

THE CLASS AND DYNAMICS OF α -BALANCED POLISH GROUPS

SHAUN ALLISON AND ARISTOTELIS PANAGIOTOPOULOS

ABSTRACT. For each ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$, we introduce the class of α -balanced Polish groups. These classes form a hierarchy that completely stratifies the space between the class of Polish groups admitting a two-side-invariant metric (TSI) and the class of Polish groups admitting a complete left-invariant metric (CLI). We establish various closure properties, provide connections to model theory, and we develop a boundedness principle for CLI groups by showing that α -balancedness is an initial segment of a regular coanalytic rank.

In the spirit of Hjorth’s turbulence theory we also introduce “generic α -unbalancedness”: a new dynamical condition for Polish G -spaces which serves as an obstruction to classification by actions of α -balanced Polish groups. We use this to provide, for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, an action of an α -balanced Polish group whose orbit equivalence relation is strongly generically ergodic against actions of any β -balanced Polish group with $\beta < \alpha$.

1. INTRODUCTION

A Polish group is a separable topological group G which admits a complete metric compatible with its topology. A metric d on a Polish group G is **left-invariant** if $d(gh, gh') = d(h, h')$ holds for all $g, h, h' \in G$ and it is **two-side-invariant** if $d(gh, gh') = d(h, h') = d(hg, h'g)$ holds for all $g, h, h' \in G$. By Birkhoff-Kakutani [Bir36, Kak36], every Polish group admits a left-invariant metric that is compatible with its topology. However, such metric cannot always be taken to be complete or two-side-invariant. This carves out two important classes of Polish groups with special properties. A Polish group is **CLI** if it admits a compatible metric that is both complete and left-invariant, and it is **TSI** if it admits a compatible metric that is two-side-invariant. It turns out that every TSI group is CLI but there are several interesting examples of CLI groups which are not TSI.


The class of TSI groups can be thought of as a common generalization of the classes of Polish groups which are compact, discrete, or abelian. By a theorem of Klee, TSI groups are precisely those Polish groups admitting a conjugation invariant basis of open neighborhood of the identity [Kle52] — a property of groups known as *balanced* or *small invariant neighborhood* (SIN). Already in the realm of locally-compact groups, the TSI property has been extensively studied in relation to properties such as unimodularity and inner amenability [Mos51, Iwa51, GM67, LP91]. It is however in the realm of non-locally-compact Polish groups — where the lack of Haar-measure prompts the search for additional structure — that the TSI property has played a central role. Namely, from establishing

This research was supported by the NSF Grant DMS-2154258: “Dynamics Beyond Turbulence and Obstructions to Classification” and Israel Science Foundation (ISF) grant no. 1832/19 .

new automatic continuity phenomena [LMW17, DT19, DD19], to extending the proof of the topological Vaught conjecture from abelian [Sam94] to all TSI Polish groups [HS99].

Similarly, the class of all CLI groups can be thought of as a common generalization of the classes of Polish groups which are locally compact, solvable, or TSI. By a theorem of Gao [Gao98], later generalized to all metric structures [BYDNT17], the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(M)$ of a countable structure M is CLI if and only if M admits proper $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1\omega}$ -embeddings into itself. The CLI property has also been used in generalizing various dynamical phenomena such as Glimm-Effros dichotomy and topological Vaught conjecture from the realm of locally-compact, nilpotent, or TSI groups [Gli61a, HS99], to the realm of all CLI groups [Bec98]. In contrast to TSI groups which are characterized by the SIN property, CLI groups do not admit a “simple” characterization in terms of open neighborhoods of the identity, as they turn out to form a coanalytic but non-Borel collection of Polish groups [Mal11].

The main goal of this paper is to introduce for each countable ordinal $\alpha > 0$ the class of α -balanced Polish groups: a new class of Polish groups which interpolates between the classes of TSI and CLI groups and which admits its own robust structure and dynamics.



In short, α -balanced Polish groups are defined as follows, where the notation $V \subseteq_1 G$ will stand throughout the paper for “ V is an open neighborhood of the identity in G ”.

Definition 1.1. A Polish group G is α -balanced if and only if $\text{rk}(G) \leq \alpha$, where

$$\text{rk}(G) := \sup\{\text{rk}(V, G) + 1 : V \subseteq_1 G\},$$

and for every ordinal β and every $V, U \subseteq_1 G$ we define inductively:

- (a) $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \beta$ if there is $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that for all $g \in U$ we have $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \beta$;
- (b) $\text{rk}(V, U) = 0$ if $U \subseteq V$;
- (c) $\text{rk}(V, U) = \infty$ if there is no ordinal β so that $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \beta$;

This paper consists of two parts, each of which is summarized in the remainder of this introduction. Part I develops the topological group theory of α -balanced Polish groups and fleshes out connections with model theory and descriptive set theory. In Part II this theory yields several consequences of α -balancedness for dynamics of Polish group actions. The main takeaway is that α -balanced Polish groups form a class of Polish groups with structure robust enough to leave a trace on the orbit equivalence relations E_X^G of the actions $G \curvearrowright X$ of its members G . This structure is exploited to identify strong ergodicity phenomena and for carving out a new ladder of complexity classes in the Borel reduction hierarchy.

1.1. Part I. The class of α -balanced Polish groups. Our first main result is that the classes of α -balanced Polish groups, for $1 < \alpha < \omega_1$, completely stratify the space between TSI and CLI:

Theorem 1.2. *For every Polish group G we have that:*

$$G \text{ is CLI} \iff \text{rk}(G) < \infty \iff \text{rk}(G) < \omega_1$$

Moreover, for every $\alpha < \omega_1$ there exists a Polish group G with $\text{rk}(G) = \alpha$.

It is easy to see that the only 1-balanced group is the trivial group and that the class of 2-balanced groups is precisely the class of all TSI groups; see Section 2. In analogy with Klee's characterization of TSI groups as Polish groups admitting a conjugation invariant basis of $V \subseteq_1 G$, Theorem 1.2 can be thought of as the simplest possible characterization of CLI groups in terms of open neighborhoods of the identity. It also provides an inductive procedure for establishing properties of the class of all CLI groups.

Definition 1.1 has been inspired by dynamical phenomena occurring in actions of non-TSI groups [AP21], as well as by the ranks that Deissler and Malicki developed and studied in the context of countable \mathcal{L} -structures [Dei77] and Polish permutation groups [Mal11], respectively. In Section 5 we show that for automorphism groups $\text{Aut}(M)$ of countable structures the rank from Definition 1.1 corresponds to a slight modification of the Deissler rank. This allows us to import model-theoretic intuition into the study of α -balanced Polish groups. In Section 7 we similarly show how a weakening of Definition 1.1, which leads to the notion of *weakly α -balanced Polish groups*, relates to the rank Malicki developed for Polish permutation groups.

One of the main results from [Mal11] is that the class of all CLI groups forms a coanalytic non-Borel set in the standard Borel space \mathcal{PG} of all Polish groups. The proof relied on exhibiting a collection of permutation group of unbounded *Malicki rank*. A similar collection of structures with unbounded *Deissler rank* is used in [Dei77, Corollary 2.5]. Here we provide a “uniformly defined” such collection and use it to strengthen the above:

Theorem 1.3. *The class of CLI Polish groups forms a complete coanalytic set.*

Finally, in Section 6 we show that the rank from Definition 1.1 is a regular Π_1^1 -rank on the coanalytic subset CLI of \mathcal{PG} . One consequence is the following boundedness principle:


Corollary 1.4. *If \mathcal{A} is a class of CLI Polish groups which admits analytic definition, then there exists a countable ordinal $\alpha = \alpha(\mathcal{A})$ so that every G in \mathcal{A} is α -balanced.*

This can be used to justify on abstract grounds why various classes of Polish groups, such as the class of locally compact Polish groups, consist of α -balanced groups for bounded α .

1.2. Part II: the dynamics of α -balanced Polish groups. One of the prominent ongoing research programs of invariant descriptive set theory seeks to identify the intrinsic complexity of various classification problems and to organize these problems accordingly to their relative complexity. Such classification problems can often be represented as *orbit equivalence relations* of a continuous action of a Polish group on a Polish space. This creates a link of utmost importance between the complexity of classification problems and

topological dynamics, as our inability to fully classify some mathematical objects up to some notion of equivalence using simple enough invariants can be often traced to dynamics.

Formally, a **classification problem** is a pair (X, E) where X is a Polish space and E is analytic equivalence relation on X . We consider the classification problem (X, E) to be of lower or equal complexity than (Y, F) , and we write $(X, E) \leq_B (Y, F)$ or simply $E \leq_B F$, if there is exists **Borel reduction** from E to F , i.e. a Borel map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ so that $xEy \iff f(x)Ff(y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Given such (X, E) , one is interested in finding the simplest type of invariants Y/F needed for classifying (X, E) in the above sense. Some classical complexity classes in the lower part of the Borel reduction hierarchy consist of the *concretely classifiable* and the *classifiable by countable structures* classification problems. These correspond to those (X, E) which can be classified using real numbers or isomorphism types of countable structures as invariants, respectively. From an dynamical point of view they are precisely those (X, E) which are *classifiable by compact groups* or *classifiable by non-archimedean groups*, respectively, in the following formal sense. A **Polish G -space** is a Polish space X together with a continuous action $G \curvearrowright X$. This induces a classification problem (X, E_X^G) , where E_X^G is the associated **orbit equivalence relation** on X given by $xE_X^G x'$ if and only if $\exists g \in G (gx = x')$. We say that E is **classifiable by G** if there is an orbit equivalence relation E_Y^G such that $E \leq_B E_Y^G$. Given a class \mathcal{C} of Polish groups, we say that E is **classifiable by a \mathcal{C} group** iff there is a Polish group in \mathcal{C} which classifies E .



This dynamical interpretation of the Borel reduction hierarchy underlies many negative anti-classification results. Indeed, *generic ergodicity* is a classical dynamical condition for $G \curvearrowright X$, going all the way back to [Mac52, Gli61b, Eff65], which prevents E_X^G from being classifiable by compact Polish groups. Similarly, Hjorth’s celebrated *theory of turbulence* [Hjo00] provides a much “wilder” dynamical condition, which precludes E_X^G even from being classifiable by non-archimedean Polish groups. More recently a dynamical obstruction to classification by CLI groups was developed [LP18] as an alternative to the forcing theoretic notion of pinnedness [Kan08, LZ20]. Finally, in the precursor [AP21] to this current paper, the authors introduced *generic unbalancedness*: a dynamical property for Polish G -spaces $G \curvearrowright X$ which precludes E_X^G from being classifiable by TSI groups.

Our ultimate goal in this paper is to show that **classification by α -balanced groups** forms a strictly increasing hierarchy of complexity classes in the Borel reduction hierarchy. In doing so we first introduce the following dynamical condition which turns out to entail *strong generic ergodicity* properties against actions of α -balanced groups.

Definition 1.5. Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a Polish G -space and let $V \subseteq_1 G$. We recursively define binary relations $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$ on X for any countable ordinal α as follows.

- (1) $x \rightsquigarrow_V^0 y$ iff both $x \in \overline{V \cdot y}$ and $y \in \overline{V \cdot x}$ hold.
- (2) $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$ iff for every open $W \subseteq_1 G$, and any open $U \subseteq X$ with $x \in U$ or $y \in U$, there exist $g^x, g^y \in V$ with $g^x x, g^y y \in U$ so that $g^x x \rightsquigarrow_W^\beta g^y y$ holds for every $\beta < \alpha$.

We say that $G \curvearrowright X$ is **generically α -unbalanced** for some $\alpha > 0$, if for every comeager $C \subseteq X$ there is a comeager $D \subseteq C$ so that for all $x, y \in D$ there exists a finite sequence $x_0, \dots, x_n \in C$ with $x_0 = x, x_n = y$, so that for all $i < n$ and $\beta < \alpha$ we have $x_i \rightsquigarrow_G^\beta x_{i+1}$.

Let \mathcal{C} be a class of Polish groups. A classification problem (X, E) is **generically ergodic against \mathcal{C} groups** if for every Polish H -space Y , with $H \in \mathcal{C}$, and any Baire-measurable map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with $xEy \implies f(x)E_Y^H f(y)$ there exists a comeager $C \subseteq X$ with $f(x)E_Y^H f(y)$ for all $x, y \in C$. The following are the main results of Part II of our paper.

Theorem 1.6. *Let α be a countable ordinal. If $G \curvearrowright X$ is generically α -unbalanced Polish G -space, then E_X^G is generically ergodic against α -balanced Polish groups.*

Corollary 1.7. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a generically α -unbalanced Polish G -space. If $G \curvearrowright X$ has meager orbits, then (X, E_X^G) is not classifiable by actions of α -balanced Polish groups.*

The proof of Theorem 1.6 combines the main arguments from Hjorth's turbulence theorem and a transfinite change of topology argument based on a variant of Scott-Hjorth analysis of orbits, following the general lines of the proof of [AP21, Theorem 1.3].

In order to show that "classification by α -balanced groups" forms a strictly increasing hierarchy of complexity classes, it suffices to exhibit, for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, an action of an $(\alpha + 1)$ -balanced Polish group satisfying Corollary 1.7. We show that the Bernoulli shift of the automorphism group a certain α -scattered linear order α^* has these properties.

Theorem 1.8. *For every $\alpha < \omega_1$ the Bernoulli shift of $\text{Aut}(\alpha^*)$ is generically α -unbalanced.*

The proof of Theorem 1.8 turns out to be surprisingly elaborate, as a naive transfinite induction based on successor and limit stages does not seem to apply. Indeed, while some basic theory of the *wreath-product jump* $(G \curvearrowright X) \mapsto ((\mathbb{Z}\text{Wr}G) \curvearrowright X^{\mathbb{Z}})$ from [AP21] can be used to propagate the induction from α to $\alpha + 1$ in the statement of Theorem 1.8, one cannot simply thread these arguments together to deal with limit stages. It turns out that one needs instead to induct on the length m of the Cantor normal form of α

$$\alpha = \omega^{\lambda_m} + \omega^{\lambda_{m-1}} + \dots + \omega^{\lambda_1}, \quad \lambda_m \geq \lambda_{m-1} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_1, \quad m \geq 1,$$

as the length n of the path needed in witnessing generic α -unbalancedness, according to Definition 1.5, turns out to be a function of m . To deal with the "atomic" cases $\alpha = \omega^\lambda$ we introduce, similarly to the wreath-product jump, a jump operation for each ordinal of the

form ω^λ and based on the fact that these ordinals are closed under Hessenberg addition \oplus we show that these jumps admit a uniform path-doubling “fusion” procedure.

Part I. The class of α -balanced Polish groups

In Part I of this paper we develop the theory of α -balanced Polish groups. Although we are primarily interested in Polish groups, some of the general theory we develop makes sense in the context of the more general classes of topological groups or metrizable topological groups. In particular, Sections 2 and 3 define the “balanced rank” assignment $G \mapsto \text{rk}(G)$ and study its closure properties in the most general category, that of all topological groups. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.2, by deriving it from a more general statement, which addresses the category of all metrizable topological groups.

Section 5 studies α -balancedness in the context of automorphism groups $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ of countable structures \mathcal{M} . In particular, we show that $\text{rk}(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M}))$ admits a model-theoretic interpretation in terms of (a minor modification of) the Deissler rank [Dei77] of the structure \mathcal{M} . As an application of this model-theoretic viewpoint, we establish Theorem 1.3. In Section 6 we derive the “boundedness principle” stated in Corollary 1.4. Finally, in Section 7 we discuss a natural weakening of Definition 1.1, leading to the class of *weakly α -balanced* Polish groups, and we connect this class to a rank that Malicki developed for Polish permutation groups in [Mal11].

We now recall some definitions and fix some conventions that will be used in the paper.

1.3. Definitions and notation. A **topological group** is a group G together with a topology on G , rendering both the multiplication map $G \times G \rightarrow G$ and the inversion map $G \rightarrow G$ continuous. If G is a topological group, then $V \subseteq_1 G$ is the notation that we will use as a shortcut for “ V is an open neighborhood for the identity element 1_G of G .” If N is a set, then $\text{Sym}(N)$ denotes the topological group of all permutations of N , endowed with the pointwise convergence topology. A basic $V \subseteq_1 \text{Sym}(N)$ is the stabilizer of finitely many points of N . A **Polish permutation group** is a closed subgroup $P \leq \text{Sym}(N)$ where N is countable. Finally, we will assume some familiarity with standard algebraic operations on ordinals. For example, the reader should be familiar with the fact that $\alpha + \beta = \beta + \alpha$ does not necessarily hold for two arbitrary ordinals α, β .

2. THE α -BALANCED TOPOLOGICAL GROUPS

Let G be a topological group. For every $U, V \subseteq_1 G$ and every ordinal β we define inductively:

- $\text{rk}(V, U) = 0$ if and only if $U \subseteq V$;
- $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \beta$ if there is $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that for any $g \in U$ we have $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \beta$;
- $\text{rk}(V, U) = \infty$ if there is no ordinal β for which $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \beta$.

When dealing with several topological groups, we will more verbosely write

$$\text{rk}(V, U; G)$$

to keep track of the ambient topological group in which the computation is taking place.

Definition 2.1. Let G be a topological group. We say that G is α -balanced if and only if

$$\text{rk}(G) := \sup\{\text{rk}(V, G) + 1 : V \subseteq_1 G\} \leq \alpha.$$

Trivially, there exist no 0-balanced topological groups and that the only 1-balanced topological group is the trivial group consisting only of the identity element. The class of all 2-balanced topological groups coincides with the class of all topological G which admit a basis of conjugation-invariant open neighborhoods of 1_G . Indeed, G is 2-balanced if and only if every all $V \subseteq_1 G$ there exists some $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that $gWg^{-1} \subseteq V$. In particular, every open neighborhood V of 1_G contains the conjugation-invariant open neighborhood of 1_G that is given by

$$\widetilde{W} := \bigcup_{g \in G} gWg^{-1}$$

As a consequence, of the metrizability theorem of Klee [Kle52] we have that the class of all 2-balanced Polish groups coincides with the class of all TSI Polish groups.

Example 2.2. We spell out the property that G is 3-balanced: given any $V \subseteq_1 G$ we have

$$\exists W \subseteq G \quad \forall g \in G \quad \exists W' \subseteq G \quad \forall h \in gWg^{-1} \quad (hW'h^{-1} \subseteq V).$$

Any locally-compact topological group is 3-balanced. Indeed, let $W \subseteq_1 G$ with \overline{W} compact and notice that for all $V \subseteq_1 G$ and $g \in G$ the set $K := \overline{gWg^{-1}}$ is compact and

$$F := \{(h, v) \in K \times V : hvh^{-1} \notin V\}$$

is a closed subset of $K \times V$. Since $(h, 1) \notin F$ for all $h \in K$, by the “tube lemma” there exists some $W' \subseteq_1 G$ so that $hW'h^{-1} \subseteq V$ for all $h \in K$. Though we prove this more generally later, we can already see that the class of 3-balanced Polish groups strictly contains the class of 2-balanced Polish groups since not every locally-compact Polish group is TSI (for example, take $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ [Gao09, Bec98]).

The next proposition collects some basic properties that will be useful in what follows.

Proposition 2.3. *Let G be a topological group and let $U, V, U', V' \subseteq_1 G$ and $h \in G$. Then:*

- (1) *if $V' \subseteq V$ and $U \subseteq U'$, then $\mathrm{rk}(V, U) \leq \mathrm{rk}(V', U')$;*
- (2) *$\mathrm{rk}(hVh^{-1}, hUh^{-1}) = \mathrm{rk}(V, U)$; and*
- (3) *$\mathrm{rk}(V \cap V', U) \leq \max\{\mathrm{rk}(V, U), \mathrm{rk}(V', U)\}$.*

Proof. (1) follows by induction on $\alpha := \mathrm{rk}(V', U')$. If $\mathrm{rk}(V', U') = 0$ holds, then

$$U \subseteq U' \subseteq V' \subseteq V$$

and thus $\mathrm{rk}(V, U) = 0$ holds. Let now $\alpha > 0$ and assume by inductive hypothesis that (1) holds if $\mathrm{rk}(V', U') < \alpha$. But if $\mathrm{rk}(V', U') = \alpha$ holds, then there is $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that

$$\mathrm{rk}(V', gWg^{-1}) < \alpha \quad \text{for all } g \in U'.$$

But then, by the induction hypothesis and the assumption $U \subseteq U'$, we have

$$\mathrm{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha \quad \text{for all } g \in U.$$

We therefore conclude that $\mathrm{rk}(V, U) \leq \alpha$ also holds.

(2) follows by a similar induction on $\alpha := \mathrm{rk}(V, U)$. For $\alpha = 0$, simply observe that

$$U \subseteq V \quad \iff \quad hUh^{-1} \subseteq hVh^{-1}.$$

Assume now that $\alpha > 0$ and fix some $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that for every $g \in U$ we have that $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha$. By the induction hypothesis, for every $g \in U$ we have that

$$\text{rk}(hVh^{-1}, hgWg^{-1}h^{-1}) < \alpha.$$

Hence, $\widehat{W} = hWh^{-1}$ witnesses that for every $f = hgh^{-1} \in hUh^{-1}$ we have that

$$\text{rk}(hVh^{-1}, f\widehat{W}f^{-1}) < \alpha,$$

and thus $\text{rk}(hVh^{-1}, hUh^{-1}) \leq \alpha$ also holds.

(3) is proved by induction on $\alpha := \max\{\text{rk}(V, U), \text{rk}(V', U)\}$. For $\alpha = 0$, we have

$$U \subseteq V \text{ and } U \subseteq V' \iff U \subseteq V \cap V'.$$

Assume now that $\alpha > 0$ and fix $W, W' \subseteq_1 G$ such that for every $g \in U$ we have

$$\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha \text{ and } \text{rk}(V', gW'g^{-1}) < \alpha.$$

Taking $\widehat{W} := W \cap W'$ and invoking (1), for every $g \in U$ we have that

$$\text{rk}(V, g\widehat{W}g^{-1}) \text{ and } \text{rk}(V', g\widehat{W}g^{-1}) < \alpha.$$

By the induction hypothesis $\text{rk}(V \cap V', g\widehat{W}g^{-1}) < \alpha$ holds for all $g \in U$, and thus

$$\text{rk}(V \cap V', U) \leq \alpha$$

as desired. \square

We close this section with a lemma which implies that, when it comes to second-countable topological groups, $\text{rk}(V, U)$ can be computed using countable amount of data.

