

Strongly minimal reducts of ACVF

Santiago Pinzon

October 31, 2022

Abstract

Let $\mathbb{K} = (K, +, \cdot, v, \Gamma)$ be a valued algebraically closed field of characteristic and (G, \oplus) be a \mathcal{K} -interpretable group that is either locally isomorphic to $(K, +)$ or to (K, \cdot) . Then if $\mathcal{G} = (G, \oplus, \dots)$ is a strongly minimal non locally modular structure interpretable in \mathbb{K} , it interprets a field.

We also present an strategy for proving the same without the assumption of having a definable group operation.

This document is the PhD thesis of the author and it was advised by professors Alf Onshuus and Assaf Hasson.

Contents

- 1 Introduction and Preliminaries 3**
 - 1.1 Introduction 3
 - 1.2 Preliminaries on Model Theory 5
 - 1.3 Group Configurations 8
 - 1.4 Preliminaries on valued fields 9
 - 1.5 Partial Isomorphism 14

- 2 Some facts of definable groups contained in K 16**
 - 2.1 Some reductions 16
 - 2.2 Good families of curves 21

- 3 Additive Case 27**
 - 3.1 Power Series 27
 - 3.2 Getting a good family of curves on \mathcal{G} 30

- 4 Multiplicative Case 33**
 - 4.1 Finding a Group 34
 - 4.2 Finding a Field 37

- 5 General Case 40**

Chapter 1

Introduction and Preliminaries

1.1 Introduction

Given any field k there are many families of curves in k^2 that one can define. For example one may define the family of all lines on k^2 . This, together with the points of k^2 , form a plane geometry in the sense of Chapter 2.1 of [Art57]. In here Artin proved a converse for this. Namely if one starts with a set E and an incidence system of lines and points on E satisfying some geometrical axioms, then one can to build a field k such that the lines of E are given by linear equations on k .

One can wonder whether this result in some other settings where one has a good notion of dimension and a big enough family of curve -in the sense of that dimension-. In this way, in [Rab93], Rabinovich proved that if k is an algebraically closed valued field and $\mathcal{D} = (D, \dots)$ is some structure whose universe is $\mathbb{A}^1(k)$ and whose definable sets are constructible sets, then if \mathcal{D} has a big enough definable family of curves contained in D^2 , then \mathcal{D} interprets an infinite field.

An example of such a family is the family of all lines contained in $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1$. This is a two dimensional family of curves, and in this case is not hard to see that one can recover an infinite field. For example if one consideres the sub-family of lines passing trough $(0, 0)$ this can be identified with $\{l_m : m \in k\} \cup l_\infty$. Where for $m \in K$ l_m is the line of equation $y = mx$ and l_∞ is the line of equation $x = 0$. In this case one has that $l_m \circ l_n = l_{m \cdot n}$ so one can recover the multiplicative group of k , \mathbb{G}_m from composition between elements of that subfamily. With some more work we can also recover the additive group \mathbb{G}_a and also the action of \mathbb{G}_m on \mathbb{G}_a .

In late 1970s, Zilber abstracted this principle in the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1.1. (*Zilber's Trichotomy Principle*)

If \mathcal{D} is a strongly minimal structure and there is a big enough \mathcal{D} -definable family of plane curves, then \mathcal{D} interprets an infinite field.

In the conjecture, “big enough” will be read for us as “morley rank 2”. The family of lines in the plane is an example.

Ravinovich' result is a very particular case of this conjecture where \mathcal{D} is some reduct of the full field structure on the affine line of an algebraically close field.

This conjecture was proved false by Hrushovski in [Hru93]. He built a class of examples of strongly minimal sets that are not trivial or locally modular but does not interpret any field. However, the principle of Zilber's trichotomy has still an important role in modern model theory.

In [HZ96] Hrushovski and Zilber defined (1-dimensional) Zariski geometries and proved that Zilber's trichotomy holds for them. This covers a vast class of examples, generalizing the algebraic case: if k is an algebraically closed field and N are the k -points of an algebraically curve (over k) then if \mathcal{N} is the structure with universe N and whose definable subsets of N^k are all the k -constructible sets, then \mathcal{N} is a Zariski Geometry and then it interprets a field.

There are other settings where the conjecture has been proved true without the use of Zariski Geometries but using intersection theory. That is the case of [HS17]. Here Hasson and Sustretov proved that if D has as universe an algebraic curve over an algebraically closed field k and all the definable sets on D^k are definables in the field structure, then Zilber's trichotomy it is true for D . Note that it is a generalization of Ravinovich result.

In some other settings the conjecture has proved to be true by using intersection theory coming from continuous open functions. This is the case of [EHP21], here is proved that if $(D, +)$ is a definable group in k , an o-minimal expansion of a real closed field, and $\mathcal{D} = (D, +, \dots)$ is a o-minimal structure that is a reduct of the structure induced by k , containing a big enough family of curves, then \mathcal{D} interprets a field.

There is also cases where the conjecture was proved to be true using intersection theory coming from analytic functions. This is the case of [KR16]. Here it is proved that if D has as universe a valued field K with $\text{char}K = 0$ and we assume that addition is definable and that all the definable sets of D^k are definable in the valued field structure, then D satisfies Zilber's trichotomy.

This is the setting in which we are interested. In the introduction of [HS17] is suggested that their methods should be suitable to be used for proving generalizations of [KR16], for example proving the result for positive characteristic or get rid of the assumption that $+$ is definable on D .

In this thesis we work on both possible generalizations:

First we prove that results on [KR16] are true even in positive characteristic. This is Theorem 3.0.1.

Moreover we also prove that if D is an expansion of the multiplicative group $(K \setminus 0, \cdot)$ then it interprets a field if it is not locally modular.

We expect that our results can be used for proving Zilber's trichotomy for D . Assuming that D is any definable subset of an algebraically close valued field K whose Zariski closure is 1-dimensional and whose definables sets are definable in the valued fields structure. This can be done finding a group interpretable in \mathcal{D} as in Section 4.1 and then proving that such a group is locally isomorphic either to $(K, +)$ or to $(K \setminus 0, \cdot)$, and then we can use our result to conclude.

Now we present the structure of the document:

In Chapter 1 we present the basic preliminaries on model theory and valued fields that we will need.

In Chapter 2 we prove some facts about definable groups contained in K . In Section 2.2 we introduce the notion of good families of curves for a definable group G and prove Theorem 2.2.2 that we will use for defining a field.

In Chapter 3 we construct a good family of curves if G is the additive group of K so using results on Chapter 2 we prove Theorem 3.0.1.

In Chapter 4 we deal with the case in which D is an expansion of the multiplicative group. In here we first build an interpretable group that is locally isomorphic to $(K, +)$. Then we use results of Chapters 2 and 3 for interpreting a field.

1.2 Preliminaries on Model Theory

Let \mathcal{L} be a first order language and let $\mathcal{P} = (P, \dots)$ be an infinite \mathcal{L} structure.

We adopt the usual definitions of \mathcal{P} -definable and \mathcal{P} -interpretable sets. See for example Section 1.3 of [Mar06]. Assume moreover that \mathcal{P} is κ -saturated, for some big enough cardinal κ . In particular $\kappa > \omega$.

Definition 1.2.1. *Given D be an interpretable set on \mathcal{P} .*

We say that D is strongly minimal if D is infinite and the only definable subsets of D are the finite and the cofinite sets.

We say that \mathcal{P} is strongly minimal if P is strongly minimal as a definable set on \mathcal{P} .

If T is a theory we say that T is strongly minimal if \mathcal{P} is strongly minimal for all $\mathcal{P} \models T$

We will use the following notion of dimension:

Definition 1.2.2. *If $X \subseteq P^n$ is a definable set we say that $\text{RM}_{\mathcal{P}}(X) \geq 0$ if X is non empty and for an ordinal α , $\text{RM}_{\mathcal{P}}(X) \geq \alpha$ if there are $X_1, X_2 \dots$ infinitely many definable subsets of X such that:*

- $\bigcup X_i = X$,
- for all $i \neq j$, $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ and
- for all i and for all $\beta < \alpha$, $\text{RM}_{\mathcal{P}}(X_i) \geq \beta$.

We say that $\text{RM}_{\mathcal{P}}(X) = \alpha$ if $\text{RM}_{\mathcal{P}}(X) \geq \alpha$ and is not the case that $\text{RM}_{\mathcal{P}}(X) \geq \alpha + 1$.

If there is some $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\text{RM}(X) = \alpha$, we say that X has bounded Morley rank and that α is the Morley rank of X .

If $\text{RM}(X) = n \in \omega$ then we say that X has finite Morley rank.

The following is well known, a proof can be find in Lemma 6.2.7 of [Mar06].

Fact 1.2.3. *If X, Y are subsets of P^n , then*

We omit the subscript if \mathcal{P} is clear from the context.

Definition 1.2.4. *If $p(x) \in S_n(A)$ we define*

$$\text{RM}(p) = \min\{\text{RM}(X) : X \in p\}.$$

For $a \in D^n$ let $\text{RM}(a/p) = \text{RM}(tp(a/A))$.

The following is well known (and easy to prove) and can be found in Lemma 6.2.7 of [Mar06].

Fact 1.2.5. *If $\mathcal{P} = (P, \dots)$ is any structure and X, Y are definable subsets of P^n , then:*

1. *If $X \subseteq Y$ then $\text{RM}(X) \leq \text{RM}(Y)$.*
2. *$\text{RM}(X \cup Y) = \max(\text{RM}(X), \text{RM}(Y))$.*
3. *If $X \neq \emptyset$ then $\text{RM}(X) = 0$ if and only if X is finite.*

Definition 1.2.6. *If $\text{RM}(X) = \alpha$ then there is no a partition of X in infinitely many definable subsets of morley rank greater than α . Therefore by compactness there is a maximal natural number n such that there are X_1, \dots, X_n definable and disjoint subsets of X covering X with $\text{RM}(X_i) = \alpha$. We define the morley degree of X as $\text{DM}(X) = n$.*

We say that X is sationary if $\text{DM}(X) = 1$.

Lemma 1.2.7. *A set D is strongly minimal if and only if $\text{RM}(D) = \text{DM}(D) = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose D is strongly minimal, then as D is infinite and $D = \cup_{d \in D} \{d\}$ one has that $\text{RM} X \geq 1$. As each infinite definable subset of D is cofinite it is not the case that there are two infinite and disjoint definable subsets of D . It shows that $\text{RM}(X) = 1$ and also that $\text{DM}(X) = 1$.

Now assume that $\text{RM} X = \text{DM} X = 1$, and suppose by contradiction that there is an infinite definable set $Y \subseteq X$ such that $X \setminus Y$ is also infinite. Then as $X = Y \cup (X \setminus Y)$ one has that $\text{DM}(X) \geq 2$, a contradiction. □

The following can be found in page 196 of [Mar17].

Fact 1.2.8. *If $\mathcal{P} = (P, \dots)$ is strongly minimal then $\text{RM}(P^n) = n$.*

Corollary 1.2.9. *If $\mathcal{P} = (P, \dots)$ is strongly minimal and $X \subseteq P^n$ is \mathcal{P} -definable, then X has finite Morley Rank.*

Proof. By Fact 1.2.8 one has that $\text{RM} P^n = n$ and by clause 1 of Fact 1.2.5 one conclude that $\text{RM} X \leq n$, in particular X has finite Morley Rank. □

Definition 1.2.10. Let $\mathcal{P} = (P, \dots)$ be a strongly minimal structure and X be a \mathcal{P} -interpretable set with parameters A . We say that a tuple $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in X^n$ is generic independent (over A) if $\text{RM}(z/A) = n \text{RM}(X)$

We now define curves and families of curves.

Definition 1.2.11. If $\mathcal{P} = (P, \dots)$ is a strongly minimal structure, a plane curve C (of \mathcal{P}) is a \mathcal{P} -definable and one dimensional subset of P^2 .

A definable family of plane curves is a \mathcal{M} -definable set $X \subseteq P^{2+n}$ such that for all a in some \mathcal{P} -definable set $Q \subseteq P^n$ one has that

$$X_a := \{(x, y) \in P^2 : (x, y, a) \in X\}$$

is a plane curve.

We usually write such a family as $(X_a)_{a \in Q}$.

Definition 1.2.12. We say that a family of curves $(X_a)_{a \in Q}$ is almost disjoint if for any $b \in Q$ the set $\{a \in Q : |X_a \Delta X_b| < \infty\}$ is finite.

From now when we say “definable family of curves” we mean “definable and almost disjoint family of curves”.

Now we define the notion of trivial and locally modular strongly minimal structures.

