

BURDEN OF HENSELIAN VALUED FIELDS IN THE DENEFPAS LANGUAGE

PETER SINCLAIR

ABSTRACT. Motivated by the Ax-Kochen/Ershov principle, a large number of questions about henselian valued fields have been shown to reduce to analogous questions about the value group and residue field. In this paper, we investigate the burden of henselian valued fields in the three-sorted Denef-Pas language. If T is a theory of henselian valued fields admitting relative quantifier elimination (in any characteristic), we show that the burden of T is equal to the sum of the burdens of its value group and residue field. As a consequence, T is NTP_2 if and only if its residue field and value group are; the same is true for the statements “ T is strong” and “ T has finite burden.”

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	2
3. Relative Quantifier Elimination	5
4. Calculating Burden	9
References	15

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ax-Kochen/Ershov principle states that the theory of a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic 0 is completely determined by the theory of its residue field and value group. It has since been extended to apply to certain henselian valued fields with positive residue characteristic (see [AJ19], [Bél99], [Kuh16]), and is a good heuristic even in fields where it does not hold: many useful properties of henselian valued fields are witnessed by some combination of the residue field and value group.

One area where this line of thinking has been particularly effective is in the classification theory of Shelah [She90], using combinatorial properties such as NIP (not the independence property, sometimes called dependence) and NTP_2 (not the tree property of the second kind). Delon [Del78] showed that a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero is NIP if and only if its residue field is; this result was later extended to certain valued fields of positive residue characteristic in [Bél99] and [JS20]. In [Che14], Chernikov showed an analogous result for NTP_2 in equicharacteristic zero.

Chernikov’s result uses Adler’s notion of burden, which measures the complexity of types using independent partition patterns (inp-patterns, described in Section 2.3 below). Burden is equivalent to weight in simple theories and to dp-rank in NIP theories, and can be used to measure the complexity of a theory by considering the partial type $\{x = x\}$: a theory is NTP_2 if and only if there is a cardinal κ such that every inp-pattern in $\{x = x\}$ has depth at most κ . Chernikov showed that in the three-sorted Denef-Pas language, the burden of a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic zero can be bounded by the burden of the induced structure on the residue field and value group, from which the NTP_2 transfer principle follows immediately.

The main result of this paper improves the precision of Chernikov’s bound and extends the result to apply to theories of any characteristic, provided the theory eliminates quantifiers in the field sort.

Key words and phrases. Valued fields, henselian, Denef-Pas language, burden, dp-rank, NTP_2 .

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose T is a theory of henselian valued fields in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} admitting relative quantifier elimination. Then*

$$\text{bdn}(T) = \text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}}) + \text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}}),$$

where T_{VG} and T_{RF} are the induced theories on the value group and residue field, respectively.

Touchard [Tou18] found similar bounds for certain classes of henselian valued fields using the RV-structure, rather than the angular component map, in a recent preprint based on work of Chernikov and Simon [CS19]. Specifically, the burden of a valued field (K, v) is equal to the burden of its RV-sorts, which is in certain cases equal to the maximum of $\text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}})$ and $\text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}})$. If any of these burdens are infinite, this bound is identical to the bound found in this paper, although Touchard's bounds are tighter in the case when all of the burdens are finite and the additional assumptions can be made.

Section 2 summarizes the necessary definitions and facts about valued fields and burden. Then in Section 3, we generalize a result of Delon [Del78] classifying types in henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic 0, which we use to obtain an improved version of relative quantifier elimination. This result has previously been extended by Bélair [Bél99] to algebraically maximal Kaplansky valued fields of equicharacteristic p and unramified henselian valued fields of mixed characteristic.

Finally, Section 4 uses the improved quantifier elimination result to prove the main result of the paper, Theorem 4.7. This section proceeds via a series of propositions that allow us to restrict our focus to increasingly tame inp-patterns.

This paper is based on results from a chapter of the author's thesis [Sin18], under the supervision of Professor Deirdre Haskell.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Algebra of Valued Fields. We assume that the reader is familiar with the basic notions of valued fields. For more detail, refer to any textbook on valued fields, such as [EP05]. Given a valuation v on a field K , we denote the value group by vK , the residue field by Kv , the valuation ring by \mathcal{O}_v , and the maximal ideal by \mathfrak{m}_v . If (K, v) and (K', v') are valued fields then a valued field isomorphism from (K, v) to (K', v') is a field isomorphism $\phi : K \rightarrow K'$ satisfying $v(x) < v(y)$ if and only if $v(\phi(x)) < v(\phi(y))$ for all $x, y \in K$.

A particularly useful class of valued fields is the class of henselian valued fields. A valuation v on a field K is called henselian if one of the following equivalent conditions holds:

- (1) There is a unique valuation w on the algebraic closure of K such that $v = w|_K$
- (2) Every polynomial $p(X) = X^n + aX^{n-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} a_i X^i \in \mathcal{O}_v[X]$ with $v(a) = 0$ and $v(a_i) > 0$ for all i has a root in K .

In this case, we call (K, v) a henselian valued field. It is clear from property (2) above that any valuation on a separably closed field is henselian; many other valued fields are also henselian, including the p -adic numbers with the usual valuation. It can be shown that every valued field has a minimal algebraic extension that is henselian, and that this extension is unique up to valued field isomorphism. This extension, denoted (K^h, v^h) , is called the henselization of (K, v) , and is always an immediate extension of (K, v) .

Example 2.1. (Field of Hahn series) Let k be any field and Γ be any group, and consider the set $k[[t^\Gamma]]$ of functions $f : \Gamma \rightarrow k$ such that $\text{supp}(f) = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : f(\gamma) \neq 0\}$ is well-ordered. We think of elements of this set as power series and write them as $f = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} a_\gamma t^\gamma$, where $a_\gamma = f(\gamma)$. This set is a field with the usual operations on power series, and the map $v(f) = \min(\text{supp}(f))$ is a henselian valuation on $k[[t^\Gamma]]$.

Definition 2.2. Let $(a_\rho)_{\rho < I}$ be a sequence of elements of a valued field (K, v) indexed by any ordered set I . We say that (a_ρ) is *pseudo-convergent* if

$$v(a_{\rho_2} - a_{\rho_1}) < v(a_{\rho_3} - a_{\rho_2})$$

for all $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < \rho_3$. If (a_ρ) is pseudo-convergent then for each $\rho \in I$ there exists $\gamma_\rho \in vK$ such that

$$v(a_\rho - a_{\rho'}) = \gamma_\rho$$

for all $\rho' > \rho$. We say that $x \in K$ is a *pseudo-limit* of (a_ρ) if $v(x - a_\rho) = \gamma_\rho$ for all ρ .

Note that pseudo-limits are not unique. However, field extensions of the form $K(x)$, where x is a pseudo-limit of a pseudo-convergent sequence in K , are unique up to valued field isomorphism in certain situations, such as when the sequence is of transcendental type.

Definition 2.3. Let I be a well-ordered set without a maximum element, and let $(a_\rho)_{\rho \in I}$ be a pseudo-convergent sequence in a valued field (K, v) . We say that (a_ρ) is of *transcendental type* if, for all $p(X) \in K[X]$,

$$v(p(a_{\rho_1})) = v(p(a_{\rho_2}))$$

for all sufficiently large $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in I$.

More details can be found in [Kap42], the paper in which pseudo-convergent sequences were originally introduced.

Definition 2.4. An *angular component map* is a function $\text{ac} : K \rightarrow Kv$ which satisfies the following:

- (1) $\text{ac}(0) = 0$
- (2) For all $x \in \mathcal{O}_v^\times$, $\text{ac}(x) = x + \mathfrak{m}$
- (3) For all $x, y \in K$, $\text{ac}(xy) = \text{ac}(x)\text{ac}(y)$.

On a Hahn field, the map that returns the nonzero coefficient with minimum index of a power series is an angular component map. Not every valued field admits an angular component map, but every valued field has an elementary extension that does [Pas90, Corollary 1.6].

The two facts below summarize some fundamental results about the relationship between valuations and angular component maps; they follow easily from the definitions and will be used repeatedly in Section 4.

