

On ordered groups of regular growth rates

BY VINCENT MAMOUTOU BAGAYOKO

IMJ-PRG (Paris)

Email: bagayoko@imj-prg.fr

Abstract

We introduce the elementary class of linearly ordered groups, called growth order groups, encompassing certain groups under composition of formal series (e.g. transseries) as well as certain groups $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of infinitely large germs at $+\infty$ of unary functions definable in an o-minimal structure \mathcal{M} . We study the algebraic structure of growth order groups and give methods for constructing examples. We show that if \mathcal{M} expands the real ordered field and germs in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ are levelled in the sense of Marker & Miller, then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a growth order group.

Table of contents

Introduction	2
Ordered groups of regular growth rates	2
Outline of the paper	3
1 Ordered groups	5
1.1 Ordered groups	5
1.2 Fractional powers	6
2 Growth order groups	6
2.1 Growth axioms	6
2.2 Some non-commutative valuation theory	7
2.3 Scaling elements	11
2.4 Growth order groups	12
2.5 Centraliser relations	13
2.6 On the structure of growth order groups	14
3 Constructions of growth ordered groups	15
3.1 Direct products not allowed	15
3.2 Semidirect products	16
3.3 Quotients	18
3.4 Growth order groups of finite growth rank	20
3.5 O-minimal germs	22
4 H-fields with composition	24
4.1 H-fields with composition	25
4.2 Taylor approximations in Hardy fields	27
4.3 Conjugacy in H-fields with composition and inversion	31
4.4 Ordered groups in H-fields with composition and inversion	33
4.5 Application in the polynomially bounded case	35
4.6 Application in the exponential case	36

Bibliography	38
Index	40
Glossary	40

Introduction

Ordered groups of regular growth rates How do two quantities that grow regularly toward infinity behave under composition? How to characterise the order of growth of such magnitudes?

Hardy introduced [22] L-functions, which are real-valued functions obtained as combinations of the exponential function, the logarithm and semialgebraic functions. They naturally form a differential ring under pointwise operations. More remarkably, Hardy showed that any two such functions can always be compared on small enough neighborhoods of $+\infty$. For instance the inequalities

$$\exp(t) > t^n > \dots > t^2 > nt > \dots > 2t > t+n > \dots > t+1 > t$$

hold on some positive half line $(a, +\infty) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. That is, the germs at $+\infty$ of L-functions are linearly ordered. The theory of resolution of differential-algebraic equations and inequalities, and indeed the whole first-order theory of fields of germs in the language of ordered valued differential fields, are well understood [3, 4].

The functional theory of such quantities, however, is little known. If f, g are two real-valued functions and g eventually exceeds all constant functions, then the germ of $f \circ g$ only depends on that of f and that of g . This yields a law of composition of germs. Even short and simple functional equations, involving germs of even regular commonplace functions... turn out to be particularly difficult to analyse. Consider the simple inequality

$$f \circ g > g \circ f \tag{1}$$

for two germs f, g in a given ordered group of germs. When is it satisfied for germs of L-functions? We will define a first-order theory of abstract ordered regular growth rates with a composition law, that describes the solutions of (1) in said group. Valuation theory, by discriminating between general orders of magnitude, can vastly simplify differential-algebraic equations [1, 2, 24, 3]. There should be a functional, non-commutative valuation theory on certain ordered groups that can likewise identify orders of growth of regular growth rates, yield non-commutative asymptotic expansions of such growth rates and help solving functional equations over them.

Before describing these ideas, let us see how the informal notion of regular growth rate can be instantiated. The most concrete example of regular growth rates is that of elements in Hardy fields [11], i.e. ordered differential fields of germs. If a Hardy field \mathcal{H} is closed under compositions, and if its subset $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ of germs that lie above all constant germs is closed under functional inversion, then $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is an ordered group which we would like to understand.

Given an o-minimal structure \mathcal{M} , the set \mathcal{M}_∞ of germs at $+\infty$ of unary definable functions in \mathcal{M} is also linearly ordered by eventual comparison. Its subset $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{M}$ of germs of functions that tend to $+\infty$ at $+\infty$ is an ordered group for the induced ordering and the composition of germs. Whereas \mathcal{M}_∞ is model theoretically tame (provided \mathcal{M} has definable Skolem functions, it is an elementary extension of \mathcal{M} , see Section 3.5), the group $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{M}$ is not interpretable in \mathcal{M} in general, and the elementary properties of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{M}$ in the language \mathcal{L}_{og} of ordered groups are not tame in general.

Consider an ordered field \mathbb{K} of generalised power series [21] over an ordered field of constants C , whose set $\mathbb{K}^{>C}$ of series lying above all constants is non-empty. In certain cases, there is a composition law $\circ: \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}^{>C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}$ such that $(\mathbb{K}^{>C}, \circ, <)$ is an ordered group. Examples include fields of formal Puiseux series, fields of grid-based transseries [26], the field of logarithmic-exponential transseries [16], fields of hyperseries [5], and, conjecturally [6, Conclusion, 1], Conway’s field of surreal numbers [12]. The elementary properties of all three types of ordered groups are not well studied.

These types of linearly ordered groups turn out to be related in at least two ways. First, in some cases, such as when \mathcal{M} is the ordered field of real numbers or the real ordered exponential field [43], the ordered group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is of the form $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ for a Hardy field \mathcal{H} , and it can be embedded [16] into an ordered group of formal series, namely transseries [13, 17]. We expect that this is always the case when \mathcal{M} expands the ordered field of real numbers, and that existentially closed extensions of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ can be found among these groups of formal series. However, constructing such embeddings is difficult, mainly because quantifier-free formulas in \mathcal{L}_{og} already involve difficult functional equations and inequalities, some of which may or may not have solutions (see Remark 1.6). Secondly, on the model theoretic side, groups of the form $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathbb{K}^{>C}$ share important first-order properties in \mathcal{L}_{og} . No systematic study of this resemblance has been done yet, and this paper can be taken as a primer on that question. We propose a first-order theory T_{gog} in \mathcal{L}_{og} whose models can be taken as abstract ordered groups of regular growth rates. We will call them *growth order groups*. Simple examples include all Abelian ordered groups, and, for instance, ordered groups of strictly increasing affine maps on an ordered vector space. Despite their specificity, they appear in natural contexts in the model theory of ordered algebraic structures. Remarkably, our solution [5] to the problem of existence of an ordered group in which all positive elements are conjugate is a growth order group.

Our goal is to convince the reader that T_{gog} is a sensible and practical theory of ordered groups. We will show that models of T_{gog} comprise both groups of o-minimal germs, groups of formal series and more abstract examples, and that T_{gog} is sufficiently strong to provide insight on these groups that is not easily deducible from their concrete presentation. This task entails studying the properties of growth order groups, proposing methods to construct growth order groups, and showing that o-minimal germs and formal series do sometimes yield growth order groups. We see our work as a mere introduction to growth order groups. The reader will find several non-trivial but approachable questions (1-2-3-4-5), subject of further research.

Outline of the paper In the first section, we state our conventions and notations for ordered groups, that are taken linearly left-ordered and right-ordered. We state well-known basic facts about such groups, taking from [30, 35, 19].

In Section 2, we state the three axioms **GOG1–GOG3** for growth order groups, starting with **GOG1** and **GOG2** (Section 2.1). Section 2.2 focuses on the existence of a notion of non-commutative valuation on ordered groups satisfying **GOG1**. The corresponding linearly ordered value set is called the *growth rank*. We then define *scaling elements* (Section 2.3). Those form scales along which elements in the group have asymptotic expansions as in valuation theory. After introducing the final axiom **GOG3** for growth order groups in Section 2.4, we show that the underlying group of a growth order group is commutative transitive [18], that is:

Theorem 1. [Corollary 2.29] *The centraliser of a non-trivial element in a growth order group is Abelian.*

We finish by discussing the existence of asymptotic expansions in growth order groups, and embeddings of growth order groups into groups of non-commutative formal series (Section 2.6).

Section 3 gives methods for constructing growth order groups. We first see that certain groups of formal series such as finitely nested hyperseries [5] are growth order groups. Although growth order groups are not closed under direct products of ordered groups (Section 3.1), we give conditions under which a lexicographically ordered semidirect product of growth order groups is a growth order group, and give examples (Section 3.2). In the other direction, we give conditions under which the quotient of a growth order group is a growth order group (Section 3.3). This allows us to describe the structure of growth order groups with finite growth rank (Section 3.4). Finally, we define the ordered groups $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of germs in an o-minimal structure \mathcal{M} and give examples where $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is, or is not a growth order group (Section 3.5).

Section 4 is dedicated to the determination of a class of o-minimal expansions \mathcal{R} of the real ordered field such that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a growth order group. We now state our main result. Let \mathcal{R} be an o-minimal expansion of the real ordered field. Given a real-valued germ g at $+\infty$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $g^{[n]}$ for the n -fold compositional iterate of g . With [32], we say that \mathcal{R} is *levelled* if for all positive elements f of the ordered group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$, there is an $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$-1 \leq \log^{[n]} \circ f - \log^{[n-e]} \leq 1.$$

This conditions means that the germ f can be made “close”, after sufficiently many compositions with \log , to the germ of the iterate $\exp^{[e]}$. Most known o-minimal expansions of \mathbb{R} are levelled, including expansions of \mathbb{R} by Gevrey functions and the exponential [42] (see Corollary 4.39), and the Pfaffian closure of the real ordered field [41] (see Corollary 4.35). In fact, no o-minimal expansion of \mathbb{R} is known not to be levelled. The main theorem is as follows.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{R} be an o-minimal expansion of the real ordered field. If \mathcal{R} is levelled, then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a growth order group. Moreover, centralisers of non-trivial elements are Archimedean.*

Our method of proof relies heavily on the fact that the elementary extension \mathcal{R}_{∞} of \mathcal{R} is closed under derivation of germs, and that as an ordered valued differential field, it is an H-field (see [1]). It applies to more general types of structures, and we introduce, in Section 4.1, a first-order theory of H-fields K over an ordered field of constants C with a composition law $\circ: K \times K^{>C} \rightarrow K$ and a compositional identity $x \in K^{>C}$, such that $(K^{>C}, \circ, x, <)$ is an ordered group. Those are called *H-fields with composition and inversion*. A crucial feature of such fields is that they satisfy the axiom scheme of Taylor expansions (**HFC5**). The field K has Taylor expansions if for all $(a, b) \in K \times K^{>C}$ and small enough δ , the value of $a \circ (b + \delta)$ is well approximated by truncated Taylor series $\sum_{k < n} \frac{a^{(k)} \circ b}{k!} \delta^k$ where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Proving that the underlying H-field with composition of \mathcal{R}_{∞} has Taylor expansions requires work as well as constraints on \mathcal{R} . This is done, in the more general case of Hardy fields, in Section 4.2. We say that a real-valued function f is *transexponential* if the germ of f lies above $\exp^{[n]}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We show in particular that:

Theorem 3. [Corollary 4.18] *Let \mathcal{R} be an o-minimal expansion of an ordered field. Assume that \mathcal{R} has an elementary substructure \mathcal{R}_0 with underlying ordered field \mathbb{R} and that \mathcal{R}_0 defines no transexponential function. Then \mathcal{R}_{∞} has Taylor expansions.*

Relying on Taylor expansions, we then derive conjugacy relations in H-fields with composition and inversion (Section 4.3). We show how to derive the axioms of growth order groups for $K^{>C}$ in special cases where the elements of $K^{>C}$ considered are close to its compositional identity x (Section 4.4). In the case when $C = \mathbb{R}$, this allows us to prove a general result (Theorem 4.7) giving conditions under which $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is a growth order group.

Theorem 2 follows from applications of Theorem 4.7. The proof relies on Miller's first dichotomy result [33] stating that either each germ in \mathcal{R}_∞ is bounded by the germ of a polynomial function, or \mathcal{R} defines the exponential function. The polynomially bounded and exponential cases are treated in Sections 4.5 and 4.6 respectively.

1 Ordered groups

1.1 Ordered groups

Definition 1.1. An ordered group is a group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1)$ together with a linear (i.e. total) ordering $<$ on \mathcal{G} such that

$$\forall f, g, h \in \mathcal{G}, g > h \implies (fg > fh \wedge gf > hf). \quad (1.1)$$

We write \leq for the large comparison relation corresponding to $<$, i.e. $f \leq g \iff f < g \vee f = g$. We have a first-order language of ordered groups $\mathcal{L}_{\text{og}} := \langle \cdot, 1, \leq, \text{Inv} \rangle$ where the unary function symbol Inv is interpreted as the inverse function $g \mapsto g^{-1}$. We write T_{og} for the expected \mathcal{L}_{og} -theory of ordered groups. Homomorphisms should be understood in the model theoretic sense: a *homomorphism* of ordered groups is a nondecreasing group morphism, whereas an *embedding*, of ordered groups is a strictly increasing group morphism.

Remark 1.2. An ordered group \mathcal{G} can be seen as a group of automorphisms of a linearly ordered set $(X, <)$ ordered by universal pointwise comparison

$$\varphi < \phi \iff (\forall x \in X, (\varphi(x) < \phi(x))).$$

Indeed, the action of \mathcal{G} act on $(\mathcal{G}, <)$ by translations on the left yields this representation. This intuition will be particularly relevant for growth order groups, and we advise the reader to see them as such.

Given an ordered group \mathcal{G} , we write

$$\mathcal{G}^> := \{f \in \mathcal{G} : f > 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}^\neq := \{f \in \mathcal{G} : f \neq 1\}.$$

An ordered group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ is said *Archimedean* if for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, there is an $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f^n \geq g$. Recall Hölder's theorem:

Hölder's theorem. (see [19, Section IV.1, Theorem 1]) *An ordered group is Archimedean if and only if it embeds into $(\mathbb{R}, +, 0, <)$. In particular, Archimedean linearly ordered groups are Abelian.*

If $(H, \cdot, 1)$ is a group and $f, g \in H$, then we write

$$[f, g] := f^{-1} g^{-1} f g.$$

We define the *centraliser* of an $g \in H$ as the subgroup

$$\mathcal{C}(g) := \{h \in H : [g, h] = 1\} = \{h \in H : hg = gh\}.$$

For $h \in H$, we have

$$\mathcal{C}(hgh^{-1}) = h\mathcal{C}(g)h^{-1}. \quad (1.2)$$

1.2 Fractional powers

Let $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ be an ordered group. Let us make a few comments on fractional powers of elements in \mathcal{G} . The axioms for ordered groups imply that \mathcal{G} is torsion-free, i.e. $f^n = 1 \implies f = 1$ for all $f \in \mathcal{G}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$.

Lemma 1.3. [35, Lemma 1.1] *For all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $n > 0$, we have $[f^n, g] = 1 \implies [f, g] = 1$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $fg \neq gf$. If $fg < gf$, then we claim that we have

$$f^k g < f^{k-1} g f < f g f^{k-1} < g f^k$$

for all $k > 1$. Indeed this holds for $k = 2$ since $f^2 g < f(gf) = (fg)f < gf^2$. Now let $k > 1$ with $f^k g < f^{k-1} g f < f g f^{k-1} < g f^k$. So

$$f^{k+1} g < f^k g f < (f g f^{k-1}) f = f g f^k < g f^{k+1}.$$

It follows by induction that $f^n g < g f^n$: a contradiction. Similarly, if $gf < fg$, then we obtain the contradiction that $g f^n < f^n g$. We deduce that $fg = gf$. \square

Corollary 1.4. [35, Corollary 1.2] *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^>$ with $f^n g^m = g^m f^n$. Then $fg = gf$.*

Corollary 1.5. *Let $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $f \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f^m = g^n$. Then f is unique to satisfy this relation and we have $[f, g] = 1$.*

Proof. That f is unique follows from the fact that \mathcal{G} is torsion-free. We have $[f, g] = 1$ by Corollary 1.4. \square

So given $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $f \in \mathcal{G}$, the element $f^{m/n} \in \mathcal{C}(f)$ is well-defined, whenever there exists a $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f^m = g^n$, as that unique g . The group \mathcal{G} is *divisible* if f^q is always defined, i.e. if for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}^>$, there is an $f \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f^m = g$.

Remark 1.6. Contrary to the non-ordered case or the ordered Abelian case, an ordered group need not embed into a divisible one [9]. We expect that growth order groups *do* embed into divisible growth order groups, but this is largely beyond the scope of the paper.

2 Growth order groups

We now introduce growth order groups by defining a first-order theory $T_{\text{gog}} \supseteq T_{\text{og}}$ thereof.

2.1 Growth axioms

Let $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ be an ordered group. Consider the following sentences in \mathcal{L}_{og} (after an obvious rewriting).

GOG1. Given $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^>$ with $f \geq g$ and $g_0 \in \mathcal{C}(g)$, there is an $f_0 \in \mathcal{C}(f)$ with $f_0 \geq g_0$.

GOG2. For $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^>$, with $f > \mathcal{C}(g)$, we have

$$f > \mathcal{C}(g) \implies fg > gf. \quad (2.1)$$

If \mathcal{G} satisfies **GOG2**, then we see by taking inverses and conjugating with g in **GOG2** that for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$(f < \mathcal{C}(g) \wedge g > 1) \implies gf > fg \quad \text{and} \quad (f > \mathcal{C}(g) \wedge g < 1) \implies fg < gf.$$

Any ordered Abelian group automatically satisfies **GOG1**, and vacuously satisfies **GOG2**. We say that \mathcal{G} has *Archimedean centralisers* if for each $g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, the ordered group $\mathcal{C}(g)$ is Archimedean (hence Abelian). We note the following elementary but important fact:

Proposition 2.1. *Let \mathcal{G} have Archimedean centralisers. Then \mathcal{G} satisfies **GOG1**.*

Proof. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^>$ with $f \geq g$ and let $g_0 \in \mathcal{C}(g)$. We have $g^{-n} \leq g_0 \leq g^n$ for a certain $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so f^n is an element of $\mathcal{C}(f)$ with $f^n \geq g^n \geq g_0$. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(I, <)$ be a linearly ordered set, let $(\mathcal{G}_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of ordered groups satisfying **GOG1** and **GOG2**, which is nondecreasing for the inclusion. Let \mathcal{G} denote the union of all \mathcal{G}_i 's. Then \mathcal{G} satisfies **GOG1** and **GOG2**.*

Proof. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ with $f \geq g$ and let $g' \in \mathcal{C}(g)$. Given $i \in I$ with $f, g, g' \in \mathcal{G}_i$, we find, by **GOG1** in \mathcal{G}_i , an $f' \in \mathcal{C}(f)$ with $f' \geq g'$. So **GOG1** holds for \mathcal{G} . Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^>$ with $f > \mathcal{C}(g)$. Let $i \in I$ with $f, g \in \mathcal{G}_i$. We have $\mathcal{C}(g) \cap \mathcal{G}_i \subseteq \mathcal{C}(g)$, so $f > \mathcal{C}(g) \cap \mathcal{G}_i$. Thus **GOG2** in \mathcal{G}_i yields $fgf^{-1} > g$, whence **GOG2** holds for \mathcal{G} . \square

Remark 2.3. Contrary to **GOG1**, the axiom **GOG2** is not a symmetric condition: if an ordered group $(H, \cdot, 1, <)$ satisfies **GOG2**, then the ordered group $(H, \cdot, 1, >)$ need not satisfy **GOG2**.

2.2 Some non-commutative valuation theory

Throughout Sections 2.2 and Section 2.3, we fix an ordered group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ satisfying **GOG1**. Recall that $(L, <)$ is a linearly ordered set, then a subset $C \subseteq L$ is said *convex* if for all $c_0, c_1 \in C$ and $l \in L$, we have $c_0 < l < c_1 \implies l \in C$.

We now introduce an important binary relation \preccurlyeq on \mathcal{G} . For $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$, set

$$f \preccurlyeq g \iff (\exists g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{C}(g), (g_0 \leq f \leq g_1)). \quad (2.2)$$

So $f \preccurlyeq g$ if and only if f lies in the convex hull of $\mathcal{C}(g)$. Note that $1 \preccurlyeq g$ and that $g \preccurlyeq 1 \implies g = 1$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$.

