

# Residue field domination in henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero

Mariana Vicaría

September 20, 2021

## Abstract

In this paper we investigate domination results for henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero for elements in the home sort. We introduce a notion of weak opaqueness to construct resolutions for certain examples of valued fields, that include among others the theory of the Laurent series over the complex numbers.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Finer valuations, places and separated bases . . . . .	4
2.2	Relative quantifier elimination . . . . .	5
2.3	Valued fields and relative quantifier elimination . . . . .	6
2.3.1	Henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero and residue field algebraically closed . . . . .	8
2.4	Independence notions . . . . .	10
2.5	Forking independence in abelian groups . . . . .	10
<b>3</b>	<b>Domination by the power residue sorts and the valued group</b>	<b>11</b>
3.0.1	Domination by the residue sort and the value group in the language $\mathcal{L}$ . . . . .	14
3.0.2	Domination by the residue field and the value group in the $\mathcal{L}_{ac}$ -language . . . . .	15
<b>4</b>	<b>Forking over maximal models in <math>NTP_2</math> henselian valued fields</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Domination by the internal sorts to the residue field</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1	Domination by the internal sorts to the residue field in the language $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$ . . . . .	18
<b>6</b>	<b>Construction of Resolutions</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1	Weak opacity and the construction of resolutions . . . . .	26
6.2	weak opacity . . . . .	26
6.3	The construction of resolutions . . . . .	27
6.4	Weakly opaquely layered groups . . . . .	28
6.5	The construction of resolutions for some henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero . . . . .	32

# 1 Introduction

The model theory of henselian valued fields has been a major topic of study during the last century. It was initiated by Robinson's model completeness results of algebraically closed valued fields in [27]. Remarkable work has been achieved by Haskell, Hrushovski and Macpherson to understand the model theory of algebraically closed valued fields. In a sequence of papers [3] and [2] they developed the notion of stable domination, that rather than being a new form of stability should be understood as a way to apply techniques of stability in the setting of valued fields.

In further work Ealy, Haskell and Mařicová introduced the following definition, which isolates in a more abstract form the notion of domination present in [2]. Let  $T$  be a complete first order theory and let  $S$  and  $\Gamma$  be stably embedded sorts, and  $C \subseteq A, B$  be sets of parameters in the monster model  $\mathfrak{C}$ .

- Definition 1.1.**
1. *the type  $\text{tp}(A/C)$  is said to be dominated by the sort  $S$ , if  $S(B)$  is independent from  $S(A)$  over  $S(C)$  implies that  $\text{tp}(A/CS(B)) \vdash \text{tp}(A/CB)$ .*
  2. *the type  $\text{tp}(A/C)$  is said to be dominated by the sort  $S$  over  $\Gamma$  if the type  $\text{tp}(A/CT(A))$  is dominated by the sort  $S$ .*

In [1] domination results for the setting of real closed convexly valued fields are proved, which suggests that the presence of a stable part of the structure is not fundamental to achieve domination results and indicates that the right notion should be residue field domination or domination by the internal sorts to the residue field in broader classes of henselian valued fields. Later in [23], Haskell, Ealy and Simon generalized the residue field domination results for the theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with bounded Galois group. In their work, it becomes clear that the key ingredients to obtain domination results are the existence of separated basis and a relative quantifier elimination statement.

Our main motivation arises from the natural question of how much further a notion of residue field domination could be extended to broader classes of valued fields to gain a deeper model theoretic insight of henselian valued field.

Stable domination has played a fundamental role in understanding the model theory of algebraically closed valued fields, and more precisely it has served as a bridge to lift ideas from stability theory to the setting of valued fields. For example, Hrushovski and Rideau-Kikuchi in [13], have shown that for any definable abelian group  $A$  in a model of  $ACVF$  we can find a definable group  $\Lambda \subseteq \Gamma^n$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the value group, and a definable homomorphism  $\lambda: A \rightarrow \Lambda$ , such that  $H := \ker(\lambda)$  is limit stably dominated [see [13, Definition 5.6]].

In this paper we investigate domination results for henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero. The general strategy to show domination of a type  $\text{tp}(A/C)$  by a sort  $S$  is taking a partial elementary map  $\sigma$  witnessing  $\text{tp}(A/CS(B)) = \text{tp}(A'/CS(B))$  and finding an automorphism  $\hat{\sigma}$  of the monster model that extends  $\sigma$  and fixes  $CB$ . Commonly, the argument goes by proving first the domination for elements in the home-sort and then to extend them to imaginary elements by using the construction of resolutions [see Definition 6.2]. For each of the statements, we specify precisely which notion of *independence* is required to extend the isomorphism, in fact not the entire power of forking independence is needed.

It is still an open question to find a reasonable language in which a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero eliminates imaginaries. Some positive results have been obtained in certain classes of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero, see for example [14] and [24].

Therefore, we start by studying domination results for henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero for elements in the home-sort. A valued field  $(K, \mathcal{O})$  where  $\mathcal{O}$  is its valuation ring and  $\mathcal{M}$  the maximal ideal, can be considered in several different languages. For instance, a valued field can be seen as a three sorted structure in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  [see Definition 2.11], where the first two sorts are equipped with the language of fields while the third one is provided with the language of ordered abelian groups  $\mathcal{L}_{OAG} = \{0, <, +, -\}$  extended by a constant  $\infty$ . We interpret the first sort as the main field, the second one as the residue field and the third one as the monoid given by the value group  $\Gamma$  and  $\infty$ , where  $\gamma < \infty$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and  $\gamma + \infty = \infty + \gamma = \infty$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ .

A natural extension of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  is the language where an angular component map is added, we denote this ex-

tension by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$  [see Definition 2.16].

In [17], Aschenbrenner, Chernikov, Gehret and Ziegler introduced a multi-sorted language  $\mathcal{L}$  extending  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  in which one obtains elimination of field quantifiers for any henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero. In this extension, we expand the structure  $(k, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\})$  by adding a new sort  $\mathbf{k}/(\mathbf{k}^\times)^n$  for every  $n \geq 2$  together with the natural surjections  $\pi_n := \mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathbf{k}/(\mathbf{k}^\times)^n$ . A precise description of the language  $\mathcal{L}$  is given in Definition 2.24. The multi-sorted structure  $(\mathbf{k}/(\mathbf{k}^\times)^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N})$  will play a fundamental role in the domination results, so we refer to them as the *power residue sorts*. We identify  $k/k^0$  with the residue field  $k$ .

This paper is organized as follows:

1. Section 2: we briefly summarize the relative quantifier elimination already known for henselian valued fields in equicharacteristic zero.
2. Section 3: we prove that over a maximal model, a valued field is dominated by the value group and the residue sorts in the language  $\mathcal{L}$  introduced by Aschenbrenner, Chernikov, Gehret and Ziegler. We show as well that over a maximal field, a valued field is dominated by the residue sorts and the value group sort in the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -language.
3. Section 4: we show that over a maximal model forking is determined by the residue sorts (residue sort) and the value group in the language  $\mathcal{L}$  (or  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ ). We assume the theory of the residue field to be  $NTP_2$ .
4. Section 5: we show that over a maximal model a valued field is dominated by the sorts internal to the residue field over the value group in the language  $\mathcal{L}$ .
5. Section 6: We introduce the notion of *weak opacity* to construct resolutions for the class of henselian valued fields with residue field algebraically closed and whose value group is  $dp$ -minimal and satisfies the property  $(P)$  (i.e. definably closed sets are models of the theory). We conclude this section by lifting the domination results to imaginary elements.

We follow ideas present in [2], and some results are present in their proofs but not in an easy quotable form. Hence we include the statements and their proofs for sake of completeness.

**Acknowledgements:** This document was written as part of the author's PhD thesis under Pierre Simon and Thomas Scanlon. The author would like to express her gratitude to both of them for many insightful conversations. The author would like as well to thank Clifton Ealy, for answering some questions in a kind and organized way when the author was learning many of the contents related to this work.

# Contents

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Finer valuations, places and separated bases

To gain our final statement of domination of the internal sorts to the residue field, we will need to construct a refined valuation induced by the composition of some places. In this subsection, we recall some basics facts about refinements and places. We refer the reader interested in further details to [26, Section 2.3].

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a valuation ring of  $K$  and  $\mathcal{O}'$  be an overring of  $\mathcal{O}$ , and hence a valuation ring of  $K$ . Then, we say that  $\mathcal{O}$  is a coarsening of  $\mathcal{O}'$  and  $\mathcal{O}'$  is a refinement of  $\mathcal{O}$ .*

Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a fixed valuation ring of  $K$  and  $\mathcal{O}'$  be an overring of  $\mathcal{O}$ . We have  $\mathcal{M}' \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathcal{M}'$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the maximal ideals of  $\mathcal{O}'$  and  $\mathcal{O}$  respectively. Since  $\mathcal{M}'$  is a prime ideal in  $\mathcal{O}'$ , then it is also a prime ideal of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Moreover, localizing  $\mathcal{O}$  at  $\mathcal{M}'$  we can recover  $\mathcal{O}'$ , in fact  $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}'}$ .

The following is [26, Lemma 2.3.1].

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a non trivial valuation ring in  $K$  corresponding to the valuation  $v : K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ . Then there is a 1-to-1 correspondence of the convex subgroups  $\Delta$  of  $\Gamma$  with the prime ideals  $p$  of  $\mathcal{O}$ , and hence with the overrings  $\mathcal{O}_p$ . This correspondence is given by:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &\rightarrow p_\Delta = \{x \in K \mid v(x) > \delta \text{ for all } \delta \in \Delta\} \\ p &\rightarrow \Delta_p = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma < v(x) \text{ and } -\gamma < v(x) \text{ for all } x \in p\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a valuation ring of  $K$  and  $v := K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$  the corresponding valuation. Let  $p$  be a prime ideal with corresponding convex subgroup  $\Delta_p$  in  $\Gamma$  and  $\mathcal{O}_p$  the refinement of  $\mathcal{O}$ . There is a group homomorphism:

$$\phi := \begin{cases} K^\times / \mathcal{O}^\times & \rightarrow K^\times / \mathcal{O}_p^\times \\ x\mathcal{O}^\times & \mapsto x\mathcal{O}_p^\times. \end{cases}$$

whose kernel is  $\Delta_p \cong \mathcal{O}_p^\times / \mathcal{O}^\times$ . The valuation  $v_p$  induced by  $\mathcal{O}_p$  is therefore obtain from  $v := K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$  simply by taking the quotient of  $\Gamma$  by the convex subgroup  $\Delta$ .

**Definition 2.3.** *Let  $M$  and  $C$  be valued fields. Let  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  be elements of  $M$ , we write  $\text{Vect}_C(m_1, \dots, m_k)$  for the  $C$ -vector space generated by  $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$ . We say that  $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$  is separated over  $C$  if for all  $c_1, \dots, c_k \in C$ , we have:*

$$v\left(\sum_{i=1}^k c_i m_i\right) = \min\{v(c_i m_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\},$$

so in particular it is a basis for  $\text{Vect}_C(m_1, \dots, m_k)$ . In general, we say that  $M$  has the separated basis property over  $C$  if every finite dimensional  $C$ -subspace  $\text{Vect}_C(m_1, \dots, m_k)$  where  $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\} \subseteq M$  has a separated basis.

If  $C \subseteq M$ , a separated basis is said to be good if in addition for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ , either  $v(m_i) = v(m_j)$  or  $v(m_i) - v(m_j) \notin \Gamma_C$ , and we say that  $M$  has the good separated basis property over  $C$  if every finite dimensional  $C$ -subspace  $\text{Vect}_C(m_1, \dots, m_k)$  where  $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\} \subseteq M$  has a good separated basis.

The following is a folklore fact, details can be found for example in [2, Lemma 12.2].

**Fact 2.4.** *Suppose  $C$  is maximally complete. Then every valued field extension  $M$  of  $C$  has the good separated basis property.*

**Definition 2.5.** *Let  $K$  and  $L$  be fields. A map  $\phi : K \rightarrow L \cup \{+\infty\}$  is a place over  $K$  if for any  $x, y \in K$ :*

- $\phi(x + y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y)$ ,
- $\phi(x \cdot y) = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y)$ ,

- $\phi(1) = 1$ .

Here for all  $a \in L$ , the following operations are defined  $a + \infty = \infty + a = \infty$ , and  $a \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot a = \infty \cdot \infty = \infty$ . While the operations  $\infty + \infty, 0 \cdot \infty, \infty \cdot 0$  are not.

The following proposition states the correspondence between places and valuations over a field. This is a standard statement, for example it can be found in [26, Exercise 2.5.4].

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $K$  and  $L$  be fields and  $\phi := K \rightarrow L \cup \{\infty\}$  be a place over  $K$ . Then  $\mathcal{O} = \phi^{-1}(L)$  is a valuation ring of  $K$  whose maximal ideal is  $\mathcal{M} = \phi^{-1}(\{0\})$  and its residue field is  $\phi(K)$ . Moreover, given a valuation ring  $\mathcal{O}$  of  $K$  whose maximal ideal is  $\mathcal{M}$  the map:*

$$\phi := K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{M} \cup \{+\infty\} \begin{cases} x \rightarrow x + \mathcal{M} & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{O} \\ x \rightarrow \infty & \text{if } x \in K \setminus \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

is a place of  $K$ .

**Notation 2.7.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be an ordered abelian group, and let  $\gamma, \delta \in \Gamma$ . We denote as:  $\gamma \ll \delta$  to indicate that  $n\gamma < \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

We conclude this subsection stating a lemma that we will need to obtain a domination result by the internal sorts of the residue field over the value group.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $v : L \rightarrow \Gamma$  be a valuation on a field  $L$ . Let  $p : L \rightarrow \text{res}(L) \cup \{\infty\}$  be the place corresponding to the valuation  $v$  and  $F$  be a subfield of  $\text{res}(L)$  and  $p' : \text{res}(L) \rightarrow F$  be a place which is the identity on  $F$ . Let  $p^* := p' \circ p : L \rightarrow F$  be the composition of the places, and  $v^* := L \rightarrow \Gamma^*$  the induced valuation. Suppose that  $a \in L$  with  $p(a) \in \text{res}(L) \setminus \{0\}$  and  $p^*(a) = 0$ . Then:*

1. *if  $\Delta = \{v^*(x), -v^*(x) \mid x \in L, p(x) \notin \{\infty, 0\}, p^*(x) = 0\} \cup \{0_{\Gamma^*}\}$ . Then  $\Delta$  is a convex subgroup of  $\Gamma^*$  and there is an isomorphism of ordered abelian groups  $g : \Gamma^*/\Delta \rightarrow \Gamma$  such that  $g \circ v^* = v$ ,*
2. *if  $b \in L$  with  $v(b) > 0$ , then  $0 < v^*(a) \ll v^*(b)$ ,*
3. *let  $M \subseteq L$  a subfield. If  $(r_1, \dots, r_n)$  is a separated basis of the  $M$ -vector subspace  $\text{Vect}_M(r_1, \dots, r_n)$  according to the valuation  $v^*$  then it is also separated basis according to the valuation  $v$ . Furthermore, if  $v^*(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i m_i) = \min\{v^*(r_i m_i) \mid i \leq n\} = v^*(r_j m_j)$ , then  $v(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i m_i) = \min\{v(r_i m_i) \mid i \leq n\} = v(r_j m_j)$ .*

*Proof.* The first and the second statement are proved in [2, Lemma 12.16]. The third one is a standard computation that we leave to the reader.  $\square$

## 2.2 Relative quantifier elimination

In this subsection we review some model theoretic definitions such as stable embeddedness, orthogonality and relative quantifier elimination. An expert reader can safely skip this subsection.

**Definition 2.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a multi-sorted language and  $\mathcal{M}$  an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure. Consider  $\Pi \cup \Sigma$  a partition of the sorts of  $\mathcal{L}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{L} \upharpoonright_{\Sigma}$  the sublanguage of  $\mathcal{L}$  consisting of the sorts for  $\Sigma$  with their relation, function and constant symbols. Then we say that:*

1.  *$\mathcal{M}$   $\Pi$ -eliminates quantifiers if every formula  $\phi(x)$  is equivalent to a formula without quantifiers in a sort of  $\Pi$ .*
2.  *$\mathcal{M}$  eliminates quantifiers relative to  $\Sigma$  if the theory of  $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma\text{-Mor}}$  (obtained by naming all the  $\mathcal{L} \upharpoonright_{\Sigma}$ -definable sets without parameters with a new predicate)- eliminates quantifiers.*

It is well known that, if  $\mathcal{M}$  eliminates quantifiers relatively to  $\Sigma$ , then it eliminates  $\Pi$ -quantifiers.

**Definition 2.10.** *1. A definable subset  $D$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  is called stably embedded if all definable subsets of  $D^n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  can be defined with parameters in  $D$ .*

2. Two definable sets  $D$  and  $E$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  are called orthogonal if for all formulas  $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_n, y_0, \dots, y_r, \bar{a})$ , where  $\bar{a}$  is a tuple of parameters from  $\mathcal{M}$ , we can find finitely many formulas  $\theta_i(x_0, \dots, x_n, \bar{a}_i)$  and  $\eta_i(y_0, \dots, y_r, \bar{a}'_i)$  with  $i < k$  and parameters  $\bar{a}_0, \dots, \bar{a}_k, \bar{a}'_0, \dots, \bar{a}'_k$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  such that:

$$\phi(D^n, E^r, \bar{a}) = \bigcup_{i < k} \theta_i(D^n, \bar{a}_i) \times \eta_i(E^r, \bar{a}'_i).$$

### 2.3 Valued fields and relative quantifier elimination

In this section, we summarize many results on valued fields that will be used through the paper. There are many languages in which one can view a valued field  $K$  to obtain field quantifier elimination statements, we introduce them in detail and state their corresponding relative quantifier elimination. In this paper we are only concerned about henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero.

**Definition 2.11.** [The  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -language] Let  $(K, \mathcal{O})$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero, where  $\mathcal{O}$  is the valuation ring and  $\mathcal{M}$  is the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Any henselian valued field can be seen as a three sorted structure  $(K, \mathbf{k}, \Gamma)$  where the first two sorts are equipped with the language of fields while the third one is provided with the language of ordered abelian groups  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{OAG}} = \{0, <, +, -\}$  extended by a constant  $\infty$ . We interpret the first sort as the main field, the second one as the residue field and the third one as the monoid given by the value group  $\Gamma$  and  $\infty$ , where  $\gamma < \infty$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and  $\gamma + \infty = \infty + \gamma = \infty$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ . We add a function symbol  $v : K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$  by extending the valuation to a monoid morphism sending  $v(0) = \infty$ . We add as well a function symbol  $\text{res} : K \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ , which sends an element  $a \in \mathcal{O}$  to its residue class  $\text{res}(a) = a + \mathcal{M}$ , while  $\text{res}(a) := 0$  for any element  $a \in K \setminus \mathcal{O}$ . We refer to this language as the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -language.

**Notation 2.12.** Let  $L$  be a henselian valued field we will denote as  $k_L$  its residue field and  $\Gamma_L$  its value group.

Certain classes of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero eliminate field quantifiers in the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -language. For example, the following is a well known fact.

**Theorem 2.13.** Let  $K$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed, then  $K$  eliminates quantifiers relative to the value group in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ .

An immediate consequence of this theorem is the following statement.

**Corollary 2.14.** Let  $(K, \mathbf{k}, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}, \text{res}, v)$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed, then  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $\Gamma$  are stably embedded and orthogonal to each other.

**Definition 2.15.** Let  $(K, \mathbf{k}, \Gamma)$  be a valued field an angular component map is a map  $\text{ac} := K \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$  that satisfies the following conditions:

- $\text{ac}(0) = 0$ ,
- for all  $x \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ ,  $\text{ac}(x) = x + \mathcal{M} = \text{res}(x)$ ,
- for all  $x, y \in K$ ,  $\text{ac}(xy) = \text{ac}(x) \text{ac}(y)$ .

**Definition 2.16.** [The  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -language] We denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$  the expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  where an angular component map is added to the language.

In [4, Theorem 4.1] Pas proved that any henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero eliminates field quantifiers in the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -language, we include the statement for sake of completeness.

Let  $\mathcal{K} = (K, \mathbf{k}, \Gamma, \text{res}, v, \text{ac})$  be a valued field of equicharacteristic zero. A good substructure of  $\mathcal{K}$  is a triple  $\mathcal{E} = (E, \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{E}})$  such that:

- $E$  is a subfield of  $K$ ,
- $\mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}}$  is a subfield of  $\mathbf{k}$  with  $\text{ac}(E) \subseteq \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}}$  (In particular,  $\text{res}(\mathcal{O}_E) \subseteq \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}}$ ),
- $\Gamma_{\mathcal{E}}$  is an ordered abelian subgroup of  $\Gamma$  with  $v(E^\times) \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{E}}$ .

**Definition 2.17.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  be henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero seen as  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -structures and let  $\mathcal{E} = (E, \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{E}}), \mathcal{E}' = (E', \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}'}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{E}'})$ , be good substructures of  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  respectively. A triple  $\mathbf{f} = (f, f_r, f_v)$  is said to be a good map, if  $f : E \rightarrow E'$  and  $f_r : \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \mathbf{k}_{\mathcal{E}'}$  are field isomorphisms and  $f_v := \Gamma_{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{E}'}$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{OAG}}$ -ordered group isomorphism such that:

- $f_r(\text{ac}(a)) = \text{ac}'(f(a))$  for all  $a \in E$  and  $f_r$  is elementary as a partial map between the fields  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $\mathbf{k}'$ ,
- $f_v(v(a)) = v'(f(a))$  for all  $a \in E^\times$ , and  $f_v$  is elementary as a partial map between the ordered abelian groups  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$ .

**Theorem 2.18.** [Pas] Let  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  be two henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero in the  $\mathcal{L}_{ac}$ -language. Let  $\mathbf{f} := \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}'$  be a good map, then  $\mathbf{f}$  is elementary.

The following statement is an immediate consequence of the relative quantifier elimination.

**Corollary 2.19.** Let  $\mathcal{K} = (K, \mathbf{k}, \Gamma, \text{res}, v, \text{ac})$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero. Then the residue field and the value group are stably embedded and orthogonal to each other.

