

STABLE REDUCTS OF ELEMENTARY EXTENSIONS OF PRESBURGER ARITHMETIC

ERAN ALOUF, ANTONGIULIO FORNASIERO, AND ITAY KAPLAN

ABSTRACT. Suppose N is elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group $(G, +, <)$ with small quotients (for all $1 \leq n < \omega$, $[G : nG]$ is finite). Then every stable reduct of N which expands $(G, +)$ (equivalently every reduct that does not add new unary definable sets) is interdefinable with $(G, +)$. This extends previous results on stable reducts of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$ to (stable) reducts of elementary extensions of \mathbb{Z} . In particular this holds for $G = \mathbb{Z}$ and $G = \mathbb{Q}$. As a result we answer a question of Conant from 2018.

1. INTRODUCTION

The classification of reducts and expansions of various structures is one of the most fundamental problems in model theory. In particular, classical structures expanding $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ such as Presburger arithmetic (i.e., $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$), their reducts and expansions (with various properties), have been the center of many recent papers. A remarkable result of Conant in this direction is the following:

Fact 1.1 ([Con18]). *Suppose that \mathcal{Z} is an expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ and a reduct of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$. Then \mathcal{Z} is interdefinable with either $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ or $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$.*

The proof used a “hands on” approach to analyze definable sets in Presburger arithmetic. One of Conant’s motivations was to answer a question of Marker from 2011 asking about the case where \mathcal{Z} is *stable*. However, this special case was already solved by Conant and Pillay in [CP18] where they showed that $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ has no proper stable expansions of finite dp-rank.

In [Ad19], d’Elbée and the first author used the aforementioned result from [CP18] to give an alternative (and arguably simpler) proof for Fact 1.1 (see [Ad19, Theorem 5.14]). They also proved an analogous result for $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$, where p is prime and \preceq_p is the partial order associated with the p -adic valuation v_p (i.e., $a \preceq_p b$ holds if and only if $v_p(a) \leq v_p(b)$):

Fact 1.2 ([Ad19, Corollary 1.12]). *Suppose that \mathcal{Z} is an expansion of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ and a reduct of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$. Then \mathcal{Z} is interdefinable with either $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1)$ or $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$.*

In [Ad19] it was also shown that both Fact 1.1 and Fact 1.2 fail when $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$ and $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$, respectively, are replaced with proper elementary extensions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$ and $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$. For proper elementary extensions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, \preceq_p)$, it was shown that there are both stable and unstable intermediate structures (see [Ad19, Propositions 6.1 and 6.2]). However, for proper elementary extensions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0, 1, <)$, it was only shown that there are unstable intermediate structures (see [Ad19, Proposition 6.3]), and the question remained whether there are also stable intermediate structures. The work leading to this paper began as an attempt

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03C45, 03C64; Secondary 03C07, 06F20.

Key words and phrases. Stable groups, Presburger arithmetic, tame expansions of the integers.

The third author would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation (grants no. 1254/18 and 804/22).

to answer this question, and indeed, we give a negative answer as a special case of Theorem 1.4.

To formalize our results, we distinguish between the notions of expansion/reduct and 0-expansion/0-reduct, see Definition 2.1. Our first main theorem is as follows:

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 4.1). *Let M be a weakly-minimal and 1-based structure expanding an abelian group $(G, +)$ with small quotients (i.e., for all $1 \leq n < \omega$, $[G : nG]$ is finite). Let N be a 0-expansion of M such that:*

- (1) N is ω -saturated.
- (2) Every unary subset $X \subseteq G$ that is definable in N is also definable in M .
- (3) For every $A \subseteq G$, $\text{acl}_M(A) = \text{acl}_N(A)$.

Then M and N are interdefinable.

The second main theorem is an application of Theorem 1.3 to ordered abelian groups:

Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 5.5). *Let $N = (G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients, and let M be a reduct of N that expands $(G, +)$. Suppose that one of the following holds:*

- (1) M is stable, or
- (2) every unary subset $D \subseteq G$ that is definable in M , is also definable in $(G, +)$.

Then M is interdefinable with $(G, +)$.

As part of the proof, we show that in the settings of Theorem 1.4, the assumptions (1) and (2) are equivalent (see Proposition 5.4).

In particular, Theorem 1.4 holds if, instead of small quotients, we make the stronger assumption that G has finite rank as a torsion-free abelian group (see Corollary 5.6).

As an application of the proof we prove that in the context of Theorem 1.4, if M is a proper expansion of $(G, +)$ then M defines the order on some infinite interval, see Corollary 5.7. This answers positively a question of Conant, see [Con18, Question 1.5].

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.3 is the following preservation lemma for group homomorphisms, which may be of independent interest:

Lemma 1.5 (Lemma 3.2). *Suppose that N is an ω -saturated structure 0-expanding a structure M that expands an abelian group $(G, +)$ with small quotients. Suppose that, for every $A \subseteq G$, $\text{dcl}_N(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_M(A)$. Then, every group homomorphism $f : G \rightarrow G$ definable in N is definable in M .*

We also prove Lemma 3.1, another version of the same idea that holds for certain groups that are not necessarily abelian.

1.1. Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we establish all the facts and notations needed to prove the main results. In particular, we discuss expansions and reducts in Section 2.1, facts about groups in Section 2.2, weak minimality and one-basedness in Section 2.3, and imaginaries in Section 2.4 and Archimedean ordered abelian groups in Section 2.5. Section 3 is devoted to Lemma 3.2 mentioned above. Section 4 handles Theorem 1.3 and Section 5 deals with Theorem 1.4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Expansions and reducts. Here we make precise what we mean when discussing expansions and reducts, and collect some observations. In this paper, when we say that a subset X in a structure M is definable, without specifying a parameter set, we mean that X is definable with parameters from M .

Definition 2.1. Let M and N be two structures with the same universe, and let A be a subset of this universe.

- (1) The structure M is an A -reduct of N if whenever $X \subseteq M^k$ is \emptyset -definable in M , it is also A -definable in N . We also say that N is an A -expansion of M .
- (2) The structures M, N are A -interdefinable iff M is an A -reduct of N and vice versa.
- (3) When A is the entire universe, we simply say *reduct*, *expansion* and *interdefinable*. When $A = \emptyset$ we also write *0-reduct*, *0-expansion* and *0-interdefinable*.

Example 2.2. Let $N = (G, +, <)$ be a proper elementary extension of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$. Let $a \in G$ be a positive and infinite element, and $M := (G, +, [0, a])$. Then M is a reduct of N , but it is not a 0-reduct.

In this paper, we focus only on definable sets, not specific languages. Therefore, whenever a structure N is a 0-expansion of a structure M , we can (and will) assume that the language of N contains the language of M .

Observation 2.3. Let M be a structure and N be an expansion of M . Let N' be an elementary extension of N , and let M' be the reduct of N' to the language of M . If M' and N' are interdefinable, then M and N are interdefinable.

Observation 2.4. Let M be a structure with language L , and let N be an expansion of M which is $|L|^+$ -saturated. Let N' be an elementary extension of N , and let M' be the reduct of N' to L . Suppose that every unary subset $X \subseteq N$ which is definable in N is also definable in M . Then, every unary subset $X \subseteq N'$ which is definable in N' is also definable in M' . If N is a 0-expansion of M it is enough to assume that N is ω -saturated.

Definition 2.5. Let M be a structure, and let $A \subseteq M$. A formula $\phi(x)$ over A is algebraic if $\phi(M)$ is finite. We let acl_M be the *algebraic closure operator*. Namely, $\text{acl}_M : \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M)$ and $\text{acl}_M(A)$ is the union of all realizations of algebraic formulas over A .

Similarly, we define dcl_M , the *definable closure operator*, as the function $\text{dcl}_M : \mathcal{P}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $\text{dcl}_M(A)$ is the union of all realizations of algebraic formulas of size 1 over A .

We omit M if it is clear from the context.

Observation 2.6. Let M be a structure with language L , and let N be a 0-expansion of M that is ω -saturated. Let N' be an elementary extension of N , and let M' be the reduct of N' to L . Suppose that $\text{acl}_M = \text{acl}_N$. Then $\text{acl}_{M'} = \text{acl}_{N'}$.

Proof. It is enough to show that for every finite tuple c in N' , we have $\text{acl}_{M'}(c) = \text{acl}_{N'}(c)$. Thus, let c be a finite tuple in N' . Since N' is a 0-expansion of M' , we have $\text{acl}_{M'}(c) \subseteq \text{acl}_{N'}(c)$.

For the other direction, let $e \in \text{acl}_{N'}(c)$. So there is a formula $\phi(x, y)$ without parameters in the language of N such that $\phi(x, c)$ is algebraic and $N' \models \phi(e, c)$. Let $m := |\phi(N', c)|$ and denote by $\tilde{\phi}(x, y)$ the following formula

$$(\exists^{\leq m} w \phi(w, y)) \wedge \phi(x, y)$$

so $N' \models \tilde{\phi}(e, c)$.

Suppose, toward a contradiction, that $e \notin \text{acl}_{M'}(c)$. So for every formula $\psi(x, y)$ without parameters in L such that $\psi(x, c)$ is algebraic, we have $M' \models \neg\psi(e, c)$. Since N' is a 0-expansion of M' , $\psi(x, y)$ is \emptyset -definable in N' and $N' \models \neg\psi(e, c)$.

For every $k < \omega$ denote by $\theta_{\psi,k}(x, y)$ the formula

$$(\exists^{\leq k} w \psi(w, y)) \rightarrow \neg \psi(x, y)$$

Then, for every $\psi(x, y)$ without parameters in L and every $k < \omega$ we have $N' \models \theta_{\psi,k}(e, c)$. Thus, the collection of formulas

$$\{\theta_{\psi,k}(x, y) : \psi(x, y) \text{ as above and } k < \omega\} \cup \{\tilde{\phi}(x, y)\}$$

is consistent and without parameters; hence, it is realized in N . Let (e_2, c_2) be a realization. Then $e_2 \in \text{acl}_N(c_2)$ but $e_2 \notin \text{acl}_M(c_2)$, a contradiction. \square

2.2. Groups.

Definition 2.7. We say that a group G has *unbounded exponent* if for all $1 \leq n < \omega$, $G^n \neq \{1\}$.

