# Generalised Indiscernibles, Dividing Lines, and Products of Structures

Nadav Meir<sup>\*†</sup>, Aris Papadopoulos<sup>‡</sup>, and Pierre Touchard <sup>§</sup>

August 13, 2024

#### Abstract

Generalised indiscernibles highlight a strong link between model theory and structural Ramsey theory. In this paper, we use generalised indiscernibles as tools to prove results in both these areas. More precisely, we first show that a reduct of an ultrahomogenous  $\aleph_0$ -categorical structure which has higher arity than the original structure cannot be Ramsey. In particular, the only nontrivial Ramsey reduct of the generically ordered random k-hypergraph is the linear order. We then turn our attention to model-theoretic dividing lines that are characterised by collapsing generalised indiscernibles, and prove, for these dividing lines, several transfer principles in (*full* and *lexicographic*) products of structures. As an application, we construct new algorithmically tame classes of graphs.

# Introduction

A major theme in modern model theory, originating, essentially, from the work of Shelah, is to try and discover properties that divide the class of all first-order theories into two sides, a 'tame side' and a 'wild side' [She90]. One wants to be able to deduce structure results for the theories that lie on the tame side and non-structure results for the theories that lie on the wild side. These abstract properties are most commonly referred to as dividing lines. Perhaps the most well-known dividing line, which appeared early on in Shelah's work, in the 1970s, is stability, and thus the programme of studying the properties and structure of stable theories is called stability theory.

Many beautiful theorems have been proved for stable theories, but since their introduction in the 1970s, there has been a general trend of trying to generalise results for stable theories to wider (and wilder) classes of theories, such as (n-)dependent (also referred to as n-NIP) theories, distal theories,  $NSOP_n$  theories, and much more, leading to what is sometimes referred to as neostability theory or classification theory.

In a certain light, the various definitions of dividing lines appearing in neostability theory may seem rather ad hoc, and hence a theme from a sort of "meta-classification theoretic" point of view is to systematically study dividing lines. Thus rather than explicitly studying the tame and wild theories, according to some dividing line, one may choose to make the object of study the dividing lines themselves.

One of the starting points of this paper is to examine the behaviour of various dividing lines through the study of transfer principles in some natural product constructions. We will discuss this

<sup>2020</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 03C45; Secondary: 05C55

<sup>\*</sup>Supported by Narodowe Centrum Nauki, Poland, grant 2016/22/E/ST1/00450, and by Israel Science Foundation grant number 665/20 and 555/21.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>The first author is supported by Narodowe Centrum Nauki, Poland, grant 2016/22/E/ST1/00450, Israel Science Foundation grant number 555/21 and Israel Science Foundation grant number 665/20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>Supported by a Leeds Doctoral Scholarship, from the University of Leeds.

 $<sup>^{</sup>S}$ Supported by the University of Campania 'Luigi Vanvitelli' in the framework of V:ALERE 2019 (GoAL project), and by KU Leuven IF C14/17/083 and C16/23/010.

in more detail in the remainder of this introduction. We will mainly study notions of model-theoretic tameness which admit definitions based on (generalised) indiscernible sequences: (n-)NIP, monadically NIP, and (n-)distal theories, as well as a hierarchy of dividing lines that we introduce now.

**Generalised Dividing Lines** Various methods have been proposed as a uniform way of generalising and extending existing and well-studied dividing lines, see for instance [GHS17] and [GM22]. In this paper, we will focus on the approach taken in [GHS17] (and developed further in [GH19]), which provides a uniform scheme of dividing lines arising from *coding* classes of finite structures: given a class of finite structures,  $\mathcal{K}$ , we will consider the class NC<sub> $\mathcal{K}$ </sub> of all first-order theories that do not code all the members of  $\mathcal{K}$  in a uniform manner (see subsection 2.2 for precise definitions), and C<sub> $\mathcal{K}$ </sub> the complement of NC<sub> $\mathcal{K}$ </sub>, in the class of all first-order theories.

The study of dividing lines of the form  $\mathrm{NC}_{\mathcal{K}}$  where  $\mathcal{K}$  is a Ramsey class (see Definition 1.3), inevitably leads to the notion of  $\mathsf{FLim}(\mathcal{K})$ -indexed indiscernibles (in the sense of Definition 2.1), where  $\mathsf{FLim}(\mathcal{K})$  denotes the Fraïssé limit of  $\mathcal{K}$ . To explain this connection, recall that order-indiscernible sequences – sequences of elements indexed by linear orders with "constant" behaviour on increasing subsequences – are widely used in model theory, as a way to extract "essential" behaviours of other sequences. Using Ramsey's theorem and compactness, given any sequence  $(a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$ , one can find an ordered-indiscernible sequence realising its so-called *Ehrenfeucht–Mostowski type* (or *EM-type*). This is however not simply a property specific to linear orders. In a very precise sense, the true reason this is possible is that the class of all finite linear orders satisfies a structural analogue of Ramsey's theorem (see Definition 1.3).

One can then observe a deep connection between generalised indiscernibles, structural Ramsey theory, and the study of dividing lines arising from coding Ramsey structures. Intuitively, the existence of 'uncollapsed'  $\mathsf{FLim}(\mathcal{K})$ -indiscernible sequences (see Definition 2.5) for a Ramsey class  $\mathcal{K}$  in some model of a first-order theory T indicates that T can somehow 'see a trace' of  $\mathcal{K}$  and therefore T cannot be in NC<sub> $\mathcal{K}$ </sub>, and vice versa (see Theorem 3.3, which generalises [GH19, Theorem 3.14]). One of our main tools for analysing dividing lines will be various notions of *indiscernible collapse*.

The starting point of understanding dividing lines in this way is Shelah's well-known theorem that in a stable theory every indiscernible sequence is totally indiscernible, and, in fact, this property characterises the class of stable theories (see [She90, Theorem II.2.13]). Results of this nature have been shown for various other dividing lines, and essentially amount to instances of Theorem 3.3 with the appropriate class  $\mathcal{K}$  for each dividing line.

**Transfer principles** A transfer principle for a given theory T and a (model-theoretic) property P, is a statement of the following form: a model  $\mathcal{M}$  of T has property P if, and only if, some simpler structures related to  $\mathcal{M}$  have property P. The Ax-Kochen-Ershov theorem is one of the most well-known and most celebrated transfer principles. It states that Henselian valued fields of equicharacteristic zero are model complete relative to their residue fields and value groups. There is extensive literature in model theory that focuses on such transfer principles, for they are often an important step toward characteristic 0 Henselian valued fields transfer the NIP (the absence of the *independence property*) from the residue field to the valued field itself [Del81], suggests that this class of valued fields is well-behaved for the model theorist, and analogous transfers for this class are known (or expected to be true) with respect to many other dividing lines.

The study of theories that are well-behaved with respect to a given dividing line is an active topic of research. In this work, we take another approach and use transfer principles as a tool that reveals whether a dividing line itself is a well-behaved one. A reasonable approach could be to think that a dividing line is "well-behaved" if some natural transfer principles hold. More precisely, we are interested in the following general question:

**Question.** Let *P* be some notion of tameness (e.g. some dividing line). Is it true that two structures  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  are tame with respect to *P* if, and only if, their *full product*,  $\mathcal{M} \boxtimes \mathcal{N}$  (see Definition 1.15), and their *lexicographic product*,  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  (see Definition 1.18), are tame with respect to *P*?

It appears that for some Ramsey classes  $\mathcal{K}$  the class of theories  $\mathrm{NC}_{\mathcal{K}}$  that do not code  $\mathcal{K}$  does not admit such transfers. The important distinction is that this is the case, for Ramsey classes of structures collapsing generalised indiscernibles to a *fixed* reduct, and this is what we will discuss in more detail now.

**Main Results** As we have already mentioned, generalised indiscernibles, coding configurations, and Ramsey classes are closely interconnected notions. This connection was first established by Guingona and Hill for structures in finite relational language [GH19, Theorem 3.14]. Our first theorem gives a slightly more general version:

**Theorem A** (Theorem 3.3). Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an  $\aleph_0$ -categorical Fraissé limit of a Ramsey class. Then the following are equivalent for a theory T:

- 1.  $T \in \mathbb{NC}_{\mathcal{I}}$ .
- 2. T collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles.

We then use generalised indiscernibles as a criterion to show that certain classes cannot be Ramsey. More precisely, we obtain the following result:

**Theorem B** (Theorem 3.9). Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be an ultrahomogeneous n-ary  $\aleph_0$ -categorical structure in a relational language  $\mathcal{L}$ , and let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a non-n-ary reduct of  $\mathcal{J}$  in a finite relational language  $\mathcal{L}'$ . Then  $\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{I})$  is not a Ramsey class.

Next, we provide a negative answer to a question asked in [GP23, Section 7] and [GPS23, Question 4.7] about the linearity of the hierarchy given by coding  $\mathcal{K}$ -configurations. More precisely, in [GPS23] the authors observe that one has the following strict inclusions:

$$\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{E}} \supset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{L}0} \supset \mathfrak{C}_{0\mathfrak{G}} = \mathfrak{C}_{0\mathfrak{H}_2} \supset \mathfrak{C}_{0\mathfrak{H}_3} \supset \cdots \supset \mathfrak{C}_{0\mathfrak{H}_n} \supset \cdots$$

where  $\mathcal{E}$  is the class of all finite sets (in the language of pure equality),  $\mathcal{LO}$  is the class of all finite linear orders, OG the class of all finite ordered graphs and  $\mathcal{OH}_n$  the class of all finite ordered *n*-hypergraphs (see Subsection 1.2 for more details). The question then becomes the following:

Question. Are there any other classes  $C_{\mathcal{K}}$ ? If so, do these classes remain linearly ordered under inclusion?

We answer this question negatively, as follows:

**Theorem C** (Example 4.3). Building on the notation above, let OC be the class of finite convexly ordered binary branching C-relations (see Subsection 1.2), and let  $OG \boxtimes OC$  be the full product the classes OG and OC (see Definition 1.15). Then:

We then turn our attention to transfer principles. One of our main tools is a characterisation of generalised indiscernibles in full products (Proposition 4.4) and lexicographic sums (Proposition 4.21). We immediately obtain transfer theorems for dividing lines characterised by generalised indiscernibility. These results are summarised below:

**Theorem D** (Corollary 4.6, Corollary 4.8, Proposition 4.9). Let  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$  be structure in respective languages  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ . For

 $P \in \{NIP_n, n\text{-}distal, indiscernible-triviality}\}$ 

the following are equivalent:

- 1.  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  have P.
- 2. The full product of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \boxtimes \mathcal{N}$ , has P.

**Theorem E** (Corollary 4.20, Proposition 4.21, Corollary 4.23, Proposition 4.25). Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure and  $\mathfrak{N} = {\mathcal{N}_a}_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$  be a collection  $\mathfrak{N}$  of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures indexed by  $\mathcal{M}$ . For:

 $P \in \{NIP_n, n\text{-}distal, indiscernible-triviality, monadic NIP\},\$ 

the following are equivalent:

- 1.  $\mathcal{M}$  and the common theory of  $\{\mathcal{N}_a : a \in \mathcal{M}\}$  have P.
- 2. The lexicographic sum of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathfrak{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$ , has P.

Notice that in particular, monadic NIP transfers in lexicographic sums. We apply this result to generalise one of the results of [PS23], to lexicographic sums of ordered graphs of bounded twinwidth. More precisely, once we obtain a result characterising ultraproducts of classes of lexicographic products, which is interesting in its own right (Proposition 5.1), we prove the following:

**Theorem F** (Corollary 5.5). Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two hereditary classes of finite graphs with bounded twin-width. Then, the class of graphs consisting of lexicographic sums of graphs from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  has bounded twin-width.

**Structure of the paper** Sections 1 and 2 contain all the relevant terminology and background definitions needed for the remainder. In Section 2, we focus on coding configurations and collapsing indiscernibles and prove some preliminary results. Then, in Section 3 we prove Theorem A and Theorem B. We then devote Section 4 to proving Theorem D and Theorem E. In Section 5 we use the monadic NIP case in Theorem E to prove Theorem F. We conclude the paper with some open questions, in Section 6.

Acknowledgements The research presented in this paper started during the P&S Workshop, which was part of the Unimod 2022 programme, at the School of Mathematics at the University of Leeds. We would like to thank the organisers of the very well-organised workshop and the School of Mathematics for its hospitality. We would also like to thank S. Braunfeld and N. Ramsey for the discussions during the Model Theory Conference in honour of Ludomir Newelski's 60th birthday, which led to Example 4.3, and D. Macpherson for his valuable comments on previous versions of this paper. Part of this research was also conducted in the Nesin Matematik Köyü, and we would like to thank it for its hospitality.

**Notation** We assume familiarity with basic model theory, and refer the reader to [Hod93] or [TZ12], for the relevant model-theoretic background. Most of the notation we will use throughout this paper is standard. Languages will be denoted by  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'$  etc. We abusively also denote by  $\mathcal{L}$  the set of all  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulas, and write  $\operatorname{Sig}(\mathcal{L})$  to specifically refer to the signature. If f is a function symbol and R is a relation symbol, we denote by arity(f) and  $\operatorname{arity}(R)$  their respective arities. Structures are typically denoted by  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \ldots$  while their respective base sets are denoted by  $M, N, \ldots$  Classes of structures are usually denoted by  $\mathcal{K}$ . By a *class of theories*, we mean a collection of theories with a certain elementary property P, such as the class NC<sub> $\mathcal{K}$ </sub> of theories who do not 'code' a class  $\mathcal{K}$  of structures.

# Contents

1	Pre	liminaries	<b>5</b>
	1.1	Reducts	5
	1.2	Standard ultrahomogeneous structures	
	1.3 Product constructions		13
		1.3.1 Full Product	13
		1.3.2 Lexicographic product	14
	1.4	Dividing lines in model theory	15
		1.4.1 NIP and higher-arity generalisations	15
		1.4.2 Distality and $n$ -Distality	16
		1.4.3 Monadic NIP	16
2 Generalised Indiscernibles and Coding Configurations		eralised Indiscernibles and Coding Configurations	18
	2.1	Generalised Indiscernibility	18
	2.2	K-Configurations    .	21
3	Stru	tructural Ramsey theory through collapsing indiscernibles 2	
4	Tra	nsfer principles	29
	4.1	Transfers in full products	29
	4.2	Transfers in lexicographic sums	32
5	Ultraproducts and Twin-width		40
6	Ope	Open Questions 4	

# **1** Preliminaries

## 1.1 Reducts

A reduct of an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  can be defined as a structure obtained from  $\mathcal{M}$  by forgetting some of the symbols in  $\mathcal{L}$ . We will use a more general notion of a reduct, sometimes also called a *definable* or *first-order reduct*:

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\mathcal{M}_0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  be structures on the same domain.

- We say that  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is a first-order reduct,  $\emptyset$ -definable reduct (or just reduct for short) of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  if every relation and every function in  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is definable in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  without parameters, and write  $\mathcal{M}_0 \hookrightarrow_{FO} \mathcal{M}_1$ , or  $\mathcal{M}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$ . In this case, we also say that  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is an expansion of  $\mathcal{M}_0$ .
- We say that  $\mathcal{M}_0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  are *interdefinable*, and we write  $\mathcal{M}_0 \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_1$ , if both  $\mathcal{M}_0 \sim \mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1 \sim \mathcal{M}_0$  hold.

- We say that  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is a *quantifier-free reduct* of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and we write  $\mathcal{M}_0 \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{M}_1$  if every relation and every function in  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is quantifier-free definable in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  without parameters.
- We say that  $\mathcal{M}_0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  are quantifier-free interdefinable if both  $\mathcal{M}_0 \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1 \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{M}_0$  hold, and we write  $\mathcal{M}_0 \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\longleftarrow} \mathcal{M}_1$ .

Reducts of structures and, in particular, reducts of ultrahomogenous structures<sup>1</sup>, play an important role in this paper, as they will be used to construct dividing lines between tame and wild structures. Notice that interdefinability (of structures on the same domain) is a much more restrictive condition than saying that two theories define each other. For instance, two independent orders on  $\mathbb{Q}$  define each other (both are models of the same theory) but are not interdefinable.

To give some additional context, we recall here a well-known conjecture, due to Thomas:

Conjecture 1.2 (Thomas, [Tho96]). If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a countable ultrahomogeneous structure in a finite relational language, then  $\mathcal{M}$  has finitely many reducts (up to interdefinability).

This conjecture has been verified for many well-known examples (e.g. in [Cam76] it is shown that  $(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$  has 3 *proper* (i.e. different from the structure itself and an infinite set) reducts up to interdefinability; in [Tho91] it is shown that the random graph has 3 proper reducts up to interdefinability; in [BPP15] it is shown that the ordered random graph has 42 proper reducts up to interdefinability, etc.) but the general case remains open.

It is well known that the set of reducts of a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  forms a lattice with respect to the relation  $\backsim$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{R}$  is the set of reducts of  $\mathcal{M}$ , up to interdefinability, then the lattice  $(\mathcal{R}, \backsim)$  is precisely the opposite lattice of  $({\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{R}) : \mathcal{R} \multimap \mathcal{M}}, \leq)$ . Recall that  ${\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{R}) : \mathcal{R} \multimap \mathcal{M}}$  is precisely the set of closed subgroups of  $\operatorname{Sym}(\mathcal{M})$  (with respect to the product topology) containing  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ .

#### **1.2** Standard ultrahomogeneous structures

In this subsection we fix some of our notation and recall some of the standard relational structures that we will be using throughout this paper. Before we do this, we recall some basic definitions. Let us start by recalling the *(structural) Erdős-Rado partition arrow*. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a countable first-order language. Given  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures  $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ , we will write  $\binom{B}{A}$  for the set of all embeddings of A into B. Given  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we write  $C \to (B)_k^A$  to mean that for every k-colouring  $c : \binom{C}{A} \to \{1, \ldots, k\}$  there is some  $B' \in \binom{C}{B}$  such that c restricted to B' is constant.

**Definition 1.3** (HP, JEP, (S/F)AP, RP). A class of  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures  $\mathcal{C}$  has the:

- 1. Hereditary Property (HP) if whenever  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $B \subseteq A$  we have that  $B \in \mathcal{C}$ .
- 2. Joint Embedding Property (JEP) if whenever  $A, B \in \mathbb{C}$  there is some  $C \in \mathbb{C}$  such that both A and B are embeddable in C.
- 3. Amalgamation Property (AP) if whenever  $A, B, C \in \mathbb{C}$  are such that A embeds into B via  $e: A \hookrightarrow B$  and into C via  $f: A \hookrightarrow C$  there exist some  $D \in \mathbb{C}$  and embeddings  $g: B \hookrightarrow D$ ,  $h: C \hookrightarrow D$  such that  $g \circ e = h \circ f$ .
- 4. The Strong Amalgamation Property (SAP) if whenever  $A, B, C \in \mathbb{C}$  are such that A embeds into B via  $e: A \hookrightarrow B$  and into C via  $f: A \hookrightarrow C$  there exists some  $D \in \mathbb{C}$  and embeddings  $g: B \hookrightarrow D$ ,  $h: C \hookrightarrow D$  such that  $g \circ e = h \circ f$ , and moreover for all  $b \in B$  and  $c \in C$ , if g(b) = h(c), there is some  $a \in A$  such that e(a) = b and f(a) = c.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Recall:  $\mathcal{M}$  is *ultrahomogeneous* if every partial isomorphism between finite substructures of  $\mathcal{M}$  extends to an automorphism of  $\mathcal{M}$ . We will call  $\mathcal{M}$  finitely homogeneous if it is ultrahomogeneous in a finite relational language.

- 5. The Free Amalgamation Property (FAP) if  $\mathcal{L}$  is a relational language, and for all  $R \in Sig(\mathcal{L})$  we have that  $R^{A \otimes_C B} = R^A \cup R^B$ .
- 6. Ramsey Property (RP) if whenever  $A, B \in \mathbb{C}$  are such that  $A \subseteq B$ , then there is some  $C \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $C \to (B)_2^A$ .

We say that a countable class C is a *Fraïssé class* if it has HP, JEP and AP, and we say that it is a *Ramsey class* if it has HP, JEP and RP.

