

Definable $(\omega, 2)$ -theorem for families with VC-codensity less than 2

Pablo Andújar Guerrero

Email address: pa377@cantab.net

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 03C45 (Primary), 52A35 (Secondary).

Key words. NIP, VC-density, (p, q) -theorem.

Abstract

Let \mathcal{S} be a family of sets with VC-codensity less than 2. We prove that, if \mathcal{S} has the $(\omega, 2)$ -property (for any infinitely many sets in \mathcal{S} , at least 2 among them intersect), then \mathcal{S} can be partitioned into finitely many subfamilies, each with the finite intersection property. If \mathcal{S} is definable in some first-order structure, then these subfamilies can be chosen definable too.

This is a strengthening of the case $q = 2$ of the definable (p, q) -conjecture in model theory [Sim15b] and the Alon-Kleitman-Matoušek (p, q) -theorem in combinatorics [Mat04].

1 Introduction

Given a family of sets \mathcal{S} , a boolean atom is a maximal nonempty intersection of sets in the closure of \mathcal{S} under complements. The dual shatter function $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}^* : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ of \mathcal{S} sends each n to the maximum number of boolean atoms of any subfamily of \mathcal{S} of size n .

For cardinals $p \geq q > 1$, a family of sets \mathcal{S} has the (p, q) -property if, for any p sets in \mathcal{S} , there exists a subfamily among them of size q with nonempty intersection

Using ideas from Alon and Kleitman, Matoušek proved the following in [Mat04, Theorem 4].

Theorem A (Alon-Kleitman-Matoušek (p, q) -theorem¹). *Let $q \geq 2$ be an integer and \mathcal{S} be a family of sets whose dual shatter function satisfies $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}^*(n) \in$*

¹While classically the Alon-Kleitman-Matoušek (p, q) -theorem is stated for finite \mathcal{F} , a straightforward application of first-order logic compactness shows that this is equivalent to the infinite version presented here.

$o(n^q)$ (that is, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}^*(n)/n^q = 0$). For any integer $p \geq q$, there exists some $m < \omega$ such that, if \mathcal{F} is a subfamily of \mathcal{S} with the (p, q) -property, then \mathcal{F} can be partitioned into at most m subfamilies, each with the finite intersection property.

For notational conventions and some model theoretic definitions in this paper we refer the reader to Section 2 and to [Sim15a].

Chernikov and Simon [CS15] used Theorem A to study NIP theories. In [CS15] they asked whether a definable version of it holds in this setting. This has evolved to be known as the definable (p, q) -conjecture [Sim15b, Conjecture 2.15]. Specifically, the conjecture (which was put forward before the connection with the (p, q) -theorem was established) states that any NIP formula which is non-dividing over a model M expands to a (finitely) consistent M -definable family. By means of first-order logic compactness, as well as Theorem A, this can be restated as follows.

Conjecture B (Definable (p, q) -conjecture²). *Let $q \geq 2$ be an integer, M be an L -structure and $\varphi(x, y)$ be an $L(M)$ -formula with dual shatter function $\pi_{\varphi}^*(n) \in o(n^q)$ (e.g VC-codensity of $\varphi(x, y)$ is less than q). If there exists an integer $p \geq q$ such that $\varphi(x, y)$ has the (p, q) -property, then there exists some $m < \omega$ and $L(M)$ -formulas $\psi_1(y), \dots, \psi_m(y)$ such that, for every $i \leq m$, the family $\{\varphi(x, a) : a \in \psi_i(M)\}$ is consistent.*

Conjecture B, which can be seen as a definable non-uniform version of Theorem A, is known to hold in certain cases. Simon [Sim14] proved it in dp-minimal theories for formulas $\varphi(x, y)$ with $|x| \leq 2$, and in any theory for formulas that extend to an invariant type of dp-rank 1. In [Sim15b], he proved it in NIP theories of small or medium directionality. Simon and Starchenko [SS14, Theorem 5] proved a stronger version of the conjecture for a class of dp-minimal theories that includes those that are linearly ordered, unpackable VC-minimal, or have definable Skolem functions. Recently, Boxall and Kestner [BK18] proved Conjecture B in distal NIP theories, using the work on NIP forking and distality of Shelah, Chernikov and Simon.

