

C -minimal fields have the exchange property

Will Johnson

June 24, 2024

Abstract

We show that C -minimal fields (i.e., C -minimal expansions of ACVF) have the exchange property, answering a question of Haskell and Macpherson [7]. Additionally, we strengthen some theorems of Cubides Kovacsics and Delon [4] on C -minimal fields. First, we show that definably complete C -minimal fields of characteristic 0 have generic differentiability. Second, we show that if the induced structure on the residue field is a pure ACF, then polynomial boundedness holds. In fact, polynomial boundedness can only fail if there are unexpected definable automorphisms of the multiplicative group of the residue field.

1 Introduction

Recall from [15, 7] that a C -minimal field is a structure $(K, \mathcal{O}, +, \cdot, \dots)$ expanding a non-trivial valued field (K, \mathcal{O}) , such that

- Every unary definable set $D \subseteq K^1$ is a finite boolean combination of balls and points.
- This property continues to hold in elementary extensions $K' \succeq K$.

For example, the theory ACVF of algebraically closed valued fields is C -minimal [15, Theorem 4.11]. Conversely, Haskell and Macpherson showed that every C -minimal field is an expansion of ACVF [7, Theorem C]. Macpherson and Steinhorn consider a more general notion of C -structures and C -minimal theories, which we will not precisely define here.

C -minimality is meant to be an analog of o-minimality. One of the key properties of (dense) o-minimal theories is the *exchange property*

$$c \in \text{acl}(Ab) \setminus \text{acl}(A) \implies b \in \text{acl}(Ac) \text{ for } A \subseteq M, b, c \in M.$$

The exchange property ensures that o-minimal theories are “geometric theories” in the sense of Hrushovski and Pillay [11, Section 2], and are therefore endowed with an excellent dimension theory.

In contrast to the o-minimal situation, the exchange property can fail in a general C -minimal theory [15, Example 3.2]. Haskell and Macpherson asked whether the exchange property holds in C -minimal fields, i.e., C -minimal expansions of ACVF [7, Problem 6.4]. We give a positive answer to this question:

Theorem (= Theorem 6.4). *Let T be a C -minimal expansion of ACVF. Then T has the exchange property.*

Consequently, C -minimal fields are geometric and have an excellent dimension theory.

The technique used to prove Theorem 6.4 has some other applications to C -minimal fields, allowing us to strengthen some of the main results of Cubides Kovacsics and Delon [4].

The first of these applications concerns polynomial boundedness. Recall that K is *polynomially bounded* if for any definable function $f : K \rightarrow K$, there is an integer n such that for all x in a neighborhood of ∞ ,

$$v(f(x)) \geq n \cdot v(x) \quad (\text{or in multiplicative notation, } |f(x)| \leq |x|^n).$$

It is an open question whether all C -minimal fields are polynomially bounded [4, Question 1].

Let Γ and k be the value group and residue field of K . Say that Γ has an *exotic automorphism* if there is a definable automorphism of $(\Gamma, +)$ other than the automorphisms $f(x) = q \cdot x$ for $q \in \mathbb{Q}^\times$. If the induced structure on $(\Gamma, +)$ is a pure divisible ordered abelian group (DOAG), then Γ has no exotic automorphisms.

Similarly, say that the multiplicative group k^\times has an *exotic automorphism* if there is a definable automorphism of k^\times other than the automorphisms $f(x) = x^{\pm p^n}$, where p is the characteristic exponent of k . If the induced structure on k is a pure ACF, then k^\times has no exotic automorphisms.

Theorem (= Theorem 5.3). *Let K be a C -minimal field.*

1. *If Γ has no exotic automorphisms, then K is polynomially bounded.*
2. *If k^\times has no exotic automorphisms, then K is polynomially bounded.*

In particular, if the induced structure on Γ is a pure DOAG, or the induced structure on k is a pure ACF, then K is polynomially bounded.

Part (1) was previously proved by Cubides Kovacsics and Delon [4, Theorems 4.3+4.7], but (2) is new. It is unknown whether exotic automorphisms of k^\times can exist.

There are also some consequences for definable completeness. Recall that K is *definably complete* if whenever \mathcal{C} is a definable chain of balls, and the radii of the balls in \mathcal{C} approach ∞ (in multiplicative notation: approach 0), then $\bigcap \mathcal{C}$ is non-empty. Most C -minimal theories arising in practice are definably complete, though Delon [5, Théorème 5.4] has constructed examples of C -minimal fields which are not.

Theorem (= Theorem 7.3). *Let K be a definably complete C -minimal field. If $f : X \rightarrow K$ is a definable function and X is a punctured neighborhood of 0, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x)$ exists in $K \cup \{\infty\}$.*

This strengthens [4, Lemma 5.3], removing their assumption that definable functions $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ are eventually linear.

Theorem (= Corollary 7.8). *Let K be a definably complete C -minimal field of characteristic 0. Suppose that Γ has no exotic automorphisms, or k^\times has no exotic automorphisms. If $f : X \rightarrow K$ is a definable function on a punctured neighborhood of 0, then $f(x)$ has an asymptotic expansion*

$$f(x) \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n x^{m_n} \text{ as } x \rightarrow 0,$$

for some $c_1, c_2, \dots \in K$ and integers $m_1 < m_2 < \dots$.

This strengthens [4, Theorem 6.1], weakening their assumption that definable functions $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ are eventually \mathbb{Q} -linear.

Theorem (= Theorem 9.1). *Let K be a definably complete C -minimal field of characteristic 0. If $f : K \rightarrow K$ is definable, then f is differentiable at all but finitely many points.*

This strengthens (part of) [4, Theorem 6.3], removing their assumption that definable functions $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ are eventually \mathbb{Q} -linear. With more work, one can also get generic differentiability in several variables (Theorem 9.5) and an implicit/inverse function theorem (Theorem 9.8).

1.1 Proof strategy

The core technique is an analysis of definable subsets of $\text{RV} \times \text{RV}$ in Section 4. In Theorems 4.22–4.23, we show that if $D \subseteq \text{RV} \times \text{RV}$ is definable and has dp-rank 1, then the image of D in $\Gamma \times \Gamma$ is a finite union of line segments (graphs of linear functions).

In the applications, we usually apply this to the following setting. Let $f : K \rightarrow \Gamma \times \Gamma$ be a definable function. Suppose that f lifts to a map $\tilde{f} : K \rightarrow \text{RV} \times \text{RV}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \text{RV} \times \text{RV} \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow \\ & & \Gamma \times \Gamma \end{array}$$

Then $\text{im}(\tilde{f})$ has dp-rank 1, so $\text{im}(f)$ is a finite union of line segments. Many natural functions from K to Γ lift to RV (for example, see [4, Section 5]). Consequently, many of the definable functions $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ appearing in [4] are automatically linear or eventually linear. This allows us to drop “eventual linearity” assumptions from many of the results in [4].

The connection to the exchange property is as follows. Suppose the exchange property fails. By a theorem of Haskell and Macpherson [7, Proposition 6.1], there must be a definable bijection f from an open set in K to an antichain in the tree of closed balls. One can arrange for f to land in the antichain K/\mathcal{O} of closed balls of valuative radius 0. The set K/\mathcal{O} is itself a dense ultrametric space with “value set” $\Gamma_{<0}$. Restricting f , one can arrange for f to be a homeomorphism between an open set in K and an open set in K/\mathcal{O} . By something that is morally the “ Γ -factorization II” of [4, Theorem 3.3], one can shrink $\text{dom}(f)$ and arrange that

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = g(v(x - y))$$

for some definable function $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_{<0}$. Since f is a homeomorphism, we must have $x \approx y \implies f(x) \approx f(y)$, which means that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} g(\gamma) = \sup \Gamma_{<0} = 0. \quad (*)$$

But g can be lifted to the RV-sorts (compare with [4, Theorem 5.8]), so g is eventually linear by the results of Section 4. No linear function g can satisfy (*), unless g is the constant 0, contradicting the fact that g 's codomain is $\Gamma_{<0}$.

The technical analysis of $\text{RV} \times \text{RV}$ in Section 4 is based on the tension between the following two properties of the short exact sequence $1 \rightarrow k^\times \rightarrow \text{RV} \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 1$:

- The two groups k^\times and Γ are orthogonal to each other.
- All three groups have dp-rank 1, so the sequence does not definably split.

The other key ingredients are the fact that k^\times and Γ are stably embedded and eliminate imaginaries, k^\times is strongly minimal, and Γ is o-minimal. Using all these ingredients, we show that the induced structure on RV is highly constrained.

1.2 Hensel minimality and its relatives

The *Hensel minimal* fields of Cluckers, Halupczok, and Rideau-Kikuchi [2, 3] satisfy generic differentiability and the exchange property [2, Lemma 5.3.5, Corollary 3.2.7]. There is some overlap between hensel minimality and C -minimality. For example, ACVF_0 is hensel minimal. It is natural to ask whether the exchange property and generic differentiability results (Theorems 6.4, 9.1) follow from the results on hensel minimality. For example,

If K is a definably complete C -minimal field, is K hensel minimal?

Hensel minimality is only defined on fields of characteristic zero, so we should restrict to the case where K has characteristic 0. Even then, the answer to this question is NO.

Example 1.1. Suppose K has residue characteristic 0, so we are in the setting of [2] rather than [3]. There are several forms of hensel minimality. The weakest form, 0-h-minimality, implies for expansions of algebraically closed valued fields that every 0-definable closed ball $B \subseteq K$ intersects $\text{acl}(\emptyset)$.¹ We can produce a C -minimal expansion of $\text{ACVF}_{0,0}$ in which this property fails by adding a unary predicate symbol to name a random ball B . If B is chosen correctly, B will not intersect $\text{acl}(\ulcorner B \urcorner)$. The resulting expansion of ACVF will be C -minimal and definably complete, but not 0-h-minimal.

¹Apply the definition of 0-h-minimality [2, Definition 1.2.3] with $\lambda = 1$, $A = \emptyset$, and $X = B$. There should be a finite \emptyset -definable set $C \subseteq K$ which “1-prepares” B in the sense of [2, Definition 1.2.2]. Under the assumption that the value group is densely ordered and the residue field is infinite, one can check that a closed ball B is 1-prepared by a finite set C if and only if C intersects B .

Another related concept is the *V-minimality* of Hrushovski and Kazhdan [9, Section 3.4]. In the V-minimal setting, Hrushovski and Kazhdan prove generic differentiability and the exchange property [9, Corollary 5.17, Lemma 3.57]. A V-minimal theory is a definably complete *C*-minimal expansion of $\text{ACVF}_{0,0}$ satisfying some additional assumptions, one of which is that RV has no induced structure beyond what is present in $\text{ACVF}_{0,0}$. Consequently, V-minimal theories have no exotic automorphisms on Γ or k^\times , and all the results above apply to them. Our results generalize the generic differentiability and exchange property for V-minimal theories.

In some sense, our setting is orthogonal to V-minimality. Most of our work goes into analyzing the induced structure on the RV sort (Section 4). But V-minimality assumes that the induced structure on RV is pure, sidestepping this issue.

2 Basic facts

We review some fundamental facts which will be used in the more technical Section 4. *All* of these facts are surely known to experts.

2.1 Consequences of *C*-minimality

Let T be a complete *C*-minimal expansion of ACVF. Assume that T includes a constant symbol t in the home sort such that $v(t) > 0$. Work in a monster model \mathbb{M} of T . Let k and Γ be the residue field and value group.

Fact 2.1 (= [5, Proposition 4.4, Principe 1]). *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be definable. Then there is a ball $B \ni 0$ such that D contains or is disjoint from $B \setminus \{0\}$.*

This is well-known—it is essentially the statement that there is a unique non-zero infinitesimal type around 0. Nevertheless, we sketch the proof for completeness.

Proof sketch. Say that D is “good” if D satisfies the conclusion of Fact 2.1. It is straightforward to check that every ball or singleton is good, and that boolean combinations of good sets are good. By *C*-minimality, every definable set is good. \square

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\{D_1, \dots, D_n\}$ be a partition of \mathbb{M}^\times into finitely many definable sets. Then there is an $i \leq n$ and a ball $B \ni 0$ such that $D_i \supseteq B \setminus \{0\}$.*

Proof. Otherwise, for each i there is a ball $B_i \ni 0$ such that $D_i \cap B_i = \emptyset$. The intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^n B_i$ is then a ball around 0 disjoint from $\bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i = \mathbb{M}^\times$. No such ball exists. \square

We next review some facts about the induced structure on k and Γ . Many of these can be found in [7, 4].

Fact 2.3. 1. *The value group Γ is a divisible ordered abelian group.*

2. *The induced structure on Γ is o-minimal.*

3. Γ is stably embedded—any definable set $X \subseteq \Gamma^n$ is definable with parameters in Γ .
4. Γ eliminates imaginaries—if $X \subseteq \Gamma^n$ is definable, then the code $\ulcorner X \urcorner$ is interdefinable with a tuple in Γ .

Part (1) holds because it holds in ACVF (see [14, Lemma 1.3.1(i)]). Part (2) is a consequence of C -minimality. For example, it follows easily from Lemma 2.4 below. Part (3) follows from part (2) by Hasson and Onshuus’s theorem that o-minimal sets are always stably embedded [8]. Part (4) follows from stable embeddedness plus the well-known fact that o-minimal expansions of DOAG eliminate imaginaries if at least one positive element is 0-definable, in this case $v(t)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be definable. Then there are two subsets $D^{\text{err}}, \tilde{D} \subseteq \Gamma$ such that the following things hold:*

- \tilde{D} is quantifier-free definable in $(\Gamma, +, \leq)$, i.e., it is a finite union of points and intervals.
- D^{err} is finite.
- If $x \in \mathbb{M}^\times$ and $v(x) \notin D^{\text{err}}$, then $x \in D \iff v(x) \in \tilde{D}$.

Proof. Say that a set $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is “good” if it satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. The class of good sets is closed under finite boolean combinations. For example, if \star is \cap or \cup (or any other 2-ary boolean operation), then we can take

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{X \star Y} &= \tilde{X} \star \tilde{Y} \\ (X \star Y)^{\text{err}} &= X^{\text{err}} \cup Y^{\text{err}}. \end{aligned}$$

Open balls, closed balls, and points are good by inspection. By C -minimality, every definable set $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is good. \square

This implies o-minimality of Γ . Indeed, let $X \subseteq \Gamma$ be definable, and take $D = v^{-1}(X) = \{x \in \mathbb{M}^\times : v(x) \in X\}$. If \tilde{D} is a quantifier-free definable set as in the lemma, then

$$v(x) \in \tilde{D} \iff x \in D \iff v(x) \in X$$

except at finitely many values of $v(x)$. Thus \tilde{D} and X differ at only finitely many points, and X is quantifier-free definable.

