

CLOSED BOUNDED SETS IN 1-H-MINIMAL VALUED FIELDS

JUAN PABLO ACOSTA LÓPEZ

ABSTRACT. We show that the 1-h-minimal fields satisfy a property of naive compactness for decreasing definable families of closed bounded sets indexed by the value group. We use this to prove that a local topological definable group has a definable family of neighborhoods of the identity consisting of open subgroups.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we show that a 1-h-minimal field with algebraic RV , satisfies a naive property of compactness, where every decreasing definable family of closed bounded sets in K^n has nonempty intersection provided the family is indexed by the value group Γ . This is Proposition 5.8. Algebraic RV in residue characteristic 0 or $RV_{p,\bullet}$ in mixed characteristic, means that the definable subsets of RV , respectively $RV_{p,\bullet}$, are the same as those of the language of pure valued fields. In the language of pure valued fields there is a quantifier elimination relative to these sorts so we can describe these sets in terms of a suitable language for them. An example of a language with this property is the extension of the algebraic language by restricted analytic functions. Every 1-h-minimal field remains 1-h-minimal when the language in RV is expanded, so in some sense the property of 1-h-minimality is a property relative to RV . For arbitrary RV this property of compactness is not true.

This property does not distinguish between, say, open balls and closed balls in an algebraically closed valued field, so it is different from notions of properness in rigid geometry.

We give as an application of this result that every definable local topological group in a 1-h-minimal valued field with algebraic RV has a fundamental neighborhood of open subgroups. This is analogous to the fact that a p -adic local Lie group has such a fundamental neighborhood too.

The proof of the main result in residue characteristic 0 uses the fact that a decreasing family of bounded sets in an ordered linear group, (the value group), is eventually constant. This property of ordered linear groups is proven in Section 3. This follows from a quantifier elimination result of ordered linear groups relative to a certain family of colored linear orders, the spine of the group. This was done in [2]. For the theory of colored linear orders we give a cell decomposition like result to show what is needed. Just like in other contexts, like the real closed fields or the p -adically closed fields, this cell decomposition actually implies previously known quantifier elimination results for colored linear orders, see for instance [11]. We mention that this method of proof has the advantage

Date: June 14, 2024.

over the more usual back-and-forth that the resulting quantifier elimination is generally constructive, in the sense that one gets a primitive recursive map from formulas to equivalent quantifier free formulas.

In Section 4, we prove the compactness property in residue characteristic 0. We work in a slightly more general framework designed to be used in the proof in mixed characteristic.

In Section 5, we prove the compactness property in mixed residue characteristic. For this we work in a residue characteristic 0 coarsening of the given valuation. Unfortunately the resulting RV is not algebraic, hence the need for the axiomatic framework in Section 4.

In Section 6 we give our application to local definable topological groups. The arguments follow topological lines using the compactness property.

In the Appendix we present the needed background on ind-definable sets for the construction appearing in the cell decomposition for colored linear orders. The terminology is unusually categorical, which we hope is clarifying for readers familiar with categories.

2. NOTATION

Here we will use basic notions of model theory without remark. The models will generally be taken to be ω -saturated.

A valued field K with valuation v and value group Γ will be denoted additively $v : K \rightarrow \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$. We denote \mathcal{O} the valuation ring of K and \mathcal{M} the maximal ideal of \mathcal{O} . We denote $RV = K^\times / (1 + \mathcal{M})$ and $rv : K^\times \rightarrow RV$ the canonical projection.

We will use the notion of a n -h-minimal valued field, most often when $n = 1$, defined in residue characteristic 0 in [3] and in mixed characteristic $(0, p)$ in [4].

3. ORDERED ABELIAN GROUPS

The main result of this section is Proposition 3.6, which is needed for the next section.

In ordered linear groups there is a quantifier elimination relative to a collection of interpretable colored linear orders (linear orders with a finite number of predicates).

We start by giving a quantifier elimination for colored linear orders which is somewhat more detailed than in [11] Proposition 4.1.

Suppose we have a linear order S with a set of predicates \mathcal{U} .

Given an element $a \in S$ and a predicate U , we can define $U_-(a) = \sup\{x \in U : x < a\}$ and $U_+(a) = \inf\{x \in U : x > a\}$. These two elements might not necessarily exist in S , but they give definable Dedekind cuts in S . So we get $U_-, U_+ : S \rightarrow \bar{S}$, where \bar{S} is the set of definable cuts of S , together with a maximal or minimal element if S does not have them. See the Appendix A for the precise definition of \bar{S} . Note that the formulas for U_- and U_+ also make sense when $a \in \bar{S}$, so we can form the compositions. More precisely \bar{S} is a strict ind-definable set (actually because the language does not have two distinct constants it is a colimit of finite disjoint unions of interpretable sets), and $U_+, U_- : \bar{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$ becomes an ind-definable map. See Example A.6 for the definition of the ind-definable structure in \bar{S} and Example A.7 for the verification that U_+ and U_- are ind-definable maps.

We denote $F(\mathcal{U})$ the set of functions $F : \bar{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$ which are a finite composition of functions of the form U_+ and U_- for $U \in \mathcal{U}$, the functions U_+ and U_- are the basic functions in $F(\mathcal{U})$.

- Lemma 3.1.** (1) *The functions in $F(\mathcal{U})$ are non-decreasing, and satisfy $U_-(a) \leq a \leq U_+(a)$. Also $U_-U_+(a) \leq a \leq U_+U_-(a)$.*
- (2) *For a and b in \bar{S} we have that there is $x \in S$ with $x \in U$ and $a < x < b$ if and only if $U_+(a) < b$.*
- (3) *$U_+(a) < b$ if and only if $a < U_-(b)$.*
- (4) *$b \leq U_+(a)$ if and only if $U_-(b) \leq a$.*
- (5) *$b = U_+(a)$ is equivalent to $U_+U_-(b) = b$ and $U_-(b) \leq a$.*
- (6) *$a = U_-(b)$ is equivalent to $U_-U_+(a) = a$ and $U_+(a) \geq b$.*

The proof is a straightforward check which we omit.

The motivation of the statement of items 3,4, 5 and 6 is to express the conditions $U_+(x) < b$ and $b < U_+(x)$ as a Boolean combination of conditions involving only inequalities of x and functions on b , and similarly for U_- .

For the next definition we use the following terminology

Definition 3.2. Let X be a set, \mathcal{A} be a collection of subsets of X and B be a subset of X . We say that \mathcal{A} refines B if for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ either $A \subset B$ or $A \subset X \setminus B$.

If \mathcal{B} is a collection of subsets of X , then \mathcal{A} refines \mathcal{B} if it refines every element of \mathcal{B} .

Starting from a finite set of colors \mathcal{U} one can inductively define \mathcal{U}_n consisting of a finite partition of S into 0-definable unary relations such that:

- \mathcal{U}_0 refines \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{U}_{n+1} refines \mathcal{U}_n .
- If F and G are in $F(\cup_{k < n} \mathcal{U}_k)$ and are a composition of less than n basic functions, then the set $\{x : F(x) < G(x)\}$ is refined by the partition \mathcal{U}_n .
- If F is as in the previous item and $V \in \cup_{k < n} \mathcal{U}_k$ then the set of x such that $F(x) \in S$ and $F(x) \in V$ is refined by the partition \mathcal{U}_n .

Then we have a new set of colors $\mathcal{U}^c = \cup_n \mathcal{U}_n$ (no longer necessarily finite).

In other words \mathcal{U}^c is such that its finite unions are closed under boolean combinations and that one can decide the truth value of $F(x) < G(x)$, by looking at the conditions $x \in V$ for $V \in \mathcal{U}^c$.

The fact that $\{x \in S \mid F(x) < G(x)\}$ is \emptyset -definable in S follows from Example A.10. The fact that $\{x \in S \mid F(x) \in S \text{ and } F(x) \in U\}$ is \emptyset -definable follows from Example A.6.

