

ZERO ONE LAWS FOR GRAPHS WITH EDGE
PROBABILITIES DECAYING WITH DISTANCE, PART II

SAHARON SHELAH

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Einstein Institute of Mathematics
Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram
Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Department of Mathematics
Hill Center-Busch Campus
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
110 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

We thank John Baldwin and Shmuel Lifsches and Cigden Gencer and Alon Iton for helping in various ways and stages to make the paper more user friendly.

The research partially supported by the United States – Israel Binational Science Foundation
Publication 517

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}\text{-}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{X}$

INTRODUCTION

This continues [Sh 467] which is Part I and will be denoted here by [I], background and a description of the results are given in [I,§0]; as this is the second part, our sections are named §4 - §7 and not §1 - §4.

Recall that we fix an irrational $\alpha \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and the random graph $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n^0$ is drawn as follows

- (a) its set of elements is $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$
- (b) for $i < j$ in $[n]$ the probability of $\{i, j\}$ being an edge is $p_{|i-j|}$ where $p_\ell = 1/\ell^\alpha$ if $\ell > 1$ as is $1/2^\alpha$ if $\ell = 1$ or just¹ $p_\ell = 1/\ell^\alpha$ for $\ell > 1$
- (c) the drawing for the edges are independent
- (d) \mathcal{K}_n is the set of possible values of \mathcal{M}_n , \mathcal{K} is the class of graphs.

Our main interest is to prove the 0-1 laws (for first order logic) for this 0-1 context, but also to analyze the limit theory.

We can now explain our intentions.

Zero Step: We define relations $<_x^*$ on the class of graphs with no apparent relation to the probability side.

First Step: We can prove that these $<_x^*$ have the formal properties of $<_x$, like $<_i^*$ is a partial order etc., this is done in §4, e.g., in 4.17 above.

Remember from [I,§1] that $A <_a B \Leftrightarrow$ for random enough \mathcal{M}_n and $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$, the maximal number of pairwise disjoint $g \supseteq f$ satisfying $g : B \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ is $< n^\varepsilon$ (for every fixed ε).

Second Step: We shall start dealing with the two version of $<_a$: the $<_a$ from [I,§1] and $<_a^*$ defined in 4.11(5) below. We intend to prove:

$$(*) \quad A <_a^* B \quad \Rightarrow \quad A <_a B.$$

For this it suffices to show that for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ and positive real ε , the expected value of the following is $\leq 1/n^\varepsilon$: the number of extensions $g : B \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ of f satisfying “the sets $\text{Rang}(g \upharpoonright (B \setminus A))$, $f(A)$ are with distance $\geq n^\varepsilon$ ”. Then, the expected value of the number of k -tuples of such (pairwise) disjoint g is $\leq \frac{1}{n^{k\varepsilon}}$. So if $k\varepsilon > |A|$, the expected value of the number of functions f with k pairwise disjoint such extensions g is $< \frac{1}{n^{k\varepsilon - |A|}}$. Hence for random enough \mathcal{M}_n , for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ there are no such k -tuples of pairwise disjoint g 's. This will help to prove that $<_i^* = <_i$. We do this and more probability arguments in §5.

¹originally we assume the former but actually also the latter works

Third step: We deduce from §5 that $<_x^* = <_x$ for all relevant x and prove that the context is weakly nice. We then work somewhat more to prove the existential part of nice (the simple goodness (see Definition [I,2.12,(1)]) of appropriate candidate). I.e. we first prove “weakly niceness” by proving that $A <_i^* B$ implies (A, B) satisfy the demand for $<_i$ of [I,§1], and in a strong way the parallel thing for \leq_s . Those involve probability estimation, i.e., quoting §5. But we need more: sufficient conditions for appropriate tuples to be simply good and this is the first part of §6.

Fourth step: This is the universal part from niceness. This does not involve any probability, just weight computations (and previous stages), in other words, purely model theoretic investigation of the “limit” theory. By the “universal part of nice” we mean (A) of [I,2.13,(1)] which includes:

if $\bar{a} \in {}^k(\mathcal{M}_n), b \in \mathcal{M}_n$ then there are $m_1 < m$, $B \subseteq c\ell^{k,m_1}(\bar{a})$ such that $\bar{a} \subseteq B$ and

$$c\ell^k(B) \bigcup_B^{\mathcal{M}_n} (c\ell^k(\bar{a}b, \mathcal{M}_n) \setminus c\ell^k(B, \mathcal{M})) \cup B.$$

This is done in the latter part of §6.

§4 APPLICATIONS

We intend to apply the general theorems (Lemmas [I,2.17,2.19]), to our problem. That is, we try to answer: does the main context \mathcal{M}_n^0 with $p_i = 1/i^\alpha$ for $i > 1$ satisfies the 0-1 law? So here our irrational number $\alpha \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is fixed. We work in Main Context (see 4.1 below, the other one, \mathcal{M}_n^1 , would work out as well, see §7).

4.1 Context. A particular case of [I,1.1]: $p_i = 1/i^\alpha$ for $i > 1$, $p_1 = p_2$ (where $\alpha \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a fix irrational) and the n -th random structure is $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n^0 = ([n], R)$ (i.e. only the graph with the probability of $\{i, j\}$ being $p_{|i-j|}$).

4.2 Fact 1) For any graph A

$$1 = \lim_n \text{Prob}(A \text{ is embeddable into } \mathcal{M}_n).$$

2) Moreover² for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$1 = \lim_n \text{Prob}(A \text{ has } \geq n^{1-\varepsilon} \text{ disjoint copies in } \mathcal{M}_n).$$

This is easy, still, before proving it, note that since by our definition of the closure $A \subseteq \text{cl}^{m,k}(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n)$ implies that A has $< n^\varepsilon$ embeddings into \mathcal{M}_n we get:

4.3 Conclusion. $\langle \text{cl}_{\mathcal{M}_n}^{m,k}(\emptyset) : n < \omega \rangle$ satisfies the 0–1 law (being a sequence of empty models).

Hence (see [I,Def.1.4,Conclusion 2.19])

4.4 Conclusion. $\mathcal{K}_\infty = \mathcal{K}$ and for our main theorem it suffices to prove simple almost niceness of \mathfrak{K} (see Def.[I,2.13]).

(Now 4.3 explicate one part of what in fact we always meant by “random enough” in previous discussions.)

Proof of 4.2. Let the nodes of A be $\{a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}\}$. Let the event \mathcal{E}_r^n be:

$$a_\ell \mapsto 2rk + 2\ell \text{ is an embedding of } A \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n.$$

²Actually also “ $\geq cn$ ” works for $c \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ depending on A only.

The point of this is that for various values of r these tries are going to speak on pairwise disjoint sets of nodes, so we get independent events.

Now

4.5 Subfact $\text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_r^n) = q > 0$ (i.e. > 0 but it does not depend on n, r).

(Note: this is not true in a close context where the probability of $\{i, j\}$ being an edge when $i \neq j$ is $1/n^\alpha + 1/2^{|i-j|}$, as in that case the probability depends on n . But still, we can have $\geq q > 0$ which suffices); where:

$$q = \prod_{\ell < m < k, \{\ell, m\} \text{ edge}} 1/(2(m - \ell))^\alpha \times \prod_{\ell < m < k, \{\ell, m\} \text{ not an edge}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{(2(m - \ell))^\alpha}\right).$$

(What we need is that all the relevant edges have probability $> 0, < 1$. Note: if we have retained $p = 1/i^\alpha$ this is false for the pairs $(i, i + 1)$, so we have changed p_1 . Anyway, in our case we multiplied by 2 to avoid this (in the definition of the event)). For the second case, (the probability of edge being $1/n^\alpha + 1/2^{(i-j)}$)

$$q \geq \prod_{\ell < m < k, \{\ell, m\} \text{ edge}} \frac{1}{2^{|m-\ell|}} \times \prod_{\ell < m < k, \{\ell, m\} \text{ not an edge}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{(3/2)^{|m-\ell|}}\right).$$

So these $\text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_r^n)$ have a positive lower bound which does not depend on r .

Also the events $\mathcal{E}_0^n, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2k} \rfloor - 1}^n$ are independent. So the probability that they all fail is

$$\prod_{i < \lfloor \frac{n}{2k} \rfloor} (1 - \text{Prob}(\mathcal{E}_i^n)) \leq \prod_i (1 - q) \leq (1 - q)^{\frac{n}{2k}}$$

which goes to 0 quite fast. The “moreover” is left to the reader. □_{4.4}

4.6 Definition. 1) Let

$$\mathcal{F} = \{(A, B, \lambda) : A \subseteq B \text{ graphs (generally: models from } \mathcal{K} \text{) and} \\ \lambda \text{ an equivalence relation on } B \setminus A\}$$

We may write (A, B, λ) instead of $(A, B, \lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus A))$.

2) We say that $X \subseteq B$ is λ -closed if:

$x \in X$ and $x \in B \cap \text{Dom}(\lambda)$ implies $x/\lambda \subseteq X$.

3) $A \leq^* B$ if³ $A \leq B \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ (clearly \leq^* is a partial order).

Story:

We would like to ask for any given copy of A in \mathcal{M}_n , is there a copy of B above it, and how many, we hope for a dichotomy: i.e. usually none, always few or always many. The point of λ is to take distance into account, because for our present distribution being near is important, $b_1 \lambda b_2$ will indicate that b_1 and b_2 are near. Note that being near is not transitive, but “luck” helps us, we will succeed to “pretend” it is. We will look at many candidates for a copy of $B \setminus A$ and compute the expected value. We would like to show that saying “variance small” says that the true value is near the expected value.

4.7 Definition. 1) For $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ let

$$\mathbf{v}(A, B, \lambda) = \mathbf{v}_\lambda(A, B) = |(B \setminus A)/\lambda|$$

be the number of λ -equivalence classes in $B \setminus A$ (\mathbf{v} stands for vertices).

(This measures degrees of freedom in choosing candidates for B over a given copy of A .)

2) Let

$$\mathbf{e}(A, B, \lambda) = \mathbf{e}_\lambda(A, B) = |e_\lambda(A, B)| \text{ where}$$

$$e_\lambda(A, B) = \{e : e \text{ an edge of } B, e \not\subseteq A, \text{ and } e \not\subseteq x/\lambda \text{ for } x \in B \setminus A\}.$$

[This measures the number of “expensive”, “long” edges (\mathbf{e} stands for edges).]

Story:

\mathbf{v} larger means that there are more candidates for B ,
 \mathbf{e} larger means that the probability per candidate is smaller.

³Note: this is in our present specific context, so this definition does not apply to §1, §2, §3, §7; in fact, in §7 we give a different definition for a different context.

4.8 Definition. 1) For $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and our given irrational $\alpha \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ we define (**w** stands for weight)

$$\mathbf{w}(A, B, \lambda) = \mathbf{w}_{\lambda}(A, B) = \mathbf{v}_{\lambda}(A, B) - \alpha \mathbf{e}_{\lambda}(A, B).$$

2) Let

$$\Xi(A, B) =: \{\lambda : (A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}, \text{ and if } C \subseteq B \setminus A \text{ is a nonempty } \lambda\text{-closed set then } \mathbf{w}_{\lambda}(A, C \cup A) > 0\}.$$

3) If $A \leq^* B$ then we let $\xi(A, B) = \text{Max}\{\mathbf{w}_{\lambda}(A, B) : \lambda \in \Xi(A, B)\}$.

4.9 Observation. 1) $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ & $A \neq B \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_{\lambda}(A, B) \neq 0$.

2) If $A \leq^* B \leq^* C$ (hence $A \leq^* C$) and $(A, C, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and B is λ -closed then

- (a) $(A, B, \lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus A)) \in \mathcal{T}$,
- (b) $(B, C, \lambda \upharpoonright (C \setminus B)) \in \mathcal{T}$
- (c) $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda}(A, C) = \mathbf{w}_{\lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus A)}(A, B) + \mathbf{w}_{\lambda \upharpoonright (C \setminus B)}(B, C)$
- (d) similarly for \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{e} .

3) Note that 4.9(2) legitimizes our writing λ instead of $\lambda \upharpoonright (C \setminus A)$ or $\lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus (C \cup A))$ when $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and C is a λ -closed subset of B . Thus we may write, e.g., $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda}(A \cup C, B)$ for $\mathbf{w}(A \cup C, B, \lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus A \setminus C))$.

4) If $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $D \subseteq B \setminus A$ and $D^+ = \bigcup\{x/\lambda : x \in D\}$ then $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D^+}(A, A \cup D^+) \leq \mathbf{w}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D}(A, A \cup D)$ and D^+ is λ -closed.

Proof. 1) As α is irrational and $\mathbf{v}_{\lambda}(A, B)$ is not zero.

2) Clauses (a), (b) are totally immediate, and for a proof of clauses (c), (d) see the proof of 4.16 below.

3) Left to the reader.

4) Clearly by the choice of D^+ we have $\mathbf{v}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D^+}(A, A \cup D^+) = |D^+/\lambda| = |D/(\lambda \upharpoonright D)| = \mathbf{v}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D}(A, A \cup D)$ and $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D^+}(A, A \cup D^+) \geq \mathbf{e}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D}(A, A \cup D)$ hence $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D^+}(A, A \cup D^+) \leq \mathbf{w}_{\lambda \upharpoonright D}(A, A \cup D)$. □_{4.9}

4.10 Discussion: Note: $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda}(A, B)$ measures in a sense the expected value of the number of copies of B over a given copy of A with λ saying when one node is “near to” another. Of course, when λ is the identity this degenerates to the definition in

[ShSp 304].

We would like to characterize \leq_i and \leq_s (from Definition [I,1.4,(3)] and Definition [I,1.4,(4)]), using \mathbf{w} and to prove that they are O.K. (meaning that they form a nice context). Looking at the expected behaviour, we attempt to give an “effective” definition (depending on α only).

All of this, of course, just says what the intention of these relations and functions is (i.e. $<_i^*$, $<_s^*$, $<_{pr}^*$ and \mathbf{v} , \mathbf{e} , \mathbf{w} below); we still will not prove anything on the connections to $\leq_i, \leq_s, \leq_{pr}$. We may view it differently: We are, for our fix α , defining $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B)$ and investigating the $\leq_i^*, \leq_s^*, \leq_{pr}^*$ defined below per se ignoring the probability side.

4.11 Definition. 1) $A \leq B$ means A is a submodel of B , and remember that by Definition 4.6(3), $A \leq^* B$ means⁴ $A \leq B \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

2) $A <_c^* B$ if $A <^* B$ and for every λ , we have

$$(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) < 0,$$

3) $A \leq_i^* B$ if $A \leq^* B$ and for every A' we have

$$A \leq^* A' <^* B \Rightarrow A' <_c^* B.$$

Of course, $A \leq_i^* B$ means $A \leq^* B$ & $A \neq B$.

4) $A \leq_s^* B$ if $A \leq^* B$ and for no A' do we have

$$A <_i^* A' \leq^* B,$$

Of course, $A <_s^* B$ means $A \leq_s^* B$ & $A \neq B$.

5) $A <_a^* B$ if $A \leq^* B$, $\neg(A <_s^* B)$ (i.e. $A \leq^* B$ and there is $A' \subseteq B \setminus A$ such that $A <_i^* A \cup A' \leq^* B$),

6) $A <_{pr}^* B$ if $A \leq^* B$ and $A <_s^* B$ but for no C do we have $A <_s^* C <_s^* B$.

4.12 Remark. We intend to prove that usually $\leq_x^* = \leq_x$ but it will take time.

4.13 Lemma. *Suppose $A' <^* B, (A', B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B) > 0$. Then there is A'' satisfying $A' \leq^* A'' <^* B$ such that A'' is λ -closed and*

(*)₁ $[A'', B, \lambda]$ we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'', B) > 0$ and if $C \subseteq B \setminus A'', C \neq \{\emptyset, B \setminus A''\}$ and C is λ -closed then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'', A'' \cup C) > 0$ and $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'' \cup C, B) < 0$.

⁴Note: this is in our present specific context, so this definition does not apply to §1, §2, §3, §7; in fact in §7 we give a different definition for a different context.

Proof. Let C' be a maximal λ -closed subset of $B \setminus A'$ such that $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A' \cup C', B) > 0$. Such a C' exists since $C' = \emptyset$ is as required and B is finite. Let $A'' = A' \cup C'$. Since C' is λ -closed, $B \setminus A''$ is λ -closed and $(A'', B, \lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus A'')) \in \mathcal{T}$ and clearly $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'', B) > 0$. Now suppose $D \subseteq B \setminus A''$ is λ -closed, $D \notin \{\emptyset, B \setminus A''\}$. By the maximality of C' , $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'' \cup D, B) < 0$. Now (by 4.9(2)(c))

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'', B) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'', A'' \cup D) + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'' \cup D, B).$$

and the left term is positive by the choice of C' and A'' , but the right term is negative by the previous sentence so together we conclude $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'', A'' \cup D) > 0$.

□_{4.13}

4.14 Claim. *Assume $A <^* B$. The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $A <^*_i B$,

(ii) for no A' and λ do we have:

$$(*)_2 = (*)_2[A, A', B, \lambda] \text{ we have } A \leq^* A' <^* B, (A', B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B) > 0,$$

(iii) for no A' , λ do we have:

$$(*)_3 = (*)_3[A, A', B, \lambda] \text{ we have } A \leq^* A' <^* B, (A', B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B) > 0 \text{ and } (*)_1[A', B, \lambda] \text{ of 4.13.}$$

Proof. For the equivalence of the first and the second clauses read Definition 4.11(2), 4.11(3) (remembering 4.9(1)). Trivially $(*)_3 \Rightarrow (*)_2$ and hence the second clause implies the third one. Now we will see that $(iii) \Rightarrow (ii)$. So suppose $\neg(ii)$, so let this be exemplified by A', λ i.e. they satisfy $(*)_2$ so by 4.13 there is A'' such that $A' \leq^* A'' <^* B$ and $(*)_1[A'', B, \lambda]$ of 4.13 holds. So A'', λ exemplified that $\neg(iii)$ holds.

□_{4.14}

4.15 Observation. 1) If $(*)_3[A, A', B, \lambda]$ from 4.14(iii) holds, then we have: if $C \subseteq B \setminus A'$ is λ -closed non-empty then $\mathbf{w}(A', A' \cup C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) > 0$.

[Why? If $C \neq B \setminus A'$ this is stated explicitly, otherwise this means $\mathbf{w}(A', B, \lambda) > 0$ which holds.]

2) In $(*)_3$ of 4.14(iii), i.e., $4.13(*)_1[A', B, \lambda]$, we can allow any λ -closed $C \subseteq B \setminus A'$ if we make the inequalities non-strict. [Why? If $C = \emptyset$ then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A' \cup C) =$

$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A') = 0$, $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A' \cup C, B) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B) > 0$. If $C = B \setminus A'$ then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A' \cup C) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B) > 0$ and $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A' \cup C, B) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(B, B) = 0$. Lastly if $C \notin \{\emptyset, B \setminus A'\}$ we use 4.13(*)₁[A', B, λ] itself.]

3) If $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$, $A' \leq^* A$, $B' \leq^* B$, $A' \leq^* B'$ and $B \setminus A = B' \setminus A'$ then $(A', B', \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{w}(A', B', \lambda) \geq \mathbf{w}(A, B, \lambda)$ also $\mathbf{e}(A', B', \lambda) \leq \mathbf{e}(A, B, \lambda)$, $\mathbf{v}(A', B', \lambda) = \mathbf{v}(A, B, \lambda)$.

4) In (3) if in addition $A \overset{M}{\bigcup} B'$, i.e., no edge $\{x, y\}$ with $x \in A \setminus A'$, $y \in B' \setminus A'$ then the equalities hold.

4.16 Claim. $A \leq_s^* B$ if and only if either $A = B$ or for some λ we have:

$(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) > 0$, moreover

for every nonempty λ -closed $C \subseteq B \setminus A$, we have $\mathbf{w}(A, A \cup C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) > 0$, that is $\Xi(A, B) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. The only if direction:

So we have $A \leq_s^* B$. If $A = B$ we are done: the left side holds as its first possibility is $A = B$. So assume $A <_s^* B$. Let C be minimal such that $A \leq^* C \leq^* B$ and for some λ_0 the triple $(C, B, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfies: for every non empty λ_0 -closed $C' \subseteq B \setminus C$ we have $\mathbf{w}(C, C \cup C', \lambda_0 \upharpoonright C') > 0$ (exists as $C = B$ is O.K. as there is no such C'). By 4.9(4): for every non empty $C' \subseteq B \setminus C$ we have $\mathbf{w}(C, C \cup C', \lambda_0 \upharpoonright C') > 0$ hence $\neg(C <_i^* C \cup C')$ by (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) of 4.14. If $C = A$ we have finished by the definition of \leq_s^* . Otherwise, the hypothesis $A \leq_s^* B$ implies that $\neg(A <_i^* C)$, hence by 4.14 the third clause (iii) fails which means that (recalling 4.11(1)), for some C' , λ_1 we have $A \leq^* C' <^* C$, $(C', C, \lambda_1) \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_1}(C', C) > 0$ and for every λ_1 -closed $D \subseteq C \setminus C'$ satisfying $D \neq \{\emptyset, C \setminus C'\}$ we have

$$\mathbf{w}(C', C' \cup D, \lambda_1 \upharpoonright D) > 0,$$

and

$$\mathbf{w}(C' \cup D, C, \lambda_1 \upharpoonright (C \setminus C' \setminus D)) < 0.$$

Define an equivalence relation λ on $B \setminus C'$: an equivalence class of λ is an equivalence class of λ_0 or an equivalence class of λ_1 .

We shall show that (C', B, λ) satisfies the requirement above on C , thus contradicting the minimality of C . Clearly $A \leq^* C' \leq^* B$. So let $D \subseteq B \setminus C'$ be λ -closed and we define $D_0 = D \cap (B \setminus C)$, $D_1 = D \cap (C \setminus C')$. Clearly D_0 is λ_0 -closed so $\mathbf{w}(C, C \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \geq 0$ (see 4.15(2)), and D_1 is λ_1 -closed so $\mathbf{w}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) \geq 0$ (this follows from: for every λ_1 -closed $D \subseteq C \setminus C'$

satisfying $D \neq \{\emptyset, C \setminus C'\}$ we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C', C' \cup D, \lambda_1 \upharpoonright D) > 0$ and by 4.15(2). Now (in the last line we change C' to C twice), by 4.15(3) we will get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}(C', C' \cup D, \lambda) &= |D/\lambda| = |D_1/\lambda_1| + |D_0/\lambda_0| \\ &= \mathbf{v}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) + \mathbf{v}(C' \cup D_1, C' \cup D_1 \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \\ &= \mathbf{v}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) + \mathbf{v}(C, C \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0), \end{aligned}$$

and (using 4.11(3)):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}(C', C' \cup D, \lambda) &= \mathbf{e}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{e}(C' \cup D_1, C' \cup D_1 \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \\ &\leq \mathbf{e}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) + \mathbf{e}(C, C \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}(C', C' \cup D, \lambda) &= \mathbf{v}(C', C' \cup D, \lambda) - \alpha \mathbf{e}(C', C' \cup D, \lambda) \\ &= \mathbf{v}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) + \mathbf{v}(C, C \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \\ &\quad - \alpha \mathbf{e}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) \\ &\quad - \alpha \mathbf{e}(C' \cup D_1, C' \cup D_1 \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \\ &\geq \mathbf{v}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) + \mathbf{v}(C, C \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \\ &\quad - \alpha \mathbf{e}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) - \alpha \mathbf{e}(C, C \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \\ &= \mathbf{w}(C', C' \cup D_1, \lambda \upharpoonright D_1) + \mathbf{w}(C, C \cup D_0, \lambda \upharpoonright D_0) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and the (strict) inequality holds by the irrationality of α , i.e. by 4.9(1). So actually (C', B, λ) satisfies the requirements on C , λ_0 thus giving contradiction to the minimality of C .

The if direction:

As the case $A = B$ is obvious, we can assume that the second half of 4.16 holds. So let λ be as required in the second half of 4.16.

Suppose $A <^* C \leq^* B$, and we shall prove that $\neg(A <_i^* C)$ thus finishing by Definition 4.11. We shall show that $(A', \lambda') = (A, \lambda \upharpoonright (C \setminus A))$ satisfies $(*)_2[A, A, C, \lambda]$ from 4.14, thus (ii) of 4.14 fail hence (i) of 4.14 fails, i.e., $\neg(A <_i^* C)$ as required.

Let $D = \bigcup\{x/\lambda : x \in C \setminus A\}$, so D is a non empty λ -closed subset of $B \setminus A$. Hence by the present assumption on A, B, λ we have $\mathbf{w}(A, A \cup D, \lambda \upharpoonright D) > 0$. Now

$$\mathbf{v}(A, C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) = |C/\lambda| = |D/\lambda| = \mathbf{v}(A, D, \lambda \upharpoonright D)$$

and

$$\mathbf{e}(A, C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) \leq \mathbf{e}(A, D, \lambda \upharpoonright D)$$

so $\mathbf{w}(A, C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) \geq \mathbf{w}(A, D, \lambda \upharpoonright D) > 0$ as requested. $\square_{4.16}$

4.17 Claim. : 1) \leq_i^* is transitive.

2) \leq_s^* is transitive.

3) For any $A \leq^* C$ for some B we have $A \leq_i^* B \leq_s^* C$.

4) If $A <^* B$ and $\neg(A \leq_s^* B)$ then $A <_c^* B$ or there is C such that $A <^* C <^* B$, $\neg(A <_s^* C)$.

5) Smoothness holds (with $<_i^*$ instead of $<_i$ see [I,2.5,(4)]), that is

(a) if $A \leq^* C \leq^* M \in \mathcal{X}$, $A \leq^* B \leq^* M$, $B \cap C = A$ then $A <_c^* B \Rightarrow C <_c^* B \cup C$ and $A \leq_i^* C \Rightarrow B \leq_i^* C \cup B$

(b) if in addition $C \bigcup_{A}^M B$ then $A <_c^* B \Leftrightarrow C \leq_c^* B \cup C$ and $A \leq_i^* C \Leftrightarrow \leq_i^* C \cup B$ and $A \leq_s^* B \Leftrightarrow \leq_s^* B \cup C$.