In this paper we prove a strengthening of both Conjecture B and (the non-uniform version of) Theorem A in the case where $q = 2$. In particular, we show that Conjecture B holds when $q = 2$, and that we may furthermore weaken the $(p, 2)$ -property to the $(\omega, 2)$ -property in the statements of Conjecture B and the case $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{F}$ of Theorem A.

²In the literature the conjecture is commonly found with the stronger assumption that the whole structure is NIP [Sim15b, Conjecture 5.1].

Theorem C (Definable $(\omega, 2)$ -theorem). *Let M be an L -structure and $\varphi(x, y)$ be an $L(M)$ -formula with dual shatter function $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \in o(n^2)$. If $\varphi(x, y)$ has the $(\omega, 2)$ -property, then there exist some $m < \omega$ and $L(M)$ -formulas $\psi_1(y), \dots, \psi_m(y)$ such that, for every $i \leq m$, the family $\{\varphi(x, a) : a \in \psi_i(M)\}$ is consistent.*

Since any family of sets can be witnessed as a definable family in some structure, the following corollary is immediate.

Corollary D ($(\omega, 2)$ -theorem). *Let \mathcal{S} be a family of sets with $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}^*(n) \in o(n^2)$. If \mathcal{S} has the $(\omega, 2)$ -property, then it can be partitioned into finitely many subfamilies, each with the finite intersection property.*

Our proof of Theorem C is elementary in that it avoids the use of both the Alon-Kleitman-Matousek (p, q) -theorem (as well as its related fractional Helly theorem) and the work of Shelah, Simon and others on NIP model theory.

Acknowledgments. The author was supported by the Fields Institute for Research in Mathematical Sciences, specifically by the 2021 Thematic Program on Trends in Pure and Applied Model Theory and the 2022 Thematic Program on Tame Geometry, Transseries and Applications to Analysis and Geometry. Pierre Simon provided some helpful comments regarding the main result of the paper.

2 Definitions

Throughout we fix two structures $M \preceq U$ in some language L , where U realizes every type over M . For any $A \subseteq U$, let $L(A)$ denote the expansion of L by formulas with parameters in A . Generally, any formula we consider is in $L(M)$.

Given a (partitioned) formula $\varphi(x, y)$, some $b \in U^{|y|}$ and $A \subseteq U^{|x|}$, let $\varphi(A, b) = \{a \in A : U \models \varphi(a, b)\}$. For $A \subseteq U$, we write $\varphi(A, b)$ instead of $\varphi(A^{|x|}, b)$.

We apply notions such as the (p, q) -property and dual shatter function to formulas $\varphi(x, y)$ by adopting the usual convention of identifying them with the family of sets $\{\varphi(M, a) : a \in M^{|y|}\}$. In the context of formulas, we refer to the finite intersection property as being (finitely) consistent, and to being pairwise disjoint as being pairwise inconsistent.

By “definable set” we mean a set of the form $\varphi(M)$ for some $L(M)$ -formula $\varphi(x)$. We say that a formula $\varphi(a) \in L(U)$ “holds” whenever $U \models \varphi(a)$.

Given a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ and $A \subseteq U^{|y|}$, by a φ_A -type $p(x)$ we mean a maximal consistent collection of formulas that are boolean combinations of formulas in $\{\varphi(x, a) : a \in A\}$.

Throughout, n, m, i, j, k and l are positive integers.

3 Main result

We recall our main result.

