

ORTHOGONALITY AND DOMINATION IN O-MINIMAL EXPANSIONS OF ORDERED GROUPS

PABLO ANDÚJAR GUERRERO, PANTELIS E. ELEFThERIOU,
AND ROSARIO MENNUNI

ABSTRACT. We analyse domination between invariant types in o-minimal expansions of ordered groups, showing that the domination poset decomposes as the direct product of two posets: the domination poset of an o-minimal expansion of a real closed field, and one derived from a linear o-minimal structure. We prove that if the Morley product is well-defined on the former poset, then the same holds for the poset computed in the whole structure. We establish our results by employing the ‘short closure’ pregeometry (scl) in semi-bounded o-minimal structures, showing that types of scl-independent tuples are weakly orthogonal to types of short tuples. As an application we prove that, in an o-minimal expansion of an ordered group, every definable type is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types. Furthermore, there are precisely two or four classes of definable types up to domination-equivalence, depending on whether a global field is definable or not.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview. The *domination poset* $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ of a saturated first-order structure $\mathfrak{U} = (U, \dots)$ is an object encoding the relations holding between *invariant types* up to small information. It was first computed in the theory of algebraically closed valued fields (ACVF) in [HHM08], developed further in [Men20b], and has recently been studied in various contexts. If domination is compatible with the *Morley product* \otimes , then $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ has the structure of a partially ordered monoid, known as the *domination monoid*.

A common theme has been to prove a decomposition theorem that enables the understanding of invariant types over U in terms of simpler ones: for instance, invariant types in a simpler, stably embedded structure. For example, in the cases of ACVF and of real closed valued fields (RCVF), it was

Date: March 24, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 03C64. Secondary: 03C45.

Key words and phrases. orthogonality, domination monoid, semi-bounded structures, definable preorder, cofinal curve.

The first and second authors were partially supported by an EPSRC Early Career Fellowship (EP/V003291/1). RM was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) via HI 2004/1-1 (part of the French-German ANR-DFG project GeoMod) and under Germany’s Excellence Strategy EXC 2044-390685587, ‘Mathematics Münster: Dynamics-Geometry-Structure’, by the projects PRIN 2017: “Mathematical Logic: models, sets, computability” Prot. 2017NWTM8RPRIN, PRIN 2022: “Models, sets and classifications” Prot. 2022TECZJA, and PRIN 2022 “Logical methods in combinatorics”, 2022BXH4R5, Italian Ministry of University and Research. He acknowledges the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Pisa, CUP I57G22000700001, and is a member of the INdAM research group GNSAGA.

shown that $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U}) \cong \widetilde{\text{Inv}}(k(\mathfrak{U})) \times \widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\Gamma(\mathfrak{U}))$, where k denotes the residue field and Γ the value group (see [HHM08, EHM19, Men22a]). In other words, every invariant type in these contexts is domination-equivalent to the product of an invariant type in the residue field with one in the value group. Moreover, every invariant type is domination-equivalent to a Morley product of 1-types. Similar but more involved results hold for larger classes of Henselian valued fields. This was proven in [HM24], where it was also shown that the monoid structure on $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ transfers from those of the residue field and value group, when available.

Parallel to these works, the third author [Men22a] analysed $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ in the o-minimal setting, proving it is a monoid, and obtaining a structure theorem (Fact 2.16 below), under the assumption that every invariant type is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types. He also showed that the latter property holds in the theory RCF of real closed fields, in the theory DOAG of divisible ordered abelian groups, and in o-minimal theories with no non-simple types in the sense of [May88]. Conjecturally, this property holds in every o-minimal structure.

Main Conjecture. *For every o-minimal theory T and monster model $\mathfrak{U} \models T$, every type over U that is invariant over a small set is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types.*

Although a proof of the Main Conjecture in arbitrary o-minimal theories remains rather elusive and open, in this paper we show that knowing it for o-minimal expansions of RCF is enough to obtain it for o-minimal expansions of DOAG. This reduction follows from our main theorem (Theorem 5.8), a decomposition result for the domination poset of non-linear o-minimal expansions of ordered groups that do not define a global field. The main technical lemma in its proof (Lemma 5.4) also yields the Main Conjecture for o-minimal theories that are intermediate between DOAG and RCF (Corollary 5.9). At the same time, we prove the Main Conjecture for linear o-minimal expansions of DOAG (Theorem 2.23).

We achieve Theorem 5.8 by employing a fine machinery developed for *semi-bounded* o-minimal structures by the second author in [Ele12]. These structures were first extensively studied in the 90s by several authors [PSS89, MPP92, Pet92], they relate to Zilber’s dichotomy principle on definable groups and fields, and have been developed further in [Edm00, Pet09, Ele12]. Examples include the real ordered group expanded by multiplication restricted to a bounded interval. Statements known for the two extreme cases, pure group and full field structure, appear to be particularly hard to prove in the semi-bounded case. See, for example, the analysis of definable groups in [EP12] in this setting. In the introduction of that paper, the authors alluded to a possible orthogonality between certain sets, or types, that are very closely related to the two extreme structures. In this paper, we formalise this intuition by decomposing invariant types into *orthogonal* ‘long’ and ‘short’ parts. We then use this orthogonality to prove the aforementioned decomposition theorem for $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ (Theorem 5.8).

While the above results hold at the level of invariant types, we are able to prove the Main Conjecture for the subclass of *definable types* in o-minimal

expansions of DOAG, by combining the aforementioned decomposition with results of the first author, Thomas and Walsberg [AG25, AGTW21] on o-minimal types and definability of cofinal curves for definable directed pre-orders. In fact, in Theorem 5.10, we fully compute the submonoid $\widetilde{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{U})$ of $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ arising from definable types.

1.2. Invariant types and domination monoids. We now recall briefly some terminology that will allow us to state precisely our results. For more detailed definitions, we refer the reader to Section 2.

Let T be a theory and $\mathfrak{U} = (U, \dots)$ a monster model. A *global type*, that is, a type over U , is *invariant* if it is fixed under the natural action of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{U}/A)$ for some small A . A special case is that of definable types, studied in the o-minimal context in [MS94].

A natural relation on invariant types is that of *domination*: we say that $p(x)$ *dominates* $q(y)$ if $p(x)$ entails $q(y)$ modulo a type $r(x, y)$ over a small set, and call p and q *domination-equivalent* if they dominate each other (Definition 2.2). The corresponding quotient $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ of the space $S_{<\omega}^{\text{inv}}(U)$ of invariant types in finitely many variables (simply denoted by $S^{\text{inv}}(U)$) is the *domination poset*; its definition is implicit in [HHM08], its general theory was developed in [Men20b], and a version for measures was recently defined in [GY23].

The space $S^{\text{inv}}(U)$ naturally carries a monoid operation \otimes . In certain cases (but not always [Men20b]), this operation is compatible with domination, hence descends to $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$, equipping it with the structure of a partially ordered monoid, the *domination monoid*.

Besides the results on valued fields already recalled above, computations of $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ are available for regular ordered abelian groups and short exact sequences of abelian structures [HM24], certain expansions of dense-meet trees [Men22b], and more. In the o-minimal setting it was shown [Men22a] that, in every theory where the Main Conjecture holds, $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ is a monoid, and may be identified with the upper semilattice $(\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(X(\mathfrak{U})), \cup, \supseteq)$ of finite subsets of the set $X(\mathfrak{U})$ of classes of non-realised invariant 1-types modulo definable bijection (Fact 2.16).

1.3. Semi-bounded o-minimal structures. Recall that, for an o-minimal expansion $\mathcal{M} = \langle M, <, +, 0, \dots \rangle$ of an ordered group, there are naturally three possibilities: \mathcal{M} is either (a) linear, (b) semi-bounded (and non-linear), or (c) it expands a real closed field. Let us define the first two.

Definition 1.1. Let Λ be the set of all \emptyset -definable partial endomorphisms of $\langle M, <, +, 0 \rangle$, and \mathcal{B} the collection of all bounded definable sets. Then \mathcal{M} is called *linear* ([LP93]) if every definable set is already definable in $\langle M, <, +, 0, \{\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \rangle$, and it is called *semi-bounded* ([Pet92, Edm00]) if every definable set is already definable in $\langle M, <, +, 0, \{\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}, \{B\}_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \rangle$.

Obviously, if \mathcal{M} is linear then it is semi-bounded. By [PS98], \mathcal{M} is not linear if and only if there is a definable real closed field. By [Edm00], \mathcal{M} is not semi-bounded if and only if \mathcal{M} expands a real closed field, if and only if for any two open intervals there is a definable bijection between them, if and only if there is *pole*: a definable bijection between a bounded interval

and an unbounded one. An important example of a semi-bounded non-linear structure is the expansion of the ordered vector space $\langle \mathbb{R}, <, +, 0, x \mapsto \lambda x \rangle_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$ by all bounded semialgebraic sets.

1.4. Results. We are now ready to state the results of this paper. In Theorem 2.23, we prove the Main Conjecture for linear o-minimal expansions of ordered groups, and in Corollary 5.9 for o-minimal structures between DOAG and RCF. The proof of the latter corollary uses a technical statement, Lemma 5.4, that we also employ in the proof of our main result, which is the following.

Theorem (5.8). *Let T be an o-minimal semi-bounded theory, and \mathfrak{U} a monster model. Assume there is an interval R whose induced structure \mathcal{R} expands a real closed field. Then there is a set $\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U})$ of domination-equivalence classes of 1-types inducing an isomorphism of posets*

$$\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U}) \cong \widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U})) \times (\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U})), \supseteq).$$

If $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U}))$ is a monoid, then so is $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ and, if $\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U}))$ is equipped with the binary operation \cup , then the above is an isomorphism of monoids. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U}))$ is a quotient of the domination monoid of the linear reduct of \mathfrak{U} .

The main tool in proving the above theorem concerns the interaction of full scl-rank tuples with short ones (Proposition 4.19), and can be phrased in terms of types as follows. (Here, $\text{scl}(A) = \text{dcl}(AR)$, see Section 4).

Proposition (Corollary 4.22). *Let T be an o-minimal semi-bounded theory, and assume there is a definable interval R whose induced structure expands a real closed field. For every parameter set A , if $p \in S(A)$ concentrates on a cartesian power of R , and $q \in S(A)$ is the type of an scl-independent tuple, then p and q are weakly orthogonal (Definition 2.1).*

In Theorem 3.8, we prove that the Main Conjecture holds in o-minimal expansions of RCF for definable types, and fully compute the corresponding submonoid $\widetilde{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{U})$. In combination with Theorem 5.8, this yields a proof of the Main Conjecture for definable types, together with a computation of $\widetilde{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{U})$, in every o-minimal expansion of DOAG.