Proposition 2.4. *The relation \preccurlyeq is a linear quasi-ordering on \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Let $f, g, h \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f \preccurlyeq g$ and $g \preccurlyeq h$. We may assume that $f, g, h \neq 1$. So there are $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{C}(g)$ and $h_0, h_1 \in \mathcal{C}(h)$ with

$$g_0 \leq f \leq g_1 \quad \text{and} \quad h_0 \leq g \leq h_1.$$

We may choose $g_0, h_0 \in \mathcal{G}^<$ and $g_1, h_1 \in \mathcal{G}^>$. By **GOG1**, there are $h_2, h_3 \in \mathcal{C}(h)$ with $g_1 \leq h_3$ and $g_0^{-1} \leq h_2$, whence $g_0 \geq h_2^{-1}$. We thus have $h_2^{-1} \leq f \leq h_3$, i.e. $f \preccurlyeq h$. So \preccurlyeq is transitive. It is clearly reflexive.

We next prove that it is linear. Since $\mathcal{C}(f) = \mathcal{C}(f^{-1})$ for all $f \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$f \preccurlyeq g \iff f^{-1} \preccurlyeq g \iff f \preccurlyeq g^{-1} \iff f^{-1} \preccurlyeq g^{-1}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$. So it is enough to prove that for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^>$, we have $f \preceq g$ or $g \preceq f$. Given such f, g we have $f \leq g$, in which case $f \preceq g$, or $g \leq f$, in which case $g \preceq f$. \square

We have an equivalence relation $f \asymp g \iff f \preceq g \wedge g \preceq f$ on \mathcal{G} or \mathcal{G}^\neq . Given $f \in \mathcal{G}$, we write $\text{gr}(f)$ for the equivalence class of f for \asymp , called its *growth rank* and we write $\text{gr}(\mathcal{G}^\neq)$ for the quotient set

$$\text{gr}(\mathcal{G}^\neq) = \mathcal{G}^\neq / \asymp = \{\text{gr}(f) : f \in \mathcal{G}^\neq\}.$$

We write $f \prec g$ if $f \preceq g$ and $g \not\preceq f$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $g \neq 1$. We have $g \prec f$ if and only if $\mathcal{C}(g) < \max(f, f^{-1})$.*

Proof. If $f \neq 1$, then this is immediate by definition of \preceq . Since one never has $g \prec 1$, $1 > \mathcal{C}(g)$, this yields the result. \square

Lemma 2.6. *For $f, g, h \in \mathcal{G}$, we have*

$$f \succ g \iff h f h^{-1} \succ h g h^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad f \asymp g \iff h f h^{-1} \asymp h g h^{-1}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f \succ g &\iff \mathcal{C}(g) < \max(f, f^{-1}) \\ &\iff h \mathcal{C}(g) h^{-1} < h \max(f, f^{-1}) h^{-1} && \text{(since } \mathcal{G} \text{ is an ordered group)} \\ &\iff \mathcal{C}(h g h^{-1}) < \max(h f h^{-1}, h f^{-1} h^{-1}) && \text{(by (1.2))} \\ &\iff h f h^{-1} \succ h g h^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The second equivalence follows from this one and Proposition 2.4. \square

Proposition 2.7. *For all $g, h \in \mathcal{G}$, we have:*

- a) $g^{-1} \asymp g$.
- b) $gh \preceq g$ or $gh \preceq h$.
- c) $1 \leq g \leq h \implies g \preceq h$.
- d) $g \neq 1 \implies 1 \prec g$.

Proof. a) The statement a) follows from the fact that $g^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}(g)$. Assume for contradiction that $gh \succ g$ and $gh \succ h$. In particular, we must have $g, h \neq 1$. By Lemma 2.5, we deduce that $gh > \mathcal{C}(g)$ or that $gh < \mathcal{C}(g)$. So $h > \mathcal{C}(g)$ or $h < \mathcal{C}(g)$. But then $|h|^{-2} < gh < |h|^2$, which by Lemma 2.5 contradicts the fact that $gh \succ h$. This shows b). For c) we have $h^{-1} \leq g \leq h$ where $h, h^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}(h)$. Finally d) follows from the definition. \square

Proposition 2.8. *For $g, h \in \mathcal{G}$, we have*

$$g \prec h \implies gh \asymp hg \asymp h.$$

Proof. We have $gh \preceq h$ by Proposition 2.7(b). Assume for contradiction that $gh \prec h$. By Proposition 2.7(a), we have $h = g^{-1}(gh) \preceq g^{-1} \asymp g \prec h$, or $h = g^{-1}(gh) \preceq gh \prec h$: a contradiction. Thus $gh \asymp h$. The proof of $hg \asymp h$ is symmetric. \square

Remark 2.9. We do *not* have $fg \asymp gf$ in general. For instance, if \mathcal{R} is the real ordered exponential field, then the elements $f = \exp$ and $g = \log^2$ in the group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ satisfy $f \circ g \succ g \circ f$.

Given $f \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, we write $\text{gr}(f)$ for the equivalence class of f for \asymp in \mathcal{G}^\neq . We call $\text{gr}(f)$ the *growth rank* of f .

Proposition 2.10. *For $f \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, the set $\text{gr}(f) \cap \mathcal{G}^\succ$ is convex.*

Proof. Let $g, h \in \mathcal{G}^\succ$ with $g, h \asymp f$ and let $j \in \mathcal{G}$ with $g \leq j \leq h$. We have $g \preceq j$ and $j \preceq h$ by Proposition 2.7(c). So $f \preceq j$ and $j \preceq f$ by Proposition 2.4, whence $j \asymp f$. \square

We can thus define a linear ordering $<$ on the quotient set $\text{gr}(\mathcal{G}) := \mathcal{G}^\neq / \asymp$, where for $g, h \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, we set

$$\text{gr}(g) < \text{gr}(h) \iff g \prec h \iff (\text{gr}(g) \cap \mathcal{G}^\succ < \text{gr}(h) \cap \mathcal{G}^\succ).$$

Definition 2.11. *The **growth rank** of \mathcal{G} is the linearly ordered set $(\text{gr}(\mathcal{G}), <)$.*

Remark 2.12. In view of Proposition 2.7, the function gr is a valuation $\mathcal{G}^\neq \rightarrow \text{gr}(\mathcal{G})$ in the sense of [19, Section 4.4].

It is easy to see that \mathcal{G} has growth rank 0 if and only if it is trivial, and that non-trivial Abelian ordered groups have growth rank 1. The growth rank does *not* extend the notion of principal rank of an ordered group [19].

Example 2.13. Let \mathcal{R} denote the real ordered field, which is o-minimal. It will follow from Theorem 2 that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ satisfies **GOG1** and has Archimedean centralisers. Therefore, the convex hull of $\mathcal{C}(g)$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is simply the convex hull of the set $g^{[\mathbb{Z}]}$ of iterates of g and its inverse. Definable functions in \mathcal{R} are semialgebraic. In particular \mathcal{R} is polynomially bounded, so the growth rank $\text{gr}(\text{id}^2)$ of the square function is maximal in $\text{gr}(\mathcal{G})$. We see that the growth rank $\text{gr}(2\text{id})$ is maximal in $\text{gr}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}) \setminus \{\text{gr}(\text{id}^2)\}$, and that the function

$$\begin{aligned} \{q \in \mathbb{Q} : q < 1\} &\longrightarrow \text{gr}(\mathcal{G}) \setminus \{\text{gr}(\text{id}^2), \text{gr}(2\text{id})\} \\ q &\longmapsto \text{gr}(\text{id} + \text{id}^q) \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism of ordered sets. In other words, the growth rank of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is isomorphic to the rational interval $((-\infty, 1] \cup \{2\}, <)$.

Lemma 2.14. *For $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ with $g \prec f$, we have*

$$fgf^{-1} \prec f.$$

Proof. Set $\delta := fgf^{-1}$. So $\mathcal{C}(\delta) = f\mathcal{C}(g)f^{-1}$. Since $g \prec f$, we have $\mathcal{C}(g) < \max(f, f^{-1})$, whence $\mathcal{C}(\delta) < \max(f, f^{-1})$, i.e. $\delta \prec f$ as claimed. \square

Given $g, h \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, we write

$$g \sim h \quad \text{if and only if} \quad gh^{-1} \prec g.$$

Note that Proposition 2.8 gives

$$g \sim h \implies g \asymp h.$$

Lemma 2.15. *For all $g, h \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, the following are equivalent:*

- a) $g \sim h$
- b) $gh^{-1} \prec h$

- c) $hg^{-1} \prec g$
d) $h \sim g$.

Proof. The equivalences between a and b on the one hand, and c and d on the other follow from Proposition 2.4. Let us show that a and d are equivalent. Assume that $g \sim h$. Set $\delta := hg^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon := gh^{-1}$, so the hypothesis that $g \sim h$ gives $\varepsilon \prec g$, whence $\varepsilon \prec h$. We deduce with Lemma 2.14 that $\delta = h\varepsilon h^{-1} \prec h$, whence $h \sim g$. Switching g and h , we obtain the converse implication $h \sim g \implies g \sim h$. \square

Corollary 2.16. For $g, h \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, we have $g \sim h \iff g^{-1} \sim h^{-1}$.

Lemma 2.17. The relation \sim is an equivalence relation on \mathcal{G}^\neq .

Proof. For all $g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, we have $1 \prec g$ whence $g \sim g$. Lemma 2.15 implies that \sim is symmetric. Let $f, g, h \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ with $f \sim g$ and $g \sim h$. So $f \asymp g \asymp h$. We have $fh^{-1} = (fg^{-1})(gh^{-1})$ where $(fg^{-1}), (gh^{-1}) \prec f$ so $fh^{-1} \prec f$ by Proposition 2.7(b). So $f \sim h$, which shows that \sim is transitive. \square

Given a $g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, we write $\text{go}(g)$ for the equivalence class of g for \sim in \mathcal{G}^\neq . We call $\text{go}(g)$ the *growth order* of g .

Proposition 2.18. For $g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, the set $\text{go}(g)$ is convex.

Proof. Let $f, h \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ with $f \sim g \sim h$ and $j \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ with $f \leq j \leq h$. In view of Corollary 2.16, we may assume that $g > 1$. Consider an $s_0 \in \mathcal{C}(jg^{-1})$. Suppose that $jg^{-1} \geq 1$. Since $hg^{-1} \geq jg^{-1}$, we find by **GOG1** an $h_0 \in \mathcal{C}(hg^{-1})$ with $h_0 \geq s_0$. Now $hg^{-1} \prec g$ so $h_0 < g$, so $s_0 < g$. This shows that $jg^{-1} \prec g$, whence $j \sim g$ in that case. Suppose now that $jg^{-1} \leq 1$. So $1 \leq gj^{-1} \leq gf^{-1}$. But $gf^{-1} \prec g$ so the same arguments for gj^{-1} show that $s_0 < g$, whence $j \sim g$. So $\text{go}(g)$ is convex. \square

We can thus define a linear ordering \leq on the set $\text{go}(\mathcal{G}) := \mathcal{G}^\neq / \sim$ given by

$$\text{go}(f) \leq \text{go}(g) \iff f < g \wedge f \asymp g.$$

We set $\text{go}(1) = \{1\}$ and $\{1\} \leq \text{go}(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$. We also write $f \leq g$ if $\text{go}(f) \leq \text{go}(g)$.

Definition 2.19. We call the linearly ordered set $(\text{go}(\mathcal{G}), \leq)$ the **growth order** of \mathcal{G} .

Lemma 2.20. For $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ and $h \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$f \leq g \iff hfh^{-1} \leq hgh^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad f \sim g \iff hfh^{-1} \sim hgh^{-1}.$$

Proof. Let us prove the second relation. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f \sim g &\iff gf^{-1} \prec g \\ &\iff hgf^{-1}h^{-1} \prec hgh^{-1} && \text{(by Lemma 2.6)} \\ &\iff (hgh^{-1})(hfh^{-1})^{-1} \prec hgh^{-1} \\ &\iff hfh^{-1} \sim hgh^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The first relation then follows from the fact that conjugacy is strictly increasing and bijective. \square

Lemma 2.21. Let $g, h \in \mathcal{G}$ with $g \sim h^{-1}$ or $g \prec h$. Then $[g, h] \prec h$.

Proof. First suppose that $g \sim h^{-1}$. Lemma 2.15 gives $\varepsilon := h^{-1}g \prec h$. Note that $g^{-1} \succ h$, so $g^{-1}\varepsilon \sim g^{-1}$, whence $\delta := g^{-1}\varepsilon g \prec h$. We have

$$[g, h] = g^{-1}\varepsilon h = \delta g^{-1}h$$

where $\delta \prec h$ and $g^{-1}h \prec h$ by Lemma 2.15. We deduce with Proposition 2.7(b) that $[g, h] \prec h$.

Suppose now that $g \prec h$. So $\delta := h^{-1}gh \prec h$. We have

$$[g, h] = g^{-1}h^{-1}gh = g^{-1}\delta \prec h$$

by Proposition 2.7(b). □

Remark 2.22. A notable distinction between our approach and other classical developments of valuation theory on arbitrary ordered groups [31, 19] is that it is first-order. Defining $f \ll g \iff f^{\mathbb{Z}} < \max(g, g^{-1})$ yields a different theory which is insufficient to study inequalities in ordered groups with non-Archimedean centralisers. Of course, if \mathcal{G} has Archimedean centralisers, then \ll and \prec coincide.

2.3 Scaling elements

Recall that $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ denotes an ordered group satisfying **GOG1**.

Definition 2.23. We say that an element $s \in \mathcal{G}^{\neq}$ is **scaling** if $\mathcal{C}(s)$ is Abelian, and for all $f \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f \succ s$, there is a $g \in \mathcal{C}(s)^{\neq}$ with $g \sim f$.

The element g , when it exists, is unique in $\mathcal{C}(s)$, and we denote it by $\mathcal{C}(s)_f$. Indeed, for $h \in \mathcal{C}(s) \setminus \{1\}$, we have $f(hg)^{-1} \succ h \succ f$ by Proposition 2.7(a,b), so hg does not satisfy the conditions.

Definition 2.24. We say that \mathcal{G} has **scaling elements** if for all $\rho \in \text{gr}(\mathcal{G})$, there is an $s \in \rho$ which is scaling.

Proposition 2.25. Let $s \in \mathcal{G}^{\neq}$ such that $(\mathcal{C}(s), \cdot, 1, <)$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{R}, +, 0, <)$. Then s is scaling.

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{G}^{\neq}$ with $f \succ s$. If $f \in \mathcal{C}(s)$, then we are done. Assume that $f \notin \mathcal{C}(s)$ and set

$$h := \sup \{g \in \mathcal{C}(s) : g \leq f\}.$$

For $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}(s) \cap \mathcal{G}^>$, we have

$$\varepsilon^{-1}h, h\varepsilon^{-1} < h < \varepsilon h, h\varepsilon.$$

We deduce that

$$\mathcal{C}(s) \cap \mathcal{G}^< < h^{-1}f < \mathcal{C}(s) \cap \mathcal{G}^>. \tag{2.3}$$

Assume for contradiction that $h^{-1}f \succ f$. We have $h_f \in \mathcal{C}(s)$ so $h \succ f \succ s$. We deduce with Proposition 2.7(a,b) that $h^{-1}f \succ f$. Since $h_f \in \mathcal{C}(s)$ and $f \notin \mathcal{C}(s)$, there are f_0, f_1 which have the same sign, with $f_0 < h^{-1}f < f_1$. By **GOG1**, there are $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{C}(s)$ which have the same sign as well, with $g_0 < h^{-1}f < g_1$. This contradicts (2.3). We deduce that $h^{-1}f \prec f$, i.e. $h \sim f$. □

Lemma 2.26. Assume that $s \in \mathcal{G}^{\neq}$ is scaling. Then for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^{\neq}$ with $f \succ g \succ s$, we have

$$[f, g] \prec f.$$

Proof. If $f \sim g^{-1}$, then this follows from Lemma 2.21. Assume that $f \approx g^{-1}$. Let $t, u \in \mathcal{C}(s)^\neq$ with $t \sim f$ and $u \sim g$. We have $t \approx u^{-1}$ by Proposition 2.18, so Proposition 2.7(b) implies that $t u \asymp t \asymp s$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon &:= t^{-1} g \prec s \\ \delta &:= j u^{-1} \prec s.\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$[f, g] = f^{-1} g^{-1} f g = \varepsilon^{-1} t^{-1} u^{-1} \delta^{-1} \varepsilon t u \delta. \quad (2.4)$$

Now $\delta^{-1} \varepsilon \prec g$ by Proposition 2.7(b), so $\delta^{-1} \varepsilon t u \sim t u$, whence there is a $\iota \prec t u$ with $\delta^{-1} \varepsilon t u = t u \iota$. Recall that t and u commute, so can rewrite (2.4) as

$$[f, g] = \varepsilon^{-1} \iota \delta$$

where $\varepsilon^{-1}, \iota, \delta \prec s$. We deduce with Proposition 2.7(b) that $[f, g] \prec s$, i.e. $[f, g] \prec f$. \square

Proposition 2.27. *Assume that $s \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ is scaling. Then the centraliser of each $f \asymp s$ is commutative.*

Proof. Let $f \asymp s$ and let $g, h \in \mathcal{C}(f)$. Assume for contradiction that $[g, h] \neq 1$. Then, since $[g, h] \in \mathcal{C}(f)$, we have $[g, h] \asymp f$. This contradicts Lemma 2.26. \square

2.4 Growth order groups

Given an ordered group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$, we consider the following axiomatic property

GOG3. \mathcal{G} has scaling elements.

Note that this can be stated as a first-order sentence in the language of ordered groups.

Definition 2.28. *We say that an ordered group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ is a **growth order group** if it satisfies **GOG1**, **GOG2** and **GOG3**.*

We write T_{gog} for the \mathcal{L}_{og} -theory $T_{\text{og}} \cup \{\mathbf{GOG1}, \mathbf{GOG2}, \mathbf{GOG3}\}$. As corollaries of Proposition 2.27, we have:

Corollary 2.29. *Growth order groups are CT-groups. That is, in all growth order groups, the relation $[f, g] = 1$ is transitive, or, equivalently, the centraliser of each non-trivial element is Abelian.*

Corollary 2.30. *Any non-Abelian growth order group has trivial center.*

Corollary 2.31. *Any nilpotent growth order group is Abelian.*

Note that ordered Abelian groups have scaling elements, hence are growth order groups. Non-trivial ordered Abelian groups are exactly the growth order groups of growth rank 1. We do not tackle the difficult problem of general extensions, or even HNN extensions of growth order groups in this paper. A simple extension problem regards the existence of centraliser extensions in relation to scaling elements in growth order groups.

Question 1. Centraliser extensions problem. Let \mathcal{G} be a growth order group. Is there an ordered group extension $\mathcal{G}^* \supseteq \mathcal{G}$ that is a growth order group, such that each $f \in (\mathcal{G}^*)^\neq$ is scaling and that we have $\mathcal{C}(s) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ whenever $s \in \mathcal{G}$ is scaling in \mathcal{G} ?

2.5 Centraliser relations

Proposition 2.32. *Let $s, t \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ be scaling. Let $f \in \mathcal{G}$ with $t \asymp f s f^{-1}$. The function*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi: \mathcal{C}(s) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(t) \\ g &\longmapsto \mathcal{C}(t)_{fgf^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism of ordered groups.