Theorem 3.1 (Definable $(\omega, 2)$ -theorem). *Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be a formula with dual shatter function $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \in o(n^2)$. If $\varphi(x, y)$ has the $(\omega, 2)$ -property then there exists a finite partition of $M^{|y|}$ into definable sets A_1, \dots, A_m such that, for every $i \leq m$, the family $\{\varphi(x, a) : a \in A_i\}$ is consistent.*

To prove Theorem 3.1 we use the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be a formula such that $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \in o(n^2)$. Suppose there exists some $b \in U^{|y|}$ such that $\varphi(M, b) = \emptyset$. Then there exists $\theta(y) \in \text{tp}(b/M)$ such that the elements in $\varphi(U, b)$ realize only finitely many $\varphi_{\theta(M)}$ -types.*

Proof. Let $\varphi(x, y)$ and $b \in U^{|y|}$ be as in the lemma. We assume that, for any $\theta(y) \in \text{tp}(b/M)$, the elements in $\varphi(U, b)$ realize infinitely many $\varphi_{\theta(M)}$ -types. We prove the lemma by showing that, for every n ,

$$\pi_\varphi^*(n) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n i = \frac{n^2 + n}{2}. \quad (1)$$

In particular, it follows that $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \notin o(n^2)$.

We construct a sequence $\{a_n : n < \omega\}$ in $M^{|x|}$ and a set $\{c_{i,j} : i < \omega, j \leq i\}$ in $M^{|x|}$ with the following property. For every n and distinct pairs (i, j) , (i', j') , with $i, i' \leq n$, $j \leq i$ and $j \leq i'$, it holds that

$$\varphi(c_{i,j}, \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}) \neq \varphi(c_{i',j'}, \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}). \quad (2)$$

That is, for every n , the set $\{c_{i,j} : i \leq n, j \leq i\}$ witnesses that

$$|\{\varphi(c, \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}) : c \in M^{|x|}\}| \geq \sum_{i=1}^n i,$$

which in turn shows that the elements $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ witness Equation (1).

Specifically, the set $\{c_{i,j} : i < \omega, j \leq i\}$ will have the following two properties.

- (i) $\neg\varphi(c_{i',j'}, a_i)$ and $\varphi(c_{i,j}, a_i)$ holds for all $i' < i, j' \leq i', j \leq i$,
- (ii) $\varphi(c_{i,j}, \{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}) \neq \varphi(c_{i,j'}, \{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\})$ for all $i \geq 2, j < j' \leq i$.

It is easy to see that condition (2) follows from (i) and (ii).

For every n and a_1, \dots, a_n in M , let $s(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ denote the number of boolean atoms C of $\{\varphi(U, a_1), \dots, \varphi(U, a_n)\}$ satisfying that $\varphi(C, b) \neq \emptyset$. We construct our sequence in such a way that $s(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq n + 1$ for every n .

We proceed to build sets $\{a_i : i \leq n\}$ and $\{c_{i,j} : i \leq n, j \leq i\}$ by induction on n .

Case $n = 1$.

Since, by assumption, $\varphi(U, b)$ realizes infinitely many φ -types, there must be some $a \in M^{|y|}$ such that

$$\varphi(U, b) \cap \varphi(U, a) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \varphi(U, b) \setminus \varphi(U, a) \neq \emptyset.$$

Let a_1 be any such a . Let $c_{1,1}$ be any point in $\varphi(M, a_1)$. Observe that $s(a_1) = 2$.

Induction $n > 1$.

