

Global Complexification of Real Analytic Restricted Log-Exp-Analytic Functions

Andre Opris

Abstract. We show that a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function has a holomorphic extension which is again restricted log-exp-analytic. We also establish a parametric version of this result.

Introduction

This paper contributes to analysis in the framework of o-minimal structures. O-minimality is a concept from mathematical logic with connections and applications to geometry, analysis, number theory and other areas. Sets and functions definable in an o-minimal structure (i.e. ‘belonging to’) exhibit tame geometric, combinatorial and topological behaviour. This includes for example the cell decomposition theorem, the fact that every definable set is homeomorphic to a finite union of hypercubes and that every definable set has finitely many connected components which are again definable. We refer to the book of Van den Dries [11] for the general properties of o-minimal structures.

The major line of research was based on discovering o-minimal structures on the reals. For example the pure real field \mathbb{R} is o-minimal. The definable sets are exactly the semialgebraic sets since they are closed under projections by Alfred Tarski (see [36]; this was popularized by Abraham Seidenberg in [32]). But there are much bigger o-minimal structures on \mathbb{R} . Together with a theorem of Gabrielov Van den Dries could prove for example the remarkable result that \mathbb{R}_{an} , the structure generated by all restricted analytic functions, is o-minimal (see [10]). The definable sets in \mathbb{R}_{an} are precisely the globally subanalytic ones. In [10] it is shown that \mathbb{R}_{an} is polynomially bounded. So the global exponential function is not definable in there. Lou van den Dries and Chris Miller showed in [15] that we stay in the o-minimal context if we add the global exponential function (see also [13]). Then we obtain the o-minimal structure $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$. This is one of the most important o-minimal structures, because a huge class of elementary functions like polynomial functions, the global arctangent function, the global logarithm, the global exponential function and hyperbolic functions are definable in there. They have crucial application in diophantine geometry (see for example [37] where definable functions with special diophantine properties and growth rates are investigated or [31] for the treatment of the André-Oort conjecture for \mathbb{C}^n from the viewpoint of o-minimality).

Kobi Peterzil and Sergei Stepanovich Starchenko designed the development of complex analysis within the o-minimal framework also in non-standard setting (see [30]). One obtains analogies of classical results as well as strong differences, due to the o-minimality assumption. For example the maximum principle, the

open mapping theorem, the theorem of Liouville, the identity theorem and Riemann's removable theorem hold in this setting. However the key feature is that a definable holomorphic function in an o-minimal expansion of \mathbb{R} does not have an essential singularity. So the entire definable holomorphic functions are exactly the polynomials. Further results of Peterzil and Starchenko concern analytic geometry. For example in [29] they gave some stronger version of Chow's theorem which states that a definable analytic subset of \mathbb{C}^n is already an algebraic variety. All this theory can be formulated for an arbitrary real closed field R with algebraic closure $K = R[\sqrt{-1}]$. But to describe such features in this non-standard setting it is necessary to use "topological analysis" instead of power series and integration.

So it would be desirable to understand definability in the complex setting outgoing from definability on the reals. A very interesting question in this context is the following.

Question

Are real analytic functions definable in an o-minimal structure \mathcal{M} on the reals reducts of definable holomorphic functions, i.e. does \mathcal{M} have global complexification?

To investigate this question one has to find a definable holomorphic extension for a given definable real analytic function. Of course finding a holomorphic extension is not difficult simply by power series expansion, but the crucial point is that this extension needs not to be definable. Tobias Kaiser affirmed this question for the o-minimal structures \mathbb{R} (see [18]) and \mathbb{R}_{an} (see [17]). He could even establish parametric versions for this results.

However there is no general concept to solve such difficult problems and this can't be generalized easily to arbitrary o-minimal structures on the reals. For example for $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ issues regarding global complexification are not solved at present. But there is the deep model theoretical fact that every definable function in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ is piecewise given by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\text{exp, log})$ -terms ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\text{exp, log})$ is the language of ordered rings augmented by all restricted analytic functions, the global exponential and the global logarithm, see [13]). Kaiser used this fact to show in [17] that univariate real analytic functions which are definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ extend in a definably way to a holomorphic function. A quantitative version of this result was given by Kaiser and Speissegger in [21] (see also Wilkie in [37]). But especially for this big structure it would be desirable to have an analogous result as in the globally subanalytic case, because there are many fields of application. A necessary condition is, of course, that the underlying function is real analytic. The idea is the same as in [17] for the globally subanalytic case: The first step is to use the preparation theorem of Lion and Rolin in order to construct an $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable holomorphic extension of a

real analytic $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable function in one variable which is again $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable and the second step is to do a technical induction on the number of variables.

But there are strong differences between the structures \mathbb{R}_{an} and $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ from the point of analysis: There are $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable functions which are C^∞ , but not real analytic (for example flat functions) or violate Tamm's Theorem (see [14],[19] or [28] for versions of Tamm's Theorem) in contrast to globally subanalytic functions. So there is the natural question if there is a big non-trivial class of $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable functions which share its analytic properties with globally subanalytic ones, but behaves completely differently from the point of o-minimality. This applies for example for restricted log-exp-analytic functions which have been defined by Opris (see [17]). They are given piecewise by compositions of globally subanalytic functions, the global logarithm and exponentials of locally bounded functions. Since the global exponential function is restricted log-exp-analytic this class of functions is not polynomially bounded and generates the whole structure $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$.

Example

The function

$$g :]0, 1[^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto \arctan(\log(e^{1/t \cdot \log^2(1/x)} + \log(e^{e^{1/t}} + 2))),$$

is restricted log-exp-analytic.

We will not answer the question above for all real analytic $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable functions, but for real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic functions. We obtain the following result.

Theorem A

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a definable open set. Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function. Then there is a definable open $V \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $U \subset V$ and a holomorphic restricted log-exp-analytic $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $F|_U = f$ (i.e. the real and imaginary part of F considered as real functions are restricted log-exp-analytic).

The idea for the proof of Theorem A is the same procedure as in the globally subanalytic case: Outgoing from a preparation theorem for restricted log-exp-analytic functions in [28] (see also Theorem C in [27] for a more general preparation theorem for $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable functions) we construct a holomorphic extension of a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable which is again restricted log-exp-analytic and then we do a technical induction on the number of variables. This gives the following version of Theorem A for parameters.

Theorem B

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ be definable such that X_t is open for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(t, x) \mapsto f(t, x)$, be restricted log-exp-analytic in x such that f_t is real analytic for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there is a definable $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with $X \subset Z$ such that Z_t is open for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a function $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $(t, z) \mapsto F(t, z)$, which is restricted log-exp-analytic in z such that F_t is holomorphic for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F|_X = f$ (i.e. the real and imaginary part of F considered as real functions are restricted log-exp-analytic in z).

This paper is organized as follows. After a short introduction in o-minimality (compare with Section 1) we introduce in Section 2 global complexification and give examples. In Section 3 we pick up the definition of log-analytic functions, the exponential number and restricted log-exp-analytic functions from [28]. Section 4 is about a preparation theorem for definable functions from [27] and for restricted log-exp-analytic functions from [28]. Section 5 is devoted to the proofs of Theorem A and Theorem B.

Notations:

The empty sum is by definition 0 and the empty product is by definition 1. By $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ we denote the set of natural numbers and by $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ the set of nonnegative integers. Let $\mathbb{R}^* := \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we set $\mathbb{R}_{>a} := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x > a\}$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}$ let $\lceil x \rceil$ be the smallest integer which is not smaller than x and let $\text{sign}(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$ its sign if $x \neq 0$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $a < \infty$, $-\infty < a$ and we set $a + \infty := \infty$ and $a - \infty := -\infty$. Given a subset A of \mathbb{R}^n we denote by \overline{A} its closure. By \log_k we denote the k -times iterated of the natural logarithm and by \exp_k the k -times iterated of the natural exponential (where $\log_0 = \exp_0 = \text{id}$). Given $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, we define the box

$$Q^n(x, r) := \{(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |y_j - x_j| < r \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ we consider the following: For $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ let $\text{dist}(x, X) := \inf\{|x - y| \mid y \in X\}$. For two functions $f, g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we say that $f > g$ if $f(x) > g(x)$ for every $x \in X$. For a set E of positive real valued functions on X we set $\log(E) := \{\log(g) \mid g \in E\}$. For $C \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ with $C \subset X$ and a set E of real valued functions on X we set $E|_C := \{g|_C \mid g \in E\}$.

We set $\sup(\emptyset) = -\infty$ and $\inf(\emptyset) = \infty$. For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $M(m \times n, \mathbb{Q})$ the set of $m \times n$ -matrices with rational entries. For $P \in M(m \times n, \mathbb{Q})$ we denote by ${}^tP \in M(n \times m, \mathbb{Q})$ its transpose.

For $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ let $X_{\neq 0} := \{(x, y) \in X \mid y \neq 0\}$.

For $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we set for the **fiber** $X_t := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid (t, x) \in X\}$ and for a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(t, x) \mapsto f(t, x)$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ let $f_t : X_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $x \mapsto f(t, x)$.

We set $\mathbb{C}^- := \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$, $\mathbb{C}_a^- := \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\leq a}$ and $\mathbb{C}_a^+ := \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\geq a}$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote by $\arg : \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow]-\pi, \pi]$ the standard argument function and define $\log : \mathbb{C}^- \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $z \mapsto \log(z) := \log(|z|) + i\arg(z)$, (i.e. z is mapped on the principal value of the complex logarithm) and $z^q := e^{q\log(z)}$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let z range over \mathbb{C} . For $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$ we define the annulus

$$A(c, r_1, r_2) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid r_1 < |z - c| < r_2\}.$$

For $r \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ we define the open ball

$$B(c, r) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - c| < r\}.$$

Given $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $r > 0$, we define the polydisc

$$D^n(z, r) := \{(w_1, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid |w_j - z_j| < r \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be definable. A **curve** is a continuous mapping $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow X$, a **subcurve** of a curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow X$ is a curve $\hat{\gamma} :]0, 1[\rightarrow X$ of the following form: There is $\delta > 1$ such that $\hat{\gamma}(y) = \gamma(y/\delta)$ for $y \in]0, 1[$.

Let z range over \mathbb{C} . For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $(t, z) \mapsto t$, be the projection on the first n real coordinates (this includes also the projection $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $(t, x) \mapsto t$). We set

$$\log^* : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \begin{cases} \log(z), & |z| \in [1/2, 3/2] \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}, \\ 0, & \text{if} \\ & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Terminology from model theory

By $\mathcal{L} := (\leq, +, \cdot, -, 0, 1)$ we denote the language of ordered rings, by \mathcal{L}_{an} the language of ordered rings augmented by symbols for all restricted analytic functions (compare with Definition 1.7 for the notion of a restricted analytic function), by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\exp, \log)$ the language \mathcal{L}_{an} augmented by symbols for the global exponential function and the global logarithm and by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(^{-1}, (\sqrt[n]{\dots})_{n=2,3,\dots}, \log)$ the language \mathcal{L}_{an} augmented by a function symbol $^{-1}$ for taking reciprocals with respect to "·", by function symbols $\sqrt[n]{\dots}$ for taking the n 'th root for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$, and by a symbol for the global logarithm.

Let $\mathcal{L}' \in \{\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(^{-1}, (\sqrt[n]{\dots})_{n=2,3,\dots}, \log), \mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\exp, \log)\}$. An \mathcal{L}' -term is inductively defined as follows.

- (i) 0 and 1 (i.e. every constant symbol in \mathcal{L}') are \mathcal{L}' -terms.

- (ii) Let x_1, x_2, \dots be the infinite list of variables in \mathcal{L}' . Then x_1, x_2, \dots are \mathcal{L}' -terms.
- (iii) If f is an m -ary function symbol in \mathcal{L}' for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and t_1, \dots, t_m are \mathcal{L}' -terms then $f(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ is an \mathcal{L}' -term.

Conventions

Definable means always $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable if not otherwise mentioned.

We identify \mathbb{C} with \mathbb{R}^2 via $x + iy \mapsto (x, y)$. So $Z \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ is definable if Z is definable considered as a subset of \mathbb{R}^{2m} for $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

1 O-Minimal Structures on the Reals

1.1 Definition

A subset A of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 1$, is called **semialgebraic** if there are $k, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and real polynomials $f_i, g_{i,1}, \dots, g_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$ such that

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^l \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f_i(x) = 0, g_{i,1}(x) > 0, \dots, g_{i,k}(x) > 0\}.$$

A map is called semialgebraic if its graph is semialgebraic.

1.2 Definition

A subset A of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 1$, is called **semianalytic** if for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there are open neighbourhoods U, V of a with $\overline{U} \subset V$, $k, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and real analytic functions $f_i, g_{i,1}, \dots, g_{i,k}$ on V for $1 \leq i \leq l$, such that

$$A \cap U = \bigcup_{i=1}^l \{x \in U \mid f_i(x) = 0, g_{i,1}(x) > 0, \dots, g_{i,k}(x) > 0\}.$$

A map is called semianalytic if its graph is semianalytic.

1.3 Definition

A subset B of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 1$, is called **subanalytic** if for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is an open neighbourhood U of a , some $p \geq n$ and some bounded semianalytic set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $B \cap U = \pi_n(A)$ where $\pi_n : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $(x_1, \dots, x_p) \mapsto (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, is the projection on the first n coordinates. A map is called subanalytic if its graph is subanalytic.

1.4 Remark

A semialgebraic set is semianalytic. A semianalytic set is subanalytic.

See [2] and [33] for geometrical descriptions of semianalytic resp. subanalytic sets and functions.

1.5 Definition

A subset B of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 1$, is called **globally subanalytic** if it is subanalytic after applying the semialgebraic homeomorphism

$$\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow]-1, 1[^n, x_i \mapsto \frac{x_i}{\sqrt{1+x_i^2}},$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. A map is called globally subanalytic if its graph is globally subanalytic.

1.6 Example

- (1) A semialgebraic set is globally subanalytic.
- (2) The restriction of the global sine function on a compact interval is globally subanalytic.

1.7 Definition

A function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called **restricted analytic** if there is a real convergent power series p in n variables which converges absolutely on an open neighbourhood of $[-1, 1]^n$ such that

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} p(x), & x \in [-1, 1]^n, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

1.8 Definition

A **structure** on \mathbb{R} is axiomatically defined as follows. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let M_n be a set of subsets of \mathbb{R}^n and let $\mathcal{M} := (M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then \mathcal{M} is a structure on \mathbb{R} if the following holds for all $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$.

- (S1) If $A, B \in M_n$ then $A \cup B$, $A \cap B$ and $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus A \in M_n$. (So M_n is a Boolean algebra of subsets of M_n .)
- (S2) If $A \in M_n$ and $B \in M_m$ then $A \times B \in M_{n+m}$.
- (S3) If $A \in M_p$ and $p \geq n$ then $\pi_n(A) \in M_n$ where $\pi_n : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $(x_1, \dots, x_p) \mapsto (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, denotes the projection on the first n coordinates.
- (S4) M_n contains the semialgebraic subsets of \mathbb{R}^n .

The structure $\mathcal{M} = (M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on \mathbb{R} is called **o-minimal** if additionally the following holds.

(O) The sets in M_1 are exactly the finite unions of intervals and points.

1.9 Definition

Let $\mathcal{M} = (M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a structure. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- a) A subset A of \mathbb{R}^n is called **definable in \mathcal{M}** if $A \in M_n$.
- b) Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. A function $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is **definable in \mathcal{M}** if its graph $\{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in B\}$ is definable in \mathcal{M} .

1.10 Remark

The global sine or cosine function is not definable in an o-minimal expansion of \mathbb{R} .

1.11 Example

- (1) The smallest o-minimal structure on \mathbb{R} is given by the semialgebraic sets (see [36] and [32]). This is the pure real field and it is denoted by \mathbb{R} .
- (2) \mathbb{R}_{exp} , the structure generated on the real field by the global exponential function $\exp : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ (i.e. the smallest structure containing the semialgebraic sets and the graph of the exponential function), is o-minimal. (With a theorem of Khovanskii from [22] together with the result from [38] that the theory of \mathbb{R}_{exp} is model complete we obtain o-minimality.)
- (3) \mathbb{R}_{an} , the structure generated on the real field by the restricted analytic functions, is o-minimal (see [10] together with Gabrielov's theorem from [16] that the complement of a globally subanalytic function is again globally subanalytic; see also [25], Section 1 for an analytic proof). The sets definable in \mathbb{R}_{an} are precisely the globally subanalytic ones (see [11]).
- (4) $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$, the structure generated by \mathbb{R}_{an} and \mathbb{R}_{exp} , is o-minimal (see for example [13] for a model-theoretic proof respectively [25], Section 2 for an analytic proof).

Especially the o-minimal structure $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ is very important, because all elementary functions are definable in there. With the following fact we understand how the definable functions in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ look like.

1.12 Fact (Van den Dries/Macintyre/Marker, [13], Corollary 4.7)

*Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$. Then there are $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\text{exp}, \text{log})$ -terms t_1, \dots, t_s such that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ with $f(x) = t_j(x)$. So f is **piecewise given by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\text{exp}, \text{log})$ -terms**.*

This means:

Definable functions are piecewise compositions of globally subanalytic functions, the global logarithm and the global exponential. So we call them also **log-exp-analytic** in some context.

Subsequently, we exhibit the tame geometric behaviour of o-minimal structures. An essential role in this context plays the cell decomposition theorem which states that we can decompose every definable set in finitely many disjoint subsets of a special form called cells. This concept is very helpful for technical proofs: The idea is to do calculation on every single cell at first and finally obtain the result by considering all of them.

For the rest of the section "definable" means always "definable in \mathcal{M} " if the underlying o-minimal structure \mathcal{M} on \mathbb{R} is clear from the context.

1.13 Definition

Let \mathcal{M} be an o-minimal structure on \mathbb{R} . By induction on n we define a **definable cell** $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ as follows.

$n = 1$: C is either a singleton or an open interval.

$n \rightarrow n + 1$: C has one of the following form.

- i) $C = \text{graph}(f)$,
- ii) $C = \{(t, x) \in B \times \mathbb{R} \mid f(t) < x < g(t)\} :=]f, g[_B$,
- iii) $C = \{(t, x) \in B \times \mathbb{R} \mid f(t) < x < \infty\} :=]f, \infty[_B$,
- iv) $C = \{(t, x) \in B \times \mathbb{R} \mid -\infty < x < f(x)\} :=]-\infty, f[_B$,
- v) $C = \{(t, x) \in B \times \mathbb{R} \mid -\infty < x < \infty\} :=]-\infty, \infty[_B$,

where $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a definable cell called the **base** of C in \mathbb{R}^n and $f, g : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous definable functions with additionally $f < g$ in ii).




Figure 1.1 Different cell types in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} on the base B

1.14 Definition

Let \mathcal{M} be an o-minimal structure on \mathbb{R} . Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be non-empty and definable. A finite partition \mathcal{C} of A into definable cells is called a **definable cell decomposition \mathcal{C} of A** .

1.15 Theorem

Let \mathcal{M} be an o-minimal structure on \mathbb{R} . Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be definable. The following holds.

- (1) There is a definable cell decomposition \mathcal{C} of A .
- (2) Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a definable function then the definable cell decomposition \mathcal{C} of A can be chosen in a way that $f|_C$ is continuous for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof

We refer to Van den Dries (compare with [11], Chapter 3). ■

Since a definable cell is definably connected an immediate consequence from this theorem is that every definable set is the union of finitely many connected components and these are again definable. We refer to the book of Van den Dries in [11] or Coste in [9] for more on the general properties of o-minimal structures.

To close this section we pick up results on definability of parameterized integrals over the reals which will be important for our purposes in Section 5.2. The class of constructible functions which was introduced by Cluckers and Miller in [7] plays a major role in this context.

1.16 Definition

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a globally subanalytic set. A function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called **constructible** if there are $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $l_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and globally subanalytic functions $g_i : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h_{ij} : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, l_i\}$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k g_i(x) \prod_{j=1}^{l_i} \log(h_{ij}(x))$$

for every $x \in A$.

1.17 Remark

A globally subanalytic function is constructible.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let u range over \mathbb{R}^n and v over \mathbb{R}^m .

1.18 Definition

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be globally subanalytic. We set

$$\text{Fin}(f) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |f(u, v)| dv < \infty \right\}.$$

1.19 Fact (Comte/Lion/Rolin, [8] Theorem 1)

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be globally subanalytic. The following holds.

(1) The set $\text{Fin}(f)$ is globally subanalytic.

(2) The function

$$h : \text{Fin}(f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(u, v) dv,$$

is constructible.

1.20 Fact (Cluckers/Miller, [6] Theorem 2.5)

The class of constructible functions is stable under parametric integration.

This means that the class of constructible functions is the smallest subclass of all definable functions in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ which contains all the globally subanalytic ones and is stable under parametric integration. Further and more deep theory on integration of constructible functions where loci of integrability and Lebesgue classes of constructible functions are studied can be found in [5] and [6].

However it is in general not possible to extend this result within $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ beyond the constructible setting as the following fact indicates.

1.21 Fact (Van den Dries/Macintyre/Marker, [12] Theorem 5.11)

The function $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto \int_0^u e^{-v^2} dv$, is not definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$.

An important consequence of this fact is that even parameterized integrals of log-analytic functions are in general not definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$. (Compare with Definition 3.1 for the notion of a log-analytic function.)

1.22 Example

Consider

$$f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, (u, v) \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2v^2\sqrt{\log(v)}}, & 1 < v < u, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We obtain for $1 < u$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\sqrt{\log(u)}} e^{-v^2} dv &= \int_0^{\log(u)} \frac{e^{-v}}{2\sqrt{v}} dv \\ &= \int_1^u \frac{1}{2v^2\sqrt{\log(v)}} dv. \end{aligned}$$

For $u \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$g(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u, v) dv.$$

We have $g(u) = 0$ for $u \leq 1$ and

$$g(u) = \int_0^{\sqrt{\log(u)}} e^{-v^2} dv \leq \sqrt{\pi}$$

for $u > 1$. So we see that $\text{Fin}(f) = \mathbb{R}$. By Fact 1.21 we obtain that $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto \int_0^u e^{-v^2} dv$, is not definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$. Therefore $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u, v) dv$, is also not definable in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$. ■

Note that the antiderivative of a continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be considered as a special parameterized integral:

$$\int_0^x f(t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{f}(x, t) dt$$

where $\tilde{f}(x, t) = f(t) \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]}(t)$. For an o-minimal structure \mathcal{M} on \mathbb{R} consider $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, the Pfaffian closure of \mathcal{M} , which is an o-minimal expansion of \mathcal{M} . It goes beyond the scope of this article to give the exact definition. For more details we refer to [35].

1.23 Fact (Speissegger, [35], Corollary on p.1)

Let $n = 1$ and $m = 1$. Let \mathcal{M} be an o -minimal structure on \mathbb{R} and let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be definable in \mathcal{M} . Then the function $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \int_0^x f(t)dt$, is definable in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$.

This shows that the parameterized integrals from Fact 1.21 and Example 1.22 are indeed definable in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}})$. But questions about this matter regarding definability of such integrals in more than one variable are quite open. (See for example [20] for definability results and open questions regarding parameterized exponential integrals given by the Brownian motion on globally subanalytic sets.)

But outgoing from Fact 1.19 it is possible to obtain definability of parameterized integrals whose integrand is globally subanalytic and bounded in the variable of integration (compare with Definition 1.24). This result is very important for the technical proofs of Theorem A and Theorem B in Section 5.

For the rest of this section let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbb{K} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ and $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{K}$. Let t range over \mathbb{R}^n , z over \mathbb{K} and τ over \mathbb{R} .

1.24 Definition

- a) Let $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $g : \pi(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ be definable. We call a function $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ **globally subanalytic in z with support function g** respectively **constructible in z with support function g** if there is a globally subanalytic respectively constructible function $F : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$f(t, z) = F(g(t), z)$$

for every $(t, z) \in Z$.

- b) We call a function $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ **globally subanalytic in z** respectively **constructible in z** if there is a globally subanalytic respectively constructible function $F : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and a definable $g : \pi(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ such that

$$f(t, z) = F(g(t), z)$$

for every $(t, z) \in Z$.

1.25 Remark

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $g : \pi(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ be definable. The following holds.

- (1) A globally subanalytic function resp. constructible function $Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ in z with support function g is definable.

- (2) Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $G : \mathbb{C}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a globally subanalytic function. Let $J_1, \dots, J_q : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be globally subanalytic in z with support function g . Then

$$H : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto G(J_1(t, z), \dots, J_q(t, z)),$$

is globally subanalytic in z with support function g .

Proof

(1): Clear.

(2): Let $K_1, \dots, K_q : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be globally subanalytic such that $J_j(t, z) = K_j(g(t), z)$ for every $(t, z) \in Z$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. Let w range over \mathbb{R}^l . Then

$$F : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (w, z) \mapsto G(K_1(w, z), \dots, K_q(w, z)),$$

is globally subanalytic. We have

$$F(g(t), z) = G(J_1(t, z), \dots, J_q(t, z))$$

for every $(t, z) \in Z$. ■

1.26 Remark

Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$. Let $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be definable. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be with $a \leq b$. Let $Z = Y \times [a, b]$. Let $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be globally subanalytic in τ with support function $g : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$. Suppose that f_t is bounded for every $t \in Y$. Consider

$$F : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, t \mapsto \int_a^b f(t, \tau) d\tau.$$

Then F is well-defined and there is a constructible $H : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $F(t) = H(g(t))$ for every $t \in Y$.

Proof

Let w range over \mathbb{R}^l . Let $J : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (w, \tau) \mapsto J(w, \tau)$, be globally subanalytic such that

$$f(t, \tau) = J(g(t), \tau)$$

for every $(t, \tau) \in Z$. Let $J = J_1 + iJ_2$ where J_1 is the real part and J_2 the imaginary part of J . For $j \in \{1, 2\}$ we consider

$$G_j : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (w, \tau) \mapsto \begin{cases} J_j(w, \tau), & \tau \in [a, b], \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then G_j is globally subanalytic. Let $G := G_1 + iG_2$. By Fact 1.19(1) the set

$$\text{Fin}(G) := \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^l \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}} |G_j(w, \tau)| d\tau < \infty \text{ for } j \in \{1, 2\} \right\}$$

is globally subanalytic. We obtain $g(Y) \subset \text{Fin}(G)$, because f_t is bounded for every $t \in Y$. With Fact 1.19(2) we obtain that the function $H : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$H(w) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(w, \tau) d\tau = \int_a^b J(w, \tau) d\tau$$

if $w \in \text{Fin}(G)$ and $H(w) = 0$ otherwise is constructible. For $t \in Y$ we have $F(t) = H(g(t))$. ■

2 Complexification and Global Complexification

In this section \mathcal{M} denotes a fixed o-minimal structure on \mathbb{R} and the expression "definable" means always "definable in \mathcal{M} " if not otherwise mentioned.

2.1 Definition

We say that \mathcal{M} has **complexification** if the following holds. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ be open and let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a definable real analytic function. Then for every $x \in X$ there is a definable open neighbourhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ of x , an open set $V \subset \mathbb{C}^l$ with $U \subset V$, and a definable holomorphic function $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $F|_U = f|_U$.

So \mathcal{M} has complexification if every definable real analytic function has locally a definable holomorphic extension.

2.2 Example

- (1) Let \mathcal{M} be an o-minimal expansion of \mathbb{R}_{an} (e.g. $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$). Then \mathcal{M} has complexification.
- (2) The o-minimal structure \mathbb{R}_{exp} does not have complexification.

Proof

(1): This follows simply by power series expansion.

(2): We denote by f the real exponential function which is definable in \mathbb{R}_{exp} . Consider

$$\exp : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, x + iy \mapsto \exp(x)(\cos(y) + i \sin(y)),$$

which is holomorphic. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and let V be an open ball in \mathbb{C} around x . By the identity theorem we see that $\exp|_V$ is the unique holomorphic extension of $f|_{V \cap \mathbb{R}}$ on V . But Bianconi showed in [1] that no restriction of the global sine function on a non-empty open interval is definable in \mathbb{R}_{exp} . ■

We mention that such questions are not answered completely. A field of open problems in this context are for example o-minimal structures which are generated by so called convergent Weierstrass systems. We refer to [26] for the details.

2.3 Definition

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that \mathcal{M} has **l -ary global complexification** if the following holds. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ be open and let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a definable real analytic function. Then there is a definable open set V in \mathbb{C}^l with $X \subset V$ and a definable holomorphic function $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $F|_X = f$. Moreover we call F a **global complexification** of f .

So \mathcal{M} has l -ary global complexification for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ if every definable real analytic function $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $X \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ is open has a definable holomorphic extension.

2.4 Remark

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$. If \mathcal{M} has $(l + 1)$ -ary global complexification then it has l -ary global complexification.

By Fact 1.12 every definable function in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ is piecewise given by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\text{exp}, \log)$ -terms. A consequence is the following.

2.5 Fact (Kaiser, [17] Theorem C)

The o-minimal structure $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ has unary global complexification.

2.6 Definition

We say that \mathcal{M} has **global complexification** if \mathcal{M} has l -ary global complexification for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

So \mathcal{M} has global complexification if every definable real analytic function has a definable holomorphic extension.

2.7 Remark

If \mathcal{M} has global complexification then it has complexification. So \mathbb{R}_{exp} does not have global complexification.

It is not known to us whether there is an o-minimal structure which has complexification but no global complexification. The problem is that there is no general concept how definable functions in o-minimal structures look like. But for the case that \mathcal{M} is the pure real field all definable real analytic functions are so called Nash functions. For this class of functions there are strong results like the implicit function theorem or the Artin-Mazur description (see [3],

Chapter 8). With such descriptions one gets the following.

2.8 Fact (Kaiser, [18] Theorem B)

The pure real field \mathbb{R} has global complexification.

(See also Shiota in [34], Chapter I.6.7.)

For the o-minimal structure \mathbb{R}_{an} the situation is much more complicated since much more functions than in \mathbb{R} are definable in there. Fortunately there are deep geometrical results for globally subanalytic functions. These are the preparation theorems of Lion and Rolin (see [25]) which give a nice representation of a globally subanalytic function in one variable and are precise enough to establish global complexification: The idea is to compute a suitable holomorphic extension of a real analytic globally subanalytic function in one variable at first and then do a non-trivial induction on the number of variables (see [17]). Therefore in [17] Tobias Kaiser set up the notion of parametric global complexification.

For $n, l \in \mathbb{N}$ let t range over \mathbb{R}^n and x over \mathbb{R}^l . Let z range over \mathbb{C}^l .

2.9 Definition

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that \mathcal{M} has **l -ary parametric global complexification** if the following holds. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l$ be definable such that X_t is open for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto f(t, x)$, be definable such that $f_t : X_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is real analytic for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there is a definable $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}^l$ with $X \subset Z$ such that $Z_t = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^l \mid (t, z) \in Z\}$ is open for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a definable function $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto F(t, z)$, such that F_t is holomorphic for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F|_X = f$. We call $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a **parametric global complexification** of f .

2.10 Remark

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

- (1) If \mathcal{M} has $(l+1)$ -ary parametric global complexification then it has l -ary parametric global complexification.
- (2) If \mathcal{M} has l -ary parametric global complexification then it has l -ary global complexification.

2.11 Definition

We say that \mathcal{M} has **parametric global complexification** if \mathcal{M} has l -ary parametric global complexification for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.12 Remark (Kaiser, [17] Remark 1.13)

Also, if there is an open nonempty subset of \mathbb{R}^l that is contained in every X_t , there may be no $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}^l$ such that there is an open and nonempty subset of \mathbb{C}^l that is contained in every Z_t as shown by the example

$$\mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto 1/(t^2 + x^2).$$

2.13 Remark

If \mathcal{M} has parametric global complexification then it has global complexification.

If one deals with parametric global complexification there is the problem to "lift" the open property from the univariate case into the multivariate case since fiberwise open does not imply open. So we set up the concept of high parametric global complexification (see also [17] for the ideas).

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let u range over \mathbb{R}^m .

2.14 Definition

- (a) Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that \mathcal{M} has **l -ary high parametric global complexification** if the following holds. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^l$ be definable such that $X_t = \{(u, x) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^l \mid (t, u, x) \in X\}$ is open in $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^l$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be definable such that $f_t : X_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, x) \mapsto f(t, u, x)$, is real analytic for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there is an l -ary parametric global complexification $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, u, z) \mapsto F(t, u, z)$, of f such that $Z_t = \{(u, z) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{C}^l \mid (t, u, z) \in Z\}$ is open in $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{C}^l$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We call F a **high parametric global complexification of f with respect to (u, x)** .
- (b) We say that \mathcal{M} has **high parametric global complexification** if \mathcal{M} has l -ary high parametric global complexification for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.15 Remark

If \mathcal{M} has high parametric global complexification then it has parametric global complexification and therefore global complexification.

2.16 Fact (Kaiser, [17] Theorem 2.10)

The o -minimal structure \mathbb{R}_{an} has high parametric global complexification. Therefore \mathbb{R}_{an} has parametric global complexification and global complexification.

For the rest of Section 2 let $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$.

2.17 Example

Let $X := \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and consider the definable function

$$f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, x) \mapsto \begin{cases} \exp(\frac{x}{u}), & u > 0, \\ 0, & u \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Let

$$Z := \{(u, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C} \mid |\operatorname{Im}(z)| < \pi u \text{ if } u > 0\}.$$

Then the function

$$G : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (u, z) \mapsto \begin{cases} \exp(\frac{z}{u}), & u > 0, \\ 0, & u \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

is a unary parametric global complexification of f .

2.18 Remark

Let X and f be as in Example 2.17. Let $Z \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}$ be definable and let $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a unary parametric global complexification of f . Then there is no $r > 0$ such that $]0, r[\times (]0, r[+ i]0, r[) \subset Z$, i.e. F is no unary high parametric global complexification with respect to (u, x) .

Proof

Note that Z_t is open for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume the contrary. Fix $r > 0$ such that

$$Q :=]0, r[\times (]0, r[+ i]0, r[) \subset Z.$$

By the identity theorem we have for $(u, z) \in Z$ that $F(u, z) = \exp(z/u)$ if $u > 0$ and $F(u, z) = 0$ otherwise. Note that Q is definable, but $F|_Q$ is not definable, because for every $(u, x + iy) \in Q$ we have

$$F(u, x + iy) = \exp(x/u)(\cos(y/u) + i \sin(y/u))$$

and the global sine function (or cosine function) is not definable at infinity, a contradiction. ■

Nevertheless it is absolutely possible that $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ has global complexification since the underlying function must be real analytic on its domain and f in Example 2.17 is not real analytic at zero.

3 $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -Definable Functions

3.1 Log-Analytic Functions and the Exponential Number

We fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a definable $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$.

3.1 Definition

Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function.

- (a) Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By induction on r we define that f is **log-analytic of order at most r** .

Base case: The function f is log-analytic of order at most 0 if there is a decomposition \mathcal{C} of X into finitely many definable sets such that for $C \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a globally subanalytic function $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f|_C = F|_C$.

Inductive step: The function f is log-analytic of order at most r if the following holds: There is a decomposition \mathcal{C} of X into finitely many definable sets such that for $C \in \mathcal{C}$ there are $k, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, a globally subanalytic function $F : \mathbb{R}^{k+l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and log-analytic functions $g_1, \dots, g_k : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, h_1, \dots, h_l : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ of order at most $r - 1$ such that

$$f|_C = F(g_1, \dots, g_k, \log(h_1), \dots, \log(h_l)).$$

- (b) Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We call f **log-analytic of order r** if f is log-analytic of order at most r but not of order at most $r - 1$.
- (c) We call f **log-analytic** if f is log-analytic of order r for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

3.2 Definition

Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Let E be a set of positive definable functions on X .

- (a) By induction on $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we define that f has **exponential number at most e with respect to E** .

Base Case: The function f has exponential number at most 0 with respect to E if f is log-analytic.

Inductive Step: The function f has exponential number at most e with respect to E if the following holds: There are $k, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, functions $g_1, \dots, g_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h_1, \dots, h_l : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with exponential number at most $e - 1$ with respect to E and a log-analytic function $F : \mathbb{R}^{k+l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f = F(g_1, \dots, g_k, \exp(h_1), \dots, \exp(h_l))$$

and $\exp(h_1), \dots, \exp(h_l) \in E$.

- (b) Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We say that f has **exponential number e with respect to E** if f has exponential number at most e with respect to E but not at most $e - 1$ with respect to E .

- (c) We say that f **can be constructed from** E if there is $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that f has exponential number e with respect to E .

3.3 Example

The function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \log(x^2 + |x| + 1)$, is log-analytic. The function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \log(\exp(x + \exp(x)) + 1)$, has exponential number at most 2 with respect to $E := \{g_1, g_2\}$ where

$$g_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, x \mapsto \exp(x), \quad g_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, x \mapsto \exp(x + \exp(x)).$$

3.4 Remark

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let E be a set of positive definable functions on X .

- (1) Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function with exponential number at most e with respect to E . Then $\exp(f)$ has exponential number at most $e + 1$ with respect to $E \cup \{\exp(f)\}$.
- (2) Let $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_s : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be functions with exponential number at most e with respect to E and let $F : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be log-analytic. Then $F(f_1, \dots, f_s)$ has exponential number at most e with respect to E .

(See also [27], Section 1 for Definition 3.1 to Remark 3.4 and also for some more facts and examples in this context.)

3.5 Remark

Let $X_1, X_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be definable and disjoint. Let $X = X_1 \cup X_2$. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$ let E_j be a set of positive definable functions on X_j and $f_j : X_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that f_j has exponential number at most e with respect to E_j for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let

$$E := \{g \mid g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is a function with } g|_{X_j} \in E_j \text{ for } j \in \{1, 2\}\}.$$

Then

$$f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \begin{cases} f_1(x), & x \in X_1, \\ f_2(x), & x \in X_2, \end{cases}$$

has exponential number at most e with respect to E .

We need the concept of the exponential number also in the complex setting.

For the rest of Section 3.1 we fix a definable $Z \subset \mathbb{C}^m$. Let $z := (z_1, \dots, z_m)$ range over \mathbb{C}^m . Let $x := (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $y := (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ range over \mathbb{R}^m such that $z = x + iy$. We fix a function $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $F(z) = u(x, y) + iv(x, y)$ where u is the real and v the imaginary part of F considered as real functions.

3.6 Definition

We call F log-analytic if u and v are log-analytic.

3.7 Remark

The function $\mathbb{C}^- \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, w \mapsto \log(w)$, is log-analytic.

Proof

Note that for every $w \in \mathbb{C}^-$

$$\log(w) = \log(|w|) + i\arg(w).$$

We see that

$$\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, v) \mapsto \log(\sqrt{u^2 + v^2}),$$

is log-analytic and that

$$\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, v) \mapsto \arg(u + iv),$$

is log-analytic (since it is globally subanalytic). ■

3.8 Definition

Let E be a set of definable functions on Z without zeros. We say that F can be constructed from E if u and v can be constructed from

$$E^{\text{Re}} := \{\exp(\text{Re}(g)) \mid g \in \log(E)\}$$

where $\log(E) := \{\log(h) \mid h \in E\}$.

3.9 Remark

Let E be a set of positive real valued definable functions on Z . Assume that F takes only real values. Then Definition 3.8 coincides with Definition 3.2(c) if one considers F and every $g \in E$ as a real function.

Proof

We have $F = u, v = 0$ and $E^{\text{Re}} = \{\exp(\text{Re}(g)) \mid g \in \log(E)\} = E$ since $\text{Re}(g) = g$ for every $g \in \log(E)$. ■

We can formulate Remark 3.4 also for the complex setting.

3.10 Remark

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let E be a set of definable functions on Z .

- (1) Assume that $\text{Im}(F)$ is bounded and that $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ can be constructed from E . Then $\exp(F)$ can be constructed from $D := E \cup \{\exp(F)\}$.