Definition 1.2.13. If \mathcal{P} is strongly minimal we say that \mathcal{P} is trivial if for any definable set $A \subseteq P^n$ one has that

$$\text{acl}(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} \text{acl}(a).$$

Definition 1.2.14. If \mathcal{P} is strongly minimal we say that \mathcal{P} is locally modular if for any X, Y definable subsets of P^n , if $X = \text{acl}(X)$ and $Y = \text{acl}(Y)$ then one has that

$$\text{RM}(X \cup Y) = \text{RM } X + \text{RM } Y - \text{RM}(X \cap Y).$$

Zilbers Trichotomy states:

Let \mathcal{P} be strongly minimal, then and assume that is no trivial and is no locally modular, then there is an infinite field k interpretable in \mathcal{P} .

In all of its generality it was proved false by Hrushovski on [Hru93]. But we can re state it relative to restricted setting:

Let T be some complete theory

Conjecture 1.2.15. (Zilber’s trichotomy principle relative to T)

Let $\mathcal{N} = (N, \dots)$ be any model of T and let P be some \mathcal{N} -interpretable set. Let $\mathcal{P} = (P, \dots)$ be some \mathcal{L}' -structure over P (for some language \mathcal{L}') such that any \mathcal{P} -definable set is also \mathcal{N} -definable. Then if \mathcal{P} is non locally modular, there is an infinite field interpretable in \mathcal{P} .

There are several instances of this conjecture that has been proved true, more relevant for us are:

Fact 1.2.16. (Theorem 4.3.3 of [HS17]) *If T is the theory of algebraically closed fields of a fixed characteristic (as defined in Section 1.4) then Conjecture 1.2.15 is true if we assume that P is an algebraic curve.*

Recently Castle proved in [Cas22] the following:

Fact 1.2.17. *If \mathcal{N} is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, then, Conjecture 1.2.15 is true.*

The following is also true:

Fact 1.2.18. (Theorem 3.17 on [KR16]) *If T is the theory of algebraically closed valued field of characteristic zero (as defined in Section 1.4) then Conjecture 1.2.15 is true if we assume that $\mathcal{N} = (N, +, \cdot, v, \Gamma)$, $P = N$ and addition is definable in \mathcal{P} .*

We will use techniques of both, [HS17] and [KR16] for almost all of our work.

1.3 Group Configurations

In this section we introduce the main tools in order to interpret groups and fields in strongly minimal structures.

From now we fix $\mathcal{N} = (N, \dots)$ an strongly minimal structure.

Definition 1.3.1. *A d -dimensional group configuration for \mathcal{N} over a set of parameters A is a 6-tuple $\mathfrak{g} = (a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3)$ where each b_i and a_i are tuples of elements of N such that:*

- $\text{RM } \mathfrak{g} = 3d + 3$
- $\text{RM}(\alpha, \beta/A) = \text{RM}(\alpha/A) + \text{RM}(\beta/A)$ for all $\alpha \neq \beta \in \mathfrak{g}$,
- $\text{RM}(b_i/A) = d$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$,
- $\text{RM}(a_i/A) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$,
- $\text{RM}(b_1, b_2, b_3/A) = 3d$,
- $\text{RM}(b_1, a_2, a_3) = \text{RM}(b_2, a_1, a_3) = \text{RM}(b_3, a_1, a_2) = d + 1$.

Definition 1.3.2. *If G is an interpretable group of dimension d , a group configuration of G is*

$$\mathfrak{g}_G = (a, b \cdot a, c \cdot b \cdot a, b, c, cb)$$

for some choice of a, b, c generic independent elements of G

Definition 1.3.3. We say that $\mathfrak{g} = (a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3)$ is a reduced group configuration for \mathcal{N} if it is a group configuration and in addition if $a'_i \in \text{acl}(a_i)$ are such $\mathfrak{g}' = (a'_1, a'_2, a'_3, b_1, b_2, b_3)$ is still a group configuration, then $a_i \in \text{acl}(a'_i)$

If \mathfrak{g}_1 is another group configuration we say that \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}_1 are interalgebraic if the correspondent coordinates satisfies $\text{acl}(a) = \text{acl}(a')$. The following is due to Hrushovski ([Hru86]). The precise statement we need can be find in Facts 4.4 and 4.6 of [HS17].

Fact 1.3.4. Let \mathcal{N} be an strongly minimal structure, then if \mathfrak{g} is a group configuration for \mathcal{N} (over some set of parameters), there is a minimal group G , an strongly minimal set X and a faithful action of G on X all of the data interpretable in N .

In addition \mathfrak{g} is reduced, then a generic group configuration of G is interalgebraic with \mathfrak{g} . In particular $\text{RM } G = d$.

The following is also due to Hrushovski [Hru86].

Fact 1.3.5. Let G be a group interpretable in \mathcal{N} acting transitively and faithfully on a strongly minimal set X . Assume $\text{RM}(G) = 2$ then there is a field structure definable in X and G is isomorphic to the semidirect product of the multiplicative and the additive group of such a field.

In particular if \mathfrak{g} is a group configuration of dimension 2 then \mathcal{N} interprets a field.

So it makes sense to define:

Definition 1.3.6. A field configuration is a 2-dimensional group configuration.

1.4 Preliminaries on valued fields

We start with some basic definitions.

Definition 1.4.1. Given a field $\mathbb{K} = (K, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ we treat it as a first order structure in the language of rings $\mathcal{L}_R = \{+, \cdot, 0, 1\}$. Let ACF_p be the first order theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic p . That is ACF_p is the theory of fields of characteristic p :

That is $(K, +, 0)$ is an abelian group:

- $\forall x(x + 0 = x)$,
- $\forall x \exists y(x + y = 0)$,
- $\forall x, y, z((x + y) + z = x + (y + z))$ and
- $\forall x, y(x + y = y + x)$.

The product (\cdot) is a binary operation defined on $K \times K$ such that $(K \setminus 0, \cdot, 1)$ is also an abelian group:

- $\forall x(x \cdot 1 = x)$,
- $\forall x(x \neq 0 \implies \exists y(x \cdot y = 1))$,
- $\forall x, y, z[(z \neq 0 \wedge y \neq 0 \wedge z \neq 0) \implies (x \cdot y) + z = x + (y \cdot z)]$ and
- $\forall x, y(x \cdot y = y \cdot x)$.

And product distributes over addition:

$$\forall x, y, z(x \cdot (y + z) = x \cdot y + x \cdot z,$$

together with the scheme of axioms given by

$$\forall a_0 \dots \forall a_n \exists x(a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_n x^n = 0)$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

And we say that $\text{char}(K) = p$, so if $p = 0$ we add the scheme of axioms

$$\phi_n := 1 + 1 + 1 \dots + 1 \neq 0$$

where 1 is added n times.

If $\text{char}(K) = p > 0$ we add the axioms ϕ_n for $n < p$ plus the axiom $\neg \phi_p$.

Definition 1.4.2. Given a field $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ we say that a set $X \subseteq K^n$ is zariski closed if there is a set of polynomials $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that for all $x \in K^n$, $x \in X$ if and only if $f(x) = 0$ for all $f \in \mathfrak{a}$.

Fact 1.4.3. (It follows for example from Theorem 3.2.2 of [Mar06]) The theory ACF_p is complete and strongly minimal

We will need:

Fact 1.4.4. (Bezout Theorem)

Let k be algebraically closed field and let $F(x, y)$ and $G(x, y)$ be polynomials with coefficients on k with no common non constant divisors, then if V is the set of zeros for F and W is the set of zeros for G then $V \cap W$ is finite and it has less than $\deg(F) \deg(G)$ points counting multiplicities. If we considerate the closures of V and W in the projective space \mathbb{P}^2 then the number of points intersection is exactly $\deg(F) \deg(G)$ (counting multiplicities).

Definition 1.4.5. If K is a field, a valuation on K is an ordered abelian group Γ together with a valuation map $v : K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ (where ∞ is an extra element such that $\infty > \gamma$ and $\infty + \gamma = \gamma + \infty = \infty$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$) such that for all $x, y \in K$, v satisfies:

1. $v(x) = \infty$ if and only if $x = 0$.
2. $v(x \cdot y) = v(x) + v(y)$.

$$3. v(x + y) \geq \min\{v(x), v(y)\}.$$

If K is valued, the valuation ring is $\mathcal{O}_K = \{x \in K : v(x) \geq 0\}$. It is easy to see that is a subring of K and its only maximal ideal is: $\mathfrak{m} = \{x \in K : v(x) > 0\}$. The residue field is $k = \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{m}$.

We treat a valued field as a two sorted structure (K, Γ, v) where K is a field, Γ is an algebraically closed ordered group and $v : K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ is the valuation. Let $\mathcal{L}_{R,v}$ be the correspondent two sorted language.

Definition 1.4.6. *Let ACVF be the first order theory in the language $\mathcal{L}_{R,v}$ saying that K is an algebraically closed field and v is a valuation into an ordered abelian group Γ :*

In ACVF we have the axioms that says that Γ is an abelian group plus the extra axioms (Γ, \leq) is a linear order:

- $\forall x, y \in \Gamma(x \leq y \vee y \leq x),$
- $\forall x, y, z \in \Gamma(x \leq y \wedge y \leq x \implies x \leq z),$
- $\forall x, y \in \Gamma(x \leq y \wedge y \leq x \implies x = y)$ and
- $\forall x \in \Gamma(x \leq x).$

And addition on Γ is compatible with \leq :

$$\forall x, y, z \in \Gamma(x \leq y \implies x + z \leq y + z)$$

From now we fix $\mathbb{K} = (K, +, \cdot, \Gamma, v)$ a model of ACVF.

Definition 1.4.7. *An open ball is a subset of K of the form*

$$B_\gamma(a) := \{x \in K : v(x - a) > \gamma\}$$

where $a \in K$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. A closed ball is a subset of K of the form

$$B_{\geq \gamma}(a) = \{x \in K : v(x - a) \geq \gamma\}$$

In this setting we have two natural topologies: the Zariski and the valuation topologies. The latter is generated by the balls. When we say ‘open’ or ‘closed’ we mean in the valuation topology. When we want to refer to the Zariski topology we will be explicit about it.

Definition 1.4.8. *If $D \subseteq K^n$ is a \mathbb{K} -definable set we define $\dim D$ as the usual algebraic dimension of the Zariski closure of D . Moreover if $p(x)$ is an n -type over A , we define $\dim p = \min\{\dim X : X \in p\}$ and if $a \in K^n$ then $\dim(a/A)$ is defined as $\dim(tp(a/A))$*

Definition 1.4.9. *If $X \subseteq K^n$ is \mathbb{K} -definable over A , we say that $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$ is a tuple of independent generics of X if $\dim(x/A) = m \dim(X)$*

We have the next classic theorem that follows from Holly's work in [Hol95]. As stated here is Theorem 7.1 of [HHM05].

Fact 1.4.10. (*Quantifier Elimination*) K has Quantifier elimination in the language $\mathcal{L}_{R,v}$. In particular any definable subset of K^n is the intersection of a (valued) open subset of K^n with a Zariski closed set.

As a corollaries we have:

Fact 1.4.11. Suppose $Y \subseteq K^2$ is \mathbb{K} -definable and infinite. Then Y can be written as a finite union of subsets of K^2 that are relatively open subsets of irreducible Zariski closed sets.

Fact 1.4.12. If $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathbb{K}}(B)$ for some set of parameters B then there is a finite set definable just with the field structure of \mathbb{K} with parameters B containing a .

In other words $\text{acl}_{\mathbb{K}} = \text{acl}_{\mathbb{K}^f}$ where \mathbb{K}^f is \mathbb{K} seen as a structure in the language of rings.

Now we fix some concepts:

Definition 1.4.13. If $U \subseteq K^n$ is an open set and $f : U \rightarrow K$ is a function, given $a \in U$ we say that f is analytic at a if there is some power series

$$g = \sum a_I x^I$$

converging in a neighborhood U' of 0 such that $f(z + a) = g(z)$ for every z in U' .

We say that f is analytic in U if it is analytic at a for every $a \in U$

Definition 1.4.14. If

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{I=(i_1, \dots, i_n)} a_I x^{(i_1, \dots, i_n)},$$

is a power series then $F_{x_k}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the (formal) partial derivative of F respect to x_k , that is

$$F_{x_k}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{I=(i_1, \dots, i_n)} i_k a_I x^{(i_1, \dots, i_k-1, \dots, i_n)}.$$

Definition 1.4.15. Let $U \subseteq K$ be an open set and let $a \in U$. Suppose $f : U \rightarrow K$ analytic at a and its expansion around a is

$$f(x) = \sum_{n \geq 0} b_n x^n.$$

We say that a is a zero of f with multiplicity d if $f(a) = 0$ and $d = \min\{n : b_n \neq 0\}$.

Lemma 1.4.16. Let $f : U \rightarrow V$ be a \mathbb{K} definable function with U and V open subsets of K^n and K^m respectively, then there is some $a \in U$ such that f is analytic at a .

Proof.