6) For $A <^* B$ we have $\neg(A \leq_s^* B)$ iff $(\exists C)(A <_c^* C \leq^* B)$.

7) If $A \leq^* B \leq^* C$ and $A \leq_s^* C$ then $A \leq_s^* B$.

8) If $A_\ell \leq_s^* B_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, $A_1 \leq^* A_2$, $B_1 \leq^* B_2$ and $B_2 \setminus A_2 = B_1 \setminus A_1$ then

$$\xi(A_1, B_1) \geq \xi(A_2, B_2).$$

9) In (8), equality holds iff A_2, B_1 are freely amalgamated over A_1 inside B_2 .

10) If $A <_s^* B_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $B_1 <_i^* B_2$ then $\xi(A, B_1) > \xi(A, B_2)$.

11) If $B_1 <^* B_2$ and for no $x \in B_1, y \in B_2 \setminus B_1$ is $\{x, y\}$ an edge of B_2 then $B_1 <_s^* B_2$.

12) If $A \leq^* B \leq^* C$ and $A \leq_i^* C$ then $B \leq_i^* C$.

13) If $A <_{\text{pr}}^* B$ and $a \in B \setminus A$ then $A \cup \{a\} \leq_i^* B$.

14) If $A_1 <_{\text{pr}}^* B_1$, $A_1 \leq^* A_2 \leq^* B_2$ and $B_1 \leq^* B_2$ then $A_2 \leq_s^* B_2$ or $A_2 <_{\text{pr}}^* B_2$.

Proof. 1) So assume $A \leq_i^* B \leq_i^* C$ and we shall prove $A \leq_i^* C$. By 4.14 it suffice to prove that clause (ii) there holds with A, C here standing for A, B there. So assume

$A \leq^* A' <^* C$, $(A', C, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and we shall prove that $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', C) \leq 0$, this suffice. Let $A'_1 = A' \cap B$, $A'_0 =: B \cup A' \cup \cup\{x/\lambda : x \in B\}$, now as $A \leq_i^* B$ by 4.14 + 4.15(2) we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'_1, B) \leq 0$, and by 4.15(3) we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B \cup A') \leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'_1, B)$ and by 4.9(4) we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A'_0) \leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A' \cup B)$. Those three inequalities together gives $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A'_0) \leq 0$ and as $B \leq_i^* C$ by 4.14 we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'_0, C) \leq 0$. By 4.9(2)(c) we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', C) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A'_0) + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A'_0, C)$ and by the previous sentence the latter is $\leq 0 + 0 = 0$, so $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A') \leq 0$ as required.

2) We use the condition from 4.16. So assume $A_0 \leq_s^* A_1 \leq_s^* A_2$ and λ_ℓ witness $A_\ell \leq_s^* A_{\ell+1}$ (i.e. $(A_\ell, A_{\ell+1}, \lambda_\ell)$ is as in 4.16). Let λ be the equivalence relation on $A_2 \setminus A_0$ such that for $x \in A_{\ell+1} \setminus A_\ell$ we have $x/\lambda = x/\lambda_\ell$. Easily $(A_0, A_2, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$. Now, by 4.9(2)(c) and 4.16 the triple (A_0, A_2, λ) satisfies the second condition in 4.16 so $A_0 \leq_s^* A_2$.

3) Let B be maximal such that $A \leq_i^* B \leq^* C$, such B exists as C is finite⁵ and for $B = A$ we get $A \leq_i^* B \leq^* C$. Now if $B \leq_s^* C$ we are done, otherwise by the definition of \leq_s^* in 4.11(4) there is B' such that $B <_i^* B' \leq^* C$, now by part (1) we have $A \leq_i^* B' \leq^* C$, contradicting the maximality of B , so really $B \leq_s^* C$ and we are done.

4) We assume $A <^* B$ and now if $A <_c^* B$ we are done hence we can assume $\neg(A <_c^* B)$, clearly there is λ such that $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) \geq 0$. So by the irrationality of α the inequality is strict and by 4.13 there is C such that $A \leq^* C <^* B$, C is λ -closed, $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C, B) > 0$ and if $C' \subseteq B \setminus C$ is non-empty λ -closed and $\neq B \setminus C$ then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C, C \cup C') > 0$ & $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C \cup C', B) < 0$. So by 4.16 + inspection, $C <_s^* B$, so by 4.17(2), $A \leq_s^* C \Rightarrow A^* \leq_s^* B$, but we know that $\neg(A <_s^* B)$ hence $\neg(A \leq_s^* C)$, so the second possibility in the conclusion holds.

5) Clause (a): $A \leq_c^* B \Rightarrow C <_c^* B \cup C$ and $A \leq_i^* C \Rightarrow B \leq_i^* B \cup C$.

[Why? Note by our assumption $C <^* B \cup C$ and $B <^* B \cup C$. The first desired conclusion is easier, so we prove the second hence assume $A \leq_i^* C$. If $B \leq^* D <^* B \cup C$, and $(D, B \cup C, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ then $A \leq^* D \cap C <^* C$ so as $A \leq_i^* C$, by the definition of \leq_i we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(D \cap C, C) < 0$ hence (noting $C \setminus D \cap C = B \cup C \setminus D$) by Observation 4.15(3) we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(D, B \cup C) \leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D \cap C, C) < 0$ hence (by the Def. of \leq_c^*) $D \leq_c^* B \cup C$. As this holds for any such D, λ by Def. 4.11(3) we have $B \leq_i^* B \cup C$ as required.]

Clause (b): If in addition $C \overset{M}{\cup} B$ then $A <_c^* C \Leftrightarrow B \leq_c^* C \cup B$ and $A \leq_i^* C \Leftrightarrow B \leq_i^* C \cup B$ and $A \leq_s^* B \Leftrightarrow B \leq_s^* B \cup C$.

[Why? Immediate by 4.15(4), Definition 4.11 and part (a).]

6) The “only if” direction can be prove by induction on $|B|$, using 4.17(4). For the

⁵Actually the finiteness is not needed if for possibly infinite A, B we define $A \leq_i^* B$ iff for every finite $B' \leq^* B$ there is a finite B'' such that $B' \leq^* B'' \leq^* B$, and $B'' \cap A <_i^* B''$.

if direction assume that for some C , $A <_c^* C \leq^* B$ and choose a minimal C like that. Now if $A \leq^* A^* <^* C$, and λ_1 is an equivalence relation on $C \setminus A^*$ then let λ_0 be an equivalence relation on $A^* \setminus A$ such that $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_0}(A, A^*) \geq 0$ (exists by the minimality of C) and let $\lambda = \lambda_0 \cup \lambda_1$ so $(A, C, \lambda) \in \mathcal{F}$ and by 4.9(2)(i) we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A^*, C) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, C) - \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A^*)$; but as $A <_c^* C$ we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, C) < 0$, and by the choice of λ_0 we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A^*) \geq 0$ hence $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A^*, C) < 0$ hence $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_1}(A^*, C) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A^*, C) < 0$. As λ_1 was any equivalence relation on $C \setminus A^*$ by Def. 4.11(2) we have shown that $A^* <_c^* C$. By the definition of \leq_i^* (4.11(3)), as A^* was arbitrary such that $A \leq^* A^* <^* C$ by Definition 4.11(3) we get that $A <_i^* C$, hence by the definition of \leq_s (4.11(4)), we can deduce $\neg(A \leq_s^* B)$ as required.

7) Immediate by Definition 4.11(4).

8) It is enough to prove that

$$\otimes \text{ if } \lambda \in \Xi(A_2, B_2) \text{ then } \lambda \in \Xi(A_1, B_1) \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_1, B_1) \geq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_2, B_2).$$

So assume λ is an equivalence relation over $B_2 \setminus A_2$ which is equal to $B_1 \setminus A_1$, now for every non-empty λ -closed $C \subseteq B_1 \setminus A_1$ we have

- (i) $\mathbf{v}_\lambda(A_1, A_1 \cup C) = |C/\lambda| = \mathbf{v}_\lambda(A_2, A_2 \cup C)$
- (ii) $\mathbf{e}_\lambda(A_1, A_1 \cup C) \leq \mathbf{e}_\lambda(A_2, A_2 \cup C)$
[as any edge in $e_\lambda(A_1, A_1 \cup C)$ belongs to $e_\lambda(A_2, A_2 \cup C)$] hence
- (iii) $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_1, A_1 \cup C) \geq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_2, A_2 \cup C)$.

So by the definition of $\Xi(A_1, B_1)$ we have $\lambda \in \Xi(A_2, B_2) \Rightarrow \lambda \in \Xi(A_1, B_1)$ and, moreover, the desired inequality in \otimes holds.

9) If $A_2 \bigsqcup_{A_1}^{B_2} B_1$ in the proof of (8) we get $e_\lambda(A_1, A_1 \cup C) = e_\lambda(A_2, A_2 \cup C)$ hence $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_1, A_1 \cup C) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_2, A_2 \cup C)$, in particular $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_1, B_1) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_2, B_2)$. Also now the proof of (8) gives $\lambda \in \Xi(A_1, B_1) \Rightarrow \lambda \in \Xi(A_2, B_2)$ so trivially $\xi(A_1, B_1) = \xi(A_2, B_2)$.

If $\neg(A_2 \bigsqcup_{A_1}^{B_2} B_1)$ then for every equivalence relation λ on $B_1 \setminus A_1 = B_2 \setminus A_2$ we have

- (ii)⁺ $\mathbf{e}_\lambda(A_1, B_1) < \mathbf{e}_\lambda(A_2, B_2)$
[Why? As $e_\lambda(A_1, B_1)$ is a proper subset of $e_\lambda(A_2, B_2)$ by our present assumption]
hence
- (iii)⁺ $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_1, B_1) > \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_2, B_2)$.

As the number of such λ is finite and as we have shown $\Xi(A_2, B_2) \subseteq \Xi(A_1, B_1)$ we get $\xi(A_1, B_1) > \xi(A_2, B_2)$.

10) This follows from $\otimes_1 + \otimes_2$ below and the finiteness of $\Xi(A, B_2)$ recalling Definition 4.8(3).

\otimes_1 $\lambda \in \Xi(A, B_2) \Rightarrow \lambda \upharpoonright (B_1 \setminus A) \in \Xi(A, B_1)$
 [Why? If λ is an equivalence relation on $B_2 \setminus A$ and let $\lambda_1 = \lambda \upharpoonright (B_1 \setminus A)$ so λ_1 is an equivalence relation on $B_1 \setminus A$ and for any non-empty λ_1 -closed $C_1 \subseteq B_1 \setminus A$, letting $C_2 = \cup\{x/\lambda : x \in C_1\}$ we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_1) \geq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_2)$ by 4.9(4) and the latter is positive because $\lambda \in \Xi(A, B_2)$.]

And

\otimes_2 $\lambda \in \Xi(A, B_2) \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_2) < \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_1)$.

Why? Otherwise let λ be from $\Xi(A, B_2)$ and let $C_\lambda = \cup\{x/\lambda : x \in B_1 \setminus A\} \cup A$ so $B_1 \leq^* C_\lambda \leq^* B_2$.

Case 1: $C_\lambda = B_2$.

So $\mathbf{v}_\lambda(A, B_1) = \mathbf{v}(A, B_1, \lambda \upharpoonright (B_1 \setminus A)) = |(B_1 \setminus A)/\lambda| = |(B_2 \setminus A)/\lambda| = \mathbf{v}_\lambda(A, B_2, \lambda)$. As $B_1 <_i^* B_2$, by part (11) below, for some $x \in B_1, y \in B_2 \setminus B_1$ the pair $\{x, y\}$ is an edge so $e(A, B_1, \lambda \upharpoonright (B_1 \setminus A))$ is a proper subset of $e(A, B_2, \lambda)$ hence

$$\mathbf{e}_\lambda(A, B_1) < \mathbf{e}_\lambda(A, B_2)$$

hence

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_1) > \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_2)$$

is as required.

Case 2: $C_\lambda \neq B_2$.

As in case 1, $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_1) \geq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, C_\lambda)$. Now $B_1 \leq^* C_\lambda \leq^* B_2$, (using the case assumption) and $B_1 <_i^* B_2$ by an assumption so by part (12) below we have $C_\lambda \leq_i^* B_2$ hence $C_\lambda <_i^* B_2$ and by 4.14 this implies $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_\lambda, B_2) < 0$. So $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_2) = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, C_\lambda) + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_\lambda, B_2) \leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_1) + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_\lambda, B_2) < \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_1)$ as required.

11) Define λ , it is the equivalence relation with exactly one class on $B_2 \setminus B_1$ so $(B_1, B_2, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbf{v}_\lambda(B_1, B_2) = 1, \mathbf{e}_\lambda(B_1, B_2) = 0$ so $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(B_1, B_2) \geq 0$ hence $\lambda \in \Xi(B_2, B_2)$ hence $B_1 <_s B_2$.

12) By the Definition 4.11(3).

13) Clearly $A \cup \{a\} \leq^* B$ hence by part (3) for some C we have $A \cup \{a\} \leq_i^* C \leq_s^* B$. If $C = B$ we are done, otherwise $A <_s^* C$ by part (7) so we have $A <_s^* C <_s^* B$, contradiction.

14) Easy by Definition 4.11(6). □_{4.17}

§5 THE PROBABILISTIC INEQUALITIES

In this section we deal with probabilistic inequalities about the number of extensions for the context \mathcal{M}_n^0 .

Note: the proof of almost simple niceness of \mathfrak{K} is in the next section.

5.1 Context. As in §4, so $p_i = 1/i^\alpha$, for $i > 1$, $p_1 = p_2$ (where $\alpha \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ irrational) and $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n^0$ (i.e. only the graph).

We may in the definition demand f to be just a one to one function.

5.2 Definition. Let $\varepsilon > 0, k \in \mathbb{N}, \mathcal{M}_n \in \mathcal{K}$ and $A <^* B$ be in \mathcal{K}_∞ . Assume $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ is an embedding or just $f : A \hookrightarrow [n]$ which means it is one to one. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) := \{ \bar{g} : & (1) \quad \bar{g} = \langle g_\ell : \ell < k \rangle, \\ & (2) \quad f \subseteq g_\ell, g_\ell \text{ a one-to-one function from } B \text{ into } |\mathcal{M}_n| \\ & (3) \quad g_\ell : B \hookrightarrow_f \mathcal{M}_n, \text{ for } \ell \leq k \text{ or just } g_\ell : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n \\ & \quad \text{which means : } \{a, b\} \in \text{Edge}(B) \setminus \text{Edge}(A) \\ & \quad \Rightarrow \{g(b), g(b)\} \in \text{Edge}(\mathcal{M}_n) \\ & \quad (\text{ and } g \text{ is one to one extending } f) \\ & (4) \quad \ell_1 \neq \ell_2 \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(g_{\ell_1}) \cap \text{Rang}(g_{\ell_2}) = \text{Rang}(f) \\ & (5) \quad [\ell < k \ \& \ x \in B \setminus A \ \& \ y \in A] \Rightarrow |g_\ell(x) - g_\ell(y)| \geq n^\varepsilon \}. \end{aligned}$$

The size of this set has natural connection with the number of pairwise disjoint extensions $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ of f , hence with the holding of $A <_s B$, see 5.3 below.

5.3 Fact: For every ε and k and $A \leq^* B$ we have:

(*) for every n, k and $M \in \mathcal{K}_n$ and one to one $f : A \hookrightarrow_A M_n$ we have: if $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, M_n) = \emptyset$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{ \ell : \text{there are } g_m : B \hookrightarrow_A M \text{ for } m < \ell \text{ such that } f \subseteq g_m \text{ and} \\ [m_1 < m_2 \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(g_{m_1}) \cap \text{Rang}(g_{m_2}) \subseteq \text{Rang}(f)] \} \\ \leq 2(|A|)n^\varepsilon + (k - 1) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Assume that there are g_m for $m < \ell^*$ where $\ell^* > 2|A|n^\varepsilon + k - 1$ as above. By renaming without loss of generality for some $\ell^{**} \leq \ell^*$ we have $\text{Rang}(g_m) \setminus \text{Rang}(f)$ if $m < \ell^{**}$ is with distance $\geq n^\varepsilon$ from $\text{Rang}(f)$ but if $\ell \in [\ell^{**}, \ell^*]$ then $\text{Rang}(g_\ell) \setminus \text{Rang}(f)$ has distance $< n^\varepsilon$ to $\text{Rang}(f)$. Recall that by one of our assumptions $\ell^{**} \leq k - 1$. Now for each $x \in \text{Rang}(f)$, there are $\leq 2n^\varepsilon$ numbers $m \in [\ell^{**}, \ell^*)$ such that $\min\{|x - g_m(y)| : y \in B \setminus A\} \leq n^\varepsilon$. So by the demand on ℓ^{**} we have $\ell^* - \ell^{**} \leq (|A|) \times (2n^\varepsilon) = 2|A|n^\varepsilon$ and as $\ell^{**} < k$ we are done. $\square_{5.3}$

The following is central, it does not yet prove almost niceness but the parallels (to 5.4) from [ShSp 304], [BlSh 528] were immediate, and here we see main additional difficulties we have which is that we are looking for copies B over A but we have to take into account the distance, the closeness of images of points in B under embeddings into \mathcal{M}_n . Now, in order to prove 5.4 we will have to look for different types of g 's which satisfies Condition (5) from the Def. of $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)$ and restricting ourselves to one kind we will calculate the expected value of “relevant part” of $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)$ and we will show that it is small enough.

5.4 Theorem. *Assume $A <^* B$ (so both in \mathcal{K}_∞). Then a sufficient condition for*

- \otimes_1 for every $\varepsilon > 0$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n we have:
 (*) if $f : A \hookrightarrow [n]$ then $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) = \emptyset$

is the following:

- \otimes_2 $A <_a^* B$ (which by Definition 4.11(5) means $A <^* B$ & $\neg(A <_s B)$).

5.5 Remark. From \otimes_1 we can conclude: for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ we have: for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n , for every $f : A \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n$, there cannot be $\geq n^\varepsilon$ extensions $g : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n$ of f pairwise disjoint over f .

For this, first choose $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon$. Note that for any k we have $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon_1,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)$. Choose k_1 for ε_1 by 5.3. Then the number of pairwise disjoint extensions $g : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n$ of f is $\leq 2(|A|)n^{\varepsilon_1} + (k_1 - 1)$. For sufficiently large n this is $< n^\varepsilon$.

5.6 Remark. We think of g extending f such that $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ that satisfies, for some constants c_1 and $c_2, c_2 > 2c_1$:

$$x\lambda y \Rightarrow |g(x) - g(y)| < c_1$$

and

$$[\{x, y\} \subseteq B \ \& \ \{x, y\} \not\subseteq A \ \& \ \neg x\lambda y] \Rightarrow |g(x) - g(y)| \geq c_2.$$

So the number of such $g \supset f$ is $\sim n^{(|B \setminus A|/\lambda)} = n^{\mathbf{v}(A, B, \lambda)}$, the probability of each being an embedding, assuming f is one, is $\sim n^{-\alpha \mathbf{e}(A, B, \lambda)}$, hence the expected value is $\sim n^{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B)}$ (\sim means “up to a constant”). So $A <_i^* B$ implies that usually there are few such copies of B over any copy of A , i.e. the expected value is < 1 . In [ShSp 304], λ is equality, here things are more complicated.

Proof of 5.4. We assume \otimes_2 ; and we shall prove \otimes_1 .

Stage A:

Without loss of generality B is minimal, i.e., $A <^* B' <^* B \Rightarrow \neg(A <_a^* B')$ which by Definition 4.11(5) means $A <^* B' <^* B \Rightarrow A <_s^* B'$.

This is because if there exists a B' contradicting this then \otimes_1 for A and B' implies \otimes_1 for A and B . By 4.17(4) we can conclude $A <_c^* B$. Clearly if \otimes_1 holds for ε_1 it holds for every $\varepsilon_2 \geq \varepsilon_1$ so without loss of generality $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, in particular moreover, we choose positive reals $\mathbf{c}, \varepsilon, \zeta$ such that:

- \boxtimes_1 (a) if $A \leq^* A' \leq^* B$ and $(A', B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B) \neq 0 \Rightarrow$
 $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B) \notin [-2\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$, a sufficient condition is $t - \alpha r \notin [-2\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$
when $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, |B \setminus A|\}$ and $r \in \{1 \dots, |\text{edge}(B)|\}$,
- (b) $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $0 < \zeta < \varepsilon/2$
- (c) $\mathbf{c} > |B \setminus A|$.

Stage B:

In order to prove \otimes_1 it suffices to prove that for some $\zeta > 0$ we have:

$$(*)_\zeta \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A, B}^{\varepsilon, 1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)|) \leq \frac{1}{n^\zeta} \text{ if } f : A \hookrightarrow [n].$$

(remember that Exp stands for “expected value”).

To see that choose k such that $k \cdot \zeta > |A|$. Now assuming $f : A \hookrightarrow [n]$ we have (the conditions (1)-(5) are from Definition 5.2:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)|) = \\
& \quad \Sigma \left\{ \text{Prob} \left(\bigwedge_{\ell < k} g_\ell : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n \right) : \bar{g} \text{ satisfies clauses (1), (2), (4) and (5) (of Def. 5.2)} \right\} = \\
& \quad \text{(so by disjointness and independence)} \\
& \quad \Sigma \left\{ \prod_{\ell < k} \text{Prob}(g_\ell : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n) : \bar{g} \text{ satisfies clauses (1),(2),(4) and (5)} \right\} \leq \\
& \quad \text{(so as the sum has just more terms, and all terms are non negative)} \\
& \quad \Sigma \left\{ \prod_{\ell < k} \text{Prob}(g_\ell : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n) : \bar{g} \text{ satisfies clauses (1),(2) and (5)} \right\} = \\
& \quad \text{(as now we have no demand connecting } g_\ell, g_m \text{ for } \ell, m < k) \\
& \quad \Sigma \left\{ \prod_{\ell < k} \text{Prob}(g_\ell : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n) : \bigwedge_{\ell < k} [g_\ell \text{ satisfies clauses (2) and (5)}] \right\} = \\
& \quad \text{(so since now all } k\text{-element sequences of "allowable" extensions of } f \text{ are allowed)} \\
& \quad \prod_{\ell < k} \Sigma \left\{ \text{Prob}(g_\ell : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n) : g_\ell \text{ satisfies clauses (2) and (5)} \right\} = \\
& \quad \prod_{\ell < k} \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)|) \leq \left(\frac{1}{n^\zeta} \right)^k.
\end{aligned}$$

By a well known easy lemma, for each $f : A \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$, it follows that

$$\text{Prob}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)| \neq \emptyset) < \frac{1}{n^{k \cdot \zeta}}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Prob}(\text{there is } f : A \hookrightarrow [n] \text{ such that } |\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)| \neq \emptyset) < \\
& \quad \frac{1}{n^{k \cdot \zeta}} |\{f : f : A \rightarrow [n]\}| \leq \frac{n^{|A|}}{n^{k \cdot \zeta}} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

(So if A has many edges there is a waste and if A has no edges then this is the right choice of k).

Stage C:

We now show, with some effort, that without loss of generality $\text{Rang}(f) = [|A|](= \{1, 2, \dots, |A|\})$ - this is certainly helpful, though it isn't really necessary but it clarifies the situation.

To see that let f_0 be a bijection between A and $[|A|]$. Divide the possible g 's to finitely many classes by their types (defined below) ("finite" means here: with a bound depending on A and B but not on n). For each type we will prove that the expected value for f under the assumption $f : A \hookrightarrow [n]$ is $\leq \text{Const}(A, B) \times$ [the expected value for f_0 as required under the assumption $f_0 : A \hookrightarrow [n]$]. We may continue to ignore " f_0 is an embedding of A ".

Notation: For any one to one $g : B \hookrightarrow [n]$ we define the linear order $<_g^*$ on B : $x <_g^* y$ iff $g(x) < g(y)$.

Let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{m-1}\}$ where $0 < i < j < m \Rightarrow a_i <_f^* a_j$ (that is, if $g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)$ then $g(a_i) < g(a_j)$). We add two "pseudo-elements" a_0 and a_m to A and stipulate $f(a_0) = 0$, $f(a_m) = n + 1$ so if $g : B \hookrightarrow [n]$ is one to one and extends f then $a_0 <_g^* b <_g^* a_m$ for all $b \in B$ and for each $\ell < m$, we let the set $\{b \in B \setminus A : a_\ell <_g^* b <_g^* a_{\ell+1}\}$ be listed by $b_{\ell,1}^g <_g^* b_{\ell,2}^g \dots <_g^* b_{\ell,m_\ell^g-1}^g$ and we stipulate $b_{\ell,0}^g = a_\ell$, $b_{\ell,m_\ell^g}^g = a_{\ell+1}$.

For f, n, ε, A, B define

$$\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon}(f, [n]) := \{g : g : B \hookrightarrow [n], \text{ i.e., } g \text{ is one-to-one and } g \text{ satisfies clauses (2) and (5)}\}.$$

We define $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tp}^0(g) = \text{tp}_{A,B}^0(g)$ to be the following information (where the number of possibilities has a bound which depends only on $|B|$, and remember $\lfloor \beta \rfloor$ is the largest integer $\leq \beta$):

- (a) $\{(x, y) : x, y \in B, g(x) < g(y)\}$, i.e., the linear order $<_g^*$ so this fixes the $b_{\ell,j}^g - s$ and $m_\ell^g - s$
- (b) $\{(\ell, j, \lfloor \frac{g(b_{\ell,j+1}^g) - g(b_{\ell,j}^g)}{f(a_{\ell+1}) - f(a_\ell)} \cdot (m_\ell^g + 8)^3 \rfloor) : \ell < m \text{ and } j < m_\ell^g\}$

(note⁶: the number of possibilities in clause (b) is at most $\prod_{\ell < m} \prod_{j < m_\ell} (m_\ell^g + 8)^3 \leq$

$(|A| + 1)^{3|B \setminus A|}$).

