

RESIDUALLY CONSTRUCTIBLE EXTENSIONS

PIETRO FRENI AND ANGUS MATTHEWS

ABSTRACT. Let T be an o-minimal theory expanding RCF and T_{convex} be the common theory of its models expanded by predicate for a non-trivial T -convex valuation ring. We call an elementary extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*) \models T_{\text{convex}}$ *res-constructible* if there is a tuple \bar{s} in \mathcal{O}_* such that the projection $\mathbf{res}(\bar{s})$ of \bar{s} in the residue field sort is dcl-independent over the residue field $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ of $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$. We study factorization properties of res-constructible extensions. Our main result is that a res-constructible extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ has the property that all $(\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ with $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ are res-constructible over $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$, if and only if \mathbb{E}_* has countable dimension over \mathbb{E} or the value group $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ contains no uncountable well-ordered subset. This analysis entails complete answers to [9, Problem 5.12].

1. INTRODUCTION

Let T be a complete o-minimal L -theory expanding the theory RCF of real closed fields in some language L containing the language of ordered rings. There has been significant work on this class of theories; for example T could be the theory T_{exp} of the field of reals expanded by the natural exponential function ([11]) or the theory $T_{\text{an,exp}}$ of the reals expanded by the natural exponential and all restricted analytic functions ([4]).

Recall from [3, (2.7)], that a T -convex valuation subring \mathcal{O} of a model $\mathbb{E} \models T$ is a convex subring closed under all continuous \emptyset -definable functions $f : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$.

By results of van den Dries and Lewenberg [3, (3.10), (3.13), (3.14)], the common theory T_{convex} in the language $L_{\text{convex}} := L \cup \{\mathcal{O}\}$ of all models of T expanded by a unary predicate \mathcal{O} interpreted as a non-trivial T -convex valuation ring, is complete and weakly o-minimal.

Results of [3], [1], and [10] entail that if T is power bounded with field of exponents Λ , then for every elementary extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*) \models T_{\text{convex}}$ one can find a dcl_T -basis of \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} of the form $(\bar{r}, \bar{v}, \bar{e})$ where:

- (1) \bar{r} is a tuple in \mathcal{O}_* such that the projection $\mathbf{res}(\bar{r})$ of \bar{r} in the residue field $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ is dcl_T -independent over the residue field $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E})$ of $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$;
- (2) \bar{v} is a tuple in \mathbb{E}_* such that $\mathbf{v}(\bar{v})$ is Λ -linearly independent over the value group $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E})$ of \mathbb{E} ;
- (3) $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is an immediate extension of $(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}, \bar{v} \rangle, \mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}, \bar{v} \rangle)$, where $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}, \bar{v} \rangle := \text{dcl}(\mathbb{E}, \bar{r}, \bar{v})$.

Even when T is not power bounded, we will call tuples as \bar{r} in item (1) above \mathcal{O}_* -*res-constructions* over \mathbb{E} (Definition 14). In this paper we will be concerned with

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 03C64; Secondary 12J10 12J15.

Key words and phrases. model theory, o-minimality, valued fields, residually constructible extensions, pseudocompletions, weakly immediate types.

The second author's work was supported by EPSRC DTP 2224 [EP/W524372/1].

res-constructible elementary extensions of models of T_{convex} , that is, elementary extensions $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*) \succeq (\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ such that for some \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction $\bar{\tau}$ over \mathbb{E} , $\mathbb{E}_* = \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{\tau} \rangle$.

Specific instances of res-constructible extensions were considered in [9]: more precisely a res-constructible extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ such that the underlying residue field extension $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is a Cauchy-completion, is exactly a *pseudo-completion* of \mathbb{E} with respect to $\{\mathcal{O}\}$ in the sense of [9, Def. 4.2].

After showing that pseudo-completions are unique up to isomorphisms but admit non-surjective self-embeddings, Tressl in [9, Problem 5.12] asks whether given $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}', \mathcal{O}') \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ such that \mathbb{E}_* and \mathbb{E}' are pseudo-completions of \mathbb{E} with respect to $\{\mathcal{O}\}$, one has that necessarily \mathbb{E}_1 is also a pseudo-completion of \mathbb{E} with respect to $\{\mathcal{O}\}$.

In this paper we will study the more general question of whether res-constructible extensions are closed under taking right-factors, i.e. whether (or rather more appropriately “when”) given a composition of elementary extensions $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ of models of T -convex such that the composite extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is res-constructible, one can deduce that $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ is also res-constructible. We show that in general res-constructible extensions are not closed under right factors and give a complete characterization of those res-constructible extensions $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ all of whose right-factors $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ are res-constructible.

Theorem A. *Suppose $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is res-constructible. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbb{E}_*/\mathbb{E})$ is countable or the value group $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ of $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ contains no uncountable ordinal;
- (2) for all $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$, the extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ is res-constructible;
- (3) for all $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$, with $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) = \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$, the extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ is res-constructible.

This implies that the answer to [9, Problem 5.12] is affirmative if and only if the value group $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ does not contain uncountable ordinals or $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ has a Cauchy-completion of countable dcl-dimension (Section 4).

We will now spend some words about the proof of the main implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) of Theorem A.

It is not hard to show that if $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is res-constructible, then for any intermediate $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_1 \preceq \mathbb{E}_*$, such that $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbb{E}_1/\mathbb{E}) < \aleph_0$, one has that $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}_1)$ and $(\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}_1) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ are both res-constructible extensions (Corollary 21). This easily entails that even if $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbb{E}_1/\mathbb{E}) = \aleph_0$, one has that $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}_1)$ is res-constructible however it is also not hard to show that $(\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}_1) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ doesn't need to be res-constructible anymore.

We will prove (1) \Rightarrow (2) of Theorem A by building a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction \bar{s} for \mathbb{E}_1 over \mathbb{E} as an ordinal indexed sequence $\bar{s} := (s_i : i < \lambda)$. By the already mentioned Corollary 21 about factors with finite dimension, the main problem in the transfinite construction of \bar{s} is at limit steps: in fact it may happen that even if \mathbb{E}_1 was res-constructible over \mathbb{E} , for some \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction, say $(s_i : i < \omega)$, it is not anymore res-constructible over $\mathbb{E}\langle s_i : i < \omega \rangle$. This difficulty will be overcome by setting up the induction so that at each limit step the res-construction $(s_i : i < \omega \cdot \alpha)$ satisfies both a model theoretic orthogonality condition and a closure condition (Definition 25) relative to a given \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction \bar{r} of \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} .

Subsequent to proving Theorem A, in Section 4, we will turn to [9, Problem 5.12], and give a complete answer, dependent on the properties of \mathbb{E}_* . We will also show that in the power-bounded setting, this dependence can be reduced to considering properties of \mathbb{E} .

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Marcus Tressl for initially posing this problem, in a problem session in the 32nd LYMoTS. We also thank the organisers. Finally, we thank Vincenzo Mantova for many helpful discussions.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND NOTATION

In the following $T \supseteq$ RCF will be some fixed complete o-minimal theory in some language L containing the language of ordered rings. If $\mathbb{E} \models T$ and x is a tuple or a set in some $\mathbb{U} \succ \mathbb{E}$, we will denote the definable closure $\text{dcl}_T(\mathbb{E} \cup x)$ by $\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle$. Recall that this is still a model of T because T has definable Skolem functions. Also, for a subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, we will denote the convex hull of S in \mathbb{U} by $\text{CH}_{\mathbb{U}}(S) := \{x \in \mathbb{U} : \exists s_1, s_2 \in S, s_1 \leq x \leq s_2\}$.

2.1. Valuation-related notation. Given a field \mathbb{E} and a valuation ring \mathcal{O} on \mathbb{E} , we will denote by \mathfrak{o} the unique maximal ideal of \mathbb{E} . The *value group* will be denoted by $(\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}), +) := (\mathbb{E}^{\neq 0}, \cdot) / (\mathcal{O} \setminus \mathfrak{o})$ or by $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbb{E}$. The *valuation* will be the quotient $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}} : \mathbb{E}^{\neq 0} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$, and will be extended to the whole \mathbb{E} by setting $\mathbf{v}(0) = \infty$. The value group will be ordered as usual by setting $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})^{\geq 0} := \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{O}^{\neq 0})$. The associated *dominance*, *weak asymptotic equivalence*, *strict dominance*, and *strict asymptotic equivalence* on \mathbb{E} will be denoted respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned} x \preceq y &\iff \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(x) \geq \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(y) \iff x/y \in \mathcal{O}; \\ x \asymp y &\iff \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(x) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(y) \iff x/y \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \mathfrak{o}; \\ x \prec y &\iff \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(x) > \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(y) \iff x/y \in \mathfrak{o}; \\ x \sim y &\iff x - y \prec x \iff 1 - x/y \in \mathfrak{o}. \end{aligned}$$

The imaginary sort given by the quotient under the strict asymptotic equivalence \sim will be called *rv-sort* and denoted by $\mathbf{rv}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) := (\mathbb{E}^{\neq 0}, \cdot) / (1 + \mathfrak{o})$ or $\mathbf{rv}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$, the quotient map will be denoted by $\mathbf{rv}_{\mathcal{O}} : \mathbb{E}^{\neq 0} \rightarrow \mathbf{rv}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$.

Finally the *residue field* sort will be denoted by $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) := \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{o}$ and the corresponding quotient map by $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}} : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$. We extend $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}$ to a total function $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ by setting $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}$ to be 0 outside of \mathcal{O} .

The subscript \mathcal{O} will be omitted when this does not create ambiguity.

2.2. Main facts on T -convex valuations. Recall that if $\mathbb{E} \models T$, a subset $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ is said to be a *T -convex subring* when it is order-convex and closed under \emptyset -definable continuous total unary functions ([3]).

