

MULTIDIMENSIONAL ASYMPTOTIC CLASSES

SYLVY ANSCOMBE, DUGALD MACPHERSON, CHARLES STEINHORN
AND DANIEL WOLF

ABSTRACT. We develop a general framework (multidimensional asymptotic classes, or m.a.c.s) for handling classes of finite first order structures with a strong uniformity condition on cardinalities of definable sets: The condition asserts that definable families given by a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ should take on a fixed number n_φ of approximate sizes in any M in the class, with those sizes varying with M . The prototype is the class of all finite fields, where the uniformity is given by a theorem of Chatzidakis, van den Dries and Macintyre. It inspired the development of asymptotic classes of finite structures, which this new framework extends.

The underlying theory of m.a.c.s is developed, including preservation under bi-interpretability, and a proof that for the m.a.c. condition to hold it suffices to consider formulas $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ with x a single variable. Many examples of m.a.c.s are given, including 2-sorted structures (F, V) where V is a vector space over a finite field F possibly equipped with a bilinear form, and an example arising from representations of quivers of finite representation type. We also give examples and structural results for multidimensional *exact* classes (m.e.c.s), where the definable sets take a fixed number of precisely specified cardinalities, which again vary with M .

We also develop a notion of infinite *generalised measurable* structure, whereby definable sets are assigned values in an ordered semiring. We show that any infinite ultraproduct of a m.a.c. is generalised measurable, that values can be taken in an ordered *ring* if the m.a.c. is a m.e.c., and explore model-theoretic consequences of generalised measurability. Such a structure cannot have the strict order property, and stability-theoretic properties can be read off from the measures in the semiring.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Notation, conventions, and model-theoretic background	6
2. Multidimensional asymptotic and exact classes	7
2.1. Key definitions	7

August 2, 2024

This research was funded by EPSRC grant EP/K020692/1. The third author was partially funded by Simons Foundation Mathematics and Physical Sciences Collaboration Grant for Mathematicians, award #524012. The fourth author (born Daniel Wood) was funded by the Leeds School of Mathematics through a Graduate Teaching Assistantship. Part of the present work forms part of his PhD thesis [74].

2.2.	Examples of m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s	9
2.3.	Non-examples associated with finite fields	13
2.4.	Projection Lemma	16
2.5.	Interpretability and bi-interpretability	18
3.	Three examples of multidimensional asymptotic classes	26
3.1.	Families of vector spaces.	26
3.2.	A m.a.c. from representation theory.	28
3.3.	Vector spaces with bilinear forms	31
4.	Multidimensional exact classes	33
4.1.	Smooth approximation and m.e.c.s of homogeneous structures	33
4.2.	M.e.c.s of groups	38
4.3.	Other examples of m.e.c.s	44
5.	Generalised measurable structures	46
5.1.	Measuring semirings	47
5.2.	\mathcal{S} -measurable structures	54
5.3.	Ultraproducts of m.a.c.s	56
5.4.	Some basic model-theoretic properties of generalized measurable structures	63
6.	Simplicity and supersimplicity	65
6.1.	Ordered polynomial rings with well-ordered variables	65
6.2.	Locally well-ordered dimensions	68
6.3.	Quasifinite fields	69
7.	Further Observations	70
	Acknowledgements	73
	References	73

1. INTRODUCTION

A classical theorem of Lang and Weil (see [53, Theorem 1]) states that the number of \mathbb{F}_q -rational points of an absolutely irreducible variety $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ defined over \mathbb{F}_q is approximately equal to q^r , where \mathbb{F}_q is the finite field of order q and V is of algebraic dimension r . ‘Approximately’ here means that the difference $||V(\mathbb{F}_q)| - q^r|$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $q^{r-\frac{1}{2}}$. This constant depends only on certain information about V : namely n , r , and the degrees of the polynomials defining V . Using ‘big O notation’, we may re-write this approximation (sacrificing some information) as an asymptotic statement:

$$(1) \quad ||V(\mathbb{F}_q)| - q^r| = O(q^{r-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty.$$

Later work of Chatzidakis, van den Dries, and Macintyre (see [14, Main Theorem]) extends these asymptotics to definable sets in finite fields, in the language of rings L_{ring} . More precisely, for any L_{ring} -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$, there is a finite set $D \subseteq \{0, \dots, |\bar{x}|\} \times \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$ such that for each prime power q and each $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{|\bar{y}|}$ either $\varphi(\mathbb{F}_q^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})$ is empty or there exists

$(d, \mu) \in D$ such that

$$(2) \quad \left| |\varphi(\mathbb{F}_q^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})| - \mu q^d \right| = O(q^{d-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \text{as } q \rightarrow \infty.$$

In this case, d is known as the ‘dimension’ and μ as the ‘measure’ of the set $\varphi(\mathbb{F}_q^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})$. Moreover, the set of \bar{b} such that (2) holds for a specified (d, μ) is uniformly definable by an L_{ring} -formula without parameters.

With a change of perspective, in [57] Macpherson and Steinhorn turned these asymptotic results into a definition: Roughly speaking, a class \mathcal{C} of finite L -structures is called a *1-dimensional asymptotic class* if it satisfies the Chatzidakis–van den Dries–Macintyre Theorem. In [24], Elwes generalised this further to study ‘ N -dimensional asymptotic classes’; see Example 2.2.1 below for details. By a theorem of Ryten [65, Theorem 1.1.1], for any fixed Lie type τ (possibly twisted) the collection of all finite simple groups of Lie type τ is an asymptotic class.

In [57] the authors also introduced the notion of a *measurable* structure – this is an infinite structure such that dimension-measure pairs (d, μ) can be assigned to definable sets, in the manner that follows for pseudofinite fields from the theorem of Chatzidakis, van den Dries and Macintyre. Measurability has content from the viewpoint of model-theoretic generalised stability theory – measurable structures are supersimple of finite SU-rank. Elwes in [24] (see also [25, Proposition 3.9]) noted among other results that any ultraproduct of an asymptotic class is measurable, and also in [24, Proposition 6.5] that any stable measurable structure is one-based. [57] gives a range of examples of measurable structures.

Aspects of this work were followed up by Garcia, Macpherson and Steinhorn in [30]. That paper considers the Hrushovski–Wagner notion of *pseudofinite dimension* (see [38, 39]), identifying conditions on this dimension which ensure that an ultraproduct of finite structures is supersimple (or simple, or stable) and showing that the conditions that imply supersimplicity hold for asymptotic classes. The present paper revisits some examples from [30], but we do not fully explore the connections between our work here and that of [30].

The notion of *asymptotic class* is very restrictive, implying that ultraproducts have finite SU-rank, and with nearly all the known examples closely related to finite fields. In addition, there are very simple examples which fail the definition because of their many-sorted nature. One such, in a language L with a single unary predicate P , would be the collection of all finite structures (M, P) . This is not an asymptotic class since P can pick out an arbitrarily sized subset of M , but this is the only obstruction.

In this paper we develop a considerably broader framework. We still consider classes of finite structures, and still impose that for any formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ determining a family of definable sets in each structure

parameterized by \bar{y} , there is a uniform finite bound on the number of (approximate) sizes of these sets in each structure, together with a corresponding definability clause, analogous to definability of Morley rank or degree. In the definition of a *multidimensional asymptotic class* (m.a.c.) of finite structures, we allow different parts of the finite structures – e.g. sorts, or definable sets, or coordinatising geometries – to vary independently, and we do not specify the form of the functions determining cardinalities. We obtain extra model-theoretic information, e.g. supersimplicity of the limit theory, when these functions are known. We separate out the regime of a multidimensional *exact class* (m.e.c.) when the cardinalities of definable sets are given *exactly*, rather than just asymptotically. When the cardinalities of definable sets are determined by polynomials, we talk of a *polynomial m.a.c.* (or m.e.c.). We also develop the notion of a *generalised measurable* infinite structure, the appropriate analogue of a measurable structure, and draw connections to m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s.

We now summarise the main results, with fuller definitions and more detailed and precise statements appearing later in the paper.

Theorem A. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of finite structures.*

- (i) *(One variable criterion, Theorem 2.4.1) If all formulas $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ satisfy the definition of a m.a.c. (or m.e.c.) for \mathcal{C} then so do all formulas $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, that is, \mathcal{C} is a m.a.c. (respectively m.e.c.).*
- (ii) *(Interpretability, Theorem 2.5.4(i)) If the class \mathcal{D} is uniformly interpretable in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C} is a m.a.c. (respectively m.e.c.) then \mathcal{D} is a weak m.a.c. (respectively weak m.e.c.).*
- (iii) *(Bi-interpretability, Theorem 2.5.4(ii)) In (ii), the word ‘weak’ can be dropped if \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are uniformly bi-interpretable.*

The next theorem gives two key motivating examples.

Theorem B.

- (i) *(Theorem 3.2.1.) Let Q be a quiver of finite representation type, and let $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ be the set of all finite structures (F, FQ, M) , where F is a finite field, FQ is the path algebra of Q over F , and M is a finite FQ -module, viewed in a 3-sorted language where F and FQ both carry (copies of) the language of rings, M carries the language of groups, and there are function symbols for the maps $F \times FQ \rightarrow FQ$, $F \times M \rightarrow M$, $FQ \times M \rightarrow M$. Then $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ is a weak polynomial m.a.c..*
- (ii) *(Theorem 3.3.3.) Let \mathcal{C}_{bil} be the collection of all L_{bil} structures (V, F) where V is a finite-dimensional vector space over the finite field F , equipped with a non-degenerate alternating bilinear form β . Let $R = \mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F})[\mathbf{V}]$. Then \mathcal{C}_{bil} is an R -m.a.c..*

The following theorem provides a wide range of examples of multidimensional *exact classes*.

Theorem C. *The following are multidimensional exact classes (polynomial m.e.c.s in (i), (ii) and (iv)).*

- (i) (Theorem 4.3.1.) *For any pseudofinite strongly minimal set M , any class of finite structures whose non-principal ultraproducts are all elementarily equivalent to M .*
- (ii) (Theorem 4.2.3.) *The class of all finite abelian groups.*
- (iii) (Theorem 4.3.3.) *For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the class of all finite graphs of degree at most d .*

In addition

- (iv) (Theorem 4.1.2.) *for any finite language L and $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the class of all finite L -structures M such that $\text{Aut}(M)$ has at most d orbits on M^A is a m.e.c., after expansion to a finite extension $L' \supseteq L$ that does not change the automorphism groups.*

Note that part (iv) involves a correction to [73, Corollary 4.4.2], discussed below before Theorem 4.1.2.

We note that (i) has been extended to pseudofinite uncountably categorical structures in [1]. As a partial converse to (ii) above we obtain the following.

Proposition 4.2.1. *If \mathcal{C} is a m.e.c. of finite groups, then there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that each $G \in \mathcal{C}$ has a (uniformly definable across \mathcal{C}) soluble radical $R(G)$ of index at most d , and $R(G)/F(G)$ has derived length at most d , where $F(G)$ is the Fitting subgroup of G .*

We also prove the following result, and conjecture that it holds for all finite relational languages (the right-to-left direction follows from Theorem C(iv) and the work of Lachlan).

Theorem D. (Proposition 4.1.5 and Theorem 4.1.6.) *Let M be a countably infinite homogeneous graph. Then M is elementarily equivalent to an ultraproduct of a m.e.c. if and only if it is stable.*

Regarding generalised measurability, we introduce the notion of (totally ordered) measuring semiring and show in Theorem 5.1.14 that any measuring semiring may be replaced by a homomorphic image which is a ‘monomial’ measuring semiring $\mathbb{R}\langle Z^D \rangle$ consisting of monomials rZ^d for $d \in D$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. Here Z is an indeterminate, and the set D of ‘dimensions’ of definable sets is a ‘tropical’ semiring. This ‘monomialisation’ has useful consequences, e.g. in ensuring that generalised measurability is inherited by M^{eq} (Proposition 5.2.7). The following result links generalised measurability to m.a.c.s. and m.e.c.s.

Theorem E.

- (i) (Theorem 5.3.1.) *If \mathcal{C} is a m.a.c. then any ultraproduct of \mathcal{C} is generalised measurable.*
- (ii) (Theorem 5.3.8.) *If \mathcal{C} is a m.e.c. then any ultraproduct of \mathcal{C} is ring-measurable, that is, generalised measurable with values in an ordered ring (an integral domain).*

We also explore model-theoretic consequences of generalised measurability, and a sample of results is the following. A theory T has the *strict order property* if some model of T has an interpretable partial order containing an infinite totally ordered subset. For the notion of *functional unimodularity*, see Definition 5.4.2. (This was called just *unimodularity* in [24] – certain confusions related to the usage in [37] were clarified later in [44].)

Theorem F.

- (i) (Proposition 5.2.3.) *Generalised measurability is preserved by elementary equivalence.*
- (ii) (Proposition 5.4.1 and Lemma 5.4.3.) *If M is generalised measurable then $\text{Th}(M)$ does not have the strict order property and is functionally unimodular.*
- (iii) (Proposition 5.4.4.) *If M is ring-measurable then any definable function from a definable set in M to itself is injective if and only if it is surjective.*
- (iv) (Theorem 6.1.4.) *If M is generalised measurable with well-ordered set of ‘dimensions’ D (e.g. if M is an ultraproduct of a polynomial m.a.c.) then $\text{Th}(M)$ is supersimple.*

Here is the overall structure of the paper. We introduce the basic definitions around multidimensional asymptotic and exact classes in Section 2 and then, referring ahead for full details, give a brief overview of some key examples. We also consider certain structures related to finite fields which we half-expected to yield examples, and show that they do not. Section 2 also contains the proof of Theorem A. The two key examples in Theorem B are considered in Section 3, along with multisorted structures of the form (F, V_1, \dots, V_t) where F is a finite field and the V_i are finite-dimensional F -vector spaces. Multidimensional *exact* classes are explored in detail in Section 4, which includes results yielding Theorem C, Proposition 4.2.1, and Theorem D. The general theory around generalised measurability is developed in Sections 5 and 6, with Section 6 focussing on stability-theoretic consequences. We conclude with some open questions in Section 7.

1.1. Notation, conventions, and model-theoretic background.

Throughout this paper, L is a first-order language, L -structures are usually denoted by M or N , and ‘definable’ means ‘definable with parameters’. For a tuple \bar{x} of variables and a set A , $A^{|\bar{x}|}$ denotes the set of $|\bar{x}|$ -tuples from A . For a structure M , let $\text{Def}(M)$ denote the collection of sets in M which are definable with parameters. A *definable family* in M is a set $\{\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b}) : \bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}\}$, for some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$.

The paper makes occasional reference to concepts from generalised stability theory, in particular stability, simplicity, and NSOP₁. These

are increasingly broad notions of model-theoretic tameness for first order theories. For stability, simplicity and other model-theoretic background, [68] can be used as a general source. More detail on simple theories can be found in [46] or [69]. The general theory around NSOP₁ has been developed more recently, and [63] provides an introduction.

2. MULTIDIMENSIONAL ASYMPTOTIC AND EXACT CLASSES

2.1. Key definitions. For a class \mathcal{C} of L -structures and a tuple \bar{y} of variables, we denote by (\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}) the set $\{(M, \bar{a}) : M \in \mathcal{C}, \bar{a} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}\}$ of pairs consisting of a structure in \mathcal{C} and a \bar{y} -tuple from that structure. A partition Π of (\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}) is said to be \emptyset -definable if for each part $\pi \in \Pi$ there exists an L -formula $\varphi_\pi(\bar{y})$ without parameters such that

$$(3) \quad \varphi_\pi(M^{|\bar{y}|}) = \{\bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{y}|} : (M, \bar{b}) \in \pi\}$$

for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$. We say that a partition is *finite* if it has finitely many parts.

The following is the main definition of this paper.

Definition 2.1.1. Let R be any set of functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. A class \mathcal{C} of finite L -structures is an *R -multidimensional asymptotic class* (or an *R -m.a.c.* for short) if for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ there is a finite \emptyset -definable partition $\Pi = \Pi_\varphi$ of (\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}) and an indexed set $H_\Pi := \{h_\pi \in R : \pi \in \Pi\}$ such that for $(M, \bar{b}) \in \pi$ we have

$$(4) \quad \left| |\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})| - h_\pi(M) \right| = o(h_\pi(M))$$

as $|M| \rightarrow \infty$. The functions h_π are called the *measuring functions* of $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$. When R is understood, we just say \mathcal{C} that is a *m.a.c.*

The ‘little o -notation’ in Equation 4 means that for every real number $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a natural number C such that, for all $(M, \bar{b}) \in \pi$, if $|M| > C$ then

$$(5) \quad \left| |\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})| - h_\pi(M) \right| \leq \varepsilon h_\pi(M).$$

Remark 2.1.2. The elements of R are called *measuring functions*. Often we will assume that R is closed under the addition and multiplication of functions.

Definition 2.1.3. If in Definition 2.1.1 we have $|\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})| = h_\pi(M)$ for all $M \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{x}|}$ with $(M, \bar{b}) \in \pi$, then we say that \mathcal{C} is an *exact R -m.a.c.*, or an *R -m.e.c.* (multidimensional *exact class*). In this case the measuring functions may be chosen to have codomain $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$.

Remark 2.1.4. We say that \mathcal{C} is a *weak m.a.c.* if Definition 2.1.1 holds but without requiring that the partition Π is \emptyset -definable (or even parameter-definable). Analogously, we say that \mathcal{C} is a *weak m.e.c.* if Definition 2.1.3 holds, but without requiring the \emptyset -definability of the partition Π . We do not explore intermediate notions given by

demanding that Π is parameter-definable, or definable by formulas of a certain complexity.

Lemma 2.1.5.

- (i) Let \mathcal{C} be an R -m.a.c. (respectively R -m.e.c.) of L -structures, let L' be an extension of L by constants, and for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$ let M' be an L' -expansion of M . Put $\mathcal{C}' := \{M' : M \in \mathcal{C}\}$. Then \mathcal{C}' is an R -m.a.c. (respectively R -m.e.c.).
- (ii) The assertion of (i) holds with m.a.c. and m.e.c. replaced by weak m.a.c. and weak m.e.c. respectively.
- (iii) Suppose $L' = L \cup \{c\}$ where c is a constant symbol not in L , and let \mathcal{C} be a class of L -structures. Let $\varphi(x)$ be an L -formula and suppose that for $M \in \mathcal{C}$, $\text{Aut}(M)$ is transitive on $\varphi(M)$. Let \mathcal{C}' consist of L' -expansions of members of \mathcal{C} with c interpreted by a realisation of φ . If \mathcal{C}' is a m.a.c. (respectively m.e.c.), then so is \mathcal{C} .

Proof. This is immediate. In (iii), we keep the definability clause in the definition of m.a.c./m.e.c., since any use of c in a defining formula can be replaced by a quantifier relativised to $\varphi(M)$. \square

For an initial sense of the content of the R -m.a.c. definition, note the following.

Lemma 2.1.6. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of finite structures, and suppose there is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with $r > 1$ such that the following holds: For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $M_n \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n \in M_n^{|\bar{y}|}$ such that $|\varphi(M_n^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a}_{i+1})| > r|\varphi(M_n^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a}_i)|$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then \mathcal{C} is not a weak R -m.a.c. for any R .*

Proof. Under the given assumption, put $X_i(M_n) := \varphi(M_n^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a}_i)$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. By the pigeon-hole principle, if the assumption holds then there are some $h_\pi \in R$ and for arbitrarily large n distinct i_n, j_n such that $|X_{j_n}(M_n)| > r|X_{i_n}(M_n)|$ and

$$(6) \quad \left| |X_{i_n}(M_n)| - h_\pi(M_n) \right| \leq \varepsilon h_\pi(M_n) \text{ and}$$

$$(7) \quad \left| |X_{j_n}(M_n)| - h_\pi(M_n) \right| \leq \varepsilon h_\pi(M_n).$$

Thus by the triangle inequality $\left| |X_{j_n}(M_n)| - |X_{i_n}(M_n)| \right| \leq 2\varepsilon h_\pi(M_n)$, so $(r-1)|X_{i_n}(M_n)| \leq 2\varepsilon h_\pi(M_n)$. Since r is fixed and ε is arbitrarily small, this contradicts (6). \square

Remark 2.1.7. It follows immediately from Lemma 2.1.6, applied to the formula $x < y$, that the class of finite total orders is not a weak m.a.c.. In fact, by Remark 5.3.7, no weak m.a.c. can have an ultra-product with the strict order property. Likewise, the class of all finite structures consisting of a set equipped with an equivalence relation E is not a weak m.a.c. (consider the formula Exy). However, given a fixed

bound on the class size or number of classes one obtains a weak m.a.c.. For a stronger version of this last statement, see Example 2.2.5(2)(c).

2.2. Examples of m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s. There are several special cases of m.a.c.s, corresponding to particular choices of the set R of functions, which are worth picking out in more detail.

Example 2.2.1. As indicated in the introduction, the above definition, Definition 2.1.1, generalises the notions of *1-dimensional asymptotic class* and *N -dimensional asymptotic class* introduced in [57] and [24], respectively. We can reformulate the definition from [24] in our framework as follows. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\mathbb{R}M^{\frac{1}{N}}$ be the set of functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ given by

$$m_{r,i} : M \mapsto r|M|^{\frac{i}{N}}$$

for some $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. A class \mathcal{C} is an N -dimensional asymptotic class (in the sense of [24]) if and only if it is an $\mathbb{R}M^{\frac{1}{N}}$ -m.a.c. with the additional requirement that, for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ with \bar{x} an m -tuple of variables, the corresponding measuring functions are of the form $m_{r,i}$ for $\frac{i}{N} \leq m$. In this context, if $m_{r,i}$ is the measuring function corresponding to a definable set, then we say that r is the *measure* and that $\frac{i}{N}$ is the *dimension* of that set.

The original notion of a 1-dimensional asymptotic class (in the sense of [57]) is essentially the special case of the above with $N = 1$. By the main theorem of [14], the class of all finite fields is a 1-dimensional asymptotic class. Furthermore, if p is prime and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(m, n) = 1$ and $m > 1$, $n \geq 1$, then let $\mathcal{C}_{m,n,p}$ be the collection of all difference fields $(\mathbb{F}_{p^{kn+m}}, x \mapsto x^{p^k})$. Then by Theorem 3.5.8 of [65], $\mathcal{C}_{m,n,p}$ is a 1-dimensional asymptotic class, and Ryten shows that it follows that the collection of all finite simple groups of any fixed Lie type is an asymptotic class. In the original definition of *1-dimensional asymptotic class*, and in the results of [14] on finite fields and of [65] on $\mathcal{C}_{m,n,p}$, there is stronger information on the error term – it takes the form given in [14].

Definition 2.2.2.

- (i) If \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c. then we say that the L -formula $\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is *balanced* if for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ there is $C \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $M \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|M| > C$ and any $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}$ with $\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a})$ and $\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{b})$ nonempty, we have

$$||\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a})| - |\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{b})|| < \varepsilon |\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{b})|.$$

We say $\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is *exactly balanced* if $|\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a})| = |\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{b})|$ whenever $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}$ with $\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a})$ and $\delta(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{b})$ are nonempty.

- (ii) Suppose in Definition 2.1.1 that \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c. satisfying the following condition: There are balanced L -formulas $\delta_1(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1), \dots, \delta_k(\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k)$ and $N_1, \dots, N_k \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$, and for each $h \in R$ a polynomial $P_h \in$

$\mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, such that for every $M \in \mathcal{C}$ there are $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k$ in M with $\delta_i(M^{|\bar{x}_i|}, \bar{a}_i) \neq \emptyset$ for each i , such that

$$h(M) = P_h(|\delta_1(M^{|\bar{x}_1|}, \bar{a}_1)|^{\frac{1}{N_1}}, \dots, |\delta_k(M^{|\bar{x}_k|}, \bar{a}_k)|^{\frac{1}{N_k}}).$$

Then we say that \mathcal{C} is a *polynomial R-m.a.c.*, or *polynomial m.a.c.*. The notion of *polynomial m.e.c.* is defined similarly, but with ‘balanced’ replaced by ‘exactly balanced’.

Remark 2.2.3.

1. In view of Theorem 2.5.4 we sometimes slightly extend the above terminology, allowing the formulas $\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ to be L^{eq} -formulas using quotients by equivalence relations uniformly \emptyset -definable across \mathcal{C} . The point here is that in the key example of envelopes of a smoothly approximable structure (see Theorem 4.1.2), the above functions h will be polynomials in the cardinalities of certain ‘Lie geometries’ which may live in M^{eq} but are uniformly definable across the class and could be added as additional sorts to the members of \mathcal{C} . We do not labour this point.

In all the examples of polynomial m.a.c.s or m.e.c.s which we consider in this paper, the polynomials are over \mathbb{Q} (and in some cases over \mathbb{Z}).

2. The condition that δ is balanced is easily arranged in a m.a.c.. Let Π be the \emptyset -definable partition associated with $\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, let $\pi \in \Pi$, and let $\varphi_\pi(\bar{y})$ be the corresponding formula defining π . Then the formula $\delta'(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ of form $\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{y})$ is balanced.

Example 2.2.4. We explain how the notion of *polynomial R-m.a.c.* stems from Example 2.2.1. The elements of $\mathbb{R}M^{\frac{1}{N}}$ are monomial functions of $|M|^{\frac{1}{N}}$. We may recast this by thinking of these functions as ‘formal’ monomials in a new variable X . These formal monomials are then represented as functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ by mapping X to $|M|^{\frac{1}{N}}$. In particular, any asymptotic class is a polynomial m.a.c. In many cases one can dispense with the exponents $\frac{1}{N}$. For example, for the 3-dimensional asymptotic class of groups $\text{SL}_2(q)$ we may choose the formula $\delta(x, \bar{y})$ to define the (1-dimensional) group of upper unitriangular matrices.

In our original approach we generalised this viewpoint to consider ‘polynomial’ functions in several variables with non-negative real exponents (or just positive integer exponents). Each of the variables is mapped to the cardinality of a definable set (or in some cases a sort) in the finite model. We allow L to be multi-sorted. For each sort s in L we let X_s be a new variable symbol. Let R_L be the field of fractions of the ring

$$\mathbb{R}[X_s^{\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}} : s \text{ is a sort of } L].$$

We have not developed this extra generality (beyond the notion of polynomial m.a.c) since it does not seem to be forced by natural examples.

Example 2.2.5. The following are examples of m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s which are discussed in this paper, and which (apart from the first) extend beyond the earlier notion of asymptotic class. The intention here, and in Subsection 2.3, is to help the reader build an intuition for the key concepts of m.a.c. and m.e.c., before the lengthy proofs of Theorems 2.4.1 and 2.5.4. The more intricate examples in (c) and (d) below are worked out in more detail in Section 3 below, and the examples of m.e.c.s are mostly given in detail in Section 4.

(1) Examples of m.a.c.s

- (a) Any asymptotic class is a m.a.c., as noted above. In particular, the collection of finite fields is a 1-dimensional asymptotic class so forms a m.a.c.. As noted in [57, Example 3.4], another example of a 1-dimensional asymptotic class is the class of *Paley graphs* P_q . Here q is a prime power with $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and P_q has as vertex set the finite field \mathbb{F}_q , with vertices a, b adjacent if and only if $a - b$ is a square. The key fact here – see [9, Theorem 13.10] – is that if U, W are disjoint sets of vertices of P_q with $m := |U \cup W|$, and $v(U, W)$ denotes the number of vertices not in $U \cup W$ adjacent to all vertices of U and to none of W , then

$$|v(U, W) - 2^{-m}q| \leq \frac{1}{2}(m - 2 + 2^{-m+1})q^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{m}{2}.$$

Any non-principal ultraproduct of distinct Paley graphs is elementarily equivalent to the random graph. There is no m.e.c. of Paley graphs – see 2(d) below.

