

Types in locally o-minimal structures

前園久智 (Hisatomo Maesono)

早稲田大学グローバルエデュケーションセンター

(Global Education Center, Waseda University)

概要

abstract Locally o-minimal structures are some local adaptation from o-minimal ones. These structures were treated, e.g. in [1], [2]. O-minimal structures have been studied extensively, in particular, they are characterized by means of behavior of types. We try analogous argument in locally o-minimal structures.

1. Introduction

We recall some definitions and fundamental results at first.

Definition 1 A linearly ordered structure $M = (M, <, \dots)$ is *o-minimal* if every definable subset of M^1 is a finite union of points and intervals.

A linearly ordered structure $M = (M, <, \dots)$ is *weakly o-minimal* if every definable subset of M^1 is a finite union of convex sets.

Definition 2 Let $M = (M, <, \dots)$ be a densely linearly ordered structure.

M is *locally o-minimal* if for any $a \in M$ and any definable set $A \subset M^1$, there is an open interval $I \ni a$ such that $I \cap A$ is a finite union of points and intervals.

M is *strongly locally o-minimal* if for any $a \in M$, there is an open interval $I \ni a$ such that whenever A is a definable subset of M^1 , then $I \cap A$ is a finite union of points and intervals.

M is *uniformly locally o-minimal* if for any formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ over $\emptyset$ and any $a \in M$, there is an open interval $I \ni a$ such that $I \cap \varphi(M, \bar{b})$ is a finite union of points and intervals for any $\bar{b} \in M^n$, where $\varphi(M, \bar{b})$ is the realization set of $\varphi(x, \bar{b})$ in M .

Example 3 The following examples are shown in [1] and [2].

$(\mathbb{R}, +, <, \mathbb{Z})$ where $\mathbb{Z}$ is the interpretation of a unary predicate, and $(\mathbb{R}, +, <, \sin)$ are (strongly) locally o-minimal structures.

Let a language $L = \{<\} \cup \{P_i : i \in \omega\}$ where P_i is a unary predicate. Let $M = (\mathbb{Q}, <^M, P_0^M, P_1^M, \dots)$ be the structure defined by $P_i^M = \{a \in M : a < 2^{-i}\sqrt{2}\}$. Then M is uniformly

locally o-minimal, but it is not strongly locally o-minimal.

Theorem 4 [1] *Weakly o-minimal structures are locally o-minimal.*

Theorem 5 [1] *A structure $\mathcal{M} = (M, <, \dots)$ expanding a dense linear order $(M, <)$ without endpoints is locally o-minimal if and only if for any $a \in M$ and any definable set $X \subset M$, there are $c, d \in M$ such that $c < a < d$ and either $X \cap (c, d)$ or $(c, d) \setminus X$ is equal to one of the following : (1) $\{a\}$, (2) $(c, a]$, (3) $[a, d)$, or (4) the whole interval (c, d) .*

Corollary 6 [1] *Local o-minimality is preserved under elementary equivalence. But, strongly local o-minimality is not preserved under elementary equivalence.*

2. Types in locally o-minimal structures

From the beginning, o-minimal structures are defined by the property of definable sets of 1-variable formulas. And they are characterized by means of behavior of 1-types. They consider two kinds of 1-types by the way to cut linear orders of parameter sets, e.g. in [5].

Definition 7 Let M be a densely linearly ordered structure and $p(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$, that is, $p(x)$ is complete over M with respect to the order relation.

We say that $p(x)$ is *cut (irrational) over M* if for any $a \in M$, if $a < x \in p(x)$, then there is $b \in M$ such that $a < b < x \in p(x)$, and similarly, if $x < a \in p(x)$, then there is $c \in M$ such that $x < c < a \in p(x)$.

We say that $q(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$ is *noncut (rational) over M* if $q(x)$ is not a cut type.

Here we consider nonisolated types only.

Definition 8 Let M be locally o-minimal and $p(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$ be noncut.

