

MAXIMAL STABLE QUOTIENTS OF INVARIANT TYPES IN NIP THEORIES

KRZYSZTOF KRUPIŃSKI AND ADRIÁN PORTILLO

ABSTRACT. For a NIP theory T , a sufficiently saturated model \mathfrak{C} of T , and an invariant (over some small subset of \mathfrak{C}) global type p , we prove that there exists a finest relatively type-definable over a small set of parameters from \mathfrak{C} equivalence relation on the set of realizations of p which has stable quotient. This is a counterpart for equivalence relations of the main result of [HP18] on the existence of maximal stable quotients of type-definable groups in NIP theories. Our proof adapts the ideas of the proof of this result, working with relatively type-definable subsets of the group of automorphisms of the monster model as defined in [HKP21].

1. INTRODUCTION

Stability theory, developed in the 1970s and 1980s, is a core part of model theory. One of the main goals of present model theory is to extend various ideas and results of stability theory to appropriate unstable contexts; it is in particular important to distinguish interesting contexts extending stability. Two of the approaches are to either impose some general global assumptions on the theory (e.g., NIP, simplicity, NSOP₁) or some local ones (such as working with a stable definable set or generically stable type) in order to prove some structural results. Another ubiquitous strategy is to look at quotients by type-definable equivalence relations and assume (or prove) their good properties (e.g., boundedness) to obtain further results.

Let T be a complete theory, $\mathfrak{C} \models T$ a monster model (i.e., κ -saturated and strongly κ -homogeneous for a strong limit cardinal $> |T|$) in which we are working, and $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ a small set of parameters (i.e., $|A| < \kappa$); a cardinal γ is *bounded* if $\gamma < \kappa$.

Recall that a *hyperdefinable set* is the quotient of a type-definable set by a type-definable equivalence relation; we say that a set is *hyperdefinable over A* if both the set and the equivalence relation are type-definable over A . A *hyperimaginary* is an element of a hyperdefinable set.

Bounded quotients have been studied thoroughly and played an important role in model theory and its applications for many years (e.g., to approximate subgroups). However, stable quotients have not been studied so deeply. The project originates with a talk by Anand Pillay in Lyon in 2009 on finest stable hyperdefinable quotients in NIP theories. The case of type-definable groups was worked out in [HP18]; some questions from [HP18] were answered in [KP22]. The general case of first order theories will be solved in this paper. One should mention that it is well known that

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03C45.

Key words and phrases. Stable quotient, hyperimaginary, invariant type.

Both authors are supported by the Narodowe Centrum Nauki grant no. 2016/22/E/ST1/00450. The first author is also supported by the Narodowe Centrum Nauki grant no. 2018/31/B/ST1/00357.

hyperimaginaries can be treated as imaginaries in continuous logic, and stability of hyperdefinable sets is equivalent to stability (of imaginary sorts) in the sense of continuous logic. But we will not be using this translation in the present paper.

For an A -type-definable set X and an A -type-definable equivalence relation E on X , the *complete type over A* of an element of X/E can be defined as the $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ -orbit of that element, or the preimage of this orbit under the quotient map, or the partial type defining this preimage.

Definition 1.1. *A hyperdefinable (over A) set X/E is stable if for every A -indiscernible sequence $(a_i, b_i)_{i < \omega}$ with $a_i \in X/E$ for all (equivalently, some) $i < \omega$, we have*

$$\text{tp}(a_i, b_j/A) = \text{tp}(a_j, b_i/A)$$

for all (some) $i \neq j < \omega$.

Let G be a \emptyset - \wedge -definable group. Since stability of hyperdefinable sets is closed under taking products and type-definable subsets (see [HP18, Remark 1.4]), it is clear that there always exists a smallest A -type-definable subgroup G_A^{st} such that the quotient G/G_A^{st} is stable. The main result of [HP18] says that under NIP, G_A^{st} does not depend on A , and so it is the smallest type-definable (over parameters) subgroup with stable quotient G/G^{st} . Moreover, it is \emptyset -type-definable and normal.

In [KP22], we gave several characterizations of stability of a hyperdefinable set both with and without assuming that the theory T has NIP (see [KP22, Section 2]). We also proved that in distal theories all stable hyperdefinable sets are bounded ([KP22, Corollary 3.5]). In Proposition 2.2, we will deduce another characterization of stability under NIP, via the so-called weak stability, generalizing [OP07, Proposition 4.2] from the definable to the hyperdefinable context.

When we lack the group structure, a natural counterpart of taking the quotient by a subgroup is taking the quotient by an equivalence relation. Thus, it is natural to ask if similar results to the ones appearing in [HP18] hold outside of the context of type-definable groups. However, the naive counterpart of [HP18, Theorem 1.1] is easily seen to be false. Namely, in general, for any non-stable type-definable set X (e.g. the home sort of a non-stable theory), a finest type-definable (over an arbitrary small set of parameters) equivalence relation on X with stable quotient does not exist. The reason is that given any type-definable equivalence relation E on X with stable quotient, E is not the relation of equality, so we can find an E -class which contains at least two distinct elements a and b . Then, the equivalence relation on X being the intersection of E and the relation \equiv_a of having the same type over a is strictly finer than E and has stable quotient by [HP18, Remark 1.4] (as both X/E and X/\equiv_a are stable).

A *relatively type-definable over a* (small) set of parameters B subset of a set Y is the intersection of Y with a set which is type-definable over B .

In Section 3 of this paper, we work with two monster models $\mathfrak{C} \prec \mathfrak{C}'$ of a NIP theory T (where \mathfrak{C}' is a monster model with respect to \mathfrak{C}), and we prove the following main theorem of this paper.

Theorem. *Assume NIP. Let $p(x) \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ be an A -invariant type. Assume that \mathfrak{C} is at least $\beth_{(\beth_2(|x|+|T|+|A|))^{++}}$ -saturated. Then, there exists a finest equivalence relation E^{st} on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ (the set of realizations of p in the bigger monster model \mathfrak{C}') relatively type-definable over a small set of parameters of \mathfrak{C} and with stable quotient $p(\mathfrak{C}')/E^{st}$.*

Our proof is via a non-trivial adaptation of the ideas from the proof of the main theorem of [HP18], using relatively type-definable subsets of the group of automorphisms of the monster model (as defined in [HKP21]).

We do not know whether E^{st} is relatively type-definable over A . At the end of Section 3, we will observe that if it was true, then the specific (large) saturation degree assumption in the above theorem could be removed. Another question is whether one could drop the invariance of p hypothesis from the above theorem. If such a strengthening is true, a proof would probably require some new tricks.

In the last section of the paper, we compute E^{st} in two concrete examples which are expansions of local orders. In fact, in these examples, we give full classifications of all relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relations on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ for a suitable invariant type $p \in S(\mathfrak{C})$.

2. BASIC RESULTS AND TRANSFERS BETWEEN MODELS

Let T be a complete first-order theory in a language L , and $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}' \models T$ monster models such that \mathfrak{C} is κ -saturated and \mathfrak{C}' is $|\mathfrak{C}|^+$ -saturated. Note that $|T|$ is the cardinality of the set of all formulas in L . Unless stated otherwise, $p(x)$ will always be a type in $S_x(\mathfrak{C})$ invariant over some small $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ (i.e., $|A| < \kappa$), where x is a small tuple of variables. Whenever $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}'$, by $p \upharpoonright_B$ we mean the restriction to B of the unique extension of p to an A -invariant type in $S(\mathfrak{C}')$. If E is a type-definable equivalence relation and a is an element of its domain, $[a]_E$ denotes the E -class of a .

The goal of this section is to present a useful criterion that allows us to check whether a relatively type-definable equivalence relation E (over a small $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$) on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient is, in fact, the finest one (see Lemma 2.7). As a corollary, we get the transfer to elementary extensions of \mathfrak{C} of the property of being the finest relatively type-definable equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ (see Corollary 2.8). We also take the opportunity to prove a new characterization of stability of hyperdefinable sets in NIP theories (see Proposition 2.2).

Let E be a type-definable equivalence relation on a type-definable subset X of \mathfrak{C}^λ , where $\lambda < \kappa$. The following definition is the hyperimaginary analogous of [OP07, Definition 1.2].

Definition 2.1. *A hyperdefinable (over A) set X/E is weakly stable if for every A -indiscernible sequence $(a_i, b_i, c)_{i < \omega}$ with $a_i, b_i \in X/E$ for all (equivalently, some) $i < \omega$, we have*

$$\text{tp}(a_i, b_j, c/A) = \text{tp}(a_j, b_i, c/A)$$

for all (some) $i \neq j < \omega$.

We obtain a hyperdefinable counterpart of [OP07, Proposition 4.2].

Proposition 2.2. *A hyperdefinable set X/E which has NIP is weakly stable if and only if it is stable.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that both X and E are type-definable over the empty set.

It is clear that stable sets are weakly stable, even without the *NIP* assumption. By [KP22, Theorem 2.10], under the *NIP* assumption, the stability of X/E is equivalent to the fact that every indiscernible sequence of elements of X/E is totally

indiscernible. Hence, it is enough to show that weak stability of X/E also implies this property.

Suppose that the sequence $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ in X/E is indiscernible but not totally indiscernible. Let us, without loss of generality, replace ω by \mathbb{Q} . Then, there exist rational numbers $i_0 < \dots < i_{n-1}$ and a natural number $j < n - 1$ such that

$$\text{tp}(a_{i_j}, a_{i_{j+1}}/A) \neq \text{tp}(a_{i_{j+1}}, a_{i_j}/A),$$

where A is the set of all a_{i_k} for $k < n$ distinct from j and $j + 1$. Choose any rationals $l_0 < l_1 < \dots$ in the interval (i_j, i_{j+1}) . Let $b_i = a_{l_i}$ for $i < \omega$. Then, the sequence $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ is A -indiscernible and $\text{tp}(b_i, b_j/A) \neq \text{tp}(b_j, b_i/A)$ for all $i < j < \omega$. Moreover, this is witnessed by some finite tuple $a \subseteq A$. Hence, the sequence $(b_i, b_i, a)_{i < \omega}$ contradicts the weak stability of X/E . \square

Next, we present a definition that we use throughout the whole section. This definition first appeared in [KNS19, Definition 3.2].

