

Around definable types in p -adically closed fields

Pablo Andújar Guerrero

Will Johnson

August 12, 2022

Abstract

We prove some technical results on definable types in p -adically closed fields, with consequences for definable groups and definable topological spaces. First, the code of a definable n -type (in the field sort) can be taken to be a real tuple (in the field sort) rather than an imaginary tuple (in the geometric sorts). Second, any definable type in the real or imaginary sorts is generated by a countable union of chains parameterized by the value group. Third, if X is an interpretable set, then the space of global definable types on X is strictly pro-interpretable, building off work of Cubides Kovacsics, Hils, and Ye [CKY21, CKHY21]. Fourth, global definable types can be lifted (in a non-canonical way) along interpretable surjections. Fifth, if G is a definable group with definable f -generics (dfg), and G acts on a definable set X , then the quotient space X/G is definable, not just interpretable. This explains some phenomena observed by Pillay and Yao [PY19]. Lastly, we show that interpretable topological spaces satisfy analogues of first-countability and curve selection. Using this, we show that all reasonable notions of definable compactness agree on interpretable topological spaces, and that definable compactness is definable in families.

1 Introduction

This paper is a collection of closely-related results on p -adically closed fields, related to three themes: definable types, definable groups, and definable topological spaces.

1.1 Definable types

If M is a structure and $q \in S_n(M)$ is a definable type, then q has a “code” $\ulcorner q \urcorner$, a tuple (possibly infinite) in M^{eq} which codes the definable sets $\{\bar{b} \in M : \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}) \in q(\bar{x})\}$ for each formula φ . Our first theorem says that in p -adically closed fields, definable types are coded by *real* tuples, rather than imaginary tuples:

Theorem 1.1 (= Theorem 3.4). *If K is a p -adically closed field and $q \in S_n(K)$ is a definable type, then $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ is interdefinable with a tuple in K (rather than K^{eq}).*

The real tuple in Theorem 1.1 is infinite in some cases—see Proposition 3.7.

Our second main result on definable types shows that they are generated by small collections of definable families of a specific form. First, we fix some conventions.

Remark 1.2. In what follows, we identify partial types $\{\varphi_i(x) : i \in I\}$ with collections of definable sets $\{\varphi_i(M) : i \in I\}$. In particular, a partial type $\Sigma(x)$ *extends* a family \mathcal{F} of definable sets if $\Sigma(x)$ extends the partial type corresponding to \mathcal{F} , meaning that $\Sigma(x) \vdash x \in D$ for each $D \in \mathcal{F}$. Likewise, \mathcal{F} *generates* $\Sigma(x)$ if the partial type $\{x \in D : D \in \mathcal{F}\}$ generates $\Sigma(x)$.

Definition 1.3. A family of sets \mathcal{F}' *refines* another family \mathcal{F} if for any $X \in \mathcal{F}$ there is $Y \in \mathcal{F}'$ with $Y \subseteq X$.

Definition 1.4. In a p -adically closed field, a Γ -family is an interpretable family of the form $\{X_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$, where Γ is the value group, each X_γ is non-empty, and $\gamma' \geq \gamma \implies X_{\gamma'} \subseteq X_\gamma$.

Theorem 1.5 (= Theorems 3.5, 7.6). *If K is a p -adically closed field and $q \in S_n(K)$ is a definable type, then q is generated by the union of countably many Γ -families. This also holds for definable types in K^{eq} .*

Theorem 1.5 (mostly) falls out of the proof of Theorem 1.1. By combining Theorem 1.5 with work of Simon and Starchenko [SS14], we get a technical result on definable and interpretable families of sets, which may be of independent interest:

Theorem 1.6 (= Theorems 5.6, 7.9). *Let \mathcal{F} be a definable family of sets in $K \models p\text{CF}$. The following are equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{F} extends to a definable type $p \in S_n(K)$.
2. \mathcal{F} is refined by a Γ -family.
3. \mathcal{F} is refined by a downward directed definable family of non-empty sets.

The analogous statements also hold in K^{eq} .

The equivalence of (1) and (3) is analogous to [AG21, Theorem 2.12] in the o-minimal case.

Next, we extend the results of Cubides Kovacsics, Hils, and Ye [CKY21, CKHY21] from the real sorts to the imaginary sorts of $p\text{CF}$. See Section 6 for the definition of uniform definability of definable types, pro-definable sets, and strictly pro-definable sets. A *pro-interpretable set* in a structure M is a pro-definable set in M^{eq} .

Theorem 1.7 (= Theorem 7.10). *The theory $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$ has uniform definability of definable types.*

This extends [CKY21, Theorem 6.3(4)] from the home sort to the imaginary sorts. If X is an interpretable set, let X^{def} denote the space of definable types on X . Theorem 1.7 lets us regard X^{def} as a pro-interpretable set, by work of Hrushovski and Loeser (see Fact 6.2).

Theorem 1.8 (= Theorem 7.11). *If X is interpretable, then the pro-interpretable set X^{def} is strictly pro-interpretable.*

This extends [CKHY21, Theorem 7.4.8] from the home sort to the geometric sorts. Meanwhile, Theorem 1.1 can be rephrased in terms of X^{def} as follows:

Theorem 1.9 (= Theorem 6.5). *If X is definable (not just interpretable), then X^{def} is pro-definable (not just pro-interpretable).*

We also prove the following technical result:

Theorem 1.10 (= Theorem 7.12). *Work in a monster model \mathbb{M} of $p\text{CF}$. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an interpretable surjection between two interpretable sets. The pushforward map $X^{\text{def}} \rightarrow Y^{\text{def}}$ is surjective (on \mathbb{M} -points). In other words, any global definable type in Y can be lifted to a global definable type in X .*

If we understand correctly, this means that $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$ has “surjectivity transfer” in the sense of [CKHY21, Definition 2.4.9]. In Theorem 1.10, we don’t know whether M -definable types can be lifted to M -definable types, when M is not saturated.

1.2 Definable groups

Theorem 1.1 has some consequences for the theory of definable groups. Recall the following general definition:

Definition 1.11. Work over a monster model \mathbb{M} . An interpretable group G has *definable f -generics* (*dfg*) if there is a small model $M_0 \preceq \mathbb{M}$ and an M_0 -definable global type q concentrated on G , such that every left translate of q under the action of $G = G(\mathbb{M})$ is also M_0 -definable.

Equivalently, G has *dfg* if there is a (global) definable type q on G with boundedly many left translates. Pushing q forward along the map $x \mapsto x^{-1}$, we also get a definable type with boundedly many right translates.

If one replaces “ M_0 -definable” with “finitely satisfiable in M_0 ” in Definition 1.11, one gets the notion of *finitely satisfiable generics* (*fsg*). In a distal theory like $p\text{CF}$, the two notions of *dfg* and *fsg* are in some sense polar opposites. For example, if G is a 1-dimensional definable group, then G has exactly one of the two properties. More generally, infinite definable groups can have at most one of the two properties *dfg* and *fsg*.¹ It turns out that a definable group G has *fsg* if and only if it is definably compact [OP08, Joh21]. Therefore, *dfg* can be understood as the “opposite” of definable compactness.

Using Theorem 1.1, we can prove the following:

¹The fact that any 1-dimensional definable group has *fsg* or *dfg* is [PY19, Lemma 2.9]. The fact that infinite definable groups cannot have both properties simultaneously is alluded to in the proof of [PY19, Corollary 2.11], but not explained there, as far as we can tell. This fact can be proved as follows. Suppose G has *dfg* and *fsg*. Take a global types q_1 and q_2 and a small model M such that every right-translate of q_1 is M -definable, and every left-translate of q_2 is finitely satisfiable in M . In an elementary extension of the monster model \mathbb{M} , take (a, b) realizing $q_1 \otimes q_2$, meaning that a realizes q_1 and b realizes $q_2|_{\mathbb{M}a}$. Definable types commute with finitely satisfiable types [HP11, Lemma 3.4], so (b, a) realizes $q_2 \otimes q_1$. In particular, a realizes

Theorem 1.12 (= Theorem 4.1). *In a model of p CF, suppose G is an interpretable dfg group and X is a definable set with a definable action of G . Then the quotient space X/G (the set of orbits) is definable. More precisely, the interpretable set X/G is in interpretable bijection with a definable set.*

This allows us to answer a question asked by Pillay and Yao [PY19]:

Corollary 1.13 (= Corollary 4.4). *Suppose G is a definable group in a p -adically closed field and H is a definable open subgroup. If H has dfg , then H has finite index in G .*

Here, H is “open” with respect to the definable manifold structure on G respecting the group topology, constructed by Pillay [Pil89].

In work by the second author and Yao [JY22a], Theorem 1.12 is applied to prove new results about abelian definable groups in p -adically closed fields, including a decomposition of abelian definable groups into dfg and fsg components.

1.3 Definable and interpretable topological spaces

A *definable topology* is a topology with a (uniformly) definable basis of open sets, and a *definable topological space* is a definable set with a definable topology. An *interpretable topological space* in M is a definable topological space in M^{eq} . Definable and interpretable topological spaces arise naturally when studying definable and interpretable groups in p CF. In fact, every definable group or interpretable group has the structure of a definable or interpretable topological space in a canonical way [Pil89, Lemma 3.8] [Joh22, Theorem 1.2].

Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 have consequences for definable and interpretable topological spaces in p -adically closed fields. In particular we show that these satisfy a definable analogue of first countability, namely: every point has a neighborhood basis that is a Γ -family (Proposition 8.2). Over \mathbb{Q}_p , this implies actual first countability. Using definable first countability, we get a form of definable curve selection (Lemma 8.5). We also show the equivalence of various notions of “definable compactness” as follows.

Theorem 1.14 (= Theorem 8.11). *Let (Z, τ) be a definable (or interpretable) topological space in a p -adically closed field K . The following are equivalent.*

1. *Every downward directed interpretable family of non-empty closed sets in Z has non-empty intersection.*
2. *Every interpretable Γ -family of closed sets in Z has non-empty intersection.*
3. *Every interpretable curve $f : D \subseteq K \rightarrow Z$ has a converging interpretable restriction.*
(See Definition 8.3).

$q_1 | \mathbb{M}b$. Now one can see easily that $\text{tp}(a \cdot b / \mathbb{M})$ is the right-translate of $q_1 = \text{tp}(a / \mathbb{M})$ by b , so $\text{tp}(a \cdot b / \mathbb{M})$ is M -definable. Similarly, $\text{tp}(a \cdot b / \mathbb{M})$ is the left-translate of $q_2 = \text{tp}(b / \mathbb{M})$ by a , so $\text{tp}(a \cdot b / \mathbb{M})$ is finitely satisfiable in M . Then $\text{tp}(a \cdot b / \mathbb{M})$ is generically stable [HP11, Remark 3.3]. By [Sim13, Proposition 2.27], generically stable types in distal theories are constant (i.e., realized), and so $\text{tp}(a \cdot b / \mathbb{M})$ must be constant. But then q_1 and q_2 are themselves constant types, and have unboundedly many translates, a contradiction.

4. Every definable type in $S_Z(K)$ has a specialization. (See Definition 8.8.)
5. Every interpretable family of closed sets $\{C_y\}_{y \in Y}$ in Z with the finite intersection property has a finite transversal, i.e. there exists a finite set T with $T \cap C_y \neq \emptyset$ for every $y \in Y$.

Say that an interpretable topological space is *definably compact* if it satisfies these equivalent conditions. We prove two additional, useful facts about definable compactness:

Theorem 1.15 (= Theorem 8.15). *An interpretable topological space Z in \mathbb{Q}_p is definably compact if and only if it is compact.*

Theorem 1.16 (= Theorem 8.16). *Definable compactness is definable in families: Let $\{X_b : b \in Y\}$ be an interpretable family of interpretable topological spaces in \mathbb{M} . Then $\{b \in Y : X_b \text{ is definably compact}\}$ is interpretable.*

Note that Theorems 1.15 and 1.16 uniquely characterize definable compactness—it is the only automorphism-invariant definable concept extending genuine compactness on \mathbb{Q}_p . This further supports the idea that we have isolated the correct notion of “definable compactness.”

1.4 Outline

In Sections 2 and 3 we analyze definable n -types, proving Theorem 1.1 on real codes, and the non-imaginary case of Theorem 1.5 on generation by Γ -families. Subsection 3.4 gives an example of a definable n -type whose code is an infinite tuple, rather than a finite tuple. In Section 4, we apply Theorem 1.1 to definable groups, proving Theorem 1.12.

In Section 5 we combine Theorem 1.5 with results of Simon and Starchenko [SS14] to prove the non-imaginary case of Theorem 1.6 on definable families. In Section 6 we review the machinery of uniform definability of definable types, pro-definable sets, and strict pro-definability, which will be applied later in the paper. While discussing this, we deduce Theorem 1.9 from Theorem 1.1. In Section 7, we extend the facts of Sections 5–6 from $p\text{CF}$ to $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$, proving Theorems 1.7–1.8 on strict pro-definability, and the technical Theorem 1.10 on lifting. In the process, we get the imaginary cases of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6.

In Section 8 we apply everything to the study of definable and interpretable topological spaces, proving definable first countability, curve selection, and Theorems 1.14–1.16. If one is only interested in definable topological spaces, rather than interpretable topological spaces, then Section 7 can be skipped, and Section 6 is only used in the proof of Theorem 1.16.

We also include an appendix containing the proofs of three known results due to Delon, Cubides Kovacsics, Ye, and Hils [Del89, CKY21, CKHY21], specifically the following:

- The definability of types over \mathbb{Q}_p (Fact 3.8).
- The uniform definability of definable types in $p\text{CF}$ (Fact 6.3).
- The strict pro-definability of X^{def} (Fact 6.4).

These three facts play an important role in the paper, and have short proofs from the machinery in Sections 2–5, so it seemed worthwhile to include the proofs. In the case of strict pro-definability, our proof seems to be novel.

1.5 Notation

We use letters like M and K to denote models, and we use \mathbb{M} to denote monster models. We distinguish M from M^{eq} . We write dcl^{eq} for definable closure in M^{eq} , and dcl for definable closure in M , and similarly with acl^{eq} and acl for algebraic closure. We distinguish “definable sets” (in M) from “interpretable sets” (in M^{eq}). Generally speaking, we use “interpretable in M ” as a synonym for “definable in M^{eq} ” when referring to sets, functions, subsets, and families. However, we say “definable type” rather than “interpretable type” when referring to definable types in M^{eq} .

We call elements of M “reals” and elements of M^{eq} “imaginaries.” A “real tuple” is a tuple of reals, possibly infinite. An “imaginary tuple” is a tuple of imaginaries, possibly infinite. We write tuples as a, b, x, y, \dots rather than $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \dots$. We write $\varphi(M)$ rather than $\varphi(M^{|x|})$ for the set defined by an $\mathcal{L}(M)$ -formula $\varphi(x)$. If x is a tuple of variables, then M^x denotes $M^{|x|}$, and $S_x(A)$ denotes the type space $S_{|x|}(A)$. If X is an A -definable or A -interpretable set, then $S_X(A)$ denotes the set of types over A concentrating on X .

