

FLOWS OF LINEAR ORDERS ON SPARSE GRAPHS

ROB SULLIVAN

ABSTRACT. We consider the topological dynamics of the automorphism group of a particular sparse graph M_1 resulting from an ab initio Hrushovski construction. We show that minimal subflows of the flow of linear orders on M_1 have all orbits meagre, partially answering a question of Tsankov regarding results of Evans, Hubička and Nešetřil on the topological dynamics of automorphism groups of sparse graphs.

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper [13] of Kechris, Pestov and Todorčević established links between topological dynamics and structural Ramsey theory, with further developments in [17], [19], [2] (among others). We assume the reader is familiar with the background here, and briefly recall three key results, which we formulate for *strong* classes (classes of structures where we restrict to a particular subclass of permitted embeddings – see [4, Definition 2.1]):

Theorem ([2, Theorems 1.1 & 1.2, Corollary 3.3]). *Let G be a Polish group with universal minimal flow $M(G)$.*

- (1) *$M(G)$ is metrisable iff G has a coprecompact extremely amenable closed subgroup;*
- (2) *if $M(G)$ is metrisable, then $M(G)$ has a comeagre orbit.*

Theorem ([13, Theorem 4.8]). *Let M be a Fraïssé limit of a strong amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . Then $\text{Aut}(M)$ is extremely amenable iff (\mathcal{K}, \leq) is a Ramsey class of rigid structures.*

Theorem ([13, Theorem 10.8], [17, Theorem 5], [19, Theorem 5.7]). *Let M be the Fraïssé limit of an amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) , and let N be the Fraïssé limit of an amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) of rigid structures which is a reasonable strong expansion of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . Let $G = \text{Aut}(M)$, $H = \text{Aut}(N)$. Suppose (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) has the Ramsey property and the expansion property over (\mathcal{K}, \leq) , and suppose H is a coprecompact subgroup of G .*

Then the universal minimal flow $M(G)$ of G is metrisable and has a comeagre orbit. Explicitly, we have $M(G) = \widehat{G/H}$, the completion of the quotient G/H of the right uniformity on G .

(We can also describe the comeagre orbit explicitly – see the references for further details.)

The paper [4], which was the starting point for the current paper, showed that classes of sparse graphs used in Hrushovski constructions ([10], [11]) demonstrate different behaviour to classes previously studied in the KPT context. A graph A is *k-sparse* if for all finite $B \subseteq A$, we have $|E(B)| \leq k|B|$. It is well-known ([15]) that a graph is *k-sparse* iff it is *k-orientable*. We take $k = 2$ for presentational simplicity.

Date: June 10, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 03C15, 37B05, 20B27, 05C55, 05D10.

Key words and phrases. sparse graphs, Hrushovski constructions, admissible orders, meagre orbits, orientations.

This project formed the second part of the PhD of the author at Imperial College London, under the supervision of Prof David Evans.

We briefly describe the classes $\mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_F$ of sparse graphs found in [4]. Let \mathcal{C}_0 denote the class of finite 2-sparse graphs. For $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_0$, we write $A \leq_s B$ if there exists a 2-orientation of B in which A is successor-closed (by [6, Lemma 1.5], this is equivalent to another phrasing in terms of predimension). With this notion of \leq_s -substructure, we have the free amalgamation class (\mathcal{C}_0, \leq_s) with Fraïssé limit M_0 (this structure, an “ab initio Hrushovski construction”, was first described in [11]).

We also have a “simplified” version of M_0 , first considered in [6]. Let \mathcal{D}_1 denote the class of finite 2-oriented graphs with no directed cycles, and let \mathcal{C}_1 be the class of graph reducts of structures in \mathcal{D}_1 . For $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_1$, write $A \leq_1 B$ if there exists an expansion $B^+ \in \mathcal{D}_1$ in which A is successor-closed. Then (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) is again a free amalgamation class, whose Fraïssé limit we denote by M_1 .

The structures M_0, M_1 are not ω -categorical, but if we consider 2-sparse graphs whose predimension is greater than a certain control function F with logarithmic growth, and take another notion of \leq_d -substructure (where the predimension strictly increases), we obtain an ω -categorical Fraïssé limit M_F (see [4] and [3, Section 3] for details).

We then have:

Theorem ([4, Theorems 3.7, 3.16]). *Let $M = M_1, M_0, M_F$. Then $\text{Aut}(M)$ has no cocompact extremely amenable closed subgroup, and so its universal minimal flow is non-metrizable.*

Equivalently, by [13, Theorem 4.8], we have that M has no cocompact Ramsey expansion.

The case of M_F is particularly interesting as it shows that the automorphism group of an ω -categorical structure need not have “tame” dynamics in the sense of metrisability of the universal minimal flow, and that ω -categorical structures are not necessarily tame from a structural Ramsey theory perspective either.

The paper [4] also investigates the existence of comeagre orbits. Let $\text{Or}(M)$ denote the $\text{Aut}(M)$ -flow of 2-orientations on M .

Theorem ([4, Theorem 5.2]). *Let $M = M_1, M_0, M_F$. Let Y be a minimal subflow of $\text{Or}(M)$. Then all $\text{Aut}(M)$ -orbits of Y are meagre.*

Note that if $M(G)$ has a comeagre orbit, then so does any minimal G -flow (see [1]), so the above result shows again that $\text{Aut}(M)$ for $M = M_1, M_0, M_F$ has non-metrizable universal minimal flow, using [2, Theorem 1.2]. In the context of the above result, T. Tsankov asked the following ([4, concluding remarks]):

Question (Tsankov). *Let $M = M_1, M_0, M_F$. Does $\text{Aut}(M)$ have a (non-trivial) metrisable minimal flow with a comeagre orbit?*

David Evans suggested that the author investigate the $\text{Aut}(M)$ -flow $\mathcal{LO}(M)$ of linear orders on M . We obtain the following result (the main result of this paper), for M_1 , the “simplified version” of M_0 (see Definition 2.4):

Theorem 4.1. *Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{LO}(M_1)$ be a minimal subflow. Then all $\text{Aut}(M_1)$ -orbits on Y are meagre.*

This result demonstrates that the phenomenon seen in [4, Theorem 5.2] occurs more generally for other flows on M_1 , partially answering the question of Tsankov. We also note in passing that M_1 is ω -saturated and its theory is ω -stable (see [6]).

To prove Theorem 4.1, we take the class of finite ordered graphs which \leq -embed into some element of the minimal flow Y , and show that this class fails to have the weak

amalgamation property – this gives the result, using Lemma 2.32. To show failure of the weak amalgamation property, we will use the Ramsey expansion given by the *admissible orders*, from [5, Section 3.1]. We discuss these in Section 3.

The author has not been able to extend Theorem 4.1 to M_0 and M_F , and believes that the proof strategy for M_1 would require significant modification for these cases. Partial results for M_0 (giving some information about minimal subflows of $\mathcal{LO}(M_0)$, and clarifying obstructions to the proof strategy) can be found in Chapter 5 of [18], the author’s PhD thesis.

Recall that we consider M_1 to be a “simplified version” of M_0 . It would be interesting to know if there is an analogous “simplified version” of M_F – if so, it may be possible to prove Theorem 4.1 for an ω -categorical structure. See [18, Chapter 7].

2. BACKGROUND

We briefly summarise the background required for Section 3 and Theorem 4.1. This section is mostly based on [4, Section 2].

All first-order languages considered in this paper will be countable and relational, unless specified otherwise. (For the Ramsey result that we use, we will also need to consider countable languages consisting of relation symbols and set-valued function symbols, as in [5].)

2.1. Graphs and oriented graphs: notation and setup. A *graph* $(A, E(A))$ consists of a *vertex set* A and an *edge set* $E(A) \subseteq A^{(2)}$ (where $A^{(2)}$ denotes the set of unordered pairs). Here we only work with *simple* graphs: graphs with no loops or multiple edges. A set $\rho_A \subseteq A^2$ is an *orientation* of $(A, E(A))$ if:

- for $xy \in E(A)$, exactly one of $(x, y), (y, x)$ is in ρ_A ;
- for $(x, y) \in \rho_A$, $xy \in E(A)$.