Aside from implying o-minimality of Γ , Lemma 2.4 also gives a “domination” statement similar to compact domination [10, Definition 9.1] or stable domination [6]. Specifically, if $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is definable, then for all but finitely many $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the annulus $v^{-1}(\gamma)$ lies entirely inside or outside D .

There is an entirely analogous picture for the residue field k . The proofs for k are similar to the proofs for Γ .

Fact 2.5. *1. The residue field k is an algebraically closed field.*

2. The induced structure on k is strongly minimal.
3. k is stably embedded—any definable set $X \subseteq k^n$ is definable with parameters in k .
4. k eliminates imaginaries—if $D \subseteq k^n$ is definable, then the code $\ulcorner D \urcorner$ is interdefinable with a tuple in k .

Let \mathcal{O} be the valuation ring and \mathfrak{m} be its maximal ideal, so that $k = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m}$.

Lemma 2.6. *If $D \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ is definable, then there are subsets $\tilde{D}, D^{\text{err}} \subseteq k$ such that*

1. \tilde{D} is finite or cofinite in k .
2. D^{err} is finite.
3. If $x \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\text{res}(x) \notin D^{\text{err}}$, then $x \in D \iff \text{res}(x) \in \tilde{D}$.

We are also interested in the interactions between k and Γ .

Definition 2.7. Two definable sets X, Y are *orthogonal* if the boolean algebra of definable subsets of $X^n \times Y^m$ is generated by sets of the form $A \times B$ with $A \subseteq X^n$ and $B \subseteq Y^m$.

If $D \subseteq X^n \times Y^m$ is definable and $a \in X^n$, let $D_a = \{y \in Y^m : (a, y) \in D\}$. Then X and Y are orthogonal if and only if the following holds:

For any definable set $D \subseteq X^n \times Y^m$, the family of slices $\{D_a : a \in X^n\}$ is finite.

Indeed, if D is a finite boolean combination of $\{A_1 \times B_1, \dots, A_n \times B_n\}$, then each slice D_a belongs to the finite boolean algebra generated by $\{B_1, \dots, B_n\}$. Conversely, if $\{D_a : a \in X^n\}$ is a finite set $\{B_1, \dots, B_n\}$, and we let $A_i = \{a \in X^n : D_a = B_i\}$, then

$$D = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (A_i \times B_i).$$

Proposition 2.8. 1. *If $D \subseteq k^n$ is definable and $f : D \rightarrow \Gamma^m$ is definable, then f has finite image.*

2. *k and Γ are orthogonal.*

3. *If $D \subseteq \Gamma^m$ is definable and $f : D \rightarrow k^n$ is definable, then f has finite image.*

Again, this is well-known, but we include a proof for completeness.

Proof. 1. The set D and its image $\text{im}(f)$ are stable and stably embedded. On the other hand, Γ^m and its subset $\text{im}(f)$ admit a definable linear ordering. A stable set admitting a definable linear ordering must be finite.

2. Let $D \subseteq k^n \times \Gamma^m$ be definable. It suffices to show that there are only finitely many possibilities for D_a as a ranges over k^n . By the strong elimination of imaginaries in Γ , we can assign a code $\ulcorner D_a \urcorner \in \Gamma^\ell$ for each $a \in k^n$ in a uniform, definable way. Then the map $f(a) = \ulcorner D_a \urcorner$ is definable, and has finite image by the previous point. Therefore $\{D_a : a \in k^n\}$ is finite as desired.
3. Apply the previous point to the graph of Γ . □

The first part of Proposition 2.8 follows formally from the fact that k is stable and Γ is linearly ordered. In contrast, the other two points need the stronger fact that Γ is o-minimal. For example, contrast the above situation with the following example:

Example 2.9. Let (M, \leq, \approx) be a generic set with a linear order and unrelated equivalence relation. Let k be the quotient M/\approx . Then it is not hard to see that k is strongly minimal and stably embedded. However, the quotient map $M \rightarrow k$ shows that the linearly ordered set M and the strongly minimal set k are not orthogonal in the sense above.

The home sort \mathbb{M} and the value group Γ are not orthogonal, obviously. Nevertheless, there are some limitations on maps from \mathbb{M} to Γ :

Fact 2.10. *If $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ and $f : D \rightarrow \Gamma^n$ is definable, then f is locally constant at all but finitely many points of D .*

Cubides Kovacsics and Delon [4, Theorem 2.2(2)] attribute Fact 2.10 to Haskell and Macpherson [7, Proposition 3.9?].

Because Γ is stably embedded with elimination of imaginaries, Fact 2.10 implies the following:

Corollary 2.11. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be definable and let $\{Y_a\}_{a \in X}$ be a definable family of subsets of Γ^n . Then the family $\{Y_a\}$ is locally constant at all but finitely many points of X . That is, for all a in a cofinite subset of X , there is a neighborhood $N \ni a$ such that the family $\{Y_a\}_{a \in X \cap N}$ is constant.*

Using this, we can quickly re-prove some facts from [4]. This is not a pointless exercise—we will need the proofs later.

Theorem 2.12 (\approx [4, Theorem 3.1]). *If $f : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ is definable, then there is a definable function $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_\infty$ such that*

$$v(f(x)) = g(v(x))$$

for all x in a punctured neighborhood of 0.

Here, Γ_∞ denotes $\Gamma \cup \{+\infty\}$.

Proof. Let $D = \{(v(x), v(f(x))) : x \in \mathbb{M}^\times\} \subseteq \Gamma_\infty^2$. Then D is the image of \mathbb{M} under a definable map, and so

$$\dim(D) = \text{dp-rk}(D) \leq \text{dp-rk}(\mathbb{M}) = 1.$$

By cell decomposition, D is a disjoint union $\coprod_{i=1}^n C_i$ where the C_i are cells of dimension ≤ 1 . In particular, each cell is either a point, a vertical line segment, or the graph of a continuous definable function on an interval. Let X_i be the preimage of C_i :

$$X_i = \{x \in \mathbb{M}^\times : (v(x), v(f(x))) \in C_i\}.$$

Then the X_i are a partition of \mathbb{M}^\times . By Corollary 2.2, one of the X_i contains a punctured ball $B \setminus \{0\}$. As x ranges over $B \setminus \{0\}$, the valuation $v(x)$ takes arbitrarily high values. Therefore, the projection $\pi_1(C_i) \subseteq \Gamma$ has no upper bound. By definition of ‘‘cell,’’ C_i must be the graph of a continuous function $g : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \Gamma$ for some a . Then

$$x \in B \setminus \{0\} \implies (v(x), v(f(x))) \in C_i \implies v(f(x)) = g(v(x)). \quad \square$$

Theorem 2.13 (\approx [4, Theorem 3.3]). *If $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is definable and infinite and $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ is definable, then there is a ball $B \subseteq D$ and a definable function $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_\infty$ such that*

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = g(v(x - y)) \text{ for distinct } x, y \in B.$$

Proof. For each $a \in D$, let

$$U_a = \{(v(x - a), v(f(x) - f(a))) : x \in D \setminus \{a\}\}.$$

By Corollary 2.11, there is some point a_0 such that U_a is constant on an open ball $B \ni a_0$:

$$a \in B \implies U_a = U_{a_0}.$$

By Theorem 2.12, there is an open ball $B' \ni a_0$ such that

$$x \in B' \setminus \{a_0\} \implies v(f(x) - f(a_0)) = g(v(x - a_0)). \quad (*)$$

Replacing B and B' with their intersection, we may assume $B = B'$. If γ is the valuative radius of B' , then

$$\begin{aligned} U_{a_0} \cap ((\gamma, +\infty) \times \Gamma) &= \{(x, g(x)) : x > \gamma\} \text{ by } (*), \\ \text{and so } U_a \cap ((\gamma, +\infty) \times \Gamma) &= \{(x, g(x)) : x > \gamma\} \text{ for } a \in B. \end{aligned} \quad (\dagger)$$

If $x, a \in B$, then $(v(x - a), v(f(x) - f(a))) \in U_a$ and $v(x - a) > \gamma$, so (\dagger) shows

$$v(f(x) - f(a)) = g(v(x - a)). \quad \square$$

2.2 Unary sets in RV

Recall that RV is the group $\mathbb{M}^\times / (1 + \mathfrak{m})$, written multiplicatively. If $a \in \mathbb{M}^\times$, then $\text{rv}(a)$ denotes the image in RV. Note that for $a, b \in \mathbb{M}^\times$, we have

$$\text{rv}(a) = \text{rv}(b) \iff v(a - b) > v(b).$$

The group RV sits in a short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow k^\times \rightarrow \text{RV} \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 1.$$

If $X \subseteq \Gamma$, let RV_X denote the preimage of X under the map $\text{RV} \rightarrow \Gamma$. For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we write RV_γ for $\text{RV}_{\{\gamma\}}$. For example, RV_0 is the subgroup $k^\times \subseteq \text{RV}$. In general, the sets RV_γ are the cosets of k^\times in RV . In particular, each set RV_γ is strongly minimal, and orthogonal to Γ in the sense of Definition 2.7.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}$ be definable. Then*

$$\text{RV}_\gamma \subseteq D \text{ or } \text{RV}_\gamma \cap D = \emptyset$$

for all but finitely many $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Let $X = \{x \in \mathbb{M}^\times : \text{rv}(x) \in D\}$. Applying Lemma 2.4 to X gives two definable sets $\tilde{X}, X^{\text{err}} \subseteq \Gamma$, with X^{err} finite, such that

$$v(x) \notin X^{\text{err}} \implies (x \in X \iff v(x) \in \tilde{X}).$$

Fix some $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus X^{\text{err}}$. If $\text{rv}(x) \in \text{RV}_\gamma$, then $v(x) = \gamma \notin X^{\text{err}}$, and so

$$\text{rv}(x) \in D \iff x \in X \iff v(x) \in \tilde{X} \iff \gamma \in \tilde{X}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \in \tilde{X} &\implies \text{RV}_\gamma \subseteq D \\ \gamma \notin \tilde{X} &\implies \text{RV}_\gamma \cap D = \emptyset. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Corollary 2.15. *Suppose $D \subseteq \text{RV}$ is definable, and $D \cap \text{RV}_\gamma$ is finite for every γ . Then D is finite.*

Proof. Otherwise, there are infinitely many γ such that D contains some but not all of RV_γ . \square

Theorem 2.16. *Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}$ be definable. Then there is a definable set $\tilde{D} \subseteq \Gamma$ such that D differs from $\text{RV}_{\tilde{D}}$ at only finitely many points.*

Proof. Let \tilde{D} be the set of points $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $D \cap \text{RV}_\gamma$ is infinite. The set \tilde{D} is definable because RV_γ admits a definable bijection² to the strongly minimal set k^\times , and strongly minimal sets eliminate \exists^∞ . By strong minimality of RV_γ ,

$$\tilde{D} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : D \cap \text{RV}_\gamma \text{ is cofinite in } \text{RV}_\gamma\}.$$

Let S be the symmetric difference of D and $\text{RV}_{\tilde{D}}$. If $\gamma \in \tilde{D}$, then D and $\text{RV}_{\tilde{D}}$ both contain almost all of RV_γ . If $\gamma \notin \tilde{D}$, then D and $\text{RV}_{\tilde{D}}$ both contain almost none of RV_γ . Either way, the symmetric difference $S \cap \text{RV}_\gamma$ is finite by strong minimality of RV_γ . Then S is finite by Corollary 2.15. \square

²... of bounded complexity as γ varies

2.3 Linear functions on Γ

Recall that the value group Γ is an o-minimal expansion of DOAG, the theory of divisible ordered abelian groups. In the following section, we work in Γ , but the arguments apply equally well to any o-minimal expansion of DOAG.

Definition 2.17. Let I be an interval in Γ . A definable function $f : I \rightarrow \Gamma$ is *linear* if

$$f(a) + f(a + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2) = f(a + \epsilon_1) + f(a + \epsilon_2)$$

for any $a, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2$ such that $\{a, a + \epsilon_1, a + \epsilon_2, a + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2\} \subseteq I$.

If $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$ is a function and $\epsilon > 0$, define a function

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\epsilon f &: (a, b - \epsilon) \rightarrow \Gamma \\ \delta_\epsilon f(x) &= f(x + \epsilon) - f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\delta_{\epsilon_1} \delta_{\epsilon_2} f = \delta_{\epsilon_2} \delta_{\epsilon_1} f$.

Remark 2.18. If $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$ is definable, then the following are equivalent:

1. f is constant.
2. f is locally constant, in the sense that for every $x \in (a, b)$ there is an interval I around x such that $f \upharpoonright I$ is constant.
3. $\delta_\epsilon f = 0$ for every $\epsilon > 0$.
4. There is ϵ_0 such that $\delta_\epsilon f = 0$ for $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$.

Indeed, the following implications are clear

$$(1) \iff (3) \implies (4) \implies (2),$$

and the implication $(2) \implies (1)$ is a well-known consequence of o-minimality, part of the monotonicity theorem [17, Theorem 3.1.2].

Lemma 2.19. *Let $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$ be definable. The following seven conditions are equivalent:*

1. f is linear.
2. $\forall \epsilon_1 > 0 \forall \epsilon_2 > 0 : \delta_{\epsilon_2} \delta_{\epsilon_1} f = 0$.
3. $\forall \epsilon_1 > 0 : (\delta_{\epsilon_1} f \text{ is a constant function})$.
4. $\forall \epsilon_1 > 0 \exists \epsilon_0 > 0 \forall \epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_0) : \delta_{\epsilon_2} \delta_{\epsilon_1} f = 0$.
5. $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0 \forall \epsilon_1 > 0 \forall \epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_0) : \delta_{\epsilon_2} \delta_{\epsilon_1} f = 0$
6. $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0 \forall \epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_0) \forall \epsilon_1 > 0 : \delta_{\epsilon_1} \delta_{\epsilon_2} f = 0$.