We distinguish “families of definable sets” from “definable families of sets.” The former is an arbitrary collection of sets, each of which is definable, without any uniform definability. In contrast, a “definable family of sets” is a uniformly definable family of sets parameterized in a definable way by a definable index set. That is, a “definable family of sets” is a family of the form $\{D_i\}_{i \in X}$ such that $\{(i, j) : i \in X, y \in D_i\}$ is a definable set. An “interpretable family of sets” is a definable family of sets in M^{eq} .

A “type” means a complete type, by default. A “partial type” means a partial type. A “quantifier-free type” means a complete quantifier-free type, that is, a partial type of the form $\text{qftp}(a/B)$ for some tuple a and set B . “Definable” always means “definable with parameters.” We abbreviate \emptyset -definability (definability without parameters) as “0-definability.”

We let $S_n^{\text{def}}(M)$ denote the space of definable n -types over a model M , and we define $S_x^{\text{def}}(M)$ and $S_X^{\text{def}}(M)$ similarly for a tuple of variables x or a definable set X . We write $\ulcorner X \urcorner$ for the code in M^{eq} of a definable or interpretable set X , and we write $\ulcorner p \urcorner$ for the code of a definable type $p \in S_n^{\text{def}}(M)$. We can take $\ulcorner X \urcorner$ to be a single element in M^{eq} , but $\ulcorner p \urcorner$ potentially needs to be an infinite tuple.

We identify a partial type $\{\varphi_i(x, b_i) : i \in I\}$ with the corresponding family of definable sets $\{\varphi_i(M, b_i) : i \in I\}$, and vice versa. Thus $D \in p$ means that $p(x) \vdash x \in D$. Similarly, if \mathcal{F} is a family of definable sets, then $p \supseteq \mathcal{F}$ means that $D \in \mathcal{F} \implies p(x) \vdash x \in D$.

We denote languages with symbols like \mathcal{L} , preferring to use L for fields. If M is an \mathcal{L} -structure and $A \subseteq M$, then $\mathcal{L}(A)$ denotes the language obtained by adding elements of A as constants. If T is an \mathcal{L} -theory, then T_{\forall} is the set of universally quantified \mathcal{L} -sentences implied by T . A model of T_{\forall} is a substructure of a model of T .

If K is a valued field, we write the valuation as $\text{val}(-)$, the value group as Γ or $\Gamma(K)$, the valuation ring as \mathcal{O} , the maximal ideal as \mathfrak{m} , the residue field \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m} as k , and the residue

map as $\text{res} : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow k$. We write valuations additively.

In this paper, a *p-adically closed field* is a field elementarily equivalent to \mathbb{Q}_p , and the theory of *p-adically closed fields* is written $p\text{CF}$. One could also consider the theory $p\text{CF}_d$ of *p-adically closed fields of p-rank d*, i.e., fields elementarily equivalent to finite extensions K/\mathbb{Q}_p with $[K : \mathbb{Q}_p] = d$. We will not consider such fields here, but we believe all the results in this paper generalize² from $p\text{CF} = p\text{CF}_1$ to $p\text{CF}_d$.

Let \mathcal{L}_{div} be the language of valued fields with the divisibility predicate $\text{val}(x) \leq \text{val}(y)$. The theory ACVF has quantifier elimination in \mathcal{L}_{div} , but $p\text{CF}$ does *not*. On the other hand, Macintyre showed that $p\text{CF}$ has quantifier elimination if we add a predicate P_m for the set of m th powers, for each m [Mac76]. We will consider $p\text{CF}$ as an \mathcal{L}_{div} -theory. Therefore, a “quantifier-free type” means a quantifier-free type in the language \mathcal{L}_{div} . (In Section 2.2 we will consider a larger language \mathcal{L}_χ and write $p\text{CF}^\chi$ for the theory of $p\text{CF}$ in this language.)

Acknowledgments. The first author was supported by the Fields Institute for Research in Mathematical Sciences, specifically by the 2021 Thematic Program on Trends in Pure and Applied Model Theory and the 2022 Thematic Program on Tame Geometry, Transseries and Applications to Analysis and Geometry. The second author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12101131). Parts of this paper arose out of joint work with Ningyuan Yao, to appear in [JY22a]. Vincent Ye and Silvain Rideau provided some helpful information about *p-adically closed fields*, including the reference to [CKY21, Lemma 5.11].

2 Tools

2.1 Interdefinability and interalgebraicity

Let \mathbb{M} be a monster model of $p\text{CF}$. Recall that “tuples” can be infinite by default.

Lemma 2.1. *Let a be an imaginary tuple (in \mathbb{M}^{eq}) and b be a real tuple (in \mathbb{M}).*

1. *If $a \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(b)$, then $a \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(b)$.*
2. *If $a \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(b)$ and $b \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(a)$, then there is a real tuple c such that $a \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(c)$ and $c \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(a)$.*

Proof. The proof uses two facts. First, $p\text{CF}$ (but not $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$) has definable Skolem functions. Second, any finite subset of \mathbb{M}^n is coded by a tuple in \mathbb{M} (this holds in any theory of fields, and can be deduced from elimination of imaginaries in ACF, for example).

1. By definable Skolem functions, $\text{dcl}(b)$ is a model $M \preceq \mathbb{M}$, and then $\text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(b) = M^{\text{eq}} \preceq \mathbb{M}^{\text{eq}}$. This implies $\text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(b)$ is algebraically closed within \mathbb{M}^{eq} (as models are always algebraically closed), and so $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(b) = \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(b)$.

²In order to get quantifier elimination in the Macintyre language and definable Skolem functions, one needs to name some elements of the prime model as constants.

2. It suffices to show for each finite subtuple $a_0 \subseteq a$, there is a finite tuple e of reals with $a_0 \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(e) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(a)$. Fix such a finite subtuple $a_0 \subseteq a$. By (1), $a_0 \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(b)$, so there is a finite tuple $b_0 \subseteq b$ with $a_0 \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(b_0)$. Write $a_0 = f(b_0)$ for some 0-interpretable function f . Let S be the orbit of b_0 under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/a)$. If $c \in S$, then $c \equiv_a b_0$, so $ca_0 \equiv b_0a_0$. In particular, $a_0 = f(c)$ for any $c \in S$, which implies $a_0 \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(\ulcorner S \urcorner)$, where $\ulcorner S \urcorner$ is the code for S . Clearly $\ulcorner S \urcorner \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(a)$, since S is an a -definable finite set. Take e to be a real tuple interdefinable with $\ulcorner S \urcorner$, using the second fact mentioned above. \square

Remark 2.2. Lemma 2.1 also holds after naming a set E of real parameters. In particular, if a is an imaginary tuple and b is a real tuple, then the following hold.

- 1'. If $a \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(Eb)$, then $a \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(Eb)$.
- 2'. If $a \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(Eb)$ and $b \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(Ea)$, then there is a real tuple c such that $a \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(Ec)$ and $c \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(Ea)$.

In fact, the proof of Lemma 2.1 continues to apply after naming parameters. Alternatively, if we view E as an infinite tuple, then (1') is an instance of Lemma 2.1(1), and (2') follows by applying Lemma 2.1(2) to the interdefinable tuples Ea and Eb (if Ea is interdefinable with c , then Ea is interdefinable with Ec).

2.2 Completions of quantifier-free types

As mentioned in the introduction, we consider $p\text{CF}$ as an \mathcal{L}_{div} -theory, and so a “quantifier-free type” means a quantifier-free type in the language \mathcal{L}_{div} .

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose $K \models p\text{CF}$ and q is a quantifier-free n -type over K . Then q has at most 2^{\aleph_0} completions in $S_n(K)$.*

This is apparently well-known to experts, but we had difficulty locating a proof in the literature, so we include one here for completeness. If $K \models p\text{CF}$ and $m \geq 1$, then

$$K^\times / (K^\times)^m \cong \mathbb{Q}_p^\times / (\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^m =: Q_m,$$

because $\mathbb{Q}_p^\times / (\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^m$ is finite. Let

$$\chi_m : K^\times \rightarrow Q_m$$

be the natural map. Let \mathcal{L}_χ be the expansion of \mathcal{L}_{div} by unary predicates $P_{m,c}$ for $m \geq 1$ and $c \in Q_m$, where $P_{m,c}(x)$ is interpreted as $\chi_m(x) = c$. Note that $P_{m,1}$ is the Macintyre predicate (the predicate naming the m th powers), and so $p\text{CF}$ has quantifier elimination in the language \mathcal{L}_χ . We will write $p\text{CF}^\chi$ for $p\text{CF}$ as an \mathcal{L}_χ -theory. If $K \models p\text{CF}^\chi$, then the $P_{m,c}$ predicates come from homomorphisms $\chi_m : K^\times \rightarrow Q_m$, but the kernel of χ_m needn't be $(K^\times)^m$.

Recall the following definition:

Definition 2.4. If K is an unramified valued field of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$ and $n \geq 0$, then $\text{RV}_n(K) = K^\times / (1 + p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_K)$, and $\text{rv}_n : K^\times \rightarrow \text{RV}_n(K)$ denotes the natural map.

There is a natural homomorphism $\text{RV}_n(K) \rightarrow \Gamma(K)$ with kernel $\mathcal{O}_K^\times / (1 + p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_K)$ or equivalently $(\mathcal{O}_K / p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$. If L/K is a valued field extension, then there is a natural injection $\text{RV}_n(K) \hookrightarrow \text{RV}_n(L)$.

Lemma 2.5. *There is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following properties:*

1. *If $K \models p\text{CF}$ and $x \in 1 + p^{f(n)+1}\mathcal{O}_K$, then x is an n th power.*
2. *If $K \models p\text{CF}_\forall^\chi$, then $\chi_n : K^\times \rightarrow Q_n$ factors through $\text{rv}_{f(n)} : K^\times \rightarrow \text{RV}_{f(n)}(K)$.*

Proof. 1. If f works for \mathbb{Q}_p then it works for any $K \equiv \mathbb{Q}_p$, so we may assume $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$. When $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$, we only need to show that 1 is in the interior of the set of n th powers. This follows easily by Hensel's lemma or dimension theory.

2. Embed K into a model $L \models p\text{CF}^\chi$. The $P_{n,c}$ predicates on L extend those on K , so $\chi_n : L \rightarrow Q_n$ extends $\chi_n : K \rightarrow Q_n$. If $x \in K$ and $\text{rv}_{f(n)}(x) = 1$, then $\chi_n(x) = 1$ by the first part applied to L . \square

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose $K \models p\text{CF}$ and L/K is a finitely generated extension of valued fields. Then there are at most 2^{\aleph_0} expansions of L to a model of $p\text{CF}_\forall^\chi$.*

Proof. Note that any $p\text{CF}_\forall^\chi$ -structure on L must extend the natural $p\text{CF}^\chi$ -structure on K . Indeed, taking a model $M \models p\text{CF}^\chi$ extending L , we see that the χ_n functions on M (and therefore L) extend those on K , because $M \succeq K$ by model completeness of $p\text{CF}$ in \mathcal{L}_{div} .

It suffices to show for fixed m that there are at most 2^{\aleph_0} ways of extending χ_m from K to L . By Lemma 2.5, χ_m factors through RV_n for some $n = f(m)$ not depending on K or L . As χ_m is a homomorphism to the finite group Q_m , it suffices to show that $\text{RV}_n(L) / \text{RV}_n(K)$ is countable for each n .

As $\Gamma(K)$ is a \mathbb{Z} -group, $\Gamma(K)$ has countable index in its divisible hull $\Gamma(K) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. The \mathbb{Q} -vector space $(\Gamma(L) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}) / (\Gamma(K) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q})$ has finite dimension by Abhyankar's inequality. Then $\Gamma(K)$ and $\Gamma(K) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ have countable index in $\Gamma(L) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. A fortiori, $\Gamma(K)$ has countable index in $\Gamma(L)$.

If $L \not\models p\text{CF}_\forall$ then there are zero expansions of L to a model of $p\text{CF}_\forall^\chi$, and there is nothing to prove. Suppose $L \models p\text{CF}_\forall$, and take a model $M \models p\text{CF}$ extending L . As above, $M \succeq K$ by model completeness of $p\text{CF}$. Then the inclusions

$$\mathcal{O}_K / p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_L / p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_L \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_M / p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_M$$

must be isomorphisms, because the leftmost ring is finite and the rightmost ring is an elementary extension of it. Finally, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & (\mathcal{O}_K / p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_K)^\times & \longrightarrow & \text{RV}_n(K) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(K) \longrightarrow 1 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & (\mathcal{O}_L / p^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_L)^\times & \longrightarrow & \text{RV}_n(L) & \longrightarrow & \Gamma(L) \longrightarrow 1 \end{array}$$

shows that $\text{RV}_n(K)$ has countable index in $\text{RV}_n(L)$. \square

Finally, Proposition 2.3 follows formally from Lemma 2.6, using quantifier elimination in $p\text{CF}^\times$. Next, we deduce some consequences of Proposition 2.3. In the following lemmas, if q is a (complete) type over a model of $p\text{CF}$, then \hat{q} denotes its quantifier-free part.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose $K \models p\text{CF}$ and $q \in S_n(K)$. If \hat{q} is definable, then q is definable.*

Proof. It suffices to show that q has at most 2^{\aleph_0} -many heirs over any elementary extension L/K . Suppose $p \in S_n(L)$ is an heir of q . The fact that p is an heir of q implies that \hat{p} is definable, defined by the same definition schema as \hat{q} . In particular, \hat{p} is the same across all heirs $p \in S_n(L)$. By Proposition 2.3, there are at most 2^{\aleph_0} -many heirs. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose $K_0 \preceq K \models p\text{CF}$ and $q \in S_n(K)$. Suppose \hat{q} is K_0 -definable.*

1. q is K_0 -definable.
2. $(q \upharpoonright K_0)(x) \cup \hat{q}(x) \vdash q(x)$.

Proof. 1. By Lemma 2.7, q is K -definable. Embed K into a monster model \mathbb{M} . Let $q^\mathbb{M} \in S_n(\mathbb{M})$ be the heir of q over \mathbb{M} . Then $q^\mathbb{M}$ is definable with the same definition as q . The quantifier-free part $\widehat{q^\mathbb{M}}$ is K_0 -definable, so it is $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/K_0)$ -invariant. By Proposition 2.3, $q^\mathbb{M}$ has at most 2^{\aleph_0} -many images under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/K_0)$. If D is a definable set with a small number of images under $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/K_0)$, then D must be $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(K_0)$ -definable, hence K_0 -definable, as K_0 is a model. Therefore $q^\mathbb{M}$ is K_0 -definable.