- (2) Let $F_1, \dots, F_l : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions which can be constructed from E and let $G : \mathbb{C}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be log-analytic. Then $G(F_1, \dots, F_l)$ can be constructed from E .

Proof

(1): Note that $\exp(F)$ is definable. Note that

$$\exp(F(x + iy)) = \exp(u(x, y))(\cos(v(x, y)) + i \sin(v(x, y)))$$

for $x + iy \in Z$. By Remark 3.4(1) $\exp(u)$ can be constructed from $E^{\text{Re}} \cup \{\exp(u)\}$. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be such that $|v| \leq M$. Let $T \in \{\cos, \sin\}$. Then

$$T^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \begin{cases} T(x), & |x| \leq M, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

is globally subanalytic. Therefore by Remark 3.4(2)

$$Z \mapsto \mathbb{R}, x + iy \mapsto \exp(u(x, y))T^*(v(x, y)),$$

can be constructed from $E^{\text{Re}} \cup \{\exp(u)\} = D^{\text{Re}}$.

(2): Let u_j be the real part and v_j be the imaginary part of F_j considered as real functions, i.e.

$$F_j(x + iy) = u_j(x, y) + iv_j(x, y)$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and $x + iy \in Z$. Let \tilde{u} be the real part and \tilde{v} be the imaginary part of G considered as real functions. Then

$$G(F_1, \dots, F_l) = \tilde{u}(u_1, \dots, u_l, v_1, \dots, v_l) + i\tilde{v}(u_1, \dots, u_l, v_1, \dots, v_l).$$

We are done with Remark 3.4(2). ■

3.2 Restricted Log-Exp-Analytic Functions

The main results of this paper are formulated in the parametric setting. So we set up the concept of restricted log-exp-analytic functions in single variables.

For Section 3.2 let t range over \mathbb{R}^n and x over \mathbb{R}^m . We fix definable sets $C, X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ with $C \subset X$. Suppose that X_t is open for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

3.11 Definition

Let $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function.

- (a) We call f **locally bounded in x with reference set X** if the following holds. For $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $w \in X_t$ there is an open neighbourhood U of w in X_t such that $U \cap C_t = \emptyset$ or $f_t|_{U \cap C_t}$ is bounded.

- (b) Suppose that C_t is open for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We call f **locally bounded in x** if f is locally bounded in x with reference set C .

3.12 Remark

The set of locally bounded functions in x with reference set X on C is an \mathbb{R} -algebra with respect to pointwise addition and multiplication.

3.13 Remark

Let $C_1, C_2 \subset X$ be disjoint definable sets such that $C = C_1 \cup C_2$. Let $g_j : C_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be locally bounded in x with reference set X for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Then

$$g : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto \begin{cases} g_1(t, x), & (t, x) \in C_1, \\ g_2(t, x), & (t, x) \in C_2, \end{cases}$$

is locally bounded in x with reference set X .

3.14 Definition

Let $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function.

- (a) Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We say that f is **restricted log-exp-analytic in x of order (at most) e with reference set X** if f has exponential number (at most) e with respect to a set E of positive definable functions on C such that every $g \in \log(E)$ is locally bounded in x with reference set X .
- (b) We say that f is **restricted log-exp-analytic in x with reference set X** if f can be constructed from a set E of positive definable functions on C such that every $g \in \log(E)$ is locally bounded in x with reference set X .

3.15 Remark

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ let $f_j : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function which is restricted log-exp-analytic in x with reference set X . Let $F : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be log-analytic. Then

$$C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, y \mapsto F(f_1(y), \dots, f_l(y)),$$

is restricted log-exp-analytic in x with reference set X .

3.16 Definition

A function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called **restricted log-exp-analytic in x** if f is restricted log-exp-analytic in x with reference set X .

3.17 Definition

Let X be open in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$. A function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called **restricted log-exp-analytic** if f is restricted log-exp-analytic in (t, x) with reference set X .

(See also [28], Section 2 for Definition 3.11 to Definition 3.17.)

3.18 Example

The function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \log(\exp(x + \exp(x)) + 1)$, is restricted log-exp-analytic (of order at most 2). The function

$$h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \begin{cases} e^{-1/x}, & x > 0, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

is not restricted log-exp-analytic since one has $h \sim e^{-1/x}$ as $x \searrow 0$, but the function $h|_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}$ is

So we see that the class of restricted log-exp-analytic functions is a proper subclass of the class of all definable functions. Since the global logarithm function is log-analytic, but not globally subanalytic and the global exponential function is restricted log-exp-analytic, but not log-analytic we obtain the following chain.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{globally subanalytic} &\subsetneq \text{log-analytic} \subsetneq \text{restricted log-exp-analytic} \\ &\subsetneq \text{log-exp-analytic} = \text{definable}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we describe briefly the class of restricted log-exp-analytic functions in the complex setting.

For the rest of Section 3.2 let $z := (z_1, \dots, z_m)$ range over \mathbb{C}^m . Let $x := (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $y := (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ range over \mathbb{R}^m such that $z = x + iy$.

3.19 Definition

Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ be definable and let $F : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function with $F(z) = u(x, y) + iv(x, y)$ where u is the real and v is the imaginary part of F considered as real functions.

- (a) Let $Z \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ be open and definable with $D \subset Z$. We say that F is **restricted log-exp-analytic with reference set Z** if u and v are restricted log-exp-analytic with reference set Z considering Z as a real set.
- (b) Assume that D is open in \mathbb{C}^m . We say that F is **restricted log-exp-analytic** if F is restricted log-exp-analytic with reference set D .

For the next definition let $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let w range over \mathbb{R}^l , let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{C}^m$ be a definable set and let $F : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function with $F(t, w, z) = u(t, w, x, y) + iv(t, w, x, y)$ where u is the real part and v is the imaginary part of F considered as real functions.

3.20 Definition

- (a) Let $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{C}^m$ be definable with $D \subset Z$ such that Z_t is open in $\mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{C}^m$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We say that f is **restricted log-exp-analytic in (w, z) with reference set Z** if u and v are restricted log-exp-analytic in (w, x, y) with reference set Z considering Z as a real set.
- (b) Suppose that D_t is open for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We say that f is **restricted log-exp-analytic in (w, z)** if f is restricted log-exp-analytic in (w, z) with reference set D .

4 A Preparation Theorem for Restricted Log-Exp-Analytic Functions

In this section we give a preparation theorem for $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable functions from [27]. For its formulation technical tools like logarithmic scales, C -heirs and C -nice functions are needed (compare also with [27]). Then we give a preparation theorem for restricted log-exp-analytic functions from [28].

For Section 4 let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, t range over \mathbb{R}^n and x over \mathbb{R} . We fix a definable set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$.

4.1 Definition

Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. A tuple $\mathcal{Y} := (y_0, \dots, y_r)$ of functions on C is called an r -**logarithmic scale** on C with **center** $\Theta = (\Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_r)$ if the following holds:

- (a) $y_j > 0$ or $y_j < 0$ for every $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.
- (b) Θ_j is a definable function on $\pi(C)$ for every $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.
- (c) For $(t, x) \in C$ we have $y_0(t, x) = x - \Theta_0(t)$ and $y_j(t, x) = \log(|y_{j-1}(t, x)|) - \Theta_j(t)$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.
- (d) We have $\Theta_0 = 0$ or there is $\epsilon_0 \in]0, 1[$ such that $0 < |y_0(t, x)| < \epsilon_0|x|$ for all $(t, x) \in C$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ the following holds: We have $\Theta_j = 0$ or there is $\epsilon_j \in]0, 1[$ such that $0 < |y_j(t, x)| < \epsilon_j|\log(|y_{j-1}(t, x)|)|$ for all $(t, x) \in C$.

4.2 Definition

Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathcal{Y} := (y_0, \dots, y_r)$ be a logarithmic scale on C .

(1) For $q := (q_0, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ and $(t, x) \in C$ we write

$$|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes q} := \prod_{j=0}^r |y_j(t, x)|^{q_j}.$$

(2) We set $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sigma := (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_r) \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}$ which defines the **sign** of \mathcal{Y} .

4.3 Example

Let $n = 1$ and consider

$$C := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \mid t \in]0, 1[, \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-t-1/t} < x < \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-1/t}\}.$$

Let $\Theta_0 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \frac{1}{1+t}$, $\Theta_1 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto -\frac{1}{t}$ and $\Theta_2 = 0$. Let $y_0 : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto x - \Theta_0(t)$, and inductively for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ let $y_j : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto \log(|y_{j-1}(t, x)|) - \Theta_j(t)$. Then $\mathcal{Y} := (y_0, y_1, y_2)$ is a 2-logarithmic scale with center $(\Theta_0, \Theta_1, \Theta_2)$.

Proof

Since $\Theta_0 < C$ we see that $y_0 > 0$. So we have

$$y_1(t, x) = \log(y_0(t, x)) - \Theta_1(t)$$

for $(t, x) \in C$. We have $\Theta_0 + e^{\Theta_1} > C$ and therefore $y_1 < 0$ since y_1 is strictly monotone increasing in x . This gives

$$y_2(t, x) = \log(-y_1(t, x)) - \Theta_2(t)$$

for $(t, x) \in C$. We have $\Theta_0 + e^{\Theta_1-1} < C$ and therefore $y_2 < 0$ and $\sigma_2 = -1$. An easy calculation shows that $x - \Theta_0(t) < \epsilon_0 x$ and that

$$|\log(x - \Theta_0(t)) - \Theta_1(t)| < \epsilon_1 |\log(x - \Theta_0(t))|$$

for $(t, x) \in C$ where $\epsilon_0 := 1/2$ and $\epsilon_1 := 1/2$. So one sees that (y_0, y_1, y_2) is a 2-logarithmic scale with center $(\Theta_0, \Theta_1, \Theta_2)$. We have $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (1, -1, -1) \in \{-1, 1\}^3$. ■

4.4 Definition

We call $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ **C -heir** if there is $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, an l -logarithmic scale $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}$ with center $(\hat{\Theta}_0, \dots, \hat{\Theta}_l)$ on C , and $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ such that $g = \exp(\hat{\Theta}_j)$.

4.5 Definition

We call $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ **C -nice** if there is a set E of C -heirs such that g can be constructed from E .

Note that the class of log-analytic functions on $\pi(C)$ is a proper subclass of the class of C -nice functions. (See [27], Section 2.3 for further properties and examples for C -heirs and C -nice functions.)

4.6 Definition

Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. We say that g is **r -log-analytically prepared in x with center Θ** if

$$g(t, x) = a(t)|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes q}u(t, x)$$

for all $(t, x) \in C$ where a is a definable function on $\pi(C)$ which vanishes identically or has no zero, $\mathcal{Y} = (y_0, \dots, y_r)$ is an r -logarithmic scale with center Θ on C , $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ and the following holds for u . There is $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $u = v \circ \phi$ where v is a power series which converges on an open neighbourhood of $[-1, 1]^s$ with $v([-1, 1]^s) \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\phi := (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_s) : C \rightarrow [-1, 1]^s$ is a function of the form

$$\phi_j(t, x) := b_j(t)|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes p_j}$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $(t, x) \in C$ where $b_j : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is definable for $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $p_j := (p_{j0}, \dots, p_{jr}) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. We call a **coefficient** and $b := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$ a tuple of **base functions** for f . An **LA-preparing tuple** for f is then

$$\mathcal{J} := (r, \mathcal{Y}, a, q, s, v, b, P)$$

where

$$P := \begin{pmatrix} p_{10} & \cdot & \cdot & p_{1r} \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ p_{s0} & \cdot & \cdot & p_{sr} \end{pmatrix} \in M(s \times (r+1), \mathbb{Q}).$$

The following preparation theorem for a log-analytic function could be established in [27].

4.7 Fact (Opris, [27] Theorem A)

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ be definable. Let $f_1, \dots, f_m : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be log-analytic functions of order at most r . Then there is a definable cell decomposition \mathcal{D} of $X_{\neq 0}$ such that $f_1|_D, \dots, f_m|_D$ are r -log-analytically prepared in x with D -nice coefficient, D -nice base functions and common D -nice center for $D \in \mathcal{D}$.

So one sees that the coefficient, center and base functions in such a preparation are compositions of log-analytic functions and C -heirs. This C -heirs are in general not log-analytic as the following example shows.

4.8 Example (Opris, [27] Example 2.37)

Consider the definable cell

$$C := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 < t < 1, \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-2/t+2e^{-1/t}} < x < \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-1/t}\}.$$

There it is shown that $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto e^{-1/t}$, is a C -heir. So the function

$$f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto e^{-1/t}x,$$

is 0-log-analytically prepared in x with center 0 with a C -nice coefficient which is not log-analytic.

4.9 Definition

Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $e \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}$. Let $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Let E be a set of positive definable functions on C .

By induction on e we define that f is **log-exp-analytically** (e, r) -**prepared** in x with center Θ with respect to E . To this preparation we assign a **preparing tuple** for f .

$e = -1$: We say that f is log-exp-analytically $(-1, r)$ -prepared in x with center Θ with respect to E if f is the zero function. A preparing tuple for f is (0) .

$e - 1 \rightarrow e$: We say that f is log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x with center Θ with respect to E if

$$f(t, x) = a(t)|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes q} \exp(c(t, x))u(t, x)$$

for every $(t, x) \in C$ where $a : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C -nice, $\mathcal{Y} := (y_0, \dots, y_r)$ is an r -logarithmic scale with C -nice center Θ , $q = (q_0, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$, $\exp(c) \in E$ where c is log-exp-analytically $(e - 1, r)$ -prepared in x with center Θ with respect to E and the following holds for u . There is $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $u = v \circ \phi$ where $\phi := (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_s) : C \rightarrow [-1, 1]^s$ with

$$\phi_j(t, x) = b_j(t)|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes p_j} \exp(d_j(t, x))$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ where $p_j \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$, $b_j : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C -nice, $\exp(d_j) \in E$, $d_j : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is log-exp-analytically $(e - 1, r)$ -prepared in x with center Θ with respect to E and v is a power series which converges absolutely on an open neighbourhood of $[-1, 1]^s$ with $v([-1, 1]^s) \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

Theorem B above is formulated in the parametric setting. So we give a preparation theorem for restricted log-exp-analytic functions in single variables (here in the last $m + 1$ variables for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$).

For the rest of Section 4 let $m, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be with $n = l + m$. Let $w := (w_1, \dots, w_l)$ range over \mathbb{R}^l and $u := (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ over \mathbb{R}^m . Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}$ be a definable set with $C \subset X$. Assume that X_w is open for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$.

4.10 Definition

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We call $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (w, u, x) \mapsto f(w, u, x)$, **$(m + 1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x** if f is log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x with respect to a set E of positive definable functions such that every $g \in \log(E)$ is locally bounded in (u, x) with reference set X .

4.11 Example

Let $C =]0, 1[^2$ and $X = \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. The function

$$C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, x) \mapsto u \cdot e^{x \cdot \log(x)},$$

is $(1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically $(1, 1)$ -prepared.

4.12 Proposition (Opris, [28] Proposition 2.12)

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}$. Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a restricted log-exp-analytic function in (u, x) of order at most e . Then there is $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a definable cell decomposition \mathcal{D} of $X_{\neq 0}$ such that $f|_D$ is $(m + 1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x for every $D \in \mathcal{D}$.

5 Proof of our Main Results

This section is devoted to the proofs of our main results. Theorem A is an immediate consequence of Theorem B. So we focus on the proof of the latter. The procedure is roughly the following.

The first step is to construct a definable holomorphic extension of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable on a single cell C . Then we have to glue the single extensions together in order to obtain a unary high parametric global complexification, an extension which is big enough to enable the induction on the number of variables and to construct a parametric global complexification in more than one variable.

The hard point here is the univariate case. For this we need a rather sophisticated set-up. Of course it is not difficult to construct a definable holomorphic extension of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable, but the challenge is to construct a unary high parametric global complexification. For this we need also some definability results on integration (see also Kaiser in [17] for the ideas in the globally subanalytic setting).

Since this procedure is very long and technical we start our considerations with some important preliminary results.

5.1 Preparations - Some Technical Preliminary Results

For the whole Section 5.1 we set the following. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let t range over \mathbb{R}^n and x over \mathbb{R} . Let z range over \mathbb{C} . We fix a non-empty definable cell $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\neq 0}$ and an r -logarithmic scale $\mathcal{Y} := (y_0, \dots, y_r)$ on C with center $\Theta := (\Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_r)$. We fix $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sigma := (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_r) \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}$.

Furthermore we say that a function $F : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ where $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$ is definable (such that Y_t is open for $t \in \pi(Y)$) is continuous (holomorphic) in z if F_t is continuous (holomorphic) for every $t \in \pi(Y)$.

5.1.1 Geometrical Properties and Holomorphic Extensions of Logarithmic Scales in One Variable

The goal for this subsection is to compute a definable holomorphic extension of the logarithmic scale \mathcal{Y} in x : Therefore one has to extend y_0, \dots, y_r in a natural way to functions g_0, \dots, g_r beyond the cell.

For Section 5.1.1 we set $D_0 := \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}$ and

$$g_0 : D_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto x - \Theta_0(t).$$

For $l \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ we set inductively

$$D_l := \{(t, x) \in D_{l-1} \mid \sigma_{l-1} g_{l-1}(t, x) > 0\}$$

and

$$g_l : D_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto \log(\sigma_{l-1}g_{l-1}(t, x)) - \Theta_l(t).$$

Set

$$D := \{(t, x) \in D_r \mid \sigma_r g_r(t, x) > 0\}.$$

5.1 Remark

We have $C \subset D \subset D_r \subset \dots \subset D_1$ and for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ we have that $g_l|_C = y_l$, and $(g_l)_t : (D_l)_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is injective and real analytic for every $t \in \pi(C)$.

5.2 Definition

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. Let $\mu_{0,l} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \Theta_l(t)$, and inductively for $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ we set

$$\mu_{j,l} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \Theta_{l-j}(t) + \sigma_{l-j} e^{\mu_{j-1,l}(t)}.$$

Set $\mu_l := \mu_{l,l}$.

5.3 Remark

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. The functions μ_l and $\mu_{j,l}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$ are definable.

It turns out that the graph of μ_l is disjoint from C and exactly the zero set of g_l for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. Additionally the sign of \mathcal{Y} defines uniquely the position of the graph of μ_l with respect to C and with respect to the graph of μ_j for $j \neq l$. (Compare with Proposition 5.4 and Corollary 5.5. The functions $\mu_{j,l}$ for $0 \leq j < l$ are needed for technical reasons in this context.)

5.4 Proposition

Let $t \in \pi(C)$. Let $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$. We have $(t, \mu_l(t)) \in D_j$ and

$$g_j(t, \mu_l(t)) = \sigma_j e^{\mu_{l-j,l}(t)}$$

if $j < l$.

Proof

That $(t, \mu_l(t)) \in D_0$ is clear. So suppose that $l > 0$. We show the statement by induction on $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$.

$j = 0$: With Definition 5.2 we obtain

$$g_0(t, \mu_l(t)) = \mu_l(t) - \Theta_0(t) = \sigma_0 e^{\mu_{l-1,l}(t)}.$$

$j - 1 \rightarrow j$: By the inductive hypothesis $(t, \mu_l(t)) \in D_{j-1}$ and

$$g_{j-1}(t, \mu_l(t)) = \sigma_{j-1} e^{\mu_{l-j,l}(t)}.$$

So we see that $(t, \mu_l(t)) \in D_j$. If $j < l$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_j(t, \mu_l(t)) &= \log(\sigma_{j-1} g_{j-1}(t, \mu_l(t))) - \Theta_j(t) \\ &= \mu_{l-j,l}(t) - \Theta_j(t) = \sigma_j e^{\mu_{l-j-1,l}(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

■

5.5 Corollary

For $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ and $t \in \pi(C)$ we have $g_l(t, \mu_l(t)) = 0$ and

$$Z(g_l) := \{(t, x) \in D_l \mid g_l(t, x) = 0\} = \{(t, x) \in D_l \mid x = \mu_l(t)\}.$$

Proof

For $l = 0$ this is clear. So assume $l > 0$. With Proposition 5.4 we obtain $(t, \mu_l(t)) \in D_l$,

$$g_{l-1}(t, \mu_l(t)) = \sigma_{l-1} e^{\Theta_l(t)},$$

and therefore

$$g_l(t, \mu_l(t)) = \log(\sigma_{l-1} g_{l-1}(t, \mu_l(t))) - \Theta_l(t) = 0$$

for every $t \in \pi(C)$. With Remark 5.1 we are done. ■

For the next proposition we say the following.

For a function $f : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we say that f is (strictly) monotone increasing in x if f_t is (strictly) monotone increasing for all $t \in \pi(C)$ and (strictly) monotone decreasing in x if f_t is (strictly) monotone decreasing for all $t \in \pi(C)$ respectively.

5.6 Proposition

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. The following properties hold.

- (1) The function g_l is strictly monotone in x . It is strictly monotone increasing in x if and only if $\prod_{j=0}^{l-1} \sigma_j = 1$.
- (2) Either $\mu_l < C$ or $\mu_l > C$. We have $\mu_l < C$ if and only if $\prod_{j=0}^l \sigma_j = 1$.
- (3) Let $k \in \{l+1, \dots, r\}$. Either $\mu_l < \mu_k$ or $\mu_k < \mu_l$. we have $\mu_l < \mu_k$ if and only if $\prod_{j=0}^l \sigma_j = 1$.

Proof

(1): We do an induction on $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. For $l = 0$ it is clear.

$l-1 \rightarrow l$: We assume $\sigma_{l-1} = 1$. The case " $\sigma_{l-1} = -1$ " is handled completely similar. Then g_l is strictly monotone increasing in x if and only if g_{l-1} is

strictly monotone increasing in x . By the inductive hypothesis we have that g_{l-1} is strictly monotone increasing in x if and only if $\prod_{j=0}^{l-2} \sigma_j = 1$. This gives the result.

(2): Because $g_l|_C = y_l$ we obtain with Definition 4.1 $g_l|_C > 0$ or $g_l|_C < 0$. We assume $g_l|_C > 0$, i.e. $\sigma_l = 1$. The case " $g_l|_C < 0$ " is handled completely similar. By (1) we have that g_l is either strictly monotone increasing in x or strictly monotone decreasing in x . If the former holds then $\mu_l < C$ by Corollary 5.5. Additionally $\prod_{j=0}^{l-1} \sigma_j = 1$ by (1) and therefore $\prod_{j=0}^l \sigma_j = 1$. If the latter holds then $\mu_l > C$ by Corollary 5.5. Additionally $\prod_{j=0}^{l-1} \sigma_j = -1$ by (1) and therefore $\prod_{j=0}^l \sigma_j = -1$.

(3): With Proposition 5.4 we obtain

$$g_l(t, \mu_k(t)) = \sigma_l e^{\mu_{k-l-1, k}(t)}$$

for every $t \in \pi(C)$. We assume that g_l is strictly monotone increasing in x . The case " g_l is strictly monotone decreasing" is handled completely similar. By (1) $\prod_{j=0}^{l-1} \sigma_j = 1$. If $\sigma_l = 1$ then $g_l(t, \mu_k(t)) = e^{\mu_{k-l-1, k}(t)} > 0$ for every $t \in \pi(C)$ and consequently $\mu_l < \mu_k$ by Corollary 5.5. If $\sigma_l = -1$ then $g_l(t, \mu_k(t)) = -e^{\mu_{k-l-1, k}(t)} < 0$ for every $t \in \pi(C)$ and consequently $\mu_k < \mu_l$ by Corollary 5.5. ■

So one sees immediately that if $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ the graphs of all zeros μ_0, \dots, μ_r are below the cell and if $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (-1, 1, \dots, 1)$ the graphs of all zeros μ_0, \dots, μ_r are above the cell.




Figure 5.1 The set D and the functions μ_j for a 2-logarithmic scale \mathcal{Y} on C with continuous center if $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (1, 1, 1)$ on the left and $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (-1, 1, 1)$ on the right.

If $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y})$ has another value than $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ or $(-1, 1, \dots, 1)$ then there is a zero whose graph is above the cell and a zero whose graph is below the cell. To identify these zeros whose graphs are "closest" to the cell also in this case we introduce the following.

5.7 Definition

We define the **change index** k^{ch} for \mathcal{Y} as follows: If there is $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ with $\sigma_l = -1$ set

$$k^{\text{ch}} := \max\{l \in \{0, \dots, r\} \mid \sigma_l = -1\} - 1.$$

Otherwise set $k^{\text{ch}} := -2$.

5.8 Remark

If $k^{\text{ch}} = -2$ then $\sigma_0 = \dots = \sigma_r = 1$. If $k^{\text{ch}} = -1$ then $\sigma_0 = -1$ and $\sigma_1 = \dots = \sigma_r = 1$.

One sees that if $k^{\text{ch}} < 0$ the graphs of all zeros are either below the cell (if $k^{\text{ch}} = -2$ which means $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (1, \dots, 1)$) or above the cell (if $k^{\text{ch}} = -1$ which means $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (-1, 1, \dots, 1)$).

5.9 Remark

Let $k := k^{\text{ch}}$. The following holds.

- (1) If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ and $k < 0$ then

$$D = \{(t, x) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R} \mid x > \mu_r(t)\}.$$

- (2) If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ and $k < 0$ then

$$D = \{(t, x) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R} \mid x < \mu_r(t)\}.$$

(3) If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ and $k \geq 0$ then

$$D = \{(t, x) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R} \mid \mu_r(t) < x < \mu_k(t)\}.$$

(4) If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ and $k \geq 0$ then

$$D = \{(t, x) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R} \mid \mu_k(t) < x < \mu_r(t)\}.$$

Proof

We show property (3). The rest is proven similarly. Note that $\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j = -1$, $\mu_r < C < \mu_k$ and $\sigma_\kappa g_\kappa(t, x) = \sigma_\kappa y_\kappa(t, x) > 0$ for $(t, x) \in C$ and $\kappa \in \{k, r\}$.

Let $(t, x) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}$ be with $\mu_r(t) < x < \mu_k(t)$. If $\prod_{j=0}^l \sigma_j = 1$ then $\mu_l < \mu_r$ if $l \neq r$ by Proposition 5.6(3). If $\prod_{j=0}^l \sigma_j = -1$ then $\mu_k < \mu_l$ if $l \neq k$ (since then $l < k$). So we obtain with the intermediate value theorem, Definition 4.1 and Corollary 5.5 that $\sigma_j g_j(t, x) > 0$ for every $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ since $C \subset D$ and $(g_j)_t$ is continuous. Therefore $(t, x) \in D$.

Let $(t, x) \in D$. Then we have $\sigma_\kappa g_\kappa(t, x) > 0$ for $\kappa \in \{k, r\}$. Again with Proposition 5.6(2), Corollary 5.5, the continuity of g_κ in x and the monotony property of g_κ for $\kappa \in \{k, r\}$ we obtain the result. ■

So one sees that if $k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$, i.e. $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) \notin \{(1, \dots, 1), (-1, 1, \dots, 1)\}$, that the graphs of μ_r and $\mu_{k^{\text{ch}}}$ are "closest" to the cell (one from above and the other from below).




Figure 5.2 The set D and the functions μ_j for a 2-logarithmic scale \mathcal{Y} on C with $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (1, -1, -1)$ and continuous center. Here we have $r = 2$ and $k^{\text{ch}} = 1$.

5.10 Example

Let $n = 1$ and consider

$$C := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \mid t \in]0, 1[, \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-t-1/t} < x < \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-1/t}\}.$$

Let $\Theta_0 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \frac{1}{1+t}$, $\Theta_1 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto -\frac{1}{t}$ and $\Theta_2 = 0$. Let $y_0 : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto x - \Theta_0(t)$, and inductively for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ let $y_j : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto \log(|y_{j-1}(t, x)|) - \Theta_j(t)$. Then $\mathcal{Y} := (y_0, y_1, y_2)$ is a 2-logarithmic scale with center $(\Theta_0, \Theta_1, \Theta_2)$ and $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) := (\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = (1, -1, -1) \in \{-1, 1\}^3$. Therefore $k^{\text{ch}} = 1$, $\mu_0 = \Theta_0$, $\mu_1 = \Theta_0 + e^{\Theta_1}$, $\mu_2 = \Theta_0 + e^{\Theta_1-1}$, $\mu_{0,1} = \Theta_1$, $\mu_{0,2} = 0$ and $\mu_{1,2} = \Theta_1 - 1$.

Proof

Compare with the proof of Example 4.3. ■

Now we are able to compute the desired definable holomorphic extension of \mathcal{Y} in x . So we merge into the complex setting.

5.11 Definition

(a) Consider $H_0 := \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$ and

$$z_0 : H_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto z - \Theta_0(t).$$

Inductively for $l \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ we set

$$H_l := \{(t, z) \in H_{l-1} \mid \sigma_{l-1} z_{l-1}(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-\}$$

and

$$z_l : H_l \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log(\sigma_{l-1} z_{l-1}(t, z)) - \Theta_l(t).$$

(b) Set

$$H := \{(t, z) \in H_r \mid \sigma_r z_r(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-\}.$$

5.12 Remark

The following holds for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.

- (1) We have $C \subset D_l \subset H_l$, $H_l \subset H_{l-1}$ if $l > 0$ and $(H_l)_t$ is open for every $t \in \pi(C)$. Additionally z_l is well-defined and holomorphic in z .
- (2) We have $z_l|_{D_l} = g_l$ and $z_l|_C = y_l$.
- (3) Let E be a set of positive definable functions such that $\Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_r$ can be constructed from E . Then z_l can be constructed from E .

Proof

(1): This follows by an easy induction on l and the fact that the complex logarithm function is holomorphic on \mathbb{C}^- .

(2): This follows immediately by an easy induction on l and from Definition 5.11(a).

(3): We do an induction on l . We have $z_0(t, z) = z - \Theta_0(t)$ for every $(t, z) \in H_0$ and are done with Remark 3.10(2).

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: We have $z_l(t, z) = \log(\sigma_{l-1} z_{l-1}(t, z)) - \Theta_l(t)$ for every $(t, z) \in H_l$ and are done with the inductive hypothesis and Remark 3.10(2). ■

We often consider z_l as a function on H for every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.

Remark 5.12 shows that z_l is a complex extension of y_l in the last variable z which is holomorphic in z .

5.13 Remark

Let $k := k^{\text{ch}}$.

If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ and $k < 0$ then

$$H = \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid z \in \mathbb{C}_{\mu_r(t)}^-\}.$$

If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ and $k < 0$ then

$$H = \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid z \in \mathbb{C}_{\mu_r(t)}^+\}.$$

If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ and $k \geq 0$ then

$$H = \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid z \in \mathbb{C}_{\mu_r(t)}^- \cap \mathbb{C}_{\mu_k(t)}^+\}.$$

If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ and $k \geq 0$ then

$$H = \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid z \in \mathbb{C}_{\mu_r(t)}^+ \cap \mathbb{C}_{\mu_k(t)}^-\}.$$

Proof

We have

$$H = D \cup (\pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}),$$

because for $(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ we obtain $\sigma_l z_l(t, z) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ for every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ by the definition of the complex logarithm function. We are done with Remark 5.12(2) and Remark 5.9. ■

5.14 Definition

Let $q := (q_0, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. We set

$$(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q} : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \prod_{j=0}^r (\sigma_j z_j(t, z))^{q_j}.$$

5.15 Remark

Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. The following holds.

- (1) H_t is open for every $t \in \pi(C)$ and $(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}$ is well-defined and holomorphic in z . In particular

$$(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}|_C = |\mathcal{Y}|^{\otimes q}.$$

- (2) Let E be a set of positive definable functions such that $\Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_r$ can be constructed from E . Then $(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}$ can be constructed from E .

Proof

Note that $\sigma_l z_l(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ for every $(t, z) \in H$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ and that for $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ the function $\mathbb{C}^- \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto z^p$, is holomorphic and globally subanalytic. So property (1) follows from Remark 5.12(1) and Remark 5.12(2). Property (2) follows immediately with Remark 5.12(3) and Remark 3.10(2). ■

For the rest of Section 5.1.1 we fix $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k^{\text{ch}}, r\}$ if $k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$.

For technical reasons it is very useful to describe z_l as a function of $z - \mu_\kappa$. This helps enormously to answer questions on definability of parameterized integrals where complex logarithmic scales are involved.

5.16 Definition

Let $H_{0,\kappa}^* := \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa} : H_{0,\kappa}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto z - \mu_\kappa(t)$, and inductively for $l \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$ let

$$H_{l,\kappa}^* := \{(t, z) \in H_{l-1,\kappa}^* \mid 1 + \frac{\sigma_{l-1} \mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}} \in \mathbb{C}^-\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa} : H_{l,\kappa}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{l-1} \mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}}\right).$$

Set $\mathcal{P}_\kappa := \mathcal{P}_{\kappa,\kappa}$.

5.17 Remark

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$. The function $\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}$ is well-defined and definable. Furthermore we have $(t, \mu_\kappa(t)) \in H_{l,\kappa}^*$ and $\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, \mu_\kappa(t)) = 0$ for $t \in \pi(C)$.

5.18 Proposition

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$. We have $H_{l,\kappa}^* = H_l$ and if $l \neq \kappa$ then

$$z_l(t, z) = \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) + \sigma_l e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1,\kappa}(t)}$$

for $(t, z) \in H_l$.

Proof

By definition of $H_{0,\kappa}^*$ we have $H_{0,\kappa}^* = H_0$. If $\kappa = 0$ we are done. So assume that $\kappa > 0$. We do an induction on l . For $(t, z) \in H_{0,\kappa}^*$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} z_0(t, z) &= z - \Theta_0 - \sigma_0 e^{\mu_{\kappa-1,\kappa}(t)} + \sigma_0 e^{\mu_{\kappa-1,\kappa}(t)} \\ &= z - \mu_\kappa(t) + \sigma_0 e^{\mu_{\kappa-1,\kappa}(t)} = \mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}(t, z) + \sigma_0 e^{\mu_{\kappa-1,\kappa}(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

$l-1 \rightarrow l$: Note that $H_{l-1} = H_{l-1,\kappa}^*$. Let $(t, z) \in H_{l-1}$. We get with the inductive hypothesis (since $l-1 \neq \kappa$)

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{l-1} z_{l-1}(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^- &\Leftrightarrow \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{l-1}(z_{l-1}(t, z) - \sigma_{l-1} e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)})}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^- \\ &\Leftrightarrow \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{l-1} \mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^-. \end{aligned}$$

So we obtain $H_l = H_{l,\kappa}^*$. Suppose $l \neq \kappa$. Let $(t, z) \in H_l$. We obtain with the inductive hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} z_l(t, z) &= \log(\sigma_{l-1} z_{l-1}(t, z)) - \Theta_l(t) \\ &= \log(\sigma_{l-1} (\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z) + \sigma_{l-1} e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)})) - \Theta_l(t) \\ &= \log(\sigma_{l-1} \mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z) + e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}) - \Theta_l(t) \\ &= \log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{l-1} \mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}}\right) + \mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t) - \Theta_l(t) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) + \mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t) - \Theta_l(t) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) + \Theta_l(t) + \sigma_l e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1,\kappa}(t)} - \Theta_l(t) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) + \sigma_l e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1,\kappa}(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

■

5.19 Corollary

For $(t, z) \in H_\kappa = H_{\kappa, \kappa}^*$ we have $z_\kappa(t, z) = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(t, z)$.

Proof

Let $\kappa = 0$. Then $\Theta_\kappa = \mu_\kappa$ and therefore

$$z_\kappa(t, z) = z - \mu_\kappa(t) = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(t, z)$$

for $(t, z) \in H_\kappa$. So let $\kappa > 0$. With Proposition 5.18 we have for $(t, z) \in H_\kappa$

$$\begin{aligned} z_\kappa(t, z) &= \log(\sigma_{\kappa-1} z_{\kappa-1}(t, z)) - \Theta_\kappa(t) \\ &= \log(\sigma_{\kappa-1}(\mathcal{P}_{\kappa-1, \kappa}(t, z) + \sigma_{\kappa-1} e^{\mu_{0, \kappa}(t)})) - \Theta_\kappa(t) \\ &= \log(\sigma_{\kappa-1}(\mathcal{P}_{\kappa-1, \kappa}(t, z) + \sigma_{\kappa-1} e^{\Theta_\kappa(t)})) - \Theta_\kappa(t) \\ &= \log(\sigma_{\kappa-1} \mathcal{P}_{\kappa-1, \kappa}(t, z) + e^{\Theta_\kappa(t)}) - \Theta_\kappa(t) \\ &= \log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{\kappa-1} \mathcal{P}_{\kappa-1, \kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\Theta_\kappa(t)}}\right) = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(t, z). \end{aligned}$$

■

We always consider $\mathcal{P}_{l, \kappa}$ as a function on H for $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$.

5.20 Example

Let $n = 1$ and consider

$$C := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \mid t \in]0, 1[, \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-t-1/t} < x < \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-1/t}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{Y} := (y_0, y_1, y_2)$ and $\Theta := (\Theta_0, \Theta_1, \Theta_2)$ be as in Example 5.10. We have

$$H = \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-1-1/t} < z < \frac{1}{1+t} + e^{-1/t} \text{ if } z \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

For $(t, z) \in H$ we have

$$z_0(t, z) = z - \Theta_0(t), \quad z_1(t, z) = \log(z_0(t, z)) - \Theta_1(t),$$

$$z_2(t, z) = \log(-z_1(t, z)) - \Theta_2(t)$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,1}(t, z) = z - \mu_1(t), \quad \mathcal{P}_{1,1}(t, z) = \log\left(1 + \frac{z - \mu_1(t)}{e^{\mu_{0,1}(t)}}\right),$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,2}(t, z) = z - \mu_2(t), \quad \mathcal{P}_{1,2}(t, z) = \log\left(1 + \frac{z - \mu_2(t)}{e^{\mu_{1,2}(t)}}\right),$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{2,2}(t, z) = \log\left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{P}_{1,2}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{0,2}(t)}}\right)$$

where $\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_{0,1}, \mu_{0,2}$ and $\mu_{1,2}$ are as in Example 5.10.

5.21 Remark

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$. Then $\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}$ is holomorphic in z . For $(t, z) \in H$ we have $(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j) \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and $(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j) \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if $z \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof

The holomorphy is clear. If $l = \kappa$ we obtain with Corollary 5.19

$$\sigma_{\kappa} \mathcal{P}_{\kappa}(t, z) = \sigma_{\kappa} z_{\kappa}(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$$

and if $z \in \mathbb{R}$ then $(t, z) \in D$ (compare with Remark 5.13 and Remark 5.9) and therefore $\sigma_{\kappa} \mathcal{P}_{\kappa}(t, z) = \sigma_{\kappa} g_{\kappa}(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ by construction of D and Remark 5.12(2). So assume $l \neq \kappa$. With Proposition 5.18

$$\left(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) = \left(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) z_l(t, z) - \left(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) \sigma_l e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1,\kappa}(t)}.$$

Since $z_l(t, z) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ for $(t, z) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ we may assume $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore $(t, z) \in D$. We show

$$\left(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

by induction on $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$. For $l = 0$ we obtain

$$\left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) \mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}(t, z) = \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) (z - \mu_{\kappa}(t)).$$

The following is easy to see with Remark 5.9: If $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j = 1$ then $\mu_{\kappa}(t) < z$ and therefore $z - \mu_{\kappa}(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. (If $k := k^{\text{ch}} < 0$ then $\kappa = r$ and therefore $\mu_r < z$ if $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ by (1) in Remark 5.9. If $k \geq 0$ and $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ then $\kappa = r$ (since $\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j = -1$) and therefore $\mu_r < z$ by (3) in Remark 5.9. If $k \geq 0$ and $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ then $\kappa = k$ (since $\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j = 1$) and therefore $\mu_k < z$ by (4) in Remark 5.9.) In a completely similar way one sees that if $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j = -1$ then $z < \mu_{\kappa}(t)$ and therefore $\mu_{\kappa}(t) - z \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: With the inductive hypothesis and Proposition 5.18 we obtain

$$\left(\prod_{j=l-1}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) \mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z) = \left(\prod_{j=l-1}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) z_{l-1}(t, z) - \left(\prod_{j=l-1}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) \sigma_{l-1} e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

Assume $\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j = 1$. The case " $\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j = -1$ " is handled completely similar. We obtain

$$\sigma_{l-1} z_{l-1}(t, z) > e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}$$

and by taking logarithm

$$\log(\sigma_{l-1}z_{l-1}(t, z)) > \mu_{\kappa-l, \kappa}(t).$$

This gives

$$z_l(t, z) > \mu_{\kappa-l, \kappa}(t) - \Theta_l(t) = \sigma_l e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1, \kappa}(t)}$$

and therefore

$$\left(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) \mathcal{P}_{l, \kappa}(t, z) = \left(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) z_l(t, z) - \left(\prod_{j=l}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) \sigma_l e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1, \kappa}(t)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

This finishes the proof. ■

5.1.2 Asymptotical Behaviour of Logarithmic Scales Under Taking Definable Curves in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$

With the monotonicity theorem in o-minimal structures (see [11], Section 3) we see that for a definable function $g :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ its limit $\lim_{x \searrow 0} g(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$. So we are able to investigate the asymptotical behaviour of Θ , \mathcal{Z} and $(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ under taking a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$. This describes also the behaviour of these functions on the boundary of H .

