Witnessing Dp-Rank

Itay Kaplan and Pierre Simon

Abstract   We prove that in NTP$_2$ theories the dp-rank of a type can be witnessed by indiscernible sequences of tuples satisfying that type. If the type has dp-rank infinity, then this can be witnessed by singletons (in any theory).

1 Introduction

In this note we answer a question of Alf Onshuus and Alexander Usvyatsov, whether dp-minimality can be witnessed by indiscernible sequences of singletons. We prove two general theorems regarding dp-rank.

Let Card denote the class of cardinals. We define Card* to be the class Card to which we add an element κ_- for each infinite cardinal κ. We extend the linear order from Card to Card* by setting $\mu < \kappa_- < \kappa$ whenever $\mu < \kappa$ are cardinals.

Definition 1.1   Let $p(x)$ be a partial (consistent) type over a set A (x is a finite tuple, here and throughout the paper). We define the *dp-rank* of $p(x)$ (which is an element of Card* or ∞) as follows.

- Let κ be a cardinal. We say that $p(x)$ has dp-rank $< \kappa$ (which we write rk-dp$(p) < \kappa$) if given any realization a of p and any κ mutually indiscernible sequences over A, at least one of them is indiscernible over Aa.
- We say that p has dp-rank κ over A (or rk-dp$(p) = \kappa$) if it has dp-rank $< \mu$ for all $\mu > \kappa$, but it is not the case that rk-dp$(p) < \kappa$.
- If κ is an infinite cardinal, we say that p has dp-rank κ_- over A (or rk-dp$(p) = \kappa_-$) if it has dp-rank $< \kappa$, but for no $\mu < \kappa$ do we have rk-dp$(p) < \mu$.
- If rk-dp$(p) < \kappa$ holds for no cardinal κ, then we say that p has dp-rank ∞.
- We call p *dp-minimal* if it has dp-rank 1.
- We call p *dependent* if rk-dp$(p) < \infty$. This is equivalent to rk-dp$(p) < |T|^+$ (see Corollary 2.3).

Remark 1.2   It is easy to see that the set A does not matter, as long as p is defined over it. Indeed, for a set B over which p is defined, let us define for the sake of discussion rk-dp(p, B) as the dp-rank of p over B similarly to the definition above; but we add the requirement that the sequences are mutually indiscernible over B. If $A \subseteq B$, and p is a type over A, then it is easy to see that rk-dp$(p, B) \leq$ rk-dp(p, A), while the other direction uses a standard application of Ramsey theorem, so rk-dp$(p, B) =$ rk-dp(p, A).

Note also that if $q(x)$ extends $p(x)$, then rk-dp$(p(x)) \geq$ rk-dp$(q(x))$, so we have the following.

Remark 1.3   Any extension of a dependent type is dependent.

Recall the following.

Definition 1.4   A (complete, first-order) theory T is *dp-minimal* if the type $\{x = x\}$ is dp-minimal. The theory T is *dependent* if the type $\{x = x\}$ is dependent.

Dp-rank and dependent types were originally defined by Usvyatsov in [7] and further studied by Onshuus in [4]. Dp-rank is a simplification of the various ranks appearing in Shelah [5]. We use a slightly different convention for it than those two papers, which has the advantage of distinguishing between κ and κ_-. Yet another convention is used in Kaplan, Onshuus, and Usvyatsov [3], which has the disadvantage of giving a different meaning to rk-dp$(p) = \kappa$ depending on whether κ is finite or infinite. Dp-minimality was first defined in [4]. It is shown in Simon [6] that the original definition of dp-minimality is equivalent to the definition given here.

   Examples of dp-minimal theories include all o-minimal theories and C-minimal theories.

   Note that the sequences that witness rk-dp$(p) \geq \kappa$ in Definition 1.1 can always be taken to be sequences of finite tuples, but can we bound the length?

Question (A. Onshuus, A. Usvyatsov)   Can we assume in the definition of dp-minimality that the indiscernible sequences are sequences of singletons?

We provide a positive answer in Corollary 1.7 below, but we need to add parameters to the base.

   We prove the following two theorems.

Main Theorem A   *If p is a type over A which is independent (i.e., rk-dp$(p) = \infty$), then there is some $A' \supseteq A$ such that $|A' \backslash A|$ is finite, a realization $a \models p$ and A'-mutually indiscernible sequences of singletons $\langle I_i \mid i < |T|^+ + |A|^+ \rangle$ such that I_i is not indiscernible over $A'a$ for all i.*

From this we will deduce the following.

