## LECTURE 23 MATH 229

LECTURE: PROFESSOR PIERRE SIMON NOTES: JACKSON VAN DYKE

## 1. Few substructure

**Definition 1.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\omega$ -categorical structure. We say it has *few-substructures* if for no polynomial p(x) do we have

$$f_n\left(\mathcal{M}\right) \ge \frac{2^n}{p\left(n\right)}$$

The theorem we will prove over the next two classes is the following.

**Theorem 1.** If primitive  $\mathcal{M}$  has few substructures, then either

(i)  $\mathcal{M}$  is stable, not  $\omega$ -stable, or

(ii)  $\mathcal{M}$  is one of the 5 reducts of DLA.

Remark 1. In (i) we cannot hope for  $\mathcal{M}$  to be finitely homogeneous. Conjecturally, it never happens.

**Lemma 1.** If  $\mathcal{M}$  has few substructures, then any expansion of  $\mathcal{M}$  by adding finitely many constants also has few substructures.

Exercise 1. Prove lemma 1.

We have seen the following.

Fact 1. If  $\mathcal{M}$  has few substructure then it is NIP.

**Fact 2.** If  $\mathcal{M}$  is primitive with few substructures, and  $\omega$ -stable, then  $\mathcal{M} \simeq (M, =)$ .

**Fact 3** (Shelah). If  $\mathcal{M}$  is NIP unstable, then there is a formula  $\varphi(x, y)$  where |x| = |y| = 1 which defines a partial order with infinite chains.

**Fact 4.** If  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\omega$ -categorical NIP, unstable, then there is a definable equivalence relation E on  $\mathcal{M}$  and a definable infinite linear order on  $\mathcal{M}/E$ 

*Proof for few substructure case.* The idea is to take this partial order and show that if it isn't close to linear then we have lots of substructures.

Let  $\leq$  be a definable (over some A) partial order on M. First we can assume  $A = \emptyset$ . Let  $D \subseteq M$  be a transitive set (i.e. complete type over  $\emptyset$ ) where  $\leq$  has infinite chains. Now we have two cases.

Case 1: Any definable  $X \subseteq D$  with an finite chain has an infinite anti-chain. Case 2: D has no infinite anti-chain.

Date: April 18, 2019.

Case 1: Assume  $C_0 \subseteq D$  is an infinite anti-chain and let  $a_0 \in X_0$ . By transitivity  $a_0$  belongs to some infinite chain so

$$D_0 = \{x \ge a_0, x \in D\}$$

has an infinite anti-chain, say  $X_1$ . Now pick  $a_1 \in C_1$  and iterate. Let  $n < \omega$ , and consider an ordered partition

$$n = m_1 + \ldots + m_k$$

with  $m_i > 0$ . Now we will associate to this a structure of size n. Consider  $A_{\overline{m}} \subseteq M$  obtained by taking  $m_i$  elements from  $C_i$  (including  $a_i$ ) and nothing else. Then we claim that if  $\overline{m} \neq \overline{m'}$  then

$$A_{\overline{m}} \not\cong A_{\overline{m'}}$$
.

The reason is as follows. We know  $A_{\overline{m}}$  has exactly  $m_0$  minimal elements. Then removing them we have exactly  $m_1$  and so on. Now there are  $2^{n-1}$  ordered partitions, hence

$$f_n(M) \ge 2^{n-1}$$

Case 2: We will construct a linear order by induction on the size of a max antichain. Assume D has no antichain of size n + 1. Now we again have two cases: Case A: There is  $a \in D$  such that the set V(a) of elements comparable to a is infinite.

Case B: Otherwise.

Case A: We are done by induction as V(a) has no antichain of size n.

Case B: Say  $|V(a)| \leq k$ . Then we induct on k. For  $a, b \in D$  define  $a \to b$  if  $b \in V(a)$  is a maximal element of V(a). Then define  $a \leq b$  if either  $a \leq b$  or  $a \to b$ .

