

CAYLEY'S THEOREM FOR ORDERED GROUPS: O-MINIMALITY

August 10, 2006

BEKTUR BAIZHANOV
INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATICS AND CONTROL PROBLEMS
ALMATY, KAZAKHSTAN

JOHN T. BALDWIN
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO

VIKTOR VERBOVSKIY
INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATICS AND CONTROL PROBLEMS
ALMATY, KAZAKHSTAN

It has long been known [4] that any group could be represented in a strongly minimal theory by just writing down the relations of the group as unary functions. We show the same process works for ordered groups and yields an o-minimal group. Baizanhov showed:

Fact 1. *If M is an o-minimal structure and $p \in S(A)$ is non-algebraic then there is an ordered group of unary definable functions defined on the realizations of p .*

He asked,

Question 2. *What ordered groups can be realized in this manner?*

We show

Theorem 3. *If G is a linearly ordered group, then G can be represented as the collection of definable unary functions acting on a complete type in an o-minimal structure.*

Proof of Fact 1. This follows from a short analysis of p -stable formulas [1]. A 2-ary formula, $\phi(x, y)$, over A is p -stable if for some (equivalently for every) realization $\alpha \in p(M)$ there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in p(M)$ such that $\gamma_1 < \phi(M, \alpha) < \gamma_2$. (In particular, $x = y$ is such a 2-formula.)

By o-minimality, $\phi(M, \alpha)$, can be written as a finite number of $L(A\alpha)$ -definable intervals and points. Thus each p -stable formula determines a finite number of functions: f_i maps α to the i th point in a linear ordering of the end points of these intervals. Let f be such function. The image $f(\alpha)$ and pre-image $f^{-1}(\alpha)$ of an arbitrary element $\alpha \in p(M)$ belong to $p(M)$. We can define f^{-1} , because

Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0100594 and CDRF grant KZM1-2620.

models of an o-minimal theory satisfy the algebraic exchange principle [2]. So f is a bijection on $p(M)$.

Classical work in o-minimality ([2], [3]) shows every function on an o-minimal model has only a finite number of singular points, where the function changes its monotonicity (e.g. from increasing to decreasing), and all such points are A -definable. Consequently, these points do not satisfy the non-algebraic one-type $p \in S_1(A)$. So, f is strictly monotone on some interval I_f , $p(M) \subseteq I_f$. It can not be constant, because $p \in S_1(A)$ is non-algebraic.

In fact, we will show that any such f is strictly increasing. Note that for any f either $\alpha < f(\alpha)$ or $\alpha < f^{-1}(\alpha)$. Suppose $\alpha < f(\alpha)$. Let $\beta = f(\alpha)$, $\gamma = f(\beta)$. We have $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$, because $\models \forall x(x \in I_f \rightarrow x < f(x))$. So we have f is strictly increasing, and because $\alpha = f^{-1}(\beta) < f^{-1}(\gamma) = \beta$, f^{-1} is strictly increasing too. *Mutatis Mutandis*, we handle the case that $\alpha < f^{-1}(\alpha)$.

Let $G_{p,A}$ be set of all $L(A)$ -definable bijections on $p(M)$; this is a group of actions under composition. Define the order ($<^1$) on this group: for every pair $f, g \in G_{p,A}$, $f <^1 g$, if for some $\alpha \in p(M)$, $f(\alpha) < g(\alpha)$. It is straightforward to show this notion is well-defined and the group is ordered in the sense described in Definition 4. \square_1

The proof of Theorem 3 consists of two steps.

- (1) Observe that any ordered group can be represented as $|G|$ unary functions acting on itself.
- (2) Show that the theory of $(G, <, t_g)_{g \in G}$ just defined admits quantifier elimination and is therefore 0-minimal

Recall:

Definition 4. $(G, \cdot, <)$ is an (linearly) ordered group if

- (1) (G, \cdot) is a group;
- (2) $<$ linearly orders G ;
- (3) (left order) if $g_1 < g_2$ then $hg_1 < hg_2$;
- (4) (right order) if $g_1 < g_2$ then $g_1h < g_2h$;
- (5) if $g < 1$ then for any x , $gx < x$;
- (6) if $g > 1$ then for any x , $gx > x$.

The following fact is evident from a little reflection on the definition.

Fact 5. Let $(G, \cdot, <)$ be an ordered group.

- (1) The order $(G, <)$ is 1-transitive.
- (2) Consequently $(G, <)$
 - (a) is discrete and isomorphic to copies of $(Z, <)$ or

(b) is dense.

Form a language L^* with $<$ and unary function symbols t_g for g in G .

