin, and Melnikov [180] proved that there exists a noncomputable torsion abelian group the degree spectrum of which contains all hyperimmune degrees. They also showed that this result cannot be generalized to co-countable collections of degrees, when restricted to direct sums of cyclic groups. These results can be re-formulated in terms of effective monotonic approximations that we will later introduce. It is also known that there exists a torsion-free abelian group having exactly non-*low* isomorphic copies [227]. Other structures studied in this context come from [166]. There are also some related results on equivalence structures (see [43, 180]).

In many cases, the existence of a computable copy of a structure is related to the ability to enumerate a certain invariant of the structure.

Examples (i) Given a set S, define its algebraic extension $\mathcal{F}_S$ of the prime field $\mathbb{Q}$ to be $\mathbb{Q}(\{\sqrt{p_x} : x \in S\})$. The field $\mathcal{F}_S$ has an X-computable copy if and only if S is c.e. in X.

(ii) Given a set S, define a subgroup $\mathcal{G}(S)$ of $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$ by having the generator $1/p_x$ for $\mathcal{G}(S)$ if and only if $x \in S$. Then $\mathcal{G}(S)$ has an X-computable copy if and only if S is c.e. in X.

It is well-known that, under an appropriate choice of S, neither $\mathcal{F}_S$ nor $\mathcal{G}(S)$ has a Turing degree for its isomorphism type (see, for example, [35]). Nevertheless, in the examples above, we may define the *enumeration degree* of $\mathcal{F}_S$ or $\mathcal{G}(S)$ to be the degree of the set S under the enumeration reducibility $\leq_e$. There is also a direct way to define an enumeration degree spectrum of a structure, as A. Soskova and Soskov did in [306, 305]. More generally, we may view a degree spectrum as a *mass problem*. The following general definition is due to Medvedev.

Definition 5. ([226]) A *mass problem* is a collection of total functions from ω to ω.

We may identify the open diagram $\mathcal{D}_0(\mathcal{B})$ of a countable structure $\mathcal{B}$ with its characteristic function $\chi_{\mathcal{D}_0(\mathcal{B})}$. This allowed Stukachev to define various reducibilities between mass problems of structures, such as Muchnik reducibility.

Definition 6. ([311])

(i) The *mass problem* of a countable structure $\mathcal{A}$ is the set

$$\{\chi_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})} : \mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}\}.$$

(ii) Given structures $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *Muchnik reducible* to $\mathcal{B}$, in symbols $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$, if $DegSp(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq DegSp(\mathcal{B})$.

Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ is Muchnik equivalent to $\mathcal{B}$, written as $\mathcal{A} =_w \mathcal{B}$, if $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B} \leq_w \mathcal{A}$. Selman's theorem [296] states that if a structure has an enumeration degree as defined above, then $\leq_w$ coincides with the enumeration reducibility $\leq_e$. Thus, the notion of enumeration degree is a special case of Definition 6. For other reducibilities on mass problems of structures see Stukachev [311, 310].

Whenever a reducibility is defined, we look for a suitable definition of the *jump*. Various authors recently and independently introduced the notion of the jump of an abstract structure: Montalbán [245] using predicates for computable infinitary Σ_1 formulas; Baleva [21] and Soskov and A. Soskova [305] using Moschovakis extensions; Stukachev [309] using hereditarily finite extensions; Puzarenko [274] and Morozov [248] in the context of admissible sets. It is remarkable that these different approaches turned out to be equivalent. We give the definition due to Montalbán.

Definition 7. ([245]) Given a language L, let $\{\theta_i : i \in \omega\}$ be a computable enumeration of all computable infinitary Σ_1 formulas in L. Given a structure $\mathcal{A}$ for L, let $\mathcal{A}'$ be the structure obtained by adding to $\mathcal{A}$ infinitely many relations P_i, for $i \in \omega$, where $\mathcal{A} \models P_i(\overline{x}) \Leftrightarrow \theta_i(\overline{x})$, and where the arity of P_i is the same as the length of $\overline{x}$ in $\theta_i(\overline{x})$.

Several results on degree spectra can be re-formulated in terms of the jump of a structure. For instance, the result of Downey and Jockusch in [73] that every low Boolean algebra is isomorphic to a computable one follows from the following result. If $\mathcal{B}$ is a Boolean algebra, and $\mathbf{0}'$ computes a copy of $\mathcal{B}'$, then $\mathcal{B}$ has a computable copy. A better understanding of the jump operator on structures may help us establish or refute the low_5 Boolean algebra conjecture.

A. Soskova and Soskov, and also Montalbán showed that the spectrum of a structure behaves well with respect to the jump of the structure. More precisely, they established the following jump inversion theorem for the jump operator on structures.

Theorem 19. *([305, 245]) For every structure $\mathcal{A}$, we have*

$$DegSp(\mathcal{A}') = \{\mathbf{x}' : \mathbf{x} \in DegSp(\mathcal{A})\}.$$

Other authors also independently proved the jump inversion theorem. See Stukachev [309] for more on the jump inversion results. Recently, Montalbán [244] and Puzarenko [273] showed independently and simultaneously that the jump operator has a fixed point.

Theorem 20. *([244, 273]) There is a structure $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} =_w \mathcal{A}'$.*

Montalbán proved this theorem under the assumption that "$0^\#$ exists", and Puzarenko obtained another proof that does not use this assumption.

Andrews and J. Miller [8] have recently introduced a notion of the *spectrum of a theory* T, $Spec(T)$, to be the set of Turing degrees of models of T. The idea behind this notion is to better understand the relationship between the model theoretic properties of a theory and the computability theoretic complexity of its models. Cones above any Turing degree are theory spectra, as well as the set of all noncomputable degrees (as in Theorem 12). On the other hand, there are examples of theory spectra that are not degree spectra for any structure, and *vice versa*. We say that a real is Martin-Löf random or 1-*random* iff for every computable collection of c.e. open sets $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$, with $\mu(U_n) \leq 2^{-n}$, $n \in \omega$, we have $x \notin \cap_{n\in\omega} U_n$ (where μ stands the standard Lebesgue measure on the Cantor space). A Turing degree is called *1-random* if it contains a set which is 1-random. For more on randomness see [72, 265].

Theorem 21. *([8]) The following sets of Turing degrees can be theory spectra:*
(a) the degrees of complete extensions of Peano arithmetic,
(b) the 1*-random degrees,*
(c) a union of the cones above two incomparable Turing degrees.

However, as it follows from [8] and [306], these sets are not the degree spectra for any structure. On the other hand, by [137], there is a structure the degree specturm of which consists of exactly the non-hyperarithmetical degrees.

Theorem 22. *([8]) The collection of non-hyperarithmetical degrees is not the spectrum of a theory.*

Further interesting examples can be found in [8] and, for the case of atomic theories, in [6].

3 Theories, types, models, and diagrams

We will assume that our theories are consistent, countable, and have infinite models. We will denote the *elementary* (*complete*) *diagram* of $\mathcal{A}$ by $D^c(\mathcal{A})$. It is easy to see that the theory of a structure $\mathcal{A}$ is computable in $D^c(\mathcal{A})$, and that $D^c(\mathcal{A})$ is computable in $(D_0(\mathcal{A}))^{(\omega)}$. The atomic diagram of a model of a theory may be of much lower Turing degree than the theory itself. Henkin's construction of models is effective and establishes that a decidable theory has a decidable model. The low basis theorem of Jockusch and Soare can be used to obtain for a theory S, a model $\mathcal{A}$ with

$$(D^c(\mathcal{A}))' \leq_T S'.$$

Harizanov, Knight, and Morozov [146] showed that for every automorphically nontrivial structure $\mathcal{A}$, and every set $X \geq_T D^c(\mathcal{A})$, there exists $\mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$D^c(\mathcal{B}) \equiv_T D(\mathcal{B}) \equiv_T X.$$

For every automorphically trivial structure $\mathcal{A}$, we have $D^c(\mathcal{A}) \equiv_T D(\mathcal{A})$.

A structure $\mathcal{A}$ is called *n-decidable* for $n \geq 1$ if the Σ_n-diagram of $\mathcal{A}$ is computable. We will denote Σ_n-diagram $\mathcal{A}$ by $D_n(\mathcal{A})$. For sets X and Y, we say that Y is *c.e. in and above* (*c.e.a. in*) X if Y is c.e. relative to X, and $X \leq_T Y$. For any structure $\mathcal{A}$, $D_{n+1}(\mathcal{A})$ is c.e.a. in $D_n(\mathcal{A})$, uniformly in n. Chisholm and Moses [52] established that there is a linear order that is n-decidable for every $n \in \omega$, but has no decidable copy. Goncharov [120] established a similar result for Boolean algebras. There are familiar structures $\mathcal{A}$ such that for all $\mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}$, we have $D^c(\mathcal{B}) \equiv_T D(\mathcal{B})$. In particular, this is true for algebraically closed fields, and for other structures for which we have effective elimination of quantifiers. In [146], Harizanov, Knight, and Morozov gave syntactic conditions on $\mathcal{A}$ under which for all $\mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}$, we have $D^c(\mathcal{B}) \equiv_T D_n(\mathcal{B})$ for $n \in \omega$.

In the early 1960's, Vaught [314] developed the theory of prime, saturated, and homogeneous models using types. The study of the computable content of these models was initiated in the 1970's. The set of all computable types of a complete decidable theory is a Π^0_2 set. Every principal type of such a theory is computable, and the set of all its principal types is Π^0_1. A model $\mathcal{A}$ of a theory T is *prime* if for all models $\mathcal{B}$ of T, $\mathcal{A}$ elementarily embeds into $\mathcal{B}$. For example, the algebraic numbers form a prime model of the theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0. All prime models of a given theory are isomorphic. It is well-known that every complete atomic theory has a prime model. It is not difficult to show that if a complete decidable theory T has a decidable prime model, then the set of all principal types of T is uniformly computable. Goncharov and Nurtazin [135], and independently Harrington [149] established the converse.

Theorem 23. *([135, 149]) For a complete decidable theory T, the following are equivalent.*

1. *There is a uniform procedure, which maps a formula consistent with T into a computable principal type of T that contains this formula.*
2. *The theory T has a decidable prime model.*
3. *The theory T has a prime model and the set of all principal types of T is uniformly computable.*

For a Turing degree $\mathbf{x} = \deg(X)$, we say that a structure $\mathcal{A}$ is *decidable in* X or $\mathbf{x}$-*decidable* if $D^c(\mathcal{A}) \leq_T X$. T. Millar [236] and Drobotun [83] independently showed that a complete, atomic, decidable theory has a $\mathbf{0}'$-*decidable* prime model. More recently, Csima [61] strengthened this result by showing that every complete, atomic, decidable theory T has a prime model $\mathcal{A}$ such that $D^c(\mathcal{A})$ is low. Although Csima's result has the same flavor as the low basis theorem of Jockusch and Soare, it does not follow from the low basis theorem. Epstein extended Csima's result by establishing the following.

Theorem 24. *([85]) Let T be a complete, atomic, decidable theory and let $\mathbf{c} > \mathbf{0}$ be the c.e. degree of a prime model of T. Then there is a prime model $\mathcal{A}$ of T such that $D^c(\mathcal{A})$ has a low c.e. degree $\mathbf{a}$, where $\mathbf{a} < \mathbf{c}$.*

On the other hand, there are theories with prime models the elementary diagrams of which have minimal degrees, but the theories have no decidable prime models.

Goncharov [114] proved that there is a complete, decidable, $\aleph_0$-stable theory in a finite language having no computable prime model. His theory has infinitely many axioms. Peretyat'kin [270] constructed a complete, atomic, finitely axiomatizable (hence decidable) theory without a computable prime model. T. Millar [233] came up with a weaker notion of a decidable model, the notion of an *almost decidable model*, and showed that if a complete decidable theory has fewer than continuum many complete types, then the theory has an almost decidable prime model. Since not every decidable complete theory with only countably many complete types has a decidable model [114], T. Millar's result cannot be extended to decidable prime models.

We can also consider complete theories of algebraic structures from natural classes, such as groups or linear orders. Even if their theories are not necessarily decidable, they can have computable models. Khisamiev [186] obtained the following negative result.

Theorem 25. *([186]) There is a complete theory of abelian groups with both a computable model and a prime model, but no computable prime model.*

Interestingly, the proof of this result had influence on other investigations in computable model theory outside investigation of groups. Khisamiev's proof uses the concept of a limitwise monotonic function, which he introduced in [187] to study which abelian p-groups have computable isomorphic copies.

Definition 8. ([187]) A total function $F : \omega \to \omega$ is *limitwise monotonic* if there is a computable function $f : \omega^2 \to \omega$ such that for all $i, s \in \omega$, $f(i, s) \leq f(i, s+1)$, $\lim_{s\to\infty} f(i, s)$ exists, and $F(i) = \lim_{s\to\infty} f(i, s)$.

See [180] for more on limitwise monotonic functions. Using limitwise monotonic functions, Hirschfeldt [162] obtained a negative solution to a long-standing problem posed by Rosenstein [285].

Theorem 26. *There is a complete theory of linear orders having a computable model and a prime model, but no computable prime model.*

A set X and its Turing degree are called *prime bounding* if every complete, atomic, decidable theory has a prime model $\mathcal{A}$ such that $D^c(\mathcal{A}) \leq_T X$. Thus, $\mathbf{0}'$ is prime bounding. Csima, Hirschfeldt, Knight, and Soare obtained the following equivalence.

Theorem 27. *([64]) Let $X \leq_T \emptyset'$. Then X is prime bounding if and only if X is not low_2.*

This theorem gives an interesting characterization of low_2 sets in terms of prime models of certain theories, thus providing a link between computable Vaughtian model theory and degree theory. To prove that a low_2 set X is not prime bounding, we use a $\emptyset'$-computable listing of the array of sets $\{Y : Y \leq_T X\}$ to find a complete, atomic, decidable theory T, which diagonalizes against all potential prime models of T the elementary diagrams of which are computable in X. To prove that any set X that is not low_2 is indeed prime bounding, we fix a function $f \leq_T X$ that dominates every total $\emptyset'$-computable function. Given a complete, atomic, decidable theory T, we use f to build a prime model of T. In addition to the two properties in Theorem 27, Csima, Hirschfeldt, Knight, and Soare [64] consider a number of other properties equivalent to these two, some of which are related to limitwise monotonic functions. Hirschfeldt [161] has an interesting result about the degree spectrum of a structure, already mentioned in the previous section.

Theorem 28. *([161]) There is a prime model of a complete decidable theory with Slaman-Wehner degree spectrum.*

Recall that a countable *saturated* model is a model realizing every type of its language augmented by any finite tuple of constants for its elements. The earliest effective notion related to saturated models was the notion of a recursively saturated model introduced and first studied by Barwise and Schlipf in [25]. A *recursively saturated* model is defined to be a model (of a computable language) realizing every *computable* set of formulas consistent with its theory, in the language expanded by any finite set of constants. Note that every saturated model is recursively saturated. It is well-known that a complete theory has a countable saturated model if and only if the theory has only countably many n-types for every $n \geq 1$. On the other hand, *every* complete theory in a computable language with infinite models has a countable recursively saturated model. In fact, in the case of a computable language, early proofs of several classical results in model theory can be simplified using recursively saturated models (see [47]). The simplification is done by replacing "large" models by recursively saturated models in the proofs [25, 282]. The "large" models exist only under certain set theoretic restrictions [47]. Being a computable language is often not a severe restriction since many important languages are computable or even finite. These remarkable results provide an application of computability to pure classical model theory. However, a recursively saturated model does not have to be decidable or even computable, so we will turn our attention to decidable saturated models.

Decidable saturated models of complete decidable theories are fairly well-understood. There is a complete description of decidable saturated models in terms of types, due to Morley [247] and T. Millar [236] independently.

Theorem 29. *[247, 236] Let T be a complete decidable theory. The set of all types of T is uniformly computable if and only if T has a decidable saturated model.*

Thus, a complete theory with a decidable saturated model also has a decidable prime model. Morozov obtained a general positive result for Boolean algebras.

Theorem 30. *([259]) Every countable saturated Boolean algebra has a decidable isomorphic copy.*

If the types are not uniformly computable, then the existence of a decidable saturated model is not guaranteed, as shown independently by Morley and T. Millar, and by Goncharov and Nurtazin, who constructed counterexamples.

Theorem 31. *[247, 236, 135] There is a complete decidable theory with all types computable, which does not have a decidable saturated model.*

Any saturated model of a complete decidable theory with all types computable has a $\mathbf{0}'$-decidable isomorphic copy [247, 236, 135]. This result leads to the investigation of the effective content of saturated models using degree theoretic concepts and machinery. The following definition was introduced by Harris and is similar to the one for prime models.

Definition 9. A Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$ is *saturated bounding* if every complete decidable theory with types all computable has a $\mathbf{d}$-decidable saturated model.

Macintyre and Marker showed that the degrees of complete extensions of Peano arithmetic are saturated bounding [220]. There is a more recent negative result due to Harris.

Theorem 32. *([151]) For every $n \in \omega$, no low$_n$ c.e. degree is saturated bounding.*

It is well-known that a countable homogeneous structure is uniquely determined, up to an isomorphism, by the set of types it realizes. Morley posed the following natural question for a complete decidable theory T. If the type spectrum of a countable homogeneous model $\mathcal{A}$ of T (the set of types realized in $\mathcal{A}$) consists only of computable types and is computable, does $\mathcal{A}$ have a decidable isomorphic copy? Independently, Goncharov [118], T. Millar [235], and Peretyat'kin [271] answered Morley's question negatively.

Theorem 33. *([118, 235, 271]) There exists a complete decidable theory T having a homogeneous model $\mathcal{M}$ without a decidable copy, such that the type spectrum of $\mathcal{M}$ consists only of computable types and is computable.*

In fact, Goncharov [118] and Peretyat'kin [271] provided a criterion for a homogeneous model to be decidable. Their criterion can be stated in terms of the *effective extension property.* A computable set of computable types of a theory has the effective extension property if there is a partial computable function f which, given a type Γ_n of arity k and a formula θ_i of arity $k+1$ (identified with their indices), outputs the index for a type containing Γ_n and θ_i, if there exists such a type.

Goncharov and T. Millar also established the following result about decidability of a homogeneous model.

Theorem 34. *([118, 234]) Suppose the set of all computable types of a complete theory T is computable. If the set of all complete types realized in a countable homogeneous model $\mathcal{A}$ of the theory T is a Σ^0_2 set of computable types, then $\mathcal{A}$ is decidable.*

It is well-known that every countable model has a countable homogeneous elementary extension. Ershov conjectured that every decidable model can be elementary embedded into a decidable homogeneous elementary extension. Peretyat'kin refuted Ershov's conjecture in a strong way.

Theorem 35. *([272]) There exists a decidable model, which does not have a* computable *homogeneous elementary extension.*

As for theories of concrete algebraic structures, Goncharov and Drobotun [123] constructed a computable linear order that does not have a computable homogeneous elementary extension.

Regarding recent investigation of the degree-theoretic content of homogeneous models, similarly to prime bounding and saturated bounding degrees, we have the following definition.

Definition 10. ([62]) A Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$ is *homogeneous bounding* if every complete decidable theory has a $\mathbf{d}$-decidable homogeneous model.

Csima, Harizanov, Hirschfeldt, and Soare obtained the following result about homogeneous bounding degrees.

Theorem 36. *([62]) There is a complete decidable theory T such that every countable homogeneous model of T has the degree of a complete extension of Peano arithmetic.*

This theorem implies that every homogeneous bounding degree is the degree of a complete extension of Peano arithmetic, but it is in fact stronger, since we build a *single* theory T such that the use of the degrees of complete extensions of Peano arithmetic is necessary to compute even the atomic diagram of a homogeneous model of T. Together with the converse fact by Macintyre and Marker [220], we have the following consequence.

