

# ON $N$ -DEPENDENT GROUPS AND FIELDS III. MULTILINEAR FORMS AND INVARIANT CONNECTED COMPONENTS

ARTEM CHERNIKOV AND NADJA HEMPEL

**ABSTRACT.** We develop some model theory of multi-linear forms, generalizing Granger in the bi-linear case. In particular, after proving a quantifier elimination result, we show that for an NIP field  $K$ , the theory of infinite dimensional non-degenerate alternating  $n$ -linear spaces over  $K$  is strictly  $n$ -dependent; and it is NSOP<sub>1</sub> if  $K$  is. This relies on a new Composition Lemma for functions of arbitrary arity and NIP relations (which in turn relies on certain higher arity generalizations of Sauer-Shelah lemma). We also study the invariant connected components  $G^\infty$  in  $n$ -dependent groups, demonstrating their relative absoluteness in the abelian case.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
Notation	6
Acknowledgments	6
2. Multilinear forms	6
2.1. Perfect pairings, non-degenerate and generic $n$ -linear forms	6
2.2. Quantifier elimination and completeness	12
3. Composition Lemma for functions of arbitrary arity and NIP relations	19
3.1. NIP formulas on indiscernible sequences and arrays	19
3.2. $N$ -dependence and generalized indiscernibles	20
3.3. Finitary type-counting characterization of $n$ -dependence	22
3.4. Array shattering lemma in NIP structures	24
3.5. Composition Lemma	27
3.6. Discussion	28
4. Non-degenerate $n$ -linear forms are $n$ -dependent and NSOP <sub>1</sub>	30
4.1. $N$ -dependence	30
4.2. NSOP <sub>1</sub>	32
5. Invariant connected components $G^\infty$ in $n$ -dependent groups	37
5.1. Invariant subgroups of bounded index	37
5.2. Lascar strong types and thick formulas	39
5.3. $G^\infty$ and Lascar strong types	40
5.4. Proof of Theorem 5.9	42

5.5. Example: $G^\infty$ and $G^{00}$ in multilinear forms over finite fields	49
References	50

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this article we study groups, fields and related structures satisfying a model-theoretic tameness condition called  $n$ -dependence, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , continuing [35, 12, 13], as well as develop further the pure theory of  $n$ -dependent structures and some related combinatorics, contributing to the emerging *higher classification theory*. The class of  $n$ -dependent theories was introduced by Shelah in [53], with the 1-dependent (or just dependent) case corresponding to the class of *NIP theories* that has attracted a lot of attention recently. Roughly speaking,  $n$ -dependence of a theory guarantees that the edge relation of an infinite generic  $(n+1)$ -hypergraph is not definable in its models (see Definition 2.1). For  $n \geq 2$ , we say that a theory is strictly  $n$ -dependent if it is  $n$ -dependent, but not  $(n-1)$ -dependent. Basic properties of  $n$ -dependent theories are investigated in [15], where in particular the numeric parameter  $VC_n$ -dimension for families of subsets of  $n$ -fold product spaces (whose finiteness characterizes  $n$ -dependence in the same way as finiteness of VC-dimension characterizes NIP [46]) is defined and investigated quantitatively, including a higher arity version of Sauer-Shelah lemma for  $VC_n$  dimension [15, Proposition 3.9] (where the case  $n = 1$  corresponds to the usual Sauer-Shelah lemma and VC-dimension, see Section 3.3). Since then, the study of  $VC_n$ -dimension, or *higher VC-theory*, has found deep connections to hypergraph combinatorics [19, 56, 55, 20].

In Section 2, we develop some basic model theory of multilinear forms, viewed as structures with two sorts for the vector space and for the field, generalizing (and correcting) some influential work of Granger [32] in the case  $n = 2$ . In Section 2.1 we consider possible generalizations of *non-degeneracy* from bilinear forms to  $n$ -linear forms, for an arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ . Several notions of non-degeneracy for multi-linear forms appear in the literature, see e.g. [30, 36, 41], but differ from the one that we consider here and that works well in the alternating case. We consider multilinear spaces as two-sorted structures  $(V, K)$  in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$  containing the field language on  $K$ , functions for vector addition on  $V$  and scalar multiplication on  $V \times K$ , function  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n : V^n \rightarrow K$  for the  $n$ -linear form, an  $m$ -ary relation symbol  $\theta_m(v_1, \dots, v_m)$  expressing that  $v_1, \dots, v_m \in V$  are  $K$ -linearly independent for each  $m$ , and for each  $p$  and  $i \leq p$ , a function  $f_i^p(v; v_1, \dots, v_p) = \lambda_i$  if  $v_1, \dots, v_p$  are linearly independent and  $v = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i v_i$  for some  $\lambda_i \in K$  (see Definition 2.10). Our main model theoretic result is the following:

**Theorem** (Theorem 2.19). *For any  $n \geq 1$  and field  $K$ , the theory  $\text{Alt} T_n^K$  of infinite dimensional alternating non-degenerate  $n$ -linear spaces over  $K$  has quantifier elimination in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ , and is complete. If  $K$  is finite, then  $\text{Alt} T_n^K$  is  $\omega$ -categorical (Remark 2.20).*

In the bilinear case, Granger [32, Corollary 9.2.3] incorrectly claimed quantifier elimination in a smaller language without the coordinate functions  $f_i^p$ . A corrected language was suggested by Dugald Macpherson who pointed out the error, by analogy with Delon's quantifier elimination in pairs of algebraically closed fields [25] (see also the discussion in [26] in the paragraph after Definition 2.7). While this paper was in preparation, a more general version of the  $\omega$ -categorical case was developed using Fraïssé constructions in [34] (see also related papers [8, 33, 49]); and the bilinear case of Theorem 2.19 was also considered in [1].

Bilinear forms play an important role in the study of  $n$ -dependent theories up to date, and in fact until recently all known “algebraic” examples of strictly  $n$ -dependent theories with  $n \geq 2$  looked like bilinear forms over *finite* fields. Namely, it was observed in [35] that the theory of a bilinear form on an infinite dimensional vector space over a finite field is strictly 2-dependent; smoothly approximable structures [11] are 2-dependent (see [15, Example 2.2(4)]) and coordinatizable via bilinear forms over finite fields; and the strictly  $n$ -dependent pure groups constructed in [12] using Mekler’s construction are essentially of this form as well, using Baudisch’s interpretation of Mekler’s construction in alternating bilinear maps [5]. In the previous paper, we demonstrated that finite fields can be replaced by arbitrary NIP fields for  $n = 2$ :

**Fact 1.1.** [13, Theorem 6.3] *Let  $T$  be a theory of bilinear forms on infinite dimensional vector spaces over  $K$  eliminating quantifiers in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ . Then  $T$  is 2-dependent if and only if  $\text{Th}(K)$  is dependent.*

The two main ingredients were Granger’s quantifier elimination for bilinear forms, and what we called the *Composition Lemma* ([13, Theorem 5.12]) showing that the composition of a relation definable in an NIP structure with *arbitrary* binary functions remains 2-dependent.

In Section 3 we obtain a generalization of the Composition Lemma for functions of arbitrary arity:

**Theorem** (Composition Lemma, Theorem 3.24). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure such that its reduct to a sublanguage  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$  is NIP. Let  $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_d)$  be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula, and  $(y_0, \dots, y_k)$  be arbitrary  $k+1$  tuples of variables. For each  $1 \leq t \leq d$ , let  $0 \leq i_1^t, \dots, i_k^t \leq k$  be arbitrary, and let  $f_t : M_{y_{i_1^t}} \times \dots \times M_{y_{i_k^t}} \rightarrow M_{x_t}$  be an arbitrary  $\mathcal{L}'$ -definable  $k$ -ary function. Then the  $\mathcal{L}'$ -formula*

$$\psi(y_0; y_1, \dots, y_k) := \varphi\left(f_1\left(y_{i_1^1}, \dots, y_{i_k^1}\right), \dots, f_d\left(y_{i_1^d}, \dots, y_{i_k^d}\right)\right)$$

*is  $k$ -dependent in  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

Our proof of this theorem for  $n = 2$  in [13] utilized an infinite type-counting criterion for 2-dependence involving the function  $\text{ded}(\kappa)$  and types realized *cofinally often* over mutually indiscernible sequences ([13, Section 5.1]), combined with a set-theoretic absoluteness argument. There does not seem to be a natural way to generalize it to higher  $n$ . Here we give a purely combinatorial proof for arbitrary  $n \in \omega$ . First we provide some preliminaries on (finitary versions of) shrinking of indiscernible sequences and generalize it to indiscernible arrays in NIP theories in Section 3.1 (utilizing uniform definability of types over finite sets in NIP theories [17]). In Section 3.2 we recall basic properties of  $n$ -dependent formulas and a characterization of  $n$ -dependence in terms of generalized indiscernibles from [15]. In Section 3.3 we provide a finitary type-counting criterion for  $n$ -dependence using the aforementioned generalization of Sauer-Shelah lemma for  $\text{VC}_n$ -dimension from [15], modeled on the infinitary type-counting criterion for 2-dependence from [13]:

**Theorem** (see Proposition 3.21 for a precise statement). *A formula  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is  $k$ -dependent if and only if given any tuple  $b \in \mathbb{M}^x$  and finite mutually indiscernible sequences  $I_1, \dots, I_{k-1}, I_k$  with  $I_1, \dots, I_{k-1}$  of length  $n$  and  $I_k$  much longer, there is a large interval  $J$  of  $I_k$  with fewer than maximal possible number (more precisely,  $\leq 2^{n^{k-1-\varepsilon}}$ ) of  $\varphi(y)$ -types over  $b, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1}, I_k$  realized in  $J$ .*

In Section 3.4 we prove an *Array Shattering Lemma* for  $k$ -ary arrays in NIP structures, which we view as a natural generalization of the Sauer-Shelah lemma from binary to higher

arity relations definable in NIP structures. We only state it here in the case  $k = 2$ , and refer to Lemma 3.23(2) for the precise statement of the general case (and its “dynamic” version with an additional moving parameter used in the inductive proof, Lemma 3.23(1); see also illustrations in the proof of Lemma 3.23).

**Theorem** (Array Shattering Lemma, Lemma 3.23(2) for  $k = 2$ ). *Assume that an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  is NIP. For every formula  $\varphi(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathcal{L}$  there exist some  $n' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  satisfying the following. Let  $n \geq n'$  and  $\bar{\delta} = (\delta_{i_1, i_2} : i \in [n]^2)$  be an array of tuples with  $\delta_{i_1, i_2} \in \mathcal{M}^{y_3}$ . For any sequences  $\bar{\zeta}^1 = (\zeta_i^1 : i \in [n])$  with  $\zeta_i^1 \in \mathcal{M}^{y_1}$  and  $\bar{\zeta}^2 = (\zeta_i^2 : i \in [n])$  with  $\zeta_i^2 \in \mathcal{M}^{y_2}$ , define*

$$S_{\bar{\zeta}^1, \bar{\zeta}^2}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} := \{(i_1, i_2) \in [n]^2 : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\zeta_{i_2}^1, \zeta_{i_1}^2, \delta_{i_1, i_2})\}.$$

Then the family of sets


$$\mathcal{F}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} = \{S_{\bar{\zeta}^1, \bar{\zeta}^2}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} \subseteq [n]^2 : \bar{\zeta}^1, \bar{\zeta}^2 \text{ arbitrary sequences}\}$$

has cardinality  $\leq 2^{n^{2-\varepsilon}}$ .

For  $k = 3$  we instead consider subsets of a hypercube  $(\delta_{i_1, i_2, i_3} : i_1, i_2, i_3 \in [n])$  of the form

$$\{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \in [n]^3 : \models \varphi(\zeta_{i_2, i_3}^1, \zeta_{i_1, i_3}^2, \zeta_{i_1, i_2}^3, \delta_{i_1, i_2, i_3})\}$$

that can be obtained by varying two-dimensional arrays  $\bar{\zeta}^1 = (\zeta_{i_2, i_3}^1 : (i_2, i_3) \in [n]^2)$ ,  $\bar{\zeta}^2 = (\zeta_{i_1, i_3}^2 : (i_1, i_3) \in [n]^2)$  and  $\bar{\zeta}^3 = (\zeta_{i_1, i_2}^3 : (i_1, i_2) \in [n]^2)$ ; etc.



In Section 3.5 we combine the type counting criterion and the array shattering lemma in order to prove the Composition Lemma for all  $k$  (Theorem 3.24). Finally, in Section 3.6 we include some discussion of the composition lemma and its possible generalizations and refinements. In particular, we provide a different proof of the dynamic array shattering lemma (Lemma 3.23(1)) in the 2-dimensional case using UDTFS, giving a polynomial bound on the number of sets of pairs that can be cut out (Lemma 3.25).

Combining quantifier elimination with the Composition Lemma discussed above, in Section 4 we obtain a generalization of Fact 1.1 to  $n$ -linear forms for all  $n$ :

**Theorem** (Theorem 4.1). *Let  $n \in \omega$  and let  $T$  be a theory of infinite dimensional  $n$ -linear  $K$ -spaces eliminating quantifiers in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\emptyset, f}^K$ . If  $K$  is NIP, then  $T$  is  $n$ -dependent (and strictly  $n$ -dependent if the form is generic). In particular, if  $K$  is NIP, the theory of non-degenerate alternating forms is  $n$ -dependent.*

We also take an opportunity to discuss an (orthogonal) model theoretic tameness property  $\text{NSOP}_1$ . Preservation of  $\text{NSOP}_1$  in bilinear forms over  $\text{NSOP}_1$  fields was considered in various contexts, starting with [16] where it was demonstrated (relying on the results of Granger [32]) that if  $K$  is an algebraically closed field, then the theory of non-degenerate symmetric or alternating bilinear forms over  $K$  is  $\text{NSOP}_1$ . Following this, [38] proposed a description of Kim-independence over models for  $K \models \text{ACF}$ , followed by [26] which proposed some corrections to both the description and the proof, and a generalization from models to arbitrary sets in the same setting. A variant of the argument describing Kim-independence with these corrections incorporated was given in [44] (allowing real closed fields). It turns out that all of these proofs contain gaps (see the discussion in Remark 4.6). Here we provide a (hopefully) correct proof of the description of Kim-independence, generalizing to multilinear forms and  $K$  an arbitrary  $\text{NSOP}_1$  field:

**Theorem** (Theorem 4.14). *If  $\text{Th}(K)$  is  $\text{NSOP}_1$ , then  $T := \text{Alt} T_n^K$  is also  $\text{NSOP}_1$ . And for any  $M \models T$  and  $A, B \supseteq M$  small ( $\mathcal{L}_{\emptyset, f}^K$ -)substructures,  $\text{tp}(A/B)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$  if and only if  $A \downarrow_M^K B$  and  $A \downarrow_M^V B$  (in the notation of Section 4.2). Moreover, if  $K$  is finite, then  $T$  is simple (Corollary 4.15).*

Composition lemma (Theorem 3.24) was recently used to obtain some further natural examples of  $n$ -dependent structures: generic nilpotent groups and Lie algebras over finite fields [24], generic nilpotent Lie algebras over algebraically closed fields in a two-sorted language [23], pseudo-finite quadratic geometries [42]. All of these are still explicitly controlled by multilinear maps over the NIP part. In view of this, it is tempting to speculate that  $n$ -dependence of a theory should imply some form of “linearity over the dependent part”. While formulating this precisely still appears difficult, this motivated our more precise conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.2.** ([13, Conjecture 1.1]; also [12, Problem 4.10]) *If a field (viewed as a structure in the pure ring language) is  $n$ -dependent for some  $n \in \omega$ , then it is already dependent.*

While this conjecture remains open, some evidence towards it is provided by the following results which demonstrate that certain known properties of NIP fields also hold for  $n$ -dependent fields:  $n$ -dependent fields are Artin-Schreier closed [35],  $n$ -dependent valued fields of positive characteristic are Henselian [13], an analog of the question for valued fields reduces to pure fields [9].

Some further evidence is provided by the intersection conditions on the connected components, generalizing their absoluteness in NIP groups and resembling modular behavior in the 2-dependent case. Given an  $(\emptyset)$ -type-definable group  $G$  and a small set of parameters  $A$ , we denote by  $G_A^{00}$  (respectively,  $G_A^\infty$ ) the intersection of all subgroups of  $G$  of bounded index type-definable over  $A$  (respectively,  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/A)$ -invariant), see Section 5 for more details. A crucial fact about definable groups in dependent theories is that for every small set  $A$  one has  $G_A^{00} = G_\emptyset^{00}$  [52] and  $G_A^\infty = G_\emptyset^\infty$  (Shelah [54] in the abelian case, Gismatullin [31] in general). Generalizing Shelah in the 2-dependent case (Fact 5.3) we have established the following in [13]:

**Fact** (Fact 5.7). *If  $T$  is  $n$ -dependent and  $G = G(\mathbb{M})$  is a type-definable group (over  $\emptyset$ ), then for any small model  $M$  and finite tuples  $b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}$  sufficiently independent over*

$M$  in an appropriate sense (see Fact 5.7 for the exact statement), we have that

$$G_{\mathcal{M} \cup b_1 \cup \dots \cup b_{n-1}}^{00} = \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, n-1} G_{\mathcal{M} \cup b_1 \cup \dots \cup b_{i-1} \cup b_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup b_{n-1}}^{00} \cap G_{C \cup b_1 \cup \dots \cup b_{n-1}}^{00}$$

for some  $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  of absolutely bounded size.

In Section 5 we prove an analog of Fact 5.7 for  $G^\infty$  in  $k$ -dependent abelian groups:

**Theorem** (Theorem 5.9). *For any  $k \geq 1$ , let  $T$  be a  $k$ -dependent theory and  $G = G(\mathbb{M})$  a  $(\emptyset)$ -type-definable abelian group. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a small model and  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  finite tuples in  $\mathbb{M}$  sufficiently independent over  $M$ . Then there is some  $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  with  $|C| \leq \beth_2(|T|)$  such that*

$$G_{\mathcal{M} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty = \left( \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, k-1} G_{\mathcal{M} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{i-1} \cup \bar{b}_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty \right) \cap G_{C \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty.$$

We note that Theorem 5.9 could be deduced from Fact 5.7 and the results in [45] (see Remark 5.11), however the proof that we provide here has the potential to apply to the case of general  $G$ . In Section 5.1 we recall some preliminaries on the connected components and our independence assumption on the tuples  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  (*generic position*, see Definition 5.5). In Section 5.2 we recall Lascar strong types and their description in terms of thick formulas and indiscernible sequences. We note that it can be strengthened to *uniformly thick formulas*, which will allow us to carry out some compactness arguments. In Section 5.3 we recall the description of  $G_S^\infty$  in terms of the commutator sets  $X_S = \{a^{-1}b : a, b \in G(\mathbb{M}), a \equiv_S^I b\}$  and their local approximations, and prove some lemmas on manipulating these sets. In Section 5.4 we give a proof of Theorem 5.9. Compared to our proof of Fact 5.7 in [13], the situation is more complicated since we cannot work with subgroups, but rather only with approximate subgroups given by the powers of the sets  $X_S$ . Finally, in Section 5.5 we calculate the example of  $G^\infty$  for the additive group in multilinear forms over finite fields.

**Notation.** As usual, given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we write  $[n]$  to denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Given a formula  $\varphi$ , we write  $\varphi^1$  to denote  $\varphi$ , and  $\varphi^0$  to denote  $\neg\varphi$ . Given a sequence of tuples  $I$ , we write  $|I|$  to denote the length of the sequence. As usual, without further context  $\delta_{i,j}$  denotes Kronecker delta symbol, i.e.  $\delta_{i,j} = 1$  if  $i = j$  and 0 if  $i \neq j$ .

**Acknowledgments.** The majority of the results in this paper were obtained by 2020 while both authors were at UCLA, and circulated since then, along with some presentation improvements added later. We thank Jan Dobrowolski, Alex Kruckman and Nick Ramsey for comments on Section 4.2. Chernikov was partially supported by the NSF Research Grant DMS-2246598, and both authors were partially supported by the NSF CAREER grant DMS-1651321.

## 2. MULTILINEAR FORMS

**2.1. Perfect pairings, non-degenerate and generic  $n$ -linear forms.** In this section we consider possible generalizations of *non-degeneracy* from bilinear forms to  $n$ -linear forms, for an arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ . Several other notions of non-degeneracy for multi-linear forms appear in the literature, see e.g. [30, 36, 41] (see also [34, Remark 1.1]).

Let  $V$  be a vector space over a field  $K$ . Recall that a bilinear form  $\langle -, - \rangle : V^2 \rightarrow K$  is *degenerate* if there exists a vector  $v \in V, v \neq 0$  such that  $\langle v, w \rangle = 0$  for all  $w \in V$ .

If  $V$  has finite dimension, a bilinear form  $\langle -, - \rangle$  is non-degenerate if and only if it is a *perfect pairing*, i.e. the maps  $V \rightarrow V^*$ ,  $v \mapsto \langle v, - \rangle$  and  $V \rightarrow V^*$ ,  $v \mapsto \langle -, v \rangle$  are isomorphisms. In other words, for any basis  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  of  $V$  and any  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in K$  there is  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle v_i, w \rangle = k_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . This equivalence is no longer true in infinite dimensional vector spaces for dimensional reasons. However, we can still obtain a “local” version: the bilinear form  $\langle -, - \rangle$  is non-degenerate if and only if for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , any linearly independent vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  in  $V$  and any  $k_1, \dots, k_m \in K$  there is  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle v_i, w \rangle = k_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . In fact, we can find such a vector  $w$  in any subspace  $W \subseteq V$  such that  $W^\perp \cap \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_m) = \{0\}$ .

A naive attempt to generalize non-degeneracy to  $n$ -linear forms  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n : V^n \rightarrow K$  would be: for any non-zero  $v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} \in V$  there is  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle \neq 0$ . However, this condition typically cannot be satisfied in an  $n$ -linear form satisfying some additional natural requirements (e.g. alternating or symmetric). In the case of an alternating form, we have for example that  $\langle v, v, v_3, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle_n = 0$  regardless of the choice of  $v, v_3, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \in V$ . To circumvent this issue, we work in the tensor product space  $\bigotimes^{n-1} V$  modulo the subspace  $N$  of  $\bigotimes^{n-1} V$  generated by the elements  $v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1}$  for which the map  $V \rightarrow K$ ,  $w \mapsto \langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle$  should be the zero map. For example, for alternating  $n$ -linear forms, we take the subspace  $N$  to be

$$\text{Alt} := \text{Span}(\{v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1} \mid v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} \text{ are linearly dependent}\}),$$

and for symmetric  $n$ -linear forms we let  $N$  be

$$\text{Sym} := \text{Span}(\{v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1} - v_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\sigma(n-1)} \mid \sigma \in \text{Sym}(\{1, \dots, n-1\})\}).$$

In these cases we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \bigotimes^{n-1} V \right) / \text{Alt} &= \bigwedge^{n-1} V, \quad \text{i.e. the } (n-1)\text{th exterior power of } V, \\ \left( \bigotimes^{n-1} V \right) / \text{Sym} &= \bigvee^{n-1} V, \quad \text{i.e. the } (n-1)\text{th symmetric power of } V. \end{aligned}$$

To talk about these cases in a uniform way (as many properties apply to both of them), from now on we let  $\diamond \in \{\wedge, \vee\}$  and write  $\diamond^{n-1} V$  to mean either  $\bigwedge^{n-1} V$  or  $\bigvee^{n-1} V$ . Moreover, given  $\sum_{i=1}^m k_i (v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1}) \in \bigotimes^{n-1} V$ , we write  $\overline{\sum_{i=1}^m k_i (v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1})}$  for its equivalence class in  $\diamond^{n-1} V$ .

Another way of thinking about these powers is via their universal property. This gives rise to a functor sending a vector space  $V$  to its exterior/symmetric power. As the embedding  $i$  of any subspace  $W$  into a vector space  $V$  is split injective,  $\diamond^n W$  embeds into  $\diamond^n V$  via  $\diamond^n i$  and can be naturally viewed as a subspace.

Then the  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  gives rise to a bilinear form  $\langle -, - \rangle_2$  on  $(\diamond^{n-1} V) \times V$  defined by

$$\left\langle \overline{\sum_{i=1}^m k_i (v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1})}, v \right\rangle_2 := \sum_{i=1}^m k_i \langle v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,n-1}, v \rangle_n.$$

This remains true restricting to  $(\diamond^{n-1} U) \times W$  for subspaces  $U$  and  $W$  of  $V$ . To ease the notation, we will not distinguish between the bilinear forms

$$\begin{aligned} \langle -, - \rangle_2 &: (\diamond^{n-1} V) \times V \rightarrow K \text{ and} \\ \langle -, - \rangle_2 &: (\diamond^{n-1} U) \times W \rightarrow K \quad (\text{its restriction to } U \text{ and } W). \end{aligned}$$

For the rest of the section, we let  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  be an alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear space ( $n \geq 2$ ) and let  $\langle -, - \rangle_2$  be the associated bilinear form on  $(\diamond^{n-1}V) \times V$ .

**Definition 2.1.** We say that the  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is:

- (1) *non-degenerate* if for any non-zero  $t \in \diamond^{n-1}V$  there is  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle t, w \rangle_2 \neq 0$ ;
- (2) a *perfect pairing* if the maps

$$V \rightarrow (\diamond^{n-1}V)^*, \quad v \mapsto \langle -, v \rangle_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \diamond^{n-1}V \rightarrow V^*, \quad t \mapsto \langle t, - \rangle_2$$

are vector space isomorphisms (where as usual  $*$  denotes the dual space);

- (3) *generic* if for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , any linearly independent elements  $t_1, \dots, t_m \in \diamond^{n-1}V$  and any  $k_1, \dots, k_m \in K$  there is  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle t_i, w \rangle_2 = k_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$ .

We also refer to the corresponding alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear space  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  as *non-degenerate* or *generic*, respectively.

It follows immediately from the definitions that any perfect pairing is a generic form, and any generic form is non-degenerate. Now, we explore the different characterizations as well as connections between these notions.

**Definition 2.2.** We define the map

$$\Psi : \diamond^{n-1}V \rightarrow V^*, \quad t \mapsto \langle t, - \rangle_2,$$

and, for any subspace  $W$  of  $V$ ,

$$\Phi_W : V \rightarrow (\diamond^{n-1}W)^*, \quad v \mapsto \langle -, v \rangle_2.$$

We write  $\Phi$  for  $\Phi_V$ .

The following lemma is immediate from the definitions:

**Lemma 2.3.**

- (1) The form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on  $V$  is non-degenerate if and only if  $\Psi$  is injective.
- (2) The following are equivalent:
  - (a)  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is generic;
  - (b)  $\Phi_W$  is surjective for any finite dimensional subspace  $W$  of  $V$ ;
  - (c) for any finite dimensional subspace  $W$  of  $V$  there is a basis  $t_1, \dots, t_l$  of  $\diamond^{n-1}W$  and  $u_1, \dots, u_l$  in  $V$  such that  $\langle t_i, u_j \rangle_2 = \delta_{ij}$ . In this case we say that the tuples  $(t_1, \dots, t_l)$  and  $(u_1, \dots, u_l)$  are dual.

We consider separately the cases when  $V$  has finite or infinite dimension.

**2.1.1. Finite dimensional case.** Let  $V$  be of dimension  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n > 2$ .

Then, by Lemma 2.3(2b), an alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on  $V$  is generic if and only if  $\Phi$  is surjective. Thus, an alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear form can only be generic if  $\dim \diamond^{n-1}V \leq d$ . The same holds for non-degenerate by Lemma 2.3(1). We have that  $\dim \left( \bigwedge^{n-1} V \right) = \binom{d}{n-1}$  and  $\dim \left( \bigvee^{n-1} V \right) = \binom{d+n-2}{n-1}$ . Thus, if  $d \neq n$  (respectively,  $d \neq 1$ ), an alternating  $n$ -linear form (respectively, symmetric) cannot be generic or non-degenerate. Thus, in contrast to the bilinear case  $n = 2$ , for  $n > 2$  there are no generic or non-degenerate alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear forms on vector spaces of dimension greater than  $n$ . If  $d = n$  and the  $n$ -linear form is alternating, then all three notions from Definition 2.1 again coincide.



