

ON DP-MINIMAL EXPANSIONS OF THE INTEGERS II

ERAN ALOUF

ABSTRACT. We first prove that if \mathcal{Z} is a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ which is not interdefinable with $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$, then every infinite subset of \mathbb{Z} definable in \mathcal{Z} is generic in \mathbb{Z} . Using this, we prove that if \mathcal{Z} is a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ with monster model G such that $G^{00} \neq G^0$, then for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, the cyclic order on \mathbb{Z} induced by the embedding $n \mapsto n\alpha + \mathbb{Z}$ of \mathbb{Z} in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} is definable in \mathcal{Z} . The proof employs the Gleason-Yamabe theorem for abelian groups.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we make another step towards classifying dp-minimal expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$. We refer to the introduction of [Alo20] for a broader exposition. For two structures $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ with the same underlying universe M , we say that \mathcal{M}_1 is a *reduct* of \mathcal{M}_2 , and that \mathcal{M}_2 is an *expansion* of \mathcal{M}_1 , if for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, every subset of M^k which is definable in \mathcal{M}_1 is also definable (with parameters) in \mathcal{M}_2 . We say that \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are *interdefinable* if \mathcal{M}_1 is a reduct of \mathcal{M}_2 and \mathcal{M}_2 is a reduct of \mathcal{M}_1 , and we say that \mathcal{M}_2 is a *proper expansion* of \mathcal{M}_1 if \mathcal{M}_2 is an expansion of \mathcal{M}_1 but \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are not interdefinable.

In [CP18] it was shown that $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ has no stable proper expansions of finite dp-rank. Every known dp-minimal proper expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ is a reduct of a dp-minimal expansion of a structure from one of three specific families:

- The first such family consists of the single structure $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$. In [ADH⁺16] it was shown that $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$ has no dp-minimal proper expansions. This was later significantly strengthened in [DG17] (see Fact 3.9). In [Con18] it was shown that $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$ has no proper reducts which are proper expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$. Finally, [Alo20] classified $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$ as the unique dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ which defines an infinite subset of \mathbb{N} , as well as the unique dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ which does not eliminate \exists^∞ .

- The second family consists of the structures $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_v)$, where v is a generalized valuation. For every strictly descending chain $(B_i)_{i < \omega}$ of subgroups of \mathbb{Z} with $B_0 = \mathbb{Z}$,

we can define a function $v : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \omega \cup \{\infty\}$ by $v(x) := \max \{i \in \omega : x \in B_i\}$. We call such a function v a generalized valuation on \mathbb{Z} . We also denote by \preceq_v the associated partial order, i.e., $a \preceq_v b$ if and only if $v(a) \leq v(b)$. When $p \in \mathbb{N}$ is prime and $B_i = p^i \mathbb{Z}$, v is the usual p -adic valuation, and we denote it by v_p and the associated order by \preceq_p . In [Ad19] it was shown that for every nonempty (possibly infinite) set of primes $P \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, the structure $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \{\preceq_p\}_{p \in P})$ has dp-rank $|P|$. In particular, for a single prime p , the structure $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$ is dp-minimal. This was generalized in [Cla20], where it was shown that for every generalized valuation v , the structure $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_v)$ is dp-minimal. In [Ad19] it was also shown that $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$ has no proper reducts which are proper expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$.

- The third family consists of the structures $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and C_α is the cyclic order on \mathbb{Z} induced by α . Denote by \mathcal{C} the positively oriented cyclic order on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , i.e., for $u, v, w \in [0, 1)$ we have $\mathcal{C}(u + \mathbb{Z}, v + \mathbb{Z}, w + \mathbb{Z})$ if and only if $u < v < w$ or $v < w < u$ or $w < u < v$. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and let $\eta : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be given by $\eta(n) := n\alpha + \mathbb{Z}$. Then C_α is defined by setting $C_\alpha(a, b, c)$ if and only if $\mathcal{C}(\eta(a), \eta(b), \eta(c))$. In [TW23] it was shown that for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, the structure $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)$ is dp-minimal.

These structures themselves are not the only dp-minimal expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$. As noted in [TW23], the Shelah expansion $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)^{Sh}$ of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)$ is a proper expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)$. In [Wal20] Walsberg constructed uncountably many proper dp-minimal expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)^{Sh}$. In the same paper, Walsberg also constructed a proper dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$. In [Cla20] it was shown that even if we expand $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_v)$ by adding to the value sort all unary subsets and all monotone binary relations, then the resulting structure is still dp-minimal. And, of course, every reduct of any of these expansions is still dp-minimal.

These results showed that $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ has many more dp-minimal expansions than was previously thought, and may give the impression that the classification of dp-minimal expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ is a lost cause. But, while a complete classification might be beyond reach, we believe that the following holds:

Conjecture 1.1. *Let \mathcal{Z} be a dp-minimal proper expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$. Then exactly one of the following holds:*

- \mathcal{Z} is interdefinable with $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$.
- There is $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ such that C_α is definable in \mathcal{Z} .
- There is a generalized valuation v such that \preceq_v is definable in \mathcal{Z} .

We can try to prove Conjecture 1.1 by classifying each case separately. [Alo20] already dealt with the first case. In this paper, we deal with the second case by proving:

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{Z} be a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$, and let G be a monster model. Suppose that $G^{00} \neq G^0$. Then for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, C_α is definable in \mathcal{Z} .*

We also show that the converse holds. In order to prove Theorem 1.2, we first prove:

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{Z} be a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ which is not interdefinable with $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$. Then every infinite subset of \mathbb{Z} definable in \mathcal{Z} is generic in \mathbb{Z} .*

This is a general theorem about dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$, and we expect it to also play a key role in dealing with the third and last case of Conjecture 1.1.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Dp-minimality.

Definition 2.1. Let T be a theory, and let κ be a cardinal. An *ict-pattern* of depth κ consists of:

- a collection of formulas $(\phi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$, with $|x| = 1$, and
- an array $(b_{\alpha,i} : i < \omega, \alpha < \kappa)$ of tuples in some model \mathcal{M} of T , with $|b_{\alpha,i}| = |y_\alpha|$

such that for every $\eta : \kappa \rightarrow \omega$ there exists an element $a_\eta \in \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\mathcal{M} \models \phi_\alpha(a_\eta; b_{\alpha,i}) \iff \eta(\alpha) = i$$

We define $\kappa_{ict} = \kappa_{ict}(T)$ as the minimal κ such that there does not exist an ict-pattern of depth κ , and define $\kappa_{ict} = \infty$ if there is no such κ . For a structure \mathcal{M} , we let $\kappa_{ict}(\mathcal{M}) := \kappa_{ict}(Th(\mathcal{M}))$.

Definition 2.2. A theory T is *dp-minimal* if $\kappa_{ict}(T) \leq 2$. A structure \mathcal{M} is *dp-minimal* if $Th(\mathcal{M})$ is.

Fact 2.3 ([Sim15, Observation 4.13]). *A theory T is NIP if and only if $\kappa_{ict}(T) < \infty$.*

Definition 2.4. Let T be a theory, and let κ be a cardinal. An *inp-pattern* of depth κ consists of:

- a collection of formulas $(\phi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$, with $|x| = 1$, and
- an array $(b_{\alpha,i} : i < \omega, \alpha < \kappa)$ of tuples in some model of T , with $|b_{\alpha,i}| = |y_\alpha|$

such that:

- (1) for each $\alpha < \kappa$ there exists $k_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ for which the row $\{\phi_\alpha(x; b_{\alpha,i}) : i < \omega\}$ is k_α -inconsistent, and
- (2) for every $\eta : \kappa \rightarrow \omega$ the path $\{\phi_\alpha(x; b_{\alpha,\eta(\alpha)}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is consistent.

We define $\kappa_{inp} = \kappa_{inp}(T)$ as the minimal κ such that there does not exist an inp-pattern of depth κ , and define $\kappa_{inp} = \infty$ if there is no such κ .

Fact 2.5 ([Adl, Proposition 10]). *For every theory T we have $\kappa_{inp} \leq \kappa_{ict}$, and if T is NIP then $\kappa_{inp} = \kappa_{ict}$.*

2.2. Connected components and compact quotients. Let G be a \emptyset -definable group in a theory T .

Definition 2.6. Let H be a subgroup of G type-definable over a small set A . If the set

$$\{[G(\mathcal{M}) : H(\mathcal{M})] : A \subseteq \mathcal{M} \models T\}$$

is bounded, we say that H has bounded index in G . The *index* of H in G is the supremum of this set.

Remark 2.7. If H has bounded index in G , then the supremum is at most $2^{|T|}$, and is obtained whenever \mathcal{M} is saturated enough. If in addition H is definable, then $[G(\mathcal{M}) : H(\mathcal{M})]$ is finite and does not depend on \mathcal{M} .

Definition 2.8. Let A be a small set. Define:

$$G_A^0 := \bigcap \{H : H \text{ is an } A\text{-definable subgroup of finite index in } G\}$$

$$G_A^{00} := \bigcap \{H : H \text{ is an } A\text{-type-definable subgroup of bounded index in } G\}$$

Both G_A^0 and G_A^{00} are A -type-definable and have bounded index in G (hence G_A^{00} is the smallest such subgroup).

Definition 2.9. If G_A^{00} (resp. G_A^0) does not depend on A , we denote it by G^{00} (resp. G^0) and say that G^{00} (resp. G^0) exists.

If G^{00} (resp. G^0) exists, then it is the intersection of all type-definable (resp. definable) subgroups of G of bounded (resp. finite) index, and is a normal subgroup of G . If G^{00} exists, then G^0 exists as well.

Fact 2.10 ([She08]). *If T is NIP then G^{00} exists.*

Let A be a small set, and H an A -type-definable subgroup of G of bounded index. Then $G(\mathfrak{C})/H(\mathfrak{C})$ does not depend on the choice of the monster \mathfrak{C} , and we denote it simply by G/H .

Let $\mathcal{M} \supseteq A$ be a small model. We define a topology (called the *logic topology*) on G/H by saying that $C \subseteq G/H$ is closed if and only if $\pi^{-1}(C)$ is \mathcal{M} -type-definable, where $\pi : G \rightarrow G/H$ is the quotient map.

Fact 2.11 ([Sim15, 8.1.5]). *This topology does not depend on \mathcal{M} . In this topology, G/G^0 and G/G^{00} are compact Hausdorff topological groups.*

Remark 2.12. If G is (a monster model of) any expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$, then G^0 exists and is equal to $\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} mG$. This is because for each m , \mathbb{Z} has exactly one subgroup of index m , namely $m\mathbb{Z}$, and this fact can be expressed by first-order formulas in $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$. It follows that $G/G^0 \cong \hat{\mathbb{Z}} = \varprojlim \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$.

2.3. Externally definable sets and the Shelah expansion.

Definition 2.13. Let \mathcal{M} be a structure in a language L , and fix an elementary extension \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} which is $|\mathcal{M}|^+$ -saturated.

- (1) An *externally definable* subset of \mathcal{M} is a subset of \mathcal{M}^k of the form

$$\phi(\mathcal{M}; b) := \{a \in \mathcal{M} : \mathcal{N} \models \phi(a; b)\}$$

for some $k \geq 1$, $\phi(x; y) \in L$, and $b \in \mathcal{N}^{|y|}$.

- (2) The *Shelah expansion* of \mathcal{M} , denoted by \mathcal{M}^{Sh} , is defined to be the structure in the language $L^{Sh} := \{R_{\phi(x;b)}(x) : \phi(x; y) \in L, b \in \mathcal{N}^{|y|}\}$ whose universe is \mathcal{M} and where each $R_{\phi(x;b)}(x)$ is interpreted as $\phi(\mathcal{M}; b)$.

Note that the property of being an externally definable subset of \mathcal{M} does not depend on the choice of \mathcal{N} . Hence, up to interdefinability, \mathcal{M}^{Sh} does not depend on the choice of \mathcal{N} (although formally, a different \mathcal{N} gives a different language and so a different structure), so it makes sense to talk about *the* Shelah expansion.

Fact 2.14 (Shelah. See [Sim15, Proposition 3.23]). *Let \mathcal{M} be NIP. Then \mathcal{M}^{Sh} eliminates quantifiers.*

It follows that if \mathcal{M} is NIP then every definable set in \mathcal{M}^{Sh} is externally definable in \mathcal{M} , and $(\mathcal{M}^{Sh})^{Sh}$ is interdefinable with \mathcal{M}^{Sh} .