Corollary 1.5   *To check whether a theory is dependent it is enough to check that for every indiscernible sequence of singletons $\langle a_i \mid i < |T|^+ \rangle$ over some finite A, and for every singleton c, there is $\alpha < |T|^+$ such that $\langle a_i \mid i > \alpha \rangle$ is indiscernible over Ac.*

The second result is about dependent types, but to prove it we need to assume[1] that the theory is NTP$_2$.

Definition 1.6   A theory T is NTP$_2$ *(does not have the tree property of the second kind)* if there is no formula $\varphi(x, y)$ and array $\langle a_{i,j} \mid i, j < \omega \rangle$ such that for every $i < \omega$, $\{\varphi(x, a_{i,j}) \mid j < \omega\}$ is k-inconsistent (i.e., each subset of size k is inconsistent) and for every $\eta : \omega \to \omega$, the set $\{\varphi(x, a_{i,\eta(i)}) \mid i < \omega\}$ is consistent.

The class of NTP$_2$ theories contains both simple and dependent theories.

Main Theorem B   *Assume that T is* NTP$_2$ *and that p is a dependent type over A with* rk-dp$(p) \geq \kappa$. *Then there are some $A' \supseteq A$, some $a \models p$, and A'-mutually indiscernible sequences $\{I_i \mid i < \kappa\}$ such that each of them is not indiscernible over $A'a$ and* all tuples in each I_i satisfy p.

Note that we may always choose A' so that $|A' \setminus A|$ is at most $\kappa + \aleph_0$ since, for each sequence I_i, we only need finitely many parameters from A' to witness that I_i is not indiscernible over $A'a$.

   Now we can answer Question 1.

Corollary 1.7   *If T is not dp-minimal, then there is some finite set A', some singleton a, and two A'-mutually indiscernible sequences $\{I, J\}$ of singletons such that both I and J are not indiscernible over $A'a$.*

Proof   Right to left is obvious. For the other direction, if T is dependent, then we may use Main Theorem B. (Since there are only two sequences, only finitely many parameters from A' are needed to witness nonindiscernibility, so we may assume that A' is finite.) But if T is not dependent, then by Main Theorem A there exist such a, A, and infinitely many such sequences. □

The following question remains open.

Question 1.8 (J. Ramakrishnan)   Can we assume in the definition of dp-rank that the indiscernible sequences are sequences of singletons by adding parameters to the base?

Our results show that this is indeed the case when the type is independent or when it is the type of a singleton in an NTP$_2$-theory.

   In Section 2 we prove Main Theorem A, and in Section 3 we prove Main Theorem B.

Question 1.9   Are the extra parameters in the main theorems needed?

Throughout the paper, $\mathfrak{C}$ will denote a monster model of the theory T (i.e., a very big saturated model).

2   On Dependent Types and a Proof of Main Theorem A

2.1 On dependent types   We start with the following easy observation (which is somewhat similar to [4, Observation 2.7]), with a very straightforward proof.

Claim 2.1   *Suppose that $p(x)$ is a partial type over A. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *there are $a \models p$ and A-mutually indiscernible sequences $\langle I_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ such that the sequence $\langle I_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ is indiscernible over Aa, and for each i, I_i is not indiscernible over Aa;*
2. *p is independent;*

3. $\mathrm{rk}\text{-}\mathrm{dp}(p) \geq |T|^+ + |A|^+$;
4. there is an A-indiscernible sequence $\langle a_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ such that $a_i \models p$, a formula $\varphi(x, y)$, and some c such that $\varphi(a_i, c)$ holds iff i is even;
5. there is an A-indiscernible sequence $\langle b_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$, a formula $\psi(y, x)$, and some $d \models p$ such that $\psi(b_i, d)$ holds iff i is even;
6. there is a set $\{a_i \mid i < \omega\}$ of realizations of p and a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ such that for every $s \subseteq \omega$, there is some c_s such that $\varphi(a_i, c_s)$ holds iff $i \in s$;
7. there is a set $\{b_i \mid i < \omega\}$ and a formula $\psi(y, x)$ such that for every $s \subseteq \omega$, there is some $d_s \models p$ such that $\psi(b_i, d_s)$ holds iff $i \in s$.

Proof   The proofs of (1) implies (2) and (2) implies (3) are easy. Assume (3), and show (1). We can find $a \models p$ and A-mutually indiscernible sequences $\langle I_i \mid i < |T|^+ + |A|^+ \rangle$ such that for all i, I_i is not indiscernible over Aa. We may assume that the order type of these sequences is ω. The fact that I_i is not indiscernible over Aa is witnessed by some formula over A and increasing tuples from I_i, so we may assume that for infinitely many i, the formula is the same, and the position of these tuples does not depend on i (maybe changing a). Then, by Ramsey and compactness, we may assume that $\langle I_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ is indiscernible over Aa.