Fact 1 (van den Dries and Lewenberg [3]). *Let $\mathbb{U} \succeq \mathbb{E} \models T$ and let $\mathcal{O}' \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ and $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ be T -convex subrings with $\mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E} = \mathcal{O}$. If $x \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \mathbb{E}$, then $\mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle \in \{\mathcal{O}_x, \mathcal{O}_x^-\}$ where*

$$\mathcal{O}_x := \{y \in \mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle : y < \mathbb{E}^{>\mathcal{O}}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}_x^- := \text{CH}_{\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle}(\mathcal{O}).$$

Definition 2. Let $L_{\text{convex}} := L \cup \{\mathcal{O}\}$ be the language L expanded by a unary predicate \mathcal{O} and let T_{convex}^- be the common theory in L_{convex} of all expansions $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ of models of T where \mathcal{O} is interpreted as a T -convex subring. Let T_{convex} be the theory $T_{\text{convex}}^- \cup \{\exists x \notin \mathcal{O}\}$.

Fact 3 (van den Dries and Lewenberg [3]). *The theory T_{convex} is complete and weakly o-minimal. Moreover if T is universally axiomatized and eliminates quantifiers, then T_{convex} eliminates quantifiers.*

Remark 4. Notice that if T^{def} is the expansion by definition of T to the language L^{def} with a symbol for every T -definable function, then T is model complete (in fact it is universally axiomatized and eliminates quantifiers). In particular Fact 3 implies that if $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \models T_{\text{convex}}$ and $\mathbb{E} \succeq \mathbb{E}' \models T$ is such that $\mathbb{E}' \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}$, then $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \succeq (\mathbb{E}', \mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E}')$.

Definition 5. An elementary substructure $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{E} \models T$ is said to be *tame* or *definably Dedekind-complete* (denoted $\mathbb{K} \preceq_{\text{tame}} \mathbb{E}$) if for all \mathbb{E} -definable $S \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, if $S \cap \mathbb{K}$ is bounded in \mathbb{K} , then it has a supremum in \mathbb{K} . If $\mathbb{K} \preceq_{\text{tame}} \mathbb{E}$, then there is a unique function $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}} : \text{CH}_{\mathbb{E}}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ with the property that $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}}(x) - x < \mathbb{K}^{>0}$ for all $x \in \text{CH}_{\mathbb{E}}(\mathbb{K})$.

Fact 6 (Marker and Steinhorn [7]). $\mathbb{K} \preceq_{\text{tame}} \mathbb{E}$ if and only if whenever c is a tuple of \mathbb{E} then $\text{tp}(c/\mathbb{K})$ is definable

It is not hard to see that given a T -convex subring $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{E} \models T$, there is $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{E}$ maximal in $\{\mathbb{K}' \preceq \mathbb{E} : \mathbb{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{O}\}$.

Fact 7 (van den Dries [1], van den Dries and Lewenberg [3]). *If $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \models T_{\text{convex}}^-$, then the following are equivalent for $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{E}$:*

- (1) \mathbb{K} is maximal in $\{\mathbb{K}' \preceq \mathbb{E} : \mathbb{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{O}\}$;
- (2) $\mathbb{K} \preceq_{\text{tame}} \mathbb{E}$ and $\text{CH}(\mathbb{K}) = \mathcal{O}$;
- (3) $\mathfrak{o} \cap \mathbb{K} = \{0\}$ and $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}} : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ induces an isomorphism between the induced structure on the imaginary sort $\text{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ and \mathbb{K} .

Proof. See [3, 2.12] for the equivalence of (1) and (2). The equivalence of (2) and (3) is instead in [1, 1.13]. \square

Definition 8. We call $\mathbb{K} \prec \mathbb{E}$ an *elementary residue-section* for $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ when the equivalent conditions of Fact 7 hold.

Fact 9 (van den Dries and Lewenberg (5.3) in [3]). *Suppose $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle, \mathcal{O}') \models T_{\text{convex}}$, then $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle, \mathcal{O}') / \text{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})) \leq 1$.*

2.3. Cuts and T -convex valuations. Let $(\mathbb{U}, \mathcal{O}) \models T_{\text{convex}}$ and $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{U} \models T$.

Definition 10. We call an element $x \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \mathbb{E}$:

- (1) *weakly \mathcal{O} -immediate* (or *\mathcal{O} -wim*) over \mathbb{E} if $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(x - \mathbb{E})$ has no maximum;
- (2) *\mathcal{O} -residual* over \mathbb{E} if $x \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(x) \notin \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$;
- (3) *\mathcal{O} -purely valational* over \mathbb{E} if $\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle \setminus \mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E} + M$ for some $M \subseteq \mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle$ such that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(M) \cap \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \emptyset$.

Furthermore we will say that x is *weakly \mathcal{O} -immediately generated* (or *\mathcal{O} -wim generated*) over \mathbb{E} if $\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle y \rangle$ for some weakly \mathcal{O} -immediate x . Similarly we will say that x is *\mathcal{O} -residually generated* over \mathbb{E} if $\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle y \rangle$ for some residual y .

Remark 11. An element $x \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \mathbb{E}$ is *weakly immediate* over \mathbb{E} , if and only if for every $c \in \mathbb{E}$, $\mathbf{rv}_{\mathcal{O}}(x - c) \in \mathbf{rv}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$.

Fact 12 (see Thm. 3.10 in [6]). *For every $x \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \mathbb{E}$ only one of the following holds:*

- (1) x is \mathcal{O} -wim-generated;

- (2) x is \mathcal{O} -residually generated;
- (3) x is \mathcal{O} -purely valational.

In particular if x is \mathcal{O} -residually generated over \mathbb{E} , then $\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle$ does not contain elements that are \mathcal{O} -wim over \mathbb{E} .

Recall from [8, Sec. 1] that if \mathbb{E} is an o-minimal expansion of a field, then a *power-function* of \mathbb{E} is a definable endomorphism of $(\mathbb{E}^{>0}, \cdot)$; by o-minimality a *power-function* $\theta : \mathbb{E}^{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^{>0}$ is always monotone and differentiable, its *exponent* λ is then defined $\theta'(1)$ and $\theta(x)$ is usually written as x^λ .

Also recall that the exponents of (the power-functions of) \mathbb{E} always form a subfield of \mathbb{E} and recall from [8, Thm. 3.6] that for every complete o-minimal theory T exactly one of the following holds:

- T is *power bounded*: for every model $\mathbb{E} \models T$, all power functions of \mathbb{E} are \emptyset -definable and all \mathbb{E} -definable total unary functions are eventually bounded by some power-function;
- T is *exponential*: for every model $\mathbb{E} \models T$, there is a T -definable ordered group isomorphism $\exp : (\mathbb{E}, +, <) \rightarrow (\mathbb{E}^{>0}, \cdot, <)$ such that $\exp'(0) = 0$.

When T is power-bounded a stronger version of Fact 12 holds: this is known as the *residue-valuation property* or *rv-property* of power-bounded o-minimal theories.

Fact 13 (Tyne [10], van den Dries and Speissegger [5]). *If T is power bounded with field of exponents Λ , then for every $x \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \mathbb{E}$, only one of the following holds*

- (1) x is \mathcal{O} -wim;
- (2) there are $c, d \in \mathbb{E}^{\neq 0}$ such that $\mathbf{res}(d(x - c)) \notin \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$;
- (3) there is $c \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}\langle x \rangle) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) + \Lambda \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(x - c)$.

3. MAIN RESULTS

3.1. Res-constructible extensions. We recall the definition of res-constructible extension from the introduction and give some of its basic properties.

Definition 14. Let $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_* \models T$ and let \mathcal{O}_* be a non-trivial T -convex subring of \mathbb{E}_* . A possibly infinite tuple $\overline{y} := (y_i : i \in I)$ in \mathcal{O}_* will be called a *\mathcal{O}_* -res-construction* over \mathbb{E} if $(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(y_i) : i \in I)$ is dcl_T -independent over $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$. We then call the extension $\mathbb{E}\langle y_i : i \in I \rangle$ of \mathbb{E} *\mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible* over \mathbb{E} (by the res-construction $(y_i : i \in I)$). When \mathcal{O}_* is clear from the context we will just say *res-construction* and *res-constructible*. We call an extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*) \models T_{\text{convex}}$ *residually constructible* (*res-constructible* for short) when \mathbb{E}_* is \mathcal{O}_* -res constructible over \mathbb{E} .

Remark 15. Notice that if $\overline{y} := (y_i : i \in I)$ is a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction over \mathbb{E} , then it is in particular dcl_T -independent over \mathbb{E} . This is because by Fact 9, for all finite $F \subseteq I$, $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}\langle y_i : i \in F \rangle) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})(\mathbf{res}(y_i) : i \in F)$.

Remark 16. Res-constructible extension are transitive (i.e. closed under composition): if $(\mathbb{E}_0, \mathcal{O}_0) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ and $(\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ are res-constructible, then $(\mathbb{E}_0, \mathcal{O}_0) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ is res-constructible as well.

Remark 17. In the same setting of Definition 14, let λ be an ordinal, and $(y_i : i < \lambda)$ a λ -indexed sequence in \mathcal{O}_* . Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) $(y_i : i < \lambda)$ is a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction over \mathbb{E} ;
- (2) for all $i < \lambda$, we have $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(y_i) \in \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle y_j : j < i + 1 \rangle) \setminus \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(\mathbb{E}\langle y_j : j < i \rangle)$.

In particular, by Fact 9, for an extension $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ to be res-constructible, it is enough that for some dcl_T -basis B of \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} , there is an ordinal indexing $(b_i : i < \alpha)$ of B such that for all $i < \alpha$, one has $\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_j : j < i \rangle) \neq \text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_j : j < i + 1 \rangle)$.

Lemma 18. *If $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is res-constructible by the ordinal indexed res-construction $(y_i : i < \lambda)$, and \mathbb{K} is an elementary residue section of $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$, then $\mathbb{K}\langle y_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ is an elementary residue section of $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$.*

Proof. Notice that by Fact 7 (3) it suffices to show that $\text{res}(\mathbb{K}\langle y_i : i < \lambda \rangle) = \text{res}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$. Proceed by induction on λ . Let $\lambda = \beta + 1$ and suppose the thesis holds for β , so assume that $\mathbb{K}\langle y_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ is an elementary residue section of $(\mathbb{E}\langle y_i : i < \beta \rangle, \mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}\langle y_i : i < \beta \rangle)$. Since by Fact 9 we must then have $\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle y_i : j < \lambda \rangle) = \text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle y_i : j < \beta \rangle)\langle \text{res}(y_\beta) \rangle$, we deduce by Fact 7 that $\text{res}(\mathbb{K}\langle y_i : i < \lambda \rangle) = \text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle y_i : j < \lambda \rangle)$.