□

We will also need an implicit function theorem, the following is well known and can be found for example in [Abh01] (Theorem (10.8), page 84)

Fact 1.4.17. (*Implicit Function Theorem*) Suppose K is complete, $U \subseteq K^n$ is open and $F : U \rightarrow K$ is an analytic function at $z \in U$. Assume z is such that $F_{x_n}(z) \neq 0$, then there are $U_1 \subseteq K^{n-1}$ and U_2 open subsets of K , $U' \subseteq U$ open with $z \in U' \cap (U_1 \times U_2)$ and $f : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ analytic such that:

$$\{u \in U' : F(u) = 0\} = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in U_1\}.$$

As a corollary of this we have the Inverse Function Theorem:

Fact 1.4.18. (*Inverse Function Theorem, Theorem 10.10 in [Abh01]*) Let $F(x)$ be analytic at 0, assume $F(0) = 0$ and $F_x(0) \neq 0$ then there is an unique analytic function G converging in a neighborhood of 0 such that $F(G(y)) = y$ for each y in such a neighborhood.

Now we state some strong results on valued fields, first a theorem about continuity of roots:

Fact 1.4.19. (*Continuity of Roots*)

Assume K is complete. Suppose U_1, U_2 are open subsets of K and

$$F : U_1 \times U_2 \rightarrow K$$

is analytic at $(a, b) \in U_1 \times U_2$. Assume that the function $F(*, b)$ has a zero of multiplicity $d > 0$ at a . Then there are open sets U_a and U_b with $a \in U_a \subseteq U_1$ and $b \in U_b \subseteq U_2$ such that:

1. a is the only $x \in U_a$ such that $F(x, b) = 0$
2. For each $y \in U_b$ the function $F(*, y)$ has exactly d zeros in U_a (counting multiplicities)

Proof. We may assume $(a, b) = (0, 0)$. By Theorem (10.3)(2) of [Abh01] there is some $F^*(x, y) = f_0(y) + f_1(y)x + \dots + x^d$ such that each f_j is analytic, $f_i(0) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d-1$, and there is some δ an unit of $K[[x, y]]$ such that $F = F^*\delta$. Because of Theorem (11.3) of [Abh01] there is an open set U_b such that each f_i is convergent in U_b , $0 \in U_b$ and for all $y \in K$ if $y \in U_b$ and $F^*(x, y) = 0$ then $x \in U_1$. Moreover for all $y \in U_b$ the polynomial $F^*(*, y)$ is a polynomial of degree d in the first variable so as K is algebraically closed there are exactly d roots (counting multiplicities) and all of them belongs to U_1 \square

We will also need an identity theorem for expansion of power series:

Fact 1.4.20. (*Identity Theorem (10.5.2) of [Abh01]*)

Let

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_I a_I x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n}$$

be a power series converging in a neighborhood $D(f)$ of $(0, \dots, 0)$. Assume that for all x in some open set $U \subseteq D(f)$ one has that $f(x) = 0$, then $a_I = 0$ for all I .

1.5 Partial Isomorphism

In this section we present the proof of Theorem 1.5.1, we follow lines on [HP94].

From now let $\mathcal{H} = (H, \otimes)$ be a fixed group definable in \mathbb{K} with parameters B .

Theorem 1.5.1. *Let (G, \oplus) be a group definable in the structure \mathbb{K} with parameters B . Assume $a, b \in G$ are such that $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(a/B) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(b/B) = \dim(G)$. And $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(ab/B) = 2 \dim(G)$. Let $c = a \oplus b$. Assume moreover that there are $a', b' \in H$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(a'/B) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(b'/B) = \dim H$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(a'b'/B) = 2 \dim(H)$. Assume as well that $\text{dcl}_{\mathbb{K}}(aB) = \text{dcl}_{\mathbb{K}}(a'B)$, $\text{dcl}_{\mathbb{K}}(bB) = \text{dcl}_{\mathbb{K}}(b'B)$ and $\text{dcl}_{\mathbb{K}}(cB) = \text{dcl}_{\mathbb{K}}(c'B)$ where $c' = a' \otimes b'$. Then there is a \mathbb{K} -definable analytic, local isomorphism between a neighborhood of the identity of G and a neighborhood of the identity of H . That is, there is a neighborhood U_1 of the identity of G , a neighborhood U_2 of the identity of H and an analytic invertible function $\phi : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ whose inverse is analytic such that if $u, v \in U_2$ are such that $u \oplus v \in U_1$, then $\phi(u \oplus v) = \phi(u) \otimes \phi(v)$.*

Proof. Our assumptions on a and a' implies that there is a formula $\phi(x, y)$ (with parameters in B) such that $\phi(a, a')$ holds and there is just one x such that $\phi(x, a')$ holds and just one y such that $\phi(a, y)$ holds. Our dimension assumptions on a and a' implies that there is an open neighborhood U_1 of a and U_2 of a' such that for all $x \in U_1$ there is just one y such that $\phi(x, y)$ holds and for all $y \in U_2$ there is just one x such that $\phi(x, y)$ holds. Therefore $\phi(x, y)$ defines the graph of a function $f : U_1 \rightarrow H$ and the opposite defines a function $f^{-1} : U_2 \rightarrow G$.

Using again our dimension assumptions on a and a' we have that $a \in U_1$ and $a' \in U_2$. So we get open sets U and U' with $a \in U$ and $a' \in U'$ and an analytic invertible function $f : U \rightarrow U'$ with analytic inverse such that $f(a) = a'$.

We can do the same thing for b, b' and c, c' finding open neighborhoods V, V', W and W' of b, b', c and c' respectively and \mathbb{K} -definable invertible functions $g : V \rightarrow V'$ and $h : W \rightarrow W'$ such that $g(b) = b'$ and $h(c) = c'$.

Now as $f(a) \otimes g(b) = h(c)$ and $\dim(ab/B) = 2 \dim G$ there is an open neighborhood Z of (a, b) in G^2 such that for all $(x, y) \in Z$ one has that $f(x) \otimes g(y) = h(x \oplus y)$. Moreover we may shrink U and V to ensure that $U \times V \subseteq Z$. So for all $x \in U$ and $y \in V$ one has that $f(x) \otimes g(y) = h(x \oplus y)$. We may also shrink U and V to ensure that $U \oplus V \subseteq W$

Let x, y and z be elements of U such that $a = x \oplus z^{-1} \oplus y$ we claim that $f(a) = f(x) \otimes f(z)^{-1} \otimes f(y)$, for this let $b_1 = x^{-1} \oplus c$ and $c_1 = z \oplus b_1$. Then as a and b are independent over B one has that $b_1 \in V$ and $c_1 \in W$. Moreover $y \oplus b = c_1$. So because of previous observation one has:

$$f(y) \otimes g(b) = h(c_1)$$

$$f(x) \otimes g(b_1) = h(c_1)$$

$$f(x) \otimes g(b_1) = h(c)$$

Thus $f(x) \otimes f(z)^{-1} \otimes f(y) \otimes g(b) = f(x) \otimes g(b_1) = h(c) = f(a) \otimes g(b)$ and we get our claim.

Now define $\phi : U^{-1} \oplus a \rightarrow (U')^{-1} \otimes a'$ as $\phi(x^{-1} \oplus a) = (f(x))^{-1} \otimes a'$ we claim that it is a local isomorphism between $U_1 := U^{-1} \oplus a$ and $U'_1 := (U')^{-1} \otimes a'$. For this let $u, v \in U_1$ such that $u \oplus v \in U_1$ we want to prove that $\phi(u \oplus v) = \phi(u) \otimes \phi(v)$. Suppose $u = x^{-1} \oplus a$ and

$v = y^{-1} \oplus a$ with $x, y \in U$. Therefore $u \oplus v = z^{-1} \oplus a$ where $z^{-1} = x^{-1} \oplus a \oplus y^{-1}$ with $z \in U$. So using the claim just proved, we have that $f(z)^{-1} = f(x)^{-1} \otimes f(a) \otimes f(y)^{-1}$ and then $\phi(z^{-1} \oplus a) = f(z)^{-1} \otimes f(a) = f(x)^{-1} \otimes f(a) \otimes f(y)^{-1} \otimes f(a) = \phi(x^{-1} \oplus a) \otimes \phi(y^{-1} \oplus a)$ and we get the result. \square

Chapter 2

Some facts of definable groups contained in K

In this chapter we give some basics on \mathbb{K} -definable groups whose universe is contained in K . We also prove the main tool we will use in order to construct interpretable fields, namely Theorem 2.2.2.

In the first section present some reductions that will be use in the second one. In the second section we prove Theorem 2.2.2 that ensures the existence of an interpretable field under the assumption of some kind of families of curves.

For the rest of the chapter we fix (G, \oplus) a \mathbb{K} -definable group of dimension one and we assume $G \subseteq K$. Let e be the neutral element of G . We assume that the map $(x, y) \mapsto x \oplus y^{-1}$ is continuous.

Definition 2.0.1. *If $X \subseteq G^2$ is a \mathbb{K} -definable set we say that X is G -affine if it is a boolean combination of cosets of \mathbb{K} -definable subgroups of G^2 .*

We fix $X \subseteq G^2$ a non affine curve and assume that $\mathcal{G} = (G, +, X)$ is strongly minimal.

2.1 Some reductions

In this section we give some basic definitions and reductions that we use in Chapter 3 and 4. The main result is Proposition 2.1.7. We would like to treat X (generically) as the graph of a function using Fact 1.4.17 but in order to do so we need the following:

Lemma 2.1.1. *Let $F(x, y) \in K[x, y]$ be an irreducible polynomial and suppose that F is not constant. If there are infinitely many points $(a, b) \in K^2$ such that*

$$F(a, b) = F_y(a, b) = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

then $F(x, y) = G(x, y^p)$ for some polynomial G .

Proof. Note first that $\deg(F_y) < \deg(F)$. So as F is irreducible, if $F_y \neq 0$ we can use Bézout's Theorem to conclude that the number of common zeros of F and F_y equals $\deg F \cdot \deg F_y$. So if F_y has infinitely many common zeros with F it is because $F_y = 0$.

If $\text{char}(K) = 0$ and $F_y = 0$ using Fact 1.4.20 we can see that $F(x, y) = kx + l = F(x, y^p)$ with $k, l \in K$.

So assume $\text{char}(K) = p > 0$. Let $V \subseteq K^2$ the set of zeros for F .

Assume F_y has infinitely many zeros at V so $F_y = 0$. Write

$$F(x, y) = f_0(x) + f_1(x)y + \dots + f_n(x)y^n$$

with $f_i(x) \in K[x]$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$.

$$F_y(x, y) = f_1(x) + 2f_2(x)y + \dots + nf_n(x)y^{n-1} = 0,$$

so for any a and any $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have that $if_i(a) = 0$. If some f_i is different from zero we can take $a \in K$ such that $f_i(a) \neq 0$ and $if_i(a) = 0$ implies that $i = 0$ so $i = mp$ for some m . Therefore if f_i is different from zero implies $p \mid i$ so $F(x, y)$ is a polynomial in the variable y^p . \square

As an immediate corollary we have:

Lemma 2.1.2. *Assume $F(x, y)$ is an irreducible polynomial and let V the set of common zeros of F then there is some finite subset of V , E such that either for all $a \in V \setminus E$, $F_x(a) \neq 0$ or for all $a \in V \setminus E$, $F_y(a) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Assume it is not the case, then, both F_x and F_y have infinitely many zeros in V . So using Lemma 2.1.1 one can conclude that $F(x, y) = G(x^p, y^p)$ for some polynomial G but then $F(x, y) = (\tilde{G}(x, y))^p$ for some polynomial \tilde{G} and then F is not irreducible. \square

Lemma 2.1.3. *There is a finite set $F \subseteq X$ such that for any $z = (z_1, z_2) \in X \setminus F$ either there is an open set U' with $z_1 \in U'$ and an analytic function $f : U' \rightarrow K$ such that $(x, f(x)) \in X$ for all $x \in U'$ or there is U'' open with $z_2 \in U''$ and an analytic function $g : U'' \rightarrow K$ such that $(g(x), x) \in X$ for all $x \in U''$.*

Proof. Decompose $X = X_0 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ as in Fact 1.4.11 with X_0 finite and each X_i in an open set of some Zariski closed set C_i for $i > 0$. By adding the intersection points to X_0 we can take the union to be disjoint. As C_i is the set of zeros of some irreducible polynomial F_i we can apply Lemma 2.1.2 to each F_i , either $(F_i)_x$ or $(F_i)_y$ has just finitely many zeros at C_i . Call E_i this finite set intersected with X_i and put $E = X_0 \cup E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_n$. If $z \in X \setminus F$ there is just one i such that $z \in X_i$, and either $(F_i)_x(z)$ or $(F_i)_y(z)$ is different from zero. Suppose $(F_i)_y(z) \neq 0$ by 1.4.17 we get an open set U with $z_1 \in U$ and an analytic function $f : U' \rightarrow K$ such that $\{(x, f(x)) : x \in U'\} \subseteq C_i$ as X_i is an open subset of C_i . Replace U' by $U' \cap f^{-1}(X_i)$ if necessary, we get $\{(x, f(x)) : x \in U'\} \subseteq X_i$. This proves the lemma. \square

Definition 2.1.4. If $W \subseteq K^2$ is a one dimensional \mathbb{K} -definable set we can decompose $W = W_0 \cup W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_n$ where W_0 is finite and for $i \geq 1$, W_i is an open subset of some irreducible Zariski closed set \tilde{W}_i . If $a \in W_i$ we say that \tilde{W}_i is a branch of W at a .

