

RELATIVIZED GALOIS GROUPS OF FIRST ORDER THEORIES OVER A HYPERIMAGINARY

HYOYOON LEE[†] AND JUNGUK LEE^{*}

ABSTRACT. We study relativized Lascar groups, which are formed by relativizing Lascar groups to the solution set of a partial type Σ . We introduce the notion of a Lascar tuple for Σ and by considering the space of types over a Lascar tuple for Σ , the topology for a relativized Lascar group is (re-)defined and some fundamental facts about the Galois groups of first-order theories are generalized to the relativized context.

In particular, we prove that any closed subgroup of a relativized Lascar group corresponds to a stabilizer of a bounded hyperimaginary having at least one representative in the solution set of the given partial type Σ . Using this, we find the correspondence between subgroups of the relativized Lascar group and the relativized strong types. We also compare the relativized notion with the restricted one, and provide a condition when two notions coincide.

D. Lascar introduced the notion of Lascar (Galois) group of a first-order theory in his paper [L82], which is proven to have Galois theoretic correspondence between the subgroups of the automorphism group and the notions of model theoretic strong types (cf. [CLPZ01, LP01]). That is, the Lascar, KP, and Shelah strong types, which play crucial roles in the study of first-order theories, are exactly the same as the orbit equivalence relations defined by the corresponding subgroups of the Lascar group.

In [DKL17], the relativized Lascar group, which are formed by restricting the domain of the automorphisms that fix the Lascar strong types in a partial type, was introduced to study the first homology groups in model theory. And then the relativized Lascar group was studied further in [DKKL21], proving that under some conditions, the relativized Lascar groups of Shelah strong types of some finite tuples are all isomorphic. In [KL23], the Galois theoretic correspondence for the Lascar group and the results concerning the relativized Lascar group in the previous papers were extended and generalized to the context of hyperimaginaries. There are also studies connecting the Lascar group and topological dynamics (such as [KPR18]), but this paper does not delve into that topic.

There are two natural ways to relativize a subgroup of automorphisms to a partial type Σ : One is simply by restricting the domains of the automorphisms in the subgroup directly (Definition 3.1, Definition 3.3(2)), and the other one is collecting restricted automorphisms that fixes the corresponding orbits in the partial type (Definition 1.19, Definition 3.3(1)). We will focus on the latter definition, re-define the topology of the relativized Lascar group, and find the correspondence between the subgroups and the strong types in the given partial type.

Section 1 is dedicated to presenting preliminaries. In Subsection 1.1, we recall definitions and facts about hyperimaginaries and Lascar groups. In particular, the

Date: February 20, 2024.

characterizations of Lascar, KP, and Shelah strong types over a hyperimaginary are given. In the following Subsection 1.2, we recall the definition of the relativized Galois groups of first-order theories over a hyperimaginary.

In Section 2, we develop most of the main results. We first introduce the notion of a Lascar tuple over a hyperimaginary e for an e -invariant partial type Σ and show its existence (Definition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2). Under the assumption that there is a tuple c of realizations of Σ with $e \in \text{dcl}(c)$, we define a topology \mathfrak{t} on a relativized Lascar group $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ of Σ , which is induced by the surjective map from the space of types over a Lascar tuple. The topology \mathfrak{t} turns out to coincide with the quotient topology given from the ordinary Lascar group of the theory, and so $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ becomes a quasi-compact group with the topology \mathfrak{t} .

The key result in Section 2 is the Galois theoretic correspondence between a closed subgroup of $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ (which can be characterized by its orbit equivalence relation) and a bounded hyperimaginary, whose set of representatives intersects with the set of tuples of realizations of Σ (Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 2.9). The Lascar tuple plays an essential role in the proof of this correspondence, Proposition 2.6. As a corollary, we find a correspondence between the relativized KP[Shelah] strong type and the closure of the trivial subgroup [the connected component containing the identity] of the relativized Lascar group (Theorem 2.15 and Corollary 2.16).

In Section 3, we recall another method of considering automorphisms only in the solution set of a partial type by restricting the domain, and compare with the relativized one. We prove that if the orbit equivalence relation induced from a given subgroup is weaker than having the same Lascar strong type, then the relativized subgroup of the automorphism group is the same as the smallest group containing the restricted one and the relativized Lascar group. We also present an example that the restricted and relativized Lascar groups are the same but the Lascar group of the theory is not the same with them.

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. Hyperimaginaries and model theoretic Galois groups. Throughout, let T be a complete first-order theory and \mathfrak{C} be a monster model of T . Recall that an object is said to be *small* if its size is less than the degree of strong homogeneity and saturation of \mathfrak{C} . We will always consider small ordinals and cardinals, and small sets, tuples and models in \mathfrak{C} otherwise stated.

Any reader who does not want to develop the arguments over a hyperimaginary (to avoid complexity) may assume that the hyperimaginary e throughout this paper to be an emptyset or interdefinable (Definition 1.4) with an emptyset, but we need basic definitions and facts about hyperimaginaries to proceed the arguments even when $e = \emptyset$.

The proofs for basic properties of hyperimaginaries can be found on [C11] and [K14]. Most of the basic definitions and facts on the Lascar group can be found on [KL23], [Lee22] and [K14], which collect and generalize the fundamental results in [Z02], [CLPZ01], [LP01] and more papers, to the context of hyperimaginaries.

We denote the automorphism group of \mathfrak{C} by $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ and for $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, we denote the set of automorphisms of \mathfrak{C} fixing A pointwise by $\text{Aut}_A(\mathfrak{C})$.

Definition 1.1. Let E be an equivalence relation defined on \mathfrak{C}^α and $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$. Then E is said to be

- (1) *finite* if the number of its equivalence classes is finite,
- (2) *bounded* if the number of its equivalence classes is small,
- (3) *A-invariant* if for any $f \in \text{Aut}_A(\mathfrak{C})$, $E(a, b)$ if and only if $E(f(a), f(b))$,
- (4) *A-definable* if there is a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ over A such that $\models \varphi(a, b)$ if and only if $E(a, b)$ holds, just *definable* if it is definable over some parameters, and
- (5) *A-type-definable* if there is a partial type $\Phi(x, y)$ over A such that $\models \Phi(a, b)$ if and only if $E(a, b)$ holds, just *type-definable* if it is type-definable over some parameters.