Fact 2.5. *Suppose (K, v) is a valued field. For every $\gamma \in vK$ and $r \in Kv^\times$, there exists $a \in K$ with $v(a) = \gamma$ and $\text{ac}(a) = r$.*

Fact 2.6. *Suppose (K, v) is a valued field and $a, b, c \in K^\times$.*

- (1) *If $v(a - b) < v(c - b)$ then $v(a - b) = v(a - c)$ and $\text{ac}(a - b) = \text{ac}(a - c)$.*
- (2) *If $v(a - b) = v(a - c)$ then $\text{ac}(a - b) \neq \text{ac}(a - c)$ if and only if $v(a - b) = v(c - b)$.*
- (3) *If $v(a - b) = v(a - c) = v(c - b)$ then $\text{ac}(a - c) = \text{ac}(a - b) - \text{ac}(c - b)$.*

2.2. Model Theory of Valued Fields. Valued fields can be viewed as first order structures in a number of ways; in this paper, we exclusively view a valued field as a three-sorted structure with sorts for K , vK , and Kv , and various maps between them.

Definition 2.7. The *Denef-Pas Language* for valued fields is the three-sorted language \mathcal{L}_{Pas} with the following sorts and functions:

- (1) The valued field sort VF has the language of rings $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ring}} = \{0, 1, +, -, \cdot\}$
- (2) The value group sort VG has an expansion of the language of ordered abelian groups $\mathcal{L}_{\text{VG}} = \{0, +, -, <, \infty, \dots\}$
- (3) The residue field sort RF has an expansion \mathcal{L}_{RF} of the language of rings

(4) The only maps between sorts are $v : \text{VF} \rightarrow \text{VG}$ and $\text{ac} : \text{VF} \rightarrow \text{RF}$.

Calling this “the” Denef-Pas Language is slightly misleading, since the value group and residue field languages are some expansion of the appropriate minimum languages. When we consider a valued field (K, v) as an \mathcal{L}_{Pas} -structure, we always assume that the VF-sort is K , the VG-sort is vK , the RF-sort is Kv , v is the valuation map, and ac is an angular component map.

We say that a theory T in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} admits *relative quantifier elimination* if it eliminates quantifiers $\forall x$ and $\exists x$, where x is a variable in the valued field sort. It follows syntactically from relative quantifier elimination that every formula $\phi(x^{\text{VF}}, x^{\text{VG}}, x^{\text{RF}})$ in T is equivalent to one of the form

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n \chi_i(v(f_1(x^{\text{VF}}), \dots, v(f_m(x^{\text{VF}})), x^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho_i(\text{ac}(f_1(x^{\text{VF}})), \dots, \text{ac}(f_m(x^{\text{VF}})), x^{\text{RF}})$$

where $x^{\text{VF}}, x^{\text{VG}}, x^{\text{RF}}$ are tuples of variables in the sorts VF, VG, RF, respectively, χ_i are \mathcal{L}_{VG} -formulas, ρ_i are \mathcal{L}_{RF} formulas, and f_j are polynomials with integer coefficients. Note that there is no $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ring}}$ -formula corresponding to the VF-sort; this is because any such formula would be a boolean combination of statements of the form $g(x^{\text{VF}}) = 0$, which is equivalent to $v(g(x^{\text{VF}})) = \infty$, and so this part of the formula can be absorbed into the \mathcal{L}_{VG} portion.

Suppose T is an \mathcal{L}_{Pas} -theory with relative quantifier elimination, and consider the special case of a formula $\phi(x)$ with parameters in some model (K, v) such that x is a singleton in the VF-sort. In this case, $\phi(x)$ is equivalent to a formula of the form

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n \chi_i(v(f_1(x), \dots, v(f_m(x))) \wedge \rho_i(\text{ac}(f_1(x)), \dots, \text{ac}(f_m(x))))$$

where χ_i are \mathcal{L}_{VG} -formulas with parameters in vK , ρ_i are \mathcal{L}_{RF} formulas with parameters in Kv , and f_j are polynomials with coefficients in K . This follows immediately from the general form of relative quantifier elimination by substituting a parameter for every variable except a singleton in the VF-sort.

Many theories of henselian valued fields have relative quantifier elimination, including all theories of henselian valued fields of characteristic $(0, 0)$ [Pas89], algebraically maximal Kaplansky fields of characteristic (p, p) [Bél99], and strongly dependent henselian valued fields in any characteristic [HH19]. In the case where T is a theory of henselian valued fields of characteristic $(0, 0)$, we may assume that the polynomials f_i are all linear by the cell decomposition of [Pas89]. In fact, we prove in Section 3 that this is true in any characteristic.

The celebrated Ax-Kochen/Ershov (AKE) principle can be viewed as an immediate consequence of relative quantifier elimination.

Fact 2.8. *Suppose (K, v) and (L, w) are both models of some theory T of henselian valued fields in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} that admits relative quantifier elimination. Then $(K, v) \equiv (L, w)$ if and only if $vK \equiv wL$ (as \mathcal{L}_{VG} -structures) and $Kv \equiv Lw$ (as \mathcal{L}_{RF} -structures).*

2.3. Inp-patterns and Burden. Burden is a notion of complexity of a partial type developed originally by Adler [Adl07] as a generalization of the notion of weight from simple theories. Conveniently, it also generalizes the notion of dp-rank from NIP theories.

Definition 2.9. Let $\pi(x)$ be a partial type and κ a cardinal. An *inp* (independent partition) pattern in $\pi(x)$ of depth κ consists of tuples $\{b_{\alpha, i} : \alpha < \kappa, i < \omega\}$, formulas $\{\phi_{\alpha}(x, y_{\alpha}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ with $|y_{\alpha}| = |b_{\alpha, i}|$, and $k_{\alpha} < \omega$ such that

- (1) $\{\phi_{\alpha}(x, b_{\alpha, i})\}_{i < \omega}$ is k_{α} -inconsistent for each $\alpha < \kappa$
- (2) $\pi(x) \cup \{\phi_{\alpha}(x, b_{\alpha, \eta(\alpha)})\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is consistent for any $\eta : \kappa \rightarrow \omega$.

The *burden* of $\pi(x)$, written $\text{bdn}(\pi)$, is the supremum of the depths of all inp-patterns in $\pi(x)$, or ∞ if the supremum does not exist.

In order to simplify the notation, we often write $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha), b_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ for the above inp-pattern. In this notation, b_α represents the sequence $(b_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$. By strengthening the assumptions on inp-patterns slightly, we can make it easier to check whether a given array is an inp-pattern.

Definition 2.10. Let $\pi(x)$ be a partial type and κ a cardinal. An *indiscernible inp-pattern* in $\pi(x)$ of depth κ consists of tuples $\{b_{\alpha,i} : \alpha < \kappa, i < \omega\}$ and formulas $\{\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ with $|y_\alpha| = |b_{\alpha,i}|$ such that

- (1) The sequences $(b_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ are mutually indiscernible; that is, for each $\alpha < \kappa$, the sequence $(b_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over $\{b_{\beta,i} : \beta \neq \alpha, i < \omega\}$
- (2) $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i})\}_{i < \omega}$ is inconsistent for each $\alpha < \kappa$
- (3) $\pi(x) \cup \{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,0})\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is consistent.

As with inp-patterns, we often condense the notation for the above indiscernible inp-pattern to $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha), b_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$.

It follows immediately from the definition of indiscernibility that every indiscernible inp-pattern is an inp-pattern. By a common argument using Ramsey theory and compactness, any inp-pattern can be used to generate an indiscernible inp-pattern of the same depth; see Lemma 5.1.3 of [TZ12] for a more detailed explanation. Thus, the burden of a partial type $\pi(x)$ is equal to the supremum of the depths of all indiscernible inp-patterns in $\pi(x)$.

The burden of $\pi(x)$ measures the complexity of π : the greater the depth κ of an inp-pattern, the closer π is to satisfying TP_2 , the tree property of the second kind. In fact, $\text{bdn}(\pi) = \infty$ if and only if $\pi(x)$ has TP_2 .

We can measure the complexity of a theory by looking at the partial type $\pi(x)$ that contains only the formula $x = x$, where x is a singleton; when we write $\text{bdn}(T)$, we mean $\text{bdn}(\pi)$ for this choice of $\pi(x)$. If T is a theory in a multi-sorted language (say \mathcal{L}_{Pas}), then there is a separate formula $x = x$ for each sort and we take $\text{bdn}(T)$ to be the supremum over the sorts. In the case of \mathcal{L}_{Pas} , we can restrict our focus to the valued field sort VF because there are definable surjections from VF to the other sorts; this is described in more detail in Section 4.

Note that if $\text{bdn}(T) = \aleph_0$ then either $\pi(x) = \{x = x\}$ has an inp-pattern of depth \aleph_0 or T has inp-patterns of all finite (but no infinite) depths; in the latter case, we say that T is *strong*. This odd situation actually occurs whenever $\text{bdn}(T)$ is an infinite cardinal; one way to handle it is with the following definition, modified from [Adl07].

