数理解析研究所講究録
第 1595 巻 2008 年 20-31

On pair-splitting and pair-reaping pairs of ω

Hiroaki Minami

Abstract

In this paper we investigate variations of splitting number and reaping number, pair-splitting number $\mathfrak{s}_{pair}$, pair-reaping number $\mathfrak{r}_{pair}$. We prove that it is consistent that $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} < \mathfrak{d}$. We also prove it is consistent that $\mathfrak{r}_{pair} > \mathfrak{b}$.

Introduction

The splitting number $\mathfrak{s}$ and the reaping number $\mathfrak{r}$ are cardinal invariants related to the structure $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin$.

For $X, Y \in [\omega]^\omega$ we say X splits Y if $X \cap Y$ and $Y \setminus X$ are infinite. We call $\mathcal{S} \subset [\omega]^\omega$ a splitting family if for each $Y \in [\omega]^\omega$, there exists $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ such that X splits Y. The splitting number $\mathfrak{s}$ is the least size of a splitting family.

We call $\mathcal{R}$ a reaping family if for each $X \in [\omega]$, there exists $Y \in [\omega]^\omega$ such that Y is not split by X, that is, $X \cap Y$ is finite or $Y \setminus X$ is finite. The reaping number $\mathfrak{r}$ is the least size of a reaping family.

We shall study variations of splitting number and reaping number, pair-splitting number $\mathfrak{s}_{pair}$ and pair-reaping number $\mathfrak{r}_{pair}$. They are introduced and investigated in [7] to analyze dual-reaping number $\mathfrak{r}_d$ and dual-splitting number $\mathfrak{s}_d$ which are reaping number and splitting number for the structure of all infinite partitions of ω ordered by "almost coarser" $((\omega)^\omega, \leq^*)$ respectively.

We call $A \subset [\omega]^2$ unbounded if for $k \in \omega$, there exists $a \in A$ such that $a \cap k = \emptyset$. For $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ and unbounded $A \subset [\omega]^2$, X pair-splits A if there exist infinitely many $a \in A$ such that $a \cap X \neq \emptyset$ and $a \setminus X \neq \emptyset$. We call $\mathcal{S} \subset [\omega]^\omega$ a pair-splitting family if for each unbounded $A \subset [\omega]^2$, there exists $X \in \mathcal{S}$ such that X pair-splits A. The pair-splitting number $\mathfrak{s}_{pair}$ is the least size of a pair-splitting family.

We call $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{P}([\omega]^2)$ a pair-reaping family if for each $A \in \mathcal{R}$, A is unbounded and for $X \in [\omega]^\omega$, there exists $A \in \mathcal{R}$ such that X doesn't pair-split A. The pair-reaping number $\mathfrak{r}_{pair}$ is the least size of a pair-reaping family.

In [7] it is proved that there is the following relationship between $\mathfrak{r}_{pair}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{pair}$ and other cardinal invariants.

Proposition 0.1 *1.* $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} \leq non(\mathcal{M}), non(\mathcal{N})$.

2. $\mathfrak{r}_{pair} \geq cov(\mathcal{M}), cov(\mathcal{N})$.

3. $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} \geq \mathfrak{s}$.

4. $\mathfrak{r}_{pair} \leq \mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{s}_d$.

It is not known that $\mathfrak{r}_d \leq \mathfrak{s}_{pair}$ or not.

Question 0.1 $\mathfrak{r}_d \leq \mathfrak{s}_{pair}$*?*

$\mathfrak{s} \leq \mathfrak{d}$ and $\mathfrak{r} \geq \mathfrak{b}$ hold (see in [2]). And Kamo proved the following statement in [7]:

Theorem 0.1 $\mathfrak{r}_d \leq \mathfrak{d}$ *and* $\mathfrak{s}_d \geq \mathfrak{b}$.

So we have the following diagram:



An arrow $\kappa \longrightarrow \lambda$ denotes the inequality $\kappa \geq \lambda$.

In [7] by using finite support iteration of Hechler forcing, the following consistency results are proved.