Lemma 2.4. *Let Q be a dense subgroup of G and let \mathcal{V} be a basis of open neighborhoods of 1_G . Suppose $\text{rk}_{Q, \mathcal{V}}(V, U)$ is defined the same way as $\text{rk}(V, U)$ except that in the definition of $\text{rk}_{Q, \mathcal{V}}(V, U) < \beta$ for $\beta > 0$ we additionally require that $W \in \mathcal{V}$ and $g \in Q \cap U$. Then for every $U, V \subseteq_1 G$ we have that $\text{rk}(V, U) = \text{rk}_{Q, \mathcal{V}}(V, U)$.*

Proof. Let $U, V \subseteq_1 G$. The fact that $\text{rk}_{Q, \mathcal{V}}(V, U) \leq \text{rk}(V, U; G)$ holds, follows from a routine induction argument using Proposition 2.3 (1). For the reverse inequality, we assume that $\text{rk}_{Q, \mathcal{V}}(V, U) = \alpha$ holds and we show that $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \alpha$ holds, by induction on α . Since the two definitions agree for $\alpha = 0$, the base case is covered. Now suppose $\alpha > 0$ and assume the claim is true below α . Let $W \in \mathcal{V}$ with $\text{rk}_{Q, \mathcal{V}}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha$, and thus $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha$ for all $g \in Q \cap U$. Let $W_0 \subseteq_1 G$ with $W_0^3 \subseteq W$ and $h \in U$ be arbitrary. Choosing any $g \in Q \cap U \cap hW_0^{-1}$ we have:

$$\text{rk}(V, hW_0h^{-1}) \leq \text{rk}(V, (gW_0)W_0(gW_0)^{-1}) \leq \text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha$$

as desired, where both inequalities follow from Proposition 2.3 (1). \square

Remark 2.5. The term “ α -balanced Polish group” was suggested (but not defined) in our earlier work [AP21, Section 7]. An attempt to define this term appears in [LY22], which is unfortunately a bit different from our definition here. The authors of the latter paper take a more indirect approach in that the “ α -balancedness” (in their sense) of a Polish group

G is inferred from the action of $c_0(G) := \{(g_n) \in G^\omega : g_n \rightarrow 1_G\}$ on G^ω . However, they do not succeed in producing CLI Polish groups which are not ω -balanced in their sense.

3. CONSTRUCTIONS AND CLOSURE PROPERTIES

In this section, we study how the rank assignment function $G \mapsto \text{rk}(G)$ behaves in the context of various classical constructions in the category of topological groups. As an application, we end this section by deriving the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *For each ordinal $\alpha > 0$, there exist a topological group G with $\text{rk}(G) = \alpha$.*

3.1. Topological subgroups and quotients. An **embedding** of topological groups is an injective homomorphism $H \rightarrow G$ that is continuous and open-on-its-image. An **epimorphism** of topological groups is a surjective homomorphism $G \rightarrow H$ that is continuous.

Proposition 3.2. *Let G and H be topological groups. Then:*

- (1) *if there exists an embedding $i: H \rightarrow G$, then $\text{rk}(H) \leq \text{rk}(G)$; and*
- (2) *if there exists an open epimorphism $q: G \rightarrow H$, then $\text{rk}(H) \leq \text{rk}(G)$.*

Proof. For (1), since the homomorphism i is open on its range, every open neighborhood of 1_H in H is of the form $i^{-1}(O)$, for some $O \subseteq_1 G$. Hence, (1) follows from the next claim.

Claim 3.3. *For all $V, U \subseteq_1 G$ we have that $\text{rk}(i^{-1}(V), i^{-1}(U); H) \leq \text{rk}(V, U; G)$.*

Proof of Claim. Clearly $U \subseteq V$ implies that $i^{-1}(U) \subseteq i^{-1}(V)$ and therefore the claim holds if $\text{rk}(V, U; G) \leq 0$. Assume now the claim holds for all $V, U \subseteq_1 G$ with $\text{rk}(V, U; G) < \alpha$ and let $V, U \subseteq_1 G$, for which there is some $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}; G) < \alpha$ holds for all $g \in U$. But then, for $\widetilde{W} := i^{-1}(W)$ and any $h \in i^{-1}(U)$ we have $g_h := i(h) \in U$ and

$$h\widetilde{W}h^{-1} = i^{-1}(g_hWh_h^{-1})$$

Hence, by inductive hypothesis, for every $h \in i^{-1}(U)$ we have that

$$\text{rk}(i^{-1}(V), h\widetilde{W}h^{-1}; H) \leq \text{rk}(V, g_hWg_h^{-1}; G) < \alpha$$

as desired. □

Similarly, (2) follows from the next claim, since q is continuous and surjective,

Claim 3.4. *If $V, U \subseteq_1 H$ and $\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{U} \subseteq_1 G$ satisfy $q(\widetilde{V}) = V$ and $q(\widetilde{U}) = U$, then*

$$\text{rk}(V, U; H) \leq \text{rk}(\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{U}; G).$$

Proof of Claim. If $q(\widetilde{V}) = V$ and $q(\widetilde{U}) = U$ hold, then $\widetilde{U} \subseteq \widetilde{V}$ implies that $U \subseteq V$ and therefore the claim holds if $\text{rk}(\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{U}; G) \leq 0$. Assume now the claim holds when $\text{rk}(\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{U}; G) < \alpha$ and let $V, U \subseteq_1 H$ and $\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{U} \subseteq_1 G$, as in the claim, for which there is some $\widetilde{W} \subseteq_1 G$ so that for all $g \in \widetilde{U}$ we have that $\text{rk}(\widetilde{V}, g\widetilde{W}g^{-1}; G) < \alpha$. Since q is open, we have that $W := q(\widetilde{W})$ is open. Since $U = q(\widetilde{U})$, for all $h \in U$ there is some $g_h \in \widetilde{U}$ so that $q(g_h) = h$. But then, for all $h \in U$ we have that:

$$\text{rk}(V, hWh^{-1}; H) \leq \text{rk}(\widetilde{V}, g_h\widetilde{W}g_h^{-1}; G) < \alpha$$

where the first inequality follows from the inductive step, since q is a homomorphism. \square

This completes the proof. \square

Let now H be a closed normal subgroup of a topological group G and let G/H be the quotient group endowed with the quotient topology. Applying Proposition 3.5 to the inclusion map $i: H \rightarrow G$ and the quotient map $q: G \rightarrow G/H$ we see that the property of being α -balanced is closed under passing to topological subgroups or quotients.

A natural question is whether there is a general formula which bounds $\text{rk}(G)$ in terms of $\text{rk}(H)$ and $\text{rk}(G/H)$. More precisely consider the following problem:

Problem 1. *Let H be a closed normal subgroup of a topological group G . Is it true that*

$$\text{rk}(G) \leq \sup \{ \text{rk}(V, H; H) + \text{rk}(G/H) : V \subseteq_1 H \}?$$

At this point it is unclear to the authors whether this problem has a positive answer even in the special case when the associated short exact sequence of topological groups **topologically splits**, or even when it (fully) **splits**. That is, even when there is a continuous function (continuous homomorphism, respectively) $s: G/H \rightarrow G$, so that $q \circ s(\hat{g}) = \hat{g}$, for all $\hat{g} \in G/H$.

$$1 \longrightarrow H \xrightarrow{i} G \xrightleftharpoons[q]{s} G/H \longrightarrow 1$$

That being said, from [Gao09, Theorem 2.2.11] and Theorem 1.2 above, we have that $\text{rk}(G) < \infty$ holds if G, H are as in Problem 1 and both $\text{rk}(G/H) < \infty$ and $\text{rk}(H) < \infty$ hold.

3.2. Products of topological groups. Let $(G_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of topological groups indexed by some set I and let $G := \prod_i G_i$ the product group with the product topology. In particular, a basis of open neighborhoods of 1_G in G consists of sets of the form $V = \prod_i V_i$ with $V_i \subseteq_1 G_i$ for all $i \in I$ and $V_i = G_i$ for all but finitely many $i \in I$.

Proposition 3.5. *If $G := \prod_i G_i$, then we have that $\text{rk}(G) = \sup \{ \text{rk}(G_i) : i \in I \}$.*

The proof is a direct consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $G := \prod_i G_i$ and let basic $V, U \subseteq_1 G$ with $V := \prod_i V_i$, $U := \prod_i U_i$. Then,*

$$\text{rk}(V, U; G) = \sup \{ \text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) : i \in I \} = \max \{ \text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) : i \in I \}.$$

Proof. The fact that the supremum is realized as some $i \in I$ is a consequence of the fact that $V_i = G_i$ for all but finite $i \in I$. So it suffices to prove the first equality. Clearly $U \subseteq V$ holds if and only if $U_i \subseteq V_i$ holds for all $i \in I$. Let now $\alpha > 0$.

We first show that $\text{rk}(V, U; G) \leq \alpha$ implies $\text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) \leq \alpha$ for all $i \in I$. Assume that $\text{rk}(V, U; G) \leq \alpha$ holds and let $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}; G) < \alpha$ holds for all $g \in U$. By Proposition 2.3(1) we may assume that $W = \prod_i W_i$ is basic open. But then, W_i witnesses that $\text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) \leq \alpha$ also holds. Indeed, let $g_i \in U_i$ and extend it to any $g \in U$. By inductive hypothesis we have that:

$$\text{rk}(V_i, g_i W_i g_i^{-1}; G_i) \leq \text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}; G) < \alpha$$

Next show that if $\text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) \leq \alpha$ holds for all $i \in I$, then so does $\text{rk}(V, U; G) \leq \alpha$. Let $A \subseteq I$ be a finite set so that $V_i = G_i$ for all $i \in I \setminus A$. For each $a \in A$ let $W_a \subseteq_1 G_a$ so that for all $g_a \in U_a$ we have that $\text{rk}(V_a, g_a W_a g_a^{-1}; G_a) < \alpha$. Set $W \subseteq_1 G$ be the basic open $\prod_i W_i$ with $W_i = W_a$ for all $a \in A$ and $W_i = G_i$ otherwise. Then, for any $g = (g_i)_{i \in I} \in U$ we have that $\text{rk}(V_i, g_i W_i g_i^{-1}; G_i) < \alpha$ holds for all $i \in I$. Indeed, for $i \in A$ by assumption, and for $i \in I \setminus A$ we have that $V_i = G_i$ and hence $\text{rk}(V_i, g_i W_i g_i^{-1}; G_i) = 0$. Hence, by inductive hypothesis $\text{rk}(V, g W g^{-1}; G) < \alpha$ holds, which implies that $\text{rk}(V, U; G) \leq \alpha$. \square

Remark 3.7. Notice that if I is countable and G_i is Polish for all $i \in I$, then so is $\prod_i G_i$.

3.3. Local direct products of topological group pairs. Let $(G_i, O_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of topological groups G_i together with an open subgroup $O_i \leq G_i$, indexed by some set I . For any finite $A \subseteq I$ consider the topological group

$$H_A := \left(\prod_{i \in A} G_i \right) \times \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus A} O_i \right)$$

endowed with the product topology. For every finite $A, B \subseteq I$ with $A \subseteq B$ the inclusion

$$i_B^A: H_A \rightarrow H_B$$

is a continuous and open group homomorphism. As a consequence the direct limit

$$\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i) := \text{colim}(H_A, i_B^A)$$

is a topological group if endowed with the colimit topology. Recall that this is the finest topology which makes all the inclusion maps $i_\infty^A: H_A \rightarrow \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ continuous. We call $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ the **local direct product** of the family $(G_i, O_i)_{i \in I}$.

It is not difficult to see that $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ admits the following more concrete description:

$$\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i) := \left\{ (g_i)_i \in \prod_i G_i : g_i \in O_i \text{ for all but finitely many } i \in I \right\}$$

and the topology on $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ is the coarsest *group topology* which refines the product topology (inherited by the inclusion $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i) \subseteq \prod_i G_i$) by declaring O open, where

$$O := \prod_i O_i$$

Remark 3.8. Notice that if I is countable and G_i is Polish for all $i \in I$, then $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ is also Polish. To see this, consider the countable discrete collection of cosets

$$N = \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i) / O$$

and notice that $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ can be identified with a closed subset of the Polish space

$$\left(\prod_{i \in I} G_i \right) \times N.$$

Proposition 3.9. *If $(G_i, O_i)_{i \in I}$ is a family of pairs $O_i \leq G_i$ of topological groups with O_i open in G_i and $O := \prod_i O_i$, then we have that:*

$$\text{rk}(O, \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i); \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)) = \sup\{\text{rk}(O_i, G_i; G_i) : i \in I\}.$$

Notice that, by the concrete description of $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ above, we see that sets of the following form constitute a basis of the open neighborhoods of 1 in $\oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$:

$$V := \prod_i V_i \subseteq \prod_i G_i$$

where $V_i = O_i$ for all but finitely many $i \in I$. Below, we refer to such sets as “basic open”. As a consequence, Proposition 3.9 follows directly from the next lemma.

Lemma 3.10. *For all basic open $V, U \subseteq_1 \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ we have that:*

$$\text{rk}(V, U; \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)) = \sup\{\text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) : i \in I\}.$$

Proof. Clearly $U \subseteq V$ holds if and only if $U_i \subseteq V_i$ holds for all $i \in I$.

Assume now that $\text{rk}(V, U; \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)) \leq \alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$. By Proposition 2.3(1) we may choose a basic $W \subseteq_1 \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ so that for all $g \in U$ we have that

$$\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}; \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)) < \alpha.$$

Since every $h \in U_i$ lifts to some $g \in U$ with $g_i = h$, by inductive assumption we have

$$\text{rk}(V_i, U_i, G_i) \leq \alpha$$

for all $i \in I$. Hence, it follows that $\sup\{\text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) : i \in I\} \leq \alpha$ also holds.

Conversely, assume that for some $\alpha > 0$ and all $i \in I$ we have that $\text{rk}(V_i, U_i; G_i) \leq \alpha$ holds. Let $A \subseteq I$ be a finite set so that $V_i = U_i = O_i$ for all $i \in I \setminus A$ and consider the basic open $W \subseteq_1 \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)$ with: $W_i = O_i$, if $i \notin A$; and with W_i chosen so that for all $h \in U_i$ we have $\text{rk}(V_i, hW_i h^{-1}; G_i) < \alpha$, if $i \in A$. It follows, that for all $g \in U$ we have

$$\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}; \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)) < \alpha$$

Indeed, let $g = (g_i)_i \in U$ and notice that by the choice of A we have $g_i W_i g_i^{-1} = O_i = V_i$ for all $i \notin A$. Hence, $\text{rk}(V_i, g_i W_i g_i^{-1}; G_i) = 0$ if $i \notin A$, and by inductive assumption we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}; \oplus_i^{\text{loc}}(G_i, O_i)) &= \sup\{\text{rk}(V_i, g_i W_i g_i^{-1}; G_i) : i \in I\} \\ &= \max\{\text{rk}(V_i, g_i W_i g_i^{-1}; G_i) : i \in A\} < \alpha \end{aligned}$$

□

3.4. Wreath products and \mathbb{Z} -jumps of Polish groups. Let $P \leq \text{Sym}(I)$ be a group of permutations of a set I . Given any group G , the **wreath product of G by P** is the following semidirect product:

$$P \text{ Wr } G := P \ltimes \prod_{i \in I} G = P \ltimes G^I.$$

More concretely, $P \text{ Wr } G$ consists of all pairs $(p, (g_i)_i)$ with $p \in P$ and $(g_i)_i \in G^I$, and the group multiplication in $P \text{ Wr } G$ is given by the formula:

$$(q, (h_i)_i) \cdot (p, (g_i)_i) = (qp, (h_{p(i)} g_i)_i).$$

If P and G are topological groups and $P \curvearrowright I$ is continuous, then the product topology on the topological space $P \times \prod_a G$ renders $P \text{ Wr } G$ a topological group. In particular

Remark 3.11. If I is countable and both P, G are Polish groups then so is $P \text{ Wr } G$.

The \mathbb{Z} -**jump** of a topological group G is the topological group $\mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G$. Here we identify \mathbb{Z} with the countable discrete permutation group $\mathbb{Z} \leq \text{Sym}(\mathbb{Z})$ given by $p(k) = p + k$ for all $p, k \in \mathbb{Z}$. The following solves a special case of Problem 1.

Proposition 3.12. *Let G be a topological group and let $\text{rk}(G) = \alpha$. Then,*

- (1) *if α is a successor ordinal then $\text{rk}(\mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) = \alpha + 1$;*
- (2) *if α is a limit ordinal then $\text{rk}(\mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) = \alpha$;*

Recall that a basic open $V \subseteq_1 G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is of the form $V = \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} V_k$, with: $V_k \subseteq_1 G$, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$; and $V_k = G$, for all but finitely many $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. For any such V , consider the set:

$$\{0\} \times V \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times G^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

Notice that sets of this form constitute a basis open neighborhoods of 1 in $\mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G$. Hence, the proof of Proposition 3.12 is a direct consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $V \subseteq_1 G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be a basic open neighborhood of 1 in $G^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Then we have that:*

$$\text{rk}(\{0\} \times V, \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G; \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) = \text{rk}(V, G^{\mathbb{Z}}; G^{\mathbb{Z}}) + 1.$$

Proof. Since $W := \{0\} \times G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a normal subgroup of $\mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G$, for all $g \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G$ we have

$$\text{rk}(\{0\} \times V, gWg^{-1}; \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) = \text{rk}(\{0\} \times V, \{0\} \times G^{\mathbb{Z}}; \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) = \text{rk}(V, G^{\mathbb{Z}}; G^{\mathbb{Z}}),$$

from which it follows that $\text{rk}(\{0\} \times V, \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G; \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) \leq \text{rk}(V, G^{\mathbb{Z}}; G^{\mathbb{Z}}) + 1$.

Conversely, assume towards contradiction that $\text{rk}(\{0\} \times V, \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G; \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) \leq \beta$ holds, where $\beta := \text{rk}(V, G^{\mathbb{Z}}; G^{\mathbb{Z}})$. By Proposition 2.3(1) we may find a basic $W = \prod_k W_k \subseteq_1 G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ so that for every $g \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G$ we have that

$$\text{rk}(\{0\} \times V, g \cdot (\{0\} \times W) \cdot g^{-1}; \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) < \beta$$

But since the sets $\{k \in \mathbb{Z}: W_k \neq G\}$ and $\{k \in \mathbb{Z}: V_k \neq G\}$ are finite, setting $g := (\ell, (g_k)_k)$ for large enough $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ and any choice of $(g_k)_k \in G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we get that

$$g \cdot (\{0\} \times W) \cdot g^{-1} = \{0\} \times \widetilde{W}$$

for some basic $\widetilde{W} = \prod_k \widetilde{W}_k \subseteq_1 G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with the property $V_k \neq G \implies \widetilde{W}_k = G$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This contradicts the assumption $\beta = \text{rk}(V, G^{\mathbb{Z}}; G^{\mathbb{Z}})$ since, by Proposition 3.5, we have:

$$\text{rk}(V, G^{\mathbb{Z}}; G^{\mathbb{Z}}) = \text{rk}(\{0\} \times V, \{0\} \times \widetilde{W}; \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G) < \beta$$

as desired. □

3.5. An application. Theorem 3.1, which stated that for every ordinal there is a topological group with that rank, is a simple consequence of the above constructions:

Proof of Theorem 3.1. For each $\alpha > 0$, we define a topological group with $\text{rk}(G_\alpha) = \alpha$. In the process, we will also need specify an open subgroup $O_\alpha \leq G_\alpha$, which satisfies

$$(1) \quad \text{rk}(G_\alpha) = \text{rk}(O_\alpha, G_\alpha, G_\alpha) + 1,$$

whenever α is a successor ordinal.

If $\alpha = 1$, then simply set $G_\alpha := O_\alpha := \{1\}$ be the trivial group.

If α is a limit ordinal, then let $G_\alpha = \prod_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta$. By Proposition 3.5 we have that

$$\text{rk}(G_\alpha) = \sup\{\text{rk}(G_\beta) : \beta < \alpha\} = \sup\{\beta : \beta < \alpha\} = \alpha,$$

where the middle equality follows by inductive assumption. Since α is not a successor ordinal, we can arbitrarily choose O_α to be, say, equal to G_α .

If α is a successor ordinal then we distinguish between the following two cases.

If $\alpha = \lambda + 1$ for a limit ordinal λ then set $G_\alpha := \bigoplus_{\beta < \lambda}^{\text{loc}} (G_\beta, O_\beta)$ and $O_\alpha := \prod_{\beta < \alpha} O_\beta$. By Proposition 3.9, inductive assumption and the cofinality of successor ordinals $\beta < \lambda$ in λ ,

$$\text{rk}(O_\alpha, G_\alpha; G_\alpha) = \sup\{\text{rk}(O_\beta, G_\beta, G_\beta) : \beta < \alpha\} = \lambda$$

It follows that $\text{rk}(G_\alpha) \geq \lambda + 1 = \alpha$. The fact that $\text{rk}(G_\alpha) \leq \alpha$ also holds, and hence so does $\text{rk}(G_\alpha) = \alpha$, is an elaboration on Lemma 3.10 and the fact the tightness of choice of $O_\beta \leq G_\beta$ with $\beta < \lambda$, coming from (1) above.

If $\alpha = \beta + 1$ for some successor ordinal, then let G_β, O_β satisfying (1) above and let

$$G_\alpha := \mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad O_\alpha := (O_\beta)^\mathbb{Z} \subseteq (G_\beta)^\mathbb{Z}$$

But then, by Proposition 3.12 and Lemma 3.13 it follows that

$$\alpha = \beta + 1 = \text{rk}(G_\alpha) = \text{rk}(O_\alpha, G_\alpha; G_\alpha) + 1$$

as desired. \square

4. STRATIFYING THE CLASS OF ALL CLI GROUPS

In this section, we formulate and prove a version of Theorem 1.2 —which stated that the CLI Polish groups are precisely those Polish groups with (countable) ordinal rank— for the more general class of metrizable topological groups. We then specialize this more general statement to the class of Polish groups and recover Theorem 1.2.

A **metrizable** group is a topological group G which admits a metric d that is compatible with its topology. By Birkhoff-Kakutani [Bir36, Kak36] a topological group is metrizable if and only if its topology is Hausdorff and first-countable. Moreover, every such group admits a metric d_ℓ that is both compatible with the topology and **left-invariant**:

$$\forall f, g, h \in G \quad d_\ell(fg, fh) = d_\ell(g, h).$$

Setting $d_r(g, h) := d_\ell(g^{-1}, h^{-1})$ we see that G also admits a **right-invariant** metric d_r compatible with the topology. Combining the two metrics we get the **strong metric**:

$$d_s(g, h) := d_\ell(g, h) + d_r(g, h)$$

While d_s is neither left-invariant nor right-invariant, it has the following important property: the completion \widehat{G}^s of G with respect to d_s carries a natural topological group structure which extends the group structure of G . In contrast, the completions $\widehat{G}^\ell, \widehat{G}^r$ of G with respect to d_ℓ and d_r , respectively, fail to carry a topological group structure that extends that of G . That is, unless $\widehat{G}^\ell = \widehat{G}^s = \widehat{G}^r$ holds. As it turns out, $\text{rk}(G)$ measures the

difficulty of the task of confirming whether $\widehat{G}^\ell = \widehat{G}^s$ holds. Before we make this precise, we recall that the definitions of \widehat{G}^ℓ , \widehat{G}^r and \widehat{G}^s do not depend on the choice of d_ℓ .