Given  $(K, \mathbf{k}, \Gamma)$  a valued field we denote as  $RV^\times$  the multiplicative quotient group  $K^\times/(1 + \mathcal{M})$  and  $\text{rv} := K^\times \rightarrow RV^\times$  the canonical projection map. By adding a constant  $0_{RV}$  we can naturally extend this map sending the element 0 to  $0_{RV}$ , so we denote  $RV = RV^\times \cup \{0_{RV}\}$ . For any  $a \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \mathcal{M}$  the class  $a(1 + \mathcal{M})$  only depends on the coset  $a + \mathcal{M}$ , so we obtain a group embedding  $i : \mathbf{k}^\times \rightarrow RV^\times$  by sending the element  $a + \mathcal{M} \in \mathbf{k}^\times$  to  $a(1 + \mathcal{M}) \in RV^\times$ . We can also consider the group morphism  $v_{\text{rv}} : RV^\times \rightarrow \Gamma$  induced by the valuation map  $v : K^\times \rightarrow \Gamma$ , defined as  $v_{\text{rv}}(a(1 + \mathcal{M})) = v(a)$ . In fact, given two elements in the main field sort  $a, b \in K$  if  $a(1 + \mathcal{M}) = b(1 + \mathcal{M})$  then  $v(a) = v(b)$ . Therefore, we have a pure exact sequence:

$$1 \rightarrow \mathbf{k}^\times \rightarrow RV^\times \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 0,$$

which can be naturally extended to a short exact sequence of monoids by adding some constants, i.e.  $1 \rightarrow \mathbf{k} \rightarrow RV \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\} \rightarrow 0$ . Besides the induced multiplication,  $RV$  also inherits a partially defined addition from  $K$ , via the ternary relation:

$$\oplus(a, b, c) \leftrightarrow \exists x, y, z \in K (a = \text{rv}(x) \wedge b = \text{rv}(y) \wedge c = \text{rv}(z) \wedge x + y = z).$$

We consider the three sorted structure  $(\mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\})$  with the language  $\mathcal{L}_{rv} = \mathcal{L}_r \cup \mathcal{L}_g \cup \{,_{rv}, i, v_{rv}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_r$  is a copy of the language of fields for the first sort,  $\mathcal{L}_g$  is the language of ordered abelian groups extended by a constant  $\infty$  i.e.  $\{0_g, +_g, -_g, <, \infty\}$ ,  $i$  is a function symbol interpreted as the monoid morphism  $i : \mathbf{k} \rightarrow RV$  and  $v_{rv}$  is a function symbol interpreted as the monoid morphism  $v_{rv} := RV \rightarrow \Gamma$ .

Building on work of Basarab in [5], Kuhlmann proved in [6] that any henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero eliminates field quantifiers relative to the structure  $(\mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma)$ . We use Flenner as a reference, the following is [7, Proposition 3.3.1].

**Proposition 2.20.** [Kuhlmann] Let  $K$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero, the theory of  $(K, \mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}, \text{res}, v, v_{rv}, i)$  eliminates field quantifiers.

The following is a direct consequence of the relative quantifier elimination to  $RV$ .

**Corollary 2.21.** Let  $K$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero, the structure  $(\mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\})$  is stably embedded.

Kuhlmann's statement reduces the elimination of field quantifiers to the structure  $(\mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\})$ . For certain classes of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero the structure  $(\mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\})$  eliminates  $RV$  quantifiers in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{rv}$ .

**Proposition 2.22.** Let  $K$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed, the structure  $(\mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\})$  eliminates quantifiers relative to the value group in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{rv}$ .

*Proof.* This follows by a standard back and forth argument using that  $k^\times$  is divisible.  $\square$

The elimination of  $RV$  quantifiers in the more general setting was later obtained by Aschenbrenner, Chernikov, Gehret and Ziegler in [17]. They extend the language adding a new sort for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  denoted as  $\mathbf{k}^\times/(\mathbf{k}^\times)^n$  which is an abelian group and we extend it adding an element  $\infty$  such that for each  $a \in \mathbf{k}^\times/(\mathbf{k}^\times)^n$ ,  $a \cdot \infty = \infty$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote this sort as  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , and we refer to the multi-sorted structure  $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N})$  as the *residue sorts*. We add surjective maps  $\pi_n := \mathbf{k}^\times \rightarrow \mathbf{k}^\times/(\mathbf{k}^\times)^n$ , which can be naturally extended to a monoid morphism  $\pi_n := \mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n$ . We add maps  $\rho_n := RV \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n$ , by sending  $\rho_n(0) = \infty$  and over  $v_{rv}^{-1}(n\Gamma)$ , we define  $\rho_n$  as the composition of the group morphisms:

$$v_{rv}^{-1}(n\Gamma) \subseteq RV \rightarrow RV^n \cdot i(\mathbf{k}^\times) \rightarrow (RV^n \cdot i(\mathbf{k}^\times))/RV^n \cong \mathbf{k}^\times/(RV^n \cap \mathbf{k}^\times) \cong \mathbf{k}^\times/(\mathbf{k}^\times)^n,$$

and zero outside of  $v_{rv}^{-1}(n\Gamma)$ . We denote the language of this expansion by  $\mathcal{L}_{rvqe} = \mathcal{L}_{rv} \cup \{\rho_n, \pi_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . The following is a direct consequence of [17, Corollary 4.8].



**Corollary 2.23.** *The structure  $(\mathcal{A}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}, \{\pi_n, \rho_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  eliminates  $RV$  quantifiers. In particular,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$  are stably embedded and are orthogonal to each other.*

Combining Proposition 2.20 and Corollary 2.23 Aschenbrenner, Chernikov, Gehret and Ziegler obtained as well a field quantifier elimination for henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero relative to the residue sorts and the value group in the following language:

**Definition 2.24.** *[The Language  $\mathcal{L}$ ] Consider the expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  obtained by adding the residue sorts  $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N})$ . We also add the surjective maps  $\pi_n := \mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n$ , and we interpret them as the described. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we add a map  $\text{res}^n := K \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n$  interpreted in the following way: if  $v(a) \notin n\Gamma$  set  $\text{res}^n(a) := 0$ . Otherwise, let  $b$  be any element of  $K$  with  $nv(b) = v(a)$  and set  $\text{res}^n(a) := \pi_n(\text{res}(\frac{a}{b^n}))$ . We denote this expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  by  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

Note that for each  $a \in K$ ,  $\text{res}^n(a) = \rho_n(rv(a))$ . The following is a direct consequence of [17, Theorem 5.15].

**Theorem 2.25.** *A henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero eliminates field quantifiers in the language  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

An immediate consequence of this theorem is the following statement.

**Corollary 2.26.** *Let  $K$  be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero seen as a  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure. The residue sorts and the value group are stably embedded and are orthogonal to each other.*

**Definition 2.27** (The  $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$ -language). *We will denote as  $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$  the extension of the language  $\mathcal{L}$  where we add as well a sort for the monoid  $RV$  where we equip the exact sequence  $(\mathbf{k}, RV, \Gamma \cup \{\infty\})$  with the language  $\mathcal{L}_{rvqe}$ .*

### 2.3.1 Henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero and residue field algebraically closed

We would like to emphasize that some residue field domination results can be improved for the class of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed. Despite the fact that most of the technical tools that are required to achieve this statement follow directly from many of the proofs already present in [2], we consider that it was worth including it as they bring a clear picture for more examples as the first order theory of the Laurent series over the complex numbers.

In 1984 Gurevich and Schmitt [11] showed that every ordered abelian group is *NIP*. In [18], Schmitt investigated deeply the model completeness of theories of ordered abelian groups and obtained a (*relative*) quantifier elimination to the spines, whose description can be found in [11, Section 2]. Later, Cluckers and Halupczok in [10, Definition 1.5] introduced a language  $\mathcal{L}_{CH}$ -extending  $\mathcal{L}_{OAG} = \{+, -, 0, <\}$  and obtained a (*relative*) quantifier elimination to the *auxiliary sorts*, whose definition can be found in [10, Section 1.2]. The language  $\mathcal{L}_{CH}$  has been more often used by the model theory community as it is more in line with Shelah's imaginary expansion. The following is [10, Corollary 1.10].

**Corollary 2.28.** *Let  $G$  be an ordered abelian group, for any function  $f := G^n \rightarrow G$  which is  $\mathcal{L}_{OAG}$ -definable with parameters from a set  $B$ , there exists a partition of  $G^n$  into finitely many  $B$ -definable sets and for each such set  $A$ ,  $f$  is linear. This is, there are finitely many elements  $r_1, \dots, r_n, s \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $s \neq 0$  and  $b \in \text{dcl}(B)$  such that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in A$  we have  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \frac{1}{s} \left( \sum_{i \leq n} r_i a_i + b \right)$ .*

Let  $G$  be an ordered abelian group, we extend the language  $\mathcal{L}_{CH}$  by adding a set of constants  $\mathcal{C}$  to name each element of  $\text{dcl}(\emptyset)$ , and we denote this extension as  $\mathcal{L}_{CH}^*$ . An immediate consequence is the following fact.

**Fact 2.29.** *Let  $G$  be an ordered abelian group and  $B \subseteq G$ . Then  $\text{dcl}(B) = (\mathbb{Q} \otimes B) \cap G$ .*

This fact will play a fundamental role to weaken the necessary hypothesis to obtain domination results for henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero. We will denote as  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}^*$  the extension of the language obtain by adding a set of constants to the main field  $\Sigma = \{t_d \mid d \in \text{dcl}(\emptyset) \cap \Gamma\}$  such that  $v(t_d) = d$  for each element  $d \in \text{dcl}(\emptyset) \cap \Gamma$ .



We will be able to construct resolutions for certain classes of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero whose value group is dp-minimal. In [16, Proposition 5.1] Jahnke, Simon and Walsberg showed that an ordered abelian group is dp-minimal if and only if for every prime  $p$ ,  $[\Gamma : p\Gamma]$  is finite.

A henselian valued field  $K$  with residue field algebraically closed and dp-minimal value group eliminates quantifiers if the value group is equipped with the language  $\mathcal{L}_{dp}$  that extends  $\mathcal{L}_{OAG}$  introduced in [9, Section 5.1]. For each convex subgroup  $\Delta$  we add a sort for the quotient group  $\Gamma/\Delta$  together with the natural projection map  $\rho_\Delta := \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma/\Delta$ . For each  $\Delta$  convex subgroup and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we add as well a set of constants  $\Omega_\Delta^k \subseteq \Gamma$  such that  $\{\rho_\Delta(d) \mid d \in \Omega_\Delta^k\}$  is a complete set of representatives of the cosets of  $k(\Gamma/\Delta)$  in  $\Gamma/\Delta$ .

**Definition 2.30.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be an ordered abelian group, then:*

1. A non-empty subset  $S \subseteq \Gamma$  is said to be an end-segment if for any  $x \in S$  and  $y \in \Gamma$  such that  $x \leq y$  then  $y \in S$ .
2. Let  $S$  and  $S'$  be end-segments, we say that  $S'$  is a translate of  $S$  if there is some  $\beta \in \Gamma$  such that  $S' = \beta + S$ .
3. A family of definable end-segments  $\mathcal{S}$  is said to be complete if every definable end-segment is the translate of some element  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ .
4. Let  $S \subseteq \Gamma$  be an end-segment, we define  $G_S := \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma + S = S\}$ .

The following is [9, Fact 3.2].

**Fact 2.31.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a dp-minimal ordered abelian group and  $S \subseteq \Gamma$  be a definable end-segment. Then  $G_S$  is a definable convex subgroup of  $\Gamma$ .*

In a valued field there is a one to one correspondence between the end-segments of  $\Gamma$  and the fractional ideals of the valuation ring. In fact given any end segment  $S \subseteq \Gamma$  we can take  $I_S = \{x \in K \mid v(x) \in S\}$ , and given a fractional ideal  $I \subseteq K$  of the valuation ring,  $S_I = \{v(x) \mid x \in I\}$  is an end segment of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_S \mid S \in \mathcal{S}_{dp}\}$  where  $\mathcal{S}_{dp}$  is the complete family of end-segments introduced in [24, Corollary 2.15].

**Definition 2.32.** 1. A 1-torsor of  $K$  is a set of the form  $a + bI$  where  $a, b \in K$  and  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ .

2. A new swiss cheese is a set of the form  $A \setminus (B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_n)$  where for each  $i \leq n$ ,  $B_i \subseteq A$  and the  $B_i$  and  $A$  are 1-torsors.
3. A basic congruence formula is a formula of the form  $zv_\Delta(x-a) - \rho_\Delta(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta)$ , where  $\Delta$  is a convex subgroup and  $d \in \Omega_\Delta^n$ .
4. A nice set is a definable set of the form  $S \cap C$  where  $S$  is a new swiss cheese and  $C$  is the set defined by a finite conjunction of basic congruence formulas.

The following is [24, Theorem 2.36].

**Corollary 2.33.** *Let  $K$  be a henselian valued field with residue field algebraically closed and dp-minimal ordered abelian group. Let  $X \subseteq K$  be a definable subset in 1-variable, then  $X$  is a finite union of nice sets.*

For each finite tuple  $(I_1, \dots, I_n) \in \mathcal{I}^n$  we define the canonical module  $C_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)} = \{\sum_{i \leq n} e_i x_i \mid x_i \in I_i\}$  where  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  denotes the canonical basis of  $K^n$ . Let  $B_n(K)$  be the  $n \times n$ - upper triangular invertible matrices of  $K$ , and define the subgroup  $Stab_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)} = \{A \in B_n(K) \mid AC_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)} = C_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_n \subseteq (K^n)^n$  be the set of  $n$ -tuples  $(\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_n)$ , such that the matrix  $B = [\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_n]$  is an invertible upper triangular matrix. We denote as  $\rho_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)} := U_n \rightarrow B_n(K)/Stab_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$  the map that sends each tuple  $(\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_n)$  to the coset  $[\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_n]Stab_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$ .

**Definition 2.34** (The language  $\mathcal{L}_{Stab}$ ). *We denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{Stab}$  the language extending  $\mathcal{L}_{val}$ , where the value group is equipped with the language  $\mathcal{L}_{dp}$  and for each finite tuple  $(I_1, \dots, I_n) \in \mathcal{I}$  we add a sort for the quotient  $B_n(K)/Stab_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$  and the maps  $\rho_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$  described above.*

The following is [24, Theorem 6.43].

**Theorem 2.35.** *Let  $K$  be a henselian valued field with residue field algebraically closed and dp-minimal value group. Then  $K$  eliminates imaginaries in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Stab}}$ .*

As before, we will denote as  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Stab}}^*$  the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Stab}}$ -extension obtained by adding a set of constants in the main field  $\Sigma = \{t_d \mid d \in \text{dcl}(\emptyset) \cap \Gamma\}$ , where  $v(t_d) = d$  for each element  $d \in \text{dcl}(\emptyset)$ .

Given elements  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$  we write as  $\text{Col}(I : J) := \{x \in K \mid xJ \subseteq I\}$ . Let  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ , then  $\text{Stab}(I) = G_{S_I}$  where  $S_I = \{v(x) \mid x \in I\}$ . This is a convex definable subgroup of  $\Gamma$  by Fact 2.31, so we simply denote it as  $\Delta_I$ . We denote as  $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta_I}$  the valuation ring associated to the coarsened valuation  $v_{\Delta_I} : K \rightarrow \Gamma/\Delta_I$ . The following is [24, Proposition 4.10].

**Proposition 2.36.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(I_1, \dots, I_n) \in \mathcal{I}^n$ . Then*

$$\text{Stab}_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)} = \{((a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in B_m(K) \mid a_{ii} \in \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_{I_i}}^\times \wedge a_{ij} \in \text{Col}(I_i, I_j) \text{ for each } 1 \leq i < j \leq n)\}.$$

## 2.4 Independence notions

Trough this paper we will use several notions of independence. We begin by recalling a few basic properties of forking.

**Definition 2.37.** *A formula  $\phi(x, b)$  divides over  $C$  if there is a sequence  $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$  in  $tp(b/C)$  with  $b = b_0$  such that  $\{\phi(x, b_i) \mid i < \omega\}$  is  $m$ -inconsistent. We say that  $\phi(x, b)$  forks if  $\phi(x, b) \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq k} \psi_i(x, b_i)$  where each formula  $\psi_i(x, b_i)$  divides over  $C$ . We say that  $tp(a/Cb)$  forks (respectively divides) over  $C$  if some formula in the type forks (or divides) over  $C$ . We write as  $a \downarrow_C b$  if  $tp(a/Cb)$  does not fork over  $C$ .*

In many theories the relation of forking independence have been completely characterized. For example, in the theory of algebraically closed fields, forking independence coincides with algebraic independence. Let  $C, E$  and  $F$  be fields, and suppose that  $C \subseteq E \cap F$  we will denote as  $E \downarrow_C^{alg} F$  if  $E$  and  $F$  are algebraically independent over  $C$ .

## 2.5 Forking independence in abelian groups

In [25], the model theory of modules is extensively studied. We will be interested in applying some of the results in [25] to the reduct of the value group to the language of groups  $\mathcal{L}_{AG} = \{+, -, 0\}$ . It is well known that modules are stable, and every abelian group can be considered as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. We recall some of the necessary notions to characterize forking independence in abelian groups. Throughout this section we consider the  $\mathcal{L}_{AG}$  first order theory of some torsion free group and we denote as  $\mathfrak{G}$  its monster model.

**Definition 2.38** (*p.p. formula*). *A p.p. formula  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{AG}$  formula of the form*

$$\exists w_1, \dots, w_l \left( \bigwedge_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^n r_{ji} v_i + \sum_{i=1}^l s_{ji} w_i = 0 \right),$$

where  $s_{j_i}, r_{j_i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$  is a tuple of variables.

Given a p.p. formula if we replace the last  $(n - i)$ - variables by a tuple of parameters  $\bar{a} = (a_i, \dots, a_n)$ , the formula  $\phi(v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, \bar{a})$  defines a coset of  $\phi(v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, \bar{0})$ , which defines a subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}^i$ .

**Definition 2.39** (*p.p.-type*). *Let  $\mathbf{c}$  be a tuple and  $A$  some set of a parameters, the p.p type of  $\bar{c}$  over  $A$  is the set of p.p.  $\mathcal{L}_{AG}(A)$ -formulas that  $\bar{c}$  satisfies. This is:*

$$\text{p.p.-type}(\mathbf{c}/A) = \{\phi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{a}) \mid \phi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{a}) \text{ is a } \mathcal{L}_{AG}(A) \text{ p.p. formula and } \models \phi(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{a})\}.$$

If  $p$  is a p.p.-type over  $A$  and  $\phi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y})$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{AG}$ -formula, then we say that it is *represented* in  $p$  if there is some tuple  $\mathbf{a} \subseteq A$  such that  $\phi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{a}) \in p$ . We consider the type definable group  $G(p) = \{\phi(\mathbf{v}, \bar{0}) \mid \phi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}) \text{ is represented in } p\}$ . It is well known that in stable theories to characterize the non-forking extensions of  $p$  the group  $G(p)$  would not be the right invariant to consider, but instead one might be more interested in its connected component  $G^0(p) = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{F}} H$ , where  $\mathcal{F} = \{H \mid H \text{ is a subgroup of some } G \in G(p) \text{ and } [G : H] \text{ is finite}\}$ . The following is [25, Theorem 5.3].

**Theorem 2.40.** *Let  $p$  be a type and suppose that  $q$  is any extension of  $p$ . Then  $q$  is a non-forking extension of  $p$  if and only if  $G^0(p) = G^0(q)$ . In particular, for any type  $p$  if  $G(p) = G^0(p)$  then  $p$  is stationary.*

This statement allows us to characterize forking independence for arbitrary set of parameters.

**Corollary 2.41.** *Let  $A, B, C \subseteq \mathfrak{G}$ , then  $B \downarrow_A^C$  if and only if for every  $p$ - $p$ -formula  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$  and tuples  $\mathbf{b} \subseteq B, \mathbf{c} \subseteq C$  and  $\mathbf{a} \subseteq A$  such that  $\models \psi(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{a})$ , there is some  $p$ - $p$ -formula  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$  and a tuple  $\mathbf{a}' \subseteq A$  such that  $\models \phi(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a}')$  and  $[\phi(\mathbf{x}, \bar{0}) : \phi(\mathbf{x}, \bar{0}) \wedge \psi(\mathbf{x}, \bar{0}, \bar{0})]$  is finite. .*

We recall some of the well known facts about stable theories.

**Fact 2.42.** *Let  $T$  be a complete first order theory and assume that  $T$  is stable and  $M \models T$ . Let  $p \in S_n(M)$  the  $p$  is stationary. Furthermore, for any set of parameters  $M \subseteq A$  and  $q \in S_n(A)$  such that  $p \subseteq q$  we have that the following conditions are equivalent:*

1.  $q$  is a non-forking extension of  $p$ ,
2.  $q$  is a heir extension of  $p$  (i.e. every formula represented in  $q$  is also represented in  $p$ ),
3.  $q$  is a co-heir extension of  $p$  (i.e. for every formula  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \in q$  is finitely satisfiable in  $M$ , i.e. there is some  $\mathbf{m} \subseteq M$  such that  $\models \phi(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{a})$ )

We conclude this subsection by introducing the notion of independence that we will be using for the value group. Let  $(\Gamma, +, -, \leq, 0)$  be a non-trivial ordered abelian group. Let  $T$  be its complete  $\mathcal{L}_{OAG}$ -theory and  $\mathfrak{G}$  be its monster model. We let  $\mathfrak{G} \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{L}_{AG}}$  be its reduct to the language of abelian group, this is purely a torsion free abelian group.

**Definition 2.43.** *Let  $A, B, C \subseteq \mathfrak{G}$ , then  $A \downarrow_C^s B$  if and only if  $tp \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{L}_{AG}}(A/BC)$  does not fork over  $C$  if and only if  $A \downarrow_C B$  in the stable structure  $\mathfrak{G} \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{L}_{AG}}$ .*

We will use the following fact repeatedly.

**Fact 2.44.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}$  and let  $C \subseteq A \cap B$  be a common subgroup. If  $A \downarrow_C^s B$ , then  $A \cap B \subseteq \text{dcl}(C)$ .*

*Proof.* This follows by forking independence for stable formulas, including  $x = y$ . If  $a \in A \cap B \setminus \text{acl}(C)$ , then the formula  $x = a \in \text{tp}(A/B)$  and divides over  $C$ , because we can find an infinite non constant indiscernible sequence  $(a_i)_{i=0}^\infty$  in  $\text{tp}(a/C)$  and  $\{x = a_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  is 2-inconsistent. We conclude that  $a$  must be algebraic over  $C$ , and as there is a definable order  $a \in \text{dcl}(C)$ .  $\square$

### 3 Domination by the power residue sorts and the valued group

In this section we investigate domination of the type of a valued fields by the power residue sorts and the value group in each of the languages. We would like to highlight that the required ingredients to carry out the argument are the existence of separated basis and a relative quantifier elimination statement. We obtain the following results:

1. In the  $\mathcal{L}$ -language the type of a valued field over a maximal model is dominated by the power residue sorts and the value group.
2. In the  $\mathcal{L}_{ac}$ -language the type of a valued field over a maximal field is dominated by the residue sort and the value group.
3. For the theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed, the type of a valued field over a maximal field is dominated by the residue sort and the value group in the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$ -language.

The following is [23, Lemma 2.5].

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be valued fields with  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  be a common valued subfield. Assume that:*

1.  $\Gamma_L \cap \Gamma_M = \Gamma_C$ ,

2.  $k_M$  and  $k_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ ,
3.  $M$  (or  $L$ ) have the good separated basis property over  $C$ .

Then  $M$  (or  $L$ ) has the good separated basis property over  $L$  (or  $M$  respectively). Therefore,  $L$  and  $M$  are linearly disjoint over  $C$ ,  $\Gamma_{C(L,M)}$  is the group generated by  $\Gamma_L$  and  $\Gamma_M$  over  $\Gamma_C$  and  $k_{C(L,M)}$  is the field generated by  $k_M$  and  $k_L$  over  $k_C$ .