**2.1.2. Infinite dimensional case.** For an infinite dimensional vector space  $V$  over a field  $K$ , its dual space  $V^*$  is never isomorphic to  $V$  itself (in fact, if a basis of  $V$  has size  $\kappa$ , i.e.  $V$  is isomorphic to  $K^{(\kappa)}$ , its dual space is isomorphic to  $K^\kappa$ ). Hence, as the dimension of  $\diamond^{n-1}V$  is at least as big as the dimension of  $V$ , an alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on  $V$  can never be a perfect pairing.

First, we want to show that any  $n$ -linear form can be extended to a non-degenerate  $n$ -linear form on a larger (and infinite dimensional in general) vector space. In particular, non-degenerate  $n$ -linear forms on infinite dimensional vector spaces exist.

**Lemma 2.4.** *For any alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear space  $(U, [-, \dots, -]_n)$  there is a vector space  $V$  of dimension at most  $\aleph_0 + \dim(U)$  (over the same field) containing  $U$  and an alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on  $V$  extending  $[-, \dots, -]_n$  and such that  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  is non-degenerate.*

*Proof.* Let  $\kappa := \aleph_0 + \dim(U)$  and let  $W$  be an arbitrary vector space over a field  $K$  of dimension  $\kappa^+$  containing  $U$ . We construct an increasing chain  $(V_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$  of subspaces of  $W$  each of dimension  $\kappa$  containing  $U$ , and define an alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on each  $V_{i+1}$  extending  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on  $V_i$  so that the map  $\diamond^{n-1}V_m \rightarrow V_{m+1}^*$ ,  $t \mapsto \langle t, - \rangle_2$  is injective for all  $m$ .

Let  $V_0 := U$  and define  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on  $V_0$  to be  $[-, \dots, -]_n$ . Assume  $(V_m, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  has already been constructed for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

If the map  $\Psi_{V_m} : \diamond^{n-1}V_m \rightarrow V_m^*$ ,  $t \mapsto \langle t, - \rangle_2$  is injective, then  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is non-degenerate on  $V_m$  by Lemma 2.3(1). We let  $V := V_m$  and conclude.

Otherwise we can find a basis  $(t_i : i \in I)$  of  $\ker(\Psi_{V_m})$  with  $I$  of size  $\leq \kappa$ , and extend this to a basis  $(t_i : i \in J)$  of  $\diamond^{n-1}V_m$ , where  $I$  is an initial segment of  $J$ . Let  $(w_i : i \in I)$  be arbitrary elements in  $W$  linearly independent over  $V_m$ , and let  $V_{m+1} := V_m + \text{Span}(\{w_i : i \in I\})$ . As the set  $(w_i : i \in I)$  is linearly independent from  $V_m$  one can extend the existing  $n$ -linear form on  $V_m$  to a linear form on  $V_{m+1}$  so that  $\langle t_i, w_j \rangle_2 = \delta_{i,j}$  for all  $i \in J$  and  $j \in I$ .

Then the map  $\diamond^{n-1}V_m \rightarrow V_{m+1}^*$ ,  $t \mapsto \langle t, - \rangle_2$  is injective by construction, completing the inductive step.

Now, let  $V := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} V_i$  and  $t \in \diamond^{n-1}V$  be non-zero. Then there is  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and non-zero  $s \in \bigotimes^{n-1}V_m$  such that  $\bar{s} = t$ . As  $\langle \bar{s}, - \rangle_2 \in V_{m+1}^*$  is non-zero by construction, there is some  $v \in V_{m+1}$  such that  $\langle t, v \rangle_2 = \langle \bar{s}, v \rangle_2 \neq 0$ . Hence  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is non-degenerate on  $V$  (by Lemma 2.3(1)).  $\square$

Next, we show that non-degeneracy and genericity are in fact equivalent:

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $V$  be of infinite dimension. Then the form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is non-degenerate if and only if it is generic.*

*Proof.* Assume  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is generic. Let  $t \in \diamond^{n-1}V$  be non-zero and  $k \in K \setminus \{0\}$  be arbitrary. Then we can find  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle t, w \rangle_2 = k \neq 0$ , hence  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is non-degenerate.

For the other direction, assume that the form is non-degenerate, and we show by induction on  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , that for any linearly independent elements  $t_1, \dots, t_l$  in  $\diamond^{n-1}V$  we can find  $u_1, \dots, u_l$  in  $V$  such that  $\langle t_i, u_j \rangle_2 = \delta_{i,j}$ . This implies that  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is generic by Lemma 2.3(2).

For  $l = 1$ , by non-degeneracy we can find  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle t_1, w \rangle \neq 0$ . Letting  $u_1 := \frac{1}{\langle t_1, w \rangle} w$ , we obtain the claim.

Now assume the claim holds for  $l \geq 1$ . Given linearly independent elements  $t_1, \dots, t_{l+1}$  in  $\diamond^{n-1}V$ , we need to find  $u_1, \dots, u_{l+1}$  in  $V$  such that  $\langle t_i, u_j \rangle_2 = \delta_{ij}$ . For  $i \in [l+1]$ , we consider the map  $f_i : V \rightarrow K$ ,  $v \mapsto \langle t_i, v \rangle_2$ . If for every  $j \in [l+1]$  there exists some  $v_j \in \left( \bigcap_{i \neq j} \ker(f_i) \right) \setminus \ker(f_j)$ , we finish the proof by setting  $u_j := \frac{1}{f_j(v_j)} v_j$ . Thus it is enough to show that  $\bigcap_{i \neq j} \ker(f_i) \not\subseteq \ker(f_j)$  for all  $j \in [l+1]$ . Assume towards a contradiction (and without loss of generality) that

$$\bigcap_{i \leq l} \ker(f_i) \subseteq \ker(f_{l+1}).$$

Let  $u_1, \dots, u_l$  be given by the induction hypothesis for  $l$ . Note that  $\ker(f_i)$  has codimension one in  $V$ . Hence  $V = \text{Span}(u_i) + \ker(f_i)$ . More generally,

$$V = \text{Span}(u_1, \dots, u_l) + \bigcap_{i=1}^l \ker(f_i),$$

and, as  $V$  is infinite dimensional,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^l \ker(f_i) \neq \{0\}$ . Fix an arbitrary  $v \in V$ . Let  $w \in \bigcap_{i \leq l} \ker(f_i) \subseteq \ker(f_{l+1})$  and  $\lambda_i \in K$  be such that  $v = \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i u_i + w$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^l \langle t_{l+1}, u_i \rangle_2 t_i - t_{l+1}, v \right\rangle_2 &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^l \langle t_{l+1}, u_i \rangle_2 t_i - t_{l+1}, \sum_{i=1}^l \lambda_i u_i + w \right\rangle_2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{j=1}^l \langle \langle t_{l+1}, u_i \rangle_2 t_i, \lambda_j u_j + w \rangle_2 - \sum_{j=1}^l \langle t_{l+1}, \lambda_j u_j + w \rangle_2 \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^l \lambda_j \langle t_{l+1}, u_i \rangle_2 \underbrace{\langle t_i, u_j \rangle_2}_{=\delta_{i,j}} - \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j \langle t_{l+1}, u_j \rangle_2 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\Psi \left( \sum_{i=1}^l \langle t_{l+1}, u_i \rangle_2 t_i - t_{l+1} \right) \in V^*$  is the zero map. By non-degeneracy  $\Psi$  is injective (Lemma 2.3), so  $\sum_{i=1}^l \langle t_{l+1}, u_i \rangle_2 t_i - t_{l+1} = 0$ . But  $t_1, \dots, t_{l+1}$  are linearly independent in  $\diamond^{n-1}V$  by assumption — a contradiction.  $\square$

As a byproduct of the proof we have the following:

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $V$  be infinite dimensional,  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  non-degenerate,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t_1, \dots, t_m \in \diamond^{n-1}V$  linearly independent and  $f_i : V \rightarrow K$ ,  $v \mapsto \langle t_i, v \rangle_2$ . Then*

$$\left( \bigcap_{i \neq j} \ker(f_i) \right) \setminus \ker(f_j) \neq \{0\}.$$

This allows us to give a characterization of non-degeneracy using pure tensors:

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $V$  be infinite dimensional. The space  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  is non-degenerate if and only if for all  $\overline{v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1}} \in (\diamond^{n-1}V) \setminus \{0\}$  there is  $w \in V$  such that*

$$\langle \overline{v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1}}, w \rangle_2 = \langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle_n \neq 0.$$

*Proof.* Non-degeneracy means that we have the given property for all non-zero vectors, so we need to show the reverse implication.

Let  $t \in \diamond^{n-1}V \setminus \{0\}$ . We can choose  $(\overline{v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1}})_{i \in [m]} \in (\diamond^{n-1}V)^m$  linearly independent and  $k_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $t = \sum_{i=1}^m k_i \overline{v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1}}$ . Consider the maps  $f_i : V \rightarrow K$ ,  $v \mapsto \langle \overline{v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1}}, v \rangle_2$ . By Corollary 2.6 we can choose  $w \in \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{m-1} \ker(f_i)\right) \setminus \ker(f_m)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle t, w \rangle_2 &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^m k_i \overline{v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1}}, w \right\rangle_2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m k_i \langle \overline{v_{i,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i,n-1}}, w \rangle_2 \\ &= k_m \langle \overline{v_{m,1} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{m,n-1}}, w \rangle_2 \\ &\neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

This gives a characterization of non-degeneracy for alternating forms without passing to  $\diamond^{n-1}V$  (and simplifies the axiomatization in the next section).

**Corollary 2.8.** *Let  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  be an infinite dimensional alternating  $n$ -linear space. Then  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  is non-degenerate if and only if for all linearly independent  $v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} \in V$  there is  $w \in V$  such that  $\langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle_n \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* If for some linearly independent  $v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} \in V$  we have that  $\langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle_n = 0$  for all  $w \in V$ , then the form is degenerate as  $\overline{v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1}} \neq 0$  in  $\bigwedge^{n-1} V$ .

For the converse, by Lemma 2.6, we only have to check non-degeneracy on pure tensors. So let  $\overline{v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1}} \in \left(\bigwedge^{n-1} V\right) \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} \in V$  are linearly independent, and by the assumption we can find  $w \in V$  such that

$$\langle \overline{v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_{n-1}}, w \rangle_2 = \langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle_n \neq 0. \quad \square$$

To work out a back-and-forth argument in vector spaces with a non-degenerate form in the next section, we need the following finer version of genericity:

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $(V, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  be an infinite dimensional non-degenerate alternating/symmetric  $n$ -linear space, and let  $U$  be a finite dimensional subspace of  $V$ . Then for any linearly independent elements  $t_1, \dots, t_m \in \diamond^{n-1}V$  and  $k_1, \dots, k_m \in K$  there is  $w \in V$  linearly independent from  $U$  and such that  $\langle t_i, w \rangle_2 = k_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(v_j : j \in [l])$  be linearly independent vectors in  $V$  such that for all  $i \in [m]$  we have

$$t_i \in \diamond^{n-1} \underbrace{\text{Span}(v_j : j \in [l])}_{=: W}.$$

Let  $f \in (\diamond^{n-1}W)^*$  be such that

$$f(t_i) = k_i$$

for all  $i \in [m]$ . As  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is generic by Lemma 2.5,  $\Phi_W$  is surjective by Lemma 2.3(2). Moreover, since  $(\diamond W^{n-1})^*$  is finite dimensional, the kernel of  $\Phi_W$  has infinite dimension. Thus, one can find  $w$  linearly independent from  $U$  such that  $f = \langle -, w \rangle_2$  and we can conclude. □

**2.2. Quantifier elimination and completeness.** In this section we generalize (and correct) a quantifier elimination result of Granger [32] from non-degenerate bilinear forms to non-degenerate multilinear forms.

**Definition 2.10.** We consider  $n$ -linear spaces as structures in the language  $\mathcal{L}$  consisting of two sorts  $V$  and  $K$ , the field language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{field}} = \{+_K, \cdot_K, -_K, {}^{-1}_K, 0_K, 1_K\}$  on  $K$ , the group language  $\mathcal{L}_G = \{+_V, 0_V\}$  on  $V$ , scalar multiplication function  $\cdot_V : K \times V \rightarrow V$  and a function symbol  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  for an  $n$ -linear form  $V^n \rightarrow K$ . The language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}$  is obtained from  $\mathcal{L}$  by adding the following ( $\mathcal{L}(\emptyset)$ -definable, with quantifiers) relations and function symbols:

- for each  $p \in \omega$ , a  $p$ -ary predicate  $\theta_p(v_1, \dots, v_p)$  which holds if and only if  $v_1, \dots, v_p \in V$  are linearly independent over  $K$ ;
- for each  $p \in \omega$  and  $i \in [p]$ , a  $(p+1)$ -ary function symbol  $f_i^p : V^{p+1} \rightarrow K$  interpreted as

$$f_i^p(v; v_1, \dots, v_p) = \begin{cases} \lambda_i & \text{if } \models \theta_p(v_1, \dots, v_p) \text{ and } v = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i v_i \text{ for some } \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p \in K, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}^K$  be an expansion of the language of fields by relations on  $K^p, p \in \omega$  (so no new constant or function symbols), which are  $\emptyset$ -definable in the language of fields such that  $K$  eliminates quantifiers in  $\mathcal{L}^K$  (e.g. we can always take Morleyzation of  $K$ ). Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K := \mathcal{L}_{\theta, f} \cup \mathcal{L}^K$ . Finally, let  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{VS}}^K := \mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K \setminus \{\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n\}$  be the language of two-sorted vector spaces.

**Remark 2.11.** Note that the functions  $f_i^p$  are similar to the language introduced by Delon to study pairs of algebraically closed fields in [25].

**Proposition 2.12.** *The class of all infinite dimensional non-degenerate alternating  $n$ -linear spaces (with the field sort a model of  $\text{Th}(K)$ ) in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$  is elementary. We will denote its theory by  $T := {}_{\text{Alt}} T_n^K$  (adapting the notation in Granger [32]).*

*Proof.* Being alternating is expressed by the axiom

$$\forall v_1, \dots, v_n (\neg \theta_n(v_1, \dots, v_n) \rightarrow \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle_n = 0),$$

and using Corollary 2.8, modulo the infinite dimension axiom schema, we can express non-degeneracy by the sentence

$$\forall v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} \left( \theta_{n-1}(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}) \rightarrow \exists w \left( \neg (\langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, w \rangle_n = 0) \right) \right). \quad \square$$

The following is the main result of the section:

**Proposition 2.13.** *The set of partial  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -isomorphisms between two  $\omega$ -saturated alternating non-degenerate  $n$ -linear spaces (over elementarily equivalent fields) has the back-and-forth property and is non-empty.*

Before proving it, we first show some auxiliary lemmas for a model  $\mathcal{V} = (V, K)$  of  $T$  and a  $(\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K)$ -substructure  $\mathcal{A} = (A_V, A_K)$  of  $\mathcal{V}$  which are needed in the proof of the proposition. Note that by our choice of using the field language (rather than the language of rings) on the  $K$ -sort, for any substructure the  $K$ -sort will indeed be a field.

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $S$  be a maximal  $K$ -linearly independent subset of  $A_V$ . Then every  $v \in A_V$  is an  $A_K$ -linear combination of elements in  $S$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $v \in A_V$ , then  $v \in \text{Span}_K(S)$  by maximality. Thus

$$v = \lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m v_m$$

for some  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in K$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_m \in S$ . Since  $\mathcal{V} \models \theta_m(v_1, \dots, v_m)$ , we have that  $f_i^m(v, v_1, \dots, v_m) = \lambda_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . As  $\mathcal{A}$  is a substructure, we can conclude that  $\lambda_i \in A_K$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $U \subseteq V$  be a  $K$ -linearly independent set, say  $U = \{v_i : i < \kappa\}$ , and let  $L \subseteq K$  be a subfield containing*

$$\{\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n} \rangle_n : 0 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_n < \kappa\}.$$

*Then the substructure generated by  $U \cup L$  is equal to  $(\text{Span}_L(U), L)$ .*

*Proof.* First note that  $(\text{Span}_L(U), L)$  is clearly contained in the substructure generated by  $U \cup L$ .

For the other inclusion, clearly  $(\text{Span}_L(U), L)$  contains  $U \cup L$  and is closed under  $+_V, \cdot_V, +_K, -_K, \cdot_K, \bar{\cdot}_K^{-1}$ . Hence it remains to show that  $(\text{Span}_L(U), L)$  is closed under the maps  $f_i^p$  for any  $i \leq p \in \omega$ , as well as under the map  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$ .

Closure under  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$ . Let  $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \text{Span}_L(v_{t_0}, \dots, v_{t_m})$  for some  $m \in \omega$  and  $t_0 < \dots < t_m < \kappa$  and  $\mu_{i,j} \in L$  be such that

$$w_j = \sum_{i=0}^m \mu_{i,j} v_{t_i}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w_1, \dots, w_n \rangle_n &= \left\langle \sum_{i=0}^m \mu_{i,1} v_{t_i}, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^m \mu_{i,n} v_{t_i} \right\rangle_n \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_n \leq m} \left( \left( \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}([n])} \text{sign}(\sigma) \mu_{i_1, \sigma(1)} \cdots \mu_{i_n, \sigma(n)} \right) \langle v_{t_{i_1}}, \dots, v_{t_{i_n}} \rangle_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

As  $\langle v_{t_{i_1}}, \dots, v_{t_{i_n}} \rangle_n \in L$  for all  $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_n \leq m$  by assumption, we can conclude that  $\langle w_1, \dots, w_n \rangle_n \in L$ .

Closure under  $f_i^p$ 's. Let  $w, w_1, \dots, w_p \in \text{Span}_L(v_{t_0}, \dots, v_{t_m})$  for some  $t_0 < \dots < t_m < \kappa$  and  $\lambda_i := f_i^p(w, w_1, \dots, w_p)$ . There exist  $\mu_0, \dots, \mu_m, \nu_{0,1}, \dots, \nu_{m,1}, \dots, \nu_{0,p}, \dots, \nu_{m,p} \in L$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad w = \sum_{i=0}^m \mu_i v_{t_i} \quad \text{and} \quad w_j = \sum_{i=0}^m \nu_{i,j} v_{t_i}.$$

We may assume that  $\mathcal{V} \models \theta_p(w_1, \dots, w_p)$  and  $w \in \text{Span}_K(w_1, \dots, w_p)$ , as otherwise all  $f_i^p$  give zero. In particular, we have that  $p \leq m+1$ .

By definition of  $f_i^p$  we have that

$$(2.2) \quad w = \lambda_1 w_1 + \cdots + \lambda_p w_p,$$

and moreover these  $\lambda_i$ 's are the unique solution in  $K$  to this equation. Replacing  $w$  and the  $w_i$ 's with the corresponding expressions in (2.1), (2.2) is equivalent to

$$\left( -\mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \nu_{0,i} \right) v_{t_0} + \cdots + \left( -\mu_m + \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \nu_{m,i} \right) v_{t_m} = 0.$$

Since the tuple  $(v_{t_0}, \dots, v_{t_m})$  is linearly independent, this holds if and only if

$$-\mu_j + \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \nu_{j,i} = 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq j \leq m,$$

equivalently if

$$M \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0 \\ \vdots \\ \mu_m \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } (M)_{ji} = \nu_{j,i}.$$

As  $p \leq m+1$ , we may get rid of the linearly dependent rows and obtain that

$$N \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{l_1} \\ \vdots \\ \mu_{l_p} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } (N)_{ji} = \nu_{j,l_i}$$

only has  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$  as a solution. Thus  $N$  is invertible. As a consequence, given that all entries of  $N$  and all  $\mu_i$ 's are elements of the field  $L$ , we obtain that also  $\lambda_i \in L$  for all  $i \in [p]$ .  $\square$

Let additionally  $\mathcal{W} = (W, L)$  be another model of  $T$  and  $\mathcal{B} = (B_V, B_K)$  be a substructure of  $\mathcal{W}$ .

**Lemma 2.16.** *Let  $\eta : (A_V, A_K) \rightarrow (B_V, B_K)$  be a bijective map preserving  $+_V$  and scalar multiplication and such that  $\eta \upharpoonright A_K : A_K \rightarrow B_K$  is a field isomorphism. Then  $\eta$  preserves  $\theta_p$  and  $f_i^p$  for all  $p \in \omega$  and  $i \leq p$ .*

*Proof.* By preserving  $+_V$  and scalar multiplication, we have that  $\eta(0_V) = 0_W$ .

Preservation of  $\theta_p$ . Let  $w_1, \dots, w_p \in A_V$  be such that  $\mathcal{V} \models \theta_p(w_1, \dots, w_p)$ . We want to show that  $\mathcal{W} \models \theta_p(\eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p))$ , in other words that  $(\eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p))$  is  $L$ -linearly independent. Assume otherwise and let  $m \in [p-1]$  be minimal such that  $\eta(w_{m+1}) \in \text{Span}_L(\{\eta(w_i) : i \in [m]\})$ . Then

$$\eta(w_{m+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \underbrace{f_i^p(\eta(w_{m+1}), \eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_m))}_{=: \mu_i} \eta(w_i).$$

As  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed under  $f_i^p$ 's, we have that  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m \in B_K$ . As by assumption  $\eta \upharpoonright A_K$  is bijective, there are  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in A_K$  such that  $\mu_i = \eta(\lambda_i)$ . Then by preservation of  $+_V$  and of scalar multiplication, and  $\eta \upharpoonright$  being a field isomorphism, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_1 \eta(w_1) + \dots + \mu_m \eta(w_m) - \eta(w_{m+1}) = 0_W \\ \Leftrightarrow & \eta(\lambda_1) \eta(w_1) + \dots + \eta(\lambda_m) \eta(w_m) - \eta(w_{m+1}) = 0_W \\ \Leftrightarrow & \eta(\lambda_1 w_1 + \dots + \lambda_m w_m - w_{m+1}) = 0_W \\ \Leftrightarrow & \lambda_1 w_1 + \dots + \lambda_m w_m - w_{m+1} = 0_V \quad (\text{as } \eta^{-1}(0_W) = 0_V) \end{aligned}$$

— a contradiction to  $\mathcal{V} \models \theta_p(w_1, \dots, w_p)$ .

Preservation of  $f_i^p$ . Let  $w, w_1, \dots, w_p \in A_V$ . We want to show that

$$\eta(f_i^p(w, w_1, \dots, w_p)) = f_i^p(\eta(w), \eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p)).$$

By the first part of the proof we already know that  $(w_1, \dots, w_p)$  is  $K$ -linearly independent if and only if  $(\eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p))$  is  $L$ -linearly independent, and similarly for  $(w, w_1, \dots, w_p)$  and  $(\eta(w), \eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p))$ . Hence we may assume that  $(w_1, \dots, w_p)$  and  $(\eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p))$  are linearly independent as well as  $w \in \text{Span}_K(w_1, \dots, w_p)$  and  $\eta(w) \in \text{Span}_L(\eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p))$ , as otherwise the values of the  $f_i^p$  are all 0.

So suppose that  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_p \in L$  are such that

$$\eta(w) = \nu_1 \eta(w_1) + \dots + \nu_p \eta(w_p),$$

or in other words  $\mathcal{W} \models f_i^p(\eta(w), \eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p)) = \nu_i$ . Since  $(B_V, B_K)$  is a substructure of  $\mathcal{W}$ , we have that  $\nu_i \in B_K$  for all  $i \leq p$ . As  $\eta$  is bijective and preserves  $+_V$  and scalar multiplication, we can conclude that

$$w = \mu_1 w_1 + \dots + \mu_p w_p$$

for  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p \in A_K$  such that  $\eta(\mu_i) = \nu_i$ . In other words,

$$\eta(f_i^p(w, w_1, \dots, w_p)) = \eta(\mu_i) = \nu_i = f_i^p(\eta(w), \eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_p))$$

for all  $i \in [p]$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main proposition:

*Proof of Proposition 2.13.* Let  $\mathcal{V} = (V, K)$  and  $\mathcal{W} = (W, L)$  be two  $\omega$ -saturated models of  $T$ .

Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be the prime fields of  $K$  and  $L$ , respectively. Then  $(\{0_V\}, P)$  and  $(\{0_W\}, Q)$  are isomorphic substructures of  $\mathcal{V} = (V, K)$  and  $\mathcal{W} = (W, L)$  respectively, and therefore the set of partial isomorphisms is nonempty.

Now, consider an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -isomorphism  $g : (\bar{a}_V, \bar{a}_K) \rightarrow (\bar{b}_V, \bar{b}_K)$  between two finitely generated substructures  $\mathcal{A} = (\bar{a}_V, \bar{a}_K)$  of  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{B} = (\bar{b}_V, \bar{b}_K)$  of  $\mathcal{W}$ . Note that, as we work in the field language,  $\bar{a}_K$  and  $\bar{b}_K$  are fields. Moreover,  $\bar{a}_V$  and  $\bar{b}_V$  are finite dimensional vector spaces over  $\bar{a}_K$  and  $\bar{b}_K$ , respectively. Indeed, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is finitely generated by  $v_1, \dots, v_m \in V$  (we may assume these are linearly independent) and  $k_0, \dots, k_l \in K$ , as  $\mathcal{A}$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -substructure, the subfield  $\bar{a}_K$  contains

$$\{\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n} \rangle_n : 0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_n \leq m\},$$

so Lemma 2.15 ensures that  $\mathcal{A} = (\text{Span}_L(v_0, \dots, v_m), \bar{a}_K)$ , so  $\bar{a}_V$  is a finite dimensional vector space over  $\bar{a}_K$ .

For the rest of the proof we fix a maximal  $K$ -linearly independent subset  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  of  $\bar{a}_V$ , then  $g(S) := \{g(v_1), \dots, g(v_m)\}$  is a maximal  $L$ -linearly independent subset of  $\bar{b}_V$  (as  $g$  preserves  $\theta_m$  and  $\theta_{m+1}$  in both directions). Fix an arbitrary  $x \in (V, K)$ , we need to extend  $g$  to a partial isomorphism between finitely generated substructures of  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  whose domain contains  $x$ .

**Suppose first that  $x \in K$ .**

By quantifier elimination for  $K$  in the language  $\mathcal{L}^K$  (see the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ ), we can choose finitely generated  $\mathcal{L}^K$ -substructures  $\bar{a}_K \cup \{x\} \subseteq \bar{a}'_K \leq K$  and  $\bar{b}_K \leq \bar{b}'_K \leq L$  (so in particular these are finitely generated subfields) and an  $\mathcal{L}^K$ -isomorphism  $h : \bar{a}'_K \rightarrow \bar{b}'_K$  such that  $g \upharpoonright \bar{a}_K = h \upharpoonright \bar{a}_K$ . Using Lemma 2.14 we have

$$(\text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(\bar{a}_V), \bar{a}'_K) = (\text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(v_1, \dots, v_m), \bar{a}'_K),$$

and similarly

$$(\text{Span}_{\bar{b}'_K}(\bar{b}_V), \bar{b}'_K) = (\text{Span}_{\bar{b}'_K}(g(v_1), \dots, g(v_m)), \bar{b}'_K).$$

As  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are substructures, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n} \rangle_n : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_n \leq m\} &\subseteq \bar{a}_K \subseteq \bar{a}'_K \text{ and} \\ \{\langle g(v_{i_1}), \dots, g(v_{i_n}) \rangle_n : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_n \leq m\} &\subseteq \bar{b}_K \subseteq \bar{b}'_K. \end{aligned}$$

Thus Lemma 2.15 ensures that  $(\text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(\bar{a}_V), \bar{a}'_K)$  is a substructure of  $\mathcal{V}$  generated by  $\bar{a}_V, \bar{a}'_K$ , and  $(\text{Span}_{\bar{b}'_K}(\bar{b}_V), \bar{b}'_K)$  is a substructure of  $\mathcal{W}$  generated by  $\bar{b}_V, \bar{b}'_K$ . So we want to extend the partial  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -isomorphism  $g$  to these larger finitely generated substructures.

