

# AROUND INDEPENDENCE AND DOMINATION IN METRIC ABSTRACT ELEMENTARY CLASSES, UNDER UNIQUENESS OF LIMIT MODELS.

ANDRÉS VILLAVECES  
PEDRO ZAMBRANO

ABSTRACT. We study notions of independence appropriate for a stability theory of metric abstract elementary classes (for short, MAECs). We build on previous notions used in the discrete case, and adapt definitions to the metric case. In particular, we study notions that behave well under superstability-like assumptions. Also, under uniqueness of limit models, we study domination, orthogonality and parallelism of Galois types in MAECs.

## INTRODUCTION

In the study of the Stability Theory of Abstract Elementary Classes (for short, AEC, in this paper), various versions of independence linked to *splitting* (introduced originally by Shelah in the discrete AEC case [Sh 394]) have played an important rôle. Various categoricity transfer results, as well as the development of stability theory in AEC have so far used non-splitting as one of the main independence notions.

In the metric continuous case (a generalization of both usual, or “discrete” AEC and “First Order” Continuous Model Theory), notions of independence have been used with some success in a strongly homogeneous  $\omega$ -stable, (Löwenheim-Skolem number  $\aleph_0$ ) case by Åsa Hirvonen [Hi].

We focus here in a notion of independence, called *smooth independence* (see 2.2), that generalizes non-splitting to the metric context, and works well under the existence of various sorts of limit models. We study conditions under which smooth independence satisfies appropriate variants of transitivity, stationarity, extension, existence (Section 2). We also study the continuity of this independence notion (see 2.15).

---

*Date:* November 11, 2021.

The second author wants to thank the first author for the time devoted to advising him for his Ph.D.’s thesis, one of whose fruits is this paper. He also thanks Tapani Hyttinen for helpful discussions in Helsinki during November 2008 and August-October 2009 and thanks John Baldwin for the nice discussions in Bogotá on domination in (discrete) AECs in November 2009. Both authors were partially supported by Colciencias.

Applications of these techniques include the study of “superstable” metric AEC (limit models and smooth towers [ViZa]), and steps towards a generalization of the main theorem in [GrVaVi] (Uniqueness of Limit Models in AEC under superstability-like assumptions under categoricity). They also include notions of domination appropriate for both discrete and metric continuous (superstable) AEC.

In [Ba1], J. Baldwin does a study of a weak notion of domination which is based on a rough notion of independence in terms of on intersections of models, although he assumes uniqueness of limit models as a superstability-like assumption.

In superstable first order theories, getting a decomposition (up to equidomination) of stationary types as a finite product of regular types provides us a proof of the following fact due to Lachlan: A countable superstable theory has 1 or infinitely many countable models. Also, there are versions of this decomposition theorem in not necessarily stable theories (see [OnUs2]) such as rosy and dependent theories (see [OnUs1]), settings where there is a very well-behaved independence notion.

In section 3, we introduce a notion of dominance in the setting of superstable MAEC. We base our work on [Ba1], but we define our notion of dominance using smooth independence and not just using intersections as J. Baldwin does in his paper. We prove that under suitable assumptions, given a tuple  $(M, \mathcal{M}, \bar{a}, N)$  (where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a resolution of  $M$  which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model over some model  $M_0$ ) such that  $\bar{a} \downarrow_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M$  (and therefore  $\text{ga-tp}(\bar{a}/M)$  is a stationary type because  $M$  is an universal model over  $M_0$ ), there exist  $N^*$  and a resolution  $\mathcal{M}^*$  which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model over  $M_0$  such that  $\bar{a} \bowtie_M^{\mathcal{M}^*} N^*$ . Also, in this chapter we study notions of orthogonality and parallelism in superstable MAECs, inspired in [Sh705]. In this study, we drop some strong conditions given in [Sh705] and simplify some of the proofs given there. Also, we prove some properties which were not studied in [Sh705].

## 1. SOME BASIC DEFINITIONS AND RESULTS

**Definition 1.1.** The *density character* of a topological space is the smallest cardinality of a dense subset of the space. If  $X$  is a topological space, we denote its density character by  $\text{dc}(X)$ . If  $A$  is a subset of a topological space  $X$ , we define  $\text{dc}(A) := \text{dc}(\bar{A})$ .

We consider a natural adaptation of the notion of *Abstract Elementary Class* (see [Gr] and [Ba2]), but work in a context of Continuous Logic

that generalizes the “First Order Continuous” setting of [BeBeHeUs] by removing the assumption of uniform continuity<sup>1</sup>. We follow the definitions given by Åsa Hirvonen and Tapani Hyttinen (see [Hi]).

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of L-structures (in the context of Continuous Logic) and  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$  be a binary relation defined in  $\mathcal{K}$ . We say that  $(\mathcal{K}, \prec_{\mathcal{K}})$  is a *Metric Abstract Elementary Class* (shortly *MAEC*) if:

- (1)  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$  are closed under isomorphism.
- (2)  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$  is a partial order in  $\mathcal{K}$ .
- (3) If  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  then  $M \subseteq N$ .
- (4) (*Completion of Union of Chains*) If  $(M_i : i < \lambda)$  is a  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$ -increasing chain then
  - (a) the function symbols in L can be uniquely interpreted on the completion of  $\bigcup_{i < \lambda} M_i$  in such a way that  $\overline{\bigcup_{i < \lambda} M_i} \in \mathcal{K}$
  - (b) for each  $j < \lambda$ ,  $M_j \prec_{\mathcal{K}} \overline{\bigcup_{i < \lambda} M_i}$
  - (c) if each  $M_i \in \mathcal{K} \in N$ , then  $\overline{\bigcup_{i < \lambda} M_i} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$ .
- (5) (*Coherence*) if  $M_1 \subseteq M_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_3$  and  $M_1 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_3$ , then  $M_1 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_2$ .
- (6) (DLS) There exists a cardinality  $LS^d(\mathcal{K})$  (which is called the *metric Löwenheim-Skolem number*) such that if  $M \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $A \subseteq M$ , then there exists  $N \in \mathcal{K}$  such that  $dc(N) \leq dc(A) + LS^d(\mathcal{K})$  and  $A \subseteq N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ .

**Examples 1.3.** (1) Any continuous elementary class (see [BeBeHeUs]) with the usual elementary substructure relation is an MAEC. Important cases include

- (a) Hilbert spaces with a unitary operator (Argoty and Berenstein, see [ArBe]).
- (b) Nakano spaces with compact essential rank (Poitevin, see [Po]).
- (c) Probability Spaces.
- (d) Compact Abstract Theories, see [Be1, Be2]
- (2) Gelfand triplets (see [Za] and forthcoming [GaZa]).
- (3) Hilbert Spaces, with various classes of unbounded operators.
- (4) A subclass of completions of metric spaces which satisfy approximately a positive bounded theory, where  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$  is interpreted by the approximate elementary submodel relation (see [HeIo]).
- (5) Various classes of Banach spaces, where  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$  is interpreted by the closed subspace relation<sup>2</sup> (see [Hi]).

<sup>1</sup>Uniform continuity guarantees logical compactness in their formalization, but we drop compactness in AEC-like settings.

<sup>2</sup>Notice that several of these classes fall under case (1) – however, in general, natural classes of Banach spaces are not axiomatizable in the context of [BeBeHeUs].

**Definition 1.4.** We call a function  $f : M \rightarrow N$  a  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedding if

- (1) For every  $k$ -ary function symbol  $F$  of  $L$ , we have  $f(F^M(a_1 \cdots a_k)) = F^N(f(a_1) \cdots f(a_k))$ .
- (2) For every constant symbol  $c$  of  $L$ ,  $f(c^M) = c^N$ .
- (3) For every  $m$ -ary relation symbol  $R$  of  $L$ , for every  $\bar{a} \in M^m$ ,  $d(\bar{a}, R^M) = d(f(\bar{a}), R^N)$ .
- (4)  $f[M] \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$ .

**Definition 1.5** (Amalgamation Property, AP). Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be an MAEC. We say that  $\mathcal{K}$  satisfies *Amalgamation Property* (for short *AP*) if and only if for every  $M, M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ , if  $g_i : M \rightarrow M_i$  is a  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedding ( $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ) then there exist  $N \in \mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$ -embeddings  $f_i : M_i \rightarrow N$  ( $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ) such that  $f_1 \circ g_1 = f_2 \circ g_2$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M_1 & \xrightarrow{\quad f_1 \quad} & N \\
 \uparrow g_1 & & \uparrow f_2 \\
 M & \xrightarrow{\quad g_2 \quad} & M_2
 \end{array}$$

**Definition 1.6** (Joint Embedding Property, JEP). Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be an MAEC. We say that  $\mathcal{K}$  satisfies *Joint Embedding Property* (for short *JEP*) if and only if for every  $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{K}$  there exist  $N \in \mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$ -embeddings  $f_i : M_i \rightarrow N$  ( $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ).

**Remark 1.7.** Notice that if  $\mathcal{K}$  has a prime model, then AP implies JEP.

**Remark 1.8** (Monster Model). If  $\mathcal{K}$  is an MAEC which satisfies AP and JEP and has large enough models, then we can construct a large enough model  $\mathbb{M}$  (which we call a *Monster Model*) which is homogeneous –i.e., every isomorphism between two  $\mathcal{K}$ -substructures of  $\mathbb{M}$  can be extended to an automorphism of  $\mathbb{M}$ – and also universal –i.e., every model with density character  $< \text{dc}(\mathbb{M})$  can be  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedded into  $\mathbb{M}$ .

**Definition 1.9** (Galois type). Under the existence of a monster model  $\mathbb{M}$  as in remark 1.8, for all  $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{M}$  and  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{M}$ , we define  $\text{ga-tp}(\bar{a}/N)$  (the *Galois type of  $\bar{a}$  over  $N$* ) as the orbit of  $\bar{a}$  under  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/N) := \{f \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}) : f \upharpoonright N = \text{id}_N\}$ . We denote the space of Galois types over a model  $M \in \mathcal{K}$  by  $\text{ga-S}(M)$ .

Throughout this paper, we assume the existence of a homogenous and universal monster model as in remark 1.8.

**Definition 1.10** (Distance between types). Let  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$ . We define  $d(p, q) := \inf\{d(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) : \bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathbb{M}, \bar{a} \models p, \bar{b} \models q\}$ , where  $\text{lg}(\bar{a}) = \text{lg}(\bar{b}) = n$  and  $d(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) := \max\{d(a_i, b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ .

**Definition 1.11** (Continuity of Types). Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be an MAEC and consider  $(a_n) \rightarrow a$  in  $\mathbb{M}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{K}$  satisfies *Continuity of Types Property*<sup>3</sup> (for short, *CTP*), if and only if, if  $\text{ga-tp}(a_n/M) = \text{ga-tp}(a_0/M)$  for all  $n < \omega$  then  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M) = \text{ga-tp}(a_0/M)$ .

**Remark 1.12.** In general, distance between types  $d$  (see Definition 1.10) is just a pseudo-metric. But it is straightforward to see that the fact that  $d$  is a metric is equivalent to CTP.

Throughout this paper, we also assume CTP (so, distance between types is in fact a metric).

**Definition 1.13** (Universality). Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be an MAEC and  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ . We say that  $M$  is  $\lambda$ -*universal* over  $N$  iff for every  $N' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} N$  with density character  $\lambda$  there exists a  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedding  $f : N' \rightarrow M$  such that  $f \upharpoonright N = \text{id}_N$ . We say that  $M$  is *universal* over  $N$  if  $M$  is  $\text{dc}(M)$ -universal over  $N$ .