Definition 2.3. *Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{M} \subseteq B$ and $q(x) \in S(B)$. We say that $q(x)$ is a strong heir extension over A of $q \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$ if for all finite $m \subseteq \mathcal{M}$*

$$(\forall \varphi(x, y) \in L)(\forall b \subseteq B)[\varphi(x, b) \in q(x) \implies (\exists b' \subseteq \mathcal{M})(\varphi(x, b') \in q(x) \wedge b \equiv_{Am} b')].$$

Note that if $q \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ is a strong heir extension over A of $q \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$, then \mathcal{M} is an \aleph_0 -saturated model in the language L_A (i.e., L expanded by constants from A). Conversely, if \mathcal{M} is an \aleph_0 -saturated model in L_A and $q(x) \in S(\mathcal{M})$, there always exists $q'(x) \in S(B)$ which is a strong heir over A of q (see [KNS19, Lemma 3.3]).

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that $q(x) \in S(\mathcal{M})$ is A -invariant (for some $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}$) and $q'(x) \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ is a strong heir extension over A of $q(x)$. Then $q'(x)$ is the unique global A -invariant extension of $q(x)$.*

Proof. To show A -invariance, suppose for a contradiction that for some $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ and $\varphi(x, a) \in q'(x)$ we have $\neg\varphi(x, \sigma(a)) \in q'(x)$. Then, there exist $a', a'' \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $a' \equiv_A a$ and $a'' \equiv_A \sigma(a)$ for which $\varphi(x, a') \in q(x)$ while $\neg\varphi(x, a'') \in q(x)$. Then $a' \equiv_A a''$, which contradicts the A -invariance of $q(x)$.

Uniqueness follows from the fact that \mathcal{M} is \aleph_0 -saturated in L_A . \square

Given a partial type (possibly with parameters) $\pi(x, y)$, we say that $\pi(x, y)$ defines an equivalence relation on a type-definable set X if $\pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}') \cap X(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is an equivalence relation. Given a relatively type-definable equivalence relation E on a type-definable set X , a partial type associated to E is any partial type $\pi(x, y)$ such that $\pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}') \cap X(\mathfrak{C}')^2 = E$. We say that a relatively type-definable equivalence relation is countably defined if some associated partial type $\pi(x, y)$ consists of countably many formulas.

Lemma 2.5 gives us a useful stability criterion when an equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ is relatively type-definable over a sufficiently saturated small model.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\pi(x, y, z)$ be a partial type over the empty set, let $a_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ enumerate a small \aleph_0 -saturated model $\mathcal{M}_0 \prec \mathfrak{C}$ in the language L_A (so containing A), and let $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ define an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$. Then, $p(\mathfrak{C}') / \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is stable if and only if $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}') / \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is stable.*

Proof. Let E_{a_0} be the equivalence relation defined by $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ and let E'_{a_0} be the equivalence relation defined by $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$.

Assume first that $p(\mathfrak{C}') / \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is unstable. Since stability does not depend on the choice of parameters over which the hyperdefinable set in question is defined, there exists a \mathfrak{C} -indiscernible sequence $(c_i, b_i)_{i < \omega}$ such that $c_i \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ for all $i < \omega$ and for all $i \neq j$

$$\text{tp}([c_i]_{E_{a_0}}, b_j / \mathfrak{C}) \neq \text{tp}([c_j]_{E_{a_0}}, b_i / \mathfrak{C}).$$

This implies that for all $i \neq j$ we have

$$\text{tp}([c_i]_{E'_{a_0}}, b_j / \mathfrak{C}) \neq \text{tp}([c_j]_{E'_{a_0}}, b_i / \mathfrak{C}),$$

and so $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}') / \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is unstable.

Assume now that $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}') / \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is unstable. This is witnessed by an a_0 -indiscernible sequence $(c_i, b_i)_{i < \omega}$ such that $c_i \in p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$ for all $i < \omega$ and for all $i \neq j$

$$\text{tp}([c_i]_{E'_{a_0}}, b_j / a_0) \neq \text{tp}([c_j]_{E'_{a_0}}, b_i / a_0).$$

Consider $q := \text{tp}((c_i, b_i)_{i < \omega} / a_0)$ and let $q' \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ be a strong heir extension over A of q . Let $(c'_i, b'_i)_{i < \omega}$ be a realization of q' . Then,

- (1) $(c'_i, b'_i)_{i < \omega}$ is \mathfrak{C} -indiscernible;
- (2) $\text{tp}(c'_i / \mathfrak{C}) = p(x)$ for all $i < \omega$;
- (3) $\text{tp}([c'_i]_{E_{a_0}}, b'_j / \mathfrak{C}) \neq \text{tp}([c'_j]_{E_{a_0}}, b'_i / \mathfrak{C})$.

(1) If $(c'_i, b'_i)_{i < \omega}$ is not \mathfrak{C} -indiscernible, then it is witnessed by a formula (with parameters d from \mathfrak{C}) of the form $\varphi(x_{i_1}, y_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, y_{i_n}, d) \wedge \neg \varphi(x_{j_1}, y_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, y_{j_n}, d)$, for some $i_1 < \dots < i_n$ and $j_1 < \dots < j_n$. Now, using that q' is a strong heir extension over A of q , we can find $d' \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0$ such that

$$\varphi(x_{i_1}, y_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, y_{i_n}, d') \wedge \neg \varphi(x_{j_1}, y_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, y_{j_n}, d') \in q,$$

contradicting the a_0 -indiscernibility of $(c_i, b_i)_{i < \omega}$.

(2) follows from the fact that $\text{tp}(c'_i / \mathfrak{C})$ is a strong heir extension of $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(x)$, which has to be $p(x)$ by Lemma 2.4.

(3) follows from (2), the fact that q' is an extension of q , and the fact that E_{a_0} is the restriction of E'_{a_0} to $p(\mathfrak{C}')$.

By (1), (2), and (3), $p(\mathfrak{C}') / \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is unstable. \square

Even though at first glance the requirement that $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$ might not seem very natural, the following result shows that this can always be assumed.

Proposition 2.6. *Let E be a B -relatively-type-definable equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$. Then, E can be written as $\bigcap_{i < I} E_i$, where $|I| \leq |B| + |x| + |T|$, each E_i is a countably defined B_i -relatively-type-definable equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ for some countable set $B_i \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, and a partial type associated to each E_i defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{B_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$. Thus, for $B' := \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$ we have $|B'| \leq |B| + |x| + |T|$ and a partial type over B' associated to E defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{B'}(\mathfrak{C}')$.*

Moreover, if we start from a given partial type π associated to E consisting of reflexive and symmetric formulas and closed under conjunction, then the resulting partial type in the last sentence is precisely π , and $|B'| \leq |\pi|$.

Proof. Fix a partial type associated to E which consists of reflexive and symmetric formulas and is closed under conjunction. Let $\psi_0(x)$ be any formula in $p(x)$ and $\varphi_0(x, y)$ any formula in the partial type associated to E . Then the partial type

$$p(x) \wedge p(y) \wedge p(z) \wedge E(x, y) \wedge E(y, z)$$

implies $\psi_0(x) \wedge \psi_0(y) \wedge \psi_0(z) \wedge \varphi_0(x, z)$. By compactness, there are $\varphi_1(x, y)$ in the partial type associated to E and $\psi_1(x)$ in $p(x)$ such that the formula

$$\psi_1(x) \wedge \psi_1(y) \wedge \psi_1(z) \wedge \varphi_1(x, y) \wedge \varphi_1(y, z)$$

implies $\varphi_0(x, z)$. Proceeding by induction, we construct a partial type

$$\{\varphi_i(x, y) : i < \omega\}$$

defining an equivalence relation on $\bigcap_{i < \omega} \psi_i(\mathfrak{C}')$. Let B_{φ_0, ψ_0} be a countable set containing the parameters of all the constructed formulas $\varphi_i(x, y)$ and $\psi_i(x)$, $i < \omega$. Then, the partial type $\{\varphi_i(x, y) : i < \omega\}$ clearly defines over B_{φ_0, ψ_0} an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{B_{\varphi_0, \psi_0}}(\mathfrak{C}')$. Applying this process separately to every $\varphi(x, y)$ in the partial type associated to E and taking the intersections of any finitely many obtained equivalence relations gives us the desired directed family of equivalence relations. \square

The following result is a criterion for when an equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ relatively type-definable over a sufficiently saturated small (with respect to \mathfrak{C}) model is the finest relatively type-definable equivalence relation (over a small $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$) on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient.