Theorem 0.2 *It is consistent that $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} < add(\mathcal{M})$. Dually it is consistent that $\mathfrak{t}_{pair} > cof(\mathcal{M})$.*

$\mathfrak{t}_{pair}$ is a lower bound of $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{pair}$ is an upper bound of $\mathfrak{s}$ (and maybe of $\mathfrak{t}_d$). So it is natural to ask the following question.

Question 0.2 *$\mathfrak{s}_{pair} \leq \mathfrak{d}$? Dually $\mathfrak{t}_{pair} \geq \mathfrak{b}$?*

In the present paper we shall investigate the relation ship between $\mathfrak{t}_{pair}$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ and the relationship between $\mathfrak{s}_{pair}$ and $\mathfrak{d}$. In section 1 we shall prove the consistency of $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} > \mathfrak{d}$. In section 2 we shall show the consistency of the consistency of $\mathfrak{t}_{pair} < \mathfrak{b}$. In section 3 we mention the development of results in section 1 and 2.

1 pair-splitting number and dominating number

Notation and Definition We present the related notions. We use standard set theoretical conventions and notation. For a set X, X^ω denotes the set of all functions from ω to X. For $f, g \in \omega^\omega$, f dominates g, written $f \leq^* g$, if for all but finitely many $n \in \omega$ $g(n) \leq f(n)$. We call $\mathcal{F}$ a dominating family if for each $g \in \omega^\omega$ there exists $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $g \leq^* f$. The dominating number $\mathfrak{d}$ is the least size of a dominating family.

We call $\mathcal{G}$ an unbounded family if for each $f \in \omega^\omega$ there exists $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $g \not\leq^* f$, i.e., there exist infinitely many $n \in \omega$ such that $g(n) > f(n)$. The unbounded number $\mathfrak{b}$ is the least size of an unbounded family.

For a set X, $X^{<\omega}$ denote the set of all functions from natural numbers to X.

We call partial ordering $(T, <)$ a tree if the set $\{s \in T : s < t\}$ is well-ordered by $<$. We say T is a tree on X if T is a subtree of $(X^{<\omega}, \subset)$. For a tree T and $t \in T$, $succ_T(t)$ is the set of all immediate successors of t in T. For a tree T, $stem(T)$ is the first element of T which has at least 2-many immediate successors.

Theorem 1.1 *It is consistent* $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} > \mathfrak{d}$.

To prove theorem 1.1, we shall construct a proper forcing notion which enlarges $\mathfrak{s}_{pair}$ and is ω^ω-bounding to show $\mathfrak{d}$ is preserved by the forcing notion.

Definition 1.1 *[4, pp340] A forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ is ω^ω-bounding if*

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \forall f \in \omega^\omega \cap V[G] \exists g \in \omega^\omega \cap V \, (f \leq^* g) \, .$$

The ω^ω-boundingness has the following good property.

Theorem 1.2 *[4, pp341] The countable support iteration of proper ω^ω-bounding forcing notions is ω^ω-bounding.*

To prove theorem 1.1 we shall construct a forcing notion which consists of finitely branching trees on $[\omega]^2$ such that the set of successors of any node carries a norm as [8].

To present the desired forcing notion, we define "norm" for finite subsets of $[\omega]^2$. Let $R(n)$ be a natural number such that if $m \geq R(n)$, then for any function $f : [m]^2 \to 2$ there exists $H \in [m]^n$ such that $|f([H]^2)| = 1$. Then recursively define $l_1 = 3$, $l_{n+1} = \max\{2l_n, R(l_n)\}$. Then for a finite subset A of $[\omega]^2$ norm$(A) \geq n$ if A contains a complete graph with l_n-many vertices.