Definition 1.2. Let E be an \emptyset -type-definable equivalence relation on \mathfrak{C}^α . An equivalence class of E is called a *hyperimaginary* and it is denoted by a_E if it has a representative a . A hyperimaginary a_E is said to be *countable* if $|a|$ is countable.

To make hyperimaginaries easily distinguishable from real tuples, we will write hyperimaginaries in boldface.

Definition 1.3. For a hyperimaginary e ,

$$\text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C}) := \{f \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) : f(e) = e \text{ (setwise)}\}.$$

We say an equivalence relation E is *e-invariant* if for any $f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$, $E(a, b)$ holds if and only if $E(f(a), f(b))$ holds.

Definition 1.4. For a hyperimaginary e , we say two ‘objects’ (e.g. elements of \mathfrak{C} , tuples of equivalence classes, enumerations of sets) b and c are *interdefinable over e* if for any $f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$, $f(b) = b$ if and only if $f(c) = c$. We may omit ‘over e ’ if $e = \emptyset$.

Fact 1.5 ([K14, Section 4.1] or [C11, Chapter 15]).

- (1) Any tuple (of elements) in \mathfrak{C} , any tuple of imaginaries of \mathfrak{C} , and any tuple of hyperimaginaries are interdefinable with a single hyperimaginary.
- (2) Any hyperimaginary is interdefinable with a sequence of countable hyperimaginaries.

Until the end of this paper, we fix some arbitrary \emptyset -type-definable equivalence relation E and a hyperimaginary $e := a_E$.

Definition 1.6.

- (1) A hyperimaginary e' is *definable over e* if $f(e') = e'$ for any $f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$.
- (2) A hyperimaginary e' is *algebraic over e* if $\{f(e') : f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})\}$ is finite.
- (3) A hyperimaginary e' is *bounded over e* if $\{f(e') : f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})\}$ is small.
- (4) The *definable closure* of e , denoted by $\text{dcl}(e)$ is the set of all countable hyperimaginaries e' definable over e .
- (5) The *algebraic closure* of e , denoted by $\text{acl}(e)$ is the set of all countable hyperimaginaries e' algebraic over e .
- (6) The *bounded closure* of e , denoted by $\text{bdd}(e)$ is the set of all countable hyperimaginaries e' bounded over e .

Definition/Remark 1.7.

- (1) By Fact 1.5(2), if $f \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ fixes $\text{bdd}(e)$ elementwise, then for any hyperimaginary e' which is bounded over e , $f(e') = e'$. Similar statements also hold for $\text{dcl}(e)$ and $\text{acl}(e)$.

- (2) By (1), for a hyperimaginary b_F which is possibly not countable, we write $b_F \in \text{bdd}(\mathbf{e})$ if b_F is bounded over \mathbf{e} . We use notation $b_F \in \text{dcl}(\mathbf{e}), \text{acl}(\mathbf{e})$ in a similar way.
- (3) Each of $\text{dcl}(\mathbf{e}), \text{acl}(\mathbf{e}),$ and $\text{bdd}(\mathbf{e})$ is small and interdefinable with a single hyperimaginary (cf. [C11, Proposition 15.18]). Thus it makes sense to consider $\text{Aut}_{\text{bdd}(\mathbf{e})}(\mathfrak{C})$.

The complete type of a hyperimaginary over a hyperimaginary, and the equality of such complete types are type-definable:

Definition 1.8 ([K14, Section 4.1]). Let b_F and c_F be hyperimaginaries.

- (1) The *complete type of b_F over \mathbf{e}* , $\text{tp}_x(b_F/\mathbf{e})$ is a partial type over a ,

$$\exists z_1 z_2 (\text{tp}_{z_1 z_2}(ba) \wedge F(x, z_1) \wedge E(a, z_2)),$$

whose solution set is the union of automorphic images of b_F over \mathbf{e} .

- (2) We write $b_F \equiv_e c_F$ if there is an automorphism $f \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C})$ such that $f(b_F) = c_F$. The equivalence relation $x_F \equiv_e y_F$ in variables xy is a -type-definable, given by the partial type:

$$\exists z_1 z_2 w_1 w_2 (E(a, z_1) \wedge E(a, z_2) \wedge \text{tp}(z_1 w_1) = \text{tp}(z_2 w_2) \wedge F(w_1, x) \wedge F(w_2, y)).$$

We also sometimes use notation $\text{tp}_x(b_F/\mathbf{e}) = \text{tp}_y(c_F/\mathbf{e})$ instead of $b_F \equiv_e c_F$.

Now we start to recall the model theoretic Galois groups.

Definition 1.9.

- (1) $\text{Aut}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})$ is a normal subgroup of $\text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C})$ generated by $\{f \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C}) : f \in \text{Aut}_M(\mathfrak{C}) \text{ for some } M \models T \text{ such that } \mathbf{e} \in \text{dcl}(M)\}$, and its elements are called *Lascar strong automorphisms over \mathbf{e}* .
- (2) The quotient group $\text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e}) = \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C}) / \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})$ is called the *Lascar group of T over \mathbf{e}* .

Fact 1.10 ([KL23, Section 1]).

- (1) $\text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e})$ does not depend on the choice of a monster model up to isomorphism, so it is legitimate to write $\text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e})$ instead of $\text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})$.
- (2) $[\text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C}) : \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})] = |\text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e})| \leq 2^{|T|+|a|}$, which is small.

Fact 1.11 ([Z02, Lemma 1]). Let M be a small model of T such that $\mathbf{e} \in \text{dcl}(M)$ and $f, g \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C})$. If $\text{tp}(f(M)/M) = \text{tp}(g(M)/M)$, then $f \cdot \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e}) = g \cdot \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})$ as elements in $\text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e})$.

Definition 1.12. Let M be a small model of T such that $\mathbf{e} \in \text{dcl}(M)$.

- (1) $S_M(M) = \{\text{tp}(f(M)/M) : f \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C})\}$.
- (2) $\nu : S_M(M) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e})$ is defined by $\nu(\text{tp}(f(M)/M)) = f \cdot \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e}) = [f]$, which is well-defined by Fact 1.11.
- (3) $\mu : \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow S_M(M)$ is defined by $\mu(f) = \text{tp}(f(M)/M)$.
- (4) $\pi = \nu \circ \mu : \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e})$, so that $\pi(f) = [f]$ in $\text{Gal}_{\mathbf{L}}(T, \mathbf{e})$.

