

Schlichting's Theorem for Approximate Subgroups

Tingxiang Zou

Abstract. We prove Schlichting's theorem for approximate subgroups: if \mathcal{X} is a uniform family of commensurable approximate subgroups in some ambient group, then there exists an invariant approximate subgroup commensurable with \mathcal{X} .

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). Primary 20N99; Secondary 20A15.

Keywords. Approximate subgroups, Schlichting's Theorem, commensurability.

1. Introduction

Schlichting's Theorem was first introduced in [1] and was rediscovered and generalized by Bergman and Lenstra in [2]. It was further generalized to a wide class of structures including vector spaces, fields and sets by Wagner in [3] with the right notion of commensurability in each case. We state the group case here:

Fact 1.1. ([4, Theorem 4.2.4]) *Let G be a group and \mathcal{F} be a family of subgroups of G . Let $\mathbb{N}^{>0}$ be the set of positive natural numbers.¹ If there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ such that $[H : H \cap H'] < n$ for all $H, H' \in \mathcal{F}$, then there is a subgroup $H_{\mathcal{F}}$ which is commensurable with every member of \mathcal{F} , and invariant under all automorphisms of G which stabilize \mathcal{F} set-wise.*

Moreover, $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \leq H_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \langle \mathcal{F} \rangle$ and $H_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a finite extension of finite intersections of groups in \mathcal{F} . In particular, if \mathcal{F} is a family of definable groups, then $H_{\mathcal{F}}$ is also definable.

Approximate subgroups are subsets in an ambient group which are almost stable under products. They have a certain subgroup-like behaviour.

This author is supported by the China Scholarship Council and partially supported by ValCoMo (ANR-13-BS01-0006).

¹In this paper, we assume $0 \in \mathbb{N}$.

The study of approximate subgroups has gained more attention since the work of Breuillard, Green and Tao around 2010 who gave a powerful structural description of finite approximate subgroups in [5].

We recall the definition of an approximate subgroups given in [6].

Definition 1.2. Let $K \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ be a parameter, G be a group and $A \subseteq G$. We say that A is a K -approximate subgroup, if

- $1_G \in A$,
- A is symmetric: $A = A^{-1}$; and
- there is a set $X \subseteq G$ with $|X| \leq K$ such that $AA \subseteq XA$.

We can also consider a family of K -approximate subgroups which are uniformly “close” to each other and wonder if there is an invariant object.

Definition 1.3. Let G be an ambient group, X, Y approximate subgroups and $N \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$. We say X is N -commensurable with Y if there are $Z_0, Z_1 \subseteq G$ with $\max\{|Z_0|, |Z_1|\} \leq N$ such that $X \subseteq Z_0Y$ and $Y \subseteq Z_1X$.

A family \mathcal{X} of approximate subgroups of G is called *uniformly N -commensurable* if X is N -commensurable with Y for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}$.

We call \mathcal{X} a *uniform family of commensurable approximate subgroups* if there are $K, N \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ such that \mathcal{X} is a family of uniformly N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups.

Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be uniform families of commensurable approximate subgroups and H be an approximate subgroup. We say \mathcal{X} (or H) is commensurable with \mathcal{Y} , if one/any member of \mathcal{X} (or H respectively) is commensurable with one/any member of \mathcal{Y} .

Thus, Schlichting’s theorem for approximate subgroups would state:

Main Theorem. *If \mathcal{X} is a uniform family of commensurable approximate subgroups in an ambient group G , then there is an approximate subgroup $H \subseteq G$ such that H is commensurable with \mathcal{X} and invariant under all automorphisms of G stabilizing \mathcal{X} set-wise.*

We will prove this theorem in this paper. Indeed, suppose \mathcal{X} is a family of uniformly N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups. We give an explicit construction of H which is a K_H -approximate subgroup N_H -commensurable with \mathcal{X} . Moreover, K_H and N_H only depend on K and N but not on \mathcal{X} . However, we cannot get an explicit bound on K_H and N_H based on K and N . In conclusion, we have the following:

Corollary 1.4. *Let $K, N \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$. There is $L \in \mathbb{N}^{>0}$ such that for any family \mathcal{X} of uniformly N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups, there is an L -approximate subgroup H which is L -commensurable with \mathcal{X} and invariant under all automorphisms of G stabilizing \mathcal{X} set-wise.*

2. Examples and Preliminaries

Let us first look at an example.