2. Take $b \in \mathbb{M}^n$ realizing $q \upharpoonright K_0$ and \hat{q} . We claim $\text{tp}(b/K) = q$. Let $r = \text{tp}(b/K)$. Then $\hat{r} = \text{qftp}(b/K) = \hat{q}$, which is K_0 -definable. By part (1), r is K_0 -definable. Additionally, $r \upharpoonright K_0 = \text{tp}(b/K_0) = q \upharpoonright K_0$. Since r and q are K_0 -definable types with the same restriction to K_0 , they must be equal, and so $\text{tp}(b/K) = r = q$. \square

2.3 Valued vector spaces

Let K be a valued field. The following definition appears in [Hru14, Joh20], among other places.

Definition 2.9. Let V be a K -vector space. A *valued vector space structure* or (*VVS structure*) on V consists of the following data:

1. A linearly ordered set $\Gamma(V)$.
2. An action of Γ on $\Gamma(V)$

$$+ : \Gamma \times \Gamma(V) \rightarrow \Gamma(V),$$
strictly increasing in each variable.
3. A surjective function $\text{val} : V \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \Gamma(V)$ satisfying the axioms

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}(av) &= \text{val}(a) + \text{val}(v) && (\text{for } a \in K, v \in V) \\ \text{val}(v + w) &\geq \min(\text{val}(v), \text{val}(w)) && (\text{for } v, w \in V) \end{aligned}$$

where we formally extend val to $0 \in V$ by taking $\text{val}(0) = +\infty > \Gamma(V)$.

We identify two VVS structures if they induce the same divisibility relation $\text{val}(v) \leq \text{val}(w)$ on V . A *valued K -vector space* is a K -vector space with a VVS structure. If V is a definable K -vector space, then a VVS structure on V is *definable* if the divisibility relation $\text{val}(v) \leq \text{val}(w)$ is definable.

Remark 2.10. If V is a valued K -vector space and $\dim_K(V) = n < \infty$, then there are at most n orbits of Γ in $\Gamma(V)$, by [Hru14, Section 2.5] or [Joh20, Remark 2.2]. In fact, if $v_1, \dots, v_m \in V$ are such that $\text{val}(v_1), \dots, \text{val}(v_m)$ are in distinct orbits of Γ , then v_1, \dots, v_m are K -linearly independent.

Remark 2.11. If $\dim_K V = 1$, then there is a unique VVS structure on V .

Definition 2.12. Let V be an n -dimensional valued K -vector space. A *splitting basis* is a set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\} \subseteq V$ such that

$$\Gamma + \text{val}(v_1) > \Gamma + \text{val}(v_2) > \dots > \Gamma + \text{val}(v_n).$$

A valued K -vector space or a VVS structure is *split* if a splitting basis exists.

If $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is a splitting basis, then $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is a basis and every coset has the form $\Gamma + \text{val}(v_i)$, by Remark 2.10.

Definition 2.13. If V is an n -dimensional K -vector space, a *complete filtration* is a chain of K -linear subspaces of length $n + 1$:

$$0 = V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_{n-1} \subset V_n = V.$$

Proposition 2.14. Let V be a split n -dimensional valued K -vector space. Let C_1, \dots, C_n be the cosets of Γ , ordered so that $C_1 > C_2 > \dots > C_n$. For $0 \leq i \leq n$, let $V_i = \{0\} \cup \{x \in V : \text{val}(x) \in \bigcup_{j=1}^i C_j\}$. Then V_i is a K -linear subspace, $\{V_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ is a complete filtration, and the VVS structure on V is determined by the filtration $\{V_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq n}$.

Proof. Take a splitting basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. By the ultrametric inequality, V_i is the K -linear span of $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$, so $\{V_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ is a complete filtration. The ultrametric inequality also shows that $\text{val} : V_i \setminus V_{i-1} \rightarrow C_i$ is induced by a VVS structure on V_i/V_{i-1} . As V_i/V_{i-1} is one-dimensional, there is a unique such VVS structure. Consequently, the VVS structure is determined by the filtration as follows. Suppose $x, y \in V$ are non-zero. Let i, j be such that $x \in V_i \setminus V_{i-1}$ and $y \in V_j \setminus V_{j-1}$. If $i < j$ then $\text{val}(x) > \text{val}(y)$. If $i > j$ then $\text{val}(x) < \text{val}(y)$. Finally, if $i = j$, the $\text{val}(x) \leq \text{val}(y) \iff \text{val}'(x) \leq \text{val}'(y)$, where val' is the unique VVS structure on the quotient space V_i/V_{i-1} . \square

Definition 2.15. If τ is a split VVS structure on V , the *associated filtration* is the complete filtration $\{V_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ on V from Proposition 2.14.

Remark 2.16. Let V be a finite-dimensional K -vector space and let τ be a split VVS structure on V with splitting basis v_1, \dots, v_n . Let τ' be another VVS structure on V . Then $\tau' = \tau$ if and only if

$$\Gamma + \text{val}_{\tau'}(v_1) > \dots > \Gamma + \text{val}_{\tau'}(v_n),$$

i.e., v_1, \dots, v_n is a splitting basis of τ' . Indeed, if v_1, \dots, v_n is a splitting basis of τ' , then τ' is split and has the same associated filtration as τ , so $\tau' = \tau$ by Proposition 2.14.

Proposition 2.17. *Work in the \mathcal{L}_{div} -structure K . If τ is a split definable VVS structure on K^n , then the code $\ulcorner \tau \urcorner$ is interdefinable with a real tuple in K .*

Proof. The code for τ is the code for the associated filtration $\{V_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq n}$. Subspaces of K^n have real codes by [Joh20, Lemma 4.3]. \square

For the rest of the section, assume $K \models p\text{CF}$.

Fact 2.18. *Suppose $M \succeq K$, $b \in M^1$, and $\text{tp}(b/K)$ is definable. If $\text{val}(b) \geq 0$, then there is $a \in K$ such that $b - a$ is K -infinitesimal, in the sense that $\text{val}(b - a) > \Gamma(K)$.*

Fact 2.18 is well-known, and can be extracted from the proofs of [JY22b, Lemma 2.22] or the $p\text{CF}$ case of [CKY21, Theorem 5.9].

Lemma 2.19. *Suppose $M \succeq K$, a is a tuple in M , and $\text{tp}(a/K)$ is definable. Let $V \subseteq K(a)$ be a finite-dimensional K -linear subspace, with the induced VVS structure. Then V is split.*

Proof. By definable Skolem functions, $\text{dcl}(Ka) \preceq M$. Shrinking M we may assume $M = \text{dcl}(Ka)$. Then $\text{tp}(b/K)$ is definable for any finite tuple b in M . Indeed, we can write b as $f(a)$ for some K -definable function f , and then $\text{tp}(b/K)$ is the pushforward of the definable type $\text{tp}(a/K)$ along the definable function f . Let $n = \dim_K(V)$.

Claim 2.20. *For $0 \leq i \leq n$, there is a basis b_1, \dots, b_n of V such that*

$$\Gamma(K) + \text{val}(b_1) < \Gamma(K) + \text{val}(b_2) < \dots < \Gamma(K) + \text{val}(b_i),$$

and $\Gamma(K) + \text{val}(b_i) < \Gamma(K) + \text{val}(b_j)$ for $j > i$.

Proof. Proceed by induction on i . For the base case $i = 0$, any basis is suitable. Suppose c_1, \dots, c_n is a suitable basis for some $i < n$. Permuting c_{i+1}, \dots, c_n , we may assume $\text{val}(c_1) < \dots < \text{val}(c_n)$. For $j > i + 1$, the model M contains $c_j c_{i+1}^{-1}$, and so $\text{tp}(c_j c_{i+1}^{-1}/K)$ is definable. Note $\text{val}(c_j c_{i+1}^{-1}) = \text{val}(c_j) - \text{val}(c_{i+1}) \geq 0$. By Fact 2.18, there is $u_j \in K$ such that $c_j c_{i+1}^{-1} - u_j$ is K -infinitesimal, in the sense that

$$\text{val}(c_j c_{i+1}^{-1} - u_j) > \Gamma(K).$$

Then $\text{val}(c_j - u_j c_{i+1}) > \Gamma(K) + \text{val}(c_{i+1})$. Replacing c_j with $c_j - u_j c_{i+1}$ for $j = i + 2, \dots, n$, we get a suitable basis for $i + 1$. \square_{Claim}

Taking $i = n$, we get a splitting basis for V . \square

The proof of Lemma 2.19 is based on the idea of [CKY21, Lemma 5.11].

3 Analysis of definable types in $p\text{CF}$

3.1 Quantifier-free types

Work in the \mathcal{L}_{div} language, where $p\text{CF}$ does *not* have quantifier elimination. Let K be a small model of $p\text{CF}$, embedded in a monster model \mathbb{M} . Let $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]_{<d}$ be the set of polynomials with homogeneous degree less than d . We abbreviate the tuple (x_1, \dots, x_n) as x .

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $a \in \mathbb{M}^n$ and $q = \text{qftp}(a/K)$. Let I_d be the kernel of the map*

$$\begin{aligned} K[x]_{<d} &\rightarrow \mathbb{M} \\ P(x) &\mapsto P(a). \end{aligned}$$

Let τ_d be the VVS structure on $K[x]_{<d}/I_d$ induced as a subspace of \mathbb{M} .

1. *The subspaces I_d and VVS structures τ_d depend only $q = \text{qftp}(a/K)$.*
2. *Conversely, q is determined by the collection of all I_d and τ_d .*
3. *If q is definable, then each τ_d is definable.*
4. *If q is definable, each τ_d is split.*

Proof. Every atomic $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}(K)$ -formula has the form $P(x) = Q(x)$ or $\text{val}(P(x)) \leq \text{val}(Q(x))$ for some d and some $P(x), Q(x) \in K[x]_{<d}$. Note

$$\begin{aligned} q(x) \vdash (P(x) = Q(x)) &\iff P - Q \in I_d \\ q(x) \vdash (\text{val}(P(x)) \leq \text{val}(Q(x))) &\iff \text{val}_{\tau_d}(P) \leq \text{val}_{\tau_d}(Q) \\ P \in I_d &\iff q(x) \vdash (P(x) = 0). \end{aligned}$$

Then (1)–(3) are clear. Part (4) is a rephrasing of Lemma 2.19. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let q be a definable quantifier-free n -type over K . Then $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ is interdefinable with a real tuple (possibly infinite).*

Proof. Take $a \in \mathbb{M}^n$ realizing q . Let I_d and τ_d be as in Lemma 3.1. The I_d are definable (as K -linear subspaces of some K^N), and the VVS structures τ_d are definable by Lemma 3.1(3). By part (4) of the lemma, each τ_d is split. By parts (1) and (2) of the lemma, $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ is interdefinable with the infinite tuple $(\ulcorner I_d \urcorner \ulcorner \tau_d \urcorner : d < \omega)$. We can take $\ulcorner I_d \urcorner$ to be real by [Joh20, Lemma 4.3] and $\ulcorner \tau_d \urcorner$ to be real by Proposition 2.17. □

Recall from Remark 1.2 that we identify partial types with families of definable sets, so that we can talk about a partial type *extending* a family of definable sets, or a family of definable sets *generating* a partial type. Also recall the notion of Γ -families from Definition 1.4.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $q(x)$ be a definable quantifier-free n -type over K . Then q is generated by countably many Γ -families. Moreover, we can take each Γ -family to be definable over $\ulcorner q \urcorner$.*

In other words, there are $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ -definable Γ -families $\{X_{i,\gamma}\}_\gamma$ for $i < \omega$ such that $q(\mathbb{M}) = \bigcap_i \bigcap_{\gamma \in \Gamma(K)} X_{i,\gamma}(\mathbb{M})$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.2 we can assume $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ is a real tuple. Let K_0 be $\text{dcl}(\ulcorner q \urcorner)$; then $K_0 \preceq K$ by definable Skolem functions.

Take $a \in \mathbb{M}^n$ realizing q . Let I_d and τ_d be as in Lemma 3.1. By parts (3) and (4) of the lemma, each τ_d is split and definable. Take $Q_{d,1}, \dots, Q_{d,m_d} \in K[x]_{<d}$ a basis of I_d . Take $P_{d,1}, \dots, P_{d,n_d} \in K[x]_{<d}$ such that $\{P_{d,1}, \dots, P_{d,n_d}\}$ is a splitting basis of $(K[x]_{<d}/I_d, \tau_d)$. As I_d and τ_d are K_0 -definable and $K_0 \preceq K$, we can take Q and P to have coefficients in K_0 .

Suppose $a' \in \mathbb{M}^n$. By parts (1) and (2) of Lemma 3.1, $\text{qftp}(a'/K) = q$ if and only if a' yields the same subspaces I_d and the same VVS structures τ_d as a . By Remark 2.16, a' induces the VVS structure τ_d if and only if

$$\Gamma(K) + \text{val}(P_{d,1}(a')) > \Gamma(K) + \text{val}(P_{d,2}(a')) > \dots > \Gamma(K) + \text{val}(P_{d,n_d}(a')).$$

In summary, a' realizes $q = \text{qftp}(a/K)$ if and only if the following conditions hold:

- $Q_{d,i}(a') = 0$ for any d and $1 \leq i \leq m_d$.
- $P_{d,i}(a') \neq 0$ for any d and $1 \leq i \leq n_d$.
- $\text{val}(P_{d,i}(a')) - \text{val}(P_{d,j}(a')) > \gamma$ for any d , any $1 \leq i < j \leq n_d$, and any $\gamma \in \Gamma(K)$.

Each of these conditions (for fixed d, i, j) is expressed by a K_0 -definable Γ -family, possibly a constant family not depending on the parameter $\gamma \in \Gamma$. \square

3.2 Complete types

Theorem 3.4. *Let K be a model of $p\text{CF}$. Let q be a definable n -type over K . Then q is coded by a real tuple, possibly infinite.*

Proof. Let \hat{q} be the quantifier-free part of q , and let $\ulcorner \hat{q} \urcorner$ be its code. By Proposition 3.2, we can take $\ulcorner \hat{q} \urcorner$ to be a real tuple. Let $K_0 = \text{dcl}(\ulcorner \hat{q} \urcorner)$. Then $K_0 \preceq K$ because $p\text{CF}$ has definable Skolem functions. The fact that \hat{q} is K_0 -definable implies that q is K_0 -definable, by Lemma 2.8(1). Then $\ulcorner q \urcorner \in \text{dcl}(\ulcorner \hat{q} \urcorner)$. On the other hand, \hat{q} is determined by q , so $\ulcorner \hat{q} \urcorner \in \text{dcl}(\ulcorner q \urcorner)$. Therefore \hat{q} and q are interdefinable, and q is coded by a real tuple because \hat{q} is. \square

In particular, we see from the proof that any definable type is interdefinable with its quantifier-free part.