We refer to $(A, E(A), \rho_A)$ as an *oriented graph*. We usually just write (A, ρ_A) or A , the edge set being clear from context.

We work with graphs in first-order languages as usual: the *language of graphs* $L_{\text{graph}} = \{E\}$ with E binary, and a L_{graph} -structure (A, E_A) is then a graph if $E_A \subseteq A^2$ is symmetric and irreflexive. We expand L_{graph} to the language of oriented graphs $L_{\text{or}} = \{E, \rho\}$, where ρ is binary. A L_{or} -structure (A, E_A, ρ_A) is an oriented graph if ρ_A is an orientation of the graph $(A, E(A))$, where $E(A)$ is the edge set of unordered pairs induced by E_A . When we refer to a subgraph of a graph, or an oriented subgraph of an oriented graph, we mean an L_{graph} - or L_{or} -substructure respectively.

Definition 2.1. Let (A, ρ_A) be an oriented graph. If $(x, y) \in \rho_A$, we write $xy \in \rho_A$. We call xy an *out-edge* of x and an *in-edge* of y . We call y an *out-vertex* or *successor* of x , and x an *in-vertex* or *predecessor* of y . The *out-neighbourhood* $N_+(x)$ and *in-neighbourhood* $N_-(x)$ of x consist of the out-vertices and in-vertices respectively of x , and we define the *out-degree* $d_+(x) = |N_+(x)|$ and the *in-degree* $d_-(x) = |N_-(x)|$.

2.2. Sparse graphs: \mathcal{C}_0 and \mathcal{C}_1 .

Definition 2.2. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$. A graph A is *k-sparse* if for all $B \subseteq_{\text{fin}} A$, $|E(B)| \leq k|B|$. Let (A, ρ_A) be an oriented graph. We call ρ_A a *k-orientation* if for $x \in A$, $|N_+(x)| \leq k$. If an undirected graph A has a *k-orientation*, we say it is *k-orientable*.

The following well-known proposition ([15]) will be a key tool here.

Proposition 2.3 ([4], Th. 3.4). *A graph A is k -orientable iff it is k -sparse.*

For presentational simplicity, we will usually work with $k = 2$. Our results generalise straightforwardly for $k > 2$.

Definition 2.4. Let \mathcal{C}_0 be the class of finite 2-sparse graphs, and let \mathcal{D}_0 be the class of finite 2-oriented graphs. By Proposition 2.3 we have that \mathcal{C}_0 is the class of graph reducts of \mathcal{D}_0 .

Let \mathcal{D}_1 be the class of finite 2-oriented graphs with no directed cycles. By a slight abuse of terminology, we will refer to a 2-oriented graph with no directed cycles as an *acyclic 2-oriented graph*. Let \mathcal{C}_1 be the class of graph reducts of \mathcal{D}_1 .

We may also define \mathcal{C}_1 directly, as per the lemma below.

Lemma 2.5 ([6], Lem. 1.3). *A finite graph A has a k -orientation with no directed cycles iff every non-empty subgraph B has a vertex of degree $\leq k$ in B .*

Proof. \Rightarrow : Consider the induced orientation on B from an acyclic k -orientation on A . As this orientation is acyclic, B contains a vertex v which has no in-edges in B , and therefore the degree of v in B is equal to its out-degree in B , which is $\leq k$.

\Leftarrow : We use induction on $|A|$. For $|A| = 1$, the claim is trivial. For the inductive step, take a vertex $a \in A$ of degree $\leq k$. By assumption, we may give $A \setminus \{a\}$ an acyclic k -orientation. Then orient the edges of a outwards from a to produce an acyclic k -orientation of A . \square

Thus \mathcal{C}_1 consists of the finite graphs A where every non-empty subgraph $B \subseteq A$ has a vertex of degree ≤ 2 .

2.3. Strong classes. To produce amalgamation classes from the classes of structures defined in the previous section, we will consider certain distinguished subclasses of embeddings. We assume the reader is familiar with Fraïssé theory for strong classes: see [3, Section 3] for more details.

Definition 2.6. Let \mathcal{K} be a class of finite L -structures closed under isomorphisms. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \text{Emb}(\mathcal{K})$ be a class of embeddings between structures in \mathcal{K} which contains all isomorphisms and is closed under composition, and which also satisfies:

(*) if $f : A \rightarrow C$ is in \mathcal{S} and $f(A) \subseteq B \subseteq C$ with $B \in \mathcal{K}$, then $f : A \rightarrow B$ is in \mathcal{S} .

Then we call $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{S})$ a *strong class*, and call the elements of \mathcal{S} *strong embeddings*.

If $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$, $A \subseteq B$ and the inclusion map $\iota : A \hookrightarrow B$ is in \mathcal{S} , then we write $A \leq B$ and say A is a *strong substructure* of B . We have that \leq is reflexive and transitive, and if $A \leq C$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ with $B \in \mathcal{K}$, then $A \leq B$. We will often write (\mathcal{K}, \leq) instead of $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{S})$, and we will use different symbols resembling \leq (e.g. $\leq_1, \leq_s, \sqsubseteq_s$) to indicate different classes of embeddings.

Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong class. Then we have that for $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{S} , if $X \leq A$, then $f(X) \leq B$.

We now define strong substructures of infinite structures. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong class. Let $A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \dots$ be an increasing \leq -chain of structures in \mathcal{K} with union M . Let $A \subseteq_{\text{fin}} M$. Then we write $A \leq M$ to mean that there is some A_i ($i \geq 1$) with $A \leq A_i$. By (*), this definition is independent of the particular \leq -chain we consider.

Let $g \in \text{Aut}(M)$. It is easy to see that if $A \leq M$, then $gA \leq M$: that is, all $g \in \text{Aut}(M)$ preserve \leq .

2.4. Fraïssé theory for strong classes. The classical Fraïssé theory directly generalises to strong classes. (See [3, Section 3]. For the classical Fraïssé theory, originally developed in [8], see [9].)

Given a strong class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) , we define the joint embedding property (JEP), amalgamation property (AP) and free amalgamation as before, but we restrict to \leq -embeddings.

Definition 2.7. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong class, and let M be a union of an increasing \leq -chain of structures in \mathcal{K} . Let $\text{Age}_{\leq}(M)$ denote the class of finite structures which \leq -embed into M .

M has the \leq -extension property if for all $A, B \in \text{Age}_{\leq}(M)$ and \leq -embeddings $f : A \rightarrow M, g : A \rightarrow B$, there exists a \leq -embedding $h : B \rightarrow M$ with $hg = f$.

M is \leq -homogeneous if each isomorphism $f : A \rightarrow A'$ between finite $A, A' \leq M$ extends to an automorphism of M .

Definition 2.8. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong class. We say that (\mathcal{K}, \leq) is an *amalgamation class* or *Fraïssé class* if (\mathcal{K}, \leq) contains countably many isomorphism types, and has the joint embedding and amalgamation properties.

Theorem 2.9 (Fraïssé-Hrushovski). *Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be an amalgamation class. Then there is a structure M which is a union of an increasing \leq -chain, such that M is \leq -homogeneous and $\text{Age}_{\leq}(M) = \mathcal{K}$. Such an M is unique up to isomorphism.*

We call this structure the Fraïssé limit of \mathcal{K} .

2.5. Strong expansions. We will often have the situation where we have a strong class of L -structures together with a strong class of L^+ -structures (with a potentially different notion of distinguished embedding), where $L^+ \supseteq L$ is a relational language expanded from L .