This norm has the following properties:

Proposition 1.1 *For a finite subset A of $[\omega]^2$,*

1. *$norm(A) \geq 1$ implies for any $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ there exists $a \in A$ such that $a \cap X = \emptyset$ or $a \subset X$.*

2. *Suppose $norm(A) \geq n+1$. For $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ let $A^0_X = \{a \in A : a \cap X = \emptyset\}$ and $A^1_X = \{a \in A : a \subset X\}$. Then $norm(A^0_X) \geq n$ or $norm(A^1_X) \geq n$.*

3. *Suppose $norm(A) \geq n+1$. If $A = A_0 \cup A_1$, then $norm(A_0) \geq n$ or $norm(A_1) \geq n$.*

Proof of proposition 1.1

1. Since $norm(A) \geq 1$, A contains a complete graph $A' \subset A$ with 3-many vertices. Then for any 2-coloring of the vertices of A', there exists an edge whose vertices have the same color. So there exists $a \in A' \subset A$ such that $a \subset X$ or $a \cap X = \emptyset$.

2. Since $norm(A) \geq n+1$, A contain a complete graph A' with l_{n+1}-many vertices. So for each $X \subset \omega$, X contains l_n-many vertices of A' or X doesn't meet l_n-many vertices of A' because $l_{n+1} \geq 2l_n$. Anyway $A^0_X = \{a \in A : a \cap X = \emptyset\}$ or $A^1_X = \{a \in A : a \subset X\}$ contains a complete graph with l_n-many vertices. Therefore $norm(A^0_X) \geq n$ or $norm(A^1_X) \geq n$.

3. Since $norm(A) \geq n+1$, A contain a complete graph A' with l_{n+1}-many vertices. Define $f : A' \to 2$ by $f(a) = i$ if $a \in A_i$ for $i < 2$. Since $l_{n+1} \geq R(l_n)$, there exists a complete graph $A^* \subset A'$ which has l_n-many vertices of A' and $|f[A^*]| = 1$. So $A^* \subset A_0$ or $A^* \subset A_1$. Hence $norm(A_0) \geq n$ or $norm(A_1) \geq n$.

□

Then let $\mathbb{P}$ be the set of perfect trees such that

1. T is a finitely branching tree on $[\omega]^2$,

2. for any branch of T and $n \in \omega$ there exist $m \geq n$ such that whenever $t \in T$ with $|t| \geq m$, $norm(succ_T(t)) \geq n$.

For T and S in $\mathbb{P}$, $T \leq S$ if $T \subset S$.

Lemma 1.1 *Let G be a generic filter on $\mathbb{P}$ and $A_G = \bigcap\{T : T \in G\}$. Then $A_G \subset [\omega]^2$ and for any $X \in [\omega]^\omega \cap V$, X doesn't pair-split A_G.*

Proof For $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ define a subset D_X of $\mathbb{P}$ by $T \in D_X$ if for all $t \in T \setminus \{s : s \subset \text{stem}(T)\}$ and $a \in \text{succ}_T(t)$, $a \subset X$ or $a \cap X = \emptyset$. Then for a given $S \in \mathbb{P}$ we can find $T \leq S$ such that for all $t \in T \setminus \{s : s \subset \text{stem}(T)\}$ and $a \in \text{succ}_T(t)$, $a \subset X$ or $a \cap X = \emptyset$ by 1 and 2 in Proposition 1.1. So D_X is dense. So X doesn't pair-split A_G.

□

By this lemma, $\mathbb{P}$ adds an infinite subset of $[\omega]^2$ which is not pair-split by any infinite subset of ω in ground model. Therefore ω_2-stage countable support iteration of $\mathbb{P}$ forces $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} = \omega_2$.

From now on we shall prove $\mathbb{P}$ is ω^ω-bounding and proper.

For $T \in \mathbb{P}$, let $\text{ess}(T) = \{t \in T : \text{stem}(T) \subset t\}$. For $T, S \in \mathbb{P}$, $T \leq^* S$ if $T \leq S$ and for all $t \in \text{ess}(T)$, $\text{norm}(\text{succ}_T(t)) \geq \text{norm}(\text{succ}_S(t)) - 1$. $T \leq_m S$ if $T \leq S$ and for all $t \in T$ with $\text{norm}(\text{succ}_S(t)) \leq m$, we have $\text{succ}_S(t) \subset T$.

As [8] we can prove the following lemmata.

Lemma 1.2 *If $S \in \mathbb{P}$ and $W \subset S$, then there is some $T \leq^* S$ such that*

I. every branch of T meets W, or else

II. T is disjoint from W.

Proof Let S^W be the set of all $s \in S$ such that there exists $S' \leq^* S_s$ such that every branch of S' meets W where S_s is the set of $t \in S$ comparable to s.