Theorem 3.5. *Let K be a model of $p\text{CF}$. Let q be a definable n -type over K . Then q is generated by countably many Γ -families definable over $\ulcorner q \urcorner$.*

Proof. Let \hat{q} be the quantifier-free part of q . As in the proof of Theorem 3.4, let $K_0 = \text{dcl}(\ulcorner \hat{q} \urcorner) = \text{dcl}(\ulcorner q \urcorner)$. As the language is countable, the code $\ulcorner \hat{q} \urcorner$ is countable and K_0 is countable. By Lemma 2.8(2), q is generated by \hat{q} and $q \upharpoonright K_0$:

$$\hat{q}(x) \cup (q \upharpoonright K_0)(x) \vdash q(x).$$

By Proposition 3.3, $\hat{q}(x)$ is generated by countably many Γ -families. On the other hand $q \upharpoonright K_0$ consists of countably many $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}(K_0)$ -formulas, each of which can be regarded as a degenerate, constant Γ -family. Therefore $q(x)$ is generated by countably many Γ -families. \square

Recall from Definition 1.3 that one definable family $\{D_a\}_{a \in X}$ *refines* another family $\{D'_b\}_{b \in Y}$ if for any $b \in Y$, there is $a \in X$ such that $D_a \subseteq D'_b$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let K be a model of $p\text{CF}$. Let $q \in S_n(K)$ be a definable type. Let $\{D_a\}_{a \in Y}$ be a definable family of sets such that q extends $\{D_a\}_{a \in Y}$. Then there is a Γ -family $\{X_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ such that q extends $\{X_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ and $\{X_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ refines $\{D_a\}_{a \in Y}$.*

Proof. Let $L \succeq K$ be a κ -saturated elementary extension for some $\kappa \gg \aleph_0$. Let $r \in S_n(L)$ be the heir of q . Note that $r(x) \vdash x \in D_a$ for any $a \in Y(L)$. By Theorem 3.5, the K -definable type $r(x)$ is generated by $\{Z_{\alpha, \gamma} : \alpha < \omega, \gamma \in \Gamma(L)\}$ where $\{Z_{\alpha, \gamma}\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ is a K -definable Γ -family for each $\alpha < \omega$. Then for each $a \in Y(L)$, $r(x) \vdash x \in D_a$, so by compactness there are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m < \omega$ and $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in \Gamma(L)$ such that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^m Z_{\alpha_i, \gamma_i} \subseteq D_a.$$

By saturation, we can assume the α_i always come from some finite set $S \subseteq \omega$. Take $X_\gamma = \bigcap_{\alpha \in S} Z_{\alpha, \gamma}$. Then $\{X_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ refines $\{D_a\}_{a \in Y}$. The fact that $r(x) \vdash x \in X_\gamma$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma(L)$ implies that $q(x) = (r \upharpoonright K)(x) \vdash x \in X_\gamma$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma(K)$. \square

3.3 Comparison with ACVF

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is formally similar to the analysis of definable types in ACVF in [Joh20, §5.2]. (ACVF is the theory of algebraically closed valued fields.) In both cases, one finds a code for a definable type $\text{tp}(b/K)$ by looking at finite-dimensional subspaces of $K[b]$ as valued vector spaces. In both cases, one can analyze the structure of these valued vector spaces, showing that they are coded in a natural way by tuples from the home sort and geometric sorts ([Joh20, Theorem 5.3], Proposition 2.17). For $p\text{CF}$, the geometric sorts turn out to be unnecessary, and the resulting code is a tuple in the home sort. This contrasts with ACVF, where the geometric sorts are strictly necessary. In fact, in ACVF *every* imaginary is interalgebraic with the code of a definable type [Joh20, Theorems 4.1, 5.14], so one could not hope for definable types to be coded by tuples in the home sort alone.

3.4 The necessity of infinite codes

Let K be a p -adically closed field and $q \in S_n(K)$ be a definable type. By Theorem 3.4, the code $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ can be taken to be a tuple in K , rather than K^{eq} . If $\dim(q) = 1$, then we can even take a finite tuple [JY22a, Theorem 2.7]. This suggests the question of whether infinite tuples are necessary in Theorem 3.4.

Proposition 3.7. *There is a definable 2-type $q(x, y) \in S_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ such that $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ is not interdefinable with any finite tuple in \mathbb{Q}_p .*

Proof. By Fact 3.8 below, any type over \mathbb{Q}_p is definable. Take $a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} . Take a monster model $\mathbb{M} \succeq \mathbb{Q}_p$. Take non-zero $b \in \mathbb{M}$ infinitesimal over \mathbb{Q}_p , in the sense that $\text{val}(b) > \Gamma(\mathbb{Q}_p) = \mathbb{Z}$. Take $c \in \mathbb{M}$ a pseudolimit of the sequence $e_n = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i b^{2^i}$. As noted above, $q(x, y) := \text{tp}(b, c/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is definable. By Theorem 3.4, q is coded by a tuple $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ in \mathbb{Q}_p . By definability of $q(x, y)$, the set

$$\left\{ (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{n+1} : \text{val} \left(c - \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i b^{2^i} \right) > \text{val}(b^{2^{n+1}}) \right\}$$

is definable over $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ for each n . By choice of c ,

$$\text{val} \left(c - \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i b^{2^i} \right) > \text{val}(b^{2^{n+1}}) \iff (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) = (a_0, \dots, a_n).$$

Therefore $(a_0, \dots, a_n) \in \text{dcl}(\ulcorner q \urcorner)$ for each n . Then

$$n + 1 = \dim(a_0, \dots, a_n/\emptyset) \leq \dim(\ulcorner q \urcorner/\emptyset)$$

for all n , which implies $\dim(\ulcorner q \urcorner/\emptyset)$ is infinite, which implies $\ulcorner q \urcorner$ cannot be a finite tuple. \square

Fact 3.8 (Delon [Del89]). *Any type $p \in S_n(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is definable.*

We give a self-contained proof of Fact 3.8 in the appendix (Theorem A.5).

4 Application to *dfg* groups

Recall the notion of groups with definable f-generics (*dfg*) from Definition 1.11.

Theorem 4.1. *In a model of pCF, suppose G is an interpretable *dfg* group and X is a definable set with a definable action of G . Then the quotient space X/G (the set of orbits) is definable. More precisely, the interpretable set X/G is in interpretable bijection with a definable set.*

Proof. Work in a monster model \mathbb{M} . Fix a definable type $q \in G$ with boundedly many right translates. Let M_0 be a small model over which X, G, q are defined. It suffices to show that each element of X/G is interdefinable over M_0 with a real tuple (possibly infinite). By Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.2, it suffices to show that each element of X/G is *interalgebraic* over M_0 with a real tuple. For $g \in G$, let $\rho_g : G \rightarrow G$ be the function $\rho_g(x) = x \cdot g$. For $a \in X$, let $\tau_a : G \rightarrow X$ be the function $\tau_a(x) = x \cdot a$.

Take any $e \in X/G$. We claim that e is interalgebraic over M_0 with a real tuple, possibly infinite. Take any $a \in X$ lifting $e \in X/G$. Consider the global definable type $\tau_{a,*}q$ obtained by pushing forward q along τ_a . Then $\tau_{a,*}q$ is concentrated on the definable set X , so it is a definable n -type for some n and $\ulcorner \tau_{a,*}q \urcorner$ is a real tuple by Theorem 3.4. The range of τ_a is the orbit $G \cdot a$ coded by e , so the definable type $\tau_{a,*}q$ is concentrated on this orbit $G \cdot a$ and therefore $e \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(\ulcorner \tau_{a,*}q \urcorner)$.

Claim 4.2. *If $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/eM_0)$, then $\sigma(\tau_{a,*}q)$ is $\tau_{a,*}\rho_{g,*}q$ for some $g \in G$.*

Proof. As σ fixes e , we have $\sigma(a) = g \cdot a$ for some $g \in G$. As q is M_0 -definable, $\sigma(q) = q$, and so $\sigma(\tau_{a,*}q) = \tau_{\sigma(a),*}q$. But $\tau_{\sigma(a)}(x) = x \cdot \sigma(a) = x \cdot g \cdot a = \tau_a(\rho_g(x))$. Therefore,

$$\sigma(\tau_{a,*}q) = \tau_{\sigma(a),*}q = \tau_{a,*}\rho_{g,*}q. \quad \square_{\text{Claim}}$$

By choice of q , there are only a small number of $\rho_{g,*}q$ as g varies, and therefore there are only a small number of $\sigma(\tau_{a,*}q)$ as σ varies in $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/e)$. It follows that $\ulcorner \tau_{a,*}q \urcorner \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(e)$. Thus e is interalgebraic with the real tuple $\ulcorner \tau_{a,*}q \urcorner$. \square

The following corollary is immediate:

Corollary 4.3. *Let G be a definable group and let H be a definable normal subgroup. If H has *dfg*, then G/H is definable.*

We can also strengthen some results of Pillay and Yao:

Corollary 4.4. *Let G be a definable group and let H be a definable subgroup with *dfg*. If $\dim(H) = \dim(G)$, then H has finite index in G .*

Proof. The quotient space G/H is a definable set, and $\dim(G/H) + \dim(H) = \dim(G)$, so $\dim(G/H) = 0$, which implies G/H is finite. \square

In particular, if H is an open subgroup of G (with respect to the Pillay topology on G), and H has *dfg*, then H has finite index. This answers Question 2 in [PY19].

5 Directed families and definable types in $p\text{CF}$

Let K be a model of $p\text{CF}$.

Fact 5.1. *Let $\mathbb{M} \succeq K$ be a monster model. Let $\varphi(x, b)$ with $b \in \mathbb{M}$ be non-forking over K (or equivalently by [CK12], non-dividing over K). Then $\varphi(x, b)$ extends to a global K -definable type.*

This was shown for a large class of dp-minimal theories, including those with definable Skolem functions, by Simon and Starchenko [SS14]. By a compactness argument Fact 5.1 can be restated, in a slightly weaker form, as follows. Recall that $S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$ denotes the space of definable n -types over K .

Corollary 5.2. *If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(K^n)$ is a definable family of sets in K with the finite intersection property, then \mathcal{F} can be partitioned into finitely many subfamilies, each of which extends to a definable type in $S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{M} \succeq K$ be a monster model. Let $\varphi(x, y)$ and $\psi(y)$ be $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}(K)$ -formulas such that $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi(K, a) : a \in \psi(K)\}$ has the finite intersection property. If $q \in S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$, let $q^{\mathbb{M}}$ denote the extension of q by the same definition scheme to a global K -definable type. For each $q \in S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$, let $D_q = \{a \in \psi(\mathbb{M}) : q^{\mathbb{M}}(x) \vdash \varphi(x, a)\}$. Each D_q is K -definable. If $a \in \psi(\mathbb{M})$, then $\varphi(x, a)$ doesn't divide over K because \mathcal{F} has the finite intersection property. By Fact 5.1, $\varphi(x, a) \in q^{\mathbb{M}}(x)$ for some $q \in S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$. Therefore $\psi(\mathbb{M}) \subseteq \bigcup_{q \in S_n^{\text{def}}(K)} D_q$. By compactness, there are finitely many $q_1, \dots, q_m \in S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$ with $\psi(\mathbb{M}) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^m D_{q_i}$. This means that for every $a \in \psi(\mathbb{M})$, there is some i such that $\varphi(x, a) \in q_i^{\mathbb{M}}(x)$. Therefore, for every $a \in \psi(K)$, there is some i such that $\varphi(x, a) \in q_i(x)$. \square

Remark 5.3. A family of sets \mathcal{S} has the (m, n) -property, for integers $m \geq n \geq 1$, if the sets in \mathcal{S} are non-empty and, for any m distinct sets in \mathcal{S} , there exists n among them with non-empty intersection.

Let $\mathbb{M} \succeq K$ be a monster model. In Appendix B (Corollary B.5 and Fact B.6) we show that, for any $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}(K)$ -formulas $\varphi(x, y)$ and $\psi(y)$, if the family $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi(K, a) : a \in \psi(K)\}$ has the $(m, 2|x|)$ -property, for some $m \geq 2|x|$, then $\varphi(x, a)$ does not divide over K for any $a \in \psi(\mathbb{M})$. It follows that, by minimally adapting its proof, Corollary 5.2 can be strengthened to the following statement:

Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(K^n)$ be a definable family of sets in K with the $(m, 2n)$ -property for some $m \geq 2n$. Then \mathcal{F} can be partitioned into finitely many subfamilies, each of which extends to a definable type in $S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$.

Say that a family of sets \mathcal{F} is *downward directed* if \mathcal{F} is non-empty, and for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$ there is $Z \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $Z \subseteq X \cap Y$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathcal{F} be a definable downward directed family of sets in a structure M and p_1, \dots, p_n be types over M such that, for every $D \in \mathcal{F}$, there is some $i \leq n$ such that $D \in p_i$. Then there exists some $i \leq n$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq p_i$.*

Proof. Towards a contradiction suppose that, for every $i \leq n$, there exists some $D_i \in \mathcal{F}$ with $D_i \notin p_i$. By downward directedness there exists some $D \in \mathcal{F}$ with $D \subseteq \bigcap_{i \leq n} D_i$, which will satisfy $D \notin p_i$ for every $i \leq n$. \square

Recall the notion of “T-family” from Definition 1.4.

Proposition 5.5. *Let \mathcal{F} be a definable downward directed family of non-empty sets in K .*

1. \mathcal{F} extends to a definable type.

2. \mathcal{F} is refined by some Γ -family.

Proof. 1. \mathcal{F} has the finite intersection property. Apply Corollary 5.2 and Lemma 5.4.

2. By part (1), there is a definable type p refining \mathcal{F} . Apply Proposition 3.6. \square

Theorem 5.6. *Let \mathcal{F} be a definable family of sets in K . The following are equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{F} extends to a definable type $p \in S_n^{\text{def}}(K)$.

2. \mathcal{F} is refined by a Γ -family.

3. \mathcal{F} is refined by a downward directed definable family of non-empty sets.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Proposition 3.6.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Γ -families are downward directed.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). Proposition 5.5(1). \square

6 Spaces of definable types in $p\text{CF}$

In this section, we review the notions of pro-definable and strict pro-definable sets from [Kam07] and [HL16, Section 2.2], as well as the results of Cubides Kovacsics, Hils, and Ye [CKY21, CKHY21] on the strict pro-definability of the space of definable types in certain theories including $p\text{CF}$.

Let \mathbb{M} be a monster model of some theory. Recall that a **-type* is a partial type in infinitely (or finitely) many variables. A *pro-definable set* is a set defined by a (small) *-type³. For example, definable sets and type-definable sets (in finitely many variables) are pro-definable. Infinite products of definable sets are pro-definable. If X, Y are pro-definable sets, then a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is *pro-definable* if the graph of f is pro-definable as a subset of $X \times Y$. This yields a category of pro-definable sets. If X is pro-definable, a subset $D \subseteq X$ is *relatively definable* (in X) if D is defined as a subset of X by an $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$ -formula (mentioning only finitely many variables). By compactness, this is equivalent to D and $X \setminus D$ both being pro-definable.