Proof. We have $\mathcal{C}(t) = f\mathcal{C}(s)f^{-1}$ so $fgf^{-1} \asymp t$ for all $g \in \mathcal{C}(s)$, whence Φ is well-defined. We next show that Φ is a morphism. Let $g, h \in \mathcal{C}(s)$. We have $fgf^{-1} \asymp fhf^{-1}$ by Lemma 2.6. Let ε, δ with $\Phi(g) = \varepsilon fgf^{-1}$ and $\Phi(h) \sim fhf^{-1}\delta$, so $\varepsilon, \delta \prec fgf^{-1}$.

$$\Phi(g)\Phi(h) = \varepsilon f^{-1}ghf^{-1}\delta \tag{2.5}$$

If $gh = 1$, then $\Phi(g)\Phi(h) = \varepsilon\delta \prec fgf^{-1}$. But $\Phi(g)\Phi(h) \in \mathcal{C}(t)$, so $\Phi(g)\Phi(h) = 1 = \Phi(gh)$. Otherwise $gh \asymp t \asymp g \asymp h$ so $fgf^{-1} \asymp fghf^{-1}$. In view of (2.5), we have $\Phi(g)\Phi(h) \sim f^{-1}ghf^{-1}$, whence $\Phi(g)\Phi(h) = \Phi(gh)$. Thus Φ is a group morphism. For $g \in \mathcal{C}(s)^\gt$, we have $fgf^{-1} > 1$ and $\Phi(g) \sim fgf^{-1}$, whence $\Phi(g) > 1$. So Φ is strictly increasing. Finally, let $u \in \mathcal{C}(t)$. We have $u = fwf^{-1}$ for a certain $w \in \mathcal{C}(f^{-1}tf)$. We have $w \asymp s$, so since s is scaling, we find a $g \in \mathcal{C}(s)$ with $g \sim w$. Lemma 2.20 gives $fgf^{-1} \sim u$, whence $\Phi(g) = \mathcal{C}(t)_{fgf^{-1}} = u$. This concludes the proof. \square

Taking $f = 1$ in the previous proposition, we obtain:

Corollary 2.33. *Let $s_0, s_1 \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ be scaling with $s_0 \asymp s_1$. There is a canonical isomorphism $\varphi_{s_0, s_1}: (\mathcal{C}(s_0), \cdot, 1, <) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{C}(s_1), \cdot, 1, <)$.*

Fix a $\rho \in \text{gr}(\mathcal{G})$ and consider the set

$$\mathcal{C}_\rho := \{\text{go}(f) : \text{gr}(f) = \rho \vee f = 1\}.$$

Recall that (\mathcal{C}_ρ, \leq) is linearly ordered. For all $\text{go}(f), \text{go}(g) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$, we set

$$\text{go}(f) + \text{go}(g) := \text{go}(fg) \quad \text{if } \text{gr}(fg) = \rho, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{go}(f) + \text{go}(g) := \text{go}(1) \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

Lemma 2.34. *The structure $(\mathcal{C}_\rho, +, \text{go}(1), \leq)$ is an ordered Abelian group. Moreover, given a scaling element s in \mathcal{G} , the function $\varphi_s: \mathcal{C}(s) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{gr}(s)}; f \mapsto \text{go}(f)$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. The operation $+: \mathcal{C}_\rho \times \mathcal{C}_\rho \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_\rho$ is well-defined. For $\text{go}(h) \in \mathcal{C}_\rho$ where $\text{gr}(h) = \rho$, since s is scaling, there is a unique $f \in \mathcal{C}(s)$ with $h \sim f$, whence $\text{go}(f) = \text{go}(h)$. So φ_s is surjective. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{C}(s)$. We have $fg = 1 \iff fg \prec f \iff \text{gr}(fg) < \rho$. So $\text{go}(fg) = \text{go}(f) + \text{go}(g)$. If $1 < f$, then $1 \leq f$, so $\text{go}(1) \leq \text{go}(f)$. Altogether this shows that φ_s is an isomorphism between the \mathcal{L}_{og} -structures $(\mathcal{C}(s), \cdot, 1, <)$ and $(\mathcal{C}_\rho, +, \text{go}(1), \leq)$. In particular, the latter is an ordered Abelian group. \square

We call the ordered family of linearly ordered Abelian groups $(\mathcal{C}_\rho)_{\rho \in \text{gr}(\mathcal{G})}$ the *skeleton* of \mathcal{G} . If \mathcal{H} is a growth order group and $\Phi: \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is an ordered group homomorphism, then we have a well-defined nondecreasing map

$$\Phi_{\text{gr}}: \text{gr}(\mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow \text{gr}(\mathcal{H}); \text{gr}(g) \longmapsto \text{gr}(\Phi(g))$$

and for each $\rho \in \text{gr}(\mathcal{G})$, an ordered group homomorphism

$$\Phi_\rho: \mathcal{C}_\rho \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\Phi_{\text{gr}}(\rho)}; \text{go}(f) \longmapsto \text{go}(\Phi(f)).$$

One can see that the skeleton thus defines a functor from the category of growth order groups to the category of families of linearly ordered Abelian groups indexed by linearly ordered sets, with the expected morphisms. We say more on the general structure of growth order group in the next subsection.

2.6 On the structure of growth order groups

Contrary to the theory of ordered Abelian groups, the theory T_{og} of all ordered groups does not have a model completion. We do not know whether that is the case for T_{gog} , which we do not think $\forall\exists$ -axiomatisable. In fact, we do not know whether T_{gog} has the amalgamation property.

Question 2. Amalgamation problem. Does T_{gog} have the amalgamation property?

Any ordered group is [28, Theorem 1] a quotient by a convex normal subgroup of an ordered free group. However that description is far from being as precise and concrete as the Hahn embedding theorem [21] (see [20, Theorem 4.C]) for Abelian ordered groups, which construes them as lexicographically ordered groups of formal commutative series with real coefficients. We expect that a similar description may exist for the theory of growth order groups, as we next explain.

Let \mathcal{G} be a growth order group, and let \mathcal{S} be a set of unique scaling representatives in each growth rank in \mathcal{G} . For each $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $c = \text{go}(g) \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{gr}(\mathfrak{s})}^\neq$, we set $\mathfrak{s}^{[c]} := \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})_g \in \mathcal{G}$. We also write $\mathfrak{s}^{[0]} := 1$. Given $f = f_0 \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$, there are a unique $\mathfrak{s}_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathfrak{s}_0 \asymp f$ and a unique $c_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{gr}(f)}$ with $f_0 \sim \mathfrak{s}_0^{[c_0]}$. Define

$$f_1 := \mathfrak{s}_0^{[-c_0]} f_0. \quad (2.6)$$

Reiterating the process for f_1 if $f_1 \neq 1$ and continuing further, we obtain an $\ell \leq \omega$, a strictly \prec -decreasing sequence $(\mathfrak{s}_n)_{n < \ell}$ in \mathcal{S} and a sequence $(c_n)_{n < \ell} \in \prod_{n < \ell} \mathcal{C}_{\text{gr}(\mathfrak{s}_n)}$ with

$$f \approx \mathfrak{s}_0^{[c_0]} \mathfrak{s}_1^{[c_1]} \mathfrak{s}_2^{[c_2]} \dots \mathfrak{s}_n^{[c_n]} \dots,$$

in the sense that $f (\mathfrak{s}_0^{[c_0]} \mathfrak{s}_1^{[c_1]} \mathfrak{s}_2^{[c_2]} \dots \mathfrak{s}_n^{[c_n]})^{-1} \prec \mathfrak{s}_n$ whenever $n < \ell$. If $\ell = \omega$, then there may exist several elements of \mathcal{G}^\neq with the same expansion as f (consider for instance an ultrapower of \mathcal{G}), so a full description of f entails extending this process inductively, and making arbitrary choices. This points to the existence of an embedding of \mathcal{G} into an ordered group of formal non-commutative series

$$\mathfrak{g}_0^{[c_0]} \mathfrak{g}_1^{[c_1]} \dots \mathfrak{g}_\gamma^{[c_\gamma]} \dots, \gamma < \lambda \quad (2.7)$$

where λ is an ordinal, the sequence $(\mathfrak{g}_\gamma)_{\gamma < \lambda} \in \text{gr}(\mathcal{G})^\lambda$ is strictly decreasing, and $(c_\gamma)_{\gamma < \lambda} \in \prod_{\gamma < \lambda} \mathcal{C}_{\text{gr}^\gamma}$. In other words, it is conceivable that there be a non-commutative version of the Hahn embedding theorem for growth order groups.

The construction of such an ordered group (let alone embedding) seems difficult in general, as defining the group operation on such non-commutative series requires additional information. Moreover, several issues that are absent in the Abelian case appear here.

First, the choice in (2.6) of expanding f systematically on the right is arbitrary. One could expand f on the left, or even alternate choices. Indeed, given an infinite limit ordinal κ and a function $N : \kappa \rightarrow \{\text{left}, \text{right}\}$, one may expand f on the side prescribed by $N(\gamma)$ at each stage $\gamma < \kappa$. This induces a linear ordering on κ which we call tree-like. How can one describe series with tree-like support?

Secondly, studying examples of groups of transseries shows that in certain cases, extending \mathcal{G} with transfinite expansions as in (2.7) forces the existence of growth ranks that are not comparable to elements in \mathcal{G} . More precisely, in certain cases, there are series $s := \mathfrak{g}_0^{[c_0]} \mathfrak{g}_1^{[c_1]} \dots \mathfrak{g}_\gamma^{[c_\gamma]} \dots$ and elements $\mathfrak{g} \in \text{gr}(\mathcal{G})$ such that the growth rank of $s \mathfrak{g} s^{-1}$ should lie in an unfilled cut in $(\text{gr}(\mathcal{G}), \prec)$. Thus an embedding theorem if it exists must involve constraints on the skeleton of \mathcal{G} .

Question 3. Embedding problem. Given a linearly ordered set $(I, <)$ and a family $(\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I}$ of Abelian ordered groups, under what conditions can one define a group law $*$ on the set $\mathbf{H}_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$ of functions $f \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$ with anti-well-ordered support $\text{supp } f = \{i \in I : f(i) \neq 0_{\mathcal{C}_i}\}$, ordered lexicographically, such that

- the ordered group $(\mathbf{H}_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i, *, 1, <)$ is a growth order group with growth rank $(I, <)$ and skeleton $(\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I}$, and
- for all growth order groups \mathcal{G} with growth skeleton $\simeq (\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I}$, there is an embedding of ordered groups $\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$?

Our first step toward answering this question will be to show that certain naturally occurring growth order groups are instances of such structures $(\mathbf{H}_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i, *, 1, <)$. This will include groups of series in real powers x^r of a variable x and real exponents (see [6, Section 1.2.5]), logarithmic-exponential transseries [16], and finitely nested hyperseries [5]. Before doing that, we study in a consecutive but independent article [7] transfinite expansions in (unordered) groups, i.e. we propose an axiomatic framework for considering linearly ordered transfinite products in groups, including products along tree-like orderings (see [7, Sections 1.4 and 6.4]). It turns out that such a framework is consistent and gives natural representations of transseries as transfinite compositions of simple transseries. We will then construct the ordered groups $(\mathbf{H}_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i, *, 1, <)$, study their features as growth order groups, and finally tackle the embedding problem.

3 Constructions of growth ordered groups

In this section, we give methods for constructing growth order groups, given growth order groups with additional information. Let us start with a large example.

Example 3.1. We constructed [5] an ordered field of formal series $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ equipped with a composition law $\circ : \tilde{\mathbb{L}} \times \tilde{\mathbb{L}}^{>\mathbb{R}} \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ such that $(\tilde{\mathbb{L}}^{>\mathbb{R}}, \circ, <)$ is a growth order group [5, Propositions 9.23 and 10.25] with Archimedean centralisers [5, Proposition 10.24]. These properties of $(\tilde{\mathbb{L}}^{>\mathbb{R}}, \circ, <)$ are deduced from the fact [5, Theorem 10.16] that any two f, g positive elements of that group are conjugate.

3.1 Direct products not allowed

We consider the notable fact that the quality of growth order group is *not* preserved under direct products in the following sense:

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ be two non-trivial growth order groups, one of which is non-Abelian. Let \blacktriangleleft be an ordering on the direct product $\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2$ such that the natural inclusions*

$$\mathcal{G}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2; f \mapsto (f, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2; g \mapsto (1, g)$$

*are strictly increasing. Then $(\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2, \cdot, (1, 1), \blacktriangleleft)$ does not satisfy **GOG2**.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $(\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2, \cdot, (1, 1), \blacktriangleleft)$ satisfies **GOG2**. We may assume without loss of generality that \mathcal{G}_1 is not Abelian. Since \mathcal{G}_1 is a growth order group, it must have rank at least 2. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\neq}$ with $f \neq g$ in \mathcal{G}_1 . So $(f, 1) \neq (g, 1)$ in $\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2$. Therefore, there exists an $h \in \mathcal{G}_2^{\neq}$ such that $(f, 1) \neq (1, h)$ or $(g, 1) \neq (1, h)$. We may assume without loss of generality that $(f, 1) \neq (1, h)$, and we may choose both f and h to be strictly positive. If $(f, 1) \succ (1, h)$, then **GOG2** in $\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2$ gives the contradiction that

$$(1, h) = (f, 1) (1, h) (f^{-1}, 1) > (1, h).$$

Otherwise $(f, 1) \prec (1, h)$, which gives the symmetric contradiction that $(f, 1) > (f, 1)$. \square

Since **GOG2** is a universal statement, the ordered group $(\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2, \cdot, (1, 1), \blacktriangleleft)$ does not embed into any growth order group. In particular, larger ordered Cartesian products $\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i$ of families $(\mathcal{G}_i)_{i \in I}$ satisfying the \mathcal{L}_{og} -embedding conditions $\mathcal{G}_i \hookrightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i$ for each summand cannot be growth order groups.

We will next define orderings on certain Cartesian products $\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2$ which do yield growth order groups, but the group structure on $\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2$ will not be the direct product.

3.2 Semidirect products

Let $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ and $(G, +, 0, <)$ be linearly ordered group. For clarity, we will use additive denotation for G , but we do not assume that $(G, +, 0)$ is Abelian. Let a morphism $\rho: (\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(G, +, 0)$ be given with the following properties:

MGA1. Each $\rho(g), g \in \mathcal{G}$ is strictly increasing.

MGA2. For $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f < g$ and $a \in G^>$ we have $\rho(f)(a) < \rho(g)(a)$.

So ρ is a strictly increasing group morphism between \mathcal{G} and the partially ordered group of \mathcal{L}_{og} -automorphisms of G , ordered by universal pointwise comparison of functions. For $(g, a) \in \mathcal{G} \times G$, we set

$$g * a := \rho(g)(a).$$

We consider the lexicographically ordered semidirect product $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$, i.e. the Cartesian product $\mathcal{G} \times G$ equipped with the operation

$$\forall (f, a), (g, b) \in \mathcal{G} \times G, (f, a) \cdot (g, b) := (fg, (f * a) + b),$$

and the lexicographic ordering

$$\forall (g, a), (h, b) \in \mathcal{G} \times G, (g, a) < (h, b) \iff (g < h \text{ or } (g = h \text{ and } a < b)).$$

Proposition 3.3. *The structure $(\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G, \cdot, (1, 0), <)$ is an ordered group, and the functions*

$$G \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G; a \mapsto (1, a) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G; f \mapsto (f, 0)$$

are embeddings.

Proof. The lexicographic ordering is linear, so we need only show that $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ is an ordered group. Assume that $(g, b) > (h, c)$. If $g > h$, then $fg > gh$ and $gf > hf$, so $(f, a) \cdot (g, b) > (f, a) \cdot (h, c)$ and $(g, b) \cdot (f, a) > (h, c) \cdot (f, a)$. Otherwise $g = h$ and $b > c$, so $f * b > f * c$, whence

$$(f, a) \cdot (g, b) = (fh, f * b + a) > (fh, f * c + a) = (f, a) \cdot (h, c).$$

Likewise $f * a + b > f * a + c$ so

$$(g, b) \cdot (f, a) = (hf, f * a + b) > (hf, f * a + c) = (h, c) \cdot (f, a).$$

This shows that $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ is an ordered group. We have natural embeddings $G \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ and $\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ given by $a \mapsto (1, a)$ and $g \mapsto (g, 0)$ respectively. \square

We consider the two further conditions on (\mathcal{G}, G) :

MGA3. For all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $b \in G$, for sufficiently large $g' \in \mathcal{C}(g)$, there is a $b' \in G$ with

$$g * b' + b = g' * b + b'.$$

MGA4. For all $a \in G$, $f \in \mathcal{G}^>$ and $b \in G^>$, we have

$$f * b > a + b - a.$$

$$g \circ f' \circ g^{\text{inv}} \circ f_0 = g' \circ f_0 \circ g'^{\text{inv}} \circ f'$$

Remark 3.4. Let $(g, b) \in (\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G)^{\neq}$. For $(f, a) \in \mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$, we have $(f, a) \cdot (g, b) = (g, b) \cdot (f, a)$ if and only if

$$fg = gf \quad \text{and} \quad f * b + a = g * a + b.$$

The first condition means that $f \in \mathcal{C}(g)$. Now given $h \in \mathcal{C}(g)^>$ sufficiently large, by **MGA3**, there is an $a \in G$ with $g * a - a = h * b - b$, hence $(h, a) \in \mathcal{C}(g, b)$.

Remark 3.5. If G is Abelian, then **MGA4** follows from **MGA2**.

Remark 3.6. The condition **MGA4** implies in particular that each $\rho(g)$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}^{\neq}$ is an outer automorphism of G .

Proposition 3.7. *If \mathcal{G} and G are growth order groups, then so is $(\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G, \cdot, (1, 0), <)$.*

Proof. We first prove **GOG1**. Let $(f, a), (g, b) \in \mathcal{G}^>$ with $(f, a) > (g, b)$, and let $(g', b') \in \mathcal{C}(g, b)$. Assume first that $g = 1$, so $b > 1$. Assume for contradiction that $g' > 1$. then we have $(g', g' * b + b') = (g', b') \cdot (1, b) = (1, b) \cdot (g', b') = (g', b' + b)$, so $g' * b = b' + b - b'$. But this contradicts **MGA4**. If $g' < 1$, then $(f, a) > (g', b')$. So we may assume that $g' = 1$. If $f > 1$, then $(f, a) > (g', b')$. Otherwise, we must have $f = 1$ and thus $a > b$. Now **GOG1** in G gives an $a' \in \mathcal{C}(a)$ with $a' > b'$, whence $(1, a') \in \mathcal{C}(1, a)$ and $(1, a') > (1, b')$.

We now treat the case when $g > 1$. We have $g' \in \mathcal{C}(g)$ where $f \geq g$, so by **GOG1** in \mathcal{G} there is an $f' \in \mathcal{C}(f)$ with $f' \geq g'$. In view of Remark 3.4, we may choose f' sufficiently large so that $f' > g'$ and that there be an $a' \in G$ with $(f', a') \in \mathcal{C}(f, a)$. We have $(f', a') > (g', b')$, hence **GOG1** holds in $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$.

Let $(g, b), (f, a) \in \mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ with $(f, a) > \mathcal{C}(g, b)$ and $(g, b) > (1, 0)$. Assume that $g = 1$, so $b > 0$ and $f \geq 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (f, a) \cdot (1, b) \cdot (f, a)^{-1} &= (f, a) \cdot (1, b) \cdot (f^{-1}, f^{-1} * (-a)) \\ &= (1, f * (f^{-1} * (-a) + b) + a) \\ &= (1, (-a) + f * b + a). \end{aligned}$$

If $f = 1$, then the condition $(1, a) > \mathcal{C}(1, b)$ amounts to $a > \mathcal{C}(b)$, so **GOG2** in G gives $(-a) + b + a > b$. That is,

$$(f, a) \cdot (1, b) \cdot (f, a)^{-1} > (1, b).$$

If $f > 1$, then **MGA4** gives $(-a) + f * b + a > b$, whence again $(f, a) \cdot (1, b) \cdot (f, a)^{-1} > (1, b)$.

Assume now that $g > 1$. So we must have $f > \mathcal{C}(g)$, whence $fgf^{-1} > g$ by **GOG2** in \mathcal{G} . This implies that $(f, a) \cdot (g, b) \cdot (f, a)^{-1} > (g, b)$. Therefore **GOG2** is satisfied.

We now prove **GOG3**. Let $(g, b) \in \mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ with $(g, b) \neq (1, 0)$ and let $(f, a) \asymp (g, b)$. If $g = 1$, then we must have $f = 1$ and $a \asymp b$ in G . Given a scaling $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{D}(G)$ with $\mathfrak{s} \asymp b$, we see that $(1, \mathfrak{s})$ is scaling in $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ with $(1, \mathfrak{s}) \asymp (f, a)$. If $g \neq 1$, then we must have $f \asymp g$. Let $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{G})$ with $\mathfrak{t} \asymp g$ and let $u \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ with $u \sim f$. Then $(u, 1) \sim (f, a)$ in $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$, which implies that $(\mathfrak{t}, 1)$ is scaling. So **GOG3** holds in $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$.