Corollary 1. *A Turing degree* $\mathbf{d}$ *is homogeneous bounding if and only* $\mathbf{d}$ *is the degree of a complete extension of Peano arithmetic.*

Lange introduced the following definition of a $\mathbf{0}$-homogeneous bounding degree.

Definition 11. ([210])

1. A countable structure $\mathcal{A}$ has a *d-basis* if the types realized in $\mathcal{A}$ are all computable and the Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$ can list $\mathbf{d}$-indices for all types realized in $\mathcal{A}$.
2. A degree $\mathbf{c}$ is $\mathbf{0}$-*homogeneous bounding* if any automorphically nontrivial homogeneous model $\mathcal{A}$ with a $\mathbf{0}$-basis has a $\mathbf{c}$-decidable isomorphic copy.

Now we can restate Theorem 33 as follows: There exists a homogeneous structure $\mathcal{A}$ having a $\mathbf{0}$-basis but no decidable isomorphic copy.

Theorem 37. *([210]) Let T be a complete decidable theory and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a homogeneous model of T with a $\mathbf{0}'$-basis. Then $\mathcal{A}$ has an isomorphic copy decidable in a low degree.*

This theorem implies Csima's result that every complete, atomic, decidable theory T has a prime model decidable in a low degree (see [61]).

Theorem 38. *(Lange [210]) Let T be a complete decidable theory with all types computable. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a homogeneous model of T with a $\mathbf{0}$-basis. Then $\mathcal{A}$ has an isomorphic copy $\mathcal{B}$ decidable in any nonzero degree.*

Lange also gave a description of $\mathbf{0}$-basis homogeneous bounding degrees.

Theorem 39. *([210, 211]) A degree $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{0}'$ is $\mathbf{0}$-basis homogeneous bounding if and only if $\mathbf{d}$ is nonlow$_2$.*

4 Algorithmic properties of small theories and their models

We now consider the question of the existence of effective (computable, decidable, etc.) models for *small theories*, that is, theories with at most countably many countable models.

Definition 12. Let κ be a cardinal. A theory is called *κ-categorical* if it has exactly one model of cardinality κ, up to isomorphism.

The following result is well-known as Morley's categoricity theorem (see [47]).

Theorem 40 (Morley)**.** *If a theory is κ-categorical for some uncountable cardinal κ, then it is λ-categorical for all uncountable λ.*

Hence, theories categorical in an uncountable cardinal are also called *uncountably categorical*. The theories that are $\aleph_0$-categorical are also called *countably categorical*. A theory that is both countably and uncountably categorical is simply called *totally categorical*. For the case of an uncoutably categorical, but not countably categorical theory, Baldwin and Lachlan [20] established that its countable models can be listed in a chain of proper elementary embeddings:

$$\mathcal{A}_0 \preceq \mathcal{A}_1 \preceq \mathcal{A}_2 \preceq \cdots \preceq \mathcal{A}_\omega,$$

where $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a prime model, and $\mathcal{A}_\omega$ is a saturated model of the theory. Thus, an uncountably categorical theory has either only one countable model or countably many countable models, up to isomorphism.

Definition 13. A theory is called *Ehrenfeucht* if it has finitely many, but more than one, countable models, up to isomorphism.

By Vaught's theorem, if a theory has two non-isomorphic models, then it has at least three non-isomorphic models. An example of a theory with exactly three countable models was given by Ehrenfeucht. His result can be easily generalized to obtain a theory with exactly n countable models, for any finite $n \geq 3$.

An important question in computable model theory is when a small theory has a computable model. For the case of countably categorical theories, Lerman and Schmerl [216] gave sufficient conditions, which were later extended by Knight as follows.

Theorem 41. *([199]) Let T be a countably categorical theory. If $T \cap \Sigma_{n+2}$ is Σ^0_{n+1} uniformly in n, then T has a computable model.*

The natural question posed by Knight was whether there exist countably categorical theories of high complexity, which satisfy the conditions of the previous theorem. First examples were given by Goncharov and Khoussainov in [130], and then generalized by Fokina.

Theorem 42. *([94]) There exists a countably categorical theory of arbitrary arithmetic complexity, which has a computable model.*

The proof is based on the method of Marker's extensions from [130]. This method was later applied to investigate various other properties of computable structures, such as in [92, 99].

The case of a countably categorical theory with a nonarithmetic complexity was resolved by Khoussainov and Montalbán [192]. Their structure is a modification of the random graph.

Theorem 43. *([192]) There exists a countably categorical theory S with a computable model such that $S \equiv_T \mathbf{0}^{(\omega)}$.*

Another proof of Theorem 43 can be found in [3].

Recall that a consistent decidable theory always has a decidable model. For small theories we can say more. Obviously, if a theory is countably categorical and decidable, then its only, up to isomorphism, countable model always has a decidable copy. For the case of uncountably categorical, but not countably categorical theories, Harrington [149] and Khissamiev [188] showed that such a theory T is decidable if and only if all countable models of T are decidable. If T is uncountably categorical, but not decidable, then some of its models can be computable, while others are not computable.

The following definition of a spectrum of computable models was introduced by Khoussainov, Nies, and Shore.

Definition 14. ([194]) Let T be an uncountably categorical theory with Baldwin-Lachlan elementary chain of countable models:

$$\mathcal{A}_0 \preceq \mathcal{A}_1 \preceq \mathcal{A}_2 \preceq \cdots \preceq \mathcal{A}_\omega.$$

The *spectrum of computable models* of the theory T is the set:

$$SCM(T) = \{i \leq \omega \mid \mathcal{A}_i \text{ has a computable isomorphic copy}\}.$$

A number of researchers investigated which sets can be realized as spectra of computable models of uncountably categorical theories. The first example of a non-trivial spectrum of computable models for uncountably categorical theories was given by Goncharov in [117], where he produced a theory with only the prime model being computable. His example was followed by a series of results about various spectra by Kudaibergenov [206], Khoussainov, Nies, and Shore [194], Nies [266], Herwig, Lempp, and Ziegler [156], Hirschfeldt, Khoussainov, and Semukhin [164], and Andrews [4, 5]. All these examples of spectra of computable models are finite or co-finite. On the other hand, the upper bound Nies gave in [266] is $\Sigma^0_{\omega+3}$. All these examples of uncountably categorical theories are $\mathbf{0}''$-decidable, in particular, all their countable models are $\mathbf{0}''$-decidable. Two natural questions arise:

1. What could be a complexity of an uncountably categorical theory with a computable model?
2. Is there a bound on complexity of all countable models of an uncountably categorical theory with a computable model?

Concerning the first question, the examples of arbitrary arithmetic complexity were given in [94, 130]. Again, the authors used Marker's extensions to build the structures. Andrews [3] resolved the nonarithmetic case by adapting famous Hrushovski's examples from [169] to computable model theoretic setting.

Theorem 44. *([3]) There exist uncountably categorical theories of arbitrary arithmetic complexity, as well as of nonarithmetic complexity, which have computable models.*

The same method was used to get the above mentioned examples of spectra of computable models [4, 5]. The original Hrushovski's construction is a powerful model theoretic tool for building strongly minimal theories [169]. Its modification by Andrews allows us to carry out the construction effectively, and with much greater control, thus providing a remarkable application of model theoretic methods to solve computability theoretic problems.

The second question was raised in the mid-1990's by Lempp. He asked whether it was possible to construct an uncountably categorical theory T with a computable prime model such that none of the countable nonprime models is even arithmetic. The answer to this question is negative for a subclass of uncountably categorical theories (see [129]).

Definition 15. (i) A complete theory T is *strongly minimal* if any definable subset of any model $\mathcal{M}$ of T is finite or co-finite. A structure $\mathcal{M}$ is *strongly minimal* if it has a strongly minimal theory.

(ii) A strongly minimal model $\mathcal{M}$ is *trivial* if for all subsets $A \subseteq M$,

$$acl(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} acl(\{a\}).$$

Goncharov, Harizanov, Lempp, Laskowski, and McCoy established the following result for trivial, strongly minimal models.

Theorem 45. *([129]) Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a computable trivial, strongly minimal model. Then $Th(\mathcal{M})$ forms a $\mathbf{0}''$-computable set of sentences, and thus all countable models of $Th(\mathcal{M})$ are $\mathbf{0}''$-decidable.*

In particular, all countable models of $Th(\mathcal{M})$ are $\mathbf{0}''$-computable. The proof of this theorem shows an interesting interplay between algorithmic and model theoretic properties of structures. Namely, the authors proved that for any trivial, strongly minimal theory T in language L, the elementary diagram of any model $\mathcal{M}$ of T is a model complete L-theory. This implies that T is $\forall\exists$-axiomatizable, which in turn implies $\mathbf{0}''$-decidability. Furthermore, it was established in [129] that, due to the structural simplicity, the complexity of spectra of computable models of trivial, strongly minimal theories is Σ^0_5.

As Khoussainov, Laskowski, Lempp, and Solomon showed in [190], the result in Theorem 45 is best possible in the following sense.

Theorem 46. *([190]) There exists a trivial, strongly minimal (and hence uncountably categorical) theory for which the prime model is computable and each of the other countable models computes* $\mathbf{0}''$.

In [69], Dolich, Laskowski, and Raichev generalized the results of [129] to any uncountably categorical, trivial theory of Morley rank 1. A new, more constructive proof of the same results can be found in [213].

In the case of Ehrenfeucht theories, the question which models can be computable or decidable also has a long history. In the mid-70's, Nerode asked whether all models of a decidable Ehrenfeucht theory must be decidable, by analogy with the results in [149, 188]. Morley [247] gave an example of a theory with six models, of which only the prime model was decidable. A good overview of further related results can be found in [109].

Sudoplatov gave in [312] a model theoretic characterization of Ehrenfeucht models (that is, models with Ehrenfeucht theories). In particular, he introduced the notion of a limit model, and a special kind of pre-ordering on the set of almost prime models. Analogously to the case of uncountably categorical theories, Gavryushkin introduced in [110] a notion of a spectrum of computable models for Ehrenfeucht theories. He characterized the spectra in the Sudoplatov's terms of pre-orderings on almost prime models and numbers of limit models over almost prime models. Moreover, Gavryushkin constructed examples of computable Ehrenfeucht models of arbitrarily high arithmetic and nonarithmetic complexity.

Theorem 47. *([110]) For every* $n \geq 3$*, there exists an Ehrenfeucht theory* T *of arbitrary arithmetic complexity such that it has* n *countable models and has a computable model among them. There also exists such a theory, which is Turing equivalent to the true first-order arithmetic.*

For further examples of Ehrenfeucht theories with various spectra of computable models see [109].

5 Effective categoricity

We are interested in the complexity of isomorphisms between a computable structure and its computable and noncomputable copies. The main notion in this area of investigation is that of *computable categoricity*. A computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ is *computably categorical* if for every computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}$, there exists a computable isomorphism from $\mathcal{M}$ onto $\mathcal{A}$. This concept has been part of computable model theory since 1956 when Fröhlich and Shepherdson [103] produced examples of computable fields, extensions of the rationals, of both finite and infinite transcendence degree, which were not computably categorical. These examples refute the natural conjecture that a computable field is computably categorical exactly when it has finite transcendence degree over its prime subfield (which is either $\mathbb{Q}$ or the p-element $\mathbb{F}_p$, depending on characteristic). Later, Ershov [88] showed that an algebraically closed field is computably categorical if and only if it has finite transcendence degree over its prime subfield. This also follows from work of Nurtazin [267] and can be found in Metakides and Nerode [229].

In [219], Mal'cev studied the question of uniqueness of a constructive enumeration of a structure and introduced the notion of a *recursively* (*computably*) *stable* structure, that is, a computable structure for which every isomorphism to another computable structure is computable. Later, in [218], he built isomorphic computable infinite-dimensional vector spaces that are not computably isomorphic. In the same paper he introduced the notion of an *autostable* structure, which is equivalent to that of a computably categorical structure. Since then the notion of computable categoricity has been studied extensively and has been extended to arbitrary levels of hyperarithmetic hierarchy, and more precisely to Turing degrees $\mathbf{d}$. Computable categoricity of a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ has also been relativized to all (including noncomputable) structures $\mathcal{A}$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}$ (see [165, 232, 31]).

Definition 16. A computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathbf{d}$-*computably categorical* if for every computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}$, there exists a $\mathbf{d}$-computable isomorphism from $\mathcal{M}$ onto $\mathcal{A}$.

In the case when $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}^{(n-1)}$, $n \geq 1$, we also say that $\mathcal{M}$ is Δ^0_n-*categorical.* Thus, computably categorical is the same as $\mathbf{0}$-computably categorical or Δ^0_1-categorical. We can similarly define Δ^0_α-categorical structures for any computable ordinal α.

Computably categorical structures tend to be quite rare. For a structure in a typical algebraic class, being computably categorical usually is equivalent to having a finite basis or a finite generating set (such as for a vector space), or to being highly homogeneous (such as for random graph). Goncharov and Dzgoev [122], and Remmel [277] independently proved that a computable linear order is computably categorical if and only if it has only finitely many successor pairs. They also established that a computable Boolean algebra is computably categorical if and only if it has finitely many atoms (see also LaRoche [212]).

As usual, by $\mathbb{Z}(p^n)$ we denote the cyclic group of order p^n, and by $\mathbb{Z}(p^\infty)$ the quasicyclic (Prüfer) abelian p-group. Goncharov [113] and Smith [301] independently characterized computably categorical abelian p-groups as those that can be written in one of the following forms: $(\mathbb{Z}(p^\infty))^l \oplus G$ for $l \in \omega \cup \{\infty\}$ and G finite, or $(\mathbb{Z}(p^\infty))^n \oplus G \oplus (\mathbb{Z}(p^k))^\infty$, where $n, k \in \omega$ and G is finite. Goncharov, Lempp, and Solomon [133] proved that a computable, ordered, abelian group is computably categorical if and only if it has finite rank. Similarly, they showed that a computable, ordered, Archimedean group is computably categorical if and only if it has finite rank. Lempp, McCoy, R. Miller, and Solomon [214] characterized computably categorical trees of finite height. R. Miller [240] previously established that no computable tree of infinite height is computably categorical.

An *equivalence structure* is a structure with a single equivalence relation. Calvert, Cenzer, Harizanov, and Morozov [31] established that a computable equivalence structure $\mathcal{A}$ is computably categorical if and only if either $\mathcal{A}$ has finitely many finite equivalence classes, or $\mathcal{A}$ has finitely many infinite classes, upper bound on the size of finite classes, and exactly one finite k with infinitely many classes of size k. An *injection structure* $\mathcal{A} = (A,\ f)$ consists of a set A and an $1-1$ function $f : A \to A$. Given $a \in A$, the *orbit* $O_f(a)$ of a under f is $\{b \in A : (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})[f^n(a) = b \vee f^n(b) = a]\}$. An injection structure (A, f) may have two types of infinite orbits: Z-orbits, which are isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}, S)$, and ω-orbits, which are isomorphic to (ω, S). Cenzer, Harizanov, and Remmel [44] characterized computably categorical injection structures as those that have finitely many infinite orbits.

In [243], R. Miller and Schoutens solved a long-standing problem by constructing a computable field that has *infinite* transcendence degree over the rationals, yet is computably categorical. Their idea uses a computable set of rational polynomials (more specifically, the Fermat polynomials) to "tag" elements of a transcendence basis, and so their field has an intrinsically computable (infinite) transcendence basis, with each single element effectively distinguishable from the others.

Very little is known about Δ^0_n-categoricity of algebraic structures from a given class for $n \geq 2$. Obtaining their classification is usually a difficult task. The reason is either the absence of invariants (such as for linear orders, abelian and nilpotent groups), or the lack of a suitable computability theoretic notion which would capture the property of being Δ^0_n-categorical (see discussion of Δ^0_2-categoricity for equivalence structures below). There is a complete description of higher levels categoricity for well-orders due to Ash [10]. Harris [150] has recently announced a description of Δ^0_n-categorical Boolean algebras, for any $n < \omega$. McCoy [223] characterized, under certain restrictions, Δ^0_2-categorical linear orders and Boolean algebras. E.J. Barker [22] proved that for every computable ordinal α, there are $\Delta^0_{2\alpha+2}$ categorical but not $\Delta^0_{2\alpha+1}$ categorical abelian p-groups. Lempp, McCoy, R. Miller, and Solomon [214] proved that for every $n \geq 1$, there is a computable tree of finite height that is Δ^0_{n+1}-categorical but not Δ^0_n-categorical.

The following problems remain open. Describe Δ^0_2-categorical linear orderings. Describe Δ^0_2-categorical equivalence relations. Describe Δ^0_2-categorical abelian p-groups. Resolving these question may require new algebraic invariants or new computability-theoretic notions.

We give several recent results on upper bounds for categoricity in the theorem below. Recall that a set X is *semi-low* if $\{e : W_e \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$ is Δ^0_2.

Theorem 48. *(i) (follows from [42, 225]) Every computable free non-abelian group is Δ^0_4-categorical, and the result cannot be improved to Δ^0_3.*

(ii) ([80]) Every coputable free abelian group is Δ^0_2-categorical, and the result cannot be improved to computable categoricity.

(iii) ([80]) Every computable abelian group of the form $\bigoplus_{i\in\omega} H_i$, where $H_i \leq (\mathbb{Q}, +)$ for $i \in \omega$, is Δ^0_3-categorical. A computable group of this form is Δ^0_2-

categorical if and only if it is isomorphic to a free module over a localization of $\mathbb{Z}$ *by a set of primes with a* semi-low *complement.*

(iv) ([31]) Every computable equivalence relation is Δ^0_3*-categorical, and the result cannot be improved to* Δ^0_2*.*

We may compare these stated above with Theorem 87 and Theorem 88. More generally, the study of higher categoricity is often equivalent to the study of algebraic properties of a family of relations specific for a given class (such as independence relations, back-and-forth relations, etc.). The result in Theorem 48 (iii) has been recently extended to arbitrary direct sums of rational subgroups [79], for which the sharp upper bound is Δ^0_5.

We can relativize the notion of Δ^0_α-categoricity by studying the complexity of isomorphisms from a computable structure to any countable isomorphic structure.

Definition 17. A computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ is *relatively* Δ^0_α*-categorical* if for every $\mathcal{A}$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}$, there is an isomorphism from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ that is Δ^0_α relative to the atomic diagram of $\mathcal{A}$.

Clearly, a relatively Δ^0_α-categorical structure is Δ^0_α-categorical. For linear orders [122, 277], Boolean algebras [122, 277, 212], trees of finite height [214], abelian p-groups [113, 301, 30], equivalence structures [31], and injection structures [44], computable categoricity implies relative computable categoricity.

A remarkable feature of relative Δ^0_α-categoricity is that it admits a syntactic characterization. This characterization involves the existence of certain effective Scott families. Scott families come from *Scott Isomorphism Theorem*, which says that for a countable structure $\mathcal{A}$, there is an $L_{\omega_1\omega}$-sentence the countable models of which are exactly the isomorphic copies of $\mathcal{A}$. For proof of Scott Isomorphism Theorem, see [13]. A *Scott family* for a structure $\mathcal{A}$ is a countable family Φ of $L_{\omega_1\omega}$-formulas with finitely many fixed parameters from A such that:

(i) Each finite tuple in $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies some $\psi \in \Phi$;

(ii) If $\overline{a}$, $\overline{b}$ are tuples in $\mathcal{A}$, of the same length, satisfying the same formula in Φ, then there is an automorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ that maps $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{b}$.