**Claim 2.17.** *The map  $\eta : (\text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(S), \bar{a}'_K) \rightarrow (\text{Span}_{\bar{b}'_K}(g(S)), \bar{b}'_K)$  that maps any*

$$v = \lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m v_m \in \text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(S) \text{ with } \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \bar{a}'_K$$

$$\text{to } h(\lambda_1)g(v_1) + \cdots + h(\lambda_m)g(v_m)$$

*and any  $\lambda \in \bar{a}'_K$  to  $h(\lambda)$  is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -structures.*

*Proof.* Note first that any element of  $\text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(S)$  is a unique linear combination of elements in the  $K$ -linearly independent set  $S$ . Thus the map is well defined. Moreover, by  $L$ -linear independence of  $g(S)$  and bijectivity of  $g$  and  $h$ , we have that  $\eta$  is bijective. In particular, only  $0_V$  gets mapped to  $0_W$  by  $\eta$ .

$\eta$  preserves  $+_V$  and  $\cdot_V$ . Let  $l \in \bar{a}'_K$  and  $\lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m v_m, \mu_1 v_1 + \cdots + \mu_m v_m \in \text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(\bar{a}_V)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(l(\lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m v_m) + (\mu_1 v_1 + \cdots + \mu_m v_m)) &= \\ \eta((l\lambda_1 + \mu_1)v_1 + \cdots + (l\lambda_m + \mu_m)v_m) &= h(l\lambda_1 + \mu_1)g(v_1) + \cdots + h(l\lambda_m + \mu_m)g(v_m) \\ &= h(l)(h(\lambda_1)g(v_1) + \cdots + h(\lambda_m)g(v_m)) + (h(\mu_1)g(v_1) + \cdots + h(\mu_m)g(v_m)) \\ &= \eta(l)\eta(\lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m v_m) + \eta(\mu_1 v_1 + \cdots + \mu_m v_m). \end{aligned}$$

$\eta$  preserves  $\theta_p$  and  $f_p^i$ . By Lemma 2.16, as  $h$  is a field isomorphism and  $\eta$  preserves  $+_V$  and scalar multiplication.

$\eta$  preserves  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$ . Let  $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(\bar{a}_V)$  be given. Fix  $\mu_{i,j} \in \bar{a}'_K$  such that  $w_j = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,j} v_i$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_n) \rangle_n &= \left\langle \eta\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,1} v_i\right), \dots, \eta\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,n} v_i\right) \right\rangle_n \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^m h(\mu_{i,1})g(v_i), \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m h(\mu_{i,n})g(v_i) \right\rangle_n \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^m \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^m h(\mu_{i_1,1}) \cdots h(\mu_{i_n,n}) \langle g(v_{i_1}), \dots, g(v_{i_n}) \rangle_n \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^m \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^m h(\mu_{i_1,1}) \cdots h(\mu_{i_n,n}) g(\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n} \rangle_n) \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^m \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^m h(\mu_{i_1,1}) \cdots h(\mu_{i_n,n}) h(\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n} \rangle_n) \\ &= h\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^m \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^m \mu_{i_1,1} \cdots \mu_{i_n,n} \langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n} \rangle_n\right) \\ &= \eta\left(\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,1} v_i, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,n} v_i \right\rangle_n\right) = \eta(\langle w_1, \dots, w_n \rangle_n). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the case for which the element  $x$  we wanted to add to the domain of our partial isomorphism belongs to the field.



Now suppose that  $x = v \in V$ .

**Case 1:**  $v \in \text{Span}_K(\bar{a}_V)$ .

Let  $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \bar{a}_V$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in K$  be such that  $v = \lambda_1 w_1 + \dots + \lambda_n w_n$ . Applying Claim 2.17 repeatedly, we can add  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  to  $\bar{a}_K$  and obtain an isomorphism between the substructures generated by  $\bar{a}_V, \bar{a}'_K$  and  $\bar{b}_V, \bar{b}'_K$  so that  $v \in \text{Span}_{\bar{a}'_K}(\bar{a}_V)$  witnessed by  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ . Then the element  $v$  will be an element of the generated substructure and we have obtained the desired map.

**Case 2:**  $v \notin \text{Span}_K(S)$ .

Applying Claim 2.17 repeatedly, we may assume that the elements

$$\{\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{n-1}}, v \rangle_n : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-1} \leq m\}$$

belong to  $\bar{a}_K$ . Since  $(W, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$  is non-degenerate and the set

$$\{t_{i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}} := g(v_{i_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes g(v_{i_{n-1}}) : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-1} \leq m\}$$

is linearly independent in  $\bigwedge^{n-1} W$ , by Lemma 2.9 we can find  $w \in W$  which is  $L$ -linearly independent from  $\text{Span}_L(\bar{b}_V)$  and such that

$$\langle g(v_{i_1}), \dots, g(v_{i_{n-1}}), w \rangle_n = \langle t_{i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}}, w \rangle_2 = g(\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{n-1}}, v \rangle_n)$$

for all  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-1} \leq m$ . Now, using that  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  is alternating and  $g$  is a partial isomorphism, it is easy to check that for any  $u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} \in \bar{a}_V$ ,

$$(2.3) \quad g(\langle u_1, \dots, u_i, v, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{n-1} \rangle_n) = \langle g(u_1), \dots, g(u_i), w, g(u_{i+1}), \dots, g(u_{n-1}) \rangle_n.$$

Indeed, for any  $i_1, \dots, i_{n-1} \in [n]$  we have  $\langle g(v_{i_1}), \dots, g(v_{i_{n-1}}), w \rangle_n = g(\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{n-1}}, v \rangle_n)$  (if two coincide then both sides are 0, and otherwise we can use the permutation that orders the  $v_i$ 's in ascending order). Then for any  $u_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,1} v_i, \dots, u_{n-1} = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,n-1} v_i$  in  $\bar{a}_V$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\langle u_1, \dots, u_i, v, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{n-1} \rangle_n) &= \text{sign}(\sigma) g(\langle u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}, v \rangle_n) \\ &= \text{sign}(\sigma) g\left(\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,1} v_i, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,n-1} v_i, v \right\rangle_n\right) \\ &= \text{sign}(\sigma) g\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^m \dots \sum_{i_{n-1}=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_{j,i_j} \langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{n-1}}, v \rangle_n\right) \\ &= \text{sign}(\sigma) \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^m \dots \sum_{i_{n-1}=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} g(\mu_{j,i_j}) g(\langle v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{n-1}}, v \rangle_n)\right) \\ &= \text{sign}(\sigma) \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^m \dots \sum_{i_{n-1}=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} g(\mu_{j,i_j}) \langle g(v_{i_1}), \dots, g(v_{i_{n-1}}), w \rangle_n\right) \\ &= \text{sign}(\sigma) \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^m g(\mu_{i,1}) g(v_i), \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m g(\mu_{i,n-1}) g(v_i), w \right\rangle_n \\ &= \text{sign}(\sigma) \left\langle g\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,1} v_i\right), \dots, g\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_{i,n-1} v_i\right), w \right\rangle_n \\ &= \text{sign}(\sigma) \langle g(u_1), \dots, g(u_{n-1}), w \rangle_n = \langle g(u_1), \dots, g(u_i), w, g(u_{i+1}), \dots, g(u_{n-1}) \rangle_n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma$  is the permutation that sends  $(u_1, \dots, u_i, v, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_{n-1})$  to  $(u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}, v)$ .

Similarly as in the first part of this proof, Lemmas 2.14 and 2.15 yield:

- the substructure generated by  $v, \bar{a}_V, \bar{a}_K$  is equal to

$$(\text{Span}_{\bar{a}_K}(S, v), \bar{a}_K) = (\bar{a}_V \oplus \text{Span}_{\bar{a}_K}(v), \bar{a}_K);$$

- the substructure generated by  $w, \bar{b}_V, \bar{b}_K$  is equal to

$$(\text{Span}_{\bar{b}_K}(g(S), w), \bar{b}_K) = (\bar{b}_V \oplus \text{Span}_{\bar{b}_K}(w), \bar{b}_K).$$

**Claim 2.18.** *The map*

$$\begin{aligned} \eta : (\bar{a}_V \oplus \text{Span}_{\bar{a}_K}(v), \bar{a}_K) &\rightarrow (\bar{b}_V \oplus \text{Span}_{\bar{b}_K}(w), \bar{b}_K) \\ (u + \lambda v, \mu) &\mapsto (g(u) + g(\lambda)w, g(\mu)) \end{aligned}$$

*is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -structures.*

*Proof.* Since  $g$  is bijective, we have that  $\eta$  is bijective as well. In particular, only  $0_V$  gets mapped to  $0_W$  by  $\eta$ .

$\eta$  preserves  $+_V$  and  $\cdot_V$ . Let  $\ell \in \bar{a}_K$ ,  $u_1 + \lambda_1 v, u_2 + \lambda_2 v \in \bar{a}_V \oplus \text{Span}_{\bar{a}_K}(v)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(\ell(u_1 + \lambda_1 v) + (u_2 + \lambda_2 v)) &= \eta((\ell u_1 + u_2) + (\ell \lambda_1 + \lambda_2)v) \\ &= g(\ell u_1 + u_2) + g(\ell \lambda_1 + \lambda_2)w = g(\ell)g(u_1) + g(u_2) + g(\ell)g(\lambda_1)w + g(\lambda_2)w \\ &= g(\ell)(g(u_1) + g(\lambda_1)w) + (g(u_2) + g(\lambda_2)w) = \eta(\ell)\eta(u_1 + \lambda_1 v) + \eta(u_2 + \lambda_2 v). \end{aligned}$$

$\eta$  preserves  $\theta_p$  and  $f_p^i$ . The map  $\eta$  preserves  $\theta_p$  and  $f_p^i$  by “linearity” and Lemma 2.16.

$\eta$  preserves  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$ . Let  $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \bar{a}_V \oplus \text{Span}_{\bar{a}_K}(v)$ . Let  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \in \bar{a}_K$  and  $u_1, \dots, u_n \in \bar{a}_V$  be such that  $w_j = u_j + \mu_j v$  for all  $j$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \eta(w_1), \dots, \eta(w_n) \rangle_n &= \langle \eta(u_1 + \mu_1 v), \dots, \eta(u_n + \mu_n v) \rangle_n \\ &= \langle g(u_1) + g(\mu_1)w, \dots, g(u_n) + g(\mu_n)w \rangle_n \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mu_i) \left\langle g(u_1), \dots, g(u_{i-1}), w, g(u_{i+1}), \dots, g(u_n) \right\rangle_n + \langle g(u_1), \dots, g(u_n) \rangle_n \\ &\quad (\text{as } \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n \text{ is alternating}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mu_i) g \left( \left\langle u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, v, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n \right\rangle_n \right) + g(\langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle_n) \\ &\quad (\text{as } g \text{ preserves } \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n \text{ and (2.3)}) \\ &= g \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \left\langle u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, v, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n \right\rangle_n + \langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle_n \right) \\ &\quad (\text{as } g \upharpoonright \bar{a}_K \text{ is a field isomorphism}) \\ &= g(\langle u_1 + \mu_1 v, \dots, u_n + \mu_n v \rangle_n) \quad (\text{as } \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n \text{ is alternating}) \\ &= g(\langle w_1, \dots, w_n \rangle_n) = \eta(\langle w_1, \dots, w_n \rangle_n). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.13.  $\square_{2.13}$

Proposition 2.13 implies immediately:

**Theorem 2.19.** *For any  $n \geq 1$  and field  $K$ , the theory  $\text{Alt } T_n^K$  of infinite dimensional alternating non-degenerate  $n$ -linear spaces over  $K$  has quantifier elimination (in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ ) and is complete.*

- Remark 2.20.** (1) Let us denote by  $T_{VS,\infty}^K$  the two-sorted theory of infinite dimensional vector spaces over fields elementarily equivalent to  $K$ , in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{VS}^K := \mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K \setminus \{\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n\}$ . Our proof of Theorem 2.19 demonstrates in particular that the theory  $T_{VS,\infty}^K$  is complete and has quantifier elimination (in  $\mathcal{L}_{VS}^K$ ).
- (2) The proof also demonstrates that if the field  $K$  is finite, then the theory  $\text{Alt} T_n^K$  is  $\omega$ -categorical. Indeed, the proof builds an isomorphism between any two countable models of  $\text{Alt} T_n^K$  by back-and-forth, starting with an isomorphism of their corresponding finite fields and using that in this case finitely generated structures are finite.

**Problem 2.21.** Here we focused on alternating multilinear forms. It remains interesting to extend this quantifier elimination/completeness result to other kinds of multilinear forms (and multilinear maps between different  $K$ -vector spaces), in particular in the symmetric case (some additional assumptions on the field  $K$  are necessary, even in the bilinear case). See also [34, 8, 33, 49].

### 3. COMPOSITION LEMMA FOR FUNCTIONS OF ARBITRARY ARITY AND NIP RELATIONS

**3.1. NIP formulas on indiscernible sequences and arrays.** Let  $T$  be a complete theory in a language  $\mathcal{L}$ . We recall some standard definitions and facts.

**Definition 3.1.** Given a formula  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  we say that it is NIP if every formula obtained from it by partitioning the variables into two groups is NIP.

**Definition 3.2.** Given  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  be linear orders, and let  $\Delta$  be a set of formulas. We say that a  $k$ -dimensional array of tuples  $(a_{\vec{i}} : \vec{i} \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k)$  from  $\mathbb{M}$  is  $\Delta$ -indiscernible if for any  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Delta$  and any  $\vec{i}_t^\alpha \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k$  for  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , with  $\vec{i}_t^\alpha = (i_{t,1}^\alpha, \dots, i_{t,k}^\alpha)$ , we have

$$\bigwedge_{s=1}^k \text{qftp}_{<}(i_{1,s}^0, \dots, i_{n,s}^0) = \text{qftp}_{<}(i_{1,s}^1, \dots, i_{n,s}^1) \implies \models \varphi(a_{\vec{i}_1^0}, \dots, a_{\vec{i}_n^0}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(a_{\vec{i}_1^1}, \dots, a_{\vec{i}_n^1}).$$

If  $\Delta$  consists of all  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulas, then we simply say *indiscernible*.

**Remark 3.3.** Indiscernible arrays were studied in various contexts, including Zilber's trichotomy in Zariski geometries [37, 47], properties of dividing in simple [43] and NTP<sub>2</sub> [6] theories, simplicity in compact abstract theories [7], study of thorn-forking in [3].

The following fact is the so-called UDTFs property of NIP formulas (i.e. *Uniform Definability of Types over Finite Sets*), established for an arbitrary formula in an NIP structure in [17], and more recently for an NIP formula in an arbitrary structure in [29].

**Fact 3.4.** Let  $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$  be an NIP formula. Then there exists a formula  $\theta(y; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ , with  $\bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$  for some  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfying the following: for every finite tuple  $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}_y$  with  $|A| \geq 2$  and every  $b \in \mathbb{M}_x$ , there exists some tuple  $c \in A^d$  such that for every  $a \in A$  we have  $\models \varphi(b, a) \iff \models \theta(a, c)$ .

This implies that every subset of an indiscernible array relatively definable by an instance of an NIP formula is a union of boundedly many boxes (this is a generalization of the finitary version of the “shrinking of indiscernibles” ([4, 51], see also [2, Section 3]) from sequences to arrays, the case  $k = 1$  appears as [18, Lemma 3.1]).

**Lemma 3.5.** Let  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r) \in \mathcal{L}$  be an NIP formula. Then there exist some  $d' = d'(\varphi) \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite set of  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulas  $\Delta$  such that the following holds. Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{M}_x$  and a  $k$ -dimensional  $\Delta$ -indiscernible array  $(a_{\vec{i}} : \vec{i} \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k)$ , with  $I_s$  finite

for  $1 \leq s \leq k$ , be arbitrary. Then there exist some tuples  $\bar{j}_1, \dots, \bar{j}_{d'} \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k$  satisfying the following: for any  $\bar{i}_1^\alpha, \dots, \bar{i}_r^\alpha \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k$  and  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$  we have

$$\bigwedge_{s=1}^k \text{qftp}_{<}(\bar{i}_{1,s}^0, \dots, \bar{i}_{r,s}^0 / j_{1,s}, \dots, j_{d',s}) = \text{qftp}_{<}(\bar{i}_{1,s}^1, \dots, \bar{i}_{r,s}^1 / j_{1,s}, \dots, j_{d',s}) \\ \implies \models \varphi(b; a_{\bar{i}_1^0}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r^0}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(b; a_{\bar{i}_1^1}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r^1}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $y' := (y_1, \dots, y_r)$ , and let  $\theta(y', \bar{y}') \in \mathcal{L}$  with  $\bar{y}' = (y'_1, \dots, y'_{d'})$  be as given by Fact 3.4 for  $\varphi(x, y')$ . Let  $\Delta := \{\theta\}$ . Let  $b$  and  $A := (a_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k)$  be given, without loss of generality  $|I_1 \times \dots \times I_k| \geq 2$ . Applying Fact 3.4 to  $b$  and  $A' := A^r$ , there are some  $(\bar{j}_1^1, \dots, \bar{j}_r^1), \dots, (\bar{j}_1^d, \dots, \bar{j}_r^d) \in (I_1 \times \dots \times I_k)^r$  such that for all  $\bar{i}_1, \dots, \bar{i}_r \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k$  we have

$$(3.1) \quad \models \varphi(b; a_{\bar{i}_1}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r}) \iff \models \theta \left( a_{\bar{i}_1}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r}; \left( a_{\bar{j}_t^q} : 1 \leq q \leq d, 1 \leq t \leq r \right) \right).$$

Let  $\bar{j}_1, \dots, \bar{j}_{d'}$  with  $d' := rd$  enumerate the list  $(\bar{j}_t^q : 1 \leq q \leq d, 1 \leq t \leq r)$ . Now given any  $\bar{i}_1^\alpha, \dots, \bar{i}_r^\alpha \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k$ ,  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$  with

$$\text{qftp}_{<}(\bar{i}_{1,s}^0, \dots, \bar{i}_{r,s}^0 / j_{1,s}, \dots, j_{d',s}) = \text{qftp}_{<}(\bar{i}_{1,s}^1, \dots, \bar{i}_{r,s}^1 / j_{1,s}, \dots, j_{d',s})$$

for all  $1 \leq s \leq k$ , by indiscernibility of the array (with respect to  $\theta$ ) we have

$$\models \theta \left( a_{\bar{i}_1^0}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r^0}; \left( a_{\bar{j}_t^q} : 1 \leq q \leq d, 1 \leq t \leq r \right) \right) \\ \iff \models \theta \left( a_{\bar{i}_1^1}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r^1}; \left( a_{\bar{j}_t^q} : 1 \leq q \leq d, 1 \leq t \leq r \right) \right),$$

hence, by (3.1),

$$\models \varphi(b; a_{\bar{i}_1^0}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r^0}) \iff \models \varphi(b; a_{\bar{i}_1^1}, \dots, a_{\bar{i}_r^1}). \quad \square$$

We will also use the following lemma on the existence of indiscernible subarrays in sufficiently large arrays.

**Lemma 3.6.** *For every  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite set of formulas  $\Delta$  there exists some  $r = r(k, \Delta, n)$  satisfying the following. If  $(a_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [r]^k)$  is an arbitrary array of finite tuples of the same length, then there exists some  $\Delta$ -indiscernible subarray  $(a_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in I_1 \times \dots \times I_k)$  with  $I_t \subseteq [r]$  and  $|I_t| \geq n$  for all  $1 \leq t \leq k$ .*

*Proof.* By a repeated application of the finite Ramsey theorem.  $\square$

**3.2.  $N$ -dependence and generalized indiscernibles.** We recall some basic properties of  $n$ -dependent formulas and theories.

**Fact 3.7.** (1) *Let  $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  and  $\psi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  be  $n$ -dependent formulas. Then  $\neg\varphi$ ,  $\varphi \wedge \psi$  and  $\varphi \vee \psi$  are  $n$ -dependent. See [15, Proposition 6.5(1)].*

(2) *Let  $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  be a formula. Suppose that  $(w, z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is any permutation of the tuple  $(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . Then  $\psi(w, z_1, \dots, z_n) := \varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  is  $n$ -dependent if and only if  $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  is  $n$ -dependent. See [15, Proposition 6.5(2)].*

(3) *A theory  $T$  is  $n$ -dependent if and only if every formula  $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  such that all but at most one of the tuples  $x, y_1, \dots, y_n$  are singletons is  $n$ -dependent. See [13, Theorem 2.12].*

We recall a characterization of  $n$ -dependence in terms of generalized indiscernible sequences from [15].

**Definition 3.8.** Fix a language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{opg}}^n = \{R_n(x_1, \dots, x_n), <, P_1(x), \dots, P_n(x)\}$ . An *ordered  $n$ -partite hypergraph* is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{opg}}^n$ -structure  $\mathcal{A} = (A; <, R_n, P_1, \dots, P_n)$  such that:

- (1)  $A$  is the disjoint union  $P_1^A \sqcup \dots \sqcup P_n^A$ ,
- (2)  $R_n^A$  is a symmetric relation so that if  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in R_n^A$  then  $P_i^A \cap \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  is a singleton for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,
- (3)  $<^A$  is a linear ordering on  $A$  with  $P_1^A < \dots < P_n^A$ .

**Fact 3.9.** [15, Fact 4.4 + Remark 4.5] *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the class of all finite ordered  $n$ -partite hypergraphs. Then  $\mathcal{K}$  is a Fraïssé class, and its limit is called the generic ordered  $n$ -partite hypergraph, denoted by  $G_{n,p}$ . An ordered  $n$ -partite hypergraph  $\mathcal{A}$  is a model of  $\text{Th}(G_{n,p})$  if and only if:*

- $(P_i^A, <)$  is a dense linear order without endpoints for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,
- for every  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , finite disjoint sets  $A_0, A_1 \subset \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq j} P_i^A$  and  $b_0 < b_1 \in P_j^A$ , there is some  $b \in P_j^A$  such that  $b_0 < b < b_1$  and:  $R_n(b, \bar{a})$  holds for every  $\bar{a} \in A_0$  and  $\neg R_n(b, \bar{a})$  holds for every  $\bar{a} \in A_1$ .

**Remark 3.10.** It is easy to see from the axiomatization that given  $G_{n,p}$  and any non-empty intervals  $I_t \subseteq P_t$  for  $t = 1, \dots, n$ , the set  $I_1 \times \dots \times I_n$  contains an induced copy of  $G_{n,p}$ .

We denote by  $O_{n,p}$  the reduct of  $G_{n,p}$  to the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{op}}^n = \{<, P_1(x), \dots, P_n(x)\}$ .

**Definition 3.11.** Let  $T$  be a theory in a language  $\mathcal{L}$ , and  $\mathbb{M}$  a monster model of  $T$ .

- (1) Let  $I$  be a structure in the language  $\mathcal{L}_0$ . We say that  $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in I}$ , with  $a_i$  a tuple in  $\mathbb{M}$ , is  *$I$ -indiscernible* over a set of parameters  $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  if for all  $n \in \omega$  and all  $i_0, \dots, i_n$  and  $j_0, \dots, j_n$  from  $I$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_0}(i_0, \dots, i_n) = \text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_0}(j_0, \dots, j_n) &\Rightarrow \\ \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}(a_{i_0}, \dots, a_{i_n}/C) = \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}}(a_{j_0}, \dots, a_{j_n}/C). \end{aligned}$$

- (2) For  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -structures  $I$  and  $J$ , we say that  $(b_i)_{i \in J}$  is *based on*  $(a_i)_{i \in I}$  over a set of parameters  $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  if for any finite set  $\Delta$  of  $\mathcal{L}(C)$ -formulas, and for any finite tuple  $(j_0, \dots, j_n)$  from  $J$  there is a tuple  $(i_0, \dots, i_n)$  from  $I$  such that:
  - $\text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_0}(j_0, \dots, j_n) = \text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_0}(i_0, \dots, i_n)$  and
  - $\text{tp}_{\Delta}(b_{j_0}, \dots, b_{j_n}) = \text{tp}_{\Delta}(a_{i_0}, \dots, a_{i_n})$ .
- (3) Let  $I$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -structure. We say that  $I$  has the *modeling property* if given any  $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in I}$  there exists an  $I$ -indiscernible  $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in I}$  based on  $\bar{a}$ .

The following is a standard method for finding generalized indiscernibles using structural Ramsey theory [50] (see also [15, Fact 4.7]):

**Fact 3.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of finite  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -structures and let  $I$  be a countable universal  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -structure (i.e. for every  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  there is some substructure  $A'$  of  $I$  such that  $A \cong A'$ ) such that  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  for every finite substructure  $A \subseteq I$ . Then  $\mathcal{K}$  is a Ramsey class if and only if  $I$  has the modeling property.*

**Fact 3.13.** [15, Corollary 4.8] *Let  $C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  be a small set of parameters.*

- (1) *For any  $n \in \omega$  and  $\bar{a} = (a_g)_{g \in O_{n,p}}$ , there is some  $(b_g)_{g \in O_{n,p}}$  which is  $O_{n,p}$ -indiscernible over  $C$  and is based on  $\bar{a}$  over  $C$ .*
- (2) *For any  $n \in \omega$  and  $\bar{a} = (a_g)_{g \in G_{n,p}}$ , there is some  $(b_g)_{g \in G_{n,p}}$  which is  $G_{n,p}$ -indiscernible over  $C$  and is based on  $\bar{a}$  over  $C$ .*

**Fact 3.14.** [13, Proposition 2.8] *The following are equivalent, in any theory  $T$ .*

- (1)  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_n)$  is not  $n$ -dependent.
- (2) There are tuples  $b$  and  $(a_g)_{g \in G_{n,p}}$  such that
  - (a)  $(a_g)_{g \in G_{n,p}}$  is  $O_{n,p}$ -indiscernible over  $\emptyset$  and  $G_{n,p}$ -indiscernible over  $b$ ;
  - (b)  $\models \varphi(b; a_{g_1}, \dots, a_{g_n}) \iff G_{n,p} \models R_n(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ , for all  $g_i \in P_i$ .
- (3) Item (2) holds for any small  $G'_{n,p} \equiv G_{n,p}$  in the place of  $G_{n,p}$ .

We will need the following easy lemma.

**Lemma 3.15.** *Let  $b$  and  $(a_g)_{g \in G_{n,p}}$  be such that  $(a_g)_{g \in G_{n,p}}$  is  $O_{n,p}$ -indiscernible over  $\emptyset$  and  $G_{n,p}$ -indiscernible over  $b$  and  $\models \varphi(b; a_{g_1}, \dots, a_{g_n}) \iff G_{n,p} \models R_n(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ , for all  $g_i \in P_i$ . Then the following hold:*

- (1) for any  $1 \leq m \leq n$ , the sequences

$$(a_g)_{g \in P_1}, \dots, (a_g)_{g \in P_{m-1}}, (a_g)_{g \in P_{m+1}}, \dots, (a_g)_{g \in P_n}$$

are mutually indiscernible over  $b$ ; in particular,

$$(\gamma_{\bar{g}} : \bar{g} \in P_1 \times \dots \times P_{m-1} \times P_{m+1} \times \dots \times P_n)$$

with  $\gamma_{\bar{g}} := (b, a_{g_1}, \dots, a_{g_{m-1}}, a_{g_{m+1}}, a_{g_n})$  is an indiscernible array;

- (2) the sequences  $(a_g)_{g \in P_1}, \dots, (a_g)_{g \in P_n}$  are mutually indiscernible; in particular,  $(\gamma_{\bar{g}} : \bar{g} \in P_1 \times \dots \times P_n)$  with  $\gamma_{\bar{g}} := (a_{g_1}, \dots, a_{g_n})$  is an indiscernible array.