Fixing the type \mathfrak{p} , we know $m, \langle m_\ell : \ell < m \rangle$, of course, f is given hence we know $\langle a_\ell : \ell = 1, 2, \dots, m-1 \rangle$ and a_0, a_m too and $\langle b_{\ell,j} : \ell < m, j < m_\ell \rangle$, i.e., they are the same for all the g 's of this type, so we shall omit the superscript g ; if confusion

⁶We do not care about the exact bound

may arrive we can write $m_\ell^{\mathbf{p}}, b_{\ell,j}^{\mathbf{p}}$. In addition for each $\ell < m$, when $m_\ell > 1$, we can compute some $x_\ell^* < x_\ell^{**}$ and $j_\ell < m_\ell$, depending only on f, n and \mathbf{p} , such that if $g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, [n])$ and $\text{tp}^0(g) = \mathbf{p}$ then

$$(*) \quad f(a_\ell) \leq g(b_{\ell,j_\ell}) \leq x_\ell^* < x_\ell^{**} \leq g(b_{\ell,j_\ell+1}) \leq f(a_{\ell+1}) \text{ and } x_\ell^{**} - x_\ell^* \geq \frac{1}{2m_\ell} \cdot (a_{\ell+1} - a_\ell - 2) \text{ and } (x_\ell^* = a_\ell \vee x_\ell^{**} = a_{\ell+1}) \Rightarrow a_{\ell+1} \leq a_\ell + 2.$$

For any $a \in [n]$ let $\ell(a) = \ell_{\mathbf{p}}(a) \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ be the unique ℓ such that for every $t \leq m$

$$(\alpha) \quad m > t > \ell(a) \Rightarrow a \leq (x_t^* + x_t^{**})/2$$

$$(\beta) \quad t \leq \ell(a) \Rightarrow (x_t^* + x_t^{**})/2 < a.$$

We define a linear order $<_0$ on $[n]$:
 $c <_0 d$ iff ($c, d \in [n]$ and)

$$(i) \quad |c - a_{\ell(c)}| < |d - a_{\ell(d)}| \quad \underline{\text{or}}$$

$$(ii) \quad (|c - a_{\ell(c)}| = |d - a_{\ell(d)}|) \ \& \ c < d.$$

Let σ be the unique permutation of $[n]$ such that for $c, d \in [n]$ we have $(c <_0 d) \equiv (\sigma(c) < \sigma(d))$. It is easy to check that $\sigma(a_1) = 1, \sigma(a_2) = 2, \dots, \sigma(a_{m-1}) = m-1$. We stipulate $\sigma(a_0) = a_0, \sigma(a_m) = a_m$.

5.7 Fact: 1) There is some $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{p}} > 0$ such that:

$$\text{if } i, j \in \{a_1, \dots, a_{m-1}\} \cup \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{m-1} (a_\ell, x_\ell^*] \cup \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{m-1} [x_\ell^{**}, a_{\ell+1}) \text{ then } |\sigma(i) - \sigma(j)| \leq \mathbf{c} \times |i - j|.$$

2) If $j \in [n]$ and $k \leq n$ and $\bigwedge_{\ell=0}^m |j - a_\ell| \geq k$

then $\bigwedge_{\ell=1}^{m-1} |\sigma(j) - \sigma(a_\ell)| \geq k$ (actually $\geq 2m(k-1) + 1$).

Proof. 1) By symmetry without loss of generality $i < j$, and by the triangle inequality without loss of generality:

$$\textcircled{*}_0 \quad \ell(i) = \ell(j) \ \& \ i + 1 = j \\ \underline{\text{or}} \quad (i, j) = (x_\ell^*, x_\ell^{**}) \text{ for some } \ell.$$

First assume that the first case in \otimes_0 occurs, then $\mathbf{c} \geq 2m$ suffice.

[Why? If $a_{\ell(i)} \leq i$ then (as $\ell(i+1) = \ell(j) = \ell(i)$ we have) $a_{\ell(i)} \leq i < i+1 = j \leq x_{\ell(i)}^*$ so $(\ell(i) = \ell(j))$ and) $i <_0 j$ hence $|j - a_{\ell(j)}| = |i - a_{\ell(i)}| + 1$, so

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma(j) - \sigma(i)| &= \sigma(j) - \sigma(i) = |\{t : i \leq_0 t <_0 j\}| \\ &= |\{t : |t - a_{\ell(t)}| = |i - a_{\ell(i)}| \text{ and } i \leq t \\ &\quad \text{or } |t - a_{\ell(t)}| = |j - a_{\ell(j)}| = |i - a_{\ell(i)}| + 1 \text{ and } t < j\}| \leq 2m. \end{aligned}$$

If $a_{\ell(i)} > i$ then $j = i + 1 \leq a_{\ell(i)} = a_{\ell(j)}$ then the proof is similar.]

Second, assume that the second possibility in \otimes_0 occurs so $(i, j) = (x_\ell^*, x_\ell^{**})$, so $\ell(i) = \ell$ & $\ell(j) = \ell + 1$. The first subcase is to assume that $i <_0 j$ & $(x_\ell^* \neq a_\ell$ & $x_\ell^{**} \neq a_{\ell+1})$ hence $a_{\ell+1} - x_\ell^{**} \geq x_\ell^* - a_\ell$ and $\sigma(i) < \sigma(j)$ so

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma(j) - \sigma(i)| &= |\{t : t \in [n] \text{ and } i \leq_0 t <_0 j\}| \\ &\leq |\{t \in [n] : |i - a_{\ell(i)}| \leq |t - a_{\ell(t)}| \leq |j - a_{\ell(j)}|\}| \\ &= |\{t \in [n] : |x_\ell^* - a_\ell| \leq |t - a_{\ell(t)}| \leq |x_\ell^{**} - a_{\ell+1}|\}| \\ &= \sum_{s \leq m} |\{t \in [n] : |x_\ell^* - a_\ell| \leq |t - a_s| \leq |x_\ell^{**} - a_{\ell+1}| \text{ and } \ell(t) = \ell\}| \\ &\leq 2m \cdot |\{r : |x_\ell^* - a_\ell| \leq r \leq |x_\ell^{**} - a_{\ell+1}|\}| \\ &= 2m((a_{\ell+1} - x_\ell^{**} + 1) - (x_\ell^* - a_\ell)) \\ &\leq 2m(a_{\ell+1} - x_\ell^{**}) \leq 2m(a_{\ell+1} - a_\ell - 1) \leq (2m)(2m_\ell)(x_\ell^{**} - x_\ell^*) + 2m \\ &= 4mm_\ell |j - i| + 2m \end{aligned}$$

so if $\mathbf{c} \geq 4mm_\ell + 2m$ for $\ell < m$ this is O.K., too. The second subcase is $j <_0 i$ & $(x_\ell^* \neq a_\ell$ & $x_\ell^{**} \neq a_{\ell+1})$. The proof is similar and the cases $x_\ell^* = a_\ell, x_\ell^{**} = a_{\ell+1}$ are easier.

2) If $j \in \{a_1, \dots, a_{m-1}\}$ this is trivial as k is necessarily zero; so assume not hence $\sigma(a_\ell) < \sigma(j)$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, m-1$. First consider $a_{\ell(j)} < j$ and $\ell \leq m$ then $|\sigma(j) - \sigma(a_\ell)| = \sigma(j) - \sigma(a_\ell) = |\{t \in [n] : a_\ell \leq_0 t <_0 j\}|$.

Now the set $\{t : a_\ell \leq_0 t <_0 j\}$ includes $a_\ell, a_{\ell(t)} + 1, \dots, j - 1$ hence has $\geq j - a_{\ell(t)}$ members so $|\sigma(j) - \sigma(a_\ell)| \geq j - a_{\ell(t)} = |j - a_{\ell(t)}| \geq k$. Second consider $a_{\ell(j)} > j$, the proof is similar. Together we are done. $\square_{5.7}$

Continuation of the proof of 5.4. Let $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathbf{p}}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) = \{g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) : \text{tp}^0(g) = \mathbf{p}\}$.

Now σ induces a 1-to-1 function from

$$\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, [n]) := \{g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, [n]) : \text{tp}^0(g) = \mathfrak{p}\}$$

into $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, [n])$, that is $g \mapsto g \circ \sigma^{-1}$. [Why? Because σ is a permutation of $[n]$ and $f \circ \sigma^{-1} = f_0$ and 5.7(2).]

We note

$$(*) \text{ Prob}(g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)) \leq \mathbf{c}_\mathfrak{p}^1 \cdot \text{Prob}(g \circ \sigma^{-1} \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n))$$

for some constant $\mathbf{c}_\mathfrak{p}^1$.

(By 5.7(1); of course we may choose to consider also the probability of non edges but this is easier as there is a constant upper bound $(1 - p_1) < 1$.) So by the definitions of $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)$, $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, [n])$, f_0 , and $(*)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)|) &= \Sigma\{\text{Prob}(g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) : g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, [n])\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_\mathfrak{p}^1 \Sigma\{\text{Prob}(g \circ \sigma^{-1} \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n) : g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, [n])\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_\mathfrak{p}^1 \Sigma\{\text{Prob}(g' \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n) : g' \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f_0, [n])\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{c}_\mathfrak{p}^1 \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)|). \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, [n]) = \bigcup \{\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, [n]) : \mathfrak{p} \text{ is a } \text{tp}^0\text{-type}\}$$

and the number of tp^0 -types has a bound not depending on n , say \mathbf{c}^2 . Hence letting $\mathbf{c}^1 = \Sigma\{\mathbf{c}_\mathfrak{p}^1 : \mathfrak{p} \text{ is a } \text{tp}^0\text{-type}\}$ it is constant and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)|) &= \sum_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1,\mathfrak{p}}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)|) \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathbf{c}_\mathfrak{p}^1 \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)|) = \mathbf{c}^1 \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)|). \end{aligned}$$

So the expected value of $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)$ is \leq a constant times the expected value of $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)$. Therefore it is enough to prove that the expected value of the second value is small (i.e., $\leq n^{-\xi}$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$).

Note: we are using heavily that we are dealing with expected values that are additive, so dependencies between various g 's are irrelevant.

Stage D:

By the previous stage it is enough for a fix f_0 to bound $\text{Exp}(\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n))$ where f_0 is a one-to-one mapping from A onto $\{1, \dots, |A|\}$.

In this step we prove that the expected value of $\mathcal{G}_{(A,B)}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)$ has an appropriate upper bound.

First we will define a new type of g , $\text{tp}^1(g)$ for $g : B \hookrightarrow_A \mathcal{M}_n$ (assuming $g \supseteq f_0$). Now we let $\text{tp}^1(g)$ includes the following information: $(\bar{b}^g, \sigma[g])$ is defined in (α) , (β) below

(α) let $\bar{b}^g = \langle b_1^g, \dots, b_m^g \rangle$ list $B \setminus A$ such that $g(b_1^g) < g(b_2^g) < \dots < g(b_m^g)$.

Stipulate $b_0 \in A$ being $f_0(b_0) = |A|$, so if $A \neq \emptyset$ then $f_0(b_0)$ is the maximal element in $\text{Rang}(f_0)$, and stipulating $b_{m+1} \in B$ with $g(b_{m+1}) = n + 1$.

(β) essentially the order between $r_\ell = r_\ell[g] =: g(b_{\ell+1}^g) - g(b_\ell^g)$ for $\ell \leq m$, i.e., the truth value of each statement $r_{\ell_1} < r_{\ell_2}$, but pedantically the value of $\sigma[g]$ defined below.

Let $\sigma = \sigma[g] = \sigma(\text{tp}^1(g))$ be a permutation on $\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ (without m , as below $r_m = n + 1 - \sum_{\ell < m} r_\ell - (m-1)$ so no need to say what is r_m) such that $r_{\sigma(0)} \leq r_{\sigma(1)} \leq \dots \leq r_{\sigma(m-1)}$ and under those restraints, is the first such permutation by lexicographic order (by fixing σ we restrict the order of the distances among the vertexes). Note that if we use the first version of (β) when $r_\ell = r_i$ we lose a degree of freedom, this of course does not really matter. Let $\bar{r}[g] = \langle r_\ell[g] : \ell < m \rangle$. Let a tp^1 -type mean $\text{tp}^1(g)$ for some g and for a tp^1 -type \mathbf{p} , $(\bar{b}^{\mathbf{p}}, \sigma[\mathbf{p}])$ is well defined and we let $<_{\mathbf{p}}$ be the linear order on $B \setminus A$ in which $1 \leq \ell < k \leq m \Rightarrow b_\ell^{\mathbf{p}} < b_k^{\mathbf{p}}$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_*[\mathbf{p}] = \Gamma_*^n[\mathbf{p}] &:= \{\bar{r} : \bar{r} = \langle r_0, \dots, r_{m-1} \rangle, r_{\sigma(0)} \leq r_{\sigma(1)} \leq \dots \leq r_{\sigma(m-1)}, \\ &\text{each } r_\ell \text{ is an integer } > 0 \text{ and} \\ &r_0 \geq n^\varepsilon \text{ and } |A| + \sum_{\ell < m} r_\ell \leq n\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma[\mathbf{p}] = \Gamma^n[\mathbf{p}] &= \{\bar{r} \in \Gamma_*[\mathbf{p}] : \text{for every } \ell < m-1 \text{ we have} \\ &r_{\sigma(\ell)} = r_{\sigma(\ell+1)} \Rightarrow \sigma(\ell) < \sigma(\ell+1)\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Gamma = \Gamma^n = \bigcup_{\mathbf{p}} \Gamma^n[\mathbf{p}]$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon,\mathfrak{p}}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n) = \{g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n) : \text{tp}^1(g) = \mathfrak{p}\}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon,\mathfrak{p}}(f_0, [n]) = \{g : \text{for some } M \in \mathcal{K}_n \text{ we have } g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon,\mathfrak{p}}(f_0, M)\}.$$

The $\Gamma[\mathfrak{p}]$'s are necessarily pairwise disjoint and $\Gamma^n[\mathfrak{p}] \subseteq \Gamma_*^n[\mathfrak{p}] \subseteq \Gamma^n$. Note that $r_{\sigma(\ell)} = r_{\sigma(\ell+1)} \Rightarrow \sigma(\ell) < \sigma(\ell+1)$ is to be consistent with the way we chose $\sigma[g]$.

Note, for each $\bar{b}^* = \langle b_1^*, \dots, b_m^* \rangle$ listing $B \setminus A$ and $\bar{r} \in \Gamma^n$ there is one and only one $g = g_{\bar{b}^*, \bar{r}}^n = g_{\bar{b}^*, \bar{r}}^n \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, [n])$ such that $\bar{b}^g = \bar{b}^*$ & $\bar{r}(g) = \bar{r}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, [n]) = \{g_{\bar{b}^*, \bar{r}}^n : \bar{r} \in \Gamma^n \text{ and } \bar{b}^* = \langle b_1^*, \dots, b_m^* \rangle \text{ list } B \setminus A\}$.

[Why? Let $g_{\bar{b}^*, \bar{r}}^n(b_\ell^*) = |A| + \Sigma\{r_m : m < \ell\}$. So g is one to one and, moreover, g preserves the order $<_{\mathfrak{p}}$ (as each r_m is an integer > 0) also $a \in A$ & $b \in B \setminus A \Rightarrow g(b) - g(a) \geq n^\varepsilon$ as the worst case is $a = |A|$ & $b = b_1^*$ so $g(b) - g(a) = (|A| + r_0) - |A| = r_0 \geq n^\varepsilon$ by one of the demands in the definition of Γ is “ $r_0 \geq n^\varepsilon$ ”.]

Stage E:

By stage D we fix a tp^1 -type \mathfrak{p} and will bound $\text{Exp}(\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon,\mathfrak{p}}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n))$. As $\bar{b}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ is constant we rename it as $\langle b_1, \dots, b_m \rangle$ and let $\sigma = \sigma[\mathfrak{p}]$.

In order to compute the probability that g is a graph embedding, we introduce the following notation. Let

$$E_B = \{(c, d) : c \in B, d \in B, \{c, d\} \not\subseteq A \text{ and either } c \in A \text{ \& } d \in B \setminus A \text{ or } \bigvee \{c = b_{\ell_1} \wedge d = b_{\ell_2} : 1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq m\}\},$$

$$E_B^0 = \{(c, d) \in E_B : \{c, d\} \in \text{edge}(B) \text{ and for no } \ell, (c, d) = (b_\ell, b_{\ell+1})\},$$

$$E_B^1 = |\{(c, d) \in E_B : (c, d) \notin \text{edge}(B)\}|$$

and

$$E_B^2 = E_B \setminus E_B^0 \setminus E_B^1.$$

Note considering whether $g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon,\mathfrak{p}}(f_0, [n])$ belong to $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)$, we have to consider all unordered pairs $\{c, d\} \subseteq B, \not\subseteq A$, but E_B contains exactly one ordered pair among $(c, d), (d, c)$. For $(c, d) \in E_B$ let $w(c, d)$ be defined as follows: if $(c, d) =$

(b_{ℓ_1}, b_{ℓ_2}) and $1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq m$ then $w(c, d) = \{\ell_1, \ell_1 + 1, \dots, \ell_2 - 1\}$ and if $c \in A$, $d = b_{\ell_2}$ then $w(c, d) = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \ell_2 - 1\}$. So $w(c, d)$ is a non empty subset of $\{0, \dots, m - 1\}$, in fact an interval of it. Thus $\sum_{\ell \in w(c, d)} r_\ell$ essentially is the distance between $g(c)$ and $g(d)$ (only if $c \in A$ we should add $g(b_0) - g(c)$ but it does not matter as this number is $\leq |A|$, it contributes just a little to the first inequality on β^* below). Let $k(c, d)$ be the $k \in w(c, d)$ such that $(\sigma[g])(k)$ is maximal, that is r_k maximal and if there are several such candidates, the last such k . So $k(c, d)$ is computable from $\mathfrak{p} = \text{tp}^1(g)$.

As we are fixing the (new) type \mathfrak{p} , hence $\sigma = \sigma[\mathfrak{p}]$, we have:
(where we assume $f_0 : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$)

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}^* &=: \text{Exp}(|\{g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n) : \text{tp}^1(g) = \mathfrak{p} \text{ hence } \bar{r}[g] \in \Gamma^n[\mathfrak{p}]\}|) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathfrak{p}]} \text{Exp}(|\{g_{\bar{r}} \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n) : \text{tp}^1(g) = \mathfrak{p} \text{ and } \bar{r}[g] = \bar{r}\}|), \\ &= \sum_{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathfrak{p}]} \text{Prob}(g_{\bar{r}} \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f_0, \mathcal{M}_n)) \end{aligned}$$

and this implies, letting $\beta'_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1/2^{\alpha|E_{\beta}^2|}$ (because p_1 is p_2 and not $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ so essentially can be replaced by 1):

$$\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}^* \leq \beta'_{\mathfrak{p}} \cdot \sum_{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathfrak{p}]} \prod_{(c,d) \in E_B^0} \left(\frac{1}{(\sum_{\ell \in w(c,d)} r_\ell)^\alpha} \right) \leq \beta'_{\mathfrak{p}} \sum_{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathfrak{p}]} \left(\prod_{(c,d) \in E_B^0} \frac{1}{(r_{k(c,d)})^\alpha} \right).$$

This means, $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}^* \leq \beta'_{\mathfrak{p}} \cdot \sum_{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathfrak{p}]} \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \frac{1}{r_\ell^{\alpha \cdot j(\ell)}}$ where we let

\otimes_1 $j(\ell) =: |\{(c, d) \in E_B^0 : k(c, d) = \ell\}|$ so necessarily $j(m) = 0$; actually we should write $j(\ell, \mathfrak{p})$.

For $\bar{r} \in \Gamma$ let $\bar{s}(\bar{r}) := \langle s_\ell(r_\ell) : \ell < m \rangle$ where $s_\ell(r_\ell) = \lfloor \log_2(r_\ell) \rfloor$ and if $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{1,\varepsilon,\mathfrak{p}}(f_0, [n])$ let $\bar{s}(g) = \bar{s}(\bar{r})$ when $g = g_{\bar{b}^{\mathfrak{p}}, \bar{r}}$.
Define

$$\begin{aligned} S =: \{ \bar{s} : \bar{s} = \langle s_\ell : \ell < m \rangle, 0 \leq s_{\sigma(0)} \leq s_{\sigma(1)} \leq \dots \leq \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor \\ \text{each } s_\ell \text{ is of course an integer} \\ \text{and } s_0 \geq \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor \}. \end{aligned}$$

Why we move from \bar{r} to \bar{s} ? As there are not too many possible sequences \bar{s} , i.e., $\leq (\log_2 n)^m$, but they are enough in giving the bounds.

So by the above we have:

$$\beta_{\mathbf{p}}^* \leq \beta'_{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \sum_{\bar{s} \in S} \sum_{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathbf{p}], \bar{s}(\bar{r}) = \bar{s}} \left(\prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \left(\frac{1}{r_{\ell}^{\alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} \right) \right) = \beta'_{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \sum_{\bar{s} \in S} \beta_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}}$$

where $\beta_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}} := \sum_{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathbf{p}], \bar{s}(\bar{r}) = \bar{s}} \left(\prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \left(\frac{1}{r_{\ell}^{\alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} \right) \right)$. Now

$$\lfloor \log_2(r_{\ell}) \rfloor = s_{\ell}(r_{\ell}) \leq \log_2(\gamma_{\ell}) < s_{\ell}(r_{\ell}) + 1$$

and hence

$$\frac{1}{r_{\ell}^{\alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} = \frac{1}{2^{(\log_2(r_{\ell})) \cdot \alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} \leq \frac{1}{2^{s_{\ell}(r_{\ell}) \cdot \alpha \cdot j(\ell)}}$$

and

$$[\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathbf{p}] \ \& \ \bar{s}(\bar{r}) = \bar{s}] \Rightarrow \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \frac{1}{(r_{\ell})^{\alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} \leq \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \frac{1}{2^{s_{\ell}(r_{\ell}) \cdot \alpha \cdot j(\ell)}}$$

Note that it is a common bound to all $\bar{r} \in \{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathbf{p}] : \bar{s}(\bar{r}) = \bar{s}\}$.

Hence

$$\beta_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}} \leq |\{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathbf{p}] : \bar{s}(\bar{r}) = \bar{s}\}| \cdot \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \left(\frac{1}{2^{s_{\ell}(r_{\ell}) \cdot \alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} \right).$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} |\{\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathbf{p}] : \bar{s}(\bar{r}) = \bar{s}\}| &\leq |\{\bar{r} : \bar{r} = \langle r_{\ell} : \ell < m \rangle \text{ and } \lfloor \log_2(r_{\ell}) \rfloor = s_{\ell}\}| \\ &= \prod_{\ell < m} |\{r : \lfloor \log_2(r) \rfloor = s_{\ell}\}| \\ &= \prod_{\ell < m} |\{r : 2^{s_{\ell}} \leq r < 2^{s_{\ell}+1}\}| \\ &= \prod_{\ell < m} (2^{s_{\ell}+1} - 2^{s_{\ell}}) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{\mathfrak{p}, \bar{s}} &\leq \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} (2^{s_{\ell}+1} - 2^{s_{\ell}}) \cdot \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \left(\frac{1}{2^{s_{\ell} \cdot \alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} \right) \\
&= \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} (2^{s_{\ell}}) \cdot \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} \left(\frac{1}{2^{s_{\ell} \cdot \alpha \cdot j(\ell)}} \right) \\
&= \prod_{\ell \in [0, m)} (2^{s_{\ell}(1-\alpha \cdot j(\ell))}) \\
&= 2^{\sum_{\ell \in [0, m)} s_{\ell}(1-\alpha \cdot j(\ell))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\bar{s}^* \in S$ which is best in the following sense: the last expression is maximal and if there is more than one candidate, demand further that $|\text{Rang}(\bar{s}^*) \setminus \{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor, \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor\}|$ is minimal (among the candidates). Note that for each $\bar{s} \in S$, hence also for this \bar{s}^* , every s_{ℓ}^* is restricted to the interval $[0, \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor]$ when $\ell > 0$ and to the interval $[\lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor, \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor]$ when $\ell = 0$ and, of course, $s_{\sigma(\ell)} \leq s_{\sigma(\ell+1)}$. We claim that

⊗₂ every s_{ℓ}^* belongs to the set $\{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor, \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor\}$.

[Why? Let $E = E_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be an equivalence relation on $[0, m)$ such that

$$\ell E k \quad \text{if and only if} \quad s_{\ell}^* = s_k^*.$$

For $\langle \sigma(\ell) : \ell < m \rangle$ this equivalence relation E is convex (i.e. if $\sigma(\ell_1) < \sigma(\ell_2) < \sigma(\ell_3)$ and $\sigma(\ell_1) E \sigma(\ell_3)$ then $\sigma(\ell_1) E \sigma(\ell_2)$).

[Why? Because if $\sigma(\ell_1) < \sigma(\ell_2) < \sigma(\ell_3)$ then $\lfloor \log_2(r_{\sigma(\ell_1)}) \rfloor \leq \lfloor \log_2(r_{\sigma(\ell_2)}) \rfloor \leq \lfloor \log_2(r_{\sigma(\ell_3)}) \rfloor$ but $\sigma(\ell_1) E \sigma(\ell_3)$ which means that $\lfloor \log_2(r_{\sigma(\ell_3)}) \rfloor = \lfloor \log_2(r_{\sigma(\ell_1)}) \rfloor$ so we obtain $\lfloor \log_2(r_{\sigma(\ell_1)}) \rfloor = \lfloor \log_2(r_{\sigma(\ell_2)}) \rfloor$ by using inequality above which means $\sigma(\ell_1) E \sigma(\ell_2)$.]

As was said above we are dealing with $tp^1(g) = \mathfrak{p}$ and so we fix the order on the distances r_{ℓ} 's by σ and we want that under this order E “will act nicely” which means E will satisfies convexity on $\langle \sigma(\ell) : \ell < m \rangle$. So each equivalence class can be identify with one number that belongs to the interval $[0, \log_2(n^\varepsilon)]$ or the interval $[\log(n^\varepsilon), \log_2(n)]$ so we actually have natural order on the set of equivalence classes.