7. $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0 \forall \epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_0) : (\delta_{\epsilon_2} f \text{ is a constant function}).$

Proof. (1) \iff (2) by unwinding the definitions. The equivalence of (2), (3), and (4) comes from applying Remark 2.18 to the function $\delta_{\epsilon_1} f$. The implications

$$\begin{aligned} (2) &\implies (5) \implies (4) \\ (5) &\iff (6) \end{aligned}$$

are clear. Finally, (6) \iff (7) by applying Remark 2.18 to the function $\delta_{\epsilon_2} f$. \square

Focusing on conditions (1), (3), and (7), we see

Corollary 2.20. *Let $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$ be definable. The following are equivalent:*

1. f is linear.
2. $\delta_\epsilon f$ is a constant function for every $\epsilon > 0$.
3. $\delta_\epsilon f$ is a constant function, for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.

Lemma 2.21. *Suppose $a < b < c < d$ and $f : (a, d) \rightarrow \Gamma$ is such that the two restrictions $f \upharpoonright (a, c)$ and $f \upharpoonright (b, d)$ are linear. Then f is linear.*

Proof. Suppose $0 < \epsilon < c - b$. By Corollary 2.20, $\delta_\epsilon f$ is constant on $(a, c - \epsilon)$ and on $(b, d - \epsilon)$. These intervals overlap, by choice of ϵ , and so $\delta_\epsilon f$ is constant on $(a, d - \epsilon)$. By Corollary 2.20 again, f is linear. \square

Theorem 2.22. *Let $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$ be definable. Suppose that for every $x \in (a, b)$, there is an interval $I \ni x$ such that $f \upharpoonright I$ is linear. Then f is linear.*

Proof. Take some small interval $(a_0, b_0) \subseteq (a, b)$ such that $f \upharpoonright (a_0, b_0)$ is linear. Let

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \{x \in (a_0, b] : f \text{ is linear on } (a_0, x)\} \\ b_1 &= \sup S. \end{aligned}$$

The set S is definable, so b_1 exists by o-minimality. The open interval (a_0, b_1) is a union of an increasing chain of intervals on which f is linear. Therefore, f is linear on (a_0, b_1) , and so $b_1 \in S$, and $b_1 = \max S$.

We claim that $b_1 = b$. Otherwise, $b_1 \in (a, b)$ and there is a small interval (c, d) around b_1 on which f is linear. By Lemma 2.21, f is linear on the union $(a_0, b_1) \cup (c, d) \supseteq (a_0, d)$. But then $d \in S$ and $d > b_1$, contradicting the fact that $b_1 = \sup S$.

Then $b = b_1 = \max S \in S$, meaning that f is linear on (a_0, b) . A similar argument shows that f is linear on (a, b_0) . By Lemma 2.21, f is linear on the union $(a, b_0) \cup (a_0, b) = (a, b)$. \square

3 A spiritual overview of the induced structure on RV

This section is a vague description of the intuition I have for Section 4. It is provided solely for motivation, to help the reader follow the next section. Nothing I say here will be used in the later proofs, and the reader who doesn't care about motivation can skip straight to Section 4. In fact, everything I say here should be treated as unofficial speculation, not taken seriously.

3.1 A first approximation

To a first approximation, we can summarize the situation as follows:

Slogan 1. *All the induced structure on RV is generated by the induced structure on k and the induced structure on Γ .*

In a C -minimal field, the induced structure on k can be an arbitrary strongly minimal expansion of ACF, and the induced structure on Γ can be an arbitrary o-minimal expansion of DOAG. Slogan 1 is saying that the additional structure on RV solely comes from the additional structure on k and the induced structure on Γ .

As a consequence, definable sets in RV^n are built out of the following components:

- Definable sets on Γ^n , pulled back to RV^n .
- Sets definable in the group structure of RV , such as

$$\{(y, x) \in \text{RV} : y^m = x^m\}. \quad (*)$$

- Definable sets in k^n , pushed forward to RV^n and translated.

If $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ has dp-rank 1, then D cannot contain the preimage of something pulled back from $\text{RV}^2 \rightarrow \Gamma^2$, because the fibers of $\text{RV}^2 \rightarrow \Gamma^2$ have dp-rank 2. Consequently, D must be built out of translates of definable sets in k^2 , which push forward to points in Γ^2 , and sets like $(*)$, which push forward to line segments in Γ^2 of rational slope. So one concludes that

If $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ has dp-rank 1, then the image of D in Γ^2 is made of points and line segments of rational slope.

However, Slogan 1 is not quite right.


3.2 A second approximation

Let E_Γ be the ring of definable endomorphisms of $(\Gamma, +)$. Then E_Γ is a skew field (possibly non-commutative). Let $E_{k^\times}^0$ be the ring of definable endomorphisms of k^\times . Unlike E_Γ , $E_{k^\times}^0$ is not a skew field. For example, if k^\times is a pure ACF of characteristic prime to $n > 1$, then the endomorphism $f(x) = x^n$ has no inverse. On the other hand, $E_{k^\times}^0$ is commutative: the action of $E_{k^\times}^0$ on the torsion in k^\times is faithful (by strong minimality) giving an embedding

of $E_{k^\times}^0$ into the ring of endomorphisms of the abelian group \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} . But $\text{End}(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ is the profinite completion $\hat{\mathbb{Z}}$ of \mathbb{Z} , which is a commutative ring. So the embedding $E_{k^\times}^0 \hookrightarrow \hat{\mathbb{Z}}$ shows that $E_{k^\times}^0$ is commutative. This also shows that $E_{k^\times}^0$ is small, unlike E_Γ .

Let E_{k^\times} be the ring obtained from $E_{k^\times}^0$ by inverting the natural numbers. Elements of E_{k^\times} are the definable “endogenies” of k^\times , in the sense of [16, Proof of Theorem 1.14]. Now E_{k^\times} is a field (not just a skew field). When Γ and k^\times have the structure of a pure DOAG and pure ACF, the two skew fields E_Γ and E_{k^\times} are both \mathbb{Q} .

Slogan 2. *There is an analogous ring E_{RV} of definable endogenies of RV, and E_{RV} embeds into both E_{k^\times} and E_Γ :*



In particular, E_{RV} is a small commutative field of characteristic 0.

Finally, the induced structure on RV is generated by the induced structure on k^\times , the induced structure on Γ , and the action of E_{RV} on RV.

Compared to Slogan 1, we now have to deal with definable sets like

$$\{(x, y) \in \text{RV}^2 : y = x^q\} \text{ for } q \in E_{\text{RV}}.$$

This leads to the following consequence for sets of dp-rank 1:

If $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ has dp-rank 1, then the image of D in Γ^2 is made of points and line segments having slopes in E_{RV} .

More precisely, the slopes of the lines live in the image of $E_{\text{RV}} \rightarrow E_\Gamma$.


Note that the field E_{RV} ties together E_{k^\times} and E_Γ in a strange way. In order for there to be strange new sets in RV, we need $E_{\text{RV}} \supsetneq \mathbb{Q}$. This requires both E_{k^\times} and E_Γ to be bigger than \mathbb{Q} , so *both* k^\times and Γ need “exotic automorphisms.”

Slogan 2 is still missing part of the picture.

3.3 A third approximation

Let (a, b) and (c, d) be two intervals in Γ containing 0. Let $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$ and $g : (c, d) \rightarrow \Gamma$ be definable linear functions with $f(0) = g(0) = 0$. Say that f and g have the same “slope” if $f = g$ on a neighborhood of 0, or equivalently, on the intersection $(a, b) \cap (c, d)$. The set of slopes is naturally a skew field E_Γ^+ extending E_Γ . An element of E_Γ^+ is something like an endomorphism of Γ defined only locally around 0. If I understand correctly, there are well-known o-minimal theories in which $E_\Gamma^+ \supsetneq E_\Gamma$.

Slogan 3. *There is an analogous skew field E_{RV}^+ for RV , fitting into the following diagram of embeddings of skew fields:*



In particular, E_{RV}^+ is a small commutative field of characteristic 0.

Finally, the induced structure on RV is generated by the induced structure on k^\times , the induced structure on Γ , and the action of E_{RV}^+ on RV .

The point is that we have to deal with line segments, not just lines. This leads to the following consequence for sets of dp-rank 1:

If $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ has dp-rank 1, then the image of D in Γ^2 is made of points and line segments having slopes in E_{RV}^+ .

We now return to the real proof.

4 Definable sets on $\text{RV} \times \text{RV}$

Recall that RV_a is the fiber of $\text{RV} \rightarrow \Gamma$ over $a \in \Gamma$. Then $\text{RV}_a \cdot \text{RV}_b = \text{RV}_{a+b}$, and $\text{RV}_0 = k^\times \subseteq \text{RV}$. The sets RV_a are the cosets of k^\times in RV . In particular, each RV_a is in definable bijection with k^\times .

Because k^\times is strongly minimal, there is a good notion of dimension for definable subsets of $(k^\times)^n$. Dimension is definable in families, and agrees with Morley rank and dp-rank. The set $\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$ is in definable bijection with $(k^\times)^2$, so there is also a good dimension theory on $\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$. Note that if $D \subseteq \text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dim(D) &\in \{-\infty, 0, 1, 2\} \\
 \dim(D) = -\infty &\iff D = \emptyset \\
 \dim(D) \leq 0 &\iff |D| < \infty \\
 \dim(D) = 2 &\iff \dim((\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b) \setminus D) \neq 2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{*}$$

because the analogous properties hold in $k^\times \times k^\times$. Condition (*) has to do with the fact that $k^\times \times k^\times$ and $\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$ have Morley degree 1.

Definition 4.1. Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ be definable. For $(a, b) \in \Gamma^2$, let

$$D_{a,b} = D \cap (\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b).$$

Let \tilde{D} and \overline{D} be the following subsets of Γ^2 :

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{D} &= \{(a, b) \in \Gamma^2 : \dim(D_{a,b}) = 2\} \\ \overline{D} &= \{(a, b) \in \Gamma^2 : D_{a,b} \neq \emptyset\} \\ &= \{(a, b) \in \Gamma^2 : \dim(D_{a,b}) \geq 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then \overline{D} is the image of D under the natural map $\text{RV}^2 \rightarrow \Gamma^2$, and \tilde{D} is the set of points $(a, b) \in \Gamma^2$ such that D contains “most” points of the fiber $\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$. The sets \overline{D} and \tilde{D} are definable sets, because dimension is definable in k^\times . Note that $D \mapsto \tilde{D}$ is a homomorphism of boolean algebras, by (*) above. For example, if D and E are complementary subsets of RV^2 , then $D_{a,b}$ and $E_{a,b}$ are complementary subsets of $\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$, exactly one of the two has dimension 2, and so \tilde{D} is complementary to \tilde{E} .

Remark 4.2. Let $v : \text{RV} \rightarrow \Gamma$ denote the natural map. Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ be definable. Then D can be decomposed as a symmetric difference

$$D = D' \Delta X,$$

where $D' = \{(x, y) \in \text{RV}^2 : (v(x), v(y)) \in \tilde{D}\}$ and

$$\tilde{X} = \widetilde{D \Delta D'} = \tilde{D} \Delta \tilde{D}' = \tilde{D} \Delta \tilde{D} = \emptyset.$$

Definition 4.3. A definable set $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ is *small over* Γ^2 if $\tilde{D} = \emptyset$, meaning that

$$\dim(D_{a,b}) = \dim(D \cap (\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b)) < 2$$

for every $(a, b) \in \Gamma^2$.

Remark 4.2 says that every definable set in RV is a symmetric difference of a definable set pulled back from Γ^2 and a definable set that is small over Γ^2 . In light of this, we will focus on sets that are small over Γ^2 .

Definition 4.4. A *fragment* is a non-empty definable set $X \subseteq \text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$ for some $(a, b) \in \Gamma^2$, such that $\dim(X) < 2$. We say that X is a *central fragment* if $a = b = 0$.

Recall that \overline{D} is the image of D under $\text{RV}^2 \rightarrow \Gamma^2$, or equivalently, the set of $(a, b) \in \Gamma^2$ such that $D_{a,b} \neq \emptyset$. If D is small over Γ^2 , then $D_{a,b}$ is a fragment for every $(a, b) \in \overline{D}$.

Say that two fragments X, Y are *equivalent* if one is a translate of the other: $Y = (u, v) \cdot X$ for some $(u, v) \in \text{RV}^2$. Every fragment X is equivalent to at least one central fragment, namely $(u, v)^{-1} \cdot X$ for any $(u, v) \in X$. Recall that central fragments are subsets of $\text{RV}_0 \times \text{RV}_0 = (k^\times)^2$. By elimination of imaginaries in k^\times , we can assign a value $\text{Shape}(X)$ to each central fragment X in such a way that

- (a) $\text{Shape}(X)$ is a finite tuple in k .
- (b) $\text{Shape}(X) = \text{Shape}(Y)$ if and only if X is equivalent to Y .

(c) $\text{Shape}(X)$ depends definably on X , as X varies in a definable family.

We call $\text{Shape}(X)$ the *shape* of X . If X is any fragment, we define $\text{Shape}(X) = \text{Shape}(X')$ for some central fragment X' equivalent to X . The choice of X' doesn't matter, and points (a)–(c) continue to hold. In particular, $\text{Shape}(X)$ is still a finite tuple in k , even though X no longer lives in a power of k .

If X is a fragment, let $\text{Stab}(X)$ denote the multiplicative setwise stabilizer of X , i.e., the subgroup

$$\text{Stab}(X) = \{(u, v) \in \text{RV}^2 : (u, v) \cdot X = X\}.$$

More generally, if X, Y are two fragments, let

$$\text{Mov}(X, Y) = \{(u, v) \in \text{RV}^2 : (u, v) \cdot X = Y\}.$$

The following properties are straightforward to verify.

Observation 4.5. *Let X and Y be fragments.*

1. $\text{Mov}(X, X) = \text{Stab}(X)$.
2. $\text{Shape}(X) = \text{Shape}(Y) \iff \text{Mov}(X, Y) \neq \emptyset$.
3. $\text{Shape}(X)$ determines $\text{Stab}(X)$: if X and Y are equivalent, then $\text{Stab}(X) = \text{Stab}(Y)$.
4. If X and Y are equivalent, then $\text{Mov}(X, Y)$ is a coset of the two equal groups $\text{Stab}(X) = \text{Stab}(Y)$.
5. If $X \subseteq \text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$ and $Y \subseteq \text{RV}_c \times \text{RV}_d$, then $\text{Mov}(X, Y) \subseteq \text{RV}_{c-a} \times \text{RV}_{b-d}$. (This uses the fact that X and Y are non-empty.)
6. In particular, $\text{Stab}(X) \subseteq \text{RV}_0 \times \text{RV}_0 = (k^\times)^2$.