Example. Let \mathcal{U} be a non-principal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} and define the ultrapower $(\mathbb{Q}^*, \leq, +) := \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathbb{Q}, \leq, +) / \mathcal{U}$. Let \mathcal{E} be the set of infinitesimals together with 0, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ \epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}^* : -\frac{1}{n} < \epsilon < \frac{1}{n}, \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}^{>0} \right\}.$$

As \mathcal{U} is non-principal, \mathcal{E} is an infinite set. For $m, \epsilon, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ let

$$X_{m, \epsilon, \eta} := [-m - \epsilon - 1, -m - \eta] \cup \{0\} \cup [m + \eta, m + \epsilon + 1] \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^*.$$

Let $\mathcal{X} := \{X_{m, \epsilon, \eta} : m \in \mathbb{N}, \epsilon, \eta \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Then \mathcal{X} is a family of uniformly 5-commensurable 5-approximate subgroups of $(\mathbb{Q}^*, +)$. For any $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, the group automorphism σ_ϵ which maps x to $(1 + \epsilon) \cdot x$ stabilizes \mathcal{X} set-wise.

Claim 2.1. $I := \bigcup \{[-1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon] : \epsilon \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is an approximate subgroup commensurable with \mathcal{X} and is invariant under all automorphisms of $(\mathbb{Q}^*, +)$ which stabilise \mathcal{X} set-wise.

Proof. It is easy to see that I is an approximate subgroup of $(\mathbb{Q}^*, +)$ commensurable with \mathcal{X} . Let σ be an automorphism of $(\mathbb{Q}^*, +)$ stabilizing \mathcal{X} . We claim that for any $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, there is $\eta \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\sigma([-1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]) = [-1 - \eta, 1 + \eta]$. Suppose not, then there are $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta', \epsilon' \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $m + \eta' > 0$ and $\sigma([-1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]) = X_{m, \epsilon', \eta'}$. Let $r \in [-1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$ such that $\sigma(r) = m + \eta'$. Note that $\frac{r}{2} \in [-1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$ and $\sigma(\frac{r}{2}) \in X_{m, \epsilon', \eta'}$. However, $\sigma(\frac{r}{2}) = \frac{\sigma(r)}{2} = \frac{m + \eta'}{2} \notin X_{m, \epsilon', \eta'}$, a contradiction. \square

Before we go to the technical details, we want to explain briefly the idea of the proof of the Main Theorem first. Basically, we will follow the strategy of the group case, see [3] or [4, Theorem 4.2.4]. Given a uniform family of commensurable approximate subgroups \mathcal{X} , we will first build a semilattice by taking finite unions. We will associate each finite union with a commensurable approximate subgroup where we reverse the order of the semilattice. Let \mathcal{I} the family of approximate subgroups associated to finite unions. In the group case, one can find a unique minimal object in \mathcal{I} , hence get an invariant object. However, in the case of approximate subgroups, it is possible that the minimal object is the infimum of the whole semilattice \mathcal{I} and it is not clear that we can control the size of the infimum. It can be shown that \mathcal{I} is also a uniform family of approximate subgroups and moreover, unlike \mathcal{X} , elements in \mathcal{I} have large finite intersections. We therefore do a dual construction. Starting from \mathcal{I} , we build another family of approximate subgroups \mathcal{Y} which is closed under finite unions. It turns out that \mathcal{Y} is uniformly upper-bounded, thus $\bigcup \mathcal{Y}$ is the invariant object that we are looking for.

In the following, we will present some lemmas that are repeatedly used in the proof of the Main Theorem. They are straightforward generalisations of classical results from additive combinatorics (for example Lemma 2.4 is from Rusza's covering lemma).

Lemma 2.2. *Let \mathcal{X} be a family of uniformly N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups in an ambient group G . Let $T := \prod_{0 \leq i < n} X_i$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n \geq 1$. Then T is at most $(NK)^{n-1}N$ -commensurable with X for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. Fix $X \in \mathcal{X}$. By assumption, there are $N_0, K_0 \subseteq G$ with $|N_0| \leq N$ and $|K_0| \leq K$ such that $X_0 \subseteq N_0 X_1$ and $X_1 X_1 \subseteq K_0 X_1$. Therefore, $\prod_{0 \leq i < n} X_i \subseteq N_0 K_0 \prod_{1 \leq i < n} X_i$. Similarly, there are $N_1, K_1, \dots, N_{n-2}, K_{n-2} \subseteq G$ such that $\prod_{0 \leq i < n} X_i \subseteq (\prod_{0 \leq i < n-1} N_i K_i) X_{n-1}$. By assumption $X_{n-1} \subseteq N_{n-1} X$ for some $|N_{n-1}| \leq N$. Therefore, $T = \prod_{0 \leq i < n} X_i \subseteq (\prod_{0 \leq i < n-1} N_i K_i) N_{n-1} X$. We have $|(\prod_{0 \leq i < n-1} N_i K_i) N_{n-1}| \leq (NK)^{n-1} N$.