Definition 2.8. Let $(G, +)$ be an abelian group.

- (1) We say that G has *small quotients* if for all $1 \leq n < \omega$, nG has finite index in G .
- (2) We say that G has *small torsion* if for all $1 \leq n < \omega$, the set $\{g \in G : ng = 0\}$ is finite. ¹

Remark 2.9.

- (1) If G is torsion-free, then it has small torsion, but it does not necessarily have small quotients (e.g., \mathbb{Z}^ω).
- (2) If G is infinite and has either small quotients or small torsion, then G has unbounded exponent.

Remark 2.10. The properties of having small quotients and having small torsion are both elementary properties of abelian groups. That is, if G_1 and G_2 are abelian groups such that $G_1 \equiv G_2$, then G_1 has this property iff G_2 has it. This is because each of these properties can be described by an infinite conjunction of infinite disjunctions of first-order sentences in the language of groups.

Definition 2.11. We say that a group G is an *R-group* if it has unique roots: for all $1 \leq n < \omega$ and $x, y \in G$, if $x^n = y^n$ then $x = y$.

Remark 2.12. If G is an *R-group*, then G is torsion-free.

Examples of *R-groups* include torsion-free nilpotent groups, see [FW99, Corollary 2.5]. See also [Bau60].

Remark 2.13. Being an *R-group* is an elementary property of groups.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $(G, +)$ be an abelian group of finite U -rank. G has small torsion if and only if G has small quotients.*

Proof. By the Lascar inequalities for groups (see [Poi01, Corollary 6.3]), for each $n < \omega$, $U(G) = U(G/nG) + U(nG)$. Let $\phi_n : G \rightarrow G$ be the homomorphism defined by $\phi_n(g) := ng$. Then, again by the Lascar inequalities for groups (and the fact that U -rank is preserved under 0-definable bijections) $U(G) = U(\ker \phi_n) + U(nG)$. Hence $U(G/nG) = U(\ker \phi_n)$. Finally, G has small torsion iff $U(\ker \phi_n) = 0$ for all n , and G has small quotients iff $U(G/nG) = 0$ for all n . \square

Recall that the *divisible hull* of a torsion-free abelian group A is the tensor product $\hat{A} := \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A$. \hat{A} is a divisible abelian group, and A canonically embeds into \hat{A} via $a \mapsto 1 \otimes a$. Abusing notation, we consider A as a subgroup of \hat{A} .

Recall that the rank of a torsion-free abelian group is the dimension of its divisible hull as a vector space over \mathbb{Q} .

¹They are also called almost torsion-free in the literature: see [TY02].

Fact 2.15. *A torsion-free abelian group of finite rank has small quotients.*

Proof. We prove a stronger statement:

Claim 2.16. If A is a subgroup of \mathbb{Q}^d , then, for every $1 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$, $|A/mA| \leq m^d$.

If A is finitely generated, then $A \simeq \mathbb{Z}^{d'}$ for some $d' \leq d$, and the claim follows. In general, let $b_1, \dots, b_\ell \in A$ and let B be the subgroup of A generated by b_1, \dots, b_ℓ . Then,

$$|\{b_1/mA, \dots, b_\ell/mA\}| \leq |\{b_1/mB, \dots, b_\ell/mB\}| \leq |B/mB| \leq m^d,$$

proving the claim.

See also [Arn82, Theorem 0.1] for a different proof. \square

2.3. Weakly-minimal and one-based theories.

Definition 2.17. A theory T is called *weakly-minimal* if T is stable and has U -rank 1.

Fact 2.18. *Let T be a theory with monster model \mathcal{M} . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) T is weakly-minimal.
- (2) For every model $M \models T$ and every non-algebraic formula $\phi(x, b)$ with $|x| = 1$ and $b \in M$, we have $\phi(M, b) \neq \emptyset$.
- (3) There is a small model $M \models T$ such that, for every non-algebraic formula $\phi(x, b)$ with $|x| = 1$ and $b \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $\phi(M, b) \neq \emptyset$.
- (4) For every model $M \models T$ and every $a, b \in M$ and $C \subseteq M$, if $a, b \notin \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$ and $\text{tp}(a/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset)) = \text{tp}(b/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset))$ then $\text{tp}(a/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)) = \text{tp}(b/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C))$.

Proof. We show (1) \implies (2) \implies (3) \implies (1) and (1) \implies (4) \implies (3).

For (1) \implies (2): Since $U(T) = 1$ and $\phi(x, b)$ is non-algebraic, $\phi(x, b)$ does not fork over \emptyset , and so does not fork over M . Thus, we can extend $\phi(x, b)$ to a global type p that does not fork over M . By stability, p is finitely satisfiable in M , so $\phi(x, b)$ is realized in M .

(2) \implies (3) is trivial.

For (3) \implies (1): To show that $U(T) = 1$ it is enough to show that every formula $\phi(x, b)$ with $|x| = 1$ and $b \in \mathcal{M}$ which divides over \emptyset , is algebraic. Therefore, suppose $\phi(x, b)$ is not algebraic. Let $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ be a sequence indiscernible over \emptyset such that $b_0 = b$ and such that $\{\phi(x, b_i) : i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent. Let M be given by (3), and let $(c_i)_{i < \omega}$ be a sequence indiscernible over M with the same EM-type over \emptyset as $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$. In particular, $\{\phi(x, c_i) : i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent, and $\phi(x, c_0)$ is not algebraic. By (3), there is $a \in M$ realizing $\phi(x, c_0)$. By indiscernibility over M , a realizes $\{\phi(x, c_i) : i < \omega\}$, a contradiction.

To demonstrate stability, let M be given by (3) and denote $\lambda := |M|$, $\kappa := 2^{2^\lambda}$. Here, we count 1-types over sets of size $\leq \kappa$. Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ such that $|A| \leq \kappa$. Let $N \prec \mathcal{M}$ be of size at most κ such that $A \subseteq N$ and $M \subseteq N$ (so $M \prec N$). By (3), every non-algebraic type over N is finitely satisfiable in M . Thus, the number of non-algebraic types over N is bounded by the number of types over N that are coheirs over M , which is bounded by $2^{2^\lambda} = \kappa$. The number of algebraic types over N is $|N| \leq \kappa$. Together we get $|S_1(A)| \leq |S_1(N)| \leq \kappa$. Therefore T is stable.

For (1) \implies (4): Let M, C, a, b be as in (4). Let $p := \text{tp}(a/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset)) = \text{tp}(b/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset))$. By stability, p has a unique extension to a type q over $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$ which does not fork over $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset)$. Since $a \notin \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)$, and since $U(T) = 1$, we get that $\text{tp}(a/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C))$ does not fork over \emptyset and hence does not fork over $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset)$. By the uniqueness of q , $\text{tp}(a/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)) = q$. Identically, $\text{tp}(b/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(C)) = q$, thus these types are equal.

For (4) \implies (3): Let M be a small $|L|^+$ -saturated model. We claim that M is as required. Let $\phi(x, b)$ be as in (3). Note that $|\text{acl}^{eq}(b)| \leq |L|$, so, since $\phi(x, b)$ is non-algebraic, there exists $a \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \phi(a, b)$ and $a \notin \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$. Let

$$Q := tp(a / \text{acl}^{eq}(\emptyset)) \cup \{x \neq d : d \in \text{acl}^{eq}(b)\}$$

Thus, Q is a partial type over $\text{acl}^{eq}(b)$, which is of size at most $|L|$, hence it has a realization $a' \in M$. So $a' \notin \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$ and $tp(a' / \text{acl}^{eq}(\emptyset)) = tp(a / \text{acl}^{eq}(\emptyset))$. By (4), we obtain $tp(a' / \text{acl}^{eq}(b)) = tp(a / \text{acl}^{eq}(b))$, and in particular, $\mathcal{M} \models \phi(a', b)$. \square

Definition 2.19. (1) A subset $X \subseteq M^k$ of a structure M is called *almost 0-definable* if it is definable over $\text{acl}^{eq}(\emptyset)$.
(2) Two structures M and N with the same universe are called *almost 0-interdefinable* if N is an $\text{acl}_M^{eq}(\emptyset)$ -reduct of M and M is an $\text{acl}_N^{eq}(\emptyset)$ -reduct of N .

Definition 2.20. A structure M 0-expanding an abelian group $(M, +)$ is called a *quasi-abelian structure* if, for every k , every definable subset $X \subseteq M^k$ is a boolean combination of cosets of almost 0-definable subgroups of M^k .

Fact 2.21 ([HL10, Proposition 2.1]). *Let M be a quasi-abelian structure. M is weakly-minimal if and only if every definable subgroup of M is either finite or of finite index. This remains true if we replace “definable” with “almost 0-definable”.*

Corollary 2.22. *If $M = (G, +)$ is an abelian group with small quotients, then M is weakly-minimal.*

Proof. By quantifier elimination for abelian groups, M is quasi-abelian, and the only subgroups of G which are definable in M are $\{0\}$ and mG for $1 \leq m < \omega$. Thus, the conclusion follows from Fact 2.21. \square

Combining this with Fact 2.15 we get:

Corollary 2.23. *If $M = (G, +)$ is a torsion-free abelian group of finite rank, then M is weakly-minimal.*

We denote by \downarrow the ternary relation of forking independence.

Definition 2.24. A stable theory T with monster model \mathcal{M} is called *1-based* if for every $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{M}^{eq}$ we have $A \downarrow_{\text{acl}^{eq}(A) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(B)} B$. A stable structure is called *1-based* if its theory is 1-based.

Remark 2.25. In the above definition, it is enough to consider only finite sets $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{M}^{eq}$.