If $s = \text{Shape}(X)$, define $\text{Stab}(s) := \text{Stab}(X)$. This is well-defined by part (3) of Observation 4.5. By the above, $\text{Stab}(s)$ is a definable subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$. If $(u, v) \in X$, then

$$\text{Stab}(s) \cdot (u, v) = \text{Stab}(X) \cdot (u, v) \subseteq X,$$

so $\dim(\text{Stab}(s)) \leq \dim(X) \leq 1$. The stabilizer $\text{Stab}(s)$ always contains $(1, 1)$, so $\text{Stab}(s)$ is non-empty and $\dim(\text{Stab}(s)) \geq 0$. Therefore, the dimension of $\text{Stab}(s)$ is either 0 or 1.

Definition 4.6. A shape s is *symmetric* if $\text{Stab}(s)$ has dimension 1, and *asymmetric* if $\text{Stab}(s)$ has dimension 0.

So s is symmetric if $\text{Stab}(s)$ is infinite, and asymmetric if $\text{Stab}(s)$ is finite.

Lemma 4.7. *If $\text{Shape}(X)$ is a symmetric shape s , then X is a finite union of cosets of $\text{Stab}(s)$.*

Proof. Replacing X with a translate, we may assume that X is a central fragment ($X \subseteq (k^\times)^2$). Let G be the 1-dimensional subgroup $\text{Stab}(s) = \text{Stab}(X) \subseteq (k^\times)^2$. The fact that G stabilizes X means that X is the pullback of some definable set along the quotient map

$$(k^\times)^2 \rightarrow (k^\times)^2/G.$$

Because $(k^\times)^2$ is connected, so is the 1-dimensional quotient $(k^\times)^2/G$, implying that $(k^\times)^2/G$ is strongly minimal. Then X is the pullback of some finite or cofinite subset of $(k^\times)^2/G$. It follows that X or the complement $(k^\times)^2 \setminus X$ is a finite union of cosets of G . However, if X is the complement of a finite union of cosets, then $\dim(X) = 2$, contradicting the assumption that X is a fragment. \square

Most definable sets in $(k^\times)^2$ cannot be written as finite unions of translates of 1-dimensional subgroups, so “most” shapes are asymmetric.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ be a definable set which is small over Γ^2 , in the sense that $\dim(D_{a,b}) < 2$ for every $(a, b) \in \Gamma^2$. Recall that \overline{D} is the image of D under $\text{RV}^2 \rightarrow \Gamma^2$.*

1. *The following set is finite:*

$$\{\text{Shape}(D_{a,b}) : (a, b) \in \overline{D}\}.$$

2. *There is a cell decomposition $\overline{D} = \coprod_{i=1}^n C_i$ and a list of shapes s_1, \dots, s_n such that $\text{Shape}(D_{a,b}) = s_i$ for $(a, b) \in C_i$.*

Proof. The map $(a, b) \mapsto \text{Shape}(D_{a,b})$ is a definable map from \overline{D} to a power of k . By Proposition 2.8(3), the image is finite. Then the fibers of this map are a partition of \overline{D} into finitely many definable sets. Take a cell decomposition which respects this partition. \square

Definition 4.9. A *bad family* is a definable family $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$ where I is an interval in Γ and S_i is a finite non-empty subset of $\text{RV}_{f(i)}$ for each $i \in I$, for some continuous, definable, non-constant function $f : I \rightarrow \Gamma$.

Given a bad family, we can restrict I to get a bad family for which f is injective, by the monotonicity theorem for o-minimal structures. Then the union $\bigcup_{i \in I} S_i$ is a definable set containing finitely many points in RV_γ for each γ in the infinite set $f(I)$. This contradicts Corollary 2.15, and so

Bad families do not exist.

Here is an example application:

Lemma 4.10. *Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ be a definable set and let*

$$X = \{(a, b) \in \overline{D} : D_{a,b} \text{ is finite and non-empty}\}.$$

Then X is finite.

Proof. The set X can be described as $\{(a, b) : \dim(D_{a,b}) = 0\}$; it is definable because dimension is definable in k . Alternatively, definability of X follows from Lemma 4.8, because whether $D_{a,b}$ is finite is determined by $\text{Shape}(D_{a,b})$.

If X is infinite, then by cell decomposition, it contains the graph of a continuous function, or the transpose of such a graph. In other words, there is a continuous definable function $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that X contains one of the sets

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(f) &= \{(x, f(x)) : x \in (a, b)\} \\ \Gamma(f)^T &= \{(f(x), x) : x \in (a, b)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\Gamma(f) \subseteq X$. (The other case is similar.) Then for every $x \in (a, b)$, the set $D_{x,f(x)}$ is a finite non-empty subset of $\text{RV}_x \times \text{RV}_{f(x)}$. Let $\pi : \text{RV}_x \times \text{RV}_{f(x)} \rightarrow \text{RV}_x$ be the projection onto the first coordinate. Then $\{\pi(D_{x,f(x)})\}_{x \in (a,b)}$ is a bad family. \square

Here is a more sophisticated example:

Theorem 4.11. *Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ be a definable set and let s be an asymmetric shape. The set $D^s = \{(x, y) \in \Gamma^2 : \text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) = s\}$ is finite.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.10, we may assume that D^s contains the graph of a continuous definable function $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$. Fix some central fragment $X \subseteq (k^\times)^2$ with $\text{Shape}(X) = s$. For any $x \in (a, b)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(x, f(x)) &\in D^s \\ \text{Shape}(D_{x,f(x)}) &= s = \text{Shape}(X).\end{aligned}$$

By Observation 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Mov}(X, D_{x,f(x)}) &\neq \emptyset \\ \text{Mov}(X, D_{x,f(x)}) &\text{ is a coset of } \text{Stab}(s) \\ \text{Mov}(X, D_{x,f(x)}) &\subseteq \text{RV}_x \times \text{RV}_{f(x)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Stab}(s)$ is finite, we see that $\text{Mov}(X, D_{x,f(x)})$ is a finite non-empty subset of $\text{RV}_x \times \text{RV}_{f(x)}$ for any $x \in (a, b)$. Projecting onto RV_x , we get a bad family as in Lemma 4.10. \square

Intuitively, most shapes are asymmetric, which makes the next corollary rather surprising:

Corollary 4.12. *Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ be a definable set that is small over Γ^2 . Then $\text{Shape}(D_{x,y})$ is symmetric for all but finitely many (x, y) in \overline{D} .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.8, the set $\{\text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) : (x, y) \in \overline{D}\}$ is finite. Let s_1, \dots, s_n enumerate the asymmetric shapes in this set. Then

$$\{(x, y) \in \overline{D} : \text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) \text{ is asymmetric}\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{(x, y) \in \overline{D} : \text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) = s_i\}$$

and the union on the right is finite by Theorem 4.11. \square

Theorem 4.11 describes the set $D^s := \{(x, y) \in \overline{D} : \text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) = s\}$ when s is an asymmetric shape. What if s is a symmetric shape? By Lemma 4.7, symmetric shapes are closely connected to 1-dimensional subgroups of $(k^\times)^2$. If (n, m) are coprime integers, let $Q_{n/m}$ be the following definable subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$:

$$Q_{n/m} = \{(x, y) \in (k^\times)^2 : y^m = x^n\}.$$

Roughly speaking, this is the graph of the “map” $f(x) = x^{n/m}$. Each group $Q_{n/m}$ is connected—there is a definable isomorphism from k^\times to $Q_{n/m}$ given by $z \mapsto (z^m, z^n)$. Therefore, a definable subgroup $G \subseteq (k^\times)^2$ is commensurable to $Q_{n/m}$ if and only if $G \supseteq Q_{n/m}$ and $|G/Q_{n/m}|$ is finite.

In the pure language of rings \mathcal{L}_{rings} , the only definable automorphisms of k^\times are $x^{\pm 1}$ if $\text{char}(k) = 0$, and $x^{\pm p^n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ if $\text{char}(k) = p > 0$.

Definition 4.13. An *exotic automorphism* of k^\times is a definable automorphism of k^\times which is not \mathcal{L}_{rings} -definable in the language of rings.

Lemma 4.14. *The following are equivalent:*

1. Every 1-dimensional definable subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$ is commensurable with some $Q_{n/m}$.
2. Every 1-dimensional definable subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$ is \mathcal{L}_{rings} -definable.
3. There are no exotic automorphisms of k^\times .

Proof. (1) \implies (2): suppose G is a 1-dimensional definable subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$ commensurable with $Q_{n/m}$. Then G is a union of finitely many translates of $Q_{n/m}$, so G is \mathcal{L}_{rings} -definable.

(2) \implies (3): If $f : k^\times \rightarrow k^\times$ is a definable automorphism of the multiplicative group, then $\Gamma(f) = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in k^\times\}$ is a 1-dimensional definable subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$. By (2), it is \mathcal{L}_{rings} -definable, which makes f be \mathcal{L}_{rings} -definable.

(3) \implies (1): Assume every definable automorphism of k^\times is \mathcal{L}_{rings} -definable. Then every definable automorphism has the form $f(x) = x^{\pm p^n}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, where p is the characteristic exponent of k .

Claim 4.15. *Every definable endomorphism $f : k^\times \rightarrow k^\times$ has the form $f(x) = x^r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/p]$.*

Proof. If $\ker(f)$ is 1-dimensional, then it is all of k^\times (because k^\times is connected), and so f vanishes, and we can take $r = 0$.

Otherwise, $\ker(f)$ is 0-dimensional, i.e., finite. Counting dimensions, $\dim(\text{im}(f)) = 1$, so $\text{im}(f)$ is all of k^\times . That is, f is onto. The only finite subgroups of k^\times are the cyclic groups $\mu_n = \{x \in k^\times : x^n = 1\}$, and so $\ker(f) = \mu_n$ for some n . Let $g(x) = x^n$. Then g and f are definable surjective endomorphisms of k^\times with the same kernel. Therefore $f = h \circ g$ for some definable automorphism h . By assumption, $h(x) = x^{\pm p^m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$f(x) = h(g(x)) = (x^n)^{\pm p^m} = x^{\pm np^m}.$$

Take $r = \pm np^m$. □

Finally, suppose G is a 1-dimensional definable subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$. If G has infinite intersection with $1 \times k^\times = Q_{1/0}$, then G is commensurable with $Q_{1/0}$, by counting dimensions. Suppose G has finite intersection with $1 \times k^\times$. This intersection is the kernel of the projection map

$$G \hookrightarrow (k^\times)^2 \xrightarrow{\pi_1} k^\times$$

onto the first coordinate. Since the kernel is finite, the image has dimension 1, and must be all of k^\times . Therefore, for any $x \in k^\times$, the slice $G_x = \{y \in k^\times : (x, y) \in G\}$ is non-empty.

Let $m = |G \cap (1 \times k^\times)|$. Then $G \cap (1 \times k^\times) = 1 \times \mu_m$. For any $x \in k^\times$, the slice G_x is a coset of μ_m , and therefore has the form $\{y \in k^\times : y^m = f(x)\}$ for some uniquely determined $f(x) \in k^\times$. The map f is a homomorphism, so it has the form $f(x) = x^r$ for some rational number, by the claim. Then

$$(x, y) \in G \implies y^m = f(x) = x^r,$$

so G is commensurable with $Q_{r/m}$. In more detail, if $r = a/b$ in lowest terms, and $r/m = a/(bm)$ is a'/b' in lowest terms, then

$$(x, y) \in G \implies y^m = x^{a/b} \implies y^{bm} = x^a,$$

so G is a subgroup of the group $\{(x, y) : y^{bm} = x^a\}$, which in turn contains $\{(x, y) : y^{b'} = x^{a'}\} = Q_{a'/b'} = Q_{r/m}$. All these groups are 1-dimensional, so they are all commensurable with each other. \square

If we are lucky, there are no exotic automorphisms of k^\times , in which case the following result applies:

Theorem 4.16. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}V^2$ be definable. Let s be a symmetric shape such that $\text{Stab}(s)$ is commensurable with $Q_{n/m}$. Let $D^s = \{(a, b) \in \overline{D} : \text{Shape}(D_{a,b}) = s\}$. Then D^s is a union of finitely many points and line segments of slope n/m .*

Here, a *line segment of slope n/m* is a set in Γ^2 of the form

$$\{(x, (n/m)x + c) : x \in (a, b)\}$$

for some open interval (a, b) (possibly half-infinite) and some $c \in \Gamma$. A line segment of slope $1/0$ means a set $\{a\} \times I$ where $a \in \Gamma$ and I is an open interval. The term “line segment” may be misleading, as we are also including rays and lines.

Theorem 4.16 reduces easily to the following lemma, by cell decomposition.

Lemma 4.17. *In the setting of Theorem 4.16, if D^s contains a parametric curve $\{(f(z), g(z)) : z \in I\}$ for some open interval I and definable continuous functions*

$$\begin{aligned} f &: I \rightarrow \Gamma \\ g &: I \rightarrow \Gamma, \end{aligned}$$

then the function $mg(z) - nf(z)$ is constant.

Proof. Suppose $mg(x) - nf(x)$ is non-constant. Let $G = \text{Stab}(s)$. By assumption, this group is a finite union of cosets of $Q_{n/m}$. Fix a central fragment $X \subseteq (k^\times)^2$ with $\text{Shape}(X) = s$. By Lemma 4.7, X is a finite union of cosets of G , and therefore a finite union of cosets of $Q_{n/m}$. Consequently, the set $\{y^m/x^n : (x, y) \in X\}$ is a finite non-empty subset of k^\times .

For any $z \in I$, we have $\text{Shape}(D_{f(z),g(z)}) = s$, so the fragment $D_{f(z),g(z)}$ is a translate of X . Therefore, the set

$$S_z = \{y^m/x^n : (x, y) \in D_{f(z),g(z)}\}$$

is finite and non-empty. If $(x, y) \in D_{f(z),g(z)}$, then $x \in \text{RV}_{f(z)}$ and $y \in \text{RV}_{g(z)}$, so $y^m/x^n \in \text{RV}_{mg(z)-nf(z)}$. Then $\{S_z\}_{z \in I}$ is a bad family. \square

By a *line segment*, we mean a vertical interval $\{a\} \times (b, c)$, or the graph of a linear function f :

$$\{(x, f(x)) : x \in (a, b)\}.$$

Two line segments A and B have the same slope if $A \cap (B + (x, y))$ is infinite for some $(x, y) \in \Gamma^2$. One can show that this is an equivalence relation on line segments, though we will not need this.

