

MODEL THEORETIC EVENTS

KYLE GANNON AND JAMES E. HANSON

ABSTRACT. How do we randomly sample an infinite sequence from a first order structure? What properties might hold on almost all random sequences? Which kinds of probabilistic processes can be meaningfully applied and studied in the model theory context? This paper takes these questions seriously and advances a plausible framework to engage with probabilistic phenomena.

The central object of this paper is a probability space. The underlying set of our space is a standard model theoretic object, i.e. the space of types in countably many variables over a monster model. Our probability measure is the iterated Morley product of a fixed Borel-definable Keisler measure. Choosing a point randomly in this space with respect to our distribution yields a *random generic type* in infinitely many variables. We are interested in which events hold for almost all random generic types. In this paper, we consider two different flavors of model theoretic events:

- (1) Given a fixed \mathcal{L} -structure N , when is the induced structure on almost all random generic types isomorphic to N ?
- (2) For a fixed formula $\varphi(x, y)$ which is unstable, IP, sOP, etc., what is the probability that a random generic type witnesses this dividing line?

In regards to Question (1), we show that if μ satisfies a particular extension axiom, then there exists an \mathcal{L} -structure N_μ such that the induced structure on almost all random generic types is isomorphic to N_μ . The proof echos a celebrated result of Glebskii et al. and Fagin concerning the existence of *almost sure theories*. We also provide several examples where no such model exists. In regards to Question (2), we observe that these values can only be 0 or 1. We show that if μ is fin, then almost no random generic types witness instability, IP, or the strict order property. In the local NIP context, we use results from combinatorics to prove that for any Borel-definable measure, the *average value of witnessing k -instability* across all permutations converges to 0. Again, several examples are provided.

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last 15 years, Keisler measures have become a mainstream topic in model theory. In the mid-1980s, Keisler originally studied measures in the NIP context as a way to study forking [26]. Around 20 years later, these objects were revisited and recontextualized in a series of papers with authors among Hrushovski, Pillay, Petzil, and Simon [22, 23, 24]. In the current ethos, Keisler measures are an ingredient for studying definable groups (see e.g., [4, 6, 15]), for applying model theory to combinatorics (e.g. regularity lemmas, see e.g., [8, 7, 27]), and for pure model theory (see e.g., [2, 5, 14, 21]). In this paper, Keisler measures are viewed through the lens of probability theory and we attempt to understand when certain model theoretic properties hold *almost everywhere*. While this perspective is new *for these kinds of measures*, our work takes philosophical inspiration from classical results which connect logic and probability theory. The use of probabilistic methods in mathematical logic to construct first order objects goes back to at least the

celebrated results of Glebskii, Kogan, Liagonkii, and Talanov [20] in *the East* and independently Fagin [16, 17] in *the West*. As Fagin points out, this connection begins even earlier with the work of Gaifman [19] and even Carnap [3].

In this paper, we are concerned with a notion of *sampling* relative to a particular probability distribution, which we refer to as *generic sampling*. In order to describe the intuition behind generic sampling, we first recall the idea of *sampling*. Given a probability space (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) , a sample is simply a tuple from a power of our underlying set, X . How likely one is to choose a specific n -tuple depends on the distribution μ^n . We are interested in infinite samples, or samples from the infinite product space $X^{\mathbb{N}}$ chosen relative to the probability measure $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}$. One can think of an infinite sample as a process: At each stage, we randomly (and independently) choose an element from X with respect to μ until we have chosen infinitely many points. This is, in essence, the same as choosing our entire sequence at once relative to the product measure $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}$ on $X^{\mathbb{N}}$. We also remark that sampling has been considered in some model theoretic contexts which are different from the ones explored in this paper [1].

In the model theory setting, our underlying spaces X is the space of types $S_x(\mathcal{U})$, with the Borel σ -algebra, and our distribution μ is some regular Borel probability measure on $S_x(\mathcal{U})$, commonly known as a *Keisler measure*. As mentioned previously, we are interested in infinite samples. However, the sample space $S_x(\mathcal{U})^{\mathbb{N}}$ does not contain enough *model theoretic data*. Combining our distribution μ with the Morley product¹ allows us to construct a measure \mathbb{P}_μ on $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ where $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \geq 1}^\omega$, i.e. the space of types in countably many variables. This probability space is rich enough to measure many of the model theoretic events we care about.

In terms of our set-up, a *model theoretic event* is simply a \mathbb{P}_μ -measurable subset of $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ and the likelihood of the specific event B occurring is precisely its measure, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B)$. There are many different kinds of events which should be interesting to model theorists and in this article, we are interested in two distinct kinds:

- (1) The event that the induced structure on a random generic type is isomorphic to a fixed structure N .
- (2) The event that a random generic type witnesses a fixed dividing line.

Our results on the first kind of events, those associated with induced structures, are intimately related to research involving *almost sure theories*. Glebskii et al. as well as Fagin independently showed that given a finite relational language \mathcal{L} , one can construct a complete consistent² \mathcal{L} -theory $T_{\mathcal{L}}^{as}$ which has the following property: For any \mathcal{L} -sentence φ ,

$$\varphi \in T_{\mathcal{L}}^{as} \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\{M \models \varphi : M \in \mathcal{A}_n\}) = 1,$$

where \mathcal{A}_n is the collection of \mathcal{L} -structures with universe $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and μ_n is the normalized counting measure on \mathcal{A}_n . $T_{\mathcal{L}}^{as}$ is known as the *almost sure theory* of all finite \mathcal{L} -structures. In the time since, almost sure theories for many different restricted classes of finite structures have been studied/shown to exist (see e.g., [10, 11, 28]). Fagin, in his proof, demonstrates that the theory $T_{\mathcal{L}}^{as}$ has a straightforward axiomatization given by a family of *extension axioms*. In particular, $T_{\mathcal{L}}^{as}$ essentially states that if $\bar{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ has a certain quantifier-free type over \emptyset , then \bar{x} can be extended to a tuple $\bar{x}y$ as long as the quantifier-free type of $\bar{x}y$ is realized in some

¹This is why the term *generic* appears in the phrase *generic sampling*.

²Fagin attributes completeness and consistency to Gaifman.

structure. Moreover, the theory $T_{\mathcal{L}}^{qs}$ is countably categorical. The axiomatization explicitly encodes a back-and-forth argument.

One of our main theorem (Theorem 4.14) has a similar flavor to the theorem described above. Let \mathcal{L} be a finite relational language. If \mathcal{U} is a monster model and μ is a global measure which satisfies a *measure theoretic extension axiom*, then

- (1) There exists a countable structure N_μ such that the induced structure on \mathbb{P}_μ -almost all random generic types is isomorphic to N_μ .
- (2) $Th_{\mathcal{L}}(N_\mu)$ is countably categorical.

Our proof, as well as Fagin’s, relies on computing the measure of certain *extension formulas*. However, the underlying spaces over which the computations are being performed are quite different and therefore require a different set of techniques. Fagin’s argument is combinatorial and involves counting subsets of finite structures while our argument involves integrating families of Borel functions over type spaces – a standard practice in the current zeitgeist.

The second kinds of events we are interested in are *witnesses to dividing lines*. Let’s consider the following example: Given a formula $\varphi(x, y)$, we say that a type $p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ *witnesses the instability of φ* if for any/all realization $(a_i)_{i < \omega} \models p$, there exists $(b_j)_{j < \omega}$ such that

$$\models \varphi(a_i, b_j) \iff i \leq j.$$

What is the probability that a random generic type witnesses instability, say, of any formula? Let’s formalize this question. Notice that we can define *witnessing k -instability of φ* as follows:

$$O_k^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k) := \exists y_1, \dots, y_k \left(\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq k} \varphi(x_i, y_j) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j < i \leq k} \neg \varphi(x_i, y_j) \right).$$

Then a type $p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ witnesses the instability of φ if and only if $p \in \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty [O_k^\varphi(\bar{x})]$, which we denote as $\mathbf{O}^\varphi := \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty [O_k^\varphi(\bar{x})]$. Then the probability of a random generic type witnessing instability is the measure of $\mathbf{O} := \bigcup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{O}^\varphi$. Similar constructions can be done for other dividing lines (i.e. \mathbf{I} for the independence property and \mathbf{L} for strict order property). We observe that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O})$, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I})$ and $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L})$ are always 0 or 1 (Lemma 6.6). Using this observation, we prove that if μ is *fm*, then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}) = 0$ (Theorem 6.8). We provide several examples which give different possible values for these events under different hypotheses.

In the NIP setting, there are many examples of measures such that almost all random types witness instability. The catch is that these measures need to not be *generically stable*. In the NIP context, this is equivalent to assuming that the measure does not self-commute, i.e. $\mu_x \otimes \mu_y \neq \mu_y \otimes \mu_x$. Hence, the construction of the measure \mathbb{P}_μ in these contexts is inherently asymmetric. This asymmetry gives us the opportunity to ask, “What is the different expected values of $O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})$ where σ is an element of the symmetric group on $\{1, \dots, n\}$? How are they related?”

It turns out that if $\varphi(x, y)$ is NIP, then the average of value across all permutations of the measure of $O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})$ must tend toward 0. More explicitly,

we prove that if $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ is M -adequate (i.e. Borel-definable and self-associative) and $\varphi(x, y)$ is NIP, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \mathbb{P}_\mu(O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})) = 0.$$

To prove the above equality, we use a *deus ex machina* from combinatorics. In particular, we reduce the measure theoretic problem to a combinatorial one and then use some hard bounds from the theory of *VC dimension for permutation sets* by Cibulka and Kynčl [9] to derive a contradiction. While we are not concerned with hard bounds, we mention that the motivated reader may derive some results about the rate of convergence of the terms above depending only on the VC dimension of $\varphi(x, y)$. We remark that when $\varphi(x, y)$ is not NIP, then it is possible for the limit to converge to 1. This occurs in the random graph.

Our paper is outlined as follows: In section 2, we discuss preliminaries. In section 3, we introduce the notion of generic sampling and formally construct our probability space. Section 3 also contains some important computational lemmas which will be relevant in later sections of the paper (Lemma 3.9, Lemma 3.10). At the end of the section, we observe a basic application of the Borel-Cantelli theorem (Proposition 3.11). Section 4 focuses on the *isomorphism problem*, i.e. when does there exist some N such that the induced structure on almost all random generic types is isomorphic to N ? We restrict ourselves to the case where our language is relational. We first prove that for any fixed \mathcal{L} -structure N , the set $\{p \in S_x(\mathcal{U}) : \text{induced structure on } p \text{ is isomorphic to } N\}$ is a Borel subset of $S_x(\mathcal{U})$ (Proposition 4.3). Next, we describe some relatively easy contexts in which one can obtain a positive answer to the isomorphism problem. We then move on to the main portion of the section where we introduce the *adequate* and *excellent* measure extension axioms. We prove that if a measure μ witnesses the excellent measure extension axiom, then we obtain a positive answer to the isomorphism problem and moreover the theory of the model witnessing this property is \aleph_0 -categorical (Theorem 4.14, Theorem 4.15). Section 5 is focused on concrete examples around the isomorphism problem. We show directly that the *model theoretic* Lebesgue measure over DLO and the *weighted-coin-flipping* measures on the random graph have positive solutions to the isomorphism problem (Example 5.1, Example 5.3). We also exhibit some examples of measures which admit a negative answer to the isomorphism problem (Example 5.5, Example 5.6). In the final section, we focus our attention on another kind of event, those associated to witnessing dividing lines. We prove that if μ is *fm*, then almost no random generic types witness instability, the independence property, or the strict order property (Theorem 6.8). This follows in part from the observation that witnessing any of these dividing lines for a particular formula has probability 0 or 1 (Lemma 6.6). Next, we discuss some alternative interpretations of *witnessing a dividing line*. We then consider some concrete examples. Finally, we focus on the NIP setting. We prove that while it is possible that almost all random generic types witness instability in this setting, the average over a certain family of permutations converges to 0 (Theorem 6.19).

2. PRELIMINARIES

Our notation is relatively standard. We assume some familiarity with model theory. A good reference for background is [29]. We will always have a fixed language

\mathcal{L} and a fixed \mathcal{L} -theory T in the background. The symbol \mathcal{U} will denote a monster model of T and M will denote a small elementary submodel. The symbols x, y, z, \dots will denote variables while a, b, c, \dots denote parameters. If $A \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, then $\mathcal{L}_x(A)$ is the Boolean algebra of formulas with free variables among x and parameters from A (modulo logical equivalence). An $\mathcal{L}(A)$ -formula is a formula with parameters only from A . An \mathcal{L} -formula is a formula over the empty set.

If $A \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, we let $S_x(A)$ be the associated type space. The central type space of study will be $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ where $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \geq 1}^\omega$ and $|x_i| = |x_j| = |x|$. We recall that $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ is a Stone space, i.e. compact, Hausdorff, and totally disconnected. For indices i_1, \dots, i_n , we will often consider the set,

$$[\varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n})] := \{p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}) : \varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \in p\}.$$

These sets form a clopen basis for $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ and in particular, they are Borel.

We let $\mathfrak{M}_x(A)$ be the collection of Keisler measures on $\mathcal{L}_x(A)$, i.e. finitely additive probability measures on $\mathcal{L}_x(A)$. We recall the fact that every Keisler measure on $\mathcal{L}_x(A)$ extends uniquely to a countably additive regular Borel probability measure on $S_x(A)$, even when x is replaced by an infinite tuple of variables. More explicitly, the following statement is from Fremlin's measure theory treatise [18, 416Q Proposition (b)] restricted to the probability measure context.

Fact 2.1. *Let \mathbb{B} be a Boolean algebra and $S(\mathbb{B})$ its Stone space. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between finitely additive probability measures on \mathbb{B} and regular Borel probability measures on $S(\mathbb{B})$ given by $\mu(A) = \tilde{\mu}([A])$ where for each $A \in \mathbb{B}$, $[A]$ is the corresponding clopen subset of $S(\mathbb{B})$.*

We often make use of this correspondence without comment. The following is a *Keisler measure cheat sheet* which is included for the reader's convenience. We remark that most, if not all, of the following definitions are originally from [22, 23, 24].

Definition 2.2. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$ and M be a small elementary submodel.

