

D-MINIMAL STRUCTURES

VERSION 20

ANTONGIULIO FORNASIERO

ABSTRACT. We study d-minimal expansions of ordered fields, and dense pairs thereof. We also consider other generalizations of o-minimality.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
Acknowledgments	4
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. Conventions, basic definitions, and notation	4
2.2. Previous results	4
2.3. Functions	6
2.4. Bad set	7
2.5. Locally closed and constructible sets	8
2.6. Pettis theorem	9
3. Restrained, i-minimal and constructible structures	10
3.1. Restrained structures	10
3.2. I-minimal structures	11
3.3. Proof of Thm. 3.10	14
3.4. Constructible structures	17
3.5. Pillay and Cantor-Bendixson rank in constructible structures	18
4. Definable choice	21
4.1. Sard's Lemma	23
4.2. Dimension	23
5. D-minimal structures	25
5.1. Fundamental results	25
5.2. Subsequence selection	28
5.3. Pillay rank in d-minimal structures	32
5.4. Stratification	33
5.5. Verdier and Whitney stratifications	36
6. Cauchy completion	41
6.1. Polish structures and theories	43
7. Dense pairs of d-minimal structures	45
7.1. The Z-closure	45

Date: 12 April 2016.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 03C64; Secondary 12J15, 54E52.

Key words and phrases. D-minimal, o-minimal, open core, ordered field, definably complete, Baire, dense pair, locally o-minimal, Whitney stratification.

7.2. Dense pairs	48
7.3. The small closure	49
8. Open covers	50
References	53

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{K} be a first-order expansion of an ordered field. Recall that \mathbb{K} is said to be **definably complete** (DC) if every definable subset of \mathbb{K} has a supremum in $\mathbb{K} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ (see e.g. [FS10] and its bibliography). In this article we study the following generalization of o-minimality:

Definition 1.1. \mathbb{K} is **d-minimal** if it is definably complete, and every definable set $X \subset \mathbb{K}$ is the union of an open set and finitely many discrete sets, where the number of discrete sets does not depend on the parameters of definition of X .

[vdD85] gives the first known example of a d-minimal non o-minimal expansion of \mathbb{R} , [FM05, MT06] give more examples of d-minimal expansions of \mathbb{R} (and introduce the notion of d-minimality), and [Mil05] studies general properties of d-minimal expansions of \mathbb{R} (and other such “tameness” notions). Here we focus on the general case, when \mathbb{K} is a d-minimal expansion of a field, not necessarily the reals.

In [For13] we studied a notion which is in between o-minimality and d-minimality: locally o-minimal structures (see also [Sch14]). In [FH14] we studied DC structures (expanding a field) in general, and proved a dichotomy theorem: a DC structure either defines a discrete subring, or it is “restrained” (see §3.1) (restrained structures are a generalization of d-minimal ones). Here we continue the study in [For13, FH14] and apply their main results.

For d-minimal structures, we have the following fact: every definable set can be partitioned into finitely many (definable and embedded) manifolds (Proposition 5.12, which generalizes a result in [Mil05] for expansions of \mathbb{R}); we also have stronger property that a definable set admits a *stratification* into finitely many manifolds satisfying a suitable version of Whitney condition (a) (see Thm. 5.30 and Prop. 5.44); for locally o-minimal structures we can even find a Whitney stratification (see Corollary 5.43, which generalizes [Loi98] for o-minimal structures).

Other important properties of a d-minimal structure \mathbb{K} are:

- (*) Every definable subset of \mathbb{K}^n is constructible (i.e., a Boolean combination of finitely many open sets), definable sets have a well-behaved dimension function, and \mathbb{K} has definable Skolem functions (Remark 5.4, Theorem 3.10, and §4).

We also study (§3 and §4) the even more general notions of “i-minimal” structures (i.e. structures such that every definable set with empty

interior is nowhere dense) and “constructible” structures (i.e. structures such that every definable set is constructible), before focusing on d-minimal structures (§§5–7). The reasons are: on the one hand, (*) holds in greater generality than for d-minimal structures, and proving the result in this additional generality does not involve extra difficulties (notice however that [Mil06] proved already that d-minimal structures have definable Skolem functions); on the other hand, we need to show that a d-minimal structure is i-minimal and constructible, and hence we need some criteria for this.

Moreover, i-minimal structures are of independent interest, as shown in §3.2 and [For11c]; in particular, many restrained expansions of the real field are i-minimal (see Fact 3.8), and i-minimal structures enjoy strong “regularity” properties (see Fact 3.7 and [Mil05] for expansion of the reals, and Theorem 3.10 and Lemma 3.14 for the general case).

A useful tool in the study of d-minimal structure is the Pillay rank of a definable set (see §3.5 and §5.3): to every definable set X we associate an ordinal number $\text{rk}^P(X)$. The Pillay rank is a refinement of the dimension function, in the sense that if X is a nowhere dense subset of Y then $\text{rk}^P(X) < \text{rk}^P(Y)$ (while in general we only have $\dim(X) \leq \dim(Y)$).

However, some properties from o-minimality do not generalize well to d-minimality: for instance, in general a set definable in d-minimal structure doesn’t have Whitney stratification (see Example 5.39); moreover, in a d-minimal non o-minimal theory the algebraic closure does not have the exchange property ([DMS10, 2.12]),⁽¹⁾ and it is easy to show that there exists a d-minimal structure with the Independence Property (cf. [For11b, Example 12.7]).

§7 is devoted to the study of dense (elementary) pairs of d-minimal structures, and augments the results in [vdD98] about dense pairs of o-minimal structures (and more generally the literature on lovely pairs of geometric structures: see [Box09] for an introduction to the topic and a bibliography). In [For11b, §9 and §13] we studied another notion: d-minimal topological structures, and proved some results about dense pairs of such structures. Here we show that if \mathbb{K} is a definably complete expansion of a field, and \mathbb{K} is d-minimal in the sense of Definition 1.1, then it is a d-minimal topological structure (see §7.1): hence, we can apply the results in [For11b] to our situation. In particular, we have the following theorem (which is new even for expansions of the reals).

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathbb{K} be a d-minimal structure, and T be its theory. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$; let T^{nd} be the theory of tuples $\mathbb{A}_0 \prec \mathbb{A}_1 \prec \dots \mathbb{A}_n \models T$, such that each \mathbb{A}_{i+1} is a proper elementary extension of \mathbb{A}_i , and \mathbb{A}_0 is topologically dense in \mathbb{A}_n . Then:*

⁽¹⁾ In a previous version of this article, it was erroneously claimed that a d-minimal non o-minimal theory is never rosy: we don’t know if this is true or not; cf. Lemma 7.15.

- (1) T^{nd} is consistent and complete.
- (2) \mathbb{A}_n is the open core of $\langle \mathbb{A}_0 \prec \mathbb{A}_1 \prec \dots \mathbb{A}_n \rangle \models T^{nd}$ (see Definition 2.8).
- (3) Any model of T^{nd} is definably complete.

In §6 we show that if \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, then \mathbb{K}^C , the Cauchy completion of \mathbb{K} , has exactly one structure such that $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}^C$. This is new even in the case when \mathbb{K} is o-minimal (see [LS95, Fré15]).

In §2 we continue the study from [DMS10, FS10, For13, FH14] of definably complete structures, introducing some concepts and proving the results we need in the remainder of the paper.

Many of the results proved in this article are adaptations of results (and proofs) either in o-minimal structures, or in expansions of \mathbb{R} (and in particular from [Mil05, DMS10, Loi98]).

Acknowledgments. Thanks to L. Kramer, and to an anonymous referee for his many suggestions on how to improve this article.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Conventions, basic definitions, and notation. See [For13, §2] for our main conventions and notations; in particular, \mathbb{K} will always be a definably complete expansion of a field, and “definable” will always mean “definable with parameters”. \mathcal{L} is the language of \mathbb{K} . Moreover, \overline{X} or $\text{cl}(X)$ denote the topological closure of X , ∂X denotes $\overline{X} \setminus X$, while $\text{bd}(X)$ denotes $\overline{X} \setminus \overset{\circ}{X}$.

2.2. Previous results. See [For13, §5] for general topology facts, definably complete structures, dimension and full dimension, and pseudo-finite, locally closed, or constructible sets.

Definition 2.1 ([FS10, §2]). Let $X \subseteq Y \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable sets.

- X is definably **meager** in Y (or, as we will almost always say, X is meager in Y) if there is a definable increasing family $(C_t : t \in \mathbb{K})$ of subsets of Y , such that each C_t is a nowhere dense subset of Y (that is, the closure of C_t in Y has empty interior as a subset of Y), and $X \subseteq \bigcup_t C_t$. If $Y = \mathbb{K}^n$, we simply say that X is meager.
- Y is **definably Baire** if, for every definable nonempty subset $U \subseteq Y$ which is open in Y , U is not meager in Y .
- X is almost open (or **a.o.** for short) if there exists a definable open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$, such that $X \Delta U$ is meager (in \mathbb{K}^n); notice that every meager set is a.o..

Fact 2.2 ([Hie13] see also [FH14, Theorem 36]). \mathbb{K} is definably Baire.

See [FS10, §1–5] for more on the definably Baire property; a fundamental result, besides Fact 2.2, is the following definable version of Kuratowski-Ulam Theorem, which implies that \mathbb{K}^n is also definably Baire.

Fact 2.3 (Kuratowski-Ulam Theorem [FS10, Proposition 5.4]). *Let D be an a.o. subset of \mathbb{K}^{m+n} . Then, D is meager iff the set $\{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{K}^m : D_{\bar{x}} \text{ is not meager}\}$ is meager.*

Moreover, we will sometimes use the following result.

Fact 2.4 ([FS10, Proposition 2.11]). *Let Y be definable and $U \subseteq Y$ be definable, open (in Y) and nonempty. Then, U is meager in Y iff U is meager in itself.*

Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Remember that call a definable set $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ **d-compact** if it is closed and bounded, **pseudo-finite** if it is d-compact and discrete, **at most pseudo-enumerable** if there exist a definable function f whose domain is a discrete subset of \mathbb{K}^m and whose image is X , and **pseudo-enumerable** if it is at most pseudo-enumerable and not pseudo-finite (see [For11a]).

Since every pseudo-enumerable set is meager, Fact 2.2 implies the following result (see also [For11a] for a proof that does not use Fact 2.2).

Fact 2.5. \mathbb{K} is not pseudo-enumerable.

Given a definable set X , let

$$\delta(X) := \inf\{d(c, X \setminus \{c\}) : c \in X\}.$$

Remark 2.6. Let X be definable and bounded. X is pseudo-finite iff $\delta(X) > 0$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable, closed, with empty interior. Let D be the set of endpoints of the complement of A (see [For11a, §2]). Then, $D \subseteq A$, D is dense in A , and is at most pseudo-enumerable.*

Proof. By [For11a, Corollary 4.18]. \square

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathbb{F} = \langle F; <, \dots \rangle$ be a structure expanding a linear order. The **open core** of \mathbb{F} is the structure on F given by a predicate for every \mathbb{F} -definable open subset of F^n , as n varies: see [DMS10].

We can always distinguish two cases: either there exists a closed definable discrete unbounded subset of \mathbb{K} , or \mathbb{K} has locally o-minimal open core (see [For13]).

Lemma 2.9. *Let $(D_t : t \in \mathbb{K})$ be a definable increasing family of discrete subsets of \mathbb{K}^n . Then, $\bigcup_t D_t$ is also at most pseudo-enumerable.*

Proof. Let $X := \bigcup_t D_t$. If \mathbb{K} has locally o-minimal open core, then each D_t is pseudo-finite; therefore, by [For13, Theorem 3.3(9)], X is also pseudo-finite. Otherwise, let I be a closed definable discrete unbounded subset of $\mathbb{K}_{\geq 1}$. Then,

$$X = \bigcup_{t \in I} D_t.$$

Each set in the above union is discrete, the index set is pseudo-enumerable, and the family of sets is definable; thus, by [For11a, Corollary 4.16], X is at most pseudo-enumerable. \square

2.3. Functions. In this subsection, we will prove that certain subsets of \mathbb{K}^n are meager.

Let $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ be a definable function. For every $s > 0$, define

$$\mathcal{D}(f, s) := \{x \in A : \forall t > 0,$$

$$f(A \cap B(x, t)) \text{ is not contained in any open ball of radius } s\}.$$
⁽²⁾

Then, each $\mathcal{D}(f, s)$ is closed in A . Moreover, $\mathcal{D}(f)$, the set of discontinuity points of f , is equal to $\bigcup_s \mathcal{D}(f, s)$, and, therefore, it is an \mathcal{F}_σ subset of A .

Fact 2.10 ([FH14, Lemma 39 and Theorem B]). *Let $f : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be definable and monotone. Then, $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is at most pseudo-enumerable. Moreover, f is differentiable on a dense subset of \mathbb{K} .*

Lemma 2.11. *Let $f : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be definable. Define $M_f := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : x \text{ is a local minimum for } f\}$. Then, $f(M_f)$ is at most pseudo-enumerable.*

Proof. For every $r > 0$, let

$$M(r) := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : |x| \leq r \ \& \ |f(x)| \leq r \ \& \ x \text{ is a minimum for } f \text{ in the ball } B(x, 1/r)\}.$$

Note that $f(M_f) = \bigcup_r f(M(r))$. Fix $r > 0$.

Claim 1. $Y := f(M(r))$ is pseudo-finite.

Assume, for a contradiction, that Y has an accumulation point $y \in \mathbb{K}$. For every $\delta > 0$, let

$$U(\delta) := \{x \in M(r) : f(x) \in B(y, \delta) \setminus \{y\}\}.$$

Let $C(\delta)$ be the closure of $U(\delta)$ in \mathbb{K}^n . Since each $C(\delta)$ is a nonempty d-compact subset of $\overline{B(0, r)}$, the intersection of the $C(\delta)$ is nonempty; let $x \in \bigcap_\delta C(\delta)$. Choose x_1, x_2 , and δ such that $x_1, x_2 \in B(x, 1/(2r)) \cap U(\delta)$ and $f(x_1) < f(x_2)$ (they exist by definitions). However, $x_1 \in B(x_2, 1/r)$, and $x_2 \in M(r)$; therefore, $f(x_1) \geq f(x_2)$, absurd.

The fact that $f(M_f)$ is at most pseudo-enumerable follows from the claim and Lemma 2.9. \square

Definition 2.12. A definable function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is **of first class** if there exists a definable function $F : \mathbb{K} \times X \rightarrow Y$, such that, for every $t \in \mathbb{K}$ and $x \in X$,

- (1) $f_t(x) := F(t, x) : X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous function of x ,
- (2) $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f_t(x) = f(x)$;

that is, f is a point-wise limit of a definable family of continuous functions $(f_t)_{t \in \mathbb{K}}$.

⁽²⁾ Note that there is a misprint in the definition of $\mathcal{D}(f, s)$ in [DMS10, 1.8]: with their definition, $\mathcal{D}(f, s)$ is not closed in A .

Lemma 2.13. *Let X be definably Baire, and $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^m$ be of first class. Then, $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is meager in X .*

Proof. Minor variation of [Oxt71, Thm. 7.3]. It suffices to show that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $F_\varepsilon := \{x \in X : \omega(x) \geq 5\varepsilon\}$ is nowhere dense, where

$$\omega(x) := \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \{ |f(x') - f(x'')| : x', x'' \in B(x; \delta) \}.$$

Fix an open definable subset $X' \subseteq X$. For every $i \in \mathbb{K}$, let

$$E_i := \bigcap_{s, t \geq i} \{x \in X' : |f_s(x) - f_t(x)| \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

Then, $(E_i)_{i \in \mathbb{K}}$ is an increasing family of closed subsets of X' , and $\bigcup_i E_i = X'$. Since X is definably Baire and X' is open in X , X' is not meager in itself (see Fact 2.4), and therefore E_{i_0} must have nonempty interior (in X'), for some $i_0 \in \mathbb{K}$. Let V be a definable nonempty open subset of E_{i_0} . We have $|f_t(x) - f_s(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in V$ and $s, t \geq i_0$. Putting $t = i_0$ and letting $s \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $|f_{i_0}(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in V$. For all $x_0 \in V$ there exists a neighborhood $U(x_0) \subseteq V$, such that $|f_{i_0}(x) - f_{i_0}(x_0)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in U(x_0)$. Hence $|f(x) - f_{i_0}(x_0)| \leq 2\varepsilon$ for all $x \in U(x_0)$. Therefore $\omega(x_0) \leq 4\varepsilon$, and so no point of V belongs to F_ε . Thus, every nonempty open set X' contains a nonempty open subset V disjoint from F_ε . This shows that F_ε is nowhere dense. \square

See also [FH14, Lemma 46] for a similar result (with a similar proof), and [FS10, Lemma 3.10] for a related one.

2.4. Bad set.

Definition 2.14. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$. The set of **bad points** for A is

$$\mathfrak{B}_n(A) := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : \text{cl}(A)_x \setminus \text{cl}(A_x) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Notice that $\mathfrak{B}_n(A) = \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : \text{cl}(A)_x \neq \text{cl}(A_x)\}$.

In the following, it will often be necessary to prove that $\mathfrak{B}_n(A)$ is “small” (in some suitable sense, usually meaning “meager”).

Remark 2.15. Assume that $A \subseteq C \subseteq \overline{A} \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$. Then, $\mathfrak{B}_n(A) \supseteq \mathfrak{B}_n(C)$.

Proof.

$$\text{cl}(A)_x \setminus \text{cl}(A_x) = \text{cl}(C)_x \setminus \text{cl}(A_x) \supseteq \text{cl}(C)_x \setminus \text{cl}(C_x). \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.16. *If A is an \mathcal{F}_σ , then $\mathfrak{B}_n(A)$ is the projection of a \mathcal{G}_δ set. If A is open, then $\mathfrak{B}_n(A)$ is a meager \mathcal{F}_σ .*

Proof. Define

$$F := \{ \langle x, y, r, y' \rangle \in \mathbb{K}^n \times \mathbb{K}^m \times \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^m : r > 0 \ \& \ \langle x, y' \rangle \in A \ \& \ |y - y'| < r \};$$

$$\pi(x, y) := x;$$

$$\pi'(x, y, r) := \langle x, y \rangle;$$

$$\pi''(x, y, r, y') := \langle x, y, r \rangle.$$

Notice that

$$\mathfrak{B}_n(A) = \pi(\overline{A} \cap \pi'(\{r > 0\} \setminus \pi''(F))).$$

If A is an \mathcal{F}_σ , then F is also an \mathcal{F}_σ , and therefore $\mathfrak{B}_n(A)$ is the projection of a \mathcal{G}_δ set.

Assume now that A is open. Then, F is also open, and therefore $\mathfrak{B}_n(A)$ is an \mathcal{F}_σ . For every $r > 0$, define $C(r) := \{\langle x, y \rangle \in \overline{A} : |x, y| \leq 1/r \text{ \& } d(y, A_x) \geq r\}$. Notice that $\mathfrak{B}_n(A) = \bigcup_{r>0} \pi(C(r))$ and each $C(r)$ is d-compact. Hence, to prove that $\mathfrak{B}_n(A)$ is meager, it suffices to prove that, for every $r > 0$, $\pi(C(r))$ has empty interior. Assume, for a contradiction, that $\pi(C(r_0))$ contains a nonempty open box W , for some $r_0 > 0$. To simplify the notation, assume that $m = 1$. Define $f : W \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, $f(x) := \min(C(r_0)_x)$. By [DMS10, Lemma 2.8], there exists a nonempty open box $W' \subseteq W$, such that $f \upharpoonright_{W'}$ is continuous; w.l.o.g., $W = W'$. Fix $x_0 \in W$, call $y_0 := f(x_0)$, and let V_{x_0} be an open box around x_0 contained in W , and such that, for every $x \in V_{x_0}$, $d(f(x), y_0) < r_0/4$. Since $\langle x_0, y_0 \rangle \in \overline{A}$, there exists $\langle x, y' \rangle \in A$, such that $x \in V_{x_0}$, and $d(y_0, y') < r_0/4$. Let $y := f(x)$. Since $\langle x, y \rangle \in C(r)$, $d(y, A_x) \geq r$; in particular, $d(y, y') \geq r$. However, this contradicts $d(y, y_0) < r_0/4$ and $d(y_0, y') < r_0/4$. \square

Remark 2.17. $\mathfrak{B}_n(A \cup B) \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_n(A) \cup \mathfrak{B}_n(B)$.

2.5. Locally closed and constructible sets. Let X be a topological space X , and $Y \subseteq X$. Y is locally closed (in X) if it is of the form $U \setminus V$, where U and V are open subsets of X . Y is constructible if it is a finite Boolean combination of open subsets of X . If we don't specify, we take $X = \mathbb{K}^n$ (for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$).

See [For13, §5.6] for basic results on definable locally closed and constructible sets; we recall here the definition and our notation. See also [Rob73] and [Pil87].

Definition 2.18 ([For13]). Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$. Define

$$\text{lc}(X) := \{x \in X : X \text{ is locally closed at } x\}$$

(that is, $x \in \text{lc}(X)$ iff there exists an open ball B of center x , such that $X \cap B = \overline{X} \cap B$), and $\ulcorner X \urcorner := X \setminus \text{lc}(X)$.

Define $X^{\ulcorner 0 \urcorner} := X$, and, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $X^{\ulcorner k+1 \urcorner} := \ulcorner X^{\ulcorner k \urcorner} \urcorner$.