(5) follows from (1): Denote $I_i = \langle a_{i,j} \mid j < \omega \rangle$. There is a formula $\psi(x, y)$ over A and an increasing tuple $k_0 < \cdots < k_{n-1} < r_0 < \cdots < r_{n-1}$ such that, letting $a_{i,\bar{k}} = (a_{i,k_0}, \ldots, a_{i,k_{n-1}})$ (and similarly we define $a_{i,\bar{r}}$), $\psi(a_{i,\bar{k}}, a) \wedge \neg\psi(a_{i,\bar{r}}, a)$ holds for all $i < \omega$. The sequence $\langle b_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ defined by $b_i = a_{i,\bar{k}}$ when i is even and $b_i = b_{i,\bar{r}}$ when i is odd satisfies (5). The fact that ψ is over A is no problem—we can add the parameters to b_i.

(2) follows from (5) is easy by compactness.

(6) is equivalent to (4) and (7) is equivalent to (5) by a standard application of Ramsey.

(6) follows from (5): By indiscernibility, we may extend the family $\langle b_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ to $\langle b_r \mid r \in \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rangle$ (with some ordering), and so, for every subset $s \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, there is some $d_s \models p$ such that $\psi(b_r, d_s)$ iff $r \in s$. For $i < \omega$, let $d_i = d_{\{r \subseteq \omega : i \in r\}}$. Then for each subset $r \subseteq \omega$, $\psi(b_r, d_i)$ iff $i \in r$. This gives us (6). The same exact argument gives that (7) follows from (4).   □

Proposition 2.2   If p is a dependent type over A, then there is $B \subseteq A$ of size $|B| \leq |T|$ such that $p|_B$ is dependent.

Proof   By Claim 2.1(6), it cannot be that there exists a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ and a set $\{a_i \mid i < \omega\}$ of realizations of p such that for each $s \subseteq \omega$, there is some c_s such that $\varphi(a_i, c_s)$ holds iff $i \in s$. By compactness, there is no formula $\varphi(x, y)$ such that for all finite $B \subseteq A$ we can find such a set $\{a_i \mid i < \omega\}$ of realizations of $p|_B$ and such c_s for $s \subseteq \omega$. So for each formula $\varphi(x, y)$, there is some finite $B_\varphi \subseteq A$ such that there is no such set. Let $B = \bigcup_\varphi B_\varphi$. Then $p|_B$ is easily seen to be dependent.   □

Corollary 2.3   The following are equivalent for a type $p(x)$ over A:

1. $p(x)$ is independent;
2. $\mathrm{rk}\text{-}\mathrm{dp}(p) \geq |T|^+$.

Proof   If p is dependent, then there is some $B \subseteq A$ such that $p|_B$ is dependent and $|B| \leq |T|$. By Claim 2.1(3), this means that rk-dp$(p|_B) < |T|^+$, so rk-dp$(p) < |T|^+$.   □

In this section we show that some useful properties that are true in dependent theories are actually true in the local context as well.

Fact 2.4 ([3, Theorem 4.11])   If p is a dependent type over A, and $a_i \models p$ for $i < n < \omega$, then tp$(a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}/A)$ is also dependent.

Recall the notions of forking and dividing. All the definitions and properties we need can be found in Chernikov and Kaplan [2].

Proposition 2.5   *If p is dependent type over a model M, and q is a global non-forking extension of p (i.e., an extension to $\mathfrak{C}$), then q is invariant over M.*

Proof   Suppose that $\varphi(x, c_0) \wedge \neg\varphi(x, c_1) \in q$, where $c_0 \equiv_M c_1$. Then using a standard technique, we can assume that c_0, c_1 start an indiscernible sequence $\langle c_0, c_1, \ldots \rangle$ over M. The set

$$p(x) \cup \left\{ \varphi(x, c_i)^{(i \text{ is even})} \mid i < \omega \right\}$$

is inconsistent by Claim 2.1. This means that for some formula $\psi(x) \in p$,

$$\left\{ \psi(x) \wedge \varphi(x, c_{2i}) \wedge \neg\varphi(x, c_{2i+1}) \mid i < \omega \right\}$$

is inconsistent, and so $\psi(x) \wedge \varphi(x, c_0) \wedge \neg\varphi(x, c_1)$ divides over M, a contradiction.
                                                                                            □

Proposition 2.6 (Shrinking of indiscernibles)   *Suppose that $p(x)$ is a dependent type over A and that B is a set of realizations of p.*

If $I = \langle a_i \mid i < |T|^+ + |B|^+ \rangle$ is an A-indiscernible sequence, then some end segment is indiscernible over AB. Note that the size of A and the size of the tuple a_i do not matter.