Definition 6. The structure $\langle X, <, t_g \rangle_{g \in G}$ is a unary representation of G on X if:

- (1) $t_g(t_h) = t_{gh}$;
- (2) If for some x , $t_g(x) = t_h(x)$ then $g = h$;
- (3) if $g_1 < g_2$ then for all x , $t_{g_1}(x) < t_{g_2}(x)$;
- (4) each t_g is increasing;
- (5) if $g < 1$ then for any x , $t_g(x) < x$;
- (6) if $g > 1$ then for any x , $t_g(x) > x$;
- (7) each t_g is onto.

Just translating from Definition 4 to Definition 6, we see:

Lemma 7. If G is any linearly ordered group, the structure $\langle G, <, t_g \rangle_{g \in G}$, with for any $h \in G$, $t_g(h) = gh$, gives a unary representation of G on itself.

Theorem 8. For any linearly ordered group G the theory T_G of $\langle G, <, t_g \rangle_{g \in G}$ (defined above) admits quantifier elimination and is therefore o-minimal.

Proof. The theory T_G is axiomatized by the properties in Definition 6 and from identities of the form $\prod_{i \leq k} g_i = h$ that hold in G , axioms $t_{g_0} \circ t_{g_2} \dots \circ t_{g_k} = t_h$. From these axioms we deduce the following Conditions which are in the theory T_G . For any g_1, g_2, x, y :

- (1) $t_{g_1}(x) < t_{g_2}(y) \equiv x < t_{g_1^{-1}g_2}(y)$
- (2) $\neg[t_{g_1}(x) < t_{g_2}(y)] \equiv [t_{g_2}(y) < t_{g_1}(x)] \vee [t_{g_1}(x) = t_{g_2}(y)]$
- (3) $\neg[t_{g_1}(x) = t_{g_2}(y)] \equiv [t_{g_2}(y) < t_{g_1}(x)] \vee [t_{g_1}(x) < t_{g_2}(y)]$

Now consider an arbitrary existential formula

$$\psi(\mathbf{y}) = (\exists x)\phi(x, \mathbf{y}) = (\exists x) \bigvee \bigwedge \theta_{ij}(x, y_1, \dots, y_k)$$

where each θ_{ij} is atomic or neg-atomic. Using Conditions 2 and 3, each θ_{ij} which is neg-atomic can be replaced by a disjunction of atomic formulas. Since T_G is unary, the representation of each term by a single t_h , and using Condition 1), each atomic $\theta_{ij}(x, y_1, \dots, y_k)$ has the form $x < t_g(y_i)$ or $t_{g_s}(y_i) < t_{g_r}(y_j)$. Let $x, y_1, \dots, y_k, t_{g_j}(y_i)$ (for $i < k$ and appropriate j) be a complete list of all terms occurring in $\phi(x, \mathbf{y})$. Now each $\bigwedge_j \theta_{ij}$ is equivalent to a finite disjunction (caused by the removal of the neg-atomic formulas) of formulas of the form: $\bigvee_s \bigwedge_t \mu_{st}$ where $\bigwedge_t \mu_{st}$ has the form:

$$t_{\sigma(1)}(y_{\tau(1)}) < \dots < t_{\sigma(i)}(y_{\tau(i)}) < x < t_{\sigma(i+1)}(y_{\tau(i+1)}) < \dots < t_{\sigma(k)}(y_{\tau(k)})$$

where by varying σ and τ we get all linear orders of the terms occurring in θ_{ij} .

Now there are two cases depending on whether the ordering on G is dense or discrete.

If $(G, <)$ is dense, we just drop x from the matrix to have the equivalent formula in T_G .

If $(G, <)$ is discrete, suppose that $t_g(y_1) < x < t_h(y_2)$ are the terms immediately surrounding x in $\bigwedge_t \mu_{st}$. Suppose f is the least element of G greater than 1. Then $(\exists x) \bigwedge_t \mu_{st}(x, \mathbf{y})$ is equivalent to replacing the occurrence of $t_g(y_1) < x < t_h(y_2)$ in μ_{st} by $t_f(t_g(y_1)) < t_h(y_2)$.

This establishes the quantifier elimination and o-minimality follows immediately.

□₈

Let us remark that a discrete G can also be represented as acting on a dense linear order by applying Theorem 8 to $G \times Q$ and then taking the reduct to the unary functions naming elements of G .

This note reflects simplifications by the three authors of an earlier argument by Baizhanov.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Baizhanov, Orthogonality of one-types in weakly o-minimal theories. In Pinus A.G. and Ponomaryov K.N., editors, *Algebra and Model Theory 2*, pages 3-28. Novosibirsk State Technical University, Novosibirsk, 1999.
- [2] A. Pillay and Ch. Steinhorn. Definable sets in ordered structures. I, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society.*, 295:565-592, 1986.
- [3] D. Marker and Ch. Steinhorn. Definable types in o-minimal theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 59:155-194, 1994.
- [4] R. Urbanik. A representation theorem for v^* -algebras. *Fundamenta Mathematica*, 53:291-317, 1963.