Outgoing from Definition 4.1 we establish a nice "boundedness condition" for Θ on so called fat cells. This condition is essential for everything that follows and implies for example that Θ is locally bounded if C is open.

5.22 Definition

For $t \in \pi(C)$ we define the **length of C** with respect to x as $L_C(t) := \sup(C_t) - \inf(C_t)$.

By the definition of a definable cell we have either $L_C(t) > 0$ for every $t \in \pi(C)$ or $L_C(t) = 0$ for every $t \in \pi(C)$ (see Definition 1.13).

5.23 Definition

We say that C is **fat** with respect to x if $L_C(t) > 0$ for every $t \in \pi(C)$ (i.e. C_t is an open interval for every $t \in \pi(C)$).

For the rest of Section 5.1 we assume that C is fat with respect to x .

5.24 Notation

Let y range over \mathbb{R} . For a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ with $\gamma := (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n+1})$ we set $\gamma_t := (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ for the first n real components, $\gamma_z := \gamma_{n+1}$ and if $\gamma_{n+1}(y) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$ we also write γ_x instead of γ_z .

5.25 Remark

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve. Then $\lim_{y \searrow 0} L_C(\gamma_t(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$.

We get all the desired information about the behaviour of Θ under taking a definable curve from Definition 4.1(d). But the underlying curve has to fulfill a special property.

5.26 Definition

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve. We say that γ is **compatible with C** if $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$, $\lim_{y \searrow 0} L_C(\gamma_t(y)) > 0$ and there is $\epsilon \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$\{\inf(C_{\gamma_t(y)} \mid y \in]0, \epsilon]\}$$

is bounded from above and

$$\{\sup(C_{\gamma_t(y)} \mid y \in]0, \epsilon]\}$$

is bounded from below.

Note that a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C$ is compatible with C if and only if $\lim_{y \searrow 0} L_C(\gamma_t(y)) > 0$ and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$.




Figure 5.3 The curves γ_1 and γ_3 are compatible with C while the curves γ_2 and γ_4 aren't. (For $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ the arrows show $\gamma_j(y)$ for decreasing $y \in]0, 1[$.)

5.27 Remark

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve compatible with C . The following holds.

- (1) There is a continuous definable function $\tilde{\gamma}_x :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma} := (\gamma_t, \tilde{\gamma}_x)$ is a definable curve in C compatible with C and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\tilde{\gamma}_x(y), \mathbb{R} \setminus C_{\gamma_t(y)}) > 0.$$

So for every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\tilde{\gamma}_x(y) - \mu_l(\gamma_t(y))| > 0.$$

(2) Let $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) := (t_0, x_0)$ where $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\text{Re}(\gamma_z(y)), C_{\gamma_t(y)}) = 0.$$

Then there is a definable function $\hat{\gamma}_x :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\hat{\gamma} := (\gamma_t, \hat{\gamma}_x)$ is a definable curve in C compatible with C and we have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_t(y), \hat{\gamma}_x(y)) = (t_0, x_0)$.

Proof

We assume that

$$C = \{(t, x) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R} \mid f_1(t) < x < f_2(t)\}$$

where $f_1, f_2 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are definable and continuous with $f_1 < f_2$. The other cases are handled completely similar (compare with Definition 1.13 iii) - v) for the other types of a definable fat cell). Note that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (f_2(\gamma_t(y)) - f_1(\gamma_t(y))) > 0$.

(1): Since γ is compatible with C we find continuous definable functions $h_1 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h_2 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $h_1 < h_2$ such that

$$\{(t, x) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R} \mid h_1(t) < x < h_2(t)\} \subset C,$$

$\lim_{y \searrow 0} h_j(\gamma_t(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} h_2(\gamma_t(y)) - h_1(\gamma_t(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. (Choose $h_1 = f_1$ and $h_2 = \min\{f_1 + 1, f_2\}$ if $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_1(\gamma_t(y)) \neq -\infty$, $h_1 = \max\{f_1, f_2 - 1\}$ and $h_2 = f_2$ if $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_2(\gamma_t(y)) \neq \infty$ and otherwise $h_1 = \max\{f_1, 0\}$ and $h_2 = \min\{f_2, 1\}$.)

Consider

$$\tilde{\gamma}_x :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, y \mapsto \frac{h_1(\gamma_t(y)) + h_2(\gamma_t(y))}{2}.$$

By o-minimality we obtain that $]0, 1[\rightarrow C, y \mapsto (\gamma_t(y), \tilde{\gamma}_x(y))$, is a definable curve compatible with C with

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\tilde{\gamma}_x(y), \mathbb{R} \setminus C_{\gamma_t(y)}) \geq \lim_{y \searrow 0} \frac{h_2(\gamma_t(y)) - h_1(\gamma_t(y))}{2} > 0.$$

We see that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\tilde{\gamma}_x(y) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))| > 0$ since $\mu_j(\gamma_t(y)) \notin C_{\gamma_t(y)}$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.

(2): There is $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that $\text{Re}(\gamma_z(y)) \in C_{\gamma_t(y)}$ for every $y \in]0, \epsilon[$ or $\text{Re}(\gamma_z(y)) \notin C_{\gamma_t(y)}$ for every $y \in]0, \epsilon[$. Assume the latter. The former is handled completely similar.

Suppose that $\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_z(y)) > C_{\gamma_t(y)}$ for $y \in]0, \epsilon[$. The case " $\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_z(y)) < C_{\gamma_t(y)}$ for $y \in]0, \epsilon[$ " is handled completely similar. Note that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_2(\gamma_t(y)) = x_0$. Fix a continuous definable function \hat{f}_1 with $f_1 < \hat{f}_1 < f_2$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \hat{f}_1(\gamma_t(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider

$$\hat{\gamma}_x :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, y \mapsto f_2(\gamma_t(y)) + y(\hat{f}_1(\gamma_t(y)) - f_2(\gamma_t(y))).$$

Note that $\hat{\gamma}_x(y) \in C_{\gamma_t(y)}$ for $y \in]0, 1[$. Since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \hat{\gamma}_x(y) = x_0$ by construction we see that $\hat{\gamma}_x$ does the job. \blacksquare

Now we are able to give the desired boundedness condition for Θ .

5.28 Proposition

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve compatible with C . Then the following holds.

$$(I_l) \lim_{y \searrow 0} \Theta_l(\gamma_t(y)) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

(II_l) $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_l(\gamma(y))| = 0$ if and only if $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_z(y) - \mu_l(\gamma_t(y))) = 0$. We have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_l(\gamma(y))| = \infty$ if and only if there is $j \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_z(y) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))) = 0$.

Proof

Fix a definable curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ which fulfills the properties from Remark 5.27(1). By o-minimality we have that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \Theta_l(\gamma_t(y)) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. We show both statements by induction on l simultaneously.

$l = 0$: Assume $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\Theta_0(\gamma_t(y))| = \infty$. So $\Theta_0 \neq 0$. By Definition 4.1(d) there is $\epsilon_0 \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$|x - \Theta_0(t)| < \epsilon_0 |x|$$

for all $(t, x) \in C$. Since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \tilde{\gamma}_x(y)$ exists we get

$$+\infty = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \left| 1 - \frac{\Theta_0(\gamma_t(y))}{\tilde{\gamma}_x(y)} \right| \leq \epsilon_0.$$

This is a contradiction. This gives (I₀). Since

$$z_0(\gamma_z(y)) = \gamma_z(y) - \Theta_0(\gamma_t(y)) = \gamma_z(y) - \mu_0(\gamma_t(y))$$

for $y \in]0, 1[$ we obtain (II₀) (since the second part in (II₀) cannot enter).

$l-1 \rightarrow l$: Assume $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\Theta_l(\gamma_t(y))| = \infty$. So $\Theta_l \neq 0$. So by Definition 4.1(d) there is $\epsilon_l \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$|\log(\sigma_{l-1} y_{l-1}(t, x)) - \Theta_l(t)| < \epsilon_l |\log(\sigma_{l-1} y_{l-1}(t, x))|$$

for all $(t, x) \in C$. Therefore

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \left| 1 - \frac{\Theta_l(\gamma_t(y))}{\log(\sigma_{l-1} y_{l-1}(\tilde{\gamma}(y)))} \right| \leq \epsilon_l.$$

This gives $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_{l-1} y_{l-1}(\tilde{\gamma}(y)) \in \{0, \infty\}$. With (II_{l-1}) we find $j \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$ such that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\tilde{\gamma}_x(y) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))) = 0.$$

But this is a contradiction to the choice of $\tilde{\gamma}$. We obtain (I_l) .

We show (II_l) . We have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_l(\gamma(y))| = \infty$ if and only if $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_{l-1}(\gamma(y))| \in \{0, \infty\}$ by (I_l) if and only if there is $j \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_z(y) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))) = 0$ by (II_{l-1}) . We see with (I_a) for $a \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} z_{l-j}(\gamma(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_{l-j} e^{\mu_{j-1, l}(\gamma_t(y))}$$

if and only if

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} z_{l-j-1}(\gamma(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_{l-j-1} e^{\mu_{j, l}(\gamma_t(y))}$$

by an easy induction on $j \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$ (and the continuity of the global exponential function and the global logarithm on the positive real line). So we obtain $\lim_{y \searrow 0} z_l(\gamma(y)) = 0$ if and only if $\lim_{y \searrow 0} z_{l-1}(\gamma(y)) = \sigma_{l-1} e^{\mu_{0, l}(\gamma_t(y))}$ by (I_l) if and only if

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} z_0(\gamma(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_0 e^{\mu_{l-1, l}(\gamma_t(y))}$$

if and only if

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_z(y) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} (\Theta_0(\gamma_t(y)) + \sigma_0 e^{\mu_{l-1, l}(\gamma_t(y))}) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \mu_l(\gamma_t(y))$$

with (I_0) . ■

The boundedness condition for Θ can be formulated also in the following way: If for $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is an open neighbourhood U of t_0 in \mathbb{R}^n , $\epsilon > 0$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $L_C(t) > \epsilon$, $\inf(C_t) < c_1$ and $\sup(C_t) > c_2$ for every $t \in \pi(C) \cap U$ then Θ_j is bounded at t_0 for every $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ (i.e. there is $V \subset U$ open in \mathbb{R}^n with $t_0 \in V$ such that $\Theta_j|_{\pi(C) \cap V}$ is bounded).

So we see also that Θ is locally bounded if C is open. Consequently every C -nice function is restricted log-exp-analytic if C is open.

An immediate consequence of this boundedness condition is the following.

5.29 Corollary

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve compatible with C . Let $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. The following holds.

(1) $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \mu_{j,l}(\gamma_t(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$.

(2)

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mu_l(\gamma_t(y)) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))| \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

for every $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ with $j \neq l$.

Proof

(1): This is clear with the continuity of the global exponential function, (I_j) in Proposition 5.28 and the definition of $\mu_{j,l}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$.

(2): Let $j \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$. With Definition 5.2 and (I_a) in Proposition 5.28 for $a \in \{0, \dots, j-1\}$ we obtain that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mu_{l-a,l}(\gamma_t(y)) - \mu_{j-a,j}(\gamma_t(y))| > 0$$

if and only if

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mu_{l-a-1,l}(\gamma_t(y)) - \mu_{j-a-1,j}(\gamma_t(y))| > 0$$

by an easy induction on $a \in \{0, \dots, j-1\}$. So we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mu_l(\gamma_t(y)) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))| > 0$$

since

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mu_{l-j,l}(\gamma_t(y)) - \mu_{0,j}(\gamma_t(y))| = \lim_{y \searrow 0} e^{\mu_{l-j-1,l}(\gamma_t(y))} > 0$$

with (1). ■

The following example shows that it is in general necessary to look at definable curves which are compatible with C to obtain such a boundedness condition.

5.30 Example

- (1) Let C , y_0, y_1 and Θ_0, Θ_1 be as in Example 5.10. Note that (y_0, y_1) is a 1-logarithmic scale with center (Θ_0, Θ_1) . Although the cell is bounded we have $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \Theta_1(t) = -\infty$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \mu_1(t) - \mu_0(t) = 0$. But we have $\lim_{t \searrow 0} L_C(t) = 0$.
- (2) Let

$$C := \{(t, x) \in]0, 1[\times \mathbb{R} \mid e^{1/t} < x - 3e^{1/t} < e^{1/2+1/t}\}$$

and consider $\hat{\Theta}_0 := 3e^{1/t}$ and $\hat{\Theta}_1 := 1/t$. A simple calculation shows that there is a logarithmic scale $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}$ on C with center $\hat{\Theta} := (\hat{\Theta}_0, \hat{\Theta}_1)$. Although $\lim_{t \searrow 0} L_C(t) > 0$ we see $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \hat{\Theta}_0(t) = \infty$, $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \hat{\Theta}_1(t) = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \searrow 0} |\mu_1(t) - \mu_0(t)| = \infty$. But we have $\lim_{t \searrow 0} \inf(C_t) = \infty$.




Figure 5.4 Possible μ_0, μ_1 and μ_2 for 2-logarithmic scales on two different cells: In the right case one has control on μ_0, μ_1, μ_2 and their distance since C is bounded and L_C is bounded by a positive number from below. In the left case it is possible that μ_0, μ_1 respectively μ_2 are unbounded at t_0 respectively t_1 (since $\inf(C_t)$ is not bounded from above at t_0 and L_C is not bounded by a positive number from below at t_1).

Outgoing from this boundedness condition we are able to look at the asymptotical behaviour of $(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ under taking a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ compatible with C .

5.31 Corollary

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve compatible with C . Then the following holds.

- (1) Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. Let $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(\gamma(y))| \in \{0, \infty\}$. Then there is $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_z(y) - \mu_l(\gamma_t(y)) = 0$.
- (2) Assume $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_z(y) - \mu_\kappa(\gamma_t(y)) = 0$. Then

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \mathcal{P}_{l, \kappa}(\gamma(y)) = 0$$

for every $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$.

Proof

(1): This is clear with (II_l) in Proposition 5.28 for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.

(2): We do an induction on l . If $l = 0$ then this is clear with Definition 5.16.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: By Definition 5.16 we obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(\gamma(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \log\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{l-1} \mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(\gamma(y))}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(\gamma(y))}}\right) = 0$$

by the inductive hypothesis, Corollary 5.29(1) and the continuity of the global logarithm at 1. ■

5.32 Definition

Assume $k := k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$. Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ with $(q_{k+1}, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$. Set

$$l_{\min}(q) := \min\{j \in \{k+1, \dots, r\} \mid q_j \neq 0\}.$$

5.33 Definition

Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ be with $(q_\kappa, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$. Let $k := k^{\text{ch}}$.

- a) Let $\kappa = r$. We call q **r -positive** if $q_r > 0$. We call q **r -negative** if $q_r < 0$.
- b) Let $\kappa = k \geq 0$. We call q **k -positive** if $q_k > 0$ or if $q_k = 0$ then $q_{l_{\min}} < 0$. We call q **k -negative** if $q_k < 0$ or if $q_k = 0$ then $q_{l_{\min}} > 0$.

Note that a $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ with $(q_\kappa, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$ is either κ -positive or κ -negative.

5.34 Proposition

Let $q := (q_0, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve compatible with C . Suppose $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_z(y) - \mu_\kappa(\gamma_t(y)) = 0$. Then the following holds.

- (1) $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_l(\gamma(y))| \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ for $l < \kappa$.
- (2) Suppose $(q_\kappa, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$. If q is κ -positive then $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(\gamma(y))| = 0$. If q is κ -negative then $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(\gamma(y))| = \infty$.

Proof

(1): Assume there is $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_l(\gamma(y))| \in \{0, \infty\}$. Then with (II_l) in Proposition 5.28 we find $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_z(y) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))) = 0$ and therefore

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\mu_\kappa(\gamma_t(y)) - \mu_j(\gamma_t(y))) = 0,$$

a contradiction to Corollary 5.29(2). We obtain the assertion with o-minimality.

(2): If $\kappa = r$ we obtain with $(II)_r$ in Proposition 5.28 $\lim_{y \searrow 0} z_r(\gamma(y)) = 0$. With (1) we are done. So let $0 \leq k := k^{\text{ch}}$ and suppose $\kappa = k$. Let

$$W := \{(t, z) \in H \mid |z_k(t, z)| < 1/\exp_{r-k}(1)\},$$

$$L_1 : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log(|z_k(t, z)|),$$

and for $l \in \{2, \dots, r - k\}$

$$L_l : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log_{l-1}(-\log(|z_k(t, z)|)).$$

Note that L_l is well-defined and definable for $l \in \{1, \dots, r - k\}$. By o-minimality and considering a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that $\gamma(]0, 1[) \subset W$ (since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} z_k(\gamma(y)) = 0$ by (II_k) in Proposition 5.28). Note also that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} L_1(\gamma(y)) = -\infty$ and that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} L_l(\gamma(y)) = \infty$ for $l \in \{2, \dots, r - k\}$.

Claim

Let $l \in \{1, \dots, r - k\}$. There is a definable function $h_l : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} h_l(\gamma(y)) = 0$ such that

$$z_{k+l}(t, z) = L_l(t, z)(1 + h_l(t, z))$$

for every $(t, z) \in W$.

Proof of the claim

We do an induction on l . Suppose $l = 1$. We have for $(t, z) \in W$

$$z_{k+1}(t, z) = \log(|z_k(t, z)|) \left(1 - \frac{\Theta_{k+1}(t) - i \arg(\sigma_k z_k(t, z))}{\log(|z_k(t, z)|)} \right).$$

So choose

$$h_1 : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto -\frac{\Theta_{k+1}(t) - i\arg(\sigma_k z_k(t, z))}{\log(|z_k(t, z)|)}.$$

We have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} h_1(\gamma(y)) = 0$ by (I_{k+1}) and (II_k) in Proposition 5.28.

$l = 2$: Note that $\sigma_{k+1} = -1$. We have for $(t, z) \in W$

$$\begin{aligned} z_{k+2}(t, z) &= \log(\sigma_{k+1} L_1(t, z)(1 + h_1(t, z))) - \Theta_{k+2}(t) \\ &= \log(-L_1(t, z)) \left(1 + \frac{\log(1 + h_1(t, z)) - \Theta_{k+2}(t)}{\log(-L_1(t, z))}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Choose

$$h_2 : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \frac{\log(1 + h_1(t, z)) - \Theta_{k+2}(t)}{\log(-L_1(t, z))}.$$

Then h_2 is definable and by (I_{k+2}) in Proposition 5.28 we get $\lim_{y \searrow 0} h_2(\gamma(y)) = 0$.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: We may assume that $l > 2$. Note that $\sigma_{k+l-1} = 1$. With the inductive hypothesis we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} z_{k+l}(t, z) &= \log(\sigma_{k+l-1} L_{l-1}(t, z)(1 + h_{l-1}(t, z))) - \Theta_{k+l}(t) \\ &= \log(L_{l-1}(t, z)) \left(1 + \frac{\log(1 + h_{l-1}(t, z)) - \Theta_{k+l}(t)}{\log(L_{l-1}(t, z))}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for every $(t, z) \in W$. Choose

$$h_l : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \frac{\log(1 + h_{l-1}(t, z)) - \Theta_{k+l}(t)}{\log(L_{l-1}(t, z))}.$$

Then h_l is definable and by (I_{k+l}) in Proposition 5.28 we get $\lim_{y \searrow 0} h_l(\gamma(y)) = 0$. ■ Claim

Let h_l and L_l be as in the claim for $l \in \{1, \dots, r - k\}$. Then we obtain for $y \in]0, 1[$

$$|(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(\gamma(y))| = d(\gamma(y)) |z_k(\gamma(y))|^{qk} \prod_{l=1}^{r-k} L_l(\gamma(y))^{qk+l} (1 + h_l(\gamma(y)))^{qk+l}$$

where

$$d(\gamma(y)) := \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} |z_l(\gamma(y))|^{q_l}.$$

Note that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} d(\gamma(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ by (1). Since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_k(\gamma(y))| = 0$ we see with the growth properties of the iterated logarithm that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_k(\gamma(y))|^{q_k} \prod_{l=1}^{r-k} |L_l(\gamma(y))|^{q_{k+l}} = 0$$

if q is k -positive and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |z_k(\gamma(y))|^{q_k} \prod_{l=1}^{r-k} |L_l(\gamma(y))|^{q_{k+l}} = \infty$$

if q is k -negative. So one sees that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(\gamma(y))| = 0$ if q is k -positive and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(\gamma(y))| = \infty$ if q is k -negative. This proves Proposition 5.34. \blacksquare

Proposition 5.34 gives the following growth property for the derivative of $(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$.

5.35 Corollary

Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ with $(q_\kappa, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$. Let $j_\kappa(q) := \min\{j \in \{\kappa, \dots, r\} \mid q_j \neq 0\}$ and

$$q_{\kappa, \text{diff}} := (0, \dots, 0, q_\kappa - 1, \dots, q_{j_\kappa(q)} - 1, q_{j_\kappa(q)+1}, \dots, q_r).$$

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H$ be a definable curve compatible with C with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_z(y) - \mu_\kappa(\gamma_t(y)) = 0$. Then

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \left| \frac{\left(\frac{d}{dz}(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}\right)(\gamma(y))}{(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q_{\kappa, \text{diff}}}(\gamma(y))} \right| \in \mathbb{R}^*.$$

Proof

We have

$$\frac{d}{dz} \sigma_l z_l = \frac{\sigma_l}{\prod_{j=0}^{l-1} z_j}.$$

We obtain

$$\frac{d}{dz} (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q} = \sum_{j=0}^r q_j (\sigma_j z_j)^{q_j-1} \frac{\sigma_j}{\prod_{i=0}^{j-1} z_i} \prod_{i \neq j} (\sigma_i z_i)^{q_i}.$$

Consider for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ with $l < \kappa$ or $q_l \neq 0$

$$p_l^* := (q_0 - 1, \dots, q_l - 1, q_{l+1}, \dots, q_r) - q_{\kappa, \text{diff}}.$$

Then p_l^* is κ -positive if $l \neq j_\kappa(q)$. (This is clear for $l < \kappa$. If $l = \kappa$ then $q_\kappa \neq 0$ and therefore $l = j_\kappa(q)$. So suppose that $0 \leq k^{\text{ch}}$ and $\kappa = k^{\text{ch}} < l$. If $l \neq j_\kappa(q)$ we see that $j_\kappa(q) < l$. This shows that p_l^* is κ -positive.) If $l = j_\kappa(q)$ we see that $(p_l^*)_\kappa = \dots = (p_l^*)_r = 0$. So we get the assertion with Proposition 5.34. \blacksquare

5.1.3 Persistence, Regularity and Integrability of Logarithmic Scales in the Complex Setting

As in the globally subanalytic setting in [17] we need definability results of special parameterized integrals of definable holomorphic extensions of prepared restricted log-exp-analytic functions in one variable. For this we have to consider sets of the form

$$D := \{(t, z) \in H \mid N(t) < |z - \mu_\kappa(t)| < M(t)\}$$

(where $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k^{\text{ch}}, r\}$ if $k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$) where $M, N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are definable functions with special properties: The "upper limit" M belongs to the class of persistent functions and the "lower limit" N to the class of soft functions (see Definition 5.38 below). It turns out that we can easily define the desired parameterized integral outgoing from such a set D . (See page 146 in [17] for the necessary result on integration in the globally subanalytic setting: There we have $r = 0$, $\kappa = 0$ and $\mu_0 = \Theta_0 = \theta$. The "lower limit" there is α^* , the "upper limit" ω^* , D corresponds to Γ and Δ describes the domain of the parameterized integral.)

But the domain Λ of a definable holomorphic extension $F : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable is determined significantly by iterations of logarithmic scales, exponentials and power series. So it requires deep technical arguments to construct such a set D with $D \subset \Lambda$. But we can even find corresponding functions N and M such that $D \subset \Lambda$ and $F(t, z)$ is complex log-analytically prepared in z on D , i.e. of the form $F(t, z) = a(t)(\sigma_0 z_0(t, z))^{q_0} \cdot \dots \cdot (\sigma_r z_r(t, z))^{q_r} U(t, z)$ where $z_0 = z - \Theta_0(t)$, $z_1 = \log(\sigma_0 z_0) - \Theta_1(t)$, ..., $\sigma_j \in \{-1, 1\}$, the q_j 's are rational exponents and $U(t, z)$ is a function of a special form (compare with Section 5.1.4). Additionally the data of this log-analytical preparation (i.e. a and $\Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_r$) belongs to a special class of functions which we call regular (see Definition 5.43 below). Regular functions are an efficient generalization of nice functions (see Definition 4.5) and are indispensable for the proof that the unary high parametric global complexification of a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function can be chosen in a restricted log-exp-analytically way.

All the necessary definitions and results are given in the parametric setting.

For Section 5.1.3 we fix $l, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $l + m = n$. Let $w := (w_1, \dots, w_l)$ range over \mathbb{R}^l and $u := (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ over \mathbb{R}^m . Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ be definable with $C \subset X$. Suppose that X_w is open for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Fix $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k^{\text{ch}}, r\}$ if $k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$.

5.36 Notation

Let $\pi_l : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l, (w, u, x) \mapsto w$, be the projection on the first l coordinates. For $w \in \pi_l(C)$ and a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H_w = \{(u, z) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{C} \mid (w, u, z) \in H\}$ we set $\gamma_u := (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m)$ for the first m real components and $\gamma_z := \gamma_{m+1}$ for the last complex component and if $\gamma_{m+1}(y) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$ we also write γ_x instead of γ_z .

5.37 Definition

We say that a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H_w$ is compatible with C_w if the curve $\hat{\gamma} :]0, 1[\rightarrow H, y \mapsto (w, \gamma(y))$, is compatible with C .

Persistent and Soft Functions

In this paragraph we define and investigate persistent and soft functions and give examples.

5.38 Definition

Let $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function.

- (a) We say that g is **(C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -persistent in u with respect to X** if g is definable and the following holds. Let $w \in \pi_l(C)$. Then for every definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ compatible with C_w with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y))) = 0$$

we have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} g(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$.

- (b) We say that g is **(C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -soft in u with respect to X** if g is definable and the following holds. Let $w \in \pi_l(C)$. Then for every definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ compatible with C_w with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y))) = 0$$

we have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} g(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$.

5.39 Remark

Let $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function. Let $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ be definable with $X \subset Y$ such that Y_w is open for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. If g is (C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -persistent ((C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -soft) in u with respect to Y then g is (C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -persistent ((C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -soft) in u with respect to X .

Note that a function which is not (C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -persistent in u with respect to X is not automatically (C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -soft in u with respect to X in general (compare with Example 5.41(1)).

Since C , \mathcal{Y} and X are fixed we often say " κ -persistent" respectively " κ -soft" instead of " (C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -persistent in u with respect to X " respectively " (C, \mathcal{Y}, κ) -soft in u with respect to X " in Section 5.1.3. In the following we give some elementary facts and examples.

5.40 Remark

Let $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a definable function. If for every $w \in \pi_l(C)$ and every definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ compatible with C_w with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y)), (C_w)_{\gamma_u(y)}) = 0$$

we have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} g(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ ($\lim_{y \searrow 0} g(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$) then g is κ -persistent (κ -soft).

5.41 Example

Let $w = 0$ and $u = 1$. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $l = 0$. Let C and $\mathcal{Y} = (y_0, y_1, y_2)$ be as in Example 5.10 (i.e. $r = 2$ and $k^{\text{ch}} = 1$). Consider the definable functions $g_1 :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, u \mapsto u$, $g_2 :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, u \mapsto 1 - u$, and $g_3 :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, u \mapsto (u - 1/2)^2$. The following holds.

- (1) Let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$. Then g_1 is 2-persistent, g_2 is 2-soft and g_3 is neither 1-persistent nor 1-soft.
- (2) Let $X = C$. Then g_1, g_2 and g_3 are κ -persistent and κ -soft for $\kappa \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof

We have

$$C = \{(u, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \mid u \in]0, 1[, \frac{1}{1+u} + e^{-u-1/u} < x < \frac{1}{1+u} + e^{-1/u}\}.$$

Note that C is open in \mathbb{R}^2 . For $u \in]0, 1[$ we have $L_C(u) = e^{-1/u}(1 - e^{-u})$. Note that $L_C(u) > 0$ for $u \in]0, 1[$, that $\lim_{u \searrow 0} L_C(u) = 0$ and that $\lim_{u \nearrow 1} L_C(u) > 0$. For $u \in]0, 1[$ we have $\mu_1(u) = \frac{1}{1+u} + e^{-1/u}$ and $\mu_2(u) = \frac{1}{1+u} + e^{-1-1/u}$.

(1): We see that

$$\lim_{u \nearrow 1} \text{dist}(\mu_2(u), C_u) = \lim_{u \nearrow 1} (e^{-u-1/u} - e^{-1-1/u}) = 0$$

and if $u \in]0, 1[$ we see that $\text{dist}(\mu_2(u), C_u) > 0$. So with Remark 5.40 we see that g_1 and g_2 fulfill the desired properties since $\lim_{u \nearrow 1} g_1(u) > 0$ and $\lim_{u \nearrow 1} g_2(u) = 0$. One sees that if a function on $\pi(C)$ is 1-persistent it does not have any zero and that the only 1-soft function on $\pi(C)$ is the zero function. (Since $\text{dist}(\mu_1(u), C_u) = 0$ for $u \in]0, 1[$: For every $u \in]0, 1[$ there is a definable function $f_u :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_u$ with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f_u(y) - \mu_1(u) = 0$. So $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C, y \mapsto (u, f_u(y))$, is a definable curve compatible with C with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_x(y) - \mu_1(u) = 0$.) So g_3 is neither 1-persistent nor 1-soft.

(2): Note that there is no definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C$ with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_u(y) \in C$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(\gamma_u(y))) = 0.$$

So the assertion follows. ■

5.42 Remark

- (1) The set of all κ -persistent (κ -soft) functions on $\pi(C)$ is closed under pointwise addition and multiplication.
- (2) Let $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be κ -persistent (κ -soft) and let $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Then $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \sqrt[q]{g(t)}$, is κ -persistent (κ -soft).
- (3) Let $f_1, f_2 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be κ -persistent (κ -soft). Then

$$\pi(C) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{f_1(t), f_2(t)\},$$

and

$$\pi(C) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \max\{f_1(t), f_2(t)\},$$

are κ -persistent (κ -soft).

5.43 Example

Let $X = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. Let $l \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, l-1\}$. Then

$$\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, t \mapsto e^{\mu_{j,l}(t)},$$

and

$$\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, t \mapsto |\mu_l(t) - \mu_j(t)|,$$

are κ -persistent.

Proof

Let $w \in \pi_l(C)$. Then for every definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ compatible with C_w we have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} e^{\mu_{j,l}(w, \gamma_u(y))} > 0$ by Corollary 5.29(1) and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mu_l(w, \gamma_u(y)) - \mu_j(w, \gamma_u(y))| > 0$$

if $j \neq l$ by Corollary 5.29(2). ■

Since the logarithms of the exponentials which occur in a $(m+1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically prepared function $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (w, u, x) \mapsto f(w, u, x)$, are locally bounded in (u, x) with respect to X (see Definition 4.10 and Proposition 4.12 above) we can make some statements about the κ -persistence and κ -softness of the data of such a preparation.

5.44 Proposition

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (w, u, x) \mapsto f(w, u, x)$, be $(m+1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x with preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}, a, \exp(c), q, s, v, b, \exp(d), P)$$

with $b = (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\exp(d) = (\exp(d_1), \dots, \exp(d_s))$ and $P = (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$. Then the following holds.

- (1) Let $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. The function $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, t \mapsto |1/b_j(t)|$, is κ -persistent. Additionally if p_j is κ -negative then $|b_j|$ is κ -soft.
- (2) Suppose that $a \neq 0$ and that f is locally bounded in (u, x) with reference set X . Then the function $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, t \mapsto |1/a(t)|$, is κ -persistent. Additionally if q is κ -negative then $|a|$ is κ -soft.

Proof

For $(t, x) \in C$ let

$$V(t, x) := v(b_1(t)|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes p_1} e^{d_1(t, x)}, \dots, b_s(t)|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes p_s} e^{d_s(t, x)}).$$

For $(t, x) \in C$ we have

$$f(t, x) = a(t)|\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes q} e^{c(t, x)} V(t, x).$$

Let $w \in \pi_l(C)$ and $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ be a definable curve compatible with C_w such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_u(y) \in X_w$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y))| = 0.$$

We find $\delta > 0$ and $B > 0$ such that $U := Q^m(u_0, \delta) \times]x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta[\subset X_w$, $|c(w, u, x)| < B$ and $|d_j(w, u, x)| < B$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and every $(u, x) \in U$.

By passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that $\gamma(y) \in Q^m(u_0, \delta) \times]x_0 - \delta/2, x_0 + \delta/2[$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$. Similarly as in the proof of Remark 5.27(1) we find a continuous definable function $\tilde{\gamma}_x :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma} := (\gamma_u, \tilde{\gamma}_x)$ is a definable curve in $C_w \cap U$ compatible with C_w and for every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\tilde{\gamma}_x(y) - \mu_l(w, \gamma_u(y))| > 0.$$

(1): Let $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Note that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mathcal{Y}(w, \tilde{\gamma}(y))|^{\otimes p_j} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$$

by Corollary 5.31(1). Since

$$b_j(t) |\mathcal{Y}(t, x)|^{\otimes p_j} e^{d_j(t, x)} \in [-1, 1]$$

for every $(t, x) \in C$ we obtain $\lim_{y \searrow 0} b_j(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$. This gives the first part.

Suppose that p_j is κ -negative. Then by Proposition 5.34(2) and Remark 5.15(1) we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mathcal{Y}(w, \gamma(y))|^{\otimes p_j} = \infty$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} b_j(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0.$$

(2): Note that there is $\rho > 1$ such that $V(t, x) \in]1/\rho, \rho[$ for every $(t, x) \in C$ and that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mathcal{Y}(w, \tilde{\gamma}(y))|^{\otimes q} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$$

by Corollary 5.31(1). Since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f(w, \tilde{\gamma}(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$ we obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} a(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This gives the first part.

Suppose that q is κ -negative. Then by Proposition 5.34(2) and Remark 5.15(1) we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mathcal{Y}(w, \gamma(y))|^{\otimes q} = \infty$$

and therefore $\lim_{y \searrow 0} a(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$ since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} f(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$. ■

Note that in the globally subanalytic setting in [17] on page 149 α^* defines a κ -soft function and ω^* a κ -persistent function which can be verified easily with Proposition 5.44(1). (There we have $r = 0$ and therefore $\kappa = 0$.)

5.45 Definition

We call C **near with respect to** μ_κ if there is a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C$ compatible with C such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\mu_\kappa(\gamma_t(y)) - \gamma_x(y)) = 0$. Otherwise we call C **far with respect to** μ_κ .




Figure 5.5 The functions μ_j for a 1-logarithmic scale \mathcal{Y} with $\text{sign}(\mathcal{Y}) = (1, -1)$ where C is far with respect to μ_0 and near with respect to μ_1 . (Here we have $k^{\text{ch}} = 0$ and $r = 1$.)

5.46 Remark

If C is far with respect to μ_κ then every definable function $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is κ -persistent and κ -soft.

So if it is desired to find a κ -persistent function M and a κ -soft function N such that $G|_D$ fulfills specific properties (where $G : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is definable and

$$D := \{(t, z) \in H \mid N(t) < |z - \mu_\kappa(t)| < M(t)\}$$

it is enough to look at cells which are near with respect to μ_κ . In the case that $k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$ and $\kappa = k^{\text{ch}}$ the boundedness condition for Θ gives the following result which simplifies technical proofs below enormously.

5.47 Proposition

Let $k := k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$ and let C be near with respect to μ_k . Then $\Theta_l = 0$ for every $l \in \{k + 1, \dots, r\}$.

Proof

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C$ be a definable curve compatible with C and let

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\mu_k(\gamma_t(y)) - \gamma_x(y)) = 0.$$

Then $\lim_{y \searrow 0} y_k(\gamma(y)) = 0$ by (II_k) in Proposition 5.28. We do an induction on $l \in \{k+1, \dots, r\}$.

$l = k+1$: Assume $\Theta_{k+1} \neq 0$. Then there is $\epsilon_{k+1} \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$|\log(\sigma_k y_k(t, x)) - \Theta_{k+1}(t)| < \epsilon_{k+1} |\log(\sigma_k y_k(t, x))|$$

for all $(t, x) \in C$. We obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \left| 1 - \frac{\Theta_{k+1}(\gamma_t(y))}{\log(\sigma_k y_k(\gamma(y)))} \right| \leq \epsilon_{k+1}$$

and therefore $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\Theta_{k+1}(\gamma_t(y))| = \infty$, a contradiction to (I_{k+1}) in Proposition 5.28.

$l \rightarrow l+1$: Note that $\sigma_{k+1} = -1$ and $\sigma_{k+2} = \dots = \sigma_l = 1$. So we obtain

$$\log(\sigma_l y_l) = \log_{l-k}(-\log(\sigma_k y_k))$$

on C by the inductive hypothesis. Assume $\Theta_{l+1} \neq 0$. Then there is $\epsilon_{l+1} \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$|\log_{l-k}(-\log(\sigma_k y_k(t, x))) - \Theta_{l+1}(t)| < \epsilon_{l+1} |\log_{l-k}(-\log(\sigma_k y_k(t, x)))|$$

for all $(t, x) \in C$. We obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \left| 1 - \frac{\Theta_{l+1}(\gamma_t(y))}{\log_{l-k}(-\log(\sigma_k y_k(\gamma(y))))} \right| \leq \epsilon_{l+1}$$

and therefore $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\Theta_{l+1}(\gamma_t(y))| = \infty$, a contradiction to (I_{l+1}) in Proposition 5.28. ■

Regular Functions

In this paragraph we define regular functions on $\pi(C)$ as compositions of log-analytic functions and exponentials of functions which fulfill a special boundedness condition depending on X . (For example the center Θ of a logarithmic scale on C fulfills this condition.)

As above we give the definitions in the parametric setting.