On the other hand, as X is N -commensurable with $X_0 \subseteq T$, there is some Z with $|Z| \leq N$ such that $X \subseteq ZX_0 \subseteq ZT$. Hence, T is $(NK)^{n-1} N$ -commensurable with X . \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be a group and $X, Y \subseteq G$. Suppose $Y^{-1} = Y$ and there is a finite set $Z \subseteq G$ such that $X \subseteq ZY$. Let $X_0 \subseteq X$ be maximal such that the family $(x_0 Y : x_0 \in X_0)$ is disjoint, that is $x_0 Y \cap x'_0 Y = \emptyset$ for all $x_0, x'_0 \in X_0$ with $x_0 \neq x'_0$. Then $|X_0| \leq |Z|$.*

Proof. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $|X_0| > |Z|$. Then there are $x_i, x_j \in X_0$ with $x_i \neq x_j$ and $z \in Z$ such that $x_i \in zY$ and $x_j \in zY$. Now we can see that $z \in x_i Y^{-1} = x_i Y$ and $z \in x_j Y^{-1} = x_j Y$, contradicting that $x_i Y \cap x_j Y = \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let G be a group and X, Y be N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups. Then there is some $E \subseteq G$ such that $|E| \leq KN$ and $XX \subseteq E(XX \cap YY)$.*

Proof. By definition, there is $Z_0 \subseteq G$ with $|Z_0| \leq N$ such that $X \subseteq Z_0 Y$. Let $X_0 \subseteq X$ be maximal such that $(x_0 Y : x_0 \in X_0)$ is a disjoint family. Then by Lemma 2.3 we have $|X_0| \leq |Z_0| \leq N$.

As $(x_0 Y : x_0 \in X_0)$ is maximal disjoint, $xY \cap X_0 Y \neq \emptyset$ for any $x \in X$, whence $x \in X_0 Y Y^{-1} = X_0 Y Y$. Therefore, $X \subseteq X_0 Y Y$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} X &= X_0 Y Y \cap X = \bigcup_{x \in X_0} (x Y Y \cap X) = \bigcup_{x \in X_0} (x Y Y \cap x x^{-1} X) \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{x \in X_0} (x Y Y \cap x X X) = \bigcup_{x \in X_0} x (Y Y \cap X X) = X_0 (X X \cap Y Y). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, there is some $X_1 \subseteq G$ with $|X_1| \leq K$ and $XX \subseteq X_1 X$. Therefore, $XX \subseteq X_1 X \subseteq X_1 X_0 (X X \cap Y Y)$. Let $E := X_1 X_0$. Then $|E| \leq KN$ and $XX \subseteq E(XX \cap YY)$. \square

Remark 2.5. If X, Y are commensurable approximate subgroups, it is possible that their intersection is empty, as shown by the example in Section 2.

3. Proof of the Main Theorem

We now proceed to prove the Main Theorem. Let G and \mathcal{X} be given as in the Main Theorem. We may assume that \mathcal{X} is a family of uniformly N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups. We define two new families. Let $\mathcal{X}^2 := \{XX : X \in \mathcal{X}\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} := \{\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i : X_i \in \mathcal{X}^2, I \text{ finite.}\}$

Remark 3.1. It is easy to see that \mathcal{X}^2 is a family of uniformly NK -commensurable K^3 -approximate subgroups. Moreover, \mathcal{X}^2 is commensurable with \mathcal{X} .

Notation: for $X \subseteq G$, we write X^k for the k -fold product of X .

In the following, we will generalise the notion of *index of a subgroup* to arbitrary subsets in an ambient group. Let H be a subgroup of G . Then the index of H in G , $[G : H]$, is the number of disjoint cosets of H that covers G . Let X, Y be two subsets of a group G . Following the definition of subgroup index, there might be two ways to define the relative size of Y in X . One is that the minimal number of X -translates of Y (that is $\{xY : x \in X\}$) which covers X . And the other is the maximal number of disjoint X -translates of Y . It turned out that the latter is easier to handle because of disjointness. Moreover, there is a connection between these two definitions by Rusza's covering lemma, that is, if $(xY : x \in X_0)$ is a maximal disjoint family of X -translates of Y then X is covered by X_0YY^{-1} . This also partially explains that in the following proof, instead of working with elements in \mathcal{X}^2 , we need to go to some higher-fold products. As has been explained in the main idea of the proof, we want to reverse the order of semilattice (\mathcal{Z}, \subseteq) , and this is not possible without going to the higher-fold products (see Lemma 3.3).