We have  $(FAP) \Rightarrow (SAP) \Rightarrow (AP)$ , and both implications here are strict. *Fraissé's theorem* (see, for instance, [Hod93, Theorem 7.1.2]) tells us that if C is a Fraissé class then there is a unique (up to isomorphism) countable ultrahomogeneous structure  $\mathcal{M}$  whose age is C. We will denote this  $\mathcal{M}$  by Flim(C).

Given an arbitrary class of structures  $\mathcal{C}$  there is a natural way of closing  $\mathcal{C}$  under substructures, making it satisfy HP. We call this the *hereditary closure of*  $\mathcal{C}$  and denote it by  $\mathsf{HC}(\mathcal{C})$ . Explicitly, for a class of structures  $\mathcal{C}$ :

$$\mathsf{HC}(\mathfrak{C}) := \{ B \subseteq A : A \in \mathfrak{C} \}.$$

Conventionally, for a structure  $\mathcal{M}$ , we denote by  $Age(\mathcal{M})$  the class of finitely generated substructures that embed into  $\mathcal{M}$ . For a class of structures  $\mathcal{C}$ , we sometimes overload this notation by writing  $Age(\mathcal{C})$  for the class of finitely generated structures embeddable in some structure  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ .

Remark 1.4. In the notation above, the following are all clear:

- 1.  $HC(\mathcal{C})$  has HP.
- 2.  $Age({\mathcal{M}}) = Age({\mathcal{M}}).$
- 3.  $Age(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  if  $\mathcal{C}$  has HP.
- 4.  $Age(HC(\mathcal{C})) = Age(\mathcal{C}) = Age(Age(\mathcal{C})).$

Fact 1.5 ([Neš05, Theorem 4.2(i)]). A Ramsey class of finite structures is a Fraïssé class.

**Basic classes of structures** We recall and fix notation for some basic classes of structures, which have already been mentioned in the introduction:

- E denotes the class of all finite sets in the language of pure equality.
- $\mathcal{LO}$  denotes the class of finite (total) orders (X, <), where < is a binary relation symbol for the order relation.
- CO denotes the class of finite cyclic orders (X, CO) where CO is a ternary relation symbol for the cyclic order relation (discussed in more detail later).

We will now introduce two well-known ultrahomogeneous structures, namely the C-relation and its reduct, the D-relation<sup>2</sup>. For more details on these structures, we direct the reader to [AM22] or [BJP16].

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ We deeply thank D. Bradley-Williams for his useful and generous comments on *D*-relations and related issues.

#### Generalised chain relations

**Definition 1.6** ([BJP16, Paragraph 3.3]). A ternary relation C(x; y, z) on a set X is called a Crelation if for all  $a, b, c, d \in X$  we have that:

- 1.  $C(a; b, c) \rightarrow C(a; c, b);$
- 2.  $C(a; b, c) \rightarrow \neg C(b; a, c);$
- 3.  $C(a; b, c) \rightarrow (C(a; d, c) \lor C(d; b, c));$

4. 
$$a \neq b \rightarrow C(a; b, b)$$
.

We say that a C-relation is derived from a binary tree or that it is binary branching if, in addition, for all distinct elements  $a, b, c \in X$  we have that:

5.  $C(a; b, c) \lor C(b; a, c) \lor C(c; a, b)$ .

Let  $\prec$  be a total order on X. We say that  $\prec$  is *convex* for C if for all  $a, b, c \in X$ , if C(a; b, c) and  $a \prec c$ , then either  $a \prec b \prec c$  or  $a \prec c \prec b$ . We denote by OC the class of all convexly ordered finite binary branching C-relations.

Fact 1.7 ([Bod15, Theorem 5.1]). The class OC is a Ramsey class.

#### Generalised direction relations

**Definition 1.8** ([BJP16, Paragraph 3.4]). A quaternary relation D(x, y; z, w) on a set X is called a *D*-relation if for all  $x, y, z, w, a \in X$  we have that:

- 1.  $D(x, y; z, w) \rightarrow D(y, x; z, w) \land D(x, y; w, z) \land D(z, w; x, y);$
- 2.  $D(x, y; z, w) \rightarrow \neg D(x, z; y, w);$
- 3.  $D(x,y;z,w) \rightarrow (D(a,y;z,w) \lor D(x,y;z,a));$
- 4.  $(x \neq z \land y \neq z) \rightarrow D(x, y; z, z).$

Similarly to Definition 1.6, we say that a *D*-relation is derived from a binary tree or that it is binary branching if, in addition for any four elements  $x, y, z, w \in X$ , if at least 3 of which are distinct then we have:

5.  $D(x,y;z,w) \lor D(x,z;y,w) \lor D(x,w;y,z).$ 

From a binary tree, we obtain such a *D*-relation on the set of leaves by setting D(a, b; c, d) if the paths between *a* and *b* and between *c* and *d* are disjoint. For instance, if *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* are arranged as follows:



then D(a, b; c, d) holds.

Recall that a (strict) cyclic order CO on X is a ternary relation such that, for all  $x, y, z, w \in X$ :

- 1.  $CO(x, y, z) \rightarrow CO(y, z, x);$
- 2.  $CO(x, y, z) \rightarrow \neg CO(x, z, y)$
- 3.  $CO(x, y, z) \wedge CO(y, y, w) \rightarrow CO(x, y, w);$
- 4. if x, y, z are distinct, then CO(x, y, w) or CO(x, w, y).

A cyclic order CO on a binary D-relation X is convex for D if for all distinct  $x, a, b, c \in X$ :

$$CO(a, b, c) \land CO(c, x, a) \rightarrow D(x, a; b, c) \lor D(a, b; c, x).$$



Equivalently, we have for all distinct  $a, b, c, d \in X$ ,

$$CO(a, b, c) \land CO(b, c, d) \rightarrow \neg D(a, c; b, d)$$

Graphically, this means that the following configuration doesn't occur:



We shall denote by COD the class of all convexly ordered finite binary branching *D*-relations.

We leave the following representation of a finite structure in COD to perhaps help convey some graphical intuition:



**Fact 1.9.** The theory of dense cyclically ordered binary branching *D*-relations is complete,  $\aleph_0$ -categorical, and admits quantifier elimination in the language  $\{D, CO\}$ . It follows that  $COD = Age(\mathcal{M})$  is a Fraissé class, where  $\mathcal{M}$  is the unique ultrahomogeneous countable model of the theory of dense cyclically ordered binary branching *D*-relations.

For completeness, we give a sketch of a proof:

*Proof (sketch).* Let T denote the theory of dense cyclically ordered binary branching D-relations and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a model of T. By assumption, there are, up to equivalence, five kinds of literals in a single variable x, namely:  $x = a, x \neq a$ , CO(a, x, b), D(a, b, c, x), D(x, a, b, c), where a, b, c are parameters in  $\mathcal{M}$  such that CO(a, b, c). To simplify systems of literals, we need the following claim:

Claim 1. Let  $a, b, c, x \in \mathcal{M}$  all distinct such that CO(a, b, c). Then D(x, a, b, c) implies



*Proof of Claim* 1. Assume CO(a, b, c), D(x, a; b, c) and CO(a, x, c). We need to show that CO(c, x, b), as then, we will have CO(a, x, b). Assume not, then we have  $\neg CO(c, x, b) \land CO(c, a, b)$ . By convexity, this implies  $D(x, c; a, b) \lor D(c, a; b, x)$ . By Axiom 3 of Definition 1.8, this implies  $\neg D(x, a; b, c)$  and we have a contradiction.

Consider a system S(x) of literals

$$\{CO(a,x,b) : (a,b) \in P\} \cup \{D(a,b,c,x) : (a,b,c) \in L\} \cup \{D(x,a,b,c) : (a,b,c) \in R\} \cup \{x \neq a : a \in Q\}$$

where  $P \subseteq \mathcal{M}^2$ ,  $L, R \subseteq CO \subseteq \mathcal{M}^3$  and Q contains the set of all parameters in P, L and R. Using Axiom 5, we may assume that if a, b, c are parameters in P, L or R such that CO(a, b, c) holds, then  $(a, b, c) \in L \cup R$ . By the previous claim, we may assume that if  $(a, b, c) \in L \cup R$ , then  $(c, a) \in P$ .

One can see, by convexity, that S(x) admits a solution if, and only if the subsystem

$$\{CO(a, x, b) : (a, b) \in P\} \cup \{x \neq a : a \in Q\}$$

has a solution. Since  $\mathcal{M}$  is a dense cyclic order, this system has a solution if and only if for all  $(a,b), (a',b') \in P, b \neq a'$  and  $\neg(CO(a,b,a') \land CO(b,a',b'))$ . We can this way eliminate one existential quantifier, and this process does not depend on the model  $\mathcal{M}$  we considered. It follows that the theory eliminates quantifiers. Finally, since the language is finite relational, quantifier elimination implies completeness and  $\aleph_0$ -categoricity of the theory, as well as the ultrahomogeneity of its unique countable model.

We will see in section 3 (Example 3.15) that, unlike OC, the class COD is *not* a Ramsey class, even augmented with a generic order.

Aside on Ordered *D*-relations One can of course consider a convex order on the *D*-relation. A total order  $\leq$  on X is convex for D if for all  $x, y, z, w \in X$  such that  $x \leq y$  and  $x \leq z$ , if D(x, y; z, w) either x, y < z, w or x < z, w < y. We denote by OD the class of all convexly ordered finite binary branching *D*-relations. However, this does not give rise to a new structure. Indeed, we will show that OD and OC are interdefinable (without parameters).

First, we recall that a *pointed* D-relation (i.e. a D-relation with a fixed "named" point) is quantifier-free interdefinable with a C-relation:

**Fact 1.10** ([AN98, Theorems 22.1 and 23.4]). Let (X, D) be a *D*-relation on a set X and let  $a \in X$  be any point. We can define a C-relation  $C_0$  on  $X_0 = X \setminus \{x\}$  by setting:

 $C_0(x, y, z)$  if, and only if D(a, x; y, z).

Conversely, if (X,C) is a C-relation on a set X and  $a \notin X$  then we can define a D-relation  $D_0$  on  $X \cup \{a\}$  by setting  $D_0(x, y; z, w)$  if, and only if:

• x = y and  $x \neq z$ ,  $x \neq w$ ; or z = w and  $z \neq x$ ,  $z \neq y$ ;

or

- x, y, w, z are all distinct, and at least one of the following holds:
  - -x = a and C(y; w, z); or y = a and C(x; w, z); or z = a and C(w; x, y); or w = a and C(z; x, y); or
  - $C(x; w, z) \wedge C(y; w, z)$  or  $C(z; x, y) \wedge C(w; x, y)$ .

Moreover, the two constructions are inverse to each other.

If the *D*-relation is convexly ordered, we can recover  $\emptyset$ -definably a *C*-relation by setting, for any ordered triple  $x, y, z \in X$ :

$$C(x; y, z) \Leftrightarrow \forall a \exists b \le a \ D(b, x; y, z).$$

$$(1)$$

In particular, we have the following:

**Fact 1.11.** The relation C given by (1) is a convexly ordered C-relation. Conversely, the D-relation we started with is precisely the D-relation induced by C as in Fact 1.10. In particular, the structures (X, D, <) and (X, C, <) are  $\emptyset$ -interdefinable.

Note that we use the total order to obtain  $\emptyset$ -interdefinability (i.e. interdefinability without parameters), at the cost of using quantifiers in the defining formulas. The point is that the order allows us to talk about a (possibly) imaginary "first" element of (X, <). First, we need a small lemma:

**Lemma 1.12.** Let (X, D, <) be a convexly ordered D-relation. Let  $x, x', x'', y, z, w \in X$ . If  $x'' \leq x' \leq x \leq y$ ,  $x \leq z$  and  $D(x, y; z, w) \land D(x'', y; z, w)$ , then D(x', y; z, w).

*Proof.* Assume for a contradiction, that D(x', y; z, w) does not hold. By Axiom 3, since D(x, y; z, w) and D(x'', y; z, w) hold, we have D(x, y; z, x') and D(x'', y; z, x'). Now, by convexity and the fact that  $x'' \le x' \le x$ , from D(x, y; z, x') we get that:

$$x' < x, y < z.$$

Similarly, using the other *D*-relations and  $x'' \leq x \leq y$ , we have

$$x'' < x', z < y,$$

which is a contradiction.

*Proof of Fact 1.11.* We start with the following claim:

Claim 2. C(x; y, z) holds if, and only if, on an initial segment I of X, we have D(b, x; y, z) for all  $b \in I$ .

Proof of Claim 2. To see this, assume C(x; y, z). For all b, b' such that  $b' \leq b < x, y, z$ , if D(b, x; y, z) holds, then D(b', x; y, z) also holds. Indeed, since C(x; y, z) holds, there is  $b'' \leq b'$  such that D(b'', x; y, z) holds. We have then that D(b', x; y, z) by convexity and Lemma 1.12. Then, the equivalence is immediate.

Let us now show that C is indeed a C-relation. Let x, y, z be elements in X. To show Axioms 1 and 2, assume C(x; y, z). Then there is an initial segment I such that for all  $b \in I$ , D(b, x; y, z) and therefore D(b, x; z, y) and  $\neg D(b, y; x, z)$  by definition of a D-relation. We have therefore C(x; z, y) and  $\neg C(y; x, z)$ .

To show Axiom 3, assume C(x; y, z) and pick  $a \in X$ . Then on an initial segment I, we have D(x, b; y, z) for all  $b \in I$ . By Axiom 3 of the definition of a D-relation, we have D(a, b; y, z) or D(x, b; y, a) for all  $b \in I$ . Using the convexity of D, either D(a, b; y, z) holds for any b in an initial segment, or D(x, b; y, a) holds for any b in an initial segment. Therefore C(a; y, z) or C(x; y, a). We have Axiom 4 by definition. The fact that C is derived from a binary tree (Axiom 5) and is convex for < can be shown similarly to Axiom 3.

Finally, to show that D can be recovers from C, we observe that for any a < x, y, z, w in X, D(x, y; z, w) holds if, and only if,  $(D(a, x; z, w) \land D(a, y; z, w)) \lor (D(x, y; w, a) \land D(x, y; z, a))$  holds. This follows, for instance, from Fact 1.10. We deduce from Claim 2 that D(x, y; z, w) holds if, and only if,  $(C(x; z, w) \land C(y; z, w)) \lor (C(w; x, y) \land C(z, x, y))$  as wanted.

**Ordered Hypergraphs** Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}_0 = \{R_i : i < m\}$  where each  $R_i$  is a relation symbol of arity  $r_i$ , for each i < m. A hypergraph of type  $\mathcal{L}_0$  or  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -hypergraph is a structure  $(A, (R_i)_{i < m})$  such that, for all i < m:

- (Uniformity): If  $R_i(a_0, \ldots, a_{r_i-1})$  then all  $a_0, \ldots, a_{r_i-1}$  are distinct.
- (Symmetry): If  $R_i(a_0, \ldots, a_{r_i-1})$  then we also have  $R_i(a_{\sigma(0)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(r_i-1)})$  for any permutation  $\sigma \in S_{r_i}$ .

The point is that each  $R_i$  is interpreted in A as an  $r_i$ -ary "hyperedge" relation, i.e.  $R_i \subseteq [A]^{r_i}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}_0^+ = \mathcal{L}_0 \cup \{<\}$ . If  $\mathcal{M} = (A, (R_i)_{i < m}, <)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_0^+$ -structure whose  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -reduct is an  $\mathcal{L}_0^-$ -hypergraph and < is interpreted as a linear order in M, then we say that M is an ordered  $\mathcal{L}_0^+$ -hypergraph.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the class of all linearly ordered finite  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -hypergraphs (for arbitrary  $\mathcal{L}_0^+$ ). Then,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Fraïssé class and its Fraïssé limit is the ordered random  $\mathcal{L}_0^+$ -hypergraph, whose order is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ .

**Fact 1.13** ([NR77]). For any finite  $\mathcal{L}_0^+$ , let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the class of all ordered  $\mathcal{L}_0^+$ -hypergraphs. Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Ramsey class.

In particular, if  $\mathcal{L}_0^+ = \{<, R\}$ , where R is a single relation symbol of arity n we call an ordered  $\mathcal{L}_0^+$ -hypergraph an ordered *n*-uniform hypergraph. The Fraïssé limit of the class of ordered *n*-uniform hypergraphs is the ordered random *n*-uniform hypergraph, which we denote by  $\mathcal{OH}_n$ .

Remark 1.14. A first-order  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -structure (M, <, R) is a model of  $\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{OH}_n)$  if, and only if:

- (M, <, R) is an ordered *n*-uniform hypergraph, in the sense above.
- (M, <) is a model of DLO.
- For all finite disjoint subsets  $A_0, A_1 \subseteq M^{n-1}$  and any  $b_0, b_1 \in M$  such that  $b_0 < b_1$ , there is some  $b \in M$  such that:
  - $b_0 < b < b_1.$
  - For every  $(a_{0,1}, \ldots, a_{0,n-1}) \in A_0$ , and  $(a_{1,1}, \ldots, a_{1,n-1}) \in A_1$  we have that:

 $R(b, a_{0,1}, \ldots, a_{0,n-1})$  and  $\neg R(b, a_{1,1}, \ldots, a_{1,n-1})$ .

In particular, an ordered random 1-hypergraph is a dense linear order with a dense co-dense subset. We will denote OG, the ordered random 2-hypergraph,  $OH_2$ , (since 2-hypergraphs are just graphs).

#### **1.3** Product constructions

We now introduce the two constructions that we will consider in this paper: the full product and the lexicographic sum. For both of them, we recall a quantifier elimination result relative to their factors. This will be later used in Section 4 in order to describe generalised indiscernible sequences (see Subsection 2.1) in full products and lexicographic sums, in terms of generalised indiscernible sequences in their factors. This description will then be our main tool for proving transfer principles in these products.

#### 1.3.1 Full Product

**Definition 1.15.** For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_i$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_i}$ -structure with main sort  $\mathcal{M}_i$ . We define the *full* product of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , denoted  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$ , to be the (multisorted) structure:

$$\{M_1 \times M_2, \mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \pi_{M_1}, \pi_{M_2}\}$$

where for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\pi_{M_i}$  is the natural projection  $M_1 \times M_2 \to M_i$  and the sort  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are equipped with their respective structure.<sup>3</sup> We denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2}$  the corresponding language (which contains *disjoint* copy of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ ).

The full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is sometimes called the *direct product*, and can be described in a one-sorted language. However, the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2}$  has the following immediate advantage:

**Fact 1.16.** For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_i$  be as above. Then  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  eliminates quantifiers relative to  $\mathcal{M}_1$ and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . Equivalently, every  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2}$ -formula is equivalent to a formula without quantifier in the main sort  $M_1 \times M_2$ .

*Proof.* We may Morleyise  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , so, without loss, we may assume that they eliminate quantifiers in their respective relational languages  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . We prove the fact by induction on the complexity of an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2}$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$ :

- If  $\varphi = R$  for some  $R \in \mathcal{L}_i$ , then, by definition  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2 \models \varphi(\bar{x}) \iff \mathcal{M}_i \models \varphi(\pi_i(\bar{x}))$ .
- If  $\varphi(x, y)$  is x = y, then, by definition,  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2 \models \varphi(x, y) \iff \mathcal{M}_1 \models \varphi(\pi_1(x, y)) \land \mathcal{M}_2 \models \varphi(\pi_2(x, y)).$
- If  $\varphi$  is of the form  $\neg \psi$  or  $\psi_1 \land \psi_2$ , then the fact follows from the induction hypothesis.
- Finally, assume  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  is of the form  $\exists y \, \psi(\bar{x}; y)$ . Applying the induction hypothesis to  $\psi$ , we may assume  $\psi$  is in *disjunctive normal form*, i.e.  $\psi(\bar{x}; y) = \bigvee_{i \in I} \bigwedge_{j \in J_i} \theta_{i,j}(\bar{x}; y)$ , where  $I, \{J_i\}_{i \in I}$  are finite and  $\theta_{i,j}$  are all atomic or negated atomic. As disjunction always commutes with the existential quantifier, we may further assume  $\psi(\bar{x}; y) = \bigwedge_{j \in J} \theta_j(\bar{x}; y)$ . Breaking up equality in  $M_1 \times M_2$  to a conjunction of equalities in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  as above, we may assume  $\psi$  is

$$\psi(\bar{x};y) = \psi_1(\pi_1(\bar{x};y)) \land \psi_2(\pi_2(\bar{x};y)).$$

The fact follows since

$$\exists y \in M_1 \times M_2 \,\psi_1(\pi_1(\bar{x};y)) \land \psi_2(\pi_2(\bar{x};y)) \iff \exists y \in M_1, \psi_1(\pi_1(\bar{x};y)) \land \exists y \in M_2, \psi_2(\pi_2(\bar{x};y)).$$

**Definition 1.17.** Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two classes of structures. We denote by  $C_1 \boxtimes C_2$  the smallest hereditary class of structures containing  $C \boxtimes D$  for all  $C \in C_1$  and  $D \in C_2$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>This notion of product should not be confused with the *Feferman product* (of two structures); full products are equipped with projection maps, which cannot always be recovered in the Feferman product.