- (b) The collection \mathcal{V}_F of 2-sorted structures (V, F) where V is a finite vector space over a finite field F is a polynomial m.a.c.. Ultraproducts are supersimple but may have SU-rank ω . The functions in the set R are polynomials in two variables over \mathbb{Q} . See [30, Theorem 4.1], or Theorem 3.1.1 for a more general result.
- (c) The collection of 2-sorted structures (V, F, β) where V is a finite vector space over a finite field F , and $\beta: V \times V \rightarrow F$ is a non-degenerate alternating bilinear form, is a m.a.c.. An ultraproduct where the field is infinite and the vector space is infinite-dimensional will not have simple theory but will be NSOP₁. The functions in R are rational in $|V|$ and $|F|$. See Section 3.3 for details.
- (d) Let Q be a quiver of finite representation type. Then the collection of all 3-sorted structures $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathbb{F}_q Q, V)$ is a weak m.a.c., where \mathbb{F}_q is a finite field, $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ is the corresponding path algebra, and V is a finite $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ -module. Details are given in Section 3.2. Again, the corresponding functions are polynomials in several variables over \mathbb{Q} , the variables corresponding to the field and to the indecomposable $\mathbb{F}Q$ -modules.

- (e) Fix a positive integer d and let $L := L_{\text{rings}} \cup \{P_1, \dots, P_d\}$ where the P_i are unary predicates. Consider the collection \mathcal{C}_d of all finite residue rings $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, where n has form $n = p_1^{l_1} \cdot \dots \cdot p_d^{l_d}$, where $p_1 < \dots < p_d$ are distinct primes and $0 \leq l_i \leq d$. Note that the number of prime divisors of n and the exponents of these primes are bounded, but not the primes themselves. View each member of \mathcal{C}_d as an L -structure, with P_i picking out the canonical subring of form $\mathbb{Z}/p^{l_i}\mathbb{Z}$. Then by [5, Proposition 3.3.4], \mathcal{C}_d is a polynomial m.a.c., and it is easily seen that the collection of reducts to L_{rings} is a weak m.a.c.. (The statement in [5] is slightly different, since there the exponents are fixed and not just bounded, but it is easily checked that the above assertions hold.)
- (2) Examples of m.e.c.s
- (a) By a result of Pillay (see Theorem 4.3.1 below) if M is a pseudofinite strongly minimal set, then there is a polynomial m.e.c. all of whose ultraproducts are elementarily equivalent to M , in which the corresponding functions are given by polynomials in one variable over \mathbb{Z} .
- (b) By a theorem of Wolf using earlier work of Cherlin and Hrushovski, if L is any countable first order language and d is a natural number, then there is finite $L' \supseteq L$ such that we may form a polynomial m.e.c. in L' containing, for each finite L -structure M with at most d 4-types, an expansion M' of M to L' with the same automorphism group as M . See Theorem 4.1.2. In particular, if M is a smoothly approximable structure then the collection of all finite ‘envelopes’ of M is a m.e.c. (after expanding the language without changing automorphism groups).
- (c) As a special case of (b), let \mathcal{C}_d be the class of all structures (M, E) where E is an equivalence relation on M with at most d different sizes of equivalence classes. Then \mathcal{C}_d is a polynomial m.e.c., after expansion by unary predicates picking out the union of the equivalence classes of given size.
- (d) It is shown in Theorem 4.1.6 (and Proposition 4.1.5) that if M is a homogeneous graph in the sense of Fraïssé, then there is a m.e.c. with an ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to M if and only if M is stable. We conjecture (see Conjecture 4.1.4(i)) that the corresponding statement holds for any finite relational language – the right-to-left direction follows from Wolf’s result above and earlier work of Lachlan and co-authors.
- (e) By Theorem 4.2.3 (ii), the collection of all finite abelian groups is a m.e.c. We do not have a clean description of the corresponding functions, apart from the special case of the collection \mathcal{C} of all finite homocyclic groups, that is groups of the

form $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^m$, where p is prime and m, n are positive integers (see Proposition 4.4.2 of [30]). As a very partial converse (Proposition 4.2.1), if \mathcal{C} is a m.e.c. of finite groups, then there is a number d such that the groups $G \in \mathcal{C}$ have a soluble uniformly definable normal subgroup R whose quotient by its Fitting subgroup has derived length at most d , and with $|G : R| \leq d$.

- (f) If L is a finite relational language, and $d \in \mathbb{N}$, then the collection of all finite L -structures such that each element lies in at most d tuples satisfying a relation is a m.e.c. See Theorem 4.3.3. Again, we do not have a description of the functions giving cardinalities.
- (g) By Proposition 4.1.8, there is no *weak* m.e.c. consisting of arbitrarily large finite fields.

The following lemma gives a tool for constructing further m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s.

Lemma 2.2.6. *Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k$ be classes of finite structures in disjoint languages L_1, \dots, L_k respectively. Let $L = L_1 \cup \dots \cup L_k$, a multi-sorted language with sorts S_1, \dots, S_k , with the symbols of each L_i restricted to S_i . Let \mathcal{C} be the class of L -structures $M = M_1 \cup \dots \cup M_k$ (disjoint union), where each M_i is the restriction of M to S_i and lies in \mathcal{C}_i . If each \mathcal{C}_i is an R_i -m.a.c. (respectively R_i -m.e.c.), then \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c. (respectively R -m.e.c.), where R is the set of functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ generated from the R_i by addition and multiplication.*

The construction of R here needs a little elucidation. We view R_i as a set of functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by putting $f_i(M_1 \cup \dots \cup M_k) = f_i(M_i)$ for $f_i \in R_i$.

Proof. See [73, Lemma 2.4.2] for the m.e.c. case. The m.a.c. argument is essentially the same. \square

2.3. Non-examples associated with finite fields. The class of finite fields forms the motivating example of a 1-dimensional asymptotic class, so it is natural to ask what additional structure may be carried by a multidimensional asymptotic class of expansions of finite fields. An obvious example of such an expansion is the 1-dimensional asymptotic class $\mathcal{C}_{m,n,p}$ from Example 2.2.1. Below we show that another function of interest on a finite (prime) field, the discrete logarithm, does not furnish examples of m.a.c.s.

1. *Discrete logarithm in finite fields.* The multiplicative group \mathbb{F}_q^\times of a finite field \mathbb{F}_q is cyclic. Fix a generator a of \mathbb{F}_q^\times . For integers k, l , we have $a^k = a^l$ if and only if k and l are congruent modulo $q - 1$. Thus one may define the *discrete logarithm* with base a to be the

isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}\log_a : \mathbb{F}_q^\times &\rightarrow C_{q-1} \\ a^l &\mapsto l,\end{aligned}$$

where C_{q-1} is the cyclic group of order $q-1$, perhaps identified with the additive group of integers modulo $q-1$.

There are at least two obvious ways to turn this into a first-order structure expanding \mathbb{F}_q . In the first (i) we write the codomain of the logarithm as a separate sort, and in the second (ii) we choose some identification of $\{0, \dots, q-2\}$ with a subset of \mathbb{F}_q , at least in the case that q is prime.

- (i) For each prime power q consider the two-sorted structure $(\mathbb{F}_q, C_{q-1}; \log_a)$, where $\log_a : \mathbb{F}_q^\times \rightarrow C_{q-1}$ is as above. We view the first sort \mathbb{F}_q as a field, and the second sort C_{q-1} as a group. Consider the class

$$\mathcal{C}_1 := \{(\mathbb{F}_q, C_{q-1}; \log_a) : q \text{ a prime power, } a \text{ a generator}\}.$$

However there is nothing new here because the logarithm is only re-writing the multiplication in \mathbb{F}_q^\times . In fact these structures are uniformly bi-interpretable with finite fields, which form an asymptotic class. The class \mathcal{C}_1 is a polynomial m.a.c..

- (ii) The second approach, for each *prime* q , is to identify the codomain $C_{q-1} = \{0, \dots, q-2\}$ with the subset $\{0, \dots, q-2\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$. This is somewhat artificial since the group structure on the codomain does not match the additive group of \mathbb{F}_q . Consider the one-sorted structures $(\mathbb{F}_q; \log_a)$ and the class

$$\mathcal{C}_2 := \{(\mathbb{F}_q; \log_a) : q \text{ a prime, } a \text{ a generator}\}.$$

Claim 2.3.1. *There is a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ which uniformly defines a total ordering on each structure in \mathcal{C}_2 .*

Proof. To keep this argument as clear as possible, for integers x, y , we write \bar{x}, \bar{y} for their residues modulo q . Thus $\mathbb{F}_q = \{\bar{0}, \dots, \overline{q-1}\}$. Consider the structure $(\mathbb{F}_q; \log_a) \in \mathcal{C}_2$. Then $\log_a(\bar{x}) = \bar{y}$ if and only if $\bar{a}^y = \bar{x}$. We define a new operation on \mathbb{F}_q^\times by:

$$\begin{aligned}\oplus : \{0, \dots, q-2\} \times \{0, \dots, q-2\} &\rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q \\ (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) &\mapsto \log_a(\bar{a}^x \cdot \bar{a}^y).\end{aligned}$$

This operation is definable in $(\mathbb{F}_q; \log_a)$. Suppose that $x+y \geq q$. Write $x+y = q+l$ where $l \in \{0, \dots, q-2\}$. Then $\bar{a}^{x+y} = \bar{a}^{q+l} = \bar{a}^{1+l}$, by Fermat's Little Theorem. Thus

$$\bar{x} \oplus \bar{y} = \log_a(\bar{a}^x \cdot \bar{a}^y) = \log_a(\bar{a}^{x+y}) = \log_a(\bar{a}^{1+l}) = \overline{1+l} \neq \bar{x} + \bar{y}$$

whereas if $x + y < q$ then $\bar{x} \oplus \bar{y} = \overline{x + y}$. Since \oplus is definable, we may define the set

$$\Delta := \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times 2} : a \oplus b = a + b\}$$

in the language with the logarithm. Now

$$\exists c ((a, c) \in \Delta \wedge (b, c) \notin \Delta)$$

defines the order $\bar{1} < \bar{2} < \dots < \overline{q-1}$ on \mathbb{F}_q^\times . We can easily add $\bar{0} < \bar{1}$ to this ordering. This definition is uniform in $(\mathbb{F}_q; \log_a)$, as required. \square

The conclusion is that \mathcal{C}_1 is too simple to be interesting and that \mathcal{C}_2 is too wild to fit into our context. Indeed, by Remark 2.1.7, or more generally Remark 5.3.7, \mathcal{C}_2 cannot form a weak m.a.c..

2. *Lie algebras.* It is well-known that the class of finite general linear groups is model-theoretically wild if no bound is imposed on dimension (see e.g [10, Section 6.3]). One might hope that the corresponding class of Lie algebras would be tame, on the grounds that the Lie algebras are a linearisation of the groups. However, we observe the following.

Proposition 2.3.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a collection of Lie algebras of the form $\mathfrak{gl}_n(q)$, for a fixed prime power q and unbounded n . Then \mathcal{C} is not a weak m.a.c..*

Proof. Let $A_r = (a_{ij}) \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(q)$ with $a_{11} = \dots = a_{rr} = 1$, and with all other a_{ij} zero. It is easily checked that if $B = (b_{ij}) \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(q)$, then $AB = BA$ if and only if $b_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \leq r$ and $j > r$ or $j \leq r$ and $i > r$. It follows that if $C(A_r) = \{X : [A_r, X] = 0\}$, then $|C(A_r)| = q^{r^2} \cdot q^{(n-r)^2}$. Thus, $\frac{|C(A_r)|}{|C(A_{r+1})|} = q^{2n-4r-2} > q$ provided n is large enough. The result now follows from Lemma 2.1.6. \square

3. *Expansions of finite fields.* If \mathcal{C} is a weak m.a.c. class of expansions of finite fields, then it is not possible uniformly to define small subsets of the fields of increasing size. We formulate this more precisely for finite fields \mathbb{F}_q with $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Suppose that \mathcal{C} is a class of finite structures which expand such finite fields, and that there is a formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ such that for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a structure $M \in \mathcal{C}$ of size $q > d$ and $\bar{a} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}$ satisfying that if $m := |\varphi(M, \bar{a})|$, then $d \leq m$ and

$$2^{-m}q > \frac{1}{2}(m - 2 + 2^{-m+1})q^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{m}{2}.$$

Let $X := \varphi(M, \bar{a})$. Then for any subset S of X , by the statement from [9] mentioned in Example 2.2.5(1)(a), there is $a \in M$ such that for all $b \in X$, $a - b$ is a square (in the field structure on M) if and only if $b \in S$. Thus, the subsets of X are uniformly definable, and it follows easily that \mathcal{C} has an ultraproduct with the strict order property, so cannot be a weak m.a.c. by Remark 5.3.7 below.

In particular, it follows that the collection of all pairs of finite fields is not a weak m.a.c, and hence, by considering the fixed field, the collection of all finite difference fields is not a weak m.a.c. – some restrictions as in the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{m,n,p}$ are needed. Such phenomena, e.g. undecidability of the theory of pairs of finite fields, are well-known – see for example Section 4 of [13].

2.4. Projection Lemma. Here we use a fibering argument to show that to check whether a class of structures is a m.a.c. or m.e.c., it suffices to consider formulas $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ where x is a single variable. We argue as in Theorem 2.1 from [57] and Lemma 2.2 from [24] but for the R -m.a.c. context, where R is a set of functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. Let $\langle R \rangle$ denote the ring generated by R under the usual addition and multiplication operations for real-valued functions.

Theorem 2.4.1.

- (i) *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of L -structures. Suppose that \mathcal{C} satisfies the definition of an R -m.a.c. (Definition 2.1.1) for formulas $\varphi(x; \bar{y})$ where x is a singleton. Then \mathcal{C} is an $\langle R \rangle$ -m.a.c..*
- (ii) [73, Lemma 2.3.1] *The assertion of (i) holds with m.e.c.s in place of m.a.c.s.*

Proof. We just prove (i), which is a bit more intricate than (ii) (given in [73]).

We proceed by induction on the length of \bar{x} . The base case is our assumption. Consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}y; \bar{z})$, with \bar{x} a non-empty tuple and y a single variable. By our inductive hypothesis, we may assume that the definition applies to $\varphi(\bar{x}; y\bar{z})$. Let Π be the finite partition of $(\mathcal{C}, y\bar{z})$ corresponding to $\varphi(\bar{x}; y\bar{z})$, let $H_\Pi = \{h_\pi \in \langle R \rangle : \pi \in \Pi\}$ be the corresponding measuring functions and let $\Gamma_\Pi = \{\gamma_\pi(y\bar{z}) : \pi \in \Pi\}$ be the indexed set of formulas which define Π .

For each $\pi \in \Pi$, we examine the family of sets defined by $\gamma_\pi(y; \bar{z})$. We apply our hypothesis to obtain a finite partition Ψ_π of (\mathcal{C}, \bar{z}) , corresponding measuring functions $L_{\Psi_\pi} = \{l_\psi \in R : \psi \in \Psi_\pi\}$, and an indexed set of formulas $\Delta_{\Psi_\pi} = \{\delta_\psi(\bar{z}) : \psi \in \Psi_\pi\}$ that define Ψ_π .

Each Ψ_π is a partition of (\mathcal{C}, \bar{z}) . For each choice function $f: \Pi \rightarrow \bigcup_{\pi \in \Pi} \Psi_\pi$, put

$$\Omega_f := \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi} f(\pi)$$

and let $\Omega := \{\Omega_f : f \text{ a choice function}\}$. Then Ω is the unique coarsest partition of (\mathcal{C}, \bar{z}) such that Ω refines Ψ_π for each $\pi \in \Pi$. If we view elements of $\prod_{\pi \in \Pi} \Psi_\pi$ as choice functions, we see that there is a bijection between $\prod_{\pi \in \Pi} \Psi_\pi$ and Ω given by $f \mapsto \Omega_f$.

Since each Ψ_π is finite and Π is finite, Ω is finite. Furthermore, Ω is definable: For $\Omega_f \in \Omega$, write $\alpha_f(\bar{z})$ for the formula

$$\bigwedge_{\pi \in \Pi} \delta_{f(\pi)}(\bar{z}).$$

Then for each $(M, \bar{c}) \in (\mathcal{C}, \bar{z})$ we have that

$$(M, \bar{c}) \in \Omega_f \text{ if and only if } M \models \alpha_f(\bar{c}).$$

For each $\pi \in \Pi$, let $\chi_\pi(\bar{x}y; \bar{z}) := \varphi(\bar{x}y; \bar{z}) \wedge \gamma_\pi(y; \bar{z})$ and note that $\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c}) = \bigsqcup_{\pi \in \Pi} \chi_\pi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c})$.

Let $\Omega_f \in \Omega$. We aim to understand the size of the set $\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c})$ for $(M, \bar{c}) \in \Omega_f$ as $|M| \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\pi \in \Pi$. We abbreviate $h_\pi := h_\pi(M)$ and $l_{f(\pi)} := l_{f(\pi)}(M)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By our inductive hypothesis, there exists $N_\pi \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $(M, \bar{c}) \in f(\pi)$ with $|M| \geq N_\pi$ we have

$$||\gamma_\pi(M; \bar{c})| - l_{f(\pi)}| < \varepsilon l_{f(\pi)},$$

and for all $b \in M$ such that $(M, b\bar{c}) \in \pi$ – that is, $M \models \gamma_\pi(b\bar{c})$ – we also have

$$||\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; b\bar{c})| - h_\pi| < \varepsilon h_\pi.$$

As $\chi_\pi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c})$ is fibered over $\gamma_\pi(M; \bar{c})$, we have

$$|\chi_\pi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c})| = \sum_{b \in \gamma_\pi(M; \bar{c})} |\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; b\bar{c})|.$$

Thus

$$(1 - \varepsilon)^2 h_\pi l_{f(\pi)} < |\chi_\pi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c})| < (1 + \varepsilon)^2 h_\pi l_{f(\pi)}.$$

Since $(1 - \varepsilon)^2, (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \rightarrow 1$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$||\chi_\pi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c})| - h_\pi l_{f(\pi)}| = o(h_\pi l_{f(\pi)}).$$

Finally, put $m_f := \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} h_\pi l_{f(\pi)}$. Then

$$||\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}y|}; \bar{c})| - m_f| = o(m_f)$$

for $(M, \bar{c}) \in \Omega_f$ as $|M| \rightarrow \infty$, as required. \square

Remark 2.4.2. Theorem 2.4.1 holds if ‘ R -m.a.c.’ (respectively ‘ R -m.e.c.’) is replaced by ‘polynomial R -m.a.c.’ (respectively ‘polynomial R -m.e.c.’) throughout. The understanding here is that the same formulas $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k$ (as in Definition 2.2.2) are used for the 1-variable condition and the general condition. The proof is essentially as above. This is noted in a special case in the proof of Theorem 4.1 of [30].

2.5. Interpretability and bi-interpretability. We prove two results from [74]. We assume familiarity with the usual model-theoretic notion of an L' -structure N being A -interpretable in an L -structure M . This means essentially that N is isomorphic to a structure with domain a quotient by an A -definable equivalence relation of an A -definable subset of a cartesian power of M , with the relations of N induced by A -definable relations of M .

The structures M and N are *bi-interpretable* if N is \emptyset -interpretable in M via an interpretation (an isomorphism) $f: N \rightarrow N^*$ (so N^* lives on a quotient of a power of M), and M is \emptyset -interpretable in N via an interpretation $g: M \rightarrow M^*$. We require in addition that if f induces the isomorphism $f^*: M^* \rightarrow M^{**}$ where M^{**} is an L -structure interpreted in N^* , and g induces the corresponding isomorphism $g^*: N^* \rightarrow N^{**}$, then the isomorphisms $f^* \circ g: M \rightarrow M^{**}$ and $g^* \circ f: N \rightarrow N^{**}$ are \emptyset -definable in M and N respectively. Slightly weakening this, we say that N is *weakly bi-interpretable in M* if we drop the assumption that $f^* \circ g$ is definable in M but keep that $g^* \circ f$ is \emptyset -definable in N .

Let \mathcal{C} be a class of L -structures and \mathcal{C}' be a class of L' -structures. We say that \mathcal{C}' is *parameter-interpretable* in \mathcal{C} if there is an injection $\alpha: \mathcal{C}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that each $N \in \mathcal{C}'$ is parameter-interpretable in $\alpha(N)$ *uniformly*, i.e. through fixed formulas giving the interpretations. Likewise, we say that \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' are *bi-interpretable* if there is a bijection $\alpha: \mathcal{C}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that each $N \in \mathcal{C}'$ is bi-interpretable with $\alpha(N)$, without use of parameters and uniformly as N ranges through \mathcal{C}' . Here we say that \mathcal{C}' is *weakly bi-interpretable in \mathcal{C}* if we just require that each $N \in \mathcal{C}'$ is uniformly weakly bi-interpretable in $\alpha(N)$.

In these definitions, we replace the word ‘interpretable’ with ‘definable’ if no quotienting is involved.

Definition 2.5.1. Let R be a set of functions from a class \mathcal{C} to $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. We define $\text{Frac}(R)$ to be the set of functions from \mathcal{C} to $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ given by

$$\text{Frac}(R) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_i}{h_i} : g_i, h_i \in R, n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0} \text{ and } h_i(M) \neq 0 \text{ for all } M \in \mathcal{C} \right\},$$

where for all $M \in \mathcal{C}$ we put

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_i}{h_i} \right) (M) := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_i(M)}{h_i(M)},$$

and we define $\frac{g_i(M)}{h_i(M)} := 0$ if $h_i(M) = 0$.

It is convenient to introduce the notion of positive-definiteness for R -m.a.c.s:

Definition 2.5.2. Let Π be a finite partition of a class of finite L -structures (\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}) as in the context of Definition 2.1.1. For $\pi \in \Pi$ let

$\pi^M := \{\bar{a} \in M^{|\bar{y}|} : (M^{\bar{x}}, \bar{a}) \in \pi\}$. The measuring function h_π associated with the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is *positive-definite* if

$$(8) \quad \varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}, \bar{a}) = \emptyset \text{ for all } \bar{a} \in \pi^M \iff h_\pi(M) = 0$$

for all $M \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\pi^M \neq \emptyset$.

Measuring functions for a weak m.a.c. are eventually positive-definite, in the sense of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5.3. *Suppose that the class of finite L -structures \mathcal{C} is a weak R -m.a.c.. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be an L -formula and let $\Pi = \Pi_\varphi$ be a partition of (\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}) corresponding to φ , with measuring functions $\{h_\pi : \pi \in \Pi\} \subseteq R$. Then for each $\pi \in \Pi$ there exists $Q_\pi \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ such that (8) holds for all $M \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|M| > Q_\pi$ and $\pi^M \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $\pi \in \Pi$ and let $n := |\bar{x}|$.

We first prove that the left-to-right direction of (8) eventually holds. For a contradiction, suppose that it never holds, i.e. for every $Q \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ there exists some $M_Q \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|M_Q| > Q$ and $\pi^{M_Q} \neq \emptyset$ such that $\varphi(M_Q^n, \bar{a}) = \emptyset$ for all $\bar{a} \in \pi^{M_Q}$ but $h_\pi(M_Q) \neq 0$. Let $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$|\varphi(M_Q^n, \bar{a})| - h_\pi(M_Q) = |0 - h_\pi(M_Q)| = h_\pi(M_Q) > \varepsilon h_\pi(M_Q).$$

Since this holds for all $Q \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$, it follows that (4) does not hold for π contradicting that \mathcal{C} is a weak R -m.a.c.. So there exists $Q_{\pi 1} \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ above which the left-to-right direction of (8) holds.

We now prove that the right-to-left direction of (8) eventually holds. For a contradiction, suppose that for every $Q \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ there exists some $M_Q \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|M_Q| > Q$ such that the right-to-left direction of (8) fails for M_Q . Thus $h_\pi(M_Q) = 0$ but there is $\bar{a} \in \pi^{M_Q}$ such that $\varphi(M_Q, \bar{a}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\varepsilon = 1$. Then

$$|\varphi(M_Q^n, \bar{a})| - h_\pi(M_Q) = |\varphi(M_Q^n, \bar{a})| > 0 = \varepsilon h_\pi(M_Q).$$

Since this holds for all $Q \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$, clause (4) does not hold for π , again contradicting that \mathcal{C} is a weak R -m.a.c.. So there exists $Q_{\pi 2} \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ for which the right-to-left direction of (8) holds.

Taking $Q_\pi := \max\{Q_{\pi 1}, Q_{\pi 2}\}$ yields the lemma. \square

Theorem 2.5.4. *Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' be, respectively, classes of L - and L' -structures.*

- (i) *If \mathcal{C}' is parameter-interpretable in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c. (resp. -m.e.c.) in L , then \mathcal{C}' is a weak $\text{Frac}(R)$ -m.a.c. (resp. -m.e.c.) in L' .*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{C}' is weakly bi-interpretable in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c. (resp. -m.e.c.) in L , then \mathcal{C}' is a $\text{Frac}(R)$ -m.a.c. (resp. -m.e.c.) in L' .*
- (iii) *If \mathcal{C}' is parameter-definable in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C} is a weak R -m.a.c. (resp. -m.e.c.) in L , then \mathcal{C}' is a weak R -m.a.c. (resp. -m.e.c.) in L' .*

Remark 2.5.5.

1. There is a small abuse of notation: If $\alpha: \mathcal{C}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ gives an interpretation, an element $s \in R$ (a function $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$) is identified with the corresponding function $\mathcal{C}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, where $s(M) := s(\alpha(M))$ for $M \in \mathcal{C}'$.
2. Many of the key ideas in the proof are due to Elwes, although our approach is slightly more direct than that in [24]. Elwes [24] stated a slightly stronger version of (ii), assuming only what he calls $\emptyset_{\mathcal{C}'}$ -bi-interpretability, that is, he only requires that no parameters from the structures in \mathcal{C}' are needed. However, it would seem that both his proof and that of (ii) require the stronger hypothesis of weak bi-interpretability over \emptyset . We explain this point when it arises in our proof of (ii).

We prove Theorem 2.5.4 only for R -m.a.c.s; the proof for R -m.e.c.s is just a simpler version of the proof for R -m.a.c.s, and details can be found in [74].

Proof of Theorem 2.5.4. We use the notation and terminology given at the beginning of this section throughout, with M, M^*, f, g , etc. For each $N \in \mathcal{C}'$ we assume that the isomorphic copy N^* of N lives (uniformly) on a quotient by a definable equivalence relation E_N of a definable subset X_N of some cartesian power $\alpha(N)^r$ of $\alpha(N)$. We drop the subscript N if the context is clear.

Proof of (i). Let $\varphi'(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_m)$ be an arbitrary L' -formula. We need to show that this formula satisfies the size clause (4). The overall strategy is to move into \mathcal{C} via the interpretation, make size estimates there, and pull back these estimates into \mathcal{C}' . Making the size estimates in \mathcal{C} forms the bulk of the argument.

We first translate the L' -formula φ' into an L -formula φ . Each L' -symbol has a uniform L -translation, so we replace each L' -symbol in φ' with its L -translation. We leave all boolean connectives as is and adapt quantifiers in accordance with the new variables; for example, if a variable x in φ' is in the scope of a quantifier $\forall x$ and x becomes \bar{x} in φ , then the quantifier $\forall x$ becomes $\forall \bar{x}$ in φ . The resulting L -formula is $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_m)$, where $|\bar{x}_i| = |\bar{y}_i| = r$.

