

# DIVIDING AND WEAK QUASI-DIMENSIONS IN ARBITRARY THEORIES

ISAAC GOLDBRING AND HENRY TOWNSNER

ABSTRACT. We show that any countable model of a model complete theory has an elementary extension with a “pseudofinite-like” quasi-dimension that detects dividing.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In a pseudofinite structure, every set  $S$  has a size  $|S|$ , a nonstandard cardinality. It is reasonable to say that  $S$  and  $T$  are “similar in size” if  $|\log |S| - \log |T||$  is bounded (by a natural number). This gives the notion of *fine pseudofinite dimension* [3, 2], the quotient of  $\log |S|$  by a suitable convex set. García shows [1] that the fine pseudofinite dimension detects dividing: roughly speaking, if  $\phi(x, b)$  divides over  $\psi(x, a)$  then there is a  $b'$  with  $tp(b'/a) = tp(b/a)$  so that the dimension of  $\phi(x, b')$  is strictly stronger than the dimension of  $\psi(x, a)$ .

We give a limited extension of this to model complete theories in relational languages (and, via Morleyization, to any theory): any countable model whose theory is model complete embeds elementarily in a “large” fragment of a pseudofinite structure in such a way that the notion of dimension pulls back to the original model; moreover, if  $\phi(x, b)$  divides over  $\psi(x, a)$  then there is a  $b'$  in an elementary extension with  $tp(b'/a) = tp(b/a)$  so that the dimension of  $\phi(x, b')$  is strictly stronger than the dimension of  $\psi(x, a)$ .

There is a straightforward way to embed a countable structure in a pseudofinite structure, namely embed  $M$  in an ultraproduct of its finite restrictions. That being said, this embedding need not be elementary. It is also easy to obtain a dimension-like function that detects dividing by linearizing the partial order on definable sets given by dividing. The dimension here, however, is an abelian group, and even a quotient of  $\mathbb{R}^*$ .

We would like to thank Dario García for useful comments on an earlier draft of this note.

## 2. CONSTRUCTION

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a countable first-order relational signature and let  $T$  be a complete, model complete theory in  $\mathcal{L}$ . Set  $\mathcal{L}' := \mathcal{L} \cup \{V_\alpha : \alpha < \omega + \omega\}$ , where the  $V_\alpha$  are fresh unary relation symbols. For the sake of readability, if  $M$  is

---

Goldbring’s work was partially supported by NSF CAREER grant DMS-1349399.

an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure and  $\alpha < \omega + \omega$ , we let  $V_\alpha(M)$  denote the interpretation of the symbol  $V_\alpha$  in  $M$ . Occasionally we might abuse notation and write a formula in the form  $\forall \vec{x} \in V_\alpha(\dots)$  to mean  $\forall \vec{x}(\bigwedge_i V_\alpha(x_i) \rightarrow \dots)$ . All  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structures considered will have the property that the interpretations of the  $V_\alpha$ 's will form a chain: if  $\alpha < \beta < \omega + \omega$ , then  $V_\alpha(M) \subseteq V_\beta(M)$ .

By a *partitioned  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula* we mean a triple  $(\varphi, \vec{x}, \vec{y})$ , where  $\varphi$  is a  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula,  $\vec{x}$  and  $\vec{y}$  are disjoint finite tuples of variables (taken from some fixed countably infinite list of variables), and the free variables of  $\varphi$  are among those appearing in  $\vec{x}$  and  $\vec{y}$ . We follow traditional model-theoretic notation by writing  $\varphi(\vec{x}; \vec{y})$  for the partitioned formula  $(\varphi, \vec{x}, \vec{y})$ . We let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the set of partitioned *quantifier-free  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulae*.

Let  $(\sigma_i : i < \omega)$  denote an enumeration of  $\mathcal{F} \times (\omega + \omega)$ . For  $i < \omega$ , we write  $\sigma_i = (\varphi_i, \alpha_i)$  and sometimes refer to  $\alpha_i$  by  $\alpha(\sigma_i)$ .

We say that an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure  $M$  *strongly satisfies*  $\sigma_i$  if, whenever  $\vec{a} \in V_{\alpha_i}(M)$  is such that there is  $N \supseteq M$  with  $N \models T$  and  $\vec{b} \in N$  such that  $N \models \varphi_i(\vec{a}; \vec{b})$ , then there is  $\vec{c} \in V_{\alpha_i+1}(M)$  such that  $M \models \varphi_i(\vec{a}; \vec{c})$ .