Proof   We may assume that B is finite. The type tp(B/A) is dependent by Fact 2.4. The proof easily follows from Corollary 2.3.   □

2.2 Proof of Main Theorem A

Definition 2.7   Let $p(x)$ be a type over A. We say that p is 1-*independent over A* if there is a realization $a \models p$ and A-mutually indiscernible sequences $\langle I_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ of *singletons* such that the sequence $\langle I_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ is indiscernible over Aa and for each $i < \omega$, I_i is not indiscernible over Aa.

We say that p is 1-*dependent over A* if it is not 1-independent over A. We say that p is 1-*dependent* if it is 1-dependent over any $A' \supseteq A$ such that $A' \backslash A$ is finite.

Observe that by Claim 2.1, if $p(x)$ is dependent, then it is 1-dependent. Also, as in Remark 1.2, this definition does not depend on A.

Claim 2.8   *If $p(x)$ is a type over A which is 1-dependent, then*
- *for every $A' \supseteq A$ such that $A' \backslash A$ is finite, every A'-indiscernible sequence*

$$\langle a_i \mid i < |T|^+ + |A|^+ \rangle$$

of tuples satisfying p and singleton c, there is some $\alpha < |T|^+ + |A|^+$ such that the end segment $\langle a_i \mid \alpha < i \rangle$ is indiscernible over $A'c$.

Proof   To simplify notation, assume $A = A' = \emptyset$. Toward a contradiction we find a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, y)$ and an indiscernible sequence $\langle \bar{a}_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ such that $\bar{a}_i$ is a tuple of length n of tuples satisfying p and $\varphi(\bar{a}_i, c)$ holds iff i is even. By the proof of Claim 2.1 (namely, (5) implies (4), with $p = \mathrm{tp}(c)$), there is an indiscernible sequence $\langle c_{\bar{i}} \mid \bar{i} \in \omega^{n+1} \rangle$ (ordered lexicographically) of singletons such that $\varphi(\bar{a}_0, c_{\bar{i}})$ holds iff the last number in $\bar{i}$ is even. We may also assume (by Ramsey) that the sequence $\langle \bar{c}_{\bar{i}} \mid \bar{i} \in \omega^n \rangle$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}_0$, where $\bar{c}_{\bar{i}} = \langle c_{\bar{i} \frown j} \mid j < \omega \rangle$.

Suppose $\bar{a}_0 = (a_{0,0}, \ldots, a_{0,n-1})$, where $a_{0,i} \models p$. Since p is 1-dependent over $\emptyset$, there is some $i_0 < \omega$ such that $\langle c_{i_0 \frown \bar{i}} \mid \bar{i} \in \omega^n \rangle$ is indiscernible over $a_{0,0}$. By assumption, p is 1-dependent over $a_{0,0}$. Inductively, we can find $i_1, \ldots, i_{n-1} < \omega$ such that $\bar{c}_{(i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1})}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}_0$, a contradiction. $\quad\square$

The following theorem implies Main Theorem A.

Theorem 2.9   *If $p(x)$ is a type over A which satisfies the conclusion of Claim 2.8, then it is dependent.*

Proof   Again, assume $A = \emptyset$. Suppose that p is a counterexample. By Claim 2.1, there is an indiscernible sequence $\langle a_i \mid i < |T|^+ \rangle$ such that $a_i \models p$, a formula $\varphi(x, y)$, and some tuple $c = (c_0, \ldots, c_{n-1})$ such that $\varphi(a_i, c)$ holds iff i is even. By assumption, there is some end segment which is indiscernible over c_0. Applying the conclusion of Claim 2.8 again with $A' = \{c_0\}$, we get an end segment which is indiscernible over $c_0 c_1$. Continuing like this, we get an end segment which is indiscernible over c, a contradiction. $\quad\square$

Since dependent implies 1-dependent, we get the following.

Corollary 2.10   *The type $p(x)$ is 1-dependent if and only if it is dependent if and only if it satisfies the conclusion of Claim 2.8.*

Corollary 1.5 follows.

Corollary 2.11   *A theory T is dependent if and only if for every indiscernible sequence of singletons*

$$\langle a_i \mid i < |T|^+ \rangle$$

over some finite A, and for every singleton c, there is $\alpha < |T|^+$ such that $\langle a_i \mid \alpha < i \rangle$ is indiscernible over Ac.