One can easily see that $\text{lc}(X)$ is locally closed, and that if X is an \mathcal{F}_σ , then $\ulcorner X \urcorner$ is also an \mathcal{F}_σ (see [For13]).

Here is the basic result on definable constructible sets.

Fact 2.19. $\ulcorner A \urcorner = A \cap \partial(\partial A)$. A is the union of m locally closed sets if and only if $A^{\ulcorner m+1 \urcorner}$ is empty.

Proof. See [All96], where ∂A is denoted by \check{A} , and $\ulcorner A \urcorner$ by either $\mathcal{B}(A)$ or $H(A)$; see also [DM01] for another proof. \square

Fact 2.20. ⁽³⁾ Let X be a topological space and $Y \subseteq X$ be a constructible subset. Then, Y is nowhere dense iff it has empty interior (inside X).

Proposition 2.21. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and locally closed. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be open, such that $A = \overline{A} \cap U$. Let $d \leq n$. Then, for every $x \in \mathbb{K}^d$,

$$A_x = \text{cl}(A_x) \cap U_x,$$

and in particular A_x is locally closed. Moreover, $\mathfrak{B}_d(A) \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_d(U)$, and therefore $\mathfrak{B}_d(A)$ is meager.

Proof. $A_x \subseteq \text{cl}(A_x) \cap U_x$ is obvious. For the opposite inclusion,

$$\text{cl}(A_x) \cap U_x \subseteq (\overline{A})_x \cap U_x = (\overline{A} \cap U)_x = A_x.$$

Assume, for a contradiction, that $x \in \mathfrak{B}_d(A) \setminus \mathfrak{B}_d(U)$. Let $E := \overline{A}$; notice that $A = E \cap U$. Since $x \notin \mathfrak{B}_d(U)$, $\text{cl}(U_x) = (\overline{U})_x$. Notice that $\text{cl}(E \cap U) = E \cap \overline{U} = E$, and therefore

$$\text{cl}(A_x) = \text{cl}(E_x \cap U_x) = E_x \cap \text{cl}(U_x) = E_x \cap (\overline{U})_x = (E \cap \overline{U})_x = E_x = (\overline{A})_x,$$

contradicting $x \notin \mathfrak{B}_d(A)$.

By Lemma 2.16, $\mathfrak{B}_d(U)$ is meager, and we are done. \square

Corollary 2.22. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and constructible, and $d \leq n$. Then, $\mathfrak{B}_d(A)$ is meager.

2.6. Pettis theorem. If X and Y are subsets of \mathbb{K}^n , then $X - Y := \{x - y : x \in X, y \in Y\}$.

Lemma 2.23 (Pettis Theorem). Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and a.o.. If A is nonmeager, then $A - A$ contains a nonempty open neighborhood of 0. Conversely, if \mathbb{K} is i -minimal (see §3), $n = 1$, and $A - A$ is nonmeager, then A is nonmeager.⁽⁴⁾

Proof. Minor variation of [Oxt71, Thm. 4.8]. Let $A = U \Delta P$, where U is open and definable, and P is meager. A is nonmeager iff U is nonempty. If A is nonmeager, let $B \subseteq U$ be a nonempty open ball, of radius $\delta > 0$. For any $x \in \mathbb{K}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (x + A) \cap A &= ((x + U) \Delta (x + P)) \cap (U \Delta P) = \\ &= ((x + U) \cap U) \Delta ((x + U) \cap P) \Delta ((x + P) \cap U) \Delta ((x + P) \cap P) \supseteq \\ &\supseteq [(x + B) \cap B] \Delta [P \cup (x + P)]. \end{aligned}$$

If $|x| < \delta$, the right member represents a nonempty open set, minus a meager set; it is therefore nonempty. Thus, for every $x \in B(0; \delta)$, $(x + A) \cap A$ is nonempty, and therefore $x \in A - A$.

⁽³⁾ See the proof of [Pil87, Lemma 2.3]

⁽⁴⁾ The original version of this and the following lemma required that \mathbb{K} has Definable Skolem Functions. Thanks to an anonymous referee for pointing out that the additional assumption was not necessary.

Conversely, assume, for a contradiction, that \mathbb{K} is i-minimal, $A \subset \mathbb{K}$ is meager, but $A - A$ is nonmeager. Then, by Theorem 3.10, by replacing A with \overline{A} , w.l.o.g. we can assume that A is closed and nowhere dense, while $A - A$ contains a nonempty interval I . Let $D \subseteq A$ be the set of endpoints of $\mathbb{K} \setminus A$. By Lemma 2.7, D is a pseudo-enumerable subset of A , and D is dense in A . Since the function $\langle x, y \rangle \mapsto x - y$ is continuous, $D - D$ is dense in I . By Theorem 3.10 again, $D - D$ has nonempty interior; however, $D - D$ is pseudo-enumerable, a contradiction. \square

Define $F : \mathbb{K}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ as $F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) := (x_1 - x_2)/(y_1 - y_2)$ if $y_1 \neq y_2$, and 0 otherwise.

Corollary 2.24. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable and a.o.. If A is nonmeager, then $F(A^4) = \mathbb{K}$. If \mathbb{K} is i-minimal and $F(A^4)$ is nonmeager, then A is nonmeager.*

Proof. If A is nonmeager, then $A - A$ contains an open neighborhood of 0, and therefore $F(A^4) = \mathbb{K}$. The converse is proved as in the previous lemma. \square

See also [For11b, Lemma 3.47].

3. RESTRAINED, I-MINIMAL AND CONSTRUCTIBLE STRUCTURES

As usual, \mathbb{K} is a definably complete structure, expanding a field.

3.1. Restrained structures.

Definition 3.1 ([FH14, Definition 23 and Theorem A]). \mathbb{K} is **restrained** if, for every definable discrete subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$, and every definable function $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, $f(D)$ is nowhere dense in \mathbb{K} .

The structures of interest to us in this article are restrained.

Fact 3.2 ([FH14, Lemma 49 and Theorem A]). *T.f.a.e.:*

- (1) \mathbb{K} is restrained;
- (2) \mathbb{K} does not define a discrete subring;
- (3) for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, every meager subset of \mathbb{K}^m is nowhere dense.

Lemma 3.3. \mathbb{K} is restrained iff every meager subset of \mathbb{K} is nowhere dense.

Proof. The ‘‘only if’’ direction is clear from Fact 3.2.

For the opposite direction, assume for a contradiction that \mathbb{K} is not restrained. Then, there exists $Z \subset \mathbb{K}$ definable discrete subring. Let $X \subset \mathbb{K}$ be the field of fractions of Z . Then, X is pseudo-enumerable, and therefore it is meager; however, X is dense in \mathbb{K} . \square

Fact 3.4 ([FH14, Lemma 51]). *Let \mathbb{K} be restrained, $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be open and definable, $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be a definable continuous function, and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, f is \mathcal{C}^p on a dense open subset of U .*

3.2. I-minimal structures.

Definition 3.5. \mathbb{K} is **i-minimal** if, for every unary definable set X , if X has empty interior, then X is nowhere dense.

See also [Mil05] for the case when \mathbb{K} is an expansion of \mathbb{R} .

Remark 3.6. If \mathbb{K} is i-minimal, then it is restrained.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3. □

In [For11c] we prove the following two facts about expansions of the real field.

Fact 3.7. *Let \mathcal{R} be an expansion of the real field. Then, t.f.a.e.:*

- (1) \mathcal{R} is i-minimal;
- (2) every unary definable set with empty interior has Lebesgue measure 0;
- (3) every unary definable set with empty interior has Hausdorff dimension 0.

Fact 3.8. *Let \mathcal{R} be an o-minimal expansion of the real field, and $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a closed set. The, either $\langle \mathcal{R}, C \rangle$ is i-minimal, or the set of natural numbers is definable in $\langle \mathcal{R}, C \rangle$.*

Thus, several of the ‘‘tameness’’ conditions introduced in [Mil05, §3.1] are equivalent to i-minimality, and, for expansion of the real field by a unary closed set, i-minimality is equivalent to being restrained.

Examples 3.9. If \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal, then it is i-minimal (trivial).

If \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, then it is i-minimal. In fact, by definition of d-minimality if $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ is definable and with empty interior, then X is a finite union of discrete sets X_1, \dots, X_n . Every discrete subset of a definably complete structure is nowhere dense. Thus, X is a finite union of nowhere dense sets, and thus it is nowhere dense.

Theorem 3.10. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbb{K} is i-minimal;
- (2) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if X is a definable subset of \mathbb{K}^n with empty interior, then X is nowhere dense;
- (3) for every definable set X , $\text{bd}(X)$ has empty interior;
- (4) for every definable $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}$, $\dim X = \dim \overline{X}$;
- (5) for every definable X , $\dim X = \dim \overline{X}$;
- (6) if $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is definable and open, and $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is definable, then $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is nowhere dense;
- (7) for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, if $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ is definable, then $\mathfrak{B}_n(A)$ is nowhere dense (see Definition 2.14);
- (8) for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, if $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ is definable, then the set

$$\{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : (\partial A)_x \neq \partial(A_x)\}$$

is nowhere dense;

- (9) for every definable $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}$, either X has interior, or it is meager;
- (10) every definable set either has interior, or it is meager;
- (11) for all definable $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{K}$, $\dim(A \cup B) = \max\{\dim A, \dim B\}$;
- (12) for all definable $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$, $\dim(A \cup B) = \max\{\dim A, \dim B\}$;
- (13) for all definable $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$, if $\dim A = d$, then $\{x \in \mathbb{K}^d : \dim A_x > 0\}$ is nowhere dense;
- (14) let $d, k, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $k \leq n$ and $d \leq m$; let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ be definable, and $\dim A \leq d + k$; define $C := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : \dim A_x \geq d\}$; then, $\dim(C) \leq k$;
- (15) any at most pseudo-enumerable union of subsets of \mathbb{K} with empty interior has empty interior;
- (16) for every $d \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, any at most pseudo-enumerable union of subsets of \mathbb{K}^n of dimension less or equal to d has dimension less or equal to d ;

Moreover, if \mathbb{K} is i -minimal, then:

- (I) every meager set is nowhere dense;
- (II) for every $d \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, any increasing definable union of subsets of \mathbb{K}^n of dimension less or equal to d has dimension less or equal to d ;
- (III) if $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ is open and definable, and $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is definable, then there exists $D \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ definable, closed and with empty interior, such that, for every definably connected component I of $U \setminus D$, $f \upharpoonright_I$ is continuous, and either constant or strictly monotone;
- (IV) every definable set is a.o..

The proof is postponed to Section 3.3; cf. [Mil05, Main Lemma and Thm. 3.3]. We record now some consequences of the above theorem.

Example 3.11. Let $\langle M', M \rangle$ be o -minimal structures (expanding a field), such that M is a proper elementary substructure of M' and it is dense in M' . Thus, the structure $N := \langle M', M \rangle$ has o -minimal open core (see [DMS10]). Therefore, if $X \subseteq N$ is meager, then X is nowhere dense (see [For13, §4]). However, N is not i -minimal, because M is a definable dense subset of N with empty interior (thus, clause (I) in Thm. 3.10 does not imply i -minimality).

Lemma 3.12. \mathbb{K} is locally o -minimal iff it is i -minimal and its open core is locally o -minimal.

Proof. The “only if” direction is clear. Let us prove the “if” direction. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable and with empty interior. By i -minimality, X is nowhere dense. Since the open core of \mathbb{K} is locally o -minimal, X is pseudo-finite (by [For13, Lemma 3.2], applied to the open core of \mathbb{K} and the closure of X). Thus, \mathbb{K} is locally o -minimal. \square

Corollary 3.13. Assume that \mathbb{K} is i -minimal. Then, \mathbb{K} is o -minimal iff every definable discrete set is finite.

Proof. The “only if” direction is clear. Assume now that \mathbb{K} is i -minimal and every definable discrete set is finite. By [For13, Corollary 4.6],

\mathbb{K} has o-minimal open core. Thus, by Lemma 3.12, \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal, and therefore it coincides with its own open core ([For13, §7]). \square

Since there do exist i-minimal structures that are not locally o-minimal (e.g., d-minimal not o-minimal expansions of the real field), we have that for some i-minimal structure there is some definable nonempty set X such that $\dim(\partial X) = \dim X$ (notice that if \mathbb{K} is i-minimal, then $\dim(\partial X) \leq \dim X$, because $\dim X = \dim(\overline{X}) = \max\{\dim(X), \dim(\partial X)\}$).

Proviso. *For the remainder of this subsection, we will assume that \mathbb{K} is i-minimal.*

Lemma 3.14. *Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be definable, where $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is open and definable. Then, for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $D \subset U$ closed, definable and nowhere dense, such that f is \mathcal{C}^p on $U \setminus D$.*

Proof. The case $p = 0$, is Thm. 3.10(6).

The case $p > 0$ follows from the case $p = 0$ and Fact 3.4. \square

Lemma 3.15. *Let $d \leq n$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable, $\pi := \Pi_d^n$, and*

$Z := Z(A) := \{a \in A : \exists U \text{ neighborhood of } a : \pi(A \cap U) \text{ is nowhere dense}\}.$

Then, Z is a definable open (in A) subset of A , and $\pi(Z)$ is nowhere dense (in \mathbb{K}^d).

Proof. Follows immediately from [For13, Lemma 5.25]. \square

Definition 3.16. We define Π -good sets as in [Mil05, §7]. That is, we say that a definable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ is π -good (where $\pi := \Pi_m^{n+m}$) if:

- $\dim A = m$;
- πA is open;
- $\pi(A \cap U)$ has interior for every $a \in A$ and open neighborhood U of a ;
- for all $x \in \pi A$, $\dim(A_x) = 0$ and $\text{cl}(A_x) = \text{cl}(A)_x$.

More generally, A is μ -good (where μ is a projection from \mathbb{K}^{n+m} to an m -dimensional coordinate space) if there is a permutation of coordinates σ such that $\mu = \pi \circ \sigma$, and σA is π -good. Finally, A is Π -good if it is μ -good for some μ as above, and a collection of sets is Π -good if each of its elements is.

Lemma 3.17 (Partition Lemma). *Let \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n . Then, there exists \mathcal{B} , a finite Π -good partition of \mathbb{K}^n compatible with \mathcal{A} (that is, \mathcal{B} is a finite collection of sets, and every set in \mathcal{A} is a union of sets in \mathcal{B}).*

Proof. The proof proceeds as in [Mil05, §7, Partition Lemma], using Lemma 3.15. \square

Lemma 3.18. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ be definable. Then,*

- (1) $\{x \in \mathbb{K}^m : \text{lc}(A_x) \neq (\text{lc } A)_x\}$ is nowhere dense;
- (2) for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{x \in \mathbb{K}^m : (A^{\lceil k \rceil})_x \neq (A_x)^{\lceil k \rceil}\}$ is nowhere dense (see Definition 2.18);
- (3) if $\{x \in \mathbb{K}^m : \text{lc}(A_x) \neq \emptyset\}$ is somewhere dense, then $\text{lc}(A) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. The same as [Mil05, Lemma 8.1]. \square

3.3. Proof of Thm. 3.10. (1 \Leftrightarrow 4) and (5 \Rightarrow 4) are clear.

For every $0 < n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $K \geq 2$, let $(K)_n$ be the instantiation at n of the K th statement. For instance, $(2)_1$ is equivalent to (1). We will prove that $(2)_n \Rightarrow (7)_n \Rightarrow (6)_n \Rightarrow (2)_n$, that $(2)_n \Rightarrow (2)_{n+1}$, that $(2)_n \Leftrightarrow (3)_n$, and that $(2)_n$ implies that every meager $X \subset \mathbb{K}^n$ is nowhere dense.

By induction on n , the above would imply (1 \Leftrightarrow 2 \Leftrightarrow 3 \Leftrightarrow 4 \Leftrightarrow 6 \Leftrightarrow 7 \Rightarrow I).

$((2)_n \Leftrightarrow (3)_n)$ is clear.

$((6)_n \Rightarrow (3)_n)$. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Let $f := 1_X$ be the characteristic function of X ; then, $\mathcal{D}(f) = \text{bd}(X)$; thus, $\text{bd}(X)$ is nowhere dense.

$((7)_n \Rightarrow (6)_n)$. Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be definable, with $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ open. We want to prove that $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is nowhere dense; w.l.o.g., f is bounded and $U = \mathbb{K}^n$. Let $A := \text{Graph}(f)$; then, $\mathcal{D}(f) = \mathfrak{B}_n(A)$. Thus, $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is nowhere dense.

Assume now that we have $(2)_n$.

Note that if $Y \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is meager and definable, then, since \mathbb{K} is definably Baire, Y has empty interior, and thus Y is nowhere dense; therefore, we have proved (I) $_n$.

We prove now $(7)_n$. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ be definable, and $B := \mathfrak{B}_n(A)$.

If we prove that B is meager, then, since \mathbb{K} is definably Baire, B has empty interior, and thus, by inductive hypothesis, B is nowhere dense. W.l.o.g., A is bounded (because, after using a definable homeomorphism from \mathbb{K} to $(0, 1)$, B can only become larger).

Let $\pi := \Pi_n^{n+m}$, and $U := \pi(A)$. If U has empty interior, then, by $(2)_n$, U is nowhere dense; thus, B is also nowhere dense, because $B \subseteq \pi(A)$. Therefore, we can assume that U has nonempty interior, and hence, w.l.o.g., that U is open.

Thus, for every $r > 0$, let

$$C(r) := \{(x, y) \in \overline{A} : d(y, A_x) \geq r\},$$

and $B(r) := \pi(C(r))$. Since $B = \bigcup_r B(r)$, and by $(2)_n$, it suffices to prove that each $B(r)$ has empty interior.

Fix $r > 0$, and assume, for a contradiction, that $U' \subseteq B(r)$ is a nonempty open definable set. W.l.o.g., $U' = U$. Let $C' := C(r)$: notice that C' is d-compact. Define $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^m$, $x \mapsto \text{lex min}(C'_x)$. By [DMS10, 2.8(1)], $\mathcal{D}(g)$ is meager, and therefore nowhere dense; thus, there exists $U' \subseteq U$ open and nonempty, such that g is continuous

on U' ; w.l.o.g., $U = U'$. Define also $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^m$; $x \mapsto \text{lex inf}(C(r)_x)$. Note that $f(x) \geq g(x)$ for every $x \in U$.

Claim 2. The set $D := \{x \in U : f(x) > g(x)\}$ is nowhere dense.

We will do only the case $m = 1$. It suffices to prove that D is meager. For every $s > 0$, let $D(s) := \{x \in U : f(x) \geq g(x) + s\}$. If we prove that each $D(s)$ is nowhere dense, we have the claim. By $(2)_n$, it suffices to prove that $D(s)$ has empty interior. Assume, for a contradiction, that V is a nonempty subset of $D(s)$, and let $x \in V$. Since g is continuous, we can assume that $d(g(x'), g(x)) < s/2$ for every $x' \in V$. By definition of f and g , there exists $x' \in V$ such that $d(f(x'), g(x)) < s/2$. Hence, $d(f(x'), g(x')) < s$, absurd.

Thus, after shrinking U , we can assume that $f = g$. Fix $x \in U$, and let $y := f(x)$. Since g is continuous on U , after shrinking U we can assume that $d(f(x'), y) < r/3$ for every $x' \in U$. Since $\text{Graph}(f) \subseteq \overline{A}$, there exists $(x', y') \in A$, such that (x', y') is near (x, y) ; that is, $x' \in U$ and $d(y', y) < r/3$. Moreover, by definition of g , there exists $y'' \in C(r)_{x'}$, such that $d(f(x'), y'') < r/3$. However, this implies that $d(y', y'') < r$, contradicting the definition of $C(r)$.

We prove now $((2)_n \Rightarrow (2)_{n+1})$: let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ be definable and with empty interior; we want to show that A is nowhere dense. If not, let

$$E' := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : \text{cl}(A)_x \text{ has nonempty interior}\}$$

By assumption, E' has nonempty interior. W.l.o.g., A is bounded. Let $E := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : \text{cl}(A_x) \text{ has nonempty interior}\}$. Since, by $(7)_n$, $E \Delta E'$ is nowhere dense, E has nonempty interior. By (1), $E = \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : A_x \text{ has nonempty interior}\}$. Since \mathbb{K} is definably Baire, there exists $0 < r \in \mathbb{K}$ such that

$$E(r) := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : A_x \text{ contains an interval of length } r\}$$

has nonempty interior; let $U \subseteq E(r)$ be a nonempty open set.

After shrinking A if necessary, we can assume that, for every $x \in U$, A is bounded and A_x is an open interval of length r . For every $x \in U$, let $h(x)$ be the center of A_x .

By $(6)_n$, the set of points where h is continuous has nonempty interior. Thus, after shrinking U , we can assume that h is continuous. But then the set $\{\langle x, y \rangle \in U \times \mathbb{K} : h(x) - r/2 < y < h(x) + r/2\}$ is open and contained in A , absurd.

$(7 \Leftrightarrow 8)$ is clear.

$(2 \Rightarrow 10 \Rightarrow 9)$ are also clear.

$(9 \Rightarrow 1)$. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable and have empty interior. By hypothesis, X is meager. Moreover, $\partial X = \overline{X} \setminus X$ has also empty interior, and thus it is meager. Therefore, \overline{X} is meager. Since \mathbb{K} is definably Baire, \overline{X} has empty interior.