Theorem (5.10). *Let \mathfrak{U} be a monster model of an o-minimal expansion of DOAG. Then $\widetilde{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{U})$ is a monoid, and isomorphic to*

- $(\mathcal{P}(\{0, 1\}), \cup, \supseteq)$ if T is semi-bounded;
- $(\mathcal{P}(\{0\}), \cup, \supseteq)$ otherwise.

Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we recall the necessary preliminaries on domination and prove the Main Conjecture in linear o-minimal theories, Theorem 2.23. Section 3 deals with definable types in o-minimal expansions of RCF, characterised up to domination-equivalence in Theorem 3.8. We prove Corollary 4.22 in Section 4 and, in our final Section 5, we combine the results of the previous sections to prove Theorems 5.8 and 5.10, and to prove the Main Conjecture for structures between DOAG and RCF (Corollary 5.9).

Acknowledgements. We thank Y. Peterzil for pointing out to us Fact 4.3 and Footnote 2.

2. DOMINATION

In this section, we recall definitions and basic facts concerning orthogonality and domination. We refer the reader to [Men20b, Men22a, HM24] for a more extensive treatment, as well as for proofs. We also prove the Main Conjecture for linear o-minimal expansions of ordered groups (Theorem 2.23).

2.1. Orthogonality and domination. Throughout the paper, we denote by T a complete first-order theory, and by $\mathfrak{U} = (U, \dots)$ a monster model, that is, a model that is κ -saturated and κ -strongly homogeneous for some fixed strong limit cardinal $\kappa = \kappa(\mathfrak{U}) > |T|$. By *small* we mean smaller than κ . For more details, see [Men22a, Section 1.1]. We denote by $\mathfrak{V} = (V, \dots)$ a larger monster model, that is, an elementary extension $\mathfrak{V} \succ \mathfrak{U}$ such that U is small with respect to \mathfrak{V} . Parameter sets, denoted for example by A , are usually assumed to be small subsets of U . Parameter sets $B \supseteq U$ are assumed to be small subsets of V , and realisations of types over U are assumed to be in V .

From now on, except in Section 4 or if otherwise specified, ‘definable’ means ‘definable with parameters from U ’. On the contrary, if not otherwise specified, formulas and terms are assumed to be over \emptyset . The length of a tuple of variables x is denoted by $|x|$, and similarly for tuples of parameters; for these, we sometimes write e.g. $a \in U$ instead of $a \in U^{|a|}$. When clear from context, $|\cdot|$ will also be used to denote the absolute value function.

We denote by $S_x(U)$ the space of types in the tuple of variables x over U , by $S(U)$ the space of types over U in any finite number of variables, and by $S^{\text{inv}}(U)$ its subspace of invariant ones, that is, those fixed under the natural action of $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{U}/A)$ for some small A . Equivalently, $p(x)$ is A -invariant if, for every formula $\varphi(x, y)$ over \emptyset , there is a set $d_p\varphi \subseteq S_y(A)$ such that, for every $d \in U^{|y|}$, we have $\varphi(x, d) \in p(x) \iff \text{tp}(d/A) \in d_p\varphi$. If $p(x)$ is a type and $f(x)$ a definable function with domain a set on which p concentrates, we write f_*p for the pushforward of p along f . Namely, if $p = \text{tp}(a/A)$, then $f_*p = \text{tp}(f(a)/A)$.

Definition 2.1. We say that two types $p(x), q(y) \in S(A)$ are *weakly orthogonal*, and write $p \perp^w q$, if $p(x) \cup q(y)$ implies a complete type over A .

Definition 2.2. Let $p(x), q(y) \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$.

- (1) If $A \subseteq U$, we define $S_{pq}(A)$ to be the subspace of $S_{xy}(A)$ of types extending $(p(x) \cup q(y)) \upharpoonright A$.
- (2) We say that p *dominates* q , and write $p \geq_{\text{D}} q$, if there are a small A and $r \in S_{pq}(A)$ such that $p(x) \cup r(x, y) \vdash q(y)$. We say that r *witnesses* that $p \geq_{\text{D}} q$.
- (3) We say that p and q are *domination-equivalent*, and write $p \sim_{\text{D}} q$, if $p \geq_{\text{D}} q$ and $q \geq_{\text{D}} p$. The domination-equivalence class of p is denoted by $\llbracket p \rrbracket$.
- (4) The *domination poset* $(\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U}), \geq_{\text{D}})$ is the quotient $S^{\text{inv}}(U)/\sim_{\text{D}}$ together with the partial order induced by \geq_{D} .

Definition 2.3. Let $p, q \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$.

- (1) If $B \supseteq U$, define $p \upharpoonright B$ as follows. Suppose A is a small subset of U and p is A -invariant. For $\varphi(x, w)$ a formula over \emptyset and $b \in B^{|w|}$,

let $\varphi(x, b) \in p \upharpoonright B$ if for every/some $d \in U^{|b|}$ with $d \equiv_A b$ we have $\varphi(x, d) \in p$.

- (2) Define $p(x) \otimes q(y)$ as follows. Fix $b \models q$. Then, for every $\varphi(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}(U)$, set $\varphi(x, y) \in p \otimes q$ if $\varphi(x, b) \in p \upharpoonright Ub$.
- (3) We call p and q *orthogonal*, and write $p \perp q$, if for every $B \supseteq U$ we have $(p \upharpoonright B) \perp^w (q \upharpoonright B)$.

We do not know whether in an o-minimal theory weak orthogonality of invariant types implies orthogonality, although in general this is false [HM24, Example 2.2]. The fact below is a summary of the known properties concerning the interaction of \otimes , domination, and (weak) orthogonality.

Fact 2.4. *Let $p_0, p_1, q \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$. The following hold.*

- (1) *If $p_0 \geq_D p_1$ then $p_0 \otimes q \geq_D p_1 \otimes q$.*
- (2) *If $p_0 \geq_D p_1$ and for $i < 2$ we have $p_i \otimes q \sim_D q \otimes p_i$, then $q \otimes p_0 \geq_D q \otimes p_1$.*
- (3) *If $p_0 \geq_D p_1$ and $p_0 \perp^w q$, then $p_1 \perp^w q$. In particular, if $p_0 \geq_D p_1$ and $p_0 \perp^w p_1$ then p_1 is realised.*
- (4) *If $p_0 \geq_D p_1$ and $p_0 \perp q$, then $p_1 \perp q$.*
- (5) *If $p \perp^w q$, then p and q commute, that is,¹ $p(x) \otimes q(y) = q(y) \otimes p(x)$.*
- (6) *If $p_0 \perp^w q_0$, $p_0 \sim_D p_1$ and $q_0 \sim_D q_1$, then $p_0 \otimes q_0 \sim_D p_1 \otimes q_1$.*
- (7) *If for $i < 2$ we have $p_i \perp q$ then $p_0 \otimes p_1 \perp q$.*

Proof. See [Men20b, Lemma 1.14] for 1, from which 2 follows easily. See [Men20b, Proposition 3.13, Corollary 3.14] for 3, [HM24, Proposition 2.4] for 4, and [Men22a, Remark 1.15] for 5. Applying the latter together with 1, 2 and 3 yields 6, while 7 is [HM24, Proposition 2.9]. \square

Definition 2.5. If for every $p_0, p_1, q \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$ we have $(p_0 \geq_D p_1) \implies (q \otimes p_0 \geq_D q \otimes p_1)$, we say that \otimes *respects* \geq_D , or that \otimes and \geq_D are *compatible*. In this case, the expansion $(\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U}), \geq_D, \otimes)$ of the domination poset by the operation induced by \otimes is a monoid, which we call the *domination monoid of \mathfrak{U}* . We abbreviate this fact by simply saying that $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ *is a monoid*.

Recall that $p(x) \in S(U)$ is *definable* over A if it is A -invariant and every $d_p \varphi$ is clopen, equivalently, given by a formula over A . We write $S^{\text{def}}(U)$ for the space of types over U that are definable over some $A \subseteq U$.

Fact 2.6 ([Men20b, Theorem 3.5(2)]). *If $p, q \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$, $p \geq_D q$, and p is definable, then so is q .*

We write $\widetilde{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{U})$ for the restriction of $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ to domination-equivalence classes of definable types.

Definition 2.7. Let P be a \emptyset -definable unary set. Consider the language

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ind}} = \{R_\varphi(x) : \varphi(x) \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

Given $\mathcal{M} \models T$, the *induced structure on P by \mathcal{M}* , denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, is the \mathcal{L}_{ind} -structure whose universe is $P(\mathcal{M})$ and, for every $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{L}$ and $a \in P(\mathcal{M})^{|x|}$,

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}) \models R_\varphi(a) \iff \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a).$$

¹See also [Men22a, Definition 1.13] and the discussion surrounding it.

Definition 2.8. If P is a \emptyset -definable unary set, we say that P is *stably embedded* if for every $\varphi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(U)$, the set $\varphi(\mathfrak{U}) \cap P(\mathfrak{U})^{|x|}$ is definable with parameters in the structure $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{U})$.

Remark 2.9.

- (1) One may still talk of stable embeddedness for A -definable unary P by adding to the language constants for elements of A . Stable embeddedness of such a P does not depend on the choice of A .
- (2) Whether P is stably embedded does not depend on the choice of monster \mathfrak{U} .

Fact 2.10. Let R be a stably embedded unary definable set. Denote by $\iota : S_{\mathcal{R}^{<\omega}}^{\text{inv}}(R(\mathfrak{U})) \rightarrow S(U)$ the map sending an invariant type of $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U})$ in finitely many variables to the unique type of \mathfrak{U} it implies. Then every type in the image of ι is invariant, and ι induces an embedding of posets $\text{Inv}(\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U})) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$, which is also a homomorphism for the relations \perp^w , $\not\perp^w$, \perp , $\not\perp$. If \otimes respects \geq_D , then it is also an embedding of monoids.