5.48 Definition

Let $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be definable. We call g **C -consistent in u with respect to X** if the following holds. Let $w \in \pi_l(C)$. Then for every definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ compatible with C_w with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$ we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} g(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

So a C -consistent function $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in u with respect to X fulfills the following: If for $(w_0, u_0) \in \pi(X)$ there is an open neighbourhood U of u_0 in $\pi(X)_{w_0}$ and $\epsilon, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $L_C(w_0, u) > \epsilon$, $\inf(C_{(w_0, u)}) < c_1$ and $\sup(C_{(w_0, u)}) > c_2$ for every $u \in \pi(C)_{w_0} \cap U$ then g_{w_0} is bounded at u_0 , i.e. there is $V \subset U$ open with $u_0 \in V$ such that $g_{w_0}|_{\pi(C)_{w_0} \cap V}$ is bounded. If $C = X$ then g is locally bounded in u .




Figure 5.6 Let $l = 0$. A C -consistent function $f : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in u with respect to X is bounded at u_0 , but not necessarily bounded at u_1 respectively u_2 .

5.49 Example

Let $l = 0$, $m = 1$, $C_1 :=]0, 1[\times]0, 1[$ and

$$C_2 := \{(u, x) \in]0, 1[\times \mathbb{R} \mid 0 < x < u\}.$$

Then $]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto 1/u$, is C_1 -consistent in u with respect to $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}$, but not C_1 -consistent in u with respect to \mathbb{R}^2 . Note that this function is C_2 -consistent with respect to any open $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $C_2 \subset X$.

In the following we give some elementary properties of C -consistent functions in u with respect to X .

5.50 Remark

Let $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ be definable with $X \subset Y$ such that Y_w is open for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. A function $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is C -consistent in u with respect to Y is also C -consistent in u with respect to X .

5.51 Example

- (1) The functions $\Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_r$ are C -consistent in u with respect to $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$.
- (2) Let $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$. The function $\pi(C) \mapsto \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \mu_{j,l}(t)$, is C -consistent in u with respect to $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$.
- (3) The logarithm of a C -heir is C -consistent in u with respect to $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$.

Proof

- (1): Follows from (I_j) in Proposition 5.28 for $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.
- (2): Follows from Corollary 5.29(1).
- (3): Let $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be a C -heir. Note that there is $l \in \mathbb{N}$, an l -logarithmic scale $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}$ with center $(\hat{\Theta}_0, \dots, \hat{\Theta}_l)$ such that $g = \exp(\hat{\Theta}_j)$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. So this property follows from (I_j) in Proposition 5.28 applied to $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. ■

5.52 Remark

- (1) The set of C -consistent functions in u with respect to X is an \mathbb{R} -algebra with respect to pointwise addition and multiplication.
- (2) The set of non-negative C -consistent functions in u with respect to X is a divisible monoid with respect to pointwise multiplication.
- (3) Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let $f : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be C -consistent in u with respect to X . Then $\exp(q \cdot f)$ is C -consistent in u with respect to X .
- (4) Let $g : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be C -consistent in u with respect to X . Then $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, t \mapsto 1/g(t)$, is κ -persistent (where $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k^{\text{ch}}, r\}$ if $k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$).

A very important observation is that most of the data of an $(m + 1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically prepared function is C -consistent in u with respect to X (since the logarithms of the exponentials in such a preparation are locally bounded in (u, x) with respect to X (compare with Definition 4.10 and Proposition 4.12 above)).

5.53 Remark

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (w, u, x) \mapsto f(w, u, x)$, be $(m + 1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x with preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}, a, \exp(c), q, s, v, b, \exp(d), P)$$

with $b = (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\exp(d) = (\exp(d_1), \dots, \exp(d_s))$ and $P = (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$. Then the following holds.

- (1) Let $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. The function b_j is C -consistent in u with respect to X .
- (2) Assume that f is locally bounded in (u, x) with reference set X . The function a is C -consistent in u with respect to X .

Proof

Compare with the proof of Proposition 5.44. ■

5.54 Definition

A function $f : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called **C -regular in u with respect to X** if there is a set E of positive definable functions on $\pi(C)$ such that the following holds. The set $\log(E)$ consists only of C -consistent functions in u with respect to X and f can be constructed from E .

Throughout Section 5.1.3 we say "consistent" respectively "regular" instead of " C -consistent in u with respect to X " respectively " C -regular in u with respect to X " since C and X are fixed.

With Remark 3.4 we obtain the following.

5.55 Remark

- (1) Let $f : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be regular and consistent. Then $\exp(f)$ is regular and consistent.
- (2) Let $f_1, \dots, f_m : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be regular. Let $G : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be log-analytic. Then $G(f_1, \dots, f_m)$ is regular.

Since the logarithmic scale which occurs in a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function has a C -nice center, we assume for the rest of Section 5.1 that Θ is C -nice and therefore also regular.

5.56 Example

- (1) Let $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. The function $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \mu_{j,l}(t)$, is C -regular and C -consistent for $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$.
- (2) The function $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} e^{q_j \mu_{j,\kappa}(t)}$, is C -regular and C -consistent for $q_0, \dots, q_{\kappa-1} \in \mathbb{Q}$.
- (3) Suppose that $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is open with $0 \in X$. Let $C :=]0, 1[$ and let $h :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto e^{-1/u}$. Then h is not C -regular.

Proof

(1): By Remark 5.55(1), Remark 5.52(1) and an easy induction on $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ we see that $\mu_{j,l}$ is C -regular and C -consistent.

(2): With (1) and Remark 5.55(1) we obtain that $e^{\mu_{j,l}}$ is C -regular. With Remark 5.55(2) we obtain that $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} e^{q_j \mu_{j,\kappa}(t)}$ is C -regular. (By considering the globally subanalytic function $\mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \mapsto \alpha_1^{q_1} \cdot \dots \cdot \alpha_l^{q_l}$.) Note that $\exp(\mu_{j,l})$ is C -consistent. Therefore $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} e^{q_j \mu_{j,\kappa}(t)}$ is C -consistent (by Remark 5.52(1)/(3)).

(3): Note that $\pi(C) =]0, 1[$. Suppose the contrary. Let E be a set of C -regular functions with respect to X such that h can be constructed from E . Note that for every $g \in \log(E)$ there is an open neighbourhood U of 0 in $\pi(X)$ such that $g|_{U \cap]0, 1[}$ is bounded. Therefore $h \sim \beta$ for a log-analytic $\beta :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at zero. But we have $h \sim e^{-1/u}$ at zero, a contradiction. ■

Integrability of Logarithmic Scales

We close this subsection by establishing some definability results of parameterized integrals of logarithmic scales in the complex setting. With the preparation result in Section 5.1.4 one gets then easily the desired result on integration for definable holomorphic extensions of prepared restricted log-exp-analytic functions in one variable. In Section 5.2 we use such results to construct the unary high parametric global complexification.

5.57 Notation

Let s and τ range over \mathbb{R} . Let $\pi^+ : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, (t, s, z) \mapsto (t, s)$, be the projection on the first $n + 1$ real coordinates.

For a definable function $g : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto g(t, s, \tau)$, where $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is definable we say that g is bounded in τ if $g_{(t,s)}$ is bounded on $Y_{(t,s)} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{R} \mid (t, s, \tau) \in Y\}$ for every $(t, s) \in \pi^+(Y)$.

5.58 Convention

For $(t, s) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we parameterize the circle $\partial B(\mu_\kappa(t), s) \subset \mathbb{C}$ with the counterclockwise oriented curve

$$\rho : [-\pi, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \tau \mapsto \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}.$$

5.59 Definition

For definable functions $N, M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a definable function $G : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we set

$$\mathcal{B}(G, M) := \{(t, z) \in H \mid |G(t, z)| < M(t)\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}(G, N, M) := \{(t, z) \in H \mid N(t) < |G(t, z)| < M(t)\}.$$

5.60 Remark

Let $N, M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be definable. For a definable $G : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the sets $\mathcal{B}(G, M) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{A}(G, N, M) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$ are definable. We have

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M) = \{(t, z) \in H \mid 0 < |z - \mu_\kappa(t)| < M(t)\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) = \{(t, z) \in H \mid N(t) < |z - \mu_\kappa(t)| < M(t)\}.$$

5.61 Definition

Let $D \subset \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$ be definable. We set

$$D(\mu_\kappa) := \{(t, s, \tau) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times [-\pi, \pi] \mid \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau} \in D_t\}.$$

For the rest of Section 5.1.3 let $k := k^{\text{ch}}$.

5.62 Remark

Let $M, N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be definable functions. Suppose that $M < |\mu_r - \mu_k|$ if $k \geq 0$. Let $D := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M)$. Then

$$D(\mu_\kappa) = \{(t, s) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \mid N(t) < s < M(t)\} \times] - \pi, \pi[.$$

Proof

Let

$$B := \{(t, s) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \mid N(t) < s < M(t)\} \times] - \pi, \pi[.$$

Suppose $\kappa = r$. Let $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$. The case " $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ " is treated completely similar. For $t \in \pi(C)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\tau \in [-\pi, \pi]$ we set $\delta(t, s, \tau) := \mu_r(t) + s e^{i\tau}$. Note that we have $\delta(t, s, \tau) \in \mathbb{C}_{\mu_r(t)}^-$ if $k < 0$ respectively $\delta(t, s, \tau) \in \mathbb{C}_{\mu_r(t)}^- \cap \mathbb{C}_{\mu_k(t)}^+$ if $k \geq 0$ for $(t, s, \tau) \in B$. Remark 5.13 gives $B \subset D(\mu_\kappa)$. Let $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_\kappa)$. Then $t \in \pi(C)$, $N(t) < s < M(t)$ and since $\delta(t, s, \tau) \in D_t$ we have $\tau \in] - \pi, \pi[$. (If $\tau \in \{-\pi, \pi\}$ we obtain $\delta(t, s, \tau) = \mu_r(t) - s < \mu_r(t)$, i.e. $\delta(t, s, \tau) \notin \mathbb{C}_{\mu_r}^-$ and therefore $\delta(t, s, \tau) \notin D_t$ by Remark 5.13.) We obtain $(t, s, \tau) \in B$. The case " $\kappa = k$ " is treated completely similar. ■

5.63 Proposition

Let $M, N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be definable functions. Suppose that $M < |\mu_r - \mu_k|$ if $k \geq 0$. Let $D := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M)$. Let $F : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be definable such that

$$F^* : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto F(t, \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is bounded in τ . Suppose that F^* is globally subanalytic in τ with support function $g : \pi^+(D(\mu_\kappa)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ for an $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let

$$\Delta := \{(t, s, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{C} \mid N(t) < s < M(t), z \in B(\mu_\kappa(t), s)\}.$$

Then the function

$$\Psi : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, z) \mapsto \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(\mu_\kappa(t), s)} \frac{F(t, \xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi,$$

is well-defined and constructible in z with support function

$$h : \pi^+(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, (t, s) \mapsto (g(t, s), \mu_\kappa(t), s).$$

Proof

Let $G : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be globally subanalytic such that for $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_\kappa)$

$$F^*(t, s, \tau) = G(g(t, s), \tau).$$

For $(t, s, z) \in \Delta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B(\mu_\kappa(t), s)} \frac{F(t, \xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{F^*(t, s, \tau)}{\mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau} - z} i \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau} d\tau \\ &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{G(g(t, s), \tau)}{\mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau} - z} i \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\Delta \times] - \pi, \pi[\rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, z, \tau) \mapsto \frac{\left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}}{\mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau} - z},$$

is bounded in τ . So Ψ is well-defined.

Let $v := (v_1, \dots, v_l)$ range over \mathbb{R}^l and y over \mathbb{R} . Set

$$Q := \{(v, x, y, z, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{C} \times] - \pi, \pi[\mid |x - z| < y\}$$

and

$$\Omega : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (v, x, y, z, \tau) \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{G(v, \tau)}{x + (\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j) y e^{i\tau} - z} i (\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j) y e^{i\tau}, & (v, x, y, z, \tau) \in Q, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then Ω is globally subanalytic since we have that

$$] - \pi, \pi[\rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \tau \mapsto e^{i\tau} = \cos(\tau) + i \sin(\tau),$$

is globally subanalytic. Then for $(t, s, z, \tau) \in \Delta \times] - \pi, \pi[$ we have $|\mu_\kappa(t) - z| < s$ and therefore $(h(t, s), z, \tau) \in Q$. So we obtain

$$\frac{G(g(t, s), \tau)}{\mu_\kappa(t) + (\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j) s e^{i\tau} - z} i (\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j) s e^{i\tau} = \Omega(h(t, s), z, \tau)$$

for every $(t, s, z, \tau) \in \Delta \times] - \pi, \pi[$. By Remark 1.26 there is a constructible $G : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Psi(t, s, z) = G(h(t, s), z)$ for $(t, s, z) \in \Delta$. So we see that Ψ is constructible in z with support function h . \blacksquare

Note the following: For $(t, s) \in \pi^+(\Delta)$ the parameterized integral Ψ coincides with F_t by Cauchy's integral formula if F_t can be extended to a holomorphic function on $B(\mu_\kappa(t), \tilde{s})$ where $s < \tilde{s} < M(t)$.

In our treatment below the initial function F is a holomorphic extension of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable. (In the globally subanalytic setting F is the holomorphic extension of a prepared globally subanalytic function in one variable (see Proposition 2.8 in [17]). There we have $\kappa = 0$ and $\mu_\kappa = \theta$.) Outgoing from Proposition 5.63 we obtain the following

Strategy:

For a definable holomorphic extension $F : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable which we will construct in Section 5.1.4 we have to find a κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $F^*|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa,N,M})}$ is bounded and globally subanalytic in τ . In the construction of the unary high parametric global complexification in Section 5.2 below the parameter s will be "replaced" by a function $\alpha : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ which arises in a natural way from N and M . For further considerations it is necessary that the function $\Psi(t, \alpha(t), z)$ which we obtain after this replacement is constructible in z with regular support function (according to the preparation result in Section 5.1.4). This is the case if M and N are regular and F^* is free-regular in s .

5.64 Definition

Let $D \subset \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$ be definable. We call a function $f : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ **free-regular in s** if there is $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that f is globally subanalytic in τ with support function $g := (g_1, \dots, g_l) : \pi^+(D(\mu_\kappa)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ and the following holds for g . There is $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$, a regular function $\beta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and for every $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ a log-analytic $h_j : \mathbb{R}^{p+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $g_j(t, s) = h_j(\beta(t), s)$ for every $(t, s) \in \pi^+(D(\mu_\kappa))$.

5.65 Remark

Let $D \subset \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$ be definable.

- (1) Let $f : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be globally subanalytic. Then f is free-regular in s .
- (2) Let $f : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be globally subanalytic in τ with log-analytic support function. Then f is free-regular in s .

5.66 Remark

Let $D \subset \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$ be definable. Let $f : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be free-regular in s . The following holds.

- (1) f is globally subanalytic in τ with support function $g : \pi^+(D(\mu_\kappa)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ which can be constructed from a set E of positive definable functions such that every $h \in \log(E)$ is consistent.
- (2) Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $G : \mathbb{C}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be globally subanalytic. Let $J_1, \dots, J_q : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions which are free-regular in s . Then $H := G(J_1, \dots, J_q) : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is free-regular in s .

Proof

(1): Let $g := (g_1, \dots, g_l)$. Definition 5.64, Definition 5.54 and Remark 5.55(2) show immediately that g_j can be constructed from a set E of positive definable functions such that every $h \in \log(E)$ is consistent for $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$.

(2): Follows directly with Remark 1.25(2). ■

In the rest of the section we focus on the case that our initial function F in Proposition 5.63 above is $(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. The first step here is to find a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$z_l^* : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M)(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_j(t, \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$. (We will see below that we can choose $N = 0$.) This can be done with the following technical result which is also needed to establish the desired preparation result in Section 5.1.4.

5.67 Proposition

Let $U : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be regular and κ -persistent. Then the following holds.

- (1) Let $0 < \delta \leq 1/2$. There is a regular κ -persistent $\zeta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $K := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \zeta) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}, U)$ for $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$ and

$$\left| \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < \delta$$

for every $(t, z) \in K$ and every $j \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. If $U > 0$ then $\zeta > 0$.

- (2) Let $W : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be regular and κ -soft. Then there is a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \mathcal{A}(z_\kappa, W, U)$.

Proof

We start with the following claim.

Claim

Let $0 < \delta \leq 1/2$. There are globally subanalytic functions $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, \delta]$ such that the following holds.

- (i) λ_j is monotone increasing for $j \in \{1, 2\}$.
- (ii) For $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have $|\log(1+z)| < r$ if $|z| < \lambda_1(r)$.
- (iii) For $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have $r < |\log(1+z)|$ if $\lambda_2(r) < |z| < \delta$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$.
- (iv) We have $\lambda_2(0) = 0$, $\lim_{r \searrow 0} \lambda_2(r) = 0$ and $\lim_{r \nearrow r_0} \lambda_j(r) > 0$ for $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof of the claim

Define

$$\lambda_1 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, \delta], r \mapsto$$

$$\sup\{c \in [0, \delta[\mid \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } |z| < c \text{ it holds } |\log^*(1+z)| < r\}.$$

Note that λ_1 is well-defined, monotone increasing and we have $\lambda_1(0) = 0$. For $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ set

$$s(r) := \inf\{c \in [0, \delta[\mid \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } c < |z| < \delta \text{ it holds } r < |\log^*(1+z)|\}.$$

Note that $s(r_1) \leq s(r_2)$ for $0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2$. Set

$$\lambda_2 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, \delta], r \mapsto \begin{cases} s(r), & s(r) \neq \infty, \\ \delta, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that λ_j is globally subanalytic since \log^* is globally subanalytic and fulfills the desired properties for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. ■ Claim

(1): Let λ_1 be as in the claim. Let $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$. Let $\zeta_{j,l} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto U(t)$. Define by descending induction on $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$

$$\zeta_{j-1,l} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \lambda_1(\zeta_{j,l}(t))e^{\mu_{\kappa-j,\kappa}(t)}.$$

By an easy descending induction on $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ one sees with the claim that $\zeta_{j,l}$ is a well-defined regular κ -persistent function (compare with Remark 5.42(1) and Example 5.43). If $|\mathcal{P}_{j-1,\kappa}(t, z)| < \zeta_{j-1,l}(t)$ then

$$\left| \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < \lambda_1(\zeta_{j,l}(t)) \leq \delta$$

and therefore

$$|\mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}(t, z)| = \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j,\kappa}(t)}} \right) \right| < \zeta_{j,l}(t)$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$ and $(t, z) \in H$ by definition of λ_1 . So we take

$$\zeta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{\zeta_{0,0}(t), \dots, \zeta_{0,\kappa}(t)\}.$$

(2): Let $0 < \delta \leq 1/2$. Let λ_2 be as in the claim. By (1) there is a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $K := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{\kappa}, U) = \mathcal{B}(z_{\kappa}, U)$ and we have

$$\left| \frac{\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < \delta$$

for every $(t, z) \in K$ and every $l \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. Let $N_{\kappa} := W$. Define by descending induction on $l \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$

$$N_{l-1} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \lambda_2(N_l(t))e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}.$$

By an easy descending induction on $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$ one sees that N_l is a well-defined regular κ -soft function. This gives the following: If $N_{l-1}(t) < |\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)|$ then

$$\lambda_2(N_l(t)) < \left| \frac{\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < \delta$$

and therefore

$$N_l(t) < \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}} \right) \right| = |\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z)|$$

for $l \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$ and $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M)$ by definition of λ_2 . So set $N := N_0$. We obtain $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \mathcal{A}(z_{\kappa}, W, U)$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.67. ■

5.68 Corollary

There is a regular κ -persistent function $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $M < |\mu_r - \mu_k|$ if $k \geq 0$ such that for every $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$ the following holds where $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M)$.

(1) The function

$$\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}^* : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, \mu_\kappa(t)) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) s e^{i\tau},$$

is free-regular in s .

(2) The function

$$z_l^* : D(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_l(t, \mu_\kappa(t)) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) s e^{i\tau},$$

is free-regular in s .

Proof

By Proposition 5.67(1) there is a regular κ -persistent $T : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < 1/2$$

for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, T)$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. Let $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{|\mu_r(t) - \mu_k(t)|, T(t)\}$ and $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M)$. Note that a regular function $h : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ considered as a function on $D(\mu_\kappa)$ is free-regular in s .

(1): We do an induction on l . Note that $\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}^*$ is globally subanalytic, because

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}^*(t, s, \tau) = \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) s e^{i\tau} = \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) s (\cos(\tau) + i \sin(\tau))$$

for $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_\kappa)$. So $\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}^*$ is free-regular in s by Remark 5.65(1).

$l-1 \rightarrow l$: For $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_\kappa)$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}^*(t, s, \tau) = \log^* \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}^*(t, s, \tau)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}} \right).$$

Because \log^* is globally subanalytic we see with Remark 5.66(2) that $\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}^*$ is free-regular in s since $e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}}$ is regular (and therefore $e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}}$ is also free-regular in s considered as a function on $D(\mu_\kappa)$ since coordinate projections are globally subanalytic).

(2): For $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_\kappa)$ we obtain with Proposition 5.18

$$z_l^*(t, s, \tau) = \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}^*(t, s, \tau) + \sigma_l e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1,\kappa}(t)}$$

for $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ and with Corollary 5.19

$$z_\kappa^*(t, s, \tau) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa,\kappa}^*(t, s, \tau).$$

So we obtain that z_l^* is free-regular in s for every $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$ with (1) if $l = \kappa$ respectively (1) and Remark 5.66(2) if $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ since $e^{\mu_{\kappa-l-1,\kappa}}$ is regular. \blacksquare

Now we obtain the desired result on integration for a logarithmic scale in the complex setting if $\kappa = r$.

5.69 Corollary

Let $\kappa = r$. Let $q := (q_0, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. There is a regular r -persistent function $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $M < |\mu_r - \mu_k|$ if $k \geq 0$ such that for $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,r}, M)$ the function

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mu_r}^{\otimes q} : D(\mu_r) \mapsto \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, \mu_r(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is bounded in τ and free-regular in s .

Proof

By Corollary 5.68(2) we find a regular r -persistent $T : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$z_l^* : \hat{D}(\mu_r) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_l(t, \mu_r(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ where $\hat{D} := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,r}, T)$. Then $\sigma_l z_l^*(t, s, \tau) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ for every $(t, s, \tau) \in \hat{D}(\mu_r)$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ by Definition 5.11 since $\mu_r(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau} \in H_t$ for $(t, s, \tau) \in \hat{D}(\mu_r)$. Let

$$\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu_r}^{\otimes q} : \hat{D}(\mu_r) \mapsto \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto (\sigma \hat{\mathcal{Z}})^{\otimes q}(t, \mu_r(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

and

$$G : (\mathbb{C}^-)^{r+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (w_0, \dots, w_r) \mapsto \prod_{j=0}^r (w_j)^{q_j}.$$

Note that G is globally subanalytic. We obtain

$$\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu_r}^{\otimes q}(t, s, \tau) = G(\sigma_0 z_0^*(t, s, \tau), \dots, \sigma_r z_r^*(t, s, \tau))$$

for every $(t, s, \tau) \in \hat{D}(\mu_r)$. Therefore $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu_r}^{\otimes q}$ is free-regular in s by Remark 5.66(2).

Let

$$d : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \min\{|\mu_r(t) - \mu_j(t)| \mid j \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}\}.$$

Note that d is regular (by Example 5.56(1) and Remark 5.55(2)) and r -persistent (by Example 5.43 and Remark 5.42(3)). Choose $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{T(t), d(t)\}$. Let $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,r}, M)$. The following claim finishes the proof of Corollary 5.69.

Claim

The function $\mathcal{Z}_{\mu_r}^{\otimes q} = \hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mu_r}^{\otimes q}|_{D(\mu_r)}$ is bounded in τ .

Proof of the claim

Assume the contrary. Then there is $(t, s) \in \pi^+(D(\mu_r))$ and a definable curve $\gamma_\tau :]0, 1[\rightarrow]-\pi, \pi[$ such that $(t, s, \gamma_\tau(y)) \in D(\mu_r)$ for $y \in]0, 1[$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mathcal{Z}_{\mu_r}^{\otimes q}(t, s, \gamma_\tau(y))| = \lim_{y \searrow 0} |(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, \mu_r(t) + (\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j) s e^{i\gamma_\tau(y)})| = \infty.$$

Note that $0 < s < d$. Consider $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow H, y \mapsto (\gamma_t(y), \gamma_z(y))$ with $\gamma_t(y) = t$ and $\gamma_z(y) = \mu_r(t) + (\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j) s e^{i\gamma_\tau(y)}$ for $y \in]0, 1[$. Note that this curve is definable and compatible with C . Since $0 < s < d$ we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_z(y) - \mu_l(t) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \mu_r(t) + (\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j) s e^{i\gamma_\tau(y)} - \mu_l(t) \neq 0$$

for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ which is a contradiction to Corollary 5.31(1). ■

Now we investigate the case " $\kappa = k$ ": So for the rest of Section 5.1.3 we suppose $k \geq 0$. It is left to show that we can find a regular k -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular k -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$z_l^* : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,k}, N, M)(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_l(t, \mu_k(t) + (\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for $l \in \{k, \dots, r\}$.

We start our considerations with the following three technical results.

5.70 Proposition

Let $D \subset H$ be definable such that D_t is connected and $\mathbb{R} \cap D_t \neq \emptyset$ for $t \in \pi(D)$. Let $f, g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^-$ be functions with the following properties.

- (1) f and g are continuous in z .
- (2) We have $f(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if $(t, z) \in D \cap (\pi(C) \times \mathbb{R})$.
- (3) $f(t, z)g(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ for every $(t, z) \in D$.

Then for every $(t, z) \in D$

$$\log(f(t, z)g(t, z)) = \log(f(t, z)) + \log(g(t, z)).$$

Proof

Suppose that there is $(t, z^*) \in D$ such that

$$\log(f(t, z^*)g(t, z^*)) = \log(f(t, z^*)) + \log(g(t, z^*)) \pm 2\pi i$$

(and therefore

$$|\arg(f(t, z^*)) + \arg(g(t, z^*))| \geq \pi.)$$

Note that

$$D_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, z \mapsto \arg(f(t, z)) + \arg(g(t, z)),$$

is continuous and that $|\arg(f(t, z)) + \arg(g(t, z))| < \pi$ if $z \in \mathbb{R}$ for $t \in \pi(C)$. By the intermediate value theorem (by taking a definable curve which connects z^* and a point $a \in D_t \cap \mathbb{R}$) there is $z' \in D_t$ such that

$$|\arg(f(t, z')) + \arg(g(t, z'))| = \pi.$$

This gives $\arg(f(t, z')g(t, z')) = \pi$. But then $f(t, z')g(t, z') \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$, a contradiction. ■

5.71 Remark

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $D := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^- \mid |z| < 1/\exp_m(1)\}$ and

$$L_m : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \log_m(-\log(z)).$$

Then L_m is well-defined, definable and holomorphic. We have $\log_m(-\log(z)) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and $\log_m(-\log(z)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if $z \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ for $z \in D$.

Proof

Let $z \in D$. If $z \notin \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ then

$$\log(z) = \log(|z|) + i\arg(z) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$$

since $\arg(z) \neq 0$ and therefore $\log_m(-\log(z)) \in \mathbb{C}^-$. So assume $z \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We obtain $\exp_{m-1}(1) < -\log(z)$ and therefore

$$\exp_{m-1-l}(1) < \log_l(-\log(z))$$

for every $l \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ (where $\exp_0 := 1$). We obtain $\log_m(-\log(z)) > 0$. ■

5.72 Proposition

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$c := \frac{1}{\exp_m(2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2})}$$

and $D :=]0, c[\times] - \pi, \pi[$. The function

$$T_l : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^-, (s, \tau) \mapsto \log_l(-\log(se^{i\tau})),$$

is a well-defined globally subanalytic function in τ with log-analytic support function for every $l \in \{0, \dots, m\}$.

Proof

Note that $se^{i\tau} \in \mathbb{C}^-$ for every $(s, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times] - \pi, \pi[$. So we obtain well-definability with Remark 5.71. Set

$$S_0 : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (s, \tau) \mapsto \frac{i\tau}{\log(s)},$$

and inductively for $l \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$

$$S_l : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (s, \tau) \mapsto \frac{\log(1 + S_{l-1}(s, \tau))}{\log_l(-\log(s))}.$$

Claim

Let $l \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$. Then S_l is a well-defined globally subanalytic function in τ with log-analytic support function. For every $(s, \tau) \in D$ we have $|S_l(s, \tau)| < 1/2$ and

$$T_l = \log_l(-\log(s))(1 + S_l(s, \tau)).$$

Proof of the claim

Let $(s, \tau) \in D$. We obtain

$$2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2} < \log_l(-\log(s)) \quad (*)$$

for every $l \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$. We do an induction on l . The case $l = 0$ is clear.

$l-1 \rightarrow l$: With the inductive hypothesis, (*), and the definition of the complex logarithm we see that S_l is well-defined and that $|S_l(s, \tau)| < 1/2$ for every $(s, \tau) \in D$. We have for $(s, \tau) \in D$

$$S_l(s, \tau) = \frac{\log^*(1 + S_{l-1}(s, \tau))}{\log_l(-\log(s))}.$$

With the inductive hypothesis and Remark 1.25(2) it follows that S_l is a globally subanalytic function in τ with log-analytic support function. Additionally we obtain for $(s, \tau) \in D$ with the inductive hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} \log_l(-\log(s) - i\tau) &= \log(\log_{l-1}(-\log(s) - i\tau)) \\ &= \log(\log_{l-1}(-\log(s))(1 + S_{l-1}(s, \tau))) \\ &= \log_l(-\log(s)) + \log(1 + S_{l-1}(s, \tau)) \\ &= \log_l(-\log(s)) \left(1 + \frac{\log(1 + S_{l-1}(s, \tau))}{\log_l(-\log(s))}\right) \\ &= \log_l(-\log(s))(1 + S_l(s, \tau)). \end{aligned}$$

■ Claim

Note that by the claim

$$\begin{aligned} T_m(s, \tau) &= \log(T_{m-1}(s, \tau)) \\ &= \log(\log_{m-1}(-\log(s))(1 + S_{m-1}(s, \tau))) \\ &= \log(\log_{m-1}(-\log(s))) + \log(1 + S_{m-1}(s, \tau)) \\ &= \log_m(-\log(s)) + \log^*(1 + S_{m-1}(s, \tau)). \end{aligned}$$

By the claim and Remark 1.25(2) we obtain immediately that T_m is globally subanalytic in τ with log-analytic support function. So Proposition 5.72 is proven. ■

5.73 Proposition

Let $k = 0$ and $\mathcal{Q}_0 := \mathcal{P}_{0,k}$. There is a regular 0-persistent function $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $M < |\mu_r - \mu_0|$ such that for $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_0, M)$ and every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ the function

$$z_l^* : D(\mu_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_l(\mu_0(t) + \sigma_0 s e^{i\tau}),$$

is globally subanalytic in τ with log-analytic support function.

Proof

We may assume that C is near with respect to μ_0 . Otherwise we are done with Remark 5.46 by choosing $M = 0$. Note that $\sigma_1 = -1$, $\sigma_2 = \dots = \sigma_r = 1$ and that $\Theta_1 = \dots = \Theta_r = 0$ by Proposition 5.47. By Definition 5.2 we have $\mu_0 = \Theta_0$, $\mu_1 = \Theta_0 + \sigma_0$ and for $j \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ we have $\mu_j = \Theta_0 + \sigma_0 e^{-e_{j-1}}$ where $e_0 := 0$ and $e_m := \exp(e_{m-1})$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that for $(t, z) \in H$

$$z_1(t, z) = \log(\sigma_0 z_0(t, z))$$

and

$$z_l(t, z) = \log_{l-1}(-\log(\sigma_0 z_0(t, z)))$$

for $l \in \{2, \dots, r\}$. Let

$$c := \frac{1}{\exp_{r-1}(2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2})}.$$

Then $c < 1/\exp_{r-1}(1) = 1/e_r = |\mu_r(t) - \mu_0(t)|$ for $t \in \pi(C)$. Consider $M := c$. With Remark 5.62 we see that

$$D(\mu_0) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_0, c)(\mu_0) = \pi(C) \times]0, c[\times] - \pi, \pi[.$$

Note that $z_0^*(t, s, \tau) = \sigma_0 s e^{i\tau} = \sigma_0 s (\cos(\tau) + i \sin(\tau))$ and $z_1^*(t, s, \tau) = \log(s) + i\tau$ for $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_0)$. So z_0^* and z_1^* fulfill the desired properties since the restriction of the global sine and cosine function on $] - \pi, \pi[$ are globally subanalytic. We obtain for $l \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} z_{l+1}^*(t, s, \tau) &= \log_l(-\log(\sigma_0 z_0(t, \Theta_0(t) + \sigma_0 s e^{i\tau}))) \\ &= \log_l(-\log(s e^{i\tau})) \end{aligned}$$

for every $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_0)$. With Proposition 5.72 we see that

$$]0, c[\times] - \pi, \pi[\rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (s, \tau) \mapsto \log_l(-\log(s e^{i\tau})),$$

is a well-defined globally subanalytic function in τ with log-analytic support function for $l \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$ and we are done with the proof of Proposition 5.73. \blacksquare

5.74 Proposition

Let $\mathcal{Q}_0 := \mathcal{P}_{0,k}$. There is a regular k -persistent function $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $M < |\mu_r - \mu_k|$ such that for $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_0, M)$ and every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ the function

$$z_l^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_l(\mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s .

Proof

For $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ we set $\mathcal{Q}_j := \mathcal{P}_{j,k}$. We may assume that C is near with respect to μ_k . Otherwise we are done with Remark 5.46 by choosing $M = 0$. Note that $\sigma_{k+1} = -1, \sigma_{k+2} = \dots = \sigma_r = 1$ and that $\Theta_{k+1} = \dots = \Theta_r = 0$ by Proposition 5.47. So for $(t, z) \in H$ we have with Corollary 5.19

$$z_{k+1}(t, z) = \log(\sigma_k z_k(t, z)) = \log(\sigma_k \mathcal{Q}_k(t, z))$$

and

$$z_l(t, z) = \log_{l-k-1}(-\log(\sigma_k z_k(t, z))) = \log_{l-k-1}(-\log(\sigma_k \mathcal{Q}_k(t, z)))$$

for $l \in \{k+2, \dots, r\}$.

If $k = 0$ we are done with Proposition 5.73. So assume $k > 0$.

Fix $\lambda \in]0, 1/2[$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\log(1+z) - z}{z} \right| < 1/2$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ with $|z| < \lambda$. For $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ set

$$\zeta_l : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}, t \mapsto \min \left\{ \frac{1}{e^{2|\mu_{k-l,k}(t)|}}, \frac{1}{\exp_{r-k-1}(2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2)+\pi^2})}, \right. \\ \left. \lambda e^{\mu_{k-l,k}(t)}, \frac{e^{\mu_{k-l,k}(t)}}{\exp_{r-k-1}(2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2)+\pi^2})} \right\}.$$

We see that ζ_l is regular (by Remark 5.55 and Example 5.56(1)) and k -persistent (by Example 5.43 and Remark 5.42(3)) for every $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. For $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ set

$$\Omega_l := \{(t, z) \in H \mid |\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \zeta_l(t)\}.$$

By Proposition 5.67(1) there is a regular k -persistent $M_l : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_0, M_l) \subset \Omega_l$ for $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Consider

$$M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{|\mu_r(t) - \mu_k(t)|, M_1(t), \dots, M_k(t)\}.$$

Then M is k -persistent and regular. We have $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_0, M) \subset \bigcap_{l=1}^k \Omega_l$. Clearly D_t is connected and $D_t \cap \mathbb{R} \neq \emptyset$ for $t \in \pi(D)$. Let for $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$

$$c_l : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \frac{\sigma_{l-1} \mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{k-l, k}(t)}}.$$

Then for every $(t, z) \in D$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_l(t, z) = \log(1 + c_l(t, z)).$$

Let $\mathcal{V} \in \{c, \mathcal{Q}\}$. By Remark 5.21 we have

$$\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) \mathcal{V}_l(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-,$$

and

$$\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) \mathcal{V}_l(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

if $z \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $(t, z) \in D$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. $(+\nu)$

Note also that

$$|\mathcal{V}_l(t, z)| < \frac{1}{\exp_{r-k-1}(2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2})}$$

for every $(t, z) \in D$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. $(++\nu)$

By shrinking M if necessary we may assume with Corollary 5.68(1) that

$$\mathcal{V}_l^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto \mathcal{V}_l(t, \mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for every $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. (Therefore

$$z_l^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_l(t, \mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is also free-regular in s .) $(+++ \nu)$

For $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$ we define

$$R_{m, l} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log_m(-\log(\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) \mathcal{Q}_l(t, z))).$$

By Remark 5.71, $(+\mathcal{Q})$ and $(++\mathcal{Q})$ we obtain that the function $R_{m,l}$ is well-defined, continuous in z , and for $(t, z) \in D$ we have $R_{m,l}(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and if $z \in \mathbb{R}$ then $R_{m,l}(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. $(+R)$

Note that $\sigma_{k+m+1}z_{k+m+1} = R_{m,k}$ for $m \in \{0, \dots, r-k-1\}$. So the goal is to show that the corresponding $R_{m,l}^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is free-regular in s by an induction on the natural numbers l and m . But the problem is that we have to deal with iterated logarithms. So we have to consider some more auxiliary functions and establish additionally properties for them (compare with Claim 1 to Claim 4).

For $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we set

$$S_{0,l} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \mu_{k-l,k}(t),$$

and inductively for $m \in \{1, \dots, r-k-1\}$

$$S_{m,l} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log\left(1 + \frac{S_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z)}\right).$$

Let for $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $m \in \{0, \dots, r-k-1\}$

$$T_{m,l} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log_m\left(-\log\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j c_l(t, z)\right)\right).$$

By Remark 5.71, $(+c)$ and $(++c)$ we obtain that the function $T_{m,l}$ is well-defined, continuous in z , and for $(t, z) \in D$ we have $T_{m,l}(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and if $z \in \mathbb{R}$ then $T_{m,l}(t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. $(+T)$

Let for $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$

$$b_l : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \frac{\log(1 + c_l(t, z)) - c_l(t, z)}{c_l(t, z)},$$

$$U_{0,l} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto -\log(1 + b_l(t, z)),$$

and inductively for $m \in \{1, \dots, r-k-1\}$

$$U_{m,l} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \log\left(1 + \frac{U_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{T_{m-1,l}(t, z)}\right).$$

Note that $|c_l(t, z)| < \lambda$ since $|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \lambda e^{\mu_{k-l,k}(t)}$ for $(t, z) \in D$. So we see that b_l is well-defined, continuous in z , $|b_l(t, z)| < 1/2$ by the choice of λ and $1 + b_l(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ for $(t, z) \in D$. $(+b)$

Claim 1

Let $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. The function $S_{m-1,l}$ is well-defined, continuous in z and for $(t, z) \in D$ we have

$$\left| \frac{S_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2$$

for every $m \in \{1, \dots, r - k - 1\}$.

Proof of Claim 1

Note that for $(t, z) \in D$

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{e^{2|\mu_{k-l,k}(t)|}}, \frac{1}{\exp_{r-k-1}(2\sqrt{\log(3/2)^2 + \pi^2})} \right\}. \quad (*)$$

We show Claim 1 by induction on $m \in \{1, \dots, r - k - 1\}$. Fix $(t, z) \in D$.