**Lemma 1.14.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a MAEC. If  $f_i : M_i \rightarrow M$  ( $i < \mu$ ) is a  $\subseteq$ -increasing and continuous (in the metric sense) chain of  $\mathcal{K}$ -embeddings, then there exists a  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedding  $f : \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i} \rightarrow M$  which extends  $g := \bigcup_{i < \mu} f_i : \bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i \rightarrow M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $a \in \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}$ , so there exist elements  $a_n \in \bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i$  for  $n < \omega$ , such that  $(a_n)_{n < \omega} \rightarrow a$ . As  $(a_n)_{n < \omega}$  is a Cauchy sequence,  $(g(a_n))_{n < \omega}$  is also a Cauchy sequence (since  $g$  is an isometry). So, there exists  $b \in M$  such that  $(g(a_n))_{n < \omega} \rightarrow b$ . Define  $f(a) := b$ . Proceed in a similar way for every  $a \in \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}$ . The function  $f$  is well-defined: if we take  $(a'_n)_{n < \omega}$  a sequence in  $\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i$  such that  $(a'_n)_{n < \omega} \rightarrow a$ , let  $b' \in M$  be such that  $(g(a'_n))_{n < \omega} \rightarrow b'$ . We will prove that  $b = b'$ . Otherwise, let  $\varepsilon := d(b, b') > 0$ .

**Claim 1.15.** *Given  $\varepsilon' > 0$ , there exists  $N < \omega$  such that for all  $n \geq N$   $d(g(a_n), g(a'_n)) < \varepsilon'$ .*

*Proof.* As  $(a_n)_{n < \omega} \rightarrow a$  and  $(a'_n)_{n < \omega} \rightarrow a$ , there exists  $N < \omega$  such that for all  $n \geq N$  we have that  $d(a_n, a) < \varepsilon'/2$  and  $d(a'_n, a) < \varepsilon'/2$ , so for all  $n \geq N$  we have that  $d(a_n, a'_n) \leq d(a_n, a) + d(a, a'_n) < \varepsilon'$ . As  $g$  is an isometry, for all  $n \geq N$  we have that  $d(g(a_n), g(a'_n)) < \varepsilon'$ .  $\square_{\text{Claim 1.15}}$

As  $(g(a_n))_{n < \omega} \rightarrow b$ ,  $(g(a'_n))_{n < \omega} \rightarrow b'$  and by claim 1.15, there exists  $M < \omega$  such that for all  $n \geq M$  we have that  $d(g(a_n), b) < \varepsilon/3$ ,  $d(g(a'_n), b') < \varepsilon/3$  and  $d(g(a_n), g(a'_n)) < \varepsilon/3$ . So, for all  $n \geq M$  we

<sup>3</sup>This property is also called *Perturbation Property* in [Hi]

have that  $d(b, b') \leq d(b, g(a_n)) + d(g(a_n), g(a'_n)) + d(g(a'_n), b') < \varepsilon = d(b, b')$  (contradiction).

Therefore  $b = b'$  and so  $f$  is well-defined.

We have that  $f$  extends  $g$ : let  $a \in \bigcup_{i < \omega} M_i$ , so taking  $a_n := a$  ( $n < \omega$ ) we have that  $(a_n)_{n < \omega} \rightarrow a$  and  $(g(a_n))_{n < \omega}$  is also a constant sequence. So,  $f(a) := \lim_{n < \omega} g(a_n) = g(a)$ .

Let  $c \in \overline{f[\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i]}$ , so there exists  $a \in \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}$  such that  $f(a) = c$ , so there exists  $(a_n)_{n < \omega}$  a sequence in  $\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i$  such that  $(a_n)_{n < \omega} \rightarrow a$  and  $c := \lim_{n < \omega} g(a_n)$ . Therefore  $c \in \overline{g[\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i]} = \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} f_i[M_i]}$ , so  $f[\overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}] \subseteq \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} f_i[M_i]}$ . Take  $c \in \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} f_i[M_i]} = \overline{g[\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i]}$ , so there exists a sequence  $(b_n)_{n < \omega}$  in  $\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i$  such that  $(g(b_n))_{n < \omega} \rightarrow c$ . As  $(g(b_n))_{n < \omega}$  is a Cauchy sequence and  $g$  is an isometry, we have that  $(b_n)_{n < \omega}$  is also a Cauchy sequence. So, there exists  $a \in \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}$  such that  $(b_n)_{n < \omega} \rightarrow a$ , and therefore  $f(a) := \lim_{n < \omega} g(b_n) = c$ , hence  $c \in f[\overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}]$ . So,  $f[\overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}] = \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} f_i[M_i]}$ . As  $(f_i : i < \mu)$  is a  $\subseteq$ -increasing and continuous chain of  $\mathcal{K}$ -embeddings,  $f_i[M_i] \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ , so by completion of union of chains (definition 1.2 (4)) and coherence (definition 1.2 (5)) MAEC axioms and we have that  $f[\overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}] = \overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} f_i[M_i]} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ . Furthermore, for every symbol  $\sigma$  of  $L(\mathcal{K})$ ,  $f$  is compatible with the interpretation of  $\sigma$  in  $\overline{\bigcup_{i < \mu} M_i}$ :  $f$  is a limit of  $\mathcal{K}$ -embeddings – function symbols on these limits are uniquely interpreted by Axiom 4(a), and  $f$  being a limit of  $\mathcal{K}$ -embeddings, distances to interpretations of predicates are preserved. Therefore  $f$  is a  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedding which extends  $g$ .  $\square_{\text{Lemma 1.14}}$

**Fact 1.16** (Hyttinen-Hirvonen). *Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $a \models p$ , there exists  $b \models q$  such that  $d(a, b) \leq \mathbf{d}(p, q) + \varepsilon$*

*Proof.* Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the definition of  $\mathbf{d}$ , there exist realizations  $c \models p$  and  $c' \models q$  such that  $d(c, c') \leq \mathbf{d}(p, q) + \varepsilon$ . As  $a, c \models p$  then there exists  $f \in \text{Aut}(M/A)$  such that  $f(c) = a$ . Note that  $d(a, f(c')) = d(f(c), f(c')) = d(c, c') \leq \mathbf{d}(p, q) + \varepsilon$ , where  $f(c') \models q$ , so  $f(c')$  is the required  $b$ .  $\square_{\text{Fact 1.16}}$

**Corollary 1.17.** *Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(p, q) < \varepsilon$  and  $b \models q$ , then there exists  $a_\varepsilon \models p$  such that  $d(a_\varepsilon, b) < 2\varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* By fact 1.16, there exists  $a_\varepsilon \models p$  such that  $d(a_\varepsilon, b) \leq \mathbf{d}(p, q) + \varepsilon$ , therefore  $d(a_\varepsilon, b) \leq \mathbf{d}(p, q) + \varepsilon < \varepsilon + \varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$ .  $\square_{\text{Cor 1.17}}$

The following lemma is useful for later constructions – usually, it is easier in the metric case to realize *dense* subsets of typespaces  $\text{ga-S}(M)$ ; the lemma provides a criterion for relative metric Galois saturation.

**Lemma 1.18.** *Suppose that we have an increasing  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$ -chain of models  $(N_n : n < \omega)$  such that  $N_{n+1}$  realizes a dense subset of  $\text{ga-S}(N_n)$ . Then, every type in  $\text{ga-S}(N_0)$  is realized in  $N_\omega := \overline{\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n}$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $p := \text{ga-tp}(b/N_0)$  there exists  $q_0 \in \text{ga-S}(N_0)$  which is realized in  $N_1$  (by assumption) and  $\mathbf{d}(p, q_0) < \frac{1}{2(0+1)^2} = \frac{1}{2}$ . Let  $a_0$  be a realization of  $q_0$ . By corollary 1.17 there exists  $b_0 \models p$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(b_0, a_0) < 2(\frac{1}{2}) = 1$ .

The key idea is to build two Cauchy sequences  $(a_n)_{n < \omega}$  and  $(b_n)_{n < \omega}$  such that  $a_n \in N_{n+1}$ ,  $\text{ga-tp}(b_n/N_0) = \text{ga-tp}(b/N_0)$  for every  $n < \omega$  and also  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  are closed enough, so if  $c := \lim_{n < \omega} b_n = \lim_{n < \omega} a_n$  then by CTP (Definition 1.11) we have that  $\text{ga-tp}(c/N_0) = \text{ga-tp}(b_0/N_0) = p$ . Since  $c = \lim_{n < \omega} a_n$ , then  $c \in N_\omega := \overline{\bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n}$ , and so  $p$  is realized in  $N_\omega$ .

The construction: Consider  $n > 0$ . Since  $N_{n+1}$  realizes a dense subset of  $\text{ga-S}(N_n)$ , take  $a_n \in N_{n+1}$  a realization of a type  $q_n \in \text{ga-S}(N_n)$  which satisfies  $\mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(b_{n-1}/N_n), q_n) < \frac{1}{2n^2}$ . By corollary 1.17, take  $b_n \models \text{ga-tp}(b_{n-1}/N_n)$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(b_n, a_n) < 2(\frac{1}{2n^2}) = \frac{1}{n^2}$ .

We have that  $(a_n)_{n < \omega}$  is a Cauchy sequence: as  $b_{n+1} \models \text{ga-tp}(b_n/N_{n+1})$ , there exists  $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/N_{n+1})$  such that  $g(b_n) = b_{n+1}$ . Since  $g$  is an isometry and  $a_n \in N_{n+1}$ , then  $\mathbf{d}(b_{n+1}, a_n) = \mathbf{d}(g(b_n), g(a_n)) = \mathbf{d}(b_n, a_n) < \frac{1}{n^2}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{d}(a_{n+1}, a_n) \leq \mathbf{d}(a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}) + \mathbf{d}(b_{n+1}, a_n) < \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} + \frac{1}{n^2} < \frac{2}{n^2}$ , so we have that  $(a_n : n < \omega)$  is a Cauchy sequence.

Therefore, there exists  $c := \lim_{n < \omega} a_n$ ,  $c \in N_\omega$  and also  $c = \lim_{n < \omega} b_n$ . So, we are done.  $\square_{\text{Lemma 1.18}}$

## 2. SMOOTH INDEPENDENCE IN MAECs

Throughout this section, every model has density cardinal  $\mu$  (unless we specify a different density).

**Definition 2.1** ( $\varepsilon$ -splitting and  $\perp^\varepsilon$ ). Let  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We say that  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M)$   $\varepsilon$ -splits over  $N$  iff there exist  $N_1, N_2$  with  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1, N_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$  and  $h : N_1 \cong_N N_2$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(a/N_2), h(\text{ga-tp}(a/N_1))) \geq \varepsilon$ . We use  $a \perp_N^\varepsilon M$  to denote the fact that  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M)$  does not  $\varepsilon$ -split over  $N$ ,

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ . Fix  $\mathcal{N} := \langle N_i : i < \sigma \rangle$  a resolution of  $N$ . We say that  $\mathfrak{a}$  is *smooth independent* from  $M$  over  $N$  relative to  $\mathcal{N}$  (denoted by  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{N}^{\mathcal{N}} M$ ) iff for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $i_\varepsilon < \sigma$  such that  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{N_{i_\varepsilon}}^\varepsilon M$ .

We call *smooth independence* the notion of independence given above, inspired by [BaSh]. In that paper, J. Baldwin and S. Shelah defined *smoothness* as a nice property of an abstract class of models  $\mathcal{K}$  which involves increasing chains of models, context where the existence of a kind of monster model holds.