Definition 2.11. Let Card^* be the class containing the cardinals and, for each limit cardinal κ , a new symbol κ_- . The ordering on cardinals is extended to Card^* by setting κ_- to be a predecessor to κ ; that is, for all $\lambda \in \text{Card}^*$, $\lambda < \kappa$ if and only if $\lambda \leq \kappa_-$.

We can then modify the definition of burden so that $\text{bdn}(T)$ is the supremum in Card^* , or ∞ if the supremum does not exist; that way, a theory T has $\text{bdn}(T) = \aleph_{0-}$ if it is strong, and $\text{bdn}(T) = \aleph_0$ if $\pi(x) = \{x = x\}$ has an inp-pattern of depth \aleph_0 . The arguments given in this paper work whether burden is defined to be a cardinal or an element of Card^* , provided the sum of two infinite elements in Card^* is defined to be the maximum of those elements, just as it is for cardinals.

3. RELATIVE QUANTIFIER ELIMINATION

In Section 4, we generalize and improve a result of [Che14] relating the burden of certain valued fields to the burdens of their value groups and residue fields. In order to obtain the generalization, we need a stronger version of relative quantifier elimination than the one given in Section 2.2.

We begin with a classification of 1-types over any model in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} , due to [Del78]. Consider an elementary extension $\mathcal{K} \prec \mathcal{M}$ of valued fields in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} , fix $x \in M \setminus K$, and define

$$I_K(x) = \{\gamma \in vK : \gamma = v(x - k) \text{ for some } k \in K\}.$$

Then $\text{tp}(x/K)$ belongs to one of three families, depending on the structure of $I_K(x)$.

- (1) $I_K(x) = \{v(x - k) : k \in K\}$ and does not have a maximum element. In this case, we say that $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is *immediate*.
- (2) $I_K(x) = \{v(x - k) : k \in K\}$ and has a maximum element. In this case, we say that $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is *residual*.
- (3) $I_K(x) \neq \{v(x - k) : k \in K\}$. In this case, we say that $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is *valuational*.

In the first two cases, $\{v(x - k) : k \in K\}$ is a subset of vK . In the third, there is a single element $\gamma_0 \in \{v(x - k) : k \in K\} \setminus vK$; if there were two, say $\gamma_0 = v(x - k_0) < v(x - k_1) = \gamma_1$, then $v(x - k_0) = v((x - k_0) - (x - k_1)) = v(k_1 - k_0) \in vK$, contradicting $\gamma_0 \notin vK$. By a similar argument, γ_0 is an upper bound for $I_K(x)$.

The stronger form of relative quantifier elimination we need is a consequence of the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose \mathcal{K} is a henselian valued field in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} such that $\text{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ admits relative quantifier elimination. Let \mathcal{M} be a monster model of $\text{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ and let $x \in M \setminus K$ be an element of the valued field sort.*

- (1) *If $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is immediate, let $(a_\rho, \gamma_\rho)_{\rho < \kappa}$ be a sequence such that $a_\rho \in K$, $\gamma_\rho = v(x - a_\rho)$, and (γ_ρ) is strictly increasing and cofinal in $I_K(x)$. Then $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is completely determined by the set of formulas $\{v(x - a_\rho) = \gamma_\rho : \rho < \kappa\}$.*
- (2) *If $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is residual, then it is completely determined by a pair of constants $a \in K$ and $\gamma \in vK$ such that $v(x - a) = \gamma$ and $\text{ac}(x - a) \notin Kv$, by the formula $v(x - a) = \gamma$, and by the type $\text{tp}(\text{ac}(x - a)/Kv)$.*
- (3) *If $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is valuational, then it is completely determined by some constant $a \in K$ such that $v(x - a) \notin vK$, by the type $\text{tp}(v(x - a)/vK)$, and by the type $\text{tp}(\text{ac}(x - a)/Kv)$.*

In equicharacteristic 0, this theorem was originally proved by Delon [Del78]; a more detailed proof using angular component maps can be found in [BB96]. Bélair later extended the result to certain fields of characteristic (p, p) and $(0, p)$ [Bél99]. Before we prove the result for any characteristic, we state the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose \mathcal{K} is a henselian valued field in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} such that $\text{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ admits relative quantifier elimination. Let \mathcal{M} be a monster model of $\text{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ and suppose there are $y, y' \in M$ such that the following exist:*

- (1) *A valued field isomorphism $\phi : K(y) \rightarrow K(y')$ with $\phi|_K = \text{id}_K$ and $\phi(y) = y'$*
- (2) *An \mathcal{L}_{VG} -automorphism $\alpha : vM \rightarrow vM$ with $\alpha|_{vK} = \text{id}_{vK}$ and $\alpha(v(y)) = v(y')$*
- (3) *An \mathcal{L}_{RF} -automorphism $\beta : Mv \rightarrow Mv$ with $\beta|_{Kv} = \text{id}_{Kv}$ and $\beta(\text{ac}(y)) = \text{ac}(y')$*

Assume moreover that the value group $v(K(y))$ is generated by $vK \cup \{v(y)\}$, that $v(K(y'))$ is generated by $vK \cup \{v(y')\}$, and that either

- (1) *$\text{ac}(y)$ and $\text{ac}(y')$ are both transcendental over Kv , or*
- (2) *$v(y^n) \notin vK$ and $v((y')^n) \notin vK$ for any nonzero $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Then there exists an \mathcal{L}_{Pas} -automorphism σ of \mathcal{M} with $\sigma|_{K(y)} = \phi$; in particular, this means $\text{tp}(y/K) = \text{tp}(y'/K)$.

Proof. First, note that since ϕ is a valued field automorphism, by choice of α we have $\alpha(v(x)) = v(\phi(x))$ for all $x \in K(y)$. We claim that we also have $\beta(\text{ac}(x)) = \text{ac}(\phi(x))$ for all $x \in K(y)$. To

prove this, we will first show that for every polynomial $p(X) \in K[X]$, there exists a polynomial $\bar{p}(X) \in Kv[X]$ such that $\text{ac}(p(y)) = \bar{p}(\text{ac}(y))$. Note that $\bar{p}(X)$ will not in general be the residue polynomial of $p(X)$, but a separate polynomial as described below.

Suppose $v(y^n) \notin vK$ for any nonzero $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and fix a polynomial $p(X) \in K[X]$. If two distinct terms of $p(y)$, say $z_1 y^{n_1}$ and $z_2 y^{n_2}$ have the same valuation, then we must have $v(y^{n_2-n_1}) = v(z_1/z_2) \in vK$, which is impossible. Thus, $p(y)$ has a term zy^n of least valuation and $\text{ac}(p(y)) = \text{ac}(z) \text{ac}(y)^n$, a polynomial in $Kv[\text{ac}(y)]$.

On the other hand, suppose $\text{ac}(y)$ is transcendental over Kv . In this case, we proceed by induction on the degree of p . If $\deg(p) = 0$ then $p(X) = z$ for some $z \in K$ and $\text{ac}(p(y)) = \text{ac}(z)$. If $\deg(p) = n > 0$, then we can write $p(X) = z + Xq(X)$ for some $z \in K$ and some polynomial $q(X)$ of degree less than n . By induction, $\text{ac}(q(y)) = \bar{q}(\text{ac}(y))$ for some polynomial \bar{q} . Since $\text{ac}(y)$ is transcendental over Kv , we must have $\text{ac}(z) \neq \text{ac}(yq(y)) = \text{ac}(y)\bar{q}(\text{ac}(y))$, and so $\text{ac}(p(y))$ must be one of $\text{ac}(z)$, $\text{ac}(y)\bar{q}(\text{ac}(y))$, or $\text{ac}(z) + \text{ac}(y)\bar{q}(\text{ac}(y))$, depending on the relationship between $v(z)$ and $v(yq(y))$. In any case, $\text{ac}(p(y))$ is a polynomial in $Kv[\text{ac}(y)]$, completing the induction.

In both cases, we showed that $\text{ac}(p(y)) = \bar{p}(\text{ac}(y))$ for some polynomial $\bar{p}(X) \in Kv[X]$, as desired. Note that the process of determining $\bar{p}(X)$ depended only on the original polynomial $p(X)$ and the valuations of the terms of $p(y)$. Because $\alpha(v(x)) = v(\phi(x))$ for all $x \in K(y)$, an identical argument shows that the same polynomial $\bar{p}(X)$ satisfies $\text{ac}(p(y')) = \bar{p}(\text{ac}(y'))$. Then, given any polynomial $p(X) \in K[X]$, we have

$$\beta(\text{ac}(p(y))) = \beta(\bar{p}(\text{ac}(y))) = \bar{p}(\beta(\text{ac}(y))) = \bar{p}(\text{ac}(y')) = \text{ac}(p(y')) = \text{ac}(\phi(p(y)))$$

by choice of β . Since every element $x \in K(y)$ can be written as a rational function in y and the angular component map is multiplicative, we can easily extend this result to the entire field.

