

ON ALGEBRAICALLY CLOSED FIELDS WITH A DISTINGUISHED SUBFIELD

CHRISTIAN D'ELBÉE, ITAY KAPLAN, AND LEOR NEUHAUSER

ABSTRACT. This paper is concerned with the model-theoretic study of pairs (K, F) where K is an algebraically closed field and F is a distinguished subfield of K allowing extra structure. We study the basic model-theoretic properties of those pairs, such as quantifier elimination, model-completeness and saturated models. We also prove some preservation results of classification-theoretic notions such as stability, simplicity, NSOP₁, and NIP. As an application, we conclude that a PAC field is NSOP₁ iff its absolute Galois group is (as a profinite group).

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminaries	3
3.	Basic properties of ACF _T	6
4.	Quantifier elimination and more	10
5.	Classification and independence	14
6.	Applications	22
7.	Questions	26
	References	26

1. INTRODUCTION

In their study of pseudo-algebraically closed fields, or PAC fields (known at that time as regularly closed fields, for obvious reasons, see Definition 6.8) Cherlin, van den Dries and Macintyre [CvdDM80, CvdDM81] described elementary invariants for those fields. This was inspired by the work of Ax on pseudo-finite fields. Among those invariants is the elementary theory of the absolute Galois group of those fields in a suitable omega-sorted language, called the *inverse system of the absolute Galois group*. It was already clear to the authors of [CvdDM80, CvdDM81] that this invariant is an essential tool for the study of PAC fields. The intuition that the model theoretic complexity of the theory of PAC fields is mainly controlled by the theory of its absolute Galois group was confirmed by numerous results since then. For example, Chatzidakis [Cha19] proved that if the inverse system of the absolute Galois group of a PAC field is NSOP_n ($n > 2$), then so is the theory of the field. Ramsey [Ram18] proved the corresponding results for NTP₁ and NSOP₁. It is a fact that the inverse system of the absolute Galois group of a field F is interpretable in the theory of the pair (K, F) for any algebraically closed field K extending F

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 03C45, 03C10, 03C60.

The authors would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation for their support of this research (grant no. 1254/18). The first-named author was partially supported by the S.A Schonbrunn Fellowship. This paper was done as part of the third-named author's master thesis under the supervision of the first- and second-named authors.

(see [Cha02, Proposition 5.5]). This motivated our interest in the model-theoretic study of such pairs (K, F) .

The model-theoretic study of pairs of fields goes back to Tarski when he raised in [Tar51] the question of the decidability of the pair $(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R} \cap \mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}})$ (the reals with a predicate for the reals algebraic over \mathbb{Q}). The (positive) answer was given by Robinson in [Rob59], who gave a full set of axioms for the theories of $(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R} \cap \mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}})$ and $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}})$. The celebrated work of Morley and of Shelah in the 70s created a growing interest in classification of first-order theories, and in particular of theories of fields and their expansions. It was known since the 80's that the theory of $(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}})$ is stable¹ and Poizat [Poi83] generalized this result to a more general context: he gave a criterion for the stability of special pairs of elementary substructures $N \succeq M$ (called “belles paires”), under a strong stability assumption on the theory of M (and N) called *nfcv*, introduced by Keisler [Kei67]. This was later generalised to the context of simple theories [BYPV03] with the notion of lovely pairs. Back to algebraically closed fields, Delon [Del12] introduced a language for quantifier elimination for proper pairs of algebraically closed fields (which are models of the theory of belles paires of algebraically closed fields) and proper pairs of algebraically closed valued fields. Recently, Martin-Pizarro and Ziegler [MPZ20] proved that the theory of proper pairs of algebraically closed fields is equational, by a deep analysis of definable sets.

As was mentioned above, the main topic of this paper is another generalization of pairs of algebraically closed fields which are pairs (K, F) where F is an arbitrary field, perhaps with some extra structure (in a language extending the language of rings), and $K \supseteq F$ is an algebraically closed field, such that the degree of K over F is infinite. An early result about this theory was given by Keisler [Kei64]: if F and F' are two elementarily equivalent fields (not real-closed nor algebraically closed and without extra structure), then the pairs (K, F) and (K', F') are also elementarily equivalent, for any algebraically closed extensions $K \supseteq F$, $K' \supseteq F'$. In [HKR18], Hils, Kamensky and Rideau gave a quantifier elimination result for the theory of the pairs (K, F) , which we also obtain in Theorem 4.3 (we became aware of their work only after we finished writing our proof and we decided to keep it for completeness).

The purpose of this paper is twofold: (1) investigate the basic logical properties of the theory of such pairs and (2) prove preservation results of several classification-theoretic properties.

For (1), we discuss saturated models, completeness, quantifier elimination and model-completeness. For example, as we mentioned above we prove quantifier elimination for the theory of pairs (K, F) (see Theorem 4.3) in a natural expansion of the language following Delon's approach [Del12]. This allows us to isolate a condition implying the model-completeness of the theory of the pair (K, F) which is weaker than the model completeness of the theory of F (see Theorem 4.12). For (2), we prove preservation of several classification-theoretic properties: if the theory of F is (ω -/super) stable/NIP/simple/NSOP₁, then so is the theory of the pair (K, F) (see Corollaries 5.25 and 5.26 and Theorems 5.9, 5.13, 5.16 and 5.34). In the case of NSOP₁, we also identify Kim-independence for algebraically closed sets (see Proposition 5.11).

As immediate applications we conclude that:

- (1) The theory of a PAC field F in the language of rings is NSOP₁ if and only if the theory of its Galois group is (see Proposition 6.7).
- (2) When F is pseudofinite in the language of rings, then the theory of the pair (K, F) is simple.

¹See the first sentence of [Poi83].

In addition, we consider the theory ACF^I of a chain of algebraically closed fields ordered by some linear order I , and discuss its properties depending on the order type of I (see Proposition 6.4).

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank Zoé Chatzidakis for her useful comments and give a special thanks to Nick Ramsey for valuable discussions and ideas in this project. We would also like to thank Anand Pillay for his comments leading us to Remark 5.15 and Question 7.3. We would also like to thank the anonymous referee for their careful reading and their comments.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present common definitions and results from fields and model theory. We will start by setting up some basic notation for the whole paper.

Notation 2.1. Whenever A is a field, let \bar{A} be its algebraic closure. Whenever A and B are subfields of a larger field, let $A.B$ be their field compositum. If A is a field and S is a set, then let $A(S)$ be the field extension of A by the elements of S . Say that the set S is algebraically independent over A if each element $s \in S$ is algebraically independent over $A(S \setminus \{s\})$. If R is a sub-ring of a larger field, then denote by $\text{Frac}(R)$ the field generated by R . Unless specified otherwise, all the fields will be subfields of a large algebraically closed field.

2.1. Linear disjointness.

Definition 2.2. Let A, B and C be fields with $C \subseteq A \cap B$.

- (1) Say that A is *linearly disjoint* from B over C if whenever $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ are linearly independent over C they are also linearly independent over B . Denote this by $A \downarrow_C^l B$.
- (2) Say that A is *algebraically disjoint* from B over C if whenever $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ are algebraically independent over C , then they are also algebraically independent over B . This is the same as the non-forking independence in ACF , which we will denote $A \downarrow_C^{\text{ACF}} B$.

Fact 2.3 ([Mor96, Proposition 20.2]). Let A, B and C be fields with $C \subseteq A \cap B$. Construct a map $A \otimes_C B \rightarrow A[B]$ by mapping $a \otimes b \mapsto ab$. This map is an isomorphism iff $A \downarrow_C^l B$.

Fact 2.4. The following is a list of useful model theoretic properties that \downarrow^l has inside ACF . Let A, B, C, D, A', B' and C' be fields with $C \subseteq A \cap B$, $C' \subseteq A' \cap B'$ and $B \subseteq D$.

- (Invariance) if $ABC \equiv A'B'C'$ and $A \downarrow_C^l B$, then $A' \downarrow_{C'}^l B'$.
- (Monotonicity) if $A \downarrow_C^l D$, then $A \downarrow_C^l B$.
- (Base monotonicity) if $A \downarrow_C^l D$, then $A.B \downarrow_B^l D$.
- (Transitivity) if $A \downarrow_C^l B$ and $A.B \downarrow_B^l D$, then $A \downarrow_C^l D$.
- (Symmetry) if $A \downarrow_C^l B$, then $B \downarrow_C^l A$.
- (Stationarity) if $A \equiv_C A'$ and $A \downarrow_C^l B$, $A' \downarrow_C^l B$, then $A \equiv_B A'$.
- (Local character) for a finite tuple a , there exists a countable subfield $B_0 \subseteq B$, such that $B_0(a) \downarrow_{B_0}^l B$.

Proof. Invariance is trivial. Proofs for monotonicity, base monotonicity and transitivity can be found in [FJ08, Lemma 2.5.3], symmetry is proven in [FJ08, Lemma 2.5.1]. Stationarity follows directly from Fact 2.3 and quantifier elimination in ACF .

Local character follows from [Lan72, Theorem III.7, Proposition III.6 and Theorem III.8], by setting B_0 to be the field of definition of the locus of a over B . This

gives an even stronger result, as B_0 is finitely generated and not merely countable. For a more direct proof of local character, see Remark 5.2. \square

Corollary 2.5. *Let A_0, B_0, C_0, A_1, B_1 and C_1 be fields with $C_0 \subseteq A_0 \cap B_0$, $C_1 \subseteq A_1 \cap B_1$, such that $A_0 \downarrow_{C_0}^l B_0$, $A_1 \downarrow_{C_1}^l B_1$. Suppose there are isomorphism $f : A_0 \rightarrow A_1$, $g : B_0 \rightarrow B_1$ such that $f|_{C_0} = g|_{C_0}$. Then there is a unique isomorphism $F : A_0.B_0 \rightarrow A_1.B_1$ such that $F|_{A_0} = f$, $F|_{B_0} = g$.*

Proof. Consider A_0, A_1, B_0 and B_1 as tuples, such that f and g match the tuples. Extend g to an automorphism σ arbitrarily. From invariance, by applying σ to $A_0 \downarrow_{C_0}^l B_0$, we get $\sigma(A_0) \downarrow_{C_1}^l B_1$. From stationarity $\sigma(A_0) \equiv_{B_1} A_1$, let τ be an automorphism witnessing the equivalence. Let $F = (\tau \circ \sigma)|_{A_0.B_0}$, we have $F(A_0) = \tau(\sigma(A_0)) = A_1$ and $F(B_0) = \tau(\sigma(B_0)) = \tau(B_1) = B_1$ as tuples. In particular, $F : A_0.B_0 \rightarrow A_1.B_1$ is an isomorphism, and from the way we chose the tuples $F|_{A_0} = f$ and $F|_{B_0} = g$. \square

Definition 2.6. A field extension $A \subseteq B$ is called:

- *regular* if $\bar{A} \downarrow_A^l B$,
- *separable* if $A^{1/p} \downarrow_A^l B$, where $p = \text{char}(A) > 0$ and $A^{1/p}$ is the field of p -th roots of all elements in A (if $\text{char}(A) = 0$, then all extensions are separable), and
- *relatively algebraically closed* if $\bar{A} \cap B = A$.

Fact 2.7. *Suppose $A \subseteq B$ is a field extension.*

- (1) [FJ08, Lemma 2.6.4] *The extension $A \subseteq B$ is regular iff it is separable and relatively algebraically closed.*
- (2) [FJ08, Lemma 2.6.7] *If the extension $A \subseteq B$ is regular and C is a field extending A such that $B \downarrow_A^{\text{ACF}} C$, then $B \downarrow_A^l C$.*

Lemma 2.8. *If $A \subseteq B$ is a regular field extension and $\sigma : B \rightarrow B'$ is an isomorphism of fields, then $\sigma(A) \subseteq B'$ is regular.*

Proof. We can extend σ to the algebraic closure, $\tilde{\sigma} : \bar{B} \rightarrow \bar{B}'$. From $\bar{A} \downarrow_A^l B$ we get by invariance $\tilde{\sigma}(\bar{A}) \downarrow_{\sigma(A)}^l B'$. But $\tilde{\sigma}(\bar{A}) = \overline{\sigma(A)}$, so we have $\overline{\sigma(A)} \downarrow_{\sigma(A)}^l B'$ as needed. \square

Lemma 2.9. *If $A \subseteq B$ is a regular field extension and S is a set algebraically independent over B , then $\overline{A(S)} \downarrow_A^l B$.*

Proof. As S is algebraically independent over B , we have $\overline{A(S)} \downarrow_A^{\text{ACF}} B$. By Fact 2.7(2), $\overline{A(S)} \downarrow_A^l B$. \square

2.2. Language of regular extensions. In [Mac08], Macintyre defines relations in the language of rings that are preserved in a field extension iff it is regular. We will present those relations, and use them to expand a theory of fields² in such a way that the models are the same but for any two models M, N , N extends M iff it is a regular field extension.

Fact 2.10 ([Mac08, §4.7]). *Let $A \subseteq B$ be a field extension.*

- (1) *The extension is relatively algebraically closed iff it preserves the relations $\text{Sol}_n(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \exists y(x_0 + x_1 y + \dots + x_{n-1} y^{n-1} + y^n = 0)$ for $n \geq 1$.*
- (2) *For $p = \text{char}(A)$, the extension is separable iff it preserves the relations $D_{n,p}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \exists y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}(y_0^p x_0 + \dots + y_{n-1}^p x_{n-1} = 0)$ for $n \geq 1$ (note that if $p = 0$, $D_{n,p}$ is quantifier-free definable).*

²By a *theory of fields*, we mean a theory in a language expanding the language of rings which contains all the fields axioms.