Corollary 2.15. *Let \mathcal{M} be any structure. Then $\kappa_{ict}(\mathcal{M}^{Sh}) = \kappa_{ict}(\mathcal{M})$.*

3. GENERICITY

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3.

Definition 3.1. A subset A of an abelian semigroup $(S, +)$ is called *generic in S* (or *syndetic in S* , as this was called in [Alo20, Subsection 4.1]) if there is a finite subset $F \subseteq S$ such that $\bigcup_{s \in F} (A - s) = S$, where $A - s := \{a \in S : a + s \in A\}$.

For $S = \mathbb{N}$, this is the same as saying that A is infinite and there is a uniform bound on the distance between every two consecutive elements of A . For $S = \mathbb{Z}$, this is the same as saying that $\inf A = -\infty$, $\sup A = \infty$, and there is a uniform bound on the distance between every two consecutive elements of A .

Recall the following definitions from [Alo20, Subsection 4.2]:

Definition 3.2. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. We say that $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is a *bound on the two-sided gaps of A* if for every $x \in A$ there exists $d \in [-N, -1] \cup [1, N]$ such that $x + d \in A$. We say that A *has bounded two-sided gaps* if there exists a bound N on the two-sided gaps of A .

Definition 3.3. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$.

- (1) Define a function $L_A : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ by

$$L_A(y) := \sup \{m \in \mathbb{N} : [y - m, y - 1] \cap A = \emptyset\}$$

- (2) Define a function $L_A : P(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$ by

$$L_A(B) := \sup \{L_A(y) : y \in B \text{ and } y > \inf A\}$$

Remark 3.4. In [Alo20, Remark 4.5. (4)] it is remarked that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is infinite and not generic in \mathbb{N} then $L_A(A) = \infty$. In fact, something a bit more general is true: for $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, if at least one of the sets $A \cap \mathbb{N}$, $(-A) \cap \mathbb{N}$ is infinite and not generic in \mathbb{N} , then $L_A(A) = \infty$.

Fact 3.5 ([Alo20, Proposition 4.7., see remark below]). *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be infinite with $L_A(A) = \infty$, and let $\mathcal{Z} := (\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, A)$. Suppose that every infinite subset of A that is definable in \mathcal{Z} has bounded two-sided gaps. Then the formula $y - x \in A$ has IP.*

Remark 3.6. In [Alo20, Proposition 4.7.], instead of assuming that $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is infinite with $L_A(A) = \infty$, the assumption is that $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is infinite and not generic in \mathbb{N} . But this assumption is used only to deduce that $L_A(A) = \infty$. The proof of [Alo20, Proposition 4.7.] also uses [Alo20, Lemma 4.6.], which assumes that $A' \subseteq A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, but in fact the proof of [Alo20, Lemma 4.6.] works for any $A' \subseteq A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be infinite, and let $\mathcal{Z} := (\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, A)$. Suppose that every infinite subset of A that is definable in \mathcal{Z} has bounded two-sided gaps. Suppose also that A is not generic in \mathbb{Z} . Then either \mathbb{N} is definable in \mathcal{Z} , or the formula $y - x \in A$ has IP.*

Proof. If A is bounded from below, let $m := \min(A)$, and let $A' := A - m$. Then $A' \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, A' is infinite, and $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, A')$ is interdefinable with \mathcal{Z} . Moreover, every infinite subset of A' that is definable in \mathcal{Z} has bounded two-sided gaps. By Remark 3.4 and Fact 3.5, either A' is generic in \mathbb{N} , or the formula $y - x \in A'$ has IP. In the former case, \mathbb{N} is definable in \mathcal{Z} . In the latter case, also the formula $y - x \in A$ has IP.

If A is bounded from above, applying the above to $-A$ gives that either \mathbb{N} is definable in \mathcal{Z} , or the formula $y - x \in A$ has IP.

So suppose that A is unbounded both from below and from above. If both sets $A \cap \mathbb{N}$, $(-A) \cap \mathbb{N}$ are generic in \mathbb{N} , then A is in fact generic in \mathbb{Z} , a contradiction.

So at least one of the sets $A \cap \mathbb{N}$, $(-A) \cap \mathbb{N}$ is infinite and not generic in \mathbb{N} . By Remark 3.4, $L_A(A) = \infty$. By Fact 3.5, the formula $y - x \in A$ has IP. \blacksquare

Proposition 3.8. *Let \mathcal{Z} be a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$. Then every infinite subset of \mathbb{Z} definable in \mathcal{Z} has bounded two-sided gaps.*

Proof. Let L be the language of \mathcal{Z} , and let $L' = L \cup \{<\}$. Expand \mathcal{Z} to an L' -structure \mathcal{Z}' by interpreting $<$ as the usual order.

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be infinite and definable in \mathcal{Z} , and suppose towards a contradiction that it does not have bounded two-sided gaps. So for all $N < \omega$ there is $a \in A$ such that $A \cap [a - N, a + N] = \{a\}$. We may assume that we can always find such $a > 0$: otherwise, replace A with $-A$. Note that as N goes to infinity, the minimal positive a satisfying the above, also goes to infinity. In particular, given N , we can always find such a which is arbitrarily large.

By recursion on $i < \omega$, we construct a strictly increasing sequence $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ of positive elements of A such that for all $i < j < \omega$, $A \cap [b_j - b_i, b_j + b_i] = \{b_j\}$: Let b_0 be any positive element of A , and, given b_i , let $b_{i+1} > b_i$ be given by the above for $N = b_i$.

Let \mathcal{M}' be an ω_1 -saturated elementary extension of \mathcal{Z}' , and let \mathcal{M} be its reduct to L . Denote by A^* the interpretation in \mathcal{M} of the formula defining A in \mathcal{Z} . Let $(a_i)_{i < \omega \cdot 2}$ be an L' -indiscernible sequence locally-based on $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$. So $(a_i)_{i < \omega \cdot 2}$ is a strictly increasing sequence of positive infinite elements of A^* , and for all $i < j < \omega \cdot 2$, $A^* \cap [a_j - a_i, a_j + a_i] = \{a_j\}$.

Let $i < j < \omega \cdot 2$. Clearly, $a_j + a_i \in A^* + a_j$ and $a_j + a_i \in A^* + a_i$. Let $k < j$, $k \neq i$. Then $a_j + a_i \notin A^* + a_k$: Suppose otherwise. So $a_j + a_i - a_k \in A^*$. But $a_j + a_i - a_k \in [a_j - a_{j-1}, a_j + a_{j-1}]$, therefore $a_j + a_i - a_k = a_j$, so $a_i = a_k$, a contradiction.

Consider the following two families:

$$\{(A^* + a_{2i+1}) \setminus (A^* + a_{2i}) : i < \omega\}$$

$$\{(A^* + a_{\omega+2j+1}) \setminus (A^* + a_{\omega+2j}) : j < \omega\}$$

Since \mathcal{Z} is NIP, both families are l -inconsistent for some $l < \omega$. By the above, for every $i, j < \omega$, $a_{\omega+2j+1} + a_{2i+1} \in (A^* + a_{2i+1}) \setminus (A^* + a_{2i})$ and $a_{\omega+2j+1} + a_{2i+1} \in (A^* + a_{\omega+2j+1}) \setminus (A^* + a_{\omega+2j})$. So this is an inp-pattern of depth 2, contradicting the dp-minimality of \mathcal{Z} . \blacksquare

We also need the following:

Fact 3.9 ([DG17, Corollary 2.20]). *Suppose that \mathcal{Z} is a strong expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$. Then \mathcal{Z} is interdefinable with $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$.*

Since every strongly-dependent theory is strong, this fact implies that every proper expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$ has dp-rank $\geq \omega$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be infinite and definable in \mathcal{Z} , and suppose towards a contradiction that it is not generic in \mathbb{Z} . By Proposition 3.8, every infinite subset of A that is definable in \mathcal{Z} has bounded two-sided gaps. Since \mathcal{Z} is NIP, by Corollary 3.7 we get that \mathbb{N} is definable in \mathcal{Z} , so \mathcal{Z} is a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$. By Fact 3.9, \mathcal{Z} is interdefinable with $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$, a contradiction. \blacksquare

Remark 3.10. Note that Theorem 1.3 is only about the structure \mathcal{Z} itself, not the monster. It implies that every infinite subset of the monster which is definable over \mathbb{Z} is generic in the monster, but other infinite definable subsets of the monster might not be generic.

In fact, it can be shown that, in general, if G is an NIP group, and every infinite definable subset of the monster is generic, then G must be stable.

4. OBTAINING A HOMOMORPHISM TO \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}

In this section, T is any theory, and G is a group \emptyset -definable in T for which G^{00} exists (and hence so does G^0).

Lemma 4.1. *$G^{00} \neq G^0$ if and only if there is an open neighborhood U of the identity in G/G^{00} which does not contain any closed subgroups of finite index.*

Proof. Denote by $\pi : G \rightarrow G/G^{00}$ the quotient map. Suppose that $G^{00} \neq G^0$, so $\pi(G^0) \neq \{1\}$. Let $1 \neq h \in \pi(G^0)$. Since G/G^{00} is Hausdorff, there are open neighborhoods U, V of $1, h$ respectively, which are disjoint. So $\pi(G^0) \not\subseteq U$.

Suppose towards a contradiction that $H' \subseteq U$ for some closed subgroup H' of G/G^{00} of finite index, and let $H := \pi^{-1}(H')$. So H is of finite index in G . Since G/G^{00} is compact, H' is also open, therefore H is definable over some (any) small model \mathcal{M} . Therefore $G^0 \subseteq H$, so $\pi(G^0) \subseteq H' \subseteq U$, a contradiction.

On the other hand, suppose that $G^{00} = G^0$, so $\pi(G^0) = \{1\}$. Let U be an open neighborhood of 1 in G/G^{00} . So $G^0 \subseteq \pi^{-1}(U)$, and $\pi^{-1}(U)$ is \forall -definable over some (any) small model \mathcal{M} . By the definition of G^0 and the saturation of the monster, there is an \mathcal{M} -definable subgroup H of G of finite index such that $H \subseteq \pi^{-1}(U)$. So $\pi(H) \subseteq U$. Since $G^{00} \subseteq H$, $\pi^{-1}(\pi(H)) = HG^{00} = H$, and so $\pi(H)$ is clopen and of finite index. ■

We need the following two well-known facts:

Fact 4.2 ([Tao14, Gleason-Yamabe theorem for abelian groups]). *Let G be a locally compact abelian Hausdorff group, and let U be a neighborhood of the identity. Then there is a compact normal subgroup K of G contained in U such that G/K is isomorphic to a Lie group.*

Fact 4.3. *Every compact abelian Lie group is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \times F$ for some $d \in \omega$ and F a finite abelian group.*

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that G is abelian and $G^{00} \neq G^0$. Then there is a surjective group homomorphism $h : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ such that for any small model \mathcal{M} :*

- (1) *A set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is closed if and only if $h^{-1}(C)$ is \mathcal{M} -type-definable.*
- (2) *$h(\mathcal{M})$ is dense.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 there is an open neighborhood U of the identity in $\bar{G} := G/G^{00}$ which does not contain any closed subgroups of finite index. By Fact 4.2 there is a compact (so also closed) normal subgroup K of \bar{G} contained in U such that \bar{G}/K is isomorphic to a Lie group. By Fact 4.3, \bar{G}/K is of the form $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \times F$ for some $d \in \omega$ and F a finite abelian group. By the choice of U , K has infinite index in \bar{G} , so $d \geq 1$.

Let $p : \bar{G}/K \cong (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \times F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be the projection on the first coordinate, and denote also by $\pi : G \rightarrow \bar{G}$ and $\rho : \bar{G} \rightarrow \bar{G}/K$ the quotient maps. Let $h := p \circ \rho \circ \pi$. Since ρ and p are topological quotient maps, and since the topology on \bar{G} is the logic topology, h satisfies (1).

(2) follows from (1): Let $\emptyset \neq O \subseteq \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be open. So $h^{-1}(O) \neq \emptyset$ is \mathbb{V} -definable over \mathcal{M} , therefore $h^{-1}(O) \cap \mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$, so $O \cap h(\mathcal{M}) \neq \emptyset$. \blacksquare

Remark 4.5. In the context of Lemma 4.4, in particular, $\ker(h)$ is type-definable over any small model. Therefore, if $P \subseteq G$ is type-definable (over any small set), then $h^{-1}(h(P)) = P + \ker(h)$ is also type-definable, and hence $h(P)$ is closed in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} .