Then we have

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose (S, \mathcal{U}) is a colored linear order. Then every \emptyset -definable set of S^n is a boolean combination of sets of the form $\{a \in S^n : \pi(a) \in U\}$ for $U \in \mathcal{U}^c$, or of the form $\{a \in S^n : F\pi(a) < G\pi'(a)\}$, where F and G are functions in $F(\mathcal{U}^c)$, and π, π' denote either a coordinate projection or a constant function equal to the minimum or maximum (in \bar{S})*

Further for every b -definable family $\{D_a\}_{a \in T}$ of subsets of S , there is a finite b -definable partition of T such that in each one D_a is a disjoint finite union of sets of the form $\{x : L\pi(a, b) < x < R\pi'(a, b), x \in U\}$ or of the form $\{x : E\pi(a, b) = x\}$, where here L, R, E, π, π' and U are as above.

Also for every b -definable function $f : X \rightarrow S$ with $X \subset S^n$ we have that there is a finite b -definable partition of the domain X such that in each one f is of the form $f(a) = F(\pi(a, b))$.

Proof. We prove the first two statements at the same time with an explicit elimination procedure.

A set defined as in the first statement will be called quantifier free definable. Let $D_a \subset S$ be an a -definable set, where $D = \{(x, a) \mid x \in D_a\}$ is quantifier free definable. We show first that there is a finite partition of the set T of the parameters a into quantifier free definable sets, such that D_a has the form of the second statement for a in each of the elements in the partition. After this we show that the set of a such that there exists x with $(x, a) \in D$, is equivalent to a quantifier free definable set in a .

Note that there is a partition of T of sets of the required form such that for a in each element of the partition we have that D_a consists of a finite disjoint union of sets which are finite intersections of sets of one of the following forms:

- (1) $L\pi(a) < G(x)$,
- (2) $G(x) < R\pi(a)$,
- (3) $G(x) = E\pi(a)$,
- (4) $G(x) < F(x)$
- (5) $G(x) = F(x)$
- (6) $G(x) \in U$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}^c$.
- (7) $G(x) \notin S$.

The last four cases are equivalent to a finite disjoint union of sets of the form $x \in U$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}^c$.

The first three cases are each equivalent to a finite disjoint union of conditions of the same form with $G = 1$, and of admissible conditions on a . This is a consequence of Lemma 3.1, (and induction in the length of the composition in G). So we assume $G = 1$ from now on.

In case 3 appears D_a is empty or consists of a single element as required, depending on quantifier free conditions on a . (according to whether $L\pi'(a) < E\pi(a)$ or not for example).

If case 3 does not appear we can further divide a into admissible cases to pick out the largest of the lower bounds in case 1, and the smallest of the upper bounds in case 2, and so we obtain that D_a is of the desired form.

Now we show that the set of a with D_a not empty is quantifier free definable. This finishes the proof of the first and second statements. This is a consequence of Lemma 3.1, item 2.

To see the statement on definable functions we have to see that if $\{x : L\pi(a) < x < R\pi'(a), x \in U\}$ consists of only one point then the set is a singleton of the form required. In this case one has $x = U_+L\pi(a)$. \square

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose S is a colored linear order. Assume we have a definable family $D_r \subset S^n$ indexed by $r \in S$ which is, in each coordinate, uniformly bounded above. Then there is r_0 and a finite definable partition of $\{r : r \geq r_0\}$ such that in each element of the partition D_r is constant.*

Proof. The statement is trivial if S has a maximum, so assume it does not.

First assume $n = 1$. Suppose d is an upper bound for D_r . From the description of definable sets in one dimension in Proposition 3.3 we obtain that the result easily from the following observation:

If $F \in F(\mathcal{U}^c)$ then either $d \ll F(a)$ for every $a \in S$ such that $d \ll a$, or $F(a) = F(a')$ for all a, a' such that $d \ll a, a'$. Here the notation $d \ll a$ means $G(d) < a$ for all $G \in F(\mathcal{U}^c)$ such that $G(d)$ is not ∞ .

This condition on $F \in F(\mathcal{U}^c)$ is preserved under compositions so we just have to prove it for $F = U_+$ and $F = U_-$. The first case follows as $a \leq U_+(a)$. The second case follows from Lemma 3.1, indeed $G(d) < U_-(a)$ is equivalent to $U_+G(d) < a$ so this condition can only fail when

$U_+G(d) = \infty$, which means that $U \subset [-\infty, G(d)]$ and so its supremum is $U_-(a)$ which does not depend on a .

For the case $n > 1$ consider the family $\{D_{ba}\}_{b \in (-\infty, d)^{n-1}}$ of one dimensional sets, defined as $D_{ba} = \{x \in S \mid (x, b) \in D_a\}$. By the argument above one obtains a finite partition into definable subsets of $(-\infty, d)^{n-1} \times S$ such that for E in the partition, $(b, a), (b, a') \in E$ and $d \ll a, a'$ we have $D_{ba} = D_{ba'}$. By induction on n the families E_a are definably piecewise constant eventually, and this finishes the proof. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let Γ be an ordered commutative group, and let E_a be a bounded definable family of finite sets indexed by Γ . Then for a sufficiently large and definable piecewise in a , E_a is constant.*

Proof. We may assume $E_a \subset \Gamma$ and that they have the same cardinality. Because Γ comes with an order we may assume this cardinality is 1, so $E_a = \{f(a)\}$. Definably piecewise in a the function f is affine, see Corollary 1.10 of [2] and because it is bounded it is constant in the unbounded pieces. \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let Γ be an ordered commutative group, and let $E_a \subset \Gamma$ be a decreasing definable family of bounded sets indexed by $a \in \Gamma$. Then there is a_0 such that if $a > a_0$ then $E_a = E_{a_0}$.*

Proof. This proof becomes simpler if Γ has finite spines.

We will use the relative quantifier elimination of [2]. We use the language L_{syn} defined there. Note that the Theorem 1.13 of [2] implies that L_{syn} eliminates quantifiers relative to the spine. (In fact it is equivalent to that, see Proposition 1.11 of [2]).

We will show that for a divisible (by every natural) and sufficiently large E_a is constant. As the family is decreasing this is enough.

We actually show the stronger property that if the family is uniformly bounded then there is a finite definable partition of the set of a , such that for a divisible and sufficiently large in one of the elements of the partition then E_a is constant. (The condition of a being divisible is necessary for this stronger property). Equivalently, if $M = (-d, d)$ is some fixed interval then $M \cap E_a$ satisfies the required condition for any family E_a . Note that this reformulation is closed under boolean combinations.

We have that the set E is given by a boolean combination of atomic formulas in Γ or inverse images of definable subsets of the spine by a term in the language. So we may assume E is either an atomic formula in Γ or the inverse image of a definable subset of the spine by a term.

Assume first we have $\rho(b, a)$ a term in a, b into the spine, and D a definable subset of the spine such that $E = \rho^{-1}(D)$. Replacing D by the image under ρ we may assume $E \rightarrow D$ is surjective.

Note that ρ is a tuple of functions of the form $\mathfrak{s}_{p^r}(ra + sb + c)$, and $\mathfrak{t}_p(ra + sb + c)$, where c are constants which define the family E_a , and r and s are natural numbers. Note that $\mathfrak{s}_{p^r}(ra + sb + c) = \mathfrak{s}_{p^r}(sb + c)$ because a is divisible. Note also that for a sufficiently large one has $\mathfrak{t}_p(ra + sb + c) = \mathfrak{t}_p(a)$. We conclude that $\rho(a, b) = (\rho'(b), \mathfrak{t}_p(a))$ and so $E_a = \rho'^{-1}D_{\mathfrak{t}_p(a)}$. Finally note that E_a being uniformly bounded implies that $D_{\mathfrak{t}_p(a)} = \rho'(E_a)$ is uniformly bounded above, so we finish by the Proposition 3.4.

Now assume that E is given by an atomic formula in the sort Γ . If E is given by the condition $ra < sb + c$ then the intersection with any interval fixed interval becomes empty, the whole interval, or does not depend on a for a large, depending on whether $r > 0$, $r < 0$ or $r = 0$. Now assume E

is given by the condition $ra + sb + c \equiv_m 0$. Then because a is divisible, this condition does not depend in a . Similarly we have the condition $ra + sb + c \equiv_m k_\bullet$ does not depend on a . We are left with the condition $ra + sb + c = k_\bullet$. For a sufficiently large and divisible by $k + 1$ this conditions never occurs. This finishes the proof. \square

4. DEFINABLE COMPACTNESS

Nowak shows, for example, that in a 1-h-minimal field of residue characteristic 0 with algebraic RV the image of a closed bounded set under a continuous definable map is closed and bounded in [8] Proposition 5.4. In this section we give a different proof of this fact. In fact this proof works in a somewhat more general setting described next. This is not an idle generalization as at the moment the mixed characteristic case in the unbounded ramification case needs the slight extra generality.