Let G be a metrizable group. A sequence $(g_n)_n$ in G is **left-Cauchy** if for every $V \subseteq_1 G$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all $n \geq n_0$ we have that $g_n \in g_{n_0}V$, and it is **right-Cauchy** if for every $V \subseteq_1 G$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all $n \geq n_0$ we have that $g_n \in Vg_{n_0}$. It is finally **strongly Cauchy**, if it is both left-Cauchy and right-Cauchy. It is not difficult to see that $(g_n)_n$ is left-Cauchy if and only if it is Cauchy to some (equivalently, any) left-invariant metric d_ℓ on G . Similar, is the relation between right-Cauchy (respectively, strongly Cauchy) sequences and Cauchy sequences with respect to d_r (respectively, d_s). In particular, this provides a “metric-free” definition of the completions \widehat{G}^ℓ , \widehat{G}^r and \widehat{G}^s .

Theorem 4.1. *If G is a metrizable topological group, then we have that:*

$$\widehat{G}^\ell = \widehat{G}^s \iff \text{rk}(G) < \infty \iff \text{rk}(G) < \omega_1$$

Proof. To establish the first equivalence, it suffices to show that the following two properties of G are equivalent:

- (1) every left-Cauchy sequence in G is also right-Cauchy;
- (2) there is some ordinal α so that $\text{rk}(V, G) \leq \alpha$ holds, for every $V \subseteq_1 G$.

We first prove (2) \implies (1). Assume that $\text{rk}(V, G) \leq \alpha$ for every $V \subseteq_1 G$ and let $(g_n)_n$ be a left-Cauchy sequence in G . Fix also some $V \subseteq_1 G$. By applying the next claim to $U = G$, we get some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all $n \geq n_0$ we have that $g_n \in Vg_{n_0}$, as desired.

Claim 4.2. *Suppose that for some $U, V \subseteq_1 G$ and $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \alpha$ and $g_n \in Ug_{m_0}$, for all $n \geq m_0$. Then, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $g_n \in Vg_{n_0}$, for all $n \geq n_0$.*

Proof of Claim. If $\alpha = 0$ then $U \subseteq V$ and hence the claim follows for $n_0 := m_0$.

Assume now that $\alpha > 0$ and that the claim holds below α . Let $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that for all $g \in U$, we have $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha$. Since $(g_n)_n$ is left-Cauchy, there exists some $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $g_n \in g_{m_1}(g_{m_0}^{-1}Wg_{m_0})$, for all $n \geq m_1$. Assuming without loss of generality that $m_1 \geq m_0$, we get $g \in U$ so that $g_{m_1} = gg_{m_0}$. But then, for all $n \geq m_1$ we have that

$$g_n \in g_{m_1}(g_{m_0}^{-1}Wg_{m_0}) = g_{m_1}(g_{m_0}^{-1}W)g_{m_0} = gg_{m_0}(g_{m_0}^{-1}W)g^{-1}g_{m_1} = (gWg^{-1})g_{m_1}.$$

Since $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha$ holds, by the inductive hypothesis we get $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for every $n \geq n_0$ we have $g_n \in Vg_{n_0}$ as desired. \square

Next we prove (1) \implies (2). Assume that there is no ordinal α as in (2). Since G is a set, this implies that there exists some $V \subseteq_1 G$ in G so that $\text{rk}(V, G) = \infty$. We will define a left-Cauchy sequence $(g_n)_n$ which is not right-Cauchy. In fact, fix any $\tilde{V} \subseteq_1 G$ with $\tilde{V}^3 \subseteq V$. We will prove the following stronger claim:

Claim 4.3. *There exists a left-Cauchy $(g_n)_n$ in G so that $g_{n+1} \notin \tilde{V}g_n$ holds, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Fix $G =: W_{-1} \supseteq W_0 \supseteq W_1 \supseteq \dots$ a basis of neighborhoods around 1_G in G so that $W_n^{-1} = W_n$ and $W_n^2 \subseteq W_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. First we recursively define some sequence $(h_n)_n$ in G together with open neighborhoods \widetilde{W}_n of 1_G in G , so that:

- (1) $h_n \in h_{n-1}\widetilde{W}_{n-1}h_{n-1}^{-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (2) $\text{rk}(V, h_n\widetilde{W}_nh_n^{-1}) = \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (3) $h_0\dots h_{n-1}\widetilde{W}_nh_{n-1}^{-1}\dots h_0^{-1} \subseteq W_n$; and
- (4) $\widetilde{W}_n \subseteq \widetilde{V}$.

Suppose now that we have successfully defined such a sequence, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$g_n := h_n\dots h_0.$$

By (1) above we have that

$$g_{n+1}^{-1}g_n = h_0^{-1}\dots h_n^{-1}h_{n+1}h_n\dots h_0 \in h_0^{-1}\dots h_{n-1}^{-1}\widetilde{W}_nh_{n-1}\dots h_0$$

which is contained in W_n by (3). Thus $(g_n)_n$ is left-Cauchy. On the other hand, we have that $g_{n+1}g_n^{-1} = h_{n+1} \notin \widetilde{V}$ also holds, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, otherwise we would have

$$h_{n+1}\widetilde{W}_{n+1}h_{n+1}^{-1} \subseteq \widetilde{V}^3 \subseteq V$$

by (4) and the choice of \widetilde{V} , which would contradict (2).

We finish by constructing $(h_n)_n$. Since $\text{rk}(V, W_{-1}) = \infty$, we may choose h_0 satisfying

$$\text{rk}(V, h_0W_0h_0^{-1}) = \infty,$$

and set $\widetilde{W}_0 := W_0 \cap \widetilde{V}$. Next, assume for the inductive step that h_0, \dots, h_n and $\widetilde{W}_0, \dots, \widetilde{W}_n$ have been defined so that they satisfy properties (1)–(4) above. Choose \widetilde{W}_{n+1} to be any open neighborhood of 1_G that is small enough so that both $h_0\dots h_n\widetilde{W}_{n+1}h_n^{-1}\dots h_0^{-1} \subseteq W_n$ and $\widetilde{W}_{n+1} \subseteq \widetilde{V}$ hold. By property (2) above we can find some $h_{n+1} \in h_n\widetilde{W}_nh_n^{-1}$ so that

$$\text{rk}(V, h_{n+1}\widetilde{W}_{n+1}h_{n+1}^{-1}) = \infty.$$

It's easy to check that properties (1)–(4) are satisfied for h_{n+1} and W_{n+1} as well. \square

This concludes the proof of the first equivalence in the statement of Theorem 4.1. The second and last equivalence is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.4 below. \square

Lemma 4.4. *If $V, U \subseteq_1 G$ for metrizable G , then $\text{rk}(V, U) < \infty$ implies $\text{rk}(V, U) < \omega_1$.*

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Let $\alpha := \text{rk}(V, U)$ be an ordinal and fix a countable dense subgroup $Q \leq G$ and a countable basis \mathcal{V} of open neighborhoods of 1_G so that $gOg^{-1} \in \mathcal{V}$ for all $O \in \mathcal{V}$ and $g \in Q$. Since \mathcal{V} is countable it suffices to prove the following claim.

Claim 4.5. *For every $\beta < \alpha$ there exists some $O \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\text{rk}(V, O) = \beta$.*

Proof of Claim. Assume that this fails for some $\beta < \alpha$. But then we can define a sequence $(O_n, \alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $O_n \in \mathcal{V}$ and α_n is an ordinal with $\alpha_n > \beta$, so that $\text{rk}(V, O_n) = \alpha_n$ and $\alpha_{n+1} < \alpha_n$ hold. This would clearly contradict the well-foundedness of ordinals.

The sequence $(O_n, \alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is defined recursively. Set $\alpha_0 = \alpha$ and $O_0 = U$. Assume now that O_n and α_n have been defined with $\alpha_n > \beta$. By inductive assumption we have that $\text{rk}(V, O_n) = \alpha_n$. By Lemma 2.4 we can fix some $W \in \mathcal{V}$ so that for every $g \in Q \cap O_n$, $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha_n$. But then there must exist $g \in Q \cap O_n$ with $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) > \beta$. Indeed,

otherwise we would have $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) \leq \beta$ for all $g \in \mathcal{Q}$, and since by the choice of β , $gWg^{-1} \in \mathcal{V}$ implies $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) \neq \beta$, we get the following contradiction:

$$\alpha_n = \text{rk}(V, O_n) = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{V}}(V, O_n) \leq \beta.$$

Hence, we may simply set $O_{n+1} := gWg^{-1}$ and $\alpha_{n+1} := \text{rk}(V, O_{n+1})$, for any such set $gWg^{-1} \in \mathcal{V}$ which satisfies $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) > \beta$. \square

This completes the proof. \square

We can now put everything together and derive Theorem 1.2 from the introduction.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Recall that for any Polish group G we have that $\widehat{G}^s = G$. The reason is that \widehat{G}^s is a Polish group and G is a dense G_δ subgroup of G . Hence, by the Baire-category theorem, the only coset of G in \widehat{G}^s is G itself. As a consequence of this observation, the first statement of Theorem 1.2 follows directly from Theorem 4.1. The second statement of Theorem 1.2 follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1 and the Remarks 3.11, 3.8, 3.7. Another family of examples of Polish groups G_α with $\text{rk}(G_\alpha) = \alpha$ for all (successor) ordinals $\alpha < \omega_1$ will be given in Section 5. \square

5. AUTOMORPHISM GROUPS OF COUNTABLE STRUCTURES

In this section we consider α -balancedness in the context of automorphism groups $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ of countable structures \mathcal{M} . In particular, we show that $\text{rk}(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M}))$ corresponds to a minor modification of a rank that Deissler developed for countable \mathcal{L} -structures. Loosely speaking, $\text{rk}(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})) = \alpha < \infty$ holds if and only if every attempt to build some $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -elementary embedding $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ results to a surjective map and, moreover, the proof that surjectivity is unavoidable requires strategies which are “ α -complex”. This connection allows us to import model-theoretic intuition into the study of α -balanced groups. We use these to generate a “uniformly defined” family of CLI Polish groups with unbounded balanced rank and derive Theorem 1.3. This family consists of automorphism groups of certain scattered linear orders and it will play important role in Part II of the paper.

We start by recalling the classical correspondence between non-archimedean Polish groups and countable model-theoretic structures. A Polish group G is **non-archimedean**, if it admits a basis of neighborhoods of the identity consisting of open *subgroups*. The prototypical non-archimedean Polish group is the group $S_\infty := \text{Sym}(\mathbb{N})$, of all permutations of \mathbb{N} , endowed with the pointwise-convergence topology. In fact, up to isomorphism, non-archimedean Polish group are precisely the closed subgroups of S_∞ .

The following proposition justifies, among other things, the use of basic countable model theory to understand the non-archimedean Polish groups. By a countable \mathcal{L} -structure we mean an \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{M} so that both the language \mathcal{L} and the domain $M := \text{dom}(\mathcal{M})$ are countable. We endow the group $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ of all automorphisms of \mathcal{M} with the pointwise-convergence topology. For a proof of the following classical result, see [BK96, 1.5.1].

Proposition 5.1. *Given a Polish group G , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) G is non-archimedean;

- (2) G is isomorphic to a closed subgroup of S_∞ ;
- (3) G is isomorphic to $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ for a countable \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{M} ;
- (4) G has a compatible left-invariant ultrametric.

Recall that an ultrametric is metric which satisfies the following strengthening of the triangle inequality: for all x, y, z we have $d(x, y) \leq \max\{d(x, z), d(z, y)\}$. For example, a natural left-invariant ultrametric d_ℓ on S_∞ is given by

$$d_\ell(g, h) := \sum \{1/2^n \mid n \in \omega, g(n) \neq h(n)\}.$$

This metric is not complete, and thus S_∞ is not CLI. To see this, view S_∞ as a G_δ subset of ω^ω equipped with the Polish topology of pointwise convergence. Then the injections in ω^ω are precisely the limits of d_ℓ -Cauchy sequences in S_∞ .

With this discussion in mind, we will speak only of automorphism groups $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ of countable structures \mathcal{M} for the remainder of this section, with the understanding that this discussion applies to the class of non-archimedean Polish groups.

We now state a characterization of Gao, which characterizes the CLI Polish automorphism groups in terms of model theoretic concepts. We will follow with a review of all the relevant model-theoretic concepts.

Theorem 5.2 (Gao, [Gao98]). *For a countable \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{M} , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ is CLI;
- (2) there is no nontrivial $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -elementary embedding of \mathcal{M} into \mathcal{M} ;
- (3) there is no uncountable model with the same $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -theory as \mathcal{M} .

For any language \mathcal{L} , the $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ formulas are those that are built up from atomic formulas using symbols in \mathcal{L} allowing finite quantification, and disjunction and conjunctions of any collection of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -formulas on a common finite variable context. If disjunctions and conjunctions are further restricted to be of countable size, then we get the $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -formulas. Given an \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{M} , formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$, and $\bar{a} \in M^{|\bar{x}|}$, we write $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ iff $\varphi(\bar{a})$ holds in \mathcal{M} . An important fact is that if \mathcal{M} is a countable \mathcal{L} -structure then for any tuple \bar{a} in \mathcal{M} there is a $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -sentence $\varphi(\bar{x})$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ holds and for any other tuple \bar{b} , if $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{b})$ holds, then there is an automorphism g of \mathcal{M} such that $g(\bar{a}) = \bar{b}$. We call φ a *Scott sentence* of \bar{a} . For a review of the theory of Scott sentences see [Gao09, Chapter 12], though only the knowledge that they exist is necessary for the following discussion.

An $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -elementary embedding of an \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{M} into an \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{N} is an injection $f : M \rightarrow N$ satisfying that for any tuple \bar{a} from M and any $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ we have $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ iff $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(f(\bar{a}))$. The $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -theory of an \mathcal{L} -structure is the set of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ sentences (formulas with no free variables) that hold in the structure.

5.1. The Deissler rank. The following rank function, which we call *Deissler rank*, is due to Deissler in [Dei77], except that here we will use tuples \bar{a}, \bar{b} instead of points a, b in the recursion. Let \mathcal{M} be a countable \mathcal{L} -structure and let \bar{a} and \bar{b} be tuples from \mathcal{M} . Write $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq 0$ iff \bar{a} is definable from \bar{b} in the sense that there is some $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ and moreover there is no other tuple \bar{c} such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{c}, \bar{b})$. For $\alpha > 0$ we recursively define $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq \alpha$ to mean that there is a tuple \bar{c} and some

$\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{c}, \bar{b})$ and for every \bar{c}' , if $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{c}', \bar{b})$ then we have $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}\bar{c}) < \alpha$. If $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq \alpha$ does not hold for any α , then we write $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \infty$.

The following proposition establishes a direct correspondence between the rank from Definition 1.1 and the Deissler rank, in the context of automorphism groups of countable structures. Below, $V_{\bar{a}}$ denotes the pointwise stabilizer of \bar{a} in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let \mathcal{M} be a countable \mathcal{L} -structure. Then, for any $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in M^{<\omega}$ we have*

$$\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{\bar{b}}).$$

Proof. We will show by induction on α that for every \bar{a} and \bar{b} , $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq \alpha$ holds if and only if so does $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{\bar{b}}) \leq \alpha$.

Starting with $\alpha = 0$, we first assume $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq 0$. Fix some $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that $\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})^{\mathcal{M}}$ holds and for any other tuple \bar{c} , if $\varphi(\bar{c}, \bar{b})^{\mathcal{M}}$ holds then $\bar{c} = \bar{a}$. To see $V_{\bar{b}} \subseteq V_{\bar{a}}$, fix any $g \in V_{\bar{b}}$. Then $\varphi(g(\bar{a}), g(\bar{b}))^{\mathcal{M}}$ holds, and since $g(\bar{b}) = \bar{b}$ we can conclude $g(\bar{a}) = \bar{a}$. Thus $g \in V_{\bar{a}}$. Next, suppose $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{\bar{b}}) \leq 0$. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a Scott sentence for $\bar{a}\bar{b}$. In particular, this means $\varphi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})^{\mathcal{M}}$ holds. On the other hand, suppose \bar{c} is a tuple such that $\varphi(\bar{c}, \bar{b})^{\mathcal{M}}$ holds. Thus there is some automorphism g of \mathcal{M} such that $g(\bar{a}\bar{b}) = \bar{c}\bar{b}$. Since $g \in V_{\bar{b}}$ we conclude $g \in V_{\bar{a}}$ and thus $\bar{c} = \bar{a}$.

We handle the general case now. Let $\alpha > 0$ and suppose the claim holds below α . If $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq \alpha$ then there is some $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and tuple \bar{c} such that $\varphi(\bar{c}, \bar{b})$ holds and $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}\bar{d}) < \alpha$ holds for every \bar{d} such that $\varphi(\bar{d}, \bar{b})$ holds. For any $g \in V_{\bar{b}}$ we have $\varphi(g(\bar{c}), \bar{b})^{\mathcal{M}}$ holds and thus $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, gV_{\bar{b}\bar{c}}g^{-1}) < \alpha$ by the induction hypothesis. Therefore, $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{\bar{b}}) \leq \alpha$. Next, suppose $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{\bar{b}}) \leq \alpha$. Fix some $W \subseteq_1 V_{\bar{b}}$ such that $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, gWg^{-1}) < \alpha$ for every $g \in V_{\bar{b}}$. Choose some tuple \bar{c} such that $V_{\bar{b}\bar{c}} \subseteq W$, and let $\varphi(\bar{x}\bar{y})$ be a Scott sentence for $\bar{b}\bar{c}$. Then for any tuple \bar{d} such that $\varphi(\bar{b}, \bar{d})^{\mathcal{M}}$ holds, there is an automorphism g of \mathcal{M} with $g(\bar{b}\bar{d}) = \bar{b}\bar{c}$ in which case we have $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, gV_{\bar{b}\bar{c}}g^{-1}) < \alpha$ and thus $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}\bar{d}) < \alpha$ by the induction hypothesis. \square

In the context of Proposition 5.3, the first part of Theorem 1.2 can be seen as an extension of Deissler theorem below (and its consequent corollary) to the realm of all Polish groups.

Theorem 5.4 (Deissler, [Dei77]). *For any \mathcal{L} -structure \mathcal{M} , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *there is no nontrivial $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -elementary substructure of \mathcal{M} ;*
- (2) *$\text{Drk}(a, \emptyset) < \infty$ for every $a \in M$; and*
- (3) *$\text{Drk}(a, \emptyset) < \omega_1$ for every $a \in M$.*

Recall that \mathcal{N} is an $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -elementary substructure of \mathcal{M} if $N \subseteq M$ and for all \bar{a} in N and any $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$, we have $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$. By Proposition 5.3 and Theorem 5.2 we also have the following corollary for countable \mathcal{L} -structures \mathcal{M} :

Corollary 5.5. *$\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ is CLI if and only if $\text{Drk}(a, \emptyset) < \omega_1$ for every $a \in M$.*

5.2. Scattered linear orders and CLI Polish groups. We first remind the reader of the basic theory of scattered linear orders, and establish some notation. Given a linear order L , recursively define equivalence relations H_α on L for each ordinal α , where each H_α -class is an interval. Let H_0 be equality and define $H_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} H_\beta$ for limit α . Define

$H_{\alpha+1}$ by saying $\ell F_{\alpha+1} \ell'$ iff only finitely-many distinct H_α classes lie between $[\ell]_{H_\alpha}$ and $[\ell']_{H_\alpha}$. We call these equivalence relations H_α the **strong Hausdorff derivatives** of L .

There must be some least ordinal $\alpha(L)$ such that $H_\alpha = H_{\alpha(L)}$ for every $\alpha \geq \alpha(L)$. We call this the **strong Hausdorff rank** of L . When L is countable, $\alpha(L)$ is easily seen to be countable. If $H_{\alpha(L)}$ only has one class, then we say that L is **scattered**.

It is well known that a linear order is scattered if and only if it does not have a suborder isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} . Indeed, if $H_{\alpha(L)}$ has more than one class, then it must have infinitely-many classes, and if we let I be a suborder of L taking one point out of each $H_{\alpha(L)}$ -class, it must be dense, and thus must have a suborder isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} . On the other hand, if I is a suborder of L isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} , then for any $\ell < \ell'$ in I , an easy argument shows that $\neg(\ell H_{\alpha(L)} \ell')$. In particular, there must be more than one $H_{\alpha(L)}$ -class.

We use the adjective “strong” here in the development of the Hausdorff rank and derivative as the usual successor case of the derivative relates ℓ and ℓ' at stage $\alpha + 1$ iff the quotient linear order of H_α classes that lie between $[\ell]_{H_\alpha}$ and $[\ell']_{H_\alpha}$ is a well-order. This may lead to different ranks, but the corresponding notion of scattered will be the same.

Theorem 5.6. *If L is a scattered linear order then $\text{Aut}(L)$ is CLI.*

Proof. We prove that if L is a linear order and $a H_\alpha b$, then $\text{Drk}(a, b) \leq \alpha$.

We prove this by induction on α . For $\alpha = 0$, we point out that if $a H_0 b$ then $a = b$, and thus clearly $\text{rk}(a, b) \leq 0$. For limit α , assuming the claim is true for all $\beta < \alpha$, we have that if $a H_\alpha b$ then by definition there is some $\beta < \alpha$ such that $a H_\beta b$, in which case by the induction hypothesis we have $\text{Drk}(a, b) \leq \beta < \alpha$.

Now suppose $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and the claim is true for β . If $a H_\alpha b$, then observe that for every automorphism $\pi \in \text{Aut}(L)$ fixing b , we have $\pi(a) H_\beta a$. By the induction hypothesis we have $\text{Drk}(a, \pi(a)) \leq \beta$ for any such π . Thus by the definition of Deissler rank we have $\text{Drk}(a, b) \leq \alpha$ as desired.