Definition 2.10 ([4], Def. 2.9). Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong class of L -structures, and let (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) be a strong class of L^+ -structures. We call (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) a *strong expansion* of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) if:

- (1) \mathcal{K} is the class of L -reducts of \mathcal{K}^+ ;
- (2) for \leq^+ -strong $f : A^+ \rightarrow B^+, f : A^+|_L \rightarrow B^+|_L$ is \leq -strong;
- (3) for \leq -strong $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $A^+ \in \mathcal{K}^+$ an expansion of A , there exists an expansion $B^+ \in \mathcal{K}^+$ of B such that $f : A^+ \rightarrow B^+$ is \leq^+ -strong.

Lemma 2.11. *Let (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) be a strong expansion of the strong class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . If (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) is a (free) amalgamation class, then so is (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . If M^+ is the Fraïssé limit of (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) , then $M = M^+|_L$ is the Fraïssé limit of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) , and $\text{Aut}(M^+)$ is a closed subgroup of $\text{Aut}(M)$.*

The proof is straightforward.

Definition 2.12. A particular case of Definition 2.10 is the *order expansion* of a strong class. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong class of L -structures, and let $L^{\prec} = L \cup \{\prec\}$ with \prec binary. Let \mathcal{K}^{\prec} be the class of L^{\prec} -structures (A, \prec_A) , where $A \in \mathcal{K}$ and \prec_A is a linear order on A . For $(A, \prec_A), (B, \prec_B) \in \mathcal{K}^{\prec}$, write $(A, \prec_A) \leq (B, \prec_B)$ if $A \leq B$ and $\prec_A = \prec_B|_A$. We then have that $(\mathcal{K}^{\prec}, \leq)$ is a strong class and a strong expansion of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . We call $(\mathcal{K}^{\prec}, \leq)$ the *order expansion* of the strong class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) .

2.6. Sparse graphs: \sqsubseteq_s and \leq_1 . We will now describe the distinguished notions of embedding involved in defining particular strong classes for \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{D}_1 . (The material in this section is based on Section 3.4 of [4], and for \leq_1 was originally developed in [7].)

Definition 2.13. Let A be an oriented graph. For $B \subseteq A$, we write $B \sqsubseteq_s A$ to mean that B is *successor-closed* in A : for $b \in B$, if $ba \in \rho_A$ then $a \in B$. Note that intersections of successor-closed subsets are also successor-closed. For $B \subseteq A$, the *successor-closure* $\text{scl}(B)$ is the smallest successor-closed subset of A containing B .

Definition 2.14. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_1$ with $A \subseteq B$. We write $A \leq_1 B$ if there exists an acyclic 2-orientation $B^+ \in \mathcal{D}_1$ of B in which the induced orientation $A^+ \in \mathcal{D}_1$ on A has $A^+ \sqsubseteq_s B^+$.

Lemma 2.15. Let $B \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

- (1) $A \leq_1 B, X \subseteq B \Rightarrow A \cap X \leq_1 X$.
- (2) $A \leq_1 C \leq_1 B \Rightarrow A \leq_1 B$.
- (3) $A_1, A_2 \leq_1 B \Rightarrow A_1 \cap A_2 \leq_1 B$.

The above three statements also hold for $B \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and \sqsubseteq_s .

Proof. (1): immediate. (2): let B^+ be an acyclic 2-orientation of B in which C is successor-closed. Create a new acyclic 2-orientation B^{++} on B by taking B^+ and replacing the induced orientation on C with an acyclic 2-orientation on C in which A is successor-closed. Then A is successor-closed in B^{++} . (3): follows from (1) and (2).

For $B \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and \sqsubseteq_s , the proof of the above three statements is straightforward. \square

By the above lemma (and similar arguments to the proof of (2) in Lemma 2.15), we have that:

Lemma 2.16. (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) and $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ are strong classes with free amalgamation, and $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ is a strong expansion of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) .

Let M_1 be the Fraïssé limit of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) and let $G_1 = \text{Aut}(M_1)$.

2.7. Topological dynamics and Ramsey classes. A G -flow is a continuous action $G \curvearrowright X$ of a Hausdorff topological group G on a nonempty compact Hausdorff topological space X . We will often simply write X to refer to the G -flow $G \curvearrowright X$ when this is clear from context. Given $G \curvearrowright X$, the orbit closure $\overline{G \cdot x}$ of a point $x \in X$ is a G -invariant compact subset of X . In general, a nonempty compact G -invariant subset $Y \subseteq X$ defines a *subflow* by restricting the G -action to Y . A G -flow on X is *minimal* if it contains no proper subflows. A G -flow is minimal iff every orbit is dense. By Zorn's lemma, every G -flow contains a minimal subflow.

Let X, Y be G -flows. A G -flow morphism $X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous map $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\pi(g \cdot x) = g \cdot \pi(x)$ (this property is called G -equivariance). Bijective G -flow morphisms are isomorphisms, as they are between compact Hausdorff spaces. If Y is minimal, then any G -flow morphism $X \rightarrow Y$ is surjective, as the image is a subflow.

Definition 2.17. Let G be a Hausdorff topological group. If every G -flow has a G -fixed point, we call G *extremely amenable*.

We now define the Ramsey property for strong classes. (This section is based on Section 2.2 of [4].)

Definition 2.18. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong class. For $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$, we write $\binom{B}{A} = \{A' \leq B : A' \cong A\}$ for the set of \leq -copies of A inside B . (Note that by the definition of a strong class, if $B \leq C \in \mathcal{K}$, then $\binom{B}{A} = \binom{C}{A} \cap \mathcal{P}(B)$.)

For $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}_+$, an r -colouring of the set $\binom{B}{A}$ is a function $\chi : \binom{B}{A} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$. We say that $\binom{B}{A}$ is *monochromatic* in the r -colouring χ if χ is constant on $\binom{B}{A}$.

For $A, B, C \in \mathcal{K}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we write $C \rightarrow (B)_r^A$ if for every r -colouring χ of $\binom{C}{A}$, there exists $B' \in \binom{C}{B}$ such that $\binom{B'}{A}$ is monochromatic in χ .

We say that (\mathcal{K}, \leq) has the *Ramsey property* if for $r \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists $C \in \mathcal{K}$ with $C \rightarrow (B)_r^A$.

The following is a well-known observation of Nešetřil ([16]) which shows a strong connection between Fraïssé theory and structural Ramsey theory (see [4, Theorem 2.11] for a proof):

Proposition 2.19. *Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be a strong, rigid class with JEP and the Ramsey property. Then (\mathcal{K}, \leq) has the amalgamation property.*

The following is one of the key results of [13], and establishes a link between topological dynamics and structural Ramsey theory:

Theorem 2.20 ([13], Th. 4.8; [17], Th. 1). *Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be an amalgamation class of rigid L -structures, with Fraïssé limit M and $G = \text{Aut}(M)$. Then G is extremely amenable iff (\mathcal{K}, \leq) has the Ramsey property.*

Here, a finite L -structure is *rigid* if it has trivial automorphism group.

2.8. Reasonable expansions and the expansion property. In this section, L^+ is an expansion of the language L .

Here we follow Section 2.3 of [4], which takes the notion of a reasonable expansion from [19].

Definition 2.21. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be an amalgamation class of L -structures. A class \mathcal{D} of finite L^+ -structures is a *reasonable expansion* of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) if \mathcal{D} is closed under isomorphisms and satisfies the following:

- (1) \mathcal{K} is the class of L -reducts of \mathcal{D} ;
- (2) for $A \in \mathcal{K}$, A has finitely many expansions in \mathcal{D} (*weak cocompactness*);
- (3) for $B^+ \in \mathcal{D}$, if $A^+ \subseteq B^+$ and $A^+|_L \leq B^+|_L$, then $A^+ \in \mathcal{D}$;
- (4) for $f : A \rightarrow B$ a strong embedding in (\mathcal{K}, \leq) , if $A^+ \in \mathcal{D}$ is an expansion of A , then there exists an expansion $B^+ \in \mathcal{D}$ of B such that $f : A^+ \rightarrow B^+$ is an embedding.

Note that if (\mathcal{K}^+, \leq^+) is a strong expansion of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) , then \mathcal{K}^+ satisfies properties (1) and (4) above.