If $\text{stem}(S) \in S^W$, then (I) holds. Otherwise we will construct $T \leq^* S$ which satisfies (II).

Suppose $\text{stem}(S) \notin S^W$. Recursively construct $t \in T$ with $|t| = n$. If $n \leq |\text{stem}(T)|$, $t \in T$ with $|t| = n$ if $t \in S$ with $|t| = n$. If $n \geq |\text{stem}(T)|$, assume $t \in T$ with $|t| \leq n$ are given and $t \notin S^W$ for $t \in T$ with $|t| \leq n$. For $t \in T$ with $|t| = n$, let $A^t = \text{succ}_S(t)$, $A^t_0 = S^W \cap A^t$ and $A^t_1 = A^t \setminus A^t_0$. By Proposition 1.1 (iii), $\text{norm}(A^t_i) \geq \text{norm}(A^t) - 1$ for some $i < 2$. Since $t \notin S^W$, there is no $S' \leq^* S_t$ such that S' holds I. So $\text{norm}(A^t_0) < n$. Hence $\text{norm}(A^t_1) \geq \text{norm}(A^t) - 1$. Define $t \in T$ with $|t| = n+1$ if $t \restriction n \in T$ and $t(n) \in A^{t\restriction n}_1$. Then for any $t \in T$ with $|t| = n+1$, $t \notin S^W$.

By construction $T \leq^* S$ and satisfies II. □

Lemma 1.3 *Let $\dot{\alpha}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for an ordinal. Let $S \in \mathbb{P}$ such that for $t \in S \setminus \{s : s \subset stem(S)\}$, $norm(succ_S(t)) > m+1$. Then there exists $T \leq_m S$ and a finite subset w of ordinal such that $T \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in w$.*

Proof Let W be the set of nodes $s \in S$ such that there exists $S^s \leq_m S_s$ which decides the value $\dot{\alpha}$.

We shall prove that there exists $S_1 \leq^* S$ such that every branch of S_1 meets W. Suppose $S' \leq^* S$ and $S'' \leq S'$ such that $S'' \Vdash \dot{\alpha} = \beta$ for some β. Then for some $t \in S''$ for each extension s of t in S'' satisfies norm($succ_{S''}(s)) > m$. Because $S''_t \leq_m S_t$ and S'' decides $\dot{\alpha}$, $t \in W$. Hence by Lemma 1.2 there exists $S_1 \leq^* S$ which satisfies I in Lemma 1.2.

Let $S_1 \leq^* S$ such that every branch of S_1 meets W. Let W_0 be the set of minimal elements of W in S_1. Since S_1 is finitely branching, W_0 is finite. (Otherwise, by Köning's Lemma we can construct infinitely branch which doesn't meet W). For $v \in W_0$ choose $T^v \leq_m S_v$ and α_v such that $T^v \Vdash \dot{\alpha} = \alpha_v$. Put $T = \bigcup_{v \in W_0} T^v$ and $w = \{\alpha_v : v \in W_0\}$. Then $T \leq_m S$ and $T \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in w$.

□

Lemma 1.4 *If $S \in \mathbb{P}$, $\dot{\alpha}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for an ordinal and $m < \omega$. Then there exists $T \leq_m S$ and a finite set of ordinals w such that $T \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in w$.*

Proof Choose $k \in \omega$ such that for any $s \in S$ with $|s| \geq k$ norm($succ_S(s)) > m+1$. For each $s \in S$ with $|s| = k$, apply Lemma 1.3 to S_s pick $T^s \leq_m S_s$ and a finite set of ordinals w_s so that $T_s \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in w_s$. Put $T = \bigcup_{s \in S, |s|=k} T_s$ and $w = \bigcup_{s \in S \cap \omega^k} w_s$. Then $T \leq_m S$ and $T \Vdash \dot{\alpha} \in w$. Since S is finitely branching, w is a finite set. □