Lemma 2.7. *Consider $\pi(x, y, z)$ and a_0 as in Lemma 2.5. Then, the equivalence relation*

$$E_{a_0} := \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$$

is the finest relatively type-definable equivalence relation (over a small subset of parameters in \mathfrak{C}) on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ whose quotient is stable if and only if

$$E'_{a_0} := \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')^2$$

is an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient and there is no partial type $\rho(x, y, t)$ over the empty set (where $|t| \leq 2^{|T|+|A|} + |a_0|$) and $a_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{C}'$ enumerating a small \aleph_0 -saturated model in L_A containing \mathcal{M}_0 such that the partial type $\rho(x, y, a_1)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')$,

$$\rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2 \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2,$$

and $p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}') / \rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is stable.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) By Lemma 2.5, the right hand side implies that E_{a_0} is stable. Assume that there exists E_B , a relatively type-definable equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ over some small set of parameters $B \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ such that the quotient $p(\mathfrak{C}')/E_B$ is stable and $E_B \subsetneq E_{a_0}$. Take a presentation of E_B as $\bigcap_{i \in I} E_{B_i}$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 2.6. Since $p(\mathfrak{C}')/E_B$ is stable, so are all $p(\mathfrak{C}')/E_{B_i}$. As $E_B \subsetneq E_{a_0}$, there exists some $i \in I$ such that

$$E_{a_0} \cap E_{B_i} \subsetneq E_{a_0}.$$

Choose any \aleph_0 -saturated model $\mathcal{M}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{M}_0 \cup B_i$ in the language L_A contained in \mathfrak{C} and of size at most $2^{|T|+|A|} + |a_0|$. Enumerate it as a_1 . By the choice of E_{B_i} , there is a partial type $\delta(x, y, a_1)$ defining E_{B_i} which also defines an equivalence relation

on $p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')$. Let $\rho(x, y, a_1) := \pi(x, y, a_0) \wedge \delta(x, y, a_1)$. Then $\rho(x, y, a_1)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')$ and $p(\mathfrak{C}') / \rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is stable. Hence, applying Lemma 2.5, we obtain that the quotient

$$p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}') / \rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2.$$

is stable. Moreover,

$$\rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2 \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2.$$

Thus, we have proved that the right hand side of the lemma fails.

(\Rightarrow) By Lemma 2.5, the left hand side implies that E'_{a_0} is stable. Assume that the right hand side does not hold. Since a_1 is small, taking a realization of $\text{tp}(a_1/a_0)$ if needed, we can assume that $a_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$. Hence, by Lemma 2.5, the fact that the quotient $p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}') / \rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is stable implies that the quotient $p(\mathfrak{C}') / \rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is stable. Let $b_1, b_2 \in p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')$ be elements witnessing

$$\rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2 \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_1}(\mathfrak{C}')^2.$$

That is, the pair (b_1, b_2) belongs to $\pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0)$ but not to $\rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1)$. Let $q := \text{tp}(b_1, b_2 / a_1)$ and let $q' \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ be a strong heir extension over A of q . By Lemma 2.4, any realization $(b'_1, b'_2) \in q'(\mathfrak{C}')$ satisfies $b'_1, b'_2 \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$, $(b'_1, b'_2) \in \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0)$, and $(b'_1, b'_2) \notin \rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1)$. Therefore,

$$\rho(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_1) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2 \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2,$$

which contradicts the minimality of E_{a_0} . \square

Let $\mathfrak{C} \prec \mathfrak{C}_1 \prec \mathfrak{C}'$ be such that \mathfrak{C}' is still a monster model with respect to \mathfrak{C}_1 , and let $p_1(x) \in S(\mathfrak{C}_1)$ be the unique A -invariant extension of $p(x)$.

Corollary 2.8. *Assume that E is the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient. Then $E \cap p_1(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}_1) equivalence relation on $p_1(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient.*

Proof. Using Proposition 2.6, we can find a small \aleph_0 -saturated model $\mathcal{M}_0 \prec \mathfrak{C}$ in L_A (so containing A) enumerated as a_0 , and a partial type $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defining E and defining an equivalence relation E'_{a_0} on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$. By Lemma 2.7, the right hand side of the equivalence in Lemma 2.7 holds. But this right hand side does not depend on the choice of \mathfrak{C} , and so, again by Lemma 2.7, $E \cap p_1(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}_1) equivalence relation on $p_1(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient. \square

However, there is no obvious transfer going in the opposite direction (i.e., from \mathfrak{C}_1 to \mathfrak{C}), as an application of Proposition 2.6 for p_1 may produce a model $\mathcal{M}_0 \prec \mathfrak{C}_1$ whose cardinality is bigger than the degree of saturation of \mathfrak{C} , and then we cannot embed it into \mathfrak{C} via an automorphism. We have only the following corollary.

Corollary 2.9. *Assume that E is the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}_1) equivalence relation on $p_1(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient, and suppose that E is relatively type-definable over a set B of small cardinality with respect to \mathfrak{C} . Pick, by Proposition 2.6, an \aleph_0 -saturated model $\mathcal{M}_0 \prec \mathfrak{C}_1$ in L_A (so containing A) of small size with respect to \mathfrak{C} , enumerated as a_0 , and such that there exists*

a partial type $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defining E and defining an equivalence relation E'_{a_0} on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$. Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}_1/A)$ be such that $\sigma(a_0) \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$. Then $\pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', \sigma(a_0)) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient.

Proof. By assumption and Lemma 2.7, the right hand side of that lemma holds for p_1 in place of p . Since $\sigma(p_1) = p_1$, it still holds for p_1 and $\sigma(a_0)$ in place of a_0 . Since this right hand side does not depend on \mathfrak{C}_1 and we have $\sigma(a_0) \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, it holds for p and $\sigma(a_0)$, so again by Lemma 2.7, we get that $\pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', \sigma(a_0)) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ is the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient. \square

3. THE MAIN THEOREM

The goal of this section is to prove the theorem stated in the introduction (see Theorem 3.8). As in the previous section, we work in a complete first-order theory T and $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}' \models T$ are monster models such that \mathfrak{C} is κ -saturated and \mathfrak{C}' is $|\mathfrak{C}'|^+$ -saturated. During this section, $p(x)$ will always be a type in $S_x(\mathfrak{C})$ invariant over some small $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ (i.e., $|A| < \kappa$), where x is a small tuple.

In this section, we use results on relatively type-definable subsets of the group of automorphisms of \mathfrak{C}' extracted from [HKP21]. The following is Definition 2.14 of [HKP21], which extends the notion of relatively definable subset of the monster model from [KPR18, Appendix A].

Definition 3.1. *By a relatively type-definable subset of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$, we mean a subset of the form $\{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}') : \mathfrak{C}' \models \pi(\sigma(a), b)\}$ for some partial type $\pi(x, y)$ (without parameters), where x and y are short tuples of variables, and a, b are corresponding tuples from \mathfrak{C}' .*

In particular, given a partial type over the empty set $\pi(x, y, z)$ and (short) tuples a, b, c in \mathfrak{C}' corresponding to x, y, z , respectively, we have a relatively type-definable subset of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ of the form

$$A_{\pi(x; y, z), a, b, c} := \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}') : \mathfrak{C}' \models \pi(\sigma(a), b, c)\}.$$

In this section, when it is clear enough what the type $\pi(x; y, z)$ is, we will denote sets of the form $A_{\pi(x; y, z_i), a, a, a_i}$ as A_{π, a, a_i} .

We use relatively type-definable sets of the group $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ to prove the following:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $a \in \mathfrak{C}'$ and $(a_i)_{i < \omega} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}'$ be such such that $a_0 \equiv_a a_i$ for all $i < \omega$ and $a \models p \upharpoonright_{a < \omega}$. Let $\pi(x, y, z)$ be a partial type over the empty set such that for every $i < \omega$ the partial type $\pi(x, y, a_i)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$. Assume that there is a formula $\varphi(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ such that for every $i < \omega$*

$$\bigcap_{i \neq j} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_j) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{a < \omega}(\mathfrak{C}'))^2 \not\subseteq \varphi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_i).$$

Then, T has IP.

To prove this result, we need the following three observations on relatively type-definable subsets of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ of special kind.

Claim 3.3. *Let $a, (a_i)_{i < \omega}$, and $\pi(x, y, z)$ be as in Lemma 3.2, and let E_{a_i} be the equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$ defined by $\pi(x, y, a_i)$. Then, for all $i < \omega$,*

$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i}$ is the stabilizer of the class $[a]_{E_{a_i}}$ under the action of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i)$, and $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_{<\omega}) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i}$ is the stabilizer of the class $[a]_{E_{a_i}}$ under the action of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_{<\omega})$.

Proof. It is clear that $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i)$ preserves both $p \upharpoonright_{a_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$ and E_{a_i} .

Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i}$. By the definition of A_{π,a,a_i} , we have $\models \pi(\sigma(a), a, a_i)$. Hence, $\sigma(a) \in [a]_{E_{a_i}}$, and so $\sigma([a]_{E_{a_i}}) = [a]_{E_{a_i}}$. Thus, we have proved that

$$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i} \subseteq \text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i)}([a]_{E_{a_i}}).$$

Conversely, let $\sigma \in \text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i)}([a]_{E_{a_i}})$. This implies $\sigma(a) E_{a_i} a$. Hence, $\models \pi(\sigma(a), a, a_i)$, and so $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i}$. Thus,

$$\text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i)}([a]_{E_{a_i}}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i}.$$

The same proof works for $\text{Stab}_{\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_{<\omega})}([a]_{E_{a_i}})$. \square

Claim 3.4. *Let a, a_0 , and $\pi(x, y, z)$ be as in Lemma 3.2. Then, for each formula $\varphi(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ there is a formula $\theta(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ such that*

$$(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_0}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\theta,a,a_0}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_0}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\varphi,a,a_0}.$$

Proof. Let us consider the type $\pi'(x_1, x_2; y, z) := \pi(x_1, y, z) \cup \{x_2 = z\}$. Then,

$$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_0} = A_{\pi'(x_1,x_2;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0}.$$

Hence, by the previous claim, $A_{\pi'(x_1,x_2;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0}$ is a group, so it satisfies

$$A_{\pi'(x_1,x_2;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0}^3 = A_{\pi'(x_1,x_2;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0}.$$