Remark 1.13 ([KL23, Remark 1.9]). Let $S_x(M) = \{p(x) : |x| = |M| \text{ and } p(x) \text{ is a complete type over } M\}$ be the compact space of complete types. Note that even if $\mathbf{e} \in \text{dcl}(M)$, possibly a is not in M , so that $S_M(M)$ is not $\{p \in S_x(M) : \text{tp}(M/\mathbf{e}) \subseteq p\}$. But for any small model M such that $\mathbf{e} \in \text{dcl}(M)$, $S_M(M)$ is a closed (so compact) subspace.

Proof. Let

$$r(x, a) = \text{tp}(M/\mathbf{e}) = \exists z_1 z_2 (\text{tp}_{z_1 z_2}(Ma) \wedge x = z_1 \wedge E(a, z_2))$$

and $r_0(y, M) = \text{tp}(a/M)$. Then

$$r'(x, M) = \exists y (r(x, y) \wedge r_0(y, M))$$

has the same solution set as $\text{tp}(M/\mathbf{e})$. Thus $S_M(M) = \{p \in S_x(M) : r'(x, M) \subseteq p\}$, which is closed. \square

Fact 1.14 ([KL23, Corollary 1.20]).

- (1) We give the quotient topology on $\text{Gal}_L(T, \mathbf{e})$ induced by $\nu : S_M(M) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_L(T, \mathbf{e})$. The quotient topology does not depend on the choice of M .
- (2) $\text{Gal}_L(T, \mathbf{e})$ is a quasi-compact topological group.

Now we introduce the notation for two canonical normal subgroups of the Lascar group and recall the KP and Shelah group.

Definition 1.15. Let $\text{Gal}_L^c(T, \mathbf{e})$ be the topological closure of the trivial subgroup of $\text{Gal}_L(T, \mathbf{e})$, and $\text{Gal}_L^0(T, \mathbf{e})$ be the connected component containing the identity in $\text{Gal}_L(T, \mathbf{e})$. Put $\text{Aut}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e}) = \pi^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^c(T, \mathbf{e})]$ and $\text{Aut}_{\text{S}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e}) = \pi^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^0(T, \mathbf{e})]$.

- (1) The *KP(-Galois) group of T over \mathbf{e}* (where KP is an abbreviation for Kim-Pillay) is

$$\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T, \mathbf{e}) := \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C}) / \text{Aut}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e}).$$

- (2) The *Shelah(-Galois) group of T over \mathbf{e}* is

$$\text{Gal}_{\text{S}}(T, \mathbf{e}) := \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C}) / \text{Aut}_{\text{S}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e}).$$

Note that we have

$$\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T, \mathbf{e}) \cong \text{Gal}_L(T, \mathbf{e}) / \text{Gal}_L^c(T, \mathbf{e}), \quad \text{Gal}_{\text{S}}(T, \mathbf{e}) \cong \text{Gal}_L(T, \mathbf{e}) / \text{Gal}_L^0(T, \mathbf{e}).$$

The strong types are defined in terms of equivalence relations satisfying particular conditions, but because we are considering a Lascar group over a hyperimaginary \mathbf{e} , it is beneficial to define them as the orbit equivalence relations and then characterize them.

Definition 1.16. Given hyperimaginaries b_F, c_F , they are said to have the same

- (1) *Lascar strong type over \mathbf{e}* if there is $f \in \text{Aut}_{\text{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})$ such that $f(b_F) = c_F$, and it is denoted by $b_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{L}} c_F$,
- (2) *KP strong type over \mathbf{e}* if there is $f \in \text{Aut}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})$ such that $f(b_F) = c_F$, and it is denoted by $b_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{KP}} c_F$, and
- (3) *Shelah strong type over \mathbf{e}* if there is $f \in \text{Aut}_{\text{S}}(\mathfrak{C}, \mathbf{e})$ such that $f(b_F) = c_F$, and it is denoted by $b_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{S}} c_F$.

Fact 1.17 ([KL23]). Let b_F and c_F be hyperimaginaries.

- (1) $b_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{L}} c_F$ if and only if for any \mathbf{e} -invariant bounded equivalence relation E' which is coarser than F , $E'(b, c)$ holds; $x_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{L}} y_F$ is the finest such an equivalence relation among them.
- (2) The following are equivalent.
 - (a) $b_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{KP}} c_F$.
 - (b) $b_F \equiv_{\text{bdd}(\mathbf{e})} c_F$.

- (c) For any \mathbf{e} -invariant type-definable bounded equivalence relation E' which is coarser F , $E'(b, c)$ holds ($x_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{KP}} y_F$ is the finest such an equivalence relation among them).
- (3) The following are equivalent.
- (a) $b_F \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^{\text{S}} c_F$.
 - (b) $b_F \equiv_{\text{acl}(\mathbf{e})} c_F$.
 - (c) For any \mathbf{e} -invariant type-definable equivalence relation E' coarser than F , if $b_{E'}$ has finitely many conjugates over \mathbf{e} , then $E'(b, c)$ holds.

If F is just $=$, so that b_F and c_F are just real tuples, then we can omit “coarser than F ”.

The following observation is necessary when we consider an equivalence class of a type-definable equivalence relation over certain parameters as a hyperimaginary.

Fact 1.18. *Let F be an \mathbf{e} -invariant type-definable equivalence relation on \mathfrak{C}^α . Then there is an \emptyset -type-definable equivalence relation F' such that for any $c \in \mathfrak{C}^\alpha$, c_F and $(ca)_{F'}$ are interdefinable over \mathbf{e} so that we can ‘replace’ an equivalence class of an \mathbf{e} -invariant type-definable equivalence relation with a hyperimaginary.*

Proof. Since F is $\mathbf{e}(= a_E)$ -invariant, F is type-definable over a , say by $F(x, y; a)$. Then for $p(x) = \text{tp}(a)$, put

$$F'(xz, yw) := (F(x, y; z) \wedge E(z, w) \wedge p(z) \wedge p(w)) \vee xz = yw.$$

Then F' is the desired one. \square

1.2. Relativized model theoretic Galois groups. From now on, we fix an \mathbf{e} -invariant partial type $\Sigma(x)$ where x is a possibly infinite tuple of variables. That is, for any $f \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C})$, $b \models \Sigma(x)$ if and only if $f(b) \models \Sigma(x)$. We write $\Sigma(\mathfrak{C})$ for the set of tuples b of elements in \mathfrak{C} such that $b \models \Sigma(x)$.