$(7 \Rightarrow 5)$. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable, and let $d := \dim \overline{X}$. We want to prove that $\dim X = d$. W.l.o.g., $\pi(\overline{X})$ contains an open subset of \mathbb{K}^d ,

where $\pi := \Pi_d^n$. If, for a contradiction, $\dim X < d$, then, by (2), $\pi(X)$ is nowhere dense. Notice that $\pi(\overline{X}) \setminus \pi(X) \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_d(X)$. Since $\mathfrak{B}_d(X)$ is nowhere dense, we get a contradiction.

(2 \Rightarrow 13). Let $X := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^d : \dim A_x > 0\}$, where $d := \dim A$, and assume, for a contradiction, that X is somewhere dense (and thus, by (2), X has nonempty interior). If $d = 0$, then $X = \emptyset \subset \mathbb{K}^0 = \{0\}$, and we have a contradiction. Thus, w.l.o.g., A is closed (because $\dim \overline{A} = \dim A$), and $Y := \Pi_{d+1}^n(A)$ satisfies

$$\forall x \in X \quad \dim(Y_x) > 0.$$

By Kuratowski-Ulam theorem, this implies that Y is not meager, and thus has nonempty interior, contradicting $\dim A = d$.

(2 \Rightarrow 12). Let $A_1, A_2 \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable, such that $\dim A_i < d$, $i = 1, 2$. We have to prove that $\dim(A_1 \cup A_2) < d$. Assume, for a contradiction, that $B := \Pi_d^n(A_1 \cup A_2)$ has nonempty interior. Let $B_i := \Pi_d^n(A_i)$; notice that $\dim B_i < d$, and $B_1 \cup B_2 = B$. By (2), the B_i are nowhere dense in \mathbb{K}^d ; thus, B is nowhere dense, absurd.

(12 \Rightarrow 11) is obvious.

(11 \Rightarrow 4). Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable. We have to prove that $\dim(\overline{A}) = \dim(A)$. However, $\overline{A} = A \cup \partial A$. Since ∂A has empty interior, $\dim \partial A = 0$, and we are done.

(13 \Rightarrow 11). Let A, B be definable subsets of \mathbb{K} with empty interior. We have to prove that $A \cup B$ has also empty interior. Define $X := (A \times (0, 1)) \cup (B \times (2, 3)) \subset \mathbb{K}^2$. Notice that $\dim X = 1$; thus, by (13), the set $Y := \{y \in \mathbb{K} : \dim(X_y) > 0\}$ is nowhere dense. However, $Y = A \cup B$; thus, $\dim(A \cup B) = 0$.

(2 \Rightarrow II). Let $(A_x)_{x \in \mathbb{K}}$ be an increasing definable family of subsets of \mathbb{K}^n , each of them of dimension less or equal to d . Let $A := \bigcup_x A_x$. Assume, for a contradiction, that $\dim A > d$; w.l.o.g., $U := \Pi_{d+1}^n(A)$ has nonempty interior. However, $U = \bigcup_x \Pi_{d+1}^n(A_x)$. Since $\dim A_x \leq d$, each $\Pi_{d+1}^n(A_x)$ is nowhere dense, and thus U is meager, contradicting the fact that \mathbb{K} is definably Baire.

(14 \Rightarrow 13) is obvious.

(13 \Rightarrow 14). Assume, for a contradiction, that $\dim C > k$; w.l.o.g., $U := \Pi_{k+1}^n(C)$ has nonempty interior. Moreover, since, by (5), $\dim(A) = \dim(\overline{A})$, w.l.o.g. A is d -compact. By (12), w.l.o.g. the set

$$C' := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^n : \dim(\Pi_d^m(A_x)) \geq d\}$$

has dimension greater than k , and $D' := \Pi_{k+1}^n(C')$ has nonempty interior. Let $B := \Pi_{d+k+1}^{n+m}(A)$; by assumption, B is nowhere dense. Hence, by Kuratowski-Ulam theorem, the set

$$D := \{u \in \mathbb{K}^{k+1} : \dim(B_u) \geq d\}$$

has empty interior. However, for every $u \in \mathbb{K}^{k+1}$, $B_u = \Pi_d(A_u)$, and thus $D' \subseteq D$, absurd.

(1 \Rightarrow III) has the same proof as [Mil05, Thm. 3.3].

(16 \Rightarrow 15) is clear (take $d = n = 1$ in (16)).

(15 \Rightarrow 11) is also clear: if A and B are subsets of \mathbb{K} of dimension 0, then the family $\langle A, B \rangle$ is an at most pseudo-enumerable family of unary sets with empty interior, and thus their union $A \cup B$ has empty interior.

(2 \Rightarrow 16) Let $(X_t : t \in N)$ be a definable family, such that N is at most pseudo-enumerable, and each X_t is a subset of \mathbb{K}^n of dimension at most d . We have to prove that $Y := \bigcup_{t \in N} X_t$ has dimension at most d . By projecting onto some \mathbb{K}^{d+1} , w.l.o.g. we can assume that $n = d+1$; by (2), each X_t is nowhere dense, and we have to prove that Y is nowhere dense. By definition of pseudo-enumerable, w.l.o.g. we can assume that N is a closed, discrete subset of $\mathbb{K}_{\geq 1}$. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{K}$. Notice that the set $\{t \in N : t < t_0\}$ is pseudo-finite. Thus, by [For13, Lemma 5.23], $\bigcup_{t < t_0} X_t$ is nowhere dense. Thus, by (II), Y is also nowhere dense.

(10 \Rightarrow IV). Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Notice that $Y := X \setminus \overset{\circ}{X}$ has empty interior; thus, it is meager. Thus, $X = \overset{\circ}{X} \cup Y$ is a.o.. \square

3.4. Constructible structures.

Definition 3.19 (see [Mil05, §3.2]). \mathbb{K} is a **constructible** structure if every definable subset of \mathbb{K}^n is constructible, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A theory T is a constructible if every model of T is constructible.

See also [Rob73] and [Pil87, §2] for related notions.

Theorem 3.20. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbb{K} is constructible;
- (2) for every \emptyset -definable $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{m+n}$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{K}^m$, if $\dim A_x = 0$, then $(A_x)^{\ulcorner N \urcorner} = \emptyset$ (see Definition 2.18);
- (3) every \emptyset -definable set is a finite union of \emptyset -definable locally closed sets;
- (4) for every $\mathbb{K}' \equiv \mathbb{K}$, every 0-dimensional set definable in \mathbb{K}' is constructible.
- (5) every definable subset of \mathbb{K}^n is a finite union of sets of the form

$$\{x \in \mathbb{K}^m : f(b, x) = 0 \ \& \ g(b, x) > 0\},$$

where f and g are \emptyset -definable and continuous, and $b \in \mathbb{K}^m$.

Moreover, if \mathbb{K} is constructible, then it is *i-minimal*.

Proof. The equivalence of the first 4 points is proved in the same way as [Mil05, Thm. 3.2], using Lemma 3.18. (5 \Rightarrow 4) is obvious. (4 \Rightarrow 5) is proved in the same way as [vdD98, Lemma 2.10]. The “moreover” clause follows from the fact that a constructible set with empty interior is nowhere dense. \square

Notice that the equivalence (4 \Leftrightarrow 1) in Theorem 3.20 shows that, if \mathbb{K} is constructible and \mathbb{K}' is elementary equivalent to \mathbb{K} , then \mathbb{K}' is also constructible.

Remark 3.21. I-minimality is not equivalent to constructibility. In fact,

- (1) it is easy to build an ultra-product of constructible structures which is not constructible (while an ultra-product of i-minimal structures is i-minimal);
- (2) [FKMS10, Theorem A] produces an i-minimal structure that defines sets on every level of the projective hierarchy.

3.5. Pillay and Cantor-Bendixson rank in constructible structures. [Pil87], extending the work in [Rob73], studies topological structures satisfying a weaker version of constructibility; that is, Pillay's Condition (A) asks that every definable unary set is constructible.

Proviso. *In this subsection we assume that \mathbb{K} is constructible.*⁽⁵⁾

Pillay then defines a **rank** for definable sets (which he calls the dimension rank), which we will denote by rk^P , in the following way:

- (1) If X is nonempty, then $\text{rk}^P(X) \geq 0$.
- (2) $\text{rk}^P(X) \geq \lambda$ iff $\text{rk}^P(X) \geq \alpha$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$, where λ is limit.
- (3) $\text{rk}^P(X) \geq \alpha + 1$ iff X contains subset Y which is definable, closed, nowhere dense (in X), and with $\text{rk}^P(Y) \geq \alpha$.

Notice that $\text{rk}^P(X)$ might depend on the ambient structure \mathbb{K} ; that is, if $\mathbb{K}' \equiv \mathbb{K}$, then $\text{rk}^P(X^{\mathbb{K}'})$ might be different from $\text{rk}^P(X^{\mathbb{K}})$.

Fact 3.22 (Pillay). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable.*

- (1) $\text{rk}^P(X) = 0$ iff X is discrete and nonempty;
- (2) $Y \subseteq X \Rightarrow \text{rk}^P(Y) \leq \text{rk}^P(X)$;
- (3) If $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$, where the X_i are closed (in X) and definable, then $\text{rk}^P(X) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \text{rk}^P(X_i)$.

Lemma 3.23. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Assume that $X = A \cup B$, where A and B are definable, and A is open in X . Then, $\text{rk}^P(X) \leq \text{rk}^P(B) + \text{rk}^P(A) + 1$ (where $+$ is the usual ordinal sum).*

Proof. By induction on $\text{rk}^P(A)$. If A is empty, the conclusion is clear; thus, we can assume that A is nonempty. Assume, for a contradiction, that $Y \subseteq X$ is definable, closed, and nowhere dense in X , but $\text{rk}^P(Y) \geq \text{rk}^P(B) + \text{rk}^P(A) + 1$. Let $Y_A := Y \cap A$ and $Y_B := Y \cap B$. Since A is open, Y_A is nowhere dense in A ; therefore (since A is nonempty) $\text{rk}^P(Y_A) < \text{rk}^P(A)$. Moreover, Y_A is open in Y . Thus, by inductive hypothesis,

$$\text{rk}^P(Y) \leq \text{rk}^P(Y_B) + \text{rk}^P(Y_A) + 1 \leq \text{rk}^P(B) + \text{rk}^P(Y_A) + 1 < \text{rk}^P(B) + \text{rk}^P(A) + 1,$$

absurd. □

⁽⁵⁾ Some of the results in this subsection hold without this assumption.

Proposition 3.24. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Write $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_r$, where each X_i is locally closed in X . Let $\gamma := \max_i \text{rk}^P(X_i)$. Then,*

$$\text{rk}^P(X) \leq r\gamma + (r - 1).$$

Proof. By induction on r . If $r = 1$, the result is clear. Thus, we can assume that $r \geq 2$ and that we have already proved the result for $r - 1$. Fix $i \leq r$. Let A_i be the closure of X_i inside X .

Claim 3. $\text{rk}^P(A_i) \leq r\gamma + (r - 1)$.

Since $X = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_r$ and each A_i is closed in X , the conclusion then follows from Fact 3.22.

Thus, it suffices to prove the claim; w.l.o.g., we can assume $i = 1$. Let $Y := (X_2 \cap A_1) \cup \dots \cup (X_r \cap A_1)$. Since $X_j \cap A_1 \subseteq X_j$, we have $\text{rk}^P(X_j) \leq \gamma$ for every $j = 2, \dots, n$. Therefore, by inductive hypothesis, $\text{rk}^P(Y) \leq (r - 1)\gamma + r - 2$. Moreover, $A_1 = X_1 \cap Y$, and X_1 is open in A_1 (because X_1 is locally closed). Therefore, by Lemma 3.23, $\text{rk}^P(A_1) \leq \text{rk}^P(Y) + \text{rk}^P(X_1) + 1 \leq (r - 1)\gamma + (r - 2) + \gamma + 1 \leq r\gamma + (r - 1)$. \square

Fact 3.25 (Pillay). *T.f.a.e.:*

- (1) $\text{rk}^P(X) = \infty$;
- (2) *there is a decreasing sequence $(X_i)_{i < \omega}$ of definable closed subsets of X , such that X_{i+1} is definable, closed, and nowhere dense in X_i , for all $i < \omega$;*
- (3) *X contains a definable closed nowhere dense subset Y , such that $\text{rk}^P(Y) = \infty$;*
- (4) $\text{rk}^P(X) > 2^{|M|}$.

Lemma 3.26. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be nonempty, definable, closed, and with empty interior. Then, C has at least one isolated point. In particular, no nonempty closed perfect subset of \mathbb{K} with empty interior is definable.*

Proof. Assume, for a contradiction, that C is perfect. Let $A := \mathbb{K} \setminus C$; A is an open set; let C^L be the set of left end-points of the connected components of A and C^R be the set of right end-points. Notice that C^L and C^R are definable subsets of C . Since C is perfect and with empty interior, C^L and C^R have no isolated points, and they are both dense in C . Notice that $C^L \cap C^R$ is the set of isolated points of C : since C is perfect, C^L and C^R are disjoint. Let $D := \text{lc}(C^L)$. Since \mathbb{K} is constructible, D is dense in C^L ; and therefore D is dense in C . Let $a \in D$; since D is locally closed, there exists $b', b'' \in \mathbb{K}$, such that $b' < a < b''$ and $I \cap D$ is closed in I , where $I := [b', b'']$. Thus, D is dense in C , $I \cap D = I \cap C$: thus, $I \cap C \subseteq C^L$, which contradicts the fact that C^R is dense in C . \square

Lemma 3.27. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{K}$ be definable with empty interior and D be the set of isolated points of C . Then, D is discrete, definable, and dense in C . Moreover, $C' := C \setminus D$ is nowhere dense in C .*

Proof. That D is discrete and definable is clear.

Claim 4. It suffices to prove the conclusion for \overline{C} .

In fact, the isolated points of \overline{C} and the isolated points of C coincide.

Thus, w.l.o.g. C is closed. Let $A := \mathbb{K} \setminus C$, C^L be the set of left end-points of the connected components of A and C^R be the set of right end-points. C^L is dense in C . If, for a contradiction, D is not dense in C , let I be a closed interval, such that $C \cap D$ has no isolated points and is nonempty: but this contradicts the Lemma 3.26.

The fact that C' is nowhere dense in C follows immediately from the first part. \square

Definition 3.28 (Cantor-Bendixson Rank, see [Kec95, §I.6.c]). Let T be a Hausdorff topological space. For every $X \subseteq T$, and every ordinal α , let $X^{(0)} := X$, $X^{(\alpha+1)}$ be the set of non-isolated points of $X^{(\alpha)}$, and $X^{(\alpha)} := \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} X^{(\beta)}$ if α is a limit ordinal. Let $\text{rk}^{CB}(X)$, the Cantor-Bendixson rank of X , be the smallest ordinal α such that $X^{(\alpha)} = \emptyset$ (or $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) = +\infty$ if such α does not exist). For every $a \in X$, let $\text{rk}_X^{CB}(a)$ be the supremum of ordinals α such that $a \in X^{(\alpha)}$.

Notice that each $X^{(\alpha)} \setminus X^{(\alpha+1)}$ is discrete, and that X is a finite union of discrete sets iff $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) < \omega$. Moreover, $X^{(\text{rk}^{CB}(X))} = \emptyset$ (if $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) < +\infty$). Besides, $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) = 0$ iff X is empty, $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) = 1$ iff X is discrete (and nonempty).

Remark 3.29. ⁽⁶⁾ If X and X' are subsets of a Hausdorff topological space T , then $\text{rk}^{CB}(X \cup X') \leq \text{rk}^{CB}(X) \oplus \text{rk}^{CB}(X')$, where \oplus is the Cantor sum of ordinals. Hence, a set X is a union of n discrete sets iff $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) \leq n$.

Proof. By induction on $\alpha := \text{rk}^{CB}(X)$ and $\beta := \text{rk}^{CB}(Y)$. The basic case when X is a singleton is obvious. For a contradiction, let $a \in (X \cup Y)^{(\alpha+\beta)}$. W.l.o.g., $a \in X$; let $\gamma := \text{rk}_X^{CB}(a) < \alpha$.

Let V be an open neighborhood of a such that $X^{(\gamma)} \cap V = \{a\}$, and $X' := X \cap V \setminus \{a\}$. Notice that $\alpha' := \text{rk}^{CB}(X') \leq \gamma < \alpha$. Hence, by inductive hypothesis, $\text{rk}^{CB}(X' \cup Y) \leq \alpha' \oplus \beta < \alpha \oplus \beta$. Thus, $\text{rk}^{CB}(X' \cup Y \cup \{a\}) \leq \alpha' \oplus \beta \oplus 1 \leq \alpha \oplus \beta$. Thus, $\text{rk}_{X \cup Y}^{CB}(a) < \alpha \oplus \beta$ for every $a \in X \cup Y$, and we are done. \square

Exercise 3.30. Given $N \in \mathbb{R}$, find A_1, \dots, A_N discrete subsets of \mathbb{R} , such that $\text{rk}^{CB}(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_N) = N$.

From the above results, it is easy to deduce the following.

Proposition 3.31. *Assume that \mathbb{K} is constructible.*

(1) *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable and closed, such that X is a finite union of discrete sets. Then, $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) = \text{rk}^P(X)$.*

⁽⁶⁾ The present remark is folklore, but we could not find a reference for it.

- (2) \mathbb{K} is locally o -minimal iff $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}) = 1$.
- (3) If \mathbb{K} is not locally o -minimal, then $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}) \geq \omega$.
- (4) If \mathbb{K} is d -minimal but not locally o -minimal, then $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}) = \omega$.
- (5) If \mathbb{K} is ω -saturated, constructible, but not d -minimal, then $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}) = \infty$.

Proof. The last point follows from the fact that, since \mathbb{K} is not d -minimal, then, by saturation, we can find $X \subset \mathbb{K}$ definable, closed, with empty interior, and such that $\text{rk}^{CB}(X) \geq \omega$. Hence, by Lemma 3.27, $X \supset X^{(1)} \supset X^{(2)} \supset \dots$ is an infinite descending chain of definable sets, such that $X^{(i+1)}$ is closed and nowhere dense in $X^{(i)}$. \square

We will compute later $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}^n)$.

4. DEFINABLE CHOICE

As usual, \mathbb{K} is some definably complete expansion of an ordered field.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be a set of parameters, and $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be P -definable and open. Then, there exists $C \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ P -definable and closed, such that $U = \Pi_n^{n+1}(C)$.*

Proof. If $U = \mathbb{K}^n$, take $C := \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$. Otherwise, for every $r > 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} U(r) &:= \{x \in U : d(U, \mathbb{K}^n \setminus U) \geq r\}, \\ D &:= \bigcup_{r>0} U(r) \times \{1/r\} \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n \times \mathbb{K}_{>0}, \\ C &:= \overline{D}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, C is closed, it is trivial that C is P -definable, and it is easy to see that $\Pi_n^{n+1}(C) = U$. \square

Lemma 4.2 (Definable Choice). (1) *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be a set of parameters, and $A \subset \mathbb{K}^n$ be P -definable, nonempty and constructible. Then, there exists a P -definable point $a \in A$.*

(2) *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{m+n}$ be definable and such that X_b is constructible for every $b \in \mathbb{K}^m$. Then, X has a definable n -choice function, that is a definable function $f : \Pi_m^{m+n}(X) \rightarrow X$, such that $f(a) \in \{a\} \times X_a$ for every $a \in \Pi_m^{m+n}(X)$.*

(3) *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ be definable and \mathcal{F}_σ . Then, X has a definable n -choice function.*

(4) *Suppose that every unary definable set contains a locally closed point. Then, \mathbb{K} has definable Skolem functions (**DSF**).*

Proof. (1). Since A is constructible, $A' := \text{lc}(A)$ is nonempty; thus, since A' is also P -definable, it suffices to prove the conclusion for A' ; therefore, w.l.o.g. A is locally closed.

CASE 1: A is closed in \mathbb{K}^n . For every $r > 0$, let $A(r) := \{a \in A : |a| \leq r\}$, let $r_0 := \inf\{r \in \mathbb{K} : A(r) \neq \emptyset\}$, and let $A' := A(2r_0)$. Notice

that A' is d-compact, nonempty and P -definable. Let $a := \text{lex min}(A')$: notice that a is also P -definable, and in A .

In the general case, since A is locally closed, we can write $A = U' \cap \text{cl}A$ for some open set U' .

Claim 5. There exists $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ open and P -definable such that $A = U \cap \overline{A}$.

For every $a \in A$ let $r(a) := \sup\{r > 0 : A \cap B(a, r) = \overline{A} \cap B(a, r)\}$. Since A is locally closed, $r(a) > 0$ for every $a \in A$. Let $U := \bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, r(a)/2)$.

Thus, by Lemma 4.1, there exists $D \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ closed and P -definable such that $U = \Pi_n^{n+1}(D)$. Let $E := D \cap (\Pi_n^{n+1})^{-1}(A)$.

Claim 6. E is closed (inside \mathbb{K}^{n+1}), nonempty, P -definable, and $\Pi_n^{n+1}(E) = A$.

In fact, since A is closed in U and Π_n^{n+1} is continuous, E is closed in D ; since D is closed in \mathbb{K}^{n+1} , E is also closed in \mathbb{K}^{n+1} . The remainder of the claim is clear.

Thus, by the case when A is closed, we can find $e \in E$ which is P -definable, and let $a := \Pi_n^{n+1}(e)$.

(2). The construction in (1) gives a definable way to choose $x_b \in X_b$ for every $b \in \Pi_m^{m+n}(X)$. (Equivalently: (2) follows from (1) by compactness).