Fact 2.26 (Special case of [HP87]). *Let T be a stable and 1-based theory of an abelian group. Then, every $M \models T$ is quasi-abelian.*

Fact 2.27 ([Lov90, Theorem 2.1]). *Let M be a weakly-minimal and 1-based structure 0-expanding an abelian group $(M, +)$ of unbounded exponent. Let R be the ring of all endomorphisms of $(M, +)$ which are definable in M , and let $M' := (M, +, f : f \in R)$. Then M and M' are interdefinable.*

Remark 2.28. (1) In [Lov90] M is assumed to be an “abelian structure” rather than “1-based”, but it should have been written there “1-based” instead. Indeed, at the very beginning of the proof, Fact 2.26 is applied to conclude that M is quasi-abelian.

(2) The formulation of Fact 2.27 is weaker than that in [Lov90] and immediately follows from it.

Fact 2.29. *Let T be a (supersimple) theory of SU -rank 1 (so in particular when T is weakly-minimal), with monster model \mathcal{M} . Then:*

- (1) *acl satisfies exchange (and therefore defines a pregeometry).*
- (2) *For every (real) tuple $a \in \mathcal{M}$ and $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ we have $SU(a/C) = \dim(a/C)$, where $\dim(a/C)$ is the acl -dimension of a over C .*
- (3) *For every (real) $A, B, C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ we have $A \underset{C}{\downarrow} B \iff A \underset{C}{\downarrow}^a B$, where $\underset{C}{\downarrow}^a$ denotes the ternary acl -independence relation.*

Proof. (1): Let $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and singletons $a, b \in \mathcal{M}$ be such that $a \in \text{acl}(Cb)$ but $a \notin \text{acl}(C)$. Since $SU(T)$ is finite, Lascar inequalities give $SU(ab/C) = SU(b/Ca) + SU(a/C)$ and $SU(ab/C) = SU(a/Cb) + SU(b/C)$. Since a is a singleton and $a \notin \text{acl}(C)$, we obtain $SU(a/C) = 1$. Since $a \in \text{acl}(Cb)$ we have $SU(a/Cb) = 0$. Therefore, and since b is a singleton, we obtain $SU(b/Ca) + 1 = SU(b/C) \leq 1$. Thus, $SU(b/Ca) = 0$, and hence $b \in \text{acl}(Ca)$.

(2): Let b be a tuple enumerating a maximal subset of the elements of a which is acl -independent over C . After rearranging the elements of a , we can write $a = bc$. Write $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Then $\dim(a/C) = n$.

On the other hand, Lascar inequalities give $SU(a/C) = SU(c/Cb) + SU(b/C)$. By the choice of b, c , we have $c \subseteq \text{acl}(Cb)$, hence $SU(c/Cb) = 0$. Therefore, by Lascar inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} SU(a/C) &= SU(b/C) = \\ &= SU(b_n/Cb_1 \dots b_{n-1}) + SU(b_{n-1}/Cb_1 \dots b_{n-2}) + \dots + SU(b_1/C). \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of b , for each i we have $b_i \notin \text{acl}(Cb_1 \dots b_{i-1})$, hence $SU(b_i/Cb_1 \dots b_{i-1}) = 1$. Therefore $SU(a/C) = n = \dim(a/C)$.

(3): It is enough to show this when $A = a$ is a finite tuple. Since T is simple, we have $a \underset{C}{\downarrow} B$ if and only if $SU(a/CB) = SU(a/C)$. By (2), this holds if and only if $\dim(a/CB) = \dim(a/C)$, which holds if and only if $a \underset{C}{\downarrow}^a B$. \square

2.4. Weak and geometric elimination of imaginaries.

- Definition 2.30.**
- (1) A structure M has *weak elimination of imaginaries* (WEI) if for every $e \in M^{eq}$ there is a tuple $a \in M$ such that $e \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(a)$ and $a \in \text{acl}^{eq}(e)$.
 - (2) A structure M has *geometric elimination of imaginaries* (GEI) if for every $e \in M^{eq}$ there is a tuple $a \in M$ such that $e \in \text{acl}^{eq}(a)$ and $a \in \text{acl}^{eq}(e)$.
 - (3) A theory T has WEI (respectively, GEI) if every $M \models T$ has WEI (respectively, GEI).

Remark 2.31. Clearly, WEI implies GEI. Also, to check that a theory T has WEI (respectively, GEI), it is sufficient to check it for a single $|T|^+$ -saturated model of T .

Fact 2.32. *Let T be a weakly-minimal theory, such that $N := \text{acl}(\emptyset)$ is a model of T . Then T has WEI.*

Proof. This is a variation of [Pil98, Lemma 1.6]. Let $M \models T$, and let $e \in M^{eq}$. Thus, there exist a 0-definable function f and a tuple $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in M^n$ such that $f(b) = e$. Let $A := \text{acl}^{eq}(e) \cap M$. So $N \subseteq A$.

We will find a tuple $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in A^n$ such that $f(c) = e$. We find c_i by recursion on i . Suppose we already found $c_1, \dots, c_{i-1} \in A$ such that for some $d_i, \dots, d_n \in M$ we have $e = f(c_1, \dots, c_{i-1}, d_i, \dots, d_n)$ (for $i = 1$ this holds with

$(d_1, \dots, d_n) = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$). Let $\phi_i(x_i)$ be the following formula

$$\exists x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n (e = f(c_1, \dots, c_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)).$$

So $d_i \in \phi_i(M) \neq \emptyset$. We have two cases: (1): $\phi_i(M)$ is finite. In this case, $d_i \in \text{acl}^{eq}(A) \cap M = A$. We let $c_i := d_i$. (2): $\phi_i(M)$ is infinite. In this case, by weak minimality (Fact 2.18 (2)) we get $\phi_i(N) \neq \emptyset$. Let c_i be any element in $\phi_i(N)$. So $c_i \in N \subseteq A$.

So we found $c \in A^n$ such that $f(c) = e$, hence $e \in \text{dcl}^{eq}(c)$ and $c \in \text{acl}^{eq}(e)$. \square

Proposition 2.33. *Let T be a stable theory with monster model \mathcal{M} . Suppose that T has GEI. Then T is 1-based if and only if for every (real) tuples $a, b \in \mathcal{M}$ we have $a \downarrow b$.*

$$\text{acl}(a) \cap \text{acl}(b)$$

Proof. Suppose T is 1-based. Let $a, b \in \mathcal{M}$ be real tuples. Then $a \downarrow b$.

$$\text{acl}^{eq}(a) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$$

We demonstrate that $\text{acl}^{eq}(a) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(b) = \text{acl}^{eq}(\text{acl}(a) \cap \text{acl}(b))$: In every theory, the right-hand side is contained in the left-hand side. Let $e \in \text{acl}^{eq}(a) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$. By GEI, there exists a real tuple $d \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\text{acl}^{eq}(e) = \text{acl}^{eq}(d)$. So also $d \in \text{acl}^{eq}(a) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$, and since d is real, $d \in \text{acl}(a) \cap \text{acl}(b)$. Therefore $e \in \text{acl}^{eq}(\text{acl}(a) \cap \text{acl}(b))$. So $\text{acl}^{eq}(a) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(b) = \text{acl}^{eq}(\text{acl}(a) \cap \text{acl}(b))$, hence

$$a \downarrow b, \text{ and therefore } a \downarrow b.$$

$$\text{acl}^{eq}(\text{acl}(a) \cap \text{acl}(b))$$

$$\text{acl}(a) \cap \text{acl}(b)$$

For the other direction, let $a, b \in \mathcal{M}^{eq}$. By GEI, there exist real tuples $a', b' \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\text{acl}^{eq}(a') = \text{acl}^{eq}(a)$ and $\text{acl}^{eq}(b') = \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$. By the assumption, $a' \downarrow b'$, so $\text{acl}^{eq}(a') \downarrow \text{acl}^{eq}(b')$, and hence $\text{acl}^{eq}(a') \downarrow \text{acl}^{eq}(b')$. Therefore $\text{acl}^{eq}(a) \downarrow \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$, and hence $a \downarrow b$. \square

$$\text{acl}^{eq}(a) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$$

$$\text{acl}^{eq}(a) \cap \text{acl}^{eq}(b)$$

2.5. Archimedean ordered abelian groups.

Definition 2.34. An *ordered abelian group* is an abelian group $(G, +)$ together with a linear order $<$ on G such that for all $a, b, c \in G$, $a < b \implies a + c < b + c$. An ordered abelian group is called *discrete* if it has a minimal positive element, and *dense* otherwise. An ordered abelian group is called *archimedean* if for every $a, b \in G$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $b < na$.

Remark 2.35. (1) In a densely ordered abelian group, the order is indeed dense.

(2) Archimedean ordered abelian groups do not have non-trivial convex subgroups.

(3) Every discrete archimedean ordered abelian group is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$.

Fact 2.36. *Let $(G, +, <)$ be an archimedean ordered abelian group.*

(1) *If G is dense, $\text{Th}(G)$ has quantifier elimination in the language $\{+, -, <, 0\} \cup \{\equiv_m : 2 \leq m < \omega\}$.*

(2) *If G is discrete, $\text{Th}(G)$ has quantifier elimination in the language $\{+, -, <, 0, 1\} \cup \{\equiv_m : 2 \leq m < \omega\}$.*

Here, $a \equiv_m b$ is interpreted as $a - b \in mG$.

Proof. This is a special case of [HH19, Proposition 3.4]. In our case, since G is archimedean, it has no non-trivial convex subgroups. In particular, this implies that all spines are trivial.

Note that “ $-$ ” is not required for quantifier elimination: however, we added it for convenience. \square

Definition 2.37. Let $(G, +, <)$ be an ordered abelian group. A *generalized interval with rational endpoints* is a nonempty set of the form $\{g \in G : ng \geq a\} \cap \{g \in G : mg \leq b\}$, where $1 \leq n, m \in \omega$, $a, b \in G \cup \{\pm\infty\}$, and either or both inequalities may be replaced by strict inequalities. As usual, a generalized interval with neither minimum nor maximum is called *open*.

We will denote a set of the form $\{g \in G : ng > a\} \cap \{g \in G : mg < b\}$ by $(\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{m})$, and similarly for other kinds of generalized intervals with rational endpoints. This notation makes sense, because an ordered abelian group is torsion-free and the order extends uniquely to the divisible hull. Thus, such an interval in G is precisely the intersection with G of the corresponding interval in the divisible hull of G .