5. RECOVERING THE CYCLIC ORDER

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. Let \mathcal{Z} be a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ with monster model G , and suppose that $G^{00} \neq G^0$. Let $h : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be a homomorphism as given by Lemma 4.4. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $h(1) = \alpha + \mathbb{Z}$. Since $h(\mathbb{Z})$ is dense, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\mathbb{Q}$. Note that $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is injective. We will show that C_α is definable in \mathcal{Z} .

Notation 5.1. Let $q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be the quotient map, and let $\iota := \left(q \upharpoonright_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]}\right)^{-1} : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Note that $q \upharpoonright_{(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})}$ and $\iota \upharpoonright_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \{q(-\frac{1}{2})\}}$ are homeomorphisms.

When it's clear from the context, we identify intervals $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with their image $q(I)$. So, for example, $h^{-1}\left(\left[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right]\right)$ means $h^{-1}\left(q\left(\left[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right]\right)\right)$.

Remark 5.2. If $s, t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\iota(s) + \iota(t) \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ then $\iota(s + t) = \iota(q(\iota(s)) + q(\iota(t))) = \iota(q(\iota(s) + \iota(t))) = \iota(s) + \iota(t)$. In particular, this is true for $s, t \in q\left(\left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right)\right)$.

We also have $\iota(-s) = -\iota(s)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$.

Notation 5.3. Let $u_1 < v_1 \leq v_2 < u_2$ in \mathbb{R} . Then $h^{-1}([v_1, v_2]) \subseteq h^{-1}((u_1, u_2))$, where $h^{-1}([v_1, v_2])$ is type-definable over \mathbb{Z} and $h^{-1}((u_1, u_2))$ is \mathbb{V} -definable over \mathbb{Z} . By saturation, there is a \mathbb{Z} -definable set $h^{-1}([v_1, v_2]) \subseteq B \subseteq h^{-1}((u_1, u_2))$. We fix one such set and denote it by B_{u_1, v_1, v_2, u_2} .

For $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq r_1 < r_2$, we denote $B_{u, r_1, r_2} := B_{u-r_2, u-r_1, u+r_1, u+r_2}$. For $r > 0$ we also denote $B_{u, r} := B_{u, \frac{r}{2}, r}$.

We may assume that the sets of the form B_{0, r_1, r_2} (and $B_{0, r}$) are symmetric, by replacing them with $B_{0, r_1, r_2} \cup (-B_{0, r_1, r_2})$.

Remark 5.4. Since $G^{00} \neq G^0$, \mathcal{Z} is not interdefinable with $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$, so by Theorem 1.3, every infinite subset of \mathbb{Z} definable in \mathcal{Z} is generic in \mathbb{Z} . By elementarity, for every infinite subset A of G which is definable over \mathbb{Z} , there is a finite subset $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A + F = G$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$, and let E be an infinite \mathbb{Z} -definable subset of G such that $h(E) \subseteq \left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2}\right)$. Then for every $0 < u < \frac{1}{2}$ there is a finite $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that*

$h(F) \subseteq \left[-u - \frac{r}{2}, u + \frac{r}{2}\right]$ and

$$h^{-1}([-u, u]) \subseteq E + F \subseteq h^{-1}((-u - r, u + r))$$

Proof. Since E is infinite and \mathbb{Z} -definable, by Remark 5.4 there is a finite $F' \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $E + F' = G$. Note that for $c \in G$, if $h(c) \notin \left[-u - \frac{r}{2}, u + \frac{r}{2}\right]$ then $h(E + c) \cap [-u, u] = \emptyset$. So $F := F' \cap h^{-1}\left(\left[-u - \frac{r}{2}, u + \frac{r}{2}\right]\right)$ is as required. ■

Lemma 5.6. *Let $A \subseteq G$ be \mathbb{Z} -definable, and let $s \in h(A)$. If s is an isolated point of $h(A)$, then there is $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A \cap h^{-1}(s) = \{b\}$.*

Proof. Since $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is injective, $|\mathbb{Z} \cap h^{-1}(s)| \leq 1$. If $|\mathbb{Z} \cap h^{-1}(s)| = 1$, denote by b the single element of $\mathbb{Z} \cap h^{-1}(s)$, and otherwise, denote $b := 0$. Since s is an isolated point of $h(A)$, there is $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $h(A) \cap (\iota(s) - r, \iota(s) + r) = \{s\}$. Let $B := B_{\iota(s), r}$ as in Notation 5.3.

Suppose towards a contradiction that $A \cap h^{-1}(s) \neq \{b\}$ (in particular, this holds if $\mathbb{Z} \cap h^{-1}(s) = \emptyset$). Since $s \in h(A)$, $A \cap h^{-1}(s) \neq \emptyset$, so let $d \in A \cap h^{-1}(s)$ such that $d \neq b$. In particular, $d \in h^{-1}\left(\left[\iota(s) - \frac{r}{2}, \iota(s) + \frac{r}{2}\right]\right) \subseteq B$. So $d \in (A \cap B) \setminus \{b\}$. But $(A \cap B) \setminus \{b\}$ is \mathbb{Z} -definable, so, by elementarity, there exists $a \in ((A \cap B) \setminus \{b\}) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore $h(a) \in h(A \cap B) \subseteq h(A) \cap h(B) \subseteq h(A) \cap (\iota(s) - r, \iota(s) + r) = \{s\}$, so $a \in \mathbb{Z} \cap h^{-1}(s) \subseteq \{b\}$, a contradiction. ■

Lemma 5.7. *Let $A \subseteq G$ be \mathbb{Z} -definable, let $0 < d \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $p \in \left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)$ be an accumulation point of $h(A)$. Then there is a finite subset $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h(F) \subseteq (-d, d)$, $0 \notin F$, and $h^{-1}\left(\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)\right) \subseteq A + F$.*

Proof. Let $d' \in \left(0, \frac{d}{2}\right)$ be such that $p \in (-d', d')$, and let $B := B_{0, d', \frac{d}{2}}$ as in Notation 5.3. Since $p \in (-d', d')$ is an accumulation point of $h(A)$, $h(A) \cap (-d', d')$ is infinite. But $h(A \cap B) \supseteq h(A \cap h^{-1}((-d', d'))) = h(A) \cap (-d', d')$, so $h(A \cap B)$, and hence $A \cap B$, are infinite as well.

Since A and B are \mathbb{Z} -definable, so is $A \cap B$. So by elementarity, $A \cap B \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is infinite. By Remark 5.4 there is a finite $F' \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A \cap B \cap \mathbb{Z} + F' = \mathbb{Z}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus F'$, and let $F'' := F' - m$. So $0 \notin F''$ and $A \cap B \cap \mathbb{Z} + F'' = \mathbb{Z} - m = \mathbb{Z}$. By elementarity, $A \cap B + F'' = G$.

Let $F := \left\{c \in F'' : (A \cap B + c) \cap h^{-1}\left(\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)\right) \neq \emptyset\right\}$. So $A + F \supseteq A \cap B + F \supseteq h^{-1}\left(\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)\right)$. If $d > \frac{1}{2}$ then clearly $h(F) \subseteq (-d, d)$, so suppose $d \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Let $c \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the choice of B , $h(A \cap B + c) \subseteq h(B + c) = h(B) + h(c) \subseteq \left(-\frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)), \frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c))\right)$, so

$A \cap B + c \subseteq h^{-1} \left(\left(-\frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)), \frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)) \right) \right)$. Therefore, for $c \in F$ we get $h^{-1} \left(\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} \right) \right) \cap h^{-1} \left(\left(-\frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)), \frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)) \right) \right) \neq \emptyset$, so $\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} \right) \cap \left(-\frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)), \frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)) \right) \neq \emptyset$. Recall that these intervals actually denote their images under the quotient map $q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, i.e., we only have $q \left(\left(-\frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)), \frac{d}{2} + \iota(h(c)) \right) \right) \cap q \left(\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} \right) \right) \neq \emptyset$. But since $d \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and since $\iota(h(c)) \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right)$, this implies that $-d < \iota(h(c)) < d$, so $h(c) \in (-d, d)$. This shows that $h(F) \subseteq (-d, d)$. \blacksquare

Corollary 5.8. *For every infinite \mathbb{Z} -definable set $B \subseteq G$ and every $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$, there is $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 < \iota(h(b)) < r$ such that $B \cap (B + b)$ is infinite.*

Proof. We may assume $r < \frac{1}{2}$. By elementarity, $B \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is infinite. Since $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is injective, $h(B) \supseteq h(B \cap \mathbb{Z})$ is infinite, and hence has an accumulation point p . Since $h(\mathbb{Z})$ is dense, there is $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h(m) \in \left(p - \frac{r}{2}, p + \frac{r}{2} \right)$. Let $B' := B - m$. So $p' := p - h(m) \in \left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2} \right)$ is an accumulation point of $h(B') = h(B) - h(m)$.

By Lemma 5.7 there is a finite subset $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h(F) \subseteq (-r, r)$, $0 \notin F$, and $h^{-1} \left(\left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2} \right) \right) \subseteq B' + F$. So $h(B' \cap (B' + F)) \supseteq h \left(B' \cap h^{-1} \left(\left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2} \right) \right) \right) = h(B') \cap \left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2} \right)$. Since $p' \in \left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2} \right)$ is an accumulation point of $h(B')$, we get that $h(B' \cap (B' + F))$, and hence $B' \cap (B' + F)$, are infinite. But $B' \cap (B' + F) = B \cap (B + F) - m$, so $B \cap (B + F)$ is infinite.

Since F is finite, there is $b \in F$ such that $B \cap (B + b)$ is infinite. So $h(b) \in (-r, r)$. Since $0 \notin F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is injective, $h(b) \neq 0$. Note that $B \cap (B - b) = B \cap (B + b) - b$ is also infinite, so by replacing b with $-b$ if necessary, we may assume that $h(b) \in (0, r)$. Since $r < \frac{1}{2}$ we get $0 < \iota(h(b)) < r$. \blacksquare

Lemma 5.9. *There is a uniformly \mathbb{Z} -definable family $\{E_r : 0 < r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of infinite subsets of G , such that for each r , $h(E_r) \subseteq \left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2} \right)$.*

Proof. Let $A := B_{0, \frac{1}{32}}$. By Remark 4.5, $h(A)$ is closed, so $C := \iota(h(A))$ is closed as well. Let $s := \min(C)$ and $t := \max(C)$. Let $C' \subseteq C$ be the set of accumulation points of C , which is closed as well, and let $s' := \min(C')$ and $t' := \max(C')$. Let $S := C \cap [s, s')$ and $T := C \cap (t', t]$. By definition, for every $u \in [s, s')$, the interval $[s, u]$ contains no accumulation points of C , so $C \cap [s, u]$ is finite. Therefore, either S is finite, or S has order-type ω with $\sup(S) = s'$. Similarly, either T is finite, or T has order-type $(\omega, >)$ with $\inf(T) = t'$. Denote $S = \{s_i\}_{i < \alpha}$, $T = \{t_i\}_{i < \beta}$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \omega + 1$ and for every $i < j$, $s_i < s_j$ and $t_i > t_j$. Note that if $S = \emptyset$ (resp. $T = \emptyset$) then $s = s'$ (resp. $t = t'$), and otherwise, $s = s_0$ (resp. $t = t_0$).

Claim 5.10. For every $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$ there are $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that:

- (1) $(A + b_1) \cap (A + b_2)$ is infinite,
- (2) $\iota(h(b_1)) < 0 < \iota(h(b_2))$, and
- (3) $-\frac{r}{2} < s' + \iota(h(b_2)) < 0 < t' + \iota(h(b_1)) < \frac{r}{2}$.

Proof of Claim. Let $0 < d < \min\left(t', -s', \frac{r}{2}, \frac{1}{16}\right)$, and let $b'_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $-\frac{d}{4} < s' + \iota(h(b'_2)) < 0$ (which exists since $\iota(h(\mathbb{Z}))$ is dense in $\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and $s' < \frac{1}{2}$). By definition of s' , $q(s' + \iota(h(b'_2))) = q(s') + h(b'_2)$ is an accumulation point of $q(C + \iota(h(b'_2))) = q(C) + h(b'_2) = h(A) + h(b'_2) = h(A + b'_2)$, so by Lemma 5.7 there is a finite subset $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h(F) \subseteq (-d, d)$, $0 \notin F$, and $h^{-1}\left(\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)\right) \subseteq A + b'_2 + F$.