#### 1.3.2 Lexicographic product

The *lexicographic sum* of relational structures was studied by the first author in [Mei16]. It is a method of constructing an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  from two  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is a relational language, in a way that generalises the lexicographic (wreath) product of graphs. We recall here the relevant definitions and a quantifier elimination result.

**Definition 1.18.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure and  $\mathfrak{N} = {\mathcal{N}_a}_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$  be a collection  $\mathfrak{N}$  of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures indexed by  $\mathcal{M}$ . The *lexicographic sum of*  $\mathfrak{N}$  *with respect to*  $\mathcal{M}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$ , is the multisorted structure with:

- a main sort with base set  $S := \bigcup_{a \in M} \{a\} \times \mathcal{N}_a$ ,
- a sort for the structure  $\mathcal{M}$ ,
- the natural projection map  $v: S \to \mathcal{M}$ .

To distinguish symbols in the main sort S from symbols in the ribs  $\mathcal{N}_a$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{\bullet,\mathfrak{N}} := \{P_{\bullet}\}_{P \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}}$ a copy of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ . The set S is equipped with an  $\mathcal{L}_{\bullet,\mathfrak{N}}$ -structure:

• if  $P \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$  is an *n*-ary predicate, then

$$P^{\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]}_{\bullet} := \left\{ ((a, b_1), \dots, (a, b_n)) \mid a \in M \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_a \models P(b_1, \dots, b_n) \right\}.$$

• if  $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$  is an *n*-ary function symbol, then

$$f_{\bullet}^{\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]}((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)) := \begin{cases} (a_n, f^{\mathcal{N}_a}(b_1, \cdots, b_n)) & \text{if } a = a_1 = \dots = a_n, \\ u & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where u is a specific constant which stands for 'undetermined'. We can also pick a constant in the language.

We denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]}$  the multisorted language

$$(S, \mathcal{L}_{\bullet, \mathfrak{N}}) \cup (M, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}) \cup \{v : S \to M\}.$$

If for every  $a \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_a$  are isomorphic copies of a structure  $\mathcal{N}$ , we simply denote the lexicographic sum by  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$ , and we call it the *lexicographic product of*  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$ .

Remark 1.19. Notice that the projection to the second coordinate is not in the language of the lexicographic product. But, to simplify notation, for all  $a \in \mathcal{M}$  we identify  $\mathcal{N}_a$  with  $\{a\} \times \mathcal{N}_a$  and write  $\mathcal{N}_a \models \varphi(c)$  for  $c = (a, n) \in \mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  and  $\varphi$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -formula such that  $\mathcal{N}_a \models \varphi(n)$ .

The sort  $\mathcal{M}$  in  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  can come with additional structure: we can indeed define the predicates  $P_{\varphi}^{\mathcal{M}} := \{a \in \mathcal{M} \mid \mathcal{N}_a \models \varphi\}$  for all  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -sentences  $\varphi$ . For technical reasons, we do not add these predicates in the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]}$ , but they play an important role in our analysis.

Any  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$  can be seen as a filter on the set of  $\emptyset$ -definable (unary) subsets of  $\mathcal{M}$ . By Łoś, the theory of an ultraproduct  $\prod_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{N}_a$  depends only on the type  $\rho$  that  $\mathcal{U}$  extends. By abuse of notation, we write such an ultraproduct  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  or  $\prod_{\rho} \mathcal{N}_a$ .

An elementary extension of  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  is of the form  $\mathcal{\tilde{M}}[\mathfrak{\tilde{N}}]$  where  $\mathcal{\tilde{M}}$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure and  $\mathfrak{\tilde{N}}$  is a collection of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures  $\mathcal{\tilde{N}}_{\tilde{a}}$  such that:

- $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is an elementary extension of  $\mathcal{M}$  in  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \{P_{\varphi}\}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}}$ ;
- For  $a \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have that  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_a$  is an elementary extension of  $\mathcal{N}_a$ ;

• For  $\tilde{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \setminus \mathcal{M}$ , we have that  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\tilde{a}}$  is elementary equivalent to the ultraproduct  $\prod_{\rho} \mathcal{N}_{a}$  where  $\rho = \operatorname{tp}(\tilde{a}) \in S_{1}^{\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ .

**Fact 1.20.** Consider the lexicographic sum  $S := \mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  of a class of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures  $\mathfrak{N} := {\mathcal{N}_a}_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$  with respect to an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$ . Assume that

- 1. For all sentences  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{R}}$ , the set  $\{a \in \mathcal{M} \mid \mathcal{N}_a \models \varphi\}$  is  $\emptyset$ -definable in  $\mathcal{M}$ ,
- 2. For all  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  admits quantifier elimination in  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ .

Then  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  eliminates quantifiers relative to  $\mathcal{M}$  in  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]}$ .

For a proof, the reader can refer to [Mei16, Theorem 2.7].

**Definition 1.21.** Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two classes of finite structures. We denote by  $C_1[C_2]$  the class of lexicographic sums  $C[(D_c)_{c \in C}]$  where  $C \in C_1$  and  $D_c \in C_2$  for every  $c \in C$ .

#### 1.4 Dividing lines in model theory

Throughout this section, T will always denote a complete  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory and  $\mathbb{M} \models T$  a  $\kappa(\mathbb{M})$ -saturated and  $\kappa(\mathbb{M})$ -homogeneous (monster) model of T, for some very large cardinal  $\kappa(\mathbb{M})$ . Unless otherwise stated all (tuples of) elements and subsets will come from this monster model and will be *small*, i.e. of size less than  $\kappa(\mathbb{M})$ .

#### 1.4.1 NIP and higher-arity generalisations

In this section, we briefly recall some basic definitions from neostability theory, in particular, NIP and its higher-arity generalisations. The notion of NIP, originating in the work of Shelah, has been studied intensively in the past years, and the definition is standard, but we include it here for the sake of keeping this paper as self-contained as possible. For more information on NIP, we direct the reader to [Sim15].

**Definition 1.22** (Independence Property, NIP). We say that a formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$  has the *independence* property in T if there exist  $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\bar{b}_I)_{I \subseteq \mathbb{N}}$  such that:

$$\models \varphi(b_I, \bar{a}_i)$$
 if, and only if,  $i \in I$ .

We say that T is *dependent* or *NIP* (No Independence Property) if no formula has the independence property in T.

In this text, we will consider a "higher-arity" generalisation of NIP, also due to Shelah in [She14], and later studied in more detail in [CPT19]. This will be one of our main examples of dividing lines arising from generalised indiscernibles.

**Definition 1.23** (*n*-Independence Property, NIP<sub>n</sub>). We say that a formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_1, \ldots, \bar{y}_n)$  has the *n*-Independence Property (in T) if there exist  $(\bar{a}_i^1 \frown \cdots \frown \bar{a}_i^n)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\bar{b}_I)_{I \subseteq \mathbb{N}^n}$  such that:

 $\models \varphi(\bar{b}_I; \bar{a}_{i_1}^1, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}^n) \text{ if, and only if, } (i_1, \dots, i_n)) \in I.$ 

We say that T is *n*-dependent or  $NIP_n$  (No *n*-Independence Property) if no formula has the *n*-independence property in T.

Remark 1.24. It is easy to observe that NIP<sub>1</sub> corresponds precisely to NIP. Moreover, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have that if T is NIP<sub>k</sub> then it is NIP<sub>k+1</sub>, and all these implications are strict, witnessed by the random k-hypergraph, which is NIP<sub>k+1</sub>, but not NIP<sub>k</sub>.

In the next subsections, we will also recall the definitions of various classes of theories contained in NIP and  $\text{NIP}_n$ .

#### **1.4.2** Distality and *n*-Distality

Distality was introduced by Simon in [Sim13]. In a certain sense, the notion of distality is meant to capture the "purely unstable" NIP structures. A theory is distal only if it admits no infinite stable quotient. All *o*-minimal structures are known to be distal, but there are a lot more natural examples of distal structures. There is prolific literature on distality and its applications, and many equivalent definitions of distality are used. A concise one that will be used in our analysis is the following:

**Definition 1.25.** The theory T is said *distal* if for every indiscernible sequence  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  in  $\mathbb{M}$  and every tuple  $b \in \mathbb{M}^{|b|}$  such that  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}}$  is indiscernible over b we have that  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  is indiscernible over b.

For other equivalent definitions, and more details on distality, we direct the reader to the work of Aschenbrenner, Chernikov, Gehret, and Ziegler [ACGZ22].

**Example 1.26.** We give below some basic examples of distal and non-distal theories:

- Total linear orders are distal.
- Meet-trees  $(T, \leq \wedge)$  are not distal, in general. For instance, the complete theory of a dense meet-tree is not distal: let  $r \in T$  and  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  are elements such that  $a_i \wedge a_j = r$  for every  $i \neq j$ . Then  $(a_i)_i$  is totally indiscernible (over r).

We will also consider a recent generalisation of distality, called *n*-distality, introduced by Walker in [Wal23]. First, we introduce some terminology.

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an indiscernible sequence  $(b_i : i \in I) \subseteq U$  indexed by an infinite linear order (I, <). Suppose  $\mathcal{I}_0 + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_n$  is a partition of  $\mathcal{I}$  corresponding to a Dedekind partition  $I_0 + \cdots + I_n$  of I. Let A be a sequence  $(a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}) \subseteq U$ . Assume  $|b_i| = |a_j|$  for all  $i \in I$  and j < n.

We say that A inserts (indiscernibly) into  $\mathcal{I}_0 + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_n$  if the sequence remains indiscernible after inserting each  $a_i$  at the *i*<sup>th</sup>-cut, i.e., the sequence

$$\mathcal{I}_0 + a_0 + \mathcal{I}_1 + a_1 + \dots + \mathcal{I}_{n-1} + a_{n-1} + \mathcal{I}_n$$

is indiscernible. Moreover, for any  $A' \subseteq A$ , we say that A' inserts (indiscernibly) into  $\mathcal{I}_0 + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_n$  if the sequence remains indiscernible after inserting each  $a_i \in A'$  at the *i*<sup>th</sup>-cut. For simplicity, we may say that A (or A') inserts into  $\mathcal{I}$  when the partition of  $\mathcal{I}$  under consideration is clear.

**Definition 1.27.** For m > 0 and an indiscernible sequence  $\mathcal{I}$ , we say that the Dedekind partition  $\mathcal{I}_0 + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_{m+1}$  is *m*-distal if every sequence  $A = (a_0, \ldots, a_m) \subseteq U$  which does not insert into  $\mathcal{I}$  contains some *m*-element subsequence which does not insert into  $\mathcal{I}$ . A theory is *m*-distal if all Dedekind partitions of indiscernible sequences in the monster model are *m*-distal.

One can see that a theory is 1-distal if, and only if, it is distal. Moreover, as shown in [Wal23], every *n*-distal theory is NIP<sub>n</sub>.

#### 1.4.3 Monadic NIP

Another differently flavoured strengthening of NIP is the notion of *monadic NIP*. Monadic NIP was introduced by Baldwin and Shelah in [BS85], but the study of monadically NIP theories has seen a resurgence in recent years, both from the point of view of pure model theory (see, for instance, [BL21]), and from the point of view of theoretical computer science (see, for instance, [BGOdM<sup>+</sup>22]).

**Definition 1.28** (Monadic NIP). We say that T is monadically NIP if, for every  $\mathcal{M} \models T$  and every expansion  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  by unary predicates, we have that  $\mathcal{N}$  is NIP.

It is not immediately clear from the definition above that if  $\mathcal{M}$  is such that every expansion of  $\mathcal{M}$  by unary predicates is NIP, then  $\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})$  is monadically NIP. This follows from Fact 1.31, below. Before we state that theorem, we need to introduce some further model-theoretic background.

**Definition 1.29** (Indiscernible-triviality [BL21, Definition 3.8]). We say that T has *indiscernible-triviality* for any order-indiscernible sequence  $(a_i : i \in \omega)$ , and every set B of parameters, if  $(a_i : i \in \omega)$  is indiscernible over each  $b \in B$  then  $(a_i : i \in \omega)$  is indiscernible over B.

The following definition originating from [She14] is a strengthening of NIP:

**Definition 1.30** (dp-rank, dp-minimality). Fix  $n \in \omega$ . An *ICT-pattern of depth* n consists of a sequence of formulas  $(\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : i \leq n)$  and an array of parameters  $(\bar{a}_i^j : i \in \omega, j \leq n)$  such that for all  $\eta : [n] \to \omega$  we have that:

$$\left\{\varphi\left(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{\eta(j)}^{j}\right):j\leq n\right\}\cup\left\{\neg\varphi\left(\bar{x},\bar{a}_{i}^{j}\right):j\leq n,i\neq\eta(j)\right\}$$

is consistent. We say that T has dp-rank n if there is an ICT-pattern of depth n, but no ICT pattern of depth n + 1 (in the monster model of T). We say that T is dp-minimal if it has dp-rank 1.

These notions have been intensively studied see e.g. [CS19], [KOU13]. The reader will find in the literature various alternative ways of defining dp-minimality. For instance, in [OU11], it is shown that T is dp-minimal if and only if it is *inp-minimal* and NIP. We now can state one of the central theorems of [BL21], which includes a "Shelah-style forbidden-configuration" characterisation of monadic NIP.

Fact 1.31 ([BL21, Theorem 4.1]). Let T be a first-order theory. Then, the following are equivalent:

- 1. T is monadically NIP.
- 2. For all  $\mathcal{M} \models T$ , we cannot find a  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, z)$ , sequences of tuples  $(\bar{a}_i : i \in \omega), (\bar{b}_j : j \in \omega)$ , and a sequence of singletons  $(c_{k,l} : k, l \in \omega)$ , from  $\mathcal{M}$  such that:

 $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j, c_{k,l})$  if, and only if, (i, j) = (k, l),

3. T is dp-minimal and has indiscernible-triviality.

Suppose that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a sufficiently saturated structure with IP. Then it is a well-known fact that we can find a formula  $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ , where |x| = 1, that witnesses IP in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If we are allowed to use unary predicates (or to add parameters [Sim21]), then the following result, from [BS85, Lemma 8.1.3] shows that we can achieve more:

**Fact 1.32.** If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a sufficiently saturated structure with IP, then there is a monadic expansion  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  and a formula  $\varphi(x, y)$  with |x| = |y| = 1 which witnesses that  $\mathcal{N}$  has IP.

In particular, the following corollary follows immediately from the fact above and the fact that monadic expansions of monadic expansions are monadic expansions:

**Corollary 1.33.** If T is not monadically NIP, then there is a monadic expansion of some  $\mathcal{M} \models T$  which has IP witnessed by a formula  $\varphi(x, y)$  with |x| = |y| = 1.

**Example 1.34.** We conclude this section by revisiting Example 1.26, to give some examples that one can keep in mind when discussing monadically NIP structures.

- Linear orders are monadically NIP.
- Meet-trees  $(T, \leq \wedge)$  are monadically NIP. This follows from [Sim11, Proposition 4.7], where it is shown that coloured meet-trees (that is, monadic expansion of meet-trees) are dp-minimal, so in particular NIP.

# 2 Generalised Indiscernibles and Coding Configurations

#### 2.1 Generalised Indiscernibility

Generalised indiscernible sequences were introduced by Shelah [She90, Section VII.2], as a tool for studying the tree property. These notions have proven an important tool in classification theory and the study of tree properties (see, for instance, [KK11] and [KKS13]). More recently, generalised indiscernibles have been used by Guigona, Hill, and Scow [GHS17] as a means for producing new dividing lines. As the name suggests, these generalise the classical notion of order-indiscernible sequences. We recall the definition:

**Definition 2.1** (Generalised indiscernibles). Let  $\mathcal{L}'$  be a first-order language and  $\mathcal{I}$  an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure. Given an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed sequence of tuples  $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  from the monster model of T, and a small subset A of the monster, we say that  $(\bar{a}_i)_i$  is an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence<sup>4</sup> over A if for all positive integer n and all sequences  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n$  from  $\mathcal{I}$  we have that if  $qftp_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{L}'}(i_1, \ldots, i_n) = qftp_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{L}'}(i_j, \ldots, j_n)$  then  $tp(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{i_n}/A) = tp(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{j_n}/A)$ . If  $A = \emptyset$ , we say that  $(\bar{a}_i)_i$  is simply an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence.

Of course, not all structures are created equal. Some structures, as it turns out are more suitable for indexing generalised indiscernible sequences than others. Indeed, a key property of (ordered) sequences is that their EM-type can always be realised by an order-indiscernible sequence. This fact is sometimes referred to as the "Standard Lemma" (see [TZ12, Lemma 5.1.3]). Its proof shows a very tight connection between order-indiscernibles and Ramsey's theorem. This connection carries through to generalised indiscernibles, this time with structural Ramsey theory (in the sense of Subsection 1.2).

The following definition captures the essence of the standard lemma idea for generalised indiscernibles:

**Definition 2.2** (The Modelling Property). Let  $\mathcal{L}'$  be a first-order language,  $\mathcal{I}$  an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure, and  $(\bar{a}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$  be an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed sequence of tuples. Given an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed sequence of tuples  $(\bar{b}_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$  from the monster, we say that  $(\bar{b}_i)_i$  is (locally) based on  $(\bar{a}_i)_i$  if for all finite sets of  $\mathcal{L}$ -formulas  $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ , all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n$  from  $\mathcal{I}$  there is some  $j_1, \ldots, j_n$  from  $\mathcal{I}$  such that  $qftp_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{L}'}(i_1, \ldots, i_n) = qftp_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{L}'}(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$  and  $tp_{\Delta}(\bar{b}_{i_1}, \ldots, \bar{b}_{i_n}) = tp_{\Delta}(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{j_n})$ .

We say that  $\mathcal{I}$  has the modelling property in T if for each  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed sequence  $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  of tuples from the monster model of T there exists an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence  $(\bar{b}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  based on  $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{I}$  has the modelling property if, for all first-order theories  $T, \mathcal{I}$  has the modelling property in T.

For a more detailed discussion of these concepts, the reader can refer to the work of the first two authors [MP23]. We recall a result of that paper which generalises a theorem of Scow, and one of it's consequences:

**Fact 2.3** ([MP23, Theorem A]). Let  $\mathcal{L}'$  be a first-order language,  $\mathfrak{C}$  a class of finite  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structures, and  $\mathcal{I}$  an infinite locally finite  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure such that  $\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathfrak{C}$ . Then, the following are equivalent:

- 1. C has the Ramsey property.
- 2. I has the modelling property.

Observe that if  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  are two structures such that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a quantifier-free reduct of  $\mathcal{I}$ , then, automatically, any  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible sequence will be an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence. Of course, the converse need not always hold. For instance, in an arbitrary theory T, not every order-indiscernible sequence is totally indiscernible. On the other hand, if T is stable, then every order-indiscernible sequence is totally indiscernible, and this implication in fact characterises stability [She90, Theorem II.2.13]. As

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>In the literature, what we refer to as an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence is often called an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed indiscernible sequence.

we will discuss in detail later in the paper, this sort of phenomenon, which is made precise in the following definition, can be used as an alternative definition for several dividing lines.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  be two structures such that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a reduct of  $\mathcal{I}$ . We say that a theory T collapses indiscernibles from  $\mathcal{I}$  to  $\mathcal{J}$  if every  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence in the monster model is a  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible sequence. We say that T collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles if it collapses any  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence to  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible sequence, where  $\mathcal{J}$  is a strict quantifier-free reduct of  $\mathcal{I}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{I} \not\curvearrowright^{\text{qf}} \mathcal{J}$ .

