

# Quasianalytic algebras with weakly smooth germs generate o-minimal structures

Rémi Guénet

March 13, 2025

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Monomialization</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Generalized series . . . . .	3
1.2	Quasianalytic algebras . . . . .	4
1.3	Monomialization . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>O-minimality and model completeness</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Some definitions . . . . .	6
2.2	Simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets . . . . .	7
2.3	Parametrizations . . . . .	8
2.4	The Fiber Cutting Lemmas . . . . .	16

## Introduction

In [6], Rolin and Servi give a proof of o-minimality and model-completeness under general assumptions satisfied by most of the currently known polynomially bounded o-minimal expansions of the real field. However, all structures that fit the setting of [6] must have smooth cell-decomposition. The goal of this paper is to weaken the assumptions of this result so that it may apply to structures that do not have smooth cell-decomposition. As a result, we obtain an axiomatic way to construct new o-minimal structures which is sufficiently general to apply to all of the currently known polynomially bounded o-minimal expansions of the real field.

Let us explain briefly the setting of [6]. The authors consider a collection of functions  $\mathcal{A}$  and they assume that, to each function  $f \in \mathcal{A}$ , we can associate a series with non-negative real exponents, written  $\mathbf{T}(f)$ , which should be thought of as an asymptotic expansion of  $f$  at 0. The key hypothesis about these expansions is known as **quasianalyticity** and it states that any two functions in  $\mathcal{A}$  with the same asymptotic expansion must coincide in a neighborhood of 0.

Under this hypothesis, along with various properties of the class  $\mathcal{A}$  of functions (such as being stable under composition, partial derivatives and the Implicit Functions Theorem), the authors then prove that the structure  $\langle \mathbb{R}; <, 0, 1, +, -, \times, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ , which is called  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$ , is both o-minimal and model-complete. We are now going to outline the method used.

Series with non-negative real exponents are called **generalized series**. In [6], the authors prove a monomialization (or desingularization) result for generalized series in order to obtain corresponding results for the functions in  $\mathcal{A}$ . This desingularization result allows the authors to obtain parametrization theorems for sets defined by equations and inequations involving functions in  $\mathcal{A}$ . When combining this with a Fiber Cutting Lemma (see [6], 3.11) and Gabrielov's Theorem of the Complement (see [3], Theorem 2.7), the authors are able to prove that  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is both o-minimal and model-complete. This method had been used before to prove o-minimality in many special cases such as in [1-3, 7, 8].

However, there is one notable example of an o-minimal and polynomially bounded structure which does not satisfy the assumptions of [6], namely the structure  $\mathbb{R}_H$  introduced in [4] by Le Gal and Rolin. This structure was the first example of an o-minimal structure that does not have smooth cell-decomposition, while it turns out that the assumptions of [6] imply that the structures considered must always have smooth cell-decomposition. In [5], we have already explained how to adapt the arguments to the case of  $\mathbb{R}_H$  and our goal in this paper is to rephrase these arguments in a general setting.

In order to do so, we reuse the setting of [6], except that we replace  $\mathcal{A}$ -analyticity (see [6], Definition 1.10) with a weaker assumption given in 2.3. As we saw already in [5], most of the local results in [6] can still be obtained without any significant change. However, it is much more difficult to derive global results. There are also two main differences between this paper and [5]. The first is that, in this paper, asymptotic developments may be given by generalized series whereas formal power series were sufficient to deal with the case of  $\mathbb{R}_H$ . The second change is that, while [5] sticks rather closely to the classical proof, we have introduced various changes in this paper that should help clarify the arguments. For instance, while **simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets** were introduced in [5] in order to prove Theorem 2.4, we have since realized that they can also be used as a replacement for  $\mathcal{A}$ -manifolds.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 1, we recall the main steps of the monomialization algorithm from [6]. For later purposes, we need a slight strengthening of their Theorem 2.11. We obtained such a strengthening in [5, Theorem 3.11] in the case of formal power series. Furthermore, we have no trouble adapting this theorem to the case of generalized series by appealing to various results from [6].

Section 2 is dedicated to the geometric arguments needed to prove Theorem 2.29, according to which  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is o-minimal and model-complete. In Paragraph 2.1, we introduce the classical definitions needed in such geometric arguments. Then, in Paragraph 2.2, we define the new notion of **simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets**. This

notion is crucial in stating Assumption 2.3, which replaces  $\mathcal{A}$ -analyticity (see [6], Definition 1.10). Furthermore, as said above, we make use of simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets throughout the rest of the text in order to avoid using  $\mathcal{A}$ -manifolds.

Finally, in Paragraph 2.3, we prove parametrization theorems while Paragraph 2.4 focuses on obtaining a Fiber Cutting Lemma. These results combine to give Theorem 2.27, according to which the assumptions of Gabrielov's Theorem of the Complement (see [3], Theorem 2.7) are satisfied. It turns out that Gabrielov's Theorem of the Complement implies that the **sub- $\Lambda$ -sets**, introduced in Paragraph 2.1, are exactly the bounded definable sets. In view of their definition, it is easy to deduce model-completeness. Furthermore, o-minimality follows from at once from Corollary 2.16 according to which sub- $\Lambda$ -sets have finitely many connected components.

In [6], the authors also obtain a quantifier-elimination result for the expansion  $\langle \mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}; ^{-1}, (\sqrt[n]{\phantom{x}})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rangle$  where the new symbols are interpreted in the obvious way wherever they are defined and extended by 0 outside their domain of definition. Most of their results seem to depend on  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$  being o-minimal rather than on  $\mathcal{A}$ -analyticity which makes us rather hopeful that these results extend to the structures considered in this paper. We are currently looking into the proof carefully to make sure that this is indeed the case.

## 1 Monomialization

### 1.1 Generalized series

This paragraph is a short reminder on the properties of generalized series. More details can be found in [3, section 4]. Firstly, we say that  $S \subseteq [0, \infty)^m$  is a **good set** when there are well ordered subsets  $S_1, \dots, S_m \subseteq [0, \infty)$  such that  $S \subseteq S_1 \times \dots \times S_m$ . If  $\alpha, \beta \in [0, \infty)^m$ , we write  $\alpha \leq \beta$  to mean that  $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Given a good set  $S \subseteq [0, \infty)^m$ , we define  $S_{\min}$  to be the set of minimal elements of  $S$ . It is proven in [3, Lemma 4.2] that  $S_{\min}$  is finite and that, for every  $\alpha \in S$ , there exists  $\beta \in S_{\min}$  such that  $\beta \leq \alpha$ .

Consider  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$  a tuple of variables. Then, a **generalized series** is a formal series  $F = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} X^{\alpha}$  where  $\alpha$  ranges over  $[0, \infty)^m$  and such that the support  $\text{supp } F = \{\alpha : c_{\alpha} \neq 0\}$  is a good set. The requirement on the support guarantees that these series can be added and multiplied in the usual way. Thus, the set of all such series is a ring that we write  $\mathbb{R}[[X^*]]$ .

If  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{R}[[X^*]]$ , then we let

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \text{supp } F$$

and we say that  $\mathcal{F}$  has **good total support** when  $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}$  is a good set.

Finally, if  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$  is a second tuple of variables, we write  $\mathbb{R}[[X^*, Y]]$  for the set of all series  $F \in \mathbb{R}[[X, Y]^*]]$  such that  $\text{supp } F \subseteq [0, \infty)^m \times \mathbb{N}^n$ . This is a subring of  $\mathbb{R}[[X, Y]^*]]$ , we say that its elements are **mixed series**.

## 1.2 Quasianalytic algebras

This paragraph is largely based on [6, section 1.2]. There are a few differences in the notation which will be pointed out when they are introduced.

Firstly, let  $m, n \geq 0$  be integers. Then, a **polyradius** is a tuple of the form  $r = (s_1, \dots, s_m, t_1, \dots, t_n) \in (0, \infty)^{m+n}$ . The set

$$I_{m,n,r} = [0, s_1) \times \cdots \times [0, s_m) \times (-t_1, t_1) \times \cdots \times (-t_n, t_n)$$

is called a **polydisk**. In [6], the same polydisk is written  $\hat{I}_{m,n,r}$ , while  $I_{m,n,r}$  refers to its interior. When  $n = 0$ , we will write  $I_{m,r}$  instead of  $I_{m,n,r}$ .

Given  $m, n \geq 0$  two integers and  $r$  a polyradius, we fix an algebra  $\mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$  of continuous functions  $f: I_{m,n,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Throughout the document, we will assume that  $\mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$  satisfies points (1)-(8) of [6, 1.8]. However, we will not be assuming that the functions  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$  are  $C^1$  on  $\text{int}(I_{m,n,r})$ . When  $n = 0$ , we might write  $\mathcal{A}_{m,r}$  in place of  $\mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$ .