Let $b'_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $0 < t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) < \frac{d}{2}$ and $t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) \notin \iota(h(F)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2))$ (which exists since $\iota(h(\mathbb{Z}))$ is dense in $\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, $t' > \frac{1}{2}$, and F is finite). By definition of t' , $q(t' + \iota(h(b'_1)))$ is an accumulation point of $q(C + \iota(h(b'_1))) = h(A + b'_1)$, so $h(A + b'_1) \cap \left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)$ is infinite. But $h((A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + F)) \supseteq h\left((A + b'_1) \cap h^{-1}\left(\left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)\right)\right) = h(A + b'_1) \cap \left(-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}\right)$, so $h((A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + F))$, and hence $(A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + F)$, are infinite as well.

Since F is finite, there is $c \in F$ such that $(A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c)$ is infinite. By the choice of b'_1 , $t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) \neq \iota(h(c)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2))$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) < \iota(h(c)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2))$, and let $u \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) < u < \iota(h(c)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2))$. By the definitions of s and t , $\iota(h((A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c))) \subseteq [\iota(h(c)) + s + \iota(h(b'_2)), t + \iota(h(b'_1))]$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \iota(h((A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c))) = \\ & \iota(h((A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c))) \cap ([\iota(h(c)) + s + \iota(h(b'_2)), u] \cup [u, t + \iota(h(b'_1))]) \subseteq \\ & (\iota(h(A + b'_1)) \cap [u, t + \iota(h(b'_1))]) \cup (\iota(h(A + b'_2 + c)) \cap [\iota(h(c)) + s + \iota(h(b'_2)), u]) \end{aligned}$$

By definition of t' , and since $t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) < u$, the set $\iota(h(A + b'_1)) \cap [u, t + \iota(h(b'_1))] = (\iota(h(A)) + \iota(h(b'_1))) \cap ([u - \iota(h(b'_1)), t] + \iota(h(b'_1))) = \iota(h(A)) \cap [u - \iota(h(b'_1)), t] + \iota(h(b'_1))$ is finite. Similarly, by definition of s' , and since $u < \iota(h(c)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2))$, the set $\iota(h(A + b'_2 + c)) \cap [\iota(h(c)) + s + \iota(h(b'_2)), u]$ is finite. So $\iota(h((A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c)))$, and hence $\iota(h((A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c) \cap \mathbb{Z}))$, are finite as well. Since ι and $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$ are injective, $(A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is finite. Since $b'_1, b'_2, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ and A is \mathbb{Z} -definable, $(A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c)$ is finite, a contradiction. So $t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) > \iota(h(c)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2))$.

Since $s' + \iota(h(b'_2)) > -\frac{d}{4}$, $t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) < \frac{d}{2}$, and $\iota(h(c)) > -d$, we have $0 < (t' + \iota(h(b'_1))) - (\iota(h(c)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2))) < \frac{7d}{4}$, hence there exists $c' \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$-d < -\frac{7d}{8} < \iota(h(c)) + s' + \iota(h(b'_2)) + \iota(h(c')) < 0 < t' + \iota(h(b'_1)) + \iota(h(c')) < \frac{7d}{8} < d$. Let $b_1 := b'_1 + c'$, $b_2 := b'_2 + c + c'$. So $0 < t' + \iota(h(b_1)) < d < t'$ and $0 > s' + \iota(h(b_2)) > -d > s'$, so in particular, $\iota(h(b_1)) < 0 < \iota(h(b_2))$. Moreover, since $d < \frac{r}{2}$ we have $-\frac{r}{2} < s' + \iota(h(b_2)) < 0 < t' + \iota(h(b_1)) < \frac{r}{2}$. Finally, $(A + b_1) \cap (A + b_2) = (A + b'_1) \cap (A + b'_2 + c) + c'$ is infinite. \blacksquare

Fix $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be as in Claim 5.10 for this r . Let $E'_r := (A + b_1) \cap (A + b_2)$. Note that $\iota(h(E'_r)) \subseteq [s' + \iota(h(b_2)), t' + \iota(h(b_1))] \cup (S + \iota(h(b_2))) \cup (T + \iota(h(b_1)))$.

Let $0 < r' \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $-\frac{r}{2} < -r' < s' + \iota(h(b_2)) < 0 < t' + \iota(h(b_1)) < r' < \frac{r}{2}$. Let $I_1 := \{i < \alpha : s_i + \iota(h(b_2)) \leq -r'\}$ and $I_2 := \{i < \beta : t_i + \iota(h(b_1)) \geq r'\}$. By the definitions of s' and t' , I_1 and I_2 are finite. Let $0 < r'' \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that:

- (1) For each $0 < i \in I_1$, $r'' < s_i - s_{i-1}$,
- (2) For each $0 < i \in I_2$, $r'' < t_{i-1} - t_i$,
- (3) $r' + r'' < \frac{r}{2}$.

By Corollary 5.8, there is $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 < \iota(h(c)) < r''$ such that $E_r := E'_r \cap (E'_r + c)$ is infinite. Note that the family $\{E_r : 0 < r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is uniformly \mathbb{Z} -definable. We have $\iota(h(E_r)) \subseteq (-r', r' + r'') \cup \{s_i + \iota(h(b_2)) : i \in I_1\} \cup \{t_i + \iota(h(b_1)) + \iota(h(c)) : i \in I_2\}$.

Let $i \in I_1$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $s_i + \iota(h(b_2)) \in \iota(h(E_r))$. So in particular, $s_i + \iota(h(b_2)) - \iota(h(c)) \in \iota(h(E'_r))$. Since $\iota(h(c)) > 0$, $s_i + \iota(h(b_2)) - \iota(h(c)) \leq -r'$, so there is $j \in I_1$, $j < i$, such that $s_i + \iota(h(b_2)) - \iota(h(c)) = s_j + \iota(h(b_2))$. So $s_{j+1} - s_j \leq s_i - s_j = \iota(h(c)) < r''$, a contradiction. Therefore $s_i + \iota(h(b_2)) \notin \iota(h(E_r))$.

Let $i \in I_2$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $t_i + \iota(h(b_1)) + \iota(h(c)) \in \iota(h(E_r))$. So in particular, $t_i + \iota(h(b_1)) + \iota(h(c)) \in \iota(h(E'_r))$. Since $\iota(h(c)) > 0$, $t_i + \iota(h(b_1)) + \iota(h(c)) \geq r'$, so there is $j \in I_2$, $j < i$, such that $t_i + \iota(h(b_1)) + \iota(h(c)) = t_j + \iota(h(b_1))$. So $t_j - t_{j+1} \leq t_j - t_i = \iota(h(c)) < r''$, a contradiction. Therefore $t_i + \iota(h(b_1)) + \iota(h(c)) \notin \iota(h(E_r))$.

This shows that $\iota(h(E_r)) \subseteq (-r', r' + r'') \subseteq \left(-\frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2}\right)$. \blacksquare

Notation 5.11. For $D \subseteq G$ and $b \in G$, denote $\Delta_{D,b} := (D \triangle (D + b)) \cup (D \triangle (D - b))$.

Lemma 5.12. *Let D be a \mathbb{Z} -definable subset of G , and let $(\epsilon_i)_{i < \omega}$ be indiscernible over \mathbb{Z} . Denote $\epsilon := \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0$. Then $h(\Delta_{D,\epsilon})$ is finite.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise. Without loss of generality, $h(D \triangle (D + \epsilon))$ is infinite. Denote $B_i := (D + \epsilon_{2i}) \triangle (D + \epsilon_{2i+1})$. So $h(B_0)$ is infinite. Since the theory is NIP, the family $\{B_i\}_{i < \omega}$ is k -inconsistent for some $k < \omega$.

Note that $h(B_i)$ does not depend on i : Let $i, j < \omega$, and let $u \in h(B_j)$. So $B_j \cap h^{-1}(u) \neq \emptyset$. By indiscernibility, there is $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(G/\mathbb{Z})$ such that $\sigma(\epsilon_{2j}) = \epsilon_{2i}$ and $\sigma(\epsilon_{2j+1}) = \epsilon_{2i+1}$. So $\sigma(B_j) = B_i$, therefore, since $h^{-1}(u)$ is type-definable over \mathbb{Z} , $B_i \cap h^{-1}(u) = \sigma(B_j \cap h^{-1}(u)) \neq \emptyset$, which gives $u \in h(B_i)$.

Let $\{u_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq \iota(h(B_0)) \setminus \{-\frac{1}{2}\}$ be distinct, and let $c_n \in G$ be such that $\iota(h(c_n)) = u_n$. Also fix a non-principal ultrafilter U on ω .

Fix $N < \omega$. Then there is $0 < r_N < \frac{1}{2}$ such that for every $0 \leq n, m \leq N-1$, $n \neq m$, we have $(u_n - 2r_N, u_n + 2r_N) \subseteq (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $(u_n - 2r_N, u_n + 2r_N) \cap (u_m - 2r_N, u_m + 2r_N) = \emptyset$. By Lemma 5.5 there is a finite $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$h^{-1}([-r_N, r_N]) \subseteq E_{r_N} + F \subseteq h^{-1}((-2r_N, 2r_N))$$

(where E_{r_N} is given by Lemma 5.9). Let $0 \leq n \leq N-1$. Then

$$h^{-1}([u_n - r_N, u_n + r_N]) \subseteq E_{r_N} + F + c_n \subseteq h^{-1}((u_n - 2r_N, u_n + 2r_N))$$

For each $i < \omega$, $u_n \in \iota(h(B_0)) = \iota(h(B_i))$, so $B_i \cap h^{-1}(q(u_n)) \neq \emptyset$, and therefore $B_i \cap (E_{r_N} + F + c_n) \neq \emptyset$. So for some $d \in F$ we have $B_i \cap (E_{r_N} + d + c_n) \neq \emptyset$. For each $d \in F$ let $I_{N,n,d} := \{i < \omega : B_i \cap (E_{r_N} + d + c_n) \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $\bigcup_{d \in F} I_{N,n,d} = \omega$, so there is $d_{N,n} \in F$ such that $I_{N,n,d_{N,n}} \in U$. Let $I_N := \bigcap_{n=0}^{N-1} I_{N,n,d_{N,n}}$. So $I_N \in U$, and in particular is infinite. Denote $e_{N,n} := d_{N,n} + c_n$.

Note that $E_{r_N} + e_{N,n} \subseteq h^{-1}((u_n - 2r_N, u_n + 2r_N))$, so for every $0 \leq n, m \leq N-1$, $n \neq m$, $(E_{r_N} + e_{N,n}) \cap (E_{r_N} + e_{N,m}) \subseteq h^{-1}((u_n - 2r_N, u_n + 2r_N) \cap (u_m - 2r_N, u_m + 2r_N)) = \emptyset$, i.e., the family $\{E_{r_N} + e_{N,n} : 0 \leq n \leq N-1\}$ is 2-inconsistent.

By the definition of I_N , for every $i \in I_N$ and every $0 \leq n \leq N-1$ we have $B_i \cap (E_{r_N} + e_{N,n}) \neq \emptyset$. Note that the family $\{E_{r_N} + e_{N,n} : N < \omega, 0 \leq n \leq N-1\}$ is uniformly definable. Therefore, and since I_N is infinite and N is arbitrary, by compactness we get an inp-pattern of depth 2, contradicting the dp-minimality of \mathcal{Z} . \blacksquare

Corollary 5.13. *Let D be a \mathbb{Z} -definable subset of G . Then $h(D)$ has only finitely many isolated points.*

Proof. Let $(\epsilon_i)_{i < \omega}$ be indiscernible over \mathbb{Z} , and denote $\epsilon := \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0$. By indiscernibility, $h(\epsilon_i)$ does not depend on i , so $h(\epsilon) = 0$. Let s be an isolated point of $h(D)$. By Lemma 5.6, there is $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $D \cap h^{-1}(s) = \{b\}$. So $h(b + \epsilon) = h(b) + h(\epsilon) = s$, hence $b + \epsilon \notin D$, therefore $b \in \Delta_{D,\epsilon}$, so $s = h(b) \in h(\Delta_{D,\epsilon})$. By Lemma 5.12, $h(\Delta_{D,\epsilon})$ is finite, so $h(D)$ has only finitely many isolated points. \blacksquare

Notation 5.14. For a finite set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ denote $B_{F,r} := \bigcup_{u \in F} B_{u,r}$. This set is \mathbb{Z} -definable.

Remark 5.15. For every $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $\bigcap_{r>0} B_{u,r} = h^{-1}(q(u))$. More generally, for every finite $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $\bigcap_{r>0} B_{F,r} = h^{-1}(q(F))$.