This shows that $\mathcal{G} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ is a growth order group. \square

Example 3.8. Positive affine maps. Consider an ordered field $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <)$ and an ordered vector space $(G, +, 0, <, \cdot)$ over K . We have an action ρ of $(K^{>}, \cdot, <)$ on $(G, +, 0, <)$ by scalar multiplication. In other words, we set

$$\rho(\lambda)(a) := \lambda \cdot a$$

for all $\lambda \in K^{>}$ and $a \in G$. Then $K^{>} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ is naturally isomorphic to the group of strictly increasing affine functions $K \rightarrow G; x \mapsto \lambda \cdot x + a$ for $(\lambda, a) \in K^{>} \times G$, under composition, and where the ordering is given by

$$(x \mapsto \lambda \cdot x + a) > x \quad \text{and if and only if} \quad \lambda \cdot b + a > b \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } b \in G.$$

The axioms **MGA1** and **MGA2** follow from the fact that $(G, +, 0, <, \cdot)$ is an ordered vector space over K . We write $\text{Aff}_K^+(G)$ for the ordered group $K^{>} \rtimes_{\rho} G$ given by Proposition 3.3.

Since $(G, +, 0)$ is Abelian, the axiom **MGA4** is satisfied. Finally, for all $\lambda, \lambda' \in K^{>}$ with $\lambda > 1$ and $a \in G$, we have $\rho(\lambda)(a) - a = \rho(\lambda - 1)(a)$ so $\rho(\lambda')(b) = \rho(\lambda)(a) - a$ for $b := \frac{\lambda - 1}{\lambda'} \cdot a \in G$. In particular, the axiom **MGA3** holds. Therefore $\text{Aff}_K^+(G)$ is a growth order group.

3.3 Quotients

It is known (see [19, Section 1.4] or [30, §4 (1–2) p 260]) that given an ordered group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ and a normal and convex subgroup $N \triangleleft \mathcal{G}$, the relation

$$gN < hN \iff gN < hN \tag{3.1}$$

makes $(\mathcal{G}/N, \cdot, N, <)$ an ordered group.

Lemma 3.9. [30, §4 (1) p 260] *The quotient map $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/N$ is an ordered group homomorphism.*

Moreover, the ordering on \mathcal{G} is the only one which induces the orderings on \mathcal{G}/N and N , i.e. we have

$$\mathcal{G}^{>} = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : (gN > N) \vee (g \in N^{>})\}. \tag{3.2}$$

When the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/N \rightarrow 0$ splits, and given a complement H of N in \mathcal{G} , we have an ordered group isomorphism $\mathcal{G} \simeq \mathcal{G}/N \rtimes_{\rho} N$ for the morphism $\rho: \mathcal{G}/N \rightarrow \text{Aut}(N)$ given by

$$\forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \forall f \in N, \rho(gN)(f) := h f h^{-1}$$

for the unique $h \in H \cap gN$, and where $\mathcal{G}/N \rtimes_{\rho} N$ is lexicographically ordered.

We shall now adapt these ideas to the case of growth order groups. If we want that N and \mathcal{G}/N both be growth ordered groups, we have to impose further conditions on (\mathcal{G}, N) . This leads to the following definition:

Definition 3.10. *Let \mathcal{G} be a growth order group. A \preccurlyeq -initial subgroup of \mathcal{G} is a non-empty subset $N \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ with*

$$\forall f \in N, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, g \preccurlyeq f \implies g \in N.$$

That an \preccurlyeq -initial subgroup is indeed a subgroup follows from Proposition 2.7(a,b,d). For the sequel of Section 3.3, we fix a growth order group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ and a normal and \preccurlyeq -initial subgroup $N \subseteq \mathcal{G}$.

Proposition 3.11. *The ordered subgroup N is a growth order group which is convex in \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. That N is convex follows from Proposition 2.10. Let us show that N is a growth order group. Let $f, g \in N^>$ with $f \geq g$ and let $g' \in \mathcal{C}(g) \cap N^>$. By **GOG1** in \mathcal{G} , there is an $f' \in \mathcal{C}(f)$ with $f' \geq g'$. But $f' \prec f$ so $f' \in N$, so **GOG1** holds in N . The universal sentence **GOG2** trivially holds in N . Let $\text{gr}(f) \in \text{gr}(N^\neq)$, and let $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{G})$ with $\mathfrak{s} \prec f$. By \prec -initiality of N , we have $\mathfrak{s} \in N$, whence $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{D}(N)$. So N satisfies **GOG3**, hence N is a growth order group. \square

Proposition 3.12. *Assume that the following holds*

$$\forall f, g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus N, [f, g] \in N \implies f \asymp g. \quad (3.3)$$

Then \mathcal{G}/N , with the ordering given by (3.1), is a growth order group.

Proof. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $fN > gN > N$. In particular $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^>$ and $f \geq g$. Let $g'N \in \mathcal{C}(gN)$, so $[g', g] \in N$. We have $g' \asymp g$ by (3.3). By **GOG1** in \mathcal{G} , there is an $f' \in \mathcal{C}(f)$ with $f' \geq g'$, hence $f'N$ is larger than fN in \mathcal{G}/N . We have $[f', f] = 1 \in N$ so $f'N \in \mathcal{C}(fN)$. This shows that **GOG1** holds in \mathcal{G}/N .

We next derive **GOG2**. Let $f, g > N$ with $(fN) \succ (gN)$. We have $\mathcal{C}(g)N \subseteq \mathcal{C}(gN)$, so $fN > \mathcal{C}(g)N$, which is equivalent to $f > \mathcal{C}(g)N$. In particular, we have $f > \mathcal{C}(g)$, so $f^{-1} \succ g^{-1}$. By (3.3), we obtain $[f^{-1}, g^{-1}] \notin N$. But $[f^{-1}, g^{-1}] > 1$ by **GOG2** in \mathcal{G} , so $[f^{-1}, g^{-1}] > N$. That is, we have $fgf^{-1}N > gN$, whence **GOG2** holds in \mathcal{G}/N .

Finally, let $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus N$. Let $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{G})$ with $\mathfrak{s} \asymp g$, and let $f \in \mathcal{G}$ with $(fN) \asymp (gN)$ in \mathcal{G}/N . From (3.3), we deduce that there are $g', g'' \in \mathcal{C}(g)$ with $g' \leq f \leq g''$. This implies that $f \asymp g$, so there is a $t \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})$ with $t \sim f$. We have $tN \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s}N)$ and $(fN)(tN)^{-1} = (ft^{-1})N \prec fN$. We claim that $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s}N) = \{uN : u \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})\}$. Indeed, let $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $gN \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s}N)$, so $[g, \mathfrak{s}] \in N$. We have $g \asymp \mathfrak{s}$ so there is a $t \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})$ with $g \sim t$. Writing $\delta := t^{-1}g$, we have

$$[g, \mathfrak{s}] = \delta^{-1}t^{-1}\mathfrak{s}^{-1}t\delta\mathfrak{s} = [\delta, \mathfrak{s}] \in N.$$

Since $\delta \prec \mathfrak{s}$, we deduce with (3.3) that $\delta \in N$, so $gN = tN$ as claimed. The group subgroup $\{uN : u \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})\}$ is Abelian, so this means that $\mathfrak{s}N$ is scaling in \mathcal{G}/N , whence \mathcal{G}/N satisfies **GOG3**. \square

Given two linearly ordered sets $(A, <)$ and $(B, <)$, we write $A \amalg B$ for the disjoint union $A \times \{0\} \sqcup B \times \{1\}$ ordered so that $A \times \{0\} < B \times \{1\}$ and that $a \mapsto (a, 0)$ and $b \mapsto (b, 1)$ are ordered embeddings $A \rightarrow A \amalg B$ and $B \rightarrow A \amalg B$ respectively.

Proposition 3.13. *Assume that (3.3) holds. We have an isomorphism of ordered sets*

$$\Phi: \text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}^\neq) \longrightarrow \text{gr}_N(N^\neq) \amalg \text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}/N}(\mathcal{G}/N)$$

defined for $g \in \mathcal{G}^{\neq 1}$ by $\Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(g)) := \text{gr}(gN)$ if $g \notin N$ and $\Phi(g) = \text{gr}_N(g)$ if $g \in N$.

Proof. We first show that Φ is well-defined. Let $g, h \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ with $f \asymp g$. If $g \notin N$, then we have $g \succ N$, and $hN \asymp gN$ by Lemma 3.9, whence $\Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(g))$ is well defined. If $g \in N$, then $h \in N$. Since N is \prec -initial, it contains the centralisers of all its elements, so $\text{gr}_N(g) = \text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(g) = \text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(h) = \text{gr}_N(h)$, whence Φ is well-defined. It is clear that Φ is surjective.

Now let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f \prec g$. We want to prove that $\Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(f)) < \Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(g))$. If $f \notin N$ and $g \notin N$, then $\text{gr}(fN) < \text{gr}(gN)$ by Lemma 3.9. So $\Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(f)) = \text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}/N}(f) < \text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}/N}(g) = \Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(g))$. If $f \in N$ and $g \notin N$, then $f \prec g$ and $\Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(f)) < \Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(g))$ by definition. If $f, g \in N$, then $\Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(f)) = \text{gr}_N(f) < \text{gr}_N(g) = \Phi(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(g))$. This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 3.14. *Assume that (3.3) holds. Assume further that N has a complement H in \mathcal{G} . Then the function*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_H: H &\longrightarrow \text{Aut}(N) \\ gN &\longmapsto (f \mapsto h f h^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

satisfies **MGA1–MGA4**.

Proof. Recall that the natural isomorphism $H \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}/N$ preserves the ordering. We deduce with Proposition 3.12 that H is a growth order group. That **MGA1** is satisfied follows from the fact that \mathcal{G} is an ordered group.

For $h_1, h_2 \in H$ with $h_1 < h_2$, and $f \in N^>$, we have $h_1^{-1} h_2 > N$, whence $h_1^{-1} h_2 \succ f$, whence $(h_1^{-1} h_2) f (h_1^{-1} h_2)^{-1} > f$ by **GOG2** in \mathcal{G} . Therefore $\rho_H(h_2)(f) > \rho_H(h_1)(f)$, hence **MGA2** holds.

Consider a $g = fh \in NH$. Recall that the sequence $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/N \rightarrow 0$ splits and that we have a natural group isomorphism $H \rtimes_{\rho_H} N \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(g) &= \{f' h' \in NH : (h' h, \rho_H(h')(f) f') = (h h', \rho_H(h)(f') f)\} \\ &= \{f' h' \in N (H \cap \mathcal{C}(h)) : \rho_H(h')(f) f' = \rho_H(h)(f') f\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $h_0 \in \mathcal{C}(h)$. Then since $g^2 \geq h$, **GOG1** in \mathcal{G} yields an $f' h' \in \mathcal{C}(g^2) = \mathcal{C}(g)$ with $f' h' \geq h_0$. Choosing h_0 sufficiently large, we may impose $h_0 = h'$, whence $f' h_0 \in \mathcal{C}(g)$. We deduce that **MGA3** is satisfied.

Finally, let $f \in N$, $h \in H^>$ and $g \in N^>$. We have $f^{-1} h \succ h \succ g$, so **GOG2** gives

$$(f^{-1} h) g (f^{-1} h)^{-1} > g,$$

whence $\rho_H(h)(g) > f g f^{-1}$. So **MGA4** holds as well. \square

3.4 Growth order groups of finite growth rank

We fix a non-trivial growth order group \mathcal{G} such that $\text{gr}(\mathcal{G})$ has a maximal element $\text{gr}(g)$, and let $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{G})$ with $\mathfrak{s} \asymp g$. Let $\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$ denote the subset of elements $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $g \prec \mathfrak{s}$.

Proposition 3.15. *The set $\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$ is a normal and \preceq -initial subgroup of \mathcal{G} . Moreover, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f, g > \mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$, we have $[f, g] \in \mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}} \implies f \asymp g$.*

Proof. The set $\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$ contains 1 since $n > 0$. It is \preceq -initial by definition. Given $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $f, g > \mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$, we must have $f \asymp \mathfrak{s} \asymp g$. \square

Proposition 3.16. *The subgroup $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})$ is a complement of $\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}} \cap N = \{t \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s}) : t \prec \mathfrak{s}\} = \{1\}$. For $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we either have $g \prec \mathfrak{s}$, and then $g \in \mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$, or $g \asymp \mathfrak{s}$, and then given $t \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})$ with $t \sim g$, we have $g t^{-1} \prec \mathfrak{s}$, whence $g = (g t^{-1}) t \in \mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}} \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})$. Thus $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})$ is a complement of $\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}}$. \square

Thus the sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow 0$ splits, so we have a natural isomorphism

$$\mathcal{G}^{\prec \mathfrak{s}} \rtimes_{\rho_{\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s})}} \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{s}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}.$$

It follows by induction that if $\text{gr}(\mathcal{G}) = \{\mathfrak{g}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{g}_n\}$ is finite with $\mathfrak{g}_1 > \dots > \mathfrak{g}_n$, then \mathcal{G} is an iterated semidirect product

$$\mathcal{G} \simeq (\dots (\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rtimes_{\rho_n} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}_{n-1}}) \rtimes_{\rho_{n-2}} \dots) \rtimes_{\rho_1} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}_n}. \quad (3.4)$$

This can be taken as a conclusion to our discussion in Section 2.6 in the case of finite growth rank, i.e. a positive answer to Question 3 in that case. Note that $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, <)$ has no non-trivial \mathcal{L}_{og} -automorphism. Therefore there is no growth order group of finite growth rank $n > 1$ and skeleton of the form $(\mathbb{Z}, G_2, \dots, G_n)$.

Proposition 3.17. *Let \mathcal{G} be a growth order group of finite growth rank $n > 0$ and let $\mathcal{J} \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{G})^>$ with $\text{gr}(\mathcal{J}) = \min \text{gr}(\mathcal{G}^\neq)$. If $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J})$ is Archimedean, then $n \leq 2$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $n > 2$. Then, using the previous decomposition $n - 3$ times, we may assume that $n = 3$ and let $\mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2 \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{G})^>$ with $\mathcal{J} \prec \mathcal{J}_1 \prec \mathcal{J}_2$. The previous construction gives $\mathcal{G} \simeq \mathcal{G}_1 \rtimes_{\rho_{\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}_2)}} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}_2)$ where

$$\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}) \rtimes_{\rho_{\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}_1)}} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}_1).$$

Set $\sigma := \rho_{\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}_2)}(\mathcal{J}_2) \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G}_1)$. For $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$, the conjugation by g induces a strictly increasing automorphism σ_g of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J})$. Since $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J})$ is Archimedean, its group of strictly increasing automorphisms is Archimedean [23] (see [34, Theorem 1.5.1]). Since $(\mathcal{J}, 1) \prec (1, \mathcal{J}_1)$ in \mathcal{G}_1 , we have $\sigma(\mathcal{J}, 1) \prec \sigma(1, \mathcal{J}_1)$, whence $\sigma(\mathcal{J}, 1) \prec (\mathcal{J}, 1)$. But then $\sigma(\mathcal{J}, 1) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}) \times \{1\}$ as well. By **MGA4**, we have $\sigma(\mathcal{J}, 1) > \sigma_{g^n}(\mathcal{J}, 1)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $\sigma(\mathcal{J}, 1)$ is an infinite element of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}) \times \{1\}$: a contradiction. \square

In particular, there is no growth order group whose growth rank is 3 and whose growth skeleton is $(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Nonetheless, let us construct a growth order group of growth rank 3.

Let \mathcal{G} be the subgroup of $(\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{R}^>}, \circ, x, <)$ generated by $x^{\mathbb{R}^>}$ and $e^{(\log x)^{\mathbb{R}^>}}$. For $r, s \in \mathbb{R}^>$, we have $(e^{(\log x)^s})^{\text{inv}} = e^{(\log x)^{s^{-1}}}$, and

$$e^{(\log x)^s} \circ x^r \circ e^{(\log x)^{s^{-1}}} = x^{r^s},$$

so \mathcal{G} has growth rank 2. One can see that we have a natural isomorphism Ψ from the semi-direct product of $(\mathbb{R}^>, \cdot, 1, <)$ with itself to \mathcal{G} , for the operation

$$\forall r, s \in \mathbb{R}^>, s * r := r^s,$$

The automorphism is given by $\Psi(r, s) = x^r \circ e^{(\log x)^s} = e^{r(\log x)^s}$.

Let \mathbb{G} denote the subgroup of $(\mathbb{T}, +, <)$ of those log-exp transseries f such that each $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{supp } f$ satisfies $\mathfrak{m} > e^{(\log x)^{\mathbb{R}^>}}$. Let $g \in \mathcal{G}^<$ and consider a transmonomial $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathbb{G}$. Then [5, Theorem 7.30] implies that $\mathfrak{m} \circ g$ is a monomial. We have $\mathfrak{m} \circ g > e^{(\log x)^{\mathbb{R}^>}}$ by definition, so $\mathfrak{m} \circ g \in \mathbb{G}$, and we can define a morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \rho: \mathcal{G} &\longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{G}) \\ g &\longmapsto (f \mapsto f \circ g). \end{aligned}$$

We will show that the axioms **MGA1–MGA4** are satisfied for $(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{G}, \rho)$.

Recall that each $\rho(g)$ extends into an isomorphism of ordered rings $\mathbb{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}$, whence in particular it is a strictly increasing automorphism of $(\mathbb{G}, +)$. In particular **MGA1** holds. Every positive element f of \mathbb{G} is positive infinite, so each $\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathbb{G}, g \mapsto f \circ g$ is strictly increasing. This shows that **MGA2** holds. The axiom **MGA4** is automatically satisfied since $(\mathbb{G}, +)$ is Abelian. Consider a $g \in \mathcal{G}^\neq$ and an $f \in \mathbb{G}$, take a $g_1 \in \mathcal{C}(g)$ and set $h := f \circ g_1 - f$. So the relation

$$y \circ g + f = f \circ g_1 + y$$

of **MGA3** can be written as the difference equation

$$y \circ g = h + y. \tag{3.5}$$

Replacing (3.5) with $y \circ g^{\text{inv}} = (-h \circ g^{\text{inv}}) + y$, we may assume that $g < 1$. For all transmonomials m in \mathbb{G} , we have $m \circ g < m$ because $g < x$, so $m \circ g \prec m$. Thus by [25, Theorem 6.2] (see also [5, Proposition 1.25]), the equation (3.5) has a solution

$$y = -h - h \circ g - h \circ g \circ g - h \circ g \circ g \circ g - \dots$$

in \mathbb{G} . In particular, **MGA3** is satisfied. We thus have a growth order group $\mathbb{G} \times_{\rho} \mathcal{G}$ of growth rank

$$\text{gr}(\mathbb{G} \times_{\rho} \mathcal{G}) \simeq \text{gr}(\mathbb{G}) \amalg \text{gr}(\mathcal{G}) \simeq 1 \amalg 2 \simeq 3.$$

3.5 O-minimal germs

Let $\mathcal{M} = (M, \dots)$ be a first-order structure in a language \mathcal{L} . Assume that \mathcal{M} has definable Skolem functions (allowing parameters). This is the case for instance if \mathcal{M} is an o-minimal expansion of an ordered group in a language expanding \mathcal{L}_{og} . Indeed, any o-minimal ordered group it is Abelian and divisible [37]. One can definably and uniformly pick an element in each non-empty interval in M , using affine rational combinations of its bounds.