As in [6], we write  $\mathcal{A}_{m,n}$  for the algebra of germs at 0 of the functions in  $\mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$ . When  $n = 0$ , we write more simply  $\mathcal{A}_m$  instead of  $\mathcal{A}_{m,n}$ . As in [6, Definition 1.11], we assume that there are injective algebra morphisms  $\mathbf{T}_{m,n}: \mathcal{A}_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\llbracket X^*, Y \rrbracket$  and that  $\mathbf{T}_{m',n'}$  extends  $\mathbf{T}_{m,n}$  whenever  $m' + n' \geq m + n$  and  $m' \geq m$ . Since this last assumption removes any possible ambiguity, we will write simply  $\mathbf{T}$  instead of  $\mathbf{T}_{m,n}$ . Also, if  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n}$ , we let  $\hat{f} = \mathbf{T}(f)$ . If  $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$ , we say that  $\alpha$  is an admissible exponent when there are  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n}$  and  $\beta \in \text{supp } \hat{f}$  such that  $\alpha$  is a component of  $\beta$ . We let  $\mathbb{A}$  be the semi-ring generated by all admissible exponents and we let  $\mathbb{K}$  be the field generated by  $\mathbb{A}$ .

We are not going to recall the definition of blow-up charts here, it can be found in [6, Definition 1.13]. Henceforth, we assume that conditions (1)-(7) in [6, 1.15] are satisfied. By [6, Remark 1.17], this implies in particular that, if  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$ , then the germs at 0 of  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y_j}$  and  $x_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}$  are in  $\mathcal{A}_{m,n}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . As a consequence, if  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$  and  $k \geq 0$  is an integer, there exists a polyradius  $r' \leq r$  such that  $f \upharpoonright \text{int}(I_{m,n,r'})$  is  $C^k$ . However, contrary to [6], it is not necessarily the case that  $f \upharpoonright \text{int}(I_{m,n,r})$  is smooth because we are not assuming  $\mathcal{A}$ -analyticity (see [6, Definition 1.10]).

## 1.3 Monomialization

This paragraph and the next are a brief reminder on the monomialization results from [6, section 2]. We will introduce slight modifications to the results but they do not change the proofs in any significant way. First of all, we modify the definition of elementary transformations to include reflections.

**Definition 1.1.** An **elementary transformation** is a map  $\nu: I_{m',n',r'} \rightarrow I_{m,n,r}$  that is of one of the following types.

- It is of one of the types described in [6, Definition 2.1];


- We have  $m' = m + 1, n' = n - 1$  and  $\nu = \sigma_{m+i}^\pm$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq n$  where

$$\sigma_{m+i}^\pm(x', y') = \begin{cases} x_k = x'_k & 1 \leq k \leq m \\ y_k = y'_k & 1 \leq k < i \\ y_i = \pm x'_{m+1} & \\ y_k = y'_{k-1} & i < k \leq n \end{cases}$$

The maps of the second type are called **reflections**. A finite composition of elementary transformations is called an **admissible transformation**.

Recall from [6, Lemma 2.5] that each elementary transformation  $\nu$  induces an injective algebra homomorphism  $\mathbb{R}[[X^*, Y]] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[[X'^*, Y']]$ ,  $F \mapsto F \circ \nu$ . Since we have changed the notion of elementary transformation, we also need to change the notion of elementary tree.

**Definition 1.2.** An **elementary tree** is either a tree that has one of the forms described in [6, Definition 2.6] or it is a tree of the form



for some  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . **Admissible trees** of height at most  $h$  are defined inductively on the ordinal  $h$ . The only admissible tree of height 0 is the tree which is reduced to its root. An admissible tree of height at most  $h$  is an elementary tree with admissible trees of height  $< h$  attached to each of its leaves.

**Remark 1.3.** Notice that we have allowed the height of an admissible tree  $T$  to be an ordinal. However, each branch of  $T$  must be finite whence it induces an admissible transformation  $\rho$ .

**Definition 1.4.** Consider  $f(x, y) \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n}$ , we say that  $f$  is **normal** if there exists  $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}^m$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$  as well as  $u \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n}$  such that  $u(0) \neq 0$  and  $f(x, y) = x^\alpha y^\beta u(x, y)$ . We also say that a series  $F \in \mathbb{R}[[X^*, Y]] \cap \text{im } \mathbf{T}$  such that  $F \neq 0$  is **normal** when there are  $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}^m$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$  as well as a unit  $U \in \mathbb{R}[[X^*, Y]]$  such that  $F = X^\alpha Y^\beta U$ .

**Remark 1.5.** If  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n}$  then  $f$  is normal if and only if  $\hat{f}$  is normal.

According to [6, Theorem 2.11], we have the following result.

**Theorem 1.6.** *If  $F_1, \dots, F_q \in \mathbb{R}[[X^*, Y]] \cap \text{im } \mathbf{T}$ , then there is an admissible tree  $T$  such that, if  $\rho$  is an admissible transformation induced by one of the branches of  $T$ , then  $F_1 \circ \rho, \dots, F_q \circ \rho$  are all normal. ■*

If  $T$  is a tree as in the statement of the theorem above then we say that  $T$  **monomializes** the series  $F_1, \dots, F_q$ . For reasons that will become clear later, this result is not quite sufficient for our purposes. In order to state the desired result, we are first going to need a few definitions.

**Definition 1.7.** Let  $\nu$  be a blow-up chart. Then, there is exactly one variable  $W$  by which we need to divide in order to write the inverse of  $\nu$ . We call it the **critical variable** of the blow-up. Given  $F_1, \dots, F_q \in \mathbb{R}[[X^*, Y]] \cap \text{im } \mathbf{T}$  and an admissible tree  $T$ , we say that  $T$  **\*-monomializes** the series  $F_1, \dots, F_q$  if

- $T$  monomializes the series  $F_1, \dots, F_q$ .
- If  $\nu$  is a blow-up with critical variable  $W$  that occurs in  $T$  and if  $T'$  is the sub-tree of  $T$  below  $\nu$ , then  $T'$  monomializes  $W$ .

**Remark 1.8.** Using [6, Lemma 2.9] is easy to see that an admissible tree  $T$  \*-monomializes the series  $F_1, \dots, F_q$  if and only if  $T$  \*-monomializes the product  $F_1 \dots F_q$ .

The required theorem is then the following.

**Theorem 1.9.** *Given  $F_1, \dots, F_q \in \mathbb{R}[[X^*, Y]] \cap \text{im } \mathbf{T}$ , there exists an admissible tree  $T$  that \*-monomializes the functions  $F_1, \dots, F_q$ .*

*Proof.* This theorem is proven in detail as [5, Theorem 3.11] in case all the variables are standard. Thus, we only need to explain how to modify the proof in order to take into account generalized variables. It turns out that we need to modify the method to make the series regular in  $Y_n$  but this is the only real difference.

By [6, Lemma 2.9], we can assume that  $q = 1$  and we write  $F = F_1$ . Also, by [6, Lemma 2.13], we may assume that  $F(0, Y) \neq 0$ . Doing as in the beginning of the proof of [6, Theorem 2.11], we may even assume that  $F$  is regular in the variable  $Y_n$ . From here, we can do everything in the same way as in the proof of [5, Theorem 3.11]. ■

## 2 O-minimality and model completeness

### 2.1 Some definitions

For each function  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$ , we define a total function  $\tilde{f}: \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tilde{f}(x, y) = f(x, y)$  if  $(x, y) \in I_{m,n,r}$  and  $\tilde{f}(x, y) = 0$  otherwise. Then, we consider the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$  which is the language of ordered rings  $\{<, 0, 1, +, -, \cdot\}$  augmented with a function symbol for each function  $\tilde{f}$ . We let  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$  be the real ordered field with its natural  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$  structure. We will show in this section that the structure  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is o-minimal and model complete under an assumption given in 2.3. To this end, we will be using Gabrielov's approach (see [3], Corollary 2.9).

Here are the necessary definitions. Firstly, if  $I_{m,r} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is a polydisk and  $f, g_1, \dots, g_q \in \mathcal{A}_{m,r}$  then the set

$$B = \{x \in I_{m,r} : f(x) = 0, g_1(x) > 0, \dots, g_q(x) > 0\}$$

is called  **$\mathcal{A}$ -basic**. If  $A \subseteq I_{m,r}$  is a finite union of  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic sets then we say that  $A$  is a  **$\mathcal{A}$ -set**. Notice in particular that the class of  $\mathcal{A}$ -sets is closed under finite unions and intersections.

Now, consider  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ . We say that  $A$  is  **$\mathcal{A}$ -semianalytic** when, for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and all  $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^m$ , there is a polydisk  $I_{m,r}$  such that the set  $h_{a,\sigma}(A) \cap I_{m,r}$  is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -set where

$$h_{a,\sigma}(x) = (\sigma_1(x_1 - a_1), \dots, \sigma_m(x_m - a_m)).$$

We say that  $A$  is a  **$\Lambda$ -set** when it is  $\mathcal{A}$ -semianalytic and bounded. Finally, we say that  $A$  is a **sub- $\Lambda$ -set** when there is a  $\Lambda$ -set  $A' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  for some integer  $k \geq 0$  such that  $A = \Pi_m(A')$ .