Corollary 5.16. *Let D and ϵ be as in Lemma 5.12, and denote $F := h(\Delta_{D,\epsilon})$. Then for every $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$ there is $d_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that:*

- (1) $0 < \iota(h(d_r)) < r$, and
- (2) $h(\Delta_{D,d_r}) \subseteq F + q((-r, r))$.

So every $a \in G$ with $h(a) \notin F + q((-r, r))$ satisfies $a \in D \iff a - d_r \in D$ and $a \in D \iff a + d_r \in D$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.12, F is finite. Let $\mathcal{E} := \{b \in G : \Delta_{D,b} \subseteq h^{-1}(F)\}$, and for $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$ let $\mathcal{E}_r := \{b \in G : \Delta_{D,b} \subseteq B_{\iota(F),r}\}$. Note that $\{(a, b) \in G^2 : a \in \Delta_{D,b}\}$ is \mathbb{Z} -definable, so \mathcal{E}_r is \mathbb{Z} -definable. By Remark 5.15, $\bigcap_{r>0} \mathcal{E}_r = \mathcal{E}$ and $\bigcap_{r>0} B_{0,r} = h^{-1}(0)$.

Recall that $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0$. By indiscernibility, $h(\epsilon_i)$ does not depend on i , so $h(\epsilon) = 0$. By the definition of F , $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$. So for every $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$, $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}_r \cap B_{0,r}$. By elementarity, and since $\epsilon \neq 0$, there is $0 \neq d_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $d_r \in \mathcal{E}_r \cap B_{0,r}$.

By the definition of $B_{0,r}$, and since $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$, $\iota(h(d_r)) \in (-r, r)$. Since $0 \neq d_r \in \mathbb{Z}$, and since ι and $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$ are injective, $\iota(h(d_r)) \neq 0$. Note that $\Delta_{D,b} = \Delta_{D,-b}$, so $\mathcal{E}_r = -\mathcal{E}_r$. Moreover, by assumption, $B_{0,r} = -B_{0,r}$. So $-d_r \in \mathcal{E}_r \cap B_{0,r}$. Since $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$, $\iota(h(-d_r)) = -\iota(h(d_r))$. Therefore, by replacing d_r with $-d_r$ if necessary, we may assume that $\iota(h(d_r)) > 0$, so $0 < \iota(h(d_r)) < r$.

By the definition of \mathcal{E}_r , $\Delta_{D,d_r} \subseteq B_{\iota(F),r} \subseteq h^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{u \in \iota(F)} q((u-r, u+r))\right)$, so $h(\Delta_{D,d_r}) \subseteq \bigcup_{u \in \iota(F)} q((u-r, u+r))$. Since $q((u-r, u+r)) = q((-r, r) + u) = q((-r, r)) + q(u)$, we get $h(\Delta_{D,d_r}) \subseteq q(\iota(F)) + q((-r, r)) = F + q((-r, r))$.

For $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$, let $d_r := d_{\frac{1}{4}}$. ■

Let D' be a \mathbb{Z} -definable subset of G such that $h^{-1}\left(\left[-\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}\right]\right) \subseteq D' \subseteq h^{-1}\left(\left(-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}\right)\right)$ (e.g., $D' := B_{0, \frac{1}{8}}$). By Corollary 5.13 $h(D')$ has only finitely many isolated points. By Lemma 5.6, for each isolated point s of $h(D')$ there is $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $D' \cap h^{-1}(s) = \{b\}$. By throwing away all these b 's we may assume that $h(D')$ has no isolated points.

Let $(\epsilon_i)_{i < \omega}$ be indiscernible over \mathbb{Z} , and denote $\epsilon := \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0$. By indiscernibility, $h(\epsilon_i)$ does not depend on i , so $h(\epsilon) = 0$. By Lemma 5.12, $F' := h(\Delta_{D',\epsilon})$ is finite. We note that $F' \subseteq h(D')$: if $b \in \Delta_{D',\epsilon}$, then at least one of $b, b + \epsilon, b - \epsilon$ is in D' , but $h(b + \epsilon) = h(b - \epsilon) = h(b)$, so $h(b) \in D'$. So $\iota(F') \subseteq \iota(h(D')) \subseteq \left(-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}\right)$. Denote $\iota(F') = \{w_0, \dots, w_{L'}\}$ such that $-\frac{1}{8} < w_0 < \dots < w_{L'} < \frac{1}{8}$.

Let $\{d'_r : 0 < r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be as in Corollary 5.16 for D' , ϵ . By Remark 4.5, $h(D')$ is closed, so $C := \iota(h(D'))$ is closed as well. Let $s' := \min(C)$ and $t' := \max(C)$.

Proposition 5.17. $s' = w_0$, $t' = w_{L'}$, and $s' \neq t'$, so $L' \geq 1$.

Proof. Since $\iota(F') \subseteq C$, we have $s' \leq w_0 \leq w_{L'} \leq t'$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $s' < w_0$, and let $0 < r < \frac{1}{4}$ be such that $s' < w_0 - r$. Since $s' \in \iota(h(D'))$, there is $b \in D'$ such that $s' = \iota(h(b))$. So $\iota(h(b)) \notin \iota(F') + (-r, r)$. Since $F' \subseteq q\left(\left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right)\right)$ and $0 < r < \frac{1}{4}$, we get $h(b) \notin F' + q\left(\left(-r, r\right)\right)$. By the choice of d'_r , $b \in D' \iff b - d'_r \in D'$, therefore $b - d'_r \in D'$. Since $h(b), h(d'_r) \in q\left(\left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right)\right)$, we get $s' - \iota(h(d'_r)) = \iota(h(b - d'_r)) \in \iota(h(D'))$. Since $\iota(h(d'_r)) > 0$, we get $s' - \iota(h(d'_r)) < s'$, a contradiction to the definition of s' . So $s' = w_0$, and the proof that $t' = w_{L'}$ is analogous. Finally, if $s' = t'$ then $h(D') = \{q(s')\}$, contradicting the fact that $h(D')$ has no isolated points. So $s' \neq t'$, and therefore $L' \geq 1$. \blacksquare

For $0 \leq i \leq L' - 1$, let $I_i := (w_i, w_{i+1})$ and $\tilde{I}_i := h^{-1}(q(I_i))$. If for all $0 \leq i \leq L' - 1$ we have $D' \cap \tilde{I}_i \neq \emptyset$, let $D := D'$, $F := F'$, $L := L'$, $s := s'$, $t := t'$. Otherwise, let $L := \min\{0 \leq i \leq L' - 1 : D' \cap \tilde{I}_i = \emptyset\}$. If $L = 0$, then $q(w_0) = q(s')$ is an isolated point of $h(D')$, a contradiction. So $L \geq 1$. Let $B := B_{-\frac{1}{8}, s', w_L, w_{L+1}}$, and let $D := D' \cap B$. So D is \mathbb{Z} -definable. Let $F := h(\Delta_{D, \epsilon})$, $s := \min(\iota(h(D)))$ and $t := \max(\iota(h(D)))$.

Proposition 5.18. *We have $F \subseteq h(D)$, $s = w_0$, $t = w_L$, and $\iota(F) = \{w_0, \dots, w_L\}$. Moreover, for all $0 \leq i \leq L - 1$ we have $D \cap \tilde{I}_i \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. If for all $0 \leq i \leq L - 1$ we had $D' \cap \tilde{I}_i \neq \emptyset$, this is clear, so suppose otherwise. The proof that $F \subseteq h(D)$ is the same as for $F' \subseteq h(D')$. Denote $J := [s', w_L]$ and $\tilde{J} := h^{-1}(q(J))$. By the definition of B , $\tilde{J} \subseteq B \subseteq h^{-1}\left(\left(-\frac{1}{8}, w_{L+1}\right)\right)$, so by the choice of L and the definition of s' we have $D = D' \cap \tilde{J}$. In particular, we have $s = w_0$, $t = w_L$.

Since $h(\epsilon) = 0$, we have $\tilde{J} + \epsilon = \tilde{J}$, so $D + \epsilon = (D' + \epsilon) \cap (\tilde{J} + \epsilon) = (D' + \epsilon) \cap \tilde{J}$. Therefore $D \setminus (D + \epsilon) = (D' \cap \tilde{J}) \setminus ((D' + \epsilon) \cap \tilde{J}) = (D' \setminus (D' + \epsilon)) \cap \tilde{J}$, and similarly, $(D + \epsilon) \setminus D = ((D' + \epsilon) \setminus D') \cap \tilde{J}$. So $D \Delta (D + \epsilon) = (D' \Delta (D' + \epsilon)) \cap \tilde{J}$, and similarly we get $D \Delta (D - \epsilon) = (D' \Delta (D' - \epsilon)) \cap \tilde{J}$. Therefore $\Delta_{D, \epsilon} = \Delta_{D', \epsilon} \cap \tilde{J}$. By the definition of \tilde{J} we get $\iota(F) = \iota(h(\Delta_{D, \epsilon})) = \iota(h(\Delta_{D', \epsilon}) \cap q(J)) = \iota(h(\Delta_{D', \epsilon})) \cap J = \iota(F') \cap J = \{w_0, \dots, w_L\}$.

Finally, for each $0 \leq i \leq L - 1$ we have $\tilde{I}_i \subseteq \tilde{J}$, so $D \cap \tilde{I}_i = D' \cap \tilde{J} \cap \tilde{I}_i = D' \cap \tilde{I}_i \neq \emptyset$. \blacksquare

Let $\{d_r : 0 < r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be as in Corollary 5.16 for D , ϵ .

Proposition 5.19. *For all $0 \leq i \leq L - 1$ and $b \in D \cap \tilde{I}_i$, $\iota(h(b))$ is an accumulation point of $\iota(h(D))$.*

Proof. Let $0 < r < \frac{1}{4}$. Let $0 < \rho < r$ be such that $\iota(h(b)) \in (w_i + \rho, w_{i+1} - \rho)$. So $\iota(h(b)) \notin \iota(F) + (-\rho, \rho)$, hence $h(b) \notin F + q((-\rho, \rho))$, and therefore $b \in D \iff b + d_\rho \in D$. So $b + d_\rho \in D$, hence $\iota(h(b + d_\rho)) \in \iota(h(D))$. Since $\iota(h(d_\rho)) \in (0, \rho)$, we get $\iota(h(b + d_\rho)) = \iota(h(b)) + \iota(h(d_\rho)) \in (\iota(h(b)), \iota(h(b)) + \rho) \subseteq (\iota(h(b)), \iota(h(b)) + r)$. ■

For each $0 \leq i \leq L - 1$, \tilde{I}_i is \forall -definable over \mathbb{Z} , so $D \cap \tilde{I}_i$ is \forall -definable over \mathbb{Z} . By Proposition 5.18, $D \cap \tilde{I}_i \neq \emptyset$, so $D \cap \tilde{I}_i \cap \mathbb{Z} \neq \emptyset$ as well. Fix $b_i \in D \cap \tilde{I}_i \cap \mathbb{Z}$, and let $u_i := \iota(h(b_i))$. Let $0 < \rho \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that for all $0 \leq i \leq L - 1$, $u_i \in (w_i + 4\rho, w_{i+1} - 4\rho)$, and denote $J_i := (u_i - \rho, u_i + \rho)$, $\tilde{J}_i := h^{-1}(q(J_i))$.

Proposition 5.20. *For each $0 \leq i \leq L - 1$ there is a finite set $\Gamma_i \subseteq h^{-1}(0)$ such that $\tilde{J}_i \subseteq D + \Gamma_i$.*

Proof. Denote $J'_i := (u_i - \frac{\rho}{2}, u_i + \frac{\rho}{2})$, $\tilde{J}'_i := h^{-1}(q(J'_i))$, $B_i := B_{u_i, \rho}$. So $\tilde{J}'_i \subseteq B_i \subseteq \tilde{J}_i$. By Proposition 5.19, u_i is an accumulation point of $\iota(h(D))$, so $\iota(h(D \cap \tilde{J}'_i)) = \iota(h(D)) \cap J'_i$ is infinite. Therefore $D \cap \tilde{J}'_i$ is infinite, and since $D \cap \tilde{J}'_i \subseteq D \cap B_i$, $D \cap B_i$ is infinite as well. Since D and B_i are \mathbb{Z} -definable and $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $D \cap B_i - b_i$ is \mathbb{Z} -definable. Note that $h(D \cap B_i - b_i) = h(D \cap B_i) - h(b_i) \subseteq h(\tilde{J}_i) - q(u_i) \subseteq q(J_i) - q(u_i) = q((-\rho, \rho))$, so by Lemma 5.5 (with $r := 2\rho$ and $u := \rho$) there is a finite set $C_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $h(C_i) \subseteq [-2\rho, 2\rho]$ and

$$h^{-1}([-\rho, \rho]) \subseteq D \cap B_i - b_i + C_i \subseteq h^{-1}((-3\rho, 3\rho)).$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{J}_i \subseteq h^{-1}([u_i - \rho, u_i + \rho]) \subseteq D \cap B_i + C_i \subseteq h^{-1}((u_i - 3\rho, u_i + 3\rho)).$$

For each $c \in C_i$ let $E_{i,c} := (D \cap B_i + c) \cap \tilde{J}_i$. So $\tilde{J}_i \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C_i} E_{i,c}$.