- (1) We let $\mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ be the collection of measures in $\mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$ which are M -invariant. We recall that μ is M -invariant if for any $a, b \in \mathcal{U}^y$ such that $a \equiv_M b$, we have that $\mu(\varphi(x, a)) = \mu(\varphi(x, b))$ for any \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$.
- (2) Suppose $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. Then for any \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$, we can define the map $F_{\mu, M}^\varphi : S_y(M) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ via $F_{\mu, M}^\varphi(q) = \mu(\varphi(x, b))$ where $b \models q$. We remark that this map is well-defined since μ is M -invariant.
- (3) Suppose $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. We say that μ is Borel-definable if for every \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$, the map $F_{\mu, M}^\varphi$ is a Borel function.
- (4) Suppose $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. We say that μ is definable if for every \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$, the map $F_{\mu, M}^\varphi$ is a continuous function.
- (5) Suppose that $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$. Moreover, suppose that μ is Borel-definable. We define the Morley product $\mu \otimes \nu$ as follows: For any formula $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$, we have that

$$(\mu \otimes \nu)(\varphi(x, y)) = \int_{S_y(M')} F_{\mu, M'}^\varphi d\nu|_{M'},$$

where M' is any small model containing M and all the parameters from φ . The measure $\nu|_{M'}$ is the regular Borel probability measure corresponding

to the restriction of ν to $\mathcal{L}_y(M')$. We remark that this product is well-defined. In practice, we often drop the M' from the notation when there is no possibility of confusion, e.g. F_μ^φ instead of $F_{\mu, M'}^\varphi$ and ν instead of $\nu|_{M'}$.

- (6) The Morley product is a *separated amalgam*. If $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ is Borel-definable and $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_y(\mathcal{U})$ then for any $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ and $\psi(y) \in \mathcal{L}_y(\mathcal{U})$, we have that

$$(\mu \otimes \nu)(\varphi(x) \wedge \psi(y)) = \mu(\varphi(x)) \cdot \nu(\psi(y)).$$

See [24].

The following definition is new, but is meant really only for internal purposes. The motivation behind the definition is obvious; we want to define a class of measures which interacts nicely with the Morley product, but we do not want to be constrained to the NIP setting. The terms *adequate* and *excellent* will become relevant in later sections when we define the *adequate measure extension axiom* and the *excellent measure extension axiom*.

Definition 2.3. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. We say that μ is *M-adequate* if

- (1) μ is Borel-definable over M .
- (2) Any iteration of the Morley product of μ is Borel-definable over M , i.e. for any $n \geq 1$, the measure $\mu^{(n+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) = \mu(x_{n+1}) \otimes \mu^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is Borel-definable over M .
- (3) μ is self-associative, i.e. the measure $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mu(x_i)$ does not depend on the placement of parentheses.

We say that μ is *M-excellent* if μ is *M-adequate* and μ is self-commuting, i.e. $\mu_x \otimes \mu_y = \mu_y \otimes \mu_x$. Obviously all *M-excellent* measures are *M-adequate*.

One should keep the following examples of measures in mind.

Example 2.4. The following are examples of excellent measures.

- (1) Suppose that T is NIP. Then $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ is *M-excellent* if and only if μ is generically stable over M (self-commuting is equivalent to generic stability; see [24]; self-associativity follows from e.g., [12, 13]). We will consider the following concrete example. Let $M = (\mathbb{R}, <)$ and L be the standard Lebesgue on \mathbb{R} restricted to the interval $[0, 1]$. We define the Keisler measure μ_L on $\mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ as follows: For any $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$,

$$\mu_L(\varphi(x)) = L(\{r \in \mathbb{R} : \mathcal{U} \models \varphi(r)\}).$$

Since the structure is *o-minimal*, every definable set is a finite union of points and intervals. In particular, the sets on the RHS are Borel subsets of \mathbb{R} and so μ_L is well-defined. One can prove that μ_L is in $\mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and is generically stable, smooth even. In particular, μ_L is *M-excellent*.

- (2) Let $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$ and T be the theory of the random graph. For $t \in (0, 1)$, we let μ_t be the unique Keisler measure in $\mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$ such that for any distinct sequence of tuples $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m$, we have that

$$\mu_t \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n R(x, a_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^m \neg R(x, b_i) \right) = (t)^n (1-t)^m.$$

For any small model M , we claim that μ_t is *M-excellent* (self-associativity follows from the associativity of the Morley product for definable measures,

see [12]; self-commuting is checked below). In particular, for any $t \in (0, 1)$ μ_t is M -excellent.

- (3) In general, if $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and μ is *fm* over M , then μ is M -excellent. Self-associativity follows from associativity of definable measures while a proof of commuting with all Borel-definable measures (and thus self-commuting) can be found in [14].

Additionally, if T is NIP, then a measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$ is M -adequate if and only if μ is M -invariant (see e.g., [23, 24] + [13]).

Fact 2.5. *For any $t \in (0, 1)$, the measure μ_t in Example 2.4 self-commutes.*

Proof. By quantifier elimination and standard facts about measures, it suffices to show that $\mu_{t,x} \otimes \mu_{t,y}$ and $\mu_{t,y} \otimes \mu_{t,x}$ agree on intersections of literals. This follows from the fact that if two probability measures agree on a π -system, then they agree on the σ -algebra generated by that π -system. We claim moreover that it suffices to show these measures agree on formulas of the form

$$\Psi(x, y) := \bigwedge_{t \in A} R^{\epsilon(t)}(x, a_t) \wedge \bigwedge_{s \in B} R^{\epsilon(s)}(y, b_s) \wedge \bigwedge_{w \in C} x \neq c_w \wedge \bigwedge_{z \in D} y \neq d_z \wedge P(x, y),$$

where $P \in \{R, \neg R, =, \neq\}$. Choose a small model N containing M and all the parameters in our formula Ψ . Let $\varphi_1(y) := \bigwedge_{s \in B} R^{\epsilon(s)}(y, b_s) \wedge \bigwedge_{z \in D} y \neq d_z$, $\varphi_2(x) := \bigwedge_{t \in A} R^{\epsilon(t)}(x, a_t) \wedge \bigwedge_{w \in C} x \neq c_w$, and $p = \mu(P(x, y))$. We remark that the possible values for p are t , $1 - t$, 0 , and 1 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_{t,x} \otimes \mu_{t,y})(\Psi(x, y)) &= \int_{S_y(N)} F_{\mu_{t,x}}^{\Psi} d\mu_y \\ &= \int_{S_y(N)} \mathbf{1}_{\varphi_1(y)} \cdot p \cdot \mu_{t,x}(\varphi_2(x)) d\mu_{t,y} \\ &= p \cdot \mu_{t,x}(\varphi_2(x)) \cdot \mu_{t,y}(\varphi_1(y)). \end{aligned}$$

An almost identical computation gives $(\mu_{t,y} \otimes \mu_{t,x})(\Psi(x, y)) = p \cdot \mu_{t,x}(\varphi_2(x)) \cdot \mu_{t,y}(\varphi_1(y))$. \square

2.1. Supports. Here we recall some basic facts relating to the supports of measures. We recall that *invariantly supported measures* were defined in [4].

Definition 2.6. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$. We let $\text{supp}(\mu)$ denote the support of μ , i.e.

$$\text{supp}(\mu) := \{p \in S_x(A) : \mu(\varphi(x)) > 0, \text{ for any } \varphi(x) \in p\}.$$

This definition makes sense when x is an infinite tuple of variables. Moreover we say that a measure μ is *invariantly supported* (over M) if μ is M -invariant and for every $p \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, we have that p is M -invariant.

Recall the measures from Example 2.4. We remark that μ_L is invariantly supported while for any $t \in (0, 1)$, μ_t is not invariantly supported (see [4] for discussion). The next fact recalls that all invariant measures in NIP theories are invariantly supported. See [29] for the definition of the Morley product of invariant types.

Fact 2.7. *Suppose that $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$ and M be a small submodel of \mathcal{U} .*

- (1) *$\text{supp}(\mu)$ is a closed non-empty subset of $S_x(\mathcal{U})$. This is still true when x is replaced by an infinite tuples of variables.*

(2) (*T NIP*) If μ is M -invariant, then μ is invariantly supported [29, Prop. 7.15].

Proposition 2.8. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_y(\mathcal{U})$.

- (1) If μ is Borel-definable, then for every $p \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ and $q \in \text{supp}(\nu)$, there exists some $r \in \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu)$ such that $r|_x = p$ and $r|_y = q$.
- (2) If μ is Borel-definable and invariantly supported, then $(\text{supp}(\mu) \otimes \text{supp}(\nu)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu)$ is a dense subset of $\text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu)$.
- (3) If μ is definable and invariantly supported, then $\text{supp}(\mu) \otimes \text{supp}(\nu) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu)$.

Proof. For (1), notice that for any $\varphi(x) \in p$ and $\psi(y) \in q$, we have that

$$(\mu \otimes \nu)(\varphi(x) \wedge \psi(y)) = \mu(\varphi(x))\nu(\psi(y)) > 0.$$

By [4, Proposition 2.7], $\text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu) \cap [\varphi(x) \wedge \psi(y)] \neq \emptyset$. If we let $A_{\varphi, \psi} = \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu) \cap [\varphi(x) \wedge \psi(y)]$, we notice that that family $\mathcal{A} := (A_{\varphi, \psi})_{\varphi \in p, \psi \in q}$ has the finite intersection property. Thus $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is non-empty. Take $r \in \bigcap \mathcal{A}$.

For (2), fix $\theta(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$. Suppose that $[\theta(x, y)] \cap \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists some $r \in \text{supp}(\mu \otimes \nu)$ such that $\theta(x, y) \in r$. Since r is in the support, $(\mu \otimes \nu)(\theta(x, y)) > 0$. Choose a model M' such that M' contains M as well as all the parameters from θ . Then $\int_{S_x(M')} F_{\mu, M'}^\theta d\nu > 0$ and so there exists some $q \in \text{supp}(\nu)$ such that $F_{\mu, M'}^\theta(q|_{M'}) > 0$. So $\mu(\theta(x, b)) > 0$ where $b \models q|_{M'}$. By [4, Proposition 2.7], there exists some $p \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ such that $\theta(x, b) \in p$. Then we have that $\theta(x, y) \in p \otimes q$.

For (3), note that for each $p \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ and $q \in \text{supp}(\nu)$, the Morley product $p \otimes q$ is well-defined. Now fix $p \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, $q \in \text{supp}(\nu)$, and $\theta(x, y) \in p \otimes q$. Let N be a small model such that $M \subseteq N$ and N contains all the parameters from θ . Then $\theta(x, b) \in p$ where $b \models q|_N$. Hence $\mu(\theta(x, b)) > 0$ since $p \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. Then $F_{\mu, N}^\theta(p) > 0$ by definition. Since μ is definable over M , it is also definable over N , and so the map $F_{\mu, N}^\theta$ is continuous. Therefore $\int_{S_x(N)} F_{\mu, N}^\theta d\nu > 0$. And by definition, $(\mu \otimes \nu)(\theta(x, y)) > 0$. \square

3. GENERIC SAMPLING

We begin by defining the probability space that is central to this paper. We remark that the space itself is not *new* and has been implicitly studied in some situations (see e.g., [24, 14]). However, it is usually framed through the eyes of model theory, i.e. when one considers the iterated Morley product, we typically tend to treat it as a *Morley sequence in a measure*. Here, however, we want to treat it as a probability space *in itself*. We recall that $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \geq 1}^\omega$.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and suppose that μ is Borel definable. We define the measure \mathbb{P}_μ on $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ as follows:

- (1) $\mu^{(1)}(x_1) = \mu(x_1)$.
- (2) $\mu^{(n+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) = \mu(x_{n+1}) \otimes \mu^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.
- (3) $\mathbb{P}_\mu = \bigcup_{i=1}^\omega \mu^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_{i+1})$.

Formally, the probability space we care about is $(S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{B}, \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu)$ where \mathcal{B} is the Borel σ -algebra of $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu$ is the unique regular Borel probability measure on $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ such that for every $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, we have that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu([\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)]) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

We remark that \mathbb{P}_μ exists and is well-defined by Fact 2.1. As convention, we will always identify $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu$ with \mathbb{P}_μ .

Remark 3.2. Intuitively, one should think of the space $(S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$ as an object arising from a *random process*. The following explanation is not technically correct, but as Pillay would say, it is *morally correct*: At each stage, we randomly and independently choose a point in $\text{supp}(\mu)$ and then concatenate the Morley product to get an element in $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$. Then for any $A \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(A)$ can be thought of as the likelihood that a type constructed in this way is in A . This is precisely what is occurring when our measure μ is a sum of finitely many invariant types, i.e. $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \delta_{p_i}$ where each $p_i \in S_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$, $r_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i = 1$ (see (3) of Proposition 3.5). The situation is more complicated in the general.

- (1) It is possible for the $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ to contain elements which do not arise simply as an iterated Morley product, i.e. $q \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ and $q \neq \bigotimes_{i=1}^\omega p_i(x_i)$ for $p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. Hence the gluing together of types in-between stages is more complex than just taking the Morley product. Moreover, we only know that $\{\bigotimes_{i=1}^\omega p_i(x_i) : p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu)\} \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ when μ is Borel and invariantly supported (See (2) of Proposition 3.5).
- (2) It is also possible that almost none of the types in the support of μ are invariant and so the Morley product does not even make sense on elements of the support. This happens only outside of the NIP context, but it does occur with excellent measures in the random graph. Indeed, for μ_t in Example 2.4), $\text{supp}(\mu_t) = S_x(\mathcal{U})$.

Finally, we remark that Proposition 3.3 and the paragraph after it argue that the random process associated to $(S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$ extends the random process of randomly sampling points from $S_x(\mathcal{U})$ with respect to μ .

There are some quirks that the uninitiated reader should keep in mind. First, the Morley product is often not “commutative” and sometimes not “associative” with respect to formulas from $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ (see i.e. [14]). For instance, it is common that the following inequality holds:³

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi(x_1, x_2)]) \neq \mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi(x_2, x_1)]).$$

Hence, when our measure μ is only Borel-definable or M -adequate, one needs to pay attention to the order of the variables.

Secondly, the space $S_x(\mathcal{U})$ is big and by extension, so is $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$. In particular, while $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ is a compact Hausdorff space, it is not Polish. However this actually seems to cause less of a problem than one might imagine. Many of the events we care about as well as those that model theorists should care about are still Borel relative to $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ and so they are \mathbb{P}_μ -measurable (for example, see Proposition 4.3).

Finally, we should compare and contrast the spaces $(S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}_\mu)$ with the *standard sampling space*. More explicitly, the *product measure on the cartesian product of our space* $(\prod_{i \geq 1}^\omega S_{x_i}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{D}, \prod_{i \geq 1}^\omega \mu(x_i))$ where \mathcal{D} is the smallest σ -algebra containing subsets of $\prod_{i \geq 1}^\omega S_{x_i}(\mathcal{U})$ of the form $\prod_{i \geq 1}^\omega A_i$ where for each $i < \omega$, A_i is a Borel subset of $S_{x_i}(\mathcal{U})$ and $A_i = S_{x_i}(\mathcal{U})$ for all but finitely many $i < \omega$. As a convention, we will drop the indices off the product space. Notice that \mathcal{D} contains every basic open subset of $\prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$ and hence \mathcal{D} is contained in the Borel σ -algebra of $\prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$. $\prod \mu$ is the unique measure such that $\prod \mu(\prod A_i) = \prod \mu(A_i)$.