Suppose instead that λ is a limit ordinal and the thesis holds for each $\beta < \lambda$. If $x \in \mathbb{E}_*$, then since λ is a limit ordinal, there is $\beta < \lambda$ such that $x \in \mathbb{E}\langle y_i : i < \beta \rangle$ and hence by inductive hypothesis $\text{res}(x) \in \text{res}(\mathbb{K}\langle y_i : i < \beta \rangle) \subseteq \text{res}(\mathbb{K}\langle y_i : i < \lambda \rangle)$. \square

The isomorphism type of a res-constructible extension only depends on the isomorphism type of the residue field extension $\text{res}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*) \succeq \text{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$.

Lemma 19. *If $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ and $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ are res-constructible extensions and $\varphi : \text{res}(\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \rightarrow \text{res}(\mathbb{E}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ is an isomorphism of models of T over $\text{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$, then there is an isomorphism $\psi : (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbb{E}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ over \mathbb{E} such that $\text{res}(\psi) = \varphi$.*

Proof. Let \mathbb{K} be an elementary residue-section of $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ and $(y_i : i < \lambda)$, $(z_i : i < \mu)$ be res-construction for \mathbb{E}_1 and \mathbb{E}_2 . Thus $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{K}\langle \bar{d} \rangle$ where \bar{d} is a tuple such that $\text{tp}(\bar{d}/\mathbb{K})$ is definable. By Lemma 18, $\mathbb{K}_1 := \mathbb{K}\langle y_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathbb{K}_2 := \mathbb{K}\langle z_i : i < \mu \rangle$ are elementary residue sections for $(\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ and $(\mathbb{E}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ respectively and moreover $\mathbb{E}_1 = \mathbb{K}_1\langle \bar{d} \rangle$ and $\mathbb{E}_2 = \mathbb{K}_2\langle \bar{d} \rangle$. Now observe that φ induces an isomorphism $h : \mathbb{K}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_2$ over \mathbb{K} . Finally notice that for both $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, $\text{tp}(\bar{d}/\mathbb{K}_i)$ is the unique definable extension of $\text{tp}(\bar{d}/\mathbb{K})$ to \mathbb{K}_i , in particular $h_* \text{tp}(\bar{d}/\mathbb{K}_1) = \text{tp}(\bar{d}/\mathbb{K}_2)$. Thus h extends to the sought isomorphism $\psi : (\mathbb{E}_1, \mathcal{O}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbb{E}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$ over \mathbb{E} . \square

Res-constructible extension only realize residually generated elements.

Lemma 20. *If $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \preceq (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is a res-constructible extension then every $x \in \mathbb{E}_* \setminus \mathbb{E}$ is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over \mathbb{E} .*

Proof. Let $(r_i : i < \alpha)$ be an ordinal-indexed res-construction for \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} . Let j be minimal such that $\text{tp}(x/\mathbb{E})$ is realized in $\mathbb{E}\langle r_i : i < j + 1 \rangle$. Thus there is $x' \in \mathbb{E}\langle r_i : i < j + 1 \rangle \setminus \mathbb{E}\langle r_i : i < j \rangle$ such that $\text{tp}(x'/\mathbb{E}) = \text{tp}(x/\mathbb{E})$. Now let $F \subseteq j$ such that $x' \in \mathbb{E}\langle r_i : i \in F \cup \{j\} \rangle$. By Fact 9 we then have

$$\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle x', r_i : i \in F \rangle) = \text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle r_i : i \in F \rangle)\langle \text{res}(r_j) \rangle.$$

In particular $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle x', r_i : i \in F \rangle)/\text{res}(\mathbb{E})) = |F| + 1$. Suppose toward contradiction that x' was not residually generated over \mathbb{E} , i.e. that $\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle x' \rangle) = \text{res}(\mathbb{E})$, then, again by Fact 9, we would have $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle x', r_i : i < F \rangle)/\text{res}(\mathbb{E})) \leq |F|$, contradiction. Thus x' is residually generated over \mathbb{E} and so also x is, because $\text{tp}(x/\mathbb{E}) = \text{tp}(x'/\mathbb{E})$. \square

Corollary 21. *If $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is a res-constructible extension and \bar{y} is a finite tuple, then \mathbb{E}_* is \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible over $\mathbb{E}\langle\bar{y}\rangle$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle\bar{y}\rangle$ is \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible over \mathbb{E} .*

Proof. It suffices to prove the case in which $\bar{y} = (y_0)$ is a single element of \mathbb{E}_* . If $y_0 \notin \mathbb{E}$, then by Lemma 20, $\mathbb{E}\langle y_0 \rangle$ is res-constructible over \mathbb{E} , say by some $r \in \mathbb{E}\langle y_0 \rangle$, such that $\mathbf{res}(r) \notin \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E})$. Let \mathbb{K} be an elementary residue section of $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ and let \mathbb{K}_* an extension of \mathbb{K} to an elementary residue section of \mathbb{E}_* such that $\mathbb{E}_* = \text{dcl}(\mathbb{E} \cup \mathbb{K}_*)$, which exists by Lemma 18. Now if \bar{s} is a dcl_T -basis of \mathbb{K}_* over $\mathbb{K}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(r) \rangle$, then \bar{s} is a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction for \mathbb{E}_* over $\mathbb{E}\langle r \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle y_0 \rangle$. In fact $\mathbf{res}(r, \bar{s}) = \mathbf{res}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(r), \bar{s})$ is dcl -independent over $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$; and since then $r \notin \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{s} \rangle$, we also have by the exchange property that $\mathbb{E}\langle r, \bar{s} \rangle = \mathbb{E}_*$. \square

Lemma 22. *Let $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \models T_{\text{convex}}$, and let x be an element of an elementary extension $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$, such that x is not residually generated over $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$. If $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ does not contain any uncountable ordinal, then there is a countable $S \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, such that $\text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(x/S) \vdash \text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(x/\mathbb{E})$.*

Proof. To show that an $x \notin \mathbb{E}$ is such that $\text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(x/S) \vdash \text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(x/\mathbb{E})$ for some countable $S \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, it is enough to show that each of $\mathbb{E}^{<x}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{<-x}$ either has countable cofinality, or is of the form $\{c \pm y : y \in \mathbb{E}, y \leq 0 \text{ or } \mathbf{v}(y) \geq v\}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{E}$, $v \in \mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E})$, and some choice of \pm . By symmetry, it suffices to check $\mathbb{E}^{<x}$. Now, if $\mathbf{v}(x - \mathbb{E}^{<x})$ has no maximum, then it is included in $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E})$ and its cofinality equals the cofinality of $\mathbb{E}^{<x}$, whence we are done by hypothesis. Suppose therefore that $\mathbf{v}(x - \mathbb{E}^{<x})$ has a maximum, and let it be achieved by $c \in \mathbb{E}$. Note that since x is not residually generated, $\mathbf{v}(x - c) \notin \mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E})$. Consider $\{\mathbf{v}(y) : y \in \mathbb{E}, 0 < y < x - c\}$. If this has no minimum, then it has countable cofinality, so $\mathbb{E}^{<x} = c + \mathbb{E}^{<x-c}$ has countable cofinality. If it has a minimum, say v , then, since $v \in \mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E})$, $v > \mathbf{v}(x - c)$. Thus, for all $y \in \mathbb{E}$, we have that $c + y < x$ iff $y \leq 0$ or $\mathbf{v}(y) \geq v$, which is precisely the second possibility. \square

In Section 4 we will need the following two easy facts about res-constructible extensions with respect to different T -convex valuations.

Lemma 23. *Let $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{U} \models T$ and let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}'$ be T -convex valuation subrings of \mathbb{U} . If \bar{x} is a \mathcal{O} -res-construction over \mathbb{E} then \bar{x} is also an \mathcal{O}' -res-construction over \mathbb{E} and $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\bar{x})$ is a $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathcal{O})$ -res construction over $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$.*

Proof. Notice that $V := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathcal{O})$ is a T -convex valuation subring of $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{U})$ and that $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}$ factors through $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}$ as $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}} = \pi \circ \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}$ where π is in fact \mathbf{res}_V . Now suppose that $\bar{x} := (x_i : i \in I)$ is such that $(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(x_i) : i \in I)$ is dcl -independent over $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$. It then follows from Remark 15 that $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\bar{x})$ is independent over $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$ because $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\bar{x}) = \pi(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\bar{x}))$ is dcl_T -independent. \square

Corollary 24. *Let $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{U} \models T$, $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}'$ be T -convex valuation subrings of \mathbb{U} , and $y \in \mathbb{U} \setminus \mathbb{E}$. If y is \mathcal{O} -residually generated, then it is \mathcal{O}' -residually generated.*

3.2. Right factors of res-constructible extensions. This subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem A, which will result as a wrap-up of Theorems 35 and 36. Throughout this subsection we fix a res-constructible extension $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*) \succeq (\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ of model of T_{convex} and let \bar{r} be a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction for \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} . We also let \mathbb{E}_1 an intermediate extension $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_1 \preceq \mathbb{E}_*$.

Definition 25. Let $\mathbb{K} \preceq_{\text{tame}} \mathbb{E}$ be a residue section for $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O})$ and $\mathbb{K}_* := \mathbb{K}\langle \bar{\tau} \rangle$, thus \mathbb{K}_* is an elementary residue section for $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ by Lemma 18. We will say that a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction \bar{x} in \mathbb{E}_1 over \mathbb{E} is

- (1) \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonal in \mathbb{E}_1 if $\text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})/\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle) \vdash \text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})/\mathbb{E}_1)$;
- (2) \mathbb{K}_* -strong in \mathbb{E}_1 (notation $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$) if it is \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonal in \mathbb{E}_1 , and $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle = \mathbb{E}_1 \cap \mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}) \rangle$.