Suppose we have a sequence $\{a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ in $M^{|y|}$ as desired. Since $s(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \geq n$, there are n distinct boolean atoms C_1, \dots, C_n of the family $\{\varphi(U, a_1), \dots, \varphi(U, a_{n-1})\}$ containing each points from $\varphi(U, b)$. Let

$$\theta(M) = \{a \in M^{|y|} : \neg\varphi(c_{i,j}, a), \varphi(C_k, a) \neq \emptyset, i < n, j \leq i, k \leq n\}.$$

Since $\varphi(M, b) = \emptyset$, note that $b \in \theta(U)$. Consequently, by assumption, the points in $\varphi(U, b)$ realize infinitely many $\varphi_{\theta(M)}$ -types. In particular, there must exist some boolean atom C of $\{\varphi(U, a_1), \dots, \varphi(U, a_{n-1})\}$ satisfying that the points in $\varphi(C, b)$ realize more than one $\varphi_{\theta(M)}$ -type. Let $a_n \in \theta(M)$ witness this, i.e. $\varphi(C, b) \cap \varphi(U, a_n) \neq \emptyset$ and $\varphi(C, b) \setminus \varphi(U, a_n) \neq \emptyset$. Then it follows that $s(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq n + 1$.

Finally, by definition of $\theta(M)$, we have that $\varphi(C_j, a_n) \neq \emptyset$ for every $j \leq n$. For any $j \leq n$, let $c_{n,j}$ be an element in $\varphi(C_j, a_n) \cap M^{|x|}$. By definition of $\theta(M)$, note that $\{c_{i,j} : i \leq n, j \leq i\}$ satisfies conditions (i) and (ii). \square

We may now prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be a formula with $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \in o(n^2)$. We assume that $\varphi(x, y)$ does not partition into finitely many consistent families and derive that it does not have the $(\omega, 2)$ -property, i.e. we build a sequence $\{a_n : n < \omega\}$ in $M^{|y|}$ such that the family $\{\varphi(x, a_n) : n < \omega\}$ is pairwise inconsistent. We proceed inductively on n .

By model theoretic compactness, the non-existence of a finite partition of $M^{|y|}$ as described in the statement of the theorem implies that we may fix $b \in U^{|y|}$ such that, for any formula $\sigma(y)$, if the family $\{\varphi(x, a) : a \in \sigma(M)\}$ is consistent, then $b \notin \sigma(U)$. In particular, since $\sigma(y)$ includes every formula of the form $\varphi(c, y)$, for $c \in M^{|x|}$, we have that $\varphi(M, b) = \emptyset$.

By Lemma 3.2, there exists some $\theta(y) \in \text{tp}(b/M)$ such that the elements in $\varphi(U, b)$ realize only finitely many $\varphi_{\theta(M)}$ -types. We impose some further assumptions on $\theta(y)$, provided by the following claim.

Claim 3.3. *After shrinking $\theta(M)$ if necessary, we may assume that, for any $c \in \varphi(U, b)$, exactly one of the following two conditions holds.*

- (a) $\theta(M) \cap \varphi(c, M) = \emptyset$.
- (b) For every $\theta'(y) \in \text{tp}(b/M)$, the set $\theta'(M) \cap \theta(M) \cap \varphi(c, M)$ is not definable.

To prove Claim 3.3, let $F \subseteq \varphi(U, b)$ be a finite set that includes realizations of all the $\varphi_{\theta(M)}$ -types realized in $\varphi(U, b)$. Let $F' \subseteq F$ be the subset of all c in F such that there exists some $\theta_c(y) \in \text{tp}(b/M)$ satisfying that the $\varphi_{\theta_c(M)}$ -type realized by c is definable, and let $\sigma_c(M) = \theta_c(M) \cap \varphi(c, M)$. Observe that, since $\{\varphi(x, a) : a \in \sigma_c(M)\}$ is consistent, by construction of b it holds that $b \notin \sigma_c(M)$. By passing from $\theta(y)$ to

$$\theta(y) \wedge \bigwedge_{c \in F'} \theta_c(y) \setminus \bigvee_{c \in F'} \sigma_c(y),$$

if necessary, we have ensured that conditions (a) and (b) hold. This completes the proof of the claim.

We prove the theorem through the next claim.