Observe that $E = E_N$ induces an equivalence relation on each power of X_N : Two tuples are equivalent if they are E -equivalent in each coordinate. We abuse notation and use E to denote this induced equivalence relation. Since the L -translation of each L' -symbol defines an E -invariant subset of a power of X_N , we see that $\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n + r \cdot m}) \subseteq X_N^{n+m}$ is a union of E -equivalence classes. Hence for all $N \in \mathcal{C}'$ and for all $a_1, \dots, a_m \in N$ we have

$$(9) \quad f(\varphi'(N^n, a_1, \dots, a_m)) = \varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \tilde{f}(a_1), \dots, \tilde{f}(a_m))/E,$$

where \tilde{f} is a choice function on the set $\{f(a) : a \in N\}$, i.e. $\tilde{f}(a)$ is an arbitrary element of the equivalence class $f(a)$, and where

$$f(\varphi'(N^n, a_1, \dots, a_m)) := \{(f(c_1), \dots, f(c_n)) : N \models \varphi'(c_1, \dots, c_n, a_1, \dots, a_m)\}.$$

Note that under the assumption of parameter-interpretability the L -translation might require translation parameters from the structures in \mathcal{C} ; that is, the L -translation of φ' might actually be of the form $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_m, \bar{c}_N)$, where \bar{c}_N is a tuple of parameters from $\alpha(N)$. However, by Lemma 2.1.5(i) we can extend L to include constant symbols for these translation parameters, so we can ignore this issue, although it will come up again in the proof of (ii) below.

To show that $\varphi'(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_m)$ satisfies the size clause (4) we need to calculate the approximate size of $\varphi'(N^n, a_1, \dots, a_m)$. By (9) we have

$$(10) \quad |\varphi'(N^n, a_1, \dots, a_m)| = |\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \tilde{f}(a_1), \dots, \tilde{f}(a_m)) / E|.$$

It thus suffices to calculate the right-hand side of (10), using that \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c..

We may safely assume that α is surjective, i.e. that $\mathcal{C} = \{\alpha(N) : N \in \mathcal{C}'\}$, since $\{\alpha(N) : N \in \mathcal{C}'\}$ is a subclass of \mathcal{C} and thus is also an R -m.a.c..

We now calculate the approximate size of $\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_m) / E$ for varying $\alpha(N) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $(\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_m) \in \alpha(N)^{r \cdot m}$. We write $\bar{y} := (\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_m)$ and $\bar{b} := (\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_m)$. The equivalence classes in $\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b})$ are uniformly defined by the L -formula

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n; \bar{b}, \bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n) \equiv \varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{b}) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} E(\bar{x}_i, \bar{d}_i)$$

for tuples $(\bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n) \in X_N^n$ varying over equivalence classes. Note that the L -formula $E(\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2)$ that defines the equivalence relation E on X_N^n may require parameters from each $\alpha(N) \in \mathcal{C}$, but these can be subsumed into \bar{c}_N .

Since \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c., the formula $\tilde{\varphi}(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n; \bar{y}, \bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n)$ gives rise to a finite partition $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_\ell\}$ of

$$(\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}, \bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n) = \{(\alpha(N), \bar{b}, \bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n) : N \in \mathcal{C}', \bar{b} \in \alpha(N)^{r \cdot m}, \bar{d}_i \in \alpha(N)^r\}$$

with measuring functions $h_1, \dots, h_\ell \in R$ and defining L -formulas

$$\{\theta_j(\bar{y}, \bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n) : 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}.$$

As φ is E -invariant, we assume that the h_1, \dots, h_ℓ respect the equivalence relation; that is, for every $\bar{b} \in \alpha(N)^{r \cdot m}$, if $(\bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n)$ and $(\bar{d}'_1, \dots, \bar{d}'_n)$ lie in the same equivalence class, then $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}, \bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n)$ and $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}, \bar{d}'_1, \dots, \bar{d}'_n)$ belong to the same element of the partition Π . Indeed, if they do not, then since

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}, \bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n) = \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}, \bar{d}'_1, \dots, \bar{d}'_n)$$

we can modify the partition so that they do.

For $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ let $Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})$ denote the union of the equivalence classes in $\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b})$ that take the function h_j . By the assumption in the preceding paragraph, $Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \cap Y_{j'}(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) = \emptyset$ for $j \neq j'$. For each j the set $Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})$ is uniformly defined by the L -formula

$$\tilde{\varphi}_j(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n; \bar{y}) := \varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{y}) \wedge \theta_j(\bar{b}, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n).$$

Since \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c., each formula $\tilde{\varphi}_j(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n; \bar{y})$ gives rise to a finite partition $P_j = \{\rho_{j1}, \dots, \rho_{je_j}\}$ of $(\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}) = \{(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) : N \in \mathcal{C}', \bar{b} \in \alpha(N)^{r \cdot m}\}$ with corresponding measuring functions $g_{j1}, \dots, g_{je_j} \in R$. Again, we may assume that this partition respects the equivalence relation, i.e. that if \bar{b} and \bar{b}' lie in the same equivalence class, then $(\alpha(N), \bar{b})$ and $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}')$ lie in the same P_j -class.

We now wish to show for $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}$ that $|Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E|$ is approximately equal to $\frac{g_{jk}(\alpha(N))}{h_j(\alpha(N))}$. This is to be expected, since $g_{jk}(\alpha(N))$ is approximately equal to $|Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})|$ and $h_j(\alpha(N))$ is approximately equal to the size of each equivalence class in $Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})$.

For brevity we now write $\bar{d} := (\bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n)$. Let R_N consist of a choice of one $\bar{d} \in X_N^n$ from each equivalence class in X_N^n , that is, a transversal for the equivalence relation induced by E on X_N^n . Thus $X_N^n/E = \{\bar{d}/E : \bar{d} \in R_N\}$ and $|X_N^n/E| = |R_N|$. We do not claim that R_N is L -definable. Put $S_j(\bar{b}) := R_N \cap \theta_j(\bar{b}, \alpha(N)^{r \cdot n})$. For each $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in (\mathcal{C}, \bar{y})$ and $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ we have

$$(11) \quad Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) = \bigcup_{\bar{d} \in S_j(\bar{b})} \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}, \bar{d}),$$

where the union is disjoint since equivalence classes are disjoint.

Now fix $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, e_j\}$. By the definitions of π_j and h_j we have for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}, \bar{d}) \in \pi_j$ that

$$(12) \quad \left| |\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}, \bar{d})| - h_j(\alpha(N)) \right| = o(h_j(\alpha(N)))$$

as $|\alpha(N)| \rightarrow \infty$. By the definitions of ρ_{jk} and g_{jk} we likewise have for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}$ that

$$(13) \quad \left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})| - g_{jk}(\alpha(N)) \right| = o(g_{jk}(\alpha(N)))$$

as $|\alpha(N)| \rightarrow \infty$.

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Recall the ε - Q definition of little- o notation. Let $Q_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that (12) holds for $\varepsilon/2$ and $Q_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that (13) holds for $\varepsilon/2$. Set $Q := \max\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ and $t := |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E|$. Notice that t depends on $\alpha(N)$, \bar{b} and j , which we suppress, and that $t = |S_j(\bar{b})|$.

Let $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}$ be such that $|\alpha(N)| > Q$. Then
(14)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})| - t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)) \right| &= \left| \sum_{\bar{d} \in S_j(\bar{b})} |\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}, \bar{d})| - t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)) \right| && \text{(by (11))} \\
&= \left| \sum_{\bar{d} \in S_j(\bar{b})} \left[|\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}, \bar{d})| - h_j(\alpha(N)) \right] \right| && \text{(as } t = |S_j(\bar{b})| \text{)} \\
&\leq \sum_{\bar{d} \in S_j(\bar{b})} \left| |\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}, \bar{d})| - h_j(\alpha(N)) \right| \\
&\leq \underbrace{\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)) + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot h_j(\alpha(N))}_{t \text{ summands}} \\
&= t \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot h_j(\alpha(N))
\end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate step follows by applying (12) to Q and $\varepsilon/2$ for each $\bar{d} \in S_j(\bar{b})$, since $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}, \bar{d}) \in \pi_j$ if $\bar{d} \in S_j(\bar{b})$. As $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}$ and $|\alpha(N)| > Q$, we similarly apply (13) to Q and $\varepsilon/2$ to yield

$$(15) \quad \left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})| - g_{jk}(\alpha(N)) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot g_{jk}(\alpha(N)).$$

By (14) and (15), applying the triangle inequality gives

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned}
\left| t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)) - g_{jk}(\alpha(N)) \right| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot g_{jk}(\alpha(N)) \\
&\leq \varepsilon \cdot \max\{t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)), g_{jk}(\alpha(N))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}$ such that $|\alpha(N)| > Q$.

Let $\frac{g_{jk}}{h_j}(\alpha(N)) := \frac{g_{jk}(\alpha(N))}{h_j(\alpha(N))}$. We now wish to show that

$$(17) \quad \left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| - \frac{g_{jk}}{h_j}(\alpha(N)) \right| = o\left(\frac{g_{jk}}{h_j}(\alpha(N))\right)$$

for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}$ as $|\alpha(N)| \rightarrow \infty$. We first assume that $h_j(\alpha(N)) \neq 0$. The argument now divides into two cases. The adaptation needed for the case $h_j(\alpha(N)) = 0$ is handled afterwards.

CASE 1. $t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)) \leq g_{jk}(\alpha(N))$.

From (16) and the fact that $t = |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E|$, we obtain

$$\left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| - \frac{g_{jk}}{h_j}(\alpha(N)) \right| \leq \varepsilon \cdot \frac{g_{jk}}{h_j}(\alpha(N))$$

from which (17) follows for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}^g := \{(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk} : t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N)) \leq g_{jk}(\alpha(N))\}$ as $|\alpha(N)| \rightarrow \infty$. END OF CASE 1.

CASE 2. $g_{jk}(\alpha(N)) < t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N))$.

From (16) we obtain

$$\left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| - \frac{g_{jk}(\alpha(N))}{h_j(\alpha(N))} \right| \leq \varepsilon \cdot |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E|.$$

Therefore

$$\left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| - \frac{g_{jk}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \right| = o(|Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E|)$$

for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}^h := \{(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk} : g_{ji}(\alpha(N)) < t \cdot h_j(\alpha(N))\}$ as $|\alpha(N)| \rightarrow \infty$. By a straightforward argument ('little-o-exchange') we have

$$\left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| - \frac{g_{jk}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \right| = o\left(\frac{g_{jk}(\alpha(N))}{h_j}\right)$$

for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{jk}^h$ as $|\alpha(N)| \rightarrow \infty$. END OF CASE 2.

As $\rho_{jk} = \rho_{jk}^g \cup \rho_{jk}^h$, the two cases together establish (17) in the case that $h_j(\alpha(N)) \neq 0$.

We briefly address the modifications necessary if $h_j(\alpha(N)) = 0$, to avoid dividing by zero. Applying Lemma 2.5.3, by taking a larger Q if necessary we may assume that h_j is positive-definite for all $\alpha(N)$ with $|\alpha(N)| > Q$. If $h_j(\alpha(N)) = 0$ then by definition we have $\frac{g_{jk}}{h_j} := 0$. Then (17) still holds, since for $|\alpha(N)| > Q$ we have that $h_j(\alpha(N)) = 0$ implies $|Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})| = 0$ and hence $|Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| = 0$.

We finally can proceed to calculate the approximate size of $\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b})/E$. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ we have a finite partition $P_j := \{\rho_{jk} : 1 \leq k \leq e_j\}$ of $\mathcal{C}(\bar{y})$. We use these partitions to construct a single finite partition Φ of $\mathcal{C}(\bar{y})$. Define

$$I := \{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell) : 1 \leq k_j \leq e_j, 1 \leq j \leq \ell\} \text{ and } \rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)} := \bigcap_{j=1}^{\ell} \rho_{jk_j}$$

for each $(k_1, \dots, k_\ell) \in I$. Then $P := \{\rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)} : (k_1, \dots, k_\ell) \in I\}$ forms a finite partition of $\mathcal{C}(\bar{y})$. We now show that this partition works.

We have

$$\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b}) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b}).$$

Since each $Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})$ is a union of E -equivalence classes and the $Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})$ are pairwise disjoint, they form a partition of $\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b})/E$. Hence

$$(18) \quad |\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b})/E| = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E|.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(k_1, \dots, k_\ell) \in I$. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, let $Q(j) \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ be such that (17) holds for ε/ℓ , where we take $g_{jk} := g_{jk_j}$. Set

$Q' := \max\{Q(j) : 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}$. Then for every $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$ with $|\alpha(N)| > Q'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| |\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b})/E| - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{g_{jk_j}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \right| &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{g_{jk_j}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \right| \quad (\text{by (18)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \left| |Y_j(\alpha(N), \bar{b})/E| - \frac{g_{jk_j}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{\varepsilon}{\ell} \cdot \frac{g_{jk_j}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \\ &= \varepsilon \cdot \frac{g_{jk_j}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate step follows by applying (17) to Q' and ε/l for each $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, since $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)} \subseteq \rho_{jk_j}$. Hence

$$(19) \quad \left| |\varphi(\alpha(N)^{r \cdot n}, \bar{b})/E| - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{g_{jk_j}(\alpha(N))}{h_j} \right| = o\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{g_{jk_j}(\alpha(N))}{h_j}\right)$$

for all $(\alpha(N), \bar{b}) \in \rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$ as $|\alpha(N)| \rightarrow \infty$.

We now pull everything back to \mathcal{C}' . Put

$$\rho'_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)} := \{(N, a_1, \dots, a_m) \in (\mathcal{C}', y_1, \dots, y_m) : (\alpha(N), \tilde{f}(a_1), \dots, \tilde{f}(a_m)) \in \rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}\}.$$

Then $P' := \{\rho'_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)} : (k_1, \dots, k_\ell) \in I\}$ is a finite partition of $(\mathcal{C}', y_1, \dots, y_m)$.

By our earlier assumption that each ρ_{jk} respects the equivalence relation E , the set $\rho'_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$ does not depend on the choice function \tilde{f} . We also define

$$\frac{g_{jk}}{h_j}(N) := \frac{g_{jk}(\alpha(N))}{h_j}$$

for $N \in \mathcal{C}'$. Then (10) and (19) together imply for every $(k_1, \dots, k_\ell) \in I$ that

$$\left| |\varphi'(N^n, a_1, \dots, a_m)| - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{g_{jk_j}(N)}{h_j} \right| = o\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{g_{jk_j}(N)}{h_j}\right)$$

for all $(N, a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \rho'_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$ as $|N| \rightarrow \infty$. Hence \mathcal{C}' is a weak $\text{Frac}(R)$ -m.a.c., completing the proof of part (i) of the theorem.

Proof of (ii). Following on from the proof of (i), we need to show that the partition P' of $(\mathcal{C}', y_1, \dots, y_m)$ is \emptyset -definable. To this end, let $\rho'_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)} \in P'$. Since \mathcal{C} is an R -m.a.c., each ρ_{jk} is \emptyset -definable and hence the intersection $\rho'_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$ also is \emptyset -definable. Thus the partition P of $(\mathcal{C}, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_m)$ is \emptyset -definable. Let $\{\psi_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_m) : \rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)} \in P\}$ be the set of defining L -formulas. Note that this is where the point of Remark 2.5.5 comes into play. In the proof of (i) we could ignore the translation parameters by applying Lemma 2.1.5. We

cannot do that here, since expanding \mathcal{C} by constant symbols might prevent it from being \emptyset -interpretable in \mathcal{C}' . Thus, to guarantee that each $\{\psi_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_m)\}$ is parameter-free, it appears that we need to assume that no translation parameters are required in the interpretation of \mathcal{C}' in \mathcal{C} .

For brevity we now write ρ and ρ' for $\rho_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$ and $\rho'_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$, respectively, and ψ for $\psi_{(k_1, \dots, k_\ell)}$, since the subscript (k_1, \dots, k_ℓ) no longer plays a role. For all $(N, \bar{a}) \in (\mathcal{C}', y_1, \dots, y_m)$ we have

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned} (N, \bar{a}) \in \rho' &\iff (\alpha(N), \tilde{f}(\bar{a})) \in \rho && \text{(by the definition of } \rho') \\ &\iff \alpha(N) \models \psi(\tilde{f}(\bar{a})) && \text{(since } \psi \text{ defines } \rho) \\ &\iff \alpha(N)^* \models \psi(g \circ \tilde{f}(\bar{a})) && \text{(since } g \text{ is an isomorphism).} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha(N)^*$ is the \emptyset -interpretation of $\alpha(N)$ in N , we can find a parameter-free L' -translation $\psi'(\bar{y}')$ of $\psi(\bar{y})$ such that

$$(21) \quad \alpha(N)^* \models \psi(g \circ \tilde{f}(\bar{a})) \iff N \models \psi'(\tilde{g} \circ \tilde{f}(\bar{a})),$$

where \tilde{g} is a choice function for g in the same way that \tilde{f} is a choice function for f . Since the isomorphism $g^*f: N \rightarrow N^{**}$ is uniformly \emptyset -definable across \mathcal{C}' , we can find a parameter-free L' -formula $\psi''(y_1, \dots, y_m)$ such that

$$(22) \quad N \models \psi'(\tilde{g} \circ \tilde{f}(\bar{a})) \iff N \models \psi''(\bar{a}).$$

Together (20), (21) and (22) yield

$$(N, \bar{a}) \in \rho' \iff N \models \psi''(\bar{a}).$$

So ρ' is definable, as required.

Proof of (iii). This is a straightforward special case of the proof of (i), with no quotienting involved, and we omit the details. \square

3. THREE EXAMPLES OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL ASYMPTOTIC CLASSES

We discuss here three examples of (weak) m.a.c.s that seem enlightening. The first, systems of vector spaces over a field, gives an example of dimensions ranging independently. It also is used in the second example, finite modules for the path algebra over a finite field for a quiver of finite representation type. The third example, vector spaces over a finite field with a bilinear form, has particular interest as ultraproducts of this class do not in general have simple theory.

3.1. Families of vector spaces. The example in this subsection is a slight generalisation of the family of 2-sorted structures (\mathbb{F}, V) considered in Theorem 4.1 of [30]. We consider it partly because the extra generality seems to be needed for the quiver representations in the next subsection. Additionally, the proof in [30] rests on a quantifier elimination result from [32] which we later realised is not quite correct – so we

take the opportunity to state the correct QE result and indicate how the proof of [30, Theorem 4.1] should be corrected. We do not quite see how to extract our result from [30] and Feferman–Vaught.

Theorem 3.1.1. *Let \mathcal{C}_d be the collection of $(d + 1)$ -sorted structures of the form (F, V_1, \dots, V_d) , where F is a finite field in the language L_{rings} of rings, and each V_i is a finite dimensional F -vector space, each carrying a distinct copy of the language of groups and with distinct function symbols for scalar multiplication $F \times V_i \rightarrow V_i$. Then \mathcal{C}_d is a polynomial R-m.a.c. and the polynomial functions in R have the form $h = p(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_d)$, so that if $M = (F, V_1, \dots, V_d) \in \mathcal{C}_d$ then $h(M) = p(|F|, |V_1|, \dots, |V_d|)$.*

We consider the structures of \mathcal{C}_d in the language L_{vs}^d as described in the theorem, but in addition for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and each $n \geq 1$ an n -ary relation symbol $\theta_n^i(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ in the V_i sort, and for each such i, n and each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ an $n + 1$ -place function symbol $\lambda_{n,j}^i$. We interpret θ_n^i so that $(M, V_1, \dots, V_d) \models \theta_n^i(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ if and only if $v_1, \dots, v_n \in V_i$ and v_1, \dots, v_n are linearly independent. Furthermore, if $(M, V_1, \dots, V_d) \models \theta_n^i(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $w = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k v_k$ with $a_1, \dots, a_n \in F$, then $\lambda_{n,j}^i(v_1, \dots, v_n, w) = a_j$, and we define $\lambda_{n,j}^i(v_1, \dots, v_n, w) = 0_F$ otherwise. Observe that the $\theta_n^i(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $\lambda_{n,j}^i$ are definable in the original language L_{vs}^d . Let $T_{vs}^d(F)$ be the theory of structures (F, V_1, \dots, V_d) in this language where each V_i is an infinite-dimensional vector space over the field F .

Proposition 3.1.2. *The theory $T_{vs}^d(F)$ is complete and has quantifier elimination relative to the field sort; that is, any formula is equivalent modulo $T_{vs}^d(F)$ to one whose only quantifiers are in the field sort.*

Note that in [30, Lemma 4.1], resting on [32], this is stated with $d = 1$ without the function symbols $\lambda_{n,j}^i$. However, it is clear that these (or some replacement) are needed. A proof incorporating the function symbols also is given in the forthcoming [20].

Proof of Theorem 3.1.1. For clarity, we just give the argument for $d = 1$; the argument for $d > 1$ is essentially the same. As in Remark 2.4.2—see also the end of the proof of [30, Theorem 4.1]—it suffices to consider formulas with a single variable (and possibly parameters). It remains to explain how the proof of [30, Lemma 4.2] needs to be adjusted to take into account that the language includes the function symbols $\lambda_{n,j}^i$. Consider a set defined by a formula $\varphi(x, \bar{b}\bar{c})$, where, in the formula $\varphi(x, \bar{v}\bar{y})$, \bar{v} ranges over the vector space sort and \bar{y} over the field sort.

Suppose first that x ranges over the vector space sort. As in [30, Lemma 4.2] we may suppose that φ is a conjunction of quantifier-free formulas and field formulas. Using the θ_n formulas, we may assume that \bar{v} is linearly independent and reduce to two possibilities: where

x is in the span of \bar{v} , and where it is not. In the first case, we may identify the span of \bar{v} with F^n , and the original formula reduces to a field formula defining a set with cardinality approximately a polynomial in F , with the definability clause also holding. In the second case, the λ -functions play no role and the argument from [30] applies.

Now assume that x ranges through the field sort (Case 2 in the proof of [30, Lemma 4.2]). The proof is essentially as given there, except that polynomials $p(x, \bar{y})$ have to be replaced by terms involving also the λ -functions. In each case, such formulas can be replaced by field formulas, and the definability clause also holds. \square

3.2. A m.a.c. from representation theory. For background on the relevant representation theory of quivers, see for example [8] or [64].

A *quiver* is a directed graph Q , and we assume that Q has vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. Given a field k , the *path algebra* kQ is an associative algebra with basis the set of all directed paths in Q , including a trivial path e_i at each vertex v_i . Multiplication is defined on the basis by composition of paths, a product taking value 0 if the composition is undefined.

A *representation* of Q (with base field k) consists of a k -vector space V_i for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and a k -linear map $\rho: V_i \rightarrow V_j$ for each arrow $v_i \rightarrow v_j$. The *dimension vector* of the representation is the sequence (r_1, \dots, r_n) where $\dim(V_i) = r_i$ for each i . There is a natural notion of *direct sum* of two representations, and a representation of Q is *indecomposable* if it cannot be written as a direct sum of two non-trivial representations. It is well-known that the category of representations of Q over k is equivalent to the category of left kQ -modules. Indeed, given a representation of Q with k -vector spaces V_i for each i , one forms the k -vector space $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n V_i$. Left multiplication by e_i corresponds to the linear map $V \rightarrow V$ given by projection $V \rightarrow V_i$ composed with inclusion $V_i \rightarrow V$, and given a directed path $\alpha: v_i \rightarrow v_j$ with corresponding linear map $\rho: V_i \rightarrow V_j$, given by composing maps coming from arcs, left multiplication by α is the linear map induced by ρ on V_i and by the 0-map on the other V_k .

The quiver Q has *finite representation type* if it has just finitely many isomorphism types of indecomposable representations. This property depends only on Q and not on k . By a famous theorem of Gabriel [28], a quiver has finite representation type if and only if it is a finite disjoint union of oriented copies of the Dynkin diagrams A_n, D_n, E_6, E_7, E_8 . Each indecomposable is associated with a unique positive root of the ‘Tits form’ (see [28], e.g.) of the quiver.

We now suppose Q is a quiver of finite representation type. Then the indecomposables of Q each have a fixed dimension vector which is independent of the base field k . Furthermore, the linear maps $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ are defined over \mathbb{Z} , so are independent of the field k ; that is, we may

identify the V_i with finite powers of k in such a way that the linear maps are given by matrices over \mathbb{Z} . This can be seen from the treatment in [8]: it is shown there that the indecomposable representations can be constructed from 1-dimensional simple modules (for a possibly differently oriented version of the quiver) by applying a sequence of reflection functors, and this process preserves the property of being defined over \mathbb{Z} . It also follows from Theorem 1 of [22], which says that for each positive root of the Tits form of the quiver there is a unique (up to isomorphism) representation of Q by a finitely generated free \mathbb{Z} -module, with the property that over any field, it gives the (unique) indecomposable representation of that dimension vector over that field.¹

We view a representation of Q as a 3-sorted structure (k, kQ, V) , where k is the base field and V is the corresponding k -vector space and kQ -module. We view (k, kQ, V) as a structure in a 3-sorted language L_Q with sorts S_F (for the field \mathbb{F}_q), S_A (for the algebra $\mathbb{F}_q Q$), and S_V (for the vector space V). The language L_Q has disjoint copies of L_{rings} for the sorts S_F and S_A , the language L_{groups} of groups on S_V , a function symbol $S_F \times S_A \rightarrow S_A$ for scalar multiplication on the algebra, a function symbol $S_F \times S_V$ for scalar multiplication (by field elements) on V , and a function symbol $S_A \times S_V \rightarrow S_V$ for the left action of the algebra sort on the vector space sort.

Theorem 3.2.1. *Let Q be a quiver of finite representation type. Then the collection*

$$\mathcal{C}(Q) := \{(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathbb{F}_q Q, V) : q \text{ prime power, } V \text{ finite-dimensional } \mathbb{F}_q Q\text{-module}\}$$

is a weak polynomial m.a.c..

Proof. Let $W_1(k), \dots, W_t(k)$ denote the indecomposable representations of Q determined by corresponding positive roots of the Tits form of Q . Suppose $W_i(k)$ has dimension vector (r_{i1}, \dots, r_{in}) and put $s_i := r_{i1} + \dots + r_{in} = \dim_k W_i(k)$. For each $i = 1, \dots, t$ and prime power q let $T_i(q) = (\mathbb{F}_q, \mathbb{F}_q Q, W_i(\mathbb{F}_q))$. Put $\mathcal{C}_i := \{T_i(q) : q \text{ prime power}\}$, a family of finite L_Q -structures.

Claim. (i) The structure $T_i(q)$ is interpretable in the field \mathbb{F}_q , uniformly in q , and includes the home sort \mathbb{F}_q .

(ii) The class \mathcal{C}_i is an N -dimensional weak asymptotic class (i.e. asymptotic class without the definability clause), where $N = 1 + s_i + \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathbb{F}_q Q)$.

Proof of Claim. (i) The path algebra $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ has a fixed dimension—the number of paths of Q —over \mathbb{F}_q . This is finite for the quivers under consideration. The algebra multiplication is uniformly definable on

¹The context in [22] is more general, but one takes $R = \mathbb{Z}$, and for a Dynkin quiver positive roots are exactly *real Schur roots*, and furthermore working over a field, indecomposable modules are exactly *exceptional modules*.

the basis, and so extends by linearity. Thus, $(\mathbb{F}_q Q, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is uniformly interpretable in \mathbb{F}_q . The vector space $W_i(\mathbb{F}_q)$ has a fixed dimension vector and so is a sum of n \mathbb{F}_q -vector spaces and thus is uniformly interpretable in \mathbb{F}_q . If we name parameters to equip the vector space at each Q -vertex with a basis then the linear maps between them determined by arrows are given uniformly by matrices over \mathbb{Z} . Thus the maps $W_i(\mathbb{F}_q) \rightarrow W_i(\mathbb{F}_q)$ given by basis elements of $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ are also given uniformly. It follows by linearity that multiplication by arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ is definable uniformly.