For each  $n \in \omega$ , we define an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure  $M_n \models T_\forall$  with the property that if  $i < n$ ,  $M_n$  strongly satisfies  $\sigma_i$ . Let  $M_0$  denote a one-element substructure of a model of  $T$  whose unique element satisfies each  $V_\alpha$ .

Suppose we have constructed  $M_{n-1}$ . Consider the first  $n$  pairs  $\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}$  and fix a permutation  $\sigma_{r_0}, \dots, \sigma_{r_{n-1}}$  so that  $i \leq j$  implies that  $\alpha(\sigma_{r_i}) \leq \alpha(\sigma_{r_j})$ . We construct  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structures  $M_n^i \models T_\forall$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, n$ , by recursion on  $i$  in such a way that  $M_n^i$  strongly satisfies  $\sigma_{r_0}, \dots, \sigma_{r_{i-1}}$ . We will then set  $M_n := M_n^n$ .

Let  $M_n^0 = M_{n-1}$ . Suppose that  $M_n^i$  has been constructed and set  $\alpha := \alpha(\sigma_{r_i})$  and let  $\varphi(\vec{x}; \vec{y})$  be the formula in  $\sigma_{r_i}$ . Enumerate the tuples of length  $|\vec{x}|$  in  $V_\alpha(M_n^i)$  as  $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_k$ . We now recursively construct a sequence of models  $M_n^{i,j}$ ; we begin with  $M_n^{i,0} = M_n^i$ . Given  $M_n^{i,j}$ , we proceed as follows:

- If there is a  $\vec{b} \in V_{\alpha+1}(M_n^{i,j})$  such that  $M_n^{i,j} \models \varphi(\vec{a}_j; \vec{b})$ , then set  $M_n^{i,j+1} := M_n^{i,j}$ ,
- Otherwise, if there is an extension  $M$  of  $M_n^{i,j}$  and a tuple  $\vec{b}$  from  $M$  such that  $M \models \varphi(\vec{a}_j; \vec{b})$ , then set  $M_n^{i,j+1} := M_n^{i,j} \cup \{\vec{b}\}$  and declare that any element of  $\vec{b}$  which is not in  $V_{\alpha+1}(M_n^{i,j})$  belongs to  $V_{\alpha+1}(M_n^{i,j+1}) \setminus V_\alpha(M_n^{i,j+1})$ .
- If neither of the first two cases apply, set  $M_n^{i,j+1} = M_n^{i,j}$ .

Set  $M_n^{i+1} := M_n^{i,k+1}$ . Since  $V_\alpha(M_n^{i+1}) = V_\alpha(M_n^i)$ , we see that  $M_n^{i+1}$  still strongly satisfies  $\sigma_{r_0}, \dots, \sigma_{r_{i-1}}$ ; moreover, by design,  $M_n^{i+1}$  also strongly satisfies  $\sigma_{r_i}$ , thus finishing the recursive construction.

Fix a nonprincipal ultrafilter  $\mathcal{U}$  on  $\omega$  and set  $M := \prod_{\mathcal{U}} M_n$ . By definition,  $V_\alpha(M) = \{x \in M : M \models V_\alpha(x)\}$ . We also set  $V_{<\omega}(M) := \bigcup_{n < \omega} V_n(M)$  and  $V(M) := \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega + \omega} V_\alpha(M)$ , both considered as  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structures in the obvious way.

Since  $T$  is model-complete, it has a set of  $\forall\exists$ -axioms. Suppose that  $\forall\vec{x}\exists\vec{y}\varphi(\vec{x};\vec{y})$  is such an axiom. Fix  $\alpha < \omega + \omega$  and take  $i$  such that  $\sigma_i = (\varphi(\vec{x};\vec{y}), \alpha)$ . Fix  $n > i$  and consider  $N \models T$  such that  $M_n \subseteq N$ . Since  $N \models T$  and  $M_n$  strongly satisfies  $\sigma_i$ , we have  $M_n \models \forall\vec{x} \in V_\alpha \exists\vec{y} \in V_{\alpha+1} \varphi(\vec{x};\vec{y})$ . It follows that  $M \models \forall\vec{x} \in V_\alpha \exists y \in V_{\alpha+1} \varphi(\vec{x};\vec{y})$ . This proves:

**Proposition 2.1.**  $V_{<\omega}(M)$  and  $V(M)$  are both models of  $T$ .

There is no guarantee that  $V_\omega(M)$  nor  $M$  are models of  $T$ . Note that  $V(M)$  is existentially closed in  $M$ . Indeed,  $M \models T_\forall$  and every model of  $T$  is an existentially closed model of  $T_\forall$  (by model-completeness of  $T$ ).

**Lemma 2.2.** *Suppose that  $p(\vec{x})$  is a countable set of existential  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulae with parameters from  $V_\alpha(M)$  that is finitely satisfiable in  $V(M)$  (equivalently, in  $M$ ). Then there is  $\vec{c} \in V_{\alpha+1}(M)$  such that  $V(M) \models p(\vec{c})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p'(\vec{x}) := p(\vec{x}) \cup \{V_{\alpha+1}(\vec{x})\}$ . Since  $M$  is countably saturated, it suffices to show that  $p'(\vec{x})$  is finitely satisfiable in  $M$ . Indeed, we then get  $\vec{c} \in V_{\alpha+1}(M)$  such that  $M \models p(\vec{c})$ ; since  $V(M)$  is existentially closed in  $M$  (as remarked above), we have that  $V(M) \models p(\vec{c})$ . In addition, since the formulae in  $p$  are existential and, to show that  $M \models \exists\vec{x} \in V_{\alpha+1} \exists\vec{z} \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{z}, \vec{a})$  it clearly suffices to show  $M \models \exists\vec{x} \in V_{\alpha+1} \exists\vec{z} \in V_{\alpha+1} \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{z}, \vec{a})$ , it suffices to assume that the formulae in  $p$  are actually quantifier-free.

We are left with showing the following: if  $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$  is a quantifier-free formula with parameters from  $V_\alpha(M)$  such that  $V(M) \models \exists\vec{x} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$ , then  $V(M) \models \exists\vec{x} \in V_{\alpha+1} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$ . Since  $M \models \exists\vec{x} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$ , we get  $M_n \models \exists\vec{x} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a}_n)$  for  $\mathcal{U}$ -almost all  $n$ , where  $(\vec{a}_n)$  is a representative sequence for  $\vec{a}$ . Fix  $i$  such that  $\sigma_i = (\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}), \alpha)$ . Since  $M_n$  strongly satisfies  $\sigma_i$  for  $n > i$ , it follows that, for  $\mathcal{U}$ -almost all  $n$ , we can find  $\vec{c}_n \in V_{\alpha+1}(M_n)$  such that  $M_n \models \varphi(\vec{c}_n, \vec{a}_n)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Suppose  $N$  is a model of  $T$  and  $A \subseteq N$  is countable. Then there is  $A' \subseteq V_{<\omega}(M)$  such that  $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}^N(A) = \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}^{V(M)}(A')$ .*

*Proof.* Enumerate  $A = \{a_0, a_1, \dots\}$  and construct  $A' \subseteq M'$  inductively: given  $a'_0, \dots, a'_n \in V_{n+1}(M)$  with  $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}^N(a_0, \dots, a_n) = \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}^{V(M)}(a'_0, \dots, a'_n)$ , by the previous lemma and the model-completeness of  $T$  (so every type is determined by its existential formulae), there is an  $a'_{n+1} \in V_{n+2}(M)$  with  $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}^N(a_{n+1}/a_0, \dots, a_n) = \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}^{V(M)}(a'_{n+1}/a'_0, \dots, a'_n)$ .  $\square$

We now fix a countable model  $N$  of  $T$  and take  $A = N$  in the above lemma, yielding an elementary embedding  $a \mapsto a' : N \rightarrow V_{<\omega}(M)$  with image  $N'$ .