For $i > 0$ suppose \tilde{W}_i is the set of zeros of an irreducible polynomial F_i , then

$$\begin{aligned} W^2 &:= \{a \in W : a \in W_i, (F_i)_y(a) \neq 0, 1 \leq i \leq n\}, \text{ and} \\ W^1 &:= \{a \in W : a \in W_i, (F_i)_x(a) \neq 0, 1 \leq i \leq n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.1.5. Let $Z \subseteq K \times K$ be the set of zeros of some irreducible polynomial $f(x, y)$. If $a \in Z$ we define:

$$m_1(a, Z) = -f_y(a)/f_x(a)$$

and

$$m_2(a, Z) = -f_x(a)/f_y(a).$$

We say that $m_2(a, Z)$ is the slope of Z at a and $m_1(a, Z)$ is the inverse slope of Z at a when they are both well defined.

Lemma 2.1.6. Let $W \subseteq K \times K$ be a \mathbb{K} -definable set whose Zariski closure has algebraic dimension 1. If $a = (a_1, a_2) \in W^2$ there is U' open neighborhood of a_1 and an analytic function $f : U' \rightarrow K$ such that $f(a_1) = a_2$, $\{(x, f(x)) : x \in U'\} \subseteq W$ and $m_2(a, \tilde{W}_i) = f'(a_1)$. Where W_i is the only component such that $a \in W_i$.

Proof. Suppose \tilde{W}_i is the zero set of $G_i(x, y)$, so $(G_i)_y(a) \neq 0$ so using Fact 1.4.17 there are open sets U_1 and U_2 with $a \in U_1 \times U_2$; and there is also a function $f : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ analytic at a and an open set $U' \subseteq U_1 \times U_2$ such that

$$\Gamma := \{u \in U' : G_i(u) = 0\} = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in U_1\};$$

as $W \cap \tilde{W}_i$ is open in \tilde{W}_i we can assume $\Gamma \subseteq W$. Now as $G_i(x, f(x)) = 0$ in a neighborhood of a_1 , if we derive with respect to x the function $G_i(x, f(x))$ we get $(G_i)_x + (G_i)_y f'(x) = 0$ so $f'(a_1) = -(G_i)_x(a)/(G_i)_y(a) = m_2(a, \tilde{W}_i)$. \square

Proposition 2.1.7. There is a set $Y \subseteq G \times G$ definable in (G, \oplus, X) such that: The $\dim Y = 1$ and for each $(x_0, y_0) \in Y$ there is an analytic function g defined in a neighborhood U_0 of x_0 and some natural number n such that $Fr^{-n}(g(x_0)) = y_0$ and

$$(z, Fr^{-n}(g(z))) \in Y$$

for each $z \in U_0$. Moreover, for $x_0 = e$ we can take $n = 0$; that is, there is an analytic function h defined in an open neighborhood U of e such that $(x, h(x)) \in Y$ for all $x \in U$.

Proof. Let $F \subseteq X$ be as in Lemma 2.1.3. Let $x = (x_1, x_2) \in X \setminus F$ so by the conclusion either $F \setminus X$ or $(F \setminus X)^{-1}$ contains the graph of a function. Define Y' as $X \setminus F$ if it contains the graph of an analytic function converging in a neighborhood of x_1 or as $(X \setminus F)^{-1}$ if it doesn't. Define $y' = (x_1, x_2)$ if $Y' = F \setminus X$ and $y' = (x_2, x_1)$ if $Y' = (F \setminus X)^{-1}$. So if $y' = (y_1, y_2)$ there is an analytic function converging in a neighborhood of y_1 whose graph is contained in Y' .

Now let $Y'' = Y'_y$, so there is an analytic function h converging in a neighborhood of e whose graph is contained in Y'' .

Write $Y'' = Y''_0 \cup \dots \cup Y''_n$ and let G_i be a polynomial whose set of zeros is the Zariski closure of Y''_i .

If $(G_i)_y(x, y)$ has just finite zeros at Y''_i then define E_i as this set of zeros.

If $(G_i)_y$ is zero for infinitely many points of Y''_i , then, by Lemma 2.1.1 $G_i(x, y)$ is a function in the variable y^{p^n} for some n , that is $G_i(x, y) = G(x, y^{p^n})$ for some polynomial G and some natural number n . Let k be the maximum among those possible n and let G be the corresponding polynomial. Therefore $G(x, y)$ is not a function in the variable y^p so the derivative G_y has just finitely many zeros in Y_i . Let E_i this finite set. Then for each $(x_0, y_0) \in Y_i \setminus E_i$ there is an analytic function g defined in some neighborhood of x_0 such that $G_i(z, g(z)) = 0$ for each z in that neighborhood. So if we define $\text{Fr}^k : K \rightarrow K$ as $\text{Fr}^k(x) = x^{p^k}$ and Fr^{-k} it's inverse, $F_i(z, \text{Fr}^{-k}(g(z))) = 0$ so Y''_i contains the graph of $z \mapsto \text{Fr}^{-k}(g(z))$ in some neighborhood of x_0 .

Therefore if we define $E = Y''_0 \cup E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_n$ then $Y = Y'' \setminus E$ satisfies conclusion of proposition. \square

For the rest of this section we fix the following notation:

Let Y be as provided by Proposition 2.1.7. Decompose $Y = Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_n$ with Y_i some open subset of a Zariski closed set C_i . And let F_i be an irreducible polynomial whose zero set is C_i .

Definition 2.1.8. *If $a \in Y^2$ let $Y'(a) = m_2(a, C_i)$ where C_i is the only branch of Y at a .*

The following is Fact 3.8 of [KR16], although the proof is just to apply usual $\epsilon - \delta$ formula.

Fact 2.1.9. *Let h be as in Proposition 2.1.7, then the function $z \mapsto h'(z)$ with domain U is definable in \mathbb{K} .*

Definition 2.1.10. *If V, W are subsets of G^2 and $a = (a_1, a_2) \in V$ we define:*

- $V \oplus W = \{(x, y \oplus z) : (x, y) \in V \text{ and } (x, z) \in W\}$
- $V \setminus W = \{(x, y \cdot z^{-1}) : (x, y) \in V \text{ and } (x, z) \in W\}$
- $V \circ W = \{(x, y) : \exists z(x, z) \in W \wedge (z, y) \in V\}$
- $V_a = \{(v_1 \oplus a_1^{-1}, v_2 \oplus a_2^{-1}) : (v_1, v_2) \in V\}$

For the rest of the Chapter we will make the following assumption on G :

Assumption 2.1.11. *For each $U \subseteq K$ open set with $e \in U \subseteq G$ and each pair of analytic functions $f, g : U \rightarrow K$ with $f(U) \cup g(U) \subseteq G$ such that $f(e) = g(e) = e$, if we define $h(x) = f(x) \cdot g(x)$ then h is analytic and $h'(e) = f'(e) + g'(e)$. And if we define $i(x) = (f(x))^{-1}$ (the inverse in G) then $i'(e) = -f'(e)$*

Note that if $G = (B, +)$ is a subgroup of $(K, +)$ or $G = (K \setminus \{0\}, \cdot)$, then G satisfies Assumption 2.1.11.

Lemma 2.1.12. *If $a, b \in Y^2$ there is a branch Z of $Y_a \oplus Y_b$ at (e, e) such that*

$$m_2((e, e), Z) = Y'(a) + Y'(b).$$

There is also a branch \hat{Z} of $Y_a \circ Y_b$ at (e, e) such that

$$m_2((e, e), \hat{Z}) = Y'(a)Y'(b).$$

Proof. Write $a = (a_1, a_2)$ and $b = (b_1, b_2)$. Let $h : U \rightarrow K$ be an analytic function whose graph is contained in Y with $a_1, b_1 \in U$. Then the graph of the function $h_a(x) := h(x \oplus a_1) \oplus a_2^{-1}$ is contained in Y_a . Similarly the graph of $h_b(x) := h(x \oplus b_1) \oplus b_2^{-1}$ is contained in Y_b . So the graph of $x \mapsto h_a(x) \oplus h_b(x)$ is contained in $Y_a \oplus Y_b$ and we can take Z as the Zariski closure of such graph and use Assumption 2.1.11. In the same way, the graph of $h_a \circ h_b$ is contained in $Y_a \circ Y_b$. \square

We can therefore define:

Definition 2.1.13. *For $a, b \in Y^2$ let*

$$(Y_a \oplus Y_b)'((e, e)) = m_2((e, e), Z)$$

and

$$(Y_a \circ Y_b)'((e, e)) = m_2((e, e), \hat{Z})$$

where Z and \hat{Z} are as in Lemma 2.1.12

We will also need a technical lemma:

Lemma 2.1.14. *Let V and W be one dimensional \mathbb{K} -definable subsets of G^2 . Suppose moreover that they do not have isolated points, then $V \oplus W$ does not have isolated points. If, moreover, we assume that W does not contain infinitely many points in any horizontal line and V does not contain infinitely many points in any vertical line, then the composition $V \circ W$ does not have isolated points.*

Proof. If $(a, b) \in V \oplus W$ there are z, w such that $(a, c) \in V$, $(a, d) \in W$ and $b = c \oplus d$. Take an open sets B_1 containing a and B_2 containing b . As \oplus is continuous one can find D and E open sets containing c and d respectively such that $D \oplus E \subseteq B_2$.

Given that $(a, c) \in V$ is not isolated there is a polynomial F such that $F(a, c) = 0$ and for all (a', c') in some neighborhood of (a, c) if $F(a', c') = 0$ then $(a', c') \in V$. If the polynomial $F_a(x) := F(a, x)$ is not zero we can use continuity of roots and get B , a neighborhood of a (we can assume $B \subseteq B_1$) such that and for each $a' \in B$ there is $c' \in D$ with $F(a', c') = 0$ and $(a', c') \in V$. In the same way (by restricting B if necessary) for each $a' \in B$ there is $d' \in E$ such that $(a', d') \in W$ so for any such a' the point $(a', c' \oplus d') \in (V \oplus W) \cap (B_1 \times B_2)$ and then (a, b) is not isolated in $V \oplus W$.

Note that if one of $F(a, _)$ is the zero polynomial then V contains infinitely many points in the vertical line $\{a\} \times K$, and so with $V \oplus W$, so that any open containing (a, b) contains points in such a line. Similarly for W .

We will now prove that $V \circ W$ doesn't contain any isolated point. Let $(a, b) \in V \circ W$ so there is c with $(a, c) \in V$ and $(c, b) \in W$. If B_1 and B_2 are open sets containing a and b respectively, as in the addition one can find B containing c such that for each $c' \in B$ there is $a' \in B_1$ such that $(a', c') \in Y_b$ (using that the closure of W doesn't contain any horizontal line) and some $b' \in B_2$ such that $(c', b') \in V$ (using that the closure of V doesn't contain any vertical line) so that for each such c' the point $(a', b') \in (V \circ W) \cap (B_1 \times B_2)$ and (a, b) is not an isolated point of $V \circ W$. \square

2.2 Good families of curves

In this section we define the notion of a good family of curves for \mathcal{G} and we show how it can be used to interpret a field in \mathcal{G} . This is done in Theorem 2.2.2.

Definition 2.2.1. *A good family of curves definable in \mathcal{G} is given by the following data:*

1. *A \mathcal{G} -definable set $Y \subseteq G \times G$ and a \mathcal{G} -definable family of curves $(X_a)_{a \in Y}$.*
2. *$U \subseteq G$, an open neighborhood of e , and an analytic function $H(x, s) : U \times U \rightarrow G$.*
3. *An analytic function $h : U \rightarrow G$.*

Such that:

1. *For all $s \in U$ if we define $\bar{s} := (s, h(s))$ then $\bar{s} \in Y$.*
2. *Each X_a is a one dimensional subset of K^2 with no isolated points.*
3. *For all $s, x \in U$, $(x, H(x, s)) \in X_{\bar{s}}$.*
4. *$H(e, s) = e$ for all $s \in U$.*
5. *The set of derivatives $\{H_x(e, s) : s \in U\}$ is infinite.*
6. *For each $s \in U$ and $(x, y) \in X_{\bar{s}}$ there is a neighborhood V_x of x and a neighborhood $U_s \subseteq U$ of s , an analytic function $\Phi(z, \delta)$ defined in $V_x \times U_s$ and a natural number n such that for all $(w, \delta) \in V_x \times U_s$ one has that $(w, \text{Fr}^{-n}(\Phi(w, \delta))) \in X_{\bar{\delta}}$.*

We will dedicate the rest of the section to proving:

Theorem 2.2.2. *If there is a good family of curves definable in \mathcal{G} then \mathcal{G} interprets a field.*

So for the rest of this section we fix Y , $(X_a)_{a \in Y}$, U , H and h as in the data of a good family of curves.