Lemma 26. *Let $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$, and suppose $\psi : (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*) \rightarrow (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is an elementary self-embedding fixing $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})$ and \mathbb{E} elementwise. Then $\psi(\bar{x}) \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \psi(\mathbb{E}_1)$.*

Proof. Since $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$, then $\bar{x} \subset \mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}) \rangle$. Thus, ψ also fixes \bar{x} elementwise. This implies that $\psi(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})) = \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\psi(\bar{x}))$. Then, by applying the elementarity of ψ and the fact that x is \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonal in \mathbb{E}_1 , we deduce that

$$\text{tp}(\psi(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}))/\psi(\mathbb{E}\langle \psi(\bar{x}) \rangle)) \vdash \text{tp}(\psi(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}))/\psi(\mathbb{E}_1)).$$

Applying $\psi(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})) = \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\psi(\bar{x}))$ yields that $\psi(\bar{x})$ is \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonal in $\psi(\mathbb{E}_1)$. Finally observe that $\mathbb{E}\langle \psi(\bar{x}) \rangle = \psi(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle) = \psi(\mathbb{E}_1) \cap \psi(\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}) \rangle) = \psi(\mathbb{E}_1) \cap \mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\psi(\bar{x})) \rangle$. \square

Lemma 27. *Let \bar{x} be a \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonal \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction in \mathbb{E}_1 and \bar{y} a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction in \mathbb{E}_1 over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$. If $z \in \mathbb{E}_1$ is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \bar{y} \rangle$ then it is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$.*

Proof. Notice that $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \bar{y} \rangle) = \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle) \subseteq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_1)$. Suppose that z is residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \bar{y} \rangle$. Then there is a finite subtuple \bar{s} of $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})$ and a $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{y} \rangle$ -definable function f such that $\mathbf{res}(f(\bar{s}, z)) \notin \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \bar{y} \rangle)$. However $\mathbf{res}(f(\bar{s}, z)) = \mathbf{res}(a)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{E}_1$ and by \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonality of \bar{x} in \mathbb{E}_1 , we have $\text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(s/\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle) \vdash \mathbf{res}(f(\bar{s}, z)) = \mathbf{res}(a)$. But then there is a L_{convex} -formula $\varphi(\bar{s})$ with parameters from $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$ such that $\varphi(\bar{s}) \vdash \mathbf{res}(f(\bar{s}, z)) = \mathbf{res}(a)$. Taking \bar{s}' in $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$ such that $(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle, \mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle) \models \varphi(\bar{s}')$ we thus get $\mathbf{res}(f(\bar{s}', z)) = \mathbf{res}(a) = \mathbf{res}(f(\bar{s}, z))$, whence z is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$. \square

Lemma 28. *Let $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$ and let \bar{y} be a finite res-construction in \mathbb{E}_1 over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$. Then every $z \in \mathbb{E}_1 \setminus \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$ is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$.*

Proof. Let $\bar{\tau}'$ be a completion of $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ to a dcl_T -basis of \mathbb{K}_* . Set $\psi(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{y})) := \bar{y}$, $\psi(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})) := \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})$ and $\psi_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{\tau}') = \bar{\tau}'$. Notice that ψ extends to an elementary self-embedding of $(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ over \mathbb{E} and that it fixes $\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \bar{\tau}' \rangle$ which has finite codimension in \mathbb{E}_* , therefore ψ is an automorphism. By Lemma 26, we have $\psi^{-1}(\bar{x}) \triangleleft_{\psi^{-1}(\mathbb{K}_*)} \psi^{-1}(\mathbb{E}_1)$. Moreover $\psi^{-1}(z) \in \psi^{-1}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ must be residual over $\psi^{-1}(\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \bar{y} \rangle) = \mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{y}) \rangle$ whence by Lemma 27 it is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over $\psi^{-1}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle)$. Applying ψ finally yields that z is \mathcal{O}_* -residual over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$. \square

As a Corollary of Lemma 28, we get that if $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$, then for all \mathbb{E}_0 such that $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle \preceq \mathbb{E}_0 \preceq \mathbb{E}_1$ and $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbb{E}_0/\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle) \leq \aleph_0$, we have that \mathbb{E}_0 is \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$. We give a more precise statement of this.

Corollary 29. *Suppose that $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$ and $\bar{y} := (y_i : i < \alpha)$ in \mathbb{E}_1 is dcl_T -independent over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$ with $\alpha \leq \omega$. Then there is a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction $\bar{z} := (z_i : i < \alpha)$ in $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$ over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$, such that for all $n \leq \alpha$, $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, x_i : i < n \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, y_i : i < n \rangle$.*

Proof. By induction, using Lemma 28, we can build a \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction $(z_i : i < \alpha)$ over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$ such that for all $n < \alpha$, we have $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, z_i : i < n \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, y_i : i < n \rangle$. \square

\mathbb{K}_* -strong res-constructions are closed under directed unions.

Lemma 30. *Let $\bar{x} := (x_i : i \in I)$ be family of elements in $\mathcal{O}_* \cap \mathbb{E}_1$. If for all finite $F \subseteq I$, $\bar{x}_F := (x_i : i \in F) \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$, then $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$.*

Proof. The fact that \bar{x} is a \mathcal{O}_* -res/construction follows from the finite character of dcl_T -independence. Similarly, that \bar{x} is \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonal follows from the fact that every formula in $\text{tp}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x})/\mathbb{E}_1)$ is in fact in some $\text{tp}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}_F)/\mathbb{E}_1)$ for some finite $F \subseteq I$. Finally $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle = \bigcup_F \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}_F \rangle = \mathbb{E}_1 \cap \bigcup_F \mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}) \rangle$, where in the unions F ranges among the finite subsets of I . \square

Lemma 31. *Suppose that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ contains no uncountable well ordered set and $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbb{K}_*$. Let $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_0 \preceq \mathbb{E}_1$ and \bar{y} be a finite \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction in \mathbb{E}_1 over \mathbb{E}_0 . Then there is a countable tuple \bar{z} in \mathbb{E}_1 such that $\text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{y})/\mathbb{E}_0(\bar{z})) \vdash \text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{y})/\mathbb{E}_1)$.*

Proof. Notice that we can reduce to the case in which y is a single residual element. Let $s = \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(y)$. We can assume that $s \notin \mathbb{E}_1$ for otherwise the thesis is trivial. Since $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbb{K}_*$, s is not residually generated over \mathbb{E}_1 , so the thesis follows from the fact that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ contains no uncountable well ordered subset and from Lemma 22. \square

Proposition 32. *Let $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$ and let B be a dcl_T -basis of \mathbb{E}_1 over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$. Suppose that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ contains no uncountable ordinal and that $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbb{K}_*$. If B is infinite, then every $b_0 \in B$ extends to a countable sequence $(b_i : i < \omega)$ in B such that there is $\bar{x}' := (x'_i : i < \omega)$ with $(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, x'_i : i < n \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, b_i : i < n \rangle$ for all $n \leq \omega$.*

Proof. Consider functions $f, g : [B]^{<\aleph_0} \rightarrow [B]^{<\aleph_1}$ defined as follows.

- given a finite subset $S \subseteq B$, let S' be a dcl_T -basis of $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, S \rangle)$ over $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle)$. Set $f(S)$ to be a countable subset of B such that

$$\text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(S'/\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, f(S) \rangle) \vdash \text{tp}_{L_{\text{convex}}}(S'/\mathbb{E}_1);$$

- given a finite subset $S \subseteq B$, choose a finite $R \subseteq \mathbb{K}_*$ such that $S \subseteq \mathbb{E}\langle R \rangle$, then set $g(S)$ to be such that $R \subseteq \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, g(S) \rangle)$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), R \rangle \cap \mathbb{E}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, g(S) \rangle$ (notice that one can choose a finite such $g(S)$).

By a standard diagonalization argument, given $b_0 \in B$ there is a countable subset $\{b_i : i < \omega\}$ of B closed under f and g . Let \bar{x}' be a res-construction of $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, b_i : i < \omega \rangle$ over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$. To see it is \mathbb{K}_* -orthogonal notice that $\text{tp}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}')/\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{x}' \rangle) \vdash \text{tp}(\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}')/\mathbb{E}_1)$ by compactness and closure under f . To see it is \mathbb{K}_* -strong, notice that $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{x}' \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}') \rangle$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}), \text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\bar{x}') \rangle \cap \mathbb{E}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, \bar{x}' \rangle$ by closure under g . \square

An immediate Corollary of Proposition 32, is the following, which amounts to the first part of our main theorem, but with extra assumption on \mathbb{E}_1 that $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbb{K}_*$.

Corollary 33. *Suppose that $\bar{x} \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$, $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ contains no uncountable ordinal and $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbb{K}_*$. Then for every dcl_T -basis B of \mathbb{E}_1 over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x} \rangle$, there is an ordinal-indexing $(b_i : i < \lambda)$ of B , such that for all $i < \lambda$, $\text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, b_j : j < i \rangle) \neq \text{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, b_j : j \leq i \rangle)$.*

Proof. Using Proposition 32 and Lemma 30 one can find some ordinal α , $\bar{x}' := (x'_i : i < \alpha)$ in \mathbb{E}_1 and $(b_i : i < \alpha)$ in B , such that $\{b_i : i < \alpha\}$ is cofinite in B , $(\bar{x}, \bar{x}') \triangleleft_{\mathbb{K}_*} \mathbb{E}_1$, and for all $i \leq \alpha$, $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, x'_j : j < i \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle \bar{x}, b_j : j < i \rangle$. To conclude it suffices to invoke Corollary 29 with \bar{y} an enumeration of the finite set $B \setminus \{b_i : i < \alpha\}$. \square

We will use the following Lemma to remove the extra assumption from the above Corollary.