Definition 3.2. Let $X, Y \subseteq G$ with $1_G \in X$. Define

$$[X : Y] := \sup\{|X_0| : 1_G \in X_0 \subseteq X \text{ and } (xY : x \in X_0) \text{ is a disjoint family}\},$$

where we denote ∞ as the supreme of an unbounded set in \mathbb{N} .

Fix k and $Z = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \in \mathcal{Z}$. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$. By Lemma 2.4 we have $X \subseteq E(X \cap X_i) \subseteq E(X \cap Z)$ for some $i \in I$ and $|E| \leq KN$. Note that $E(X \cap Z) \subseteq E(X \cap Z)^{2^k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 2.3, $[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^k}] \leq KN$, and $\max\{[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^k}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\}$ exists for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\max\{[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^k}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\}$ is non-increasing when k increases. Hence, $\min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \max\{[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^k}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\}$ exists and there is a minimal k_Z such that $\max\{[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^{k_Z}}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\}$ reaches this value for $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$. Let

$$m := \min_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \max\{[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^k}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{Z}_m := \{Z \in \mathcal{Z} : \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \max\{[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^k}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\} = m\}$. Then \mathcal{Z}_m is non-empty. Moreover, for any $Z \subseteq Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ if $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_m$, then

$$\max\{[X : (X \cap Z')^{2^{k_Z}}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\} \leq \max\{[X : (X \cap Z)^{2^{k_Z}}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\} = m.$$

Hence, $\min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \max\{[X : (X \cap Z')^{2^k}] : X \in \mathcal{X}^2\} \leq m$, and they are equal by minimality of m . Thus, $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}_m$. We can also see that $k_{Z'} \leq k_Z$.

Let $k_0 := \min\{k_Z : Z \in \mathcal{Z}_m\}$. We call $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_m$ *strong* if $k_Z = k_0$. It is easy to see that for Z and $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$, if $Z' \supseteq Z$ and $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_m$ is strong, then so is Z' . For strong Z , define $\eta(Z) := \{X \in \mathcal{X}^2 : [X : (X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0+1}}] = m\}$ and $N(Z) := \bigcup_{X \in \eta(Z)} X \cap (X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0+1}}$.

Lemma 3.3. *If $Z \subseteq Z'$ are both strong, then $N(Z) \supseteq N(Z')$.*

Proof. If $Z \subseteq Z'$ are both strong then $\eta(Z') \subseteq \eta(Z)$. Let $X \in \eta(Z')$ and $x_1 = 1_G, x_2, \dots, x_m \in X$ be such that the family $(x_i(X \cap Z')^{2^{k_0+1}} : i \leq m)$ is disjoint. Note that $(x_i(X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0}} : i \leq m)$ is also disjoint. As $\max\{[X' : (X' \cap Z)^{2^{k_0}}] : X' \in \mathcal{X}^2\} = m$ by definition of k_0 , $(x_i(X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0}} : i \leq m)$ is a maximal disjoint family in $\{x(X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0}} : x \in X\}$. Therefore,

$$X \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m} x_i(X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0+1}} \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m} x_i(X \cap Z')^{2^{k_0+1}}.$$

As $x_i(X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0+1}} \subseteq x_i(X \cap Z')^{2^{k_0+1}}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $(x_i(X \cap Z')^{2^{k_0+1}} : i \leq m)$ is a disjoint family,

$$X \cap x_i(X \cap Z')^{2^{k_0+1}} = X \cap x_i(X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0+1}},$$

for each $i \leq m$. In particular, we have $X \cap (X \cap Z')^{2^{k_0+1}} = X \cap (X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0+1}}$. Therefore, $N(Z) \supseteq N(Z')$. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ be strong. Then $N(Z)$ covers any $X' \in \mathcal{X}^2$ with at most $(KN)^2$ -translates.*

Proof. Suppose $Z = \bigcup_{i \leq n_Z} X_i$ where $X_i \in \mathcal{X}^2$. Note that $X \cap (X \cap Z)^{2^{k_0+1}} \supseteq X \cap X_0$ covers X by KN -translates for any $X \in \eta(Z)$. As \mathcal{X}^2 is KN -uniformly commensurable, $N(Z)$ covers any $X' \in \mathcal{X}^2$ with at most $(KN)^2$ -translates. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let Z_0, \dots, Z_n be strong. Then $\bigcap_{i \leq n} N(Z_i) \supseteq N(\bigcup_{i \leq n} Z_i)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, $N(Z_i) \supseteq N(\bigcup_{i \leq n} Z_i)$ for each $i \leq n$. \square