Claim 5.21. For every $c \in C_i$ there is $\gamma_c \in h^{-1}(0)$ such that $E_{i,c} \subseteq D + \gamma_c$.

Proof. Let $c \in C_i$, and let $v := \iota(h(c))$. So $v \in [-2\rho, 2\rho]$. If $v = 0$ then $\gamma_c := c$ is as required, so suppose $v \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, $v > 0$.

Since \tilde{J}_i is \forall -definable over \mathbb{Z} and $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, also $E_{i,c}$ is \forall -definable over \mathbb{Z} . Write $E_{i,c} = \bigcup_\alpha E_{i,c,\alpha}$, where each $E_{i,c,\alpha}$ is \mathbb{Z} -definable. Let $P_{i,c} := \{c' \in G : E_{i,c} \subseteq D + c'\}$. Then $P_{i,c} = \bigcap_\alpha \{c' \in G : E_{i,c,\alpha} \subseteq D + c'\}$, so $P_{i,c}$ is type-definable over \mathbb{Z} .

Let $P'_{i,c} := P_{i,c} \cap h^{-1}([0, v])$. So $P'_{i,c}$ is type-definable over \mathbb{Z} , therefore, by Remark 4.5, $\iota(h(P'_{i,c}))$ is closed. Note that $c \in P_{i,c}$ and $\iota(h(P'_{i,c})) = \iota(h(P_{i,c})) \cap [0, v]$, so $v = \iota(h(c)) \in \iota(h(P'_{i,c})) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\tilde{v} := \min(\iota(h(P'_{i,c})))$, and let $\tilde{c} \in P'_{i,c}$ be such that $\iota(h(\tilde{c})) = \tilde{v}$. So $0 \leq \tilde{v} \leq v$ and $E_{i,c} \subseteq D + \tilde{c}$.

Suppose towards a contradiction that $\tilde{v} > 0$. Let $0 < r < \min(\tilde{v}, \rho)$ and denote $c' := \tilde{c} - d_r$, $v' := \iota(h(c')) = \tilde{v} - \iota(h(d_r))$. Since $0 < \iota(h(d_r)) < r$ we have $0 < v' < \tilde{v}$.

We show that $E_{i,c} \subseteq D + c'$. Let $a \in E_{i,c}$. In particular, $a \in \tilde{J}_i$, so $\iota(h(a - \tilde{c})) = \iota(h(a)) - \tilde{v} \in J_i - \tilde{v} = (u_i - \tilde{v} - \rho, u_i - \tilde{v} + \rho)$. Since $u_i \in (w_i + 4\rho, w_{i+1} - 4\rho)$ and $0 \leq \tilde{v} \leq v \leq 2\rho$, we get $\iota(h(a - \tilde{c})) \in (w_i + \rho, w_{i+1} - \rho) \subseteq (w_i + r, w_{i+1} - r)$, so $h(a - \tilde{c}) \notin F + q((-r, r))$. By the choice of d_r , $a - \tilde{c} \in D \iff a - \tilde{c} + d_r \in D$. Since $E_{i,c} \subseteq D + \tilde{c}$, we have $a - \tilde{c} \in D$, so $a - \tilde{c} + d_r \in D$, and therefore $a \in D + \tilde{c} - d_r = D + c'$.

So $c' \in P'_{i,c}$, hence $v' = \iota(h(c')) \in \iota(h(P'_{i,c}))$, contradicting the minimality of \tilde{v} . Therefore $\tilde{v} = 0$, so $\gamma_c := \tilde{c}$ is as required. \blacksquare

Let $\Gamma_i := \{\gamma_c : c \in C_i\}$. So $\Gamma_i \subseteq h^{-1}(0)$ and we have

$$\tilde{J}_i \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C_i} E_{i,c} \subseteq \bigcup_{c \in C_i} (D + \gamma_c) = D + \Gamma_i$$

 \blacksquare

Proposition 5.22. $\tilde{I}_i \subseteq D + \Gamma_i$.

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} w'_i &:= \min \{w_i \leq v \leq u_i : h^{-1}((v, u_i]) \subseteq D + \Gamma_i\} \\ w'_{i+1} &:= \max \{u_i \leq v \leq w_{i+1} : h^{-1}([u_i, v]) \subseteq D + \Gamma_i\} \end{aligned}$$

So $w'_i \geq w_i$ and $w'_{i+1} \leq w_{i+1}$, and since $\tilde{J}_i \subseteq D + \Gamma_i$ we have $w'_i \leq u_i - \rho$ and $w'_{i+1} \geq u_i + \rho$. We claim that $w'_i = w_i$ and $w'_{i+1} = w_{i+1}$. We show that $w'_i = w_i$, and the proof that $w'_{i+1} = w_{i+1}$ is analogous.

Suppose towards a contradiction that $w'_i > w_i$, and let $0 < r < \min(\rho, w'_i - w_i)$. Since $\iota(h(d_r)) > 0$, by the definition of w'_i there exists $a \in G$ such that $w'_i - \iota(h(d_r)) < \iota(h(a)) \leq w'_i$ and $a \notin D + \Gamma_i$. Since $\iota(h(d_r)) < r$ we get

$$(\star) \quad w'_i < \iota(h(a)) + \iota(h(d_r)) = \iota(h(a + d_r)) \leq w'_i + \iota(h(d_r)) < w'_i + r < w'_i + \rho \leq u_i$$

and therefore, by the definition of w'_i , $a + d_r \in D + \Gamma_i$, so there is $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ such that $a + d_r - \gamma \in D$.

Since $r < \rho \leq w'_{i+1} - u_i \leq w_{i+1} - u_i$ and $r < w'_i - w_i$, by (Eq. (\star)) we get $w_i + r < \iota(h(a + d_r)) < w_{i+1} - r$. Since $\Gamma_i \subseteq h^{-1}(0)$, $\iota(h(a + d_r - \gamma)) = \iota(h(a + d_r)) - \iota(h(\gamma)) = \iota(h(a + d_r))$, so $w_i + r < \iota(h(a + d_r - \gamma)) < w_{i+1} - r$, and hence $h(a + d_r - \gamma) \notin F + q((-r, r))$. By the choice of d_r we get $a + d_r - \gamma \in D \iff a - \gamma \in D$, and therefore $a - \gamma \in D$. So $a \in D + \gamma \subseteq D + \Gamma_i$, a contradiction.

So $w'_i = w_i$, and similarly $w'_{i+1} = w_{i+1}$, therefore $\tilde{I}_i = h^{-1}((w_i, w_{i+1})) \subseteq D + \Gamma_i$. \blacksquare

Proposition 5.23. *There exists $0 < u < \frac{1}{4}$ such that $h^{-1}((0, u)) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is externally definable in \mathcal{Z} .*

Proof. Let $\Gamma := \bigcup_{i=0}^{L-1} \Gamma_i$. So $\bigcup_{i=0}^{L-1} \tilde{I}_i \subseteq D + \Gamma$. Since $D \subseteq h^{-1}([w_0, w_L])$ and $\Gamma \subseteq h^{-1}(0)$, also $D + \Gamma \subseteq h^{-1}([w_0, w_L])$. Since Γ is finite, $D + \Gamma$ is definable.

Let $0 < u < \min(w_1 - w_0, w_L - w_{L-1}) < \frac{1}{4}$. Since $w_L - w_0 < \frac{1}{4}$, we have $0 < w_L - w_0 - u < \frac{1}{4}$, so there is $e \in G$ such that $\iota(h(e)) = w_L - w_0 - u$. Let $B_1 := (D + \Gamma) \cap (D + \Gamma + e)$. So $h^{-1}((w_L - u, w_L)) \subseteq h^{-1}((w_{L-1}, w_L)) = \tilde{I}_{L-1} \subseteq D + \Gamma$, and $h^{-1}((w_L - u, w_L)) - e \subseteq h^{-1}((w_0, w_1)) = \tilde{I}_0 \subseteq D + \Gamma$, therefore $h^{-1}((w_L - u, w_L)) \subseteq B_1$. We also have $\iota(h(B_1)) \subseteq \iota(h(D + \Gamma)) \cap \iota(h(D + \Gamma + e)) = \iota(h(D + \Gamma)) \cap (\iota(h(D + \Gamma)) + \iota(h(e))) \subseteq [w_0, w_L] \cap [w_L - u, 2w_L - w_0 - u] = [w_L - u, w_L]$, so $B_1 \subseteq h^{-1}([w_L - u, w_L])$.

Let $b \in G$ be such that $\iota(h(b)) = w_L - u$, and let $B_2 := B_1 - b$. So $h^{-1}((0, u)) \subseteq B_2 \subseteq h^{-1}([0, u])$. If $u \in \iota(h(\mathbb{Z}))$, then, since ι and $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$ are injective, there is a unique $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u = \iota(h(c))$. Otherwise, let $c = 0$. Let $B_3 := B_2 \setminus \{0, c\}$. So B_3 is definable and satisfies $h^{-1}((0, u)) \subseteq B_3 \subseteq h^{-1}([0, u]) \setminus \{0, c\}$. Therefore $B_3 \cap \mathbb{Z} = h^{-1}((0, u)) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is externally definable in \mathcal{Z} . \blacksquare

Recall that in the beginning of this section we chose $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $h(1) = \alpha + \mathbb{Z} = q(\alpha)$, and that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. Denote by $\eta : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ the function given by $\eta(n) := n\alpha + \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $\eta = h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}}$. So for any $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ we have $\eta^{-1}(S) = h^{-1}(S) \cap \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 5.24. *Let \mathcal{M} be an expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$, and suppose that there exists $0 < u < \frac{1}{4}$ such that $J := \eta^{-1}(q((0, u)))$ is definable in \mathcal{M} . Then the cyclic order C_α is definable in \mathcal{M} .*

Proof. Define $R(x, y)$ by $y - x \in J$. Then for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $R(a, b)$ exactly when either $\iota(\eta(a)) < \iota(\eta(b)) < \iota(\eta(a)) + u$ or $1 + \iota(\eta(b)) < \iota(\eta(a)) + u$ (which implies $\iota(\eta(b)) < \iota(\eta(a))$). Also note that $R(a, b) \implies \neg R(b, a)$.

Since $\iota(\eta(\mathbb{Z}))$ is dense in $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, we can choose $e_0, \dots, e_N \in \mathbb{Z}$ for some $N < \omega$ such that $-\frac{1}{2} < \iota(\eta(e_0)) < \iota(\eta(e_1)) < \dots < \iota(\eta(e_N)) < \frac{1}{2}$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$, $\iota(\eta(e_{i+1})) - \iota(\eta(e_i)) < u$, and $1 + \iota(\eta(e_0)) - \iota(\eta(e_N)) < u$ (so in particular, $\frac{1}{2} - \iota(\eta(e_N)) < u$ and $\iota(\eta(e_0)) + \frac{1}{2} < u$). For each $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$, let $I_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be the set defined by $(R(e_i, x) \wedge R(x, e_{i+1})) \vee (x = e_i)$, and let $I_N \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be the set defined by $(R(e_N, x) \wedge R(x, e_0)) \vee (x = e_N)$. So for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have that for each $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$, $a \in I_i$ if and only if $\iota(\eta(e_i)) \leq \iota(\eta(a)) < \iota(\eta(e_{i+1}))$, and $a \in I_N$ if and only if $\iota(\eta(e_N)) \leq$

$\iota(\eta(a)) < \frac{1}{2}$ or $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \iota(\eta(a)) < \iota(\eta(e_0))$. Therefore the sets $\{I_i\}_{i=0}^N$ are disjoint and $\bigcup_{i=0}^N I_i = \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\xi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, N\}$ be such that $\xi(a)$ is the unique $0 \leq i \leq N$ for which $a \in I_i$. Since the sets $\{I_i\}_{i=0}^N$ are definable in \mathcal{M} , the relations $\xi(x) = \xi(y)$ and $\xi(x) < \xi(y)$ are also definable in \mathcal{M} .