**Notation 2.3.** Let  $p$  be a Galois-type over  $M$ ,  $N$  a  $\mathcal{K}$ -submodel of  $M$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  a resolution of  $N$ . We denote by  $p \perp_{N}^\varepsilon M$  ( $p \perp_{N}^{\mathcal{N}} M$ ) iff for any realization  $\mathfrak{a} \models p$  we have that  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{N}^\varepsilon M$  ( $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{N}^{\mathcal{N}} M$ ).

Next, we prove some basic properties of smooth independence.

**Fact 2.4** (Invariance). *Let  $f \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M})$ . Then  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$  iff  $f(\mathfrak{a}) \perp_{f[M]}^{f[\mathcal{M}]} f[N]$ .*

**Proposition 2.5** (Monotonicity of smooth independence). *Let  $M_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_1 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_3$ . Fix  $\mathcal{M}_k := \langle M_i^k : i < \sigma_k \rangle$  a resolution of  $M_k$  ( $k = 0, 1$ ), where  $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$ . If  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_3$  then  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_1}^{\mathcal{M}_1} M_2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_3$ , there exists  $i_\varepsilon < \sigma_0$  such that  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_{i_\varepsilon}^0}^\varepsilon M_3$ . But  $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$ , then there exists  $j_\varepsilon < \sigma_1$  such that  $M_{i_\varepsilon}^0 = M_{j_\varepsilon}^1$ . Therefore, for every  $M_{j_\varepsilon}^1 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1 \stackrel{h}{\cong}_{M_{j_\varepsilon}^1} N_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_3$  (in particular if  $N_1, N_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_2$ ) we have that  $d(\text{ga-tp}(\mathfrak{a}/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(h(\mathfrak{a})/N_2)) < \varepsilon$ . Then  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_{j_\varepsilon}^1}^\varepsilon M_2$ . Since this holds for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_1}^{\mathcal{M}_1} M_2$ .  $\square_{\text{Prop. 2.5}}$

**Proposition 2.6** (Monotonicity of non- $\varepsilon$ -splitting). *Let  $M_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_1 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_3$ . If  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_0}^\varepsilon M_3$  then  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M_1}^\varepsilon M_2$ .*

**Lemma 2.7** (Stationarity (1)). *Suppose that  $N_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_2$  and  $N_1$  is universal over  $N_0$ . If  $\text{ga-tp}(\mathfrak{a}/N_1) = \text{ga-tp}(\mathfrak{b}/N_1)$ ,  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{N_0}^\varepsilon N_2$  and  $\mathfrak{b} \perp_{N_0}^\varepsilon N_2$ , then  $d(\text{ga-tp}(\mathfrak{a}/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(\mathfrak{b}/N_2)) < 2\varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $N_1$  is universal over  $N_0$ , then there exists a  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedding  $g : N_2 \rightarrow_{N_0} N_1$ . So,  $N_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} g[N_2] \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1$ .

Since  $N_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} g[N_2], N_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_2$ ,  $g^{-1} \upharpoonright g[N_2] : g[N_2] \cong_{N_0} N_2$  and  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{N_0}^\varepsilon N_2$ , then  $d(\text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(\mathfrak{a})/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(\mathfrak{a}/N_2)) < \varepsilon$ .

Doing a similar argument, it is easy to prove that



$$\mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(b)/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(b/N_2)) < \varepsilon.$$

Also, since  $\text{ga-tp}(a/N_1) = \text{ga-tp}(b/N_1)$  and  $g[N_2] \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1$ , then  $\text{ga-tp}(a/g[N_2]) = \text{ga-tp}(b/g[N_2])$ , so  $\text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(a)/N_2) = \text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(b)/N_2)$ .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(a/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(b/N_2)) &\leq \mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(a/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(a)/N_2)) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(a)/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(b)/N_2)) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(g^{-1}(b)/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(b/N_2)) \\ &< \varepsilon + 0 + \varepsilon \\ &= 2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

□<sub>Lemma 2.7</sub>

**Proposition 2.8** (Extension of  $\downarrow^{\mathcal{N}}$  over universal models). *If  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M'$ ,  $\mathcal{N} := \langle N_i : i < \sigma \rangle$  is a resolution of  $N$ ,  $M$  is universal over  $N$  and  $p := \text{ga-tp}(a/M) \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  is a Galois type such that  $a \downarrow_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathcal{N}} M$ , then there exists  $b$  such that  $\text{ga-tp}(b/M) = \text{ga-tp}(a/M)$  and  $b \downarrow_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathcal{N}} M'$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $M$  is universal over  $N$ , there exists a  $\mathcal{K}$ -embedding  $h' : M' \rightarrow_N M$ . Extend  $h'$  to an automorphism  $h \in \text{Aut}(M/N)$ . Since  $a \downarrow_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathcal{N}} M$  and  $h[M'] \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ , by monotonicity of  $\downarrow^{\mathcal{N}}$  we have that  $a \downarrow_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathcal{N}} h[M']$ . By invariance, we have that  $h^{-1}(a) \downarrow_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathcal{N}} M'$ .

**Claim 2.9.**  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M) = \text{ga-tp}(h^{-1}(a)/M)$ .

*Proof.* Take  $N_1 := h^{-1}[M]$  and  $N_2 := M$ . Notice that  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1, N_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} h^{-1}[M]$  and  $h \upharpoonright N_1 : N_1 \cong_N N_2$ . Since  $a \downarrow_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathcal{N}} M$ , by invariance we have that  $h^{-1}(a) \downarrow_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathcal{N}} h^{-1}[M]$ . So, given  $n < \omega$  there exists  $i_n < \sigma$  such that  $h^{-1}(a) \downarrow_{N_{i_n}}^{\frac{1}{n+1}} h^{-1}[M]$ .

By monotonicity of non- $\varepsilon$ -splitting (Proposition 2.6), we may conclude that  $h^{-1}(a) \downarrow_{N_{i_n}}^{\frac{1}{n+1}} h^{-1}[M]$  for every  $n < \omega$ .

Since  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1, N_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} h^{-1}[M]$ , we have that for every  $n < \omega$   $\mathbf{d}(\text{ga-tp}(h^{-1}(a)/N_2), \text{ga-tp}((h \circ h^{-1})(a)/N_2)) < \frac{1}{n+1}$

Since  $N_2 := M$ , we have that  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M) = \text{ga-tp}(h^{-1}(a)/M)$ . This finishes the proof of claim 2.9

□<sub>Claim 2.9</sub>

Since  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M) = \text{ga-tp}(h^{-1}(a)/M)$ , there exists  $g \in \text{Aut}(M/M)$  such that  $g(h^{-1}(a)) = a$ . Recall that  $h^{-1}(a) \downarrow_N^{\mathcal{N}} M'$ , so by invariance we have that  $g(h^{-1}(a)) \downarrow_N^{\mathcal{N}} g[M']$ , i.e.:  $a \downarrow_N^{\mathcal{N}} g[M']$ . Applying invariance again, we have that  $g^{-1}(a) \downarrow_N^{\mathcal{N}} M'$ . Take  $b := g^{-1}(a)$ . This now ends the proof of Proposition 2.8.  $\square_{\text{Prop. 2.8}}$

**Proposition 2.10** (Stationarity (2)). *If  $\mathcal{N} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M'$ ,  $M$  is universal over  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{N} := \langle N_i : i < \sigma \rangle$  a resolution of  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $p := \text{ga-tp}(a/M) \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  is a Galois type such that  $a \downarrow_N^{\mathcal{N}} M$ , then there exists a unique extension  $p^* \supset p$  over  $M'$  which is independent (relative to  $\mathcal{N}$ ) from  $M'$  over  $\mathcal{N}$ .*

*Proof.* By proposition 2.8, there exists at least an extension  $p^* := \text{ga-tp}(b/M')$  of  $p$  with the desired property.

Let  $q^* := \text{ga-tp}(c/M') \supset p$  be another extension with satisfies the desired property. So,  $p^* \upharpoonright M = q^* \upharpoonright M$ ,  $b \downarrow_N^{\mathcal{N}} M'$  and  $c \downarrow_N^{\mathcal{N}} M'$ .

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . So, there exist  $i_\varepsilon^a, i_\varepsilon^b < \sigma$  such that  $a \downarrow_{N_{i_\varepsilon^a}}^\varepsilon M'$  and  $b \downarrow_{N_{i_\varepsilon^b}}^\varepsilon M'$ . Taking  $i := \max\{i_\varepsilon^a, i_\varepsilon^b\}$ , by monotonicity of non- $\varepsilon$ -splitting we have that  $a \downarrow_{N_i}^\varepsilon M'$  and  $b \downarrow_{N_i}^\varepsilon M'$ .

Since  $M$  is universal over  $N_i$  (because  $M$  is universal over  $\mathcal{N}$ ),  $a \downarrow_{N_i}^\varepsilon M'$ ,  $b \downarrow_{N_i}^\varepsilon M'$  and  $p^* \upharpoonright M = q^* \upharpoonright M$ , by lemma 2.7 we have that  $d(p^*, q^*) < 2\varepsilon$ . Therefore  $p^* = q^*$ .  $\square_{\text{Prop. 2.10}}$

The following property of smooth independence (called *antireflexivity*) is the metric version of the following property of thorn-forking in the first order setting: if  $a \downarrow_B^{\text{thorn}} a$  then  $a \in \text{acl}(B)$ .

**Proposition 2.11** (Antireflexivity). *Let  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{N}$  where  $M$  is a  $(\mu, \theta)$ -limit model witnessed by  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \theta\}$ . If  $a \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{N}$  and  $a \in \mathcal{N}$ , then  $a \in M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $i_\varepsilon < \theta$  be such that  $a \downarrow_{M_{i_\varepsilon}}^\varepsilon \mathcal{N}$ . Since  $M$  is universal over  $M_{i_\varepsilon}$ , there exists an  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$ -embedding  $f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow M$  which fixes  $M_{i_\varepsilon}$  pointwise. Define  $c := f(a)$ . Notice that  $c \in M$ . Setting  $N_1 := \mathcal{N}$  and  $N_2 := f[\mathcal{N}]$ , notice that  $M_{i_\varepsilon} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_1 \overset{f}{\approx}_{M_{i_\varepsilon}} N_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{N}$ . Since  $a \downarrow_{M_{i_\varepsilon}}^\varepsilon \mathcal{N}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} d(\text{ga-tp}(a/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(c/N_2)) &= d(\text{ga-tp}(a/N_2), \text{ga-tp}(f(a)/N_2)) \\ &< \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Since  $c = f(a) \in f[N] = N_2$ ,  $c$  is the unique realization of  $\text{ga-tp}(c/N_2)$ . Therefore, we can find  $a' \models \text{ga-tp}(a/N_2)$  such that  $d(a', c) < \varepsilon$  (by definition of distance between types).

Since  $a' \models \text{ga-tp}(a/N_2)$ , there exists  $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/N_2)$  such that  $g(a) = a'$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d(a, c) &= d(g(a), g(c)) \text{ (} g \text{ is an isometry)} \\ &= d(a', c) \text{ (since } c \in N_2 \text{ and } g \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M}/N_2)) \\ &< \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Defining  $B(a, \varepsilon) := \{b \in N : d(a, b) < \varepsilon\}$ , we have that  $c \in B(a, \varepsilon) \cap f[N] \subseteq B(a, \varepsilon) \cap M$ , so  $B(a, \varepsilon) \cap M \neq \emptyset$ , hence  $a \in \overline{M} = M$ .  $\square_{\text{Prop. 2.11}}$

**Proposition 2.12** (Local character of non- $\varepsilon$ -splitting). *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a  $\mu$ -d-stable MAEC and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For every  $p \in \text{ga-S}(N)$  with  $N$  of density character  $> \mu$  there exists  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  with density character  $\mu$  such that  $p \not\downarrow_M^{\varepsilon} N$*

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists some  $p := \text{ga-tp}(\bar{a}/N)$  such that  $p \not\downarrow_M^{\varepsilon} N$  for every  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  with density character  $\mu$ . If  $\bar{a} \in N$ , it is straightforward to see that  $p$  does not  $\varepsilon$ -split over its domain. Then, suppose that  $\bar{a} \notin N$ .