Lemma 2.22. *For any amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) of L -structures, the order expansion \mathcal{K}^\prec of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) (see Definition 2.12) is a reasonable expansion of the class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) .*

The proof is straightforward.

Lemma 2.23. *The class \mathcal{D}_1 is a reasonable expansion of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) .*

Proof. As (\mathcal{D}_1, \leq_s) is a strong expansion of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) , we have that \mathcal{D}_1 satisfies (1) and (4) in the definition of reasonableness. Parts (2) and (3) are immediate. \square

Definition 2.24. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be an amalgamation class with Fraïssé limit M . Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable L^+ -expansion of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) .

Let $X(\mathcal{D})$ be the set consisting of the L^+ -expansions M^+ of M such that $M^+|_A \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $A \leq M$. (Here, $M^+|_A$ denotes the L^+ -structure induced on the domain of A by M^+ .) We define a topology on $X(\mathcal{D})$: for $B \leq M$ with expansion $B^+ \in \mathcal{D}$, we specify a basic open set $U(B^+) = \{M^+ \in X(\mathcal{D}) : M^+|_B = B^+\}$. We will see below that $X(\mathcal{D})$ gives a G -flow.

Lemma 2.25. *Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be an amalgamation class with Fraïssé limit M . Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable L^+ -expansion of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . Then for $A \leq M$ with expansion $A^+ \in \mathcal{D}$, there is an expansion $M^+ \in X(\mathcal{D})$ with $M^+|_A = A^+$.*

Proof. Write M as the union of an increasing \leq -chain $A = A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \dots$ starting at A . Let $A_1^+ = A^+$. By part (4) of reasonableness, we may inductively expand A_i to some A_i^+ ($i \geq 2$) such that $A_{i-1}^+ \leq A_i^+ \in \mathcal{D}$. We then take $M^+ = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} A_i^+$. For $B \leq M$, we have that $B \leq A_i$ for some i , so by part (3) of reasonableness, $M^+|_B \in \mathcal{D}$. So $M^+ \in X(\mathcal{D})$. \square

Lemma 2.26 (after Prop. 5.3, [19]). *Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable expansion of the amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . Let M be the Fraïssé limit of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) and let $G = \text{Aut}(M)$. Then $X(\mathcal{D})$ is a G -flow with the natural action.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.25, $X(\mathcal{D})$ is non-empty. It is straightforward to see that the action is continuous and $X(\mathcal{D})$ is Hausdorff. To see that $X(\mathcal{D})$ is compact, consider the topological space $Q = \prod_{A \leq M} \{A^+ \mid A^+ \text{ is an expansion of } A \wedge A^+ \in \mathcal{D}\}$, where each set of the product has the discrete topology and Q has the product topology. Using part (2) of reasonableness, we have that Q is compact. We define a map $\gamma : X(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow Q$, $\gamma(M^+) = (M^+|_A)_{A \leq M}$, and it is straightforward to see that γ is a homeomorphism onto its image. Thus it suffices to show that $\text{Im}(\gamma)$ is a closed subspace of Q . We have that

$$\text{Im}(\gamma) = \{(p_A)_{A \leq M} \in Q : \forall B \leq C \leq M, p_C|_B = p_B\},$$

and so if an element of Q lies in the complement of $\text{Im}(\gamma)$, this is witnessed on a finite set. \square

Definition 2.27. Let (\mathcal{K}, \leq) be an amalgamation class with Fraïssé limit M and $G = \text{Aut}(M)$. As the order expansion \mathcal{K}^\prec is a reasonable expansion of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) , we have that $X(\mathcal{K}^\prec)$ is a G -flow: we denote this by $\mathcal{LO}(M)$, the *flow of linear orders* on M .

As \mathcal{D}_1 is a reasonable expansion of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) , we have that $X(\mathcal{D}_1)$ is a G_1 -flow, which we denote by $\text{Or}(M_1)$, the *flow of orientations*. (Recall that M_1 is the Fraïssé limit of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) and $G_1 = \text{Aut}(M_1)$.)

Lemma 2.28. *Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable expansion of the amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . Let M be the Fraïssé limit of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) and let $G = \text{Aut}(M)$.*

Let Y be a subflow of $X(\mathcal{D})$. Let $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ be the class of finite L^+ -structures which \leq -embed into some element of Y . Then

- (1) \mathcal{D}' is a reasonable expansion of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) with $X(\mathcal{D}') = Y$;
- (2) if $Y = G \cdot M_0^+$ for some $M_0^+ \in X(\mathcal{D})$, then $\mathcal{D}' = \text{Age}_{\leq}(M_0^+)$.

(Part (1) is from [4, Lemma 2.16].)

Proof. (1): Parts (1), (2), (3) of reasonableness of \mathcal{D}' are straightforward, and (4) follows from the \leq -homogeneity of M and the G -invariance of Y . Clearly $Y \subseteq X(\mathcal{D}')$. To see that $X(\mathcal{D}') \subseteq Y$, take $M^+ \in X(\mathcal{D}')$. It remains to show that $M^+ \in \text{cl}_{X(\mathcal{D}')} (Y) = Y$: this follows from the \leq -homogeneity of M and the G -invariance of Y .

(2): Let $A^+ \in \mathcal{D}'$. By the definition of \mathcal{D}' we may assume $A^+ \leq M_1^+$ for some $M_1^+ \in Y$. As $Y = G \cdot M_0^+$, there is $g \in G$ such that $A^+ = M_1^+|_A = (gM_0^+)|_A$, so A^+ \leq -embeds into M_0^+ and thus $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \text{Age}_{\leq}(M_0^+)$. The reverse inclusion is immediate as $M_0^+ \in Y$. \square

Definition 2.29. Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable expansion of the amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . We say that \mathcal{D} has the *expansion property* over (\mathcal{K}, \leq) if for $A \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists B in \mathcal{K} with $A \leq B$ such that for all expansions A^+, B^+ of A, B in \mathcal{D} , there exists a \leq -embedding $A^+ \rightarrow B^+$.

It is easy to see that to prove the expansion property for \mathcal{D} , it suffices to show that for $A^+ \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{K}$ such that for all expansions $B^+ \in \mathcal{D}$ of B , there exists a \leq -embedding $A^+ \rightarrow B^+$ (use weak coprecompactness of \mathcal{D} and JEP for \mathcal{K}).


Theorem 2.30 ([17], Th. 4). *Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable expansion of the amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) with Fraïssé limit M and $G = \text{Aut}(M)$.*

Then the G -flow $X(\mathcal{D})$ is minimal iff \mathcal{D} has the expansion property over (\mathcal{K}, \leq) .

2.9. Meagre orbits. We now introduce the weak amalgamation property (WAP), which will be essential in the proof of Theorem 4.1. (WAP was first defined in [14]. A similar property (the almost amalgamation property) was previously defined in [12].)

Definition 2.31. Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable class of L^+ -expansions of an L -amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . We say that (\mathcal{D}, \leq) has the *weak amalgamation property* (WAP) if:

for all $A \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists $B \in \mathcal{D}$ and a \leq -strong L^+ -embedding $f : A \rightarrow B$ such that, for any \leq -strong L^+ -embeddings $f_i : B \rightarrow C_i \in \mathcal{D}$ ($i = 0, 1$), there exists $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and \leq -strong L^+ -embeddings $g_i : C_i \rightarrow D$ ($i = 0, 1$) with $g_0 \circ f_0 \circ f = g_1 \circ f_1 \circ f$. (Note that here we specify only that the diagram commutes for A .)



Lemma 2.32 ([4, Lemma 2.23] - adapting [14, Theorem 3.4]). *Let \mathcal{D} be a reasonable class of L^+ -expansions of an L -amalgamation class (\mathcal{K}, \leq) . Let M be the Fraïssé limit of (\mathcal{K}, \leq) and let $G = \text{Aut}(M)$. Suppose that $X(\mathcal{D})$ is a minimal flow.*

If (\mathcal{D}, \leq) does not have the weak amalgamation property, then all G -orbits on $X(\mathcal{D})$ are meagre.