(ii) This follows immediately from (i) and [24, Lemma 3.7].

An $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ -module V has form $W_1(\mathbb{F}_q)^{l_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_t(\mathbb{F}_q)^{l_t}$. We first claim that if W denotes one of the W_i , of dimension s , then the class

$$\mathcal{D}(Q) = \{(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathbb{F}_q Q, W(\mathbb{F}_q)^l) : q \text{ a prime power}, l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\}$$

is a m.a.c.. Now the $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ -module $W(\mathbb{F}_q)^l$ is $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ -isomorphic to $W(q) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} U(l, q)$, where $U(l, q)$ is an l -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q , and the paths in Q act as the identity map on $U(l, q)$: Indeed, if (f_1, \dots, f_l) is a basis of $U(l, q)$ then the map $(w_1, \dots, w_l) \mapsto w_1 \otimes f_1 + \dots + w_l \otimes f_l$ provides the required $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ -isomorphism. By Example 2.2.5(1)(b)—see also Theorem 3.1.1—the class of structures $(\mathbb{F}_q, U(l, q))$ is a polynomial m.a.c. Furthermore, each element of $W(q) \otimes U(l, q)$ can be written as a sum of at most s simple tensors, i.e., elements of form $w \otimes u$ where $w \in W(q)$ and $u \in U(l, q)$. The equivalence relation which expresses that two such sums of simple tensors are equal in $W(q) \otimes U(l, q)$ is determined by bilinearity conditions and so is definable, and it follows that the vector space $W(q) \otimes U(l, q)$ is interpretable in $(\mathbb{F}_q, U(l, q))$. Since the multiplication by paths in Q is \emptyset -definable in $(\mathbb{F}_q, U(l, q))$, it follows from Theorem 2.5.4 that $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ is a weak polynomial m.a.c..

For the general case, observe that by Theorem 3.1.1 the class of structures $(\mathbb{F}_q, V_1, \dots, V_t)$, where each V_i is a finite-dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q , is a polynomial m.a.c.. Since $W_1(\mathbb{F}_q)^{l_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_t(\mathbb{F}_q)^{l_t}$ is uniformly interpretable in $(\mathbb{F}_q, U(l_1, q), \dots, U(l_t, q))$, the result follows from Theorem 2.5.4. \square

Remark 3.2.2.

- (i) In Theorem 3.2.1 (and the Corollary below), we suspect that ‘weak m.a.c.’ can be replaced by ‘m.a.c.’. The difficulty is that in the claim we have mutual interpretability without parameters between the $T_i(q)$ and the \mathbb{F}_q , but it is not clear that we have parameter-free bi-interpretability, since the vector spaces at each quiver vertex do not naturally come with a uniformly definable basis. In the claim, if we identify the vector space at each vertex with a power of \mathbb{F}_q , so that the corresponding maps between them are given uniformly by matrices over \mathbb{Z} , then the class of corresponding structures of form $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathbb{F}_q Q, \mathbb{F}_q^{s_i})$ does form a m.a.c..

- (ii) The conclusion of Theorem 3.2.1 still holds if V is expanded by unary predicates interpreted by the powers of indecomposables $W_i(\mathbb{F}_q)^{l_i}$.

Corollary 3.2.3. *Let k be a positive integer and let \mathcal{C} be the collection of all structures of form $(\mathbb{F}_q, W_1, \dots, W_k)$, where q is a prime power and $W_1 \leq W_2 \leq \dots \leq W_k$ are finite-dimensional \mathbb{F}_q -vector spaces. We view these as two-sorted structures, with a field sort and a vector space sort expanded by predicates for subspaces W_1, \dots, W_{k-1} of W_k . Then \mathcal{C} is a weak polynomial m.a.c..*

Proof. Let Q be the quiver obtained by orienting the Dynkin diagram A_k as a directed path $v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_k$, and let α_i be the arc $v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1}$. For each structure $(\mathbb{F}_q, W_1, \dots, W_k)$ as above, let $r_i := \dim(W_i)$, and let V be a representation of Q over \mathbb{F}_q with an r_i -dimensional vector space V_i at vertex v_i for each i and with α_i corresponding to an embedding $V_i \rightarrow V_{i+1}$. We view V as an $\mathbb{F}_q Q$ -module, a member of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ as described in the proof of Theorem 3.2.1. Then $(\mathbb{F}_q, W_1, \dots, W_k)$ is uniformly interpretable in the structure $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathbb{F}_q Q, V)$ since we may identify W_k with V_k and W_i with $\alpha_{k-1} \circ \dots \circ \alpha_i(V_i)$. The result follows. \square

Remark 3.2.4. An ultraproduct of members of \mathcal{C} in Corollary 3.2.3 has SU-rank at most ω^k .

3.3. Vector spaces with bilinear forms. Let V be a vector space over a field F , equipped with a bilinear form $\beta : V \times V \rightarrow F$. For $v \in V$ we put $v^\perp = \{w \in V : \beta(v, w) = 0\}$. The form β is said to be *non-degenerate* if $(\forall v \in V) v^\perp = V \rightarrow v = 0$, and to be *alternating* if $\forall v \in V (\beta(v, v) = 0)$. We view vector spaces with a bilinear form as 2-sorted structures (V, F) in a language L_{bil} which has the language of groups on the sort for V , the language of rings on the sort for F , a function symbol $F \times V \rightarrow V$ for scalar multiplication, and a function symbol $\beta : V \times V \rightarrow F$ for the bilinear form. The expanded language $L_{\text{bil,qe}}$ contains also—as in Section 3.1—for each $n \geq 1$, an n -ary relation symbol θ_n , and, for each $n \geq 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$, function symbols $\lambda_{n,j}$. In structures (V, F) , the relation $\theta_n(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ holds just of linearly independent n -tuples in the V -sort, and if v_1, \dots, v_n are linearly independent and $w = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i$ for some $a_1, \dots, a_n \in F$, then $\lambda_{n,j}(v_1, \dots, v_n, w) = a_j$, with the $\lambda_{n,j}$ taking value 0_F otherwise.

Proposition 3.3.1. *The theory of non-degenerate alternating bilinear forms has quantifier elimination in the vector space sort in the language $L_{\text{bil,qe}}$; that is, any formula is uniformly (in all such structures) equivalent to one with no vector space quantifiers.*

Proof. A version of this is claimed in Theorem 9.2.3 of [32] but is not quite correct in the form there, since the functions $\lambda_{n,j}$ are omitted

but are clearly needed. With these functions, it is straightforward to adapt Granger's proof to obtain the result; a detailed proof is given in [20]. See also Theorem 5.18 of [33], though some care is needed in interpreting results from that paper since, though the language is treated as 2-sorted, the authors do not think of the field as varying. \square

Lemma 3.3.2. *Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space over the finite field \mathbb{F}_q , equipped with a non-degenerate bilinear form $\beta : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$, and let v_1, \dots, v_m be linearly independent and $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Then the set $\{v \in V : \bigwedge_{i=1}^m \beta(x, v_i) = a_i\}$ has cardinality $|V|/q^m$.*

Proof. The map $\bar{\beta} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$ given by $\bar{\beta}(x) = (\beta(x, v_1), \dots, \beta(x, v_m))$ is a group homomorphism, so it suffices to show that it is surjective. Extend v_1, \dots, v_m to a basis v_1, \dots, v_l of V . The homomorphism $\beta^* : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^l$ given by $\beta^*(x) = (\beta(x, v_1), \dots, \beta(x, v_l))$ is injective (by non-degeneracy) and so is surjective. It follows that $\bar{\beta}$ is also surjective, as required. \square

Theorem 3.3.3. *Let \mathcal{C}_{bil} be the collection of all L_{bil} structures (V, F) where V is a finite-dimensional vector space over the finite field F , equipped with a non-degenerate alternating bilinear form β . Let $R = \mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F})[\mathbf{V}]$. Then \mathcal{C}_{bil} is an R -m.a.c..*

Proof. We apply Theorem 2.4.1(i), working in the richer language $L_{\text{bil}, \text{qe}}$ with quantifier elimination in the vector space sort. Consider first a formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi})$, where x and $\bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ range through the V -sort and $\bar{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ through the F -sort. We aim to compute the approximate cardinality of $\varphi(V, u_1, \dots, u_m, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ in $(V, F) \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{bil}}$, for $u_1, \dots, u_m \in V$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in F$. By adjusting φ , we may suppose that $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_m, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ determines whether or not x lies in the linear span $\langle y_1, \dots, y_m \rangle$. We may also assume that $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_m, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ implies that y_1, \dots, y_m are linearly independent; indeed, if say y_1, \dots, y_r span $\langle y_1, \dots, y_m \rangle$ with $r < m$, we may replace y_{r+1}, \dots, y_m each by a linear combination of the form $\sum_{i=1}^r \nu_i y_i$, where the ν_i for $i = 1, \dots, r$ are new field variables.

Suppose first that $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_m, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \rightarrow x \in \langle y_1, \dots, y_m \rangle$. We may, definably over u_1, \dots, u_m , identify $\langle u_1, \dots, u_m \rangle$ with F^m , and define β uniformly on F^m , putting $\beta(\bar{c}, \bar{d}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m c_i d_j \beta(u_i, u_j)$. Thus, using quantifier elimination in the sort V , the formula φ can in this case be replaced by an L_{rings} -formula, and the result follows in this case from the fact that finite fields form a m.a.c. with functions taking values of form $\mu|F|^d$ as in [14].

Suppose next that $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_m, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \rightarrow x \notin \langle y_1, \dots, y_m \rangle$. Using bilinearity of β , we may introduce a new field variable ρ_i for each term $\beta(x, y_i)$ in φ , and replace φ by a formula $\varphi^*(x, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho})$ of the form $\beta(x, y_{i_1}) = \rho_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta(x, y_{i_r}) = \rho_r \wedge \chi(x, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho})$, where χ

involves no terms of the form $\beta(x, y_i)$. Working in (V, F) , let $\bar{u} \in V^m$ be linearly independent, $\bar{a} \in F^m$ and $\bar{b} \in F^r$. Since we have assumed that φ implies that $x \in V \setminus \langle u_1, \dots, u_m \rangle$, applying Lemma 3.3.2 we see in this case that there are $(|V| - |F|^m)/|F|^r$ elements $x \in V$ satisfying $\beta(x, u_{i_1}) = b_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta(x, u_{i_r}) = b_r$. Moreover, as \bar{b} ranges over F^r the sets of $x \in V$ satisfying $\beta(x, u_{i_1}) = b_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta(x, u_{i_r}) = b_r$ are pairwise disjoint. If we further replace each $\beta(y_i, y_j)$ for $i < j \leq m$ by a new variable τ_{ij} , and each $\beta(y_i, y_i)$ by 0 in $\chi(x, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho})$, then our formula φ^* becomes $\varphi^{**}(x, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau})$ of the form

$$\beta(x, y_{i_1}) = \rho_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta(x, y_{i_r}) = \rho_r \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j} \beta(y_i, y_j) = \tau_{ij} \wedge \theta(x, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau})$$

where θ is a formula in the 2-sorted vector space language for (V, F) . Now let $\bar{c} \in F^k$, where $k = \binom{m}{2}$, be such that $\bigwedge_{i < j} \beta(u_i, u_j) = c_{ij}$. Since for any two linearly independent $m + 1$ tuples $\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2 \in V^{m+1}$ there is an automorphism of (V, F) that fixes F pointwise taking \bar{w}_1 to \bar{w}_2 , it follows that for each $\bar{b} \in F^m$, either $\theta(x, \bar{y}, \bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$ is satisfied by all such \bar{w} (substituted for (x, \bar{y})) or it is satisfied by no such \bar{w} . By identifying the span of linearly independent $m + 1$ tuples with F^{m+1} , e.g., it follows that there is a field formula $\theta^*(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{\tau})$ such that for all $\bar{b} \in F^m$, there exist linearly independent $v, u_1, \dots, u_m \in V$ such that $\theta(v, \bar{u}, \bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$ holds in (V, F) if and only if $\theta^*(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$ is satisfied in F . Hence, there are μ and d such that there are $\mu|F|^d$ tuples $\bar{b} \in F^r$ satisfying $\theta^*(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})$, as in [14]. (Note that there are finitely many possible pairs (d, μ) depending definably on \bar{c} —and thus \bar{u} —and \bar{a} .) It follows that the number of realisations of our original formula $\varphi(x, \bar{u}, \bar{a})$ in this case is $\frac{(|V| - |F|^m)\mu|F|^d}{|F|^r}$. This has the required form.

Lastly, we consider formulas of the form $\varphi(\rho, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi})$, where ρ ranges through the field sort. As before, we may reduce to the case when $\varphi(\rho, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi})$ implies that the entries y_1, \dots, y_m of \bar{v} are linearly independent. This is handled as in the last paragraph but one, since, working over \bar{v} and using quantifier elimination in the V -sort, we may identify $\langle y_1, \dots, y_m \rangle$ with \mathbb{F}_q^m , and replace φ by an L_{rings} -formula.

It can be checked that the definability condition in the definition of m.a.c. holds in each step in the above argument, so holds for $\mathcal{C}_{\text{bil,qe}}$. \square

4. MULTIDIMENSIONAL EXACT CLASSES

In this section we focus on multidimensional *exact* classes. We give a range of examples, partial results, and conjectures. The examples suggest that there is a connection between being a m.e.c. and ultra-products being one-based (in an appropriate sense).

4.1. Smooth approximation and m.e.c.s of homogeneous structures. We first recall the notion of *smooth approximation* introduced

by Lachlan and developed in [42] and [19]. We say that the countably infinite structure M is *smoothly approximable* if M is ω -categorical and $M = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} M_i$ is a union of a chain of finite substructures $M_0 \leq M_1 \leq \dots \leq M$, where the M_i are *homogeneous substructures* of M in the sense that two tuples of M_i lie in the same orbit of $\text{Aut}(M)$ if and only if they lie in the same orbit of $\text{Aut}(M)_{\{M_i\}}$, the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(M)$ stabilising M_i setwise.

The following result follows rather directly from the definition of smooth approximation.

Proposition 4.1.1. [73, Proposition 3.2.1] *Let M be a structure smoothly approximated by a chain $(M_i)_{i \in \omega}$ of finite substructures. Then there is R such that $\{M_i : i < \omega\}$ is an R -m.e.c..*

Using further material from [19], Proposition 4.1.1 was extended by Wolf ([74], also [73, Theorem 4.6.4]) to Theorem 4.1.2 below. Note that the statement and proof in [73] contain an inaccuracy, as one needs to allow the expansion to L' . For example, let L have a single binary relation E , and let \mathcal{C} be the collection of finite L -structures in which E is interpreted by an equivalence relation with at most two class sizes; then the number of orbits on quadruples is bounded, but the definability clause in the m.e.c. definition is not satisfied. Essentially, one needs to work in the language \mathcal{M}^D of [19, Definition 8.3.1] with dimension quantifiers expressing that one Lie geometry has smaller dimension than another (and with Witt index quantifiers), and this can be done in a finite extension L' of L as above. In Wolf's proof, the error occurs in the second use of [19, Proposition 4.4.3] in the penultimate paragraph of the proof of [73, Theorem 4.4.1]: [19, Proposition 4.4.3] requires that the models have 'true dimensions' relative to the skeletal language, and this is ensured by the expansion to \mathcal{M}^D . In the statement of [73, Theorem 4.4.1] one first expands the members of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}, d)$ to \mathcal{M}^D before finding the finite partition. See the corresponding discussion in the proof of [19, Proposition 8.3.2].

Theorem 4.1.2. *Let L be a finite first-order language, d a natural number, and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(L, d)$ the collection of all finite L -structures M with at most d 4-types (so $\text{Aut}(M)$ has at most d orbits on M^4). Then there is a finite language $L' \supseteq L$ and for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$ an L' -expansion M' with the same automorphism group as M , such that $\mathcal{C}' := \{M' : M \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is a polynomial m.e.c..*

The polynomials here are essentially polynomials in the cardinalities of certain coordinatising Lie geometries (formally, in numbers of the form $(-\sqrt{q})^{d_E(J)}$, where E is a finite 'envelope' and J is a (finite-dimensional approximation of a) Lie geometry of E of dimension $d_E(J)$ over a field \mathbb{F}_q , or in the case of a geometry that is a pure set, $d_E(J)$ is the cardinality of the set). The geometries arising belong to a 'standard system of geometries' in the sense of [19, Definition 2.5.6]. Wolf's

results say in particular that if M is smoothly approximated then the collection of all finite envelopes of M is a polynomial m.e.c., after extension of the language as above.

See also Lemma 5.2.2 and the preceding pages of [19].

Remark 4.1.3. In the last theorem the exponent 4 cannot be reduced to 3. For consider the collection of all finite Desarguesian projective planes, each viewed as a structure whose universe is the set of points, equipped with a ternary collinearity relation. By the Veblen–Young theorem, the Desarguesian plane over \mathbb{F}_q has automorphism group $\text{PTL}_3(q)$ in its natural action on projective space, which has a bounded number of orbits on triples (and two orbits on triples of distinct elements). However, by a classical fact from projective geometry, the Desarguesian plane over \mathbb{F}_q uniformly *defines* the field \mathbb{F}_q , and so no infinite collection of such planes can be even a weak m.e.c., by Theorem 2.5.4(iii) in combination with Proposition 4.1.8 below.

The above results of Wolf, and those which follow, make the following conjecture very natural. A general proof might require revisiting Lachlan’s work on finite homogeneous structures, but under weaker assumptions than full homogeneity. Below, a countable structure over a relational language is *homogeneous* if every isomorphism between finite substructures extends to an automorphism. Part of the motivation is that the conjecture leads to natural questions about families of finite structures with arbitrarily high levels of combinatorial regularity but no assumptions on the automorphism group (rather in the way that distance-regularity for graphs is a combinatorial generalisation of distance-transitivity); see Section 7.

Conjecture 4.1.4.

- (i) Let M be a homogeneous structure over a finite relational language L . Then there is an m.e.c. with ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to M if and only if M is stable.
- (ii) Let M be an unstable homogeneous structure over a finite relational language. Then M is not elementarily equivalent to any structure interpretable in an ultraproduct of a m.e.c..

The right-to-left direction of Conjecture 4.1.4(i) is true:

Proposition 4.1.5. *Let M be a stable homogeneous structure over a finite relational language L . Then there is an m.e.c. \mathcal{C} with an infinite ultraproduct which is elementarily equivalent to M .*

Proof. It is well-known that any stable structure which is homogeneous over a finite relational language is ω -stable – for example, definability of types and quantifier-elimination yield that there are countably many types over any countable model. Hence M is smoothly approximable by [16, Corollary 7.4]. It follows that there is an m.e.c. of envelopes

of M , by the results of Wolf (essentially Proposition 4.1.1). We may take this m.e.c. to consist of the members of a smoothly approximating sequence of homogeneous substructures M_i of M , and every sentence in $\text{Th}(M)$ holds in cofinitely many of the M_i . Hence any non-principal ultraproduct of \mathcal{C} is elementarily equivalent to M , and the result follows. \square

For the other direction of Conjecture 4.1.4(i), we have the limited evidence in the following result. Let I_n (for $n \geq 3$) denote the digraph consisting of n vertices with no arcs between them. The classification of homogeneous digraphs by Cherlin [18] includes for each $n \geq 3$ the universal homogeneous I_n -free digraph Q_n . The ‘generic bipartite graph’ is a homogeneous structure in a language with two relations, an equivalence relation E for the bipartition, and a symmetric irreflexive graph relation R which only holds between E -inequivalent pairs; it is the unique countably infinite such structure such that for any two finite disjoint subsets A, B of one part of the bipartition, there is a vertex in the other part adjacent to all vertices of A and to no vertices of B .

Theorem 4.1.6. *Let M be any of the following homogeneous structures. Then there is no m.e.c. with an ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to M .*

- (i) *Any homogeneous structure whose theory has the strict order property.*
- (ii) *Any unstable homogeneous graph.*
- (iii) *Any homogeneous tournament.*
- (iv) *The digraph Q_n for each $n \geq 3$.*
- (v) *The generic bipartite graph, with the two parts named by unary predicates.*

Proof. (i) This follows immediately from Remark 5.3.7.

(ii) If M is an unstable homogeneous graph, then by the Lachlan–Woodrow classification [52] M is the random graph H , the universal homogeneous K_n -free graph H_n for some $n \geq 3$, or the complement of H_n . We shall suppose that M is the random graph, as the same argument eliminates the other cases. Let $T = \text{Th}(M)$, and suppose that \mathcal{C} is a m.e.c. with an ultraproduct $N \models T$. After thinning out \mathcal{C} we may suppose that all non-principal ultraproducts of \mathcal{C} are elementarily equivalent – that is, each element of T holds of cofinitely many $P \in \mathcal{C}$.

For any formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ there is a finite set E of functions $h: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and some formula $\psi_h(\bar{y})$ for each $h \in E$, such that for any $P \in \mathcal{C}$ and $h \in E$, if $\bar{a} \in P^{|\bar{y}|}$ then

$$P \models \psi_h(\bar{a}) \implies |\varphi(P, \bar{a})| = h(P).$$

Since T has quantifier-elimination, there is a quantifier-free formula $\chi_h(\bar{y})$ and $\sigma \in T$ such that $\sigma \models \forall \bar{y} (\psi_h(\bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \chi_h(\bar{y}))$. As σ holds on cofinitely many members of \mathcal{C} , provided we work in sufficiently large

$P \models T$, we may assume that $\psi_h(\bar{y})$ is quantifier-free. Taking $\bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_5)$ and $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ to say that x is adjacent to each y_i , it follows that any sufficiently large $P \in \mathcal{C}$ is *5-regular*: For any $A \subset P$ of size at most 5, the number of common neighbours of A depends only on the isomorphism type of A .

By the note added in proof at the end of [11], any finite 5-regular graph occurs in the list in [11, Theorem 3.2]: the pentagon, the line graph of $K_{3,3}$, a disjoint union of complete graphs all of the same size, or the complement of the latter. (We remark that these are exactly the finite homogeneous graphs, so include the finite graphs smoothly approximating the stable homogeneous graphs). However, if P is chosen sufficiently large, then P will satisfy appropriate extension axioms true of the random graph but not satisfied by these, a contradiction.

(iii) By [51], there are three infinite homogeneous tournaments, namely a dense total order, the ‘local order’, and the random tournament. The first two have the strict order property, so by (i) cannot be elementarily equivalent to an ultraproduct of an m.e.c.. So let M be the random tournament, and suppose for a contradiction that M is elementarily equivalent to an ultraproduct of the m.e.c \mathcal{C} of finite tournaments.

A finite tournament D is said to be *regular* if any two vertices have the same out-degree. By counting in two ways the set $S := \{(x, y) : x \rightarrow y\}$, we see that if D is a finite regular tournament then its in-degree equals its out-degree, so D has an odd number of vertices.

Arguing as in (i), if $D \in \mathcal{C}$ is sufficiently large then the out-degree of a vertex depends just on the isomorphism type of the vertex, so D is regular so has odd size. Fix distinct vertices $a, b \in D$ with $a \rightarrow b$. Define the sets $E_1 := \{x \in D : a \rightarrow x \wedge b \rightarrow x\}$, $E_2 := \{x : a \rightarrow x \wedge x \rightarrow b\}$, $E_3 := \{x : b \rightarrow x \wedge x \rightarrow a\}$ and $E_4 := \{x : x \rightarrow a \wedge x \rightarrow b\}$. Arguing as above, provided D is sufficiently large each of E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4 is non-empty and regular, so has odd size. Since the vertex set of D is $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup E_4 \cup \{a, b\}$, D has an even number of vertices, a contradiction.

(iv) For any digraph D let $D^{\parallel}(x)$ be the set of vertices y distinct from x and non-adjacent to x . Observe that for each vertex x of Q_n , if $n > 3$ we have $Q_n^{\parallel}(x) \cong Q_{n-1}$, and $Q_3^{\parallel}(x)$ is isomorphic to the generic tournament. Now if \mathcal{C} is an m.e.c with ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to Q_n , then the set of digraphs

$$\{D^{\parallel}(x) : D \in \mathcal{C}, x \text{ a vertex of } D\}$$

is a m.e.c. with ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to $Q_n^{\parallel}(y) \cong Q_{n-1}$ for y a vertex of Q_n . The result now follows by (iii) and induction.

(v) Let B be the random bipartite graph, and let \mathcal{C} be a m.e.c. of finite graphs with an ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to B ; we work in a language with a binary relation symbol for adjacency and two unary predicates giving a bipartition in B and in members of \mathcal{C} .

Then \mathcal{C} can be thinned out so that, in the language of [34], its members are *3-tuple regular*: If $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and S and S' are sets of size at most 3 of vertices of Γ that induce isomorphic vertex-coloured subgraphs, then the number of vertices of Γ which are adjacent to every vertex of S is equal to the number adjacent to all vertices of S' . It follows from [34, Lemma 4.8] that either there is a matching between the two parts, or there are no edges between the parts, or the bipartite complement of one of these situations occurs. In particular, such graphs cannot have ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to B . \square

- Remark 4.1.7.** 1. The above result makes essential use of the definability clause in the definition of a m.e.c.. Also, the argument in (iii) and (iv) makes use of a parity argument which appears to be unavailable for the universal homogeneous digraph, and for the families of digraphs determined by a collection of forbidden finite tournaments. These observations suggest Question 7.0.5 from the final section. Since many random homogeneous structures are interpretable in pseudofinite fields, the following observation is relevant.
2. A small adjustment of the proof of (iii) shows that if D is a finite tournament which is *3-regular* in the sense that the number of realisations of a quantifier-free 1-type over a tuple \bar{a} of length at most 3 depends just on the quantifier-free type of \bar{a} , then D is a single vertex or a directed 3-cycle.

Proposition 4.1.8. *There is no weak m.e.c. consisting of finite fields.*

Proof. See the proposition on p.44 of [67]. It is noted that given a prime power q , for every m with $(m, q) = 1$ and $|m| \leq 2\sqrt{q}$, there is an elliptic curve E over \mathbb{F}_q with isogeny class corresponding to m , and with $q + 1 - m$ rational points in \mathbb{F}_q . In particular, the number of distinct possible sizes of the number of rational points of an elliptic curve over \mathbb{F}_q increases with q . Since elliptic curves are uniformly definable, the result follows. \square

4.2. M.e.c.s of groups. We first show that there is a strong structural restriction on m.e.c.s of groups. If G is a finite group, let $R(G)$ denote the soluble radical of G (the largest soluble normal subgroup of G) and $F(G)$ the Fitting subgroup of G (the largest nilpotent normal subgroup of G – so $F(G) \leq R(G)$).

Proposition 4.2.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a m.e.c. of finite groups. Then:*

- (i) *There is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that each $G \in \mathcal{C}$ has a uniformly \emptyset -definable soluble normal subgroup of index at most d .*
- (ii) *There is $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $G \in \mathcal{C}$, the quotient $R(G)/F(G)$ has derived length at most e .*

Proof. (i) By a theorem of Wilson [71], there is a formula $\psi(x)$ which defines the soluble radical $R(G)$ in each finite group G . Our purpose

is to show that $|G : R(G)|$ is bounded. For convenience of notation, we assume $R(G) = 1$ for each $G \in \mathcal{C}$, though the argument could be given directly in G .

