

# The Analogy between Inductively-defined Sets and Computably Enumerable Sets

Alvaro Pintado

January 14, 2026

There is an analogy between inductively-defined sets and computably enumerable sets that seems to have been observed many times before, which gives an analogy between inductive-coinductive duality and the duality between c.e. and co-c.e. sets.

The predicative construction of an inductive set begins with the empty set and applies the associated operator iteratively *enumerating* the elements of the least fixed point. If further, this construction is in some sense computable, then this should give a computable enumeration of the inductive set.

Dually, the predicative construction of a coinductive set begins with the entire set and iteratively removes elements just how non-membership in a co-c.e. set is computed.

Old and well-known results in the literature on inductive definitions give a way to make this analogy formal. All results presented here can be found in Hinman's book *Recursion-theoretic Hierarchies*.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The least fixed point of a computable monotone operator is computably enumerable. Moreover, every computably enumerable set is 1-1 reducible to the least fixed point of a computable monotone operator.*

If we broaden the class of monotone operators to  $\Sigma_1^0$  operators, then we get something slightly tighter.

**Theorem 1.2.** *The least fixed point of a  $\Sigma_1^0$  computable monotone operator is computably enumerable. Moreover, every computably enumerable set is the least fixed point of some  $\Sigma_1^0$  monotone operator.*

The analogy can also be made formal by taking the perspective of inductively-defined sets as being generated by rules and enumeration operators. Below I try to give intuitive sketches for some of the statements.

---

**Definition 1.3** (stages). Let  $F : P(X) \rightarrow P(X)$  be a monotone operator. By transfinite recursion, we define

$$F^\alpha := F(F^{<\alpha})$$

with

$$F^{<\alpha} := \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} F^\xi.$$

Then  $\bar{F} := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} F^\alpha$ .

It's a basic result of fixed point theory that  $\bar{F} = \mu F$  and that there is a least ordinal  $\lambda$  such that  $F^{<\lambda} = F^\lambda$  where  $|\lambda| \leq |X|$ .

**Definition 1.4.** The **closure ordinal**  $|F|$  of  $F$  is the least ordinal  $\lambda$  such that

$$F^{<\lambda} = F^\lambda.$$

**Definition 1.5.**

1. An operator  $F : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega)$  is **computable**<sup>1</sup> if there is a total Turing functional  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow 2$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} x \in F(A) &\implies \Phi^A(x) = 1 \\ x \notin F(A) &\implies \Phi^A(x) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

2. An operator  $F : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega)$  is  $\Sigma_1^0$  if there is a partial Turing functional  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega)$

$$x \in F(A) \iff \Phi^A(x) \downarrow = 1.$$

**Proposition 1.6.** *If  $F$  is a computable monotone operator, then*

1. *the sequence*

$$(F^n)_{n \in \omega}$$

*is uniformly computable,*

2.  $|F| \leq \omega$ , and

3.  $\bar{F}$  is  $\Sigma_1^0$ .

The essential idea is that use is finite and any element in the  $\omega$ th stage of the construction was already added at some finite stage.

*Proof.*

1. Let  $\Phi$  witness that  $F$  is computable. Given inputs  $n, x$ , we want a uniform to decide  $x \in F^n$ . If  $n = 0$ , we just run the total procedure  $\Phi^\emptyset(x)$ , and if  $n = k + 1$ , then we run  $\Phi^{F^k}(x)$  and queries  $y \in F^k$  are computed recursively.
2. Let  $x \in F^\omega = F(F^{<\omega})$ , then  $\Phi^{F^{<\omega}}(x) = 1$ . Since the use of this computation is finite and the sets  $(F^n)_{n < \omega}$  are increasing, then there is a maximal  $m$  such that  $\Phi^{F^m}(x) = 1$ . Thus,  $x \in F^{<\omega}$ .
3. Since the closure ordinal is  $\leq \omega$ , it suffices to computably enumerate the union  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} F^n$ , but since this is a uniformly computable sequence, then this is immediate.

□

In this context, what is computable about the iterative construction is that we can computably decide if some number  $x$  is in the  $n$ th stage of the construction of the inductive set.

**Lemma 1.7.** *Let  $F$  be a  $\Sigma_1^0$  monotone operator, then  $|F| \leq \omega$ .*

**Lemma 1.8.** *Let  $F$  be a  $\Sigma_1^0$  monotone operator, then there is a computable relation  $R$  such that for all  $x \in \omega$  and  $A \in 2^\omega$ ,*

$$x \in F(A) \iff \exists n[D_n \subseteq A \wedge R(x, n)].$$

**Proposition 1.9.** *Let  $F$  be a  $\Sigma_1^0$  operator, then  $\bar{F}$  is computably enumerable.*

By the duality for monotone operators, we get the dual result for  $\Pi_1^0$  operators and co-c.e. sets.

---

<sup>1</sup>More generally, the complexity of an operator is the complexity of the relation  $x \in F(A)$  as a subset of  $\omega \times 2^\omega$ .