When we say **manifold**, we will mean a  $C^1$ -submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  for some integer  $m \geq 0$ . As in [3, p.4379], we will say that a set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  has dimension when it is a countable union of manifolds. In this case, we set

$$\dim(S) = \max\{\dim(M) : M \subseteq S \text{ is a manifold}\}$$

when  $S \neq \emptyset$  and  $\dim(\emptyset) = -\infty$ . Recall from [3, p.4379] the following facts.

- If  $S$  is a manifold then the dimension defined above agrees with its dimension as a manifold.
- If  $S = \bigcup_{j \in J} S_j$  where  $J$  is a countable set and each  $S_j$  has dimension then  $S$  also has dimension and  $\dim(S) = \max\{\dim(S_j) : j \in J\}$ .
- If  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is a manifold and  $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a  $C^1$ -map of constant rank  $r$  then  $f(M)$  has dimension and  $\dim(f(M)) = r$ .

The goal of this section is to prove that the structure  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is o-minimal. In order to do so, we want to show that every definable set has finitely many connected component. Since we can define an homeomorphism from  $\mathbb{R}$  to the interval  $(-1, 1)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{A}}$ , it suffices to prove that all bounded definable sets have finitely many connected components. We will use Gabrielov's Theorem of the Complement (see [3], Theorem 2.7) to prove that the collection of sub- $\Lambda$ -sets is stable under set difference. From this result, it is easy to deduce that sub- $\Lambda$ -sets are exactly the bounded definable sets (see [5], Theorem 4.18). Furthermore, in Corollary 2.16, we prove that every  $\Lambda$ -set has finitely many connected components. The same must be true about sub- $\Lambda$ -sets since they are themselves continuous images of  $\Lambda$ -sets. Finally, in order to prove that the assumptions of Gabrielov's Theorem of the Complement are satisfied, we prove in Theorem 2.27 that, for every sub- $\Lambda$ -set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ , there exist an integer  $k \geq 0$  and a  $\Lambda$ -set  $A' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  such that  $\Pi_m(A') = A$  and  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright A'$  has finite fibers.

## 2.2 Simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets

Considering the goal of this section, we will be especially interested in the following class of sub- $\Lambda$ -sets.

**Definition 2.1.** A set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is called a **simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set** when there is a  $\Lambda$ -set  $A' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  such that  $A = \Pi_m(A')$  and  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright A'$  has finite fibers.

The goal of this section is then to prove that every sub- $\Lambda$ -set is simple (see Theorem 2.27). The lemma below summarizes the main properties enjoyed by the class of simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets. All of these properties are immediate and we will thus omit the proof.

**Lemma 2.2.** Consider  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  three simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets. Then, the sets  $A \cap B, A \cup B$  and  $A \times C$  are also simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets. If  $k \leq m$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$  then the fiber

$$\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{m-k} : (x, y) \in A\}$$

is a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set. Furthermore, if  $\Pi_k \upharpoonright A$  has finite fibers then  $\Pi_k(A)$  is also a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set. Finally, if  $s(1), \dots, s(m) \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  then

$$\{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k : (x_{s(1)}, \dots, x_{s(m)}) \in A\}$$

is also a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set. ■

Throughout the rest of this section, we will be assuming the following.

**Assumption 2.3.** For every  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$ , the graph  $\Gamma(f)$  is a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set.

**Remark 2.4.** All of the hypotheses stated in the previous section were local while the assumption above is global. It is meant as a replacement for  $\mathcal{A}$ -analyticity (see [6], Definition 1.10). In particular, notice that if  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n,r}$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -analytic, then its graph  $\Gamma(f)$  is a  $\Lambda$ -set and thus also a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set. This shows that the current setting is more general than that presented in [6]. For instance, the o-minimal structure  $\mathbb{R}_H$  presented in [4] does not fit the setting of [6] since  $H$  is not  $\mathcal{A}$ -analytic but, as we showed in [5], it verifies assumption 2.3. It is also worth noting that, as an immediate consequence of the above assumption, if  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic set then  $A$  is also a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set.

## 2.3 Parametrizations

In order to prove that every sub- $\Lambda$ -set is simple, we need to obtain a good understanding of their geometry. In view of the definitions given in Paragraph 2.1, it is clear that a first step towards this goal is to understand the geometry of  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic sets. This paragraph is dedicated to achieving this. The main tool that we use to study this question is the following notion of parametrization.

**Definition 2.5.** Consider a set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  and a family  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  where  $\rho_j : I_{m,r_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is an admissible transformation and  $Q_j \subseteq I_{m,r_j}$  is a sub-quadrant. We say that it is a **local parametrization of  $A$  at 0** when the following conditions are satisfied.

- For each  $j \in J$ , the function  $\rho_j \upharpoonright Q_j$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image  $\rho_j(Q_j) \subseteq A$ .



- If  $U_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is a neighborhood of 0 for each  $j \in J$  then there is a finite subset  $J_0 \subseteq J$  such that  $\bigcup_{j \in J_0} \rho_j(Q_j \cap U_j)$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $A$ .

If also  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  are real valued functions whose domains contain  $A$  then we say that this parametrization is **compatible** with the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  when the functions  $f_k \circ \rho_j$  have constant sign for each  $j \in J$  and each  $1 \leq k \leq q$ .

**Remark 2.6.** The second point in the definition above is meant as some kind of compactness property for parametrizations. Accordingly, when we construct parametrizations in Lemma 2.7, this property is obtained by using compactness of a suitable topological space.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Consider a polydisk  $I_{m,r} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  and functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q \in \mathcal{A}_{m,r}$ . Then, there exists a local parametrization at 0 of  $I_{m,r}$  which is compatible with the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$ .*

Notice that the lemma above is obvious when the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  are normal. Indeed, in this case, the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  have constant sign on each subquadrant  $Q \subseteq I_{m,r}$ . In the general case, the idea of the proof is to use a tree  $T$  that \*-monomializes the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  in order to reduce to the case that  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  are all normal.

*Proof.* By 1.9, there is a tree  $T$  that \*-monomializes the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$ . Up to adding suitable reflections at the leaves of the tree, we may also assume that each  $\rho$  induced by a branch of the tree is defined on a polydisk of the form  $I_{m,r_\rho}$ . The proof now proceeds by induction on the pairs  $(m, h)$  ordered lexicographically where  $h$  is the height of  $T$ . Firstly, if  $m \in \{0, 1\}$  or if  $h = 0$  then the germs  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  are already normal and the result follows at once since normal germs have constant sign on each sub-quadrant up to restricting to a neighborhood of 0.

Now, assume that  $m > 1$  and that  $h > 0$ . To begin with, we are going to consider the case when the elementary transformations attached to the root of  $T$  are not blow-ups. In this case, let  $\nu: I_{m_\nu, n_\nu, r_\nu} \rightarrow I_{m,r}$  be one of these elementary transformations. The sub-tree  $T^\nu$  below  $\nu$  \*-monomializes the functions  $f_1 \circ \nu, \dots, f_q \circ \nu$ . Thus, by applying the inductive hypothesis, we get a family  $\{(Q_j^\nu, \rho_j^\nu) : j \in J^\nu\}$  adapted to the functions  $f_1 \circ \nu, \dots, f_q \circ \nu$ . For each  $j \in J^\nu$ , the admissible transformation  $\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  is then clearly a diffeomorphism onto its image and  $f_1 \circ \nu \circ \rho_j^\nu, \dots, f_q \circ \nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  have constant sign on  $Q_j^\nu$  by assumption. Finally, consider  $U_j^\nu \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  a neighborhood of 0 for each  $\nu$  attached to the root of  $T$  and each  $j \in J^\nu$ . Then, given  $\nu$ , there is a finite subset  $J_0^\nu \subseteq J^\nu$  such that  $\bigcup_{j \in J_0^\nu} \rho_j^\nu(Q_j^\nu \cap U_j^\nu)$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $I_{m_\nu, n_\nu, r_\nu}$ . Since there are only finitely many elementary transformations attached to the root in this case, we are done.

Next, assume that the elementary transformations attached to the root are blow-ups and let  $w, w'$  be the two variables that are involved in this family of blow-ups. Let  $K$  be the set of elementary transformations attached to the root of  $T$  and consider  $\nu: I_{m_\nu, n_\nu, r_\nu} \rightarrow I_{m,r}$  one of them. Let also  $w_\nu$  be the

critical variable of  $\nu$ . Then, the sub-tree  $T'$  of  $T$  below  $\nu$  \*-monomializes the functions  $f_1 \circ \nu, \dots, f_q \circ \nu, w_\nu$ , where  $w_\nu$  is viewed as a coordinate function. By the inductive hypothesis, we get a family  $\{(Q_j^\nu, \rho_j^\nu) : j \in J^\nu\}$  that is adapted to the functions  $f_1 \circ \nu, \dots, f_q \circ \nu, w_\nu$ .