Proof   Apply Corollary 2.10 with $p(x) = \{x = x\}$. $\quad\square$

3   Proof of Main Theorem B

3.1 Preliminaries on NTP$_2$-theories   From here up to the end of the section, we assume that the theory is NTP$_2$.

In the study of forking in NTP$_2$-theories, it is sometimes useful to consider independence relations. For instance, we denote $a \mathop{\smash{\displaystyle\mathop{\bigcup}}}\nolimits_B^f C$ for $\mathrm{tp}(a/BC)$ does not fork over B. Similarly, $a \mathop{\smash{\displaystyle\mathop{\bigcup}}}\nolimits_B^i C$ means that there is a global extension (i.e., an extension to $\mathfrak{C}$) of $\mathrm{tp}(a/BC)$ which is Lascar invariant over B, meaning that if d and c have the same Lascar strong type over B, then either both $\varphi(x, c)$ and $\varphi(x, d)$ are in this extension or neither of them is. We do not really need Lascar strong type in this section, because we only work over models. Over a model, Lascar invariance is the same as invariance.

In the proofs we shall only use the following facts about NTP$_2$-theories. These were proved in [2].

Definition 3.1 (Strict invariance)   We say that tp(a/Bb) is *strictly invariant* over B (denoted by $a \underset{B}{\overset{\text{ist}}{\downarrow}} b$) if there is a global extension p, which is Lascar invariant over B (so $a \underset{B}{\overset{i}{\downarrow}} b$) and for any $C \supseteq Bb$, if $c \models p|_C$, then $C \underset{B}{\overset{f}{\downarrow}} c$.

Fact 3.2   In NTP$_2$-theories,

1. forking equals dividing over models;
2. "Kim's lemma": If $\varphi(x, a)$ divides over A, and $\langle b_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ is a sequence satisfying $b_i \equiv_A a$ and $b_i \underset{A}{\overset{\text{ist}}{\downarrow}} b_{<i}$, then $\{\varphi(x, b_i) \mid i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent. In particular, if $\langle b_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence, then it witnesses dividing of $\varphi(x, a)$.

Recall the following.

Definition 3.3   Suppose that p is a global type which is invariant over a set A.

1. We say that a sequence $\langle a_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle$ is a Morley sequence of a type p over $B \supseteq A$ if $a_0 \models p|_B$ and for all $i < \alpha$, $a_i \models p|_{Ba_{<i}}$. This is an indiscernible sequence over B.
2. We let the type $p^{(\alpha)}$ be the union of tp$(\langle a_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle/B)$ running over all $B \supseteq A$. This is again an A-invariant type.
3. If q is also an A-invariant global type, we define $p \otimes q$ as the union of tp$(a, b/B)$ running over all $B \supseteq A$ where $a \models p|_B$ and $b \models q|_{Ba}$. This is also an A-invariant global type.
4. Similarly, given a sequence $\langle p_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle$ of A-invariant global types, we define $\bigotimes_{i<\alpha} p_i$ as the union of tp$(\langle a_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle/B)$ running over all $B \supseteq A$, where $a_i \models p_i|_{Ba_{<i}}$. Again, this is an A-invariant global type.

In the definition above, all types may have infinitely many variables.

Remark 3.4   If $\{J_0, \ldots, J_k\}$ is a set of mutually indiscernible sequences over $C \supseteq A$, and $\langle a_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle$ is a Morley sequence of a global A-invariant type over $\{J_0, \ldots, J_k\} \cup C$, then $\{J_0, \ldots, J_k, \langle a_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle\}$ is mutually indiscernible over C.

(Why? On the one hand, $\{J_0, \ldots, J_k\}$ is mutually indiscernible over $C \cup \{a_i \mid i < \alpha\}$ since tp$(\langle a_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle/\{J_0, \ldots, J_k\} \cup C)$ does not split over A. On the other hand, $\langle a_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle$ is a Morley sequence over $\{J_0, \ldots, J_k\} \cup C$ and as such is indiscernible over that set.)

We also need to recall the notions of heir and coheir.

Definition 3.5   A global type $p(x)$ is called a *coheir* over a set A if it is finitely satisfiable in A. Note that in this case, it is invariant over A, and $p^{(\alpha)}$ is also a coheir over A.

It is called an *heir* over A if for every formula over A, $\varphi(x, b) \in p$, there exists some $a' \in A$ such that $\varphi(x, a') \in p$.