The following is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.1, but we bring details to the picture to clarify some of our arguments.

**Fact 3.2.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be valued fields with  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  a common valued subfield. Assume that:*

1.  $\Gamma_L \cap \Gamma_M = \Gamma_C$ ,
2.  $k_M$  and  $k_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ ,
3.  $M$  (or  $L$ ) has the good separated basis property over  $C$ .

Let  $a \in \mathcal{O}_{C(L,M)}^\times$  then there are elements  $l_1^1, \dots, l_k^1, l_1^2, \dots, l_s^2, l \in \mathcal{O}_L$  and  $m_1^1, \dots, m_k^1, m_1^2, \dots, m_s^2, m \in \mathcal{O}_M$ , such that:

$$\text{res}(a) = \left(1 + \sum_{i \leq k} \text{res}(l_i^1) \text{res}(m_i^1)\right) \left(1 + \sum_{i \leq s} \text{res}(l_i^2) \text{res}(m_i^2)\right)^{-1} \text{res}(l) \text{res}(m).$$

*Proof.* Let  $a = \frac{y_1}{y_2}$  where  $y_1, y_2 \in C[L, M]$ . By Proposition 3.1  $L$  and  $M$  are linearly disjoint over  $C$  and  $M$  (or  $L$ ) has the separated basis property over  $L$  (or  $M$ ). Suppose that  $y_i = \sum_{j \leq n_i} \hat{l}_j^i \hat{m}_j^i$ , by hypothesis

$v(y_1) = v(y_2) = \gamma$ . As  $M$  (or  $L$ ) has the separated basis property over  $L$  (or  $M$ ) there is some index  $j_0^i$  such that  $\gamma = v(\hat{l}_{j_0^i}^i \hat{m}_{j_0^i}^i)$  and let  $I_i = \{j \leq n_i \mid v(\hat{l}_j^i \hat{m}_j^i) = \gamma\}$ . Hence  $y_i = \hat{l}_{j_0^i}^i \hat{m}_{j_0^i}^i \left(1 + \sum_{j \leq n_i, j \neq j_0^i} \left(\frac{\hat{l}_j^i \hat{m}_j^i}{\hat{l}_{j_0^i}^i \hat{m}_{j_0^i}^i}\right)\right)$ .

*Claim:* given elements  $l \in L$  and  $m \in M$  such that  $v(lm) = 0$  there is some element  $c \in C$  such that  $v(lc) = 0$  and  $v(mc^{-1}) = 0$

Let  $l \in L$  and  $m \in M$  be such that  $v(lm) = 0$  then  $v(l) = -v(m) \in \Gamma_L \cap \Gamma_M = \Gamma_C$  so there is some  $c \in C$  such that  $v(lc) = 0$  and  $v(mc^{-1}) = 0$ .

In particular, for any  $j \in I_i$ , since  $v(\hat{l}_j^i \hat{m}_j^i) = v(\hat{l}_{j_0^i}^i \hat{m}_{j_0^i}^i)$  we have that  $v\left(\frac{\hat{l}_j^i \hat{m}_j^i}{\hat{l}_{j_0^i}^i \hat{m}_{j_0^i}^i}\right) = 0$ , so we can find elements  $c_j^i \in C$  such that  $v\left(\frac{\hat{l}_j^i}{\hat{l}_{j_0^i}^i} c_j^i\right) = 0$  and  $v\left((c_j^i)^{-1} \frac{\hat{m}_{j_0^i}^i}{\hat{m}_j^i}\right) = 0$ . Let  $l_j^i = \frac{\hat{l}_j^i}{\hat{l}_{j_0^i}^i} c_j^i$  and  $m_j^i = (c_j^i)^{-1} \frac{\hat{m}_{j_0^i}^i}{\hat{m}_j^i}$ . Moreover,

$\gamma = v(l_{j_0^1}^1 m_{j_0^1}^1) = v(l_{j_0^2}^2 m_{j_0^2}^2)$ , thus we can find an element  $c \in C$  such that  $v\left(\frac{l_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{l}_{j_0^1}^1} c\right) = 0$  and  $v\left(\frac{\hat{m}_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{m}_{j_0^2}^2} c^{-1}\right) = 0$ , we set

$$l = \frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{l}_{j_0^2}^2} c \text{ and } m = \frac{\hat{m}_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{m}_{j_0^2}^2} c^{-1}.$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{res}(a) &= \text{res}\left(\frac{y_1}{y_2}\right) = \text{res}\left(1 + \sum_{j \leq n_1, j \neq j_0^1} \left(\frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^1}^1 \hat{m}_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{l}_j^1 \hat{m}_j^1}\right)\right) \left(\text{res}\left(1 + \sum_{j \leq n_2, j \neq j_0^2} \left(\frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^2}^2 \hat{m}_{j_0^2}^2}{\hat{l}_j^2 \hat{m}_j^2}\right)\right)\right)^{-1} \text{res}\left(\frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^1}^1 \hat{m}_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{l}_{j_0^2}^2 \hat{m}_{j_0^2}^2}\right) \\ &= \text{res}\left(1 + \sum_{j \in I_1, j \neq j_0^1} \left(\frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^1}^1 \hat{m}_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{l}_j^1 \hat{m}_j^1}\right)\right) \left(\text{res}\left(1 + \sum_{j \in I_2, j \neq j_0^2} \left(\frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^2}^2 \hat{m}_{j_0^2}^2}{\hat{l}_j^2 \hat{m}_j^2}\right)\right)\right)^{-1} \text{res}(l) \text{res}(m) \\ &= \left(1 + \sum_{j \in I_1, j \neq j_0^1} \text{res}\left(\frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^1}^1 \hat{m}_{j_0^1}^1}{\hat{l}_j^1 \hat{m}_j^1}\right)\right) \left(1 + \sum_{j \in I_2, j \neq j_0^2} \text{res}\left(\frac{\hat{l}_{j_0^2}^2 \hat{m}_{j_0^2}^2}{\hat{l}_j^2 \hat{m}_j^2}\right)\right)^{-1} \text{res}(l) \text{res}(m) \\ &= \left(1 + \sum_{j \in I_1, j \neq j_0^1} \text{res}(l_j^1) \text{res}(m_j^1)\right) \left(1 + \sum_{j \in I_2, j \neq j_0^2} \text{res}(l_j^2) \text{res}(m_j^2)\right)^{-1} \text{res}(l) \text{res}(m), \text{ as required.} \end{aligned}$$

□

We start by recalling some propositions about extending a given isomorphism of valued fields in the reduct  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ . The following is [23, Proposition 2.6].

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be valued fields with  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  a common valued subfield. Assume that  $\Gamma_L \cap \Gamma_M = \Gamma_C$ ,  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$  and that  $L$  or  $M$  has the good separated basis property. Let  $\sigma : L \rightarrow L'$  be a  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -valued field isomorphism which is the identity on  $C\Gamma_L k_L$ . Then  $\sigma$  can be extended to a  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -valued field isomorphism  $f$  from  $C(L, M)$  to  $C(L', M)$  which is the identity on  $M$  and  $f \upharpoonright_L = \sigma$ .*

We continue arguing that without loss of generality we may assume the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism to fix the residue field and the value group of  $M$  instead.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be valued fields with  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  a common valued subfield. Assume that:*

1.  $\Gamma_L \cap \Gamma_M = \Gamma_C$ ,
2.  $k_M$  and  $k_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ ,
3.  $M$  or  $L$  have the good separated basis property over  $C$ .

*And let  $\sigma := C(L, M) \rightarrow C(L', M')$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism fixing  $Ck_M\Gamma_M$ , such that  $\sigma(L) = L'$  and  $\sigma(M) = M'$ . Then there is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism  $\tau : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(L', M)$  such that  $\tau$  is the identity on  $M$  and  $\tau \upharpoonright_L = \sigma \upharpoonright_L$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(L', M')$  be the given  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism fixing  $Ck_M\Gamma_M$ . We want to find an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism  $\tau : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(L', M)$  which is the identity on  $M$  and such that  $\tau \upharpoonright_L = \sigma \upharpoonright_L$ . We consider the restriction map  $\sigma^{-1} \upharpoonright_{M'} : M' \rightarrow M$ , an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism fixing  $Ck_M\Gamma_M$ . By Proposition 3.3 there is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism  $\phi : C(M', L') \rightarrow C(M, L')$  that extends  $\sigma^{-1} \upharpoonright_{M'} : M' \rightarrow M$  and is the identity on  $L'$ . Let  $\tau : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(L', M)$  be the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism given by the composition  $\tau = \phi \circ \sigma$ ; this map satisfies the required conditions.  $\square$

We conclude this section by restating our result in terms of domination for the class of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed. We first recall a general fact about regular extensions:

**Fact 3.5.** *Let  $F$  be a field,  $E$  a regular field extension of  $F$  and  $R$  be any other field extension of  $F$ . If  $E \downarrow_F^{\text{alg}} R$  then  $E$  and  $R$  are linearly disjoint over  $F$ .*

*Proof.* See [15, Theorem 4.12 Chapter VIII].  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $T$  be some  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$ -complete extension of the first order theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed. Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be its monster model,  $C$  a maximal field and  $C \subseteq L$  a valued field extension such that  $\Gamma_L/\Gamma_C$  is a torsion free extension and  $k_L$  is a regular extension of  $k_C$ . Then  $\text{tp}(L/C)$  is dominated by the residue field and the value group, this is for any field extension  $C \subseteq M$  such that  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$  we have  $\text{tp}(L/Ck_M\Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C \subseteq M$  be a field extension such that  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$ . By Fact 3.5  $k_M$  and  $k_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ . As  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$ , by Fact 2.44  $\Gamma_M \cap \Gamma_L \subseteq \text{dcl}(\Gamma_C)$ . Combining Fact 2.29 together with the hypothesis of  $\Gamma_L/\Gamma_C$  is torsion free we obtain that  $\Gamma_M \cap \Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_C$ . Let  $L' \models \text{tp}(L/Ck_M\Gamma_M)$  and let  $\sigma : L \rightarrow L'$  be a partial elementary map fixing  $Ck_M\Gamma_M$ , as the hypothesis of Proposition 3.3 are satisfied, we can find an automorphism  $\tau$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  fixing  $M$  and extending  $\sigma$ .  $\tau$  must be an elementary map by Theorem 2.13, because its restriction to the value group a partial elementary map of  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{M}}$ . We conclude that  $\text{tp}(L/Ck_M\Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ , as required.  $\square$

In the following remark we indicate how forking independence relates to the notions of independence required in Corollary 3.6.

**Remark 3.7.** *Let  $T$  be some  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$ -complete extension of the first order theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed. Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be its monster model, and  $L, M$  substructures. Let  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  be a common subfield, then if  $k_M\Gamma_M \downarrow_C k_L\Gamma_L$  we have  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 2.14, the residue field and the value group are stably embedded and orthogonal to each other, hence  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C} \Gamma_L$ . Forking independence in the residue field implies in particular algebraic independence, so  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$ . Forking independence in the value group guarantees forking independence in the reduct to  $\mathcal{L}_{AG}$  so  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$ .  $\square$

### 3.0.1 Domination by the residue sort and the value group in the language $\mathcal{L}$ .

In this subsection, we let  $T$  be some complete extension of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero and we let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be its monster model. Given  $L$  an  $\mathcal{L}$  substructure of  $\mathfrak{C}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $(\mathcal{A}_n)_L = \{\text{res}^n(l) \mid l \in L\}$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_L = ((\mathcal{A}_n)_L \mid n \in \mathbb{N})$ . The main goal of this subsection is proving that the type of a valued field over a maximal model  $C$  is dominated by the power residue sorts and the value group.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be substructures of  $\mathfrak{C}$ , and let  $C$  be a maximal model of  $T$  which is also a common substructure of  $L$  and  $M$ . If*

1.  $\Gamma_L \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_M$ ,
2.  $k_M$  and  $k_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ ,
3.  $M$  or  $L$  has the good separated basis property over  $C$ .

Then  $\text{tp}(L/C\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $L' \models \text{tp}(L/C\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M)$  and let  $\sigma$  be a partial elementary map sending  $L$  to  $L'$  fixing  $C\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M$ . By Fact 2.44,  $\Gamma_L \cap \Gamma_M \subseteq \text{dcl}(\Gamma_C) = \Gamma_C$  because  $C$  is definably closed. By Proposition 3.4, there is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  valued field isomorphism  $\tau : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(L', M)$  which is the identity on  $M$  and  $\tau \upharpoonright_L = \sigma$ . By Proposition 3.1,  $L$  and  $M$  are linearly disjoint over  $C$ ,  $L$  has the good basis property over  $M$ , the value group  $\Gamma_{C(L, M)}$  is the group generated by  $\Gamma_M$  and  $\Gamma_L$  over  $\Gamma_C$  and the residue field  $k_{C(L, M)}$  is the field generated by  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  over  $k_C$ . In particular, any element  $x \in C[L, M]$  can be represented as  $x = \sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i$

and  $v(x) = v(\sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i) = \min\{v(l_i) + v(m_i) \mid i \leq n\}$ . As  $\tau$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism, we have:

$$\tau(v(x)) = \tau(\min\{v(l_i) + v(m_i) \mid i \leq n\}) = \min\{\sigma(v(l_i)) + v(m_i) \mid i \leq n\} = v(\tau(x)),$$

and because  $\sigma : L \rightarrow L'$  is a partial elementary map fixing  $\Gamma_M$ , the restriction map  $\tau : \Gamma_{C(L, M)} \rightarrow \Gamma_{C(L', M)}$  is a partial elementary map. We want to extend the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism to a  $\mathcal{L}$ -isomorphism, we start by proving the following claim.

*Claim:* Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in C(L, M)$  be such that  $v(x) \in n\Gamma$ . Then there are  $a \in \mathcal{O}_{C(L, M)}^\times$ ,  $l \in L$  and  $m \in M$  such that  $\text{res}^n(x) = \pi_n(\text{res}(a)) \text{res}^n(l) \text{res}^n(m)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in C(L, M)$ , as  $L$  has the good basis property over  $M$  there are  $l' \in L$  and  $m' \in M$  such that  $v(x) = v(l') + v(m')$ . Let  $\phi(x, y) = \exists \gamma(x + y = n\gamma)$ , because  $\models \phi(v(l'), v(m'))$  the  $\mathcal{L}_{AG}$ -formula  $\phi(x, y)$  is represented in the type  $\text{tp}(v(l')/\Gamma_M)$ . Because  $\Gamma_L \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_M$ , by Fact 2.42  $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}_{AG}}(v(l')/\Gamma_M)$  is an heir of  $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}_{AG}}(v(l')/\Gamma_C)$  so we can find some element  $c \in C$  such that  $\models \phi(v(l'), v(c))$ . Take  $l = l'c \in L$  and  $m = m'c^{-1}$ , then  $v(x) = v(l) + v(m)$  where  $v(l), v(m) \in n\Gamma$ . Let  $a = \frac{x}{lm}$ , so  $x = a(lm)$  and

$$\text{res}^n(x) = \text{res}^n(a) \text{res}^n(lm) = \pi_n(\text{res}(a)) \text{res}^n(l) \text{res}^n(m), \text{ as desired.}$$

□

Now, let  $x, y \in C(L, M)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $\text{res}^n(x) = \text{res}^n(y)$  and let  $a, b \in \mathcal{O}_{C(L, M)}^\times$  and  $l_1, l_2 \in L$  and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$  be such that  $\text{res}^n(x) = \pi_n(\text{res}(a)) \text{res}^n(l_1) \text{res}^n(m_1)$  and  $\text{res}^n(y) = \pi_n(\text{res}(b)) \text{res}^n(l_2) \text{res}^n(m_2)$ . Thus:

$$\text{res}^n(x) = \text{res}^n(y) \text{ if and only if } \pi_n(\text{res}(a)) \text{res}^n(l_1) \text{res}^n(m_1) = \pi_n(\text{res}(b)) \text{res}^n(l_2) \text{res}^n(m_2).$$

By Fact 3.2 the equality  $\pi_n(\text{res}(a)) \text{res}^n(l_1) \text{res}^n(m_1) = \pi_n(\text{res}(b)) \text{res}^n(l_2) \text{res}^n(m_2)$  can be expressed by a formula in  $\text{tp}(L/C\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M)$ , as  $\sigma$  is an elementary map the same formula holds for the elements in  $\sigma(L)$ . As a result,  $\pi_n(\text{res}(\tau(a))) \text{res}^n(\tau(l_1)) \text{res}^n(\tau(m_1)) = \pi_n(\text{res}(\tau(b))) \text{res}^n(\tau(l_2)) \text{res}^n(\tau(m_2))$  so  $\text{res}^n(\tau(x)) = \text{res}^n(\tau(y))$ . Hence we can naturally extend the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism  $\tau$  to an  $\mathcal{L}$ -isomorphism, by taking maps  $\tau_n := (\mathcal{A}_n)_{(C(L, M))} \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}_n)_{(C(L', M))}$  sending the residue class  $\text{res}^n(x)$  to  $\text{res}^n(\tau(x))$ . Then  $\mathbf{t} = \tau \cup \{\tau_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a  $\mathcal{L}$ -isomorphism from  $C(L, M)$  into  $C(L', M)$  satisfying the following properties:

1.  $\mathbf{t} \upharpoonright_M = \text{id}_M$  and  $\tau \upharpoonright_L = \sigma$ ,



2.  $\mathbf{t} : \Gamma_{C(L,M)} \rightarrow \Gamma_{C(L',M)}$  is a partial elementary map in  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{C}}$  because  $\Gamma_{C(L,M)}$  is the value group generated by  $\Gamma_M$  and  $\Gamma_L$  over  $\Gamma_C$  and  $\sigma$  fixes  $\Gamma_M$ ,
3.  $\mathbf{t} : \mathcal{A}_{C(L,M)} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{C(L',M)}$  is a partial elementary map in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ . This follows by the fact that  $\sigma$  is a partial elementary map fixing  $\mathcal{A}_M$  combined with the Claim and Fact 3.2.

By the relative quantifier elimination (Theorem 2.25)  $\tau$  is a partial elementary map and therefore can be extended to an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{C}$ . As a result  $\text{tp}(L/M) = \text{tp}(L'/M)$  as required.  $\square$

We conclude this section by restating our result in terms of domination.

**Corollary 3.9.** *Let  $C \subseteq L$  be substructures of  $\mathfrak{C}$  with  $C$  a maximal model of  $T$ . Then  $\text{tp}(L/C)$  is dominated by the value group and the power residue sorts, this is for any field extension  $C \subseteq M$  such that  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$  we have  $\text{tp}(L/C\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$*

*Proof.* We want to show that  $\text{tp}(L/C\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ . Because  $C$  is a model and the residue field is of characteristic zero,  $k_L$  is a regular extension of  $k_C$ . By hypothesis  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$ , by Fact 3.5  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  must be linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ . By Fact 2.4,  $L$  has the good separated basis property over  $C$ . Hence, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.8 are satisfied, so  $\text{tp}(L/C\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$  as required.  $\square$

The following remark emphasizes how forking independence relates to the required independence conditions in Corollary 3.9.

**Remark 3.10.** *Let  $C$  and  $L$  be as in Corollary 3.9. Let  $C \subseteq M$  be a field extension, such that  $\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_C\Gamma_C} \mathcal{A}_L\Gamma_L$  then  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M \supseteq C$  be another structure such that  $\mathcal{A}_M\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_C\Gamma_C} \mathcal{A}_L\Gamma_L$ , because the sorts  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\Gamma$  are orthogonal and stably embedded this is equivalent to having  $\mathcal{A}_M \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_C} \mathcal{A}_L$  and  $\Gamma_L \downarrow_{\Gamma_C} \Gamma_M$ . In particular in the reduct to  $\mathcal{L}_{AG}$  it must be the case that  $\Gamma_L \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_M$ . Because  $\mathcal{A}_L \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_C} \mathcal{A}_M$ , then  $k_L \downarrow_{k_C} k_M$  and in particular  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  are algebraically independent over  $k_C$ .  $\square$

### 3.0.2 Domination by the residue field and the value group in the $\mathcal{L}_{ac}$ -language

In this subsection we prove a domination result for henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{ac}$ , using the quantifier elimination of field quantifiers relative to the residue field and the value group obtained by Pas. Adding an angular component simplifies significantly the henselian valued field, in fact it corresponds to having the exact sequence  $1 \rightarrow k^\times \rightarrow RV \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 0$  to split. However, it should be noted that adding an angular component increases the set of definable sets, so it is interesting to understand as well domination results in this framework by its own sake.

Through this section  $T$  is some complete extension of the  $\mathcal{L}_{ac}$ -theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero and  $\mathfrak{C}$  is its monster model. Given  $M$  a substructure of  $\mathfrak{C}$ , we will denote as  $k(M) = \text{dcl}(M) \cap k_{\mathfrak{C}}$  and we observe that  $\text{ac}(M) \subseteq k(M)$ .

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be good substructures of  $\mathfrak{C}$ , and let  $C$  be a maximal model of  $T$  which is also a common substructure of  $L$  and  $M$ . If the following conditions hold*

1.  $k_M$  and  $k_L$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ ,
2.  $\Gamma_M \cap \Gamma_L = \Gamma_C$ ,
3.  $M$  or  $L$  have the good separated basis property over  $C$ ,

then  $\text{tp}(L/Ck(M)\Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ .

*Proof.* As in Theorem 3.8 we start taking  $L' \models \text{tp}(L/Ck(M)\Gamma_M)$ , and  $\sigma$  a partial elementary map sending  $L$  to  $L'$  fixing  $Ck(M)\Gamma_M$ . By Proposition 3.4, there is a  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$  valued field isomorphism  $\tau : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(L', M)$  which is the identity on  $M$  and  $\tau \upharpoonright_L = \sigma$ .

By Proposition 3.1,  $L$  and  $M$  are linearly disjoint over  $C$ ,  $M$  (or  $L$ ) has the separated basis property over  $L$  (or  $M$ ), the value group  $\Gamma_{C(L,M)}$  is the group generated by  $\Gamma_M$  and  $\Gamma_L$  over  $\Gamma_C$  and the residue field  $k_{C(L,M)}$

is the field generated by  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  over  $k_C$ . In particular, any element  $x \in C[L, M]$  can be represented as  $x = \sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i$  and  $v(x) = v(\sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i) = \min\{v(l_i) + v(m_i) \mid i \leq n\}$ . As  $\tau$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism, we have:

$$\tau(v(x)) = \tau(\min\{v(l_i) + v(m_i) \mid i \leq n\}) = \min\{\sigma(v(l_i)) + v(m_i) \mid i \leq n\} = v(\tau(x)).$$

We want to extend the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism to a  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -isomorphism, so it is sufficient to verify that  $\tau$  respects also the angular component map.

*Claim:* Let  $x \in C[L, M]$  then there are  $a \in \mathcal{O}_{C(L, M)}^\times$ ,  $l \in L$  and  $m \in M$  such that  $x = alm$ . In particular,  $\tau(\text{ac}(x)) = \text{ac}(\tau(x))$  and  $\text{ac}(x) = \text{res}(a) \text{ac}(l) \text{ac}(m)$ .