In [GH19], the following variant of a definition was given for non-collapsing indiscernibles:

**Definition 2.5** (non-collapsing indiscernibles (for finite languages) [GH19, Definition 3.2]). Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a structure and let T be a theory. A sequence  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  of element in a model  $\mathcal{M}$  of T is non-collapsing indiscernibles if

$$\mathsf{qftp}(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = \mathsf{qftp}(j_1,\ldots,j_n) \iff \mathsf{tp}(a_{i_1},\ldots,a_{i_n}) = \mathsf{tp}(a_{j_1},\ldots,a_{j_n}),$$

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$ .

The definition above was given under the assumption  $\mathcal{I}$  is an ultrahomogeneous structure in a finite relational language. The following lemma shows that in this context, the two definitions coincide. Example 2.8 shows that Lemma 2.6 fails in general.

**Lemma 2.6.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an ultrahomogeneous  $\aleph_0$ -categorical structure in a countable language, let  $\mathcal{M}$  be some structure and  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence. Then the following are equivalent:

- 1.  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is non-collapsing, according to Definition 2.5.
- 2. For all  $\mathcal{J} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{I}$  such that  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible,  $\mathcal{J} \stackrel{q_f}{\longleftarrow} \mathcal{I}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$  be the respective languages of  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}$ . Observe that since  $\mathcal{I}$  is  $\aleph_0$ -categorical, every  $\mathcal{J} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{I}$  must be  $\aleph_0$ -categorical too.

 $(1 \Longrightarrow 2)$  Let  $\mathcal{J} \leadsto \mathcal{I}$  such that  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible. We need to show that, in this case, for every  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -formula  $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$  there exists a quantifier-free  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{J}}$ -formula  $\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$  such that for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$  we have that  $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$  if, and only if,  $\mathcal{J} \models \psi(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$ .

By Item 1 and  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernibility we have that:

$$qftp_{\mathcal{J}}(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = qftp_{\mathcal{J}}(j_1,\ldots,j_n) \implies qftp_{\mathcal{I}}(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = qftp_{\mathcal{I}}(j_1,\ldots,j_n),$$
(2)

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$ . Given  $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ , by Ryll-Nardzewski, there are finitely many complete *n*-types  $p_1, \ldots, p_k \in S_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\emptyset)$  such that  $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^k p_i(\bar{x})$ . By quantifier elimination in  $\mathcal{I}$ , we may assume  $p_1, \ldots, p_k$  are quantifier-free complete types.

By Equation (2) and by  $\aleph_0$ -categoricity of  $\mathcal{J}$ , for each  $p_i$ , there are complete quantifier-free types  $q_{i,1}, \ldots, q_{i,l_i}$  in  $\mathcal{J}$  such that  $\mathcal{J} \models \bigvee_{j=1}^{l_i} q_{i,j}(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \iff \mathcal{I} \models p_i(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$  for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$ . In conclusion, there are finitely many quantifier-free types  $q_1, \ldots, q_m$  such that

$$\mathcal{J} \models \bigvee_{j=1}^{m} q_j(i_1, \dots, i_n) \iff \mathcal{I} \models \varphi(i_1, \dots, i_n) \tag{3}$$

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$ . Now, since  $\mathcal{J}$  is  $\aleph_0$ -categorical, we may replace each  $q_j$  in Equation (3) with an isolating formula for it, so  $\varphi$  is  $\emptyset$ -quantifier-free-definable in  $\mathcal{J}$ , and the result follows.

 $(2 \Longrightarrow 1)$  We need to show that given any  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  we have that:

 $\mathsf{qftp}(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = \mathsf{qftp}(j_1,\ldots,j_n) \iff \mathsf{tp}(a_{i_1},\ldots,a_{i_n}) = \mathsf{tp}(a_{j_1},\ldots,a_{j_n}),$ 

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$ .

To this end, we will start by constructing a reduct  $\mathcal{J} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{I}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{J}}$  be the language consisting of an *n*-ary relation symbol  $R_{\varphi}$  for every  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -formula  $\varphi$  in *n* free variables. Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be the structure with the same universe as  $\mathcal{I}$  such that for every  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -formula  $\varphi$  and every  $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$  we set  $\mathcal{J} \models R_{\varphi}(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \iff \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_n})$ . By construction,  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible.

Furthermore, as in the previous implication, by  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibility of  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  and by  $\aleph_0$ -categoricity of  $\mathcal{I}$ , for every  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -formula  $\varphi$ , there are  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -formulas  $\psi_{\varphi,1}, \ldots, \psi_{p,k(\varphi)}$  such that:

$$\mathcal{I} \models \bigvee_{j=1}^{k(\varphi)} \psi_{\varphi,j}(i_1, \dots, i_n) \iff \mathcal{J} \models R_{\varphi}(i_1, \dots, i_n)$$

So  $\mathcal{J} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{I}$ . Therefore, by Item 2,  $\mathcal{J} \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\longleftarrow} \mathcal{I}$ . Finally, let  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$  be such that  $\operatorname{tp}(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_n}) = \operatorname{tp}(a_{j_1}, \ldots, a_{j_n})$ . Then, by definition of  $\mathcal{J}$ ,  $\operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{J}}(i_1, \ldots, i_n) = \operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{J}}(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ . Since  $\mathcal{I} \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{J}$ , this implies that  $\operatorname{tp}_{\mathcal{I}}(i_1, \ldots, i_n) = \operatorname{tp}_{\mathcal{I}}(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ , and hence  $\operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}}(i_1, \ldots, i_n) = \operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}}(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ , as required.

The following example shows that, in general, a collapsing  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence may collapse only to a  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible sequence where  $\mathcal{J}$  is not a strict reduct of I, but a quantifier-free reduct.

**Example 2.7.** Let  $\mathcal{BG}^E = (G, R, E)$  be the countable random bipartite graph  $\mathcal{BG} = (G, R)$  equipped with a two-class equivalence relation for the partition. We may embed  $\mathcal{BG}$  (as a graph) into the countable random graph  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then the sequence  $(g)_{g \in \mathcal{BG}^E}$  is not uncollapsing, for it is a  $\mathcal{BG}$ -indiscernible sequence. One can see, by quantifier elimination in the random graph, that the sequence doesn't collapse further, that is  $(g)_{g \in \mathcal{BG}}$  is an uncollapsing  $\mathcal{BG}$ -indiscernible sequence.

The following example shows that, in Lemma 2.6, one needs indeed to assume that the language is countable:

**Example 2.8.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be the structure on  $\mathbb{N}$  in the *full set-theoretic language*  $\mathcal{L}_F$ , i.e., the language which for every  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}^n$ , contains a relation symbol  $R_A \in \operatorname{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_F)$ , naturally interpreted as  $R_A(\mathcal{N}) = A$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{N}$  is an ultrahomogeneous  $\aleph_0$ -categorical structure. Let  $\mathcal{N}_S$  be the reduct of  $\mathcal{N}$  to the language  $\mathcal{L}_S \subset \mathcal{L}_F$  consisting only of unary predicates for the singleton sets, i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_S := \{R_{\{a\}} : a \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{N}$  codes any countable structure  $\mathcal{M}$ , and it is in particular unstable. On the other hand,  $\mathcal{N}_S$  is strongly minimal, and in particular, stable. So  $\mathcal{N}_S \leadsto \mathcal{N}$  but  $\mathcal{N} \nleftrightarrow \mathcal{N}_S$ .

- 1. letting  $a_i := i$ ,  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$  is a non-collapsing  $\mathcal{N}$ -indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{N}$ , in the sense of Definition 2.5.
- 2.  $\mathcal{N}$  collapses  $\mathcal{N}$ -indiscernibles to  $\mathcal{N}_S$  indiscernibles according to Definition 2.4. (In fact, every  $\mathcal{N}$ -indiscernible sequence in any model of any theory is also an  $\mathcal{N}_S$ -indiscernible sequence.)

An analogue of Shelah's theorem characterising stable theories as those that collapse order-indiscernible sequences to indiscernible sets was proved by Scow for NIP in [Sco12] and her result was generalised in [CPT19] to NIP<sub>n</sub>, for n > 1.

**Fact 2.9** ([CPT19, Theorem 5.4]). Let  $\mathfrak{OH}_{n+1}$  be the ordered random (n+1)-hypergraph. Then, the following are equivalent for a first-order theory T:

- 1. T is  $NIP_n$ .
- 2. T collapses  $OH_{n+1}$ -indiscernibles into order-indiscernibles.

#### 2.2 *X*-Configurations

We will develop the study of transfer principles with respect to the notion of  $\mathcal{K}$ -configurations. Forbidding  $\mathcal{K}$ -configurations offers a unified way of describing tameness conditions that arise from coding combinatorial configurations, such as the Order Property and the Independence Property, and provides an interesting scheme of dividing lines. The notion of  $\mathcal{K}$ -configurations originates from the work of Guingona and Hill [GH19], and has been developed further in [GPS23]. In this section, we will fix a relational first-order language  $\mathcal{L}_0$ , and an arbitrary first-order language  $\mathcal{L}$ . Throughout, we will use  $\mathcal{K}$  to denote a class of finite  $\mathcal{L}_0$ -structures closed under isomorphism.

**Definition 2.10** ( $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration, [GPS23, Definition 5.1]). An  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  admits (or codes) a  $\mathcal{K}$ - configuration if there are an integer n, a function  $I : \text{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_0) \to \mathcal{L}$  and a sequence of functions  $(f_A : A \in \mathcal{K})$  such that:

- 1. for all  $A \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $f_A : A \to \mathcal{M}^n$ ,
- 2. for all  $R \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_0)$ , for all  $A \in \mathcal{K}$ , for all  $a \in A^{\text{arity}(R)}$ ,

 $A \models R(a) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models I(R)(f_A(a)).$ 

A theory T admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration if some model  $\mathcal{M} \models T$  admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration. We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$  the class of theories which admit a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration, and by N $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$  the class of theories which *do not* admit a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration.

**Example 2.11.** Recall that  $\mathcal{LO}$  and  $\mathcal{CO}$  denote respectively the class of finite linear orders and finite cyclic orders, and  $\mathcal{COD}$  denotes the class of finite cyclically ordered *D*-relation. One can observe that any structure admits an  $\mathcal{CO-configuration}$  if, and only if, it admits  $\mathcal{LO-configuration}$ . In particular  $NC_{\mathcal{CO}} = NC_{\mathcal{LO}}$ . This is of course due to the fact that, after naming one constant, a dense cyclic order is inter-definable with a standard linear order. Similarly, any structure admits an  $\mathcal{COD-configuration}$  if admits  $\mathcal{OC-configuration}$ . Therefore  $NC_{\mathcal{COD}} = NC_{\mathcal{OC}}$ .

**Proposition 2.12.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of structures. Then  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{K})} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{HC}(\mathcal{K})}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{M})}$  for a structure  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $Age(\mathcal{K}) = Age(HC(\mathcal{K}))$ , it suffices to show the first equality (as we may replace  $\mathcal{K}$  with  $HC(\mathcal{K})$  to obtain the second).

For the inclusion  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{K})}$ , suppose that  $T \in \mathcal{C}_{\{\mathcal{M}\}}$ . Fix I and  $(f_{\mathcal{M}})_{\mathcal{M}\in\mathcal{K}}$  as promised. For every  $A \in \mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{K})$  fix some  $\mathcal{M}_A \in \mathcal{K}$  and embedding  $e_A : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_A$ ; then letting  $f_A := f_{\mathcal{M}} \circ e_A$ , we get an  $\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{M})$ -configuration.

For the inclusion  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{K})} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$ , suppose that  $T \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{K})}$ . Fix I and  $(f_A : A \in \mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{K}))$  as promised; then, for all  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{K}$ , the type in  $|\mathcal{M}|$ -variables

$$T \cup \{ I(R)(x_{a_1}, \dots, x_{a_n}) : R \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}), \ \mathcal{M} \models R(a_1, \dots, a_n) \} \\ \cup \{ \neg I(R)(x_{a_1}, \dots, x_{a_n}) : R \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K}), \ \mathcal{M} \models \neg R(a_1, \dots, a_n) \}$$

is finitely satisfiable, and therefore satisfiable by compactness.

In light of Proposition 2.12 above, given a structure  $\mathcal{M}$ , we overload notation, writing  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$  for  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{M})} = \mathcal{C}_{\{\mathcal{M}\}}$ , and  $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$  for  $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{M})} = \mathcal{N}\mathcal{C}_{\{\mathcal{M}\}}$ .

Remark 2.13. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure and assume that  $\mathcal{N}$  is an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure which admits an  $\mathcal{M}$ configuration, witnessed by I, f. Given a quantifier-free  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} \bigvee_{j \in J} \psi_{i,j}(\bar{x})$ , where
each  $\psi_{i,j}(\bar{x})$  is an atomic or negated atomic formula. In particular, for each  $\psi_{i,j}(\bar{x})$ , we can define

 $I(\psi_{i,j})$  to be  $I(\psi_{i,j})$  if  $\psi_{i,j}$  is a relation symbol, and  $\neg I(\psi_{i,j})$  if  $\psi_{i,j}$  is a negated relation symbol. Then, by definition:

$$\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a)$$
 if, and only if,  $\mathcal{N} \models \bigwedge_{i \in I} \bigvee_{j \in J} I(\psi_{i,j})(f(a)),$ 

for all  $a \in \mathcal{M}$ .

A somewhat different approach to coding  $\mathcal{K}$ -configurations is the focus of [Wal21]. There, the relevant notion is called *trace definability* and it is seen as a weak form of interpretability. We will not be discussing trace definability in this paper. We will only take note that, from the point of view of trace definability, the following lemma is immediate. We include a proof here for coding  $\mathcal{K}$ -configurations, for completeness.

**Proposition 2.14.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ -structure. If an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  is interpretable in  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration, then  $\mathcal{N}$  also admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration. In particular, the class  $\mathrm{NC}_{\mathcal{K}}$  is closed under bi-interpretability.

Proof. Assume that  $\mathcal{N}$  interprets  $\mathcal{M}$ . There is a definable set  $D \subseteq \mathcal{N}^m$ , a definable equivalence relation  $\sim$  on D and a bijection  $\mathcal{M} \simeq D/\sim$  which interprets  $\mathcal{M}$ . This induces a map  $*: \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ which associates to any  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ -formula  $\varphi(x)$  an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -formula  $\varphi^*(x^*)$  interpreting it (where  $|x^*| = m \times |x|$ ). Let  $s: \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}^m$  a section of the natural projection  $\mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D}/\sim$  (where we identify  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $D/\sim$ ).

If  $\mathcal{M}$  admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration via  $(I : \operatorname{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_0) \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}, (f_A : A \to \mathcal{M}^n : A \in \mathcal{K}))$ , then  $\mathcal{N}$  also admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration, via  $(* \circ I : \operatorname{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_0) \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}, (s \circ f_A : A \to \mathcal{M}^{nm} : A \in \mathcal{K}))$ . Indeed, by unravelling the definitions, we have that:

$$A \models R(a) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models I(R)(f_A(a)) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{N} \models I(R)^*(s(f_A(a))),$$

for all  $R \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_0)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  for all  $a \in A^{\operatorname{arity}(R)}$ .

We immediately deduce that the class of dp-minimal structures, and in particular, the class of monadically NIP structures cannot be of the form  $N\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$ , for any  $\mathcal{K}$ , as neither is closed under biinterpretatability. For instance, an infinite set  $\mathcal{S}$  in the language of pure equality is bi-interpretable with the full product  $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathcal{S}$  which has of dp-rank 2. Similarly, it is well-known that distality is not preserved under taking reducts. Thus the class of distal structures is not of the form  $N\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$  for any  $\mathcal{K}$ .

A version of the following lemma appears in [GP23, Proposition 5.4(4)], under the assumption the classes are strong amalgamation classes, and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a Fraïssé limit of such a class. For our purposes, we omit this requirement and introduce an elementary proof.

**Lemma 2.15.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a structure with quantifier elimination and  $\mathcal{K}$  a class of structures. Then the following are equivalent:

- 1.  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$ .
- 2.  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$ .

Proof. For  $(1 \Rightarrow 2)$  suppose that  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$  and  $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . Let I, f witness that  $\mathcal{M}$  admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ configuration, and J, g witness that  $\mathcal{N}$  admits an  $\mathcal{M}$ -configuration. By quantifier elimination, we may
assume that I(R) is quantifier-free for all  $R \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{K})$ . It is clear, using Remark 2.13, that  $g \circ f$  and  $J \circ I$  witness that  $\mathcal{N}$  admits a  $\mathcal{K}$ -configuration. For  $(2 \Rightarrow 1)$ , observe that clearly  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$  and
therefore, by assumption  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$ .

Fact 2.16 below was originally stated for classes of *finite* structures. However, notice that:

•  $\operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{K}_2) = \operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_1) \boxtimes \operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_2).$ 

- $\operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_1[\mathcal{K}_2]) = \operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_1)[\operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_2)].$
- $\operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{K}_2) = \operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_1) \sqcup \operatorname{Age}(\mathcal{K}_2).$
- If Age(𝔅<sub>1</sub>) and Age(𝔅<sub>2</sub>) contain structures of size n for every n ∈ ℕ, then Age(𝔅<sub>1</sub>) \* Age(𝔅<sub>2</sub>) = Age(𝔅<sub>1</sub> \* 𝔅<sub>2</sub>).

Therefore, by Proposition 2.12, we may phrase Fact 2.16 in the fullest generality:

**Fact 2.16** ([GPS23, Theorem 4.27]). Let  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$  be classes of structures in respective finite disjoint relational language,  $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$ . Then

$$\mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{K}_1 \boxtimes \mathfrak{K}_2} = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{K}_1 [\mathfrak{K}_2]} = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{K}_1 \sqcup \mathfrak{K}_2} = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{K}_1} \cap \mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{K}_2}.$$

If, additionaly,  $Age(\mathcal{K}_1)$  and  $Age(\mathcal{K}_2)$  both contain structures of size n for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then all of the above are also equal to  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}_1 * K_2}$ .

The fact was originally phrased under a slightly weaker assumption that  $\mathcal{K}_1$  and  $\mathcal{K}_2$  both containing structures of size n, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We note that this requirement is only needed when considering free superpositions: for the full product and lexicographic product it is precisely [GPS23, Corollary 5.16] and [GPS23, Corollary 5.12], respectively. The fact above also did not include the disjoint union, however, this equality is almost trivial.

The following theorem can be seen as a generalisation of Fact 2.16.

**Theorem 2.17.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a structure and let  $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2$  be quantifier-free reducts of  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \vee \mathcal{N}_2$  in the lattice of quantifier-free reducts of  $\mathcal{N}$ , up to interdefinability (i.e.  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{N}) = \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{N}_1) \cap \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{N}_2)$ ). Then  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}_1} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}_2} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}}$ .

Proof. The inclusion  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}_1} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}_2}$  follows almost immediately, from the fact that  $\mathcal{N}_i \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{N}$ , for  $i \in [2]$ , and does not require the assumption that  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \vee \mathcal{N}_2$ . Suppose that  $T \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}}$  and let  $\mathcal{M} \models T$  be a model admitting an  $\mathcal{N}$ -configuration, witnessed by I, f. Since  $\mathcal{N}_1 \stackrel{\text{qf}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{N}$  for each  $R \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}_1}$ , there is a quantifier-free  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ -formula  $\varphi_R$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi_R(a)$  if, and only if,  $\mathcal{N}_1 \models R(a)$ , for all  $a \in R$ . Let  $I(\varphi_R)$  be as in Remark 2.13 and define

$$J: \operatorname{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}_1}) \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$$
$$R \mapsto I(\varphi_R)$$

It is clear that f, J witness that  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}_1}$ . Similarly,  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ , and the result follows.