We argue as in the proof of Theorem 4.15 (Claim 1) in [56]. For $G \in \mathcal{C}$, let $S = S(G)$ be the socle of G , the direct product of the minimal normal subgroups of G . Then $S = S_1 \times \dots \times S_t$, where the S_i are non-abelian simple groups. By Theorem 1.5 of [54] (together with the Feit–Thompson theorem), there is a constant c such that each finite non-abelian simple group H has an involution h such that each element of H is a product of exactly c conjugates of h . It follows that S is parameter-definable in G , uniformly as G ranges over \mathcal{C} . Indeed, if h_i is such an involution chosen in S_i , then S is exactly the set of products of c conjugates (by elements of G) of (h_1, \dots, h_t) . Furthermore, each S_i is itself uniformly definable, as the set of products of c conjugates (by elements of the definable group S) of h_i .

The number t is bounded as G ranges through \mathcal{C} . Indeed, there is a definable partial order on S , where $g_1 < g_2$ if and only if $C_S(g_1) < C_S(g_2)$. It is easily seen that with the h_i as above,

$$C_S((h_1, 1, \dots, 1)) > C_S((h_1, h_2, 1, \dots, 1)) > C_S((h_1, h_2, h_3, 1, \dots, 1)) > \dots,$$

so if t is unbounded then \mathcal{C} has an ultraproduct with the strict order property, contrary to Remark 5.3.7.

We shall view the alternating group Alt_n as having Lie rank n . There is a uniform bound on the Lie rank of S as G ranges through \mathcal{C} . This can be seen in many ways, and we do not give full details. For example, consider finite alternating groups. For each n , there is an element $g \in \text{Alt}_n$ which consists of a single cycle of length n or $n - 1$ (according to parity) and at most one fixed point, and it can be seen that $C_{\text{Alt}_n}(g) < C_{\text{Alt}_n}(g^2) < \dots$, so any infinite collection of distinct alternating groups has an ultraproduct with the strict order property, again contradicting Remark 5.3.7. In the case of $\text{PSL}_n(q)$, we may replace this g by the image in $\text{PSL}_n(q)$ of an element of $\text{SL}_n(q)$ with a single large cycle on a basis.

Thus, each S_i is of bounded size or is a simple group of Lie type $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of bounded Lie rank (bounded as G ranges through \mathcal{C}). By results of Ryten (Theorems 5.2.4 and 5.3.3 and Proposition 5.4.6 of [65]), the finite field \mathbb{F}_q is uniformly parameter-interpretable in $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$. By Proposition 4.1.8, an infinite collection of distinct finite fields cannot form a weak m.e.c.. It follows by Theorem 2.5.4(i) that the S_i have bounded size, so $|S|$ is bounded as G ranges through \mathcal{C} .

Finally, for $G \in \mathcal{C}$, G acts on S by conjugation, and since $R(G) = 1$, the kernel of the action is trivial; that is, $C_G(S) = 1$. It follows that $|G| \leq |\text{Aut}(S)|$, so $|G|$ is bounded, as required.

(ii) Following [12, Definition 3] we define $\text{crk}(G)$ to be the conjugacy rank of G ; that is, the number of distinct sizes greater than 1 of conjugacy classes of G . Clearly in a m.e.c. of groups there is a uniform bound on $\text{crk}(G)$ for $G \in \mathcal{C}$. The result now follows immediately from [43, Theorem A]. \square

We conjecture that in the last proposition ‘soluble’ can be replaced by ‘nilpotent of bounded class’. Note that by [43, Theorem A], there is a bound on the Fitting height of $R(G)$ for $G \in \mathcal{C}$.

Remark 4.2.2. In fact Proposition 4.2.1 only requires that \mathcal{C} be a *weak* m.e.c. of finite groups. The only point in the above proof that needs attention is the use of Theorem 2.5.4(i) near the end of the proof of (i). However, Ryten in fact shows that given any family of finite simple groups of fixed Lie type, the corresponding finite fields are uniformly *definable* (in 1-space). The result then follows from Theorem 2.5.4(iii) and Proposition 4.1.8 – note that in our proof above, the move to the quotient modulo $R(G)$ was unnecessary.

For the theorem below, given a ring R let $L_R = (+, -, 0, (f_r)_{r \in R})$ be the usual language for left R -modules, and T_R be the theory of left R -modules. A *positive-primitive* (p.p.) formula is one of the form $\exists \bar{w} \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \psi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{w})$, where the ψ_i are atomic. If M is an R -module and $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is a p.p. formula without parameters, then $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{0})$ defines a subgroup of M^n where $|\bar{x}| = n$, and any formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ defines a coset of it; such a subgroup is called a *p.p. definable subgroup*. Given p.p. formulas $\varphi_1(x)$ and $\varphi_2(x)$, defining subgroups G_1 and G_2 respectively of M , an *invariant sentence* is one expressing, for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$, that $|G_1 : G_1 \cap G_2| \leq t$. The Baur quantifier-elimination theorem for modules asserts that given any L_R -formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ there is an L_R -formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ that is a boolean combination of p.p. formulas and invariant sentences such that $T_R \models \forall \bar{x}(\varphi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}))$.

We thank Charlotte Kestner for a useful discussion leading to the next proof.

Theorem 4.2.3.

- (i) *Let R be a ring and \mathcal{C} be the set of all finite R -modules, in the language of R -modules. Then \mathcal{C} is a m.e.c..*
- (ii) *The collection of all finite abelian groups is a m.e.c..*

Proof. (i) The argument is analogous to those in [45]. As usual, by Theorem 2.4.1, to prove the theorem it suffices to consider formulas $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ where x is a singleton. As noted, such a formula is equivalent in all R -modules to a fixed boolean combination of p.p. formulas and invariant sentences. In a particular model, the invariant sentences are either true or false, and there are finitely many possibilities for the truth values of the sentences, so we may suppose there are no sentences

involved. Hence, since a conjunction of p.p. formulas is a p.p. formula, given any formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ we may suppose that it has the form

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^t (\psi_i(x, \bar{y}) \wedge (\bigwedge_{j=1}^{r_i} \neg\psi_{ij}(x, \bar{y})))$$

where the ψ_i and ψ_{ij} are p.p. We may suppose that the disjuncts define disjoint sets, so the size of any set defined by $\varphi(x, \bar{a})$ is the sum of the sizes of the disjuncts, and hence that there is only one disjunct; that is, φ has the form

$$\psi(x, \bar{y}) \wedge (\bigwedge_{j=1}^r \neg\psi_j(x, \bar{y}))$$

where ψ and the ψ_j are p.p.

Observe first that in a given module M , all sets of the form $\psi(M, \bar{a})$ have the same size, since they are all cosets of the group defined by $\psi(x, \bar{0})$. Furthermore, any conjunction of the form $\psi_{j_1}(M, \bar{a}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_{j_t}(M, \bar{a})$ is either empty or a coset of the p.p.-definable group $\psi_{j_1}(M, \bar{0}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_{j_t}(M, \bar{0})$, so such sets assume at most two sizes (and there is a formula in \bar{y} that determines which size arises uniformly across all R -modules M). Thus, by inclusion–exclusion, the conditions for a m.e.c. hold for formulas of the form $\bigwedge_{j=1}^r \neg\psi_j(x, \bar{y})$, and likewise for formulas

$$\psi(x, \bar{y}) \wedge (\bigwedge_{j=1}^r \neg\psi_j(x, \bar{y})).$$

The result follows (the definability clause for a m.e.c. is easily verified).

(ii) This is immediate from (i). \square

Regarding our question above whether any m.e.c. of groups consists of nilpotent-by-bounded groups, we consider next extraspecial p -groups, noting that these furnish examples of m.e.c.s of nilpotent class 2 groups, and that these classes are not abelian-by-bounded.

Let p be an odd prime. An extraspecial p -group of exponent p is a group G of exponent p such that $G' = Z(G) = \Phi(G) \cong C_p$, and $x^p = 1$ for all $x \in G$; here $\Phi(G)$ denotes the Frattini subgroup of G (the intersection of the maximal subgroups of G). Such an extraspecial group, if finite, has order p^{2n+1} for some n , is determined up to isomorphism by the pair (p, n) , and is a central product of copies of a certain specific group of order p^3 . It is noted in [57, Proposition 3.11] that for fixed p the class of extraspecial p -groups of exponent p forms a 1-dimensional asymptotic class which smoothly approximates a countably infinite extraspecial p -group which was shown to be ω -categorical by Felgner in [27]. In particular, any countably infinite extraspecial p -group of exponent p is ω -categorical, smoothly approximated, and has SU-rank 1. For more on the model theory of extraspecial groups see Milliet [60, Appendix A].

Let $G_{p,n}$ denote the unique extraspecial p -group of order p^{2n+1} (and exponent p). Put

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{ext}} := \{G_{p,n} : p \text{ an odd prime, } n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}\}.$$

Also let c be a constant symbol not in the language L of groups, let $L' = L \cup \{c\}$, and let $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{ext}}$ contain, for each $G \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{ext}}$, an L' -expansion of G with c interpreted by a non-identity element of $Z(G)$. Let L_{bil} be a 2-sorted language with a sort \mathbf{K} carrying the language of rings, a sort \mathbf{V} carrying the language of (additive) groups (for a vector space structure), a map $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ for scalar multiplication, and a binary function symbol $\beta : \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$. Let \mathcal{B} be the collection of 2-sorted finite L_{bil} -structures (V, \mathbb{F}_p) with β interpreted by a symplectic form on V .

Lemma 4.2.4. *The classes $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{ext}}$ and \mathcal{B} are uniformly bi-interpretable.*

Proof. To interpret $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{ext}}$ in \mathcal{B} , following Lemma A.6 of [60], for each $(V, \mathbb{F}_p) \in \mathcal{B}$, define a group G with domain $V \times (\mathbb{F}_p, +)$, with group operation

$$(u, a) * (v, b) = (u + v, a + b + \beta(u, v)).$$

Interpret the constant symbol c by the element $(0, 1)$. Then G is extraspecial, and all members of \mathcal{C}_{ext} arise in this way.

For the other direction, let $G = G_{p,n}$ be finite extraspecial of exponent p , and $(G, c) \in \mathcal{C}'_{\text{ext}}$ be an expansion. Then $V = G/Z(G)$ is an elementary abelian p -group, so can be viewed as a vector space over \mathbb{F}_p . There is an equivalence relation E definable on $V \setminus \{0\}$, where $uEu' \iff C_G(uZ(G)) = C_G(u'Z(G))$. (Here $C_G(uZ(G))$ just means the subgroup of G commuting with all elements of the set $uZ(G)$.) It can be checked that uEu' holds if and only if the 1-spaces $\langle u \rangle$ and $\langle u' \rangle$ are equal, so we recover the domain of the projective space on V as $(V \setminus \{0\})/E$.

We now show that the field structure on $Z(G)$ is uniformly definable over the parameter c naming a generator for $Z(G)$. Indeed, we may identify such a parameter with the element 1 of \mathbb{F}_p . Then, using that we know uniformly the 1-spaces of $V = G/Z(G)$, for $x \in G \setminus Z(G)$ and non-identity $a \in Z(G)$ we can identify ax with the unique x' in the 1-space $\langle x \rangle$ such that $[x', y] = a$ whenever $[x, y] = c$. We may then identify the product ab (for $a, b \in Z(G)$) with the unique d such that $[ax, by] = d[x, y]$ for any $x, y \in G \setminus Z(G)$.

It can be checked that these mutual interpretations in fact give a bi-interpretation. \square

Corollary 4.2.5. *Suppose \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter on \mathcal{C}_{ext} such that for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{G_{p,n} : p > e\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Then an infinite field is definable in the ultraproduct $H = \prod_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{ext}}} G_{p,n}/\mathcal{U}$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the uniform interpretation of \mathcal{B} in $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{ext}}$ and its proof – note that the field lives on the centre of the extraspecial group. \square

Corollary 4.2.6.

- (i) For any odd prime p the set $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ext},p} := \{G_{p,n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{ext}} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a m.e.c..
- (ii) Any subset \mathcal{C}_0 of \mathcal{C}_{ext} which contains groups $G_{p,n}$ for arbitrarily large odd primes p is a m.a.c. but not a weak m.e.c..

Proof. (i) It is noted in the proof of [57, Proposition 3.11] that the class $\mathcal{C}_{\text{ext},p}$ is a sequence smoothly approximating a countably infinite extraspecial p -group. The result now follows from Proposition 4.1.1.

(ii) The automorphism group of $G_{p,n}$ acts transitively on the non-identity elements of $Z(G)$ – see e.g. [72, Theorem 1]. The fact that \mathcal{C}_0 is a m.a.c. now follows from the bi-interpretability in Lemma 4.2.4 together with Theorem 3.3.3 and Theorem 2.5.4, along with Lemma 2.1.5(iii). That \mathcal{C}_0 is not a weak m.e.c. is a consequence of Corollary 4.2.5 in combination with Theorem 2.5.4(iii) and Proposition 4.1.8. \square

Lemma 4.2.7. *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on \mathcal{C}_{ext} . Then the ultraproduct $G := \prod_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{ext}}} G_{p,n} / \mathcal{U}$ has NSOP₁ theory, and has simple theory if and only if there is some $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{G_{p,n} : p > e \wedge n > e\} \notin \mathcal{U}$.*

Proof. By a result of Kestner and Ramsey (personal communication [63]), any ultraproduct (V, K) of members of \mathcal{B} has NSOP₁ theory, so G has NSOP₁ theory by Lemma 4.2.4. If the underlying vector space V has finite dimension then G is interpretable in a pseudofinite field so has simple (in fact supersimple finite rank) theory. Likewise, if V is infinite dimensional and K is finite, then (V, K) (equipped with β) is a smoothly approximable Lie geometry and supersimple of rank 1.

On the other hand, suppose that K is infinite and V is infinite dimensional; this corresponds to the case when for each e we have $\{G_{p,n} : p > e \wedge n > e\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Then the formula $\varphi(x, yz)$ (with x, y ranging through the vector space sort and z through the field sort) which says $[x, y] = z$ has the tree property. Indeed, let $\{f_i : i < \omega\}$ be a linearly independent subset of V with $\beta(f_i, f_j) = 0_K$ for all $i, j \in \omega$, and $\{a_i : i \in \omega\}$ be an infinite subset of K . If $\mu \in \omega^{<\omega}$ has length n , let $b_{\mu i} = (f_n, a_i)$ so $\varphi(x, b_{\mu i})$ asserts $\beta(x, f_n) = a_i$. Then for any $\eta \in \omega^\omega$ the set $\{\varphi(x, b_{\eta i}) : i \in \omega\}$ is consistent, but for any $\mu \in \omega^{<\omega}$, the set $\{\varphi(x, b_{\mu i}) : i \in \omega\}$ is 2-inconsistent. This shows that such (V, K) is not simple. For the corresponding extraspecial groups, the formula $\psi(x, yz)$ which says $x^{-1}y^{-1}xy = z$ has the tree property for essentially the same reasons. \square

We conclude this subsection by examining a particular case of Theorem 4.2.3, namely the class \mathcal{C}_{hom} of all finite homocyclic groups; that is, groups

$(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^m$ as p ranges through primes and n, m through positive integers. For this class, the precise functions giving cardinalities of definable sets were calculated in [30]. For nonnegative integers d, k , let $S(d, k)$ be the set of functions of the form $P(X, u, v) = \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{j=-kd}^{kd} c_{ij} X^{u(iv+j)}$, where $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$ and $-kd \leq j \leq kd$. By Szmielew's Theorem (see [36, Theorem A.2.2]), modulo the theory of abelian groups, every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is equivalent to a Boolean combination of formulas of the form $t(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$ or $p^l | t(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, where t is a term in the language of groups and p is prime. We say that such a Boolean combination is in *standard form*.

Proposition 4.2.8 (Proposition 4.4 of [30]). *Let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a formula in the language of groups in standard form. Let d be the greatest integer l such that for some prime p , either some subformula $p^l | t(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ occurs in φ or some term $t(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ occurring in φ has a coefficient divisible by p^l . Then*

- (i) *There is a finite subset $F = F(\varphi)$ of $S(d, r)$ (where $r = |\bar{x}|$) such that for each $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^m \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\bar{a} \in G^s$, there is $P(X, u, v) = \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{j=-kd}^{kd} c_{ij} X^{u(iv+j)} \in F$ with $c_{ij} = 0$ whenever $in + j < 0$, such that $|\varphi(G^r, \bar{a})| = P(p, m, n)$.*
- (ii) *For each such function $P \in F$ there is a formula φ_P such that for each $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^m \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\bar{a} \in G^s$ we have $G \models \varphi_P(\bar{a})$ if and only if $|\varphi(G^r, \bar{a})| = P(p, m, n)$.*

For the class \mathcal{C}_{hom} it is interesting to consider the model theory of different ultraproducts. Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on the set $J := \{(p, n, m) : p \text{ prime}, n, m \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}\}$. We say that p, n are *unbounded* on the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} if for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $U_d \in \mathcal{U}$ such that if $(p, n, m) \in U_d$ then $p, n > d$; similarly for other subsets of the three coordinates. Note that if p is unbounded and n is unbounded then p, n are (together) unbounded. A variable is *bounded* if it is not unbounded.

Proposition 4.2.9. *Let \mathcal{U} be a non-principal ultrafilter on J and $G_{\mathcal{U}} := \prod \mathcal{C}_{\text{hom}}/\mathcal{U}$.*

- (i) *If p, n are bounded on \mathcal{U} but m is unbounded, then $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ has ω -categorical, ω -stable and smoothly approximable theory.*
- (ii) *If p is bounded but n, m are unbounded on \mathcal{U} then $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is stable unsuperstable.*
- (iii) *If p, m are bounded but n unbounded on \mathcal{U} then $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is superstable but not ω -stable.*
- (iv) *If p is unbounded but n, m are bounded on \mathcal{U} then $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is ω -stable.*
- (v) *If p, m are unbounded but n is bounded then $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is ω -stable.*

We omit the proof, which is elementary.

4.3. Other examples of m.e.c.s. We thank Dario García for drawing our attention to the following example.

Theorem 4.3.1. *Let M be a pseudofinite strongly minimal set. Then there is a m.e.c. whose ultraproducts are all elementarily equivalent to M . Furthermore, for each formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ the functions $h_\varphi(\bar{y})$ in the definition of m.e.c. are polynomials over \mathbb{Z} in the cardinality of the finite structure, whose degree is exactly the Morley rank of the corresponding set in the ultraproduct.*

Proof. This is immediate from [62, Theorem 1.1], though the latter is formulated in terms of non-standard cardinalities. \square

The following result of van Abel builds on Theorem 4.3.1, exploiting the way any uncountably categorical structure is controlled by a strongly minimal set. Note that a version of this for totally categorical structures is already implied by Proposition 4.1.1 and Theorem 4.1.2 above (using the fact that totally categorical structures are smoothly approximated, by [16, Corollary 7.4]).

Theorem 4.3.2 (Proposition 5.5 of van Abel [1]). *Let T be a pseudofinite uncountably categorical theory and let \mathcal{C} be a class of finite structures all of whose non-principal ultraproducts satisfies T . Then \mathcal{C} is a polynomial m.e.c..*

Proof. The term ‘polynomial m.e.c.’ is not used in [1], so some elucidation is needed. The essential point is that, working in models of T , if $\theta(x, \bar{d})$ defines a strongly minimal set for every \bar{d} realising the isolated type $q(\bar{y})$, then in members of \mathcal{C} the formula $\theta(x, \bar{y})$ is exactly balanced in the sense of Definition 2.2.2. This holds essentially by [1, Corollary 5.8]. \square

Fix a finite relational language L . If d is a positive integer, M is an L -structure and $a \in M$, we say that a has *degree* d if there are d pairs (R, \bar{a}) where \bar{a} is a tuple of M containing a , R is a relation symbol of L , and $M \models R\bar{a}$. We say that the L -structure M has degree at most d if all elements of M have degree at most d . Let $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{gaif}}$ be the collection of finite L -structures of degree at most d .

Theorem 4.3.3. *The class $\mathcal{C}_d^{\text{gaif}}$ is a m.e.c..*

Proof. We only sketch the proof. The basic idea is to use the Gaifman Locality Theorem from [29], which we briefly describe. See also [23, Section 2.5].

We first introduce some standard notation. The *Gaifman graph* $G(M)$ of M is the simple graph with vertex set M , with two vertices adjacent if and only if there is a tuple containing both of them and satisfying a relation (so the degree of an element of M is bounded in terms of its degree as a vertex of $G(M)$). If $a, b \in M$, then the *distance* $d(a, b)$ is the length of a shortest path in M with endpoints a, b . For each $a \in M$ and $e \in \mathbb{N}$, define the *sphere of radius e around a* to be

$$S_e(a) := \{x \in M : d(a, x) \leq e\}.$$

There is a finite set $\psi_{e,1}^d(x), \dots, \psi_{e,n_e}^d(x)$ of quantifier-free L -formulas such that if M is an L -structure of degree at most d , and $a \in M$, then for some i the sentence $\psi_{e,i}^d(a)$ describes the atomic diagram of the $L(a)$ -structure $(S_e(a), a)$.

If M is an L -structure, $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in M^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S_k(\bar{a}) := S_k(a_1) \cup \dots \cup S_k(a_n)$. For each L -formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a formula $\varphi^{S_k}(\bar{x})$, called a *local formula*, such that for each L -structure M and $\bar{a} \in M^n$,

$$M \models \varphi^{S_k}(\bar{a}) \text{ if and only if } S_k(\bar{a}) \models \varphi(\bar{a}).$$

The formula $\varphi^{S_k}(\bar{x})$ is obtained from $\varphi(\bar{x})$ by relativising all quantifiers to $S_k(\bar{x})$. A *basic local sentence* has the form

$$\exists x_1 \cdots \exists x_m \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} d(x_i, x_j) > 2r \wedge \varphi^{S_r}(x_i).$$

Gaifman's Locality Theorem asserts that every first order L -sentence is logically equivalent to a boolean combination of basic local sentences, and that every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is logically equivalent to a boolean combination of local formulas and basic local sentences. As with the proof of Theorem 4.2.3, the proof now reduces to handling formulas $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ which are conjunctions of local formulas.

We may suppose that such a formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ has the form $\sigma(x) \wedge \tau(x, \bar{y})$, where $\sigma(x)$ is a local formula (so a partial description of a radius r neighbourhood of x) and for $\tau(x, \bar{y})$ there is $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $M \in \mathcal{C}_d$ and $\bar{a} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}$, either $|\tau(M, \bar{a})| \leq e$ or $|M \setminus \tau(M, \bar{a})| \leq e$. Clearly at most e sizes of sets $\varphi(M, \bar{a})$ arise from \bar{a} such that $|\tau(M, \bar{a})| \leq e$. Likewise, at most e sizes of $\varphi(M, \bar{a})$ arise from \bar{a} with $|M \setminus \tau(M, \bar{a})| \leq e$. This gives the bound on the number of possible sizes, and the definability clause follows similarly. \square

5. GENERALISED MEASURABLE STRUCTURES

In this and the next section we shift our focus to infinite structures, in particular to ultraproducts of m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s.

In [57] the notion of a measurable structure was introduced. A structure M is *measurable*² if there is a function $h = (\dim, \text{meas}) : \text{Def}(M) \rightarrow (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^{>0}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ such that the following hold:

- (i) If $X \in \text{Def}(M)$ is finite then $h(X) = (0, |X|)$.
- (ii) For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ there is a finite set $D_\varphi \subseteq (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^{>0}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ such that
 - (a) for all $\bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{y}|}$, $h(\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})) \in D_\varphi$, and

²Some authors have renamed this *MS-measurable* to avoid conflict with other definitions of measurability. The definitions in [57] and [24] have an additional clause built in to ensure supersimplicity, but it is shown in [25] that this clause is unnecessary.

- (b) for all $(d, \mu) \in D_\varphi$, the set $\{\bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{y}|} : h(\varphi(M^{|\bar{x}|}; \bar{b})) = (d, \mu)\}$ is \emptyset -definable.
- (iii) Let $X, Y \in \text{Def}(M)$ and let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a definable surjection. As guaranteed by (ii), there is a positive integer r and $(d_1, \mu_1), \dots, (d_r, \mu_r) \in (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^{>0}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ such that if $Y_i := \{\bar{b} \in M^{|\bar{y}|} : h(f^{-1}(\bar{b})) = (d_i, \mu_i)\}$, then $Y = Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_r$ is a partition of Y into non-empty disjoint \emptyset -definable sets. Let $h(Y_i) = (e_i, \nu_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, and let $c := \max\{d_1 + e_1, \dots, d_r + e_r\}$, where we suppose that this maximum is attained by the values $d_1 + e_1, \dots, d_s + e_s$. Then $h(X) = (c, \mu_1 \nu_1 + \dots + \mu_s \nu_s)$.

The intuition is that ‘meas’ is a measure and ‘dim’ is a dimension, so the function h combines measure and dimension into one. As noted in the introduction, any infinite ultraproduct of an asymptotic class is measurable by [57, Lemma 5.4].

In this section we extend this idea by allowing functions h that can take values in more general algebraic structures; however we keep the intuition that h combines measure and dimension into one.

5.1. Measuring semirings. The definition of ‘measurable’, above, makes implicit use of a natural algebraic structure on the codomain $(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^{>0}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ of the measuring function.

Example 5.1.1. We note that $(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^{>0}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ admits natural addition and multiplication, as well as a compatible ordering. The multiplication and ordering are clear: There is an associative multiplication $(d_1, \mu_1) \cdot (d_2, \mu_2) = (d_1 + d_2, \mu_1 \mu_2)$, with identity $(0, 1)$, and there is a total ordering given by the lexicographic product of the usual orders on \mathbb{N} and $\mathbb{R}^{>0}$, with $(0, 0)$ the smallest element. Addition is a little less obvious:

$$(d, r) + (e, s) = \begin{cases} (d, r + s) & \text{if } d = e \\ (d, r) & \text{if } d > e \\ (e, s) & \text{if } d < e. \end{cases}$$

This defines an associative addition for which $(0, 0)$ is the identity element and over which the multiplication distributes. Moreover, both addition and multiplication are compatible with the ordering in the usual sense. Writing each pair (d, μ) as μZ^d , where Z is a new indeterminate, we may identify $(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^{>0}) \cup \{(0, 0)\}$ with the *real monomial semiring* $\mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$ which is the set $\{\mu Z^d \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, d \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0Z^0\}$ equipped with ‘max-plus’ addition, standard multiplication, and the total ordering given by

$$\mu_1 Z^{d_1} < \mu_2 Z^{d_2} \iff d_1 < d_2 \text{ or } d_1 = d_2 \text{ and } \mu_1 < \mu_2.$$

Note that \mathbb{N} embeds into $\mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$ via the identification of n with nZ^0 . This is an example of a more general class of ‘monomial semirings’ that will be defined in Example 5.1.13.

Following this example we give the next definition (there will be variants in the literature).

Definition 5.1.2. We say that $S = (S, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <)$ is an *ordered semiring* if:

- (OS1) $(S, +, 0)$ and $(S, \cdot, 1)$ are commutative monoids,
- (OS2) \cdot distributes over $+$,
- (OS3) $(S, <, 0)$ is a totally ordered set with least element 0,
- (OS4) $\forall x, y, z (x \leq y \rightarrow x + z \leq y + z)$,
- (OS5) $\forall x, y, z (x \leq y \rightarrow x \cdot z \leq y \cdot z)$,
- (OS6) $\forall x (0 \cdot x = x \cdot 0 = 0)$, and
- (OS7) $\forall x \forall y ((0 < x \wedge 0 < y) \rightarrow 0 < xy)$.
- (OS8) $0 \neq 1$.