For any formula $\varphi(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ we have

$$A_{\pi'(x_1,x_2;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0}^3 \subseteq A_{\varphi(x;y,z),a,a,a_0}.$$

Applying compactness ([HKP21, Corollary 4.8]), for each $\varphi(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ there is some $\theta(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ such that

$$A_{\pi'(x_1,x_2;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0} \cdot A_{\{x_2=z\} \wedge \theta(x_1;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0} \cdot A_{\pi'(x_1,x_2;y,z),aa_0,a,a_0} \subseteq A_{\varphi(x;y,z),a,a,a_0}.$$

Finally, since every automorphism on the left hand side belongs to $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0)$, we conclude that

$$(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_0}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\theta,a,a_0}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_0}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\varphi,a,a_0}.$$

\square

Claim 3.5. *Let $a, (a_i)_{i < \omega}$, and $\pi(x, y, z)$ be as in Lemma 3.2. Then, for any formulas $\varphi(x, y, z)$ and $\theta(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$, for every $i < \omega$:*

$$(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_0}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\theta,a,a_0}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_0}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) \cap A_{\varphi,a,a_0}$$

if and only if

$$(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\theta,a,a_i}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi,a,a_i}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\varphi,a,a_i}.$$

Proof. Let $\tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a)$ be such that $\tau(a_0) = a_i$. The conjugation by τ

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_0) &\rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/a_i) \\ \sigma &\mapsto \tau \sigma \tau^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

is a bijection whose inverse is the conjugation by τ^{-1} . Moreover,

$$\models \pi(\tau\sigma\tau^{-1}(a), a, a_i) \iff \models \pi(\sigma\tau^{-1}(a), a, a_0) \iff \models \pi(\sigma(a), a, a_0).$$

Analogous equivalences also hold for φ and for θ in place of π . Hence, the desired equivalence follows by applying the conjugation by τ . \square

We are now ready to prove Lemma 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Note that for all $i < \omega$, using automorphisms of \mathcal{C}' fixing $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$, we can reduce the condition

$$\bigcap_{j \neq i} \pi(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{C}', a_j) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{a_{< \omega}(\mathcal{C}')})^2 \not\subseteq \varphi(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{C}', a_i)$$

to

$$\bigcap_{j \neq i} \pi(\mathcal{C}', a, a_j) \cap p \upharpoonright_{a_{< \omega}(\mathcal{C}')} \not\subseteq \varphi(\mathcal{C}', a, a_i),$$

because, given a pair (c, d) witnessing the former condition, there exists some $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega})$ such that $\sigma(d) = a$, and then the pair $(\sigma(c), a)$ witnesses the latter condition. Moreover, using the same approach, one can see that the latter condition can be expressed using relatively type-definable subsets of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}')$ as

$$\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\bigwedge_{j \neq i} \pi(x; y, z_j), a, a, (a_j)_{j \neq i}} \not\subseteq A_{\varphi(x; y, z_i), a, a, a_i}.$$

For every $i < \omega$, choose some

$$\sigma_i \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\bigwedge_{j \neq i} \pi(x; y, z_j), a, a, (a_j)_{j \neq i}} \setminus A_{\varphi(x; y, z_i), a, a, a_i},$$

and let σ_I denote the composition $\prod_{i \in I} \sigma_i$, for any finite $I \subseteq \omega$.

By Claims 3.4 and 3.5, there is a formula $\theta(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ such that for all $i < \omega$

$$(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi, a, a_i}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\theta, a, a_i}) \cdot (\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\pi, a, a_i}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_i) \cap A_{\varphi, a, a_i}.$$

Claim. For any finite $I \subseteq \omega$

$$\models \theta(\sigma_I(a), a, a_i) \iff i \notin I.$$

Proof of claim. Firstly, take $i \notin I$. Then, for every $j \in I$, σ_j belongs to the set $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\pi, a, a_i}$. By Claim 3.3, the set $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\pi, a, a_i}$ is a group, and so we get $\sigma_I \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\pi, a, a_i}$. Hence, $\theta(\sigma_I(a), a, a_i)$ holds.

Now take $i \in I$ and write $I := I_0 \sqcup \{i\} \sqcup I_1$. For each $j \in I_0 \cup I_1$ we have $\sigma_j \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\pi, a, a_i}$. Then, $\theta(\sigma_I(a), a, a_i)$ does not hold. Otherwise,

$$\sigma_I = \sigma_{I_0} \sigma_i \sigma_{I_1} \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\theta, a, a_i},$$

which, by Claim 3.3 and the statement before the claim, implies

$$\sigma_i \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/a_{< \omega}) \cap A_{\varphi, a, a_i},$$

a contradiction with our choice of σ_i . \square

The formula θ witnesses that T has IP. \square

When we write (NIP) in the statement of a result, it means that we assume that the theory T has NIP.

Lemma 3.6 (NIP). *Let $p(x) \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ be an A -invariant type, let $\pi(x, y, z)$ be a partial type over the empty set, and let $a_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{C}'$ be such that $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$. Then, for any $(a_i)_{i < \lambda}$, where $\lambda \geq \beth_{(2^{(|a_0|+|x|+|T|+|A|)})^+}$, satisfying $a_i \equiv_A a_0$ for all $i < \lambda$, there exists $i < \lambda$ such that*

$$\bigcap_{j \neq i} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_j) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{a_{i < \lambda}}(\mathfrak{C}'))^2 \subseteq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_i).$$

Proof. Assume the conclusion does not hold. Then, for every $i < \lambda$

$$\bigcap_{j \neq i} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_j) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{a_{i < \lambda}}(\mathfrak{C}'))^2 \not\subseteq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_i).$$

Take pairs $(b_i, c_i)_{i < \lambda}$ witnessing it. Let $(a'_i, b'_i, c'_i)_{i < \omega} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}'$ be an A -indiscernible sequence obtained by extracting indiscernibles from the sequence $(a_i, b_i, c_i)_{i < \lambda}$ (see [BY03, Lemma 1.2]). Then, since p is A -invariant, for all $i < \omega$ the elements (a'_i, b'_i, c'_i) satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} (b'_i, c'_i) &\in \bigcap_{j \neq i} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a'_j) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{a'_{i < \omega}}(\mathfrak{C}'))^2; \\ (b'_i, c'_i) &\notin \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a'_i); \\ a'_i &\equiv_A a'_0 \equiv_A a_0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the indiscernibility of the sequence $(a'_i, b'_i, c'_i)_{i < \omega}$, there exists a formula $\varphi(x, y, z)$ implied by $\pi(x, y, z)$ such that for all $i < \omega$

$$(b'_i, c'_i) \notin \varphi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a'_i).$$

Take any $a \models p \upharpoonright_{a'_{i < \omega}}$. Since p is A -invariant, $a'_i \equiv_A a'_j$ implies $a'_i \equiv_a a'_j$. Moreover, since $a'_i \equiv_A a'_0 \equiv_A a_0$, $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$, and p is A -invariant, we get that $\pi(x, y, a'_i)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a'_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$ for all $i < \omega$.

Hence, the sequence $(a'_i)_{i < \omega}$ together with a , $\pi(x, y, z)$, and $\varphi(x, y, z)$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.2, and so we get IP, which is a contradiction. \square

Remark 3.7. *Let E and F be type-definable equivalence relations on a type-definable set X , where E is finer than F (i.e., $E \subseteq F$). We can define an equivalence relation F/E on X/E by: $[a]_E F/E [b]_E$ if and only if $a F b$.*

The next theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.8 (NIP). *Let $p(x) \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ be an A -invariant type. Assume that \mathfrak{C} is at least $\beth_{(2^{(|x|+|T|+|A|)})^+}$ -saturated. Then, there exists a finest equivalence relation E^{st} on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ relatively type definable over a small set of parameters from \mathfrak{C} and with stable quotient $p(\mathfrak{C}')/E^{st}$.*

Proof. Let $\nu := \beth_{(2^{(|x|+|T|+|A|)})^+}$.

Claim. *If for every countable partial type $\pi(x, y, z)$ over the empty set and countable tuple a_0 from \mathfrak{C} such that $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defines an equivalence relation E_{a_0} on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient there is no sequence $(a_i)_{i < \nu}$ of (countable) tuples a_i in \mathfrak{C} such that for all $i < \nu$ we have $a_i \equiv_A a_0$ and $\bigcap_{j < i} E_{a_j} \not\subseteq E_{a_i}$, then the theorem holds.*

Proof of claim. Consider an arbitrary collection $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ of relatively type-definable equivalence relations (over small subsets of \mathfrak{C}) on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient. Our goal is to prove that the intersection $\bigcap_{i \in I} E_i$ is a relatively type-definable over a small subset of \mathfrak{C} equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient.

Using Proposition 2.6, we can write each E_j as $\bigcap_{i \in I_j} F_j^i$, where each F_j^i is a countably defined relatively type-definable (over a countable subset of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$. Since the F_j^i 's are coarser than the corresponding E_j , each F_j^i also has stable quotient. We can now write

$$\bigcap_{j \in I} E_j = \bigcap_{j \in I} \bigcap_{i \in I_j} F_j^i.$$

Note that the number of possible countable types $\pi_j^i(x, y, z)$ over \emptyset associated to the F_j^i 's is bounded by $2^{|x|+|T|}$, and the set of types over A of the countable tuples of parameters used in the definitions of the F_j^i 's is bounded by $2^{|T|+|A|}$. Hence, by the assumptions of the claim, the intersection $\bigcap_{j \in I} E_j$ coincides with an intersection $\bigcap_{k \in K} F_{j_k}^{i_k}$, where $|K| \leq 2^{|T|+|A|} \times 2^{|T|+|x|} \times \nu = \nu$. In fact, since $2^{|T|+|A|+|x|}$ is strictly smaller than the cofinality of ν , we can even get $|K| < \nu$. Finally, by [HP18, Remark 1.4], $\bigcap_{k \in K} F_{j_k}^{i_k}$ is a relatively type-definable over a small subset of \mathfrak{C} (as \mathfrak{C} is ν -saturated) equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient. \square

Suppose the theorem fails. By the claim, there exists a countable type $\pi(x, y, z)$ over \emptyset and a countable tuple a_0 in \mathfrak{C} such that $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with $p(\mathfrak{C}') / \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_0) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2$ stable and there is $(a_i)_{i < \nu} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ such that for all $i < \nu$, $a_i \equiv_A a_0$ and $\bigcap_{j < i} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_j) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2 \not\subseteq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_i)$. By Proposition 2.6, enlarging a_0 , we can assume that a_0 enumerates an \aleph_0 -saturated model in L_A of size at most $2^{|T|+|A|}$ and $\pi(x, y, a_0)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$; by Lemma 2.5, this relation also yields stable quotient.