Now, consider  $j \in J^\nu$ . Then, the functions  $f_1 \circ \nu \circ \rho_j^\nu, \dots, f_q \circ \nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  have constant sign on  $Q_j^\nu$  by assumption. Furthermore,  $w_\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  also has constant sign on  $Q_j^\nu$ . Thus, if  $w_\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu \upharpoonright Q_j^\nu \not\equiv 0$ , then  $w_\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  does not vanish on  $Q_j^\nu$  so that  $\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image. Thus, define

$$\underline{J}^\nu := \{j \in J^\nu : w_\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu \text{ does not vanish on } Q_j^\nu\}.$$

Now, consider  $U_j^\nu \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  a neighborhood of 0 for each  $\nu$  attached to the root of  $T$  and each  $j \in J^\nu$  such that  $\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  does not vanish on  $Q_j^\nu$ . If  $j \in J^\nu$  is such that  $\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu \upharpoonright Q_j^\nu \equiv 0$ , then define  $U_j^\nu = \mathbb{R}^m$ . For each  $\nu$  attached to the root of  $T$ , there is a finite subset  $J_0^\nu \subseteq J^\nu$  such that  $\bigcup_{j \in J_0^\nu} \rho_j^\nu(Q_j^\nu \cap U_j^\nu)$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $I_{m_\nu, n_\nu, r_\nu}$ . Then, by [6, Remark 2.17], there is a finite subset  $K_0 \subseteq K$  such that

$$V := \bigcup_{\nu \in K_0} \bigcup_{j \in J_0^\nu} \nu \circ \rho_j^\nu(Q_j^\nu \cap U_j^\nu)$$

is a neighborhood of 0 in  $I_{m, n, r}$ . Consider now  $a \in V$  such that  $w(a) \neq 0$  or  $w'(a) \neq 0$ . Then, let  $\nu \in K_0$ ,  $j \in J_0^\nu$  and  $b \in Q_j^\nu \cap U_j^\nu$  such that  $\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu(b) = a$ . We must have  $w_\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu(b) \neq 0$  so that  $w_\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu$  does not vanish on  $Q_j^\nu$ . Thus, letting

$$\underline{J}_0^\nu := \{j \in J_0^\nu : w_\nu \circ \rho_j^\nu \text{ does not vanish on } Q_j^\nu\},$$

we have that  $\underline{J}_0^\nu \subseteq \underline{J}^\nu$  is finite and

$$\bigcup_{\nu \in K_0} \bigcup_{j \in \underline{J}_0^\nu} \nu \circ \rho_j^\nu(Q_j^\nu \cap U_j^\nu)$$

is a neighborhood of 0 in  $\{a \in I_{m, r} : w(a) \neq 0 \text{ or } w'(a) \neq 0\}$ .

Now, write  $\hat{x}$  for the tuple  $x$  with the variables  $w$  and  $w'$  removed. By induction on  $m$ , there is a family  $\{(Q_j', \rho_j') : j \in J\}$  that is adapted to the functions  $f_1(\hat{x}, 0, 0), \dots, f_q(\hat{x}, 0, 0)$ . Given  $j \in J$ , define

$$Q_j := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \hat{x} \in Q_j', w = 0, w' = 0\}$$

and let  $\rho_j$  be the extension of  $\rho_j'$  to the variables  $x$  obtained by making  $\rho_j$  act as the identity on  $w$  and  $w'$ . Then, for each  $j \in J$ ,  $\rho_j$  is an admissible transformation such that  $\rho_j \upharpoonright Q_j$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image. Furthermore, the functions  $f_1 \circ \rho_j, \dots, f_q \circ \rho_j$  have constant sign on  $Q_j$ . Finally, if  $U_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  is a neighborhood of 0 for each  $j \in J$ , then there is a finite subset  $J_0 \subseteq J$  such that  $\bigcup_{j \in J_0} \rho_j(Q_j \cap U_j)$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $\{a \in I_{m, n, r} : w(a) = w'(a) = 0\}$ . All in all, this shows that the family

$$\{(Q_j, \rho_j) : j \in J\} \cup \{(Q_j^\nu, \nu \circ \rho_j^\nu) : \nu \in K, j \in \underline{J}^\nu\}$$

is adapted to the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  whence the result.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2.8.** The lemma above is inspired by [6, Proposition 3.4] but there are two main differences. To begin with, we have to use  $*$ -monomialization instead of just using monomialization when handling blow-ups. This is necessary to ensure that each chart in the local parametrization is a diffeomorphism onto its image. Indeed, in order to write the inverse of a blow-up chart  $\nu$ , we need to stay away from the hyperplane  $\{w_\nu = 0\}$  which can only be done if we know the sign of  $w_\nu$  after monomialization.

Notice also that we handle compactness quite differently. Indeed, in [6], the authors use compactness to obtain a finite covering which is weaker than what we have proven above. Indeed, if we restrict the domains of the charts to smaller neighborhoods of 0, there is no way to ensure that the charts still cover a neighborhood of 0 in  $I_{m,r}$ . In [6], this strategy is sufficient because the authors do not need to restrict the domains of the chart at any point. However, we will do so quite often hence the need to obtain a “finiteness property after suitable restrictions of the domain”, which is exactly the content of the second point in Definition 2.5.

The lemma above is seemingly weaker than [6, Proposition 3.4] because we have constructed local parametrizations for polydisks only, and not for general  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic sets. However, since  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic sets are defined by equations and inequations, it is easy to refine the lemma to fix this shortcoming.

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $A \subseteq I_{m,r}$  be a  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic set and consider functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q \in \mathcal{A}_{m,r}$ . Then, there exists a local parametrization of  $A$  at 0 which is adapted to the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$ .*

*Proof.* Up to shrinking  $I_{m,r}$ , we may assume that there are  $f, g_1, \dots, g_p \in \mathcal{A}_{m,r}$  such that

$$A = \{x \in I_{m,r} : f(x) = 0, g_1(x) > 0, \dots, g_p(x) > 0\}.$$

Now, consider  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  a local parametrization of  $I_{m,r}$  at 0 compatible with the functions  $f, f_1, \dots, f_q, g_1, \dots, g_p$  and let  $J' = \{j \in J : \rho_j(Q_j) \subseteq A\}$ . The family  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J'\}$  is a local parametrization of  $A$  at 0 compatible with the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$ . ■

Recall that we want to study the geometry of sub- $\Lambda$ -sets. Thus, we would like to derive similar results to the above, but for projections of  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic sets instead. In order to do so, the idea is to sharpen Proposition 2.9 by making each chart in the local parametrization be compatible with a certain projection. Accordingly, the rest of this paragraph is dedicated to proving Corollary 2.14. The corollary is inspired by the paragraph before the Fiber Cutting Lemma (Lemma 4.5) in [8]. The main difference between the present treatment and the classical one (see [8] or [6] for instance) is that, instead of decomposing manifolds into smaller submanifolds, we further parametrize the manifolds obtained in Proposition 2.9. To do so, we need to be able to “compose” parametrizations which is the content of the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  be a set and consider  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  a local parametrization of  $A$  at 0. Let also  $\{(\rho_{jk}, Q_{jk}) : k \in K_j\}$  be a local parametrization of  $Q_j$  at 0 for each  $j \in J$ . Then*

$$\{(\rho_j \circ \rho_{jk}, Q_{jk}) : j \in J, k \in K_j\}$$

*is a local parametrization of  $A$  at 0. ■*

As in [8], we are going to decompose the various manifolds obtained in function of the sign of some determinants involving a basis for the tangent plane of the manifolds in question. Such bases can be obtained by straightforward computations with matrices. However, we must be careful to replace every division by a multiplication in order to stay within the quasianalytic algebras. These issues are explained in more detail below.

**2.11.** Consider  $\eta: I_{d,r} \rightarrow I_{m+k,s}$  a function whose components are all in  $\mathcal{A}_{d,r}$ . Let  $a: I_{d,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function defined by  $a(x) = x_1 \dots x_d$ , it is clear that  $a \in \mathcal{A}_{d,r}$ . Consider also  $Q \subseteq I_{d,r}$  the open sub-quadrant of  $I_{d,r}$ . Up to shrinking  $I_{d,r}$ , we may assume that  $x_i \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial x_j} \in \mathcal{A}_{d,r}$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq m+k$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Thus, if we define the matrix  $A(x) = (a(x) \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial x_j})_{1 \leq i \leq m+k, 1 \leq j \leq d}$ , then all of the entries of  $A(x)$  are in  $\mathcal{A}_{d,r}$ . Furthermore, if  $x \in Q$ , then  $\eta$  is differentiable at  $x$  and  $A(x) = a(x)d_x(\eta)$ , where  $a(x) \neq 0$ .

Assume in particular that  $\eta \upharpoonright Q$  is a diffeomorphism onto  $M = \eta(Q)$ . Then,  $A(x)$  is injective for every  $x \in Q$ . If  $e_1, \dots, e_d$  is the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and if  $a_i(x) = A(x)e_i$  for each  $x \in I_{d,r}$  and each  $1 \leq i \leq d$ , then all the components of  $a_i$  are  $\mathcal{A}_{d,r}$  and  $a_1(x), \dots, a_d(x)$  is a basis of  $T_{\eta(x)}(M)$ .