Claim 3.6   *If p is an A-invariant global type, and $p^{(\omega)}$ is both an heir and a coheir over A, then any Morley sequence of p over A, $\langle a_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ satisfies $a_{\geq i} \underset{A}{\overset{\text{ist}}{\downarrow}} a_{<i}$ for any $i < \omega$.*

Proof   The type $p^{(\omega)}$ is a global A-invariant (so also A-Lascar invariant) type that extends tp$(a_{\geq i}/Aa_{<i})$, and if $c \models p^{(\omega)}|AC$, then tp$(C/Ac)$ is finitely satisfiable over A (since $p^{(\omega)}$ is an heir over A), and it follows that $C \underset{A}{\overset{f}{\downarrow}} c$. $\square$

Claim 3.7   *Given any global type $p(x)$ and a set A, we can find a model $M \supseteq A$ such that p is an heir over M.*

Proof   Construct inductively a sequence of models M_i for $i < \omega$. Let M_0 be any model containing A. Let $M_{i+1} \supseteq M_i$ be such that for every formula $\varphi(x, y)$ over M_i, if $\varphi(x, a) \in p$, then there is some such a in M_{i+1}. Finally, let $M = \bigcup_{i<\omega} M_i$.   □

Lemma 3.8   *Let M be a model. Suppose that p is an M-invariant global type such that $p^{(\omega)}$ is an heir-coheir over M. Suppose that I is an endless Morley sequence of p over M. If I is indiscernible over Ma, then $\mathrm{tp}(a/MI)$ does not fork over M.*

Proof   By Fact 3.2, it is enough to see that the type does not divide over M. Suppose that $\varphi(x, b_0) \in \mathrm{tp}(a/MI)$ divides over M, where φ is over M and $b_0 \subseteq I$. For $i \geq 1$ choose tuples $b_i \subseteq I$ of the same length as b_0 that appear after b_0 in increasing order. By Claim 3.6, $b_i \underset{M}{\overset{\mathrm{ist}}{\downarrow}} b_{<i}$ so by "Kim's lemma" (Fact 3.2), it must witness dividing. But this is a contradiction to the fact that I is indiscernible over Ma.   □

3.2 Proof of the main theorem The following is the key definition in the proof.

Definition 3.9   Suppose that
1. p is a global A-invariant type such that $p|_A$ is dependent (we call such types *A-invariant* and *A-dependent*);
2. B is some set containing A;
3. $\varphi(x, y)$ is a formula over A;
4. a is a tuple of length $\mathrm{lg}(y)$.

Then we define $\mathrm{alt}(\varphi, B, a, p)$ to be the maximal number n such that there is a realization $\langle a_i \mid i < n \rangle \models p^{(n)}|_B$, such that $\varphi(a_i, a)$ alternates for $i < n$, that is, such that $\varphi(a_i, a) \Leftrightarrow \neg\varphi(a_{i+1}, a)$ for $i < n - 1$.

Note that $\mathrm{alt}(\varphi, B, a, p)$ exists by Claim 2.1(4). Observe also that if $B' \supseteq B \supseteq A$, then $\mathrm{alt}(\varphi, B, a, p) \geq \mathrm{alt}(\varphi, B', a, p)$, but not necessarily the other way. Sometimes we have the following equality.

Lemma 3.10   *Suppose that p is a global A-invariant and A-dependent type, a is some tuple, and I is an indiscernible sequence over Aa.*
    Then for every infinite subset $I' \subseteq I$ and for any formula $\varphi(x, y)$ over A, $\mathrm{alt}(\varphi, IA, a, p) = \mathrm{alt}(\varphi, I'A, a, p)$.

Proof   Obviously, $\mathrm{alt}(\varphi, IA, a, p) \leq \mathrm{alt}(\varphi, I'A, a, p)$.
    Conversely, suppose that we have some n such that $\bar{a} = \langle a_i \mid i < n \rangle \models p^{(n)}|_{I'A}$ alternates as in the definition. Let $\bar{x} = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$. We want to show that the type

$$p^{(n)}(\bar{x})|_{IA} \cup \left\{ \varphi(x_i, a)^{(\mathrm{if}\ \varphi(a_i, a))} \mid i < n \right\}$$

is consistent.
    Take any finite subset, and write it as $\psi(\bar{x}, b, c) \wedge \xi(\bar{x}, a)$, where $b \subseteq I, c \subseteq A$. As I' is infinite and I is indiscernible over Aa, we can find $b' \in I'$ such that $b' \equiv_{Aa} b$, so $\mathfrak{C} \models \exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{x}, b', c) \wedge \xi(\bar{x}, a)$ iff $\mathfrak{C} \models \exists \bar{x} \psi(\bar{x}, b, c) \wedge \xi(\bar{x}, a)$. Now, $\psi(\bar{x}, b, c) \in p^{(n)}$, and $p^{(n)}$ is A-invariant; hence $\psi(\bar{x}, b', c) \in p^{(n)}$, and since $\bar{a}$ satisfies $\psi(\bar{x}, b', c) \wedge \xi(\bar{x}, a)$, we are done.   □

We will deduce Main Theorem B from the following theorem.