For a proof, see [18, Lemma 1.77].

3. ADMISSIBLE ORDERS: A RAMSEY EXPANSION OF $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$

We now provide an explicit description of a Ramsey expansion of $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$, given by the *admissible orders* on $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$, using Theorem 1.4 of [5]. This will be an essential tool in the proof of Theorem 4.1. (This Ramsey expansion will also have the expansion property over $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$, though we will not use this in the proof of Theorem 4.1.) In the below two definitions, we adapt definitions from [5, Section 1 and Section 3] to the specific case of $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$.

Definition 3.1. Let $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$. For $a \in A$, let $a^\circ = \text{scl}_A(a) \setminus \{a\}$.

For $a \in A$, we inductively define the *level* $l_A(a)$ of a as follows. If $\text{scl}_A(a) = \{a\}$, then $l_A(a) = 0$. Otherwise, let b be a vertex of a° of maximum level, and then define $l_A(a) = l_A(b) + 1$. We write $L_n(A)$ ($n \geq 0$) for the set of vertices of A of level n .

We say that $a, b \in A$ are *homologous* if $a^\circ = b^\circ$ and there is an isomorphism $\text{scl}_A(a) \rightarrow \text{scl}_A(b)$ which is the identity on $a^\circ = b^\circ$. We let $Q_A(a)$ denote the set of vertices of A homologous to a , and call $Q_A(a)$ the *cone* of a .

If there is $a \in A$ with $A = \text{scl}_A(a)$, we call A a *closure-extension* with *head vertex* a , and write $A^\circ = a^\circ$. (Note that a is necessarily unique.)

Definition 3.2. Fix a linear order \trianglelefteq on the set of isomorphism types of ordered closure-extensions A^\sphericalangle such that:

- (*) if $|A| < |B|$, then $A^\sphericalangle \triangleleft B^\sphericalangle$.

We say that a class $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1^\sphericalangle$ is a *class of admissible orderings* of structures in \mathcal{D}_1 if:

- (1) each $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$ has an expansion $A^\sphericalangle \in \mathcal{O}$;
- (2) \mathcal{O} is closed under \sqsubseteq_s -substructures;
- (3) for $A^\sphericalangle \in \mathcal{O}$ and $u, v \in A$, if:
 - $\text{scl}_A(u)^\sphericalangle \triangleleft \text{scl}_A(v)^\sphericalangle$, or
 - $\text{scl}_A(u)^\sphericalangle \cong \text{scl}_A(v)^\sphericalangle$ and u° is lexicographically before v° in the order \prec_A , then $u \prec_A v$;
- (4) for each $B \in \mathcal{D}_1$, if $A_1, \dots, A_n \sqsubseteq_s B$ and \prec' is a linear order on $A = \bigcup_{i \leq n} A_i$ such that \prec' satisfies (3) and each A_i is admissibly ordered by \prec' , then there exists an admissible order \prec_B on B extending \prec' ;

(In the above, we adapt [5, Definition 3.5]. Several aspects of the general definition in [5] simplify in this case: (A4) can be omitted as closure components are single vertices, and (A6) follows from (*) and (3).)

The below theorem is an immediate translation of [5, Theorem 1.4] to the context of this paper. We will explain how to adapt [5, Theorem 1.4] to our context at the end of this section.

Proposition 3.3. *There exists a class $\mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1^\sphericalangle$ of admissible orderings of structures in \mathcal{D}_1 . We have that $(\mathcal{O}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ is an amalgamation class, and $(\mathcal{O}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ has the Ramsey property and the expansion property over $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$.*

Lemma 3.4. *$(\mathcal{O}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ is a strong expansion of $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$.*

Proof. Parts (1) and (2) in the definition of strong expansion are immediate. Part (3) follows immediately from part (4) of the definition of admissible orders. \square

We now give a specific property resulting from Definition 3.2 that we will use in the proof of Theorem 4.1, the main result of this paper.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $A^\sphericalangle \in \mathcal{O}_1$. Let $a \in A$ and let $b \in a^\circ$. Then $b \prec_A a$.*

Proof. As $|\text{scl}_A(b)| < |\text{scl}_A(a)|$, by parts (*) and (3) in Definition 3.2 we have $b \prec_A a$. \square

We now explain how to adapt [5, Theorem 1.4] and the definition of admissible orders found in [5] to give the definitions and theorem above. The paper [5] gives Ramsey expansions for classes of finite structures in languages that may include *set-valued function symbols*, which enables us to deal with the strong class $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$.

Definition 3.6 ([5, Section 1]). A language $L = L_R \cup L_F$ of relation and set-valued function symbols consists of a set L_R of relation symbols and a set L_F of *set-valued function symbols* L_F , where each symbol has an associated arity $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

An L -structure $(A, (R_A)_{R \in L_R}, (F_A)_{F \in L_F})$ consists of a set A (the domain) together with sets $R_A \subseteq A^n$ for each relation symbol $R \in L_R$ of arity n and functions $F_A : A^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ for each set-valued function symbol $F \in L_F$ of arity n . Usually we will just write A to denote the structure.

A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ between L -structures A, B is an *embedding* if f is injective and:

- for each relation symbol $R \in L_R$ of arity n ,

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in R_A \Leftrightarrow (f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n)) \in R_B;$$

- for each set-valued function symbol $F \in L_F$ of arity n ,

$$f(F_A(a_1, \dots, a_n)) = F_B(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n)).$$

For L -structures A, B , we say that A is a substructure of B , written $A \subseteq B$, if the domain of A is a subset of the domain of B and the inclusion map $A \hookrightarrow B$ is an embedding of L -structures.

We define the hereditary property, joint embedding property, amalgamation property, Ramsey property and expansion property for classes of L -structures exactly as for usual first-order languages, and we also define amalgamation classes and Ramsey classes as before.

Let $A \subseteq B_0, B_1$ be L -structures, and suppose that $B_0 \cap B_1 = A$. The *free amalgam* of B_0, B_1 over A is the L -structure C with domain $B_0 \cup B_1$, where $R_C = R_{B_0} \cup R_{B_1}$ for each $R \in L_R$ and where, for each $F \in L_F$ of arity n , the function $F_C : C^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(C)$ is defined by $F_C(\bar{c}) = F_{B_i}(\bar{c})$ for $\bar{c} \in B_i^n$ ($i = 0, 1$) and $F_C(\bar{c}) = \emptyset$ otherwise. An amalgamation class where amalgams can always be taken to be free amalgams is called a *free amalgamation class*.

The above framework enables us to deal with $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ as follows ([5, Section 5.1]). Let \tilde{L} consist of the relational language L_{or} of oriented graphs together with a unary set-valued function symbol F . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ consist of the \tilde{L} structures $\tilde{A} = (A, F_A)$ where $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $F_A : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ is a function sending each vertex of A to its out-neighbourhood in A . Then there is a bijection $\mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ sending each $A \in \mathcal{D}_1$ to its unique \tilde{L} -expansion \tilde{A} in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$, and for $A, B \in \mathcal{D}_1$, we have that $A \sqsubseteq_s B$ iff $\tilde{A} \subseteq \tilde{B}$. We then have that \tilde{L} -embeddings between elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ are \sqsubseteq_s -embeddings when considered in the language L_{or} , and therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ is a free amalgamation class.

We now recall [5, Theorem 1.4], which will give us an explicitly defined Ramsey expansion of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ via admissibly ordered structures.

Theorem ([5, Theorem 1.4]). *Let L be a language (consisting of relation and set-valued function symbols). Let \mathcal{K} be a free amalgamation class of L -structures. Then there exists an explicitly defined amalgamation class $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{K}^<$ of admissible orderings such that:*

- every $A \in \mathcal{K}$ has an ordering in \mathcal{O} ;
- the class \mathcal{O} has the Ramsey property and the expansion property over \mathcal{K} .