From now on, we also suppose that  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M$  has constant rank  $l$  and that there is a strictly increasing sequence  $\iota: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  such that  $\iota(l) \leq m$  and  $\Pi_\iota \upharpoonright M$  is an immersion. For  $x \in I_{d,r}$ , we define the matrix  $A'(x) = (a(x) \frac{\partial \eta_{\iota(i)}}{\partial x_j})_{1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq d}$ . All of the entries of  $A'(x)$  are in  $\mathcal{A}_{d,r}$  and, for  $x \in Q$ , we have  $A'(x) = a(x)d_x(\Pi_\iota \circ \eta)$  so that  $A'(x)$  is invertible. Consider also  $B(x)$  the transpose of the cofactor matrix of  $A'(x)$ . Then, all of the entries of  $B(x)$  are in  $\mathcal{A}_{d,r}$  and, for  $x \in Q$ , we have  $B(x) = \det(A'(x))A'(x)^{-1}$ . Finally, define  $b_i(x) = B(x)e_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . It is clear that all of the components of  $b_i$  are in  $\mathcal{A}_{d,r}$ . Fix some  $x \in Q$ , we have that  $b_1(x), \dots, b_d(x)$  is a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Furthermore, since  $\ker(\Pi_m \upharpoonright T_{\eta(x)}(M))$  has dimension  $d-l$ , it follows that  $\Pi_\iota$  induces an isomorphism from  $\ker(\Pi_m \upharpoonright T_{\eta(x)}(M))$  to  $\ker(\Pi_\iota)$ . If  $1 \leq i \leq d-l$ , then

$$\Pi_\iota \circ \Pi_\iota \circ d_x(\eta)(b_i(x)) = \Pi_\iota \left( \frac{\det(A'(x))}{a(x)} e_i \right) = 0$$

so that  $\Pi_m \circ d_x(\eta)(b_i(x)) = 0$ . Thus,  $b_{d-l+1}(x), \dots, b_d(x)$  are a basis of  $\ker(\Pi_m \circ d_x(\eta))$ .

We are especially interested in the following situation. Consider  $Q \subseteq I_{m+k,s}$  a sub-quadrant and let  $\rho: I_{m+k,s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  be an admissible transformation such that  $\rho \upharpoonright Q$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image. If we write  $d = \dim(Q)$ , then

there is a unique strictly increasing sequence  $\kappa: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  such that  $\Pi_\kappa \upharpoonright Q$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image  $Q' \subseteq I_{d,r}$ , where  $r = \Pi_\kappa(s)$ . Then,  $Q'$  is the open sub-quadrant of  $I_{d,r}$  and we might apply the previous results to the map  $\eta: I_{d,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  defined by  $\eta(x) = \rho(y)$  where  $y_i = x_j$  when  $\kappa(j) = i$  and  $y_i = 0$  when  $i \notin \text{im}(\kappa)$ .

**Proposition 2.12.** *Let  $Q \subseteq I_{m+k,r}$  be a sub-quadrant and  $\rho: I_{m+k,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  be an admissible transformation such that the restriction  $\rho \upharpoonright Q$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image. There is a local parametrization  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  of  $Q$  at 0 such that, for each  $j \in J$ , if we write  $M_j = \rho \circ \rho_j(Q_j)$  then*

- *The projection  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_j$  has constant rank  $l$ .*
- *There is a strictly increasing sequence  $\iota: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  such that  $\iota(l) \leq m$  and  $\Pi_\iota \upharpoonright M_j$  is an immersion.*

*Proof.* We prove the result by induction on  $\dim(Q)$ , the result being obvious when  $\dim(Q) = 0$ . Thus, assume that  $d = \dim(Q) > 0$  and write  $M = \rho(Q)$ . By 2.11, up to shrinking  $I_{m+k,r}$ , we might assume that there are functions  $a_1, \dots, a_d: I_{m+k,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  such that all of their components are in  $\mathcal{A}_{m+k,r}$  and  $a_1(x), \dots, a_d(x)$  is a basis of  $T_{\rho(x)}(M)$  for each  $x \in Q$ . Both points of the proposition are proven by introducing parametrizations that are compatible with some family of determinants involving  $a_1, \dots, a_d$ .

Firstly, consider a local parametrization  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  of  $Q$  at 0 that is compatible with the functions

$$\det(\Pi_\iota(a_{\kappa(1)}(x)), \dots, \Pi_\iota(a_{\kappa(k)}(x)))$$

for every integer  $k \geq 0$  and every strictly increasing functions  $\iota: \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\kappa: \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d\}$ . By Lemma 2.10, it suffices to show that the result holds for each pair  $(\rho \circ \rho_j, Q_j)$ . Fix  $j \in J$ , if  $\dim(Q_j) < \dim(Q)$ , we are done by induction hypothesis. Thus, assume that  $\dim(Q_j) = \dim(Q)$  and let  $M_j = \rho \circ \rho_j(Q_j)$ . Since  $\dim(M_j) = \dim(M)$ , it follows that  $M_j$  is an open submanifold of  $M$ . Thus, for every  $x \in Q_j$ , the family  $a_1 \circ \rho_j(x), \dots, a_d \circ \rho_j(x)$  is a basis of  $T_{\rho \circ \rho_j(x)}(M_j)$ . Furthermore, for every integer  $k \geq 0$  and every increasing sequences  $\iota: \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\kappa: \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d\}$ , the function

$$\det(\Pi_\iota(a_{\kappa(1)} \circ \rho_j(x)), \dots, \Pi_\iota(a_{\kappa(k)} \circ \rho_j(x)))$$

has constant sign. Thus, it follows at once that  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_j$  has constant rank  $l$  for some integer  $l \geq 0$ . All in all, we have shown that it suffices to prove the proposition when the first point is already satisfied.

Thus, assume that the first point holds and consider  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  a local parametrization of  $Q$  at 0 that is compatible with the functions

$$\det(\Pi_\iota(a_1(x)), \dots, \Pi_\iota(a_d(x)))$$

for every strictly increasing sequence  $\iota: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  such that  $\iota(l) \leq m$ . By Lemma 2.10, it suffices to prove the result for each pair  $(\rho \circ \rho_j, Q_j)$ .

Fix  $j \in J$ , if  $\dim(Q_j) < \dim(Q)$  then the result follows by the induction hypothesis. Thus, assume that  $\dim(Q_j) = \dim(Q)$  so that  $M_j := \rho \circ \rho_j(Q_j)$  is an open submanifold of  $M$ . Then,  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_j$  must have constant rank  $l$ . Let  $x \in Q_j$  and write  $y = \rho_j(x)$ . Then the family  $\Pi_m(a_1(y)), \dots, \Pi_m(a_d(y))$  has rank  $l$  so that, up to changing the order, we might assume that  $\Pi_m(a_1(y)), \dots, \Pi_m(a_l(y))$  are independent. Thus, there is some strictly increasing sequence  $\iota': \{1, \dots, l\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\Pi_{\iota'}(a_1(y)), \dots, \Pi_{\iota'}(a_l(y))$  is a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^l$ . Since the vectors  $a_1(y), \dots, a_d(y)$  are independent, there exists a strictly increasing sequence  $\iota: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  which extends  $\iota'$  and such that  $\Pi_\iota(a_1(y)), \dots, \Pi_\iota(a_d(y))$  is a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In particular,  $\iota(l) \leq m$  and

$$\det(\Pi_\iota(a_1 \circ \rho_j(x)), \dots, \Pi_\iota(a_d \circ \rho_j(x))) \neq 0.$$

Since this is a constant function of  $x$ , it follows that  $\Pi_\iota \upharpoonright M_j$  has to be an immersion whence the result.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2.13.** Notice that the induction on dimension is necessary in the proof above. Indeed, reusing the notations of the second paragraph, if  $\dim(Q_j) < \dim(Q)$  then we do not know a basis of  $T_{\rho \circ \rho_j(x)}(M_j)$  for  $x \in Q_j$ . In particular, the determinants

$$\det(\Pi_\iota(a_{\kappa(1)} \circ \rho_j(x), \dots, a_{\kappa(k)} \circ \rho_j(x)))$$

have no meaning in this context.

The following corollary is the result we have been building up to in this section. As explained earlier, it gives parametrizations for  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic sets that are “compatible” with a certain projection. We intend to use the corollary in conjunction with the Fiber Cutting Lemma to be introduced in the next paragraph to obtain results about the geometry of sub- $\Lambda$ -sets.