$m = 1$: That $S_{0,l}$ is well-defined and continuous in z is clear. We obtain with (*)

$$|\mu_{k-l,k}(t)| < -1/2 \log(|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)|)$$

and with the definition of the complex logarithm

$$|\mu_{k-l,k}(t)| < 1/2 \left| \log \left(\prod_{j=l-1}^k \sigma_j \mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z) \right) \right|.$$

This gives

$$\left| \frac{S_{0,l}(t, z)}{R_{0,l-1}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2.$$

$m - 1 \rightarrow m$: We obtain well-definability of $S_{m-1,l}$ by the inductive hypothesis. We get

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{m-1,l}(t, z)| &= \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{S_{m-2,l}(t, z)}{R_{m-2,l-1}(t, z)} \right) \right| \\ &< \sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2} \end{aligned}$$

by the inductive hypothesis and definition of the complex logarithm. So we obtain by (*)

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \frac{1}{\exp_m(2|S_{m-1,l}(t, z)|)},$$

i.e.

$$2|S_{m-1,l}(t, z)| < \log_{m-1}(-\log(|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)|)).$$

By the definition of the complex logarithm we obtain that

$$\left| \frac{S_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2$$

and we are done since $R_{m-1,l-1}$ is continuous in z .

■ Claim 1

By Claim 1 and $(+R)$ we have that $S_{m,l}$ is well-defined, continuous in z and

$$1 + \frac{S_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z)} \in \mathbb{C}^-$$

for $(t, z) \in D$, $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, r - k - 1\}$. $(+S)$

Claim 2

Let $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. The function $U_{m-1,l}$ is well-defined, continuous in z and for $(t, z) \in D$ we have

$$\left| \frac{U_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{T_{m-1,l}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2$$

for every $m \in \{1, \dots, r - k - 1\}$.

Proof of Claim 2

Fix $(t, z) \in D$. We have

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \frac{e^{\mu_{k-l,k}(t)}}{\exp_{r-k-1}(2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2})}$$

and by $(+b)$

$$|U_{0,l}(t, z)| < \sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2}. (**)$$

We do an induction on m .

$m = 1$: With $(+b)$ we obtain that $U_{0,l}$ is well-defined and continuous in z .

With $(**)$ we obtain

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \frac{e^{\mu_{k-l,k}(t)}}{\exp(2\sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2})}$$

and therefore

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \frac{e^{\mu_{k-l,k}(t)}}{\exp(2|U_{0,l}(t, z)|)}.$$

This gives

$$|U_{0,l}(t, z)| < -1/2 \log(|c_l(t, z)|)$$

and with the definition of the complex logarithm

$$|U_{0,l}(t, z)| < 1/2 |\log(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j c_l(t, z))|.$$

We obtain

$$\left| \frac{U_{0,l}(t, z)}{T_{0,l}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2.$$

$m-1 \rightarrow m$: We obtain well-definability of $U_{m-1,l}$ by the inductive hypothesis. We get

$$\begin{aligned} |U_{m-1,l}(t, z)| &= \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{U_{m-2,l}(t, z)}{T_{m-2,l}(t, z)} \right) \right| \\ &< \sqrt{\log^2(3/2) + \pi^2} \end{aligned}$$

by the inductive hypothesis. This gives with (**)

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z)| < \frac{e^{\mu_{k-l,k}(t)}}{\exp_m(2|U_{m-1,l}(t, z)|)}.$$

This implies

$$2|U_{m-1,l}(t, z)| < \log_{m-1}(-\log(|c_l(t, z)|))$$

and with the definition of the complex logarithm we obtain

$$\left| \frac{U_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{T_{m-1,l}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2$$

and are done. (We obtain the continuity of $U_{m-1,l}$ in z since $T_{m-2,l}$ is continuous in z .) ■ Claim 2

By Claim 2 we have that $U_{m,l}$ is well-defined, continuous in z , and we have

$$1 + \frac{U_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{T_{m-1,l}(t, z)} \in \mathbb{C}^-$$

for $(t, z) \in D$, $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, r-k-1\}$. (+ U)

Claim 3

Let $(t, z) \in D$. Let $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. It holds

$$T_{m,l}(t, z) = R_{m,l-1}(t, z) + S_{m,l}(t, z)$$

for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$.

Proof of Claim 3

We do an induction on m .

$m = 0$: We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_{0,l}(t, z) &= -\log\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) c_l(t, z) \\ &= -\log\left(\prod_{j=l-1}^k \sigma_j\right) \mathcal{Q}_{l-1}(t, z) + \mu_{k-l,k}(t) \\ &= R_{0,l-1}(t, z) + S_{0,l}(t, z). \end{aligned}$$

$m - 1 \rightarrow m$: By Proposition 5.70, $(+_R)$, $(+_S)$, $(+_T)$ we obtain with the inductive hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} \log(T_{m-1,l}(t, z)) &= \log(R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z) + S_{m-1,l}(t, z)) \\ &= \log(R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z)) + \log\left(1 + \frac{S_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$T_{m,l}(t, z) = \log(T_{m-1,l}(t, z)) = R_{m,l-1}(t, z) + S_{m,l}(t, z).$$

■ Claim 3

Claim 4

Let $(t, z) \in D$. Let $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. It holds

$$R_{m,l}(t, z) = T_{m,l}(t, z) + U_{m,l}(t, z)$$

for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$.

Proof of Claim 4

We do an induction on m .

$m = 0$: We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_{0,l}(t, z) &= -\log\left(\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) \mathcal{Q}_l(t, z)\right) = -\log\left(\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) \log(1 + c_l(t, z))\right) \\ &= -\log\left(\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) (c_l(t, z) + \log(1 + c_l(t, z)) - c_l(t, z))\right) \\ &= -\log\left(\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) c_l(t, z) (1 + b_l(t, z))\right). \end{aligned}$$

With $(+_b)$, $(+_c)$, $(+_Q)$ and Proposition 5.70 we obtain

$$-\log\left(\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) c_l(t, z) (1 + b_l(t, z))\right) = -\log\left(\left(\prod_{j=l}^k \sigma_j\right) c_l(t, z)\right) - \log(1 + b_l(t, z)).$$

Therefore

$$R_{0,l} = T_{0,l}(t, z) + U_{0,l}(t, z).$$

$m - 1 \rightarrow m$: By Proposition 5.70, $(+_R)$, $(+_T)$, $(+_U)$ and the inductive hypothesis we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log(R_{m-1,l}(t, z)) &= \log(T_{m-1,l}(t, z) + U_{m-1,l}(t, z)) \\ &= \log(T_{m-1,l}(t, z)) + \log\left(1 + \frac{U_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{T_{m-1,l}(t, z)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$R_{m,l}(t, z) = \log(R_{m-1,l}(t, z)) = T_{m,l}(t, z) + U_{m,l}(t, z).$$

■ Claim 4

Now we are able to show that the corresponding $R_{m,l}^*$ is free-regular in s : The idea is to show simultaneously that $T_{m,l}^*$ and $R_{m,l}^*$ are free-regular in s for $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$ by doing an induction on l and using Claim 1 to Claim 4.

Claim 5

(I_l) for $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$: The function

$$T_{m,l}^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto T_{m,l}(t, \mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$.

(II_l) for $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$: The function

$$R_{m,l}^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto R_{m,l}(t, \mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$.

Proof of Claim 5

We start with (II₀). Let $(t, s, \tau) \in D(\mu_k)$. We have

$$0 < s < \frac{1}{\exp_{r-k-1}(2\sqrt{\log(3/2)^2 + \pi^2})}$$

since

$$|z - \mu_k(t)| = |\mathcal{Q}_0(t, z)| < \frac{1}{\exp_{r-k-1}(2\sqrt{\log(3/2)^2 + \pi^2})}$$

for all $(t, z) \in D$. Note that

$$R_{m,0}^*(t, s, \tau) = \log_m(-\log(se^{i\tau}))$$

for $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$. Therefore with Proposition 5.72 and Remark 5.65(2) we are done.

Assume that (I_{l-1}) and (II_{l-1}) have already been shown for $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ where (I₀) is any true statement. We show (I_l). By Claim 3 we have $T_{m,l} = R_{m,l-1} + S_{m,l}$ on D for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$. With (II_{l-1}) and Remark 5.66(2) it suffices to show that

$$S_{m,l}^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto S_{m,l}(t, \mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r - k - 1\}$. We do an induction on m . For $m = 0$ this is clear since $S_{0,m}^*$ considered as a function on $\pi(D)$ is the restriction of the regular function $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \mu_{k-l,k}(t)$. So with Definition 5.64 one sees immediately that $S_{0,m}^*$ is free-regular in s . Assume $m > 0$. By Claim 1 we obtain that

$$\left| \frac{S_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{R_{m-1,l-1}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2$$

for every $(t, z) \in D$. So

$$S_{m,l} = \log^* \left(1 + \frac{S_{m-1,l}}{R_{m-1,l-1}} \right).$$

With (II_{l-1}) , the inductive hypothesis and Remark 5.66(2) we are done.

We show (II_l) . By Claim 4 we have $R_{m,l} = T_{m,l} + U_{m,l}$ on D for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r-k-1\}$. With (I_l) and Remark 5.66(2) it suffices to show that

$$U_{m,l}^* : D(\mu_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto U_{m,l}(t, \mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j \right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r-k-1\}$. We do an induction on m .

$m = 0$: Note that $U_{0,l}(t, z) = \log^*(1 + b_l(t, z))$ and

$$b_l(t, z) = \frac{\log^*(1 + c_l(t, z)) - c_l(t, z)}{c_l(t, z)}$$

for every $(t, z) \in D$ (compare with $(+_b)$ and $(++_c)$). With $(+++_c)$ and Remark 5.66(2) we are done.

$m-1 \rightarrow m$: By Claim 4 we obtain that

$$\left| \frac{U_{m-1,l}(t, z)}{T_{m-1,l}(t, z)} \right| < 1/2$$

for every $(t, z) \in D$. So

$$U_{m,l} = \log^* \left(1 + \frac{U_{m-1,l}}{T_{m-1,l}} \right).$$

With (I_l) , the inductive hypothesis and Remark 5.66(2) we are done. \blacksquare Claim 5

We have

$$\sigma_{k+m+1} z_{k+m+1}|_D = R_{m,k}$$

for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r-k-1\}$. Therefore we obtain with (II_k) in Claim 5 that z_{k+m+1}^* is free-regular in s for every $m \in \{0, \dots, r-k-1\}$. By $(+++_{\mathcal{Q}})$ we also have that z_l^* is free-regular in s for $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.74. \blacksquare

5.75 Corollary

Let $q := (q_0, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$. There is a k -persistent regular function $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $M < |\mu_r - \mu_k|$ such that for $D := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,k}, M)$ the function

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mu_k}^{\otimes q} : D(\mu_k) \mapsto \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, \mu_k(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^k \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is bounded in τ and free-regular in s .

Proof

The proof for this corollary is the same as the proof of Corollary 5.69. ■

5.1.4 Holomorphic Extensions of Prepared Restricted Log-Exp-Analytic Functions in one Variable and the Desired Result on Integration

In this section we compute a definable holomorphic extension $F : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in one variable and construct for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k^{\text{ch}}, r\}$ if $k^{\text{ch}} \geq 0$ a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that the following holds: We have $D := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \Gamma$ and $F|_D$ is complex log-analytically prepared in z with regular data, i.e. of the form

$$F|_D = a(t)(\sigma_0 z_0)^{q_0} \cdot \dots \cdot (\sigma_r z_r)^{q_r} U(t, z)$$

where $a(t)$ is regular, $q_0, \dots, q_r \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $U = V \circ \phi$ where V is a convergent complex power series and the components of ϕ are of the form $b_j(t)(\sigma_0 z_0)^{p_0} \cdot \dots \cdot (\sigma_r z_r)^{p_r}$ where $b_j(t)$ is regular and $p_0, \dots, p_r \in \mathbb{Q}$. This fact shows that $F|_D$ depends "only in a globally subanalytically way" from $z_0|_D, \dots, z_r|_D$. Finally we obtain the desired result on integration with our considerations in Section 5.1.3.

At first we define complex log-analytically prepared functions.

5.76 Definition

Let $Y \subset H$ be definable. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $F : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function. We say that F is **complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with center Θ** if

$$F(t, z) = a(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z)U(t, z)$$

for all $(t, z) \in Y$ where a is a definable function on $\pi(Y)$ which vanishes identically or has no zero, $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$, and $U = V \circ \phi$ such that the following holds.

(a) The function ϕ is given by

$$\phi : Y \rightarrow \overline{D^s(0, 1)}, (t, z) \mapsto (b_1(t) \prod_{l=0}^r (\sigma_l z_l(t, z))^{p_{1l}}, \dots, b_s(t) \prod_{l=0}^r (\sigma_l z_l(t, z))^{p_{sl}}),$$

where $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $b_1, \dots, b_s : \pi(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are definable which have no zeros and $p_{1l}, \dots, p_{sl} \in \mathbb{Q}$ for every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.

(b) V is a power series which converges absolutely on an open neighbourhood of $\overline{D^s(0, 1)}$.

We call a **coefficient** and b_1, \dots, b_s are called **base functions**. We call $\mathcal{LA}_\mathbb{C} := (r, \mathcal{Z}, a, q, s, V, b, P)$ where $\mathcal{Z} := (z_0, \dots, z_r)$ and $b := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$ and

$$P := \begin{pmatrix} p_{10} & \cdot & \cdot & p_{1r} \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ p_{s0} & \cdot & \cdot & p_{sr} \end{pmatrix} \in M(s \times (r+1), \mathbb{Q})$$

a **complex LA-preparing tuple** for F .

The next Remark shows that a log-analytically prepared function $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in x can be extended to a complex log-analytically prepared function in z which is holomorphic in z , i.e. there is a definable $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$ with $C \subset \Gamma$ and a complex r -log-analytically prepared function $F : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ in z such that Γ_t is open, F_t is holomorphic for $t \in \pi(C)$ and $F|_C = f$.

5.77 Remark

Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be r -log-analytically prepared in x . Let $\mathcal{LA} := (r, \mathcal{Y}, a, q, s, v, b, P)$ be a preparing tuple for f with $b := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$ and $P := (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$. Let $R > 1$ be such that v converges absolutely on an open neighbourhood of $[-R, R]^s$. For $l \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ set

$$\Gamma_l := \{(t, z) \in H \mid |b_l(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_l}(t, z)| < R\}.$$

Set

$$\Gamma := \bigcap_{l=1}^s \Gamma_l$$

and consider

$$F : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto a(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z) \hat{V}(b_1(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}(t, z), \dots, b_s(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_s}(t, z))$$

where \hat{V} is a complex power series in s variables which converges absolutely on an open neighbourhood of $\overline{D^s(0, R)}$ with $\hat{V}|_{[-1, 1]^s} = v$. Then the function F

is well-defined, definable and holomorphic in z . Additionally we have $C \subset \Gamma$, $F|_C = f$ and F is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with preparing tuple $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}_\mathbb{C} := (r, \mathcal{Z}, a, q, s, V, 1/R \cdot b, P)$ where $V(z_1, \dots, z_s) := \hat{V}(Rz_1, \dots, Rz_s)$.

Now we compute a definable holomorphic extension of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable. At first we consider a function $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared with respect to a set E of positive definable functions on C .

For Section 5.1.4 we fix the following. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Fix a function $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x with center Θ with respect to a finite set E of positive definable functions such that every $g \in \log(E)$ is log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in x with respect to E for a $l \in \{-1, \dots, e-1\}$ (compare with Definition 4.9). For $g \in \log(E) \cup \{f\}$ we fix a corresponding preparing tuple $(r, \mathcal{Y}, a_g, \exp(d_{0,g}), q_g, s, v_g, b_g, \exp(d_g), P_g)$ where $b_g := (b_{1,g}, \dots, b_{s,g})$ and $\exp(d_g) := (\exp(d_{1,g}), \dots, \exp(d_{s,g}))$ (compare with Definition 4.9). Fix a finite set \mathcal{E} of C -heirs such that Θ and a_g, b_g can be constructed from \mathcal{E} for $g \in \log(E) \cap \{f\}$.

Fix $R > 1$ such that v_g converges absolutely on $[-R, R]^s$ and a complex power series V_g which converges absolutely on $\overline{D^s(0, R)}$ with $V_g|_{[-1, 1]^s} = v_g$ for every $g \in \log(E) \cup \{f\}$. By redefining a_g if necessary we may suppose that $|V_g| < \pi$ (since V_g is bounded. This implies also $v_g < \pi$).

5.78 Definition

For a log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared function $g \in \log(E) \cup \{f\}$ we define by induction on $l \in \{-1, \dots, e\}$ a set $\Lambda_g \subset \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$ and a function $\Phi_g : \Lambda_g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is **complex (l, r) -prepared in z** and a **complex preparing tuple $\mathcal{J}_\mathbb{C}$** for Φ_g . To this preparation we assign a set E_{Φ_g} of **complex definable functions** on Λ_g .

Base case: $l = -1$: We set $\Lambda_g = \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$, $\Phi_g = 0$, $E_{\Phi_g} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{J}_\mathbb{C} = (0)$.

Inductive Step: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}, a, e^{d_0}, q, s, v, b, e^d, P) := (r, \mathcal{Y}, a_g, e^{d_{0,g}}, q_g, s, v_g, b_g, e^{d_g}, P_g)$$

where $b_g := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $e^{d_g} := (e^{d_1}, \dots, e^{d_s})$, $P_g := (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$ and for d_i the corresponding Λ_{d_i} , the complex log-exp-analytically $(l-1, r)$ -prepared Φ_{d_i} in z and the corresponding set $E_{\Phi_{d_i}}$ have already been defined for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. Set

$$\Lambda_{0,g} := \{(t, z) \in \Lambda_{d_0} \cap H \mid |\operatorname{Im}(\Phi_{d_0}(t, z))| < \pi\}$$

and for $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ set

$$\Lambda_{i,g} := \{(t, z) \in \Lambda_{d_i} \cap H \mid |b_i(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_i}(t, z) \exp(\Phi_{d_i}(t, z))| < R, |\operatorname{Im}(\Phi_{d_i}(t, z))| < \pi\}.$$

Set $\Lambda_g = \bigcap_{i=0}^s \Lambda_{i,g}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_g : \Lambda_g &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto a(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z)e^{\Phi_{d_0}(t, z)} \\ V_g(b_1(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}(t, z)e^{\Phi_{d_1}(t, z)}, \dots, b_s(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_s}(t, z)e^{\Phi_{d_s}(t, z)}). \end{aligned}$$

We set

$$E_{\Phi_g} = (E_{\Phi_{d_0}} \cup E_{\Phi_{d_1}} \cup \dots \cup E_{\Phi_{d_s}} \cup \{e^{\Phi_{d_0}}, \dots, e^{\Phi_{d_s}}\})|_{\Lambda_g}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}} = (r, \mathcal{Z}, a, \exp(\Phi_{d_0}), q, s, V_g, b, \exp(\Phi_d), P)$$

for Φ_g where $\exp(\Phi_d) := (\exp(\Phi_{d_1}), \dots, \exp(\Phi_{d_s}))$.

We often write F instead for Φ_g and Λ instead for Λ_g if $g = f$.

5.79 Remark

Let $g \in \log(E) \cup \{f\}$ be log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in x with respect to E for $l \in \{-1, \dots, e\}$. We have that Λ_g is definable, $(\Lambda_g)_t$ is open for $t \in \pi(C)$ and Φ_g is holomorphic in z . Additionally we have $\Phi_g|_C = g$ and Φ_g can be constructed from $E_{\phi_g} \cup \mathcal{E}$.

Proof

We show that Φ_g can be constructed from $E_{\Phi_g} \cup \mathcal{E}$. The other properties are clear. We do an induction on l . For $l = -1$ there is nothing to show.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}, a, e^{d_0}, q, s, v, b, e^d, P) := (r, \mathcal{Y}, a_g, e^{d_0, g}, q_g, s, v_g, b_g, e^{d_g}, P_g)$$

where $b_g := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\exp(d_g) := (\exp(d_1), \dots, \exp(d_s))$ and $P_g := (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$. Note that a and b can be constructed from \mathcal{E} . Let

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}} := (r, \mathcal{Z}, a, \exp(D_0), q, s, V, b, \exp(D), P)$$

be a complex preparing tuple for Φ_g where $D_j := \Phi_{d_j}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ and

$$\exp(D) := (\exp(D_1), \dots, \exp(D_s)).$$

Note that z_0, \dots, z_r can be constructed from \mathcal{E} by Remark 5.12(3) since $\Theta_0, \dots, \Theta_r$ can be constructed from \mathcal{E} . By the inductive hypothesis we have that the functions D_0, \dots, D_s can be constructed from $E_{D_0} \cup \dots \cup E_{D_s} \cup \mathcal{E}$. So we obtain that $D_0|_{\Lambda_g}, \dots, D_s|_{\Lambda_g}$ can be constructed from $(E_{D_0} \cup \dots \cup E_{D_s})|_{\Lambda_g} \cup \mathcal{E}$ and we see with Remark 3.10(1) that the functions $e^{D_0}|_{\Lambda_g}, \dots, e^{D_s}|_{\Lambda_g}$ can be constructed from $E_{\phi_g} \cup \mathcal{E}$ since the imaginary part of D_j is bounded and $e^{D_j}|_{\Lambda_g} \in E_{\Phi_g}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. Let

$$\eta : \Lambda_g \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^s \times \mathbb{C}^{s+1}, (t, z) \mapsto (a(t), b_1(t), \dots, b_s(t), e^{D_0(t, z)}, \dots, e^{D_s(t, z)}).$$

Then η can be constructed from $E_{\Phi_g} \cup \mathcal{E}$.

Claim

There is a globally subanalytic $J : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^s \times \mathbb{C}^{s+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\Phi_g(t, z) = J(\eta(t, z), z_0(t, z), \dots, z_r(t, z))$$

for every $(t, z) \in \Lambda_g$.

Proof of the claim

Let $u := (u_0, \dots, u_s)$ and $y := (y_0, \dots, y_s)$ range over \mathbb{C}^{s+1} . Let $q := (p_{00}, \dots, p_{0r})$. Let $w := (w_0, \dots, w_r)$ range over \mathbb{C}^{r+1} . For $l \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ let

$$\alpha_l : \mathbb{C}^{s+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{s+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (u, y, w) \mapsto \begin{cases} u_l y_l \prod_{j=0}^r (\sigma_j w_j)^{p_{lj}}, & \sigma_j w_j \in \mathbb{C}^- \text{ for every } j \in \{0, \dots, r\}, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Set

$$J : \mathbb{C}^{s+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{s+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (u, y, w) \mapsto \begin{cases} \alpha_0(u, y, w) V(\alpha_1(u, y, w), \dots, \alpha_s(u, y, w)), & |\alpha_i(u, y, w)| \leq 1 \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, s\}, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then J is globally subanalytic. Note that $\sigma_l z_l(t, z) \in \mathbb{C}^-$ for every $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ and $(t, z) \in H$. Therefore

$$\Phi_g(t, z) = J(\eta(t, z), z_0(t, z), \dots, z_r(t, z))$$

for every $(t, z) \in \Lambda_g$. ■ Claim

With Remark 3.10(2) we are done with the proof of Remark 5.79. ■

Now we consider restricted log-exp-analytically prepared functions and so we set up the parametric setting from Section 5.1.3.

For the rest of this section we set the following. Let $l, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be with $n = l + m$. Let w range over \mathbb{R}^l , u over \mathbb{R}^m and x over \mathbb{R} . Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ be definable with $C \subset X$ such that X_w is open for $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. We suppose that $\log(E)$ consists only of restricted log-exp-analytic functions in (u, x) with reference set X which are locally bounded in (u, x) with reference set X . So $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (w, u, x) \mapsto f(w, u, x)$, is $(m + 1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x and every $g \in \log(E)$ is $(m + 1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in x for an $l \in \{0, \dots, e - 1\}$.

We say "consistent" respectively "regular" instead of " C -consistent in u with respect to X " respectively " C -regular in u with respect to X ". Let $k := k^{\text{ch}}$. We fix $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k, r\}$ if $k \geq 0$.

The expression "κ-persistent" respectively "κ-soft" means always "(C, Y, κ)-persistent in u with respect to X" respectively "(C, Y, κ)-soft in u with respect to X".

We start our considerations with some examples: It may happen that there is an unbounded $g \in \log(E)$ such that Φ_g has bounded imaginary part or there can be a bounded $g \in \log(E)$ such that Φ_g is unbounded and has a bounded imaginary part.

5.80 Example

Let $w = 0$. Let $X = C :=]0, 1[^2$. Let $E := \{C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, x) \mapsto \exp(u \log(x))\}$. Then E is a set of one positive definable function with $\log(E) = \{g\}$ where $g : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, x) \mapsto u \log(x)$, is locally bounded in (u, x) with reference set X , but not bounded. Consider

$$f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, x) \mapsto \exp(u \log(x))$$

Then f is $(2, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically $(1, 1)$ -prepared in x with center 0 (since f is $(1, 1)$ -prepared in x with respect to E , the underlying logarithmic scale is $\mathcal{Y} = (x, \log(x))$ and $v_f = v_g = 1$). Note that $\mu_0 = 0$ and $\mu_1 = 1$. Therefore $H =]0, 1[\times (\mathbb{C}_0^- \cap \mathbb{C}_1^+)$. We see that $\Lambda = \Lambda_g = H$ (since $\text{Im}(u \log(z)) < \pi$ for $(u, z) \in H$), $\Phi_g : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (u, z) \mapsto u \log(z)$, and

$$F : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (u, z) \mapsto \exp(u \log(z)).$$

Note that Φ_g has bounded imaginary part, but is unbounded at zero. Let

$$D := \{(u, x) \in]0, 1[\times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \mid e^{-1/u} < x < 1\}$$

and consider $h := f|_D$. Then h is $(2, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically $(1, 1)$ -prepared in x since h is log-exp-analytically $(1, 1)$ -prepared in x with respect to $E|_D$. Note that $\log(E|_D) = \{g|_D\}$ is a set of one bounded function. We have $\Lambda_h = \Lambda_{g|_D} = \Lambda$ and $\Phi_h = F$ (since $v_h = v_{g|_D} = 1$ and therefore $V_h = V_{g|_D} = 1$).

In the following we establish the desired preparation result. The proof is very sophisticated and needs some more preparations.

For a definable function $T : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ we set

$$T_{\text{pers}} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} 1/T(t), & T(t) \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$T_{\text{soft}} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} 1/T(t), & T(t) \neq 0, \\ 1, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that T_{pers} and T_{soft} are regular if T is regular.

5.81 Proposition

Let $T : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a regular κ -persistent function. Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ be with $(q_\kappa, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$. The following holds.

- (1) Let $q_\kappa > 0$. Then there is a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.
- (2) Let $k \geq 0$. Suppose that $\kappa = k$ and let q be k -positive with $q_k = 0$. Suppose that T_{pers} is consistent. Then there is a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.
- (3) Suppose that T_{soft} is κ -soft and $q_\kappa < 0$. Then there is a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.

Proof

We may assume that C is near with respect to μ_κ . Otherwise we are done with Remark 5.46 by choosing $M = 0$ in (1) respectively (2) and $N = M = 0$ in (3). Note that if $\kappa = k$ then $\sigma_{k+1} = -1$ and $\sigma_{k+2} = \dots = \sigma_r = 1$ and $\Theta_{\kappa+1} = \dots = \Theta_r = 0$ by Proposition 5.47 and therefore by definition of H

$$\log_l(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z)) = \log_{l-1}(-\log(\sigma_k z_k(t, z))) \in \mathbb{C}^-$$

for $(t, z) \in H$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, r - k\}$. By Proposition 5.18 we have

$$\prod_{j=0}^r |z_j(t, z)|^{q_j} = \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} |\sigma_j \mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}(t, z) + e^{\mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)}|^{q_j} \prod_{l=\kappa}^r |z_l(t, z)|^{q_l}$$

for $(t, z) \in H$. We have $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$ if

$$\prod_{l=\kappa}^r |z_l(t, z)|^{q_l} < T(t) \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} \frac{e^{-q_j \mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)}}{\left| \frac{\sigma_j \mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)}} + 1 \right|^{q_j}}$$

for $(t, z) \in H$. By Proposition 5.67(1) there is a regular κ -persistent $M^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that for every $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M^+)$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ we have

$$\left| \frac{\sigma_j \mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < 1/2.$$

So we have $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$ if

$$\prod_{l=\kappa}^r |z_l(t, z)|^{q_l} < \rho T(t) \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} e^{-q_j \mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)} \quad (+)$$

for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M^+)$ where $\rho := \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (1/3)^{|q_j|}$.

Set

$$\phi : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \rho T(t) \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} e^{-q_j \mu_{\kappa-j-1, \kappa}(t)}.$$

Note that ϕ is regular by Example 5.56(1) and Remark 5.55(2) and κ -persistent by Remark 5.42(1) (compare also with Example 5.43).

To be able to do necessary estimations with the iterated logarithms in (+) and to construct the desired functions M respectively N in the appropriate cases below we need the following Claim 1.

Claim 1

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}^-$ with $\exp_l(m^2\pi) < |z|$. Then $|\log_l(z)| < {}^{2^l m}\sqrt{|z|}$.

Proof of Claim 1

For $p \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $c_p := \exp(p^2\pi)$. We do an induction on l .

$l = 1$: Assume $c_m < |z|$. We show

$$\sqrt{|z|^{-1/m}(\log^2(|z|) + \arg^2(z))} < 1.$$

One sees that

$$[c_m, \infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, x \mapsto \log^2(x)x^{-1/m},$$

is strictly monotone decreasing and that the function

$$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, x \mapsto x^4\pi^2/\exp(x\pi),$$

takes its values on $]0, 1/2[$. Therefore

$$\log^2(c_m)c_m^{-1/m} = \log^2(c_m)/\exp(m\pi) = m^4\pi^2/\exp(m\pi) < 1/2$$

and consequently

$$\log^2(|z|)|z|^{-1/m} < 1/2.$$

Clearly

$$\arg^2(z)|z|^{-1/m} < 1/2.$$

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: Assume $\exp_l(m^2\pi) < |z|$. We have by the definition of the complex logarithm

$$c_1 \leq c_m < \log_{l-1}(|z|) \leq |\log_{l-1}(z)|.$$

Therefore by the base case for $m = 1$ applied to $\log_{l-1}(z)$

$$|\log_l(z)| = |\log(\log_{l-1}(z))| < \sqrt{|\log_{l-1}(z)|}$$

and by the inductive hypothesis

$$\sqrt{|\log_{l-1}(z)|} < \sqrt{2^{l-1} \sqrt[m]{|z|}} = 2^l \sqrt[m]{|z|}.$$

■ Claim 1

If $k \geq 0$ we set

$$m := \max\{\lceil |q_j/q_b| \rceil \mid j \in \{b+1, \dots, r\}\}$$

where $b = k$ if $q_k \neq 0$ or $b = l_{\min}(q)$ if $q_k = 0$.

(1): Suppose that $q_\kappa > 0$. We do two cases.

Case 1:

Assume $\kappa = r$ or if $\kappa = k$ (i.e. $k \geq 0$) then $q_{k+1} = \dots = q_r = 0$. Let

$$\hat{M} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \sqrt[q_\kappa]{\phi(t)}.$$

Then \hat{M} is κ -persistent by Remark 5.42(2) and regular by Remark 5.55(2). If $|z_\kappa(t, z)| < \hat{M}(t)$ then $|z_\kappa(t, z)|^{q_\kappa} < \phi(t)$ for $(t, z) \in H$ (so the inequality in (+) is fulfilled for such a (t, z)). By Proposition 5.67(1) there is a regular κ -persistent $M^* : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0, \kappa}, M^*) \subset \mathcal{B}(z_\kappa, \hat{M})$. So take $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{M^*(t), M^+(t)\}$. Clearly M is regular by Remark 5.55(2) and κ -persistent by Remark 5.42(3). With (+) we have $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0, \kappa}, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.

Case 2:

Assume $\kappa = k$ (i.e. $k \geq 0$), $q_k > 0$ and $(q_{k+1}, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$. Set

$$\hat{M} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{\sqrt[s]{\phi(t)}, 1/\exp_{r-k}(m^2\pi)\},$$

where $s := \frac{q_k}{2^{r-k}}$. Then \hat{M} is regular and k -persistent. Let $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(z_k, \hat{M})$. We show that the estimation in (+) holds. We have

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} |z_k(t, z)|^{-\frac{1}{2^j}} < \sqrt[q_k]{\phi(t)}$$

and therefore

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} (1/|z_k(t, z)|)^{\frac{1}{2^j}} < \sqrt[q_k]{\phi(t)}.$$

We obtain

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} (1/|z_k(t, z)|)^{\left\lfloor \frac{q_{k+j}}{2^j m q_k} \right\rfloor} < \sqrt[q_k]{\phi(t)}$$

since $1/|z_k(t, z)| > \exp_{r-k}(m^2\pi)$ and $|\frac{q_{k+j}}{mq_k}| \leq 1$. With Claim 1 applied to $1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z)$ we obtain

$$|\log_j(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))| < \sqrt[2^j]{1/|z_k(t, z)|}$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, r-k\}$ and therefore

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} |\log_j(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))|^{q_{k+j}/q_k} < \sqrt[q_k]{\phi(t)}.$$

Because $|\log_j(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))| > 1$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, r-k\}$ we obtain

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} |\log_j(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))|^{q_{k+j}/q_k} < \sqrt[q_k]{\phi(t)}.$$

Now define M outgoing from \hat{M} in the same way as in Case 1. With (+) we have $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,k}, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.

(2): Suppose that $\kappa = k$, that q is k -positive with $q_k = 0$ and that T_{pers} is consistent. We have that ϕ_{pers} is consistent by Example 5.51(2), Remark 5.52(1)/(3) (since T_{pers} is consistent). Let $l := l_{\min}(q)$. Note that $q_l < 0$. Set

$$\hat{M} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} \min\{1/\exp_{l-k}(\sqrt[s]{\phi_{\text{pers}}(t)}), 1/\exp_{r-k}(m^2\pi)\}, & \phi_{\text{pers}}(t) \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where $s := -(1/2)^{r-l}q_l$. Since ϕ_{pers} is consistent we obtain that $\sqrt[s]{\phi_{\text{pers}}}$ is consistent by Remark 5.52(2). By Remark 5.52(3) we see that $\exp_j(\sqrt[s]{\phi_{\text{pers}}})$ is also consistent for $j \in \{1, \dots, l-k\}$. So we see that \hat{M} is regular by Remark 5.55(2).

Claim 2

\hat{M} is κ -persistent.

Proof of Claim 2

Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ be a definable curve compatible with C_w with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y))) = 0.$$

Since ϕ is κ -persistent we see $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \phi(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ and therefore

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \phi_{\text{pers}}(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

■ Claim 2

Let $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(z_k, \hat{M})$. Then $\phi_{\text{pers}}(t) \neq 0$. We show that the inequality in (+) is satisfied for this (t, z) . Let $y := \log_{l-k}(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))$. Note that

$$\max\{\sqrt[s]{\phi_{\text{pers}}(t)}, \exp_{r-l}(m^2\pi)\} < |y|.$$

We obtain with $\phi_{\text{pers}}(t) = 1/\phi(t)$

$$|y| \prod_{j=l+1}^r |y|^{-\frac{1}{2^{j-l}}} > \sqrt[q]{\phi(t)}$$

and therefore

$$|y| \prod_{j=l+1}^r (1/|y|)^{\frac{1}{2^{j-l}}} > \sqrt[q]{\phi(t)}.$$

This gives

$$|y| \prod_{j=l+1}^r (1/|y|)^{\left|\frac{q_j}{2^{j-l} m^{q_l}}\right|} > \sqrt[q]{\phi(t)}$$

since $|y| > 1$ and $|\frac{q_j}{m^{q_l}}| \leq 1$. Since $\exp_{r-l}(m^2\pi) < |y|$ we obtain with Claim 1 applied to y

$$|\log_{j-l}(y)| < 2^{j-l} m \sqrt[q]{|y|}$$

for $j \in \{l+1, \dots, r\}$ and therefore

$$|y| \prod_{j=l+1}^r |\log_{j-l}(y)|^{-|q_j/q_l|} > \sqrt[q]{\phi(t)}.$$

Because $|\log_{j-l}(y)| > 1$ for every $j \in \{l+1, \dots, r\}$ we obtain

$$\prod_{j=l}^r |\log_{j-k}(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))|^{q_j/q_l} > \sqrt[q]{\phi(t)}$$

and therefore

$$\prod_{j=l}^r |\log_{j-k}(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))|^{q_j} < \phi(t).$$

Now define M outgoing from \hat{M} in the same way as in (1) in Case 1. With (+) we have $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,k}, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.

(3): Suppose that T_{soft} is κ -soft and $q_\kappa < 0$. We see with Remark 5.52(3) that ϕ_{soft} is also κ -soft. We have to consider two more cases.

Case 1:

Assume $\kappa = r$ or if $\kappa = k$ then $q_{k+1} = \dots = q_r = 0$. Let

$$\hat{N} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto {}^{-q_\kappa}\sqrt{\phi_{\text{soft}}(t)}.$$

Then \hat{N} is regular and κ -soft. For $(t, z) \in H$ with $\hat{N}(t) < |z_\kappa(t, z)| < 1$ we see that the inequality in (+) is satisfied (since $\phi(t) \neq 0$). By Proposition 5.67(2) there is a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $M^* : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M^*) \subset \mathcal{A}(z_\kappa, \hat{N}, 1)$. So take $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{M^*(t), M^+(t)\}$. With (+) we see that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.

Case 2:

Assume $\kappa = k$ and $(q_{k+1}, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$. Let $s := -(2 - (1/2)^{r-k})q_k$. Set

$$\hat{N} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{> 0}, t \mapsto \sqrt[s]{\phi_{\text{soft}}(t)},$$

and

$$\hat{M} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{> 0}, t \mapsto 1/\exp_{r-k}(m^2\pi).$$

Then \hat{N} is k -soft and regular. Let $(t, z) \in \mathcal{A}(z_\kappa, \hat{N}, \hat{M})$. Then $\phi(t) \neq 0$. We show that the inequality in (+) is satisfied for this (t, z) . We obtain

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} |z_k(t, z)|^{\frac{1}{2^j}} > {}^{q_k}\sqrt{\phi(t)}$$

and therefore

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} (1/|z_k(t, z)|)^{-\frac{1}{2^j}} > {}^{q_k}\sqrt{\phi(t)}.$$

We obtain

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} (1/|z_k(t, z)|)^{-\left|\frac{q_{k+j}}{2^j m q_k}\right|} > {}^{q_k}\sqrt{\phi(t)}$$

since $1/|z_k(t, z)| > \exp_{r-k}(m^2\pi)$ and $\left|\frac{q_{k+j}}{m q_k}\right| \leq 1$. With Claim 1 applied to $1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z)$ we obtain

$$|\log_j(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))| < 2^j m \sqrt{1/|z_k(t, z)|}$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, r-k\}$ and therefore

$$|z_k(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} |\log_j(1/\sigma_k z_k(t, z))|^{-|q_{k+j}/q_k|} > {}^{q_k}\sqrt{\phi(t)}.$$

Because $|\log_j(1/\sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z))| > 1$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, r - k\}$ we obtain

$$|z_\kappa(t, z)| \prod_{j=1}^{r-k} |\log_j(1/\sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z))|^{q_{k+j}/q_k} > \sqrt[q_k]{\phi(t)}.$$

Now define N and M analogously as in Case 1 (outgoing from \hat{N} and \hat{M} instead from \hat{N} and 1). With (+) we have $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$.