Lemma 2.2.3. *There exists a ball $B \subseteq K$ with center t contained in $\{H_x(e, s) : s \in U\}$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, b) \in K^5$ with $\dim \mathbf{a} = 5$ such that*

$$\{ta_1, t + a_2, tb_1, t + b_2, ta_1a_2, t + a_1b_2 + a_2, t + b, t + a_1b + a_2, t + a_1b_1b + b_1a_2 + b_2\} \subseteq B$$

.

Proof. As $\{H_x(e, s) : s \in U\}$ is infinite and \mathbb{K} -definible, it contains an open ball say $B \subseteq G$ with $0 \neq t = H_x(e, d) \in B$ for some $d \in U$. Then $\mathbf{a} \in K^5$ exists because B is a non empty open and both addition and multiplication are continuous functions. □

For $s \in U$ define $Y'(s) = H_x(e, s)$. So we have:

Lemma 2.2.4. *Let \mathbf{a} as in Lemma 2.2.3, then there are tuples: $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ contained in U^2 such that:*

- $Y'(\alpha_1) = ta_1, Y'(\alpha_2) = t + a_2,$
- $Y'(\beta_1) = tb_1, Y'(\beta_2) = t + b_2,$ and
- $Y'(\gamma_1) = ta_1b_1, Y'(\gamma_2) = t + a_1b_2 + a_2.$

There is also a triple $(p, q, r) \in U^3$ such that:

- $Y'(p) = t + b,$
- $Y'(q) = t + a_1b + a_2,$ and
- $Y'(r) = t + a_1b_1b + b_1a_2 + b_2.$

Proof. It just follows from the fact that

$$\{ta_1, t + a_2, tb_1, t + b_2, ta_1a_2, t + a_1b_2 + a_2, t + b, t + a_1b + a_2, t + a_1b_1b + b_1a_2 + b_2\} \subseteq B$$

and

$$B \subseteq \{H_x(e, s) : s \in U\}.$$

□

For the rest of the section fix $B, \mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, b)$ and $G_1 = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, p, q, r)$ as before.

Proposition 2.2.5. *G_1 is a field configuration for \mathcal{M} .*

Proof. Using Fact 2.1.9 the \mathcal{G} -independence relations follows, so we only need to prove \mathcal{G} -dependence relations.

Let us prove for example that $q \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha, p)$.

We have

$$Y'(q) = t + a_1b + a_2 = t + t^{-1}Y'(\alpha_1)(Y'(p) - t) + Y'(\alpha_2) - t.$$

Multiplying by t we get:

$$tY'(q) = Y'(\alpha_1)Y'(p) - tY'(\alpha_1) + tY'(\alpha_2). \quad (2.2)$$

Let $d \in U$ such that $H_x(e, d) = t$. Call $X = X_{(d, h(d))}$ and define the family of curves

$$Z_{\delta} := (X_{\alpha_1} \circ X_p) \ominus (X \circ X_{\alpha_1}) \oplus (X \circ X_{\alpha_2}) \ominus (X_{\delta} \circ X) \quad (2.3)$$

for $\delta \in Y$.

Here the $-$ is taken as in Definition 2.1.10.

For $\delta \in Y$ define

$$Z_{\delta}^e = \{x \in G : (x, e) \in Z_{\delta}\}$$

Since the family $(Z_{\delta})_{\delta \in Y}$ is \mathcal{G} -definable with parameters α and p it is enough to show that

$$\{\delta \in Y : |Z_{\delta}^e| \leq |Z_q^e|\}$$

is finite. As we may assume that Morley degree of Y computed in \mathcal{G} is 1, it is enough to show:

Claim 2.2.6. *There is an open neighborhood W containing q such that for all $\delta \in W \setminus \{q\}$, $|Z_{\delta}^e| > |Z_q^e|$*

For this, list $Z_q^e = \{e = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$

Define the function

$$F : U \times U_2 \rightarrow K$$

$$F(x, s) = H(H(x, p), \alpha_1) \oplus H(H(x, \alpha_1), d)^{-1} \oplus H(H(x, \alpha_2), d) \oplus H(H(x, d), s)^{-1}$$

Where $U_2 \subseteq U$ is some neighborhood of q_1 contained in U such that everything is well defined.

If $\delta \in U_2$ then the graph of the function $F(-, \delta)$ is contained in Z_{δ} in a neighborhood of 0.

Using Equation (2.2) it is easy to see that $F_x(e, q_1) = 0$. Therefore the function $F(-, q_1)$ has a zero of multiplicity $d \geq 2$ at $x = e$. Apply Fact 1.4.19 to the function F and get open sets V and W with $(e, q_1) \in V \times W \subseteq U \times U_2$ such that for all $y \in W$ the function $F(-, y)$ has exactly d roots (counting multiplicities) at V .

Note that $F_x(e, s) = 0$ just for finitely many $s \in U$. That is because

$$F(x, s) = T(x) \oplus H(H(x, d), s)^{-1}$$

where $T(x)$ is a function depending just on x . Therefore

$$F_x(e, s) = T'(e) + H_x(H(e, d), s)H_x(e, d) = T'(e) + H_x(e, s)t,$$

here we are using that $H(e, d) = e$. Thus if $F_x(e, s)$ is zero for infinitely many s then $H_x(e, s) = -T'(e)/t$ for all such s and then as the function $H_x(e, s)$ is \mathbb{K} definable, Fact 1.4.10 tells us that $\{s : H_x(e, s) = 0\}$ contains an open ball and Fact 1.4.20 implies that $s \mapsto H_x(e, s)$ is a constant function on U but this contradicts clause 5 of the definition of a good family of curves.

Therefore we may assume that for each $s \in W \setminus \{q_1\}$ the function $F(-, s)$ has a simple zero at $x = e$.

Because of our choice of V and W , for each $s \in W$ the function $F(-, s)$ has at least two zeros at V (counting multiplicities) and if $s \neq q_1$, as $F(-, s)$ has only simple roots, there are two different points $c_1, c_2 \in V$ such that $F(c_i, s) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, for any $\delta \in W \setminus \{q_1\}$ there are at least two different $x \in V$ such that $x \in Z_\delta^0$.

Claim 2.2.7. *For $i > 1$ take pairwise disjoint open sets V_i containing x_i . Remember that x_i are the elements of Z_q^e . Then we can find open sets $W_i \subseteq U$ with $(x_i, q_1) \in V_i \times W_i$ such that for each $s \in W_i$ there is at least one $x \in Z_s^0 \cap V_i$.*

Proof. (Proof of Claim 2.2.7) Call

$$P := (X_{\alpha_1} \circ X_p) \ominus (X \circ X_{\alpha_1}) \oplus (X \circ X_{\alpha_2}).$$

So there is some y_i such that

$$(x_i, y_i) \in P \cap X_q \circ X.$$

Then there is some z_i such that $(x_i, z_i) \in X$ and $(z_i, y_i) \in X_q$.

We can find an analytic function $\Phi_1(x, s)$ and a natural number n_1 such that

$$(x, \text{Fr}^{-n_1}(\Phi_1(x, s))) \in X_s$$

for all x in some neighborhood of x_i and all s in a neighborhood of e . In the same way we can find Φ_2 and n_2 such that

$$(z, \text{Fr}^{-n_2}(\Phi_2(z, s))) \in X_s$$

for all z in a neighborhood of z_i and all s in a neighborhood of q .

For $j = 1, 2$ let $\Psi_j = \text{Fr}^{-n_j} \circ \Phi_j$.

Therefore

$$(x, \Psi_2(\Psi_1(x, d), q)) \in X_q \circ X$$

for all x in some neighborhood of x_i . Moreover if δ is close enough to q_1 then the graph of

$$x \mapsto \Psi_2(\Psi_1(x, d), \delta)$$

is contained in $X_\delta \circ X$.

Call

$$\Psi(x, s) = \Psi_2(\Psi_1(x, d), s)$$

As $(x_i, y_i) \in P$ and P has no isolated points there is a polynomial $G(x, y)$ such that for (x, y) close enough to (x_i, y_i) if $G(x, y) = 0$ then $(x, y) \in P$.

So we would be done if we are able to prove that for all δ close enough to q_1 there is some $x \in V_i$ such that

$$G(x, \Psi(x, \delta)) = 0.$$

For this note that

$$\Psi(x, z) = \text{Fr}^{-n}(\tilde{\Phi}_2(\Phi_1(x, d), z))$$

where $n = n_1 + n_1$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ is a function such that $\text{Fr}^{-n_1}(\Phi_2(x, s)) = \tilde{\Phi}_2(\text{Fr}^{-n_1}(x), s)$ for all (x, s) so $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ is the function obtained by changing all the coefficients of ϕ_2 for its p^{n_1} -power. That is, if

$$\Phi_2(x, s) = \sum_I a_I x^{i_1} s^{i_2},$$

then

$$\tilde{\Phi}_2(x, s) = \sum_I a_I^{p^{n_1}} x^{i_1} s^{i_2 p^{n_1}}.$$

Let

$$\tilde{\Psi}(x, s) := \tilde{\Phi}_2(\Phi_1(x, e), z)$$

an analytic function.

So we want to prove that for δ close enough to q_1 the function $G(x, \text{Fr}^{-n}(\tilde{\Psi}(x, \delta)))$ has a zero at V_i but again

$$G\left(x, \text{Fr}^{-n}(\tilde{\Psi}(x, z))\right) = \text{Fr}^{-n}\left(\tilde{G}(x, \tilde{\Psi}(x, z))\right)$$

where \tilde{G} is obtained from G changing all the coefficients for its p^n -power. That is, if

$$G(x, y) = \sum_I a_I x^{i_1} y^{i_2},$$

then

$$\tilde{G}(x, y) = \sum_I a_I^{p^n} x^{i_1 p^n} y^{i_2}.$$

Now as $\tilde{G}(x, \tilde{\Psi}(x, z))$ is an analytic function that is zero at (x_i, q_1) we can apply Fact 1.4.19 and find some neighborhood W_i of q_1 such that for all $\delta \in W_i$ there is $x \in V_i$ with $\tilde{G}(x, \tilde{\Psi}(x, \delta)) = 0$ but then

$$G\left(x, \text{Fr}^{-n}(\tilde{\Psi}(x, \delta))\right) = \text{Fr}^{-n}\left(\tilde{G}(x, \tilde{\Psi}(x, \delta))\right) = \text{Fr}^{-n}(0) = 0.$$

End of proof of Claim 2.2.7

□

Then if $\delta \in \bigcap W_i \setminus \{q_1\}$, Z_δ^0 contains at least two zeros at V and at least one at V_i for $i > 1$ so it has at least $n + 1$ points and since there are infinitely many such z 's, we are done.

□

Chapter 3

Additive Case

In this chapter we prove:

Theorem 3.0.1. *Let $(G, +)$ be an infinite \mathbb{K} -definable subgroup of $(K, +)$ group and let $X \subseteq G^2$ be a non affine \mathbb{K} -definable set of dimension one. Assume that the structure $\mathcal{G} = (G, \oplus, X)$ is strongly minimal, then \mathcal{G} interprets an algebraically closed field that is definable isomorphic (in \mathbb{K}) to $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$.*

The fact that the field is isomorphic to K follows from Theorem 7.1 of [HHP22a]. So we will devote the entire chapter to find an interpretable field.

Throughout this chapter we fix G and $X \subseteq G^2$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.0.1. Without loss of generality we may assume that $(0, 0) \in X$.

Note that in this case Assumption 2.1.11 just says that $(f + g)'(0) = f'(0) + g'(0)$ and $(-f)'(0) = -(f'(0))$ for each pair of functions f and g analytic at 0. Which is clearly true.

Therefore it is enough to provide a good family of curves definable in \mathcal{G} .

Toward that end we need some preliminaries on power series.

3.1 Power Series

Definition 3.1.1. *Let*

$$f(x) = \sum_{n \geq 1} b_n x^n$$

be a power series converging in a neighborhood $D(f)$ of 0. For $a \in D(f)$ define $f_a(x) = f(x + a) - f(a)$. Suppose

$$f_a(x) = \sum_{n \geq 1} b_{n,a} x^n$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned} s_n(f) &:= \{b_{n,a} : a \in D(f)\} \\ N(f) &:= \min\{n : s_n(f) \text{ is infinite}\} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1.2. *Let $f(x)$ be a function analytic at 0 such that $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(0) \neq 0$. Let $g(x)$ be an analytic inverse for f converging in some neighborhood of 0. Then if $N(f)$ is finite, $N(g) \geq N(f)$.*

Proof. The existence of g it is just Fact 1.4.18.