*Proof.* Part (1) is immediate from  $G_{n,p}$ -indiscernibility over  $b$ , as for any tuples  $\bar{g}, \bar{g}' \subseteq P_1 \times \dots \times P_{m-1} \times P_{m+1} \times \dots \times P_n$  we have

$$\text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{op}}^n}(\bar{g}) = \text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{op}}^n}(\bar{g}') \implies \text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{opg}}^n}(\bar{g}) = \text{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\text{opg}}^n}(\bar{g}')$$

(as the edge relation  $R$  can never hold). And (2) is immediate by  $O_{n,p}$ -indiscernibility.  $\square$

**3.3. Finitary type-counting characterization of  $n$ -dependence.** We recall a generalization of Sauer-Shelah lemma to higher arity VC-dimension from [15].

**Definition 3.16.** Let  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  be arbitrary sets, and let  $X := \prod_{i=1}^k X_i$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  be a family of subsets of  $X$ .

- (1) Given  $A \subseteq X$ , we write  $\mathcal{F} \cap A := \{B \subseteq A : B = A \cap S \text{ for some } S \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .
- (2) We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  *shatters* a set  $A \subseteq X$  if for every  $B \subseteq A$  there is some  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $B = A \cap S$ .
- (3) By an  $n$ -box we mean a set  $A = \prod_{i=1}^k A_i$  with  $|A_i| = n$ .
- (4) The  $\text{VC}_k$ -dimension of  $\mathcal{F}$ , denoted  $\text{VC}_k(\mathcal{F})$ , is the largest  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  so that  $\mathcal{F}$  shatters an  $n$ -box, or  $\infty$  if there is no such  $n$ .

**Fact 3.17.** [15, Proposition 3.9] *For every  $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists some  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $n_0 \geq \mathbb{N}$  such that the following holds for all  $n > n_0$ . If  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  are finite sets with  $|X_i| = n$ , and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 2^{n^{k-\varepsilon}}$ , then  $\mathcal{F}$  shatters some  $d$ -box  $A \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^k X_i$ .*

**Remark 3.18.** Given a formula  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  and  $a \in \mathbb{M}_x$ , we consider:

- (1)  $\varphi(a; \mathbb{M}) := \{(b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{M}_{y_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{M}_{y_k} : \models \varphi(a; b_1, \dots, b_k)\}$ ,
- (2)  $\mathcal{F}_\varphi := \{\varphi(a; \mathbb{M}) : a \in \mathbb{M}_x\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{M}_{y_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{M}_{y_k})$ ,
- (3)  $\text{VC}_k(\varphi) := \text{VC}_k(\mathcal{F}_\varphi)$ .

We now establish a finitary version of the type-counting criterion for  $k$ -dependence from [13, Section 5.1]. This provides a partial answer to [13, Problem 5.11].

**Definition 3.19.** Given a partitioned formula  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  and sets  $A_0 \subseteq \mathbb{M}_x$ ,  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{M}_{y_i}$  for  $i \in [k-1]$  and  $B \subseteq \mathbb{M}_{y_k}$ , we denote by  $S_{\varphi, B}(A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1})$  the set of all  $\varphi$ -types over  $A_0 \times A_1 \times \dots \times A_{k-1}$  in the variable  $y_k$  that are realized in  $B$ ; where by a  $\varphi$ -type over  $A_0 \times A_1 \times \dots \times A_{k-1}$  in the variable  $y_k$  we mean a maximal consistent collection of formulas of the form  $\varphi(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, y_k)$  or  $\neg \varphi(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, y_k)$  with  $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}) \in A_0 \times A_1 \times \dots \times A_{k-1}$ . If  $A_0 = \{b\}$  is a singleton, we will simply write  $S_{\varphi, B}(b, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1})$ .

**Definition 3.20.** Given a formula  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , we consider the following condition.

- ( $\dagger$ ) $_{f, \varepsilon}$  There exists some  $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the following holds for all  $n^* \leq n \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$ : for any mutually indiscernible sequences  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  of finite length, with  $I_i \subseteq \mathbb{M}_{y_i}$ ,  $n = |I_1| = \dots = |I_{k-1}|$ ,  $m = |I_k|$ , and  $b \in \mathbb{M}_x$  an arbitrary tuple there exists an interval  $J \subseteq I_k$  with  $|J| \geq \frac{m}{f(n)} - 1$  satisfying  $|S_{\varphi, J}(b, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1})| < 2^{n^{k-1-\varepsilon}}$ .

**Proposition 3.21.** *The following are equivalent for a formula  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$ , with  $k \geq 2$ :*

- (1)  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is  $k$ -dependent.
- (2) There exist some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\varphi$  satisfies ( $\dagger$ ) $_{f, \varepsilon}$  with respect to the function  $f(n) = n^d$ .
- (3) There exist some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and some function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\varphi$  satisfies ( $\dagger$ ) $_{f, \varepsilon}$ .

*Proof.* (1) implies (2). Assume that  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is  $k$ -dependent, say of VC $_k$ -dimension  $d_0$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n_0$  be as given by Fact 3.17 for  $k-1$  and  $d_0$ . Let  $d := d_0(k-1) + 1$  and  $n^* := \max\{n_0, d_0\}$ . Assume that  $n^* \leq n \leq m$ ,  $b, I_1, \dots, I_k$  witness that (2) fails with respect to  $d$  and  $\varepsilon$  (in particular  $m > f(n)$  as otherwise (2) would hold using  $J := \emptyset$ ). We can partition  $I_k$  into  $n' := f(n) = n^d \geq d_0 n^{d_0(k-1)}$  disjoint intervals  $J_1 < \dots < J_{n'}$ , with  $|J_i| \geq \frac{m}{f(n)} - 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n'$ . Then by assumption we have  $|S_{\varphi, J_i}(b, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1})| \geq 2^{n^{k-1-\varepsilon}}$  for each  $i$ . Hence, by Fact 3.17, for each  $i$  there exists some  $d_0$ -box  $A_i \subseteq I_1 \times \dots \times I_{k-1}$  shattered by the family  $\{\varphi(b, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, a) : a \in J_i\}$ . As there are at most  $\binom{n}{d_0}^{k-1}$ -choices for  $A_i$ , by pigeonhole there exist some  $d_0$ -box  $A' = A'_1 \times \dots \times A'_{k-1} \subseteq I_1 \times \dots \times I_{k-1}$  and some  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{d_0} \leq n'$  such that  $A'$  is shattered by each of the families  $\{\varphi(b, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, a) : a \in J_{i_t}\}$ , for  $1 \leq t \leq d_0$ .

For each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , let  $I'_i$  be the initial segment of  $I_i$  of length  $d_0$ , and let  $R \subseteq I'_1 \times \dots \times I'_k$  be arbitrary. By the choice of  $A'$  we can select points  $a_t \in J_{i_t}$  such that the ordered  $k$ -partite hypergraph  $(R; I'_1, \dots, I'_k)$  is isomorphic to the ordered  $k$ -partite hypergraph  $(\varphi(b; y_1, \dots, y_k); A'_1, \dots, A'_{k-1}, \{a_1, \dots, a_{d_0}\})$ . By mutual indiscernibility of  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  there is an automorphism sending  $A'_i$  to  $I'_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$  and  $\{a_1, \dots, a_{d_0}\}$  to  $I'_k$ ; then the image  $b_R$  of  $b$  under this isomorphism satisfies

$$\models \varphi(b_R; a_1, \dots, a_k) \iff (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in R$$

for all  $a_i \in I'_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . That is, the  $d_0$ -box  $I'_1 \times \dots \times I'_k$  is shattered by the instances of  $\varphi$ , contradicting the assumption on the VC $_k$ -dimension of  $\varphi$ .

(2) implies (3) is obvious.

(3) implies (1). Let  $k \geq 2, d, n \in \mathbb{N}$  be arbitrary. We define a  $k$ -partite ordered hypergraph  $(R_{d, n}^{k-1}; V_1, \dots, V_k)$  as follows. Let  $d' := 2d$ , and let  $s_1, \dots, s_{2n^{k-1}}$  be an arbitrary enumeration of  $\mathcal{P}([n]^{k-1})$ . We take  $V_i := [n]$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$  with the natural ordering, and we let  $V_k := [d'] \times [2n^{k-1}]$ , with the order given by the lexicographic product

of the natural orders on  $[d']$  and  $[2^{n^{k-1}}]$ . And for any  $(a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}) \in V_1 \times \dots \times V_{k-1}$  and  $(t, a) \in V_k$  we define

$$(a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, (t, a)) \in R_{d,n}^{k-1} : \iff (a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}) \in s_a.$$

**Claim 3.22.** *The  $k$ -partite ordered hypergraph  $(R_{d,n}^{k-1}; V_1, \dots, V_k)$  satisfies the following.*

- (a)  $|V_i| = n$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$  and  $|V_k| = 2d2^{n^{k-1}}$ .
- (b) For any interval  $J \subseteq V_k$  with  $|J| \geq \frac{|V_k|}{d} - 1$ , the family of sets

$$\mathcal{F}_J := \left\{ R_{d,n}^{k-1}(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, c) \cap V_1 \times \dots \times V_{k-1} : c \in J \right\}$$

shatters  $V_1 \times \dots \times V_{k-1}$ . In particular,  $|\mathcal{F}_J| = 2^{n^{k-1}}$ .

*Proof.* (a) is obvious by construction. For (b), let  $J$  be an interval in  $V_k$  of length  $\geq \frac{|V_k|}{d}$ . As  $d' = 2d$ ,  $J$  must contain entirely the whole set  $\{(t, a) : a \in [2^{n^{k-1}}]\}$  for some  $1 \leq t \leq d'$ , hence (b) holds by construction.  $\square$

Now assume that  $\varphi(x; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is not  $k$ -dependent. Then, by Fact 3.14, there are tuples  $b$  and  $(a_g)_{g \in G_{k,p}}$  such that  $(a_g)_{g \in G_{k,p}}$  is  $O_{n,p}$ -indiscernible and  $\models \varphi(b; a_{g_1}, \dots, a_{g_k}) \iff G_{k,p} \models R_k(g_1, \dots, g_k)$ , for all  $g_i \in P_i$ . In particular, taking  $I_i := (a_g : g \in P_i)$ , the sequences  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  are mutually indiscernible (with the ordering given by the ordering on  $P_i$ ).

We fix an arbitrary  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ . As  $G_{k,p}$  contains any finite ordered  $k$ -partite hypergraph as an induced substructure, restricting  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  to the corresponding finite subsequences we find finite mutually indiscernible sequences  $I'_1, \dots, I'_k$  such that the  $k$ -partite ordered hypergraph  $(\varphi(b, y_1, \dots, y_k); I'_1, \dots, I'_k)$  is isomorphic to  $(R_{f(n^*),n^*}^{k-1}; V_1, \dots, V_k)$ . Then, by Claim 3.22,  $|I'_i| = n^*$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $|I'_k| = m := 2f(n^*)2^{(n^*)^{k-1}}$ ; and if  $J$  is an arbitrary interval in  $I'_k$  with  $|J| \geq \frac{m}{f(n^*)} - 1$ , then  $I'_1 \times \dots \times I'_{k-1}$  is shattered by the family  $\{\varphi(b, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, c) : c \in J\}$ , so  $S_{\varphi,J}(b, I'_1, \dots, I'_{k-1}) = 2^{(n^*)^{k-1}}$ . But this contradicts  $(\dagger)_{f,\varepsilon}$ .  $\square$

**3.4. Array shattering lemma in NIP structures.** The following is our key technical lemma. In this section, given a tuple  $\vec{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$  and  $s \subseteq [k]$ , we write  $\vec{i}_s$  to denote the subtuple  $(i_t : t \in s)$ . And if  $\vec{i}' = (i'_1, \dots, i'_{k'})$  is another tuple, we write  $\vec{i} + \vec{i}'$  to denote the concatenated tuple  $(i_1, \dots, i_k, i'_1, \dots, i'_{k'})$ .

**Lemma 3.23** (Array shattering lemma). *Assume that every  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula is NIP. Then (1)<sub>k</sub> below holds for all  $k \geq 2$  and (2)<sub>k</sub> holds for all  $k \geq 1$  (below all of the  $y_i$ 's are tuples of variables of arbitrary finite length).*

- (1)<sub>k</sub> For every  $\varphi(y_0, \dots, y_k) \in \mathcal{L}$  there exist some  $f_\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_\varphi \in \mathbb{N}$ , a sequence  $(\Delta_{\varphi,n} : n \in \mathbb{N})$  with each  $\Delta_{\varphi,n}$  a finite set of  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulas, and  $\varepsilon_\varphi > 0$  satisfying the following:

Let  $n_\varphi \leq n \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$  be arbitrary. Let  $\bar{\gamma} = (\gamma_{\vec{i}} : \vec{i} \in [n]^{k-1} \times [m])$  be a  $\Delta_{\varphi,n}$ -indiscernible array. Let  $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_{\vec{i}} : \vec{i} \in [n]^{k-1})$  and  $\bar{\beta}^t = (\beta_{\vec{i}}^t : \vec{i} \in [n]^{k-2} \times [m])$  for  $1 \leq t \leq k-1$  be arbitrary arrays. For  $j \in [m]$ , let

$$S_j^\varphi := \left\{ \vec{i} \in [n]^{k-1} : \models \varphi \left( \alpha_{\vec{i}}, \beta_{i_{[k-1] \setminus \{1\}} + (j)}^1, \dots, \beta_{i_{[k-1] \setminus \{k-1\}} + (j)}^{k-1}, \gamma_{\vec{i} + (j)} \right) \right\}.$$

Then there exists some interval  $J \subseteq [m]$  with  $|J| \geq \frac{m}{f_\varphi(n)} - 1$  such that the family of sets  $\mathcal{F}_J^\varphi := \{S_j^\varphi : j \in J\}$  has cardinality at most  $2^{n^{k-1} - \varepsilon_\varphi}$ .



(2)<sub>k</sub> For every  $\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{L}$  there exist some  $n'_\varphi \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon'_\varphi > 0$  satisfying the following:

Let  $n'_\varphi \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\bar{\delta} = (\delta_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k)$  be an array. For a sequence of arrays  $(\bar{\zeta}^t = (\zeta_{\bar{i}}^t : \bar{i} \in [n]^{k-1}))_{1 \leq t \leq k}$ , we define


$$S_{\bar{\zeta}^1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}^k}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} := \left\{ \bar{i} \in [n]^k : \models \varphi \left( \zeta_{\bar{i}_{[k] \setminus \{1\}}}^1, \dots, \zeta_{\bar{i}_{[k] \setminus \{k\}}}^k, \delta_{\bar{i}} \right) \right\}.$$

Then the family

$$\mathcal{F}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} = \left\{ S_{\bar{\zeta}^1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}^k}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} \subseteq [n]^k : \bar{\zeta}^1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}^k \text{ arbitrary arrays} \right\}$$

has cardinality  $< 2^{n^{k-\varepsilon'_\varphi}}$ .

*Proof.* We already saw an illustration for the properties (2)<sub>2</sub> and (2)<sub>3</sub> in the introduction. The following is an illustration for the properties (1)<sub>2</sub> and (1)<sub>3</sub>:



Note that (2)<sub>1</sub> holds by Sauer-Shelah lemma: In this case given an NIP formula  $\varphi(y_1, y_2)$  and an arbitrary  $\bar{\delta} = (\delta_i : i \in [n])$ , for any  $\bar{\zeta}^1 = (\zeta, \zeta \in \mathbb{M}_{y_1})$ , the set  $S_{\bar{\zeta}^1}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} := \{i \in [n] : \models \varphi(\zeta, \delta_i)\}$  is determined by the  $\varphi$ -type of  $\zeta$  over  $\bar{\delta}$ . By Sauer-Shelah there exist some  $c \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the number of  $\varphi$ -types over every set of size  $n \geq n_0$  is bounded by  $n^c$ . And for an arbitrary  $0 < \varepsilon_\varphi < 1$  there exists some  $n_\varphi \geq n_0$  and such that  $n^c < 2^{n^{-\varepsilon_\varphi}}$  for all  $n \geq n_\varphi$ , so (2)<sub>1</sub> holds.

We will show that (1)<sub>k</sub> implies (2)<sub>k</sub> for all  $k \geq 2$ , and that (2)<sub>k</sub> implies (1)<sub>k+1</sub> for all  $k \geq 1$ , which is sufficient.

(1)<sub>k</sub> **implies** (2)<sub>k</sub>. Let  $\varepsilon_{\varphi'} > 0, n_\psi, (\Delta_{\psi, n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $f_\psi$  be as given by (1)<sub>k</sub> for

$$\psi(y_0, \dots, y_k) := \varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}, y_0, y_k).$$

We consider the  $k$ -partite ordered hypergraph  $(R_{f_\psi(n_\psi), n_\psi}^{k-1}; V_1, \dots, V_k)$  defined in the proof of Proposition 3.21. By Claim 3.22(a) we have  $|V_i| = n_\psi$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$  and  $|V_k| = m := 2f_\psi(n_\psi)2^{n_\psi^{k-1}}$ . Let  $r = r(k, \Delta_{\psi, n_\psi}, m) \in \mathbb{N}$  be as given by Lemma 3.6. Finally, let  $\varepsilon'_\varphi > 0$  and  $n'_\varphi \in \mathbb{N}$  be as given by Fact 3.17 with  $d := r$ .

We claim that (2)<sub>k</sub> holds for  $\varphi$  with respect to  $n'_\varphi, \varepsilon'_\varphi$  (note that they were chosen only depending on  $\varphi$ ). If not, then there exists some  $n \geq n'_\varphi$  and an array  $\bar{\delta} = (\delta_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k)$

such that the family of sets  $\mathcal{F}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}} = \left\{ S_{\bar{\zeta}_1, \dots, \bar{\zeta}_k}^{\bar{\delta}} \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([n]^k)$  has cardinality  $\geq 2^{n^{k-\varepsilon'_\varphi}}$ . Note that  $n > n_\psi$  and  $n > m$ . Then, by Fact 3.17 and the choice of  $n'_\varphi, \varepsilon'_\varphi$ , there exists some  $I = I_1 \times \dots \times I_k \subseteq [n]^k$  with  $|I_1| = \dots = |I_k| = r$  shattered by  $\mathcal{F}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}}$ . By Lemma 3.6 and the choice of  $r$ , there exist some  $I'_t \subseteq I_t$  for  $1 \leq t \leq k$ , with  $|I'_t| = n_\psi$  for  $1 \leq t \leq k-1$  and  $|I'_k| = m$ , and such that the array  $\{\delta_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in I'\}$  is  $\Delta_{\psi, n_\psi}$ -indiscernible, where  $I' = I'_1 \times \dots \times I'_k$ . Note that  $I'$  is still shattered by  $\mathcal{F}^{\varphi, \bar{\delta}}$ . In particular, there exist some arrays  $\bar{\zeta}^t = (\zeta_{\bar{i}}^t : \bar{i} \in [n]^{k-1})$  for  $1 \leq t \leq k$  such that, identifying  $V_t$  with  $I'_t$  in an order-preserving way for  $1 \leq t \leq k$ , for every  $\bar{i} \in I'_1 \times \dots \times I'_k$  we have

$$(3.2) \quad \models \varphi \left( \zeta_{\bar{i}_{[k] \setminus \{1\}}}^1, \dots, \zeta_{\bar{i}_{[k] \setminus \{k\}}}^k, \delta_{\bar{i}} \right) \iff \bar{i} \in R_{f_\psi(n_\psi), n_\psi}^{k-1}.$$

Identifying  $I'_t$  with  $[n_\psi]$  in an order-preserving way for  $1 \leq t \leq k-1$  and  $I'_k$  with  $[m]$ , we define:

- $\alpha_{\bar{i}} := \zeta_{\bar{i}}^k$  for  $\bar{i} \in [n_\psi]^{k-1}$ ;
- for each  $1 \leq t \leq k-1$ ,  $\beta_{\bar{i}}^t := \zeta_{\bar{i}}^t$  for  $\bar{i} \in [n_\psi]^{k-2} \times [m]$ ;
- $\gamma_{\bar{i}} := \delta_{\bar{i}}$  for all  $\bar{i} \in [n_\psi]^{k-1} \times [m]$ .

Then, by (3.2), for any tuple  $\bar{i} \in [n_\psi]^{k-1}$  and  $j \in [m]$  we have

$$(3.3) \quad \models \psi \left( \alpha_{\bar{i}}, \beta_{\bar{i}_{[k-1] \setminus \{1\}} + (j)}^1, \dots, \beta_{\bar{i}_{[k-1] \setminus \{k-1\}} + (j)}^{k-1}, \gamma_{\bar{i} + (j)} \right) \iff \bar{i} + (j) \in R_{f_\psi(n_\psi), n_\psi}^{k-1}.$$

But then by Claim 3.22(b), for any interval  $J \subseteq [m]$  with  $|J| \geq \frac{m}{f_{\varphi'}(n_{\varphi'})} - 1$ , the family of sets  $S_J^{\varphi'} = \left\{ \bar{i} \in [n_{\varphi'}]^{k-1} : \bar{i} + (j) \in R_{f_{\varphi'}(n_{\varphi'}), n_{\varphi'}}^{k-1} \right\}$  with  $j$  varying over  $J$  shatters  $[n_{\varphi'}]^{k-1}$ , so in particular has cardinality  $2^{n_{\varphi'}^{k-1}}$ . This is a contradiction to the choice of  $\varepsilon_{\varphi'}, n_{\varphi'}, \Delta_{\varphi', n_{\varphi'}}, f_{\varphi'}$ , i. e.  $(1)_k$ .

$(2)_k$  **implies**  $(1)_{k+1}$ . Let  $\varphi(y_0, \dots, y_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{L}$  be arbitrary. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\eta \in 2^{n^k}$ , we consider the partitioned  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula

$$\xi_{\varphi, n, \eta} \left( (x_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k); (y_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k) \right) := \\ \exists (z_{\bar{i}}^1 : \bar{i} \in [n]^{k-1}) \dots \exists (z_{\bar{i}}^k : \bar{i} \in [n]^{k-1}) \bigwedge_{\bar{i} \in [n]^k} \varphi \left( x_{\bar{i}}, z_{\bar{i}_{[k] \setminus \{1\}}}^1, \dots, z_{\bar{i}_{[k] \setminus \{k\}}}^k, y_{\bar{i}} \right)^{\eta(\bar{i})}.$$

By assumption each  $\xi_{\varphi, n, \eta}$  is NIP, hence let  $d'_{\varphi, n, \eta} \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite set of formulas  $\Delta_{\varphi, n, \eta}$  be as given for it by Lemma 3.5 with  $k = 1$  and  $r = 1$ .

Let  $\psi(y_1, \dots, y_k, y'_{k+1}) := \varphi(y_0, \dots, y_{k+1})$ , where  $y'_{k+1} := y_0 y_{k+1}$ , by assumption it satisfies  $(2)_k$  with respect to some  $n'_\psi$  and  $\varepsilon'_\psi > 0$ .

We will show that  $(1)_{k+1}$  holds for  $\varphi$  with respect to:

- the function  $f_\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  defined by  $f_\varphi(n) := \sum_{\eta \in 2^{n^k}} d'_{\varphi, n, \eta}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- $\Delta_{\varphi, n} := \bigcup_{\eta \in 2^{n^k}} \Delta_{\varphi, n, \eta}$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- $\varepsilon_\varphi := \varepsilon'_\psi$ ,
- $n_\varphi := n'_\psi$ .

Assume that  $n_\varphi \leq n \leq m$  are arbitrary. Let  $\bar{\gamma} = (\gamma_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k \times [m])$  be a  $\Delta_{\varphi, n}$ -indiscernible array. Let  $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k)$  and  $\bar{\beta}^t = (\beta_{\bar{i}}^t : \bar{i} \in [n]^{k-1} \times [m])$  for  $1 \leq t \leq k$  be arbitrary arrays. For each  $j \in [m]$  we let

- $\bar{\gamma}^j := \left( \gamma_{\bar{i}+(j)} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k \right);$
- $\bar{\delta}^j := \left( \alpha_{\bar{i}}, \gamma_{\bar{i}+(j)} : \bar{i} \in [n]^k \right).$

Then we have

$$(3.4) \quad S_j^\varphi \in \mathcal{F}^{\psi, \bar{\delta}^j} \text{ for all } j \in [m],$$

where  $S_j^\varphi$  is as in the definition of  $(1)_{k+1}$ , and  $\mathcal{F}^{\psi, \bar{\delta}^j}$  as in the definition of  $(2)_k$ .

By the choice of  $f_\varphi, \Delta_{\varphi, n}$  and Lemma 3.5, there exists some set  $J_0 \subseteq [m]$  with  $|J_0| \leq f_\varphi(n)$  such that for every  $\eta \in 2^{n^k}$  and  $j, j' \in [m]$  we have:

$$\text{qftp}_{<}(j/J_0) = \text{qftp}_{<}(j'/J_0) \implies \models \xi_{\varphi, n, \eta}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\gamma}^j) \leftrightarrow \xi_{\varphi, n, \eta}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\gamma}^{j'}).$$

But then taking  $J$  to be the longest interval in  $[m]$  between two points in  $J_0$  without any points of  $J_0$  between them, we have that  $|J| \geq \frac{m}{f_\varphi(n)} - 1$ , and

$$(3.5) \quad \models \xi_{\varphi, n, \eta}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\gamma}^j) \leftrightarrow \xi_{\varphi, n, \eta}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\gamma}^{j'}) \text{ for all } \eta \in 2^{n^k} \text{ and } j, j' \in J.$$

By the choice of the formulas  $\xi_{\varphi, n, \eta}$ , (3.5) implies

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{F}^{\psi, \bar{\delta}^j} = \mathcal{F}^{\psi, \bar{\delta}^{j'}} \text{ for all } j, j' \in J.$$

And for an arbitrary fixed  $j_0 \in J$ , we have  $|\mathcal{F}^{\psi, \bar{\delta}^{j_0}}| < 2^{n^{k-\varepsilon'_\psi}} = 2^{n^{k-\varepsilon_\varphi}}$  by  $(2)_k$  and the choice of  $\varepsilon_\varphi$  and  $n_\varphi$ . Hence, combining (3.4) and (3.6), we conclude that

$$|\mathcal{F}_J^\varphi| = \left| \left\{ S_j^\varphi : j \in J \right\} \right| \leq \left| \mathcal{F}^{\psi, \bar{\delta}^{j_0}} \right| < 2^{n^{k-\varepsilon_\varphi}},$$

as wanted.  $\square$

**3.5. Composition Lemma.** We are ready to prove the main result of this section (generalizing the binary case  $k = 2$  established in [13]): composing a relation definable in an NIP structure with *arbitrary* functions of arity at most  $k$  produces a  $k$ -dependent relation. As before, all the variables below are allowed to be tuples of arbitrary finite length.