Given this, we observe finally that $\text{Drk}(a, \emptyset)$ is at most $\alpha(L) + 1$ for every a , as desired. \square

The converse is not true, as it is possible to have a non-scattered linear order that is *rigid* (meaning that the only automorphism is the trivial one). For example, fix an enumeration q_n of \mathbb{Q} in ordertype ω and consider the linear order consisting of pairs (q_n, i) where $0 \leq i \leq n$ where we declare $(q_n, i) < (q_m, j)$ iff either $q_n < q_m$ or $q_n = q_m$ and $i < j$. This is easily seen to be non-scattered as the suborder of pairs $(q_n, 0)$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} . However, we will see in the next subsection that for certain nice L , the converse is indeed true in a very strong sense.

5.3. Homogeneous scattered linear orders. Given a linear order L , let L^* be the set of all functions $x : L \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ so that $x(\ell) = 0$ for all but finitely-many $\ell \in L$. Write $x <_L^* y$ iff $x \neq y$ and for the L -greatest $\ell \in L$ with $x(\ell) \neq y(\ell)$, we have $x(\ell) < y(\ell)$. Then $(L^*, <_L^*)$ is easily seen to be a linear order, which we simply denote by L^* . When L is countable, so is L^* . For examples, we have that 1^* is a \mathbb{Z} -line and 2^* is a \mathbb{Z} -line of \mathbb{Z} -lines.

We caution that the order we are considering is *not* the usual lexicographic ordering. This is particularly subtle because it only becomes truly apparent for infinite L . For

example, ω^* is not $\omega^{<\omega}$ with the lex ordering. The linear order $\omega^{<\omega}$ is a dense linear order with a left endpoint, while ω^* is a scattered linear order with strong Hausdorff rank ω .

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 5.7. *For any linear order L , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) L is a well-order;
- (2) L^* is scattered;
- (3) $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ is CLI; and
- (4) $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ does not involve S_∞ .

The fact that (2) implies (3) is Theorem 5.6. The fact that (3) implies (4) follows from [Gao09, Theorem 2.2.11] and from the fact that S_∞ is not CLI. We will prove the equivalence of (1) and (2) in the next proposition, and then we will follow up with the more involved implication $\neg(1) \rightarrow \neg(4)$.

Proposition 5.8. *If L is a countable linear order, then L^* is scattered if and only if L is a well-order.*

Proof. We start with the reverse direction. Without loss of generality assume $L = \alpha$ for some ordinal α . For $\beta < \alpha$, define the equivalence relation F_β on L^* where $x F_\beta y$ iff $x(\gamma) = y(\gamma)$ for every $\gamma \geq \beta$, and $F_\alpha = L \times L$. It is easy to check that these are precisely the Hausdorff derivatives of L^* and thus L is scattered of rank α .

Now we proceed to the forward direction, which we prove by showing that if L is ill-founded, then L^* has a suborder isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} .

First we show that if L has no minimal element, then L^* is dense. In particular, as L^* has no endpoints, this means that if L is countable with no minimal element then L^* is isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} . To this end, suppose $x <^*_L y$ in L^* . Let $\ell \in L$ be minimal such that $x(\ell) \neq 0$ or $y(\ell) \neq 0$. By the assumption there is some $\hat{\ell} \in L$ with $\hat{\ell} < \ell$. Define $z \in L^*$ by

$$z(\ell') = \begin{cases} x(\ell') & \ell' \neq \hat{\ell} \\ 1 & \ell' = \hat{\ell} \end{cases}.$$

It is easy to check that $x <^*_L z <^*_L y$, as desired.

We conclude with observing that if I is a suborder of L then there is a suborder of L^* isomorphic to I^* . Indeed, the map $x \mapsto \hat{x}$ where

$$\hat{x}(\ell) = \begin{cases} x(\ell) & \ell \in I \\ 0 & \ell \notin I \end{cases}$$

is an embedding of I^* into L^* . Of course, every ill-founded order has a suborder with no minimal element, and thus we are done. \square

Our next task is to connect these properties of the linear orders L and L^* with the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(L^*)$.

The next fact is known but highly relevant, so we include a proof for completeness.

Proposition 5.9. *The Polish group $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{Q})$ involves S_∞ .*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{Q} = A_0 \sqcup A_1 \sqcup \dots$ be a partition into dense sets and let $H \leq \text{Aut}(\mathbb{Q})$ be the (closed) subgroup of automorphisms π such that for some $\sigma \in S_\infty$, we have for every $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $i \in \omega$ that $\pi(x) \in A_{\sigma(i)}$ iff $x \in A_i$. The map from $\pi \in H$ to the unique such σ is easily seen to be a continuous surjective homomorphism from H to S_∞ . \square

The proof of Proposition 5.8 shows that, if L does not have a minimal element, then L^* is isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} , and thus $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ involves S_∞ . One's first instinct to complete the picture might be to show that if I is a suborder of L then $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ involves $\text{Aut}(I^*)$, however this runs into trouble. Instead, in the case that L is not a well-order, we will write L as $L = I + J$ where J has no minimal element, and show that $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ involves $\text{Aut}(J^*)$. Given two linear orders I and J , write $I + J$ as the linear order on

$$(\{0\} \times I) \bigsqcup (\{1\} \times J)$$

where $(k, \ell) < (k', \ell')$ iff either $k = k'$ and $\ell < \ell'$, or $k = 0$ and $k' = 1$. Note that $(I + J)^*$ is usually *not* isomorphic to $I^* + J^*$.

Lemma 5.10. *Suppose $L = I + J$ and $\pi_0 \in \text{Aut}(I^*)$, $\pi_1 \in \text{Aut}(J^*)$. Define $\pi : L^* \rightarrow L^*$ by*

$$\pi(x)(\ell) = \begin{cases} \pi_0(x \upharpoonright I)(\ell) & \ell \in I \\ \pi_1(x \upharpoonright J)(\ell) & \ell \in J \end{cases}.$$

Then $\pi \in \text{Aut}(L^)$.*

Proof. Suppose $x, y \in L^*$ with $x <^*_L y$. We need to see that $\pi(x) <^*_L \pi(y)$. Let $\ell \in L$ be greatest such that $x(\ell) \neq y(\ell)$ in which case $x(\ell) < y(\ell)$.

First we consider the case that $\ell \in I$. Then $x(\ell') = y(\ell')$ for every $\ell' \in J$ and in particular $\pi_1(x \upharpoonright J) = \pi_1(y \upharpoonright J)$. Thus $\pi(x)(\ell') = \pi(y)(\ell')$ for every $\ell' \in J$. Furthermore $(x \upharpoonright I) <^*_I (y \upharpoonright I)$ and thus $\pi_0(x \upharpoonright I) <^*_I \pi_0(y \upharpoonright I)$. There is then some $\hat{\ell} \in I$ such that $\pi(x)(\hat{\ell}) < \pi(y)(\hat{\ell})$ and $\pi(x)(\ell') = \pi(y)(\ell')$ for every $\ell' \in I$ with $\ell' > \hat{\ell}$. In fact, $\pi(x)(\ell') = \pi(y)(\ell')$ for every $\ell' \in L$ with $\ell' > \hat{\ell}$. By definition $\pi(x) <^*_L \pi(y)$.

The case that $\ell \in J$ is similar, and actually easier. Observe $(x \upharpoonright J) <^*_J (y \upharpoonright J)$, and thus $\pi_1(x \upharpoonright J) <^*_J \pi_1(y \upharpoonright J)$. Therefore there is some $\hat{\ell} \in J$ such that $\pi(x)(\hat{\ell}) < \pi(y)(\hat{\ell})$ and $\pi(x)(\ell') = \pi(y)(\ell')$ for every $\ell' > \hat{\ell}$. This means that $\pi(x) <^*_L \pi(y)$. \square

Given a subset $I \subset L$, let H_L^I be the closed subgroup of $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ consisting of the automorphisms π such that $\pi(x)(i) = x(i)$ for every $i \notin I$.

Lemma 5.11. *Suppose $L = I + J$. Then there are continuous surjective homomorphisms $\pi \mapsto \pi_I$ from H_L^I to $\text{Aut}(I^*)$ and $\pi \mapsto \pi_J$ from H_L^J to $\text{Aut}(J^*)$ defined by*

$$\pi_I(x) = \pi(\hat{x}) \upharpoonright I \quad \text{where } \hat{x}(\ell) := x(\ell) \text{ for } \ell \in I \text{ and } 0 \text{ for } \ell \in J$$

and

$$\pi_J(x) = \pi(\hat{x}) \upharpoonright J \quad \text{where } \hat{x}(\ell) := 0 \text{ for } \ell \in I \text{ and } x(\ell) \text{ for } \ell \in J.$$

Proof. The fact that the maps are continuous homomorphisms is easy to check. To see that π_I is surjective, fix an arbitrary $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(I^*)$. Applying Lemma 5.10 with $\pi_0 = \sigma$ and π_1 the identity map on J^* to get $\pi \in \text{Aut}(L^*)$, it follows by definition that $\pi \in H_L^J$ and $\pi_I = \sigma$. The surjectivity of π_J is similar. \square

Note that it follows by Lemma 5.11 that $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ involves both $\text{Aut}(I^*)$ and $\text{Aut}(J^*)$. If L is ill-founded then we can write $L = I + J$ where J has no minimal element and thus $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ involves $\text{Aut}(J^*)$. By the proof of Proposition 5.8, J^* is isomorphic to \mathbb{Q} and thus $\text{Aut}(J^*) = \text{Aut}(\mathbb{Q})$. In particular, by Proposition 5.9, we have that $\text{Aut}(J^*)$ and thus $\text{Aut}(L^*)$ involves S_∞ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.7.

In [Mal11], Malicki showed that in the Polish space of Polish groups, the set of CLI Polish groups in the standard Borel space of all Polish groups is $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$ but not $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1^1$. We may now prove Theorem 1.3, which strengthens Malicki's result to the following:

CLI Polish groups form a $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$ -complete set in the space of all Polish groups.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let LO be the Polish space of linear orders, and $\text{WO} \subseteq \text{LO}$ be the $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$ -complete set of well-orders. The map

$$L \mapsto \text{Aut}(L^*)$$

is Borel, and we just showed that it is a reduction to the set of CLI Polish groups. \square

6. A BOUNDEDNESS PRINCIPLE FOR ANALYTIC CLASSES OF CLI GROUPS

Before we have a serious discussion of analytic classes of Polish groups, we need to establish a Polish (or at least standard Borel) space of Polish groups. This can be done in several ways, so we will spend a little time detailing the particular construction we plan to use.

We will now define the Polish space \mathcal{PG} of all Polish groups, which is a topological refinement of the standard Borel space of all Polish groups from [Mal11] constructed as follows. Let (\mathbb{U}, d) be the universal Urysohn metric space [Ury27] and let $G_{\mathbb{U}} := \text{Iso}(\mathbb{U}, d)$ be its isometry group. Fix some compatible complete metric $d_{\mathbb{U}}$ on $G_{\mathbb{U}}$ and let $\mathcal{F}(G_{\mathbb{U}})$ be the hyperspace of all closed subsets of $G_{\mathbb{U}}$ endowed with the Wijsman topology [Wij66]. Recall that the Wijsman topology is the weakest topology on $\mathcal{F}(G_{\mathbb{U}})$ with the property that, for each $x \in G_{\mathbb{U}}$, the functional $\hat{x}: \mathcal{F}(G_{\mathbb{U}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\hat{x}(F) = d_{\mathbb{U}}(x, F)$ is continuous. This renders $\mathcal{F}(G_{\mathbb{U}})$ a Polish space [Bee91], whose Borel sets induce the Effros Borel structure on $\mathcal{F}(G)$; see [Kec95, Section 12.C]. Let now $\mathcal{SG}(G_{\mathbb{U}})$ be the collection of closed subgroup of G and notice that $\mathcal{SG}(G_{\mathbb{U}})$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{F}(G_{\mathbb{U}})$ and hence a Polish space. We set

$$\mathcal{PG} := \mathcal{SG}(G_{\mathbb{U}}).$$

Recall that every Polish group G embeds as a closed subgroup of $G_{\mathbb{U}}$; see [Usp90]. Hence, \mathcal{PG} can be viewed as the Polish space of all Polish groups. Let $\text{CLI} \subseteq \mathcal{PG}$ be the subset consisting of all Polish groups which are CLI. Since the existence of a sequence $(g_n)_n$ in G which is left-Cauchy but not right-Cauchy is an analytic condition, it follows that CLI is a coanalytic subset of \mathcal{PG} . By a theorem of Malicki CLI is in fact not Borel, see [Mal11].

From the general structure theory of coanalytic sets one may define an unbounded function

$$\varphi: \text{CLI} \rightarrow \omega_1$$

which constitutes a **regular Π_1^1 -rank on CLI**. That is, a function as above, which if we naturally extend to $\varphi: \mathcal{PG} \rightarrow \omega_1 \cup \{\omega_1\}$, setting $\varphi(\mathcal{PG} \setminus \text{CLI}) = \{\omega_1\}$, and let for $H, G \in \mathcal{PG}$:

$$(2) \quad H \leq_{\varphi} G \iff \varphi(H) \leq \varphi(G) \text{ and } \varphi(H) < \omega_1$$

$$(3) \quad H <_{\varphi} G \iff \varphi(H) < \varphi(G),$$

we have that both $\leq_{\varphi}, <_{\varphi}$ are coanalytic as subsets of $\mathcal{PG} \times \mathcal{PG}$; see [Kec95, Section 34.B,C].

Of course, this abstract ranking need not be “natural” in any sense. A pertinent question is whether CLI admits a regular Π_1^1 -rank which reflects the structural properties of the class CLI. To quote [Kec95, page 270]: *In many concrete situations, however, it is important to be able to find a “natural” Π_1^1 -rank on a given Π_1^1 set which reflect the particular structure of this set.* The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.1. *The assignment $G \mapsto \text{rk}(G)$ is a regular Π_1^1 -rank on CLI.*

Our strategy is to associate each group $G \in \mathcal{PG}$ with an open game where Player I has a winning strategy if and only if G is CLI. This map can be done in a Borel fashion, and moreover the set of open games in which Player I has a winning strategy has a regular Π_1^1 -rank which happens to correspond to rk on CLI.

6.1. Review of infinite games. We begin with a brief review of infinite games and winning strategies.

Let X be a countable discrete set, and let $A \subseteq X^{\omega}$ be any subset. A **game on X with payoff set A** is a combinatorial game between two players, Player I and Player II, in which both players alternate in selecting elements of X in order to construct an infinite sequence or “run” $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Player I wins if the run is in A , and Player II wins otherwise.

A winning strategy for I is a function $\sigma: X^{<\omega} \rightarrow X$ such that for any sequence a_1, a_3, \dots if a_0, a_2, \dots is inductively defined by $a_{2n} = \sigma(a_0, \dots, a_{2n-1})$, then $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in A$. Conversely, a winning strategy for II is a function $\sigma: X^{<\omega} \rightarrow X$ such that for any sequence a_0, a_2, \dots if a_1, a_3, \dots is inductively defined by $a_{2n+1} = \sigma(a_0, \dots, a_{2n})$, then $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \notin A$. We say A is **determined** if and only if either Player I or Player II has a winning strategy. We let $\sigma * \langle a_1, a_3, \dots \rangle$ denote the run as constructed when σ is a winning strategy for I, and $\sigma * \langle a_0, a_2, \dots \rangle$ denote the run as constructed when σ is a winning strategy for II.

The theory of determined sets is a deep and interesting theory which includes the study of the axiom of determinacy, an axiom stating that every set is determined (which happens to be incompatible with the axiom of choice under the ordinary rules of mathematics), as well as a celebrated result of Martin that every Borel set is determined when viewed as a subset of the product topological space $X^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the discrete topology on X . A more basic fact, however, is the result of Gale-Stewart that open sets (and thus also closed sets) are determined. The proof of this is straightforward, but we will give a refinement of this result which strongly connects with our refinement of the theory of CLI Polish groups.

We will want to consider the space of open games on X , which we denote by OPEN_X . Associating each game with its (open) payoff, we let this be the space $\mathcal{O}(X^\omega)$, the space of open subsets of X^ω . We already discussed that there is the (Polish) Wisjman topology on the Effros Borel space $\mathcal{F}(X^\omega)$, and we can use this to put a Polish topology on $\mathcal{O}(X^\omega)$ by making the complementation map $A \mapsto X^\omega \setminus A$ a homeomorphism.

Let OPEN_X^I be the set of all open games in which Player I has a winning strategy, and let OPEN_X^{II} be the set of open games in which Player II has a winning strategy. By the Gale-Stewart result, $\text{OPEN}_X = \text{OPEN}_X^I \sqcup \text{OPEN}_X^{II}$, and it's straightforward to calculate that OPEN_X^I is a Π_1^1 set and OPEN_X^{II} is a Σ_1^1 set.

Given an open game $A \in \text{OPEN}_X$ and a partial run $\bar{x} = (x_i)_{i \leq n} \in X^n$ of even length, we define the **game rank of A and \bar{x}** , denoted as follows. We say $\text{Grk}(A, \bar{x}) \leq 0$ iff $N_{\bar{x}} := \{\bar{a} \in X^\omega \mid \bar{x} \sqsubseteq \bar{a}\}$ is a subset of A . More generally, for $\alpha > 0$, we say $\text{Grk}(A, \bar{x}) \leq \alpha$ iff there is some $x_{n+1} \in X$ such that for every $x_{n+2} \in X$, we have $\text{Grk}(A, \bar{x}x_{n+1}x_{n+2}) < \alpha$. We write $\text{Grk}(A, \bar{x}) = \alpha$ iff α is the least ordinal in which $\text{Grk}(A, \bar{x}) \leq \alpha$ holds, or $\text{Grk}(A, \bar{x}) = \infty$ iff there is no such α . We define $\text{Grk}(A)$ to be $\text{Grk}(A, \langle \rangle)$. It's straightforward to check that $\text{Grk}(A) < \infty$ iff $\text{Grk}(A) < \omega_1$ iff Player I has a winning strategy for A .

The fact that the map $A \mapsto \text{Grk}(A)$ is a regular Π_1^1 -rank on W_1 can be proved by an appeal to [Kec95, 34.18], but for completeness we sketch an argument here. Given two open games $A, B \in \text{OPEN}_X$, we consider two games on $X \times X$. Both games have the same format but have different payoff sets. First, Player I makes a move in game A as Player I. Next, Player II makes a move in game A as Player II, *and* makes a move in game B as Player I. Then, Player I makes a move in game A as Player I, *and* makes a move in game B as Player II. The game continues like this to produce a sequence $(a_i, b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a run of game A and $(b_{i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a run of game B . Since Player I does not make a move in game B in their first move, we treat b_0 as a ‘‘dummy’’ move which is discarded. Informally, Players I and II play both games A and B against each other at the same time but as different players. In the first game, Player I wins as long as Player II wins game B but not before Player I wins game A . In the second game, Player I wins as long as they win game A , and moreover they win it before Player II has a chance to win game B . More formally, we define payoff sets:

$$G_{A,B}^{\leq} := \{(a_i, b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mid (b_{i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in B \text{ and } \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, (b_{i+1})_{i \leq n-1} \sqsubseteq B \rightarrow (a_i)_{i \leq n} \sqsubseteq A\}$$

and

$$G_{A,B}^{<} := \{(a_i, b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, (a_i)_{i \leq n} \sqsubseteq A \text{ and } (b_{i+1})_{i \leq n-1} \not\sqsubseteq B\}.$$

Note again that b_0 is ignored in both cases because in the very first move of the game, Player I does not make a move in game B . The following is straightforward:

Lemma 6.2. *The games $G_{A,B}^{\leq}$ and $G_{A,B}^{<}$ are open, and moreover:*

- (1) *Player I has a winning strategy in $G_{A,B}^{\leq}$ if and only if $\text{Grk}(A) \leq \text{Grk}(B)$ and $\text{Grk}(B) < \omega_1$; and*
- (2) *Player I has a winning strategy in $G_{A,B}^{<}$ if and only if $\text{Grk}(A) < \text{Grk}(B)$.*

Given that OPEN_X^I is $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$, we finish by observing that the maps $(A, B) \mapsto G_{A,B}^{\leq}$ and $(A, B) \mapsto G_{A,B}^{<}$ are open as maps from $\text{OPEN}_X \times \text{OPEN}_X$ to $\text{OPEN}_{X \times X}$. Our next goal is to define the CLI game and connect it to our rank notion.

6.2. The CLI game. Let $G_{\mathbb{U}}^0$ be a countable dense subgroup of $G_{\mathbb{U}}$, and let \mathcal{B} be a countable local basis of the identity of $G_{\mathbb{U}}$ of symmetric *regular* open sets which is closed under conjugation by elements of $G_{\mathbb{U}}^0$. Let $G \in \mathcal{PG}$, in which case G is a closed subgroup of $G_{\mathbb{U}}$. For any $U \in \mathcal{B}$, the *CLI game for U and G* is the game played on \mathcal{B} as follows:

- In the first round, Player I chooses some $V_0 \in \mathcal{B}$;
- In the second round, Player II chooses some conjugate $W_0 := gV_0g^{-1}$ where $g \in (G \cap V_0)V_0 \cap G_{\mathbb{U}}^0$;
- In round $2n + 1$, Player I chooses some $V_n \in \mathcal{B}$ with $V_n \subseteq W_{n-1}$;
- In round $2n + 2$, Player II chooses some $W_n := gV_ng^{-1}$ where $g \in (G \cap V_n)V_n \cap G_{\mathbb{U}}^0$.

Player I wins if for some n , we have $W_n \cap G \subseteq U$. Otherwise, Player II wins. This is easily an open game, which we denote by $\mathcal{C}_{U,G}$.

Proposition 6.3. *For every $U \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $\text{Grk}(\mathcal{C}_{U,G}) = \text{rk}(U, G)$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on α simultaneously for any run \bar{x} that, if W is Player II's last move in \bar{x} or $W = G_{\mathbb{U}}$ otherwise,

$$\text{Grk}(\mathcal{C}_{U,G}, \bar{x}) \leq \alpha \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{rk}(U, W \cap G).$$

For $\alpha = 0$, note that the restrictions of \mathcal{B} to G form a countable local basis of the identity of G , and thus both of the above are literally equivalent. Now let $\alpha > 0$ and assume the claim is true below α .

We start with the forward direction. Suppose $\text{Grk}(\mathcal{C}_{U,G}, \bar{x}) \leq \alpha$ where W is Player II's last move. Then there is some $V' \subseteq W$ such that for every $g \in WV' \cap G_{\mathbb{U}}^0$ and we have $\text{Grk}(\mathcal{C}_{U,G}, \bar{x} \frown \langle V', gV'g^{-1} \rangle) < \alpha$. Choose $V'' \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $(V'')^3 \subseteq V'$. Then for any $g \in W \cap G$ we have by the induction hypothesis that $\text{rk}(U, gV''g^{-1}) < \alpha$.