Situation 4.1. Here we consider a valued field K such that

- (1) K is definably spherically complete. In other words any definable family of balls which form a chain has a nonempty intersection.
- (2) The map $rv : K^\times \rightarrow RV$ is opaque. In other words for every definable set $X \subset K^\times$ the set $rv(X) \cap rv(K^\times \setminus X)$ is finite.
- (3) Every definable set $S \subset k \times \Gamma$ is a boolean combination of cartesian products of sets definable in k and in Γ .
- (4) Every definable subset of Γ^n is definable in the ordered group language of Γ .

Conditions 1 and 2 are true in a 0-h-minimal field of residue characteristic 0, (if C prepares X then the set mentioned in 2 is contained in C , and if C prepares the family of balls in 1, then an element of C will be in the intersection). Condition 3 and 4 are true in any henselian valued field of residue characteristic 0 with the valued field language. This follows for example from Denef-Pas quantifier elimination, see for instance [9]. This is a quantifier elimination relative to RV where K comes equipped with a cross section of $RV \rightarrow \Gamma$, in the ordered group language in Γ , the field language in k and the angular component map $K^\times \rightarrow k^\times$ coming from the cross section. In this case Γ and k are orthogonal because there are no relation or function symbols connecting the two sorts.

For convenience of reference of the next section we make this argument explicit.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that we have a model M in a many sorted relational language \mathcal{L} , and suppose that the collection of sorts is partitioned into two sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . We consider $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}}$ the restrictions of \mathcal{L} to these sorts. Suppose every basic relation $R \subset A \times B$ (or a coordinate permutation of $A \times B$) is a boolean combination of cartesian products of sets definable in A in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and sets definable in B in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}}$, where here A is a product of the sorts in \mathcal{A} and B is a product of the sorts in \mathcal{B} . Then every definable set $X \subset A \times B$ is a boolean combination of a cartesian product of sets definable in A in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and sets definable in B in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

The proof is an easy induction on the quantifier complexity of X .

Note also that all the conditions in Situation 4.1 are true in $ACVF$ (in any characteristic), and also their analytic expansions. Typically however condition 2 does not hold for valued fields in mixed characteristic. We deal with them later.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose K is a valued field as in Situation 4.1. Then the intersection of a decreasing family of nonempty bounded closed sets indexed by Γ is nonempty.*

Proof. Suppose we have a fixed family $\{C_r\}_r$ like that with empty intersection. First we prove that $rv(C_r)$ is eventually constant equal to a finite set.

Note that $v(C_r)$ is a bounded decreasing family, and so by Proposition 3.6 it is eventually constant equal to some set R . On the other hand if $E_r \subset RV$ is the exceptional set of C_r , that is $rv(C_r) \cap rv(K^\times \setminus C_r)$, then $v(E_r)$ is bounded definable family of finite sets, and so definably piecewise in r it is eventually constant, by Proposition 3.5. If R is infinite we conclude that there is a $t \in R$ not in $v(E_r)$ for all r sufficiently large. Note that $J_t = v^{-1}(t) \subset RV$ is definably isomorphic to k^\times , so by orthogonality $rv(C_r) \cap J_t$ is eventually constant. Any point in the eventual set has an rv fiber in the intersection of C_r . We conclude that $v(C_r)$ is eventually constant equal to a finite set.

If $t \in v(C_r)$, then, as noted before $J_t \cap rv(C_r)$ is eventually constant, also $E_r \cap J_t$ is eventually constant definably piecewise in r , so if the eventual value of $J_t \cap rv(C_r)$ is infinite then any point in this eventual value and not in $E_r \cap J_t$ for r large has its rv fiber in the intersection. We conclude that $rv(C_r)$ is eventually constant and finite, as desired.

Let us call a decreasing family unbranched if whenever it is contained in a finite union of disjoint open balls eventually, then it is contained in one of these open balls eventually. Now we prove $\{C_r\}_r$ is eventually contained in a finite union of open balls such that the intersection of the family with each one is unbranched. If not then we can form an infinite tree with finite levels, each point corresponding to an open ball, branching at each point not a leaf, such that points later in the tree correspond to smaller open balls and incomparable nodes correspond to disjoint open balls, the family is eventually contained in the union of the balls corresponding to a maximal antichain at finite levels, and the family has nonempty intersection with all balls in the tree. By König's Lemma we may find an infinite chain in the tree. By ω -saturativity we may assume there is a point in the intersection, and translating we may assume this point is 0. If B is a ball in the tree not in the chain, then the valuation of B is in the eventual value of $v(C_r)$, so we conclude that this is infinite in contradiction with the above.

So now assume the family is unbranched. Take the family of open balls that eventually contain the family. By definable spherical completeness there is a point in the intersection, and again we may assume this point is 0. As $v(C_r)$ is eventually constant equal to a finite set we conclude that this family of open balls actually intersect in a closed ball around the origin (of radius the minimum of the eventual set of $v(C_r)$). As the rv values are also eventually constant we conclude that C_r is eventually contained in a union of a finite number of disjoint open balls of smaller radiuses, the unbranched hypothesis now says that it is eventually contained in one of these balls, and this contradicts the choice of the closed ball as the minimal containing C_r eventually. \square

After this, standard topological arguments about compactness go through, we write this next. For convenience of reference we interpolate the conclusion of the previous proposition as a hypothesis

Situation 4.4. In this situation we consider a valued field K satisfying the conclusion of the previous proposition, that is, such that every decreasing definable family of closed bounded nonempty subsets of K indexed by Γ has nonempty intersection.

Proposition 4.5. *Let K be as in Situation 4.4, then every decreasing definable family of closed bounded nonempty subsets of K^n indexed by Γ , has a nonempty intersection.*

Proof. This is by induction on the dimension of the ambient space n . Suppose it is true for n and that the family $\{C_r\}_r$ lives in $K^n \times K$. Denote $\pi_1 : K^n \times K \rightarrow K^n$ the first projection and $\pi_2 : K^n \times K \rightarrow K$ the second projection. By the induction hypothesis one has a point $a \in \bigcap_r \overline{\pi_1(C_r)}$. Now consider the family $D_{r,s} = \pi_2(C_r \cap \pi_1^{-1}(B_s(a)))$. This is a decreasing family of nonempty closed sets so by the hypothesis (applied to $D_{r,r}$) we get a point b in the intersection. Now a straightforward verification shows $(a, b) \in \bigcap_r (C_r)$. \square

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose K is as in Situation 4.4. Suppose $X \subset K^n$ is closed and bounded and $f : X \rightarrow K^m$ is definable and continuous. Then $f(X)$ is closed and bounded.*

Proof. To prove that it is bounded consider the family $C_r = \{x \in X \mid v(f(x)) < -r\}$. To see that it is closed consider the family $f^{-1}(B_r(a))$ for $a \in f(X)$. \square

Proposition 4.7. *In Situation 4.4. Assume $f : X \times Y \rightarrow K^n$ is continuous and definable, for $X \subset K^r$ and $Y \subset K^s$. Suppose $L \subset X$ and $S \subset Y$ are closed and bounded in K^r and K^s respectively. Suppose W is a definable open set with $f(L \times S) \subset W$. Then there are definable open sets $U \subset K^r$ and $V \subset K^s$ such that $L \subset U$, $S \subset V$ and $f(U \times V) \subset W$.*

Proof. Otherwise we can consider the family $\overline{f^{-1}(K^n \setminus W)} \cap B_r(L) \times B_r(S)$ to obtain a contradiction \square

5. THE CLOSEDNESS THEOREM IN MIXED CHARACTERISTIC

In this section we prove the closedness theorem in the form of Proposition 4.3 for 1-h-minimal valued fields of mixed characteristic with algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$. Here we are denoting $RV_{p,\bullet}$ the collection of sorts $RV_n = K^\times / (1 + p^n \mathcal{M})$ where \mathcal{M} is the maximal ideal of the valuation ring of K . The proof proceeds by verifying that the conditions in Situation 4.3 apply to K with a characteristic 0 coarsening of the valuation. Denote \mathcal{L}_c the given language in K expanded with such a coarsening. Then K_c (that is K considered as a valued field with the coarse valuation v_c) is 1-h-minimal in the language \mathcal{L}_c , so it satisfies hypothesis 1 and 2. In this section we verify it also satisfies hypothesis 3 and 4. The fact that the any residue characteristic 0 coarsening is 1-h-minimal is one of the main theorems of [4], see Theorem 2.2.7.