**Corollary 2.14.** *Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  be a  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic set. Then, there exists a local parametrization  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  of  $A$  at 0 such that, for every  $j \in J$ , we have*

- *If we write  $M_j = \rho_j(Q_j)$  then  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_j$  has constant rank  $l$ .*
- *There is a strictly increasing sequence  $\iota: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  such that  $\iota(l) \leq m$  and  $\Pi_\iota \upharpoonright M_j$  is an immersion.*

*Proof.* We may first obtain a local parametrization  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  of  $A$  at 0 by Proposition 2.9. For each  $j \in J$ , we consider  $\{(\rho_{jk}, Q_{jk}) : k \in K_j\}$  the local parametrization of  $Q$  at 0 obtained by Proposition 2.12. Finally, by Lemma 2.10, the family  $\{(\rho_j \circ \rho_{jk}, Q_{jk}) : j \in J, k \in K_j\}$  is a local parametrization of  $A$  at 0 whence the result.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2.15.** Consider  $Q \subseteq I_{m+k,r}$  a sub-quadrant of dimension  $d$  and  $\rho: I_{m+k,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  an admissible transformation such that  $\rho \upharpoonright Q$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image. Consider also  $M = \rho(Q)$  and assume that  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M$  has constant rank  $l < d$  and that there is a strictly increasing sequence

$\iota: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  such that  $\Pi_\iota \upharpoonright M$  is an immersion and  $\iota(l) \leq m$ . Let  $f = \rho_{\iota(l+1)}$  and consider  $x \in Q$ . We are going to show that  $\nabla f(x)$  is not in the orthogonal of  $\ker(\Pi_m \circ d_x(\rho))$ .

Indeed, let  $e_1, \dots, e_{d-l}$  be a basis of  $\ker(\Pi_m \circ d_x(\rho))$ . The family of vectors  $\Pi_\iota(T_x(\rho)(e_1)), \dots, \Pi_\iota(T_x(\rho)(e_{d-l}))$  are linearly independent and we have  $\Pi_m(T_x(\rho)(e_1)) = \dots = \Pi_m(T_x(\rho)(e_{d-l})) = 0$ . Thus, if we define  $\iota': \{1, \dots, d-l\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  by setting  $\iota'(i) = \iota(l+i)$ , the vectors  $\Pi_{\iota'}(T_x(\rho)(e_1)), \dots, \Pi_{\iota'}(T_x(\rho)(e_{d-l}))$  are independent so that they are a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{d-l}$ . In particular, there must be some  $1 \leq i \leq d-l$  such that the  $\iota(l+1)$ -th coordinate of  $T_x(\rho)(e_i)$  is non-zero. Thus,  $\nabla \rho_{\iota(l+1)} \cdot e_i \neq 0$  whence the result.

Combining what we said above with 2.11, it is easy to show that the charts obtained by Corollary 2.14 verify the assumptions of the Local Fiber Cutting Lemma (Lemma 2.19).

Before ending this paragraph, we prove a few results about the geometry of  $\Lambda$ -sets and sub- $\Lambda$ -sets that are easy consequences of the corollary above. To begin with, if  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  is a  $\Lambda$ -set, we can use the compactness of  $\bar{A}$  to obtain the following:

**Corollary 2.16.** *Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  be a  $\Lambda$ -set. Then, there are  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  some simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets that are also connected manifolds such that  $A = M_1 \cup \dots \cup M_p$ , and, for each  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , the projection  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_i$  has constant rank  $l_i$  and there is a strictly increasing sequence  $\iota: \{1, \dots, d_i\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$ , where  $d_i = \dim(M_i)$ , such that  $\Pi_\iota \upharpoonright M_i$  is an immersion and  $\iota(l_i) \leq m$ . ■*

**Remark 2.17.** Notice that, as an immediate consequence of the corollary,  $\Lambda$ -sets have finitely many connected components. Since sub- $\Lambda$ -sets are continuous images of  $\Lambda$ -sets, they too have only finitely many connected components.

Since the image of a manifold by a function with constant rank has dimension, we can use the corollary above to show that sub- $\Lambda$ -sets have dimension. The next lemma will allow us to compute that dimension in some key cases. It shows in particular that, if  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  is a  $\Lambda$ -set and  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright A$  has finite fibers, then  $\dim(\Pi_m(A)) = \dim(A)$  which is useful when considering simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets.

**Lemma 2.18.** *Consider  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set and assume that there is an integer  $\mu \geq 0$  such that  $\dim A_y = \mu$  for all  $y \in \Pi_m(A)$ . Then  $\dim(A) = \dim(\Pi_m(A)) + \mu$ .*

*Proof.* We are first going to prove the result when  $A$  is a  $\Lambda$ -set. To this end, consider  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  as in Corollary 2.16. Let  $d_i = \dim(M_i)$  and  $l_i$  be the constant rank of  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_i$ . If we define  $\mu_i = d_i - l_i$ , then  $\dim((M_i)_y) = \mu_i$  for each  $y \in \Pi_m(M_i)$ . Since  $(M_i)_y \subseteq A_y$ , it follows that  $\mu_i \leq \mu$ . Furthermore,  $\dim(\Pi_m(M_i)) = l_i$  so that  $l_i \leq \dim(\Pi_m(A))$ . Thus,  $d_i \leq \dim(\Pi_m(A)) + \mu$ . But  $\dim(A) = \max(d_1, \dots, d_p)$  so that  $\dim(A) \leq \dim(\Pi_m(A)) + \mu$ .

Now, we prove the opposite inequality. To this end, consider  $y \in \Pi_m(A)$ , we have  $A_y = (M_1)_y \cup \dots \cup (M_p)_y$ . Since  $\dim(A_y) = \mu$ , there is some  $1 \leq i \leq p$

such that  $\dim((M_i)_y) = \mu$ . But then,  $\mu_i = \mu$  and  $y \in \Pi_m(M_i)$  so that we obtain

$$\Pi_m(A) = \bigcup_{\mu_i = \mu} \Pi_m(M_i).$$

Thus, there is some  $1 \leq i \leq p$  such that  $\mu_i = \mu$  and such that  $l_i = \dim(\Pi_m(M_i)) = \dim(\Pi_m(A))$ . We now have  $\dim(A) \geq \dim(M_i) = l_i + \mu_i = \dim(\Pi_m(A)) + \mu$  whence the result when  $A$  is a  $\Lambda$ -set.

Assume next that  $A$  is a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set and consider an integer  $k \geq 0$  and a  $\Lambda$ -set  $A' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k+h}$  such that  $\Pi_{m+k}(A') = A$  and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A'$  has finite fibers. In particular, we may apply the lemma to  $A'$  to obtain that  $\dim(A') = \dim(A)$ . Furthermore,  $\Pi_m(A) = \Pi_m(A')$  and, for every  $y \in \Pi_m(A')$ , we have  $\Pi_{m+k}(A'_y) = A_y$ . Since  $A'_y$  is a  $\Lambda$ -set and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A'_y$  has finite fibers, we conclude that  $\dim(A'_y) = \dim(A_y) = \mu$  by the lemma. Finally, applying the lemma again, we find that  $\dim(A) = \dim(A') = \dim(\Pi_m(A')) + \mu = \dim(\Pi_m(A)) + \mu$  which concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

## 2.4 The Fiber Cutting Lemmas

For every sub- $\Lambda$ -set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , there exist some integer  $k \geq 0$  and some  $\Lambda$ -set  $A' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  such that  $\Pi_{n+k}(A') = A$ . However, it is possible that  $\dim A' > \dim A$ . Thanks to the Global Fiber Cutting Lemma (stated as Corollary 2.23 below), we are able to replace  $A'$  with  $\Lambda$ -sets of lower dimension whenever this is the case. It is then rather easy to deduce Theorem 2.27 according to which all sub- $\Lambda$ -sets are simple. We first prove a local version of the Fiber Cutting Lemma, from which the global version follows by compactness of parametrizations.

**Lemma 2.19** (Local Fiber Cutting Lemma). *Let  $Q \subseteq I_{d,r}$  be a sub-quadrant of  $I_{d,r}$ . Consider also  $\eta: I_{d,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  a  $C^1$ -map such that  $\eta \upharpoonright Q$  has constant rank  $l < d$  and  $\eta_i \in \mathcal{A}_{d,r}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$  where  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m)$ . Assume also that*

- *There are functions  $b_1, \dots, b_{d-l}: I_{d,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  such that all of their components are in  $\mathcal{A}_{d,r}$  and, for every  $x \in Q$ ,  $b_1(x), \dots, b_{d-l}(x)$  is a basis of  $\ker(T_x(\eta))$ .*
- *There is a function  $f \in \mathcal{A}_{d,r}$  such that, for all  $x \in Q$ ,  $\nabla f(x)$  is not in the orthogonal of  $\ker(T_x(\eta))$ .*

*Then, there exists a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set  $A \subseteq Q$  and a neighborhood  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  of 0 such that  $\eta(Q \cap U) = \eta(A)$  and  $\dim(A) < d$ .*

**Remark 2.20.** The function  $f$  whose existence is assumed will only be useful at the end of the proof. It serves as a way to show that the connected components of the fibers of  $\eta \upharpoonright Q$  must have non-empty frontier following the discussion before Lemma 4.5 in [8].