For $1 \leq n < \omega$ we will use the convention that $n \cdot \infty = \frac{\infty}{n} = \infty$ and $n \cdot (-\infty) = \frac{-\infty}{n} = -\infty$.

Definition 2.38. Let $(G, +, <)$ be an ordered abelian group. For a subset $A \subseteq G$, we denote by $\text{span}(A)$ the linear span of A over \mathbb{Q} , computed in the divisible hull of G . We also denote $\text{span}^+(A) := \text{span}(A \cup \text{dcl}(0))$.

If $(G, +, <)$ is elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group, there are two cases: If G is dense, then by Fact 2.36 we have $\text{dcl}(0) = \{0\}$ and $\text{span}^+(A) = \text{span}(A)$. Otherwise, G is discrete, so elementarily equivalent to $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$. By Fact 2.36 we may assume that G is an elementary extension of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$, so $\text{dcl}(0) = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\text{span}^+(A) = \text{span}(A \cup \{1\})$.

Corollary 2.39. *Let $(G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients. Then, every unary definable subset $D \subseteq G$ is of the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i$ such that, for each i , either*

- $D_i = \{c_i\}$ is a singleton, or
- $D_i = I_i \cap (mG + g_i)$, where $g_i \in G$ and I_i is an open generalized interval with rational endpoints,

and $1 \leq m < \omega$ does not depend on i .

In addition, suppose D is definable over \bar{b} . Then, for each i , if $D_i = \{c_i\}$ is a singleton then $c_i \in \text{span}^+(\bar{b}) \cap G$, and otherwise, the endpoints of I_i are in $\text{span}^+(\bar{b}) \cup \{\pm\infty\}$.

Proof. By Fact 2.36, D is definable by a boolean combination of atomic formulas over \bar{b} in either $\{+, -, <, 0\} \cup \{\equiv_m : 2 \leq m < \omega\}$ or $\{+, -, <, 0, 1\} \cup \{\equiv_m : 2 \leq m < \omega\}$, depending on whether G is dense or discrete. We note the following points:

- A term $t(\bar{x})$ is a linear combination over \mathbb{Z} of either the elements of \bar{x} , if G is dense, or the elements of \bar{x} and 1, if G is discrete.
- A formula of the form $t_1(x, \bar{b}) = t_2(x, \bar{b})$ is equivalent to a formula of the form $nx = t(\bar{b})$ with $n < \omega$. If $n = 0$, then this formula is equivalent to either \top or \perp . In addition, if $n \geq 1$, then if $\frac{t(\bar{b})}{n} \in G$ then this formula defines $\frac{t(\bar{b})}{n}$, otherwise this formula is equivalent to \perp . This also implies that a conjunction of formulas such that one of them is $nx = t(\bar{b})$ with $n \geq 1$, is equivalent to either $nx = t(\bar{b})$ or to \perp .
- A formula of the form $\neg(t_1(x, \bar{b}) = t_2(x, \bar{b}))$ is equivalent to $(t_1(x, \bar{b}) < t_2(x, \bar{b})) \vee (t_1(x, \bar{b}) > t_2(x, \bar{b}))$.
- A formula of the form $t_1(x, \bar{b}) < t_2(x, \bar{b})$ is equivalent to a formula of either the form $nx < t(\bar{b})$ or the form $nx > t(\bar{b})$, with $n < \omega$. If $n = 0$, then this formula is equivalent to either \top or \perp .
- A formula of the form $\neg(t_1(x, \bar{b}) < t_2(x, \bar{b}))$ is equivalent to $(t_1(x, \bar{b}) > t_2(x, \bar{b})) \vee (t_1(x, \bar{b}) = t_2(x, \bar{b}))$.

- A formula of the form $(n_1x > t_1(\bar{b})) \wedge (n_2x > t_2(\bar{b}))$ with $n_1, n_2 \geq 1$ is equivalent to a formula of the form $nx > t(\bar{b})$ with $n \geq 1$, and analogously for $<$ in place of $>$.
- Let $2 \leq m < \omega$. Since G has small quotients, we can take a finite set $g_1, \dots, g_N \in G$ of representatives for the cosets of mG . A formula of either the form $t_1(x, \bar{b}) \equiv_m t_2(x, \bar{b})$ or the form $\neg(t_1(x, \bar{b}) \equiv_m t_2(x, \bar{b}))$ is equivalent to $\bigvee_{i \in F} x \equiv_m g_i$ for some $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$.
- Similarly, if $2 \leq m_1, m_2 < \omega$, $m_1 | m_2$ and $g_1, \dots, g_N \in G$ are representatives for the cosets of m_2G , then a formula of the form $x \equiv_{m_1} h$ is equivalent to $\bigvee_{i \in F} x \equiv_{m_2} g_i$ for some $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$.
- A formula of the form $(x \equiv_m g) \wedge (x \equiv_m h)$ is equivalent to either $x \equiv_m g$, if $g \equiv_m h$, or to \perp , if $g \not\equiv_m h$.

The conclusion follows easily from these points. \square

Lemma 2.40. *Let $(G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients. Then, for every $1 \leq m < \omega$, $g \in G$, $1 \leq n, k < \omega$, and $a, b \in G \cup \{\pm\infty\}$, if $(\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{k})$ is infinite then $(\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{k}) \cap (mG + g)$ is infinite.*

Proof. First, we demonstrate that it is sufficient to prove this for $n = k = 1$. Since $(\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{k}) = (\frac{ka}{nk}, \frac{nb}{nk})$, we may assume that $n = k$. Since $(\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{n})$ is infinite and G is torsion-free, also (a, b) is infinite. Applying the lemma with nm in place of m , ng in place of g , $n = k = 1$, and a, b , we find that $(a, b) \cap (nmG + ng)$ is infinite. Every element in this set is of the form $nmh + ng = n(mh + g)$ for some $h \in G$, so $mh + g \in (\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{n}) \cap (mG + g)$. And if $n(mh_1 + g) \neq n(mh_2 + g)$ then $(mh_1 + g) \neq (mh_2 + g)$. Therefore $(\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{n}) \cap (mG + g)$ is infinite.

Second, we show that it is enough to prove this for $a, b \in G$. Indeed, suppose that $b = \infty$. By replacing g with $(1 - m)g$ we may assume that $g \geq 0$. If $a > 0$, let $c := 2a > a$; otherwise, let $c > 0$ be any positive element. Now for every $1 \leq k < \omega$, $a < mkc + g \in mG + g$, so $(a, \infty) \cap (mG + g)$ is infinite. And similarly for the case when $a = -\infty$.

If G is discrete, then it is elementarily equivalent to $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$, and (using quantifier elimination) we may assume that G is an elementary extension of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$. In this case, the set $\{a + n : 1 \leq n < \omega\}$ is contained in (a, b) and has an infinite intersection with $mG + g$.

So suppose G is dense. Then (a, b) is infinite if and only if $a < b$, and, by iterating, $(a, b) \cap (mG + g)$ is infinite if and only if it is nonempty. Thus, for each m , the statement we want to prove is equivalent to “for every $a, b, g \in G$, if $a < b$ then $(a, b) \cap (mG + g)$ is nonempty”, which is a first-order sentence. Hence, we may assume that G itself is archimedean. Also, note that it is enough to prove this statement for $a = 0$.

Thus, let $2 \leq m < \omega$ and let $b, g \in G$ such that $b > 0$. We show that $(0, b) \cap (mG + g)$ is nonempty. Since G has small quotients, G/mG is finite. Since $(0, b)$ is infinite, there are $0 < d_1 < d_2 < b$ such that $c := d_2 - d_1 \in mG$. Since G is archimedean, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $nc < g \leq (n + 1)c$. Let $e := g - nc$. Then $0 < e \leq c < b$ and $e \in mG + g$, as required. \square

Corollary 2.41. *Let $(G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients. If G is discrete, let $N := (G, +, <, 1)$ and $M := (G, +, 1)$, otherwise let $N := (G, +, <)$ and $M := (G, +)$. Then for every $A \subseteq G$, $\text{acl}_N(A) = \text{span}^+(A) \cap G = \text{acl}_M(A)$.*

Proof. Clearly $\text{span}^+(A) \cap G \subseteq \text{dcl}_M(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_M(A)$. We show $\text{acl}_N(A) \subseteq \text{span}^+(A) \cap G$. Let $c \in \text{acl}_N(A)$. Thus, there exists a finite unary subset $D \subseteq G$

definable over A such that $c \in D$. By Corollary 2.39, $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i$ such that, for each i , either

- (1) $D_i = \{c_i\}$ is a singleton with $c_i \in \text{span}^+(A)$, or
- (2) $D_i = I_i \cap (mG + g_i)$, where $g_i \in G$ and I_i is an open generalized interval with rational endpoints, such that the endpoints of I_i are in $\text{span}^+(A) \cup \{\pm\infty\}$,

and $1 \leq m < \omega$ does not depend on i . Thus, $c \in D_i$ for some i . If D_i is as in the first case, then $c = c_i \in \text{span}^+(A)$ as required. So suppose that D_i is as in the second case. Write $I_i = (a, b)$ with $a, b \in \text{span}^+(A) \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. Since D is finite, also $D_i = I_i \cap (mG + g_i)$ is finite. By Lemma 2.40, I_i is finite, which is possible only when G is discrete. Since I_i is finite, $a, b \notin \{\pm\infty\}$, so $a, b \in \text{span}^+(A)$. In particular, this means that I_i is bounded from below; therefore, since G is discrete, I_i has a minimum a' . So $a' \in I_i$ but $a' - 1 \notin I_i$, hence $a < a' \leq a + 1$. Since $a \in \text{span}^+(A)$, there exists $1 \leq n < \omega$ such that $na \in G$. Now $na < na' \leq na + n$ and $na, na' \in G$, so there exists $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $na' = na + k$, and hence $a' = a + \frac{k}{n} \in \text{span}^+(A)$. Since $c \in I_i$ and I_i is finite, there exists $l < \omega$ such that $c = a' + l \in \text{span}^+(A)$, as required. \square

3. PRESERVING GROUP HOMOMORPHISMS

In this section, we will give sufficient conditions for when an expansion of a group does not add new definable group homomorphisms. Namely, we have a structure M expanding a group (G, \cdot) , and some expansion N , and we ask whether N adds new N -definable group homomorphisms $G \rightarrow G$. We give two lemmas which ensure that in two important cases, the answer is no. The first case is when G is an R -group (see Definition 2.11), and the second is when G is an abelian group with small quotients (see Definition 2.8). In both cases we require that $\text{dcl}_N \subseteq \text{acl}_M$, namely, that for every set $A \subseteq M$, $\text{dcl}_N(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_M(A)$. We also require some saturation.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that N is an ω -saturated structure 0-expanding a structure M that expands an R -group (G, \cdot) . Suppose that $\text{dcl}_N \subseteq \text{acl}_M$. Then, every group homomorphism $f : G \rightarrow G$ definable in N is definable in M .*

Proof. The group operation is definable in M , possibly using finitely many parameters. By adding these parameters to both M and N , we may assume that M 0-expands (G, \cdot) . Since we added only finitely many parameters, N remains ω -saturated.