The above theorem, together with [5, Definition 3.5], which gives the explicit definition of admissible orders, gives a Ramsey expansion $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_1$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$. Using the correspondence between $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ and $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ detailed in the preceding paragraph, we thus obtain a Ramsey expansion $(\mathcal{O}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ of $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 3.2 (this definition is just a direct adaptation of [5, Definition 3.5]).

4. MINIMAL SUBFLOWS OF M_1

In this section, we prove the main theorem of this paper:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{LO}(M_1)$ be a minimal subflow of $\mathcal{LO}(M_1)$. Then all G -orbits on Y are meagre.*

4.1. Preparatory definitions and lemmas.

Definition 4.2. Let $N_1 = (M_1, \rho)$ be the Fraïssé limit of $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$, and let (N_1, \prec_α) be the Fraïssé limit of $(\mathcal{O}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$. (Here, we use Lemma 2.11: $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ is a strong expansion of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) and $(\mathcal{O}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$ is a strong expansion of $(\mathcal{D}_1, \sqsubseteq_s)$.)

Recall that $G_1 = \text{Aut}(M_1)$. Let $H_1 = \text{Aut}(N_1, \alpha)$. By Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 2.20, we have that H_1 is extremely amenable.

We will write $G = G_1, H = H_1$ in the remainder of Section 4 for ease of notation.

Definition 4.3. Let $a \in N_1$. As N_1 is the union of an increasing chain of \sqsubseteq_s -substructures, we have that $\text{scl}_{N_1}(a)$ is finite, and for any $A \sqsubseteq_s N_1$ we have $\text{scl}_{N_1}(a) = \text{scl}_A(a)$. We define $a^\circ = \text{scl}_{N_1}(a) \setminus \{a\}$, and define homologous vertices and cones in N_1 as in Definition 3.1. We define the *level* $l_{N_1}(a)$ of a in N_1 , usually just denoted $l(a)$, to be the level of a in $\text{scl}_{N_1}(a)$.

Lemma 4.4. Let \prec_β be an H -fixed point in the flow $H \curvearrowright \mathcal{LO}(M_1)$, and let Q be a cone of N_1 . Then \prec_β agrees with either \prec_α or \prec'_α on Q , where \prec'_α denotes the reverse of the linear order \prec_α .

Proof. Take $a_0, b_0 \in Q$ with $a_0 \prec_\alpha b_0$. Then for $a, b \in Q$ with $a \prec_\alpha b$, by Lemma 3.5 there exists an ordered digraph isomorphism $f : \text{scl}_{N_1}(a_0, b_0)^{\prec_\alpha} \rightarrow \text{scl}_{N_1}(a, b)^{\prec_\alpha}$ with $f(a_0) = a, f(b_0) = b$, and by \sqsubseteq_s -ultrahomogeneity we may extend to an element $f \in H$.

As $H \subseteq G_\beta$, f is β -preserving. If $a_0 \prec_\beta b_0$, then $f(a_0) \prec_\beta f(b_0)$, so $a \prec_\beta b$, and so \prec_β agrees with \prec_α on Q . If $a_0 \succ_\beta b_0$, then \prec_β agrees with \prec'_α on Q . \square

4.2. Setup and proof notation. Before beginning the proof, we first need to set up our approach.

Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{LO}(M_1)$ be a minimal subflow of $G \curvearrowright \mathcal{LO}(M_1)$. As H is extremely amenable, the flow $H \curvearrowright Y$ has an H -fixed point \prec_β , and as Y is a minimal G -flow, we have $Y = \overline{G \cdot \prec_\beta}$. Let $\mathcal{J} = \text{Age}_{\leq 1}(M_1, \prec_\beta)$. By Lemma 2.28, we have $Y = X(\mathcal{J})$. We will show that (\mathcal{J}, \leq_1) does not have the weak amalgamation property (WAP), which implies that all G -orbits on Y are meagre by Lemma 2.32.

We will now use the above notation throughout the rest of this section.

4.3. Proof idea - informal overview. We will assume (\mathcal{J}, \leq_1) has WAP, for a contradiction. Let $\{a_0\} \in \mathcal{J}$ be a singleton with the trivial linear order. By assumption $\{a_0\}$ has a WAP-witness A^\prec . We will then construct \leq_1 -embeddings of A^\prec into two ordered graphs $C_0^\prec, C_1^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$ which are WAP-incompatible: it will not be possible to find D^\prec completing the WAP commutative diagram for $\{a_0\}$ with the two embeddings, and this will give a contradiction.

The incompatibility of the two ordered graphs C_0^\prec, C_1^\prec in \mathcal{J} will result from them forcing incompatible orientations: we can use the order \prec_β to force certain edge orientations in ρ . The incompatible orientations will consist of a binary out-directed tree T_0 and a binary out-directed tree with the successor-closures of two vertices identified, which we denote by T_1 : these cannot start from the same point of a 2-orientation, as one contains a 4-cycle and the other does not. The idea to use two incompatible orientations in the WAP commutative diagram comes from the proof of [4, Theorem 5.2].

The key difficulties in the proof of Theorem 4.1 are showing that we can use \prec_β (specifically, particular finite ordered graphs in $\mathcal{J} = \text{Age}_{\leq 1}(M_1, \prec_\beta)$) to force orientations of edges in ρ (Lemma 4.6), and also showing that the ordered graphs that we construct to force orientations of edges in ρ do in fact lie in \mathcal{J} (Lemma 4.7).

4.4. Attaching trees and near-trees. For $q \in \mathbb{N}_+$, let $T_0(q)$ be the digraph given by a binary tree of height $2q + 1$, oriented outwards towards the leaves and with head vertex c . Let $T_1(q)$ be the digraph given by taking $T_0(q)$ and identifying the successor-closures




FIGURE 1. The oriented graph D_T .




FIGURE 2. The ordered graph $C_T^<$ with witness vertices indicated on one vertex.

of two vertices at height $q + 2$ whose paths to the head vertex c meet at height q . We have $T_0(q), T_1(q) \in \mathcal{D}_1$.

Let T be one of the digraphs $T_0(q)$ or $T_1(q)$. Take $C \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with each vertex having out-degree 2 or 0. Let D_T be the digraph consisting of C together with, for each vertex $v \in C$ with $d_+(v) = 0$, a copy of T attached at v , where we identify c and v . Let Z_T denote the sub-digraph of D_T whose vertices are the vertices of the copies of T attached to C in D_T . Let D_T^- denote the graph reduct of D_T . (We will use this notation throughout this section. See Figure 1.)

We have $D_T \in \mathcal{D}_1$. Let D_T' be the acyclic 2-reorientation of D_T where the copies of T have been oriented so that the non-head vertices of each copy of T are directed towards the head vertex c , leaving the orientation on vertices of C unchanged. Then we have $C \sqsubseteq_s D_T'$ in this reorientation, and so $C^- \leq_1 D_T^-$.

Definition 4.5. Let $C \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with each vertex having out-degree 2 or 0, and let D_T be defined as above.

An ordered graph $C_T^< \in \mathcal{J}$ is a T -witness ordered graph for C if:

- C_T consists of the graph reduct D_T^- of D_T together with, for each non-leaf tree vertex v of D_T , an additional 10 copies of $\text{scl}_{D_T}(v)$ freely amalgamated (as graphs) over $\text{scl}_{D_T}(v)^\circ$, and $C \leq_1 C_T$;
- for each non-leaf tree vertex $v \in D_T$, the additional 10 copies of v may be labelled as $v_{-5}, \dots, v_{-1}, v_1, \dots, v_5$ so that $v_{-5} \prec \dots \prec v_{-1} \prec v \prec v_1 \prec \dots \prec v_5$ in \prec_{C_T} . (We call these v_i the *witness vertices* of v .)

(See Figure 2.)