³The sets we are measuring on either side of the inequality are typically different.

We remark that the probability space we are studying is an extension of the standard sampling space. The following fact brings this claim into focus.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ such that μ is Borel-definable. Let $r : S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$ be the restriction map given by $r(p) = (p|_{x_i})_{i \geq 1}^\omega$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) *r is a continuous surjection between compact Hausdorff spaces. Hence r is a quotient map.*
- (2) *The pushforward of \mathbb{P}_μ is precisely $\prod \mu$, i.e. $r_*(\mathbb{P}_\mu) = \prod \mu$.*
- (3) *By the previous observation, if an event occurs for $\prod \mu$ -almost all $(p_i)_{i \geq 1}^\omega \in \prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$, then the corresponding event occurs for \mathbb{P}_μ -almost all $p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$. This is just a fancy way to say that if $B \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\prod \mu(B) = 1$ then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(r^{-1}(B)) = 1$.*

Proof. We prove the statements:

- (1) Clear.
- (2) Since the collection of basic open subsets of $\prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$ forms a π -system which generates \mathcal{D} , it suffices to show that the measures $r_*(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ and $\prod \mu$ agree on basic open subsets of $\prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$. First assume that $A_i = [\theta_i(x_i)]$ for $i \leq n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} r_*(\mathbb{P}_\mu) \left(\prod A_i \right) &= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left\{ p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}) : \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \theta_i(x_i) \in p \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \theta_i(x_i) \right] \right) \\ &= \mu^{(n)} \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \theta_i(x_i) \right) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_{x_i}(\theta_i(x_i)) \\ &= \prod \mu \left(\prod A_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation follows from induction and the fact that the Morley product is a separated amalgam. Now assume that A_i is open for $i \leq n$. Then $A_i = \bigcup_{j_i \in J_i} [\theta_{j_i}(x)]$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} r_*(\mathbb{P}_\mu) \left(\prod A_i \right) &= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_n} [\theta_{j_1}(x_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_{j_n}(x_n)] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \sup_{(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_n} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \theta_{j_i}(x_i) \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \sup_{(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_n} \prod \mu_{x_i}(\theta_{j_i}(x_i)) \\ &= \prod \sup_{j_i \in J_i} \mu_{x_i}(\theta_{j_i}(x_i)) \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} \prod \mu_{x_i}(A_i) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \prod \mu \left(\prod A_i \right).$$

Equations (*) and (**) follow from regularity of our measures \mathbb{P}_μ and μ respectively, (i.e. approximating opens by clopens). Equation (†) follows from the previous case.

(3) Clear. □

Aided by the previous fact, we have the following alternative interpretation in terms of random processes. A random point in the space $\prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$ corresponds to infinitely many independent trials. In each trial, we choose a point randomly with respect to μ . To find a random point in $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$, we do the same thing, but then must make decisions about more formulas, e.g. if we choose p_{x_1} and then p_{x_2} , we need to make some choice about formulas of the form $\varphi(x_1, x_2)$. These choices are determined generically by the Morley product.

We use the following jargon without excuse.

Definition 3.4. Given a Borel-definable measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$, and a subset $B \subseteq S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ we say that:

- (1) B is an *event* if B is \mathbb{P}_μ -measurable. All Borel subsets of $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ are events.
- (2) B holds on *almost all* random generic types if $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B) = 1$.
- (3) B holds on *almost no* random generic types if $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B) = 0$.

3.1. The support. The support of the measure \mathbb{P}_μ is an interesting set in itself. The elements in $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ can be thought of as those types in *which one could potentially sample*. Lets make a few observations in the invariantly supported context.

Proposition 3.5. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ such that μ is Borel-definable and invariantly supported. Let $r : S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \prod S_x(\mathcal{U})$ via $r(p) = (p|_{x_i})_{i \geq 1}^\omega$. Then

- (1) $\{r(p) : p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)\} = \{(p_i)_{i \geq 1}^\omega : p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu)\}$.
- (2) If μ is definable then

$$\left\{ \bigotimes_{i=1}^\omega p_i : p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu) \right\} \subseteq_{\text{dense}} \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu).$$

- (3) If $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \delta_{p_i}$ for some $p_1, \dots, p_n \in S_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and positive real numbers r_1, \dots, r_n such that $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i = 1$, then

$$\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu) = \left\{ \bigotimes_{i=1}^\omega q_i(x_i) : q_i \in \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \right\}.$$

Proof. We prove the statements:

- (1) It is clear that $\{r(p) : p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)\} \subseteq \{(p_i)_{i \geq 1}^\omega : p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu)\}$. It suffices to prove the other direction. Suppose that for each $i \geq 1$, $p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. We build a type in $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$:
 - (a) Step 1: Choose $q_1(x_1) = p_1(x_1)$.
 - (b) Step n : Suppose we have constructed a type $q_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that $q_n \in \text{supp}(\mu^{(n)})$ and for each $i \leq n$, $q_n|_{x_i} = p_i(x_i)$. By (1) of Proposition 2.8, there exists some $q_{n+1} \in \text{supp}(\mu_{x_{n+1}} \otimes \mu_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{(n)})$ such that $q_{n+1}|_{x_{n+1}} = p_{n+1}(x_{n+1})$ and $q_{n+1}|_{x_1, \dots, x_n} = q_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.
 - (c) Consider the type $q = \bigcup_{n=1}^\omega q_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. We claim that q has the desired properties.

- (2) By induction and (3) of Proposition 2.8, it is straightforward to show that for every $n \geq 1$, $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i) \in \text{supp}(\mu^{(n)})$. It follows quickly that for every sequence p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots of elements from $\text{supp}(\mu)$, $\bigotimes_{i=1}^\omega p_i(x_i) \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$.

We now prove the density claim. We first show that for every $n \geq 1$, $\{\bigotimes_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i) : p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu)\}$ is dense in $\text{supp}(\mu^{(n)})$. Base case is trivial. Suppose the statement holds for n . We now show $n + 1$. Suppose that $\mu^{(n+1)}(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})) > 0$. It suffices to find some sequence of types p_1, \dots, p_{n+1} such that $p_i \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ and $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n+1} p_i(x_i)$. Since $\mu^{(n+1)}(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})) > 0$, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &< \mu^{(n+1)}(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})) \\ &= (\mu_{x_{n+1}} \otimes \mu_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{(n)})(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})) \\ &= \int_{S_x(N)} F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}, N}^\theta d\mu^{(n)}|_N \\ &= \int_{S_x(\mathcal{U})} \left(F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}, N}^\theta \circ r_N \right) d\mu^{(n)}, \end{aligned}$$

where N is a small model containing M and all the parameters from θ and r_N is the standard restriction map from $S_x(\mathcal{U})$ to $S_x(N)$. Let $\Psi := \left(F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}, N}^\theta \circ r|_N \right) |_{\text{supp}(\mu^{(n)})}$. Since the integrand in equation above is greater than ϵ , we conclude that there exists some $t \in \text{supp}(\mu^{(n)})$ such that $\Psi(t) > \epsilon$. Thus that $\Psi^{-1}((\frac{\epsilon}{2}, 2))$ is non-empty. Since μ is definable, $F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}, N}^\theta$ is continuous and as consequence, so is Ψ . Hence $\Psi^{-1}((\frac{\epsilon}{2}, 2))$ is an open (non-empty) subset of $\text{supp}(\mu^{(n)})$. By our induction hypothesis, there exists some type $s \in \Psi^{-1}((\frac{\epsilon}{2}, 2))$ such that $s = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i)$. Let $\bar{b} \models s|_N$. Then $F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}}^\theta(s|_N) = \mu_{x_{n+1}}(\theta(\bar{b}, x_{n+1})) > \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By [4, Proposition 2.7], there exists some $q \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ such that $\theta(\bar{b}, x) \in q$. Then $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in q(x_{n+1}) \otimes s(x_1, \dots, x_n) = q(x_{n+1}) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i)$, which completes the claim.

To complete the density proof, notice that it suffices to show that if $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)) > 0$ there exists some sequence p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots from $\text{supp}(\mu)$ such that $\bigotimes_{i=1}^\omega p_i(x_i) \in [\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)]$. Now, if $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)) > 0$, then $\mu^{(n)}(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)) > 0$. By the previous paragraph, there exists $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ such that $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i)$. By the first paragraph, the type $\bigotimes_{j=n+1}^\omega q_j(x_j) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i)$ where for any $j \geq n + 1$, q_j is an arbitrary element from $\text{supp}(\mu)$ has the desired property. In particular, $\bigotimes_{j=n+1}^\omega q_j(x_j) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^n p_i(x_i) \in [\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n)] \cap \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$.

- (3) Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \delta_{p_i} \right) (x_2) \otimes \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \delta_{p_i} \right) (x_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n r_i r_j (\delta_{p_i}(x_2) \otimes \delta_{p_j}(x_1)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n r_i r_j \delta_{p_i \otimes p_j}(x_2, x_1). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, equality holds. \square

The next definition insures that we do not have certain kinds of pathologies when working with random generic types. The condition below is *in the same vein as* assuming the types one is working with are *not realized*. While this assumption will sometimes not be necessary when it is used, it streamlines proofs and cuts down on case work.

Definition 3.6. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$. We say that μ *does not concentrate on points* if for every $a \in \mathcal{U}$, $\mu(x = a) = 0$.

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose that $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$, μ is M -adequate, and μ does not concentrate on points. Then for every $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ and $i \neq j \geq 1$, $x_i \neq x_j \in p$.*

Proof. Fix $j < i$. If $\varphi(x_i, x_j) := (x_i = x_j)$, then for any $q \in S_x(M)$ and $b \models q$ we have that

$$F_{\mu_{x_i}, M}^\varphi(q) = \mu_{x_i}(x_i = b) = 0,$$

since μ does not concentrate on points. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}([(x_i = x_j)]) = (\mu_{x_i} \otimes \mu_{x_j})(x_i = x_j) = \int_{S_{x_j}(M)} F_{\mu_{x_i}, M}^\varphi d\mu_{x_j} = \int_{S_{x_j}(M)} 0 d\mu_{x_j} = 0.$$

Thus if $x_i = x_j \in p$, then $p \notin \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$. By contraposition, the statement holds. \square

3.2. How to compute? In order to figure out the probability that a complicated event occurs, one must first know how to compute the probabilities of basic events. The lemmas in this sections are a guide to such computations. Our first fact is standard and left as an exercise to the reader.

Fact 3.8. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and suppose that μ is M -adequate. Then for any formula $\varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \in \mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ such that $i_1 < \dots < i_n$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n})]) = \mu^{(n)}(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

If μ is M -excellent then for any formula $\varphi(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) \in \mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ such that the indices j_1, \dots, j_n are pairwise distinct,

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n})]) = \mu^{(n)}(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

The following lemma shows that formulas with disjoint variables are probabilistically independent.

Lemma 3.9. *Fix $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ such that μ is M -adequate. Let $\{\varphi_l(\bar{z}_l)\}_{l=1}^n$ be a collection of $\mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ -formulas such that:*

- (1) *For each $l \leq n$, $\bar{z}_l = (x_{j_1^l}, \dots, x_{j_{k_l}^l})$.*
- (2) *For each $l_1 < l_2 \leq n$ we have that $\{j_1^{l_1}, \dots, j_{k_{l_1}}^{l_1}\} \cap \{j_1^{l_2}, \dots, j_{k_{l_2}}^{l_2}\} = \emptyset$.*

Then

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l=1}^n \varphi_l(\bar{z}_l) \right] \right) = \prod_{l=1}^n \mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi_l(\bar{z}_l)]) = \prod_{l=1}^n \mu^{(|\bar{z}_l|)}(\varphi_l(x_1, \dots, x_{k_l})).$$

Proof. This follows directly by induction and the fact that the Morley product is a separated amalgam (see Definition 2.2). We give an explicit proof for two formulas with two variables each, which, with proper bookkeeping, can be extended to the general case in the lemma: Consider the $\mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ -formulas $\varphi(x_1, x_3)$ and $\psi(x_2, x_4)$.

Let M_1 be a small model containing M and all the parameters from our formulas. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi(x_1, x_3) \wedge \psi(x_2, x_4)]) &= (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_{x_1})(\varphi(x_1, x_3) \wedge \psi(x_2, x_4)) \\ &= \int_{S_{x_1}(M_1)} F_{\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3} \otimes \mu_{x_2}}^{\varphi \wedge \psi} d\mu_{x_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now for any $q \in S_{x_1}(M_1)$, if $a \models q$ then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3} \otimes \mu_{x_2}}^{\varphi \wedge \psi}(q) &= (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3} \otimes \mu_{x_2})(\varphi(a, x_3) \wedge \psi(x_2, x_4)) \\ &= \int_{S_{x_2}(M_2)} F_{\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3}}^{(\varphi \wedge \psi)_a} d\mu_{x_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where M_2 is a small model containing $M_1 a$. Now we note that for any $r \in S_{x_2}(M_2)$, if $b \models r$ then

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3}}^{(\varphi \wedge \psi)_a}(r) &= (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3})(\varphi(a, x_3) \wedge \psi(b, x_4)) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \mu_{x_3}(\varphi(a, x_3)) \mu_{x_4}(\psi(b, x_4)) \\ &= \mu_{x_3}(\varphi(a, x_3)) \cdot F_{\mu_{x_4}}^\psi(r), \end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ holds since the Morley product is a separated amalgam (again, see Definition 2.2). And so,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_{x_2}(M_2)} F_{\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3}}^{(\varphi \wedge \psi)_a} d\mu_2 &= \int_{S_{x_2}(M_2)} \mu_{x_3}(\varphi(a, x_3)) \cdot F_{\mu_{x_4}}^\psi d\mu_2 \\ &= \mu_{x_3}(\varphi(a, x_3)) \int_{S_{x_2}(M_2)} F_{\mu_{x_4}}^\psi d\mu_2 \\ &= \mu_{x_3}(\varphi(a, x_3)) \cdot (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_2})(\psi(x_2, x_4)) \\ &= F_{\mu_{x_3}}^\varphi(q) \cdot (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_2})(\psi(x_2, x_4)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi(x_1, x_3) \wedge \psi(x_2, x_4)]) &= \int_{S_{x_1}(M_1)} F_{\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_3} \otimes \mu_{x_2}}^{\varphi \wedge \psi} d\mu_{x_1} \\ &= \int_{S_{x_1}(M_1)} F_{\mu_3}^\varphi \cdot (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_2})(\psi(x_2, x_4)) d\mu_{x_1} \\ &= (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_2})(\psi(x_2, x_4)) \cdot \int_{S_{x_1}(M_1)} F_{\mu_3}^\varphi d\mu_{x_1} \\ &= (\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_2})(\psi(x_2, x_4)) \cdot (\mu_{x_3} \otimes \mu_{x_1})(\varphi(x_1, x_3)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\mu([\psi(x_2, x_4)]) \cdot \mathbb{P}_\mu([\varphi(x_1, x_3)]). \end{aligned}$$

We also remark that by renaming variables (Fact 3.8) we have the following equality,

$$(\mu_{x_4} \otimes \mu_{x_2})(\psi(x_2, x_4)) \cdot (\mu_{x_3} \otimes \mu_{x_1})(\varphi(x_1, x_3)) = \mu^{(2)}(\psi(x_1, x_2)) \cdot \mu^{(2)}(\varphi(x_1, x_2)).$$

And so the proof is complete. \square

The next lemma shows us how to compute when there are some basic dependencies between the formulas in our family of definable sets (specifically a block of shared variables followed by disjoint families of variables as in Lemma 3.9). This computation will become quite important in the next section.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. Suppose that μ is M -adequate. Let $\{\varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l)\}_{l=1}^n$ be a collection of $\mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ -formulas such that*

- (1) $\bar{x} = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_m})$ and for each $l \leq n$, $\bar{z}_l = (x_{j_1^l}, \dots, x_{j_{k_l}^l})$.
- (2) $i_1 < \dots < i_m$ and for each $l \leq n$, $j_1^l < \dots < j_{k_l}^l$.
- (3) For each $l \leq n$, $\max\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} < \min\{j_1^l, \dots, j_{k_l}^l\}$.
- (4) For each $l_1, l_2 \leq n$, if $l_1 < l_2$ then $\{j_1^{l_1}, \dots, j_{k_{l_1}}^{l_1}\} \cap \{j_1^{l_2}, \dots, j_{k_{l_2}}^{l_2}\} = \emptyset$.