Suppose that some s_{ℓ}^* is not one of the $\{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor, \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor\}$.

Now take the last E -equivalence class with a value that is different from our three desired values and move this block up or down to get a better expression. That is, let ℓ be maximal such that $s_{\ell}^* \notin \{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor, \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor\}$, and for $i \in \{1, -1\}$ define \bar{s}^i by s'_k is s_k if $\neg(k E \ell)$ and $s'_k = s_k + i$ if $k E \ell$. Clearly $\bar{s}^1, \bar{s}^{-1} \in S$, (and we do not care that it does not correspond to some g with $tp^1(g) = \mathfrak{p}$) but the

expression above for \bar{s}^1 or for \bar{s}^{-1} is strictly smaller than the one for \bar{s}^* except when $1 - \alpha \cdot \Sigma\{j(k) : k \in \ell/E\} = 0$ but then $\alpha = 1/\Sigma\{j(k) : k \in \ell/E\}$ so α is rational, contradiction; so \otimes_2 holds.]

So the number we are estimating is bounded from above by (more see 5.8 below)

$$\otimes_3 \beta_{\mathbf{p}}^* \leq \sum_{\bar{s} \in S} \beta_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}} \leq \sum_{\bar{s} \in S} 2^{\Sigma\{s_\ell(1-\alpha \cdot j(\ell))\}} \leq |S| \times 2^{\Sigma\{s_\ell^*(1-\alpha \cdot j(\ell))\}} \leq (\log_2(n) + 1)^m \times 2^{\Sigma\{s_\ell^*(1-\alpha \cdot j(\ell))\}}.$$

The third inequality follows from the choice of \bar{s}^* and the second inequality follows from the fact that $\beta_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}} \leq 2^{\Sigma_{\ell \in [0, m]} s_\ell(1-\alpha(j(\ell)))}$. For the fourth inequality we have to note that $|S| \leq (\log_2(n))^m$.

Stage F: Now we show that for the \bar{s}^* (chosen above) $\beta'_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}^*} \times 2^{\Sigma\{s_\ell^*(1-\alpha \cdot j(\ell))\}} \leq \frac{1}{n^\zeta}$ for the appropriate $\zeta > 0$ (this will suffice by \otimes_3 above).

Define two equivalence relations on $B \setminus A = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$:

(1) $b_i \lambda_1 b_j$ if and only if we have $i = j$ or $i < j$ & $\bigwedge_{i \leq \ell \leq j-1} s_\ell^* \in \{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor\}$

or $j < i$ & $\bigwedge_{j \leq \ell \leq i-1} s_\ell^* \in \{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor\}$; because of \otimes_2 this is an equivalence relation which by its definition is convex for the natural ordering $<_{\mathbf{p}}$ on $\{b_1 \dots b_m\}$ (that is each i/E is a convex subset of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ (recall that we have agreed that $\bar{b}^{\mathbf{p}} = \langle b_1, \dots, b_m \rangle$))

(2) $b_i \lambda_0 b_j$ if and only if we have $i = j$ or $i < j$ & $\bigwedge_{i \leq \ell \leq j-1} s_\ell^* = 0$ or $j < i$

i & $\bigwedge_{j \leq \ell \leq i-1} s_\ell^* = 0$; this is an equivalence relation, convex for the natural ordering on $\{b_1^{\mathbf{p}} \dots b_m^{\mathbf{p}}\}$ and it refines λ_1

(3) Let $C_1 < C_2 < \dots < C_t$ be the λ_1 -equivalence classes, ordered naturally by $<_{\mathbf{p}}$.

(4) Let $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \upharpoonright (\bigcup_{\ell=2}^t C_\ell)$.

Case 1: $t > 1$, $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B) < 0$ and $s_0^* = \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor$.

So for $\bar{r} \in \Gamma[\mathbf{p}]$ or just $\bar{r} \in \Gamma'_*[\mathbf{p}]$ and $g = g_{\bar{b}^{\mathbf{p}}, \bar{r}}$ with $s(g) = \bar{s}^*$, the set $\{g(b_\ell) : \ell \in C_1\}$ is “near 0, i.e., near $f_0(A)$ ” (that is of distance $\sim n^\varepsilon$, as $s_0^* = \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor$) but $\bigcup_{\ell=2}^t C_\ell$

is not empty (as $t > 1$) and the nodes in $\{g(b) : b \in \bigcup_{\ell=2}^t C_\ell\}$ are quite “far” from zero.

Note: $s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor$ iff $s_\ell^* \notin \{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor\}$ iff for some $r \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$ we have:

$$\{\ell, \ell + 1\} = \{\text{the maximal } i \in C_r, \text{ the minimal } j \in C_{r+1}\}.$$

Hence $\{\ell < m : s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor\}$ has exactly $t - 1$ members which is $\mathbf{v}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)$; also recalling the definition of $j(\ell)$ in \otimes_1 we get $\sum\{j(\ell) : \ell < m \text{ and } s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor\}$ is exactly $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda_1}(A \cup C_1, B)$ hence together $\Sigma\{1 - \alpha j(\ell) : \ell < m \text{ and } s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor\}$ is equal to $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)$.

Recalling from stage A that $\mathbf{c}, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ depend on A, B only and $\mathbf{c} \geq \Sigma\{1 - \alpha \cdot j(\ell) : \ell \text{ satisfies } s_\ell^* \in \{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor\}\}$ because $\mathbf{c} \geq |B \setminus A|$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta'_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}^*} &\leq 2^{\sum_\ell s_\ell^* \cdot (1 - \alpha \cdot j(\ell))} \\ &= 2^{\Sigma\{s_\ell^* \cdot (1 - \alpha \cdot j(\ell)) : \ell \text{ satisfies } s_\ell^* \in \{0, \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor\}\}} \\ &\quad \times 2^{\Sigma\{s_\ell^* \cdot (1 - \alpha \cdot j(\ell)) : \ell \text{ satisfies } s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor\}} \\ &\leq n^{\mathbf{c}\varepsilon} \times n^{(t-1) - \alpha \mathbf{e}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)} \\ &= n^{\mathbf{c} \cdot \varepsilon} \times n^{\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)} \leq \frac{1}{n^{2\zeta}}, \end{aligned}$$

and we are done (by the assumption of the case $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B) < 0$, hence as by \boxtimes_1 from Stage A, $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough such that $-\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)/2 > |\mathbf{c}| \cdot \varepsilon, \zeta \leq (-\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)/2)$ all is O.K.).

Case 2: $s_0^* = \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor$ (here we use λ_1 for the relevant g 's, all members of $\{g(b) : b \in B \setminus A\}$ are far from zero).

Now $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_1}(A, B) < 0$ (as $A <_c^* B$ by stage A; see Definition 4.11(2)) and the proof is similar to that of case 1, but here we will have $\mathbf{v}_{\lambda_1}(A, B) = t$ by the definition of λ_1 .

Case 3: $t > 1$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B) \geq 0, s_0^* = \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor$.

We will try to get a contradiction to the minimality of the set B from stage A, and let us try $B' = A \cup C_1$.

Let λ be an equivalence relation on C_1 , by 4.16 it suffice to prove that $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_1) < 0$.

Let λ^* be the equivalence relation on $B \setminus A$ defined by: C_2, \dots, C_t are equivalence classes of λ^* , no $x \in C_1$ and $y \in \bigcup_{\ell=2}^t C_\ell$ are equivalent, and $\lambda^* \upharpoonright C_1 = \lambda$, clearly $(A, B, \lambda^*) \in \mathcal{T}$. Now (first inequality as $A <_c^* B$ which holds by Stage A) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 > \mathbf{w}_{\lambda^*}(A, B) &= |(B \setminus A) / \lambda^*| - \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\lambda^*}(A, B) \\
&= |(B \setminus C_1 \setminus A) / \lambda^*| + |C_1 / \lambda^*| - \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\lambda^*}(A, B) \\
&= |(B \setminus (C_1 \cup A)) / \lambda_2| \\
&\quad + |C_1 / \lambda| - \alpha \cdot (\mathbf{e}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_1) + \mathbf{e}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)) \\
&= [| (B \setminus (C_1 \cup A)) / \lambda_2| - \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)] \\
&\quad + [|C_1 / \lambda| - \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_1)] \\
&= \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B) + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $0 > \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B) + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_1)$. By the assumption of the present case 3 we have $0 \leq \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_2}(A \cup C_1, B)$ hence $0 > \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C_1)$. As λ was any equivalence relation on C_1 we get $A <_c^* A \cup C_1$ so by 4.17(6), $\neg(A <_s^* A \cup C_1)$, a contradiction as desired (for this case).

Case 4: $s_0^* = \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor$ and $t = 1$.

This is like case 2, using λ_0 and replacing n by n^ε . That is, let $C'_1 < \dots < C'_{t'}$ be the λ_0 -equivalence classes ordered naturally. Clearly $s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor$ iff $s_\ell^* \neq 0$ iff for $r \in \{0, \dots, t' - 1\}$ we have $\{\ell, \ell + 1\} = \{\text{the maximal } i \in C'_r, \text{ the minimal } j \in C'_{r+1}\}$ where we stipulate $C_0 = \{A\}$. Hence $\{\ell : \ell < m \text{ and } s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor\}$ has exactly t' members which is $\mathbf{v}_{\lambda_0}(A, B)$ and $\Sigma\{j(\ell) : s_\ell^* = \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor\}$ is exactly $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda_0}(A, B)$, see the definition of $j(\ell)$ in \circledast_1 .

So if $0 < \zeta \leq \varepsilon \times | - \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_0}(A, B) |$ then

$$\beta'_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}^*} = (n^\varepsilon)^{t' - \mathbf{e}_{\lambda_0}(A, B)} = n^{\varepsilon(\mathbf{w}_{\lambda_0}(A, B))} < 1/n^{\varepsilon - (2\varepsilon)} < 1/n^{2\zeta}.$$

By Stage A this is enough.

The four cases cover all possibilities (remembering $s_0^* \geq \lfloor \log_2(n^\varepsilon) \rfloor$). So we have finished getting a bound on $\beta'_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}^*}$ of the form $1/n^{\zeta + \varepsilon}$ hence $\leq 1/n^\zeta$ (see end of stage E) and as said in stages B, C this suffices. $\square_{5.4}$

5.8 Remark. 1) Actually the situation is even better as $\sum_{\bar{s} \in S} \beta'_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}} \leq \mathbf{c} \beta'_{\mathbf{p}, \bar{s}^*}$ by the formula for the sum of a geometric series (induction on m).

2) We can get logarithmic bound instead n^ε , a simple way is to divide the problem according to $\min\{\lfloor \log_2(|g(x) - g(y)|) \rfloor : x \in A, y \in B \setminus A\}$.

3) Similarly we can get better bounds in 5.9, but all this is not needed to our main purpose.

By 5.4 we have sufficient conditions for (given $A \leq^* B$) “every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ has few pairwise disjoint extension to $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ ”. Now we try to get a dual, a sufficient condition for: (given $A \leq^* B$) for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n , every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ has “many” pairwise disjoint extensions to $g : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$.

5.9 Lemma. *Assume*

(A) $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$,

(B) $(\forall B')[A <^* B' \leq^* B \ \& \ B' \text{ is } \lambda\text{-closed} \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B') > 0]$
(recall that “ B' is λ -closed” means $x \lambda y \ \& \ x \in B' \Rightarrow y \in B'$).

Then there is $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, in fact we can let

$$\zeta =: \min\{\mathbf{w}_{\lambda \upharpoonright B'}(A, B') : A \subseteq B' \subseteq B \text{ and } B' \text{ is } \lambda\text{-closed}\},$$

such that:

⊗ for every small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, for random enough \mathcal{M}_n , for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ and k with $0 < k < k + n^{1-\varepsilon} < n$, there are $\geq n^{(1-\varepsilon)\zeta}$ pairwise disjoint extensions g of f satisfying

(i) $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$,

(ii) $g(B \setminus A) \subseteq [k, k + n^{1-\varepsilon})$.

Proof. Let the λ -equivalence classes be $B_1 \dots B_{\ell(*)}$, and $B_\ell = \{b_{\ell,1} \dots b_{\ell,m_\ell}\}$.

Without loss of generality $\text{Rang}(f) \cap [k, k + \frac{1}{|A|+1}n^{1-\varepsilon}) = \emptyset$ as for this we can replace k by some $k' \in [k, k + n^{1-\varepsilon}(1 - \frac{1}{|A|+1})]$.

For $\ell = 1, \dots, \ell(*)$ let $k_\ell = k + \frac{n^{1-\varepsilon}}{2^{\ell(*)+1}} \cdot \frac{2\ell-1}{|A|+1}$ and $I_\ell = [k_\ell, k_\ell + \frac{n^{1-\varepsilon}}{2^{\ell(*)+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{|A|+1})$ and $J_\ell = \{i \in I_\ell : m_\ell \text{ divides } (i - k_\ell) \text{ and } i + m_\ell \in I_\ell\}$. (The point is that for some positive constant \mathbf{c} , $|J_\ell| \geq \mathbf{c}n^{1-\varepsilon}$ and $j_1 \in I_{\ell_1} \ \& \ j_2 \in I_{\ell_2} \ \& \ \ell_1 \neq \ell_2 \Rightarrow |j_1 - j_2| \geq \mathbf{c}n^{1-\varepsilon} + |B|$ and $j_1 \in \text{Rang}(f) \ \& \ j_2 \in \bigcup_{\ell} I_\ell \rightarrow |j_1 - j_2| \geq \mathbf{c}n^{1-\varepsilon}$ and $j_1, j_2 \in J_\ell$ and $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, m_\ell\} \ \& \ j_1 + i_1 = j_2 + i_2 \Rightarrow (j_1, i_1) = (j_2, i_2)$), e.g., for $\mathbf{c} = 1/(2^{\ell(*)+1}) \times (|B| + 1)$, (the $|B|$ an overkill).

Now if $\bar{j} = \langle j_1 \dots j_{\ell(*)} \rangle \in \prod_{\ell} J_{\ell}$ and we let $g_{\bar{j}}$ be the function with domain B satisfying $g_{\bar{j}}(b_{\ell,m}) = j_{\ell} + m$ and $g_{\bar{j}} \upharpoonright A = f$, then from the random \mathcal{M}_n we can compute the set $Y = Y[\mathcal{M}_n] =: \{\bar{j} : g_{\bar{j}} \text{ is an embedding of } B \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n\}$. As said above, each $g_{\bar{j}}$ is a one-to-one mapping of the desired kind and $g_{\bar{j}}(b_{\ell,m}) \in I_{\ell}$.

Note that

- ⊗ $(\text{Rang}(g_{\bar{j}_1}) \setminus \text{Rang}(f))$ is disjoint from $(\text{Rang}(g_{\bar{j}_2}) \setminus \text{Rang}(f))$ if and only if $\text{Rang}(\bar{j}_1)$ is disjoint from $\text{Rang}(\bar{j}_2)$.

Reflecting, this is similar to [ShSp 304], [BlSh 528] and is a particular case of [Sh 550]; informally the transformation of [ShSp 304], [BlSh 528] corresponding to non λ -equivalent pairs consists of

- (i) the probability of an edge is $\in [\mathbf{c}_1 \frac{1}{(n^{1-\varepsilon})^{\alpha}}, \mathbf{c}_2 \frac{1}{(n^{1-\varepsilon})^{\alpha}}]$ here for some positive constants $\mathbf{c}_1 < \mathbf{c}_2$ (and not as there $\frac{1}{n^{\alpha}}$), as $|J_{\ell}|$ is $\sim n^{1-\varepsilon}$,
- (ii) the number of nodes is now $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ (and not n), factoring by λ ,
- (iii) here we have several candidates for edges for each pair j_1, j_2 , as we are thinking of equivalence classes as nodes,
- (iv) we have random unary predicates coming from edges inside a λ -equivalence class and edges from a point in A to a point in $B \setminus A$.

However, (i), (iii) and (iv) are insignificant changes and (ii) is o.k. if ε is small enough.

Formally, for every graph $M \in \mathcal{K}_n$ we define a model $N[M]$ (this depends on $f, A, B, \langle B_{\ell} : \ell = 1, \dots, \ell(*) \rangle$ and the k). Its set of elements is

$$\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\ell(*)} R_{\ell}^{N[M]},$$

where

- (a) $R_{\ell}^{N[M]} = R_{\ell}^n$ is a unary predicate, $R_{\ell}^{N[M]}$ is

$$\left\{ i : 1 \leq i \leq \frac{n^{1-\varepsilon}}{2\ell(*) + 1} \cdot \frac{1}{|A| + 1} \cdot \frac{1}{m_{\ell}} \right\} \times \{\ell\}$$

(so is constant), a member i of J_{ℓ} is represented by $(i - k_{\ell})/m_{\ell}$. We may say that the set R_{ℓ}^n consists of representatives of the set J_{ℓ}

- (b) if $e = \{b_1, b_2\}$, $b_1 = b_{\ell_1, j_1}$, $b_2 = b_{\ell_2, j_2}$ with $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ from $[\ell(*)]$ (so $j_1 \in [m_{\ell_1}]$, $j_2 \in [m_{\ell_2}]$) then $Q_e^{N[M]}$ is the following binary predicate:

$$Q_e^{N[M]} = \{ \{(i_1, \ell_1), (i_2, \ell_2)\} : \{k_{\ell_1} + m_{\ell_1} \times i_1 + j_1, k_{\ell_2} + m_{\ell_2} \times i_2 + j_2\} \text{ is an edge of } M \}$$

(i.e. it is symmetric and trivially irreflexive) (i.e., (b) is talking about long edges; edges between two disjoint equivalence classes and we represent it as a binary predicate),

- (c) if $e = \{a, b\}$, $a \in A$, $\ell_1 \in [\ell(*)]$, $j \in [m_{\ell_1}]$, $b = b_{\ell_1, j}$ then Q_e is a unary predicate of $N[M]$:

$$Q_e^{N[M]} = \{(i, \ell_1) : \{f(a), k_{\ell_1} + m_{\ell_1} \times i + j\} \text{ is an edge of } M\},$$

[i.e., (c) is talking about edges from $f(A)$ to $g(B \setminus A)$ and this is represented by unary predicate.]

- (d) if $e = \{b_{\ell, j_1}, b_{\ell, j_2}\}$, $\ell \in [\ell(*)]$, $j_1 < j_2$ in $[m_\ell]$, then Q_e is a unary predicate

$$Q_e^{N[M]} = \{(i, \ell) : \{k_\ell + m_\ell \times i + j_1, k_\ell + m_\ell \times i + j_2\} \text{ is an edge of } M\}.$$

[i.e., (d) is talking about the “short edges” and so it is represented as a unary predicate.]

Now let $\mathcal{K}_n^* = \{N[M] : M \in \mathcal{K}_n\}$ and let \mathcal{N}_n vary on \mathcal{K}_n^* with

$$\text{Prob}_{\mu_n^*}(\mathcal{N}_n = N) = \text{Prob}_{\mu_n}(N[\mathcal{M}_n] = N).$$

Now reflecting, the relations Q_e are drawn independently, moreover all the instances are drawn independently and the probabilities are essentially constant. More formally, for $e = \{b_{\ell_1, j_1}, b_{\ell_2, j_2}\} \subseteq B$ as in clause (b), $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ in $[\ell(*)]$ and $x \in R_{\ell_1}$, $y \in R_{\ell_2}$ the event

$$\mathcal{E}(x, y, e) =: [\mathcal{N}_n \models Q_e(x, y)]$$

has probability $p_{(x, y)}^e$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} p_{x, y}^e &= \text{Prob}_{\mu_n}(\{k_{\ell_1} + m_{\ell_1} \times x + j_1, k_{\ell_2} + m_{\ell_2} \times y + j_2\} \text{ an edge of } \mathcal{M}_n) \\ &= (|(k_{\ell_1} + m_{\ell_1} \times x + j_1) - (k_{\ell_2} + m_{\ell_2} \times y + j_2)|)^{-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n^{1-\varepsilon}}{(2\ell(*)+1) \times |B|} &\leq |k_{\ell_1} - m_{\ell_1} \times x + j_1 - (k_{\ell_2} + m_{\ell_2} \times y + j_2)| \\ &\leq n^{1-\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

[Why? We first evaluate the lower bound. The worst case is $\ell_1, \ell_2 = \ell_1 + 1$. The difference is at least $\min\{|g(w) - g(y) : w \in B_{\ell_2} \text{ and } y \in B_{\ell_1}\} \geq \min\{|w - y| : w \in I_{\ell_1}, y \in I_{\ell_2}\} \geq \frac{1}{|2\ell(*)+1| \times |B|} \geq n^\varepsilon$ (see beginning).

The upper bound: any two members of $g(z), z \in B \setminus A$ are in $[k, k + n^\varepsilon]$ hence for some constants $\mathbf{c}_1 < \mathbf{c}_2$ (i.e., numbers depending on A, B but not on n)

$$\mathbf{c}_1 \cdot (n^{1-\varepsilon})^{-\alpha} \leq p_{x,y}^e \leq \mathbf{c}_2 \cdot (n^{1-\varepsilon})^{-\alpha}.$$

Similarly, if $e = \{a, b_{\ell,j}\}, a \in A, \ell \in [\ell(*)], j \in [m_\ell]$ and $x \in R_\ell^n$ the event

$$\mathcal{E}(x, e) =: \mathcal{N}_n \models Q_e(x)$$

has probability p_x^e which for some $\varepsilon(e) \in [0, \varepsilon]_{\mathbb{R}}$ and constants $\mathbf{c}_3, \mathbf{c}_4 (> 0)$, satisfies

$$\mathbf{c}_3(n^{1-\varepsilon})n^{-\alpha} \leq p_x^e \leq \mathbf{c}_4 \cdot (n^{1-\varepsilon(e)})^{-\alpha}.$$

Lastly, for $e = \{b_{\ell,j_1}, b_{\ell,j_2}\}, \ell \in [\ell(*)], j_1 < j_2$ in $[m_\ell]$ and $x \in R_\ell^n$ the event

$$\mathcal{E}(x, e) =: \mathcal{N}_n \models Q_e(x)$$

has probability p_x^e which is constant $\in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$: it is

$$p_{|j_1-j_2|} = \begin{cases} |j_1 - j_2|^{-\alpha} & \text{if } |j_1 - j_2| > 1 \\ \frac{1}{2^\alpha} & \text{if } |j_1 - j_2| = 1. \end{cases}$$

Now these events $\mathcal{E}(x, y, e), \mathcal{E}(x, e)$ are independent. This is a particular case of [Sh 550], but if we like to deduce it from [BlSh 528], first draw the unary predicates. There we know with large probability good lower and upper bounds to the number of elements in

$$\begin{aligned} R_\ell^{n,*} &= \{x \in R_\ell^n : \text{if } e = \{b_{\ell,j_1}, b_{\ell,j_2}\}, j_1 < j_2 \text{ in } [m_\ell] \\ &\quad \text{or } e = \{a, b_{\ell,j}\}, j \in [m_\ell] \\ &\quad \text{then } e \in \text{edge}(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_n \models Q_e(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the rest of the drawing and what we need is like [BlSh 528] only having $\ell(*)$ sorts of elements, which are not exactly of the same size: we can throw some nodes to equalize. $\square_{5.9}$

Now, 5.4, 5.9 are enough for proving $\langle_i^* = \langle_i$, $\langle_s^* = \langle_s$, weakly nice and similar things. But we need more.

5.10 Lemma. *Assume*

- (A) $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$,
- (B) $\xi = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) > 0$,
- (C) if $A \langle^* C \langle^* B$, and C is λ -closed then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C, B) < 0$ (hence necessarily $\xi \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $C \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, C) > 0$ and even $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, C) > \xi$).

Then for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$, for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n , for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ we have

- (a) the number of $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f is at least $n^{\xi - \varepsilon}$
- (b) also the maximal number of pairwise disjoint extension $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ of f is at least this number.

5.11 Remark. 1) We can get reasonably much better bound (see [ShSp 304], [BlSh 528] and [Sh 550]) but this suffices.

2) In the most interesting cases of 5.10 we have $A \langle_{\text{pr}}^* B$ but it applies to more cases.

Proof. Repeat the proof of 5.9 noting that for $(\bar{j}, g_{\bar{j}})$ as there, for random enough \mathcal{M}_n :

(*) for some $k^* = k^*(A, B)$, for every x (recalling $J = \prod_{\ell} J_{\ell}$)

$$|\{\bar{j} \in J : x \in \text{Rang}(g_{\bar{j}}) \setminus \text{Rang}(f)\}| < k^*.$$

Why (*)? By 5.4 and 4.17(13).

$\square_{5.10}$

5.12 Claim. *Assume*

(A) $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and

(B) if $C \subseteq B \setminus A$ is non empty and λ -closed then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C) > 0$.

Then for some $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)_{\mathbb{R}}$, every random enough \mathcal{M}_n for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ we have

- (a) the number of $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f is at least $n^{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) - \varepsilon}$; moreover
- (b) for every $X \subseteq [n]$, $|X| \leq n^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon}$, the number of $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f with $\text{Rang}(g) \cap X \subseteq \text{Rang}(f)$ is at least $n^{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) - \varepsilon}$.

5.13 Remark. 1) By 4.16 the statement

“for some λ the hypothesis of 5.12 holds”

is equivalent to “ $A \leq_s^* B$ ”.

2) The affinity of this claim to being nice (see [I, §2]) should be clear.

3) If $|X| \geq n^{1-\varepsilon}$ we can demand $\text{Rang}(g) \subseteq X$ but no need arises.

Proof. Choose a sequence $\bar{B} = \langle B_\ell : \ell \leq k \rangle$ such that:

- (i) $A = B_0 <^* B_1 <^* \dots <^* B_k = B$,
- (ii) each B_ℓ is λ -closed,
- (iii) $\xi_\ell = \mathbf{w}(B_\ell, B_{\ell+1}, \lambda \upharpoonright (B_{\ell+1} \setminus B_\ell)) > 0$,
- (iv) if $C \subseteq B_{\ell+1} \setminus B_\ell$ is non empty λ -closed then $\mathbf{w}(B_\ell, B_\ell \cup C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) > 0$,
- (v) if $B_\ell <^* C <^* B_{\ell+1}$ and C is λ -closed then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C, B_{\ell+1}) < 0$.