The inequality $N(g) \geq N(f)$ is a consequence of the usual Lagrange inversion formula but we present a proof anyway. We will prove that c_n depends only on b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n by induction on n . For $n = 1$ it is easy to see that $c_1 = 1/b_1$. Assume therefore that c_n depends only on b_1, \dots, b_n and we will prove it for $n + 1$. As we have that

$$x = f(g(x)) = \sum_i b_i \left(\sum_j c_j x^j \right)^i$$

the coefficient of x^{n+1} in the right side of equality has to be 0. But this coefficient is

$$b_1 c_{n+1} + b_2 d_2 + \dots + b_n d_n + b_{n+1} c_1^{n+1},$$

where d_2, \dots, d_n are some polynomial quantities depending only on c_1, \dots, c_n that on its turn, by induction hypothesis, depend only on b_1, \dots, b_n . Therefore

$$c_{n+1} = \frac{-b_2 d_2 - \dots - b_n d_n - b_{n+1} c_1^n}{b_1}$$

depends only on b_1, \dots, b_n, b_{n+1} .

Thus $c_{n,a}$ depends only on $b_{1,a}, \dots, b_{n,a}$ and if $k \leq N$ $b_{k,a}$ is constant as a varies. Therefore if $n \leq N$ $c_{n,a}$ is constant as a varies and then $N(g) \geq N$. □

Corollary 3.1.3. *Assuming notation of Lemma 3.1.2. If $N(f)$ and $N(g)$ are both finite then $N(f) = N(g)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1.2 one has that $N(f) \leq N(g)$ apply same lemma for g and get that $N(g) \leq N(h)$ where h is the inverse of g but then $h = f$ so $N(f) = N(g)$. □

Lemma 3.1.4. *Assume*

$$f = \sum_{n \geq 1} b_n x^n$$

is an analytic function converging in a neighborhood of 0. Assume moreover that $N(f)$ is finite. Let

$$l = \min\{e \in \mathbb{N} : \exists n > 1 \text{ such that } p \nmid n \wedge b_{np^e} \neq 0\}.$$

Then for all $k < l$ and all $m \geq 1$ such that $p \nmid m$ the coefficient $b_{mp^k, a}$ is constant as a varies. Moreover $N(f) = p^l$.

Proof. Assume notation of Definition 3.1.1 and let l be as in the statement of the lemma. It is well defined because of our assumption on $N(f)$: If

$$\{e \in \mathbb{N} : \exists n > 1 \text{ such that } p \nmid n \wedge b_{np^e} \neq 0\} = \emptyset$$

then f is a function in which the degree of all the non zero monomials are powers of p so $f(x+a) = f(x) + f(a)$ and therefore $s_n(f)$ is finite for all n .

We will show that for all $k < l$ and all $m \geq 1$ with $p \nmid m$ the coefficient $b_{mp^k, a}$ is constant as a varies. And we will also show that the coefficient $b_{p^l, a}$ assumes infinitely many values as a varies.

Let $n > 1$ such that $b_{np^l} \neq 0$ and $p \nmid n$. Therefore

$$f(x) = b_1x + b_{p^2}x^{p^2} + \dots + b_{p^l}x^{p^l} + \sum_{i>p^l} b_i x^i.$$

We will show first that if $k < l$ and $m \geq 1$ with $p \nmid m$, then the coefficient $b_{mp^k, a}$ is constant as a varies. Remember that $b_{mp^k, a}$ is the coefficient of x^{mp^k} in the expansion of $f_a(x) = f(x+a) - f(a)$. In this expansion x^{mp^k} just appears in the terms of the form $b_t(x+a)^t$ with $t \geq mp^k$. Write $t = up^s$ with $p \nmid u$. Suppose first $u > 1$ then if $s < l$, $b_t = 0$. If $s \geq l > k$ then $(x+a)^t = (x^{p^s} + a^{p^s})^u$. And therefore in the expansion of $(x+a)^t$ all the exponents of x are multiples of p^s so non of those equals mp^k (as $s > k$ and $p \nmid m$). We can assume then that $u = 1$ but in this case $(x+a)^t = x^{p^s} + a^{p^s}$ and the only way the term x^{mp^k} appears is $k = s$ and $m = 1$. In this case the coefficient of x^{mp^k} in $f_a(x)$ is b_{mp^k} so it is constant as a varies.

We show now that the coefficient $b_{p^l, a}$ is not constant as a varies. As

$$f(x) = b_1x + b_{p^2}x^{p^2} + \dots + b_{p^l}x^{p^l} + \sum_{i>p^l} b_i x^i$$

and $b_{np^k} = 0$ for all $n > 0$ and $k < l$ the function $\sum_{i>p^l} b_i x^i$ is indeed a function in the variable x^{p^l} . So

$$f(x) = b_1x + \dots + b_{p^l}x^{p^l} + \sum_{i>1} b_{ip^l} x^{ip^l}$$

therefore the coefficient of x^{p^l} in f_a is

$$b_{p^l, a} = b_{p^l} + \sum_{i>1} b_{ip^l} (a^{p^l})^i$$

but this is a series in the variable a with some non zero coefficients, using Fact 1.4.20 we conclude that it is not constant as a varies and we conclude. \square

3.2 Getting a good family of curves on \mathcal{G}

In this section we prove:

Proposition 3.2.1. *There is a good family of curves (as in Definition 2.2.1) definable in \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Take Y , U and h as provided by Proposition 2.1.7 applied to the structure \mathcal{K} . If $s_1(h) = \{h'(z) : z \in U\}$ is infinite, then for $a \in Y$ define $X_a := Y_a$ (as in Definition 2.1.10). So we can take

$$H(x, s) = h(x - s) + h(s)$$

and if $s \in U$ and $(x, y) \in Y_{\bar{s}}$ by the conclusion of Proposition 2.1.7 there is an analytic function g defined in a neighborhood of x and a natural number n such that $(w, \text{Fr}^{-n}(g(w))) \in Y$ for all w in that neighborhood. Now using Lemma 2.1.12, if δ is close enough to 0 then

$$(w - \delta, \text{Fr}^{-n}(g(w)) - h(\delta)) \in Y_{\bar{\delta}}$$

so we can take

$$\Phi(w, \delta) = g(w + \delta) - \text{Fr}^n(h(\delta)).$$

Now assume that $s_1(h)$ is finite. Therefore there is an open neighborhood U containing 0 such that $h'(w)$ is constant in U . Using Fact 1.4.20 we have that $h(w) = Kw + f(w)$ where K is some constant and $f(w)$ is a function in the variable w^{p^n} for some $n > 0$. Take n maximal with that property. So $h(w) = Kw + F(w^{p^n})$ for some analytic function F . For each $a \in Y$ define

$$X_a := (Y - Y_a) \circ (Y - Y_c)^{-1} \tag{3.1}$$

where $c = (c_1, h(c_1))$ for some fixed $c_1 \in U$.

Claim 3.2.2. *The family $(X_a)_{a \in Y}$ defined by Equation 3.1 is a good family of curves for \mathcal{G} .*

Suppose that

$$h(x) = Kx + \sum_{i \geq 1} b_{ip^n} x^{ip^n}$$

with $b_{p^n} \neq 0$. Moreover let m such that $N(f) = p^m$ (using Lemma 3.1.4). So there is an open neighborhood U_0 of 0 such that for all $a \in U_0$, if we define

$$h_a(x) = h(x + a) - h(a)$$

and put

$$h_a(x) = \sum_{n \geq 1} b_{n,a} x^n$$

then

$$b_{n,a} = b_n$$

for all n such that $s_n(h)$ is finite. Therefore $Y - Y_a$ contains the graph of

$$h - h_a = \sum_{i \geq 1} d_{i,a} x^{ip^m}$$

where $d_{i,a} = b_{ip^m} - b_{ip^m,a}$. Note that $\{d_{1,a} : a \in U\}$ is infinite. In the same fashion for all $b_1 \in U$ if we call $b = (b_1, h(b_1))$, then $Y - Y_b$ contains the graph of

$$h - h_b = \sum_{i \geq 1} d_{i,b} x^{ip^m}$$

we can pick b_1 such that $d_{1,b} \neq 0$.

Now define

$$G_a(x) = \sum_{i \geq 1} d_{i,a} x^i$$

so

$$(h - h_a)(x) = G_a(x^{p^m}).$$

As $d_{1,b} \neq 0$ then $G'_b(0) \neq 0$ so using Fact 1.4.18, exists an analytic function G_b^{-1} defined in some neighborhood of 0 such that $G_b(G_b^{-1}(z)) = z$ for all z in that neighborhood.

Claim 3.2.3. *The graph of $G_a \circ G_b^{-1}$ is contained in $(Y - Y_{\bar{a}}) \circ (Y - Y_b)^{-1} = X_{\bar{a}}$.*

Proof. (Proof of Claim 3.2.3)

Let $y = G_a(G_b^{-1}(x))$ and we will prove that $(x, y) \in (Y - Y_{\bar{a}}) \circ (Y - Y_b)^{-1} = X_{\bar{a}}$. So we have to show that there is some z with $(z, x) \in Y - Y_b$ and $(z, y) \in Y - Y_{\bar{a}}$. Let z such that $z^{p^m} = G_b^{-1}(x)$. Then,

$$(h - h_b)(z) = G_b(z^{p^m}) = G_b(G_b^{-1}(x)) = x$$

and as the graph of $h - h_b$ is contained in $Y - Y_b$ then $(z, x) \in Y - Y_b$. In a similar way

$$(h - h_a)(z) = G_a(z^{p^m}) = G_a(G_b^{-1}(x)) = y$$

and as the graph of $h - h_a$ is contained in $Y - Y_{\bar{a}}$ then $(z, y) \in Y - Y_{\bar{a}}$ so $(x, y) \in (Y - Y_{\bar{a}}) \circ (Y - Y_b)^{-1}$

(End of proof of Claim) □

Now note that

$$G_b^{-1}(x) = \frac{1}{d_{1,b}} x + L(x)$$

for some analytic function L such that every non zero monomial of L has degree bigger than 1.

Therefore

$$G_a \circ G_b^{-1}(x) = \frac{d_{1,a}}{d_{1,b}} x + \sum_{i > 1} e_{i,a} x^i$$

For some coefficients $e_{i,a}$. It is easy to see that each $e_{i,a}$ is a power series in the variable a , and the same is true for $d_{1,a}$. Therefore there is a power series $H(x, a)$ such that for all a in a neighborhood of 0 one has that $H(x, a) = (G_a \circ G_b^{-1})(x)$ so

$$H_x(0, a) = (G_a \circ G_b^{-1})'(0) = \frac{d_{1,a}}{d_{1,b}}$$

that takes infinitely many values as a varies.

So we have already proved clauses 1-5 in the definition of good family of curves and only 6 is missing. For this let $s \in U$ and let $(x, y) \in (Y - Y_{\bar{s}}) \circ (Y - Y_b)^{-1}$ so there is some z such that $(z, x) \in Y - Y_b$ and $(z, y) \in Y - Y_{\bar{s}}$. There are y_1, y_2 such that $(z, y_1) \in Y$, $(z, y_2) \in Y_{\bar{s}}$ and $y = y_1 - y_2$. Again Proposition 2.1.7 there are analytic functions g_1, g_2 defined in some neighborhoods U_1 and U_2 of 0, and natural numbers n_1, n_2

$$\text{Fr}^{-n_1}(g_1(z)) = y_1, \text{Fr}^{-n_2}(g_2(z)) = y_2,$$

and the graph of $\text{Fr}^{-n_1} \circ g_1$ and $\text{Fr}^{-n_2} \circ g_2$ are contained in Y and $Y_{\bar{s}}$ respectively.

Moreover for δ close enough to s , the graph of $w \mapsto \text{Fr}^{-n_2}(g_2(w - s + \delta)) + h(s) - h(\delta)$ for $w \in U_2$ is contained in $Y_{\bar{s}}$. For showing that we have to prove that if

$$y = \text{Fr}^{-n_2}(g_2(w - s + \delta)) + h(s) - h(\delta)$$

then $(w, y) \in Y_{\bar{s}}$ but this is equivalent to show that $(w + \delta, y + h(\delta)) \in Y$ and again this is the same to show that $(w + \delta - s, y + h(\delta) - h(s)) \in Y_{\bar{s}}$. And as the graph of $\text{Fr}^{-n_2} \circ g_2$ is contained in $Y_{\bar{s}}$ it is enough to prove that

$$\text{Fr}^{-n_2}(g_2(w + \delta - s)) = y + h(\delta) - h(s)$$

but this is precisely the definition of y .