For any $Z = \bigcup_{i \in I} Z_i \in \mathcal{Z}$, define $n(Z) = |I|$ (we regard \mathcal{Z} as a formal family of finite unions of members in \mathcal{X}^2). Let $n_0 := \min\{n(Z) : Z \text{ strong}\}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let Z be strong and $n(Z) = n_0$. Then there is $M \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on n_0, k_0, K and N such that $Z^{2^{k_0+1}}$ is M -commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$, and $Z^{2^{k_0+2}}$ is M^2 -commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$.*

Proof. Suppose $Z = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}^2$. Then

$$Z^{2^{k_0+1}} = \bigcup_{f: 2^{k_0+1} \rightarrow I} \prod_{i < 2^{k_0+1}} X_{f(i)}.$$

X is at most $(K^4 N)^{2^{k_0+1}-1} KN$ -commensurable with each $\prod_{i < 2^{k_0+1}} X_{f(i)}$ by Lemma 2.2 and the remark before Definition 3.2. Therefore, X covers $Z^{2^{k_0+1}}$ with at most $M := n_0^{2^{k_0+1}} K^{2^{k_0+3}+1} N^{2^{k_0+1}}$ translates. As any $X_i \subseteq Z$ covers X with at most KN -translates, so does $Z^{2^{k_0+1}}$. Similarly, $Z^{2^{k_0+2}}$ is at most M^2 -commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$. \square

We define

$\mathcal{I} := \{N(Z') : Z' \text{ strong and there is } Z \subseteq Z' \text{ with } Z \text{ strong and } n(Z) = n_0\}$,
and define a subclass $\mathcal{I}' := \{N(Z) : Z \text{ strong and } n(Z) = n_0\}$.

Lemma 3.7. \mathcal{I} is a uniform family of commensurable approximate subgroups and is commensurable with \mathcal{X} .

Proof. Note that any $N(Z') \in \mathcal{I}$ is symmetric and contains the identity. Moreover, as $Z' \supseteq Z$ for some strong Z with $n(Z) = n_0$, we conclude that $N(Z') \subseteq N(Z) \subseteq Z^{2^{k_0+1}}$ is M -commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$ by Lemma 3.6. Since $Z^{2^{k_0+2}}$ is M^2 -commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$ and $N(Z')$ covers X with at most $(KN)^2$ -translates by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.4,

$$N(Z')^2 \subseteq N(Z)^2 \subseteq Z^{2^{k_0+2}} \subseteq T_0 X \subseteq T_0 T_1 N(Z'),$$

where $T_0, T_1 \subseteq G$ with $|T_0| \leq M^2$ and $|T_1| \leq (KN)^2$. Therefore, $N(Z')$ is an $(MKN)^2$ -approximate subgroups.

Suppose $N(Z'') \in \mathcal{I}$. Then since $Z^{2^{k_0+1}}$ is M -commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$ and $N(Z'')$ covers X by $(KN)^2$ -translates,

$$N(Z') \subseteq N(Z) \subseteq Z^{2^{k_0+1}} \subseteq T'_0 X \subseteq T'_0 T'_1 N(Z'')$$

for some $|T'_0| \leq M$ and $|T'_1| \leq (KN)^2$.

We conclude that \mathcal{I} is a family of uniformly $M(KN)^2$ -commensurable $(MKN)^2$ -approximate subgroups.

By the above argument, we know that $N(Z)$ is M -commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}^2$. Hence \mathcal{I} is commensurable with \mathcal{X}^2 . As \mathcal{X}^2 is commensurable with \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{I} is commensurable with \mathcal{X} . \square

Note that \mathcal{I} is also invariant under all automorphisms of G stabilizing \mathcal{X} set-wise.

If \mathcal{I} has a unique minimal element H , then H is commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and invariant under all automorphisms stabilizing \mathcal{X} set-wise, and the proof is done.

Otherwise, we do a dual construction with the family \mathcal{I} to get another family of uniformly commensurable approximate subgroups which is closed under finite unions.

Remark 3.8. In the example $\mathcal{X} := \{X_{m,\epsilon,\eta} : m \in \mathbb{N}, \epsilon, \eta \in \mathcal{E}\}$ discussed in Section 2, every $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ is strong and $N(Z) = \bigcup\{-1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon\} : \epsilon \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Hence, \mathcal{I} has a unique minimal element, which is exactly the one we found in Claim 2.1.

Now we start the dual construction.