Finally, by the above observations, relative quantifier elimination, and the fact that α and β are elementary maps, it follows that $\phi : K(y) \rightarrow M$ is a partial elementary map, and hence can be extended to an automorphism σ of \mathcal{M} . \square

We can now prove Theorem 3.1. The proof follows the outline of [Del78], [BB96], and [Bél99], but with any references to the specific characteristic of the field replaced by Lemma 3.2.

Proof. (of Theorem 3.1)

Case 1: Suppose $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is immediate. Fix any strictly increasing well-ordered cofinal sequence $(\gamma_\rho)_{\rho < \kappa}$ of $I_K(x)$ and any sequence $(a_\rho)_{\rho < \kappa}$ with $a_\rho \in K$ such that $v(x - a_\rho) = \gamma_\rho$. We claim that the set of formulas $\{v(x - a_\rho) = \gamma_\rho : \rho < \kappa\}$ completely determines $\text{tp}(x/K)$.

Note that by choice of a_ρ and γ_ρ , for $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < \kappa$, we have

$$v(a_{\rho_2} - a_{\rho_1}) = v((a_{\rho_2} - x) + (x - a_{\rho_1})) = \min\{v(a_{\rho_2} - x), v(x - a_{\rho_1})\} = \gamma_{\rho_1}$$

since $\gamma_{\rho_1} < \gamma_{\rho_2}$. Thus, for $\rho_1 < \rho_2 < \rho_3 < \kappa$, we have

$$v(a_{\rho_2} - a_{\rho_1}) = \gamma_{\rho_1} < \gamma_{\rho_2} = v(a_{\rho_3} - a_{\rho_2})$$

and so $(a_\rho)_{\rho < \kappa}$ is a pseudo-convergent sequence. Moreover, since $v(x - a_\rho) = \gamma_\rho$ for all $\rho < \kappa$, x is a pseudo-limit of $(a_\rho)_{\rho < \kappa}$.

Suppose $x' \in M$ is another element with $v(x' - a_\rho) = \gamma_\rho$ for all $\rho < \kappa$. Then x' is also a pseudo-limit of $(a_\rho)_{\rho < \kappa}$, and since $\mathcal{K} \prec \mathcal{M}$, both x and x' are pseudo-limits of transcendental type. Then by Theorem 2 of [Kap42], $K(x)$ and $K(x')$ are immediate extensions of K and there exists a valued field isomorphism $\phi : K(x) \rightarrow K(x')$ fixing K and sending x to x' .

Because $K(x)$ is an immediate extension of K , for any $y \in K(x)$, there must exist $b \in K$ with $\text{ac}(b) = \text{ac}(y)$ and $v(b) = v(y)$ by Fact 2.5. Then

$$v(\phi(y)) = v(\phi(b)) = v(b) = v(y).$$

Moreover, since $\text{ac}(b) = \text{ac}(y)$, we must have $v(b - y) > v(b)$. Then

$$v(b - \phi(y)) = v(\phi(b - y)) > v(\phi(b)) = v(b)$$

and so $\text{ac}(\phi(y)) = \text{ac}(b) = \text{ac}(y)$.

Thus, the value group map induced by ϕ is the identity on $vK = v(K(x)) = v(K(x'))$ and the residue field map induced by ϕ is the identity map on $Kv = (K(x))v = (K(x'))v$. It then follows from relative quantifier elimination that ϕ is a partial elementary map and can be extended to an automorphism σ of \mathcal{M} . Because $\sigma(x) = \phi(x) = x'$, this automorphism demonstrates that $\text{tp}(x/K) = \text{tp}(x'/K)$ as desired.

Case 2: Suppose $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is residual; we must first show that there exists $a \in K$ and $\gamma \in vK$ as described in the theorem. Let $\gamma \in vK$ be the largest element of $I_K(x)$, and fix $a \in K$ such that $v(x - a) = \gamma$. If $\text{ac}(x - a) \in Kv$ then there must exist some $b \in K$ with $\text{ac}(x - a) = \text{ac}(b)$ and $v(b) = \gamma$ by Fact 2.5. But then

$$v(x - (a + b)) = v((x - a) - b) > v(x - a) = \gamma,$$

contradicting the maximality of γ . Thus, $\text{ac}(x - a) \notin Kv$.

Now, suppose $x' \in M$ is another element with $v(x' - a) = \gamma$, $\text{ac}(x' - a) \notin Kv$, and $\text{tp}(\text{ac}(x - a)/Kv) = \text{tp}(\text{ac}(x' - a)/Kv)$. We wish to show that $\text{tp}(x/K) = \text{tp}(x'/K)$, which we will do by finding an \mathcal{L}_{Pas} -automorphism of \mathcal{M} that fixes \mathcal{K} and maps $y = x - a$ to $y' = x' - a$.

Since $\mathcal{K} \prec \mathcal{M}$ is an elementary extension, $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{K}) = \mathcal{K}$; in particular, $K^{\text{acl}} \cap M = K$, and so y and y' must both be transcendental over K . Thus, there is a field isomorphism $\phi : K(y) \rightarrow K(y')$ fixing K and sending y to y' . Moreover, ϕ is a valued field isomorphism since $v(y) = \gamma = v(y')$. Setting $\alpha : vM \rightarrow vM$ to be the identity automorphism, we have $\alpha(v(y)) = v(y')$.

Since $\text{tp}(\text{ac}(x - a)/K) = \text{tp}(\text{ac}(x' - a)/K)$, there is an \mathcal{L}_{RF} -automorphism $\beta : Mv \rightarrow Mv$ with $\beta|_{Kv} = \text{id}_{Kv}$ and $\beta(\text{ac}(y)) = \text{ac}(y')$. Finally, $\text{ac}(y)$ and $\text{ac}(y')$ must be transcendental over Kv since $Kv \prec Mv$. Then by Lemma 3.2, $\text{tp}(y/K) = \text{tp}(y'/K)$, which implies $\text{tp}(x/K) = \text{tp}(x'/K)$.

Case 3: Suppose $\text{tp}(x/K)$ is valational, fix any $a \in K$ with $v(x - a) \notin vK$, and suppose $x' \in M$ is another element with $v(x' - a) \notin vK$, $\text{tp}(v(x - a)/vK) = \text{tp}(v(x' - a)/vK)$, and $\text{tp}(\text{ac}(x - a)/Kv) = \text{tp}(\text{ac}(x' - a)/Kv)$. As in Case 2, it suffices to show that $\text{tp}(y/K) = \text{tp}(y'/K)$ for $y = x - a$ and $y' = x' - a$.

Again following Case 2, $\mathcal{K} \prec \mathcal{M}$, which means y and y' are both transcendental over K and there exists a field isomorphism $\phi : K(y) \rightarrow K(y')$ fixing K and sending y to y' . Moreover, we have $v(K(y)) = vK \oplus \mathbb{Z}v(y)$ and $v(K(y')) = vK \oplus \mathbb{Z}v(y')$ since $vK \prec vM$ and $v(y), v(y') \notin vK$; in particular, $v(K(y))$ is generated by $vK \cup \{y\}$ and $v(y^n) = nv(y) \notin vK$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and similarly for y' . It then follows from Corollary 2.2.3 of [EP05] that ϕ is a valued field isomorphism.

Finally, by choice of x' , there exists an \mathcal{L}_{VG} -automorphism α of vM that fixes vK and such that $\alpha(v(y)) = v(y')$. Similarly, there exists an \mathcal{L}_{RF} -automorphism β of Mv that fixes Kv and such that $\beta(\text{ac}(y)) = \text{ac}(y')$. Thus, by Lemma 3.2, $\text{tp}(y/K) = \text{tp}(y'/K)$, so $\text{tp}(x/K) = \text{tp}(x'/K)$. \square

As a consequence of the above theorem, we can improve the equivalence of formulas provided by relative quantifier elimination.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose \mathcal{K} is a henselian valued field in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} such that $\text{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ admits relative quantifier elimination. Let $\phi(x)$ be a formula in one valued field sort variable with parameters in \mathcal{K} . Then $\phi(x)$ is equivalent to a finite disjunction of formulas of the form*

$$\chi(v(x - c^1), \dots, v(x - c^n), b^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho(\text{ac}(x - c^1), \dots, \text{ac}(x - c^n), b^{\text{RF}})$$

where $\chi(x, \bar{y})$ is an \mathcal{L}_{VG} -formula, $\rho(x, \bar{y})$ is an \mathcal{L}_{RF} -formula, c^1, \dots, c^n are singletons in the VF-sort, b^{VF} is a \mathcal{K} -tuple in the VG-sort, and b^{RF} is a \mathcal{K} -tuple in the RF-sort.