If we strengthen condition (ii) to require that the formulas in Φ define each tuple in $\mathcal{A}$, then Φ is called a *defining family* for $\mathcal{A}$. A *formally* Σ^0_α *Scott family* is a Σ^0_α Scott family consisting of computable Σ_α formulas. In particular, it follows that a formally c.e. Scott family is a c.e. Scott family consisting of finitary existential formulas. The following equivalence was established by Goncharov [121] for $\alpha = 1$, and by Ash, Knight, Manasse, and Slaman [18] and independently by Chisholm [48] for any computable ordinal α.

Theorem 49. *([18, 48]) The following are equivalent for a computable structure* $\mathcal{A}$*.*

1. *The structure* $\mathcal{A}$ *is relatively* Δ^0_α*-categorical.*
2. *The structure* $\mathcal{A}$ *has a formally* Σ^0_α *Scott family* Φ*.*
3. *The structure* $\mathcal{A}$ *has a formally c.e. Scott family* Φ*.*

Infinitary language is essential for Scott families. Cholak, Shore, and Solomon [53] proved the existence of a computably stable rigid graph that does not have a Scott family of finitary formulas.

R. Miler and Shlapentokh [242] proved that a computable algebraic field $\mathcal{F}$ with a splitting algorithm is computably categorical iff it is decidable which pairs of elements of $\mathcal{F}$ belong to the same orbit under automorphisms. They also showed that this criterion is equivalent to the relative computable categoricity of $\mathcal{F}$.

In [223], McCoy characterized, relatively Δ^0_2-categorical linear orders and Boolean algebras. In [224], McCoy gave a complete description of relatively Δ^0_3-categorical Boolean algebras, and proved that there are $2^{\aleph_0}$ relatively Δ^0_3-categorical linear orders. More recently, Calvert, Cenzer, Harizanov, and Morozov investigated relative Δ^0_2-categoricity for equivalence structures [31] and abelian p-groups [30], and Cenzer, Harizanov, and Remmel [44] investigated relative Δ^0_2-categoricity for injection structures.

The length of an abelian p-group G, $lh(G)$, is the least ordinal α such that $p^{\alpha+1}G = p^{\alpha}G$. The divisible part of G is $Div(G) = p^{lh(G)}G$ and is a direct summand of G. The group G is said to be reduced if $Div(G) = \{0\}$. For an element $g \in G$, the height $ht(g)$ is ∞ if $g \in Div(G)$ and is otherwise the least α such that $g \notin p^{\alpha+1}G$. For a computable group G, $ht(g)$ can be an arbitrary computable ordinal. The period of G is $max\{order(g) : g \in G\}$ if this quantity is finite, and ∞ otherwise. For example, it follows from the index set results in [34] that for abelian p-group G, if $\lambda(G) = \omega \cdot n$ and $m \leq 2n-1$, or if $\lambda(G) > \omega \cdot n$ and $m \leq 2n-2$, then G is not Δ^0_m categorical.

The following result describes a characterization of relative Δ^0_2-categoricity for Boolean algebras, equivalence structures, abelian p-groups, and injection structures.

Theorem 50. *(i) ([223]) A computable Boolean algebra is relatively Δ^0_2-categorical if and only if it can be expressed as a finite direct sum $c_1 \vee \cdots \vee c_n$, where each c_i is either atomless, an atom, or a 1-atom.*

(ii) ([31]) A computable equivalence structure is relatively Δ^0_2-categorical if and only if it either has finitely many infinite equivalence classes, or there is an upper bound on the size its finite equivalence classes.

(iii) ([30]) A computable abelian p-group G is relatively Δ^0_2-categorical iff all elements in G *are of finite height or G is isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{\alpha} \mathbb{Z}(p^\infty) \oplus H$, where $\alpha \leq \omega$ and H has finite period.*

(iv) ([44]) A computable injection structure is relatively Δ^0_2-categorical if and only if it has finitely many orbits of type ω or finitely many orbits of type Z.

Every Δ^0_2-categorical injection structure is relatively Δ^0_2-categorical [44]. Every computable injection structure is relatively Δ^0_3-categorical. Every computable equivalence structure is relatively Δ^0_3-categorical.

Goncharov [119] was the first to show that computable categoricity of a computable structure does not imply its relative computable categoricity. The main idea of his proof was to code a special kind of family of sets into a computable structure. Such families were constructed independently by Badaev [19] and Selivanov [297]. The result of Goncharov was lifted to higher levels in the hyperarithmetic hierarchy by Goncharov, Harizanov, Knight, McCoy, R. Miller, and Solomon for successor ordinals [126], and by Chisholm, Fokina, Goncharov, Harizanov, Knight, and Quinn for limit ordinals [49].

Theorem 51. *([126, 49]) For every computable ordinal α, there is a Δ^0_α-categorical, but not relatively Δ^0_α-categorical structure.*

It is not known whether every Δ^1_1-categorical computable structure must be relatively Δ^1_1-categorical (see [127]).

Kach and Turetsky [174] showed that there exists a computable Δ^0_2-categorical equivalence structure, which is not relatively Δ^0_2-categorical. Hirschfeldt, Kramer, R. Miller, and Shlapentokh [163] characterized relative computable categoricity for computable algebraic fields and used their characterization to construct a field with the following property.

Theorem 52. *([163]) There is a computably categorical algebraic field, which is not relatively computably categorical.*

The notions of computable categoricity and relative computable categoricity coincide if we add more effectiveness requirements on the structure. Goncharov showed in [121] that in the case of 2-decidable structures, computable categoricity and relative computable categoricity coincide. Kudinov showed that the assumption of 2-decidability cannot be weakened, by giving in [207] an example of 1-decidable structure that is not relatively computably categorical. Ash [9] established that for every computable ordinal α, under certain decidability conditions on $\mathcal{A}$, if $\mathcal{A}$ is Δ^0_α-categorical, then it has a formally Σ^0_α Scott family.

T. Millar [232] proved that if a structure $\mathcal{A}$ is 1-decidable, then any expansion of $\mathcal{A}$ by finitely many constants remains computably categorical. Cholak, Goncharov, Khoussainov, and Shore showed that the assumption of 1-decidability is important.

Theorem 53. *([50]) There is a computable structure, which is computably categorical, but ceases to be after naming any element of the structure.*

Clearly, the structure in this theorem is not relatively computably categorical. Khoussainov and Shore [196] proved that there is a computably categorical structure $\mathcal{A}$ without a formally c.e. Scott family such that the expansion of $\mathcal{A}$ by any finite number of constants is computably categorical. Downey, Kach, Lempp, and Turetsky have recently shown the following.

Theorem 54. *([75]) Any* 1*-decidable computably categorical structure is relatively Δ^0_2-categorical.*

Based on this result, we could conjecture that every computable structure that is computably categorical should be relatively Δ^0_3-categorical. However, this is not the case, as recently announced by Downey, Kach, Lempp, Lewis, Montalbán, and Turetsky.

Theorem 55. *([74]) For every computable ordinal α, there is a computably categorical structure that is not relatively Δ^0_α-categorical.*

Thus, a natural question arises whether there is a computably categorical structure that is not relatively hyperarithmetically categorical. The uniformity of the constructed structures in [74] together with an overspill argument allowed the authors to solve a long-standing problem about the complexity of the index set of computably categorical structures (see Theorem 94).

Definition 18. The **d**-*computable dimension* of a structure $\mathcal{M}$ with a computable copy is the number of computable isomorphic copies of $\mathcal{M}$, up to **d**-computable isomorphism.

Hence, a computably categorical structure has computable dimension 1. Many natural structures have computable dimension 1 or ω. For example, it was shown in [229] that it is impossible for a computable algebraic field to have finite computable dimension greater than 1. Goncharov was first to produce examples of computable structures of finite computable dimension greater than 1.

Theorem 56. *([116, 112]) For every finite $n \geq 2$, there is a computable structure of computable dimension n.*

After Goncharov's examples, structures of finite computable dimension $n \geq 2$ were found in several familiar classes, such as 2-step nilpotent groups [134] and others [166].

For a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$, some Turing degree, which is not necessarily $\mathbf{0}^{(n)}$, may compute an isomorphism between any two computable copies of the structure. The following notion of the categoricity spectrum, introduced by Fokina, Kalimullin, and R. Miller [99], aims to capture the set of all Turing degrees capable of computing isomorphisms among arbitrary computable copies of $\mathcal{A}$.

Definition 19. ([99]) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a computable structure.

(i) The *categoricity spectrum* of $\mathcal{A}$ is

$$\mathrm{CatSpec}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\mathbf{a} : \mathcal{A} \text{ is } \mathbf{a}\text{-computably categorical}\}.$$

(ii) A Turing degree **d** is the *degree of categoricity* of $\mathcal{A}$, if it exists, if **d** is the least degree in CatSpec($\mathcal{A}$).

(iii) A Turing degree **d** is *categorically definable* if it is the degree of categoricity of some computable structure.

This terminology intends to parallel the notions of the degree spectrum of a structure $\mathcal{A}$, and the degree of the isomorphism class of $\mathcal{A}$. Since there are only countably many computable structures, most Turing degrees are not categorically definable. Fokina, Kalimullin, and R. Miller investigated which Turing degrees are categorically definable. Their main result in [99] gives a partial answer for the case of arithmetic degrees. It was later extended by Csima, Franklin, and Shore to hyperarithmetic degrees.

Theorem 57. *([59]) (i) For every computable ordinal α, $\mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$ is the degree of categoricity of a computable structure.*

(ii) For a computable successor ordinal α, every degree $\mathbf{d}$ that is c.e. in and above $\mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$ is a degree of categoricity.

Negative results were also provided in the same papers [99, 59]. Namely, if $\mathbf{d}$ is a non-hyperarithmetic degree, then $\mathbf{d}$ cannot be a degree of categoricity of a computable structure. Furthermore, Anderson and Csima showed that not all hyperarithmetic degrees are degrees of categoricity.

Theorem 58. *([1]) (i) There exists a Σ_2^0 degree that is not categorically definable.*

(ii) Every degree of a set that is 2-generic relative to some perfect tree is not a degree of categoricity.

(iii) Every noncomputable hyperimmune-free degree is not a degree of categoricity.

Thus, it is natural to ask whether all Δ_2^0 degrees are categorically definable.

Not every computable structure has a degree of categoricity. The first negative example was built by R. Miller.

Theorem 59. *([239]) There exists a computable field with a splitting algorithm, which is not computably categorical, and such that its categoricity spectrum must contain degrees $\boldsymbol{d}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_1$ with $\boldsymbol{d}_0 \wedge \boldsymbol{d}_1 = \mathbf{0}$.*

Subsequently, R. Miller built another computable field the categoricity spectrum of which has no least degree and does not contain $\mathbf{0}'$. R. Miller used the algebraicity of the field to present the isomorphisms between it and a computable isomorphic copy as infinite paths through a finite-branching computable tree. If the field has a splitting algorithm, then the branching of this tree is computable, and we can apply the low basis theorem of Jockusch and Soare. If the field does not have a splitting algorithm, then we relativize to the degree of the branching and apply the relativized low basis theorem.

Further interesting examples of structures without a degree of categoricity were built by Fokina, Frolov, and Kalimullin in [98]. The main property of these structures is that they are *rigid*, that is, have no nontrivial automorphisms, which was not the case for the examples from [239]. If a rigid structure $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathbf{d}$-categorical, then it is also $\mathbf{d}$-*stable*, i.e., every isomorphism from $\mathcal{M}$ onto a computable copy is $\mathbf{d}$-computable. (The converse is not true, for example, a computable copy of a two-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{Q}$ is computably stable but not rigid.) Constructions from [98] give for every nonzero c.e. degree $\mathbf{d}$, a rigid $\mathbf{d}$-computably categorical structure with no degree of categoricity. For all $\alpha < \omega_1^{CK}$, and for all degrees $\mathbf{d}$ that are c.e. in $\mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$ and with $\mathbf{d} < \mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$, the structures from [59, 99] are rigid. When we pass to d.c.e. structures, we lose the property of rigidity. It is natural to ask whether there is a computable structure the categoricity spectrum of which is the set of all noncomputable Turing degrees. It is also interesting to find out whether a union of two cones of Turing degrees can be a categoricity spectrum.

Effective categoricity of computable structures has been recently investigated within Ershov's difference hierarchy: for graphs by Khoussainov, Stephan, and Yang [198], and for the equivalence structures by Cenzer, LaForte, and Remmel [45].

6 Automorphisms of effective structures

In algebra, automorphism groups of structures often reflect the algebraic properties of structures (for example, as in Galois theory). In computable model theory, the study of *effective* automorphisms help us better understand computability theoretic properties of countable structures. The set of all automorphisms of a computable structure forms a group under composition, and we may ask questions about isomorphism types of this group and its natural subgroups. Thus, the theory automorphisms of effective structures provides another link between computable algebra and classical group theory. We may also study the Turing degrees of members of the automorphism group. This line of investigation is related to the study of effective categoricity of structures. Finally, we may restrict ourselves to computable models from familiar classes (such as Boolean algebras, linear orders, etc.) and study groups of effective automorphisms for these models. As usual, we assume that all infinite computable structures have ω as their domains. The next definition captures one of the main notions of this investigation.

Definition 20. For an infinite computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ and a Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$, we define $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathcal{M})$ to be the set of all permutations of ω, which are computable in $\mathbf{d}$ and induce automorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$.

We write $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ for $Aut_{\mathbf{0}}(\mathcal{M})$ (the subscript c stands for *computable*). For every Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$, the set $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(M)$ forms a group under composition. In contrast, the set $Aut_p(\omega)$ of all primitive recursive permutations of ω is not a group under composition, as shown by Kuznetsov [209]. One of the central problems here is to study classical and effective properties of the group $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathcal{M})$ for various $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbf{d}$. We can start with a structure in the empty language, that is, ω with equality and consider its automorphism group $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathcal{M})$ as a structure. Recall that the degree of the isomorphism type of a structure, if it exists, is the least Turing degree in its Turing degree spectrum. Morozov established the following result.

Theorem 60. *([256]) For every Turing degree* $\mathbf{d}$*, the degree of the isomorphism type of the group* $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\omega)$ *is* $\mathbf{d}''$*.*

Morozov [250] showed that the embedding $\mathbf{d} \to Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\omega)$ can be used to substitute Turing reducibility by the group theoretic embedding.

Theorem 61. *[250] For every pair of Turing degrees,* $\mathbf{c}$ *and* $\mathbf{d}$*,*

$$Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\omega) \leqq Aut_{\mathbf{c}}(\omega) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{c},$$

where $\leqq$ *stands for the usual group theoretic embedding.*

It follows from this theorem that $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{d}$ if and only if $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\omega) \cong Aut_{\mathbf{c}}(\omega)$. In contrast, there exists a Turing degree $\mathbf{a}$ such that $Aut_{\mathbf{a}}(\omega)$ and $Aut_{\mathbf{b}}(\omega)$ are elementary equivalent for all $\mathbf{b} \geq \mathbf{a}$ (see [253]). Intuitively, the last statement says that this first-order theory cannot recognize the difference between very "large" Turing degrees.

Kent [183] investigated group theoretic properties of $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\omega)$.

Theorem 62. *([183]) For every Turing degree* $\mathbf{d}$*, the unique normal series for* $Aut_{\mathbf{a}}(\omega)$ *has the form*

$$1 \lhd E \lhd F \lhd Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\omega),$$

where F is group of finite permutations, and E is the group of all even finite permutations.

Notice that a finitely generated subgroup of $Aut_c(\omega)$ has to be a Π^0_1 group. Higman asked if every Π^0_1 finitely generated group can be isomorphically embedded into $Aut_c(\omega)$. The following result of Morozov answers Higman's question negatively.

Theorem 63. *([249]) There exists a 2-generated Π^0_1 group G such that $G \nleqq Aut_c(\omega)$.*

Morozov [254] characterized subgroups of $Aut_c(\omega)$ that are isomorphic to the whole $Aut_c(\omega)$.

Theorem 64. *([254]) There exists a first-order sentence in the language of groups such that for every $G \leqq Aut_c(\omega)$,*

$$(G \models \phi) \Leftrightarrow (G \cong Aut_c(\omega)).$$

More specifically, Morozov [254] proved that the class of all groups of the form $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$, where $\mathcal{M}$ is a computable structure, is definable in the monadic second-order language within $Aut_c(\omega)$. Morozov also showed that the theories of the following three classes of groups are all distinct and differ from the theory of all groups: (i) groups that can be embedded into $Aut_c(\omega)$, (ii) groups that are $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ for computable $\mathcal{M}$, and (iii) computable groups. The first class cannot be axiomatized by a hyperarithmetic set of axioms, the other two cannot be axiomatized by any arithmetic set of axioms. Furthermore, Morozov [254] proved that there exists a single sentence, consistent with the theory of groups, which is not true in any group $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ where $\mathcal{M}$ is a computable structure.

Now, for various computable structures $\mathcal{M}$, we compare $Aut_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $Aut(\mathcal{M})$. For $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$, Dzgoev [84], and independently Manaster and Remmel [222] established the following result.

Theorem 65. *([84, 222]) There exists a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ such that $Aut(\mathcal{M})$ has 2^ω elements, while $Aut_c(M)$ has only one element.*

The previous theorem can be strengthened in several ways. Kudaibergenov [205] showed that we can make such $\mathcal{M}$ decidable and homogeneous. Morozov [252] proved that there exists a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ with $card(Aut(M)) = 2^\omega$ such that every hyperarithmetic model isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}$ has no nontrivial hyperarithmetic automorphisms.

For a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$, the group $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ does not have to be isomorphic to a computable one. Morozov [257] gave the following characterization for $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ to have a computable copy.

Theorem 66. *[257] For a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$, the group $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to a computable one if and only if there exists a finite tuple $\overline{p}$ such that $Aut(\mathcal{M}, \overline{d}) = \{1\}$, and the set $\{(\overline{m}, \overline{n}) : \overline{m} \cong_r \overline{n}\}$ is c.e., where*

$$\overline{m} \cong_r \overline{n} \Leftrightarrow (\exists f \in Aut_c(\mathcal{M}))[f : \overline{m} \to \overline{n}].$$

Theorem 66 has several interesting corollaries, one of which is the following.

Corollary 2. *([257]) A finitely generated group G is isomorphic to $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ for some computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if G has a decidable word problem.*

For groups that are not finitely generated the situation is rather complex. Even if the group is abelian, not much can be said. It is not very difficult to show that $\bigoplus_{p \in S} \mathbb{Z}_p$, where S is a set of primes, is isomorphic to $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ for some computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if S is Σ^0_3 (see Morozov and Buzykaeva [260] for a proof). The general case of arbitrary abelian groups is unresolved. Theorem 66 also implies that for every infinite computable Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$, the group $Aut_c(\mathcal{B})$ is not computable, and the same is true for every decidable infinite model of an $\aleph_0$-categorical theory with a computable set of atomic formulas.

We can show that the group $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ of a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathbf{0}''$-computable (folklore). This upper bound is sharp, as shown in the following theorem due to Morozov.

Theorem 67. *([251]) For every Turing degree $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{0}''$, there exists a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ such that $deg\,(Aut_c(\mathcal{M})) = \mathbf{d}$.*

We may ask whether for various computable $\mathcal{M}$, the group $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ has a degree of its isomorphism type. As we have seen earlier, this was the case when $\mathcal{M}$ is ω with equality (i.e., the language of $\mathcal{M}$ is empty). Nonetheless, Morozov [251] constructed a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ such that $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ has no degree of its isomorphism type. Also, we may ask which Turing degrees contain only groups isomorphic to $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ for some computable $\mathcal{M}$. Morozov [257, 251] proved that this collection of degrees is the singleton $\{\mathbf{0}\}$.