Now the reverse direction. Fix some $V' \subseteq W$ such that for every $g \in W \cap G$ we have $\text{rk}(U, gV'g^{-1}) < \alpha$. Choose $V'' \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $(V'')^3 \subseteq V'$. Then for any $g \in WV'' \cap G_{\mathbb{U}}^0$ we have $\text{rk}(U, gV''g^{-1}) < \alpha$ and thus $\text{Grk}(\mathcal{C}_{U,G}, \bar{x} \frown \langle V'', gV''g^{-1} \rangle) < \alpha$ by the induction hypothesis. \square

Now we define the CLI game for G as follows. In round 1, Player I does not make a move. In round 2, Player II choose some $U \in \mathcal{B}$. Then Player I and Player II begin playing $\mathcal{C}_{U,G}$ to determine the winner. Let \mathcal{C}_G denote the CLI game for G . The following is immediate:

Proposition 6.4. $\text{Grk}(\mathcal{C}_G) = \text{rk}(G)$.

What remains is to show that the map $G \mapsto \mathcal{C}_G$ is Borel as a function from \mathcal{PG} to $\text{OPEN}(\mathcal{B})$. The standard Borel space on $\text{OPEN}(\mathcal{B})$ is generated by sets $\{C \in \text{OPEN}(\mathcal{B}) \mid A \not\subseteq C\}$ where A ranges over basic open subsets of \mathcal{B}^ω . Suppose A is the basic open subset of all runs that start with

$$\langle *, U, V_0, W_0, \dots, V_n, W_n \rangle.$$

We want to show that the set of $G \in \mathcal{PG}$ such that $A \not\subseteq C_G$ is Borel. This is precisely the set of G for which there is no extension

$$V_{n+1}, W_{n+1}, \dots, V_m, W_m$$

which enters the payoff set. This is a countable universal statement, so it is enough to check that given the run

$$\langle *, U, V_0, W_0, \dots, V_m, W_m \rangle$$

the following sets of G are Borel:

- (1) The set of G in which this run enters the payoff set C_G ;
- (2) The set of G in which this run breaks the rules for Player I;
- (3) The set of G in which this run breaks the rules for Player II.

For the first, we are looking for the set of G in which $W_m \cap G \subseteq U$. By the regularity of U , this is precisely the complement of the set of G in which $G \cap (W_m \cap \bar{U}^c) \neq \emptyset$, which is Borel in Effros Borel structure. The second set is always either all of \mathcal{PG} or \emptyset , as the rules for Player I do not depend on G . For the third, we are looking for the set of G in which there is some $0 \leq k < m$ such that W_k was not a valid move. Observe W_k is not a valid move exactly when for every $g \in G_{\cup}^0$ if $g \in (G \cap V_k)V_k$ then $W_k \neq gV_kg^{-1}$. It's enough to check that for any $V_k \in \mathcal{B}$ and $g \in G_0$, the set of $G \in \mathcal{PG}$ with $g \in (G \cap V_k)V_k$ is Borel. Indeed, this is equivalent to saying $G \cap (gV_k \cap V_k) \neq \emptyset$ which is Borel in the Effros Borel structure. This concludes our proof that the map $G \mapsto \text{rk}(G)$ is a regular $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$ -rank on CLI.

7. WEAKLY α -BALANCED GROUPS

In proving that CLI groups form a class of Polish groups that is not Borel, Malicki developed a rank for Polish permutation groups similar to Deissler's rank. Here, we show that Malicki's rank generalizes to a rank for all topological groups. This leads to another stratification of CLI Polish groups into the classes of *weakly α -balanced Polish groups*. Here we only briefly discuss these connections, as the theory of weakly α -balanced Polish groups follows exactly the same lines as the theory of α -balanced Polish groups.

Let G be a topological group and $U, V \subseteq_1 G$. Consider the rank function rk^* we would get if we modify the base case of $\text{rk}(-, -)$ by declaring $\text{rk}^*(V, U) = 0$ if and only if $U \subseteq FV$ for some finite $F \subseteq G$. We leave the other clauses unchanged, so $\text{rk}^*(V, U) \leq \beta$ if there is $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that if $g \in U$, then $\text{rk}^*(V, gWg^{-1}) < \beta$, and $\text{rk}^*(V, U) = \infty$ if there is no ordinal β , for which $\text{rk}^*(V, U) \leq \beta$. We say that G is **weakly α -balanced** if and only if

$$\text{rk}^*(G) := \sup\{\text{rk}^*(V, G) + 1 : V \subseteq_1 G\} \leq \alpha.$$

Example 7.1. Consider the full lamplighter group $L := \mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z} \times \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. By Proposition 3.12 it follows that $\text{rk}(L) = 3$, and it is easy to check that $\text{rk}^*(L) = 2$.

The difference between rk and rk^* (see Example 7.1) turns out to be rather marginal:

Proposition 7.2. *For any Polish group G , we have $\text{rk}(G) \leq \text{rk}^*(G) \leq \text{rk}(G) + 1$, and moreover $\text{rk}(G) = \text{rk}^*(G)$ whenever either is infinite.*

Proof. Fix any $U, V \subseteq_1 G$. A straightforward induction shows that $\text{rk}^*(V, U) \leq \text{rk}(V, U)$. On the other hand, we show that $\text{rk}(V^3, U) \leq 1 + \text{rk}^*(V, U)$. We prove this simultaneously for every U and V . For the base case, suppose $\text{rk}^*(V, U) = 0$. Fix some finite $F \subseteq G$ such that $U \subseteq FV$. Now we can define $W \subseteq_1 G$ to be the set

$$W := \bigcap_{g \in F} gVg^{-1}.$$

We show that for any $u \in U$, we have $uWu^{-1} \subseteq V^3$. To that end, fix any $u \in U$, in which case $u^{-1} \in U$ by symmetry of U , and thus there is some $g \in G$ with $g^{-1}u^{-1} \in V$. We also have $ug \in V$ by symmetry of V . Then $uWu^{-1} \subseteq ugVg^{-1}u^{-1} \subseteq V^3$.

The induction step is completely routine. Suppose $\alpha > 0$ and $\text{rk}(V^3, U) \leq 1 + \text{rk}^*(V, U)$ for every U and V with $\text{rk}^*(V, U) < \alpha$. Now suppose $\text{rk}^*(V, U) \leq \alpha$. We may then fix some $W \subseteq_1 G$ with $\text{rk}^*(V, uWu^{-1}) < \alpha$ for every $u \in U$. By the induction hypothesis we have $\text{rk}(V^3, uWu^{-1}) \leq 1 + \text{rk}^*(V, uWu^{-1}) < 1 + \alpha$ for every $u \in U$. Thus $\text{rk}(V^3, U) \leq \alpha$ as desired. The proposition follows. \square

This weaker rank easily corresponds to a weaker variation of the Deissler rank, where the base case is modified to replace definable closure with algebraic closure. Let \mathcal{L} be a language and \mathcal{M} an \mathcal{L} -structure. For every pair of tuples $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in M^{<\omega}$ we define $\text{Drk}^*(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = 0$ iff there is some $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$ -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that $\varphi^{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ holds and moreover there are only finitely many $\bar{c} \in M^{<\omega}$ such that $\varphi^{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{c}, \bar{b})$ holds. For general α , we define $\text{Drk}^*(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ inductively the exact same way as $\text{Drk}(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ but replacing every instance of Drk with Drk^* . By essentially the same argument as Proposition 5.3, we have $\text{Drk}^*(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \text{rk}^*(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{\bar{b}})$.

7.1. Malicki's orbit tree. Let P be a closed subgroup of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{N}_+)$, where $\mathbb{N}_+ := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. For any $n \geq 0$, let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For any $\bar{a} \in (\mathbb{N}_+)^{<\omega}$, and any $n \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{a}}^n$ be the orbit of \bar{a} under the stabilizer $P_{[n]}$ of $[n]$ in P , acting with the diagonal action on $(\mathbb{N}_+)^{|\bar{a}|}$.

Malicki defines the **orbit tree** T_P of P to be the tree on all infinite $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{a}}^n$ ordered by reverse inclusion. Note that Malicki only defined this for orbits of individual points rather than tuples, but the definition generalizes naturally. The **Malicki rank** $\text{Mrk}(P)$ of P is then defined to be Cantor-Bendixson rank $\text{CBrk}(T_P)$ of the tree T_P , where the Cantor-Bendixson rank of a tree T is defined as follows. Given $a \in T$, if a is a leaf of T then $\text{CBrk}(a) = 0$. For $\alpha > 0$, we inductively define $\text{CBrk}(a) \leq \alpha$ iff $\text{CBrk}(b) < \alpha$ holds for every $b \in T$ with $b \geq a$. If $\text{CBrk}(a) \leq \alpha$ does not hold for any α , then $\text{CBrk}(a) = \infty$, otherwise $\text{CBrk}(a) = \alpha$ for is least α so that $\text{CBrk}(a) \leq \alpha$ holds. Finally, $\text{CBrk}(T)$ is defined to be the sup of $\text{CBrk}(a) + 1$ where a ranges over all of T .

Proposition 7.3. *For any $P \leq \text{Sym}(\mathbb{N}_+)$, we have $\text{rk}^*(P)$ is precisely $\text{Mrk}(P)$.*

Proof. We prove that $\text{rk}(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{[n]}) = \text{CBrk}(\mathcal{O}_{\bar{a}}^n)$. Specifically, we prove by induction that for any ordinal α , we have $\text{rk}^*(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{[n]}) \leq \alpha$ if and only if $\text{CBrk}(\mathcal{O}_{\bar{a}}^n) \leq \alpha$.

For $\alpha = 0$, we simply observe that $\text{rk}^*(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{[n]}) \leq 0$ exactly when $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{a}}^n$ is finite, which happens exactly when it is a leaf in T_G . Now let $\alpha > 0$ and assume for every $\beta < \alpha$ we have $\text{rk}^*(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{[n]}) \leq \beta$ if and only if $\text{CBrk}(\mathcal{O}_{\bar{a}}^n) \leq \beta$. Observe that $\text{rk}^*(V_{\bar{a}}, V_{[n]}) \leq \alpha$ if and only if there is some $W \subseteq_1 G$ with $\text{rk}^*(V_{\bar{a}}, vWv^{-1}) < \alpha$ for every $v \in V_{[n]}$. By Proposition 2.3.(1)

we may as well take W to be some $V_{[m]}$ for some $m > n$, and by Proposition 2.3.(2) this is equivalent to saying that $\text{rk}^*(V_{\bar{c}}, V_{[m]}) < \alpha$ for every $\bar{c} \in \mathcal{O}_a^n$. By the induction hypothesis, this is equivalent to saying that $\text{CBrk}(\mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}}^m) < \alpha$ for every $\bar{c} \in \mathcal{O}_a^n$. \square

Part II. The dynamics of α -balanced Polish groups

In Part II of this paper we connect the consequences of α -balancedness of a Polish group G to its dynamics. Our first goal is to prove Theorem 1.6 which establishes that *generic α -unbalancedness* is an obstruction to classification by α -balanced groups. The proof of Theorem 1.6 is given in Section 11 and it relies on series of intermediate results from Sections 8, 9, 10, which are interesting on their own right. Our second goal is to prove Theorem 1.8 which provides, for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, an example of an action of some α -balanced Polish group, which is generic β -unbalancedness for all $\beta < \alpha$. In Section 12 we discuss these actions and we introduce the “fusion lemma”, see Lemma 12.3. We then show how Theorem 1.8 follows from this lemma. The proof of Lemma 12.3 is then broken into two main cases which are proved in Sections 13 and 14, respectively.

We now recall and fix some usual conventions that will be used throughout Part II.

7.2. Definitions and notation. Let G be a Polish group. Recall that a **Polish G -space** is a Polish space X along with a continuous (left) action $G \curvearrowright X$. The associated **orbit equivalence relation** E_X^G is defined by setting $x E_X^G y \iff \exists g \in G \, gx = y$ for all $x, y \in X$, induces a classification problem (X, E_X^G) . If $V \subseteq G$ then “ $\forall^* g \in V \, P(g)$ ” stands for “the set $\{g \in V : P(g)\}$ is comeager in V ”, where V has been endowed with the subspace topology. If $A \subseteq X$ and $V \subseteq G$ then the **Vaught transform** of A in $G \curvearrowright X$ is the set given by

$$A^{*V} := \{x \in X : \forall^* g \in V \, gx \in A\}.$$

A **classification problem** is a pair (X, E) where X is a Polish space and E is an analytic equivalence relation on X . Let (X, E) and (Y, F) be two classification problems. A map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is an **(E, F) -homomorphism** if for all $x, y \in X$ we have that $x E y \implies f(x) F f(y)$. It is a **reduction from E to F** if $x E y \iff f(x) F f(y)$ holds for all $x, y \in X$. We say E is **generically ergodic with respect to F** if for every Baire-measurable (E, F) -homomorphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ there is a comeager $C \subseteq X$ so that $f(x) F f(y)$ for all $x, y \in C$. Let H be a Polish group. We say that E is **generically ergodic against actions of H** if for every Polish H -space Y we have that E is generically ergodic with respect to E_Y^H .

8. GENERIC α -UNBALANCEDNESS

In this section we develop some basic theory around generic α -unbalancedness. We start by recalling the main definitions from the introduction.

Definition 8.1. Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a Polish G -space and let $V \subseteq_1 G$. We recursively define binary relations $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$ on X for any ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$ as follows:

- (1) $x \rightsquigarrow_V^0 y$ iff both $x \in \overline{V \cdot y}$ and $y \in \overline{V \cdot x}$ hold.
- (2) $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$ iff for every open $W \subseteq_1 G$, and any open $U \subseteq X$ with $x \in U$ or $y \in U$, there exist $g^x, g^y \in V$ with $g^x x, g^y y \in U$ so that $g^x x \rightsquigarrow_W^\beta g^y y$ holds for every $\beta < \alpha$.

Definition 8.2. We say that $G \curvearrowright X$ is **generically α -unbalanced** for some $\alpha > 0$, if for every comeager $C \subseteq X$ there is a comeager $D \subseteq C$ so that for all $x, y \in D$ there exists

a finite sequence $x_0, \dots, x_n \in C$ with $x_0 = x, x_n = y$, so that for all $\beta < \alpha$ we have that:

$$x_0 \rightsquigarrow_G^\beta x_1 \rightsquigarrow_G^\beta \dots \rightsquigarrow_G^\beta x_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow_G^\beta x_n.$$

The following lemma summarizes some basic properties that we will use repeatedly.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a Polish G -space and let $x, y \in X$ and $V \subseteq_1 G$ with $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$. The following all hold:*

- (1) *the symmetric statement $y \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha x$ holds;*
- (2) *for any $\beta < \alpha$, we also have $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\beta y$;*
- (3) *for any $W \supseteq V$, we also have $x \rightsquigarrow_W^\alpha y$;*
- (4) *for any $g \in G$, we also have $gx \rightsquigarrow_{gVg^{-1}}^\alpha gy$; and*
- (5) *if $D \subseteq G$ is comeager and $x \rightsquigarrow_V^{\alpha, D} y$ is defined exactly as $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$, except that in Definition 8.1(2) we require $g^x, g^y \in V \cap D$, then we also have $x \rightsquigarrow_V^{\alpha, D} y$.*

Proof. The first three properties follow straight from the definition of $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$. For (4), let $U \subseteq X$ and $W \subseteq_1 G$ be open, say with $gy \in U$ (the case $gx \in U$ is similar). Since $g^{-1}U$ contains y , $g^{-1}Wg$ contains 1_G , and $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$ holds, we can find $h^x, h^y \in V$ with $h^x x, h^y y \in g^{-1}U$ and $h^x x \rightsquigarrow_{g^{-1}Wg}^\beta h^y y$ for all $\beta < \alpha$. But then $gh^x x, gh^y y \in U$ and by inductive hypothesis $gh^x x \rightsquigarrow_W^\beta gh^y y$. Setting $g^x := gh^x g^{-1}$, $g^y := gh^y g^{-1}$, we found $g^x, g^y \in gVg^{-1}$ so that $g^x(gx) \in U$, $g^y(gy) \in U$ and $g^x(gx) \rightsquigarrow_W^\beta g^y(gy)$, as desired.

For (5), let $W \subseteq_1 G$ and $U \subseteq X$ open with $x \in U$ (the case $y \in U$ is similar). Find $\widehat{W} \subseteq_1 G$ with $\widehat{W} = \widehat{W}^{-1}$ and $\widehat{W}^3 \subseteq W$. Since $x \rightsquigarrow_V^\alpha y$ holds we can find $g^x, g^y \in V$ so that $g^x x \rightsquigarrow_{\widehat{W}}^\beta g^y y$ for all $\beta < \alpha$. Since D is comeager in G we can find $g \in \widehat{W}$ so that $gg^x, gg^y \in V \cap D$ and $(gg^x)x, (gg^y)y \in U$. By (3) and (4) we have $(gg^x)x \rightsquigarrow_W^\beta (gg^y)y$. \square

Generic α -unbalancedness for the action $G \curvearrowright X$ is a strong form of “path-connectedness” for the edge relation $\rightsquigarrow_G^\alpha$ on X . What is important for what follows is that, generically, these edges push forward under Baire-measurable (E_X^G, E_Y^H) -homomorphisms.

Theorem 8.4. *Let X be a Polish G -space and Y be a Polish H -space, for Polish groups G, H . If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a Baire-measurable (E_X^G, E_Y^H) -homomorphism, then there exists a comeager set $C \subseteq X$ so that for all $x, y \in C$ and any countable ordinal α we have that:*

$$x \rightsquigarrow_G^\alpha y \implies f(x) \rightsquigarrow_H^\alpha f(y).$$

The proof of Theorem 8.4 relies on the following “orbit continuity” lemma. This lemma is essentially [Hjo00, Lemma 3.17], modified as in the beginning of the proof of [Hjo00, Lemma 3.18]. For a direct proof see [LP18].

Lemma 8.5. *Let X be a Polish G -space and Y a Polish H -space, and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a Baire-measurable (E_X^G, E_Y^H) -homomorphism. Then there is a comeager set $C \subseteq X$ with:*

- (1) *f is continuous on C ;*
- (2) *for every $x \in C$, there is a comeager set of $g \in G$ such that $gx \in C$.*

(3) for all $x_0 \in C$ and every $W \subseteq_1 H$, there is a $V \subseteq_1 G$ and open $U \subseteq X$ with $x_0 \in U$ such that for all $x \in C \cap U$ and comeager many $g \in V$ we have $f(gx) \in Wf(x)$.

We may now turn to the proof of Theorem 8.4.

Proof of Theorem 8.4. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a Baire-measurable (E_X^G, E_Y^H) -homomorphism and let C be the set from Lemma 8.5. For open sets $U \subseteq X$, $V \subseteq_1 G$, $W \subseteq_1 H$ we say that (U, V) **captures** W if $\forall x \in U \cap C$ and $\forall^* g \in V$ we have $f(gx) \in Wf(x)$ and $gx \in C$. Notice that:

(i) (X, G) captures H ;

(ii) for all $x \in C$ and $W \subseteq_1 H$ there are open $U \ni x$, $V \subseteq_1 H$ so that (U, V) captures W .

Indeed (i) follows from (2) of Lemma 8.5 and (ii) follows from (2), (3) of Lemma 8.5. Theorem 8.4 now follows from the following claim and point (i) above.

Claim 8.6. *If (U, V) captures W and $x, y \in U \cap C$, then for any countable ordinal α*

$$x \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_V y \implies f(x) \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_W f(y).$$

Proof of Claim. If $\alpha = 0$ and $x \overset{0}{\rightsquigarrow}_V y$, then $y \in \overline{V \cdot x}$. Since $y \in U$ and (U, V) captures W , we can find a sequence $(g_n)_n$ in V with $g_n x \rightarrow y$ so that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $f(g_n x) \in Wf(x)$ and $g_n x \in C$. Pick $h_n \in W$ so that $h_n f(x) = f(g_n x)$. Since f is continuous on C , we have that $f(g_n x) \rightarrow f(y)$ and hence $h_n f(x) \rightarrow f(y)$. That is $f(y) \in \overline{W \cdot f(x)}$. Similarly we show that $f(x) \in \overline{W \cdot f(y)}$. As a consequence $f(x) \overset{0}{\rightsquigarrow}_W f(y)$ holds.

Assume now that the statement of the claim is true for all ordinals β with $\beta < \alpha$ and assume that $x \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_V y$ holds. We will show that so does $f(x) \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_W f(y)$. Let $\widehat{W} \subseteq_1 H$ and $O \subseteq Y$ open, say with $f(y) \in O$ (the case where $f(x) \in O$ is similar). By continuity of $f \upharpoonright C$ there is some open set $\widehat{O} \subseteq X$, with $y \in \widehat{O}$, so that $f(C \cap \widehat{O}) \subseteq O$. By applying (ii) above to $y \in C$, $\widehat{W} \subseteq_1 H$, we get $\widehat{V} \subseteq_1 G$ and the ability to shrink \widehat{O} , if necessary, so that $(\widehat{O}, \widehat{V})$ captures \widehat{W} , in addition to $y \in \widehat{O}$. Since $x \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_V y$ holds, we get $g^x, g^y \in V$ with $g^x x, g^y y \in \widehat{O}$ and $g^x x \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\widehat{V}} g^y y$ for all $\beta < \alpha$. By Lemma 8.3(5), and since (U, V) captures W , we can arrange so that g^x, g^y come from this comeager subset of V which guarantees that we also have $g^x x, g^y y \in C$ and $h^x f(x) = f(g^x x)$, $h^y f(y) = f(g^y y)$ for some $h^x, h^y \in W$. Since $g^x x, g^y y \in \widehat{O} \cap C$ and $(\widehat{O}, \widehat{V})$ captures \widehat{W} , by inductive hypothesis $g^x x \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\widehat{V}} g^y y$ implies that $f(g^x x) \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\widehat{W}} f(g^y y)$. Hence, there exist $h^x, h^y \in W$ so that $h^x f(x), h^y f(y) \in O$ and $h^x f(x) \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\widehat{W}} h^y f(y)$ holds for all $\beta < \alpha$. \square

This finishes the proof of Theorem 8.4. \square

9. DYNAMICAL BACK & FORTHS

Let G be a Polish group and X a Polish G -space. Recall the following relations from [Hjo00], which are a generalization of the back-and-forth relations of model theory into the more general context of Polish group actions. For $x, y \in X$ and open $U, V \subseteq G$, write $(x, U) \leq_1 (y, V)$ iff $U \cdot x \subseteq \overline{V \cdot y}$. For $\alpha \geq 1$, write $(x, U) \leq_{\alpha+1} (y, V)$ iff for every

open $U' \subseteq U$ there is some $V' \subseteq V$ such that $(y, V') \leq_\alpha (x, U')$. For limit γ , write $(x, U) \leq_\gamma (y, V)$ iff for every $\alpha < \gamma$, $(x, U) \leq_\alpha (y, V)$.