Proof. For the duration of this proof, we will refer to formulas of the form $\chi \wedge \rho$ as in the statement of the Proposition as *good formulas*. Note that all of the formulas occurring in the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 are good formulas:

- (1) If x is immediate then each formula has the form $v(x - a_\rho) = \gamma_\rho$ with $a_\rho \in K$ and $\gamma_\rho \in vK$.
- (2) If x is residual then each formula is an element of $\text{tp}(\text{ac}(x - a)/Kv)$ with $a \in K$, and hence has the form $\rho(\text{ac}(x - a), b^{\text{RF}})$.
- (3) If x is valuatinal then each formula is an element of $\text{tp}(v(x - a)/vK)$ or $\text{tp}(\text{ac}(x - a)/Kv)$ with $a \in K$, and so is a good formula in either case.

Moreover, by a simple rearrangement, the conjunction of a finite set of good formulas is itself a good formula.

Let $\{p_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ be the set of complete K -types containing $\phi(x)$. By Theorem 3.1, for each $\alpha < \kappa$ there is a partial type $\pi_\alpha(x)$ consisting only of good formulas such that $\pi_\alpha \vdash p_\alpha$; in particular, $\pi_\alpha \vdash \phi$. By compactness, this implication only requires a finite subset of $\pi_\alpha(x)$; let $\psi_\alpha(x)$ be the conjunction of this finite set, and note that $\psi_\alpha(x)$ is a good formula by the observation above.

Ranging over α , we have $\phi \vdash \bigvee_{\alpha < \kappa} \psi_\alpha(x)$. Of course, this statement is not first-order, due to the infinite disjunction. However, by a standard compactness argument, we can find a finite set $\{\psi_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \psi_{\alpha_n}\}$ such that

$$\mathcal{K} \models \phi(x) \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{\alpha_i}(x).$$

Since each $\psi_\alpha(x)$ is a good formula, this shows that $\phi(x)$ is equivalent to a finite disjunction of good formulas, as desired. \square

4. CALCULATING BURDEN

Throughout this section, we assume that $\mathcal{K} = (K, vK, Kv)$ is a sufficiently saturated model of some theory T of henselian valued fields in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} that admits relative quantifier elimination. For example T might be strongly dependent or a theory of fields of characteristic $(0, 0)$. In [Che14], Chernikov gives a bound for $\text{bdn}(T)$ in terms of $\text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}})$ and $\text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}})$ in the characteristic $(0, 0)$ case, but the proof in that paper uses a Ramsey theory argument, and so the bound is very imprecise. The goal of this section is to improve Chernikov's bound and extend the result to apply to theories of any characteristic. First, we repeat two results from that paper that we will use throughout this section.

Fact 4.1. [Che14, Lemma 7.1]

- (1) If $(\phi_{\alpha,0}(x, y_{\alpha,0}) \vee \phi_{\alpha,1}(x, y_{\alpha,1}), a_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an (indiscernible) inp-pattern, then

$$(\phi_{\alpha, f(\alpha)}(x, y_{\alpha, f(\alpha)}), a_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$$

is also an (indiscernible) inp-pattern for some $f : \kappa \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$.

- (2) Let $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha), a_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an (indiscernible) inp-pattern and assume that

$$\phi_\alpha(x, a_{\alpha,i}) \leftrightarrow \psi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i})$$

for all $\alpha < \kappa$, all $i < \omega$, and some (mutually indiscernible) $(b_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$. Then there is an (indiscernible) inp-pattern of the form $(\psi_\alpha(x, z_\alpha), b_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$.

Fact 4.2. [Che14, Lemma 7.9] Let $(c_i)_{i \in I}$ be an indiscernible sequence of singletons. Then the function $(i, j) \mapsto v(c_j - c_i)$ with $i < j$ satisfies one of the following:

- (1) It is strictly increasing depending only on i (so $(c_i)_{i \in I}$ is pseudo-convergent),
- (2) It is strictly decreasing depending only on j (so $(c_i)_{i \in I}$ taken in the reverse direction is pseudo-convergent), or

(3) *It is constant (in this case $(c_i)_{i \in I}$ is referred to as a “fan”).*

Because there are definable surjections $v : K^\times \rightarrow vK$ and $\text{ac} : K \rightarrow Kv$, we only need to consider inp-patterns where the variable is in the VF-sort. Combining Proposition 3.3 and Fact 4.1, we can already focus only on inp-patterns with very tame formulas, but before we can prove the main result, we need to restrict our focus to even more tame inp-patterns.

Throughout this section, we will write $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ for indiscernible inp-patterns, where for each $\alpha < \kappa$

- (1) x is a singleton in the VF-sort,
- (2) y_α is a tuple of VG-sort and RF-sort variables (we will use y_α^{VG} to indicate the subtuple of y_α containing precisely the VG-sort parameters of y_α , in the same order; similarly for y_α^{RF}),
- (3) $b_\alpha = (b_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ is a sequence of VG-sort and RF-sort parameters corresponding to y_α (we will use $b_{\alpha,i}^{\text{VG}}$ and $b_{\alpha,i}^{\text{RF}}$ to indicate the subtuples of $b_{\alpha,i}$ corresponding to y_α^{VG} and y_α^{RF} , respectively),
- (4) z_α is a tuple of VF-sort variables, and
- (5) $c_\alpha = (c_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ is a sequence of VF-sort parameters corresponding to z_α .

We begin with a technical lemma which will allow us to replace an inp-pattern with another of the same depth with certain VF-sort parameters removed.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume T and \mathcal{K} are as above and let $(\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an indiscernible inp-pattern with x a singleton in the valued field sort. Assume moreover that for each $\alpha < \kappa$ there exist finitely many terms $\{t_\alpha^j : 1 \leq j < n_\alpha\}$ in the VG-sort and RF-sort such that*

- (1) *none of the terms t_α^j contain the variable x , and*
- (2) *viewing ψ_α as a string of symbols, whenever a variable from the tuple z_α occurs in ψ_α , that occurrence is contained in a substring of ψ_α equal to one of the terms t_α^j .*

Then for each $\alpha < \kappa$ there exists a tuple of VG-sort and RF-sort variables y'_α , a corresponding parameter sequence b'_α , and a formula $\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ such that $((\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa})$ is an indiscernible inp-pattern of the same depth κ .

Proof. We build ϕ'_α from ψ_α by introducing new variable symbols to replace the terms containing z_α . Fix $\alpha < \kappa$ and let $w_\alpha^1, \dots, w_\alpha^{n_\alpha}$ be new variable symbols. For each $j \leq n_\alpha$ and $i < \omega$, let $d_{\alpha,i}^j = t_\alpha^j(b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}, c'_{\alpha,i})$. Let $y'_\alpha = y_\alpha w_\alpha^1 \dots w_\alpha^{n_\alpha}$, and let $b'_{\alpha,i} = b_{\alpha,i} d_{\alpha,i}^1 \dots d_{\alpha,i}^{n_\alpha}$ such that the variables w_α^j correspond to the parameters $d_{\alpha,i}^j$.

Let $\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ be the same formula as $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$, but with the new variables $w_\alpha^1, \dots, w_\alpha^{n_\alpha}$ replacing each occurrence of the terms $t_\alpha^1, \dots, t_\alpha^{n_\alpha}$. By assumption, z_α no longer occurs in the formula after making this substitution, and so we can remove it from the list of variables.

Apply the above process for each $\alpha < \kappa$, and note that

$$\mathcal{K} \models \phi'_\alpha(x, b'_{\alpha,i}, c'_{\alpha,i}) \leftrightarrow \psi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}, c'_{\alpha,i})$$

for each $\alpha < \kappa$ and $i < \omega$. Since each coordinate of $b'_{\alpha,i}$ was built from a term including only parameters from $(b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}, c'_{\alpha,i})$, the array $\{(b'_\alpha, c'_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible. Then applying Fact 4.1(2), $(\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an indiscernible inp-pattern of depth κ , as desired. \square

We will use Lemma 4.3 to prove a sequence of propositions towards a proof of Theorem 4.7. The propositions will allow us to replace a general inp-pattern for T with progressively less complicated inp-patterns, until the pattern is sufficiently simple for us to deduce the theorem.