Claim 3.4. *Let $\chi(x)$ be a formula such that $\varphi(U, b) \subseteq \chi(U)$. Then there exists some $a \in \theta(M)$ such that,*

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \chi(U) \tag{3}$$

and moreover

$$\varphi(U, a) \cap \varphi(U, b) = \emptyset. \tag{4}$$

Once we have Claim 3.4, we may construct $\{a_n : n < \omega\}$ inductively as follows. Let $a_1 \in M^{|y|}$ be any element satisfying (4). Then, for the inductive step, let $\{a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ be elements satisfying (4) and such that the formulas $\varphi(x, a_i)$, for $i \leq n-1$, are pairwise inconsistent. Let

$$\chi(x) = \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} \neg \varphi(x, a_i) \right).$$

By (4), note that $\varphi(U, b) \subseteq \chi(U)$. Now let $a_n \in \theta(M)$ be an element satisfying (3) and (4). The family $\{\varphi(x, a_i) : i \leq n\}$ is pairwise inconsistent as desired.

We prove Claim 3.4. By shrinking $\theta(M)$ if necessary we may assume that every $a \in \theta(M)$ satisfies that $\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \chi(U)$, and so it suffices to find some $a \in \theta(M)$ such that $\varphi(U, a) \cap \varphi(U, b) = \emptyset$.

Let $p_1(x), \dots, p_l(x)$ denote the distinct $\varphi_{\theta(M)}$ -types realized by points in $\varphi(U, b)$. Let the numbering be such that, for some fixed $1 \leq k \leq l$, the realizations of types p_k, \dots, p_l satisfy condition (a) and the realizations of types p_1, \dots, p_{k-1} satisfy condition (b) in Claim 3.3. Note that we are assuming that there exists at least one point in $\varphi(U, b)$ satisfying condition (a) in Claim 3.3. The proof when this is not the case is analogous (but simpler).

We prove Claim 3.4 by finding some $a \in \theta(M)$ such that $\varphi(x, a) \notin p_i(x)$ for every $i \leq l$. By assumptions on $\theta(M)$ and the numbering given to the types $p_i(x)$, it suffices to check that $\varphi(x, a) \notin p_i(x)$ for every $i < k$. We will use the following fact, which follows from the definition of types p_i for $i < k$ (condition (b) in Claim 3.3).

Fact 3.5. For any $\lambda(x) \in \bigcup_{i=1}^l p_i(x)$ and any fixed $m < k$, there exists some $a \in \theta(M)$ such that

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \lambda(U)$$

and

$$\varphi(x, a) \in p_m(x).$$

Now let us fix, for every $i \leq k$, a formula $\chi_i(x)$ satisfying the following conditions.

- $\chi_i(x) \in p_i(x)$ for every $i < k$.
- $\chi_k(x) \in p_j(x)$ for all $k \leq j \leq l$.
- $\chi_i(U) \cap \chi_j(U) = \emptyset$ for every $i < j \leq k$.

For any formulas $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_{k-1}(x)$, let $\Psi_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k-1})(M)$ denote the set of all $a \in \theta(M)$ such that

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup \chi_k(U).$$

Let $\Psi_{k-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k-2})(M)$ denote the set of all $a \in \theta(M)$ such that

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-2} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup \bigcup_{i=k-1}^k \chi_i(U)$$

and

$$\Psi_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k-1}, \varphi(x, a))(M) \neq \emptyset.$$

Finally, for any $m \leq k - 2$, let $\Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M)$ denote the set of all $a \in \theta(M)$ with

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^k \chi_i(U)$$

such that there exists two elements $a_1, a_2 \in \Psi_{m+1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1}, \varphi(x, a))(M)$, with

$$\varphi(U, a_1) \cap \varphi(U, a_2) \cap \chi_{m+1}(U) = \emptyset.$$

We prove Claim 3.4 by means of the following claim.

Claim 3.6. *For any $m \leq k$, the following four statements hold.*

(I_m) *For any family of formulas $\lambda_i(x, a_i)$, $i < m$, the set*

$$\Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M)$$

is definable uniformly on the parameters a_i , $i < m$.