Proof. See [Men20a, Proposition 2.3.31] and [HM24, Proposition 2.5]. Note that the latter uses the terminology *fully embedded*. In the context of the present paper, whenever we consider definable sets as structures, we always mean with the full induced structure, in which case full embeddedness coincides with stable embeddedness. \square

2.2. Domination in o-minimal theories. Here we recall some facts regarding o-minimal theories and the behaviour of domination in them. We refer the reader to [Men22a] for details.

Fact 2.11. Let T be o-minimal, and R a unary definable set. Then R is stably embedded.

Proof. This is an easy consequence of [PSS89, Lemma 1.2], as noted in [PS98, after Lemma 2.3]. \square

Fact 2.12 ([Men22a, Lemmas 1.24 and 1.25]). If T is o-minimal and $p, q \in S_1(A)$ are non-realised, then $p \not\perp^w q$ if and only if there is an A -definable bijection f such that $f_*p = q$. If $p, q \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U)$, then this is also equivalent to $p \sim_D q$.

By Fact 2.4, \perp is preserved by \otimes . Under *distality*, so is \perp^w . Recall that every o-minimal theory is distal, and every distal theory is NIP, see [Sim15].

Fact 2.13 ([Men22a, Lemma 1.29]). Assume T is distal and $q_0, q_1, p \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$. If $q_0 \perp^w p$ and $q_1 \perp^w p$, then $q_0 \otimes q_1 \perp^w p$. In particular, if $p \perp^w q$ then for every $n, m \in \omega$ we have $p^n \perp^w q^m$.

Fact 2.14 [Sim14, Corollary 4.7]). If T is NIP and $\{p_i : i \in I\}$ is a family of pairwise weakly orthogonal invariant types then $\bigcup_{i \in I} p_i(x^i)$ is complete.

Fact 2.15. If T is o-minimal and $p \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U)$, then for every $n > 0$ we have $p(x) \sim_D p(y_0) \otimes \dots \otimes p(y_n)$. Moreover, this can be witnessed by a small type implying $x = y_n$.

Proof. The first statement follows from Fact 2.4(2) and [Men22a, Corollary 2.4], while the ‘moreover’ part is clear from the proof of the latter. \square

Fact 2.16. *Assume T is o-minimal and let $D(x, y)$ be the relation of being disjoint.*

- (1) *If every $p \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$ is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types, then \otimes and \geq_D are compatible and, if $X(\mathfrak{U})$ is the set of non-realised invariant 1-types modulo being in definable bijection, then*

$$(\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U}), \otimes, \geq_D, \perp^w) \cong (\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(X(\mathfrak{U})), \cup, \supseteq, D).$$

- (2) *If every $p \in S^{\text{def}}(U)$ is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types, then \otimes and \geq_D are compatible on definable types and, if $Y(\mathfrak{U})$ is the set of non-realised definable 1-types modulo being in definable bijection, then*

$$(\widetilde{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{U}), \otimes, \geq_D, \perp^w) \cong (\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(Y(\mathfrak{U})), \cup, \supseteq, D).$$

Proof. The first part is [Men22a, Theorem 2.13]. The second part is obtained by observing that the proof of the cited result still goes through when all types considered are definable. \square

2.3. Extremal witnesses. In order to simplify some of the technical statements to follow, we introduce the following notion.

Definition 2.17. Let $p(x), q(y) \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$. We call a witness $r(x, y)$ of $p \geq_D q$ *extremal* if

- (1) there is a definable function τ such that $r(x, y) \vdash y = \tau(x)$, and
(2) if $(a, b) \models p(x) \cup r(x, y)$, then there is no $c \in \text{dcl}(Ua) \setminus U$ such that $\text{tp}(c/U)$ is realised in $\text{dcl}(Ub)$ and $\text{tp}(bc/U) = \text{tp}(b/U) \otimes \text{tp}(c/U)$. In this case, we say that b is *extremal* with respect to a and U .

If the same r also witnesses $q \geq_D p$, then we say that r is an *extremal witness* of $p \sim_D q$.

In other words, in the notation above, b is extremal if it is not extendable ‘invariantly on the right’ in $\text{dcl}(Ua) \setminus U$ by points with the same type as something in $\text{dcl}(Ub)$. That is, there is no q' realised in $\text{dcl}(Ub)$ such that $q(y) \otimes q'(z)$ is realised in $\text{dcl}(Ua) \setminus U$ by some tuple of the form (b, c) . This does not prevent tuples of the form (c, b) from realising an invariant type of the form $q'(z) \otimes q(y)$, as clear from the example below.

Example 2.18. Let T be an o-minimal theory, $p_{+\infty}$ the type at infinity, $p(x) := p_{+\infty}(x_0) \otimes p_{+\infty}(x_1)$, and $q(y) = p_{+\infty}(y)$. If a witness of $p \geq_D q$ contains $x_1 = y$, then it is extremal, but if it contains $x_0 = y$ then it is not.

The following remark is easy to prove, arguing as in the proof of [Men22a, Lemma 1.24].

Remark 2.19. In an o-minimal theory, a 1-type q is dominated by some p if and only if, for every $a \models p$, the 1-type q is realised in $\text{dcl}(Ua)$.

Lemma 2.20. *Let T be o-minimal, and for $i \leq n$ let $q_i \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U)$ be non-realised, pairwise weakly orthogonal, and such that $q \geq_D q_i$.*

- (1) *There is an extremal witness of $q(x) \geq_D (q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q_n)(y)$.*

- (2) For every extremal witness $r(x, y)$ of $q(x) \geq_{\mathbb{D}} (q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q_n)(y)$, and every $p_0, \dots, p_m \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U)$ such that every p_i is domination-equivalent to some q_j , there is an extension $r'(x, y, z)$ of r witnessing $q(x) \geq_{\mathbb{D}} (p_0 \otimes \dots \otimes p_m)(z) \otimes (q_0, \dots, q_n)(y)$. Moreover, the analogous statement where every $\geq_{\mathbb{D}}$ is replaced by $\sim_{\mathbb{D}}$ also holds.

Proof. To prove Point 1, fix $a \models q$. For $i \leq n$, if q_i^k is realised in $\text{dcl}(Ua)$, then $k \leq \dim(a/U)$. Moreover, $k \geq 1$ by Remark 2.19. Hence, by taking a maximal such k we find $b_i \models q_i$ in $\text{dcl}(Ua)$ such that there is no $c \in \text{dcl}(Ua)$ with $(b_i, c) \models q_i^2$. We repeat this for every $i \leq n$, let $b := (b_0, \dots, b_n)$, and observe that the type r of (a, b) over a suitable small set witnesses $q \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q_n$ by Fact 2.14. If there was c witnessing that b is not extremal with respect to U and a , then by Remark 2.19, Fact 2.13, and Fact 2.12 we would find $i \leq n$ and a definable bijection such that $f(c) \models q_i$. We conclude by observing that $(b_i, f(c)) \models q_i^2$, against the choice of b_i .

For point 2, recall that by Fact 2.12, in an o-minimal theory, non-realised 1-types are either weakly orthogonal or in definable bijection. By [Men20b, Corollary 1.24] domination witnessed by definable functions is always compatible with \otimes . Using this, Fact 2.13, and Fact 2.4(5), we find an extremal witness of

$$p_0 \otimes \dots \otimes p_m \otimes q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q_n \sim_{\mathbb{D}} q_0^{\ell_0} \otimes \dots \otimes q_n^{\ell_n},$$

for suitable ℓ_i . Fact 2.15 tells us that for each j there is an extremal witness of $q_j^{\ell_j} \sim_{\mathbb{D}} q_j$, so we find an extremal witness r'' of

$$p_0 \otimes \dots \otimes p_m \otimes q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q_n \sim_{\mathbb{D}} q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q_n.$$

From r and r'' we easily construct the required r' . \square

Definition 2.21. Let $p(x) \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$, $A \subseteq U$, and let $\mathcal{F}_A^{p,1}$ be the set of A -definable functions with domain a set on which p concentrates and codomain U . We define

$$\pi_{p,A}(x) := \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_A^{p,1}} \{\varphi(f(x)) \in \mathcal{L}(U) : p(x) \vdash \varphi(f(x))\}.$$

Proposition 2.22. Let T be o-minimal and $p(x) \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$. Let $q(y)$ be any product of non-realised, invariant, pairwise weakly orthogonal 1-types maximal amongst those realised in $\text{dcl}(Ua)$, for $a \models p$. For every small $A \subseteq U$ there is an extremal witness of $p \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q$ such that $q(y) \cup r(x, y) \vdash \pi_{p,A}(x)$.

Proof. Write $q = q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q_k$. By Lemma 2.20(1), there is an extremal witness $r'(x, y)$ of $p \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q$, say containing the formula $y = \tau(x)$. Let $q'(z) = q_{i_0} \otimes \dots \otimes q_{i_n}$ be such that $q'(z) \otimes q(y)$ is maximal amongst the products of non-realised invariant 1-types realised in $\text{dcl}(Ua)$. Such a q' exists by maximality of q and Fact 2.12.

By [Men22a, Proposition 2.18] and extremality, r' extends to some small type $r''(x, y, z)$ such that $(q'(z) \otimes q(y)) \cup r''(x, y, z) \vdash \pi_{p,A}(x)$.

We apply Lemma 2.20(2), and by discarding the coordinates in z by quantifying over them as in [Men20a, Lemma 2.1.10], we obtain $r''(x, y)$ such that $q(y) \cup r(x, y) \vdash \exists z ((q'(z) \otimes q(y)) \cup r''(x, y, z))$. It follows that $q(y) \cup r(x, y) \vdash \pi_{p,A}(x)$, as desired. Moreover, by construction $r(x, y)$ still contains $y = \tau(x)$, hence is still an extremal witness of $p \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q$. \square

2.4. Linear o-minimal theories.

Theorem 2.23. *Let T be a linear expansion of DOAG. Then in T every invariant type is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types. More precisely, let $p \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$, $a \models p$, and $p_0, \dots, p_k \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U)$ any maximal tuple of pairwise weakly orthogonal, non-realised invariant 1-types realised in $\text{dcl}(Ua)$. Then there is an extremal witness of $p \sim_{\text{D}} p_0 \otimes \dots \otimes p_k$.*

Proof. By [LP93, Corollary 6.3] T has quantifier elimination in the language \mathcal{L} consisting of the ordered group language, constants for all \emptyset -definable points, and function symbols for all partial endomorphisms, set equal to 0 outside their domain.