Proposition 4.4. *Assume T and \mathcal{K} are as above and let $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an indiscernible inp-pattern with x a singleton in the valued field sort. Then we can construct a new*

inp-pattern $(\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ of the same depth, such that each formula ϕ'_α has the form

$$\chi_\alpha(v(x - z'_\alpha), (y'_\alpha)^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho_\alpha(\text{ac}(x - z'_\alpha), (y'_\alpha)^{\text{RF}})$$

and such that:

- (1) χ_α and ρ_α are formulas in \mathcal{L}_{VG} and \mathcal{L}_{RF} , respectively, and
- (2) z'_α is a singleton in the valued field sort.

Proof. We wish to apply Lemma 4.3. Fix some $\alpha < \kappa$. By Proposition 3.3, Fact 4.1, and the indiscernibility of (b_α, c_α) , we may assume that $\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha)$ has the form

$$\chi_\alpha(v(x - z_\alpha^1), \dots, v(x - z_\alpha^n), y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho_\alpha(\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^1), \dots, \text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^n), y_\alpha^{\text{RF}})$$

where $z_\alpha = (z_\alpha^1, \dots, z_\alpha^n)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $n = 1$ then we may take $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha) = \phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ (z_α will be an unused variable), $c'_\alpha = c_\alpha$, and the set of terms t'_α to be the empty set. Otherwise, let $\theta = \phi_\alpha$ and fix a realization a of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,0}, c_{\alpha,0}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$.

Let I_θ be the set of indices i such that either $v(x - z_\alpha^i)$ or $\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^i)$ appears in θ . We proceed recursively, at each step replacing θ with a new formula θ' such that $|I_{\theta'}| = |I_\theta| - 1$. Set $r = \min(I_\theta)$ and $s = \max(I_\theta)$; we break into cases based on the relationships between a , $c_{\alpha,0}^r$, and $c_{\alpha,0}^s$, following the proof of Lemma 7.12 of [Che14].

Case 1: If $v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^r) < v(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$, then $v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^r) = v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s)$ and $\text{ac}(a - c_{\alpha,0}^r) = \text{ac}(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s)$ by Fact 2.6. Take $\theta'(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha)$ to be the conjunction of

- (1) θ with each occurrence of $v(x - z_\alpha^s)$ replaced by $v(x - z_\alpha^r)$ and each occurrence of $\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^s)$ replaced by $\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^r)$, and
- (2) The formula $v(x - z_\alpha^r) < v(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r)$.

Case 2: If $v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^r) > v(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$ then $v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s) = v(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$ and $\text{ac}(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s) = \text{ac}(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$. Take $\theta'(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha)$ to be the conjunction of

- (1) θ with each occurrence of $v(x - z_\alpha^s)$ replaced by $v(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r)$ and each occurrence of $\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^s)$ replaced by $\text{ac}(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r)$, and
- (2) The formula $v(x - z_\alpha^r) > v(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r)$.

Case 3: If $v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s) < v(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$, proceed symmetrically to case 1.

Case 4: If $v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s) > v(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$, proceed symmetrically to case 2.

Case 5: If $v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^r) = v(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s) = v(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$ then by Fact 2.6 again, we must have $\text{ac}(a - c_{\alpha,0}^s) = \text{ac}(a - c_{\alpha,0}^r) - \text{ac}(c_{\alpha,0}^s - c_{\alpha,0}^r)$. Take $\theta'(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha)$ to be the conjunction of

- (1) θ with each occurrence of $v(x - z_\alpha^s)$ replaced by $v(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r)$ and each occurrence of $\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^s)$ replaced by $\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^r) - \text{ac}(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r)$, and
- (2) The formula $v(x - z_\alpha^r) = v(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r) \wedge \text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^r) \neq \text{ac}(z_\alpha^s - z_\alpha^r)$.

Note that in each case, we have $\mathcal{K} \models \theta'(a, b_{\alpha,0}, c_{\alpha,0})$ by construction, and that $|I_{\theta'}| = |I_\theta| - 1$. If $|I_{\theta'}| = 1$, let r be the single index in $I_{\theta'}$, set $c'_\alpha = (c_{\alpha,i}^r)_{i < \omega}$, and set $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ to be θ' with each occurrence of $v(x - z_\alpha^r)$ replaced by $v(x - z'_\alpha)$ and each occurrence of $\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha^r)$ replaced by $\text{ac}(x - z'_\alpha)$. Otherwise, repeat the process recursively with θ' in place of θ .

Since c'_α is a subtuple of c_α , the array $\{(b_\alpha, c_\alpha, c'_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible. By choice of θ' and ψ_α , any realization of $\Psi_\alpha = \{\psi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}, c'_{\alpha,i}) : i < \omega\}$ would also be a realization of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}) : i < \omega\}$, and so Ψ_α is inconsistent. Thus, $(\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an indiscernible inp-pattern.

If we then take the collection $\{v(z_\alpha^i - z_\alpha^j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq n\} \cup \{\text{ac}(z_\alpha^i - z_\alpha^j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$ for the set of terms t_α^i , we can apply Lemma 4.3 to obtain $((\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa})$, a new indiscernible inp-pattern of depth κ . By choice of ψ_α and the fact that z'_α is a singleton for all $\alpha < \kappa$, the formulas in the new inp-pattern have the desired form. \square

We have just shown that we can replace any inp-pattern with one in which there is only one VF-sort parameter in each row. In the next two propositions, we show that we can find a new inp-pattern in which the VF-sort parameter is constant within each row, and then one in which there is no VF-sort parameter in any row.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume T and \mathcal{K} are as above, and let $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an indiscernible inp-pattern with x a singleton in the valued field sort. Then we can construct a new indiscernible inp-pattern $(\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ of the same depth, such that for each $\alpha < \kappa$,*

- (1) *the formula ϕ'_α has the form described in Proposition 4.4, and*
- (2) *the VF-sort sequence $c'_\alpha = (c'_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ is a constant sequence of singletons.*

Proof. First, by applying Proposition 4.4, we may assume that each ϕ_α has the form described in that proposition. We again wish to apply Lemma 4.3. From the conclusion of Proposition 4.4, each c_α is an indiscernible sequence of singletons.

For every $\alpha < \kappa$, fix an element $c_{\alpha,\infty}$ such that

- if c_α is pseudo-convergent or a fan, then $c_\alpha^+ = (c_{\alpha,0}, c_{\alpha,1}, c_{\alpha,2}, \dots, c_{\alpha,\infty})$ is indiscernible, and
- if c_α taken in the reverse order is pseudo-convergent, then $c_\alpha^+ = (c_{\alpha,\infty}, c_{\alpha,0}, c_{\alpha,1}, \dots)$ is indiscernible.

By compactness, we may assume that the set of sequences $\{(b_\alpha, c_\alpha^+) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible. Take $c'_\alpha = (c'_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ to be the constant sequence $c'_{\alpha,i} = c_{\alpha,\infty}$ for all $i < \omega$ and all $\alpha < \kappa$.

Let z'_α be a new variable symbol corresponding to c'_α and fix a realization a of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,0}, c_{\alpha,0}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$. To find the formulas $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ needed for Lemma 4.3, we split into cases based on the relationship between $v(a - c_{\alpha,\infty})$ and $v(c_{\alpha,0} - c_{\alpha,\infty})$.

Fix $\alpha < \kappa$. For legibility, we will write b_i, c_i, c_∞ in place of $b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,\infty}$ in the cases below. We will clearly have $\mathcal{K} \models \psi_\alpha(a, b_0, c_0, c_\infty)$ by choice of ψ_α in each case. Once ψ_α is chosen, set $\Psi_\alpha(x) = \{\psi_\alpha(x, b_i, c_i, c_\infty) : i < \omega\}$.

Case 1: If $v(a - c_\infty) < v(c_0 - c_\infty)$ then $v(a - c_0) = v(a - c_\infty)$ and $\text{ac}(a - c_0) = \text{ac}(a - c_\infty)$ by Fact 2.6. Let $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ be the formula

$$v(x - z'_\alpha) < v(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha) \wedge \chi(v(x - z'_\alpha), y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho(\text{ac}(x - z'_\alpha), y_\alpha^{\text{RF}}).$$

Note that any realization of $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ would also be a realization of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_i, c_i) : i < \omega\}$, so $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ is inconsistent.