Any pro-definable set X sits inside a product $X \subseteq \prod_{i \in I} D_i$ of definable sets, where I is small, but possibly infinite (for example, we can take D_i to be the sort of the i th variable in the tuple of variables). For $J \subseteq I$, let $\pi_J : \prod_{i \in I} D_i \rightarrow \prod_{i \in J} D_i$ be the projection. Following Hrushovski and Loeser [HL16, Section 2.2], one says that X is *strictly pro-definable* if the following equivalent conditions hold:

³More precisely, these should be called “*-definable sets” rather than “pro-definable sets.” However, the categories of pro-definable sets and *-definable sets are equivalent: This is mentioned in [HL16, Section 2.2], and easy to see from the explicit description of the pro-definable category in [Kam07, Corollary 8]. We believe *-definable sets are conceptually simpler than genuine pro-definable sets.

1. For any finite $J \subseteq I$, the set $\pi_J(X)$ is a definable subset of $\prod_{i \in J} D_i$.
2. For any definable set Y and pro-definable function $f : X \rightarrow Y$, the image $f(X)$ is definable.

The first condition is more practical to work with, while the second condition shows that strictness is an intrinsic property. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is left as an exercise to the reader. A *(strictly) pro-interpretable* set is a (strictly) pro-definable set in \mathbb{M}^{eq} . For future use, we record a useful fact about strict pro-definability:

Remark 6.1 (Quantification over strictly pro-definable sets). Let X, Y be pro-definable sets. Let $R \subseteq X \times Y$ be relatively definable. If X is strictly pro-definable, then the sets

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\exists} &= \{b \in Y : (\exists a \in X) R(a, b)\} \\ R_{\forall} &= \{b \in Y : (\forall a \in X) R(a, b)\} \end{aligned}$$

are relatively definable subsets of Y .

Proof. Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be an $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$ -formula defining R . Then $\varphi(x, y)$ uses only finitely many variables from x , so it is equivalent to $\varphi'(\pi(x), y)$ where π is a coordinate projection onto finitely many coordinates. Replacing X with $\pi(X)$ and φ with φ' , we may assume X is definable, rather than pro-definable. Then R_{\exists} and R_{\forall} are defined by the first-order $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$ -formulas $\exists x \in X \varphi(x, y)$ and $\forall x \in X \varphi(x, y)$. \square

Recall that $S_n^{\text{def}}(M)$ denotes the space of definable types over a model M . Recall that an \mathcal{L} -theory T has *uniform definability of definable types*⁴ (UDDT) if definable types are uniformly definable in models of T : for any \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$ there is an \mathcal{L} -formula $\psi(y, z)$ such that if $M \models T$ and $p \in S_x^{\text{def}}(M)$, then there is $c_{p, \varphi} \in M^z$ such that

$$\{b \in M^y : \varphi(x, b) \in p(x)\} = \psi(M, c_{p, \varphi}).$$

Replacing ψ with an \mathcal{L}^{eq} -formula, we may assume that

$$\psi(M, c) = \psi(M, c') \implies c = c',$$

and then $c_{p, \varphi}$ is uniquely determined. Fix such a formula $\psi = d(\varphi)$ for each φ . For any variable tuple x , let $\mathcal{L}(x)$ denote the set of partitioned \mathcal{L} -formulas of the form $\varphi(x; y)$ (with varying y). Note that the map

$$p \mapsto (c_{p, \varphi} : \varphi \in \mathcal{L}(x)) \tag{\dagger}$$

is injective on $S_x^{\text{def}}(M)$. Now, suppose the model M is a monster model \mathbb{M} . If $X \subseteq \mathbb{M}^x$ is definable, let X^{def} be the image of $S_X^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$ under the map (\dagger) .

Fact 6.2. *Assuming UDDT, X^{def} is pro-interpretable.*

⁴Called “uniform definability of types” in [CKY21].

This fact is proved by Cubides Kovacsics and Ye [CKY21, Proposition 4.1] building off an argument of Hrushovski and Loeser [HL16, Lemma 2.4.1]. Fact 6.2 lets us identify $S_X^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$ with the pro-interpretable set X^{def} . Restricting to $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/M)$ -invariant points, we can identify $S_X^{\text{def}}(M)$ with $X^{\text{def}}(M)$ for any small model M .

Fact 6.3 (Cubides-Ye [CKY21]). *The theory $p\text{CF}$ has UDDT.*

Consequently, the pro-interpretable set X^{def} exists for any definable set X .

Fact 6.4 (Cubides, Hils, Ye [CKHY21]). *In $p\text{CF}$, the pro-interpretable set X^{def} is strictly pro-interpretable.*

To be self-contained, we give proofs of Facts 6.3 and 6.4 in the appendix (Theorems A.7 and A.8).

The existence of real codes for definable types implies the following:

Theorem 6.5. *Work in a monster model \mathbb{M} of $p\text{CF}$. If X is a definable set, then the pro-interpretable set X^{def} is pro-definable. (More precisely, it is in pro-interpretable bijection with a pro-definable set.)*

Proof. Fix a small set A over which X is definable. If $q \in S_X^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$, then the tuple $c = (c_{q,\varphi} : \varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}(x)) \in X^{\text{def}}$ is a code for q . By Theorem 3.4, c is interdefinable with a real tuple. It follows that

Every point c in X^{def} is interdefinable over A with a real tuple.

The following general fact completes the proof:

Claim 6.6. *If X is pro-interpretable over A and every point of X is interdefinable over A with a real tuple, then there is a bijection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ where Y is pro-definable over A and f is pro-interpretable over A .*

The proof of this fact is subtle, so we include it. It suffices to find an A -pro-interpretable injection $f : X \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} D_i$ where the D_i are A -definable, as we can then take Y to be the A -pro-definable image of f . Equivalently, we need to find a jointly injective family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ of A -pro-interpretable maps $f_i : X \rightarrow D_i$ where the sets D_i are A -definable. We may as well take \mathcal{F} to be the collection of *all* A -pro-interpretable maps $f : X \rightarrow D$ with A -definable D .

Fix distinct $x, x' \in X$. We must find $f : X \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{F} separating x and x' . If $x \not\equiv_A x'$, then there is a relatively A -interpretable set $U \subseteq X$ distinguishing x and x' , and so we can find an A -pro-interpretable function $f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ separating x and x' . Next suppose that $x \equiv_A x'$. Take $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/A)$ with $\sigma(x) = x'$. By assumption, there is a real tuple y interdefinable with x over A . Then $\sigma(y) \neq y$. Let z be one of the coordinates of y such that $\sigma(z) \neq z$. Then $z \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(x)$, so we can write z as $f_0(x_0)$ for some finite subtuple of x_0 and some A -interpretable function f_0 . Let π be the coordinate projection sending x to x_0 . Extending f_0 by zero, we may assume the domain of f_0 contains $\pi(X)$. Let $f = f_0 \circ \pi$. Then f is an A -pro-interpretable function from X to the home sort, and $f(x) = z$. Finally,

$$f(x') = f(\sigma(x)) = \sigma(f(x)) = \sigma(z) \neq z = f(x),$$

and so f separates x and x' as desired. \square

For future use, we make two observations on arbitrary theories with UDDT:

Remark 6.7 (Assuming UDDT). Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be an \mathcal{L} -formula and let X be a definable set. Under the identification of $S_X^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$ with X^{def} , the set

$$\{(b, p) \in \mathbb{M}^y \times X^{\text{def}} : \varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) \in p\}$$

is relatively definable in $\mathbb{M}^y \times X^{\text{def}}$, essentially by construction.⁵ It follows that if $\{D_b\}_{b \in Y}$ is a definable family of subsets of X , then the following set is relatively definable in $Y \times X^{\text{def}}$:

$$\{(b, p) \in Y \times X^{\text{def}} : D_b \in p\}.$$

Lemma 6.8 (Assuming UDDT). *Let $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a small collection of definable families. Suppose that for each finite $I_0 \subseteq I$, the definable family $\bigcup_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{F}_i$ extends to a definable type. Then $\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i$ extends to a definable type.*

Proof. For each $i \in I$, let $D_i \subseteq X^{\text{def}}$ be the set of $p \in S_n^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$ extending \mathcal{F}_i . We claim that D_i is relatively definable in X^{def} . Indeed, if \mathcal{F}_i is $\{Y_c\}_{c \in Z}$, then

$$D_i = \{p \in X^{\text{def}} : (\forall c \in Z) Y_c \in p\},$$

and this condition is first-order by Remark 6.7.

The assumption is that any finite intersection of D_i 's is non-empty, and the conclusion is that the intersection of all D_i 's is non-empty. As the D_i 's are relatively definable subsets of the pro-interpretable set X^{def} , the conclusion holds by compactness. \square

7 Definable types in $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$

In this section we extend results from Sections 3, 5 and 6 from $p\text{CF}$ to $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$. We use these in Section 8 to prove results about interpretable topological spaces. If one only cares about *definable* topological spaces, this section can be skipped.

Lemma 7.1 (like Fact 3.8). *Every type over \mathbb{Q}_p^{eq} is definable.*

Proof. If $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ is an interpretable surjection with \tilde{X} definable, then we can lift types in X to types in \tilde{X} : the map $S_{\tilde{X}}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \rightarrow S_X(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is surjective. But $S_{\tilde{X}}^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{Q}_p) = S_{\tilde{X}}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ by Fact 3.8, and $S_{\tilde{X}}^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ maps into $S_X^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. \square

7.1 Lifting definable types from K^{eq} to K

Work in a model $K \models p\text{CF}$. Fix an interpretable surjection $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ where \tilde{X} is definable. Let $S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ and $S_{\tilde{X}}^{\text{def}}(K)$ be the spaces of K -definable types on X and \tilde{X} , respectively, and let $\pi_* : S_{\tilde{X}}^{\text{def}}(K) \rightarrow S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ be the pushforward map.

⁵It's defined by $\psi(y, \pi(z))$, where ψ is the uniform definition of φ and π is the coordinate projection on X^{def} picking out the coordinate $c_{p, \varphi}$ from the infinite tuple $(c_{p, \varphi} : \varphi \in \mathcal{L}(x))$.

Lemma 7.2. *Let \mathcal{F} be an interpretable family of subsets of X with the finite intersection property. Then there are finitely many definable types $q_1, \dots, q_n \in S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ such that each set $D \in \mathcal{F}$ belongs to at least one $\pi_* q_i$.*

Proof. Note that $D \in \pi_* q_i \iff \pi^{-1}(D) \in q_i$. Apply Corollary 5.2 to the family $\{\pi^{-1}(D) : D \in \mathcal{F}\}$. \square

The proof of Lemma 7.3 below resembles the proof of Lemma 5.4, except we rely on distal cell decomposition in place of downward directedness.

Lemma 7.3. *Let \mathcal{F} be an interpretable family of subsets of X . If \mathcal{F} extends to a definable type, then \mathcal{F} extends to a definable type of the form $\pi_* q$ for some $q \in S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$.*

Proof. Fix a type $r \in S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ extending \mathcal{F} . By distal cell decomposition [CS18, Fact 2.5], there is an interpretable family \mathcal{G} such that any finite intersection of sets in \mathcal{F} is a finite union of sets in \mathcal{G} . Let $\mathcal{G} \cap r$ be the set of $D \in \mathcal{G}$ with $D \in r$. Then $\mathcal{G} \cap r$ is an interpretable family with the finite intersection property. By Lemma 7.2, there are finitely many $q_1, \dots, q_n \in S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ such that each set in $\mathcal{G} \cap r$ is in $\pi_* q_i$ for at least one i .

We claim that some $\pi_* q_i$ extends \mathcal{F} . Otherwise, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ take $D_i \in \mathcal{F}$ with $D_i \notin \pi_* q_i$. Each D_i is in r , and r is a complete type, so the intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^n D_i$ is in r . We can write this intersection as $\bigcup_{j=1}^m D'_j$ with $D'_j \in \mathcal{G}$. As r is a complete type, some D'_j is in r , and therefore in $\mathcal{G} \cap r$. By choice of the q_i , there is some i such that $D'_j \in \pi_* q_i$. But $D'_j \subseteq D_i$, so then $D_i \in \pi_* q_i$, contradicting the choice of D_i . \square

Lemma 7.4. *If K is sufficiently saturated, then the pushforward map $\pi_* : S_X^{\text{def}}(K) \rightarrow S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ is surjective.*

Proof. Fix $r \in S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$. As r is definable, it is generated by a small union $\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i$ of interpretable families \mathcal{F}_i . For each $i \in I$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i$ be the definable family $\{\pi^{-1}(D) : D \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$. By Lemma 7.3, for any finite $I_0 \subseteq I$ there is $q \in S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ such that $\bigcup_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \pi_* q$, or equivalently, $\bigcup_{i \in I_0} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i \subseteq q$. By Lemma 6.8, there is $q \in S_X^{\text{def}}(K)$ with $\bigcup_{i \in I} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i \subseteq q$, or equivalently, $\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \pi_* q$. Then $\pi_* q$ must be r . \square

7.2 Generation by Γ -families

Proposition 7.5 (like Proposition 3.6). *Suppose $K \models \text{pCF}$ and q is a definable type in K^{eq} . Let \mathcal{F} be an interpretable family such that q extends \mathcal{F} . Then there is an interpretable Γ -family \mathcal{G} such that q extends \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G} refines \mathcal{F} .*

Proof. Passing to an elementary extension $K' \succeq K$, we may assume K is \aleph_1 -saturated.⁶ Let X be the interpretable set where q lives, and let \tilde{X} be a definable set with an interpretable

⁶To return from K' to K , let b_0 be a tuple in K' defining the Γ -family \mathcal{G} , and write \mathcal{G} as \mathcal{G}_{b_0} to make the dependence on b_0 explicit. Let D be the set of $b \in K'$ such that \mathcal{G}_b is a Γ -family refining \mathcal{F} and extended by q . As q is K -definable, the set D is K -definable. As $K \preceq K'$, we can replace $b_0 \in D$ with a K -definable tuple $b_1 \in D$, getting a K -definable Γ -family.

surjection $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$. By \aleph_1 -saturation and Lemma 7.4, there is $\tilde{q} \in S_{\tilde{X}}^{\text{def}}(K)$ such that $q = \pi_*\tilde{q}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \{\pi^{-1}(D) : D \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is a definable family extended by the definable type \tilde{q} . By Proposition 3.6, there is a definable Γ -family \mathcal{G}_0 such that \mathcal{G}_0 refines $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, and \tilde{q} extends \mathcal{G}_0 . Let

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\pi(D) : D \in \mathcal{G}_0\}.$$

Then \mathcal{G} is an interpretable Γ -family in X . If $D \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then $D \in \tilde{q}$ (because \tilde{q} extends \mathcal{G}_0), so $\pi^{-1}(\pi(D)) \in \tilde{q}$ (because $\pi^{-1}(\pi(D)) \supseteq D$), and then $\pi(D) \in \pi_*\tilde{q} = q$. Therefore q extends \mathcal{G} . It remains to show that \mathcal{G} refines \mathcal{F} . Take some $D \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $\pi^{-1}(D) \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, so there is $E \in \mathcal{G}_0$ with $E \subseteq \pi^{-1}(D)$ because \mathcal{G}_0 refines $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Then $\pi(E) \subseteq D$ and $\pi(E) \in \mathcal{G}$. This shows that \mathcal{G} refines \mathcal{F} . \square

This yields an analogue of Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 7.6. *Suppose $K \models p\text{CF}$ and q is a definable type in K^{eq} . Then q is generated by a union of countably many Γ -families.*

Proof. As a definable type, q is generated by a union of countably many interpretable families $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_i$. (Indeed, q is a union of countably many interpretable families, one for each formula in the language.) For each i , take an interpretable Γ -family \mathcal{G}_i refining \mathcal{F}_i and extended by q . Then $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_i$ generates q . \square

7.3 Directed families and definable types

Let K be a model of $p\text{CF}$.