**Theorem 3.24** (Composition Lemma). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure such that its reduct to a language  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$  is NIP. Let  $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_d)$  be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula, and  $(y_0, \dots, y_k)$  be arbitrary  $k+1$  tuples of variables. For each  $1 \leq t \leq d$ , let  $0 \leq i_1^t, \dots, i_k^t \leq k$  be arbitrary, and let  $f_t : M_{y_{i_1^t}} \times \dots \times M_{y_{i_k^t}} \rightarrow M_{x_t}$  be an arbitrary  $\mathcal{L}'$ -definable  $k$ -ary function. Then the formula*

$$\psi(y_0; y_1, \dots, y_k) := \varphi \left( f_1(y_{i_1^1}, \dots, y_{i_k^1}), \dots, f_d(y_{i_1^d}, \dots, y_{i_k^d}) \right)$$

*is  $k$ -dependent.*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_d)$  and  $(f_t)_{1 \leq t \leq d}$  be given. For each  $0 \leq r \leq k$ , consider the set

$$S_r := \{ 1 \leq t \leq d : \{i_1^t, \dots, i_k^t\} \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{r\} \}.$$

We let  $x'_r := (x_t : t \in S_r)$  and let  $f'_r : \prod_{0 \leq s \leq k, s \neq r} M_{y_s} \rightarrow M_{x'_r}$  be the  $k$ -ary  $\mathcal{L}'$ -definable function given by

$$f'_r((y_s : s \in \{0, \dots, k\} \setminus \{r\})) := (f_t(y_{i_1^t}, \dots, y_{i_k^t}) : t \in S_r).$$

Consider the  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\varphi'(x'_0, \dots, x'_k) := \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ . Then

$$(3.7) \quad \models \psi(y_0; y_1, \dots, y_k) \leftrightarrow \varphi' \left( f'_k((y_s)_{s \in \{0, \dots, k\} \setminus \{k\}}), \dots, f'_0((y_s)_{s \in \{0, \dots, k\} \setminus \{0\}}) \right).$$

In order to show that  $\psi(y_0; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is  $k$ -dependent we check that it satisfies the criterion in Proposition 3.21(3). Consider the  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula

$$\varphi''(x'_k, x'_1, \dots, x'_{k-1}, x'_0) := \varphi'(x'_0, \dots, x'_k).$$

Let  $f_{\varphi''} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n_{\varphi''} \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(\Delta_{\varphi'', n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with each  $\Delta_{\varphi'', n}$  a finite set of  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulas, and  $\varepsilon_{\varphi''} > 0$  be as given for  $\varphi''$  by  $(1)_k$  in Lemma 3.23. We claim that  $\psi(y_0; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  satisfies  $(\dagger)_{f_{\varphi'', \varepsilon_{\varphi''}}}$  with respect to  $n^* := n_{\varphi''}$ .

Indeed, assume that  $n^* \leq n \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  are mutually  $\mathcal{L}'$ -indiscernible sequences with  $I_t \subseteq M_{y_t}$  for  $1 \leq t \leq k$ ,  $I_t = (a_i^t : i \in [n])$  for  $1 \leq t \leq k-1$ ,  $I_k = (a_i^k : i \in [m])$ , and  $b \in \mathbb{M}_{y_0}$  is an arbitrary tuple. We define:

- $\alpha_{\bar{i}} := f'_k(b, a_{i_1}^1, \dots, a_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1})$  for every  $\bar{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}) \in [n]^{k-1}$ ;
- $\gamma_{\bar{i}} := f'_0(a_{i_1}^1, \dots, a_{i_k}^k)$  for every  $\bar{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_k) \in [n]^{k-1} \times [m]$ ;
- $\beta_{\bar{i}}^t := f'_t(b, a_{i_1}^1, \dots, a_{i_{t-1}}^{t-1}, a_{i_{t+1}}^{t+1}, \dots, a_{i_k}^k)$  for every  $1 \leq t \leq k-1$  and every tuple  $\bar{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{t-1}, i_{t+1}, \dots, i_k) \in [n]^{k-2} \times [m]$ .

Note that then the array  $\bar{\gamma} = (\gamma_{\bar{i}} : \bar{i} \in [n]^{k-1} \times [m])$  is  $\mathcal{L}'$ -indiscernible by mutual  $\mathcal{L}'$ -indiscernibility of the  $I_t$ 's, so in particular  $\bar{\gamma}$  is  $\Delta_{\varphi'', n}$ -indiscernible. And, by (3.7) and definition of  $\varphi''$ , for every  $\bar{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}) \in [n]^{k-1}$  and  $j \in [m]$  we have

$$\models \psi(b; a_{i_1}^1, \dots, a_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1}, a_j^k) \iff \models \varphi''(\alpha_{\bar{i}}, \beta_{\bar{i}_{[k-1] \setminus \{1\}} + (j)}^1, \dots, \beta_{\bar{i}_{[k-1] \setminus \{k-1\}} + (j)}^{k-1}, \gamma_{\bar{i} + (j)}).$$

In particular, for every  $j \in [m]$ , the type  $\text{tp}_{\psi}(a_j^k/b, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1})$  is determined by the set  $S_j^{\varphi''}$  as in the definition of Lemma 3.23,  $(1)_k$ . Hence there exists some interval  $J \subseteq [m]$  with  $|J| \geq \frac{m}{f_{\varphi''}(n)}$  such that the family of sets  $\mathcal{F}_J^{\varphi''} := \{S_j^{\varphi''} : j \in J\}$  has cardinality at most  $2^{n^{k-1-\varepsilon_{\varphi''}}}$ . Thus  $|S_{\psi, J}(b, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1})| < 2^{n^{k-1-\varepsilon_{\varphi''}}}$ , as wanted.  $\square$

**3.6. Discussion.** In our proof of Lemma 3.23 we did not try to optimize any of the bounds, and we expect that they are much stronger than our argument provides.

We show how to obtain a polynomial bound for both  $f_{\varphi}$  and  $|\mathcal{F}_J^{\varphi}|$  in  $(1)_2$  of Lemma 3.23 with a different argument (but do not pursue the general case here).

**Lemma 3.25.** *Let  $n \leq m$ ,  $(\alpha_i : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ ,  $(\beta_j : 1 \leq j \leq m)$  be arbitrary sequences and  $(\gamma_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m)$  a (sufficiently) indiscernible array. Let  $\varphi(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{L}$ , and assume that every  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula is NIP. For  $j \leq m$ , let  $S_j := \{1 \leq i \leq n : \models \varphi(\alpha_i, \beta_j, \gamma_{i,j})\}$ . Then there exists some  $d = d(\varphi) \in \mathbb{N}$  and an interval  $J \subseteq [m]$  of length  $\geq \frac{m}{n^d}$  such that, assuming  $n$  is large enough,  $|\{S_j : j \in J\}| \leq n^d$ .*

*Proof.* As the partitioned formula  $\varphi'(y; xz) := \varphi(x, y, z)$  is NIP, by Fact 3.4 there exists some formula  $\theta(x, z; \bar{x}, \bar{z}) \in \mathcal{L}$  with  $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_1})$ ,  $\bar{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{d_1})$  such that: for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$  there exist some  $1 \leq i_{j,1}, \dots, i_{j,d_1} \leq n$  and  $1 \leq i'_{j,1}, \dots, i'_{j,d_1} \leq n$  such that: for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$i \in S_j \iff \models \varphi(\alpha_i, \beta_j, \gamma_{i,j}) \iff \models \theta(\alpha_i, \gamma_{i,j}; \alpha_{i_{j,1}}, \dots, \alpha_{i_{j,d_1}}, \gamma_{i'_{j,1}, j}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{j,d_1}, j}).$$

By assumption,  $\theta$  is NIP under any partition of its variables into two groups. Let  $d_2 = d_2(\theta)$  be as given by Lemma 3.5. Let  $i \in [n]$  and  $\bar{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{d_1})$ ,  $\bar{i}' = (i'_1, \dots, i'_{d_1}) \in [n]^{d_1}$  be arbitrary. Note that the sequence of tuples

$$(\gamma_{i,j}, \gamma_{i'_1, j}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{d_1}, j} : 1 \leq j \leq m)$$

is indiscernible by indiscernibility of the array  $(\gamma_{i,j})$ . Hence there exist some  $1 \leq j_1^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'} \leq \dots \leq j_{d_2}^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'} \leq m$  such that, letting  $\bar{j}^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'} := (j_1^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'}, \dots, j_{d_2}^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'})$ , for any  $1 \leq j, j' \leq m$ ,

$$\text{qftp}_{<}(j/\bar{j}^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'}) = \text{qftp}_{<}(j'/\bar{j}^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'}) \implies$$

$$\models \theta \left( \alpha_i, \gamma_{i,j}; \alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_{d_1}}, \gamma_{i'_1,j}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{d_1},j} \right) \leftrightarrow \theta \left( \alpha_i, \gamma_{i,j'}; \alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_{d_1}}, \gamma_{i'_1,j'}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{d_1},j'} \right).$$

Note that there are  $n^{2d_1+1}$  possible choices for the tuple  $(i, \bar{i}, \bar{i}')$ . We let  $\bar{j}$  be a tuple of strictly increasing elements in  $[m]$  consisting of all elements appearing in any of the tuples  $(\bar{j}^{i,\bar{i},\bar{i}'} : i \in [n], \bar{i}, \bar{i}' \in [n]^{d_1})$ , then  $\bar{j}$  consists of at most  $d_2 n^{2d_1+1}$  elements and satisfies: for any  $i \in [m]$ ,  $\bar{i}, \bar{i}' \in [n]^{d_1}$  and any  $1 \leq j, j' \leq m$ ,

$$\text{qftp}_{<}(j/\bar{j}) = \text{qftp}_{<}(j'/\bar{j}) \implies$$

$$\models \theta \left( \alpha_i, \gamma_{i,j}; \alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_{d_1}}, \gamma_{i'_1,j}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{d_1},j} \right) \leftrightarrow \theta \left( \alpha_i, \gamma_{i,j'}; \alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_{d_1}}, \gamma_{i'_1,j'}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{d_1},j'} \right).$$

Hence there is an interval  $J \subseteq [m]$  of length  $\geq \frac{m}{d_2 n^{2d_1+1} + 1}$  such that for any  $i \in [m]$ ,  $\bar{i}, \bar{i}' \in [n]^{d_1}$  and any  $j, j' \in J$  we have

$$\models \theta \left( \alpha_i, \gamma_{i,j}; \alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_{d_1}}, \gamma_{i'_1,j}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{d_1},j} \right) \leftrightarrow \theta \left( \alpha_i, \gamma_{i,j'}; \alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_{d_1}}, \gamma_{i'_1,j'}, \dots, \gamma_{i'_{d_1},j'} \right).$$

By the above, this implies that for any  $j, j' \in J$ ,

$$(i_{j,1}, \dots, i_{j,d_1}) = (i_{j',1}, \dots, i_{j',d_1}) \wedge (i'_{j,1}, \dots, i'_{j,d_1}) = (i'_{j',1}, \dots, i'_{j',d_1}) \\ \implies S_j = S_{j'}.$$

Note that there are at most  $n^{2d_1}$  choices for the tuple  $(i_{j,1}, \dots, i_{j,d_1}, i'_{j,1}, \dots, i'_{j,d_1})$ . Hence taking  $d := 2d_1 + 2$ , the Lemma is satisfied assuming  $n$  is large enough.  $\square$

**Problem 3.26.** (1) Obtain better bounds in  $(1)_k$  for a general  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(2) In the Composition Lemma, is it sufficient to assume that the formula  $\varphi$  is NIP? (As opposed to our assumption that the complete theory of the  $\mathcal{L}$ -reduct of  $\mathcal{M}$  is NIP.)

We conjecture a generalization of Theorem 3.24 (which corresponds to the case  $n = 1$ ; the bound  $kn$  is clearly optimal):

**Conjecture 3.27.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure such that its reduct to a language  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$  is  $n$ -dependent. Let  $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_d)$  be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula, and  $(y_0, \dots, y_{kn})$  be arbitrary  $kn + 1$  tuples of variables. For each  $1 \leq t \leq d$ , let  $0 \leq i_1^t, \dots, i_k^t \leq kn$  be arbitrary, and let  $f_t : M_{y_{i_1^t}} \times \dots \times M_{y_{i_k^t}} \rightarrow M_{x_t}$  be an arbitrary  $\mathcal{L}'$ -definable  $k$ -ary function. Then the formula

$$\psi(y_0; y_1, \dots, y_{kn}) := \varphi \left( f_1 \left( y_{i_1^1}, \dots, y_{i_k^1} \right), \dots, f_d \left( y_{i_1^d}, \dots, y_{i_k^d} \right) \right)$$

is  $kn$ -dependent.

**Remark 3.28.** An analog of the Composition Lemma for  $k = 2$  was demonstrated when the  $\mathcal{L}$ -reduct of  $\mathcal{M}$  is stable for the property NFOP<sub>2</sub> in [1]. A preliminary version of this paper also contained an analogous result for the stronger property NOP<sub>2</sub> (in the sense of Takeuchi), this will be included in future work.

4. NON-DEGENERATE  $n$ -LINEAR FORMS ARE  $n$ -DEPENDENT AND  $\text{NSOP}_1$ 

**4.1.  $N$ -dependence.** In this section we demonstrate  $n$ -dependence of certain theories of non-degenerate  $n$ -linear forms over NIP fields, generalizing the  $n = 2$  case established in [13, Theorem 6.3]. The proof is similar to the binary case, with the two main new ingredients being the relative quantifier elimination result for non-degenerate  $n$ -linear forms (Theorem 2.19, generalizing Granger [32] in the case  $n = 2$ ) and the  $n$ -ary Composition Lemma (Theorem 3.24, generalizing [13, Theorem 5.12] in the case  $n = 2$ ). Our proof in [13, Theorem 6.3] utilized additional analysis of generalized indiscernibles in bilinear spaces and a certain simplification of terms procedure in order to reduce the question to an application of the Composition Lemma (see [13, Section 6.3]), working in a language without the functions  $f_i^p$  (which turned out to be insufficient for Granger's quantifier elimination, see the discussion in the introduction). Later [1] proposed a streamlined argument simplifying these last two points using the existing results of pairs of fields/vector spaces. While a direct generalization of our proof can be carried out in the language expanded by the functions  $f_i^p$ , we use here the same simplification.

The following is the main result of the section (see Section 2.2 for notation).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $n \in \omega$  and let  $T$  be a theory of infinite dimensional  $n$ -linear  $K$ -spaces (in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ ).*

- (1) *Assume that  $T$  eliminates quantifiers in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ . If  $K$  is NIP, then  $T$  is  $n$ -dependent (and strictly  $n$ -dependent if the form is generic). In particular, if  $K$  is NIP, the theory of non-degenerate alternating forms  $\text{Alt}_n^K$  is  $n$ -dependent.*
- (2) *If  $K$  has  $\text{IP}_k$  and the form is generic, then  $T$  has  $\text{IP}_{nk}$ .*

**Remark 4.2.** If we instead consider  $T$  to be a theory of  $m$ -dimensional (for some  $m \in \omega$ )  $n$ -linear  $K$ -spaces  $(V, K, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n)$ , then  $K$  is  $n$ -dependent if and only if  $T$  is  $n$ -dependent, for any  $n \geq 1$ , via an interpretation of a model of  $T$  in  $K$  using  $K^m \cong V$  as follows. Interpreting the vector space structure is obvious. Now, let  $(e_1, \dots, e_m)$  be the standard basis of  $K^m$ . The  $n$ -linear form is completely determined by fixing  $k_{i_1, \dots, i_n} := \langle e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_n} \rangle_n$  for all  $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_n \leq m$ . Let  $\pi_i : K^m \rightarrow K$  be the projection map onto the  $i$ -th coordinate. Then for any  $v_1, \dots, v_n \in K^m$ , we have

$$\langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle_n = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n=1}^m \pi_{i_1}(v_1) \dots \pi_{i_n}(v_n) k_{i_1, \dots, i_n},$$

which is definable using  $\{k_{i_1, \dots, i_n} : 1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_n \leq m\}$  as parameters.

We will use a result on tameness of algebraically closed fields with a distinguished subfield named by a predicate from [22].

**Fact 4.3.** *Let  $T$  be a theory of fields (possibly incomplete), in a language  $\mathcal{L}$  expanding the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ring}}$  of rings. Let  $\mathcal{L}^P := \mathcal{L} \cup \{P\}$  with  $P$  a new unary predicate, and let  $\text{ACF}_T$  be an expansion of  $\text{ACF}$  in the language  $\mathcal{L}^P$  by the axioms expressing that all relations in  $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{\text{ring}}$  are trivial unless all of the variables are in  $P$ , that  $P$  is a subfield and a model of  $T$ , and that the degree of the field extension of the universe over  $P$  is infinite.*

- (1) [22, Proposition 4.1] *If  $T$  is complete, then  $\text{ACF}_T$  is also complete.*
- (2) [22, Theorems 5.24/5.34/5.9/5.13] *If  $T$  is stable/NIP/simple/ $\text{NSOP}_1$ , then  $\text{ACF}_T$  is also stable/NIP/simple/ $\text{NSOP}_1$ .*

From this we immediately have:

**Corollary 4.4.** *If  $\text{Th}(K)$  is stable/NIP/simple/NSOP<sub>1</sub>, then the theory  $T_{\text{VS},\infty}^K$  of infinite dimensional vector spaces over fields elementarily equivalent to  $K$  (see Remark 2.20) is also stable/NIP/simple/NSOP<sub>1</sub>.*

*Proof.* Given a field  $K$ , we can take an infinite degree field extension  $F$  which is algebraically closed. Then  $(K, F) \models \text{ACF}_{\text{Th}(K)}$  (with  $\mathcal{L}$  in Fact 4.3 taken to be  $\mathcal{L}^K$  from Definition 2.10), and  $(K, F)$  clearly interprets a model of  $T_{\text{VS},\infty}^K$ . The claim follows by completeness of  $T_{\text{VS},\infty}^K$  (Remark 2.20) and preservation of stability/NIP/simplicity/NSOP<sub>1</sub> under reducts.  $\square$

The following lemma is an elaboration on the term reduction argument that we have used in our proof of the bilinear case in [13, Section 6.3].

**Fact 4.5.** [1, Lemma 5.9] *For any  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -term  $t(\bar{x})$ , with  $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_V \widehat{\ } \bar{x}_K$ , variables of sorts  $V$  and  $K$  respectively,  $\bar{x}_V = (x_1^V, \dots, x_n^V)$  with  $x_i^V$  singleton variables, there is some  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{VS}}^K = \left( \mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K \setminus \{ \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n \} \right)$ -term  $t'(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$  with  $\bar{u}$  of sort  $K$  so that*

$$T \models \forall \bar{x} \left( t(\bar{x}) = t'(\bar{x}, \langle \bar{x}_V \rangle_n) \right),$$

where  $\langle \bar{x}_V \rangle_n := \left( \langle x_{i_1}^V, \dots, x_{i_n}^V \rangle_n : (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in [m]^n \right)$ .

We can now prove the main result of the section.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1. (1)* By assumption  $T$  has quantifier elimination in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ , and  $n$ -dependent formulas are closed under Boolean combinations (Fact 3.7). Hence it suffices to show that every atomic  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -formula  $\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{n+1})$  with  $y_1, \dots, y_{n+1}$  arbitrary finite tuples of variables, is  $n$ -dependent in  $T$ . From the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ ,  $\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{n+1})$  has the form  $R(t_1(\bar{x}), \dots, t_d(\bar{x}))$  for some  $d \in \omega$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -relation symbol  $R$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -terms  $t_1, \dots, t_d$  and  $\bar{x} := y_1 \widehat{\ } \dots \widehat{\ } y_{n+1}$ . Permuting the variables if necessary, we have  $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_V \widehat{\ } \bar{x}_K$ , variables of sorts  $V$  and  $K$  respectively, and  $\bar{x}_V = (x_1^V, \dots, x_m^V)$ ,  $\bar{x}_K = (x_1^K, \dots, x_\ell^K)$  with  $m, \ell \in \omega$  and  $x_i^V, x_i^K$  singleton variables. By Fact 4.5 there are  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{VS}}^K$ -terms  $t'_j(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$  for  $j \in [d]$  so that

$$T \models \forall \bar{x} \left( t_j(\bar{x}) = t'_j(\bar{x}, \langle \bar{x}_V \rangle_n) \right) \text{ for all } j \in [d], \text{ hence}$$

$$T \models \forall \bar{x} \left( R(t_1(\bar{x}), \dots, t_d(\bar{x})) \leftrightarrow R(t'_1(\bar{x}, \langle \bar{x}_V \rangle_n), \dots, t'_d(\bar{x}, \langle \bar{x}_V \rangle_n)) \right).$$

Let  $\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$  be the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{VS}}^K$ -formula  $R(t'_1(\bar{x}, \bar{u}), \dots, t'_d(\bar{x}, \bar{u}))$ , then  $\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{n+1})$  is equivalent to  $\theta(\bar{x}, \langle \bar{x}_V \rangle_n)$  in  $T$ .

Each singleton  $x_i^V, i \in [m]$  and  $x_i^K, i \in [\ell]$  appears in some tuple  $y_{t_i}, t_i \in [n+1]$ . Hence for each  $(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in [m]^n$ , adding dummy variables if necessary, each of the terms  $\langle x_{i_1}^V, \dots, x_{i_n}^V \rangle_n, x_i^V, x_i^K$  can be viewed as a term  $g(y_{t_1}, \dots, y_{t_n})$  for some  $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in [n+1]^n$ .

As  $\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{n+1})$  is  $T$ -equivalent to  $\theta(\bar{x}, \langle \bar{x}_V \rangle_n)$ , it is then  $T$ -equivalent to

$$\theta' \left( g_1((y_i : i \in s_1)), \dots, g_D((y_i : i \in s_D)) \right),$$

where  $\theta' \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{VS}}^K$  is just  $\theta$  with an appropriate repartition of its variables,  $D \in \omega$ ,  $s_k \in [n+1]^n$  and  $g_k$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -term, for each  $k \in [D]$ . As  $T_{\text{VS},\infty}^K$  is the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{VS}}^K$ -reduct of  $T$ , and  $T_{\text{VS},\infty}^K$  is NIP by assumption and Corollary 4.4, it follows by Theorem 3.24 that  $\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{n+1})$  is  $n$ -dependent.

(2) Fix  $k \geq 2$  and assume that  $K$  has  $\text{IP}_k$ , then by Fact 3.7(2),(3) it must be witnessed by some  $\mathcal{L}_K$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}; y_1, \dots, y_k)$  with each  $y_i$  a single variable. So for any  $p \in \omega$  and  $1 \leq \ell \leq k$  we can find sequences

$$(c_{(i_1^\ell, \dots, i_n^\ell)}^\ell : (i_1^\ell, \dots, i_n^\ell) \in (p)^n)$$

with  $p$  viewed as an ordinal and  $(p)^n$  ordered lexicographically, and all  $c_{(i_1^\ell, \dots, i_n^\ell)}^\ell$  pairwise distinct elements in  $K$ , such that: for every  $I \subseteq ((p)^n)^k$  there is some  $\bar{e}_I$  satisfying

$$\models \varphi(\bar{e}_I; c_{(i_1^1, \dots, i_n^1)}^1, \dots, c_{(i_1^k, \dots, i_n^k)}^k) \iff ((i_1^1, \dots, i_n^1), \dots, (i_1^k, \dots, i_n^k)) \in I.$$

As the space  $V$  is infinite dimensional, we can choose

$$\bar{a} := (a_{t,i}^\ell : 1 \leq \ell \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n-1, i \in p)$$

a finite tuple consisting of linearly independent elements from  $V$ .

Since the  $n$ -linear form is generic, and  $\bar{a}$  is linearly independent, for each  $1 \leq \ell \leq k$  and  $j \in p$  there exists some  $b_j^\ell \in V$  satisfying

$$\langle a_{1,i_1}^\ell, \dots, a_{n-1,i_{n-1}}^\ell, b_j^\ell \rangle_n = c_{(i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}, j)}^\ell$$

for all  $(i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}) \in (p)^{n-1}$ . But then, identifying  $((p)^n)^k$  with  $(p)^{nk}$ , for any set  $I \subseteq (p)^{nk}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \models \varphi(\bar{e}_I, \langle a_{1,i_1^1}^1, \dots, a_{n-1,i_{n-1}^1}^1, b_{j_1}^1 \rangle_n, \dots, \langle a_{1,i_1^k}^k, \dots, a_{n-1,i_{n-1}^k}^k, b_{j_n}^k \rangle_n) \\ & \iff (i_1^1, \dots, i_{n-1}^1, j_1; i_1^2, \dots, i_{n-1}^2, j_2; \dots; i_1^k, \dots, i_{n-1}^k, j_k) \in I. \end{aligned}$$

As  $p$  was arbitrary, we conclude that the formula

$$\psi(\bar{x}; y_1, \dots, y_{nk}) := \varphi(\bar{x}; \langle y_1, \dots, y_n \rangle_n, \dots, \langle y_{n(k-1)+1}, \dots, y_{nk} \rangle_n)$$

has  $\text{IP}_{nk}$ . □

**4.2. NSOP<sub>1</sub>.** In this section we consider another model theoretic tameness property NSOP<sub>1</sub>, orthogonal to the  $n$ -dependence hierarchy, in the context of multilinear forms. We refer to [16, 38, 39, 40, 27, 14] for the recently developed basic theory of NSOP<sub>1</sub> and Kim-independence. Preservation of NSOP<sub>1</sub> in bilinear forms over NSOP<sub>1</sub> fields and related questions were considered in various contexts, starting with [16] where it was demonstrated (relying on the results of Granger [32]) that if  $K$  is an algebraically closed field, then the theory of non-degenerate symmetric or alternating bilinear forms over  $K$  is NSOP<sub>1</sub>. Following this, [38] proposed a description of Kim-independence over models, followed by [26] which proposed some corrections to this description and a generalization from models to arbitrary sets. A variant of the argument describing Kim-independence with these corrections incorporated was given in [44] (allowing real closed fields). It appears that all of these proofs contain gaps:

**Remark 4.6.** (1) Some issues with the proof of [38, Proposition 9.37] are already pointed out in [26], which proposed a correct description of Kim-independence.  
 (2) The issue with the proposed correction in the proof of [26, Proposition 8.12] is that, following the notation there,  $\text{Lin}_L(A' \cup B_i)$  need not be a substructure containing  $A' \cup B_i$  since it need not be closed under applying the bilinear form to pairs of vectors in  $A' \times B_i$ , so the claim that  $A'B_0 \equiv A'B_i$  is not justified.  
 (3) In the proof of [44, Theorem 4.9], the issue is that, following the notation there, it is possible that e.g.  $[a_{i'}, b_{0,k}] \in (B_1)_K \setminus (B_0)_K$ , so assigning both  $[a_{i'}, b_{0,k}]^N := [a_{i'}, b_{0,k}]^{\mathbb{M}}$  and  $[a_{i'}, b_{1,k}]^N := [a_{i'}, b_{0,k}]^{\mathbb{M}}$  as suggested there, we again cannot conclude  $A'B_1 \equiv_M A'B_0$ .



Here we provide a (hopefully) correct proof, generalizing to multilinear forms.

First we recall some basic notions and facts around  $\text{NSOP}_1$ .

**Definition 4.7.** Let  $M \models T$ .

- (1) A formula  $\varphi(x, a) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$  *Kim-divides over  $M$*  if there is a global  $M$ -invariant type  $q(y)$  extending  $\text{tp}(a/M)$  and a Morley sequence  $(a_i)_{i \in \omega}$  in  $q$  over  $M$  (i.e.  $a_i \models q|_{Ma_{<i}}$  for all  $i \in \omega$ ; in particular  $(a_i)_{i \in \omega}$  is indiscernible over  $M$ ) so that  $\{\varphi(x, a_i) : i \in \omega\}$  is inconsistent.
- (2) A formula  $\varphi(x, a) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$  *Kim-forks over  $M$*  if there exist finitely many  $\varphi_i(x, b_i) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$ ,  $i < k$  so that each  $\varphi_i(x, b_i)$  Kim-divides over  $M$  and  $\varphi(x, a) \vdash \bigvee_{i < k} \varphi_i(x, b_i)$ .
- (3) A (partial) type  $\pi(x)$  Kim-divides (Kim-forks) over  $M$  if it implies a formula that Kim-divides (respectively, Kim-forks) over  $M$ .
- (4) In this section, we will write  $a \downarrow_M b$  to denote that  $\text{tp}(a/Mb)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$ .

**Remark 4.8.** We note that in any theory, for any tuples  $A, B, C$ ,  $A \downarrow_C^u B$  (i.e.  $\text{tp}(A/BC)$  is finitely satisfiable in  $C$ ) implies  $A \downarrow_C^i B$  (i.e.  $\text{tp}(A/BC)$  extends to a global type invariant over  $C$ ), which implies  $A \downarrow_C^f B$  (i.e.  $\text{tp}(A/BC)$  does not fork over  $C$ ), which implies  $A \downarrow_C B$  (i.e.  $\text{tp}(A/BC)$  does not Kim-fork over  $C$ ).