It suffices to deal with the case of a global A_0 -invariant type $p(x)$ of a U -independent tuple. Let $\mathcal{N} \prec \mathfrak{U}$ be $|A_0|^+$ -saturated. Apply Proposition 2.22 with $A = N$, and work in the notation of the latter. We show that $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash p(x)$.

By quantifier elimination in \mathcal{L} , and the fact that p is the type of a U -independent tuple, this amounts to showing that, whenever $t(x, w)$ is an \mathcal{L} -term, d is a tuple from U , and $p(x) \vdash t(x, d) > 0$, then $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t(x, d) > 0$. We show the (seemingly) stronger statement that $\pi_{p,N}(x)$ decides the cut in U of $t(x, d)$.

To this end we prove, by induction on $t(x, w)$, that if $\tilde{d} \in N$ is such that $\tilde{d} \equiv_{A_0} d$ then there is $e \in U$ such that $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t(x, d) = t(x, \tilde{d}) + e$. This suffices because, since $\tilde{d} \in N$, by definition $\pi_{p,N}(x)$ decides the cut of $t(x, \tilde{d})$ in U .

When $t(x, w)$ is a single variable, or a constant, the conclusion is clear since, as usual, we are working modulo the elementary diagram of \mathfrak{U} . If $t(x, y) = t_0(x, w) + t_1(x, w)$, assume that, for $i < 2$, the conclusion holds for $t_i(x, w)$, witnessed by $e_i \in U$ such that

$$\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t_i(x, d) - t_i(x, \tilde{d}) = e_i.$$

Then

$$\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t(x, d) - t(x, \tilde{d}) = t_0(x, d) - t_0(x, \tilde{d}) + t_1(x, d) - t_1(x, \tilde{d}) = e_0 + e_1,$$

and the conclusion follows with $e := e_0 + e_1$. The case where $t(x, w) = -t_0(x, w)$ is also easy, so we are left to deal with the case $t(x, w) = f(t_0(x, w))$, with f a partial endomorphism. Inductively, there is $e \in U$ such that $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t_0(x, d) = t_0(x, \tilde{d}) + e$. Therefore, $\pi_{p,N}(x)$ decides the type of $t_0(x, d)$, and in particular it decides whether it is in $\text{dom} f$. Since $\tilde{d} \equiv_{A_0} d$, and p is A_0 -invariant, we must have $p \vdash t_0(x, d) \in \text{dom} f \iff p \vdash t_0(x, \tilde{d}) \in \text{dom} f$. We have two cases.

- (1) $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t_0(x, \tilde{d}) \notin \text{dom} f$ (hence also $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t_0(x, d) \notin \text{dom} f$).
Then $f(t_0(x, d)) - f(t_0(x, \tilde{d})) = 0 - 0 = 0 \in U$
- (2) $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t_0(x, \tilde{d}) \in \text{dom} f$ (hence also $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash t_0(x, d) \in \text{dom} f$).
By invariance, $t_0(x, \tilde{d})$ and $t_0(x, d)$ have the same sign, and it follows that $\pi_{p,N}(x) \vdash |e| = |t_0(x, d) - t_0(x, \tilde{d})| \leq \max\{|t_0(x, d)|, |t_0(x, \tilde{d})|\}$. Since $\text{dom} f$ is a symmetric interval centred at 0, this proves $e \in \text{dom} f$, and the conclusion follows easily by writing $f(t_0(x, d)) = f(t_0(x, \tilde{d})) + f(e)$. \square

Corollary 2.24. *If T is an o-minimal, linear expansion of DOAG, then $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ is a monoid and isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(X(\mathfrak{U}), \cup, \supseteq)$, where $X(\mathfrak{U})$ is the set of non-realised invariant 1-types modulo definable bijection.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.23 and Facts 2.12 and 2.16. \square

3. COFINAL CURVES AND DEFINABLE TYPES

Throughout this section, we fix an o-minimal \mathcal{L} -theory T expanding the theory of dense linear orders without endpoints, and a monster model \mathfrak{U} . We refer indistinctively to collections of formulas and the sets that they define in \mathfrak{U} . We use $p|_{\varphi}^+$ for the restriction of a type $p(x)$ to ‘positive instances’ of a formula $\varphi(x, y)$, that is, $p|_{\varphi}^+$ denotes the family of all formulas of the form $\varphi(x, b)$, with $b \in U^{|y|}$, in $p(x)$.

Recall that a *preorder* is a transitive and reflexive relation. We call a preordered set (W, \preceq) *definable* if the preorder \preceq is definable (in which case, by reflexivity, W is definable too). A preordered set (W, \preceq) is *downward directed* if, for every $x, y \in W$, there exists $z \in W$ such that $z \preceq \{x, y\}$; equivalently, for every finite subset $W_0 \subseteq W$, there is $z \in W$ with $z \preceq W_0$. A family of sets (respectively, formulas) is downward directed if it is downward directed with respect to the inclusion (respectively, implication) preorder.

Fact 3.1 ([AG25], Proposition 4.1). *Let $p \in S_x(U)$. For every formula $\varphi(x, y)$ there exists another formula $\psi(x, z)$ such that $p|_{\psi}^+$ is downward directed and $p|_{\psi}^+ \vdash p|_{\varphi}^+$.*

Fact 3.2 ([AGTW21], Corollary 25). *Suppose that T expands RCF. Let (W, \preceq) be a definable downward directed preordered set. Then there exists a definable curve $\gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow W$ satisfying that, for every $b \in W$, there exists some $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for every $d \in (0, c)$, we have $\gamma(d) \preceq b$.*

Following terminology from [AGTW21], we call a definable curve γ as above a *cofinal curve* in (W, \preceq) .

Remark 3.3. In Fact 3.2, if (W, \preceq) is $\mathcal{L}(A)$ -definable, for some $A \subseteq U$, then γ can be chosen A -definable too. Indeed, suppose $\varphi(x, y, d)$ defines the graph of a cofinal curve $\gamma(x) = y$ in (W, \preceq) . Then the set

$$S = \{t : \varphi(x, y, t) \text{ defines a cofinal curve in } (W, \preceq)\}$$

is non-empty and A -definable. By definable choice, pick $a \in S \cap \text{dcl}(A)$. Then $\varphi(x, y, a)$ defines the desired A -definable cofinal curve.

Remark 3.4. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{X_a : a \in W\}$ be a family of sets. Consider the relation \preceq on W given by $a \preceq b$ whenever $X_a \subseteq X_b$. This is clearly a preorder on W . Observe that, if \mathcal{X} is definable, then \preceq is definable (over the same parameters). Clearly (W, \preceq) is a downward directed set if and only if \mathcal{X} is a downward directed family of sets.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that T expands RCF. Let $A \subseteq U$ and $p \in S_x^{\text{def}}(U)$ be an A -definable type. For every \mathcal{L} -formula $\varphi(x, y)$ there exists an $\mathcal{L}(A)$ -formula $\psi(x, t)$, with $|t| = 1$, satisfying that*

$$(1) \ p|_{\psi}^+ = \{\psi(x, c) : c > 0\},$$

- (2) for every $\varphi(x, b) \in p|_{\varphi}^+$ there exists some $c > 0$ such that for every $d \in (0, c)$ we have $\psi(x, d) \vdash \varphi(x, b)$.

In particular $p|_{\psi}^+ \vdash p|_{\varphi}^+$.

Proof. By Fact 3.1 we may assume that $\varphi(x, y)$ satisfies that $p|_{\varphi}^+$ is downward directed. Let $W = \{b \in U^{|y|} : \varphi(x, b) \in p\}$. Let \preceq be the directed preorder on W described in Remark 3.4. Since p is A -definable then (W, \preceq) is A -definable too. By Fact 3.2 and Remark 3.3 let γ be an A -definable cofinal curve in (W, \preceq) . Consider the $\mathcal{L}(A)$ -formula $\psi(x, t)$ given by

$$\exists y (\varphi(x, y) \wedge (y = \gamma(t))).$$

Observe that $p|_{\psi}^+ = \{\psi(x, c) : c > 0\}$. Since γ is cofinal in (W, \preceq) , it is easy to check that condition 2 is also satisfied. \square

Denote by p_{0+} the definable type of positive infinitesimals. It is a known fact that, in an o-minimal structure \mathfrak{U} , every non-realised A -definable type in $S_1^{\text{def}}(U)$ is either the type at $+\infty$, the type at $-\infty$, or the type of some element infinitesimally close to some $a \in \text{dcl}(A)$. Using the field operations one easily reaches the following fact.

Fact 3.6. *In every o-minimal expansion of RCF every A -definable 1-type q is either realised or in A -definable bijection with p_{0+} . In particular, in the latter case $q \sim_{\text{D}} p_{0+}$, witnessed by the aforementioned bijection.*

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose that T expands RCF. Then every non-realised definable type is domination-equivalent to the type p_{0+} of positive infinitesimals. Moreover, if p is A -definable, then this is witnessed by a type over A .*

Proof. Let $p \in S_x^{\text{def}}(U)$ be a non-realised A -definable type. As p is non-realised, there is a projection $q(x_i)$ of $p(x)$ to some coordinate that is non-realised. Since q is a projection, it is clearly A -definable and $p(x) \vdash q(x_i)$. Since q is A -definable, by Fact 3.6 we have that $q(x_i) \sim_{\text{D}} p_{0+}(y)$, witnessed by any $r \in S_{pq}(A)$ placing x_i and y in definable bijection. We conclude that $p \cup r \vdash p_{0+}$.

We now show that $p_{0+} \geq_{\text{D}} p$, witnessed by a type over A . Let $r(x, t)$ be the collection of all $\mathcal{L}(A)$ -formulas $\psi(x, t)$ given by Lemma 3.5 as $\varphi(x, y)$ ranges among all \mathcal{L} -formulas $\varphi(x, y)$. By Lemma 3.5(1), it is easy to see that $p_{0+}(t) \cup r(x, t)$ is consistent. Finally, by Lemma 3.5(2), observe that $p_{0+}(t) \cup r(x, t) \vdash p(x)$. \square

Theorem 3.8. *Let T be an o-minimal expansion of RCF. Then all non-realised definable types are domination-equivalent, and $\widehat{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{U})$ is a monoid and isomorphic to $(\mathcal{P}(\{0\}), \cup, \supseteq)$.*

Proof. This follows from Fact 2.16(2), Corollary 3.7, and Fact 3.6. \square

4. ORTHOGONALITY IN SEMI-BOUNDED STRUCTURES

4.1. Preliminaries. In this section, we fix a semi-bounded o-minimal expansion $\mathcal{M} = \langle M, <, +, 0, \dots \rangle$ of an ordered group that is not linear. For convenience, we assume that the language \mathcal{L} of \mathcal{M} contains a constant symbol 1 for a positive element such that the induced structure \mathcal{R} on $R = (0, 1)$

expands a real closed field whose order agrees with $<$.² Note that, as far as weak orthogonality and domination are concerned, naming finitely many constants is harmless.