For the other inclusion, observe that since  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \vee \mathcal{N}_2$ , there is a structure  $\mathcal{N}'$  which is interdefinable with  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}'} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}_1} \cup \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ . By Proposition 2.14 we may assume that  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}'$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_i \models T$  and let  $I_i, f_i$  be a coding of  $\mathcal{N}_i$  in  $\mathcal{M}_i$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . By taking a common elementary extension, we may assume  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{M}$ . Then  $f_i : N_i \to \mathcal{M}^{n_i}$  for some  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $f : N \to \mathcal{M}^{n_1+n_2}$  be defined as  $f_1 \frown f_2$ , i.e.,  $f(a) := f_1(a) \frown f_2(a)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{N}$ . Let  $\pi_i$  be the obvious projection of  $\mathcal{M}^{n_1+n_2}$  onto  $\mathcal{M}^{n_i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Then, for every  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and every  $R \in \mathcal{L}_i$ , let  $I(R) := I_i \circ \pi_i$ . By construction, I, f is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -configuration in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Theorem 2.17 can be seen as a generalisation of Fact 2.16 in the context of the following observation:

Observation. Let  $\mathcal{K}$  is a class of structures, and let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the class of all finite sets. Then:

$$\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{K}\boxtimes\mathcal{E}} = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{K}[\mathcal{E}]} = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{K}]} = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{K}\sqcup\mathcal{E}}.$$

If, additionally,  $\mathcal{K}$  contains only finite structures, and it contains structures of size n for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the above are also equal to  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}*\mathcal{E}}$ . We can then deduce all the equalities in Fact 2.16 using that, up to  $\overset{\text{qf}}{\longrightarrow}$ , we have in the lattice of quantifier-free reducts we have the following:

- $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{E}] \vee \mathcal{E}[\mathcal{N}] = \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}],$
- $\mathcal{M} \boxtimes \mathcal{E} \lor \mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M} \boxtimes \mathcal{N},$
- $\mathcal{M} \sqcup \mathcal{E} \lor \mathcal{E} \sqcup \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M} \sqcup \mathcal{N},$
- $\mathcal{M} * \mathcal{E} \lor \mathcal{E} * \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M} * \mathcal{N}.$

# 3 Structural Ramsey theory through collapsing indiscernibles

The main result of this section is Theorem 3.9, which roughly says that (ages of) "higher-arity" reducts of an  $\aleph_0$ -categorical ultrahomogeneous structure cannot have the Ramsey property. The proof of the theorem is not combinatorial but uses exclusively model-theoretic tools, notably the notion of collapsing indiscernibles.

Let us start by recalling that, under some mild hypotheses, the notions of  $NC_{\mathcal{K}}$  and collapsing generalised indiscernibles are closely related. More precisely:

**Fact 3.1** ([GH19, Theorem 3.14]). Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be the Fraïssé limit of a Ramsey class with the strong amalgamation property, in a finite relational language. Then the following are equivalent for a theory T:

- 1.  $T \in \mathbb{NC}_{\mathcal{I}}$ .
- 2. T collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles.

We will use this second characterisation later, in order to prove our transfer principles. For instance, the following is immediate from Fact 2.9 combined with Fact 3.1:

**Fact 3.2.** Let  $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}$  the class of finite (n + 1)-hypergraphs. Then the following are equivalent for a first-order theory T:

- 1. T is  $NIP_n$ .
- 2. T is  $N\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}_{n+1}}$ .

The reader will find a similar statement in [CPT19, Proposition 5.2].

In the context of this section, our approach is to use Fact 3.1 as a sort of criterion to witness the Ramsey property in a given class of structures. More precisely, if given an ultrahomogeneous Fraïssé limit  $\mathcal{I}$ , if there is a theory T which codes  $\mathcal{I}$  but collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles, then we must conclude that  $\mathcal{I}$  is not Ramsey.

Notice that the underlying assumption in [GH19] is that all classes are in a *finite relational language*. We give a more general version of Fact 3.1, as we don't require that the language is finite and that the age of the structure  $\mathcal{I}$  has the *strong* amalgamation property.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an  $\aleph_0$ -categorical Fraïssé limit in a countable language. Then, for any theory  $T, T \in \mathbb{NC}_{\mathcal{I}}$  implies that T collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles.

Moreover, if  $Age(\mathcal{I})$  is Ramsey, these are equivalent.

The theorem may fail when uncountable languages are involved. (See Example 3.4 below.)

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{L}_T, \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{I}$  be the respective languages of  $T, \mathcal{I}$ .

For the first part of the theorem, we argue via contraposition. Suppose that T does not collapse  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles. Then, by definition there is some  $\mathcal{M} \models T$  and a non-collapsing  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible ( $\bar{a}_i : i \in \mathcal{I}$ ), in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  is Morleyised. We wish to show

that  $T \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}$ , so we must find some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , a function  $J : \operatorname{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}) \to \mathcal{L}$  and a function  $f : I \to M^n$  such that:

$$\mathcal{I} \models R(a) \iff \mathcal{M} \models J(R)(f(a)),$$

for all  $R \in \text{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}})$  and all  $a \in I^{\text{arity}(R)}$ .

The idea is to code the configuration along the non-collapsing sequence  $(\bar{a}_i : i \in \mathcal{I})$ , that is, to use the function  $J : i \mapsto \bar{a}_i$ , for  $i \in I$  (so  $m = |\bar{a}_i|$ ).

To this end, let  $R \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$  be an *n*-ary relation symbol. Since  $\mathcal{I}$  is  $\aleph_0$ -categorical and finitely homogeneous it has quantifier-elimination, so there are finitely many complete quantifier-free types  $p_1, \ldots, p_k \in S_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\emptyset)$ , such that:

$$\mathcal{I} \models R(i_1, \dots, i_n) \iff \mathcal{I} \models \bigvee_{j=1}^k p_j(i_1, \dots, i_n)$$
(4)

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$ .

At this point, by Lemma 2.6, we get that  $(\bar{a}_i : i \in \mathcal{I})$  is non-collapsing, in the sense of Definition 2.5. Explicitly, we have that:

$$qftp(i_1, \dots, i_n) = qftp(j_1, \dots, j_n) \iff tp(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}) = tp(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{j_n})$$
(5)

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$ .

The point is that for each quantifier-free type  $p_j$  in (4) there is a complete type  $q_j \in S_n^{\mathcal{M}}(\emptyset)$  such that:

$$\mathcal{I} \models R(i_1, \dots, i_n) \iff (\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}) \models \bigvee_{j=1}^k q_j(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n), \tag{6}$$

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}}$  be the structure  $\mathcal{M}$  expanded by an *m*-ary relation symbol *R*, where  $m = |\bar{a}_i|$ , naming precisely the tuples in the sequence  $(\bar{a}_i : i \in \mathcal{I})$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{I}} := \mathcal{L} \cup \{R\}$ . We start with the following claim:

Claim 3. The sequence  $(\bar{a}_i : i \in \mathcal{I})$  remains indiscernible in the structure  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ . In particular, it is a non-collapsing indiscernible.

Proof of Claim 3. Suppose not. Then there are  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$  and an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ -formula  $\phi(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n)$  such that:

$$qftp(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = qftp(j_1,\ldots,j_n)$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}} \models \phi(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}) \land \neg \phi(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{j_n})$$

We prove that this is impossible by induction on the complexity of  $\phi(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n)$ . It is obviously impossible for quantifier-free formulas, and, in fact, it suffices to check that it is impossible when  $\phi(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n)$  is of the form:

$$\exists \bar{y}(\bar{y} \in R \land \psi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n, y)).$$

Suppose that there is such a formula and  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$  such that:

$$\mathsf{qftp}(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = \mathsf{qftp}(j_1,\ldots,j_n)$$

and:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}} \models \exists \bar{y}(\bar{y} \in R \land \psi(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}, y)) \land \neg \exists \bar{y}(\bar{y} \in R \land \psi(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{j_n}, y))$$

In particular, there is some  $k \in \mathcal{I}$  such that:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}} \models \psi(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{i_n}, \bar{a}_k).$$

Since  $\mathcal{I}$  is ultrahomogeneous there is an automorphism  $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I})$  sending  $i_l$  to  $j_l$  for all  $l \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ . Then:

$$qftp(i_1,\ldots,i_n,k) = qftp(j_1,\ldots,j_n,\sigma(k)),$$

and, by induction, we have that:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}} \models \psi(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{j_n}, \bar{a}_{\sigma(k)})),$$

contradicting the fact that:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}} \models \neg \exists \bar{y}(\bar{y} \in R \land \psi(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_n}, y)).$$

The claim then follows.

In particular, by the claim above, Equations (5) and (6) hold in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ .

Now, let  $\mathfrak{I}$  be the structure induced by  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{I}}$  on the set  $\{\bar{a}_i : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ . It is easy to check that  $\mathfrak{I}$  has quantifier-elimination.

Since  $\mathcal{I}$  is  $\aleph_0$ -categorical, it has finitely many complete (quantifier-free) *n*-types, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and thus by (5), and since  $\Im$  has quantifier-elimination it follows that types in  $\mathcal{M}_{\Im}$  determine (quantifierfree) types in  $\Im$ . So  $\Im$  has finitely many complete *n*-types for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and thus  $\Im$  is also  $\aleph_0$ -categorical. Therefore, by replacing the types  $q_j$  in (6) by complete types in the induced structure  $\Im$ , we can assume that each  $q_j$  is isolated (along the sequence), by some  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula in  $\psi_{q_j}$ . Replacing each  $q_j$  with  $\psi_{q_j}$  in (6) we get that:

$$\mathcal{I} \models R(i_1, \dots, i_n) \iff \mathfrak{I} \models \bigvee_{j=1}^k q_j(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}),$$

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$ .

Since the domain of  $\mathfrak{I}$  is precisely the range of the function  $f: \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{M}^{|\bar{a}_i|}$ , it follows that:

$$\mathcal{I} \models R(i_1, \dots, i_n) \iff \mathcal{M} \models \bigvee_{j=1}^k q_j(f(i_1), \dots, f(i_n)),$$

Thus, setting  $J(R) := \bigvee_{j=1}^k \psi_{q_j}$ , gives us that  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}$ , as required.<sup>5</sup>

Now, for the "moreover" part, assume in addition that  $\mathcal{I}$  is Ramsey. Let  $T \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}$ , let  $\mathcal{M} \models T$ , and let  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  be an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed sequence from  $\mathcal{M}$ . Since  $T \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}$ , let  $I : \operatorname{Sig}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}) \to \mathcal{L}_T$ , as in Definition 2.10. In particular, we have that

$$\mathsf{tp}_{\mathcal{L}_T}(a_{i_1},\ldots,a_{i_n}) = \mathsf{tp}_{\mathcal{L}_T}(a_{j_1},\ldots,a_{j_n}) \implies \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}}(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}}(j_1,\ldots,j_n),$$

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$ . Notice that this implication is expressible in the language  $\mathcal{L}_T$  and is in the EM-type of the sequence  $(a_i)_I$ . Since  $\mathcal{I}$  is Ramsey, we can find, in some elementary extension  $\mathcal{M}' \succ \mathcal{M}$ , an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence  $(b_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{M}' \succ \mathcal{M}$  based on  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ , by Fact 2.3. This new sequence also satisfies the previous implication. By definition of  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibility, we also have that

$$\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}}(i_1,\ldots,i_n) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}}(j_1,\ldots,j_n) \implies \mathsf{tp}_{\mathcal{L}_T}(b_{i_1},\ldots,b_{i_n}) = \mathsf{tp}_{\mathcal{L}_T}(b_{j_1},\ldots,b_{j_n})$$

for all  $i_1, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n \in \mathcal{I}$ . In particular, combining the two implications, we see that the sequence  $(b_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is non-collapsing, and hence, by Lemma 2.6, T does not collapse  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles.

◄

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Observe that the Ramsey assumption was not used in this implication. It will, however, be used in the converse.

We revisit Example 2.8 to show an obstruction when the indexing structure is not Ramsey and the language is not countable. Of course, we will be primarily interested in Ramsey structures in the sequel, and thus this non-example should not be a cause for concern. Nonetheless, it illustrates the necessity of working in a countable language, for the coding/indexing structure.

**Example 3.4.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be the set  $\mathbb{N}$  equipped with its full set-theoretic structure, and  $\mathcal{N}_S$  be its reduct to unary predicates for singleton. We can see that  $\mathcal{N}_S$  doesn't collapse  $\mathcal{N}$ -indiscernible (in the sense of Definition 2.5) but we have clearly that  $\mathcal{N}_S \in \mathbb{NC}_{\mathcal{N}}$ .

We will observe now that an n-ary structure automatically collapses indiscernibles indexed by a higher arity structure. First, we recall the definitions:

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a relational  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure. We say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is:

- 1. *n*-ary, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , if it admits quantifier elimination in a relational language that consists only of relation symbols of arity at most n.
- 2. *irreflexive* if for all relation symbols P in  $\mathcal{L}$  and tuples  $\overline{i} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{arity}(P)}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{M} \models \neg P(\overline{i})$  if an element occurs twice in  $\overline{i}$ .

The following is clear:

Remark 3.6. Given a relational language  $\mathcal{L}'$  and an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure  $\mathcal{I}$ , we may always find a quantifier-free interdefinable language  $\mathcal{L}''$  such that, as an  $\mathcal{L}''$ -structure,  $\mathcal{I}$  is irreflexive. Moreover it can be done in such a way that the notion of quantifier-free type remains the same: for all tuples  $\bar{i}, \bar{j}$  we have  $\mathsf{qftp}^{\mathcal{L}'}(\bar{i}) = \mathsf{qftp}^{\mathcal{L}'}(\bar{j})$  if, and only if,  $\mathsf{qftp}^{\mathcal{L}''}(\bar{i}) = \mathsf{qftp}^{\mathcal{L}''}(\bar{j})$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** Let n be a positive integer and consider a relational language  $\mathcal{L}'$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}$  be the sublanguage consisting of symbols of arity less or equal to n. Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an irreflexive  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure and  $\mathcal{J}$  the reduct to  $\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}$ . Then any n-ary structure  $\mathcal{M}$  collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles to  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernibles.

Proof. Denote by  $\mathcal{L}$  a relational language with symbols of arity at most n, in which  $\mathcal{M}$  admits quantifier elimination. Let  $(a_i)_{i\in I}$  be an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence of elements in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We need to show that  $(a_i)_{i\in I}$ is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible. By quantifier elimination, it is enough to check that, for any relation  $R \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $(a_i)_{i\in I}$  is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible with respect to the formula  $R(\bar{x})$ . Consider two arity(R)-tuples  $\bar{i}$  and  $\bar{j}$  such that  $qftp^{\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}}(i) = qftp^{\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}}(j)$ . By irreflexivity of  $\mathcal{I}$ , and since  $\bar{i}$  has fewer than n elements, we have  $qftp^{\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}}(\bar{i}) \vdash qftp^{\mathcal{L}'}(\bar{i})$ , and similarly for  $\bar{j}$ . In particular, it follows that  $qftp^{\mathcal{L}'}(\bar{i}) = qftp^{\mathcal{L}'}(\bar{j})$ , and thus, by  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibility,  $\mathcal{M} \models R(a_{\bar{i}}) \leftrightarrow R(a_{\bar{j}})$ , and the result follows.

**Example 3.8.** We illustrate Proposition 3.7 with some useful examples:

- 1. Let  $\mathcal{I} = \text{Flim}(\mathcal{OC})$  be the binary branching *C*-relation equipped with a convex order. Then any binary structure  $\mathcal{M}$  collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles to order-indiscernibles. Since  $\mathcal{OC}$  is Ramsey, by Fact 3.1,  $\mathcal{M} \in \text{NC}_{\mathcal{OC}}$ .
- 2. Let  $\mathcal{I} = \text{Flim}(\mathcal{COD})$  be the binary branching *D*-relation equipped with a convex cyclic order. Then any ternary structure  $\mathcal{M}$  collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible to cyclically ordered-indiscernibles.

**Theorem 3.9.** Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be an n-ary  $\aleph_0$ -categorical ultrahomogeneous structure in a relational language  $\mathcal{L}$ , and let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a non-n-ary reduct of  $\mathcal{J}$  which is ultrahomogeneous in a finite relational language  $\mathcal{L}'$ . Then  $\mathsf{Age}(\mathcal{I})$  is not a Ramsey class.

*Proof.* As a reduct of  $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}$  is also  $\aleph_0$ -categorical ultrahomogeneous. Assume  $\mathcal{I}$  is Ramsey. Let  $\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}$  be the sublanguage of  $\mathcal{L}'$  consisting of symbols of arity less or equal to n. Since  $\mathcal{I} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{J}$ , clearly  $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}$ , therefore, by Fact 3.1,  $\mathcal{J}$  does not collapse  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles. On the other hand, by Proposition 3.7,  $\mathcal{J}$  collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles to  $\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}}$ . By assumption, since  $\mathcal{I}$  is not n-ary,  $\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}'_{\leq n}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{I}$ , and thus we have a contradiction.

For the remainder of this section, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}_n^o} = \{R, <\}$  be a language with a binary relation symbol < and and an *n*-ary relation symbol *R*. By an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}_n^o}$ -structure we shall always mean a structure in which < is a (total) linear order and *R* is a uniform symmetric *n*-ary relation (i.e.  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}_n^o}$  structures are ordered *n*-uniform hypergraphs, in the sense of Subsection 1.2).

**Proposition 3.10.** Let  $n \geq 2$  and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}_n^o}$ -structure and  $\mathcal{N}$  be a reduct of  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $\mathcal{M} \upharpoonright \{<\} \simeq \mathcal{N} \simeq \mathcal{M}$  then  $\mathcal{N}$  is not n-ary.

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{N}$  is a proper reduct of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$  preserves <, we must have that  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$  does not preserve R. Therefore, there are  $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$  such that

$$\mathcal{M} \models R(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \land \neg R(g(a_1), \ldots, g(a_n)).$$

By symmetry, we may assume that  $a_1 < \cdots < a_n$ . Since g preserves < we have that  $g(a_1) < \cdots < g(a_n)$ . Observe that for all  $x_1, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_n \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $x_1 < \cdots < x_n$  and  $y_1 < \ldots y_n$ , there is some  $f \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$  such that  $y_i = f(x_i)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Indeed, letting  $f_1, f_2 \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$  such that  $f_1(x_i) = a_i$  and  $f_2(g(a_i)) = y_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we have that  $f = f_2 \circ g \circ f_1$  is as stated. So the only non-trivial definable relation in  $\mathcal{N}$  of arity  $\leq n$  is <. As  $\mathcal{N} \nleftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \upharpoonright \{<\}$ , this implies  $\mathcal{N}$  is not n-ary.

**Theorem 3.11.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  be a non-trivial reduct of  $\mathfrak{OH}_n$ , other than DLO. Then  $\mathcal{M}$  is not Ramsey.

The proof of Theorem 3.11 will make use of the following fact:

**Fact 3.12** ([MP23, Theorem B]). Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a Ramsey class of  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structures and  $\mathcal{N}$  an  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure such that  $Age(\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{C}$ . Then there is an  $Aut(\mathcal{N})$ -invariant linear order on  $\mathcal{N}$  which is the union of quantifier-free types. More explicitly, there is a (possibly infinite) Boolean combination of atomic and negated atomic  $\mathcal{L}'$ -formulas  $\Phi(x, y) := \bigvee_{i \in I} \bigwedge_{j \in J_i} \varphi_{j_i}^{(-1)^{n_{j_i}}}(x, y)$ , such that  $\Phi$  is a linear order for every structure in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Proof of Theorem 3.11. Assume towards contradiction  $\mathcal{N}$  is Ramsey. Then, by Fact 3.12, there is a linear order  $\triangleleft$  on  $\mathcal{N}$  which is a union of quantifier-free types in  $\mathcal{N}$ . As  $\mathcal{N}$  is a quantifier-free reduct of  $\mathcal{M}$ , we see that  $\triangleleft$  is a union of quantifier-free types in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Claim 4. The order  $\triangleleft$  is either  $\lt$  or >.

Proof of Claim 4. This is clear when  $n \ge 3$ , since R is uniform and thus the only quantifier-free types in two variables in  $\mathcal{M}$  are x < y and x > y. As  $\triangleleft$  is antisymmetric, it cannot be equivalent to  $x < y \lor x > y$ .