Recently Harizanov, Morozov, and R. Miller [148] introduced another approach to the study of $Aut(\mathcal{M})$.

Definition 21. ([148]) The *automorphism (Turing) degree spectrum* of a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$, in symbols $AutSp(\mathcal{M})$, is the set $\{deg(f) : f \in Aut(\mathcal{M}) - \{id\}\}$, where id is the identity automorphism of M.

Harizanov, Morozov, and R. Miller [148] showed that various collections of Turing degrees, including many upper cones, can be realized as automorphism degree spectra. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a computable structure. If $AutSp(\mathcal{M})$ is the upper cone of degrees $\geq \boldsymbol{d}$, then $\boldsymbol{d}$ is hyperarithmetic. Harizanov, Morozov, and R. Miller [148] showed that any computable ordinal α, and any Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$ with $\mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)} \leq \boldsymbol{d} \leq \mathbf{0}^{(\alpha+1)}$, the upper cone of degrees $\geq \mathbf{d}$ forms an automorphism spectrum. They also showed that there exists a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ the spectrum of which is the union of the upper cones above each degree of an infinite antichain of Σ^0_n degrees for $n \geq 1$.

The spectrum $AutSp(\mathcal{M})$ is at most countable if and only if it contains only hyperarithmetic degrees. Since for every $f, g \in Aut(\mathcal{M})$ the composition fg is also an automorphism, the automorphism degree spectrum cannot contain exactly two incomparable degrees, as Harizanov, Morozov, and R. Miller [148] showed.

Theorem 68. *([148])*

1. *Let $\boldsymbol{d}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_1$ be incomparable Turing degrees. Then no computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ has $AutSp(\mathcal{M}) = \{\boldsymbol{d}_0, \boldsymbol{d}_1\}$ or $AutSp(\mathcal{M}) = \{\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{d}_0, \boldsymbol{d}_1\}$.*
2. *There exist pairwise incomparable Δ^0_2 Turing degrees $\boldsymbol{d}_0$, $\boldsymbol{d}_1$, $\boldsymbol{d}_2$, and computable structures $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ such that $AutSp(\mathcal{A}) = \{\boldsymbol{d}_0, \boldsymbol{d}_1, \boldsymbol{d}_2\}$ and $AutSp(\mathcal{B}) = \{\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{d}_0, \boldsymbol{d}_1, \boldsymbol{d}_2\}$.*

It was shown in [148] that there exists a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ such that for every c.e. degree $\mathbf{d}$, some computable copy of $\mathcal{A}$ has automorphism degree spectrum $\{\mathbf{d}\}$. If $\mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)} \leq \boldsymbol{d} \leq \mathbf{0}^{(\alpha+1)}$ for some computable ordinal α, then there exists a computable structure with automorphism degree spectrum $\{\boldsymbol{d}\}$. A total function $f : \omega \to \omega$ is said to be a Π^0_1-*function singleton* if there exists a computable tree $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ through which f is the unique infinite path. A Turing degree $\mathbf{d}$ contains a Π^0_1-function singleton if and only if $\{\mathbf{d}\}$ is the automorphism spectrum of some computable structure [148].

Given $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ where $\mathcal{M}$ is a computable structure from some well-known algebraic class of structures, the typical question we might ask is: *Given $Aut(\mathcal{M})$, what can we say about the isomorphism type of $\mathcal{M}$?* Usually, obtaining a satisfactory answer to this question is a difficult task. The effective analogue of this question, when $\mathcal{M}$ is computable and $Aut(\mathcal{M})$ is replaced by $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$, is not any easier. In the case of computable Boolean algebras, Morozov obtained a positive partial result. By $\mathcal{B} \cong_c \mathcal{A}$ we denote that $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are computably isomorphic.

Theorem 69. *([258]) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an atomic decidable Boolean algebra. For any computable Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$, $Aut_c(\mathcal{B}) \cong Aut_c(\mathcal{A})$ implies $\mathcal{B} \cong_c \mathcal{A}$.*

In contrast, Remmel [276] showed that for every computable Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$, there exists $\mathcal{C} \cong \mathcal{B}$ such that every $f \in Aut_c(\mathcal{C})$ moves only finitely many atoms of $\mathcal{C}$. It is also known [258] that there exist two decidable Boolean algebras, $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$, such that $\mathcal{B}_0 \ncong \mathcal{B}_1$ and $Aut_c(\mathcal{B}_0) \cong Aut_c(\mathcal{B}_1)$. Morozov [258] also showed that there exists a computable Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$ and a Boolean algebra $\mathcal{C}$, having no computable copy, such that $Aut(\mathcal{B}) \cong Aut(\mathcal{C})$.

In [54], Chubb, Harizanov, Morozov, Pingrey, and Ufferman investigated the relationship between algebraic structures and their inverse semigroups of partial automorphisms. An *inverse semigroup* is a semigroup where for each element f there is a unique g so that $gfg = g$ and $fgf = f$. For a structure $\mathcal{A}$, the authors considered the semigroup $I_{fin}(\mathcal{A})$ of all finite automorphisms, and, in the case of a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$, the semigroup of all partial computable automorphisms, $I_c(\mathcal{A})$. As usual, $\equiv$ stands for elementary equivalence of structures. In [54], it was shown that structures from certain classes can be recovered, up to isomorphism or elementary equivalence, from these semigroups. For example, the authors showed that for all nontrivial countable equivalence structures $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{A}_1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i) } (I_{fin}(\mathcal{A}_0) &\cong I_{fin}(\mathcal{A}_1)) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{A}_0 \cong \mathcal{A}_1); \\ \text{(ii) } (I_{fin}(\mathcal{A}_0) &\equiv I_{fin}(\mathcal{A}_1)) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{A}_0 \equiv \mathcal{A}_1). \end{aligned}$$

We call an equivalence relation E on a set A (and the corresponding equivalence structure) *nontrivial* if E differs from the diagonal relation $\{(a, a) : a \in A\}$ and from the set $A \times A$. It was shown in [54] that for a nontrivial computable equivalence structure $\mathcal{E}_0$, there is a first-order sentence σ in the language of inverse semigroups such that for any nontrivial computable equivalence structure $\mathcal{E}_1$, $I_{pc}(\mathcal{E}_1) \models \sigma$ implies $\mathcal{E}_1 \cong_c \mathcal{E}_0$. The authors of [54] also considered partial orders, relatively complemented distributive lattices, and Boolean algebras. It would be interesting to investigate for other natural algebraic structures how structures themselves can be recovered, up to isomorphism or elementary equivalence, from various inverse semigroups of their partial automorphisms.

There are some interesting results about computable automorphisms of computable linear orders. Schwartz obtained the following characterization of computable linear orders containing dense intervals.

Theorem 70. *([288]) A computable linear order $\mathcal{A}$ contains a dense interval if and only if $card(Aut_c(\mathcal{L})) > 1$ for every computable $\mathcal{L}$ such that $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{A}$.*

In order to state the next result by Morozov and Truss [261], we will first introduce some notation. For a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$ and a Turing ideal I, let $Aut_I(\mathcal{M})$ be the collection of all automorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$ computable from members of I. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$.

Theorem 71. *([261]) For Turing ideals I and J and order η, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} Aut_I(\mathcal{Q}) &\leqq Aut_J(\mathcal{Q}) \Leftrightarrow I \subseteq J, \text{ and} \\ Aut_I(\mathcal{Q}) &\cong Aut_J(\mathcal{Q}) \Leftrightarrow I = J. \end{aligned}$$

The proof uses techniques from the theory of ordered abelian groups [111]. It is interesting to compare Theorem 71 with Theorem 61. The next result of Morozov and Truss can be compared with Theorem 64.

Theorem 72. *([262]) There is a first-order sentence ψ such that, up to isomorphism, the group $Aut_c(\eta)$ is the only model of ψ among all subgroups of $Aut_c(\omega)$.*

Lempp, McCoy, Morozov, and Solomon [215] studied the algebraic properties of $Aut_c(\mathcal{Q})$ and compared them with those of $Aut(\mathcal{Q})$. They obtained the following result distinguishing $Aut_c(\mathcal{Q})$ from $Aut(\mathcal{Q})$.

Theorem 73. *([215]) The following three properties, known to be true for $Aut(\mathcal{Q})$, fail for $Aut_c(\mathcal{Q})$:*

(a) the group is divisible;

(b) every element is a commutator of itself with some other element;

(c) two elements are conjugate if and only if they have isomorphic orbital structures.

Much less is known about effective automorphisms of computable modules, including vector spaces and abelian groups. Many algebraic difficulties arise in the study of their automorphism groups. The following result about modules due to Morozov is similar to Theorem 70.

Theorem 74. *([255]) For every computable division ring $\mathcal{R}$, there exists a computable copy of the module $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{i\in\omega} \mathcal{R}$ such that $Aut_c(\mathcal{M})$ contains only multiplications by scalars from $\mathcal{R}$.*

Further partial results can be found in [208].

7 Degree spectra of relations

One of the important questions in computable model theory is how a specific aspect of a computable structure may change if the structure is isomorphically transformed so that it remains computable. A computable property of a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$, which Ash and Nerode [17] considered, is given by an additional computable relation R on the domain of $\mathcal{A}$. That is, R is not named in the language of $\mathcal{A}$. Ash and Nerode investigated syntactic conditions on $\mathcal{A}$ and R under which for every isomorphism f from $\mathcal{A}$ onto a computable structure $\mathcal{B}$, $f(R)$ is c.e. Such relations are called *intrinsically c.e.* on $\mathcal{A}$. In general, we have the following definition.

Definition 22. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a certain class of relations. An additional relation R on the domain of a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ is called *intrinsically* $\mathcal{P}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ if the image of R under every isomorphism from $\mathcal{A}$ to a computable structure belongs to $\mathcal{P}$.

For example, the successor relation, and being an even number are not intrinsically computable on $(\omega, <)$.

Clearly, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a computably stable structure, then every computable relation on its domain is intrinsically computable. If R is definable in $\mathcal{A}$ by a computable Σ_1 formula with finitely many parameters, then R is intrinsically c.e. Ash and Nerode [17] proved that, under a certain extra decidability condition on $\mathcal{A}$ and R, the relation R is intrinsically c.e. on $\mathcal{A}$ iff R is definable by a computable Σ_1 formula with finitely many parameters. The Ash-Nerode condition for an m-ary relation R says that there is an algorithm, which determines for every existential formula $\psi(x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}, \overline{y})$ and every $\overline{c} \in A^{lh(\overline{y})}$, whether the following implication holds for every $\overline{a} \in A^m$:

$$(\mathcal{A} \vDash \psi(\overline{a}, \overline{c})) \Rightarrow R(\overline{a}).$$

E.M. Barker [23] extended this result by showing that for every computable ordinal α, under certain additional decidability conditions on $\mathcal{A}$, the relation R is intrinsically Σ^0_α on $\mathcal{A}$ iff R is definable by a computable Σ_α formula with finitely many parameters. For the relative notions, the effectiveness conditions are not needed. We say R is *relatively intrinsically* Σ^0_α if in all $\mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}$, the image of R is Σ^0_α relative to the atomic diagram of $\mathcal{B}$. The following equivalence is due to Ash, Knight, Manasse, and Slaman [18], and independently Chisholm [48].

Theorem 75. *([18, 48]) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a computable structure. Then a relation R on $\mathcal{A}$ is relatively intrinsically Σ^0_α iff R is definable by a computable Σ_α formula with finitely many parameters.*

Goncharov [119] and Manasse [221] gave examples of intrinsically c.e. relations on computable structures, which are not relatively intrinsically c.e. This result was lifted to higher levels in the hyperarithmetic hierarchy by Chisholm, Fokina, Goncharov, Harizanov, Knight, McCoy, R. Miller, Solomon, and Quinn, first for the successor ordinals in [126] and then for the limit ones in [49].

Theorem 76. *([126, 49]) For every computable ordinal α, there a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ with an intrinsically Σ^0_α relation R such that R is not definable by a computable Σ_α formula with finitely many parameters.*

For syntactic characterizations of relations on structures having Post-type properties, or their degree theoretic complexity see [159, 158, 16, 139, 125, 138, 124].

In addition to considering the complexity of relations on computable structures within hyperarithmetic hierarchy, we also consider their degrees such as Turing degrees or strong degrees. Harizanov introduced the following definition.

Definition 23. ([144]) The *Turing degree spectrum* of R on $\mathcal{A}$, in symbols $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$, is the set of all Turing degrees of the images of R under all isomorphisms from $\mathcal{A}$ onto computable structures.

In the previous definition, if for some isomorphism f from A to a computable structure, $X = f(R)$ and $\mathbf{x} = deg(X)$, then we say that $\mathbf{x}$ is realized in $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ *via* X, or *via* f. Uncountable degree spectra of relations were studied by Harizanov [143, 140], and Ash, Cholak, and Knight [11]. In particular, they showed independently that if every Turing degree $\leq \mathbf{0}''$ can be realized in $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ *via* an isomorphism of the same Turing degree as its image of R, then $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ contains every Turing degree.

In [142], Harizanov studied when every c.e. degree can be obtained in $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ *via* an isomorphism of the same degree as its image of R, and Ash, Cholak, and

Knight [11] lifted her result to arbitrary α-c.e. degrees in Ershov's difference hierarchy. For example, the degree spectrum of the successor relation on a computable linear order contains all c.e. degrees, and the same holds for the set of all even numbers. The degree spectrum of the set of algebraic elements in an algebraically closed field of infinite transcendence degree contains all c.e. Turing degrees.

One of the general results by Harizanov about $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ containing all c.e. degrees is the following theorem, which requires extra effectiveness condition – it is enough that the existential diagram of $(\mathcal{A}, R)$ is computable.

Theorem 77. *([142]) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a computable structure, and let R be a relation that is intrinsically c.e. on $\mathcal{A}$, while $\neg R$ is not. Then, under a certain extra decidability condition, for any c.e. degree $\mathbf{d}$, we have $\mathbf{d} \in DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$.*

Ash and Knight [14] generalized the previous theorem. Their generalization involves degrees that are coarser than Turing degrees. In the following definition we will use the symbol Δ^0_α to denote a complete Δ^0_α set.

Definition 24. ([14]) (i) $A \leq_{\Delta^0_\alpha} B$ iff $A \leq_T B \oplus \Delta^0_\alpha$

(ii) $A \equiv_{\Delta^0_\alpha} B$ iff ($A \leq_{\Delta^0_\alpha} B$ and $B \leq_{\Delta^0_\alpha} A$)

(iii) The equivalence classes under $\equiv_{\Delta^0_\alpha}$ are called *α-degrees.*

Note that $\leq_{\Delta^0_1}$ is the same as $\leq_T$.

Theorem 78. *([14]) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a computable structure, and let R be a relation that is not intrinsically Δ^0_α on $\mathcal{A}$. Then, under certain extra effectiveness conditions, for any Σ^0_α set C, there is an isomorphism f from $\mathcal{A}$ onto a computable copy with $f(R) \equiv_{\Delta^0_\alpha} C$.*

Ash and Knight also showed that it is not possible to substitute Turing degrees for α-degrees. In [15], there produced examples of structures $\mathcal{A}$ and relations R, satisfying a great deal of effectiveness, in which certain Σ^0_α Turing degrees, in particular, minimal degrees, are impossible for the image of R. Hirschfeldt and Walker [167] constructed a family of relations on computable structures, the degrees of which coincide with the levels of the hyperarithmetic hierarchy. Their examples are built up from back-and-forth trees, which explicitly code the alternations of quantifiers. In [51], the authors investigated the spectra of relations on computable structures under strong reducibilities such as *weak truth-table* (wtt) reducibility and *truth-table* (tt) reducibility.

Using Goncharov's result from the theory of numberings [115], we can show that there is a computable non-intrinsically c.e. relation R on a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ such that $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R) = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{d}\}$, where $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{0}''$ but $\mathbf{d} \not\leq \mathbf{0}'$ (see [142]). Harizanov [141] showed that there is a two-element degree spectrum $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R) = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{d}\}$, such that $\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{0}'$ where $\mathbf{d}$ cannot be realized *via* a c.e. set. Goncharov, Khoussainov, and Shore [196, 131] proved that there is a two-element degree spectrum $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R) = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{c}\}$ such that $\mathbf{c}$ is a nonzero degree realized *via* a c.e. set. Khoussainov and Shore broadly generalized this result.

Theorem 79. *([196]) Let $(P, \preceq)$ be a computable partially ordered set. Then there are a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ and a computable unary relation R on its domain such that $(DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R), \leq) \cong (P, \preceq)$ and every degree in $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ is realized* via *a c.e. set.*

For some familiar relations on computable structures, their Turing degree spectra exhibit the dichotomy: either singletons or infinite. Harizanov [142] established that if for a non-intrinsically c.e. relation R on $\mathcal{A}$, the Ash-Nerode decidability condition holds, then $DgSp_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ must be infinite. Hirschfeldt [160] proved that a computable relation on a computable linear order is either intrinsically computable or has an infinite Turing degree spectrum. Downey, Goncharov, and Hirschfeldt [71] established the same dichotomy for Boolean algebras.

Theorem 80. *([71]) A computable relation on a computable Boolean algebra is either intrinsically computable or has infinite Turing degree spectrum.*

A similar question can be asked for computable relations on other classes of structures such as computable abelian groups. Another interesting question from [71] is whether the degree spectrum of an intrinsically Δ^0_2 relation on a computable linear order is always a singleton or infinite.

It is also interesting to study degrees spectra of specific important relations on natural classes of structures. One such relation is the successor relation (also called adjacency relation) on a computable linear order. There are two known examples of singleton degree spectra of the successor relation. If L has only finitely many successor pairs, then the order is computably categorical, hence the successor relation is intrinsically computable. Downey and Moses [81] constructed a linear order $\mathcal{L}$ having an intrinsically complete successor relation S, that is, $DgSp_{\mathcal{L}}(S) = \{\mathbf{0}'\}$. It was a long standing open question to investigate upward closure in c.e. degrees of the degree spectrum of the successor relation in computable linear orders. Harizanov, Chubb, and Frolov [55] showed that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a computable linear order with domain A where for all $x \in A$ there is a successor pair (a, b) in $\mathcal{A}$ with $x < a$, then the spectrum of the successor relation of $\mathcal{A}$ is closed upward in the c.e. Turing degrees. As a consequence, they established that for every c.e. Turing degree $\mathbf{b}$, the upper cone of c.e. Turing degrees determined by $\mathbf{b}$ is the degree spectrum of the successor relation of some computable linear order. Downey, Lempp, and Wu [78] established the positive result in full generality by using a new method of constructing Δ^0_3 isomorphisms. Their proof uses a result from [55].

Theorem 81. *([78]) If a computable linear order has infinitely many successor pairs, then the degree spectrum of the successor relation is closed upward in the computably enumerable Turing degrees.*

In [308], Soskov established that a Δ^1_1 relation on computable $\mathcal{A}$, which is invariant under automorphisms of $\mathcal{A}$, is definable in $\mathcal{A}$ by a computable infinitary formula with no parameters. This led to the following characterization of intrinsically Δ^1_1 relations.

Theorem 82. *([308]) For a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$, and a relation R on $\mathcal{A}$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) R is intrinsically Δ_1^1 on $\mathcal{A}$;

(ii) R is relatively intrinsically Δ_1^1 on $\mathcal{A}$;

(iii) R is definable in $\mathcal{A}$ by a computable infinitary formula, with finitely many parameters.

In the following theorem characterizing intrinsically Π_1^1 relations, Soskov [307] established the equivalence $(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii)$, while $(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)$ was established in [127].