Proposition 9.1. *Let X be a Polish G -space and let $x, y \in X$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then $(x, U) \leq_\alpha (y, V)$ if and only if for every Π_α^0 set A , $y \in A^{*V}$ implies $x \in A^{*U}$.*

Proof. The forward direction is stated and proved in Hjorth's original preprint [Hjo10]. The full statement of this appeared in [Dru22] but without proof. A complete proof of the statement appears in [All20]. \square

In [AP21], we introduced a system of relations that are similar to Hjorth's relations but slightly stronger. These appear to be more appropriate for the following arguments.

Definition 9.2. Let X be a Polish G -space. For any $x, y \in X$ and $V \subseteq_1 G$ we write:

- (1) $x \leq_V^0 y$, if and only if $x \in \overline{Vy}$ holds;
- (2) $x \sim_V^\alpha y$, for an ordinal α , if and only if both $x \leq_V^\alpha y$ and $y \leq_V^\alpha x$ hold;
- (3) $x \leq_V^\alpha y$, for an ordinal $\alpha > 0$, if and only if for every $W \subseteq_1 G$, there exists some $v \in V$ such that for every $\beta < \alpha$ we have that $vy \sim_W^\beta x$.

Below we collect a few basic properties that are straightforward to prove by induction.

Proposition 9.3. *Let X be a Polish G -space and $x, y, z \in X$, $\alpha \geq 0$, and let V and W be symmetric open neighborhoods of 1_G . Then*

- (1) if $x \sim_V^\alpha y$ then $y \sim_V^\alpha x$;
- (2) if $V \subseteq W$ and $x \sim_V^\alpha y$ then $x \sim_W^\alpha y$;
- (3) for any $v \in V$, $vx \sim_V^\alpha x$;
- (4) if $x \sim_V^\alpha y$ and $y \sim_V^\alpha z$ then $x \sim_{V^2}^\alpha z$;
- (5) if $x \leq_V^\alpha y$ and $g \in G$ then $g \cdot x \leq_{gVg^{-1}}^\alpha g \cdot y$; and
- (6) if $x \leq_V^\alpha y$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ then for any open neighborhood W of 1_G there is some $v_0 \in G_0 \cap V$ such that $v_0 \cdot y \sim_W^\beta x$ for every $\beta < \alpha$, where G_0 is some fixed countable dense subgroup of G .

Proof. Statement (1) is immediate. Statement (2) is proved by a straightforward induction, as is statement (3). Statements (4), (5), are [AP21, Lemma 4.3].

We prove Statement (6). Let $\alpha \geq 1$ and assume $x \leq_V^\alpha y$. Fix any open neighborhood W of 1_G . Let W_0 be an open neighborhood of 1_G with $W_0^2 \subseteq W$. Now fix some $v \in V$ such that $v \cdot y \sim_{W_0}^\beta y$ for every $\beta < \alpha$. Let $v_0 \in W_0 v \cap G_0$. For any $\beta < \alpha$ we have by (3) that $v_0 \cdot y \sim_{W_0}^\beta v \cdot y$ and by (4) we have $v_0 \cdot y \sim_{W_0^2}^\beta x$ and thus by (2) we have $v_0 \cdot y \sim_W^\beta x$. \square

Here we show that the relations \sim_G^α are just as strong as the Hjorth relations.

Proposition 9.4. *Let X be a Polish G -space and $x, y \in X$. Then for any $\alpha \geq 0$ if $x \leq_G^\alpha y$ then $(x, G) \leq_{\alpha+1} (y, G)$.*

Proof. We prove the stronger claim that for any ordinal α , open neighborhood W_0 of 1_G , and $x, y \in X$ that $x \leq_{W_0}^\alpha y$ implies $(x, W_0) \leq_{\alpha+1} (y, W_0^2)$.

For $\alpha = 0$ this is immediate, so assume $\alpha > 0$ and assume the claim is true below α . Suppose $x \leq_{W_0}^\alpha y$. With the intention of showing $(x, W_0) \leq_{\alpha+1} (y, W_0^2)$, we fix an arbitrary basic open $U \subseteq W_0$. Choose any $u \in U$ and basic open neighborhood U_0 of 1_G such that $U_0^2 u \subseteq U$. We have $u \cdot x \leq_{uW_0u^{-1}}^\alpha u \cdot y$ by Proposition 9.3.(5). Find $w \in W_0$ such that

$$\forall \beta < \alpha, uw \cdot y \leq_{U_0}^\alpha u \cdot x.$$

By the induction hypothesis we have

$$\forall \beta < \alpha, (uw \cdot y, U_0) \leq_{\beta+1} (u \cdot x, U_0^2),$$

or equivalently,

$$\forall \beta < \alpha, (y, U_0uw) \leq_{\beta+1} (x, U_0^2u).$$

And because $U_0^2u \subseteq U$, we have

$$\forall \beta < \alpha, (y, U_0uw) \leq_{\beta+1} (x, U).$$

A case analysis on whether α is successor or limit applied to the recursive definition of \leq gives us

$$(y, U_0uw) \leq_\alpha (x, U).$$

Finally, we observe that because $U_0uw \subseteq UW \subseteq W_0^2$ and U was arbitrary we have proved

$$(x, W_0) \leq_{\alpha+1} (y, W_0^2)$$

as desired. \square

10. A CRITERION FOR STRONG GENERIC ERGODICITY

The following is the critical fact for our generic ergodicity result. This should be compared to the theorem in Hjorth's theory of turbulence that an equivalence relation being generically ergodic with respect to $=^+$ implies being generic ergodic with respect to any orbit equivalence relation induced by a continuous action of S_∞ on any Polish space, see e.g., [Gao09, Corollary 10.3.7].

Theorem 10.1. *Let E be an equivalence relation on a Polish space X and let Y be a Polish G -space. Suppose E is generically ergodic with respect to \sim_G^1 as computed in (Y, τ) for every compatible G -space Polish topology τ on Y . Then E is generically ergodic with respect to E_Y^G .*

Proof. We first claim that it is enough to show that E is generically ergodic with respect to \sim_G^α on Y for every countable α . Indeed, we can find a countable ordinal α and a comeager set $C \subseteq X$ such that $G \cdot f(x)$ is $\mathbf{\Pi}_\alpha^0$ for every $x \in C$, see [AP21, Claim 5.4]. In particular, by Propositions 9.1 and 9.4, there is a countable ordinal α such that for every $x, y \in C$, $f(x) \sim_G^\alpha f(y)$ if and only if $f(x) E_X^G f(y)$. Thus if comeager $D \subseteq X$ satisfies that $f(x) \sim_G^\alpha f(x)$ for every $x, y \in D$, then we have $f(x) E_Y^G f(y)$ for every $x, y \in C \cap D$.

We proceed to show by induction on α that E is generically ergodic with respect to \sim_G^α on Y for every countable α . If $\alpha = 1$ this is immediately true, so assume $\alpha > 1$. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a Baire-measurable homomorphism from E to E_X^G . Suppose for the

induction hypothesis we have a comeager set $C \subseteq X$ such that for every $x, y \in C$ and for every $\beta < \alpha$, we have $f(x) \sim_\beta f(y)$.

Fix some $x_0 \in C$. Let G_0 be a countable dense subgroup of G . For any basic open $W_0 \subseteq G$, $g_0 \in G_0$, and $\beta < \alpha$, define

$$A_{W_0, g_0, \beta} := \{y \in Y \mid \forall \gamma < \beta, y \sim_{W_0}^\gamma g_0 \cdot f(x_0)\}.$$

Let σ be a compatible Polish topology on Y such that $A_{W_0, g_0, \beta}^{\Delta W_1}$ is open for every basic open neighborhood W_0 of 1_G , basic open $W_1 \subseteq G$, $g_0 \in G_0$, and $\beta < \alpha$. Such topologies exist by a result of Hjorth, see [Gao09, Theorem 4.3.3]. Let $D \subseteq C$ be comeager such that $f(x) \sim_G^{1, \sigma} f(y)$ for every $x, x' \in D$, where $\sim_G^{1, \sigma}$ is the relation \sim_G^1 as computed in (Y, σ) . Now fix any $x, x' \in D$ and our goal is to show that

$$(4) \quad f(x) \leq_G^\alpha f(x').$$

To that end, fix any basic open neighborhood V of 1_G . Choose V_0 to be a basic open symmetric neighborhood of 1_G such that $V_0^2 \subseteq V$. Applying the definition of $f(x) \sim_G^{1, \sigma} f(x')$, find some $g \in G$ such that

$$(5) \quad g \cdot f(x') \sim_{V_0}^{0, \sigma} f(x).$$

Fix any $\beta < \alpha$. We argue that

$$g \cdot f(x') \sim_V^\beta f(x),$$

which would be enough to prove equation 4.

To that end, fix any open neighborhood W of 1_G . Choose W_0 to be a basic open neighborhood of 1_G such that $W_0^2 \subseteq W$. Because $f(x) \sim_G^\beta f(x_0)$ holds, we can find some $g_0 \in G$ such that

$$(6) \quad \forall \gamma < \beta, f(x) \sim_{W_0}^\gamma g_0 \cdot f(x_0).$$

By Proposition 9.3.(6), we can choose g_0 to be in G_0 . In particular,

$$f(x) \in A_{W_0, g_0, \beta}^{\Delta V_0}.$$

Thus by equation 5, there is some $v_0 \in V_0$ such that

$$v_0 g \cdot f(x') \in A_{W_0, g_0, \beta}^{\Delta V_0}.$$

In particular, there is some $v_1 \in V_0$ such that

$$(7) \quad \forall \gamma < \beta, v_1 v_0 g \cdot f(x') \sim_{W_0}^\gamma g_0 \cdot f(x_0).$$

By Proposition 9.3.(4) and equations 6 and 7, we have

$$\forall \gamma < \beta, v_1 v_0 g \cdot f(x') \sim_{W_0^2}^\gamma f(x).$$

By Proposition 9.3.(2), we have

$$\forall \gamma < \beta, v_1 v_0 g \cdot f(x') \sim_W^\gamma f(x)$$

and then by observing $v_1 v_0 \in V_0^2 \subseteq V$, we are done. \square

11. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Here we show how Theorem 1.6 follows from Theorem 8.4 and Theorem 10.1. We start by proving a lemma that will be needed in putting everything together.

Lemma 11.1. *Let G be a Polish group with $\text{rk}(G) \leq \alpha$ and $G \curvearrowright X$ be a Polish G -space. For every $x, y \in X$, if $x \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_G y$ holds for all $\beta < \alpha$, then so does $x \sim_G^1 y$.*

Proof. If $\text{rk}(G) = 1$, then $G = \{1_G\}$ is the trivial group. In this case $x \overset{0}{\rightsquigarrow}_G y$ trivially implies that $[x]_G = [y]_G$, and therefore $x \sim_G^1 y$ holds. So we may assume that $\alpha > 1$.

Let $V \subseteq_1 G$. We will find some $h \in G$ so that $x \sim_V^0 hy$. A symmetric argument will then establish $x \sim_G^1 y$. Set $\beta := \text{rk}(V, G)$. Since $\text{rk}(G) \leq \alpha$ we have that $\beta < \alpha$. Let now $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that for every $g \in G$ we have that $\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \beta$. But by assumption we have that $x \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_G y$ holds. Hence there exist $g^x, g^y \in G$ so that for all $\gamma < \beta$ we have:

$$g^x x \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_W g^y y.$$

Set $h_0 := (g^x)^{-1} g^y$ and $g := (g^x)^{-1}$. By Lemma 8.3(4), for all $\gamma < \beta$ we have that:

$$x \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_{gWg^{-1}} h_0 y.$$

Set $\gamma := \text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1})$ and notice that by the choice of W we have that $\gamma < \beta$. Hence, by the next claim, we get $u \in (gWg^{-1})^3 \subseteq G$ so that, setting $h := u \cdot h_0$, we have that:

$$x \sim_V^0 hy$$

Claim 11.2. *Let $V, U \subseteq_1 G$ with $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \gamma$ so that $U = U^{-1}$. Assume that $a \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_U b$ holds for some $a, b \in X$. Then we have that $a \sim_V^0 ub$ holds for some $u \in U^3$.*

Proof of Claim. For $\gamma = 0$, $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq 0$ implies that $U \subseteq V$. Hence, by Lemma 8.3(3), $a \overset{0}{\rightsquigarrow}_U b$ implies $a \overset{0}{\rightsquigarrow}_V ub$ for $u = 1_G \in U^3$. Hence, we may assume that $\gamma > 0$.

Since $\text{rk}(V, U) \leq \gamma$, there exists some $W \subseteq_1 G$ so that for every $g \in U$ we have that

$$\text{rk}(V, gWg^{-1}) < \gamma.$$

By Proposition 2.3(1) we may assume that $W^3 \subseteq U$. Since $a \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_U b$ holds, we get $g^a, g^b \in U$ so that for all $\delta < \gamma$ we have that $g^a a \overset{\delta}{\rightsquigarrow}_W g^b b$. By Lemma 8.3(4), for all $\delta < \gamma$, we have

$$a \overset{\delta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{(g^a)^{-1}Wg^a} (g^a)^{-1} g^b b$$

But since $\text{rk}(V, (g^a)^{-1}Wg^a) \leq \delta$ for some $\delta < \gamma$, by inductive hypothesis, and since

$$((g^a)^{-1}Wg^a)^3 = (g^a)^{-1}W^3g^a,$$

we get some $\tilde{w} \in W^3$ so that

$$a \sim_V^0 (g^a)^{-1} \tilde{w} g^a (g^a)^{-1} g^b b.$$

But then, for $u := (g^a)^{-1} \tilde{w} g^a \in U^{-1}W^3U \subseteq U^3$ we have that:

$$a \sim_V^0 ub$$

□

The proof of the claim concludes the proof of Lemma 11.1. \square

We can now put everything together and conclude with the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $G \curvearrowright X$ and $H \curvearrowright Y$ be continuous actions of Polish groups on Polish spaces, with $G \curvearrowright X$ generically α -unbalanced and H being α -balanced. By Theorem 10.1 it suffices to show that E_X^G is generically ergodic with respect to \sim_H^1 on Y .

Indeed, let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a Baire-measurable (E_X^G, E_Y^H) -homomorphism. Let $C \subseteq X$ be the comeager set provided by Theorem 8.4 and consequently let $D \subseteq C$ be the comeager set provided by Definition 8.2.

Claim 11.3. *For every $x, y \in D$ we have that $f(x) \sim_H^1 f(y)$.*

Proof of Claim 11.3. Fix $x, y \in D$ and let $x_0, \dots, x_n \in C$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$ and

$$x_0 \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_G x_1 \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_G \dots \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_G x_{n-1} \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_G x_n,$$

for all $\beta < \alpha$. Having chosen C according to Theorem 8.4, for all $\beta < \alpha$ we have that:

$$f(x_0) \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_H f(x_1) \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_H \dots \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_H f(x_{n-1}) \overset{\beta}{\longleftrightarrow}_H f(x_n)$$

But since $\text{rk}(H) \leq \alpha$ by Lemma 11.1 we have that:

$$f(x_0) \sim_H^1 f(x_1) \sim_H^1 \dots \sim_H^1 f(x_{n-1}) \sim_H^1 f(x_n)$$

By Proposition 9.3, since $x = x_0, y = x_n$ we have that $f(x) \sim_H^1 f(y)$. \square

The claim shows that E_X^G is generically ergodic with respect to \sim_H^1 and hence, by Theorem 10.1, we have that E_X^G is generically ergodic against actions of H . \square

12. EXAMPLES OF GENERICALLY α -UNBALANCED BERNOULLI SHIFTS

Let N be a countably-infinite set and let P be a closed subgroup of the group $\text{Sym}(N)$, of all permutations of N , endowed with the pointwise convergence topology. The action $P \curvearrowright N$ induces continuous action $P \curvearrowright \{0, 1\}^N$ on the space of all maps $x: N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ given by

$$(p, x) \mapsto p \cdot x \text{ where } (p \cdot x)(n) = x(p^{-1}(n))$$

We call $P \curvearrowright \{0, 1\}^N$ the **Bernoulli shift of P** . In the remaining of this paper we will be interested in the Bernoulli shifts of the automorphism groups of the α -scattered linear orders α^* of countable ordinals α , where $\alpha \mapsto \alpha^*$ is defined in Section 5.3. More precisely, for each ordinal $0 < \alpha < \omega_1$, let α^* be the collection of all maps $a: \alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with $a(\beta) = 0$ for all but finitely many $\beta < \alpha$. We view α^* as a linear ordering, by setting for all $a, b \in \alpha^*$

$$a <^* b \iff "a(\beta) < b(\beta), \text{ for the largest } \beta < \alpha \text{ for which } a(\beta) \neq b(\beta)"$$

In the remainder of this paper we provide the proof of Theorem 1.8. Set $G_\alpha := \text{Aut}(\alpha^*)$ and $X_\alpha := \{0, 1\}^{\alpha^*}$, so that $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ denotes the Bernoulli shift of $\text{Aut}(\alpha^*)$. We prove:

Theorem 12.1. *$G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ is generically α -unbalanced and has meager orbits.*

One interesting aspect of Theorem 12.1 is that its proof seems to require something more sophisticated than a straightforward induction. Before we proceed to the actual proof, we first discuss where the usual base/successor/limit–case induction falls short.

When it comes to the base–case $\alpha = 1$, Theorem 12.1 follows directly from the fact that the Bernoulli shift $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of \mathbb{Z} is generically ergodic and has countable orbits. Successor stages $\alpha := \beta + 1$ can also be dealt with, just by appropriating ideas and methods from [AP21]. Indeed, if $\alpha := \beta + 1$, then $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ turns out to just be the “ \mathbb{Z} –jump”

$$\mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G_\beta \curvearrowright (X_\beta)^{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Assuming now that the paths x_0, \dots, x_n witnessing the generic β -unbalancedness of $G_\beta \curvearrowright X_\beta$ according to Definition 8.2 are “nice enough”, a technical elaboration on the ideas from [AP21] can be used to leverage these dynamics to generic α -unbalancedness of $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$.

The difficulty is with the limit stages. For example, already for finite $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, the length $n := n(\alpha)$ of the paths x_0, \dots, x_n witnessing the α -unbalancedness of $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ goes to infinity $n(\alpha) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \omega$. As a consequence, there seems to be no simple way to combine these paths to some finite “limiting” path witnessing the generic ω -unbalancedness of $G_\omega \curvearrowright X_\omega$. But even when the “right” argument for $\alpha = \omega$ has been established, a similar “phase transition” takes place at the limit ordinal $\alpha = \omega^2$, requiring yet another new argument that was not needed for the earlier limit ordinals $\omega, 2\omega, 3\omega, \dots$

As it turns out one needs to analyze separately the “atomic” case $\alpha = \omega^\lambda$ for each $\lambda < \omega_1$ and then use the Cantor normal form in order to reduce the general α to a finite combination of atomic cases. In the remainder of this section we make this strategy precise. More specifically, we start by introducing a jump operator $(G \curvearrowright X) \mapsto J(\omega^\lambda, G \curvearrowright X)$ for Polish G -spaces and we establish that, in a certain technical sense, it amplifies generic unbalancedness from α to $\alpha + \omega^\lambda$; see Lemma 12.3. We then show how to reduce Theorem 12.1 to Lemma 12.3. The proof of Lemma 12.3 is given in the subsequent Sections 13, 14.

12.1. The fusion lemma. For every Polish group G and any Polish permutation group $P \leq \text{Sym}(L)$ on a countable set L , let $P \text{ Wr } G := P \times \prod_{a \in L} G$ be the Polish group of all pairs $(p, (g_a)_a)$ with $p \in P$ and $(g_a)_a \in \prod_{a \in L} G$, endowed with the product topology and

$$(p, (g_a)_a) \cdot (q, (h_a)_a) = (pq, (g_{q(a)}h_a)_a)$$

For any Polish G -space X we have a Polish $P \text{ Wr } G$ -space X^L given by:

$$(8) \quad (p, (g_a)_a) \cdot (x_a)_a := (g_{p^{-1}(a)} \cdot x_{p^{-1}(a)})_a$$

Definition 12.2. For any countable ordinal $\mu > 0$ and any Polish G -space X , the μ -**jump**

$$J(\mu, G \curvearrowright X)$$

of $G \curvearrowright X$ is the Polish $P \text{ Wr } G$ -space X^L , where L is the linear order μ^* and $P = \text{Aut}(L)$.

Notice that $J(1, G \curvearrowright X)$ is just the \mathbb{Z} –jump, as defined in [AP21]; see also [CC22]. In this case, $X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ comes together with a continuous, surjective, and open map $\pi: X^{\mathbb{Z}} \times X^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow X^{\mathbb{Z}}$

which combines any pair $(x_a)_a, (y_a)_a \in X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ to the “fused” $(z_a)_a = \pi((x_a)_a, (y_a)_a)$ so that if x_a and y_a have dense orbits in $G \curvearrowright X$, then both

$$(x_a)_a \overset{1}{\curvearrowright}_{\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G} (z_a)_a \quad \text{and} \quad (z_a)_a \overset{1}{\curvearrowright}_{\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G} (y_a)_a$$

hold in $\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G \curvearrowright X^{\mathbb{Z}}$; see proof of [AP21, Theorem 1.5]. Central to the proof of Theorem 12.1 is that the jumps $J(\mu, G \curvearrowright X)$ admit a *fusion map* with similar properties, if μ is of the form ω^λ for some countable ordinal λ . This is made precise in the following lemma.

Lemma 12.3. *Let X be a Polish G -space and X^L be the $\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr} G$ -space $J(\mu, G \curvearrowright X)$ for some ordinal of the form $\mu = \omega^\lambda$. Then, there exists a continuous, surjective, and open map $\pi: X^L \times X^L \rightarrow X^L$ so that for any $x = (x_a)_a, y = (y_a)_a \in X^L$ and $\nu < \omega_1$, if*

- (1) $x_a \overset{\gamma}{\curvearrowright}_G y_a$ holds for all $a \in L$ and all $\gamma < \nu$; and if
- (2) the orbits of x_a and of y_a are dense in X for all $a \in L$;

then, for every $\beta < \mu$ we have that:

$$x \overset{\nu+\beta}{\curvearrowright}_{\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr} G} \pi(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(x, y) \overset{\nu+\beta}{\curvearrowright}_{\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr} G} y.$$

The proof of Lemma 12.3 will be given in Sections 13 and 14. Section 13 deals with the case $\mu = 1$, by elaborating on a construction covered in [AP21]. Section 14 deals with the remaining cases: $\mu = \omega^\lambda$ with $\lambda > 0$. The special property of ordinals of the form ω^λ that will be used is additive idecomposability: if $\alpha, \beta < \omega^\lambda$, then $\alpha + \beta < \omega^\lambda$; see Lemma 14.1. It is not very difficult to find a uniform argument covering both cases. However, dealing separately with the $\lambda = 0$ case provides not only a nice warm-up, but it also allows us to argue the $\lambda > 0$ case more efficiently, as we can specialize our notation to the case when ω^λ is a limit ordinal. We may now reduce Theorem 12.1 to Lemma 12.3.