Case 2: If $v(a - c_\infty) > v(c_0 - c_\infty)$ then by Fact 2.6, $v(a - c_0) = v(c_\infty - c_0)$ and $\text{ac}(a - c_0) = \text{ac}(c_\infty - c_0)$, so $\mathcal{K} \models \phi(c_\infty, b_0, c_0)$. Then by indiscernibility, c_∞ realizes $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_i, c_i) : i < \omega\}$, contradicting the inconsistency of that row of the inp-pattern. Thus, case 2 cannot occur.

Case 3: Assume $v(a - c_\infty) = v(c_0 - c_\infty)$. In this case, we need to split into subcases based on the form of the sequence $(c_i)_{i < \omega}$ and the relationship between $\text{ac}(a - c_\infty)$ and $\text{ac}(c_0 - c_\infty)$.

Case 3a: If $\text{ac}(a - c_\infty) \neq \text{ac}(c_0 - c_\infty)$ then $v(a - c_0) = v(a - c_\infty) = v(c_0 - c_\infty)$, so $\text{ac}(a - c_0) = \text{ac}(a - c_\infty) - \text{ac}(c_0 - c_\infty)$. Let $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ be the formula

$$v(x - z'_\alpha) = v(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha) \wedge \text{ac}(x - z'_\alpha) \neq \text{ac}(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha)$$

$$\wedge \chi(v(x - z'_\alpha), y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho(\text{ac}(x - z'_\alpha) - \text{ac}(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha), y_\alpha^{\text{RF}}).$$

As in Case 1, note that any realization of $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ would also be a realization of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_i, c_i) : i < \omega\}$, so $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ is inconsistent.

Case 3b: Suppose $(c_i)_{i < \omega}$ or its reversal is pseudo-convergent and let $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ be the formula $v(x - z'_\alpha) = v(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha)$. It is easy to check that c_∞ is a pseudo-limit of $(c_i)_{i < \omega}$ or its reversal, whichever is pseudo-convergent, and so $v(c_i - c_\infty) \neq v(c_j - c_\infty)$ whenever $i \neq j$. Thus, for any $d \in K$, it is impossible for $v(d - c_\infty)$ to be equal to both $v(c_i - c_\infty)$ and $v(c_j - c_\infty)$; in other words, $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ is inconsistent.

Case 3c: Finally, by Fact 4.2, suppose $(c_i)_{i < \omega}$ is a fan and $\text{ac}(a - c_\infty) = \text{ac}(c_0 - c_\infty)$. Let $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ be the formula

$$v(x - z'_\alpha) = v(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha) \wedge \text{ac}(x - z'_\alpha) = \text{ac}(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha).$$

Since c_∞ will be an element of the fan, $\text{ac}(c_i - c_\infty) \neq \text{ac}(c_j - c_\infty)$ for any $i \neq j$. Thus, for any $d \in K$, it is impossible for $\text{ac}(d - c_\infty)$ to be equal to both $\text{ac}(c_i - c_\infty)$ and $\text{ac}(c_j - c_\infty)$, which means $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ is inconsistent.

As noted above, Case 2 cannot occur. In each other case, we have chosen $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ so that $\Psi_\alpha(x)$ is inconsistent and $\mathcal{K} \models \psi_\alpha(a, b_{\alpha,0}, c_{\alpha,0}, c'_{\alpha,0})$. In addition, by choice of c'_α , the array $\{(b_\alpha, c_\alpha, c'_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible. Thus, $\{\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha, c'_\alpha)\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an indiscernible inp-pattern.

Finally, the terms $t_\alpha^1 = v(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha)$ and $t_\alpha^2 = \text{ac}(z_\alpha - z'_\alpha)$ satisfy the remaining conditions of Lemma 4.3, and we obtain a new inp-pattern $((\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha, z'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha, c'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ in which the VF-sort parameter sequence of each row of the new inp-pattern is c'_α , a constant sequence of singletons. Moreover, each ψ_α has the form described in Proposition 4.4 by construction, and ϕ'_α inherits this form since it is obtained from ψ_α through a substitution of terms. Thus, the new inp-pattern has the desired form. \square

Proposition 4.6. *Assume T and \mathcal{K} are as above, and let $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be an indiscernible inp-pattern with x a singleton in the valued field sort. Then we can construct a new indiscernible inp-pattern $(\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ of the same depth, such that for each $\alpha < \kappa$, the formula ϕ'_α has the form*

$$\chi_\alpha(v(x), (y'_\alpha)^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho_\alpha(\text{ac}(x), (y'_\alpha)^{\text{RF}}),$$

where χ_α and ρ_α are formulas in \mathcal{L}_{VG} and \mathcal{L}_{RF} , respectively.

Proof. From the previous propositions, we may assume each $\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha)$ has the form

$$\chi_\alpha(v(x - z_\alpha), y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho_\alpha(\text{ac}(x - z_\alpha), y_\alpha^{\text{RF}})$$

and that for each $\alpha < \kappa$, z_α is a singleton and c_α is a constant sequence. Throughout this proof, we will identify a constant sequence with its value. We will again apply Lemma 4.3. Let a be some realization of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,0}, c_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$.

For any $\alpha, \beta < \kappa$ such that $v(a - c_\alpha) < v(a - c_\beta)$, we have $v(a - c_\alpha) = v(c_\beta - c_\alpha)$ and $\text{ac}(a - c_\alpha) = \text{ac}(c_\beta - c_\alpha)$ by Fact 2.6. Then, since $K \models \phi_\alpha(a, b_{\alpha,0}, c_\alpha)$, we have $K \models \phi_\alpha(c_\beta, b_{\alpha,0}, c_\alpha)$. But then by mutual indiscernibility, $K \models \phi_\alpha(c_\beta, b_{\alpha,i}, c_\alpha)$ for all $i < \omega$, contradicting the inconsistency of the row α .

Thus, $v(a - c_\alpha)$ is constant for all $\alpha < \kappa$; in particular, it is equal to $v(a - c_0)$. For each α , let $c'_\alpha = c_\alpha - c_0$, and let $a' = a - c_0$. Since $(b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible over c_0 for all $\alpha < \kappa$ (including $\alpha = 0$, since $c_0 = c_{0,i}$ for all $i < \omega$), the array obtained by replacing c_α with c'_α is still

an inp-pattern, and a' will be a realization of the first column. To simplify notation, assume that $c_0 = 0$, so $a' = a$ and $c'_\alpha = c_\alpha$.

Now $v(a - c_\alpha) = v(a - c_0) = v(a)$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$, and so $\text{ac}(a - c_\alpha)$ equals either $\text{ac}(a)$ or $\text{ac}(a) - \text{ac}(c_\alpha)$, depending on whether $v(a) < v(c_\alpha)$ or $v(a) = v(c_\alpha)$; the case where $v(a) > v(c_\alpha)$ is impossible since $v(a - c_\alpha) = v(a)$. We again split into cases in order to define formulas $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha, z'_\alpha)$ for $\alpha < \kappa$.

Case 1: If $v(a) < v(c_\alpha)$, take $\psi(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha)$ to be the formula

$$v(x) < v(z_\alpha) \wedge \chi(v(x), y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho(\text{ac}(x), y_\alpha^{\text{RF}}).$$

Case 2: If $v(a) = v(c_\alpha)$, take $\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha)$ to be the formula

$$v(x) = v(z_\alpha) \wedge \chi(v(x), y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho(\text{ac}(x) - \text{ac}(z_\alpha), y_\alpha^{\text{RF}}).$$

In either case, $\mathcal{K} \models \psi_\alpha(a, b_{\alpha,0}, c_\alpha)$ and any realization of $\Psi_\alpha = \{\psi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}) : i < \omega\}$ would also be a realization of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}) : i < \omega\}$. Thus, Ψ_α is inconsistent and $\{\psi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha, z_\alpha), (b_\alpha, c_\alpha)\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an indiscernible inp-pattern. Take $v(z_\alpha)$ and $\text{ac}(z_\alpha)$ for the terms t_α^i .

Then, setting z'_α and c'_α to be empty tuples, we may apply Lemma 4.3 to obtain a new inp-pattern $((\phi'_\alpha(x, y'_\alpha), (b'_\alpha))_{\alpha < \kappa}$ with no VF-sort parameter sequences, and in which each formula has the desired form. \square

Now that we can reduce to inp-patterns with no VF-sort parameters, we can prove the main theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose T is a theory of henselian valued fields in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} admitting relative quantifier elimination. Then*

$$\text{bdn}(T) = \text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}}) + \text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}}),$$

where T_{VG} and T_{RF} are the induced theories on the value group and residue field, respectively.