(II_m) *Let $\lambda_i(x) \in p_i(x)$, $i < m$, and $a \in \theta(M)$. Suppose that*

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^k \chi_i(U)$$

and

$$\varphi(x, a) \in p_m(x).$$

Then

$$a \in \Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M).$$

(III_m) *Let $\lambda_i(x) \in p_i(x)$, $i < m$. If $m = k$ then*

$$\Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M) \neq \emptyset.$$

If $m < k$ then there exists

$$a, a' \in \Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M)$$

such that

$$\varphi(U, a) \cap \varphi(U, a') \cap \chi_m(U) = \emptyset.$$

(IV_m) Let $\lambda_i(x)$, $i < m$, be such that there exist $a', a'' \in \Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M)$, with

$$\varphi(U, a') \cap \varphi(U, a'') \cap \chi_m(U) = \emptyset.$$

Then there exists some $a \in \theta(M)$ with

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^k \chi_i(U)$$

satisfying that

$$\varphi(x, a) \notin p_j(x) \text{ for every } m \leq j \leq l.$$

We prove Claim 3.6 by reverse induction on m , where the base case is $m = k$. Claim 3.4, and hence the theorem, then follows from (III₁) and (IV₁), since the $a \in \theta(M)$ described in the statement of (IV₁), which exists by (III₁), satisfies (3) and 4.

We prove the case $m = k$. Clearly (I_k) holds by definition of $\Psi_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k-1})(M)$. Statement (II_k) is vacuously true since, by definition of $p_k(x)$ (condition (a) in Claim 3.3), there exists no $a \in \theta(M)$ with $\varphi(x, a) \in p_k(x)$. In statement (III_k), the fact that the set $\Psi_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k-1})(M)$ is nonempty follows from noticing that

$$\varphi(U, b) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup \chi_k(U).$$

Finally, (IV_k) holds by the definition of $\Psi_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k-1})(M)$ and of types $p_k(x), \dots, p_l(x)$ (again condition (a) in Claim 3.3).

We now prove the case $m < k$. Statement (I_m) follows easily from (I_{m+1}) and the definition of the set $\Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M)$. We derive (II_m) from (III_{m+1}), and (III_m) from (II_m) and (I_m). Finally (IV_m) will follow from (IV_{m+1}).

Proof of (III_{m+1}) \Rightarrow (II_m)

Let $\lambda_i(x)$, $i < m$, and $a \in \theta(M)$ be as described in (II_m). In particular we have that $\varphi(x, a) \in p_m(x)$.

If $m = k - 1$ then, by (III_k), it holds that $\Psi_k(\lambda_1(x), \dots, \varphi(x, a))(M) \neq \emptyset$, and so $a \in \Psi_{k-1}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k-2})(M)$ by definition.

If $m < k - 1$ then, by (III_{m+1}), there exists

$$a', a'' \in \Psi_m(\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_m(x), \varphi(x, a))(M)$$

such that

$$\varphi(U, a') \cap \varphi(U, a'') \cap \chi_{m+1}(U) = \emptyset.$$

But then by definition this means that $a \in \Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M)$.

Proof of $(\mathbf{I}_m) \wedge (\mathbf{II}_m) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{III}_m)$

Let $\lambda_i(x) \in p_i(x)$ for $i < m$. Let $\theta'(M)$ be the set of all $a \in \theta(M)$ such that

$$\varphi(U, a) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^k \chi_i(U).$$