Claim 1. If  $a \leq b$  and  $b \leq c$  then  $a \leq c$ .

Assume not, i.e.  $a \not\leq c$ . Then either c < a or  $c \in V(a)$  not maximal. Now we again have cases.

Case  $\alpha$ : c < a.

Case  $\beta$ :  $c \in V(a)$  not maximal.

Case  $\alpha$ : If  $a \leq b$  then c < b which is a contradiction. If  $a \to b$  and b < c then since c < a we have b < a so  $b \to c$  but now both  $a, c \in V(b)$  which contradicts maximality of c.

Case  $\beta$ : Let  $d > c \in V(a)$ . If  $b \leq x, b \leq d$ , and  $b \to c$  then  $d \notin V(b)$  In either case  $d \notin V(b)$ . If  $d \leq b$  then c < b. So b < d and  $a \not\leq b$  which means  $a \to b$  which is a contradiction since d > b.

So  $\leq$  is a quasi-order. If  $a \leq b$  and  $b \leq a$  for  $a \neq b$  then it must be that  $a \rightarrow b$  and  $b \rightarrow a$  so the equivalence classes of the quasi-order are finite in the quotient,  $\leq$  induces an infinite order with  $|V(a)| \leq k-1$  for all a.

## 2. Interpretable orders in $\mathcal{M}$ with few substructures

From now on assume  $\mathcal{M}$  has few substructures.

**Lemma 2.** Let  $D \subseteq M$  and  $\pi : D \to V$  an interpretable map with V linearly ordered. If V is infinite and transitive then  $\pi$  has finite fibers.

*Proof.* Take the partial order  $\pi(a) \leq \pi(b)$  on D. This is the same argument as before.

**Lemma 3.** Let  $D \subseteq M$  and  $\pi : D \to V$  an interpretable map with V linearly ordered. Then any parameter-defined subset of V is a finite union of convex sets.

*Proof.* Let X be a definable set which is not a finite union of convex sets. For any  $n < \omega$  and any  $\sigma : n \to 2$  we can find

$$D_{\sigma} = \{d_0, \dots, d_{n-1}\} \subseteq D$$

with  $\pi(d_i) < \pi(d_{i+1})$  and  $\pi(d_i) \in X$  iff  $\sigma(i) = 1$ . Then we get  $2^n$  many.  $\Box$ 

For V linearly ordered, let  $\overline{V}$  denote the completion of V. A function  $f: X \to \overline{V}$ (for  $X \subseteq M^k$  definable) is definable if the set

$$\{(x,t) \in X \times V \,|\, t < f(x)\} \subseteq X \times V$$

is definable.

**Lemma 4.** Let  $X \subseteq M$  be definable and transitive.Let  $D \subseteq M$  and  $\pi : D \to V$  as above, V transitive. If  $f : X \to \overline{V}$  is definable then X = D and  $f = \pi$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $D \setminus X$  is not empty. Then by transitivity of V we have that  $\pi$ :  $D \setminus X \to V$  is onto. So now fix  $n < \omega$ . For  $\sigma \in Fun(n, 2)$  take

$$(a_i^{\sigma} \mid i < n)$$

in M such that

•  $a_i^{\sigma} \in D \setminus X$  if  $\sigma(i) = 0$  and  $a_i^{\sigma} \in X$  if  $\sigma(i) = 1$ 

•  $g_i(a_i^{\sigma}) < g_{i+1}(a_{i+1}^{\sigma})$  where  $g_0 \in \{f, \pi\}$ .

This gives  $2^n$  substructures of size n. It follows that  $D \subseteq X$  and therefore X = D by transitivity of X.

So now we have D = X and potentially two different maps to V which we want to show are the same. By transitivity  $f(a) > \pi(a)$ . Now we construct  $2^n$  substructures. Take any point  $a_0$  then act f on it. This lands somewhere else, and now when we choose our next point we can either choose it ahead of  $f(a_0)$  or behind it. Now just iterate it.