Let $(b_i, c_i)_{i < \nu}$ be a sequence witnessing that $\bigcap_{j < i} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_j) \cap p(\mathfrak{C}')^2 \not\subseteq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a_i)$. Let $(a'_i, b'_i, c'_i)_{i < \nu} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}'$ be an A -indiscernible sequence extracted from $(a_i, b_i, c_i)_{i < \nu}$. Then, since p is A -invariant, we get that for all $i < \nu$

$$(b'_i, c'_i) \in \left(\bigcap_{j < i} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a'_j) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{a'_{< \nu}}(\mathfrak{C}'))^2 \right) \setminus \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a'_i).$$

Moreover, since $a'_0 \equiv_A a_0$, we get that $\pi(x, y, a'_0)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{a'_0}(\mathfrak{C}')$, and we also have $a'_i \equiv_A a'_0$ for all $i < \nu$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.6, there exists some $\beta < \nu$ such that

$$(*) \quad \bigcap_{\alpha \neq \beta} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a'_\alpha) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{a'_{\alpha < \nu}}(\mathfrak{C}'))^2 \subseteq \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', a'_\beta).$$

In the sequence $(a'_i, b'_i, c'_i)_{i < \nu}$, let us insert a sequence $(d'_i, e'_i, f'_i)_{i < \omega}$ from \mathfrak{C}' in place of the element $(a'_\beta, b'_\beta, c'_\beta)$ so that the resulting sequence is still A -indiscernible. Then, since p is A -invariant, for all $i < \omega$

$$(**) \quad (e'_i, f'_i) \in \left(\bigcap_{j < i} \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', d'_j) \cap (p \upharpoonright_{\substack{a'_{\alpha < \nu}, d'_{< \omega} \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}(\mathfrak{C}'))^2 \right) \setminus \pi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', d'_i).$$

Hence, due to the A -indiscernibility of the sequence $(d'_i, e'_i, f'_i)_{i < \omega}$, there exists some formula φ implied by π such that for all $i < \omega$ we have $(e'_i, f'_i) \notin \varphi(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}', d'_i)$.

Moreover, since $d'_i \equiv_A a'_0 \equiv_A a_0$ and using the A -invariance of p , we get that $\pi(x, y, d'_i)$ defines an equivalence relation on $p \upharpoonright_{d'_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$.

Let us consider the set

$$X := p \upharpoonright_{\substack{\alpha < \nu \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}(\mathfrak{C}').$$

By the above choices and A -invariance of p , the type $\bigcap_{\substack{\alpha < \nu \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} \pi(x, y, a'_\alpha)$ defines an equivalence relation E on X with stable quotient, and the sequence $(d'_i, [e'_i]_E, [f'_i]_E)$ is indiscernible over

$$B := A \cup \{a'_\alpha : \alpha < \nu; \alpha \neq \beta\}.$$

Let E_i be the equivalence relation defined by $\pi(x, y, d'_i)$ on $p \upharpoonright_{\substack{\alpha < \nu \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}^{d'_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$ and $E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_i}}$ the restriction of E to $p \upharpoonright_{\substack{\alpha < \nu \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}^{d'_i}(\mathfrak{C}')$. By (**), the elements $[e'_i]_{E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_i}}}$ and $[f'_i]_{E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_i}}}$ are $E_j/E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_j}}$ -related for all $j < i$ (recall Remark 3.7, and note that $E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_j}} \subseteq E_j$ by (*)). This is coded in

$$\text{tp}((d'_j, [e'_i]_E, [f'_i]_E) / B).$$

Since X/E is stable, we know that

$$\text{tp}((d'_j, [e'_i]_E, [f'_i]_E) / B) = \text{tp}((d'_i, [e'_j]_E, [f'_j]_E) / B),$$

so we conclude that the elements $[e'_j]_{E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_i}}}$ and $[f'_j]_{E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_i}}}$ are $E_i/E \upharpoonright_{p_{d'_i}}$ -related for all $j < i$. Hence, the elements e'_j and f'_j are E_i -related for all $j < i$.

We have shown that the sequence (d'_i, e'_i, f'_i) satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi(e'_j, f'_j, d'_i) \text{ for all } i \neq j; i, j < \omega; \\ & \neg \varphi(e'_i, f'_i, d'_i) \text{ for all } i < \omega. \end{aligned}$$

Take any $a \models p \upharpoonright_{d'_{< \omega}}$. Since $d'_i \equiv_A d'_0$ for all $i < \omega$, we get that $d'_i \equiv_a d'_0$ for all $i < \omega$. Thus, the sequence $(d'_i)_{i < \omega}$ satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.2, and so we get IP, a contradiction. \square

We end this section with some comments on whether the large saturation condition in Theorem 3.8 is necessary or could be eliminated.

Note that in the above proof, in order to apply extracting indiscernibles to the sequence $(a_i, b_i, c_i)_{i < \lambda}$, we need to know that ν is at least $\beth_{(2^{2^{|T|+|A|+|x|+|T|+|A|})+}} = \beth_{(2^{2^{|T|+|A|+|x|})+}}$. On the other hand, the proof of the claim requires that any number smaller than ν is bounded in \mathfrak{C} . That is why the whole proof requires that \mathfrak{C} is at least $\beth_{(2^{2^{|T|+|A|+|x|})+}}$ -saturated. In the statement of the theorem, it is enough to assume that \mathfrak{C} is $\beth_{(2^{2^{|T|+|A|+|x|})+}}$ -saturated; we used a bigger degree of saturation, which is notationally more concise.

Although our proof uses essentially the assumption on the degree of saturation, one could still try to transfer the existence of the finest relatively definable equivalence relation from big models to their elementary substructures.

Let $\mathfrak{C} \prec \mathfrak{C}_1 \prec \mathfrak{C}'$ be such that \mathfrak{C}' is still a monster with respect to \mathfrak{C}_1 and let $p_1(x) \in S(\mathfrak{C}_1)$ be the unique A -invariant extension of $p(x)$.

While Corollary 2.8 allows us to transfer the existence of the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with stable quotient to the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}_1) equivalence relation on $p_1(\mathfrak{C}')$, in order to eliminate the specific saturation assumption in Theorem 3.8, we would need to have a transfer going in the other direction. In Corollary 2.9, we proved such a transfer but only under the additional assumption that the finest relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}_1) equivalence relation E on $p_1(\mathfrak{C}')$ is defined by type over a set of parameters of small size with respect to \mathfrak{C} . Therefore, the specific saturation assumption could be eliminated if we could answer positively the following question.

Question 3.9. *In the context of Theorem 3.8, is E^{st} always relatively type-definable over A ?*

In the examples studied in the next section, this turns out to be true. Also, in the context of type-definable groups studied in [HP18], G^{st} is type-definable over the parameters over which G is type-definable.

4. EXAMPLES

We present two examples where E^{st} is computed explicitly, the second example is based on [KP22, Setcion 4]. In fact, in both examples, we give full classifications of all relatively type-definable (over small subsets of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relations on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$, for suitably chosen $p \in S(\mathfrak{C})$.

Example 1. Let our language be $L := \{R_r(x, y), f_s(x) : r \in \mathbb{Q}^+, s \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ and T be the theory of $(\mathbb{R}, R_r, f_s)_{r \in \mathbb{Q}^+, s \in \mathbb{Q}}$, where $f_s(x) := x + s$ and $R_r(x, y)$ holds if and only if $0 \leq y - x \leq r$.

We define the directed distance between two points as a function

$$d : \mathfrak{C} \times \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{Q}_+ \cup \mathbb{Q}_- \cup \{\infty\}$$

satisfying

$$d(x, y) = q \in \mathbb{Q} \iff y = f_q(x);$$

$$d(x, y) = r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \mathbb{Q} \iff \forall s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \text{ such that } s_1 < r < s_2, \neg R_{s_1}(x, y) \wedge R_{s_2}(x, y);$$

$$d(x, y) = q_+ \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \iff y \neq f_{q_+}(x) \text{ is infinitely close to } f_{q_+}(x) \text{ on the right;}$$

$$d(x, y) = q_- \in \mathbb{Q}_- \iff y \neq f_{q_-}(x) \text{ is infinitely close to } f_{q_-}(x) \text{ on the left;}$$

$$d(x, y) = \infty \iff \neg(R_s(x, y) \vee R_s(y, x)) \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{Q}^+.$$

We complete the definition of d extending it symmetrically in the negative irrational case.

Lemma 4.1. *Properties of the distance:*

- (1) $d(a, f_q(b)) = q + d(a, b)$ and $d(f_q(a), b) = -q + d(a, b)$;
- (2) For any distinct real numbers r_1, r_2 , if $d(a, b) = r_1$ and $d(a, c) = r_2$, then $d(b, c) = r_2 - r_1$;
- (3) For any irrational r , if $d(a, b) = r$ and $d(b, c) = 0_\pm$, then $d(a, c) = r$;
- (4) For any irrational r , if $d(a, b) = r = d(a, c)$, then $d(b, c) = 0_\pm$.