Then

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcap_{l=1}^n [\varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l)] \right) = \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M')} \prod_{l=1}^n F_{\mu_{\bar{z}_l}}^{\varphi_l} d\mu_{\bar{x}},$$

where

- (1) $M \subseteq M'$ and M' contains all the parameters from $\{\varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l)\}_{l=1}^n$.
- (2) $\mu_{\bar{x}} = \mu_{x_{i_m}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_{x_{i_1}}$.
- (3) For each $l \leq n$, $\mu_{\bar{z}_l} = \mu_{x_{j_{k_l}^l}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_{x_{j_1^l}}$.

Proof. We let $\psi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) := \bigwedge_{l=1}^n \varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l)$. Let $\bigcup_{l=1}^n \bar{z}_l = \{x_{t_1} < \dots < x_{t_q}\}$. Now consider the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcap_{l=1}^n [\varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l)] \right) &= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l=1}^n \varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l) \right] \right) \\ &= \left(\mu_{x_{t_q}} \otimes (\dots \otimes (\mu_{x_{t_1}} \otimes \mu_{\bar{x}}) \dots) \right) \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l=1}^n \varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l) \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \left((\mu_{x_{t_q}} \otimes (\dots \otimes \mu_{x_{t_1}}) \dots) \otimes \mu_{\bar{x}} \right) \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l=1}^n \varphi_l(\bar{x}, \bar{z}_l) \right] \right) \\ &= \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M')} F_{\mu_{x_{t_q}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_{x_{t_1}}}^\psi d\mu_{\bar{x}} \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{=} \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M')} \prod_{l=1}^n F_{\mu_{\bar{z}_l}}^{\varphi_l} d\mu_{\bar{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that equation (*) follows from self-associativity. We now justify equation (**). For any $q \in S_{\bar{x}}(M')$, if $\bar{a} \models q$ then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu_{x_{t_q}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_{x_{t_1}}}^\psi(q) &= \left(\mu_{x_{t_q}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_{x_{t_1}} \right) \left(\bigwedge_{l=1}^n \varphi_l(\bar{a}, \bar{z}_l) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \prod_{l=0}^n \mu_{\bar{z}_l}(\varphi_l(\bar{a}, \bar{z}_l)) \\ &= \prod_{l=1}^n F_{\mu_{\bar{z}_l}}^{\varphi_l}(q). \end{aligned}$$

Equation (\dagger) follows by Lemma 3.9. \square

3.3. A basic event. In this short section, we take a moment to consider a basic event. We argue that if $\mu^{(n)}(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)) > 0$, then for almost all random generic types p there exists some tuples of indices (i_1, \dots, i_n) such that $\varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \in p$. In fact, this doesn't just happen once, but infinitely often. This is a classical type of

event from probability theory and follows directly from the Borel-Cantelli theorem. We recall this theorem below (see e.g., [30])

Theorem (Borel-Cantelli). *Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and A_1, A_2, \dots be a sequence of events. Then*

(1) *if $\sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \mathbb{P}(A_i) < \infty$, then $\mathbb{P}(A_n, \text{i.o.}) = 0$ where*

$$A_n, \text{i.o.} := \bigcap_{t=1}^{\omega} \bigcup_{i \geq t} A_i,$$

which we interpret to mean that A_n occurs infinitely often.

(2) *If A_1, A_2, \dots are (probabilistically) independent and $\sum_{i=0}^{\omega} \mathbb{P}(A_i) = \infty$, then $\mathbb{P}(A_n, \text{i.o.}) = 1$.*

The following can be proved by applying Borel-Cantelli. However, the proof is quick and so we provide it for the uninitiated.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. Suppose that μ is M -adequate. For any $\mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$ -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, we can consider the event*

$$A_\varphi := \{p \in S_x(\mathcal{U}) : \exists^\infty (i_1, \dots, i_n) \text{ such that } \varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \in p.\}$$

(In other words, the event A_φ holds on a type p if there exists infinitely many indices (i_1, \dots, i_n) such that $\varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \in p$.) If $\mu^{(n)}(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)) > 0$, then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(A_\varphi) = 1$.

Proof. We first notice that

$$\bigcap_{t=1}^{\omega} \left(\bigcup_{t < i_1 < \dots < i_n} [\varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n})] \right) \subseteq A_\varphi.$$

Hence it suffices to prove the term on the left is measure 1. Fix $t \geq 1$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{t < i_1 < \dots < i_n} [\varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n})] \right) &\geq \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l > t} [\varphi(x_{l-n}, \dots, x_{l+n})] \right) \\ &= \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > t}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigvee_{l > t}^k \varphi(x_{l-n}, \dots, x_{l+n}) \right] \right) \\ &= 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > t}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l=t}^k \neg \varphi(x_{l-n}, \dots, x_{l+n}) \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > t}} \left(1 - \mu^{(n)}(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \right)^{k-t} \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

Equation (*) follows from Lemma 3.9 and Fact 3.8. Since the intersection of countably many sets of full measure is itself full measure, the statement holds. \square

Remark 3.12. Some computations in this paper would be simplified if the following statement were true: Suppose that $\mu^{(n+1)}(\theta(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})) > 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_l)] \right) = 1.$$

However, this is not the case. Consider $(\mathbb{R}, <) \prec (\mathcal{U}, <)$. Fix types $p_1, p_2 \in S_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{R})$ such that

- (1) $p_1 \supseteq \{x > a : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{x < a : a > \mathbb{R}\}$.
- (2) $p_2 \supseteq \{x < a : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{x > a : a < \mathbb{R}\}$.

Consider the measure $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{p_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{p_2}$. A quick computation demonstrates that $\mu^{(2)}(x_1 < x_2) = 1/2$. We also have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [x_1 < x_l] \right) = 1/2.$$

Why? If $q \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$, then either $q|_{x_1} = p_1$ or $q|_{x_1} = p_2$ (each event has probability $1/2$). If $q|_{x_1} = p_1$, then $q \notin \bigcup_{l>1}^{\infty} [x_1 < x_l]$. If $q|_{x_1} = p_2$, then $q \in [x_1 < x_2]$. Hence the statement holds.

We provide another example of this phenomenon.

Example 3.13. Consider the structure $M = (\{a, b, c, d\}, E)$ where E is an equivalence relation. Suppose that the equivalence class of a is $\{a, b\}$ and the equivalence class of c is $\{c, d\}$. Consider the measure $\mu = \frac{1}{4}\delta_a + \frac{1}{4}\delta_b + \frac{1}{2}\delta_c$. Then we have that $\mu^{(2)}(E(x_1, x_2) \wedge x_1 \neq x_2) = 1/8$. However, we also have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [E(x_1, x_l) \wedge x_1 \neq x_l] \right) = 1/2$$

Why? If $q \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$, then either $q|_{x_1}$ is the type of a, b or c . The former two scenarios each occur with probability $1/4$ while the latter with probability $1/2$. Notice that if $q|_{x_1}$ is the type of c , then $q \notin \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [E(x_1, x_l) \wedge x_1 \neq x_l]$ and so

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [E(x_1, x_l) \wedge x_1 \neq x_l] \right) \leq 1/2$$

We leave equality to the reader as an exercise.

4. INDUCED SUBSTRUCTURE

Throughout this entire section, we assume that \mathcal{L} is a countable relational language. Given a type $p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$, one can associate to p an \mathcal{L} -structure $p_{\mathcal{L}}$ as follows.

Definition 4.1. Fix $p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$. Consider \mathcal{U}' where $\mathcal{U} \prec \mathcal{U}'$. Given a type $p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ and a tuple $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots) \in (\mathcal{U}')^{\omega}$ such that $\mathbf{a} \models p$, one can consider the \mathcal{L} -structure $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{L}}$ which is simply the induced structure from \mathcal{U}' onto the set $\{a_i : i \geq 1\}$. We remark that if $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \models p$ then $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{L}} \cong \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{L}}$. In particular, the map $f(a_i) = b_i$ is an isomorphism between the induced structures. Hence we let $p_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the isomorphism type of any/all the realizations of p . One can also think about this process as constructing a structure on the set $\{x_i : i \geq 1\}$ where the points in the model are the variables, but this causes a lot of notional confusion and so we will avoid writing this.

Given an \mathcal{L} -structure N , we are interested in the following event:

$$B_N := \{p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}) : p_{\mathcal{L}} \cong N\}.$$

This section revolves around the following question.

Question 4.2. *Given $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ such that μ is M -adequate, does there exist an \mathcal{L} -structure N such that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N) = 1$?*

There are several *relatively easy contexts* in which the answer to the above question is yes. We will briefly discuss these later in this section. There are also quite a few examples where the answer is no. Our main affirmative result occurs in the following setting: Suppose that \mathcal{L} is a finite relational language and μ satisfies a particular extension axiom, then there exists an \mathcal{L} -structure N_μ with the desired properties. Moreover, $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{L}}(N_\mu)$ is countably categorical. Before continuing any further, we remark that for any \mathcal{L} -structure N , the event B_N is Borel and hence always measurable:

Proposition 4.3. *For any \mathcal{L} -structure N , the event $B_N \subseteq S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ is Borel.*

Proof. We recall that the space of labeled \mathcal{L} -structures forms a Polish space, as $X_{\mathcal{L}} = \prod_{R \in \mathcal{L}} 2^{\mathbb{N}^r}$ where r is the arity of R . An element $g \in X_{\mathcal{L}}$ clearly induces an \mathcal{L} -structure on \mathbb{N} , which we will write as A_g . We have a continuous map $f : S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{L}}$ via $p \rightarrow f_p = (f_p^R)_{R \in \mathcal{L}}$ where for each fixed R ,

$$f_p^R((i_1, \dots, i_n)) = \begin{cases} 1 & R(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \in p, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We remark that $p \in B_N$ if and only if $A_{f_p} \cong N$. Hence,

$$B_N = f^{-1}(\{g \in X_{\mathcal{L}} : A_g \cong N\}).$$

A classical result of Scott implies that $\{g \in X_{\mathcal{L}} : A_g \cong N\}$ is Borel (e.g., see [25, II.16.6]). Hence, B_N is Borel (as it is the continuous preimage of a Borel set). \square

4.1. Some relatively easy contexts. Before working toward our main result, we briefly consider some relatively easy contexts where the answer to Question 4.2 is yes. While the proofs are *nothing to write home about*, the statements provide nice sanity checks for the kinds of theorems one might think they can prove.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that $p \in S_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. Consider the measure $\mu = \delta_p \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. Then there exists a structure N_μ such that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_{N_\mu}) = 1$.*

Proof. Notice that $|\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)| = |\{p^{(\omega)}\}| = 1$. So N_μ is precisely the isomorphism type of $(p^{(\omega)})_{\mathcal{L}}$. \square

A priori, the measure μ in the previous proposition might not be Borel-definable. This is not a problem because the Morley product can be extended to a more general context where one asks that certain measurability conditions hold. These conditions always holds when the measure is a type. See [14] for a discussion.

The next result shows that for any countable \mathcal{L} -structure N , there exists a measure μ_N such that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_N}(B_N) = 1$. This is done by simply choosing a sum of realized types which concentrates on N .

Proposition 4.5. *Let N be any countable subset of M and consider the measure $\mu = \sum_{a \in N} r_a \delta_a$ where $\sum_{a \in N} r_a = 1$. Then $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and μ is smooth (and therefore definable). Moreover $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N) = 1$.*

Proof. The proof is essentially Borel-Cantelli and is left to the reader as an exercise. \square

We remark that sometimes one can prove some easy examples by hand, especially when they are constructed from a finite sum of types. In these cases, one can think of random generic types as paths through a finitely branching tree. At step $n + 1$, we choose one of the finitely many types in the support of our measure and take the Morley product with the type we constructed at step n (see Proposition 3.5). However, not all finite sums of types yield a positive answer to Question 4.2 (see Example 5.5) and so a case-by-case analysis is necessary. We leave the following example as an exercise as well. Hint: Borel-Cantelli.

Proposition 4.6. *Consider $(\mathbb{R}, <) \prec (\mathcal{U}, <)$. Consider the types $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \in S_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathbb{R})$ such that*

- (1) $p_1 \supseteq \{x > a : a \in \mathcal{U}\}$.
- (2) $p_2 \supseteq \{x < a : a \in \mathcal{U}\}$.
- (3) $p_3 \supseteq \{x > a : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{x < a : a > \mathbb{R}\}$.
- (4) $p_4 \supseteq \{x < a : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{x > a : a < \mathbb{R}\}$.

Let $\mu_1 = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{p_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{p_2}$ and $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{p_3} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{p_4}$. Let $N_1 = (\mathbb{Z}, <)$ and $N_2 = (\mathbb{N} + \mathbb{N}^*, <)$. Then $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_1}(B_{N_1}) = 1$ while $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_2}(B_{N_2}) = 1$.