Let  $x \in C[L, M]$  and suppose that  $x = \sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i$ . Because  $M$  (or  $L$ ) has the separated basis property over  $L$  (or  $M$ ) there is some  $i_0 \leq n$  such that  $v(x) = v(l_{i_0} m_{i_0})$ . Let  $a = \frac{x}{l_{i_0} m_{i_0}} \in \mathcal{O}_{C(L, M)}^\times$ , then  $\text{ac}(x) = \text{ac}(l_{i_0} m_{i_0} a) = \text{ac}(l_{i_0}) \text{ac}(m_{i_0}) \text{res}(a)$ . Note that  $\tau(x) = \tau(a) \sigma(l_{i_0}) m_{i_0}$ . Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\text{ac}(x)) &= \tau(\text{ac}(l_{i_0}) \text{ac}(m_{i_0}) \text{res}(a)) = \tau(\text{ac}(l_{i_0})) \tau(\text{ac}(m_{i_0})) \tau(\text{res}(a)) \\ &= \text{ac}(\sigma(l_{i_0})) \text{ac}(m_{i_0}) \text{res}(\tau(a)) = \text{ac}(\sigma(l_{i_0}) m_{i_0} \tau(a)) = \text{ac}(\tau(x)), \text{ as required.} \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $\tau$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -isomorphism, and because  $\Gamma_{C(L, M)}$  is the group generated by  $\Gamma_L$  and  $\Gamma_M$  over  $\Gamma_C$  and  $\sigma$  fixes  $\Gamma_M$ , then  $\tau \upharpoonright \Gamma_{C(L, M)} \rightarrow \Gamma_{C(L', M)}$  in an elementary map in  $\Gamma$ . Combining the Claim, the fact that the residue field  $k_{C(L, M)}$  is the field generated by  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  over  $k_C$  and the noting that  $\text{ac}(M) \subseteq k(M)$  which is fixed by  $\sigma$ , we can conclude that  $\tau \upharpoonright \text{ac}(C(L, M))$  is an elementary map in  $\mathbf{k}$ . By Theorem 2.18, such map must be elementary.  $\square$

We restate our result in terms of domination, and we highlight that we required weaker hypothesis compare to Corollary 3.9.

**Corollary 3.12.** *Let  $T$  be some complete extension of the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}^*$  first order theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero and let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be its monster model. Let  $C \subseteq L$  be substructures of  $\mathfrak{C}$ , with  $C$  maximal,  $k_L$  a regular extension of  $k_C$  and  $\Gamma_L/\Gamma_C$  torsion free. Then  $\text{tp}(L/C)$  is dominated by the value group and the residue field, this is for any field extension  $C \subseteq M$  if  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$  then  $\text{tp}(L/C k_M \Gamma_M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ .*

*Proof.* The argument follows in a very similar manner as Corollary 3.6.  $\square$

**Remark 3.13.** 1. *As in Remark 3.7, using the stable embeddeness and orthogonality between the residue field and the value group one can obtain that forking independence implies the independence conditions required in 3.12, this is if  $k_M \Gamma_M \downarrow_C k_L \Gamma_L$  implies that  $k_M \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k_L$  and  $\Gamma_M \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma_L$ .*

2. *A similar version of Corollary 3.12 can be obtained for the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$  without adding the constants and requiring  $C$  to be a model of  $T$ . The proof is similar to Corollary 3.9.*

## 4 Forking over maximal models in $NTP_2$ henselian valued fields

In this section we apply the domination results obtained in Section 3 to show that forking independence over maximal models is controlled by the value group and the power residues sorts in the class of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero which are  $NTP_2$ .

It is well known that in general forking and dividing are different notions, however, they do coincide in a very large class of theories (sometimes over arbitrary sets or only over models). In [21] Chernikov and Kaplan shown that if a theory is  $NTP_2$  then forking and dividing over models are the same. Forking is in general not transitive in arbitrary theories, but it is always left transitive. The following is [22, Lemma 1.5], commonly stated for dividing but it holds as well for forking.

**Fact 4.1.** *Let  $T$  be a complete first order theory and  $\mathfrak{M}$  its monster model. Let  $A \subseteq \mathfrak{M}$  be a set of parameters,  $a, b, c \in \mathfrak{M}$ , if  $a \downarrow_A c$  and  $a \downarrow_{Aa} b$  then  $ab \downarrow_A c$ .*

In [19, Theorem 7.6] Chernikov proved that a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero in the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$  language is  $NTP_2$  if and only if its residue field is  $NTP_2$ . Later in [20, Theorem 3.11] P. Touchard proved that if  $\mathcal{K} = (K, \mathbf{k}, \Gamma, \text{ac}, \text{res}, v)$  is a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero then  $\text{bdn}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{ac}}) = \text{bdn}(\mathbf{k}) + \text{bdn}(\Gamma)$ , where  $\text{bdn}(X)$  is the burden of the definable set  $X$  as defined in [20, Definition 1.12]. He also showed that if a valued field of equicharacteristic zero is considered in the language  $\mathcal{L}$  then  $\text{bdn}(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{n \geq 0} (\text{bdn}(k^\times / (k^\times)^n) + \text{bdn}(n\Gamma))$ , therefore a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero is  $NTP_2$  if and only if its residue field is  $NTP_2$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $C$  be some set of parameters and  $a, b$  tuples in the main field sort.*

1. *In the  $\mathcal{L}$  language,  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  if and only if  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ .*
2. *In the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$  language,  $k(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  if and only if  $k(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C k(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ .*
3. *For the theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed, in the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -language  $k(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  if and only if  $k(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C k(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ .*

*Proof.* We start by proving the first statement. The left to right direction is clear, because if  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  then  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \text{acl}(Cb)$ , and  $\mathcal{A}(Cb)\Gamma(Cb) \subseteq \text{acl}(Cb)$ . We proceed to prove the converse.

Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ , because  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\Gamma$  are orthogonal to each other, this is equivalent to  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)$  and  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \Gamma(Cb)$ . By Corollary 2.26  $\Gamma$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are orthogonal to each other and stably embedded, thus  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  if and only if  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  and  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$ . Hence, it is sufficient to prove that  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  and  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$ .

*Claim:*  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  and  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$ .

We proceed by contradiction, and we assume that  $\text{tp}(\mathcal{A}(Ca)/Cb)$  forks over  $C$  to show that  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \not\downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)$ . We can find a formula  $\phi(\bar{x}, b) \in \text{tp}(\mathcal{A}(Ca)/Cb)$ , and finite set of formulas  $\{\psi_i(\bar{x}, d_i) \mid i \leq n\}$  such that  $\phi(\bar{x}, b) \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq n} \psi_i(\bar{x}, d_i)$ , where each formula  $\psi_i(\bar{x}, d_i)$  divides over  $C$ .

As  $\mathcal{A}$  is a stably embedded, the subset of  $\mathcal{A}^n$  defined by  $\phi(\bar{x}, b)$  is also defined by a formula  $\eta(\bar{x}, e)$  where  $e$  is a tuple of elements in  $\mathcal{A}(Cb)$ . By a similar argument, the set defined by each formula  $\psi_i(\bar{x}, d_i)$  is also defined by a formula  $\epsilon_i(\bar{x}, f_i)$  where  $f_i$  is a tuple of elements in  $\mathcal{A}(Cd_i)$ . Because  $\phi(\bar{x}, b)$ ,  $\eta(\bar{x}, e)$  define the same set, as  $\psi_i(\bar{x}, d_i)$  and  $\epsilon_i(\bar{x}, f_i)$  do, then it is also the case that  $\eta(\bar{x}, e) \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq n} \epsilon_i(\bar{x}, f_i)$ . Since  $\eta(\bar{x}, e) \in \text{tp}(\mathcal{A}(C)/\mathcal{A}(Cb))$

it is sufficient to argue that  $\epsilon_i(\bar{x}, f_i)$  also divides over  $C$ .

Each formula  $\psi_i(\bar{x}, d_i)$  divides over  $C$ , so we can find an infinite sequence  $\langle b_j \mid j < \omega \rangle$  in the type  $\text{tp}(d_i/C)$  such that  $b_0 = d_i$  and  $\{\psi_i(\bar{x}, b_j) \mid j < \omega\}$  is  $m_i$ -inconsistent. Let  $\sigma_j$  be an automorphism of the monster model sending  $b_0$  to  $b_j$  and fixing  $C$ . Let  $g_j = \sigma_j(f_i)$ , then  $g_0 = f_i$ ,  $\langle g_j \mid j < \omega \rangle$  is in the type  $\text{tp}(f_i/C)$ . As a result,  $\{\epsilon_i(\bar{x}, g_j) \mid j < \omega\}$  is also  $m_i$ -inconsistent, because  $\psi_i(\bar{x}, b_j)$  and  $\epsilon_i(\bar{x}, g_j)$  define the same subset of  $\mathcal{A}^n$ . Consequently, each  $\epsilon_i(\bar{x}, f_i)$  divides over  $C$ , so  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \not\downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)$ . We conclude that if  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)$  then  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C b$ . Likewise, one can show that if  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \Gamma(Cb)$  then  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$ . This concludes the proof of the right to left direction.

Likewise, we can conclude similarly the second and the third statement. In fact, the proof only requires that the residue field and the value group are orthogonal to each other and stably embedded. This is guaranteed by Corollary 2.19 and 2.14 respectively.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $C$  be some maximal model and assume that the residue field is  $NTP_2$ .*

1. *In the  $\mathcal{L}$ -language,  $a \downarrow_C b$  if and only if  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ .*
2. *In the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -language,  $a \downarrow_C b$  if and only if  $k(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C k(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ .*

*Proof.* We start proving the first statement, the left to right direction is clear. We assume that  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ . By Corollary 2.26  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\Gamma$  are stably embedded and orthogonal to each other, so this is equivalent to  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)$  and  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \Gamma(Cb)$ . Because  $\mathcal{A}(Ca) \downarrow_C \mathcal{A}(Cb)$ , then  $k(Ca) \downarrow_{k_C}^{\text{alg}} k(Cb)$ . As  $C$  is a model and the residue field is of characteristic zero,  $k(Ca)$  is a regular extension of  $k_C$  so we can apply Fact 3.5 to conclude that  $k(Ca)$  and  $k(Cb)$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ . Because  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C \Gamma(Cb)$ , then  $\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_{\Gamma_C}^s \Gamma(Cb)$ , as  $\Gamma$  is a stably embedded sort and we are considering the reduct to the language of abelian groups.

*Claim:*  $a \downarrow_{C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca)} b$ .

*Proof.* Let  $p(x, C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca)) = \text{tp}(a/C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca), b)$ . As forking is equal to dividing it is sufficient to argue that no formula  $\phi(\bar{x}, b) \in p(x, C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca), b)$  divides over  $C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca)$ . Let  $\{b_i \mid i \in \omega\}$  a  $C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca)$ -indiscernible sequence in the type  $\text{tp}(b/C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca))$ . Let  $\sigma_i$  be an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{C}$  fixing  $C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca)$  sending  $b$  to  $b_i$ , by Theorem 3.8 we can find an automorphism  $\tau$  of  $\mathfrak{C}$  which is the identity on  $Ca$  and whose restriction to  $\text{dcl}(Cb)$  coincides with  $\sigma_i$ . In particular,

$$a \models \bigcap_{i < \omega} p(x, Ck(Ca)\Gamma(Ca), b_i) \supseteq \bigwedge_{i < \omega} \{\phi(x, b_i) \mid i < \omega\}$$

so  $\{\phi(x, b_i) \mid i < \omega\}$  is consistent, and we conclude that  $\phi(x, b)$  does not divide over  $Ck(Ca)\Gamma(Ca)$  as required.  $\square$

Combining the Claim with Lemma 4.2 we have that  $a \downarrow_{C\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca)} b$  and  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$  so we can apply Fact 4.1 to conclude that  $a\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \downarrow_C b$ . Because  $\mathcal{A}(Ca)\Gamma(Ca) \subseteq \text{acl}(Ca)$ , this is equivalent to  $a \downarrow_C b$ .

Likewise, we can conclude the second statement for the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}$ -language, using Theorem 3.11 and Corollary 2.19 instead. We observe that there is no need to work with the extension  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ac}}^*$ , as the independence assumption over the value group implies that  $\Gamma(Ca) \cap \Gamma(Cb) \subseteq \Gamma(C) = \Gamma_C$ , because  $C$  is definably closed.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $T$  be some complete extension of the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$ - first order theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed. Let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be its monster model and  $C \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  a maximal field. Let  $a, b \in \mathfrak{C}$  and suppose that  $k(Ca)$  is a regular extension of  $k_C$  and  $\Gamma(Ca)/\Gamma_C$  is torsion free. We have that  $a \downarrow_C b$  if and only if  $k(Ca)\Gamma(Cb) \downarrow_C k(Cb)\Gamma(Cb)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows by a very similar argument as in Theorem 4.3, applying Proposition 3.4 instead. In fact,  $\Gamma_M \cap \Gamma_L \subseteq \text{dcl}(\Gamma_C) = (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \cap \Gamma_{\mathfrak{C}}$  and as  $\Gamma(Ca)/\Gamma_C$  is torsion free we have that  $\Gamma_M \cap \Gamma_L = \Gamma_C$ . Also, the independence in the residue field together with the assumption of  $k(Ca)$  being a regular extension of  $k_C$  guarantees that  $k(Ca)$  and  $k(Cb)$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ . We can apply the equivalence between forking and dividing over elements in the main sort by a result of Cotter and Starchenko [12, the remarks preceding Proposition 2.6 together with Corollary 5.5].  $\square$

## 5 Domination by the internal sorts to the residue field

In this section we investigate domination of a field by the sorts internal to the residue field over the value group, as before we analyze the situation and the improvement of each of the statements depending on the language that is being used.

### 5.1 Domination by the internal sorts to the residue field in the language $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$

Any henselian valued field  $K$  can be naturally embedded into a model of  $ACVF$ , in fact we can simply take the algebraic closure of  $K$  with the unique extension of  $v$  to  $K^{\text{alg}}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{O}$  the valuation ring of  $K$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  its prime ideal, while  $\mathcal{O}^{\text{alg}}$  is the valuation ring of  $K^{\text{alg}}$  and  $\mathcal{M}^{\text{alg}}$  indicates its maximal ideal. Hence, the sort  $RV(K)$  can be naturally embedded into  $RV(K^{\text{alg}})$ , by sending the class  $x(1 + \mathcal{M})$  to  $x(1 + \mathcal{M}^{\text{alg}})$ . Likewise, there is a natural embedding from the residue field of  $K$  into the residue field of  $K^{\text{alg}}$ , where for  $x \in \mathcal{O}$  we send the class  $x + \mathcal{M}$  to  $x + \mathcal{M}^{\text{alg}}$ .

In [3, Section 3.1] Haskell, Hrushovski and Macpherson introduced the well known *geometric language*  $\mathcal{L}_G$ , in which  $ACVF$  eliminates imaginaries (see [3, Theorem 1.0.1]).

**Notation 5.1.** *Let  $T$  be the  $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$ -theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero. We will denote by  $\mathfrak{C}$  its monster model, which can be embedded into the monster model  $\mathfrak{A}$  of  $ACVF$ . Through this section we will work in both theories, so we emphasize the notation that we will be using to distinguish both theories. We will simply denote as  $\text{dcl}$ ,  $\text{acl}$ , or  $\text{tp}(A/C)$  the definable closure, algebraic closure or the type in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$ . While we emphasize that  $\text{dcl}_{ACVF}$ ,  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}$  or  $\text{tp}_{ACVF}$  indicate the definable closure, algebraic closure or the type in the geometric language. We recall our notation, given  $S$  a stably embedded sort in the  $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$ -theory and  $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  a set of parameters we denote as  $S(A) = S \cap \text{dcl}(A)$ , while if  $S$  is a stably embedded sort in  $ACVF$  we indicate by  $S_{ACVF}(A) = S \cap \text{dcl}_{ACVF}(A)$ .*

**Definition 5.2.** 1. A definable set  $E$  is said to be internal to a definable set  $D$  if there is some finite set of parameters  $F$  such that  $E \subseteq \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(F \cup D)$ .

2. A family of definable sets  $\{E_i\}_{i \in I}$  is said to be internal to a definable set  $D$  if for each  $i \in I$  we have that  $E_i$  is internal to  $D$ .

For each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  the fiber  $RV \cap v_{RV}^{-1}(\gamma)$  is internal to the residue field, and as the parameters mention to witness the internality lie in  $RV \cap v_{RV}^{-1}(\gamma)$  then  $RV \cap v_{RV}^{-1}(\gamma)$  is also stably embedded.

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $B$  be some set of parameters and  $S \subseteq \Gamma$ . We denote by  $\text{kInt}_S^B$  the multi-sorted structure  $\{k(B)\} \cup \{RV(B) \cap v_{RV}^{-1}(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in S\}$ .

As  $k(B)$  and  $RV_\gamma(B) = RV(B) \cap v_{RV}^{-1}(\gamma)$  where  $\gamma \in S$ , are all internal to the residue field, so it is  $\text{kInt}_S^L$ . Moreover, as the function witnessing the internality of  $RV_\gamma$  uses parameters within  $RV_\gamma$ , then  $\text{kInt}_S^B$  is also stably embedded.

In the case of  $ACVF$ , if  $M$  is a substructure of  $\mathfrak{U}$  and  $\Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_{ACVF}(M)$  then

$$\text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M) = \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_{ACVF}(M) \cup \{RV_{ACVF}(M) \cap v_{RV}^{-1}(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in S\}),$$

is precisely the part of  $M^{\text{eq}}$  which is internal to the residue field and contained in sets definable over  $C$  and  $\Gamma_{ACVF}(L)$  (see [2, Lemma 12.9]). In  $ACVF$  the residue field is an algebraically closed field, so it has a strongly minimal theory and forking independence coincides with algebraic independence in the field theoretic sense. In [3, Lemma 2.6.2], Haskell, Hrushovski and Macpherson characterize the definable sets that are internal to the residue field precisely as those that are stable and stably embedded, or more precisely as those that have finite Morley rank with the induced structure. In particular, in  $ACVF$  the multi-sorted structure  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$  is naturally equipped with a well-behaved notion of independence, which is simply forking independence in stable theories.

We will not investigate this in the more general setting of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero. Instead we use the fact that any henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero can be naturally embedded into a model of  $ACVF$  and we use the well-behaved notion of independence induced there, which in our setting corresponds to independence for the quantifier free and stable formulas.

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $L$  and  $M$  be substructures of  $\mathfrak{C}$  such that  $\text{dcl}(L) = L$  and  $\Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_M$ . We consider these structures embedded in the monster model  $\mathfrak{U}$  of  $ACVF$ . Suppose that  $\Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_M$  and let  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  be a common valued field. We say that  $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^L \downarrow_{C\Gamma_L}^{\text{qfs}} \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$  if and only if  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^L) \downarrow_{C\Gamma_L} \text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$  in  $\mathfrak{U}$ .

Our next goal is showing that types over maximally complete bases are dominated by the sorts internal to the residue field, to achieve this final milestone we will need Lemma 5.7, which generalizes [2, Lemma 12.9 and 12.10], both obtained for algebraically closed substructures.

The following is a well-known fact for valued field extensions, we use [8] as a reference.

**Fact 5.5.** Let  $C \subseteq L$  be a valued field extension, where  $\mathcal{O}_C$  is the valuation ring of  $C$  and  $\mathcal{O}_L$  is the valuation ring of  $L$ . Let  $(b_i)_{i \in I}$  be a family of elements of  $\mathcal{O}_L^\times$  such that  $\text{res}(b_i)$  in  $\mathbf{k}_L$  is algebraically independent over  $\mathbf{k}_C$ . And let  $(a_j \mid j \in J)$  be a family of elements of  $L^\times$  such that the family  $(v(a_j))_{j \in J}$  in  $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_L$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C$ . Assume that  $I \cap J = \emptyset$  and define  $d_k \in L$  for  $k \in I \cup J$  by  $d_i = b_i$  for  $i \in I$  and  $d_j = a_j$  for  $j \in J$ . Then:

1. The family  $(d_k)_{k \in I \cup J}$  in  $L$  is algebraically independent over  $C$ , and
2. if  $C \subseteq L$  is an extension of finite transcendence degree, then  $\text{trdeg}(\mathbf{k}_L/\mathbf{k}_C) + \dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_L/\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \leq \text{trdeg}(L/C)$ .

The second statement is known as the Zariski-Abhyankar Inequality and it is a direct consequence of the first one.

*Proof.* This is [8, Lemma 3.24 and Corollary 3.25]. □



In the case of  $ACVF$  the following statement is an immediate consequence of the Zariski-Abhyankar inequality. Let  $k_C$  be a subfield of the residue field and  $\mathbf{e} = \langle e_i \mid i \leq n \rangle$  be a tuple of elements in the residue field, we denote as  $k_C = \langle a_i \mid i \leq n \rangle$  the field generated by  $k_C$  and the tuple  $\mathbf{e}$ .

**Corollary 5.6.** *Let  $C \subseteq L$  be a valued field extension of finite transcendence degree. Let  $\mathcal{O}_C$  and  $\mathcal{O}_L$  be the valuation rings of  $C$  and  $L$  respectively. Let  $(b_i)_{i \leq r}$  be a family of elements of  $\mathcal{O}_L^\times$  such that  $\text{res}(b_i)$  in  $\mathbf{k}_L$  is algebraically independent over  $\mathbf{k}_C$ . And let  $(a_j \mid j \leq s)$  be a family of elements of  $L^\times$  such that the family  $(v(a_j))_{j \leq s}$  in  $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_L$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C$ . Let  $E$  the field generated by  $C$  and  $\langle b_i \mid i \leq r \rangle$  and  $\langle a_j \mid j \leq s \rangle$ , then  $\Gamma_{ACVF}(E) \subseteq (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \oplus \bigoplus_{j \leq s} (\mathbb{Q} \otimes v(a_j))$  and  $k_{ACVF}(E) \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C(\text{res}(b_i) \mid i \leq r))$ , where  $k_C(\text{res}(b_i) \mid i \leq r)$  denotes the field generated by  $k_C$  and the tuple  $(\text{res}(b_i) \mid i \leq r)$ . In particular, if for each  $j \leq s$  we let  $d_i = \text{rv}(a_i)$  then  $\Gamma_{ACVF}(Cd_1, \dots, d_s, \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_r)) \subseteq (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \oplus \bigoplus_{j \leq s} (\mathbb{Q} \otimes v(a_j))$  and  $k_{ACVF}(Cd_1, \dots, d_s, \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_r)) \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C(\text{res}(b_i) \mid i \leq r))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C \subseteq L$  and  $(v(a_j))_{j \leq s}, (b_i)_{i \leq r}$  be tuples as in the statement. Let  $E_0$  be the field generated by  $C$  and the tuple  $\langle b_i \mid i \leq s \rangle$ . By Fact 5.5,

$$r = \text{trdeg}(E_0/C) \geq \text{trdeg}(k_{ACVF}(E)/k_C) + \dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Gamma_{ACVF}(E_0)/\Gamma_{ACVF}(C)),$$

because  $\text{trdeg}(k_{ACVF}(E)/k_C) \geq r$ , then  $\text{trdeg}(k_{ACVF}(E)/k_C) = r$  and  $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Gamma_{ACVF}(E_0)/\Gamma_{ACVF}(C)) = 0$ . In particular,  $\Gamma_{ACVF}(E_0) \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C = \text{dcl}_{ACVF}(C) \cap \Gamma$ , and  $k_{ACVF}(E) \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C(\text{res}(b_i) \mid i \leq s))$ . Let  $E$  be the field generated by  $E_0$  and  $\langle a_i \mid i \leq s \rangle$ . Again by Fact 5.5,

$$s = \text{trdeg}(E/E_0) \geq \text{trdeg}(k_{ACVF}(E)/k_{ACVF}(E_0)) + \dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Gamma_{ACVF}(E)/\Gamma_{ACVF}(E_0)),$$

and as  $(v(a_i))_{i \leq s} \in \Gamma_{ACVF}(E)$  and  $\Gamma_{ACVF}(E_0) \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C$ , we obtain as a result that  $s = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Gamma_{ACVF}(E)/\Gamma_{ACVF}(E_0))$ . Thus,  $\text{trdeg}(k_{ACVF}(E)/k_{ACVF}(E_0)) = 0$ . Summarizing all the above, we conclude that:

- $k_{ACVF}(E) \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C(\text{res}(b_i) \mid i \leq s))$ , and
- $\Gamma_{ACVF}(E) \subseteq (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \oplus \bigoplus_{j \leq s} (\mathbb{Q} \otimes v(a_j))$ , as required.