Definition 1.19 (Relativization of automorphism groups to Σ). Let $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$.

- (1) $\text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma) = \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma(\mathfrak{C})) = \{f \upharpoonright \Sigma(\mathfrak{C}) : f \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathfrak{C})\}$.
- (2) For a cardinal λ , $\text{Autf}_X^\lambda(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma) : \text{for any of tuple } b = (b_i)_{i < \lambda} \text{ where each } b_i \models \Sigma(x_i), b \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^X \sigma(b)\}$.
- (3) $\text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma) : \text{for any cardinal } \lambda \text{ and for any tuple } b = (b_i)_{i < \lambda} \text{ with each } b_i \models \Sigma(x_i), b \equiv_{\mathbf{e}}^X \sigma(b)\}$.

Remark 1.20. For $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$, it is easy to check that $\text{Autf}_X^\lambda(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$ and $\text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$ are normal subgroups of $\text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma)$.

Definition 1.21.

- (1) For $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$, for any cardinal λ , $\text{Gal}_X^\lambda(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma) / \text{Autf}_X^\lambda(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$.
- (2) $\text{Gal}_{\text{L}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma) / \text{Autf}_{\text{L}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$ is the *Lascar(-Galois) group over \mathbf{e} relativized to Σ* .
- (3) $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma) / \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$ is the *KP(-Galois) group over \mathbf{e} relativized to Σ* .
- (4) $\text{Gal}_{\text{S}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \text{Aut}_{\mathbf{e}}(\Sigma) / \text{Autf}_{\text{S}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$ is the *Shelah(-Galois) group over \mathbf{e} relativized to Σ* .

Remark 1.22.

- (1) For $X \in \{\mathbb{L}, \text{KP}, \mathbb{S}\}$, if $[f] = [\text{id}]$ in $\text{Gal}_X(T, e)$, then $[f] = [\text{id}]$ in $\text{Gal}_X(\Sigma, e)$.
 (2) In general, $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^1(\Sigma) \neq \text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^2(\Sigma)$ (cf. [DKKL21, Example 2.3]).

Fact 1.23.

- (1) $\text{Autf}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e) = \text{Autf}_{\mathbb{L}}^{\omega}(\Sigma, e)$.
 (2) $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e) = \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}^{\omega}(\Sigma, e)$.
 (3) $\text{Autf}_{\mathbb{S}}(\Sigma, e) = \text{Autf}_{\mathbb{S}}^{\omega}(\Sigma, e)$.

Proof. (1): The proof is the same as [DKL17, Remark 3.3] and [Lee22, Proposition 6.3] over a hyperimaginary, so we omit it.

(2): $\sigma \in \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e)$ if and only if for any tuple b of realizations of Σ , $b \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} \sigma(b)$. But \equiv_e^{KP} is equivalent to $\equiv_{\text{bdd}(e)}$ (which is type-definable) by Fact 1.17, thus if $b' \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} \sigma(b')$ for any corresponding subtuples $b', \sigma(b')$ of $b, \sigma(b)$, which are tuples of finitely many realizations of Σ , then $b \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} \sigma(b)$ by compactness. Thus if $\sigma \in \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}^{\omega}(\Sigma, e)$, then $\sigma \in \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e)$. The proof for (3) is the same as (2), replacing $\text{bdd}(e)$ by $\text{acl}(e)$. \square

Fact 1.24 ([DKL17, Proposition 3.6] or [Lee22, Proposition 6.5]). *The relativized Lascar group $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$ does not depend on the choice of \mathfrak{C} .*

2. TOPOLOGY ON RELATIVIZED MODEL THEORETIC GALOIS GROUPS

In this section, we will generalize Fact 1.14 and Fact 1.17 to the relativized Lascar group. To that end, we will find a topology \mathfrak{t} on the relativized Lascar group $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$, so that

- the group $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$ is a quasi-compact group with respect to \mathfrak{t} , and
- $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e) = \pi'^{-1}[\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^c(\Sigma, e)]$ and $\text{Autf}_{\mathbb{S}}(\Sigma, e) = \pi'^{-1}[\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^0(\Sigma, e)]$,

where $\pi' : \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$ is the natural surjective map, and $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^c(\Sigma, e)$ and $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^0(\Sigma, e)$ are the closure of the trivial subgroup and the connected component containing the identity of $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$ with respect to the topology \mathfrak{t} , respectively.

For this purpose, we introduce a notion that will replace the role of a small model when we consider Lascar groups.

Definition 2.1. A small tuple b of realizations of Σ is called a *Lascar tuple* (in Σ over e) if $\text{Autf}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e) = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma) : b \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} \sigma(b)\}$.

Lemma 2.2. *For any e -invariant partial type $\Sigma(x)$, there is a Lascar tuple.*

Proof. By Fact 1.10(2), the set of all Lascar equivalence classes

$$C = \{c_{\equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}}} : c \text{ is a countable tuple of realizations of } \Sigma\}$$

is small, say its cardinality is κ .

Let $b = (b_i : i < \kappa)$ be a small tuple that collects representatives of Lascar classes in C , only one for each class. Then b is the desired one; by Fact 1.23, it is enough to show that for an automorphism $f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$, if $b \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} f(b)$, then for any tuple d of countable realizations of Σ , $d \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} f(d)$. Note that there is $i < \kappa$ such that $d \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} b_i$. Then we have

$$d \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} b_i \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} f(b_i) \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} f(d)$$

where the last equivalence follows from the invariance of $\equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}}$. \square

Remark 2.3.

- (1) Any small tuple of realizations of Σ can be extended into a Lascar tuple.

(2) Any concatenation of two Lascar tuples is again a Lascar tuple.