The following is the key lemma here.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $C \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with each vertex having out-degree 2 or 0, and let $C_T^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$ be a T -witness ordered graph for C . As $C_T^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$, there exists a \leq_1 -ordered graph embedding $\theta : C_T^\prec \rightarrow (M_1, \prec_\beta)$. Then, considering the digraph structure on Z_T induced by D_T , $\theta|_{Z_T} : Z_T \rightarrow (M_1, \rho)$ is also a digraph embedding.*

Proof. We may take $\theta = \text{id}$ for ease of notation. Take $v, x, y \in Z_T$ with out-edges vx, vy in the orientation of Z_T . We need to show that v has out-edges vx, vy in the orientation ρ of M_1 . Let $v_{-5}, \dots, v_{-1}, v_1, \dots, v_5$ be the witness vertices of v in C_T^\prec , and let $v_0 = v$. As θ is a \leq_1 -ordered graph embedding, we have that $v_i \prec_\beta v_j$ for $i < j$, and we have undirected edges $v_i x, v_i y$ for $-5 \leq i \leq 5$.

As ρ is a 2-orientation, for some i with $-5 \leq i \leq -1$ we must have that $v_i x, v_i y$ are out-edges of ρ , and likewise for some j with $1 \leq j \leq 5$ we must have that $v_j x, v_j y$ are out-edges of ρ . If either $xv_0 \in \rho$ or $yv_0 \in \rho$, then $v_0 \in \text{scl}_\rho(x, y)$, and as v_i, v_j lie in the same cone, by Lemma 3.5 there exists $h \in H$ with $hv_i = v_j$ and h fixing v_0 . As $H \subseteq G_\beta$, we have that $h \in G_\beta$. But $v_i \prec_\beta v_0$, so $hv_i \prec_\beta hv_0$, thus $v_j \prec_\beta v_0$ - contradiction. So therefore $v_0 x, v_0 y \in \rho$. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Let $C \in \mathcal{D}_1$ with each vertex having out-degree 2 or 0. Then there exists a T -witness ordered graph $C_T^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$ for C .*

Proof. Let d_1, \dots, d_k be an enumeration of the non-leaf tree vertices of D_T which preserves the order of levels, i.e. for $i < j$, $l_{D_T}(d_i) \leq l_{D_T}(d_j)$. We will show, by induction on i , that for $0 \leq i \leq k$ there exists an ordered graph $C_i^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$ such that:

- (1) C_i consists of D_T together with, for $1 \leq j \leq i$, an additional 10 copies of $\text{scl}_{D_T}(d_j)$ freely amalgamated (as graphs) over $\text{scl}_{D_T}(d_j)^\circ$;
- (2) for $1 \leq j \leq i$, the 10 copies of d_j may be labelled as $d_{j,-5}, \dots, d_{j,-1}, d_{j,1}, \dots, d_{j,5}$ such that $d_{j,-5} \prec \dots \prec d_{j,-1} \prec d_j \prec d_{j,1} \prec \dots \prec d_{j,5}$ in \prec_{C_i} . We will call these the *witness* vertices of d_j , and let W_j denote the set of witness vertices of d_j .

For the base case $i = 0$, take $C_0 = D_T^-$. As $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and \mathcal{J} is a reasonable class of expansions of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) , there exists a linear order \prec_{C_0} on C_0 such that $C_0^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$, and then C_0^\prec satisfies (1) and (2) vacuously.

For the induction step, assume we have $C_i^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$ satisfying (1) and (2). Let

$$X = L_0(D_T) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq i} \text{scl}_{D_T}(d_j) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq i} W_j.$$

There is an acyclic 2-orientation τ_i of C_i in which X is successor-closed: take the orientation of D_T , and orient the two edges of each witness vertex $d_{j,m}$ outwards from $d_{j,m}$. Thus $X \leq_1 C_i$. Note that for $j' > i \geq j$ we have $l_{D_T}(d_{j'}) \geq l_{D_T}(d_j)$, so $d_{j'} \notin X$ for $j' > i$. Let (E, τ) be the free amalgam of (C_i, τ_i) 11 times over (X, τ_i) . As \mathcal{D}_1 is a free amalgamation class, we have $(E, \tau) \in \mathcal{D}_1$. Hence $E \in \mathcal{C}_1$, and we have $X \leq E$.

Let $\prec_X = \prec_{C_i}|_X$. We have that $X^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$, so let $\theta_X : X^\prec \rightarrow (M_1, \prec_\beta)$ be a \leq_1 -ordered graph embedding. By the extension property of M_1 , we have a \leq_1 -graph embedding $\theta : E \rightarrow M_1$ extending θ_X . Define a linear order \prec_ζ on E by $x \prec_\zeta y$ iff $\theta(x) \prec_\beta \theta(y)$. We have that \prec_ζ is a linear order on E extending \prec_X on X , and that $\theta : (E, \prec_\zeta) \rightarrow (M_1, \prec_\beta)$ is a \leq_1 -ordered graph embedding.

We may label the 11 copies of C_i in E as $C_{i,m}$ ($-5 \leq m \leq 5$), with \leq_1 -embeddings $\eta_m : C_i \rightarrow C_{i,m} \leq E$, and the corresponding copies of d_{i+1} as $d_{i+1,m} \in C_{i,m}$, such that $d_{i+1,-5} \prec \dots \prec d_{i+1,5}$ in \prec_ζ . Let $C_{i+1}' = C_{i,0} \cup \{d_{i+1,m} : -5 \leq m \leq 5\}$. We have that $(C_{i+1}', \tau) \sqsubseteq_s (E, \tau)$, so $C_{i+1}' \leq E$. So $\theta : (C_{i+1}', \prec_\zeta) \rightarrow (M_1, \prec_\beta)$ is a \leq_1 -ordered graph embedding.

We have that C_{i+1}' consists of a copy $C_{i,0} = \eta_0(C_i)$ of C_i , where $\eta_0|_X = \text{id}_X$ and $\eta_0|_X : (X, \prec_X) \rightarrow (X, \prec_\zeta)$ is order-preserving, together with witness vertices $d_{i+1,m}$ (where $1 \leq |m| \leq 5$) for $d_{i+1,0} = \eta(d_{i+1})$.

Recall that C_i consists of D_T together with, for $1 \leq j \leq i$, the witness vertices for d_j , and also that X consists of $L_0(D_T)$ together with, for $1 \leq j \leq i$, d_j and its witness vertices.

Therefore (C_{i+1}', \prec_ζ) consists of a graph-isomorphic copy $\eta_0(D_T)$ of D_T , together with witness vertices in \prec_ζ for $\eta_0(d_1) = d_1, \dots, \eta_0(d_i) = d_i$ and witness vertices in \prec_ζ for an additional vertex $\eta_0(d_{i+1})$. We can therefore construct an ordered graph C_{i+1}^\prec isomorphic to $(C_{i+1}', \prec_\zeta) \in \mathcal{J}$ such that C_{i+1} consists of D_T together with witness vertices for d_j , $1 \leq j \leq i+1$. This completes the induction step. We then let $C_T^\prec = C_k^\prec$. \square

4.5. (\mathcal{J}, \leq_1) does not have WAP.

Proposition 4.8. *The class (\mathcal{J}, \leq_1) does not have the weak amalgamation property.*

Proof. Suppose (\mathcal{J}, \leq_1) has WAP, seeking a contradiction. Let $\{a_0\} \in \mathcal{J}$ be a singleton with the trivial linear order. Then there exists $\{a_0\} \leq_1 A^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$ with A^\prec witnessing WAP for $\{a_0\}$. Take $A \leq_1 B \in \mathcal{C}_1$ witnessing for A the expansion property of \mathcal{J} over (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) . (Here we use Theorem 2.30, recalling that $Y = X(\mathcal{J})$ is a minimal G -flow.)