Theorem 83. *([307, 127]) For a computable structure $\mathcal{A}$ and relation R on $\mathcal{A}$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) R is intrinsically Π_1^1 on $\mathcal{A}$;

(ii) R is relatively intrinsically Π_1^1 on $\mathcal{A}$;

(iii) R is definable in $\mathcal{A}$ by a Π_1^1 disjunction of computable infinitary formulas with finitely many parameters.

Goncharov, Harizanov, Knight, and Shore [127] considered a general family of examples of intrinsically Π_1^1 relations arising in computable structures of Scott rank $\omega_1^{CK}+1$. A *Harrison order* is a computable linear order of type $\omega_1^{CK}(1+\eta)$, where η is the order type of the rationals. Harrison [154] showed that such an order exists. The initial segment of this order of type ω_1^{CK} is intrinsically Π_1^1 since it is defined by the disjunction of computable infinitary formulas saying that the interval to the left of x has order type α, for computable ordinals α. A *Harrison Boolean algebra* is a computable Boolean algebra of type $I(\omega_1^{CK}(1+\eta))$, where for an order $\mathcal{L}$, the interval algebra $I(\mathcal{L})$ is the algebra generated, under finite union, by the half-open intervals $[a,b)$, $(-\infty,b)$, $[a,\infty)$, with endpoints in $\mathcal{L}$. The set of superatomic elements of this Boolean algebra is intrinsically Π_1^1. A *Harrison group* is a countable abelian p-group G for some prime p such that the length of G is ω_1^{CK}, every element in its Ulm sequence $(u_G(\alpha))_{\alpha<\omega_1^{CK}}$ is ∞, and the divisible part has infinite dimension. Recall that the Ulm subgroups G^α are defined by $G^\alpha = p^{\omega\alpha}G$, and $u_\alpha(G) = \dim_{\mathbb{Z}_p} P_\alpha(G)/P_{\alpha+1}(G)$, where $P_\alpha(G) = G_\alpha \cap \{x \in G : px = 0\}$. The set of elements of a Harrison group, which have computable ordinal heights, is intrinsically Π_1^1. It is the complement of the divisible part.

By a *path* through Kleene's $\mathcal{O}$ we mean a subset of $\mathcal{O}$ that is linearly ordered under $<_{\mathcal{O}}$ and includes a notation for every computable ordinal.

Theorem 84. *([127]) The following sets are equal:*

1. *The set of Turing degrees of Π_1^1 paths through $\mathcal{O}$;*

2. *The set of Turing degrees of left-most paths of computable trees $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ such that $\mathcal{T}$ has a path, but no hyperarithmetic path;*

3. *The set of Turing degrees of maximal well-ordered initial segments of Harrison orders;*

4. *The set of Turing degrees of superatomic parts of Harrison Boolean algebras;*

5. *The set of Turing degrees of divisible parts of Harrison groups.*

For certain types of structures, there is a close connection between the notions of degree spectra of structures and of relations. Harizanov and R. Miller [147] defined a computable structure $\mathcal{U}$ to be *spectrally universal* for a theory T if for every automorphically nontrivial countable model $\mathcal{A}$ of T, there is an embedding $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ as a structure, has the same degree spectrum as $f(A)$, as a relation on the domain of $\mathcal{U}$. Spectrally universal structures investigated in [147] are countable dense linear orders and the random graph. Both are Fraïssé limits. This led Csima, Harizanov, R. Miller, and Montalbán to develop the theory of computable Fraïssé limits in [63]. They gave a sufficient condition for certain Fraïssé limits to be spectrally universal, which they used to show that the countable atomless Boolean algebra is spectrally universal.

8 Families of relations on a structure

Many important algebraic properties can be investigated by considering natural families of relations on a structure. For example, for a vector space V we can consider the family if its bases:

$$\mathcal{B}(V) = \{X \subseteq V : X \text{ is a base of } V\}.$$

For an orderable field F we can consider the set of all linear orders on its domain, which are invariant under the field operations:

$$O(F) = \{R \subseteq F \times F : R \text{ is an order on } F\}.$$

Such a family of relations does not have to have a computable member even when the structure is computable. Mal'cev showed that there exists a computable vector space that has no computable basis [219]. Rabin [275] constructed a computable orderable field that cannot be computably ordered. We could ask for a sufficient condition for a family to have a computable member. More generally, we may ask what the collection of Turing degrees of its members is.

Definition 25. ([67]) Given a family of relations $\mathcal{R}$ on a computable structure $\mathcal{M}$, define

$$DegSp_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{R}) = \{deg(R) : R \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

In the next definition we are computing all relations simultaneously (uniformly).

Definition 26. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a computable structure with domain A, and let $\mathcal{R} = (R_i)_{i\in I}$ be a family of relations on $\mathcal{A}$, where $l(i)$ is the arity of R_i. Define

$$Deg_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{R}) = deg\{\overline{a} \subseteq A^{l(i)} : \mathcal{A} \models R_i(\overline{a}), i \in I\}.$$

In many interesting examples, the index set I and the arities of relations are computable

The previous two definitions are dependent on a given presentation of a structure. We could let the definitions range over all computable copies of $\mathcal{A}$. However, this approach is not common.

Let us consider the problem of computing a generating set (or a basis) of a given computable structure. The definition of a basis depends on the class of structures. The study of the problem of computing a basis in several classical algebraic examples provides a natural link between Definition 26 and Definition 25. More specifically, to build a basis stage-by-stage (Definition 25), one usually needs a corresponding notion of independence (Definition 26). Consider the following example.

Example. Let V be a countable vector space of infinite dimension. Define the following sets of relations on V.

1. For every $i \in \omega$, we set $P_i(x_0, \ldots, x_i) = 1$ if and only if $x_0, \ldots, x_i \in V$ are linearly independent.
2. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the collection of maximal linearly independent sets (bases) in V.

If $\mathcal{P} = (P_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is uniformly computable, then we say that V has an algorithm for linear independence.

Theorem 85. *(folklore; see [219] and [230]) Every computable vector space over a computable field possesses a $\mathbf{0}'$-basis, and this bound is sharp.*

Let us now look at another natural example from algebra.

Example. Let F be a countable algebraically closed field of infinite transcendence degree. Define the following sets of relations on F:

1. $T_i(a_1, \ldots, a_i) = 1$ if and only if, $a_1, \ldots, a_i \in F$ are algebraically independent.
2. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the collection of maximal algebraically independent subsets of F.

If $\mathcal{T} = (T_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is uniformly computable in F, then F is said to have an algorithm for algebraic independence.

Theorem 86. *(folklore; see [103, 229, 275]) The algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}(x_i : i \in \omega)$ has a $\mathbf{0}'$-maximal algebraically independent set, and this bound is sharp.*

It is clear that independence can be formalized using families of relations as in Definition 26, and the collection of bases should be studied according to Definition 25. It is important to observe that in the context of vector spaces and algebraically closed fields, the existence of a generating set is equivalent to the problem of computable categoricity relative to an oracle. The same can be said about many other natural examples.

A number of researchers investigated complexity of bases and structures of subsets and subspaces of c.e. vector spaces and c.e. algebraically closed fields (see, for example, [230, 175, 280, 299, 228, 68]). In many of their results the operations (vector addition and scalar multiplication or field operations, respectively) play no direct role. For instance, in the proofs of Theorems 85 and 86 only the phenomenon of independence occurs. In fact, Metakides and Nerode [228] initiated the study of the effective content of abstract independence relations (Steinitz closure systems). For an extended survey of the results about computable Steinitz closure systems, see [82].

We now turn to the discussion of recent results on bases of various structures. Recently, Downey, and Melnikov [80] studied free modules over localizations of integers.

Theorem 87. *([80]) Let $S \subseteq \omega$ be a c.e. set of primes.*

(i) Every computable free module $\mathcal{F}(S)$ over the localization of Z by S has a Σ^0_3 (actually, Π^0_2 in S) set of generators.

(ii) Every computable copy of $\mathcal{F}(S)$ has a Σ^0_2 set of generators if and only if the complement of S is semi-low.

The theorem can be equivalently re-formulated in terms of computable categoricity relative to an oracle. The corresponding analogue of linear independence for free modules of this kind is *S-independence,* which is a generalization of the classical notion of p-independence [80].

As a consequence of Theorem 87 with $S = \emptyset$, every free abelian group has a Σ^0_2 (in fact, Π^0_1) generating set. Algebraic structure becomes more complex in the case of free non-abelian groups. Relatively recently, Sela in a series of papers [295, 294, 292, 293, 291, 290, 289] solved the problem of elementary equivalence of free groups of different ranks, posed by Tarski in the 1940's. (See also Kharlampovich and Myasnikov [184].) Inspired by this result, Carson, Harizanov, Knight, Lange, Maher, McCoy, Morozov, Quinn, and Wallbaum [42], and McCoy and Wallbaum [225] investigated free groups in the context of computable model theory.

Theorem 88. *([42, 225]) Every computable copy of the free non-abelian group has a Π^0_2 base, and the result cannot be improved to Σ^0_2.*

The proof of the theorem uses deep results in algebra. The corresponding notion of independence is what is called *primitiveness* in every finitely generated subgroup (see [42] Definition 7, Lemma 1.1 and discussion after Lemma 1.1).

In general, not every family of unary relations (Definition 25) possesses a hyperarithmetic "notion of independence" (Definition 26). For example, consider the collection of paths on $\mathcal{T} \subset \omega^{<\omega}$, where $\mathcal{T}$ codes a Σ^1_1-complete set. In contrast, we have seen that natural structures well-understood in algebra tend to have arithmetic bases. Thus, we ask whether there is natural structure (such as a ring, a module, or a group) for which finding a generating set is not (hyper)arithmetic. A possible candidate is the pure transcendental ring over the rationals, $\mathbb{Q}[x_i : i \in \omega]$. Does every computable copy of $\mathbb{Q}[x_i : i \in \omega]$

have a (hyper)arithmetic base? Describing automorphism orbits of generators in $\mathbb{Q}[x_i : i \in \omega]$ is a long standing open problem in algebra. There has been some progress in this direction; see the recent paper by Shestakov and Umirbaev [298].

We will now discuss results on the spectra of orders on orderable groups and fields. A left-order on a group $\mathcal{G} = (G, \cdot)$ is a linear order of its elements, which is left-invariant under the group operation:

$$x \leq y \Rightarrow z \cdot x \leq z \cdot y,$$

for every $x, y, z \in G$. Every left order $<_l$ on $\mathcal{G}$ induces a right order $<_r$ on $\mathcal{G}$ as follows:

$$a <_r b \Leftrightarrow b^{-1} <_l a^{-1}.$$

A bi-order (or simply order) is invariant under both left and right multiplication. The definition of an order for a field is similar.

Clearly, every left order on an abelian group is a bi-order. It is well-known that an abelian group is orderable if and only if it is torsion-free. A field is orderable exactly when it is formally real [106]. In the case of orderable computable groups and fields, the effective analogue of the classical result fails. Downey and Kurtz [77] showed that there exists a computable group isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^\omega = \bigoplus_{i \in \omega} \mathbb{Z}$, which does not have a computable order.

For a group $\mathcal{G}$, by $LO(\mathcal{G})$ we denote the set of left orders on $\mathcal{G}$, and by $BiO(\mathcal{G})$ the set of bi-orders on $\mathcal{G}$. There is a natural topology on these sets, making these topological spaces compact, even when $\mathcal{G}$ is a semigroup instead of a group or just a structure with a single binary operation (see [66]). Solomon [303] obtained the following results about Turing degrees of orders on abelian groups.

Theorem 89. *([303])*

1. *A computable, torsion-free, abelian group of finite rank $n > 1$ has an order in every Turing degree.*

2. *A computable, torsion-free, abelian group of infinite rank has an order in every Turing degree $\mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{0}'$.*

The positive cone of an order $\leq$ on a group $\mathcal{G}$ is $P = \{a \in G : e \leq a\}$, where $e \in G$ be the identity element. The negative cone is $P^{-1} = \{a \in G : a \leq e\}$. Clearly, $a \leq b$ iff $a^{-1}b \in P$. Hence, we can effectively pass from binary relations (orders) to unary relations (positive cones) and *vice versa*. We can easily verify that if $P \subseteq G$ is a *subsemigroup* of $\mathcal{G}$ (i.e., $PP \subseteq P$), which satisfies $P \cap P^{-1} = \{e\}$, then P defines a left order on $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if P is *total* (i.e., $P \cup P^{-1} = G$). Moreover, P defines a bi-order on $\mathcal{G}$ if, in addition, P is a *normal* subsemigroup (i.e., $g^{-1}Pg \subseteq P$ for every $g \in G$). Thus, it is sufficient to study the collection of positive cones.

For a computable torsion-free abelian group (a formally real field) $\mathcal{A}$, denote the collection of positive cones on $\mathcal{A}$ by $\mathbb{C}(\mathcal{A})$. The elements of $\{\deg(C) : C \in \mathbb{C}(\mathcal{A})\}$ are exactly degrees of orders on the computable group (field) $\mathcal{A}$. Thus, we will denote this set by $DgSp(BiO(\mathcal{A}))$. The definition of a positive cone on a computable group (field) $\mathcal{A}$ is Π^0_1, hence $\mathbb{C}(\mathcal{A})$ is a Π^0_1 class. For example, as a consequence of the low basis theorem of Jockusch and Soare, every computable, torsion-free, abelian group has a *low* order.

Metakides and Nerode [229] showed that for any nonempty Π^0_1 class $\mathbb{P}$, there is a computable formally real field $\mathcal{A}$ having $\mathbb{C}(\mathcal{A})$ homeomorphic to $\mathbb{P}$ *via* a Turing degree preserving map. Their proof is based on a result by Craven [58] that for every Boolean topological space $\mathcal{T}$, there is a formally real field $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbb{C}(\mathcal{F})$ is homeomorphic to $\mathcal{T}$. It is not hard to see that the situation is different for torsion-free abelian groups. Solomon [304], using a result by Jockusch and Soare [172], showed that there is a Π^0_1 class $\mathbb{P}$ such that for any computable, torsion free, abelian group G, $\{deg(f) : f \in \mathbb{P}\} \neq DgSp(BiO(\mathcal{A}))$.

More recently Dabkowska, Dabkowski, Harizanov, and Togha [67] studied topological and computability theoretic properties of left-orders and bi-orders on (not necessarily abelian) groups. Among other results, they [67] obtained a general sufficient condition for a group to contain the upper cone of Turing degrees above $\mathbf{d}$. As a consequence of this general condition, they established the following result.

Theorem 90. *([67]) For any computable free group F_n of finite rank $n > 1$, $DgSp(BiO(F_n))$ is the collection of all Turing degrees.*

Kach, Lange, and Solomon [173] constructed computable, torsion-free, abelian groups $\mathcal{G}$, such that $DgSp(BiO(\mathcal{G}))$ are not upward closed. Their groups are isomorphic to effectively completely decomposable groups. Khisamiev and Krykpaeva [189] defined a computable, infinite rank, torsion-free, abelian group $\mathcal{H}$ to be *effectively completely decomposable* if there is a uniformly computable sequence of rank one groups $\mathcal{H}_i$, $i \in \omega$, such that $\mathcal{H}$ is equal to $\oplus_{i\in\omega}\mathcal{H}_i$.

Theorem 91. *([173]) Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an effectively completely decomposable, computable, infinite rank, torsion-free, abelian group. There is a computable copy $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $DgSp(BiO(\mathcal{G}))$ contains $\mathbf{0}$, but is not upward closed.*

More precisely, Kach, Lange, and Solomon showed that there is a noncomputable, computably enumerable set C such that $\mathcal{G}$ has exactly two computable orders, and every C-computable order on $\mathcal{G}$ is computable. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is effectively completely decomposable, $DgSp(BiO(\mathcal{H}))$ contains all Turing degrees. That is because $\mathcal{H}$ has a computable basis formed by choosing a nonzero element h_i from every $\mathcal{H}_i$. Hence the group $\mathcal{G}$ is not effectively completely decomposable. Kach, Lange, and Solomon [173] conjectured that the conclusion of Theorem 91 holds for all computable, infinite rank, torsion-free, abelian groups $\mathcal{H}$.

Complexity of infinite chains and antichains in computable partial orders was studied by Herrmann [155] and Harizanov, Knight and Jockusch.

9 Algorithmic complexity for classes of structures and equivalence relations

We want to measure the complexity of classes of computable structures and equivalence relations on these classes. More precisely, we want to know how complex are the answers to the following types of questions. Does a computable structure belong to a particular class of structures with fixed algebraic, model theoretic, or algorithmic properties (e.g., class of groups, uncountably categorical structures, decidable structures, etc.)? Are two structures from such a class isomorphic, computably isomorphic, bi-embeddable, etc.? We are looking for a criterion that will allow us to say whether such questions have "nice" answers.

There are many papers investigating the complexity of classes of countable structures. There is earlier work [237, 238] in descriptive set theory investigating subsets of the Polish space of structures with universe ω for a given countable relational language. Concerning the possible complexity (in the noneffective Borel hierarchy) of the set of copies of a given structure, D. Miller [238] showed that if this set is $\Delta^0_{\alpha+1}$, then it is d-Σ^0_α. In [237], A. Miller showed that this set cannot be properly Σ^0_2. There are also examples illustrating other possibilities.

The main issue is to find an optimal definition of the class of structures under investigation. This often requires the use various internal properties of structures in the class. After a reasonable definition is found, it is necessary to prove its strictness. Usually, this is done by proving completeness in some complexity class.

For the case of equivalence relations, the study of Borel reducibility has developed into a rich area inside descriptive set theory. The notion of Borel reducibility allows us to compare the complexity of equivalence relations on Polish spaces (see [107, 181]). In particular, natural equivalence relations on classes of countable structures, such as isomorphism and bi-embeddability, have been widely studied. For example, see [102, 101, 168]. An effective version of this study was introduced by Calvert, Cummins, Knight, S. Miller (Quinn) [32], and Knight, S. Miller (Quinn), and Vanden Boom [202]. The main idea is that the complexity of the isomorphism relation on various classes of countable structures can be measured using the effective transformations. The introduced c-embeddings and tc-embeddings are based on uniform enumeration reducibility and uniform Turing reducibility, respectively. The main advantage is that this approach allows distinctions among classes with countably many isomorphism types.

In computable model theory, we may state our goal as follows. Let K be a class of structures. We denote by K^c the set of computable structures in K. A *computable characterization* of K should separate computable structures in K from all other structures (those not in K, or noncomputable ones). A *computable classification* for K, up to an equivalence relation E (isomorphism, computable isomorphism, etc.) should determine each computable element, up to the equivalence E, in terms of relatively simple invariants. In [132], Goncharov and Knight present three possible approaches to the study of computable characterizations of classes of structures.

Within the framework of the first approach, we say that K has a computable characterization if K^c is the set of computable models of a computable infinitary sentence.

Proposition 1. *(i) The class of linear orders can be characterized by a single first-order sentence.*

(ii) The class of abelian p-groups is characterized by a single computable Π_2 sentence.

(iii) The class of well orders and the class of reduced abelian p-groups cannot be characterized by single computable infinitary sentence.

Furthermore, we say that there is a computable classification for K if there is a computable bound on the ranks of elements of K^c. By a *computable rank* $R^c(\mathcal{A})$ of a structure $\mathcal{A}$ we mean the least ordinal α such that for all tuples $\overline{a}$ and $\overline{b}$ of the same length in $\mathcal{A}$, if for all $\beta < \alpha$, all computable Π_β formulas that true of $\overline{a}$ are also true of $\overline{b}$, then there is an automorphism taking $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{b}$. For hyperarithmetic structures, the computable rank and Scott rank coincide. For more on computable ranks see [132]. For example, the computable rank of vector spaces over $\mathbb{Q}$ is 1. There is no computable bound on ranks of linear orders or abelian p-groups.