Define  $\chi := \min\{\kappa : 2^\kappa > \mu\}$ . So,  $\chi \leq \mu$  and  $2^{<\chi} \leq \mu$ .

We will construct a sequence of models  $\langle M_\alpha, N_{\alpha,1}, N_{\alpha,2} : \alpha < \chi \rangle$  in the following way: First, take  $M_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  as any submodel of density character  $\mu$ .

Suppose  $\alpha := \gamma + 1$  and that  $M_\gamma$  (with density character  $\mu$ ) has been constructed. Then  $p$   $\varepsilon$ -splits over  $M_\gamma$ . Then there exist  $M_\gamma \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_{\gamma,1}, N_{\gamma,2} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  with density character  $\mu$  and  $F_\gamma : N_{\gamma,1} \cong_{M_\gamma} N_{\gamma,2}$  such that  $d(F_\gamma(p \upharpoonright N_{\gamma,1}), p \upharpoonright N_{\gamma,2}) \geq \varepsilon$ . Take  $M_{\gamma+1} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  a submodel of size  $\mu$  which contains  $|N_{\gamma,1}| \cup |N_{\gamma,2}|$ . At limit stages  $\alpha$ , take  $M_\alpha := \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} M_\gamma}$ .

Let us construct a sequence  $\langle M_\alpha^* : \alpha \leq \chi \rangle$  of models and a tree  $\langle h_\eta : \eta < \alpha \rangle$  ( $\alpha \leq \chi$ ) of  $\mathcal{K}$ -embeddings such that:

- (1)  $\gamma < \alpha$  implies  $M_\gamma^* \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_\alpha^*$ .
- (2)  $M_\alpha^* := \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} M_\gamma^*}$  if  $\alpha$  is limit.
- (3)  $\gamma < \alpha$  and  $\eta \in {}^\alpha 2$  imply that  $h_{\eta \upharpoonright \gamma} \subset h_\eta$ .
- (4)  $h_\eta : M_\alpha \rightarrow M_\alpha^*$  for every  $\eta \in {}^\alpha 2$ .

(5) If  $\eta \in {}^\gamma 2$  then  $h_{\eta \frown 0}(N_{\gamma,1}) = h_{\eta \frown 1}(N_{\gamma,2})$

Take  $M_0^* := M_0$  and  $h_{\emptyset} := \text{id}_{M_0}$ .

If  $\alpha$  is limit, take  $M_\alpha^* := \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} M_\gamma^*}$  and if  $\eta \in {}^\alpha 2$  define  $h_\eta := \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} h_{\eta \upharpoonright \gamma}}$ , the unique extension of  $\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} h_{\eta \upharpoonright \gamma}$  to  $M_\alpha = \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} M_\gamma}$ .

If  $\alpha := \gamma + 1$ , let  $\eta \in {}^\gamma 2$ . Take  $\overline{h_\eta} \supset h_\eta$  any automorphism of the monster model  $\mathbb{M}$  (this is possible because  $\mathbb{M}$  is homogeneous).

Notice that  $\overline{h_\eta} \circ F_\gamma(N_{\gamma,1}) = \overline{h_\eta}(N_{\gamma,2})$ . Define  $h_{\eta \frown 0}$  as any extension of  $\overline{h_\eta} \circ F_\gamma$  to  $M_{\gamma+1}$  and  $h_{\eta \frown 1}$  as  $\overline{h_\eta} \upharpoonright M_{\gamma+1}$ . Take  $M_{\gamma+1}^* \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  as any model with density character  $\mu$  which contains  $h_{\eta \frown 1}(M_{\gamma+1})$  for any  $\eta \in {}^\gamma 2$  and  $l = 0, 1$ .

Now, for every  $\eta \leq {}^x 2$ , let  $H_\eta$  be an automorphism of  $\mathbb{M}$  which extends  $h_\eta$ ,

**Claim 2.13.** *If  $\eta \neq \nu \in {}^x 2$  then  $d(\text{ga-tp}(H_\eta(\overline{a})/M_\chi^*), \text{ga-tp}(H_\nu(\overline{a})/M_\chi^*)) \geq \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not, then  $d(\text{ga-tp}(H_\eta(\overline{a})/M_\chi^*), \text{ga-tp}(H_\nu(\overline{a})/M_\chi^*)) < \varepsilon$ . Let  $\rho := \eta \wedge \nu$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $\rho \frown 0 \leq \eta$  and  $\rho \frown 1 \leq \nu$ . Let  $\gamma := \text{lg}(\rho)$ . Since  $h_{\rho \frown 0}(N_{\gamma,1}) = h_{\rho \frown 1}(N_{\gamma,2}) \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_\chi^*$ , then  $d(\text{ga-tp}(H_\eta(\overline{a})/h_{\rho \frown 0}(N_{\gamma,1})), \text{ga-tp}(H_\nu(\overline{a})/h_{\rho \frown 1}(N_{\gamma,2}))) < \varepsilon$ . Also<sup>4</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} d(\text{ga-tp}(H_\nu^{-1} \circ H_\eta(\overline{a})/F_\gamma(N_{\gamma,1})), \text{ga-tp}(\overline{a}/N_{\gamma,2})) &= \\ d(\text{ga-tp}(H_\eta(\overline{a})/h_{\rho \frown 0}(N_{\gamma,1})), \text{ga-tp}(H_\nu(\overline{a})/h_{\rho \frown 1}(N_{\gamma,2}))) &< \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

(as  $H_\nu$  is an isometry,  $h_{\rho \frown 0} = h_\rho \circ F_\gamma$ ,  $\rho < \nu$ ,  $\rho \frown 0 \leq \eta$  and  $\rho \frown 1 \leq \nu$ ). Since  $H_\nu^{-1} \circ H_\eta \supset F_\gamma$ , then  $d(F_\gamma(p \upharpoonright N_{\gamma,1}), p \upharpoonright N_{\gamma,2}) < \varepsilon$ , which contradicts the choice of  $N_{\gamma,1}$ ,  $N_{\gamma,2}$  and  $F_\gamma$ . This finishes the proof of claim 2.13 □<sub>Claim 2.13</sub>

We have that  $dc(M_\chi^*) = \mu$ , but claim 2.13 says that there are at least  $2^x > \mu$  many types mutually at distance at least  $\varepsilon$ . Therefore  $dc(\text{ga-S}(M_\chi^*)) > \mu$ , which contradicts  $\mu$ -d-stability. □<sub>Prop. 2.12</sub>

**Proposition 2.14** (Existence). *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a  $\mu$ -d-stable MAEC. Then, for every  $\overline{a} \in \mathbb{M}$  and every  $N \in \mathcal{K}$  there exists  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  with density character  $\mu$  and a resolution  $\mathcal{M} := \langle M_i : i < \omega \rangle$  of  $M$  such that  $\overline{a} \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$ .*

<sup>4</sup>This distance between Galois types makes sense, as  $h_{\rho \frown 0}(N_{\gamma,1}) = h_{\rho \frown 1}(N_{\gamma,2})$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n < \omega$ . By proposition 2.12, there exists  $M_n \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  with density character  $\mu$  such that  $\bar{a} \downarrow_{M_n}^{\frac{1}{n+1}} N$ . By monotonicity, without loss of generality we can assume that  $m < n < \omega$  implies  $M_m \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_n$ . Take  $M := \overline{\bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n}$ . Notice that  $\text{dc}(M) = \mu$ . It is straightforward to see that  $\bar{a} \downarrow_M^M N$ .  $\square_{\text{Prop. 2.14}}$

**Lemma 2.15** (Continuity of independence). *Let  $(b_n)_{n < \omega}$  be a convergent sequence and  $b := \lim_{n < \omega} b_n$ . If  $b_n \downarrow_N^N M$  for every  $n < \omega$ , then  $b \downarrow_N^N M$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $b_n \downarrow_N^N M$  ( $n < \omega$ ), for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $i_{n,\varepsilon} < \sigma$  such that for every  $N_{i_{n,\varepsilon}} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N^1 \cong_{N_\varepsilon^n} N^2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ , therefore we have that  $d(\text{ga-tp}(b_n/N^2), \text{ga-tp}(h(b_n)/N^2)) < \varepsilon/3$ .

Let  $K < \omega$  be such that for every  $n \geq K$  we have that  $d(b_n, b) < \varepsilon/3$ . Therefore,  $d(\text{ga-tp}(b_n/N^2), \text{ga-tp}(b/N^2)) < \varepsilon/3$  for every  $n \geq K$ .

Since  $h$  is an isometry, we have that  $(h(b_n)) \rightarrow h(b)$  and also for every  $n \geq K$  we have that  $d(h(b_n), h(b)) < \varepsilon/3$  (and therefore  $d(\text{ga-tp}(h(b_n)/N^2), \text{ga-tp}(h(b)/N^2)) < \varepsilon/3$ ).

Therefore, for any  $n \geq K$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d(\text{ga-tp}(h(b)/N^2), \text{ga-tp}(b/N^2)) &\leq d(\text{ga-tp}(h(b)/N^2), \text{ga-tp}(h(b_n)/N^2)) + \\ &\quad d(\text{ga-tp}(h(b_n)/N^2), \text{ga-tp}(b_n/N^2)) + \\ &\quad d(\text{ga-tp}(b_n/N^2), \text{ga-tp}(b/N^2)) \\ &< \varepsilon/3 + \varepsilon/3 + \varepsilon/3 = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $b \downarrow_{N_{i_{n,\varepsilon}}}^\varepsilon M$  and so,  $b \downarrow_N^N M$ .  $\square_{\text{Lemma 2.15}}$

**Proposition 2.16** (stationarity (3)). *Let  $M_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  be such that  $M$  is a  $(\mu, \sigma)$ -limit model over  $M_0$ , where  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \sigma\}$  witnesses that  $M$  is  $(\mu, \sigma)$ -limit over  $M_0$ . If  $a, b \downarrow_M^M N$  and  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M) = \text{ga-tp}(b/M)$ , then  $\text{ga-tp}(a/N) = \text{ga-tp}(b/N)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $a, b \downarrow_M^M N$ , there exists  $i < \sigma$  such that  $a, b \downarrow_{M_i}^\varepsilon N$  (by definition and monotonicity of non- $\varepsilon$ -splitting). Since  $M_{i+1}$  is universal over  $M_i$  and  $M_i \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$ , there exists and  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$ -embedding  $f : N \rightarrow_{M_i} M_{i+1}$ . Also, since  $M_i \prec_{\mathcal{K}} f[N] \cong_{M_i} N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  and  $a \downarrow_{M_i}^\varepsilon N$ , therefore  $d(\text{ga-tp}(a/N), \text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(a)/N)) < \varepsilon$ .

Doing a similar argument, we have that  $d(\text{ga-tp}(b/N), \text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(b)/N)) < \varepsilon$ .

On the other hand, we have that  $\text{ga-tp}(a/f[N]) = \text{ga-tp}(b/f[N])$  (since  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M) = \text{ga-tp}(b/M)$  and  $f[N] \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_{i+1} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M$ ), therefore we have that  $\text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(a)/N) = \text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(a)/N)$ .