Proposition 5.1. *If K is a 0-h-minimal mixed characteristic field then $RV_{p,\bullet}$ is stably embedded, in the strong sense of Proposition 2.6.12 of [3].*

Proof. The proof of Proposition 2.6.12 in [3], using Lemma 2.3.1 and Proposition 2.3.2 in [4] goes through. \square

Proposition 5.2. *If K is a valued field which is 0-h-minimal then there is a definitionally equivalent language in which there is resplendent relative elimination of quantifiers to $RV_{p,\bullet}$ or RV according to the residue characteristic.*

Proof. We expand the language and assume that every 0-definable set in $RV_{p,\bullet}$ is quantifier free definable. Also we may assume that every 0-definable function $f : K^n \rightarrow RV_{p,\bullet}$ is a term. We

also assume that $RV_{p,\bullet}$ form a closed family of sorts in the terminology of [10] Appendix A. Then by the result of that Appendix we just have to see elimination of quantifiers.

It is enough to see that every formula $\exists x\varphi(x, y, z)$ where y is a tuple of field variables, x is a field variable and z is an $RV_{p,\bullet}$ variable; is equivalent to a quantifier free formula. If we denote by $A_{yz} = \{x \mid \varphi(x, y, z)\}$, and $D_{yz} = rv(A_{yz})$ then A_{yz} is not empty if and only if D_{yz} is not empty. By the strong stable embeddedness we conclude that $D_{yz} = D'_{t(y)z}$ for some term t (Apply strong embeddedness to $D_y = \cup_z D_{yz} \times \{z\}$). \square

Definition 5.3. Suppose K is a valued field of residue characteristic 0. In RV we consider the following language. RV comes equipped with the group language and sorts for k^\times and Γ , and function symbols for the short exact sequence $1 \rightarrow k^\times \rightarrow K^\times \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 0$. Additionally Γ has the ordered group language and k^\times has a ternary relation symbol for addition (wherever it is defined).

We call this language the Basarab language in RV .

If K is a valued field of mixed characteristic we consider in $RV_{p,\bullet}$ the language that comes with one sort for each RV_n with the group language, and sorts for $\mathcal{R}_n = \mathcal{O}^\times / (1 + p^n \mathcal{M})$ and Γ , function symbols for $1 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_n \rightarrow RV_n \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow 0$, and the order in Γ . Additionally we have a function symbol for the projection $RV_{n+1} \rightarrow RV_n$. Finally, in each RV_n we have a ternary relation symbol \oplus and a binary relation symbol \ominus , defined as $\oplus(x, y, z)$ if one has $rv_n(x') = x, rv_n(y') = y, rv_n(z') = z$ and $z' = x' + y'$, for some x', y', z' ; and $\ominus(x, y)$ if there is and $x' \in K$ with $rv_n(x') = x$ and $rv(-x') = y$.

We say the field K has algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$ if every 0-definable subset of RV_n^m in K is definable in $RV_{p,\bullet}$ in the Basarab language.

Every henselian mixed characteristic valued field K with the pure valued field language has algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$, see for example [6]. Also every henselian valued field in mixed characteristic with an analytic expansion also has algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$, see for instance Theorem 6.3.7 of [5].

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose K is a valued field of residue characteristic 0. Consider in RV the Basarab language \mathcal{L}_b . In RV denote the relations \oplus and \ominus defined as $\oplus(x, y, z)$ if $rv(x') = x, rv(y') = y, rv(z') = z$ for some x, y, z with $x' + y' = z'$ and $\ominus(x, y)$ if $rv(x') = x, rv(-x') = y$ for some x' . Then \oplus and \ominus definable in \mathcal{L}_b .*

Proof. Recall that the relation $\oplus^r(x, y, z)$ defined as $x, y, z \in k^\times$ and $z = x + y$ is definable in the Basarab language. From this we get that $\ominus^r(x, y)$ defined as $y = -x, x, y \in k^\times$ is also definable by the condition $x, y \in k^\times \wedge \neg(\exists z) \oplus^r(x, y, z)$.

To define \oplus we consider cases. If $v(x) < v(y)$ then $\oplus(x, y, z)$ is equivalent to $z = x$. Similarly if $v(y) < v(x)$, $\oplus(x, y, z)$ is equivalent to $z = y$. If $v(x) = v(y)$, we get $\oplus(x, y, z)$ is equivalent to $\oplus(1, yx^{-1}, zx^{-1})$ so assume $x = 1$ and $v(y) = 0$. Now if $y \neq -1$ we have that $\oplus(1, y, z)$ is equivalent to $\oplus^r(1, y, z)$. Finally $\oplus(1, -1, z)$ is equivalent to $v(z) > 0$.

The analysis for $\ominus(x, y)$ is similar. Namely, $\ominus(x, y)$ implies $v(x) = v(y)$, and if $v(x) = v(y)$ it is equivalent to $\ominus(1, yx^{-1})$, which is equivalent to $\ominus^r(1, yx^{-1})$. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let K be a valued field of mixed characteristic in a language \mathcal{L} . Suppose we have a non-trivial residue characteristic 0 coarsening v_c . In RV_c denote \mathcal{L}_{be} the Basarab language expanded by the maps $RV_c \rightarrow RV_{p,\bullet}$, and the Basarab language in $RV_{p,\bullet}$. Then k_c and Γ_c are*

orthogonal, that is, every 0-definable subset of $k_c^m \times \Gamma_c^n$ is a boolean combination of cartesian products of 0-definable sets in Γ_c^n and k_c^m .

Also every 0-definable subset of Γ_c^n is 0-definable in the ordered group language.

Note that \mathcal{R}_n and Γ are not orthogonal in the Basarab language when the field K is henselian of infinite ramification. This is because \mathcal{R}_1 is a definable quotient of \mathcal{R}_n and there is a surjective function $\mathcal{R}_1 \setminus \{1\} \rightarrow [0, v(p))$ in the valued field language (and so in the Basarab language) given by $w(x) = v(1 - x)$.

Proof. We consider a diferent language in RV_c , denoted \mathcal{L}_1 consisting of the Basarab language in RV_c together with a predicate for $\mathcal{O}^\times / (1 + \mathcal{M}_c) \subset k_c^\times$, and predicates for $(1 + p^n \mathcal{M}) / (1 + \mathcal{M}_c)$, and the ordering in the quotient $k_c^\times / (\mathcal{O}^\times / (1 + \mathcal{M}_c)) \subset \Gamma$.

In this language we may consider the expansion of the language by a group section of $RV_c \rightarrow \Gamma_c$. Using this section we can identify RV_c with $k_c^\times \times \Gamma_c$. An application of Lemma 4.2, shows that k_c and Γ_c are orthogonal; and 0-definable subsets of Γ_c^n are 0-definable in the ordered group language of Γ_c .

So we just need to prove that $RV_{p,\bullet}$ is interpretable in this language. As a set, RV_n, k^\times and Γ are interpretable in \mathcal{L}_1 by the quotients $RV_n = RV_c / ((1 + p^n \mathcal{M}) / (1 + \mathcal{M}_c))$, $k^\times = \mathcal{O}^\times / (1 + \mathcal{M}_c) / ((1 + p^n \mathcal{M}) / (1 + \mathcal{M}_c))$, and $\Gamma = RV_c / (\mathcal{O}^\times / (1 + \mathcal{M}_c))$

Also, from Lemma 5.4, we get that \oplus and \ominus in RV_n are interpretable in \mathcal{L}_1 . Finally note that if I denotes the image of k_c^\times in Γ and $p : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_c$ is the projection, then for $r \in \Gamma$ one has $0 < r$ if and only if either $0 < p(r)$, or $r \in I$ and $0 < r$. As the orders in Γ_c and I are definable in \mathcal{L}_1 we conclude that the order in Γ is also definable. \square

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose K is 1-h-minimal valued field of mixed characteristic in some language \mathcal{L} . Suppose K has algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$.*

Suppose K comes with a non-trivial residue characteristic 0 coarsening and let \mathcal{L}_c be the extension of the language \mathcal{L} obtained by adding this.