Note that $\text{Fr}^{-n_2}(g_2(w - s + \delta)) + h(s) - h(\delta) = \text{Fr}^{-n_2}(G(w, \delta))$ where

$$G(w, \delta) = g_2(w - s + \delta) + h(s)^{p^{n_2}} - h(\delta)^{p^{n_2}},$$

an analytic function.

For all $(z, x) \in Y - Y_b$ there is an analytic function g converging in some neighborhood of z and a natural number k such that $\text{Fr}^{-k}(g(z)) = x$ and the graph of $\text{Fr}^{-k} \circ g$ is contained in $Y - Y_b$ in some neighborhood of z . Moreover we can assume that g' is never zero. So there exists an inverse for g , say f , converging in a neighborhood of x^{p^k} therefore the graph of $f \circ \text{Fr}^k$ is contained in $(Y - Y_b)^{-1}$ so, for δ close enough to s , the graph of

$$w \mapsto \text{Fr}^{-n_1}(g_1(\hat{w})) - \text{Fr}^{-n_2}(G(\hat{w}, \delta))$$

where $\hat{w} = f(\text{Fr}^k(w))$ is contained in $(Y - Y_{\bar{s}}) \circ (Y - Y_b)^{-1}$.

Assume $n_1 \geq n_2$ so

$$\text{Fr}^{-n_1}(g_1(\hat{w})) - \text{Fr}^{-n_2}(G(\hat{w}, \delta)) = \text{Fr}^{-n_1}(g_1(\hat{w}) - \text{Fr}^{n_1-n_2}(G(\hat{w}, \delta)))$$

We can take $n = n_1$ and

$$\Phi(w, \delta) = g_1(\hat{w}) - \text{Fr}^{n_1-n_2}(G(\hat{w}, \delta))$$

in order to get clause 6 of the definition. □

By Theorem 2.2.2 and Proposition 3.2.1 we complete the proof of Theorem 3.0.1

Chapter 4

Multiplicative Case

In this chapter we call $M = K \setminus \{0\}$ the universe of the multiplicative group of K and (\cdot) denotes the multiplication on M .

Definition 4.0.1. *Let (H, \otimes) be a one dimensional group interpretable in \mathbb{K} . We say that H is locally isomorphic to (M, \cdot) if there is $U \subseteq M$, some open set containing 1, and $i : U \rightarrow H$, a \mathbb{K} -definable injection such that $i(1)$ is the neutral element of H and for all $x, y \in U$ if $x \cdot y \in U$ then $i(x \cdot y) = i(x) \otimes i(y)$.*

The main result of the chapter is:

Theorem 4.0.2. *Let (H, \otimes) be a \mathbb{K} -interpretable group of dimension one. Suppose that H is locally isomorphic to (M, \cdot) . Assume moreover that $X \subseteq H^2$ is a \mathbb{K} -interpretable set that is not a boolean combination of subgroups of $(H, \otimes) \times (H, \otimes)$, and assume $\mathcal{H} = (H, \otimes, X)$ is strongly minimal, then \mathcal{M} interprets a field, moreover such a field is definable isomorphic (on \mathbb{K}) to K .*

Again the fact that the field is isomorphic to K follows from Theorem 7.1 of [HHP22a] so we just have to find an interpretable field.

Throughout this chapter fix H and $X \subseteq H^2$ as in the hypothesis of Theorem 4.0.2 and call $\mathcal{H} := (H, \otimes, X)$. We also fix $U \subseteq M$ an open set containing 1 and $i : U \rightarrow H$ given by the definition of locally isomorphic to (M, \cdot)

Let 1_H be the neutral element of H so without loss of generality we shall assume that $(1_H, 1_H) \in X$.

For $Y \subseteq H^n$ let $Y^* \subseteq B^n$ be the inverse image of Y via i , that is:

$$Y^* = \{(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in B^n : (i(y_1), \dots, i(y_n)) \in Y\}$$

and for $y \in H^n$ let $y^* \in B^n$ such that $i(y^*) = y$.

Therefore X^* is a \mathbb{K} -definable subset of K of dimension one

By using same definition as in proof of Proposition 2.1.7 there is a \mathcal{H} -definable set $Y \subseteq H^2$, an open set V contained in U , $V \ni 1$ and analytic function $h : V \rightarrow M$ such that $h(1) = 1$ and $(x, h(x)) \in Y^*$ for all $x \in V$.

Changing U by $U \cap V$ (and i by $i|_{U \cap V}$) we may assume that $U = V$.

Assume for a moment that $s_1(h) := \{h'_a(1) : a \in U\}$ is infinite. In this case we can get a good family of curves definable in \mathcal{M} just as in the additive case taking $H(x, s) = h(xs)/h(s)$. Therefore we can use the same definition as in Theorem 2.2.2 and get a field interpretable in \mathcal{H} . So we may assume that $s_1(X)$ is finite and by shrinking B we may assume:

Assumption 4.0.3. $h'_a(1)$ is constant as a varies in B .

Under Assumption 4.0.3 we will find a group G interpretable in \mathcal{H} that is (locally) isomorphic to $(K, +)$ therefore we use the results of Chapter 3 to find a field interpretable in G and therefore in \mathcal{H} .

In the first section of this chapter we find such a group. In the second section we use that group for finding a field interpretable in \mathcal{H} .

4.1 Finding a Group

Proposition 4.1.1. *Under Assumption 4.0.3, in any V , open neighborhood of 1, there is a group tuple of elements of U such that its image via i is a configuration \mathcal{H} that is inter algebraic some group configuration of $(K, +)$.*

Proof. Remember that we fixed $Y \subseteq H^2$ a one dimensional \mathcal{H} -definable subset, and $h : U \rightarrow M$ an analytic function such that for all $x \in U$, $(x, h(x)) \in Y^*$. Replacing B by $B \cap U$ we assume that $B = U$ and replacing V for $V \cap B$ may assume that $V \subseteq B$.

Note that if $a \in U$ then the graph of $h_a(x) := h(xa)/h(a)$ is contained in $(Y^*)_{(a, h(a))}$ for x in some neighborhood of 1. For $a \in U$ we will write Y_a^* instead of $(Y^*)_{(a, h(a))}$.

As h_a is analytic there is some power series converging in a neighborhood of 1 that represents h_a , say

$$h_a(x) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} d_n(a)(x - 1)^n. \quad (4.1)$$

By Assumption 4.0.3 we know that $d_1(a)$ is finite as a varies in U . So we may assume it is constant. Let N be the minimum natural number such that $\{d_N(a) : a \in U\}$ is infinite.

We may assume that for $n < N$ the set $\{d_n(a) : a \in U\}$ is a singleton.

Exchanging Y by $Y_c \circ Y_b^{-1}$ for (b, c) generic enough we may assume that for all $a \in U$, $d_1(1) = d_1(a) = 1$ and for $1 < n < N$, $d_n(1) = d_n(a) = 0$. That follows from a straightforward computation of the coefficients of $h_a \circ h_b^{-1}$.

Note that if a and b are close enough of 1 then the function $h_a \circ h_b$ is analytic in some neighborhood of 1. So if the power expansion of $h_a \circ h_b$ is given by:

$$h_a(h_b(x)) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} d_n(a, b)(x - 1)^n, \quad (4.2)$$

Then we have:

Claim 4.1.2. $d_N(a, b) = d_N(a) + d_N(b)$.

Proof. (Proof of Claim 4.1.2) Note that

$$\begin{aligned} h_a(h_b(x)) &= 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} d_n(a) \left(1 + \sum_k b_k(b)(x-1)^k - 1\right)^n \\ &= 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} d_n(a) \left(\sum_k b_k(b)(x-1)^k\right)^n \end{aligned}$$

So the coefficient that multiplies $(x-1)^N$ is

$$d_N(a, b) = d_1(a)b_N(b) + d_2(a)p_1(b) + \cdots + d_N(a)(b_1(b))^N$$

Where for $1 < i < N$ p_i is some polynomial on b . Given that for each such i $d_i(a) = 0$ and $d_1(a) = d_1(b) = 1$ then

$$d_N(a, b) = d_N(a) + d_N(b)$$

as desired. □

Note that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the map from U to K given by $a \mapsto d_n(a)$ is \mathbb{K} -definable. So, as $\{d_N(a) : a \in U\}$ is an infinite \mathbb{K} -definable subset of K , it contains an open ball, say B with center t . Assume $t = d_N(1)$ and call $B_0 = \{x - t : x \in B\}$ a ball around 0.

Find $a, b, e \in U$ generic independent (in the sense of \mathbb{K}). Then $d_N(a) - t$ and $d_N(b) - t$ are in B_0 , their sum is in B_0 so $t + (d_N(a) - t) + (d_N(b) - t) = d_N(a) + d_N(b) - t \in B$ so there is some $c \in U$ such that $d_N(c) = d_N(a) + d_N(b) - t$. Fix such c .

In the same way there is $f \in U$ such that $d_N(f) = d_N(a) + d_N(e) - t$. And there is also g such that $d_N(g) = t + (d_N(a) - t) + (d_N(b) - t) + (d_N(c) - t)$.

Let $G_2 = (d_N(a) - t, d_N(b) - t, d_N(c) - t, d_N(e) - t, d_N(f) - t, d_N(g) - t)$. It is a group configuration for $(K, +)$ in \mathbb{K} . Define $G_1 = (i(a), i(b), i(c), i(e), i(f), i(g))$. Note that G_1 is interdefinable with G_2 (in \mathbb{K}) just because the map $z \mapsto d_N(i^{-1}(z)) - t$ is \mathbb{K} definable.

Claim 4.1.3. $G_1 = (i(a), i(b), i(c), i(e), i(f), i(g))$ is a group configuration for \mathcal{H} .

Proof. (Proof of Claim 4.1.3)

Let us see for example that $i(c) \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{H}}(i(a), i(b))$. Let $Z = Y_{i(a)} \circ Y_{i(b)} \circ Y^{-1}$. This is a \mathcal{H} -definable set with parameters $(i(a), i(b))$.

We will prove that if we define

$$E_Z := \{e \in Y : |Y_e \cap Z| > |Y_{i(c)} \cap Z|\},$$

then it is an infinite set.

For this we will prove first that

$$F_Z := \{e \in Y^* : |Y_e^* \cap Z^*| > |Y_c^* \cap Z^*|\}$$

is an infinite set.

For proving that list

$$Y_c^* \cap Z^* = \{x_1 = (1, 1), x_2, \dots, x_n\},$$

and for $i = 1, \dots, n$ take $W_i = W_i' \times W_i'' \subseteq U \times U$ pairwise disjoint open sets with $x_i^* \in W_i^*$. We will prove that there is an open subset $V \subseteq U$ containing c such that for all $e \in V \setminus \{c\}$ the curve Y_e^* intersects Z^* at two distinct points in W_1 and at least one inside of W_i for $i > 1$.

First note that there are just finitely many $z \in U$ such that $d_n(z) = d_N(a) + d_N(b) - t$. Otherwise there will be an open set where the equality holds and then by Fact 1.4.20 $d_N(z)$ is constant as z varies in U and we are assuming that this is not the case. So we may assume that $d_N(z) \neq d_N(a) + d_N(b) - t$ for $z \in U \setminus \{c\}$

Now define the function $H(x, e) = h_a \circ h_b \circ h^{-1} - h_e^{-1}(x)$ that is analytic in some neighborhood of $(1, c)$. As the function $H(\cdot, c)$ has a zero of multiplicity N at $x = 1$. Using Fact 1.4.19 we find some open sets $V_1 \subseteq W_1'$ and $U_1 \subseteq U$ with $(1, c) \in V_1 \times U_1$ such that for each $e \in U_1$ the function $x \mapsto H(x, e)$ has N zeros (counting multiplicities) in V_1 . Note that the function $x \mapsto H(x, e)$ has a zero of order N at $x = 1$ just for finitely many e , otherwise by 1.4.20 $d_N(a)$ should be constant in some open and we are assuming that it is not the case. So, by shrinking U we may assume that if $e \neq c$ there is no zero of multiplicity N at U . Therefore there are at least two different zeros at V_1 . That is, there is two different points $x, x' \in W_1'$ such that $y := h_a \circ h_b \circ h^{-1}(x) = h_e(x)$. By shrinking W_1' one may assume that $y \in W_1''$. So as the graph of $h_a \circ h_b \circ h^{-1}$ is contained in Z^* and the graph of h_e is contained in Y_e^* one has that $(x, y) \in Z^* \cap Y_e^* \cap W_1$. The same is true for x' so for each $e \in U_1$ we can find two different points in $Z^* \cap Y_e^* \cap W_1$.