Proof. We begin by showing that $\text{bdn}(T) \leq \text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}}) + \text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}})$. Suppose that $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha), b_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an indiscernible inp-pattern for T . If x is a VG-sort variable then we can obtain a new inp-pattern $(\phi'_\alpha(x', y_\alpha), b_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ with x' a VF-sort variable by taking $\phi'_\alpha(x', y_\alpha) = \phi_\alpha(v(x'), y_\alpha)$. A similar substitution with $\text{ac}(x')$ can replace an RF-sort variable with a VF-sort variable.

Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that x is in the valued field sort. By Proposition 4.6, we may further assume that for each $\alpha < \kappa$, y_α has no VF-sort component and $\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha)$ has the form

$$\chi_\alpha(v(x), y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}) \wedge \rho_\alpha(\text{ac}(x), y_\alpha^{\text{RF}})$$

where $\chi_\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{VG}}$ and $\rho_\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{RF}}$.

Suppose that for some $\alpha < \kappa$, the sets $X_\alpha(x) = \{\chi_\alpha(v(x), b_{\alpha,i}^{\text{VG}}) : i < \omega\}$ and $P_\alpha(x) = \{\rho_\alpha(\text{ac}(x), b_{\alpha,i}^{\text{RF}}) : i < \omega\}$ are both consistent, say they are realized by elements c and d , respectively. Then by Fact 2.5, there exists an element a with $v(a) = v(c)$ and $\text{ac}(a) = \text{ac}(d)$. But then a would be a realization of $X_\alpha(x) \cup P_\alpha(x)$, and so would also be a realization of $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha,i}) : i < \omega\}$, contradicting the inconsistency of the row.

Thus, we can write $\kappa = G \cup R$, where $\alpha \in G$ if $X_\alpha(x)$ is inconsistent, and $\alpha \in R$ if $P_\alpha(x)$ is inconsistent. Then for new variable symbols z and w , $(\chi_\alpha(z, y_\alpha^{\text{VG}}), b_\alpha^{\text{VG}})_{\alpha \in G}$ is an inp-pattern in vK and $(\rho_\alpha(w, y_\alpha^{\text{RF}}), b_\alpha^{\text{RF}})_{\alpha \in R}$ is an inp-pattern in Kv , so

$$\kappa = G \cup R = |G \cup R| \leq |G| + |R| \leq \text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}}) + \text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}}).$$

Since $\text{bdn}(T)$ is the supremum of all such κ , we have $\text{bdn}(T) \leq \text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}}) + \text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}})$.

For the reverse inequality, let $(\chi_\alpha(z, y_\alpha), b_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha < \kappa}$ and $(\rho_\alpha(w, y_\alpha), b_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{\kappa \leq \alpha < \lambda}$ be inp-patterns for T_{VG} and T_{RF} ; we do not make any assumption of indiscernibility. For each $0 \leq \alpha < \kappa$, let

$\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha)$ be the formula $\chi_\alpha(v(x), y_\alpha)$, and for each $\kappa \leq \alpha < \lambda$, let $\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha)$ be the formula $\rho_\alpha(\text{ac}(x), y_\alpha)$. We claim that $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha), b_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha < \lambda}$ is an inp-pattern for K .

First, note that each row is k_α -inconsistent, since we started with inp-patterns for T_{VG} and T_{RF} . Fix any function $\eta : \lambda \rightarrow \omega$. If $\gamma \in vK$ and $c \in Kv$ are realizations of $\{\chi_\alpha(z, b_{\alpha, \eta(\alpha)}) : 0 \leq \alpha < \kappa\}$ and $\{\rho_\alpha(w, b_{\alpha, \eta(\alpha)}) : \kappa \leq \alpha < \lambda\}$, respectively, then any element $a \in K$ with $v(a) = \gamma$ and $\text{ac}(a) = c$ will realize $\{\phi_\alpha(x, b_{\alpha, \eta(\alpha)}) : 0 \leq \alpha < \lambda\}$.

Thus, $(\phi_\alpha(x, y_\alpha), b_\alpha, k_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha < \lambda}$ is an inp-pattern for T , which means $\lambda \leq \text{bdn}(T)$. Since λ is the sum of the depths of arbitrary inp-patterns for T_{VG} and T_{RF} , taking the supremum over all such inp-patterns yields $\text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}}) + \text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}}) \leq \text{bdn}(T)$, completing the proof. \square

As an immediate consequence of the theorem, we get that NTP_2 transfers from T_{VG} and T_{RF} to T . This generalizes [Che14, Theorem 7.6] from equicharacteristic zero to any characteristic, provided the theory has relative quantifier elimination.

Corollary 4.8. *Let T be a theory of henselian valued fields in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} admitting relative quantifier elimination. Then T is NTP_2 if and only if T_{VG} and T_{RF} are. The same is true for the statements “ T is strong” and “ T has finite burden.”*

Note that equality only holds in the theorem when working in the Denef-Pas language; if T' is the theory of a reduct of a model of T (for example, if T' is the usual one-sorted valued field language \mathcal{L}_{div}), then we only have the inequality

$$\text{bdn}(T') \leq \text{bdn}(T) = \text{bdn}(T_{\text{VG}}) + \text{bdn}(T_{\text{RF}}).$$

We know that both $\text{bdn}(T') < \text{bdn}(T)$ and $\text{bdn}(T') = \text{bdn}(T)$ are possible, depending on the choice of T and T' :

- (1) The burden of ACVF in \mathcal{L}_{div} is 1, but the burden of ACVF in \mathcal{L}_{Pas} is 2.
- (2) The burden of $\text{Th}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is 1 in both \mathcal{L}_{div} and \mathcal{L}_{Pas} , since the residue field of \mathbb{Q}_p is finite.

It is not known whether there is a valued field K with infinite residue field where equality holds in a reduct of the Denef-Pas language. This will certainly happen if the angular component map is definable in \mathcal{L}_{div} , but may occur in other situations as well.

REFERENCES

- [Adl07] Hans Adler. Strong theories, burden, and weight. Available on the author’s website at <http://www.logic.univie.ac.at/~adler/docs/strong.pdf>, March 2007.
- [AJ19] Sylvie Anselme and Franziska Jahnke. The model theory of Cohen rings. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.08297>, 2019.
- [BB96] Luc Bélair and Michel Bousquet. Types dans les corps valués. *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences de Paris*, 323:841–844, 1996. Available at https://archipel.uqam.ca/3611/1/belair-bousquet_finaledec2010.pdf.
- [Bél99] Luc Bélair. Types dans les corps valués munis d’applications coefficients. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 43(2):410–425, 1999.
- [Che14] Artem Chernikov. Theories without the tree property of the second kind. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165:695–723, 2014.
- [CS19] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Henselian valued fields and inp-minimality. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 84(4):1510–1526, 2019.
- [Del78] Françoise Delon. Types sur $\mathbf{C}((x))$. In *Groupe d’Étude de Théories Stables, année 78-79*. Secrétariat mathématique, Institut Henri-Poincaré, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, 1978.
- [EP05] A.J. Engler and A. Prestel. *Valued Fields*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005.
- [HH19] Yatir Halevi and Assaf Hasson. Eliminating field quantifiers in strongly dependent henselian fields. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 25(2):182–195, 2019.
- [JS20] Franziska Jahnke and Pierre Simon. NIP henselian valued fields. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 59:167–178, 2020.
- [Kap42] Irving Kaplansky. Maximal fields with valuations. *Duke Mathematics Journal*, 9:303–321, 1942.

- [Kuh16] Franz-Viktor Kuhlmann. The algebra and model theory of tame valued fields. *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik*, 719:1–43, 2016.
- [Pas89] Johan Pas. Uniform p -adic cell decomposition and local zeta functions. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 399:137–172, 1989.
- [Pas90] Johan Pas. On the angular component map modulo P . *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 55(3):1125–1129, 1990.
- [She90] Saharon Shelah. *Classification Theory and the Number of Nonisomorphic Models*, volume 91 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1990.
- [Sin18] Peter Sinclair. *Relationships between model theory and valuations of fields*. PhD thesis, McMaster University, 2018. Available at <https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/handle/11375/23326>.
- [Tou18] Pierre Touchard. Burden in henselian valued fields. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.08756>, 2018.
- [TZ12] Katrin Tent and Martin Ziegler. A course in model theory. In *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

PETER SINCLAIR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DOUGLAS COLLEGE, 700 ROYAL AVE, NEW WESTMINSTER,
BRITISH COLUMBIA V3M 5Z5, CANADA

Email address: `sinclairp@douglascollege.ca`