[Why \bar{B} exists? As $\{\bar{B}' : \bar{B}' \text{ satisfies (i)-(iv)}\}$ is not empty (as $\langle A, B \rangle$ belongs to it) and every member has length $< |B \setminus A| + 1$, so there is $\bar{B} = \langle B_\ell : \ell \leq k \rangle$ in the family of maximal length. If it fails, clause (v), say for m and we have a λ -closed set C satisfying $B_m <^* C <^* B_{m+1}$ such that $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C, B_{m+1}) \geq 0$ hence $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C, B_{m+1}) > 0$, and without loss of generality C is maximal under those conditions. Let $\bar{B}' = \langle B'_\ell : \ell \leq k + 1 \rangle$, B'_ℓ is B_ℓ if $\ell \leq k$ and is $B_{\ell-1}$ if $\ell > k$ and is C if $\ell = k$. It is easy to check that \bar{B}' satisfies clauses (i)-(iv), too. So we got a contradiction to the maximal length.]

Now, by 4.9(2)(c):

$$\xi =: \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) = \sum_{\ell < k} \mathbf{w}(B_\ell, B_{\ell+1}, \lambda \upharpoonright (B_{\ell+1} \setminus B_\ell)),$$

and let

$$\varepsilon_0 = \min\{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(B_\ell, B_{\ell+1}) : \ell < k\}$$

(it is > 0). For each $(B_\ell, B_{\ell+1})$ we can apply 5.10 (for disjointness to X use clause (b) of 5.10).

Detailed Proof of (b). Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, let \mathcal{M}_n be random enough and let $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$. Let $X \subseteq [n]$, $|X| \leq n^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon}$. For $\ell \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ we let

$$\mathcal{F}_\ell = \left\{ g : g \text{ is an embedding of } B_\ell \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n \text{ extending } f \right. \\ \left. \text{and such that } \text{Rang}(g) \cap X \subseteq \text{Rang}(f) \right\}.$$

Clearly $|\mathcal{F}_0| = 1$. Now let $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon/k$ and we prove by induction on ℓ that $|\mathcal{F}_\ell| \geq n^{\sum_{i < \ell} \mathbf{w}_\lambda(B_i, B_{i+1}) - \ell \varepsilon(1)}$.

For $\ell = 0$ this is clear; for $\ell + 1$ it is enough to prove that for each $f^* \in \mathcal{F}_\ell$ the set

$$\mathcal{F}_{\ell+1, f^*} = \{g \in \mathcal{F}_{\ell+1} : g \upharpoonright B_\ell = f^*\}$$

has $\geq n^{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(B_\ell, B_{\ell+1}) - \varepsilon(1)}$ members (noting that $\mathcal{F}_{\ell+1}$ is the disjoint union of $\{\mathcal{F}_{\ell+1, f^*} : f^* \in \mathcal{F}_\ell\}$). Now clearly

$$\mathcal{F}_{\ell+1, f^*} = \left\{ g : g \text{ is an embedding of } B_{\ell+1} \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n \text{ extending } f^* \right. \\ \left. \text{and such that } \text{Rang}(g) \cap X \subseteq \text{Rang}(f^*) \right\}$$

(as $\text{Rang}(f^*) \cap X \subseteq \text{Rang}(f)$ as $f^* \in \mathcal{F}_\ell$). Now the inequality follows by clause (b) of 5.10. □_{5.12}

5.14 Claim. Assume $A <_{pr}^* B$ and $k = |B \setminus A|$, and we let $\xi = \xi(A, B)$ that is

$$\xi = \max\{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) : (A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and} \\ \text{for every } \lambda\text{-closed non empty } C \subseteq B \setminus A \\ \text{we have } \mathbf{w}(A, A \cup C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) > 0\}.$$

Then for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ we have

(*) the number of $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f is at most $n^{\xi + \varepsilon}$.

Proof. Like the proof of 5.4 and 5.9.

In detail, for this it is enough to prove that for each $f : A \rightarrow [n]$ the probability of failure is $< 1/n^k$ for any k . By 5.4 (or more fully, 6.2 below) it is enough to prove that: for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n , for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$

(*)' there are no $n^{\xi+\varepsilon}$ extensions $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ of f with $\text{Rang}(g) \setminus \text{Rang}(f)$ pairwise disjoint.

We can consider $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) = \{g : g \text{ a one to one function from } B \text{ to } [n] \text{ extending } f \text{ and mapping every edge of } B \text{ not } \subseteq A \text{ to an edge of } \mathcal{M}_n\}$. As in stage C in the proof of 5.4, for each $f : A \rightarrow [n]$, we can divide the extensions $g : [B] \rightarrow [n]$ of f to types (by tp^0), and the set of types is computable from A, B , so it is enough to restrict ourselves to one type, and as there, it is enough to deal with the case $\text{Rang}(f) = \{1, \dots, |A|\}$ (of course, h^* changes too). This just simplifies the computations.

Again as in the proof of 5.4, stage D, we can fix $B \setminus A = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, stipulate $b_0 = f^{-1}(|A|)$, and having fixed \bar{v} we fix $\text{tp}^1(g)$ (i.e., the permutation $\sigma = \sigma(g)$ which essentially is the order of $\langle g(b_{\ell+1}) - g(b_\ell) : \ell \rangle$) and we can fix $s_\ell = \lfloor \log_2(g(b_{\ell+1}) - g(b_\ell)) \rfloor$ (again partition to some power of $\log_2(n)$ cases) as in 5.4, this disappears and we take more cases. No harm in increasing the probability. So the situation is similar enough to [BISh 528].

Let for $\ell_1 < \ell_2$, $k(\ell_1, \ell_2)$ be the k such that $\ell_1 \leq k < \ell_2$ and $\text{tp}^1(g)$ says that $\sigma(k)$ is maximal equivalently s_k is and k is maximal among those satisfying this condition if we have some candidates.

So it is enough to prove

(a) assume: $s_\ell \leq \log_2(n)$, for $\ell < m$, X_ℓ is a set of $2^{s_\ell-1}$ elements for $\ell = 1, \dots, m, X_0 = \{1, \dots, |A|\}$, pairwise disjoint for simplicity, we draw a graph on $X = \bigcup_{\ell < m} X_\ell$, flipping a coin for each edge independently, the probability of “ $\{x, y\}$ is an edge” is:

$$\text{zero} \quad \underline{\text{if}} \quad \bigvee_i \{x, y\} \subseteq X_\ell$$

$$\frac{1}{2^{s_{k(\ell_1, \ell_2)}\alpha}} \quad \underline{\text{if}} \quad x \in X_{\ell_1}, y \in X_{\ell_2}, \ell_1 < \ell_2.$$

We have to show: with probability $\geq 1 - \frac{1}{n^{|B|+1}}$ the number of embeddings $g \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}(f, M)$ satisfying $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\} \Rightarrow g(b_\ell) \in X_\ell$, is $< n^{\xi+\varepsilon}$.

Of course, we can discard the cases $\bigvee_{\ell} 2^{s_\ell} < n^{\varepsilon/2}$ (as then we can apply 5.4 to $(A \cup \{b_\ell\}, B)$). The rest should be clear.

Alternative proof: Let $m = \lfloor \log(n) \rfloor + 1$, and $\eta_i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}^2$ be the binary representation of i for $i \in [n]$ that is $i = \sum_{\ell < m} \eta(\ell) 2^\ell$. For $\eta \neq \nu \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}^2$ we let

$\ell_1(\eta, \nu) = \text{Min}\{\ell < m : \eta(\ell) \neq \nu(\ell)\}$ and $\ell_2(\eta, \nu) = \text{Max}\{\ell : \ell_1(\eta, \nu) < \ell \leq m \text{ and if } \ell_1(\eta; \nu) + 2 \leq m \text{ then } (\forall t)(\ell_1(\eta, \nu) + 1 < t < \ell \Rightarrow \eta(t) = 1 - \eta(\ell_1(\eta, \nu) + 1) \ \& \ \nu(t) = \nu(\ell_1(\eta, \nu) + 1)\}$. For each one to one $g : B \rightarrow [n]$ let

$$w_g =: \{\ell_1(\eta_{g(b_1)}, \eta_{g(b_2)}) : b_1 \neq b_2 \in B\} \cup \{\ell_2(\eta_{g(b_1)}, \eta_{g(b_2)}) : b_2 \neq b_2 \in B \text{ and } \ell_1(g(b_1), g(b_2)) + 1 < m \text{ and } \ell_2(\eta_{g(b_1)}, \eta_{g(b_2)}) < m\}$$

$\bar{\nu}^g = \langle \eta_{g(b)} \upharpoonright w_g : b \in B \rangle$; this is a little more information than we need.

Easily $|w_g| \leq 2|B|$. As there are $< (\log n)^{2 \cdot |B|}$ cases, and $(\log n)^k \ll n^\varepsilon$ for n large enough, it suffices to prove (*) when we restrict ourselves to one $\bar{\nu}$ as $\bar{\nu}^g$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and let n be large enough.

Lastly, let $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) = \{g : g \text{ is a one-to-one function from } B \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n, \text{ it extends } f \text{ and } \bar{\nu}_g = \bar{\nu} \text{ and } g \text{ maps edges of } B \text{ not } \subseteq A \text{ to edges of } \mathcal{M}_n\}$ and let

$$\mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, [n]) = \{g : \text{for some } M \in \mathcal{K}_n \text{ into which } f \text{ is an embedding of } A, \text{ we have } f \subseteq g : B \hookrightarrow M \text{ and } \bar{\nu}_g = \bar{\nu}\}$$

Now we try to bound $\beta_{\bar{\nu}} =: \text{Exp}(|\mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}^{\xi+\varepsilon}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)|)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}^{\xi+\varepsilon}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) &= \{\bar{g} : \bar{g} = \langle g_i : i < n^{\xi+\varepsilon} \rangle, \\ &\text{satisfies } g_i \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, \mathcal{M}_n) \text{ and} \\ &i < j \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(g_i) \cap \text{Rang}(g_j) = \text{Rang}(f)\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}^{\xi+\varepsilon}(f, [n])$ is defined similarly.

Let $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{\nu}} = \max\{\text{Prob}(g \text{ embed } B \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n \text{ over } A) : g \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, [n])\}$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\bar{\nu}} &\leq \Sigma \{ \text{Prob}(\bigwedge_i g_i \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)) : \bar{g} \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}^{\xi+\varepsilon}(f, [n]) \} \\ &= \Sigma \{ \prod_i (\text{Prob}(g_i \in \mathcal{G}_{A,B}(f, \mathcal{M}_n))) : \bar{g} \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}^{\xi+\varepsilon}(f, [n]) \} \\ &= |\mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}^{\xi+\varepsilon}(f, [n])| \cdot (\mathbf{p}_{\bar{\nu}})^{n^{\xi+\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, [n])|^{n^{\xi+\varepsilon}} (\mathbf{p}_{\bar{\nu}})^{n^{\xi+\varepsilon}} \end{aligned}$$

Recall that for simplicity we assume without loss of generality $\text{Rang}(f) = \{1, \dots, |A|\}$.

Let $B \setminus A = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ and let b_0 be such that $f(b_0) = |A|$ and if $A = \emptyset$ we stipulate such b_0 . Clearly there are $\langle \ell_{i,j}^1 : i < j \leq k \rangle, \langle \ell_{i,j}^2 : i < j \leq k \rangle$ such that

$$g \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, [n]) \Rightarrow \ell_{i,j}^1 = \ell_1(\eta_{g(b_i)}, \eta_{g(b_j)}) \ \& \ \ell_{i,j}^2 = \ell_2(\eta_{g(b_1)}, \eta_{g(b_2)}).$$

Now note that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $g_* \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, [n])$

$$|\{g(b_\ell) : g_* \upharpoonright \{b_0, \dots, b_{\ell-1}\} \subseteq g \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, [n])\}|$$

is $\leq 2^{m - \ell^{2i-1, i}}$.

Hence

$$|\mathcal{G}_{\bar{\nu}}(f, [n])| \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^k 2^{m - \ell^{2i-1, i}} = 2^{\sum\{(m - \ell_{i,i+1}^2) : i=0, \dots, k-1\}}.$$

What about $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{\nu}}$? For each $c \in \text{Edge}(B) \setminus \text{Edge}(A)$ let $e = \{a(e), b(e)\}$ such that $b(e) = b_{i_2(e)}$ and $(a(e) \in A \ \& \ i_0(e) = 0) \vee (a(e) = b_{i_0(e)} \ \& \ i_0(e) < i_2(e))$. Let $i_1(e)$ be the $i \in \{i_0(e), i_0(e) + 1, \dots, i_2(e) - 1\}$ such that $\ell_{i,i+1}^2$ is minimal, and among those, i is minimal.

For $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ let $j(i) = \{e : e \in \text{Edge}(B) \setminus \text{Edge}(A) \text{ and } i_1(e) = i\}$.

The rest should be clear being similar to 5.4.

§6 THE CONCLUSION

Comment: In this section it is shown that $<_i^*$ and $<_s^*$ (introduced in §4) agree with the $<_i$ and $<_s$ of [I,§1] by using the probabilistic information from §5. Then it is proven that main context \mathcal{M}_n is simply nice (hence simply almost nice) and it satisfies the 0 – 1 law.

6.1 Context. As in §4 and §5, so $p_i = 1/i^\alpha$, for $i > 1$, $p_1 = p_2$ (where $\alpha \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ irrational) and $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n^0$ (only the graph) and $\leq_i, \leq_s, \text{cl}$ are as defined §1. (So $\mathcal{K}_\infty = \mathcal{K}$ by 4.4).

Note that actually the section has two parts of distinct flavours: in 6.2 - 6.5 we use the probabilistic information from §5 to show that the definition of $<_x$ from [I,§1] and of $<_x^*$ from §4 give the same relation. But to actually prove almost niceness, we need more work on the relations \leq_x^* defined in §4; this is done in 6.8, 6.10, 6.11. Lastly we put everything together.

The argument in 6.2 - 6.5 parallels that in [BSh 528] which is more hidden in [ShSp 304]. The most delicate step is to establish clauses (A)(δ) and (ε) of Definition [I,2.13,(1)] (almost simply nice). For this, we consider $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ and try to extend f to $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ where $A \leq_s B$ such that $\text{Rang}(g)$ and $\text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$ are “freely amalgamated” over $\text{Rang}(f)$. The key facts have been established in Section 5. If $\zeta = \mathbf{w}(A, B, \lambda)$ we have shown (Claim 5.12) that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n , there are $\geq n^{\zeta - \varepsilon}$ embeddings of B into \mathcal{M}_n extending f . But we also show (using 5.14) that for each obstruction to free amalgamation there is a $\zeta' < \zeta$ such that for every $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that the number of embeddings satisfying this obstruction is $< n^{\zeta' + \varepsilon_1}$, where $\zeta' = \mathbf{w}(A, B', \lambda)$ (for some B' exemplifying the obstruction) with $\zeta' + \alpha \leq \zeta$. So if $\alpha > \varepsilon + \varepsilon_1$ we overcome the obstruction. The details of this computation for various kinds of obstructions are carried out in proving Claim 6.5.

6.2 Claim. *Assume $A <^* B$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $A <_i^* B$ (i.e. from Definition 4.11(3)),
- (ii) it is not true that: for some ε , for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$, the number of $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f is $\geq n^\varepsilon$,
- (iii) for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ the number of $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f is $< n^\varepsilon$ (this is the definition of $A <_i B$ in [I,§1]).

Proof. We shall use the well known finite Δ -system lemma: if $f_i : B \rightarrow [n]$ is one to one for $i < k$ then for some $w \subseteq \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, $|w| \geq \frac{1}{|B \setminus A|^2} k^{1/2|B|}$, and $A' \subseteq B$ and f^* we have: $\bigwedge_{i \in w} f_i \upharpoonright A' = f^*$ and $\langle \text{Rang}(f_i \upharpoonright (B \setminus A')) : i \in w \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint (so if the f_i 's are pairwise distinct then $B \setminus A' \neq \emptyset$).

We use freely Fact 4.2. First, clearly $(iii) \Rightarrow (ii)$. Second, if $\neg(i)$, i.e., $\neg(A <_i^* B)$ then by 4.14 (equivalence of first and last possibilities + 4.13(1)) there are A', λ as there, that is such that:

$$A \leq^* A' <^* B \text{ and } (A', B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and if } C \subseteq B \setminus A' \text{ is non empty } \\ \lambda\text{-closed then } \mathbf{w}(A', A' \cup C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) > 0 \text{ (see 4.14).}$$

So (A', B, λ) satisfies the assumptions of 5.9 which gives $\neg(ii)$, i.e., we have proved $\neg(i) \Rightarrow \neg(ii)$ hence $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$.

Lastly to prove $(i) \Rightarrow (iii)$ assume $\neg(iii)$ (and we shall prove $\neg(i)$). So for some $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$:

$$(*)_1 \ 0 < \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Prob (for some } f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n, \text{ the number of } g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n \\ \text{extending } f \text{ is } \geq n^\varepsilon).$$

But the paragraph of this proof showing $\neg(i) \Rightarrow \neg(ii)$ shows also that from $(*)_1$ we can deduce that for some $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$$(*)_2 \ 0 < \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Prob (for some } A', A \leq^* A' <^* B, \text{ and } f' : A' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n \text{ there are } \\ \geq n^\zeta \text{ functions } g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n \text{ which are pairwise disjoint extensions of } f').$$

So for some $A', A \leq^* A' <^* B$ and

$$(*)_3 \ 0 < \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Prob (for some } f' : A' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n \text{ there are } \geq n^\zeta \text{ functions } \\ g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n \text{ which are pairwise disjoint extensions of } f').$$

By 5.4 (and 5.3, 5.2) we have $\neg(A' <_a^* B)$, which by Definition 4.11(5) means that $A' <_s^* B$ which (by Definition 4.11(4)) implies $\neg(A <_i^* B)$ so $\neg(i)$ holds as required.

$\square_{6.2}$

6.3 Claim. For $A <^* B \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $A <_s^* B$,
- (ii) it is not true that: “for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$, for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$, there are no n^ε pairwise disjoint extensions $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ of f ”,
- (iii) for some $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ there are $\geq n^\varepsilon$ pairwise disjoint extensions $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ of f .

Proof. Reflection shows that $(iii) \Rightarrow (ii)$.

If $\neg(i)$, i.e., $\neg(A <_s^* B)$ then by Definition 4.11(4) for some $B', A <_i^* B' \leq B$, hence by 6.2 easily $\neg(ii)$, so $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$.

Lastly, it suffices to prove $(i) \Rightarrow (iii)$. Now by (i) and 4.16 for some λ the assumptions of 5.9 holds hence the conclusion which give clause (iii). $\square_{6.3}$

6.4 Conclusion. 1) $<_s^* = <_s$ and $<_i^* = <_i$, and \mathfrak{K} is weakly nice where $<_s, <_i$ are defined in [I,1.4(4),1.4(5)] hence $<_{pr}^* = \leq_{pr}$.

2) (\mathcal{K}, cl) is as required in [I,§2], and the \leq_i, \leq_s defined in [I,§2] are the same as those defined in [I,§1] for our context, of course when for $A \leq B \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ we let $\text{cl}(A, B)$ e minimal A' such that $A \leq A' \leq_s^* B$.

3) Also \mathfrak{K} (that is (\mathcal{K}, cl)) is transitive local transparent and smooth, (see [I,2.2(3),2.3(2),2.5(5),2.5(4)]).

Proof. 1) $<_s^* = <_s$ and $<_i^* = <_i$ by 6.2, 6.3 and see Definition in [I,§1].

Lastly, \mathfrak{K} being weakly nice follows from 6.3, see Definition in [I,§1].

2) By [I,2.6].

3) By [I,2.6] the transitive local and transparent follows (see clauses $(\delta), (\varepsilon), (\zeta)$ there). As for smoothness, use 4.17(5). $\square_{6.4}$

Note that we are in a “nice” case, in particular no successor function. Toward proving it we characterize “simply good”.

6.5 Claim. *If $A \leq_s^* B$ and $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $k + |B| \leq t$, then for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n , for every $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$, we can find $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f such that:*

$$(i) \text{Rang}(g) \cap \text{cl}^t(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n) = \text{Rang}(f),$$

$$(ii) \text{Rang}(g) \bigcup_{\text{Rang}(f)}^{\mathcal{M}_n} \text{cl}^t(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n),$$

$$(iii) \text{cl}^k(\text{Rang}(g), \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq \text{Rang}(g) \cup \text{cl}^k(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n).$$

6.6 Remark. 1) The reader may compare this with 7.4(2) below where we have successor function.

2) Note that we can in clauses (i), (ii) of 6.5 replace t by k - this just demands less. We shall use this freely. Have we put t in the second appearance of k in clause (iii) of 6.5 the loss would not be great: just in [I], we should systematically use [I2.12(2)] instead of [I2.12(1)].

Proof. We prove this by induction on $|B \setminus A|$, but by the character of the desired conclusion, if $A <_s^* B <_s^* C$, to prove it for the pair (A, C) it suffices to prove it for the pairs (A, B) and (B, C) . Also, if $B = A$ the statement is trivial (because we can take $f = g$). So, without loss of generality, $A <_{pr}^* B$ (see Definition 4.11(6)). Let λ be such that $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}$ and for every λ -closed $C \subseteq B \setminus A$ we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, A \cup C) > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \xi =: \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) = \max\{ & \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_1}(A, B) : (A, B, \lambda_1) \in \mathcal{T} \text{ satisfies :} \\ & \text{for every } \lambda_1\text{-closed non-empty } C \subseteq B \setminus A \\ & \text{we have } \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_1}(A, A \cup C) > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ small enough. The requirements on ε , $k(*)$ will be clear by the end of the argument.

Let \mathcal{M}_n be random enough, and $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$. Now by 6.2 and the definition of cl^t we have $(*)$ and by 5.10 we have $(*)_1$ where

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad |cl^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)| &\leq n^{\varepsilon/k(*)}, \\ (*)_1 \quad |\mathcal{G}| &\geq n^{\xi - \varepsilon/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} = \{g : g \text{ extends } f \text{ to an embedding of } B \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n\}.$$

Recall that

$$\textcircled{*}_1 \text{ if } A' \subseteq M \in \mathcal{K} \text{ and } a \in cl^k(A', M) \text{ \underline{then} for some } C \text{ we have } C \subseteq cl^k(A', M), |C| \leq k, a \in C \text{ and } cl^k(C \cap A', C) = C$$

(by the Definition of cl^k , see [I,§1]).

We intend to find $g \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying the requirements in the claim. Now g being an embedding of B into \mathcal{M}_n extending f follows from $g \in \mathcal{G}$. So it is enough to prove that $< n^{\xi - \varepsilon}$ members g of \mathcal{G} fail clause (i) and similarly for clauses (ii) and (iii).

More specifically, let $\mathcal{G}^1 = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : g(B) \cap cl^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n) \neq A\}$, $\mathcal{G}^2 = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : g \notin \mathcal{G}^1 \text{ but clause (ii) fails for } g\}$ and $\mathcal{G}^3 = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : \text{clause (iii) fails for } g \text{ but } g \notin \mathcal{G}^1 \cup \mathcal{G}^2\}$. So clearly it is enough to prove $\mathcal{G} \not\subseteq \mathcal{G}^1 \cup \mathcal{G}^2 \cup \mathcal{G}^3$ (because (i) fails for $g \Rightarrow g \in \mathcal{G}^1$, (ii) fails for $g \Rightarrow g \in \mathcal{G}^2 \vee g \in \mathcal{G}^1$ and (iii) fails for $g \Rightarrow g \in \mathcal{G}^3 \vee g \in \mathcal{G}^2 \vee g \in \mathcal{G}^1$).

On the number of $g \in \mathcal{G}^1$: For $a \in B \setminus A$ and $x \in cl^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$ let $\mathcal{G}_{a,x}^2 = \{g \in \mathcal{G}^2 : g(a) = x\}$, so $\mathcal{G}^2 = \cup\{\mathcal{G}_{a,x}^2 : a \in B \setminus A \text{ and } x \in cl^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)\}$, and by 4.17(3)

clearly $A \cup \{a\} \leq_i B$ (as $A <_{pr} B$). The rest is as in the proof for \mathcal{G}^2 below, only easier.

On the number of $g \in \mathcal{G}^2$:

If $g \in \mathcal{G}^2$ then for some

$$x_g \in \text{cl}^t(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n) \setminus \text{Rang}(f) \text{ and } y \in B \setminus A$$

we have: $\{x_g, g(y)\}$ is an edge of \mathcal{M}_n . Note $x_g \notin g(B)$ as $g \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

We now form a new structure $B^2 = B \cup \{x^*\}$, ($x^* \notin B$), such that $g \cup \{\langle x^*, x_g \rangle\} : B^2 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ and let $A^2 = B^2 \upharpoonright (A \cup \{x^*\})$. Now up to isomorphism over B there is a finite number (i.e., with a bound not depending on n) of such B^2 , say $\langle B_j^2 : j < j_2^* \rangle$.

For $x \in \text{cl}^{k,m}(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n)$ and $j < j_2^*$ let

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,x}^2 =: \{g : g \text{ is an embedding of } B_j^2 \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n \text{ extending } f \\ \text{and satisfying } g(x^*) = x\}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_j^2 =: \bigcup_{x \in \text{cl}^{k,m}(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)} \mathcal{G}_{j,x}^2.$$

So:

(*)₂ if $g \in \mathcal{G}^2$ then

$$g \in \bigcup_j \{\{g' \upharpoonright B : g' \in \mathcal{G}_{j,x}^2\} : j < j_2^* \text{ and } x \in \text{cl}^{k,m}(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)\}.$$

Now, if $\neg(A_j^2 <_s B_j^2)$ then as $A <_{pr}^* B$ easily $A_j^2 <_i B_j^2$ so by 6.2 using (*) (with $\varepsilon/2 - \varepsilon/k(*)$ here standing for ε in (iii) there) we have

(*)₃ if $\neg(A_j^2 <_s B_j^2)$ then $|\mathcal{G}_j^2| \leq n^{\varepsilon/2}$.