Lemma 7.7 (like Corollary 5.2). *If \mathcal{F} is an interpretable family of sets in K^{eq} with the finite intersection property, then \mathcal{F} can be partitioned into finitely many subfamilies, each of which extends to a definable type.*

Proof. Let X be the sort where the sets in \mathcal{F} live, let \tilde{X} be a 0-definable set with a 0-interpretable surjection to X , and apply Lemma 7.2. \square

Proposition 7.8 (like Proposition 5.5). *Let \mathcal{F} be an interpretable downward directed family of non-empty sets in K .*

1. \mathcal{F} extends to a definable type.
2. \mathcal{F} is refined by some Γ -family of non-empty sets.

Proof. Like the proof of Proposition 5.5, using Lemma 7.7 instead of Corollary 5.2, and Proposition 7.5 instead of Proposition 3.6. \square

Theorem 7.9 (like Theorem 5.6). *Let \mathcal{F} be an interpretable family of sets in K . The following are equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{F} extends to a definable type.

2. \mathcal{F} is refined by a Γ -family.

3. \mathcal{F} is refined by a downward directed interpretable family of non-empty sets.

Proof. Like the proof of Theorem 5.6, using Proposition 7.5 instead of Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 7.8 instead of Proposition 5.5. \square

7.4 Strict pro-definability in $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$

Work in a monster model $\mathbb{M} \models p\text{CF}$.

Theorem 7.10. *$p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$ has uniform definability of definable types (UDDT).*

Proof. (Compare with [CKHY21, Remark 2.4.10].) Let X be any product of sorts in \mathbb{M}^{eq} . Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be an $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}^{\text{eq}}$ -formula where x lives in the sort X . We must bound the complexity of the sets

$$\{b \in \mathbb{M}^y : \varphi(x, b) \in r(x)\}$$

as r ranges over $S_X^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$. By Lemma 7.4, this is the same as bounding the complexity of

$$\{b \in \mathbb{M}^y : \varphi(x, b) \in (\pi_* q)(x)\}$$

as q ranges over $S_{\tilde{X}}^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$, where $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ is a 0-interpretable surjection from a definable set \tilde{X} . But

$$\{b \in \mathbb{M}^y : \varphi(x, b) \in (\pi_* q)(x)\} = \{b \in \mathbb{M}^y : \varphi(\pi(w), b) \in q(w)\},$$

so this follows by UDDT in $p\text{CF}$ applied to the formula $\varphi(\pi(w), y)$. \square

By UDDT and Fact 6.2, there is a pro-interpretable set X^{def} associated to any interpretable set X .

Theorem 7.11. *If X is an interpretable set, then X^{def} is strictly pro-interpretable.*

Proof. Take a definable set \tilde{X} and an interpretable surjection $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$. By Lemma 7.4, the map $\tilde{X}^{\text{def}} \rightarrow X^{\text{def}}$ is surjective. The strict pro-definability of \tilde{X}^{def} (Fact 6.4) then implies strict pro-definability for X^{def} . \square

Theorem 7.12. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an interpretable surjection. Then $f_* : X^{\text{def}} \rightarrow Y^{\text{def}}$ is surjective.*

Proof. Take a definable set W and interpretable surjection $g : W \rightarrow X$. Applying Lemma 7.4 to the interpretable surjection $f \circ g : W \rightarrow Y$, we see that $f_* \circ g_* : W^{\text{def}} \rightarrow Y^{\text{def}}$ is surjective, which implies $f_* : X^{\text{def}} \rightarrow Y^{\text{def}}$ is surjective. \square

Remark 7.13. The analogue of Theorem 7.12 for *definable* surjections is trivial, because any definable surjection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ has a section $g : Y \rightarrow X$ by definable Skolem functions, and then $g_* : Y^{\text{def}} \rightarrow X^{\text{def}}$ witnesses that $f_* : X^{\text{def}} \rightarrow Y^{\text{def}}$ is surjective.

Question 7.14. If the surjection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of Theorem 7.12 is interpretable over a small model M , is the induced map $X^{\text{def}}(M) \rightarrow Y^{\text{def}}(M)$ surjective? Equivalently, does every M -definable type in Y lift to an M -definable type in X ? This doesn't follow formally from Theorem 7.12, as there is a surjection of strictly pro-interpretable sets $f : X \rightarrow Y$ over \mathbb{Q}_p such that $X(\mathbb{Q}_p) \rightarrow Y(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is not surjective. Specifically, take X to be the value group and Y to be the set of tuples $(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$ satisfying $x_0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \dots$. Let $f : \Gamma \rightarrow Y$ be the map sending γ to (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) , where x_i is 0 if $i < \gamma$ and 1 if $i \geq \gamma$. Over the monster model, f is surjective, but no $\gamma \in \Gamma(\mathbb{Q}_p) = \mathbb{Z}$ maps to $(0, 0, 0, \dots) \in Y(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. On the other hand, when $M = \mathbb{Q}_p$ the specific map $X^{\text{def}}(M) \rightarrow Y^{\text{def}}(M)$ is surjective, because Lemma 7.1 ensures all types are definable.

8 Definable and interpretable topological spaces

Throughout let $K \models p\text{CF}$.

Definition 8.1. If $Z \subseteq K^n$ is a definable set, a *definable topology* on Z is a topology τ with a definable basis of open sets. That is, there is a definable family \mathcal{B} of subsets of Z that is a basis of opens for τ . A *definable topological space* is a definable set with a definable topology. An *interpretable topological space* is a definable topological space in K^{eq} .

An analogue of the following result was proved in o-minimal expansions of ordered fields in [AGTW21, Corollary 40 (2)].

Proposition 8.2 (Definable first countability). *Let (Z, τ) be an interpretable topological space in K . For any $z \in Z$, there exists a basis of open neighborhoods of z given by a Γ -family (a Γ -basis).*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{B_y : y \in Y\}$ be an interpretable basis for τ and fix $z \in Z$. Let $Y_z = \{y \in Y : z \in B_y\}$. Note that $\{B_y : y \in Y_z\}$ is an interpretable basis of open neighborhoods of z .

For any $y \in Y_z$, let

$$Y(y) = \{x \in Y : z \in B_x \subseteq B_y\}.$$

The family $\{Y(y) : y \in Y_z\}$ of non-empty sets is interpretable and downward directed. We apply Proposition 5.5(2) or Proposition 7.8(2) to find a Γ -family $\{X_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ that refines it.

For any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let

$$A_\gamma = \bigcup_{y \in X_\gamma} B_y.$$

Then $\{A_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ is a Γ -basis of open neighborhoods of z . □

Note that Proposition 8.2 shows in particular that any interpretable topological space in \mathbb{Q}_p is first countable (i.e. every point has a countable basis of neighborhoods).

Given a topological space (Z, τ) and a subset $Y \subseteq Z$, we let $\text{cl}(Y)$ denote the closure of Y . We regard K as a definable topological space via the usual valuation topology.

Definition 8.3. Let (Z, τ) be an interpretable topological space in K . An *interpretable curve* on Z is an interpretable map $f : D \rightarrow Z$, where $D \subseteq K$ is definable with $0 \in \text{cl}(D) \setminus D$, where $\text{cl}(D)$ denotes the closure with respect to the valuation topology. We do not assume f is continuous. We say that f *converges* to $z \in Z$ if $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x) = z$, in the sense that for any neighborhood U of z there exists $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ such that, for any $x \in D$ with $\text{val}(x) \geq \gamma_0$, $f(x) \in U$.

Remark 8.4. The theory $p\text{CF}$ has definable Skolem functions. Therefore, any definable surjection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ has a definable section, that is, a definable map $s : Y \rightarrow X$ with $f \circ s = \text{id}_Y$. The same does not hold in $p\text{CF}^{\text{eq}}$. In other words, interpretable surjections need not have interpretable sections. For example the valuation map $\text{val} : K^\times \rightarrow \Gamma$ has no interpretable section. However, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an interpretable surjection and Y is definable, then f has an interpretable section $s : Y \rightarrow X$. To see this, take an interpretable surjection $\pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ with \tilde{X} definable, and apply definable Skolem functions to the definable surjection $f \circ \pi : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Y$ to get a section $s_0 : Y \rightarrow \tilde{X}$. Then $f \circ \pi \circ s_0 = \text{id}_Y$, so $\pi \circ s_0$ is an interpretable section of the original map f . This argument is formally related to the proof of Lemma 2.1(1).

In what follows, when we apply “definable Skolem functions” to choose a function $s : Y \rightarrow X$, the domain Y will always be definable.

Definable first countability (Proposition 8.2) and definable Skolem functions allow us to prove a form of definable curve selection.

Lemma 8.5 (Definable curve selection). *Let (Z, τ) be an interpretable topological space in K . For any interpretable set $Y \subseteq Z$ and any $z \in \text{cl}(Y)$ there exists an interpretable curve in Y converging to z .*

Proof. Let $z \in \text{cl}(Y)$ and, by Lemma 8.2, let $\{A_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ be a Γ -basis of neighborhoods of z . By definable Skolem functions let $f : K \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow Y$ be an interpretable map satisfying $f(x) \in A_{\text{val}(x)} \cap Y$ for every $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$. Then clearly f is an interpretable curve in Y converging to z . \square

Definable curve selection can be used to characterize continuity of interpretable functions in terms of whether limits of interpretable curves are maintained. We make this explicit in the following proposition, whose proof we omit, pointing the reader to [vdD98, Chapter 6, Lemma 4.2] and [AGTW21, Proposition 42] for analogous results in the o-minimal setting.

Proposition 8.6. *Let (Z, τ) and (Y, μ) be interpretable topological spaces in K . Let $h : (Z, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ an interpretable map. Then, for any $z \in Z$, the map h is continuous at z if and only if, for every interpretable curve f in Z , if f converges to z then the curve $h \circ f$ in Y converges to $h(z)$.*

Recall that if $\{x_i\}_{i < \omega}$ is a sequence in a topological space X , then a point $p \in X$ is a *cluster point* if every neighborhood of p contains infinitely many terms in the sequence. If X is first-countable, then p is a cluster point if and only if some subsequence of $\{x_i\}_{i < \omega}$ converges to p . (This need not hold in a general topological space.) The analogous equivalence holds in our setting, thanks to definable first countability:

Proposition 8.7. *Let $f : D \rightarrow Z$ be an interpretable curve in an interpretable topological space (Z, τ) in K . Let $z \in Z$ be a point. The following are equivalent:*

1. *z is a cluster point of f , in the sense that, for every γ ,*

$$z \in \text{cl}\{f(x) : x \in D, \text{val}(x) \geq \gamma\}.$$

2. *There is an interpretable curve g that is a restriction of f and converges to z .*

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) is easy. We prove (1) \Rightarrow (2). Using Lemma 8.2, let $\{A_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ be a Γ -basis of open neighborhoods of z .

For each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, set

$$J_\gamma := \{x \in D : \text{val}(x) \geq \gamma, f(x) \in A_\gamma\}.$$

Observe that $\{J_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ is a Γ -family.

For each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let J_γ^{\min} denote the set of $x \in J_\gamma$ of minimum valuation. (Any non-empty bounded-below interpretable subset of Γ has a minimum, because this holds in the standard model \mathbb{Q}_p). Set

$$C := \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} J_\gamma^{\min} \subseteq D \subseteq K.$$

By definition of the sets J_γ it clearly holds that $0 \in \text{cl}(C)$, where the closure $\text{cl}(C)$ is with respect to the valuation topology on K . For any γ , let $\mu(\gamma)$ be the valuation of points in J_γ^{\min} , or equivalently, the minimum valuation of points in J_γ . Note that

$$\gamma \geq \gamma' \implies J_\gamma \subseteq J_{\gamma'} \implies \mu(\gamma) \geq \mu(\gamma'). \quad (*)$$

We show that $f|_C$ converges to z . Fix a basic neighborhood $A_\gamma \ni z$. We claim that if $x \in C$ and $\text{val}(x) > \mu(\gamma)$ then $f(x) \in A_\gamma$. Fix γ' such that $x \in J_{\gamma'}^{\min}$. Then $\mu(\gamma) < \text{val}(x) = \mu(\gamma')$. By (*), $\gamma < \gamma'$. By definition of $J_{\gamma'}$, $f(x) \in A_{\gamma'} \subseteq A_\gamma$. This proves the claim. \square

Definition 8.8. Fix an interpretable topological space (Z, τ) in K . If $q \in S_Z(K)$ and $z \in Z$, then q *specializes* to z (equivalently z is a *specialization* of q) if the following equivalent conditions hold:

1. For every interpretable open set $U \ni z$, we have $U \in q$.
2. For every interpretable closed set $C \in q$, we have $z \in C$.
3. For every interpretable set $Y \in q$, we have $z \in \text{cl}(Y)$.

Remark 8.9. Fix an interpretable basis of open sets on (Z, τ) . In conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 8.8, it suffices to consider *basic* open sets and *basic* closed sets, respectively. Here, a “basic closed set” is the complement of a basic open set. Note that when q is a definable type, the family of basic closed sets (or basic open sets) in q is an interpretable family.

Definition 8.10. An interpretable topological space (Z, τ) in K is

1. *directed-compact* if every downward directed interpretable family of non-empty closed subsets of Z has non-empty intersection.
2. *curve-compact* if for every interpretable curve f in Z there exists another interpretable curve g that is a restriction of f and that converges. By Proposition 8.7, we could equivalently say: every interpretable curve f in Z has a cluster point.
3. *type-compact* if every definable type concentrating on Z specializes to a point in Z .

Theorem 8.11. Let (Z, τ) be an interpretable topological space in K . The following are equivalent.

1. (Z, τ) is directed-compact.
2. Any Γ -family of closed sets in Z has non-empty intersection.
3. (Z, τ) is curve-compact.
4. (Z, τ) is type-compact.
5. Any interpretable family of closed sets $\{C_y\}_{y \in Y}$ in Z with the finite intersection property has a finite transversal, i.e. there exists a finite set T with $T \cap C_y \neq \emptyset$ for every $y \in Y$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Γ -families are downward directed.