Corollary 2.11. *Suppose M and N are fields. If $M \preceq N$, then $M \subseteq N$ is a regular extension.*

Proof. The fact that $M \preceq N$ implies in particular that $M \subseteq N$ is a field extension that preserves Sol_n and $D_{n,p}$ ($p = \text{char}(A)$). By Fact 2.10 the extension $M \subseteq N$ is relatively algebraically closed and separable, so by Fact 2.7(1) it is a regular extension. \square

Definition 2.12. Let T be a theory of fields in a language L expanding the language of rings. Define $L_{\text{reg}} = L \cup \{\text{Sol}_n\}_{n \geq 1} \cup \{\tilde{D}_{n,p}\}_{n \geq 1, p \in \text{Primes} \cup \{0\}}$, where Sol_n , $\tilde{D}_{n,p}$ are n -ary relations, and extend T to T_{reg} in L_{reg} by defining Sol_n as above and defining

$$\tilde{D}_{n,p} = D_{n,p} \wedge \underbrace{(1 + \cdots + 1 = 0)}_p.$$

Lemma 2.13. *Let T be a theory of fields and let $Q, R \models T$ with $Q \subseteq R$ a substructure. By adding definable relations, Q and R can be expanded to models of T_{reg} . Then Q is an L_{reg} -substructure of R iff $Q \subseteq R$ is a regular field extension.*

Proof. Let $p = \text{char}(Q)$. Note that by Facts 2.7 and 2.10, it is enough to prove that Q is an L_{reg} -substructure of R iff the extension $Q \subseteq R$ preserves Sol_n and $D_{n,p}$ for all n . Indeed, this equivalence holds because $\tilde{D}_{n,p}$ is equivalent to $D_{n,p}$ and $\tilde{D}_{n,q}$ is trivially false for any prime $q \neq p$. \square

2.3. NSOP₁. In this subsection we will review the definition and basic properties of NSOP₁ theories.

We will work in a monster model \mathbb{M} (large, saturated) of a complete theory T .

Definition 2.14. A formula $\phi(x; y)$ has SOP₁ if there is a tree of tuples $(b_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^{<\omega}}$ such that

- for all $\eta \in 2^\omega$, $\{\phi(x; b_{\eta|_\alpha}) \mid \alpha < \omega\}$ is consistent,
- for all $\eta \in 2^{<\omega}$, if $\nu \supseteq \eta \frown \langle 0 \rangle$, then $\{\phi(x; b_\nu), \phi(b; a_{\eta \frown \langle 1 \rangle})\}$ is inconsistent.

We say that a theory T is SOP₁ if some formula has SOP₁ modulo T . Otherwise, T is NSOP₁.

Definition 2.15. Let A be a set and a and b tuples, say that a is *coheir independent* of b over A if the type $\text{tp}(a/Ab)$ is finitely satisfiable in A , and denote $a \downarrow_A^u b$. A sequence $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ is an A -indiscernible coheir sequence if it is A -indiscernible and $a_i \downarrow_A^u a_{<i}$

Using coheir-independence, we can use a different criterion for NSOP₁, due to [CR16, Theorem 5.7].

Fact 2.16 (Weak independent amalgamation). *The theory T is NSOP₁ iff given any model $M \models T$ and tuples $a_0 b_0 \equiv_M a_1 b_1$ such that $b_1 \downarrow_M^u b_0$ and $b_i \downarrow_M^u a_i$ for $i = 0, 1$, there exists a such that $ab_0 \equiv_M ab_1 \equiv_M a_0 b_0$.*

Kim-dividing, and its extension Kim-forking, were defined in [KR20], over arbitrary sets. For our purposes we will give a simplified definition, which we will call Kim^u-dividing, and define it only over models.

Definition 2.17. A formula $\phi(x, b)$ *Kim^u-divides* over a model M if there exists an M -indiscernible coheir sequence $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ with $b \equiv_M b_i$, such that $\{\phi(x, b_i)\}_{i < \omega}$ is inconsistent. A formula *Kim^u-forks* over M if it implies a disjunction of Kim^u-dividing formulas over M .

A type *Kim^u-divides* (Kim^u-forks) over M if it implies a Kim^u-dividing (Kim^u-forking) formula over M . Denote $a \downarrow_M^K b$ when the type $\text{tp}(a/Mb)$ does not Kim^u-fork over M .

Remark 2.18. *In this definition, $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ is a Morley sequence in a restriction of a global coheir type. In the original definition of Kim-dividing, the global coheir type is replaced with a global invariant type. By Kim's lemma for Kim-dividing [KR20, Theorem 3.16], those definitions are equivalent for NSOP₁ theories.*

Remark 2.19. *The type $\text{tp}(a/Mb)$ does not Kim^u-divide over M iff for every M -indiscernible coheir sequence $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ with $b \equiv_M b_i$, there exists a' such that $ab \equiv_M a'b_i$ for every $i < \omega$.*

Fact 2.20. *Suppose T is NSOP₁, then*

- (1) [KR20, Theorem 3.16] *If $\phi(x, b)$ Kim-divides over $M \models T$, then for every M -indiscernible coheir sequence $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ with $b \equiv_M b_i$, $\{\phi(x, b_i)\}_{i < \omega}$ is inconsistent.*
- (2) [KR20, Proposition 3.19] *Kim-dividing is equivalent to Kim-forking over models.*
- (3) [KR20, Theorem 5.16] *\downarrow^K is symmetric over models.*
- (4) [KR20, Corollary 5.17] *Let $M \models T$, $a \downarrow_M^K b \iff \text{acl}(a) \downarrow_M^K b \iff a \downarrow_M^K \text{acl}(b)$.*
- (5) [KR20, Proposition 8.8] *T is simple iff \downarrow^K satisfies base monotonicity over models: if $M, N \models T$ and $M \subseteq N$, then $a \downarrow_M^K Nb$ implies $a \downarrow_N^K b$.*
- (6) [KR20, Proposition 8.4] *T is simple iff $\downarrow^K = \downarrow^f$ over models.*

3. BASIC PROPERTIES OF ACF_T

In this section we will define and study the basic properties of ACF_T , the theory of algebraically closed fields with a distinguished subfield (in an arbitrary language). We will also consider expansions of the theory by definable relations and functions, that Delon defined to study pairs of ACF in [Del12].

3.1. Delon's language.

Definition 3.1. Let T be a theory of fields (not necessarily complete), in a language expanding the language of rings $L \supseteq L_{\text{rings}}$. Expand L to the language $L^P = L \cup \{P\}$, with P a unitary predicate, and expand ACF to ACF_T in the language L^P by adding the following axioms:

- (1) P is a subfield of the universe, i.e. P is closed under the ring operations (and contains $0, 1$).
- (2) P is a model of T . This can be achieved by taking all the axioms of T and restricting the quantifiers to be over P (see Remark 3.6).
- (3) For every n -ary function symbol $f \in L \setminus L_{\text{rings}}$, if $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in P$, then $f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in P$. Else, if some $x_i \notin P$, then we do not care about the value of $f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$, and we can set it arbitrarily to 0.
- (4) For every n -ary relation symbol $R \in L$ (equivalently $R \in L \setminus L_{\text{rings}}$ as L_{rings} does not have any relation symbols), if some $x_i \notin P$, then $\neg R(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$. That is, $R \subseteq P^n$.
- (5) The degree of the field extension of the universe over P is infinite, i.e. the universe has infinite dimension as a vector space over P . By the Artin-Schreier theorem [AS27], it is enough to assert that the degree is at least 3.

Remark 3.2. *The assumption that the degree of the universe over P is infinite, that is, for $M \models \text{ACF}_T$, $[M : P_M] = \infty$, always holds when models of T are not algebraically closed or real closed, because in that case $[\overline{P_M} : P_M] = \infty$. When models of T are algebraically closed, it simply means that $M \neq P_M$, i.e. (M, P_M) is a proper pair. The only case excluded is when models of T are real closed and $M = \overline{P_M}$, but then $(\overline{P_M}, P_M)$ is definable in P_M .*

Definition 3.3. Let T, L be as above. Consider the following definable relations and functions over ACF_T :

- For $n \geq 1$, define the n -ary relation l_n by $l_n(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ iff x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} are linearly independent over P .
- For $n \geq 1$, suppose we have $l_n(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ and $\neg l_{n+1}(x_0, \dots, x_n)$. That is, x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} are linearly independent over P and x_n is in their span over P . Then there are unique $y_i \in P$ such that $x_n = y_0 x_0 + \dots + y_{n-1} x_{n-1}$. Define the $n+1$ -ary function $f_{n,i}$ by $f_{n,i}(x_n; x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = y_i$. If x_0, \dots, x_n do not satisfy this condition, then we do not care about the value of $f_{n,i}(x_n; x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ and can set it arbitrarily to 0.

Expand ACF_T to ACF_T^{ld} in the language $L^{ld} = L^P \cup \{l_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, by defining l_n as above. Expand ACF_T^{ld} to ACF_T^f in the language $L^f = L^{ld} \cup \{f_{n,i}\}_{n > i \geq 0}$, by defining $f_{n,i}$ as above.

Notation 3.4. If $M \models \text{ACF}_T$, then let P_M be the predicate P in M with the associated L -structure. If $A \subseteq M$ is a subset, then let $P_A = P_M \cap A$. This notation is used instead of the usual $P(M)$ and $P(A)$, because the notation $P(A)$ is reserved for the field extension of P by A .

Definition 3.5. Call a formula $\phi(x) \in L^P$ bounded if every quantifier in ϕ is over P .

Remark 3.6. For a formula $\phi(x) \in L$ there is a corresponding bounded formula $\phi^P(x) \in L^P$ created by restricting every quantifier to be over P and asserting $x \in P$. For $M \models \text{ACF}_T$, we have $\phi^P(M) = \phi(P_M)$.

3.2. Substructures and isomorphisms.

Lemma 3.7. Let $M \models \text{ACF}_T^f$ and $A \subseteq M$ a subset. Then A is an L^f -substructure iff $P_A \subseteq P_M$ is an L -substructure, A is a subring, P_A is a subfield and $\text{Frac}(A) \downarrow_{P_A}^l P_M$.

Proof. Suppose $A \subseteq M$ is an L^f -substructure. We get that $P_A \subseteq P_M$ is an L -substructure, because for any function symbol $f \in L$ and $\bar{a} \in P_A$, $f(\bar{a}) \in A$ as $A \subseteq M$ is a substructure, and also $f(\bar{a}) \in P_M$ because of the axioms of ACF_T , so $f(\bar{a}) \in A \cap P_M = P_A$. It is clear that A is a subring, and so is P_A , but for every $0 \neq a \in P_A$, $a^{-1} = f_{1,0}(1; a) \in P_A$, so P_A is also a subfield. By [Lan72, Chapter III, Criterion 1], to prove that $\text{Frac}(A) \downarrow_{P_A}^l P_M$, it is enough to show that if $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ are linearly dependent over P_M , then they are linearly dependent over P_A . Suppose $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ are linearly dependent over P_M . If $a_0 = 0$, then the tuple is trivially linearly dependent over P_A . Else, there is some maximal $1 \leq k < n$ such that a_0, \dots, a_{k-1} are linearly independent over P_M , so we have $\models l_k(a_0, \dots, a_{k-1})$ and $\models \neg l_{k+1}(a_0, \dots, a_k)$. Hence we can look at $p_i = f_{k,i}(a_k; a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}) \in P_M$, which give us $a_k = p_0 a_0 + \dots + p_{k-1} a_{k-1}$. Because A is a substructure, $p_i \in A$, so $p_i \in P_A$. Thus, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} are linearly dependent over P_A .

In the other direction, suppose A is a subring, P_A is a subfield, $P_A \subseteq P_M$ is an L -substructure and $\text{Frac}(A) \downarrow_{P_A}^l P_M$. It follows that $\text{Frac}(A) \cap P_M = P_A$, and in particular $A \cap P_M = P_A$. For any function symbol $f \in L \setminus L_{\text{rings}}$ and $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$, if $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in P_A$, then $f(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in P_A$ as $P_A \subseteq P_M$ is a substructure, and else we defined $f(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) = 0 \in A$. It remains to check that A is closed under $f_{n,i}$. Let $a_0, \dots, a_n \in A$ and suppose $\models l_n(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$, $\models \neg l_{n+1}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$. Let $p_i = f_{n,i}(a_n; a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$, that is $p_i \in P_M$ and $a_n = p_0 a_0 + \dots + p_{n-1} a_{n-1}$. We know that a_0, \dots, a_n are linearly dependent over P_M , so by $\text{Frac}(A) \downarrow_{P_A}^l P_M$ they are linearly dependent over P_A . However, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}

must be linearly independent over P_A , as they are linearly independent over P_M , so a_n can be written as a linear combination of a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} over P_A . This linear combination is in particular over P_M , but $a_n = p_0 a_0 + \dots + p_{n-1} a_{n-1}$ is the unique linear combination over P_M , so we must have $p_0, \dots, p_{n-1} \in P_A$, as needed. \square

Corollary 3.8. *If $M \models \text{ACF}_T^f$ and $A \subseteq M$ is an L^f -substructure, then $\text{Frac}(A) \subseteq M$ is an L^f -substructure with $P_{\text{Frac}(A)} = P_A$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.7 implies that $\text{Frac}(A) \downarrow_{P_A}^l P_M$, and in particular $P_{\text{Frac}(A)} = P_M \cap \text{Frac}(A) = P_A$. Thus, $P_{\text{Frac}(A)} \subseteq P_M$ is a subfield and an L -substructure, $\text{Frac}(A)$ is a subring (even subfield) and $\text{Frac}(A) \downarrow_{P_{\text{Frac}(A)}}^l P_M$, so by Lemma 3.7 $\text{Frac}(A) \subseteq M$ is an L^f -substructure. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T^f$ and let $A \subseteq M$, $B \subseteq N$ be L^f -substructures. A map $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ is an L^f -isomorphism iff σ is an isomorphism of rings such that $\sigma(P_A) = P_B$ and $\sigma|_{P_A} : P_A \rightarrow P_B$ is an L -isomorphism.*

Proof. If σ is an L^f isomorphism, then it is clearly an isomorphism of rings, $\sigma(P_A) = P_B$ because σ preserves P and $\sigma|_{P_A} : P_A \rightarrow P_B$ is an L -isomorphism because L^f expands L on P . For the other direction, we need to show that σ preserves $l_n, f_{n,i}$. Let $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ with $\models l_n(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$. Suppose we have $\models \neg l_n(\sigma(a_0), \dots, \sigma(a_{n-1}))$, i.e. $\sigma(a_0), \dots, \sigma(a_{n-1})$ are linearly dependent over P_N . Lemma 3.7 implies that $\text{Frac}(B) \downarrow_{P_B}^l P_N$, so $\sigma(a_0), \dots, \sigma(a_{n-1})$ are also linearly dependent over P_B . Thus, there are $q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} \in P_B$, not all zero, such that $q_0 \sigma(a_0) + \dots + q_{n-1} \sigma(a_{n-1}) = 0$. By applying σ^{-1} we get $\sigma^{-1}(q_0) a_0 + \dots + \sigma^{-1}(q_{n-1}) a_{n-1} = 0$, however $\sigma^{-1}(q_0), \dots, \sigma^{-1}(q_{n-1}) \in P_A$, in contradiction to $\models l_n(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$. The other direction follows from symmetry. Now suppose we have $a_0, \dots, a_n \in A$ with $\models l_n(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$ and $\models \neg l_{n+1}(a_0, \dots, a_n)$. By the first part, we also have $\models l_n(\sigma(a_0), \dots, \sigma(a_{n-1}))$ and $\models \neg l_{n+1}(\sigma(a_0), \dots, \sigma(a_n))$. Let $p_i = f_{n,i}(a_n; a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in P_A$, $a_n = p_0 a_0 + \dots + p_{n-1} a_{n-1}$. Apply σ to get $\sigma(a_n) = \sigma(p_0) \sigma(a_0) + \dots + \sigma(p_{n-1}) \sigma(a_{n-1})$, but $\sigma(p_0), \dots, \sigma(p_{n-1}) \in P_B$, so by uniqueness $\sigma(p_i) = f_{n,i}(\sigma(a_n); \sigma(a_0), \dots, \sigma(a_{n-1}))$. \square

Lemma 3.10. *Let $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T$. By adding definable relations and functions, M and N can be expanded to models of ACF_T^{ld} , ACF_T^f . With those expansions, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $M \subseteq N$ is an L^f -substructure.
- (2) $M \subseteq N$ is an L^{ld} -substructure.
- (3) $M \subseteq N$ is a subfield, $P_M \subseteq P_N$ is an L -substructure and $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l P_N$.