The second approach involves the notion of an index set. A *computable index* for a structure $\mathcal{A}$ is a number e such that $D(\mathcal{A}) = W_e$, where $D(\mathcal{A})$ is the atomic diagram of $\mathcal{A}$. We denote the structure with index e by $\mathcal{A}_e$. For a class K of structures, the *index set* $I(K)$ is the set of computable indices of members of K^c:

$$I(K) = \{e : W_e = D(\mathcal{A}) \wedge \mathcal{A} \in K\}.$$

For an equivalence relation E on a class K, we define

$$I(E, K) = \{(m, n) : m, n \in I(K) \wedge \mathcal{A}_m E \mathcal{A}_n\}.$$

Within this approach, we say that K has a computable characterization if $I(K)$ is hyperarithmetic. The class K has a computable classification up to E if $I(E, K)$ is hyperarithmetic.

The first and the second approach are known to be equivalent [132]. In fact, we do not know a better way to estimate the complexity of an index set than giving a description by a computable infinitary formula.

Proposition 2. *(i) For the following classes K, the index set $I(K)$ is Π^0_2:*

(a) linear orders,

(b) Boolean algebras,

(c) abelian p-groups,

(d) vector spaces over $\mathbb{Q}$.

(ii) (Kleene, Spector) For the following classes K, the index set $I(K)$ is not hyperarithmetic:

(a) well-orders,

(b) superatomic Boolean algebras,

(c) reduced abelian p-groups.

In the following theorem, the calculations of the complexity of index sets for classes of structures with interesting model theoretic properties are due to White [317], Calvert, Fokina, Goncharov, Knight, Kudinov, Morozov, and Puzarenko [33], Fokina [93], and Pavlovskii [269]. In (v), $\Sigma^0_3 - \Sigma^0_3$ denotes the difference of two Σ^0_3 sets.

Theorem 92. *(i) ([269, 317]) The index set of computable prime models is an m-complete $\Pi^0_{\omega+2}$ set.*

(ii) ([317]) The index set of computable homogeneous models is an m-complete $\Pi^0_{\omega+2}$ set.

(iii) ([269]) The index set of structures with uncountably categorical theories is a Δ^0_ω-hard $\Sigma^0_{\omega+1}$ set.

(iv) ([269]) The index set of structures with countably categorical theories is a Δ^0_ω-hard $\Pi^0_{\omega+2}$ set.

(v) ([93]) The index set of structures with decidable countably categorical theories is an m-complete $\Sigma^0_3 - \Sigma^0_3$ set.

(vi) ([33]) The index set of computable structures with noncomputable Scott rank is m-complete Σ^1_1. The index set of structures with the Scott rank ω_1^{CK} is m-complete Π^0_2 relative to Kleene's $\mathcal{O}$. The index set of structures with the Scott rank $\omega_1^{CK}+1$ is m-complete Σ^0_2 relative to Kleene's $\mathcal{O}$.

Index sets for structures with specific algorithmic properties were also studied by White [317], Fokina [92], and Downey, Kach, Lempp, and Turetsky [75].

Theorem 93. *(i) ([92]) The index set of decidable structures is Σ^0_3-complete.*

(ii) ([317]) The index set of hyperarithmetically categorical structures is Π^1_1-complete.

(iii) ([75]) The index set of relatively computably categorical structures is Σ^0_3-complete.

The following result of Downey, Kach, Lempp, Lewis, Montalbán, and Turetsky resolves an old question.

Theorem 94. *([74]) The index set of computably categorical structures is Π^1_1-complete.*

The structures constructed to establish this result are computable trees of special kind. It would be worthwhile to calculate the complexity of the index sets of other classes of computable structures having interesting algebraic, model theoretic, or algorithmic properties.

The third approach of Goncharov and Knight [132] to computable characterization of classes of structures involves the notion of *enumeration*. A class of structures has a good characterization if all its structures are represented in the list, up to isomorphism or some other equivalence relation. A good classification of the class would mean listing each equivalence class only once.

Definition 27. (i) An *enumeration* of K^c/E is a sequence $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n\in\omega}$ representing all E-equivalence classes in K^c.

(ii) A *Friedberg enumeration* of K^c/E is an enumeration in which every E-equivalence class is represented only once.

(iii) An enumeration is Δ^0_α-*computable* if there is a Δ^0_α-computable sequence of computable indices for the structures.

Then we say that K has a computable characterization if there is a hyperarithmetic enumeration of $K^c/\cong$. We say that K has a computable classification up to E if there is a hyperarithmetic Friedberg enumeration of K^c/E. It is known that this approach is not equivalent to the previous two approaches from [132]. Recall that a Harrison order is a computable order of type $\omega_1^{CK}(1+\eta)$.

Proposition 3. *Consider the class K consisting of copies of the Harrison order and of the linear orders of rank at most ω. Then $K^c/\cong$ has a hyperarithmetic Friedberg enumeration, but its index set is not hyperarithmetic.*

We will now focus on the classification problems up to important equivalence relations. The most interesting cases are the isomorphism, bi-embeddability, and isomorphism of bounded algorithmic complexity.

Possible ways to compare the complexity of various equivalence relations are:

1. comparison among sets;

2. comparison among equivalence relations.

The former case was discussed above. It corresponds to the second approach from [132]. Within this approach, we usually prove m-completeness among sets in some complexity class. There has been quite a lot of work on the isomorphism problem for various classes of computable structures. See, for example, [27, 28, 29, 132, 34].

Theorem 95. *(i) (Calvert [27]) The isomorphism problem for computable vector spaces over $\mathbb{Q}$ is m-complete among Π^0_3 sets.*

(ii) (Calvert [27]) The isomorphism problem for torsion free abelian groups of finite characteristic is m-complete among Σ^0_3 sets.

(iii) (see [132]) The isomorphism problem for abelian p-groups is m-complete among Σ^1_1 sets. The isomorphism problem for trees is m-complete among Σ^1_1 sets.

Recently, Carson, Fokina, Harizanov, Knight, Maher, Quinn, and Wallbaum initiated the study of the *computable embedding problem.* In [41], they investigated the relation between the isomorphism problem and the embedding problem for some well-known classes of structures. The isomorphism problem and the embedding problem were compared as sets, that is, using the standard m-reducibility. While for some classes of structures the two problems have the same complexity, for other classes the isomorphism problem is more complicated than the embedding problem, or *vice versa.*

Further work was done using the 2-dimensional versions of reducibilities. This approach can be seen as an analogue of some work done in descriptive set theory. Recall that in descriptive set theory, two equivalence relations, E and F, on Borel classes K and L of structures, respectively, can be compared using Borel reducibility. In the computable case, instead of arbitrary invariant Borel classes of countable structures, we consider classes of computable structures with hyperarithmetic index sets. In other words, we consider classes consisting of computable models of computable infinitary sentences. As mentioned above, this corresponds to a "nice" characterization of a class.

A straightforward analogue of the Borel reducibility is the hyperarithmetic reducibility.

Definition 28. For equivalence relations E_1, E_2 on (hyperarithmetic subsets of) ω, we say that E_1 is *h-reducible to* E_2, in symbols $E_1 \leq_h E_2$, if there is a hyperarithmetic function f such that for all x, y,

$$xE_1y \Leftrightarrow f(x)E_2f(y).$$

A stronger reducibility would be a 2-dimensional version of the m-reducibility. This reducibility is traditionally used in the general study of equivalence relations on ω. It was introduced by Ershov in [87] where he studied properties of numberings. Later it was used, for example, in [26, 108, 57, 7] and denoted simply by $\leq$. As sometimes we need to emphasize the difference between m-reducibility and h-reducibility, we will denote the reducibility *via* a computable function by $\leq_m$, specifying when necessary that we consider the 2-dimensional version of m-reducibility among relations. When the results hold for both h-reducibility and m-reducibility we will use the symbol $\leq$.

Definition 29. Let E, E_1 be equivalence relations on hyperarithmetic subsets $X, Y \subseteq \omega$, respectively. The relation E is *m-reducible* to E_1 iff there exists a partial computable function f with $X \subseteq dom(f)$ and $Y \subseteq f(X)$ such that for all $x, y \in X$,

$$xEy \Leftrightarrow f(x)E_1f(y).$$

We denote this reducibility by $E \leq_m E_1$.

Each notion of reducibility generates the corresponding notion of completeness:

Definition 30. A relation E on a hyperarithmetic subset of ω is an *h-complete* Σ^1_1 equivalence relation or *m-complete* Σ^1_1 equivalence relation if E is Σ^1_1, and every Σ^1_1 equivalence relation E' on a hyperarithmetic subset of ω is h-reducible or m-reducible to E, respectively.

We use previous definitions to compare equivalence relations on classes of computable structures. Recall that each such relation E on a class K has the index set $I(E, K)$. We make no distinction between E and $I(E, K)$ in the following sense. If E_1 is an arbitrary equivalence relation on ω, then we say that E_1 h-reduces or m-reduces to E iff there exists a hyperarithmetic or computable, respectively, sequence of computable structures $\{\mathcal{A}_x\}_{x\in\omega}$ from K such that for all x, y, we have xE_1y iff A_xEA_y (this is equivalent to $E_1 \leq_h I(E, K)$ or $E_1 \leq_m I(E, K)$ in the sense of Definitions 28 and 29).

From now on we use the symbol $\leq$ to denote any of $\leq_h$, $\leq_m$. We use terms "reduces," "complete," etc. for the corresponding notion of reducibility. The following statement is due to Fokina and Friedman.

Proposition 4. *There is a class K of structures with hyperarithmetic index set such that the bi-embeddability relation on K^c is complete among Σ^1_1 equivalence relations.*

This result corresponds to the analogous result from the descriptive set theory S. Friedman and Motto Ros [101]. However, the theory of Σ^1_1 equivalence relations on ω under $\leq$-reducibility behaves very differently from the theory of Borel equivalence relations on Polish spaces. In particular, in [97] the authors established the following result.

Theorem 96. *([97]) The isomorphism of computable graphs is complete with respect to the chosen effective reducibility in the context of all Σ^1_1 equivalence relations on ω.*

This is false in the context of countable structures and Borel reducibility since Kechris and Louveau [182] showed that there are examples of Borel equivalence relations that are not Borel-reducible to isomorphism of graphs. Moreover, Fokina, S. Friedman, Harizanov, Knight, McCoy, and Montalbán [97] showed that the isomorphism relation on computable torsion abelian groups is complete among Σ^1_1 equivalence relations on ω, while in the classical case it is known to be incomplete among isomorphism relations on classes of countable structures, as established by H. Friedman and Stanley [102]. In [97], the authors also established that the isomorphism relation on computable torsion-free abelian groups is complete among Σ^1_1 equivalence relations on ω, while in the case of countable structures it is not known to be complete for isomorphism relations.

Regaridng bounding the complexity of the isomorphism relation, Fokina, Friedman and Nies obtained the following result.

Theorem 97. *([91]) The computable isomorphism relation on computable structures from classes including predecessor trees, Boolean algebras, and metric spaces is a complete Σ^0_3 equivalence relation under the computable reducibility.*

To prove their result, the authors first showed that one-one equivalence relation of c.e. sets, as an equivalence relation on indices, is Σ^0_3 complete, and then reduced this equivalence relation to the computable isomorphism on predecessor trees. Using the technique developed by Hirschfeldt and White in [167] and Csima, Franklin, and Shore in [59], the result of Theorem 97 can be lifted to hyperarithmetical levels.

It follows from [101] by S. Friedman and Motto Ros that the following result holds for the bi-embeddability relation on computable structures.

Theorem 98. *([101]) For every Σ^1_1 equivalence relation E on ω, there exists a hyperarithmetic class K of structures, which is closed under isomorphism, and such that E is h-equivalent to the bi-embeddability relation on computable structures from K.*

In fact, the reduction functions have complexity at most $\mathbf{0}'$. In [95], Fokina and S. Friedman showed that the general structure of Σ^1_1 equivalence relations on hyperarithmetic subsets of ω is rich. The previous theorem states that the structure of bi-embeddability relations on hyperarithmetic classes of computable structures is as complex as the whole structure of Σ^1_1 equivalence relations under h-reducibility. It would be interesting to answer the following question and possibly get a refinement of Theorem 98. If E is a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation on ω, does there exist a hyperarithmetic class K of structures, which is closed under isomorphism, and such that E is equivalent to the bi-embeddability relation on computable structures from K *via* computable functions?

It is not known whether there exists a hyperarithmetic class of computable structures with Σ^1_1, but not Δ^1_1 isomorphism relation, which is not complete among all isomorphism relations on hyperarithmetic classes of computable structures. An affirmative answer to the following question may help solve this problem. Does there exist a hyperarithmetic class K of computable structures, which contains a unique structure of noncomputable Scott rank (up to isomorphism)? If such a class exists, then the isomorphism relation on the class of computable graphs cannot be reduced to the isomorphism relation on K. Indeed, there exist non-isomorphic graphs of high (that is, ω_1^{CK} or $\omega_1^{CK}+1$) Scott rank. They must be mapped to non-isomorphic structures in K. However, no computable structure of high Scott rank can be mapped to a computable structure of computable Scott rank under a hyperarithmetic reducibility. This question is closely connected with many important open questions in computable model theory concerning computable structures of high Scott rank, such as the question of strong computable approximation (see [33, 132]). It is known that, up to bi-embeddability, this is true in the following sense. In the class of computable linear orders, the equivalence class of linear orders bi-embeddable with the rationals is Σ^1_1-complete, but every computable scattered linear order (that is, one not bi-embeddable with the rationals) has a hyperarithmetic equivalence class. For more information on the bi-embeddability relation in the class of countable linear orders see a paper by Montalbán [246].

References

[1] B. Anderson and B. Csima, Degrees that are not degrees of categoricity, preprint.

[2] B. Anderson, A. Kach, A. Melnikov, and D. Solomon, Jump degrees of torsion-free abelian groups, to appear in the *Journal of Symbolic Logic*.

[3] U. Andrews, The degrees of categorical theories with recursive models, to appear in the *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*.

[4] U. Andrews, A new spectrum of recursive models using an amalgamation construction, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 76 (2011), pp. 883–896.

[5] U. Andrews, New spectra of strongly minimal theories in finite languages, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 162 (2011), pp. 367–372.

[6] U. Andrews and J.F. Knight, Spectra of atomic theories, preprint.

[7] U. Andrews, S. Lempp, J.S. Miller, K.M. Ng, L.S. Mauro, and A. Sorbi, Universal computably enumerable equivalence relations, preprint.

[8] U. Andrews and J.S. Miller, Spectra of theories and structures, preprint.

[9] C.J. Ash, Categoricity in hyperarithmetical degrees, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 34 (1987), pp. 1–14.

[10] C.J. Ash, Recursive labeling systems and stability of recursive structures in hyperarithmetical degrees, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 298 (1986), pp. 497–514.

[11] C.J. Ash, P. Cholak, and J.F. Knight, Permitting, forcing, and copying of a given recursive relation, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 86 (1997), pp. 219–236.

[12] C.J. Ash, C.G. Jockusch, Jr., and J.F. Knight, Jumps of orderings, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 319 (1990), pp. 573–599.

[13] C. Ash and J. Knight, *Computable Structures and the Hyperarithmetical Hierarchy*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2000.

[14] C.J. Ash and J.F. Knight, Possible degrees in recursive copies II, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 87 (1997), pp. 151–165.

[15] C.J. Ash and J.F. Knight, Possible degrees in recursive copies, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 75 (1995), pp. 215–221.

[16] C. J. Ash, J. F. Knight, and J. B. Remmel, Quasi-simple relations in copies of a given recursive structure, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 86 (1997), 203–218.

[17] C.J. Ash and A. Nerode, Intrinsically recursive relations, in: J.N. Crossley, editor, *Aspects of Effective Algebra* (U.D.A. Book Co., Steel's Creek, Australia, 1981), pp. 26–41.

[18] C. Ash, J. Knight, M. Manasse, and T. Slaman, Generic copies of countable structures, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 42 (1989), pp. 195–205.

[19] S.A. Badaev, Computable enumerations of families of general recursive functions, *Algebra and Logic* 16 (1977), pp. 129–148 (Russian); (1978) pp. 83–98 (English translation).

[20] J. Baldwin and A. Lachlan, On strongly minimal sets, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 36 (1971), pp. 79–96.

[21] V. Baleva, The jump operation for structure degrees, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 45 (2006), pp. 249–265.

[22] E.J. Barker, Back and forth relations for reduced abelian p-groups, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 75 (1995), pp. 223–249.

[23] E.M. Barker, Intrinsically Σ^0_α relations, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 39 (1988), pp. 105–130.

[24] J. Barwise, Infinitary logic and admissible sets, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 34 (1969), pp. 226–252.

[25] J. Barwise and J. Schlipf, On recursively saturated models of arithmetic, *Model Theory and Algebra*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 498 (Springer, Berlin, 1975), pp. 42–55.

[26] C. Bernardi and A. Sorbi, Classifying positive equivalence relations, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 48 (1983), 529–538.

[27] W. Calvert, *Algebraic Structure and Computable Structure*, PhD dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2005.

[28] W. Calvert, The isomorphism problem for computable abelian p-groups of bounded length, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 70 (2005), pp. 331–345.

[29] W. Calvert, The isomorphism problem for classes of computable fields, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 43 (2004), pp. 327–336.

[30] W. Calvert, D. Cenzer, V. Harizanov, and A. Morozov, Effective categoricity of Abelian p-groups," *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 159 (2009), pp. 187–197.

[31] W. Calvert, D. Cenzer, V. Harizanov, and A. Morozov, Effective categoricity of equivalence structures, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 141 (2006), pp. 61–78.

[32] W. Calvert, D. Cummins, J.F. Knight, and S. Miller, Comparing classes of finite structures, *Algebra and Logic* 43 (2004), pp. 374–392.

[33] W. Calvert, E. Fokina, S. Goncharov, J. Knight, O. Kudinov, A. Morozov, and V. Puzarenko, Index sets for classes of high rank structures, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 72 (2007), pp. 1418–1432.

[34] W. Calvert, V.S. Harizanov, J.F. Knight, and S. Miller, Index sets of computable structures, *Algebra and Logic* 45 (2006), pp. 306–325.

[35] W. Calvert, V. Harizanov, and A. Shlapentokh, Turing degrees of isomorphism types of algebraic objects, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 75 (2007), pp. 273–286.

[36] W. Calvert, V. Harizanov, and A. Shlapentokh, Turing degrees of the isomorphism types of geometric objects, preprint.

[37] W. Calvert, S.S. Goncharov and J.F. Knight, Computable structures of Scott rank ω_1^{CK} in familiar classes, in: S. Gao, S. Jackson, and Y. Zhang, eds., *Advances in Logic*, Con. Math. 45 (2007), pp. 49–66.

[38] W. Calvert, S. Goncharov, J. Millar, and J. Knight, Categoricity of computable infinitary theories, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 48 (2009), pp. 25–38.

[39] W. Calvert and J.F. Knight, Classification from a computable point of view, *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 12 (2006), pp. 191-218.

[40] W. Calvert, J.F. Knight, and J. Millar, Computable trees of Scott rank ω_1^{CK}, and computable approximability, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 71 (2006), pp. 283–298.

[41] J. Carson, E. Fokina, V. Harizanov, J. Knight, C. Maher, S. Quinn, and J. Wallbaum, Computable embedding problem, *Algebra and Logic* 50 (2011), pp. 707–732.

[42] J. Carson, V. Harizanov, J. Knight, K. Lange, C. Safranski, C. McCoy, A. Morozov, S. Quinn, and J. Wallbaum. Describing free groups, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 364 (2012), pp. 5715–5728.

[43] D. Cenzer, V. Harizanov, and J. Remmel, Σ_1^0 and Π_1^0 equivalence structures, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 162 (2011), pp.490–503.