Let $n > 0$ and let p be a complete n -type in \mathcal{M} over M such that each finite subset of p is realised in \mathcal{M} . Let $p(\mathcal{M}) := \{\varphi(M^n) : \varphi \in p\}$ be the corresponding ultrafilter on the Boolean algebra of definable subsets of M^n . Consider the set \mathcal{F}_n of functions $M^n \rightarrow M$ that are definable in \mathcal{M} with parameters, and the set \mathcal{M}_p of germs at p

$$[f]_p := \{g \in \mathcal{F}_n : \exists X \in p(\mathcal{M}) : f \text{ and } g \text{ coincide on } X\}$$

of such functions. If R is a relation symbol of arity $k \in \mathbb{N}$ in the corresponding language (including as special cases function symbols and constant symbols), then R can be interpreted on \mathcal{M}_p as the well-defined subset

$$\{([f_1], \dots, [f_k]) \in \mathcal{F}_n^k : \exists X \in p(\mathcal{M}), \forall \bar{m} \in M^n, \mathcal{M} \models R[f_1(\bar{m}), \dots, f_n(\bar{m})]\}.$$

Then it is a folklore result that \mathcal{M}_p is an elementary extension of \mathcal{M} , hence also an o-minimal structure, for the natural inclusion $\Psi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_p$ sending $\bar{m}_0 \in M$ to the germ of the constant function $\bar{m} \mapsto \bar{m}_0$. We include a proof based on a version of the Łoś ultraproduct theorem, for completion:

Lemma 3.18. *For all \mathcal{L}_M -formulas $\varphi(v_1, \dots, v_k)$ and all $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{F}_n$, we have*

$$\mathcal{M}_p \models \varphi([f_1], \dots, [f_k]) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \{\bar{m} \in M^n : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(f_1(\bar{m}), \dots, f_k(\bar{m}))\} \in p(\mathcal{M}).$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on the complexity of formulas. If φ is atomic, then this follows from the interpretation of non-logical symbols of \mathcal{L} . Recall that any \mathcal{L}_M -formula is universally equivalent to an \mathcal{L}_M -formula without conjunction symbol or universal quantifier. Therefore it suffices to show the inductive step for negations, conjunctions and existential quantifications of smaller complexity formulas.

Suppose that that $\varphi = \exists v_k \psi(v_0, \dots, v_k)$. For $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$, define

$$X_f := \{\bar{m} \in M^n : \mathcal{M} \models \psi(f_1(\bar{m}), \dots, f_k(\bar{m}), f(\bar{m}))\}.$$

Also write $X = \{m \in M : \mathcal{M} \models \exists v_k \psi(f_1(\bar{m}), \dots, f_k(\bar{m}), v_k)\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_p \models \varphi([f_1], \dots, [f_p]) &\iff \text{there is an } f \in \mathcal{F}_n \text{ with } \mathcal{M}_p \models \psi([f_1], \dots, [f_p], [f]) \\ &\iff \text{there is an } f \in \mathcal{F}_n \text{ with } X_f \in p(\mathcal{M}) \quad (\text{induction hyp.}) \end{aligned}$$

If $X_f \in p(\mathcal{M})$ for some $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$, then since X contains X_f , we have $X \in p(\mathcal{M})$.

Conversely, assume that $X \in p(\mathcal{M})$. Let $\zeta(v_0, \dots, v_k)$ be a formula obtained from defining formulas for f_1, \dots, f_n such that for all $(\bar{m}, m') \in M^n \times M$, the statement $\zeta(\bar{m}, m')$ holds if and only if $\psi(f_1(\bar{m}), \dots, f_k(\bar{m}), m')$ holds. Recall that \mathcal{M} has definable Skolem functions. Thus there is a $g \in \mathcal{F}_n$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \zeta(\bar{m}, g(\bar{m}))$, whence $\mathcal{M} \models \psi(f_1(\bar{m}), \dots, f_p(\bar{m}), g(\bar{m}))$ for all $\bar{m} \in X$. This shows that $X \subseteq X_g$. It follows that $X_g \in p(\mathcal{M})$, as desired.

Suppose that $\varphi = \neg\psi$. Since p is complete and the set

$$\{\bar{m} \in M^n : \mathcal{M} \models \psi(f_1(\bar{m}), \dots, f_k(\bar{m}))\}$$

or its complement lies in $p(\mathcal{M})$. We conclude by the induction hypothesis at ψ .

Finally if $\varphi = \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$, then we use the induction hypothesis at ψ and the fact that $p(\mathcal{M})$ is closed under binary intersections and taking supersets. The statement follows by induction. \square

Corollary 3.19. *The natural inclusion $\Psi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_p$ is an elementary embedding.*

Proof. Let $\varphi(v_1, \dots, v_k)$ be an $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -formula and let $m_1, \dots, m_k \in M$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= \{\bar{m} \in M^n : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\Psi(m_1)(\bar{m}), \dots, \Psi(m_k)(\bar{m}))\} \\ &= \{\bar{m} \in M^n : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(m_1, \dots, m_k)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(m_1, \dots, m_k)$ if and only if $X = M^n$ if and only if $X \neq \emptyset$. Since $M^n \in p(\mathcal{M})$ whereas $\emptyset \notin p(\mathcal{M})$, we deduce with Lemma 3.18, that we have $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(m_1, \dots, m_k)$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}_p \models \varphi(\Psi(m_1), \dots, \Psi(m_k))$. \square

Assume now that \mathcal{L} contains a binary relation symbol $<$ and that $\mathcal{M} = (M, <, \dots)$ is o-minimal. Consider the set p_0 of formulas $m < v_0$, in one free variable v_0 , where m ranges in M . Write p_∞ for the set of consequences in \mathcal{M} of elements of p_0 . For any \mathcal{L} -formula φ with free variable v_0 , the definable set $\varphi(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq M$ or its complement $(\neg\varphi)(\mathcal{M})$ must be unbounded. Since M is o-minimal, one of them must contain a $\psi(\mathcal{M})$ for $\psi \in p_0$. Therefore $\varphi \in p_\infty$ or $\neg\varphi \in p_\infty$, so p_∞ is a complete 1-type over M called the type at infinity. The germ $[f]$ at p of an $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$ is simply its germ at $+\infty$. We write $\mathcal{M}_\infty := \mathcal{M}_{p_\infty}$. The ordering on \mathcal{M}_∞ is given by $[f_0] < [f_1] \iff f_0(m) < f_1(m)$ for all sufficiently large $m \in M$.

Recall by the monotonicity theorem [14, Chapter 3, (1.2)] for o-minimal structures that for any definable function $f : M \longrightarrow M$, there are finitely many open intervals $I = (a, b)$ of M (where $a, b \in M \cup \{\pm\infty\}$) and points $\{a\}$ in M such that f is constant or strictly monotonous on each interval or point. In particular, only one such interval contains a neighbourhood of $+\infty$, so the germ of f is the germ of a constant or strictly monotonous function.

Note that a germ $[f]$ lies above each $m \in M$ under the embedding $\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_\infty$ if and only if f tends to $+\infty$ at $+\infty$. We define $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ as the subset of \mathcal{M}_∞ of germs $[f]$ with $[f] > M$. A germ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ cannot be constant or strictly decreasing, so it is strictly increasing. We write id for the identity function on M , so $[\text{id}] \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Since \mathcal{M} is o-minimal, for any $[f], [g] \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$, there is $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(r, +\infty)$ is a neighbourhood of $+\infty$. We may choose r so that $f(r, +\infty) = (f(r), +\infty)$, and thus f induces a strictly increasing bijection between two neighbourhoods of $+\infty$. Thus the germ of $f \circ g$ lies in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$. Since this germ does not depend on f, g we may define $[f] \circ [g] := [f \circ g]$. Note that $[f] \circ [\text{id}] = [\text{id}] \circ [f] = [f]$. Writing f^{inv} for the inverse of $f : (r, +\infty) \longrightarrow (f(r), +\infty)$, we see that $[f^{\text{inv}}]$ only depends on $[f]$, and we have $[f] \circ [f^{\text{inv}}] = [f^{\text{inv}}] \circ [f] = [\text{id}]$. Thus $(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}, \circ, [\text{id}])$ is a group. Consider the ordering on $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ induced from that on \mathcal{M}_∞ . It is a left-ordering because the germs are strictly increasing. It is a right-ordering by definition. So $(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}, \circ, [\text{id}], <)$ is an ordered group.

This raises the naive question: is $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ always growth order group? The answer is negative. Indeed, it is known [8, Theorem 8] that given any linearly ordered group $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$, the structure $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{G}, <, (t_g)_{g \in \mathcal{G}})$ where each t_g for $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is the unary function $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$; $h \mapsto gh$ eliminates quantifiers and has a universal axiomatisation. In particular, it is o-minimal, and $g \mapsto [t_g]$ is an isomorphism between $(\mathcal{G}, \cdot, 1, <)$ and $(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}, \circ, [\text{id}], <)$. If \mathcal{G} is not a growth order group, then neither is $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$. We may still ask:

Question 4. O-minimal problem. In the case when \mathcal{M} is an expansion of the real ordered field, is $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ a growth order group?

We will leave this question open in the paper, but we will answer it in the positive in a particular case in the next section. We finish this section with a positive answer to the naive question in the case when \mathcal{M} is a pure ordered group:

Example 3.20. Let $\mathcal{M} := (G, +, 0, <)$ be a non-trivial o-minimal ordered group. This is a divisible, Abelian ordered group [37]. It follows that it has Skolem functions (in each non-empty interval in G , one can uniformly and definably pick an affine rational combination of the bounds which lies in the interval). Recall [38] that the \mathcal{L}_{og} -theory T_{daog} of non-trivial divisible Abelian ordered group is complete and has quantifier elimination in \mathcal{L}_{og} . Note that T_{daog} has universal axiomatisation in the extended language $\mathcal{L}_{\text{doag}} := \langle \cdot, 1, <, \text{Inv}, (\mu_q)_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \rangle$ where each unary function symbol μ_q , $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ is interpreted as the scalar multiplication $x \mapsto q \cdot x$. This implies that the germ at $+\infty$ of each definable function $G \rightarrow G$ is that of a unary term in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{doag}}$. So each germ is the germ of some function

$$G \rightarrow G; x \mapsto q \cdot x + y$$

where $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $y \in G$ are fixed. In other words, the ordered group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is isomorphic to the growth order group $\text{Aff}_{\mathbb{Q}}^+(G)$ of Example 3.8.

4 H-fields with composition

We recall (see [1, 2]) that an *H-field* is an ordered valued field $(K, +, \times, 0, 1, <, \mathcal{O})$ with valuation ring \mathcal{O} and maximal ideal thereof \mathfrak{o} , equipped with a derivation $\partial: K \rightarrow K$ such that the two following conditions are satisfied:

HF1. $\forall a \in \mathcal{O}, \exists c \in \text{Ker}(\partial), a - c \in \mathfrak{o}$.

HF2. $\forall a \in K, a > \text{Ker}(\partial) \implies \partial(a) > 0$.

We usually denote the kernel $\text{Ker}(\partial)$ by C . This is a subfield of K called the *field of constants*. If C is isomorphic to \mathbb{R} , then the condition **HF1** is automatically satisfied, taking c as the supremum in C of the set $\{b \in C : b \leq a\}$. We write $K^{>C}$ for the set of elements of K with $a > c$ for all $c \in C$.

In accordance with the Landau notations in real analysis, we write $\mathcal{O}(a)$ and $\mathfrak{o}(a)$ respectively for the sets $\mathcal{O}a = \{\delta a : \delta \in \mathcal{O}\}$ and $\mathfrak{o}a = \{\varepsilon a : \varepsilon \in \mathfrak{o}\}$. So $\mathcal{O}(1) = \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathfrak{o}(1) = \mathfrak{o}$.

For $a \in K^\times$, we write

$$a^\dagger := \frac{a'}{a} \in K.$$

Note that $(ab)^\dagger = a^\dagger + b^\dagger$ and $(ca)^\dagger = a^\dagger$ for all $b \in K^\times$ and $c \in C^\times$. We have the following important valuative inequality of [1, Lemma 1.1]:

$$\forall a, b \in \mathfrak{o}, b' \in \mathfrak{o}(a^\dagger). \tag{4.1}$$

4.1 H-fields with composition

We now expand H-fields with a composition law.

Definition 4.1. An **H-field with composition** (over $C = \text{Ker}(\partial)$) is an H-field $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <, \mathcal{O}, \partial)$ with a fixed $x \in K^{>C}$ with $x' = 1$, equipped with a binary operation

$$\circ : K \times K^{>C} \longrightarrow K$$

satisfying the following conditions:

HFC1. For all $b \in K^{>C}$, the function $K \longrightarrow K$; $a \mapsto a \circ b$ is a C -linear morphism of ordered rings.

HFC2. For all $a, b, d \in K$ with $b, d \in K^{>C}$, we have $a \circ (b \circ d) = (a \circ b) \circ d$.

HFC3. For all $a \in K^{>C}$, the function $K^{>C} \longrightarrow K^{>C}$; $b \mapsto a \circ b$ is strictly increasing.

HFC4. For all $a \in K$ and $b \in K^{>C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a \circ x &= a \\ x \circ b &= b. \end{aligned}$$

HFC5. Let $a, \delta \in K$ and $b \in K^{>C}$ with $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(a)$ and $(a^\dagger \circ b) \delta \in \mathfrak{o}$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$a \circ (b + \delta) - \sum_{k < n} \frac{a^{(k)} \circ b}{k!} \delta^k \in \mathfrak{o}((a^{(n)} \circ b) \delta^n),$$

where $a^{(k)}$ denotes the k -th derivative of a .

Consider the language \mathcal{L}_{hfc} expanding the language of ordered valued differential fields with a constant symbol x and a function symbol \circ of arity 2. We interpret x on K as expected and extend \circ to $K \times K$ by setting $a \circ b := 0$ if $b \notin K^{>C}$. Thus K is an \mathcal{L}_{hfc} -structure, and the class of H-fields with composition is elementary in \mathcal{L}_{hfc} .

The axioms **HFC1–HFC4** imply that $(K^{>C}, \circ, x, <)$ is an ordered monoid, and that it acts by automorphism on the ordered valued field $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <, \mathcal{O})$. In order to avoid confusion between compositions and products in K , given an $a \in K^{>C}$ and an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $a^{[n]}$ for the n -fold iterate of a (i.e. its n -th power in the monoid $K^{>C}$). If a has an inverse in $K^{>C}$, then we denote it by a^{inv} and we set

$$a^{[-n]} := (a^{\text{inv}})^{[n]} = (a^{[n]})^{\text{inv}}.$$

Example 4.2. Let C be an ordered field. Let $C(x)$ be a purely transcendental simple extension, ordered so that $x > C$. So a $P \in C[x]$ is positive if its coefficient of highest degree in x is positive, and the sign of a $\frac{P}{Q} \in C(x)$ is the product of the signs of P and Q in $C[x]$. Write \mathcal{O} for the convex hull of C in $C(x)$, which is the set of fractions with non-positive degree.

We have a standard derivation $\partial : C(x) \longrightarrow C(x)$ with respect to x , which is determined by $C = \text{Ker}(\partial)$ and $\partial(x) = 1$, and for which $(C(x), +, \cdot, 0, 1, \partial, \mathcal{O}, <)$ is an H-field. For $P \in C(x)$ and $Q \in C(x)^{>C}$, since Q lies above each pole of P , the compositum $P \circ Q$ is well-defined. It is easy to see that **HFC1–HFC4** are satisfied. As for **HFC5**, it can be stated as scheme of elementary statements in the language of ordered fields and proved in $C^{\text{rc}}(x)$ where C^{rc} is a real closure of C , since it is valid in $\mathbb{R}(x)$ by Taylor's theorem. As a set of universal statements, it then follows in the substructure $C(x)$.

The set $(C(x)^{>C}, \circ)$ is not a group. Indeed, there is no inverse of x^2 in $C(x)^{>C}$, since we have a degree morphism $\deg: (C(x)^{>C}, \circ, x) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{N}, \cdot, 1)$ and $2 = \deg(x^2)$ has no inverse in $(\mathbb{N}, \cdot, 1)$. Note that each H-field with composition over C contains $C(x)$ as an \mathcal{L}_{hfc} -substructure.

Example 4.3. Consider the field \mathbb{T} of grid-based transseries [17, 24]. We have a derivation and composition law [26] on \mathbb{T} such that it is an H-field with field of constants \mathbb{R} and that **HFC1**, **HFC2**, **HFC4** and **HFC5** are satisfied. As for **HFC3**, it follows from the inclusion of \mathbb{T} in the field of finitely nested hyperseries of [5], where it holds. By [26, Section 5.4], this field has inversion.

We will see other, more analytic examples in the next section (see Corollary 4.17). We now state a few simple consequences of the axioms.

Remark 4.4. If $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{o}$, then $\varepsilon' \in \mathfrak{o}((x^{-1})^\dagger) = \mathfrak{o}(x^{-1})$ by (4.1). In particular $\varepsilon' \in \mathfrak{o}$, so the derivation on K is small as per [3, p 7].

As an ordered field, an H-field has a field topology for which $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon \in K^>$ is a fundamental system of neighbourhoods of 0. We understand limits in that sense.

Lemma 4.5. *Let K be an H-field with composition. For $a \in K$ and $b \in K^{>C}$, we have*

$$a' \circ b = \lim_{\substack{\delta \rightarrow 0 \\ \delta \neq 0}} \frac{a \circ (b + \delta) - a \circ b}{\delta},$$

where the limit is defined in the

Proof. Let $\delta \in K$ with sufficiently large absolute value, so that $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(b)$ and $(a^\dagger \circ b) \delta \in \mathfrak{o}$. By **HFC5** for $n=1$, we have $a \circ (b + \delta) - a \circ b - (a' \circ b) \delta \in \mathfrak{o}((a'' \circ b) \delta^2)$, so

$$\left| \frac{a \circ (b + \delta) - a \circ b}{\delta} - (a' \circ b) \delta \right| < |(a'' \circ b) \delta|$$

letting δ tend to 0, we obtain the desired result. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let K be an H-field with composition. Let $a \in K$ and $b \in K^{>C}$. We have*

$$(a \circ b)' = (a' \circ b) b'.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (a \circ b)' &= \lim_{\substack{\delta \rightarrow 0 \\ \delta \neq 0}} \frac{(a \circ b) \circ (x + \delta) - a \circ b}{\delta} \\ &= \lim_{\substack{\delta \rightarrow 0 \\ \delta \neq 0}} \frac{a \circ (b + (b \circ (x + \delta) - b)) - a \circ b}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

By **HFC5** for (b, x, δ) , choosing δ small enough, the element $b \circ (x + \delta) - b \in b' \delta + \mathcal{O}(b'' \delta^2)$ can be taken arbitrarily small. In turn, applying **HFC5** for $(a, b, b \circ (x + \delta) - b)$ we obtain

$$a \circ (b + (b \circ (x + \delta) - b)) - a \circ b - (a' \circ b) b' \delta \in \mathcal{O}((a' \circ b) b'' \delta^2)$$

provided δ is sufficiently small. We thus have

$$\frac{a \circ (b + (b \circ (x + \delta) - b)) - a \circ b}{\delta} \in \mathcal{O}((a' \circ b) b'' \delta).$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{\substack{\delta \rightarrow 0 \\ \delta \neq 0}} \frac{a \circ (b + (b \circ (x + \delta) - b)) - a \circ b}{\delta} = (a' \circ b) b'. \quad \square$$

We say that K is an *H-field with composition and inversion* if furthermore $(K^{>C}, \circ, x)$ is a group. Then in view of **HFC1–HFC4**, the structure $(K^{>C}, \circ, x, <)$ is an ordered group. We will show that under certain conditions, it is a growth order group. More precisely, consider the following condition on an ordered pair $(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)$ of subsets of an H-field with composition and inversion K :

- (\star). The set \mathcal{G}_0 is a normal convex subgroup of $K^{>C}$ containing $x + C$, the set \mathcal{G}_1 is a complement \mathcal{G}_1 of \mathcal{G}_0 in $K^{>C}$ which is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers, and the set

$$\{a \circ (a^{\text{inv}} + 1) : a \in \mathcal{G}_1\}$$

is cofinal in \mathcal{G}_0 .

We will derive Theorem 2 as a consequence of the following theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \partial, \mathcal{O}, <, \circ, x)$ be an H-field over \mathbb{R} with composition and inversion suppose we are given $(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)$ as in (\star). Then $(K^{>\mathbb{R}}, \circ, x, <)$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers. Moreover, the subgroup \mathcal{G}_0 is a growth order group, and it is \preceq -initial in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$.*

This will be proved in Section 4.4 below.