Our final example of this section is more general. We show that if a measure concentrates on finitely many types which pairwise commute (including with themselves), then we obtain an positive answer to Question 4.2. This happens, for example, if our measure μ is the sum of finitely many generically stable types.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i q_i$ where each type in $\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ is M -invariant, $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i = 1$ and for each pair $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, we have that $q_i(x) \otimes q_j(y) = q_j(y) \otimes q_i(x)$. If μ does not concentrate on points, then there exists an \mathcal{L} -structure N such that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(B_N) = 1$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.5, every element of $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\mu})$ is an iterated Morley product of elements in $\{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$. For each $k \leq n$ we let $W_k := \{p \in S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U}) : \exists^{\infty} j, p|_{x_j} = q_k(x_j)\}$. By Borel-Cantelli, we claim that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(W_k) = 1$. Let $W = \bigcap_{k=1}^n W_k$. Now $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(W) = 1$. We claim that if $p, s \in W \cap \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\mu})$, then $p|_{\mathcal{L}} \cong s|_{\mathcal{L}}$. Indeed, suppose that $(a_1, a_2, \dots) \models p|_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $(b_1, b_2, \dots) \models s|_{\mathcal{L}}$. Notice that since μ does not concentrate on points, we have that $a_i = a_j$ if and only if $i = j$ by Proposition 3.7. Similarly for the b_i 's. We prove they are isomorphism using a back-and-forth method.

- (1) For a_1 , choose the first b_t such that $\text{tp}(a_1/\mathcal{U}) = \text{tp}(b_t/\mathcal{U})$.
- (2) Now suppose we a map $f : \{a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}\} \rightarrow \{b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}\}$. Let l be the smallest index which has not yet appeared in $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$. By commutativity, we have that $\text{tp}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}, a_l/\mathcal{U}) = \text{tp}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}/\mathcal{U}) \otimes \text{tp}(a_l/\mathcal{U})$. By our induction hypothesis, we have that $\text{tp}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}/\mathcal{U}) = \text{tp}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}/\mathcal{U})$. Now choose the smallest index t such that $\text{tp}(b_t/\mathcal{U}) = \text{tp}(a_l/\mathcal{U})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tp}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}, a_l/\mathcal{U}) &= \text{tp}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}/\mathcal{U}) \otimes \text{tp}(a_l/\mathcal{U}) \\ &= \text{tp}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}/\mathcal{U}) \otimes \text{tp}(b_t/\mathcal{U}) \\ &= \text{tp}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}, b_t/\mathcal{U}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $f(a_l) = b_t$.

- (3) A similar argument allows us to *go back*.

We claim that f is an isomorphism. Thus we can just let N be the isomorphism type of any type $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu) \cap W$. \square

4.2. The measure extension axioms. Moving on, we now aim to prove the main theorem of this section. We prove that if a measure μ witnesses the *excellent measure extension axiom*, then there exists some \mathcal{L} -structure N such that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N) = 1$. We begin by defining some terminology.

Definition 4.8. Suppose that \mathcal{L} is a finite relational language. If $\bar{a} := a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{U}$, we let $\text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be the quantifier-free diagram of the tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) . If q is a complete quantifier-free type in variables x_1, \dots, x_n over \emptyset , then we let $\text{diag}_q(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ where $\bar{a} \models q$.

Definition 4.9. Fix $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. We say that μ satisfies the *adequate measure extension axiom* if μ is M -adequate and for any $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1} \in \mathcal{U}$, if $\bar{a} = a_1, \dots, a_n$ and

$$\mu_{x_{n+1}} \otimes \mu_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{(n)}(\text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_{n+1}}(\bar{x}, x_{n+1})) > 0,$$

then

$$\mu_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{(n)}|_M \left([\text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_n)] \cap \left(F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}, M}^\varphi \right)^{-1}(\{1\}) \right) = 0.$$

where $\varphi(x_{n+1}; x_1, \dots, x_n) := \neg \text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_{n+1}}(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})$. Since the variables are a little tricky, we recall that for any $q \in S_{x_1, \dots, x_n}(M)$, we have that

$$F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}, M}^\varphi(q) = \mu_{x_{n+1}}(\neg \text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(c_1, \dots, c_n, x_{n+1})).$$

where $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \models q$.

In other words: if some quantifier free diagram of length $n + 1$ occurs with positive measure, then $\mu^{(n)}|_M$ -almost all types $q \in S_{\bar{x}}(M) \cap [\text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_n)]$ of length n can be extended to such a tuple satisfying the $n + 1$ tuple.

We say that μ satisfies the *excellent measure extension axiom* if μ is M -excellent and μ satisfies the adequate measure extension axiom.

Example 4.10. We recall our two main examples from Example 2.4. We claim that both witness the excellent measure extension axiom. We only sketch these arguments since these examples will be worked with rigorously in the next section.

- (1) It is relatively straightforward to see that μ_t satisfies the excellent extension axiom. In this case, any quantifier-free type (of positive measure) in n variables can always be extended to any quantifier-free type (of positive measure) in $n + 1$ variables as long as the restriction of the larger type is the smaller one. In this example, the term *almost all* could have been replaced with *all* in the extension axiom.
- (2) Now lets consider the measure μ_L . We claim that μ_L also satisfies the excellent measure extension axiom, however this is more complicated to verify. Indeed, notices that a quantifier free type in variables x_1, \dots, x_n has positive measure if and only if there is no equality between the variables, i.e. we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_L^{(n+1)}(\text{diag}_{a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}}(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})) &> 0 \\ \iff \models \bigvee_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n+1)} a_{\sigma(1)} < \dots < a_{\sigma(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The cases are more or less similar, so we only consider the following quantifier free type over the empty set, $q(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}) := x_1 < \dots < x_n < x_{n+1}$. Notice that for any $s \in [\text{diag}_q(x_1, \dots, x_n)] \cap S_{\bar{x}}(M)$, and $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \models s$,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}}}^\varphi(q) &= 1 \\ \iff \mu_{x_{n+1}}(-\text{diag}_s(c_1, \dots, c_n, x_{n+1})) &= 1 \\ \iff \mu_{x_{n+1}}(\text{diag}_s(c_1, \dots, c_n, x_{n+1})) &= 0 \\ \iff \mu_{x_{n+1}}(\text{diag}_{s|_{x_n, x_{n+1}}}(c_n, x_{n+1})) &= 0 \\ \iff \mu_{x_{n+1}}(c_n < x_{n+1}) &= 0 \\ \iff \text{st}(c_n) \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{st}(c_n)$ is the standard part of c_n . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{diag}_{a_1 < \dots < a_n}(x_1, \dots, x_n)] \cap \left(F_{\mu_{x_{n+1}, M}}^\varphi \right)^{-1}(\{1\}) \\ = \{p \in S_{\bar{x}}(M) : \text{st}(x_n) \geq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\{p \in S_{\bar{x}}(M) : \text{st}(x_n) \geq 1\} \cap \text{supp}(\mu^{(n)}|_M) \neq \emptyset,$$

However this set has $\mu^{(n)}|_M$ -measure 0.

We will now prove a general computational lemma. We will apply it to measures which satisfy the extension axioms. We will need the following fact.

Fact 4.11. *Let X be a topological space, μ be a Borel probability measure on X , and $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ a Borel-function. If $\mu(\{x \in X : f(x) = 1\}) = 0$, then*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f^k d\mu = 0.$$

Proof. Notice the sequence $(g_n)_{n \geq 1}$ where $g_n = f^n$ is a uniformly bounded sequence of function which converges pointwise to $\mathbf{1}_{f(x)=1}$. By the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X g_n d\mu = \int_X \mathbf{1}_{f(x)=1} d\mu = \mu(\{x \in X : f(x) = 1\}) = 0. \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.12. *Suppose $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and μ is M -adequate. Let $\Delta_{n+1} := \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ be a finite collection of $\mathcal{L}(M)$ -formulas with variables among x_1, \dots, x_n, y . Let $p(x_1, \dots, x_n, y) := \bigwedge_{\varphi \in \Delta_{n+1}} \varphi$. Let Δ_n be the subcollection of formulas from Δ_{n+1} which contain variables only among x_1, \dots, x_n . We let $r_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \bigwedge_{\varphi \in \Delta_n} \varphi$.*

Suppose that

- (1) $\mu_y \otimes \mu_{\bar{x}}^{(n)}(p(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)) > 0$.
- (2) For $\mu^{(n)}$ -almost all $q \in S_{\bar{x}}(M) \cap [r_p(\bar{x})]$, if $c \models q$ then $\mu(p(\bar{c}, y)) > 0$. In other words,

$$\mu^{(n)}|_M \left([r_p(\bar{x})] \cap (F_\mu^{-p})^{-1}(\{1\}) \right) = 0.$$

Then for any distinct indices $i_1 < \dots < i_n$ and $t \geq 1$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l > t} [r_p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \rightarrow p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, x_l)] \right) = 1.$$

Additionally if μ is M -excellent then for any pairwise distinct indices j_1, \dots, j_n and $t \geq 1$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l>t} [r_p(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) \rightarrow p(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, x_l)] \right) = 1.$$

Proof. Fix variables $\bar{x} := x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}$. Let $m = \max\{i_1, \dots, i_n, t\}$. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we let

- (1) $\theta_l(x_l; x_1, \dots, x_n) = r_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \wedge \neg p(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_l)$.
- (2) $\psi_l(x_l; x_1, \dots, x_n) = \neg p(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_l)$.

Now we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l>t} [r_p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \rightarrow p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, x_l)] \right) \\ & \geq \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > m}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left([r_p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \rightarrow \bigvee_{l>m}^k p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, x_l)] \right) \\ & = 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > m}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left([r_p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \wedge \bigwedge_{l>m}^k \neg p(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, x_l)] \right) \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > m}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left([r_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \wedge \bigwedge_{l>m}^k \neg p(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_l)] \right) \\ & = 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > m}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left([\bigwedge_{l>m}^k r_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \wedge \neg p(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_l)] \right) \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > m}} \int_{S_{\bar{x}(M)}} \prod_{l>m}^k F_{\mu_l}^{\theta_l} d\mu^{(n)}|_M \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > m}} \int_{S_{\bar{x}(M)}} \prod_{l>m}^k (\mathbf{1}_{r_p(\bar{x})} \cdot F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l}) d\mu^{(n)}|_M \\ & \stackrel{(d)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > m}} \int_{S_{\bar{x}(M)}} (\mathbf{1}_{r_p(\bar{x})} \cdot F_\mu^\psi)^{k-m} d\mu^{(n)}|_M \\ & \stackrel{(e)}{=} 1 - 0 = 1 \end{aligned}$$

We provide the following justifications:

- (a) Renaming variables for clarity, see Fact 3.8.
- (b) Lemma 3.10.
- (c) Direct computation.
- (d) Renaming variables, i.e. let $\psi(x; x_1, \dots, x_n) = \neg p(x_1, \dots, x_n, x)$.
- (e) Notice that

$$\mu^{(n)}|_M (\{q \in S_{\bar{x}(M)} : (\mathbf{1}_{r_p(\bar{x})} \cdot F_\mu^\psi)(q) = 1\}) = 0$$

by condition (2). Hence we may apply Fact 4.11.

We remark that the *additionally* claim follows from the fact that if μ is M -excellent then the ordering of the variables does not matter. More explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l>t} [r_p(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) \rightarrow p(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, x_l)] \right) \\ &= \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k>t}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigvee_{l>t}^k r_p(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) \rightarrow p(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, x_l) \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k>t}} \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\left[\bigvee_{l>t}^k r_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow p(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_l) \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l>t} [r_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow p(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_l)] \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Equation $(*)$ is an application of Fact 3.8. The last equality follows from the first portion of this lemma. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Suppose $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and μ satisfies the adequate measure extension axiom. Then for any tuple $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mu^{(n+1)}(\text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_{n+1}}(\bar{x}, x_{n+1})) > 0$, $t \geq 1$, and increasing indices $i_1 < \dots < i_n$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l>t} [\text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \rightarrow \text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_{n+1}}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, x_l)] \right) = 1.$$

If additionally μ satisfies the excellent measure extension axiom then for any sequence j_1, \dots, j_n of distinct indices (not necessarily increasing) we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l>t} [\text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) \rightarrow \text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_{n+1}}(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, x_l)] \right) = 1.$$

Proof. Follows directly from Lemma 4.12. \square

Theorem 4.14. *Suppose that \mathcal{L} is a finite relational language. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and suppose that μ satisfies the excellent measure extension axiom. Then there exists a countable \mathcal{L} -structure N such that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N) = 1$.*

Proof. We describe a Borel subset K of $S_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{U})$ such that if $q, p \in B$, then $q_{\mathcal{L}} \cong p_{\mathcal{L}}$. After defining this Borel set, we construct an isomorphism via a back-and-forth argument. We let $S_{\bar{x}}^{\text{qf}}(\emptyset)$ denote the collection of quantifier-free types over the empty set. For each n , we let $E_n := \{q \in S_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{\text{qf}}(\emptyset) : \mu(\text{diag}_q(x_1, \dots, x_n)) > 0\}$. Since \mathcal{L} is a finite relational language, we have that $S_{x_1, \dots, x_n}^{\text{qf}}(\emptyset)$ is finite for each n and as consequence, E_n is non-empty for each n . Consider the following Borel sets:

- (1) If $q \in E_1$ and $t \geq 1$, we let

$$C_{q,t} := \bigcup_{l>t} [\text{diag}_q(x_l)].$$

By Proposition 3.11, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(C_{q,t}) = 1$.

- (2) Suppose $q(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}) \in E_{n+1}$, $\bar{j} = j_1, \dots, j_n$ are distinct indices, and $t \geq 1$. Let r_q be the restriction of q to the variables x_1, \dots, x_n . We define

$$D_{q,\bar{j},t} = \bigcup_{l>t} [\text{diag}_{r_q}(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) \rightarrow \text{diag}_q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, x_l)]$$

By Lemma 4.13, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(D_{q,\bar{j},t}) = 1$.