Theorem 3.11 *Suppose that $p(x)$ is a dependent type over C with rk-dp$(p) \geq \kappa$. Assume that this is witnessed by $c \models p$ and $\{I_i \mid i < \kappa\}$, where I_i has order type ω for $i < \kappa$.*

Then there are

- $C' \supseteq C$ *with* $|C' \backslash C|$ *finite,* $c' \models p$ *and* J_0

such that

- $\{J_0\} \cup \{I_i \mid 0 < i < \kappa\}$ *is mutually indiscernible over* C'; $c' \equiv_{C \cup \{I_i \mid 0 < i < \kappa\}} c$; J_0 *is not indiscernible over* $C'c'$; *and*
- *all the tuples in* J_0 *satisfy* p.

Proof   Denote $I_i = \langle f_{i,j} \mid j < \omega \rangle$. By compactness, we can find $f_{i,j}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $i < \kappa$ such that, letting $I_i' = \langle f_{i,j} \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}, j < 0 \rangle$, $\{I_i' \frown I_i \mid i < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible over C. Let U be a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω. For $i < \kappa$, let p_i be global coheir over I_i' defined by the following:

- for a formula $\psi(z, y)$ and tuple $a \in \mathfrak{C}$, $\psi(z, a) \in p_i$ iff $\{n < \omega \mid \models \psi(f_{i,-n}, a)\} \in U$.

So each p_i is invariant over $\bigcup_{i<\kappa} I_i'$, and we can consider the type $(\bigotimes_{0<i<\kappa} p_i^{(\omega)})^{(\omega)}$ and find a model $M \supseteq C \cup \bigcup_{i<\kappa}(I_i' \frown I_i)$ such that this type is an heir over M (using Claim 3.7).

Let $\langle K_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle \models \bigotimes_{i<\kappa} p_i^{(\omega)} |_M$; then

- each K_i is a Morley sequence of p_i over M,
- since $\{I_i' \frown I_i \mid i < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible over C, and p_i is finitely satisfiable in I_i', $\langle K_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle \equiv_C \langle I_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ (this follows from the fact that the order type of I_i' is ω^*—ω in reverse), and
- by Remark 3.4, $\{K_i \mid i < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible over M.

By the second bullet, there is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ that fixes C (but may move M and p_i) and maps $\langle K_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ to $\langle I_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$. By applying it we may assume that $\langle K_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle = \langle I_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$.

Let $\mu = |T|^+$. Let $J = \langle d_i \mid i < \mu \rangle$ be a Morley sequence of $(\bigotimes_{0<i<\kappa} p_i^{(\omega)})$ over MI_0 so that d_0 is the infinite tuple $\langle I_i \mid 0 < i < \kappa \rangle$. Note that I_0 is indiscernible over JM, J is indiscernible over I_0M, and $\{I_i \mid i < \kappa\}$ is mutually indiscernible over $M \cup \{d_i \mid 0 < i < \mu\}$ (by Remark 3.4).

Now, I_0 is not indiscernible over Cc. So there are increasing tuples a_0 and a_1 from I_0 of the same length and a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ over C such that $\neg\varphi(c, a_0) \wedge \varphi(c, a_1)$ holds. By indiscernibility, there is an automorphism σ of $\mathfrak{C}$ that fixes JM and takes a_0 to a_1. Let $c_0 = c$ and $c_1 = \sigma(c_0)$. Then $\varphi(c_0, a_1) \wedge \neg\varphi(c_1, a_1)$ holds.

By Proposition 2.6, for some $\alpha < \mu$, the sequence $J' = \langle d_i \mid \alpha < i < \mu \rangle$ is indiscernible over Mc_0c_1. By Lemma 3.8, $c_0c_1 \underset{M}{\overset{f}{\smile}} J'$.

Let $r(x)$ be a global nonforking (over M) extension of $\text{tp}(c_0/MJ')$ (which equals $\text{tp}(c_1/MJ')$). Since $\text{tp}(c_0/C)$ is dependent, $r(x)$ is M-dependent and M-invariant (by Proposition 2.5). Let $n = \text{alt}(\varphi, MJ, a_1, r)$, and let $\langle e_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ be a Morley sequence of r over MJ that witnesses this, that is, such that $\varphi(e_i, a_1)$ alternates for $i < n$. Let $\langle e_i \mid \omega \leq i < \omega + \omega \rangle$ be a Morley sequence of r over $MJc_0c_1e_{<\omega}$.