There are four kinds of noncut types ;

$$p(x) = \{m < x < a : m < a \in M\} \text{ for some fixed } a,$$

$$\text{or } \{a < x < m : a < m \in M\} \text{ for some fixed } a.$$

Here we call these types *bounded* noncut types.

$$p(x) = \{m < x : m \in M\} \text{ or } \{x < m : m \in M\}.$$

We call these types *unbounded* noncut types.

3. Basic property of types in locally o-minimal structures

We can characterize locally o-minimal structures by means of types defined as above to some

extent.

At first we recall some basic result from [3].

Theorem 9 [3] *Let M be a linearly ordered structure.*

Then M is o-minimal

if and only if

Any $p(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$ is complete over M , that is, $p(x)$ is extended to the unique 1-type over M .

We can show the next lemma.

Lemma 10 *Let M be a densely linearly ordered structure.*

Then M is locally o-minimal

if and only if

Any bounded noncut type $p(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$ is complete over M .

Proof ;

($\Rightarrow$)

Let $p(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$ be bounded noncut, that is, $p(x) = \{m < x < a : m < a \in M\}$ for some fixed $a \in M$. The other cases are proved similarly.

For any formula $\varphi(x, \overline{m})$ over M , there is an interval $I \subset M$ such that $a \in I$ and " $I \cap \varphi(M, \overline{m})$ is a union of finite points and intervals". (We call this property " I has o-minimal property", "OM-property" for short in the following.)

Thus there is $b \in I$ such that either for any $c \in I$ with $b < c < a$, $M \models \varphi(c, \overline{m})$, or for any $c \in I$ with $b < c < a$, $M \models \neg\varphi(c, \overline{m})$. If for any $c \in I$ with $b < c < a$, $M \models \varphi(c, \overline{m})$, then $p(x) \vdash \varphi(x, \overline{m})$. Suppose that $p(x) \cup \{\neg\varphi(x, \overline{m})\}$ is consistent, then the formula " $b < x < a \wedge \neg\varphi(x, \overline{m})$ " is satisfied in M . Contradiction.

($\Leftarrow$)

We must show that for any formula $\varphi(x, \overline{m})$ over M and any $a \in M$, there is an interval $I \subset M$ such that $a \in I$ and I has OM-property with respect to $\varphi(x, \overline{m})$.

Suppose that for any $b < a$, there are convex sets $\{D_i : i < \omega\}$ in the interval $I' = \{b < x < a\}$ such that ;

for any $d_i \in D_i$ and $d_j \in D_j$, if $i < j < \omega$, then $d_i < d_j$, and

for any $d_j \in D_{2i}$ and $d_k \in D_{2i+1}$, $M \models \varphi(d_j, \overline{m}) \wedge \neg\varphi(d_k, \overline{m})$.

Thus for the noncut type $p(x)$, both $p(x) \cup \{\varphi(x, \overline{m})\}$ and $p(x) \cup \{\neg\varphi(x, \overline{m})\}$ are consistent. It contradicts to the hypothesis.

So there is a convex set C such that for any $e \in C$, either if $e < g < a$, then $M \models \varphi(g, \overline{m})$ or if $e < g < a$, then $M \models \neg\varphi(g, \overline{m})$. If C has no left boundary point in M , then we can take it

in C for the interval I . The reverse argument holds in the right side of a . Then M is locally o -minimal. ■

For the next argument, we recall some definition.

Definition 11 Let M be a linearly ordered structure.

M is *definably complete* if every definable unary set has both a supremum and an infimum in $M \cup \{\pm\infty\}$.

This condition is equivalent to the fact that every open definable unary set in M is a disjoint union of open intervals. We can show the next lemma.

Lemma 12 Let M be a locally o -minimal structure and $A \subset M$ with $A \neq \emptyset$. And let M be definably complete.

Then the isolated types of $Th(M, a)_{a \in A}$ are dense.

Next, we refer to results in [6]. We recall some definitions.

Definition 13 Let M be a structure.

A type $p(\bar{x}) \in S_n(M)$ is *definable* if for any $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ (over $\emptyset$), there is a formula $d\varphi(\bar{y})$ over M such that for all $\bar{a} \in M$, $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in p(\bar{x})$ iff $M \models d\varphi(\bar{a})$.