The second part of the statement follows immediately by the fact that  $\text{res}(b_j) \in \text{dcl}_{ACVF}(b_j)$  and  $d_i = \text{rv}(a_i) \in \text{dcl}_{ACVF}(a_i)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $L, M$  be substructures of  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the monster model of  $ACVF$ . Let  $C$  be a common substructure of  $L$  and  $M$  and suppose that  $\Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_M$ . Let*

- $A = \{a_i \mid i \in R\} \subseteq L$  be such that  $\{v(a_i) \mid i \in R\}$  is a maximally  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent set of  $\Gamma_L \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_L = \text{dcl}_{ACVF}(\Gamma_L)$  over  $\Gamma_C$ .
- $E = \{e_i \mid i \in R\} \subseteq M$  satisfying  $v(e_i) = v(a_i)$ ,
- $B = \{b_j \mid j \in S\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_L^\times$  such that  $\{\text{res}(b_j) \mid j \in S\}$  is a transcendence base of  $k_L \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_L)$  over  $k_C$ .

The following statements are equivalent:

1. The set

$$\left\{ \text{res}\left(\frac{a_i}{e_i}\right), \text{res}(b_j) \mid j \in S, i \in R \right\}, \text{ is algebraically independent over } k_M.$$

2. The structures  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^L)$ ,  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$  are independent over  $C\Gamma_L$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(a_i), (e_i)$  and  $\text{res}(b_j)$  as in the hypothesis of the Proposition. Let  $d_i$  be the code of the open ball  $B_{v(a_i)}(a_i) = \{x \in \mathfrak{A} \mid v(x - a_i) > v(a_i)\}$ , note that this code is inter-definable with the class  $\text{rv}(a_i) \in \text{dcl}_{ACVF}(a_i)$ . For notational convenience we will assume that  $R$  and  $S$  are finite and equal to  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  and  $\{1, \dots, s\}$  respectively, as the more general argument follows in a similar manner by applying the argument to any finite sequence.

*Claim:* The set  $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_r, \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)\} \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^L)$  is algebraically independent over  $C\Gamma_L$ . (In the model theoretic sense)



*Proof.* We proceed by contradiction and we argue by cases. Suppose the existence of some index  $j_0 \leq s$  such that  $\text{res}(b_{j_0}) \in \text{acl}_{ACVF}(D_0CT_L)$ , where  $D_0 = D \setminus \{\text{res}(b_{j_0})\}$ . Let  $B_0 = B \setminus \{b_{j_0}\}$  and note that  $\text{res}(b_{j_0}) \in \text{acl}_{ACVF}(D_0CT_L) \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(C(A, B_0))$ , where  $C(A, B_0)$  denotes the field generated over  $C$  by  $A$  and  $B_0$ . Combining that the residue field is stably embedded and Corollary 5.6, we have:

$$\text{res}(b_{j_0}) \in \text{acl}_{ACVF}(C(A, B_0)) \cap \mathbf{k} \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C \langle \text{res}(b_j) \mid j \leq s, j \neq j_0 \rangle).$$

This contradicts the choice of the elements  $(b_i)_{i \leq s}$ . We now assume that for some index  $i_0 \leq s$  such that  $d_{i_0} \in \text{acl}_{ACVF}(CD_0\Gamma_L)$  where  $D_0 = D \setminus \{d_{i_0}\}$ . Let  $E_0 = \text{acl}(C(A_0B))$  where  $A_0 = A \setminus \{a_{i_0}\}$ , and  $C(A_0B)$  denotes the field generated by  $A_0$  and  $B$  over  $C$ . Let  $G = RV_{A_0}$ , by Corollary 5.6,  $k_{ACVF}(E_0) = \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C \langle \text{res}(b_j) \mid j \leq s \rangle)$  and  $\Gamma_{ACVF}(E_0) = (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \oplus \bigoplus_{j \neq j_0} (\mathbb{Q} \otimes v(a_j)) = v_{RV}(G)$ . Moreover by construction  $\Gamma_L \subseteq (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \oplus \bigoplus_{j \leq r} (\mathbb{Q} \otimes v(a_j))$ . Let  $\gamma = v(a_{i_0})$  and let  $\phi(x, \gamma)$  be the  $\mathcal{L}(CD_0)$ -formula witnessing that

$d_{i_0} \in \text{acl}_{ACVF}(CD_0\Gamma_L)$ . Because the residue field is infinite, we can find an element  $d \in RV \cap v^{-1}(\gamma)$ , such that  $\models \neg\phi(d, \gamma)$ . To simplify the notation, we indicate by  $\hat{\Gamma} := (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_C) \oplus \bigoplus_{j \leq r} (\mathbb{Q} \otimes v(a_j))$ .

By Corollary 5.6,  $k_{ACVF}(CD_0 \cup \{d\}) \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C \langle \text{res}(b_j) \mid j \leq s \rangle) = k_{ACVF}(E_0)$  and  $k_{ACVF}(CD) \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_C \langle \text{res}(b_j) \mid j \leq s \rangle) = k_{ACVF}(E_0)$ .

Let  $G_1 = G \cdot d_{i_0}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  and  $G_2 = G \cdot d^{\mathbb{Z}}$  and consider the partial isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} f : G_1 &\rightarrow G_2 \\ gd_{i_0}^n &\rightarrow gd^n, \text{ where } n \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $f_v = id_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ , and  $f_r = id_{k_{ACVF}(E_0)}$ , then the triple  $(f_r, f, f_v) : (k_{ACVF}(E_0), G_1, \hat{\Gamma}) \rightarrow (k_{ACVF}(E_0), G_2, \hat{\Gamma})$  is a partial isomorphism in the  $\mathcal{L}_{rv}$  language [See Definition 2.3]. By Proposition 2.22 the partial isomorphism  $(f_r, f, f_v)$  must be an elementary map. In particular  $\text{tp}(d/CD_0\Gamma_L) = \text{tp}(d_{i_0}/CD_0\Gamma_L)$ , but this leads us to a contradiction because  $\models \neg\phi(d, \gamma) \wedge \phi(d_{i_0}, \gamma)$ .  $\square$

We can now prove the equivalence between (1) and (2). By our claim,  $D \subseteq \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^L)$  is algebraically independent (in the model theoretic sense) over  $CT_L$ . Because each of the fibers  $RV \cap v^{-1}(\gamma)$  is stably embedded and internal to the residue field, it must be a strongly minimal set. Therefore, algebraic independence in the model theoretic sense over  $CT_L$  coincides with forking independence in the stable sense, in particular  $MR(D/CT_L) = s + r$ . Thus,  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^L) \downarrow_{CT_L} \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$  if and only if  $MR(D/\text{acl}_{ACVF}(k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M)) = r + s$ . As  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$  is stably embedded,  $MR(D/\text{acl}_{ACVF}(k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M)) = r + s$  if and only if  $MR(D/M) = r + s$ . Because each element  $d_i$  is interdefinable over  $M$  with  $\text{res}(\frac{a_i}{e_i})$ , then  $MR(D/M) = r + s$  if and only if  $MR(\{\text{res}(\frac{a_1}{e_1}), \dots, \text{res}(\frac{a_r}{e_r}), \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)\}/M) = r + s$ . As the residue field is stably embedded,  $MR(\{\text{res}(\frac{a_1}{e_1}), \dots, \text{res}(\frac{a_r}{e_r}), \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)\}/M) = r + s$  if and only if  $MR(\{\text{res}(\frac{a_1}{e_1}), \dots, \text{res}(\frac{a_r}{e_r}), \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)\}/k_M) = r + s$ , thus  $\{\text{res}(\frac{a_1}{e_1}), \dots, \text{res}(\frac{a_r}{e_r}), \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)\}$  is algebraically independent over  $k_M$ . We conclude therefore the equivalence between (1) and (2) as required.  $\square$

**Remark 5.8.** Let  $T$  be a complete extension of the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$ -first order theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed. Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be its monster model. For  $B$  a set of parameters in  $\mathfrak{M}$  and  $S \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathfrak{M}}$  we denote as  $\text{INT}_S^B = \text{acl}(k(B) \cup \{RV(B) \cap v^{-1}(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in S\})$ . We observe that the analogues of Corollary 5.6 and Lemma 5.7 hold in this setting without the need to go to  $ACVF$ . In fact Corollary 5.6 requires the fact that the residue field and the value group are stably embedded (given by Corollary 2.14) combined with the fact that given a set of parameters  $S \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathfrak{M}}$ ,  $\text{dcl}(S) = (\mathbb{Q} \otimes S) \cap \Gamma_{\mathfrak{M}}$ . On the other hand, Lemma 5.7 uses the elimination of  $RV$  quantifiers relative to the value group, this is given by Proposition 2.22.

We emphasize that in the following statement we work for  $T$  a complete extension of the  $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$ -theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero, and we let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be its monster model. The following theorem generalizes ideas present in [2, Proposition 12.15], we include all details for sake of completeness. Given a set of parameters  $B \subseteq \mathbf{k}_{\mathfrak{C}}$  we will denote as  $\text{cl}(B)$  the field theoretic algebraic closure of  $B$  inside of  $\mathbf{k}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ . We recall that given a substructure  $M$  of  $\mathfrak{C}$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote as  $(\mathcal{A}_n)_M = \{\text{res}^n(m) \mid m \in M\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_M = ((\mathcal{A}_n)_M \mid n \in \mathbb{N})$ .

**Theorem 5.9.** *Let  $L$  and  $M$  be substructures of  $\mathfrak{C}$  and let  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  be a common substructure which is a maximal model of  $T$ . We suppose:*

- $\Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_M$  and  $\text{dcl}(\Gamma_L) = \Gamma_L$ ,
- $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^L \downarrow_{C\Gamma_L}^{qfs} \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$ ,
- $L$  has finite transcendence degree over  $C$ .

Then  $\text{tp}(L/C\Gamma_L\mathcal{A}_M \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $L' \models \text{tp}(L/C\Gamma_L\mathcal{A}_M \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$  and let  $\sigma :$  be an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{C}$  fixing  $C\Gamma_L\mathcal{A}_M \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  taking  $L$  to  $L'$ .

*Step 1: Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\sigma$  fixes  $\Gamma_M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\beta \in \Gamma_M$  such that  $\sigma(\beta) = \beta'$ . Because  $\Gamma$  is stably embedded it is sufficient to prove that  $\beta$  and  $\beta'$  realize the same type over  $\Gamma(L' \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$ . So, we can take an automorphism of the structure  $\tau$  fixing  $L' \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  sending  $\beta'$  to  $\beta$  and we may replace  $\sigma$  by  $\tau \circ \sigma$ . To show that  $\text{tp}(\beta/\Gamma(L' \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M)) = \text{tp}(\beta'/\Gamma(L' \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M))$  we will argue that  $\Gamma(L' \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M) = \Gamma_L$ . Let  $f$  be a  $L'$ -definable function from  $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  to  $\Gamma$ . For each  $\gamma \in \Gamma_L$ , as the residue sorts and the value group are orthogonal to each other, the function  $f$  takes finitely many values on  $RV_M \cap v^{-1}(\gamma)$ , hence those values are algebraic over  $L'$ . Because  $\text{dcl}(L) = L$ , we conclude that  $\Gamma(L' \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M) = \Gamma_{L'} = \Gamma_L$ , as required. □

As in Proposition 12.15 in [2] we start by perturbing the valuation on  $C(L, M)$ .

*Step 2 : There is some valuation  $\hat{v}$  on  $C(L, M)$  finer than  $v$  satisfying the following properties*

- $\Gamma_{(L, \hat{v})} \cap \Gamma_{(M, \hat{v})} = \Gamma_{(C, \hat{v})}$ ,
- $k_{(L, \hat{v})}$  and  $k_{(M, \hat{v})}$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_{(C, \hat{v})}$ ,
- for any element  $x \in M$ , we have that  $v(x) = \hat{v}(x)$ .

*Proof.* We choose elements  $\{a_i \mid i \in r\}, \{b_j \mid j \in s\} \subseteq L$  and  $\{e_i \mid i \in r\} \subseteq M$  satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 5.7. By hypothesis,  $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^L \downarrow_{C\Gamma_L}^{qfs} \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  thus  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^L) \downarrow_{C\Gamma_L} \text{acl}_{ACVF}(\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M)$ , so we can apply Lemma 5.7 and we obtain that:

$$\left\{ \text{res}\left(\frac{a_1}{e_1}\right), \dots, \text{res}\left(\frac{a_r}{e_r}\right), \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s) \right\}$$

are algebraically independent (in the field theoretic sense) over  $k_M$ . For each  $i \leq r$  we define:

$$R^i = \text{cl}(k_M, \text{res}\left(\frac{a_1}{e_1}\right), \dots, \text{res}\left(\frac{a_i}{e_i}\right), \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)).$$

In particular:

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(0)} &= \text{cl}(k_M, \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)) = \text{cl}(k_M, k_L), \\ R^{(r)} &= \text{cl}\left(k_M, k_L, \text{res}\left(\frac{a_1}{e_1}\right), \dots, \text{res}\left(\frac{a_r}{e_r}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $p_i : R^{i+1} \rightarrow R^i \cup \{\infty\}$  be a place which fixes  $R^i$  and  $p_i(\text{res}(\frac{a_i}{e_i})) = 0$ , such a map can be found by the algebraic independence of  $\{\text{res}(\frac{a_i}{e_i}), \dots, \text{res}(\frac{a_r}{e_r}), \text{res}(b_1), \dots, \text{res}(b_s)\}$  over  $k_M$ .

Let  $p_v : C(L, M) \rightarrow k_{C(L, M)} \cup \{\infty\}$  be the place corresponding to the valuation ring over  $C(L, M)$  given by Proposition 2.6, and fix a place  $p^* : k_{C(L, M)} \rightarrow R^r \cup \{\infty\}$  fixing  $R^r$ .

We take the place  $\hat{p} : C(L, M) \rightarrow \text{cl}(k_L, k_M) \cup \{\infty\}$  given by taking the composition

$$\hat{p} = p_0 \circ p_1 \circ \dots \circ p_{r-1} \circ p^* \circ p_v.$$

Let  $\hat{v}$  be the valuation over  $C(L, M)$  induced by  $\hat{p}$ , which is a refinement of the original valuation  $v$ . Because each of the places is the identity map on  $k_M$ , we may identify the valued field  $(M, v)$  with  $(M, \hat{v})$  and the valued groups  $\Gamma_{(M, v)}$  and  $\Gamma_{(M, \hat{v})}$ . So we now have two valuations  $v$  and  $\hat{v}$  induced over  $C(L, M)$ , and the construction ensures that the following conditions are satisfied:

- if  $x \in M$ , then  $v(x) = \hat{v}(x)$  and if  $x, y \in L$  and  $v(x) \leq v(y)$  then  $\hat{v}(x) \leq \hat{v}(y)$ ,
- and by Lemma 2.8 (2) for any  $x \in C(L, M)$  with  $v(x) > 0$  we have:

$$0 < \hat{v}\left(\frac{a_1}{e_1}\right) \ll \dots \ll \hat{v}\left(\frac{a_r}{e_r}\right) \ll \hat{v}(x).$$

Likewise, we can identify  $(L, v)$  and  $(L, \hat{v})$  and their valued groups, as all the places are the identity map as well over  $k_L$ . However, it is impossible to identify  $(M, v)$  and  $(M, \hat{v})$ , and  $(L, v)$  with  $(L, \hat{v})$  simultaneously. We should not identify  $(L, v)$  and  $(L, \hat{v})$ . For each  $i \leq r$ , let  $\eta_i = \hat{v}\left(\frac{a_i}{e_i}\right)$  and  $\hat{v}(e_i) = v(e_i) = \epsilon_i$ .

Let  $\Delta = \{\hat{v}(x), -\hat{v}(x) \mid x \in C(L, M), p_v(x) \notin \{0, \infty\} \text{ and } \hat{p}(x) = 0\} \cup \{0_{\Gamma_{(C(L, M), \hat{v})}}\}$ , by Lemma 2.8 (1)  $\Delta$  is a convex subgroup of  $\Gamma_{(C(L, M), \hat{v})}$ , that contains the subgroup generated by  $\{\eta_i \mid i \leq r\}$ . (Because for each  $i \leq r$ ,  $p_v\left(\frac{a_i}{e_i}\right) \notin \{0, \infty\}$  while  $\hat{p}\left(\frac{a_i}{e_i}\right) = 0$ ).

We continue to show that the refined valuation satisfies the independence conditions over the valued group and its residue field.

*Claim 1:*  $\Gamma_{(M, \hat{v})} \cap \Gamma_{(L, \hat{v})} = \Gamma_{(C, \hat{v})}$ .

Take an element  $m \in M$  and  $l \in L$  be such that  $\hat{v}(m) = \hat{v}(l)$ . By hypothesis  $\{v(a_i) \mid i \leq r\} \subseteq \Gamma_{(L, v)}$  and it is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent set over  $\Gamma_{(C, v)}$ , hence  $v(l)$  must belong to the pure hull of the subgroup generated by  $\{v(a_i) \mid i \leq r\}$  and  $\Gamma_{(C, v)}$ , thus we can find we can find  $p_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \gamma \in \Gamma_C$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}^{\geq 1}$  such that:

$$kv(l) = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i v(a_i) + \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i v(e_i) + \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i \epsilon_i + \gamma. \quad (5.1)$$

Because  $\Gamma_{(L, v)}$  and  $\Gamma_{(L, \hat{v})}$  are isomorphic,

$$k\hat{v}(l) = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i \hat{v}(a_i) + \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i \eta_i + \sum_{i=1}^r p_i \epsilon_i + \gamma. \quad (5.2)$$

Because  $\{v(a_i) \mid i \leq r\}$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent set over  $\Gamma_{(C, v)} = \Gamma_{(C, \hat{v})}$  and  $\{v(a_i) \mid i \leq r\} = \{v(e_i) \mid i \leq r\} \subseteq \Gamma_{(M, v)} = \Gamma_{(M, \hat{v})}$  then  $\{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_r\}$  is also a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent set over  $\Gamma_{(C, v)} \subset \Gamma_{(M, v)} = \Gamma_{(M, \hat{v})}$ . Thus we can extend it to a maximal set of elements in  $\Gamma_M$  which are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent set over  $\Gamma_C$ , say  $\{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_r\} \cup \{\mu_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \lambda\}$ . Hence, we can find indices  $\{\mu_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mu_{\alpha_t}\}$  such that

$$s\hat{v}(m) = \sum_{i=1}^r r_i \epsilon_i + \sum_{i=1}^t q_i \mu_{\alpha_i} + \gamma', \text{ where } r_i, q_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \gamma' \in \Gamma_C \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{N}^{\geq 1}.$$

Since  $\hat{v}(l) = \hat{v}(m)$ , we must have that  $s(k\hat{v}(l)) = k(s\hat{v}(m))$  thus:

$$\underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^r sp_i \eta_i}_{=\delta \in \Delta} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^r (sp_i - kr_i) \epsilon_i - \sum_{i=1}^t kq_i \mu_i + (s\gamma - k\gamma')}_{=\beta \in \Gamma_M} = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

Because the elements  $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_r\}$  are infinitesimal with respect to  $\Gamma_{(M, v)}^>0$ , the equation 5.3 is satisfied if and only if  $\delta = \sum_{i=1}^r sp_i \eta_i = 0$  and  $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^r (sp_i - kr_i) \epsilon_i - \sum_{i=1}^t kq_i \mu_i + (s\gamma - k\gamma') = 0$ . Since  $0 < \eta_1 \ll \eta_2 \ll \dots \ll \eta_r$ , then  $\sum_{i=1}^r sp_i \eta_i = 0$  if and only if  $p_i = 0$  for all  $i \leq r$ . Then,

$$-\sum_{i=1}^r kr_i \epsilon_i - \sum_{i=1}^t kq_i \mu_{\alpha_i} + (s\gamma - k\gamma') = 0$$

but the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear independence of  $\{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_r\} \cup \{\mu_{j_1}, \dots, \mu_{j_t}\}$  over  $\Gamma_C$  implies that  $r_i = 0$  for all  $i \leq r$  and  $q_i = 0$  for all  $i \leq t$ . Summarizing we have that  $k\hat{v}(l) = \gamma$  and  $s\hat{v}(m) = \gamma'$ , thus  $\gamma$  is  $k$ -divisible and  $\gamma'$  must be  $s$ -divisible. Hence:

$$\hat{v}(l) = \frac{\gamma}{k} = \frac{\gamma'}{s} = \hat{v}(m).$$

As  $C$  is a model of  $T$ ,  $\Gamma_C$  must be definably closed, thus  $\frac{\gamma}{k} = \frac{\gamma'}{s} \in \Gamma_C$ , as required.

*Claim 2:*  $k_{(M, \hat{v})}$  and  $k_{(L, \hat{v})}$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_{(C, \hat{v})}$ .

By hypothesis,  $\text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_L) \downarrow_{C\Gamma_L} \text{acl}_{ACVF}(k_M)$ , so  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  are algebraically independent over  $k_C$ . Because  $C$  is a model,  $k_C = \text{cl}(k_C)$  and since the residue field is of characteristic zero, it must be the case that  $k_C \leq k_L$  is a regular extension. By Fact 3.5,  $k_L$  and  $k_M$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ . Each of the places  $p^j$  and  $p^*$  are the identity map over  $k_M$  and  $k_L$ , so is their composition

$$p_0 \circ p_1 \circ \dots \circ p_{r-1} \circ p^* : k_{(C(L, M), v)} \rightarrow \text{cl}(k_M, k_L).$$

Because  $k_{(M, v)}$  and  $k_{(L, v)}$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_{(C, v)}$  then  $k_{(M, \hat{v})}$  and  $k_{(L, \hat{v})}$  must be linearly disjoint over  $k_{(C, \hat{v})} = k_{(C, v)}$ .  $\square$

*Step 3:* We find the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism  $\hat{\sigma}$  extending  $\sigma$  which is the identity on  $M$ .