4.2 Taylor approximations in Hardy fields

Let $\mathcal{C}^{<\infty}$ denote the set of all germs $[f]$ at $+\infty$ of real-valued functions f defined on positive half-lines $(a, +\infty)$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$ in \mathbb{R} such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a positive half-line on which f is k -times differentiable. We identify constants with the germs of the corresponding constant functions. Then $\mathcal{C}^{<\infty}$ is an \mathbb{R} -algebra under pointwise sum and product. Moreover, it is equipped with a partial \mathbb{R} -algebra ordering given by $[f] < [g] \iff f(t) < g(t)$ for all sufficiently large $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It is a differential ring under derivation of germs

$$[f]' := [f']$$

whenever $f : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable. Finally, if $[g] > \mathbb{R}$ in $\mathcal{C}^{<\infty}$, i.e. if g tends to $+\infty$ at $+\infty$, then for all $[f] \in \mathcal{C}^{<\infty}$ where $f \circ g$ is defined on a positive half-line, the germ $[f \circ g]$ only depends on $[f]$ and $[g]$. We set $[f] \circ [g] := [f \circ g]$.

We will identify germs with given representatives, trying not to confuse the reader in the process. Given a germ $g \in \mathcal{C}^{<\infty}$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{o}(g) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{C}^{<\infty} : \forall r \in \mathbb{R}^>, |f| < r |g|\} \\ \mathcal{O}(g) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{C}^{<\infty} : \exists r \in \mathbb{R}, |f| < r |g|\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \Theta(g) &:= \{f \in \mathcal{C}^{<\infty} : f \in \mathcal{O}(g) \wedge g \in \mathcal{O}(f)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We simply write $\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{O}$ and Θ for $\mathfrak{o}(1), \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\Theta(1)$ respectively.

We recall that a *Hardy field* is a subfield of $\mathcal{C}^{<\infty}$ which is also a subalgebra, i.e. which contains all constant germs. The induced ordering on such fields is linear [11, 2 p 107].

Definition 4.8. *A Hardy field with composition is a Hardy field \mathcal{H} which is closed under composition of germs. We say that it has inversion if $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is closed under inversion.*

Example 4.9. If \mathcal{R} is an o-minimal expansion of the real ordered field, then \mathcal{R}_∞ is a Hardy field [14, Section 7.1] with composition and inversion.

Example 4.10. Boshernitzan's field E defined as the intersection of all \subseteq -maximal Hardy fields is a Hardy field with composition [10]. It is unknown whether it has inversion.

We will show that certain Hardy fields with composition and inversion are H-fields with composition and inversion. This mainly entails deriving the Taylor axiom **HFC5** in those fields. If \mathcal{H} is a Hardy field, then $\mathcal{O}(1) \cap \mathcal{H}$ is a valuation ring on \mathcal{H} for which it is an H-field. The notations above are coherent with the notations introduced for H-fields. Moreover, we have

$$\forall f, g \in \mathcal{H}, ((f \in \mathfrak{o}(g) \wedge g \notin \Theta(1)) \implies f' \in \mathfrak{o}(g')), \quad (4.2)$$

and the derivation on \mathcal{H} is small, i.e.

$$\mathfrak{o}' \subseteq \mathfrak{o}. \quad (4.3)$$

See [3, Proposition 9.1.9] for proofs. Toward proving **HFC5**, let us derive a mean value theorem for Hardy fields with composition and inversion.

Lemma 4.11. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hardy field with composition and inversion and let $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g, h \in \mathcal{H}^>$ with $g < h$. There is a $c \in \mathcal{H}$ with $g < c < h$ and $f \circ h - f \circ g = (h - g) f' \circ c$.*

Proof. Assume first that $f' \in \mathbb{R}$. So f is the germ of an affine function $f = a \text{id} + b$, and we have $f \circ h - f \circ g = (h - g) a = (h - g) f' \circ c$ where $c := \frac{g+h}{2} \in (g, h)$.

Assume now that $f' \notin \mathbb{R}$. So f' is the germ of a strictly monotonous function. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$ be large enough so that $h(s) > g(s)$ for all $s \geq t$, that f is differentiable on $[t, +\infty)$ and that f' is strictly monotonous on $[t, +\infty)$. The mean value theorem for f gives $f(h(t)) - f(g(t)) = (h(t) - g(t)) f'(c_t)$ for a certain $c_t \in (g(t), h(t))$. Since f' is strictly monotonous on $[t, +\infty)$, the number c_t is unique, and we have a function $t \mapsto c_t$ whose germ c satisfies $c \in (g, h)$ and $f \circ h - f \circ g = (h - g) f' \circ c$.

Note that $f' \circ c = \frac{f \circ h - f \circ g}{h - g} \in \mathcal{H}$. Our hypothesis that $f' \notin \mathbb{R}$ implies that the function f' induces a bijection $\varphi: (t_0, +\infty) \rightarrow (t_1, t_2)$ for some $t_0 \geq t$ and $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ with $t_1 < t_2$. By considering translations, homotheties and inversions if necessary, we may assume that $t_2 = +\infty$, so $c = \varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ \frac{f \circ h - f \circ g}{h - g}$, lies in \mathcal{H} . \square

Lemma 4.12. *For all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $f^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1})$, we have $(f')^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1})$.*

Proof. We have $f'x \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ where $f \notin \Theta(1)$, so $(f'' \text{id} + f') \in \mathcal{O}(f')$ by (4.2). We recall that \mathcal{O} is a valuation ring on \mathcal{H} . Since $f' \in \mathcal{O}(f')$, we must have $f'' \text{id} \in \mathcal{O}(f')$, i.e. $(f')^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1})$. \square

Lemma 4.13. *For all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $f^\dagger \notin \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1})$, we have $(f')^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(f^\dagger)$.*

Proof. By [40, Theorem 2], there is a Hardy field \mathcal{H}^* containing \mathcal{H} and which is closed under composition on the left of strictly positive germs with the germ \log of the natural logarithm. Note that $f^\dagger = (\log \circ f)'$. We have $\text{id}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{o}(f^\dagger)$ in \mathcal{H}^* i.e. $\log' \in \mathfrak{o}((\log \circ f)')$. So (4.2) gives $\log \in \mathfrak{o}(\log \circ f)$. This means that $\mathbb{N} \log < \log \circ f$, so $\text{id}^{\mathbb{N}} < f$. In particular $\text{id}^2 \in \mathfrak{o}(f)$ so (4.2) yields $2 \text{id} \in \mathfrak{o}(f')$, whence $2 < f''$ by **HF2**.

Now $-\frac{f'}{f^2} = (f^{-1})' \in \mathfrak{o}$ by (4.3), which means that $f' \in \mathfrak{o}(f^2)$. We deduce with [1, Lemma 1.4] that $(f')^\dagger < (f^2)^\dagger = 2 f^\dagger$. Since $f'' > 0$ and $f' > 0$, we have $(f')^\dagger > 0$, so this entails that $(f')^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(f^\dagger)$. \square

Proposition 4.14. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hardy field with composition. Then \mathcal{H} satisfies **HFC5** if and only if for all $f, g \in \mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ and $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(g)$ with $(f^\dagger \circ g) \delta \in \mathfrak{o}$, we have*

$$f \circ (g + \delta) \in \Theta(f \circ g). \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. The relation in (4.4) is equivalent to **HFC5** at $n = 0$. So assuming that (4.4) holds, it suffices to show that **HFC5** holds at all $n > 0$. Let $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and let g, δ be as in the statement with respect to f . We first claim that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, (f^{(n+1)} \circ g) \delta^{n+1} \in \mathfrak{o}((f^{(n)} \circ g) \delta^n). \quad (4.5)$$

Indeed, for $n = 0$, this follows directly from (4.4). Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (4.5) holds at n . Suppose that $(f^{(n)})^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1})$. Then $(f^{(n+1)})^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1})$ by Lemma 4.12, so $f^{(n+2)} \in \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1} f^{(n+1)})$, so

$$(f^{(n+2)} \circ g) \delta^{n+2} \in \frac{\delta}{g} \mathcal{O}((f^{(n+1)} \circ g) \delta^{n+1}).$$

But $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(g)$ so $(f^{(n+2)} \circ g) \delta^{n+2} \in \mathfrak{o}((f^{(n+1)} \circ g) \delta^{n+1})$ as claimed. Suppose now that $(f^{(n)})^\dagger \notin \mathcal{O}(\text{id}^{-1})$. Then Lemma 4.13 gives $(f^{(n+1)})^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}((f^{(n)})^\dagger)$ so $((f^{(n+1)})^\dagger \circ g) \delta \in \mathcal{O}(((f^{(n)})^\dagger \circ g) \delta) \subseteq \mathfrak{o}$ by the induction hypothesis. Therefore

$$(f^{(n+2)} \circ g) \delta \delta^{n+1} \in \mathfrak{o}((f^{(n+1)} \circ g) \delta^{n+1}).$$

We conclude by induction that (4.5) holds.

Let us now derive **HFC5** at a given $n > 0$. Assume that δ is positive. Let $r_0, r_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{>}$ and let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be large enough so that f is \mathcal{C}^{n+1} on $[t_0, +\infty)$, that δ is positive on $[t_0, +\infty)$, and that $f^{(n+1)}$ is monotonous on $g(t_0, +\infty)$. By (4.4) for $f^{(n+1)}$, we may also assume that

$$r_0 |f^{(n+1)}(g(t))| \leq |f^{(n+1)}(g(t) + \delta(t))| \leq r_1 |f^{(n+1)}(g(t))|$$

for all $t \in (t_0, +\infty)$. By Taylor's theorem, for $t > t_0$, the integral

$$I(t) := \int_{g(t)}^{g(t)+\delta(t)} \frac{(g(t) + \delta(t) - s)^n}{n!} f^{(n+1)}(s) ds$$

satisfies

$$f(g(t) + \delta(t)) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{f^{(k)}(g(t))}{k!} \delta(t)^k + I(t).$$

Now

$$|I(t)| \leq \int_{g(t)}^{g(t)+\delta(t)} \frac{(g(t) + \delta(t) - s)^n}{n!} r_1 |f^{(n+1)}(g(t))| ds = \frac{|f^{(n+1)}(g(t))|}{(n+1)!} \delta(t)^{n+1}.$$

Thus **HFC5** at n follows from (4.5). The case when $\delta \leq 0$ is similar. This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 4.15. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hardy field with composition and inversion. Assume that there is no germ $f \in \mathcal{H}$ with $f > \exp^{[n]}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then \mathcal{H} satisfies **HFC5**.*

Proof. By [40, Theorem 2], there is a Hardy field \mathcal{H}^* containing \mathcal{H} and which is closed under \exp and \log . We will partly inside \mathcal{H}^* so that we may compare our germs $f \in \mathcal{H}$ with elements of the form $\exp^{[n]}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{H}$ with $v\delta > v g$ and $v((f^\dagger \circ g) \delta) > 0$. Let $c \in \mathcal{C}^{<\infty}$ with

$$f \circ (g + \delta) - f \circ g = \delta f' \circ c \quad (4.6)$$

as in Lemma 4.11. We will show that $f \circ (g + \delta) \in \Theta(f \circ g)$ by distinguishing two cases.

Case 1: $f \in \mathcal{O}((\log)^p)$ in \mathcal{H}^* for a certain $p \in \mathbb{N}^>$. Then $f^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\text{id} \log}\right)$ whence $f' \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{f}{\text{id} \log}\right)$. Recall that $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(g)$. So there is a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that given $s \in \mathbb{R}^>$ and sufficiently large $t > 1$, we have $(1-s)g(t) < c(t)(1+s)$, and

$$|f'(c(t))| \leq \frac{k \max(f(g(t) + \delta(t)), f(g(t)))}{(1-s)g(t) \log(g(t))}.$$

Since $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(g)$ we get $\frac{|\delta(t)|}{g(t)} < \frac{1-s}{k}$ for sufficiently large $t > 1$. We deduce that

$$|\delta(t) f'(c(t))| \leq \frac{\max(f(g(t) + \delta(t)), f(g(t)))}{\log(g(t))}.$$

for sufficiently large $t > 1$. Since $\log \circ g \notin \mathcal{O}$, we deduce that $\delta f' \circ c \in \mathfrak{o}(f \circ (g + \delta))$ or $\delta f' \circ c \in \mathfrak{o}(f \circ g)$. In particular $f \circ (g + \delta) \in \Theta(f \circ g)$, hence the result.

Case 2: $\log^{\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(f)$ in \mathcal{H}^* . Our assumption on \mathcal{H} implies that there are an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\exp^{[n-2]} \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}((\exp^{[n-1]})^p)$ in \mathcal{H}^* . We prove by induction on $k \leq n$ that for all $h \in \mathcal{H}^*$ with $h > \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p > 0$, we have

$$(\exp^{[k-2]} \in \mathcal{O}(h) \wedge h \in \mathcal{O}((\exp^{[k-1]})^p)) \implies h \circ (g + \delta) \in \Theta(h \circ g). \quad (4.7)$$

Note that for $k < n$, $p \in \mathbb{N}^>$ and $h \in (\mathcal{H}^*)^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $\exp^{[k-2]} \in \mathcal{O}(h)$ and $h \in \mathcal{O}((\exp^{[k-1]})^p)$ we have $h \in \mathcal{O}(f)$ so $h^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}(f^\dagger)$, so

$$(h^\dagger \circ g) \delta \in \mathfrak{o}(1). \quad (4.8)$$

Thus if $k = 0$, then (4.7) follows from **Case 1**.

Let $k < n$ such that the (4.7) holds at k . Let $h \in (\mathcal{H}^*)^{>\mathbb{R}}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}^>$ with $\exp^{[k-1]} \in \mathcal{O}(h)$ and $h \in \mathcal{O}((\exp^{[k]})^p)$. We again write

$$h \circ (g + \delta) - h \circ g = \delta h' \circ d$$

where d lies strictly between g and $g + \delta$. It suffices to show that $\delta h' \circ c \in \mathfrak{o}(h \circ g)$ or that $\delta h' \circ c \in \mathfrak{o}(h' \circ (g + \delta))$. Note that $h' \circ c \in \mathcal{O}(h' \circ g)$ or $h' \circ c \in \mathcal{O}(h' \circ (g + \delta))$ by monotonicity of h' . If $h' \circ c \in \mathcal{O}(h' \circ g)$, then (4.8) yields the result. So we may assume that $h' \circ c \in \mathcal{O}(h' \circ (g + \delta))$. We have $h \in \mathcal{O}((\exp^{[n]})^p)$, so $\log \circ h \in \mathcal{O}(\exp^{[n-1]})$, so

$$h^\dagger \in \mathcal{O}((\exp^{[n-1]})') \subseteq \mathfrak{o}((\exp^{[n-1]})^2).$$

The induction hypothesis at $n-1$ for h^\dagger yields $h^\dagger \circ (g + \delta) \in \Theta(h^\dagger \circ g)$, whence $(h^\dagger \circ (g + \delta)) \delta \in \mathfrak{o}$, whence $(h' \circ c) \delta \in \mathfrak{o}(h \circ (g + \delta))$ as desired. By induction, the statement (4.7) holds for $k = n$, whence in particular $f \circ (g + \delta) \in \Theta(f \circ g)$.

We conclude with Proposition 4.14 that \mathcal{H} satisfies **HFC5**. □

Remark 4.16. We expect that this result can be extended to certain Hardy fields with composition containing transexponential germs. In particular, if Padgett's Hardy field with composition [36] turns out to have inversion, we expect it will satisfy **HFC5**.

Question 5. Taylor expansion problem. Do all Hardy fields with composition satisfy **HFC5**?

Corollary 4.17. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hardy field with composition and inversion. Assume that there is no germ $f \in \mathcal{H}$ with $f > \exp^{[n]}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then \mathcal{H} is an H-field with composition and inversion.*

Proof. We set $x := \text{id} \in \mathcal{H}$. We already know that \mathcal{H} is an H-field with $x' = 1$. The monotonicity of germs in \mathcal{H} yields **HFC3**, whereas **HFC1**, **HFC2** and **HFC4** are immediate. Finally, **HFC5** follows from Proposition 4.15. \square

Corollary 4.18. *Let \mathcal{R} be an o-minimal expansion of the real ordered field in a first-order language \mathcal{L} . Assume that each $f \in \mathcal{R}_\infty$ lies below a germ $\exp^{[k]}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ in $(\mathcal{C}^{<\infty}, <)$. Let $\mathcal{R}^* = (\mathbb{R}^*, \dots)$ be an elementary extension of \mathcal{R} . Consider the ordered field \mathcal{R}_∞^* with its canonical [14] derivation ∂ , with the convex hull \mathcal{O}^* of \mathbb{R}^* as a valuation ring, and composition of germs. Then \mathcal{R}_∞^* is an H-field with composition and inversion.*

Proof. The result holds, by Corollary 4.17, for $\mathcal{R}^* = \mathcal{R}$. The structure $(\mathcal{R}_\infty^*, \partial)$ is a differential field by [14, Chapter 7, (1.3)]. Each element h of the valuation ring of \mathcal{R}_∞^* is the germ of a definable bounded monotonous function on \mathbb{R}^* , so by o-minimality of \mathcal{R}^* , it has a limit $c \in \mathbb{R}^*$. We have $h - c \in \mathfrak{o}^*$ by definition, so **HF1** holds. If $h \in \mathcal{R}_\infty^*$ lies above \mathbb{R}^* , then by the monotonicity theorem h must be the germ of a strictly increasing function. We deduce with [14, Chapter 7, (2.5), Lemma 1] that $h' > 0$. So **HF2** holds and \mathcal{R}_∞^* is an H-field. Except for **HFC1** which refers to $\text{Ker}(\partial) = \mathbb{R}^*$, all statements in Definition 4.1 can be turned, after specialisation of the universally quantified variables, into sentences in \mathcal{L} . Since they hold for \mathcal{R}_∞ , they hold for \mathcal{R}_∞^* . The existence of compositional inverses for elements in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}^*}$ has already been established. This leaves the axiom **HFC1** to justify, but that follows immediately from the definition of \mathbb{R}^* . \square

4.3 Conjugacy in H-fields with composition and inversion

We fix an H-field with composition and inversion $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \mathcal{O}, <, \partial, \circ, x)$ over \mathbb{R} and we write \mathcal{G} for the group $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ under composition.

Lemma 4.19. *Let $g = x + 1 + \varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{o}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $\mathcal{C}(g)$ is Archimedean and each $h \in \mathcal{C}(g)$ has the form $h = x + r + \delta$ for an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and a $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}$.*

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we claim that $(g^{[n]} - (x + n)) \in \mathfrak{o}$. Indeed this holds for $n = 0$. Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $g^{[n]} = x + n + \varepsilon_n$ where $\varepsilon_n \in \mathfrak{o}$, we have

$$g^{[n+1]} = x + n + \varepsilon_n + 1 + \varepsilon \circ (x + n + \varepsilon_n) = x + (n + 1) + \varepsilon_{n+1}$$

where $\varepsilon_{n+1} := \varepsilon \circ (x + n + \varepsilon_n) \in \mathfrak{o}$. So we have the result for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by induction. Consider the germ $\varepsilon_{-1} := g^{[-1]} - x + 1$. We have

$$g \circ (x - 1 + \varepsilon_{-1}) = x + \varepsilon_{-1} + \varepsilon \circ (x - 1 + \varepsilon_{-1}) = x$$

where $\varepsilon \circ (x - 1 + \varepsilon_{-1}) \in \mathfrak{o}$, so we must have $\varepsilon_{-1} \in \mathfrak{o}$, and we can use the same arguments as in the case $n \geq 0$, to show by induction that $(g^{[n]} - (x + n)) \in \mathfrak{o}$ for all $n \in -\mathbb{N}$. We deduce in particular that $\mathcal{C}(g)$ is cofinal with respect to $x + \mathbb{R}$.

Now let $h \in \mathcal{C}(g)$ and assume for contradiction that $\delta := h - x$ tends to $+\infty$ at $+\infty$. In particular δ is the germ of a strictly increasing function, and $h > x$. We have

$$x + \delta + 1 + \varepsilon \circ h = g \circ h = h \circ g = x + 1 + \varepsilon + \delta \circ g.$$

So

$$\delta + \varepsilon \circ h = \varepsilon + \delta \circ g. \tag{4.9}$$

From $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{o}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we deduce that ε is the germ of a strictly decreasing function, so $\varepsilon \circ h < \varepsilon$, whereas $\delta \circ g > \delta$. This contradicts (4.9). So $h = x + r + \iota$ for a certain $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and a certain $\iota \in \mathfrak{o}$. Combining these two results, we also deduce that $\mathcal{C}(g)$ is Archimedean. \square

Lemma 4.20. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}^>$ with $f > x + \mathbb{R}$, and assume that $g = x + 1 + \varepsilon$ for a certain $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{o}$ with $\varepsilon > 0$. Then*

$$f \circ g > g \circ f.$$

Proof. Recall that K is an H-field, so $f - x > \mathbb{R}$ entails that $(f - x)' > 0$, whence $f' > 1$. We distinguish three cases.