Proof. 1 \implies 2: L^{ld} is a restriction of L^f .

2 \implies 3: It is clear that $M \subseteq N$ is a subfield and $P_M \subseteq P_N$ as sets. For every quantifier free formula $\phi(\bar{x}) \in L$ and $\bar{a} \in P_M$, $P_M \models \phi(\bar{a}) \iff M \models \phi(\bar{a}) \wedge \bar{a} \in P \iff N \models \phi(\bar{a}) \wedge \bar{a} \in P \iff P_N \models \phi(\bar{a})$, so P_M is an L -substructure of P_N . Let $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in M$ be linearly independent over P_M , $M \models l_n(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \implies N \models l_n(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$, so a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} are linearly independent over P_N . Thus, $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l P_N$.

3 \implies 1: Let M' be the L^f -structure with the same underlying set as M , but with structure induced as a subset of N . Note that $M' \subseteq N$ is really an L^f -substructure, from Lemma 3.7. To prove that M is an L^f -substructure of N , we need to show that M and M' have the same structure, that is that the identity map $id : M \rightarrow M'$ is an L^f -isomorphism. We know that M is a subfield of N , so $id : M \rightarrow M'$ is a field isomorphism. From $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l P_N$ we get that

$P_{M'} = M \cap P_N = P_M$ and P_M is an L -substructure of P_N , so $id|_{P_M} : P_M \rightarrow P_{M'}$ is an L -isomorphism. Lemma 3.9 implies that id is an L^f -isomorphism. \square

3.3. Saturated models. We will study saturated models of ACF_T . Note that κ -saturated models of ACF_T are the same as κ -saturated models of ACF_T^{ld} or ACF_T^f , because $\{l_n\}_{n>1}$ and $\{f_{n,i}\}_{n>i>0}$ are definable in ACF_T . A full characterization of κ -saturated models will be given in Proposition 4.11.

Lemma 3.11. *If $M \models \text{ACF}_T$ is κ -saturated, then P_M is a κ -saturated model of T .*

Proof. Follows from Remark 3.6, by relativizing each formula in the type we wish to realize to P . \square

For the next result, we will need the following algebraic technical lemma, whose proof is left as an exercise to the reader.

Fact 3.12. *Suppose F is a field and t is transcendental over F . For every n , $[F(t) : F(t^n)] = n$.*

Lemma 3.13. *If $M \models \text{ACF}_T$ is κ -saturated, then $\text{trdeg}(M/P_M) \geq \kappa$.*

Proof. Let $S \subseteq M$ be an algebraically independent set over P_M . Suppose $|S| < \kappa$, we want to prove that there is some $a \in M$ such that $a \notin \overline{P_M(S)}$. Consider the partial type over S

$$\Sigma(x) = \{\forall \bar{y} \in P (q(x, \bar{y}) = 0 \rightarrow \forall x' q(x', \bar{y}) = 0) \mid q(x, \bar{y}) \in Q[x, \bar{y}, S]\}$$

where Q is the prime field (\mathbb{F}_p or \mathbb{Q}), x is a single variable and \bar{y} is a tuple of variables. Let $\Sigma_n(x)$ contain all formulas in $\Sigma(x)$ where the degree of $q(x, \bar{y})$ in x is $\leq n$. We will show that $a \models \Sigma_n(x)$ iff $[P_M(S, a) : P_M(S)] > n$ and that $\Sigma_n(x)$ is satisfiable in M . From compactness and saturation ($|S| < \kappa$), we will get that $\Sigma(x)$ is satisfied by some $a \in M$. But then $[P_M(S, a) : P_M(S)] > n$ for all n , so $a \notin \overline{P_M(S)}$.

Suppose $a \models \Sigma_n(x)$. If $[P_M(S, a) : P_M(S)] \leq n$, then there is some non-zero polynomial $r(x) \in P_M(S)[x]$ of degree $\leq n$ such that $r(a) = 0$. The coefficients of $r(x)$ are rational functions in S over P_M . By multiplying by the denominators, we can assume the coefficients are polynomials in S and P_M , so $r(x) = q(x, \bar{p})$ for $q(x, \bar{y}) \in Q[x, \bar{y}, S]$ and $\bar{p} \in P_M$. However, because $q(a, \bar{p}) = r(a) = 0$, we get from $a \models \Sigma_n(x)$ that $r(x)$ is constant zero.

Now suppose $[P_M(S, a) : P_M(S)] > n$. Let $q(x, \bar{y}) \in Q[x, \bar{y}, S]$ of degree $\leq n$ in x and $\bar{p} \in P_M$, such that $q(a, \bar{p}) = 0$. The polynomial $q(x, \bar{p})$ is over $P_M(S)$, has degree $\leq n$ and has a as root, but $[P_M(S, a) : P_M(S)] > n$, so $q(x, \bar{p})$ must be constant zero. Hence $a \models \Sigma_n(x)$.

To prove that $\Sigma_n(x)$ is satisfiable for every n , we need to prove that there is some $a \in M$ such that $[P_M(S, a) : P_M(S)] > n$. Split into three cases.

- (1) $S = \emptyset$, $M \neq \overline{P_M}$: Take some $a \in M \setminus \overline{P_M}$ and we are done.
- (2) $S = \emptyset$, $M = \overline{P_M}$: The axioms of ACF_T (Definition 3.1) imply that $[\overline{P_M} : P_M] = \infty$. By [Kei64, Lemma 3.1], there exists some $a \in \overline{P_M}$ such that $[P_M(a) : P_M] > n$.
- (3) $S \neq \emptyset$: Take some $s_0 \in S$ and define $F = P_M(S \setminus \{s_0\})$. Because M is algebraically closed, there exists an $n+1$ -th root $a = s_0^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \in M$. We know that s_0 is transcendental over F , so a is also transcendental over F . Fact 3.12 implies that $[F(a) : F(s_0)] = n+1$, where $F(s_0) = P_M(S)$ and $F(a) = P_M(S, a)$, as needed.

\square

Lemma 3.14. *Suppose $\text{trdeg}(M/P_M) \geq \kappa$ (in particular, if M is κ -saturated) and let $A, A' \subseteq M$ be subsets with $|A|, |A'| < \kappa$. If $f : P_M(A) \rightarrow P_M(A')$ is an isomorphism of fields that restricts to an L -automorphism $f|_{P_M}$, then f can be extended to an automorphism of M .*

Proof. From transitivity of transcendental degree

$$\text{trdeg}(M/P_M) = \text{trdeg}(M/P_M(A)) + \text{trdeg}(P_M(A)/P_M),$$

and $\text{trdeg}(P_M(A)/P_M) \leq |A| < \kappa$, so $\text{trdeg}(M/P_M(A)) = \text{trdeg}(M/P_M)$. Similarly, $\text{trdeg}(M/P_M(A')) = \text{trdeg}(M/P_M)$. Let $S, S' \subseteq M$ be transcendence basis of M over $P_M(A), P_M(A')$ respectively, $|S| = \text{trdeg}(M/P_M) = |S'|$. Extend f to an automorphism of fields $\sigma : M \rightarrow M$, by mapping $S \mapsto S'$ and extending to the algebraic closure arbitrarily. The restriction $\sigma|_{P_M} = f|_{P_M}$ is an L -automorphism of P , so Lemma 3.9 implies that σ is an L^P -automorphism. \square

4. QUANTIFIER ELIMINATION AND MORE

4.1. Completions. Keisler [Kei64] proved that ACF_T is complete when T is a complete theory in the language of rings. We generalize this by allowing the language of T to be arbitrary.

In his proof, Keisler used special models. We will instead use saturated models, which simplifies the proof, but requires an additional set-theoretic assumption (namely, the generalized continuum hypothesis). There are standard techniques from set theory that ensures the generalized continuum hypothesis from some point on while fixing a fragment of the universe (so this does not affect questions of e.g., completeness of a given theory), see [HK21], and we will use this freely.

Proposition 4.1. *If T is a complete theory of fields, then ACF_T is complete.*

Proof. It is enough to show that if $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T$ are saturated models of the same cardinality κ , then they are isomorphic (see the discussion above the proposition). By Lemma 3.11, $P_M, P_N \models T$ are κ -saturated, and in particular $|P_M| = |P_N| = \kappa$. Because T is complete, [CK90, Theorem 5.1.13] implies that there is an L -isomorphism $\sigma_0 : P_M \rightarrow P_N$. By Lemma 3.13, $\text{trdeg}(M/P_M) = \text{trdeg}(N/P_N) = \kappa$. Let $S \subseteq M, S' \subseteq N$ be transcendence basis over P_M, P_N respectively, $|S| = |S'| = \kappa$. We can extend σ_0 to an isomorphism of fields $\sigma_1 : M \rightarrow N$, by mapping $S \mapsto S'$ and extending to the algebraic closure arbitrarily. The restriction $\sigma_1|_{P_M}$ is an L -isomorphism, so by Lemma 3.9 σ_1 is an L^P -isomorphism. \square

4.2. Quantifier elimination. Our proof of quantifier elimination will be essentially the same as Delon's [Del12, Proposition 14]. One difference is that the criterion used by Delon to prove quantifier elimination assumes a countable language, so we will need a slightly generalized criterion.

In [HKR18], Hils, Kamensky and Rideau proved the same result in a similar fashion. Our proof was derived independently, as we were not aware of their work during the research.

We will need the following fact, which follows from [Hod93, Theorem 8.4.1].

Fact 4.2. *A theory T has quantifier elimination iff for any two models $M, N \models T$ such that N is $|M|^+$ -saturated and any substructures $A \subseteq M$ and $A' \subseteq N$ with an isomorphism $\sigma : A \rightarrow A'$, σ can be extended to an embedding $M \rightarrow N$.*

Theorem 4.3. *If T has quantifier elimination, then ACF_T^f has quantifier elimination.*

Proof. Let $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T^f$ such that N is $|M|^+$ -saturated. Let $A \subseteq M, A' \subseteq N$ be L^f -substructures with isomorphism $\sigma : A \rightarrow A'$. By Corollary 3.8, $\text{Frac}(A) \subseteq M$,

$\text{Frac}(A') \subseteq N$ are L^f -substructures with $P_{\text{Frac}(A)} = P_A$, $P_{\text{Frac}(A')} = P_{A'}$. We can extend σ to an isomorphism of fields $\text{Frac}(A) \rightarrow \text{Frac}(A')$ that will have the same restriction $P_A \rightarrow P_{A'}$, and so by Lemma 3.9 would still be an L^f -isomorphism. Thus, we can assume without loss of generality that A and A' are subfields. By 3.11, P_N is $|M|^+$ -saturated, and in particular $|P_M|^+$ -saturated. The restriction $\sigma|_{P_A} : P_A \rightarrow P_{A'}$ is an isomorphism of L -structures from Lemma 3.9, so quantifier elimination and Fact 4.2 imply that we can extend $\sigma|_{P_A}$ to an embedding $\sigma_0 : P_M \rightarrow P_N$.

Let $B = \sigma_0(P_M) \subseteq P_N$. By Lemma 3.7, $A \downarrow_{P_A}^l P_M$ and $A' \downarrow_{P_{A'}}^l P_N$, in particular by monotonicity $A' \downarrow_{P_{A'}}^l B$. The field isomorphisms $\sigma : A \rightarrow A'$ and $\sigma_0 : P_M \rightarrow B$ both restrict to the same isomorphism $P_A \rightarrow P_{A'}$, so there is a unique field isomorphism $\sigma_1 : A.P_M \rightarrow A'.B$ such that $\sigma_1|_A = \sigma$, $\sigma_1|_{P_M} = \sigma_0$, by Corollary 2.5.

Let $S \subseteq M$ be a transcendental basis of M over $A.P_M$, $|S| \leq |M|$. From Lemma 3.13 $\text{trdeg}(N/P_N) \geq |M|^+$ and $|A'| = |A| \leq |M|$, so there exists $S' \subseteq N$ algebraically independent over $A'.P_N$ with $|S| = |S'|$. Let $M' = \overline{A'.B(S')} \subseteq N$. Quantifier elimination implies that the substructure $B \subseteq P_N$ is elementary, so by Corollary 2.11 $B \subseteq P_N$ is regular. We also know that $A' \downarrow_{P_{A'}}^l P_N$, so by base monotonicity $A'.B \downarrow_B^l P_N$ and by Lemma 2.9 $\overline{A'.B(S')} \downarrow_B^l P_N$, where $\overline{A'.B(S')} = M'$. Thus, $M' \subseteq N$ is a substructure, with $P_{M'} = B$, from Lemma 3.7.

We also have $M = \overline{A.P_M(S)}$, so we can extend $\sigma_1 : AP_M \rightarrow A'B$ to $\sigma_2 : M \rightarrow M'$ by mapping $S \mapsto S'$ arbitrarily and extending to the algebraic closure. In particular, $\sigma_2(P_M) = B = P_{M'}$ and $\sigma_2|_{P_M} = \sigma_0$ is an isomorphism of L -structures, so σ_2 is an isomorphism of L^f -structures by Lemma 3.9. Thus, σ_2 is an embedding of M into N that extends σ . \square

Corollary 4.4 ([Del12, Theorem 1]). $\text{ACF}_{\text{ACF}}^f$ eliminates quantifiers.

Corollary 4.5. $\text{ACF}_{\text{RCF}}^f$ eliminates quantifiers, where RCF is the theory of real closed fields in the language $L_{\text{rings}} \cup \{\leq\}$.