Then K_c in the language \mathcal{L}_c satisfies conditions 3 and 4 in Situation 4.3.

Proof. We can add some constants to the Basarab language in $RV_{p,\bullet}$ and assume that every set definable without parameters in $RV_{p,\bullet}$ in the language \mathcal{L} is definable without parametes in the $RV_{p,\bullet}$.

Denote \mathcal{L}_e the extension of K to the coarsening and constants as before. Denote \mathcal{L}_{be}^0 the Basarab language in RV_c together with the maps $RV_c \rightarrow RV_n$, the Basarab language in $RV_{p,\bullet}$, and some constants as in the first paragraph. We denote \mathcal{L}_{be}^p the Basarab language with constants in $RV_{p,\bullet}$, together with a sort for Γ_c and the function symbol for the projection $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_c$. Let \mathcal{L}_{ve} be the valued field language of v expanded by v_c and the constants in $RV_{p,\bullet}$.

Note that K_c is 1-h-minimal with the language \mathcal{L}_e , by Theorem 2.2.7 of [4].

We prove first that every $X \subset RV_c \times RV_{p,\bullet}^r$ which is \mathcal{L}_e definable, is definabe in \mathcal{L}_{be}^0 . Indeed, note that v is 0-h-minimal in \mathcal{L}_e , because it is an $RV_{p,\bullet}$ expansion (see Lemma 2.6.3 of [4]). So there are $a_1, \dots, a_n \in K$ and m an integer which prepare the family $rv_c^{-1}(X_z)$ uniformly in $z \in RV_{p,\bullet}^r$, see Proposition 2.3.2 of [4].

So if $R = \{(rv_c(x), rv_c(x - a_1), \dots, rv_c(x - a_n))\} \subset RV_c \times RV_c^n$ then $X_z = R^{-1}(\pi_m^{-1}(Y_z))$ for an \mathcal{L}_e -definable family $Y_z \subset RV_m^n$. Here we denote $\pi_m : RV_c^n \rightarrow RV_m^n$ the projection. By

resplendent relative quantifier elimination $\{Y_z\}_z$ is \mathcal{L}_{be}^p -definable, see Proposition 5.2. We conclude X is \mathcal{L}_{ve} -definable, and by resplendent quantifier elimination relative to RV_c (in the valued field language of v_c), X is \mathcal{L}_{be}^0 -definable.

Now we show that in \mathcal{L}_e Γ_c, k_c satisfy property 3 of Situation 4.1. As $k_c \subset RV_c$ and Γ_c is interpretable in $RV_{p,\bullet}$, by what we proved before we see that it is enough to see that k_c and Γ_c are orthogonal in the language \mathcal{L}_{be}^0 . This follows from Lemma 5.5.

We still have to see property 4 of Situation 4.1. Let $X \subset \Gamma_c^n$ be definable in \mathcal{L}_e . We have to see it is definable in the ordered group language in Γ_c^n . By resplendent relative quantifier elimination it is definable in \mathcal{L}_{be}^p in $RV_{p,\bullet}$, and so a fortiori it is definable in \mathcal{L}_{be}^0 . By Lemma 5.5 we finish. \square

Question: Suppose K is a 0-h-minimal field in mixed characteristic with a language \mathcal{L} that extends the valued field language, and expand the language to \mathcal{L}_c to include a non-trivial residue characteristic 0 coarsening v_c . Does it follow that every 0-definable set $X \subset RV_c^n$ is definable in the expansion of the Basarab language in RV_c described in Lemma 5.5 and the 0- \mathcal{L} -definable sets in $RV_{p,\bullet}$? In the course of the above proof we see this for $n = 1$.

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose K is a 1-h-minimal valued field of mixed characteristic with algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$. Then K satisfies the hypothesis in Situation 4.4.*

Proof. Let K_c be an expansion of K obtained by adding a non-trivial residue characteristic 0 coarsening to K . By Proposition 5.6 K_c satisfies the hypothesis in Proposition 4.3. If $\{C_r\}_{r \in \Gamma}$ is a decreasing \mathcal{L} -definable family of closed bounded nonempty sets in K , and $p : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_c$ is the projection, then the family $D_s = \cap \{C_r \mid p(r) = s\}$ is definable in \mathcal{L}_c , it is closed in K_c because the topologies coincide, it is bounded for the same reason, and it is non-empty because for $r \in \Gamma$ with $p(r) > s$ one has $C_r \subset D_s$. We conclude that D_s and so C_r have a non-empty intersection. \square

As a consequence of Propositions 4.3, 5.7, and 4.5 we have the main result of this document.

Proposition 5.8. *Suppose K is a 1-h-minimal field of residue characteristic 0 with algebraic RV , or a 1-h-minimal field of mixed characteristic $(0, p)$ with algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$. Then every decreasing definable family $\{C_r\}_{r \in \Gamma}$ of closed bounded sets in K^n , has a nonempty intersection.*

6. LOCAL GROUPS CONTAIN DEFINABLE OPEN SUBGROUPS

Here we show that a definable topological group has a definable family of open subgroups that form a neighborhood base of the identity, for general classes of valued fields

Situation 6.1. Here K is either a 1-h-minimal valued field of residue characteristic 0 with algebraic RV , or 1-h-minimal of mixed characteristic with algebraic $RV_{p,\bullet}$, or a definably spherically complete C-minimal expansion of $ACVF_{p,p}$ with algebraic RV .

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose K is 1-h-minimal. Suppose X is a definable topological local group with the underlying topology being the subspace topology of K^n in X , then X is isomorphic as a definable local group to a $Y \subset K^n$ which is closed in K^n .*

Proof. If X is a definable local group we can choose U definable open such that $U \cap X$ is symmetric and transitivity makes sense and holds.

Denote C the closure of $U \cap X$. By Proposition 2.17 and Fact 6.7 in [1] (applied to $X \cap U \subset C$) we obtain that $U \cap X$ contains a nonempty set relatively open in C , say $W \cap C$ for some open W open. Making W smaller we may assume it is also closed. If $g \in W \cap C$ then left multiplication by g is a topological isomorphism $L_g : g^{-1}(W \cap C) \rightarrow W \cap C$, and $g^{-1}(W \cap C)$ is open in X around 0.

Transferring the local group structure from $g^{-1}(W \cap C)$ to $W \cap C$ via L_g we finish. \square

As a remark we note that X itself is locally closed around 0 whenever the closedness theorem applies, as then $g^{-1}(W \cap C)$, being the continuous image by a definable map of a closed bounded set, is closed and bounded.

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose K is as in Situation 6.1. Suppose $X \subset K^n$ is a definable set, and in X with the subspace topology there is the structure of a definable local topological group. Then there is a decreasing definable family $\{G_r\}_r$ of open subgroups of X indexed by $\Gamma_{>0}$ which form a neighborhood basis of the identity.*

Proof. We start by finding a definable open subgroup in X , and then show the stronger statement.

By Proposition 6.2 we may assume X is closed. Making X smaller we may assume X is closed and bounded. Let $U \subset X$ be a closed and open definable subset of X containing the identity, and on which transitivity makes sense and holds, and similarly for inverses and the identity element. In that case we define V to be the set of a in U such that $aU \subset U$. Then we have that V contains 1 and is closed under products. Also V is open in X because of Proposition 4.7. Then we have that $G = V \cap V^{-1}$ is an open subgroup of X .