Now define the set K as follows:

$$K := \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu) \cap \bigcap_{\substack{q \in E_1 \\ t \geq 1}} C_{q,t} \cap \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \left(\bigcap_{\substack{q \in E_{n+1} \\ j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_n \\ t \geq 1}} D_{q,\bar{j},t} \right).$$

Notice that K is the countable intersection of subsets of full measures. Hence $\mathbb{P}_\mu(K) = 1$. We claim that the set K witnesses the isomorphism property. We now prove this via a back-and-forth argument. Fix $p, q \in K$. Let $(a_i)_{i \geq 1} \models p$ and $(b_i)_{i \geq 1} \models q$. These are points in an elementary extension of our monster, namely \mathcal{U}' . It suffices to construct an isomorphism from the induced structure on $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ to the induced structure on $\{b_i\}_{i \geq 1}$. Consider the following

- (1) (Forwards) Consider a_1 . We have that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\text{diag}_{a_1}(x_1)) > 0$ because $\text{diag}_{a_1}(x_1) \in p$ and $p \in \text{supp}(P_\mu)$. Hence $K \subseteq C_{\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(a_1/\emptyset),1}$ and so $q \in C_{\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(a_1/\emptyset),1}$. Hence $\text{diag}_{a_1}(x_l) \in q$ for some $l > 1$. Let l be the smallest such index and let $f(a_0) = b_l$.
- (2) (Backwards) Similar to above, find a_t and send $f(a_t) = b_1$.
- (3) (Forwards) Suppose we are given $a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}, b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}$ and a bijection $f : \{a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}\} \rightarrow \{b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}\}$ such that $f(a_{i_l}) = b_{j_l}$ and $\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}/\emptyset) = \text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}/\emptyset)$. We let $\bar{a} = (a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n})$. Let l be the smallest index such that a_l does not yet appear in $\{a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}\}$. Since $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_l}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, x_l)) > 0.$$

Since μ is M -excellent, by Fact 3.8, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_l}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}, x_l)) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_l}(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})),$$

and so $\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(\bar{a}, a_l/\emptyset) \in E_{n+1}$. Choose $t > \max\{i_1, \dots, i_n, j_1, \dots, j_n\}$. Then $K \subseteq D_{\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(\bar{a}, a_l/\emptyset), \bar{j}, t}$ and so $q \in D_{\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(\bar{a}, a_l/\emptyset), \bar{j}, t}$. By construction, this implies that there exists an index $l_* > t$ such that

$$q \in [\text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) \rightarrow \text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_l}(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}, x_{l_*})].$$

Then

$$\mathcal{U}' \models \text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}) \rightarrow \text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_l}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}, b_{l_*}).$$

Since $\text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}/\emptyset) = \text{tp}_{\text{qf}}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}/\emptyset)$, we have that

$$\mathcal{U}' \models \text{diag}_{\bar{a}}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}).$$

By modus ponnes, we conclude

$$\mathcal{U} \models \text{diag}_{\bar{a}, a_l}(b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_n}, b_{l_*}).$$

We let $f(a_l) = b_{l_*}$.

- (4) (Backwards) Similar.

We claim that f is an isomorphism. By construction, f is a bijection which preserves quantifier free types over the empty set. \square

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose that \mathcal{L} is a finite relational language. Suppose that $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$, μ satisfies the excellent measure extension axiom, and μ does not concentrate on points. Let $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N) = 1$. Then $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{L}}(N)$ is countably categorical.*

Proof. Since μ does not concentrate on finitely many realized types, we claim that $|N| = \aleph_0$. Recall the definition of E_n from Theorem 4.14. Now consider the following set of axioms:

- (1) For each $q \in E_n$, we have $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n q(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.
- (2) For each $q \in E_n$, $\forall x_1, \dots, x_n (\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} x_i \neq x_j \rightarrow \bigvee_{q \in E_n} q(x_1, \dots, x_n))$.
- (3) For each $q \in E_{n+1}$, let r_q be the restriction to the first n variables. Then we have that

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_n \exists x_{n+1} \left(\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} x_i \neq x_j \rightarrow (r_q(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow q(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})) \right).$$

By Theorem 4.14 and Proposition 3.7, N models the sentences above. Notice that given any two countable models, these axioms explicitly encode a back-and-forth argument. We conclude that our theory is \aleph_0 -categorical. \square

5. EXAMPLES

In this section, we work with explicit examples. While the examples themselves are usually quite intuitive, the computations are sometimes a little complicated. We begin with two examples such that the induced structure on almost all random generic types is isomorphic to a fixed countable model. These are our friends from Example 2.4. In both cases, the measure of certain events requires integrating particular functions over type space. It seems that this step, the integration of these functions, is the critical step for working with specific examples. Different examples requires different techniques. Remark 3.12 is relevant to this section.

Example 5.1. Let \mathcal{U} be a monster model of the random graph and M a small submodel. For $t \in (0, 1)$, we let μ_t be the unique Keisler measure in $\mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$ such that for any distinct sequence of tuples $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m$, we have that

$$\mu_t \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n R(x, a_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^m \neg R(x, b_i) \right) = (t)^n (1-t)^m.$$

We note that for any $t \in (0, 1)$, the measure μ_t is definable over the empty set and so $\mu_t \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. We claim that the induced structure on almost all randomly generic types is isomorphic to the unique countable model of the random graph. In other words, if N is the unique countable model of the random graph, then $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_t}(B_N) = 1$.

Proof. First note that the induced substructure on any subsets of a graph is also a graph. Hence for any type $p \in S_x(\mathcal{U})$, by construction $p_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a graph. For each pair of natural numbers n and subset A of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, we define the set

$$K_{n,A} := \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} \left[\bigwedge_{i \in A} R(x_i, x_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in [n] \setminus A} \neg R(x_j, x_l) \right].$$

For each pair (n, A) , we prove that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(K_{n,A}) = 1$. So fix a pair (n, A) . For each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we let

$$\psi_l(\bar{x}, x_l) := \left(\bigvee_{i \in A} \neg R(x_i, x_l) \vee \bigvee_{j \in [n] \setminus A} R(x_j, x_l) \right).$$

Now consider the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\mu_t}(K_{n,A}) &= \mathbb{P}_\mu \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} \left[\bigwedge_{i \in A} R(x_i, x_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in [n] \setminus A} \neg R(x_j, x_l) \right] \right) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_t} \left(\left[\bigvee_{l=1}^k \left(\bigwedge_{i \in A} R(x_i, x_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in [n] \setminus A} \neg R(x_j, x_l) \right) \right] \right) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mu_t} \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l=1}^k \left(\bigvee_{i \in A} \neg R(x_i, x_l) \vee \bigvee_{j \in [n] \setminus A} R(x_j, x_l) \right) \right] \right) \\
&= 1 - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_t} \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l=1}^k \left(\bigvee_{i \in A} \neg R(x_i, x_l) \vee \bigvee_{j \in [n] \setminus A} R(x_j, x_l) \right) \right] \right) \\
&\geq 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_t} \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l > n}^k \left(\bigvee_{i \in A} \neg R(x_i, x_l) \vee \bigvee_{j \in [n] \setminus A} R(x_j, x_l) \right) \right] \right) \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M)} \prod_{l > n}^k F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l} d\mu_t^{(n)} \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M)} \prod_{l > n}^k (1 - (t)^{|A|} (1 - t)^{n - |A|}) d\mu_t^{(n)} \\
&= 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M)} (1 - (t)^{|A|} (1 - t)^{n - |A|})^{k - n} d\mu_t^{(n)} \\
&= 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} (1 - (t)^{|A|} (1 - t)^{n - |A|})^{k - n} \\
&= 1 - 0 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (*) follows from Lemma 3.10. Equation (**) follows from the fact that for each $l > n$, the map $F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l}$ is constant. Indeed, if $q \in S_{\bar{x}}(M)$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \models q$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l}(q) &= \mu_l \left(\bigvee_{i \in A} \neg R(a_i, x_l) \vee \bigvee_{j \in [n] \setminus A} R(a_j, x_l) \right) \\
&= 1 - \mu_l \left(\bigwedge_{i \in A} R(a_i, x_l) \vee \bigwedge_{j \in [n] \setminus A} \neg R(a_j, x_l) \right) \\
&= (1 - (t)^{|A|} (1 - t)^{n - |A|}).
\end{aligned}$$

We now consider the set $V = \bigcap_{(n,A): n \in \mathbb{N}, A \subseteq [n]} K_{n,A}$. V is the intersection of countably many open sets of full measures and so $\mathbb{P}_\mu(V) = 1$. We claim that for any $p \in V$, the structure $p_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a countable model of the random graph. Since the random graph is countably categorical, we have that $p_{\mathcal{L}}$ is isomorphic to the unique countable model, N . Thus, $V \subseteq B_N$ and since $\mathbb{P}_\mu(V) = 1$, so does $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N)$. \square

We need a computation lemma before our next example.

Lemma 5.2. *Recall Example 2.4. We have that $M = (\mathbb{R}, <)$, $\mu_L \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. Let $\text{st} : S_{\bar{x}}(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \cup \{*\}$ be the usual standard part map. Let $\text{tp} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow S_{\bar{x}}(M)$ be the map sending a tuple to its associated type. Suppose that $f : S_{x_1, \dots, x_n}(M) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a Borel function such that for any $p, q \in \text{supp}(\mu_L^{(n)})$ if $\text{st}(p) = \text{st}(q)$ then $f(p) = f(q)$. Then*

$$\int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M)} f d\mu_L^{(n)} = \int_{[0,1]^n} (f \circ \text{tp}) dL^n.$$

Proof. Standard push-forward/quotient argument and the fact that every definable subset of M^n is Borel. \square

Example 5.3. Let \mathcal{U} be a monster model of DLO and $\mathbb{R} = M \prec \mathcal{U}$. Let L be the Lebesgue measure restricted to the interval $[0, 1]$. We recall from Example 2.4 the measure μ_L in $\mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. For any formula $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x(\mathcal{U})$, we have that

$$\mu_L(\varphi(x)) = L(\{r \in \mathbb{R} : \mathcal{U} \models \varphi(r)\}).$$

Let N be the unique countable model of DLO, i.e. $N \cong (\mathbb{Q}, <)$. Then $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_L}(B_N) = 1$. In other words, the induced structure on almost all random generic types is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$.

Proof. The induced substructure on any subset of a total ordering is a total order. Hence it suffices to show that that the induced structure on almost all random generic type is a dense ordering and is without endpoints. We first show the “without endpoints” condition: For any $n \geq 1$, we consider the sets

$$A_n := \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [x_n < x_l] \right) \text{ and } F_n := \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [x_n > x_l] \right)$$

We show that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(A_n) = 1$. A similar computation shows that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(F_n) = 1$. Indeed, let $\psi_l(x_n, x_l) := x_n \geq x_l$. Now consider the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(A_n) &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [x_n < x_l] \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\left[\bigvee_{l=1}^k x_n < x_l \right] \right) \\ &\geq \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\left[\bigvee_{l > n}^k x_n < x_l \right] \right) \\ &= 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\left[\bigwedge_{l > n}^k x_n \geq x_l \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \int_{S_{x_n}(M)} \prod_{l > n}^k F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l} d\mu_n \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \int_{p \in S_{x_n}(M)} \text{st}(p)^{k-n} d\mu_n \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \int_{[0,1]} x^{k-n} dL \\
&= 1 - \lim_{\substack{k > n \\ k \rightarrow \infty}} \frac{1}{k-n} \\
&= 1 - 0 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

We provide the following justifications:

(a) Lemma 3.10.

(b) Follows from a direct computation. Notice that if $s \in \text{supp}(\mu_n)$ and $a \models s$, then

$$\prod_{l>n}^k F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l}(q) = \prod_{l>n}^k \mu_l(a \geq x_l) = \text{st}(a)^{k-n} = \text{st}(q)^{k-n}.$$

(c) Lemma 5.2.

We now prove the density claim. For any $n, m \geq 1$, we consider the sets

$$C_{n,m} := \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [(x_n < x_m) \rightarrow (x_n < x_l < x_m)],$$

and

$$D_{n,m} := \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [(x_n > x_m) \rightarrow (x_m < x_l < x_n)],$$

Fix n, m and let $h = \max\{m, n\}$. Here we let $\psi_l(x_l; x_n, x_m) := x_n < x_m \wedge \neg(x_n < x_l < x_m)$. Now Behold!

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(C_{n,m}) &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} [(x_n < x_m) \rightarrow (x_n < x_l < x_m)] \right) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\left[x_n < x_m \rightarrow \bigvee_{l=1}^k x_n < x_l < x_m \right] \right) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\left[x_n < x_m \rightarrow \bigvee_{l=1}^k x_n < x_l < x_m \right] \right) \\
&\geq \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > \max\{m,n\}}} \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\left[x_n < x_m \rightarrow \bigvee_{l > \max\{m,n\}}^k x_n < x_l < x_m \right] \right) \\
&\geq \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > h}} 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mu} \left(\left[x_n < x_m \wedge \bigwedge_{l > h}^k \neg(x_n < x_l < x_m) \right] \right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > h}} \int_{S_{x_n x_m}(M)} \prod_{l > h}^k F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l} d(\mu_n \otimes \mu_m) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > h}} \int_{p \in S_{x_n x_m}(M)} \mathbf{1}_{x_n < x_m}(p) (1 - \text{st}_m(p) + \text{st}_n(p))^{k-h} d(\mu_n \otimes \mu_m) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} 1 - \lim_{\substack{k \rightarrow \infty \\ k > h}} \int_{[0,1]^2: x < y} (1 - y + x)^{k-h} dL^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - 0 = 1.$$

We provide the following justifications:

- (a) Lemma 5.2.
 (b) Fix $s \in S_{x_n, x_m}(M)$ and let $(a_n, a_m) \models s$.

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{l>h}^k F_{\mu_l}^{\psi_l}(s) &= \prod_{l>h}^k \mu_l(a_n < a_m \wedge \neg(a_n < x_l < a_m)) \\ &= \prod_{l>h}^k (\mathbf{1}_{x_n < x_m}(a_n, a_m) \cdot (1 - \mu_l(a_n < x_l < a_m))) \\ &= \prod_{l>h}^k (\mathbf{1}_{x_n < x_m}(a_n, a_m) \cdot (1 - (\text{st}(a_m) - \text{st}(a_n)))) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{x_n < x_m}(a_n, a_m) \prod_{l>h}^k (1 - \text{st}(a_m) + \text{st}(a_n)) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{x_n < x_m}(a_n, a_m) (1 - \text{st}(a_m) + \text{st}(a_n))^{k-h} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{x_n < x_m}(s) (1 - \text{st}_m(s) + \text{st}_n(s))^{k-h}. \end{aligned}$$

- (c) Notice that if $g : \{(x, y) \in [0, 1] : x < y\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ via $g(x, y) = 1 - y + x$, then the image of g is a subset of $[0, 1)$. Apply Fact 4.11.

A similar computation shows that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(D_{n,m}) = 1$. Consider the Borel set

$$K = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} A_n \cap \bigcap_{n \geq 1} F_n \cap \bigcap_{n, m \geq 1} C_{n,m} \cap \bigcap_{n, m \geq 1} D_{n,m}.$$

K is the countable intersection of sets of full measures and therefore $\mathbb{P}_\mu(K) = 1$. We claim that if $p \in K$ then $p_{\mathcal{L}} \cong (\mathbb{Q}, <)$. \square

The next example is easier to deal with. We provide it as a contrast to the examples in the next subsection.

Example 5.4. Consider $M = (2^{<\omega}, \leq)$ where $M \models \tau \leq \sigma$ if and only if τ is an initial segment of σ . Let \mathcal{U} be a monster model of T . There is a unique measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x(\mathcal{U})$ such that for any $\tau \in M$, $\mu(\tau \leq x) = \frac{1}{2^{|\tau|}}$ and $\mu(x = \tau) = 0$. We claim that μ is M -excellent (even more, it is smooth). Now let N be the theory of a countable anti-chain in this language. We claim that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N) = 1$.