Corollary 4.6. Let ACVF be the theory of algebraically closed valued fields in the divisibility language, that is the language of rings with a binary relation $x|y$ signifying $v(x) < v(y)$. ACVF eliminates quantifiers, so $\text{ACF}_{\text{ACVF}}^f$ eliminates quantifiers (by Corollary 5.35 it is also NIP).

From quantifier elimination, we can deduce a couple of important corollaries. Both corollaries will rely on expanding a theory T to the Morleyzation, which has quantifier elimination, as defined below.

Definition 4.7. For a theory T , the *Morleyzation* T_{Mor} of T is an expansion of T by relations $R_\psi(x)$ for any $\psi(x) \in L$, such that $T_{\text{Mor}} \vdash \forall x(R_\psi(x) \leftrightarrow \psi(x))$.

Corollary 4.8. Every formula $\phi(x) \in L^P$ is equivalent modulo ACF_T to a bounded formula, that is a formula where every quantifier is over P (see Definition 3.5).

Proof. Consider the Morleyzation T_{Mor} and the theory $\text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}}^f$ which has quantifier elimination by Theorem 4.3. In particular, $\phi(x)$ is equivalent to a quantifier free formula $\phi_0(x) \in L_{\text{Mor}}^f$ modulo $\text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}}^f$. Replace all occurrences of $l_n, f_{n,i}$ in $\phi_0(x)$ with the formulas defining them, to get an equivalent formula $\phi_1(x) \in L_{\text{Mor}}^P$. The formulas defining $l_n, f_{n,i}$ are bounded, so $\phi_1(x)$ is bounded.

For any formula $\psi(y) \in L^P$ consider the bounded formula $\psi^P(y) \in L^P$ created from Remark 3.6. The axioms of $\text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}}$ (Definition 3.1) imply that $\text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}} \vdash \forall y(R_\psi(y) \leftrightarrow \psi^P(y))$. Replace each predicate $R_\psi(y)$ in $\phi_1(x)$ by the corresponding

$\psi^P(y)$, to get a bounded formula $\phi_2(x) \in L^P$ which is equivalent to $\phi(x)$ modulo ACF_T . \square

Remark 4.9. *In that case that L is the language of rings, Corollary 4.8 follows from [CZ01, Proposition 2.1], because ACF has nfcP and P_M is small in any model $M \models \text{ACF}_T$ (as witnessed in a saturated extension, by Lemma 3.13).*

Corollary 4.10. *Let $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T^f$ and let $A \subseteq M, B \subseteq N$ be substructures. Then $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ is a partial elementary map from M to N iff $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ is an isomorphism of rings such that $\sigma(P_A) = P_B$ and $\sigma|_{P_A} : P_A \rightarrow P_B$ is a partial elementary map from P_M to P_N .*

Proof. Suppose $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ is a partial elementary map from M to N in ACF_T^f . Then σ is in particular an isomorphism, so $\sigma(P_A) = P_B$. The restriction $\sigma|_{P_A}$ is a partial elementary map from P_M to P_N in T , because for every formula $\phi(x) \in T$, we can apply Remark 3.6 to get $\phi^P(\bar{x}) \in \text{ACF}_T$, such that $\phi(P_B) = \phi^P(B) = \sigma(\phi^P(A)) = \sigma(\phi(P_A))$.

For the other direction, suppose $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ is an isomorphism of rings such that $\sigma(P_A) = P_B$ and $\sigma|_{P_A} : P_A \rightarrow P_B$ is a partial elementary map from P_M to P_N in T . In particular, P_M and P_N have the same theory, so we can assume that T is the complete theory $T = \text{Th}(P_M) = \text{Th}(P_N)$. Let T_{Mor} be the Morleyzation of T , T_{Mor} has quantifier elimination. We can expand the language of P_M and P_N by definable relations to get $P_M, P_N \models T_{\text{Mor}}$. With this expanded language $M, N \models \text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}}^f$. The expansion is only relational, so we can still consider A and B as substructure. The restriction $\sigma|_{P_A}$ is a partial elementary map in T , so it is an isomorphism in T_{Mor} , and thus by Lemma 3.9 σ is an isomorphism in $\text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}}^f$. By Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.3 $\text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}}^f$ is complete and eliminates quantifiers, so σ is a partial elementary map in $\text{ACF}_{T_{\text{Mor}}}^f$. In particular, it is a partial elementary map in ACF_T^f . \square

Using this result on elementary maps, we can now show that Lemmas 3.11 and 3.13 fully characterize the saturated models of ACF_T .

Proposition 4.11. *Suppose $\kappa > |L|$, then $N \models \text{ACF}_T$ is κ -saturated iff $P_N \models T$ is κ -saturated and $\text{trdeg}(N/P_N) \geq \kappa$*

Proof. The first direction, if $N \models \text{ACF}_T$ is κ -saturated, then $P_N \models T$ is κ -saturated and $\text{trdeg}(N/P_N) \geq \kappa$, is proved in Lemmas 3.11 and 3.13. For the other direction, we will prove κ -homogeneity and κ^+ -universality. By expanding the language with definable relations and functions, we can assume $N \models \text{ACF}_T^f$. Let $A, B \subseteq N$ and let $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ be a partial elementary map in N with $\sigma(A) = B$, such that $|A| = |B| < \kappa$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $A, B \subseteq N$ are L^f -substructures, and by Corollary 3.8 we can also assume they are subfields. Corollary 4.10 implies that $\sigma|_{P_A} : P_A \rightarrow P_B$ is a partial elementary map in P_N . We know that P_N is κ -homogeneous and $|P_A| = |P_B| < \kappa$, so we can extend $\sigma|_{P_A}$ to an automorphism $\sigma_0 : P_N \rightarrow P_N$ in T .

We have $A \downarrow_{P_A}^l P_N$ and $B \downarrow_{P_B}^l P_N$ from Lemma 3.7, and the field isomorphisms σ and σ_0 restrict to the same isomorphism $P_A \rightarrow P_B$, so by Corollary 2.5 they can be jointly extended to an isomorphism of fields $\sigma_1 : A.P_N \rightarrow B.P_N$. From Lemma 3.14, σ_1 can be extended to an automorphism of fields $\sigma_2 : N \rightarrow N$. Lemma 3.9 implies that σ_2 is an L^f automorphism because $\sigma_2|_{P_N} = \sigma_0$ is an automorphism in T , and σ_2 extends σ as needed.

Now Let $M \models \text{ACF}_T$ with $|M| \leq \kappa$, by expanding the language we can assume $M \models \text{ACF}_T^f$. We have $P_M \models T$ with $|P_M| < \kappa$, so by κ^+ -universality of P_N there

exists an elementary embedding $\tau_0 : P_M \rightarrow P_N$. Let $B = \tau_0(P_M)$. We have $B \preceq P_N$, and in particular from Corollary 2.11 $B \subseteq P_N$ is a regular extension. Let S be a transcendental basis of M over P_M , $|S| \leq \kappa$ and $\text{trdeg}(N/P_N) \geq \kappa$, so there exists $S_0 \subseteq N$ algebraically independent over P_N with $|S_0| = |S|$. We can extend τ_0 to an embedding $\tau_1 : M \rightarrow N$ by mapping $\overline{S} \mapsto S_0$ arbitrarily and extending to the algebraic closure. Let $M_0 = \tau_1(M) = \overline{B(S_0)}$. From Lemma 2.9, $\overline{B(S_0)} \downarrow_B^l P_N$, so by Lemma 3.10 $M_0 \subseteq N$ is an L^f -substructure with $P_{M_0} = B$. We have that $\tau_1 : M \rightarrow M_0$ is an isomorphism of fields with $\tau_1|_{P_M} = \tau_0 : P_M \rightarrow P_{M_0}$ an elementary embedding, so by Corollary 4.10 τ_1 is an elementary embedding. \square

4.3. Model completeness. In [Del12, Corollary 15], Delon proved that $\text{ACF}_{\text{ACF}}^{ld}$ is model complete. We can show that if T is model complete, then ACF_T^{ld} is model complete, but in fact we only need a weaker condition — that regular extensions in T are elementary.

Theorem 4.12. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) ACF_T^f is model complete.
- (2) ACF_T^{ld} is model complete.
- (3) For any $Q, R \models T$ such that $Q \subseteq R$ is a substructure, if $Q \subseteq R$ is a regular extension, then $Q \preceq R$.
- (4) T_{reg} (Definition 2.12) is model complete.

Proof. 1 \implies 2: Let $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T^{ld}$ with $M \subseteq N$ an L^{ld} -substructure. We can expand M and N uniquely to models of ACF_T^f , by Lemma 3.10 $M \subseteq N$ is an L^f -substructure. ACF_T^f is model complete, so $M \preceq N$ in L^f , in particular $M \preceq N$ in L^{ld} .

2 \implies 3: Let $Q, R \models T$ with $Q \subseteq R$ a regular extension. We will construct $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T^{ld}$ such that $P_M = Q$, $P_N = R$ and $M \subseteq N$. We would have liked to take $M = \overline{Q}$, but then we may have $[M : Q] < \infty$, so we should make M a bit larger. Let s be a new element, transcendental over R . The subfield $Q \subseteq R$ is regular, so by Lemma 2.9 $\overline{Q(s)} \downarrow_Q^l R$. Define $M = \overline{Q(s)}$, $Q \subseteq M$ is not an algebraic extension so in particular $[M : Q] = \infty$. We have $M \models \text{ACF}_T^{ld}$, where we define $P_M = Q$. Similarly, define $N = \overline{R(s)}$, $N \models \text{ACF}_T^{ld}$ with $P_N = R$. We know that $P_M \subseteq P_N$ is an L -substructure and $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l P_N$, so by Lemma 3.10 $M \subseteq N$ is an L^{ld} -substructure. Model completeness implies $M \preceq N$, and in particular $P_M \preceq P_N$, because for every formula $\phi(\bar{x}) \in L$ we have $P_M \models \phi(\bar{a}) \iff M \models \phi^P(\bar{a}) \iff N \models \phi^P(\bar{a}) \iff P_N \models \phi(\bar{a})$ for every $\bar{a} \in P_M$, where ϕ^P is given by Remark 3.6.

3 \implies 4: Let $Q, R \models T_{\text{reg}}$ be such that $Q \subseteq R$ is an L_{reg} -extension. By Lemma 2.13, $Q \subseteq R$ is a regular field extension, so $Q \preceq R$ in L by assumption. Because L_{reg} is an expansion by definable relations, $Q \preceq R$ also in L_{reg} .

4 \implies 1: Let $M, N \models \text{ACF}_T^f$ and suppose $M \subseteq N$ is a substructure. Lemma 3.10 implies that $P_M \subseteq P_N$ is an L -substructure and $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l P_N$. However, M is algebraically closed, so by monotonicity $\overline{P_M} \downarrow_{P_M}^l P_N$, that is $P_M \subseteq P_N$ is a regular extension. Extending P_M and P_N to models T_{reg} , we see by Lemma 2.13 that $P_M \subseteq P_N$ is an L_{reg} -extension, so $P_M \preceq P_N$ by assumption. The inclusion map $M \rightarrow N$ restricts to the elementary inclusion $P_M \rightarrow P_N$, so by Corollary 4.10, $M \preceq N$. \square

Corollary 4.13 ([Del12, Corollary 15]). $\text{ACF}_{\text{ACF}}^{ld}$ is model complete.

Corollary 4.14. $\text{ACF}_{\text{PSF}}^{ld}$ is model complete, where PSF is the theory of pseudo-finite fields in the language of rings (see Proposition 6.9 for a proof).

Remark 4.15. ACF_{ACF} is not model complete. By [TZ12, page 207], the pregeometry of an algebraically closed field K of transcendence degree at least 4 over its prime field with algebraic independence is not modular: there are algebraically closed subfields $A, B \subseteq K$ such that $A \not\downarrow_{A \cap B}^{\text{ACF}} B$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} M &= A & N &= K \\ P_M &= A \cap B & P_N &= B. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $M \subseteq N$ is an L^P -substructure, however if $M \preceq N$, then Lemma 3.10 would imply that $A \downarrow_{A \cap B}^l B$, and in particular $A \downarrow_{A \cap B}^{\text{ACF}} B$, a contradiction.

5. CLASSIFICATION AND INDEPENDENCE

In this section we will assume that T is complete (Proposition 4.1 implies that ACF_T is also complete) and we will work inside a monster model $\mathbb{M} \models \text{ACF}_T$. Denote $P := P_{\mathbb{M}}$.

Assuming T is NSOP_1 , we will define an independence relation \downarrow^* on \mathbb{M} and prove that it implies Kim-dividing (in fact, Kim^u dividing, see Definition 2.17). With this result, we will prove that ACF_T is NSOP_1 and that under certain conditions \downarrow^* is the Kim-independence. We will then expand this result to simplicity and stability.

We will also prove that stability lifts from T to ACF_T using a different approach, by counting types. This approach will let us extend the result to λ -stability.

Finally, we will prove that NIP lifts from T to ACF_T ,

5.1. Kim-dividing.

Definition 5.1. Call a subfield $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ *D-closed* (D for Delon's language) if it is closed under the functions $f_{n,i}$, or equivalently if $A \downarrow_{P_A}^l P$. For a set $B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, denote by $\langle B \rangle_D$ the D-closure of B , that is the smallest field containing B and closed under $f_{n,i}$.

Remark 5.2. We have the following remarks on D-closure:

- In [MPZ20, Definition 3.1], the condition D-closed was called *P-special*.
- If $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is definably closed in L^P , then it is D-closed. In particular, for every $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, $\text{dcl}(A)$ and $\text{acl}(A)$ are D-closed.
- D-closure gives a shorter proof of local character of \downarrow^l (see Fact 2.4). Suppose a is finite and P is an infinite field. Let $A = \langle a \rangle_D$ be the D-closure of a inside the pair of fields $(P(a), P)$. Consider $P_A = P \cap A$, which is countable. We have $P_A(a) \subseteq A$, so by monotonicity $P_A(a) \downarrow_{P_A}^l P$.

Lemma 5.3. Suppose $A, B, C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ are subfields with $C \subseteq A \cap B$. If A is D-closed, then $A.P \downarrow_{C.P}^l B.P$ iff $A \downarrow_{C.P_A}^l B.P$. By symmetry, if B is D-closed, then $A.P \downarrow_{C.P}^l B.P$ iff $A.P \downarrow_{C.P_B}^l B$. Furthermore, if both A and B are D-closed, then $A.P \downarrow_{C.P}^l B.P$ implies $A.B \downarrow_{P_A.P_B}^l P$, i.e. $P_{A.B} = P_A.P_B$ and $A.B$ is D-closed.