Lemma 34. *Let $(b_i : i < \alpha)$ be an ordinal-indexed sequence of elements of \mathbb{E}_* . Let \bar{r} be a res-construction over $\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ and suppose that for all $\beta < \alpha$, $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}, b_i : i < \beta \rangle) \neq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}, b_i : i \leq \beta \rangle)$. Then for all $\beta < \alpha$, $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \beta \rangle) \neq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i \leq \beta \rangle)$. In particular $\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ is \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible over \mathbb{E} .*

Proof. Note that if the hypotheses hold for α , they also hold for any $\alpha' < \alpha$. Therefore, by induction, we may assume the statement holds for all $\alpha' < \alpha$. If α is a limit ordinal, then there is nothing to show. Suppose thus that $\alpha = \alpha' + 1$. Notice that \bar{r} is in particular also an \mathcal{O}_* -res-construction over $\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle$, so by the inductive hypothesis $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \beta \rangle) \neq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i \leq \beta \rangle)$ for all $\beta < \alpha'$ and we only need to show that $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle) \neq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i \leq \alpha' \rangle)$, i.e. that $b_{\alpha'}$ is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle$. Notice that $b_{\alpha'}$ is \mathcal{O}_* -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}, b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle$ by hypothesis, so there is a finite $\bar{r}' \subseteq \bar{r}$, a finite $F \subseteq \alpha'$, and an \mathbb{E} -definable function f , such that $\mathbf{res}(f(\bar{r}', b_F)) \notin \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}, b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle)$. Since then $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}', b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle) / \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle)) = |\bar{r}'|$ and $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle \bar{r}', b_i : i \leq \alpha' \rangle) / \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle)) = |\bar{r}'| + 1$ it follows by a dimension argument that $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \alpha' \rangle) \neq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i \leq \alpha' \rangle)$. \square

Theorem 35. *Suppose $\mathbb{E}_* \succ \mathbb{E}$ is \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible over \mathbb{E} , $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_*}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ contains no uncountable well-order and $\mathbb{E}_* \succ \mathbb{E}_1 \succ \mathbb{E}$. Then \mathbb{E}_1 is \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible.*

Proof. Let S be a complement of $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ to a dcl-basis of \mathbb{K}_* . Set $\mathbb{E}_2 := \mathbb{E}_1\langle S \rangle$, $\mathbb{E}_0 := \mathbb{E}\langle S \rangle$ and let B be a dcl-basis of \mathbb{E}_1 over \mathbb{E} . Notice that \mathbb{E}_* is res-constructible over \mathbb{E}_0 , $\mathbb{E}_0 \prec \mathbb{E}_2 \prec \mathbb{E}_*$, $\mathbb{E}_2 = \mathbb{E}_0\langle B \rangle$, and $\text{st}_{\mathbb{K}_*}(\mathbb{E}_2) = \mathbb{K}_*$. By Corollary 33, we can find an ordinal-indexed enumeration $(b_i : i < \alpha)$ of B such that $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_0\langle b_i : i < \beta \rangle) \neq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_0\langle b_i : i \leq \beta \rangle)$ for all $\beta < \alpha$. By Lemma 34, it follows that $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i < \beta \rangle) \neq \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}\langle b_i : i \leq \beta \rangle)$ for all $\beta < \alpha$. Thus one easily sees that $\mathbb{E}_1 = \mathbb{E}\langle B \rangle$ is \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible over \mathbb{E} . \square

Theorem 36. *Suppose that $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \prec (\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_*)$ is res-constructible and such that:*

- (1) $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ contains an uncountable well ordered subset;
- (2) \mathbb{E}_* has uncountable dcl_T -dimension over \mathbb{E} .

Then there is $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{E}_1 \prec \mathbb{E}_$ such that \mathbb{E}_1 is not \mathcal{O}_* -res-constructible and moreover $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_*)$.*

Proof. By the hypothesis we can find $(s_i : i < \aleph_1)$, r and $(r_i : i < \aleph_1)$ in \mathbb{E}_* such that $\mathbf{res}(r)$, $\mathbf{res}(r_i)_{i < \aleph_1}$, $\mathbf{res}(s_i)_{i < \aleph_1}$ are a dcl_T -basis of $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ over $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E})$ and moreover $\mathbb{E}_0 := \mathbb{E}\langle s_i : i < \aleph_1 \rangle$ contains a sequence $(x_i : i < \aleph_1)$ such that $\mathbf{v}(x_i) > \mathbf{v}(x_j)$ for all $i < j$.

Set $\mathbb{F}'_i := \mathbb{E}_0\langle r + r_j x_j : j < i \rangle$. We claim that $\mathbb{F} := \mathbb{F}'_{\aleph_1}$ is not res-constructible. Suppose toward contradiction that it is: then there is a sequence $(\mathbb{F}_i)_{i < \aleph_1}$, such that

- (1) $\mathbb{E}_0 = \mathbb{F}_0 \prec \mathbb{F}_i \prec \mathbb{F}_j \prec \mathbb{F}$ for all $0 \leq i < j < \aleph_1$;
- (2) $\dim(\mathbb{F}_{i+1}/\mathbb{F}_i) = 1 = \dim(\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{F}_{i+1})/\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{F}_i))$ and $\mathbb{F}_i = \bigcup_{j < i} \mathbb{F}_{j+1}$, for all $i < \aleph_1$.

Consider the two functions $f, g : \aleph_1 \rightarrow \aleph_1$ defined respectively as

$$f(\alpha) := \min\{\beta : \mathbb{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{F}'_\beta\} \quad \text{and} \quad g(\alpha) := \min\{\beta : \mathbb{F}'_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{F}_\beta\}.$$

Notice that these are both increasing and continuous.

It follows that there is some $0 < \delta < \aleph_1$ which is a limit ordinal and a fixed point both of f and g . For such δ we have $\mathbb{F}_\delta = \mathbb{F}'_\delta$. Since by construction \mathbb{F} is res-constructible over \mathbb{F}_δ , by Lemma 20 all elements of \mathbb{F} should be residually generated over $\mathbb{F}_\delta = \mathbb{F}'_\delta$.

Notice that $r + x_\delta r_\delta \in r + x_\beta r_\beta + x_\beta \mathcal{O}_*$, thus since $r + x_\delta r_\delta$ cannot be weakly immediate over \mathbb{F}_δ (by Fact 12), it follows that there is $a \in \mathbb{F}_\delta$ such that $r + x_\delta r_\delta - a \in \bigcap_{\beta < \delta} x_\beta \mathcal{O}_*$. Now there is a finite $F \subseteq \delta$, such that $a \in \mathbb{E}_0 \langle r + r_\beta x_\beta : \beta \in F \rangle$. But now for all $\beta \in F$, $\mathbf{res}(r_\beta) = \mathbf{res}((r + r_\beta x_\beta - a)/x_\beta) \in \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_0 \langle r + r_\beta x_\beta : \beta \in F \rangle)$ and on the other hand $\mathbf{res}(r) = \mathbf{res}(a) = \mathbf{res}(r + r_\beta x_\beta) \in \mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_0 \langle r + r_\beta x_\beta : \beta \in F \rangle)$ as well, thus since $\{\mathbf{res}(r)\} \cup \{\mathbf{res}(r_\beta) : \beta \in F\}$ are independent over $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_0)$, it would follow that $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_0 \langle r + r_\beta x_\beta : \beta \in F \rangle)$ has dimension $|F| + 1$ over $\mathbf{res}(\mathbb{E}_0)$ contradicting Fact 9. \square

Proof of Theorem A. The implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) is Theorem 35, (2) \Rightarrow (3) is trivial, and finally (3) \Rightarrow (1) is Theorem 36. \square

4. APPLICATION TO TRESSL'S PSEUDO-COMPLETIONS

We recall the definition of pseudo-completion of [9], and show how our results apply to [9, Problem 5.12].

Definition 37. We call an elementary extension $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}' \models T$, *dense* if \mathbb{K} is dense in \mathbb{K}' , we call it *cofinal* if \mathbb{K} is cofinal in \mathbb{K}' . Thus a *Cauchy-completion* of some $\mathbb{K} \models T$, can be defined as an elementary extension $\mathbb{K}_* \succeq \mathbb{K}$ which is maximal among the dense elementary extensions $\mathbb{K}' \succeq \mathbb{K}$.

Remark 38. In [9, Sec. 3], what we call Cauchy-completion is called just *completion*.

Lemma 39. *Suppose that $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}'$ is a dense extension and suppose that $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{E}$ is a cofinal extension such that for all $x \in \mathbb{K}'$, $\text{tp}(x/\mathbb{K})$ is realized in \mathbb{E} . Then there is a unique elementary embedding over \mathbb{K} of \mathbb{K}' in \mathbb{E} .*

Proof. For the uniqueness, it suffices to show that for all $x \in \mathbb{K}' \setminus \mathbb{K}$, $\text{tp}(x/\mathbb{K})$ has a unique realization in \mathbb{E} . If it was not the case and $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{E}$, were distinct realizations of $\text{tp}(x/\mathbb{K})$ then since \mathbb{K} is dense in both $\mathbb{K}\langle x_0 \rangle$ and $\mathbb{K}\langle x_1 \rangle$ it would follow that $1/|x_0 - x_1| > \mathbb{K}$ contradicting the cofinality of \mathbb{K} in \mathbb{E} . To prove existence, let $(b_i : i < \alpha)$ be a dcl_T -basis of \mathbb{K}' over \mathbb{K} . To build an embedding of \mathbb{K} in to \mathbb{E} it suffices to show that for all $\beta < \alpha$, if $(c_i : i < \beta)$ is a tuple in \mathbb{E} with $(b_i : i < \beta) \equiv_{\mathbb{K}} (c_i : i < \beta)$, then we can find c_β in \mathbb{E} such that $(b_i : i \leq \beta) \equiv_{\mathbb{K}} (c_i : i \leq \beta)$. This easily follows from the fact that $\text{tp}(b_\beta/\mathbb{K}) \vdash \text{tp}(b_\beta/\mathbb{K}\langle b_i : i < \beta \rangle)$ because \mathbb{K}' is dense in \mathbb{K} . \square

Corollary 40. *The following hold:*

- (1) *if \mathbb{E} is a cofinal extension of \mathbb{K} , then there is a unique maximal dense extension of \mathbb{K} in \mathbb{E} ;*

- (2) *Cauchy-completions exist and are unique up to a unique isomorphism: if $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}'$ and $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}''$ are Cauchy-completions of \mathbb{K} , then there is a unique isomorphism $\mathbb{K}' \simeq \mathbb{K}''$ over \mathbb{K} .*

Definition 41. Let $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{U} \models T$ and \mathcal{O} a T -convex subring of \mathbb{U} . We will call an extension $\mathbb{E}_* \preceq \mathbb{U}$ of \mathbb{E} \mathcal{O} -residually dense (resp. \mathcal{O} -residually cofinal) if it is \mathcal{O} -res-constructible and moreover the extension $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) \preceq \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ is dense (resp. cofinal).