[Why? As $A_j^2 <_i B_j^2$ on the one hand for each $x \in \text{cl}^t(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n)$ by 6.2 the number of $g : B_j^2 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending $f \cup \{\langle x^*, x \rangle\} : A_j^2 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ is $< n^{\varepsilon/k(*)}$ and on the other hand the number of candidates for x is $\leq |\text{cl}^t(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n)| \leq n^{\frac{\varepsilon}{k(*)}}$. So $|\mathcal{G}_j^2| \leq n^{\varepsilon/k(*)} \times n^{\varepsilon/k(*)} \leq n^{2\varepsilon/k(*)} \leq n^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$.]

If $A_j^2 <_s B_j^2$, then by 4.17(14) still $A_j^2 <_{pr} B_j^2$ and letting

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j^2 =: \max\{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_j^2, B_j^2) : (A_j^2, B_j^2, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and for every} \\ \lambda\text{-closed non-empty } C \subseteq B_j^2 \setminus A_j^2 \\ \text{we have } \mathbf{w}(A_j^2, A_j^2 \cup C, \lambda \upharpoonright C) > 0\} \end{aligned}$$

clearly $\xi_j^2 < \xi - 2\varepsilon$ (as we retain the “old” edges, and by at least one we actually enlarge the number of edges but we keep the number of “vertex”, i.e., equivalence classes see 4.17(9)).

So, by 5.14,

$$(*)_4 \text{ if } A_j^2 <_{pr}^* B_j^2 \text{ then } |\mathcal{G}_j^2| \leq n^{\xi-2\varepsilon}.$$

As $\xi - 2\varepsilon > \varepsilon$ by $(*)_3 + (*)_4$, multiplying by j^* , as n is large enough

$$(*)_5 \text{ the number of } g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}^1 \text{ failing clause (ii) of 6.5 is } \leq n^{\xi-\varepsilon}.$$

On the number of $g \in \mathcal{G}^3$:

Next assume $g \in \mathcal{G}^3$. So there are A^+, B^+, C, g^+ such that

$$\otimes A \leq_i A^+ \leq_s B^+, B \leq B^+, B \cap A^+ = A, |B^+| \leq |B| + k, |A^+| \leq |A| + k, C \not\subseteq B \cup A^+, B^+ \setminus B \subseteq C \subseteq B^+, cl^k(C \cap B, B^+) \supseteq C \text{ and } g \subseteq g^+, g^+ : B^+ \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n, g^+(A^+) \subseteq cl^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n).$$

[Why? As $g \in \mathcal{G}^3$ there is $y_g \in cl^k(g(B), \mathcal{M}_n)$ such that $y_g \notin g(B)$ and moreover $y_g \notin cl^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$. By the first statement (and \otimes_1 above) there is $C^* \subseteq cl^k(g(B), \mathcal{M}_n)$ with $\leq k$ elements such that $y_g \in C^*$ and $C^* \cap g(B) \leq_i C^*$. Let $B^* = g(B) \cup C^* \leq \mathcal{M}_n$. Let B^+, g^+ be such that $B \leq B^+ \in \mathcal{H}, g \subseteq g^+, g^+$ an isomorphism from B^+ onto B^* , and let $C = g^{-1}(C^*)$. Lastly, choose A^+ such that $A' \leq_i A^+ \leq_s B^+$, clearly it exists by 4.17(2). Now $|A^+| \leq |B| + |C| \leq t$ by the assumptions on A, B, k, t hence $g^+(A^+) \subseteq cl^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$ but as $g \in \mathcal{G}^3$ we have $g \notin \mathcal{G}^1$ hence $A = g(B) \cap cl^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$ so we have $A^+ \cap B = A$. Also $C \not\subseteq B \cup A^+$,

otherwise, as $g \notin \mathcal{G}^2, g \notin \mathcal{G}^1$ we have $B \bigsqcup_A^{B^+} A^+$ hence $C \cap B \bigsqcup_{C \cap A} C \cap A^+$ but as $C \cap B <_i^* C$ so by smoothness (e.g. 4.17(5)) we get $C \cap A <_i^* C \cap A^+$ hence $C \cap A^+ \subseteq cl^k(A, B^+)$ hence $C^* \setminus g(B) = g^+(C \setminus B) \subseteq g^+(C \cap A^+) \subseteq cl^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$ hence $y_g \in cl^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$, contradiction. So \otimes holds.]

Now if $\lambda \in \Xi(A^+, B^+)$ (see 4.8(2)), as $A \subseteq A^+ \ \& \ B \setminus A \subseteq B^+ \setminus A^+$ easily $\lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus A) \in \Xi(A, B)$, and $\mathbf{w}(A^+, B^+, \lambda) < \mathbf{w}(A^+, B \cup A^+) \leq \mathbf{w}(A, B, \lambda \upharpoonright (B \setminus A))$, see 4.17(8) noting that $A^+ \cup B <_i^* B^+$.

Let $\{(A_j^+, B_j^+) : j < j_3^*\}$ list the possible (A^+, B^+, λ) up to isomorphism over B as described above. Let

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,h}^3 =: \{g \in \mathcal{G} : g \text{ embeds } B_j^+ \text{ into } \mathcal{M}_n \text{ extending } f \text{ and moreover } h\}$$

for any $h \in \mathcal{H}_j^3 =: \{h : h : A_j^+ \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n \text{ extending } f\}$, so h necessarily satisfies $h(A_j^+) \subseteq \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq \text{cl}^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$.

Now easily (for random enough \mathcal{M}_n)

(*)₆ if $g \in \mathcal{G}^3$ then

$$g \in \bigcup_{j < j_3^*} \bigcup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_j^3} \{g' \upharpoonright B : g' \in \mathcal{G}_{j,h}^3\},$$

(*)₇ $|\mathcal{G}_{j,h}^3| < n^{\xi-2\varepsilon}$ for each $h \in \mathcal{H}_j^3$

(*)₈ $|\mathcal{H}_j^3| < |\text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)|^k \leq |\text{cl}^t(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)|^k < n^{\varepsilon,k}$.

Together

(*)₉ the number of $g \in \mathcal{G}^3$ is $< n^{\xi-\varepsilon}$. □_{6.5}

6.7 Conclusion. If $A <_s^* B$ and $B_0 \subseteq B$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then the tuple (B, A, B_0, k) is simply good (see Definition [I,2.12(1)]).

Proof. Read 6.5 and Definition [I,2.12(1)]. □_{6.7}

* * *

Toward simple niceness the “only” thing left is the universal part, i.e., Definition [I,2.13(1)(A)].

The following claims 6.8, 6.10 do not use §5 and have nothing to do with probability; they are the crucial step for proving the satisfaction of Definition [I,2.13(1)(A)] in our case; claim 6.8 is a sufficient condition for goodness (by 6.7). Our preceding the actual proof (of 6.11) by the two claims (6.8,6.10) and separating them is for clarity, though it has a bad effect on the bound; see also - 6.8 using “ $\text{cl}^{k,m}(\bar{a}b, M)$ ” instead $\text{cl}^k(\bar{a}b, M)$ when $k' < k$ may improve the bound.

6.8 Claim. For every k and ℓ (from \mathbb{N}) there are natural numbers $t = t(k, \ell)$ and $k^*(k, \ell) \geq t$, k such that for any $k^* \geq k^*(k, \ell)$ we have:

- (*) if $m^\otimes \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M \in \mathcal{K}$, $\bar{a} \in {}^{\ell} \geq M$, $b \in M$ then
 \otimes the set

$$\mathcal{R} =: \{(c, d) : d \in cl^k(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus cl^{k^*, m^\otimes+k}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and} \\ c \in cl^{k^*, m^\otimes}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and } \{c, d\} \text{ is an edge of } M\}$$

has less than t members.

Proof. If $k = 0$ this is trivial so without loss of generality $k > 0$. Choose $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ small enough such that

$$(*)_1 \ C_0 <^* C_1 \ \& \ (C_0, C_1, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \ \& \ |C_1| \leq k \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_0, C_1) \notin [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$$

(in fact we can restrict ourselves to the case $C_0 <_i^* C_1$)).

Choose $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ large enough such that

$$(*)_2 \ (C_0, C_1, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}, |(C_1 \setminus C_0)/\lambda| \leq k \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_0, C_1) \leq \mathbf{c}.$$

(so actually $\mathbf{c} = k$ is enough). Choose $t_1 > 0$ such that $t_1 > \mathbf{c}/\varepsilon$ and $t_1 > 2$.

Choose $t_2 \geq 2^{2^{t_1+k+\ell}}$ (overkill, we mainly need to apply twice the Δ -system lemma; but note that in the proof of 6.10 below we will use Ramsey Theorem). Lastly, choose $t > k^2 t_2$ and let $k^* \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough which actually means that $k^* > k$ & $k^* \geq (k+1) \times t_2$ so $k^*(k, \ell) =: (k+1) \times t_2$ is O.K.

Suppose we have m^\otimes , M , \bar{a} , b as in (*) but such that the set \mathcal{R} has at least t members. Let $(c_i, d_i) \in \mathcal{R}$ for $i < t$ be pairwise distinct⁷.

As $d_i \in cl^k(\bar{a}b, M)$, we can choose for each $i < t$ a set $C_i \leq M$ such that:

- (i) $C_i \leq M$,
- (ii) $|C_i| \leq k$,
- (iii) $d_i \in C_i$,
- (iv) $C_i \upharpoonright (C_i \cap (\bar{a}b)) <_i C_i$.

⁷Note: we do not require the d_i 's to be distinct; though if $w = \{i : d_i = d^*\}$ has $\geq k' > \frac{1}{\alpha}$ elements then $d^* \in cl^{k'}(cl^{k^*, m^\otimes+k}(\bar{a}, M))$

For each $i < t$, as $C_i \cap c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + k}(\bar{a}, M)$ is a proper subset of C_i (this is witnessed by d_i , i.e., as $d_i \in C_i \setminus (C_i \cap c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + k}(\bar{a}, M_n))$) clearly this set has $< k$ elements and hence for some $k[i] < k$ we have

$$(v) \quad C_i \cap c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + k[i] + 1}(\bar{a}, M) \subseteq c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + k[i]}(\bar{a}, M).$$

So without loss of generality

$$(vi) \quad i < t/k^2 \Rightarrow k[i] = k[0] \ \& \ |C_i| = |C_0| = k' \leq k,$$

remember $t_2 < t/k^2$; also

$$(vii) \quad b \in C_i.$$

[Why? If not then by clause (iv) we have $(C_i \cap \bar{a}) <_i C_i$, hence $d_i \in C_i \subseteq c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + k}(\bar{a}, M)$, contradiction.]

As $k^* \geq t_2 \times (k + 1)$ (by the assumption on k^*), clearly $|\bigcup_{i < t_2} C_i| \cup |\{c_i : i < t_2\}| \leq$

$\sum_{i < t_2} |C_i| + t_2 \leq \sum_{i < t_2} k + t_2 \leq t_2 \times (k + 1) \leq k^*$ and we define

$$D = \bigcup_{i < t_2} C_i \cup \{c_i : i < t_2\}$$

$$D' = D \cap c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + k[0]}(\bar{a}, M).$$

So by the previous sentence we have $|D'| \leq |D| \leq k^*$.

Now

$$\otimes_0 \quad D' <_s D.$$

[Why? As otherwise “there is D'' such that $D' <_i D'' \leq_s D$ so as $|D''| \leq |D| \leq k^*$ clearly $D'' \subseteq c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + k[0] + 1}(\bar{a}, M)$; contradiction.]

So we can choose $\lambda \in \Xi(D', D)$ (see Definition 4.8(2)). Let $C_i = \{d_{i,s} : s < k'\}$, with $d_{i,0} = d_i$ and recalling (vii) also $b \neq d_i \Rightarrow b = d_{i,1}$ and with no repetitions.

Clearly $d_{i,0} = d_i \notin D'$. By the finite Δ -system lemma for some $S_0, S_1, S_2 \subseteq \{0, \dots, k' - 1\}$ and $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, t_2 - 1\}$ with $\geq t_1$ elements we have:

$$\oplus_1 (a) \quad \lambda' =: \{(s_1, s_2) : d_{i,s_1} \lambda d_{i,s_2}\} \text{ is the same for all } i \in u \text{ and } S_0 = \{0, \dots, k'\} \setminus \text{Dom}(\lambda') \\ \text{so } d_{i,s} \in D' \Rightarrow i \in S_0$$

$$(b) \quad \text{for each } j < \ell g(\bar{a}) + 1, \text{ and } s < k', \text{ the truth value of } d_{i,s} = (\bar{a}b)_j \text{ is the same} \\ \text{for all } i \in u \text{ and } s \in S_0 = \{0, \dots, k' - 1\} \setminus \text{Dom}(\lambda') \text{ so } d_{i,s} \in D' \Rightarrow i \in S_0$$

$$(c) \quad d_{i_1, s_1} = d_{i_2, s_2} \Rightarrow s_1 = s_2 \text{ for } i_1, i_2 \in u$$

- (d) $d_{i_1,s} = d_{i_2,s} \Leftrightarrow s \in S_1$ for $i_1 \neq i_2 \in u$
(e) $d_{i_1,s_1} \lambda d_{i_2,s_2} \Rightarrow d_{i_1,s_1} \lambda d_{i_1,s_2} \ \& \ d_{i_1,s_2} \lambda d_{i_2,s_2}$ for $i_1 \neq i_2 \in u$
(f) $d_{i_1,s} \lambda d_{i_2,s} \Leftrightarrow s \in S_2$ for $i_1 \neq i_2 \in u$: so $i \in u \ \& \ s \in S_2 \Rightarrow d_{i,s} \notin D'$
(g) the statement $b = d_{i,0}$ has the same truth value for all $i \in u$
[(h) in §7 we also demand $(d_{i_1,s_1} S d_{i_1,s_2}) = (d_{i_2,s_1} S d_{i_1,s_2})$ where S is the successor relation].

Now we necessarily have:

$$\oplus_2 \ 0 \notin S_2 \text{ (i.e., } \lambda \upharpoonright \{d_i : i \in u\} \text{ is equality).}$$

[Why? Otherwise, letting $X = d_i/\lambda$ for any $i \in u$, the triple $(D', D' \cup X, \lambda \upharpoonright X) \in \mathcal{F}$ has weight

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}(D', D' \cup X, \lambda \upharpoonright X) &= \mathbf{v}(D', D' \cup X, \lambda \upharpoonright X) \\ &\quad - \alpha \mathbf{e}(D', D' \cup X, \lambda \upharpoonright X) \\ &= 1 - \alpha \times |\{e : e \text{ an edge of } M \text{ with one end in} \\ &\quad D' \text{ and the other in } X\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Now as $c_i \in c\ell^{k^*,m^\otimes}(\bar{a}, M)$ clearly $c_i \in D'$ and the pairs $\{c_i, d_i\} \in \text{edge}(M)$ are distinct for different i clearly the number above is $\leq 1 - \alpha \times |\{(c_i, d_i) : i \in u\}| = 1 - \alpha \times |u| = 1 - \alpha \times t_1 < 0$; contradiction to $\lambda \in \Xi(D', D)$.]

Let $D_0 = \bar{a} \cup \bigcup \{d_{i,s}/\lambda : s \in S_2 \text{ and } i \in u\}$, clearly D_0 is λ -closed subset of D though not necessarily $\subseteq \text{Dom}(\lambda) = D \setminus D'$ because of \bar{a} .

- $\oplus_3 \ b = d_{i,1}$ and $1 \in S_1 \setminus S_0$ and $0 \notin S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2$ and $S_1 \setminus S_0 \subseteq S_2$ (hence $b \in D_0$).
[Why? The first two clauses hold as $b \in C_i$, $b \in \{d_{i,0}, d_{i,1}\}$ and \oplus_2 and (g) of \oplus_1 . The last clause holds by \oplus_1 (d),(f) and the “hence $b \in D_0$ ” by the definition of D_0 , $S_1 \setminus \text{Dom}(\lambda') \subseteq S_2$ and the first clause. Also $0 \notin S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2$ should be clear.]
- \oplus_4 For each $i \in u$ we have $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_i \cap D_0, C_i) < 0$.
[Why? As $C_i \cap (\bar{a}b) \subseteq C_i \cap D_0$ by clauses (b) + (f) of \oplus_1 and by monotonicity of $<_i$ we have $C_i \upharpoonright (C_i \cap \bar{a}b) <_i C_i \Rightarrow C_i \cap D_0 \leq_i C_i$ but $d_{i,0} = d_i \in C_i \setminus C_i \cap D_0$.]

Hence

- $\oplus_5 \ \mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_i \cap D_0, C_i) \leq -\varepsilon$ for $i \in u$.
[Why? See the choice of ε .]

Let

$$D_1 =: D' \cup \bigcup \{d_{i,s}/\lambda : i \in u, s < k'\} = D' \cup D_0 \cup \{d_{i,s}/\lambda : i \in u, s < k' \ \& \ s \notin S_2\}$$

so clearly D_1 is λ -closed subset of D including D' but $D_1 \neq D'$ as $i \in u \Rightarrow d_i \in D_1$ by \oplus_2 . Also clearly

$$\oplus_6 \quad D' \subseteq D' \cup D_0 \subseteq D_1 \subseteq D \text{ and } D_0, D_1 \text{ are } \lambda\text{-closed.}$$

So, as we know $\lambda \in \Xi(D', D)$, we have

$$\oplus_7 \quad \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D', D_1) > 0.$$

Now:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D', D_1) &= \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D', \bigcup \{x/\lambda : x \in \bigcup_{i \in u} C_i \setminus D'\} \cup D') \\ &= \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D', D' \cup D_0) + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D' \cup D_0, D' \cup D_0 \\ &\quad \cup \bigcup \{d_{i,s}/\lambda : i \in u, s < k', s \notin S_0 \cup S_2\}) \\ &\quad [\text{now by 6.9 below with } B_i = \{d_{i,s} : s < k', s \notin S_2 \cup S_0\} \text{ and} \\ &\quad B_i^+ = \cup \{d_{i,s}/\lambda : s < k', s \notin S_2\}] \\ &\leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D', D' \cup D_0) + \sum_{i \in u} \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D' \cup D_0, D' \cup D_0 \cup \{d_{i,s} : s < k', s \notin S_2 \cup S_0\}) \\ &\quad [\text{now as } C_i = \{d_{i,s} : s < k'\} \text{ and } d_{i,s} \in D' \cup D_0 \text{ if } s < k', s \in S_0 \cup S_2, i \in u] \\ &\leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D', D' \cup D_0) + \sum_{i \in u} \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D' \cup D_0, D' \cup D_0 \cup C_i) \\ &\quad [\text{now as } \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_1, B_1) \leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) \\ &\quad \text{when } A \leq A_1 \leq B_1, A \leq B \leq B_1, B_1 \setminus A_1 = B \setminus A] \text{ by 4.15(3)} \\ &\leq \mathbf{w}_\lambda(D' \cap D_0, D_0) + \sum_{i \in u} \mathbf{w}_\lambda(C_i \cap D_0, C_i) \\ &\quad [\text{now by the choice of } \mathbf{c}, D_0 \text{ i.e., } (*)_2 \text{ and the choice of } \varepsilon, u + \oplus_5 \text{ respectively}] \\ &\leq \mathbf{c} + |u| \times (-\varepsilon) = \mathbf{c} - t_1 \varepsilon < 0, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the choice of λ , i.e., \oplus_7 .

□_{6.8}

6.9 Observation. Assume

- (a) $A \leq^* A \cup B_i \leq^* A \cup B_i^+ \leq^* B$ for $i \in u$
- (b) $B \setminus A$ is the disjoint union of $\langle B_i^+ : i \in u \rangle$
- (c) λ is an equivalence relation on $B \setminus A$
- (d) each B_i^+ is λ -closed
- (e) $B_i^+ = \cup\{x/\lambda : x \in B_i \setminus A\}$

Then $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B) \geq \Sigma\{\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A, B_i) : i \in u\}$.

Proof. By clause (b) + (d)

$$\mathbf{v}_\lambda(A, B) = \Sigma\{\mathbf{v}_\lambda(A, A \cup B_i^+) : i \in u\} = \Sigma\{\mathbf{v}_\lambda(A, A \cup B_i) : i \in u\}$$

and by clause (b) the set $e_\lambda(A, B)$ contains the disjoint union of $\langle e_\lambda(A, B_i) : i \in u \rangle$. Together the result follows. $\square_{6.9}$

6.10 Claim. For every k, m and ℓ from \mathbb{N} for some $m^* = m^*(k, \ell, m)$, for any $k^* \geq k^*(k, \ell)$ (the function $k^*(k, \ell)$ is the one from claim 6.8) satisfying $k^* \geq k \times m^*$ we have

- (*) if $M \in \mathcal{X}$, $\bar{a} \in {}^\ell \geq M$ and $b \in M \setminus c\ell^{k^*, m^*}(\bar{a}, M)$ then for some $m^\otimes \leq m^* - m$ we have

$$c\ell^k(\bar{a}b, M) \cap c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes + m}(\bar{a}, M) \subseteq c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes}(\bar{a}, M).$$

Proof. For $k = 0$ this is trivial so without loss of generality $k > 0$. Let $t = t(k, \ell)$ be as in the previous claim 6.8. Choose m^* such that, e.g., $\lfloor m^*/(km) \rfloor \rightarrow (t+5)_{2^{k+1+\ell}}^2$ in the usual notation in Ramsey theory. We could get more reasonable bounds but no need as for now. Remember that $k^*(k, \ell)$ is from 6.8 and k^* is any natural number $\geq k^*(k, \ell)$ such that $k^* \geq km^*$.

If the conclusion fails, then the set

$$Z =: \{j \leq m^* - k : c\ell^k(\bar{a}b, M) \cap c\ell^{k^*, j+1}(\bar{a}, M) \not\subseteq c\ell^{k^*, j}(\bar{a}, M)\}$$

satisfies:

$$j \leq m^* - m - k \Rightarrow Z \cap [j, j+m) \neq \emptyset.$$

Hence $|Z| \geq (m^* - m - k)/m$.

For $j \in Z$ there are $C_j \leq M$ and d_j such that

$$|C_j| \leq k \text{ and } (C_j \cap (\bar{a}b)) <_i^* C_j, \text{ and } d_j \in C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, j+1}(\bar{a}, M) \setminus \text{cl}^{k^*, j}(\bar{a}, M).$$

Now we use the same argument as in the proof of 6.8.

As $d_j \in C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, j+1}(\bar{a}, M) \setminus \text{cl}^{k^*, j}(\bar{a}, M)$ we will get that $C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, j}(\bar{a}, M)$ is a proper subset of $C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, j+1}(\bar{a}, M)$ (witness by d_j) so $|C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, j}(\bar{a}, M)| < |C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, j+1}(\bar{a}, M)| \leq k$ so $|C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, j}(\bar{a}, M)| < k$. Hence for some $k_j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have $C_j \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, m^* - k_j + 1}(\bar{a}, M) \subseteq \text{cl}^{k^*, m^* - k_j}(\bar{a}, M)$ hence for some $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have $|Z'| \geq (m^* - m - k)/(mk)$ where $Z' = \{j \in Z : k_j = k'\}$.

Let $C_j = \{d_{j,s} : s < s_j \leq k\}$ with $d_{j,0} = d_j$ and no repetitions. We can find $s^* \leq k$ and $S_1, S_0 \subseteq \{0, \dots, s^* - 1\}$ and $u \subseteq Z'$ satisfying $|u| = t + 5$ such that (because of the partition relation):

- (a) $i \in u \Rightarrow s_j = s^*$,
- (b) for each $j < \ell g(\bar{a}) + 1$ and $s < s^*$ the truth value of $d_{i,s} = (\bar{a}b)_j$ is the same for all $i \in u$,
- (c) if $i \neq j$ are from u then $|i - j| > k + 1$, i.e., the C_i 's for $i \in u$ are quite far from each other
- (d) the truth value of “ $\{d_{i,s_1}, d_{i,s_2}\}$ is an edge” is the same for all $i \in u$,
- (e) for all $i_0 < i_1$ from u :

$$[d_{i_0,s} \in \text{cl}^{k^*, i_1}(\bar{a}, M)] \Leftrightarrow s \in S_0,$$

- (f) for all $i_0 < i_1$ from u :

$$d_{i_1,s} \in \text{cl}^{k^*, i_0}(\bar{a}, M) \Leftrightarrow s \in S_1,$$

- (g) for each $s < s^*$, the sequence $\langle d_{i,s} : i \in u \rangle$ is constant or with no repetition,
- (h) if $d_{i_1,s_1} = d_{i_2,s_2}$ then $d_{i_1,s_1} = d_{i_1,s_2} = d_{i_2,s_2}$, moreover, $s_1 = s_2$ (recalling that $\langle d_{i,s} : s < s_j \rangle$ is with no repetitions).

Now let $i(*)$ be, e.g., the third element of the set u and

$$B_1 =: C_{i(*)} \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, \min(u)}(\bar{a}, M), \text{ and } B_2 =: C_{i(*)} \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, \max(u)}(\bar{a}, M).$$

So

- ⊗₁ $B_1 <^* B_2 \leq^* C_{i(*)}$ (note: that $B_1 \neq B_2$ because $d_{i(*)} \in B_2 \setminus B_1$) and
- ⊗₂ $(\bar{a}b) \cap B_2 \subseteq B_1$ by clause (b) and
- ⊗₃ there is no edge in $(C_{i(*)} \setminus B_2) \times (B_2 \setminus B_1)$.