All in all we are done with the proof of Proposition 5.81. \blacksquare

5.82 Corollary

Let $T : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be κ -persistent. Suppose that T_{soft} is κ -soft. Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ be κ -negative. Then there is a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T).$$

Proof

Note that \sqrt{T} is κ -persistent and that $\sqrt{T_{\text{soft}}}$ is κ -soft. Let $q_\kappa^* := |q_\kappa| + 1$. Let

$$\hat{\mathcal{Z}} := (\sigma_\kappa z_\kappa)^{q_\kappa - q_\kappa^*} \prod_{j \neq \kappa} (\sigma_j z_j)^{q_j}.$$

Then we have $\mathcal{B}((\sigma_\kappa z_\kappa)^{q_\kappa^*}, \sqrt{T}) \cap \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathcal{Z}}, \sqrt{T}) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$. With Proposition 5.81(1) respectively Proposition 5.81(3) we find regular κ -persistent functions $M_1, M_2 : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft function $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M_1) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma_\kappa z_\kappa)^{q_\kappa^*}, \sqrt{T})$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M_2) \subset \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathcal{Z}}, \sqrt{T})$. Set $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{M_1(t), M_2(t)\}$. We see that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T)$. \blacksquare

5.83 Convention

Let $D \subset \pi(C)$ be definable. If a function $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the restriction of a regular (consistent) function then we call g also regular (consistent).

For the next proposition we set the following: For a definable function $W : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ where $Y \subset \pi(C)$ is definable we set

$$W^C : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} W(t), & t \in Y, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

For $0 < l \leq m$ we denote by $M_l(s \times (r+1), \mathbb{Q})$ the set of all $(s \times (r+1))$ -matrices whose first l columns are zero.

Now we are ready to establish the desired preparation result.

5.84 Proposition

Let $g \in \log(E) \cup \{f\}$. There is a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M) \subset \Lambda_g$ and $G := \Phi_g|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M)}$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with a complex LA-preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a_G, q_G, s_G, V_G, b_G, P_G)$$

where $q_G := ((q_G)_0, \dots, (q_G)_r)$, $b_G := (b_{1,G}, \dots, b_{s_G,G})$ and the following holds.

- (1) We have $(q_G)_0, \dots, (q_G)_{\kappa-1} = 0$ and $P_G \in M_\kappa(s \times (r+1), \mathbb{Q})$.
- (2) a_G is regular. If $g \in \log(E)$ then the following holds: a_G is consistent and if q_G is κ -negative then $1/((|a_G|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft.
- (3) b_G is regular, consistent and if $p_{i,G}$ is κ -negative for $i \in \{1, \dots, s_G\}$ then $1/((|b_{i,G}|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft where $P_G := (p_{1,G}, \dots, p_{s_G,G})^t$.

Proof

Let g be log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in x with respect to E for $l \in \{-1, \dots, e\}$. We do an induction on l . For $l = -1$ there is nothing to show.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}, a, e^{d_0}, q, s, v, b, e^d, P) := (r, \mathcal{Y}, a_g, e^{d_0, g}, q_g, s, v_g, b_g, e^{d_g}, P_g)$$

where $b_g := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\exp(d_g) := (\exp(d_1), \dots, \exp(d_s))$, $P_g := (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$ and $|v_g| < \pi$. We may assume that $a \neq 0$. Otherwise the statement is clear. Note that d_i is locally bounded in (u, x) with reference set X for every $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. For $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ let $\Lambda_i := \Lambda_{d_i}$. Let

$$\mathcal{J}_C = (r, \mathcal{Z}, a, \exp(\tilde{D}_0), q, s, V, b, \exp(\tilde{D}), P)$$

be a complex preparing tuple for Φ_g where $\tilde{D}_j := \Phi_{d_j}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ and $\exp(\tilde{D}) := (\exp(\tilde{D}_1), \dots, \exp(\tilde{D}_s))$.

By the inductive hypothesis there is a regular κ -soft $N^* : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $M^* : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$

$$B^* := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, M^*) \subset \Lambda_i$$

and $D_i := \tilde{D}_i|_{B^*}$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with complex LA-preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a_{D_i}, q_{D_i}, s_{D_i}, V_{D_i}, b_{D_i}, P_{D_i})$$

where $q_{D_i} := ((q_{D_i})_0, \dots, (q_{D_i})_r)$, $P_{D_i} := (p_{1,D_i}, \dots, p_{s_{D_i},D_i})^t$, $b_{D_i} := (b_{1,D_i}, \dots, b_{s_{D_i},D_i})$ and the following properties (1) - (3) holds for this preparing tuple:

- (1) $(q_{D_i})_0 = \dots = (q_{D_i})_{\kappa-1} = 0$ and $P_{D_i} \in M_\kappa(s_{D_i} \times (r+1), \mathbb{Q})$.
- (2) a_{D_i} is regular. If $g \in \log(E)$ the following holds: a_{D_i} is consistent and if q_{D_i} is κ -negative then $1/((|a_{D_i}|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft.
- (3) b_{D_i} is regular, consistent and if p_{j,D_i} is κ -negative then $1/((|b_{j,D_i}|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft for $j \in \{1, \dots, s_{D_i}\}$.

At first we deal with $\exp(D_0), \dots, \exp(D_s)$ and start with the following

Claim 1

Let $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Then there is a regular κ -soft $S_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $T_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $Y_\delta := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, S_\delta, T_\delta) \subset B^*$ and for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ definable functions $D_{i,1} : \pi(Y_\delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto D_{i,1}(t)$, and $D_{i,2} : Y_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto D_{i,2}(t, z)$, with the following properties.

- (1)* $D_i|_{Y_\delta} = D_{i,1} + D_{i,2}$.
- (2)* $D_{i,1}$ is regular and consistent.
- (3)* $D_{i,2}$ is bounded by δ . Additionally $\exp(D_{i,2})$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with complex LA-preparing tuple $(r, \mathcal{Z}, a^*, q^*, s^*, V^*, b^*, P^*)$ with which fulfills properties (1) - (3) above where $a^* = 1$ and $q^* = 0$.

Proof of Claim 1

Let $K \in \{D_0, \dots, D_s\}$. It suffices to find a regular κ -soft $\hat{S}_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $\hat{T}_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $W := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{S}_\delta, \hat{T}_\delta) \subset B^*$ and corresponding functions $K_1 : \pi(W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $K_2 : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which fulfill properties (1)* - (3)*. Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{q}, \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{V}, \mathbf{b}, \mathfrak{P}) := (r, \mathcal{Z}, a_K, q_K, s_K, V_K, b_K, P_K).$$

Suppose $\mathbf{a} \neq 0$. Otherwise the claim follows. Fix $R > 1$ such that \mathfrak{V} converges absolutely on $\overline{D^s(0, R)}$. Let $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} c_\alpha Z^\alpha$ be the power series expansion of \mathfrak{V} where $Z := (Z_1, \dots, Z_s)$. Fix $L \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $\delta < L$ such that $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^s} |c_\alpha w^\alpha| < L$ for $w \in D^s(0, R)$. We are doing two cases.

1. Case: $(\mathbf{q}_\kappa, \dots, \mathbf{q}_r) \neq 0$.

Consider the regular function

$$T_\delta^* : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} \min\{\frac{\delta}{L|a(t)|}, \frac{1}{|a(t)|}\}, & t \in \pi(B^*), \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Subclaim 1

T_δ^* is κ -persistent.

Proof of Subclaim 1

Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ be a definable curve compatible with C_w with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$ and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y))| = 0$. Note that there is $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ such that $(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \pi(B^*)$ for every $y \in]0, \epsilon[$ (since N^* is κ -soft and M^* is κ -persistent). Since \mathfrak{a} is consistent we see that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} T_\delta^*(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. ■ Subclaim 1

Note that if $|(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z)| < T_\delta^*(t)$ then $|K(t, z)| < \delta$ for $(t, z) \in B^*$.

1.1 Case: \mathfrak{q} is κ -positive.

By Proposition 5.81(1) if $q_\kappa > 0$ respectively Proposition 5.81(2) if $\kappa = k \geq 0$ and $q_k = 0$ (since $(T_\delta^*)_{\text{pers}}$ is consistent, because \mathfrak{a} is consistent) there is a regular κ -persistent $M_\delta^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, M_\delta^+) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T_\delta^*)$. Take $\hat{S}_\delta := N^*$,

$$\hat{T}_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{M_\delta^+(t), M^*(t)\},$$

$K_1 := 0$ and $K_2 := K|_W$ where $W := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{S}_\delta, \hat{T}_\delta)$. Note that $\exp(K_2) = \exp^*(K_2)$ where

$$\exp^* : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \begin{cases} \exp(z), & |z| \leq \delta, \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

is globally subanalytic. Additionally we obtain $|\mathfrak{a}(t)(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z)| < 1$ for $(t, z) \in W$. By composition of power series we get the desired preparation for $\exp(K_2)$.

1.2 Case: \mathfrak{q} is κ -negative.

Similarly as in the proof of Subclaim 1 we see that $(T_\delta^*)_{\text{soft}}$ is κ -soft (since $1/((|\mathfrak{a}|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft). By Corollary 5.82 there is a regular κ -soft $N_\delta^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $M_\delta^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N_\delta^+, M_\delta^+) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}, T_\delta^*)$. Take $\hat{S}_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \max\{N_\delta^+(t), N^*(t)\}$, $\hat{T}_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{M_\delta^+(t), M^*(t)\}$, $K_1 := 0$ and $K_2 := K|_W$ where $W = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{S}_\delta, \hat{T}_\delta)$. We are done in a completely similar way as in Case 1.1.

2. Case: $(\mathfrak{q}_\kappa, \dots, \mathfrak{q}_r) = 0$.

Let

$$\mathcal{S} := \{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}\} \mid (\mathfrak{p}_{i\kappa}, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_{ir}) \neq 0\}.$$

If $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ then $K = \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{Y}(\mathfrak{b}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{b}_\mathfrak{s})$ is a regular and consistent function considered as function on $\pi(B^*)$. So we are done by taking $\hat{S}_\delta := N^*$, $\hat{T}_\delta := M^*$, $K_1 := 0$

and $K_2 := K$. So suppose $\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$\Gamma_1 := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{\mathfrak{s}} \mid {}^t P\alpha = 0\}$$

and $\Gamma_2 := \mathbb{N}_0^{\mathfrak{s}} \setminus \Gamma_1$. Note that $\Gamma_2 \neq \emptyset$. Set $\mathfrak{Y}_1 := \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_1} c_\alpha Z^\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{Y}_2 := \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_2} c_\alpha Z^\alpha$. For $l \in \{1, 2\}$ let

$$J_l := \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{Y}_l(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_1(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_{\mathfrak{s}}}).$$

Note that $K = J_1 + J_2$. Let $\phi_i := \mathbf{b}_i(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}\}$. For $j \in \mathcal{S}$ we define the regular function

$$U_{j,\delta} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} \left| \frac{\delta}{L\mathfrak{a}(t)\mathbf{b}_j(t)} \right|, & t \in \pi(B^*), \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Similarly as in the proof of Subclaim 1 one sees for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ that $U_{j,\delta}$ is κ -persistent (since \mathbf{b}_j and \mathfrak{a} are consistent) and that if \mathbf{p}_j is κ -negative then $(U_{j,\delta})_{\text{soft}}$ is κ -soft (since \mathfrak{a} is consistent and $1/((\|\mathbf{b}_j\|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft). Additionally $(U_{j,\delta})_{\text{pers}}$ is consistent for $j \in \mathcal{S}$.

We see that for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ there is a regular κ -soft $\hat{S}_{j,\delta} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $\hat{T}_{j,\delta} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{S}_{j,\delta}, \hat{T}_{j,\delta}) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\mathbf{p}_j}, U_{j,\delta}).$$

(By Proposition 5.81(1) if \mathbf{p}_j is κ -positive and $\mathbf{p}_{j\kappa} \neq 0$ respectively Proposition 5.81(2) if \mathbf{p}_j is κ -positive, $\kappa = k \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{p}_{jk} = 0$ since $(U_{j,\delta})_{\text{pers}}$ is consistent respectively Corollary 5.82 if \mathbf{p}_j is κ -negative. If \mathbf{p}_j is κ -positive take $\hat{S}_{j,\delta} = 0$.) Of course we may assume that $N^* \leq \hat{S}_{j,\delta}$ and $\hat{T}_{j,\delta} \leq M^*$ for $j \in \mathcal{S}$. Consider $\hat{S}_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \max\{\hat{S}_{j,\delta}(t) \mid j \in \mathcal{S}\}$ and $\hat{T}_\delta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{\hat{T}_{j,\delta}(t) \mid j \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Then \hat{S}_δ is regular and κ -soft and \hat{T}_δ is regular and κ -persistent. Consider $W := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{S}_\delta, \hat{T}_\delta)$.

To obtain Claim 1 it remains to show that $\exp(J_2)|_W$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z as desired (see Subclaim 2) and that $J_1|_W$ coincides with a regular and consistent function on $\pi(W)$.

Subclaim 2

For $(t, z) \in W$ we have $|J_2(t, z)| < \delta$. The function $\exp(J_2)|_W$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z as required in property (3)*.

Proof of Subclaim 2

Set $\phi := (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{\mathfrak{s}})$. For every $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\mathfrak{s}}) \in \Gamma_2$ fix $i_\alpha \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}\}$ with $i_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha_{i_\alpha} \neq 0$. Therefore we have for $(t, z) \in W$

$$|\mathfrak{a}(t)\phi_{i_\alpha}(t, z)| < \delta/L.$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_2(t, z)| &= |\mathbf{a}(t)\mathfrak{Y}_2(\phi(t, z))| \\
&= |\mathbf{a}(t) \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_1} c_\alpha \phi_{i_\alpha}(t, z)^{\alpha_{i_\alpha}} \prod_{j \neq i_\alpha} \phi_j(t, z)^{\alpha_j}| \\
&= \left| \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_1} c_\alpha \mathbf{a}(t) \phi_{i_\alpha}(t, z) \phi_{i_\alpha}(t, z)^{\alpha_{i_\alpha}-1} \prod_{j \neq i_\alpha} \phi_j(t, z)^{\alpha_j} \right| \\
&< \delta/L \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_1} |c_\alpha \phi_{i_\alpha}(t, z)^{\alpha_{i_\alpha}-1} \prod_{j \neq i_\alpha} \phi_j(t, z)^{\alpha_j}| \\
&< \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{S} := \{j_1, \dots, j_\beta\}$ where $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $i_\alpha \in \{j_1, \dots, j_\beta\}$ is unique for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$. Let $(w_{j_1}, \dots, w_{j_\beta})$ be a new tuple of complex variables. Consider for $\gamma \in \{1, \dots, \beta\}$

$$\tilde{\phi}_\gamma : W \rightarrow \overline{B(0, 1)}, (t, z) \mapsto a(t)b_{j_\gamma}(t)(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_{j_\gamma}}(t, z).$$

Consider

$$\hat{V} : \overline{D^{s+\beta}(0, 1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (z_1, \dots, z_s, w_{j_1}, \dots, w_{j_\beta}) \mapsto \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_2} c_\alpha w_{i_\alpha} z_{i_\alpha}^{\alpha_{i_\alpha}-1} \prod_{j \neq i_\alpha} z_j^{\alpha_j}.$$

Note that \hat{V} defines a power series which converges absolutely on an open neighbourhood of $\overline{D^{s+\beta}(0, 1)}$ (and is therefore globally subanalytic). We have for $(t, z) \in W$

$$J_2(t, z) = \hat{V}(\phi_1(t, z), \dots, \phi_s(t, z), \tilde{\phi}_1(t, z), \dots, \tilde{\phi}_\beta(t, z))$$

and therefore

$$\exp(J_2(t, z)) = \exp^*(\hat{V}(\phi_1(t, z), \dots, \phi_s(t, z), \tilde{\phi}_1(t, z), \dots, \tilde{\phi}_\beta(t, z)))$$

where

$$\exp^* : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \begin{cases} \exp(z), & |z| \leq \delta, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

By using the exponential series and composition of power series we see that $\exp(J_2)$ has the desired properties. ■Subclaim 2

Set

$$\Xi : \pi(W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_1} \mathbf{a}(t)c_\alpha \prod_{j=1}^s \mathbf{b}_j(t)^{\alpha_j}.$$

Then we obtain $J_1(t, z) = \Xi(t)$ for $(t, z) \in W$. We show that Ξ is consistent and regular and are done with Claim 1. Note that

$$\Xi(t) = \mathbf{a}(t)\mathfrak{Y}_1(\mathbf{b}_1(t)(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}(t, \lambda(t)), \dots, \mathbf{b}_s(t)(\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_s}(t, \lambda(t)))$$

for $t \in \pi(W)$ where

$$\lambda : \pi(W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j \right) \frac{\hat{S}_\delta(t) + \hat{T}_\delta(t)}{2},$$

is regular. (Note also that $(t, \lambda(t)) \in W$ for $t \in \pi(W)$.) So we see that Ξ is consistent since \mathbf{a} is consistent.

Subclaim 3

The function Ξ is regular.

Proof of Subclaim 3

Similarly as in the proof of the claim in Remark 5.79 we find a globally sub-analytic function $G : \mathbb{C}^{s+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r-\kappa+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that for $t \in \pi(W)$

$$\Xi(t) = G(\eta(t), \mathcal{Z}_\kappa(t, \lambda(t)))$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_\kappa := (z_\kappa, \dots, z_r)$ and $\eta : \pi(W) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{s+1}, t \mapsto (\mathbf{a}(t), \mathbf{b}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{b}_s(t))$. Note that η and Θ are regular. By Remark 5.55(2) it is enough to show that $\pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, t \mapsto z_l(t, \lambda(t))$, is regular. We do an induction on $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$.

$l = 0$: We have $z_0(t, \lambda(t)) = \lambda(t) - \Theta_0(t)$ for $t \in \pi(W)$. Remark 5.55(2) gives the result since Θ_0 is regular.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: We have $z_l(t, \lambda(t)) = \log(\sigma_{l-1} z_{l-1}(t, \lambda(t))) - \Theta_l(t)$ for $t \in \pi(W)$. Remark 5.55(2) and the inductive hypothesis gives the result since Θ_l is regular.

■ Subclaim 3

So we set $K_1 := \Xi$ and $K_2 := J_2|_W$.

All in all we obtain Claim 1.

■ Claim 1

Let Y_δ and $D_{i,j}$ as in Claim 1 for $0 < \delta < \pi$. We obtain for $(t, z) \in \Lambda_g \cap Y_\delta$

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_g(t, z) &= a(t) \exp(D_{0,1}(t)) (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z) \exp(D_{0,2}(t, z)) \\ &V(b_1(t) \exp(D_{1,1}(t)) (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}(t, z) \exp(D_{1,2}(t, z)), \dots, \\ &b_s(t) \exp(D_{s,1}(t)) (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_s}(t, z) \exp(D_{s,2}(t, z))) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $q_l \neq 0$ for $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ and $p_{ij} \neq 0$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ in general. So we deal with $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (\sigma_j z_j)^{q_j}$ respectively with $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (\sigma_j z_j)^{p_{ij}}$ in the following

Claim 2

Let $1 < \epsilon$ and $p_0 := (p_{00}, \dots, p_{0r}) := q$. There is a regular κ -persistent $T_\epsilon : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, T_\epsilon) \subset B^*$ and the following holds for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$.

The function $\omega_i := \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (\sigma_j z_j)^{p_{ij}}|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, T_\epsilon)}$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with complex LA-preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a_{\omega_i}, q_{\omega_i}, s_{\omega_i}, V_{\omega_i}, b_{\omega_i}, P_{\omega_i})$$

such that $a_{\omega_i} \neq 0$, a_{ω_i} and b_{ω_i} are regular and consistent, $q_{\omega_i} = 0$, $(P_{\omega_i})_{l(\kappa+1)} = 1$ and $(P_{\omega_i})_{lj} = 0$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, r+1\} \setminus \{\kappa+1\}$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, s_{\omega_i}\}$, and $|V_{\omega_i}(\overline{D^{s_{\omega_i}}(0, 1)})| \subset [1/\epsilon, \epsilon]$.

Proof

Let $\nu \in \{p_0, \dots, p_s\}$. It suffices to find a regular κ -persistent $\hat{T}_\epsilon : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, \hat{T}_\epsilon) \subset B^*$ such that $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (\sigma_j z_j)^{\nu_j}|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, \hat{T}_\epsilon)}$ fulfills the desired properties.

Let $0 < \beta \leq 1/2$ be such that $1/\epsilon < \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} |1+z|^{\nu_j} < \epsilon$ for $z \in B(0, \beta)$. By Proposition 5.67(1) there is a regular κ -persistent $T_\beta^* : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < \beta$$

for every $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, T_\beta^*)$ and every $j \in \{0, \dots, \kappa-1\}$. We have

$$\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (\sigma_j z_j(t, z))^{\nu_j} = \prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} e^{\nu_j \mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)} \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_j \mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)}}\right)^{\nu_j} \quad (+)$$

for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, T_\beta^*)$ (compare with Proposition 5.18).

We say that a function $S : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ where $Z \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, T_\beta^*)$ is definable fulfills property $(*)_{\text{prep}}$ if the following holds:

J is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with complex LA-preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a_J, q_J, s_J, V_J, b_J, P_J)$$

such that $a_J \neq 0$, a_J and b_J are regular and consistent, $(q_J)_{\kappa+1} = 1$ and $(q_J)_j = 0$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, r+1\} \setminus \{\kappa+1\}$, $(P_J)_{i(\kappa+1)} = 1$ and $(P_J)_{ij} = 0$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, r+1\} \setminus \{\kappa+1\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, s_J\}$.

Let $\Omega := T_\beta^*$.

Subclaim 1

By shrinking Ω if necessary we have that $\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)}$ fulfills property $(*)_{\text{prep}}$ (i.e. there is a regular κ -persistent $\hat{\Omega} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\hat{\Omega} \leq \Omega$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{\Omega})}$ fulfills property $(*)_{\text{prep}}$).

Proof of Subclaim 1

Let $E_0 := z_\kappa|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa},\Omega)}$. Inductively for $l \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$ let

$$E_l : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \sigma_{k-l} e^{\mu_{l-1,\kappa}(t)} (e^{E_{l-1}(t,z)} - 1).$$

We see by an easy induction on $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$ that $E_l(t, z) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t, z)$ for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)$. We show by induction on $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa\}$ that $E_l|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa},\Omega)}$ fulfills property $(*)_{\text{prep}}$ by shrinking Ω if necessary. For $l = 0$ this is clear.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, \tilde{a}, \tilde{q}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{V}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{P})$$

be a corresponding complex LA-preparing tuple for $E_{l-1}|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa},\Omega)}$ where $\tilde{P} := (\tilde{p}_{i(j-1)})_{i,j}$. We have for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)$

$$E_l(t, z) = \sigma_{k-l} e^{\mu_{l-1,\kappa}(t)} (\exp(\tilde{a}(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z) Q(t, z)) - 1)$$

where

$$Q(t, z) := \tilde{V}(\tilde{b}_1(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z), \dots, \tilde{b}_{\tilde{s}}(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z)).$$

We see

$$E_l(t, z) = \sigma_{k-l} e^{\mu_{l-1,\kappa}(t)} \tilde{a}(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z) \frac{\exp(\tilde{a}(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z) Q(t, z)) - 1}{\tilde{a}(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z)}.$$

Note that $\tilde{a} \neq 0$. Because \tilde{a} is consistent and regular we see that $1/|\tilde{a}|$ is regular and κ -persistent. So we may assume that $|z_\kappa(t, z)| < 1/|\tilde{a}(t)|$ for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)$ after shrinking Ω if necessary (by Proposition 5.81(1) there is a regular κ -persistent $\hat{M} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{M}) \subset \mathcal{B}(z_\kappa, 1/|\tilde{a}|)$). Note that $\sigma_{k-l} e^{\mu_{l-1,\kappa}} \tilde{a}$ is consistent and regular (since $e^{\mu_{l-1,\kappa}}$ is consistent and regular). Now it is easy to check by using the exponential series and composition of power series that E_l is complex r -log-analytically prepared with a preparing tuple which fulfills the desired properties. ■Subclaim 1

Subclaim 2

By shrinking Ω if necessary we have that $\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa},\Omega)}$ fulfills property $(*)_{\text{prep}}$ for $l \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$.

Proof of Subclaim 2

We do an induction on l . By Claim 1 we get the assertion for $l = 0$.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, \hat{a}, \hat{q}, \hat{s}, \hat{V}, \hat{b}, \hat{P})$$

be a corresponding complex LA-preparing tuple for $\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa},\Omega)}$. Let $\alpha := \hat{a}/e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}}$. We have for $(t, z) \in D$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}(t, z) &= \log^* \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{P}_{l-1,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-l,\kappa}(t)}} \right) \\ &= \alpha(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z) \frac{\log^* \left(1 + \alpha(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z) Q(t, z) \right)}{\alpha(t) \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z)} \end{aligned}$$

where for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)$

$$Q(t, z) := \hat{V}(\hat{b}_1(t)\sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z), \dots, \hat{b}_s(t)\sigma_\kappa z_\kappa(t, z)).$$

Note that α is regular and consistent since $e^{\mu\kappa-l,\kappa}$ is regular and consistent. So $1/|\alpha|$ is regular and κ -persistent. So by shrinking Ω if necessary we may assume that $|z_\kappa(t, z)| < 1/|\alpha(t)|$ for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)$. We see by using the logarithmic series and composition of power series that $\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)}$ fulfills property $(*)_{\text{prep}}$. ■ Subclaim 2

So by Subclaim 2 we find for $j \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ a complex preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a_j^*, q_j^*, s_j^*, V_j^*, b_j^*, P_j^*)$$

for $\mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)}$ according to property $(*)_{\text{prep}}$ after shrinking Ω if necessary. Note that $a_j^*(t)/e^{\mu\kappa-j-1,\kappa(t)}$ is regular and consistent. Therefore the absolute value of its reciprocal is regular and κ -persistent. So by further shrinking Ω if necessary we may assume that $|z_\kappa(t, z)| < e^{\mu\kappa-j-1,\kappa(t)}/|a_j^*(t)|$ for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \Omega)$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$. So choose $T_\epsilon := \Omega$. With $(+)$ and composition of power series we obtain the desired preparation for $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (\sigma_j z_j)^{\nu_j}|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, T_\epsilon)}$ since $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} e^{\nu_j \mu \kappa - j - 1, \kappa}$ is regular and consistent (by writing $\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (1 + w_j)^{\nu_j}$ as a power series for $w := (w_0, \dots, w_{\kappa-1}) \in D^\kappa(0, 1/2)$ which converges absolutely on an open neighbourhood of $D^\kappa(0, 1/2)$). This gives Claim 2. ■ Claim 2

Fix $1 < \epsilon < \sqrt[4]{R}$. To this ϵ fix the corresponding regular κ -persistent function T_ϵ from Claim 2. Then

$$\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa-1} (\sigma_j z_j)^{p_{ij}}|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, T_\epsilon)} = a_{w_i} V_{w_i}((b_{w_i})_1 \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa, \dots, (b_{w_i})_{s_{w_i}} \sigma_\kappa z_\kappa) := a_{w_i} Q_i$$

for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ where $a_{w_i} \neq 0$, a_{w_i} and b_{w_i} are regular and consistent. Note that $1/\sqrt[4]{R} < |Q_i(t, z)| < \sqrt[4]{R}$ for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, T_\epsilon)$. $(++)$

Fix $0 < \delta < \min\{\log(\sqrt[4]{R}), \pi\}$. To this δ fix the corresponding regular κ -soft S_δ and the regular κ -persistent T_δ from Claim 1. By shrinking T_δ if necessary we may assume that $T_\delta \leq T_\epsilon$.

Let $Y := Y_\delta = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, S_\delta, T_\delta)$ (note that $Y \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^*, M^*)$) and let $D_{i,1}$ and $D_{i,2}$ be as in Claim 1 for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. Then $1/\sqrt[4]{R} < |\exp(D_{i,2}(t, z))| < \sqrt[4]{R}$ for $(t, z) \in Y$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. $(+++)$

For $\lambda := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}$ and $(t, z) \in \Lambda_g \cap Y$ let $(\sigma \mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes \lambda}(t, z) := \prod_{j=\kappa}^r (\sigma_j z_j(t, z))^{\lambda_j}$. For $(t, z) \in \Lambda_g \cap Y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_g(t, z) &= a(t) a_{w_0}(t) \exp(D_{0,1}(t)) (\sigma \mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes q}(t, z) Q_0(t, z) \exp(D_{0,2}(t, z)) \\ &V(b_1(t) a_{w_1}(t) \exp(D_{1,1}(t)) (\sigma \mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes p_1}(t, z) Q_1(t, z) \exp(D_{1,2}(t, z)), \dots, \end{aligned}$$

$$b_s(t)a_{\omega_s}(t)\exp(D_{s,1}(t))(\sigma\mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes p_s}(t,z)Q_s(t,z)\exp(D_{s,2}(t,z))).$$

Let $b_0 := a$ and for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$

$$A_i : \pi(\Lambda_g \cap Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, t \mapsto b_i(t)a_{\omega_i}(t)\exp(D_{i,1}(t)).$$

Note that for $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ the function A_i is consistent (by Remark 5.52(3) $\exp(D_{i,1})$ is consistent, by Remark 5.53(1) b_i is also consistent) and regular (by Remark 5.55(2) since b_i is C -nice and therefore regular). Note that A_0 is regular (since a is C -nice and therefore regular), and if $g \in \log(E)$ then A_0 is consistent (by Remark 5.53(2) b_0 is consistent if $g \in \log(E)$, by Remark 5.52(3) $\exp(D_{0,1})$ is consistent).

Note that $|\operatorname{Im}(D_{i,2}(t,z))| < \delta < \pi$ for $(t,z) \in Y$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_g \cap Y = \{ & (t,z) \in Y \mid |A_i(t)(\sigma\mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes p_i}(t,z)Q_i(t,z)\exp(D_{i,2}(t,z))| < R \\ & \text{for every } i \in \{1, \dots, s\} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Claim 3

There is a regular κ -persistent $M^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N^+, M^+) \subset \Lambda_g \cap Y$.

Proof of Claim 3

For $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ let

$$\phi_i : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t,z) \mapsto A_i(t)(\sigma\mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes p_i}(t,z)Q_i(t,z)\exp(D_{i,2}(t,z)).$$

It is enough to show that there is a regular κ -persistent $M_i^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N_i^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N_i^+, M_i^+) \subset \mathcal{B}(\phi_i, R) \cap Y$. As in the proof of Claim 1 we consider two cases.

Case 1:

Let $(p_{i\kappa}, \dots, p_{ir}) \neq 0$. Consider the regular

$$U : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{R}}{|A_i(t)|}, & t \in \pi(Y), \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Since A_i is consistent we see that U_{pers} is also consistent. So with the proof of Subclaim 1 in Claim 1 we obtain that U is κ -persistent. For $(t,z) \in \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes p_i}, U) \cap Y$ we have $|\phi_i(t,z)| < R$ since $|Q_i(t,z)\exp(D_{i,2}(t,z))| < \sqrt{R}$.

Suppose that p_i is κ -positive. By Proposition 5.81(1) if $p_{i\kappa} \neq 0$ respectively Proposition 5.81(2) if $\kappa = k \geq 0$ and $p_{i\kappa} = 0$ (since U_{pers} is consistent) there is a regular κ -persistent $\hat{M}_i^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{M}_i^+) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})_o^{\otimes p_i}, U)$. Choose $N_i^+ := S_\delta$ and

$$M_i^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \min\{\hat{M}_i^+(t), T_\delta(t)\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N_i^+, M_i^+) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_i}, U) \cap Y$.

Suppose that p_i is κ -negative. Note that U_{soft} is κ -soft (since $|b_i|$ is κ -soft by Proposition 5.44(1), compare also with the proof of Subclaim 1 in Claim 1). With Corollary 5.82 we find a regular κ -soft $\hat{N}_i^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $\hat{M}_i^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, \hat{N}_i^+, \hat{M}_i^+) \subset \mathcal{B}((\sigma\mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_i}, U)$. The rest of the proof is similar as in the " κ -positive"-case.

Case 2:

Let $(p_{i\kappa}, \dots, p_{ir}) = 0$. Take $N_i^+ := S_\delta$. Note that if $|A_i(t)| < \sqrt{R}$ then

$$|\phi_i(t, z)| = |A_i(t)Q_i(t, z)\exp(D_{i,2}(t, z))| < \sqrt{R} \cdot \sqrt[4]{R} \cdot \sqrt[4]{R} = R$$

for $(t, z) \in Y$ by (++) and (+++) (since $T_\delta \leq T_\epsilon$). Let

$$M_i^+ : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} T_\delta(t), & t \in \pi(Y) \text{ and } |A_i(t)| < \sqrt{R}, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that M_i^+ is regular and by construction that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N_i^+, M_i^+) \subset \mathcal{B}(\phi_i, R) \cap Y$. We show that M_i^+ is κ -persistent and are done.

Note that

$$|A_i(t)Q_i(t, z)\exp(D_{i,2}(t, z))| \leq 1$$

for every $(t, z) \in Y \cap C$. Let $w \in \pi_i(C)$. Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow C_w$ be a definable curve compatible with C_w with $\lim_{y \searrow 0}(\gamma(y)) \in X_w$ and

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0}(\gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y))) = 0.$$

By passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that $(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \pi(Y)$ for $y \in]0, 1[$ (compare with the proof of Subclaim 1 in Claim 1) and that there is a definable continuous $\hat{\gamma}_x :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $(\gamma_u(y), \hat{\gamma}_x(y)) \in C_w \cap Y_w$ for $y \in]0, 1[$. We have

$$|A(w, \gamma_u(y))Q_i(w, \gamma_u(y), \gamma_x(y))e^{D_{i2}(w, \gamma_u(y), \gamma_x(y))}| \leq 1$$

and therefore

$$|A(w, \gamma_u(y))| \leq [Q_i(w, \gamma_u(y), \gamma_x(y))e^{D_{i2}(w, \gamma_u(y), \gamma_x(y))}]^{-1} \leq \sqrt{R}$$

for $y \in]0, 1[$. So we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} M_i^+(w, \gamma_u(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} T_\delta(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0.$$

This gives Claim 3. ■ Claim 3

Take $N := N^+$ and $M := M^+$ where N^+ and M^+ are from Claim 3. From now on we consider A_i as a function on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N(t), M(t))$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. We obtain the following:

If p_i is κ -negative for $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ then $1/((|A_i|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft (since $|b_i|$ is κ -soft if p_i is κ -negative by Proposition 5.44(1)) and if $g \in \log(E)$ and q is κ -negative then $1/((|A_0|^C)_{\text{soft}})$ is κ -soft (since by Proposition 5.44(2) $|a|$ is κ -soft for $g \in \log(E)$ if q is κ -negative) and we are done. \blacksquare

Outgoing from this preparation result we are able to prove our desired result on integration for a holomorphic extension of a prepared restricted log-exp-analytic function in one variable.

5.85 Corollary

There is a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that the following holds. Let

$$\Delta := \{(t, s, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{> 0} \times \mathbb{C} \mid N(t) < s < M(t), z \in B(\mu_\kappa(t), s)\}.$$

Then the function

$$\Psi : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, z) \mapsto \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(\mu_\kappa(t), s)} \frac{F(t, \xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi,$$

is well-defined. Additionally there is $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and a definable function $g = (g_1, \dots, g_l) : \pi^+(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ such that Ψ is constructible in z with support function

$$\pi^+(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, (t, s) \mapsto (g(t, s), \mu_\kappa(t), s),$$

where the following holds for g_j for $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$: There is $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$, a regular function $\beta : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and a log-analytic $h_j : \mathbb{R}^{p+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $g_j(t, s) = h_j(\beta(t), s)$ for every $(t, s) \in \pi^+(\Delta)$.

Proof

By Proposition 5.84 there is a regular κ -persistent $\hat{M} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $F|_{\hat{W}}$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with center Θ with regular coefficient and base functions where $\hat{W} := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0, \kappa}, N, \hat{M})$. Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a, q, s, V, b, P)$$

be a complex LA-preparing tuple for $F|_{\hat{W}}$ where a and b are regular.

By Corollary 5.68(2) if $\kappa = r$ respectively Proposition 5.74 if $\kappa = k$ we find a regular κ -persistent $\tilde{M} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (with $\tilde{M} < |\mu_r - \mu_k|$ if $k \geq 0$) such that for $W := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0, \kappa}, N, \tilde{M})$ we have $W \subset \hat{W}$ and

$$z_\alpha^* : W(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto z_\alpha(t, \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s for $\alpha \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. (Note that

$$W(\mu_\kappa) = \{(t, s) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \mid N(t) < s < \hat{M}(t)\} \times] - \pi, \pi[.$$

Let $\eta := (a, b_1, \dots, b_s)$. Note that η is regular. Similarly as in the proof of the claim in Remark 5.79 there is a globally subanalytic function $G : \mathbb{C}^{s+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$F(t, z) = G(\eta(t), z_0(t, z), \dots, z_r(t, z))$$

for every $(t, z) \in W$. With Remark 5.66(2) we have that

$$F^* : W(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto F(t, \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is free-regular in s (since the components of η considered as functions on $W(\mu_\kappa)$ are free-regular in s). By shrinking \tilde{M} if necessary we may assume that F^* is bounded in τ . (By Corollary 5.69 if $\kappa = r$ respectively Corollary 5.75 if $\kappa = k$ we obtain after shrinking \tilde{M} if necessary that

$$W(\mu_\kappa) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, \tau) \mapsto (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, \mu_\kappa(t) + \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\kappa} \sigma_j\right) s e^{i\tau}),$$

is bounded in τ .) Choose $M := \tilde{M}$. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g := (g_1, \dots, g_l) : \pi^+(W(\mu_\kappa)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ be a corresponding support function for F^* . With Proposition 5.63 we see that the function

$$\Psi : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, z) \mapsto \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(\mu_\kappa(t), s)} \frac{F(t, \xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi,$$

is well-defined and constructible in z with support function

$$\pi^+(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, (t, s) \mapsto (g(t, s), \mu_\kappa(t), s).$$

Since $\pi^+(W(\mu_\kappa)) = \pi^+(\Delta)$ we see with Definition 5.64 that g_j fulfills the desired properties for $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. ■

We can also strengthen Proposition 5.84 in the following way.

5.86 Proposition

There is a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that the following holds where $W := \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M)$.

- (1) $F|_W$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared as in Proposition 5.84.
- (2) If $N(t) = 0$, $M(t) > 0$ and $F(t, -)$ has a holomorphic extension at $\mu := \mu_\kappa(t)$ (i.e. there is an open neighbourhood U of μ in $B(\mu, M(t))$ and a holomorphic $J : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $J|_{U \cap W_t} = F(t, -)$) then there is a holomorphic function $h : B(\mu, M(t)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $h|_{W_t} = F(t, -)$.

Proof

By Proposition 5.84 there is a regular κ -persistent $M : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a regular κ -soft $N : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $F|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N, M)}$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with complex LA-preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a, q, s, V, b, P)$$

such that $q_0 = \dots = q_{\kappa-1} = 0$, $P \in M_\kappa(s \times r + 1, \mathbb{Q})$, a and b are regular. By shrinking M if necessary we can suppose

$$\left| \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j,\kappa}(t, z)}{e^{\mu_{\kappa-j-1,\kappa}(t)}} \right| < 1/2$$

for $(t, z) \in D$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ (compare with Proposition 5.67(1)). (+)

We have

$$F(t, -) = a(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z) V(b_1(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}(t, z), \dots, b_s(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_s}(t, z)).$$

Since $z_\kappa(t, z) = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(t, z)$ we obtain with (+) by successively using the logarithmic series

$$z_\kappa(t, z) = L(z - \mu) (*)$$

for $z \in D_t$ where L is a power series around zero which converges absolutely on $B(0, M(t))$. We set $Z := (Z_1, \dots, Z_s)$. Let $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^s} c_\alpha Z^\alpha$ be the power series expansion of V .