By Step 1 there is some valuation  $\hat{v}$  over  $C(L, M)$  finer than  $v$  satisfying the following conditions:

- $\Gamma_{(M, \hat{v})} \cap \Gamma_{(L, \hat{v})} = \Gamma_{(C, \hat{v})}$ ,
- $k_{(M, \hat{v})}$  and  $k_{(L, \hat{v})}$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_{(C, \hat{v})}$ ,
- for any element  $x \in M$ , we have that  $v(x) = \hat{v}(x)$ .

Because  $C \subseteq M$ , then the valuations  $v$  and  $\hat{v}$  coincide over  $C$ . In particular  $(C, \hat{v})$  is maximal, so by Fact 2.4  $(M, \hat{v})$  has the separated basis property over  $C$ . By Proposition 3.1  $M$  has the separated basis property over  $(L, \hat{v})$ ,  $M$  and  $L$  are linearly disjoint over  $C$ , the valued group of  $\Gamma_{(C(L, M), \hat{v})}$  is the group generated by  $\Gamma_{(L, \hat{v})}$  and  $\Gamma_{(M, \hat{v})}$  over  $\Gamma_{(C, \hat{v})}$  and the residue field  $k_{(C(L, M), \hat{v})}$  is the field generated by  $k_{(L, \hat{v})}$  and  $k_{(M, \hat{v})}$  over  $k_{(C, \hat{v})}$ .

We consider the field  $C(\sigma(L), \sigma(M))$  with the valuation  $\hat{v}$  such that  $\sigma : (C(L, M), \hat{v}) \rightarrow (C(\sigma(L), \sigma(M)), \hat{v})$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism, which fixes  $k_M \subset \text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M \Gamma_L$  and  $\Gamma_M$  by Step 1. By Proposition 3.4, we can find an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism  $\tau : (C(L, M), \hat{v}) \rightarrow (C(\sigma(L), M), \hat{v})$  which is the identity on  $M$  and  $\tau \upharpoonright_{(L, \hat{v})} := (L, \hat{v}) \rightarrow (\sigma(L), \hat{v})$ .

We want to show that  $\tau : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(\sigma(L), M)$  induces as well an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism with the original valuation  $v$ . Let  $x \in C[L, M]$ , without loss of generality we may assume that  $x = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i m_i$  where  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  is a separated basis of  $\text{Vect}_L(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  according to the valuation  $\hat{v}$ , thus

$$\hat{v}(x) = \hat{v}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n l_i m_i\right) = \min\{\hat{v}(l_i m_i) \mid i \leq n\} = \hat{v}(m_j l_j).$$

As  $\tau : (C(L, M), \hat{v}) \rightarrow (C(\sigma(L), M), \hat{v})$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism,  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  is a separated basis of  $\text{Vect}_{\sigma(L)}(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  and

$$\hat{v}(\tau(x)) = \hat{v}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma(l_i) m_i\right) = \min\{\hat{v}(\sigma(l_i) m_i) \mid i \leq n\} = \hat{v}(\sigma(l_j) m_j) = \tau(\hat{v}(l_j m_j)).$$

By Lemma 2.8(3)  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  is also a separated basis of  $\text{Vect}_L(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  and  $\text{Vect}_{\sigma(L)}(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  with respect to the valuation  $v$ , and

$$v(x) = v(m_j l_j) = v(m_j) + v(l_j) = v(m_j) + \sigma(v(l_j)) = v(m_j) + v(\sigma(l_j)) = v(m_j \sigma(l_j)) = v(\tau(x)).$$

As  $x \in C[L, M]$  is an arbitrary element, we conclude that the valued group of  $C(L, M)$  and  $C(\sigma(L), M)$  according to the valuation  $v$  is  $\Gamma_M$  and  $\tau$  acts as the identity on  $\Gamma_M$ .

Hence  $\tau$  is also a  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism between the valued field structures  $(C(L, M), v)$  and  $(C(\sigma(L), M), v)$  which acts as the identity on  $M$  and coincides with  $\sigma$  on  $L$ . We want to extend the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}$ -isomorphism to a  $\mathcal{L}$ -isomorphism, thus we first want to extend the isomorphism by adding maps  $\tau_n : (\mathcal{A}_n)_{C(L, M)} \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}_n)_{C(\sigma(L), M)}$ .

Let  $a \in C(L, M)$  we say that  $\text{rv}(a)$  is *representable with parameters over  $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$*  if there are  $l_1, \dots, l_s \in L$  and  $m_1, \dots, m_s \in M$  such that  $\text{rv}(a) = \left( \sum_{i \leq s} \text{rv}(l_i) \text{rv}(m_i) \right)$  where for each  $i \leq s$ ,  $\text{rv}(m_i) \in \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$ .

*Claim:* For each  $x \in C[L, M]$  there are some  $\hat{m} \in M$  and  $a \in C(L, M)$  with  $v(a) = 0$  such that  $\text{rv}(x) = \text{rv}(a) \text{rv}(\hat{m})$  and  $\text{rv}(a)$  is representable with parameters over  $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$ . Furthermore,  $x = a\hat{m}$  and  $a = \sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i$  for some  $l_i \in L$  and  $m_i \in M$ , thus  $\tau(x) = \tau(a)\tau(\hat{m}) = \left( \sum_{i \leq n} \sigma(l_i) m_i \right) \hat{m}$ .

*Proof.* Fix an element  $x \in C[L, M]$ , and suppose  $x = \sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i$ . Take some  $\hat{m} \in M$  such that  $v(x) = v(\hat{m})$ . Because  $M$  has the separated basis property over  $L$  according to the valuation  $v$ ,  $v\left(\sum_{i \leq n} l_i m_i\right) = \min\{v(l_i m_i) \mid i \leq n\} = v(l_{i_0} m_{i_0})$ . As  $\Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_M$  there is some  $\hat{m} \in M$  such that  $v(l_{i_0} m_{i_0}) = v(\hat{m})$ . Let  $a = \frac{x}{\hat{m}} = \sum_{i \leq n} l_i \frac{m_i}{\hat{m}}$ , For each  $i \in I$ ,  $v\left(\frac{m_i}{\hat{m}}\right) = -v(l_i) = -\lambda_i \in \Gamma_L$ , thus  $\text{rv}\left(\frac{m_i}{\hat{m}}\right) \in \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$ . As a result,  $\text{rv}(a) = \sum_{i \in I} \text{rv}(l_i) \text{rv}\left(\frac{m_i}{\hat{m}}\right)$  where each  $\text{rv}\left(\frac{m_i}{\hat{m}}\right) \in \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$ . Summarizing, we have that  $x = a\hat{m}$ , so  $\text{rv}(x) = \text{rv}(a) \text{rv}(\hat{m})$  where  $\text{rv}(a)$  is representable with parameters over  $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$ . For the second part of the statement, we simply notice that  $\tau(a) = \frac{\tau(x)}{\tau(\hat{m})} = \sum_{i \leq n} \sigma(l_i) \frac{m_i}{\hat{m}}$ , as required.  $\square$

Thus, given  $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in C[L, M]$  we can find elements  $m_1, n_1, m_2, n_2 \in M$ ,  $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 \in \mathcal{O}_{C(L, M)}^\times$  such that  $x_1 = a_1 m_1, x_2 = a_2 m_2, y_1 = b_1 n_1$  and  $y_2 = b_2 n_2$ .

We argue that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $v\left(\frac{x_1}{x_2}\right), v\left(\frac{y_1}{y_2}\right) \in n\Gamma$  and  $\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{x_1}{x_2}\right)\right) = \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{y_1}{y_2}\right)\right)$  then  $\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{\tau(x_1)}{\tau(x_2)}\right)\right) = \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{\tau(y_1)}{\tau(y_2)}\right)\right)$ .

Note that:

$$\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{x_1}{x_2}\right)\right) = \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{y_1}{y_2}\right)\right) \text{ if and only if } \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{a_1 m_1}{b_1 n_1}\right)\right) = \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{a_2 m_2}{b_2 n_2}\right)\right),$$

$$\text{if and only if } \rho_n(\text{rv}(a_1))\rho_n(\text{rv}(b_1)^{-1})\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{m_1}{n_1}\right)\right) = \rho_n(\text{rv}(a_2))\rho_n(\text{rv}(b_2)^{-1})\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{m_2}{n_2}\right)\right),$$

where  $\text{rv}(a_1), \text{rv}(b_1), \text{rv}(a_2)$  and  $\text{rv}(b_2)$  are representable with parameters in  $\text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  and  $\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{m_1}{n_1}\right)\right), \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{m_2}{n_2}\right)\right) \in \mathcal{A}_M$ . In particular, the equality  $\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{x_1}{x_2}\right)\right) = \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{y_1}{y_2}\right)\right)$  can be represented by a formula satisfied by  $L$  using parameters in  $C \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L} \mathcal{A}_M$ . As  $\sigma : L \rightarrow L'$  is an elementary map fixing  $C \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M \mathcal{A}_M$ , the same formula must hold for  $\sigma(L)$ , thus  $\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{\tau(x_1)}{\tau(x_2)}\right)\right) = \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{\tau(y_1)}{\tau(y_2)}\right)\right)$ .

Hence, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can naturally define the map  $\tau_n : (\mathcal{A}_n)_{C(L, M)} \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}_n)_{C(\sigma(L), M)}$ , where for  $x, y \in C[L, M]$  we define  $\tau_n\left(\rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)\right)\right) : \rho_n\left(\text{rv}\left(\frac{\tau(x)}{\tau(y)}\right)\right)$ . Take  $\mathbf{t} = \tau \cup \{\tau_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , then  $\mathbf{t} : C(L, M) \rightarrow C(\sigma(L), M)$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_{RV}$ -isomorphism which satisfies the following conditions:

1.  $\mathbf{t} \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{A}_{C(L, M)}} : \mathcal{A}_{C(L, M)} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{C(\sigma(L), M)}$  is partial elementary map of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ . This follows by the Claim combined with the fact that  $\sigma : L \rightarrow L'$  is a partial elementary map fixing  $C \text{kInt}_{\Gamma_L}^M \mathcal{A}_M$ .
2.  $\mathbf{t} \upharpoonright_{\Gamma_{C(L, M)}} : \Gamma_{C(L, M)} \rightarrow \Gamma_{C(\sigma(L), M)}$  is partial elementary map of  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{C}}$ . In fact,  $\Gamma_{C(L, M)} = \Gamma_M = \Gamma_{C(\sigma(L), M)}$  and  $\mathbf{t}$  acts as the identity on the value group.

By the quantifier elimination relative to the residue sorts and the value group, the partial isomorphism  $\tau$  must be an elementary map. It coincides with  $\sigma$  over  $L$  and is the identity on  $M$ , so we conclude that  $\text{tp}(L/M) = \text{tp}(L'/M)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 5.10.** Let  $T$  be a complete extension of the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$  first order theory of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero and let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be its monster model. Let  $C \subseteq L \cap M$  be substructures of  $\mathfrak{C}$  and suppose that  $\text{dcl}(\Gamma_L) = \Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma_M$  and  $C$  is maximal. Then If  $\text{INT}_{\Gamma_L}^L \downarrow_{C\Gamma_L} \text{INT}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  then  $\text{tp}(L/CT_L \text{INT}_{\Gamma_L}^M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/M)$ .

*Proof.* The proof of the first statement follows by a very similar argument to that of Theorem 5.9. The only condition required to construct the refined valuation is the algebraic independence of  $\{\text{res}(\frac{a_i}{e_i}), \text{res}(b_j) \mid i \leq s, j \leq r\}$  over  $k_M$ ; this holds by Remark 5.8. The  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{val}}^*$  isomorphism found in Step 3 is already an elementary map by Theorem 2.13.  $\square$

We restate the result in terms of domination,

**Corollary 5.11.** *Let  $L$  be an elementary substructure of  $\mathfrak{C}$  and let  $C \subseteq L$  be a maximal model of  $T$ . Then the type  $\text{tp}(L/C)$  is dominated over its value group by the sorts internal to the residue field, that is for any field  $CT_L \subseteq M$  such that  $k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M \downarrow_{k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_C}^L} k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^L$  we have  $\text{tp}(L/CT_L k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/CT_L M)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $CT_L \subseteq M$  such that  $k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M \downarrow_{k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_C}^L} k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^L$ . We aim to prove that  $\text{tp}(L/CT_L k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M) \vdash \text{tp}(L/CT_L M)$ , this is given an elementary map  $\sigma : L \rightarrow L'$  fixing  $CT_L k\text{Int}_{\Gamma_L}^M$  we can find an automorphism  $\tau$  extending  $\sigma$  which is the identity on  $M$ . This is precisely the conclusion of Theorem 5.9.  $\square$

## 6 Construction of Resolutions

### 6.1 Weak opacity and the construction of resolutions

In this section we want to extend the domination results to imaginary elements for some classes of valued fields, more precisely for the class of henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed and whose value group is  $dp$ -minimal and satisfies the following property:

**Definition 6.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a non trivial  $dp$ -minimal ordered abelian group, we say that it satisfies the property (P) if given  $B \subseteq \Gamma$  a non-empty set of parameters such that  $B \neq \{0\}$  then  $\text{dcl}(B) \equiv \Gamma$ .*

We lift the domination results to imaginary elements through the construction of resolutions, originally introduced in [2, Chapter 11]. We replace the notion of opacity in [2] by weak opacity to construct resolutions. We follow closely their arguments, but we include all details for sake of completeness. Through this section we fix a complete first order theory  $T$  and we let  $T^{\text{eq}}$  be its imaginary extension. We denote as  $\mathfrak{C}$  the monster model of  $T$  and  $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$  its extension to the  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{eq}}$ -language.

**Definition 6.2.** 1. *Let  $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ , we say that a subset in the home sort  $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  is a pre-resolution of  $A$  if  $A \subseteq \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B)$ .*

2. *Let  $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ , we say that a subset in the home sort  $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  is a resolution of  $A$  if  $A \subseteq \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(B)$  and  $B$  is an algebraically closed subset in the home-sort.*

### 6.2 weak opacity

**Definition 6.3** (Splits). *Let  $E$  be a definable equivalence relation on a definable set  $D$ . Let  $Z$  be a definable subset of  $D$ , we say that  $Z$  splits an equivalence class of  $E$ , if we can find elements  $a, b \in D$  such that  $\models E(a, b)$ ,  $\text{tp}(a/\emptyset) = \text{tp}(b/\emptyset)$  and  $a \in Z$  while  $b \notin Z$ .*

**Definition 6.4** (Opaque equivalence relation). *Let  $E$  be a definable equivalence relation on a definable set  $D$ . We say that  $E$  is weakly opaque if for any definable set  $Z \subseteq D$ ,  $Z$  splits only finitely many equivalence classes of  $E$ .*

**Definition 6.5.** (Weakly opaque sequences, weakly opaquely layered imaginaries, and weakly opaquely layered equivalence relations)

1. *Let  $(a_0, \dots, a_{N-1})$  be a sequence of imaginary elements. We say that the sequence  $(a_0, \dots, a_{N-1})$  is a weakly opaque sequence over  $C$  if for any  $n \leq N-1$ ,  $a_n = b_n/E_n$  where  $E_n$  is a weakly opaque equivalence relation defined over  $A_n = C \cup \{a_j \mid j < n\}$ .*
2. *Let  $e$  be an imaginary element we say that  $e$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$  if there is a weakly opaque sequence  $(a_0, \dots, a_n)$  over  $C$  such that  $\text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(Ca_0, \dots, a_n) = \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(Ce)$ . In such case we say that the sequence  $(a_0, \dots, a_n)$  is a weakly opaque layering of  $e$  over  $C$ .*
3. *Let  $E$  be an equivalence relation on a definable set  $D$ . We say that  $E$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$  if  $E$  and  $D$  are both definable over  $C$  and every imaginary element  $e = b/E$  (where  $b \in D$ ) is weakly opaquely layered.*



### 6.3 The construction of resolutions

**Definition 6.6.** Let  $C$  be a set of parameters and  $a$  be a tuple. We say that the type  $\text{tp}(a/C)$  is relatively-isolated if there is some  $\mathcal{L}(C)$ -formula  $\phi(x) \in \text{tp}(a/C)$  such that  $\text{tp}(a/\emptyset) \cup \{\phi(x)\} \vdash \text{tp}(a/C)$ .

The following is a slight refinement of [2, Lemma 11.3].

**Lemma 6.7.** Let  $E$  be a  $C$ -definable equivalence relation on a definable set  $D$ . Assume that  $E$  is a weakly opaque and let  $a = b/E$  be a class of  $E$ . Then either the type  $\text{tp}(b/Ca)$  is relatively isolated by the formula  $\phi(y)$  stating that  $y/E = a$ , or  $a \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f : D \rightarrow D/E$  be the  $C$ -definable function such that  $f(y) = y/E$ . Suppose that the formula  $\{f(y) = a\} \cup \text{tp}(b/\emptyset) \not\vdash \text{tp}(b/Ca)$ . This means, that we can find an element  $d$  in the same  $E$ -class of  $b$ , such that  $\text{tp}(d/\emptyset) = \text{tp}(b/\emptyset)$  while  $\text{tp}(d/Ca) \neq \text{tp}(b/Ca)$ . Let  $\psi(y, a)$  be an  $\mathcal{L}(C)$ -formula such that  $\psi(y, a) \in \text{tp}(b/Ca)$  while  $\neg\psi(y, a) \in \text{tp}(d/Ca)$ . Consider the  $C$ -definable set:

$$Z(y, w) := \psi(y, f(y)) \wedge \neg\psi(w, f(w)) \wedge f(y) = f(w).$$

We claim that  $a \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$ . We suppose by contradiction that  $a \notin \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$ . Thus we can find a non-constant  $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$ -indiscernible sequence  $\langle a_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$  such that  $a_0 = a$ . We let  $\sigma_i$  be an automorphism fixing  $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$  sending  $a$  to  $a_i$ , and we let  $b_i = \sigma_i(b)$  and  $d_i = \sigma_i(d)$ , thus  $\text{tp}(d_i/\emptyset) = \text{tp}(b_i/\emptyset)$  and  $\models Z(b_i, d_i)$ . This contradicts that  $E$  is weakly opaque, as infinitely many classes are split by  $Z$ . Consequently,  $a \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$ .  $\square$

**Fact 6.8.** For any first-order structure  $M$ , set of parameters  $C$  in  $M$  and  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$  tuples, if  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/C\bar{b})$  and  $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/C)$  are relatively isolated then  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/C)$  is also relatively isolated.

*Proof.* As  $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/C)$  is relatively isolated there is some  $\mathcal{L}(C)$ -formula  $\phi(x)$  such that  $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/\emptyset) \cup \{\phi(x)\} \vdash \text{tp}(\bar{b}/C)$ . Because  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/C\bar{b})$  is relatively isolated we can find an  $\mathcal{L}(C)$ -formula such that  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/\emptyset) \cup \{\theta(y, \bar{b})\} \vdash \text{tp}(\bar{a}/C\bar{b})$ . Let  $\psi(y, x) = \theta(y, x) \wedge \phi(x)$ , then  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}/\emptyset) \cup \{\psi(y, x)\} \vdash \text{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/C)$ , as required.  $\square$

**Fact 6.9.** Suppose that  $\bar{a}$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$  and  $\bar{b}$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C\bar{a}$ , then  $\bar{a}\bar{b}$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ .

*Proof.* Weakly opaque layering of  $\bar{a}\bar{b}$  over  $C$  may be witnessed by a concatenation of a sequence witnessing the weakly opaque layering of  $\bar{a}$  over  $C$ , and a sequence witnessing the weakly opaque layering of  $\bar{b}$  over  $C\bar{a}$ .  $\square$

The following statement follows ideas of [2, Lemma 11.4], which shows how to construct pre-resolutions.

**Lemma 6.10.** Let  $(a_0, \dots, a_{N-1})$  be a weakly opaque sequence over  $C$ . Let  $A_n = C \cup \{a_j \mid j < n\}$ , and express  $a_n$  as  $a_n = b_n/E_n$  where  $E_n$  is a weakly opaque equivalence relation definable over  $A_n$ . Define recursively a sequence  $\langle B_n \mid 0 \leq n \leq N \rangle$  of subsets of  $\{b_0, \dots, b_{N-1}\}$  in the following way:

- $B_N = \emptyset$ ,
- $B_{n-1} = B_n \cup \{b_{n-1}\}$  if  $a_n \notin \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A_n \cup B_n)$ ,
- $B_{n-1} = B_n$  if  $a_n \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A_n \cup B_n)$ .

Then:

1.  $\{a_0, \dots, a_{N-1}\} \subseteq \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B_0 \cup C)$ ,
2.  $\text{tp}(B_0/C(a_0, \dots, a_{N-1}))$  is relatively isolated.

*Proof.* We start by proving the following claim, to show that  $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B_0C)$  is a pre-resolution of  $C(a_0, \dots, a_{N-1})$ . *Claim:* for each  $k \leq N-1$ , we have that for all  $n \geq k$ ,  $a_n \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B_k \cup A_k)$  and if  $b_k \in B_k$  then  $\text{tp}(b_k/A_k \cup \{a_k\} \cup (B_k \setminus \{b_k\}))$  is relatively isolated.

We proceed by inducting over  $k$ . Let  $k = N-1$ , then one of the following cases happened:

- either  $a_{N-1} \notin \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A_{N-1})$ , then  $B_{N-1} = \{b_{N-1}\}$  so  $a_{N-1} \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(B_{N-1} \cup A_{N-1}) \subseteq \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A_{N-1} \cup \{b_{N-1}\})$ . By Lemma ??,  $\text{tp}(b_{N-1}/A_{N-1} \cup \{a_{N-1}\}) = \text{tp}(b_{N-1}/C(a_0, \dots, a_{N-1}))$  is relatively isolated.

- $a_{N-1} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{N-1})$ , then  $B_{N-1} = \emptyset$ , and clearly  $a_{N-1} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{N-1} \cup B_{N-1})$ .

Let  $0 < k \leq N-1$  and assume that for any  $n \geq k$ , we have that  $a_n \in \text{acl}^{eq}(B_k \cup A_k)$  and if  $b_n \in B_n$  then  $\text{tp}(b_n/A_n \cup \{a_n\} \cup (B_n \setminus \{b_n\}))$  is relatively isolated. We would like now to show the statement for  $k-1$ , we proceed by cases according to the construction.

- Assume that  $a_{k-1} \notin \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_k)$  then  $B_{k-1} = B_k \cup \{b_{k-1}\}$ , thus  $a_{k-1} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_{k-1})$ . We first show the first part of the statement and we fix an element  $n \geq k$ . By the induction hypothesis  $a_n \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_k \cup B_k) \subseteq \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup \{a_{k-1}\} \cup B_{k-1}) \subseteq \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_{k-1})$ , because  $B_k \subseteq B_{k-1}$  and  $a_{k-1} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_{k-1})$ . The second part of the statement follows by Lemma 6.7, Fact 6.8 and the induction hypothesis.
- Suppose that  $a_{k-1} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_k)$ , then  $B_{k-1} = B_k$ . So for each  $n \geq k$ , we have that  $a_n \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_k \cup B_k) = \text{acl}^{eq}(A_k \cup B_{k-1})$ . Since  $A_k = A_{k-1} \cup \{a_{k-1}\}$  and  $a_{k-1} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_k) = \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_{k-1})$ , then  $a_n \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A_{k-1} \cup B_{k-1})$ . The second part of the statement in this case is vacuous since no extra element was added.