[44] D. Cenzer, V. Harizanov, and J. Remmel, Effective categoricity of injection structures, in: B. Löwe, D. Normann, I. Soskov, A. Soskova, eds., *Models of Computation in Context*, Computability in Europe 2011, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 6735 (Springer, Heidelberg, 2011), pp. 51–60.

[45] D. Cenzer, G. LaForte, and J. Remmel, Equivalence structures and isomorphisms in the difference hierarchy, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 74 (2009), pp. 535–556.

[46] D. Cenzer and J.B. Remmel, Complexity-theoretic model theory and algebra, in: Yu.L. Ershov, S.S. Goncharov, A. Nerode, and J.B. Remmel, eds., *Handbook of Recursive Mathematics*, vol. 1, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics 139 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998), pp. 381–513.

[47] C.C. Chang and H.J. Keisler, *Model Theory*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics 73. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.

[48] J. Chisholm, Effective model theory vs. recursive model theory, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 55 (1990), pp. 1168–1191.

[49] J. Chisholm, E. Fokina, S. Goncharov, V. Harizanov, J. Knight, and S. Quinn, Intrinsic bounds on complexity and definability at limit levels, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 74 (2009), pp. 1047–1060.

[50] P. Cholak, S. Goncharov, B. Khoussainov, and R.A. Shore, Computably categorical structures and expansions by constants, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 64 (1999), pp. 13–37.

[51] J.A. Chisholm, J. Chubb, V.S. Harizanov, D.R. Hirschfeldt, C.G. Jockusch, Jr., T.H. McNicholl, and S. Pingrey, Π^0_1 classes and strong degree spectra of relations, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 72 (2007), pp. 1003–1018.

[52] J. Chisholm and M. Moses, An undecidable linear order that is n-decidable for all n, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 39 (1998), pp. 519–526.

[53] P. Cholak, R.A. Shore, and R. Solomon, A computably stable structure with no Scott family of finitary formulas. *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 45 (2006), pp. 519–538.

[54] J. Chubb, V. Harizanov, A. Morozov, S. Pingrey, and E. Ufferman, Partial automorphism semigroups, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 156 (2008), pp. 245–258.

[55] J. Chubb, A. Frolov, and V. Harizanov, Degree spectra of the successor relation on computable linear orderings, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 48 (2009), pp. 7–13.

[56] R.J. Coles, R.G. Downey, and T.A. Slaman, Every set has a least jump enumeration, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 62 (2000), pp. 641–649.

[57] S. Coskey, J. Hamkins, and R. Miller, The hierarchy of equivalence relations on the natural numbers under computable reducibility, *Computability* 1 (2012), pp. 15–38.

[58] T.C. Craven, The Boolean space of orderings of a field, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 209 (1975), pp. 225–235.

[59] B.F. Csima, J.N.Y. Franklin, and R.A. Shore, Degrees of categoricity and the hyperarithmetic hierarchy, to appear.

[60] B. Csima and I.Sh. Kalimullin, Degree spectra and immunity properties, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 56 (2010), pp. 67–77.

[61] B.F. Csima, Degree spectra of prime models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 69 (2004), pp. 430–412.

[62] B. Csima, V. Harizanov, D. Hirschfeldt, and R. Soare, Bounding homogeneous models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 72 (2007), pp.305–323.

[63] B. Csima, V. Harizanov, R. Miller, and A. Montalbán, Computability of Fraïssé limits, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 76 (2011), pp. 66 – 93.

[64] B.F. Csima, D.R. Hirschfeldt, J.F. Knight, and R.I. Soare, Bounding prime models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 69 (2004), pp. 1117–1142.

[65] M. Dabkowska, M. Dabkowski, V. Harizanov, and A. Sikora, Turing degrees of nonabelian groups, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 135 (2007), pp. 3383–3391.

[66] M. Dabkowska, M. Dabkowski, V. Harizanov, J. Przytycki, and M. Veve, Compactness of the space of left orders, *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications* 16 (2007), pp. 257–366.

[67] M.A. Dabkowska, M.K. Dabkowski, V.S. Harizanov and A.A. Togha. Spaces of orders and their Turing degree spectra, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 161 (2010), pp. 1134–1143.

[68] R. Dimitrov, V. Harizanov, and A.S. Morozov, Dependence relations in computably rigid computable vector spaces, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 132 (2005), pp. 97–108.

[69] A. Dolich, C. Laskowski, and A. Raichev, Model completeness for trivial, uncountably categorical theories of Morley rank one, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 45 (2006), pp. 931–945.

[70] R.G. Downey, On presentations of algebraic structures, in: A. Sorbi, editor, *Complexity, Logic and Recursion Theory*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics 187 (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1997), pp. 157–205.

[71] R.G. Downey, S.S. Goncharov, and D.R. Hirschfeldt, Degree spectra of relations on Boolean algebras, *Algebra and Logic* 42 (2003), pp. 105–111.

[72] R. Downey, and D. Hirschfeldt, *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity*, Springer, 2010.

[73] R. Downey and C.G. Jockusch, Jr., Every low Boolean algebra is isomorphic to a recursive one, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 122 (1994), pp. 871–880.

[74] R. Downey, A. Kach, S. Lempp, A. Lewis, A. Montalbán, and D. Turetsky, The complexity of computable categoricity, preprint.

[75] R. Downey, A. Kach, S. Lempp, and D. Turetsky, Computable categoricity versus relative computable categoricity, submitted.

[76] R. Downey and J. Knight, Orderings with αth jump degree $\mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 114 (1992), pp. 545–552.

[77] R.G. Downey and S.A. Kurtz, Recursion theory and ordered groups, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 32 (1986), pp. 137–151.

[78] R. Downey, S. Lempp and G. Wu, On the complexity of the successivity relation in computable linear orderings, *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 10 (2010), pp. 83–99.

[79] R. Downey and A.G. Melnikov, Computable completely decomposable groups, preprint.

[80] R. Downey and A.G. Melnikov, Effectively categorical abelian groups, to appear in *Journal of Algebra*.

[81] R.G. Downey and M.F. Moses, Recursive linear orders with incomplete successivities, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 326 (1991), pp. 653–668.

[82] R. Downey and J.B. Remmel, Computable algebras and closure systems: coding properties, in: Yu.L. Ershov, S.S. Goncharov, A. Nerode, and J.B. Remmel, eds., *Handbook of Recursive Mathematics*, vol. 2, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics 139 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998), pp. 997–1040.

[83] B.N. Drobotun. Enumerations of simple models, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 18 (1977), pp. 707–716 (English translation).

[84] V.D. Dzgoev, Recursive automorphisms of constructive models, in: *Proc. 15th. All-Union Algebraic Conf.*, (Novosibirsk, 1979), Part 2, 52 (in Russian).

[85] R. Epstein, Computably enumerable degrees of prime models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 73 (2008), pp. 1373–1388.

[86] Yu.L. Ershov, *Decidability Problems and Constructive Models*, Nauka, Moscow, 1980 (in Russian).

[87] Yu. Ershov, *Theory of Numberings*, Nauka, Moscow, 1977.

[88] Yu.L. Ershov, Theorie der Numerierungen, *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 23 (1977), pp. 289–371.

[89] Yu.L. Ershov and S.S. Goncharov, *Constructive Models*, Siberian School of Algebra and Logic, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2000 (English translation).

[90] L. Feiner, Hierarchies of Boolean algebras, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 35 (1970), pp. 365–374.

[91] E. Fokina, S.D. Friedman, and A. Nies, Equivalence relations that are Σ^0_3 complete for computable reducibility, in: C.-H.L. Ong, R.J.G.B. de Queiroz, eds., *Logic, Language, Information and Computation*, 19th International Workshop, WoLLIC 2012, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7456 (Springer 2012), pp. 26–33.

[92] E. Fokina, Index sets for some classes of structures, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 157 (2009), pp. 139–147.

[93] E. Fokina, Index sets of decidable models, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 48 (2007), pp. 939–948 (English translation).

[94] E. Fokina, On complexity of categorical theories with computable models, *Vestnik NGU* 5 (2005), pp. 78–86 (Russian).

[95] E. Fokina and S. Friedman, On Σ^1_1 equivalence relations over the natural numbers, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 58 (2012), pp. 113–124.

[96] E.B. Fokina and S.D. Friedman, Equivalence relations on classes of computable structures, *Proceedings of "Computability in Europe 2009"*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 5635 (Springer, Heidelberg, 2009), pp. 198–207.

[97] E. Fokina, S. Friedman, V. Harizanov, J. Knight, C. McCoy, and A. Montalbán, Isomorphism relations on computable structures, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 77 (2012), pp. 122–132.

[98] E. Fokina, A. Frolov, and I. Kalimullin, Spectra of categoricity for rigid structures, preprint 2012.

[99] E.B. Fokina, I. Kalimullin, and R. Miller, Degrees of categoricity of computable structures, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 49 (2010), pp. 51–67.

[100] C. Freer, *Models with High Scott Rank*, PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2008.

[101] S.D. Friedman, L. Motto Ros, Analytic equivalence relations and biembeddability, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 76 (2011), pp. 243–266.

[102] H. Friedman, L. Stanley, A Borel reducibility theory for classes of countable structures, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 54 (1989), pp. 894–914.

[103] A. Fröhlich and J. Shepherdson, Effective procedures in field theory, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, ser. A, 248 (1956), pp. 407–432.

[104] A. Frolov, V. Harizanov, I. Kalimullin, O. Kudinov, and R. Miller, Degree spectra of high_n and nonlow_n degrees, *Journal of Logic and Computation* 22 (2012), pp. 755–777.

[105] A. Frolov, I. Kalimullin, and R. Miller, Spectra of algebraic fields and subfields, in: K. Ambos-Spies, B. Löwe, and W. Merkle,eds., *Mathematical Theory and Computational Practice*, Fifth Conference on Computability in Europe, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 5635 (Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 2009), pp. 232–241.

[106] L. Fuchs, *Partially Ordered Algebraic Systems*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1963.

[107] S. Gao, *Invariant Descriptive Set Theory*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, CRC Press/Chapman & Hall, 2009.

[108] S. Gao and P. Gerdes, Computably enumerable equivalence relations, *Studia Logica* 67 (2001), pp. 27–59.

[109] A. Gavryushkin, Computable models of Ehrenfeucht theories, to appear in proceedings of the Infinity Conference.a

[110] A. Gavryushkin, Spectra of computable models for Ehrenfeucht theories, *Algebra and Logic* 46 (2007), pp. 149–157.

[111] A.M.W. Glass, *Ordered Permutation Groups*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 55, Cambridge University Press, 1981.

[112] S.S. Goncharov, Autostable models and algorithmic dimensions, in: Yu.L. Ershov, S.S. Goncharov, A. Nerode, and J.B. Remmel, eds. *Handbook of Recursive Mathematics*, vol. 1, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998), pp. 261–287.

[113] S.S. Goncharov, Autostability of models and abelian groups, *Algebra and Logic* 19 (1980), pp. 13–27 (English translation).

[114] S.S. Goncharov. A totally transcendental decidable theory without constructivizable homogeneous models. *Algebra and Logic* 19 (1980), pp. 85–93 (English translation).

[115] S.S. Goncharov, Computable single valued numerations, *Algebra and Logic* 19 (1980), pp. 325–356 (English translation).

[116] S.S. Goncharov, Problem of number of nonautoequivalent constructivizations, *Algebra and Logic* 19 (1980), pp. 401–414 (English translation).

[117] S.S. Goncharov, Constructive models of and ω_1-categorical theories, *Matematicheskie Zametki* 23 (1978), pp. 885–888.

[118] S. S. Goncharov, Strong constructivizability of homogeneous models, *Algebra and Logic* 17 (1978), pp. 247–263 (English translation).

[119] S.S. Goncharov, The quantity of nonautoequivalent constructivizations, *Algebra and Logic* 16 (1977), pp. 169–185 (English translation).

[120] S. S. Goncharov, Restricted theories of constructive Boolean algebras, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 17 (1976), pp. 601–611 (English translation).

[121] S. Goncharov, Self-stability and computable families of constructivizations, *Algebra and Logic* 14 (1975), pp. 647–680.

[122] S.S. Goncharov and V.D. Dzgoev, Autostability of models, *Algebra and Logic* 19 (1980), pp. 28–37 (English translation).

[123] S.S. Goncharov and B.N. Drobotun, Numerations of saturated and homogeneous models, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 21 (1980), pp. 164–176 (English translation).

[124] S.S. Goncharov, V.S. Harizanov, J.F. Knight, and C.F.D. McCoy, Relatively hyperimmune relations on structures, *Algebra and Logic* 43 (2004), pp. 94–101 (English translation).

[125] S.S. Goncharov, V.S. Harizanov, J.F. Knight, and C.F.D. McCoy, Simple and immune relations on countable structures, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 42 (2003), pp. 279–291.

[126] S. Goncharov, V. Harizanov, J. Knight, C. McCoy, R. Miller, and R. Solomon, Enumerations in computable structure theory, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 136 (2005), pp. 219–246.

[127] S.S. Goncharov, V.S. Harizanov, J.F. Knight, and R.A. Shore, Π^1_1 relations and paths through $\mathcal{O}$, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 69 (2004), pp. 585–611.

[128] S. Goncharov, V. Harizanov, J. Knight, A. Morozov, and A. Romina, On automorphic tuples of elements in computable models, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 46 (2005), pp. 405–412 (English translation).

[129] S. Goncharov, V. Harizanov, C. Laskowski, S. Lempp, an C. McCoy, Trivial, strongly minimal theories are model complete after naming constants, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 131 (2003), pp. 3901–3912.

[130] S.S. Goncharov and B. Khoussainov, Complexity of theories of computable categorical models, *Algebra and Logic* 43 (2004), pp. 365–373.

[131] S.S. Goncharov and B. Khoussainov, On the spectrum of degrees of decidable relations, *Doklady Mathematics* 55 (1997), pp. 55–57.

[132] S. Goncharov and J. Knight, Computable structure and non-structure theorems, *Algebra and Logic* 41 (2002), pp. 351–373.

[133] S. Goncharov, S. Lempp, and R. Solomon, The computable dimension of ordered abelian groups, *Advances in Mathematics* 175 (2003), pp. 102–143.

[134] S.S. Goncharov, A.V. Molokov, and N.S. Romanovskii, Nilpotent groups of finite algorithmic dimension, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 30 (1989), pp. 63–68.

[135] S.S. Goncharov and A.T. Nurtazin, Constructive models of complete solvable theories, *Algebra and Logic* 12 (1973), pp. 67–77 (English translation).

[136] N. Greenberg, A. Montalbán, and T.A. Slaman, Relative to any non-hyperarithmetic set, preprint.

[137] N. Greenberg, A. Montalbán, and T.A. Slaman, The Slaman-Wehner theorem in higher recursion theory. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 139 (2011), pp.1865–1869.

[138] V. Harizanov, Turing degrees of hypersimple relations on computable structures, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 121 (2003), pp. 209–226.

[139] V. Harizanov, Effectively nowhere simple relations on computable structures, in: M.M. Arslanov and S. Lempp, eds., *Recursion Theory and Complexity* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999), pp. 59–70.

[140] V.S. Harizanov, Turing degrees of certain isomorphic images of computable relations, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 93 (1998), pp. 103–113.

[141] V.S. Harizanov, The possible Turing degree of the nonzero member in a two element degree spectrum, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 60 (1993), pp. 1–30.

[142] V.S. Harizanov, Some effects of Ash-Nerode and other decidability conditions on degree spectra, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 55 (1991), pp. 51–65.

[143] V.S. Harizanov, Uncountable degree spectra, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 54 (1991), pp. 255–263.

[144] V.S. Harizanov, *Degree Spectrum of a Recursive Relation on a Recursive Structure*, PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1987.

[145] V. Harizanov, C. Jockusch, Jr., and J. Knight, Chains and antichains in computable partial orderings, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 48 (2009), pp. 39–53.

[146] V.S. Harizanov, J.F. Knight and A.S. Morozov, *Sequences of n-diagrams*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 67 (2002), pp. 1227–1247.

[147] V. Harizanov and R. Miller, Spectra of structures and relations, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 72 (2007), pp. 324–348.

[148] V. Harizanov, R. Miller, and A.S. Morozov, Simple structures with complex symmetry. *Algebra and Logic* 49 (2010), pp. 98–134 (English translation).

[149] L. Harrington, Recursively presentable prime models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 39 (1974), pp. 305–309.

[150] K. Harris, Categoricity in Boolean algebras, preprint.

[151] K. Harris, On bounding saturated models, preprint.

[152] K. Harris and A. Montalbán, On the n-back-and-forth types of Boolean algebras, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 364 (2012), pp. 827–866.

[153] K. Harris and A. Montalbán, Boolean algebra approximations, preprint.

[154] J. Harrison, Recursive pseudo-well-orderings, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 131 (1968), pp. 526–543.

[155] E. Herrmann, Infinite chains and antichains in computable partial orderings, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 66 (2001), pp. 923–934.

[156] B. Herwig, S. Lempp, and M. Ziegler, Constructive models of uncountably categorical theories, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* (1999), pp. 3711–3719.

[157] G. Higman, Subgroups of finitely presented groups, *Proc. Royal Soc. London* 262 (1961), pp. 455–475.

[158] G.R. Hird, Recursive properties of relations on models, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 63 (1993), pp. 241–269.

[159] G. Hird, Recursive properties of intervals of recursive linear orders, in: J. N. Crossley, J. B. Remmel, R. A. Shore, and M. E. Sweedler, eds., *Logical Methods* (Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993), pp. 422–437.

[160] D.R. Hirschfeldt, Degree spectra of relations on computable structures in the presence of Δ^0_2 isomorphisms, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 67 (2002), pp. 697–720.

[161] D.R. Hirschfeldt, Prime models and relative decidability, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 134 (2006), pp. 1495–1498.

[162] D.R. Hirschfeldt, Prime models of theories of computable linear orderings, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 129 (2001), pp. 3079–3083.

[163] D. Hirschfeldt, K. Kramer, R. Miller, and A. Shlapentokh, Categoricity properties for computable algebraic fields, preprint.

[164] D.R. Hirschfeldt, B. Khoussainov, and P. Semukhin, An uncountably categorical theory whose only computably presentable model is saturated, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 47 (2006), pp. 63–71.

[165] D.R. Hirschfeldt, B. Khoussainov, and R.A. Shore, A computably categorical structure whose expansion by a constant has infinite computable dimension, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 68 (2003), pp. 1199–1241.

[166] D. Hirschfeldt, B. Khoussainov, R. Shore, and A. Slinko, Degree spectra and computable dimensions in algebraic structures, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 115 (2002), pp. 71–113.

[167] D. Hirschfeldt and W. White, Realizing levels of the hyperarithmetic hierarchy as degree spectra of relations on computable structures, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 43 (2002), pp. 51–64.

[168] G. Hjorth, The isomorphism relation on countable torsion-free Abelian groups, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 175 (2002), pp. 241–257.

[169] E. Hrushovski, A new strongly minimal set, Stability in model theory, III (Trento, 1991), *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 62 (1993), pp. 147–166.

[170] C.G. Jockusch, Jr. and R.I. Soare, Boolean algebras, Stone spaces, and the iterated Turing jump, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 59 (1994), pp. 1121–1138.

[171] C.G. Jockusch, Jr. and R.I. Soare, Degrees of orderings not isomorphic to recursive linear orderings, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 52 (1991), pp. 39–64.

[172] C.G. Jockusch, Jr. and R. Soare, Π^0_1 classes and degrees of theories, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 173 (1972), pp. 33–56.