For the sake of brevity, until the end of the section we will abuse the notation by writing R in place of $R(\mathcal{M})$. In this section, *definable* means ‘definable in \mathcal{M} with parameters’ unless otherwise specified. By Λ we denote the set of all \emptyset -definable partial endomorphisms of $\langle M, <, +, 0 \rangle$. The *linear reduct* of \mathcal{M} is $\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}} := \langle M, <, +, 0, \{\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \rangle$ of \mathcal{M} , and its language is denoted by \mathcal{L}_{lin} .

Following [Pet09], an interval $I \subseteq M$ is called *short* if there is a definable bijection between I and R ; otherwise, it is called *long*. Equivalently, I is short if there is a definable real closed field with domain I ([Pet09, Corollary 3.3]) whose order agrees with that of \mathcal{M} . An element $a \in M$ is called *short* if either $a = 0$ or $(0, |a|)$ is a short interval; otherwise, it is called *tall*. A tuple $a \in M^n$ is called *short* if $|a| := |a_1| + \dots + |a_n|$ is short, and *tall* otherwise. A definable set $X \subseteq M^n$ (or its defining formula) is called *short* if it is in definable bijection with a subset of R^n ; otherwise, it is called *long*. Notice that this is compatible, for $n = 1$, with the notion of a short interval.

We recall some information from [Ele12]. Define the following closure operator. For $A \subseteq M$, let

$$\text{scl}(A) = \{a \in M : \text{there is an } A\text{-definable short interval that contains } a\}.$$

Remark 4.1. Contrary to what happens with the usual dcl operator, $\text{scl}(A)$ grows if we pass to an elementary extension. In this section, when we write scl, we mean scl computed in \mathcal{M} .

By [Ele12, Lemma 5.5], scl defines a pregeometry. Let $\text{scl-rk}(b/A)$ denote the usual scl-dimension of a tuple b over A . Let $\mathfrak{U} \succ \mathcal{M}$ be a monster model, and let

$$\text{ldim}(X) = \max\{\text{scl-rk}(b/A) : b \in X(\mathfrak{U}), A \text{ small, and } X \text{ is } A\text{-definable}\}$$

be the associated notion of dimension for a definable set X , which is shown in [Ele12, Lemma 5.7] to be well-defined.³

In [Ele12, Corollary 5.10], ldim was shown to equal a ‘structural dimension’, which we do not define here, but notice that using that equality, we obtain that for a definable set X , we have $\text{ldim}(X) = 0$ if and only if X is short. Moreover, the following hold:

Fact 4.2. *For definable sets X, Y and a definable function $f : X \rightarrow M^n$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{ldim}(X \times Y) = \text{ldim}X + \text{ldim}Y$,
- (2) $\text{ldim}f(X) \leq \text{ldim}X$, with equality if f is a bijection.

Proof. By [Ele12, Lemma 4.2 and Corollary 3.11], respectively. \square

There is also a dimension formula for families, but we will not need it. Also, notably, ldim is not a definable notion.

²If instead of 1 we named any non-zero constant, the set R would still be \emptyset -definable by definable choice.

³In [Ele12] ldim is denoted by lgdim.

Fact 4.3. *Let \mathcal{M} be any o-minimal expansion of an ordered group with a non-zero constant. Suppose X, Y are two A -definable sets such that there is a definable bijection between them. Then there is an A -definable bijection between them.*

Proof. This is similar to the argument in Remark 3.3. \square

Fact 4.4. *The following are equivalent, for $a \in M$ and $A \subseteq M$:*

- (1) $a \in \text{dcl}(AR)$,
- (2) *there is $b \in \text{dcl}(A)$ such that $a - b$ is short,*
- (3) $a \in \text{scl}(A)$.

Proof. By [Ele12, Lemma 5.4], $2 \Leftrightarrow 3$. For $1 \Rightarrow 3$, let $a \in \text{dcl}(AR)$. So there is an A -definable map f with $a \in f(R^k)$, for some k . By Fact 4.2(2), $f(R^k)$ is short, as needed. For $3 \Rightarrow 1$, let X be an A -definable short interval that contains a . Since X is short, it is in definable bijection with R and, by Fact 4.3, that bijection can be chosen to be A -definable. Therefore, $a \in \text{dcl}(AR)$, as needed. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $c \in M^n$ be a tuple with $\text{scl-rk}(c/A) = k$. Then there is an A -definable set Y containing c with $\text{ldim}(Y) = k$.*

Proof. Let c' be an scl-basis of c over A . Say $c = (c', d)$, after perhaps permuting coordinates. By Fact 4.4 there is an A -definable map $f : M^{k+m} \rightarrow M^{n-k}$ with $f(c', r) = d$, for some $r \in R^m$. Let Y be the graph of the map $f \upharpoonright_{M^k \times R^m}$. This is an A -definable set containing c with $\text{ldim} Y = k$. \square

The induced structure \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{M} on R is obviously o-minimal. We next recall that, in the special case when \mathcal{M} is a reduct of a real closed field, \mathcal{R} is a pure real closed field, that is, a real closed field with no extra structure. Such a case arises when, for example, we start with a real closed field $\mathcal{N} = \langle M, <, +, \cdot \rangle$, and let \mathcal{R} be a definable (in \mathcal{N}) real closed field with bounded domain, and $\mathcal{M} = \langle M, <, +, \mathcal{R} \rangle$.

Fact 4.6 ([MPP92, Corollary 3.6]). *Let \mathcal{M} be a reduct of a pure real closed field \mathcal{N} . Then \mathcal{R} is a pure real closed field.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{R}' be the reduct of \mathcal{R} to the ordered field structure. By [OPP96], there is an isomorphism $\sigma : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}'$ definable in \mathcal{N} . Now let $X \subseteq R^n$ be definable in \mathcal{R} . So X is also definable in \mathcal{N} . Hence, $\sigma^{-1}(X)$ is definable in \mathcal{N} . But since σ is an isomorphism between the structures \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{R}' , this means that X is definable in \mathcal{R}' . \square

4.2. Long cones. In [Ele12], the notion of a ‘cone’ from [Edm00] was refined as follows.

Definition 4.7. If $v = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Lambda^n$ and $t \in M$, we denote $vt := (\lambda_1 t, \dots, \lambda_n t)$ and $\text{dom}(v) := \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{dom}(\lambda_i)$. We say that $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \Lambda^n$ are *independent* if for all $t_1, \dots, t_k \in M$ with $t_i \in \text{dom}(v_i)$,

$$v_1 t_1 + \dots + v_k t_k = 0 \text{ implies } t_1 = \dots = t_k = 0.$$

Definition 4.8. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A k -long cone $C \subseteq M^n$ is a definable set of the form

$$\left\{ b + \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i : b \in B, t_i \in J_i \right\},$$

where $B \subseteq M^n$ is a short cell, $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \Lambda^n$ are independent and J_1, \dots, J_k are long intervals each of the form $(0, a_i)$, for $a_i \in M^{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, with $J_i \subseteq \text{dom}(v_i)$. So a 0-long cone is just a short cell. A *long cone* is a k -long cone, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that the long cone C is *normalised* if for each $x \in C$ there are unique $b \in B$ and $t_1 \in J_1, \dots, t_k \in J_k$ such that $x = b + \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i$. In this case, we write:

$$C = B + \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i | J_i.$$

In what follows, all long cones are assumed to be normalised, and we thus drop the word ‘normalised’. We will also often omit ‘long’ from the terminology. By a *subcone* of C we simply mean a cone contained in C .

We recall the first part of the structure theorem from [Ele12]. (The second part is about definable functions, but we will not use that here.)

Fact 4.9 (Structure Theorem, [Ele12, Theorem 3.8]). *Let $X \subseteq M^n$ be an A -definable set. Then X is a finite union of A -definable cones.*

Lemma 4.10. *Let C be a cone as above. If C is A -definable, then so are all of B and J_1, \dots, J_k .*

Proof. By definable choice, there is an element $a \in C$ which is in $\text{dcl}(A)$. Recall that $J_i = (0, a_i)$. It is then not hard to check that each

$$a_i = \sup\{t - s : t, s \in M, a + v_i t, a + v_i s \in C\}.$$

So every J_i is A -definable. Moreover,

$$B = \left\{ b \in M^n : \exists (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_k \left(b + \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i \in C \right) \right\}$$

is also A -definable. \square

Notation. If $J = (0, a)$, we denote $\pm J := (-a, a)$. Let $C = B + \sum_{i=1}^m v_i t_i | J_i$ be an m -long cone. We set

$$\langle C \rangle := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m v_i t_i : t_i \in \pm J_i \right\}.$$

Fact 4.11 (Lemma on Subcones [Ele12, Lemma 3.1]). *If $C' = B' + \sum_{i=1}^{m'} w_i t_i | J'_i$ and $C = B + \sum_{i=1}^m v_i t_i | J_i$ are two long cones such that $C' \subseteq C \subseteq M^n$, then $\langle C' \rangle \subseteq \langle C \rangle$ (and hence $m' \leq m$).*

It follows that the long dimension of a k -cone is k ([Ele12, Lemma 3.6(iii)]).

Remark 4.12. A k -long cone $C = B + \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i | J_i$ has dimension k if and only if B is finite. In fact, $\dim(C) = \dim(B) + k$.

Lemma 4.13. *Let $C \subseteq M^n$ be an n -cone. Then both C and $\langle C \rangle$ contain boxes of the form*

$$B = I_1 \times \dots \times I_n,$$

where each I_i is a long interval and, in the case of $\langle C \rangle$, of the form $(-\kappa_i, \kappa_i)$.