The same argument can be applied for finding each $i > 1$, exists an open neighborhood of c , say U_i , such that for all $e \in U_i$, $|Z^* \cap Y_e^* \cap W_i| \geq 1$. Then for each $e \in V := U_1 \cap U_2 \cap \dots \cap U_n$ there is at least $n + 1$ different points at $Z^* \cap Y_e^*$.

Now if

$$Y_c^* \cap Z^* = \{x_1 = (1, 1), x_2, \dots, x_n\},$$

then $i(x_i)$ are distinct elements of $Y_c \cap Z$ So we can list

$$Y_{i(c)} \cap Z = \{y_1 = (1, 1), y_2 = i(x_2), \dots, y_n = i(x_n), z_1, \dots, z_k\}.$$

Where each $z_j \in H \times H \setminus i(U) \times i(U)$. Let $z_j = (s_j, t_j)$ then if we define $U_j = s_j i(U)$ it is an infinite set containing s_j and $m_j \circ i : U \rightarrow U_j$ is injective, where $m_j : G \rightarrow G$ is multiplication by s_j . By shrinking U we may assume that the V_j are pairwise disjoint.

We can apply the same argument as before but changing the function i by $m_j \circ i$ for finding an open V_j set around c such that for each e in such a neighborhood there is at least one point at $Y_e \cap Z \cap (U_j \times U_j)$. Therefore for each $e \in V \cap V_1 \cap \dots \cap V_n$ the curve $Y_e(i(e)) \cap Z$ has at least $n + 1$ points at $i(U) \times i(U)$ (just the image of the elements in $Z^* \cap Y_e^*$) and at least one at U_i for each U_i so in total has at least $n + k + 1$ intersection points.

Therefore E_Z is infinite and as X is strongly minimal in \mathcal{H} we are done.

(End of the proof of Claim 4.1.3)

□

Therefore we use Theorem 1.3.4 and conclude that there is a group definable in \mathcal{H} and there is a group configuration for \mathcal{H} that it is inter definable with a configuration for the additive group $(K, +)$.

□

So there is a group interpretable in \mathcal{M} whose group configuration is interalgebraic (in \mathbb{K}) with the group configuration of $(K, +)$.

4.2 Finding a Field

In this section we prove Theorem 4.0.2.

First we need a Fact from [HHP22b] (Remark 7.8)

Fact 4.2.1. *Let $H = F / \sim$ be a \mathbb{K} -interpretable group with $F \subseteq K^m$ \mathbb{K} -definable. Assume that each \sim -equivalence class is finite. Then, after quotient H by a finite normal subgroup, there is a \mathbb{K} -definable injection $f : H' \rightarrow K^d$ for some d , where H' is an infinite and definable subset of H .*

Proof. (Proof of Theorem 4.0.2)

As we said, we may assume 4.0.3. Let (G, \oplus) an interpretable group as provided by Proposition 4.1.1. Let e denote its neutral element. We may assume that G is strongly minimal as a interpretable set in \mathcal{H} .

Let $L \subseteq G$ and $f : L \rightarrow K^d$ as provided by Fact 4.2.1, by taking translations one may assume that $e \in L$ and then group operation on G can be used for defining some (partial) operation on $f(L)$ moreover we can find a, b, c generic independent (in the sense of acl) elements of G inside of L and then $f(a), f(b), f(c)$ are generic independent elements of $f(L)$.

Thus one can use Theorem 1.5.1 and find U_1 , an open subset of $f(L)$ containing $f(e)$, U_2 a neighborhood of 0 in K and $\psi : U_2 \rightarrow U_1$ a \mathbb{K} -definable bijection with analytic inverse. Let $\phi = f^{-1} \circ \psi$ a \mathbb{K} -definable function, note that for $x, y \in U_2$ if $x + y \in U_2$ then $\phi(x + y) = \phi(x) \oplus \phi(y)$. As U_2 is open it contains an open ball around 0. Replace U_2 for such a ball and then one can assume U_2 is a subgroup of $(K, +)$, so

$$H := f^{-1}(U_1)$$

is a subgroup of G isomorphic to $(U_2, +)$.

So $\phi : U_2 \rightarrow G$ is a \mathbb{K} definable injective group homomorphism.

It is enough then if we prove the next general statement:

Proposition 4.2.2. *If G is a \mathbb{K} -interpretable group and $\phi : U_2 \rightarrow G$ is a \mathbb{K} -interpretable map such $\phi(x + y) = \phi(x) \oplus \phi(y)$ for each $x, y \in U_2$, then if $X \subseteq G \times G$ is a \mathbb{K} -definable set of dimension one that is not G -affine, then the structure $\mathcal{G} = (G, \oplus, X)$ interprets a field*

Proof. (Proof of Proposition 4.2.2)

For $Y \subseteq G \times G$ define

$$Y^* := \phi^{-1}(Y \cap H \times H) \subseteq U_2 \times U_2$$

and for $a \in H \times H$ define

$$a^* := \phi^{-1}(a)$$

As G with the induced structure is not locally modular there is some $Y \subseteq G^2$ \mathcal{M} -definable that is not G -affine.

In this case Y^* is a curve on $U_2 \times U_2$ that is not $(U_2, +)$ -affine.

Considerate the \mathcal{G} -definable family of curves

$$X_a := (Y \ominus Y_a) \circ (Y \ominus Y_c)^{-1},$$

for $c \in H \times H \cap Y$ fixed and $a \in Y$.

Therefore if for $a \in Y^*$ we define,

$$X_a^* = (Y^* - Y_a^*) \circ (Y^* - Y_{c^*}^*)^{-1}.$$

Where c^* is some fixed element of Y , we can apply Claim 3.2.2 to the structure \mathcal{U} and conclude that $(X_a^*)_{a \in Y^*}$ is a good family of curves for \mathcal{U} .

Let $U \subseteq U_2$ and $h : U \rightarrow U_2$ as given by the data of a good family of curves. Let be

$$\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, b) \in K^5$$

as given by Lemma 2.2.3 and let

$$G_1 = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, p, q, r)$$

be as given by Lemma 2.2.4.

So if $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ then $\alpha_1 \in U$ so there is some $\hat{\alpha}_1 \in H \times H$ such that $(\hat{\alpha}_1)^* = (\alpha_1, h(\alpha_1))$ define $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_1, \hat{\alpha}_2)$ and the same for β, γ and also for p, q and r .

We claim that

$$\hat{G}_1 := (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}, \hat{r})$$

is a field configuration for \mathcal{G} .

Again we only have to prove the \mathcal{G} -dependence relations. So let's prove for example that $\hat{q} \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{p})$

For $\delta \in Y$ define

$$Z_\delta := (X_{\hat{\alpha}_1} \circ X_{\hat{p}}) \ominus (X \circ X_{\hat{\alpha}_1}) \oplus (X \circ X_{\hat{\alpha}_2}) \ominus (X_\delta \circ X) \quad (4.3)$$

It is a \mathcal{G} definable family of subsets of $G \times G$.

For $\delta \in Y$ define

$$Z_\delta^e = \{x \in G : (x, e) \in Z_\delta\}$$

Since the family $(Z_\delta)_{\delta \in Y}$ is \mathcal{G} -definable with parameters α and p it is enough to show that

$$\{\delta \in Y : |Z_\delta^e| \leq |Z_q^e|\}$$

is finite. As we may assume that Morley degree of Y computed in \mathcal{G} is 1, it is enough to show that

$$\{\delta \in Y : |Z_\delta^0| > |Z_q^0|\}$$

is infinite.

Note that for $\delta \in Y^*$,

$$Z_\delta^* = (X_{\alpha_1}^* \circ X_p^*) - (X^* \circ X_{\alpha_1}^*) + (X^* \circ X_{\alpha_2}^*) - (X_\delta^* \circ X^*)$$

We proceed to prove that there is an open subset of q such that for all δ in that open one has that

$$|Z_\delta^e| > |Z_q^e|$$

For this list $Z_q^e = \{(e, e) = x_1, \dots, x_l, x_{l+1}, \dots, x_n\}$ in such a way that $x_1, \dots, x_l \in H \times H$ and $x_{l+1}, \dots, x_n \in G \times G \setminus H \times H$.

By Claim 2.2.6 there is an open subset $W \ni q$ such that for all $\delta \in W \setminus \{q\}$ one has that

$$|(Z_\delta^*)^e| > |(Z_q^*)^e|.$$

Moreover

$$|(Z_\delta^*)^e| = |Z_\delta^e \cap H \times H|.$$

and the same it is true for Z_q .

So for all $\delta \in W$

$$|Z_\delta^e \cap H \times H| > |Z_q^e \cap H \times H|$$

Moreover just as in Claim 2.2.7 we have:

For all i with $l < i \leq n$ if V_i is an open set containing x_i , there is W_i a neighborhood of q such that if $\delta \in W_i \setminus \{q\}$ then $|Z_\delta^e \cap V_i| \geq 1$

So if we take V_i disjoint not intersecting H and define

$$\bar{W} = W \cap W_{l+1} \cap \dots \cap W_n,$$

then for all $\delta \in \bar{W} \setminus q$ Z_δ^e has more than l points on $H \times H$ and at least 1 point in V_i for $i > l$ so it has more than n points in total.

So \hat{G}_1 is a field configuration for \mathcal{G} therefore \mathcal{G} interprets a field and then.

(End o proof of Proposition 4.2.2) □

Therefore as \mathcal{G} is intepretable in \mathcal{H} , one has that \mathcal{H} interprets a field. □

Chapter 5

General Case

In this chapter we present a strategy for proving the general definable one dimensional case, that is we present an outline of the prove of:

Conjecture 5.0.1. *Let N be a \mathbb{K} -definable set of dimension one. Let $\mathcal{N} = (N, \dots)$ a strongly minimal, non locally modular structure over N that is definable in \mathcal{K} , then \mathcal{N} interprets a field.*

For this the first step is finding a group, for doing so a procedure very similar as the one presented in Section 4.1 should works. In this the group structure of G is just used for finding a family of curves that has no analytic points and where one can use continuity of roots. One should be able to find such a family without the group structure just as is done in the proof of Theorem 4.25 of [HS17].

Moreover as the group configuration is constructed using the coefficients of the Taylor expansion of the curves, there are two cases:

Either the first derivative is infinite (as one varies in the family) and in this case the group configuration is interalgebraic with some group configuration of $(K, +)$. Or the first derivative is finite and there is some coefficient of the taylor expansion that is infinite.

Then by Theorem 1.5.1 either G is locally isomorphic to $(K, +)$ or it is locally isomorphic to (M, \cdot) . In the first case we use Proposition 4.2.2 and in the second we use Theorem 4.0.2.

Bibliography

- [Abh01] Shreeram Shankar Abhyankar. *Local analytic geometry*, volume 14. World Scientific, 2001.
- [Art57] Emil Artin. *Geometric algebra*. Interscience Publishers, Inc., 1957.
- [Cas22] Benjamin Castle. Restricted trichotomy in characteristic zero. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00730*, 2022.
- [EHP21] Pantelis E Eleftheriou, Assaf Hasson, and Ya’acov Peterzil. Strongly minimal groups in o-minimal structures. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 23(10):3351–3418, 2021.
- [HHM05] Deirdre Haskell, Ehud Hrushovski, and Dugald Macpherson. Stable domination and independence in algebraically closed valued fields. *arXiv preprint math/0511310*, 2005.
- [HHP22a] Yatir Halevi, Assaf Hasson, and Ya’acov Peterzil. Interpretable fields in various valued fields. *Advances in Mathematics*, 404:108408, 2022.
- [HHP22b] Yatir Halevi, Assaf Hasson, and Ya’acov Peterzil. On groups interpretable in various valued fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.05677*, 2022.
- [Hol95] Jan E Holly. Canonical forms for definable subsets of algebraically closed and real closed valued fields. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 60(3):843–860, 1995.
- [HP94] Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay. Groups definable in local fields and pseudo-finite fields. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 85(1):203–262, 1994.
- [Hru86] Ehud Hrushovski. *Contributions to stable model theory*. University of California, Berkeley, 1986.
- [Hru93] Ehud Hrushovski. A new strongly minimal set. *Annals of pure and applied logic*, 62(2):147–166, 1993.
- [HS17] Assaf Hasson and Dmitry Sustretov. Incidence systems on cartesian powers of algebraic curves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05554*, 2017.
- [HZ96] Ehud Hrushovski and Boris Zilber. Zariski geometries. *Journal of the American mathematical society*, pages 1–56, 1996.

- [KR16] Piotr Kowalski and Serge Randriambololona. Strongly minimal reducts of valued fields. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 81(2):510–523, 2016.
- [Mar06] David Marker. *Model theory: an introduction*, volume 217. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [Mar17] David Marker. Strongly minimal sets and geometry. In *Colloquium'95 (Haifa)*, pages 191–213, 2017.
- [Rab93] Evgenia D Rabinovich. *Definability of a field in sufficiently rich incidence systems*, volume 14. School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary and Westfield College, 1993.