Proof. Choose distinct $n, m \geq 1$. Since the measure μ is M -smooth, it self-commutes and so $\mu_{x_n} \otimes \mu_{x_m} = \mu_{x_m} \otimes \mu_{x_n}$. Let $\varphi(x_n, x_m) = x_n < x_m$ and notice

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\mu([x_n < x_m]) &= (\mu_{x_n} \otimes \mu_{x_m})(x_n < x_m) \\ &= \int_{S_{x_m}(M)} F_{\mu_{x_n}}^\varphi d\mu_{x_m} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \int_{S_{x_m}(M)} 0 d\mu_{x_m} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We justify equation (*) is justified. Let $p \in \text{supp}(\mu_{x_m})$. Then there exists a unique path $\gamma_p \in 2^\omega$ such that for each initial segment τ of γ_p , $\tau \leq x \in p$. We let $\gamma_p(i)$ be the truncated path at height i . Let $a \models p$ and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} F_\mu^\varphi(p) &= \mu(x < a) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigvee_{i=0}^n x = \gamma_p(i) \vee \gamma_p(n) \leq x \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\gamma_p(n) \leq x) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$K = \bigcap_{n, m \geq 1} [\neg(x_n < x_m)]$$

has measure one and if $p \in K$, $p_{\mathcal{L}} \cong N$. \square

5.1. The bad. We now consider examples which answer a resounding no to Question 4.2. Our first example is in a finite relational language. We remark that the measure satisfies the adequate measure extension axiom. The measure is also quite simple: a measure which concentrates on two types. However, the measure fails to self commute and therefore it does not satisfy the excellent measure extension axiom. This obstruction arises from the asymmetry of the Morley product.

Example 5.5. Consider the structure $M = (\mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}; P, <)$. We have that $M \models P((a, i))$ if and only if $i = 0$, and we have that $M \models (a, i) < (b, j)$ if and only if $a < b$. Let \mathcal{U} be a monster model such that $M \prec \mathcal{U}$. Consider the two definable-types p, q where

- (1) $P(x) \in p$ and $\{k < x : k \in \mathcal{U}\} \subseteq p$.
- (2) $\neg P(x) \in q$ and $\{k < x : k \in \mathcal{U}\} \subseteq q$.

Consider the measure $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\delta_p + \frac{1}{2}\delta_q$. Then for any countable \mathcal{L} -structure N , we have that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_N) = 0$.

Proof. We need to only consider N such that there exists $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ such that $p_{\mathcal{L}} \cong N$. Fix $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$. We claim that $p|_{<} is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{N}, <)$ via $x_i \rightarrow i$. For every $i \geq 1$, exclusively $P(x_i) \in p$ or $\neg P(x_i) \in p$. For each $\tau \in 2^{<\omega}$, consider the formula given by$

$$A_\tau(x_1, \dots, x_{|\tau|}) := \left(\bigwedge_{\tau(i)=1} P(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{\tau(i)=0} \neg P(x_i) \right).$$

A standard computation show that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(A_\tau(x_1, \dots, x_{|\tau|})) = \frac{1}{2^{|\tau|}}.$$

Notice that if τ and σ are not initial segments of one another, then $[A_\tau(x_1, \dots, x_{|\tau|})] \cap [A_\sigma(x_1, \dots, x_{|\sigma|})] = \emptyset$. Furthermore, there exists some path γ_p in 2^ω such that

$$p_{\mathcal{L}} \models \exists x_1, \dots, x_{|\tau|} \left(A_\tau(x_1, \dots, x_{|\tau|}) \wedge \forall z (x_1 \leq z) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{|\tau|-1} \forall z (x_i < z \rightarrow x_{i+1} \leq z) \right) \right),$$

if and only if τ is an initial segment of γ_p . So for any $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_{p_\mathcal{L}}) \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu([A_{\gamma_p(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_i)]) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^i} = 0,$$

where $\gamma_p(i)$ is the path γ_p truncated at height i . □

The next example gives a measure which satisfies the excellent measure extension axiom but over an infinite language. We remark that the underlying theory is stable. This obstruction seems to arise because the type space is *too large*. There are continuum many 1-types over the empty set which the measure equidistributes over, and so choosing a *countable* subcollection of types cannot yield a unique model up to isomorphism.

Example 5.6. Consider the structure $M = ([0, 1], (B_{p,q}(x))_{q,p \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0,1]})$ where

$$M \models B_{p,q}(a) \iff |a - p| < q.$$

There exists a unique measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ determined by

$$\mu(B_{p,q}(x)) = L(\{r \in [0, 1] : M \models B_{p,q}(r)\})$$

where L is the Lebesgue measure. Notice that for every $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$, we have that $p_\mathcal{L}$ realizes a countable collection of cuts. Notice moreover that if $p_\mathcal{L}$ and $q_\mathcal{L}$ realize different cuts, then they are not isomorphic. Realizing a specific cut c has probability 0 and so the collection of random generic types which do not realize c has probability 1. So for any $p \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu)$ and any cut c realized by p , we have that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(B_{p_\mathcal{L}}) \leq \mathbb{P}_\mu(\{q \in S_x(M) : q_\mathcal{L} \text{ realizes } c\}) = 0$. This gives the result.

6. WITNESSING DIVIDING LINES

Throughout this section we assume that \mathcal{L} is countable, but not necessarily relational.

The second kinds of events we are interested in are those related to *witnessing dividing lines*. There are many dividing lines, but in this section we focus on three: instability, the independence property, and the strict order property. We are motivated by the following *soft question*:

Question 6.1. *Given a random generic type, does it witness a dividing line?*

Now, there are multiple ways to interpret the question above. Here, we will be concerned with when a random generic type witnesses the dividing line either *on-the-nose* or *eventually* (this will be evident from our definitions). We will see that under this interpretation, these events are $\{0, 1\}$ -valued. Using this observation, we show that if μ is *fim* then \mathbb{P}_μ -almost no random generic types witness instability. As a consequence, \mathbb{P}_μ -almost no random generic types witness the independence property or the strict order property either. The statements themselves are philosophically potent. *fim* measures in NIP theories are called *generically stable* and these results gives more credence to idea that *fim* measures outside of NIP theories should also be called *generically stable*. In the next subsection, we will focus on the local NIP setting and derive some results about particular permutation averages. We will motivate those results at the beginning of that subsection. Before going any further, let us recall the definition of a *fim* measure.

Definition 6.2. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. We say that μ is *fim* over M if μ is definable and for any \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$ there exists a sequences of $\mathcal{L}(M)$ -formula $(\theta_n(x_1, \dots, x_n))_{n \geq 1}$ such that

- (1) for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists some n_ϵ such that if $n > n_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{U} \models \theta_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ then

$$\sup_{b \in \mathcal{U}^y} |\mu(\varphi(x, b)) - \text{Av}(a_1, \dots, a_n)(\varphi(x, b))| < \epsilon,$$

$$\text{where } \text{Av}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{a_i}.$$

- (2) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{(n)}(\theta_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = 1$.

The next fact follows directly from the fact that the product of measures which are both definable and finitely satisfiable is again definable and finitely satisfiable (see [24]).

Fact 6.3. Suppose that $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. If μ is *fim*, then $\mu^{(m)}$ is definable and finitely satisfiable in M for every $m \geq 1$. Recall that a measure $\lambda \in \mathfrak{M}_{x_1, \dots, x_m}(\mathcal{U})$ is finitely satisfiable in M if whenever $\lambda(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_m)) > 0$ then there exists a_1, \dots, a_m in M such that $\mathcal{U} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_m)$.

We now define the events which pertain to instability, the independence property, and the strict order property.

Definition 6.4. Fix a formula $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$. The following formulas corresponds to *witnessing n -instability* of φ , *shattering a set of size n via φ* , and *witnessing a strict order of length n for φ* respectively.

- (1) $O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \exists y_1, \dots, y_n \left(\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \varphi(x_i, y_j) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j < i \leq n} \neg \varphi(x_i, y_j) \right)$,
- (2) $I_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \exists y_\emptyset, \dots, y_{\mathcal{P}(n)} \bigwedge_{K \in \mathcal{P}(n)} \left(\bigwedge_{i \in K} \varphi(x_i, y_K) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \notin K} \neg \varphi(x_i, y_K) \right)$,
- (3) $L_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \forall y (\varphi(x_1, y) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \varphi(x_n, y))$.

The following events correspond to *witnessing the instability* of φ , *witnessing the independence property* for φ and *witnessing the strict order property* for φ .

- (1) $\mathbf{O}^\varphi = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)]$,
- (2) $\mathbf{I}^\varphi = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [I_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)]$,
- (3) $\mathbf{L}^\varphi = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [L_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)]$.

The following events correspond to *witnessing instability*, *witnessing IP*, and *witnessing the strict order property*.

- (1) $\mathbf{O} = \bigcup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{O}^\varphi$
- (2) $\mathbf{I} = \bigcup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{I}^\varphi$
- (3) $\mathbf{L} = \bigcup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{L}^\varphi$

The following facts are either immediate or left to the reader as an exercise. We will sometimes use these results without reference.

Fact 6.5. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and supposed that μ is M -adequate. Fix any formula $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$. If $R \in \{\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{L}\}$,

- (1) For any $n < m$, $[R_m^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_m)] \subseteq [R_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)]$
- (2) $\mathbf{L}^\varphi \subseteq \mathbf{O}^\varphi$ and so $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{O}$.
- (3) $\mathbf{I}^\varphi \subseteq \mathbf{O}^\varphi$ and so $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathbf{O}$.
- (4) $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{R}^\varphi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{(n)}(R_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n))$.
- (5) $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{R}) \leq \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{R}^\varphi)$.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and suppose that μ is M -adequate. If $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$, then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi), \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}^\varphi), \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}^\varphi) \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof. We prove the statement for \mathbf{O}^φ . A similar proof works for the other dividing lines. We have two cases:

- (1) $\mu^{(n)}(O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = 1$ for every $n \geq 1$. Then clearly $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) = 1$.
- (2) Otherwise, let k be the smallest integer such that $\mu^{(k)}(O_k^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)) < 1$. Notice that the sequence $(\mu^{(n)}(O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)))_{n \geq 1}$ is a decreasing sequence bounded below by 0. Hence it converges. Thus it suffices to find a subsequence which converges to 0. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{(mk)}(O_{mk}^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{mk})) &\leq \mu^{(mk)}\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^m O_k^\varphi(x_{(i-1)k+1}, \dots, x_{ik})\right) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \left(\mu^{(k)}(O_k(x_1, \dots, x_k))\right)^m \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as m goes to infinity. Equation $(*)$ follows Lemma 3.9. \square

Proposition 6.7. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$. If μ is *fim* then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{N}^\varphi) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}^\varphi) = 0$.*

Proof. By (2) and (3) of Fact 6.5, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) = 0$. By Lemma 6.6, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) \neq 1$. Towards a contradiction, assume $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) = 1$. This implies that $\mu^{(n)}(O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = 1$ for each $n \geq 1$. Since μ is *fim*, there exists a formula $\theta_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that

- (1) $\mu^{(n)}(\theta_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \approx_{\frac{1}{100}} 1$
- (2) If $\models \theta_n(\bar{a})$, then

$$\mu(\varphi(x, c)) \approx_{\frac{1}{100}} \text{Av}(\bar{a})(\varphi(x, c)).$$

Now notice that since $\mathbb{P}_\mu([O_{2n}^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{2n})]) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_\mu\left(O_{2n}^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) \wedge \theta_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \wedge \theta_n(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n})\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\mu(\theta_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \wedge \theta_n(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n})) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\mu(\theta_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \cdot \mathbb{P}_\mu(\theta_n(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n})) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{100}\right)^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Fact 6.3 the measure $\mu^{(2n)}$ is finite satisfiability in M . Therefore there exists some tuple (\bar{a}, \bar{b}) in M which such that $\mathcal{U} \models O_{2n}^\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \wedge \theta_n(\bar{a}) \wedge \theta_n(\bar{b})$. Hence there exists some $c \in M$ such that $\mathcal{U} \models \bigwedge_{i \leq n} \varphi(a_i, c) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \leq n} \neg \varphi(b_i, c)$. However, this implies that $\text{Av}(\bar{a})(\varphi(x, c)) = 1$ while $\text{Av}(\bar{b})(\varphi(x, c)) = 0$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \text{Av}(\bar{a})(\varphi(x, c)) \\ &\approx_{\frac{1}{100}} \mu(\varphi(x, c)) \\ &\approx_{\frac{1}{100}} \text{Av}(\bar{b})(\varphi(x, c)) \\ &= 0 \\ &\implies 1 \approx_{\frac{2}{100}} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 6.8. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. If μ is fim, then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}) = 0$*

Proof. By Fact 6.5 and Proposition 6.7,

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}) \leq \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) \leq \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) = \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} 0 = 0.$$

Replacing \mathbf{I} with \mathbf{L} gives the other computation. \square

6.1. Extension and alternate interpretations. As mentioned earlier, the definitions of \mathbf{O}^φ , \mathbf{I}^φ and \mathbf{L}^φ are *on-the-nose*. Theorem 6.8 holds in a slightly more general setting. We may replace *witnessing* with *eventually witnessing* and derive a similar result. We remark that the proof is quite similar to the proof of Theorem 6.8 and so we provide the definitions and give a sketch of the argument.

Definition 6.9. Fix a formula $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$. For any $t \geq 1$ and $R \in \{O, I, L\}$ we let

- (1) $\mathbf{R}_t^\varphi := \bigcap_{k > t} [R_{t+1}^\varphi(x_t, \dots, x_{t+n})]$.
- (2) $\mathbf{R}_E^\varphi := \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \mathbf{R}_t^\varphi$.
- (3) $\mathbf{R}_E = \bigcup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{R}_E^\varphi$.

For instance, we interpret $p \in \mathbf{O}_E$ as *p eventually witnesses instability*.

Corollary 6.10. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$. If μ is fim then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}_E) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}_E) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}_E) = 0$*

Proof. By a similar argument to Lemma 6.6 and Proposition 6.7, we claim that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}_t^\varphi) = 0$. Similarly

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}_E) \leq \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}_E) = \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}_E^\varphi) = \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{t \geq 1} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}_t^\varphi) = \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{t \geq 1} 0 = 0.$$

Again replacing \mathbf{I}_E by \mathbf{L}_E gives the other result. \square

Another interpretation might involve witnessing instability *via a subsequence*. We can formalize this as follows: Given a formula $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}_{xy}(\mathcal{U})$, we say that a *subsequence of p witnesses instability of φ* if there exists an injection $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the pushforward $f_*(p)$ witnesses instability of φ . We recall that $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in f_*(p)$ if and only if $\theta(x_{f(1)}, \dots, x_{f(n)}) \in p$. And so, the set $\{p \in S_x(\mathcal{U}) : \text{a subsequence of } p \text{ witnesses instability for } \varphi\}$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{S}^\varphi := \bigcup_{\substack{f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \\ \text{injective}}} f_*^{-1}(\mathbf{O}^\varphi).$$

We first remark that, a priori, \mathbf{S}^φ may not be \mathbb{P}_μ -measurable. It is a union of uncountably many Borel sets. Secondly, it is easy to find examples of measures μ such that μ is *fim* and $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{S}^\varphi) = 1$. Reconsider Example 2.4 and the measure μ_L . We recall that this measure is *fim*. Moreover, we know that with probability one, the induced structure on almost all random generic types is *DLO* (Example 5.3). Let $N = (\mathbb{Q}, <)$ and $\varphi(x, y) = x < y$. Then the following two facts hold:

- (1) $B_N \subseteq \mathbf{S}^\varphi$.
- (2) $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_L}(B_N) = 1$.