Proof. Let $e_i \in \Lambda^n$ be the unit vector, with 1 in the i -th coordinate and 0 everywhere else, where 1 is the identical endomorphism with full domain. By Remark 4.12, $\langle C \rangle$ is an open neighbourhood of 0. Hence, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ there is a positive $s_i \in M$ such that $e_i s_i \in \langle C \rangle$. By [Ele12, Lemma 2.16], there is an n -cone $C' \subseteq C$ of the form $C' = c + \sum_{i=1}^n e_i t_i | (0, \kappa_i)$, for some tall $\kappa_i \in M$. So

$$c + (0, \kappa_1) \times \dots \times (0, \kappa_n) \subseteq C,$$

is the required box for C . Moreover, by the Lemma on Subcones (Fact 4.11), $\langle C' \rangle \subseteq \langle C \rangle$. We conclude by observing that $\langle C' \rangle = (-\kappa_1, \kappa_1) \times \dots \times (-\kappa_n, \kappa_n)$ is also an open box with each $(-\kappa_i, \kappa_i)$ long. \square

Observe also the following fact. Let $\pi : M^{m+n} \rightarrow M^m$ denote the projection onto the first m coordinates. Below, we abuse the notation and write 0 for a tuple $(0, \dots, 0)$ of suitable arity.

Lemma 4.14. *Let $C = B + \sum_{i=1}^n v_i t_i | J_i$ be an n -cone contained in M^{m+n} , and $I_1, \dots, I_n \subseteq M$ open intervals of the form $(-d_i, d_i)$, such that*

$$\{0\} \times I_1 \times \dots \times I_n \subseteq \langle C \rangle.$$

Then $\pi(\langle C \rangle) = \{0\}$. In other words, for each v_i there is $u_i \in \Lambda^n$ such that $v_i = (0, u_i)$.

Proof. Let $I = \{0\} \times I_1 \times \dots \times I_n$. Since $I \subseteq \langle C \rangle$ has dimension n , the set I is a relatively open neighbourhood of the identity in $\langle C \rangle$. Hence, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, since v_i is continuous, there is a non-zero $t_i \in M$ such that the element $c_i = v_i t_i$ belongs to I . This implies that, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the j -th coordinate of c_i equals 0. Since $t_i \neq 0$, it follows that the j -th coordinate of v_i is 0. \square

We will also need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.15. *Let $C \subseteq M^n$ be an n -cone of the form*

$$C = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i t_i | J_i,$$

where $J_i = (0, a_i)$. Let $b \in M^n$ be a short tuple. Then

$$\text{ldim}((C + b) \setminus C) < n.$$

Proof. We start with a claim.

Claim. *There are short $b_1, \dots, b_n \in M$, such that*

$$b = v_1 b_1 + \dots + v_n b_n.$$

Proof of Claim. Let $B = (-\kappa_1, \kappa_1) \times \dots \times (-\kappa_n, \kappa_n) \subseteq \langle C \rangle$ be as in Lemma 4.13, with each $(-\kappa_i, \kappa_i)$ long. Since $b \in M^n$ is short, we have $b \in B \subseteq \langle C \rangle$. Therefore, there are $b_1, \dots, b_n \in M$, such that

$$b = v_1 b_1 + \dots + v_n b_n.$$

By [Ele12, Lemma 2.6], b_1, \dots, b_n are all short. □

CLAIM

For ease of notation, for $m \in M$, let us convene that $\infty + m = \infty$, and that $[\infty, \infty)$ denotes the empty set. Fix b_1, \dots, b_n as in the Claim. Then $C + b$ is contained in the set

$$T = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n v_i t_i : \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} t_i \in (-|b_i|, a_i + |b_i|) \right\}.$$

Hence, $(C + b) \setminus C$ is contained in the set

$$D := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n v_i t_i \in T : \exists i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\} t_{i_0} \notin (0, a_{i_0}) \right\}.$$

For $H \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, define

$$C_H = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n v_i t_i : \forall i \notin H t_i \in (-|b_i|, a_i + |b_i|), \text{ and} \right. \\ \left. \forall i \in H t_i \in (-|b_i|, 0] \cup [a_i, a_i + |b_i|) \right\}.$$

By definition, $D = \bigcup \{C_H : \emptyset \neq H \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}\}$. It is not hard to check that if $H \neq \emptyset$ then C_H is in definable bijection with a set of the form $Y = Y_1 \times \dots \times Y_n$, with at least one of the Y_i being short and of the form

$$(-|b_i|, 0] \cup [a_i, a_i + |b_i|),$$

via the map $\tau : Y \rightarrow M^n$, $\tau(t_1, \dots, t_n) = (v_1 t_1, \dots, v_n t_n)$. It follows that $\text{ldim} Y < n$, implying that $\text{ldim}(C + b) \setminus C < n$, as needed. □

Lemma 4.16. *Let $C \subseteq M^n$ be an n -cone of the form*

$$C = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i t_i | J_i,$$

where $J_i = (0, a_i)$. Let $B \subseteq M^n$ be a short cell, and denote

$$T := \bigcup_{b \in B} (b + C) \quad \text{and} \quad S := \bigcap_{b \in B} (b + C).$$

Then $\text{ldim}(T \setminus S) < n$.

Proof. We have

$$T \setminus S = \bigcup_{b \in B} \bigcup_{b' \in B} (b + C) \setminus (b' + C).$$

Hence, by a standard application of [Ele12, Lemma 4.2(i)], it suffices to prove that for every $b, b' \in B$,

$$\text{ldim}(b + C) \setminus (b' + C) < n.$$

Subtracting b' from both sets, it is equivalent to show that for $b'' = b - b'$, we have

$$\text{ldim}(b'' + C) \setminus C < n.$$

Since b, b' belong to the short cell B , the element b'' is short. Hence the above inequality is given by Lemma 4.15. \square

4.3. Orthogonality and short closure.

Lemma 4.17. *Let $c \in M^n$ be scl-independent over A . Then its type over A is determined by its type over A in the linear reduct $\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}} = \langle M, <, +, 0, \{\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \rangle$. That is, if X is an A -definable set containing c , then there is an $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lin}}(A)$ -definable set $Y \subseteq X$ containing c .*

Proof. By Fact 4.9, we may assume that X is an A -definable cone $X = B + \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i | J_i$. Since c is scl-independent over A , it must be $k \geq n$, and since $X \subseteq M^n$, it follows that $k = n$. Moreover, by Remark 4.12, $\dim X = \dim B + n$. Hence $\dim B = 0$, and since B is a cell, it follows that $B = \{b\}$ is a singleton. Hence $X = \{b\} + \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i | J_i$ is definable in the linear reduct, and we conclude by Lemma 4.10. \square

Lemma 4.18. *Fix $A \subseteq M$. Let $b \in M^m$ have $\text{scl-rk}(b/A) = 0$ and $c \in M^n$ have $\text{scl-rk}(c/A) = n$. Let $X \subseteq M^{m+n}$ be an A -definable set containing (b, c) . Then there are A -definable sets $Y \subseteq M^m$ and $Z \subseteq M^n$ such that $(b, c) \in Y \times Z \subseteq X$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, we may assume $\text{ldim} X \leq n$. Indeed, we may intersect X with an A -definable set X' that contains (b, c) and has $\text{ldim} X' = n$. Since $\text{scl-rk}(c/A) = n$, we actually have $\text{ldim} X = n$. Now, by Fact 4.9, X is a finite union of A -definable cones, and hence we may assume it is one such n -cone, $X = B + \sum_{i=1}^n v_i t_i | J_i$, with $J_i = (0, a_i)$. Let $\pi : M^{m+n} \rightarrow M^m$ be the projection onto the first m coordinates.

Claim 1. *We have $\pi(\langle X \rangle) = \{0\}$, that is, each v_i is of the form $v_i = (0, u_i)$, for some $u_i \in \Lambda^n$.*

Proof of Claim 1. By the Structure Theorem, the fiber X_b of X above b is a finite union of Ab -definable cones. Since $b \in \text{scl}(A)$ and c is scl-independent over A , it is contained in some n -cone K among them. By Lemma 4.13, there is an open box $I = I_1 \times \dots \times I_n \subseteq K$, where each I_i is a long interval.⁴ The cone $T = \{b\} \times I$ is then contained in X , with $\langle T \rangle = \{0\} \times J_1 \times \dots \times J_n$, for some open intervals $J_1, \dots, J_n \subseteq M$. By the Lemma on Subcones (Fact 4.11), $\langle T \rangle \subseteq \langle X \rangle$. We conclude by Lemma 4.14. \square

CLAIM

For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $u_i \in \Lambda^n$ be given by Claim 1. Writing $p : M^{m+n} \rightarrow M^n$ for the projection onto the last n coordinates, and setting $C := \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(0, a_i)$, we obtain:

$$X = B + \sum_{i=1}^n v_i(0, a_i) = \bigcup_{\beta \in B} (\{\pi(\beta)\} \times (p(\beta) + C)).$$

Claim 2. *We have $c \in \bigcap_{\beta \in B} (p(\beta) + C)$.*

⁴Note that even if it were $\pi(B) \times I \subseteq X$, we could not conclude the proof of the lemma, because I need not be A -definable and need not contain c .

Proof of Claim 2. Observe that $c \in \bigcup_{\beta \in B} (p(\beta) + C)$. Since $p(B)$ is short, by Lemma 4.16 we obtain:

$$\text{ldim} \left(\bigcup_{\beta \in B} (p(\beta) + C) \setminus \bigcap_{\beta \in B} (p(\beta) + C) \right) < n.$$

Since the above set is A -definable, and c is scl-independent over A , we obtain that c does not belong to it. Therefore, $c \in \bigcap_{\beta \in B} (p(\beta) + C)$. □
CLAIM

To finish the proof of the lemma, observe that, by Claims 1 and 2,

$$(b, c) \in \pi(B) \times \bigcap_{\beta \in B} (p(\beta) + C) \subseteq X.$$

Since $Y := \pi(B)$ and $Z := \bigcap_{\beta \in B} (p(\beta) + C)$ are A -definable by Lemma 4.10, we are done. □

Proposition 4.19. *Let $A \subseteq M$, and $b, b' \in M^m, c \in M^n$ be such that $\text{scl-rk}(b/A) = 0$, $\text{tp}(b/A) = \text{tp}(b'/A)$, and $\text{scl-rk}(c/A) = n$. Let $X \subseteq M^{m+n}$ be an A -definable set. Then X contains (b, c) if and only if X contains (b', c) .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.18, we may assume that X is of the form $X = Y \times I$. Since Y is an A -definable set containing b , and $\text{tp}(b/A) = \text{tp}(b'/A)$, we have $b' \in Y$. Hence $(b', c) \in X$. □

Remark 4.20. If $\text{scl-rk}(c/A) < n$, then the conclusion of Proposition 4.19 fails. Indeed, let $b, b' \in M$ be distinct positive A -infinitesimals, that is, distinct realisations of $p_{0+} \upharpoonright A$. Let $d \in M$ have $\text{scl-rk}(d/A) = 1$, e.g. $d > \text{dcl}(A)$, and let $c = (d, b + d)$. If X is the graph of the addition map $M^2 \rightarrow M$, then $(b, c) \in X$ but $(b', c) \notin X$.