Note that for $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $C_\alpha(a, b, c)$ if and only if $\iota(\eta(a)) < \iota(\eta(b)) < \iota(\eta(c))$ or $\iota(\eta(b)) < \iota(\eta(c)) < \iota(\eta(a))$ or $\iota(\eta(c)) < \iota(\eta(a)) < \iota(\eta(b))$. Therefore we have:

- If $\xi(a) = \xi(b) = \xi(c)$, then

$$C_\alpha(a, b, c) \iff (R(a, b) \wedge R(b, c)) \vee (R(b, c) \wedge R(c, a)) \vee (R(c, a) \wedge R(a, b))$$

- If $\xi(a) = \xi(b) \neq \xi(c)$, then $C_\alpha(a, b, c) \iff R(a, b)$.
- If $\xi(b) = \xi(c) \neq \xi(a)$, then $C_\alpha(a, b, c) \iff C_\alpha(b, c, a) \iff R(b, c)$.
- If $\xi(c) = \xi(a) \neq \xi(b)$, then $C_\alpha(a, b, c) \iff C_\alpha(c, a, b) \iff R(c, a)$.
- If $\xi(a), \xi(b), \xi(c)$ are pairwise distinct, then

$$\begin{aligned} C_\alpha(a, b, c) &\iff C_\alpha(e_{\xi(a)}, e_{\xi(b)}, e_{\xi(c)}) \iff \\ &\iff \xi(a) < \xi(b) < \xi(c) \text{ or } \xi(b) < \xi(c) < \xi(a) \text{ or } \xi(c) < \xi(a) < \xi(b) \end{aligned}$$

Combining these, we get that C_α is definable in \mathcal{M} . ■

From Proposition 5.23 and Lemma 5.24 we get:

Corollary 5.25. *The cyclic order C_α is definable in \mathcal{Z}^{Sh} .*

We now work to upgrade Corollary 5.25 and obtain that C_α is definable in \mathcal{Z} . The following is a special case of [SW19, Theorem 6.1] where $(M, +, C)$ is $(\mathbb{Z}, +, C_\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}$:

Fact 5.26. *Let \mathcal{M} be a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)$. Then every subset of \mathbb{Z} which is definable in \mathcal{M} is a finite union of sets of the form $a + nJ$ for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq n < \omega$, and $J \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ convex with respect to C_α .*

In the above, a subset $J \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is convex with respect to C_α if for every $a, b \in J$ such that $a \neq b$, we have either $\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : C_\alpha(a, k, b)\} \subseteq J$ or $\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : C_\alpha(b, k, a)\} \subseteq J$. Equivalently, J is convex if and only if there is an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of length at most 1 such that $J = \eta^{-1}(q(I))$.

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be infinite and definable in \mathcal{Z} such that $A \subseteq \eta^{-1}\left(q\left(\left(-\frac{1}{32}, \frac{1}{32}\right)\right)\right)$ (e.g., $A := B_{0, \frac{1}{32}} \cap \mathbb{Z}$, see Notation 5.3). So A is definable in \mathcal{Z}^{Sh} , which, by Corollary 5.25 and Corollary 2.15, is a dp-minimal expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)$. So by Fact 5.26, $A =$

$\bigcup_{i=0}^N (a_i + n_i J_i)$ for some $N < \omega$, where for each $i \leq N$, $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq n_i < \omega$, and $J_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ convex with respect to C_α . Let $I_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be an interval of length at most 1 such that $J_i = \eta^{-1}(q(I_i))$. Note that for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\eta^{-1}(q(s))$ is either empty or a singleton. So by throwing away at most finitely many points from A , we may assume that for each $i \leq N$, I_i is open and nonempty.

Notation 5.27. For $B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 \leq m < \omega$ we denote $B/m = \frac{1}{m}B := \{a \in \mathbb{Z} : ma \in B\}$.

Observation 5.28. *Let $I = (s, t) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be an interval of length at most 1 and let $J := \eta^{-1}(q(I))$. Let $1 \leq k < \omega$, and for each $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ denote $I_i := \left(\frac{s}{k}, \frac{t}{k}\right) + \frac{i}{k}$. Then $J/k = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} \eta^{-1}(q(I_i))$. The same holds if we replace all open intervals with closed or half-open intervals.*

For each $i \leq N$, write $a_i = n_i b_i + r_i$ such that $b_i, r_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \leq r_i \leq n_i - 1$. Denote $p := \iota(\eta(r_0))$, $s := -\frac{1}{32} - p$, $t := \frac{1}{32} - p$. So by replacing A with $A - r_0$ we may assume that $r_0 = 0$, with $A \subseteq \eta^{-1}(q((s, t)))$ instead of $A \subseteq \eta^{-1}\left(q\left(\left(-\frac{1}{32}, \frac{1}{32}\right)\right)\right)$. Denote $m := \prod_{i=0}^N n_i$ and $B := A/m$. Denote also $\Lambda := \left[\frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m}, \frac{t}{m} + \frac{m-1}{m} + \frac{15}{32m}\right)$, and note that the length of Λ is exactly 1.

Proposition 5.29. *B can be written as $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^{N'} \eta^{-1}(q(I'_i))$ for some $N' < \omega$, such that:*

- for each $i \leq N'$, $I'_i \subseteq \Lambda$ is a nonempty interval,
- $\{I'_i\}_{i=0}^{N'}$ are pairwise disjoint, enumerated by their order in \mathbb{R} , and
- for each $1 \leq i \leq N'$, I'_i is open, and either I'_0 is open, or I'_0 is of the form $\left[\frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m}, w\right)$.

Proof. For each $i \leq N$, denote $m_i := \frac{m}{n_i} = \prod_{j \neq i} n_j$. Clearly, if $r_i \neq 0$ then $\frac{1}{m}(a_i + n_i J_i) = \emptyset$. Conversely, if $r_i = 0$ then $\frac{1}{m}(a_i + n_i J_i) = \frac{1}{m_i}(b_i + J_i) \neq \emptyset$, since $\eta(m_i \mathbb{Z} - b_i)$ is dense in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} . So $mB = A \cap m\mathbb{Z} = \bigcup \{a_i + n_i J_i : i \leq N, r_i = 0\}$, and since $r_0 = 0$, this union is over a nonempty set. Therefore, and since $(mB)/m = B$, by replacing A with mB we may assume that for each $i \leq N$, $r_i = 0$. So $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{m_i}(b_i + J_i)$.

By replacing J_i with $b_i + J_i$ we may assume that for each $i \leq N$, $b_i = 0$, i.e., $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{m_i} J_i$. For each i , by Observation 5.28 for $J_i = \eta^{-1}(q(I_i))$ we get that $\frac{1}{m_i} J_i = \bigcup_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \eta^{-1}(q(I_{i,j}))$ for nonempty open intervals $\{I_{i,j}\}_{j=0}^{m_i-1}$ in \mathbb{R} , each of length at most 1. So $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^N \bigcup_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \eta^{-1}(q(I_{i,j}))$, and we rewrite this as $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^{N''} \eta^{-1}(q(I''_i))$.

We may assume that for each i , $I''_i \subseteq \Lambda$: There exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(I''_i + k) \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset$, and since I''_i is of length at most 1, there is a smallest such k , and it satisfies $I''_i + k \subseteq \Lambda \cup (\Lambda - 1)$. So we replace I''_i with the two intervals $(I''_i + k) \cap \Lambda$ and $(I''_i + k + 1) \cap \Lambda$

(or just the first one, if the second one is empty). So for each i , either I''_i is open, or $I''_i = \left[\frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m}, w_i \right)$ for some $w_i \leq \frac{t}{m} + \frac{m-1}{m} + \frac{15}{32m}$. By combining intervals which intersect, we can rewrite $\bigcup_{i=0}^{N''} I''_i$ as a finite union $\bigcup_{i=0}^{N''} I'_i$ of pairwise disjoint intervals which satisfy all the requirements, and $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^{N''} \eta^{-1}(q(I''_i)) = \eta^{-1}(q(\bigcup_{i=0}^{N''} I''_i)) = \eta^{-1}(q(\bigcup_{i=0}^{N'} I'_i)) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{N'} \eta^{-1}(q(I'_i))$. \blacksquare

Proposition 5.30. *There is an open interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of length $0 < L \leq \frac{1}{16}$ such that $\eta^{-1}(q(I))$ is definable in \mathcal{Z} .*

Proof. Denote $K := (s, t)$. Recall that $B = A/m$ and $A \subseteq \eta^{-1}(q(K))$, so $B \subseteq \frac{1}{m}\eta^{-1}(q(K))$. By Observation 5.28 we have $\frac{1}{m}\eta^{-1}(q(K)) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \eta^{-1}(q(K_i))$, where $K_i := \left(\frac{s}{m}, \frac{t}{m} \right) + \frac{i}{m}$. So for each $0 \leq i \leq m-1$, $K_i \subseteq \left(\frac{s}{m}, \frac{t}{m} + \frac{m-1}{m} \right) \subseteq \Lambda$. Write $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^{N'} \eta^{-1}(q(I'_i))$ as in Proposition 5.29. So $\eta^{-1}(q(\bigcup_{i=0}^{N'} I'_i)) = B \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \eta^{-1}(q(K_i)) = \eta^{-1}(q(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} K_i)) \subseteq \eta^{-1}(q(\left(\frac{s}{m}, \frac{t}{m} + \frac{m-1}{m} \right)))$.

Denote $S := \bigcup_{i=0}^{N'} I'_i$ and $\bar{K}_i := \left[\frac{s}{m}, \frac{t}{m} \right] + \frac{i}{m}$. Let $U := (\Lambda \setminus \left\{ \frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m} \right\}) \setminus (\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \bar{K}_i) = \left(\frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m}, \frac{s}{m} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-2} \left(\frac{t+i}{m}, \frac{s+i+1}{m} \right) \right) \cup \left(\frac{t}{m} + \frac{m-1}{m}, \frac{t}{m} + \frac{m-1}{m} + \frac{15}{32m} \right)$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $U \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Note that either S is open or $S \setminus \left\{ \frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m} \right\}$ is open, hence $U \cap S$ is open. Note that $q \upharpoonright_{\Lambda \setminus \left\{ \frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m} \right\}}$ is a homeomorphism, therefore, since $\eta(\mathbb{Z})$ is dense in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , we have $\eta^{-1}(q(U \cap S)) \neq \emptyset$. Since $q \upharpoonright_{\Lambda}$ is a bijection, we get $\eta^{-1}(q(U \cap S)) = \eta^{-1}(q(U)) \cap \eta^{-1}(q(S)) \subseteq \eta^{-1}(q(U)) \cap \eta^{-1}(q(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} K_i)) = \eta^{-1}(q(U \cap \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} K_i)) = \emptyset$, a contradiction. So $S \subseteq \left\{ \frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m} \right\} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \bar{K}_i$. But we know that for each $1 \leq i \leq N'$, I'_i is open, and either I'_0 is open, or I'_0 is of the form $\left[\frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m}, w \right)$. So we must have that I'_0 is open as well and that $S \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} K_i$.

For each $i \leq N'$ denote $I'_i = (v_i, w_i)$. Since I'_i is an interval, there is a unique $0 \leq j \leq m-1$ such that $I'_i \subseteq K_j$. Denote this j by $\xi(i)$. Suppose that for some $i \leq N' - 1$, $w_i = v_{i+1}$. Then $\xi(i) = \xi(i+1)$ and $(v_i, w_{i+1}) \subseteq K_{\xi(i)}$. Note that $\eta^{-1}(q(w_i))$ is either empty or a singleton, so by adding at most one point to $B = \bigcup_{i=0}^{N'} \eta^{-1}(q(I'_i))$, we can replace the two intervals I'_i, I'_{i+1} with (v_i, w_{i+1}) . Repeating this, we see that by adding at most finitely many points to B , we may assume that for all $i \leq N' - 1$, $w_i < v_{i+1}$.

If $N' = 0$ then $B = \eta^{-1}(q(I'_0))$ is definable in \mathcal{Z} , so suppose $N' \geq 1$. Let $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\frac{s}{m} - \frac{15}{32m} < v_0 - r < v_0 < w_0 < w_0 + r < v_1 < \frac{t}{m} + \frac{m-1}{m} + \frac{15}{32m}$, and let $B' := \mathbb{Z} \cap B_{v_0-r, v_0, w_0, w_0+r}$ (see Notation 5.3). So B' is definable in \mathcal{Z} and satisfies $\eta^{-1}(q([v_0, w_0])) \subseteq B' \subseteq \eta^{-1}(q((v_0 - r, w_0 + r)))$. Since $q \upharpoonright_{\Lambda}$ is a bijection, we get $B \cap B' = \eta^{-1}(q(I'_0))$, so $\eta^{-1}(q(I'_0))$ is definable in \mathcal{Z} .