Now if $B_r \subset U$ is a definable family of open and closed subsets of X indexed by $r \in \Gamma_{\geq 0}$, which are bounded and decreasing, then we take V_r to be the set of $a \in X$ such that $aB_s \subset B_s$ for all $s \leq r$. To see that this is an open set consider $S = \{(x, y) \in K^\times \times X \mid y \in B_{v(x)}\}$, and $S_r = S \cap \{(x, y) \mid v(x) \leq r\}$. Then it becomes a straightforward exercise to see that S is open and closed in $K^\times \times X$, and bounded in $K \times K^n$. If we consider the continuous function $f : U \times K^\times \times U \rightarrow K^\times \times X$ defined by $(y, x, y') \mapsto (x, yy')$, then $b \in V_r$ if and only if $f(\{b\} \times S_r) \subset S_r$, and so by Proposition 4.7 there is an open ball around b contained in V_r . We conclude $G_r = V_r \cap V_r^{-1}$ is a decreasing definable family of open sets indexed by r as required. \square

APPENDIX A. IND-DEFINABLE SETS

Given S a linear order definable in some model, we define \bar{S} to be set of definable Dedekind cuts of S , together with a maximal or minimal element if S does not have it.

More precisely $x \in \bar{S}$ if $x \subset S$ is a definable set satisfying:

- (1) If $a \in x$ and $b < a$ then $b \in x$.
- (2) If x has a supremum a in S , then $a \in x$.

If $x \in \bar{S}$ and $y \in \bar{S}$ we say $x \leq y$ if $x \subset y$.

This relation gives a linear order in \bar{S} . With this linear order the set S becomes the maximum of \bar{S} . Also \emptyset is a minimum of \bar{S} if S has no minimal element, and if S has a minimal element m , then $\{m\}$ is the minimum of \bar{S} .

We consider the map $\iota : S \rightarrow \bar{S}$ given by $a \mapsto \{b \in S \mid b \leq a\}$. This is an injection and $\iota(a) < \iota(b)$ if and only if $a < b$. We abuse notation and denote $S \subset \bar{S}$ via this map.

Lemma A.1. *If $X \subset S$ is a definable subset then $\sup(X)$ and $\inf(X)$ exist in \bar{S} .*

If $x \in \bar{S}$, and $s \in S$, then $s \in x$ if and only if $s \leq x$.

If $x, y \in \bar{S}$ and $x < y$, then there are $s, s' \in S$ such that $x \leq s < s' \leq y$.

The proof follows easily from the definitions and it is omitted.

Note that when $X \subset S$ is not bounded above, the supremum of X is the maximum of \bar{S} , and when X is empty the supremum is the minimum of \bar{S} . Similarly, when X is unbounded below the infimum is the minimum of \bar{S} , and when X is empty the infimum is the maximum of \bar{S} .

We will use the notion of an ind-definable set. The material following in this appendix is an elaboration of remark 2.2.9 of [7]. This remark says that an ind-definable set is a directed colimit of definable sets. These objects can be seen as sets with extra structure, and given an explicit description of the underlying set there is in practice only one reasonable way of giving the set the structure of an ind-definable set. This slight ambiguity can be removed by using the Yoneda embedding functor. Next we provide the details of this construction.

Given a model M in a possibly multisorted language, we consider the category of all \emptyset -definable sets in M with \emptyset -definable maps, and denote it Def_0 . This category comes equipped with a forgetful functor $\text{Fr} : \text{Def}_0 \rightarrow \text{Sets}$ given by $D \mapsto D(M)$, which is faithful. In this situation one calls Def_0 a category of sets with extra structure, the underlying set of an object D of Def_0 is $\text{Fr}(D)$, and it is often denoted by the same symbol as D , and informally identified with D , when there is no risk of confusion. Also, given two \emptyset -definable sets D_1, D_2 a function of the underlying sets $f : \text{Fr}(D_1) \rightarrow \text{Fr}(D_2)$ is said to be \emptyset -definable if there is an \emptyset -definable map $g : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ such that $\text{Fr}(g) = f$. In this case f and g will be denoted by the same symbol and informally identified when there is no risk of confusion.

An \emptyset -interpretable set in M is a set of the form Y/E where Y is \emptyset -definable and $E \subset Y \times Y$ is an \emptyset -definable equivalence relation. The \emptyset -interpretable sets form a category Int_0 , with a forgetful functor $\text{Fr} : \text{Int}_0 \rightarrow \text{Sets}$. We have a fully faithful inclusion functor $\text{Def}_0 \rightarrow \text{Int}_0$ which commutes with the forgetful functors.

When the model M does not have \emptyset -definable elements in every sort, it is more convenient to work in a category larger than Int_0 where there are finite disjoint unions. We define this category fInt_0 next. Its objects are the finite sequences $(X_k)_{k < n}$ with X_k an \emptyset -interpretable object. This object is denoted suggestively as $\bigsqcup_{k < n} X_k$. Given \emptyset -interpretable sets X and Y_k , a morphism $X \rightarrow (Y_k)_{k < n}$ is given by a partition of X into \emptyset -interpretable subsets $X_k \subset X$ and a collection of \emptyset -definable maps $X_k \rightarrow Y_k$. A morphism $(X_k)_{k < n} \rightarrow Y$ where Y is an \emptyset -f-interpretable object, is a collection of morphisms $X_k \rightarrow Y$. We omit the definition of the composition and the verification that this gives a category. Note that Int_0 has a final object given by X/E where $E = X^2$, and X is arbitrary, so it is not necessary to add a formal final object to fInt_0 .

We have a fully faithful functor $\text{Int}_0 \rightarrow \text{fInt}_0$ and a forgetful faithful functor $\text{fInt}_0 \rightarrow \text{Sets}$ which commutes with the forgetful functor in fInt_0 .

Proposition A.2. *Suppose X is an object in fInt_0 . Suppose $E \subset X^2$ is an \emptyset -definable subset, which is an equivalence relation.*

Then there exist a quotient object X/E in fInt_0 . Satisfying $\text{Fr}(X/E) = \text{Fr}(X)/\text{Fr}(E)$, and characterized by the natural bijection $\text{Mor}(X/E, Z) = \text{Mor}(X, Z) \times_{\text{Mor}(\text{Fr}(X)/\text{Fr}(E), \text{Fr}(Z))} \text{Mor}(\text{Fr}(X), \text{Fr}(Z))$.

In other words there is a canonical \emptyset -definable map $p : X \rightarrow X/E$ such that, $Fr(X/E) = Fr(X)/Fr(E)$ and $Fr(p)$ equals the canonical projection $Fr(X) \rightarrow Fr(X)/Fr(E)$. And also, for every $f : X \rightarrow Z$ which is \emptyset -definable and such that $Fr(f) : Fr(X) \rightarrow Fr(Z)$ factors as $g : Fr(X)/Fr(E) \rightarrow Fr(Z)$, there exists a unique $\bar{f} : X/E \rightarrow Z$ \emptyset -definable map such that $\bar{f}p = f$ and $Fr(\bar{f}) = g$.

Proof. Let $X = \bigsqcup_k X_k$ and $E_k = E \cap X_k \times X_k$. Let $Y_k = X_k/E_k$ which is an object in Int_0 . Then as sets $X/E = \cup_k Y_k$ (not necessarily disjoint union). We take $Z_k \subset Y_k$ the \emptyset -definable subset given by $Y_k \setminus \cup_{r < k} Y_r$. Then $X/E = \bigsqcup_k Z_k$. Some details omitted. \square

Now we define the category of \emptyset -ind-f-interpretable sets as the ind-completion of the category fInt_0 . So its objects are given by diagrams $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ in fInt_0 indexed by a directed set I , and denoted suggestively $\text{colim}_i X_i$, and the morphisms are given by the formula $\text{Mor}(\text{colim}_i X_i, \text{colim}_j Y_j) = \lim_i \text{colim}_j \text{Mor}(X_i, Y_j)$. We get a fully faithful functor $\text{fInt}_0 \rightarrow \text{indfInt}_0$ given by the constant system, and a forgetful functor $Fr : \text{indfInt}_0 \rightarrow \text{Sets}$. The forgetful functor acts on objects by the formula $Fr(\text{colim}_i X_i) = \text{colim}_i Fr(X_i)$, and it is faithful when M is ω -saturated.

From here on out we assume M is ω -saturated.