Definition 4.21. Let $p(x) \in S(A)$ and $b \models p$. We define $\text{scl-rk}(p) := \text{scl-rk}(b/A)$. If $\text{scl-rk}(p) = 0$ we call p *short*; if $\text{scl-rk}(p) = |x|$, we call p *scl-independent*.

Corollary 4.22. *Let $p(x), q(y) \in S(A)$. If p is short and q is scl-independent, then $p \perp^w q$.*

Proof. Immediate from Proposition 4.19. □

5. DOMINATION IN O-MINIMAL EXPANSIONS OF ORDERED GROUPS

We resume studying types over a monster model \mathfrak{U} . As in Section 2, their realisations, as well as sets $B \supseteq U$, are assumed to be in a larger monster model \mathfrak{V} such that B is small with respect to \mathfrak{V} .

Until Theorem 5.8, we will work in a non-linear semi-bounded structure, and use the same notation as in Section 4, except that we replace \mathcal{M} by \mathfrak{V} . In particular, $\text{scl}(A)$ will coincide with $\text{dcl}(AR(\mathfrak{V}))$.

We begin with a version of Corollary 4.22 for orthogonality of invariant types.

Lemma 5.1. *For every $p \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$ and $B \supseteq U$ we have $\text{scl-rk}(p) = \text{scl-rk}(p \upharpoonright B)$.*

Proof. It is immediate that $\text{scl-rk}(p \upharpoonright B) \leq \text{scl-rk}(p)$. For the opposite inequality, fix $a = (a_0, \dots, a_m) \models p \upharpoonright B$. It suffices to show that if $a_0 \in \text{scl}(Ba_1, \dots, a_m)$ then for every $c = (c_0, \dots, c_m) \models p$ we have that $c_0 \in \text{scl}(Uc_1, \dots, c_m)$. If the former holds, then there is a Ba_1, \dots, a_m -definable short interval containing a_0 , say defined by $\varphi(x_0, a_1, \dots, a_m, b)$. By Definition 2.3(1), if p is A -invariant there is $\tilde{b} \in U$ with $\tilde{b} \equiv_A b$ such that $p(x) \vdash \varphi(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m, \tilde{b})$. Whether the interval $\varphi(x_0, c_1, \dots, c_m, \tilde{b})$ is short is a property of $\text{tp}(c_1, \dots, c_m, \tilde{b})$, and by Definition 2.3(1)

$$a_1, \dots, a_m, b \equiv a_1, \dots, a_m, \tilde{b} \equiv c_1, \dots, c_m, \tilde{b}.$$

Therefore c_0 belongs to the short interval defined by $\varphi(x_0, c_1, \dots, c_m, \tilde{b})$. \square

Proposition 5.2. *Let $p(x), q(y) \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$. If p is short and q is scl-independent, then $p \perp q$.*

Proof. By Corollary 4.22 and Lemma 5.1. \square

Recall that by Fact 2.11 R is stably embedded.

Lemma 5.3. *For any tuple $a \in V$ and any scl-basis of a over U there is a tuple $b \subseteq R$ such that $\text{dcl}(aU) = \text{dcl}(bU)$.*

Proof. Let c be an scl-basis of a over U . Then $a \in \text{dcl}(R(\mathfrak{Y})Uc)$, so there are $e \in R(\mathfrak{Y})^n$ and an Uc -definable map $f : V^n \rightarrow V^{|a|}$, such that $a = f(e)$. The set

$$X = f^{-1}(a) \cap R^n = \{x \in R^n : f(x) = f(e)\}$$

is Uec -definable and contained in R^n . Hence X is definable in $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{Y})$ by stable embeddedness. Let $b \subseteq R(\mathfrak{Y})$ be a canonical parameter for it in the sense of $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{Y})$. Now let σ be an automorphism of \mathfrak{Y} that fixes Uc pointwise. Then $\sigma \upharpoonright R(\mathfrak{Y})$ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{Y})$. Recall that $c \subseteq a$, and observe that X is also Ua -definable. Moreover, $\{a\} = f(X)$, hence we have

$$\sigma(a) = a \iff \sigma(X) = X \iff \sigma(b) = b,$$

showing that $\text{dcl}(bU) = \text{dcl}(aU)$, as needed. \square

As \mathcal{R} is stably embedded, we may use Fact 2.10 and, for ease of notation, conflate types in the sense of $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U})$ with types in the sense of \mathfrak{U} concentrating on a cartesian power of R .

In order to simplify statements, in what follows we allow the degenerate case $k = -1$, in which case $p \sim_{\text{D}} p_R$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let T be a semi-bounded o-minimal theory with a definable interval R such that \mathcal{R} expands a real closed field. For every $p \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$ there are a definable function $\tau^p = (\rho^p, \lambda^p)$ and pairwise weakly orthogonal invariant types $p_R = \rho_*^p p \in S^{\text{inv}}(R(\mathfrak{U}))$ and $p_0, \dots, p_k \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U)$ such that*

- (1) for $0 \leq i \leq k$, each p_i is the type of an element of scl-rank 1; and
- (2) there is a small type containing $y = \tau^p(x)$ that is an extremal witness of $p \sim_{\text{D}} p_R \otimes p_0 \otimes \dots \otimes p_k = \rho_*^p p \otimes \lambda_*^p p$.

Furthermore, if $a \models p$,

- (3) as p_0, \dots, p_k we may take any tuple of pairwise weakly orthogonal 1-types of scl-rank 1 that is maximal amongst those realised in $\text{dcl}(Ua)$;

- (4) the product of any such is domination-equivalent to the type q of some scl-basis of a over U ; and
- (5) as p_R we may take any element of $S^{\text{inv}}(R(\mathfrak{U}))$ such that $p_R \otimes q$ is in definable bijection with p ; in particular, the dimension of p_R equals $\dim(R(\text{dcl}(Ua))/U)$.

Proof. Let $a \models p$. Observe immediately that, for any choice of p_0, \dots, p_k as in point 3, and any $c_0, \dots, c_k \models p_0(x_0) \cup \dots \cup p_k(x_k)$, we may extend c_0, \dots, c_k to an scl-basis c of a over U . Let $b \subseteq R(\text{dcl}(Ua))$ be such that a and bc are in definable bijection, say via definable functions ρ^p and λ_0^p mapping a to b and c respectively; at least one such b exists by Lemma 5.3. Note immediately that we are not fixing any particular such b, c , so as to take care of points 5 and 3 (hence also of point 1).

Set $p_R := \rho_*^p p = \text{tp}(b/U)$ and $q := (\lambda_0^p)_* p = \text{tp}(c/U)$. We have $\text{tp}(a/U) \sim_{\text{D}} \text{tp}(bc/U)$, and the types p_R and q are invariant by [Men20b, Lemma 1.8], and weakly orthogonal by Corollary 4.22. By Facts 2.4 and 2.10, it suffices to find a definable function λ^p and a small type r'' containing $w = \lambda^p(z)$ and witnessing extremally $q(z) \sim_{\text{D}} (p_0 \otimes \dots \otimes p_k)(w)$. From this, we obtain point 2 by setting $\tau^p := (\rho^p, \lambda^p)$, and simultaneously prove point 4. We will obtain the required λ^p by composing λ_0^p with suitable definable functions.

Let $q'(z)$ be the restriction of q to the linear language. By Lemma 4.17 $q' \vdash q$. In the linear reduct of T , apply Theorem 2.23 to q and some $q'_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q'_n$ satisfying its assumptions and such that, for $i \leq k$, the type p_i is the unique (by o-minimality) completion in T of q'_{n-k+i} . Hence, in the linear reduct, we have a definable function τ , a small type r' implying $w = \tau(z)$, and pairwise orthogonal invariant 1-types q'_i such that r witnesses extremally $q'(z) \sim_{\text{D}} (q'_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q'_n)(w)$.

Let $\lambda_1^p := \tau \circ \lambda_0^p$ and, for $-n+k \leq i \leq -1$, define p_i to be the unique completion of q'_{n-k+i} . By construction, if r' witnesses $q'_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q'_n \geq_{\text{D}} q'$, we have $p_{-n+k} \otimes \dots \otimes p_k \cup r' \vdash q'_0 \otimes \dots \otimes q'_n \cup r' \vdash q' \vdash q$.

Claim. For every $i < 0$ there is $j \geq 0$ such that $p_i \sim_{\text{D}} p_j$.

Proof of Claim. Clearly τ , being defined in the linear reduct of T , is a fortiori definable in T . Now, $w = \tau(z)$, and $q(z)$ says that z is scl-independent over U . Since no coordinate w_i of w is realised, it follows from Corollary 4.22 and Fact 2.4(3) that no p_i is short, hence all of them must have scl-rank 1. The conclusion follows from maximality of p_0, \dots, p_k and Fact 2.12. \square

CLAIM

Compose λ_1^p with the projection on the last $k+1$ coordinates, obtaining a function λ^p . By the Claim, we may apply Lemma 2.20(2), and correspondingly modify r' to obtain the required r'' , hence concluding the proof. \square

Definition 5.5. We define $\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U})$ to be the quotient of $\{p \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U) : \text{scl-rk}(p) = 1\}$ by domination-equivalence.

Remark 5.6. The only definable 1-type p with $\text{scl-rk}(p) = 1$ is the type at $+\infty$.

Remark 5.7. The monoid $(\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U})), \cup, \supseteq)$ may be naturally viewed as a quotient of the domination monoid $\text{Inv}(\mathfrak{U}_{\text{lin}})$ of the linear reduct. Namely, we identify two generators $\llbracket p \rrbracket, \llbracket q \rrbracket$, where $p, q \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{U}_{\text{lin}})$, whenever

- (1) p and q are in definable bijection in \mathfrak{U} , or
- (2) p and q are both short.

It is easy to see that this is well-defined and extends to a surjective homomorphism of partially ordered monoids.