Let L be the language of M and L' be the language of N . We may assume that $L \subseteq L'$. Let $f : G \rightarrow G$ be a group homomorphism definable in N . Again, by adding the finitely many parameters in the definition of f to both M and N we may assume that f is \emptyset -definable in N .

Since f is \emptyset -definable, it follows by the assumption that $\text{dcl}_N \subseteq \text{acl}_M$ that for every $g \in G$, $f(g) \in \text{acl}_M(g)$. Thus, for all g , there exists an L -formula $\varphi_g(x, y)$ (over \emptyset) such that $N \models \varphi_g(g, f(g))$ and $\varphi_g(g, M)$ is finite. Hence, by saturation of N , for all $p \in S_{L'}(\emptyset)$ there is an L -formula $\varphi_p(x, y)$ such that $\varphi_p(x, f(x)) \in p$ and $\exists^{\leq n_p} y \varphi_p(x, y) \in p$ for some $n_p < \omega$. By compactness, there are finitely many formulas corresponding to finitely many types p_0, \dots, p_k which cover all of $S_{L'}(\emptyset)$. Taking the disjunction of these formulas, we obtain an L -formula $\varphi(x, y)$ (over \emptyset) such that, for all $g \in G$, $N \models \varphi(g, f(g))$ (in other words, φ contains the graph of f) and $\varphi(g, M)$ is uniformly bounded by some number. Given such a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ (maybe with parameters from M), let $m_\varphi := \max\{|\varphi(g, M)| : g \in G\}$. Let $m := \min\{m_\varphi : \varphi \text{ as above}\}$, and let φ_0 be such that $m_{\varphi_0} = m$.

(*) Note that if φ' implies φ_0 and contains the graph of f then $m_{\varphi'} = m_{\varphi_0} = m$.

Let $\varphi_1(x, y) := \varphi_0(x, y) \wedge \forall x' \exists y' (\varphi_0(x', y') \wedge \varphi_0(xx', yy'))$. Note that φ_1 also contains the graph of f : for all $g \in G$, $\varphi_0(g, f(g))$ holds and for all $g', f(gg') = f(g)f(g')$ so that $\varphi_0(gg', f(g)f(g'))$ and $\varphi_0(g', f(g'))$. By (*), for some $g_* \in G$, $|\varphi_1(g_*, M)| = m$. Let $\varphi_1(g_*, M) = \{f(g_*)h_i : i < m\}$ where $h_i \in G$ are distinct for $i < m$ and $h_0 = 1$.

Let $K := m^2 + 1$.

Let $\varphi_2(x, y) := \bigwedge_{k < K} \varphi_0(x^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \wedge \bigwedge_{k < K} \varphi_0(g_*x^{k+1}, f(g_*)y^{k+1})$. Note that φ_2 implies φ_0 (by putting $k = 0$) and contains the graph of f as well (because $f(g^k) = f(g)^k$ and $f(g_*g^k) = f(g_*)f(g)^k$). Again by (*), $m_{\varphi_2} = m$. We claim that φ_2 defines f .

Let $g_{\dagger} \in G$ be such that $|\varphi_2(g_{\dagger}, M)| = m$ and write $\varphi_2(g_{\dagger}, M) = \{f(g_{\dagger})c_i : i < m\}$ where $c_i \in G$ are distinct for $i < m$ and $c_0 = 1$.

We now note the following points:

- (1) For all $k < K$, $\varphi_0(g_{\dagger}^{k+1}, M) = \{(f(g_{\dagger})c_i)^{k+1} : i < m\}$. Why? as $\varphi_2(g_{\dagger}, f(g_{\dagger})c_i)$ we get \supseteq by the definition of φ_2 . On the other hand as the group is an R -group, $(f(g_{\dagger})c_i)^{k+1} \neq (f(g_{\dagger})c_j)^{k+1}$ for $i \neq j$, and as $m_{\varphi_0} = m$, $|\varphi_0(g_{\dagger}^{k+1}, M)| \leq m$ so we obtain equality.
- (2) For the same reason as (1), for all $k < K$, $\varphi_0(g_*g_{\dagger}^{k+1}, M) = \{f(g_*)(f(g_{\dagger})c_i)^{k+1} : i < m\}$.
- (3) For $i < m$ and $k < K$, as $\varphi_1(g_*, f(g_*)h_i)$ holds, applying the second half of φ_1 with $x' = g_{\dagger}^{k+1}$, by (1) we get some $j = j_{i,k} < m$ such that $y' = (f(g_{\dagger})c_j)^{k+1}$ works: $\varphi_0(g_*g_{\dagger}^{k+1}, f(g_*)h_i(f(g_{\dagger})c_j)^{k+1})$ holds.
- (4) By (2) and (3) we find that for all $i < m$ and $k < K$ there is some $j' = j'_{i,k}$ such that $f(g_*)(f(g_{\dagger})c_{j'})^{k+1} = f(g_*)h_i(f(g_{\dagger})c_j)^{k+1}$ which implies

$$(f(g_{\dagger})c_{j'})^{k+1} = h_i(f(g_{\dagger})c_j)^{k+1}.$$

Assume towards contradiction that $m > 1$ and fix $i = 1$. For all $k < K$ we found some $j_{1,k}$ and $j'_{1,k}$, both $< m$, and as $h_1 \neq 1$, they must be distinct by

- (4). As $K = m^2 + 1$, by pigeonhole there must be $k < k'$ such that $(j_{1,k}, j'_{1,k}) = (j_{1,k'}, j'_{1,k'})$. Denote this pair by (j, j') . Let $a := f(g_{\dagger})c_{j'}$, $b := f(g_{\dagger})c_j$. So we have $a^{k+1} = h_1b^{k+1}$ and $a^{k'+1} = h_1b^{k'+1}$, hence substituting $h_1 = a^{k+1}(b^{k+1})^{-1}$ in the second equation we get $a^{k'-k} = b^{k'-k}$. As G is an R -group, $a = b$, so $j = j'$ — contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that N is an ω -saturated structure 0-expanding a structure M that expands an abelian group $(G, +)$ with small quotients. Suppose that $\text{dcl}_N \subseteq \text{acl}_M$. Then, every group homomorphism $f : G \rightarrow G$ definable in N is definable in M .*

Proof. The proof is an elaboration of the idea of the proof of Lemma 3.1. Exactly as in there, let L be the language of M and L' the language of N , we may assume that $L \subseteq L'$, that M 0-expands $(G, +)$, and that f is \emptyset -definable in N .

By compactness, we obtain an L -formula $\varphi(x, y)$ (over M) containing the graph of f and such that for $\varphi(g, M)$ is uniformly bounded. Again, we let $m_{\varphi} := \max\{|\varphi(g, M)| : g \in G\}$ and $m := \min\{m_{\varphi} : \varphi \text{ as above}\}$. Let φ_0 be such that $m_{\varphi_0} = m$. Again, we let $K := m^2 + 1$.

Given an L -formula $\psi(x, y)$ (over M) and a group $H \leq G$, say that ψ contains (the graph of) f up to H if $\psi(G) + (\{0\} \times H)$ contains f , i.e., whenever $f(g) = g'$, for some $e \in H$, $M \models \psi(g, g' + e)$. For a set $C \subseteq G$, let $C/H := \{c + H : c \in C\}$. Let $m_{\psi, H} := \sup\{|\psi(g, M)/H| : g \in G\}$. For $0 < t < \omega$, let $m_{\psi, t} := m_{\psi, H_t}$

where $H_t := \{g : tg = 0\}$. In this notation, for φ as in the previous paragraph, $m_\varphi = m_{\varphi,1}$. Thus:

$$m_* := \min \{m_{\psi,t} : 1 \leq t < \omega, \psi \text{ contains } f \text{ up to } H_t\} \leq m.$$

If $m_* = 1$, then we are done: let ψ, t be such that $1 = m_{\psi,t}$. It follows that $\psi(g, f(g) + e)$ for some $e \in H_t$ and that if $\psi(g, h_1), \psi(g, h_2)$ hold then $t(h_1 - h_2) = 0$. Let $\psi'(x, y) := \exists x'y' (x = tx' \wedge y = ty' \wedge \psi(x', y'))$. Then, for all $g \in tG$, $\psi'(g, f(g))$ holds, as witnessed by g', h' where $tg' = g$ and $h' = f(g') + e$ for some $e \in H_t$. Conversely, for such g , if $\psi'(g, h)$ holds, then there are g', h' such that $\psi(g', h')$ and $tg' = g, th' = h$. As $m_{\psi,t} = 1$, It follows that $h' - f(g') \in H_t$ so that $h = tf(g') = f(g)$. Together we got that ψ' defines f on tG . But since tG has finite index in G , we can now define f on all G : for every coset $C = tG + h$, $f \upharpoonright C$ is defined by $f(g) = f(g - h) + f(h)$, i.e., by $\psi'(x - h, y - f(h))$.