Figure 1:

*Proof.* Notice first that it suffices to prove the result when  $Q$  is an open sub-quadrant of  $I_{d,r}$ . Then, define

$$\tilde{Q} = \{(x, r') \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d : 0 < r'_i < r_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq d \text{ and } x \in Q \cap I_{d,r'}\}$$

and consider the function  $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\Phi(x, r') = \prod_{i=1}^d x_i(r'_i - x_i).$$

Let also

$$\tilde{A} = \{(x, r') \in \tilde{Q} : \nabla_x \Phi(x, r') \cdot b_1(x) = \dots = \nabla_x \Phi(x, r') \cdot b_{d-l}(x) = 0\}.$$

Now, fix some  $r'$  such that  $0 < r'_i < r_i$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . The first step is to show that  $\eta(\tilde{A}_{r'}) = \eta(Q \cap I_{d,r'})$ . To do this, we proceed as in [6, Lemma 3.11]. Thus let  $y \in \eta(Q \cap I_{d,r'})$  and consider  $C$  a connected component of the fiber of  $\eta \upharpoonright Q \cap I_{d,r'}$  above  $y$ . Since  $\bar{C}$  is compact, there is  $x_0 \in \bar{C}$  such that  $\Phi(x_0, r')$  is maximal. Given that  $x \mapsto \Phi(x, r')$  is strictly positive on  $Q \cap I_{d,r'}$  and vanishes on its frontier, it follows that  $x_0 \in C$ . Thus, the restriction of  $x \mapsto \Phi(x, r')$  to  $C$  is critical at  $x_0$  so that  $x_0 \in \tilde{A}_{r'}$ . This shows in particular that  $\eta(\tilde{A}_{r'}) = \eta(Q \cap I_{d,r'})$  as announced above. Furthermore,  $\tilde{A}_{r'}$  is a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set so that we might pick  $A = \Pi_d(\tilde{A}_{r'})$  whenever  $\dim(\tilde{A}_{r'}) < d$ .

In [6, Lemma 3.11], the authors show that we must have  $\dim(\tilde{A}_{r'}) < d$  for every  $r'$ . However, this involves using  $\mathcal{A}$ -analyticity which we have not assumed. Thus, we will instead attempt to show that there is some  $r'$  such that  $\dim(\tilde{A}_{r'}) < d$ . The argument will rely on an ability to restrict to arbitrary neighborhoods of 0 in  $\tilde{Q}$ . More precisely, given a polydisk  $I_{2d,s}$ , we have  $\tilde{A}_{r'} \subseteq I_{2d,s}$  for every sufficiently small  $r'$ . This is illustrated in the case  $d = 1$ ,  $r = 4$  and  $s = (2, 3)$

in Figure 1. Indeed, the set  $\tilde{Q}$  is included in the orange area in the leftmost drawing whence the fibers in the green area in the rightmost drawing are fully contained in  $I_{2d,s}$ .

Thus, assume by contradiction that  $\dim(\tilde{A}_{r'}) = d$  for every  $r'$  such that  $0 < r'_i < r_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq d$  and let  $B$  be the interior of  $\tilde{A}$ . We are going to show that  $0 \in \overline{B}$ . To this end, consider  $I_{2d,s} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  a polydisk. For every sufficiently small  $r'$ , we have  $\tilde{A}_{r'} \subseteq I_{2d,s}$  so that, by Lemma 2.18, it follows that  $\dim(\tilde{A} \cap I_{2d,s}) = 2d$ . Thus,  $\tilde{A} \cap I_{2d,s}$  has non-empty interior so that  $B \cap I_{2d,s} \neq \emptyset$ . This shows that  $0 \in \overline{B}$  as we wanted. Consider a parametrization  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  of  $I_{d,r} \times I_{d,r}$  that is compatible with the functions  $a_1, \dots, a_{d-l} \in \mathcal{A}_{2d,(r,r)}$ , where

$$a_i(x, r') = \nabla_x \Phi(x, r') \cdot b_i(x),$$

and let  $J_0 \subseteq J$  be a finite subset such that  $\bigcup_{j \in J_0} \rho_j(Q_j)$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $I_{d,r} \times I_{d,r}$ . Since  $B$  is an open set and  $0 \in \overline{B}$ , there has to be some  $j \in J_0$  such that  $\dim(B \cap \rho_j(Q_j)) = 2d$ . It follows that  $Q_j$  is an open sub-quadrant and that  $a_i \circ \rho_j \upharpoonright Q_j \equiv 0$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq d-l$ . Thus, for  $1 \leq i \leq d-l$ , we have  $\mathbf{T}(a_i \circ \rho_j) = 0$  so that  $\mathbf{T}(a_i) = 0$ . But then, by quasi-analyticity, we deduce that there is a polydisk  $I_{2d,s} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  such that  $a_1, \dots, a_{d-l}$  vanish on  $I_{2d,s}$ .

Now, for every sufficiently small  $r'$ , we have  $\tilde{Q}_{r'} \subseteq I_{2d,s}$ . Consider such a  $r'$ , some  $y \in \eta(Q \cap I_{d,r'})$  and let  $C$  be a connected component of the fiber of  $\eta \upharpoonright Q \cap I_{d,r'}$  above  $y$ . Then,  $\Phi(x, r')$  is constant and strictly positive on  $C$  and it vanishes on the frontier of  $C$ . This implies that  $C$  has empty frontier whence it is compact. Thus, there is some  $x_0 \in C$  such that  $f(x_0)$  is maximal. But, by hypothesis, there is some  $1 \leq i \leq d-l$  such that  $\nabla f(x_0) \cdot b_i(x_0) \neq 0$  which contradicts the maximality.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2.21.** Reusing the notation of the proof above, the function  $x \mapsto \Phi(x, r')$  for some fixed  $r'$  is simpler than the function  $g$  in [6, Lemma 3.11] since there are no functions  $g_1, \dots, g_q$ . This is a consequence of our approach towards refining the parametrization. Indeed, the functions  $g_1, \dots, g_q$  in [6] are used to define an open submanifold. Since we have decided to parametrize further instead of taking submanifolds, these functions do not appear.

Assume that  $Q \subseteq I_{m+k,r}$  is a sub-quadrant and that  $\rho: I_{m+k,r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  is an admissible transformation such that  $\rho \upharpoonright Q$  is a diffeomorphism onto  $M := \rho(Q)$ . Assume also that  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M$  has constant rank  $l < d$  and that there is a strictly increasing sequence  $\iota: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m+k\}$  such that  $\iota(l) \leq m$  and  $\Pi_\iota \upharpoonright M$  is an immersion. Then, by 2.11 and by Remark 2.15, it follows that the function  $\eta := \Pi_m \circ \rho$  satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma. Thus, reusing the notations of Corollary 2.14, for each  $j \in J$ , either we can apply the Local Fiber Cutting Lemma to  $\eta_j := \Pi_m \circ \rho_j$  over the sub-quadrant  $Q_j$  or the projection  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_j$  has finite fibers.


By the remark above, we can apply the Local Fiber Cutting Lemma to the charts obtained thanks to Corollary 2.14. The proposition below is obtained by doing exactly that.

**Proposition 2.22.** Consider  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  a  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic set such that  $\dim(\Pi_m(B)) < \dim(B)$ . Then, there are  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  some  $\Lambda$ -sets such that

- For every  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , there is some integer  $h_i \geq 0$  such that  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k+h_i}$ ,  $\dim(A_i) < \dim(B)$ ,  $\Pi_{m+k}(A_i) \subseteq B$  and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A_i$  has finite fibers.
- There is a neighborhood  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  of 0 such that

$$\Pi_m(B \cap U) = \Pi_m(A_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_m(A_p).$$

*Proof.* As said above, the proof proceeds by first parametrizing  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic sets using Corollary 2.14 and then applying the Local Fiber Cutting Lemma to each of the charts we obtain. The following diagram illustrates the situation.



Consider  $\{(\rho_j, Q_j) : j \in J\}$  a parametrization of  $B$  obtained by Corollary 2.14 and fix  $j \in J$ . If  $\dim(Q_j) < \dim(B)$  then we let  $U_j = \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  and  $C_j = Q_j$ . Notice in particular that  $\Pi_m(\rho_j(Q_j \cap U_j)) = \Pi_m(\rho_j(C_j))$  and that  $\dim(C_j) < \dim(B)$ . Now, assume that  $\dim(Q_j) = \dim(B)$ . Then, let  $\eta: Q_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  defined by  $\eta = \Pi_m \circ \rho_j$ . By assumption, this map has constant rank  $l$  and we must have

$$l = \dim(\eta(Q_j)) \leq \dim(\Pi_m(B)) < \dim(B) = \dim(Q_j).$$

By the Fiber Cutting Lemma above, there are  $U_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  a neighborhood of 0 and  $C_j \subseteq Q_j$  a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set such that  $\eta(Q_j \cap U_j) = \eta(C_j)$  and  $\dim(C_j) < \dim(B)$ .