We now discuss the case where n = 2. In this case, the only quantifier-free types in  $\mathcal{M}$  are:

- 1.  $x < y \land R(x, y)$ .
- 2.  $x > y \land R(x, y)$ .
- 3.  $x < y \land \neg R(x, y)$ .
- 4.  $x > y \land \neg R(x, y)$ .

It is left as an exercise to the reader to verify that the only unions of the types above that define a linear order in the random graph are the following:

$$(x < y \land R(x,y)) \lor (x < y \land \neg R(x,y))$$
 and  $(x > y \land R(x,y)) \lor (x > y \land \neg R(x,y))$ ,

again, it follows that  $\triangleleft$  is either  $\langle$  or  $\rangle$ .

◀

By Claim 4, we have that  $\mathcal{M} \upharpoonright \{ < \} \curvearrowright \mathcal{N} \simeq \mathcal{N} \simeq \mathcal{M}$ . Therefore, by Proposition 3.10,  $\mathcal{N}$  is not *n*-ary. By [Tho96, Theorem 2.7], we know that  $\mathcal{N}$  is finitely homogeneous, therefore by Theorem 3.9,  $\mathcal{N}$  is not Ramsey.

*Remark* 3.13. In fact, a slightly more careful analysis of the proof of Theorem 3.11 allows us to deduce a slightly more general result. We state it, and explain how to deduce it from the proof of Theorem 3.11 below.

**Corollary 3.14.** Let  $n \ge 2$  and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\aleph_0$ -categorical ultrahomogeneous  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}_n^o}$ -structure. If  $\mathcal{M}$  is not interdefinable with  $(M, <_1, <_2)$ , where  $<_1$  and  $<_2$  are two (independent) linear orders, then every proper quantifier-free reduct  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ , which is not interdefinable with  $\mathcal{M} \upharpoonright \{<\}$  is not Ramsey.

*Proof.* In the case n = 2, in the proof of Claim 4, the only other unions of quantifier-free types that we would need to consider are:

 $(x < y \land R(x, y)) \lor (x > y \land \neg R(x, y))$  and  $(x > y \land R(x, y)) \lor (x < y \land \neg R(x, y)).$ 

But, if either of the formulas above defines a linear order on  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $\mathcal{M}$  is interdefinable with a structure  $(M, <_1, <_2)$ , where  $<_1$  and  $<_2$  are independent linear orders, which is a contradiction.

By [Bod15, Proposition 2.23], the class of finite cyclically ordered binary branching *D*-relations COD is not Ramsey, since no total order is definable in FLim(COD). We can see that, adding a generic order will not suffice to turn the class into a Ramsey class:

**Example 3.15.** The free superposition  $\mathcal{LO} * \mathcal{COD}$  is an amalgamation class, but is not a Ramsey class. Indeed,  $\mathsf{FLim}(\mathcal{LO} * \mathcal{COD})$  is a reduct of  $\mathsf{FLim}(\mathcal{LO} * \mathcal{OC})$ . The latter is ternary, while the former is not. Therefore, by Theorem 3.9, the former is not Ramsey.

## 4 Transfer principles

We study transfer principles for products, full and lexicographic, with respect to monadic NIP, distality, and N $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$ . The common point of these properties is that they admit characterisations involving indiscernibility (and potentially some other notions). Our main tool we will thus be a description of indiscernible sequences, both for full and lexicographic product.

#### 4.1 Transfers in full products

In this section, we will observe that the full product behaves nicely with respect to the notion collapsing indiscernible to a specified reduct, but not necessarily for the dividing line arising from coding structures. It is fairly easy to describe indiscernible sequences in a full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  (see next Proposition 4.4). This characterisation has some interesting consequences that we will collect here for the sake of completeness.

We first observe that the full product of structures  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is almost never monadically NIP (or, for that matter, monadically anything).

**Proposition 4.1.** Assume  $\mathcal{M}_i$  is NIP for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . We have  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is NIP of dp-rank dp  $- \operatorname{rk}(\mathcal{M}_1) + \operatorname{dp} - \operatorname{rk}(\mathcal{M}_2)$ .

One can find a proof in [Tou23, Proposition 1.24]. We deduce immediately the following remark:

**Corollary 4.2.** A full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  of infinite structures is never monadically NIP, as it has burden at least 2 by the previous proposition. Indeed,  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is monadically NIP precisely when one of the structures is finite and the other is monadically NIP. Another negative result is that  $NC_{\mathcal{K}}$  is not always stable under full products. We illustrate this in the following example:

**Example 4.3.** Recall that we denote by OG the class of finite ordered graphs, and by OC the class of finite convexly ordered binary branching *C*-relations. Let us consider the product  $OG \boxtimes OC$  of the two classes. The ordered random graph  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $NC_{OC}$  because the random graph is a binary structure, and therefore collapses OC-indiscernibles to order-indiscernibles (see Example 3.8). In particular,  $\mathcal{M} \in NC_{OG \boxtimes OC}$ . The generic *C*-relation  $\mathcal{N}$  induced by a binary tree is  $NC_{OG}$  as it is NIP, so again,  $\mathcal{N} \in NC_{OG \boxtimes OC}$ . However, one can observe that  $\mathcal{M} \boxtimes \mathcal{N} \notin NC_{OG \boxtimes OC}$ , since  $\mathcal{M} \boxtimes \mathcal{N}$  is the Fraïssé limit of  $OG \boxtimes OC$ .

Intuitively,  $NC_{09\boxtimes0C}$  fails to be stable by full products because  $09\boxtimes0C$ -indexed sequences can collapse to two orthogonal notions of indiscerniblity, namely N-indiscernibles and M-indiscernibles.

Example 4.3 above shows in particular that the hierarchy of  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{K}}$ -configuration is not linearly ordered. By the above, we have indeed that  $\mathcal{OG} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{OC}}$  and  $\mathcal{OC} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{OG}}$ . Using Lemma 2.15, we obtain:

Above  $\mathcal{LO}$  is the class of linear orders, and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the class of finite (unstructured) sets. The key is to observe that:

- $C_{OG} \not\subseteq C_{OC}$ , which follows from Item 1 of Example 3.8 together with Lemma 2.15.
- $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{OC}} \not\subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{OG}}$  which follows from the fact that, as discussed above, the generic *C*-relation is NIP, so, in particular it belongs to N $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{OG}}$ , but of course it also belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{OC}}$ .

This provides a negative answer to the question asked in [GP23, Section 7] and [GPS23, Question 5.6] about linearity of the hierarchy.

Now, we will obtain positive results, using the following proposition:

**Proposition 4.4.** A sequence  $(\bar{c}_i)_{i \in I}$  in  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed indiscernible if and only if  $(\pi_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\bar{c}_i))_{i \in I}$  is an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $(\pi_{\mathcal{M}_2}(\bar{c}_i))_{i \in I}$  is an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

To clarify the notation, if  $\bar{c} = c_1, \ldots, c_n$  is a tuple of  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$ , the components can be in any of the three sorts, and we denote by  $\pi_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\bar{c})$  the tuple of size at most n consisting of the projections  $\pi_{\mathcal{M}_1}(c_i)$  if  $c_i \in \mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$ , and of the elements  $c_i$  if  $c_i \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . In particular, we removed the components  $c_i \in \mathcal{M}_2$ .

*Proof.* By relative quantifier elimination, a formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  in  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2}$  is equivalent modulo the theory of  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  to a union of formulas of the form:

$$\varphi_1(\pi_{M_1}(\bar{x})) \wedge \varphi_2(\pi_{M_2}(\bar{x})).$$

where  $\varphi_1(\bar{x}_1)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ -formula and  $\varphi_2(\bar{x}_2)$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ -formula. Let  $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in I}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$ , where I is an ordered set. To check whether  $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in I}$  is an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed indiscernible sequence, it is necessary and sufficient to check if  $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in I}$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible with respect to the formulas  $\varphi_i(\pi_{\mathcal{M}_i}(x))$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . But this is exactly to check whether the sequence  $(\pi_{\mathcal{M}_1}(\bar{c}_i))_i$  is an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and the sequence  $(\pi_{\mathcal{M}_2}(\bar{c}_i))_i$  is an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

We immediately deduce transfer principles for full products with respect to some properties which can easily be described with indiscernibles.

**Corollary 4.5.** Consider  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  two structures such that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a reduct of  $\mathcal{I}$ . The full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles to  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernibles if and only if  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  collapse  $\mathcal{I}$ indiscernibles to  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernibles.

The following corollary is immediate from Corollary 4.5 together with the characterisation of  $NIP_n$  via an indiscernible collapse (Fact 2.9).

**Corollary 4.6** (NIP<sub>n</sub> transfer for full products). For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is NIP<sub>n</sub> if, and only if, both  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are NIP<sub>n</sub>.

**Proposition 4.7.** The full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is distal if, and only if,  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is distal and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is distal.

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is distal, we see easily that  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are distal. To prove the right-to-left implication, assume that  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are both distal, and let  $((a_i, b_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$ , and B a set of parameters in  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  such that:

1.  $((a_i, b_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}}$  is indiscernible over B,

2.  $((a_i, b_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  is indiscernible.

By the characterisation in Proposition 4.4, we have

- 1.  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}}$  is indiscernible over  $\pi_{\mathcal{M}_1}(B)$ ,
- 2.  $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  is indiscernible,
- 3.  $(b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}}$  is indiscernible over  $\pi_{\mathcal{M}_2}(B)$ ,
- 4.  $(b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  is indiscernible.

By distality in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , we have:

- 1.  $(a_i)_{i\in}$  is indiscernible over  $\pi_{\mathcal{M}_1}(B)$ ,
- 2.  $(b_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$  is indiscernible over  $\pi_{\mathcal{M}_2}(B)$ ,

Again by the characterisation,  $((a_i, b_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$  is indiscernible over B. This shows that  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is distal and concludes the proof.

Similarly one can show more generally that m-distality also transfers to the full product.

**Corollary 4.8.** The full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is n-distal if, and only if,  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is n-distal and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is n-distal.

We leave the proof to the reader. We will discuss again the notion of m-distality in Proposition 4.25, where we show the transfer for lexicographic products.

**Proposition 4.9.** The full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  has indiscernible-triviality if, and only if,  $\mathcal{M}_1$  has indiscernible-triviality and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  has indiscernible-triviality.

*Proof.* Remark that any model of the theory of  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is a full product. We may thus assume that  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is a monster model. The left-to-right implication follows from the definition: an indiscernible sequence of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  (or of  $\mathcal{M}_2$ ) is in particular an indiscernible sequence of  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$ .

For the right-to-left implication, let  $(c_i)$  be a sequence of tuples in  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  which is indiscernible over a set of parameters B and over another set of parameters C. Since the projection are in the language, we may assume without loss that  $B = B_1 \times B_2 \subset \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$  and  $C = C_1 \times C_2 \subset \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ . By the characterisation,  $(\pi_{M_1}(c_i) \frown B_1)$  and  $(\pi_{M_1}(c_i) \frown C_1)$  are indiscernible in  $\mathcal{M}_1$ . By indiscernibletriviality of  $\mathcal{M}_1$ ,  $(\pi_{M_1}(c_i) \frown B_1 \frown C_1)$  is indiscernible in  $\mathcal{M}_1$ . Similarly,  $(\pi_{M_2}(c_i) \frown B_2 \frown C_2)$  is indiscernible in  $\mathcal{M}_2$  and by the characterisation,  $(c_i \frown B \frown C)_{i \in I}$  is indiscernible in  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$ .  $\Box$ 

#### 4.2 Transfers in lexicographic sums

Through this subsection, we consider the lexicographic sum S of an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  and a class of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures  $\mathfrak{N} := {\mathcal{N}_a}_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$ . We will always assume the following:

For every sentence 
$$\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$$
, the set  $\{a \in \mathcal{M} \mid \mathcal{N}_a \models \varphi\}$  is  $\emptyset$ -definable in  $\mathcal{M}$ . (\*)

This technical assumption ensures that the induced structure on the sort for M in S is exactly the  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  (this is a consequence of Theorem 1.20). Concretely, this means that we will often work with more colours on the structure  $\mathcal{M}$  than initially intended. Since most of the notions that we will consider in our application are preserved under taking reducts, this will be a harmless assumption.

We should, as for the full product, describe the generalised indiscernible sequences of  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  in terms of generalised indiscernibility in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_i$ . But unlike the full product, some assumptions will have to be made on the kinds of indexing structures we consider. We start with the following motivating example:

**Example 4.10.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an infinite set, in the language of pure equality, say  $\mathcal{M} = \omega$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  be an infinite set equipped with an equivalence relation with two infinite equivalence classes, say  $\mathcal{N} = R \sqcup B$ , where R and B are disjoint copies of  $\omega$ . The lexicographic product  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  is precisely an infinite set equipped with two equivalence relations  $E_1, E_2$  such that all  $E_i$ -classes for i = 1, 2 are infinite,  $E_2$  refines  $E_1$  and each  $E_1$ -class is refined by exactly two  $E_2$ -classes. To fix notation, we may write

$$\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}] = \bigsqcup (\{i\} \times (\{r_i^j : j \in \omega\} \sqcup \{b_i^j : j \in \omega\})),$$

and for  $(w, x), (y, z) \in \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  we have:

- $(w, x)E_1(y, z)$  if, and only if, w = y.
- $(w,x)E_2(y,z)$  if, and only if w = y and either  $(x = r_w^j) \wedge (z = r_w^k)$  or  $(x = r_w^j) \wedge (z = r_w^k)$ , for some  $j, k \in \omega$ .

Let  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  be the reduct of  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  to  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{J}} = \{E_1\}$ , i.e. an infinite set equipped with an equivalence relation with infinitely many infinite equivalence classes.

Consider the sequence:

$$A = (((i, r_i^j) : j \in \omega) \frown ((i, b_i^j) : j \in \omega) : i \in \omega))$$

We may view this as a  $\mathcal{J}$ -indexed sequence in  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$ , where  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  is taken with the same enumeration as A. By quantifier elimination in  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$ , this sequence is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if we view this sequence as an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed sequence, with the same enumeration, it is not  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible.

Let us consider the "factors" of the sequence A, that is, the sequences:

• v(A), consisting of the first coordinates of the elements appearing in A, with the same enumeration, so:

$$v(A) = ((i: j \in \omega) \frown (i: j \in \omega): i \in \omega).$$

A<sub>i</sub>, for i ∈ ω, consisting of the second coordinantes of elements in A whose first coordinate is i, so:

$$A_i = (r_i^j : j \in \omega) \frown (b_i^j : j \in \omega)$$

We can view both sequences above as  $\mathcal{I}$ -indexed sequences in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$ , respectively. In both cases we can make sure that the sequences are  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible (for v(A) we make sure that whenever two elements are equal they are in the same  $E_1$ -class, and for  $A_i$  we make sure that the  $E_1$ -classes refine the equivalence relation of  $\mathcal{N}$ ). The upshot of the previous example is that it is possible to have a  $\mathcal{J}$ -indexed sequence in a lexicographic product whose components are  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible, but which is not  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible. We investigate conditions on  $\mathcal{I}$  that allow us to formulate a relatively simple characterisation of  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles in a lexicographic sum in terms of  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles in the summands.

First, to fix some terminology, given a structure  $\mathcal{I}$  We define the following graphs on  $\{0,1\} \times \mathcal{I}$ :

$$C := \{ ((\epsilon, i), (1 - \epsilon, i)) : i \in \mathcal{I}, \epsilon \in \{0, 1\} \},\$$

and

$$D := \{((\epsilon, i), (\epsilon, j)) : i, j \in \mathcal{I}, \epsilon \in \{0, 1\}\}$$

These are shown below:



Figure 1: The graphs C and D

**Definition 4.11.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a structure. The structure  $\mathcal{I}$  is called a reasonable indexing structure or simply reasonable if for every graph R on  $\{0,1\} \times I$  such that  $R((\epsilon_0, i), (\epsilon_1, j))$  depends only on  $qftp_{\mathcal{I}}(i, j)$  and on  $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ , one of the following holds:

- 1. R is connected (i.e. there is a path joining any two vertices of  $\{0,1\} \times I$ ),
- 2. R is contained in C (i.e. it is a subgraph of  $(\{0,1\} \times I, C))$ ,
- 3. R is contained in D (i.e. it is a subgraph of  $(\{0,1\} \times I, D)$ ).

It is clear that the structure  $\mathcal{M}$  from Example 4.10 is not reasonable. Of course, that structure does not have the modelling property. The next example shows that the modelling property on  $\mathcal{I}$  does not imply that  $\mathcal{I}$  is a reasonable indexing structure.

**Example 4.12.** An infinite linear order  $(\mathcal{M}, <)$  equipped with an equivalence relation E with infinitely many, infinite, convex equivalence classes is not a reasonable indexing structure. Indeed, consider the graph  $(\{0,1\} \times M, R)$  where for  $a, b \in M$  and  $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in \{0,1\}, R((\epsilon_0, a), (\epsilon_1, b))$  if, and only if, aEb and  $\epsilon_0 \neq \epsilon_1$ .



One sees by definition that the edge relation of this graph depends only on the quantifier-free type of the nodes, but this graph does not satisfy any of the conditions 1,2 and 3 of Definition 4.11.

The definition of reasonability may seem rather ad hoc, at first sight. We will show that modulo some mild assumptions,  $\mathcal{I}$  is reasonable precisely when it is *primitive*. To this end, let us recall some terminology from permutation group theory. We say that a permutation group G acting on a set  $\Omega$  acts *primitively* if the only G-invariant equivalence relations on  $\Omega$  are trivial (i.e. *equality* and *universality*). In the context of first-order structures, we have the following definition:

**Definition 4.13** (Primitivity). We say that an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  is *primitive* if Aut( $\mathcal{M}$ ) acts primitively on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Explicitly,  $\mathcal{M}$  is primitive if, and only if, the only Aut( $\mathcal{M}$ )-invariant equivalence relations on  $\mathcal{M}$  are trivial.

**Proposition 4.14.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an infinite ultrahomogeneous structure in a finite relational language. Then, the following are equivalent:

- 1.  $\mathcal{I}$  is reasonable,
- 2.  $\mathcal{I}$  is primitive.

Proof.

 $(1 \Rightarrow 2)$  Assume  $\mathcal{I}$  is reasonable, and let E be a non-trivial Aut( $\mathcal{I}$ )-invariant equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{I}$ . Since  $\mathcal{I}$  is ultrahomogeneous, in a finite relational language, E must be quantifier-free definable. Now, we may define the graph R on  $\{0,1\} \times M$  as follows: For  $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in \{0,1\}$ ,

 $R((\epsilon_0, a), (\epsilon_1, b))$  if and only if aEb.

By definition, the edges between the nodes  $(\epsilon_0, a)$ ,  $(\epsilon_1, b)$  depend only on the quantifier-free type of a, b, and the  $\epsilon_i$ . Since E is non-trivial there is a class with at least two elements; thus, the graph is not contained in the graphs C, D from Definition 4.11. It follows that the graph must be connected. But then, by transitivity of E, we must have that aEb for all  $a, b \in I$ . Thus, Eis the universality equivalence relation, contradicting our initial assumption.

 $(2 \Rightarrow 1)$  Assume  $\mathcal{I}$  is not reasonable. Then, by definition, we can find a graph R on  $\{0,1\} \times \mathcal{I}$  such that  $R((\epsilon_0, a), (\epsilon_1, b))$  depends only on  $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1$  and on the quantifier-free type of a, b, which is not connected, and not included in the graphs C and D from Definition 4.11. We can define two equivalence relations  $E_{\epsilon}$ , for  $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$ , by setting  $aE_{\epsilon}b$  if, and only if,  $(\epsilon, a)$  and  $(\epsilon, b)$  are connected. By assumption on R, it follows that  $E_{\epsilon}$  is Aut( $\mathcal{I}$ )-invariant. If either  $E_0$  or  $E_1$  is not trivial, then we are done. Thus, we may assume, without loss of generality, that they both are trivial.

We first show that  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  cannot both have a single equivalence class. Suppose not, then there are no edges of the form R((0, a), (1, b)), for otherwise the graph would be connected. But then, the graph would be included in D, which is absurd.

Assume now that  $E_1$  has one equivalence class and  $E_0$  has only singleton classes, it is easy to deduce from the conditions on R that there must be exactly one element (0, i) which connects with some elements (1, j) on the top row.