At the end we obtain for  $k=0$  that  $\{a_0, \dots, a_{N-1}\} \subseteq \text{acl}^{eq}(B_0 \cup A_0) = \text{acl}^{eq}(B_0 \cup C)$ . Moreover,  $\text{tp}(B_0/C(a_0, \dots, a_{N-1}))$  is relatively isolated by Fact 6.8 and the second part of the Claim. □

The following statement corresponds to [2, Corollary 11.9], we recall its proof for sake of completeness.

**Proposition 6.11.** *Let  $T$  be a first order theory and  $\mathfrak{C}$  be its monster model. Suppose that algebraically closed sets in  $\mathfrak{C}$  are models of  $T$  and  $\mathfrak{C}$  admits elimination of finite sets in the home-sort (i.e. any finite set in  $\mathfrak{C}$  can be coded by a tuple in  $\mathfrak{C}$ ). Let  $C \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  and  $\bar{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{N-1}) \in \mathfrak{C}^{eq}$  be a tuple of imaginaries weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ . Then we can find a set  $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$  satisfying the following two conditions:*

1.  $C\bar{a} \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(B)$ ,
2. and  $\text{tp}(B/C\bar{a})$  is relatively isolated.

*Proof.* Let  $B_0$  be the subset of representatives given by Lemma 6.10 such that  $\bar{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{N-1}) \in \text{acl}^{eq}(B_0 C)$ . Let  $D = B_0 \cup C$ , by the hypothesis  $\text{acl}^{eq}(D) \models T$ . Thus, we can find a sequence of representatives  $\bar{b} = (b_0, \dots, b_{N-1})$  such that  $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(D)$  and  $\bar{a} \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(C\bar{b})$  (as we can always find representatives in any model). By Lemma 6.10,  $\text{tp}(D/C\bar{a})$  is relatively isolated.

*Claim:* there is a tuple  $\bar{b}' \in \text{acl}(D) = \text{acl}^{eq}(D) \cap \mathfrak{C}$  such that:

1.  $\bar{a} \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(D\bar{b}')$  and  $\bar{b}' \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(D\bar{a})$  (i.e.  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}'$  are interdefinable over  $D$ ),
2.  $\text{tp}(D\bar{b}'/C\bar{a})$  is relatively isolated.

Because  $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}^{eq}(D)$  then its orbit  $X$  over  $D\bar{a}$  is finite (and clearly contained in the home-sort). Because the home-sort codes finite sets, there is some tuple  $\bar{b}'$  which is a code of  $X$ . Then  $\bar{b}' \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(D\bar{a})$  and  $\bar{a} \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(D\bar{b}')$  (i.e. both tuples are inter-definable over  $D$ ) and  $\bar{b}' \in \text{acl}(D)$ . Since  $\bar{b}' \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(D\bar{a})$  and  $\text{tp}(D/C\bar{a})$  is relatively isolated,  $\text{tp}(D\bar{b}'/C\bar{a})$  is also relatively isolated. Take  $B = D\bar{b}'$ , then  $B$  satisfies the required conditions. □

## 6.4 Weakly opaquely layered groups

In this subsection we study some results of weakly opaquely layered groups, which play a fundamental role in the construction of resolutions in value fields of equicharacteristic zero, residue field algebraically closed and  $dp$ -minimal value group. In fact, elimination of imaginaries reduces the study of imaginaries in the quotient groups  $B_n(K)/\text{Stab}_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$ , and such quotients can be easily shown to be weakly opaquely by the results that we will present in this section.

**Definition 6.12** (weakly opaquely and weakly opaquely layered groups). *Let  $G$  be a definable group and  $H$  be a definable subgroup of  $G$ . We define the canonical equivalence  $E_H$  relation on  $G$  as:*

$$E_H(g_1, g_2) \text{ if and only if } g_1H = g_2H.$$

*Then we say that:*

1.  $G/H$  is weakly opaquely over  $C$  if the equivalence relation  $E_H$  is opaque over  $C$ .
2.  $G/H$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$  if the equivalence relation  $E_H$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ .

**Fact 6.13.** *Let  $D$  be a  $C$ -definable set and assume that  $E(x, y)$  is a  $C$ -definable relation, and let  $f := D \rightarrow f(D)$  be a  $Cd$ -definable bijection. Let  $f(E)$  be the  $Cd$ -definable relation over  $f(D)$  defined as  $E(f(x), f(y))$  if and only if  $E(x, y)$ . If  $E$  is a weakly opaquely equivalence relation, then  $f(E)$  is weakly opaquely.*

*Proof.* Suppose by contradiction that  $f(E)$  is not weakly opaquely. Then there is some definable set  $Z \subseteq f(D)$  which splits infinitely many classes of  $f(E)$ , then  $f^{-1}(Z)$  is a definable set of  $D$  which splits infinitely many classes of  $E$ , this contradicts the fact that  $E$  is a weakly opaquely relation on  $D$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.14.** *Let  $D$  be a  $C$ -definable set and let  $S$  be a  $C$ -definable equivalence relation. Let  $f : D \rightarrow f(D)$  be a  $Cd$ -definable bijection. If  $D/S$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$  then  $f(D)/f(S)$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $Cd$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $b \in D$  and  $e = b/S$ . By hypothesis, there is a weakly opaquely sequence  $\bar{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_n)$  over  $C$  such that  $\text{dcl}^{eq}(e, C) = \text{dcl}^{eq}(\bar{a}, C)$ . Let  $b_i$  be such that  $a_i = b_i/E_i$ , where  $E_i$  is a weakly opaquely equivalence relation defined over  $C \cup \{a_j \mid j < i\}$ . We now define  $f(a_i) = f(b_i)/f(E_i)$ , where  $f(E_i)$  is a weakly opaquely equivalence relation defined over  $Cd \cup \{f(a_j) \mid j < i\}$ . We now claim that the sequence  $(f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n))$  is a weakly opaquely layering of  $f(e) = f(b)/f(E)$  over  $Cd$ , for this it is enough to show that  $\text{dcl}^{eq}(f(e), Cd) = \text{dcl}^{eq}(f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n), Cd)$ , this will follow by interdefinability of the tuples, but we present more details below.

We first show that  $\text{dcl}^{eq}(f(e), Cd) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n), Cd)$ . By hypothesis  $e \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(C, a_0, \dots, a_n)$ , then  $eCd \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, a_0, \dots, a_n)$ , thus  $f(e) \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(eCd) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, a_0, \dots, a_n)$ . In particular  $\text{dcl}^{eq}(f(e)Cd) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, a_0, \dots, a_n)$ . Since  $\{a_0, \dots, a_n\} \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n))$  we therefore conclude that  $\text{dcl}^{eq}(f(e)Cd) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n))$ .

On the other hand,  $(a_0, \dots, a_n) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(C, e)$ , thus  $(f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n)) \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, a_0, \dots, a_n) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, e)$ . Hence,  $\text{dcl}^{eq}(f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n), Cd) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, e)$ . because  $e \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, f(e))$ . We conclude that  $\text{dcl}^{eq}(f(a_0), \dots, f(a_n), Cd) \subseteq \text{dcl}^{eq}(Cd, f(e))$ , as required.  $\square$

**Notation 6.15.** *Let  $G$  be a group and  $F$  a subgroup of  $G$ . Fix an element  $h \in G$ , we denote as  $F^h = hFh^{-1}$ .*

**Lemma 6.16.** *Let  $G$  be a definable group and  $N, F$  and  $H$   $C$ -definable subgroups. Suppose that*

1.  $N$  is normal,
2.  $N \cap H = \{1\}$ ,
3.  $NH = G$ ,
4. Defining  $N_F = N \cap F$  and  $H_F = H \cap F$  then  $N_F H_F = F$ .

*We assume as well that*

1. the coset space  $H/H_F$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ , and
2. for each  $h \in H$ ,  $N/(N \cap F)^h$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C \cup \{^h h H_F^{-1}\}$ ,

*then the quotient group  $G/F$  is weakly opaquely layered.*

*Proof.* The proof is exactly as in [2, Lemma 11.10], replacing opaqueness by weakly opaqueness.  $\square$

The following corresponds to [2, Corollary 11.11].

**Corollary 6.17.** *Let  $\{1\} \triangleleft G_0 \triangleleft G_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft G_n = G$  be a sequence of  $C$ -definable groups and let  $F$  be a  $C$ -definable subgroup of  $G$ . Assume that:*

1. *for each  $i < n$ , there is a subgroup  $H_i \leq G_{i+1}$  such that  $G_{i+1} = G_i H_i$  and  $H_i \cap G_i = \{1\}$ ,*
2. *for all  $i < n$ ,  $(G_{i+1} \cap F) = (G_i \cap F)(H_i \cap F)$ ,*
3.  *$H_i/(H_i \cap F)$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ .*

*Then  $G/F$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $n$ , that is the length of the sequence. The statement is trivial for  $n = 0$ . Let  $G_0 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft G_n \triangleleft G_{n+1} = G$  and  $F$  be a  $C$ -definable subgroups of  $G$ , satisfying the conditions (1), (2) and (3) of the hypothesis. By the inductive hypothesis  $G_n/(F \cap G_n)$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ . Given an  $h \in H_n$  we consider the definable bijection:

$$\begin{aligned} f_h : G_n &\rightarrow G_n \\ g &\mapsto hgh^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and  $f_h(F \cap G_n) = h(F \cap G_n)h^{-1} = G_n \cap hFh^{-1} = G_n \cap F^h$ . By Proposition 6.14,  $G_n/(G_n \cap F^h)$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $Ch$ . As  $H_n/(H_n \cap F)$  is weakly opaquely layered, by Lemma 6.16 we have that  $G_{n+1}/F$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ , as required.  $\square$

The following corresponds to [2, Lemma 11.12], we present a refined version to make more clear which is the decomposition needed to gain the weakly opaqueness of the quotient groups  $B_n(K)/\text{Stab}_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$ , by using the solvability of the upper triangular matrices. We would like to keep our notation as explicit as possible (and describe precisely each of the groups that appear in this chain), thus we start by introducing some notation.

- Notation 6.18.**
1. *For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $B_m(K)$  is the group of  $m \times m$ -upper triangular, invertible matrices.*
  2. *For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $T_m(K)$  is the set of  $m \times m$ -strictly upper triangular matrices. This is  $T_m(K) = \{(a_{i,j}) \in M_{m \times m}(K) \mid a_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for } i \geq j\}$*
  3. *For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $U_m(K)$  is the group of  $m \times m$ -upper triangular matrices which are invertible and whose  $(i, i)$ -entry is 1 for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .*
  4. *For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $D_m(K)$  is the group of  $m \times m$ -diagonal, invertible matrices.*

**Lemma 6.19.** *Let  $K$  be a field,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $N = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} i$ . Then there are sequences of linear algebraic groups  $I_n = G_0 \triangleleft G_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft G_N = B_n(K)$  and of linear algebraic subgroups  $H_i \leq G_{i+1}$  such that we have:*

1.  $G_{i+1}(K) = G_i(K)H_i(K)$ ,
2.  $G_i(K) \cap H_i(K) = \{I_n\}$ ,
3.  $H_i(K)$  is isomorphic either to  $(K, +)$  or  $(K^\times, \cdot)$ ,
4.  $G_i(k)$  is a normal subgroup of  $G_{i+1}(K)$ ,
5.  $G_0 = \{I_n\}$  and  $G_N(K) = B_n(K)$ .

*Proof.* Step 1: Let  $G_N = B_n(K)$ , will first run through the diagonal making each of the entries equal to 1. Consider the subgroups

$$\begin{aligned} G_{N-1} &:= \{(a_{i,j}) \in B_n(K) \mid a_{11} = 1\} \text{ and} \\ H_{N-1} &:= \{(a_{i,j}) \in B_n(K) \mid (a_{i,j}) = 0 \text{ if } 1 < i < j \leq n, a_{1,1} \in K^\times \text{ and } a_{i,i} = 1 \text{ for any } 2 \leq i \leq n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\rho_{N-1} := \begin{cases} B_n(K) & \rightarrow H_{N-1} \\ (a_{i,j}) & \mapsto (b_{i,j}) \end{cases}$  be the homomorphism defined as  $b_{1,1} = a_{1,1}$ ,  $b_{i,j} = 0$  for any index  $1 < i < j \leq n$  and  $b_{i,i} = 1$  for any  $2 \leq i \leq n$ . This homomorphism is the identity in  $H_{N-1}$  and its kernel is  $G_{N-1}$ . In other words, the exact sequence:

$$1 \rightarrow G_{N-1} \rightarrow B_n(K) \rightarrow H_{N-1} \rightarrow 1,$$

splits. Thus  $B_{n-1}(K) = G_N = G_{N-1}H_{N-1}$ ,  $G_{N-1} \cap H_{N-1} = \{I_n\}$  and  $G_{N-1} \triangleleft G_N$ .

We will now keep restricting into subgroups where the entries in the diagonal entry are 1 following the same idea presented above. More generally, for  $2 \leq k \leq n$  let:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{N-k} &:= \{(a_{i,j}) \in B_n(K) \mid (a_{i,i}) = 1 \text{ for any } 1 \leq i \leq k\}, \\ H_{N-k} &:= \{(a_{i,j}) \in B_n(K) \mid (a_{i,j}) = 0 \text{ if } 1 < i < j \leq n, a_{k,k} \in K^\times \text{ and } a_{i,i} = 1 \text{ for any } i \leq k, 1 \leq i \leq n\}. \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily shown that for any  $1 \leq k \leq N$ , then  $G_{N-k}, H_{N-k} \leq G_{N-k+1}$ . And we can define the homomorphism:  $\rho_{N-k} := \begin{cases} G_{N-k+1} & \rightarrow H_{N-k} \\ (a_{i,j}) & \mapsto (b_{i,j}) \end{cases}$  where where  $b_{k,k} = a_{k,k}$ ,  $b_{i,j} = 0$  for any index  $1 < i < j \leq n$  and  $b_{i,i} = 1$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $i \neq k$ . Such homomorphism is the identity on  $H_{N-k}$  and its kernel is precisely  $G_{N-k}$ . Meaning that the following exact sequence splits:

$$1 \rightarrow G_{N-k} \rightarrow G_{N-k+1} \rightarrow H_{N-k} \rightarrow 1.$$

We conclude therefore that  $G_{N-k+1} = G_{N-k}H_{N-k}$  and  $G_{N-k} \cap H_{N-k} = I_n$  and  $G_{N-k} \triangleleft G_{N-k+1}$ .

Secondly, for each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , we can define:  $\tau_k := \begin{cases} H_{N-k} & \rightarrow (K, \cdot) \\ (a_{i,j}) & \mapsto a_{k,k}, \end{cases}$  which is a group isomorphism.

Note that  $G_N = B_n(K)$  and  $G_{N-n} = U_n(K)$ .

*Step 2: We will construct a sequence of subgroups of  $U_n(K)$  to make the  $(i,j)$ -entry equal to zero for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ .*

Let  $l = \binom{n}{2}$ . We fix an enumeration  $\{v_1, \dots, v_l\}$  of the pairs  $\{(i,j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$  as follows:

- for  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ ,  $v_k = (1, n-k+1)$ ,
- for  $1 \leq k \leq n-2$ ,  $v_{(n-1)+k} = (2, n-k+1)$ ,
- $\vdots$
- $v_l = (n-1, n)$ .

Let  $X_m = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  and define  $J_m := \{A \in T_n(K) \mid \text{if } A(v) \neq 0 \rightarrow v \in X_m\}$ , where  $A(v)$  denotes the  $v$ -th entry of the matrix.

We define

$$N_m := \{I_n + A \mid A \in J_m\},$$

where  $I_n$  is the identity matrix. Note that  $N_l = U_n(K)$ . Define as well:

$$\begin{aligned} S_m &:= \{A \in T_n(K) \mid \text{if } A(v) \neq 0 \rightarrow v = v_m\}, \\ H_{m-1}^* &:= \{I_n + A \mid A \in S_m\}. \end{aligned}$$

For each  $m \leq l$  we have then that  $H_{m-1}^*, N_{m-1} \leq N_m$  and we can define the homomorphism that forgets all the coordinates except for the  $v_m$ -entry, this is:

$$\phi_m := \begin{cases} N_m & \rightarrow H_{m-1}^* \\ (a_{i,j}) & \mapsto (b_{i,j}) \end{cases},$$

where  $b_{i,i} = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $b_{i,j} = 0$  if  $i \neq j$  and  $(i,j) \neq v_m$  and  $b_{i,j} = a_{i,j}$  if  $(i,j) = v_m$ . The kernel of this map is  $N_{m-1}$  and it is the identity on  $H_{m-1}^*$ , we therefore have the exact splitting sequence:

$$1 \rightarrow N_{m-1} \rightarrow N_m \rightarrow H_{m-1}^* \rightarrow 1.$$

In particular,  $N_{m-1} \triangleleft N_m$ ,  $N_m = N_{m-1}H_{m-1}^*$  and  $H_{m-1} \cap N_{m-1} = \{I_n\}$ . Secondly, consider the isomorphism,

$$\psi_m := \begin{cases} H_m^* & \rightarrow (K, +) \\ (a_{i,j}) & \mapsto a_{v_m}, \end{cases}$$

and reindex the previous construction to conclude. That is, for each  $m \leq l$  take  $G_{N-n-(l-m)} = N_m$  and  $H_{N-n-(l-m)} = H_m^*$ .  $\square$

## 6.5 The construction of resolutions for some henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero

In this subsection, we construct resolutions for some value fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed and  $dp$ -minimal value group.

**Proposition 6.20.** *Let  $K$  be a value field with residue field algebraically closed and  $dp$ -minimal value group. Let  $\Delta \in RJ(\Gamma)$  be a convex subgroup, we denote by  $\mathcal{O}_\Delta$  the valuation ring associated to the coarsened valuation  $v_\Delta : K \rightarrow \Gamma/\Delta$ . Then:*

1. For each  $\Delta \in RJ(\Gamma)$ ,  $K^\times/\mathcal{O}_\Delta^\times$  (isomorphic to  $\Gamma/\Delta$ ) under multiplication is weak opaque and,
2. for each  $J \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $b \in K$  the group  $K/bJ$  under addition is weak opaque.

*Proof.* 1. Let  $X \subseteq K$  be a 1-definable set. By Corollary 2.33 there is a finite decomposition  $X = \bigcup_{i \leq m} T_i$  into nice sets. We aim to show that each such definable set  $X$  splits only finitely many classes of  $K^\times/\mathcal{O}_\Delta^\times$ . Given  $\gamma \in \Gamma_\Delta = \Gamma/\Delta_\Delta$  we denote the class in  $K^\times$  as  $\hat{\gamma} = \{y \in K^\times \mid v_\Delta(y) = \gamma\}$ . For each  $i \leq n$ ,  $T_i = S_i \wedge C_i$  where  $C_i$  is defined by a finite conjunction of basic positive congruence formulas, while  $S_i$  defines a generalized swiss cheese, say of the form  $A_i \setminus (B_i^1 \cup \dots \cup B_i^{k_i})$ .

**Fact:**

Let  $U = a + bI$  be a 1-torsor for some  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $S_I = \{v(x) \mid x \in I\} \subseteq \Gamma$ . Let  $\gamma \in \Gamma_\Delta$ , then exactly one of the following holds:

- (a) If  $v(a) \notin v(b) + S_I$ , then for any  $x \in U$ ,  $v(x) = v((x-a) + a) = v(a)$ . Thus if  $\rho_\Delta(v(a)) = v_\Delta(a) < \gamma$  or  $v_\Delta(a) > \gamma$ , then  $U \cap \hat{\gamma} = \emptyset$ . If it is the case that  $v_\Delta(a) = \gamma$  then  $U \subseteq \hat{\gamma}$ .
- (b) If  $v(a) \in v(b) + S_I$ , then  $0 \in U$  and  $U = bI$ . In this case, if  $\gamma \notin \rho_\Delta(v(b) + S_I)$  then  $\hat{\gamma} \cap U = \emptyset$ . If  $\gamma \in \rho_\Delta(v(b) + S_I)$  then either  $\hat{\gamma} \subseteq U$  or  $\hat{\gamma}$  is the unique class such that  $\hat{\gamma} \cap U \neq \emptyset$  and  $\hat{\gamma} \cap K \setminus U = \emptyset$ .

We now want to show that each nice set  $T_i$  splits only finitely many cosets of  $\mathcal{O}_\Delta^\times$  in  $K^\times$ . Fix an element  $\gamma \in \Gamma_\Delta$  such that  $\hat{\gamma} \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$ . If the first case of the Fact occurs, then  $A_i \subseteq \hat{\gamma}$ . Hence,  $\hat{\gamma}$  is the unique equivalence class that is not disjoint from  $A_i$ . In this case, it is clear that the nice set  $T_i$  could only split the class  $\hat{\gamma}$ .

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $A_i = bI$ . By the Fact for any  $\gamma \in \rho_j(v(b) + S_I)$  either  $\hat{\gamma} \subseteq A_i$  or  $\hat{\gamma}$  is the unique class split by  $A_i$ .

*Claim:* There are finitely many  $\beta \in \Gamma_\Delta = \Gamma/\Delta$  such that  $\hat{\beta} \subseteq A_i$  and  $T_i$  splits the class  $\hat{\beta}$ .

Fix an index  $0 \leq j \leq k_i$  and let  $\beta \in \Gamma_\Delta$  be such that  $\hat{\beta} \cap B_j^i \neq \emptyset$ . By the Fact exactly one of the following cases holds:

- (a)  $\hat{\beta}$  is the unique class such that  $B_j^i \subseteq \hat{\beta}$ ,
- (b)  $B_j^i$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -submodule of  $K$  and  $B_j^i$  can only split the class  $\hat{\beta}$  or
- (c)  $B_j^i$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -submodule of  $K$  and  $\hat{\beta} \subseteq B_j^i$ .

Given  $\beta \in \Gamma_\Delta = \Gamma/\Delta$  such that  $\hat{\beta} \subseteq A_i$  the equivalence class  $\hat{\beta}$  could be split by the generalized swiss cheese  $A_i \setminus (B_i^1 \cup \dots \cup B_i^{k_i})$  only if for some  $1 \leq j \leq k_i$  such that either the first or the second case in 1 occurs. As there are finitely many sub-torsors  $B_j^i$ , the generalized swiss cheese  $S_i$  could split only finitely many classes contained in  $A_i$ .



We have thus reduced to proving that for at most finitely many  $\beta \in \Gamma_\Delta = \Gamma/\Delta$ 's, such that  $\hat{\beta} \subseteq A_i$  and  $\hat{\beta} \cap B_i^j = \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k_i$  does the set  $T_i$  split this class. Consequently, it is sufficient to show that each of the basic positive congruence formula in  $C_i$  splits at most one equivalence class of  $K^\times/\mathcal{O}_\Delta^\times$ .