The category indfInt_0 has directed colimits and Fr commutes with them. The category fInt_0 has finite limits (e.g., products of two elements and fiber products) and Fr commutes with them. From this one gets that indfInt_0 has finite limits and Fr commutes with them.

The category fInt_0 has finite coproducts and Fr commutes with them. This implies that indfInt_0 has finite coproducts and Fr commutes with them.

Proposition A.3. *If we denote $F(C, \text{Sets})$ the category of contravariant functors $C \rightarrow \text{Sets}$, then the functor $Y : \text{indfInt}_0 \rightarrow F(\text{Int}_0, \text{Sets})$ which is the restriction of the Yoneda functor, that is, the functor which acts on objects as $Y(X)(D) = \text{Mor}(D, X)$, is fully faithful.*

Proof. We have the Yoneda embedding $Y_0 : \text{indfInt}_0 \rightarrow F(\text{indfInt}_0, \text{Sets})$ and the restriction functors $r_0 : F(\text{indfInt}_0, \text{Sets}) \rightarrow F(\text{fInt}_0, \text{Sets})$, and $r_1 : F(\text{fInt}_0, \text{Sets}) \rightarrow F(\text{Int}_0, \text{Sets})$.

We have that Y_0 is a fully faithful functor by the Yoneda lemma. The idea is that we can recover a representable functor by its action on Int_0 . More precisely one gets functors $s_1 : F(\text{Int}_0, \text{Sets}) \rightarrow F(\text{fInt}_0, \text{Sets})$, $s_0 : F(\text{fInt}_0, \text{Sets}) \rightarrow F(\text{indfInt}_0, \text{Sets})$, such that $r_i s_i$ is naturally equivalent to the identity and $s_i r_i$ restricted to the essential image of indfInt_0 is naturally equivalent to the identity. These functors are given by the following formulas on objects: $s_1 F(\bigsqcup_k X_k) = \prod_k F(X_k)$ and $s_0 F(\text{colim}_i X_i) = \lim_i F(X_i)$. From here the rest of the verification is straightforward. \square

Given an \emptyset -ind-f-interpretable set X , we can also consider $\text{Mor}(D, X)$ as a functor on D running over the \emptyset -definable sets. Note that we have that $\text{Mor}(D, X) \subset \text{Mor}(Fr(D), Fr(X))$. Let us denote $\mathcal{G}(\text{Def}_0)$ the category of pairs (F, Z) , where Z is a set, and F is a contravariant functor $F : \text{Def}_0 \rightarrow \text{Sets}$ which is a subfunctor of $\text{Mor}(Fr(-), Z)$. Then we have the Yoneda functor $\text{indfInt}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ given by $X \mapsto (\text{Mor}(D, X), Fr(X))$.

Proposition A.4. *With the above notation the Yoneda functor $\text{indfInt}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\text{Def}_0)$ is fully faithful.*

A pair (F, P) is called representable if it is in the essential image of the functor described above. The upshot of this proposition is that to give an \emptyset -ind-f-interpretable structure on the set P is the same thing as finding a subfunctor F of $\text{Mor}(Fr(-), P)$ such that (F, P) is representable.

Proof. That the Yoneda functor $\text{indfInt}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\text{Int}_0)$ is fully faithful follows from Proposition A.3. We have a restriction functor $r : \mathcal{G}(\text{Int}_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\text{Def}_0)$. The idea is to find a functor $s : \mathcal{G}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\text{Int}_0)$ which is a quasi-inverse when restricted to representable functors. Here \mathcal{G}^r is a fully faithful subcategory of $\mathcal{G}(\text{Def}_0)$ which contains the representable functors. This s is given in objects by $s(F, Z)(X/E) = \{f \in F(X) \mid f : Fr(X) \rightarrow Z \text{ factors through } Fr(X/E)\}$. In order to define $s(F, Z)$ on interpretable maps we restrict to \mathcal{G}^r the full subcategory of pairs (F, P) such that for every $g : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ a surjective map of \emptyset -definable sets, if $f : Fr(D_2) \rightarrow P$ is such that $fFr(g) \in F(D_1)$, then $f \in F(D_2)$.

Then, if X/E_1 and Y/E_2 are objects of Int_0 and $f : Y/E_2 \rightarrow X/E_1$ is an \emptyset -definable map, we consider $R \subset Y \times X$ given by $R = \{(y, x) \mid p(x) = fp(y)\}$. We have the coordinate projection maps $a : R \rightarrow Y$ and $b : R \rightarrow X$. Note that a is surjective. The map $s(F, Z)(f) : s(F, Z)(X/E_1) \rightarrow s(F, Z)(Y/E_2)$ is defined by $s(F, Z)(f)(r_1) = r_2$ satisfying $F(a)(r_2) = F(b)(r_1)$. We omit the straightforward but cumbersome verification that this is a well-defined function, that $s(F, Z)$ is a functor, that s is a functor and that r and s are quasi-inverses when restricted to representable objects. \square

Next we give a criterion for representability.

Proposition A.5. *With the notation of Proposition A.4, assume that (F, P) is an object in $\mathcal{G}(\text{Def}_0)$, satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) *For every $p \in P$ there is D in Def_0 and a $f \in F(D)$ such that $p \in \text{Im}(f)$.*
- (2) *For every $g : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ a surjective map of \emptyset -definable sets, if $f : D_2 \rightarrow P$ is such that $f g \in F(D_1)$, then $f \in F(D_2)$.*
- (3) *If $D = \sqcup_k D_k$ is a partition of the \emptyset -definable set D into a finite number of \emptyset -definable subsets, and $f : D \rightarrow P$ is such that $f|_{D_i} \in F(D_i)$, then $f \in F(D)$.*
- (4) *For every D in Def_0 and $f, g \in F(D)$, the set $\{x \in D \mid f(x) = g(x)\}$ is a definable subset of D .*

Then (F, P) is representable.

Proof. For $D \in \text{Def}_0$ and $h \in F(D)$, define $E_h \subset D \times D$ as the set of pairs (x, y) such that $h(x) = h(y)$. This is an equivalence relation on D and it is definable by item 4.

We consider \mathcal{I} the category of pairs (D, h) with $h \in F(D)$ and morphisms $(D_1, h_1) \rightarrow (D_2, h_2)$ given by a map $g : D_1 \rightarrow D_2$ such that $h_2 Fr(g) = h_1$. Now consider the category \mathcal{J} with objects the finite subsets of \mathcal{I} and morphisms $s \rightarrow t$ given by a function of sets $l : s \rightarrow t$ and a collection of morphisms in \mathcal{I} , $(D, h) \rightarrow l(D, h)$. For $s \in \mathcal{J}$ define $D_s = \bigsqcup_{(D, h) \in s} D$. For $l : s \rightarrow t$ a morphism in \mathcal{J} , we also get a morphism $D_l : D_s \rightarrow D_t$, in other words D_\bullet is a functor $\mathcal{J} \rightarrow \text{fInt}_0$.

Consider the map $h_s : D_s \rightarrow P$ given by $h_s \tau_{(D, h)} = h$, where $\tau_{(D, h)}$ is the canonical coprojection $D \rightarrow D_s$. Note that $h_s D_g = h_t$ for every $g : s \rightarrow t$ morphism. Consider $E_s \subset D_s \times D_s$ given by $(x, y) \in E_s$ if and only if $h_s(x) = h_s(y)$. This is a definable subset of $D_s \times D_s$ by item 4. Indeed that it is definable is equivalent to $\{(x, y) \in D_1 \times D_2 \mid h_1(x) = h_2(y)\}$ being definable in $D_1 \times D_2$, for D_i definable and $h_i \in F(D_i)$, which follows from item 4. This implies D_s/E_s is an element of fInt_0 which we denote X_s , see Proposition A.2.

The map h_s factors as an injection $\bar{h}_s : X_s \rightarrow P$. If $g : s \rightarrow t$ is a morphism in \mathcal{J} , then $D_g : D_s \rightarrow D_t$ factors as $X_g : X_s \rightarrow X_t$, and as \bar{h}_t is injective this does not depend on the choice

of g . So if we define a relation in \mathcal{J} by $s \leq t$, if there is a morphism $s \rightarrow t$, this becomes a preorder in the set of objects of \mathcal{J} . Denote J the set of objects of \mathcal{J} considered as the category associated to this preorder. Then we get a diagram. $X : J \rightarrow \text{fInt}_0$. Consider J' the partial order associated to J , note that the natural projection $J \rightarrow J'$ is an equivalence of categories, so if we choose a quasi-inverse we get a diagram $X : J' \rightarrow \text{fInt}_0$. Note also that J' is a directed set.