(3). If \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal, the result is clear. Otherwise, there exists $N \subset \mathbb{K}_{\geq 0}$ which is definable without parameters, closed, discrete, and unbounded. Since X is \mathcal{F}_σ , there exists a definable family of d-compact sets $(X(i) : i \in N)$ such that $X = \bigcup_{i \in N} X(i)$. For every $i \in N$, let $Y := \Pi_m^{m+n}(X(i))$, and $Z(i) := Y(i) \setminus \bigcup_{j < i} X(j)$. Notice that $Y := \Pi_m^{m+n}(X)$ is the disjoint union of all $Z(i)$. For every $\bar{z} \in Z(i)$, let $f_i(\bar{z}) := \langle z, \text{lex min}(X(i)_{\bar{z}}) \rangle$. Let $f : Y \rightarrow X$ be the function that coincides with f_i on each $Z(i)$. Then, f is a definable n -choice function for X .

(4). Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{m+n}$ be definable. We have to prove that there exists $f : B \rightarrow A$ definable, such that $f(b) \in \{b\} \times A_b$ for every $b \in B$, where $B := \Pi_m^{m+n}(A)$. We proceed by induction on n .

If $n = 0$, f is the identity. If $n = 1$, for every $b \in B$ let $C_b := \text{lc}(A_b)$. By hypothesis, $C_b \neq \emptyset$ for every $b \in B$, and it is constructible. Thus, by (2), C has a definable 1-choice function, and the same function will work for A .

Assume that $n > 1$ and we have already proved the conclusion for every $n' < n$. Let $C := \Pi_{m+1}^{m+n}(A)$. By inductive hypothesis, there exists a definable $(n-1)$ -choice function $g : C \rightarrow A$. By the case $n = 1$, there exists a definable 1-choice function $h : \Pi_m^{m+1}(C) \rightarrow C$. Let $f := g \circ h : \Pi_m^{m+n}(A) \rightarrow A$: f is an n -choice function for A . \square

Therefore, locally o-minimal, d-minimal and constructible structures have DSF. On the other hand, structures with locally o-minimal open core might not have DSF: for instance, $\langle \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\text{alg}} \rangle$ does not have DSF (see [DMS10, 5.4]). For the same reason, constructible structures have elimination of imaginaries. [Mil06] already proved DSF and elimination of imaginaries for d-minimal structures.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Assume that X is both an \mathcal{F}_σ and a \mathcal{G}_δ , and that \overline{X} is definably Baire. Then, $\text{lc}(X) \neq \emptyset$.*

Cf. [Kur66, §34.VI].

Proof. Let $Y := \overline{X}$. We have to prove that the interior of X inside Y is nonempty. Otherwise, X is both dense and co-dense in Y . However, since X is an \mathcal{F}_σ , this implies that X is meager in Y . For the same reason, $Y \setminus X$ is meager in Y , contradicting the fact that Y is definably Baire. \square

4.1. Sard's Lemma. For every \mathcal{C}^1 function $f : \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$, define $\Lambda_f(k) := \{ \bar{x} \in \mathbb{K}^m : \text{rk}(Df(\bar{x})) \leq k \}$, and $\Sigma_f(k) := f(\Lambda_f(k))$. The set of singular values of f is $\Sigma_f := \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} \Sigma_f(k)$.

Lemma 4.4 (Sard's Lemma). *Let $f : \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and \mathcal{C}^1 . If \mathbb{K} is i-minimal then $\dim(\Sigma_f(d)) \leq d$.*

Proof. If $d \geq n$, the conclusion is trivial. Let $d < n$, and assume, for a contradiction, that $\Pi_d^n(\Sigma_f(d))$ contains a nonempty open box B . Since $\Lambda_f(d)$ is an \mathcal{F}_σ set, there exists $g : B \rightarrow \Lambda_f(d)$, such that $\Pi_d^n \circ f \circ g = 1_B$. Since \mathbb{K} is i-minimal, we can apply Lemma 3.14, and, by shrinking B if necessary, we can assume that g is \mathcal{C}^1 . Hence, by differentiation, we have that, for every $x \in B$, $\Pi_d^n(f(g(x))) \cdot Df(g(x)) \cdot Dg(x) = \mathbf{1}_d$. Therefore, the matrix $Df(g(x))$ has rank at least d , a contradiction. \square

4.2. Dimension.

Proviso. *In this subsection, \mathbb{K} is i-minimal with DSF.*

Lemma 4.5. *The dimension \dim is a dimension function in the sense of [vdD89]. That is, \dim satisfies the following axioms: for every definable sets A and $B \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ and $C \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$,*

(Dim 1) $\dim(A) = -\infty$ iff $A = \emptyset$, $\dim(\{a\}) = 0$ for each $a \in \mathbb{K}$, $\dim(\mathbb{K}) = 1$.

(Dim 2) $\dim(A \cup B) = \max(\dim(A), \dim(B))$;

(Dim 3) $\dim(A^\sigma) = \dim(A)$ for each permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$.

(Dim 4) Define $C(i) := \{ \bar{x} \in \mathbb{K}^n : \dim(C_{\bar{x}}) = i \}$, $i = 0, 1$. Then, each $C(i)$ is definable, and $\dim(C \cap (C(i) \times \mathbb{K})) = \dim(C(i)) + i$, $i = 0, 1$.

Proof. The axioms (Dim 1,2,3) are either trivial, or follow immediately from Theorem 3.10. It remains to prove Axiom (Dim 4). We prove (Dim 4) by induction on n . The fact that the $C(i)$ are definable is clear.

Let $D := \Pi_n^{n+1}(C)$. W.l.o.g., we can assume that either $D = C(0)$ or $D = C(1)$. If $n = 0$ the result is clear. Assume now that $n = 1$.

1) If $D = C(0)$, we have to prove that $\dim(C) = \dim(D)$. Assume not. If $\dim(C) = 2$, then C has nonempty interior; thus, there exists $d \in D$ such that C_d has nonempty interior, contradicting $\dim(C_d) = 0$. Since $\dim(C) \geq \dim(D)$, the only possibility left is that $\dim(C) = 1$ and $\dim(D) = 0$. Let $\rho : \mathbb{K}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be the projection onto the second coordinate; our assumptions imply that $\rho(C)$ has nonempty interior; let J be an open interval contained in $\rho(C)$.

By definable choice, there exists a definable function $f : J \rightarrow D$, such that, for every $j \in J$, $\langle j, f(j) \rangle \in C$. After shrinking J if necessary, w.l.o.g. f is continuous and either constant, or strictly monotone. If f is strictly monotone, then D contains an open interval, contradicting $\dim(D) = 0$. If f is constant, say $f = d$, then $J \subseteq C_d$, contradicting $\dim(C_d) = 0$.

2) If $D = C(1)$, we have to prove that $\dim(C) = \dim(D) + 1$. Assume not. Remember that $\dim(C) \geq \dim(D)$. If $\dim(D) = 0$, then $0 \leq \dim(C) \leq 1$, thus $\dim(C) = 0$, contradicting the fact that $\dim(C_d) = 1$ for every $d \in D$. If $\dim(D) = 1$, then the only possibility is that $\dim(C) = 1$. However, Theorem 3.10(13) implies that $\dim(C_d) = 0$ for at least one $d \in D$, absurd.

Assume now that we have proved Axiom (Dim 4) for every $n' < n$; we want to prove it for n . Let $d := \dim(D)$.

1) If $D = C(0)$, we have to prove that $\dim(C) = d$. Assume not. Since $C \subseteq D \times \mathbb{K}$ and $\dim(C) \geq d$, the only possibility is that $\dim(C) = d + 1$. Let $L := \mathbb{K}^d \times \{0\}^{n-d} \times \mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$, and $\Pi_L^{n+1} : \mathbb{K}^{n+1} \rightarrow L$ be the orthogonal projection onto L . Since $\dim(C) = d + 1$, after a permutation of the first n coordinates, we can assume that E has nonempty interior, where $E := \Pi_L^{n+1}(C)$. After shrinking C if necessary, we can assume that E is open. Let $F := \Pi_d^{n+1}(C) = \Pi_D^L(E)$. Notice that F has nonempty interior in \mathbb{K}^d . Since $\dim(D) = d$, by Theorem 3.10(13), for \bar{f} outside a nowhere dense set, $\dim(D_{\bar{f}}) \leq 0$. Thus, there exists $\bar{f} \in F$ such that $\dim(D_{\bar{f}}) = 0$. We will compute the dimension of $C' := C_{\bar{f}}$ in two different ways, and reach a contradiction. Since E is open, $\dim(E_{\bar{f}}) = 1$, and thus $\dim(C') \geq 1$. For every $\bar{x} \in D_{\bar{f}}$, $C'_{\bar{d}} = C_{\bar{f}, \bar{x}}$, and thus $\dim(C'_{\bar{d}}) = 0$. Thus, by the case $n = 1$, $\dim(C') = 0$, absurd.

2) If $D = C(1)$, we have to prove that $\dim(C) = d + 1$. Assume not. The only possibility is that $\dim(C) = d$. First, we will treat the case when $d = n$. Thus, D has nonempty interior. On the other hand, C is nowhere dense; thus, by Kuratowski-Ulam Theorem, there exists $\bar{d} \in D$ such that $C_{\bar{d}}$ has empty interior, contradicting the fact that $\dim(C_{\bar{d}}) = 1$.

Assume now that $d < n$. W.l.o.g., D' has nonempty interior, where $D' := \Pi_d^n(D)$. Let $L := \mathbb{K}^d \times \{0\}^{n-d} \times \mathbb{K}$ and $C' := \Pi_L^{n+1}(C)$. By

inductive hypothesis, $\dim C \geq \dim(C') = \dim(D') + 1 = d + 1$, absurd. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$, $Y \subseteq \mathbb{K}^m$, and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be definable. Then:*

- (1) *if f is surjective, then $\dim Y \leq \dim X$;*
- (2) *if f is injective, then $\dim Y \geq \dim X$;*
- (3) *if f is bijective, then $\dim Y = \dim X$.*

Proof. 1) Apply Lemma 4.5 to the graph of f .

2) follows from 1) and definable choice; 3) follows from 1) and 2). \square

5. D-MINIMAL STRUCTURES

5.1. Fundamental results.

Definition 5.1. \mathbb{K} is d-minimal if (it is definably complete and) for every $\mathbb{K}' \equiv \mathbb{K}$, every definable subset of \mathbb{K}' is the union of an open set and finitely many discrete sets.

Remark 5.2. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. If A is a Hausdorff topological space, such that A is a union of N discrete sets, then $\text{rk}^{CB}(A) \leq N$ (see Definition 3.28). If $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is definable and $\text{rk}^{CB}(A) \leq N$, then A is a union of N disjoint definable and discrete sets.

Proof. The first part is immediate from Remark 3.29 and induction on N . Let A be as in the second part, and proceed by induction on N . If $N = 1$, A itself is discrete, and we are done. Assume that we have already proved the conclusion for $N - 1$. Let B be the set of isolated points of A . Notice that A is the disjoint union of B and $A^{(1)}$, and that $\text{rk}^{CB}(A^{(1)}) = N - 1$. Therefore, by inductive hypothesis, $A^{(1)}$ is the disjoint union of $N - 1$ definable discrete sets, and we are done. \square

Remark 5.3. Definition 5.1 is equivalent to Definition 1.1.

Proof. By compactness. More in details, assume that \mathbb{K} does satisfy Definition 5.1. Let $X \subset \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ be definable; we have to prove that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for each $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{K}^n$, the set $Y_{\bar{b}} := X_{\bar{b}} \setminus \text{int}(X_{\bar{b}})$ is the union of at most N discrete sets. Assume not. Let $\mathbb{K}' \succeq \mathbb{K}$ be ω -saturated. By saturation, there exists $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{K}'^n$ such that $Y_{\bar{b}}$ is not the union of any finite number of definable discrete sets, and thus, by the Remark 5.2, $Y_{\bar{b}}$ is not the union of any finite number of discrete sets, absurd.

Conversely, assume that \mathbb{K} satisfies Definition 1.1. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ be \emptyset -definable and let $\mathbb{K}' \equiv \mathbb{K}$. We want to show that, for every $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{K}'^n$, the set $Y_{\bar{b}} := X_{\bar{b}} \setminus \text{int}(X_{\bar{b}})$ is the union of finitely many discrete sets. By our assumption and Remark 5.2, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for every $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{K}^n$, $\text{rk}^{CB}(Y_{\bar{b}}) \leq N$. Since the above can be expressed by a first-order formula, we have that, for every $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{K}'^n$, $\text{rk}^{CB}(Y_{\bar{b}}) \leq N$, which (again, by Remark 5.2) is what we wanted. \square

Remark 5.4. Let \mathbb{K} be d -minimal. Then, \mathbb{K} is constructible, and therefore every \mathbb{K} -definable set is constructible.

Question 5.5. Assume that \mathbb{K} is constructible. Is it d -minimal? What if moreover \mathbb{K} expands \mathbb{R} ?

Definition 5.6 ([Mil05, Def. 8.4]). Let $d \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Pi(n, d)$ be the set of projections from \mathbb{K}^n onto d -dimensional coordinate spaces, and $\mu \in \Pi(n, d)$. Given $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ definable and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\text{reg}_\mu^p(A)$ denote the set of all $a \in A$ such that, for definable some open neighbourhood U of a , $A' := A \cap U$ is a \mathcal{C}^p embedded manifold of dimension d , and $\mu \upharpoonright_{A'}$ maps A' \mathcal{C}^p -diffeomorphically onto an open subset of \mathbb{K}^d . A is μ^p -**regular** if it is equal to $\text{reg}_\mu^p(A)$, and it is d^p -regular if it is μ^p -regular for some $\mu \in \Pi(n, d)$ (and will drop the superscript p if it is clear from the context). We define $\text{reg}^p(A) := \bigcup_{i=0}^n \text{reg}_i^p(A)$.

Notice that $\text{reg}_0^p(A)$ is the set of isolated points of A : we will use the notation $\text{isol}(A) := \text{reg}_0^0(A)$.

As in the case when \mathbb{K} is an expansion of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$, $\text{reg}_\mu^p(A)$ is definable, open in A , and a \mathcal{C}^p -submanifold of \mathbb{K}^n of dimension d . Hence, if A is d^p -regular, then it is an embedded manifold of dimension d . For instance, $\text{reg}^n(A)$ is the interior of A (inside \mathbb{K}^n).

Remark 5.7. Let $\pi := \Pi_d^n$, and $A \subset \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. A is π^p -regular iff, for every $y \in \pi(A)$ and $x \in A_y$, there exist $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^d$ open box around y and $W \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n-d}$ open box around x , such that $A \cap (U \times W) = \text{Graph}(f)$ for some (definable) \mathcal{C}^p -map $f : U \rightarrow W$.

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose that \mathbb{K} is i -minimal, and let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{m+n}$ be definable, such that $B := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^m : \text{isol}(A_x) \neq \emptyset\}$ has interior. Then, for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{reg}_\pi^p(A) \neq \emptyset$, where $\pi := \Pi_m^{n+m}$.*

Proof. Fix $p \in \mathbb{N}$; let $V \subseteq B$ be a nonempty open box, and $C := \bigsqcup_{v \in V} (\{v\} \times \text{isol}(A_v))$. Notice that $V \subseteq \pi(C)$. By Definable Choice, there exists a definable function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ such that $\langle x, f(x) \rangle \in C$ for every $x \in V$. For every $x \in V$, define

$$\begin{aligned} f^+(x) &:= \min(f(x) + 1, \inf\{y \in A_x : y > f(x)\}), \\ f^-(x) &:= \max(f(x) - 1, \sup\{y \in A_x : y < f(x)\}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $f^- < f < f^+$ on all V . By i -minimality, after shrinking V , we can assume that f , f^+ and f^- are \mathcal{C}^p on V . It is easy to see that $\text{Graph}(f) \subseteq \text{reg}_\pi^p(A)$. \square

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose that every 0-dimensional definable subset of \mathbb{K} has an isolated point, and let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:*

- (1) \mathbb{K} is i -minimal.
- (2) Let \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n . Then, there is a Π -good partition \mathcal{P} of \mathbb{K}^n , compatible with \mathcal{A} , such that $P \setminus \text{reg}_\mu^0(P)$

is nowhere dense in P for every projection μ and every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that P is μ -good.

(3) $A \setminus \text{reg}^p(A)$ is nowhere dense in A , for every definable set A .

Proof. (1): let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be definable and with empty interior. Suppose, for a contradiction, that \overline{X} contains a nonempty open interval I , and let $Y := X \cap I$. Notice that $\dim Y = 0$ and Y is dense in I , and therefore it has no isolated points.

(2) and (3) have the same proof as [Mil05, Prop. 8.4] (using Thm. 3.10 and Lemmas 3.17 and 5.8). \square

Lemma 5.10. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbb{K} is d -minimal;
- (2) for every $\mathbb{K}' \equiv \mathbb{K}$, every subset of \mathbb{K} is the union of a definable open set and finitely many definable discrete sets;
- (3) for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every definable $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{m+1}$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{K}^m$, either A_x has interior or is a union of N definable discrete sets;
- (4) for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and definable $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+m}$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $x \in \mathbb{K}^m$, either $\dim A_x > 0$, or A_x is a union of N definable discrete sets.

Proof. (1 \Leftrightarrow 2) follows from Remark 5.2.

(2 \Leftrightarrow 3) is a routine compactness argument.

(3) is the case $n = 1$ of (4).

(3 \Rightarrow 4). Induction on n . The case $n = 1$ is the hypothesis. Let $n > 1$, and assume we have already proved (3) for each $n' < n$. Let $C := \{x \in \mathbb{K}^m : \dim(A_x) = 0\}$. Let $x \in C$. For each $y \in K$, we have $\dim(A_{(x,y)}) = 0$, and therefore $A_{(x,y)}$ is a union of N discrete definable sets (for some N independent from x and y). Moreover, for each $x \in C$, the set $D(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{K} : A_{(x,y)} \neq \emptyset\}$ has empty interior, because \mathbb{K} is i -minimal. Thus, for every $x \in C$, $D(x)$ is a union of M definable discrete sets (for some M independent from x). Hence, for every $x \in C$, A_x is a union of NM discrete sets, which can be taken definable. \square

Recall the definition of the Cantor-Bendixson rank (Definition 3.28).

Corollary 5.11. *If \mathbb{K} is d -minimal iff for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every definable $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $a \in \mathbb{K}^n$, $\text{rk}^{CB}(X_a \setminus \text{int}(X_a)) \leq N$.*

Proposition 5.12. *Assume \mathbb{K} is d -minimal, let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n . Then, there exists a finite partition of \mathbb{K}^n into regular definable \mathcal{C}^p -submanifolds compatible with \mathcal{A} .*

Proof. As in the proof of [Mil05, Thm. 3.4.1], we are reduced to show that if $A \in \mathcal{A}$, with $0 < d := \dim A < n$; then A can be partitioned into regular \mathcal{C}^p -manifolds. Moreover, we can further assume that A is

a π -good, where $\pi := \Pi_d^n$, that $A \setminus \text{reg}_\pi^p(A)$ is nowhere dense in A , and each A_x is discrete, for every $x \in \mathbb{K}^d$.

Let $M := \text{reg}_\pi^p(A)$. By definition, M is a π -regular \mathcal{C}^p -manifold. It suffices to prove that $\pi(A \setminus M)$ is nowhere dense (in \mathbb{K}^d) to conclude the proof (since then $\text{fdim}(A \setminus M) < \text{fdim}(A)$ and we can proceed by induction on $\text{fdim}(A)$). Assume, for a contradiction, that $B \subset \pi(A \setminus M)$ is a nonempty open box, and let $N := \text{reg}_\pi^p(A \setminus M)$. By shrinking B , we might assume that $\text{cl}(M_x) = (\text{cl } M)_x$ for every $x \in B$. By Lemma 5.9, M is dense in A , and therefore, for every $x \in B$, $\text{cl}(A_x) = (\text{cl } A)_x = (\text{cl } M)_x = \text{cl}(M_x)$, that is M_x is dense in A_x . However, A_x is discrete, and thus $A_x = M_x$. \square

We say that A is π -special if it is π -regular and the box U in Remark 5.7 does *not* depend on x (but only on y).

Conjecture 5.13. *Assume \mathbb{K} is d -minimal, let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n . Then, there exists a finite partition of \mathbb{K}^n into special definable \mathcal{C}^p -submanifolds compatible with \mathcal{A} .*

The proof in [Mil05, Theorem 3.4.1] unfortunately has a mistake, and we were not able to adjust it to prove the above conjecture.

5.2. Subsequence selection. Again, \mathbb{K} is a d -minimal structure. If \mathbb{K} were o -minimal (or, more generally, locally o -minimal), then Curve Selection would hold: given a definable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ and $b \in \partial A$, there exists a definable continuous function $\gamma : (0, 1) \rightarrow A$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \gamma(t) = b$. If \mathbb{K} is not locally o -minimal, then Curve Selection does not hold: for instance, let $A \subset (0, 1)$ be discrete and definable, such that $0 \in \partial A$: then no such curve γ exists. However, in that case we can use definable sequences instead of definable curves (see Definition 5.16).

Definition 5.14. A pseudo- \mathbb{N} set is a definable, discrete, closed, and unbounded subset of $\mathbb{K}_{\geq 1}$.