For $x \in S$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ we write nx as an abbreviation for $x + \dots + x$ (n times). We say that $a, b \in S$ are *of equal magnitude*, and write $a \sim b$, if $a \leq b \leq n \cdot a$ or $b \leq a \leq n \cdot b$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$. Observe that \sim is an equivalence relation and that \sim -classes on S are convex. The quotient $D := S/\sim$ admits an ordering, induced by $<$, with respect to which the minimum element is the \sim -class of 0, which is usually denoted $-\infty$. We will denote the quotient map by $d: S \rightarrow D$, and for $x \in S$ write $[x]_\sim$ for $d(x) \in D$. We call d the *S-dimension*, or just *dimension* when there is no ambiguity, and remark that d is (weakly) monotone with respect to the orderings on S and D .

There are many familiar examples of ordered semirings. The real monomial semiring, as defined above, is an ordered semiring. Moreover, if R is any totally ordered ring, then the non-negative cone in R , which we denote by $R^{\geq 0}$, is naturally an ordered semiring.

An arbitrary ordered semiring can be relatively wild. For example it is possible that $x + x = x$ for some $x > 0$. To see this, consider a totally ordered abelian group $(\Gamma \cup \{\infty\}, +, 0, \leq)$ with additional element ∞ satisfying $\infty + a = a + \infty = \infty$ for all a , as in valuation theory. Then $(\Gamma_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}, \min, +, \infty, 0, >)$ is an ordered semiring, where $\Gamma_{\geq 0} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma \geq 0\}$, and yet $\infty + \infty = \infty > 0$.

Our intention is to end up with an algebraic structure in which a ‘generalised measure’ may take its values. With this in mind, we wish to exclude some very wild behaviour while allowing enough freedom. Suppose that Y and Z are sets of equal ‘high dimension’, that X is a set of ‘low dimension’, and that X, Y, Z are pairwise disjoint. We wish to allow – but not impose – that the (generalised) measure of $X \cup Y$ is equal to the measure of Y . On the other hand, we want to forbid that the measure of $X \cup Z$ is equal to the measure of $Y \cup Z$. These considerations motivate the following axiom.

Definition 5.1.3. An ordered semiring S with dimension $d: S \rightarrow D$ is a *measuring semiring* if:

(MS) $\forall x, y, z \in S \left((x < y \wedge d(y) = d(z)) \rightarrow x + z < y + z \right)$.

Later in Theorem 5.1.14 we will show that we can always work with measuring semirings that abstractly have the monomial structure that will be introduced in Example 5.1.13.

This axiom **(MS)** is implied by additive cancellation (i.e. $x + z = y + z \implies x = y$). In fact it is strictly weaker than additive cancellation as demonstrated by the following example.

Example 5.1.4. The real monomial semiring $\mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$, defined in Example 5.1.1, is an ordered semiring, but is not cancellative as $Z + Z^3 = Z^3 = Z^2 + Z^3$ but $Z \neq Z^2$. Nevertheless, $\mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$ is a measuring semiring. To see this we note that $d(\sum_{i \leq m} a_i Z^i) = m$ if $a_m \neq 0$. Then $\sum_{i \leq m} a_i Z^i < \sum_{j \leq n} b_j Z^j$ (where $a_m \neq 0 \neq b_n$) implies that $m < n$ or ($m = n$ and $a_m < b_n$).

Lemma 5.1.5. *Let S be a measuring semiring, $x, y \in S$, and $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Then:*

- (i) $x < y \iff nx < ny$,
- (ii) $x \leq y \iff nx \leq ny$, and
- (iii) if $0 < x$ and $0 < n < m$, then $nx < mx$.

Proof. The direction \implies of (ii) is a straightforward induction using **(OS4)**. For \implies of (i), we suppose $x < y$. Note that $d(y) = d(ny)$ for all $n > 0$. By **(OS4)** and **(MS)**, if $nx < ny$ for some $n > 0$, then $nx + x \leq nx + y < ny + y$, which gives $(n+1)x < (n+1)y$, proving the implication \implies of (i) by induction. The converse implications of both (i) and (ii) now follow. For (iii), by **(MS)** we have $nx < nx + (m-n)x$. \square

Proposition 5.1.6. *Let S be a measuring semiring. Then*

$$n \mapsto n \cdot 1$$

is an embedding of ordered semirings

$$(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <) \rightarrow (S, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <).$$

Proof. All that is required to prove is that the map is injective. First note that $0 < 1$ by **(OS3)** and **(OS8)**, and then **(MS)** yields $0 < 1 < 1 + 1 < 1 + 1 + 1 < \dots$ \square

Let $S = (S, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <)$ be a measuring semiring. As noted above, \sim is an equivalence relation with convex equivalence classes. Moreover, \sim respects addition and multiplication:

$$x \sim y \implies x + z \sim y + z$$

$$x \sim y \implies x \cdot z \sim y \cdot z,$$

for all $x, y, z \in S$.

Lemma 5.1.7 (‘Rough cancellation’). *Let $(S, +, \cdot, 0, 1, <)$ be a measuring semiring and $x, y, z \in S$ with $0 < x$. If $x \cdot y \sim x \cdot z$, then $y \sim z$.*

Proof. We may assume $y, z \neq 0$. Indeed, if both are 0, then $y \sim z$, while the assumptions $0 < x$ and $x \cdot y \sim x \cdot z$ are incompatible with just one of y, z being 0. Now, for the contrapositive we suppose without loss that $ny \leq z$ for all n . Then $n(x \cdot y) \leq x \cdot z$ for all n . It cannot happen that $n(x \cdot y) = x \cdot z$ for some n ; indeed, as $0 < x \cdot y$ (by **(OS7)**, since $0 < x$ and $0 < y$) we have $2n(x \cdot y) > n(x \cdot y)$ by Lemma 5.1.5(iii), so $n(x \cdot y) = x \cdot z$ would imply $2n(x \cdot y) > x \cdot z$, a contradiction. Thus $n(x \cdot y) < x \cdot z$ for all n , so $x \cdot y \approx x \cdot z$. \square

The quotient $D = S/\sim$ admits induced addition and multiplication. The induced addition is in fact max: If $x \leq y$, then

$$y \leq x + y \leq 2y$$

and so $y \sim x + y$. Thus the quotient has the form

$$D = (D, \max, \oplus, -\infty, 0_D, <),$$

where $0_D = [1]_\sim$. Note that $-\infty \oplus [x]_\sim = -\infty$ and $0_D \oplus [x]_\sim = [x]_\sim$ for all $x \in S$.

Lemma 5.1.8. (i) *The operation \oplus in D is cancellative.*
(ii) *The monoid $(D, \oplus, <)$ embeds in an ordered abelian group $(\hat{D}, \oplus, <)$.*

Proof.

- (i) This follows from the ‘rough cancellativity’ of multiplication in S . If $[x]_\sim \oplus [y]_\sim = [x]_\sim \oplus [z]_\sim$ and $[x]_\sim \neq -\infty$, then $x \cdot y \sim x \cdot z$ and $y \sim z$ by Lemma 5.1.7, i.e. $[y]_\sim = [z]_\sim$.
- (ii) Note that \oplus is commutative since $+$ is. We put $\hat{D} = D \times D/\equiv$, where $(a, b) \equiv (a', b')$ if and only if $a \oplus b' = a' \oplus b$. It is routine to extend \oplus and $<$ to \hat{D} . \square

5.1.1. *The Divisible hull.* Here we construct the divisible hull, which will be something like the ‘ordered semiring tensor product with $\mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$ ’.

Definition 5.1.9. Let S^{div} be the quotient of $\mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0} \times S$ by the equivalence relation $=^{\text{div}}$ defined by

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}, r\right) =^{\text{div}} \left(\frac{c}{d}, s\right) \text{ iff } dar = bcs.$$

By an abuse of notation we let $\left(\frac{a}{b}, r\right)$ denote its $=^{\text{div}}$ -equivalence class. We define addition $+^{\text{div}}$ by

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}, r\right) +^{\text{div}} \left(\frac{c}{d}, s\right) := \left(\frac{1}{bd}, dar + bcs\right),$$

multiplication \cdot^{div} by

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}, r\right) \cdot^{\text{div}} \left(\frac{c}{d}, s\right) := \left(\frac{ac}{bd}, r \cdot s\right),$$

and the ordering \leq^{div} by

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}, r\right) \leq^{\text{div}} \left(\frac{c}{d}, s\right) \text{ iff } dar \leq bcs.$$

Finally, let $0^{\text{div}} := (0, 0)$ and $1^{\text{div}} := (1, 1)$. By another abuse of notation we write $S^{\text{div}} := (S^{\text{div}}, +^{\text{div}}, \cdot^{\text{div}}, 0^{\text{div}}, 1^{\text{div}}, \leq^{\text{div}})$.

Observe that, by Lemma 5.1.5(i), for all $c, d \in S$, $c < d$ implies $(1/n, c) < (1/n, d)$.

Lemma 5.1.10. *Let S be a measuring semiring. Then the operations on S^{div} given above in Definition 5.1.9 are well-defined, and S^{div} is a measuring semiring. The map $s \mapsto (1, s)$ gives an embedding of ordered semirings $S \rightarrow S^{\text{div}}$.*

Proof. The proof that the operations are well-defined is straightforward and is left as an exercise. As one case, to see that \leq^{div} is well-defined, suppose that $dar \leq bcs$ and $(\frac{a}{b}, r) =^{\text{div}} (\frac{a'}{b'}, r')$. We must check that $da'r' \leq b'cs$, so suppose $da'r' > b'cs$. Multiplying by ab using Lemma 5.1.5 (i) we obtain $da'r'ab > b'csab$. Hence, as $b'ar = ba'r'$ we have $darab' > b'csab$, so $dar > bcs$ by 5.1.5(i), a contradiction. To show that S^{div} satisfies **(MS)**, one simply unpacks the definitions and applies that S satisfies **(MS)**. Details are left to the reader. \square

Convention. In view of this lemma, we shall from now on replace S by its divisible hull S^{div} ; that is, we assume that S is divisible in the sense that for all $s \in S$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$ there is a well-defined element qs of S . Observe that if $s \in S$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$, then $s \sim qs$.

5.1.2. *The standard part image of S .* If two elements of a measuring semiring S have the same S -dimension, then we can compare them more finely.

Definition 5.1.11. Let S be a measuring semiring, and let $x, y \in S$. We write $x \approx y$ if $x \sim y$ and for all $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{>1}$ we have $x \leq qy$ and $y \leq qx$.

It is apparent that $x \approx y$ is an equivalence relation refining \sim , and we denote the quotient of S by \approx by S^{st} .

Lemma 5.1.12. *Let S be a measuring semiring and $x, y, z \in S$. If $z \neq 0$ and $xz \approx yz$ then $x \approx y$.*

Proof. We may suppose $x \neq 0$, since otherwise $yz = 0$, hence $y = 0$ by Definition 5.1.2(**OS7**), and thus $x \approx y$. Suppose for a contradiction that there is $q = \frac{m}{n} > 1$ with $qx < y$. Then $qyz \leq yz$. Since $0 < xz$ by

(OS7), we have $(2m - 1)xz < 2mxz$ by Lemma 5.1.5(iii) — note that this uses the Measuring Axiom (MS). Then $(2m - 1)xz < 2mxz \leq 2nyz$. Write $r := \frac{2m-1}{2n}$. By Lemma 5.1.5 we obtain $rxz < yz$. As $r > 1$, this contradicts $xz \approx yz$. \square

Let $a \in S$. We define the function

$$\rho_a: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$$

by

$$x \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d(x) < d(a) \\ r & \text{if } d(x) = d(a), \text{ where } r := \sup\{q \in \mathbb{Q} : qa \leq x\} \\ \infty & \text{if } d(x) > d(a). \end{cases}$$

Example 5.1.13. Using the functions ρ_a and sacrificing some information, we can work with a measuring semiring in a canonical form. With S and its quotient $D = S/\sim$ as above, and Z as an indeterminate, we form another measuring semiring $P = (\mathbb{R}\langle Z^D \rangle, \boxplus, \boxminus, 0, 1, <)$, where $\mathbb{R}\langle Z^D \rangle = \{rZ^d \mid r \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, d \in D\} \cup \{0Z^0\}$ and $n := nZ^0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which we equip with ‘max-plus’ addition and the standard multiplication:

$$r_1Z^{d_1} \boxplus r_2Z^{d_2} := \begin{cases} (r_1 + r_2)Z^{d_1} & d_1 = d_2 \\ r_1Z^{d_1} & d_1 > d_2 \\ r_2Z^{d_2} & d_1 < d_2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$r_1Z^{d_1} \boxminus r_2Z^{d_2} := r_1r_2Z^{d_1 \oplus d_2}.$$

We put $r_1Z^{d_1} < r_2Z^{d_2} \iff (d_1, r_1) < (d_2, r_2)$ lexicographically. The measuring semiring axiom (MS) is easily verified. Again, there is a quotient map $d_P: P \rightarrow D$, with $d_P(rZ^d) = d$. We call a measuring semiring of the form P a *monomial semiring*.

Theorem 5.1.14. *There is a semiring homomorphism $\varphi: S \rightarrow P$ such that $d = d_P \circ \varphi$, with the property that for $x, y \in S$, $x \approx y$ if and only if $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y)$.*

Proof. In the argument below we sometimes write $ra \approx r'a'$, where $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a, a' \in S$. This is an abbreviation for the statement

$$(\forall q, q' \in \mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}) [((q < r \wedge r' < q') \rightarrow qa < q'a') \wedge ((q' < r' \wedge r < q) \rightarrow q'a' < qa)].$$

We define φ by transfinite induction. For a subsemiring A of S write d_A for the restriction of d to A . Suppose A is a subsemiring of S and $\varphi_A: A \rightarrow P$ is a homomorphism satisfying $d_A = d_P \circ \varphi_A$, with the property that for all $a, a' \in A$, $a \approx a'$ if and only if $\varphi(a) = \varphi(a')$. We write $\varphi_A(a) = m(a)Z^{d(a)}$ for each $a \in A$. We may extend φ_A to the divisible hull of A in S by putting $\varphi_A(qa) = q\varphi_A(a)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$ and $a \in A$; that is, we may suppose that A is divisible.

Let $x \in S \setminus A$, and let B be the subsemiring generated by $A \cup \{x\}$. For the inductive step we must show that φ_A extends to $\varphi_B: B \rightarrow P$, with $d_B = d_P \circ \varphi_B$ and the \approx -condition preserved. Elements of B have the form $p(x)$, where $p(X) \in A[X]$. Let $d_0 = d(x)$. We will put $\varphi_B(x) = rZ^{d_0}$ for some $r \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. The map φ_B will then extend to the required homomorphism on B , provided r can be found satisfying certain constraints. These constraints arise through equations of the form $p(x) = q(x)$ holding in B , where $p(X), q(X) \in A[X]$.

Let $p(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i X^i$ and $q(X) = \sum_{i=1}^l b_i X^i$, and let $p(x) = q(x)$ be such a constraint. By dropping lower dimension terms, we may replace $p(x) = q(x)$ by $p(x) \approx q(x)$ and assume that all monomials in $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ are either 0 or of the same dimension e . Furthermore, by cancelling powers of x using Lemma 5.1.12, we may assume that the constant term of p or q , say the constant term a_0 of p , is nonzero. Thus $\rho_{a_0}(c)$ is a positive real number for each $c \in S$ with $d(c) = d(a_0) = e$. Hence, for each non-zero term of form $a_i x^i$ of $p(x)$ we have an equivalence $a_i x^i \approx \mu_i a_0$ for some $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\rho_{a_0}(a_i x^i) = \mu_i$. Similarly for each non-zero term $b_j x^j$ we obtain the equivalence $b_j x^j \approx \nu_j a_0$.

An equivalence such as $a_i x^i \approx \mu_i a_0$ will force $m(x)$ to be defined so that $m(a_i) m(x)^i = \mu_i m(a_0)$. We have to show that two such equivalences, possibly coming from polynomial equations in different dimensions, do not impose conflicting constraints on $m(x)$. So suppose we have two such constraints

$$(23) \quad a_i x^i \approx \mu_i a_0$$

$$(24) \quad d_j x^j \approx \xi_j c_0$$

where $a_i, d_j, a_0, c_0 \in A$ and $\mu_i, \xi_j \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. Taking the j^{th} power of both sides of (23) and the i^{th} power of both sides of (24), and multiplying the first equation by d_j^i and the second by a_i^j , we obtain

$$(25) \quad d_j^i a_i^j x^{ij} \approx \mu_i^j a_0^j d_j^i$$

and

$$(26) \quad a_i^j d_j^i x^{ij} \approx \xi_j^i c_0^i a_i^j.$$

Thus

$$(27) \quad \mu_i^j a_0^j d_j^i \approx \xi_j^i c_0^i a_i^j.$$

Since $a_0, a_i, c_0, d_j \in A$, it follows by the inductive hypothesis that

$$(28) \quad \mu_i^j m(a_0)^j m(d_j)^i = \xi_j^i m(c_0)^i m(a_i)^j.$$

We aim to extend m to B so that $m(x)$ is a solution to all equations of the form $m(a_i) X^i = \mu_i m(a_0)$. Since the coefficients are positive real numbers, each such equation has a unique positive real solution. The problem is to check that two such equations are consistent, and this reduces to showing that the equations $m(a_i) X^i = \mu_i m(a_0)$ and

$m(d_j)X^j = \xi_j m(c_0)$ have a simultaneous positive real solution. This is equivalent to the following equation in \mathbb{R} holding, which is itself equivalent to (28):

$$\left(\frac{\mu_i m(a_0)}{m(a_i)}\right)^{1/i} = \left(\frac{\xi_j m(c_0)}{m(d_j)}\right)^{1/j}.$$

Thus, there is no inconsistency. The final assertion follows from the construction of φ given above. \square

5.2. S -measurable structures.

Definition 5.2.1. Let S be a measuring semiring and let M be an L -structure. We say that M is S -measurable if there is a function $h : \text{Def}(M) \rightarrow S$ such that

- (i) (**finite sets**) $h(X) = |X|$ for finite X ;
- (ii) (**finite additivity**) h is finitely additive, that is, if $X, Y \in \text{Def}(M)$ are disjoint then $h(X \cup Y) = h(X) + h(Y)$;
- (iii) (**m.a.c. condition**) for each \emptyset -definable family \mathcal{X} there exists a finite set $F \subseteq S$ such that $h(\mathcal{X}) = F$ and for each $f \in F$, $h^{-1}(\{f\})$ is a \emptyset -definable family; and
- (iv) (**Fubini**) suppose that $p: X \rightarrow Y$ is a definable function for which there exists $f \in S$ such that for all $a \in Y$, $h(p^{-1}(\{a\})) = f$; then we have $h(X) = f \cdot h(Y)$.

We refer to h as a *generalised measure*. Also, when S is clear from the context, we just say that M is *generalised measurable*. By an abuse of notation, we also use d to denote the composition $d \circ h : \text{Def}(M) \rightarrow D$.

As with MS-measurability, the above definition also has content if, in (iii), we drop the definability assumption that each $h^{-1}(\{f\})$ is an \emptyset -definable family; without this assumption we say that M is *weakly S -measurable*.

We say that M is S -ring-measurable, or just *ring-measurable*, if there is a commutative ordered unital ring S such that M is $S^{\geq 0}$ -measurable.

We assemble some simple facts about generalized measurability.

Proposition 5.2.2. *Let M be S -measurable with set D of dimensions.*

- (i) *Any expansion of M by constants is S -measurable.*
- (ii) *The generalised measure is monotonic, i.e. for all definable $A \subseteq B$ we have $h(A) \leq h(B)$.*
- (iii) *Definable bijections preserve h .*
- (iv) *Let $A := \prod_{i=1}^n B_i$ be a cartesian product of definable sets. Then $h(A) = \prod_{i=1}^n h(B_i)$.*
- (v) *M is S' -measurable, where S' is the monomial semiring $\mathbb{R}\langle Z^D \rangle$.*
- (vi) *If $D = \mathbb{N}$, then M is measurable, i.e. is MS-measurable.*

Proof. Part (i) is an easy analogue of Lemma 2.1.5. For (ii), let $C := B \setminus A$. Then $h(B) = h(A) + h(C) \geq h(A)$. Assertion (iii) is trivial

using Definition 5.2.1(iv), and (iv) follows from Definition 5.2.1(iv) by induction. Part (v) is a consequence of Theorem 5.1.14. Finally, to see (vi), observe that if $D = \mathbb{N}$ then by Theorem 5.1.14 we may suppose that $S = \mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$, and the result then follows from the definitions. \square

Proposition 5.2.3. *Suppose that S is a measuring semiring, M is S -measurable with generalised measure h^M , and $N \equiv M$. Then N is S -measurable.*

Proof. We define a generalised measure h^N for N . Let χ^N be a definable family of sets in N determined by the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, and let χ^M be the corresponding definable family in M . Let $h^M(\chi^M) = F \subset S$, and for each $f \in F$ let $d\varphi_f(\bar{y})$ be the formula defining those \bar{a} such that $h^M(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})) = f$, as guaranteed by Definition 5.2.1 (iii). Since F is finite, for each $\bar{a} \in N^{|\bar{y}|}$ it follows that $d\varphi_f(\bar{a})$ holds for exactly one $f \in F$, and for this f we may put $h^N(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})) = f$. It is easily checked that this is well-defined – i.e. independent of the choice of formula defining χ – and that h^N satisfies Definition 5.2.1. \square

Remark 5.2.4. The use of the finiteness of F in Definition 5.2.1(iii) in the proof of Proposition 5.2.3 is, by compactness, essential. The result justifies the following definition.

Definition 5.2.5. If T is a complete theory and S is a measuring semiring, we say that T is S -measurable if some model of T is S -measurable.

Proposition 5.2.6. *Let M be S -measurable, let $D = d(S)$ and let \hat{D} be the corresponding ordered abelian group as in Lemma 5.1.8. Then $\text{Th}(M)$ is dimensional in the sense of [70], dimensions taking values in \hat{D} .*

Proof. We must extend the dimension function on $\text{Def}(M)$ to the family $\text{Int}(M)$ of interpretable sets. Suppose X is a definable set with $d(X) = e$, and E is a definable equivalence relation on X . Since the E -classes are uniformly definable via the formula Exy they take finitely many dimensions f_1, \dots, f_r , with the union S_i of the E -classes of dimension f_i having dimension g_i , say. We extend h to $\text{Int}(M)$ by putting $h(S_i/E) = g_i - f_i \in \hat{D}$ and $h(S/E) = \text{Max}\{g_i - f_i : 1 \leq i \leq r\}$. It is routine to check that the dimension so defined satisfies Definition 1.1 of [70]. \square

In fact, the above proof, in combination with Theorem 5.1.14, yields that generalised measurability extends to M^{eq} .

Proposition 5.2.7. *Let M be generalised measurable. Then M^{eq} is generalised measurable.*

Proof. Using Theorem 5.1.14 and Lemma 5.1.12 we may suppose that M is S -measurable, where S is a monomial semiring $S = \mathbb{R}\langle Z^D \rangle$ with D an ordered abelian group. We extend the map h in Definition 5.2.1 to interpretable sets. The key idea is that if X is a definable set and

E is a definable equivalence relation on X such that $h(X) = sZ^e$ and $h(C) = rZ^d$ for each E -class C , then we put $h(X/E) = \frac{s}{r}Z^{e-d}$. We leave the reader to verify the details. \square

The following observation connects to Theorem 4.3.1 above.

Proposition 5.2.8. *Let M be a generalised measurable strongly minimal set. Then M is measurable, i.e. is MS-measurable.*

Proof. We may suppose that M is S -measurable with generalised measure h , where $S = \mathbb{R}\langle Z^D \rangle$ for some divisible ordered abelian group D . We now apply Lemma 2.3 of [44] and its proof. Indeed, by the proof of that lemma which works equally well for generalised measurability, if $d(M) = t$, then for any definable $X \subset M^n$ we have $d(X) = t \cdot \text{RM}(X)$. It follows that we may replace the measuring function h by h' taking values in $\mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$, putting $h'(X) = \mu Z^{\text{RM}(X)}$ whenever $h(X) = \mu Z^{t \cdot \text{RM}(X)}$ – the axioms of generalised measurability still apply. Now apply Proposition 5.2.2(vi). \square

5.3. Ultraproducts of m.a.c.s. We show that ultraproducts of m.a.c.s are generalized measurable.

Theorem 5.3.1. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{M_i : i \in I\}$ be an R -m.a.c., where R is a set of functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. Assume that \mathcal{C} contains only finitely many structures of any given finite size. Let \mathcal{U} be a non-principal ultrafilter on I . Then there is a measuring semiring S such that $M := \prod_{i \in I} M_i / \mathcal{U}$ is S -measurable.*

Proof. The proof consists of three main steps. We first define S and show that it is a measuring semiring; this is done in Claims 5.3.2–5.3.4. Next, we define the generalised measure on definable sets $X = \varphi(M; \bar{b})$ in the ultraproduct M , show that this definition is well-defined, and in Claim 5.3.5 confirm that this definition is independent of the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ used to define X . We then complete the proof of the theorem in Claim 5.3.6 by showing that M is S -measurable.

We construct S from R as a quotient. We assume without loss of generality that R is the semiring generated by the functions used to measure definable sets in the models in \mathcal{C} . Moreover, we can assume for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ that no member π of the \emptyset -definable partition for $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ satisfies for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that if $(M, \bar{b}) \in \pi$ then $|M| \leq n$. For $f, g \in R$, write $f \leq g$ if and only if $\{i : f(M_i) \leq g(M_i)\} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Claim 5.3.2. \leq is a (weak) total pre-order on R , i.e. it is reflexive, transitive, and total.

Proof of claim. Reflexivity and transitivity follow from the fact that \mathcal{U} is a filter. Since \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter, \leq is total. \square

Put

$$R_{=0} := \{f \in R : (\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\exists U \in \mathcal{U})(\forall i \in U) 0 \leq |f(M_i)| < \varepsilon\},$$

and $R_{>0} := R \setminus R_{=0}$.

Define \cong on $R_{>0}$ by

$$f \cong g \iff \left| \frac{f}{g} - 1 \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty \text{ on } \mathcal{U},$$

where the right-hand side means

$$(\forall \varepsilon > 0)(\exists U \in \mathcal{U})(\forall i \in U) \left| \frac{f(M_i)}{g(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon,$$

that is,

$$|f(M_i) - g(M_i)| = o(g(M_i)) \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty \text{ on } \mathcal{U}.$$

Claim 5.3.3. *The relation \cong is an equivalence relation and \cong -equivalence classes are \leq -convex in R . Also, $R_{=0}$ is \leq -convex in R .*

Proof. That $R_{=0}$ is \leq -convex is evident.

Reflexivity of \cong is immediate. To see that \cong is symmetric, suppose $f \cong g$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$, with $\varepsilon < 1$. Let $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $(\forall i \in U) \left| \frac{f(M_i)}{g(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$. There is $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta < \frac{f(M_i)}{g(M_i)}$ for all $i \in U$. There is $V \in \mathcal{U}$ with $V \subset U$ such that $(\forall i \in V) \left| \frac{f(M_i)}{g(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon\delta$. Then for all $i \in V$ we have $\left| \frac{g(M_i)}{f(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$. A similar argument proves transitivity.