Since \mathcal{I} is uniformly $M(KN)^2$ -commensurable, $[I : J] \leq M(KN)^2$ for all $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ by Lemma 2.3. Define $m' := \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \max\{[I : J] : J \in \mathcal{I}'\}$, and $\mathcal{I}_{m'} := \{I \in \mathcal{I} : \max\{[I : J] : J \in \mathcal{I}'\} = m'\}$. If $I \subseteq I'$ with $I' \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$, then

$$\max\{[I : J] : J \in \mathcal{I}'\} \leq \max\{[I' : J] : J \in \mathcal{I}'\} = m'.$$

By minimality of m' , $\max\{[I : J] : J \in \mathcal{I}'\} = m'$. Hence, $I \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$.

Fix $I \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$. Let $T \in \mathcal{I}'$ with $[I : T] = m'$. Let $(x_1 T, \dots, x_{m'} T)$ be a maximal disjoint family in $\{xT : x \in I\}$. For any $J \supseteq I$ and $J \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$, we have

$(x_1T, \dots, x_{m'}T)$ must also be maximal disjoint in $\{yT : y \in J\}$. Therefore, $J \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m'} x_iT^2$ and $\bigcup\{J \supseteq I, J \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}\} \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m'} x_iT^2$.

Let $\mathcal{Y} := \{\bigcup_{i \leq n} J_i : J_i \in \mathcal{I}_{m'} \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $J_0, \dots, J_n \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$, there is some $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $\bigcap_{i \leq n} J_i \supseteq I$ by Lemma 3.5. As $J_i \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$ we have $I \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$. Therefore, $\bigcup_{i \leq n} J_i \subseteq \bigcup\{J \supseteq I, J \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}\}$.

Lemma 3.9. *\mathcal{Y} is a uniformly commensurable family and any $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is commensurable with \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Let $Y, Y' \in \mathcal{Y}$. Suppose $Y = \bigcup_{i \leq n} J_i$ and $Y' = \bigcup_{i \leq n'} J'_i$. By the argument before, there are $I \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}$, $T \in \mathcal{I}'$ and $M \subseteq G$ with $|M| \leq m'$ such that $Y \subseteq \bigcup\{J \supseteq I, J \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}\} \subseteq MT^2$. Since \mathcal{I} is a family of uniformly $M(KN)^2$ -commensurable $(MKN)^2$ -approximate subgroups, $T \in \mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and $J'_0 \in \mathcal{I}$, there are M_1, M_2 with $|M_1| \leq (MKN)^2$ and $|M_2| \leq M(KN)^2$ such that $T^2 \subseteq M_1T$ and $T \subseteq M_2J'_0$. Thus,

$$Y \subseteq MT^2 \subseteq MM_1T \subseteq MM_1M_2J'_0 \subseteq MM_1M_2\left(\bigcup_{i \leq n'} J'_i\right) = MM_1M_2Y'.$$

Let $N_Y := m'M^3(NY)^4$. Then \mathcal{Y} is uniformly N_Y -commensurable.

By the above argument, for any $\bigcup_{i \leq n} J_i = Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ there is $T \in \mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ such that Y is contained in $m'(MKN)^2$ -translates of T . As $J_i \in \mathcal{I}'$ is commensurable with T and $J_i \subseteq Y$, Y is commensurable with T . Hence, Y is commensurable with I . As \mathcal{I} is commensurable with \mathcal{X} by Lemma 3.7, Y is commensurable with \mathcal{X} . \square

Note that any $Y = \bigcup_{i \leq n} J_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ is symmetric and contains the identity. Moreover, as \mathcal{I} is a family of uniformly $M(KN)^2$ -commensurable $(MKN)^2$ -approximate subgroups,

$$Y^2 = \bigcup_{i, j \leq n} J_i J_j \subseteq \bigcup_{i, j \leq n} T_{ij}(J_j)^2 \subseteq \bigcup_{i, j \leq n} T_{ij}T_j J_j \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{i, j \leq n} T_{ij}T_j\right)Y$$

where $|T_{ij}| \leq M(KN)^2$ and $|T_j| \leq (MKN)^2$ for $i, j \leq n$. Therefore, Y is an approximate subgroup. We conclude that \mathcal{Y} is a family of approximate subgroups which are uniformly commensurable and closed under finite unions.

For any $X = X^{-1} \subseteq G$ define $\langle X \rangle := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} X^k$, that is the group generated by X .