Fact 5.15. *A definably complete structure \mathbb{F} has locally o -minimal open core iff a pseudo- \mathbb{N} subset of \mathbb{F} does not exist. In particular, \mathbb{K} is not locally o -minimal iff a pseudo- \mathbb{N} subset of \mathbb{K} exists.*

Proviso. *For the remainder of this subsection we will assume that \mathbb{K} is d -minimal but not locally o -minimal (and hence a pseudo- \mathbb{N} subset of \mathbb{K} exists).*

Definition 5.16. A definable sequence is a definable function $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$, such that D is a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set.

Given a definable sequence $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$, a definable subsequence is the restriction of f to E , such that $E \subseteq D$ and E is unbounded (and hence a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set).

Lemma 5.17. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable, $b \in \partial A$, and D be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set. Then, there exists a definable sequence $f : D \rightarrow A$, such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(t) = b$.*

Moreover, f can be chosen uniformly: given $(A_x : x \in \mathbb{K}^m)$ a definable family of subsets of \mathbb{K}^n , and $b : \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ a definable function, such that for every $x \in \mathbb{K}^m$ $b(x) \in \partial(A_x)$, there exists a definable function $f : D \times \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \in \mathbb{K}^n \quad \forall t \in D \quad (f(x, t) \in A_x) \\ \forall x \in \mathbb{K}^n \quad \left(\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(t, x) = b(x) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Definable Choice, there is a definable function $f : D \rightarrow A$ such that, for every $d \in D$, $|f(d) - b| < 1/d$. \square

In particular, from a definable sequence we can extract a converging (in $\mathbb{K} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$) definable subsequence.

Definition 5.18. Given a definable sequence $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{K}^n$, we say that b is an accumulation point for f if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad \forall N \in D \quad \exists d \in D \quad (d > N \ \& \ |f(d) - b| < \varepsilon)$$

(or equivalently

$$\forall N \in D \quad \exists d \in D \quad (d > N \ \& \ |f(d) - b| < 1/N)).$$

Lemma 5.19. *Let $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ be a definable sequence and b be an accumulation point for f . Then, there exists a definable subsequence g converging to b (that is, there exists $E \subseteq D$ definable and unbounded, such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E} f(t) = b$).*

Proof. Trivial. \square

The following proposition is a uniform version of Lemma 5.19 (uniform both in the sense that the given convergence is uniform in the parameter x , and that the domain E of the subsequence does not depend on x). In §5.5 we will see an application of it.

Proposition 5.20. *Let D be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set. Let $f : D \times \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ and $g : \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ be definable functions. For every $x \in \mathbb{K}^n$ consider the definable sequence $f_x(t) := f(t, x)$. Assume that, for every $x \in \mathbb{K}^n$, $g(x)$ is an accumulation point for f_x . Then, there exists $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^m$ definable, open, and dense, such that f is continuous on $D \times U$ and for every $B \subseteq U$ definably connected g is uniformly continuous on B and there exists $E \subseteq D$ definable and unbounded, such that*

$$\forall x \in B \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E} f(t, x) = g(x)$$

uniformly on B , and therefore

$$\forall x \in B \quad \lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E \\ y \rightarrow x, y \in B}} f(t, y) = g(x).$$

In Proposition 5.20 we *cannot* take E to be independent from the choice of B .⁽⁷⁾

Example 5.21. Let $D := \{2^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{K} := \langle \mathbb{R}, +, \cdot, <, D \rangle$. Then, \mathbb{K} is d-minimal and D is a pseudo- \mathbb{N} subset of \mathbb{K} . Define $f : D \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$f(t, x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 1/t \leq x \leq 1 \\ 1 - tx & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 1/t. \end{cases}$$

Then, for every $x \in (0, 1]$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f_x(t) = 0$, but not uniformly on $(0, 1)$. Let $F := 1/D$ and $U := (0, 1) \setminus F$. Then, for each interval $B \subset U$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f_x(t) = 0$ uniformly on B .

Putting together Proposition 5.20 and Lemma 5.17, we have the following result.

Corollary 5.22. *Let D be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set. Let $(A_x : x \in \mathbb{K}^m)$ be a definable family of subsets of $[0, 1]^n$, and $g : \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ a definable function, such that $\forall x \in \mathbb{K}^m (g(x) \in \partial(A_x))$. Then, there exist*

- (a) *a definable function $f : D \times \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$*
- (b) *$U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^m$ definable, open, and dense*

such that

- (1) $\forall x \in \mathbb{K}^n \forall t \in D (f(x, t) \in A_x)$,
- (2) g is uniformly continuous on each definably connected subset of U ,
- (3) f is continuous on $D \times U$,
- (4) and for every $B \subseteq U$ definably connected there exists $E \subseteq D$ definable and unbounded such that

$$\forall x \in B \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E} f(t, x) = g(x)$$

uniformly on B , and in particular

$$\forall x \in B \lim_{\substack{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E \\ y \rightarrow x, y \in B}} f(t, y) = g(x).$$

Before proving Proposition 5.20, we need an easy lemma: notice that Lemma 5.23 is false if \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal!

⁽⁷⁾ For a counter-example, let \mathbb{K} be some d-minimal non o-minimal expansion of \mathbb{R} , A be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set, X be a definable 0-dimensional subset of \mathbb{R} such that A is the set of accumulation points of X , and $h : D \rightarrow X \setminus A$ be a definable bijection with some other pseudo- \mathbb{N} set D . Define $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow A$ as $g(x) := \min\{a \in A : a \geq x\}$ and $f : D \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X \setminus A$ as $f(t, x) := h(t)$. Let E be any pseudo- \mathbb{N} subset of D and U be any definable open dense subset of \mathbb{R} . We claim that there exists some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(x) \neq \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E} f(t, x)$. In fact, w.l.o.g. we can assume that $A \subset U$. If the claim were false, then for every $a \in A$ we would have

$$a = g(a) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E} f(t, a) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty, t \in E} h(t),$$

which is absurd, since the left side depends on a while the right side is constant.

Lemma 5.23. *Let $g : (0, 1)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Then, there exists $U \subseteq (0, 1)^m$ open and dense such that, for every $B \subseteq U$ definably connected, $g \upharpoonright_B$ is uniformly continuous.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.10(6), there exists $U' \subseteq (0, 1)^m$ definable, open, and dense, such that $g \upharpoonright_{U'}$ is continuous. For uniform continuity, the only problematic points are the ones in $C := \partial U'$ (where ∂ is taken inside $[0, 1]^m$). Let D be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set. Let $U := \{x \in U' : 1/d(x, C) \notin D\}$. Then, U is open and dense in $(0, 1)^m$, and, for every $B \subseteq U$ definably connected, $\partial B \cap C = \emptyset$: therefore, $g \upharpoonright_B$ is uniformly continuous. \square

Example 5.24. Let \mathbb{K} and U be as in Example 5.21. Let $g : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, $g(x) := 1/x$. Then, g is continuous but not uniformly continuous; however, it is easy to check that U satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 5.23.

Proof of Proposition 5.20. Let $V \subseteq D \times \mathbb{K}^m$ be open and dense in $D \times \mathbb{K}^m$, such that f is continuous on V . By applying Theorem 3.10(7) to the set V (and the fact that D is a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set), there exists $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^m$ definable, open, and dense, such that $D \times U \subseteq V$.

By Lemma 5.23, after shrinking U if necessary, we can assume that, given $B \subseteq U$ definably connected, $g \upharpoonright_B$ is uniformly continuous. Define $\tau : D \times U \rightarrow D$ as

$$\tau(t, x) := \min\{s \in D : |f(s, x) - g(x)| < 1/t \text{ \& } s > t\}.$$

Thus,

$$\forall d \in D \forall x \in U (|f(\tau(d, x), x) - g(x)| < 1/d \text{ \& } \tau(d, x) > d).$$

By applying the same trick as at the start of the proof, after further shrinking U , we can further assume that τ is continuous on $D \times U$. Let $B \subseteq U$ be definably connected. Since D is discrete, for every $d \in D$, the function $\tau(d, \cdot)$ is constant on B : we can therefore denote $\lambda(d) := \tau(x, d)$. Let $E \subseteq D$ be the image of λ . Thus, for every $d \in D$, we have

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} |f(\lambda(d), x) - g(x)| &< 1/d, \\ \lambda(d) &\in E; \\ \lambda(d) &> d. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By (1) we have that there exists $M > 0$ s.t.

$$(2) \quad \forall x \in B \forall d \in D (d > M \rightarrow |f(\lambda(d), x) - g(x)| < \varepsilon).$$

Since $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, the following function $\mu : E \rightarrow D$ is well-defined

$$\mu(e) := \max\{d \in D : \lambda(d) = e\}.$$

Notice that $\forall e \in E (e = \lambda(\mu(e)))$; therefore,

$$(3) \quad \forall x \in B \forall e \in E (|f(e, x) - g(x)| = |f(\lambda(\mu(e)), x) - g(x)| < 1/\mu(e)).$$

Claim 7. $\lim_{e \rightarrow +\infty, e \in E} \mu(e) = +\infty$.

Otherwise, there exists $N > 0$ s.t.

$$(4) \quad \forall L > 0 \exists e \in E (e > L \ \& \ \mu(e) \in D_{\geq N}),$$

Notice that $D_{\geq N}$ is pseudo-finite: hence $F := \lambda(D_{\geq N})$ is also pseudo-finite, and in particular F is bounded by some $L > 0$. Take $e \in E$ as in (3): then, $e = \lambda(\mu(e)) \in F$ and $e > L$, absurd.

By Claim 7, there exists $N > 0$ such that $\forall e \in E (e > N \rightarrow \mu(e) > M)$, and therefore by (2) we have

$$\forall x \in B \forall e \in E (e > N \rightarrow |f(e, x) - g(x)| < \varepsilon). \quad \square$$

Corollary 5.25. *Let N be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set. Let $f : N \times \mathbb{K}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ be a definable function; write $f_t(x) := f(t, x)$. Assume that, for every $x \in \mathbb{K}^m$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f_t(x) = 0$. Then, there exists $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^m$ open, definable, and dense, such that $\forall x \in U \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} Df_t(x) = 0$ (where D denotes the derivation with respect to the x variables).*

Proof. Assume not. By Proposition 5.20, after shrinking N and taking an open subset of \mathbb{K}^m if necessary, there exists $C > 0$ such that $\forall x \in \mathbb{K}^m \forall t \in N$ large enough $Df_t(x) > C$. Fix $x \neq x' \in \mathbb{K}^m$; let $b := |x - x'|$. Then,

$$|f_t(x) - f_t(x')| \geq Cb$$

while the left side goes to 0 as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, absurd. \square

Notice that Proposition 5.20 remains true with the weaker hypothesis that \mathbb{K} is i-minimal but not locally o-minimal (with the same proof), while Lemma 5.17 requires also DSF.

5.3. Pillay rank in d-minimal structures. Remember that \mathbb{K} is a d-minimal structure. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and closed. In §3.5 we defined the Pillay rank of X , and computed the rank of \mathbb{K} . Here we want to give an upper bound on $\text{rk}^P(X)$, and in particular prove that it's not ∞ (but it will be, in general, an ordinal).

First, let's consider the locally o-minimal case, when the rank is finite.

Lemma 5.26. *Let \mathbb{K} be locally o-minimal.*

- (1) $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}^n) = n$.
- (2) *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable. Then, $\text{rk}^P(X) = \dim(X)$.*

Proof. It's an easy exercise to show that $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}^n) \geq n$. Thus, it suffices to prove 2). Proceed by induction on $d := \dim(X)$. If $d = 0$, then X is discrete, and therefore $\text{rk}^P(X) = 0$. For the inductive step, assume $d > 0$. Let $Y \subset X$ be definable and nowhere dense. Since \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal, $\dim(Y) < d$. Hence, by inductive hypothesis, $\text{rk}^P(Y) < d$, and therefore $\text{rk}^P(X) \leq d$. For the opposite inequality, it's easy to find $Y \subset X$ definable such that $\dim(Y) = d - 1$ and Y is a manifold.

Therefore, by inductive hypothesis, $\text{rk}^P(Y) = d - 1$. Since Y is a manifold and $\dim(Y) < \dim(X)$, Y is nowhere dense in X : therefore, $\text{rk}^P(X) \geq d$. \square

Let us consider now the general d -minimal case.

Theorem 5.27. *Let \mathbb{K} be d -minimal.*

- (1) *If \mathbb{K} is locally o -minimal, then $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}^n) = n$.*
- (2) *Assume that is not locally o -minimal, then $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}^n) = \omega^n$.*
- (3) *If $Y \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is an embedded manifold of dimension d , then $\text{rk}^P(Y) \leq \omega^d$, with equality holding when \mathbb{K} is not locally o -minimal.*
- (4) *If $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is definable of dimension d , then there exists a natural number m such that $\text{rk}^P(X) \leq m\omega^d$.*

Proof. 1) is Lemma 5.26.

For 2), like in Proposition 3.31, it is easy to see that $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}^n) \geq \omega^n$. Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and nowhere dense. Thus, by 4), $\text{rk}^P(Y) < \omega^{\dim(Y)+1} \leq \omega^n$, and therefore $\text{rk}^P(\mathbb{K}^n) \leq \omega^n$.

3) and 4) are proved together by induction on d .

If $d = 0$, then Y is discrete, and therefore $\text{rk}^P(Y) = 0$. X is a union of finitely many discrete sets, and therefore $\text{rk}^P(X) \leq m$ for some natural number m .

Assume now that $d > 0$ and that we have proven 3) and 4) for every $d' < d$: we want to prove them for d . Let $Z \subseteq Y$ be definable and nowhere dense. Since Y is a manifold, $\dim(Z) < d$; thus, by inductive hypothesis, $\text{rk}^P(Z) < \omega^d$, and hence $\text{rk}^P(Y) \leq \omega^d$. Thus, it remains to prove 4).

By Proposition 5.12, there exists a partition $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_r$ of X into embedded manifolds X_i . Let $\gamma := \max_{i=1, \dots, r} \text{rk}^P(X_i)$. By 3), $\gamma \leq \omega^d$. Notice that each X_i is locally closed in X (since it is locally closed in \mathbb{K}^n). Thus, by Proposition 3.5, $\text{rk}^P(X) \leq r\gamma + (r - 1) < (r + 1)\omega^d$, and we are done. \square

Let $Y \subset X$ be definable sets with Y nowhere dense in X . In o -minimal structures we have the inequality $\dim(Y) < \dim(X)$, which is quite useful in proving theorem by induction on the dimension. In d -minimal structure such inequality fails. The usefulness of the Pillay rank is that we have $\text{rk}^P(Y) < \text{rk}^P(X)$, and therefore we can proceed by induction on it. §5.4 will show an application of the above idea.

Moreover, rk^P is a refinement of both the dimension and the Cantor-Bendixson rank: that is, if $\dim(X) < \dim(Y)$, then $\text{rk}^P(X) < \text{rk}^P(Y)$, and similarly for rk^{CB} .

5.4. Stratification.

Definition 5.28. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be a definable set. A **weak stratification** of X is a finite partition $X = C_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup C_k$, such that each C_i is definable, and for each i , ∂C_i is a union of some of the C_j (where ∂C_i

is the set of points in the closure of C_i inside X but not in C_i). The C_i are the strata of the given stratification.

The difference with the usual definition of stratification (for subsets of \mathbb{R}^n) is that in the latter case the strata are required to be connected. Since we will only consider weak stratifications, we will drop the adjective weak: a stratification will be a weak stratification.

Definition 5.29. Let $X \subseteq Y$ be sets, \mathcal{A} a family of subsets of Y . Let \mathcal{B} be partition (or a stratification) of Y ; we say that \mathcal{B} is compatible with \mathcal{A} if, for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \cap X$ is a union of sets in \mathcal{B} .

We also denote $\partial\mathcal{A} := \{\partial A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$.

Thus, a stratification is a partition \mathcal{B} which is compatible with $\partial\mathcal{B}$.

Theorem 5.30. *Let \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there exists a stratification of \mathbb{K}^n into embedded \mathcal{C}^p manifolds compatible with \mathcal{A} .*

Proof. We prove (by induction) the following statement.

(*) Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be a definable set. Let \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there is a stratification of X into embedded \mathcal{C}^p manifolds compatible with \mathcal{A} .

By Proposition 5.12, there exists a finite partition of \mathbb{K}^n in \mathcal{C}^p manifolds compatible with $\mathcal{A} \cup \{X\}$. W.l.o.g., we can assume that \mathcal{A} itself is such partition: we want to find a stratification refining \mathcal{A} .

Let $\mathcal{A}' := \{A \in \mathcal{A} : A \subseteq X\}$. We want to find a stratification of X refining \mathcal{A}' . Notice that if A were open in X for every $A \in \mathcal{A}'$, then \mathcal{A}' would already be a stratification of X .

We proceed by induction on $\alpha := \text{rk}^P(X)$ (by Theorem 5.27, α is an ordinal number). Let $d := \dim(X)$; for each $i = 0, \dots, d$, let $Y_i := \text{reg}_d^p(X)$ and $Y := \bigcup_{i=0}^d Y_i = \text{reg}^p(X)$. Notice that each Y_i is a \mathcal{C}^p -manifold of dimension i and is open in X . For $i = 0 \dots d$, let $\mathcal{B}_i := \{A \cap Y_i : A \in \mathcal{A}' \text{ \& } \dim(Y_i \cap A) = i\}$ and $Y'_i := \bigcup \mathcal{B}_i$. Notice that, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}_i$, B is an open subset both of the corresponding $A \in \mathcal{A}$ (because Y_i is open in X and A is a subset of X) and of Y_i (because Y_i is a manifold and B is a submanifold of the same dimension as Y_i) and hence of X (because Y_i is open in X). Let $\mathcal{B} := \bigcup_{i=0}^d \mathcal{B}_i$ and $Y' := \bigcup_{i=0}^d Y'_i = \bigcup \mathcal{B}$. Thus, \mathcal{B} is a stratification of Y' compatible with \mathcal{A} . Moreover, for each $i = 0, \dots, d$, $\dim(Y_i \setminus Y'_i) < i$, thus, since Y_i is a manifold, Y'_i is dense in Y_i : therefore, Y' is dense in Y . By Lemma 5.9, Y is dense in X , and therefore Y' is dense in X . Let $Z := X \setminus Y'$. Since Z is nowhere dense in X , we have $\text{rk}^P(Z) < \alpha$. Thus, by inductive hypothesis, there exists \mathcal{C} stratification of Z compatible with $\mathcal{A} \cup \partial\mathcal{B}$. Then, $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$ is a stratification of X compatible with \mathcal{A} (because, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}$, B and C are disjoint and B is open in X , and hence B and ∂C are also disjoint). \square

Among all possible stratifications of X there is a canonical one.

Definition 5.31. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be a definable set, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n . We now define $\mathcal{S}^p(X, \mathcal{A})$ the canonical \mathcal{C}^p stratification of X compatible with \mathcal{A} by induction on $\text{rk}^p(X)$. By replacing \mathcal{A} with the atoms of the Boolean algebra generated by it, w.l.o.g. we can assume that \mathcal{A} is a partition of \mathbb{K}^n . Let $d := \dim(X)$; define

$$\begin{aligned} Z &:= \text{reg}_d^p(X); \\ \mathcal{B} &:= \mathcal{B}^p(Z, \mathcal{A}) := \{ \text{reg}_d^p(A \cap Z) : A \in \mathcal{A} \ \& \ \dim(A \cap Z) = d \}, \\ W &:= \bigcup \mathcal{B}, \\ Y &:= X \setminus W, \\ \mathcal{A}' &:= \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that W is a \mathcal{C}^p manifold, it is open in X , and that \mathcal{B} is a partition of W by open sets, and therefore \mathcal{B} is a stratification of W compatible with \mathcal{A} . By Lemma 5.32, $\text{rk}^p(Y) < \text{rk}^p(X)$: therefore, by induction on rk^p , we can assume that we have already defined $\mathcal{S}^p(Y, \mathcal{A}')$, the canonical \mathcal{C}^p stratification of Y compatible with \mathcal{A}' . Then, $\mathcal{S}^p(X, \mathcal{A}) := \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{S}^p(Y, \mathcal{A}')$ is the canonical \mathcal{C}^p stratification of X compatible with \mathcal{A} (notice that $\mathcal{S}^p(X, \mathcal{A})$ is indeed a stratification of X compatible with \mathcal{A}).

If we don't specify the family \mathcal{A} , the canonical \mathcal{C}^p stratification of X is $\mathcal{S}^p(X) := \mathcal{S}^p(X, \emptyset)$.

Lemma 5.32. *In the setting of Definition 5.31, we have $\text{rk}^p(Y) < \text{rk}^p(X)$.*

Proof. Notice that it's not true in general that Y is nowhere dense in X : thus, we do need to give an argument.

Assume, for a contradiction, that $\text{rk}^p(Y) = \text{rk}^p(X) =: \alpha$.

Let $T := \overline{Z}$ (where the closure is taken inside X).

Claim 8. $\dim(X \setminus T) < d$.

In fact, by Lemma 5.9, we have $X \setminus T \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{d-1} \overline{\text{reg}_i^p(X)}$. Since, for every $i = 0, \dots, i-1$, we have that either $\text{reg}_i^p(X)$ is empty, or $\dim(\overline{\text{reg}_i^p(X)}) = \dim(\text{reg}_i^p(X)) = i < d$, the claim follows.

Let $Y_1 := Y \cap T$ and $Y_2 := \text{cl}_Y(Y \setminus T)$.

Claim 9. $\text{rk}^p(Y_1) = \alpha$.