(*) Suppose that ψ, t are any pair such that $m_* = m_{\psi,t}$. Note that if t divides t' then ψ contains f up to $H_{t'}$ and $m_{\psi,t'} \leq m_{\psi,t}$ (because $H_t \leq H_{t'}$) so $m_{\psi,t'} = m_*$. In addition, if ψ' contains f up to H_t and implies ψ up to H_t in the sense that $\psi(G) + (\{0\} \times H_t) \supseteq \psi'(G)$ (i.e., $\psi'(x, y) \rightarrow \exists e \in H_t \psi(x, y + e)$ holds), $m_{\psi',t} \leq m_{\psi,t}$ so $m_{\psi',t} = m_*$.

Fix some ψ_0, t such that $m_* = m_{\psi_0,t}$.

Let $H := H_t$ and let $H' := H_{K!t}$. By (*), $m_{\psi_0,H'} = m_* = m_{\psi_0,H}$.

Let

$$\psi_1(x, y) := \psi_0(x, y) \wedge \forall x' \exists y' \exists e \in H (\psi_0(x', y') \wedge \psi_0(x + x', y + y' + e)).$$

Note that ψ_1 contains f up to H : if $f(g) = h$, then, for some $e \in H_t = H$, $\psi_0(g, h + e)$ and for all g' , let $h' := f(g')$. Then for some $e', e'' \in H_t$, $\psi_0(g', h' + e')$ and $\psi_0(g + g', h + h' + e'')$. So

$$M \models \psi_0(g, h + e) \wedge \psi_0(g', h' + e') \wedge \psi_0(g + g', h + e + h' + e' + (e'' - e - e'))$$

so $\psi_1(g, h + e)$ holds. By (*), $m_{\psi_1,H} = m_*$.

Let g_* be such that $m_* = |\psi_1(g_*, M)/H|$. Enumerate it as $\{f(g_*) + h_i + H : i < m_*\}$ where $h_0 \in H$.

Let

$$\psi_2(x, y) := \bigwedge_{1 \leq k < K+1} \exists e_{k,0} e_{k,1} \in H \psi_0(kx, ky + e_{k,0}) \wedge \psi_0(g_* + kx, f(g_*) + ky + e_{k,1}).$$

Then ψ_2 also contains f up to H (by a similar argument as above) and implies ψ_0 up to H , so $m_{\psi_2,H'} = m_{\psi_2,H} = m_*$ by (*). Let g_\dagger be such that $m_* = |\psi_2(g_\dagger, M)/H'|$ and let $\{f(g_\dagger) + c_i + H' : i < m_*\}$ be an enumeration where $c_0 \in H'$. Then it also follows that $m_* = |\psi_2(g_\dagger, M)/H|$ and that $\{f(g_\dagger) + c_i + H : i < m_*\} = \psi_2(g_\dagger, M)/H$.

Note the following points:

- (1) For all $1 \leq k \leq K$, $\psi_0(kg_\dagger, M)/H = \{k(f(g_\dagger) + c_i) + H : i < m_*\}$. Why? as for all $i < m_*$, for some $e \in H$, $\psi_2(g_\dagger, f(g_\dagger) + c_i + e)$ holds, we get \supseteq by the definition of φ_2 . On the other hand for $i \neq j$, $kc_i - kc_j = k(c_i - c_j) \notin H$ because otherwise $tk(c_i - c_j) = 0$ so $c_i - c_j \in H'$ which is false since they belong to different cosets. This implies that the set on the right has size m_* and as $m_* = m_{\psi_0,t} = \max \{|\psi_0(g, M)/H| : g \in G\}$, we get \subseteq and equality.
- (2) For all $1 \leq k \leq K$, $\psi_0(g_* + kg_\dagger, M)/H = \{f(g_*) + k(f(g_\dagger) + c_i) + H : i < m_*\}$ (for the same reason as (1)).
- (3) For $i < m_*$ and $1 \leq k \leq K$, as $\psi_1(g_*, f(g_*) + h_i + e)$ holds for some $e \in H$, applying the second half of ψ_1 with $x' = kg_\dagger$, by (1) we obtain some $j = j_{i,k} < m_*$ such that $y' = k(f(g_\dagger) + c_j) + e'$ for some $e' \in H$ works: $\psi_0(g_* + kg_\dagger, M)/H$ contains $f(g_*) + h_i + k(f(g_\dagger) + c_j) + H$.

- (4) By (2) and (3) we obtain that, for all $i < m_*$ and $1 \leq k \leq K$ there is some $j' = j'_{i,k}$ such that $f(g_*) + k(f(g_{\dagger}) + c_{j'}) - f(g_*) - h_i - k(f(g_{\dagger}) + c_j) \in H$ which implies

$$k(c_{j'} - c_j) \in h_i + H.$$

Assume towards contradiction that $m_* > 1$. As $K = m^2 + 1 \geq m_*^2 + 1$, for $i = 1$, we get $1 \leq k < k' \leq K$ such that $j = j_{1,k} = j_{1,k'}$ and $j' = j'_{1,k} = j'_{1,k'}$ so by (4), $k'(c_{j'} - c_j) - k(c_{j'} - c_j) \in H$ so that $(k' - k)(c_{j'} - c_j) \in H$, i.e., $t(k' - k)(c_{j'} - c_j) = 0$, so $c_{j'} - c_j \in H'$, contradiction. \square

Example 3.3. The following exemplifies the need for saturation.

Let $N := (\mathbb{Q}(\pi), f_\pi, +)$ and $M := (\mathbb{Q}(\pi), +)$ where $f_\pi : \mathbb{Q}(\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(\pi)$ is multiplication by π . Let $M' := M_M, N' := N_N$ (i.e., the structures we get by naming all elements). Clearly, M' is a 0-reduct of N' . Also, since $\text{dcl}_{M'}(\emptyset) = \text{acl}_{M'}(\emptyset) = \mathbb{Q}(\pi)$, we have $\text{dcl}_{N'} \subseteq \text{acl}_{M'}$.

However, f_π is not definable in M' : Let $N^* \succ N'$ be a proper extension of N' . Let $e \in N^* \setminus N'$. Let M'' be the vector space generated by $\mathbb{Q}(\pi)$ and e over \mathbb{Q} . Then $M'' \succ M'$ by quantifier elimination for divisible abelian groups. However, $f_\pi(e) \notin M''$ (otherwise $N^* \models f_\pi(e) = v + qe$ where $v \in \mathbb{Q}(\pi)$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, but $v/(\pi - q) \in N$ and hence for some $e' \in N'$ such that $e' \neq v/(\pi - q)$, $N' \models \pi e' = v + qe'$, a contradiction). Hence, it cannot be that f_π is definable in M' (suppose that $\varphi(x, y)$ defines it. Let M^* be the reduct of N^* to the language of M , so that $M'' \prec M^*$ and $\varphi^{M^*} = \varphi^{N^*}$. Then $N^* \models \forall x \forall y \varphi(x, y) \leftrightarrow f_\pi(x) = y$, and since $M'' \models \forall x \exists y \varphi(x, y)$, it follows that if $M'' \models \varphi(e, e')$ then $M^* \models \varphi(e, e')$ and hence $e' = f_\pi(e)$, a contradiction.)

Example 3.4. The following shows that in Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 it is not enough to assume that N is just an expansion of M , instead of a 0-expansion. Consider the structures N and M' from Example 3.3. Then N is an expansion of M' and is ω -saturated, and $\text{dcl}_N \subseteq \text{acl}_{M'}$. However, as before, f_π is not definable in M' .

Combining Lemma 3.2 and Fact 2.27 we get:

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that M is a 0-reduct of an ω -saturated structure N , both 0-expanding an abelian group $(G, +)$ with small quotients. Suppose that:*

- (1) $\text{dcl}_N \subseteq \text{acl}_M$, and
- (2) N is weakly-minimal and 1-based.

Then M and N are interdefinable.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, every endomorphism of the group $(G, +)$ that is definable in N is definable in M . Also note that since $(G, +)$ has small quotients, it has unbounded exponent. The conclusion now follows from Fact 2.27 \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

Theorem 4.1. *Let M be a weakly-minimal and 1-based structure expanding an abelian group $(G, +)$ with small quotients. Let N be a 0-expansion of M such that:*

- (1) N is ω -saturated.
- (2) Every unary subset $X \subseteq G$ that is definable in N is also definable in M .
- (3) $\text{acl}_M = \text{acl}_N$.

Then M and N are interdefinable.

Proof. The group operation is definable in M , possibly using finitely many parameters. By adding these parameters to both M and N , we may assume that M 0-expands (G, \cdot) . Since we added only finitely many parameters, N remains ω -saturated.

We show that it is enough to prove the theorem when N is a monster model for $\text{Th}(N)$. Thus, let \mathcal{N} be a monster model for $\text{Th}(N)$, and let $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{N} \upharpoonright L$. Clearly, \mathcal{M} is a weakly-minimal and 1-based structure 0-expanding an abelian group $(\mathcal{G}, +)$. By Remark 2.10, \mathcal{G} has small quotients. By Observation 2.4, every unary subset $X \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ that is definable in \mathcal{N} is also definable in \mathcal{M} . By Observation 2.6, $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}} = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}$. So, by the theorem for the case of monster models, we find that \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are interdefinable. By Observation 2.3, M and N are interdefinable.

So, without loss of generality, we may assume that N is a monster model for $\text{Th}(N)$. Let $N_0 \prec N$ be a small model and denote by M' and N' the structures obtained from M and N by adding constants for all elements of N_0 . All assumptions still hold and N' is still a monster model for its theory. So we may assume that $M = M'$ and $N = N'$. Since every unary subset $X \subseteq G$ which is definable in N is also definable in M , and since M is weakly-minimal, by Fact 2.18 (2) we get that N is also weakly-minimal. Since $\text{acl}_N(\emptyset) = N_0$ is a model of $\text{Th}(N)$, by Fact 2.32 $\text{Th}(N)$ has WEI and hence also GEI. Similarly, $\text{acl}_M(\emptyset) = N_0 \upharpoonright L \prec M$, hence $\text{Th}(M)$ has GEI.