Note that $b \in \theta'(U)$. By definition of $p_m(x)$ (see condition (b) in Claim 3.3), the set A of all $a \in \theta'(M)$ with

$$\varphi(x, a) \in p_m(x)$$

is not definable. By (\mathbf{II}_m) note that

$$A \subseteq \Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M).$$

By (\mathbf{I}_m) , the set $\Psi_m(\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_{m-1}(x))(M)$ is definable. Since the subset A is not definable, there must exist some $a \in \Psi_m(\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_{m-1}(x))(M)$ that is not in A , in particular

$$\varphi(x, a) \notin p_m(x).$$

Now by, Fact 3.5, there exists some $a' \in \theta(M)$ with

$$\varphi(U, a') \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} (\chi_i(U) \cap \lambda_i(U)) \cup (\chi_m(U) \setminus \varphi(U, a)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m+1}^k \chi_i(U)$$

such that

$$\varphi(x, a') \in p_m(x).$$

And once again by (\mathbf{II}_m) it holds that

$$a' \in \Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M).$$

However by construction note that

$$\varphi(U, a) \cap \varphi(U, a') \cap \chi_m(U) = \emptyset.$$

Proof of $(\mathbf{IV}_{m+1}) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{IV}_m)$

Let $\lambda_i(x)$, $i < m$, and $a, a' \in \theta(M)$ be as in (\mathbf{IV}_m) . Since

$$\varphi(U, a) \cap \varphi(U, a') \cap \chi_m(U) = \emptyset,$$

we may assume without loss of generality that $\varphi(x, a) \notin p_m(x)$.

By definition of $\Psi_m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m-1})(M)$ and (IV_{m+1}) we derive that there exists some $a'' \in \theta(M)$ such that

$$\varphi(U, a'') \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_i(U) \cap \chi_i(U)) \cup (\varphi(U, a) \cap \chi_m(U)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m+1}^k \chi_i(U)$$

and

$$\varphi(x, a) \notin p_j(x) \text{ for every } m < j \leq l.$$

However, since $\varphi(x, a) \notin p_m(x)$, then it must also be that $\varphi(x, a'') \notin p_m(x)$. \square

Questions 3.7.

- (1) Definable (ω, q) -conjecture: *Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be a formula and $q \geq 2$ an integer such that $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \in o(n^q)$. If $\varphi(x, y)$ has the (ω, q) -property, does it partition into finitely many consistent definable subfamilies?*
- (2) Uniform definable $(p, 2)$ -conjecture 1: *Let $\varphi(x, y)$ and $\psi(y, z)$ be formulas where $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \in o(n^2)$. Given any integer $p \geq 2$, is there an m such that any family of the form $\{\varphi(x, a) : M \models \psi(a, b)\}$, for $b \in M^{|z|}$, with the $(p, 2)$ -property partitions into at most m consistent definable subfamilies?*
- (3) Uniform definable $(p, 2)$ -conjecture 2: *Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be a formula with $\pi_\varphi^*(n) \in o(n^2)$. Given any integer $p \geq 2$, is there an m such that any definable subfamily of $\varphi(x, y)$ with the $(p, 2)$ -property partitions into at most m consistent definable subfamilies?*

References

- [BK18] Gareth Boxall and Charlotte Kestner. The definable (P, Q) -theorem for distal theories. *J. Symb. Log.*, 83(1):123–127, 2018.
- [CS15] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Externally definable sets and dependent pairs II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(7):5217–5235, 2015.
- [Mat04] Jiří Matoušek. Bounded VC-dimension implies a fractional Helly theorem. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 31(2):251–255, 2004.
- [Sim14] Pierre Simon. Dp-minimality: invariant types and dp-rank. *J. Symb. Log.*, 79(4):1025–1045, 2014.

- [Sim15a] Pierre Simon. *A guide to NIP theories*, volume 44 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Association for Symbolic Logic, Chicago, IL; Cambridge Scientific Publishers, Cambridge, 2015.
- [Sim15b] Pierre Simon. Invariant types in NIP theories. *J. Math. Log.*, 15(2):1550006, 26, 2015.
- [SS14] Pierre Simon and Sergei Starchenko. On forking and definability of types in some DP-minimal theories. *J. Symb. Log.*, 79(4):1020–1024, 2014.