Now we fix a Lascar tuple b in Σ over e , a small model M with $b \in M$, and $e \in \text{dcl}(M)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} S_b(b) &:= \{\text{tp}(\sigma(b)/b) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)\} \\ &= \{\text{tp}(f(b)/b) : f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the natural restriction map $r : S_M(M) \rightarrow S_b(b)$, which is continuous with respect to the logic topology on the type space, we have that $S_b(b)$ is a compact space. Next, Consider a map

$$\nu_b : S_b(b) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_L^\lambda(\Sigma, e), \quad p = \text{tp}(\sigma(b)/b) \mapsto [\sigma].$$

Then it is not hard to check that ν_b is well-defined if $e \in \text{dcl}(b)$. Indeed, given $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$ with $\sigma(b) \equiv_b \sigma'(b)$, there is $\tau \in \text{Aut}_b(\Sigma)$ such that $\tau(\sigma'(b)) = \sigma(b)$ and so $\sigma^{-1}\tau\sigma' \in \text{Aut}_b(\Sigma)$. Since $e \in \text{dcl}(b)$ and b is a Lascar tuple, we have

$$\text{Aut}_b(\Sigma) = \text{Aut}_{be}(\Sigma) \leq \text{Aut}_L(\Sigma, e),$$

so we have

$$[\text{id}] = [\sigma^{-1}\tau\sigma'] = [\sigma]^{-1}[\tau][\sigma'] = [\sigma]^{-1}[\sigma'], \text{ hence } [\sigma] = [\sigma'].$$

From now on, we assume that there is a Lascar tuple b in Σ over e such that $e \in \text{dcl}(b)$. Note that it is equivalent to the condition that there is a small tuple c of realizations of Σ such that $e \in \text{dcl}(c)$; if there is such a small tuple c , by Remark 2.3, we may assume that c is a Lascar tuple.

Remark 2.4. We have the following commutative diagram of natural surjective maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C}) & \xrightarrow{\mu} & S_M(M) & \xrightarrow{\nu} & \text{Gal}_L(T, e) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\text{KP}}} & \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T, e) & \xrightarrow{\eta_S} & \text{Gal}_S(T, e) \\ \downarrow \xi & & \downarrow r & & \downarrow \xi_L & & \downarrow \xi_{\text{KP}} & & \downarrow \xi_S \\ \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma) & \xrightarrow{\mu_b} & S_b(b) & \xrightarrow{\nu_b} & \text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\text{KP}, \Sigma}} & \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{S, \Sigma}} & \text{Gal}_S(\Sigma, e) \end{array}$$

Put $\pi_b := \nu_b \circ \mu_b$ and $\pi_\Sigma := \pi_b \circ \xi = \xi_L \circ \pi$. Note that $\pi = \nu \circ \mu : \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_L(T, e)$ and $\pi_b = \pi' : \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$.

Remark 2.5 (Relativized Galois groups are topological groups). Consider a topology \mathfrak{t}_b on $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ given by the quotient topology via ν_b . Then $(\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e), \mathfrak{t}_b)$ is a quasi-compact topological group whose topology \mathfrak{t}_b is independent of the choice of a Lascar tuple b , so there is no harm to denote this \mathfrak{t}_b by \mathfrak{t} .

Proof. The restriction map $r : S_M(M) \rightarrow S_b(b)$ is a continuous surjective map between compact Hausdorff spaces, hence a quotient map. Thus $\nu_b : S_b(b) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ and $\nu_b \circ r : S_M(M) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ induce the same quotient topology on $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$.

But the quotient topology on $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ given by the natural projection map $\xi_L : \text{Gal}_L(T, e) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ is also the same as the above topology, thus the topology of $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ is independent of the choice b (Fact 1.14) and it is a topological group since a quotient group of a topological group with quotient topology is a topological group (it is the same reasoning as [DKL17, Remark 3.4]). \square

The following proposition is a relativized analogue of [KL23, Proposition 2.3], which have extended [LP01, Lemma 1.9] over a hyperimaginary. The purpose of Proposition 2.6 is to interpret closed subgroups of $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$ using bounded hyperimaginaries, and it will play a critical role in many arguments until the end of this section.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $H \leq \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\pi_{\Sigma}[H]$ is closed in $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$ and $H = \pi_{\Sigma}^{-1}[\pi_{\Sigma}[H]]$.
- (2) $H = \text{Aut}_{e'}(\mathfrak{C})$ for some hyperimaginary $e' \in \text{bdd}(e)$, and one of the representatives of e' is a tuple of realizations of Σ .

Proof. The method of proof is the same as the proof of [KL23, Proposition 2.3], but we use a Lascar tuple b instead of a model M .

(\Rightarrow): We have

$$\text{Aut}_b(\mathfrak{C}) = \text{Aut}_{b_e}(\mathfrak{C}) \leq \xi^{-1}[\text{Aut}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)] \leq H$$

and since $\pi_{\Sigma}[H]$ is closed, $\nu_b^{-1}[\pi_{\Sigma}[H]]$ is closed and thus $\{h(b) : h \in H\}$ is type-definable over b . Hence by [KL23, Proposition 2.2], $H = \text{Aut}_{b_F e}(\mathfrak{C})$ for some \emptyset -type-definable equivalence relation F .

We have $b_F \in \text{bdd}(e)$: $[\text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C}) : H] = \kappa$ is small since $\text{Aut}_{\mathbb{L}}(\mathfrak{C}, e) \leq H$, and so there is $\{f_i \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C}) : i < \kappa\}$ such that $\text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C}) = \bigsqcup_{i < \kappa} f_i \cdot H$. Then for all $g, h \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$, if $g \cdot H = h \cdot H$, then $h^{-1}g \in H$ and hence $g(b_F) = h(b_F)$.

(\Leftarrow): Say $e' = c_F$ where c is a tuple of realizations of Σ and F is an \emptyset -type-definable equivalence relation. By Remark 2.3 and Remark 2.5, we may assume that the Lascar tuple b contains c . For $q(x) = \text{tp}(c/e)$, because $e' \in \text{bdd}(e)$,

$$F'(z_1, z_2) := (q(z_1) \wedge q(z_2) \wedge F(z_1, z_2)) \vee (\neg q(z_1) \wedge \neg q(z_2))$$

is an e -invariant bounded equivalence relation on $\mathfrak{C}^{|c|}$. Since c is a tuple in $\Sigma(\mathfrak{C})$, for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$, $\sigma(c) \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} c$ and thus $F'(\sigma(c), c)$ by Fact 1.17(1). Note that $c_F = c_{F'}$, so we have $\xi^{-1}[\text{Aut}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)] \leq H = \text{Aut}_{c_F e}(\mathfrak{C})$, hence $\pi_{\Sigma}^{-1}[\pi_{\Sigma}[H]] = H$. Notice that $H = \{f \in \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C}) : f(c) \models F(z, c)\}$. Then $\nu_b^{-1}[\pi_{\Sigma}[H]] = \{p(z') \in S_b(b) : F(z, c) \subseteq p(z')\}$ where $z \subseteq z'$ and $|z'| = |b|$. Thus $\pi_{\Sigma}[H]$ is closed. \square

Definition 2.7.