In fact, we have that Y is the union of its two closed (in Y) subsets Y_1 and Y_2 , and therefore, by Fact 3.22, either $\text{rk}^p(Y_1) = \alpha$, or $\text{rk}^p(Y_2) = \alpha$. However, $\dim(Y_2) \leq \dim(X \setminus T) < d$, and therefore, by Theorem 5.27, $\text{rk}^p(Y_2) < \omega^d$; on the other hand $\dim(X) = d$, and therefore $\alpha \geq \omega^d$.

Thus, it suffices to prove the following claim to get a contradiction.

Claim 10. Y_1 is nowhere dense in T .

We need some further results before proving Claim 10.

Claim 11. W is dense in T .

Since Z is dense in T , it suffices to show that W is dense in Z . Assume, for a contradiction, that U is nonempty definable subset of $Z \setminus W$ which is open in Z . Since W is a manifold of dimension d , we have that $\dim(U) = d$. Thus, there exists $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\dim(A \cap U) = d$. By Lemma 5.9, $\text{reg}_d^p(A \cap U)$ is nonempty (or, equivalently, $\text{int}_U(A \cap U)$ is nonempty). However, $\text{reg}_d^p(A \cap U) \subseteq \text{reg}_d^p(A \cap Z)$ (again, because Z is a manifold of dimension d , and hence $\text{reg}_d^p(A \cap Z) = \text{int}_Z(A \cap Z)$, and similarly for U). Thus, $\text{reg}_d^p(A \cap Z) \in \mathcal{B}$ and therefore $\text{reg}_d^p(A \cap Z) \subseteq W$; hence, $\text{reg}_d^p(A \cap U)$ is a nonempty subset of $U \cap W$, absurd.

Thus, since W is also open in T , Claim 10 follows from the fact that $Y \cap W = \emptyset$. \square

5.5. Verdier and Whitney stratifications. Whitney stratifications are particularly important in semialgebraic and subanalytic geometry.

[Loi98] proved that in o-minimal structures every definable set admits a Whitney stratification (he stated his result for expansions of \mathbb{R} , but the same proof works in general o-minimal structures). To do it, he introduced Verdier stratifications (see Def. 5.36), and proved that, for an o-minimal structure,

- (1) Every Verdier stratification (with finitely many definable sets) is a Whitney stratification
- (2) Every definable set admits a Verdier stratification (into finitely many definable sets).

Unfortunately, Loi's result does not extend to d-minimal structures (see Example 5.39).

However, some partial result is still true.

Definition 5.33. Let $P(X, Y; y)$ be a property, where X and Y are definable embedded submanifolds of \mathbb{K}^n , $Y \subseteq \partial X$, and $y \in Y$.

We say that P is **local** if, for every $y \in Y$ and every definable open neighbourhood U of y , $P(X, Y; y)$ holds iff $P(X \cap U, Y \cap U; y)$ holds.

We denote $P(X, Y) := \{y \in Y : P(X, Y; y) \text{ holds}\}$.

Definition 5.34. In the setting of Definition 5.33, we say that:

- (1) Whitney Property (a) holds if $a(X, Y; y) :=$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighbourhood U of y in \mathbb{K}^n such that

$$\forall x \in X \cap U \forall z \in Y \cap U \delta(T_z Y, T_x X) \leq \varepsilon,$$

where

$$\delta(A, B) := \sup_{a \in A, \|a\|=1} d(a, B)$$

is the distance between the vector subspaces $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$.

(2) Whitney Property (b) holds if

$b(X, Y; y) :=$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighbourhood U of y in \mathbb{K}^n such that

$$\forall x \in X \cap U \quad \forall z \in Y \cap U \quad \delta(\mathbb{K} \cdot (x - z), T_x X) < \varepsilon.$$

A \mathcal{C}^1 stratification \mathcal{S} is an a-stratification if for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $Y \subseteq \partial X$, we have $a(X, y) = Y$. If moreover $b(X, y) = Y$, then \mathcal{S} is a Whitney stratification.

Remark 5.35. If X and Y are \mathcal{C}^2 manifolds and \mathbb{K} is an expansion of the real field, then the definition of the Whitney properties (a) and (b) given above coincides with the usual Whitney conditions (defined in [Whi65]).

Definition 5.36 ([Loi98, p. 348]). In the setting of Definition 5.33, we say that $w(X, Y; y)$ holds if there exists a constant $C > 0$ and a neighbourhood U of y in \mathbb{K}^n such that

$$\forall x \in X \cap U \quad \forall z \in Y \cap U \quad \delta(T_z Y, T_x X) \leq C \|z - x\|$$

A \mathcal{C}^1 stratification \mathcal{S} is a Verdier stratification if for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $Y \subseteq \partial X$, we have $w(X, y) = Y$.

Notice that $w(X, Y; y)$ implies $a(X, Y; y)$: thus, by Loi's Theorem, every o-minimal structure admits an a-stratification. We will show that every d-minimal structure admits an a-stratification.

We need first a general result about stratifications (cf. [LSW86, Prop. 2]).

Remark 5.37. Properties (a), (b), and (w) are local properties.

Proposition 5.38. *Let $P(X, Y; y)$ be a local property. Suppose that for every pair $\langle X, Y \rangle$ of definable \mathcal{C}^p submanifolds of \mathbb{K}^n with $Y \subseteq \partial X$ and $Y \neq \emptyset$, we have*

() the set $P(X, Y)$ is definable and nonempty.*

Then, with the same assumptions on X and Y , we have

*(**) the set $P(X, Y)$ is definable and dense in Y .*

Moreover, let $F \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and \mathcal{A} be a family definable subsets of \mathbb{K}^n . Then, there exists a \mathcal{C}^p stratification \mathcal{D} of F compatible with \mathcal{A} , and such that

*(***) $P(X, Y) = Y$ for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$ with $Y \subseteq \partial X$.*

Proof. We first show that (*) implies (**). If not, then there exists X and Y as in the assumption such that $P(X, Y)$ is not dense in Y : therefore, there exists $Y' \subseteq Y$ definable, open, and nonempty, such that $P(X, Y) \cap Y' = \emptyset$. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and open, such that $Y' = Y \cap U$, and let $X' := X \cap U$. Then, since P is local, we have that $P(X', Y') = \emptyset$, contradicting (*).

We now show that (**) implies (***). As usual, we can assume that \mathcal{A} is a partition of \mathbb{K}^n into \mathcal{C}^p manifolds. We proceed by induction on $\text{rk}^P(F)$. Notice that, since Y is a manifold, (**) is equivalent to saying that $Y \setminus P(X, Y)$ is definable and nowhere dense in Y , or that $\dim(Y \setminus P(X, Y)) < \dim(Y)$.

For the induction to work, we strengthen the conditions we require for the stratification \mathcal{D} .

- (i) \mathcal{D} is a \mathcal{C}^p stratification of F compatible with $\mathcal{A} \cup \partial\mathcal{A}$;
- (ii) For every $X \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{D}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$, if $Y \subseteq \partial X$ (equivalently, Y meets ∂X), then $P(X, Y) = Y$.

So, assume we have already proven that, for every F' with $\text{rk}^P(F') < \text{rk}^P(F)$ and every finite family of definable sets \mathcal{A}' there exists a \mathcal{D}' satisfying (i) and (ii) for F' and \mathcal{A}' ; we want to find \mathcal{D} for F and \mathcal{A} .

Let $\mathcal{A}' := \mathcal{A} \cup \partial\mathcal{A}$. We build \mathcal{D} inductively. Let $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}^p(F, \mathcal{A}')$ (as in Definition 5.31). \mathcal{B} is not yet a good enough starting point, since given $Y \in \mathcal{B}$ and $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with $Y \subseteq \partial X$, it may happen $P(X, Y) \neq Y$. Thus, given $B \in \mathcal{B}$, let

$$e(B) := \bigcap \{ P(A, B) : A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ \& } B \subseteq \partial A \};$$

by (**), $e(B)$ is dense in B ; since P is a local condition, $e(B)$ is also open in B . Let

$$\mathcal{E} := \{ e(B) : B \in \mathcal{B} \}$$

$$F := \bigcup \mathcal{E}$$

$$D' := D \setminus F.$$

Notice that \mathcal{E} is a stratification of F satisfying (i) and (ii).

Claim 12. $\text{rk}^P(D') < \text{rk}^P(D)$.

Let $W := \bigcup \mathcal{B}$ and $T := \overline{W}$. Reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 5.32, it suffices to prove that $\text{rk}^P(D' \cap W) < \text{rk}^P(D)$. But $D' \cap W$ is nowhere dense in W , and the claim follows.

Thus, by inductive hypothesis, we can find a stratification \mathcal{D}' satisfying (i) and (ii) for D' and the family $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{E}$. Finally, $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{D}'$ satisfies (i) and (ii). \square

In general, not every definable set admits a Verdier or a Whitney stratification.

Examples 5.39. Let \mathbb{K} be a d-minimal non o-minimal expansion of $\langle \mathbb{R}, <, +, \cdot, \exp \rangle$ and let $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set.

- (1) Consider the following subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$X := (0, 1) \times \{0\}$$

$$Y := \{ \langle x, y \rangle : 0 < x < 1 \text{ \& } \exists t \in D (y = \exp(-tx)) \}.$$

Notice that Y is an open subset of ∂X and $w(X, Y)$ is empty. Thus, no Verdier stratification of \mathbb{R}^2 compatible with X exists.

(2) Let $X := \{\mathbb{R} \times \{1/d\} : d \in D\}$ and $Y := \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$. Then, $Y = \partial X$ and $b(X, Y) = \emptyset$. Thus, there is no Whitney stratification of \mathbb{R}^2 compatible with X . Moreover, $w(X, Y) = Y$, and therefore (for a d-minimal structure) a Verdier stratification is not necessarily a Whitney stratification. It's an easy exercise to modify the example and also make X connected.

We can generalize Loi's theorem to locally o-minimal structures.

Lemma 5.40 (Wing Lemma). *Assume that \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal. Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{K}^k$ be a nonempty open definable set, and $S \subseteq \mathbb{K}^k \times \mathbb{K}^\ell$ be a definable set. Suppose that $V \subseteq \partial S$. Then, there exists a nonempty open subset U of V , $\alpha_0 > 0$, and a definable map $\bar{\rho} : U \times (0, \alpha_0) \rightarrow S$, of class \mathcal{C}^p , such that $\bar{\rho}(y, t) = \langle y, \bar{\rho}(y) \rangle$ and $\|\bar{\rho}(y, t)\| = t$, for all $y \in U$, $t \in (0, \alpha_0)$.*

Proof. Given $x \in \mathbb{K}^k$, denote $S_{[x]} := S \cap (\{x\} \times \mathbb{K}^\ell)$. By Theorem 3.10(8), after shrinking V , w.l.o.g. we can assume that, for every $x \in V$, $x \in \partial S_{[x]}$. By DSF, there exists a definable partial function $\rho : V \times (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^\ell$ such that $\rho(x, t) \in V$ and $\|\rho(x, t)\| = t$ (if there exists an element $y \in S_x$ such that $\|y\| = t$, and is undefined otherwise). Let D be the domain of ρ : notice that, for every $x \in V$, $0 \in \partial(D_x)$. Let $\alpha(x) := \sup\{t > 0 : (0, t) \subseteq D_x\}$. Since \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal, $\alpha(x) > 0$ for every $x \in V$. By Theorem 3.10(6), after shrinking V , w.l.o.g. we can assume that α is continuous on V , and hence, after shrinking V again, we can assume that there exists $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $\alpha(x) > \alpha_1$ for every $x \in V$.

It remains to shrink V and α_1 in order to make ρ a \mathcal{C}^p function.

By Lemma 3.14, there exists $W \subseteq V \times (0, \alpha_1)$ definable, open, and dense, such that ρ is \mathcal{C}^p on W . By Theorem 3.10(8), w.l.o.g. we can assume that $x \in \partial(W_{[x]})$, for every $x \in V$. Repeating the reasoning as above for W , we find $\alpha_0 > 0$ and $U \subseteq V$ open and definable, such that $U \times (0, \alpha_0) \subseteq W$. \square

Lemma 5.41. *Assume that \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal. Let X be a definable subset of \mathbb{K}^n and $1 \leq p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there exists a definable \mathcal{C}^p Verdier stratification of \mathbb{K}^n compatible with X .*

Proof. The proof in [Loi98] can be generalized to this situation. By Proposition 5.38, it suffices to prove that, if X , and Y are definable \mathcal{C}^1 submanifolds of \mathbb{K}^n with $Y \subseteq \partial X$ and $Y \neq \emptyset$, we have that the set $w(X, Y)$ is definable and nonempty. The fact that $w(X, Y)$ is definable is clear, and thus it remains to show that it is nonempty. The remainder of the proof is as in [Loi98], using Lemma 5.40. \square

Lemma 5.42. *Assume that \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal. Let $p \geq 2$ and $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable \mathcal{C}^p manifolds such that $Y \subseteq \partial X$. Let $y \in Y$ such that $w(X, Y; y)$ holds. Then, $b(X, Y; y)$ also holds.*

Proof. The proof in [Loi98, Prop. 1.10] transfers to this situation (the main ingredients in the proof is Curve Selection, which holds for locally o-minimal structures).⁽⁸⁾ \square

Corollary 5.43. *Assume that \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal and $p \geq 2$. Then, for every definable set $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ there exists a definable \mathcal{C}^p Whitney stratification of \mathbb{K}^n compatible with X .*

For d-minimal structures, we can prove that definable sets have an a-stratification.

Proposition 5.44. *(Let \mathbb{K} be d-minimal.) Let X be a definable subset of \mathbb{K}^n and $1 \leq p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there exists a definable \mathcal{C}^p a-stratification of \mathbb{K}^n compatible with X .*

Proof. By Proposition 5.38, it suffices to prove that, if X , and Y are definable \mathcal{C}^2 submanifolds of \mathbb{K}^n with $Y \subseteq \partial X$ and $Y \neq \emptyset$, we have that the set $a(X, Y)$ is definable and nonempty. The fact that $a(X, Y)$ is definable is clear, and thus it remains to show that it is nonempty.

By Corollary 5.43, we can assume that \mathbb{K} is not locally o-minimal, and therefore the content of §5.2 applies. Assume, for a contradiction, that $a(X, Y)$ is empty. Since a is a local property and is invariant under definable \mathcal{C}^2 diffeomorphisms, w.l.o.g. we can assume that Y is an open subset of $\mathbb{K}^k \subset \mathbb{K}^k \times \mathbb{K}^\ell$, where $\ell := n - k$. In this case, $T_y Y = \mathbb{K}^k$ for every $y \in Y$.

Let N be a pseudo- \mathbb{N} set. By Corollary 5.22, there exists a definable \mathcal{C}^2 function $f : Y \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^\ell$ such that

$$\forall y \in Y \forall t \in N (f(y, t) \in X_y \text{ \& } |f(y, t)| < 1/t).$$

Write $f_t(y) := f(y, t)$. By Corollary 5.25, we have that, after shrinking Y , $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} Df_t(y) = 0$, uniformly in y . But since $T_{\langle y, f(y, t) \rangle} X \supseteq \text{Graph}(Df_t(y))$, we have that $a(X, Y) = Y$, absurd. \square

We give now an example of a submanifold of \mathbb{R}^3 (not definable in any d-minimal expansion of \mathbb{R}) which does not admit an a-stratification.

Example 5.45. Let

$$X := \{ \langle x, r \sin(x/r), r \cos(x/r) \rangle : 0 < x < 1 \in \mathbb{R}, r \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}} \}$$

$$Y := (0, 1) \times \{0\} \times \{0\}.$$

Notice that $Y \subset \partial X$ and $a(X, Y) = \emptyset$. Then, there is no a-stratification of \mathbb{R}^3 (into finitely many \mathcal{C}^1 manifolds) compatible with X .

It remains open the quest of finding a property $b'(X, Y; y)$ such that:

- (1) when \mathbb{K} is o-minimal, $b'(X, Y; y)$ coincides with $b(X, Y; y)$ for sufficiently smooth definably connected manifolds
- (2) when \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, every definable set admits a stratification satisfying a and b' .

⁽⁸⁾ There is a misprint in the proof of [Loi98, Prop. 1.10], where it should be $\phi(t) = (b(t), a(t))$ instead of $\phi(t) = (a(t), b(t))$.

6. CAUCHY COMPLETION

Definition 6.1. If $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ is an ordered field, we denote by $\overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$ the **Cauchy completion** of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$, that is, the maximal linearly ordered group such that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ is dense in $\overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$; notice that $\overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$ is, in a canonical way, a real closed field (see [Sco69]). If \mathbb{K} is an expansion of an ordered field $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$, we define $\mathbb{K}^C := \overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$ (later we will show how to extend the structure to \mathbb{K}^C : see Proposition 6.7).

A **cut** $\Lambda := (\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$ of \mathbb{K} is a partition of \mathbb{K} into two disjoint subsets Λ^L and Λ^R , such that $y < x$ for every $y \in \Lambda^L$ and $x \in \Lambda^R$. We use the notations $y < \Lambda$ if $y \in \Lambda^L$, and $x > \Lambda$ if $x \in \Lambda^R$. A cut (Λ^L, Λ^R) is a **gap** if Λ^L is nonempty and has no maximum, and Λ^R is nonempty and has no minimum. A cut Λ is **regular** if $\hat{\Lambda} = 0$, where $\hat{\Lambda} := \inf\{x - y : x, y \in \mathbb{K} \text{ \& } y < \Lambda < x\}$.

Notice that the Cauchy completion of \mathbb{K} is the disjoint union of \mathbb{K} and the set of regular gaps of \mathbb{K} , with suitably defined order $<$ and operations $+$ and \cdot .

Remark 6.2. Let κ be the cofinality of \mathbb{K} . The Cauchy completion is the set of Cauchy sequences in \mathbb{K} of length κ , modulo the set of null sequences.

Lemma 6.3. *Let \mathbb{K} be definably complete, $\mathbb{K}^* \succ \mathbb{K}$, $b \in \mathbb{K}^* \setminus \mathbb{K}$. For every $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^m$ definable, let $X^* \subseteq \mathbb{K}^{*m}$ be the interpretation of X in \mathbb{K}^* .*

Let $E \subset \mathbb{K}$ be closed, \mathbb{K} -definable, and with $n := \text{rk}^{CB}(E) < \omega$, let Λ be the cut of \mathbb{K} determined by b . If Λ is regular, then $b \notin E^$.*

If moreover \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, and $D \subset \mathbb{K}$ is \mathbb{K} -definable and of dimension 0, then $b \notin D^$.*

Proof. We will prove the lemma by induction on $n := \text{rk}^{CB}(E)$. W.l.o.g., E is bounded (because b is \mathbb{K} -bounded). If $n = 0$, then $E = \emptyset$. If $n = 1$, then E is discrete; thus, E is pseudo-finite; let $\delta := \delta(E)$; notice that $0 < \delta \in \mathbb{K}$. Since Λ is regular, there exist $a', a'' \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $a' < b < a''$ and $a'' - a' < \delta$. Thus, $(a', a'')^* \cap E^* = \{b\}$, and therefore b is \mathbb{K} -definable, absurd.

If $n > 1$, let $G := E^{(n-1)}$; notice that G is closed, discrete and nonempty; thus, $\text{rk}^{CB}(G) = 1$, and G is pseudo-finite. By the case $n = 1$, $b \notin G^*$; let $a', a'' \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $a' < b < a''$ and $G \cap [a', a''] = \emptyset$ (a' and a'' exist by the proof of the case $n = 1$). Let $F := E \cap [a', a'']$. Notice that F is d-compact. Moreover, $\text{rk}^{CB}(F) < n$. Therefore, by inductive hypothesis, $b \notin F^*$. Hence, $b \notin E^*$.

If \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, let E be the closure of D in \mathbb{K} . By d-minimality, $\text{rk}^{CB}(D) < \omega$; thus, $b \notin D^*$. \square

From the proof of the above lemma, we can deduce the following.