Assume that $f - x \in \mathfrak{o}(x)$. So $f = x + \delta$ where the germ δ satisfies $\delta > \mathbb{R}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ g - g \circ f &= x + 1 + \varepsilon + \delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - x - \delta - 1 - \varepsilon \circ (x + \delta) \\ &= (\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta) + (\varepsilon - \varepsilon \circ (x + \delta)). \end{aligned}$$

Now $\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta > 0$ because $\delta > \mathbb{R}$ and $x + 1 + \varepsilon > x$, and $\varepsilon - \varepsilon \circ (x + \delta) > 0$ because $\varepsilon \in K^> \cap \mathfrak{o}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x + \delta > x$. So $f \circ g > g \circ f$ in that case.

Assume now that $f \in \Theta(x)$. Then let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with $f - rx \in \mathfrak{o}(x)$. So r must be strictly larger than 1. Write $\delta := f - rx$, so $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(x)$. This time, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ g - g \circ f &= rx + r + r\varepsilon + \delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - rx - \delta - 1 - \varepsilon \circ (x + \delta) \\ &= (r - 1) + (\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta) + (r\varepsilon - \varepsilon \circ (x + \delta)). \end{aligned}$$

As in the previous case, the term $\varepsilon - \varepsilon \circ (x + \delta)$ is strictly positive. We deduce since $r > 1$ that $r\varepsilon - \varepsilon \circ (x + \delta) > 0$. Since $r - 1 > 0$, it suffices to show that $\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta \in \mathfrak{o}$. This is immediate if $\delta \in \mathcal{O}$. Indeed then we find by **HF1** an $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a $\iota \in \mathfrak{o}$ with $\delta = r_0 + \iota$. Thus

$$\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta \in \Theta(\iota \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \iota),$$

whence $\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta \in \mathfrak{o}$.

Assume that $\delta \notin \mathcal{O}$. Recall that $\delta \in \mathfrak{o}(x)$, so in view of (4.2), we have $\delta' \in \mathfrak{o}$. Therefore $\delta'(1 + \varepsilon) \in \mathfrak{o}$. By **HFC5**, we have

$$\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta - \delta'(1 + \varepsilon) \in \mathfrak{o}(\delta'(1 + \varepsilon)).$$

Since $\delta'(1 + \varepsilon) \in \mathfrak{o}$, we must have $\delta \circ (x + 1 + \varepsilon) - \delta \in \mathfrak{o}$ as claimed.

We finally treat the remaining case when $f/x > \mathbb{R}$. We have $f > x \mathbb{R}^>$, so $f^{\text{inv}} < \mathbb{R}^> x$. Since $f^{\text{inv}} > \mathbb{R}$, we deduce with **HF2** that $0 < (f^{\text{inv}})' < \mathbb{R}^>$, i.e. $(f^{\text{inv}})' \in \mathfrak{o}$. It suffices to show that

$$g^{\text{inv}} \circ f^{\text{inv}} < f^{\text{inv}} \circ g^{\text{inv}}.$$

Now $g^{\text{inv}} = x - 1 - \delta$ for a certain $\delta \in \mathfrak{o} \cap K^>$, and $(f^{\text{inv}})^\dagger = \frac{(f^{\text{inv}})'}{f^{\text{inv}}} \in \mathfrak{o}$. Since $(f^{\text{inv}})^\dagger 1 \in \mathfrak{o}$, the axiom **HFC5** gives

$$f^{\text{inv}} \circ (x - 1 - \delta) \in f^{\text{inv}} - (f^{\text{inv}})'(1 + \delta) + \mathfrak{o}((f^{\text{inv}})').$$

Therefore $f^{\text{inv}} \circ g^{\text{inv}} - f^{\text{inv}} \in \mathfrak{o}$. We have

$$g^{\text{inv}} \circ f^{\text{inv}} - f^{\text{inv}} = (x - 1 - \delta) \circ f^{\text{inv}} - f^{\text{inv}} = -1 - \delta \circ f^{\text{inv}} \in -1 + \mathfrak{o},$$

so $g^{\text{inv}} \circ f^{\text{inv}} - f^{\text{inv}} < f^{\text{inv}} \circ g^{\text{inv}} - f^{\text{inv}}$, whence $g^{\text{inv}} \circ f^{\text{inv}} < f^{\text{inv}} \circ g^{\text{inv}}$ as desired. \square

Lemma 4.21. *For all $\delta \in \mathcal{O}(x^{-2})$, there is an $h \in K$ such that $h' - \delta \in \mathfrak{o}(\delta) \cap K^>$.*

Proof. In view of [40, Theorem 1], it suffices to show that $x^{-2} \in \mathfrak{o}(f^\dagger)$ for all $f \in \mathfrak{o} \setminus \{0\}$. Let $f \in \mathfrak{o} \setminus \{0\}$. By (4.1), we have $g' \in \mathfrak{o}(f^\dagger)$ for all $g \in \mathfrak{o}$. In particular $(x^{-1})' = -x^{-2} \in \mathfrak{o}(f)$, hence the result. \square

Lemma 4.22. *Let $g \in \mathcal{G}^>$ be of the form $g = x + \delta$ where $\delta \in K^> \cap \mathcal{O}(x^{-2})$. There are an $h \in \mathcal{G}$ and an $\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{o}$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ and $h \circ g \circ h^{\text{inv}} = x + 1 + \varepsilon$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.21, the condition on δ implies that there is an $h \in K$ such that the germ $\iota := h' - \delta^{-1}$ satisfies $\iota \in \mathfrak{o}(\delta^{-1})$ and $\iota > 0$. Since $\delta \in K^> \cap \mathfrak{o}$, we have $h \in \mathcal{G}$. We have $\delta \circ h^{\text{inv}} \in \mathfrak{o}(h)$ because $\delta \in \mathcal{O}$ whereas $h \notin \mathcal{O}$ is not. Finally, we have

$$\delta h^\dagger \in \Theta\left(\frac{\delta}{h\delta}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{h} \in \mathfrak{o},$$

so $\delta h^\dagger \in \mathfrak{o}$. By Proposition 4.15, we have the Taylor approximation

$$\begin{aligned} h \circ g \circ h^{\text{inv}} &= h \circ (h^{\text{inv}} + \delta \circ h^{\text{inv}}) \\ &= x + (h' \circ h^{\text{inv}}) (\delta \circ h^{\text{inv}}) + \frac{1}{2} (h'' \circ h^{\text{inv}}) (\delta \circ h^{\text{inv}})^2 + \delta_1 \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_1 \in \mathfrak{o}((h'' \circ h^{\text{inv}}) (\delta \circ h^{\text{inv}})^2)$. Note that

$$(h' \circ h^{\text{inv}}) (\delta \circ h^{\text{inv}}) = (1 + \iota \delta) \circ h^{\text{inv}} = 1 + (\iota \delta) \circ h^{\text{inv}}$$

where $(\iota \delta) \circ h^{\text{inv}}$ is positive.

We have $h'' = \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)' > 0$ since $\frac{1}{\delta} > \mathbb{R}$, so $h'' \delta^2 > 0$, so $\frac{1}{2} (h'' \circ h^{\text{inv}}) (\delta \circ h^{\text{inv}})^2 > 0$ whence

$$\varepsilon := (\iota \delta) \circ h^{\text{inv}} + \frac{1}{2} (h'' \circ h^{\text{inv}}) (\delta \circ h^{\text{inv}})^2 + \delta_1 > 0.$$

We have $h \circ g \circ h^{\text{inv}} = x + 1 + \varepsilon$ as desired. \square

4.4 Ordered groups in H-fields with composition and inversion

We now prove Theorem 4.7. Let $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \partial, \mathcal{O}, <, \circ, x)$, \mathcal{G}_0 and \mathcal{G}_1 be as in the statement of Theorem 4.7. Consider the projections $\pi_0: K^{>\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\pi_1: K^{>\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$ with $\pi_0 \pi_1 = \text{Id}_{K^{>\mathbb{R}}}$.

Lemma 4.23. *Each non-trivial $g \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ has an Archimedean centraliser.*

Lemma 4.24. *For all $g \in \mathcal{G}_0^>$, there are a $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and an $\varepsilon \in K^> \cap \mathfrak{o}$ such that*

$$\varphi \circ g \circ \varphi^{\text{inv}} = x + 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1$ such that $\varphi > x^3 + C$ and $g \leq \varphi \circ (\varphi^{\text{inv}} + 1)$. So $\varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ g \circ \varphi \leq x + 1$, so $x \leq \varphi^{[-3]} \circ g \circ \varphi^{[3]} \leq \varphi^{[-2]} \circ (\varphi^{[2]} + 1)$. Note that $\varphi > x + C$, so $\varphi' > 1$ by HF2. We have

$$(\varphi^{\text{inv}})^\dagger \circ \varphi = \frac{(\varphi^{\text{inv}})' \circ \varphi}{\varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ \varphi} = \frac{1}{\varphi' x} \in \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

So HFC5 applies to $(\varphi^{\text{inv}}, \varphi, 1)$ and yields $\varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ (\varphi + 1) - x - (\varphi^{\text{inv}})' \circ \varphi \in \mathfrak{o}((\varphi^{\text{inv}})' \circ \varphi)$, whence

$$\varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ (\varphi + 1) - x \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varphi'}\right).$$

But $\varphi > x^3 + C$ so $\varphi' > 3x^2$, so $\delta := \varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ (\varphi + 1) - x$ lies in $\mathcal{O}(x^{-2})$. We deduce that Lemma 4.22 applies and yields the result. \square

Lemma 4.25. For $g \in \mathcal{G}_0^\neq$, we have $\mathcal{C}(g) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$.

Proof. We may assume that $g > x$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1$ with $\varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ g \circ \varphi = x + 1 + \varepsilon$ for an $\varepsilon \in K^> \cap \mathfrak{o}$. We have $\mathcal{C}(g) = \varphi \circ \mathcal{C}(x + 1 + \varepsilon) \circ \varphi^{\text{inv}}$, so it suffices to show that $\mathcal{C}(x + 1 + \varepsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$. This follows from Lemma 4.19 and the fact that \mathcal{G}_0 is a convex subgroup of $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. \square

We will use the identity

$$\forall g \in \mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{C}(g) = \mathcal{C}(g) \cap \mathcal{G}_0$$

without mention in the sequel of this subsection.

Corollary 4.26. The subgroup $\mathcal{G}_0 \subseteq K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is \preceq -initial in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$.

Proposition 4.27. The group $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ has Archimedean centralisers.

Proof. Let $g \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $g > x$. If $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then as we have seen we have $\mathcal{C}(g) \simeq \mathcal{C}(x + 1 + \varepsilon)$ for an $\varepsilon \in K^> \cap \mathfrak{o}$, whence $\mathcal{C}(g)$ is Archimedean by Lemma 4.19.

If $g \notin \mathcal{G}_0$, then we must have $g > \mathcal{G}_0$ by convexity. For $f, h \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}$, we have $[f, h] = 1 \implies [\pi_1(f), \pi_1(h)] = \pi_1(1) = 1$, so the morphism $\pi_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{C}(g) : \mathcal{C}(g) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$ ranges in $\mathcal{C}(\pi_1(g)) \cap \mathcal{G}_1$. It is nondecreasing by (3.2). For $h \in \text{Ker}(\pi_1) \cap \mathcal{C}(g) = \mathcal{G}_0 \cap \mathcal{C}(g)$, since $g \notin \mathcal{G}_0$, we cannot have $h \in \mathcal{G}_0^\neq$ by Lemma 4.25. Therefore $\pi_1 \upharpoonright \mathcal{C}(g)$ is an embedding of ordered groups $\mathcal{C}(g) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(\pi_1(g)) \cap \mathcal{G}_1$. We deduce since its codomain is Archimedean that $\mathcal{C}(g)$ is Archimedean. \square

Corollary 4.28. The axiom **GOG1** holds in \mathcal{G}_0 and in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. For $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ this follows from Propositions 4.27 and 2.1. For \mathcal{G}_0 , this follows from Lemma 4.25 and Propositions 4.27 and 2.1. \square

Lemma 4.29. The axiom **GOG2** holds in \mathcal{G}_0 and in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. Let $f, g \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $f, g \geq x$. Suppose first that $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $f > \mathcal{C}(g)$. We may assume by Lemma 4.24 that $g = x + 1 + \varepsilon$ for an $\varepsilon \in K^> \cap \mathfrak{o}$. We must have $f > x + \mathbb{R}$ by Lemma 4.19, whence $f \circ g > g \circ f$ by Lemma 4.20. Applying this for $f \in \mathcal{G}_0$, we see that **GOG2** holds in \mathcal{G}_0 .

Suppose now that $f > \mathcal{C}(g)$. If $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then the arguments above apply and yield $f \circ g > g \circ f$. If not, we have $\pi_1(g) > x$ since \mathcal{G}_0 is a convex subgroup of $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. Recall that $\mathcal{C}(\pi_1(g)) \cap \mathcal{G}_1$ is Archimedean, so $\pi_1(g)^{[\mathbb{N}]}$ is cofinal in it. We have $\pi_1(f) > \pi_1(\mathcal{C}(g)) \supseteq \pi_1(g)^{[\mathbb{N}]}$, so $\pi_1(f) > \mathcal{C}(\pi_1(g)) \cap \mathcal{G}_1$. Thus **GOG2** in \mathcal{G}_1 yields

$$\pi_1(f \circ g) = \pi_1(f) \circ \pi_1(g) > \pi_1(g) \circ \pi_1(f) = \pi_1(g \circ f).$$

Since \mathcal{G}_0 is convex, in view of (3.2), it follows that $f \circ g > g \circ f$. This proves **GOG2** in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. \square

Lemma 4.30. The ordered groups $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ and \mathcal{G}_0 are scaling.

Proof. We first treat the case of \mathcal{G}_0 . Let $g \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $g > x$. Suppose first that $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1$ with $\varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ g \circ \varphi = x + 1 + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon \in K^> \cap \mathfrak{o}$. By Lemma 4.19, the element $x + 1$ is scaling in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $x + 1 \asymp \varphi^{\text{inv}} \circ g \circ \varphi$ in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. The conjugation by φ is an automorphism of $(\mathcal{G}_0, \circ, x, <)$, so the element $\mathfrak{s} := \varphi \circ (\varphi^{\text{inv}} + 1) \in \mathcal{G}_0$ is scaling in \mathcal{G}_0 with $\mathfrak{s} \asymp g$. In particular, the ordered group \mathcal{G}_0 is scaling. By Lemma 4.25, we also obtain that \mathfrak{s} is also scaling in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $\mathfrak{s} \asymp g$ in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$.

Now suppose that $g \notin \mathcal{G}_0$, whence $g > \mathcal{G}_0$ by convexity. Let $t \in \mathcal{G}_1$ be scaling in \mathcal{G}_1 with $t \asymp \pi_1(g)$ in \mathcal{G}_1 . Since $\mathcal{C}(\pi_1(g)) \cap \mathcal{G}_1$ is Archimedean, we have $\pi_1(g)^{[-n]} \leq t \leq \pi_1(g)^{[n]}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $g^{[-n-1]} \leq t \leq g^{[n+1]}$, whence $t \asymp g$ in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. We claim that t is scaling in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. Indeed let $f \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ with $f \asymp g$. By Proposition 4.27, we have $g^{[-n]} \leq f \leq g^{[n]}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $\pi_1(g^{[-n]}) \leq \pi_1(f) \leq \pi_1(g^{[n]})$, whence $\pi_1(f) \asymp t$ in \mathcal{G}_1 . Let $u \in \mathcal{C}(t) \cap \mathcal{G}_1$ with $\pi_1(f) u^{-1} \prec \pi_1(f)$ in \mathcal{G}_1 . Since \mathcal{G}_1 has Archimedean centralisers, this means that $(\pi_1(f) u^{-1})^{[\mathbb{Z}]} \prec \pi_1(f)$, i.e. $\pi_1((f u^{-1})^{[\mathbb{Z}]}) \prec \pi_1(f)$, whence $(f u^{-1})^{[\mathbb{Z}]} \prec f$. We deduce with Proposition 4.27 that $f \sim u$ in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. This shows that t is scaling in $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$. Therefore $K^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is scaling. \square

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.7. Note by Proposition 3.14 that the projection $K^{>\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow K^{>\mathbb{R}}/\mathcal{G}_0$ satisfies the conditions **MGA1–MGA4**.

4.5 Application in the polynomially bounded case

Let us prove a subcase Theorem 2. Let \mathcal{R} be an o-minimal expansion of the real ordered field, and consider the corresponding H-field \mathcal{R}_∞ and ordered group $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R}$. We recall an important dichotomy for the asymptotic growth of germs in \mathcal{R}_∞ :

Miller's dichotomy. [33] If there is an $f \in \mathcal{R}_\infty$ with $f > x^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the exponential function is definable in \mathcal{R} , i.e. $\exp \in \mathcal{R}_\infty$.

If the exponential is not definable then \mathcal{R} is said *polynomially bounded*. Let us first work on that smaller side of the dichotomy, that is, suppose that \mathcal{R} is polynomially bounded. Let E denote the set of real numbers r such that the germ id^r of the r -power function is in \mathcal{R}_∞ . Let F denote the set of real numbers c such that the germ $c \text{id}$ of the c -homothety function is in \mathcal{R}_∞ . It is easy to see that E and F are subfields of \mathbb{R} . By [33, Proposition], for each $f \in \mathcal{R}_\infty$, there is a unique $(r_f, c_f) \in E \times F$ such that

$$f - c_f \text{id}^{r_f} \in \mathfrak{o}(f).$$

If $f > \mathbb{R}$, then we must have $r_f > 0$ and $c_f > 0$. Note that for $r \in E$ and $c \in F^{>}$, we have $c^r \text{id} = \text{id}^r \circ (c \text{id}^{1/r}) \in \mathcal{R}_\infty$, so $c^r \in F^{>}$. Therefore $F^{>}$ is an ordered vector space over E , and thus we have a growth order group $\text{Aff}_E(F^{>})$ as in Example 3.8. We set

$$\mathcal{G}_1 := F^{>} \text{id}^{E^{>}}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (r, c) : \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R} &\longrightarrow \text{Aff}_E(F^{>}) \\ f &\longmapsto (r_f, c_f) \end{aligned}$$

is a homomorphism of ordered groups which restricts to an isomorphism $\mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \text{Aff}_E(F^{>})$. Therefore $\mathcal{G}_1 \simeq \text{Aff}_E(F^{>})$ is a growth order group. Let \mathcal{G}_0 denote the kernel of (r, c) . So \mathcal{G}_0 is a normal subgroup of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R}$ and \mathcal{G}_1 is a complement of \mathcal{G}_0 in $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R}$.

Proposition 4.31. *The ordered pair $(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)$ satisfies (\star) for $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. We recall that \mathcal{O} is a valuation ring on \mathcal{R}_∞ with maximal ideal \mathfrak{o} , so $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{g \in \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R} : g - x \in \mathfrak{o}(\text{id})\}$. We see that \mathcal{G}_0 is a convex subgroup of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R}$ which contains $\text{id} + 1$.

The centraliser of $(1, c)$ in $\text{Aff}_E(F^{>})$ where $c \in F^{>} \setminus \{1\}$ is $\{1\} \times F^{>} \simeq F^{>}$. In Example 3.8, we saw that given $r \in E^{>}$ with $r \neq 1$ and $c \in F^{>}$, for all $q \in E^{>}$, there is a unique $c_0 \in F^{>}$ such that (q, c_0) and (r, c) commute. Thus the projection on the first variable is an isomorphism of ordered groups between the centraliser of (r, c) and $E^{>}$. Note that $E^{>}$ and F both embed into the Archimedean ordered group $(\mathbb{R}^{>}, \cdot, 1, <)$ \simeq $(\mathbb{R}, +, 0, <)$, so they are Archimedean. Therefore \mathcal{G}_1 has Archimedean centralisers.