**Fact 4.9.** (1) If  $T$  is  $\text{NSOP}_1$ , then a formula  $\varphi(x, a)$  Kim-divides over  $M$  if and only if it Kim-forks over  $M$ , and this is witnessed by a Morley sequence of any  $M$ -invariant global type extending  $\text{tp}(a/M)$  [38, Proposition 3.19].  
 (2) A theory  $T$  is  $\text{NSOP}_1$  if and only if Kim-dividing is symmetric over models, i.e. for any  $M \models T$  and tuples  $a, b$ ,  $\text{tp}(a/bM)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$  if and only if  $\text{tp}(b/aM)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$ . [38, Theorem 5.16].  
 (3) A theory  $T$  is simple if and only if Kim-independence  $\downarrow$  satisfies base monotonicity over models: whenever  $M \preceq N \models T$ , if  $a \downarrow_M Nb$ , then  $a \downarrow_N^K b$  [38, Proposition 8.8].

For the rest of the section, let  $T := \text{Alt} T_n^K$  be the theory of non-degenerate alternating forms over fields elementarily equivalent to  $K$ . For a set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  we write  $A_K$  for the elements of  $A$  of the field sort and  $A_V$  for the elements of  $A$  of the vector space sort. For  $A \subseteq \mathbb{M}_V$ , we write  $\langle A \rangle$  to denote  $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{M}_K}(A)$  (so  $\langle A \rangle$  can be large even when  $A$  is small). For  $A, B, C \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ , we write  $A \downarrow_C^V B$  to denote  $\langle A_V \rangle \cap \langle B_V \rangle \subseteq \langle C_V \rangle$ . And we write  $A \downarrow_C^K B$  to denote that  $A_K$  and  $B_K$  are Kim-independent over  $C_K$  in the reduct  $\mathbb{M}_K$  to a model of  $\text{Th}(K)$ . We will also use the notation from Definition 2.10.

**Fact 4.10.** If  $\text{tp}(A/MB)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$  in  $T$  and  $\text{Th}(K)$  is  $\text{NSOP}_1$ , then  $A \downarrow_M^K B$  and  $A \downarrow_M^V B$ .

*Proof.* By the proof of [44, Lemma 4.7] (but easier, as  $\text{Th}(K)$  is  $\text{NSOP}_1$ , every coheir sequence witnesses Kim-dividing in  $K$  by Fact 4.9(1)) and the proof of [44, Lemma 4.8(3)] (the assumption that  $K \models \text{RCF}$  stated there is not used).  $\square$

**Remark 4.11.** For any tuple  $a$  in  $\mathbb{M}_K$  and an  $(\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K)$ -substructure  $C$  of  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $\text{tp}(a/C)$  is determined by  $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}^K}(a/C_K)$ . In particular, in any model of  $T := \text{Alt} T_n^K$ , the field sort is stably embedded, and the induced structure is just the  $\mathcal{L}^K$ -structure of  $\text{Th}(K)$ .

*Proof.* Follows by quantifier elimination (Theorem 2.19), as an (iterated application of) Claim 2.17 (applied with  $g := \text{id}_C$ ) shows that any partial  $\mathcal{L}^K$ -isomorphism  $h$  fixing  $C_K$

and sending  $a$  to some  $a'$  extends to a partial  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -isomorphism extending both  $h$  and  $g$ , hence fixing  $C$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $M \prec \mathbb{M}$  be a small model and  $A, B \supseteq M$  small substructures. Then  $\text{tp}(A/B)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$  if and only if  $A \downarrow_M^K B$  and  $A \downarrow_M^V B$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\text{tp}(A/MB)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$ , then  $A \downarrow_M^K B$  and  $A \downarrow_M^V B$  by Fact 4.10.

For the other direction, assume  $A \downarrow_M^K B$  and  $A \downarrow_M^V B$ . Let  $q(\bar{y}) \in S_{\bar{y}}(\mathbb{M})$  be a global type extending  $\text{tp}(B/M)$  and invariant over  $M$  (in the sense of  $T$ ), and let  $(B_i)_{i \in \omega}$  be a Morley sequence in  $q$  over  $M$ . Let  $B^* \models q(\bar{y})$  in some bigger monster model  $\mathbb{M}' \succeq_M \mathbb{M}$  of  $T$ . Let  $q_K(\bar{y}_K) := \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}^K}(B_K^*/\mathbb{M}_K)$ . Then  $q_K$  is a global type extending  $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}^K}(B_K/M_K)$ , which is moreover  $M_K$ -invariant in the sense of  $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{L}^K}(K)$ . Indeed, given any formula  $\psi(\bar{y}_K, z) \in \mathcal{L}^K$  and tuples  $c, c' \in \mathbb{M}_K$  with  $c \equiv_{M_K}^{\mathcal{L}^K} c'$ , by Remark 4.11 we have  $c \equiv_M c'$ . Hence by  $M$ -invariance of  $q$  we have  $\psi(\bar{y}_K, c) \in q_K \iff \psi(\bar{y}_K, c) \in q \iff \psi(\bar{y}_K, c') \in q \iff \psi(\bar{y}_K, c') \in q_K$ . It follows that  $((B_i)_K)_{i \in \omega}$  is a Morley sequence over  $M_K$  of the global invariant type  $q_K$  in the  $\mathcal{L}^K$ -reduct to a model of  $\text{Th}(K)$ . Let  $p(x; B) := \text{tp}(A_K/B)$ , and let  $p'(x; B_K) := \text{tp}_{\mathcal{L}^K}(A_K/B_K)$ . As  $B$  is a substructure of  $\mathbb{M}$  by assumption, by Remark 4.11 we have  $p'(x; B_K) \vdash p(x; B)$  in  $T$ . For each  $i$ , let  $p(x; B_i)$  and  $p'(x; (B_i)_K)$  be the images of  $p(x; B)$  and  $p'(x; B_K)$ , respectively, under an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -isomorphism fixing  $M$  and sending  $B$  to  $B_i$ , we still have  $p'(x; (B_i)_K) \vdash p(x; B_i)$ . And as  $A \downarrow_M^K B$ ,  $p'(x; B_K)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M_K$  in  $\text{Th}(K)$ , hence there is some  $A'_K$  in  $\mathbb{M}_K$  such that  $A'_K \models \bigcup_{i \in \omega} p'(x; (B_i)_K) \vdash \bigcup_{i \in \omega} p(x; B_i)$ . That is,  $A'_K B_i \equiv_M A_K B$  for all  $i \in \omega$ . For each  $i \in \omega$ , fix an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -automorphism

$$\sigma_i : A_K \cup B \rightarrow A'_K \cup B_i, \sigma_i \upharpoonright_M = \text{id} \upharpoonright_M.$$

Let  $C$  be the  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -substructure of  $\mathbb{M}$  generated by  $A \cup B$ , in particular  $A_K \cup B_K \subseteq C_K$ . As  $\sigma_i \upharpoonright_{A_K \cup B_K} : A_K \cup B_K \rightarrow A'_K \cup (B_i)_K$  is elementary, we can extend it to an elementary map

$$(4.1) \quad \sigma_i^K : C_K \rightarrow K_i, \sigma_i^K \upharpoonright_{A_K \cup B_K} = \sigma_i \upharpoonright_{A_K \cup B_K}, \text{ in particular } \sigma_i^K \upharpoonright_{M_K} = \text{id} \upharpoonright_{M_K}$$

for some field  $K_i \subseteq \mathbb{M}_K$  with  $A'_K \cup (B_i)_K \subseteq K_i$ .

Choose some small  $\widetilde{M} \preceq \mathbb{M}$  with  $(K_i)_{i \in \omega} (B_i)_{i \in \omega} A'_K A_K \subseteq \widetilde{M}$ , and let  $\widetilde{K} := \widetilde{M}_K$ , in particular  $\widetilde{K} \models \text{Th}(K)$ .

Let  $\bar{m} = (m_i)_{i < \alpha}$  be a tuple from  $M_V$  which is a basis for  $\langle M_V \rangle$  viewed as a vector space over  $\mathbb{M}_K$ . Similarly, let  $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i < \beta}$  be a tuple from  $A_V \supseteq M_V$  such that  $\bar{m} \bar{a}$  is a basis of  $\langle A_V \rangle$  as a vector space over  $\mathbb{M}_K$ . Note that by Lemma 2.14 (as  $A$  is a substructure) also

$$(4.2) \quad \bar{m} \bar{a} \text{ is a basis for } A_V \text{ as a vector space over } A_K$$

Let  $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i < \gamma}$  be a tuple from  $B_V \supseteq M_V$  such that  $\bar{b} \bar{m}$  is a basis of  $\langle B_V \rangle$  as a vector space over  $\mathbb{M}_K$ . For each  $i, j < \omega$ , let  $b_{i,j} := \sigma_i(b_j)$ , and let  $\bar{b}_i := (b_{i,j} : j < \gamma)$ , as  $\sigma_i$  is  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -elementary and fixes  $M$ , it follows that  $\bar{m} \bar{b}_i$  is a basis for  $\langle (B_V)_i \rangle$  as a vector space over  $\mathbb{M}_K$ . As by assumption  $A \downarrow_M^V B$ , it follows that

$$(4.3) \quad \bar{m} \cup \bar{a} \cup \bar{b} \text{ is a basis for } \langle A_V \cup B_V \rangle \text{ as a vector space over } \mathbb{M}_K.$$

As  $(B_i)_{i \in \omega}$  is a Morley sequence in an  $M$ -invariant type, it is also a  $\downarrow_M^V$ -independent sequence (by Fact 4.10 and Remark 4.8). In particular, the set  $\{m_i\}_{i < \alpha} \cup \{b_{i,j} : i \in \omega, j < \gamma\}$  is linearly independent over  $\mathbb{M}_K$ .

Let  $\tilde{V} := \text{Span}_{\tilde{K}}(\overline{m}(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in \omega})$ , the vector space over  $\tilde{K}$  spanned by  $\overline{m}(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in \omega}$ . Let  $\tilde{N} := (\tilde{V}, \tilde{K})$ . Then  $\tilde{N}$  is a substructure of  $\mathbb{M}$  (by Lemma 2.15 and the choice of  $\tilde{K}$ ) and  $B_i \subseteq \tilde{N}$  for all  $i \in \omega$  (as by the choice of  $\tilde{K}$  it contains the values of  $f_i^p$  on  $((B_i)_V)_{i \in \omega}$ ). Note that  $\tilde{N}$  is small, and that the intended interpretation of  $\theta_n$  and  $f_i^p$  in  $\tilde{N}$  agrees with the interpretation of these symbols in  $\mathbb{M}$  restricted to  $\tilde{N}$ .

Let  $\bar{a}' = (a'_i)_{i < \beta}$  be a tuple of new vectors (not in  $\mathbb{M}_V$ ) of the same length as  $\bar{a}$ . Let  $W$  be the  $\tilde{K}$ -vector space extending  $\tilde{V}$  with ordered basis  $\overline{m} \cup \bar{a}' \cup (\bar{b}_i)_{i \in \omega}$  (which we order as written, by  $\alpha + \beta + \omega \times \gamma$ ). We define a new  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -structure  $N$  extending  $\tilde{N}$  with  $N_K = \tilde{N}_K = \tilde{K}$  and  $N_V = W$ . The field structure on  $\tilde{K}$  is determined by  $\tilde{N}$  and the vector space structure has been determined, so it remains to define the  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n^N$  on  $W$  extending the  $n$ -linear form on  $\tilde{V}$  determined by  $\tilde{N}$ .

Note that *any* function on strictly increasing  $n$ -tuples of vectors in an ordered basis extends uniquely to an alternating form on the whole vector space. We take  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n^N$  to agree with  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}}$  on all such  $n$ -tuples from  $\overline{m} \cup (\bar{b}_i)_{i \in \omega}$ .

For any  $q, r, s \in \{0, \dots, n\}$  with  $q + r + s = n$  and  $r \geq 1$  (so there is at least one element from  $\bar{a}'$  in the tuple) and  $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_q < \alpha$ ,  $\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_r < \beta$ ,  $\gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_s < \gamma$  and any  $i < \omega$  we define

$$(4.4) \quad \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a'_{\beta_1}, \dots, a'_{\beta_r}, b_{i, \gamma_1}, \dots, b_{i, \gamma_s} \rangle_n^N := \sigma_i^K \left( \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a_{\beta_1}, \dots, a_{\beta_r}, b_{\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} \right) \in K_i \subseteq \tilde{K}.$$

For all other strictly increasing  $n$ -tuples from  $\overline{m} \cup \bar{a}' \cup (\bar{b}_i)_{i \in \omega}$  (i.e. containing  $b_{i,*}$  and  $b_{j,*}$  with  $i \neq j \in \omega$ ) with at least one element in  $\bar{a}'$ , we define  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n^N$  to be an arbitrary element in  $\tilde{K}$ . This uniquely determines an alternating  $n$ -linear form  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n^N$  on the vector space  $W$  extending  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n^{\tilde{N}}$ . The natural interpretations of  $\theta_n, f_i^p$  on  $(W, \tilde{K})$  agree with those on  $\tilde{N}$  (by the choice of  $\tilde{K}$ ,  $\tilde{N}_K = N_K$ ). So we have:

$$(4.5) \quad \tilde{N} \leq N \text{ (an } \mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K\text{-substructure)}.$$

As  $\tilde{K} \models \text{Th}(K)$ , by Lemma 2.4 and completeness of  $T$  (Theorem 2.19) there exists  $N' = (N', \tilde{K})$  such that  $N' \models T$  (interpreting  $f_i^p$  and  $\theta_i$  naturally in  $N'$ ),  $\dim(N'_V) \leq \dim(N_V) + \aleph_0$  (so  $N'$  is still small) and  $N \leq N'$  (an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -substructure, using that the field is the same). By quantifier elimination in  $T$  there is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -embedding  $\iota : N' \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$  over  $\tilde{N}$  (see e.g. [48, Proposition 4.3.28]).

Let  $a''_i := \iota(a'_i)$  for  $i < \beta$ , and  $\bar{a}'' := (a''_i : i < \beta)$ . Let  $A'_V := \iota(\text{Span}_{A_K}(\overline{m} \bar{a}')) = \text{Span}_{A_K}(\overline{m} \bar{a}'')$  and  $A' := (A'_K, A'_V)$ .

**Claim 4.13.** *We have  $A'B_i \equiv_M AB$  for all  $i \in \omega$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $i \in \omega$ .

Note that  $(\text{Span}_{C_K}(\overline{m} \bar{a} \bar{b}), C_K)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, f}^K$ -substructure (by Lemma 2.15, as  $\overline{m} \bar{a} \bar{b}$  are  $\mathbb{M}_K$ -linearly independent and the choice of  $C_K$ ) containing  $AB$  (by the choice of  $C_K$ ).

Using (4.4) and that  $\iota$  is an embedding which is an identity on  $\tilde{N}$  we have

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a''_{\beta_1}, \dots, a''_{\beta_r}, b_{i, \gamma_1}, \dots, b_{i, \gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} &= \\ \iota \left( \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a'_{\beta_1}, \dots, a'_{\beta_r}, b_{i, \gamma_1}, \dots, b_{i, \gamma_s} \rangle_n^N \right) &= \\ \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a'_{\beta_1}, \dots, a'_{\beta_r}, b_{i, \gamma_1}, \dots, b_{i, \gamma_s} \rangle_n^N &\in K_i. \end{aligned}$$

We have that  $\overline{ma''b_i}$  is an  $\mathbb{M}_K$ -linearly independent set (as  $\overline{ma'b_i}$  were linearly independent over  $N'_K$  in  $N'$  and the embedding  $\iota$  preserves  $\theta_i$ 's) and the values of  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$  on  $\overline{ma''b_i}$  are contained in  $K_i$  by the above. Hence, using Lemma 2.15 again,  $(\text{Span}_{K_i}(\overline{ma''b_i}), K_i)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -substructure containing  $A'B_i$ .

By (4.1)  $\sigma_i^K : C_K \rightarrow K_i$  is an  $\mathcal{L}^K$ -isomorphism. We define  $\tilde{\sigma}_i^V$  constant on  $\bar{m}$ , sending  $a_\beta$  to  $a''_\beta$  and  $b_\gamma$  to  $b_{i,\gamma}$ , and extend by linearity to  $\sigma_i^V : \text{Span}_{C_K}(\overline{mab}) \rightarrow \text{Span}_{K_i}(\overline{ma''b_i})$ : for any  $q, r, s \in \omega$ ,  $\alpha_j < \alpha$ ,  $\beta_j < \beta$ ,  $\gamma_j < \gamma$  and  $k_j, k'_j, k''_j \in C_K$  we define

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i^V \left( \sum_{j \in [q]} k_j m_{\alpha_j} + \sum_{j \in [r]} k'_j a_{\beta_j} + \sum_{j \in [s]} k''_j b_{\alpha_j} \right) := \\ \sum_{j \in [q]} \sigma_i^K(k_j) m_{\alpha_j} + \sum_{j \in [r]} \sigma_i^K(k'_j) a''_{\beta_j} + \sum_{j \in [s]} \sigma_i^K(k''_j) b_{i,\alpha_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\tilde{\sigma}_i := \sigma_i^V \cup \sigma_i^K$ , we claim that

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i : (\text{Span}_{C_K}(\overline{mab}), C_K) \rightarrow (\text{Span}_{K_i}(\overline{ma''b_i}), K_i)$$

is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -structures. By definition of  $\tilde{\sigma}_i$  and Lemma 2.16, it remains to verify that  $\tilde{\sigma}_i$  preserves  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n$ . So we consider

$$\langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a_{\beta_1}, \dots, a_{\beta_r}, b_{\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{\gamma_s} \rangle_n$$

for  $q, r, s \in \{0, \dots, n\}$  with  $q + r + s = n$ .

If  $r = 0$  then  $\langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, b_{\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} \in B_K$ , so using that  $\sigma_i^K \upharpoonright_{A_K \cup B_K} = \sigma_i \upharpoonright_{A_K \cup B_K}$  and  $\sigma_i : B \rightarrow B$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,f}^K$ -isomorphism fixing  $M$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}_i \left( \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, b_{\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} \right) &= \\ \sigma_i \left( \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, b_{\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} \right) &= \\ \langle \sigma_i(m_{\alpha_1}), \dots, \sigma_i(m_{\alpha_q}), \sigma_i(b_{\gamma_1}), \dots, \sigma_i(b_{\gamma_s}) \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} &= \\ \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, b_{i,\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{i,\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

And if  $r \geq 1$ , using (4.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}_i \left( \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a_{\beta_1}, \dots, a_{\beta_r}, b_{\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} \right) &= \\ \sigma_i^K \left( \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a_{\beta_1}, \dots, a_{\beta_r}, b_{\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}} \right) &\stackrel{(4.4)}{=} \\ \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a'_{\beta_1}, \dots, a'_{\beta_r}, b_{i,\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{i,\gamma_s} \rangle_n^N &\stackrel{(4.6)}{=} \\ \langle m_{\alpha_1}, \dots, m_{\alpha_q}, a''_{\beta_1}, \dots, a''_{\beta_r}, b_{i,\gamma_1}, \dots, b_{i,\gamma_s} \rangle_n^{\mathbb{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

□ Claim 4.13

It follows from the claim that  $\text{tp}(A/BM)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$ , as wanted. □

**Theorem 4.14.** *If  $\text{Th}(K)$  is NSOP<sub>1</sub>, then  $\text{Alt} T_n^K$  is also NSOP<sub>1</sub>. And for any  $M \models T$  and  $A, B \supseteq M$  small substructures,  $\text{tp}(A/MB)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$  if and only if  $A \perp_M^K B$  and  $A \perp_M^V B$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.12 and Fact 4.9(2). □

**Corollary 4.15.** *If the field  $K$  is finite, then  $\text{Alt} T_n^K$  is simple.*

*Proof.* Take any model  $M$  and substructures  $A, B \supseteq M$ . As  $K$  is finite, for any substructure  $A$  of  $\mathbb{M}$  we have  $A_K = K$ . As obviously  $K \downarrow_K^u K$ , hence  $K \downarrow_K^K K$  (Remark 4.8) we have in particular  $A \downarrow_M^K B$ . Hence, by Proposition 4.12,  $\text{tp}(A/MB)$  does not Kim-divide over  $M$  if and only if  $\text{Span}_K(A_V) \cap \text{Span}_K(B_V) \subseteq \text{Span}_K(M_V)$ ; that is if and only if  $A_V$  and  $B_V$  are independent over  $M_V$  in the stable theory of infinite dimensional vector spaces over finite fields. This implies in particular that Kim dividing in  ${}_{\text{Alt}}T_n^K$  satisfies base monotonicity, hence  ${}_{\text{Alt}}T_n^K$  is simple by Fact 4.9(2).  $\square$

## 5. INVARIANT CONNECTED COMPONENTS $G^\infty$ IN $n$ -DEPENDENT GROUPS

**5.1. Invariant subgroups of bounded index.** Throughout the section, we let  $T$  be a complete theory in a language  $\mathcal{L}$ . Let  $G = G(\mathbb{M})$  be a type-definable group (to simplify the notation, over  $\emptyset$ ) and  $S \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  a parameter set.

**Definition 5.1.** For a small set of parameters  $S \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ , we let:

- (1)  $G_S^0$  be the intersection of all  $S$ -definable subgroups of  $G$  of finite index,
- (2)  $G_S^{00}$  be the intersection of all  $S$ -type-definable subgroups of  $G$  of bounded index,
- (3)  $G_S^\infty$  (sometimes also denoted  $G_S^{000}$ ) be the intersection of all  $S$ -invariant subgroups of  $G$  of bounded index.

We have  $G_S^\infty \subseteq G_S^{00} \subseteq G_S^0$  (all of these coincide in stable theories, but the inclusions can be proper already in dependent theories [21]); and as  $S$  is small,  $G_S^0, G_S^{00}$  are  $S$ -type-definable subgroups of  $G$  of bounded index, and  $G_S^\infty$  is an  $S$ -invariant subgroup of  $G$  of bounded index. A fundamental fact about dependent groups is the “absoluteness” of their connected components:

**Fact 5.2.** *Let  $T$  be dependent. Then for any small set of parameters  $S$  we have  $G_S^{00} = G_\emptyset^{00}$  (Shelah, [52]) and  $G_S^\infty = G_\emptyset^\infty$  (Shelah [54] in the abelian case, and Gismatullin [31] in general).*

This is no longer true in 2-dependent groups (see Section 5.5), however the following “relative absoluteness” holds:

**Fact 5.3.** (Shelah, [54]) *Let  $T$  be 2-dependent,  $G$  an  $S$ -type-definable group,  $\kappa := \beth_2(|S| + |T|)^+$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \supseteq S$  a  $\kappa$ -saturated model, and  $\bar{b}$  an arbitrary finite tuple in  $\mathbb{M}$ . Then*

$$G_{\mathcal{M}\bar{b}}^{00} = G_{\mathcal{M}}^{00} \cap G_{C\bar{b}}^{00}$$

for some  $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  with  $|C| < \kappa$ .

In [13, Section 4] we generalized Fact 5.3 to  $n$ -dependent groups for arbitrary  $n$ . This required us to consider tuples in arbitrary (or  $n$ -dependent) theories that are sufficiently independent, in the sense of a notion of independence considered in [13, Section 4].

**Definition 5.4.** ( $\kappa$ -coheirs) For any cardinal  $\kappa$ , any model  $\mathcal{M}$ , and any tuples  $a, B$  we write

$$a \downarrow_{\mathcal{M}}^{u, \kappa} B$$

if for any set  $C \subset B \cup \mathcal{M}$  with  $|C| < \kappa$ ,  $\text{tp}(a/C)$  is realized in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Hence  $a \downarrow_{\mathcal{M}}^{u, \aleph_0} B \iff a \downarrow_{\mathcal{M}}^u B$ , i.e. if and only if  $\text{tp}(a/B\mathcal{M})$  is finitely satisfiable in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Recall that for an infinite cardinal  $\kappa$  and  $n \in \omega$ , the cardinal  $\beth_n(\kappa)$  is defined inductively by  $\beth_0(\kappa) := \kappa$  and  $\beth_{n+1}(\kappa) := 2^{\beth_n(\kappa)}$ . Then the Erdős-Rado theorem says that  $(\beth_r(\kappa))^+ \rightarrow (\kappa^+)^{r+1}$  for all infinite  $\kappa$  and  $r \in \omega$ .

**Definition 5.5.** (*Generic position*) Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a small model,  $A$  a subset of  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  finite tuples in  $\mathbb{M}$ . We say that  $(\mathcal{M}, A, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1})$  are in a *generic position* if there exist regular cardinals  $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2 < \dots < \kappa_{k-1}$  and models  $\mathcal{M}_0 \preceq \mathcal{M}_1 \preceq \dots \preceq \mathcal{M}_{k-1} = \mathcal{M}$  such that  $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0$ ,  $\beth_2(|\mathcal{M}_i|)^+ \leq \kappa_{i+1}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, k-2$  and

$$\bar{b}_i \downarrow_{\mathcal{M}_i}^{u, \kappa_i} \bar{b}_{<i} \mathcal{M}$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ .

**Remark 5.6.** We think about generic position as expressing that the tuples  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  form a sufficiently independent set over  $\mathcal{M}$  (imitating being realizations of pairwise commuting global invariant types, without being able to choose such types in general; in particular, while  $\downarrow^{u, \kappa}$  is not symmetric, the assumption implies that it holds somewhat symmetrically between the  $\bar{b}_i$ 's). See Remark 4.12 and Problem 4.13 in [13] on the open question of necessity of generic position in our results about connected components of groups; Remark 4.14 of [13] shows that it can always be arranged.

**Fact 5.7.** [13, Corollary 4.10] *For any  $k \geq 1$ , let  $T$  be a  $k$ -dependent theory,  $A \subseteq \mathbb{M} \models T$  a small set of parameters and  $G = G(\mathbb{M})$  a type-definable group over  $A$ . Let  $\mathcal{M} \supseteq A$  be a small model and  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  finite tuples in  $\mathbb{M}$  so that  $(\mathcal{M}, A, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1})$  are in a generic position. Then there is some  $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  with  $|C| \leq \beth_2(|T| + |A|)$  such that*

$$G_{\mathcal{M} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^{00} = \left( \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, k-1} G_{\mathcal{M} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{i-1} \cup \bar{b}_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^{00} \right) \cap G_{C \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^{00}.$$

**Remark 5.8.** (1) For  $k = 1$  the assumptions of generic position in Corollary 5.7 are trivially satisfied by any sufficiently large model  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_0$ , and the conclusion gives  $G_{\mathcal{M}}^{00} = G_C^{00}$  for some small subset  $C$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  (since the first intersection on the right hand side is over the empty set). This easily implies absoluteness of  $G^{00}$  in Fact 5.2.

(2) For  $k = 2$ , the assumption  $\bar{b}_1 \downarrow_{\mathcal{M}_1}^{u, \kappa_1} \mathcal{M}_1$  is clearly satisfied by any  $\kappa_1$ -saturated model  $\mathcal{M}_1 \supseteq A$  (taking  $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0 \preceq \mathcal{M}_1$  arbitrary), and the conclusion gives  $G_{\mathcal{M}_1 \bar{b}_1}^{00} = G_{\mathcal{M}_1}^{00} \cap G_{\bar{b}_1 C}^{00}$  — hence Fact 5.3 follows from Fact 5.7.

In this section we prove an analog of Fact 5.7 (and in particular of Fact 5.3) for  $G^\infty$  in  $k$ -dependent *abelian* groups:

**Theorem 5.9.** *For any  $k \geq 1$ , let  $T$  be a  $k$ -dependent theory,  $A \subseteq \mathbb{M} \models T$  a small set of parameters and  $G = G(\mathbb{M})$  a type-definable abelian group over  $A$ . Let  $\mathcal{M} \supseteq A$  be a small model and  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  finite tuples in  $\mathbb{M}$  so that  $(\mathcal{M}, A, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1})$  are in a generic position. Then there is some  $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  with  $|C| \leq \beth_2(|T| + |A|)$  such that*

$$G_{\mathcal{M} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty = \left( \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, k-1} G_{\mathcal{M} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{i-1} \cup \bar{b}_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty \right) \cap G_{C \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty.$$

**Conjecture 5.10.** The conclusion of Theorem 5.9 holds for arbitrary  $k$ -dependent groups (not necessarily abelian).

**Remark 5.11.** (1) We note that in any theory, if a definable group  $G$  is definably amenable (so for example abelian), then for any set  $S$  we have  $G_S^{00} = G_S^\infty$  (this is a special case of [45, Theorem 0.5]). Hence a generalization of Theorem 5.9 for definably amenable groups  $G$  follows from Fact 5.7. However we provide a self-contained proof most of which works for arbitrary groups, and highlight the use of abelianity in the final part.