Proof. (1) follows from the definition of the distance.

(2) Since the rational case is covered in (1), we can assume that r_1, r_2 are irrationals. Consider the case $0 < r_1 < r_2$; other cases are similar. Let q be any

rational bigger than $r_2 - r_1$. We can write q as $q_2 - q_1$, where q_1, q_2 are rationals, $q_1 > r_1$, $q_2 > r_2$, and $q_2 > q_1$. Since $R_{q_1}(a, b)$ and $R_{q_2}(a, c)$ hold, so does $R_{q_2 - q_1}(b, c)$. Hence, $d(b, c) \leq q$. Let now q be any positive rational smaller than $r_2 - r_1$. We can write q as $q_2 - q_1$, where q_1, q_2 are rationals, $q_1 > r_1$, $q_2 < r_2$, and $q_2 > q_1$. Since $R_{q_1}(a, b)$ holds, $R_{q_2 - q_1}(b, c)$ cannot hold; otherwise, $R_{q_2}(a, c)$ would hold, contradicting $d(a, c) = r_2$. Hence, $d(b, c) \geq q$.

(3) Consider the case $r > 0$ and $d(b, c) = 0_+$; the other cases are analogous. Let q be any rational bigger than r . We can write q as $q_1 + q_2$, where q_1, q_2 are rationals, $q_1 > r$, and $q_2 > 0$. Then, $R_{q_1}(a, b)$ and $R_{q_2}(b, c)$ hold, hence, so does $R_{q_1 + q_2}(a, c)$. This implies that $d(a, c) \leq q$. Let now q be any positive rational smaller than r . Then, $R_q(a, c)$ cannot hold; otherwise it would imply $R_q(a, b)$, a contradiction.

(4) Consider the case $r > 0$; the other case is similar. Consider any rationals q_1, q_2 satisfying $0 < q_1 < r < q_2$. Then, $R_{q_2 - q_1}(f_{q_1}(a), b) \wedge R_{q_2 - q_1}(f_{q_1}(a), c)$ holds, which imply $R_{q_2 - q_1}(b, c) \vee R_{q_2 - q_1}(c, b)$. Since q_2 and q_1 were arbitrary, this means that b and c are infinitesimally close. \square

It is clear that the distance determines the quantifier-free type of a pair (a, b) . Since our language only contains unary and binary symbols, the collection of distances between elements of a given n -tuple determines its quantifier-free type.

Proposition 4.2. *The theory T has NIP and quantifier elimination.*

Proof. T has NIP, because it is a reduct of an o-minimal theory.

We prove quantifier elimination using a back and forth argument. Let \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} be two \aleph_0 -saturated models of T and let (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) be tuples of elements of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} , respectively, satisfying the same quantifier free type. Choose a new element $a_{n+1} \in \mathcal{M}$. There are three cases:

- (1) a_{n+1} is infinitely far from a_1, \dots, a_n ;
- (2) $a_{n+1} = f_q(a_i)$ for some $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- (3) a_{n+1} is related (i.e., at finite distance) to some of the a_i 's but is not equal to $f_q(a_i)$ for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$.

In the first two cases, by \aleph_0 -saturation, we can clearly choose $b_{n+1} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) have the same quantifier-free type. Now, let us tackle the third case.

In the third case, by removing the elements of the sequence (a_1, \dots, a_n) which are at infinite distance from a_{n+1} as well as the corresponding elements of the sequence (b_1, \dots, b_n) , we may assume that no a_i is infinitely far from a_{n+1} . Note also that for each $i < n$ there is at most one $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $f_{q_i}(a_i)$ is infinitesimally close to a_{n+1} . Let A be the set of all such $f_{q_i}(a_i)$'s.

First, consider the case when $A \neq \emptyset$. Note that A is totally ordered (for example, by the relation $R_1(x, y)$). Let $B := \{f_{q_i}(b_i) : f_{q_i}(a_i) \in A\}$. Then, there exists b_{n+1} with the same distances to the elements in B as a_{n+1} to the corresponding elements in A . By Lemma 4.1,

$$\text{tp}^{\text{qf}}(b_1, \dots, b_n, b_{n+1}) = \text{tp}^{\text{qf}}(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1}).$$

In the case when $A = \emptyset$, $d(a_i, a_{n+1})$ is irrational for every $i \leq n$. Pick b_{n+1} so that $d(b_1, b_{n+1}) = d(a_1, a_{n+1})$. Since $A = \emptyset$, by Lemma 4.1(4), we get that $d(a_1, a_{n+1}) \neq d(a_1, a_i)$ for all $1 < i \leq n$. Hence, Lemma 4.1(2) implies that

$$\text{tp}^{\text{qf}}(b_1, \dots, b_n, b_{n+1}) = \text{tp}^{\text{qf}}(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1}). \quad \square$$

Let $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}'$ be monster models of T , where \mathfrak{C}' is also a monster model with respect to \mathfrak{C} , and let $p \in S_x(\mathfrak{C})$ be the complete global type determined by

$$\bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \bigwedge_{n \in \omega} (\neg R_n(x, c) \wedge \neg R_n(c, x)).$$

We denote by $E(x, y)$ the equivalence relation on \mathfrak{C}' defined by

$$\bigwedge_{r \in \mathbb{Q}^+} (R_r(x, y) \vee R_r(y, x))$$

and by $E \upharpoonright_p$ the equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ defined by the same partial type.

Lemma 4.3. *The hyperdefinable set $\mathfrak{C}'/E(\mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}')$ is stable.*

Proof. By [KP22, Theorem 2.10], it is enough to prove that for any $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}'$ with $|A| \leq \mathfrak{c}$ we have $|S_{\mathfrak{C}'/E}(A)| \leq \mathfrak{c}$.

Clearly, the elements c and c' are in the same E -class if and only if $c = c'$ or $d(c, c') = 0_{\pm}$. Note that whenever $d(c, a) = d(c', a) \neq \infty$, then cEc' . Therefore, specifying the distance $d(c, a) \neq \infty$ from c to a given element $a \in A$ determines the class $[c]_E$. On the other hand, by q.e., the condition saying that $d(c, a) = \infty$ for all $a \in A$ determines $\text{tp}(c/A)$. Therefore, $|S_{\mathfrak{C}'/E}(A)| \leq \mathfrak{c} \times \mathfrak{c} + 1 = \mathfrak{c}$. \square

Proposition 4.4. *The only equivalence relations on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ relatively type-definable over a small subset of \mathfrak{C} are equality, $E \upharpoonright_p$, and the total equivalence relation.*

Proof. Let $F(x, y)$ be any equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ relatively type-definable over a small subset of \mathfrak{C} . Let $S_n(x, y) := R_n(x, y) \vee R_n(y, x)$. There are two cases.

Case 1: $\exists a, b \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that aFb and $\models \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \neg S_n(a, b)$. For any $c, d \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ we can find $e \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that $\models \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \neg S_n(c, e) \wedge \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \neg S_n(d, e)$. Hence, by q.e.,

$$(d, e) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (a, b) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (c, e).$$

As F is \mathfrak{C} -invariant, we conclude that cFd . This implies that F is the total relation.

Case 2: $\forall a, b \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ if aFb , then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\models S_n(a, b)$.

First, we show that aFb implies $aE \upharpoonright_p b$. Assume that it is not the case. Then there exists $m \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ such that aFb and $\neg S_m(a, b)$. On the other hand, $S_n(a, b)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $a \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} b$, there is $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/\mathfrak{C})$ satisfying $\sigma(a) = b$. Let $b_i := \sigma^i(a)$ for $i < \omega$. Clearly,

$$(a, b) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (b, b_2) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (b_2, b_3) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} \dots$$

We deduce that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, aFb_k and $\models \neg S_{km}(a, b_k)$. Hence, by compactness, there exists $b' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that aFb' and $\models \neg S_n(a, b')$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, contradicting the hypothesis of the second case.

Finally, if F is not equality, there exist elements $a \neq b \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that aFb , and so $aE \upharpoonright_p b$ by the last paragraph. Take any distinct $c, d \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ satisfying $cE \upharpoonright_p d$. Then, by q.e., either $(a, b) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (c, d)$ or $(a, b) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (d, c)$. Both cases imply cFd , which means that F and $E \upharpoonright_p$ are the same equivalence relation. \square

Since $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ is not stable, we obtain the following:

Corollary 4.5. *The equivalence relation $E \upharpoonright_p$ is the finest equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ relatively type definable over a small set of parameters from \mathfrak{C} and with stable quotient, that is $E^{st} = E \upharpoonright_p$.*

Example 2. This example is based on [KP22, Section 4]. We work in the language $L := \{+, -, 1, R_r(x, y) : r \in \mathbb{Q}^+\}$ and our theory is $\text{Th}((\mathbb{R}, +, -, 1, R_r(x, y))_{r \in \mathbb{Q}^+})$.

The next result was proven in [KP22, Proposition 4.1, Proposition 4.8].

Fact 4.6. *The theory T has NIP and quantifier elimination.*

As in the previous example, let $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}'$ be monster models of T , where \mathfrak{C}' is also a monster model with respect to \mathfrak{C} , and let $p \in S_x(\mathfrak{C})$ be the complete global type determined by

$$\{\neg R_r(x, c) \wedge \neg R_r(c, x) : c \in \mathfrak{C}, r \in \mathbb{Q}^+\}.$$

Without loss of generality, for convenience we can assume that \mathfrak{C}' is a reduct of a monster model of $\text{Th}(\mathbb{R}, +, -, 1, \leq)$. So it makes sense to use \leq .