Proof. If $A \downarrow_{C.P_A}^l B.P$, then $A.P \downarrow_{C.P}^l B.P$ from base monotonicity. On the other hand, if $A.P \downarrow_{C.P}^l B.P$, then because $A \downarrow_{P_A}^l P$ implies $A \downarrow_{C.P_A}^l C.P$ from base monotonicity, we get from transitivity that $A \downarrow_{C.P_A}^l B.P$. For the furthermore part, we know from $A \downarrow_{P_A}^l P$ and $A.P \downarrow_{C.P}^l B.P$ that $A \downarrow_{C.P_A}^l B.P$. By base monotonicity, $A.B \downarrow_{B.P_A}^l B.P$. Also, from $B \downarrow_{P_B}^l P$ and base monotonicity, $B.P_A \downarrow_{P_A.P_B}^l P$, thus by transitivity $A.B \downarrow_{P_A.P_B}^l P$. \square

Definition 5.4. Let $M \preceq \mathbb{M}$ and $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be small D-closed subfields, such that $M \subseteq A \cap B$. Define $A \downarrow_M^* B$ if

- (1) $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ in P .
- (2) $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l B.P$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $A, B, C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be small subsets with $C \subseteq A \cap B$. If $A \downarrow_C^u B$, then:*

- (1) $P_A \downarrow_{P_C}^u P_B$ in P .
- (2) *If A, B and C are subfields and B is D -closed, then $A.P \downarrow_{C.P}^l B.P$.*

In particular, if $M \preceq \mathbb{M}$ and A and B are D -closed with $M \subseteq A \cap B$, then $A \downarrow_M^u B$ implies $A \downarrow_M^ B$.*

Proof. For point (1), suppose $P \models \phi(a, b)$ for some formula $\phi(x, y) \in L$, $a \in P_A$ and $b \in P_B$. Let $\phi^P(x, y) \in L^P$ be as in Remark 3.6, we have $\mathbb{M} \models \phi^P(a, b)$. By $A \downarrow_C^u B$ there is some $c \in C$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models \phi^P(c, b)$. Thus, $c \in P \cap C = P_C$, and we have $P \models \phi(c, b)$.

For point (2), by Lemma 5.3 it is enough to prove $A.P \downarrow_{C.P_B}^l B$. Let $\sum_i u_i b_i = 0$ for $u_i \in A.P$ and $b_i \in B$ such that the u_i are not all equal to 0. We can write $u_i = f_i(\bar{a}_i, \bar{p}_i)$ for $f_i \in C(\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i)$ rational functions, $\bar{a}_i \in A$ and $\bar{p}_i \in P$. Assume that f_i are polynomials by multiplying by all denominators. We have

$$\models \sum_i f_i(\bar{a}_i, \bar{p}_i) b_i = 0 \wedge \bigvee_i f_i(\bar{a}_i, \bar{p}_i) \neq 0,$$

and in particular

$$\models \exists \bar{y}_i \in P, \sum_i f_i(\bar{a}_i, \bar{y}_i) b_i = 0 \wedge \bigvee_i f_i(\bar{a}_i, \bar{y}_i) \neq 0.$$

From $A \downarrow_C^u B$, there are $\bar{c}_i \in C$ such that

$$\models \exists \bar{y}_i \in P \sum_i f_i(\bar{c}_i, \bar{y}_i) b_i = 0 \wedge \bigvee_i f_i(\bar{c}_i, \bar{y}_i) \neq 0.$$

Let $\bar{q}_i \in P$ witness the existence, and let $v_i = f_i(\bar{c}_i, \bar{q}_i) \in C.P$. We have $\sum_i v_i b_i = 0$ and v_i are not all equal to 0. Moreover, $B \downarrow_{P_B}^l P$, so by base monotonicity $B \downarrow_{C.P_B}^l C.P$, thus there are $w_i \in C.P_B$, not all equal to 0, such that $\sum_i w_i b_i = 0$, as needed.

The ‘‘in particular’’ part follows from the definition of \downarrow^* , because $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^u P_B$ implies $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ (see [dE21, Fact 3.10]). \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $A, B, C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be small subsets with $C \subseteq A \cap B$ and let $(B_i)_{i < \omega}$ be a C -indiscernible coheir sequence such that $B \equiv_A B_i$ in ACF_T , then $(P_{B_i})_{i < \omega}$ is a P_C -indiscernible coheir sequence such that $P_B \equiv_{P_A} P_{B_i}$ in P .*

Proof. For every formula in P , we can restrict all quantifiers and free variables to be over P to get a formula in \mathbb{M} with the same definable set. This proves that $(P_{B_i})_{i < \omega}$ is P_C -indiscernible and $P_B \equiv_{P_A} P_{B_i}$ in P . From Lemma 5.5, $P_{B_i} \downarrow_{P_C}^u P_{B_{<i}}$ in P , and $P_{B_{<i}} = \bigcup_{j < i} P_{B_j}$, so $(P_{B_i})_{i < \omega}$ is a P_C -indiscernible coheir sequence. \square

Proposition 5.7. *Assume T is NSOP_1 . Let $M \preceq \mathbb{M}$ and let $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be small D -closed subfields with $M \subseteq A \cap B$, such that A is algebraically closed as a field. If $A \downarrow_M^* B$, then $\text{tp}(A/B)$ does not Kim^u -divide over M (recall Definition 2.17).*

Proof. Let $(B_i)_{i < \omega}$ be any M -indiscernible coheir sequence such that $B \equiv_M B_i$ in ACF_T for every $i < \omega$ and let $\beta_i : B \rightarrow B_i$ be L^P -isomorphisms such that $(\beta_i(b))_{b \in B}$ is an M -indiscernible coheir sequence in ACF_T . By Lemma 5.6, $(P_{B_i})_{i < \omega}$ is a P_M -indiscernible coheir sequence in P , where P_{B_i} is enumerated as $(\beta_i(b))_{b \in P_B}$. Because T is NSOP_1 and $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ in P , Fact 2.20(2) implies that there exists $Q \subseteq P$ such that $P_A P_B \equiv_{P_M} Q P_{B_i}$ in P for all $i < \omega$, where we consider all the above fields as tuples. More explicitly, let $p((x_a)_{a \in P_A}, (x_b)_{b \in P_B}) = \text{tp}((a)_{a \in P_A}, (b)_{b \in P_B} / P_M)$,

then let $(a')_{a \in P_A}$ be a realization of $\bigcup_{i < \omega} p((x_a)_{a \in P_A}, (\beta_i(b))_{b \in P_B})$, and let Q be $\{a' \mid a \in P_A\}$. As $(a)_{a \in P_A} (b)_{b \in P_B} \equiv_{P_M} (a')_{a \in P_A} (\beta_i(b))_{b \in P_B}$ in P , by saturation there are automorphisms γ_i of P mapping $P_A P_B$ to $Q P_{B_i}$ extending $\beta_i|_{P_B}$ (so fixing P_M pointwise) such that $\gamma_i(a) = a'$ for all $a \in P_A$. In particular, the restrictions $\gamma_i|_{P_A} : P_A \rightarrow Q$ are the same for every $i < \omega$. Name this restriction $\alpha_0 : P_A \rightarrow Q$.

Let $S \subseteq A$ be a transcendence basis of A over $M.P_A$. Lemma 3.13 implies that $\text{trdeg}(\mathbb{M}/P) = |\mathbb{M}|$, so there exists some S' algebraically independent over $B_{<\omega}P$ with $|S'| = |S|$. Define $A' = \overline{M.Q(S')}$. From Lemma 3.7, $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l P$, so from monotonicity $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l P_A$ and $M \downarrow_{P_M}^l Q$. Thus, from stationarity of \downarrow^l , we can extend $\alpha_0 : P_A \rightarrow Q$ to an isomorphism of fields $M.P_A \rightarrow M.Q$ preserving M pointwise. Map $S \mapsto S'$ arbitrarily and extend arbitrarily to the algebraic closure, to get an isomorphism of fields $\alpha : A \rightarrow A'$. This give us a way to consider A' as a tuple.

Let $i < \omega$. We know that $B \downarrow_{P_B}^l P$ and $B_i \downarrow_{P_{B_i}}^l P$, the field isomorphisms $\beta_i : B \rightarrow B_i$ and $\gamma_i : P \rightarrow P$ both restrict to the same isomorphism $P_B \rightarrow P_{B_i}$, so from Corollary 2.5 they can be jointly extended to an isomorphism of fields $\sigma_{i,0} : B.P \rightarrow B_i.P$. From $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l B.P$ and Lemma 5.3 we get that $A \downarrow_{M.P_A}^l B.P$. We would like to prove that also $A' \downarrow_{M.Q}^l B_i.P$. We know that A is algebraically closed, so $M.P_A \subseteq B.P$ is regular. Applying Lemma 2.8 with $\sigma_{i,0}$, we get that $M.Q \subseteq B_i.P$ is regular. The set S' is algebraically independent over $B_i.P$, so from Lemma 2.9 $\overline{M.Q(S')} \downarrow_{M.Q}^l B_i.P$, where $\overline{M.Q(S')} = A'$.

The isomorphisms of fields $\alpha : A \rightarrow A'$ and $\sigma_{i,0} : B.P \rightarrow B_i.P$ restrict to the same isomorphism $M.P_A \rightarrow M.Q$, which acts as α_0 on P_A and preserves M pointwise. Thus, from Corollary 2.5, they can be jointly extended to an isomorphism of fields $\sigma_{i,1} : A.B.P \rightarrow A'.B_i.P$. By Lemma 3.14, $\sigma_{i,1}$ can be extended to $\sigma_{i,2}$ an L^P -automorphism of \mathbb{M} . The automorphism $\sigma_{i,2}$ maps $AB \mapsto A'B_i$ and extends α and β_i (in particular fixes M pointwise). Let $q((x_a)_{a \in A}, (x_b)_{b \in B}) = \text{tp}((a)_{a \in A}, (b)_{b \in B}/M)$. We get that $(\alpha(a))_{a \in A}$ realizes $\bigcup_{i < \omega} q((x_a)_{a \in A}, (\beta_i(b))_{b \in B})$ as required. \square

5.2. NSOP₁, simplicity.

Remark 5.8. *In a general theory T , if $A \downarrow_C^u B$, then $\text{acl}(AC) \downarrow_{\text{acl}(C)}^u \text{acl}(BC)$. Indeed, by extension, for some $A' \equiv_{BC} A$ we have $A' \downarrow_C^u \text{acl}(BC)$, and by applying an automorphism taking A' to A and fixing BC we get that $A \downarrow_C^u \text{acl}(BC)$. By base monotonicity, $A \downarrow_{\text{acl}(C)}^u \text{acl}(BC)$.*

Suppose that $\models \phi(d, b)$ where $\phi(x, y)$ is a formula over $\text{acl}(C)$, $d \in \text{acl}(AC)$ and $b \in \text{acl}(BC)$. Let $\psi(x, z)$ be a formula over C and $a \in A$ be such that $\psi(x, a)$ is algebraic, say of size n , and $\models \psi(d, a)$, that is

$$\models \exists^{\leq n} x \psi(x, a) \wedge \exists x (\phi(x, b) \wedge \psi(x, a)).$$

As $A \downarrow_{\text{acl}(C)}^u \text{acl}(BC)$, there exists $c \in \text{acl}(C)$ such that $\psi(x, c)$ is of size at most n and $\models \exists x (\phi(x, b) \wedge \psi(x, c))$, let e witness the existence. The fact that $\models \psi(e, c)$ implies that $e \in \text{acl}(C)$, and we have $\models \phi(e, b)$, so $\text{acl}(AC) \downarrow_{\text{acl}(C)}^u \text{acl}(BC)$.

Theorem 5.9. *If T is NSOP₁, then ACF_T is NSOP₁.*

Proof. We will use Fact 2.16. Let $M \preceq \mathbb{M}$ and suppose A_0, A_1, B_0 and B_1 are such that $A_0 B_0 \equiv_M A_1 B_1$ in ACF_T , $B_1 \downarrow_M^u B_0$ and $B_i \downarrow_M^u A_i$ for $i = 0, 1$. By Remark 5.8, we can assume that $A_i = \text{acl}(A_i M)$, $B_i = \text{acl}(B_i M)$, and in particular they are all D-closed and algebraically closed.

From $B_0 \downarrow_M^u A_0$, we get using Lemma 5.5 that $B_0 \downarrow_M^* A_0$. However, T is NSOP₁, so Fact 2.20(3) implies that \downarrow^K in P is symmetric, thus \downarrow^* is also

symmetric and we have $A_0 \downarrow_M^* B_0$. By Proposition 5.7, $\text{tp}(A_0/B_0)$ does not Kim^u-divide over M . Extend the pair (B_0, B_1) to a coheir sequence $(B_i)_{i < \omega}$ (to do that, first extend $\text{tp}(B_1/MB_0)$ to a global type which is finitely satisfiable in M , and then generate a Morley sequence in that type; see [KR20, §3.1]). By the definition of Kim^u-dividing (Definition 2.17) we get that there exists $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ such that $A_0 B_0 \equiv_M A B_0 \equiv_M A B_1$ in ACF_T . \square

Corollary 5.10. *The theory of ω -free PAC fields was shown to be non-simple by Chatzidakis [Cha99], as it is PAC and unbounded, and NSOP₁ by Chernikov and Ramsey [CR16]. Thus, $\text{ACF}_{\omega\text{-free PAC}}$ is NSOP₁ and non-simple as the theory of ω -free PAC fields is interpretable in $\text{ACF}_{\omega\text{-free PAC}}$.*

Now we will show that in NSOP₁ theories, Kim-independence is \downarrow^* for certain sets.

Proposition 5.11. *Assume T is NSOP₁. Let $M \preceq \mathbb{M}$ and let $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be small D-closed subfields with $M \subseteq A \cap B$. Then $A \downarrow_M^K B$ implies $A \downarrow_M^* B$. If either A or B are algebraically closed as fields, then also $A \downarrow_M^* B$ implies $A \downarrow_M^K B$.*

Proof. We will first prove that $A \downarrow_M^K B$ implies $A \downarrow_M^* B$. Suppose $A \downarrow_M^K B$, we need to prove that $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ in P and $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l B.P$. Take an arbitrary M -indiscernible coheir sequence $(B_i)_{i < \omega}$, with $B \equiv_M B_i$ in ACF_T . The theory T is NSOP₁, so ACF_T is also NSOP₁ from Theorem 5.9. By Remark 2.19 and Fact 2.20(2) there exists $A' \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ such that $AB \equiv_M A'B_i$ in ACF_T . In particular, by $A \equiv_M A'$ in ACF_T there exists an automorphism σ of \mathbb{M} mapping A' to A and preserving M pointwise. Letting $B'_i = \sigma(B_i)$, $(B'_i)_{i < \omega}$ is an M -indiscernible coheir sequence with $B \equiv_A B'_i$ in ACF_T . By Lemma 5.6, $(P_{B'_i})_{i < \omega}$ is a P_M -indiscernible coheir sequence with $P_B \equiv_{P_A} P_{B'_i}$ in P . Because T is NSOP₁, Fact 2.20(1) implies that $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ in P .