Why? Toward contradiction assume that this fails. Let the edge be $\{d_{i(*)}, s_1, d_{i(*)}, s_2\}$ with

$$d_{i(*)}, s_1 \in C_{i(*)} \setminus B_2 \text{ and } d_{i(*)}, s_2 \in B_2 \setminus B_1;$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_1 \quad & d_{i(*)}, s_1 \in C_{i(*)} \setminus \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, \max(u)}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and} \\ & d_{i(*)}, s_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, \max(u)}(\bar{a}, M) \setminus \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, \min(u)}(\bar{a}, M) \\ & \text{and } \{d_{i(*)}, s_1, d_{i(*)}, s_2\} \text{ is an edge.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence by clause (d)

$$(*)_2 \quad \{d_{i}, s_1, d_{i}, s_2\} \text{ is an edge for every } i \in u$$

and by clauses (e), (f) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_3 \quad & \text{if } i_0 < i_1 < i_2 \text{ are in } u \text{ then } d_{i_1}, s_2 \notin \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, i_0}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and } d_{i_1}, s_2 \in \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, i_2}(\bar{a}, M) \\ & \text{and } d_{i_1}, s_1 \notin \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, i_2}(\bar{a}, M) \end{aligned}$$

and so necessarily

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_4 \quad & \langle d_{i}, s_2 : i \in u \rangle \text{ is with no repetitions.} \\ & [\text{Why? By clause (g) and } (*)_3.] \end{aligned}$$

So the set of edges $\{\{d_{i}, s_1, d_{i}, s_2\} : i \in u \text{ but } |u \cap i| \geq 2 \text{ and } |u \setminus i| \geq 2\}$ contradicts 6.8 using $m^\otimes = \max(u) - k$ there (and our choice of parameters and $C_i \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\ell^k}(\bar{a}b, M)$). So \otimes_3 holds.

As $C_{i(*)} \upharpoonright (\bar{a}b) <_i C_{i(*)}$ and $B_2 \cap (\bar{a}b) \subseteq B_1$ (by \otimes_2), clearly $C_{i(*)} \cap \bar{a}b \subseteq C_{i(*)} \setminus (B_2 \setminus B_1) \subset C_{i(*)}$, the strict \subset as $d_{i(*)} \in C_{i(*)} \cap (\mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, i(*)+1}(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, i(*)}(\bar{a}b, M)) \subseteq B_2 \setminus B_1$. But, as stated above, $C_{i(*)} \setminus (B_2 \setminus B_1) \upharpoonright B_1$, hence by the previous sentence

(and smoothness, see 4.17(5)) we get $B_1 <_i^* B_2$; also $|B_2| \leq |C_{i(*)}| \leq k \leq k^*$. By their definitions, $B_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, \min(u)}(\bar{a}, M)$, but $B_1 \leq_i^* B_2$, $|B_2| \leq k \leq k^*$ and hence $B_2 \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, 2^{\text{nd member of } u}}(\bar{a}, M)$. Contradiction to the choice of $d_{i(*)}$. $\square_{6.10}$

6.11 Lemma. *For every k, m and ℓ (from \mathbb{N}), for some m^*, k^* and t^* we have:*

- (*) *if $M \in \mathcal{H}$, $\bar{a} \in \ell^{\geq} M$ and $b \in M \setminus \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, m^*}(\bar{a}, M)$ then for some $m^\otimes \leq m^* - m$ and B we have*
 - (i) $|B| \leq t^*$,
 - (ii) $\bar{a} \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\ell^k}(B, M) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\ell^{k^*}, m^\otimes}(\bar{a}, M)$,

- (iii) $cl^{k^*, m^{\otimes} + m}(\bar{a}, M), (cl^k(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus cl^{k^*, m^{\otimes} + m}(\bar{a}, M)) \cup B$ are free over B inside M ,
- (iv) $B \leq_s^* B^* =: M \upharpoonright ((cl^{k^*}(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus cl^{k^*, m^{\otimes} + m}(B, M)) \cup B)$.

6.12 *Remark.* Clearly this will finish the proof of simply nice.

6.13 Comments: Let us describe the proof below.

1) In the proof we apply the last two claims. By them we arrive to the following situation: inside $cl^k(\bar{a}b, M)$ we have $B \leq B^*, |B| \leq t^*$ and there is no “small” D such that $B <_i^* D \leq B^*$ and we have to show that $B <_s^* B^*$, a kind of compactness lemma.

2) Note that for each $d \in cl^k(\bar{a}b, M)$ there is $C_d \subseteq cl^k(\bar{a}b, M)$ witnessing it, i.e., $C_d \cap (\bar{a}b) \leq_i C_d, d \in C_d, |C_d| \leq k$. To prove the statement above we choose an increasing sequence $\langle D_i : i \leq i(*) \rangle$ of subsets of $B^*, D_0 = B \cup \{b\}, |D_i|$ has an a priori bound, D_{i+1} “large” enough. So by our assumption toward contradiction $B <_s^* D_{i(*)}$ hence there is $\lambda \in \Xi(B, D_{i(*)})$, without loss of generality, $B^* = B \cup \bigcup \{C_d : d \in D_{i(*)}\}$. For each $i < i(*)$ we try to “lift” $\lambda \upharpoonright (D_i \setminus B)$ to $\lambda^+ \in \Xi(B, B^*)$, a failure will show that we could have put elements satisfying some conditions in D_{i+1} so we had done so. As this occurs for every $i < i(*)$, by weight computations we get contradiction.

Proof. Without loss of generality $k > 0$. Let $t = t(k, \ell), k^*(k, \ell)$ be as required in 6.8 (for our given k, ℓ).

Choose $m(1) = t \times (m + 1) + k + 2$ and let $t^* = t + \ell + k$.

Choose m^* as in 6.10 for k (given in 6.11), $m(1)$ (chosen above) and ℓ (given in 6.11), i.e., $m^* = m^*(k, m(1), \ell)$. Let $\varepsilon^* \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ be such that

$$(A', B', \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \ \& \ |B'| \leq k \ \& \ A' \neq B' \Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', B') \notin (-\varepsilon^*, \varepsilon^*).$$

Let $i(*) > \frac{1}{\varepsilon^*}$. Define inductively k_i^* for $i \leq i(*)$ as follows

$$k_0^* = \max\{k^*(k, \ell), m \times k, m^* \times t^* + 1\}$$

$$k_{i+1}^* = 2^{2^{k_i^*}}$$

and lastly let

$$k^* = k \times k_{i(*)}^*.$$

We shall prove that m^* , k^* , t^* are as required in 6.11. So let M , \bar{a} , b be as in the assumption of $(*)$ of 6.11. So $M \in \mathcal{K}$, $\bar{a} \in {}^{\ell \geq} M$ and $b \in M \setminus c\ell^{k^*, m^*}(\bar{a}, M)$, but this means that the assumption of $(*)$ in 6.10 holds for k , $m(1)$, ℓ , so we can apply it (i.e., as $m^* = m^*(k, m(1), \ell)$, $k^* \geq k^*(k, \ell)$ where $k^*(k, \ell)$ is from 6.8 and $k^* \geq k \times m^*$ as $k^* \geq k_{i(*)}^* > k_0^* \geq m^* \times k$). So for some $r \leq m^* - m(1)$ we have

$$\oplus_1 c\ell^k(\bar{a}b, M) \cap c\ell^{k^*, r+m(1)}(\bar{a}, M) \subseteq c\ell^{k^*, r}(\bar{a}, M).$$

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} = \{ & (c, d) : d \in c\ell^k(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus c\ell^{k^*, r+m(1)}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and} \\ & c \in c\ell^{k^*, r+m(1)-k}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and} \\ & \{c, d\} \text{ is an edge of } M \}. \end{aligned}$$

How many members does \mathcal{R} have? By 6.8 (with $r + m(1) - k$ here standing for m^\otimes there as $k^* \geq k^*(k, \ell)$) at most t members. But by \oplus_1 above

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} = \{ & (c, d) : d \in c\ell^k(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus c\ell^{k^*, r}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and} \\ & c \in c\ell^{k^*, r+m(1)-k}(\bar{a}, M) \text{ and} \\ & \{c, d\} \text{ is an edge of } M \}. \end{aligned}$$

But $t \times (m + 1) + 1 < m(1) - k$ by the choice of $m(1)$ (and, of course, $c\ell^{k^*, i}(\bar{a}, M)$ increase with i) hence for some $m^\otimes \in \{r + 1, \dots, r + m(1) - k - m\}$ we have

$$\oplus_2 (c, d) \in \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow c \notin c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes+m}(\bar{a}, M) \setminus c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes-1}(\bar{a}, M).$$

So

$$\oplus_3 r \leq m^\otimes - 1 < m^\otimes + m \leq r + m(1) - k.$$

Let

$$B =: \{c \in c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes-1}(\bar{a}, M) : \text{for some } d \text{ we have } (c, d) \in \mathcal{R}\} \cup \bar{a}.$$

So by the above $B = \{c \in c\ell^{k^*, m^\otimes+m}(\bar{a}, M) : (\exists d)((c, d) \in \mathcal{R})\} \cup \bar{a}$.

Let us check the demands (i) - (iv) of (*) of 6.11, remember that we are defining $B^* = (cl^k(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus cl^{k^*, m^\otimes+m}(\bar{a}, M)) \cup B$, that is the submodel of M with this set of elements.

Clause (i): $|B| \leq t^*$.

As said above, $|\mathcal{R}| \leq t$, hence clearly $|B| \leq t + \ell g(\bar{a}) \leq t + \ell \leq t^*$.

Clause (ii): $\bar{a} \subseteq B \subseteq cl^k(B, M) \subseteq cl^{k^*, m^\otimes}(\bar{a}, M)$.

As by its definition $B \subseteq cl^{k^*, m^\otimes-1}(\bar{a}, M)$, and $k \leq k^*$ clearly $cl^k(B, M) \subseteq cl^{k^*, m^\otimes}(\bar{a}, M)$ and $B \subseteq cl^k(B, M)$ always and $\bar{a} \subseteq B$ by its definition.

Clause (iii):

Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} B &= cl^{k^*, m^\otimes+m}(\bar{a}, M) \cap ((cl^k(\bar{a}b, M) \setminus cl^{k^*, m^\otimes+m}(\bar{a}, M)) \cup B) \\ &= (cl^{k^*, m^\otimes+m}(\bar{a}, M)) \cap B^*. \end{aligned}$$

Now the “no edges” holds by the definitions of B and \mathcal{R} .

Clause (iv): $B \leq_s^* B^*$.

Clearly $B \subseteq B^*$ by the definition of B^* before the proof of clause (i). Toward contradiction assume $\neg(B \leq_s^* B^*)$ then 4.17(2) for some D , $B <_i D \leq B^*$, and choose such D with minimal number of elements. Note that as $B \subseteq cl^{k^*, m^\otimes-1}(\bar{a}, M)$ and $B^* \cap cl^{k^*, m^\otimes+m}(\bar{a}, M) = B$, necessarily $|D| > k^*$ (and $B <^* D \leq B^*$). For every $d \in D \setminus B$, as $d \in B^*$ clearly $d \in cl^k(\bar{a}b, M)$ hence there is a set $C_d \leq M$, $|C_d| \leq k$ such that $C_d \upharpoonright (\bar{a}b) \leq_i C_d$, $d \in C_d$; note that $C_d \subseteq cl^k(\bar{a}b, M)$ by the definition of cl^k , hence by the choice of B^* and m^\otimes and \oplus_1 we have $C_d \subseteq B^* \cup cl^{k^*, m^\otimes-1}(\bar{a}, M)$. Let $C'_d = C_d \cap (B \cup \{b\})$, $C''_d = C_d \cap B^*$. Clearly $C_d \cap (\bar{a}b) \leq C'_d \leq C''_d \leq C_d$ hence $C'_d \leq_i C_d$. Now by clause (iii), $C''_d \bigcup_{C'_d}^M C'_d \cup (C_d \setminus C''_d)$ hence (by smoothness) we have $C'_{d_i} \leq_i C''_{d_i}$. Of course, $|C''_d| \leq |C_d| \leq k$. For $d \in B$ let $C_d = C'_d = C''_d = \{d\}$.

We now choose a set D_i by induction on $i \leq i^*$, such that (letting $C_i^{**} = \bigcup_{d \in D_i} C''_d$):

$$(a) \ D_0 = B \cup \{b\}$$

- (b) $j < i \Rightarrow D_j \subseteq D_i \subseteq D$
- (c) $|D_i| \leq k_i^*$
- (d) if λ is an equivalence relation on $C_i^{**} \setminus B$ and for some $d \in D \setminus D_i$ one of the clauses below holds then there is such $d \in D_{i+1}$ where
- $\otimes_{\lambda,d}^1$ for some $x \in C_d'' \setminus C_i^{**}$, there are no $y \in C_d'' \cap C_i^{**}$, $j^* \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\langle y_j : j \leq j^* \rangle$ such that $y_j \in C_d''$, $y_{j^*} = x$, $y_0 = y$, $\{y_j, y_{j+1}\}$ an edge of M , (actually an empty case, i.e., never occurs see $(*)_{14}$ below)
 - $\otimes_{\lambda,d}^2$ there are $x \in C_d'' \setminus C_i^{**}$, $y \in (C_i^{**} \setminus C_d'') \cup B$ and $y' \in C_d'' \cap C_i^{**}$ such that $\{x, y\}$ is an edge of M and y is connected by a path $\langle y_0, \dots, y_1 \rangle$ inside C_d'' to x so $x = y_j$, $y = y_0$ and $[y_i \in C_i^{**} \equiv i = 0]$ and $\neg(y' \lambda y)$
 - $\otimes_{\lambda,d}^3$ there is an edge $\{x_1, x_2\}$ of M such that we have:
 - (A) $\{x_1, x_2\} \subseteq C_d''$
 - (B) $\{x_1, x_2\}$ is disjoint to C_i^{**}
 - (C) for $s \in \{1, 2\}$ there is a path $\langle y_{s,0}, \dots, y_{s,j_s} \rangle$ in C_d'' , $y_{s,j_s} = x_s$, $[y_{s,j} \in C_i^{**} \equiv j = 0]$ and $\neg(y_{1,0} \lambda y_{2,0})$
- (e) if λ is an equivalence relation on $C_i^{**} \setminus B$ to which clause (d) does not apply but there are $d_1, d_2 \in D$ satisfying one of the following then we can find such $d_1, d_2 \in D_{i+1}$
- $\otimes_{\lambda,d_1,d_2}^4$ for some $x_1 \in C_{d_1}'' \setminus C_i^{**}$, $x_2 \in C_{d_2}'' \setminus C_i^{**}$ and $y_1 \in C_{d_1}'' \cap C_i^{**}$, $y_2 \in C_{d_2}'' \cap C_i^{**}$ we have: for $s = 1, 2$ there is a path $\langle y_{s,0}, \dots, y_{s,j_s} \rangle$ in C_{d_s}'' , $y_{s,j_s} = x_s$, $y_{s,0} = y_s$, $[y_{s,j} \in C_i^{**} \Leftrightarrow j = 0]$ and: $x_1 = x_2$ & $\neg(y_1 \lambda y_2)$
 - $\otimes_{\lambda,d_1,d_2}^5$ for some x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 as in $\otimes_{\lambda,d_1,d_2}^4$ we have: $\neg(y_1 \lambda y_2)$ and $\{x_1, x_2\}$ an edge.

So $|D_{i(*)}| \leq k^*/k$ (by the choice of k^* , $i(*)$ and clause (c)), hence $C_{i(*)}^{**} =$

$\bigcup_{d \in D_{i(*)}} C_d''$ has $\leq k^*$ members, $\bar{a}b \subseteq B \cup \{b\} \subseteq D_0 \subseteq C_{i(*)}^{**} \subseteq \text{cl}^k(\bar{a}b, M)$ and

$C_{i(*)}^{**} \cap \text{cl}^{k^*, m^{\otimes} + m}(\bar{a}, M) = B \subseteq \text{cl}^{k^*, m^{\otimes} - 1}(\bar{a}, M)$ hence necessarily $B \leq_s C_{i(*)}^{**}$

hence there is $\lambda \in \Xi(B, C_{i(*)}^{**})$. Let $\lambda_i = \lambda \upharpoonright (C_i^{**} \setminus B)$.

Now

$$\square (B, C_i^{**}, \lambda_i) \in \Xi(B, C_i^{**}).$$

[Why? Easy.]

Case 1: For some i , (d) and (e) are vacuous for λ_i .

Let λ_i^* be the set of pairs (x, y) from $C^{**} \setminus B$ where $C^{**} = \bigcup_{d \in D} C_d''$ which satisfies

(α) or (β) where

(α) $x, y \in C_i^{**} \setminus B$ and $x\lambda_i\beta$

(β) for some $d \in D$ we have $x \in C^{**} \setminus C_i^{**}, x \in C_d'', y \in C_i^{**} \cap C_d''$ and there is a sequence $\langle y_j : j \leq j^* \rangle, j^* \geq 1$ such that $y_j \in C_d'', y_0 = y, \{y_j, y_{j+1}\}$ an edge of M and $[j > 0 \Rightarrow y_j \notin C_i^{**}]$.

This in general is not an equivalence relation.

Let $C^\otimes = \{x : \text{for some } (x_1, x_2) \in \lambda_i^* \text{ we have } x \in \{x_1, x_2\}\}$

$$\lambda_i^+ = \{(x_1, x_2) : \text{for some } y_1, y_2 \in D_i \text{ we have } y_1\lambda y_2, (x_1, y_1) \in \lambda_i^*, (x_2, y_2) \in \lambda_i^*\}.$$

Now

- (*)₁ λ_i^+ is a set of pairs from C^\otimes with $\lambda_i^+ \upharpoonright D_i = \lambda_i$
- (*)₂ $x \in C^\otimes \Rightarrow (x, x) \in \lambda_i^+$
[why? read (α) or (β) and the choice of λ_i^+]
- (*)₃ for every $x \in C^\otimes$ for some $y \in C_i^{**}$ we have $x\lambda_i^*y$
[why? read the choice of λ_i^+, λ_i^* .]
- (*)₄ λ_i^+ is a symmetric relation on C^\otimes
[why? read the definition of λ_i^+ recalling λ is symmetric.]
- (*)₅ λ_i^+ is transitive
[why? looking at the choice of λ_i^* this is reduced to the case excluded in (*)₆ below]
- (*)₆ if $(x, y_1), (x, y_2) \in \lambda_i^*, \{y_1, y_2\} \subseteq D_i, x \notin D_i$, then $y_1\lambda y_2$.
[Why? Because clause (e) in the choice of D_{i+1} is vacuous. More fully, otherwise possibility $\otimes_{\lambda, d_1, d_2}^4$ holds for λ_i .]
- (*)₇ for every $x \in C^{**} \setminus C_i^{**}$, clause (β) apply to $x \in C^\otimes$, i.e., $C_{**}^\otimes = C^{**}$
[why? as $x \in C^{**}$ there is $d \in D$ such that $x \in C_d''$, hence by $\otimes_{\lambda, d}^1$ of clause (d) of the choice of D_{i+1} holds for x hence is not vacuous contradicting the assumption on i in the present case]
- (*)₈ λ_i^+ is an equivalence relation on $C^{**} \setminus B$
[why? its domain is $C^{**} \setminus B$ by (*)₇, it is an equivalence relation on its domain by (*)₁ + (*)₂ + (*)₄ + (*)₅.]

Also

- (*)₉ $\lambda_i^+ \upharpoonright C_i^{**} = \lambda_i$
[why? by the choice of λ_i^+ that is by (*)₁]
- (*)₁₀ every λ_i^+ -equivalence class is represented in C_i^{**}
[why? by the choice of λ_i^+ and λ_i^*]
- (*)₁₁ if $x_1, x_2 \in C^{**} \setminus B$ and $\neg(x_1 \lambda_i^+ x_2)$ but $\{x_1, x_2\}$ is an edge then $\{x_1, x_2\} \subseteq C_i^{**}$.

[Why (*)₁₁ holds? Assume $\{x_1, x_2\}$ is a counterexample, so $\{x_1, x_2\} \not\subseteq C_i^{**}$, so without loss of generality $x_1 \notin C_i^{**}$. Now for $\ell = 1, 2$ if $x_\ell \notin C_i^{**}$ then we can choose $d_\ell \in D_i$ and $y_\ell \in C_{d_\ell}'' \cap C_i^{**}$ such that d witnesses that $(x_\ell, y_\ell) \in \lambda_i^*$ that is, as in clause (β) there is a path $\langle y_{\ell,0}, \dots, y_{\ell,j_\ell} \rangle$ such that $y_{\ell,0} = y_\ell, y_{\ell,0} = x_\ell$ and ($j > 0 \Rightarrow y_{\ell,j} \notin C_i^{**}$).

We separate to cases:

- (A) $x_1, x_2 \notin C_i^{**}, d_1 = d_2$.
This case can't happen as $\otimes_{\lambda_i, d_1}^3$ of clause (d) is vacuous
- (B) $x_1, x_2 \notin C_i^{**}, d_1 \neq d_2$.
In this case by the vacuousness of $\otimes_{\lambda_i, d_1, d_2}^5$ of clause (e) we get contradiction
- (C) $x_1 \in C_d''$ and $x_2 \in C_i^{**}$
by the vacuousness of $\otimes_{\lambda_i, d_1}^2$ of clause (d).

Together we have proved (*)₁₁.]

As $\lambda_i \in \Xi(B, C_i^{**})$ by (*)₈ + (*)₉ + (*)₁₀ + (*)₁₁ and \square , easily $\lambda_i^+ \in \Xi(B, C^{**})$, hence (see 4.16) $B <_s^* C^{**}$, so as $B \subseteq D \subseteq C^{**}$ we have $B <_s^* D$, the desired contradiction.

Case 2: For every $i < i(*)$, at least one of the clauses (d), (e) is non vacuous for λ_i .

Let $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_i}(B, C_i^{**})$. For each i let $\langle d_{i,j} : j < j_i \rangle$ list $D_{i+1} \setminus D_i$, such that: if clause (d) applies to λ_i then $d_{i,0}$ form a witness and if clause (e) applies to λ_i then $d_{i,0}, d_{i,1}$ form a witness. For $j \leq j_i$ let $C_{i,j}^{**} = C_i^{**} \cup \bigcup_{s < j} C_{d_{i,s}}''$, so $C_{i,0}^{**} = C_i^{**}$,

$C_{i,j_i}^{**} = C_{i+1}^{**}$. Let $\mathbf{w}_{i,j} = \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_i}(B, C_{i,j}^{**})$.

So it suffice to prove:

- (A) $\mathbf{w}_{i,j} \geq \mathbf{w}_{i,j+1}$
- (B) $\mathbf{w}_{i,0} - \varepsilon^* \geq \mathbf{w}_{i,1}$ or $\mathbf{w}_{i,1} - \varepsilon^* \geq \mathbf{w}_{i,2}$.

Let $i < i(*)$, $j < j_i$.

Clearly $C_{i,j+1}^{**} \setminus C_{i,j}^{**} \subseteq C_{d_{i,j}}'' \subseteq C_{i,j+1}^{**}$, let

$$A_{i,j} = \{x \in C''_{d_{i,j}} : x \in B \text{ or } x/\lambda \text{ is not disjoint to } C_{i,j}^{**}\}.$$

Clearly $A_{i,j} \setminus B$ is $(\lambda \upharpoonright C''_{d_{i,j}})$ -closed hence $A_{i,j} \leq^* C''_{d_{i,j}}$, $C''_{d_{i,j}} \setminus A_{i,j}$ is disjoint to $C_{i,j}^{**}$ and $C'_{d_{i,j}} = C_{d_{i,j}} \cap (B \cup \{b\}) \subseteq C_{i,j}^{**}$, and $C'_{d_{i,j}} \subseteq C''_{d_{i,j}}$ hence $C'_{d_{i,j}} \subseteq A_{i,j}$, $A_{i,j} \leq^* C''_{d_{i,j}}$, but $C'_{d_{i,j}} \leq_i C''_{d_{i,j}}$ so $A_{i,j} \leq_i^* C''_{d_{i,j}}$ (the \leq^* in this sentence serves §7 where we say, “repeat the proof of 6.16”).

Clearly

$$(*)_{12} \quad \mathbf{w}_{i,j+1} = \mathbf{w}_{i,j} + \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_{i,j}, C''_{d_{i,j}}) - \alpha \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^1 - \alpha \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^2 \text{ where}$$

$$\mathbf{e}_{i,j}^1 = |\{\{x, y\} : \{x, y\} \text{ an edge of } M, \{x, y\} \subseteq A_{i,j}, \\ \neg(x\lambda y) \text{ but } \{x, y\} \not\subseteq C_{i,j}^{**}\}|$$

$$\mathbf{e}_{i,j}^2 = |\{\{x, y\} : \{x, y\} \text{ an edge of } M, x \in C''_{d_{i,j}} \setminus C_{i,j}^{**}, \\ y \in C_{i,j}^{**} \setminus C''_{d_{i,j}} \text{ but } \neg(x\lambda y)\}|.$$

Note

$$(*)_{13} \quad \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_{i,j}, C''_{d_{i,j}}) \text{ can be zero if } A_{i,j} = C''_{d_{i,j}} \text{ and is } \leq -\varepsilon^* \text{ otherwise.} \\ [\text{Why? As } A_{i,j} \leq_i^* C''_{d_{i,j}}.]$$

$$(*)_{14} \quad \text{in clause (d), } \otimes_{\lambda, d}^1 \text{ never occurs} \\ [\text{Why? If } x \in C''_d \text{ is as there, let } Y = \{y \in C''_d : y, x \text{ are connected in } \\ M \upharpoonright C''_d\}. \text{ So } x \in Y \subseteq C''_d, Y \cap C_i^{**} = \emptyset \text{ hence } C'_d = C''_d \cap (B \cup \{b\}) = \\ C''_d \cap C_0^{**} \subseteq C_i^{**}. \text{ Hence } (C''_d \setminus Y) <_i^* C''_d, \text{ but the equivalence relation } \\ \{(y', y'') : y', y'' \in Y\} \text{ exemplify that this fail.}]$$

Proof of (A).

Easy by $(*)_{12}$, because $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_{i,j}, C''_{d_{i,j}}) \leq 0$ holds by $(*)_{13}$, $-\alpha \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^1 \leq 0$, and $-\alpha \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^2 \leq 0$ as $\mathbf{e}_{i,j}^1, \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^2$ are natural numbers.

Proof of (B).