We may assume that $a(t) \neq 0$. Note that $(p_{j\kappa}, \dots, p_{jr}) = 0$ or p_j is κ -positive for $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Let

$$\Gamma_1 := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^s \mid {}^t P \alpha + q \in \{0\}^\kappa \times \mathbb{N}_0 \times \{0\}^{r-\kappa}\}$$

and $\Gamma_2 := \mathbb{N}_0^s \setminus \Gamma_1$. Set $V_1 := \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_1} c_\alpha Z^\alpha$ and $V_2 := \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_2} c_\alpha Z^\alpha$. For $l \in \{1, 2\}$ let

$$G_l : D_t \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto a(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z) V_l(b_1(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}(t, z), \dots, b_s(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_s}(t, z)).$$

So we see by composition of power series and (*) that

$$G_1(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} d_j (z - \mu)^j$$

for $z \in D_t$ where $d_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and the series to the right converges absolutely on $B(\mu, M(t))$. So G_1 has a holomorphic extension \hat{G}_1 on $B(\mu, M(t))$. Let $0 < \epsilon < M(t)$ be such that $F|_{B(\mu, \epsilon) \cap D_t}$ has a holomorphic extension \hat{F} on $W := B(\mu, \epsilon)$. Set

$$\hat{G}_2 : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \hat{F}(z) - \hat{G}_1(z).$$

Note that \hat{G}_2 is holomorphic and that $\hat{G}_2|_{D_t \cap W} = G_2$. We show that $\hat{G}_2 = 0$ and we are done by the identity theorem (since F_t coincides then with G_1 on $W \cap D_t$). Let

$$\Omega := \{(\omega_\kappa, \dots, \omega_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r-\kappa+1} \mid \text{there is } \alpha \in \Gamma_2 \text{ such that}$$

$$({}^t P\alpha + q)_j = \omega_j \text{ for } j \in \{\kappa, \dots, r\}\}.$$

Then $\Omega \subset \mathbb{Q}^{r-\kappa+1} \setminus (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \{0\}^{r-\kappa})$. For $\omega \in \Omega$ let

$$\Gamma_{2,\omega} := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^s \mid ({}^t P\alpha + q)_j = \omega_j \text{ for } j \in \{\kappa, \dots, r\}\}.$$

We have

$$\hat{G}_2(z) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} e_\omega \prod_{j=\kappa}^r (\sigma_j z_j(t, z))^{\omega_j}$$

where

$$e_\omega = a(t) \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_{2,\omega}} c_\alpha \prod_{j=1}^s b_j(t)^{\alpha_j}$$

for $z \in W$. Let

$$\Omega^* := \{\omega \in \Omega \mid e_\omega \neq 0\}.$$

If $\Omega^* = \emptyset$ we are done. So assume $\Omega^* \neq \emptyset$. There is $\xi := (\xi_\kappa, \dots, \xi_r) \in \Omega$ such that $\prod_{j=\kappa}^r |z_j|^{\omega_j} = o(\prod_{j=\kappa}^r |z_j|^{\xi_j})$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$ with $\omega \neq \xi$. By investigating the following two cases we are done.

Case 1:

If $\xi_\kappa \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (note that $\xi \neq 0$) we differentiate \hat{G}_2 m -times with respect to z where $m := \xi_\kappa + 1$ and we see with Corollary 5.35 (note that $\xi \neq 0$) that there is $\beta = (-1, \beta_{\kappa+1}, \dots, \beta_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r-\kappa+1}$ such that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \mu} \left| \frac{d^m \hat{G}_2 / dz^m(z)}{\prod_{j=\kappa}^r z_j^{\beta_j}} \right| \in \mathbb{R}^*.$$

But we obtain

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \mu} \frac{d^m \hat{G}_2}{dz^m}(z) = \frac{d^m \hat{G}_2}{dz^m}(\mu) \in \mathbb{C},$$

a contradiction.

Case 2:

If $\xi_\kappa \notin \mathbb{N}_0$ (note that $\xi \neq 0$) we differentiate \hat{G}_2 m -times with respect to z where $m := \lceil \xi_\kappa \rceil$ and we see with Corollary 5.35 that there is $\gamma = (\gamma_\kappa, \dots, \gamma_r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{r-k+1}$ with $\gamma_\kappa < 0$ such that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \mu} \left| \frac{d^m \hat{G}_2 / dz^m(z)}{\prod_{j=\kappa}^r z_j^{\gamma_j}} \right| \in \mathbb{R}^*.$$

We get the same contradiction as in Case 1. ■

We close Section 5.1 by giving two more technical results which we need to show that a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function has a unary high parametric global complexification which is again restricted log-exp-analytic. For the rest of this section we set the following.

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ and $k < 0$ we set

$$H_{\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) \in]\mu_r(t), \infty[\}.$$

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ and $k < 0$ we set

$$H_{\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) \in]-\infty, \mu_r(t)[\}.$$

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = 1$ and $k \geq 0$ we set

$$H_{\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) \in]\mu_r(t), \mu_k(t)[\}.$$

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_j = -1$ and $k \geq 0$ we set

$$H_{\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) \in]\mu_k(t), \mu_r(t)[\}.$$

Note that H_{small} is definable and that $C \subset H_{\text{small}} \subset H$ (compare with Remark 5.13).

5.87 Proposition

Let $g \in \log(E)$. Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Let $\gamma, \hat{\gamma} :]0, 1[\rightarrow (\Lambda_g)_w \cap (H_{\text{small}})_w$ be definable curves compatible with C_w where $\hat{\gamma}$ runs also through $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma_u = \hat{\gamma}_u$. Suppose that

- $\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\gamma_z(y) - \hat{\gamma}_z(y)) = 0$,
- $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_z(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y))| > 0$ for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k, r\}$ if $k \geq 0$, and
- $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$.

Then we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \Phi_g(w, \gamma(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \Phi_g(w, \hat{\gamma}(y)) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof

Note that g is log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in x with respect to E for $l \in \{-1, \dots, e-1\}$. We do an induction on l . For $l = -1$ the statement is clear.

$l-1 \rightarrow l$: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}, a, e^{d_0}, q, s, v, b, e^d, P) := (r, \mathcal{Y}, a_g, e^{d_0, g}, q_g, s, v_g, b_g, e^{d_g}, P_g)$$

where $b_g := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\exp(d_g) := (\exp(d_1), \dots, \exp(d_s))$ and $P_g := (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$. Note that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} b_i(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ by Remark 5.53(1) and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} a(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$ by Remark 5.53(2) (since g is locally bounded in (u, x) with reference set X). Let

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}} := (r, \mathcal{Z}, a, \exp(D_0), q, s, V, b, \exp(D), P)$$

be a complex preparing tuple for Φ_g where $D_j := \Phi_{d_j}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ and $\exp(D) := (\exp(D_1), \dots, \exp(D_s))$. By the inductive hypothesis we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \exp(D_j(w, \gamma(y))) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \exp(D_j(w, \hat{\gamma}(y))) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

for $j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$.

Claim

Let $\alpha \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. Then we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_\alpha z_\alpha(w, \gamma(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_\alpha z_\alpha(w, \hat{\gamma}(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

Proof of the claim

Note that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\hat{\gamma}_x(y) - \mu_j(w, \gamma_u(y))| > 0$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, \alpha\}$. Since $\sigma_\alpha z_\alpha(w, \hat{\gamma}_u(y)) > 0$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$ we obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_\alpha z_\alpha(w, \hat{\gamma}_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

with (II_α) in Proposition 5.28.

We show the statement by induction on α . For $\alpha = 0$ we have with (I_0) in Proposition 5.28

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_0 z_0(w, \gamma(y)) &= \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_0(\gamma_z(y) - \Theta_0(w, \gamma_u(y))) \\ &= \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_0(\hat{\gamma}_z(y) - \Theta_0(w, \gamma_u(y))) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \end{aligned}$$

$\alpha - 1 \rightarrow \alpha$: We have with the inductive hypothesis, (I_α) in Proposition 5.28 and the continuity of the global logarithm

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_\alpha z_\alpha(w, \gamma(y)) &= \lim_{y \searrow 0} (\sigma_\alpha(\log(\sigma_{\alpha-1} z_{\alpha-1}(w, \gamma(y))) - \Theta_\alpha(w, \gamma_u(y)))) \\ &= \lim_{y \searrow 0} (\sigma_\alpha(\log(\sigma_{\alpha-1} z_{\alpha-1}(w, \hat{\gamma}(y))) - \Theta_\alpha(w, \gamma_u(y)))) \\ &= \lim_{y \searrow 0} \sigma_\alpha z_\alpha(w, \hat{\gamma}(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \end{aligned}$$

■ Claim

By the claim we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes \nu}(\gamma(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} (\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes \nu}(\hat{\gamma}(y)) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

for every $\nu \in \{q, p_1, \dots, p_s\}$ and we are done since V is a continuous function on $\overline{D^s(0, R)}$. ■

For a definable $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$ and $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ we set

$$\zeta_Z(t, x) := \sup\{y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid x + iQ(0, y) \subset Z_t\}.$$

5.88 Proposition

Let $g \in \log(E) \cup \{f\}$. Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Let $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow (H_{\text{small}})_w \cap (\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R})$ be a definable curve compatible with C_w with

- $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) \in X_w$,
- $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\gamma_x(y), C_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}) = 0$,
- $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma_x(y) - \mu_\kappa(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k, r\}$ if $k \geq 0$.

Then we have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{\Lambda_g}(w, \gamma(y)) > 0$.

Proof

Let $(u_0, x_0) := \lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y)$. Assume that g is log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in x with respect to E for $l \in \{-1, \dots, e\}$. We do an induction on l . The assertion is clear for $l = -1$ (since $\Lambda_g = \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C}$).

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}, a, e^{d_0}, q, s, v, b, e^d, P) := (r, \mathcal{Y}, a_g, e^{d_{0,g}}, q_g, s, v_g, b_g, e^{d_g}, P_g)$$

where $b_g := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\exp(d_g) := (\exp(d_1), \dots, \exp(d_s))$ and $P := (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$. Let

$$\mathcal{J}_C = (r, \mathcal{Z}, a, \exp(D_0), q, s, V, b, \exp(D), P)$$

be a complex preparing tuple for Φ_g where $D_j := \Phi_{d_j}$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ and $\exp(D) := (\exp(D_1), \dots, \exp(D_s))$. We set for $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $(t, z) \in \Lambda_g$

$$\phi_j(t, z) := b_j(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_j}(t, z)e^{D_j(t, z)}.$$

Note that $|\phi_j(t, z)| \leq 1$ if $(t, z) \in C$. By the inductive hypothesis and passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that $(w, \gamma(y)) \in \Lambda_{d_i}$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ and every $y \in]0, 1[$.

Assume $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{\Lambda_g}(w, \gamma(y)) = 0$. Then there is a definable curve $\hat{\gamma} :]0, 1[\rightarrow (H_{\text{small}})_w$ with $\hat{\gamma}_u = \gamma_u$, $\text{Re}(\hat{\gamma}) = \gamma_x$, $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \hat{\gamma}_z(y) = x_0$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that $\hat{\gamma}_z(y) \notin (\Lambda_g)_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}$ for $y \in]0, \epsilon[$.

By shrinking ϵ if necessary we may assume that $\hat{\gamma}(y) \in (\Lambda_{d_i})_w$ for every $y \in]0, \epsilon[$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, s\}$. By further shrinking ϵ if necessary we find $j^* \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ such that

$$|\text{Im}(D_{j^*}(w, \hat{\gamma}(y)))| \geq \pi$$

for every $y \in]0, \epsilon[$ or $j^+ \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $|\phi_{j^+}(w, \hat{\gamma}(y))| \geq R$ for every $y \in]0, \epsilon[$. By Remark 5.27(2) there is a definable curve $\tilde{\gamma} :]0, \epsilon[\rightarrow C_w$ compatible with C_w with $\tilde{\gamma}_u = \hat{\gamma}_u = \gamma_u$ and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \tilde{\gamma}(y) = (u_0, x_0)$. Since $\tilde{\gamma}$ runs through C_w we have $|\phi_{j^+}(w, \tilde{\gamma}(y))| \leq 1$ for $y \in]0, \epsilon[$ and therefore $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\phi_{j^+}(w, \tilde{\gamma}(y))| \leq 1$. So the latter cannot hold by Proposition 5.87 (since $R > 1$). Since $\tilde{\gamma}$ runs through C_w we obtain

$$\text{Im}(D_{j^*}(w, \tilde{\gamma}(y))) = \text{Im}(d_{j^*}(w, \tilde{\gamma}(y))) = 0$$

for $y \in]0, \epsilon[$. So the former cannot hold by Proposition 5.87, a contradiction. ■

5.2 Global Complexification of Restricted Log-Exp-Analytic Functions

Now we are able to show that a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function has a global complexification which is again restricted log-exp-analytic. The idea is to show that a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function has a unary high parametric global complexification which is again restricted log-exp-analytic and then to do a technical induction on the number of variables. We start with the following result from analysis.

5.89 Proposition

Let Y be a non-empty topological space. Let $g : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function that is bounded from below. Let

$$f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad x \mapsto \liminf_{y \rightarrow x} g(y).$$

Then f is lower semi-continuous, i.e. for every $x \in Y$ and every $a < f(x)$ there is an open neighbourhood V of x such that $a < f(y)$ for all $y \in V$.

Proof

See for example Bourbaki ([4], Chapter IV, §6, Section 2, Proposition 4). ■

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, definable sets $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ with $Y \subset X$, a function $f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a set E of positive definable functions on X we say that f can be constructed from E if f can be constructed from $E|_Y$.

5.2.1 The One Dimensional Case

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let t range over \mathbb{R}^n and x over \mathbb{R} . Let $l, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be with $n = l + m$. Let w range over \mathbb{R}^l and u over \mathbb{R}^m . For a definable set $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}$ and $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ we set

$$\zeta_Z := \sup\{r \geq 0 \mid x + iQ(0, r) \subset Z_t\}.$$

5.90 Proposition

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be definable such that X_w is open for every $w \in \pi_l(X)$. Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (w, u, x) \mapsto f(w, u, x)$, be restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, x) such that f_w is real analytic for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Then f has a unary high parametric global complexification $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (w, u, z) \mapsto F(w, u, z)$, with respect to (u, x) which is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, z) .

Proof

For a definable cell $C \subset X$ which is fat with respect to x we say the following: The expression " C -consistent" means always " C -consistent in u with respect to X " and " C -regular" means always " C -regular in u with respect to X ".

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that f is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, x) of order at most e . By Proposition 4.12 there is $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a definable cell decomposition \mathcal{C}' of $X_{\neq 0}$ such that $f|_{C'}$ is $(m + 1, X)$ -restricted log-exp-analytically (e, r) -prepared in x . Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}'$ be the set of fat cells with respect to x .

For every $C \in \mathcal{C}$ we consider the following.

Fix a finite set E_C of locally bounded functions in (u, x) with reference set X such that every $g \in \log(E_C) \cup \{f|_C\}$ is log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in x with respect to E_C for $l \in \{-1, \dots, e\}$. For $g \in \log(E_C) \cup \{f|_C\}$ fix a corresponding preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Y}_C, a_{C,g}, \exp(d_{C,0,g}), q_{C,g}, s, v_{C,g}, b_{C,g}, \exp(d_{C,g}), P_{C,g})$$

where $b_{C,g} := (b_{C,1,g}, \dots, b_{C,s,g})$, $\exp(d_{C,g}) := (\exp(d_{C,1,g}), \dots, \exp(d_{C,s,g}))$ and $|v_{C,g}| < \pi$ (without loss of generality s is independent of C and of the function $g \in \log(E_C)$). Note that the center $\Theta_C := (\Theta_{C,0}, \dots, \Theta_{C,r})$ of \mathcal{Y}_C and for every $g \in \log(E_C) \cup \{f|_C\}$ the components of $b_{C,g}$ are C -consistent (compare Example 5.51(1) and Remark 5.53(1)) and C -regular (since they are C -nice and every C -nice function is C -regular). For every $g \in \log(E_C) \cup \{f|_C\}$ we have that a_g is C -regular since it is C -nice and if $g \in \log(E_C)$ then a_g is C -consistent in addition (by Remark 5.53(2)).

For every $C \in \mathcal{C}$ fix the sign $\sigma_C := (\sigma_{C,0}, \dots, \sigma_{C,r})$ of \mathcal{Y}_C , its change index

$$k_C := k_C^{\text{ch}} := \min\{l \in \{0, \dots, r\} \mid \sigma_{C,l} = -1\} - 1,$$

its corresponding functions $\mu_{C,r}$ and μ_{C,k_C} if $k_C \geq 0$ from Definition 5.2 which are C -regular by Example 5.56(1).

Step 1: Constructing a suitable holomorphic extension of $f|_C$ in the last variable x for $C \in \mathcal{C}$:

For $C \in \mathcal{C}$ we construct a holomorphic extension of $f|_C$ such that, after gluing the single extensions together, we obtain a unary **high** parametric global complexification with respect to (u, x) which is **restricted log-exp-analytic** in (u, z) . A very complex and detailed construction is necessary to obtain this both properties at once.

Let H_C be from Definition 5.11(b). For every $g \in \log(E_C)$ fix $\Phi_{C,g}$ from Definition 5.78 and for $\Phi_{C,g}$ a complex preparing tuple

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}_C, a_{C,g}, \exp(D_{C,0,g}), q_{C,g}, s, V_{C,g}, b_{C,g}, \exp(D_{C,g}), P_{C,g})$$

where $b_{C,g} := (b_{C,1,g}, \dots, b_{C,s,g})$ and

$$\exp(D_{C,g}) := (\exp(D_{C,1,g}), \dots, \exp(D_{C,s,g})).$$

Let $\Lambda_C := \Lambda_{C,f}$, $\Phi_C := \Phi_{C,f}$ and $E_{\Phi_C} := E_{\Phi_{C,f}}$. Then Φ_C is a holomorphic extension of $f|_C$ in x .

The expression " (C, κ) -persistent" respectively " (C, κ) -soft" means always " $(C, \mathcal{Y}_C, \kappa)$ -persistent in u with respect to X " respectively " $(C, \mathcal{Y}_C, \kappa)$ -soft in u with respect to X ". Let $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$.

By Proposition 5.86 and Corollary 5.85 there is for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$ a C -regular (C, κ) -persistent $\hat{M}_{C,\kappa} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a C -regular (C, κ) -soft $N_{C,\kappa} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$K_{C,\kappa} := \{(t, z) \in H_C \mid N_{C,\kappa}(t) < |z - \mu_{C,\kappa}(t)| < \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t)\} \subset \Lambda_C,$$

$\Phi_C|_{K_{C,\kappa}}$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with center Θ_C as in Proposition 5.84 and for

$$\hat{\Delta}_{C,\kappa} := \{(t, s, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{C} \mid N_{C,\kappa}(t) < s < \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t), z \in B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), s)\}$$

that

$$\Psi_{C,\kappa} : \hat{\Delta}_{C,\kappa} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, s, z) \mapsto \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), s)} \frac{\Phi_C(t, \xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi,$$

is well-defined. Additionally there is $l_C \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a definable function $g_{C,\kappa}^* := ((g_{C,\kappa}^*)_1, \dots, (g_{C,\kappa}^*)_{l_C}) : \pi^+(\hat{\Delta}_{C,\kappa}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{l_C}$ such that $\Psi_{C,\kappa}$ is constructible in z with support function

$$\pi^+(\hat{\Delta}_{C,\kappa}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{l_C} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, (t, s) \mapsto (g_{C,\kappa}^*(t, s), \mu_{C,\kappa}(t), s),$$

where the following holds for $(g_{C,\kappa}^*)_j$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, l_C\}$: There is $p_{C,\kappa} \in \mathbb{N}_0$, a regular function $\beta_{C,\kappa} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p_{C,\kappa}}$ and a log-analytic $h_{C,\kappa,j} : \mathbb{R}^{p_{C,\kappa}+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $(g_{C,\kappa}^*)_j(t, s) = h_{C,\kappa,j}(\beta_{C,\kappa}(t), s)$ for every $(t, s) \in \pi^+(\hat{\Delta}_{C,\kappa})$.

We have that $(\Phi_C|_{K_{C,\kappa}})_t$ has a holomorphic extension on $B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t))$ if $(\Phi_C|_{K_{C,\kappa}})_t$ has a holomorphic extension at $\mu_{C,\kappa}(t)$ and $N_{C,\kappa}(t) = 0$ (by Proposition 5.86(2)). (+)

Furthermore fix the C -regular coefficient $\hat{a}_{C,\kappa}$ and a tuple of C -regular base functions $\hat{b}_{C,\kappa}$ for the complex r -log-analytical preparation of $\Phi_C|_{K_{C,\kappa}}$.

We fix a finite set \mathcal{E}_C of positive definable functions on $\pi(C)$ such that every $g \in \log(\mathcal{E}_C)$ is C -consistent and the following holds.

- (1) The functions $\Theta_{C,0}, \dots, \Theta_{C,r}$ can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C and we have $\exp(\Theta_{C,0}), \dots, \exp(\Theta_{C,r}) \in \mathcal{E}_C$.

- (2) For every $g \in \log(E_C) \cup \{f\}$ we have that $a_{C,g}, b_{C,1,g}, \dots, b_{C,s,g}$ can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C and that $\exp(a_{C,g}) \in \mathcal{E}_C$ if $g \in \log(E_C)$.
- (3) The functions $N_{C,\kappa}, \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}, \beta_{C,\kappa}, \hat{a}_{C,\kappa}, \hat{b}_{C,\kappa}$ and $\mu_{C,\kappa}$ can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$.

Since $\Phi_C|_{K_{C,\kappa}}$ is complex r -log-analytically prepared in z with coefficient, center and base functions which can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C we have that $\Phi_C|_{K_{C,\kappa}}$ can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$ (compare with (the proof of) the claim in Remark 5.79 and with Remark 3.10(2)). (β)

Note also that Φ_C can be constructed from $\mathcal{E}_C \cup E_{\phi_C}$ by Remark 5.79. (ββ)

Fix $l_C^* \in \mathbb{N}$ and positive definable functions $e_{C,1}, \dots, e_{C,l_C^*}$ on $\pi(C)$ such that $\mathcal{E}_C = \{e_{C,1}, \dots, e_{C,l_C^*}\}$.

For $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$ let

$$\tilde{M}_{C,\kappa} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto$$

$$\min\{L_C(t), \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t), \exp(-|\log(e_{C,1}(t))|), \dots, \exp(-|\log(e_{C,l_C^*}(t))|)\}$$

where L_C denotes the length of C with respect to x . Consider

$$M_{C,\kappa} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} \tilde{M}_{C,\kappa}(t), & C_t \cap B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \tilde{M}_{C,\kappa}(t)) \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $\tilde{M}_{C,\kappa}$ is (C, κ) -persistent by Remark 5.52(4) and Remark 5.42(3) (since $\exp(-|\log(e_{C,j})|)$ is C -consistent), but not necessarily C -regular (since it depends on L_C). So one sees also that $M_{C,\kappa}$ is κ -persistent. By shrinking $M_{C,\kappa}$ if necessary we may assume that $M_{C,\kappa} < 1/2|\mu_{C,r} - \mu_{C,k_C}|$ if $k_C \geq 0$. Set

$$\hat{\Lambda}_C := \{(t, z) \in \Lambda_C \mid |\operatorname{Im}(z)| <$$

$$\min\{L_C(t), \exp(-|\log(e_{C,1}(t))|), \dots, \exp(-|\log(e_{C,l_C^*}(t))|)\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_C := \{(t, z) \in \hat{\Lambda}_C \mid z \text{ is in the same connected component of } (\hat{\Lambda}_C)_t \text{ as } C_t\}.$$

Note that $\tilde{\Gamma}_C$ is definable with $C \subset \tilde{\Gamma}_C$ and $(\tilde{\Gamma}_C)_t$ is open and connected for $t \in \pi(C)$. Additionally we have $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{0,\kappa}, N_{C,\kappa}, M_{C,\kappa}) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}_C$ for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$.

We set

$$\alpha_{C,\kappa} : \pi(C) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, t \mapsto \begin{cases} 2N_{C,\kappa}(t), & N_{C,\kappa}(t) \neq 0, \\ \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t)/2, & N_{C,\kappa}(t) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\alpha_{C,\kappa}$ is C -regular. Let

$$\Delta_{C,\kappa} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid N_{C,\kappa}(t) < \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t), z \in B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t))\}.$$

We have that

$$\Delta_{C,\kappa} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \Psi_{C,\kappa}(t, \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t), z),$$

can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C (since $\mu_{C,\kappa}$, $\alpha_{C,\kappa}$, $\beta_{C,\kappa}$ and therefore also $g_{C,\kappa}^*(t, \alpha_{C,\kappa})$ can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C by construction of $g_{C,\kappa}^*$. Note that a constructible function is log-analytic). (Here the parameter s is "replaced" by this regular function $\alpha_{C,\kappa}$ in order to obtain the desired parametric integral.)

Let $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$. We set

$$B_{C,\kappa} := \{t \in \pi(C) \mid \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t) < \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t) \text{ and } B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \\ z \mapsto \Psi_{C,\kappa}(t, \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t), z), \text{ is holomorphic}\}.$$

Then $B_{C,\kappa}$ is definable since $\Psi_{C,\kappa}$ is definable, $\alpha_{C,\kappa}$ is definable and since the property of being holomorphic is definable by the Cauchy-Riemann equations. We set

$$\mathcal{G}_{C,\kappa} := \{(t, z) \in H_C \mid t \in B_{C,\kappa} \text{ and } z \in B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \min\{\alpha_{C,\kappa}(t), M_{C,\kappa}(t)\})\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{G}_{C,\kappa} \subset \Delta_{C,\kappa}$. Consider

$$\chi_{C,\kappa} : \mathcal{G}_{C,\kappa} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \Psi_{C,\kappa}(t, \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t), z).$$

Note that $\chi_{C,\kappa}$ can be constructed from \mathcal{E}_C . (BBB)

Let

$$\hat{B}_{C,\kappa} := \{t \in B_{C,\kappa} \mid (\Phi_C)_t = (\chi_{C,\kappa})_t \text{ on } (\tilde{\Gamma}_C)_t \cap (\mathcal{G}_{C,\kappa})_t\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_{C,\kappa} := \{(t, z) \in H_C \mid t \in \hat{B}_{C,\kappa} \text{ and } z \in B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), M_{C,\kappa}(t))\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}_{C,\kappa} \subset K_C \cup \mathcal{G}_{C,\kappa}$ and if $t \in \hat{B}_{C,\kappa}$ then $(\mathcal{T}_{C,\kappa})_t = (K_{C,\kappa})_t \cup (\mathcal{G}_{C,\kappa})_t$.

Further let $\mathfrak{d}_{C,\kappa}(t) := \text{dist}(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), C_t)/2$ for $t \in \pi(C)$. Let $H_{C,\text{small}}$ be defined in the following way.

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_{C,j} = 1$ and $k_C < 0$ we set

$$H_{C,\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Re}(z) \in]\mu_{C,r}(t) + \mathfrak{d}_{C,r}(t), \infty[.\}$$

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_{C,j} = -1$ and $k_C < 0$ we set

$$H_{C,\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Re}(z) \in]-\infty, \mu_{C,r}(t) - \mathfrak{d}_{C,r}(t)[.\}$$

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_{C,j} = 1$ and $k_C \geq 0$ we set

$$H_{C,\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) \in]\mu_{C,r}(t) + \mathfrak{d}_{C,r}(t), \mu_{C,k_C}(t) - \mathfrak{d}_{C,k_C}(t)[\}$$

- If $\prod_{j=0}^r \sigma_{C,j} = -1$ and $k_C \geq 0$ we set

$$H_{C,\text{small}} := \{(t, z) \in \pi(C) \times \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) \in]\mu_{C,k_C}(t) + \mathfrak{d}_{C,k_C}(t), \mu_{C,r}(t) - \mathfrak{d}_{C,r}(t)[\}$$

Note that $H_{C,\text{small}} \subset H_C$ (compare with Remark 5.13) and that $H_{C,\text{small}}$ is definable. Consider $\Gamma_C := H_{C,\text{small}} \cap \tilde{\Gamma}_C$.

Suppose that $k := k_C < 0$. We set

$$(\hat{\Xi}_C)_t := \begin{cases} (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,r}, \\ (\Gamma_C)_t, & t \in \pi(C) \setminus \hat{B}_{C,r}, \\ \emptyset, & t \notin \pi(C). \end{cases}$$

We define $G_C : \hat{\Xi}_C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by letting

$$(G_C)_t(z) := \begin{cases} (\Phi_C)_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_t \text{ and} \\ (\chi_{C,r})_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\mathcal{G}_{C,r})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,r}, \\ (\Phi_C)_t(z), & t \in \pi(C) \setminus \hat{B}_{C,r}. \end{cases}$$

Note that $(\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$ is open for every $t \in \pi(C)$ and that G_C is a well-defined unary parametric global complexification of $f|_C : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose that $k := k_C \geq 0$. Let for $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$(\hat{\Xi}_C)_t := \begin{cases} (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,k})_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,k} \cap \hat{B}_{C,r}, \\ (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,k})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,k} \setminus \hat{B}_{C,r}, \\ (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,r} \setminus \hat{B}_{C,k}, \\ (\Gamma_C)_t, & t \in \pi(C) \setminus (\hat{B}_{C,k} \cup \hat{B}_{C,r}), \\ \emptyset, & t \notin \pi(C). \end{cases}$$

Finally define $G_C : \hat{\Xi}_C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by letting

$$(G_C)_t(z) := \begin{cases} (\Phi_C)_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,k})_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_t \text{ and } (\chi_{C,r})_t(z) \\ \text{if } z \in (\mathcal{G}_{C,r})_t \text{ and } (\chi_{C,k})_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\mathcal{G}_{C,k})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,k} \cap \hat{B}_{C,r}, \\ (\Phi_C)_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,k})_t \text{ and } (\chi_{C,k})_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\mathcal{G}_{C,k})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,k} \setminus \hat{B}_{C,r}, \\ (\Phi_C)_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\Gamma_C)_t \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_t \text{ and } (\chi_{C,r})_t(z) \text{ if } z \in (\mathcal{G}_{C,r})_t, & t \in \hat{B}_{C,r} \setminus \hat{B}_{C,k}, \\ (\Phi_C)_t(z), & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $(\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$ is open for every $t \in \pi(C)$ and that G_C is a well-defined unary parametric global complexification of $f|_C : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Claim 1

Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$. Let $t \in \pi(C)$ be with $N_{C,\kappa}(t) = 0$ and $0 < M_{C,\kappa}(t)$. Suppose there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $Q(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \subset X_t$ and $f_t(x) = p(x - \mu_{C,\kappa}(t))$ for $x \in Q(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon)$ where p is a convergent power series on $] -\epsilon, \epsilon[$. Suppose that $C_t \cap B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \neq \emptyset$. Then $t \in \hat{B}_{C,\kappa}$ and therefore $B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), M_{C,\kappa}(t)) \cap (H_C)_t \subset (\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$.

Proof of Claim 1

By (+) and the identity theorem we see that $(\Phi_C|_{K_C})_t$ has a holomorphic extension h on $B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t))$. Since $\alpha_{C,\kappa}(t) = \hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t)/2$ we get by Cauchy's integral formula that

$$h(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t))} \frac{(\Phi_C)_t(\xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi$$

for all $z \in B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t))$. So we get that

$$B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \Psi_{C,\kappa}(t, \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t), z),$$

coincides with h and is therefore holomorphic. Hence $t \in \hat{B}_{C,\kappa}$. This gives

$$B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), M_{C,\kappa}(t)) \cap (H_C)_t \subset (\hat{\Xi}_C)_t.$$

■ Claim 1

Claim 2

Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$. Let $t \in \pi(C)$ be with $N_{C,\kappa}(t) \neq 0$. Suppose there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $Q(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \subset X_t$ and $f_t(x) = p(x - \mu_{C,\kappa}(t))$ for $x \in Q(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon)$ where p is a convergent power series on $] -\epsilon, \epsilon[$. Suppose that $\alpha_{C,\kappa}(t) < \min\{\hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon\}$ and that $C_t \cap B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \neq \emptyset$. Then $t \in \hat{B}_{C,\kappa}$ and therefore $B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), M_{C,\kappa}(t)) \cap (H_C)_t \subset (\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$.

Proof of Claim 2

Note that $\alpha_{C,\kappa}(t) = 2N_{C,\kappa}(t)$. By power series expansion there is a holomorphic extension $h : B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of $f_t : Q(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We have $h = (\Phi_C)_t$ on $B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \cap (\tilde{\Gamma}_C)_t$ by the identity theorem (since $B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon) \cap (\tilde{\Gamma}_C)_t$ is connected). By Cauchy's integral formula we get for all $z \in B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t))$ that

$$h(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t))} \frac{(\Phi_C)_t(\xi)}{\xi - z} d\xi$$

since $N_{C,\kappa}(t) < \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t) < \min\{\hat{M}_{C,\kappa}(t), \epsilon\}$. So we get that

$$B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \Psi_{C,\kappa}(t, \alpha_{C,\kappa}(t), z),$$

coincides with h and is therefore holomorphic. Hence $t \in \hat{B}_{C,\kappa}$. We obtain

$$B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(t), M_{C,\kappa}(t)) \cap (H_C)_t \subset (\hat{\Xi}_C)_t.$$

■ Claim 2

Step 2: Constructing a unary high parametric global complexification $G : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of f with respect to (u, x) .

Now we are ready to construct a unary high parametric global complexification $G : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of f with respect to (u, x) by gluing the single functions G_C together. In step 3 below we show that G can be "redefined" to a function F which is indeed restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, z) (i.e. there is a restricted log-exp-analytic function $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in (u, z) which coincides with G).

We say that $(t, z) \in \hat{\Xi}_C$ fulfills property (ω) if the following holds.

(ω_1) $(t, \operatorname{Re}(z)) \in X$.

(ω_2) There is an open neighbourhood U of z in $(\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$ such that for every $v_1 + iv_2 \in U$ we have that $v_1 + i]0, v_2[\subset (\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$ if $\operatorname{Re}(v_2) > 0$ or $v_1 + i]v_2, 0[\subset (\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$ if $\operatorname{Re}(v_2) < 0$.

(ω_3) The point z is in the same connected component of $(\hat{\Xi}_C)_t$ as C_t .

Let

$$\Xi_C := \{(t, z) \in \hat{\Xi}_C \mid (t, z) \text{ fulfills property } (\omega)\}.$$

Then Ξ_C is definable, $C_t \subset (\Xi_C)_t$ and $(\Xi_C)_t$ is open for $t \in \pi(C)$. Let

$$\Omega := X \cup \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \Xi_C.$$

Then Ω is definable and it is easy to check with Proposition 5.88 and Claim 1 that Ω_t is open for every $t \in \pi(C)$. We define

$$G : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \begin{cases} G_C(t, z), & (t, z) \in \Xi_C, \\ f(t, z), & (t, z) \in X. \end{cases}$$

By definition of Ω and the identity theorem we see that $G : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a well-defined unary parametric global complexification of $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We show that G is a unary high parametric global complexification of $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to (u, x) . This is done with the following

Claim 3

Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$ and $(u_0, x_0) \in X_w$. Then

$$\liminf_{(s,v) \rightarrow (u_0, x_0)} \zeta_\Omega(w, s, v) > 0.$$

Proof of Claim 3

We find $\epsilon > 0$ such that $W^* := Q^m(u_0, \epsilon) \times]x_0 - \epsilon, x_0 + \epsilon[\subset X_w$ and $f_w(u, x) = p(u - u_0, x - x_0)$ for $(u, x) \in W^*$ for a convergent power series p on $Q^{m+1}(0, \epsilon)$. We assume

$$\liminf_{(s,v) \rightarrow (u_0, x_0)} \zeta_\Omega(w, s, v) = 0.$$

Then there is a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow Q^m(u_0, \epsilon) \times]x_0 - \epsilon/2, x_0 + \epsilon/2[$, $y \mapsto (\gamma_u(y), \gamma_x(y))$, with $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) = (u_0, x_0)$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_\Omega(w, \gamma(y)) = 0$. For $y \in]0, 1[$ let

$$I(y) := \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid C_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \cap]x_0 - \epsilon/2, x_0 + \epsilon/2[\neq \emptyset\}.$$

By passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that $I(y)$ is independent of y . We set

$$I_{\text{big}} := \{C \in I : \lim_{y \searrow 0} L_C(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0\}$$

and

$$I_{\text{small}} := \{C \in I : \lim_{y \searrow 0} L_C(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0\}.$$

Because $\sum_{C \in I} L_C(w, \gamma_u(y)) \geq \epsilon$ for all $y \in]0, 1[$ we see that $I_{\text{big}} \neq \emptyset$. For $y \in]0, 1[$ we choose $C_y \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $(w, \gamma(y)) \in \overline{C_y}$. We may assume that $C^* := C_y$ is independent of y by passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary. We also have $(u_0, x_0) \in \overline{(C^*)_w}$. Let $k^* := k_{C^*}$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: $C^* \in I_{\text{big}}$. Note that γ is compatible with $(C^*)_w$.

Subcase 1.1:

Assume $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_x(y) - \mu_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))| > 0$ for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k^*, r\}$ if $k^* \geq 0$. By passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that $\gamma(y) \in (H_{C^*, \text{small}})_w$ for $y \in]0, 1[$. So by Proposition 5.88 we obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{\Lambda_{C^*}}(w, \gamma(y)) > 0.$$

Note also that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \exp(-|\log(e_{C^*, j}(w, \gamma_u(y)))|) > 0$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, l_{C^*}^*\}$ since $(u_0, x_0) \in X_w$, $e_{C^*, j} \in \mathcal{E}_{C^*}$ (and so $e_{C^*, j}$ is C^* -consistent) and γ is compatible with $(C^*)_w$. Since $C^* \in I_{\text{big}}$ and $\Gamma_{C^*} = \hat{\Gamma}_{C^*} \cap H_{C^*, \text{small}}$ we obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{\Gamma_{C^*}}(w, \gamma(y)) > 0.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_\Omega(w, \gamma(y)) \geq \lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{\Gamma_{C^*}}(w, \gamma(y)) > 0$$

by construction of Ω , a contradiction.

Subcase 1.2:

Suppose that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_x(y) - \mu_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))| = 0$$

for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k^*, r\}$ if $k^* \geq 0$. Fix this κ . Since $M_{C^*, \kappa}$ is (C^*, κ) -persistent respectively $N_{C^*, \kappa}$ is (C^*, κ) -soft we have with Definition 5.38 that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} M_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} N_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$ (by considering a definable curve $\hat{\gamma}$ in C_w^* converging to (u_0, x_0) with $\hat{\gamma}_u = \gamma_u$. Such a definable curve is compatible with C_w^* and exists by Remark 5.27(2) since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\gamma_x(y), (C^*)_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}) = 0$). For $y \in]0, 1[$ set

$$\mathcal{S}(y) := \min\{M_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), \epsilon/2\}.$$

By passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that

$$|\gamma_x(y) - \mu_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))| < 1/2\mathcal{S}(y), \quad (*)$$

that

$$B(\mu_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), 1/2\mathcal{S}(y)) \cap C_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}^* \neq \emptyset \quad (**)$$

and that $2N_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) < 1/2\mathcal{S}(y)$ for $y \in]0, 1[$. Additionally we may suppose that either $N_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ for all $y \in]0, 1[$ or $N_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$ for all $y \in]0, 1[$.