To see that \cong -classes are convex, suppose that $f, g, h \in R_{>0}$ and $f \cong h$ and $f < g < h$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfy $(\forall i \in U) \left| \frac{f(M_i)}{h(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$. We may suppose that $f(M_i) < g(M_i) < h(M_i)$ for all $i \in U$, so $\left| \frac{f(M_i)}{g(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \left| \frac{f(M_i)}{h(M_i)} - 1 \right|$ for all $i \in U$. It follows that $\left| \frac{f(M_i)}{g(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$, as required. \square

By the claim, $R_{>0}/\cong$ inherits a total ordering from \leq . We treat $R_{=0}$ as an additional equivalence class that we denote by $[0]$. Likewise we write $[f]$ for the \cong -class of $f \in R_{>0}$. Let $S := (R_{>0}/\cong) \cup \{[0]\}$. It is evident that every function in R is \cong -equivalent to a $\{+, \times\}$ -term in functions in R that measure a definable set in the models in \mathcal{C} . There are now several assertions to be established.

Claim 5.3.4. *The operations $+$ and \times are well-defined on S , and with these operations S is a measuring semiring.*

Proof. First we handle the assertion that $+$ and \times are well-defined on S , omitting many details. To see that $+$ is well-defined, suppose $f, f', g, g' \in R_{>0}$ with $f \cong f'$ and $g \cong g'$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. There are $U, V \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $i \in U$ we have $\left| \frac{f(M_i)}{f'(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$, that is,

$|f(M_i) - f'(M_i)| < \varepsilon|f'(M_i)|$, and likewise for all $i \in V$ we have $\left| \frac{g(M_i)}{g'(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$, so $|g(M_i) - g'(M_i)| < \varepsilon|g'(M_i)|$. Let $W = U \cap V \in \mathcal{U}$. For all $i \in W$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(f(M_i)+g(M_i))-(f'(M_i)+g'(M_i))| &\leq |f(M_i)-f'(M_i)|+|g(M_i)-g'(M_i)| \\ &< \varepsilon(|f'(M_i)| + |g'(M_i)|) = \varepsilon|f'(M_i) + g'(M_i)|. \end{aligned}$$

Similar arguments show that \times is well-defined and S is an ordered semiring.

To see that S is a measuring semiring, define \sim and the dimension function $d: S \rightarrow D$ as usual. Suppose that $f, g, h, \in S$ are such that $[f] < [g]$ and $d([g]) = d([h])$. We further suppose that $[g] \leq [h] \leq n[g]$, the other case being similar. There is $\varepsilon > 0$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $i \in U$ we have $f(M_i) < g(M_i)$ and $1 - \frac{f(M_i)}{g(M_i)} > \varepsilon$. We may assume additionally that for all $i \in U$ we have $g(M_i) < h(M_i) < ng(M_i)$. Let $\varepsilon' := \frac{\varepsilon}{n+1}$. Then for $i \in U$ we have

$$1 - \frac{f(M_i) + h(M_i)}{g(M_i) + h(M_i)} \geq 1 - \frac{f(M_i) + ng(M_i)}{(n+1)g(M_i)} \geq \varepsilon',$$

hence $[f] + [h] < [g] + [h]$, as required. \square

We now define the generalised measure in the ultraproduct M and show that this definition is well-defined. Let X be definable in M with parameters via the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$. Let Π and H_Π be as given in Definition 2.1.1 of an R -m.a.c. applied to the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$. Write $\bar{b} = [(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in I}]_{\mathcal{U}}$. Let $\pi \in \Pi$ be such that $\{i \in I : (M_i, \bar{b}_i) \in \pi\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Since \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter and Π is finite, this choice is well-defined and unique. Define $h(X) := [M_i \mapsto h_\pi(M_i)]_{\cong}$, where we abuse notation slightly by viewing $[0]$ as an \cong -class. Note that $h(X) \in S$.

This assignment uses the definition of X by an instance of a particular formula φ . We must show the following:

Claim 5.3.5. *The definition of $h(X)$ above is independent of the formula defining X .*

Proof. To this end, suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ is as above and $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ also defines X . Let the partition and measuring functions associated with $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be Λ and $H_\Lambda = \{h_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, and $\lambda \in \Lambda$ be such that

$$\left| |\psi(M_i^{\bar{x}}, \bar{c}_i)| - h_\lambda(M_i) \right| = o(|h_\lambda(M_i)|)$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$ on \mathcal{U} . Let $U \in \mathcal{U}$ be such that $M_i \models \forall \bar{x} (\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_i) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i))$ for all $i \in U$. Modulo the ultrafilter, we may assume without loss of generality that $h_\pi \leq h_\lambda$. By the triangle inequality

$$|h_\pi(M_i) - h_\lambda(M_i)| = o(h_\lambda(M_i))$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$ on \mathcal{U} . Therefore $h_\pi \cong h_\lambda$, and thus the definition of $h(X)$ does not depend on the defining formula, as desired. Note that the

argument must be modified slightly if $X = \emptyset$, since X is measured by $[0]$. \square

For $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ we define the \cong -equivalence class $[n]$ as follows. Let $\varphi_n(x; y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be the formula stating that y_1, \dots, y_n are distinct and x is equal to one of them. Let h_n be the measuring function for φ_n as defined above, and put $[n] := [h_n]_{\cong}$. The mapping $n \mapsto [n]$ is an embedding of $(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot)$ into S . We note, but do not use, that it is easy to show that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is no \cong -equivalence class between $[n]$ and $[n+1]$.

With 0 interpreted by $[0]$ and 1 interpreted by $[1]$ in S , we come to our last claim:

Claim 5.3.6. *The axioms in Definition 5.2.1 are satisfied.*

Proof. To see that Definition 5.2.1(i) holds, let X be a finite set in M of size n . Then X is defined via a formula φ_n as above, and it follows that $h(X) = [n]$.

For Definition 5.2.1(ii), suppose that X and Y are disjoint definable sets, defined by formulas $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$, say. Let $\chi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}\bar{z})$ be the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \vee \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ (so $|\bar{y}| = |\bar{a}|$ and $|\bar{z}| = |\bar{b}|$). Thus $\chi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}\bar{b})$ defines X . There is $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for $i \in U$ the sets defined by $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_i)$ and $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$ are disjoint. Let Π be the partition associated with $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ with $H_\Pi \subset R$, and likewise let Θ and H_Θ be associated with $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$, and Λ and H_Λ with $\chi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}\bar{z})$. We may further suppose there are $\pi \in \Pi$, $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $(M_i, \bar{a}_i) \in \pi$, $(M_i, \bar{b}_i) \in \theta$ and $(M_i, \bar{a}_i\bar{b}_i) \in \lambda$ for all $i \in U$. Let h_π , h_θ and h_λ be the corresponding elements of R .

Suppose first that there is $V \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for $i \in V$ we have $h_\lambda(M_i) \geq 3(h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i))$. Replacing U by a suitable subset of $U \cap V$, we may then arrange that for all $i \in U$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| h_\pi(M_i) - |\varphi(M_i, \bar{a}_i)| \right| &< \frac{1}{2}h_\pi(M_i), \\ \left| h_\theta(M_i) - |\psi(M_i, \bar{b}_i)| \right| &< \frac{1}{2}h_\theta(M_i), \\ \text{and } \left| h_\lambda(M_i) - |\chi(M_i, \bar{a}_i\bar{b}_i)| \right| &< \frac{1}{2}h_\lambda(M_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\chi(M_i, \bar{a}_i\bar{b}_i)| = |\varphi(M_i, \bar{a}_i)| + |\psi(M_i, \bar{b}_i)|$ for $i \in U$, it follows by the triangle inequality that $h_\lambda(M_i) - (h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i)) < \frac{1}{2}(h_\lambda(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i) + h_\pi(M_i))$, and it is easily checked that this is incompatible with $h_\lambda(M_i) \geq 3(h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i))$.

Thus, we now assume for all $i \in U$ that $h_\lambda(M_i) < 3(h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i))$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and put $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. Adjusting U , we may suppose for all $i \in U$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| h_\pi(M_i) - |\varphi(M_i, \bar{a}_i)| \right| &< \varepsilon' h_\pi(M_i), \\ \left| h_\theta(M_i) - |\psi(M_i, \bar{b}_i)| \right| &< \varepsilon' h_\theta(M_i), \\ \text{and } \left| h_\lambda(M_i) - |\chi(M_i, \bar{a}_i \bar{b}_i)| \right| &< \varepsilon' h_\lambda(M_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $|h_\lambda(M_i) - (h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i))| < \varepsilon'(h_\lambda(M_i) + h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i))$, so

$$\left| \frac{h_\lambda(M_i)}{h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon' \frac{h_\lambda(M_i) + h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i)}{h_\pi(M_i) + h_\theta(M_i)} < \varepsilon.$$

It follows that $h_\lambda \cong h_\pi + h_\theta$, as required for Definition 5.2.1(ii).

Definition 5.2.1(iii) follows almost immediately from how we assigned values in S to definable sets. Definition 5.2.1(iv) is proved by similar arguments; we omit the details. \square

With this, the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 is complete. \square

Remark 5.3.7. The above argument shows that if \mathcal{C} is a weak m.a.c. then any ultraproduct is weakly generalised measurable, and hence, by Proposition 5.4.1 and Lemma 5.4.3 below, does not have the strict order property and has functionally unimodular theory.

The construction of S is much simpler if \mathcal{C} is a m.e.c., the essential point being that because of exactness, Definition 2.1.1 holds with values taken in a ring.

Theorem 5.3.8. *Suppose that \mathcal{C} is a m.e.c. and let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on \mathcal{C} and M the corresponding ultraproduct of \mathcal{C} . Then there is an ordered commutative ring S (an integral domain) such that M is $S^{\geq 0}$ -measurable.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{C} is an R -m.e.c. and let \bar{S} be the ring of functions $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ generated by R . We adopt the notation h_π , etc. from Definition 2.1.1. For each definable family Φ given by the formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ there is a corresponding finite set $H_\Phi \subset R$ and for each $r \in H_\Phi$ a corresponding formula $d\varphi_r(\bar{y})$ defining in each $N \in \mathcal{C}$ the set of \bar{a} such that $|\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})| = r(N)$.

Now define $\tilde{h}: \text{Def}(M) \rightarrow \bar{S}$ in the obvious way: If $X := \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$, then put $\tilde{h}(X) = r$ if and only if $M \models d\varphi_r(\bar{a})$. It can be checked that this is well-defined and that conditions (i)–(iv) of Definition 5.2.1 hold for M , but with the ring \bar{S} in place of a semiring. There is a natural pre-total order \preceq on \bar{S} , where $s_1 \preceq s_2$ if and only if

$$\{N \in \mathcal{C} : s_1(N) \leq s_2(N)\} \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Define

$$J := \{s \in \bar{S} : \{N \in \mathcal{C} : s(N) = 0\} \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

Then J is a convex ideal of \bar{S} and the pre-total order \preceq on \bar{S} induces a total order on $S := \bar{S}/J$. If η is the natural map $\bar{S} \rightarrow S$ and $h = \eta \circ \tilde{h}$, then h witnesses the statement of the theorem; since S is an ordered ring, $S^{\geq 0}$ certainly satisfies the measuring semiring axiom. As S is an ordered ring it is immediate that it is an integral domain. \square

We next explore the implications of Theorem 5.3.1 and Theorem 5.3.8 for *polynomial* m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s. In the context of Theorem 5.3.1 and its proof, we may suppose that if $f \in R$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$, then $rf \in R$, where $(rf)(M) = r(f(M))$ for each $M \in \mathcal{C}$. Given an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on I , we extend to R our earlier definition of \sim on a measuring semiring. We define \sim on R by putting $f \sim g$ if there is $V \in \mathcal{U}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ such that

$$(f(M_k) \leq g(M_k) \leq nf(M_k)) \vee (g(M_k) \leq f(M_k) \leq ng(M_k)) \text{ for all } k \in V.$$

Then \sim is an equivalence relation on R . Also, for $f, g \in R$, write $f \ll g$ if $f \not\sim g$ and there is $V \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $f(M_i) < g(M_i)$ for all $i \in V$.

Lemma 5.3.9. *With the assumptions and notation of Theorem 5.3.1, the following hold.*

- (i) *If $f, g \in R \setminus R_{=0}$ with $f \sim g$, then there is $r \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ such that $f \cong rg$.*
- (ii) *If $f, g \in R$ with $f \ll g$, then $f + g \cong g$.*
- (iii) *If $f, g \in R$ with $f \sim g$ and $f \cong rg$, then $f + g \cong (r + 1)g$.*

Proof. (i) Let $X = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} : (\exists V \in \mathcal{U})(\forall k \in V) f(M_k) \leq qg(M_k)\}$. Then X is non-empty and bounded below, so we may put $r = \inf(X)$. For every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ there is $W \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $k \in W$ we have

$$r(1 - \varepsilon)g(M_k) \leq f(M_k) \leq r(1 + \varepsilon)g(M_k).$$

Thus $\left| \frac{f(M_k)}{rg(M_k)} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $k \in W$, so $f \cong rg$ as required.

(ii) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > 1/\varepsilon$. There is $V \in \mathcal{U}$ with $nf(M_k) < g(M_k)$ for all $k \in V$. Then $|(f + g)(M_k) - g(M_k)| \leq f(M_k) \leq \varepsilon g(M_k)$, as required.

(iii) The proof is similar and left to the reader. \square

We next consider strengthenings of Theorems 5.3.1 and 5.3.8 for polynomial m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s. The main purpose of the next proposition is to support Lemmas 6.1.3 and 6.1.7, which give supersimplicity of ultraproducts of polynomial m.a.c.s.

Proposition 5.3.10. *Suppose that $\mathcal{C} = \{M_i : i \in I\}$ is a polynomial m.a.c. containing just finitely many members of each finite size, and let M be an ultraproduct of \mathcal{C} with respect to a non-principal ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on I . Let R, S and \cong be as in Theorem 5.3.1. Then there is a set P*

of monomials in R of form $rZ_1^{d_1} \dots Z_k^{d_k}$, where $r \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$, $d_1, \dots, d_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and Z_1, \dots, Z_k are indeterminates, such that:

- (i) each element of $R \setminus R_{=0}$ lies in the \cong -class of a unique element of P ; and
- (ii) the ordered semiring structure on S induces a total order $<$ on $P \cup \{0\}$ with least element 0 and ordered semiring operations \boxplus and \boxtimes on P as follows, where $f, g \in P$:

$$f \boxplus g = \begin{cases} g & \text{if } f \ll g \\ f & \text{if } g \ll f \\ \text{the unique } h \in P \text{ with } h \cong (r+1)g & \text{if } f \sim g \text{ and } f \cong rg \end{cases}$$

$$rZ_1^{d_1} \dots Z_k^{d_k} \boxtimes sZ_1^{e_1} \dots Z_k^{e_k} \cong rsZ_1^{d_1+e_1} \dots Z_k^{d_k+e_k}.$$

Proof. We just sketch the proof. We suppose that \mathcal{C} is a polynomial m.a.c. with respect to balanced formulas

$$\delta_1(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1), \dots, \delta_k(\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k) \text{ and } N_1, \dots, N_k$$

as in Definition 2.2.2. Thus, every element $h \in R$ may be identified with a polynomial $P_h(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathbb{R}[Z_1, \dots, Z_k]$ and a definable set in a structure $M \in \mathcal{C}$ that has cardinality approximately $P_h\left(|\delta_1(M^{|\bar{x}_1|}, \bar{a}_1)|^{\frac{1}{N_1}}, \dots, |\delta_k(M^{|\bar{x}_k|}, \bar{a}_k)|^{\frac{1}{N_k}}\right)$ for suitable $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k$. Thus, every element of $S \setminus \{0\}$ in the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 is an \cong -class of such polynomials.

Choose P to contain a unique monomial $rZ_1^{e_1} \dots Z_k^{e_k}$ from each \cong -class restricted to the set of monomials. By Lemma 5.3.9, every polynomial $P_h \in R \setminus R_{=0}$ is equivalent modulo \cong to a unique element of P . The ordering on S defined in the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 induces an ordering on P , and the semiring operations of S induce operations \boxplus and \boxtimes on P with the stated properties. \square

Proposition 5.3.11. *Suppose that \mathcal{C} is a polynomial m.e.c. in the sense of Definition 2.2.2, and let M be an ultraproduct of \mathcal{C} . Then M is S -measurable for some finitely generated ordered ring S .*

Proof. We follow the proof of Theorem 5.3.8. The ring S will have the form $\mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_f]/I$ for some f and some convex ideal I . Here each X_i corresponds in \mathcal{C} to a certain set defined by $\delta(\bar{x}_i, \bar{a}_i)$. \square

Example 5.3.12.

- (i) Let M be a measurable structure, as defined at the beginning of this section. Then M is generalised measurable, with monomial measuring semiring $\mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$. A definable set assigned the measure-dimension pair (μ, d) will be assigned the value $\mu Z^d \in \mathbb{R}\langle Z \rangle$.
- (ii) Consider a structure of the form (K, W_1, \dots, W_k) , where K is a pseudofinite field in the language of rings and $W_1 < \dots < W_k$ are infinite-dimensional vector spaces over K , with W_{i+1}/W_i infinite dimensional for each i ; these are ultraproducts of the class

from Corollary 3.2.3. This structure is generalised measurable in a monomial semiring of the form $\mathbb{R}\langle Z^D \rangle$, where $D \cong \mathbb{Z}^{k+1}$ (lexicographically ordered).

- (iii) By Theorem 3.3.3, the class of finite vector spaces equipped with a symplectic form over a finite field is an R -m.a.c., where $R = \mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{F})[\mathbf{V}]$. It follows from Theorem 5.3.1 that an ultraproduct consisting of an infinite-dimensional vector space with a symplectic form over an infinite pseudofinite field is S -measurable for some measuring semiring S . Inspection of the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 shows that we may take S to be the set of monomials $\mu \mathbf{V}^r \mathbf{F}^s$ where \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{F} are indeterminates, and the pairs $(r, s) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}$ are lexicographically ordered. The semiring operations are as in Proposition 5.3.10.
- (iv) Let M be a pseudofinite strongly minimal set. By Theorem 4.3.1, M is elementarily equivalent to an ultraproduct of a m.e.c. and, in fact, Theorem 4.3.1 and Theorem 5.3.8 ensure that M is ring-measurable in the ring $\mathbb{Z}[Z]$, in which $1 \ll Z \ll \dots \ll Z^n \ll \dots$.
- (v) If M is a smoothly approximable structure, then M is ring-measurable in a finitely generated ordered ring, where the number of generators is at most the number of geometries in a ‘standard system of geometries’ in the sense of [19, Definition 2.5.6]. This follows from Proposition 5.3.11 and Theorem 4.1.2.

5.4. Some basic model-theoretic properties of generalized measurable structures. Recall that a theory T has the *strict order property* if some model of T has an interpretable partial order containing an infinite totally ordered subset. A theory is said to have NSOP if it does not have the strict order property.

Proposition 5.4.1. *If M is a weakly generalised measurable structure then its theory has NSOP.*

Proof. Let S be a measuring semiring and let M be weakly S -measurable. Suppose there exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}_1; \bar{x}_2)$ that defines a (strict) pre-order on the power M^t of M with arbitrarily long finite chains. Let $\psi(\bar{z}; \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$ be the formula

$$\varphi(\bar{x}_1; \bar{z}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{z}; \bar{x}_2).$$

By Ramsey’s theorem and clause (iii) of weak S -measurability, there exists $s \in S$ and $\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3$ such that $\varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j)$ and $h(\psi(\bar{z}; \bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j)) = s$ for each $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $i < j$. Now $\psi(M; \bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_3)$ contains the disjoint union of $\psi(M; \bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2)$ and $\psi(M; \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3)$, together with the singleton $\{\bar{a}_2\}$. Thus

$$s \geq s + s + 1$$

which contradicts Lemma 5.1.5(iii). □

The following definition is essentially from [24], although note that there is some confusion in the literature around related notions, as clarified in [44] and [31].

Definition 5.4.2. A structure M is *functionally unimodular* if, whenever $f_1, f_2: A \rightarrow B$ are definable maps and there are integers k_1, k_2 such that $|f_1^{-1}(b)| = k_1$ and $|f_2^{-1}(b)| = k_2$ for all $b \in B$, then $k_1 = k_2$.

Lemma 5.4.3. *Let M be a weakly S -measurable structure for some measuring semiring S . Then M is functionally unimodular.*

Proof. Let h be the corresponding measuring function, and adopt the notation and assumptions of Definition 5.4.2. By Definition 5.2.1(i) and (iv), we have $h(A) = k_1 h(B) = k_2 h(B)$, and it follows by Lemma 5.1.5(iii) that $k_1 = k_2$. \square

We consider briefly the additional model-theoretic implications of *ring*-measurability as compared with generalised measurability.

Proposition 5.4.4. *Suppose that the structure M is S -ring-measurable and let $X \subset M^n$ be definable. Then*

- (i) *any definable injection $f: X \rightarrow X$ is surjective; and*
- (ii) *any definable surjection $f: X \rightarrow X$ is injective.*

Proof. Let $h: \text{Def}(M) \rightarrow S$ denote the function given by S -measurability.

(i) Let $Y := X \setminus f(X)$. Then $h(X) = h(f(X)) + h(Y) = h(X) + h(Y)$, as $h(X) = h(f(X))$ by injectivity. Hence $h(Y) = 0$, so $Y = \emptyset$.

(ii) Suppose that $X = Y_1 \cup Y_2$, where $Y_1 := \{x \in X : |f^{-1}(f(x))| = 1\}$ and $Y_2 = X \setminus Y_1$. Put $Z_1 = f(Y_1)$ and $Z_2 := f(Y_2)$. Then $h(Y_1) + h(Y_2) = h(X) = h(Z_1) + h(Z_2) = h(Y_1) + h(Z_2)$, in view of the definable partitions $X = Y_1 \cup Y_2 = Z_1 \cup Z_2$ and of the fact that $h \upharpoonright_{Y_1}$ is a bijection onto Z_1 . As $h \upharpoonright_{Y_2}$ is at least 2-to-1, we have $h(Y_2) \geq 2h(Z_2)$. Combining these observations, $h(Z_2) = h(Y_2) \geq 2h(Z_2)$, forcing $h(Z_2) = 0$ and hence $Y_2 = Z_2 = \emptyset$. \square

Remark 5.4.5.

- (i) Both parts of Proposition 5.4.4 require *ring*-measurability, not just generalised measurability. For example, the structure (\mathbb{N}, S) (with S the successor function) is strongly minimal and unimodular in the sense of [44], hence measurable by [44, Proposition 3.1]. Here, the definable function S is injective but not surjective.
- (ii) For an example of a measurable structure with a definable surjection $M \rightarrow M$ that is not injective, let $\{c_n : n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{N}\}$ be disjoint from \mathbb{Z} and let M have domain $\mathbb{Z} \cup C$. Define $f: M \rightarrow M$ by putting $f(n) = n + 1$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f(c_n) = c_{n+1}$ for $n < -1$, and $f(c_{-1}) = 0$. Then (M, f) is again strongly minimal and unimodular, hence measurable, but f is surjective but not injective.
- (iii) Proposition 5.4.4(i) also follows from [47, Theorem 3.1].

- (iv) If M is S -ring-measurable where S is generated as a ring by $\text{Im}(h)$, then the ring S is a quotient of the Grothendieck ring of M , as defined for example in [48].
- (v) Just as generalised measurability extends to M^{eq} (see Proposition 5.2.7), also if M is ring-measurable then so is M^{eq} . This follows essentially because the quotient field of an ordered integral domain is an ordered field, and thus we may extend a measuring function h to quotients (as in the proof of Proposition 5.2.7) so that it takes values in an ordered field.

6. SIMPLICITY AND SUPERSIMPLICITY

As shown in [25, Corollary 3.7], (MS-)measurable structures (defined at the beginning of Section 5) are supersimple of finite rank, so it is natural to ask what model-theoretic properties generalised measurable structures have. In this section we give criteria on measuring rings S which are sufficient for the supersimplicity/simplicity of S -measurable structures.

6.1. Ordered polynomial rings with well-ordered variables.

6.1.1. *Well-ordered semigroups.* Let $(S, +, <)$ be a commutative totally ordered semigroup (written additively) and let $\langle A \rangle$ denote the semigroup generated by a subset $A \subseteq S$.

We require the following fact proved by Higman [35]; a simpler proof was given by Nash-Williams [61].

Lemma 6.1.1. *Let $A \subseteq S$ be well-ordered, positive and such that $0 \in A$. Then $\langle A \rangle$ is well-ordered.*

6.1.2. *Well-ordered dimensions.* Let $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ be a set of variables, let $R := \mathbb{R}[(X_i)_{i \in I}]$ be the commutative ring generated over \mathbb{R} by the X_i and let $<$ be a ring ordering on R . Let M be an $(R^{\geq 0}, <)$ -measurable structure with measuring function $h : \text{Def}(M) \rightarrow R^{\geq 0}$. Let \sim be the usual equivalence relation on R given by: $x \sim y$ if x is in the convex hull of $\{ry \mid r \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}\}$. Let $\langle X \rangle$ be the semigroup generated multiplicatively by the variables $\{X_i : i \in I\}$.

Lemma 6.1.2. *Assume $\{X_i/\sim : i \in I\}$ is well-ordered by the ordering induced from R . Then $R^{\geq 0}/\sim$ is well-ordered.*

Proof. The \sim -equivalence class of a given $h \in R$ is equal to the maximum of the equivalence classes of the monomials that make up h . Thus it suffices to show that the set of \sim -equivalence classes of monomials is well-ordered. This follows from Lemma 6.1.1, applied multiplicatively. \square

Similarly, we have:

Lemma 6.1.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a polynomial m.a.c., let M be an infinite ultraproduct of members of \mathcal{C} and let S be obtained as in Theorem 5.3.1 (so M is S -measurable). Then S/\sim is well-ordered.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.3.10, we may identify S with a certain set P of monomials in X_1, \dots, X_k , with the natural multiplication. By Lemma 6.1.1 the multiplicative submonoid of S generated by $\{1, X_1, \dots, X_k\}$ is well-ordered. Since every element of S is \sim -equivalent to an element in this monoid, the result follows. \square

6.1.3. *Dimension versus D -rank.* For a definable set X in a structure we write $D(X)$ for the (ordinal-valued) D -rank of X (see e.g. [46, Definition 2.5.6]). This should not be confused with the set D of dimensions. Below, we write $d(X)$ for $d(h(X))$, for any definable set X .

Theorem 6.1.4. *Let M be S -measurable, let $d: S \rightarrow D$ be the corresponding dimension function and let $D_0 = \{d(X) : X \in \text{Def}(M)\}$, the set of dimensions taken by definable sets. Suppose that D_0 is well-ordered and identify it with the corresponding ordinal. Then*

- (i) $D(X) \leq d(X)$ for all definable sets X ; and
- (ii) $T = \text{Th}(M)$ is supersimple.

Proof. We first note that (ii) follows immediately from (i) and [46, Proposition 2.5.11]. For the proof of (i), it suffices to show for all definable sets X and all $\alpha \in \mathbf{Ord}$ that $D(X) \geq \alpha$ implies $d(X) \geq \alpha$. We prove this by transfinite induction.

Suppose that $D(X) \geq \alpha$. If $\alpha = 0$ then the result is trivial since d always takes non-negative values. Likewise the case when α is a limit ordinal is immediate.

Suppose now that $\alpha = \beta + 1$. There exists a formula $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ and $(\bar{c}_i)_{i \in \omega}$ such that

- (1) for all $i \in \omega$, $\psi(M; \bar{c}_i) \subseteq X$;
- (2) for all $i \in \omega$, $D(\psi(M; \bar{c}_i)) \geq \beta$; and
- (3) there exists $k \in \omega$ such that $\{\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{c}_i) \mid i \in \omega\}$ is k -inconsistent.