As in the previous example, let $S_r(x, y) := R_r(x, y) \vee R_r(y, x)$. We say that x, y are *related* if $S_r(x, y)$ holds for some $r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$.

We denote by $E(x, y)$ the equivalence relation on \mathfrak{C}' defined by

$$\bigwedge_{r \in \mathbb{Q}^+} S_r(x, y),$$

and by $E \upharpoonright_p$ the equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ defined by the same partial type. In other words, this is the relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ of lying in the same coset modulo the subgroup of all infinitesimals in \mathfrak{C}' which will be denoted by μ .

Another possible relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathfrak{C}) equivalence relations on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ are as follows. Take any $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. Let E_c be the equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with classes $\{a, -a + c\}$, where a ranges over $p(\mathfrak{C}')$. It is clear that this is an equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ defined by a type over c . We also have the equivalence relation E_c^μ with classes $(a + \mu) \cup (-a + c + \mu)$, where a ranges over $p(\mathfrak{C}')$, which is also defined by a type over c .

For any non-empty small set A of positive infinitesimals in \mathfrak{C} we will consider the equivalence relation E_A on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ given as

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} |x - y| \leq \frac{1}{n} a.$$

Note that this relation is relatively type-definable over A on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ in the original language L by the following condition

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} R_1(n(x - y), a) \wedge R_1(n(y - x), a).$$

One can also combine the above examples to produce one more class of equivalence relations on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$. Take any $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ and any non-empty small set A of positive infinitesimals in \mathfrak{C} . Let μ_A be the infinitesimals in \mathfrak{C}' defined by

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A} \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} |x| \leq \frac{1}{n} a.$$

Then we have the equivalence relation $E_{A,c}$ on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with classes

$$(a + \mu_A) \cup (-a + c + \mu_A),$$

which is clearly defined on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ by a type over Ac .

Theorem 4.7. *The only equivalence relations on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ relatively type-definable over a small subset of \mathfrak{C} are: the total equivalence relation, equality, $E \upharpoonright_p$, the relations of the form E_c or E_c^μ (where $c \in \mathfrak{C}$), and the relations of the form E_A or $E_{A,c}$ for any non-empty small set A of positive infinitesimals in \mathfrak{C} and any $c \in \mathfrak{C}$.*

In the proof below, by a non-trivial term $t(x, y)$ (in the language L) we mean an expression $nx + my + k$, where $m, n, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \neq 0$ or $n \neq 0$.

Proof. Let $F(x, y)$ be an arbitrary equivalence relation on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$ relatively type-definable over a small subset of \mathfrak{C} .

Claim. *Either F is the total equivalence relation, or F is finer than E_c^μ (i.e., $F \subseteq E_c^\mu$) for some $c \in \mathfrak{C}$.*

Proof of Claim. We consider two cases.

Case 1: $\exists a, b \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that aFb and $\models \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \neg S_n(t(a, b), c)$ for all non-trivial terms $t(x, y)$. Take any $a', b' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$. We can find $d' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that $\models \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \neg S_n(t(a', d'), c)$ and $\models \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \neg S_n(t(b', d'), c)$ for all non-trivial terms $t(x, y)$. Then, by q.e., $(a', d') \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (a, b) \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} (b', d')$. Since F is \mathfrak{C} -invariant, we conclude that $a'Fb'$, hence F is the total equivalence relation.

Case 2: $\forall a, b \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ if aFb , then there are $n \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, and a non-trivial term $t(x, y)$ such that $\models S_n(t(a, b), c)$. Suppose that for every $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, F is not finer than E_c^μ . We will reach a contradiction, but this will require quite a bit of work.

First, we claim that there $a, b \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that

$$(*) \quad aFb \text{ and } \models \bigwedge_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \neg S_q(a, b) \text{ and } \models \bigwedge_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \neg S_q(a, -b + c).$$

To show it, notice that since F is not contained in any E_c^μ , either we get a pair $(a, b) \in F$ satisfying the above condition, or such that $S_m(a, b)$ and $\neg S_n(a, b)$ for some positive rationals n, m , or we get two pairs $(a, b), (a', b') \in F$ and elements $c, c' \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $c - c' \notin \mu$ and $a + b - c \in \mu$ and $a' + b' - c' \in \mu$. In this third case, applying an automorphism of \mathfrak{C}' over \mathfrak{C} mapping a' to a , we may assume that $a' = a$, and so we get $F(b, b')$ and $b - b' \in c - c' + \mu$. Then $b + b' \in 2b' + c - c' + \mu$ is not related to any element of \mathfrak{C} (as $2b'$ is not related), so $\models \bigwedge_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \bigwedge_{c' \in \mathfrak{C}} \neg S_q(b, -b' + c')$, and either $\models \bigwedge_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \neg S_q(b, b')$ (so we are done), or there are positive rationals m, n such that $S_m(b, b')$ and $\neg S_n(b, b')$. In this way, the whole third case reduces to the second one, i.e. we have a pair $(a, b) \in F$ with $S_m(a, b)$ and $\neg S_n(a, b)$ for some positive rationals n, m .

Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/\mathfrak{C})$ be such that $\sigma(a) = b =: b_1$. We produce an infinite sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} a & & b_1 & & b_2 & & \cdots \\ & \searrow & \nearrow & \searrow & \nearrow & \searrow & \\ & \sigma & & \sigma & & \sigma & \end{array}$$

Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, aFb_k and $\models S_{km}(a, b_k)$ and $\models \neg S_{kn}(a, b_k)$. Since $\models S_{km}(a, b_k)$ and b_k is not related to anything in \mathfrak{C} , we get $\bigwedge_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \neg S_q(a, -b_k + c)$. As we can use arbitrarily large k , the desired b (i.e., such that (a, b) satisfies $(*)$) exists by compactness (or rather $|\mathfrak{C}'|^+$ -saturation of \mathfrak{C}').

We will show now that there is $b' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that

$$(**) \quad aFb' \text{ and } \models \bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \bigwedge_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \neg S_q(a - b', c) \wedge \neg S_q(a + b', c).$$

Namely, either $b' := b$ already satisfies it, or $a - b$ is related to some infinite $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. In the latter case, $a - b$ is related precisely to the elements from the set $c + \mathbb{R} + \mu$.

Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/\mathfrak{C})$ be such that $\sigma(a) = b =: b_1$. We get

$$a \xrightarrow{\sigma} b_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma} b_2 \xrightarrow{\sigma} \dots$$

Then aFb_k , and one easily checks that $a - b_k$ is related precisely to the elements from the set $kc + \mathbb{R} + \mu$, and so $a + b_k$ is not related to anything in \mathfrak{C} . Since c is infinite, the sets $kc + \mathbb{R} + \mu$ are pairwise disjoint for different k 's, and so we find the desired b' using compactness (or rather $|\mathfrak{C}|^+$ -saturation of \mathfrak{C}').

Since we are working in a divisible group, we can replace the terms $t(x, y)$ in the statement of Case 2 by expressions $t_q(x, y) := x - qy$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ or $t_q(x, y) := qy$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$.

Note that for $t_z(x, y) := x - zy$ and $d \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$, there exists at most one rational q such that

$$S_n(t_q(a, d), c)$$

holds for some $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. For if there existed $q \neq q' \in \mathbb{Q}$, $n, n' \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, and $c, c' \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $S_n(t_q(a, d), c)$ and $S_{n'}(t_{q'}(a, d), c')$, then $(q - q')d$ would be related to some element of \mathfrak{C} . Hence, so would be d , a contradiction with $d \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$. This also shows that for every $q \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$, qd is not related to anything in \mathfrak{C} .

We will show now that there exists $b'' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that

$$aFb'' \text{ and } \models \bigwedge_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{Q}^+} \bigwedge_{c \in \mathfrak{C}} \neg S_n(t_q(a, d), c),$$

where $t_z(x, y) := x - zy$, contradicting the assumption of Case 2.

Namely, either $d := b'$ does the job, or there are $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $n \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, and $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $S_n(t_q(a, b'), c)$. By the choice of a and b' satisfying (**), we have that $q \notin \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

Again, let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/\mathfrak{C})$ be such that $\sigma(a) = b' =: b'_1$. We get

$$a \xrightarrow{\sigma} b'_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma} b'_2 \xrightarrow{\sigma} \dots$$

Then aFb'_k for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$. On the other hand, applying powers of σ , we easily conclude that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $t_{q^k}(a, b'_k)$ is related to some element of \mathfrak{C} . Hence, by an observation above, we get that for all rationals $r \neq q^k$, $t_r(a, b'_k)$ is not related to anything in \mathfrak{C} . Since $q \notin \{-1, 0, 1\}$, we know that q, q^2, \dots are pairwise distinct. So the desired b'' exists by compactness. \square

Claim. $F \cap E \upharpoonright p$ is either equality, or $E \upharpoonright p$, or E_A for some non-empty small set A of positive infinitesimals in \mathfrak{C} .

Proof of Claim. We may assume that $F \subseteq E \upharpoonright p$, and just work with F . Let B be a small dcl-closed subset of \mathfrak{C} over which F is relatively defined on $p(\mathfrak{C}')$. Extending the notation from before the statement of Theorem 4.7, for any $B' \subseteq B$ put

$$E_{B'} := \{(x, y) \in p(\mathfrak{C}')^2 : \bigwedge_{b \in B'^+} \bigwedge_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} |y - x| \leq \frac{1}{n}b\},$$

where $B'^+ := \{b \in B' : b > 0\}$. Let $A := \bigcup\{B' \subseteq B : F \subseteq E_{B'}\}$. Then

$$F \subseteq \bigcap\{E_{B'} : B' \subseteq B \text{ such that } F \subseteq E_{B'}\} = E_A,$$

and, as $F \subseteq E \upharpoonright p$, we have that $1 \in A$.