Finally, since $I'_0 \subseteq K_{\xi(i)}$, the length of I'_0 is at most $\frac{1}{16m} \leq \frac{1}{16}$. \blacksquare

Proposition 5.31. *There exists $0 < u < \frac{1}{4}$ such that $\eta^{-1}(q((0, u)))$ is definable in \mathcal{Z} .*

Proof. Let I be as in Proposition 5.30, and denote $J := \eta^{-1}(q(I))$. By replacing J with $J - a$ for some $a \in J$, we may assume that $0 \in I$. By replacing J with $J \cup (-J)$, we may assume that $J = -J$, so $I = -I$, but now the length of I is at most $\frac{1}{8}$ instead of $\frac{1}{16}$. So $I = (-u, u)$ for some $0 < u \leq \frac{1}{16}$. Define a relation $R(x, y)$ by $R(a, b) \iff J \cap (J + a) \supseteq J \cap (J + b)$. So R is definable in \mathcal{Z} .

For all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $b \in J + a \iff b - a \in J \iff \eta(b) - \eta(a) = \eta(b - a) \in q(I) \iff \eta(b) \in q(I) + \eta(a) = q(I) + q(\iota(\eta(a))) = q(I + \iota(\eta(a)))$, so for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $J + a = \eta^{-1}(q(I + \iota(\eta(a))))$. Also note that if $a \in J$ then $\iota(\eta(a)) \in \iota(q(I)) = I$ hence $I + \iota(\eta(a)) \subseteq (-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8})$. Therefore, since $q \upharpoonright_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]}$ is a bijection, for all $a \in J$ we have $J \cap (J + a) = \eta^{-1}(q(I \cap (I + \iota(\eta(a))))$. In general, for (possibly empty) open intervals $I_1, I_2 \subseteq (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ we have $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \iff \eta^{-1}(q(I_1)) \subseteq \eta^{-1}(q(I_2))$: Left to right is clear, so suppose $I_1 \not\subseteq I_2$. Then $I_1 \setminus I_2$ contains a nonempty open interval. Since $q \upharpoonright_{(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})}$ is a homeomorphism, $q(I_1 \setminus I_2)$ contains a nonempty open set, and since $\eta(\mathbb{Z})$ is dense in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\eta(d) \in q(I_1 \setminus I_2) = q(I_1) \setminus q(I_2)$. So $d \in \eta^{-1}(q(I_1)) \setminus \eta^{-1}(q(I_2))$. In particular, for all $a, b \in J$ we have $R(a, b) \iff J \cap (J + a) \supseteq J \cap (J + b) \iff I \cap (I + \iota(\eta(a))) \supseteq I \cap (I + \iota(\eta(b)))$.

Fix $a \in J$ such that $\iota(\eta(a)) > 0$, and let $J' := \{0 \neq b \in J : R(a, b) \text{ or } R(b, a)\}$. So J' is definable in \mathcal{Z} . Note that $I \cap (I + \iota(\eta(a))) = (-u + \iota(\eta(a)), u)$. Let $b \in J$. If $\iota(\eta(b)) > 0$ then $I \cap (I + \iota(\eta(b))) = (-u + \iota(\eta(b)), u)$, so $R(a, b) \iff \iota(\eta(a)) \leq \iota(\eta(b))$ and $R(b, a) \iff \iota(\eta(b)) \leq \iota(\eta(a))$, hence $b \in J'$. If $\iota(\eta(b)) < 0$ then $I \cap (I + \iota(\eta(b))) = (-u, u + \iota(\eta(b)))$, so we have both $\neg R(a, b)$ and $\neg R(b, a)$, hence $b \notin J'$. Therefore $J' = \eta^{-1}(q((0, u)))$. \blacksquare

From Proposition 5.31 and Lemma 5.24 we get that C_α is definable in \mathcal{Z} , thus proving Theorem 1.2.

6. THE CONVERSE TO THEOREM 1.2

Theorem 6.1. *Let \mathcal{Z} be an expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, C_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, and let G be a monster model. Suppose that G^{00} exists. Then $G^{00} \neq G^0$.*

Proof. Let $S := \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and let $\mathcal{S} := (S, +, \mathcal{C})$, where \mathcal{C} is the positively oriented cyclic order on S . Let $\eta : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow S$ be given by $\eta(n) := n\alpha + \mathbb{Z}$, and let $\mathcal{Z}' := (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{S}, \eta)$. Let

\mathfrak{C}' be a monster model of \mathcal{Z}' , and let \mathfrak{C} be the reduct of \mathfrak{C}' to the language of \mathcal{Z} . So \mathfrak{C} is a monster model of \mathcal{Z} , and we may assume that $\mathfrak{C} = G$. Denote by $\tilde{C}_\alpha, \tilde{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \tilde{\eta}$ the interpretations in \mathfrak{C}' of $C_\alpha, S, \mathcal{C}, \eta$, respectively. By definition, for all $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $C_\alpha(a, b, c) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}(\eta(a), \eta(b), \eta(c))$, so by elementarity, for all $a, b, c \in G$ we have $\tilde{C}_\alpha(a, b, c) \leftrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\tilde{\eta}(a), \tilde{\eta}(b), \tilde{\eta}(c))$. Let $\text{st} : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ be the standard part map, and let $h := \text{st} \circ \tilde{\eta}$. So $h : G \rightarrow S$ is a homomorphism and $h \upharpoonright_{\mathbb{Z}} = \eta$. Since $\eta(\mathbb{Z})$ is dense in S , by saturation we get that h is surjective.

Claim 6.2. For every closed subset $C \subseteq S$, $h^{-1}(C)$ is type-definable over \mathbb{Z} in \mathcal{Z} .

Proof of Claim. Equivalently, for every open subset $U \subseteq S$, $h^{-1}(U)$ is \forall -definable over \mathbb{Z} in \mathcal{Z} . Let $q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be the quotient map. So for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that $q \upharpoonright_{(s, s+1)}$ is a homeomorphism and that for every $s < u < v < s+1$, $q((u, v))$ is the subset of S defined by $\mathcal{C}(q(u), x, q(v))$. It is enough to show that for every $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u < v < u+1$, $h^{-1}(q((u, v)))$ is \forall -definable over \mathbb{Z} in \mathcal{Z} .

So let $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $u < v < u+1$. Let $s \in (v, u+1)$ be such that $s \notin \alpha\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}$ (so $q(s) \notin \eta(\mathbb{Z})$), and let $\iota := (q \upharpoonright_{(s, s+1)})^{-1} : (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \{q(s)\} \rightarrow (s, s+1)$. Since $\eta(\mathbb{Z})$ is dense in S and ι is a homeomorphism, $\iota(\eta(\mathbb{Z}))$ is dense in $(s, s+1)$, so there are sequences $(b_i)_{i < \omega}, (c_i)_{i < \omega}$ of elements in \mathbb{Z} such that $u < \dots < \iota(\eta(b_2)) < \iota(\eta(b_1)) < \iota(\eta(b_0)) < \iota(\eta(c_0)) < \iota(\eta(c_1)) < \iota(\eta(c_2)) < \dots < v$, $\inf_{i < \omega} \iota(\eta(b_i)) = u$, and $\sup_{i < \omega} \iota(\eta(c_i)) = v$. For each $i < \omega$ let $D_i \subseteq G$ be the set defined by $C_\alpha(b_i, x, c_i)$. We show that $h^{-1}(q((u, v))) = \bigcup_{i < \omega} D_i$:

Let $a \in h^{-1}(q((u, v)))$. Then $\iota(h(a)) \in (u, v) = \bigcup_{i < \omega} (\iota(\eta(b_i)), \iota(\eta(c_i)))$, so for some $i < \omega$ we have $\iota(h(a)) \in (\iota(\eta(b_i)), \iota(\eta(c_i)))$. Applying q we get $\mathcal{C}(\eta(b_i), h(a), \eta(c_i))$, i.e., $\mathcal{C}(\eta(b_i), \text{st} \circ \tilde{\eta}(a), \eta(c_i))$. Therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\eta(b_i), \tilde{\eta}(a), \eta(c_i))$, and so $\tilde{C}_\alpha(b_i, a, c_i)$, i.e., $a \in D_i$.

Suppose that $a \in D_i$ for some $i < \omega$. So $\tilde{C}_\alpha(b_i, a, c_i)$, therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\tilde{\eta}(b_i), \tilde{\eta}(a), \tilde{\eta}(c_i))$, and since $b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\eta(b_i), \tilde{\eta}(a), \eta(c_i))$. Since $s < \iota(\eta(b_{i+1})) < \iota(\eta(b_i)) < \iota(\eta(c_i)) < \iota(\eta(c_{i+1})) < s+1$ we get $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\eta(b_{i+1}), \text{st} \circ \tilde{\eta}(a), \eta(c_{i+1}))$, i.e., $\mathcal{C}(\eta(b_{i+1}), h(a), \eta(c_{i+1}))$. Therefore $h(a) \in q((\iota(\eta(b_{i+1})), \iota(\eta(c_{i+1})))) \subseteq q((u, v))$, so $a \in h^{-1}(q((u, v)))$. ■

In particular, $\mathcal{E} := h^{-1}(0)$ is type-definable over \mathbb{Z} in \mathcal{Z} . By definition, \mathcal{E} has bounded index in G , so $G^{00} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. By Remark 2.12 we get $G^{00} \neq G^0$. ■

Remark 6.3. In the context of Theorem 6.1, it is worth noting that the converse to Claim 6.2 also holds, i.e., a subset $C \subseteq S$ is closed if and only if $h^{-1}(C)$ is type-definable

over \mathbb{Z} in \mathcal{Z} : h induces a group isomorphism $\hat{h} : G/\mathcal{E} \rightarrow S$, which is continuous by Claim 6.2. Since G/\mathcal{E} is compact, \hat{h} is in fact a homeomorphism.

Remark 6.4. In the context of Theorem 6.1, it follows that for each $2 \leq m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m\mathcal{E}$ has bounded index in mG and hence in G . So $G^{00} \subseteq \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} m\mathcal{E}$.

REFERENCES

- [Ad19] Eran Alouf and Christian d’Elbée. A new dp-minimal expansion of the integers. *J. Symb. Log.*, 84(2):632–663, 2019.
- [ADH⁺16] Matthias Aschenbrenner, Alf Dolich, Deirdre Haskell, Dugald Macpherson, and Sergei Starchenko. Vapnik-Chervonenkis density in some theories without the independence property, I. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(8):5889–5949, 2016.
- [Adl] Hans Adler. Strong theories, burden, and weight. Draft, available on the author’s website.
- [Alo20] Eran Alouf. On dp-minimal expansions of the integers. *arXiv:2001.11480 [math.LO]*, January 2020.
- [Cla20] Tim Clausen. Dp-minimal profinite groups and valuations on the integers. *arXiv:2008.08797 [math.LO]*, 2020.
- [Con18] Gabriel Conant. There are no intermediate structures between the group of integers and Presburger arithmetic. *J. Symb. Log.*, 83(1):187–207, 2018.
- [CP18] Gabriel Conant and Anand Pillay. Stable groups and expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0)$. *Fund. Math.*, 242(3):267–279, 2018.
- [DG17] Alfred Dolich and John Goodrick. Strong theories of ordered Abelian groups. *Fund. Math.*, 236(3):269–296, 2017.
- [She08] Saharon Shelah. Minimal Bounded Index Subgroup for Dependent Theories. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 136(3):1087–1091, 2008.
- [Sim15] Pierre Simon. *A guide to NIP theories*, volume 44 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Association for Symbolic Logic, Chicago, IL; Cambridge Scientific Publishers, Cambridge, 2015.
- [SW19] Pierre Simon and Erik Walsberg. Dp and other minimalities. *arXiv:1909.05399 [math.LO]*, September 2019.
- [Tao14] Terence Tao. *Hilbert’s Fifth Problem and Related Topics*. American Mathematical Society, jul 2014.
- [TW23] Chieu-Minh Tran and Erik Walsberg. A Family of dp-Minimal Expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}; +)$. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 64(2), May 2023.
- [Wal20] Erik Walsberg. Dp-minimal expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ via dense pairs via Mordell-Lang. *arXiv:2004.06847 [math.LO]*, April 2020.

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

Email address: Eran.Alouf@mail.huji.ac.il