It remains to show that the set $L = \{f \circ (f^{\text{inv}} + 1) : f \in \mathcal{G}_1\}$ is cofinal in \mathcal{G}_0 . Let $g = x + \delta \in \mathcal{G}_0$, so $\delta \in o(\text{id})$. We have $\delta - cx^r \in o(\delta)$ for a certain $(r, c) \in E \times F$. The condition $\delta \in o(\text{id})$ implies that $r < 1$, so we find an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\frac{2^n - 1}{2^n} > r$. Note that

$$\text{id}^{2^n} \circ (\text{id}^{2^{-n}} + 1) \in \text{id} + 2^n \text{id}^{\frac{2^n - 1}{2^n}} + \mathfrak{o}(\text{id}^{\frac{2^n - 1}{2^n}}).$$

Therefore $\text{id}^{2^n} \circ (\text{id}^{2^{-n}} + 1) > g$. This implies that L is cofinal in \mathcal{G}_0 and concludes the proof. \square

Since \mathcal{R} is polynomially bounded, it defines no germ f with $f > \exp^{[n]}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We deduce with Corollary 4.17 that \mathcal{R}_∞ is an H-field with composition and inversion. Applying Theorem 4.7, we obtain:

Corollary 4.32. *Let \mathcal{R} be a polynomially bounded o -minimal expansion of the real ordered field. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers.*

4.6 Application in the exponential case

In order to deal with the exponential case, we introduce a notion of H-field with an exponential function. We will also give additional applications of Theorem 4.7.

Definition 4.33. *An exponential H-field is an H-field $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <, \mathcal{O}, \partial)$ over \mathbb{R} together with an isomorphism $\log: (K^>, \cdot, 1, <) \rightarrow (K, +, 0, <)$, whose reciprocal is denoted \exp , such that*

$$\log(1 + \mathfrak{o}) = \mathfrak{o} \tag{4.10}$$

and

$$\forall a \in K^\times, a^\dagger = (\log a)'. \tag{4.11}$$

Thus $(K, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <, \exp)$ is an ordered exponential field as per [29]. We fix an exponential H-field K . Consider a Hardy field with composition \mathcal{H} containing \log and a morphism of ordered valued differential fields $\Phi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow K$. For all $f \in \mathcal{H}^>$, we have $\Phi(f) > 0$ and

$$(\log \Phi(f))' = \frac{\Phi(f)'}{\Phi(f)} = \frac{\Phi(f')}{\Phi(f)} = \Phi\left(\frac{f'}{f}\right) = \Phi((\log \circ f)') = \Phi(\log \circ f)'$$

by (4.11). So $\log \Phi(f) - \Phi(\log \circ f) \in \mathbb{R}$.

We claim that

$$\forall a \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}, \forall \delta \in \mathfrak{o}(a), \log(a + \delta) - \log(a) \in \mathfrak{o}. \tag{4.12}$$

Indeed, we have $\log(a + \delta) = \log(a(1 + \delta a^{-1})) = \log(a) + \log(1 + \delta a^{-1}) \in \mathfrak{o}$ by (4.10). An easy induction gives

$$\log^{[k]} \Phi(f) - \Phi(\log^{[k]} \circ f) \in \mathfrak{o} \tag{4.13}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ and $k > 1$.

Proposition 4.34. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hardy field with composition and inversion containing \exp and assume that there exists an embedding of ordered valued differential fields $\Phi: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow K$. Assume that for all $a \in K^{>\mathbb{R}}$, there is an $e \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\log^{[k]}(a) - \exp^{[e-k]}(\Phi(\text{id})) \in \mathfrak{o}. \tag{4.14}$$

Then $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers.

Proof. We will write $\mathfrak{o}_K := \mathfrak{o}(1) \subseteq K$ and $\mathfrak{o}_\mathcal{H} := \mathfrak{o}(1) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Set $x := \Phi(\text{id}) \in K$. Consider the subgroup $\mathcal{G}_1 := \exp^{[\mathbb{Z}]}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$. This is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers, since it is Abelian and Archimedean. Let \mathcal{G}_0 denote the subset of $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ of elements g with $g^{[\mathbb{Z}]} < \exp$. This is a convex subgroup of $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ containing $\text{id} + \mathbb{R}$. We claim that $(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)$ satisfies (\star) . Let us first show that \mathcal{G}_1 is a complement of \mathcal{G}_0 . The intersection $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_0$ is trivial by definition.

Let $f \in \mathcal{H}$ with $f \geq \text{id}$. By (4.13) and (4.14), we find an $e \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for large enough $k > 1$, the element $\log^{[k]}(\Phi(f)) - \log^{[k]}(\exp^{[e]}(x))$ lies in \mathfrak{o}_K . We claim that $g := f \circ \exp^{[-\ell(\Phi(f))]} \in \mathcal{G}_0$. By (4.13), given $k > 1$ large enough, we have $\Phi(\log^{[k]} \circ f) - \Phi(\exp^{[e-k]}(\text{id})) \in \mathfrak{o}_K$, whence $\log^{[k]} \circ f - \exp^{[e-k]}(\text{id}) \in \mathfrak{o}_\mathcal{H}$. It follows that $\log^{[k]} \circ f \circ \exp^{[k]} - \exp^{[e]} \in \mathfrak{o}_\mathcal{H}$, so

$$\log^{[k]} \circ g \circ \exp^{[k]} - \text{id} \in \mathfrak{o}_\mathcal{H}.$$

But then $\log^{[k]} \circ g \circ \exp^{[k]} \leq \text{id} + 1$ so $g^{[n]} < \exp^{[k]} \circ (\text{id} + n) \circ \log^{[k]} \leq \exp^{[k]} \circ \exp \circ \log^{[k]} = \exp$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$. So \mathcal{G}_1 is a complement of \mathcal{G}_0 .

Given $f \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$, we have $(f \circ g \circ f^{\text{inv}})^{[\mathbb{N}]} = f \circ g^{[\mathbb{N}]} \circ f^{\text{inv}} < f \circ \exp \circ f^{\text{inv}} = \exp$. So $f \circ \mathcal{G}_0 \circ f^{\text{inv}} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$. It follows in view of the relation $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}} = \mathcal{G}_0 \mathcal{G}_1$ that \mathcal{G}_0 is a normal subgroup of $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$.

Finally, assume for contradiction that there is a $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$ with $g > \exp^{[k]} \circ (\log^{[k]} + 1)$ for all $k > 1$. By (4.13), for each $k > 1$, we have a $\delta_k \in \mathfrak{o}_K$ with $\log^{[k]} \Phi(g) + \delta_k > \log^{[k]}(x) + 1$. In particular $\log^{[k]} \Phi(g) > \log^{[k]}(x) + \frac{1}{2}$ for all $k > 1$, so $\Phi(g) > \exp^{[k]}(\log^{[k]}(x) + \frac{1}{2})$ for all $k > 1$. Now let $e' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k_0 > 1$ with $\log^{[k_0]}(\Phi(g)) - \exp^{[e'-k_0]}(x) \in \mathfrak{o}_K$. We have

$$\log^{[k_0]}(x) + \frac{1}{4} < \exp^{[e'-k_0]}(x),$$

so e' must be strictly positive. The relation (4.13) gives $\Phi(\log^{[k_0]}(g) - \exp^{[e'-k_0]}) \in \mathfrak{o}_K$, so $\log^{[k_0]}(g) - \exp^{[e'-k_0]} \in \mathfrak{o}_\mathcal{H}$. In particular $\log^{[k_0]}(g) - \exp^{[e'-k_0]} \geq -1$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} g^{[2]} &= \exp^{[k_0]}(\log^{[k_0]}(g)) \circ \exp^{[k_0]}(\log^{[k_0]}(g)) \\ &\geq \exp^{[k_0]} \circ (\text{id} - 1) \circ (\exp^{[e'-k_0]}) \circ \exp^{[k_0]} \circ (\text{id} - 1) \circ (\exp^{[e'-k_0]}) \\ &\geq \exp^{[k_0]} \circ ((\text{id} - 1) \circ (\exp^{[e']}) \circ (\text{id} - 1) \circ (\exp^{[e']})) \circ \exp^{[-k_0]}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$(\text{id} - 1) \circ (\exp^{[e']}) \circ (\text{id} - 1) \circ (\exp^{[e']}) = h \circ (\exp^{[2e']})$$

where $h := (\text{id} - 1) \circ ((\exp^{[e']}) \circ (\text{id} - 1) \circ (\exp^{[-e']}))$. Now $h \in \mathcal{G}_0$ by our previous arguments, so $h \geq \log$, so $g^{[2]} \geq \exp^{[k_0]} \circ h \circ (\exp^{[2e']}) \circ \exp^{[-k_0]} \geq \exp^{[e']}$. Since $e' > 0$, this contradicts the assumption that $g \in \mathcal{G}_0$, and thus concludes our proof that $\{f \circ (f^{\text{inv}} + 1) : f \in \mathcal{G}_1\}$ is cofinal in \mathcal{G}_0 . Therefore (\star) holds for $(\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1)$. We deduce with Theorem 4.7 that $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers. \square

Corollary 4.35. *Let \mathcal{R} denote the Pfaffian closure of the real ordered field of [41]. The ordered group $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{R}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers.*

Proof. The field \mathbb{T}_{LE} of logarithmic-exponential transseries is an exponential H-field (see [16, 3]). By [32, Claim, p 248], the property (4.14) is satisfied in \mathbb{T}_{LE} . Finally, we have an embedding of ordered valued differential fields [4, Corollary 7.3.4] of \mathcal{R}_∞ into \mathbb{T}_{LE} . So Proposition 4.34 applies and yields the result. \square

Similarly, we have:

Corollary 4.36. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hardy field with composition and inversion. Assume that \mathcal{H} is a transserial Hardy field as per [27]. Then $\mathcal{H}^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers.*

Corollary 4.37. *Let \mathbb{T}_g denote the H-field with composition of grid-based transseries of Example 4.3. Then $\mathbb{T}_g^{>\mathbb{R}}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers.*

Let us finally complete our proof of Theorem 2 by treating the exponential case. Let \mathcal{R} be a levelled expansion of the real ordered field and assume that \mathcal{R} is not polynomially bounded. We have $\exp \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ by Miller's dichotomy. This yields an isomorphism of ordered groups

$$\begin{aligned} \log : \mathcal{R}_{\infty}^{\geq} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\infty} \\ f &\longmapsto \log \circ f. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $(\mathcal{R}_{\infty}, \log)$ is an exponential H-field. Indeed for $g \in \mathfrak{o}$ and sufficiently large $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $|g(t)| < 1$, whence $\log(1 + |g(t)|) \leq |g(t)|$. This implies that $\log(1 + \mathfrak{o}) \subseteq \mathfrak{o}$. Similarly, one shows that $\exp(\mathfrak{o}) \subseteq 1 + \mathfrak{o}$, so (4.10) holds. The identity (4.11) holds since $\log' = \frac{1}{\text{id}}$. This proves our claim.

We next claim that \mathcal{R}_{∞} satisfies (4.14). Indeed, given $a \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$, there are an $e \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$-1 \leq \log^{[k_0]}(a) - \exp^{[e-k_0]}(\Phi(\text{id})) \leq 1.$$

We deduce with (4.13) that $\log^{[k]}(a) - \exp^{[e-k]}(\Phi(\text{id})) \in \mathfrak{o}$ whenever $k > k_0$. We can thus apply Proposition 4.34 for the identity embedding of \mathcal{R}_{∞} into itself, and obtain:

Corollary 4.38. *Let \mathcal{R} be a levelled \mathfrak{o} -minimal expansion of the real ordered field that is not polynomially bounded. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers.*

Theorem 2 follows from Corollaries 4.32 and 4.38.

Corollary 4.39. *Let \mathcal{R} be the \mathfrak{o} -minimal expansion of the real ordered field by Tougeron's class of Gevrey functions of [42]. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a growth order group with Archimedean centralisers.*

Proof. The structure \mathcal{R} is an expansion by the exponential function of a polynomially bounded structure. As a consequence of [42, Proposition 10.9], the field \mathcal{R}_{∞} embeds as an ordered exponential field into the exponential H-field \mathbb{T}_{LE} of logarithmic-exponential transseries. By [15, Corollary 2.8], the structure \mathbb{T}_{LE} is an elementary extension of \mathbb{R}_{exp} . We have seen that it satisfies (4.14). It follows that \mathcal{R}_{∞} is levelled. \square

Remark 4.40. We believe Proposition 4.34 also applies to groups $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}}$ where \mathcal{R} is an expansion by the exponential function of the real ordered field with generalised quasianalytic classes [39]. A proof of this by Rolin, Servi and Speissegger should appear soon.

Acknowledgments. We thank Lou van den Dries, Françoise Point and Tamara Servi for their answers to our questions. We thank Sylvy Anscombe for her precious advice.

Bibliography

- [1] M. Aschenbrenner and L. van den Dries. H-fields and their Liouville extensions. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 242(3):543–588, 2002.

- [2] M. Aschenbrenner and L. van den Dries. Liouville closed H-fields. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 197:1–55, 2003.
- [3] M. Aschenbrenner, L. van den Dries, and J. van der Hoeven. *Asymptotic Differential Algebra and Model Theory of Transseries*. Number 195 in Annals of Mathematics studies. Princeton University Press, 2017.
- [4] M. Aschenbrenner, L. van den Dries, and J. van der Hoeven. Maximal Hardy fields. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.10846>, 2023.
- [5] V. Bagayoko. Hyperexponentially closed fields. <https://www.hal.inserm.fr/X-LIX/hal-03686767v1>, 2022.
- [6] V. Bagayoko. *Hyperseries and surreal numbers*. PhD thesis, UMon, Ecole Polytechnique, 2022. <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04105359>.
- [7] V. Bagayoko. Groups with infinite linearly ordered products (forthcoming). 2024.
- [8] B. Baizhanov, J. Baldwin, and V. Verbovskiy. Cayley’s theorem for ordered groups: o-minimality. *Sibirskie Èlektronnye Matematicheskie Izvestiya [electronic only]*, 4:278–281, 2007.
- [9] V. V. Bludov. Completions of linearly ordered groups. *Journal of Algebra and Logic*, 44(370–380), 2005.
- [10] M. Boshernitzan. New “orders of infinity”. *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*, 41:130–167, 1982.
- [11] N. Bourbaki. *Fonctions d’une variable réelle: Théorie élémentaire*. Éléments de mathématique. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [12] J. H. Conway. *On numbers and games*. Academic Press, 1976.
- [13] B. Dahn and P. Göring. Notes on exponential-logarithmic terms. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 127(1):45–50, 1987.
- [14] L. van den Dries. *Tame topology and o-minimal structures*, volume 248 of *London Math. Soc. Lect. Note*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [15] L. van den Dries, A. Macintyre, and D. Marker. Logarithmic-exponential power series. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 56(3):417–434, 1997.
- [16] L. van den Dries, A. Macintyre, and D. Marker. Logarithmic-exponential series. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 111:61–113, 07 2001.
- [17] J. Écalle. *Introduction aux fonctions analysables et preuve constructive de la conjecture de Dulac*. Actualités Mathématiques. Hermann, 1992.
- [18] B. Fine and G. Rosenberger. *Reflections on Commutative Transitivity*, chapter 8, pages 112–130. World Scientific Press, 2008.
- [19] L. Fuchs. *Partially Ordered Algebraic Systems*. Dover Publications, 2011.
- [20] A. M. W. Glass. *Partially ordered groups*, volume 7 of *Series in Algebra*. World Scientific Publisher Co Pte Ltd, 1999.
- [21] H. Hahn. Über die nichtarchimedischen Größensysteme. *Sitz. Akad. Wiss. Wien*, 116:601–655, 1907.
- [22] G. H. Hardy. *Orders of infinity, the ‘Infinitärcalcül’ of Paul du Bois-Reymond*. Cambridge University Press edition, 1910.
- [23] J. V. Hion. Archimedean ordered rings. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 9(4):237–242, 1954.
- [24] J. van der Hoeven. *Automatic asymptotics*. PhD thesis, École polytechnique, Palaiseau, France, 1997.
- [25] J. van der Hoeven. Operators on generalized power series. *Journal of the Univ. of Illinois*, 45(4):1161–1190, 2001.
- [26] J. van der Hoeven. *Transseries and real differential algebra*, volume 1888 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [27] J. van der Hoeven. Transserial Hardy fields. *Differential Equations and Singularities. 60 years of J. M. Aroca*, 323:453–487, 2009.
- [28] K. Iwasawa. On linearly ordered groups. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 1(1):1–9, 1948.
- [29] S. Kuhlmann. *Ordered exponential fields*, volume 12 of *Field Institute Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [30] F. W. Levi. Ordered groups. *Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences - Section A*, 16(4):256–263, 1942.
- [31] F. Loonstra. Ordered groups. *Proc. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch.*, 49:41–46, 1946.
- [32] D. Marker and C. Miller. Levelled o-minimal structures. *Revista Matemática de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid*, 10, 1997.
- [33] C. Miller. Exponentiation is hard to avoid. *Proc. of the Am. Math. Soc.*, 122(1):257–259, 1994.
- [34] R. B. Mura and A. Rhemtulla. *Orderable groups*. Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics. Taylor Francis, 1977.
- [35] B. H. Neumann. On ordered groups. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 71(1):1–18, 1949.
- [36] A. Padgett. *Sublogarithmic-transexponential series*. PhD thesis, Berkeley, 2022.

- [37] A. Pillay and C. Steinhorn. Definable Sets in Ordered Structures. I. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 295(2):565–592, 1986.
- [38] A. Robinson. *Complete theories*. North Holland, 1956.
- [39] J.-P. Rolin and T. Servi. Quantifier elimination and rectilinearization theorem for generalized quasi-analytic algebras. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 110(5):1207–1247, 2015.
- [40] M. Rosenlicht. Hardy fields. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 93(2):297–311, 1983.
- [41] P. Speissegger. The Pfaffian closure of an o-minimal structure. *Journal für die reine und angewante Mathematik*, 1999:189–211, 1997.
- [42] L. van den and P. Speissegger. The Field of Reals with Multisummable Series and the Exponential Function. *Proc. of the Lon. Math. Soc.*, 81:513–565, 2000.
- [43] A. J. Wilkie. Model completeness results for expansions of the ordered field of real numbers by restricted Pfaffian functions and the exponential function. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 9(4):1051–1094, 1996.

Index

Archimedean centralisers	7	Hardy field with composition	27
Archimedean ordered group	5	Hardy field	27
centraliser of an element	6	having scaling elements	11
convexity	7	H-field with composition and inversion	27
divisibility	6	H-field with composition	25
embedding of ordered groups	5	H-field	24
exponential H-field	36	homomorphism of ordered groups	5
field of constants	24	levelled o-minimal field	4
growth order group	12	ordered group	5
growth order of a group	10	polynomially bounded o-minimal structure	35
growth order of an element	10	scaling element	11
growth rank of a group	9	skeleton	13
growth rank of an element	8–9	transexponential function	4

Glossary

\mathcal{L}_{og}	first-order language of ordered groups	5
$\mathcal{G}^>$	$\{f \in \mathcal{G} : f > 1\}$	5
\mathcal{G}^\neq	$\mathcal{G} \setminus \{1\}$	5
$[f, g]$	$f^{-1}g^{-1}fg$	5
$\mathcal{C}(f)$	centraliser of f	6
$f \preceq_f g$	f lies in the convex hull of $\mathcal{C}(g)$	7
$f \succ_g g$	$f \preceq g$ and $g \preceq f$	8
$f \prec g$	$f \preceq g$ and $f \not\preceq g$	8
$\text{gr}(f)$	growth rank of f	9
$f \sim g$	$fg^{-1} \prec f$	9
$\text{go}(f)$	growth order of f	10
$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})_f$	unique $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G})$ with $g \sim f$	11
T_{gog}	theory of growth ordered groups	12
\mathcal{C}_ρ	group of growth orders of growth rank ρ	13
\mathcal{M}_∞	structure of germs of unary definable maps in \mathcal{M}	23
$\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{M}$	group of germs $g \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$ with $\lim_{+\infty} g = +\infty$	23
a^\dagger	a'_a	24
$a^{[n]}$	n -fold iterate of a	25
a^{inv}	compositional inverse of a	25