Denote by \downarrow^M and \downarrow^N the ternary relations of forking independence in M, N , respectively, and denote by $\downarrow^{M,a}$ and $\downarrow^{N,a}$ the ternary relations of acl-independence in M, N , respectively. We claim that for every (real) tuples $a, b \in G$ and $C \subseteq G$, $a \downarrow_C^M b \iff a \downarrow_C^N b$. Indeed, since both M and N are weakly minimal, by Fact 2.29 (3) we have $a \downarrow_C^M b \iff a \downarrow_C^{M,a} b$ and $a \downarrow_C^N b \iff a \downarrow_C^{N,a} b$. But $\text{acl}_M = \text{acl}_N$, hence $a \downarrow_C^{M,a} b \iff a \downarrow_C^{N,a} b$.

It now follows that $\text{Th}(N)$ is 1-based: Since $\text{Th}(M)$ is 1-based and has GEI, by Proposition 2.33 for every (real) tuples $a, b \in G$ we have $a \downarrow_{\text{acl}_M(a) \cap \text{acl}_M(b)}^M b$. But

$$\text{acl}_M = \text{acl}_N, \text{ so } a \downarrow_{\text{acl}_N(a) \cap \text{acl}_N(b)}^M b, \text{ and by the previous paragraph we obtain } a \downarrow_{\text{acl}_N(a) \cap \text{acl}_N(b)}^N b.$$

Since $\text{Th}(N)$ has GEI, by Proposition 2.33 $\text{Th}(N)$ is 1-based.

Now all the assumptions of Proposition 3.5 are satisfied, therefore M and N are interdefinable. \square

Remark 4.2. In Theorem 4.1, if N is $|L|^+$ -saturated, where L is the language of M , then it is enough to assume that N is an expansion of M instead of a 0-expansion.

Proof. There exists a subset $A \subseteq G$ of size $|A| \leq |L|$ such that every set that is \emptyset -definable in M is also A -definable in N . Denote by M' and N' the structures obtained from M and N by adding constants for all elements of A . Then N' is also $|L|^+$ -saturated, and all the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 still hold for M' and N' . So by Theorem 4.1 M' and N' are interdefinable and therefore M and N are interdefinable. \square

Note that if $M = (G, +)$ is itself an abelian group with small quotients, then it is already 1-based and (by Corollary 2.22) weakly-minimal.

By Lemma 2.14 we get:

Corollary 4.3. *Theorem 4.1 holds if we assume that $(G, +)$ has small torsion rather than small quotients.*

By Observation 2.3 we get:

Corollary 4.4. *Let M be a structure and N be a 0-expansion of M . Suppose that there are elementary extensions $M' \succ M$ and $N' \succ N$ that satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 or Corollary 4.3. Then M and N are interdefinable.*

Example 4.5. The structures M' and N' from Example 3.3 show that some saturation is required in Theorem 4.1. Both M' and N' are strongly minimal: therefore, every unary subset that is definable in N' is also definable in M' . The remaining requirements of Theorem 4.1 (except for saturation) are clearly satisfied.

5. ELEMENTARY EXTENSIONS OF ARCHIMEDEAN ORDERED ABELIAN GROUPS OF FINITE RANK

In this section, we apply Theorem 4.1 in the context of ordered abelian groups to prove Theorem 1.4 (see Theorem 5.5).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $N = (G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients, and let M be a reduct (but not necessarily a 0-reduct) of N that expands $(G, +)$. Suppose that there exists a unary subset $D \subseteq G$ that is definable in M but not in $(G, +)$. Then, there exists $b \in G \cup \{\infty\}$ such that the interval $(0, b)$ is infinite and definable in M .*

Proof. By Corollary 2.39, $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i$ such that, for each i , either

- (1) $D_i = \{c_i\}$ is a singleton, or
- (2) $D_i = I_i \cap (mG + g_i)$, where $g_i \in G$ and I_i is an open generalized interval with rational endpoints,

and $1 \leq m < \omega$ does not depend on i .

By removing at most finitely many points from D , we may assume that, for all i , D_i is infinite, and, in particular, it is of the latter form. Let $h_1, \dots, h_K \in G$ be such that for every $1 \leq i \leq N$ there exists exactly one $1 \leq j \leq K$ such that $g_i \equiv_m h_j$. We can rewrite D as

$$D = \bigcup_{j=1}^K \left((mG + h_j) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_j} I_{j,i} \right)$$

where each $I_{j,i}$ is an infinite open generalized interval with rational endpoints.

Since D is not definable in $(G, +)$, there exists j_0 such that $(mG + h_{j_0}) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_{j_0}} I_{j_0,i}$ is not definable in $(G, +)$. By replacing D with

$$D \cap (mG + h_{j_0}) = (mG + h_{j_0}) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_{j_0}} I_{j_0,i}$$

(which is clearly definable in M), we may assume that D has the following form

$$D = (mG + g) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i$$

where each I_i is an infinite open generalized interval with rational endpoints.

By replacing D with $D - g$, we may assume that $g = 0$, so $D = mG \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i$. For each i , let $J_i := I_i/m = \{a \in G : ma \in I_i\}$. Then J_i is an infinite open generalized interval with rational endpoints. Since $D/m = \bigcup_{i=1}^N J_i$ is definable using only D and $+$, and vice versa, D/m is definable in M but not in $(G, +)$. Therefore, by replacing D with D/m , we may assume that D is of the form $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^N J_i$, where each J_i is an infinite open generalized interval with rational endpoints.

Whenever two intervals J_{i_1} and J_{i_2} have a nonempty intersection, we may replace them with their union, which is also an infinite open generalized interval with rational endpoints. Thus, we may assume that the intervals $\{J_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are pairwise disjoint. Note that $G \setminus D$ is a finite union of disjoint closed generalized intervals with rational endpoints. By removing at most finitely many points from $G \setminus D$, we obtain a set D' which is a finite union of disjoint infinite open generalized intervals

with rational endpoints, and which is definable in M but not in $(G, +)$. If D is not bounded from below, D' is bounded from below. Thus, by replacing D with D' if necessary, we may assume that D is bounded from below.

To recap, $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^N J_i$, where each J_i is an infinite open generalized interval with rational endpoints, and D is definable in M but not in $(G, +)$. By reordering, we may assume that $i < j \implies J_i < J_j$. Since D is not definable in $(G, +)$, it is not empty, i.e., $N \geq 1$. Since D is bounded from below, in particular so is J_1 . There are two cases:

If N is discrete, then (since it is elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group) we may assume that it is an elementary extension of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$. Since J_1 is definable in N , it has a minimum, which we denote by a . By replacing D with $D - a + 1$, we may assume that $a = 1$. If J_1 is not bounded from above, then $D = J_1 = (0, \infty)$ is definable in M . Otherwise, J_1 has a maximum, which we denote by b . Now $D \cap (-D + b) = (0, b)$ is infinite and definable in M .

So suppose that N is dense. J_1 is an infinite open generalized interval with rational endpoints bounded from below, so we can write it as $J_1 = (\frac{a}{n}, \frac{b}{n})$ with $1 \leq n < \omega$, $a \in G$, $b \in G \cup \{\infty\}$, and $a < b$. If $b = \infty$, let $c \in J_1$. Otherwise, by Lemma 2.40 we have $(2a, a + b) \cap 2nG \neq \emptyset$, hence $(\frac{a}{n}, \frac{a+b}{2n}) \neq \emptyset$, so let $c \in (\frac{a}{n}, \frac{a+b}{2n})$.

Let $E := (D - c) \cap (-D + c)$. Then E is definable in M , and, denoting $d := c - \frac{a}{n}$, we have $E = (-d, d)$. Note that d is in the divisible hull of G , but not necessarily in G . For $g \in E$ denote $C_g := E \cap (E - g)$. Note that $\{C_g : g \in E\}$ is uniformly definable in M . Let $e \in (0, d)$, and let

$$E_2 := \{g \in E : C_g \subseteq C_e \text{ or } C_g \supseteq C_e\}.$$

Then E_2 is definable in M . Note that for $g \in E$, if $g \geq 0$, then $C_g = (-d, d - g)$, and if $g < 0$ then $C_g = (-d - g, d)$. Therefore $E_2 = [0, d)$. Let $E_3 := (E_2 \cap (-E_2 + e)) \setminus \{0, e\} = (0, e)$. Then E_3 is definable in M , as required. \square

Fact 5.2 ([Ad19, Lemma 5.13]). *Let \mathcal{M} be a monster model of an unstable theory T , and let \mathcal{M}^- be a 0-reduct of \mathcal{M} that is stable. Then, there exists a unary subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ that is definable in \mathcal{M} but not in \mathcal{M}^- .*

Fact 5.3 ([Ad19, Claim 5.16]). *Let $N = (G, +, <)$ be an elementary extension of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$, and let $\varphi(x, z)$ be a formula without parameters. Let $\chi(y, z)$ be the formula $\chi_1(y, z) \wedge \chi_2(y, z) \wedge \chi_3(y, z)$ where:*

- χ_1 is $\varphi(0, z) \wedge \varphi(y, z) \wedge \neg\varphi(-1, z) \wedge \neg\varphi(y + 1, z) \wedge \neg\varphi(2y, z)$,
- χ_2 is $\forall w ((w \neq 0 \wedge \varphi(w, z)) \rightarrow \varphi(w - 1, z))$,
- χ_3 is $\forall w ((w \neq y \wedge \varphi(w, z)) \rightarrow \varphi(w + 1, z))$.

Then, for every $b, c \in G$, $N \models \chi(b, c)$ if and only if $b > 0$ and $\varphi(G, c) = [0, b]$.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $N = (G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients, and let M be a reduct (but not necessarily a 0-reduct) of N that expands $(G, +)$. Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{G}, +, <)$ be a monster model for $\text{Th}(N)$, and let \mathcal{M} be the reduct of \mathcal{N} to the language of M . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) M is stable.
- (2) Every unary subset $D \subseteq G$ that is definable in M is also definable in $(G, +)$.
- (3) Every unary subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ that is definable in \mathcal{M} is also definable in $(\mathcal{G}, +)$.