**Definition 2.4.** For an  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\varphi(\vec{x})$ , we let  $\varphi_\omega(\vec{x}) := \varphi(\vec{x}) \wedge V_\omega(\vec{x})$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Suppose that  $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$  and  $\psi(\vec{x}, \vec{z})$  are existential  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulae. If  $N \models \forall\vec{x}(\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\vec{x}, \vec{b}))$ , then  $M \models \forall\vec{x}(\varphi_\omega(\vec{x}, \vec{a}') \leftrightarrow \psi_\omega(\vec{x}, \vec{b}'))$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $a \mapsto a'$  is elementary, we get  $V_{<\omega}(M) \models \forall\vec{x}(\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a}') \leftrightarrow \psi(\vec{x}, \vec{b}'))$ . Since  $V_{<\omega}(M) \preceq V(M)$  (by model-completeness of  $T$ ), the same equivalence

holds in  $V(M)$ . Finally, if  $\vec{c} \in V_\omega(M)$ , then  $M \models \varphi_\omega(\vec{c}, \vec{a}')$  if and only if  $V(M) \models \varphi_\omega(\vec{c}, \vec{a}')$  and likewise with  $\psi_\omega$ .  $\square$

We recall the notion of pseudofinite dimension, especially as considered in [3, 2]. Since  $M$  is an ultraproduct of finite sets, any definable set  $D$  has a nonstandard cardinality  $|D|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^*$  (the ultrapower of the reals). We let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the convex hull of  $\mathbb{Z}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^*$ . Then for any definable set  $X$ , we can define

$$\delta_M(X) = \log |X|/\mathcal{C},$$

the image of  $\log |X|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^*/\mathcal{C} \cup \{-\infty\}$  (where  $\log |X| = -\infty$  if  $|X| = 0$ ). This is the *fine pseudofinite dimension*.

The fine pseudofinite dimension satisfies the quasi-dimension axioms:

- $\delta_M(\emptyset) = -\infty$  and  $\delta_M(X) > -\infty$  implies  $\delta_M(X) \geq 0$ ,
- $\delta_M(X \cup Y) = \max\{\delta_M(X), \delta_M(Y)\}$ ,
- For any definable function  $f : X \rightarrow Z$  and every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^*/\mathcal{C} \cup \{-\infty\}$ , if  $\delta_M(f^{-1}(z)) \leq \alpha$  for all  $z \in Z$  then  $\delta_M(X) \leq \alpha + \delta_M(Z)$ .

One of the features of fine pseudofinite dimension is that if we fix any definable set  $X$ , we may define a measure  $\mu_X(Y)$  on definable  $Y$  by  $\mu_X(Y) = st(\frac{|Y|}{|X|})$  so that  $\delta_M(Y) = \delta_M(X)$  if and only if  $\mu_X(Y) \in (0, \infty)$ .

In light of the lemma above, the following definition makes sense.

**Definition 2.6.** Suppose  $X \subseteq N^k$  is definable. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that  $X$  is defined by  $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$ , where  $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$  is quantifier-free. We then define  $\delta_N(X) = \delta_M(\varphi_\omega(\vec{x}, \vec{a}'))$ , where the latter dimension is computed in the pseudofinite structure  $M$ .

**Lemma 2.7.**  $\delta_N(X \times Y) = \delta_N(X) + \delta_N(Y)$

*Proof.* Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are defined by  $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$  and  $\psi(\vec{y}, \vec{b})$  respectively. Then  $X \times Y$  is defined by  $\rho(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{a}) \wedge \psi(\vec{y}, \vec{b})$ . Then

$$\delta_N(X \times Y) = \delta_M(\rho_\omega(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{a}, \vec{b})) = \delta_M(\varphi_\omega(\vec{x}, \vec{a})) + \delta_M(\psi_\omega(\vec{y}, \vec{b})) = \delta_N(X) + \delta_N(Y).$$

using the pseudofinite axioms for  $\delta_M$ .  $\square$

$\delta_N$  need not satisfy the final quasi-dimension axiom, however—it is possible that there are many values  $z \in Z_\omega$  so that  $\delta(f^{-1}(z))$  is large and so  $\delta_M(X_\omega)$  is large as well, but that none of these are in the image of  $M$ , so  $\delta_N(X)$  is large even though  $\delta_N(f^{-1}(z))$  is small for all  $z \in Z$ .