It suffice to prove that $\mathbf{w}_{i,0} \neq \mathbf{w}_{i,1}$ or $\mathbf{w}_{i,1} \neq \mathbf{w}_{i,2}$ (as inequality implies the right order (by clause (A)) and the difference is $\geq \varepsilon^*$ by definition of ε^* (if $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_{i,1}, C''_{d_{i,j}}) \neq$

0) and $\geq \alpha$ (if $\mathbf{e}_{i,j}^1 \neq 0$ or $\mathbf{e}_{i,j}^2 \neq 0$). But if $\mathbf{w}_{i,0} = \mathbf{w}_{i,1}$ recalling $(*)_{14}$ easily clause (d) does not apply to λ_i , and if $\mathbf{w}_{i,0} = \mathbf{w}_{i,1} = \mathbf{w}_{i,2}$ also clause (e) does not apply.

So (A),(B) holds so we are done proving case 2 hence the claim. $\square_{6.11}$

6.14 *Remark.*

- (a) We could use smaller k^* by building a tree $\langle (D_t, D_t^+, C_t, \lambda_t) : t \in T \rangle$, T a finite tree with a root Λ , $D_\Lambda = \emptyset$, $D_\Lambda^+ = B \cup \{b\}$, for each t we have λ_t an equivalence relation on $C_t \setminus B$ and $C_t = \cup \{C_d'' : d \in D_t\} \cup B$, $s \in \text{suc}_T(t) \Rightarrow D_t^+ = D_s$ and $D_t^+ \setminus D_t$ is $\{d\}$ or $\{d_1, d_2\}$ which witness clause (d) or clause (e) for (D_t, λ_t) when $t \neq \Lambda$ and

$$\{(D_s, \lambda_s) : s \in \text{suc}_T(t)\} = \{(D_t^+, \lambda) : \lambda \upharpoonright D_t = \lambda_t, \lambda$$

an equivalence relation on $D_t^+ \setminus B\}$.

- (b) We can make the argument separated that is prove as a separate claim that is for any k and ℓ there is k^* such that: if $A, B \subseteq M \in \mathcal{K}$, $|B|, |A| \leq \ell$, $B \subseteq B^*$, $c^{\ell k}(A, M) \setminus c^{\ell k}(B, M) \subseteq B^* \setminus B \subseteq c^{\ell k}(A, M)$ and $(\forall C)(B \subseteq C \subseteq B^* \wedge |C| \leq k^* \Rightarrow B <_s C)$ then $B <_s B^*$.
This is a kind of compactness.

6.15 *Conclusion.* Requirements (A) of [I,2.13(1)] and even (B) + (C) of [I,2.13(3)] hold.

Proof. Requirement (B) of [I,2.13(3)] holds by 6.7. Requirement (A) of [I,2.13(2)] holds by 6.11 (and the previous sentence). $\square_{6.15}$

6.16 *Conclusion.*

- (a) \mathfrak{K} is smooth and transitive and local and transparent
(b) \mathfrak{K} is simply nice (hence simply almost nice)
(c) \mathfrak{K} satisfies the 0-1 law.

Proof. 1) By 6.4.

2) By 6.15 we know that \mathfrak{K} is simply nice.

3) By 4.2 we know that for each k , for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n , $c^{\ell k}(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n)$ is empty. Hence by [I,2.19(1)] we get the desired conclusion. $\square_{6.16}$

§7 RANDOM GRAPHS WITH THE SUCCESSOR FUNCTION

Recall that \mathcal{M}_n^1 is defined like \mathcal{M}_n^0 (called \mathcal{M}_n earlier) but we expand it by interpreting the two-place predicate S by the relation $S_n = \{(\ell, \ell+1) : \ell \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}\}$. Trivially, \mathcal{M}_n^1 fails the 0-1 law; (e.g., “the first two elements (by S) are connected by an edge” has probability p_1). So now $\mathcal{K} = \{M : M = (|M|, R, S), (|M|, R) \text{ a graph, } S \text{ an anti-symmetric irreflexive two-place relation satisfying } x_1 S x_2 \wedge y_1 S y_2 \Rightarrow (x_1 = y_2 \equiv x_2 = y_2)\}$. Still we prove the convergence law. We may remedy the failure by replacing the relation S_n by $S'_n =: S_n \cup \{(n, 1)\}$, call this random model $\mathcal{M}_n^{0.5}$.

7.1 Theorem. *Let \mathfrak{K} be the 0-1 context as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ be irrational,} \\ p_\ell &= \frac{1}{\ell^\alpha} \text{ for } \ell > 1, \\ p_1 &= \frac{1}{2^\alpha} \text{ (we can omit this) and } \mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n^1 \end{aligned}$$

Then \mathfrak{K} satisfies the convergence law.

Proof. This is proved later.

7.2 Remark. If the probability of “ $\{i, j\}$ is an edge” is $\frac{1}{n^\alpha} + \frac{1}{|i-j+1|^\alpha}$, then the same conclusion holds, see [I, §3].

7.3 Theorem. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ be irrational, $p_i = 1/i^\alpha$ for $i > 1$, $p_1 = \frac{1}{2^\alpha}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n^{0.5}$ be $([n], R, S'_n)$ where R is a graph on $[n]$ chosen randomly: $\{i, j\} \in R$ has probability p_k where $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ is minimal such that n divides $|i-j-k|$, the choices are independent for distinct edges and, lastly, the predicate S is interpreted by the relation*

$$S'_n =: \{(x, y) : x \in [n], y \in [n] \text{ and } x+1 = y \bmod n\}.$$

So a 0-1 context \mathfrak{K} is defined.

Then

- (a) \mathfrak{K} is smooth, transitive, local and transparent,
- (b) \mathfrak{K} is simply almost nice
- (c) for every k for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n we have: $cl^k(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n) = \emptyset$ hence $\langle \mathcal{M}_n \upharpoonright cl^k(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ satisfies the 0-1 law
- (d) Consequently \mathfrak{K} satisfies the 0-1 law.

Proof. We repeat the proof for $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n^0$ in §4, §5, §6 with some changes. Let \mathcal{K} be the class of finite models (X, R, S) such that: R is a symmetric irreflexive two-place relation on X , S is an irreflexive antisymmetric two-place relation satisfying

$$(\forall x_0, y_0)(\forall x_1, y_1)(S(x_0, y_0) \wedge S(x_1, y_1) \Rightarrow (x_0 = x_1 \equiv y_0 = y_1)).$$

We use below unary predicates P_f, P_ℓ for the proof of 7.1 later so at present $P_f(x) \equiv P_\ell(x) \equiv \text{false}$.

Let \mathcal{K}' be the set of $(X, R, S) \in \mathcal{K}$ with no S -cycle. \mathcal{K}_n is the set of possible values of $\mathcal{M}_n^{0.5}$ so every member M of \mathcal{K}_n is an S^M -cycle but $\mathcal{K}_\infty = \mathcal{K}'$, see below.

Easily $\mathcal{K}_n, \mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ and by the proof of 4.2:

- (*) for each $A \in \mathcal{K}'$ for some $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n there are $\geq \mathbf{c} \times n$ pairwise disjoint embeddings of A into \mathcal{M}_n .

[Why? Let $A = \{a_\ell : \ell < k\}$, and without loss of generality $a_\ell S a_m \rightarrow \ell + 1 = m$ and let

$$u = \{\ell < k : \ell = 0 \text{ or } \ell > 0 \ \& \ \neg a_{\ell-1} S a_\ell\},$$

and for $r < \lfloor n/2k \rfloor$ let \mathcal{E}_r^n be the event $a_\ell \mapsto 2rk + \ell + |\{m : m \leq \ell \ \& \ m \in u\}|$ is an embedding of A into \mathcal{M}_n .

Note that for S this is always an embedding and those embeddings have pairwise disjoint ranges.]

Trivially

- (*) if $A \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{K}'$ and $M \in \mathcal{K}_n$ then A cannot be embedded into M .

Hence $\mathcal{K}' = \mathcal{K}_\infty \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, and hence (the parallel of) 4.3, 4.4 hold, but in 4.4 we replace simple by simple* which is defined in [I,2.21].

And so replace [I,2.17] by [I,2.23]. If $A \subseteq B$ we let

$$scl^0(A, B) = A$$

$$scl^1(A, B) = \{x \in B : x \in A \text{ or } (\exists y \in A)(S^B(x, y) \vee S^B(y, x)) \\ \text{or (for the proof of 7.1 below) } P_f(x) \vee P_\ell(x)\}$$

$$scl^{k+1}(A, B) = scl^1(scl^k(A, B))$$

$$rcl^0(A, B) = A$$

$$rcl^1(A, B) = \{x \in B : x \in A \text{ or } (\exists y \in A)(S^B(x, y) \vee S^B(y, x))\}$$

$$rcl^{k+1}(A, B) = rcl^1(rcl^k(A, B)).$$

So for our present context $(\mathcal{M}_n^{0,5})$ we have $scl^k(A, B) = rcl^k(A, B)$ but not so for the proof of 7.1. Lastly, let

$$scl(A, B) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} scl^k(A, B)$$

$$rcl(A, B) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} rcl^k(A, B).$$

Let $A \leq B$ means $A \subseteq B \in \mathcal{K}'$ (submodel) so $M \in \mathcal{K}_n \Rightarrow \neg(M \leq M)$.

Let $A \leq^* B$ means $A \leq B$ & $scl(A, B) = A$. Clearly it is a partial order on \mathcal{K}_∞ .

Let E_A be the finest equivalence relation on A such that $S^A(x, y) \Rightarrow xEy$.

Lastly, let $A \leq^{**} B$ means: $A \leq B$ and $E_A = E_B \upharpoonright A$ and $x \in scl(A, B) \setminus A$ & $y \in scl(A, B) \Rightarrow \{x, y\}$ not an edge. Clearly it is a partial order on \mathcal{K}' .

Now we define \mathcal{T} (instead of definition 7.7(1)):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} = \{ & (A, B, \lambda) : A <^* B \in \mathcal{K}_\infty, \lambda \text{ an equivalence relation on } B \setminus A \\ & \text{which } E_B \text{ refines, which means that } x \in B \setminus A \text{ \& } y \in B \\ & \text{\& } (S(x, y) \vee S(y, x)) \Rightarrow y \in (x/\lambda)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note: generally in this version cases of S counts as edges (even more so). But in the definition of $e(A, B, \lambda)$ below they do not count as any $xS^B y \Rightarrow \{x, y\} \subseteq A \vee (x\lambda y)$ and $x\lambda y \rightarrow \{x, y\} \subseteq B \setminus A$.

We define λ -closed as in definition 7.7(2) (but $A \leq^* B$ has already been defined). So $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \Rightarrow scl(A, B) = A$ and $A \leq^* B \Rightarrow A \leq^{**} B$. Now for applying §2 we are interested in \leq , but in applying §4 - §6 only in $<^*$, so these sections are written trying to have this in mind.

Now $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{w}$ are defined for $A \leq^* B$ as in 4.7, 4.8 and $A <_x^* B$ are defined as in 4.11, and the parallel to 4.9 and 4.14 - 4.17 hold.

In the proof of 5.4 we should be careful to preserve $\pm S$ in the relevant cases, in particular in the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,k}(f, \mathcal{M}_n)$ in condition (1) (all in Definition 5.2) and of $\mathcal{G}_{A,B}^{\varepsilon,1}(f, [n])$ in stage C of the proof of 5.4, choose m^* large enough and in the types (tp^0, tp^1 mentioned there) of g fix $g(b) + m^*\mathbb{Z}$ for each $b \in B$. So there is $m^\otimes \in \{0, \dots, m^* - 1\}$ such that for no b is $g(b) = m^\otimes \bmod m^*$, and we move blocks

$$\{m^* \cdot i + m^\otimes + 1, m^* \cdot i + m^\otimes + 2, \dots, m^* \cdot (i + 1) + m^\otimes\}$$

together. And concerning f_0 we just ask

$$\text{rang}(f_0) \subseteq \{i : 1 \leq i \leq m^*|A| \text{ or } n - m^*|A| \leq i \leq n\}$$

so there are some possibilities for f_0 (but there is a bound on the number not depending on n). The other cases are even less serious.

In 5.9, on each λ -equivalence class we should preserve S and we change $g_{\bar{j}}$ as we have for 7.1 (i.e., in proving $(*)$ above). Note that in 5.9 - 5.12 we have $(A, B, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T} \Rightarrow A \leq^* B$ and λ -closed implies S -closed in relevant places. Now 6.4 has to be rephrased by 7.4(1) below. Also we have to change somewhat 6.5 because 6.5 says we have the nice case, whereas here we only have the almost nice case, so we replace it by 7.4(2) below.

7.4 Claim. 1) For $A, B \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ we have

- (a) $A <_s B \Leftrightarrow A <_s^* B$,
- (b) $A <_i B \Leftrightarrow A \leq B \ \& \ scl(A, B) \leq_i^* B$.

2) If $A <_s^* B$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then for every random enough \mathcal{M}_n and $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ we can find $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f and such that

- (i) $\text{Rang}(g) \cap \text{cl}^k(\text{Rang}(f), \mathcal{M}_n) = \text{Rang}(f)$,
- (ii) $\text{rcl}^{k+1}(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n), \text{rcl}^{k+1}(g(B \setminus A), \mathcal{M}_n)$ are disjoint
- (iii) letting $B^+ = f(A) \cup \text{rcl}^k(g(B \setminus A), \mathcal{M}_n)$ we have $g(B) \leq^{**} B^+$
- (iv) $B^+ \bigcup_{f(A)}^{\mathcal{M}_n} \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$
- (v) if $|C| \leq k$, $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n$ and $C \upharpoonright (C \cap g(B)) <_i C$ then $C \setminus \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq \text{rcl}(C \cap g(B) \setminus A, C)$.

Proof. Like 6.5.

1a) By the parallel of 6.2 and the definitions of $<_s, <_s^*$.

1b) By the parallel of 6.3 of the definitions of $<_i, <_i^*$.

2) (i), (iv) and (v) follows from 6.5. (iii) follows from definition of B^+ and 6.5.

(Could use k, k' as in [I,2.12,2.13]!) □_{7.4}

Similarly we replace 6.7 by 7.5 below as first approximation (see 7.8 later).

7.5 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $A <_s B$

(b) $B_0 \subseteq B$, and (for 7.1) for simplicity if $\mathcal{M}_n \models \exists x P_f(x) \vee (\exists y) P_\ell(y)$ then $(\exists x, y \in B_0)(P_f(x) \wedge P_\ell(y))$

(c) if $A' \subseteq A, |A'| \leq k^2$ and $x \in \text{cl}^k(B_0 \cup A', B), x \notin A$ and the S -component of x in B is $\{x_0, \dots, x_j\}$ with $S^B(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1})$ and $x = x_{i(*)}$ then $(i(*) > k)$ and $(i(*) < j - k)$.

Then (B, A, B_0, k) is simply good (see Definition [I,2.12]).

7.6 Remark. What is the reason for assumption (c)?

Assume $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ and $A <_s^* B$ and $B_0 \subseteq B$ and we would like to find $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ extending f such that $\text{cl}^k(g(B_0), \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq g(B) \cup \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$. A problematic point which does not arise earlier is: suppose $b \in B_0 \setminus A$ and $\text{scl}^k(\{g(b)\}, \mathcal{M}_n)$ include an element $c \in \mathcal{M}_n \setminus g(B)$. Also if $b \in g(B \cap \text{cl}^{k(1)}(g(\bar{a}b), \mathcal{M}_n))$ and $c \in \text{rccl}^{k(2)}(\{b_1\}, \mathcal{M}_n)$ and $k(1) + k(2) \leq k$ we have a similar problem. The aim of clause (c) is to exclude those cases.

The need of something like A' arises in the possibility of C ; can be avoid if we use smoothness.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M}_n be random enough and $f : A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$. By 7.4(2) applied to large enough k^* , we can find an extension $g : B \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n$ of f , and B^+ as there. Now from the demands in Definition [I,2.12(1)]: clause (i) there holds by 7.4(2)(ii) + (iii).

Clause (ii) there holds by 7.4(2)(iv) and obvious monotonicity property of \bigcup . So

our problem is to show that clause (iii) of Definition [I,2.12(1)] holds, i.e.,

$$(*) \text{cl}^k(g(B_0), \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq g(B) \cup \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n).$$

Toward contradiction suppose $d \in \text{cl}^k(g(B_0), \mathcal{M}_n) \setminus (g(B) \cup \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n))$, so for some $C \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n$ we have $|C| \leq k, d \in C$ and let $C_1 =: C \upharpoonright (g(B_0) \cap C)$ we have $C_1 <_i C$.

So also $(g(B) \cap C) \leq_i C$, hence by 7.4(2)(v) we have $C \subseteq \text{rcl}(g(B) \cap C \setminus f(A, C) \cup \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n))$ and $x = x_j$ which means that $C \subseteq B^+ \cup \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)$. Hence by clause (ii) of 7.4(2) clearly let $C_2 \subseteq |C_2| \leq k^2$ be such that

$$C_2 \subseteq f(A)$$

$$C \cap \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq \text{cl}^k(C_2, \mathcal{M}_n)$$

$$g(A) \cap C \subseteq C_2.$$

Let $B'_0 = f(B_0) \cap C$.

Let $C_0 = (B'_0) \cup C_2$, $C^+ = C \cup C_2$ so as $B'_0 \leq_i C$ also $C_0 \leq_i C^+$. By clauses (iv) + (v) of 7.4(2) we get

$$\otimes C_3 =: C^+ \cap (B \cup \text{cl}^k(f(A), \mathcal{M}_n)) \leq^{**} C^+.$$

Clearly $C_0 \leq C_3 \leq C^+$ and as by \otimes and claim 7.8 below we get $C_0 \leq_i C_3$, also $|C_3| \leq |C^+| \leq |C| + |C_2| = k + k^2$. As $C_3 \leq^{**} C^+$ and $C^+ \setminus C_3 \subseteq B^+ \setminus B$, clearly

$$\otimes \text{ if } c \in C^+ \setminus C_3 \text{ and } d \in C_3 \text{ then } \{c, d\} \text{ is not an edge of } \mathcal{M}_n.$$

Now this implies that $\text{scl}(C_3, C^+) \leq_s C^+$ (using the choice of B^+) but as $C_0 \leq_i C^+$, $C_0 \leq C_3 \leq C^+$ clearly $C_3 \leq_i C^+$. So necessarily $\text{scl}(C_3, C^+) = C^+$.

But $d \in C^+ \setminus C_3$ we have $C_3 \neq C^+$ hence for some $d' \in C_3$ and $d'' \in C^+$ are S -nbs. But this contradicts clause (c). $\square_{7.5}$

7.7 Fact. If $A \leq^* B \leq^{**} C$ and $A \leq_i^* C$ then $A \leq_i^* B$.

Proof. Remember that, e.g., E_C is the closure of S^C to an equivalence relation, and similarly E_B . If $\neg(A \leq_i^* B)$ then we can find A' such that $A \leq^* A' <_s^* B$, hence there is $\lambda \in \Xi(A', B)$ (see 4.8(2)). Now clearly $\text{scl}(A', B) = A'$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} A^+ &= A' \cup \{x \in C : (x/E_C) \cap A' \neq \emptyset \text{ equivalently} \\ &\quad (x/E_C) \cap A' \neq \emptyset \ \& \ (x/E_C) \cap B \subseteq A'\}, \end{aligned}$$

so $A^+ \cap B = A' \cap B = A'$. We define λ' , an equivalence relation on $C \setminus A^+$, by:

$$x\lambda'y \Leftrightarrow (\exists x' \in x/E_C)(\exists y' \in y/E_C)(x'\lambda'y').$$

As $E_C \upharpoonright B = E_B$ (by the definition of $<^{**}$), clearly $\lambda' \upharpoonright (B \setminus A^+) = \lambda$, and every equivalence class of λ' has member in $B \setminus A'$ (as $B \leq^{**} C$), so $\mathbf{v}(A^+, C, \lambda') = \mathbf{v}(A', B, \lambda)$. Also every edge of C not included in A^+ is an edge of B not included in A' hence $\mathbf{e}(A^+, C, \lambda') = \mathbf{e}(A', B, \lambda)$, together $\mathbf{w}(A^+, C, \lambda') = \mathbf{w}(A', B, \lambda)$. Moreover, if $D' \subseteq C \setminus A^+$ is λ' -closed then $D = D' \cap B$ is λ -closed and $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A^+, A^+ \cup D') = \mathbf{w}_\lambda(A', A' \cup D) > 0$. So $(A^+, C, \lambda') \in \Xi(A^+, C)$ so $A^+ <_s C$ which contradicts $A \leq_i^* C$. $\square_{7.7}$

* * *

The rest (generalizing 6.8, 6.10, 6.11, 6.15) is similar to the original except the following. In 6.8 - 6.11 instead “ $\{x, y\}$ an edge” we should say “ $\{x, y\}$ an edge or xSy or ySx ”. In 6.8, 6.10, 6.11 $M \in \mathcal{K}'$ (rather than $M \in \mathcal{K}$). In the proof of 6.8, in \oplus_1 we add

- (h) the truth value of d_{i,s_i}, Sd_{i,s_2} do not depend on i ;
- (i) if $d_{i_1,s_1}, Sd_{i_2,s_2}$ then $d_{i_1,s_1}, Sd_{i_1,s_2}$ (so necessarily $i_1 = i_2 \vee \{s_1, s_2\} \subseteq S_1$).

Also in the proof of \oplus_4 (inside the proof of 6.8), d_i is not in $\{d_{i,s} : s \in S_2\}$ which is closed under S^{C_i} , hence (see clause (i)), $C_i \cap D_0 <^* C_i$ but, as there, $C_i \cap D_0 \leq_i C_i$. Now check the inequality.

In the proof of 6.10 note that after (h), really $B_1 <^* B_2 \leq^* C_{i(*)}$ by clauses (f)+(g) there, as $b'S^M b''$ & $b' \in c\ell^{k^*, \ell}, \ell(\bar{a}, M) \Rightarrow b'' \in c\ell^{k^*, \ell+1}(\bar{a}, M)$.

In claim 6.11, easily $B <^* B^*$ (as in the addition to 6.10); also in the proof, “ $\{x, y\}$ is an edge” means $xRy \vee xSy \vee ySx$; in $(*)_2$ there $\mathbf{w}_\lambda(A_{i,j}, C''_{d_{i,j}}) = 0$ holds iff $A_{i,j} \leq^{**} C''_{d_{i,j}}$, and be more careful in $(*)_4$ and the proof of clause (B). However there is a gap: 6.11 does not give clause (c) of 7.5. For this we can use the “simply* almost nice”, i.e., use [I,2.20 - 2.24]. So the parallel to 6.7 is:

7.8 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $A <_s B$, \bar{c} list A ,
- (b) $B_0 \subseteq B_1 = B$
- (c) if $x \in B_1$ and $\{x_0, \dots, x_j\}$ is its S^B -component, $\bigwedge_{i < j} S^B(x_i, x_{i+1})$, $x = x_{i(*)}$
then $P_f(x_0) \vee (i(*) > k)$ and $P_\ell(x_j) \vee (i(*) < j - k)$
- (d) $A \leq A' \leq N$, $B \leq N$, $B \bigsqcup_A^N A'$, and $c\ell^k(B_0, N) \subseteq B_1 \cup A'$.

We can prove, as in 7.3, that

⊗ \mathfrak{K} is simply* almost nice.

The difference in the proof with 7.3 is that here for positive $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for random enough \mathcal{M}_n , $c\ell^{k,m}(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n)$ is not empty, so we get only convergence in 4.3 (in fact, e.g.,

$$(\exists x, y, z)(S(x, y) \wedge P_f(x) \wedge R(x, z))$$

has probability p_2). Still applying [I,2.19] we need

⊗₁ for every f.o. φ the sequence

$$\langle \text{prob}(\mathcal{M}_n \upharpoonright c\ell^k(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n) \models \varphi) : n \in \mathbb{N}n \rangle$$

converges.

For this it suffices to prove

⊗₂(a) for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}n$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}n$, for every n large enough $1 - \varepsilon \leq \text{prob}(\mathcal{E}_k^n)$, where \mathcal{E}_k^n is the event

$$e\ell^k(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n) \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\} \cup \{n - m + 1, \dots, n - 1, n\},$$

(b) for every first order φ , for some k assuming \mathcal{E}_k^n occurs and for random enough \mathcal{M}_n (in particular, $n > 2k + 1$), the satisfaction of $\mathcal{M}_n \upharpoonright c\ell^k(\emptyset, \mathcal{M}_n) \models \varphi$ depends only on the isomorphism type of $\mathcal{M}_n \upharpoonright (\{1, \dots, m\} \cup \{n - m + 1, \dots, n\})$,

(c) for all $n > 2k$, for every $N \in \mathcal{K}$ with $2k$ elements, the probability $\text{prob}((\mathcal{M}_n \upharpoonright (\{1, \dots, m\} \cup \{n - m + 1, \dots, n\})) \cong N)$ does not depend on n or at least, as a function of n , it converge.

Now in ⊗₂, clauses (b) and (c) are immediate. For proving (a), we show by induction on ℓ that

⊗₃ for every ε for some m , for every n large enough and $w \subseteq [n]$ with $k - \ell$ elements

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \text{prob} \begin{cases} \text{if} & \mathcal{M}_n \upharpoonright w \prec_i A \leq \mathcal{M}_n, |A| \leq k \\ \text{then} & (\forall x \in A \setminus w)(\exists y \in w)[|x - y| \leq m] \end{cases}$$

(Note: this is for a fixed w ; if we say “for every w ”, this is a different matter).

If you have read the proof of 5.4 this should be clear. □_{7.1}

REFERENCES.

- [BISh 528] John T. Baldwin and Saharon Shelah. Randomness and Semigenericity. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **349**:1359–1376, 1997. math.LO/9607226.
- [Sh 550] Saharon Shelah. 0–1 laws. *Preprint*. math.LO/9804154.
- [Sh 467] Saharon Shelah. Zero-one laws for graphs with edge probabilities decaying with distance. Part I. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **175**:195–239, 2002. math.LO/9606226.
- [ShSp 304] Saharon Shelah and Joel Spencer. Zero-one laws for sparse random graphs. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, **1**:97–115, 1988.