(2) \Rightarrow (3). Let $f : D \subseteq K \rightarrow X$ be an interpretable curve. We apply (2) to the Γ -family of non-empty sets

$$\{f(x) : x \in D, \text{val}(x) \geq \gamma\} \text{ for } \gamma \in \Gamma$$

to find a point in the τ -closure of all of them (a cluster point of f). Then apply Proposition 8.7.

(3) \Rightarrow (4). Assume curve-compactness. Let q be a definable type on Z . We claim that q specializes to some point in Z . Let $\{C_y : y \in Y\}$ be the interpretable family of basic closed sets in q . By Remark 8.9, it suffices to find a point in $\bigcap_{y \in Y} C_y$.

By the implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) of Theorem 5.6 (or Theorem 7.9 in the interpretable case), there is a Γ -family $\{X_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ that refines $\{C_y : y \in Y\}$. Applying definable Skolem functions to the family $\{X_{\text{val}(x)} : x \in K \setminus \{0\}\}$, there is an interpretable curve $f : K \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow Z$ such that $f(x) \in X_{\text{val}(x)}$ for every x . Applying the definition of curve-compactness, let g be a restriction of f that converges to some point $z \in Z$. Clearly $z \in C_y$ for every $y \in Y$.

(4) \Rightarrow (5). A direct consequence of Corollary 5.2 (or Lemma 7.7 in the interpretable case).

(5) \Rightarrow (1). Assume that (Z, τ) satisfies (5) and let $\{C_y : y \in Y\}$ be an interpretable downward directed family of non-empty closed subsets of Z . In particular $\{C_y : y \in Y\}$ has the finite intersection property, and so it has a finite transversal $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \subset K$. In other words, for every $y \in Y$ there exists some $i \leq n$ such that $C_y \in \text{tp}(z_i/K)$. It follows from Lemma 5.4 that there is some $i \leq n$ with $z_i \in \bigcap_{y \in Y} C_y$. \square

Definition 8.12. An interpretable topological space (Z, τ) is *definably compact* if the equivalent conditions of Theorem 8.11 hold.

Note that in the proof of Theorem 8.11 we only apply definable Skolem functions in order to prove the implication (3) \Rightarrow (4). The equivalence between (1), (2), (4) and (5) can be derived from Proposition 3.6, distality, and Fact 5.1 without additional p CF machinery.

Remark 8.13. Let (Z, τ) be a definable topological space in K , with $Z \subseteq K^n$. Then the five conditions in Theorem 8.11 are equivalent to the following:

- 6. Any definable family of non-empty closed sets $\{C_y\}_{y \in Y}$ in Z with the $(m, 2n)$ -property, for some $m \geq 2n$, has a finite transversal.

To see this note that, by Remark 5.3, Condition (4) in Theorem 8.11 implies (6). Furthermore, Condition (6) is stronger than Condition (5) in Theorem 8.11, because the finite intersection property is stronger than the (p, q) -property for any $p \geq q$.

Remark 8.14. Definable Skolem functions yield a definable analogue of the classical characterization of compactness in terms of nets (every net has a convergent subnet), where a definable net is understood to be an interpretable map from a definable directed set into an interpretable topological space. That is, in a structure with definable Skolem functions (e.g. a p -adically closed field) one may show, by direct adaptation of the proof of the classical equivalence, that an interpretable topological space is directed-compact if and only if every definable net in it has a convergent definable subnet. See [AGTW21, Corollary 44] for a proof of this fact in the o-minimal group setting.

Theorem 8.15. *An interpretable topological space (Z, τ) in \mathbb{Q}_p is definably compact if and only if it is compact.*

Proof. If Z is compact, then it is clearly directed-compact, type-compact, and curve-compact. Conversely, suppose Z is type-compact. Fix an interpretable basis for τ . Note that any intersection of closed subsets of Z can be rewritten as an intersection of basic closed sets. Any family of basic closed sets \mathcal{C} with the finite intersection property extends to a type $q \in S_Z(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. The type q is definable by Fact 3.8 (or Lemma 7.1 in the interpretable case). By type-compactness, q has a specialization $z \in Z$, which will satisfy $z \in \bigcap \mathcal{C}$. \square

Theorem 8.16. *Let $\{(X_b, \tau_b) : b \in Y\}$ be an interpretable family of interpretable topological spaces. Then $\{b \in Y : X_b \text{ is definably compact}\}$ is interpretable.*

Proof. First suppose that K is a monster model \mathbb{M} . Fix a sort D in \mathbb{M}^{eq} such that $X_b \subseteq D$ for each b . Identify D^{def} with $S_D^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$. For each $b \in Y$, let $\{C_{b,i}\}_{i \in I_b}$ be a basis of closed sets for X_b . Because $\{X_b\}_{b \in Y}$ is an interpretable family of interpretable topologies, we may assume that $\{I_b\}_{b \in Y}$ and $\{C_{b,i}\}_{b \in Y, i \in I_b}$ are interpretable families.

By Theorem 8.11, X_b is definably compact if and only if X_b is type-compact, meaning that every $p \in S_{X_b}^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$ has a specialization. By Remark 8.9, p specializes to $x \in X_b$ if and only if x is in every basic closed set contained in p , i.e.,

$$\forall i \in I_b (C_{b,i} \in p \rightarrow x \in C_{b,i}).$$

Thus X_b is definably compact if and only if

$$\forall p \in X_b^{\text{def}} \exists x \in X_b \forall i \in I_b (C_{b,i} \in p \rightarrow x \in C_{b,i}),$$

or equivalently

$$\forall p \in D^{\text{def}} (X_b \in p \rightarrow \exists x \in X_b \forall i \in I_b (C_{b,i} \in p \rightarrow x \in C_{b,i})).$$

This condition is first-order: the expressions $X_b \in p$ and $C_{b,i} \in p$ are first-order by Remark 6.7, and the quantification over D^{def} is harmless by Remark 6.1, *because D^{def} is strictly pro-interpretable* by Fact 6.4 (or Theorem 7.11 in the interpretable case).

This completes the case when K is a monster model. For the general case, take a monster model $\mathbb{M} \succeq K$. Let $\{(X_b(\mathbb{M}), \tau_b(\mathbb{M})) : b \in Y(\mathbb{M})\}$ denote the interpretable family of interpretable topological spaces in \mathbb{M} defined by the same formulas as the original family $\{(X_b, \tau_b) : b \in Y\}$. Definable compactness is preserved in elementary extensions. (This is straightforward to see using the definitions of directed-compactness or curve-compactness.) Therefore

$$(X_b(\mathbb{M}), \tau_b(\mathbb{M})) \text{ is definably compact} \iff (X_b, \tau_b) \text{ is definably compact}$$

for $b \in Y(K)$. Let Q be the set of $b \in Y(\mathbb{M})$ such that $(X_b(\mathbb{M}), \tau_b(\mathbb{M}))$ is definably compact. By the highly saturated case considered above, Q is an interpretable subset of $Y(\mathbb{M})$. It is also $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/K)$ -invariant, and therefore K -interpretable. Then the set

$$\{b \in Y(K) : (X_b, \tau_b) \text{ is definably compact}\} = Q(K)$$

is interpretable in the structure K . □

Theorem 8.16 is a substantial strengthening of [Joh22, Theorem 6.6], which proved the same result for the special case of “strongly admissible” interpretable topologies.

9 Open problems

A natural question to ask is whether the results of this paper generalize to P-minimal fields [HM97]. The results of this paper depend heavily on Sections 2–3, which are very specific to p CF and don’t generalize in an obvious way to P-minimal expansions of p CF.

In an orthogonal direction, it would be interesting to see whether some of the results in this paper generalize to other dp-minimal valued fields, such as the fields of Laurent functions $\mathbb{R}((t))$ and $\mathbb{Q}_p((t))$. Some things fail to generalize to ACVF, as discussed in Section 3.3. Perhaps the natural dividing line is distality. For example, does Theorem 3.4 hold in distal dp-minimal valued fields?

Beyond the valued field setting, we ask whether Theorem 5.6 generalizes in the following sense: in distal dp-minimal structures, any definable family of sets that extends to a definable type is refined by a definable downward directed family in the type. This was proved for o-minimal structures in [AG21, Theorem A]. The reverse question, namely whether any definable downward directed family of sets extends to a definable type, is also open and would follow for all dp-minimal structures from a positive answer to Simon’s conjecture [Sim15b, Conjecture 5.2] that Fact 5.1 holds in the general dp-minimal setting.

Another open problem, discussed above, is whether M -definable types can be lifted along interpretable surjections (Question 7.14).

A New proofs of known results

In this appendix, we give self-contained proofs of three facts about p CF that were used earlier in the paper:

1. Fact 3.8: the definability of types over \mathbb{Q}_p , due to Delon [Del89].
2. Fact 6.3: the uniform definability of definable types in p CF, due to Cubides Kovacsics and Ye [CKY21].
3. Fact 6.4: the strict pro-definability of the space of definable types in p CF, due to Cubides Kovacsics, Hils, and Ye [CKHY21].

Our proof of Fact 6.4 is probably new. In contrast, our proofs of Fact 3.8 and 6.3 might be equivalent to the original proofs. Nevertheless, since the three facts follow easily from the machinery in this paper, it seemed worthwhile to include the proofs.

Lemma A.1. *Let $K, \mathbb{M}, a, K[x]_{<d}, I_d, \tau_d$ be as in Lemma 3.1. The following are equivalent:*

1. $\text{tp}(a/K)$ is definable.
2. Each τ_d is split.
3. Each τ_d is definable.

Proof. (1) \implies (2): Lemma 3.1(4).

(2) \implies (3): split VVS structures are definable.

(3) \implies (1): Suppose the τ_d are definable. Note that the sets I_d are also definable, as they are K -linear subspaces of finite-dimensional K -vector spaces. Let $q = \text{tp}(a/K)$.

Claim A.2. *Suppose $K' \succeq K$, and suppose $q', q'' \in S_n(K')$ are heirs of q . Then q' and q'' have the same quantifier-free part.*

Proof. Let $I'_d \subseteq K'[x]_{<d}$ and τ'_d on $K'[x]_{<d}/I'_d$ be derived from q' the same way that I_d and τ_d are derived from q . Similarly, let I''_d and τ''_d be derived from q'' . Because q' is an heir of q , I'_d and τ'_d must be definable, defined by the same $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}(K)$ -formulas that define I_d and τ_d . The same holds for I''_d and τ''_d , so $I'_d = I''_d$ and $\tau'_d = \tau''_d$. By Lemma 3.1(2), q' and q'' have the same quantifier-free part. □_{Claim}

By the claim and Proposition 2.3, q has at most 2^{\aleph_0} -many heirs over any elementary extension $K' \succeq K$. Therefore q is definable. □

Remark A.3. Suppose $M \succeq \mathbb{Q}_p$ and $b \in M^1$. If $\text{val}(b) \geq 0$, then there is $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ such that $b - a$ is \mathbb{Q}_p -infinitesimal, in the sense that $\text{val}(b - a) > \Gamma(\mathbb{Q}_p) = \mathbb{Z}$. This holds because \mathbb{Z}_p is compact.

Lemma A.4. *Suppose $M \succeq \mathbb{Q}_p$ and a is a tuple in M . Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_p(a)$ be a finite-dimensional K -linear subspace, with the induced VVS structure. Then V is split.*

Lemma A.4 is like Lemma 2.19, but instead of assuming $\text{tp}(a/K)$ is definable, we assume $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$.

Proof. Like Lemma 2.19, using Remark A.3 instead of Fact 2.18. □

Delon's theorem follows easily:

Theorem A.5 (= Fact 3.8). *Every type over \mathbb{Q}_p is definable.*

Proof. Take $a \in M \succeq \mathbb{Q}_p$. We claim $\text{tp}(a/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is definable. Let I_d and τ_d be as in Lemmas 3.1 and A.1. By Lemma A.1, we must show that τ_d is split. But τ_d is the induced VVS structure on the image of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_p[x]_{<d} &\rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p(a) \\ P(x) &\mapsto P(a). \end{aligned}$$

The image is a finite-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{Q}_p(a)$, so the VVS structure is split by Lemma A.4. □

Lemma A.6. *Let \mathcal{K}_n be the class of structures (M, K, a) where $M \models p\text{CF}$, $K \preceq M$, $a \in M^n$, and $\text{tp}(a/K)$ is definable. Then \mathcal{K}_n is elementary.*

Proof. The difficulty is expressing that $\text{tp}(a/K)$ is definable. By Lemma A.1, it suffices to express the condition “ τ_d is a split VVS structure” for each d . This is straightforward, if tedious. □

The result of Cubides Kovacsics and Ye follows directly:

Theorem A.7 (= Fact 6.3). *The theory $p\text{CF}$ has uniform definability of definable types (UDDT).*

Proof. Fix an \mathcal{L}_{div} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$ and let $n = |x|$. We must find an \mathcal{L}_{div} -formula $\psi(y, z)$ such that for any model $M \models T$ and definable type $p \in S_n(M)$, the set $\{b \in M : p(x) \vdash \varphi(x, b)\}$ is a ψ -set. Let T_n axiomatize the class \mathcal{K}_n of Lemma A.6 in the language \mathcal{L}' of structures (M, K, a) . For each \mathcal{L}_{div} -formula ψ , let α_ψ be the \mathcal{L}' -sentence saying that $\text{tp}^\varphi(a/K)$ is defined by a ψ -formula, in the sense that

$$\{b \in K : M \models \varphi(a, b)\} = \psi(K, c) \text{ for some } c \in K.$$

Every model of T_n satisfies α_ψ for some ψ . By compactness, there are finitely many \mathcal{L}_{div} -formulas ψ_1, \dots, ψ_m such that $T_n \vdash \bigvee_{i=1}^m \alpha_{\psi_i}$. This means that if $K \models p\text{CF}$ and $\text{tp}(a/K)$ is definable, then $\text{tp}^\varphi(a/K)$ is defined by a ψ_i -formula for some i . The usual coding tricks allow us to reduce to a single ψ , and then we have UDDT. \square

Note that the proof of Theorem A.7 is really just a miniature version of the argument in [CKY21].

Finally, we prove strict pro-interpretability of the space of definable types, due to Cubides Kovacsics, Hils, and Ye [CKHY21]. Let X be a definable set and let X^{def} be the pro-interpretability set of definable types as in Section 6.

Theorem A.8 (= Fact 6.4). *X^{def} is strictly pro-interpretable.*

Proof. We easily reduce to the case where X is \mathbb{M}^k . (If X is a definable subset of \mathbb{M}^k , then X^{def} is relatively definable in $(\mathbb{M}^k)^{\text{def}}$.)