To prove that $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l B.P$, it is enough to prove that $A \downarrow_{M.P_A}^l B.P$, by Lemma 5.3. Let $\bar{a} \in A$ be a finite tuple and suppose it is linearly dependent over $B.P$. Because $A \downarrow_M^K B$, we can construct an uncountable M -indiscernible coheir sequence $(B_i)_{i < \omega_1}$, with $B \equiv_A B_i$ in ACF_T . Let $\sigma_i \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/A)$ be an automorphism mapping B to B_i . We know that σ_i preserves P setwise, so by applying σ_i we get that \bar{a} is linearly dependent over $B_i.P$. By local character, there is some countable subfield $C \subseteq \text{acl}(B_{< \omega_1}).P$ such that $C(\bar{a}) \downarrow_C^l \text{acl}(B_{< \omega_1}).P$. Because C is countable, there is some $i < \omega_1$ such that $C \subseteq \text{acl}(B_{< i}).P$. By Remark 5.8 we have $B_i \downarrow_M^u \text{acl}(B_{< i})$, so Lemma 5.5 implies that $B_i.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l \text{acl}(B_{< i}).P$, and in particular from monotonicity $B_i.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l M.P.C$. However, the fact that $C(\bar{a}) \downarrow_C^l \text{acl}(B_{< \omega_1}).P$ also implies, using monotonicity, base monotonicity and symmetry, that $B_i.P.C \downarrow_{M.P.C}^l M.P.C(\bar{a})$, so by transitivity $B_i.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l M.P.C(\bar{a})$. The tuple \bar{a} is linearly dependent over $B_i.P$, so it is linearly dependent over $M.P$. However, A is D-closed so $A \downarrow_{P_A}^l P$ and by base monotonicity $A \downarrow_{M.P_A}^l M.P$. Thus, \bar{a} is linearly dependent over $M.P_A$, as needed.

If A is algebraically closed and $A \downarrow_M^* B$, then from Proposition 5.7 $\text{tp}(A/B)$ does not Kim^u-divide over M . ACF_T is NSOP₁, so by Remark 2.18 Kim^u-dividing is the same as Kim-dividing, and by Fact 2.20(2) Kim-dividing is the same as Kim-forking, thus $A \downarrow_M^K B$. The case where B is algebraically closed follows from symmetry of \downarrow^* and \downarrow^K (Fact 2.20(3)). \square

Remark 5.12. *The proof of Proposition 5.11 was inspired by the proof of [BYPV03, Proposition 7.3]*

Theorem 5.13. *If T is simple, then ACF_T is simple.*

Proof. Suppose T is simple, in particular T is NSOP₁ so Theorem 5.9 implies that ACF_T is NSOP₁. By Fact 2.20(5), for an NSOP₁ theory being simple is equivalent to Kim-independence having base monotonicity. Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be small subsets and $M, N \preceq \mathbb{M}$ submodels, such that $M \subseteq A$, $M \subseteq N \subseteq B$. Suppose $A \downarrow_M^K B$, we want to prove $A \downarrow_N^K B$. Without loss of generality we can assume that A and B are acl-closed.

By Proposition 5.11, $A \downarrow_M^K B$ implies $A \downarrow_M^* B$. We have $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l B.P$, and by monotonicity $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l N.P$, so from Lemma 5.3 $N.A$ is D-closed. Since B is D-closed and algebraically closed as a field, by Proposition 5.11 it is enough to prove $N.A \downarrow_N^* B$. By base monotonicity of linear disjointness, $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^l B.P$ implies $N.A.P \downarrow_{N.P}^l B.P$. We know that T is simple, so by base monotonicity of Kim-independence in P , $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ implies $P_N.P_A \downarrow_{P_N}^K P_B$. \square

Corollary 5.14. *ACF_{PSF} is simple, where PSF is the theory of pseudo-finite fields (see Proposition 6.10 for an alternative proof).*

5.3. Stability. There are a few ways to prove that if T is stable, then ACF_T is stable. The first option, continuing in the path of the previous results, is using a Kim-Pillay style characterization on non-forking independence, which in simple theories is the same as Kim-independence over models.

The second option is a more direct approach, by counting types. The second option will give us a stronger result, that if T is λ -stable, then so is ACF_T , which will let us extend to super-stability and ω -stability. Even though the second option is strictly stronger than the first, we will also show the first, to complete the picture on Kim-independence.

A third way to prove stability, is by proving the existence of saturated models of certain cardinalities. This could be done using the characterization of saturated models of ACF_T found in Proposition 4.11, but we will not expand on it here.

Remark 5.15. *When the predicate has no extra structure, stability can also be deduced from [CZ01, Corollary 5.4] (which cites [Pil98], probably meaning Proposition 3.1 there), which is a much more general statement: if M is strongly minimal and A is some subset of M such that the induced structure on A is stable, then (M, A) is stable.*

Theorem 5.16. *If T is stable, then ACF_T is stable.*

Proof. Suppose T is stable, in particular T is simple so Theorem 5.13 implies that ACF_T is simple. [KR20, Proposition 8.4] says that in simple theories, non-forking independence over models is the same as Kim-independence. To show that ACF_T is stable, it is enough to show that non-forking independence has stationarity over models ([Cas11, Theorem 12.22]). Let A, A' and B be small subsets such that $M \subseteq A \cap A' \cap B$. Suppose $A \downarrow_M^K B$, $A' \downarrow_M^K B$ and $A \equiv_M A'$. Without loss of generality we can assume A, A' and B are acl-closed. Let $\alpha : A \rightarrow A'$ be an L^P -elementary map fixing M pointwise. We want to extend α to an automorphism fixing B pointwise.

By Corollary 4.10 $\alpha|_{P_A}$ is an L -elementary map in P , and by Proposition 5.11 $P_A \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ and $P_{A'} \downarrow_{P_M}^K P_B$ in P . We know that T is stable, so by stationarity $P_A \equiv_{P_B} P_{A'}$, i.e., $(a)_{a \in P_A} \equiv_{P_B} (\alpha(a))_{a \in P_A}$. Let σ_0 be an automorphism of P mapping P_A to $P_{A'}$ extending $\alpha|_{P_A}$ and preserving P_B pointwise. We have $B \downarrow_{P_B}^l P$, so by stationarity of linear disjointness we can extend σ_0 to $\sigma_1 : B.P \rightarrow B.P$ preserving B pointwise. By Proposition 5.11 and Lemma 5.3, $A \downarrow_{M.P_A}^l B.P$ and $A' \downarrow_{M.P_{A'}}^l B.P$, so by Corollary 2.5 we can extend σ_1 and α to $\sigma_2 : A.B.P \rightarrow$

A'.B.P. Extend σ_2 to σ_3 , an automorphism of \mathbb{M} , using Lemma 3.14. Since σ_3 extends α and fixes B pointwise we are done. \square

Corollary 5.17. *ACF_{SCF} is stable, where SCF is the theory of separably closed fields.*

To prove stability by counting types, we will need to show that P is stably embedded in \mathbb{M} .

Definition 5.18. A set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{M}^m$ which is definable over the empty set is called *stably embedded* if for every n , if $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}^{mn}$ is definable, then $D \cap Q^n$ is definable with parameters from Q .

Fact 5.19 ([Cha99, Appendix, Lemma 1]). *For $Q \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ as above, if every automorphism of the induced structure on Q lifts to an automorphism of \mathbb{M} , then Q is stably embedded.*

Remark 5.20. *The precise formulation of the above fact is more general but requires extra assumptions on T , namely that $T = T^{eq}$ and that the language is countable. However, those assumptions are not used in the proof of the direction we cited.*

Lemma 5.21. *The induced structure on P as a subset of \mathbb{M} is the same (up to interdefinability) as the intrinsic L -structure of P .*

Proof. If $A \subseteq P^n$ is definable in P by a formula $\phi \in L$, then we can construct by Remark 3.6 a formula $\phi^P \in L^P$ that defines A in \mathbb{M} .

In the other direction, if $A \subseteq P^n$ is definable in \mathbb{M} by a formula $\psi \in L^P$, then we can assume by Corollary 4.8 that ψ is bounded. Remove any occurrence of P in ψ , by replacing $x \in P$ with a tautology ($x = x$), to get a formula in L that defines A in P .

This can also be deduced from Lemma 3.14 using compactness (since Lemma 3.14 implies that if $a, b \in P$ and $a \equiv b$ in L , then $a \equiv b$ in L^P which implies the lemma using e.g. [TZ12, Lemma 3.1.1]). \square

From Fact 5.19 and Lemmas 3.14 and 5.21³ we conclude the following:

Corollary 5.22. *P is stably embedded in \mathbb{M} .*

Remark 5.23. *It follows from a simple compactness argument that P is even uniformly stably embedded, that is, for any formula $\phi(x, y)$ there exists a formula $\psi(x, z)$ such that for every $b \in \mathbb{M}$ there is $c \in P$ with $\phi(P, b) = \psi(P, c)$.*

Theorem 5.24. *If T is λ -stable, then ACF _{T} is λ -stable.*

Proof. Suppose T is λ -stable, we can assume that $|T| \leq \lambda$ by replacing T with an interdefinable theory (see e.g. [TZ12, Exercise 5.2.6]). Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a subset with $|C| \leq \lambda$, we need to prove that $|S_1^{\text{ACF}_T}(C)| \leq \lambda$, where $S_1^{\text{ACF}_T}(C)$ is the space of types in one variable over C . First we will prove that all elements in $\mathbb{M} \setminus \overline{P(C)}$ have the same type over C in ACF _{T} . Suppose $a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{M} \setminus \overline{P(C)}$, that is both a_0 and a_1 are transcendental over $P(C)$. There is an isomorphism of fields $P(C, a_0) \rightarrow P(C, a_1)$ given by fixing $P(C)$ pointwise and mapping $a_0 \mapsto a_1$. By Lemma 3.14, we can extend this map to an automorphism of \mathbb{M} , so $a_0 \equiv_C a_1$ in ACF _{T} .

³We only need the “easy” direction of Lemma 5.21, i.e. that the L -structure is a reduct of the induced structure.

It remains to show that there are at most λ types in $\overline{P(C)}$. Any element of $\overline{P(C)}$ solves some non-zero polynomial of the form $q(x; b, c)$ with $b \in P^n$ and $c \in C^m$, and in particular satisfies

$$\phi(x; c) = \exists y \in P (q(x; y, c) = 0 \wedge \exists x' q(x'; y, c) \neq 0).$$

Thus, any type in $\overline{P(C)}$ contains some formula $\phi(x; c)$ as above. There are at most λ formulas in L^P with parameters from C , so it is enough to prove that there are at most λ types that contain any given formula $\phi(x; c)$ as above.

First of all, P is stably embedded in \mathbb{M} (Corollary 5.22), so every C -definable subset of P^n in ACF_T is also definable in ACF_T with parameters from P . Let $D \subseteq P$ be the set of all the parameters needed to define every C -definable subset of P^n . There are at most λ definable subsets of P^n over C , so $|D| \leq \lambda$.

Let $[\phi] \subseteq S_1^{\text{ACF}_T}(C)$ be the set of types implying $\phi(x; c)$. We will construct a map $\rho : [\phi] \rightarrow S_n^T(D)$ such that ρ has finite fibers. Because T is λ -stable, $|S_n^T(D)| \leq \lambda$, so this will imply $|[\phi]| \leq \lambda$ as needed.

For any type $p(x) \in [\phi]$, choose some realization $a \models p$. In particular, $\models \phi(a; c)$, so we can choose some $b \in P^n$ such that $q(x; b, c)$ is non-zero and $q(a; b, c) = 0$. Define $\rho(p) = \text{tp}^T(b/D)$. Suppose $p_0, p_1 \in [\phi]$ and $\rho(p_0) = \rho(p_1)$, that is, if a_i, b_i are the specific elements we chose for p_i ($i = 0, 1$), then $b_0 \equiv_D b_1$ in T . There is an automorphism of P over D mapping $b_0 \mapsto b_1$, which can be extended by Lemma 3.14 to an automorphism of \mathbb{M} over D , so $b_0 \equiv_D b_1$ in ACF_T . We want to prove that $b_0 \equiv_C b_1$ in ACF_T . Suppose b_0 belongs to some C -definable set, we can assume that it is a subset of P^n because $b_0 \in P^n$. By the construction of D , this C -definable subset of P^n is also D -definable in ACF_T , so b_1 belongs to it as $b_0 \equiv_D b_1$ in ACF_T .

Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/C)$ be an automorphism mapping b_0 to b_1 . In particular $q(\sigma(a_0); b_1, c) = 0$, thus a_0 has the same type over C as a root of $q(x; b_1, c)$, specifically $\sigma(a_0)$. It follows that every type in the fiber of $\rho(p_1)$ is a type over C of a root of $q(x; b_1, c)$, however $q(x; b_1, c)$ is non-zero, so it has only finitely many roots. Thus, ρ has finite fibers. \square

We can apply Theorem 5.24 to specific λ 's to give another proof of Theorem 5.16. We also get the following corollaries:

Corollary 5.25. *If T is superstable, then ACF_T is superstable.*

Corollary 5.26. *If T is ω -stable, then ACF_T is ω -stable.*

Corollary 5.27. *ACF_{ACF} is ω -stable, see Proposition 6.2 for an extended application of this result.*

Remark 5.28. *By [Poi83], ACF_{ACF} is a belle pair (see there for the definition), and it is stable. In [BYPV03], the notion of belle pairs was expanded to lovely pairs and a description of non-forking independence was given. When considering pairs of ACF, the description of non-forking independence in Proposition 5.11 is slightly different from the description given in [BYPV03, Proposition 7.3] — instead of the condition $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^I B.P$ they have $A.P \downarrow_{M.P}^{\text{ACF}} B.P$. However, in this case the conditions are equivalent, as can be seen in [MPZ20, Corollary 6.2].*

5.4. NIP. We will prove that if T is NIP, then ACF_T is NIP. First we will define the notions of a NIP formula, type and theory, and present some basic facts based on [Sim15] and [KS14].