Then, we have a non trivial  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I})$ -equivalence relation E with given by

$$E(j', j)$$
 if and only if  $j = j' = i$  or  $(j \neq i \text{ and } j' \neq i)$ .

By symmetry, we may assume now that both  $E_0$  and  $E_1$  are trivial with singleton classes. In particular, this means that R is the edge relation of a bipartite graph.

Let  $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$ . We say there is a *jump* from a to b if R((0, a), (1, b)). Observe that, by assumption on R, for any  $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I})$  and any  $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$ , if there is a jump from a to b then there will also be a jump from  $\sigma(a)$  to  $\sigma(b)$ .



We see that, given that  $E_1$  is trivial with singleton classes, an element can jump to at most one element. Indeed, suppose not then there is some vertex with two different edges to  $\{1\} \times \mathcal{I}$ , say R((0,a), (1,b)) and R((0,a), (1,b')), but then (1,b) and (1,b') lie on the same path, which is a contradiction.



If an element does not jump to any other element, we can define a two-class  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I})$ -invariant equivalence relation as follows: one class for jumping elements and one class for non-jumping elements. Similarly, if there is some  $b \in \mathcal{I}$  such that no element jumps to b, we can again define an analogous two-class  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I})$ -invariant equivalent relation.

Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that we have a well-defined bijection  $j : \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{I}$  given by  $a \mapsto b$ , when a jumps to b. We have the following  $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I})$ -invariant equivalence relation  $\sim_j$  given by:

 $a \sim_j b$  if, and only if, there is an integer  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $j^n(a) = b$ .

Clearly, there must exist elements  $a \neq b$  such that a jumps to b, otherwise R would be contained in the graph C from Definition 4.11. Thus, the equivalence relation  $\sim_j$  has a non-singleton class. If  $\sim_j$  is not universal, i.e. has at least two classes, then we are done. Otherwise, there is exactly one class, and we may consider the equivalence relation  $\sim_{j^2}$  given by the squared function  $j^2$ , and which has exactly 2 disjoint equivalence classes. We showed that  $\mathcal{I}$  is not primitive.

**Lemma 4.15.** If  $\mathcal{I}$  is a transitive Fraïssé limit of a free amalgamation class  $\mathcal{C}$ , possibly endowed with a generic order, then  $\mathcal{I}$  is a reasonable indexing structure.

Proof. Let G be a graph on  $\{0,1\} \times \mathcal{I}$  with edge relation  $R((\epsilon_0, i), (\epsilon_1, j))$  which only depends on the quantifier-free type of (i, j) and  $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ . Assume it is not included in C nor D. We need to show that G is connected. Let  $i_0, i'_0 \in \mathcal{I}$ , we will show that there is a path between  $(0, i_0)$  and  $(0, i'_0)$ . The other paths from  $(\epsilon_0, i_0)$  and  $(\epsilon_1, i'_0)$  for  $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 \in \{0, 1\}$  can be deduced similarly. Since G is not included in C nor D, there exists some  $i \neq i_1 \in I$  such that there is a path of length at most 2 from (0, i)  $(1, i_1)$ .

We claim that such a path could have one of the following two forms:



Suppose we are not in the first case. Then G contains no edges of the form R((0,i),(1,j)), for  $i \neq j$ . Since G is not contained in either C nor D it must contain at least one edge of the form R((0,i),(0,j)) and at least one edge of the form R((0,i),(1,i)). But in this case, it must contain all edges of the form R((0,i),(1,i)), since by transitivity  $qftp_{\mathcal{I}}(i)$  is constant, for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , and thus it contains the second path.

We assume that we are in the first case since the argument below will work identically for the second. By transitivity, we may assume that  $i_0 = i$ . By transitivity, again, there is some  $i'_1$  with  $qftp_{\mathcal{I}}(i_0, i_1) = qftp_{\mathcal{I}}(i'_0, i'_1)$ . Without loss of generality, in what follows we assume that  $i_1 < i_0$ , in  $\mathcal{I}$ , and the case  $i_0 < i_1$  follows by an almost identical argument.

By freely amalgamating  $\{i_0, i'_0, i_1\}$  and  $\{i_0, i'_0, i'_1\}$  over  $\{i_0, i'_0\}$  we can find a structure  $\{k_0, k'_0, k_1, k'_1\}$ in  $\mathbb{C}$  such that  $\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(i_0, i'_0) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(k_0, k'_0)$  and  $\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(i_0, i_1) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(k_0, k_1) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(k'_0, k'_1)$  and there are no relations between  $k_1$  and  $k'_1$ . Now, since  $\mathcal{I}$  is ultrahomogeneous, there is some  $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}})$ such that  $\sigma(k_0) = i_0$  and  $\sigma(k'_0) = i'_0$ . We let  $i_2 := \sigma(k_1)$  and  $i'_2 := \sigma(k'_1)$ . It is now immediate, by construction, that  $\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(i_0, i_1) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(i_0, i_2) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(i'_0, i'_2)$ , and that there are no relations between  $i_2$  and  $i'_2$ . Since the order in  $\mathcal{I}$  is generic, we can choose, in  $\mathcal{I}$ ,  $i_2, i'_2$  so that  $i_2 < i_0$  and  $i'_2 < i'_0$ . In particular, this means that  $\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(i_0, i_1) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(i_0, i_2) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(i'_0, i'_2)$ . So, by assumption on R, we have that  $R((0, i_0), (1, i_2))$  and that  $R((0, i'_0), (1, i'_2))$ .

We now use free amalgamation again, this time amalgamating  $\{i_0, i_2\}$  and  $\{i'_0, i'_2\}$  over  $i_0$ , which we identify with  $i'_0$ , since they have the same quantifier-free type, and we obtain a structure  $\{p_0, p_2, p'_2\} \in \mathbb{C}$  where  $\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(p_0, p_2) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(i_0, i_2)$ ,  $\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(p_0, p'_2) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(i_0, i'_2)$  and there are no relations between  $p_2$  and  $p'_2$ . But observe that this means that  $\mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(i_2, i'_2) = \mathsf{qftp}_{\mathcal{L}}(p_2, p'_2)$ , so there is an automorphism  $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}})$  such that  $\sigma(p_2) = i_2$  and  $\sigma(p'_2) = i'_2$ . Let  $j_0 := \sigma(p_0)$ .



Then we have that  $\operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(i_0, i_1) = \operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(j_0, i_2) = \operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}|_{\mathcal{L}}}(j_0, i_2')$ , and, again, since the order is generic, we may assume that  $j_0 > i_2, i_2'$ . It follows that  $\operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}}(i_0, i_1) = \operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}}(j_0, i_2) = \operatorname{qftp}_{\mathcal{I}}(j_0, i_2')$ . Thus G contains the path:  $R((0, i_0), (1, i_2)), R((1, i_2), (0, j_0)), R((0, j_0), (1, i_2'))$ , and  $R((1, i_2'), (0, i_0'))$  as required.

*Remark* 4.16. In particular, combining Proposition 4.14 and Lemma 4.15 we extend [MT11, Lemma 2.6], which states that transitive Fraïssé limits of free amalgamation classes are primitive, to transitive Fraïssé limits of free amalgamation classes with a generic order.

Under this assumption of reasonable index sequence, we can describe the  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequences in the lexicographic sum  $\mathcal{S}$ :

**Proposition 4.17.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure,  $\mathfrak{N} = {\mathcal{N}_a}_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$  be a collection  $\mathfrak{N}$  of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures indexed by  $\mathcal{M}$  and let  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a reasonable indexing structure, and let  $(c_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  be a sequence of tuples of size  $\lambda$  (possibly infinite) in  $\mathcal{S}$ . For  $a \in \mathcal{M}$ , denote by  $(c_i^a)_{i \in I}$  the sequence of subtuples  $c_i^a := (c_{\kappa_0,i}, c_{\kappa_1,i}, \cdots) \subseteq c_i$  consisting of all the elements  $c_{\kappa_j,i}$  of  $c_i$  such that  $v(c_{\kappa_j,i})$  is equal to a. Then:

(A) For all  $\kappa < \lambda$  and all distinct  $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$  if  $v(c_{\kappa,i}) = v(c_{\kappa,j})$ , then the sequence  $(v(c_{\kappa,i}))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is constant.

We denote by  $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  the subset of elements  $a \in \mathcal{M}$  such that for some  $\kappa < \lambda$  and all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $v(c_{\kappa,i}) = a$ . In this notation we have that:

- (B) The following are equivalent:
  - 1. The sequence  $(c_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible over  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ .
  - 2. The following conditions hold:
    - (a) For all  $a \in A$ , the sequence  $(c_i^a)_{i \in I}$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible in  $\mathcal{N}_a$  over  $B \cap \mathcal{N}_a$ .
    - (b) The sequence  $(v(c_i))_{i \in I}$ , where  $v(c_i)$  denote the tuple  $v(c_{\kappa,i})_{\kappa < \lambda}$ , is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible over v(B) in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathsf{tp}(c_i)$  is constant.

#### Proof.

(A) Consider the graph G on  $\{0,1\} \times \mathcal{I}$  whose edge relation is defined as follows:

$$R((\epsilon_0, i)(\epsilon_1, j))$$
 if, and only if,  $v(c_i) = v(c_j)$ .

Clearly, in G whether  $R((\epsilon_0, i), (\epsilon_1, j))$  holds depends only on qftp(i, j) by indiscernibility of  $(c_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ . Thus, since  $\mathcal{I}$  is reasonable if this graph contains at least one edge of the form R((0, i), (0, j)), for some  $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$  then it must be connected and by construction, this means that  $(v(c_{\kappa,i}))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is constant.

(B) It is easy to verify  $1 \implies 2$ , and the proof is left to the reader.

We show that  $2 \implies 1$ . Let  $(c_i)_{i \in I}$  be a sequence of tuples of size  $\lambda$  satisfying 2. Let  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]}$ -formula, where  $|\mathbf{x}_0| = \cdots = |\mathbf{x}_{n-1}| = \lambda$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{x}$  the tuple  $\mathbf{x}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{n-1}$ . By relative quantifier elimination (Fact 1.20), we may Morleyise the structures  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  for  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$  and assume that  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  is equivalent to a Boolean combination of

- $-v(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa,l}) = v(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa',m})$  for some  $m < l < n, \kappa, \kappa' < \lambda$ ,
- $-P_{\bullet}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \text{ for } P \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}} \text{ and subtuples } \hat{\mathbf{x}} \text{ of } \mathbf{x},$
- $P(v(\hat{\mathbf{x}})), \text{ for } P \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \text{ and subtuples } \hat{\mathbf{x}} \text{ of } \mathbf{x}.$

So it suffices to check indiscernibility with respect to each formula  $\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  as above. More precisely, for all  $i_0, \ldots, i_n \in \mathcal{I}$  and all  $i'_0, \ldots, i'_n \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $\mathsf{qftp}(\bar{i}) = \mathsf{qftp}(\bar{i'})$  we have to show that  $\mathcal{S} \models \psi(\bar{c}_{\bar{i}}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{c}_{\bar{i'}})$ .

We start with the following, easy, claim:

Claim 5. Fix  $\kappa_0, \ldots, \kappa_n < \lambda$ . Let  $i_0, \ldots, i_n \in I$  not all equal. If  $v(c_{\kappa_0, i_0}) = \cdots = v(c_{\kappa_n, i_n}) = a$  for some  $a \in \mathcal{M}$ , then for all  $i \in I$ ,  $v(c_{\kappa_0, i}) = \cdots = v(c_{\kappa_n, i}) = a$ .

Proof of Claim 5. For n = 1, the result follows immediately from Definition 4.11 applied to the graph G on  $\{0,1\} \times I$ , where  $R((\epsilon_0, i), (\epsilon_1, j))$  if, and only if,  $v(c_{\kappa_{\epsilon_0},i}) = v(c_{\kappa_{\epsilon_1},j})$ . Clearly, in G whether  $R((\epsilon_0, i), (\epsilon_1, j))$  holds depends only on  $\mathsf{qftp}(i, j)$  and  $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1$ , by indiscernibility of  $(c_i)_{i \in I}$ . The statement for n > 1 follows easily by induction.

If  $i_0, \ldots, i_n$  are all equal to some i, then, since  $(\mathsf{tp}(c_i))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is constant, for any formula  $\psi(\mathbf{x}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ ,  $\psi(c_{\kappa_0,i}, \ldots, c_{\kappa_n,i})$  holds if, and only if,  $\psi(c_{\kappa_0,i'}, \ldots, c_{\kappa_n,i'})$  holds for all  $i' \in I$ . We may assume now that  $i_0, \ldots, i_n$  are not all equal.

First, we check  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibility with respect to a formula  $v(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_0,i_0}) = v(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa_1,i_1})$ . We assumed that  $i_0 \neq i_1$  and by the previous claim, for any  $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 < \lambda$  we have that  $v(c_{\kappa_0,i_0}) = v(c_{\kappa_1,i_1}) = a$  for some  $a \in \mathcal{M}$  if, and only if, for all  $i' \in I$ ,  $v(c_{\kappa_0,i'}) = v(c_{\kappa_1,i'}) = a$ . Thus, this case follows.

We check now  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibility with respect to a formula  $P_{\bullet}(c_{\kappa_0,i_0},\ldots,c_{\kappa_n,i_n})$ . If  $v(c_{\kappa_0,i_0}),\ldots,v(c_{\kappa_n,i_n})$  are not all equal, then by the previous claim, for all  $i'_0,\ldots,i'_n \in I$  with same quantifier-free type in  $\mathcal{I}$ ,  $v(c_{\kappa_0,i'_0}),\ldots,v(c_{\kappa_n,i'_n})$  are not all equal. In particular, for any  $i'_0,\cdots,i'_n$  with the same quantifier-free type as  $i_0,\cdots,i_n$ ,  $P_{\bullet}(c_{\kappa_0,i'_0},\ldots,c_{\kappa_n,i'_n})$  doesn't hold.

Thus, we may assume that there is  $a \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $v(c_{\kappa_1,i}) = \cdots = v(c_{\kappa_n,i}) = a$  for all  $i \in I$ . This means that  $c_{\kappa_1,i}, \ldots, c_{\kappa_n,i} \in c_i^a$ . Then, since, by assumption,  $(c_i^a)$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible in  $\mathcal{N}_a$ , we have that:

$$\mathcal{N}_a \models P(c_{\kappa_0, i_0}, \dots, c_{\kappa_n, i_n})$$
 if, and only if,  $\mathcal{N}_a \models P(c_{\kappa_0, i'_0}, \dots, c_{\kappa_n, i'_n})$ ,

for any  $i'_0, i'_1, \ldots, i'_n$  with same quantifier-free type in  $\mathcal{I}$ . This shows that  $(c_i)_i$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible with respect to the formula  $P_{\bullet}(c_{\kappa_0,i_0}, \ldots, c_{\kappa_n,i_n})$ , as required.

Finally,  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibility with respect to the formula  $P(v(c_{\kappa_0,i_0}), \cdots, v(c_{\kappa_n,i_n}))$  where  $P \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is clear by the assumption that  $(v(c_{i_1}))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible in  $\mathcal{M}$ . This concludes our proof.

In the literature, it is sometimes the case that indiscernibles indexed by non-primitive (i.e. non-reasonable) structures are considered (see for instance [GHS17, Theorem 5.8] for a nice characterisation of NTP<sub>2</sub> theories). We have obtained partial results in this direction and leave a full characterisation for future work.

From the proposition, we obtain the following easy corollary.

**Corollary 4.18.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure,  $\mathfrak{N} = {\mathcal{N}_a}_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$  be a collection  $\mathfrak{N}$  of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures indexed by  $\mathcal{M}$  and let  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$ . Consider  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  two reasonable indexing structures, such that  $\mathcal{J}$  is a reduct of  $\mathcal{I}$ . Then, the following are equivalent:

- 1. S collapses I-indiscernibles to J-indiscernibles.
- 2. For all  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles to  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernibles and  $\mathcal{M}$  collapses  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernibles to  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernibles.

*Proof.* As a monster model of  $\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{S})$  is still a lexicographic sum of models of  $\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{N}_{\rho})$  where  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ , we may assume that  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  is a monster model. Let  $(c_i)_i$  be an  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{S}$ . By Proposition 4.17, and using the same notation, we have that:

1. For all  $a \in A$ , the sequence  $(c_i^a)_{i \in I}$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible in  $\mathcal{N}_a$  over  $B \cap \mathcal{N}_a$ .

2. The sequence  $(v(c_i))_{i \in I}$ , where  $v(c_i)$  denote the tuple  $v(c_{\kappa,i})_{\kappa < \lambda}$ , is  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible over v(B) in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathsf{tp}(c_i)$  is constant.

By assumption,  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_a$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{M}$  collapse  $\mathcal{I}$ -indiscernible sequences to  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible sequences. In particular, we have

- 1. For all  $a \in A$ ,  $(c_i^a)_{i \in I}$  is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible in  $\mathcal{N}_a$  over  $B \cap \mathcal{N}_a$ .
- 2. The sequence  $(v(c_i))_{i \in I}$  is  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible over v(B) in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathsf{tp}(c_i)$  is constant.

By Proposition 4.17,  $(c_i)_i$  is a  $\mathcal{J}$ -indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{S}$ . This concludes our proof.

Observe that  $NC_{\mathcal{K}}$  is stable under reducts and thus Example 4.3 also applies to lexicographic products. More precisely:

*Remark* 4.19. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the ordered random graph and  $\mathcal{N}$  the convexly ordered *C*-relation, as in Example 4.3. Then  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  is  $\mathcal{C}_{0G\boxtimes 0C} \xrightarrow{Fact 2.16} \mathcal{C}_{0G[0C]}$ , but, as we have already seen  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\mathrm{NC}_{0C} \subset \mathrm{NC}_{0G\boxtimes 0C}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  is  $\mathrm{NC}_{0G} \subset \mathrm{NC}_{0G\boxtimes 0C}$ .

We can also apply Corollary 4.18 to the specific case of  $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ -indiscernibles where  $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}$  is the ordered random (n+1)-hypergraph since the latter is primitive. We obtain:

**Corollary 4.20** (*n*-NIP transfer for lexicographic sum). Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -structure,  $\mathfrak{N} = {\mathcal{N}_a}_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$ be a collection  $\mathfrak{N}$  of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}$ -structures indexed by  $\mathcal{M}$  and let  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$ . The lexicographic product  $\mathcal{S}$  is *n*-NIP if, and only if, for all  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  is *n*-NIP and  $\mathcal{M}$  is *n*-NIP.

Since for positive integer k > k', k'-NIP structures are k-NIP, we have that a lexicographic product  $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$  of an *m*-NIP structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with an *n*-NIP structure  $\mathcal{N}$  is  $\max(n, m)$ -NIP.

**Proposition 4.21.** Assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  has indiscernible-triviality and that for all  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  has indiscernible-triviality. Then so does  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that S is  $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}|^+$ -saturated. Let  $(c_i)_{i \in I}$  be an indiscernible sequence in S. Then  $(c_i)_i$  is indiscernible over an element a if and only if  $(c_i \frown a)$  is indiscernible.

Let  $d, d' \in S$  and assume that  $(c_i \frown d)$  and  $(c_i \frown d')$  are indiscernible. For  $a \in \mathcal{M}$  denote by  $d^a$  the singleton d if val(d) = a and the empty word  $\emptyset$  if not. By Proposition 4.17, and using the same notation, we have:

- 1. for all  $a \in A$ ,  $(c_i^a \frown d^a)_{i \in I}$   $(c_i^a \frown d'^a)_{i \in I}$  are indiscernible in  $\mathcal{N}_a$ .
- 2.  $(v(c_i) \frown v(d))_{i \in I}$  and  $(v(c_i) \frown v(d'))_{i \in I}$  are indiscernible and  $(\mathsf{tp}(c_i \frown d))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  and  $(\mathsf{tp}(c_i \frown d'))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  are constant.

By assumption, the  $\mathcal{N}_a$ 's and  $\mathcal{M}$  have trivial indiscernibility. It follows that:

- 1. for all  $a \in A$ ,  $(c_i^a \frown d^a \frown d'^a)_{i \in I}$  is indiscernible in  $\mathcal{N}_a$ .
- 2.  $(v(c_i) \frown v(d) \frown v(d'))_{i \in I}$  is indiscernible.