Let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ be \mathcal{L}_{div} -formulas. We must show that the image of the following map on $S_k^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$ is definable (and not just type-definable) in \mathbb{M}^{eq} :

$$f(p) = (c_{p, \varphi_i} : 1 \leq i \leq n).$$

Take an \mathcal{L}_{div} -formula φ such that (1) for $1 \leq i \leq n$, every φ_i -set is a φ -set, and (2) the negation of a φ -set is a φ -set. Then the φ -definition of p determines the φ_i -definition of p , for $p \in S_k^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$, and so the map f factors through $p \mapsto c_{p, \varphi}$. Replacing $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ with φ , we may assume $n = 1$ and we need to show definability of

$$D := \{c_{p, \varphi} : p \in S_k^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})\}.$$

Let ψ be the \mathcal{L}_{div} -formula uniformly defining φ , so that

$$\{b \in \mathbb{M} : \varphi(x, b) \in p(x)\} = \psi(\mathbb{M}, c_{p, \varphi})$$

Claim A.9. *$c \in D$ if and only if the following two conditions hold.*

1. *For any $b, b' \in \mathbb{M}^y$ such that $\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b)$ and $\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b')$ are complementary, exactly one of b, b' is in $\psi(\mathbb{M}, c)$.*

2. The family of sets $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) : b \in \psi(\mathbb{M}, c)\}$ is refined by a definable downward directed family of non-empty sets.

Proof. Suppose $c \in D$, so $c = c_{p,\varphi}$ for some p . If $\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b)$ is complementary to $\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b')$, then exactly one of $\varphi(x, b), \varphi(x, b')$ is in $p(x)$, and so exactly one of b, b' is in $\psi(\mathbb{M}, c)$. Moreover, the family of sets $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) : b \in \psi(\mathbb{M}, c)\}$ extends to the definable type p , and therefore is refined by a definable downward directed family of non-empty sets by the implication (1) \implies (3) of Theorem 5.6.

Conversely, suppose c satisfies the two listed conditions. There is a definable type $p \in S_k^{\text{def}}(\mathbb{M})$ extending the family $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) : b \in \psi(\mathbb{M}, c)\}$ by the implication (3) \implies (1) of Theorem 5.6. Then

$$\psi(\mathbb{M}, c) \subseteq \{b \in \mathbb{M}^y : \varphi(x, b) \in p(x)\}.$$

If equality holds, then $c = c_{\varphi,p} \in D$ as desired. Otherwise, take $b \notin \psi(\mathbb{M}, c)$ such that $\varphi(x, b) \in p(x)$. Take b' such that $\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b')$ is the complement of $\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b)$. By assumption, exactly one of b, b' is in $\psi(\mathbb{M}, c)$, and so $b' \in \psi(\mathbb{M}, c)$, implying that $\varphi(x, b') \in p(x)$. Then $p(x)$ contains the contradictory formulas $\{\varphi(x, b), \varphi(x, b')\}$, a contradiction. \square_{Claim}

The conditions in the claim are \forall -definable, so D is \forall -definable in \mathbb{M}^{eq} . On the other hand, D is the image of the pro-definable set X^{def} under a coordinate projection, so D is type-definable in \mathbb{M}^{eq} . By compactness, D is definable in \mathbb{M}^{eq} . \square

B An application of the (p, q) -theorem

In this appendix we show how the Alon-Kleitman-Matousek (p, q) -theorem [Mat04, Theorem 4] can be used to study the notion of dividing in the NIP setting, and in particular in $p\text{CF}$, with applications to Remarks 5.3 and 8.13. While the (p, q) -theorem has already seen strong applications in the NIP setting by Simon [CS15, Sim15b] and Chernikov [CS15], they rely on a weaker form of the theorem (in terms of dual VC-dimension in place of VC-codensity) that does not yield our results.

Let \mathcal{F} be a family of subsets of some set U . For any finite $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, let $\sim_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the equivalence relation on U defined by

$$x \sim_{\mathcal{S}} y \iff (\forall i) (x \in X_i \iff y \in X_i).$$

We call each equivalence class of $\sim_{\mathcal{S}}$ a *Boolean atom* of \mathcal{S} . One defines $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}^*(n)$ to be the maximum k ($\leq 2^n$) such that there exist $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathcal{F}$ with k Boolean atoms. The function $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}^*(-)$ is called the *dual shatter function* of \mathcal{F} . The *VC-codensity* of \mathcal{F} is the infimum of positive real numbers α such that $\pi_{\mathcal{F}}^*(n)$ is $O(n^\alpha)$, or ∞ if no such α exists. We write the VC-codensity of \mathcal{F} as $\text{vc}^*(\mathcal{F})$.

Definition B.1. Let $p \geq q \geq 1$ be integers. The family \mathcal{F} has the (p, q) -property if $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$ and, for any p distinct sets in \mathcal{F} , there are q among them with non-empty intersection.

Fact B.2 (Alon-Kleitman-Matoušek (p, q) -theorem [Mat04, Theorem 4]). *Fix $p \geq q$. Suppose $\text{vc}^*(\mathcal{F}) < q$. Then there is an integer N such that that, if \mathcal{S} is a finite subfamily of \mathcal{F} with the (p, q) -property, then there exists a set of size N intersecting every set in \mathcal{S} .*

If M is an L -structure and $\varphi(x, y)$ is an $L(M)$ -formula, then $\text{vc}^*(\varphi)$ denotes $\text{vc}^*(\mathcal{F})$ where $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi(M, b) : b \in M^y\}$. The formula $\varphi(x, y)$ is NIP iff $\text{vc}^*(\varphi) < \infty$ [Sim15a, Section 6.1]. Note that if $\varphi(x, y)$ has no parameters then $\text{vc}^*(\varphi)$ is determined by the theory of M .

Suppose M sits inside a monster model \mathbb{M} and $b \in \mathbb{M}^y$. By unwinding the definitions [CK12, Definition 2.8], we see that $\varphi(x, b)$ k -divides over M if and only if, for every $m \geq k$, the family $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b') : b' \equiv_M b\}$ does not have the (m, k) -property. Thus, $\varphi(x, b)$ does *not* k -divide over M if and only if there is $m \geq k$ such that $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b') : b' \equiv_M b\}$ has the (m, k) -property.

The following lemma, which we prove using Fact B.2, is an improvement of [Sim15b, Lemma 2.4], which states similar results in terms of dual VC-dimension in place of VC-codensity.

Lemma B.3. *Let $M, \mathbb{M}, \varphi(x, y)$ be as above. Fix an integer $k > \text{vc}^*(\varphi)$. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}^y$ be type-definable over M . The following are equivalent:*

1. *For any $b \in D$, the formula $\varphi(x, b)$ does not k -divide over M .*
2. *There is $m \geq k$ such that the family $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) : b \in D\}$ has the (m, k) -property.*
3. *For any $b \in D$, the formula $\varphi(x, b)$ does not divide over M .*
4. *For any k' , there is $m' \geq k'$ such that $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) : b \in D\}$ has the (m', k') -property.*

Proof. The implication (4) \implies (3) follows by unwinding the definitions as above and the implication (3) \implies (1) is trivial. The implication (1) \implies (2) follows by a standard compactness and Ramsey argument as in the proof of [Sim15b, Lemma 2.4, (3) \implies (2)]. In more detail, suppose (2) fails. If $\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) = \emptyset$ for some $b \in D$ then $\varphi(x, b)$ k -divides. Otherwise, for any $m \geq k$ let $b_1, \dots, b_m \in D$ be such that $\{\varphi(x, b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ is k -inconsistent. By compactness and Ramsey (or really, compactness and the pigeonhole principle), there are $b_1, b_2, b_3, \dots \in D$ such that $\{\varphi(x, b_i) : 1 \leq i < \omega\}$ is k -inconsistent and $b_i \equiv_M b_j$ for any i, j . Then $\varphi(x, b_1)$ k -divides over M .

Finally, we show (2) \implies (4). Let \mathcal{F} be the family $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) : b \in D\}$. Then $\text{vc}^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq \text{vc}^*(\varphi) < k$. Let m be as in (2). Then \mathcal{F} and all its finite subfamilies have the (m, k) property. Let N be given by Fact B.2. Then for any finite subfamily $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, there is a set of size N intersecting every element of \mathcal{S} . Fix any k' and let $m' = (k' - 1)N + 1$. We claim that \mathcal{F} has the (m', k') -property. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a subfamily of size m' . Then there is a set X of size N intersecting every element of \mathcal{S} . As $|\mathcal{S}| > (k' - 1)N$, by the pigeonhole principle there is some point $p \in X$ such that at least k' elements of \mathcal{S} contain p . That is, there are distinct $Y_1, \dots, Y_{k'} \in \mathcal{S}$ all containing p . Then $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k'} Y_i \supseteq \{p\} \neq \emptyset$, proving the (m', k') -property. \square

Corollary B.4. *If $M \preceq \mathbb{M}$ and $b \in \mathbb{M}$ and $\text{vc}^*(\varphi) < k$, then $\varphi(x, b)$ divides over M iff $\varphi(x, b)$ k -divides over M .*

Proof. Apply Lemma B.3 with D equal to the set of realizations of $\text{tp}(b/M)$. \square

Corollary B.4 is related to “lowness”; see [Sim15a, Proposition 5.50].

Corollary B.5. *Let $\varphi(x, y), \psi(y)$ be $L(M)$ -formulas. Suppose that $\{\varphi(M, b) : b \in \psi(M)\}$ has the (m, k) -property for some $m \geq k > \text{vc}^*(\varphi)$. Then $\varphi(x, b)$ does not divide over M for any $b \in \psi(\mathbb{M})$.*

Proof. The (m, k) -property is expressed by a first-order formula, so $\{\varphi(\mathbb{M}, b) : b \in \psi(\mathbb{M})\}$ has the (m, k) -property. Then Lemma B.3 shows that $\varphi(x, b)$ does not divide for any $b \in \psi(\mathbb{M})$. \square

In the specific case of a p -adically closed field, we know bounds on the VC-codensity of formulas in terms of the number of object variables.

Fact B.6 ([ADH⁺16], Theorem 1.2). *Let K be a model of $p\text{CF}$ and $\varphi(x, y)$ be a $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}(K)$ -formula. Then $\text{vc}^*(\varphi) \leq 2|x| - 1$.*

Although Theorem 1.2 in [ADH⁺16] is stated for \mathbb{Q}_p , recall that the VC-codensity of a formula without parameters is determined by the underlying theory, and moreover note that, for any formula $\varphi(x, y)$, with $y = (y_1, y_2)$, and parameters $c \in K^{y_2}$, clearly $\text{vc}^*(\varphi(x, y_1, c)) \leq \text{vc}^*(\varphi(x, y))$.

Fact B.6 yields p -adic versions of the results in this appendix, by substituting $\text{vc}^*(\varphi)$ with $2|x| - 1$. In particular, the p -adic version of Corollary B.5 can be applied to the proof of Corollary 5.2 to yield Remark 5.3, which in turn is used to characterize p -adic definable compactness in Remark 8.13.

References

- [ADH⁺16] Matthias Aschenbrenner, Alf Dolich, Deirdre Haskell, Dugald Macpherson, and Sergei Starchenko. Vapnik-Chervonenkis density in some theories without the independence property, I. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(8):5889–5949, 2016.
- [AG21] Pablo Andújar Guerrero. Types, transversals, and definable compactness in o-minimal structures. arXiv:2111.03802v1 [math.LO], 2021.
- [AGTW21] Pablo Andújar Guerrero, Margaret Thomas, and Erik Walsberg. Directed sets and topological spaces definable in o-minimal structures. *J. London Math. Soc.* (2), 104(3):989–1010, 2021.
- [CK12] Artem Chernikov and Itay Kaplan. Forking and dividing in NTP_2 theories. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 77(1):1–20, 2012.
- [CKHY21] Pablo Cubides Kovacsics, Martin Hils, and Jinhe Ye. Beautiful pairs, 2021. arXiv:2112.00651 [math.LO].

- [CKY21] Pablo Cubides Kovacsics and Jinhe Ye. Pro-definability of spaces of definable types. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, Series B*, 8:173–188, June 2021.
- [CS15] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Externally definable sets and dependent pairs II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(7):5217–5235, 2015.
- [CS18] Artem Chernikov and Sergei Starchenko. Regularity lemma for distal structures. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 20(10):2437–2466, 2018.
- [Del89] Françoise Delon. Définissabilité avec paramètres extérieurs dans \mathbb{Q}_p et \mathbb{R} . *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 106(1):193–198, May 1989.
- [HL16] Ehud Hrushovski and François Loeser. *Non-Archimedean Tame Topology and Stably Dominated Types*. Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, March 2016.
- [HM97] Deirdre Haskell and Dugald Macpherson. A version of o -minimality for the p -adics. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 62(4):1075–1092, December 1997.
- [HP11] Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay. On NIP and invariant measures. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 13(4):1005–1061, 2011.
- [Hru14] Ehud Hrushovski. Imaginaries and definable types in algebraically closed valued fields. *preprint*, 2014. arXiv:1403.7326.
- [Joh20] Will Johnson. On the proof of elimination of imaginaries in algebraically closed valued fields. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 61(3):363 – 381, 2020.
- [Joh21] Will Johnson. A note on fsg groups in p -adically closed fields. arXiv:2108.06092v1 [math.LO], 2021.
- [Joh22] Will Johnson. Topologizing interpretable groups in p -adically closed fields. arXiv:2205.00749v1 [math.LO], 2022.
- [JY22a] Will Johnson and Ningyuan Yao. Abelian groups definable in p -adically closed fields. arXiv:2206.14364v1 [math.LO], 2022.
- [JY22b] Will Johnson and Ningyuan Yao. On non-compact p -adic definable groups. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 87(1):188–213, 2022.
- [Kam07] Moshe Kamensky. Ind- and pro- definable sets. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 147(3):180–186, 2007.
- [Mac76] Angus Macintyre. On definable subsets of p -adic fields. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 41(3):605–610, September 1976.

- [Mat04] Jiří Matoušek. Bounded VC-dimension implies a fractional Helly theorem. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 31(2):251–255, 2004.
- [OP08] A. Onshuus and A. Pillay. Definable groups and compact p -adic Lie groups. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 78(1):233–247, 2008.
- [Pil89] A. Pillay. On fields definable in \mathbb{Q}_p . *Arch. Math. Logic*, 29:1–7, 1989.
- [PY19] Anand Pillay and Ningyuan Yao. Definable f -generic groups over p -adic numbers. arXiv:1911.01833v1 [math.LO], 2019.
- [Sim13] Pierre Simon. Distal and non-distal NIP theories. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164:294–318, 2013.
- [Sim15a] Pierre Simon. *A guide to NIP theories*. Lecture Notes in Logic. Cambridge University Press, July 2015.
- [Sim15b] Pierre Simon. Invariant types in NIP theories. *J. Math. Log.*, 15(2):1550006, 26, 2015.
- [SS14] Pierre Simon and Sergei Starchenko. On forking and definability of types in some DP-minimal theories. *J. Symb. Log.*, 79(4):1020–1024, 2014.
- [vdD98] Lou van den Dries. *Tame Topology and O-minimal Structures*. Number 248 in London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1998.