Definition 5.29. Suppose that T is some theory. A formula $\phi(x, y)$ has the *independence property (IP)* if there is a sequence $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ (in a model of T) such that for every $s \subseteq \omega$ the set $\{\phi(a_i, y) \mid i \in s\} \cup \{\neg\phi(a_i, y) \mid i \notin s\}$ is consistent.

A partial type $\pi(x)$ has *IP* if there is a formula $\phi(x, y)$ and a sequence $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ of realizations $a_i \models \pi(x)$ such that for every $s \subseteq \omega$ the set $\{\phi(a_i, y) \mid i \in s\} \cup \{\neg\phi(a_i, y) \mid i \notin s\}$ is consistent. Otherwise, $\pi(x)$ is *NIP*.

The theory T has *IP* if some formula has *IP*, or equivalently the type $x = x$ has *IP*. Otherwise, T is *NIP*.

Fact 5.30 ([Sim15, Lemma 2.7]). *A formula $\phi(x, y)$ has *IP* iff there is an indiscernible sequence $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ and a tuple b such that $\models \phi(a_i, b) \iff i$ is even.*

Fact 5.31 ([Sim15, Proposition 2.11]). *A theory T is *NIP* iff no formula $\phi(x, y)$ with $|y| = 1$ has *IP*.*

Fact 5.32 ([KS14, Proposition 2.6]). *Suppose $\pi(x)$ is a partial *NIP* type over A and B is a set of realizations of $\pi(x)$. If $I = (a_i)_{i < |T| + |B|}$ is an A -indiscernible sequence, then some end segment of I is indiscernible over AB .*

First we need to show that P is *NIP* as in Definition 5.29

Lemma 5.33. *If T is *NIP*, then P is *NIP*, i.e. the partial type $x \in P$ is *NIP*.*

Proof. Suppose $x \in P$ has *IP*. Then there are a sequence $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ with $a_i \in P$ and a formula $\phi(x, y)$, such that for every $s \subseteq \omega$, there exists $b_s \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models \phi(a_i, b_s) \iff i \in s$. By Remark 5.23, P is uniformly stably embedded in \mathbb{M} , so there exists a formula $\psi(x, z) \in L^P$ and parameters $c_s \in P$ for every $s \subseteq \omega$, such that $\phi(P, b_s) = \psi(P, c_s)$, and in particular $\mathbb{M} \models \psi(a_i, c_s) \iff i \in s$.

The induced structure on P is interdefinable with the internal L -structure of P (Lemma 5.21), so there is some formula $\psi'(x, z) \in L$ that defines the same set in P as $\psi(x, z)$, in particular $P \models \psi'(a_i, c_s) \iff i \in s$. The formula $\psi'(x, y)$ has *IP* in $P \models T$, in contradiction to T being *NIP*. \square

Theorem 5.34. *If T is *NIP*, then ACF_T is *NIP*.*

Proof. Suppose ACF_T has *IP*, by Fact 5.31 there is some $\phi(x, y)$ with $|y| = 1$ that has *IP*. Using Fact 5.30 and compactness, there is an indiscernible sequence $I = (a_i)_{i < |T|} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and some $c \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models \phi(a_i, c) \iff i$ is even.

First consider the case where c is transcendental over $P(I)$. In particular, c is transcendental over $P(a_0)$ and $P(a_1)$. There is an automorphism mapping a_0 to a_1 , as they have the same type over the empty set. Apply this automorphism on c to get c' which is transcendental over a_1 . Both c and c' are transcendental over $P(a_1)$, so by Lemma 3.14 c and c' have the same type over $P(a_1)$ in ACF_T . This is a contradiction, as we have $\models \phi(a_1, c')$ and $\models \neg\phi(a_1, c)$.

Now consider the case where c is algebraic over $P(I)$. There is some finite subsequence $I_0 \subseteq I$ and some finite tuple $b \in P$, such that c is algebraic over $I_0 b$. Let $I' \subseteq I$ be some end segment starting after I_0 ; note that I' is indiscernible over I_0 . As P is *NIP* (Lemma 5.33), by Fact 5.32 there is an end segment $I'' \subseteq I'$ that is indiscernible over $I_0 b$. It follows that I'' is also indiscernible over $\text{acl}(I_0 b)$, and in particular over c , a contradiction. \square

Corollary 5.35. *Let ACVF be the theory of algebraically closed valued fields in the divisibility language, that is the language of rings with a binary relation $x|y$ signifying $v(x) < v(y)$. ACVF is *NIP*, so ACF_{ACVF} is *NIP*.*

Remark 5.36. *One could also use a counting type approach to prove preservation of *NIP*, similar to the proof of Theorem 5.24. This would require working in a generic extension of ZFC such that $\text{ded}(\kappa)^{\aleph_0} < 2^\kappa$ for some infinite cardinal κ (where $\text{ded}(\kappa)$ is the supremum of cardinalities of linear orders with a dense subset of size $\leq \kappa$). For an expanded explanation of this approach, see [She90, Theorem II.4.10] and [Adl07, Corollary 24].*

Alternatively, one could also apply more general results, i.e., [CS15, Corollary 2.5] and [JS20, Proposition 2.5], but we chose to give a direct argument.

6. APPLICATIONS

In this section we will apply the above results to specific theories.

6.1. Tuples of algebraically closed fields. In this section we will consider (perhaps infinite) chains of algebraically closed fields, which, for the finite case, is a particular case of *beaux uples* in the sense of [BP88]. The main result of this section is Proposition 6.4 which classifies the theories of such chains based on the order type of the chain.

Definition 6.1. For any ordered set I , define $L^I = L_{\text{rings}} \cup \{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ with P_i unitary predicates and define the theory ACF^I expanding ACF in L^I , such that:

- (1) Each P_i is an algebraically closed field, that is strictly contained in the model.
- (2) For $i < j$, $P_i \subsetneq P_j$.

In particular, ACF^n is the theory of algebraically closed fields M , with n algebraically closed subfields $P_0 \subsetneq P_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq P_{n-1} \subsetneq M$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let I be any ordered set.*

- (1) *The completions of ACF^I are given by fixing the characteristic, ACF_p^I .*
- (2) *Every completion of ACF^I is stable.*

Proof. We will first prove for $I = n$, by induction on n . For $n = 0$, $\text{ACF}^0 = \text{ACF}$, and indeed the completions of ACF are given by fixing the characteristic and every completion ACF_p is stable. Suppose it is true for n . We have $\text{ACF}^{n+1} = \text{ACF}_{\text{ACF}^n}$, where we denote the added predicate by P_n . By Proposition 4.1, the completions of ACF^{n+1} are given by completions of ACF^n , which are given by fixing the characteristic. Furthermore, $\text{ACF}_p^{n+1} = \text{ACF}_{\text{ACF}_p^n}$, so by Theorem 5.16 every completion ACF_p^{n+1} is stable.

Now consider a general ordered set I and fix a characteristic ACF_p^I . Let ϕ be a sentence in L^I and let $I_\phi \subset I$ be the subset of indexes $i \in I$ such that P_i appears in ϕ . I_ϕ is finite, suppose $I_\phi = \{i_0 < \dots < i_{n-1}\}$. ACF_p^n is complete, so by renaming the predicates P_0, \dots, P_{n-1} to $P_{i_0}, \dots, P_{i_{n-1}}$ we get that $\text{ACF}_p^{I_\phi}$ is complete. Thus, $\text{ACF}_p^{I_\phi} \vdash \phi$ or $\text{ACF}_p^{I_\phi} \vdash \neg\phi$, but $\text{ACF}_p^{I_\phi}$ is a restriction of ACF_p^I , so $\text{ACF}_p^I \vdash \phi$ or $\text{ACF}_p^I \vdash \neg\phi$. The completions ACF_p^I are all the completions of ACF^I , because any completion has to fix a characteristic so it must extend some ACF_p^I .

We need to show that every completion ACF_p^I is stable. If $\phi \in L^I$ was a formula witnessing instability in ACF_p^I , then it would witness instability in $\text{ACF}_p^{I_\phi}$, which would imply that ACF_p^n is unstable for $n = |I_\phi|$. \square

We will further classify the stability of ACF_p^I (when is it ω -stable, superstable or totally transcendental) based on the order type of I . In the case that I is an ordinal, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 6.3. *Let α be an ordinal and $M \models \text{ACF}^\alpha$. Any L^β -automorphism of P_β for $\beta < \alpha$ can be extended to an L^α -automorphism of M .*

Proof. Let σ_β be an automorphism of P_β , we will construct by transfinite induction on $\beta \leq \gamma < \alpha$ automorphisms σ_γ of P_γ , such that if $\beta \leq \gamma' < \gamma < \alpha$, then σ_γ extends $\sigma_{\gamma'}$.

Let $\beta \leq \gamma < \alpha$ and suppose we constructed $\sigma_{\gamma'}$ for $\beta \leq \gamma' < \gamma$. Let $\sigma_{<\gamma}$ be the union of $\{\sigma_{\gamma'}\}_{\beta \leq \gamma' < \gamma}$, $\sigma_{<\gamma}$ is a field automorphism of $P_{<\gamma} = \bigcup_{\gamma' < \gamma} P_{\gamma'}$ (if $\gamma = \gamma' + 1$ is a successor ordinal, then $\sigma_{<\gamma} = \sigma_{\gamma'}$). Let S be a transcendence basis of P_γ over $P_{<\gamma}$, extend $\sigma_{<\gamma}$ to a field automorphism σ_γ by fixing S pointwise and extending to the algebraic closure. For every $\gamma' < \gamma$, σ_γ preserves $P_{\gamma'}$ setwise, so σ_γ is an L^γ -automorphism.

Once we constructed σ_γ for every $\beta \leq \gamma < \alpha$, we can construct σ_α , an L^α -automorphism of M , in a similar fashion: take $\sigma_{<\alpha}$ the union of $\{\sigma_\gamma\}_{\beta \leq \gamma < \alpha}$, fix a transcendence basis of M over $P_{<\alpha}$ pointwise and extend to the algebraic closure. \square

Proposition 6.4. *For an ordered set I :*

- (1) *If I is finite, or countable and well-ordered, then every completion of ACF^I is ω -stable.*
- (2) *If I is uncountable and well-ordered, then every completion of ACF^I is totally transcendental, and in particular superstable, but not ω -stable.*
- (3) *If I is not well-ordered, then no completion of ACF^I is superstable.*

Proof. Fix a completion ACF_p^I (by Proposition 6.2).

(1) The theory ACF_p^I depends only on the order type of I , up to renaming predicates, so it is enough to prove for $I = \alpha$ a finite or countable ordinal. We will prove that ACF_p^α is ω -stable by transfinite induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$. For $\alpha = 0$, $\text{ACF}_p^0 = \text{ACF}_p$ is ω -stable. If ACF_p^α is ω -stable, then note that $\text{ACF}_p^{\alpha+1} = \text{ACF}_{\text{ACF}_p^\alpha}^\alpha$ where we name the added predicate P_α , so by Corollary 5.26 $\text{ACF}_p^{\alpha+1}$ is ω -stable.

Suppose that α is a countable limit ordinal and for every $\beta < \alpha$, ACF_p^β is ω -stable, the proof that ACF_p^α is ω -stable will be similar to the proof of Theorem 5.24. Let $\mathbb{M} \models \text{ACF}_p^\alpha$ be a monster model and let $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a countable subset. Denote $P_{<\alpha} = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} P_\beta$. First we will show that every two elements in $\mathbb{M} \setminus \overline{P_{<\alpha}(C)}$ have the same type over C . Let $a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{M} \setminus \overline{P_{<\alpha}(C)}$, for every $\beta < \alpha$, a_0 and a_1 are transcendental over $P_\beta(C)$ so by Lemma 3.14 there is an automorphism of $\mathbb{M} \upharpoonright L^{\beta+1}$ preserving $P_\beta(C)$ and mapping $a_0 \mapsto a_1$. Thus, $a_0 \equiv_C a_1$ in $L^{\beta+1}$ for every $\beta < \alpha$, so $a_0 \equiv_C a_1$ in L^α , as every formula in L^α belongs to some $L^{\beta+1}$ where β is the largest ordinal such that P_β appears in the formula.

Now we will show that there at most countably many types over C realized in $\overline{P_{<\alpha}(C)}$. Any element $a \in \overline{P_{<\alpha}(C)}$ solves some non-zero polynomial of the form $q(x; b, c)$ with $b \in P_{<\alpha}^n$ and $c \in C^m$. There is some $\beta < \alpha$ such that $b \in P_\beta^n$, in particular a satisfies

$$\phi(x; c) = \exists y \in P_\beta (q(x; y, c) = 0 \wedge \exists x' q(x'; y, c) \neq 0).$$

Thus, any type in $\overline{P_{<\alpha}(C)}$ contains some formula $\phi(x; c)$ as above. There are countably many formulas in L^α with parameters from C , so it is enough to prove that there are at most countably many types that contain any given formula $\phi(x; c)$ as above.

First of all, P_β is stably embedded in \mathbb{M} (every automorphism of P_β can be extended to an automorphism of \mathbb{M} so we can use Fact 5.19; alternatively, ACF_p^α is stable so every definable subset is stably embedded), so every C -definable subset of P_β^n is also definable in ACF_p^α with parameters from P_β . Let $D \subseteq P_\beta^n$ be the set of all the parameters needed to define every C -definable subset of P_β^n . There are at most countably many definable subsets of P_β^n over C , so D is countable.

Let $[\phi] \subseteq S_1^{\text{ACF}_p^\alpha}(C)$ be the set of types implying $\phi(x; c)$ as above, we will construct a map $\rho : [\phi] \rightarrow S_n^{\text{ACF}_p^\beta}(D)$ such that ρ has finite fibers. Because ACF_p^β is ω -stable, $|S_n^{\text{ACF}_p^\beta}(D)|$ is countable, so this will imply that $[\phi]$ is countable as needed.