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d(\text{ga-tp}(a/N), \text{ga-tp}(b/N)) &\leq \text{ga-tp}(a/N) + \text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(a)/N) \\ &\quad + d(\text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(a)/N), \text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(b)/N)) \\ &\quad + d(\text{ga-tp}(f^{-1}(b)/N), \text{ga-tp}(b/N)) \\ &< \varepsilon + 0 + \varepsilon \\ &= 2\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\text{ga-tp}(a/N) = \text{ga-tp}(b/N)$ .

□<sub>Prop. 2.16</sub>

**Proposition 2.17** (Transitivity). *Let  $M_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_1 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_2$  be such that  $M_1$  and  $M_0$  are  $(\mu, \sigma)$ -limit over some  $M' \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_0 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M_1$ , where  $\mathcal{M}_i$  witnesses that  $M_i$  is  $(\mu, \sigma)$ -limit over  $M'$  and  $\mathcal{M}_0 \subset \mathcal{M}_1$ . Then  $\mathfrak{a} \downarrow_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_2$  iff  $\mathfrak{a} \downarrow_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_1$  and  $\mathfrak{a} \downarrow_{M_1}^{\mathcal{M}_1} M_2$ .*

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) By monotonicity.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose  $\mathfrak{a} \downarrow_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_1$  and  $\mathfrak{a} \downarrow_{M_1}^{\mathcal{M}_1} M_2$ . Notice that  $M_1$  is universal over  $M_0$ . Therefore, by extension property (proposition 2.8), there exists  $\mathfrak{b} \models \text{ga-tp}(a/M_1)$  such that  $\mathfrak{b} \downarrow_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_2$ . By monotonicity, we have that  $\mathfrak{b} \downarrow_{M_1}^{\mathcal{M}_1} M_2$ . Since  $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \downarrow_{M_1}^{\mathcal{M}_1} M_2$ ,  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M_1) = \text{ga-tp}(b/M_1)$  and in particular  $M_1$  is a limit model over  $M_0$ , then by stationarity (proposition 2.16) we have that  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M_2) = \text{ga-tp}(b/M_2)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{b} \downarrow_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_2$ , then  $\mathfrak{a} \downarrow_{M_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} M_2$ .

□<sub>Prop. 2.17</sub>

### 3. DOMINATION, ORTHOGONALITY AND PARALLELISM UNDER UNIQUENESS OF LIMIT MODELS

The study of Zilber's trichotomy for strongly minimal sets in understanding the classification -up to bi-interpretability- of uncountably categorical strongly minimal theories is an important step toward geometric stability theory (although restricted to  $\omega_1$ -categoricity). The non-finite

axiomatizability of totally categorical theories -works of Cherlin, Harrington, Lachlan and Zilber- is the main initial step toward geometric stability theory. Buechler used generalizations of this machinery outside of totally-categorical and  $\omega_1$ -categorical settings and obtained a proof of his famous dichotomy theorem on the collection  $D$  of realizations of  $\text{stp}(a/A)$  for  $a$  any realization of a weakly minimal type, which says that either  $D$  is locally modular or  $p$  has Morley rank 1 [Bu2].

In Superstable First Order theories, the development of Geometric Stability Theory (see [Pi, Bu1]) includes generalizations of results studied in the categorical settings. In his doctoral thesis, E. Hrushovski extended this work to Stable First Order Theories [Hr]. Also, this study has been extended to Rosy Theories by A. Onshuus and A. Usvyatsov (see [OnUs1]). In abstract settings, S. Shelah provided some extensions of these results in *AEC Good Frames* (see [Sh705]), which corresponds to a setting that J. Baldwin calls *intermediate stability theory* because it does not really consider more refined techniques of geometric stability theory, e.g. group configurations and Hrushovski's analysis.

This chapter is devoted to the study of some basic geometrical notions of classical stability theory: *domination, orthogonality and parallelism*. These notions correspond in the MAEC setting to the well-known notions going by the same names in stable first order theories. We will study some of their properties in MAEC settings exhibiting behavior akin to (variants of) superstability, and will extend results due to Baldwin ([Ba1]) and Shelah [Sh705].

**Assumption 3.1.** *Throughout this section, we assume AP, JEP, CTP, existence of arbitrarily large enough models and the following assumptions (we sometimes abusively call them “superstability” - but we do not attempt to define that notion at this stage): For every  $a$  and every increasing and continuous  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$ -chain of models  $\langle M_i : i < \sigma \rangle$  and  $M_j$  a resolution of  $M_j$  ( $j < \sigma$ ):*

- (1) (Continuity) *If  $p \upharpoonright M_i \downarrow_{M_0}^{M_0} M_i$  for all  $i < \sigma$ , then  $p \downarrow_{M_0}^{M_0} \overline{\bigcup_{i < \sigma} M_i}$ .*
- (2) (Locality) *if  $\text{cf}(\sigma) > \omega$ , there exists  $j < \sigma$  such that  $a \downarrow_{M_j}^{M_j} \bigcup_{i < \sigma} M_i$ .*
- (3) ( $\varepsilon$ -simplicity) *if  $\text{cf}(\sigma) = \omega$ , there exists  $j < \sigma$  such that  $a \downarrow_{M_j}^{\varepsilon} \overline{\bigcup_{i < \sigma} M_i}$ .*

**Remark 3.2.** Under these assumptions plus categoricity, we proved in [ViZa] the uniqueness -up to isomorphisms- of limit models over a fixed base: If  $M_i$  is a  $(\mu, \theta_i)$ -d-limit over  $M$  ( $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ) such that  $\text{dc}(M_1) = \text{dc}(M_2)$ , then  $M_1 \approx_M M_2$ . It is straightforward to see that assumptions 3.1 2. and 3. imply  $a \downarrow_M^M M$  for every  $M$  and every resolution  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $M$ .


**Assumption 3.3** (Uniqueness of limit models). *If  $M$  and  $N$  are limit models of the same density character  $\mu$  over the same model  $M_0$ , then there exists an isomorphism  $f : M \rightarrow N$  fixing  $M_0$  pointwise.*

**3.1. Domination in MAEC.** In this section, we define a natural adaptation of the notion of domination in the setting of superstable MAECs that exhibit the superstability-like assumption 3.1. We base the development of this section on [Ba1] but we use  $s$ -independence instead of intersections as Baldwin does.

According to S. Buechler ([Bu1]), the motivating question which takes us to the notion of *domination* is whether nonorthogonal (first order syntactical) types  $p$  and  $q$  have bases relative to a model  $M$  (i.e., maximal Morley sequences of  $p$  and  $q$  respectively over the domain of the respective types contained in  $M$ ) with the same cardinality. In such context, domination is a kind of opposite notion to orthogonality. In first order, we say that a (possibly infinite) set  $B$  dominates another (possibly infinite) set  $A$  over  $C$  if and only if for any set  $D$ , if  $B \perp_C D$  then  $A \perp_C D$ . But in our setting, we cannot define independence on sets because, in general, Galois types are defined on models. Because of that, we have to adapt this notion to our general context.

**Notation 3.4.**  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, \mathfrak{a})$  means that  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$ ,  $M$  is a limit model witnessed by  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathfrak{a} \in N \setminus M$ .

**Definition 3.5.** We say that  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, \mathfrak{a}) \prec_{\text{nf}} (M', \mathcal{M}', N', \mathfrak{a})$  if and only if  $M'$  is a limit model over  $M$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}'$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  corresponds to an initial segment of  $\mathcal{M}'$ ,  $N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N'$  and  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$ .



**Definition 3.6.** We say that a set  $A$  is smooth independent from  $M$  over  $N$  relative to a resolution  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $N$  -denoted by  $A \perp_N^{\mathcal{N}} M$  - if and only if  $b \perp_N^{\mathcal{N}} M$  for every finite tuple  $b \in A$ .

**Definition 3.7.** Given  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, \mathfrak{a})$ , we say that  $\mathfrak{a}$  *dominates*  $N$  over  $M$  relative to  $\mathcal{M}$  (denoted by  $\mathfrak{a} \triangleright_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$ ) iff for every  $(M', \mathcal{M}', N', \mathfrak{a}) \succ_{\text{nf}} (M, \mathcal{M}, N, \mathfrak{a})$  we have that  $N \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$  (i.e., for every  $b \in N$   $b \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$ ).



Remember that in first order,  $B$  dominates  $A$  over  $C$  if and only if for any set  $D$ , if  $B \downarrow_C D$  then  $A \downarrow_C D$ . Because in our general context Galois types are defined on models instead of sets, we have to adapt this notion to our setting. Notice that  $(M', \mathcal{M}', N', a) \succ_{\text{nf}} (M, \mathcal{M}, N, a)$  implies  $a \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$ , so  $a \triangleright_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$  means that  $a \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$  implies  $N \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$ , agreeing with the first order notion of domination.

The following proposition says that domination over a model  $M_\alpha$  implies domination over a  $\mathcal{K}$ -superstructure  $M \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M_\alpha$  if there is some independence from  $M$  over  $M_\alpha$  (i.e., the information given over  $M$  is the same over  $M_\alpha$ ).


**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, a)$  (where  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \theta\}$  witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model) and  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$  be a resolution of  $M_\alpha$  ( $\alpha < \theta$ ) such that  $a \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ . If  $a \triangleright_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$  then  $a \triangleright_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(M', \mathcal{M}', N', a) \succ_{\text{nf}} (M, \mathcal{M}, N, a)$ . Therefore,  $a \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$ . By hypothesis  $a \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ , hence  $a \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M'$  (by transitivity, proposition 2.17). So,  $(M', \mathcal{M}', N', a) \succ_{\text{nf}} (M_\alpha, \mathcal{M}_\alpha, N, a)$ . Since  $a \triangleright_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ , then  $N \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M'$ . By monotonicity (proposition 2.5),  $N \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} M'$ , therefore  $a \triangleright_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$ .  $\square_{\text{Prop. 3.8}}$

The following proposition is a kind of reciprocal of proposition 3.8. This says that under some independence from  $M$  over  $M_\alpha$ , domination over  $M$  implies domination over  $M_\alpha$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, a)$  (where  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \theta\}$  witnesses that  $M$  is a  $(\mu, \sigma)$ -limit model) and  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$  be a resolution of  $M_\alpha$  ( $\alpha < \theta$ ) such that  $N \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ . If  $a \triangleright_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$  then  $a \triangleright_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(M', \mathcal{M}', N', a) \succ_{\text{nf}} (M_\alpha, \mathcal{M}_\alpha, N, a)$ . Let  $M \cup M' \subset \widehat{M} \prec_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{M}$  (by downward Löwenheim-Skolem axiom) and  $M^* \succ_{\mathcal{K}} \widehat{M}$  be a limit over  $\widehat{M}$  -and so  $M^*$  is a limit model over  $M$ , where  $\mathcal{M}^{**}$  is a witness of that-. Let  $N^* \succ_{\mathcal{K}} N$  be such that  $N^* \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M^*$ . and  $\mathcal{M}^* := \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{M}^{**}$



Since  $a \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M'$  (by definition of  $\prec_{\text{nf}}$ ) and  $M'$  is universal over  $M_\alpha$ , by the extension property of smooth independence (proposition 2.8), there exists  $a' \models \text{ga-tp}(a/M')$  such that  $a' \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M^*$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $a \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M^*$ . Notice that  $(M^*, \mathcal{M}^*, N^*, a) \succ_{\text{nf}} (M, \mathcal{M}, N, a)$ . Since

$\mathfrak{a} \triangleright_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{N}$ , then  $\mathcal{N} \perp_{\mathcal{M}} M^*$ . By hypothesis,  $\mathcal{N} \perp_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ , so by transitivity (proposition 2.17, since  $M$  and  $M_\alpha$  are limit models over  $M_0$ )  $\mathcal{N} \perp_{M_\alpha} M^*$ , and by monotonicity (proposition 2.5)  $\mathcal{N} \perp_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M'$  (since  $M_\alpha \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M' \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M^*$ ). So, we have that  $\mathfrak{a} \triangleright_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} \mathcal{N}$ .  $\square_{\text{Prop. 3.9}}$

The following proposition says that given any tuple  $(M, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathfrak{a})$ , we can find some extensions  $\mathcal{N}' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{N}$  and  $M' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$  such that  $\mathcal{N}' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M'$ , and  $\mathfrak{a}$  dominates  $\mathcal{N}'$  over  $M'$ .