Proof of theorem 1.1 Lemma 1.4 implies that $\mathbb{P}$ is ω^ω-bounding. Given a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a function $\dot{f}$ from ω to ω and $S \in \mathbb{P}$, we can construct a sequence $\langle T_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of conditions of $\mathbb{P}$ such that $T_0 = S$, $T_{n+1} \leq_n T_n$ and for each $n \in \omega$, there exists some finite w_n of natural numbers such that $T_n \Vdash \dot{f}(n) \in w_n$. Then there exists $T \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $T \leq_n T_n$ and $T \Vdash \forall n \in \omega(\dot{f}(n) \in w_n)$. Put $g(n) = \max\{w_n\}$. Then $T \Vdash \forall n \in \omega(\dot{f}(n) \leq g(n))$. So $\mathbb{P}$ is ω^ω-bounding. Also this claim say $\mathbb{P}$ satisfies Baumgartner's Axiom A. Hence $\mathbb{P}$ is proper.

Hence the ω_2-stage countable support iteration of $\mathbb{P}$ is ω^ω-bounding by theorem 1.2. Therefore if $V \models CH$, then the ω_2-stage countable support iteration of $\mathbb{P}$ forces $\omega^\omega \cap V$ is a dominating family. So the ω_2-stage countable support iteration of $\mathbb{P}$ forces $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$. Hence it is consistent that $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} > \mathfrak{d}$. □

Since $\mathfrak{s} \leq \mathfrak{d}$ (see[2]), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1.1 *It is consistent that* $\mathfrak{s} < \mathfrak{s}_{pair}$.

2 pair-reaping number and unbounded number

To show the consistency of $\mathfrak{r}_{pair} < \mathfrak{b}$, we shall use the Laver forcing $\mathbb{L}$. $\mathbb{L}$ is defined by $T \in \mathbb{L}$ if $T \subset \omega^{<\omega}$ is a tree and for $s \in T$ with $stem(T) \subset s$, $|succ_T(s)| = \aleph_0$. $\mathbb{L}$ is ordered by inclusion. Then $\mathbb{L}$ adds an unbounded real.

Proposition 2.1 *Let G be a $\mathbb{L}$-generic over V and $f_G = \bigcup\{stem(T) : T \in G\}$. Then $f_G \in \omega^\omega$ and f_G dominates for all $g \in \omega^\omega \cap V$.*

Therefore if $\mathbb{L}_{\omega_2}$ is ω_2-stage countable support iteration of Laver forcing, then $V^{\mathbb{L}_{\omega_2}} \models \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$.

By using ω_2-stage countable support iteration of Laver forcing, we shall construct ZFC model which satisfies $\mathfrak{r}_{pair} < \mathfrak{b}$.

Theorem 2.1 *It is consistent* $\mathfrak{r}_{pair} < \mathfrak{b}$.

By proposition 2.1 it is enough $\mathbb{L}$ preserves $\mathfrak{r}_{pair}$. We shall use the Laver property.

Definition 2.1 *[4] A forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ have the Laver property if for every $H : \omega \to \omega \in V$*

$$\Vdash \forall f \in (\Pi_{n\in\omega}H(n)) \cap V[\dot{G}] \exists A : \omega \to \omega^{<\omega} \in V \forall n \in \omega\, (f(n) \in A(n) \wedge |A(n)| \leq 2^n)$$

Theorem 2.2 *[4] The Laver property is preserved under countable support iteration of proper forcing notions.*

Theorem 2.3 *[1, pp353] The Laver forcing $\mathbb{L}$ has the Laver property.*

So $\mathbb{L}_{\omega_2}$ has the Laver property. If forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ has the Laver property, then $\mathbb{P}$ has the following good property:

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion satisfying the Laver property. Then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \forall \dot{X} \in V[\dot{G}] \exists A \in V (\dot{X}$ doesn't pair-split $A)$.*