For any type $p(x) \in [\phi]$, choose some realization $a \models p$. In particular, $\models \phi(a; c)$, so we can choose some $b \in P_\beta^n$ such that $q(x; b, c)$ is non-zero and $q(a; b, c) = 0$. Define $\rho(p) = \text{tp}^{\text{ACF}_p^\beta}(b/D)$. Suppose $p_0, p_1 \in [\phi]$ and $\rho(p_0) = \rho(p_1)$, that is, if a_i and b_i are the specific elements we chose for p_i ($i = 0, 1$), then $b_0 \equiv_D b_1$ in ACF_p^β . There is an automorphism of P_β over D mapping $b_0 \mapsto b_1$, which can be extended by Lemma 6.3 to an automorphism of \mathbb{M} over D , so $b_0 \equiv_D b_1$ in ACF_p^α . We want to prove that $b_0 \equiv_C b_1$ in ACF_p^α . Suppose b_0 belongs to some C -definable set, we can assume that it is a subset of P_β^n because $b_0 \in P_\beta^n$. By the construction of D , this C -definable subset of P_β^n is also D -definable in ACF_p^α , so b_1 belongs to it as $b_0 \equiv_D b_1$ in ACF_p^α .

Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/C)$ be an automorphism mapping $b_0 \mapsto b_1$. In particular $q(\sigma(a_0); b_1, c) = 0$, thus a_0 has the same type over C as a root of $q(x; b_1, c)$, specifically $\sigma(a_0)$. It follows that every type in the fiber of $\rho(p_1)$ is a type over C of a root of $q(x; b_1, c)$, however $q(x; b_1, c)$ is non-zero, so it has only finitely many roots. Thus, ρ has finite fibers.

(2) Suppose I is uncountable and well-ordered. If ACF_p^I was not totally transcendental, there would be a binary tree of consistent formulas $\{\phi_s(x; c_s)\}_{s \in 2^{<\omega}}$ (see [TZ12, Definition 5.2.5]). Let $I_0 \subseteq I$ be the finite or countable subset of indexes $i \in I$ such that P_i appears in some formula ϕ_s . The tree $\{\phi_s(x; c_s)\}_{s \in 2^{<\omega}}$ is also a binary tree of consistent formulas in $\text{ACF}_p^{I_0}$, so $\text{ACF}_p^{I_0}$ is not totally transcendental. However, a subset of a well-ordered set is also well-ordered, so by the previous part $\text{ACF}_p^{I_0}$ is ω -stable and in particular totally transcendental.

However, ACF_p^I can not be ω -stable, as it is not interdefinable with a theory in a countable language — each P_i for $i \in I$ is a distinct definable set.

(3) Note that an ordered set I is well-ordered iff I does not contain an infinite descending chain. If I is not well-ordered, let $(i_k)_{k < \omega} \subseteq I$ be a descending chain, then $(P_{i_k})_{k < \omega}$ is a descending chain of definable subfields in ACF_p^I . Considering only the additive group structure, $(P_{i_k})_{k < \omega}$ is a descending chain of definable subgroups each of infinite index in the previous one, so ACF_p^I is not superstable (see e.g. [TZ12, Exercise 8.6.10]). \square

6.2. Complete system of a Galois group. For a profinite group G one can associate a structure $S(G)$, called the complete system of G , in a multi-sorted language. This definition is due to [CvdDM81], we will present the definition as given in [Ram18, Definition 7.1.6].

Definition 6.5. Suppose G is a profinite group. Let $\mathcal{N}(G)$ be the collection of open normal subgroups of G . Define

$$S(G) = \coprod_{N \in \mathcal{N}(G)} G/N.$$

Let L_G be the language with a sort X_n for each $n < \omega$, two binary relation symbols \leq, C and a ternary relation P . We regard $S(G)$ as an L_G -structure in the following way:

- The coset gN is in the sort X_n iff $[G : N] \leq n$.
- $gN \leq hM$ iff $N \subseteq M$.
- $C(gN, hM)$ iff $N \subseteq M$ and $gM = hM$.
- $P(g_1N_1, g_2N_2, g_3N_3)$ iff $N_1 = N_2 = N_3$ and $g_1g_2N_1 = g_3N_1$.

Note that we do not require the sorts to be disjoint (see [Cha98, §1] for a discussion on the syntax of this structure).

For a field F , let $G(F) = \text{Gal}(\overline{F}/F)$ be the absolute Galois group of F , which is profinite. In [Ram18, Corollary 7.2.7], Ramsey proved that if F is a PAC field such that $\text{Th}(S(G(F)))$ is NSOP_1 , then $\text{Th}(F)$ is NSOP_1 . We will prove the other direction, using the following fact, proved in [Cha02, Proposition 5.5].

Fact 6.6. *$S(G(F))$ is interpretable in (K, F) where K is any algebraically closed field extending F .*

Proposition 6.7. *Let F be a PAC field. Then $\text{Th}(F)$ is NSOP_1 iff $\text{Th}(S(G(F)))$ is NSOP_1 .*

Proof. The left to right direction is [Ram18, Corollary 7.2.7]

For the right to left direction, let $K \supseteq F$ be a large enough algebraically closed extension, $(K, F) \models \text{ACF}_{\text{Th}(F)}$. From Theorem 5.9 $\text{ACF}_{\text{Th}(F)}$ is NSOP_1 , but from Fact 6.6 $S(G(F))$ is interpretable in (K, F) , so $\text{Th}(S(G(F)))$ is NSOP_1 . \square

6.3. Pseudo finite fields. Pseudo finite fields were first studied in [Ax68], we will give the definition from [TZ12].

Definition 6.8. Suppose F is a field. We say that F is *pseudo-algebraically closed* if every absolutely irreducible variety over F has an F -rational point, or equivalently if it is existentially closed in every regular extension. We say that F is *pseudo-finite* if it is perfect, pseudo-algebraically closed and 1-free (has exactly one extension of degree n for every n). Being pseudo-algebraically closed or pseudo-finite is an elementary property [TZ12, Corollary B.4.3, Remark B.4.12], so there are first-order theories PAC, PSF of pseudo-algebraically closed, pseudo-finite fields respectively.

Proposition 6.9. *$\text{ACF}_{\text{PSF}}^{ld}$ is model complete.*

Proof. If Q and R are pseudo-finite fields such that $Q \subseteq R$ is a relatively algebraically closed extension, that is $\overline{Q} \cap R = Q$, then $Q \preceq R$ [FJ08, Proposition 20.10.2]. In particular, if $Q \subseteq R$ is a regular extension, then it is relatively algebraically closed, so $Q \preceq R$. Thus, by Theorem 4.12, $\text{ACF}_{\text{PSF}}^{ld}$ is model complete. \square

Proposition 6.10. *Every completion of ACF_{PSF} is simple.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, completions of ACF_{PSF} are given by completions of PSF, which are simple by [TZ12, Corollary 7.5.6], so the result follows from Theorem 5.13. We will give another more direct proof using ACFA, the model companion of difference fields, which is simple [Kim14, Example 2.6.9].

Let $(M, P) \models \text{ACF}_{\text{PSF}}$. We will show that there is an automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(\overline{P}/P)$ such that $\text{Fix}(\sigma) := \{a \in \overline{P} \mid \sigma(a) = a\} = P$. Consider P_n the unique cyclic extension of degree n of P and σ_n a generator of $\text{Gal}(P_n/P)$. The fixed field of σ_n is P , so the inverse limit of σ_n is an automorphism of \overline{P} whose fixed field is P .

By [Afs14, Corollary 1.2], we can embed (\overline{P}, σ) into (N, σ') a model of ACFA, with $\text{Fix}(\sigma') = P$. The structure (N, P) is a reduct of (N, σ') , so it is simple. The structures (M, P) , (N, P) and (\overline{P}, P) are models of ACF_{PSF} , and they can be uniquely expanded to models of $\text{ACF}_{\text{PSF}}^{ld}$. Lemma 3.10 implies that $(\overline{P}, P) \subseteq (M, P)$, $(\overline{P}, P) \subseteq (N, P)$ are substructures in $\text{ACF}_{\text{PSF}}^{ld}$, because they all share the same predicate. However, Proposition 6.9 says that $\text{ACF}_{\text{PSF}}^{ld}$ is model complete, so those are elementary substructures. In particular, they are elementary substructures in ACF_{PSF} . Because (N, P) is simple and $(\overline{P}, P) \preceq (N, P)$, we get that (\overline{P}, P) is simple. But also $(\overline{P}, P) \preceq (M, P)$, so (M, P) is simple. \square

7. QUESTIONS

There are several questions that arose in our work, which we did not address in this paper.

Question 7.1. *What other classification properties can we lift from T to ACF_T ? NTP_2 , NSOP_n (for $n \geq 2$)?*

Question 7.2. *What results still hold when we replace ACF in ACF_T with a different theory of fields? SCF , ACVF ? The theory of dense pairs of ACVF was studied in [Del12].*

Question 7.3. *What results still hold when we replace ACF in ACF_T with any strongly minimal theory? See Remark 5.15.*

REFERENCES

- [Adl07] Hans Adler. Introduction to theories without the independence property, 2007.
- [Afs14] Bijan Afshordel. Generic automorphisms with prescribed fixed fields. *J. Symb. Log.*, 79(4):985–1000, 2014.
- [AS27] Emil Artin and Otto Schreier. Algebraische Konstruktion reeller Körper. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, 5(1):85–99, 1927.
- [Ax68] James Ax. The elementary theory of finite fields. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 88:239–271, 1968.
- [BP88] Elisabeth Bouscaren and Bruno Poizat. Des belles paires aux beaux uples. *J. Symb. Log.*, 53(2):434–442, 1988.
- [BYPV03] Itai Ben-Yaacov, Anand Pillay, and Evgueni Vassiliev. Lovely pairs of models. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 122(1-3):235–261, 2003.
- [Cas11] Enrique Casanovas. *Simple theories and hyperimaginaries*, volume 39 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Association for Symbolic Logic, Chicago, IL; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.
- [Cha98] Zoé Chatzidakis. Model theory of profinite groups having the Iwasawa property. *Illinois J. Math.*, 42(1):70–96, 1998.
- [Cha99] Zoé Chatzidakis. Simplicity and independence for pseudo-algebraically closed fields. In *Models and computability (Leeds, 1997)*, volume 259 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 41–61. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [Cha02] Zoé Chatzidakis. Properties of forking in ω -free pseudo-algebraically closed fields. *J. Symb. Log.*, 67(3):957–996, 2002.
- [Cha19] Zoé Chatzidakis. Amalgamation of types in pseudo-algebraically closed fields and applications. *J. Math. Log.*, 19(2):1950006, 28, 2019.
- [CK90] Chen Chung Chang and Howard Jerome Keisler. *Model theory*, volume 73 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, third edition, 1990.
- [CR16] Artem Chernikov and Nicholas Ramsey. On model-theoretic tree properties. *J. Math. Log.*, 16(2):1650009, 41, 2016.
- [CS15] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Externally definable sets and dependent pairs II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(7):5217–5235, 2015.
- [CvdDM80] Gregory Cherlin, Lou van den Dries, and Angus Macintyre. The elementary theory of regularly closed fields. *preprint*, 1980.
- [CvdDM81] Gregory Cherlin, Lou van den Dries, and Angus Macintyre. Decidability and undecidability theorems for PAC-fields. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 4(1):101–104, 1981.
- [CZ01] Enrique Casanovas and Martin Ziegler. Stable theories with a new predicate. *J. Symb. Log.*, 66(3):1127–1140, 2001.
- [dE21] Christian d'Elbée. Forking, imaginaries and other fetures of acfg . *J. Symb. Log.*, page 1–34, Jun 2021.
- [Del12] Françoise Delon. Élimination des quantificateurs dans les paires de corps algébriquement clos. *Confluentes Math.*, 4(2):1250003, 11, 2012.
- [FJ08] Michael D. Fried and Moshe Jarden. *Field arithmetic*, volume 11 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 2008. Revised by Jarden.

- [HK21] Yatir Halevi and Itay Kaplan. Saturated models for the working model theorist, 2021.
- [HKR18] Martin Hils, Moshe Kamensky, and Silvain Rideau. Imaginaries in separably closed valued fields. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 116(6):1457–1488, 2018.
- [Hod93] Wilfrid Hodges. *Model theory*, volume 42 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [JS20] Franziska Jahnke and Pierre Simon. NIP henselian valued fields. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 59(1-2):167–178, 2020.
- [Kei64] Howard Jerome Keisler. Complete theories of algebraically closed fields with distinguished subfields. *Michigan Math. J.*, 11:71–81, 1964.
- [Kei67] Howard Jerome Keisler. Ultraproducts which are not saturated. *J. Symb. Log.*, 32:23–46, 1967.
- [Kim14] Byunghan Kim. *Simplicity theory*, volume 53 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014.
- [KR20] Itay Kaplan and Nicholas Ramsey. On Kim-independence. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 22(5):1423–1474, 2020.
- [KS14] Itay Kaplan and Pierre Simon. Witnessing dp-rank. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.*, 55(3):419–429, 2014.
- [Lan72] Serge Lang. *Introduction to algebraic geometry*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., 1972. Third printing, with corrections.
- [Mac08] Angus Macintyre. Algebra and geometry in basic model theory of fields, 2008. <http://www.logique.jussieu.fr/modnet/Publications/Introductory%20Notes%20and%20surveys/macintyre.pdf>.
- [Mor96] Patrick Morandi. *Field and Galois theory*, volume 167 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [MPZ20] Amador Martin-Pizarro and Martin Ziegler. Equational theories of fields. *J. Symb. Log.*, 85(2):828–851, 2020.
- [Pil98] Anand Pillay. The model-theoretic content of Lang’s conjecture. In *Model theory and algebraic geometry*, volume 1696 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 101–106. Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [Poi83] Bruno Poizat. Paires de structures stables. *J. Symb. Log.*, 48(2):239–249, 1983.
- [Ram18] Samuel Nicholas Ramsey. *Independence, Amalgamation, and Trees*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2018. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of California, Berkeley.
- [Rob59] A. Robinson. Solution of a problem of Tarski. *Fund. Math.*, 47:179–204, 1959.
- [She90] S. Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1990.
- [Sim15] Pierre Simon. *A guide to NIP theories*, volume 44 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Association for Symbolic Logic, Chicago, IL; Cambridge Scientific Publishers, Cambridge, 2015.
- [Tar51] Alfred Tarski. *A decision method for elementary algebra and geometry*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif., 1951. 2nd ed.
- [TZ12] Katrin Tent and Martin Ziegler. *A course in model theory*, volume 40 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.

FIELDS INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES OFFICE 416 222 COLLEGE STREET. TORONTO, ONTARIO. CANADA.

Email address: cdelbee@fields.utoronto.ca

URL: http://choum.net/~chris/page_perso/

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, 91904, JERUSALEM ISRAEL.

Email address: kaplan@math.huji.ac.il

URL: math.huji.ac.il/~kaplan

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, 91904, JERUSALEM ISRAEL.

Email address: leor.neuhauser@math.huji.ac.il