Let $M \subset N$ be linearly ordered structures.

M is *Dedekind complete* in N if no cut in $S_1(M)$ is realized in N (where a cut $p(x) \in S_1(M)$ is a complete type over M which contains the cut $p(x) \upharpoonright < \in S_1^{or}(M)$).

Theorem 14 [6] Let M be an o -minimal structure and let $p(\bar{x}) \in S_n(M)$.

Then $p(\bar{x})$ is definable if and only if for any realization $\bar{a}$ of $p(\bar{x})$, M is Dedekind complete in $M(\bar{a})$ where $M(\bar{a})$ is the prime model over $M \cup \{\bar{a}\}$.

In particular, let $q(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$.

Then $q(x)$ is definable if and only if $q(x)$ is noncut.

Non-definability of cut types is easily checked in o -minimal structures. They used the cell decomposition theorem to prove the theorem above. I can not clearly show that the cell decomposition theorem holds in locally o -minimal structures on what condition. But the next fact is easily confirmed.

Fact 15 Let M be a locally o -minimal structure and $p(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$ be bounded and noncut.

Then $p(x)$ is definable.

4. Some characterization of strongly locally o-minimal structures by types

In this section, the property of 1-types is used for characterizing strongly locally o-minimal structures. It is suggested by the argument in [5] and [6]. First we recall some result from [2].

Theorem 16 [2] *Let M be strongly locally o-minimal. And let D be a definable set of M and $f : D \rightarrow M$ be a definable function.*

Then for any $a \in D$, there are open intervals $I \subset M$ containing a and $J \subset M$ containing $f(a)$ such that, by putting $f^ = f \cap (I \times J)$,*

the domain of f^ can be broken up into a finite union of points and intervals, on each of which f^* is constant, strictly increasing and continuous, or strictly decreasing and continuous.*

We can show the next propositions. In general, there are many examples of locally o-minimal structures which are not definably complete and have incomplete cut types.

Proposition 17 *Let M be a locally o-minimal structure and $p(x), q(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$. And let $p(x)$ be noncut and $q(x)$ be cut, and $q(x)$ be incomplete over M .*

Then there are no realizations a of $p(x)$ and b of $q(x)$ such that a and b have a common interval $I \subset N$ such that $\{a, b\} \subset I$ and for any formula $\varphi(x, \bar{n})$ over N , $\varphi(N, \bar{n}) \cap I$ is a finite union of points and intervals in any strongly locally o-minimal structure $N \succ M$.

(In the following, we say that the interval I above has "strongly locally o-minimal property", "SLOM-property" for short.)

Sketch of proof ;

Suppose not, that is, there are a strongly locally o-minimal structure $N \succ M$ and realizations a of $p(x)$ and b of $q(x)$, and an interval $I \subset N$ such that $a, b \in I$ and I has SLOM-property. Thus we can consider $tp^{or}(b/\text{acl}(Ma)) \vdash tp(b/M)$ where $tp^{or}(b/\text{acl}(Ma)) \in S_1^{or}(\text{acl}(Ma))$. So there is a realization c of $q(x)$ such that $c \in \text{acl}(Ma)$. Thus there is a definable function $f(x)$ over M such that $f(a) = c$.

Let $p(x) = \{m < x < d; m \in M, m < d\}$ for some fixed $d \in M$ and $a < c$. (The other cases are proved similarly.) We may assume that the set $I \cap "x < d" = \{n \in I : n < d, n \in N\}$ is the domain of $f(x)$. By the monotonicity theorem of strongly locally o-minimal structures as above, we may assume that $I \cap "x < d"$ is monotone and continuous. Moreover as $M \prec N$, there is $e \in M$ such that $f(x)$ is monotone and continuous on the interval (e, d) .

Intuitively, it is obvious that the function $f(x)$ deduces a contradiction. But we show details.