Lemma 42. *Suppose that $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}'$ are T -convex valuation subrings of \mathbb{E}_1 and let \mathbb{E}_1 be \mathcal{O} -res-constructible over \mathbb{E} . If \mathbb{E}_1 is \mathcal{O} -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E} , or if $\mathcal{O} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}'$, then \mathbb{E}_1 is \mathcal{O}' -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E} .*

Proof. We first observe that if $\mathbb{K} \prec \mathbb{K}_1 \models T$, V is a non-trivial T -convex valuation ring of \mathbb{K}_1 , and \mathbb{K}_1 is V -res-constructible over \mathbb{K} , then \mathbb{K} is cofinal in \mathbb{K}_1 . In fact if there was $t \in \mathbb{K}_1$ such that $t > \mathbb{K}$, then t is V -purely valutional over \mathbb{K} so by Fact 12 t is not V -residually generated, contradicting Lemma 20.

Now let \bar{r} be an \mathcal{O} -res-construction of \mathbb{E}_1 over \mathbb{E} , then by Lemma 23, it is also a \mathcal{O}' -res construction and $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\bar{r})$ is a $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathcal{O})$ -res-construction for $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ over $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$. In particular \mathbb{E}_1 is \mathcal{O}' -res-constructible over \mathbb{E} and $\mathbb{K}_1 := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ is $V := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathcal{O})$ -res-constructible over $\mathbb{K} := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$. Thus to conclude we only need to show that \mathbb{K} is cofinal in \mathbb{K}_1 .

If $\mathcal{O}' \neq \mathcal{O}$, then $V \neq \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ and we are done by our first observation.

On the other hand if $\mathcal{O}' = \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$ is cofinal in $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1)$, then the thesis is trivial. \square

Remark 43. In the situation of the Definition 41 above, if \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}' are T -convex subrings of \mathbb{U} such that $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E} = \mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E}$, then $\mathbb{E}_* \preceq \mathbb{U}$ is \mathcal{O} -residually dense (resp. \mathcal{O} -residually cofinal) over \mathbb{E} if and only if it is \mathcal{O}' -residually dense (resp. \mathcal{O}' -residually cofinal). This is because if \mathbb{E}_* is \mathcal{O} -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E} , then $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E}_*$ is the only T -convex valuation ring of \mathbb{E}_* whose restriction to \mathbb{E} is $\mathbb{E} \cap \mathcal{O}$.

Thus if \mathcal{O}'' is a T -convex valuation subring of \mathbb{E} , we will call an extension \mathbb{E}_* of \mathbb{E} , \mathcal{O}'' -residually dense (resp. \mathcal{O}'' -residually cofinal) if it is \mathcal{O} -residually dense (resp. \mathcal{O} -residually cofinal) for some T -convex \mathcal{O} in \mathbb{U} with $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E} = \mathcal{O}''$.

Lemma 44. *If $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{E}_1$ is a dense extension and \mathcal{O} is a non-trivial T -convex valuation ring of \mathbb{E}_1 , then $\mathbb{E} \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}$, $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1)$, and $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1)$.*

Proof. The claim that $\mathbb{E} \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}$ is trivial, because if $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, then by density of \mathbb{E} in \mathbb{E}_1 it would follow that $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{E}_1$.

To prove $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1)$, suppose toward contradiction that there was an element x of $\mathbb{E}_1 \setminus \mathbb{E}$ such that $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(x) \notin \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$. Then there would be no elements of \mathbb{E} in $x + \mathfrak{o}$ whereas $(x + \mathfrak{o}) \cap \mathbb{E}_1$ would be infinite, thus contradicting the density of \mathbb{E} in \mathbb{E}_1 .

Finally to see that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ notice that since \mathbb{E} is dense in \mathbb{E}_1 , then in particular for all $z \in \mathbb{E}_1^{>0}$, there is $c \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $c \geq z$ and $|c - z|/|z| < 1$. \square

Remark 45. If \bar{r} is a \mathcal{O} -res-construction over \mathbb{E} and $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$, then \bar{r} is a \mathcal{O} -res-construction over \mathbb{E}_1 .

Lemma 46. *Let $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{U} \models T$ and $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}'$ be T -convex valuation subrings of \mathbb{U} such that $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E} \neq \mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E}$. Suppose that \mathbb{E}_1 is a \mathcal{O}' -residually dense extension of*

\mathbb{E} with \mathcal{O}' -res-construction \bar{b} and \mathbb{E}_2 is a \mathcal{O} -res-constructible extension of \mathbb{E} with \mathcal{O} -res-construction \bar{c} . Then the following hold:

- (1) $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E} \cap (\mathcal{O}' \setminus \mathfrak{o}')) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1 \cap (\mathcal{O}' \setminus \mathfrak{o}'))$, in particular $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E}_1$ is the unique T -convex extension of $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E}$;
- (2) \bar{c} is a \mathcal{O} -res-construction of $\mathrm{dcl}(\mathbb{E}_2 \cup \mathbb{E}_1)$ over \mathbb{E}_1 and $\mathrm{dcl}(\mathbb{E}_2 \cup \mathbb{E}_1)$ is \mathcal{O}' -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E} with \mathcal{O}' -res-construction (\bar{b}, \bar{c}) ;
- (3) $\mathrm{tp}_L(\mathbb{E}_1/\mathbb{E}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}_L(\mathbb{E}_1/\mathbb{E}_2)$.

Proof. Throughout the proof let $V := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathcal{O})$ so that $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbf{res}_V \circ \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}$.

(1) Since \mathbb{E}_1 is \mathcal{O}' -residually dense, $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ is a dense extension of $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$. Thus by Lemma 44 $\mathbf{res}_V \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbf{res}_V \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$ and

$$\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbf{res}_V \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1) = \mathbf{res}_V \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}).$$

The statement about the value group is proved in the same way using that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1 \cap (\mathcal{O}' \setminus \mathfrak{o}')) = \mathbf{v}_V(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1))$ and Lemma 44. The last clause is because in particular $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1 \cap (\mathcal{O}' \setminus \mathfrak{o}')) = \mathbf{v}_V(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1))$ and $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ imply that there is no $x \in \mathbb{E}_1$ such that $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E} < x < \mathbb{E}^{>\mathcal{O}}$.

(2) The first assertion is by point (1) and Remark 45. As for the second one, notice that by Lemma 23 it follows from the first assertion that (\bar{b}, \bar{c}) is a \mathcal{O}' -res-construction over \mathbb{E} , because \bar{b} was a \mathcal{O}' -res-construction over \mathbb{E} . Finally To see that $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$ is cofinal in $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathrm{dcl}(\mathbb{E}_2 \cup \mathbb{E}_1))$, recall that $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$ is dense in $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ by hypothesis and that $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1) \prec \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathrm{dcl}(\mathbb{E}_2 \cup \mathbb{E}_1))$ is a V -res-constructible extension with $V \not\geq \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_1)$ and thus in particular it is cofinal by Lemma 42.

(3) Let \bar{b} be a \mathcal{O}' -res-construction of \mathbb{E}_1 over \mathbb{E} . Then it suffices to show that for any finite tuple $b'_0, \dots, b'_n \subset \bar{b}$, $\mathrm{tp}(b'_n/\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(b'_n/\mathbb{E}_2\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle)$.

For this notice that by Remark 45 and point (1), we have that $\mathbb{E}_2\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle$ is \mathcal{O} -res-constructible over $\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle$. Thus by Lemma 20, every element of $\mathbb{E}_2\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle$ is \mathcal{O} -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle$.

Now by point (1), $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_n \rangle) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$, thus b'_n is not \mathcal{O} -residually generated over $\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle$. Moreover $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_n \rangle$ is the unique extension of $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle$, so $\mathrm{tp}_L(b'_n/\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle)$ implies the L_{convex} -type of b'_n over $(\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle, \mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle)$. It follows that $\mathrm{tp}_L(b'_n/\mathbb{E}\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle)$ is not realized in $\mathbb{E}_2\langle b'_0, \dots, b'_{n-1} \rangle$ and we are done. \square

Corollary 47. *Suppose that $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{U} \models T$ and let $\{\mathcal{O}_i : i \in I\}$ be a family of T -convex subrings of \mathbb{U} such that for all $i \neq j$, $\mathcal{O}_i \cap \mathbb{E} \neq \mathcal{O}_j \cap \mathbb{E}$. Let also for each $i \in I$, $\mathbb{E}_i \preceq \mathbb{U}$ be a \mathcal{O}_i -residually dense extension of \mathbb{E} with \mathcal{O}_i -res-construction $\bar{x}^{(i)}$. Then, setting $\mathcal{O} := \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{O}_i$:*

- (1) $(x_n^{(i)} : i \in I, n < |\bar{x}^{(i)}|)$ is a \mathcal{O} -res-construction over \mathbb{E} and $\mathrm{dcl}(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{E}_i)$ is \mathcal{O} -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E} ;
- (2) $\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathrm{tp}_L(\mathbb{E}_i/\mathbb{E}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}_L(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{E}_i/\mathbb{E})$;

Proof. We first prove the statement with the additional hypothesis that I is finite. If I is empty there is nothing to show, otherwise let $j \in I$ be such that $\mathcal{O}_j \cap \mathbb{E} \supseteq \mathcal{O}_i \cap \mathbb{E}$ for all $i \in I \setminus \{j\}$. By induction we may assume that the statement holds for $I' = I \setminus \{j\}$. So $\bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \{j\}} \mathrm{tp}(\mathbb{E}_i/\mathbb{E}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}((\bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{E}_i)/\mathbb{E})$ and, with $\mathcal{O}' := \bigcup_{i \neq j} \mathcal{O}_i$, $\mathrm{dcl}(\bigcup_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_i)$ is \mathcal{O}' -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E} with \mathcal{O}' -res-construction $(x_n^{(i)} : i \in I \setminus \{j\}, n < |\bar{x}^{(i)}|)$.

But now by Lemma 46 (3) and (2) respectively, it follows that

$$\text{tp}(\mathbb{E}_j/\mathbb{E}) \cup \text{tp}\left(\left(\bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{E}_i\right)/\mathbb{E}\right) \vdash \text{tp}\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{E}_i/\mathbb{E}\right)$$

and that $\text{dcl}(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{E}_i)$ is \mathcal{O}_j -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E} with \mathcal{O}_j -res-construction $(x_n^{(i)} : i \in I, n < |\overline{x}^{(i)}|)$.