Theorem 5.8. *Let T be a semi-bounded o -minimal theory with a definable interval R such that its induced structure \mathcal{R} expands a real closed field. There is an isomorphism of posets*

$$\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U}) \cong \widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U})) \times (\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U})), \supseteq).$$

If \otimes is compatible with $\geq_{\mathbb{D}}$ in $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U})$, then the same holds in \mathfrak{U} , and if $\mathcal{P}_{<\omega}(\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U}))$ is equipped with the binary operation \cup , then the above is an isomorphism of monoids.

Proof. Lemma 5.4, together with the definition of $\text{Long}(\mathfrak{U})$, Fact 2.12 and Proposition 5.2, gives us the required isomorphism of posets. Moreover, if $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U}))$ and $\widetilde{\text{Inv}}(\mathfrak{U})$ are monoids, then the above is also easily seen to be an isomorphism of monoids.

In order to show transfer of compatibility of \otimes with $\geq_{\mathbb{D}}$ we need to show that, assuming that it holds in $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{U})$, if $p, q_0, q_1 \in S^{\text{inv}}(U)$ and $q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q_1$, then $p \otimes q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} p \otimes q_1$. Apply to p, q_0, q_1 Lemma 5.4, obtaining $\tau^p = (\rho^p, \lambda^p)$, and analogously for q_0 and q_1 .

Let $s \in S_1^{\text{inv}}(U)$. By Fact 2.13, if $p \otimes q_i \geq_{\mathbb{D}} s$ then $p \geq_{\mathbb{D}} s$ or $q_i \geq_{\mathbb{D}} s$. Again by Fact 2.13, and by Corollary 4.22, if $\text{scl-rk}(s) = 1$ then we must have $\lambda_*^p p \geq_{\mathbb{D}} s$ or $\lambda_*^{q_i} q_i \geq_{\mathbb{D}} s$.

For $i < 2$ consider the definable function $\tau^i := (\rho^p, \rho^{q_i}, \lambda^p, \lambda^{q_i})$. By the above paragraph and the dimension considerations in Lemma 5.4(5), we see that τ^i satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 5.4 for $p \otimes q_i$, with the possible exception of the weak orthogonality requirement; namely, the 1-types constituting the factors of $(\lambda^p, \lambda^{q_i})_* p \otimes q_i$ contain a maximal tuple as in Lemma 5.4(3), but this containment may be strict, as it may happen that some 1-type of scl-rank 1 is dominated by both $\lambda_*^p p$ and $\lambda_*^{q_i} q_i$. Nevertheless, because $q_i \sim_{\mathbb{D}} \tau_*^{q_i} q_i$ is witnessed extremally, it is easy to see that there is a definable function π consisting in a projection on a suitable set of coordinates followed by a permutation of the remaining ones such that $\pi \circ \tau^i$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 5.4 for $p \otimes q_i$. Applying Facts 2.13, 2.14 and 2.15 yields that $\tau_*^i(p \otimes q_i) \sim_{\mathbb{D}} (\pi \circ \tau^i)_*(p \otimes q_i)$, and it follows that $\tau_*^p p \otimes \tau_*^{q_i} q_i \sim_{\mathbb{D}} p \otimes q_i$. By arguing as in the proof of [HM24, Proposition 1.3], it now suffices to show that if $q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q_1$ then $\tau_*^p p \otimes \tau_*^{q_0} q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} \tau_*^p p \otimes \tau_*^{q_1} q_1$.

Recall that by Proposition 5.2 and Fact 2.4(7) we have $\rho_*^p p \perp \lambda_*^p p$; hence,

$$(*) \quad \tau_*^p p \sim_{\mathbb{D}} \rho_*^p p \otimes \lambda_*^p p \sim_{\mathbb{D}} \lambda_*^p p \otimes \rho_*^p p,$$

and analogously for the q_i . By Corollary 4.22 and [HM24, Lemma 2.6], if $q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q_1$ then $\rho_*^{q_0} q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} \rho_*^{q_1} q_1$, and since \otimes is compatible with $\geq_{\mathbb{D}}$ in \mathcal{R} , we have $\rho_*^p p \otimes \rho_*^{q_0} q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} \rho_*^p p \otimes \rho_*^{q_1} q_1$.

Since $\lambda_*^p p$ is a product of 1-types, and similarly for the q_i , it follows from Lemma 2.20 and $q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} q_1$ that $\lambda_*^p p \otimes \lambda_*^{q_0} q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} \lambda_*^p p \otimes \lambda_*^{q_1} q_1$. By Fact 2.4(7) we have $\rho_*^p p \otimes \rho_*^{q_1} q_1 \perp \lambda_*^p p \otimes \lambda_*^{q_1} q_1$, hence by orthogonality

$$\rho_*^p p \otimes \rho_*^{q_0} q_0 \otimes \lambda_*^p p \otimes \lambda_*^{q_0} q_0 \geq_{\mathbb{D}} \rho_*^p p \otimes \rho_*^{q_1} q_1 \otimes \lambda_*^p p \otimes \lambda_*^{q_1} q_1.$$

Again by orthogonality, we may easily rearrange the terms in the products above and use $(*)$ to conclude that $\tau_*^p p \otimes \tau_*^{q_0} q_0 \geq_D \tau_*^p p \otimes \tau_*^{q_1} q_1$, as promised. \square

Corollary 5.9. *Let T be any theory which expands DOAG and is a reduct of RCF. Then every invariant type is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types.*

Proof. If T is linear, we already proved this in Theorem 2.23, and if $T = \text{RCF}$ this is [Men22a, Proposition 5.10]. The remaining case is that of a semi-bounded T . By Fact 4.6, \mathcal{R} is a real closed field with no extra structure. We then conclude by Lemma 5.4 and a further use of [Men22a, Proposition 5.10]. \square

Theorem 5.10. *If T is an o-minimal expansion of DOAG, then $\widetilde{\text{Def}}(\mathfrak{L})$ is a monoid, and isomorphic to*

- $(\mathcal{P}(\{0, 1\}), \cup, \supseteq)$ if T is semi-bounded;
- $(\mathcal{P}(\{0\}), \cup, \supseteq)$ otherwise.

Proof. If T is not semi-bounded, then by [Edm00] it expands RCF, and we already dealt with this case in Theorem 3.8.

If T is semi-bounded, it follows from Theorem 5.8, Fact 3.6, Remark 5.6 and Corollary 4.22 that there are precisely two non-realised 1-types up to definable bijection: any non-realised short type (for instance, the type of an infinitesimal), and the type at $+\infty$. Moreover, the combination of Lemma 5.4 with Theorem 3.8 tells us that every definable type is domination-equivalent to a product of 1-types. We conclude by Fact 2.16. \square

REFERENCES

- [AG25] Pablo Andújar Guerrero. Definable compactness in o-minimal structures. *Model Theory*, 2025+. To appear, preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07112>.
- [AGTW21] Pablo Andújar Guerrero, Margaret E. M. Thomas, and Erik Walsberg. Directed sets and topological spaces definable in o-minimal structures. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 104(3):989–1010, 2021.
- [Edm00] Mario J. Edmundo. Structure theorems for o-minimal expansions of groups. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 102(1):159–181, 2000.
- [EHM19] Clifton Ealy, Deirdre Haskell, and Jana Maříková. Residue Field Domination in Real Closed Valued Fields. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 60(3):333–351, 2019.
- [Ele12] Pantelis E. Eleftheriou. Local analysis for semi-bounded groups. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 216(3):223–258, 2012.
- [EP12] Pantelis E. Eleftheriou and Ya’acov Peterzil. Definable groups as homomorphic images of semi-linear and field-definable groups. *Selecta Mathematica*, 18(4):905–940, 2012.
- [GY23] Kyle Gannon and Jinhe Ye. An Invitation to Extension Domination. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 64(3):253–280, 2023.
- [HHM08] Deirdre Haskell, Ehud Hrushovski, and Dugald Macpherson. *Stable Domination and Independence in Algebraically Closed Valued Fields*, volume 30 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [HM24] Martin Hils and Rosario Mennuni. The domination monoid in henselian valued fields. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 328(2):287–323, 2024.
- [LP93] James Loveys and Ya’acov Peterzil. Linear O-minimal structures. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 81(1-2):1–30, 1993.

- [May88] Laura L. Mayer. Vaught’s Conjecture for o-Minimal Theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 53(1):146–159, 1988.
- [Men20a] Rosario Mennuni. *Invariant Types in Model Theory*. PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2020.
- [Men20b] Rosario Mennuni. Product of invariant types modulo domination–equivalence. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 59:1–29, 2020.
- [Men22a] Rosario Mennuni. The domination monoid in o-minimal theories. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 22(01):2150030, 2022.
- [Men22b] Rosario Mennuni. Weakly binary expansions of dense meet-trees. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 68(1):32–47, 2022.
- [MPP92] David Marker, Ya’acov Peterzil, and Anand Pillay. Additive Reducts of Real Closed Fields. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 57:109–117, 1992.
- [MS94] David Marker and Charles Steinhorn. Definable Types in O-minimal Theories. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 59:185–198, 1994.
- [OPP96] Margarita Otero, Ya’acov Peterzil, and Anand Pillay. On Groups and Rings Definable In O-Minimal Expansions of Real Closed Fields. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 28(1):7–14, 1996.
- [Pet92] Ya’acov Peterzil. A structure theorem for semibounded sets in the reals. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 57(3):779–794, 1992.
- [Pet09] Ya’acov Peterzil. Returning to semi-bounded sets. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 74(2):597–617, 2009.
- [PS98] Y Peterzil and S Starchenko. A trichotomy theorem for o-minimal structures. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 77(3):481–523, 1998.
- [PSS89] A. Pillay, P. Scowcroft, and C. Steinhorn. Between Groups and rings. *Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics*, 19(3):871–886, 1989.
- [Sim14] Pierre Simon. Invariant types in NIP theories. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, 15(02):1550006, 2014.
- [Sim15] Pierre Simon. *A guide to NIP theories*, volume 44 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.

PABLO ANDÚJAR GUERRERO, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA, BURJASSOT 46100, SPAIN

Email address: `pablo.andujar@uv.es`

PANTELOS E. ELEFThERIOU, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS, LEEDS LS2 9JT, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: `P.Eleftheriou@leeds.ac.uk`

ROSARIO MENNUNI, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI MILANO, VIA SARDINI 50, 20133 MILANO, ITALY

Email address: `R.Mennuni@posteo.net`