Theorem 4.18. *Let $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$ be definable. Let s be a symmetric shape. Let $D^s = \{(a, b) \in \overline{D} : \text{Shape}(D_{a,b}) = s\}$. Then D^s is a union of finitely many points and finitely many line segments of equal slope.*

The core of the argument is the following lemma:

Lemma 4.19. *In the setting of Theorem 4.18, suppose that D^s contains the graph of two continuous definable functions*

$$\begin{aligned} f &: (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma \\ g &: (a + d, b + d) \rightarrow \Gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Then the function $g(x + d) - f(x)$ is constant on (a, b) .

Proof. Let $G = \text{Stab}(s)$. If G is commensurable with $Q_{1/0}$, then D^s can only contain points and vertical line segments by Theorem 4.16, so G certainly does not contain the graph of any function. Therefore G is not commensurable with $Q_{1/0}$. This implies that the map

$$\begin{aligned} G &\rightarrow k^\times \\ (x, y) &\mapsto x \end{aligned}$$

is onto with finite fibers.

For $x \in (a, b)$, the two points $(x, f(x))$ and $(x + d, g(x + d))$ are both in $D^s \subseteq \overline{D}$, and so

$$S_x := \text{Mov}(D_{x,f(x)}, D_{x+d,g(x+d)})$$

is a coset of G contained in $\text{RV}_d \times \text{RV}_{g(x+d)-f(x)}$. Then the map

$$\begin{aligned} S_x &\rightarrow \text{RV}_d \\ (u, v) &\mapsto u \end{aligned}$$

is onto with finite fibers. Fix some $u \in \text{RV}_d$. Let S'_x be the slice $\{v \in \text{RV}_{g(x+d)-f(x)} : (u, v) \in S_x\}$. Then S'_x is a finite non-empty subset of $\text{RV}_{g(x+d)-f(x)}$. The family $\{S'_x\}_{x \in (a,b)}$ is a bad family, unless $g(x+d) - f(x)$ is constant. \square

We will also need the following:

Lemma 4.20. *In the setting of Theorem 4.18, if $\text{Stab}(s)$ is not commensurable to $Q_{1/0}$, then D^s contains no vertical lines.*

Proof. Let $G = \text{Stab}(s)$. As in Lemma 4.19, the projection $\pi_1 : G \rightarrow k^\times$ is onto with finite fibers, because G is not commensurable with $Q_{1/0}$. If X_0 is a central fragment with shape s , then X_0 is a finite union of translates of G (Lemma 4.7), so the projection $\pi_1 : X_0 \rightarrow k^\times$ is again onto with finite fibers. Finally, if $X \subseteq \text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$ is a fragment with shape s , then X is a translate of X_0 , and so the projection $\pi_1 : X \rightarrow \text{RV}_a$ is again onto with finite fibers.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that D^s contains a vertical interval $\{a\} \times (b, c)$. Then for any $y \in (b, c)$, we have $(a, y) \in D^s$, so $\text{Shape}(D_{a,y}) = s$ and the projection $\pi_1 : D_{a,y} \rightarrow \text{RV}_a$ is onto with finite fibers. Fix some $u \in \text{RV}_a$. Let S_y be the slice of $D_{a,y}$ over u :

$$S_y = \{v \in \text{RV}_y : (u, v) \in D_{a,y}\}.$$

Then S_y is a finite nonempty subset of RV_y , and $\{S_y\}_{y \in (b,c)}$ is a bad family. \square

Now we can prove Theorem 4.18.

Proof (of Theorem 4.18). Take a cell decomposition $\overline{D} = \coprod_{i=1}^n C_i$. First, we rule out the case where some C_i has dimension 2. In this case, C_i is open. Take a point $(a, b) \in C_i$ and a small $\epsilon > 0$ such that C_i contains the box $(a - \epsilon, a + \epsilon) \times (b - \epsilon, b + \epsilon)$. Then C_i contains the graphs of the two functions $f, g : (a - \epsilon, a + \epsilon) \rightarrow \Gamma$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= b + (x - a) \\ g(x) &= b - (x - a) \end{aligned}$$

These two functions contradict Lemma 4.19 (with $d = 0$).

Therefore, every C_i is one-dimensional. If $\text{Stab}(s)$ is commensurable with $Q_{1/0}$, then D^s is a union of points and vertical line segments by Theorem 4.16, and there is nothing to prove. So we may assume that $\text{Stab}(s)$ is not commensurable with $Q_{1/0}$. Then Lemma 4.20 shows that D^s contains no vertical lines segments. Therefore every cell is either a point, or the graph $\Gamma(f)$ of a continuous definable function $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma$.

Claim 4.21. *If $\Gamma(f) \subseteq D^s$, then f is linear.*

Proof. For any small $\epsilon > 0$, let g and h be the restrictions of f to the intervals $(a, b - \epsilon)$ and $(a + \epsilon, b)$, respectively. The graphs of g and h are contained in D^s . By Lemma 4.19, the following function must be constant:

$$\begin{aligned} & (a, b - \epsilon) \rightarrow \Gamma \\ x & \mapsto h(x + \epsilon) - g(x) = f(x + \epsilon) - f(x) = \delta_\epsilon f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then f is linear, by Corollary 2.20. □

Now D^s is a finite union of points and graphs of linear functions. If

$$\begin{aligned} f & : (a, b) \rightarrow \Gamma \\ g & : (c, d) \rightarrow \Gamma \end{aligned}$$

are two linear functions whose graphs are contained in D^s , then the graphs must have the same slope by Lemma 4.19. In more detail, we can shrink b or d to make $b - a = d - c$. Let $\epsilon = c - a = d - b$, so that $\text{dom}(g) = (a + \epsilon, b + \epsilon)$. Then Lemma 4.19 implies that

$$g(x + \epsilon) - f(x) \text{ is a constant } u,$$

in which case $\Gamma(g) = (\epsilon, u) + \Gamma(f)$. Thus, the two line segments have the same slope. □

Putting everything together, we have proven the following:

Theorem 4.22. *Let D be a definable subset of RV^2 which is small over Γ^2 , in the sense that the fibers of $D \hookrightarrow \text{RV}^2 \rightarrow \Gamma^2$ have dimension at most 1.*

1. \overline{D} is a union of finitely many line segments.
2. If k^\times has no exotic automorphisms, then \overline{D} is a union of finitely many line segments with rational slopes.
3. For all but finitely many points of \overline{D} , the fragment $D_{x,y}$ is a finite union of translates of a 1-dimensional subgroup of $(k^\times)^2$.

Indeed, if $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\} = \{\text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) : (x, y) \in \overline{D}\}$, then \overline{D} is the union of the finitely many sets $D^{s_1} \cup \dots \cup D^{s_n}$. Each of the sets D^{s_i} is a finite union of points and line segments by Theorems 4.11 and 4.18. In the absence of exotic automorphisms, we can assume that the slopes are rational (Theorem 4.16 plus Lemma 4.14). When s_i is asymmetric, D^{s_i} is finite (Theorem 4.11), and so $\text{Shape}(D_{x,y})$ is symmetric at all but finitely many (x, y) in \overline{D} . Then $D_{x,y}$ must be a finite union of cosets by Lemma 4.7.

We also note the following connection to dp-rank:

Theorem 4.23. *Let D be a definable subset of RV^2 . Then $\text{dp-rk}(D) \leq 1$ if and only if D is small over Γ^2 .*

Proof. First suppose $\text{dp-rk}(D) \leq 1$. Then the subset $D_{a,b} = D \cap (\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b)$ has dp-rank at most 1 for any $(a, b) \in \Gamma^2$. Dp-rank agrees with dimension and Morley rank on $\text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_b$, so $\dim(D_{a,b}) \leq 1$, and D is small over Γ^2 .

Conversely, suppose D is small over Γ^2 . By Lemma 4.8, we can partition \overline{D} into finitely many sets $D^{s_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup D^{s_n}$ such that $\text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) = s_i$ for $(x, y) \in D^{s_i}$. Let D_i be the part of D lying over D^{s_i} . It suffices to show that $\text{dp-rk}(D_i) \leq 1$ for each i . Replacing D with D_i , we may assume that $\overline{D} = D^s$ for some fixed shape s , i.e., $\text{Shape}(D_{x,y}) = s$ for every $(x, y) \in \overline{D}$.

If s is asymmetric, then $\overline{D} = D^s$ is finite by Theorem 4.11. Therefore, D is a finite union $\bigcup_{i=1}^n D_{a_i, b_i}$, where $\{(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)\}$ enumerates \overline{D} . Each of the fragments D_{a_i, b_i} has dimension ≤ 1 because D is small over Γ^2 , and dimension agrees with dp-rank on $\text{RV}_{a_i} \times \text{RV}_{b_i}$, so $\text{dp-rk}(D_{a_i, b_i}) \leq 1$ and $\text{dp-rk}(D) \leq 1$.

Next suppose that s is symmetric. Exchanging the two coordinates, we may assume that s is not commensurable with $Q_{1/0}$. Then $\overline{D} = D^s$ contains no vertical lines by Lemma 4.20, and it is one-dimensional by Theorem 4.18. Therefore, the projection $\pi_1 : \overline{D} \rightarrow \Gamma$ has finite fibers. Moreover, for any $(a, b) \in \overline{D}$, the projection $\pi_1 : D_{a,b} \rightarrow \text{RV}_a$ has finite fibers as in the proof of Theorem 4.18. It follows that the projection $\pi_1 : D \rightarrow \text{RV}$ has finite fibers. Otherwise, D contains an indiscernible sequence of distinct points $(x, y_1), (x, y_2), \dots$. Let $a = v(x)$ and $b_i = v(y_i)$, so that $(x, y_i) \in \text{RV}_a \times \text{RV}_{b_i}$. Then $(a, b_i) \in \overline{D}$. Because $\pi_1 : \overline{D} \rightarrow \Gamma$ has finite fibers, the set $\{b_1, b_2, \dots\}$ is finite, and so b_i is a constant b by indiscernibility. Then (x, y_i) is an infinite sequence of distinct points in $D_{a,b}$, contradicting the fact that $\pi_1 : D_{a,b} \rightarrow \text{RV}_a$ has finite fibers.

So $\pi_1 : D \rightarrow \text{RV}$ has finite fibers, as claimed. By properties of dp-rank, $\text{dp-rk}(D) \leq \text{dp-rk}(\text{RV}) \leq \text{dp-rk}(\mathbb{M}) = 1$. \square

5 Asymptotics and polynomial-boundedness

Theorem 5.1. *Let $f : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \Gamma$ be a definable linear function. Then $f(x) = g(x) + c$ for some definable endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and constant $c \in \Gamma$.*

Proof. For $b \in \Gamma$, define $g(b)$ to be $f(x+b) - f(x)$ for any x with $\{x, x+b\} \subseteq (a, +\infty)$. The choice of x doesn't matter because f is linear. The definable function g is an endomorphism because given b_1, b_2 , we have

$$g(b_1 + b_2) = f(x + b_1 + b_2) - f(x) = [f(x + b_1 + b_2) - f(x + b_2)] + [f(x + b_2) - f(x)] = g(b_1) + g(b_2)$$

for all sufficiently large x . Note that for $x, y > a$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f(y) &= g(x - y) = g(x) - g(y) \\ f(x) - g(x) &= f(y) - g(y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $f(x) - g(x)$ is some constant c . \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \text{RV}$ be definable.*

1. There is a ball $B \ni 0$, an endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and a constant $c \in \Gamma$ such that

$$v(f(x)) = g(v(x)) + c \text{ for } x \in B \setminus \{0\}.$$

2. If k^\times has no exotic automorphisms, then $g(x) = qx$ for some $q \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. Let $D = \{(\text{rv}(x), f(x)) : x \in \mathbb{M}^\times\}$. This set has dp-rank 1 as it is the image of \mathbb{M}^\times under a definable map. By Theorem 4.23, D is small over Γ^2 . The image in Γ^2 is

$$\overline{D} = \{(v(x), v(f(x))) : x \in \mathbb{M}^\times\}.$$

By Theorem 4.22, \overline{D} has a cell decomposition $\coprod_{i=1}^n C_i$ where each C_i is a point or a “line segment”—a vertical line segment or the graph of a linear function. Moreover, if k^\times has no exotic automorphisms then we can assume each line segment has rational slope.

As in the proof of Theorem 2.12, there is a cell C_i and a ball $B \ni 0$ such that

$$x \in B \setminus \{0\} \implies (v(x), v(f(x))) \in C_i,$$

and C_i must be the graph of a continuous definable function $h : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \Gamma$, so that

$$x \in B \setminus \{0\} \implies v(f(x)) = h(v(x)).$$

Because C_i is a line segment, h must be a linear map, so $h(x) = g(x) + c$ for some endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$, by Lemma 5.1. If k^\times has no exotic automorphisms, then C_i has rational slope, so $g(x) = q \cdot x$ for some $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. \square

Say that “ Γ has no exotic automorphisms” if the only definable automorphisms of the ordered abelian group $(\Gamma, +, \leq)$ are multiplication by positive rational numbers. This is equivalent to the statement that the only definable endomorphisms $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ are $g(x) = qx$ for rational q .

Theorem 5.3. *If k^\times has no exotic automorphisms or Γ has no exotic automorphisms, then \mathbb{M} is polynomially bounded: for any definable function $f : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$, there is some n such that*

$$v(f(x)) > n \cdot v(x)$$

for all x outside a bounded set.

Proof. Applying Lemma 5.2 to the function $\text{rv}(f(1/x))$, we get a punctured ball $B \setminus \{0\}$ and a rational number q such that

$$x \in B \setminus \{0\} \implies v(f(1/x)) = q \cdot v(x) = -q \cdot v(1/x).$$

This implies that f is polynomially bounded. \square

6 The exchange property

The group \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} is the set of closed balls of valuative radius 0. The zero element $0 \in \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$ “is” the valuation ring \mathcal{O} . If $B \in \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\}$, define $\text{rv}(B)$ to be $\text{rv}(x)$ for any element $x \in B$. This is well-defined, because if $x, y \in B$, then

$$\begin{aligned} x - y &\in \mathcal{O} \text{ but } x, y \notin \mathcal{O} \\ v(x - y) &\geq 0 > v(y) \\ \text{rv}(x) &= \text{rv}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, define $v(B)$ to be $v(x)$ for any $x \in B$. This makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\} & \xrightarrow{\text{rv}} & \text{RV} \\ & \searrow v & \downarrow \\ & & \Gamma, \end{array}$$

where $\text{RV} \rightarrow \Gamma$ is the usual map. Note that $v(B) < 0$ for non-zero $B \in \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$.