12.2. Proof of Theorem 12.1 from Lemma 12.3. Fix α with $0 < \alpha < \omega_1$, and let

$$(9) \quad \alpha = \omega^{\lambda_m} + \omega^{\lambda_{m-1}} + \cdots + \omega^{\lambda_1}, \quad \lambda_m \geq \lambda_{m-1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_1, \quad m \geq 1$$

be the Cantor normal form of α . We record the length m of the above expression by setting

$$\text{cnf}(\alpha) := m.$$

Claim 12.4. *There is a sequence $\{\pi_i: 0 \leq i \leq 2^m\}$ of continuous, open, surjective maps*

$$\pi_i: X_\alpha \times X_\alpha \rightarrow X_\alpha,$$

and a comeager $Y \subseteq X_\alpha$ so that for all $x, y \in Y$ and every $i < 2^m$ we have that

$$\pi_0(x, y) = x, \quad \pi_{2^m}(x, y) = y, \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_i(x, y) \overset{\beta}{\curvearrowright}_{G_\alpha} \pi_{i+1}(x, y) \text{ for all } \beta < \alpha.$$

Proof of Claim. We will run an induction on m .

Assume that $m = 1$. Then $\alpha = \omega^\lambda$ for some ordinal countable λ .

If $\lambda = 0$, then $\alpha = 1$ and $G_1 \curvearrowright X_1$ is just the Bernoulli shift $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of the discrete group $\mathbb{Z} = G_1$. In this case, simply let $Y \subseteq X_1$ be the set of all elements with dense orbit in $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let π_0, π_1, π_2 simply be the maps $X_\kappa \times X_\kappa \rightarrow X_\kappa$ with $\pi_0(x, y) = x$, $\pi_1(x, y) = x$, $\pi_2(x, y) = y$. Since all $x, y \in Y$ have dense orbits, we have $x \overset{1}{\curvearrowright}_{G_1} x \overset{1}{\curvearrowright}_{G_1} y$.

If $\lambda > 0$, then $\alpha = 1 + \omega^\lambda$, and hence $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ is isomorphic to $J(\omega^\lambda, G_1 \curvearrowright X_1)$. Let $Y_1 \subseteq X_1$ be set of all elements with dense orbit in the $G_1 \curvearrowright X_1$. Applying Lemma 12.3 to $J(\omega^\lambda, G_1 \curvearrowright X_1)$ we get a map $\pi: X^L \times X^L \rightarrow X^L$ as in the conclusion of the lemma, where $L = \alpha^* = (\omega^\lambda)^*$. Let $Y := Y_1^L$ and π_0, π_1, π_2 be the maps $X^L \times X^L \rightarrow X^L$ with $\pi_0(x, y) = x$, $\pi_1(x, y) = \pi(x, y)$, $\pi_2(x, y) = y$. Since $x = (x_a)_{a \in L}$, $y = (y_a)_{a \in L} \in Y$, we have that $x_a \overset{0}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_\alpha} y_a$ for all $a \in L$. Hence, by Lemma 12.3 for all $\beta < \alpha$ we have that:

$$\pi_0(x, y) \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_\alpha} \pi_1(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_1(x, y) \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_\alpha} \pi_2(x, y).$$

Assume that $m > 1$. Then, we can rewrite α as $\nu + \omega^\lambda$ where $\nu := \omega^{\lambda m} + \dots + \omega^{\lambda^2} \geq 1$ and $\omega^\lambda := \omega^{\lambda^1} \geq 1$ as in the Cantor normal form (9) of α . Since $\text{cnf}(\nu) = m - 1 < m$, the inductive hypothesis applies and we get a comeager set $Y_\nu \subseteq X_\nu$ and a sequence $\{\rho_\ell: 0 \leq \ell \leq 2^{m-1}\}$ of maps $X_\nu \times X_\nu \rightarrow X_\nu$ so that for all $x, y \in Y_\nu$ and all $\gamma < \nu$ we have:

$$\rho_0(x, y) = x, \quad \rho_{2^{m-1}}(x, y) = y, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_\ell(x, y) \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_\nu} \rho_{\ell+1}(x, y).$$

But since $\alpha = \nu + \omega^\lambda$, we have that $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ is isomorphic to $J(\omega^\lambda, G_\nu \curvearrowright X_\nu)$. Set $L := (\omega^\lambda)^*$ and let $\pi: X_\nu^L \times X_\nu^L \rightarrow X_\nu^L$ be the map provided by Lemma 12.3.

We define the desired sequence $\{\pi_i: 0 \leq i \leq 2^m\}$ of maps $X_\alpha \times X_\alpha \rightarrow X_\alpha$ using the identification of X_α with X_ν^L . If $i = 2\ell$ for some $\ell \leq 2^{m-1}$ then set $\pi_i = \otimes_{a \in L} \rho_\ell$. That is,

$$\pi_i((x_a)_a, (y_a)_a) := (\rho_\ell(x_a, y_a))_a, \quad \text{when } i = 2\ell \text{ for } \ell \leq 2^{m-1}.$$

Otherwise, we have that $i = 2\ell + 1$ for some $\ell < 2^{m-1}$. In which case we let π_i to be the ‘‘fusion of ρ_ℓ and $\rho_{\ell+1}$ via π ’’. More precisely for all $(x_a)_a, (y_a)_a \in X_\nu^L$ we have that

$$\pi_i((x_a)_a, (y_a)_a) := \pi((\rho_\ell(x_a, y_a))_a, (\rho_{\ell+1}(x_a, y_a))_a), \quad \text{if } i = 2\ell + 1 \text{ for } \ell < 2^{m-1}.$$

Set finally $Y := Y_\nu^L \subseteq X_\nu^L = X_\alpha$. Clearly Y is comeager in X_α . Moreover, by the choice of Y_ν and $\rho_\ell, \rho_{\ell-1}$, for every $(x_a)_a, (y_a)_a \in Y$, every $\ell \leq 2^{m-1}$ and all $a \in L$ we have that

$$\rho_\ell(x_a, y_a) \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_\nu} \rho_{\ell+1}(x_a, y_a), \quad \text{for all } \gamma < \nu.$$

But then, by the conclusion of Lemma 12.3, for $i = 2\ell + 1$ we have that:

$$\pi_i((x_a)_a, (y_a)_a) \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_{\nu+\omega^\lambda}} \pi_{i+1}((x_a)_a, (y_a)_a) \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_{\nu+\omega^\lambda}} \pi_{i+2}((x_a)_a, (y_a)_a)$$

for all $x = (x_a)_a, y = (y_a)_a \in Y$ and every $\beta < \omega^\lambda$. Hence by 8.3(2) have that

$$\pi_i(x, y) \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{G_\alpha} \pi_{i+1}(x, y)$$

for all $\beta < \alpha$, $i < 2^m$, and $x = (x_a)_a, y = (y_a)_a \in Y$. This concludes the induction. \square

Proof of Theorem 12.1 from Lemma 12.3. Let now $\{\pi_i: i \leq 2^m\}$ and $Y \subseteq X_\alpha$ as in the above claim. We may conclude with the proof of Theorem 1.8 as follows.

Let $C \subseteq X_\alpha$ be comeager and consider the subset \hat{D} of $X_\alpha \times X_\alpha$ given by

$$\hat{D} := \left(\bigcap_{i \leq 2^m} \pi_i^{-1}(C) \right) \cap (Y \times Y).$$

Since each π_i is continuous open and surjective, there exists some $z_* \in C$ and some comeager $D \subseteq C$ so that for all $z \in D$ we have that $(z_*, z) \in \widehat{D}$, i.e., $\pi_i(z, z_*) \in C$ for all $i \leq 2^m$. But then, for every $x, y \in D$, the concatenation of the paths

$$x = \pi_0(x, z_*), \dots, \pi_{2^m}(x, z_*) = z_* \quad \text{and} \quad z_* = \pi_{2^m}(y, z_*), \dots, \pi_0(y, z_*) = y$$

provides a finite path from x to y in C which witnesses the generic α -unbalancedness of the Bernoulli shift $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$, according to Definition 8.2. Finally, a simple induction on α establishes that the action $G_\alpha \curvearrowright X_\alpha$ has meager orbits for all $\alpha < \omega_1$. \square

12.3. The product lemma. We close this section with the following general lemma that is going to be used in both Sections 13 and 14 for the proof of Lemma 12.3.

Lemma 12.5. *Let $G_n \curvearrowright X_n$ be a Polish G_n -space, $x_n, y_n \in X_n$, and $V_n \subseteq_1 G_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $G := \prod G_n$, $V := \prod V_n$, $X := \prod X_n$, $x := (x_n)_n$, $y := (y_n)_n$. If there is some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $V_n = G_n$ for $n < n_0$ and $x_n \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_{V_n} y_n$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then so does*

$$x \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_V y.$$

Proof. This is clearly true if $\alpha = 0$, as in the product topology on X we have that “ $y_n \in \overline{V_n \cdot x_n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ” implies that “ $y \in \overline{V \cdot x}$ ”, and similarly for x in place of y .

Assume now inductively that the lemma holds for all ordinals less than $\alpha > 0$ and let $U \subseteq X$, $W \subseteq_1 G$ be open, say with $y \in U$ (the case $x \in U$ is similar). We may assume without loss of generality that there exists some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and open $W_n \subseteq_1 G_n$ and $U_n \subseteq X_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $W_n = G_n$ and $U_n = X_n$ for all $n < m_0$, so that $W := \prod W_n$ and $U := \prod U_n$. Since $x_n \overset{\alpha}{\rightsquigarrow}_{V_n} y_n$, we can find $g_n^x, g_n^y \in V_n$ so that $g_n^x \cdot x, g_n^y \cdot y \in U_n$ and

$$g_n^x \cdot x_n \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{W_n} g_n^y \cdot y_n$$

for all $\beta < \alpha$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $g^x := (g_n^x)_n$ and $g^y := (g_n^y)_n$ and notice that $g^x x, g^y y \in U$. Moreover, by inductive assumption, for all $\beta < \alpha$ we have that

$$g^x \cdot x \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_W g^y \cdot y.$$

\square

13. PROOF OF LEMMA 12.3, WHEN $\lambda = 0$

If $\lambda = 0$ then L is isomorphic to (\mathbb{Z}, \leq) and $\text{Aut}(L)$ is isomorphic to the discrete group \mathbb{Z} . Hence, $J(1, G \curvearrowright X)$ is induced simply by taking the wreath product with \mathbb{Z} :

$$\mathbb{Z} \text{ Wr } G \curvearrowright X^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

We will define a continuous, surjective, and open map $\pi: X^{\mathbb{Z}} \times X^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 12.3. First, let $p: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \times\{0, 1\}$ be any map with the property:

- (\star) if $B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is finite and $j \in \{0, 1\}$, there is $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $p(k - \ell) = j$ for all $k \in B$.

For example, the generic map in $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has this property. Alternatively one can simply take the map sending all negative $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ to 0 and strictly positive $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ to 1. Having fixed any $p: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \times\{0, 1\}$ which satisfies (\star) as above, we consider the induced map

$$\pi: X^{\mathbb{Z}} \times X^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow X^{\mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{with} \quad \pi(x, y) = z, \quad \text{where } z_k = \begin{cases} x_k & \text{if } p(k) = 0 \\ y_k & \text{if } p(k) = 1 \end{cases}$$

Claim 13.1. *The map $\pi: X^{\mathbb{Z}} \times X^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a continuous, open, and surjective.*

Proof of Claim. The map π is the composition of the projection $X^{\mathbb{Z}} \times X^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow X^M \times X^N$ where $M = p^{-1}(0)$ and $N = p^{-1}(1)$ with the homomorphism $X^M \times X^N \rightarrow X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ induced by $M \sqcup N = \mathbb{Z}$. These two maps are continuous, open, and surjective. \square

Claim 13.2. *Let $x = (x_k)_k, y = (y_k)_k$ in $X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and a countable ordinal ν so that for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ the G -orbits of x_k and y_k are dense in X and $x_k \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_G y_k$ holds for all $\gamma < \nu$. Then,*

$$x \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G} \pi(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(x, y) \overset{\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G} y \quad \text{hold for all } \beta < \nu + 1.$$

Proof of Claim. Set $z := \pi(x, y)$. By Lemma 8.3(2) it suffices to show that $x \overset{\nu}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G} z$ and $z \overset{\nu}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G} y$ hold. Since the argument is symmetric we only establish the relation:

$$x \overset{\nu}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G} z.$$

Let $U \subseteq X$ be open with $z \in U$ (the case $x \in U$ is similar) and let $V \subseteq_1 \mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G$. After shrinking U, V if necessary we may assume that there exists some finite set $B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and, for all $k \in B$, non-empty open sets $U_k \subseteq X$ and $V_k \subseteq_1 G$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \{x \in X^{\mathbb{Z}}: x_k \in U_k \text{ for all } k \in B\}, \\ V &= \{h \in G^{\mathbb{Z}}: h_k \in V_k \text{ for all } k \in B\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $G^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is identified with its natural copy as a clopen subgroup of $\mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G$.

By property (\star) of the map p in the definition of π , we may choose some $h \in \mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G$ which implements an outer \mathbb{Z} -shift $(gx)_k = x_{k-\ell}$ by an appropriate integer ℓ so that for all $k \in B$ we have that $(gx)_k = (gz)_k$. By the density of the orbits of x_n and y_n in X we can further find $h_k \in G$ for every $k \in B$ so that $h_k \cdot (gx)_k \in U_k$, and hence $h_k \cdot (gz)_k \in U_k$, for all $k \in B$. Let $h := \oplus_{k \in B} h_k$ be the associated element of $G^{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \mathbb{Z} \text{Wr} G$. Set now $g^x = g^z = hg$. It is immediate that both $g^x x \in U$ and $g^z z \in U$ hold. But by hypothesis

$$g^x x \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_V g^z z$$

holds for all $\gamma < \nu$, as desired. Indeed, the latter follows from Lemma 12.5 since

$$(g^x x)_k \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_{V_k} (g^z z)_k$$

holds for all $\gamma < \nu$ and all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. To see this, notice that: when $k \in B$, we have the even stronger property $(g^x x)_k = (g^z z)_k$; and when $k \notin B$, then $V_k = G$, $(g^x x)_k = x_{k-\ell}$ and $(g^z z)_k = z_{k-\ell}$. But since $z_{k-\ell}$ is either equal to $x_{k-\ell}$ or to $y_{k-\ell}$, by the hypothesis in the statement of the claim we have that $x_{k-\ell} \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_G y_{k-\ell}$ for all $\gamma < \nu$. \square

14. PROOF OF LEMMA 12.3, WHEN $\lambda > 0$

Throughout this section we fix a countable ordinal $\lambda \neq 0$ and set $\mu := \omega^\lambda$ and $L := \mu^*$. We also fix some Polish G -space X and consider the jump $J(\mu, G \curvearrowright X)$ of $G \curvearrowright X$:

$$(10) \quad \text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr } G \curvearrowright X^L$$

We will define a “fusion” map $\pi: X^L \times X^L \rightarrow X^L$ satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 12.3.

The fact that μ is of the form ω^λ implies that μ **additively indecomposable**:

Lemma 14.1. *If $\mu = \omega^\lambda$ for some ordinal λ and $\alpha, \beta < \mu$, then $\alpha + \beta < \mu$.*

Proof. For $\lambda = 0$ we have $\alpha + \beta = 0 + 0 = 0 < 1 = \mu$. When $\lambda = \nu + 1$ then there exist $k, \ell < \omega$ with $\alpha < \omega^\nu \cdot k$ and $\beta < \omega^\nu \cdot \ell$. Hence $\alpha + \beta < \omega^\nu \cdot (k + \ell) < \omega^\nu \cdot \omega$. Finally, if $\lambda = \sup_{\xi < \lambda} \xi$ then pick $\xi < \lambda$ with $\alpha, \beta < \omega^\xi$ and note $\alpha + \beta < \omega^\xi \cdot 2 < \omega^\xi \cdot \omega = \omega^{\xi+1} < \omega^\lambda$. \square

Additive indecomposability will be at the heart of the construction of the map π . Indeed the “saturation” of μ , derived by its indecomposability

$$\forall \alpha, \beta < \mu \exists \gamma < \mu (\alpha + \beta < \gamma),$$

will equip the “generic choice” of a fusion map π with the desired properties.

There is just one problem. In trying to saturate π with the desired structure, the use of ordinal addition falls short in that it does not preserve order from the right. Indeed, $\beta < \alpha$ does not imply $\beta + \gamma < \alpha + \gamma$ (take for example $\beta = 0, \alpha = 1, \gamma = \omega$). For this reason, we will occasionally need to make use of what is known as “natural” or “Hessenberg” addition.

14.1. Hessenberg addition of ordinals. Let α, β be two ordinals and rewrite them as

$$(11) \quad \alpha = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \omega^{\xi_i} k_i \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \omega^{\xi_i} \ell_i$$

by first expressing each of them in its Cantor normal form (9); then combining all elements of the same power ω^ξ to get summands as above so that $\xi_n > \xi_{n-1} > \dots > \xi_1$ and $k_i, \ell_i \geq 0$. By letting k_i, ℓ_i take the value 0 we have expressed both α and β as “polynomials” in ω , where every power ω^ξ of ω which shows up in the above expression of α shows up also in the above expression of β , and vice versa. The **Hessenberg** or **natural** addition $\alpha \oplus \beta$ of α and β is the ordinal attained if we add the expressions (11) as polynomials of ω :

$$\alpha \oplus \beta := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \omega^{\xi_i} (k_i + \ell_i)$$

An important feature of \oplus is that it is commutative, associative, and “order preserving”:

Lemma 14.2. *For every α, β, γ the following properties hold:*

- (1) $\alpha \oplus \beta = \beta \oplus \alpha$;
- (2) $(\alpha \oplus \beta) \oplus \gamma = \alpha \oplus (\beta \oplus \gamma)$;
- (3) $\beta < \alpha$ if and only if $\gamma \oplus \beta < \gamma \oplus \alpha$

It will be important that μ above is \oplus -additively indecomposable.

Lemma 14.3. *If $\alpha, \beta < \omega^\lambda$ for some λ , then $\alpha \oplus \beta \in \omega^\lambda$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 14.1 and the definition of \oplus . \square

14.2. Generic antichain pairs. We fix the following notation. Elements a, b, c, \dots of L are functions $a: \mu \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with $a(\xi) = 0$ for all but finite $\xi < \mu$. We view L as a linear order with $a < b$ holds iff $a(\xi) < b(\xi)$ holds in \mathbb{Z} for the largest $\xi \in \mu$ for which $a(\xi) \neq b(\xi)$ holds.

Let T be the collection of all possible restrictions $s := a \upharpoonright [\beta, \mu)$ of elements $a \in L$ to some final interval $[\beta, \mu) := \{\xi \in \text{ORD} : \beta \leq \xi < \mu\}$ of $\mu = [0, \mu)$ with $\beta < \mu$. Equivalently,

$$T = \bigcup_{\beta < \mu} [\beta, \mu)^*,$$

is the union of all sets of the form $[\beta, \mu)^*$ with $\beta < \mu$, where for every $\Xi \subseteq [0, \mu)$ we let Ξ^* be the set of all maps $s: \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ so that $s(\xi) = 0$ for all but finitely many $\xi \in \Xi$.

If $s \in [\beta, \mu)^*$, then we say that the **height** of s is β and write $\text{ht}(s) = \beta$. Given $r \in [\alpha, \beta)^*$ and $s \in [\beta, \mu)^*$, we write $r \frown s$ for the unique element of $[\beta, \mu)^*$ with $r \frown s \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta) = r$ and $r \frown s \upharpoonright [\beta, \mu) = s$. We view T as a partial order under the relation \sqsubseteq , where $s \sqsubseteq t$ holds for $s, t \in T$ if and only if $\text{ht}(t) \leq \text{ht}(s)$ and there exists $r \in [\text{ht}(t), \text{ht}(s))^*$ so that $t = r \frown s$. In this case, we say that s is an **initial segment** of t or that t **extends** s . Notice that L is a subset of T , consisting of all the \sqsubseteq -maximal elements of T .

When $\mu = \omega$ then T is a tree (with no root). More generally, for any μ of the form ω^λ with $\lambda > 0$, T can be thought of as a “piecewise tree”. Every pair $s, t \in T$ admits a **meet** $s \wedge t$, which is the $r \in T$ of least $\text{ht}(r)$ with $r \sqsubseteq s$ and $r \sqsubseteq t$. We say that $s, t \in T$ are **comparable** if $s \wedge t \in \{s, t\}$ and we write $s \perp t$ if they are not comparable. A subset $J \subseteq T$ of T is an **antichain** if $s \perp t$ for every $s, t \in J$. An antichain J is **maximal** if for all $t \in T$ there is $s \in J$ so that s and t are compatible. For every $J \subseteq T$ consider the sets

$$\begin{aligned} L(J) &:= \{a \in L : s \sqsubseteq a \text{ for some } s \in J\} \subseteq L \\ T(J) &:= \{t \in T : s \sqsubseteq t \text{ for some } s \in J\} \subseteq T \end{aligned}$$

If $a \in L(J)$ then we say that a is **covered** by J . If $J = \{s\}$ then we simply write $L(s)$ and $T(s)$ in place of $L(\{s\})$ and $T(\{s\})$ above, and we say that a is **covered** by s .

Notice that if $s \in T$ with $\text{ht}(s) = \alpha > 0$, then $L(s)$ is a suborder of L isomorphic to α^* , as it is the image of $\alpha^* := [0, \alpha)^*$ under the embedding $i: \alpha^* \rightarrow \mu^*$ with $i(a) = a \frown s$, for all $a \in \alpha^*$. Notice, moreover, that every $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(L(s))$ extends to the automorphism $\times_{s, \varphi} \in \text{Aut}(L)$, where: $\times_{s, \varphi}(a) = \varphi(a)$, if $a \in L(s)$; and $\times_{s, \varphi}(a) = a$, if $a \in L \setminus L(s)$.