(2) Similarly, if the theory  $T$  is simple, then  $G_S^{00} = G_S^\infty$ , hence in a simple  $k$ -dependent theory, Theorem 5.9 holds for an arbitrary group  $G$  by Fact 5.7.

**5.2. Lascar strong types and thick formulas.** We recall some material about Lascar strong types [58], [28], [10, Chapter 9] as a reference. Recall that two (possibly infinite) tuples  $a, b$  have the same *Lascar strong type* over a small set of parameters  $S \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  if  $aEb$  holds for any  $S$ -invariant bounded equivalence relation  $E$  (on tuples of the appropriate sorts of  $\mathbb{M}$ ); in which case we write  $a \equiv_S^L b$ .

**Definition 5.12.** [10, Definition 9.5]

- (1) A symmetric formula  $\theta(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$ , with  $x, y$  tuples of variables of the same sorts (and length), is *thick* if there is no sequence  $(a_i)_{i \in \omega}$  from  $\mathbb{M}^x$  (with some of  $a_i$ 's possibly repeated) with  $\models \neg\theta(a_i, a_j)$  for all  $i < j < \omega$ . Note that in particular every thick formula is reflexive.
- (2) For  $S \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  and  $x, y$  fixed tuples of variables of the same sorts, let  $\Theta_S(x, y)$  be the set of all thick formulas with parameters in  $S$  in (finite subtuples of) variables  $x, y$ .

**Fact 5.13.** [10, Lemma 9.7] *For any set  $S$  and tuples  $a, b$  of the same sorts,  $\models \Theta_S(a, b)$  if and only if there is a sequence  $(c_i)_{i \in \omega}$  indiscernible over  $S$  with  $c_0 = a, c_1 = b$ .*

**Definition 5.14.** We will say that a partitioned formula  $\theta(x, y; z) \in \mathcal{L}$  is *uniformly thick* if for every  $c \in \mathbb{M}^z$ , the formula  $\theta(x, y; c)$  is thick.

**Remark 5.15.** (1)  $\theta(x, y; z)$  is uniformly thick if and only if there is some  $n = n(\theta) \in \omega$  so that: for any  $c \in \mathbb{M}^z$ ,  $\theta(x, y; c)$  is symmetric and there are no  $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$  with  $\models \neg\theta(a_i, a_j; c)$  for all  $i < j < n$ .  
 (2) Every thick formula  $\theta(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$  is equivalent to an instance (over the same parameters) of some uniformly thick formula  $\theta'(x, y; z) \in \mathcal{L}$ .  
 (3) Let  $\Theta^u(x, y; z)$  be the set of all uniformly thick formulas (without parameters) in (finite subtuples of) the variables  $x, y, z$ . Then if  $S$  is a set and  $z$  corresponds to an enumeration of  $S$ , we have  $\Theta_S(x, y) \equiv \Theta^u(x, y; S)$ .

*Proof.* (1) By compactness.

(2) Assume  $\theta(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{M})$  is thick, say  $\theta(x, y) = \varphi(x, y; c)$  for some  $\varphi(x, y; z) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $c \in \mathbb{M}^z$ , and  $n \in \omega$  is such that there are no  $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$  with  $\models \neg\theta(a_i, a_j)$  for all  $i < j < n$ . Then the formula

$$\theta'(x, y; z) := \left( \exists x_0, \dots, x_n \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-1} \neg\varphi(x_i, x_{i+1}; z) \right) \vee \left( \varphi(x, y; z) \wedge \varphi(y, x; z) \right)$$

is uniformly thick, and  $\theta(x, y) \equiv \theta'(x, y; c)$ .

(3) Follows from (2). □

**Remark 5.16.** Note that by Ramsey's theorem, both sets of formulas  $\Theta^u(x, y; z)$  and  $\Theta_S(x, y)$  (for an arbitrary  $S$ ) are closed under conjunctions.

**Definition 5.17.** For  $n \in \omega$ , we let the *Lascar distance*  $\text{dist}_S(a, b)$  over  $S$  between  $a$  and  $b$  be the smallest  $n \in \omega$  such that there exist  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  with  $a_0 = a, a_n = b$  and  $\models \Theta_S(a_i, a_{i+1})$  for each  $i < n$ ; or  $\infty$  if no such  $n$  exists.

**Fact 5.18.** [58, Lemma 7]

- (1) If  $\text{dist}_S(a, b) = 1$ , then there is a small model  $M \supseteq S$  such that  $a \equiv_M b$ .
- (2) If  $a \equiv_M b$  then  $\text{dist}_M(a, b) \leq 2$ .

**Fact 5.19.** [58, Corollary 8] *The relation  $\equiv_S^L$  is the finest bounded  $S$ -invariant equivalence relation, and  $a \equiv_S^L b$  if and only if  $\text{dist}_S(a, b) < \infty$ .*

**Remark 5.20.** For any fixed (finite or small infinite) tuples of variables  $x, y, z$  and  $n \in \omega$ , there is a partial  $\mathcal{L}(\emptyset)$ -type  $\pi_n(x, y; z)$  so that for any tuples  $a, b, c$  in  $\mathbb{M}$  of appropriate length we have  $\models \pi_n(a, b; c) \iff \text{dist}_c(a, b) \leq n$ . Moreover,  $\pi_n(x, y; z) \equiv \bigwedge_{x' \subseteq x, y' \subseteq y, z' \subseteq z \text{ finite}} \pi_n(x', y'; z')$ .

*Proof.* By compactness, Remark 5.15 and Remark 5.16, we can take  $\pi_n(x, y; z)$  to be

$$\bigwedge_{x', y', z'} \bigwedge_{\theta(x', y'; z') \in \Theta^u(x, y; z)} \exists u_0, \dots, u_n \left( u_0 = x' \wedge u_n = y' \wedge \bigwedge_{i < n} \theta(u_i, u_{i+1}; z) \right),$$

where  $x', z'$  are arbitrary finite subtuples of  $x, z$  respectively, and  $y'$  is a finite subtuple of  $y$  corresponding to  $x'$ . The “moreover” part follows from the definition of  $\pi_n$  and compactness.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.21.** Assume that  $(a_i : i \in \mathbb{Q})$  is an  $S$ -indiscernible sequence (of finite or infinite tuples) and  $I, J \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$  are finite with  $I \cap J = \emptyset$ , say  $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$  for some  $n \in \omega$  and  $i_1 < \dots < i_n$ . For  $t \in [n]$ , let  $i'_t \in \mathbb{Q}$  be arbitrary so that  $i_t < i'_t$  and

$$\text{qftp}_{<}(i'_t/J \cup \{i_k : k \in [n] \setminus \{t\}\}) = \text{qftp}_{<}(i_t/J \cup \{i_k : k \in [n] \setminus \{t\}\}).$$

Then

$$\text{dist}_{S \cup (a_i)_{i \in J}} \left( (a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}), (a_{i'_1}, \dots, a_{i'_n}) \right) \leq 1.$$

*Proof.* For each  $t \in [n]$ , let  $i_{t,0} := i_t < i_{t,1} := i'_t$  and by assumption and density of  $\mathbb{Q}$  for  $2 \leq \alpha < \omega$  we can choose strictly increasing  $i_{t,\alpha} \in \mathbb{Q}$  so that  $i_{t,1} < i_{t,2}$  and  $\text{qftp}_{<}(i_{t,\alpha}/J \cup \{i_k : k \in [n] \setminus \{t\}\}) = \text{qftp}_{<}(i_t/J \cup \{i_k : k \in [n] \setminus \{t\}\})$ . Then by  $S$ -indiscernibility of  $(a_i : i \in \mathbb{Q})$  it follows that the sequence  $((a_{i_{1,\alpha}}, \dots, a_{i_{n,\alpha}}) : \alpha \in \omega)$  is indiscernible over  $S \cup (a_i)_{i \in J}$  and its first two elements are  $(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n})$  and  $(a_{i'_1}, \dots, a_{i'_n})$ , so we conclude by Fact 5.13.  $\square$

**Remark 5.22.** If for some tuples  $a, b$  we have  $\text{dist}_S(a, b) \leq n$  and  $f$  is an  $S$ -definable function, then  $\text{dist}_S(f(a), f(b)) \leq n$ .

*Proof.* By induction on  $n$ , using that if  $(c_i : i \in \omega)$  is an  $S$ -indiscernible sequence with  $c_0 = a, c_1 = b$ , then  $(f(c_i) : i \in \omega)$  is also an  $S$ -indiscernible sequence starting with  $f(a), f(b)$ .  $\square$

**5.3.  $G^\infty$  and Lascar strong types.** Let  $G$  be an  $\emptyset$ -type-definable group. For  $X \subseteq G$  and  $m \in \omega$ , we let  $X^m := \{g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_m : g_i \in X\}$  and let  $\langle X \rangle$  be the subgroup of  $G$  generated by  $X$ .

**Definition 5.23.** Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ .

- (1) We let  $X_S = X_{S,1} := \{a^{-1}b : a, b \in G(\mathbb{M}), \models \Theta_S(a, b)\}$ .
- (2) For  $n \in \omega$ , we let  $X_{S,n} := \{a^{-1}b : a, b \in G(\mathbb{M}), \text{dist}_S(a, b) \leq n\}$ . We also let  $X_{S,<\omega} := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} X_{S,n} = \{a^{-1}b : a, b \in G(\mathbb{M}), a \equiv_S^L b\}$ .
- (3) Given a set of formulas  $\Phi(x, y; z) \subseteq \Theta^u(x, y; z)$ , if  $S$  is a set such that  $z$  corresponds to an enumeration of  $S$ , we define

$$X_S^\Phi = \{a^{-1}b : \models \theta(a, b), \theta(x, y) \in \Phi(x, y; S)\}.$$

We write  $X_S^\theta$  instead of  $X_S^{\{\theta\}}$ . By Remark 5.15(3), Remark 5.16 and compactness,  $X_S = \bigcap_{\theta(x, y; z) \in \Theta^u(x, y; z)} X_S^\theta$ .

We summarize some basic properties of the sets  $X_{S,n}$  that we will often use, sometimes without explicitly mentioning it:



- Remark 5.24.** (1) If  $1_G$  is the identity of  $G$ , then  $1_G \in X_{S,n}$  for all  $S$  and  $n \in \omega$ .  
 (2) For all  $\Phi$ , if  $a \in X_S^\Phi$ , then also  $a^{-1} \in X_S^\Phi$ . Similarly, for all  $n$ , if  $a \in X_{S,n}$  then also  $a^{-1} \in X_{S,n}$ .  
 (3)  $X_{S,n}^m \subseteq X_{S',n'}^{m'}$  for all  $S' \subseteq S$  and  $n \leq n', m \leq m'$ .  
 (4)  $X_{S,n} \subseteq X_S^n$ .  
 (5) If  $d \in G$  and  $n \in \omega$  are arbitrary, then  $d(X_{S,n})d^{-1} \subseteq (X_{S,2n})^2$ .  
 (6) For any fixed  $m, n$  and (finite or small infinite) tuple of variables  $z$ , there is a partial  $\mathcal{L}(\emptyset)$ -type  $\rho_{m,n}(x; z)$  so that for any  $g \in G(\mathbb{M})$  and tuple in  $\mathbb{M}$  of appropriate length we have  $\models \rho_{m,n}(g; c) \iff g \in (X_{c,n})^m$ . Moreover,  $\rho_{m,n}(x; z) \equiv \bigwedge_{z' \subseteq z, |z'| < \aleph_0} \rho_{m,n}(x; z')$ .  
 (7) In particular, for any  $S$  and  $m \in \omega$ ,

$$X_S^m = \bigcap_{S' \subseteq S, |S'| < \aleph_0} X_{S'}^m = \bigcap_{S' \subseteq S \text{ finite}, \theta(x,y;z) \in \Theta^u(x,y;z)} (X_{S'}^\theta)^m.$$

*Proof.* (1) As  $\text{dist}_S(a, a) = 0$  for all  $S$  and  $a \in G$ , and  $1_G = a^{-1}a$ .

(2) All formulas in  $\Phi(x, y; S)$  are thick, hence symmetric, so if  $a = b^{-1}c$  and  $\models \Phi(b, c; S)$ , then  $a^{-1} = c^{-1}b$  and  $\models \Phi(c, b; S)$ , and the second part follows as  $\text{dist}_S(a, b) \leq n \iff \text{dist}_S(b, a) \leq n$ .

(3) Clear from the definitions, using (1).

(4) Assume  $c \in X_{S,n}$ , that is  $c = a^{-1} \cdot b$  and there exist some  $c_0, \dots, c_n \in G(\mathbb{M})$  such that  $a = c_0, b = c_n$  and  $\models \Theta_S(c_i, c_{i+1})$  for all  $i < n$ . But then we have

$$a^{-1} \cdot b = \prod_{i < n} (c_i^{-1} \cdot c_{i+1}) \in X_{S,1}^n.$$

(5) Let  $e \in X_S$ , so (using (2))  $e = a \cdot b^{-1}$  for some  $a, b \in G$  with  $\text{dist}_S(a, b) \leq n$ , and let  $d \in G$  be arbitrary. By Fact 5.18(1) there exist some  $c_i \in G, i \leq n$  with  $c_0 = a, c_n = b$  and models  $\mathcal{M}_i \supseteq S$  so that  $c_i \equiv_{\mathcal{M}_i} c_{i+1}$  for  $i < n$ . We let  $d_0 := d$  and inductively (taking automorphisms over  $\mathcal{M}_i$ ) choose  $d_i$  so that  $(c_i, d_i) \equiv_{\mathcal{M}_i} (c_{i+1}, d_{i+1})$ . Fact 5.18(2), we have  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{M}_i}((c_i, d_i), (c_{i+1}, d_{i+1})) \leq 2$  for all  $i < n$ , so  $\text{dist}_S((a, d), (b, d_n)) \leq 2n$  (hence also  $\text{dist}_S(d, d_n) \leq 2n$ ). Hence

$$ded^{-1} = d(ab^{-1})d^{-1} = (da)(d_nb)^{-1} \cdot d_nd^{-1} \in (X_{S,2n})^2.$$

(6) By Remark 5.20 and compactness we can define  $\rho_{m,n}(x; z)$  as follows:

$$\exists x_1, \dots, x_m \exists y_1, \dots, y_m (\pi_n(x_i, y_i; z) \wedge x = x_1^{-1} \cdot y_1 \cdot \dots \cdot x_m^{-1} \cdot y_m).$$

The “moreover” part follows by compactness from this definition and the “moreover” part of Remark 5.20.

(7) By the “moreover” part of (6), definition of  $\rho_{m,1}$  and Remark 5.16.  $\square$

The main point for us is the following description of  $G^\infty$ :

**Fact 5.25.** [31, Lemma 2.2] *For any set of parameters  $S$ ,*

$$G_S^\infty = \langle X_{S, < \omega} \rangle = \langle X_S \rangle = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} X_S^n \text{ and } [G : G_S^\infty] \leq 2^{|\mathcal{L}(S)|}$$

(where the second equality is by Remark 5.24(4)).

**Lemma 5.26.** *For any small set of parameters  $C \subset \mathbb{M}$  we have*

$$G_C^\infty = \bigcap \{G_S^\infty : S \subseteq C \text{ countable}\}.$$

*Proof.* The inclusion from left to right is obvious. To see the inclusion from right to left, assume that  $d \in G \setminus G_C^\infty$ , i.e.  $d \notin \langle X_C \rangle$  by Fact 5.25. By Remark 5.24(7), for any  $m < \omega$ , we can choose a finite set  $S_m \subseteq C$ , such that  $d \notin (X_{S_m})^m$ . Let  $S := \bigcup_{m < \omega} S_m$ . Then, using Remark 5.24(3),  $d \notin \langle X_S \rangle = G_S^\infty$ , and  $S$  is countable.  $\square$

**5.4. Proof of Theorem 5.9.** We fix  $k \geq 1$  and assume that  $T$  is a  $k$ -dependent theory,  $A \subseteq \mathbb{M} \models T$  is a small parameter set and  $G = G(\mathbb{M})$  is a type-definable over  $A$  abelian group. To ease the notation let us name the elements of  $A$  by constant in our language. We let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a model and  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  finite tuples in  $\mathbb{M}$  in a generic position.

Assume the conclusion of Theorem 5.9 fails. Then, using Lemma 5.26, by transfinite induction on  $\alpha < \beth_2(|T|)^+$  we can choose *countable* tuples  $S_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  and elements  $d_\alpha \in G(\mathbb{M})$  so that for every  $\alpha < \beth_2(|T|)^+$  we have:

$$(5.1) \quad d_\alpha \in \bigcap_{i \in [k-1]} G_{\mathcal{M} \cup (\bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}) \setminus \bar{b}_i}^\infty,$$

$$(5.2) \quad d_\alpha \in \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} G_{S_\beta \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty,$$

$$(5.3) \quad d_\alpha \notin G_{S_\alpha \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\infty.$$

By (5.1), (5.2), Fact 5.25 and Remark 5.24(3), for every  $\alpha < \beta$  there exists some  $m_{\alpha, \beta} \in \omega$  so that

$$d_\alpha \in \bigcap_{i \in [k-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M} \cup (\bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}) \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{m_{\alpha, \beta}} \text{ and } d_\beta \in \left( X_{S_\alpha \cup \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}} \right)^{m_{\alpha, \beta}}.$$

By Erdős-Rado theorem, passing to a subsequence of  $((d_\alpha, S_\alpha) : \alpha < \beth_2(|T|)^+)$  of length  $\kappa_0 = (|T|)^+$ , we may assume that there is some  $1 \leq m \in \omega$  so that  $m_{\alpha, \beta} = m$  for all  $\alpha < \beta \in \kappa_0$ . Next, by (5.3), Fact 5.25 and Remark 5.24(7), for every  $\alpha < \kappa_0$  there is some uniformly thick formula  $\Phi_\alpha(x, y; z) \in \Theta^u(x, y; z)$  and  $n_\alpha \in \omega$  such that

$$d_\alpha \notin \left( X_{(S_\alpha \upharpoonright n_\alpha) \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^{\Phi_\alpha} \right)^{2k + (2^{2k-1} - 1)m},$$

where  $S_\alpha \upharpoonright n_\alpha$  denotes the initial segment of length  $n_\alpha$  of the countable tuple  $S_\alpha$ . As  $\kappa_0 > |T|$ , by pigeonhole, passing to a subsequence of length  $\kappa_0$ , we may assume that  $\Phi_\alpha(x, y; z) = \Phi(x, y; z)$  and  $n_\alpha = n$  for some fixed uniformly thick formula  $\Phi(x, y; z) \in \Theta^u(x, y; z)$  and  $n \in \omega$ . That is, for all  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa_0$  we have:

$$(5.4) \quad d_\alpha \in \bigcap_{i \in [k-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M} \cup (\bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}) \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^m,$$

$$(5.5) \quad d_\beta \in \left( X_{S_\alpha \cup \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}} \right)^m,$$

$$(5.6) \quad d_\alpha \notin \left( X_{S_\alpha \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1}}^\Phi \right)^{2k + (2^{2k-1} - 1)m}.$$

As  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1}$  are finite tuples in  $\mathbb{M}$  in a generic position, there are regular cardinals  $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2 < \dots < \kappa_{k-1}$  and models  $\mathcal{M}_0 \preceq \mathcal{M}_1 \preceq \dots \preceq \mathcal{M}_{k-1} = \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\beth_2(|\mathcal{M}_i|)^+ \leq \kappa_{i+1}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, k-2$  and

$$(5.7) \quad \bar{b}_i \downarrow_{\mathcal{M}_i}^{u, \kappa_i} \bar{b}_{<i} \mathcal{M}_{k-1}$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ .

**Claim 5.27.** *There exist  $m' \in \omega$ , sequences  $(\bar{b}_{l,\alpha} : \alpha < \omega)$  for  $l \in [k-1]$  (in  $\mathcal{M}_{k-1}$ ) and elements  $(d_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \omega^k := \prod_{i=1}^k \omega)$  in  $G$  such that:*

(1) *for all  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) <^{\text{lex}} (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in \omega^k$  we have*

$$d_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_{1,\alpha_1}, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m'};$$

(2) *for all  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \omega^k$  we have*

$$d_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} \notin \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1,\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}}^\Phi \right)^{2k+(2^k-1)m'}.$$

*Proof of Claim 5.27.* Let  $m' := 2^{k-1}m$ . For  $l = 1, \dots, k$ , let

$$(5.8) \quad \lambda_l := \omega^{k-l+1} = \prod_{i=l}^k \omega, \quad m_l := 2^{k-l}m, \quad q_1 := 2k + (2^k - 1)m', \quad q_l := \sum_{i=2}^l m_i + q_1.$$

In particular  $m' = m_1$ ,  $2m_{l+1} = m_l$ ,  $q_{l+1} = m_{l+1} + q_l$ ,  $q_k = 2k + (2^{2^{k-1}} - 1)m$ .

To show the claim we choose, by reverse induction on  $l = k, \dots, 1$ , sequences  $(\bar{b}_{l,\alpha} : \alpha < \omega)$  (these are only chosen and needed for  $l < k$ ) and elements  $(d_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k} : (\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_l)$  in  $G$  such that the following hold:

( $\dagger_1^l$ ): for all  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k), (\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k) \in \lambda_l$  we have

$$d_{\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k} \in \bigcap_{i \in [l-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_{1,\alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1, \alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{m_l};$$

( $\dagger_2^l$ ): for all  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) <^{\text{lex}} (\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k) \in \lambda_l$  we have

$$d_{\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_{1,\alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1, \alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m_l};$$

( $\dagger_3^l$ ): for all  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_l$  we have

$$d_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k} \notin \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1,\alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1, \alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}}^\Phi \right)^{q_l}.$$

For  $l = 1$  this completes the proof of Claim 5.27 (by ( $\dagger_2^1$ ), ( $\dagger_3^1$ ) and the choice of  $\lambda_1, m_1, q_1$ , see (5.8)).

Since we had  $S_{\alpha_k} \subseteq \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{k-1}$  for all  $\alpha_k < \kappa_0$ , the above holds for  $l = k$  with  $(d_{\alpha_k} : \alpha_k < \omega)$ , i.e. ( $\dagger_1^k$ ), ( $\dagger_2^k$ ) and ( $\dagger_3^k$ ) hold by (5.4), (5.5) and (5.6), respectively (and by the choice of  $\lambda_k, m_k, q_k$  (5.8)).

Now suppose we have found the data as above satisfying ( $\dagger_1^{l+1}$ ), ( $\dagger_2^{l+1}$ ) and ( $\dagger_3^{l+1}$ ) for  $2 \leq l+1 \leq k$ , and we want to choose the corresponding data for  $l$ . Let  $S$  be the concatenation of all the tuples  $S_\alpha$  for  $\alpha < \omega$  (then  $S$  is countable) and

$$A_l := \mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S \cup \bar{b}_{<l} \cup \{\bar{b}_{i,\beta} : l+1 \leq i < k, \beta < \omega\}.$$

As  $A_l \subseteq \bar{b}_{<l} \mathcal{M}_{k-1}$ ,  $|A_l| \leq |\mathcal{M}_{l-1}| + \aleph_0 < \kappa_l$  and

$$\bar{b}_l \perp_{\mathcal{M}_l}^{u, \kappa_l} \bar{b}_{<l} \mathcal{M}_{k-1}$$

by (5.7), we can choose by transfinite induction a sequence of tuples

$$(\bar{b}_{l,\alpha}, (d_{\alpha, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} : (\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}) : \alpha < \kappa_l)$$

with  $\bar{b}_{l,\alpha} \in \mathcal{M}_l$  and  $d_{\alpha, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \in G(\mathbb{M})$  such that, taking  $A_{l,\alpha} := A_l \cup \{\bar{b}_{l,\beta} : \beta < \alpha\}$ , for each  $\alpha < \kappa_l$  we have

$$(\star): (\bar{b}_l, \alpha, (d_{\alpha, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k})_{(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}}) \models \text{tp}(\bar{b}_l, (d_{\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k})_{(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}} / A_{l, \alpha})$$

(we apply automorphisms of  $\mathbb{M}$  over  $A_{l, \alpha}$  sending  $\bar{b}_l$  to  $\bar{b}_{l, \alpha}$  to find the  $d$ 's).

We claim that  $(\dagger_2^l)$  holds in the following strong form: for any  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) <^{\text{lex}} (\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k) \in \kappa_l \times \lambda_{l+1}$  we have

$$(5.9) \quad d_{\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m_{l+1}}.$$

Indeed, fix any  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) <^{\text{lex}} (\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k) \in \kappa_l \times \lambda_{l+1}$ .

If  $\beta_l = \alpha_l$ , then  $(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) <^{\text{lex}} (\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k)$ , hence by  $(\dagger_2^{l+1})$  we have

$$d_{\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_l \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m_{l+1}},$$

which using  $(\star)$  (for  $\alpha_l$ ) and Remark 5.24(6) implies

$$d_{\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} = d_{\alpha_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m_{l+1}}.$$

Otherwise  $\beta_l > \alpha_l$ . By  $(\dagger_1^{l+1})$  we have in particular

$$d_{\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_l \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m_{l+1}}.$$

As  $\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_l$  and  $\bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \in \mathcal{M}_l$ , by Remark 5.24(3) this implies

$$d_{\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m_{l+1}}.$$

And  $\bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \subseteq A_{l, \beta_l}$  as  $\beta_l > \alpha_l$ , so by  $(\star)$  and Remark 5.24(6) this again implies that (5.9) holds.

Using  $(\dagger_3^{l+1})$  and  $(\star)$ , we get that  $(\dagger_3^l)$  is satisfied in the following strong form: for all  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \kappa_l \times \lambda_{l+1}$  we have

$$(5.10) \quad d_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k} \notin \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{q_{l+1}}.$$

Concerning  $(\dagger_1^l)$ , we first show the following: for all  $(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k), (\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}$  and  $\alpha_l \leq \beta_l < \kappa_l$ ,

$$(5.11) \quad d_{\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k} \in \bigcap_{i \in [l-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_l \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{m_{l+1}}.$$

Indeed, fix any  $(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k), (\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}$ . By  $(\dagger_1^{l+1})$  we have

$$(5.12) \quad d_{\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \bigcap_{i \in [l]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_l \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_l \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{m_{l+1}}.$$

If  $\alpha_l = \beta_l$ , then by (5.12) we have in particular

$$d_{\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \bigcap_{i \in [l-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_l \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{m_{l+1}},$$

which using  $(\star)$  (and  $d_{\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} = d_{\alpha_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k}$ ) implies (5.11).

And if  $\alpha_l < \beta_l$ , from (5.12) we have (using  $\bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \in \mathcal{M}_l$ ) in particular

$$d_{\beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \bigcap_{i \in [l-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, \alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{m_{l+1}},$$

which using  $(\star)$  (and  $\alpha_l < \beta_l$ ) again implies (5.11).