We can apply the ideas from the proofs of Theorems 2.13 and 5.3 to the setting of definable functions $\mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$, yielding the following:

Lemma 6.1. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be definable and infinite and $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$ be definable and injective.*

1. *There is a ball $B_1 \subseteq D$ and a definable continuous function $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that*

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = h(v(x - y))$$

for distinct $x, y \in B_1$.

2. *There is a ball $B_2 \subseteq D$, a definable endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$, and a constant $c \in \Gamma$ such that*

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = g(v(x - y)) + c$$

for distinct $x, y \in B_2$.

Later in Lemma 6.3, we will see that the assumptions of Lemma 6.1 can never hold.

Proof. 1. The proofs of Theorems 2.12 and 2.13 work in this setting.

2. Let h and B_1 be as in part (1). Fix some $a \in B_1$. Applying Lemma 5.2 to the map

$$y \mapsto \text{rv}(f(y + a) - f(a)),$$

we get a definable endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$, a constant $c \in \Gamma$, and a ball $B_2 \ni a$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} y \in B_2 - a &\implies v(f(y + a) - f(a)) = g(v(y)) + c \\ x \in B_2 &\implies v(f(x) - f(a)) = g(v(x - a)) + c. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$x \in B_2 \implies v(f(x) - f(a)) = h(v(x - a)).$$

Then $h(z) = g(z) + c$ for any z greater than the radius of B_2 . It follows that

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = h(v(x - y)) = g(v(x - y)) + c$$

for any $x, y \in B_2$. □

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$ is a definable set and $c \in \Gamma$ is a constant such that*

$$v(x - y) = c \text{ for distinct } x, y \in D.$$

Then D is finite.

Proof. Suppose D is infinite. Note that $c = v(x - y) < 0$. Let U be the open ball of radius c . Then U/\mathcal{O} is infinite. The map

$$\begin{aligned} D \times (U/\mathcal{O}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} \\ (x, z) &\mapsto x + z \end{aligned}$$

is injective.³ But $D \times (U/\mathcal{O})$ has dp-rank at least 2, and \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} has dp-rank at most 1. □

Lemma 6.3. *If $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is infinite and definable, then there is no definable injection $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.1, there is a ball $B \subseteq D$, an endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$, and a constant c such that

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = g(v(x - y)) + c$$

for distinct $x, y \in B$. By o-minimality of Γ , the endomorphism g must fall into one of three cases:

1. g is increasing and $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} g(z) = +\infty$. Fix $a \in B$. As x approaches a , the valuation $v(x - a)$ approaches $+\infty$, and so

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} v(f(x) - f(a)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a} (g(v(x - a)) + c) = +\infty.$$

But $f(x) - f(a)$ is a non-zero element of \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} , so its valuation is negative, and the limit cannot approach $+\infty$.

³Indeed, if (x, z) and (y, w) map to the same point, then $x + z = y + w$, $x - y = w - z \in U/\mathcal{O}$, $v(x - y) > c$, $x = y$, and $z = w$.

2. g is decreasing and $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} g(z) = -\infty$. Take $x, y, z \in B$ with

$$v(x - y) > v(x - z) = v(y - z).$$

Applying the order-reversing function $g(z) + c$, we get

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) < v(f(x) - f(z)) = v(f(y) - f(z)).$$

This is impossible. For example, taking points x', y', z' in $f(x), f(y), f(z)$, respectively, we get

$$v(x' - y') < v(x' - z') = v(y' - z'),$$

a violation of the triangle inequality.

3. g is identically zero. Then

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = c \text{ for distinct } x, y \in B. \quad (*)$$

Let $D = \{f(x) : x \in B\}$. Then the set D contradicts Lemma 6.2. \square

Theorem 6.4. \mathbb{M} has the exchange property.

Proof. Suppose not. By [7, Proposition 6.1], there is a “bad function”. Whatever the definition of bad function is, it at least gives us a definable bijection between an infinite definable set $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, and an infinite definable antichain in the class \mathcal{B} of closed balls. That is, there is a definable injection $f : D \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$f(x) \cap f(y) = \emptyset \text{ for distinct } x, y \in B.$$

Let $g(x)$ be the radius of $f(x)$. By Fact 2.10, the function g is locally constant almost everywhere. Shrinking D , we may assume that g is constant. Then f is a definable injection from D to the class of closed balls of radius γ , for some fixed $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Rescaling, we may assume $\gamma = 0$. Then f is a definable injection from B to \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} , contradicting Lemma 6.3. \square

Remark 6.5. The definition of “bad function” gives much more than an injection from D to an antichain in \mathcal{B} . One even gets an isomorphism of \mathcal{C} -structures. Using this, one can probably streamline the proof of Theorem 6.4. For example, one can essentially avoid Lemma 6.2 as well as Cases 2 and 3 in the proof of Lemma 6.3. We have avoided this streamlined approach in order to minimize the use of \mathcal{C} -structures.

Corollary 6.6. *The theory T is geometric.*

Proof. We need to check that T has the exchange property and eliminates \exists^∞ . The first part is Theorem 6.4. The second part is a trivial consequence of \mathcal{C} -minimality. Indeed, $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is infinite if and only if it contains a ball. \square

6.1 A variant of Lemma 6.1

Assaf Hasson suggested the following variant of Lemma 6.1:

Proposition 6.7. *Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$ be definable and infinite, and let $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}$ be definable and injective. Then there is a ball $B \subseteq D$ and a linear function $g : [-\gamma, \gamma] \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that $g(0) = 0$, and*

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = g(v(x - y)) \quad (\dagger)$$

for distinct $x, y \in B$. If k^\times has no exotic automorphisms, then we can take g to be $g(x) = q \cdot x$ for some rational q .

Proof. Because \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} is itself C -minimal, the analogue of Fact 2.10 holds: any definable function $D \rightarrow \Gamma^n$ is locally constant at all but finitely many points of D . Then Corollary 2.11 and Theorem 2.12–2.13 continue to hold in this setting. In particular, we can shrink D and arrange for (\dagger) to hold for some definable function $g : (-\gamma, 0) \rightarrow \Gamma_{<0}$, not necessarily linear. By the generic continuity of definable functions in C -minimal structures (applied to the C -minimal structure \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O}), we can shrink D and assume that f is continuous. Since the “value set” of \mathbb{M}/\mathcal{O} is $\Gamma_{<0}$, continuity of f means precisely that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^-} g(\gamma) = 0.$$

Fix some $a \in D$. The set $\{(rv(x - a), rv(f(x) - f(a))) : x \in D\} \subseteq RV \times RV$ has dp-rank 1, so its image in $\Gamma \times \Gamma$, the set

$$S = \{(v(x - a), v(f(x) - f(a))) : x \in D\} \subseteq \Gamma \times \Gamma,$$

must be a finite union of points and line segments, and the line segments must have rational slopes unless k^\times has exotic automorphisms. The set S is contained in the graph of g . As in the proof of Lemma 5.2, it follows that g is piecewise linear. In particular, g is linear on an interval of the form $(-\gamma, 0)$, for sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$. An easy exercise shows that g extends to a linear function on the interval $[-\gamma, \gamma]$. The fact that $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^-} g(\gamma) = 0$ implies that $g(0) = 0$. In the case where k^\times has no exotic automorphisms, g must be \mathbb{Q} -linear, so $g(x) = q \cdot x$ for some rational number q . \square

7 Definably complete C -minimal fields

In this section, **suppose that \mathbb{M} is definably complete**, meaning that if $\{B_a\}_{a \in D}$ is a definable chain of balls with radii approaching $+\infty$, then $\bigcap_{a \in D} B_a$ is non-empty.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ be definable. Let B be a closed ball. Suppose that $f(x) \in B$ for all sufficiently small x . Then there is an open ball $B' \subset B$ such that $f(x) \in B'$ for all sufficiently small x .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, $B = \mathcal{O}$. For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let

$$A_\gamma = \{\text{res}(f(x)) : x \in \mathbb{M}, v(x) > \gamma\}.$$

Then A_γ is a descending chain of non-empty subsets of k . By the orthogonality of Γ and k (Proposition 2.8), there are only finitely many A_γ . So there is some fixed definable set $A \subseteq k$ such that $A_\gamma = A$ for all sufficiently large γ . Take $\alpha \in A$. Then for every γ , there is x with $v(x) > \gamma$ and $\text{res}(f(x)) = \alpha$. That is, the set

$$\{x : \text{res}(f(x)) = \alpha\}$$

contains arbitrarily small points. By Fact 2.1, this set contains *all* sufficiently small x . Then we can take B' to be the residue class $\{y \in \mathcal{O} : \text{res}(y) = \alpha\}$. \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a non-empty definable chain of balls with empty intersection. There is a unique definable function $\rho : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \text{RV}$ with the following property:*

1. *If $a \in \mathbb{M}$, $B \in \mathcal{C}$, $a \notin B$, and $x \in B$, then $\text{rv}(a - x) = \rho(a)$.*

Moreover, $v(\rho(a))$ has the following two properties:

2. *If $v(\rho(a)) \geq r$, then there is a ball $B \in \mathcal{C}$ with radius $\geq r$.*
3. *If $B \in \mathcal{C}$ has radius r , then $v(\rho(a)) \geq r$ for $a \in B$.*

Intuitively, $\rho(a)$ is $\text{rv}(a - x)$ for a non-existent point x in the intersection $\bigcap \mathcal{C}$, and $v(\rho(a))$ measures how close a is to the intersection.

Proof. 1. Fix a point $a \in \mathbb{M}$. Then $a \notin \emptyset = \bigcap \mathcal{C}$, so there is at least one ball $B \in \mathcal{C}$ with $a \notin B$. Take any $x \in B$ and define

$$\rho(a, B) = \text{rv}(a - x).$$

This is well-defined because if $x, y \in B$, then

$$v(x - y) > v(a - x) = v(a - y) \tag{*}$$

thanks to the ball B which contains x and y but not a . But (*) implies $\text{rv}(a - x) = \text{rv}(a - y)$.

Moreover, if B and B' are two different balls in \mathcal{C} not containing a , then taking $x \in B \cap B'$ we see

$$\rho(a, B) = \text{rv}(a - x) = \rho(a, B').$$

Therefore $\rho(a, B)$ does not depend on B , and we can write it as $\rho(a)$. Definability of ρ is straightforward.

2. Suppose $v(\rho(a)) \geq r$. Take a ball $B \in \mathcal{C}$ not containing a . If the radius of B is at least r , we are done. Otherwise, the radius is less than r , so there are $x, y \in B$ with $v(x - y) < r$. Then

$$\text{rv}(a - x) = \rho(a) = \text{rv}(a - y)$$

implying that

$$v(a - x) < v(x - y) < r.$$

But $\rho(a) = \text{rv}(a - x)$, so

$$v(\rho(a)) = v(a - x) < r \leq v(\rho(a)),$$

a contradiction.

3. Suppose $B \in \mathcal{C}$ has radius r and $a \in B$. Take $B' \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $a \notin B'$. Then $B' \subsetneq B$. Take $x \in B'$. By definition of ρ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(a) &= \text{rv}(a - x) \\ v(\rho(a)) &= v(a - x) \geq r. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Theorem 7.3. *Let $B \ni 0$ be a ball and $f : B \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ be a definable function. Then $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{M} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

Here, $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x) = \infty$ means that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} 1/f(x) = 0$. Theorem 7.3 was proved by Cubides Kovacsics and Delon [4, Lemma 5.3] under an additional assumption on Γ , building off an earlier result of Delon [5, Proposition 4.5].⁴

Proof. By Corollary 2.2, we may shrink B and assume that one of the following holds:

- $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}$ for all x .
- $f(x) \notin \mathcal{O}$ for all x .

Replacing $f(x)$ with $1/f(x)$, we may assume the first case: $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}$.

Let \mathcal{C} be the definable class of (open and closed) balls B' with the property that $f(x) \in B'$ for all sufficiently small x . We have just arranged $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{C}$, and so \mathcal{C} is non-empty. Moreover, \mathcal{C} is a chain, because if B_1, B_2 are two incomparable balls in \mathcal{C} , then $f(x) \in B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ for sufficiently small x .

First suppose that $\bigcap \mathcal{C}$ is non-empty, containing a point a . By Lemma 5.2 applied to $\text{rv}(f(x) - a)$, there is an endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and constant $c \in \Gamma$ such that

$$v(f(x) - a) = g(v(x)) + c$$

for all sufficiently small x . There are three cases:

⁴It's possible that Cubides Kovacsics and Delon's proof would apply here with minimal changes. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to understand the proof of [5, Proposition 4.5].

1. g is increasing and $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} g(z) = +\infty$. Then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} v(f(x) - a) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} (g(v(x)) + c) = +\infty,$$

and so $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x) = a$.

2. g is decreasing and $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} g(z) = -\infty$. Then $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} v(f(x) - a) = -\infty$, contradicting the fact that $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}$.

3. g is zero and so

$$v(f(x) - a) = c \text{ for all sufficiently small } x. \quad (*)$$

Let $B' = \{y \in \mathbb{M} : v(y - a) \geq c\}$. Then $f(x) \in B'$ for all sufficiently small x . By Lemma 7.1, there is a smaller open ball $B'' \subset B'$ such that $f(x) \in B''$ for sufficiently small x . Then $B'' \in \mathcal{C}$, so $a \in B''$. This forces B'' to be the open ball $\{y \in \mathbb{M} : v(y - a) > c\}$, or a subset. Thus

$$v(f(x) - a) > c \text{ for all sufficiently small } x,$$

contradicting $(*)$.

Otherwise, $\bigcap \mathcal{C}$ is empty. Consequently, \mathcal{C} contains no minimum. Let r_∞ be the supremum of the radii of balls in \mathcal{C} . By definable completeness, $r_\infty < +\infty$. In other words, \mathcal{C} witnesses a failure of definable spherical completeness, but not a failure of definable completeness. No ball in \mathcal{C} has radius exactly r_∞ , or else \mathcal{C} would contain a minimum.