We aim to show that $d(X) \geq \alpha$, equivalently $d(X) > \beta$. Write $X_i := \psi(M; \bar{c}_i)$. Since $X_i \subseteq X$, by induction we have $d(X) \geq \beta$, so we assume for a contradiction that $d(X) = \beta$. Let $s = h(X)$ and for each definable set Y write $\rho(Y) = \rho_s(h(Y))$, the measure of Y relative to s (i.e. to X), as defined just before Example 5.1.13.

Let $\rho^* := \min\{\rho(X_i) \mid i \in \omega\}$, which exists by clause (iii) of Definition 5.2.1. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and choose $m \geq Nk^3$. We restrict our attention to X_i where $i \leq m$, and put $\mathcal{X} := \{X_i \mid i \leq m\}$. We aim to approximate the ρ -measure of $\bigcup_{X_i \in \mathcal{X}} X_i$. We cannot use finite additivity directly since there can be some non-trivial intersection between different X_i .

For $j < k$, let X^j denote those elements of $\bigcup \mathcal{X}$ which are members of precisely j -many X_i , and let $X_i^j := X_i \cap X^j$. We thus have a partition

$X_i = \bigsqcup_{j < k} X_i^j$ for each $i \leq m$. For $j < k$, put $I^j := \{i \leq m \mid \rho(X_i^j) \geq \rho^*/k\}$.

Claim 6.1.5. $\bigcup\{I^j \mid j < k\} = \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Proof of Claim. Let $i \leq m$. Since $\rho(X_i) \geq \rho^*$ and the partition above of X_i has k -many elements, there must be at least one, say X_i^j , with measure $\geq \rho^*/k$, hence $i \in I^j$. \square

Applying the claim there exists $j_0 < k$ such that $|I^{j_0}| \geq m/k$. Elements of $X_i^{j_0}$ are included in at most j_0 members of \mathcal{X} , hence

$$j_0 \cdot \rho(X) \geq j_0 \cdot \rho\left(\bigcup_{i \in I^{j_0}} X_i^{j_0}\right) \geq \sum_{i \in I^{j_0}} \rho(X_i^{j_0}).$$

Therefore $\rho(X) \geq \frac{1}{j_0} \frac{m}{k} \frac{\rho^*}{k} \geq N\rho^*$. Since $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary, $d(X) > \beta$, as required. \square

Under the assumptions of Theorem 6.1.4 and in particular that the set D_0 of dimensions of definable sets is well-ordered, for a type p we can define $d(p) = \text{Min}\{d(\varphi(\bar{x})) : \varphi(\bar{x}) \in p\}$ and put $d(\bar{a}/C) = d(\text{tp}(\bar{a}/C))$. Now write $\bar{a} \downarrow_C^d B$ if $d(\bar{a}/B \cup C) < d(\bar{a}/C)$.

Proposition 6.1.6. *Let M be S -measurable, and satisfy the assumptions and notation of Theorem 6.1.4. If $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/B \cup C)$ forks over C then $\bar{a} \not\downarrow_C^d B$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/B \cup C)$ forks over C . By our assumption that D_0 is well-ordered, there is a C -definable set X containing all realisations of $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/C)$ with $d(X) = d(\bar{a}/C)$. Some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}/b)$ in $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/B \cup C)$ forks over C , so implies $\varphi_1(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_1) \vee \dots \vee \varphi_r(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_r)$ for some r , where each $\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$ divides over C . We may suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$ and the $\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)$ each imply that $\bar{x} \in X$.

We claim that for each $i \leq r$, $d(\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)) < d(X)$. To see this, fix $i \leq r$. There is an indiscernible sequence $(\bar{c}_j : j \in \omega)$ realising $\text{tp}(\bar{b}_i/C)$ and some $k \in \omega$ such that the formulas $\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_j)$ are k -inconsistent. Let X_j be the set of realisations of $\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_j)$. Then the X_j are k -inconsistent subsets of X with $d(X_j) = d(X_l)$ for all $j, l \in \omega$, and the proof of Theorem 6.1.4(i) above forces $d(X_j) < d(X)$ for all j . Thus $d(\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i)) < d(X)$, as claimed.

Given the claim, it follows that $d(\varphi_1(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_1) \vee \dots \vee \varphi_r(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_r)) < d(X)$, and so $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}) < d(X)$. The proposition follows. \square

Corollary 6.1.7. *Let \mathcal{C} be a polynomial m.a.c.. Then any infinite ultraproduct of members of \mathcal{C} has supersimple theory.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 5.3.10, Lemma 6.1.3, and Theorem 6.1.4. \square

Example 6.1.8. In each of the cases in Example 5.3.12 the semiring is a polynomial ring or monomial semiring and the dimension function

d takes values in some well-ordered set. Thus all of these examples are supersimple by Theorem 6.1.4.

6.2. Locally well-ordered dimensions. Next, we localise the results in the last subsection to instances of a formula.

Let $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ be an L -formula and let L_φ denote the set of instances of φ , i.e. formulas $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{c})$ for a \bar{y} -tuple of parameters \bar{c} . Let Δ_φ be the set of finite positive φ -types, i.e. conjunctions of instances of φ , and put $h(\Delta_\varphi) = \{h(p) : p \in \Delta_\varphi\}$. For an L -structure M we write $\text{Def}_\varphi(M)$ for the collection of sets in M defined by formulas from Δ_φ .

Now let M be an S -measurable structure with generalised measure h , and $d: S \rightarrow D$ the corresponding dimension function. Suppose for each φ that $h(\Delta_\varphi)/\sim$ is well-ordered. We may identify this set with its corresponding ordinal and define $d_\varphi(p) := \text{Min}\{d(h(\psi)) : \psi \in p\}$ for all $p \in \Delta_\varphi$. Likewise, if $X \in \text{Def}_\varphi(M)$ is defined by $p \in \Delta_\varphi$, then put $d_\varphi(X) := d_\varphi(p)$. The rank $D(p, \varphi, k)$ (for partial types p) is defined in [69, Definition 2.3.4]

Fact 6.2.1. [69, Theorem 2.4.7] *A theory T is simple if and only if, for all formulas φ and all $k < \omega$, $D(\bar{x} = \bar{x}, \varphi, k) < \omega$.*

Theorem 6.2.2. *Suppose that $h(\Delta_\varphi)/\sim$ is well-ordered for each φ . Let $X \in \text{Def}_\varphi(M)$. Then $D(X, \varphi, k) \leq d_\varphi(X)$.*

Proof. The proof is the same as that for Theorem 6.1.4(i). \square

Corollary 6.2.3. *Suppose that $h(\Delta_\varphi)/\sim$ is well-ordered for each φ . Then M is simple.*

We also state a characterisation of stability for a formula, under the assumption that an appropriate set of dimensions is well-ordered. For an L -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$, let Δ_φ^* be the set of finite φ -types; that is, the set of finite conjunctions of instances of φ and their negations.

Theorem 6.2.4. *Let M be generalised measurable, let $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ be a formula and suppose that $h(\Delta_\varphi^*)/\sim$ is well-ordered. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is unstable.
- (ii) There is an $N \equiv M$ and for some $A \subset N$ an A -definable set $D \subset N^{|\bar{x}|}$ and sequence $\{\bar{a}_i : i \in \omega\} \subset N^{|\bar{y}|}$ indiscernible over A such that $d(D) = d(D \wedge \bigwedge_{i < k} \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_i))$ for all $k \in \omega$ and $\rho_{h(D)}(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_i) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_j)) < \rho_{h(D)}(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_i))$ for all $i < j$.
- (iii) $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ has the independence property.

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as that of [30, Proposition 3.3], with the well-ordering assumption in place of (A_φ^*) ; we omit the details. \square

Remark 6.2.5. We refer back to Propositions 4.2.8 and 4.2.9 above for the m.e.c. example consisting of the collection \mathcal{C} of all finite homocyclic

groups $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^m$ where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ and p is prime. Stability and simplicity properties of ultraproducts can be read off from the formulas for cardinalities of definable sets. In particular, Proposition 4.2.9(ii), in combination with Theorems 4.2.3(ii) and 5.3.8, gives examples of ring-measurable stable unsuperstable pseudofinite groups.

Remark 6.2.6. An interesting example of a generalised measurable structure is discussed in [7]. Let M be a structure which is *coherent measurable* in the sense of [7, Definition 5.3]. This means that M is measurable of SU-rank 1, dimension coincides with SU-rank on definable sets, and M is ‘nowhere trivial’, a condition which typically follows if M has some algebraic structure. Consider the structure $(M, H(M))$ where H is a predicate for a ‘generic’ independent subset of M . Then, by [7, Theorem 5.16], $(M, H(M))$ is generalised measurable and the set D of dimensions has order type $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, lexicographically ordered. In particular the set of dimensions is well-ordered, so $(M, H(M))$ is supersimple, as already follows from [6].

6.3. Quasifinite fields. In this section we adapt the main result of [66] to the context of generalised measurable fields.

Definition 6.3.1. A field K is *quasifinite* if it is perfect and $G_K := \text{Aut}(K^{\text{alg}}/K) \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Definition 6.3.2. A *strong ordered Euler characteristic* on a field K is a function

$$\chi: \text{Def}(K) \rightarrow R_{\geq 0}$$

into a partially-ordered ring R such that for all $X, Y \in \text{Def}(K)$:

- (i) $\chi(X) = \chi(Y)$ if X and Y are definably isomorphic;
- (ii) $\chi(X \times Y) = \chi(X) \cdot \chi(Y)$;
- (iii) $\chi(X \cup Y) = \chi(X) + \chi(Y)$ if X and Y are disjoint;
- (iv) if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a definable function such that $c = \chi(f^{-1}(\{y\}))$ for every $y \in Y$, then $\chi(X) = c \cdot \chi(Y)$.

The Euler characteristic is nontrivial if $0 < 1$ in R and the image of χ is not $\{0\}$.

Theorem 6.3.3. (Theorem 1, [66]) *Any field admitting a nontrivial strong ordered Euler characteristic is quasifinite.*

Note that a generalised measurable field need not admit a nontrivial strong ordered Euler characteristic: In the definition above R is a ring whereas the definition of a generalised measurable structure uses a semiring. However, we can adjust the proof of Theorem 5.18 of [57] to the generalised measurable context to obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 6.3.4. *Let K be a generalised measurable field. Then K is quasifinite.*

Proof. For convenience, we may assume by Theorem 5.1.14 that the measuring function for K takes values in a monomial semiring (see Example 5.1.13). We note that K is perfect by a simple measure argument. For the rest, the proof of Theorem 5.18 of [57] easily adapts: Dimension in D serves as a proxy for S_1 rank, and for disjoint sets of the same dimension, (relative) measure is additive, as is apparent from the definition of a monomial semiring. We omit further details. \square

7. FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

The examples of m.e.c.s in Section 4 have ultraproducts which are smoothly approximable, or are modules, or are graphs of bounded degree (or at least have Gaifman graph of bounded degree), or are uncountably categorical pseudofinite. All such structures are simple and one-based in the sense of [46, Definition 5.5.14]. This suggests the following question.

Problem 7.0.1. Find an example of a m.e.c. with an ultraproduct which does not have simple theory. Must it have NSOP_1 theory? If the ultraproduct has simple theory, must it be one-based?

Related to the distinction between m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s, we ask:

Question 7.0.2. Are there model-theoretic consequences of adjusting the error term $o(h_\pi(M))$ in the definition of an R -m.a.c. for certain R (e.g. for polynomial R -m.a.c.s)?

We find the conjecture below from Section 4 particularly appealing.

Conjecture 7.0.3.

- (i) Let M be a homogeneous structure over a finite relational language L . Then there is an m.e.c. with ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to M if and only if M is stable.
- (ii) Let \mathcal{C} be an m.e.c. and let M be an unstable homogeneous structure over a finite relational language. Then M is not elementarily equivalent to any structure interpretable in an ultraproduct of \mathcal{C} .

The above conjecture leads to natural questions, for a given finite relational language L , concerning finite L -structures without any symmetry assumption but with arbitrarily high levels of combinatorial regularity; for example with the 5-regularity and 3-tuple regularity mentioned respectively in parts (ii) and (v) of the proof of Theorem 4.1.6. Such issues are considered also in [34], with connections mentioned to the Weisfeiler–Leman algorithm for graph isomorphism. It would be interesting to explore such notions further, for arbitrary finite relational languages, in the spirit of Lachlan’s shrinking and stretching theory for finite homogeneous structures, cf. [49]. (The structure theory in the latter depends on the existence of a bound – dependent only on L – on a certain rank for finite homogeneous L -structures; the existence

of this bound was verified in [17], using substantial finite group theory, though a somewhat shorter proof is given in the binary case in [50].) More precisely:

Problem 7.0.4. Let L be a finite relational language. We say that the class \mathcal{C} of finite L -structures is *eventually regular* if the following hold:

- (i) For each L -formula $\varphi(\bar{y})$ there is a quantifier-free L -formula $\psi(\bar{y})$ such that all but finitely many $M \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfy $M \models \forall \bar{y}(\varphi(\bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{y}))$.
- (ii) There is a function $f_L: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any quantifier-free formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ with $|\bar{y}| = n$, and any $\bar{a} \in M^n$ where $M \in \mathcal{C}$ has size at least $f_L(n)$, the size of $\varphi(M, \bar{a})$ depends only on the quantifier-free type of \bar{a} .

Show that Lachlan’s shrinking and stretching theory from [49] applies to eventually regular classes. In particular, show that all but finitely many members of such \mathcal{C} are homogeneous.

Cameron’s result at the end of [11], cited above in the proof of Theorem 4.1.6(ii), yields that this holds for finite graphs even without assumption (i). Likewise, by [34], it holds (without assumption (i) above) for finite graphs expanded by unary predicates. Ainslie [2] has extensive partial results in this direction for finite structures in a language with three symmetric irreflexive binary relations such that every pair of distinct vertices satisfies exactly one relation. Ainslie also proves Conjecture 7.0.3(i) for several other homogeneous structures, namely the universal metrically homogeneous graph of any fixed finite diameter, the universal homogeneous two-graph, and the ‘semifree’ binary structures listed by Cherlin in the appendix of [18].

Question 7.0.5.

- (i) Is there a weak m.e.c. with an ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to the random graph?
- (ii) Is there a m.e.c. with an ultraproduct elementarily equivalent to the random (i.e. universal homogeneous) digraph? Or to the random 3-uniform hypergraph?

Question 7.0.6. Clarify the model-theoretic implications of ring-measurability (as a strengthening of generalised measurability). For example, does it imply simplicity of the theory? Also, is there a ring-measurable structure that is not pseudofinite? Is there an infinite ring-measurable field? Is every ring-measurable group soluble-by-finite?

Problem 7.0.7. Clarify the connections between m.a.c.s and m.e.c.s and the Hrushovski–Wagner notion of pseudofinite dimension ([38, 39]). In particular, clarify the connections to the key concepts of [30]. For example, what natural conditions on a m.a.c. ensure that any ultraproduct (in the appropriate extended language) satisfies conditions such as

(SA), (DC), and (FMV) from [30]. There are some results of this kind in [1], building on Theorem 4.3.2.

In this direction, we note the following result. For the definitions in (i), see [30].

Proposition 7.0.8. *Let \mathcal{C} be a polynomial m.a.c..*

- (i) *Any infinite ultraproduct of members of \mathcal{C} satisfies (SA), (DC_L) , (MD_L) .*
- (ii) *Tao's Algebraic Regularity Lemma (as expressed in [30, Theorem 6.4]) holds for graphs uniformly definable in members of \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. (i) (SA) holds essentially by Lemma 6.1.3, and (DC_L) and (MD_L) follow from definability of generalised measure.

(ii) This follows from [30, Theorem 6.4]. □

By Proposition 6.5 of [24] (see [44]) every stable measurable structure is one-based. This suggests the following question.

Question 7.0.9. Is every stable generalised measurable structure one-based?

Note that every generalised measurable strongly minimal set is measurable by Proposition 5.2.8, and so is one-based.

We say that a homogeneous structure is *free homogeneous* if its age is a free amalgamation class. The first author has shown in [3] that any free homogeneous structure is generalised measurable; in particular the universal homogeneous triangle-free graph is generalised measurable even though it does not have supersimple theory so is not MS-measurable. As another example, let M be the universal homogeneous tetrahedron-free 3-hypergraph (so determined by the minimal forbidden configuration of 4-set all of whose 3-subsets are edges). Then M is supersimple of SU-rank 1 and even one-based, and not MS-measurable (see [58, Theorem 7.3.9]), but is generalised measurable as it is free-homogeneous. The corresponding measuring semiring has infinite descending chains of dimensions. In light of Theorem 6.1.4, we ask

Question 7.0.10. Is the universal homogeneous tetrahedron-free 3-hypergraph generalised measurable with a measuring semiring having well-ordered dimensions?

Section 6.3 suggests the following question.

Question 7.0.11. Must generalised measurable fields be PAC?

Finally, we remark that Evans [26] and Marimon [59] have recently shed further light on the content of MS-measurability, finding connections to n -amalgamation, and developing new methods for showing structures are *not* MS-measurable. It would be interesting to explore whether these methods apply to generalised measurability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Charlotte Kestner for a useful conversation regarding the proof of Theorem 4.2.3, and Darío García for several helpful conversations. They would also like to thank Bethany Marsh and William Crawley-Boevey for very helpful discussions on the representation theory of quivers of finite representation type.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexander van Abel, Counting in uncountably categorical pseudofinite structures. *arXiv preprint math/2103.03276*, 2021.
- [2] Rory Ainslie, Definable sets in finite structures. PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2022.
- [3] Sylvy Anscombe. Free homogeneous structures are generalised measurable. *Manuscript*, 2016.
- [4] Sylvy Anscombe and Charlotte Kestner, Independence in the theory of bilinear forms. *Manuscript*, 2016.
- [5] Ricardo Bello Aguirre, *Model theory of finite and pseudofinite rings*. PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2016.
- [6] Alexander Berenstein and Evgueni Vassiliev, Geometric structures with a dense independent subset. *Selecta Math.*, 22,(1): 191-225, 2016.
- [7] Alexander Berenstein, Darío García, and Tingxiang Zou. Dimension and measure in pseudofinite H-structures. *arXiv preprint math/2009.07331*, 2020.
- [8] Joseph Bernstein, Israel M. Gel'fand, V.A. Ponomarev, Coxeter functors and Gabriel's theorem. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk.*, 38(2): 19-33, 1973. (*Russian Math. Surveys* 38(2): 17-32, 1973.)
- [9] Béla Bollobás, *Random graphs*, 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [10] Elena I. Bunina and Aleksander V. Mikhalëv, Elementary properties of linear groups and related problems. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences (New York)*, 123(2): 3921–3985, 2004.
- [11] Peter J. Cameron. 6-transitive graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, 28: 168–179, 1980.
- [12] Alan R. Camina and Rachel D. Camina. The influence of conjugacy class sizes on the structure of finite groups: a survey. *Asian-European Journal of Mathematics*, 4(4): 559–588, 2011.
- [13] Zoé Chatzidakis, Model theory of finite fields and pseudo-finite fields, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 88: 95–108, 1997.
- [14] Zoé Chatzidakis, Lou van den Dries, and Angus J. Macintyre. Definable sets over finite fields. *J. reine angew. Math.*, 427: 107–135, 1992.
- [15] Zoé Chatzidakis and Anand Pillay. Generic structures and simple theories. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 95: 71–92, 1998.
- [16] Gregory L. Cherlin, Leo Harrington, and Alistair H. Lachlan. \aleph_0 -categorical, \aleph_0 -stable structures. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 28(2): 103–135, 1985.
- [17] Gregory L. Cherlin and Alistair H. Lachlan. Stable finitely homogeneous structures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 296(2): 815–850, 1986.
- [18] Gregory L. Cherlin. The classification of countable homogeneous directed graphs and countable homogeneous n -tournaments. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 131(621): 1998.

- [19] Gregory L. Cherlin and Ehud Hrushovski. *Finite Structures with Few Types*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, Number 152. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2003.
- [20] Artem Chernikov and Nadja Hempel. On n -dependent groups and fields III, *Manuscript*, 2016.
- [21] Artem Chernikov and Nicholas Ramsey. On model-theoretic tree properties, *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 16(2): 1650009, 2016.
- [22] William Crawley-Boevey. Rigid integral representations of quivers, *Representation theory of algebras (Cocoyoc, 1994)*, 155-163, CMS Conf. Proc., 18, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1996.
- [23] Hans-Dieter Ebbinghaus and Jörg Flum. *Finite model theory*, 2nd edition. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [24] Richard Elwes. Asymptotic classes of finite structures. *J. Symb. Logic*, 72(2): 418–438, 2007.
- [25] Richard Elwes and Dugald Macpherson. A survey of asymptotic classes and measurable structures, *Model theory with applications to algebra and analysis*. 125–159, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 350(2), Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [26] David Evans Higher amalgamation properties in measured structures, *Model Theory*, 2 (2023), no. 2, 233–253.
- [27] Ulrich Felgner. On \aleph_0 -categorical extra-special p -groups. *Logique et Analyse*, 18(71-72): 408–428, 1975.
- [28] P. Gabriel. Unzerlegbare Darstellungen I, *Manuscripta Math.*, 6: 71-103, 1972.
- [29] Haim Gaifman. On local and non-local properties. *Proceedings of the Herbrand Symposium, Logic Colloquium '81*, 105–135, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, 107, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [30] Darío García, Dugald Macpherson, and Charles Steinhorn. Pseudofinite Structures and Simplicity, *J. Mathematical Logic*, 15(1): 1550002, 2015.
- [31] Darío García and Frank Wagner. Unimodularity unified. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 82(3): 1051–1065, 2017.
- [32] Nicolas Granger, *Stability, simplicity, and the model theory of bilinear forms*, PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 1999.
- [33] Nate Harman and Andrew Snowden. Ultrahomogeneous tensor spaces. *arXiv preprint math/2207.09626v1*, 2022.
- [34] Irene Heinrich, Thomas Schneider, and Pascal Schweitzer, Classification of finite highly regular vertex-coloured graphs, *arXiv preprint math/2012.01058v2*, 2021.
- [35] Graham Higman. Ordering by divisibility in abstract algebras. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 2: 326-336, 1952.
- [36] Wilfrid Hodges. *Model theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [37] Ehud Hrushovski, Unimodular minimal structures. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 46(3): 385–396, 1992.
- [38] Ehud Hrushovski and Frank Wagner. Counting and dimensions, *Model theory with applications to algebra and analysis Vol. 2.*, 161-176, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, 350, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [39] Ehud Hrushovski. On pseudo-finite dimensions. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic*, 54(3-4): 463–495, 2013.
- [40] Ehud Hrushovski. Stable group theory and approximate subgroups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 25:189–243, 2012.
- [41] Itay Kaplan and Nicholas Ramsey. On Kim-independence. *J. European Math. Soc.*, 22(5): 1423–1474, 2020.

- [42] William M. Kantor, Martin W. Liebeck and Dugald Macpherson. \aleph_0 -categorical structures smoothly approximated by finite structures. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 59:439–463, 1989.
- [43] Thomas M. Keller. Derived length and conjugacy class sizes. *Advances in Math.*, 199(1): 88–103, 2006.
- [44] Charlotte Kestner and Anand Pillay. Remarks on unimodularity. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 76(4): 1453–1458, 2011.
- [45] Charlotte Kestner. Measurability in modules, *Arch. Math. Logic*, 53: 593–620, 2014.
- [46] Byunghan Kim. *Simplicity Theory*. Oxford Logic Guides 53, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014.
- [47] Jan Krajčec. Uniform families of polynomial equations over a finite field and structures admitting an Euler characteristic of definable sets. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 81: 257–284, 2000.
- [48] Jan Krajčec and Thomas Scanlon. Combinatorics with definable sets: Euler characteristics and Grothendieck rings. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 6(3): 311–330, 2000.
- [49] Alistair H. Lachlan. On countable stable structures which are homogeneous for a finite relational language. *Israel J. Math.*, 49(1-3): 69–153, 1984.
- [50] Alastair H. Lachlan and Saharon Shelah. Stable structures homogeneous for a finite relational language *Isr. J. Math.* 49(1-3): 155–180, 1984.
- [51] Alistair H. Lachlan. Countable homogeneous tournaments. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 284(2): 431–461, 1984.
- [52] Alistair H. Lachlan and Robert E. Woodrow. Countable homogeneous undirected graphs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 262(1): 51–94, 1980.
- [53] Serge Lang and André Weil. Number of points of varieties in finite fields. *Amer. J. Math.*, 76: 819–827, 1954.
- [54] Martin W. Liebeck and Aner Shalev. Diameters of finite simple groups: sharp bounds and applications. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 154: 383–406, 2001.
- [55] Dugald Macpherson. A survey of homogeneous structures. *Discrete Math.*, 311: 1599–1634, 2011.
- [56] Dugald Macpherson. Model theory of finite and pseudofinite groups. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 57: 159–184, 2018.
- [57] Dugald Macpherson and Charles Steinhorn. One-dimensional asymptotic classes of finite structures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360: 411–448, 2008.
- [58] Paolo Marimon, Measures and amalgamation properties in ω -categorical structures. PhD Thesis, Imperial College London, 2023.
- [59] Paolo Marimon, Invariant Keisler measures for omega-categorical structures arXiv:2211.14628
- [60] Cédric Milliet. Definable envelopes in groups having a simple theory. *J. Algebra*, 492: 298–323, 2017.
- [61] Crispin St. J. A. Nash-Williams. On well-quasi-ordering finite trees. *Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.* 59: 833–835, 1963.
- [62] Anand Pillay. Strongly minimal pseudofinite structures. *arXiv preprint math/1411.5008v2*, 2014.
- [63] N. Ramsey. *Personal communication*, July 2024.
- [64] C.M. Ringel, Representation theory of Dynkin quivers. Three contributions. *Front. Math. China* 11(4): 765–814, 2016.
- [65] Mark J. Ryten, *Model theory of finite difference fields and simple groups*. PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2007.
- [66] Thomas Scanlon. Fields admitting ordered nontrivial strong Euler characteristics are quasifinite. Unpublished note.

- [67] Balasubramanian Sury. Elliptic curves over finite fields. *Elliptic curves, modular forms and cryptography (Allahabad 2000)*, 33–47, Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 2003.
- [68] Katrin Tent and Martin Ziegler. *A course in model theory*. Lecture Notes in Logic vol. 40., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [69] Frank Wagner. *Simple Theories*. Mathematics and its Applications, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [70] Frank Wagner. Dimensional groups and fields. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 85(3): 918–936, 2020.
- [71] John S. Wilson. First-order characterization of the radical of a finite group. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 74(4): 1429–1435, 2009.
- [72] D.L. Winter. The automorphism group of an extraspecial p -group. *Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics*, 2(2): 159–168, 1972.
- [73] Daniel Wolf. Multidimensional exact classes, smooth approximation and bounded 4-types. *J. Symbolic Logic* 85(4): 1305–1341, 2020.
- [74] D. Wolf, *Model theory of multidimensional asymptotic classes*, PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2016.

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ AND SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, IMJ-PRG,
F-75013 PARIS, FRANCE

Email address: `sylvy.anscombe@imj-prg.fr`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS, LEEDS LS2 9JT, UNITED
KINGDOM

Email address: `h.d.macpherson@leeds.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, VASSAR COLLEGE, 124 RAY-
MOND AVENUE, POUGHKEEPSIE, NEW YORK 12604

Email address: `steinhorn@vassar.edu`

Formerly of the SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS, LEEDS
LS2 9JT, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: `dwolfeu@gmail.com`