Lemma 6.4. *Let \mathbb{K} be d -minimal, and $\mathbb{K} \prec \mathbb{K}^*$. Let $c \in \mathbb{K}^* \setminus \mathbb{K}$, Λ be the cut determined by c over \mathbb{K} , and $X^* \subseteq \mathbb{K}^*$ be \mathbb{K} -definable. If Λ is a regular gap and $c \in X^*$, then there exists an open interval I with end-points in \mathbb{K} such that $c \in I \subseteq X^*$.*

Lemma 6.5. *Let \mathbb{K} be definably complete, $\mathbb{K}^* \succ \mathbb{K}$, $b \in \mathbb{K}^* \setminus \mathbb{K}$, Λ be the cut of \mathbb{K} determined by b , $f : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be definable, $c := f^*(b) \in \mathbb{K}^*$, and Γ be the cut determined by c over \mathbb{K} . Assume that Λ is a regular gap and f is continuous and strictly monotone. Then, Γ is a regular gap, and $\mathbb{K}\langle c \rangle = \mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle$, where $\mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle$ is the definable closure of $\mathbb{K} \cup \{b\}$.*

Proof. Let $0 < \varepsilon \in \mathbb{K}$; by uniform continuity, there exists $0 < \delta \in \mathbb{K}$, such that, if $x, y \in \mathbb{K}$ and $|x - y| < \delta$, then $|f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon$. Let $y', y'' \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $y' < b < y''$ and $y'' - y' < \delta$ (they exist because Λ is a regular cut). Thus, $f(y') < c < f(y'')$ and $f(y'') - f(y') < \varepsilon$, and therefore Γ is regular. Moreover, f is invertible, and therefore $b = f^{-1}(c) \in \mathbb{K}\langle c \rangle$. \square

Lemma 6.6. *Let \mathbb{K} be a d -minimal structure, and $\mathbb{K}^* \succ \mathbb{K}$, such that \mathbb{K} is dense in \mathbb{K}^* . Then, the algebraic closure in \mathbb{K}^* has the Exchange Property (EP) relative to \mathbb{K} ; that is, if $A \subset \mathbb{K}^*$, and $b, c \in \mathbb{K}^*$ satisfy $c \in \mathbb{K}\langle A, b \rangle \setminus \mathbb{K}\langle A \rangle$, then $b \in \mathbb{K}\langle A, c \rangle$.*

Proof. Let b and c be as in the hypothesis. Let $\mathbb{K}' := \mathbb{K}\langle A \rangle$; w.l.o.g., $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K}'$. Then, since \mathbb{K} has definable Skolem function, $b = f^*(c)$ for some K -definable $f : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. By Theorem 3.10-III there exists $D \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ nowhere dense and K -definable, such that f is continuous and either constant or strictly monotone on each subinterval of $\mathbb{K} \setminus D$. By Lemma 6.3, $b \notin D^*$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.5, either $c \in \mathbb{K}$, or $b \in \mathbb{K}\langle c \rangle$. \square

Notice that the hypothesis that \mathbb{K} is dense in \mathbb{K}^* in the above lemma is necessary: [DMS10, 1.17] shows that if \mathbb{K}^* does not satisfy UF and it is sufficiently saturated, then the algebraic closure in \mathbb{K}^* does not satisfy (EP).

[LS95] proves the following proposition for o-minimal expansions of Archimedean ordered groups, and [Fré15] gives a proof for o-minimal structures expanding a field.

Proposition 6.7 (Cauchy completion). *Let \mathbb{K} be a d -minimal structure, expanding the ordered field $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$, and $\mathcal{L} = (0, 1, +, \cdot, <, \dots)$ be the language of \mathbb{K} . There exists a unique expansion of the Cauchy completion $\overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$ to an \mathcal{L} -structure \mathbb{K}^C , such that \mathbb{K} is an elementary substructure of \mathbb{K}^C .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{S} be set of elementary extensions \mathbb{K}' of \mathbb{K} , such that \mathbb{K} is dense in \mathbb{K}' ; order \mathcal{S} by elementary inclusion. Let \mathbb{K}' be a maximal element of \mathcal{S} (\mathbb{K}' exists by Zorn's lemma). We claim that $\overline{\mathbb{K}'} = \overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$ (and, thus, $\overline{\mathbb{K}'}^C$ can be expanded to an \mathcal{L} -structure).

Suppose not. W.l.o.g., $\mathbb{K}' = \mathbb{K}$. Let Λ be a regular gap of \mathbb{K} , \mathbb{K}^* be an elementary extension of \mathbb{K} , and $b \in \mathbb{K}^*$ fills the gap Λ . Let $\mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle$ be the definable closure of $\mathbb{K} \cup \{b\}$ in \mathbb{K}^* ; since \mathbb{K} has definable Skolem functions (by definable choice), $\mathbb{K} \prec \mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle \preceq \mathbb{K}^*$.

We claim that \mathbb{K} is dense in $\mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle$, contradicting the maximality of \mathbb{K} . In fact, let $c \in \mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle$; thus, $c = f(b)$ for some \mathbb{K} -definable $f : \mathbb{K}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^*$. We have to prove that either $c \in \mathbb{K}$, or that Γ is a regular gap, where Γ is the cut determined by c over \mathbb{K} . By Theorem 3.10(III) there exists $D \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ nowhere dense and definable, such that f is continuous and either constant or strictly monotone on each subinterval of $\mathbb{K} \setminus D$. By Lemma 6.3, $b \notin D^*$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.5, either $c \in \mathbb{K}$, or Γ is a regular gap.

It remains to prove that the \mathcal{L} -structure on $\overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$ is unique. Let \mathbb{K}_1^C and \mathbb{K}_2^C be two expansion of $\overline{\mathbb{K}}^C$ to elementary extensions of \mathbb{K} . Let \mathbb{K}' be a maximal common elementary substructure of \mathbb{K}_1^C and \mathbb{K}_2^C extending \mathbb{K} . Assume, for a contradiction, that $\mathbb{K}' \neq \mathbb{K}^C$; w.l.o.g., we can assume that $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K}'$. Let $b \in \mathbb{K}^C \setminus \mathbb{K}$, and let $\phi(x)$ be an \mathcal{L} -formula with parameters in \mathbb{K} . In order to reach a contradiction, we must prove that $\mathbb{K}_1^C \models \phi(b)$ iff $\mathbb{K}_2^C \models \phi(b)$. W.l.o.g., $\mathbb{K}_1^C \models \phi(b)$; let $X := \phi(\mathbb{K})$. Moreover, for every $Y \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ definable, let Y_i^C be the interpretation of Y in \mathbb{K}_i^C , for $i = 1, 2$. Notice that $X = U \cap D$, where $U := \overset{\circ}{X}$ is open and definable, and $D := X \setminus \overset{\circ}{X}$ is definable, with $\dim D = 0$. Since \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, $\text{rk}^{CB}(D) < \omega$. Thus, by Lemma 6.3, $b \notin D_1^C$. Hence, $b \in U_1^C$; since \mathbb{K} is dense in \mathbb{K}_1^C , and U_1^C is open, there exist $y' < y'' \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $b \in (y', y'')_1^C \subseteq U_1^C$. Since $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}_1^C$, $(y', y'') \subseteq U$, and since $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}_2^C$, $b \in (y', y'')_2^C \subseteq U_2^C \subseteq X_2^C$. \square

Corollary 6.8 (of the proof). *Let \mathbb{K} be a d-minimal structure, $\mathbb{K}^* \succ \mathbb{K}$, $b \in \mathbb{K}^* \setminus \mathbb{K}$, and Λ be the cut of \mathbb{K} determined by b . If Λ is a regular gap, then it uniquely determines the type of b over \mathbb{K} ; moreover, \mathbb{K} is dense in $\mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle$; besides, for every $c \in \mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle \setminus \mathbb{K}$, we have $\mathbb{K}\langle c \rangle = \mathbb{K}\langle b \rangle$.*

Corollary 6.9. *An Archimedean locally o-minimal structure is o-minimal*

Proof. If \mathbb{K} is Archimedean, then $\overline{\mathbb{K}}^C = \overline{\mathbb{R}}$; thus, \mathbb{K} has an elementary extension $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ that is an expansion of \mathbb{R} . Therefore, $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ is o-minimal, and thus \mathbb{K} is o-minimal. \square

6.1. Polish structures and theories.

Lemma 6.10. *Let \mathbb{F} be an ordered field. Assume that \mathbb{F} contains a countable dense subset (not necessarily definable) and that \mathbb{F} is Cauchy complete. Then:*

- (1) \mathbb{F} has cofinality ω .
- (2) \mathbb{F} is a Polish space (i.e., a Cauchy complete separable metric space).
- (3) $|\mathbb{F}| = 2^{\aleph_0}$.

- (4) If $X \subset \mathbb{F}^n$ is perfect, nonempty, and a \mathcal{G}_δ (in the topological sense), then $|X| = 2^{\aleph_0}$.
- (5) If $X \subset \mathbb{F}^n$ is closed and $|X| < 2^{\aleph_0}$, then $\text{isol}(X)$, the set of isolated points of X , is dense in X .
- (6) If $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ is a nonempty \mathcal{G}_δ (in the topological sense), then it is a Baire space (again, in the topological sense), and it is even strong Choquet (see [Kec95]).

Proof. (1) is obvious.

(2) requires us to define a metric. If \mathbb{F} is Archimedean, then \mathbb{F} is homeomorphic to the reals, and we are done. Otherwise, let v be the natural valuation on \mathbb{F} induced by the ordering, and G be the value group of \mathbb{F} .

Claim 13. The topology induced by v on \mathbb{F} is the same as the order topology.

Notice that the claim is false if \mathbb{F} is Archimedean.

Claim 14. G is countable.

Thus, there exists a cointial order-reversing embedding ι of $(G, >)$ in $(\mathbb{R}_+, >)$ (notice that ι ignores the group structure). For every $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$, define

$$d(x, y) := \begin{cases} \iota(v(x - y)) & \text{if } x \neq y; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Claim 15. (\mathbb{F}, d) is a metric space.

Actually, (\mathbb{F}, d) satisfies the ultra-metric inequality.

Claim 16. (\mathbb{F}, d) is homeomorphic to (\mathbb{F}, v) (and hence to $(\mathbb{F}, <)$).

Claim 17. If $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (\mathbb{F}, d) , then $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (\mathbb{F}, v) .

Hence, assume that $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequences in (\mathbb{F}, d) . Since (\mathbb{F}, v) is Cauchy complete (by assumption), $a_n \rightarrow a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{F}$, according to the topology induced by v . However, v and d induce the same topology, and therefore $a_n \rightarrow a$ according also to d ; thus, (\mathbb{F}, d) is a complete metric space. Finally, (\mathbb{F}, d) is separable by assumption.

(3) Follows from (2) and the fact that if Y is a nonempty perfect Polish space, then $|Y| = 2^{\aleph_0}$ (see [Kec95, 6.2]).

(4) Notice that a \mathcal{G}_δ nonempty subset of \mathbb{F}^n is a Polish space (see [Kec95, 3.11]). Thus, X itself is a nonempty perfect Polish space, and therefore $|X| = 2^{\aleph_0}$.

(5) Assume, for a contradiction, that $\text{isol}(X)$ is not dense in X ; let $B \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be a closed box, such that $\overset{\circ}{B} \cap X \neq \emptyset$, and $Y := X \cap B$ contains no isolated points. Hence, Y satisfies the hypothesis of (4), absurd.

(6) Every Polish space is Baire and strong Choquet (see [Kec95, 8.17]). \square

Definition 6.11. Let T be a complete theory expanding the theory of ordered fields, in a language \mathcal{L} , expanding the language \mathcal{L}_{OF} of ordered fields. We say that T is a **Polish theory** if, for every finite language \mathcal{L}' , such that $\mathcal{L}_{OF} \subseteq \mathcal{L}' \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, the restriction of T to \mathcal{L}' has a model which is separable and Cauchy complete. If T is not complete, we say that T is a Polish theory if every completion of T is Polish.

Lemma 6.12. *Let T be a definably complete theory (expanding RCF). If T is Polish, $\mathbb{K} \models T$ and $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is definable and \mathcal{G}_δ (in the definable sense), then X is definably Baire.*

Proof. W.l.o.g., \mathbb{K} is Cauchy complete and separable. Hence, by Lemma 6.10, X is topologically Baire, and *a fortiori* definably Baire. \square

Proposition 6.13. *A d -minimal theory T is Polish. In particular, if \mathbb{K} is d -minimal and $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ is definable, then X is definably Baire.*

Proof. W.l.o.g., the language of T is countable. Let \mathbb{F}' be a countable model of T , and \mathbb{F} be the Cauchy completion of \mathbb{F}' . Therefore, \mathbb{F} is a model of T and a Polish space. \square

The above proposition may be a step in the proof of the following conjecture.

Conjecture 6.14. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ be definable and closed. Then, X is definably Baire.*

7. DENSE PAIRS OF D-MINIMAL STRUCTURES

7.1. The Z-closure.

Definition 7.1. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ and $c \in \mathbb{K}$. We define the Z-closure of A inside \mathbb{K}

$$\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}}(A) := \bigcup \{ C \subseteq \mathbb{K} : C \text{ nowhere dense and definable with parameters from } A \}.$$

If \mathbb{K} is clear from the context, we drop the superscript \mathbb{K} . $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ is Z-closed in \mathbb{K} if $\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}}(A) = A$.

The notion above is most interesting when A is an elementary substructure of \mathbb{K} .

Remark 7.2. $\text{dcl} \subseteq \text{Zcl}$. Moreover, if \mathbb{K} is o-minimal, then $\text{Zcl} = \text{dcl}$.

Remark 7.3. If \mathbb{K} is o-minimal and $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$, then A is Z-closed in \mathbb{K} if and only if A is an elementary substructure of \mathbb{K} .

Remark 7.4. If \mathbb{K} has DSF, then $\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}}(A) \preceq \mathbb{K}$.

Lemma 7.5. *If $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ has nonempty interior, then $\text{dcl}(A) = \mathbb{K}$, and therefore $\text{Zcl}(A) = \mathbb{K}$.*

Proof. Since $A \subseteq \text{dcl} A = \text{dcl}(\text{dcl}(A))$, w.l.o.g. $A = \text{dcl} A$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $B(a; \varepsilon) \subseteq A$. Hence, $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \subseteq A$. Thus, $(1/\varepsilon, +\infty) \subseteq A$. Let $b \in \mathbb{K}$; we want to prove that $b \in A$; w.l.o.g., $b > 0$. Let $a := (1/\varepsilon)$ and $a' := b + 1/\varepsilon$; notice that a and a' are in A , and therefore $b = a' - a \in A$. \square

Remark 7.6. Let $\mathbb{K} \prec \mathbb{F}$ be a dense substructure. If \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, then \mathbb{K} is Z-closed in \mathbb{F} .

Proof. By Lemma 6.3. \square

Remark 7.7. Given $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$, $\text{dcl}(A)$ does not depend on \mathbb{K} : that is, if $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}'$, then the definable closure of A inside \mathbb{K} and the definable closure of A inside \mathbb{K}' are the same set. Instead, $\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}}(A)$ may depend on \mathbb{K} : for instance, if an infinite nowhere dense subset of \mathbb{K} is A -definable and if \mathbb{K}' is a κ -saturated elementary extension of \mathbb{K} , then $|\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}'}(A)| \geq \kappa$. If \mathbb{K} is d-minimal but not o-minimal, then Zcl does depend on \mathbb{K} : for instance there exists some $\mathbb{K}' \succ \mathbb{K}$ such that $\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}'}(\emptyset) \neq \text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}}(\emptyset)$.

Remark 7.8. If $A \subseteq \mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}'$, then $\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}}(A) = \text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{K}'}(A) \cap \mathbb{K}$.

Definition 7.9. Let $f : X \rightsquigarrow Y$ be a definable application (i.e., a multi-valued partial function), with graph F . Assume that \mathbb{K} is i-minimal. For every $x \in X$, let $f(x) := \{y \in Y : \langle x, y \rangle \in F\} \subseteq Y$. Such an application f is a **Z-application** if, for every $x \in X$, $\dim(f(x)) = 0$ (thus, the domain of f is all X); it is a partial Z-application if for every $x \in X$, $\dim(f(x)) \leq 0$.

Remark 7.10. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$, and $b \in \mathbb{K}$. Then, $b \in \text{Zcl} A$ iff there exists an \emptyset -definable Z-application $f : \mathbb{K}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{K}$ and $\bar{a} \in A$, such that $b \in f(\bar{a})$. Moreover, if $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{K}^n$, then $b \in \text{Zcl}(A\bar{c})$ iff there exists an A -definable Z-application $f : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, such that $b \in f(\bar{c})$.

Proof. The “if” direction is clear: $f(\bar{a})$ is nowhere dense. For the converse, let $Z \subset \mathbb{K}$ be nowhere dense and A -definable, such that $b \in Z$. Let $\phi(x, \bar{a})$ be the formula defining Z . Let $\psi(x, \bar{y})$ be the formula “ $(\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\psi(\mathbb{K}, \bar{y})$ is nowhere dense) or $(x = 0$ and $\phi(\mathbb{K}, \bar{y})$ is somewhere-dense)”. Then, ψ defines a Z-application $f : \mathbb{K}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{K}$, and $b \in f(\bar{a})$.

The “moreover” part is clear. \square

Proviso. For the rest of this section, \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, and $\mathbb{M} \succeq \mathbb{K}$ is “the” monster model.

In [For11b, §9], we defined d-minimal topological structures. We will now prove that \mathbb{K} is such a structure.

Proposition 7.11. \mathbb{K} is a d-minimal topological structure, in the sense of [For11b, Definition 9.1].

Proof. The only nontrivially true conditions in [For11b, Definition 9.1] are:

- (4) For ever $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^n$ definable and discrete, $\Pi_1^n(X)$ has empty interior;
- (5) Given $X \subseteq \mathbb{K}^2$ and $U \subseteq \Pi_1^2(X)$ definable sets, if U is open and nonempty, and X_a has nonempty interior for every $a \in U$, then X has nonempty interior.

Notice that (4) is immediate from Fact 2.5, and (5) follows from the fact that \mathbb{K} is constructible and Kuratowski-Ulam Theorem. \square

Corollary 7.12. *Zcl is an existential matroid.*

Proof. It is [For11b, Theorem 9.8]. \square

Notice that if \mathbb{K} is o-minimal, then $\text{Zcl} = \text{dcl}$, and therefore $\downarrow^{\text{Z}} = \downarrow^{\text{P}}$, where \downarrow^{Z} is the independence relation induced by Zcl . The converse is also true (remember the assumption that \mathbb{K} is d-minimal):

Lemma 7.13. *T.f.a.e.:*

- (1) $\text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{M}} = \text{dcl}$;
- (2) $\downarrow^{\text{Z}} = \downarrow^{\text{P}}$ (in the monster model);
- (3) \mathbb{K} is o-minimal.

Proof. (3 \Rightarrow 1) is clear. If (1) holds, then $\downarrow^{\text{Z}} = \downarrow^{\text{M}}$ (where \downarrow^{M} was defined in [Adl05]); moreover, since \downarrow^{Z} is symmetric, \downarrow^{M} is also symmetric, and therefore $\downarrow^{\text{M}} = \downarrow^{\text{P}}$ (see [Adl05, Theorem 2.39]).

Assume that (2) holds. Let $a \in \text{Zcl}(B)$. Then, $a \downarrow_B^{\text{Z}} a$, therefore $a \downarrow_B^{\text{P}} a$, and thus $a \in \text{dcl} B$: hence, (1) also holds. We have to prove that \mathbb{M} is o-minimal. Assume, for a contradiction, that $A \subset \mathbb{M}$ is definable with parameters \bar{b} , infinite and with empty interior. Then, $A \subseteq \text{Zcl}^{\mathbb{M}}(\bar{b}) = \text{dcl}(\bar{b})$. However, since A is infinite, $|A| \geq \kappa$, and therefore $|\text{dcl}(\bar{b})| \geq \kappa > |T|$, which is impossible. \square

Remark 7.14. The dimension induced by Zcl and the geometric notion of dimension coincide. That is, if $X \subseteq \mathbb{M}^n$ is definable, then $\dim X = \max\{\text{rk}^{\text{Z}}(\bar{x}) : \bar{x} \in X\}$ (where rk^{Z} is the rank function induced by Zcl).

Contrast the situation of \downarrow^{Z} to the notion of M -dividing independence (defined in [Adl05]), where, $A \downarrow_B^{\text{M}} C$ iff, for every $\bar{c} \subset \text{dcl}(BC)$,

$$\text{dcl}(A\bar{c}) \cap \text{dcl}(BC) = \text{dcl}(B\bar{c}).$$

Lemma 7.15. *Assume that T is d-minimal, but not o-minimal. Then, \downarrow^{M} is not symmetric (and therefore dcl does not have the Exchange Property).*

We don't know whether T might be rosy or not.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{K} \prec \mathbb{M}$ such that \mathbb{K} is not Cauchy complete. By expanding the language by $|\mathbb{K}|$ new constants, w.l.o.g. we can assume that \mathbb{K} is the prime model of T . Let π be a regular gap of \mathbb{K} ; choose c_0 and c_1 such

that $c_1 > \mathbb{K}$ and $c_0 \models \pi$. Let $\bar{c} := \langle c_0, c_1 \rangle$. Since \mathbb{K} is d-minimal but not o-minimal, there exists an infinite pseudo-finite set X definable over \mathbb{K} . By compactness, there exists $b \in X \setminus \text{dcl}(\bar{c})$. W.l.o.g., we can assume that $b > 0$. Let $\delta := \delta(X)$; since X is pseudo-finite and definable over \mathbb{K} , $0 < \delta \in \mathbb{K}$, and b is bounded by some element of \mathbb{K} . Let $a_0 \in B(b; \delta/4) \setminus \text{Zcl}(b\bar{c})$ (a_0 exists because Zcl is an existential matroid). Define $a := a_0/c_1 + c_0$.

Hence, we have the following properties:

- (1) $a \models \pi$ (and therefore a is in a Cauchy completion of \mathbb{K});
- (2) $a \notin \text{Zcl}(\bar{c}b)$;
- (3) $b \in \text{dcl}(\bar{c}a) \setminus \text{dcl}(\bar{c})$.

Claim 18. $a \not\downarrow_{\bar{c}}^M b$.

$b \in \text{dcl}(\bar{c}a) \cap \text{dcl}(\bar{c}b)$, but $b \notin \text{dcl}(\bar{c})$.

Claim 19. $a \not\downarrow^M \bar{c}b$.

Follows immediately from the previous claim and transitivity for \downarrow^M .

Claim 20. $\bar{c}b \downarrow^M a$.