Proof Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Let $\Pi = \langle I_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an interval partition of ω such that $|I_n| = 2^{2^n} + 1$. Then $\langle \dot{X} \restriction I_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in \Pi_{n \in \omega} 2^{I_n}$. By the Laver property there exists $q \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p$ such that $\langle A_n : n \in \omega \rangle \in V$ such that $A_n \subset 2^{I_n}$, $|A_n| \leq 2^n$ and $q \Vdash \forall n \in \omega(\dot{X} \restriction I_n \in A_n)$. For each $n \in \omega$ $\{\langle \sigma(k) : \sigma \in A_n \rangle : k \in A_n\}$ is at most 2^{2^n}-many element. But $|I_n| = 2^{2^n} + 1$. So there exists k_0^n and k_1^n in I_n such that $k_0^n \neq k_1^n$ and $\langle \sigma(k_0^n) : \sigma \in A_n \rangle = \langle \sigma(k_1^n) : \sigma \in A_n \rangle$. Put $a_n = \{k_0^n, k_1^n\}$ and $A = \{a_n : n \in \omega\} \in V$. Then $q \Vdash \dot{X} \restriction I_n \cap a_n = \emptyset$ or $a_n \subset \dot{X} \restriction I_n$ for $n \in \omega$. Therefore $q \Vdash \dot{X}$ doesn't pair-split A. □

Proof of theorem 2.1 Suppose $V \models CH$. By theorem 2.2 and 2.3 $\mathbb{L}_{\omega_2}$ has the Laver property. By lemma 2.1 for each $X \in [\omega]^\omega \cap V^{\mathbb{L}_{\omega_2}}$ there exists an unbounded $A \subset [\omega]^2$ such that $V^{\mathbb{L}_{\omega_2}} \models X$ doesn't pair-split A. So $\{A \subset [\omega]^2 : A \text{ unbounded}\} \cap V$ is pair-reaping family. Since $V \models CH$, $\{A \subset [\omega]^2 : A \text{ unbounded}\} \cap V$ has the cardinality at most ω_1. Therefore $V^{\mathbb{L}_{\omega_2}} \models \mathfrak{r}_{pair} < \mathfrak{b}$.

□

Since $\mathfrak{r} \geq \mathfrak{b}$ (see[2]), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1 *It is consistent that* $\mathfrak{r} > \mathfrak{r}_{pair}$.

In [5] Masaru Kada introduces a cardinal invariant associated with the Laver property.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the collection of functions ϕ from ω to $[\omega]^{<\omega}$ such that $|\phi(n)| \leq n+1$. $\mathfrak{l}$ is the smallest cardinal κ such that for every $h \in \omega^\omega$ there is a set $\Phi \subset \mathcal{S}$ with cardinality κ so that, for every $f \in \omega$ with $f(n) < h(n)$ for all $n < \omega$, there is $\phi \in \Phi$ such that for all but finitely many $n \in \omega$ we have $f(n) \in \phi(n)$.

As the proof of theorem 2.1 we can prove the following statement.

Corollary 2.2 $\mathfrak{r}_{pair} \leq \mathfrak{l}$.

Pawlikowski shows that the dual notion to the definition of $\mathfrak{l}$ is the characterization of trans-add($\mathcal{N}$), transitive additivity of null ideal (see [1, pp91]). That is, trans-add($\mathcal{N}$) is the smallest size of $\leq^*$-bounded family $F \subset \omega^\omega$ such that for every $\phi \in \mathcal{S}$ there is $f \in F$ such that for infinitely many $n \in \omega$ such that $f(n) \notin \phi(n)$.

Then the dual inequality to the corollary 2.2 holds.

Proposition 2.2 $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} \geq$ *trans-add*($\mathcal{N}$).

It is known the following relation between trans-add($\mathcal{N}$) and $\mathfrak{d}$.

Theorem 2.4 *[6] It is consistent that trans-add($\mathcal{N}$) $> \mathfrak{d}$.*

By theorem 2.4 and proposition 2.2 it is consistent that $\mathfrak{s}_{pair} > \mathfrak{d}$.

3 Further results

In this section we mention the development of above results in the paper [3] written by Hrušák, Meza-Alcántara and the author.