- (1) For $H \leq \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$, the relation \equiv^H is an orbit equivalence relation such that for tuples b, c in \mathfrak{C} , $b \equiv^H c$ if and only if there is $h \in H$ such that $h(b) = c$.
- (2) For $H \leq \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$, we will use the same notation \equiv^H but it is confined to the tuples of realizations of Σ .

Remark 2.8. Let $H \leq \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$ and c, d be tuples of realizations of Σ .

- (1) If $H = \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$, then $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $c \equiv_e^{\mathbb{L}} d$.
- (2) If $H = \text{Aut}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e)$, then $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$.
- (3) If $H = \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{S}}(\Sigma)$, then $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $c \equiv_e^{\mathbb{S}} d$.

Now we prove that closed subgroups of the relativized Lascar groups are completely determined by the orbit equivalence relations they define.

Lemma 2.9. *Let H be a subgroup of $\text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$ containing $\text{Aut}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$ such that $\pi_b[H]$ is a closed subgroup of $\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}(\Sigma, e)$. Then*

- (1) For any tuples c and d of realizations of Σ , $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if for all corresponding subtuples c' and d' of c and d , which are finite tuples of realizations of Σ , $c' \equiv^H d'$.
- (2) Given $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$, the following are equivalent.
- (a) $\sigma \in H$.
 - (b) σ fixes all the \equiv^H -classes of any tuples of realizations of Σ .
 - (c) σ fixes all the \equiv^H -classes of any finite tuples of realizations of Σ .

Proof. (1): Suppose that for all corresponding subtuples c' and d' of c and d , which are finite tuple of realizations of Σ , $c' \equiv^H d'$. Note that, by Proposition 2.6, $H' := \pi_\Sigma^{-1}[\pi_b[H]] = \text{Aut}_{e'e}(\mathbf{C})$ for some hyperimaginary $e' \in \text{bdd}(e)$ such that one of its representatives is a tuple of realizations of Σ . Then by commutativity of the diagram in Remark 2.4, $H = \xi[H'] = \text{Aut}_{e'e}(\Sigma)$ and so $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $\text{tp}(c/e'e) = \text{tp}(d/e'e)$. Since $\text{tp}(c'/e'e) = \text{tp}(d'/e'e)$ for all corresponding subtuples c' and d' of c and d , which are finite tuples of realizations of Σ , by compactness, we have that $\text{tp}(c/e'e) = \text{tp}(d/e'e)$ and so $c \equiv^H d$.

(2): It is enough to show that (c) implies (a). Take arbitrary $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$ and suppose σ fixes all the \equiv^H -classes of any finite tuples of realizations of Σ . For any subtuple b' of b , which is a finite tuple of realizations of Σ , $b' \equiv^H \sigma(b')$, and so by (1), $b \equiv^H \sigma(b)$. Thus there is $\tau \in H$ such that $\tau(b) = \sigma(b)$ and so $\tau^{-1}\sigma(b) = b$. Then we have

$$\tau^{-1}\sigma \in \text{Aut}_b(\Sigma) \leq \text{Aut}_L(\Sigma, e) \leq H,$$

and conclude that $\sigma \in \tau H = H$. \square

Definition 2.10.

- (1) $\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, e)$ is the topological closure of the trivial subgroup of $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$.
- (2) $\text{Gal}_L^0(\Sigma, e)$ is the connected component containing the identity in $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$.

Note that $\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, e)$ and $\text{Gal}_L^0(\Sigma, e)$ are closed normal subgroups because $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$ is a topological group.

Lemma 2.11. $\text{Aut}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e)/\text{Aut}_L(\Sigma, e)$ and $\text{Aut}_S(\Sigma, e)/\text{Aut}_L(\Sigma, e)$ are closed in $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, e)$.

Proof. We have

$$\nu_b^{-1}\eta_{\text{KP}, \Sigma}^{-1}[\text{Aut}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e)/\text{Aut}_L(\Sigma, e)] = \{\text{tp}(f(b)/b) : b \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} f(b)\}.$$

By Fact 1.17(2) and the proof of Remark 1.13, \equiv_e^{KP} is type-definable and there is an e -invariant partial type $\Gamma(x, y)$ over b such that $\{\text{tp}(f(b)/b) : b \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} f(b)\} = \{p(x) \in S_b(b) : \models \Gamma(x, b)\}$, implying that $\text{Aut}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, e)/\text{Aut}_L(\Sigma, e)$ is closed. The proof for $\text{Aut}_S(\Sigma, e)/\text{Aut}_L(\Sigma, e)$ is exactly the same; replace KP by S. \square

Notation 2.12. Let A be a set of hyperimaginaries.

$A \cap \Sigma := \{e' \in A : \text{one of the representatives of } e' \text{ is a tuple of realizations of } \Sigma\}$.

Lemma 2.13.

$$\pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, e)] = \text{Aut}_{\text{bdd}(e) \cap \Sigma}(\Sigma), \text{ and}$$

$$\pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^0(\Sigma, e)] = \text{Aut}_{\text{acl}(e) \cap \Sigma}(\Sigma).$$

Proof. By the essentially same proof of [KL23, Proposition 3.12(1)], the assertions follow using Proposition 2.6 and the fact that $\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$ is the intersection of all closed subgroups containing the identity and $\text{Gal}_L^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$ is the intersection of all closed (normal) subgroups of finite indices in $\text{Gal}_L(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$. \square

Proposition 2.14.

- (1) Let $H = \pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})] \leq \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$. Then $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$.
- (2) Let $H = \pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})] \leq \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma)$. Then $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $c \equiv_e^{\text{S}} d$.