We will show that either F is equality, or $F = E_A$. This will clearly complete the proof of the claim (note that if A does not contain any positive infinitesimals, then $E_A = E \upharpoonright p$). Suppose E is not the equality. It remains to show that $F \supseteq E_A$.

Case 1: $A = B$. Pick any distinct $\alpha, \beta \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that $\alpha F \beta$. Then

$$\bigwedge_{a \in A^+} |\alpha - \beta| \leq a.$$

Consider any $\alpha', \beta' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ with $\alpha' E_A \beta'$. Then either $\alpha' = \beta'$ (and so $\alpha' F \beta'$), or $\bigwedge_{a \in A^+} 0 < |\beta' - \alpha'| \leq a$. In the latter case, it remains to show that $\alpha \beta \equiv_A \alpha' \beta'$ or $\alpha \beta \equiv_A \beta' \alpha'$ (as then $\alpha' F \beta'$, since F is relatively type-definable over A). Without loss of generality, $\beta > \alpha$ and $\beta' > \alpha'$; equivalently, $R_1(\alpha, \beta)$ and $R_1(\alpha', \beta')$ both hold. Since $\alpha \equiv_{\mathfrak{C}} \alpha'$, we can assume that $\alpha = \alpha'$. It suffices to show that

$$\{0 < t - \alpha \leq a : a \in A^+\}$$

determines a complete type over $\text{dcl}(A, \alpha)$. By the o-minimality of $(\mathbb{R}, +, -, 1, \leq)$, this boils down to showing that there is no $b \in \text{dcl}^*(A, \alpha)$ with $\bigwedge_{a \in A^+} \alpha < b \leq \alpha + a$, where dcl^* is computed in the language $\{+, -, 1, \leq\}$. If there was such a b , then, by q.e. for the theory of divisible ordered abelian groups, it would be of the form $\gamma + q\alpha$ for some $\gamma \in A$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, and we would have $\bigwedge_{a \in A^+} 0 < \gamma + (q-1)\alpha \leq a$. If $q = 1$, we get $0 < \gamma < \gamma$, a contradiction. If $q \neq 1$, we get that α is related to an element of A which contradicts the fact that $\alpha \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$.

Case 2: $A \subsetneq B$. Then we can find $b \in B^+$ such that $\bigwedge_{a \in A^+} b < a$. Consider any such b . Then, $F(x, y)$ holds for some $x, y \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that $y - x > \frac{1}{n}b$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Indeed, otherwise $F \subseteq E_{A \cup \{b\}} \subsetneq E_A$, which contradicts the minimality of E_A (note that $E_{A \cup \{b\}} \subsetneq E_A$ is witnessed by $(c, c+b)$ for any $c \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$, as A is closed under taking fractions).

Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'/\mathfrak{C})$ be such that $\sigma(x) = y =: y_1$. We get

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} a & & y_1 & & y_2 & & \cdots \\ & \searrow & \nearrow & \searrow & \nearrow & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & \sigma & & \sigma & & \sigma & & \end{array}$$

We easily conclude that $F(x, y_k)$ and $y_k - x > \frac{k}{n}b$ for all k ; in particular, $y_n - x > b$. By compactness (or rather $|\mathfrak{C}'|^+$ -saturation of \mathfrak{C}'), there exist $x', y' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ such that $F(x', y')$ and:

- (1) $\bigwedge_{a \in A^+} 0 < y' - x' < a$;
- (2) $\bigwedge_{b \in B^+}$ (if $\bigwedge_{a \in A^+} b < a$, then $b < y' - x'$).

We will check now that whenever $x'', y'' \in p(\mathfrak{C}')$ satisfy (1) and (2), then $x'y' \equiv_B x''y''$. For that, without loss of generality, we can assume that $x' = x''$. It remains to show that the partial type

$$\pi(t) := \{0 < t - x' < a : a \in A^+\} \cup \{b < t - x' : b \in B^+ \text{ such that } \bigwedge_{a \in A^+} b < a\}$$

determines a complete type over $\text{dcl}(B, x')$. By the o-minimality of $(\mathbb{R}, +, -, 1, \leq)$, this boils down to showing that there is no $c \in \text{dcl}^*(B, x')$ realizing $\pi(t)$, where dcl^* is computed in the language $\{+, -, 1, \leq\}$. If there was such a c , then, by q.e. for

the theory of divisible ordered abelian groups, it would be of the form $\beta + qx'$ for some $\beta \in B$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, so

$$0 < \beta + (q-1)x' < A^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \bigwedge_{b \in B^+} (\text{if } b < A^+, \text{ then } b < \beta + (q-1)x').$$

If $q = 1$, then $0 < \beta < A^+$, so $\beta < \beta$, a contradiction. If $q \neq 1$, then x' is related to an element of B , which contradicts the fact that $x' \in p(\mathcal{C}')$.

Finally, consider any $(\alpha, \beta) \in E_A$, say with $\beta > \alpha$. Applying $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}'/\mathcal{C})$ mapping y' to α , we obtain $\gamma := \sigma(x')$ such that the pair (γ, α) satisfies (1) and (2). Since $0 < \beta - \alpha < A^+$ and A is closed under taking fractions, the pair (γ, β) also satisfies (1) and (2). Therefore, $\gamma\alpha \equiv_B x'y' \equiv_B \gamma\beta$. As $x'Fy'$, we conclude that $\alpha F\beta$, which completes the proof of the claim. \square

The above two claims easily imply the classification given in the theorem. \square

Corollary 4.8. *The equivalence relation $E \upharpoonright_p$ is the finest equivalence relation on $p(\mathcal{C}')$ relatively type-definable over a small set of parameters of \mathcal{C} and with stable quotient, that is $E^{st} = E \upharpoonright_p$*

Proof. The quotient $p(\mathcal{C}')/E \upharpoonright_p$ is stable by [KP22, Proposition 4.9]. Let F be a relatively type-definable (over a small subset of \mathcal{C}) equivalence relation on $p(\mathcal{C}')$ strictly finer than $E \upharpoonright_p$. By Theorem 4.7, $F = E_A$ for some non-empty small set A of positive infinitesimals in \mathcal{C} . One easily concludes that for every $a, d, e \in p(\mathcal{C}')$ and infinitesimal $c \in \mathcal{C}'$ bigger than all infinitesimals in \mathcal{C} such that dFa and $eF(a+c)$ we have $d < e$, and so $\neg R_1(e, d)$.

Take any $a \in p(\mathcal{C}')$ and infinitesimal $c \in \mathcal{C}'$ bigger than all infinitesimals in \mathcal{C} . Using Ramsey's theorem and compactness, we extract a \mathcal{C} -indiscernible sequence $(a'_i)_{i < \omega}$ from the sequence $(a + kc)_{k < \omega}$. Then, the sequence $([a'_i]_F)_{i < \omega}$ is \mathcal{C} -indiscernible but not totally \mathcal{C} -indiscernible, since the formula $R_1(x, y)$ witnesses that

$$\text{tp}([a'_i]_F, [a'_{i+1}]_F/\mathcal{C}) \neq \text{tp}([a'_{i+1}]_F, [a'_i]_F/\mathcal{C}).$$


Thus, $p(\mathcal{C}')/F$ is unstable by virtue of [KP22, Theorem 2.10]. \square

REFERENCES

- [BY03] Itay Ben-Yaacov. "Simplicity in compact abstract theories". In: *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 03.02 (2003), pp. 163–191. DOI: 10.1142/S0219061303000297. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219061303000297>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219061303000297>.
- [HKP21] Ehud Hrushovski, Krzysztof Krupiński, and Anand Pillay. *On first order amenability*. 2021. arXiv: 2004.08306 [math.LO].
- [HP18] Mike Haskel and Anand Pillay. "On maximal stable quotients of definable groups in NIP theories". In: *J. Symb. Log.* 83.1 (2018), pp. 117–122. ISSN: 0022-4812. DOI: 10.1017/jsl.2017.26. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2017.26>.
- [KNS19] Krzysztof Krupiński, Ludomir Newelski, and Pierre Simon. "Boundeness and absoluteness of some dynamical invariants in model theory". In: *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 19.02 (2019), p. 1950012. DOI: 10.1142/S0219061319500120. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219061319500120>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219061319500120>.

- [KP22] Krzysztof Krupiński and Adrián Portillo. “On Stable Quotients”. In: *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 63.3 (2022), pp. 373–394. DOI: 10.1215/00294527-2022-0023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1215/00294527-2022-0023>.
- [KPR18] Krzysztof Krupiński, Anand Pillay, and Tomasz Rzepecki. “Topological dynamics and the complexity of strong types”. In: *Israel J. Math.* 228 (2018), pp. 863–932. DOI: 10.1007/s11856-018-1780-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11856-018-1780-3>.
- [OP07] Alf Onshuus and Ya’acov Peterzil. “A note on stable sets, groups, and theories with NIP”. In: *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 53.3 (2007), pp. 295–300. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.200610046>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/malq.200610046>.

INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY UNIwersYTETU WROCLAWSKIEGO, PL. GRUNWALDZKI 2, 50-384
WROCLAW, POLAND

KRZYSZTOF KRUPIŃSKI  [HTTPS://ORCID.ORG/0000-0002-2243-4411](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2243-4411)

Email address: Krzysztof.Krupinski@math.uni.wroc.pl

ADRIÁN PORTILLO  [HTTPS://ORCID.ORG/0000-0001-9354-8574](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9354-8574)

Email address: Adrian.Portillo-Fernandez@math.uni.wroc.pl