Hrušák and Meza-Alcántara study cardinal invariants of ideals on ω and they define the pair-splitting number and the pair-reaping number independently of the author and they showed the pair-splitting number and the pair-reaping number are described as cardinal invariants of an ideal on ω.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an ideal on ω. Define the cardinal invariants associate with $\mathcal{I}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{cov}^*(\mathcal{I}) &= \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{I} \wedge \forall I \in \mathcal{I} \exists A \in \mathcal{A}(|A \cap I| = \aleph_0)\} \\ \mathrm{non}^*(\mathcal{I}) &= \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subset [\omega]^\omega \wedge \forall I \in \mathcal{I} \exists A \in \mathcal{A}(|A \cap I| < \aleph_0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.1 *[3] Let $\mathcal{G}_{FC}$ be an ideal on $[\omega]^2$ defined by*

$$\mathcal{G}_{FC} = \{A \subset [\omega]^2 : \chi(\omega, A) < \aleph_0\}$$

where $\chi(\omega, A) = \min\{k \in \omega : \exists f : \omega \to k \forall a \in A(|f[a]| = 2)\}$.

Then non$^*(\mathcal{G}_{FC}) = \mathfrak{r}_{pair}$ and cov$^*(\mathcal{G}_{FC}) = \mathfrak{s}_{pair}$.

From now on we assume 2^ω is equipped with product topology and the topology of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is induced by identification of each subset of ω with its characteristic function.

Then $\mathcal{G}_{FC}$ is an F_σ-ideal on $[\omega]^2$. As theorem 2.4, 1.1 and theorem 2.1 we can show the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose $\mathcal{I}$ is an F_σ-ideal on ω.*

1. *[6] It is consistent that $\mathfrak{d} <$ cov$^*(\mathcal{I})$.*

2. *[3] It is consistent that $\mathfrak{b} >$ non$^*(\mathcal{I})$.*

Also the following statement holds as corollary 2.2 and proposition 2.2.

Corollary 3.1 *Suppose $\mathcal{I}$ is an F_σ-ideal.*

1. *If $non^*(\mathcal{I}) \neq \omega$, then $non^*(\mathcal{I}) \leq \mathfrak{l}$.*

2. *If $non^*(\mathcal{I}) \neq \omega$, then $cov^*(\mathcal{I}) \geq trans\text{-}add(\mathcal{I})$.*

So many results in section 1 and 2 follows from theorem 3.2 and corollary 3.1.

Acknowledgment

While carrying out the research for this paper, I discussed my work with Jörg Brendle. He gave me helpful advice. I greatly appreciate his help.

I also thank Shizuo Kamo for pointing out some remarks. I also thank Masaru Kada for pointing out corollary 2.2, proposition 2.2 and another proof for theorem 2.1 from proposition 2.2 and theorem2.4.

I thank to Michael Hrušák and David Meza-Alcántara who point out the relation between their results and my research. The collaboration produce theorem 3.2 2 and corollary 3.1.

I also thank Teruyuki Yorioka and Noboru Osuga for pointing out some mistake of proof and for suggestions which improved the presentation of this work.

Finally I thank members of Arai Project at Kobe University for much support while carrying out the research.

References

[1] Tomek Bartoszyński, Haim Judah, "Set theory. On the structure of the real line". A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1995.

[2] Andreas Blass, "Combinatorial cardinal characteristics of the continuum", in Handbook of Set Theory (A.Kanamori et al.,eds.),to appear.

[3] Michael Hrušák David Meza-Alcántara and Hiroaki Minami, "Around pair-splitting and pair-reaping number", preprint.

[4] Martin Goldstern, "Tools for your forcing construction". Set theory of the reals (Ramat Gan, 1991), 305–360, Israel Math. Conf. Proc., 6, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1993.

[5] Masaru Kada, "More on Cichoń's diagram and infinite games", J. Symbolic Logic 65 (2000), no. 4, 1713–1724.

[6] Laflamme, Claude, "Zapping small filters", Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 114 (1992), no. 2, 535–544.

[7] Hiroaki Minami, "Around splitting and reaping number for partitions of ω", submitted Aug 2007.

[8] Saharon Shelah, "Vive la diffe'rence. I. Nonisomorphism of ultrapowers of countable models". Set theory of the continuum (Berkeley, CA, 1989), 357–405, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 26, Springer, New York, 1992.