Proof. (1): By Proposition 2.6, we know that $\pi_\Sigma^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})] = \text{Aut}_{e'e}(\mathfrak{C})$ for $e' \in \text{bdd}(e)$. Thus by commutativity of the diagram in Remark 2.4, $H = \xi[\text{Aut}_{e'e}(\mathfrak{C})] = \text{Aut}_{e'e}(\Sigma)$ and so $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $c \equiv_{e'e} d$. By Fact 1.17(2), $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$ if and only if $c \equiv_{\text{bdd}(e)} d$, and $e' \in \text{bdd}(e)$, thus $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$ implies $c \equiv^H d$.

By Lemma 2.11, $\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) \leq \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) / \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$. We already have proved that $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$ implies $c \equiv^H d$, and by Remark 2.8, $c \equiv_{\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})} d$ if and only if $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$, so it follows that $c \equiv^H d$ if and only if $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$.

(2): By Fact 1.17(3), if $c \equiv_e^{\text{S}} d$, then $c \equiv_{\text{acl}(e)} d$, so by Lemma 2.13, $c \equiv^H d$. Conversely, assume $c \equiv^H d$. By Fact 1.17(3), it suffices to show that if F is an e -invariant equivalence relation and c_F has finitely many automorphic images over e , then $F(c, d)$ holds.

Since F is e -invariant and $e \in \text{dcl}(b)$, F is type-definable over b . Then by the same method of Fact 1.18, there is an \emptyset -type-definable equivalence relation F' such that c_F and $(cb)_{F'}$ are interdefinable over e . But then $(cb)_{F'}$ is a hyperimaginary in $\text{acl}(e)$ and cb is a tuple of realizations of Σ , thus $(cb)_{F'} \in \text{acl}(e) \cap \Sigma$. By Lemma 2.13, we know that there is $f \in \text{Aut}_{\text{acl}(e) \cap \Sigma}(\mathfrak{C})$ such that $f(c) = d$. Then $f \in \text{Aut}_{(cb)_{F'}}(\mathfrak{C}) = \text{Aut}_{c_F}(\mathfrak{C})$ and so $F(c, d)$. \square

Now we can give an answer to one of the main questions of this section, which says that the quotient groups of relativized KP and Shelah automorphisms are exactly the canonical normal subgroups of the relativized Lascar group.

Theorem 2.15.

- (1) $\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) / \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$.
- (2) $\text{Gal}_L^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) = \text{Autf}_{\text{S}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e}) / \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$.

Proof. (1): Let $H_1 = \pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})]$ and $H_2 = \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$. By Remark 2.8 and Proposition 2.14, we have that \equiv^{H_1} and \equiv^{H_2} are the same equivalence relations on the tuples of realizations of $\Sigma(\mathfrak{C})$. So, by Lemma 2.9, $H_1 = H_2$.

(2): By exactly the same proof as (1), letting $H_1 = \pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^0(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})]$ and $H_2 = \text{Autf}_{\text{S}}(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})$. \square

We summarize the results obtained to prove Theorem 2.15 in this section, and state the characterization of strong types in Σ , which is analogous to Fact 1.17, in the following corollary. It says that having the same strong type can be, in some sense, localized by finding a partial type that contains the real tuples of interest.

Corollary 2.16. *Let c and d be tuples of realizations of Σ .*

- (1) *The following are equivalent.*
 - (a) $c \equiv_e^{\text{KP}} d$.
 - (b) $c \equiv_{\text{bdd}(e) \cap \Sigma} d$.
 - (c) *There is $\sigma \in \pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_L^c(\Sigma, \mathbf{e})]$ such that $\sigma(c) = d$.*

- (2) *The following are equivalent.*
- (a) $c \equiv_e^S d$
 - (b) $c \equiv_{\text{acl}(e) \cap \Sigma} d$.
 - (c) *There is $\sigma \in \pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^0(\Sigma, e)]$ such that $\sigma(c) = d$.*

Proof. (1): (a) \Rightarrow (b) is clear by Fact 1.17(2). By Lemma 2.13, $\pi_b^{-1}[\text{Gal}_{\mathbb{L}}^c(\Sigma, e)] = \text{Aut}_{\text{bdd}(e) \cap \Sigma}(\Sigma)$, so (b) and (c) are equivalent. (c) \Rightarrow (a) follows from Proposition 2.14. The proof for (2) is similar. \square

3. RESTRICTED MODEL THEORETIC GALOIS GROUPS

There is another possible approach to consider the subgroups of the automorphism group in Σ , by restricting the domains of the automorphisms in the subgroup.

Definition 3.1. For $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$,

$$\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e) = \{f \upharpoonright \Sigma(\mathfrak{C}) : f \in \text{Autf}_X(\mathfrak{C}, e)\} \leq \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma).$$

Remark 3.2.

- (1) For $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$, $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e) \leq \text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$.
- (2) Let $H_1 = \text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e)$ and $H_2 = \text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$. Then \equiv^{H_1} and \equiv^{H_2} are the same.

Proof. (1) is clear, and for (2), we only need to show that $c \equiv^{H_2} d$ implies $c \equiv^{H_1} d$ where c, d are tuples of realizations of Σ . By Remark 2.8, \equiv^{H_2} is the same as \equiv_e^X , thus $c \equiv^{H_2} d$ implies $c \equiv_e^X d$ and hence there is $f \in \text{Autf}_X(\mathfrak{C}, e)$ such that $f(c) = d$. So, $c \equiv^{H_1} d$. \square

Of course, we can relativize or take restriction for any subgroup of the automorphism group. We will use the following notation for general subgroups.

Definition 3.3. Given a subgroup $H \leq \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$, let \equiv^H be an orbit equivalence relation.

- (1) $\text{Aut}_{\equiv^H}(\Sigma, e) = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma) : \text{for any tuple } c \text{ of realizations of } \Sigma, c \equiv^H \sigma(c)\}$.
- (2) $H^{\text{res}} = \{f \upharpoonright \Sigma(\mathfrak{C}) : f \in H\}$.

Remark 3.4.

- (1) For any $H \leq \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$, $H^{\text{res}} \leq \text{Aut}_{\equiv^H}(\Sigma, e)$.
- (2) For $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$,
 - (a) $\text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e) = \text{Aut}_{\equiv_e^X}(\Sigma, e)$, and
 - (b) $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e) = \text{Autf}_X(\mathfrak{C}, e)^{\text{res}}$.

