

Def (a) (P, Σ) is a le -pair (with scope V_0)
 iff P is a premaximal and Σ is an IS
 for P defined on V_0 and Σ
normalizes well and has strong hull
 condensation NW SHC

(b) (P, Σ) is a lbt hod pair iff P is a lpm
 and ...

LEM If (P, Σ) is an le/lpm pair and $\pi: N \rightarrow P$
 is elementary then (N, Σ^π) is a le/lpm pair
 s.t. $\Sigma^\pi(\sigma) = \Sigma(\pi\sigma)$

(Normalizing well goes from Σ to Σ^π
 because normalizing commutes with copying.)

Notation $\pi: (P, \Sigma) \rightarrow (Q, \Lambda)$ iff $\pi: P \rightarrow Q$ elem
 and $\Sigma = \Lambda^\pi$

$(P, \Sigma) \trianglelefteq (Q, \Lambda)$ iff $\exists (r, k)$ s.t. $P = Q \upharpoonright (r, k)$
 and $\Sigma = \Lambda \upharpoonright (r, k)$

Comparison lemma ~~A~~ Next page

Comparison Lemma (AD^+). Let $(P, \Sigma), (Q, \Lambda)$ be lc/lbt pairs with slope H_S . Then there are countable normal \mathcal{T} on P and \mathcal{U} on Q by Σ and Λ resp. with left models (P_1, Σ_1) and (Q_1, Λ_1) , $\Sigma_1 = \sum_{\mathcal{T}, P_1}$, $\Lambda_1 = \sum_{\mathcal{U}, Q_1}$ s.t.

(a) $(P_1, \Sigma_1) \trianglelefteq (Q_1, \Lambda_1)$ and P -to- P_1 in \mathcal{T} does not drop

or vice versa:

(b) $(Q_1, \Lambda_1) \trianglelefteq (P_1, \Sigma_1)$ and Q -to- Q_1 in \mathcal{U} does not drop

Follows from Thm 4.3 in the notes:

Thm 4.3 Given δ Woodin, $P \in V_\delta$, Σ is δ -UB with slope V_δ , (P, Σ) an lc/lbt pair, and given \mathcal{C} a maximal lc/lbt-construction of V_δ and s.t. $(M_{\gamma, k}^{\mathcal{C}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\gamma, k}^{\mathcal{C}})$ exists then either:

(a) (P, Σ) iterates normally to some

$$(M_{\gamma, \ell}^{\mathcal{C}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\gamma, \ell}^{\mathcal{C}}) \text{ s.t. } \langle \gamma, \ell \rangle \in_{lex} (r, k)$$

or

(b) (P, Σ) iterates past $(M_{r, \ell}^{\mathcal{C}}, \mathcal{Q}_{r, \ell}^{\mathcal{C}})$, perhaps not strictly.

Moreover, there is a $\langle r, k \rangle \prec_{lex} \langle \sigma, 0 \rangle$ s.t. (a) holds

To get comparison then from Thm 4.3 mentioned above:

Given $(P, \Sigma), (Q, \Omega)$ we have that
Code $(\Sigma),$ Code (Ω) are Suslin-co-Suslin

Let Γ be a good scaled pointclass s.t.

$$\text{Code}(\Sigma), \text{Code}(\Omega) \in \underline{\Delta}.$$

Let $(N^*, \Sigma^*, \delta^*)$ be a count Γ -Woodin model
that captures Σ and Ω . ($P \in HC^{N^*}$, have
 T_0, T_1 trees on $\omega \times \delta^*$ in N^* s.t.

$$\text{Code}(\Sigma) = \bigcup_{i: N^* \rightarrow M^*} P[i(T_0)]$$

$$\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{Code}(\Sigma) = \bigcup_i P[i(T_1)]$$

Apply Thm 4.3 in N^* to (P, Σ) also
to (Q, Ω)

$N^* \models "$ I am uniquely iterable for trees in $V_{\delta^*}"$
so the construction \mathbb{E} converges, as will prove

$$(P, \Sigma) \rightsquigarrow (M_{r_0, k_0}^{\mathbb{E}}, \Omega_{r_0, k_0}^{\mathbb{E}})$$

$$(Q, \Omega) \rightsquigarrow (M_{r_1, k_1}^{\mathbb{E}}, \Omega_{r_1, k_1}^{\mathbb{E}})$$

So $N^* \models$ conclusion of the comparison for
 $(P, \Sigma), (Q, \Omega)$

Then, by absoluteness, the conclusion is true in our model of AD^+ .