Let $\rho : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \text{RV}$ be as in Lemma 7.2. By Lemma 7.2(2),

$$v(\rho(a)) < r_\infty \text{ for } a \in \mathbb{M}. \quad (\dagger)$$

On the other hand,

Claim 7.4. *If $r < r_\infty$, then $v(\rho(f(x))) \geq r$ for all sufficiently small x .*

Proof. By definition of r_∞ , there is a ball $B \in \mathcal{C}$ with radius at least r . By definition of \mathcal{C} , we have $f(x) \in B$ for all sufficiently small x . Then $v(\rho(f(x))) \geq r$ by Lemma 7.2(3). \square_{Claim}

Therefore, as x approaches 0, $v(\rho(f(x)))$ approaches r_∞ from below.

By Lemma 5.2 applied to $\rho(f(x))$, there is a definable endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and constant $c \in \Gamma$ such that

$$v(\rho(f(x))) = g(v(x)) + c.$$

As x goes to zero, the left hand side approaches r_∞ . This can only happen if g vanishes and $c = r_\infty$. Then

$$v(\rho(f(x))) = r_\infty$$

for all sufficiently small x , *contradicting* (\dagger) . \square

Combining this with the results on asymptotics, we get an interesting corollary:

Theorem 7.5. *Let $f : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^\times$ be definable. Then there is a definable multiplicative endomorphism $g : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^\times$ and a constant $c \in \mathbb{M}^\times$ such that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x)/g(x) = c$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 5.2 to $\text{rv}(f(x))$, we get an endomorphism $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and constant γ such that

$$v(f(x)) = h(v(x)) + \gamma$$

for sufficiently small $x \neq 0$. For any constant $a \in \mathbb{M}^\times$, we then have

$$v\left(\frac{f(ax)}{f(x)}\right) = v(f(ax)) - v(f(x)) = h(v(ax)) - h(v(x)) = h(v(ax) - v(x)) = h(v(a))$$

for sufficiently small x . It follows that $f(ax)/f(x)$ is confined to the annulus $\{y \in \mathbb{M}^\times : v(y) = h(v(a))\}$. Define

$$g(a) := \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(ax)}{f(x)}.$$

By Theorem 7.3, $g(a)$ exists and lives in the annulus. In particular, $g(a) \in \mathbb{M}^\times$ rather than $g(a) = \infty$ or $g(a) = 0$. Moreover,

$$v(g(a)) = h(v(a)). \tag{*}$$

Given $a, b \in \mathbb{M}^\times$,

$$g(a) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(abx)}{f(bx)}$$

and so

$$g(ab) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{f(abx)}{f(bx)} \cdot \frac{f(bx)}{f(x)} \right) = g(a)g(b).$$

Thus g is a definable multiplicative endomorphism. Finally, note that

$$v\left(\frac{f(x)}{g(x)}\right) = v(f(x)) - v(g(x)) = h(v(x)) + \gamma - h(v(x)) = \gamma$$

for sufficiently small x , by (*). Applying Theorem 7.3 again,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = c$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{M}^\times$ with $v(c) = \gamma$. □

It is worth noting the following about definable endomorphisms of \mathbb{M}^\times :

Theorem 7.6. *Let $f : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^\times$ be a definable endomorphism.*

1. There is a definable endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that

$$v(f(x)) = g(v(x)).$$

2. If k^\times has no exotic automorphisms or Γ has no exotic automorphisms, then $g(x) = q \cdot x$ for some rational number q .

3. If $g(x) = q \cdot x$ for some rational number q , then $q = n/p^m$ where p is the characteristic exponent of \mathbb{M} and n, m are integers. Moreover, $f(x) = x^{n/p^m}$.

Proof. For (1) and (2), Lemma 5.2 gives an endomorphism g and a constant c such that

$$v(f(x)) = g(v(x)) + c \tag{*}$$

for all sufficiently small x . Moreover, g has the form $q \cdot x$ unless both Γ and k^\times have exotic automorphisms.

Fix some $a \in \mathbb{M}^\times$. Take x so small that (*) holds for both x and ax . Then

$$\begin{aligned} v(f(ax)) &= g(v(ax)) + c \\ v(f(x)) &= g(v(x)) + c \\ \text{and so } v(f(a)) &= g(v(a)) \end{aligned}$$

by subtracting the second line from the first. This proves (1) and (2).

For part (3), first suppose that $g(x) = q \cdot x$ for some q of the form n/p^m . Then $v(f(x)) = q \cdot v(x) = v(x^q)$. We must show that $f(x) = x^q$. Replacing $f(x)$ with $f(x)/x^q$, we may assume $q = 0$, so that $v(f(x)) = 0$ for all x . We must show that $f(x) = 1$. Note that f is a definable homomorphism $\mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$. By Theorem 7.3,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x) = c$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{M} \cup \{\infty\}$. But $f(x)$ lies in the clopen set \mathcal{O}^\times , so in fact $c \in \mathcal{O}^\times$. For any $a \in \mathbb{M}^\times$, we have

$$c = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(ax) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(a)f(x) = f(a) \cdot c.$$

This is impossible unless $f(a) = 1$.

Next suppose that $g(x) = q \cdot x$ where q does *not* have the desired form. We must obtain a contradiction. Write q in lowest terms as $n/(p^m \ell)$, where $\ell > 1$ is prime to p . Note that

$$v(f(x)^\ell) = \ell \cdot q \cdot v(x) = (n/p^m) \cdot v(x).$$

By the case described above, we must have $f(x)^\ell = x^{n/p^m}$. Since f is a multiplicative endomorphism,

$$f(x^\ell) = x^{n/p^m} \text{ for any } x \in \mathbb{M}^\times.$$

Taking x to be a primitive ℓ th root of unity, we get a contradiction (the left side is 1 and the right side is not). \square

As a corollary, a definable endomorphism of \mathbb{M}^\times is determined by the induced map on Γ :

Corollary 7.7. *Let h, h' be two definable endomorphisms of \mathbb{M}^\times . Let g and g' be the corresponding definable endomorphisms of $(\Gamma, +)$, so that*

$$\begin{aligned} v(h(x)) &= g(v(x)) \\ v(h'(x)) &= g'(v(x)) \end{aligned}$$

If $g = g'$, then $h = h'$.

Proof. Let $h''(x) = h(x)/h'(x)$. Then h'' is a definable endomorphism of \mathbb{M}^\times , and the corresponding definable endomorphism of Γ is $g''(x) = g(x) - g'(x) = 0$. By Theorem 7.6(3), with $q = 0$, we see that $h''(x) = x^0 = 1$, so that $h(x) = h'(x)$. \square

We can also deduce asymptotic expansions of definable functions, under some special assumptions:

Theorem 7.8. *Suppose k^\times has no exotic automorphisms or Γ has no exotic automorphisms, and suppose \mathbb{M} has characteristic 0. Let X be a punctured neighborhood of 0 and $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ be a definable function. Then there is an increasing sequence of integers $m_1 < m_2 < \dots$ and elements $c_1, c_2, \dots \in \mathbb{M}$ such that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{\ell} c_n x^{m_n}}{x^{m_\ell}} = 0 \text{ for each } \ell.$$

In other words,

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\ell} c_n x^{m_n} + o(x^{m_\ell}) \text{ as } x \rightarrow 0,$$

so $f(x)$ has the asymptotic expansion $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n x^{m_n}$.

Proof. By Theorem 7.5 and Theorem 7.6(2-3), any non-zero definable function $f(x)$ on a punctured neighborhood of 0 has asymptotic behavior

$$f(x) \sim cx^m \text{ as } x \rightarrow 0,$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{M}^\times$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. The remainder $f(x) - cx^m$ is $o(x^m)$, so it has asymptotic expansion

$$f(x) - cx^m \sim c'x^{m'}$$

for some greater integer $m' > m$. Iterating this, we get the desired asymptotic expansion. \square

Cubides Kovacsics and Delon proved Theorem 7.8 in the special case where definable unary functions on Γ are eventually \mathbb{Q} -linear, a stronger assumption than “ Γ has no exotic automorphisms” [4, Theorem 6.1].

8 Strengthening limits

We need the following random technical fact.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a ball containing 0. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be definable and open. Let $f : U \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ be a definable function. Suppose that*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} f(a, y) = f(a, 0)$$

for every $a \in U$. Then f is continuous at $(a, 0)$ for all but finitely many $a \in U$.

Proof. Otherwise, $\{a \in U : f \text{ is discontinuous at } (a, 0)\}$ has non-empty interior by C -minimality. Shrinking U , we may assume that f is discontinuous at $(a, 0)$ for every $a \in U$. By generic continuity, we may shrink U and assume that the function $f(x, 0)$ is continuous for $x \in U$.

If $\epsilon \in \Gamma$ and $a \in U$, say that a is ϵ -good if $v(f(x, y) - f(a, 0)) > \epsilon$ for all (x, y) in a neighborhood of $(a, 0)$. Otherwise, say that a is ϵ -bad. Every $a \in U$ is ϵ -bad for sufficiently large ϵ , or else f would be continuous at $(a, 0)$.

Take distinct $a_1, a_2, \dots \in U$. Take ϵ_i such that a_i is ϵ_i -bad. By saturation, there is $\epsilon \geq \epsilon_i$ for every i . Then a_i is ϵ -bad for every i . Therefore, the set of ϵ -bad points is infinite, and contains a ball by C -minimality. Shrinking U , we may assume that every $a \in U$ is ϵ -bad (for some fixed ϵ).

Fix this ϵ . Say that $a \in U$ is *compatible with $\delta \in \Gamma$* if

$$v(y) > \delta \implies v(f(a, y) - f(a, 0)) > \epsilon.$$

The fact that $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} f(a, y) = f(a, 0)$ implies that every $a \in U$ is compatible with all sufficiently large δ . Take distinct a_1, a_2, \dots in U . Take δ_i compatible with a_i . Take δ greater than every δ_i . Then every a_i is compatible with δ . The set of $a \in U$ compatible with δ is definable and infinite, so it contains a ball. Shrinking U , we may assume that every $a \in U$ is compatible with δ .

Fix some $a_0 \in U$. By continuity of $f(x, 0)$, there is a ball $a_0 \in B' \subseteq U$ such that

$$a \in B' \implies v(f(a, 0) - f(a_0, 0)) > \epsilon.$$

If $a \in B'$ and $v(y) > \delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} v(f(a, 0) - f(a_0, 0)) &> \epsilon \\ v(f(a, y) - f(a, 0)) &> \epsilon \\ v(f(a, y) - f(a_0, 0)) &> \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The second line holds because a is compatible with δ . The third line holds by the ultrametric inequality. If $B(\gamma)$ denotes the open ball around 0 of radius γ , then we have just shown that

$$(a, y) \in B' \times B(\delta) \implies v(f(a, y) - f(a_0, 0)) > \epsilon.$$

Therefore a_0 is ϵ -good, contradicting the fact that every point in U is ϵ -bad. □

As an example, if f is differentiable, then f is strictly differentiable at almost all points:

Theorem 8.2. *Let B be a ball and $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ be a differentiable definable function. Then*

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (a,a)} \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{x - y} = f'(a)$$

for all but finitely many $a \in B$.

Proof. Translating, we may assume that $0 \in B$. Then B is a definable subgroup of $(\mathbb{M}, +)$, which simplifies some of the notation. Consider the definable function

$$g : B \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$$

$$g(a, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{f(a+y) - f(a)}{y} & \text{if } y \neq 0 \\ f'(a) & \text{if } y = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} g(a, y) = f'(a) = g(a, 0)$. Theorem 8.1 shows that for almost all $a \in B$,

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (a,0)} g(x, y) = g(a, 0) = f'(a).$$

Restricting to $y \neq 0$, this implies

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (a,0)} \frac{f(x+y) - f(y)}{y} = f'(a).$$

Modulo a change of variables, this is what we want. □

9 Generic differentiability

Theorem 9.1. *Suppose $\text{char}(\mathbb{M}) = 0$ and \mathbb{M} is definably complete. If $B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ is a ball and $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ is definable, then there is a smaller ball $B' \subseteq B$ on which f is differentiable.*

Consequently, f is differentiable at all but finitely many points of B .

Proof. By the proof of Lemma 6.1, we may shrink B and assume that f is continuous and that

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) = g(v(x - y)) + c \quad \text{for } x, y \in B$$

for some increasing endomorphism $g : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and constant c . For any fixed $a \in B$, Theorem 7.5 gives a definable endomorphism $h_a : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^\times$ and constant $c_a \in \mathbb{M}^\times$ such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{h_a(x - a)} = c_a.$$

Theorem 7.6 gives a definable endomorphism $g_a : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that $v(h_a(x)) = g_a(v(x))$ for sufficiently small x . Then for x sufficiently close to a , we have

$$v(f(x) - f(a)) = v(c_a) + v(h_a(x - a)) = v(c_a) + g_a(v(x - a))$$

but also

$$v(f(x) - f(a)) = c + g(v(x - a)).$$

Therefore $g = g_a$ and $c = v(c_a)$. In particular, g_a doesn't depend on a . By Corollary 7.7, h_a doesn't depend on a . Therefore, there is a fixed definable endomorphism $h : \mathbb{M}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^\times$ such that $h_a = h$ and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{h(x - a)} = c_a \in \mathbb{M}^\times \quad (*)$$

for all $a \in B$. By the proof of Theorem 8.2, we even get

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (a,a)} \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{h(x - y)} = c_a \in \mathbb{M}^\times \quad (\dagger)$$

for almost all $a \in B$. Fix such an a .

Claim 9.2. *If we extend h to a function $\mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ by setting $h(0) = 0$, then $h(u + v) = h(u) + h(v)$ for $u, v \in \mathbb{M}$.*

Proof. If $u, v \in \mathbb{M}$ are distinct, then

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a + uy) - f(a + vy)}{h(y)} = h(u - v) \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a + uy) - f(a + vy)}{h((a + uy) - (a + vy))} = h(u - v)c_a \quad (\ddagger)$$

by (\dagger) , because $h((a + uy) - (a + vy)) = h((u - v)y) = h(u - v)h(y)$. Equation (\ddagger) also holds when $u = v$, since then both sides are zero.

Now letting u and v be arbitrary, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(u)c_a + h(v)c_a &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a + (u + v)y) - f(a + vy)}{h(y)} + \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a + vy) - f(a)}{h(y)} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a + (u + v)y) - f(a)}{h(y)} = h(u + v)c_a. \end{aligned}$$

Cancelling a factor of c_a , we see that $h(u + v) = h(u) + h(v)$. \square

By the claim, it follows that h is a field embedding $\mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$. Let $F = \{x \in \mathbb{M} : h(x) = x\}$. Then F is a definable subfield of \mathbb{M} . Because $\text{char}(F) = \text{char}(\mathbb{M}) = 0$, F must be infinite. Then $\text{dp-rk}(F) = 1$. So $[\mathbb{M} : F] = \text{dp-rk}(\mathbb{M}) / \text{dp-rk}(F) = 1/1 = 1$, and $F = \mathbb{M}$, which means that $h(x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{M}$. Then $h = \text{id}_{\mathbb{M}}$, and finally $(*)$ says that f is differentiable. \square

By Theorem 8.2, we also get strict differentiability at almost all points.