Now suppose I is infinite. Then (2) follows from a standard compactness argument. As for (1), observe that $(\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(x_n^{(i)} : i \in I, n < |\overline{x}^{(i)}|))$ is dcl_T -independent by Lemma 23 and by finite character of dcl_T . Similarly $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\text{dcl}(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{E}_i))$ must be a cofinal extension of $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$. \square

Definition 48. Let $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{U} \models T$ and \mathcal{F} be a family of T -convex valuation subrings of \mathbb{U} such that for all $\mathcal{O} \neq \mathcal{O}' \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E} \neq \mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E}$. We will call \mathcal{F} -residually dense any extension $\mathbb{E}_* \preceq \mathbb{U}$ of \mathbb{E} given as $\mathbb{E}_* = \text{dcl} \bigcup \{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}} : \mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{F}\}$ where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}}$ is \mathcal{O} -residually dense over \mathbb{E} .

Remark 49. In the situation of Definition 48, by Corollary 47, the isomorphism type of \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} only depends on the isomorphism types of the $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}}$ over \mathbb{E} , which in turn by Lemma 19 only depends on the isomorphism type of $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}})$ over $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$.

Remark 50. If \mathbb{E}_* is a \mathcal{F} -residually dense extension of \mathbb{E} and \mathcal{O} is any T -convex valuation ring of \mathbb{E} , then $\text{CH}_{\mathbb{E}_*}(\mathcal{O})$ is the unique extension of \mathcal{O} to a T -convex valuation ring of \mathbb{E}_* .

To see this, note first that the extension is unique if and only if \mathbb{E}_* does not realise the type $\mathbb{E} < x < \mathbb{E}^{>\mathcal{O}}$, so we can reduce to the case where $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_*$ is of finite dcl_T -dimension. Note next that if $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_{\dagger} \preceq \mathbb{E}_*$, and \mathcal{O} has a unique extension to \mathbb{E}_{\dagger} , say \mathcal{O}_{\dagger} , and \mathcal{O}_{\dagger} has a unique extension to \mathbb{E}_* , then \mathcal{O} must have a unique extension to \mathbb{E}_* . Thus, we can reduce further to the case where $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_*$ is 1-dimensional. In particular, we may assume $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_*$ is \mathcal{O}' -residually dense for some $\mathcal{O}' \in \mathcal{F}$. If $\mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}$, then Lemma 46 implies that the extension is \mathcal{O} -residually cofinal, whence the result follows. If they are equal, the result follows from Fact 12. Finally, if $\mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E} \supsetneq \mathcal{O}$, then any \mathcal{O}' -residually dense extension cannot realize the cut $\mathbb{E} < x < \mathbb{E}^{>\mathcal{O}}$ because its realization would be \mathcal{O}'' -residual where $\mathcal{O}'' := \{t \in \mathbb{U} : |t| < \mathbb{E}^{>\mathcal{O}}\} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}'$.

Corollary 51. Let $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{U} \models T$ and \mathcal{F} be a family of T -convex valuation subrings of \mathbb{U} . Every \mathcal{F} -residually dense extension $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_* \preceq \mathbb{U}$ has a dcl_T basis B over \mathbb{E} such that for all $b \in B$, $\text{tp}(b/\mathbb{E}) \vdash \text{tp}(b/\mathbb{E}\langle B \setminus \{b\} \rangle)$.

Definition 52 (Tressl, [9]). Let $\mathbb{E} \models T$, \mathcal{F} be a family of T -convex valuation rings of \mathbb{E} , $\mathbb{U} \succ \mathbb{E}$ be $|\mathbb{E}|^+$ -saturated, and $\mathcal{F}' := \{\text{CH}_{\mathbb{U}}(\mathcal{O}) : \mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Let also for each $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{F}'$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}}$ be a maximal \mathcal{O} -residually dense extension of \mathbb{E} in \mathbb{U} . The \mathcal{F}' -residually dense extension $\mathbb{E}_* := \text{dcl}(\bigcup_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{F}'} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}})$ of \mathbb{E} is called a *pseudo-completion* of \mathbb{E} with respect to \mathcal{F} .

Corollary 53 (Tressl, 4.1 in [9]). If \mathcal{F} is a family of T -convex valuation rings of \mathbb{E} , then the pseudocompletion of \mathbb{E} with respect to \mathcal{F} is unique up to isomorphism over \mathbb{E} .

Proof. Follows from Corollary 40 and Remark 49. \square

Proposition 54. *Let $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{U} \models T$ and $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathcal{O}_i : 0 \leq i \leq n\}$ be strictly increasing sequence of T -convex valuation rings of \mathbb{U} such that $\mathbb{E} \cap \mathcal{O}_i \neq \mathbb{E} \cap \mathcal{O}_j$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\mathcal{O}_n \supseteq \mathbb{E}$. For each $i \leq n$, let \mathbb{E}_i be a \mathcal{O}_i -residually dense extension of \mathbb{E} and let $\mathbb{E}_* := \text{dcl}(\bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}_i)$ be \mathcal{F} -residually dense over \mathbb{E} . Moreover, for each cofinal extension $\mathbb{K} \preceq \mathbb{K}'$ of models of T , denote by $d(\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{K}')$ the dcl_T -dimension of \mathbb{K}' over the maximal dense extension of \mathbb{K} within \mathbb{K}' . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *if $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{E}_\dagger \preceq \mathbb{E}_*$ and for all $i \leq n$, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger)$ contains $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_i)$, then \mathbb{E}_\dagger is isomorphic to \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} ;*
- (2) *for all $0 \leq i < n$, we have $d(\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{i+1}}(\mathbb{E}_*), \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{i+1}}(\mathbb{E})) \leq \aleph_0$ or $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_i)$ does not contain an uncountable well ordered subset.*

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1). We induct on n . Notice that since \mathbb{E}_* is a cofinal extension of \mathbb{E} , it follows that $\mathbb{E}_* \subset \mathcal{O}_n$. Then, the hypothesis $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\mathbb{E}_n) \subset \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger)$ directly implies that $\mathbb{E}_n \subset \mathbb{E}_\dagger$. So if $n = 0$ we are done, and we can assume $n > 0$.

By repeatedly applying Lemma 46 (2), for all $0 \leq i < n$ we know that $\text{dcl}(\mathbb{E}_n, \mathbb{E}_0, \mathbb{E}_2, \dots, \mathbb{E}_i)$ is \mathcal{O}_i -residually cofinal over \mathbb{E}_n so in particular \mathbb{E}_* is \mathcal{O}_{n-1} -res-constructible over \mathbb{E}_n . Now since $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbb{E}_*/\mathbb{E}_n) \leq \aleph_0$ or $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ does not contain uncountable well ordered sets, by Theorem 35, it follows that \mathbb{E}_\dagger is also \mathcal{O}_{n-1} -res-constructible over \mathbb{E}_n .

Since by Lemma 19 the isomorphism type of \mathbb{E}_\dagger over \mathbb{E}_n only depends on the extension $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger) \supseteq \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_n) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E})$, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}'_\dagger := \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{E}'_* := \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ over $\mathbb{E}' := \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E})$. Now let for all $i < n$, $\mathcal{O}'_{n-1} := \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathcal{O}_i)$ and observe that for all $i < n$, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_*) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*)$, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_\dagger) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger)$, and there is a natural inclusion $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_*) \subseteq \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*)$. Thus we can apply the inductive hypothesis to conclude that \mathbb{E}'_\dagger is isomorphic to \mathbb{E}'_* over \mathbb{E}' .

(-2) \Rightarrow (-1). Again we proceed by induction on n . Notice that if $n = 0$, then (2) always holds, so we can assume $n > 0$. Thus let $i < n$ be the maximum i such that $d(\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{i+1}}(\mathbb{E}_*), \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{i+1}}(\mathbb{E})) > \aleph_0$ and $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_i)$ contains an uncountable well ordered subset. If $i = n - 1$, then by Theorem 36, we can find \mathbb{E}_\dagger as in (1) which is not \mathcal{O}_{n-1} -constructible over \mathbb{E}_n . But then, if $\phi : \mathbb{E}_* \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\dagger$ is an isomorphism over \mathbb{E} , then ϕ must fix \mathbb{E}_n . So if \bar{x} is a res-construction for \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E}_n , then $\phi(\bar{x})$ is a res-construction for \mathbb{E}_\dagger over \mathbb{E}_n , a contradiction. If instead $i < n - 1$, then $\dim_{\text{dcl}}(\mathbb{E}_*/\mathbb{E}_n) \leq \aleph_0$ or $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O}_{n-1})$ does not contain an uncountable well ordered set, so by Theorem 35 any \mathbb{E}_\dagger as in (1) is \mathcal{O}_{n-1} -res-constructible over \mathbb{E}_n , and we can reduce to the inductive hypothesis. In fact we then have that the isomorphism type of \mathbb{E}_\dagger over \mathbb{E}_n is determined by the isomorphism type of $\mathbb{E}'_\dagger := \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger)$ over $\mathbb{E}' := \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_n) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E})$ and that, setting as before $\mathcal{O}'_i := \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathcal{O}_i)$:

- For any $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_*) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*)$, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_\dagger) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger)$ and the cokernel of the natural inclusion $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_*) \subseteq \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ is $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ which does not contain uncountable well orders by hypothesis, so $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_*)$ contains an uncountable well order if and only if $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ does.