Nonetheless, there is a connection between  $\delta_N$  and dividing, essentially the one shown by García in [1] for pseudofinite dimension.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Suppose that  $\psi(x, a)$  and  $\varphi(x, b)$  are existential  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulae with parameters from  $V_\omega(M)$  such that  $\varphi(x, b)$  implies  $\psi(x, a)$  and  $\varphi(x, b)$  divides over  $a$ . Then there is  $b^\# \in V_\omega(M)$  with  $b^\# \equiv_{\mathcal{L}, a} b$  and  $\delta_M(\varphi(x, b^\#)) < \delta_M(\psi(x, a))$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that no  $b^\#$  exists as in the conclusion. We then use that to get  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $K|\varphi_\omega(x, b^\#)| \geq |\psi_\omega(x, a)|$  for all  $b^\# \in V_\omega(M)$  with  $b^\# \equiv_{\mathcal{L}, a} b$ . In fact, by saturation again, there is  $\chi(x, a) \in \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}^M(b/a)$  such that  $K|\varphi_\omega(x, b^\#)| \geq |\psi_\omega(x, a)|$  for all  $b^\# \models \chi_\omega(x, a)$ .

Fix  $L$  sufficiently large (depending only on  $k$  and  $K$ ) and take  $(b_i)_{i < L}$  from  $V_{<\omega}(M)$  satisfying  $\chi_\omega(x, a)$  and such that  $\{\varphi(x, b_i) : i < L\}$  is  $k$ -inconsistent. In particular, we have  $K|\varphi_\omega(x, b_i)| \geq |\psi_\omega(x, a)|$  for all  $i < L$ . As in [1], if  $L$  is sufficiently large, we get  $i_1 < \dots < i_k < L$  such that  $\bigcap_{j=1}^k \mu_{\psi_\omega}(\varphi_\omega(x, b_{i_j})) > 0$ . In particular, there is  $c \in V_\omega(M)$  such that  $M \models \varphi_\omega(c, b_{i_j})$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . It follows that  $V(M) \models \varphi(c, b_{i_j})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

In the previous result, if we have  $\psi(x, a)$  and  $\varphi(x, b)$  formulae with parameters from  $N$  such that  $\varphi(x, b)$  implies  $\psi(x, a)$  and  $\varphi(x, b)$  forks over  $a$ , then we can apply the previous result with  $\psi(x, a')$  and  $\varphi(x, b')$ . It should not be too surprising that, even in this situation, we need to look in  $V(M)$  for the desired witness to dimension drop as  $N$  is usually not saturated enough to see this dimension drop.

Combining Proposition 2.8 with the remarks made in the previous paragraph yields the main result of this note:

**Theorem 2.9.** *Suppose that  $\psi(x, a)$  and  $\phi(x, b)$  are existential  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulae with parameters from  $N$  such that  $\phi(x, b)$  implies  $\psi(x, a)$  and  $\phi(x, b)$  divides over  $a$ . Then there is an elementary extension  $N^\#$  of  $N$ , an extension of  $\delta_N$  to a quasidimension  $\delta_{N^\#}$  on  $N^\#$ , and  $b^\# \in N^\#$  with  $b^\# \equiv_{\mathcal{L}, a} b$  and  $\delta_{N^\#}(\phi(x, b^\#)) < \delta_{N^\#}(\psi(x, a)) = \delta_N(\psi(x, a))$ .*

**Remark 2.10.** Note that a similar argument applies to an arbitrary relational language by taking  $\mathcal{L}_0$  and an  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -structure  $N$  and letting  $T$  be the theory of the Morleyization of  $N$ .

**Remark 2.11.** Note that the same construction applies, with only the obvious changes, to theories in continuous logic.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Dario García. A note on pseudofinite dimensions and forking. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2014.
- [2] Ehud Hrushovski. Stable group theory and approximate subgroups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 25(1):189–243, 2012.
- [3] Ehud Hrushovski. On pseudo-finite dimensions. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.*, 54(3-4):463–495, 2013.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS, AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING OFFICES (M/C 249), 851 S. MORGAN ST., CHICAGO, IL 60607-7045, USA

*E-mail address:* isaac@math.uic.edu

*URL:* www.math.uic.edu/~isaac

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 209 S. 33RD STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-6395

*E-mail address:* [htowsner@math.upenn.edu](mailto:htowsner@math.upenn.edu)

*URL:* [www.sas.upenn.edu/~htowsner](http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~htowsner)