Lemma 3.10. *There is no $N_Y + 1$ -chain $\langle Y_1 \rangle \leq \langle Y_2 \rangle \leq \dots \leq \langle Y_{N_Y+1} \rangle$ with $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$.*

Proof. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that there is such a chain. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq N_Y$ there is some $y_i \in Y_{i+1} \setminus \langle Y_i \rangle$. Therefore, $y_i \langle Y_i \rangle \cap \langle Y_i \rangle = \emptyset$. Let $y_0 := 1_G$. We claim that $(y_i Y_1 : 0 \leq i \leq N_Y)$ is a disjoint family. Indeed, for any $i < j$, we have $y_j \langle Y_j \rangle \cap \langle Y_j \rangle = \emptyset$ and $y_i Y_1 \subseteq \langle Y_{i+1} \rangle \subseteq \langle Y_j \rangle$. Therefore, $y_j Y_1 \cap y_i Y_1 = \emptyset$. By assumption, Y_1 should be N_Y -commensurable with $\bigcup_{i \leq N_Y} Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$. This contradicts Lemma 2.3. \square

By Lemma 3.10, the family $\{\langle Y \rangle : Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ has a maximal element $G_{\max} := \langle Y_{\max} \rangle$ for some $Y_{\max} \in \mathcal{Y}$. By maximality, $G_{\max} \supseteq \bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} Y$.

Lemma 3.11. *There is some $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $Y \subseteq (Y_{\max})^{n_1}$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$.*

Proof. Suppose not, then there is some $Y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $a_0 \in Y_0$ such that $a_0 \notin Y_{\max}$. As $G_{\max} = \langle Y_{\max} \rangle \supseteq Y_0$, there is ℓ_0 with $a_0 \in (Y_{\max})^{\ell_0}$. By assumption, there is some $Y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $a_1 \in Y_1$ with $a_1 \notin (Y_{\max})^{\ell_0+2}$. Since $Y_1 \subseteq \langle Y_{\max} \rangle$, we have $a_1 \in (Y_{\max})^{\ell_1}$ for some $\ell_1 > \ell_0 + 2$. Repeating this procedure, $(Y_i)_{0 \leq i \leq N_Y}$, $(a_i)_{0 \leq i \leq N_Y}$ and $\ell_0 < \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_{N_Y}$ such that $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $a_i \in Y_i$, and moreover: $a_i \in (Y_{\max})^{\ell_i}$ and $a_i \notin (Y_{\max})^{\ell_{i-1}+2}$.

Consider $\{a_i Y_{\max} : 0 \leq i \leq N_Y\}$. For any $i < j$, if $a_i Y_{\max} \cap a_j Y_{\max} \neq \emptyset$, then $a_j \in a_i (Y_{\max})^2$ since Y_{\max} is closed under inverses. As $a_i \in (Y_{\max})^{\ell_i}$, $a_j \in (Y_{\max})^{\ell_i+2} \subseteq (Y_{\max})^{\ell_{j-1}+2}$, a contradiction. Therefore, $(a_i Y_{\max} : 0 \leq i \leq N_Y)$ is a disjoint family. Let $Y' := \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq N_Y} Y_i$, then $Y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ but is not N_Y -commensurable with Y_{\max} , which contradicts our assumption. \square

Now we will consider a subfamily of $\mathcal{I}_{m'}$ which is invariant under all automorphisms of G stabilizing \mathcal{X} set-wise.

Let

$$n_2 := \min\{n(Z) : N(Z) \in \mathcal{I}_{m'}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y}' := \{N(Z) \in \mathcal{I}_{m'} : n(Z) = n_2\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.

Let $H := \bigcup \mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{Y} \subseteq (Y_{\max})^{n_1}$. Then H is invariant under all automorphisms stabilizing \mathcal{X} , since \mathcal{Y}' is. Moreover, as Y_{\max} is an approximate subgroup commensurable with any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, H is commensurable with \mathcal{X} . It is also an approximate subgroup as Y_{\max} is. This ends the proof of the Main Theorem.

4. Uniform Bound

The aim of this section is to prove Corollary 1.4. The strategy is that if we assume the bound does not exist, then we can build a counterexample using ultraproducts. To do this, we need some basic first-order logic and definability of H constructed from \mathcal{X} in the Main Theorem.

Lemma 4.1. *Let \mathcal{L} be a first-order language which contains the group language. Let \mathcal{M} be an \mathcal{L} -structure expanding a group G . Suppose that \mathcal{X} is a uniform family of commensurable approximate subgroups in G and that \mathcal{X} is uniformly definable in \mathcal{M} by a formula $\phi(x; \bar{y})$. That is,*

$$\mathcal{X} = \{\phi(G, \bar{b}) : \bar{b} \in \mathcal{M}^{|\bar{y}|}\}.$$

Let H be the invariant approximate subgroup obtained by the Main Theorem. Then H is also definable by a formula $\psi_{\mathcal{X}, \phi}(x)$.