More generally, let $J \subseteq T$ be an antichain and let $\varphi_s \in \text{Aut}(L_s)$ for every $s \in J$. Then the system $(\varphi_s : s \in J)$ of “local” automorphisms induces a “global” automorphism $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(L)$, where $\varphi(a) = \varphi_s(a)$, if a is covered by some $s \in J$; and $\varphi(a) = a$, otherwise. We say that φ is the automorphism of L **induced by the system** $(\varphi_s : s \in J)$.

Definition 14.4. An **antichain pair** is any pair (P_0, P_1) , with $P_0, P_1 \subseteq T$ so that:

- (P1) $P_0 \cup P_1$ is a maximal antichain of T with $P_0 \cap P_1 = \emptyset$;
- (P2) if $s \in P_0$ and $t \in P_1$ then $\text{ht}(s) \oplus \text{ht}(t) < \text{ht}(s \wedge t)$.

We denote by \mathcal{P} the collection of all antichain pairs.

Viewed as a closed subset of the Cantor space $2^T \times 2^T$, \mathcal{P} is a Polish space. Moreover, since any partition of $L \subseteq T$ in $P_0, P_1 \subseteq L$ satisfies (P1) and (P2), we have that $\mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$.

We will define the pertinent fusion π in Lemma 12.3 by means of the generic element of \mathcal{P} . Hence, in establishing the various properties of π , it will be convenient to rely on a handy basis for the topology of \mathcal{P} . For any pair (F_0, F_1) of finite subsets of T let

$$\mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1) := \{(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P} : F_0 \subseteq P_0 \text{ and } F_1 \subseteq P_1\}$$

Let also \mathcal{F} be the collection of all pairs (F_0, F_1) of finite subsets of T so that moreover: $F_0 \cup F_1$ is an antichain with $F_0 \cap F_1 = \emptyset$ and (F_0, F_1) satisfies (P2), in place of (P_0, P_1) .

Lemma 14.5. *The collection of all sets of the form $\mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1)$ forms a basis for the topology on \mathcal{P} . Moreover, for all finite $F_0, F_1 \subseteq T$ we have that $\mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1) \neq \emptyset \iff (F_0, F_1) \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. For the first part notice that if $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfies $s \notin P_0$, then by (P1) we can pick some $t \in P_0 \cup P_1$ with $L(s) \cap L(t) \neq \emptyset$. Hence any condition of the form $s \notin P_0$ for pairs (P_0, P_1) in \mathcal{P} can be written as a union of positive conditions $t \in P_0$ or $t \in P_1$.

For the second part, if $(F_0, F_1) \in \mathcal{F}$, then let (Q_0, Q_1) be any partition of $L \setminus L(F_0 \cup F_1)$ and notice that $(P_0, P_1) := (F_0 \cup Q_0, F_1 \cup Q_1)$ satisfies both (P1) and (P2) above. Hence, we have that $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1)$. The other direction is straightforward. \square

It will be important for the definition of the fusion map π to find $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ so that both P_0 and P_1 satisfy the following property (\star_α) , for all $\alpha < \mu$. Recall that $\text{Aut}(L)_A$ denotes the pointwise stabilizer $\{g \in \text{Aut}(L) : g(a) = a \text{ for all } a \in A\}$ of A in $\text{Aut}(L)$.

Definition 14.6. Let $J \subseteq T$ be an antichain and $\alpha < \mu$. We say that J satisfies (\star_α) if:

- (\star_α) for all finite $A, B \subseteq L$ and every $\beta < \alpha$, if each $a \in A$ is covered by some $s_a \in J$ with $\text{ht}(s_a) \geq \alpha$, then there exists some $g \in \text{Aut}(L)_A$ so that for every $b \in B$ we have that $g(b)$ is covered by some $t_b \in J$ with $\text{ht}(t_b) \geq \beta$.

Remark 14.7. Property (\star) from Section 13 is essentially the requirement that both $\pi^{-1}(0)$ and $\pi^{-1}(1)$ therein satisfy (\star_α) for $\alpha = 1$. Indeed, in the context of Section 13, where $\mu = 1$, there is no $s \in [0, \mu]^*$ with $\text{ht}(s) \geq 1$. As a consequence, in order to check (\star_1) in the context of Section 13, it would suffice to take $A = \emptyset$ in Definition 14.6.

Next we find some $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ so that both P_0 and P_1 satisfy property (\star_α) :

Lemma 14.8. *Let \mathcal{R} be the collection of all pairs (P_0, P_1) in \mathcal{P} so that P_i satisfies (\star_α) for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and every α with $\alpha < \mu$. Then \mathcal{R} forms a comeager subset of \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. Fix some α with $0 < \alpha < \mu$ and let \mathcal{R}_α be the set of all of all $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ so that P_i satisfies (\star_α) for both $i \in \{0, 1\}$. We will show that \mathcal{R}_α is comeager in \mathcal{P} .

Let $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ be chosen generically. Let $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and assume that we are trying to confirm that (\star_α) holds for some fixed A, B, β . We will do that by partitioning B into subsets $C \subseteq B$ with the property that each such C is covered by some $r \in T$, of maximum possible $\text{ht}(r)$, so that $L(r)$ does not intersect A . By the maximality of $\text{ht}(r)$, there will be enough room for the genericity of the choice of (P_0, P_1) to kick in and give us a “local”

automorphism $g_r \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$ which satisfies the conclusion of (\star_α) only for the C piece. Then we will glue all these “local” automorphisms to the desired global one.

Fix some $i \in \{0, 1\}$, ordinals β, ρ with $\beta < \alpha < \rho < \mu$, some $s, r \in T$ with $\text{ht}(r) = \rho$, $\text{ht}(s) \geq \alpha$, $\text{ht}(r \wedge s) = \rho + 1$ and any finite $C \subseteq L(r)$. Consider the set $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$ which consists of all (P_0, P_1) in \mathcal{P} which satisfy the following property:

if $s \in P_i$, then there is $g \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$ so that for every $c \in C$,
 $g(c)$ is covered by some $t \in P_i$ with $\text{ht}(t) \geq \beta$.




FIGURE 1. The data needed for defining $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$

Claim 14.9. *For all s, r, i, β, C as above, the set $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$ is comeager in \mathcal{P} .*

Proof of Claim. Clearly $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$ is open, so it suffices to show that it intersects any basic open set $\mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1)$, with $(F_0, F_1) \in \mathcal{F}$; see Lemma 14.5. We may assume without loss of generality that $s \in F_i$, as otherwise we can find some $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1)$ with $s \notin P_i$, which would imply that $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$. Moreover, notice that if $r \in F_i$, then $\mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$. Hence we may also assume that $r \notin F_i$.

Since F_0 and F_1 are finite, we may find some ordinal γ , with $\beta \leq \gamma < \rho$, so that for all $q \in F_0 \cup F_1$ with $r \sqsubset q$ we have that $\text{ht}(q) \leq \gamma$. In particular, $q(\gamma)$ is defined for all q as above—recall that q is a map $[\xi, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ for some $\xi < \mu$. Similarly, let

$$\delta := \max\{\text{ht}(t) : t \in F_{i-1} \text{ with } r \sqsubset t\}.$$

Choose any $g \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$ so that the following two properties hold:

- (1) if $q \in F_0 \cup F_1$ with $r \sqsubset q$ and $c \in C$ then $(g(c))(\gamma) \neq q(\gamma)$;
- (2) if $q \in F_{i-1}$ with $r \sqsubset q$ and $c \in C$, then $\text{ht}(g(c) \wedge q) > \beta \oplus \delta$

To find such g notice first that $\beta \oplus \delta < \rho$. Indeed, since $s \in F_i$, by property (P2) for (F_0, F_1) , if $t \in F_{i-1}$ with $r \sqsubset t$ we have that $\alpha \oplus \text{ht}(t) < \rho + 1$. It follows that $\alpha \oplus \delta < \rho + 1$.

On the other hand we know that $\beta < \alpha$. By property (3) of Lemma 14.2 we have that

$$(12) \quad \beta \oplus \delta \oplus 1 \leq \alpha \oplus \delta < \alpha \oplus \delta \oplus 1 \leq \rho \oplus 1, \quad \text{which implies that} \quad \beta \oplus \delta < \rho.$$

Notice now that since both $\beta \oplus \delta < \rho$ and $\gamma < \rho$ hold, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have a well-defined automorphism $\hat{n} \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$ given by sending every $c \in L(r)$ to $\hat{n}(c) \in L(r)$ with:

$$(\hat{n}(c))(\xi) \begin{cases} c(\xi) - n & \text{if } \xi \in \{\gamma, \beta \oplus \delta\}, \\ c(\xi) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since F_0, F_1 and C are all finite, to find $g \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$ for which both properties (1), (2) above hold, we can just set $g := \hat{n}$ for some large enough $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

We may now conclude with the proof that $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$ intersects the basic open set $\mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1)$ as follows. Choose any $g \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$ which satisfies (1), (2) above and let (E_0, E_1) be the pair given by $E_i := F_i \cup \{(g(c))(\beta) : c \in C\}$ and $E_{i-1} := F_{i-1}$. Clearly $\mathcal{P}(E_0, E_1) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(F_0, F_1)$ and if $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}(E_0, E_1)$ we have that $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C)$. So it suffices to show that $\mathcal{P}(E_0, E_1) \neq \emptyset$, or equivalently by Lemma 14.5, that $(E_0, E_1) \in \mathcal{F}$.

But $E_0 \cup E_1$ is an antichain by (1) above, and since all elements of $E_0 \setminus F_0$ have same height. Again by (1) above we have that $E_0 \cap E_1 = \emptyset$. Let now $q \in E_i \setminus F_i$ and $t \in E_{i-1}$. The fact that $\text{ht}(q) \oplus \text{ht}(t) < \text{ht}(q \wedge t)$ holds follows from (2) above if $r \sqsubseteq t$. It also holds from simple computations when $r \not\sqsubseteq t$. To see the latter, break $r \not\sqsubseteq t$ into the cases $q \wedge t = r \wedge s$ and $q \wedge t \not\sqsubseteq r \wedge s$ and then use, in each case, that $\text{ht}(s) \oplus \text{ht}(t) < \text{ht}(s \wedge t)$. We leave the details of confirming these cases to the reader. \square

Hence, in order to show that \mathcal{R}_α is comeager, we are left to show that:

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha \supseteq \bigcap_{s, r, i, \beta, C} \mathcal{R}_\alpha(s, r, i, \beta, C),$$

where the intersection is taken over all possible parameters; see paragraph before the claim. So fix some (P_0, P_1) in the above intersection. We will show $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha$.

Let $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $\beta < \alpha$, and $A, B \subseteq L$ finite, so that for every $a \in A$ is covered by some $s \in P_i$ with $\text{ht}(s) \geq \alpha$. Let S be the set of all $s \in P_i$ for which there is some $a \in A$ with $s \sqsubseteq a$. Fix any $b \in B \setminus L(S)$ and notice that the set $\{s \wedge b : s \in S\}$ is linearly ordered by \sqsubseteq . Let \tilde{r}_b be the \sqsubseteq -maximal element of this set, i.e. the element of this set of least height. Let also r_b be the immediate extension of \tilde{r}_b which covers b . That is, r_b is the unique element of T with $\tilde{r}_b \sqsubseteq r_b \sqsubseteq b$ and $\text{ht}(\tilde{r}_b) = \text{ht}(r_b) + 1$. This is well defined, as $b \notin A$ implies $\text{ht}(\tilde{r}) > 0$.

Set now $R := \{r_b : b \in B\}$ and notice that R is an antichain. Indeed, if $b, c \in B \setminus L(S)$, say with $r_b \not\sqsubseteq r_c$, then let $s \in S$ so that r_c is the immediate extension of $s \wedge c$ and notice that r_b covers both s and b , contradicting that r_b is an extension of the element of least height in $\{t \wedge b : t \in S\}$. The desired automorphism will be defined as the automorphism induced by a system $(g_r : r \in R)$ of automorphisms $g_r \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$.

To define the system, fix some $r \in R$ and let \tilde{r} be the immediate predecessor of r . Set $B_r := B \cap L(r)$ and let s_r be any element of S so that for all $b \in B_r$ we have that $b \wedge s_r = \tilde{r}$. Set $\rho_r := \text{ht}(r)$. Since $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha(s_r, r, i, \beta, B_r)$ we get some $g_r \in \text{Aut}(L(r))$ so that for all $b \in B_r$, $g_r(b)$ is covered by some $t \in P_i$ with $\text{ht}(t) \geq \beta$.

Let g be the automorphism of L induced by the system $(g_r : r \in R)$. Since $r \perp s$ for every $r \in R$ and $s \in S$, g pointwise fixes every element of $T(S)$. It follows that $g \in \text{Aut}(L)_A$. Moreover, for every $b \in B$, $g(b)$ is covered by some $t_b \in P_i$ with $\text{ht}(t_b) \geq \beta$. Indeed, if $b \in B \setminus L(S)$, then this follows from the definition of g_r . If $b \in L(S)$, then we can set t to be the unique $s \in S$ which covers b and observe that, in this case, $g(s) = s$ and $g(b) = b$. \square

14.3. The fusion map π . Fix now some $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ so that both P_0, P_1 satisfy property (\star_α) for all $\alpha < \mu$. By Lemma 14.8 such pair exists. Let also $G \curvearrowright X$ be a Polish G -space. Define the “fusion” map $\pi : X^L \times X^L \rightarrow X^L$ as follows:

$$\pi(x_0, x_1) = x, \text{ where for all } a \in L \text{ we have that } x(a) = \begin{cases} x_0(a), & \text{if } a \in L(P_0) \\ x_1(a), & \text{if } a \in L(P_1) \end{cases}$$

As in the case of Claim 13.1 it is straightforward to see that the map π is continuous open and surjective. We claim that π also satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 12.3.

Fix some $x = (x_a)_a, y = (y_a)_a$ in X^L and assume that for a countable ordinal ν we have:

- (1) $x_a \overset{\gamma}{\rightsquigarrow}_G y_a$ holds for all $a \in L$ and all $\gamma < \nu$; and
- (2) the orbits of x_a and of y_a are dense in X for all $a \in L$.

We will show that for every $\beta < \mu$ we have that:

$$x \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G} \pi(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(x, y) \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G} y.$$

Set $z := \pi(x, y)$. Since the argument below is symmetric, we will only prove that:

Claim 14.10. *For every $\beta < \mu$ we have that $x \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_{\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G} z$.*

This follows from a more general claim which is needed in order to run the necessary induction on α . First recall that elements of $\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G$ are pairs $(\varphi, (g_a)_a)$ where $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(L)$ and $g_a \in G$ for all $a \in L$. In particular, $\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G$ admits a basis of open neighborhoods of the identity of the form:

$$V := \{(\varphi, (h_a)_a) : \varphi \in \text{Aut}(L)_A \text{ and } h_a \in V_a \text{ for all } a \in A\},$$

where A ranges over all finite subsets of L and V_a range over all open neighborhoods of 1 in G . Let \mathcal{V} denote the collection of all such neighborhoods. For each V as above we set $\text{supp}(V) := A$ and we say that $(V_a : a \in A)$ are the associated fibers of V . Claim 14.10 follows from the next by setting $V := \text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G$, $h = 1_{\text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G}$ and say $\alpha := \beta + 1$.

Claim 14.11. *Let $\beta < \alpha < \mu$, let $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and $h = (\varphi, (h_a)_a) \in \text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G$. If for every $a \in \text{supp}(V)$ there exists $s_a \in P_0$ so that $\text{ht}(s_a) \geq \alpha$ and $\varphi^{-1}(a) \ni s_a$, then $hx \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_V hz$.*

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on α . For $\alpha = 1$ it follows from Lemma 12.5. Assume now that it holds for all ordinals below α and let V, h as in the statement. We will show that $hx \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_V hz$ holds for every $\beta < \alpha$.

Let $W \subseteq_1 \text{Aut}(L)\text{Wr}G$ and $U \subseteq X$ be open with $z \in U$ (the case $x \in U$ is similar). After shrinking U, W if necessary we may assume that $W \in \mathcal{V}$ and that for all $c \in \text{supp}(W)$ there exists an open $U_c \subseteq X$ so that $U = \{x \in X^L : x_c \in U_c \text{ for all } c \in \text{supp}(W)\}$. Set

$$A := \{\varphi^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{supp}(V)\} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \{\varphi^{-1}(c) : c \in \text{supp}(W)\}.$$

Since the map π is induced by some $(P_0, P_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ which satisfies (\star_α) , we may find some $\psi \in \text{Aut}(L)_A$ so that for every $b \in B$ there is $t_b \in P_0$ with $\text{ht}(t_b) \geq \beta$ so that $\psi^{-1}(b)$ is covered by t_b . Since the orbits of x_a and z_a are dense in X for all $a \in L$, we may choose some sequence $(g_a)_a$ in G^L so that, setting $g := (\varphi\psi\varphi^{-1}, (g_a)_a)$, we have that

$$(13) \quad ghx, ghz \in U$$

In fact, since $(hx)_c = (hz)_c$ for all $c \in \text{supp}(V)$ and $\varphi\psi\varphi^{-1} \in \text{Aut}(L)_{\text{supp}(V)}$, we may assume without loss of generality that $g_c = 1_G$ for all $c \in \text{supp}(V)$. It follows that $g \in V$.

We are left with checking that $ghx \overset{\nu+\beta}{\rightsquigarrow}_W ghz$ holds for all $\beta < \alpha$. But this follows by induction hypothesis. Indeed, notice that gh is of the form $(\varphi\psi, (f_a)_a)$ for some choice of $(f_a)_{a \in L} \in G^L$ and that for all $c \in \text{supp}(W)$ we have chosen ψ so that there exists $t_c \in P_0$ with $\text{ht}(t_c) \geq \beta$ so that $\psi^{-1}(\varphi^{-1}(c))$ is covered by t_c . \square

The proof of Lemma 12.3 and hence of Theorem 1.8 is now complete.

REFERENCES

- [All20] S. Allison. Non-Archimedean TSI polish groups and their potential complexity spectrum. available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.05085>, 2020.
- [AP21] S. Allison and A. Panagiotopoulos. Dynamical obstructions to classification by (co)homology and other TSI-group invariants. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 374:8793–8811, 2021.
- [Bec98] H. Becker. Polish group actions: dichotomies and generalized elementary embeddings. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 11:397–449, 1998.
- [Bee91] G. Beer. A polish topology for the closed subsets of a polish space. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 113(4):1123–1133, 1991.
- [Bir36] G. Birkhoff. A note on topological groups. *Compositio Math.*, 3:427–430, 1936.
- [BK96] H. Becker and A. S. Kechris. *The descriptive set theory of Polish group actions*, volume 232 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [BYDNT17] I. Ben Yaacov, M. Doucha, A. Nies, and T. Tsankov. Metric Scott analysis. *Adv. Math.*, 318:46–87, 2017.
- [CC22] J. D. Clemens and S. Coskey. New jump operators on equivalence relations. *J. Math. Log.*, 22:Paper No. 2250015, 44, 2022.
- [DD19] L. Diels and P. A. Dowerk. Invariant automatic continuity for compact connected simple Lie groups. *Topology Appl.*, 266:106858, 9, 2019.
- [Dei77] R. Deissler. Minimal models. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 42:254–260, 1977.
- [Dru22] O. Drucker. A boundedness principle for the Hjorth rank. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 61:223–232, 2022.
- [DT19] P. A. Dowerk and A. Thom. Bounded normal generation and invariant automatic continuity. *Adv. Math.*, 346:124–169, 2019.
- [Eff65] E. G. Effros. Transformation groups and C^* -algebras. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 81:38–55, 1965.
- [Gao98] S. Gao. On automorphism groups of countable structures. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 63:891–896, 1998.
- [Gao09] S. Gao. *Invariant descriptive set theory*, volume 293 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. CRC Press, 2009.
- [Gli61a] J. Glimm. Locally compact transformation groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 101:124–138, 1961.
- [Gli61b] J. Glimm. Type I C^* -algebras. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 73:572–612, 1961.
- [GM67] S. Grosser and M. Moskowitz. On central topological groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 127:317–340, 1967.
- [Hjo00] G. Hjorth. *Classification and orbit equivalence relations*, volume 75 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, 2000.

- [Hjo10] G. Hjorth. The fine structure and borel complexity of orbits. available at <https://www.math.ucla.edu/~greg/fineorbits.pdf>, 2010.
- [HS99] G. Hjorth and S. Solecki. Vaught’s conjecture and the Glimm-Effros property for Polish transformation groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351:2623–2641, 1999.
- [Iwa51] K. Iwasawa. Topological groups with invariant compact neighborhoods of the identity. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 54:345–348, 1951.
- [Kak36] S. Kakutani. Über die Metrisation der topologischen Gruppen. *Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo*, 12:82–84, 1936.
- [Kan08] V. Kanovei. *Borel equivalence relations*, volume 44 of *University Lecture Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008. Structure and classification.
- [Kec95] A. S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [Kle52] V. L. Klee, Jr. Invariant metrics in groups (solution of a problem of Banach). *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3:484–487, 1952.
- [LMW17] F. Le Maître and P. Wesolek. On strongly just infinite profinite branch groups. *J. Group Theory*, 20:1–32, 2017.
- [LP91] A. T. M. Lau and A. L. T. Paterson. Inner amenable locally compact groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 325:155–169, 1991.
- [LP18] M. Lupini and A. Panagiotopoulos. Games orbits play and obstructions to Borel reducibility. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 12:1461–1483, 2018.
- [LY22] D. Longyun and Zheng Y. On equivalence relations induced by polish groups. *arXiv:2204.04594*, 2022.
- [LZ20] P. B. Larson and J. Zapletal. *Geometric set theory*, volume 248 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2020.
- [Mac52] G. W. Mackey. Induced representations of locally compact groups. I. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 55:101–139, 1952.
- [Mal11] M. Malicki. On Polish groups admitting a compatible complete left-invariant metric. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 76:437–447, 2011.
- [Mos51] G. D. Mostow. On an assertion of Weil. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 54:339–344, 1951.
- [Sam94] R. L. Sami. Polish group actions and the Vaught conjecture. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 341:335–353, 1994.
- [Ury27] P. Urysohn. Sur un espace métrique universel. *Bull. Sci. Math*, 51(2):43–64, 1927.
- [Usp90] V.V. Uspenskij. On the group of isometries of the urysohn universal metric space. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 31(1):181–182, 1990.
- [Wij66] R.A. Wijsman. Convergence of sequences of convex sets, cones and functions. ii. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 123(1):32–45, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ON, M5S 2E4
 Email address: shaunpallison@gmail.com

KURT GÖDEL RESEARCH CENTER, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, KOLINGASSE 14-16, 1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA
 Email address: aristotelis.panagiotopoulos@gmail.com