So we have that $X \in \text{indfInt}_0$. We claim that X represents the data (F, P) . Note that the maps $\bar{h}_s : X_s \rightarrow P$ glue to a map $h : X \rightarrow P$ which is surjective by item 1, and injective by construction.

Now we have to see that if D is a definable set, then the composition by h gives a bijection $\text{Mor}(D, X) \rightarrow F(D)$. In other words $f \in F(D)$ if and only if $hf' = f$ for some ind-definable map $f' : D \rightarrow X$. Take first $f \in F(D)$. Then $(D, f) \in \mathcal{I}$ and so we may take $s \in J'$ with $X_s = D/E_f$. We take f' given by the projection $D \rightarrow X_s$ followed by the canonical map $X_s \rightarrow X$. Then it follows from the definitions that $hf' = f$. Now take f such that $f = hf_1$ for some ind-definable morphism $f_1 : D \rightarrow X$. We have to show $f \in F(D)$. By the definitions this means that f_1 factors as $D \rightarrow X_s \rightarrow X$ for some $s \in J'$ and $X_s \rightarrow X$ the canonical map. If we denote $f_2 : D \rightarrow X_s$ we conclude that $f = \bar{h}_s f_2$. We have that $s = \{(D_k, h_k)\}_k$ and we denote X_k the image of $X_{(D_k, h_k)}$ in X_s . Then $X_s = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$. Restricting to $(f_2)^{-1}(X_k)$ and using item 3 we may assume $X_s = D_1/E_{h_1}$ for some $(D_1, h_1) \in I$. Denote $R = \{(x, y) \in D \times D_1 \mid f_2(x) = p(y)\}$, and $g_1 : R \rightarrow D, g_2 : R \rightarrow D_1$ the projections. Composing f with g_1 and using Item 2 we see that we may assume $f_2 : D \rightarrow X_s$ lifts to a definable map $f_3 : D \rightarrow D_1$. Now denote $h_2 = h_1 f_3$, which is an element $F(D)$, as F is a functor. Then from the definitions $f = \bar{h}_s f_2 = \bar{h}_s p f_3 = h_1 f_3 = h_2$ as required. \square

One sees in the proof that a representing object of (F, P) is given by a colimit $\text{colim}_i X_i$ where $X_i \in \text{fInt}_0$ and the intermediate maps $X_i \rightarrow X_j$ are injective. Such an object is called strict \emptyset -ind-f-interpretable. A representable pair (F, P) always satisfies items 1,2 and 3, and it satisfies item 4 if and only if it is representable by a strict \emptyset -ind-f-interpretable set.

Example A.6. We apply this to the case we considered in the start of the section. Take \bar{S} the definable completion of a linear order S definable in some model. If D is \emptyset -definable then $F(D)$ is defined as the set of functions $f : D \rightarrow \bar{S}$ such that $\{f(x)\}_{x \in D}$ is a \emptyset -definable family of subsets of S . Then we see that the pair (F, \bar{S}) is representable by an element of indfInt_0 , by the Proposition A.5 (all conditions in the hypothesis are easy to check).

Now we can see that the inclusion map $S \rightarrow \bar{S}$ is ind-definable. This follows as the family $\{\{x \in S \mid x \leq a\}\}_{a \in S} = \{i(a)\}_{a \in S}$ is an \emptyset -definable family.

Example A.7. Suppose $C \subset S$ is an \emptyset -definable subset. Here we verify that $C_- : \bar{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$ defined by the formula $C_-(a) = \sup\{x \in S \mid x < a, x \in C\}$ is a well defined ind-definable map.

Note that if $a \in \bar{S}$ then $\{x \in S \mid x < a, x \in C\}$ is definable in S so it has a supremum in \bar{S} . To see that it is ind-definable one can use Proposition A.4 for instance. So one needs to verify that for T definable and $T \rightarrow \bar{S}$ an ind-definable map, then $C_- T$ is ind-definable. The ind-definable maps $T \rightarrow \bar{S}$ are in natural bijective correspondence with the definable families $\{x_t\}_{t \in T}$ of cuts in S . So now has to check that $\{C_-(x_t)\}_{t \in T}$ is also a definable family of cuts in S . This is straightforward, for example, from Lemma A.1 $C_-(x_t) = \{s \in S \mid s \leq C_-(x_t)\}$, and $s \leq C_-(x_t)$ if and only if for every $s' < s, s' \in S$, we have $s' < C_-(x_t)$, and this holds if and only there is a $s'' \in S$ such

that $s' < s'' \leq x_t$ and $s'' \in C$. As the condition $s'' \leq x_t$ can be expressed by a formula in (s'', t) we see that the condition $s \leq C_-(x_t)$ can be expressed by a formula in (s, t) .

One can check in a similar way that $C_+ : \bar{S} \rightarrow \bar{S}$ given by $C_+(a) = \text{Inf}\{x \in S \mid a < x, x \in C\}$ makes sense and is ind-definable.

Definition A.8. If X is an ind-definable set, then $Y \subset X$ is called \emptyset -relatively definable. if for every \emptyset -ind-definable map $f : D \rightarrow X$, where D is \emptyset -definable, the inverse image $f^{-1}(Y) \subset D$ is \emptyset -definable.

An element $x \in X$ is \emptyset -definable if $\{x\}$ is \emptyset -relatively definable

Note that this definition can be read directly from the pair (F, P) in Proposition A.5. Indeed, $Q \subset P$ is \emptyset -relatively definable if and only if for every $f \in F(D)$ one has $f^{-1}(Q) \subset D$ is \emptyset -definable.

Note also that boolean combinations of \emptyset -relatively definable subsets are \emptyset -relatively definable.

Example A.9. If X is an \emptyset -ind-definable set, then X is strict ind-definable if and only if the diagonal in $X \times X$ is relatively definable. This is a restatement of condition 4 in Proposition A.5.

Example A.10. In \bar{S} the relation \leq in \bar{S}^2 is \emptyset -relatively definable. This boils down to verifying that if $\{X_a\}_{a \in T}$ and $\{Y_a\}_{a \in T}$ are \emptyset -definable families of cuts, then $\{a \in T \mid Y_a \leq X_a\}$ is a definable subset of T .

Similarly we have that the minimum and maximum of \bar{S} are definable elements of \bar{S} .

REFERENCES

- [1] Juan Pablo Acosta and Assaf Hasson. On groups and fields definable in 1-h-minimal fields, 2023.
- [2] Raf Cluckers and Immanuel Halupczok. Quantifier elimination in ordered abelian groups. *Confluentes Math.*, 3(4):587–615, 2011.
- [3] Raf Cluckers, Immanuel Halupczok, and Silvain Rideau-Kikuchi. Hensel minimality I. *Forum Math. Pi*, 10:Paper No. e11, 2022.
- [4] Raf Cluckers, Immanuel Halupczok, Silvain Rideau-Kikuchi, and Floris Vermeulen. Hensel minimality II: Mixed characteristic and a diophantine application. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2104.09475, April 2021.
- [5] Raf Cluckers and Leonard Lipshitz. Fields with analytic structure. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 13(4):1147–1223, 2011.
- [6] Joseph Flenner. Relative decidability and definability in henselian valued fields. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 76(4):1240–1260, 2011.
- [7] Ehud Hrushovski and François Loeser. *Non-archimedean tame topology and stably dominated types*, volume 192 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2016.
- [8] Krzysztof Jan Nowak. Tame topology and desingularization in hensel minimal structures, 2021.
- [9] Johan Pas. Uniform p-adic cell decomposition and local zeta function. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 339:137–172, 1989.
- [10] Silvain Rideau. Some properties of analytic difference valued fields. *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu*, 16(3):447–499, 2017.
- [11] Pierre Simon. On dp-minimal ordered structures. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 76(2):448–460, 2011.