REM The comparison process involves hitting the same E on both sides on the P -side and Q -side.

Theorem (AD^+). Let (P, Σ) be a lbt hod pair. Then (P, Σ) is solid and universal. It follows that $\text{core}(P)$ exists.

(Here we need that the $\Sigma_{\gamma/k}^E$ are ~~nice~~ "nice" under unique iterability.)

Corollary \mathcal{C}^{N^+} does not break down for $(N^+, \Sigma^+, \delta^+)$ as above.

REM Condensation works, too

e.g. if (P, Σ) is a lbt hod pair,

$P|z \models ZFC$ for $z < \delta(P)$, $Q = \text{Hull}_w^P(\emptyset)$,

$\pi: Q \rightarrow P|z$ elementary

Then $(Q, \Sigma^\pi) \trianglelefteq (P, \Sigma)$, $Q \triangleleft P|w_1^P$.

Proof involves iterating a phalanx with a companion

$(M_{\gamma/k}^E, \Sigma_{\gamma/k}^E)$. The technique also gives

→ and PFC

Theorem (AD⁺) If (P, Σ) is a lbt hod pair with scope HC then

$P \vDash \text{UBH}$ for mice trees (plus two trees) using extenders from E^+

(known for (P, Σ) a le-pair)

Corollary For (P, Σ) as above:

$P \vDash \lambda$ a limit of Woodins

and g on $\text{Coll}(w, < \lambda)$ is P -generic

$$R^\# = \bigcup_{\eta < \lambda} R^{P[g \cap \text{Coll}(w, \eta)]}$$

$$\text{Hom}^\# = \{ P[T] \cap R^\# \mid \exists \alpha < \lambda$$

$$P[g \cap \text{Coll}(w, \alpha)] \vDash T \text{ is } \lambda\text{-a.c.} \}$$

then for each $\langle \alpha, b \rangle \in \langle \lambda, 0 \rangle$ there is a term $\tau \in P$ s.t. for all such g , $R^\#$

$$\tau g = \sum_{P \Vdash \langle \alpha, b \rangle} \cap \text{HC}$$

also

$$\Vdash \tau \in \text{Hom}^\#$$

also these τ_g 's are wedge cofinal in $\text{Hom}^\#$.

Proof Sangsyan's thesis, "Generic interpretability"

Def (AD^+) Hod pair capturing (HPC) is the statement

$\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R} \exists$ lbr hod pair (P, \mathcal{E}) s.t.
 $A \in_w \text{Code}(\mathcal{E})$

for A \uparrow
 Suslin
 Co-Suslin

~~Theorem Assume~~

Corollary (of the proof of Wadge cofinality)

$L(\mathbb{R}^*, \text{HOD}^*) \models \text{HPC}$

for $\mathbb{R}^*, \text{HOD}^*$ as above.

Theorem ($AD_{\mathbb{R}} + \text{HPC}$) $\text{HOD} \upharpoonright \mathbb{R}$ is an lpm.

Rem By a result of Steel-Troyanov can weaken $AD_{\mathbb{R}}$ to AD^+ , but need a stronger version of HPC.

Local HOD computation:

Given $AD^+ + \text{HPC}$; for every Γ s.t.

$L(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) = \Gamma$ we have

$L(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}) \models \text{HPC}$.

Proof Connect Suslin cardinals to $o(M_\alpha(P, \mathcal{E}))$
 for (P, \mathcal{E}) a lbr hod pair.

Using this connection: let (M, \mathcal{E}) be a ~~hd~~ lbr hod pair,

$$M \models \delta \text{ a WLW} + (\exists \lambda > \delta)(\lambda \text{ a limit of Woodins})$$

(This may be a very strong requirement)

let

$$D = L(\mathbb{R}^*, \text{Han}^*) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D(M, < \lambda)$$

Then there is a pointclass Π_1^1 .

$$L(\Pi_1^1, \mathbb{R}) \models \text{LSA} + \text{for every } s: \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}, \text{ every OD}(s) \text{ set of reals is Suslin co-Suslin}$$

REM This is essentially due to Sarason.