Now, consider  $J_0 \subseteq J$  a finite subset such that  $V := \bigcup_{j \in J_0} \rho_j(Q_j \cap U_j)$  is a neighborhood of 0 in  $B$ . We then have

$$\Pi_m(V) = \bigcup_{j \in J_0} \Pi_m(\rho_j(Q_j \cap U_j)) = \bigcup_{j \in J_0} \Pi_m(\rho_j(C_j)).$$

For  $j \in J_0$ ,  $C_j$  is a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set so that  $\rho_j(C_j)$  is also a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set. Thus, there is a  $\Lambda$ -set  $A_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k+h_j}$  such that  $\Pi_{m+k}(A_j) = \rho_j(C_j)$  and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A_j$  has finite fibers. We deduce that  $\dim(A_j) = \dim(C_j)$  by Lemma 2.18. In particular,  $\dim(A_j) < \dim(B)$  for  $j \in J_0$  and

$$\Pi_m(V) = \bigcup_{j \in J_0} \Pi_m(A_j)$$

whence the result. ■

Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  be a  $\Lambda$ -set. Since  $A$  is locally a finite union of  $\mathcal{A}$ -basic set around each point of  $\bar{A}$ , we can use the proposition above and the compactness of  $\bar{A}$  to obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.23** (Global Fiber Cutting). *Let  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  be a  $\Lambda$ -set such that  $\dim(\Pi_m(B)) < \dim(B)$ . Then, there are  $\Lambda$ -sets  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  such that*

- For every  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , there is some integer  $h_i \geq 0$  such that  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k+h_i}$ ,  $\dim(A_i) < \dim(B)$ ,  $\Pi_{m+k}(A_i) \subseteq B$  and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A_i$  has finite fibers.
- We have

$$\Pi_m(B) = \Pi_m(A_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_m(A_p).$$

■

**Remark 2.24.** We require that  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A_i$  has finite fibers and that  $\Pi_{m+k}(A_i) \subseteq B$  so that, for every  $y \in \Pi_m(A_i)$ , we have  $\dim((A_i)_y) \leq \dim(B_y)$ . Indeed, consider  $y \in \Pi_m(A_i)$ . We have  $\Pi_{m+k}((A_i)_y) \subseteq B_y$  and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright (A_i)_y$  has finite fibers so that, by Lemma 2.18,  $\dim((A_i)_y) = \dim(\Pi_{m+k}((A_i)_y)) \leq \dim(B_y)$ .

We now want to prove that every sub- $\Lambda$ -set is simple. The rough idea of the proof is to apply the corollary above inductively. However, we still need to make a link between satisfying  $\dim(\Pi_m(B)) = \dim(B)$  and having  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright B$  have finite fibers. This is the point of the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.25.** *Let  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$  be a  $\Lambda$ -set. Then, there are  $\Lambda$ -sets  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  such that*

- For every  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , there is some integer  $h_i \geq 0$  such that  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k+h_i}$  and  $\dim((A_i)_y)$  does not depend on  $y \in \Pi_m(A_i)$ .
- For each  $1 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A_i$  has finite fibers and

$$B = \Pi_{m+k}(A_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_{m+k}(A_p).$$


*Proof.* By Corollary 2.16, there are  $M_1, \dots, M_p$  some simple sub- $\Lambda$ -sets that are also manifolds such that  $A = M_1 \cup \dots \cup M_p$  and  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright M_i$  has constant rank for each  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . Now, consider a  $\Lambda$ -set  $B_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+k+h_i}$  such that  $\Pi_{m+k}(B_i) = M_i$  and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright B_i$  has finite fibers. We have that  $A = \Pi_{m+k}(B_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_{m+k}(B_p)$ . Furthermore, if  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $y \in \Pi_m(B_i)$ , then  $y \in \Pi_m(M_i)$  and  $(M_i)_y = \Pi_{m+k}((B_i)_y)$ . Since  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright (B_i)_y$  has finite fibers, it follows by Lemma 2.18 that  $\dim((B_i)_y) = \dim((M_i)_y)$  whence the result. ■

**Remark 2.26.** Reusing the notations of the lemma, since  $\Pi_{m+k}(A_i) \subseteq B$  and  $\Pi_{m+k} \upharpoonright A_i$  has finite fibers, we can apply Lemma 2.18 to find that  $\dim(A_i) = \dim(\Pi_{m+k}(A_i)) \leq \dim(B)$ .

This allows us to refine the statement of Corollary 2.23. Indeed, we may assume that the  $\Lambda$ -sets  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  in the conclusion of the corollary satisfy that  $\dim((A_i)_y)$  does not depend on  $y \in \Pi_m(A_i)$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . This is especially interesting in view of Lemma 2.18.

**Theorem 2.27.** *Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  be a sub- $\Lambda$ -set. Then,  $A$  is also a simple sub- $\Lambda$ -set.*

*Proof.* The following diagram illustrates the proof below.



It suffices to show that there are  $\Lambda$ -sets  $B_1, \dots, B_p$  such that  $\Pi_m \upharpoonright B_i$  has finite fibers and  $A = \Pi_m(B_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_m(B_p)$ . Thus, consider  $B_1, \dots, B_p$  some  $\Lambda$ -sets such that  $A = \Pi_m(B_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_m(B_p)$ . By applying Lemma 2.25, we can assume that, for every  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , the dimension  $\mu_i := \dim((B_i)_y)$  does not depend on  $y \in \Pi_m(B_i)$ . Define also  $d_i = \dim(\Pi_m(B_i))$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . Finally, consider  $\mu = \max(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)$  and  $d = \max\{d_i : \mu_i = \mu\}$  and assume that  $B_1, \dots, B_p$  have been chosen in such a way that the pair  $(\mu, d)$  is minimal for the lexicographic order. To prove the result, we only need to show that  $\mu = 0$ . Thus, assume by contradiction that  $\mu > 0$ .

Let  $1 \leq i \leq p$  such that  $\mu_i = \mu$  and  $d_i = d$ . For the rest of the proof, we will write  $B = B_i$ . By Lemma 2.18, we have  $\dim(B) = d + \mu > d$  so that, by Corollary 2.23, there are  $C_1, \dots, C_q$  some  $\Lambda$ -sets such that

$$\Pi_m(B) = \Pi_m(C_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_m(C_q)$$

and  $\dim(C_j) < \dim(B)$  for  $1 \leq j \leq q$ . Up to strengthening Corollary 2.23 as explained in Remark 2.26, we may assume that, for every  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , the dimension  $\mu_j := \dim((C_j)_y)$  does not depend on  $y \in \Pi_m(C_j)$ . Define also  $d_j = \dim(\Pi_m(C_j))$  for  $1 \leq j \leq q$ . Then, fixing  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , we have  $\mu_j \leq \mu$  by Remark 2.24. If  $\mu_j = \mu$ , then  $\dim(C_j) = \mu_j + d_j = \mu + d_j$  so that  $\mu + d > \mu + d_j$  whence  $d_j < d$ . Thus, we contradict the minimality of the pair  $(\mu, d)$  by replacing  $B$  with the family  $C_1, \dots, C_q$  and by repeating the same operation for each  $B_i$  such that  $\mu_i = \mu$  and  $d_i = d$ . ■

**Remark 2.28.** The proof can be seen as a procedure that takes a representation of the form  $A = \Pi_m(B_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi_m(B_p)$  and that produces a new one such that the pair  $(\mu, d)$  decreases. Since this procedure can be applied as long as  $\mu > 0$ , we can apply it repeatedly until  $\mu = 0$ . Also, the set of pairs  $(\mu, d)$  is well ordered so that the process must stop eventually.

It is easy to see that  $\Lambda$ -sets have the  $\Lambda$ -Gabriellov property using Theorem 2.27 and Corollary 2.16. Following [5, Theorem 4.18], we obtain:

**Theorem 2.29.** *The structure  $\mathbb{R}_A$  is o-minimal and model-complete. Furthermore, the sub- $\Lambda$ -sets are exactly the bounded definable sets.*

## References

- [1] L. van den Dries. “A generalization of the Tarski-Seidenberg theorem, and some nondefinability results”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 15.2 (1986), pp. 189–193.
- [2] L. van den Dries and P. Speissegger. “The Field of Reals with Multi-summable Series and the Exponential Function”. In: *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 81 (Nov. 2000), pp. 513–565.
- [3] L. van den Dries and P. Speissegger. “The real field with convergent generalized power series”. In: *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 350 (1998), pp. 4377–4421.
- [4] O. Le Gal and J.-P. Rolin. “An o-minimal structure which does not admit  $C^\infty$  cellular decomposition”. In: *Ann. Inst. Fourier* 59 (2009), pp. 543–562.
- [5] R. Guénet. *A quasianalytic class with weakly smooth germs*. 2025. arXiv: 2501.17583 [math.LO].
- [6] J.-P. Rolin and T. Servi. “Quantifier elimination and rectilinearization theorem for generalized quasianalytic algebras”. In: *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 110 (2015), pp. 1207–1247.
- [7] T. Kaiser; J.-P. Rolin and P. Speissegger. “Transition maps at non-resonant hyperbolic singularities are o-minimal”. In: *J. Reine Angew. Math* 636 (2009), pp. 1–45.
- [8] J.-P. Rolin; P. Speissegger and A. J. Wilkie. “Quasianalytic Denjoy-Carleman classes and o-minimality”. In: *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 16 (2003), pp. 751–777.