Without loss of generality we may assume that our basic congruence formula is of the form  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$ , where  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $d \in \Omega_{\Delta'}^n$ . We first suppose that  $\Delta \subseteq \Delta'$  and we recall that for any  $x \in K^\times$ ,  $v_{\Delta'}(x) = \phi_{\Delta, \Delta'} \circ v_\Delta(x)$ , where  $\phi_{\Delta, \Delta'} := \Gamma/\Delta \rightarrow \Gamma/\Delta'$  is the map sending the coset  $\gamma + \Delta$  to the coset  $\gamma + \Delta'$ .

Let  $\delta = v_\Delta(\alpha)$ , we will show that the basic congruence formula  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  can only split the class  $\hat{\delta}$ . Let  $\beta \in \Gamma_\Delta$  and let  $x \in K^\times$  be such that  $v_\Delta(x) = \beta$ . Then:

- if  $\beta < \delta$ , then  $v_\Delta(x - \alpha) = v_\Delta(x) = \beta$ , thus  $v_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) = \phi_{\Delta, \Delta'}(\beta)$ . In particular, for any  $x \in \hat{\beta}$ , we must have that  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  if and only if  $z\phi_{\Delta, \Delta'}(\beta) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  if and only if  $\phi_{\Delta, \Delta'}(\beta) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma_{\Delta'})$ , where  $\Gamma_{\Delta'} = \Gamma/\Delta'$ . Consequently, the class  $\hat{\beta}$  is either contained in or disjoint from the set of realizations of the basic congruence formula.
- if  $\beta > \delta$ , then  $v_\Delta(x - \alpha) = v_\Delta(\alpha) = \delta$ . As a result  $v_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) = \phi_{\Delta, \Delta'}(\delta)$ . As in the previous case, for any  $x \in K^\times$  such that  $v_\Delta(x) = \beta$  we must have that  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  if and only if  $z\phi_{\Delta, \Delta'}(\delta) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$ . Therefore, the class  $\hat{\beta}$  is either contained or disjoint from the set of realizations of the basic congruence formula.

We conclude that the basic congruence formula can only split the equivalence class  $\hat{\delta} = \{x \in K \mid v_\Delta(x) = v_\Delta(\alpha) = \delta\}$ .

We suppose now that  $\Delta' \subseteq \Delta$ . We want to show that the basic congruence formula  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  can only split the class  $\hat{\delta}$ , where  $\delta = v_\Delta(\alpha)$ . We let  $\beta \in \Gamma_\Delta = \Gamma/\Delta$  and we take an element  $x \in \hat{\beta}$ . Then:

- If  $\beta < \delta$ , we have that  $\beta = v(x) + \Delta < v(\alpha) + \Delta = \delta$ . In particular,  $v(x) < v(\alpha)$  and  $v(x)$  and  $v(\alpha)$  lie in different  $\Delta$ -cosets. Hence, they also lie in different  $\Delta'$  cosets, and  $v_{\Delta'}(x) = v(x) + \Delta' < v(\alpha) + \Delta'$ . Consequently,  $v_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) = v_{\Delta'}(x)$  for any  $x \in \hat{\beta}$ , thus  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  if and only if  $zv_{\Delta'}(x) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$ . We have shown that the basic congruence formula is equivalent to a quantifier free formula over the empty set over  $\hat{\beta}$ , so it cannot split the class  $\hat{\beta}$ .
- if  $\beta > \delta$  we have that  $\beta = v(x) + \Delta > v(\alpha) + \Delta = \delta$ . In particular,  $v(x) > v(\alpha)$  and  $v(x)$  and  $v(\alpha)$  lie in different  $\Delta$ -cosets. Hence, they also lie in different  $\Delta'$  cosets, and  $v_{\Delta'}(x) = v(x) + \Delta' > v(\alpha) + \Delta'$ . Consequently,  $v_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) = v_{\Delta'}(\alpha)$ , so for any  $x \in \hat{\beta}$ :  
 $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  if and only if  $zv_{\Delta'}(\alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$ .  
As a result, if  $v_{\Delta'}(\alpha)$  satisfies the desired congruence restriction, then  $\hat{\beta}$  is contained in the set of realization of the basic congruence formula. Otherwise,  $\hat{\beta}$  is disjoint in the set of realizations of the congruence formula and therefore it is also disjoint from  $T_i$ .

We conclude that the basic congruence formula  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - \alpha) - \rho_{\Delta'}(d) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  can split at most the class  $\hat{\delta}$ , where  $\delta = v_\Delta(\alpha)$ .

2. Let  $J \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $b \in K$  we want to show that  $K/bJ$  is weak opaque.

Let  $X \subseteq K$  be a definable set in 1 variable, by Corollary 2.33  $X$  can be decomposed as the finite union of finitely many nice sets  $X = \bigcup_{i \leq n} T_i$ . For each  $i \leq n$ ,  $T_i = S_i \cap C_i$  where  $C_i$  is defined by a finite conjunction of basic positive congruence formulas while  $S_i$  is a generalized swiss cheese, say of the form  $A_i \setminus (B_i^1 \cup \dots \cup B_i^{k_i})$ .

*Fact:* Given a 1 torsor  $U$  and  $d + bJ$  a fixed coset of  $K/bJ$  exactly one of the following holds:

- (a)  $U \cap (d + bJ) = \emptyset$ ,
- (b)  $U \subseteq d + bJ$ , and  $d + bJ$  is the unique coset of  $K/bJ$  such that  $U \subseteq d + bJ$ .
- (c)  $d + bJ \subseteq U$ .

Fix some index  $i \leq n$ . If  $A_i$  is disjoint from the class  $d + bJ$  then it is clear that  $T_i$  cannot split this class. If the second case holds, then  $T_i$  may split the class  $d + bJ$ , but the torsor  $A_i$  is contained in the unique class  $d + bJ$ .

Consequently, to show that each  $T_i$  splits only finitely many classes, we must show that there are only finitely many classes which are contained in  $A_i$  and are split by  $T_i$ .

For each index  $1 \leq j \leq k_i$  and a torsor  $d + bJ \subseteq A_i$  we may have that  $B_i^j \subseteq d + bJ$ , in which case it is possible that  $T_i$  splits the class  $d + bJ$ . As there are only finitely many torsors  $B_i^j$  there will be only finitely many cosets  $d + bJ$  that are split by  $T_i$  by this reason. It could also be the case that  $d + bJ \subseteq B_i^j$ , but in this case  $d + bJ$  is contained in the complement of  $T_i$ , so  $T_i$  will not split this class. So, without loss of generality we may assume that the torsor  $b + dJ$  is disjoint from all the subtorsors  $B_i^j$  and contained in  $A_i$ .

As a result, we may reduce to the set of cosets contained  $A_i$  and disjoint from all the subtorsors  $B_i^j$  which can be split by a congruence restriction in  $C_i$ , say by  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - c) - \rho_{\Delta'}(e) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  for some  $e \in \Omega_n^{\Delta'}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Without loss of generality  $c \in A_i$ . Let  $d + bJ \subseteq A_i$  be a different 1-torsor than  $c + bJ$ , in particular  $v(e - c) \notin v(b) + S_J$ , where  $S_J = \{v(x) \mid x \in J\}$ . Hence, for any  $y \in d + bJ$ ,  $v(y - c) = v(d - c)$  thus  $v_{\Delta'}(y - c) = v_{\Delta'}(d - c)$ . Therefore, if  $\models v_{\Delta'}(d - c) - \rho_{\Delta'}(e) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$ , then the torsor  $d + bJ$  is completely contained in the set of realizations of the basic congruence formula. Otherwise it is disjoint from the set of realizations and hence it is also disjoint from  $T_i$ .

This shows that the each of the basic congruence formulas  $zv_{\Delta'}(x - c) - \rho_{\Delta'}(e) \in n(\Gamma/\Delta')$  can split at most the coset  $c + bJ$ . As there are finitely many congruence restrictions, the nice set  $T_i$  can split at most finitely many classes, so does  $X$ . We conclude that the additive quotient  $K/bJ$  is weak opaque (actually opaque). □

**Corollary 6.21.** *Let  $K$  be a valued field of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed and  $dp$ -minimal value group. Each of the quotient groups  $B_n(K)/\text{Stab}(I_1, \dots, I_n)$  is weakly opaquely layered, where each  $I_i \in \mathcal{I}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.19 Then there are sequences of  $\emptyset$ -definable groups  $I_n = G_0 \triangleleft G_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft G_N = B_n(K)$  and of  $\emptyset$  definable subgroups  $H_i \leq G_{i+1}$  such:

1.  $G_{i+1}(K) = G_i(K)H_i(K)$ ,
2.  $G_i(K) \cap H_i(K) = \{I_n\}$ ,
3.  $H_i(K)$  is isomorphic either to  $(K, +)$  or  $(K^\times, \cdot)$ ,
4.  $G_i(K)$  is a normal subgroup of  $G_{i+1}(K)$ ,
5.  $G_0 = \{I_n\}$  and  $G_N(K) = B_N(K)$ .

By Corollary 6.17 applied to  $G = B_n(K)$  and  $F = \text{Stab}_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$  it is sufficient to check that the quotients  $H_i/(H_i \cap F)$  are opaquely layered. Looking in detail at the description of the groups  $H_i$  given in Lemma 6.19, it is enough to show that the multiplicative groups  $\Gamma = K^\times/O_\Delta^\times$  and the additive groups  $K/J$  where  $J$  is a definable  $\mathcal{O}$  submodule of  $K$  are weakly opaque. This is the conclusion of Proposition 6.20. □

**Definition 6.22.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a non trivial  $dp$ -minimal ordered abelian group, we say that it satisfies the property  $P$  if given  $B \subseteq \Gamma$  of parameters  $\text{dcl}(B) \equiv \Gamma$ .*

There are some natural examples of ordered abelian groups that satisfy this property. For example in [28, Theorem 4.5 and 4.6], M. Liccardo proved that finite products of  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$  with the lexicographic ordered have Skolem functions, in particular  $\text{dcl}(B) < \Gamma$ . In particular, this includes the theory of Presburger Arithmetic.

**Fact 6.23.** *Let  $K$  be a value field of equicharacteristic zero, residue field algebraically closed and  $dp$ -minimal ordered abelian group satisfying property  $(P)$ . Let  $D \subseteq K$  be an algebraically closed set (in the model theoretic sense) i.e.  $\text{acl}(D) = D$ , then  $D \equiv K$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $D \subseteq K$  be an algebraically closed set. Then its residue field  $k_D$  is algebraically closed, and its value group  $\Gamma_D = \text{dcl}(\Gamma_D)$ . Indeed, By Fact 2.29,  $\text{dcl}(\Gamma_D) = (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_D) \cap \Gamma_K$  and by [8, Lemma 5.6] for any element  $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q} \otimes \Gamma_D$  we can find an element  $a \in K$  algebraic over  $D$  (in the field theoretic sense, therefore in the model theoretic sense), thus  $a \in D$ . The statement now follows by the Ax-Kochen principle.  $\square$

In the following proposition we let  $T$  be  $\mathcal{L}_{dp}^*$ -first order theory of henselian valued fields with residue field algebraically closed, whose value group is dp-minimal and satisfies the property  $(P)$ , and let  $\mathfrak{K}$  be its monster model. The following is an adapted version of [2, Theorem 11.14] for our setting.

**Theorem 6.24.** *Let  $C$  be a subfield of  $\mathfrak{K}$ . Let  $e$  be a finite set of imaginaries, then  $Ce$  admits a resolution  $D$ . Also  $k(D) = \text{acl}(k(Ce))$ ,  $\Gamma(D) = \Gamma(Ce)$  and  $\text{INT}_{\Gamma(D)}^D = \text{INT}_{\Gamma(Ce)}^{Ce}$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.35 the theory of henselian value fields of equicharacteristic zero with residue field algebraically closed and  $dp$ -minimal value group admits elimination of imaginaries in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Stab}}^*$ , where sorts for the quotients  $B_n(K)/\text{Stab}_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$  are added. As a result,  $e$  is interdefinable over  $C$  with a tuple  $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$  where each  $b_i$  lies in a quotient of the form  $B_n(K)/\text{Stab}_{(I_1, \dots, I_n)}$ . By Corollary 6.21 each of the tuples  $b_i$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ . Therefore, each  $b_i$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C(b_1, \dots, b_{i-1})$ , and by Fact 6.9 the tuple  $\bar{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$  is weakly opaquely layered over  $C$ . The hypothesis of Proposition 6.24 are satisfied, combining Fact 6.23 and the fact that finite sets are coded in any field. Consequently, we can find a set  $B$  in the home-sort such that:

- $C\bar{b} \subseteq \text{dcl}(B)$ , and
- $\text{tp}(B/C\bar{b})$  is relatively isolated.

Let  $D = \text{acl}(B)$ , we aim to show that  $D$  is the resolution that we are looking for.

*Claim:*  $k(D) = \text{acl}(k(Ce))$ ,  $\Gamma(D) = \Gamma(Ce)$  and  $\text{INT}_{\Gamma(D)}^D = \text{INT}_{\Gamma(Ce)}^{Ce}$

By the way in which  $\bar{b}$  was chosen, we have  $\text{dcl}(C\bar{b}) = \text{dcl}(Ce)$ , so it is equivalent to prove the conclusion for  $C\bar{b}$ . Clearly,  $\Gamma(C\bar{b}) \subseteq \Gamma(D)$  and  $k(C\bar{b}) \subseteq k(D)$ . Then  $\text{acl}(k(C\bar{b})) \subseteq k(D)$  as the latter is algebraically closed. It is therefore sufficient to show that  $k(D) \subseteq \text{acl}(k(C\bar{b}))$  and  $\Gamma(D) \subseteq \Gamma(C\bar{b})$ . Let  $d \in B$ , by construction,  $\text{tp}(d/C\bar{b})$  is relatively isolated. As the residue field is stably embedded  $\text{tp}(\text{res}(d)/k(C\bar{b}))$  is also relatively-isolated, so it must be isolated and therefore algebraic, thus  $\text{res}(d) \in \text{acl}(k(C\bar{b}))$ . Likewise, as the value group is stably embedded  $\text{tp}(v(d)/\Gamma(C\bar{b}))$  is relatively isolated, by the quantifier elimination for dp-minimal ordered abelian groups, it must belong to the pure hull of  $\{v(t_d) \mid d \in \Sigma\}$  and  $\Gamma_{C(b)}$  inside  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{K}}$ , thus  $v(d) \in \Gamma(C\bar{b})$ .

Let  $d \in D = \text{acl}(B) \cap \mathfrak{K}$ , because the value group is stably embedded  $v(d) \in \Gamma(B) \subseteq \Gamma(C\bar{b})$ . As the later is definably closed  $v(d) \in \Gamma(C\bar{b})$ . Likewise, as the residue field is stably embedded  $\text{res}(d)$  is algebraic over  $k(B) \subseteq \text{acl}(k(C\bar{b}))$ , as the later is algebraically closed then  $\text{res}(d) \in \text{acl}(k(C\bar{b}))$ .

All that remains is to note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{INT}_{\Gamma(D)}^D &= \text{acl}(k(D) \cup \{RV(D) \cap v^{-1}(\gamma)\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma(D)}) \\ &= \text{acl}(k(Ce) \cup \{RV(Ce) \cap v^{-1}(\gamma)\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma(Ce)}) = \text{INT}_{\Gamma(Ce)}^{Ce}, \text{ as desired.} \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We conclude stating all the domination results in the multi-sorted language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Stab}}^*$  also for imaginary elements.

**Theorem 6.25.** *Let  $C$  be a substructure of  $\mathfrak{K}$  which is maximal. Let  $e$  be a finite tuple of imaginary elements and suppose that  $\text{acl}(k(Ce))$  is a regular extension of  $k_C$  and  $\Gamma(Ce)/\Gamma_C$  is torsion free (or that  $C$  is a model). Then:*

1.  $\text{tp}(e/C)$  is dominated by the value group and the residue field,
2.  $\text{tp}(e/C)$  is dominated by the sorts internal to the residue field over the value group.

*Proof.* 1. Let  $M$  be any substructure of  $\mathfrak{K}$  containing  $C$ . We assume that  $k(M)$  and  $k(Ce)$  are independent over  $k(C)$ , and  $\Gamma(M)$ ,  $\Gamma(Ce)$  are independent over  $\Gamma(C)$  and we would like to show that

$$\text{tp}(e/Ck(M)\Gamma(M)) \vdash \text{tp}(e/M).$$

Fix another element  $e' \models \text{tp}(e/k(M)\Gamma(M))$  and let  $\sigma$  be an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{M}$  fixing  $Ck(M)\Gamma(M)$  with  $\sigma(e) = e'$ . By Theorem 6.24, there is a resolution  $L \subseteq \mathfrak{K}$  of  $Ce$  such that  $k(L) = \text{acl}(k(Ce))$  and  $\Gamma(L) = \Gamma(Ce)$ , let  $L' = \sigma(L)$ . As  $k(M) \downarrow_{k(C)} k(Ce)$  then  $k(M) \downarrow_{k(C)} \text{acl}(k(Ce))$  so  $k(M) \downarrow_{k(C)} k(L)$ . Because  $k(L) = \text{acl}(k(Ce))$  is a regular extension of  $k_C$  (or simply requiring  $C$  to be a model), we can apply Fact 3.5 to conclude that  $k(L)$  and  $k(M)$  are linearly disjoint over  $k_C$ . The hypothesis of  $\Gamma(M) \downarrow_{\Gamma(C)} \Gamma(L)$  together with Facts 2.44, 2.29 and the condition of having  $\Gamma(Ce)$  to be a torsion free extension of  $\Gamma_C$  guarantee that  $\Gamma_L \cap \Gamma_M = \Gamma_C$ . Thus, the hypothesis of Proposition 3.4 are satisfied, so we can find an automorphism  $\tau$  of  $\mathfrak{K}$  which agrees with  $\sigma$  over  $L$  and fixes  $M$ . Because  $e \in \text{dcl}(L)$ , then  $\tau$  sends  $e$  to  $e'$ . Hence  $A$  and  $A'$  realize the same type over  $M$ , as required.

2. Let  $C\Gamma(Ce) \subseteq M$  be a substructure of  $\mathfrak{K}$  such that  $\text{INT}_{\Gamma(D)}^M \downarrow_{C\Gamma(Ce)} \text{INT}_{\Gamma(D)}^L$ . By Theorem 6.24 we can find a resolution  $L$  of  $Ce$  such that  $\text{INT}_{\Gamma(L)}^L = \text{INT}_{\Gamma(Ce)}^{Ce}$  and  $\Gamma(L) = \Gamma(Ce)$ . Fix an element  $e' \models \text{tp}(e/C\text{INT}_{\Gamma(Ce)}^M \Gamma(Ce))$  and let  $\sigma$  be a partial automorphism fixing  $C\text{INT}_{\Gamma(Ce)}^M \Gamma(Ce)$  sending  $e$  to  $e'$ . By Remark 5.10,  $\text{tp}(L/M) = \text{tp}(L'/M)$  and because  $e \in \text{dcl}(L)$  then  $\text{tp}(e/M) = \text{tp}(e'/M)$ . □

## References

- [1] C. Ealy, D. Haskell and J. Marikova, *Residue field domination in real closed fields*, Notre Dame J. Formal Logic Volume 60, Number 3 (2019), 333-351.
- [2] D. Haskell, E. Hrushovski and D. Macpherson, *Stable Domination and Independence in Algebraically Closed Valued Fields* (Lecture Notes in Logic), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2007).
- [3] D. Haskell, E. Hrushovski and D. Macpherson, *Definable sets in algebraically closed valued fields: elimination of imaginaries*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik, 597,(2006), 175-236.
- [4] J.Pas, *On the angular component map modulo p*. J. Symbolic Logic 55.3 (1990), pp.1125–1129.
- [5] S. A. Basarab, *Relative elimination of quantifiers for Henselian valued fields*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 53.1 (1991), pp. 51–74.
- [6] F.V. Kuhlmann, *Quantifier elimination for Henselian fields relative to additive and multiplicative congruences*, Israel J. Math. 85 (1994), pp. 277–306.
- [7] J. Flenner, PhD thesis ,*The relative structure of Henselian Valued Fields*, University of California at Berkeley, (2008).
- [8] L. van den Dries, *Lectures on the Model Theory of Valued Fields* In: Model Theory in Algebra, Analysis and Arithmetic. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol 2111. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.(2014)
- [9] M. Vicaría, *Elimination of imaginaries in Ordered Abelian groups with bounded regular rank*, [arXivpreprintarXiv:2106.01500](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.01500), 2021.
- [10] R. Cluckers and I. Halupczok, *Quantifier elimination in ordered abelian groups*, Confluentes Math. 3, no. 4,(2011), 587–615.
- [11] Y. Gurevich and P. H. Schmitt, *The theory of ordered abelian groups does not have the independence property*,Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 284, (1984) no. 1, 171–182.
- [12] S. Cotter, and S. Starchenko, *Forking in VC-minimal theories*, Journal of Symbolic Logic, vol 77(2012), no. 4,1257–1271.
- [13] E. Hrushovski and S. Rideau, *Valued fields, metastable groups*, Selecta Mathematica, (2019), vol 25, no.3, 1–58.
- [14] M. Hils, S. Rideau Kikuchi, personal communication.
- [15] S. Lang, *Algebra*, Graduate texts in mathematics, New York, USA, (2002)
- [16] F. Jahnke, P. Simon, P. and E. Walsberg, *Dp-minimal valued fields*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic, 82(1), 151-165. [doi:10.1017/jsl.2016.15](https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2016.15).
- [17] M. Aschembrenner, A. Chernikov, A. Gehret, M. Ziegler, *Distality in valued fields and related structures*, arxiv-preprint <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2008.09889.pdf>.
- [18] P. Schmitt, *Model and substructure complete theories of ordered abelian groups*, Models and sets,(1984), 389–418.
- [19] A. Chernikov, *Theories without the tree property of the second kind*,Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, vol 165, no.2, (2014), 695–723.
- [20] P. Touchard, *Burdens in henselian valued fields*, [arXivpreprintarXiv:1811.08756](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.08756).
- [21] A. Chernikov and I. Kaplan, *Forking and dividing in NTP2 theories*, Journal of Symbolic Logic (2012), vol 77, no. 1, 1-20.
- [22] S. Shelah, *Classification theory and the number of non-isomorphic models*, Elsevier, (1990).
- [23] , C. Ealy, D. Haskell and P. Simon *Residue field domination in some henselian valued fields*, pre-print.
- [24] M. Vicaría, *Elimination of imaginaries in multivalued fields*, preprint, 2021.
- [25] M. Prest, *Model theory and modules*, Handbook of algebra, vol 3. (2003), 227–253.

- [26] A. Engler and A. Prestel, *Valued fields*, Springer Science and Business Media, (2005).
- [27] A. Robinson, *Complete theories. Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, VIII 129 pp. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 25(2), (1956), 172-174. doi:10.2307/2964239.
- [28] M. Liccardo, *Elimination of imaginaries in lexicographic products of ordered abelian groups*, arXivpreprint arXiv:2105.14646, (2021).