In fact, let $A := \text{dcl}(a) = \mathbb{K}\langle a \rangle$, and $A' \subseteq A$. Define $Y := \text{dcl}(\bar{c}A'b) \cap A$; we have to prove that $Y = A'$. Since a satisfies a regular gap over \mathbb{K} , $\text{dcl}(\emptyset) = \mathbb{K}$ is dense in A ; therefore, dcl^A satisfies EP. Hence, either $A' = \mathbb{K}$, or $A' = A$. If $A' = A$, the conclusion is obvious. If $A' = \mathbb{K}$, then $a \notin Y$, because $Y \subset \text{Zcl}(\bar{c}b)$, and $a \notin \text{Zcl}(\bar{c}b)$; therefore, since dcl^A satisfies EP, $Y = \mathbb{K}$. \square

We do not know if the above lemma extends to i-minimal theories with DSF, or to constructible theories.

7.2. Dense pairs. Dense pairs of o-minimal structures were studied in [vdD98]. Dense pairs of d-minimal topological structures were studied in [For11b].

Proviso. *Remember that \mathbb{K} is d-minimal. Let $T := \text{Th}(\mathbb{K})$.*

We have seen that the Z-closure is an existential matroid on \mathbb{K} . Moreover, $A \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ is topologically dense iff it is dense w.r.t. to the matroid Zcl , that is iff X intersects every definable subset of \mathbb{K} of dimension 1.

Definition 7.16. Let T^d be the theory of pairs $\mathbb{A} \prec \mathbb{B} \models T$, such that \mathbb{A} is dense in \mathbb{B} . More generally, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let T^{nd} be the theory of tuples $\mathbb{A}_0 \prec \mathbb{A}_1 \prec \dots \prec \mathbb{A}_n \models T$, such that each \mathbb{A}_{i+1} is a proper elementary extension of \mathbb{A}_i , and \mathbb{A}_0 is dense in \mathbb{A}_n .

Notice that $T^{1d} = T^d$. We can apply the results in [For11b] to T , and obtain the following results.

Theorem 7.17. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, T^{nd} is consistent and complete. Besides, \mathbb{A}_n is the open core of $\langle \mathbb{A}_0 \prec \mathbb{A}_1 \prec \dots \mathbb{A}_n \rangle \models T^{nd}$. Any model of T^{nd} is definably complete.*

Proof. By [For11b, Theorems 13.5 and 13.11]. \square

More results can be proved for T^d (e.g. near model-completeness: see [For11b, Theorem 8.5]).

We will give some additional results and conjectures that are more specific to our situation.

Theorem 7.18 ([vdD98, Theorem 2]). *Let $\langle \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{A} \rangle \models T^d$. Given a set $Y \subset \mathbb{A}^n$, t.f.a.e.:*

- (1) Y is definable in $\langle \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{A} \rangle$;
- (2) $Y = Z \cap \mathbb{A}^n$ for some set $Z \subseteq \mathbb{B}^n$ that is definable in \mathbb{B} .
- (3) Y is definable in the structure $\langle \mathbb{A}, (\mathbb{A} \cap (0, b))_{b \in \mathbb{B}} \rangle$.

Proof. (1 \Rightarrow 2) and (2 \Rightarrow 3) are as in [vdD98, Theorem 2]. (3 \Rightarrow 1) and (2 \Rightarrow 1) are obvious. \square

Question 7.19. Let T' be a complete theory with locally o-minimal open core. Is there an existential matroid on T' ? [DMS10, 6.2] and [For11b, §8.4] prove that if T is equal to either T^d or T^g (see [DMS10] for the definition of T^g) for some o-minimal theory T , then T' admits such a matroid (in the case of T^g , the matroid is acl).

7.3. The small closure.

Proviso. *Remember that T is a d -minimal complete theory. Let $\mathbb{C} := \langle \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{A} \rangle \models T^d$.*

We have seen that \mathbb{B} is the open core of \mathbb{C} . Hence, since every \mathcal{F}_σ subset of \mathbb{C}^n is definable in the open core of \mathbb{C} , every such set is constructible. Scl is the **small closure** on \mathbb{C} and Sdim is the corresponding dimension function, as defined in [For11b, §8.4]. I recall that a \mathbb{C} -definable set X is called **small** if $\text{Sdim}(X) \leq 0$.

Remark 7.20. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be \mathbb{B} -definable. Then, $\text{Sdim}(X) = \dim(X)$.

Proof. [For11b, Lemma 8.31]. \square

Lemma 7.21. *Let $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{C}}$ be a definable increasing family of subsets of \mathbb{C}^n , and $X := \bigcup_t X_t$. Let $d \leq n$ and assume that, for every $t \in \mathbb{C}$, $\text{Sdim}(X_t) \leq d$. Then, $\text{Sdim}(X) \leq d$.*

Proof. [For11b, Lemma 3.71], applied to Scl. \square

Proposition 7.22. (1) T^d is a Polish theory.

(2) Assume that T is countable. Then, there exists $\langle \mathbb{B}', \mathbb{A}' \rangle \models T^d$ such that:

- \mathbb{A}' is countable;

- \mathbb{B}' is a separable complete metric space;
- for every $X \subseteq \mathbb{B}'^n$ definable in $\langle \mathbb{B}', \mathbb{A}' \rangle$, $\text{Sdim}(X) \leq 0$ iff X is countable.

Proof. It suffices to prove (2): therefore, we can assume that T is countable. Let \mathbb{A}' be a countable model of T and \mathbb{B}' be its Cauchy completion. Notice that $\mathbb{B}' \neq \mathbb{A}'$ and therefore $\langle \mathbb{B}', \mathbb{A}' \rangle$ is a Cauchy complete and separable model of T^d (and therefore \mathbb{B}' is a Polish space). Hence, by Lemma 6.10(3), $|\mathbb{B}'| = 2^{\aleph_0}$.

Claim 21. Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{B}'$ be definable in \mathbb{B}' and of dimension 0. Then, Y is countable.

In fact, by d-minimality, Y is a finite union of discrete sets, and in a Polish space every discrete subset is countable.

Claim 22. Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{B}'^n$ be definable in \mathbb{B}' and of dimension at least 1. Then, $|Y| = 2^{\aleph_0}$.

In fact, after a permutation of coordinates, $\Pi_1^n(Y)$ will contain an open interval.

Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{B}'^n$ be definable in $\langle \mathbb{B}', \mathbb{A}' \rangle$.

If $\text{Sdim}(X) = 0$, then, by [For11b, Lemma 8.33], there exists a \mathbb{B}' -definable Z -application $f : \mathbb{B}'^m \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{B}'^n$ such that $X \subseteq f(\mathbb{A}'^m)$. By the Claim 21, $f(\mathbb{A}'^m)$ is countable, and therefore X is countable.

If $\text{Sdim}(X) > 0$, then, after a permutation of coordinates, $\text{Sdim}(Z) = 1$, where $Z := \Pi_1^n(X)$. By [For11b, Proposition 8.36], there exists $Y \subseteq \mathbb{B}'$ such that Y is \mathbb{B}' -definable, and $\text{Sdim}(Z \Delta Y) \leq 0$. Thus, $\dim(Z) = 1$. By the previous case, $Z \Delta Y$ is countable, and, by Claim 22, $|Z| = 2^{\aleph_0}$. Thus, $|Y| = 2^{\aleph_0}$. \square

8. OPEN COVERS

In this section C will be a topological space and $\mathcal{V} = (V_i : i \in I)$ a family of open subsets of C (indexed, possibly with repetitions, by some set I), covering C and with each element in \mathcal{V} nonempty. We say that: \mathcal{V} is pointwise finite (resp., pointwise countable) if, for every x in C , the set $\{i \in I : x \in V_i\}$ is finite (resp., countable); \mathcal{V} is pointwise uniformly finite if there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every x in C , the set $\{i \in I : x \in V_i\}$ has cardinality at most k ; \mathcal{V} is locally finite if every $x \in C$ has an open neighborhood U , such that the set $\{i \in I : U \cap V_i \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite (and similarly for uniformly locally finite); finally, \mathcal{V} is finite (resp., infinite) if I is finite (resp., infinite). If C is a definable set, we say that \mathcal{V} is pseudo-finite if \mathcal{V} is a definable family, and the index set I is pseudo-finite; the definitions of pseudo-enumerable, pointwise pseudo-finite, etc. are analogous.

We will now give some properties of definable covers of definable sets. The main results are propositions 8.5 and 8.6, which also show some nice applications of propositions 6.13 and 7.22.

First, some observations in the “topological” setting.

- (1) C is compact iff every open cover \mathcal{V} of C has a finite subcover.
- (2) C is compact iff, for every \mathcal{V} locally finite open cover of C , \mathcal{V} is finite.
- (3) There exists \mathcal{V} open cover of \mathbb{R} , such that \mathcal{V} is infinite but uniformly locally finite (take e.g. $\mathcal{V} := \{ (n-1, n+1) : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$).
- (4) There exists \mathcal{V} open cover of $[0, 1]$, such that \mathcal{V} is infinite but uniformly pointwise finite (take $\mathcal{V} := \{ [0, 1] \} \cup \{ (\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n}) : 0 < n \in \mathbb{N} \}$).

Fact 8.1. *Assume that C is separable. Let $Q \subseteq C$ be dense and countable. Assume that every point of Q is contained in at most countably many elements of \mathcal{V} . Then, \mathcal{V} is (at most) countable. In particular, if C is a subset of a Polish space and \mathcal{V} is pointwise countable, then \mathcal{V} is countable.*

Assume now that C is definable, and every $V \in \mathcal{V}$ is also definable.

- (5) If \mathbb{K} is nonarchimedean and C is the interval $[0, 1]$ in \mathbb{K} , then there exists \mathcal{V} definable and with no finite subcover (take $\varepsilon > 0$ infinitesimal, and let $\mathcal{V} := \{ (x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon) : x \in [0, 1] \}$).
- (6) If C is the interval $[0, 1]$ in \mathbb{K} , then there exists \mathcal{V} covering $C = [0, 1]$, such that \mathcal{V} is uniformly pointwise finite, but \mathcal{V} is infinite (use the same cover as in (4)).

The following remark is a definable version of Heine-Borel Theorem.

Remark 8.2. *Assume that \mathcal{V} is at most pseudo-enumerable and C is d-compact. Then, \mathcal{V} has a pseudo-finite subcover.*

Proof. W.l.o.g., I is a definable, closed, and discrete subset of $\mathbb{K}_{\geq 0}$. If, for a contradiction, \mathcal{V} has no pseudo-finite subcover, then for every $i \in I$, the set $C \setminus \bigcup_{j \leq i} V_j$ is closed in C and nonempty. Since C is d-minimal, $C \setminus \bigcup_{j \in I} V_j$ is also nonempty, absurd. \square

Lemma 8.3. *Assume that \mathcal{V} is definable and locally pseudo-finite. If C is d-compact, then \mathcal{V} is pseudo-finite. If C is an open subset of \mathbb{K}^n , then \mathcal{V} is at most pseudo-enumerable.*

Proof. Assume that C is d-compact. For every definable subset $D \subseteq C$, let $P(D)$ be the property “ D intersects only pseudo-finitely many sets in \mathcal{V} ”. Then, P is definable, monotone and additive (see [For13, Definitions 4.1 and 5.6]). Hence, by [For13, Lemma 5.7], $P(C)$ holds.

If C is open in \mathbb{K}^n , then $C = \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{K}} C_t$, where $(c_t : t \in \mathbb{K})$ is an increasing definable family of d-compact sets. Each C_t intersects only pseudo-finitely many sets in \mathcal{V} , hence \mathcal{V} is at most pseudo-enumerable. \square

Remark 8.4. Let \mathcal{V} be definable. If \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal and \mathcal{V} is pointwise pseudo-finite, then \mathcal{V} is pseudo-finite. In particular, if \mathbb{K} is o-minimal and \mathcal{V} is pointwise finite, then \mathcal{V} is finite.

Proof. See Proposition 8.5(1) (since pseudo-enumerable and pseudo-finite coincide when \mathbb{K} is locally o-minimal). \square

Notice that in the above remark we did *not* assume that C is d-compact: therefore, in the o-minimal and locally o-minimal cases, what *prima facie* would seem a property of d-compact sets, is true instead for every definable set. For d-minimal non locally o-minimal structures instead, a converse of Lemma 8.3 holds: see Proposition 8.5(2). The assumption in Proposition 8.5(2) is equivalent to the fact that the open core of \mathbb{K} is not locally o-minimal (see [For13, Theorem A]): in particular, it holds if \mathbb{K} is d-minimal but not locally o-minimal.

Proposition 8.5. *Assume that \mathcal{V} is definable.*

- (1) *If \mathbb{K} is d-minimal and \mathcal{V} is pointwise at most pseudo-enumerable, then \mathcal{V} is at most pseudo-enumerable.*
(2) *Assume that there exists N a definable, closed, discrete, and unbounded subset of $\mathbb{K}_{\geq 0}$. Then, t.f.a.e.:*

2.1 *C is d-compact,*

2.2 *for every \mathcal{V} definable open cover of C , if \mathcal{V} is locally pseudo-finite, then it is pseudo-finite.*

Proof. 1) Since \mathbb{K} is d-minimal, “being pseudo-enumerable” is equivalent to “having dimension 0”, which is a first-order property. Therefore, by Proposition 6.13, w.l.o.g. \mathbb{K} is a Polish space, and hence C is separable. By Fact 8.1, \mathcal{V} is at most countable, and therefore at most pseudo-enumerable.

2) The fact that (2.1 \Rightarrow 2.2) is Lemma 8.3. For the converse, assume that C is not d-compact. Hence, w.l.o.g. C is unbounded.

For every $n \in N$, let $p(n) := \max\{m \in N \cup \{-\infty\} : m < n\}$, and $s(n) := \min\{m \in N : m > n\}$, and $V_n := \{x \in C : p(n) < |x| < s(n)\}$. Let $M := \{n \in N : V_n \neq \emptyset\}$ (notice that M is unbounded, because C is unbounded). Then, $(V_n : n \in M)$ is a definable locally pseudo-finite open cover of C which is not pseudo-finite. \square

Proposition 8.6. *Let $\mathbb{K} := \langle \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{A} \rangle$ be a dense pair of d-minimal structures (with $\mathcal{A} \prec \mathcal{B}$). Assume that \mathcal{V} is definable and pointwise small (that is, for every $x \in C$, $\text{Sdim}(\{i \in I : x \in V_i\}) = 0$). Then, \mathcal{V} is small.*

Proof. By Proposition 7.22(2), w.l.o.g. \mathcal{B} is Polish, \mathcal{A} is a dense countable subset, and every small definable set is countable. Therefore, by Fact 8.1, \mathcal{V} is countable and definable; thus, again by Proposition 7.22(2), \mathcal{V} is small. \square

(7) Let $\mathbb{K} := \langle \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{A} \rangle$ be as in the above proposition, and C be the interval $[0, 1]$ in \mathbb{K} . Assume that \mathbb{K} is nonarchimedean. Then, there exists \mathcal{V} definable open cover of C , such that \mathcal{V} is small but has no finite subcovers (take $\varepsilon > 0$ infinitesimal, and let $\mathcal{V} := \{(x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon) : x \in \mathcal{A} \cap [0, 1]\}$).

REFERENCES

- [Adl05] Hans Adler, *Explanation of independence*, Ph.D. Thesis, Freiburg im Breisgau, 2005. [↑47](#)
- [All96] Jean-Paul Allouche, *Note on the constructible sets of a topological space*, Papers on general topology and applications (Gorham, ME, 1995), 1996, pp. 1–10. MR1429640 (98a:54032) [↑8](#)
- [Box09] Gareth Boxall, *Lovely pairs and dense pairs of real closed fields*, Ph.D. Thesis, Leeds, 2009. [↑3](#)
- [DM01] Randall Dougherty and Chris Miller, *Definable Boolean combinations of open sets are Boolean combinations of open definable sets*, Illinois J. Math. **45** (2001), no. 4, 1347–1350. MR1895461 (2003c:54018) [↑8](#)
- [DMS10] Alfred Dolich, Chris Miller, and Charles Steinhorn, *Structures having o -minimal open core*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), 1371–1411. [↑3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [8](#), [12](#), [14](#), [23](#), [42](#), [49](#)
- [FH14] Antongiulio Fornasiero and Philipp Hieronymi, *A fundamental dichotomy for definably complete expansions of ordered fields*, 2014. To appear in J. Symbolic Logic. [↑2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [10](#)
- [FKMS10] Harvey Friedman, Krzysztof Kurdyka, Chris Miller, and Patrick Speissegger, *Expansions of the real field by open sets: definability versus interpretability*, J. Symbolic Logic **75** (2010), no. 4, 1311–1325. MR2767970 [↑18](#)
- [FM05] Harvey Friedman and Chris Miller, *Expansions of o -minimal structures by fast sequences*, J. Symbolic Logic **70** (2005), no. 2, 410–418. MR2140038 (2006a:03053) [↑2](#)
- [For11a] Antongiulio Fornasiero, *Definably complete structures are not pseudo-enumerable*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **50** (2011), 603–615. 10.1007/s00153-011-0235-x. [↑5](#)
- [For11b] ———, *Dimensions, matroids, and dense pairs of first-order structures*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **162** (2011), no. 7, 514–543. MR2781093 [↑3](#), [10](#), [46](#), [47](#), [48](#), [49](#), [50](#)
- [For11c] ———, *Expansions of the reals which do not define the natural numbers*, 2011. Submitted. [↑3](#), [11](#)
- [For13] ———, *Locally o -minimal structures and structures with locally o -minimal open core*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **164** (2013), no. 3, 211–229. MR3001544 [↑2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [8](#), [12](#), [13](#), [17](#), [51](#), [52](#)
- [Fré15] Olivier Frécon, *O -minimal expansions of real closed fields and completeness in the sense of Scott*, 2015. Unpublished. [↑4](#), [42](#)
- [FS10] Antongiulio Fornasiero and Tamara Servi, *Definably complete Baire structures*, Fund. Math. **209** (2010), no. 3, 215–241. MR2720211 [↑2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [Hie13] Philipp Hieronymi, *An analogue of the Baire category theorem*, J. Symbolic Logic **78** (2013), no. 1, 207–213. MR3087071 [↑4](#)
- [Kec95] Alexander S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 156, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. MR1321597 (96e:03057) [↑20](#), [44](#), [45](#)
- [Kur66] Kazimierz Kuratowski, *Topology. Vol. I*, New edition, revised and augmented. Translated from the French by J. Jaworowski, Academic Press, New York, 1966. MR0217751 (36 #840) [↑23](#)
- [Loi98] Ta Lê Loi, *Verdier and strict Thom stratifications in o -minimal structures*, Illinois J. Math. **42** (1998), no. 2, 347–356. MR1612771 (99c:32058) [↑2](#), [4](#), [36](#), [37](#), [39](#), [40](#)

- [LS95] Michael C. Laskowski and Charles Steinhorn, *On o-minimal expansions of Archimedean ordered groups*, J. Symbolic Logic **60** (1995), no. 3, 817–831. MR1348995 (96i:03032) ↑4, 42
- [Mil05] Chris Miller, *Tameness in expansions of the real field*, Logic Colloquium '01, 2005, pp. 281–316. MR2143901 (2006j:03049) ↑2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 26, 27, 28
- [Mil06] ———, *Definable choice in d-minimal expansions of ordered groups*, 2006. Unpublished notes. ↑3, 23
- [MT06] Chris Miller and James Tyne, *Expansions of o-minimal structures by iteration sequences*, Notre Dame J. Formal Logic **47** (2006), no. 1, 93–99. MR2211185 (2006m:03065) ↑2
- [Oxt71] John C. Oxtoby, *Measure and category. A survey of the analogies between topological and measure spaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 2. MR0393403 (52 #14213) ↑7, 9
- [Pil87] Anand Pillay, *First order topological structures and theories*, J. Symbolic Logic **52** (1987), no. 3, 763–778. MR902989 (88k:03084) ↑8, 9, 17, 18
- [Rob73] Abraham Robinson, *A note on topological model theory*, Fund. Math. **81** (1973/74), no. 2, 159–171. Collection of articles dedicated to Andrzej Mostowski on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, II. MR0342389 (49 #7135) ↑8, 17, 18
- [Sch14] Hans Schoutens, *o-minimalism*, J. Symb. Log. **79** (2014), no. 2, 355–409. MR3224973 ↑2
- [Sco69] Dana Scott, *On completing ordered fields*, Applications of Model Theory to Algebra, Analysis, and Probability (Internat. Sympos., Pasadena, Calif., 1967), 1969, pp. 274–278. MR0245560 (39 #6866) ↑41
- [LSW86] Stanisław Łojasiewicz, Jacek Stasica, and Krystyna Wachta, *Stratifications sous-analytiques. Condition de Verdier*, Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. **34** (1986), no. 9-10, 531–539 (1987). MR884199 (89g:32011) ↑37
- [vdD85] Lou van den Dries, *The field of reals with a predicate for the powers of two*, Manuscripta Math. **54** (1985), no. 1-2, 187–195. MR808687 (87d:03098) ↑2
- [vdD89] ———, *Dimension of definable sets, algebraic boundedness and Henselian fields*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **45** (1989), no. 2, 189–209. Stability in model theory, II (Trento, 1987). MR1044124 (91k:03082) ↑23
- [vdD98] ———, *Dense pairs of o-minimal structures*, Fund. Math. **157** (1998), no. 1, 61–78. MR1623615 (2000a:03058) ↑3, 17, 48, 49
- [Whi65] Hassler Whitney, *Tangents to an analytic variety*, Ann. of Math. (2) **81** (1965), 496–549. MR0192520 (33 #745) ↑37

UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA (ITALY)

Email address: antongiulio.fornasiero@gmail.com