So

- $I_0' = \langle e_i \mid i < \omega + \omega \rangle$ is an MJ-indiscernible sequence, and moreover the union $\{I_i \mid 0 < i < \kappa\} \cup \{I_0'\}$ is a set of MJ'-mutually indiscernible sequences.

Now, both $\langle c_0, e_\omega, e_{\omega+1}, \ldots \rangle$, $\langle c_1, e_\omega, e_{\omega+1}, \ldots \rangle$ are Morley sequences of r over MJ'. But if in addition $\langle c_0, e_0, e_1, \ldots \rangle$ and $\langle c_1, e_0, e_1, \ldots \rangle$ are also Morley sequences of r over MJ', then since one of c_0, c_1, adds an alternation of the truth value of $\varphi(x, a_1)$, this is a contradiction to the choice of e_i and to Lemma 3.10 (which we can use because J is indiscernible over a_1, and J' is infinite). Let $c' \in \{c_0, c_1\}$ be such that $\langle c', e_0, e_1, \ldots \rangle$ is not a Morley sequence of r over MJ'. Note that $c' \equiv_{MJ} c$ and that MJ contains $C \cup \{I_i \mid 0 < i < \kappa\}$.

So, $\langle c', e_0, \ldots \rangle \not\equiv_{MJ'} \langle c', e_\omega, \ldots \rangle$, and hence the sequence I_0' is not indiscernible over $c'MJ'$. Let J_0 be some infinite subset of I_0' of order type ω that witnesses this, let $C' \supseteq C$ be such that $|C' \backslash C|$ is finite, and let $C' \subseteq MJ'$ so that J_0 is not indiscernible over $C'c'$.

It is now easy to check that all conditions are satisfied. □

Now let us conclude.

Proof of Main Theorem B   Suppose that p is a dependent type over A with rk-dp$(p) \geq \kappa$. Consider the family $\mathcal{F}$ of triples (s, c, J, A') such that

- $c \models p, s \subseteq \kappa, J = \langle I_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle; A \subseteq A'; J$ is a sequence of A'-mutually indiscernible sequences such that for each $i < \kappa$, I_i is not indiscernible over $A'c$; all tuples in I_i for $i \in s$ realize p.

By assumption, $\mathcal{F}$ is not empty. Define the following order relation on these triples:

- $(s, c, J, A') \leq (s', c', J', A'')$ iff $(s \subseteq s', A' \subseteq A''$, if $i \in s \cup (\kappa \backslash s')$, then $I_i = I_i'$ and $c' \equiv_{A' \cup \{I_i \mid i \in s \cup (\kappa \backslash s')\}} c)$.

It is easy to see that by compactness $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the conditions of Zorn's lemma, so it has a maximal member (s_0, c_0, J_0, A_0'). By Theorem 3.11, $s_0 = \kappa$ and we are done. □

Note

1. After the appearance of this note, Artem Chernikov has removed this assumption; see [1].

References

[1] Chernikov, A., "Theories without the tree property of the second kind," *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 165 (2014), pp. 695–723. MR 3129735. DOI 10.1016/j.apal.2013.10.002. 428

[2] Chernikov, A., and I. Kaplan, "Forking and dividing in NTP$_2$ theories," *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 77 (2012), pp. 1–20. MR 2951626. DOI 10.2178/jsl/1327068688. 423, 425

[3] Kaplan, I., A. Onshuus, and A. Usvyatsov, "Additivity of the dp-rank," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 365 (2013), pp. 5783–804. MR 3091265. DOI 10.1090/S0002-9947-2013-05782-0. 420, 423

[4] Onshuus, A., and A. Usvyatsov, "On dp-minimality, strong dependence and weight," *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 76 (2011), pp. 737–58. MR 2849244. DOI 10.2178/jsl/1309952519. 420, 421

[5] Shelah, S., "Strongly dependent theories," to appear in *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, preprint, arXiv:math/0504197v4 [math.LO]. 420

[6] Simon, P., "On dp-minimal ordered structures," *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 76 (2011), pp. 448–60. Zbl 1220.03037. MR 2830411. DOI 10.2178/jsl/1305810758. 420

[7] Usvyatsov, A., "On generically stable types in dependent theories," *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 74 (2009), pp. 216–50. Zbl 1181.03040. MR 2499428. DOI 10.2178/jsl/1231082310. 420

Acknowledgment

Kaplan
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Einstein Institute of Mathematics
Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram
Jerusalem 91904
Israel
itay.kaplan@uni-muenster.de
https://sites.google.com/site/itay80/

Simon
Université Claude Bernard – Lyon 1
Institut Camille Jordan
43 boulevard du 11 novembre 1918
69622 Villeurbanne Cedex
France
pierre.simon@normalesup.org
www.normalesup.org/~simon