W.l.o.g, we assume that $f(x)$ is strictly increasing on (e, d) . (Another case is proved similarly.) Let $(e, d) \cap M = \{m \in M : e < m < d\}$. As $f(x)$ is monotone and continuous, its image of $(e, d) \cap M$ is an interval $(f(e), f(d))$ in M ($f(e)$ may be $-\infty$ and $f(d)$ may be ∞).

And as $q(x)$ is cut, for the realization c of $q(x)$, there is $g \in M$ such that $c < g < f(d)$. Now $N \models \forall x (f^{-1}(g) < x < d \longrightarrow g < f(x))$. As $f^{-1}(g) < a < d$, $g < f(a) = c$. Contradiction. ■

Proposition 18 *Let M be locally o-minimal and N with $M \prec N$ be strongly locally o-minimal. And let $p(x) \in S_1(M)$ be definable, and a be a realization of $p(x)$ and $I \subset N$ be an interval such that $a \in I$ and I has SLOM – property.*

Then for any $b \in I$, if $tp^{or}(b/M) \in S_1^{or}(M)$ is incomplete, then $tp(b/M) \in S_1(M)$ is definable.

Proposition 19 *Let M be a locally o-minimal structure and let $p(x), q(x) \in S_1^{or}(M)$, and $q(x)$ be incomplete over M .*

Moreover let $p(x)$ be realized in N and $q(x)$ be not realized in N for some N with $M \prec N$.

Then no realizations of $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ have a common interval $I (\subset N')$ with SLOM – property in any strongly locally o-minimal structure N' with $N \prec N'$.

5. Further problems

As is mentioned above, some results about o-minimal structures are generalized to the context of locally o-minimal structures. I will continue this attempt hereafter.

I studied about the independence relation in locally o-minimal structures before. I will investigate whether the difference between two kinds of 1–types has effect on the independence relation.

References

- [1] C.Toffalori and K.Vozoris, *Note on local o – minimality*, MLQ Math. Log. Quart., 55, pp 617–632, 2009.
- [2] T.Kawakami, K.Takeuchi, H.Tanaka and A.Tsuboi, *Locally o – minimal structures*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, vol.64, no.3, pp 783–797, 2012.
- [3] A.Pillay and C.Steinhorn, *Definable sets in ordered structures. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 295, pp 565–592, 1986.
- [4] J.Knight, A.Pillay and C.Steinhorn, *Definable sets in ordered structures. II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 295, pp 593–605, 1986.
- [5] D.Marker, *Omitting types in o – minimal theories*, J. Symb. Logic, vol.51, pp 63–74, 1986.
- [6] D.Marker and C.Steinhorn, *Definable types in o – minimal structures*, J. Symb. Logic, vol.59, pp 185–198, 1994.

- [7] A.Pillay, *Some remarks on definable equivalence relations in o -minimal structures*, J. Symb. Logic, vol.51, pp 709–714, 1986.
- [8] A.Pillay and C.Steinhorn, *On Dedekind complete o -minimal structures*, J. Symb. Logic, vol.52, pp 156–164, 1987.
- [9] H.D.Macpherson, D.Marker and C.Steinhorn, *Weakly o -minimal structures and real closed fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 352, pp 5435–5482, 2000.
- [10] A.Dolich, C.Miller and C.Steinhorn, *Structures having o -minimal open core*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 362, pp 1371–1411, 2010.
- [11] A.Berenstein, C.Ealy and A.Gunaydin, *Thorn independence in the field of real numbers with a small multiplicative group*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 150, pp 1–18, 2007.
- [12] E.Hrushovski, Y.Peterzil and A.Pillay, *Groups, measures, and the NIP*, J. Amer. Math. Soc, Vol.21, pp 563–596, 2008.
- [13] E.Hrushovski and A.Pillay, *On NIP and invariant measures*, J. Eur. Math. Soc, 13, pp 1005–1061, 2011.
- [14] A.Conversano and A.Pillay, *Connected components of definable groups and o -minimality I*, Advan. Math, vol.231, pp 605–623, 2012.
- [15] L.van den Dries, *Tame topology and o -minimal structures*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser, 248, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [16] A.Pillay, *Geometric Stability Theory*, Oxford University Press, 1996.