Assume the former. Then we have $\alpha_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 2N_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))$ and therefore $\alpha_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) < 1/2\mathcal{S}(y)$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$. By Claim 2 and $(**)$ we have

$$B(\mu_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), M_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))) \cap (H_{C^*})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \subset (\hat{\Xi}_{C^*})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}$$

for all $y \in]0, 1[$. We have with the construction of Ξ_{C^*} and $M_{C^*, \kappa}$

$$B(\mu_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), \mathcal{S}(y)) \cap (H_{C^*})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \subset (\Xi_{C^*})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}$$

and therefore

$$B(\mu_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), \mathcal{S}(y)) \subset \Omega_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}$$

for all $y \in]0, 1[$. This gives with $(*)$ and Pythagoras

$$\{\gamma_x(y) + iv \in \mathbb{C} \mid v \in]0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\mathcal{S}(y)[\} \subset \Omega_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}$$

for all $y \in]0, 1[$. So we have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{\Omega}(w, \gamma(y)) \geq \lim_{y \searrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\mathcal{S}(y) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \min\{M_{C^*, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), \epsilon/2\} > 0,$$

since $M_{C^*, \kappa}$ is (C^*, κ) -persistent, a contradiction. The latter case is handled completely similar.

Case 2: $C^* \in I_{\text{small}}$.

Note that there is $C_{\mathcal{L}} \in I_{\text{big}}$ with $C_{\mathcal{L}} < C^*$ such that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\gamma_x(y), (C_{\mathcal{L}})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}) = 0.$$

So $(u_0, x_0) \in \overline{(C_{\mathcal{L}})_w}$.

Subcase 2.1:

Suppose that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_x(y) - \mu_{C_{\mathcal{L}}, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))| > 0$$

for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_{C_{\mathcal{L}}}, r\}$ if $k_{C_{\mathcal{L}}} \geq 0$. By passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may assume that γ runs through $(H_{C_{\mathcal{L}}, \text{small}})_w$ since for $\mu_{C_{\mathcal{L}}, \kappa} \geq C_{\mathcal{L}}$

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\mu_{C_{\mathcal{L}}, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), (C_{\mathcal{L}})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}) > 0$$

for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_{C_{\mathcal{L}}}, r\}$ if $k_{C_{\mathcal{L}}} \geq 0$. Note that γ is compatible with $(C_{\mathcal{L}})_w$. By Proposition 5.88 we obtain

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{\Lambda_{C_{\mathcal{L}}}}(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0.$$

A completely similar argument as in Subcase 1.1 applied to $C_{\mathcal{L}}$ gives the desired contradiction.

Subcase 2.2:

Suppose

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_x(y) - \mu_{C_{\mathcal{L}}, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))| = 0$$

for $\kappa = r$ or a $\kappa \in \{k_{C_{\mathcal{L}}}, r\}$ if $k_{C_{\mathcal{L}}} \geq 0$. Fix such a κ . Then

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} N_{C_{\mathcal{L}}, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$$

and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} M_{C_{\mathcal{L}}, \kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ by Definition 5.38 (by considering a suitable definable curve $\hat{\gamma}$ in $(C_{\mathcal{L}})_w$ converging to (u_0, x_0) with $\hat{\gamma}_u = \gamma_u$. Such a curve is compatible with $(C_{\mathcal{L}})_w$ and exists by Remark 5.27(2) since

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\gamma_x(y), (C_{\mathcal{L}})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}) = 0.)$$

A completely similar argument as in subcase 1.2 applied to $C_{\mathcal{L}}$ gives the desired contradiction. ■ Claim 3

We set

$$Z := \{(w, u, z) \in \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{C} \mid (w, u, \operatorname{Re}(z)) \in X \text{ and} \\ \operatorname{Im}(z) \in Q(0, \rho_\Omega(w, u, \operatorname{Re}(z)))\}$$

where for $(w, u, x) \in \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}$

$$\rho_\Omega(w, u, x) := \liminf_{(s,v) \rightarrow (u,x)} \zeta_\Omega(w, s, v).$$

Note that Z is definable with $X \subset Z$ by Claim 3.

Claim 4

Z_w is open for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$ (considered as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^2$).

Proof of Claim 4

Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$ and $(u_0, z_0) \in Z_w$. Let $z_0 := x_0 + iy_0$ for $x_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there is $r > 0$ such that $y_0 < r < \rho_\Omega(w, u_0, x_0)$. Since the function

$$\rho_\Omega : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (u, x) \mapsto \liminf_{(s,v) \rightarrow (u,x)} \zeta_\Omega(w, s, v),$$

is lower semi-continuous by Proposition 5.89 we find an open neighbourhood U of (u_0, x_0) contained in the open set X_w such that $\rho_\Omega(w, u, x) > r$ for every $(u, x) \in U$. This shows that $V := U + iQ(0, r) \subset Z_w$ and we have $(u_0, z_0) \in V$.

■ Claim 4

Claim 4 shows that $G|_Z$ is a unary high parametric global complexification of f with respect to (u, x) .

Step 3: Constructing a unary high parametric global complexification $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of f with respect to (u, x) which is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, z) .

Now we are able to redefine G suitably in order to obtain the desired function F .

Let $\mathcal{B} := \{\pi(C) \mid C \in \mathcal{C}\}$. Then \mathcal{B} is a definable cell decomposition of $\pi(X)$. For $B \in \mathcal{B}$ consider the following.

Set

$$\mathcal{C}_B := \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid \pi(C) = B\}$$

and let $X_B := \{(t, x) \in X \mid t \in B\}$ and $Z_B := \{(t, z) \in Z \mid t \in B\}$. Then $X = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} X_B$ and $Z = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} Z_B$. Let u_B be the cardinality of \mathcal{C}_B . Let $C_{B,1}, \dots, C_{B,u_B} \in \mathcal{C}_B$ be the unique cells with $C_{B,1} < \dots < C_{B,u_B}$. Note that $C_{B,j}$ is fat with respect to x for $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$ we set $\Gamma_{B,j} := \Gamma_{C_{B,j}}$, $\Xi_{B,j} := \Xi_{C_{B,j}}$, $\mathcal{E}_{B,j} := \mathcal{E}_{C_{B,j}}$, $\Phi_{B,j} := \Phi_{C_{B,j}}$, $k_{B,j} := k_{C_{B,j}}$,

$G_{B,j} := G_{C_{B,j}}$ and for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_{B,j}, r\}$ if $k_{B,j} \geq 0$ we set $\mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa} := \mathcal{T}_{C_{B,j},\kappa}$. From now on we consider every $g \in \mathcal{E}_{B,j}$ as a function on $\Xi_{B,j}$.

Let $Y_{B,j} := (X_B \cup \Xi_{B,j}) \cap Z$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$. We define

$$Z_{B,1} := \{(t, z) \in Y_{B,1} \mid \zeta_{Y_{B,1}}(t, \operatorname{Re}(z)) \geq \zeta_{Y_{B,j}}(t, \operatorname{Re}(z))\}$$

for every $j \in \{2, \dots, u_B\}$

and inductively for $l \in \{2, \dots, u_B\}$

$$Z_{B,l} := \{(t, z) \in Y_{B,l} \mid \zeta_{Y_{B,l}}(t, \operatorname{Re}(z)) \geq \zeta_{Y_{B,j}}(t, \operatorname{Re}(z)) \text{ for every } j \in \{l+1, \dots, u_B\} \text{ and } (t, z) \notin Z_{B,1} \cup \dots \cup Z_{B,l-1}\}.$$

Note that $Z_{B,j}$ is definable for $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$ and that $Z_B = \dot{\bigcup}_{j=1}^{u_B} Z_{B,j}$. Note also that for $(t, x) \in X_B$ there is a unique $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ such that $(t, x + iy) \in Z_{B,j}$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ with $(t, x + iy) \in Z_B$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$ set

$$X_{B,j} := \{(t, x) \in X_B \mid (t, x) \in Z_{B,j}\}.$$

Note that $X_B = \dot{\bigcup}_{j=1}^{u_B} X_{B,j}$. Fix $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$. We have

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{Z_{B,j}}(w, \gamma_u(y), \gamma_x(y)) > 0$$

for $(w, u_0, x_0) \in X$ and a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow (X_{B,j})_w$ converging to (u_0, x_0) . (++)

(Otherwise

$$\liminf_{(u,x) \rightarrow (u_0, x_0)} \zeta_Z(w, u, x) = 0$$

by construction of $Z_{B,j}$ which is a contradiction to the fact that F is a unary high parametric global complexification of f which respect to (u, x) .)

If $k_{B,j} < 0$ we set $Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} := \mathcal{T}_{B,j,r} \cap Z_{B,j}$. If $k_{B,j} \geq 0$ we set $Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} := (\mathcal{T}_{B,j,k_{B,j}} \dot{\cup} \mathcal{T}_{B,j,r}) \cap Z_{B,j}$. Set $Z_{B,j,\Gamma} := (\Gamma_{B,j} \cap Z_{B,j}) \setminus Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$. Then $Z_{B,j} = Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} \cup Z_{B,j,\Gamma}$.

For $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$ let

$$E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} := \mathcal{E}_{B,j} |_{Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} \setminus X}$$

and

$$E_{B,j,\Gamma} := (\mathcal{E}_{B,j} \cup E_{\Phi_{B,j}}) |_{Z_{B,j,\Gamma} \setminus X}.$$

Additionally consider

$$F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} : Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} \setminus X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto G_{B,j}(t, z),$$

and

$$F_{B,j,\Gamma} : Z_{B,j,\Gamma} \setminus X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto \Phi_{B,j}(t, z).$$

Note that $F_{B,j,\Gamma}$ can be constructed from $E_{B,j,\Gamma}$ by (ββ).

Claim 5

$F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$ can be constructed from $E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof of Claim 5

For $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_{B,j}, r\}$ if $k_{B,j} \geq 0$ we set $\mathcal{W}_\kappa := G_{B,j}|_{\mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa}}$. Then we have for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa}$ (since then $(\mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa})_t = (K_{C_{B,j,\kappa}})_t \cup (\mathcal{G}_{C_{B,j,\kappa}})_t$)

$$\mathcal{W}_\kappa(t, z) = \begin{cases} \Phi_{B,j}(t, z), & (t, z) \in K_{C_{B,j,\kappa}}, \\ \chi_{C_{B,j,\kappa}}(t, z), & (t, z) \in \mathcal{G}_{C_{B,j,\kappa}}. \end{cases}$$

We have that $\Phi_{B,j}|_{K_{C_{B,j,\kappa}}}$ can be constructed from $\mathcal{E}_{B,j}$ by (β) and that $\chi_{C_{B,j,\kappa}}$ can be constructed from $\mathcal{E}_{B,j}$ by (βββ) for $\kappa = r$ or $\kappa \in \{k_{B,j}, r\}$ if $k_{B,j} \geq 0$. So with Remark 3.5 we see that \mathcal{W}_κ can be constructed from $\mathcal{E}_{B,j}$ since every $g \in \mathcal{E}_{B,j}$ is a positive definable function which depends only on t .

If $k_{B,j} < 0$ we have that $F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{W}_r|_{Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} \setminus X}$. So $F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$ can be constructed from $E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$ and we are done. So suppose $k_{B,j} \geq 0$. Since for $\kappa \in \{k_{B,j}, r\}$

$$F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}|_{(\mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa} \cap Z_{B,j}) \setminus X} = \mathcal{W}_\kappa|_{(\mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa} \cap Z_{B,j}) \setminus X}$$

we have that $F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}|_{(\mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa} \cap Z_{B,j}) \setminus X}$ can be constructed from $E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}|_{(\mathcal{T}_{B,j,\kappa} \cap Z_{B,j}) \setminus X}$. By Remark 3.5 we see that $F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$ can be constructed from $E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$ since every $g \in E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$ is a positive definable function which depends only on t . ■_{Claim 5}

Finally we define $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ in the following way.

If $(t, z) \in Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} \setminus X$ for $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$ let $F(t, z) = F_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}(t, z)$. If $(t, z) \in Z_{B,j,\Gamma} \setminus X$ for $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$ let $F(t, z) = F_{B,j,\Gamma}(t, z)$. If $(t, z) \in X$ set $F(t, z) = f(t, z)$.

Then $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (w, u, z) \mapsto F(w, u, z)$, is a unary high parametric global complexification of f with respect to (u, x) since we have $F(w, u, z) = G(w, u, z)$ for every $(w, u, z) \in Z$. Let

$$E := \{g \mid g : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ is a function with } g|_X \in E_f, g|_{Z_{B,j,\mathcal{T}} \setminus X} \in E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}},$$

$$g|_{Z_{B,j,\Gamma} \setminus X} \in E_{B,j,\Gamma} \text{ for } B \in \mathcal{B}, j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}\}.$$

Here E_f is a set of positive definable functions on X such that every $g \in \log(E_f)$ is locally bounded in (u, x) and f can be constructed from E_f . (Since f is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, x) such a set E_f exists.) By Remark 3.5 we see that F can be constructed from E (compare also with Definition 3.8).

So it remains to show that E_f , $E_{B,j,\tau}$ and $E_{B,j,\Gamma}$ consists only of positive definable functions whose logarithms are locally bounded in (u, z) with respect to Z . (One sees then with Remark 3.13 that E is a set of locally bounded functions in (u, z) and therefore that F is a unary high parametric global complexification of f with respect to (u, x) which is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, z) .)

Claim 6

Let $h \in E_f$. Then the function $\log(h)$ is locally bounded in (u, z) with respect to Z .

Proof of Claim 6

Note that h is defined on X . Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$. Let $(u_0, z_0) \in Z_w$. We show that $\log(h_w)$ is bounded at (u_0, z_0) and are done.

If $\text{Im}(z_0) \neq 0$ we are clearly done by taking an open neighbourhood of (u_0, z_0) in Z_w disjoint from X . So assume $\text{Im}(z_0) = 0$. Then $(u_0, z_0) \in X_w$ and we find an open neighbourhood U of (u_0, z_0) in X_w such that $\log(h)|_U$ is bounded. So take an open neighbourhood V of (u_0, z_0) in Z_w with $V \cap X \subset U$. ■_{Claim 6}

For $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$ we set $\hat{E}_{B,j,\Gamma} := \{\exp(\text{Re}(g)) \mid g \in \log(E_{B,j,\Gamma})\}$.

Claim 7

Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$. Let $h \in \hat{E}_{B,j,\Gamma}$. The function $\log(h)$ is locally bounded in (u, z) with respect to Z .

Proof of Claim 7

Let $C := C_{B,j}$, $\mathcal{K} := Z_{B,j,\Gamma} \setminus X$, $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$ and $(u_0, z_0) \in Z_w$. We show that $\log(h_w)$ is bounded at (u_0, z_0) .

If $(u_0, z_0) \notin \overline{\mathcal{K}_w}$ we are clearly done by taking an open neighbourhood of (u_0, z_0) in Z_w disjoint from \mathcal{K}_w . So assume $(u_0, z_0) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}_w}$.

Case 1:

Let $h \in \mathcal{E}_{B,j}|_{\mathcal{K}}$. Suppose that $\log(h_w)$ is not bounded at (u_0, z_0) (i.e. at u_0). Then there is a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathcal{K}_w$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \gamma(y) = (u_0, z_0)$ and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\log(h(w, \gamma_u(y)))| = \infty$. Note that $(\gamma_u, \text{Re}(\gamma_z))$ runs through $X_{B,j}$. By construction of $Z_{B,j}$ (since $\zeta_{Z_{B,j}}$ is bounded by $\exp(-|\log(h)|)$) we have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{Im}(\gamma_z(y)) = 0$ and thus $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. So we see

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{Z_{B,j}}(w, \gamma_u(y), \text{Re}(\gamma_z(y))) = 0,$$

a contradiction to the property (++).

Case 2:

Assume that $h \in E_{\Phi_C}|_{\mathcal{K}}$. Then $h = \exp(\Phi_g)|_{\mathcal{K}}$ for a $g \in \log(E_C)$ where Φ_g is complex log-exp-analytically (l, r) -prepared in z for $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $l \in \{-1, \dots, e-1\}$. We show the statement by induction on l . If $l = -1$ then $g = 0$ and the assertion follows.

$l-1 \rightarrow l$: Let

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}, a, \exp(D_0), q, s, V, b, \exp(D), P) :=$$

$$(r, \mathcal{Z}_{C,g}|_{\mathcal{K}}, a_{C,g}|_{\mathcal{K}}, \exp(D_{C,0,g})|_{\mathcal{K}}, q_{C,g}, s, V_{C,g}, b_{C,g}|_{\mathcal{K}}, \exp(D_{C,g})|_{\mathcal{K}}, P_{C,g}).$$

Let $b := (b_1, \dots, b_s)$, $\exp(D) := (\exp(D_1), \dots, \exp(D_s))$ and $P := (p_1, \dots, p_s)^t$. So we have

$$h(t, z) = a(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes q}(t, z) \exp(D_0(t, z))$$

$$V(b_1(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_1}(t, z) \exp(D_1(t, z)), \dots, b_s(t)(\sigma \mathcal{Z})^{\otimes p_s}(t, z) \exp(D_s(t, z)))$$

for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{K}$ where $t := (w, u)$. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{C}$ be an open neighbourhood of (u_0, z_0) such that $(D_0)_w, \dots, (D_s)_w$ are bounded on $\hat{U} := U \cap \mathcal{K}_w$. We may also assume that a_w and $(\Theta_0)_w, \dots, (\Theta_r)_w$ are bounded on \hat{U} . (Since we have that $\exp(a) \in \mathcal{E}_C$ and $\exp(\Theta_j) \in \mathcal{E}_C$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$. Otherwise we derive the same contradiction as in Case 1.) Assume that there is an open neighbourhood $W \subset U$ of (u_0, z_0) such that h_w is not bounded on $\hat{W} := W \cap \mathcal{K}_w$. Then there is a definable curve $\gamma :]0, 1[\rightarrow \hat{W}$ such that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\mathcal{Z}^{\otimes q}(w, \gamma(y))| = \infty$. Note that γ runs through $(\Gamma_C)_w \setminus (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_w$ respectively $(\Gamma_C)_w \setminus ((\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_w \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,k_C})_w)$ if $k_C \geq 0$. Therefore γ runs also through $(H_{C,\text{small}})_w$. By the proof of (II_l) in Proposition 5.28 for $l \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ (since $(\Theta_0)_w, \dots, (\Theta_r)_w$ are bounded on \hat{W}_w) and by construction of Γ_C we have that $\lim_{y \searrow 0} |\gamma_z(y) - \mu_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))| = 0$ for $\kappa = r$ or a $\kappa \in \{k_C, r\}$ if $k_C \geq 0$ (since $\lim_{y \searrow 0} \mu_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \mathbb{R}$, compare also with Corollary 5.29(1)).

Fix such a κ . We see $(u_0, z_0) \in X_w$. Let $x_0 := z_0$. By definition of $(H_{C,\text{small}})_w$ we see that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \mathfrak{d}_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = \lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\mu_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), C_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}) = 0.$$

So $(u_0, x_0) \in \overline{C_w}$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ such that $Q^{m+1}((u_0, x_0), \epsilon) \subset X_w$ and $f_w(u, x) = p((u, x) - (u_0, x_0))$ for $(u, x) \in Q^{m+1}((u_0, x_0), \epsilon)$ where p is a convergent power series on $Q^{m+1}(0, \epsilon)$.

We have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} L_C(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ since otherwise we see that

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \zeta_{Z_{B,j}}(w, \gamma_u(y), \text{Re}(\gamma_z(y))) = 0$$

(since $(Z_{B,j})_t \subset \mathbb{R} + iQ(0, L_C(t))$ for $t \in \pi(C)$). But this is a contradiction to property $(++)$.

So we see that γ is compatible with C_w . We have $\lim_{y \searrow 0} M_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ and $\lim_{y \searrow 0} N_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$. (Since $M_{C,\kappa}$ is (C, κ) -persistent and $N_{C,\kappa}$ is (C, κ) -soft: Consider a suitable definable curve $\hat{\gamma}$ in C_w converging to (u_0, x_0) with $\hat{\gamma}_u = \gamma_u$. Such a curve is compatible with C_w and exists by Remark 5.27(2) since

$$\lim_{y \searrow 0} \text{dist}(\gamma_x(y), C_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}) = 0.)$$

By passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary we may suppose the following.

- (1) We have $\gamma_u(y) \in Q^m(u_0, \epsilon/2)$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$.
- (2) We have $|\mu_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) - \gamma_z(y)| < 1/2 \min\{M_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), \epsilon/2\}$ and $C_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \cap B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), \epsilon) \neq \emptyset$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$.
- (3) We have either $N_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) > 0$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$ or $N_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 0$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$.

Assume the former in (3). The latter is handled completely similar. Then $\alpha_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) = 2N_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))$ for $y \in]0, 1[$. Therefore

$$\alpha_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)) < 1/2 \min\{M_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), \epsilon/2\}$$

for every $y \in]0, 1[$ after passing to a suitable subcurve of γ if necessary. We obtain with Claim 2 that $(w, \gamma_u(y)) \in \hat{B}_{C,\kappa}$ and therefore

$$B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), M_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))) \setminus X_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \subset (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \setminus X_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}$$

respectively

$$B(\mu_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y)), M_{C,\kappa}(w, \gamma_u(y))) \setminus X_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \subset (\mathcal{T}_{C,r} \cup \mathcal{T}_{C,k_C})_{(w, \gamma_u(y))} \setminus X_{(w, \gamma_u(y))}$$

if $k_C \geq 0$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$. This gives $(w, \gamma(y)) \in \mathcal{T}_{C,r} \setminus X$ respectively $(w, \gamma(y)) \in (\mathcal{T}_{C,r} \cup \mathcal{T}_{C,k_C}) \setminus X$ for every $y \in]0, 1[$ if $k_C \geq 0$ with property (2). But this is a contradiction since γ runs through $(\Gamma_C)_w \setminus (\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_w$ respectively through $(\Gamma_C)_w \setminus ((\mathcal{T}_{C,r})_w \cup (\mathcal{T}_{C,k_C})_w)$ if $k_C \geq 0$. So we obtain Claim 7. $\blacksquare_{\text{Claim 7}}$

Similarly as in Claim 7 one sees that $\log(h)$ is locally bounded in (u, z) with respect to Z if $h \in E_{B,j,\mathcal{T}}$ for $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, u_B\}$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.90. \blacksquare

5.2.2 The Higher Dimensional Case

We show by induction on the number of variables that the class of restricted log-exp-analytic functions exhibits parametric global complexification. The

”highness” from the unary case above is necessary to enable the induction. We adapt Kaiser’s arguments from [17] to our situation and establish Theorem B.

Theorem B

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let w range over \mathbb{R}^m and v over \mathbb{C}^m . Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ be definable. Assume that X_t is open for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, w) \mapsto f(t, w)$, be restricted log-exp-analytic in w such that f_t is real analytic for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then f has an m -ary parametric global complexification $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, v) \mapsto F(t, v)$, which is restricted log-exp-analytic in v .

Proof

For $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ let u range over \mathbb{R}^{m-l} and x over \mathbb{R}^l . Let $\pi_n : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, (t, u, x) \rightarrow t$, be the projection on the first n real coordinates. We show by induction on $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ that $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, u, x) \mapsto f(t, u, x)$, has an l -ary high parametric global complexification $F : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, u, z) \mapsto F(t, u, z)$, with respect to (u, x) where F is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, z) .

$l = 1$: This follows from Proposition 5.90.

$l - 1 \rightarrow l$: Given $x = (x_1, \dots, x_l) \in \mathbb{R}^l$ we set $x'' := (x_2, \dots, x_l)$. The set

$$X_{(t,u,x_1)} = \{x'' \in \mathbb{R}^{l-1} \mid (t, u, x_1, x'') \in X\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{l-1}$$

is open and the function $f_{(t,u,x_1)} : X_{(t,u,x_1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is real analytic since it coincides with $(f_t)_{(u,x_1)}$ for $(t, u, x_1) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m-l} \times \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbb{R}^{n+m-l+1}$ be the parameter space and write \hat{X} if we consider X as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+m-l+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{l-1}$. Moreover we write \hat{f} if we consider f as a function on \hat{X} . By the inductive hypothesis we find a definable set $\hat{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m-l+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{l-1}$ such that $\hat{Y}_t \subset \mathbb{R}^{m-l+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{l-1}$ is open for $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and an $(l - 1)$ -ary high parametric global complexification $\hat{G} : \hat{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, u, x_1, z'') \mapsto \hat{G}(t, u, x_1, z'')$, of f with respect to (u, x) which is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, x_1, z'') . We set $G_1 := \text{Re}(\hat{G}) : \hat{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $G_2 := \text{Im}(\hat{G}) : \hat{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Note that $G_1|_X = f$ and $G_2|_X = 0$. Note that G_1 and G_2 are restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, x_1, z'') . Let

$$Y := \{(t, u, x_1, z'') \in \hat{Y} \mid (G_j)_t \text{ is real analytic at } (u, x_1, z'') \text{ for } j \in \{1, 2\}\}.$$

Then Y is definable by a parametric version of Tamm’s theorem for restricted log-exp-analytic functions (see Corollary 3.27 in [28]). We have $X \subset Y \subset \hat{Y}$. Since real analyticity is an open property we have that Y_t is open in $\mathbb{R}^{m-l+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{l-1}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Considering z'' as a tuple of $2(l - 1)$ real variables we find with Proposition 5.90 a unary high parametric global complexification

$$F_j : Z_j \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, u, \hat{z}, z'') \mapsto F_j(t, u, \hat{z}, z''),$$

for $G_j|_Y$ with respect to (u, x_1, z'') which is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, \hat{z}, z'') where $j \in \{1, 2\}$. (Here \hat{z} is an additional variable which ranges over \mathbb{C} . Note also that $(Z_j)_t$ is open in $\mathbb{R}^{m-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $X \subset Z_j$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$.)

(*)

Let

$$\tilde{Z} := \{(t, u, z) \in Z_1 \cap Z_2 \mid (F_1 + iF_2)_{(t,u)} \text{ is holomorphic at } z\}.$$

Then \tilde{Z} is definable and $F := (F_1 + iF_2)|_{\tilde{Z}} : \tilde{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, z) with reference set $Z_1 \cap Z_2$.

Let

$$\zeta_{\tilde{Z}}(t, u, x) := \sup\{r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid x + iQ^l(0, r) \subset \tilde{Z}_{(t,u)}\}.$$

Claim

Let $(t, u, x) \in X$. Then

$$\liminf_{(s,y) \rightarrow (u,x)} \zeta_{\tilde{Z}}(t, s, y) > 0.$$

Proof of the claim

We find some $0 < r$ and an open neighbourhood V of (u, x) in X_t such that $f_t(s, y) = p((s, y) - (u, x))$ for $(s, y) \in V$ where p is a convergent power series on $Q^m(0, r)$. We find some $0 < r' < r/2$ such that

$$U := Q^{m-l}(u, r') \times]x_1 - r', x_1 + r'[\times (Q^{l-1}(x'', r') + iQ^{l-1}(0, r')) \subset \hat{Y}_t$$

and that $\tilde{G}_t(s, y_1, z'') = p((s, y_1, z'') - (u, x))$ for all $(s, y_1, z'') \in U$. So for $(s, y) \in Q^m((u, x), r')$ we see that

$$y'' + iQ^{l-1}(0, r') \subset Y_{(t,s,y_1)}.$$

So by (*) we find some $0 < \epsilon < r'/2$ and an open neighbourhood W of (u, x) in X_t with $W \subset Q^m((u, x), r')$ such that for $(s, y) \in W$ we have the following. We have $y + iQ^l(0, \epsilon) \subset (Z_j)_{(t,s)}$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $F_{(t,s)}(z) = p_{s-u}(z - x)$ for all $z \in D^l(y, \epsilon)$. So by construction $y + iQ^l(0, \epsilon) \subset \tilde{Z}_{(t,s)}$ for all $(s, y) \in W$. Hence

$$\liminf_{(s,y) \rightarrow (u,x)} \zeta_{\tilde{Z}}(t, s, y) \geq \epsilon > 0.$$

■ Claim

Let

$$Z := \{(t, u, z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l \mid (t, u, \operatorname{Re}(z)) \in X \\ \text{and } \operatorname{Im}(z) \in Q^l(0, \rho(t, u, \operatorname{Re}(z)))\}$$

where

$$\rho(t, u, x) := \liminf_{(s,y) \rightarrow (u,x)} \zeta_{\tilde{Z}}(t, s, y)$$

for $(t, u, x) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m-l} \times \mathbb{R}^l$. Note that Z_t is open for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. (Compare with the proof of Claim 4 in Proposition 5.90: The function $\mathbb{R}^{m-l} \times \mathbb{R}^l, (u, x) \mapsto \rho(t, u, x)$, defines a lower semi-continuous function for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$.) By the claim we have $X \subset Z$. So we see that $F|_Z$ is an l -ary high parametric global complexification of f with respect to (u, x) . By the above we see that F is restricted log-exp-analytic in (u, z) . This finishes the proof of Theorem B. ■

An immediate consequence of Theorem B is Theorem A.

Theorem A

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a definable open set. Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic function. Then f has a global complexification which is again restricted log-exp-analytic, i.e. there is a definable open $V \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $U \subset V$ and a holomorphic restricted log-exp-analytic $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $F|_U = f$.

5.91 Corollary

(1) *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ be definable such that X_t is open for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (t, x) \mapsto f(t, x)$, be log-analytic. Suppose that f_t is real analytic for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there is a definable $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with $U \subset V$ such that V_t is open for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a restricted log-exp-analytic $F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, (t, z) \mapsto F(t, z)$, in z such that F_t is holomorphic for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F|_U = f$.*

(2) *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open. Let $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real analytic log-analytic function. Then there is an open definable $V \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $U \subset V$ and a restricted log-exp-analytic $G : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $G|_U = g$.*

Proof

(1): This follows directly from the fact that a log-analytic function is restricted log-exp-analytic in x .

(2): This follows directly from (1). ■

To close this paper we want to discuss two open questions for further research in this context outgoing from Theorem A and Theorem B.

5.92 Question

Does a real analytic log-analytic function have a global complexification which is again log-analytic?

This question could be true simply by the observation that a log-analytic function extends piecewise to a holomorphic log-analytic function (by considering the single $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(-1, (\sqrt[n]{\dots})_{n=2,3,\dots}, \log)$ -terms). But to enable the induction on the

number of variables one needs a preparation theorem for log-analytic functions with log-analytic data only. So one has to get better control on the exponentials which are involved in the construction of the coefficient, the center and the base functions of such a preparation. But such questions are pretty unsolved at present. An idea would be to adapt somehow the preparation theorem of Cluckers and Miller for constructible functions from [5], [6] respectively [7] to the log-analytic case.

Since we established global complexification for real analytic restricted log-exp-analytic functions and the class of restricted log-exp-analytic functions is a proper subclass of the class of all definable functions (compare with Example 3.18) the following question arises.

5.94 Question

Does $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ have global complexification?

With our results above this question can be reformulated in the following way: Is every real analytic definable function restricted log-exp-analytic? This may be true from the point of analysis: If the global exponential function comes not locally bounded into the game features like flatness may occur (compare with Example 3.18). But neither real analytic functions nor restricted log-exp-analytic functions are flat.

References

- [1] R. Bianconi, *Nondefinability results for expansions of the field of real numbers by the exponential function and by the restricted sine function*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **62** (1997), 1173-1178.
- [2] E. Bierstone and P.D. Milman, *Semianalytic and subanalytic sets*, Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS **67** (1988), 5-42.
- [3] J. Bochnak, M. Coste and M.-F. Roy, *Real Algebraic Geometry*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 3. Folge, A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, 1998.
- [4] N. Bourbaki, *General Topology Chapters (1-4)*, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [5] R. Cluckers and D.J. Miller, *Lebesgue classes and preparation of real constructible functions*, Journal of Functional Analysis **264** (2013), 1599-1642.
- [6] R. Cluckers and D.J. Miller, *Loci of integrability, zero loci, and stability under integration for constructible functions on Euclidean space with Lebesgue measure*, International Mathematics Research Notices **14** (2012), 3182-3191.
- [7] R. Cluckers and D.J. Miller, *Stability under integration of sums of products of real globally subanalytic functions and their logarithms*, Duke Mathematical Journal **156** (2011), 311-348.
- [8] G. Comte, J.-M. Lion and J.-P. Rolin, *Nature log-analytique du volume des sous-analytiques*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics **44** (2000), 884-888.
- [9] M. Coste, *An Introduction to O-Minimal Geometry*, Institut de Recherche Mathématique de Rennes, 1999.
- [10] L. van den Dries, *A generalization of the Tarski-Seidenberg theorem and some nondefinability results*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **15** (1986), 189-193.
- [11] L. van den Dries, *Tame Topology and O-Minimal Structures*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge **248**, 1998.
- [12] L. van den Dries, A. Macintyre and D. Marker, *Logarithmic-exponential power series*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **56** (1997), 417-434.

- [13] L. van den Dries, A. Macintyre and D. Marker, *The elementary theory of restricted analytic fields with exponentiation*, Annals of Mathematics **140** (1994), 183-205.
- [14] L. van den Dries and C. Miller, *Extending Tamm's theorem*, Annales de l'Institut Fourier **44** (1994), 1367-1395.
- [15] L. van den Dries and C. Miller, *On the real exponential field with restricted analytic functions*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **85** (1994), 19-56.
- [16] A.M. Gabrielov, *Projections of semi-analytic sets*, Functional Analysis and Its Applications **2** (1968), 282-291.
- [17] T. Kaiser, *Global complexification of real analytic globally subanalytic functions*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **213** (2016), 139-173.
- [18] T. Kaiser, *R-analytic functions*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **55** (2016), Springer Verlag, 605-623.
- [19] T. Kaiser and A. Opris, *Differentiability Properties of Log-Analytic Functions*, to appear at Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics, 26pp.
- [20] T. Kaiser and J. Ruppert, *Asymptotics of parameterized exponential integrals given by Brownian motion on globally subanalytic sets*, arXiv:1710.07085 (2017).
- [21] T. Kaiser and P. Speissegger, *Analytic continuations of log-exp-analytic germs*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **371** (2019), 5203-5246.
- [22] A.G. Khovanskii, *Fewnomials*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, AMS Providence, Rhode Island **88**, 1991.
- [23] S. Krantz and H. Parks, *A Primer of Real Analytic Functions*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts, Basler Lehrbücher, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2002.
- [24] J.-M. Lion and J.-P. Rolin, *Intégration des fonctions sous-analytiques et volumes des sous-ensembles sous-analytiques*, Annales de l'Institut Fourier **48** (1998), 755-767.
- [25] J.-M. Lion and J.-P. Rolin, *Théorème de préparation pour les fonctions logarithmico-exponentielles*, Annales de l'Institut Fourier **47** (1997), 859-884.
- [26] D.J. Miller, *A preparation theorem for Weierstrass systems*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **358** (2006), 4395-4439.

- [27] A. Opris, *On preparation theorems for $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable functions*, arXiv:2112.08161, 2021.
- [28] A. Opris, *Restricted log-exp-analytic functions and some differentiability results*, arXiv:2112.08161, 2021.
- [29] Y. Peterzil and S. Starchenko, *Complex analytic geometry in a nonstandard setting*, Model Theory with Applications to Algebra and Analysis, ed. Z. Chatzidakis, D. Macpherson, A. Pillay and A. Wilkie **349** (2008), 117-166.
- [30] Y. Peterzil and S. Starchenko, *Tame complex analysis and o-minimality*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Volume II, Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi (2010), 58-81.
- [31] J. Pila, *O-minimality and the André-Oort conjecture for \mathbb{C}^n* , Annals of Mathematics **173** (2011), 1779–1840.
- [32] A. Seidenberg, *A new decision method for elementary algebra*, Annals of Mathematics **60** (1954), 365–374.
- [33] M. Shiota, *Geometry of Subanalytic and Semialgebraic Sets*, Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA **150**, 1997.
- [34] M. Shiota, *Nash Manifolds*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1987.
- [35] P. Speissegger, *The Pfaffian closure of an o-minimal structure*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik **508** (1999), 189-211.
- [36] A. Tarski, *A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry*, RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1948.
- [37] A.J. Wilkie, *Complex continuations of $\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$ -definable unary functions with a diophantine application*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **93** (2016), 547-566.
- [38] A.J. Wilkie, *Model completeness results for expansions of the ordered field of real numbers by restricted Pfaffian functions and the exponential function*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **9** (1996), 1051-1094.

Index

Symbols

$(\sigma Z)^{\otimes q}$	39
$A(c, r_1, r_2)$	5
$B(c, r)$	5
$D(\mu_\kappa)$	66
$D^n(z, r)$	5
E	C4
E_{Φ_g}	91 f.
H	37
H_l	37
$L_C(t)$	43
$M(m \times n, \mathbb{Q})$	4
$Q^n(x, r)$	4
T_{pers}	94
T_{soft}	94
X_t	5
$X_{\neq 0}$	4
Λ_g	91 f.
Φ_g	91 f.
\exp_k	4
γ_t	43
γ_u	55
γ_x	43, 55
γ_z	43, 55
$[x]$	4
$\log(E)$	4
$\log(z)$	5
\log^*	5
\log_k	4
\mathbb{C}_a^+	5
\mathbb{C}^-	5
\mathbb{C}_a^-	5
\mathbb{N}	4
\mathbb{N}_0	4
\mathbb{R}	8
\mathbb{R}^*	4
$\mathbb{R}_{>a}$	4
$\mathbb{R}_{\text{an,exp}}$	8
\mathbb{R}_{an}	8
\mathbb{R}_{exp}	8
$\mathcal{A}(G, N, M)$	66

$\mathcal{B}(G, M)$	66
\mathcal{L}	5
\mathcal{L}_{an}	5
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\exp, \log)$	5
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(-1, (\sqrt[n]{\dots})_{n=2,3,\dots}, \log)$	5
\mathcal{P}_κ	39
$\mathcal{P}_{l,\kappa}$	39
μ_κ, μ_l	32
$\mu_{j,l}$	32
$\pi(A)$	5
π^+	65
π_l	55
$\text{Fin}(f)$	11
\arg	5
dist	4
$\text{sign}(x)$	4
$ \mathcal{Y} ^{\otimes q}$	27
ζ_Z	119, 121
tP	4
f_t	5
k^{ch}	35
$l_{\min}(q)$	50
r -log-analytically prepared	28
y_l	26
z^q	5
z_l	37

B

base	9
base functions	28, 90
bounded in τ	65

C

change index	35
coefficient	28, 90
compatible	44
with C_w	55
complex	
(l, r) -prepared	91
log-exp-analytically	
(l, r) -prepared	92
log-analytically prepared	89

preparing tuple.....	91 f.	with reference set.....	23
complex LA-preparing tuple....	90	log-analytic.....	20, 22
complexification.....	15	log-exp-analytic.....	9
consistent.....	61	log-exp-analytically prepared	
constructed from.....	21 f.	(e, r) with respect to.....	29
constructible.....	11	$(m + 1, X)$ -restricted (e, r) ..	30
with support function.....	13	logarithmic scale.....	26
continuous in z	31	N	
curve.....	5	near.....	60
D		negative- κ	50
definable		nice.....	28
cell.....	9	O	
cell decomposition.....	10	o-minimal structure.....	7
function.....	8	P	
in \mathbb{C}^m	6	persistent.....	55
set.....	8	piecewise.....	8
E		positive- κ	50
exponential		preparing tuple.....	29
number.....	20	projection on the first n real	
F		coordinates.....	5
far.....	60	pure real field.....	8
fat.....	43	R	
fiber.....	5	regular.....	64
free-regular.....	69	restricted analytic.....	7
G		restricted log-exp-anal.....	24 ff.
global complexification.....	16	with reference set.....	24 ff.
high parametric.....	18	S	
parametric.....	17	semialgebraic.....	6
globally subanalytic.....	13	semianalytic.....	6
map.....	7	sign of \mathcal{Y}	27
set.....	7	soft.....	55
with support function.....	13	structure.....	7
H		subanalytic.....	6
heir.....	27	subcurve.....	5
holomorphic in z	31	T	
L		term	
LA-preparing tuple.....	28	\mathcal{L}_{an}	5
length of a cell.....	43	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(\text{exp}, \text{log})$	5
locally bounded.....	24	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}(-1, (\sqrt[n]{\dots})_{n=2,3,\dots}, \text{log})$	5