**Proposition 3.10.** *Given  $(M, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathfrak{a})$  there exists  $(M', \mathcal{M}', \mathcal{N}', \mathfrak{a}) \succ_{\text{nf}} (M, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathfrak{a})$  such that  $\mathfrak{a} \triangleright_{M'}^{\mathcal{M}'} \mathcal{N}'$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. This allows us to construct an  $\prec_{\text{nf}}$ -increasing and continuous sequence of tuples  $\langle (M^\alpha, \mathcal{M}^\alpha, \mathcal{N}^\alpha, \mathfrak{a}) : \alpha < \mu^+ \rangle$  such that  $(M^0, \mathcal{M}^0, \mathcal{N}^0, \mathfrak{a}) := (M, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathfrak{a})$  and  $(M^{\alpha+1}, \mathcal{M}^{\alpha+1}, \mathcal{N}^{\alpha+1}, \mathfrak{a})$  witnesses that  $(M^\alpha, \mathcal{M}^\alpha, \mathcal{N}^\alpha, \mathfrak{a})$  does not satisfy that  $\mathfrak{a} \triangleright_{M^\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}^\alpha} \mathcal{N}^\alpha$ . Therefore, there exists  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{N}^\alpha$  such that  $\mathfrak{a} \perp_{M^\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}^\alpha} M^{\alpha+1}$  but  $\mathfrak{b} \not\perp_{M^\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}^\alpha} M^{\alpha+1}$ . By assumption 3.1, given any  $\mathfrak{c}$  there exists  $\alpha_c < \mu^+$  such that  $\mathfrak{c} \perp_{M^{\alpha_c}}^{\mathcal{M}^{\alpha_c}} \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu^+} M^\alpha$ .

Consider  $\gamma_0 < \mu^+$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma_0}$  has density character  $\mu$ , there exists  $B_{\gamma_0}$  a dense subset of  $\mathcal{N}^{\gamma_0}$  of cardinality  $\mu$ . Defining  $f_0 : B_{\gamma_0} \rightarrow \mu^+$  as  $f_0(\mathfrak{c}) := \alpha_c$ , we have that there exists  $\gamma'_0 < \mu^+$  such that  $f_0(\mathfrak{c}) := \alpha_c < \gamma'_0$  for every  $\mathfrak{c} \in B_{\gamma_0}$ . Define  $\gamma_1 := \max\{\gamma_0, \gamma'_0\} + 1$ .

In the same way we define  $B_{\gamma_n}$  and  $\gamma_n$  for every  $n < \omega$ . Notice that  $(\gamma_n : n < \omega)$  is an increasing sequence of ordinals  $< \mu^+$ .

Define  $\gamma := \sup\{\gamma_n : n < \omega\}$ . Notice that  $\gamma < \mu^+$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{N}^\gamma$  be such that  $\mathfrak{b} \not\perp_{M^\gamma}^{\mathcal{M}^\gamma} M^{\gamma+1}$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}^\gamma := \overline{\bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} \mathcal{N}^\alpha}$ , there exists a sequence  $(\mathfrak{b}_n) \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} \mathcal{N}^\alpha$  such that  $(\mathfrak{b}_n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}$ . By proposition 2.15 (continuity of  $\perp$ ), there exists  $k < \omega$  such that  $\mathfrak{b}_k \not\perp_{M^\gamma}^{\mathcal{M}^\gamma} M^{\gamma+1}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{b}_k \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} \mathcal{N}^\alpha$ , there exists  $\beta < \gamma$  such that  $\mathfrak{b}_k \in \mathcal{N}^\beta$ . Since  $\beta < \gamma := \sup\{\gamma_n : n < \omega\}$ , there exists  $m < \omega$  such that  $\beta < \gamma_m$ , so  $\mathfrak{b}_k \in \mathcal{N}^{\gamma_m}$ . Since by construction we have that  $\overline{B_{\gamma_m}} = \mathcal{N}^{\gamma_m}$ , there exists a sequence  $(\mathfrak{c}_n) \in B_{\gamma_m}$  such that  $(\mathfrak{c}_n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}_k$ . By proposition 2.15 again, there exists  $l < \omega$  such that  $\mathfrak{c} := \mathfrak{c}_l \not\perp_{M^\gamma}^{\mathcal{M}^\gamma} M^{\gamma+1}$ . By construction,  $\alpha_c < \gamma_{m+1} < \gamma < \gamma + 1 < \mu^+$ , then by proposition 2.5 (monotonicity of  $\perp$ ) we have that  $\mathfrak{c} \not\perp_{M^{\alpha_c}}^{\mathcal{M}^{\alpha_c}} \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu^+} M^\alpha$  (contradiction). Therefore, the proposition is true.  $\square_{\text{Prop. 3.10}}$



because  $M$  is an universal model over  $M_\alpha$ , there exist  $N^*$  and a resolution  $\mathcal{M}^*$  which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model over  $M_0$  such that  $\bar{a} \triangleleft_M^{\mathcal{M}^*} N^*$ .


**Question 3.14.** *In general, we cannot assure the existence of prime models in metric and discrete AECs. In superstable first order theories, we can prove that if  $p$  is a stationary syntactic type, there exist regular types  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  such that  $p \triangleleft p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_n$ . Setting  $(\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n) \models p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_n$  and  $\bar{a} \models p$ , it is known that  $M[\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n] = M[\bar{a}]$  (i.e., the  $a$ -prime model over  $M \cup \{\bar{a}\}$  and the  $a$ -prime model over  $M \cup \{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n\}$  agree). In Hilbert spaces with a unitary operator (see [ArBe]),  $\alpha \perp_M N$  iff  $P_M(\alpha) = P_N(\alpha)$  (i.e., the respective orthogonal projections of  $\alpha$  over  $M$  and  $N$  agree). Considering this independence notion instead of smooth-independence, corollary 3.13 would say that that given  $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{H}$  (where  $\mathcal{H}$  is a monster Hilbert space with a unitary operator) and  $M$  a Hilbert space with a unitary operator such that  $M$  is saturated enough and  $\bar{a} \notin M$ , there exists a Hilbert space with a unitary operator  $N^* \supset \text{acl}(M\bar{a})$  extending  $M$  such that for every Hilbert space with a unitary operator  $M' \geq M$ ,  $P_M(\bar{a}) = P_{M'}(\bar{a})$  implies that  $P_M(b) = P_{M'}(b)$  for every  $b \in N^*$ ; i.e.:  $\bar{a}$  determines the projections on  $M$  of all elements in  $N^*$ . A natural question that arises at this point is naturally connected to the question on existence of prime models over sets in MAECs: under which assumptions can we guarantee that existence.*

**3.2. Orthogonality.** Orthogonality arose from the question on the existence of bases -maximal Morley sequences- of arbitrary size in a model, for (first order syntactical types)  $p$  and  $q$  (see [Bu1]).

In this section, we adapt the study of orthogonality which S. Shelah did in the setting of good frames in (discrete) Abstract Elementary Classes (see [Sh705, Sh600]). Shelah provided a suitable study of superstability in (discrete) AECs via good frames, without assuming the existence of a monster model as in 1.8 and with an abstract notion of independence. Most of the definitions in this section are inspired on Shelah's work ([Sh705]), with some exceptions (e.g., the definition of domination of types, which we define in this thesis in order to prove that domination corresponds to a kind of nonorthogonality). However, we point out some differences between our results and the analysis done in [Sh705]: although we are assuming the existence of a homogeneous monster model (thereby losing generality), we are using a fixed notion of independence (smooth independence). In this section, we obtain an adaptation of the notions given by Shelah to our setting and prove some basic facts which were not proved in [Sh705].

However, we have to point out that there might be problems proving the existence of weakly orthogonal types, with our definition of weak orthogonality is being defined. Still, we develop this section and show some important properties, consequence of uniqueness of limit models.

**Notation 3.15.**  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  means  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \delta\}$  is a resolution of  $M$  which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model,  $\alpha < \delta$  is a limit ordinal,  $N \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$  is universal over  $M$ ,  $b \in N \setminus M$  and  $b \perp_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ , where  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$  is a resolution of  $M_\alpha$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$ .




### 3.2.1. Orthogonality and Independence of sequences.

**Definition 3.16.** Let  $\mathbb{J}$  be a sequence of elements in  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $M \subset N$  where  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  be a resolution of  $M$ . We say that  $\mathbb{J}$  is *independent* in  $(M, N)$  iff there exist  $\langle N_j, a_i : j \leq \alpha, i < \alpha \rangle$  such that

- (1)  $\langle N_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$  is a  $\prec_{\mathcal{K}}$ -increasing and continuous chain.
- (2)  $\mathbb{J} = \{a_i : i < \alpha\}$ .
- (3)  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} N_i$
- (4)  $a_i \in N_{i+1} \setminus N_i$ .
- (5)  $a_i \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} N_i$ .

**Definition 3.17.** Let  $M \in \mathcal{K}$  be a limit model witnessed by  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $M_\alpha$  be a resolution of a model  $M_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  be non-algebraic types such that  $p, q \perp_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ . We say that  $p$  is *weakly orthogonal to  $q$  relative to  $\alpha$*  (denoted by  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$ ) iff for every  $b \models q$  there exists  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  where  $b \models q$  and if  $p' \in \text{ga-S}(N)$  is any extension of  $p$  then  $p' \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$  -notice that by definition of  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$ ,  $b \in N$ -. We drop the subindex  $\alpha$  if it is clear.




In first order, for stationary types  $p, q \in S(A)$ , we say that  $p$  is (almost) orthogonal to  $q$  (over  $A$ ) if and only if there exist realizations  $a \models p$  and  $b \models q$  such that  $a \perp_A b$ . Since in our setting we cannot consider independence either from or over sets which are not models, we have to adapt this notion to our context, as in [Sh705]. Notice that if we could define smooth independence on sets,  $p' \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$  would imply  $p \perp_M^{\mathcal{M}} b$  because

$b \in N$ . Hence, weak orthogonality corresponds to a stronger notion of orthogonality. In spite of that, the notion of independence defined at the beginning of this subsection (independence of sequences, definition 3.16) allows us to catch such independence between a realization  $a$  of  $p$  and a realization  $b$  of  $q$ .

**Example 3.18.** Consider the class of Hilbert spaces. As in Hilbert spaces together with a unitary operator (see [ArBe]), independence is characterized by agreeing with the respective projections (i.e.,  $a \perp_N M$  if and only if  $P_N(a) = P_M(a)$ ). In this case, replacing this notion of independence instead of smooth-independence,  $p \perp^{\text{wk}} q$  (both of them in  $\text{ga-S}(M)$ ) means that for every Hilbert space  $N \geq M$  which contains a realization of  $q$  and given any realization  $a$  of  $p$ ,  $P_M(a) = P_N(a)$ . If  $M = \langle 0 \rangle$  and  $N = \langle b \rangle$ , notice that weak orthogonality implies that  $0 = P_M(a) = P_N(a)$ , therefore  $a$  and  $b$  are orthogonal in the sense of the inner product in Hilbert spaces.