Proof. (3) \implies (2) is clear, and (3) \implies (1) is by Fact 5.2 (after adding parameters to \mathcal{M} to make it a 0-expansion of $(\mathcal{G}, +)$). We show (1) \implies (3) and (2) \implies (3).

For (1) \implies (3): Suppose that there exists a unary subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ that is definable in \mathcal{M} but not definable in $(\mathcal{G}, +)$. By Lemma 5.1, there exists $b \in \mathcal{G} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that the interval $I := (0, b)$ is infinite and definable in \mathcal{M} . Let $R(x_1, x_2)$ be

the relation defined by $x_2 - x_1 \in I$. Then R is definable in \mathcal{M} , and on I the relation R coincides with the order $<$. Since I is infinite, \mathcal{M} is unstable.

For (2) \implies (3): Suppose that there exists a unary subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ that is definable in \mathcal{M} but not definable in $(\mathcal{G}, +)$. By Lemma 5.1, there exists $b \in \mathcal{G} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that the interval $I := (0, b)$ is infinite and definable in \mathcal{M} . Let $\varphi(x, z)$ be a formula without parameters in the language of \mathcal{M} and let c be a tuple from \mathcal{G} such that $\varphi(\mathcal{G}, c) = I$. There are two cases:

If N is discrete, then (since it is elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group) we may assume that it is an elementary extension of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$. If $b = \infty$, let $\theta(z)$ be the formula

$$\forall x (\varphi(x, z) \leftrightarrow x > 0).$$

Then c satisfies $\theta(z)$, hence by elementarity there exists a tuple e in G that satisfies $\theta(z)$. So $\varphi(G, e) = (0, \infty)$ is definable in M but not definable in $(G, +)$, as required.

So suppose that $b < \infty$. Replace $I = (0, b)$ with $I := [0, b]$ (with $\varphi(x, z)$ as before, but with respect to this new I). Let $\chi(y, z)$ be as in Fact 5.3. So $\chi(y, z)$ is a formula in the language of \mathcal{M} , and for every $b', c' \in \mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{N} \models \chi(b', c')$ if and only if $b' > 0$ and $\varphi(\mathcal{G}, c') = [0, b']$. Let $\psi(x)$ be the following formula

$$\exists y, z (\chi(y, z) \wedge \varphi(x, z)).$$

Then $\psi(x)$ is a formula in the language of \mathcal{M} . We show that $\psi(G)$ is an infinite convex set and that 0 is its minimum element. Clearly, if $a \in \psi(G)$ then $a \geq 0$, and if $\psi(G) \neq \emptyset$ then $0 \in \psi(G)$. If $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ and $a_1, a_3 \in \psi(G)$, then, first, $a_1 \geq 0$ and hence $a_2 \geq 0$, and second, there are $b', c' \in G$ such that $\varphi(G, c') = [0, b']$ and $a_3 \in [0, b']$. In particular, $a_3 \leq b'$, so we have $0 \leq a_2 \leq b'$, i.e., $a_2 \in [0, b']$, and therefore $a_2 \in \psi(G)$. It remains to show that $\psi(G)$ is infinite. For each $n < \omega$, since $\varphi(\mathcal{G}, c) = I = [0, b]$ is infinite, we have

$$\mathcal{M} \models \chi(b, c) \wedge \exists^{\geq n} x \varphi(x, c).$$

By elementarity, there are $d_n, e_n \in G$ such that

$$M \models \chi(d_n, e_n) \wedge \exists^{\geq n} x \varphi(x, e_n),$$

hence $\psi(G)$ has at least n elements. Therefore $\psi(G)$ is infinite. It follows that $\psi(G)$ is not definable in $(G, +)$, as required: Otherwise, the same proof as in (1) \implies (3) shows that $(G, +)$ is unstable, a contradiction.

So suppose that N is dense. Recall that $\varphi(\mathcal{G}, c) = I = (0, b)$. Let $\theta(z)$ be the following formula

$$\exists y ((y > 0) \wedge \forall x (\varphi(x, z) \leftrightarrow 0 < x < y)).$$

Then c satisfies $\theta(z)$, hence by elementarity there exists a tuple e in G that satisfies $\theta(z)$. So there exists $0 < d \in G$ such that $J := \varphi(G, e) = (0, d)$. Since $d > 0$ and N is dense, J is infinite. It follows that J is not definable in $(G, +)$, as required: Otherwise, the relation $R(x_1, x_2)$ defined by $x_2 - x_1 \in J$ is also definable in $(G, +)$, but on J this relation coincides with the order $<$, which is unstable. \square

Theorem 5.5. *Let $N = (G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients, and let M be a reduct (but not necessarily a 0-reduct) of N that expands $(G, +)$. Suppose that one of the following holds:*

- (1) M is stable, or
- (2) every unary subset $D \subseteq G$ that is definable in M is also definable in $(G, +)$.

Then M is interdefinable with $(G, +)$.

Proof. Since every abelian group is 1-based (in the pure group language), $(G, +)$ is 1-based. By Corollary 2.22, $(G, +)$ is also weakly-minimal.

Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{G}, +, <)$ be a monster model for $\text{Th}(N)$ which is at least $|G|^+$ -saturated, and let \mathcal{M} be the reduct of \mathcal{N} to the language of M . Denote by \mathcal{G}_G , \mathcal{M}_G and \mathcal{N}_G the structures obtained from $(\mathcal{G}, +)$, \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} by adding all the elements of G as constants. Then \mathcal{G}_G is weakly-minimal and 1-based, and \mathcal{M}_G is $|G|^+$ -saturated. Also note that now \mathcal{N}_G 0-expands \mathcal{M}_G which 0-expands $(\mathcal{G}, +)$. By Proposition 5.4, every unary subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ that is definable in \mathcal{M} (equivalently, in \mathcal{M}_G) is also definable in $(\mathcal{G}, +)$ (equivalently, in \mathcal{G}_G).

By Corollary 2.41, for every $A \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ we have $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}_G}(A) = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(A \cup G) = \text{acl}_{(\mathcal{G}, +)}(A \cup G) = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{G}_G}(A)$ (note that if N is discrete then $1 \in G$). Since \mathcal{N}_G 0-expands \mathcal{M}_G which 0-expands \mathcal{G}_G , for every $A \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ we have $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{G}_G}(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}_G}(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}_G}(A)$. Therefore $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{G}_G} = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}_G} = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}_G}$.

Now all the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 hold (with \mathcal{G}_G and \mathcal{M}_G taking the roles of M and N from Theorem 4.1, respectively), therefore, by Corollary 4.4, M is interdefinable with $(G, +)$. \square

By Fact 2.15 we get:

Corollary 5.6. *Theorem 5.5 holds if instead of “with small quotients” we write “of finite rank”.*

Corollary 5.7. *Let $N = (G, +, <)$ be elementarily equivalent to an archimedean ordered abelian group with small quotients, and let M be a reduct (but not necessarily a 0-reduct) of N that is a proper expansion of $(G, +)$. Then there exists $b \in G \cup \{\infty\}$ such that the interval $I := (0, b)$ is infinite and definable in M and the restriction of $<$ to I is definable in M .*

Proof. Since M is a proper expansion of $(G, +)$, by Theorem 5.5 there exists a unary subset $D \subseteq G$ that is definable in M but not definable in $(G, +)$. By Lemma 5.1, there exists $b \in G \cup \{\infty\}$ such that the interval $I := (0, b)$ is infinite and definable in M . Let $R(x_1, x_2)$ be the relation defined by $x_2 - x_1 \in I$. Then R is definable in M , and on I the relation R coincides with the order $<$. \square

In particular, Corollary 5.7 holds for elementary extensions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, <)$ and $(\mathbb{Q}, +, <)$. This answers positively a question of Conant, see [Con18, Question 1.5].

REFERENCES

- [Ad19] Eran Alouf and Christian d’Elbée. A new dp-minimal expansion of the integers. *J. Symb. Log.*, 84(2):632–663, 2019.
- [Arn82] David M. Arnold. *Finite Rank Torsion Free Abelian Groups and Rings*, volume 931 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1982.
- [Bau60] Gilbert Baumslag. Some aspects of groups with unique roots. *Acta Math.*, 104:217–303, 1960.
- [Con18] Gabriel Conant. There are no intermediate structures between the group of integers and Presburger arithmetic. *J. Symb. Log.*, 83(1):187–207, 2018.
- [CP18] Gabriel Conant and Anand Pillay. Stable groups and expansions of $(\mathbb{Z}, +, 0)$. *Fund. Math.*, 242(3):267–279, 2018.
- [FW99] Temple H. Fay and Gary L. Walls. \overline{R} -groups. *J. Algebra*, 212(1):375–393, 1999.
- [HH19] Yatir Halevi and Assaf Hasson. Strongly dependent ordered abelian groups and henselian fields. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 232(2):719–758, June 2019.
- [HL10] Ehud Hrushovski and James Loveys. Strongly and co-strongly minimal abelian structures. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 75(2):442–458, 2010.
- [HP87] Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay. Weakly normal groups. In *Logic Colloquium ’85*, volume 122 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 233–244. Elsevier, 1987.

- [Lov90] James Loveys. Weakly minimal groups of unbounded exponent. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 55(3):928–937, 1990.
- [Pil98] Anand Pillay. *Model theory of algebraically closed fields*, pages 61–84. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1998.
- [Poi01] Bruno Poizat. *Stable groups*, volume 87 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. Translated from the 1987 French original by Moses Gabriel Klein.
- [TY02] Mikhail Tkachenko and Ivan Yaschenko. Independent group topologies on abelian groups. *Topology and its Applications*, 122(1):425–451, 2002. Proceedings of the International Conference on Topology and its Applications.

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, 91904, JERUSALEM ISRAEL.

Email address: `Eran.Alouf@mail.huji.ac.il`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E INFORMATICA ‘ULISSE DINI’ (DIMAI), UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE, 50134 FIRENZE (FI), ITALY

Email address: `antongiulio.fornasiero@unifi.it`

URL: `https://sites.google.com/site/antongiuliofornasiero`

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, 91904, JERUSALEM ISRAEL.

Email address: `kaplan@math.huji.ac.il`