However, in order to achieve  $(\dagger_1^l)$  in full (i.e. so that the condition in  $(\dagger_1^l)$  also holds when  $\beta_l < \alpha_l < \omega$ ) we have to modify the sequence and increase  $m_{l+1}$ . Consider the sequence of *countable* tuples

$$(\bar{b}_{l,\alpha_l}, (d_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k} : (\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}) : \alpha_l < \kappa_l).$$

For  $\beta_l < \kappa_l$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_{l,\beta_l} \prec \mathbb{M}$  be an arbitrary model containing  $A_l \cup \bar{b}_{l,\beta_l}$  with  $|\mathcal{M}_{l,\beta_l}| \leq |\mathcal{M}_{l-1}|$ . Let  $(p_\gamma^{\beta_l}(x) : \gamma < 2^{|\mathcal{M}_{l-1}|})$  be an arbitrary enumeration (possibly with repetitions if there are fewer types) of the set  $S_x(\mathcal{M}_{l,\beta_l})$  of complete types over  $\mathcal{M}_{l,\beta_l}$  in the tuple of variables  $x$  corresponding to the sort of  $G$ .

For  $\alpha_l < \beta_l < \kappa_l$  and  $(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}$ , let  $t_{\alpha_l, \beta_l}^{(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k)}$  be the smallest  $\gamma < 2^{|\mathcal{M}_{l-1}|}$  so that  $\text{tp}(d_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k} / \mathcal{M}_{l,\beta_l}) = p_\gamma^{\beta_l}$ , and consider the tuple

$$\bar{t}_{\alpha_l, \beta_l} := (t_{\alpha_l, \beta_l}^{(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k)} : (\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}).$$

There are at most  $(2^{|\mathcal{M}_{l-1}|})^{\aleph_0} \leq 2^{|\mathcal{M}_{l-1}|}$  possible choices for  $\bar{t}_{\alpha_l, \beta_l}$ . As  $\kappa_l \geq \beth_2(|\mathcal{M}_{l-1}|)^+$  by assumption, applying Erdős-Rado and passing to a countable subsequence we have that (5.9) and (5.10) still hold (replacing  $\kappa_l$  by  $\omega$ ) and for any fixed  $(\alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_{l+1}$  we have additionally: for all  $\alpha_l < \alpha'_l < \beta_l < \omega$ ,

$$(5.13) \quad d_{\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \equiv_{\mathcal{M}_{l,\beta_l}} d_{\alpha'_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k},$$

hence, using Fact 5.18(2) and Remark 5.24(4), in particular

$$(5.14) \quad d_{\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k}^{-1} \cdot d_{\alpha'_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \in X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} S \bar{b}_1 \dots \bar{b}_{l-1} \bar{b}_{l,\beta_l}} \{ \bar{b}_{i,\gamma} : l+1 \leq i < k, \gamma < \omega \}, 2 \\ \subseteq \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} S \bar{b}_1 \dots \bar{b}_{l-1} \bar{b}_{l,\beta_l}} \{ \bar{b}_{i,\gamma} : l+1 \leq i < k, \gamma < \omega \} \right)^2.$$

Now for  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_l$ , we define

$$e_{\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} := d_{2\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k}^{-1} \cdot d_{2\alpha_l+1, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \in G(\mathbb{M}), \\ \bar{c}_{l,\alpha_l} := \bar{b}_{l,2\alpha_l} \in \mathcal{M}_l,$$

and claim that the sequences  $(\bar{c}_{l,\alpha_l} : \alpha_l < \omega)$ ,  $(\bar{b}_{l+1,\alpha_{l+1}} : \alpha_{l+1} < \omega)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $(\bar{b}_{k-1,\alpha_{k-1}} : \alpha_{k-1} < \omega)$  and elements  $(e_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k} : (\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \omega^k)$  satisfy the requirements  $(\dagger_1^l)$ ,  $(\dagger_2^l)$  and  $(\dagger_3^l)$ .

Fix any  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k), (\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k) \in \lambda_l$ . If  $\alpha_l \leq \beta_l$ , then  $2\alpha_l \leq 2\beta_l, 2\beta_l + 1$ , so by (5.11) we have

$$e_{\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} = d_{2\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k}^{-1} \cdot d_{2\beta_l+1, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \\ \bigcap_{i \in [l-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l,2\alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1,\alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1,\alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{2m_{l+1}}.$$

If  $\beta_l < \alpha_l$ , then  $2\beta_l < 2\beta_l + 1 < 2\alpha_l$ , so by (5.14) we have

$$e_{\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} S \bar{b}_1 \dots \bar{b}_{l-1} \bar{b}_{l,2\alpha_l} \bar{b}_{l+1,\alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1,\alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^2,$$

hence in particular

$$e_{\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \bigcap_{i \in [l-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l,2\alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1,\alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1,\alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^2.$$

In either case, we have (as  $1 \leq m = m_k \leq m_{l+1}$  and  $2m_{l+1} = m_l$  by (5.8))

$$e_{\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k} \in \bigcap_{i \in [l-1]} \left( X_{\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \cup S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{c}_{l, \alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}} \setminus \bar{b}_i} \right)^{m_l},$$

so  $(\dagger_1^l)$  holds.

Fix any  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) <^{\text{lex}} (\beta_l, \dots, \beta_k) \in \lambda_l$ . Then both

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) &<^{\text{lex}} (2\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k) \text{ and} \\ (2\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) &<^{\text{lex}} (2\beta_l + 1, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k), \end{aligned}$$

hence using (5.9) (and Remark 5.24(2)) we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} &= d_{2\beta_l, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k}^{-1} \cdot d_{2\beta_l+1, \beta_{l+1}, \dots, \beta_k} \in \\ &\left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, 2\alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{2m_{l+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

demonstrating that  $(\dagger_2^l)$  holds (as  $2m_{l+1} = m_l$  by (5.8)).

Finally, assume towards contradiction that  $(\dagger_3^l)$  does not hold. That is, there is some  $(\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \lambda_l$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k} &= d_{2\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k}^{-1} \cdot d_{2\alpha_l+1, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \in \\ &\left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, 2\alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}}^\Phi \right)^{q_l}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $(2\alpha_l + 1, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) >^{\text{lex}} (2\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k)$ , by (5.9) we have

$$d_{2\alpha_l+1, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, 2\alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m_{l+1}}.$$

As  $d_{2\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} = d_{2\alpha_l+1, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \cdot e_{\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_k}^{-1}$ , together these imply (using Remark 5.24(2), (7) and uniform thickness of  $\Phi(x, y; z)$ ) that

$$d_{2\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}, \dots, \alpha_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{l-1} \cup \bar{b}_{l, 2\alpha_l} \cup \bar{b}_{l+1, \alpha_{l+1}} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}}^\Phi \right)^{m_{l+1}+q_l}.$$

But as  $m_{l+1} + q_l = q_{l+1}$  by (5.8), this contradicts (5.10). So  $(\dagger_3^l)$  holds.  $\square_{\text{Claim 5.27}}$

We can additionally assume that the sequences form an indiscernible array (and are indexed by  $\mathbb{Q}$  instead of  $\omega$ ):

**Claim 5.28.** *There exist sequences  $(\bar{b}_{l, \alpha} : \alpha \in \mathbb{Q})$  for  $l \in [k-1]$  and  $(S_{\alpha_k} : \alpha_k \in \mathbb{Q})$ , and elements  $(d_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{Q}^k)$  in  $G(\mathbb{M})$  such that:*

(1) *for all  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) <^{\text{lex}} (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in \mathbb{Q}^k$  we have*

$$d_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k} \in \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \cup \bar{b}_{1, \alpha_1}, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}} \right)^{m'};$$

(2) *for all  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{Q}^k$  we have*

$$d_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} \notin \left( X_{S_{\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1, \alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}}}^\Phi \right)^{2k+(2^k-1)m'};$$

(3) *Taking  $\bar{c}_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} := (S_{\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n, \bar{b}_{1, \alpha_1}, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1, \alpha_{k-1}})$ , the  $k$ -dimensional array  $(\bar{c}_{\bar{\alpha}} : \bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Q}^k)$  is indiscernible in the sense of Definition 3.2, i.e. for any  $i \in [k]$  the sequence*

$$\left( (\bar{c}_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)} : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{Q}^{k-1}) : \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q} \right)$$

is indiscernible.

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.6 applied to the sequences given by Claim 5.27 (note that (1) and (2) still hold restricting to any subarray) and compactness (using Remark 5.24(6)).  $\square_{\text{claim}}$

For  $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \omega^k$ , finite  $I \subset \omega^k$  and  $\bar{i} \in \{0, 1\}^k$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\bar{\alpha}, \bar{i}} &:= d_{2\alpha_1+i_1, \dots, 2\alpha_k+i_k} & d_{I, \bar{i}} &:= \prod_{(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k) \in I} d_{\bar{\gamma}, \bar{i}} \\ X_{\bar{\alpha}} &:= X_{S_{2\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1, 2\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, 2\alpha_{k-1}}} & X_{\bar{\alpha}}^\Phi &:= X_{S_{2\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1, 2\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, 2\alpha_{k-1}}}^\Phi. \end{aligned}$$

Since the group  $G$  is abelian (we have not used abelianity of  $G$  up to this point), the order in which we take the product in  $d_{I, \bar{i}}$  does not matter. As usual, the product over the empty set is the identity, so e.g. if  $I = \emptyset$  then  $d_{I, \bar{i}} = 1_G$ . Moreover, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Odd} &:= \left\{ (i_1, \dots, i_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k : \sum_{j=1}^k i_j \text{ is odd} \right\}, \\ \text{Even} &:= \left\{ (i_1, \dots, i_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k : \sum_{j=1}^k i_j \text{ is even} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for any finite  $I \subset \omega^k$ , we define

$$d_I := \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Even}} d_{I, \bar{i}} \cdot \left( \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Odd}} d_{I, \bar{i}} \right)^{-1}.$$

**Claim 5.29.** *Let  $I$  be a finite subset of  $\omega^k$  and  $\bar{\alpha} \in \omega^k \setminus I$ . Then  $d_I \in X_{\bar{\alpha}}^k \subseteq (X_{\bar{\alpha}}^\Phi)^k$  (the inclusion holds by Remark 5.24(7) and uniform thickness of  $\Phi(x, y; z)$ ).*

*Proof.* We split  $I$  up into  $k$  disjoint subset  $(I_j)_{j \in [k]}$  (some of which could be empty), such that for each  $\bar{\beta} \in I_j$  the  $j$ -th coordinate of  $\bar{\beta}$  is different from the  $j$ -th coordinate of  $\bar{\alpha}$ . Formally, for a fixed  $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ , we define recursively

$$I_1 = \{(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k) \in I \mid \gamma_1 \neq \alpha_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad I_{j+1} = \{(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k) \in I \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^j I_i \mid \gamma_k \neq \alpha_k\}.$$

As  $\bar{\alpha} \notin I$ , we obtain that  $I = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^k I_j$  and, as  $G$  is abelian,  $d_I = \prod_{j=1}^k d_{I_j}$ . We now show that  $d_{I_j} \in X_{\bar{\alpha}}$  for every  $j \in [k]$ .

To ease notation, we let  $j = 1$  (the general case works analogously). Moreover, we write  $J$  for  $I_1$  and  $(0, \bar{i})$  (respectively,  $(1, \bar{i})$ ) for elements in  $\{0, 1\}^k$  whose first coordinate is 0 (respectively, 1). By definition of  $J$ , we have  $\beta_1 \neq \alpha_1$  for every  $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in J$ . Hence, by Claim 5.28(3) and Lemma 5.21 applied to the sequence of countable tuples  $\left( (\bar{c}_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)} : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{Q}^{k-1}) : \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{Q} \right)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{dist}_{S_{2\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1, 2\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1, 2\alpha_{k-1}}} \left( \left( d_{\bar{\beta}, (0, \bar{i})} : \beta \in J, (0, \bar{i}) \in \{0\} \times \{0, 1\}^{k-1} \right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left( d_{\bar{\beta}, (1, \bar{i})} : \bar{\beta} \in J, (1, \bar{i}) \in \{1\} \times \{0, 1\}^{k-1} \right) \right) \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

By Remark 5.22 this implies

$$\text{dist}_{S_{2\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1,2\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1,2\alpha_{k-1}}} \left( \prod_{(0,\bar{i}) \in \text{Even}} d_{J,(0,\bar{i})} \cdot \prod_{(0,\bar{i}) \in \text{Odd}} d_{J,(0,\bar{i})}^{-1}, \right. \\ \left. \prod_{(1,\bar{i}) \in \text{Odd}} d_{J,(1,\bar{i})} \cdot \prod_{(1,\bar{i}) \in \text{Even}} d_{J,(1,\bar{i})}^{-1} \right) \leq 1.$$

Using this, abelianity and definition of  $d_J$ , we get

$$d_J = \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Even}} d_{J,\bar{i}} \cdot \left( \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Odd}} d_{J,\bar{i}} \right)^{-1} = \\ \left( \prod_{(0,\bar{i}) \in \text{Even}} d_{J,(0,\bar{i})} \cdot \prod_{(1,\bar{i}) \in \text{Even}} d_{J,(1,\bar{i})} \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{(0,\bar{i}) \in \text{Odd}} d_{J,(0,\bar{i})} \cdot \prod_{(1,\bar{i}) \in \text{Odd}} d_{J,(1,\bar{i})} \right)^{-1} = \\ \left( \prod_{(0,\bar{i}) \in \text{Even}} d_{J,(0,\bar{i})} \cdot \prod_{(0,\bar{i}) \in \text{Odd}} d_{J,(0,\bar{i})}^{-1} \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{(1,\bar{i}) \in \text{Odd}} d_{J,(1,\bar{i})} \cdot \prod_{(1,\bar{i}) \in \text{Even}} d_{J,(1,\bar{i})}^{-1} \right)^{-1} \\ \in X_{S_{2\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n \cup \bar{b}_{1,2\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup \bar{b}_{k-1,2\alpha_{k-1}}} = X_{\bar{\alpha}}.$$

It follows that  $d_I = \prod_{j=1}^k d_{I_j} \in X_{\bar{\alpha}}^k$ , as wanted.  $\square_{\text{claim}}$

On the other hand, we have:

**Claim 5.30.** *If  $\bar{\alpha} \in I$ , then  $d_I \notin (X_{\bar{\alpha}}^\Phi)^k$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that the conclusion does not hold, i.e.  $d_I \in (X_{\bar{\alpha}}^\Phi)^k$ . Let

$$I' := I \setminus \{\bar{\alpha}\}.$$

Then, using abelianity,

$$d_I = d_{I'} \cdot \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Even}} d_{\bar{\alpha},\bar{i}} \cdot \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Odd}} d_{\bar{\alpha},\bar{i}}^{-1}.$$

Reordering, we obtain

$$d_{\bar{\alpha},(0,\dots,0)} = \underbrace{d_{I'}}_{\text{assumption } (X_{\bar{\alpha}}^\Phi)^k} \cdot \underbrace{d_{I'}^{-1}}_{\text{Claim 5.29 } (X_{\bar{\alpha}}^\Phi)^k} \cdot \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Even} \setminus \{(0,\dots,0)\}} \underbrace{d_{\bar{\alpha},\bar{i}}^{-1}}_{\text{Claim (5.28(1)) } (X_{\bar{\alpha}})^{m'}} \cdot \prod_{\bar{i} \in \text{Odd}} \underbrace{d_{\bar{\alpha},\bar{i}}}_{\text{Claim (5.28(1)) } (X_{\bar{\alpha}})^{m'}}.$$

It follows (using Remark 5.24(7)) that  $d_{2\alpha_1,\dots,2\alpha_k} = d_{\bar{\alpha},(0,\dots,0)} \in (X_{\bar{\alpha}}^\Phi)^{2k+(2^k-1)m'}$ , which contradicts Claim 5.28(2).  $\square_{\text{claim}}$

Finally, consider the formula

$$\psi(x; \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_k) := \exists u_1, \dots, u_{2k} \left( \left( \bigwedge_{i=0}^{k-1} \Phi(u_{2i}, u_{2i+1}; \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k) \right) \wedge x = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} x_{2i}^{-1} \cdot x_{2i+1} \right).$$

By Claims 5.29 and 5.30 and compactness, the sequences  $(\bar{b}_{1,2\alpha_1} : \alpha_1 \in \omega), \dots, (\bar{b}_{k-1,2\alpha_{k-1}} : \alpha_{k-1} \in \omega), (S_{2\alpha_k} \upharpoonright n : \alpha_k \in \omega)$  witness that  $\psi(x; \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_k)$  is not  $k$ -dependent.



**5.5. Example:  $G^\infty$  and  $G^{00}$  in multilinear forms over finite fields.** As an example, we calculate the connected component of the additive group of an infinite dimensional vector space over a finite field with an alternating non-degenerate (see Definition 2.1, and also Corollary 2.8)  $n$ -linear form. We consider the 2-sorted structure

$$\mathcal{M} = (V, \mathbb{F}_p, +_G, 0_G, \langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n, \epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{p-1}),$$

where  $V$  is an infinite dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ ,  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle_n : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$  is an alternating non-degenerate  $n$ -linear form and  $\mathbb{F}_p = \{\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{p-1}\}$ . The theory  $\text{Th}(\mathcal{M})$  is (strictly)  $n$ -dependent (by Theorem 4.1),  $\omega$ -categorical (by Remark 2.20(2)) and simple (Corollary 4.15).

**Claim 5.31.** *For any small set of parameter  $A \subset \mathbb{M}$ , we have*

$$V_A^\infty = V_A^{00} = V_A^0 = \bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}},$$

where  $V_{\mathbf{a}} = \{v \in V \mid \langle \mathbf{a}, v \rangle_n = 0\}$ .

**Remark 5.32.** This is a generalization of the [57, Example 4.1.14], although our form is alternating rather than symmetric.

*Proof.* Note first, that, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}$ ,  $V_{\mathbf{a}}$  is either  $V$  (if  $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = 0$  in  $\bigwedge^{n-1} V$ ) or an  $\mathbf{a}$ -definable subgroup of  $V$  of index  $p$ . Hence  $V_A^{00} \leq \bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}}$ .

By quantifier elimination from Theorem 2.19 (specialized to the case of a finite field) we have that for any  $v \in V(\mathbb{M})$  and set of parameters  $A$ ,  $\text{tp}(v/A)$  is determined by one of the following conditions:

- (1)  $v \in \text{Span}(A)$ , i.e. (using that the field is finite)  $v = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a_i \in A$  (not necessarily distinct); or
- (2)  $v \notin \text{Span}(A)$  and  $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} \langle \mathbf{a}, v \rangle_n = \epsilon_{i_t}$  for some  $i_t \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  (using that the form is alternating, its values with  $v$  placed in the other coordinates are determined by this).

As  $A$  is small and  $V_A^{00}$  has bounded index in  $V$ , we know that  $V_A^{00} \not\subseteq \text{Span}(A)$  (in particular  $\bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}} \not\subseteq \text{Span}(A)$ ). So we can find  $v \in V_A^{00} \setminus \text{Span}(A)$ . As  $V_A^{00} \leq \bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}}$ , we have  $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} \langle \mathbf{a}, v \rangle_n = 0$ . By the above observation, it follows that  $\text{tp}(v/A)$  is determined by  $v \notin \text{Span}(A)$  and  $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} \langle \mathbf{a}, v \rangle_n = 0$ . Hence for any  $v' \in (\bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}}) \setminus \text{Span}(A)$  we have  $v' \equiv_A v$ . And as  $V_A^{00}$  is type-definable over  $A$  and  $v \in V_A^{00}$ , we have  $v' \in V_A^{00}$ . Thus we have shown that  $(\bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}}) \setminus \text{Span}(A) \subset V_A^{00}$ . Now, let  $u \in \text{Span}(A) \cap \bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}}$  be arbitrary (if it exists). Take any  $w \in (\bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}}) \setminus \text{Span}(A)$ . Then  $-(w - u) \in (\bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}}) \setminus \text{Span}(A)$ . In particular  $w$  and  $-(w - u)$  belong to  $V_A^{00}$ . As  $V_A^{00}$  is a group, we obtain that  $u = w + (-(w - u)) \in V_A^{00}$ . Hence

$$\bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}} = \left( \bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}} \setminus \text{Span}(A) \right) \cup \left( \text{Span}(A) \cap \bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \in A^{n-1}} V_{\mathbf{a}} \right) \subseteq V_A^{00}.$$

□

In particular, for any sets  $A_1, \dots, A_n \subseteq \mathbb{M}$  we have

$$V_{A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n}^\infty = \bigcap_{i \in [n]} V_{A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_{i-1} \cup A_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup A_n}^\infty,$$

— a strong form of Theorem 5.9 is satisfied without any additional assumptions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A Abd-Aldaim, G Conant, and C Terry. Higher arity stability and the functional order property. *Preprint, arXiv:2305.13111*, 2023.
- [2] Hans Adler. An introduction to theories without the independence property. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 5, 2008.
- [3] Hans Adler. Thorn-forking as local forking. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 9(01):21–38, 2009.
- [4] John Baldwin and Michael Benedikt. Stability theory, permutations of indiscernibles, and embedded finite models. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 352(11):4937–4969, 2000.
- [5] Andreas Baudisch. Mekler’s construction preserves CM-triviality. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 115(1-3):115–173, 2002.
- [6] Itai Ben Yaacov and Artem Chernikov. An independence theorem for  $NTP_2$  theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 79(1):135–153, 2014.
- [7] Itay Ben-Yaacov. Simplicity in compact abstract theories. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 3(02):163–191, 2003.
- [8] Arthur Bik, Alessandro Danelon, and Andrew Snowden. Isogeny classes of cubic spaces. *Preprint, arXiv:2207.13951*, 2022.
- [9] Blaise Boissonneau. NIPn CHIPS. *Preprint, arXiv:2401.04697*, 2024.
- [10] Enrique Casanovas. *Simple theories and hyperimaginaries*. Number 39. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [11] Gregory L Cherlin and Ehud Hrushovski. *Finite structures with few types*. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [12] Artem Chernikov and Nadja Hempel. Mekler’s construction and generalized stability. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 230:745–769, 2019.
- [13] Artem Chernikov and Nadja Hempel. On n-dependent groups and fields II. *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, 9:e38, 2021.
- [14] Artem Chernikov, Byunghan Kim, and Nicholas Ramsey. Transitivity, lowness, and ranks in  $NSOP_1$  theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 88(3):919–946, 2023.
- [15] Artem Chernikov, Daniel Palacin, and Kota Takeuchi. On n-dependence. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 60(2):195–214, 2019.
- [16] Artem Chernikov and Nicholas Ramsey. On model-theoretic tree properties. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 16(02):1650009, 2016.
- [17] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Externally definable sets and dependent pairs II. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 367(7):5217–5235, 2015.
- [18] Artem Chernikov, Sergei Starchenko, and Margaret EM Thomas. Ramsey growth in some NIP structures. *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu*, 20(1):1–29, 2021.
- [19] Artem Chernikov and Henry Towsner. Hypergraph regularity and higher arity VC-dimension. *Preprint, arXiv:2010.00726*, 2020.
- [20] Artem Chernikov and Henry Towsner. Perfect stable regularity lemma and slice-wise stable hypergraphs. *Preprint, arXiv:2402.07870*, 2024.
- [21] Annalisa Conversano and Anand Pillay. Connected components of definable groups and o-minimality I. *Advances in Mathematics*, 231(2):605–623, 2012.
- [22] Christian d’Elbée, Itay Kaplan, and Leor Neuhauser. On algebraically closed fields with a distinguished subfield. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, pages 1–43, 2024.
- [23] Christian d’Elbée, Isabel Müller, Nicholas Ramsey, and Daoud Siniora. A two-sorted theory of nilpotent Lie algebras. *Preprint, arXiv:2407.12452*, 2024.
- [24] Christian d’Elbée, Isabel Müller, Nicholas Ramsey, and Daoud Siniora. Model-theoretic properties of nilpotent groups and Lie algebras. *Journal of Algebra*, 662:640–701, 2025.
- [25] Françoise Delon. Élimination des quantificateurs dans les paires de corps algébriquement clos. *Confluentes Mathematici*, 4(2), 2012.
- [26] Jan Dobrowolski. Sets, groups, and fields definable in vector spaces with a bilinear form. In *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, volume 73, 2023.
- [27] Jan Dobrowolski, Byunghan Kim, and Nicholas Ramsey. Independence over arbitrary sets in  $NSOP_1$  theories. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 173(2):103058, 2022.
- [28] A. Pillay M. Ziegler E. Casanovas, D. Lascar. Galois groups of first order theories. *J. Math. Log.*, 1:305–319, 2001.
- [29] Shlomo Eshel and Itay Kaplan. On uniform definability of types over finite sets for NIP formulas. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 21(03):2150015, 2021.
- [30] Israel M Gelfand, Mikhail Kapranov, and Andrei Zelevinsky. *Discriminants, Resultants, and Multi-dimensional Determinants*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

- [31] Jakub Gismatullin. Model theoretic connected components of groups. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 184:251–274, 2011.
- [32] Nicolas Mark Granger. *Stability, simplicity and the model theory of bilinear forms*. University of Manchester, 1999.
- [33] Nate Harman and Andrew Snowden. Tensor spaces and the geometry of polynomial representations. *Preprint, arXiv:2407.19132*, 2024.
- [34] Nate Harman and Andrew Snowden. Ultrahomogeneous tensor spaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 443:109599, 2024.
- [35] Nadja Hempel. On  $n$ -dependent groups and fields. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 62(3):215–224, 2016.
- [36] Nigel Hitchin. Stable forms and special metrics. *Contemporary mathematics*, 288:70–89, 2001.
- [37] E Hrushovski and B Zilber. Zariski geometries. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 9(1):1–56, 1996.
- [38] Itay Kaplan and Nicholas Ramsey. On Kim-independence. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 22(5):1423–1474, 2020.
- [39] Itay Kaplan and Nicholas Ramsey. Transitivity of Kim-independence. *Advances in Mathematics*, 379:107573, 2021.
- [40] Itay Kaplan, Nicholas Ramsey, and Saharon Shelah. Local character of Kim-independence. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 147(4):1719–1732, 2019.
- [41] David Kazhdan and Tamar Ziegler. Properties of high rank subvarieties of affine spaces. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 30(4):1063–1096, 2020.
- [42] Charlotte Kestner and Nicholas Ramsey. Some model theory of quadratic geometries. *Preprint, arXiv:2408.10196*, 2024.
- [43] Byunghan Kim. *Simple first order theories*. University of Notre Dame, 1996.
- [44] Alex Kruckman and Nicholas Ramsey. A New Kim’s lemma. *Model Theory*, 3(3):825–860, 2024.
- [45] Krzysztof Krupiński and Anand Pillay. Amenability, definable groups, and automorphism groups. *Advances in Mathematics*, 345:1253–1299, 2019.
- [46] Michael C Laskowski. Vapnik-Chervonenkis classes of definable sets. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(2):377–384, 1992.
- [47] Elad Levi. Indiscernible arrays and rational functions with algebraic constraint. *Preprint, arXiv:1506.07489*, 2015.
- [48] David Marker. *Model theory: an introduction*, volume 217. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [49] Yury A Neretin. Oligomorphic groups and ultrahomogeneous cubic spaces over finite fields. *Preprint, arXiv:2308.13247*, 2023.
- [50] Lynn Scow. Indiscernibles, EM-types, and Ramsey classes of trees. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 56(3):429–447, 2015.
- [51] Saharon Shelah. Classification theory for elementary classes with the dependence property—a modest beginning. *Sci. Math. Jpn.*, 59:265–316.
- [52] Saharon Shelah. Minimal bounded index subgroup for dependent theories. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 136(3):1087–1091, 2008.
- [53] Saharon Shelah. Strongly dependent theories. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 204(1):1–83, 2014.
- [54] Saharon Shelah. Definable groups for dependent and 2-dependent theories. *Sarajevo J. Math.*, 13(25)(1):3–25, 2017.
- [55] Caroline Terry and Julia Wolf. Higher-order generalizations of stability and arithmetic regularity. *Preprint, arXiv:2111.01739*, 2021.
- [56] Caroline Terry and Julia Wolf. Irregular triads in 3-uniform hypergraphs. *Preprint, arXiv:2111.01737*, 2021.
- [57] Frank Olaf Wagner. *Simple theories*, volume 260. Springer, 2000.
- [58] Martin Ziegler. *Introduction to the Lascar group*, volume 291 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Tits buildings and the model theory of groups edition, 1998.