This shows us that \mathbf{S}^φ does not behave like \mathbf{O}^φ or \mathbf{O}_E^φ .

6.2. Some examples. Here, we have a quick interlude on some basic examples. One might have the impression that, like in the previous section, the main ingredient in the proof of Theorem 6.8 is secretly commutativity. This is not the case. We consider our old friends from the random graph. We recall that these measures are M -excellent and thus self-commute.

Example 6.11. Recall from Example 2.4 the measures μ_t for $t \in (0, 1)$. We remark that

- (1) $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_t}(B_N) = 1$ where N is the countable model of the random graph (see Example 5.1).
- (2) $B_N \subseteq \mathbf{I}$ and so $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_t}(\mathbf{I}) = \mathbb{P}_{\mu_t}(\mathbf{O}) = 1$.
- (3) The theory of the random graph is simple and therefore no formula witnesses the strict order property. In particular, this implies that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, $\mathbf{L}^\varphi = \emptyset$ and thus $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}) = 0$.

Weaker versions of tameness are not enough to derive the conclusions of Theorem 6.8. Our next example is a *fam* measure which behaves poorly relatives to our dividing line events.

Example 6.12. Let T be the theory of the random triangle free graph (the Henson graph) in the language $\mathcal{L} = \{R\}$. Let $M \models T$ and $M \prec \mathcal{U}$. Consider the type $p = \{\neg R(x, b) : b \in \mathcal{U}\}$. We recall from [12] that the measure $\mu := \delta_p$ is *fam* over any model and to μ is *fam* over M . Since μ is a type, we remark that $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu) = \{p^{(\omega)}\}$. One can prove that $\neg R(x_i, x_j) \in p^{(\omega)}$ for any $i, j \geq 1$. We claim that one can thus shatter any realization of $p^{(\omega)}$ via the edge relation. Hence $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = 1$. Notice that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}) = 0$ since T does not have the strict order property.

We now construct an example where $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}) = 1$ while $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}) = 0$.

Example 6.13. Consider $M = (\mathbb{R}, <)$ and let $M \prec \mathcal{U}$. Let p be the unique type extending $\{x > a : a \in \mathcal{U}\}$ and consider the measure $\mu := \delta_p$. The measure μ is definable over M , but it is not *fim*. Notice that $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_\mu) = \{p^{(\omega)}\}$ and for each $n \geq 1$, $(x_n < x_{n+1}) \in p^{(\omega)}$. Let $\varphi(x, y) := x < y$. Notice that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}^\varphi) = 1$ and so $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}) = 1$. Since our structure is NIP, we have that $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}) = 0$.

Our model-theoretic intuition tells use the answer to the following question should be false via Shelah's theorem.

Question 6.14. *Does there exist a pair of structure (\mathcal{U}, M) and a measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ such that the following properties hold:*

- (1) μ is M -adequate.
- (2) $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = 1$ while $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{I}) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{L}) = 0$?

6.3. The NIP. In the NIP setting, there are many examples of measures such that almost all random generic types witness instability. This phenomena is quite abundant (for a concrete example, see Example 6.13). The catch is that these measures need to not be *generically stable* and in the NIP context, this means that the measure does not self-commute. Hence, the construction of the measure \mathbb{P}_μ in these contexts is asymmetric. This asymmetry gives us the opportunity to ask, "what are the different expected values of $O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})$ where σ is an element of the symmetric group on $\{1, \dots, n\}$? Are these values dependent on one another in some way?"

It turns out that if $\varphi(x, y)$ is NIP, then the average of value of the measure of $O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})$ across all permutations must tend toward 0. Why? Let's think about the extreme case. If $\mathbb{P}_\mu(O_n^\varphi(\bar{x})) = 1$ for every permutation of variables, then one can quickly deduce that $\varphi(x, y)$ has VC dimension at least n . Using this intuition, we prove that if μ is M -adequate and $\varphi(x, y)$ is NIP then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \mathbb{P}_\mu(O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})).$$

One interpretation of this phenomenon is that under NIP, while one might be able to find a large measure of witnesses to instability (e.g. Example 6.13), those witnesses are quite fragile under permutations.

To prove the main result of this section, we use some hard bounds from the theory around *VC dimension of set of permutation* to prove a soft result. It would be interesting in its own right to compute some of the hard bounds in our setting. We first recall the definition of the VC-dimension of a set of permutation form [9].

Definition 6.15. Let $\text{Sym}(n)$ denote the permutation group on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and $A \subseteq \text{Sym}(n)$. Then the *VC-dimension of the set A* is defined to be the largest integer k such that the set of restrictions of the permutations in A on some k -tuple of positions is the set of all $k!$ permutation patterns. We let $r_k(n)$ be the maximum size of a set of n -permutations with VC-dimension k .

There is a clear connection between the VC dimension of a set of permutations and our setting.

Lemma 6.16. *Fix a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ and a type $p \in S_{x_1, \dots, x_m}(M)$. If*

$$A := \{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(m) : O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)}) \in p\} > r_d(m),$$

Then the VC dimension of $\{\varphi(x, b) : b \in \mathcal{U}^y\}$ is strictly greater than d .

Proof. Since our permutation set is strictly larger than $r_d(m)$, we know that the VC dimension of the permutation set is strictly greater than d . Hence there exists $j_1 < \dots < j_d$ in $\{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\{\sigma|_{j_1, \dots, j_d} : \sigma \in A\} = \text{Sym}(\{j_1, \dots, j_d\})$. Now let $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \models p$. We claim the set $\{a_{j_l} : 1 \leq l \leq d\}$ is shattered by $\{\varphi(x, b) : b \in \mathcal{U}\}$. Indeed, if $K \subseteq \{j_1, \dots, j_d\}$, let τ be an element of $\text{Sym}(\{j_1, \dots, j_d\})$ which places the elements of K before the elements of $\{j_1, \dots, j_d\} \setminus K$. Then there exists some $\tau' \in A$ such that $\tau'|_{j_1, \dots, j_d} = \tau$. Thus, $\models O_m^\varphi(a_{\tau'(1)}, \dots, a_{\tau'(m)})$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} &\models \exists y \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{|K|} \varphi(a_{\tau'(i)}, y) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=|K|+1}^m \neg \varphi(a_{\tau'(i)}, y) \right) \\ &\implies \mathcal{U} \models \exists y \left(\bigwedge_{i \in K} \varphi(a_i, y) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \{j_1, \dots, j_d\} \setminus K} \neg \varphi(a_i, y) \right) \end{aligned}$$

And so, for some $b \in \mathcal{U}$, we have that $\{a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_d}\} \cap \{\varphi(\mathcal{U}, b)\} = \{a_i : i \in K\}$. \square

The next theorem is by Cibulka and Kynčl [9, Theorem 1.1].

Fact 6.17. *For every $t \geq 1$, we have that $r_{2t+2}(m) = 2^{\Theta(m\alpha(m)^t)}$ and $r_{2t+3}(m) = 2^{\Theta(m\alpha(m)^t \log \alpha(m))}$ where $\alpha(m)$ is the inverse Ackermann function.*

A straightforward consequence of the above fact is the following.

Fact 6.18. *For every pair of integers (n, d) there exists an integer m such that $m!/n > r_d(m)$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Fact 6.17. Intuitively, this holds because $m!$ grows much faster than “2 to the inverse Ackermann of m to the d ” for fixed d . Dividing by n is more or less garnish. \square

Finally we come to the main theorem of this subsection.

Theorem 6.19. *Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ and suppose that μ is M -adequate. Let $\varphi(x, y)$ be an NIP formula. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \mathbb{P}_\mu(O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})) = 0.$$

Proof. Since $\varphi(x, y)$ is NIP, there exists a d such that the VC-dimension of the set system $\{\varphi(x, b) : b \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is less than or equal to d . We notice that if $n < n'$, then

$$\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \mathbb{P}_\mu(O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})) \geq \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n')} \mathbb{P}_\mu(O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n')})).$$

Therefore, our terms are decreasing and bounded below, and the sequence converges to some number c . We argue that $c = 0$. If not, then $c > 0$. Choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < \frac{1}{n_0} < c$. By Fact 6.18, there exists a number m such that $m!/n_0 > r_d(m)$. Now we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_0} < c &< \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(m)} \mu^{(m)}(O_m^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)})) \\ &= \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M)} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(m)} \mathbf{1}_{O_m^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)})} d\mu^{(m)} \\ &\implies \frac{m!}{n_0} < \int_{S_{\bar{x}}(M)} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(m)} \mathbf{1}_{O_m^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)})} d\mu^{(m)} \\ &\implies \exists p_* \in \text{supp}(\mu^{(m)}) \text{ such that } \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(m)} \mathbf{1}_{O_m^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)})}(p_*) > \frac{m!}{n_0} \\ &\implies |\{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(m) : O_m^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)}) \in p_*\}| > \frac{m!}{n} \end{aligned}$$

And so by our choice of m ,

$$|\{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(m) : O_m^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)}) \in p_*\}| > r_d(m).$$

By Lemma 6.16, we have that the VC dimension of $\{\varphi(x, b) : b \in \mathcal{U}\}$ strictly greater than d , which is a contradiction. \square

Remark 6.20. The previous result actually gives us another proof of Theorem 6.8 for generically stable measures in the NIP setting. Suppose T is NIP, $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathcal{U}, M)$ is generically stable over M . Then $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = 0$. Notice that for any \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}^\varphi) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{(n)}(O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \mu^{(n)}(O_n^\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{(*)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \mu^{(n)}(O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})) \\ & \stackrel{(**)}{=} 0 \end{aligned}$$

Equation (*) follows from the fact that μ self-commutes. Equation (**) is Theorem 6.19. Hence $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathbf{O}) = 0$ since \mathbf{O} is the countable union of sets of measures 0.

We consider an example where the limit is equal to 1.

Remark 6.21. Notice if we consider μ_t from Example 2.4 and set $\varphi(x, y) := R(x, y)$, the edge relation, we see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \mathbb{P}_{\mu_t}(O_n^\varphi(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} 1 = 1,$$

because μ is M -excellent (i.e. self-commutes) and $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_t}(O_n^R(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = 1$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nathanael Ackerman, Cameron Freer, and Rehana Patel. Invariant measures concentrated on countable structures. In *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, volume 4, page e17. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [2] Itai Ben Yaacov and H Jerome Keisler. Randomizations of models as metric structures. *Confluentes Mathematici*, 1(02):197–223, 2009.
- [3] Rudolf Carnap. *Logical foundations of probability*. University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- [4] Artem Chernikov and Kyle Gannon. Definable convolution and idempotent keisler measures. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 248(1):271–314, 2022.
- [5] Artem Chernikov, Ehud Hrushovski, Alex Kruckman, Krzysztof Krupiński, Slavko Moconja, Anand Pillay, and Nicholas Ramsey. Invariant measures in simple and in small theories. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 23(02):2250025, 2023.
- [6] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Definably amenable NIP groups. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 31(3):609–641, 2018.
- [7] Artem Chernikov and Sergei Starchenko. Regularity lemma for distal structures. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 20(10):2437–2466, 2018.
- [8] Artem Chernikov and Sergei Starchenko. Definable regularity lemmas for nip hypergraphs. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 72(4):1401–1433, 2021.
- [9] Josef Cibulka and Jan Kynčl. Tight bounds on the maximum size of a set of permutations with bounded vc-dimension. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 119(7):1461–1478, 2012.
- [10] Kevin J Compton. The computational complexity of asymptotic problems I: partial orders. *Information and Computation*, 78(2):108–123, 1988.
- [11] Kevin J Compton. Laws in logic and combinatorics. In *Algorithms and order*, pages 353–383. Springer, 1989.
- [12] Gabriel Conant and Kyle Gannon. Remarks on generic stability in independent theories. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 171(2):102736, 2020.
- [13] Gabriel Conant and Kyle Gannon. Associativity of the morley product of invariant measures in nip theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 86(3):1293–1300, 2021.
- [14] Gabriel Conant, Kyle Gannon, and James Hanson. Keisler measures in the wild. *Model Theory*, 2(1):1–67, 2023.
- [15] Gabriel Conant, Anand Pillay, and Caroline Terry. A group version of stable regularity. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 168, pages 405–413. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [16] Ronald Fagin. *Contributions to the model theory of finite structures*. University of California, Berkeley, 1973.
- [17] Ronald Fagin. Probabilities on finite models I. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 41(1):50–58, 1976.
- [18] David Heaver Fremlin. *Measure theory*, volume 4. Torres Fremlin, 2000.

- [19] Haim Gaifman. Concerning measures in first order calculi. *Israel journal of mathematics*, 2:1–18, 1964.
- [20] Yu V Glebskii, Dmitry I Kogan, MI Liogon'kiI, and Vladimir A Talanov. Range and degree of realizability of formulas in the restricted predicate calculus. *Cybernetics*, 5(2):142–154, 1969.
- [21] Ehud Hrushovski, Krzysztof Krupiński, and Anand Pillay. On first order amenability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08306*, 2020.
- [22] Ehud Hrushovski, Ya'acov Peterzil, and Anand Pillay. Groups, measures, and the NIP. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 21(2):563–596, 2008.
- [23] Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay. On NIP and invariant measures. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 13(4):1005–1061, 2011.
- [24] Ehud Hrushovski, Anand Pillay, and Pierre Simon. Generically stable and smooth measures in NIP theories. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 365(5):2341–2366, 2013.
- [25] Alexander Kechris. *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*. Springer, 1995.
- [26] H Jerome Keisler. Measures and forking. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 34(2):119–169, 1987.
- [27] Maryanthe Malliaris and Anand Pillay. The stable regularity lemma revisited. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 144(4):1761–1765, 2016.
- [28] Saharon Shelah and Joel Spencer. Zero-one laws for sparse random graphs. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 1(1):97–115, 1988.
- [29] Pierre Simon. *A guide to NIP theories*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [30] Alexei Stepanov. On the borel-cantelli lemma. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1110.2577*, 2011.

BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH (BICMR), PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA.

Email address: kgannon@bicmr.pku.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,, COLLEGE PARK, MD, 20742, USA

Email address: jhanson9@umd.edu