[173] A.M. Kach, K. Lange, and R. Solomon, Degrees of orders on torsion-free abelian groups, preprint.

[174] A.M. Kach and D. Turetsky, Δ^0_2-categoricity of equivalence structures, *New Zealand Journal of Mathemtics* 39 (2009), pp. 143–149.

[175] I. Kalantari and A. Retzlaff, Maximal vector spaces under automorphisms of the lattice of recursively enumerable vector spaces, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 42 (1977), pp. 481–491.

[176] I.Sh. Kalimullin, Almost computably enumerable families of sets, *Sbornik. Mathematics* 199 (2008), pp. 1451–1458 (English translation).

[177] I.Sh. Kalimullin, Restrictions on the spectra of degrees of algebraic structures, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 49 (2008), pp. 1034–1043 (English translation).

[178] I.Sh. Kalimullin, Spectra of degrees of some algebraic structures, *Algebra and Logic* 46 (2007), pp. 729–744.

[179] I. Sh. Kalimullin, Some notes on degree spectra of structures, in: S.B. Cooper, B. Löwe, and A. Sorbi, editors, *Computation and Logic in the Real World*, Computability in Europe, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 4497 (Springer, 2007), pp. 389–397.

[180] I. Kalimullin, B. Khoussainov, and A. Melnikov, Limitwise monotonic sequences and degree spectra of structures, to appear in the *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*.

[181] V. Kanovei, *Borel Equivalence Relations. Structure and Classification*, University Lecture Series 44, (American Mathematical Society, 2008).

[182] A. Kechris, and A. Louveau, The classification of hypersmooth Borel equivalence relations, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 10 (1997), pp. 215–242.

[183] C.F. Kent, Constructive analogues of the group of permutations of the natural numbers, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 104 (1962), pp. 347–362.

[184] O. Kharlampovich and A. Myasnikov, Elementary theory of free non-abelian groups, *Journal of Algebra* 302 (2006), pp. 451–552.

[185] A.N. Khisamiev, On the upper semilattice L_E, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 45 (2004), pp. 173–187 (English translation).

[186] N.G. Khisamiev, Theory of abelian groups with constructive models, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 27 (1986), pp. 572–585 (English translation).

[187] N.G. Khisamiev, A constructibility criterion for the direct product of cyclic p-groups, *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk Kazakhskoj SSR, Seriya Fiziko-Matematicheskaya* 51 (1981), pp. 51–55 (in Russian).

[188] N.G. Khisamiev, Strongly constructive models of a decidable theory, *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk Kazakhskoj SSR, Seriya Fiziko-Matematicheskaya* 1 (1974), pp. 83–84 (in Russian).

[189] N.G. Khisamiev and A.A. Krykpaeva. Effectively totally decomposable abelian groups, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 38 (1997), pp. 1227–1229 (English translation).

[190] B. Khoussainov, C. Laskowski, S. Lempp, and R. Solomon, On the computability-theoretic complexity of trivial, strongly minimal models, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 135 (2007), pp. 3711–3721.

[191] B. Khoussainov and M. Minnes, Three lectures on automatic structures, in: F. Delon, U. Kohlenbach, P. Maddy, F. Stephan, *Logic Colloquium '07*, Lecture Notes in Logic 35, (Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 132–176.

[192] B. Khoussainov and A. Montalbán, A computable $\aleph_0$-categorical structure whose theory computes true arithmetic, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 75 (2010), pp. 728–740.

[193] B. Khoussainov and A. Nerode, Automatic presentations of structures, in: D. Leivant, editor, *Logic and Computational Complexity: International Workshop*, LCC '94, Indianapolis, IN, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 960 (Springer, 1995), pp. 367–395.

[194] B. Khoussainov, A. Nies, and R. Shore, On recursive models of theories, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 38 (1997), pp. 165–178.

[195] B. Khoussainov, P. Semukhin, and F. Stephan, Applications of Kolmogorov complexity to computable model theory, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 72 (2007), pp. 1041–1054.

[196] B. Khoussainov and R.A. Shore, Computable isomorphisms, degree spectra of relations and Scott families, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 93 (1998), pp. 153–193.

[197] B. Khoussainov, T. Slaman, P. Semukhin, Π^0_1-presentations of algebras, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 45 (2006), pp. 769–781.

[198] B. Khoussainov, F. Stephan, and Y. Yang, Computable categoricity and the Ershov hierarchy, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 156 (2008), pp. 86–95.

[199] J. Knight, Nonarithmetical $\aleph_0$-categorical theories with recursive models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 59 (1994), pp. 106–112.

[200] J. F. Knight, Degrees coded in jumps of orderings, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 51 (1986), pp.1034–1042.

[201] J.F. Knight and J. Millar, Computable structures of Scott rank ω_1^{CK}, *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 10 (2010), pp. 31–43.

[202] J.F. Knight, S. Miller, and M. Vanden Boom, Turing computable embeddings, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 73 (2007), pp. 901–918.

[203] J.F. Knight and M. Stob, Computable Boolean algebras, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 65 (2000), pp. 1605–1623.

[204] G. Kreisel, Note on arithmetic models for consistent formulae of the predicate calculus, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 37 (1950) pp. 265–285.

[205] K.Zh. Kudaibergenov, Effectively homogenous models, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 27 (1986), pp. 180–182 (in Russian).

[206] K. Kudaibergenov, On constructive models of undecidable theories, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 21 (1980), pp. 155–158 (in Russian).

[207] O. Kudinov, An autostable 1-decidable model without a computable Scott family of $\exists$-formulas, *Algebra and Logic* 35 (1996), pp. 458–467.

[208] V.A. Kuzicheva, Inverse isomorphisms of rings of recursive endomorphisms, *Moscow University Mathematics Bulletin* 41 (1986) pp. 82–84 (English translation).

[209] A.V. Kuznetsov, On primitive recursive functions of large oscillation, *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR* 71 (1950), pp. 233–236 (in Russian).

[210] K. Lange, A characterization of the **0**-basis homogeneous bounding degrees, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 75 (2010), pp. 971–995.

[211] K. Lange, The degree spectra of homogeneous models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 73 (2008), pp. 1009–1028.

[212] P. LaRoche, Recursively presented Boolean algebras, *Notices AMS* 24 (1977), A552–A553.

[213] C. Laskowski, Characterizing model completeness among mutually algebraic structures, submitted.

[214] S. Lempp, C. McCoy, R. Miller and R. Solomon, Computable categoricity of trees of finite height, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 70 (2005), pp. 151–215.

[215] S. Lempp, C.F.D. McCoy, A.S. Morozov, and R. Solomon, Group theoretic properties of the group of computable automorphisms of a countable dense linear order, *Order* 19 (2002), pp. 343–364 .

[216] M. Lerman and J. Schmerl, Theories with recursive models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 44 (1979), pp. 59–76.

[217] M. Makkai, An example concerning Scott heights, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 46 (1981), pp. 301–318.

[218] A.I. Mal'cev, On recursive Abelian groups, *Soviet Mathematics. Doklady* 32 (1962), pp. 1431–1434.

[219] A.I. Mal'cev, Constructive algebras. I, *Russian Math. Surveys* 16 (1961), pp. 77–129.

[220] A.J. Macintyre and D. Marker, Degrees of recursively saturated models, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 282 (1984), pp. 539–554.

[221] M. Manasse, *Techniques and Counterexamples in Almost Categorical Recursive Model Theory*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1982.

[222] A.B. Manaster and J.B. Remmel, Some recursion theoretic aspects of dense two-dimensional partial orderings, in: J.N. Crossley, editor, *Aspects of Effective Algebra* (U.D.A. Book Co., Steel's Creek, Australia, 1981), pp. 161–188.

[223] C.F.D. McCoy, Δ^0_2-categoricity in Boolean algebras and linear orderings, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 119 (2003), pp. 85–120.

[224] C.F.D. McCoy, On Δ^0_3-categoricity for linear orders and Boolean algebras, *Algebra and Logic* 41 (2002), pp. 295–305 (English translation).

[225] C. McCoy and J. Wallbaum, Describing free groups, part II: Π^0_4-hardness and no Σ^0_2 basis, to appear in the *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*.

[226] Yu.T. Medvedev, Degrees of difficulty of the mass problem, *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR* (N.S.) 104 (1955), pp. 501–504 (in Russian).

[227] A.G. Melnikov, Enumerations and completely decomposable torsion-free abelian groups, *Theory of Computing Systems* 45 (2009), pp. 897–916.

[228] G. Metakides and A. Nerode, Recursion theory on fields and abstract dependence, *Journal of Algebra* 65 (1980), pp. 36–59.

[229] G. Metakides and A. Nerode, Effective content of field theory, *Annals of Mathematical Logic* 17 (1979), pp. 289–320.

[230] G. Metakides and A. Nerode, Recursively enumerable vector spaces, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 11 (1977) pp. 147–171.

[231] J. Millar and G.E. Sacks, Atomic models higher up, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 155 (2008), pp. 225–241.

[232] T. Millar, Recursive categoricity and persistence, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 51 (1986), pp. 430–434.

[233] T. Millar, T. Prime models and almost decidability, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 51 (1986), pp. 412–420.

[234] T.S. Millar, Type structure complexity and decidability, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 271 (1982), pp.73–81.

[235] T.S. Millar, Homogeneous models and decidability, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 91 (1980), pp. 407–418.

[236] T.S. Millar, Foundations of recursive model theory, *Annals of Mathematical Logic* 13 (1978), pp. 45–72.

[237] A.W. Miller, On the Borel classification of the isomorphism class of a countable model, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 24 (1983), pp. 22–34.

[238] D.E. Miller, The invariant Π^0_α separation principle, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 242 (1978), pp. 185–204.

[239] R. Miller, **d**-computable categoricity for algebraic fields, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 74 (2009), pp. 1325–1351.

[240] R. Miller, The computable dimension of trees of infinite height, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 70 (2005), pp. 111–141.

[241] R.G. Miller, The Δ^0_2-spectrum of a linear order, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 66 (2001), pp. 470–486.

[242] R. Miller and A. Shlapentokh, Computable categoricity for algebraic fields with splitting algorithms, preprint.

[243] R. Miller and H. Schoutens, Computably categorical fields *via* Fermat's Last Theorem, preprint.

[244] A. Montalbán, A fixed point for the jump operator on structures, to appear.

[245] A. Montalbán, Notes on the jump of a structure, *Mathematical Theory and Computational Practice* (2009) pp. 372–378.

[246] A. Montalbán, On the equimorphism types of linear orderings, *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 13 (2007), pp. 71–99.

[247] M. Morley, Decidable models, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 25 (1976), pp. 233–240.

[248] A.S. Morozov, On the relation of Σ-reducibility between admissible sets, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 45 (2004), pp. 634–652 (English translation).

[249] A.S. Morozov, Once again on the Higman question, *Algebra and Logic* 39 (2000), pp. 78–83 (English translation).

[250] A.S. Morozov, Turing reducibility as algebraic embeddability, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 38 (1997) pp. 312–313 (English translation).

[251] A.S. Morozov, On degrees of the recursive automorphism groups, in: *Algebra, Logic, and Applications*, In Memoriam of A.I. Kokorin (Irkutsk University, Irkutsk, 1994), pp. 79–85 (in Russian).

[252] A.S. Morozov, Functional trees and automorphisms of models, *Algebra and Logic* 32 (1993), pp. 28–38 (English translation).

[253] A.S. Morozov, Groups of computable automorphisms, in: Yu.L. Ershov, S.S. Goncharov, A. Nerode, and J.B. Remmel, eds., *Handbook of Recursive Mathematics*, vol. 1, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics 139 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998), pp. 311–345.

[254] A.S. Morozov, On theories of classes of groups of recursive permutations (Russian), in: Proc. Inst. Math. Acad. Sibirsk. sssa, Trudy Inst. Mat., Novosibirsk, 12 (1989), pp. 91–104, 189; (translated in: *Siberian Adv. Math.*, 1 (1991), pp. 138–153).

[255] A.S. Morozov, Rigid constructive modules, *Algebra and Logic* 28 (1989), pp. 379–387 (English translation).

[256] A.S. Morozov, Permutations and implicit definability, *Algebra and Logic* 27 (1988), pp. 12–24 (English translation).

[257] A.S. Morozov, Computable groups of automorphisms of models, *Algebra and Logic* 25 (1986), pp. 261–266 (English translation).

[258] A.S. Morozov, Groups of recursive automorphisms of constructive Boolean algebras, *Algebra and Logic* 22 (1983), pp. 95–112 (English translation).

[259] A.S. Morozov, Strong constructivizability of countable saturated Boolean algebras, *Algebra and Logic* 21 (1982), pp. 130–137 (English translation).

[260] A.S. Morozov and A.N. Buzykaeva, On a hierarchy of groups of computable automorphisms, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 43 (2002), pp. 124–127 (English translation).

[261] A.S. Morozov and J.K. Truss, On computable automorphisms of the rational numbers, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 66 (2001), pp. 1458–1470.

[262] A.S. Morozov and J.K. Truss, On the categoricity of the group of all computable automorphisms of the rational numbers, *Algebra Logic* 46 (2007), pp. 354–361 (English translation).[30]

[263] M. Moses, Relations intrinsically recursive in linear orders, *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 32 (1986), pp. 467–472.

[264] A. Mostowski, A formula with no recursively enumerable model, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 42 (1955), pp. 125–140.

[265] A. Nies, *Computability and Randomness*, Oxford University Press, 2009..

[266] A. Nies, A new spectrum of recursive models, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 40 (1999), pp. 307–314.

[267] A.T. Nurtazin, Strong and weak constructivizations and computable families, *Algebra and Logic* 13 (1974), pp. 177–184 (English translation).

[268] S. Oates, *Jump Degrees of Groups*, PhD dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1989.

[269] E. Pavlovskii, An estimate for the algorithmic complexity of classes of computable models, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 49 (2008), pp. 512–523.

[270] M. Peretyat'kin, Turing machine computations in finitely axiomatizable theories, *Algebra and Logic* 21 (1982), pp. 272–295 (English translation).

[271] M.G. Peretyat'kin, Criterion for strong constructivizability of a homogeneous model, *Algebra and Logic* 17 (1978), pp. 290–301 (English translation).

[272] M.G. Peretyat'kin, Strongly constructive models and enumerations of the Boolean algebra of recursive sets, *Algebra and Logic* 10 (1971), pp. 332–345 (English translation).

[273] V.G. Puzarenko, Fixed points for the jump operator, *Algebra and Logic* 50 (2011), pp. 418–438.

[274] V.G. Puzarenko, On a certain reducibility on admissible sets, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* 50 (2009), pp. 415–429.

[275] M.O. Rabin, Computable algebra, general theory and theory of computable fields, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 95 (1960), pp. 341–360.

[276] J.B. Remmel, Recursively rigid Boolean algebras, *Annals of Pure Applied Logic* 36 (1987), pp. 39–52.

[277] J.B. Remmel, Recursively categorical linear orderings, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 83 (1981), pp. 387–391.

[278] J. B. Remmel, Recursive isomorphism types of recursive Boolean algebras, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 46 (1981), pp. 572–594.

[279] J. B. Remmel, Recursively enumerable Boolean algebras, *Annals of Mathematical Logic* 15 (1978), pp. 75–107.

[280] J. Remmel, Maximal and cohesive vector spaces, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 42 (1977), pp. 400–418.

[281] J.B. Remmel, Combinatorial functors on co-r.e. structures, *Annals of Mathematical Logic* 10 (1976), pp. 261–287.

[282] J.-P. Ressayre, Boolean models and infinitary first order languages, *Annals of Mathematical Logic* 6 (1973), pp. 41–92.

[283] L.J. Richter; Degrees of structures, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 46 (1981), pp. 723–731.

[284] H. Rogers, *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability*, McGraw-Hill, 1967.

[285] J. Rosenstein, *Linear Orderings*, Academic Press, 1982.

[286] S. Rubin, Automata presenting structures: a survey of the finite string case, *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 14 (2008), pp. 169–209.

[287] G.E. Sacks, *Higher Recursion Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.

[288] S. Schwarz, Recursive automorphisms of recursive linear orderings, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 26 (1984) pp. 69–73.

[289] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups VI: The elementary theory of a free group, *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 16 (2006), pp. 707–730.

[290] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups V_2: Quantifier elimination II, *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 16 (2006), pp. 537–706.

[291] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups V_1: Quantifier elimination I, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 150 (2005), pp. 1–197.

[292] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups III: Rigid and solid solutions, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 147 (2005), pp. 1–73.

[293] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups IV: An iterative procedure for validation of a sentence, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 143 (2004), pp. 1–130.

[294] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups II: Completions, closures, and formal solutions, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 134 (2003), pp. 173–254.

[295] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups I: Makanin-Razborov diagrams, *Publications Mathématiques* 93 (2001) Institute des Hautes Études Scientifiques, pp. 31–105.

[296] A. Selman, Arithmetical reducibilities I, *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 17 (1971), pp. 335–370.

[297] V.L. Selivanov, Enumerations of families of general recursive functions, *Algebra and Logic* 15 (1976), pp. 128–141 (English translation).

[298] I.P. Shestakov and U.U. Umirbaev, The tame and the wild automorphisms of polynomial rings in three variables, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 17 (2004), pp. 197–227.

[299] R.A. Shore, Controlling the dependence degree of a recursively enumerable vector space, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 43 (1978), pp. 13–22.

[300] T. Slaman, Relative to any nonrecursive set, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 126 (1998), pp. 2117–2122.

[301] R.L. Smith, Two theorems on autostability in p-groups, in *Logic Year 1979–80*, Univ. Connecticut, Storrs, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 859, (Springer, Berlin, 1981), pp. 302–311.

[302] R.I. Soare, *Recursively Enumerable Sets and Degrees*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.

[303] R. Solomon, Π_1^0 classes and orderable groups, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 115 (2002), 279–302.

[304] D.R. Solomon, *Reverse Mathematics and Ordered Groups*, PhD dissertation, Cornell University, 1998.

[305] A.A. Soskova and I.N. Soskov, A jump inversion theorem for the degree spectra, *Journal of Logic and Computation* 19 (2009), pp. 199–215.

[306] I.N. Soskov, Degree spectra and co-spectra of structures, *Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia "St. Kliment Ohridski". Faculté de Mathématiques et Informatique* 96 (2004), pp. 45–68.

[307] I.N. Soskov, Intrinsically Π_1^1 relations, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 42 (1996), pp. 109–126.

[308] I.N. Soskov, Intrinsically hyperarithmetical sets, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 42 (1996), pp. 469–480.

[309] A.I. Stukachev, A jump inversion theorem for the semilattices of Sigma-degrees, *Siberian Advances in Mathematics* 20 (2010), pp. 68–74.

[310] A.I. Stukachev, Degrees of presentability of structures. II, *Algebra and Logic* 47 (2008), pp. 65–74.

[311] A.I. Stukachev, Degrees of presentability of structures. I, *Algebra and Logic* 46 (2007), pp. 419–432.

[312] S.V. Sudoplatov, Complete theories with finitely many countable models, *Algebra and Logic* 43 (2004), pp. 62–69.

[313] J.J. Thurber, Every low_2 Boolean algebra has a recursive copy, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 123 (1995), pp. 3859–3866.

[314] R.L. Vaught, Denumerable models of complete theories, in: *Proceedings of Symposium on Foundations of Mathematics: Infinitistic Methods* (Pergamon Press, London, 1961), pp. 301–321.

[315] R.L. Vaught, Sentences true in all constructive models, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 25 (1960), pp. 39–58.

[316] S. Wehner, Enumerations, countable structures and Turing degrees, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 126 (1998), pp. 2131–2139.

[317] W. White, *Characterization for Computable Structures*, PhD dissertation, Cornell University, 2000.