Proof. By assumption \mathcal{X} is uniformly definable. Hence, so is \mathcal{X}^2 , but neither are \mathcal{Z} or \mathcal{Z}_m . However, knowing m, k_0 and n_0 , the family of strong Z with $n(Z) = n_0$ is uniformly definable. Given m, k_0 and a strong Z , we have that

$\eta(Z)$ is definable, hence $N(Z)$ is also definable. Therefore, \mathcal{I}' is uniformly definable. Similarly, knowing m' and n_2 additionally, \mathcal{J}' is uniformly definable, thus H is definable by a formula $\varphi_{\mathcal{X},\phi}(x)$. □

Remark 4.2. Unlike the case of groups, H is not obtained by finite operations. The defining formula for H involves additional existential and universal quantifiers. As shown by the example in Section 2, the existential or universal quantifier is necessary.

Proof. (Proof of Corollary 1.4) Fix K and N . Suppose that Corollary 1.4 fails. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a group G_n and a family of uniformly N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups \mathcal{X}_n such that there is no H which is an n -approximate subgroup n -commensurable with \mathcal{X}_n invariant under all automorphisms stabilizing \mathcal{X}_n set-wise.

Let \mathcal{L} be the language $((G, 1_G, \cdot), I, R)$ which contains two sorts G and I and a relation $R \subseteq G \times I$ where G is equipped with a group language. We interpret (G_n, \mathcal{X}_n) as \mathcal{L} -structures by:

- Interpret the first sort as G_n with the group operation;
- Let I_n be an index set such that there is a bijection $\tau : I_n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_n$. Interpret the second sort as I_n and $R : G_n \times I_n$ as $R(g, i)$ if and only if $g \in \tau(i)$.

Let $(G, \mathcal{X}) := \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (G_n, \mathcal{X}_n) / \mathcal{U}$ be an ultraproduct of $\{(G_n, \mathcal{X}_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ (seen as \mathcal{L} -structures) where \mathcal{U} is a non-principal ultrafilter over \mathbb{N} . Note that \mathcal{X} is a family of uniformly N -commensurable K -approximate subgroups in G , and \mathcal{X} is uniformly definable by $R(x, i)$. By the Main Theorem, there is an L -approximate subgroup H that is M -commensurable with \mathcal{X} and invariant under all automorphisms stabilising \mathcal{X} set-wise. By Lemma 4.1, H is definable. By Los's Theorem H is an ultraproduct of $\{H_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ along \mathcal{U} , and the set $J := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n > \max\{N, L\}, H_n \text{ is an } L\text{-approximate subgroup } M\text{-commensurable with } \mathcal{X}_n\}$ is in the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} . For any $n \in J$, as $n > \max\{N, L\}$, H_n is also an n -approximate subgroup n -commensurable with \mathcal{X}_n . Therefore, there is an automorphism σ_n of G_n which fixes \mathcal{X}_n set-wise, but $\sigma_n(H_n) \neq H_n$. For $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus J$ define $\sigma_n := id$, that is the identity automorphism on G_n . Let σ be the ultraproduct of $\{\sigma_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ along \mathcal{U} . Then σ is an automorphism of G fixing \mathcal{X} set-wise, but $\sigma(H) \neq H$, contradiction. □

Acknowledgment

The author wants to thank her supervisor Frank Wagner for suggesting this interesting topic and for his brilliant idea of going to the 2^k -fold product of approximate subgroups to make the key lemma, Lemma 3.3, work. She also wants to thank the anonymous referee for lots of valuable advices and comments.

References

- [1] G. Schlichting, *Operationen mit periodischen Stabilisatoren*. Archiv der Mathematik **34(1)** (1980), 97-99.
- [2] G. Bergman and H. Lenstra Jr, *Subgroups close to normal subgroups*. Journal of Algebra **127** (1989), 80-97.
- [3] F. Wagner, *Almost invariant families*. Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society **30(3)** (1998), 235-240.
- [4] F. Wagner, *Simple theories*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
- [5] E. Breuillard, B. Green and T. Tao, *The structure of approximate groups*. Publications Mathématiques de l'IHÉS **116(1)** (2012), 115-221.
- [6] T. Tao, *Product set estimates for non-commutative groups*. Combinatorica **28(5)** (2008), 547-594.

Tingxiang Zou
Institut Camille Jordan
Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1
69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France
e-mail: zou@math.univ-lyon1.fr