9.1 Multi-variable generic differentiability and the inverse function theorem

Using techniques from [12, Sections 3 and 5], we can strengthen Theorem 9.1 to yield generic differentiability of functions in several variables, as well as the inverse function theorem.

First, we need an analogue of [12, Lemma 3.1]:

Fact 9.3. *Let $\{D_a\}_{a \in X}$ be a definable chain of subsets of \mathbb{M}^k , meaning that $\{D_a\}_{a \in X}$ is a definable family, $D_a \subseteq \mathbb{M}^k$ for any $a \in X$, and $D_a \subseteq D_b$ or $D_b \subseteq D_a$ for any $a, b \in X$. If $\dim(D_a) < k$ for all $a \in X$, then $\dim(\bigcup_{a \in X} D_a) < k$.*

The proof of [12, Lemma 3.1] applies almost verbatim, using Fact 3.2 about dp-minimal theories in [12]. Alternatively, Fact 9.3 is an instance of a general fact about visceral theories [13, Theorem 2.52(9)]: the dimension of a definable filtered union $\bigcup_{a \in X} D_a$ equals the maximum $\max_{a \in X} \dim(D_a)$.

Fact 9.3 then allows one to upgrade Theorem 8.1 to a statement in several variables:

Theorem 9.4. *Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a ball containing 0. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}^k$ be definable and open. Let $f : U \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ be a definable function. Suppose that $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} f(a, y) = f(a, 0)$ for every $a \in U$. Then*

$$\dim\{a \in U : f \text{ is discontinuous at } (a, 0)\} < k.$$

(Compare with Theorem 8.1 above, or [12, Lemma 3.4].)

Proof. We may assume U is non-empty, so $\dim(U) = k$. As in the proof of Theorem 8.1, we can assume that f is discontinuous at $(a, 0)$ for every $a \in U$, but $f(x, 0)$ is continuous on U . Say that $a \in U$ is ϵ -good if $v(f(x, y) - f(a, 0)) > \epsilon$ for all (x, y) in a neighborhood of $(a, 0)$, and ϵ -bad otherwise. As in the proof of Theorem 8.1, every $a \in U$ is ϵ -bad for sufficiently large ϵ . Then

$$U = \bigcup_{\epsilon} \{a \in U : a \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-bad}\},$$

so Fact 9.3 gives an ϵ such that

$$\dim\{a \in U : a \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-bad}\} = k.$$

Then the set $\{a \in U : a \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-bad}\}$ has non-empty interior. Shrinking U , we may assume that every point in U is ϵ -bad.⁵

Say that $a \in U$ is *compatible with δ* if

$$v(y) > \delta \implies v(f(a, y) - f(a, 0)) > \epsilon.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 8.1, every $a \in U$ is compatible with sufficiently large δ . By a similar argument to the above⁶, we can shrink U and arrange for every $a \in U$ to be compatible with some fixed $\delta \in \Gamma$.

⁵This is exactly the argument used to prove Lemma 3.1(2) in [13]. In fact, we could directly apply Lemma 3.1(2) here.

⁶Or another application of [13, Lemma 3.1(2)].

The remainder of the proof of Theorem 8.1 now applies verbatim, to give a contradiction. \square

Theorem 9.5. *Suppose $\text{char}(\mathbb{M}) = 0$ and \mathbb{M} is definably complete. If $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}^n$ is definable and open and $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^m$ is definable, then there is a definable open subset $U_0 \subseteq U$ such that f is strictly differentiable on U_0 , and $\dim(U \setminus U_0) < n$.*

Proof. The proof of [12, Theorem 5.14] applies verbatim, with the following changes:

- Use Theorem 9.1 instead of [12, Proposition 5.12], for single variable generic differentiability.
- Use Theorem 9.4 rather than [12, Lemma 3.4] for strengthening limits. \square

Next, we turn to the implicit function theorem. We need a replacement for the definable compactness used in [12]. To state it, we need some notation. If $\bar{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{M}^n$ is a tuple, let $v(\bar{c})$ denote $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} v(c_i)$. In \mathbb{M}^n , a *closed ball of radius γ* is a set of the form $\{x \in \mathbb{M}^n : v(x - a) \geq \gamma\}$. Equivalently, a closed ball of radius γ in \mathbb{M}^n is a set of the form $\prod_{i=1}^n B_i$ with B_i a closed ball of radius γ in \mathbb{M} . If \mathbb{M} is definably complete, then so is \mathbb{M}^n , in the sense that any definable chain of closed balls in \mathbb{M}^n with radii tending to $+\infty$ has non-empty intersection.

Lemma 9.6. *Suppose \mathbb{M} is definably complete. Let $\{D_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ be a definable family of non-empty closed subsets of \mathbb{M}^n , such that*

1. $D_\gamma \supseteq D_{\gamma'}$ for $\gamma' > \gamma$.
2. If $a, b \in D_\gamma$, then $v(a - b) \geq \gamma$.

Then $\bigcap_{\gamma \in \Gamma} D_\gamma \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $B_\gamma \subseteq \mathbb{M}^n$ be the unique closed ball of radius γ containing D_γ . By definable completeness, there is $a \in \bigcap_\gamma B_\gamma$. If $a \in \bigcap_\gamma D_\gamma$, we are done. Otherwise, $a \notin D_{\gamma_0}$ for some γ_0 . Since D_{γ_0} is closed, there is $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$ such that

$$b \in D_{\gamma_0} \implies v(a - b) < \gamma. \quad (\dagger)$$

Take $b \in D_\gamma \subseteq B_\gamma \cap D_{\gamma_0}$. Then $a, b \in B_\gamma$, so $v(a - b) \geq \gamma$, contradicting (\dagger) . \square

Using this, we get an analogue of [12, Lemma 5.15].

Lemma 9.7. *Let $\gamma_0 > 0$ be a positive element of Γ . Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{M}^n$ be a ball around 0. Let $f : B \rightarrow B$ be a function such that*

$$v(f(x) - f(y)) \geq \gamma_0 + v(x - y) \text{ for } x, y \in B.$$

1. *There is a unique $x \in B$ such that $f(x) = x$.*

2. For any $c \in B$, there is a unique $x \in B$ such that $f(x) = x - c$.

The assumption here is slightly stronger than [12, Lemma 5.15], which merely required $v(f(x) - f(y)) > v(x - y)$.

Proof. As in the proof of [12, Lemma 5.15], we only need to prove the existence part of (1). Let $g : B \rightarrow \Gamma$ be the function $g(x) = v(f(x) - x)$. Like in the proof of [12, Lemma 5.15], we get

$$g(f(x)) \geq \gamma_0 + g(x). \quad (*)$$

By o-minimality of Γ , the set $\{g(x) : x \in B\} \subseteq \Gamma$ has a supremum $\gamma \in \Gamma \cup \{+\infty\}$. Then (*) implies $\gamma + \gamma_0 = \gamma$, and so $\gamma = +\infty$. Therefore, for any $\epsilon \in \Gamma$, there is $x \in B$ with $g(x) = v(f(x) - x) \geq \epsilon$.

Let $D_\epsilon = \{x \in B : v(f(x) - x) \geq \epsilon\}$. Then D_ϵ is non-empty and definable. The function f is continuous because it is contracting, so D_ϵ is closed. Finally,

$$x, y \in D_\epsilon \implies v(x - y) \geq \epsilon.$$

Otherwise, the three conditions

$$\begin{aligned} v(f(x) - x) &\geq \epsilon \\ v(f(y) - y) &\geq \epsilon \\ v(x - y) &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

would imply $v(f(x) - f(y)) = v(x - y)$ by the ultrametric inequality, contradicting the fact f is contracting. Then Lemma 9.6 gives $a \in \bigcap_{\epsilon \in \Gamma} D_\epsilon$. So $a \in B$ and $v(f(a) - a) \geq \epsilon$ for all ϵ . This implies $f(a) = a$. \square

Theorem 9.8 (Inverse function theorem). *Suppose \mathbb{M} is definably complete. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{M}^n$ be a definable open set, and let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^n$ be a strictly differentiable definable function. Let $a \in U$ be a point such that the strict derivative $Df(a)$ (an $n \times n$ matrix) is invertible. Then there are open neighborhoods $U_0 \ni a$ and $V_0 \ni f(a)$ such that f restricts to a homeomorphism $U_0 \rightarrow V_0$, and the inverse map $f^{-1} : V_0 \rightarrow U_0$ is strictly differentiable.*

Proof. Fix some $\gamma_0 > 0$. Then the proofs of Lemma 5.16, Corollary 5.17, and Theorem 5.18 in [12] carry through verbatim with the following changes to the proof of Lemma 5.16:

- When applying [12, Fact 5.3] in the proof of Lemma 5.16, take $\gamma = \gamma_0 > 0$ rather than $\gamma = 0$, to get the stronger contraction assumption needed in Lemma 9.7.
- Apply Lemma 9.7(2) in place of [12, Lemma 5.15(2)]. \square

One can deduce a version of the implicit function theorem as a corollary. We leave the details as an exercise to the reader.

10 Future directions

In Section 4, we proved *some* facts about the induced structure on RV , but we did not fully classify definable sets $D \subseteq \text{RV}^2$, let alone definable sets $D \subseteq \text{RV}^n$. It would be nice to see how far these arguments can be pushed, hopefully making the ideas of Section 3 precise.

In light of the main results of this paper, an obvious question is

Question 10.1. *Is there a C -minimal field such that k^\times has exotic automorphisms?*

The induced structure on k can be an arbitrary strongly minimal expansion of ACF, so the question is really the following:

Question 10.2. *Is there a strongly minimal expansion of ACF in which k^\times has an exotic definable automorphism? Equivalently, is there a strongly minimal structure $(k, +, \cdot, \sigma)$ where σ is a non-algebraic multiplicative automorphism?*

Question 10.2 is a variant of a well-known open problem:

Question 10.3. *Is there a strongly minimal expansion of ACF in which k has an exotic definable field automorphism? Equivalently, is there a strongly minimal structure $(k, +, \cdot, \sigma)$ where σ is a non-algebraic field automorphism?*

Question 10.3 is only interesting in positive characteristic; it is easy to see that there are no exotic field automorphisms in characteristic 0. On the other hand, Question 10.2 remains open in characteristic 0. I suspect that in characteristic 0, it may be possible to construct exotic multiplicative automorphisms using techniques similar to the ones used to produce bad fields in [1] (but I could be wrong—I am far from an expert in this subject).

Another natural question is whether we can generalize the proof of the exchange property to other settings, such as weakly o-minimal fields, or more generally, dp-minimal fields. Some aspects of the proof generalize naturally, such as the dp-rank calculations. However, in other parts of the proof we use o-minimality and strong minimality. It's not clear what the analogue would be in other more general settings.

Lastly, it would be worthwhile to compare the proof of generic differentiability here to the proofs of generic differentiability in V-minimal fields [9, Corollary 5.17] and Hensel minimal fields [2, Lemma 5.3.5], and look for a common generalization. Perhaps the assumptions of Hensel minimality can be weakened.

Acknowledgments. The author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12101131) and the Ministry of Education of China (Grant No. 22JJD110002). The author would like to thank Françoise Delon, Frank Wagner, Tom Scanlon, and Silvain Rideau-Kikuchi for helpful information. This paper grew out of a report given at the 17th Asian Logic Conference in Tianjin; the author would like to thank the organizers of the conference. Lastly, the author would like to thank Assaf Hasson for suggesting adding Subsections 6.1 and 9.1.

References

- [1] Andreas Baudisch, Martin Hils, Amador Martin-Pizarro, and Frank O. Wagner. Die böse Farbe. *J. Institute Math. Jussieu*, 8(3):415–443, 2009.
- [2] Raf Cluckers, Immanuel Halupczok, and Silvain Rideau-Kikuchi. Hensel minimality I. *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, 10:e11, 2022.
- [3] Raf Cluckers, Immanuel Halupczok, Silvain Rideau-Kikuchi, and Floris Vermeulen. Hensel minimality II: mixed characteristic and a diophantine application. *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, 11:e89, 2023.
- [4] Pablo Cubides Kovacsics and Françoise Delon. Definable functions in tame expansions of algebraically closed valued fields. *Israel J. Math.*, 236:651–683, 2020.
- [5] Françoise Delon. Corps C -minimaux, en l’honneur de François Lucas. *Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse*, XXI(2):413–434, 2012.
- [6] Deirdre Haskell, Ehud Hrushovski, and Dugald Macpherson. *Stable domination and independence in algebraically closed valued fields*. Number 30 in Lectures Notes in Logic. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [7] Deirdre Haskell and Dugald Macpherson. Cell decompositions of C -minimal structures. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 66:113–162, 1994.
- [8] Assaf Hasson and Alf Onshuus. Embedded o-minimal structures. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 42:64–74, 2010.
- [9] Ehud Hrushovski and David Kazhdan. Integration in valued fields. In *Algebraic Geometry and Number Theory*, volume 253 of *Progress in Mathematics*, pages 261–405. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2006.
- [10] Ehud Hrushovski, Ya’acov Peterzil, and Anand Pillay. Groups, measures, and the NIP. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(2):563–596, April 2008.
- [11] Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay. Groups definable in local fields and pseudo-finite fields. *Israel J. Math.*, 85(1-3):203–262, 1994.
- [12] Will Johnson. Generic differentiability and P -minimal groups. arXiv:2404.17234v2 [math.LO], 2024.
- [13] Will Johnson. Visceral theories without assumptions. arXiv:2404.11453v2 [math.LO], 2024.
- [14] Dugald Macpherson. Model theory of valued fields. <http://www1.maths.leeds.ac.uk/Pure/staff/macpherson/modnetval4.pdf>, May 2008.

- [15] Dugald Macpherson and Charles Steinhorn. On variants of o -minimality. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 79:165–209, 1996.
- [16] Bruno Poizat. *Stable groups*, volume 87 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. Translated from the 1987 French original by Moses Gabriel Klein.
- [17] Lou van den Dries. *Tame Topology and O-minimal Structures*. Number 248 in London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1998.