It is also easy to check, by quantifier elimination and trivial-indiscernibility, that  $tp(c_i \frown d \frown d')$  is constant. By the same characterisation, we get that  $(c_i \frown d \frown d')_i$  is indiscernible, in other words that  $(c_i)_i$  is indiscernible over d and d'. This concludes our proof.

Combining the previous propositions, we will conclude a transfer principle for monadic NIP structures. We need one more ingredient to ensure that the lexicographic sum has dp-rank one: Fact 4.22. [Tou21, Theorem 2.16] We have:

$$\operatorname{bdn}(\mathcal{S}) = \sup\left(\operatorname{bdn}(\mathcal{M}), \operatorname{bdn}(\mathcal{N}_{\rho}), \rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}\right).$$

In particular, S is inp-minimal if, and only if,  $\mathcal{M}$  is inp-minimal and  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  is inp-minimal for every  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ .

Then, we have by Fact 1.31 and Proposition 4.21:

**Corollary 4.23** (Transfer Principle For Monadic NIP Structures). Assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  is monadicaly NIP<sup>6</sup> and that for all  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  is monadically NIP. Then so is  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$ .

**Example 4.24.** Given two meet-trees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , the lexicographic product  $T_1[T_2]$  is a meet-tree with a convex equivalence relation. By Theorem 4.23 and Example 1.34, it is monadically NIP. More generally, any meet-trees with finitely many convex equivalence relations  $E_0, \ldots, E_n$  such that  $E_{s+1}$  refines  $E_s$  for s < n is monadically NIP.

**Proposition 4.25** (*m*-Distality transfer for lexicographic product). Assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  is *m*-distal and that for all  $\rho \in S_1^{\mathsf{Th}(\mathcal{M})}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{\rho}$  are *m*-distal. Then  $\mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{R}]$  is *m*-distal.

*Proof.* Without loss, we may assume that  $S = \mathcal{M}[\mathfrak{N}]$  is a monster model. Let  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_{m+1}$  be an indiscernible sequence partitioned in m + 2 subsequences. Let  $(c_i)_{i \leq m}$  be a sequence of m + 1 elements which does not insert indiscernibly into  $\mathcal{I}$ . By definition, the sequence

$$\mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I}_0 + c_0 + \dots + c_m + \mathcal{I}_{m+1}$$

is not indiscernible in S. By Proposition 4.17, and using the same notation, we have the following cases to consider:

Case 1. For some  $a \in A$ ,  $(\mathcal{I}')^a$  is not indiscernible in  $\mathcal{N}_a$ . Then, since  $\mathcal{N}_a$  is *m*-distal, there is a *m*-subtuple of  $(c_i)_{i \leq m}$  which does no insert in  $\mathcal{I}^a$  (as indiscernible sequence in  $\mathcal{N}_a$ ).

Case 2. The sequence  $v(\mathcal{I})$  is not indiscernible in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then, since  $\mathcal{M}$  is *m*-distal, there is an *m*-subtuple of  $(v(c_i))_{i < m}$  which does not insert in  $v(\mathcal{I})$ .

Case 3. The sequence of types of elements in  $\mathcal{I}'$  is not constant. This means that there is an element  $c_i$ ,  $i \leq m$ , which does not have the same type as the elements in  $\mathcal{I}$ .

In all cases, there is an *m*-subtuples of  $(c_i)_{i \leq m}$  which do not insert in  $\mathcal{I}$ . Indeed, in the first two cases this is by Proposition 4.17, and in the third case, we find in fact a single  $c_i$  which does not insert in  $\mathcal{I}$ .

### 5 Ultraproducts and Twin-width

We now apply our results to construct new algorithmically tame hereditary (i.e. closed under induced subgraphs) classes of graphs from given ones. The main notion of study here is that of *bounded twinwidth*. For a general introduction and precise definitions, we refer the reader to [BKTW21], where the notion of twin-width was introduced. For basic background in parametrised complexity theory, we refer the reader to [JF06].

In the next proposition we show that an ultraproduct of the class of lexicographic sums of two classes is isomorphic to a lexicographic sum of ultraproducts of these classes. More precisely:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Notice that the assumption (\*) is not required here, as the expansion of  $\mathcal{M}$  by an unary predicates for the set  $\{a \in \mathcal{M} \mid \mathcal{N}_a \models \varphi\}$  will be automatically monadic NIP, by definition.

**Proposition 5.1.** Fix a cardinal  $\kappa$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  an ultraproduct on  $\kappa$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  be two classes of (not necessarily finite) structures. Let  $(G^i[H_g^i])_{i < k}$  be a sequence of lexicographic sum in  $\mathcal{C}_1[\mathcal{C}_2]$ . Then we have:

$$\prod_{\mathcal{U}} \left( G^i \left[ H_g^i \right] \right) \simeq \left( \prod_{\mathcal{U}} G^i \right) \left[ \mathcal{H}_g \right]$$

where, for each  $g = [(g_i)]_{\mathcal{U}}, \ \mathcal{H}_g = \prod_{\mathcal{U}} H_{g_i}^i$ .

Proof. First, notice that  $\mathcal{H}_g$  doesn't depend on the choice of representative  $(g_i)_i$  of g. Each  $G^i[H_g^i]$  for  $i \in \kappa$  carries a definable (through the projection v) equivalence relation  $\sim$  where two elements (g,h), (g',h') are equivalent if, and only if g = g'. We remark by Loś that  $\sim$  is also an equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{M} = \prod_{\mathcal{U}} \left( G^i[H_g^i] \right)$ , and we have more precisely that for  $a = [((g_i, h_i))_i]_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $b = [((g'_i, h'_i))_i]_{\mathcal{U}}$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\mathcal{M} \models a \sim b \Leftrightarrow \text{ for } \mathcal{U}\text{-many } i, \ G^i[H_g^i] \models (g_i, h_i) \sim (g'_i, h'_i)$$
$$\Leftrightarrow (g_i)_i = (g'_i)_i \mod \mathcal{U}.$$

Similarly, if  $P \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ , we have for any tuples  $a = [((g_i, h_i))_i]_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{M}$ :

$$\mathcal{M} \models P(v(a)) \Leftrightarrow \text{ for } \mathcal{U}\text{-many } i, \ G^i[H_g^i] \models P(v(g_i, h_i))$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \text{ for } \mathcal{U}\text{-many } i, \ G^i \models P(g_i).$$

It follows that  $\mathcal{M}/\sim$  is isomorphic to  $\prod_{\mathcal{U}} G^i$ . It remains to show that each equivalence class is an ultraproduct of structures in  $\mathcal{C}_2$ . Fix  $a = [(g_i, h_i)]_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{M}$ . By the above, an elements b in  $\mathcal{M}$  is equivalent to a if and only if it has a representative in  $\prod_{i \in \kappa} \{g_i\} \times H^i_{g_i}$ . Thus the class  $[a]_{\sim}$  of a is an isomorphic copy of  $\mathcal{H}_g = \prod_{\mathcal{U}} H^i_{g_i}$ .

**Definition 5.2.** A class C of structures is called *monadically NIP* if any ultraproduct of structures in C is monadically NIP.

**Corollary 5.3.** Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two classes of structures that are monadically NIP. Then their lexicographic sum is monadically NIP.

*Proof.* This follows immediately Corollary 4.23, the fact that monadic NIP is closed under reducts and Proposition 5.1.

It is conjectured (see, for instance,  $[GHO^+20$ , Conjecture 8.2]) that for hereditary classes of graphs, under a mild assumption from descriptive complexity theory (namely that FPT  $\neq AW[\star]$ , which, in particular, implies that first-order model checking for the class of all graphs is not tractable), the algorithmic tameness condition of having *fixed-parameter tractable model checking* coincides with the class being monadically NIP. There is strong evidence for this conjecture. In particular, it is true for *monotone* (i.e. closed under not necessarily induced substructures) classes of relational structures [BDEP23], and hereditary classes of ordered graphs [BGOdM<sup>+</sup>22]. More precisely, the latter result is the following:

**Fact 5.4** ([BGOdM<sup>+</sup>22, Theorems 1 and 3]). *The following conditions are equivalent for a hereditary class* C *of finite, ordered binary structures:* 

- 1. C is monadically NIP.
- 2. C has bounded twin-width.
- 3. (Assuming  $FPT \neq AW[\star]$ ) Model-checking first-order logic is fixed-parameter tractable on  $\mathbb{C}$ .

Observe that any graph G can be expanded by a total order resulting in an *ordered graph* of the same twin-width (see [BKTW21] or [ST21] for an explicit argument), but it is known that finding these orders is hard to do efficiently. In any case, given a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of graphs with bounded twin-width we can assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of ordered graphs and still has bounded twin-width. Moreover, given any graph G, the twin-width of any (induced) subgraph of G is at most that of G (see [BKTW21]). In particular, given a class of graphs  $\mathcal{C}$  with bounded twin-width we may assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is hereditary.

One of the results in [BKR<sup>+</sup>22] is that the lexicographic product of two graphs of bounded twinwidth has bounded twin-width. This was expanded for various other product notions (always involving two graphs) in [PS23]. Here we generalise the first result to lexicographic sums of graphs with bounded twin-width. More precisely we obtain the following:

**Corollary 5.5.** Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two classes of finite graphs with bounded twin-width. Then, the reduct of  $C_1[C_2]$  to the language of graphs has bounded twin-width.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  consist of ordered graphs and are hereditary. By Fact 5.4, it follows that  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are monadically NIP. Now, by Corollary 5.3, it follows that the class  $C_1[C_2]$ , in which there is a natural total order coming from the orders from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  is monadically NIP, and thus, its reduct to the language of ordered graphs is a monadically NIP hereditary class of ordered graphs. Thus, by Fact 5.4 it has bounded twin-width, as claimed.  $\Box$ 

## 6 Open Questions

We conclude this paper by collecting some open questions. Recall that a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  admits a distal expansion if it is a reduct of a distal structure. With respect to some combinatorial and model-theoretic aspects, it is more relevant to ask if a structure has a distal expansion, rather than if the structure itself is distal. Clearly, given two structures each of which has a distal expansion, their full product will also have a distal expansion. However, the other direction remains unclear. We have the following observation:

Observation. An expansion of  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  is not necessarily a reduct of a full product of expansions of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . Assume  $|\mathcal{M}_1| = |\mathcal{M}_2|$  and let  $b : \mathcal{M}_1 \to \mathcal{M}_2$  be a bijection. Then  $(\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2, b)$  cannot be such a reduct, as its theory implies  $|\mathcal{M}_1| = |\mathcal{M}_2|$ .

This motivates the following question:

Question 6.1. Assume that a full product  $\mathcal{M}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{M}_2$  admits a distal expansion. Do both  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  admit a distal expansion?

In Subsubsection 1.4.3, we stated the fact that indiscernible triviality and dp-minimality characterise monadically NIP structures. Dp-minimality cannot be characterised in terms of forbidden coding (since it is not closed under bi-interpretation), but one can ask if there is a natural non-coding class strictly contained in NIP, that contains all monadically NIP structures. A natural candidate for such a class would be that of NIP structures with indiscernible triviality. This leads to the following question:

**Question 6.2.** Is it possible to characterise indiscernible triviality in terms of collapsing indiscernibles or in terms of forbidden coding?

Finally, the following question naturally relates to the classification of ultrahomogeneous  $\text{NIP}_n$  structures:

**Question 6.3.** Given an integer n, is there an ultrahomogeneous countable structure with the Ramsey property, that is NIP<sub>n</sub>, but not *n*-ary?

Some positive examples will give, by Proposition 3.7, some other instances of ultrahomogeneous countable structures  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\mathrm{NC}_{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $\mathrm{NC}_{\mathcal{M}}$  are not included into each other.

More generally, one can ask about the structure of the NC<sub> $\mathcal{K}$ </sub>-hierarchy - say, when  $\mathcal{K}$  ranges over the class of all ultrahomogeneous countable structures. By Fact 2.16 and Example 4.3, it is a rooted meet-tree, with a countable ascending chain and an antichain of size at least two. One can then reformulate [GPS23, Question 4.7]:

Question 6.4. What is the width of the  $NC_{\mathcal{K}}$ -hierarchy?

# References

[ACGZ22]	Matthias Aschenbrenner, Artem Chernikov, Allen Gehret, and Martin Ziegler. Distality in valued fields and related structures. <i>Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.</i> , 375(7):4641–4710, 2022.
[AM22]	Asma Ibrahim Almazaydeh and Dugald Macpherson. Jordan permutation groups and limits of <i>D</i> -relations. <i>J. Group Theory</i> , 25(3):447–508, 2022.
[AN98]	S.A. Adeleke and P.M. Neumann. <i>Relations Related to Betweenness: Their Structure and Automorphisms: Their Structure and Automorphisms</i> . American Mathematical Society: Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society. American Mathematical Society, 1998.
[BDEP23]	Samuel Braunfeld, Anuj Dawar, Ioannis Eleftheriadis, and Aris Papadopoulos. Monadic NIP in monotone classes of relational structures. arXiv 2302.05695, 2023.
[BGOdM <sup>+</sup> 22]	Édouard Bonnet, Ugo Giocanti, Patrice Ossona de Mendez, Pierre Simon, Stéphan Thomassé, and Szymon Toruńczyk. Twin-width iv: Ordered graphs and matrices. In <i>Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing</i> , STOC 2022, page 924–937, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
[BJP16]	Manuel Bodirsky, Peter Jonsson, and Trung Van Pham. The reducts of the homogeneous binary branching C-relation. J. Symb. Log., $81(4)$ :1255–1297, 2016.
$[BKR^+22]$	Édouard Bonnet, Eun Jung Kim, Amadeus Reinald, Stéphan Thomassé, and Rémi Watrigant. Twin-width and polynomial kernels. <i>Algorithmica</i> , 84(11):3300–3337, April 2022.
[BKTW21]	Édouard Bonnet, Eun Jung Kim, Stéphan Thomassé, and Rémi Watrigant. Twin-width i: Tractable fo model checking. J. $ACM$ , $69(1)$ , nov 2021.
[BL21]	Samuel Braunfeld and Michael C. Laskowski. Characterizations of monadic NIP. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B, 8:948–970, 2021.
[Bod15]	Manuel Bodirsky. <i>Ramsey classes: examples and constructions</i> , page 1–48. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
[BPP15]	Manuel Bodirsky, Michael Pinsker, and András Pongrácz. The 42 reducts of the random ordered graph. <i>Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society</i> , 111(3):591–632, July 2015.
[BS85]	John Baldwin and S. Shelah. Second-order quantifiers and the complexity of theories. Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic, 29, 07 1985.

- [Cam76] Peter J. Cameron. Transitivity of permutation groups on unordered sets. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 148(2):127–139, June 1976.
- [CPT19] Artem Chernikov, Daniel Palacin, and Kota Takeuchi. On *n*-Dependence. Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic, 60(2):195 214, 2019.
- [CS19] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Henselian valued fields and inp-minimality. J. Symb. Log., 84(4):1510–1526, 2019.
- [Del81] Françoise Delon. Types sur C((X)). In Study Group on Stable Theories (Bruno Poizat), Second year: 1978/79 (French), pages Exp. No. 5, 29. Secrétariat Math., Paris, 1981.
- [GH19] Vincent Guingona and Cameron Donnay Hill. On positive local combinatorial dividinglines in model theory. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 58(3-4):289–323, 2019.
- [GHO<sup>+</sup>20] Jakub Gajarský, Petr Hliněný, Jan Obdržálek, Daniel Lokshtanov, and M. S. Ramanujan. A new perspective on fo model checking of dense graph classes. ACM Trans. Comput. Logic, 21(4), jul 2020.
- [GHS17] Vincent Guingona, Cameron Donnay Hill, and Lynn Scow. Characterizing modeltheoretic dividing lines via collapse of generalized indiscernibles. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 168(5):1091–1111, 2017.
- [GM22] Darío García and Rosario Mennuni. Model-theoretic dividing lines via posets. arXiv 2209.00571, 2022.
- [GP23] Vincent Guingona and Miriam Parnes. Ranks based on strong amalgamation Fraïssé classes. Arch. Math. Logic, 62(7-8):889–929, 2023.
- [GPS23] Vince Guingona, Miriam Parnes, and Lynn Scow. Products of classes of finite structures. Notre Dame J. Form. Log., 64(4):441–469, 2023.
- [Hod93] Wilfrid Hodges. *Model Theory*. Cambridge University Press, March 1993.
- [JF06] Martin Grohe Jörg Flum. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [KK11] Byunghan Kim and Hyeung-Joon Kim. Notions around tree property 1. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 162(9):698–709, 2011.
- [KKS13] Byunghan Kim, Hyeung-Joon Kim, and Lynn Scow. Tree indiscernibilities, revisited. Archive for Mathematical Logic, 53(1-2):211–232, December 2013.
- [KOU13] Itay Kaplan, Alf Onshuus, and Alexander Usvyatsov. Additivity of the dp-rank. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 365(11):5783–5804, 2013.
- [Mei16] Nadav Meir. On products of elementarily indivisible structures. J. Symb. Log., 81(3):951–971, 2016.
- [MP23] Nadav Meir and Aris Papadopoulos. Practical and Structural Infinitary Expansions. arXiv 2212.08027, 2023.
- [MT11] Dugald Macpherson and Katrin Tent. Simplicity of some automorphism groups. *Journal* of Algebra, 342(1):40–52, 2011.

[Neš05]Jaroslav Nešetřil. Ramsey classes and homogeneous structures. Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, 14(1-2):171-189, 2005. [NR77] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Vojtěch Rödl. Partitions of finite relational and set systems. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, 22(3):289–312, 1977. [OU11] Alf Onshuus and Alexander Usvyatsov. On dp-minimality, strong dependence and weight. The Journal of Symbolic Logic, 76(3):737–758, 2011. [PS23] William Pettersson and John Sylvester. Bounds on the twin-width of product graphs. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., 25(1):Paper No. 18, 24, 2023. [Sco12] Lynn Scow. Characterization of nip theories by ordered graph-indiscernibles. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 163(11):1624–1641, 2012. Kurt Goedel Research Prize Fellowships 2010. [She90]Saharon Shelah. Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models, volume 92 of Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1990. [She14] Saharon Shelah. Strongly dependent theories. Israel J. Math., 204(1):1–83, 2014. [Sim11] Pierre Simon. On dp-minimal ordered structures. J. Symbolic Logic, 76(2):448–460, 2011. [Sim13] Pierre Simon. Distal and non-distal nip theories. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 164(3):294-318, 2013.[Sim15] Pierre Simon. A guide to NIP theories, volume 44 of Lecture Notes in Logic. Association for Symbolic Logic, Chicago, IL; Cambridge Scientific Publishers, Cambridge, 2015. [Sim21] Pierre Simon. A note on stability and nip in one variable. arXiv, 2021. [ST21] Pierre Simon and Szymon Toruńczyk. Ordered graphs of bounded twin-width, 2021. [Tho91] Simon Thomas. Reducts of the random graph. The Journal of Symbolic Logic, 56(1):176-181, 1991.[Tho96] Simon Thomas. Reducts of random hypergraphs. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 80(2):165-193, 1996.[Tou21] Pierre Touchard. On model theory of valued vector spaces. arXiv 2111.15516, 2021. [Tou23] Pierre Touchard. Burden in Henselian valued fields. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 174(10):Paper No. 103318, 61, 2023. [TZ12] Katrin Tent and Martin Ziegler. A course in model theory, volume 40 of Lecture Notes in Logic. Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. [Wal21] Erik Walsberg. Notes on trace equivalence. arXiv 2101.12194, 2021. [Wal23] Roland Walker. Distality rank. J. Symb. Log., 88(2):704-737, 2023.

NADAV MEIR DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV, 84105 BE'ER-SHEVA, ISRAEL and INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, UNIWERSYTET WROCŁAWSKI, PL. GRUNWALDZKI 2/4, 50-384 WROCŁAW, POLAND math@nadav.me

ARIS PAPADOPOULOS SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS, LEEDS LS2 9JT, UNITED KINGDOM mmadp@leeds.ac.uk

PIERRE TOUCHARD KU LEUVEN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, B-3001 LEUVEN, BELGIUM pierre.touchard@kuleuven.be