While it is unclear whether two groups H^{res} and $\text{Aut}_{\equiv^H}(\Sigma, e)$ are the same in general, at least, we can ascertain the following fact.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $H \leq \text{Aut}_e(\mathfrak{C})$ such that \equiv^H is weaker than \equiv_e^{L} (that is, if $c \equiv_e^{\text{L}} d$, then $c \equiv^H d$). Then*

$$H^{\text{res}} \text{Autf}_{\text{L}}(\Sigma, e) = \text{Aut}_{\equiv^H}(\Sigma, e)$$

where $H^{\text{res}} \text{Autf}_{\text{L}}(\Sigma, e) = \{g_1 g_2 \in \text{Aut}_e(\Sigma) : g_1 \in H^{\text{res}}, g_2 \in \text{Autf}_{\text{L}}(\Sigma, e)\}$. Especially, for $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$, $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e) \text{Autf}_{\text{L}}(\Sigma, e) = \text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$.

Proof. (\subseteq): Let $\sigma \in H^{\text{res}} \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, e)$, so that $\sigma = \tau\tau'$ for some $\tau \in H^{\text{res}}$ and $\tau' \in \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, e)$. It is enough to show that for a Lascar tuple b , $\sigma(b) \equiv^H b$, and

$$\sigma(b) = \tau\tau'(b) \equiv^H \tau'(b) \equiv^H b.$$

(\supseteq): Take $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_{\equiv^H}(\Sigma, e)$. For a Lascar tuple b in Σ , $b \equiv^H \sigma(b)$, thus there is $\tau \in H$ such that $\tau(b) = \sigma(b)$. Then letting $\tau_\Sigma = \tau \upharpoonright \Sigma(\mathfrak{C})$, we have

$$\tau_\Sigma^{-1}\sigma \in \text{Aut}_b(\Sigma) \leq \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, e),$$

and so

$$\sigma \in \tau_\Sigma \cdot \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, e) \subseteq H^{\text{res}} \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma, e).$$

□

Example 3.6. We consider a multi-sorted structure in [CLPZ01, Section 4]. Let $\mathcal{M} = (M_n, S_n, g_n, \pi_n)_{n \geq 1}$, where for each $n \geq 1$,

- M_n is a unit circle,
- S_n is a ternary relation on M_n saying that $S_n(a, b, c)$ holds if and only if a, b, c are distinct and b comes before c going around the circle clockwise starting from a ,
- g_n is a unary function on M_n taking the clockwise rotation by $\frac{2\pi}{n}$ -radians,
- π_n is a function from M_n to M_1 such that $x \mapsto x^n$.

Put $T := \text{Th}(\mathcal{M})$ and for each $n \geq 1$, $T_n := \text{Th}(M_n, S_n, g_n)$. Then, by [CLPZ01, Section 4] (or [DKKL21, Section 3.1]), we have

- T and each T_n have quantifier elimination,
- $\text{Gal}_L(T)$ is not G -compact, that is, $\text{Gal}_L(T)$ is not Hausdorff, and
- each $\text{Gal}_L(T_n)$ is trivial, so G -compact.

Let $\mathfrak{C} = (\mathfrak{M}_n, S_n, g_n, \pi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a monster model of T . Now let $\Sigma(x)$ be the sort corresponding to \mathfrak{M}_1 . Then, since $\text{Gal}_L(T_1)$ is trivial, we have

$$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}_1) = \text{Aut}(\Sigma) = \text{Autf}_L(\Sigma) = \text{Autf}_L^{\text{res}}(\Sigma).$$

By Remark 3.2, we know that $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e)$ is dense in $\text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$ after equipping the pointwise convergence topology on both of $\text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$ and $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e)$, that is, defining basic open sets on $\text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$ of the form $\{\sigma \in \text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e) : \sigma(c) = d\}$ for finite tuples c, d of realizations of Σ and the same on $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e)$. We close this paper with asking whether two groups $\text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$ and $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e)$ coincide or not.

Question 3.7. For $X \in \{\text{L}, \text{KP}, \text{S}\}$, $\text{Autf}_X^{\text{res}}(\Sigma, e) = \text{Autf}_X(\Sigma, e)$?

REFERENCES

- [C11] Enrique Casanovas, Simple theories and hyperimaginaries (Lecture Notes in Logic), Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [CLPZ01] Enrique Casanovas, Daniel Lascar, Anand Pillay and Martin Ziegler, Galois groups of first order theories, *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, **1**, (2001), 305–319.
- [DKKL21] Jan Dobrowolski, Byunghan Kim, Alexei Kolesnikov and Junguk Lee, The relativized Lascar groups, type-amalgamation, and algebraicity, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **86**, (2021), 531–557.
- [DKL17] J. Dobrowolski, B. Kim, and J. Lee, The Lascar groups and the first homology groups in model theory, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, **168**, (2017), 2129–2151.
- [K14] Byunghan Kim, Simplicity theory, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- [KL23] B. Kim, and H. Lee, Automorphism groups over a hyperimaginary, *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **75**, (2023), 21–49.

- [KPR18] K. Krupiński, A. Pillay, and T. Rzepecki, Topological dynamics and the complexity of strong types, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **228**, (2018), 863–932.
- [L82] Daniel Lascar, On the category of models of a complete theory, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **47**, (1982), 249–266.
- [LP01] Daniel Lascar and Anand Pillay, Hyperimaginaries and automorphism groups, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **66**, (2001), 127–143.
- [Lee22] H. Lee, Quotient groups of the Lascar group and strong types in the context of hyperimaginaries, Ph.D thesis, Yonsei University, 2022.
- [Z02] Martin Ziegler, Introduction to the Lascar group, Tits buildings and the model theory of groups, *London Math. Lecture Note Series*, **291**, Cambridge University Press, (2002), 279–298.

*DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, YONSEI UNIVERSITY, 50 YONSEI-RO, SEODAEMUN-GU, SEOUL, 03722, SOUTH KOREA

Email address: `hyoyoonlee@yonsei.ac.kr`

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CHANGWON NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, 20 CHANGWONDAEHAK-RO, UICHANG-GU, CHANGWON-SI, GYEONGSANGNAM-DO, 51140, SOUTH KOREA

Email address: `ljwhayo@changwon.ac.kr`