Thus, by induction there exists some $\mathbb{E}'_\dagger \prec \mathbb{E}'_*$, such that for all $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_\dagger) \subset \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_*)$, and which is non-isomorphic to \mathbb{E}'_* over \mathbb{E}' . Let \bar{x} be a tuple in \mathbb{E}_* such that $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\bar{x})$ is a dcl-basis for \mathbb{E}'_\dagger over \mathbb{E}' , and let $\mathbb{E}_\dagger = \mathbb{E}_n(\bar{x})$. Then, for any $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_\dagger) \supset \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}'_i}(\mathbb{E}'_*) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_i)$, and $\mathbb{E}_n \subset \text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger)$, so \mathbb{E}_\dagger satisfies the conditions of (1). Finally, $\text{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_\dagger) =$

\mathbb{E}'_{\dagger} is not isomorphic to $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ over $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{n-1}}(\mathbb{E})$, so in particular \mathbb{E}_{\dagger} is not isomorphic to \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} . \square

Remark 55. Notice that in Proposition 54, the hypothesis that $\mathcal{O}_n \supseteq \mathbb{E}$ is not essential, as we can always assume that \mathbb{E}_n is the trivial extension. Also notice that for all i , $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_i)$ is going to be a maximal dense extension of $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E})$ in $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*) = \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i} \text{dcl}(\bigcup_{j \leq i} \mathbb{E}_j)$. Thus

$$d(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*), \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E})) = \sum_{j < i} \dim_{\text{dcl}_T}(\mathbb{E}_j/\mathbb{E}).$$

In particular in (2) of Proposition 54, if there is $i < n$ such that

$$\dim_{\text{dcl}_T}(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{i+1}}(\mathbb{E}_*)/\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{i+1}}(\mathbb{E})) \leq \aleph_0,$$

then for all $j \leq i$, it follows that $d(\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{j+1}}(\mathbb{E}_*), \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}_{j+1}}(\mathbb{E})) \leq \aleph_0$.

It is natural to ask whether the conditions on $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ in point (2) of Proposition 54, can be substituted with conditions on $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$, given that \mathbb{E}_* is a very ‘‘narrow’’ extension of \mathbb{E} . We answer this conditionally to some properties of T .

Lemma 56. *Let T be power bounded, $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{U} \models T$, and $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}'$ be T -convex valuation subrings of \mathbb{U} . If $\mathbb{E}_* \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ is a \mathcal{O}' -residually dense extension of \mathbb{E} , then $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) \cong \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_*)$.*

Proof. When $\mathcal{O}' \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, then by Lemma 23, it follows that \mathbb{E}_* is \mathcal{O} -res-constructible over \mathbb{E} and the thesis follows from the rv-property (here Fact 13). Suppose instead $\mathcal{O}' \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Let $\mathbb{K} := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$, $\mathbb{K}_* := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_*)$, $V := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathcal{O})$. The inclusion $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}) \subseteq \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ induces a morphism of short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{v}_V(\mathbb{K}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{v}_V(\mathbb{K}_*) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E}_*) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_*) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Now since \mathbb{K}_* is a dense extension of $\mathbb{K} := \mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$, by Lemma 44, the leftmost vertical map is an isomorphism. On the other hand by the case $\mathcal{O}' \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, proved above, also the rightmost vertical map must be an isomorphism. So, by the short five lemma, the middle vertical map is an isomorphism. \square

Corollary 57. *Let T be power bounded, $\mathbb{E} \prec \mathbb{U} \models T$, and \mathcal{F} be a family of T -convex valuation rings of \mathbb{U} such that $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E} \neq \mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E}$ for all $\mathcal{O} \neq \mathcal{O}'$ in \mathcal{F} . Suppose that \mathbb{E}_* is a \mathcal{F} -residually dense extension of \mathbb{E} . Then $\mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) = \mathbf{v}(\mathbb{E}_*, \mathcal{O})$ for all T -convex valuation rings \mathcal{O} .*

Proof. By definition of \mathcal{F} -residually dense extension there are \mathcal{O} -residually dense extensions $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}}$ for all $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $\mathbb{E}_* = \text{dcl}(\bigcup_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}})$. Notice that by the finite character of dcl we can reduce to the case in which $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{O}_i : i \leq n\}$ for some $n \in \omega$ and without loss of generality $\mathcal{O}_i \supseteq \mathcal{O}_j$ for all $0 \leq i < j \leq n$. Then set $\mathbb{E}_i := \text{dcl}(\bigcup_{j < i} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{O}_j})$ for $0 \leq i \leq n+1$ and notice that by Corollary 47, each \mathbb{E}_{i+1} is a \mathcal{O}_i -residually dense extension of \mathbb{E}_i , moreover $\mathbb{E}_0 = \mathbb{E}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{n+1} = \mathbb{E}_*$. At this point it suffices to apply Lemma 56 to conclude that for any T -convex valuation ring \mathcal{O}' , $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E}_i) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}'}(\mathbb{E})$. \square

Remark 58. When T is not power-bounded, for a model $(\mathbb{E}, \mathcal{O}) \models T_{\text{convex}}$, we have that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$ contains an uncountable well ordered subset if and only if \mathbb{E} itself contains an uncountable well ordered subset.

In fact if \mathbb{E} contains an uncountable well ordered set, then either $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$ or $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$ must contain an uncountable well ordered set (argue as in Lemma 22). On the other hand if \mathbb{E} defines an exponential and $\mathbf{res}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbb{E})$ contains an uncountable well ordered set S and $d \in \mathbb{E}^{>\mathcal{O}}$, then $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}}(\exp(Sd))$ is an uncountable well ordered set.

Thus, in view of Remark 58, when T is not power-bounded, to see whether the condition that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E})$ does not contain any uncountable well ordered set implies that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{O}_i}(\mathbb{E}_*)$ does not contain any uncountable well ordered set we can just ask the same question about \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{E}_* . This leads to consider the following property.

Definition 59. We say that an o-minimal theory T has *property C* if for every $\mathbb{E} \models T$, if \mathbb{E} does not contain any uncountable well ordered set, then so does any 1-dcl $_T$ -dimensional extension $\mathbb{E}(x)$ of \mathbb{E} .

Lemma 60. Let $\mathbb{E} \preceq \mathbb{U} \models T$, \mathcal{F} be a family of T -convex subrings of \mathbb{U} such that $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathbb{E} \neq \mathcal{O}' \cap \mathbb{E}$ for all $\mathcal{O} \neq \mathcal{O}'$ in \mathcal{F} , and let $\mathbb{E}_* \preceq \mathbb{U}$ be \mathcal{F} -residually dense over \mathbb{E} . Suppose furthermore that T has property C. If \mathbb{E}_* contains an uncountable well-ordered set, then so does \mathbb{E} .

Proof. Suppose toward contradiction that \mathbb{E}_* contains an uncountable well-ordered set and \mathbb{E} does not.

By Corollary 51 we can find a dcl $_T$ -basis B of \mathbb{E}_* over \mathbb{E} such that for all $b \in B$, $\text{tp}(b/\mathbb{E}) \vdash \text{tp}(b/\mathbb{E}\langle B \setminus \{b\} \rangle)$.

Let $(y_i)_{i < \aleph_1}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{E}_* such that y_i is strictly increasing. Since \mathbb{E} does not contain an uncountable well ordered set, there must be i_0 such that for all $i > i_0$, $\text{tp}(y_i/\mathbb{E}) = \text{tp}(y_{i_0}/\mathbb{E})$.

For each i , write $y_i := f_i(\bar{b}^{(i)})$ for some tuple $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ from B and some \mathbb{E} -definable function f_i . The orthogonality property of B entails that there is a non-empty $B_0 \subseteq B$ such that for every \mathbb{E} -definable f , if $\text{tp}(f(\bar{b})/\mathbb{E}) = \text{tp}(y_{i_0}/\mathbb{E})$ for some tuple \bar{b} from B , then $\bar{b} \supseteq B_0$. Thus all tuples $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ for $i > i_0$ must contain B_0 .

Since B_0 is finite and thus by property C, $\mathbb{E}\langle B_0 \rangle$ still does not contain an uncountable well-ordered set, we can repeat the argument on the sequence $(y_i)_{i_0 \leq i < \aleph_1}$, but this time over $\mathbb{E}\langle B_0 \rangle$, instead of \mathbb{E} .

Thus by induction we get an increasing sequence $(i_n : n < \omega)$ in \aleph_1 , such that for $i \geq i_n$, $\bar{b}^{(i)}$ must contain at least n distinct elements from B . Since $\{i_n : n < \omega\}$ is bounded in \aleph_1 we get a contradiction. \square

We will discuss further which theories have property C in a later version of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. van den Dries. T -convexity and tame extensions. II. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 62(1):14–34, 1997. ISSN 0022-4812,1943-5886. doi:10.2307/2275729. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/2275729>.
- [2] L. van den Dries. Correction to: “ T -convexity and tame extensions. II” [J. Symbolic Logic **62** (1997), no. 1, 14–34; MR1450511 (98h:03048)]. *J. Symbolic*

- Logic*, 63(4):1597, 1998. ISSN 0022-4812,1943-5886. doi:10.2307/2586669. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/2586669>.
- [3] L. van den Dries and A. H. Lewenberg. T -convexity and tame extensions. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 60(1):74–102, 1995. ISSN 0022-4812,1943-5886. doi:10.2307/2275510. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/2275510>.
- [4] L. van den Dries and C. Miller. On the real exponential field with restricted analytic functions. *Israel J. Math.*, 85(1-3):19–56, 1994. ISSN 0021-2172,1565-8511. doi:10.1007/BF02758635. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02758635>.
- [5] L. van den Dries and P. Speissegger. The field of reals with multisummable series and the exponential function. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 81(3):513–565, 2000. ISSN 0024-6115,1460-244X. doi:10.1112/S0024611500012648. URL <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0024611500012648>.
- [6] P. Freni. T -convexity, weakly immediate types and T - λ -spherical completions of o-minimal structures, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.07646>.
- [7] D. Marker and C. I. Steinhorn. Definable types in O-minimal theories. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 59(1):185–198, 1994. ISSN 0022-4812,1943-5886. doi:10.2307/2275260. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/2275260>.
- [8] C. Miller. A growth dichotomy for o-minimal expansions of ordered fields. In *Logic: from foundations to applications (Staffordshire, 1993)*, Oxford Sci. Publ., pages 385–399. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1996. ISBN 0-19-853862-6.
- [9] M. Tressl. Pseudo completions and completions in stages of o-minimal structures. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 45(8):983–1009, 2006. ISSN 0933-5846,1432-0665. doi:10.1007/s00153-006-0022-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00153-006-0022-2>.
- [10] J. M. Tyne. *T-levels and T-convexity*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2003. ISBN 978-0496-34011-8. URL http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- [11] A. J. Wilkie. Model completeness results for expansions of the ordered field of real numbers by restricted Pfaffian functions and the exponential function. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 9(4):1051–1094, 1996. ISSN 0894-0347,1088-6834. doi:10.1090/S0894-0347-96-00216-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-96-00216-0>.