**Proposition 3.19.** *Let  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  be non-algebraic types such that  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  (witnessed by  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$ ) and  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  be resolutions of  $M_\alpha$  and  $M$  respectively such that  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model. Therefore, for every  $N' \succ_{\mathcal{X}} M$  and every realization  $a$  of  $p$  and a realization  $b$  of  $q$  belonging to  $N'$  we have that  $\langle b, a \rangle$  is independent in  $(M, N')$ .*

*Proof.* Define  $N_0 := M$ . Given  $M, N'$ , and  $a, b \in N'$  as above, define  $N_1 := N$ . Notice that  $b \notin N_0$  (since  $q$  is non-algebraic). Trivially we have that  $b \perp_{N_0}^{N_0} N_0$ . Since  $\text{ga-tp}(a/N) \supset p$  and  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  witnesses  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  we may say  $a \perp_{N_0}^{N_0} N$ ; i.e.:  $a \perp_M^{M_0} N_1$ . Notice that  $a \notin N_1$  since  $a \notin N_0$  (since  $p$  is non-algebraic and by antirreflexivity, proposition 2.11). Let  $N_2 \succ_{\mathcal{X}} N_1 \cup N'$ .



Defining  $\alpha_0 := b$  and  $\alpha_1 := a$ , notice that  $\{N_0, N_1, N_2; \alpha_0, \alpha_1\}$  witness that  $\langle b, a \rangle$  is independent in  $(M, N')$ .  $\square_{\text{Prop. 3.19}}$

The following proposition says that given  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  and  $N \succ_{\mathcal{X}} M$  has a realization of  $q$ , then  $p$  is weakly orthogonal to  $q$  if and only if  $p$  has just one extension in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$ .

**Proposition 3.20.** *Let  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  be non-algebraic types,  $\mathcal{M}$  be a resolution of  $M$  which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model such that  $p, q \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$  where  $M_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a resolution of  $M_\alpha$ . Then  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q \Leftrightarrow$  for some  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  such that  $q = \text{ga-tp}(b/M)$ ,  $p$  has just one extension in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$ .*

*Proof.*

$\Rightarrow$  Suppose  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  witnessed by  $(M, \mathcal{M}, b, N, \alpha)$ , then every extension  $p' \in \text{ga-S}(N)$  of  $p$  satisfies  $p' \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$ ; since  $M_\alpha$  and  $M$  are limit model over  $M_0$ , by transitivity (proposition 2.17) we have  $p' \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ . By stationarity over limit models of s-independence (proposition 2.10), we have that there is just one extension of  $p$  in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Let  $(M, \mathcal{M}, b, N, \alpha)$  be such that  $b \models q$  and such that  $p$  has just one extension in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$ . By extension property of s-independence (proposition 2.8, since  $M$  is a limit model over  $M_\alpha$ ), there exists an extension  $p' \supset p$  in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$  such that  $p' \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ . By monotonicity (proposition 2.5, since  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$ ),  $p' \downarrow_M^{\mathcal{M}} N$ . Since  $p$  has just one extension in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$ , then the unique extension of  $p$  in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$  is  $p'$ . Therefore,  $(M, \mathcal{M}, b, N, \alpha)$  witnesses  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$ .

□<sub>Prop. 3.20</sub>

**Proposition 3.21.** *Let  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  be such that  $b \models q$  and  $p \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  be a non-algebraic Galois type such that  $p \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ . If  $p$  is realized in  $N$ , then  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  cannot witness  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $M$  is universal over  $M_\alpha$  and  $p \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ , by extension property (proposition 2.8) there exists  $p' \supset p$  in  $\text{ga-S}(N)$  such that  $p' \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ . Notice that  $p'$  is non-algebraic: otherwise, by antirreflexivity (proposition 2.11 (6), since  $M_\alpha$  is a limit model witnessed by  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ )  $p'$  would be realized in  $M_\alpha$  and so realized in  $M$  (contradiction). But by hypothesis, there exists  $c \in N$  such that  $c \models p$ . Notice that  $p'' := \text{ga-tp}(c/N) \supset p$  and  $p' \neq p''$ . If  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  witnessed  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$ , this would contradict proposition 3.20.


□<sub>Prop. 3.21</sub>

Another way to understand the previous proposition is the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.22.** *Let  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  be such that  $b \models q$  and  $p \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  be a non-algebraic Galois type such that  $p \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ . If  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  is witnessed by  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$ , then  $p$  is not realized in  $N$ .*

As we stated in section 3.1, orthogonality corresponds (in first order) in some way to nonorthogonality. In order to prove a similar result in our context, we adapt the notion of domination of types.

**Definition 3.23.** Let  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$  be non-algebraic Galois types such that  $p, q \perp_{M_\alpha}^{M_\alpha} M$ . We say that  $q$  is *dominated by*  $p$  (denoted by  $q \triangleleft p$ ) if there exist  $a \models p$ ,  $b \models q$  and  $N \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$  such that  $a, b \in N$  and  $N \triangleleft_M a$ .



The following proposition says that this notion of domination is a kind of “opposite” of weak orthogonality.

**Proposition 3.24.** Let  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \theta\}$  be a resolution of a model  $M$  and  $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$  be a resolution of  $M_\alpha$ . If  $q \triangleleft p$  witnessed by  $a \models p$ ,  $b \models q$  and  $a, b \in N$ , then  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  does not witness  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  and  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, a, \alpha)$  does not witness  $q \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} p$ .

*Proof.* Let  $a \models p$ ,  $b \models q$  and  $N \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$  be witnesses of  $q \triangleleft p$ . Notice that  $p' := \text{ga-tp}(a/N)$  is an extension of  $p$  such that  $a \not\perp_M^{M'} N$  (by antirreflexivity -proposition 2.11-, since  $a \in N \setminus M$ ). Notice that  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  does not witness  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$ . By an analogous argument, we can prove that  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, a, \alpha)$  does not witness  $q \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} p$ , using  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, a, \alpha)$ .

$\square_{\text{Prop. 3.24}}$

**Remark 3.25.** Notice that proposition 3.24 says that if given  $a \models p$  and  $b \models q$ , if  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  witnesses  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  and  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, a, \alpha)$  witnesses  $q \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} p$ , then  $a, b, N$  cannot witness  $q \triangleleft p$ .

**3.3. Parallelism.** Roughly speaking, two (first order syntactical) stationary types  $p$  and  $q$  are parallel if and only if they have a common independent extension. In this section, we study parallelism of strong limit Galois types in the setting of superstable MAECs.

We defined parallelism of strong Galois types in [Za, ViZa] inspired in the definition given in [GrVaVi], which we used it as an auxiliary tool for studying full-relative  $s$ -towers. Full-relative  $s$ -towers were very important to get a proof of uniqueness of limit models because they codified a kind of saturation. In this subsection, we study some properties of a stronger version of parallelism, but in the setting of superstable MAECs.




However, for the sake of completeness, we provide the definition of parallelism once more. But we have to point out that in this subsection, we require that if  $(p, N) \in \mathfrak{St}(M)$ , then  $M$  is a limit model over  $N$ , instead of just being a universal model over  $N$ . Because of that, we define a stronger notion of strong type, which we call *strong limit type*. In this thesis, we use the notion of *strong limit type* instead of *strong types* because we want to use *uniqueness of limit models* to prove some properties of parallelism, e.g. proposition 3.31 (2) and (3).

**Definition 3.26** (strong limit type). Let  $M$  be a  $(\mu, \sigma)$ -limit model



$$\mathfrak{SL}(M) := \left\{ (p, N) : \begin{array}{l} N \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M \\ N \text{ is a } \theta\text{-Limit Model} \\ M \text{ is a Limit Model over } N \\ p \in \text{ga-S}(M) \text{ is non-algebraic} \\ \text{and } p \perp_N^N M \\ \text{for some resolution } \mathcal{N} \text{ of } N. \end{array} \right\}$$

**Definition 3.27** (Parallelism). Two strong limit types  $(p_l, N_l) \in \mathfrak{SL}(M_l)$  ( $l \in \{1, 2\}$ ) are said to be *parallel* (which we denote by  $(p_1, N_1) \parallel (p_2, N_2)$ ) iff for every  $M' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M_1, M_2$  with density character  $\mu$ , there exists  $q \in \text{ga-S}(M')$  which extends both  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  and  $q \perp_{N_l}^{N_l} M'$  ( $l \in \{1, 2\}$ ) (where  $N_l$  is the resolution of  $N_l$  which satisfies  $p_l \perp_{N_l}^{N_l} M_l$ ). If there is no any confusion, we denote it by  $p_1 \parallel p_2$ .



**Remark 3.28.** Consider the class of Hilbert spaces. Let us suppose that we could set  $N_1 = N_2 = \langle 0 \rangle \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  -the space generated by the origin- (despite this is not a universal model) and let  $M := M_1 = M_2 = \{(x, 0, 0) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . Remember that we stated in 3.18 that, as in a Hilbert space with a unitary operator (see [ArBe]), independence in Hilbert spaces means the respective projections agree. Let  $p_i \in \text{ga-S}(M)$ ,  $a \models p_1$  and  $b \models p_2$  be such that  $a$  and  $b$  are independent from  $M$  over  $\langle 0 \rangle$ ; i.e.:  $0 = P_M(a) = P_M(b)$ , therefore  $a$  and  $b$  are orthogonal to  $M$ .

If  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are parallel in the sense defined above, consider  $M' := \langle M \cup \{a, b\} \rangle \geq M$ , so there exists a type over  $M'$   $q \supset p_1, p_2$  (so  $\text{ga-tp}(a/M) = \text{ga-tp}(b/M) = q \upharpoonright M$ ) such that  $q$  is independent from  $M'$  over  $\langle 0 \rangle$  (i.e., any realization  $c \models q$  satisfies  $0 = P_{M'}(c)$ ), therefore  $c$  is orthogonal to  $a$  and  $b$ . If  $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , notice that it means that if  $\varphi$  is the angle between  $a$  and  $b$  and  $\theta$  is the angle between  $b$  and  $c$  (and so  $\theta + \varphi$  is the angle between  $a$  and  $c$ ), since  $a$  and  $c$  are orthogonal then  $|\cos(\varphi + \theta)| = 0$ , and since  $b$  and  $c$  are orthogonal then  $|\cos(\theta)| = \cos(\theta) = 0$ , then  $\theta = \frac{(2k+1)\pi}{2}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $0 = |\cos(\varphi + \theta)| = |\cos(\theta)\cos(\varphi) - \sin(\theta)\sin(\varphi)| = |\sin\left(\frac{(2k+1)\pi}{2}\right)\sin(\varphi)| = |\sin(\varphi)|$ , therefore  $\varphi = m\pi$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ ; i.e.:  $a$  and  $b$  would be parallel as vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .



**Claim 3.29.**  $\parallel$  is an equivalence relation.

*Proof.* Reflexivity and symmetry are trivial. We focus on transitivity. Let  $(p_l, N_l) \in \mathfrak{S}\mathcal{L}(M_l)$  ( $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ) be such that  $p_1 \parallel p_2$  and  $p_2 \parallel p_3$ . Let  $M$  be a  $\mathcal{K}$ -extension of both  $M_1$  and  $M_3$ . By Downward Löwenheim-Skolem axiom (Definition 1.2 (6)) and Coherence axiom of MAEC (Definition 1.2 (5)), there exists a  $\mathcal{K}$ -extension  $M'$  of both  $M$  and  $M_2$ . Denote by  $p_l^{M'}$  ( $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ) the unique  $s$ -independent extension of  $p_l$  in  $\text{ga-S}(M')$  (such that extension exists by propositions 2.8 and 2.10, since  $M$  is universal

over  $N_i$ ) and by  $p_k^M$  ( $k \in \{1, 3\}$ ) the unique  $s$ -independent extension of  $p_k$  in  $\text{ga-S}(M)$ . Notice that for  $k \in \{1, 3\}$  we have  $p_k^M = p_k^{M'} \upharpoonright M$ . Since  $M_1, M_2 \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M'$  and  $p_1 \parallel p_2$ , then  $p_1^{M'} = p_2^{M'}$ . In a similar way we have  $p_2^{M'} = p_3^{M'}$ , then  $p_1^{M'} = p_3^{M'}$ . Since  $M \prec_{\mathcal{K}} M'$ , then  $p_1^M = p_1^{M'} \upharpoonright M = p_3^{M'} \upharpoonright M = p_3^M$ . Therefore,  $p_1 \parallel p_3$ .  $\square_{\text{Claim 3.29}}$

The following proposition says that strong limit types are stationary (up to parallelism).

**Proposition 3.30** (“Stationarity” of parallelism). *Let  $(p, N) \in \mathfrak{SL}(M)$  and  $M' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$  be a limit model over  $M$ . There exists a unique  $(q, N) \in \mathfrak{SL}(M')$  such that  $p \parallel q$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $M$  is universal over  $N$ , by stationarity (proposition 2.10) there exists a unique  $q \in \text{ga-S}(M')$  such that  $q \downarrow_N^N M'$ . Notice that  $(q, N) \in \mathfrak{SL}(M')$ .

We have that  $p \parallel q$ : Let  $M'' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M'$  (and so  $M'' \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$ ). If  $p', q' \in \text{ga-S}(M')$  are the  $s$ -independent extensions of  $p$  and  $q$  respectively, we have  $p' = q'$  (if not,  $p' \neq q'$  are  $s$ -independent extensions of  $p$ , contradicts stationarity). Therefore  $p \parallel q$ .

If  $(q^*, N) \in \mathfrak{SL}(M')$  satisfies  $p \parallel q^*$  and  $q' \in \text{ga-S}(M')$  is the unique extension of  $p$  and  $q^*$  (so  $q^* = q'$ ) such that  $q' \downarrow_N^N M'$ , then by stationarity (proposition 2.10)  $q^* = q' = q$ . So, uniqueness is proved.  $\square_{\text{Prop. 3.30}}$

Next, we prove that weak orthogonality is preserved under parallelism. Before giving its proof, we prove that weak orthogonality is invariant under isomorphisms and that weak orthogonality is preserved under  $\mathcal{K}$ -submodels and  $\mathcal{K}$ -superstructures if we have suitable independence conditions.

**Proposition 3.31.** (1) *Given  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(M)$ ,  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \delta\}$  a resolution of  $M$  which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model such that  $p, q \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{M_\alpha} M$  for some  $\alpha < \delta$  (where  $M_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$  is a resolution of  $M_\alpha$ ) and  $f : M \approx N$  is an isomorphism, then  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N', b, \alpha)$  witnesses  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  if and only if  $(N, f[\mathcal{M}], \bar{f}[N'], \bar{f}(b), \alpha)$  witnesses  $f(p) \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} f(q)$ , where  $\bar{f} \in \text{Aut}(M)$  extends  $f$ .*

(2) *Given  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \delta\}$  a resolution which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model, if  $N \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$  is limit over  $M$ , given  $p, q \in \text{ga-S}(N)$  such that  $p, q \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{M_\alpha} N$ ,  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q \Leftrightarrow p \upharpoonright M \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q \upharpoonright M$ .*

(3) *Given  $\mathcal{M} := \{M_i : i < \delta\}$  a resolution which witnesses that  $M$  is a limit model, if  $N \succ_{\mathcal{K}} M$  is a limit model over  $M$  (and in particular*

over  $M_{\alpha+1}$ ) and  $(p_1, M_\alpha) \in \mathfrak{GL}(M)$  and  $(q_1, M_\alpha) \in \mathfrak{GL}(N)$  ( $1 \in \{1, 2\}$ ) satisfy  $p_i \parallel q_i$  ( $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ), then  $p_1 \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} p_2$  iff  $q_1 \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q_2$ .

*Proof.*

- (1) Since  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N, b, \alpha)$  witnesses  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$  then  $p \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ . Notice that  $f[\mathcal{M}] := \{f[M_i] : i < \delta\}$  witnesses that  $N$  is a limit model. By invariance (fact 2.4),  $f(p) \downarrow_{f[M_\alpha]}^{f[\mathcal{M}]_\alpha} f[N]$ , therefore  $(N, f[\mathcal{M}], f[N'], f(b), \alpha)$  witnesses  $f(p) \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} f(q)$ . Converse follows from a similar argument as above.
- (2) Let  $\mathcal{N}^*$  be a resolution of  $N$  witnessing  $N$  is a limit model over  $M$ , so  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}^*$  witnesses that  $N$  is a limit model over  $M_0$  (and in particular, it witnesses that  $N$  is a limit model over  $M_{\alpha+1}$ ). Since  $M$  and  $N$  are limit models over  $M_{\alpha+1}$ , by assumption 3.3 (uniqueness of limit models) there exists  $f : M \approx_{M_{\alpha+1}} N$ . Notice that  $p \upharpoonright M_{\alpha+1} = f(p \upharpoonright M_{\alpha+1}) \subset f(p \upharpoonright M) \in \text{ga-S}(N)$  and  $q \upharpoonright M_{\alpha+1} = f(q \upharpoonright M_{\alpha+1}) \subset f(q \upharpoonright M) \in \text{ga-S}(N)$ . Since  $p \upharpoonright M_{\alpha+1} \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M_{\alpha+1}$  (by monotonicity, since  $p \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ ) and  $f(p \upharpoonright M) \supset p \upharpoonright M_{\alpha+1}$  satisfies  $f(p \upharpoonright M) \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$  (by invariance of s-independence, since  $p \upharpoonright M \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} M$ ) and we also have  $p \downarrow_{M_\alpha}^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha} N$ , then by stationarity of  $p \upharpoonright M_{\alpha+1}$  (proposition 2.10, notice that  $M_{\alpha+1}$  is universal over  $M_\alpha$ ) we have that  $f(p \upharpoonright M) = p$ . In a similar way we can prove  $f(q \upharpoonright M) = q$ . By proposition 3.31 (1) we have  $(M, \mathcal{M}, N', b, \alpha)$  witnesses  $p \upharpoonright M \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q \upharpoonright M$  iff  $(N, f[\mathcal{M}], f[N'], f(b), \alpha)$  witnesses  $p \perp_\alpha^{\text{wk}} q$ , where  $\bar{f} \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M})$  extends  $f$ .
- (3) Notice that in this case,  $p_i \parallel q_i$  implies  $p_i = q_i \upharpoonright M$ . So, this holds by proposition 3.31 (2).

□<sub>Prop. 3.31</sub>

## REFERENCES

- [ArBe] C. Argoty and A. Berenstein, *Hilbert spaces with Unitary operators*, Math. Logic Quarterly, vol 55 (1), pp. 37–50, 2009.
- [Ba1] J. Baldwin, *Splitting independence in superstable AEC*, Preprint, 200x.
- [Ba2] J. Baldwin, *Categoricity in Abstract Elementary Classes*, ACTUALIZAR.
- [BaSh] J. Baldwin and S. Shelah, *The primal framework II: Smoothness*, APAL 55, pp. 1-34, 1991. Shelah's publication n. 360.
- [Be1] I. Ben-Yaacov, *Positive Model Theory and compact abstract theories*, J. Math. Log. 3 (1), pp. 85-118, 2003.
- [Be2] I. Ben-Yaacov, *Uncountable dense categoricity in cats*, J. Symbolic Logic, 70(3), pp. 829-860, 2005.
- [BeBeHeUs] I. Ben-Yaacov, A. Berenstein, C. W. Henson and A. Usvyatsov, *Model theory for metric structures*, Model theory with Applications to Algebra and Analysis Vol.

- 2 (Eds. Z. Chatzidakis, D. Macpherson, A. Pillay and A. Wilkie) London Math Soc. Lecture Note Series Nr 350, Cambridge Univ Press, 2008.
- [Bu1] S. Buechler, *Essential Stability Theory*, Springer - Verlag, 1996.
- [Bu2] S. Buechler, *The geometry of weakly minimal*, types. Journal of Symbolic Logic 50(4) pp.1044–1053, 1985.
- [GaZa] J. Galvis & P. Zambrano, *Gelfand triplets and non-elementary classes*. In process.
- [Gr] R. Grossberg, *Classification theory for abstract elementary classes*, Logic and Algebra, ed. Yi Zhang, Contemporary Mathematics, Vol. 302, AMS, pp. 165-204, 2002.
- [GrVa] R. Grossberg and M. VanDieren, *Galois-stability for Tame Abstract Elementary Classes*, J. Math. Logic. 6(1), pp. 25-49, 2006.
- [GrVaVi] R. Grossberg, M. VanDieren and A. Villaveces, *Uniqueness of Limit Models in Classes with Amalgamation*, submitted.
- [HeIo] C.W. Henson and J. Iovino, *Ultraproducts in analysis*, in Analysis and Logic (Mons, 1997), vol. 262 of London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., pp. 1-110, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [Hi] Å. Hirvonen, *Categoricity in homogeneous complete metric spaces*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Helsinki. Available at <http://www.helsinki.fi/~asaekman/paperit/categoricityv2.pdf>
- [Hr] E. Hrushovski, *Contributions to stable model theory*, PhD thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1986.
- [OnUs1] A. Onshuus & A. Usvyatsov, *Orthogonality and domination in unstable theories*. Fund. Math., 214(3), pp. 241–268, 2011.
- [OnUs2] A. Onshuus & A. Usvyatsov, *Stable domination and weight*, APAL 162 (7), pp. 544–560, 2011.
- [Pi] A. Pillay, *Geometric Stability Theory*, Clarendon Press, 1996.
- [Po] P. Poitevin, *Model Theory of Nakano Spaces*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Available at <http://w3.salemstate.edu/~lpoitevin/thesis.pdf>
- [Sh394] S. Shelah, *Categoricity of abstract classes with amalgamation*, APAL ???, 1999.
- [Sh600] S. Shelah, *Categoricity in abstract elementary classes: going up inductively*, Preprint, 2008. Available at <http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/math.LO/0011215>
- [ViZa] A. Villaveces and P. Zambrano, *Limit Models in Metric Abstract Elementary Classes: The categorical case*, Preprint, 2013. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.6797>
- [Sh705] S. Shelah, *Toward classification theory of good  $\lambda$  frames and abstract elementary classes*, Preprint, 2009. Available at <http://shelah.logic.at/files/705.pdf>
- [ViZa] A. Villaveces and P. Zambrano, *Limit Models in Metric Abstract Elementary Classes: The categorical case*, Preprint, 2013. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.6797>
- [Za] P. Zambrano, *Around superstability in Metric Abstract Elementary Classes*, Ph.D. Thesis, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2011.

E-mail - A. Villaveces: [avillavecesn@unal.edu.co](mailto:avillavecesn@unal.edu.co), DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS  
UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COLOMBIA, AK 30 # 45-03, BOGOTÁ - COLOMBIA

E-mail - P. Zambrano: [phzambranor@unal.edu.co](mailto:phzambranor@unal.edu.co), DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS  
UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COLOMBIA, AK 30 # 45-03, BOGOTÁ - COLOMBIA