Take $B^+ \in \mathcal{D}_1$ such that the undirected reduct of B^+ is B . For each $v \in B^+$ with $d_+(v) = 1$, add to B^+ a new vertex v' and out-edge vv' , and call the resulting digraph $C \in \mathcal{D}_1$. Note that each vertex of C has out-degree 0 or 2. We have that $B \leq_1 C^-$ as undirected graphs. Let q be the maximum number of levels in any acyclic reorientation of C (i.e. if C when reoriented has levels $0, \dots, n$, then $q = n + 1$).

For $i = 0, 1$, let $C_i^\prec \in \mathcal{J}$ be $T_i(q)$ -witness ordered graphs for C , using Lemma 4.7, and let D_i, Z_i denote $D_{T_i(q)}, Z_{T_i(q)}$ (the notation here is introduced just above Definition 4.5).

As $B \leq C_i$ witnesses the expansion property for A , there exist \leq_1 -ordered graph embeddings $\zeta_i : A^\prec \rightarrow (B, \prec_{C_i}) \leq C_i^\prec$ ($i = 0, 1$). As A^\prec witnesses WAP for $\{a_0\}$, there exists $D \leq M_1$ and \leq_1 -ordered graph embeddings $\theta_i : C_i^\prec \rightarrow (D, \prec_\beta)$ with $\theta_0\zeta_0(a) = \theta_1\zeta_1(a)$. By Lemma 4.6, $\theta_i|_{Z_i} : Z_i \rightarrow (D, \rho)$ are also digraph embeddings.

If r is a vertex of C of out-degree 0 in C , then as $\theta_i|_{Z_i}$ is a digraph embedding, $\theta_i(r)$ has out-degree 0 in $\theta_i(C)$. Also θ_i is a graph embedding, so preserves the sum of out-degrees, and as each vertex of C has out-degree 2 or 0 and $\theta_i(C)$ is 2-oriented, we have that the vertices of $\theta_i(C)$ of out-degree < 2 are exactly the $\theta_i(r)$ for r a vertex of C of out-degree 0.

Let $d = \theta_i\zeta_i(a)$, and let U_n be the set of vertices of (M_1, ρ) that can be reached from d by an outward-directed path of length $\leq n$. As the only vertices of $\theta_i(D_i)$ of out-degree less than 2 are the leaves of the copies of T_i , we have $U_{2q+1} \subseteq \theta_i(D_i)$ ($i = 0, 1$).

We now obtain a contradiction by comparing the two cases $i = 0$ and $i = 1$. As $U_{2q+1} \subseteq \theta_0(D_0)$, we have that $U_{2q+1} - U_{q-1}$ does not contain any (undirected) cycles. But as $U_{2q+1} \subseteq \theta_1(D_1)$, we have that $U_{2q+1} - U_{q-1}$ contains a 4-cycle - contradiction. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

4.6. $\mathcal{LO}(M_1)$ is not minimal. We now quickly show that $\mathcal{LO}(M_1)$ is not in fact minimal itself.

Proposition 4.9. *$\mathcal{LO}(M_1)$ is not a minimal flow.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{Q}_1 be the class of ordered graphs A^\prec where $A \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and \prec_A induces a 2-orientation τ_A on A : that is $\tau_A = \{(x, y) \in E_A : y \prec_A x\}$ is a 2-orientation (which must necessarily be acyclic, as \prec_A is a linear order).

We will show that \mathcal{Q}_1 is a reasonable class of expansions of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) (see Definition 2.21). Parts (2) and (3) of reasonableness are immediate. For parts (1) and (4), take $A^\prec \in \mathcal{Q}_1$ and $B \in \mathcal{C}_1$ with $A \leq_1 B$ (where we allow $A^\prec = \emptyset$). Let τ_A be the acyclic 2-orientation induced by \prec_A on A . As $A \leq_1 B$, there exists an acyclic 2-orientation τ_B of B extending τ_A . Let $\prec_0 = \{(b, b') \in B^2 : b \neq b' \text{ and there exists an out-path from } b' \text{ to } b \text{ in } \tau_B\}$. Then \prec_0 is a strict partial order on B . \prec_A and \prec_0 are compatible, and so we may extend the partial order $\prec_A \cup \prec_0$ arbitrarily to a linear order \prec_B on B . Then \prec_B induces τ_B , so $(B, \prec_B) \in \mathcal{Q}_1$.

By Lemma 2.26, we therefore have that $X(\mathcal{Q}_1)$ is a subflow of $\mathcal{LO}(M_1)$. To see that it is a proper subflow, we produce a linear order on M_1 which does not induce an acyclic 2-orientation. Let \prec be the linear order of the Fraïssé limit of the order expansion $(\mathcal{C}_1^\prec, \leq_1)$ of (\mathcal{C}_1, \leq_1) . By genericity, there exists a graph $A \leq_1 M_1$ consisting of vertices a, b_1, \dots, b_3 and edges ab_i with $b_i \prec a$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$), so \prec does not induce a 2-orientation. \square

See [18, Section 4.6] for an explicit example of a minimal subflow of $\mathcal{LO}(M_1)$.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank David Evans for his supervision during this project, which formed part of the second half of the author's PhD thesis.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Angel, A. S. Kechris, and R. Lyons. Random orderings and unique ergodicity of automorphism groups. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 016(10):2059–2095, 2014.
- [2] I. Ben Yaacov, J. Melleray, and T. Tsankov. Metrizable universal minimal flows of Polish groups have a comeagre orbit. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 27(1):67–77, 2017.
- [3] D. Evans. Homogeneous structures, omega-categoricity and amalgamation constructions. http://wwwf.imperial.ac.uk/~dmevans/Bonn2013_DE.pdf - unpublished notes from talks given at the Hausdorff Institute for Mathematics, Bonn, 2013.
- [4] D. Evans, J. Hubička, and J. Nešetřil. Automorphism groups and Ramsey properties of sparse graphs. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 119(2):515–546, 2019.
- [5] D. Evans, J. Hubička, and J. Nešetřil. Ramsey properties and extending partial automorphisms for classes of finite structures. *Fund. Math.*, 253(2):121–153, 2021.
- [6] D. M. Evans. Ample dividing. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 68(4):1385–1402, 2003.
- [7] D. M. Evans. Trivial stable structures with non-trivial reducts. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 72(2):351–363, 2005.
- [8] R. Fraïssé. Sur l'extension aux relations de quelques propriétés des ordres. *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. (3)*, 71:363–388, 1954.
- [9] W. Hodges. *Model theory*, volume 42 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [10] E. Hrushovski. A stable \aleph_0 -categorical pseudoplane. Unpublished notes, 1988.
- [11] E. Hrushovski. A new strongly minimal set. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 62(2):147–166, 1993.
- [12] A. A. Ivanov. Generic expansions of ω -categorical structures and semantics of generalized quantifiers. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 64(2):775–789, 1999.
- [13] A. S. Kechris, V. G. Pestov, and S. Todorcevic. Fraïssé limits, Ramsey theory, and topological dynamics of automorphism groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 15(1):106–189, 2005.
- [14] A. S. Kechris and C. Rosendal. Turbulence, amalgamation, and generic automorphisms of homogeneous structures. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 94(2):302–350, 2007.
- [15] C. S. J. A. Nash-Williams. Decomposition of finite graphs into forests. *J. of London Math Soc.*, 39(1):12, 1964.
- [16] J. Nešetřil. For graphs there are only four types of hereditary Ramsey classes. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 46(2):127–132, 1989.

- [17] L. Nguyen Van Thé. More on the Kechris-Pestov-Todorcevic correspondence: precompact expansions. *Fund. Math.*, 222(1):19–47, 2013.
- [18] R. Sullivan. *Aspects of the topological dynamics of sparse graph automorphism groups*. PhD thesis, Imperial College London, 2022.
- [19] A. Zucker. Topological dynamics of automorphism groups, ultrafilter combinatorics, and the generic point problem. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(9):6715–6740, 2016.

ROB SULLIVAN, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATISCHE LOGIK, UNIVERSITÄT MÜNSTER, EINSTEINSTRASSE 62, 48149 MÜNSTER, GERMANY

Email address: robertsullivan1990+maths@gmail.com