

# Measuring Fixed Sets in SMA

Richard Elwes

July 23, 2008

## 1 Introduction

These notes are essentially an expansion of the proof of Proposition 11.1 in [2]. The context is a strongly minimal theory  $T$  in a language  $L$ , which satisfies the DMP (definable multiplicity property) and has elimination of imaginaries. (Almost certainly elimination of Galois imaginaries is sufficient, but I haven't checked this yet.) Analogously to ACFA, we can adjoin a new unary function symbol  $\sigma$  to  $L$  to obtain  $L_\sigma$ , and we look at the model companion of the theory in which  $\sigma$  is interpreted as an automorphism. This model complete theory is called  $TA$ . (By [4] the DMP is exactly the criterion needed for  $TA$  to exist.)

We work in  $(M, \sigma) \models TA$ , which we will assume to be saturated. We will appeal to some elementary results from [5], in which many properties of ACFA are generalised to this context.

In these notes we are concerned with the fixed set  $F$  of  $\sigma$ . We know by Proposition 4.10 of [5], that any subset of  $F$  which is  $L_\sigma$ -definable in the structure  $(M, \sigma)$  with parameters from  $M$ , is in fact  $L$ -definable in the structure  $F$  (with parameters from  $F$ ). Now, Proposition 11.1 in [2] states that  $F$  is *measurable*:

**Definition 1.1.** An infinite structure  $F$  is *measurable* if to every definable set  $X$  of  $F$  we can associate a pair  $(\text{Dim}(X), \text{Meas}(X))$ , where  $\text{Dim}(X), \text{Meas}(X) \geq 0$  such that the following hold.

1. For each  $L$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  there is a finite set  $D \subset \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{R}^{\geq 0} \cup \{(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})\}$ , so that for all  $\bar{a} \in M^m$  we have  $(\text{Dim}, \text{Meas})(\varphi(M^n, \bar{a})) \in D$ .
2. If  $X$  is finite then  $(\text{Dim}, \text{Meas})(X) = (0, |\varphi(M^n, \bar{a})|)$ .
3. For every  $L$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and all  $(d, \mu) \in D_\varphi$ , the set  $\{\bar{a} \in M^m : h(\varphi(M^n, \bar{a})) = (d, \mu)\}$  is  $\emptyset$ -definable.
4. If  $X$  and  $Y$  are disjoint, then

$$(\text{Dim}, \text{Meas})(X \sqcup Y) = \begin{cases} (\text{Dim}(X), \text{Meas}(X) + \text{Meas}(Y)) & \text{if } \text{Dim}(X) = \text{Dim}(Y) \\ (\text{Dim}(X), \text{Meas}(X)) & \text{if } \text{Dim}(X) > \text{Dim}(Y) \\ (\text{Dim}(Y), \text{Meas}(Y)) & \text{if } \text{Dim}(X) < \text{Dim}(Y) \end{cases}$$

5. (Fubini) If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a definable surjection, where the fibres have constant dimension and measure  $(d, \mu)$ , then  $(\text{Dim}, \text{Meas})(X) = (\text{Dim}(Y) + d, \text{Meas}(Y) \cdot \mu)$ .

For further background on this notion, see [1]. In our case, the measure on  $F$  will be *normalized*: if  $X$  is  $L$ -definable in  $M$  over  $F$  and of Morley degree 1, then  $\text{Meas}(X(F)) = 1$ .

**Notation 1.2.** We will write  $L_\sigma$  to mean  $L \cup \{\sigma\}$ , and  $\text{acl}^-$  or  $\text{acl}^\sigma$ , etc. to indicate the language being used.

If  $p$  and  $q$  are complete types, we will abuse notation by writing  $f : p \rightarrow q$  to mean that  $f$  is function on the domains of  $p$  and  $q$  in  $M$ .

In all that follows  $x, y, z, a, b, \dots$  will be tuples in  $M$ .

## 2 Comments on $G^{op}$

If a group  $G$  acts on a set  $\Omega$ , then  $G^{op}$  is by definition the automorphism group of the structure  $(\Omega, g)_{g \in G}$ , i.e the subgroup of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$  which commutes with the action of  $G$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose  $G$  acts faithfully on  $\Omega$  and  $G^{op}$  is transitive on  $\Omega$ . Then every point stabilizer of the action of  $G$  is trivial.*

**Proof.** Suppose  $g \in G$  and  $g(y) = y$ . Then for any  $\zeta \in G^{op}$  we have  $g(\zeta(y)) = \zeta(g(y)) = \zeta(y)$ . By the transitivity assumption it follows that  $g(z) = z$  for all  $z \in \Omega$ . Thus  $g = 1$ . ■

**Lemma 2.2.** *If  $G$  acts regularly on  $\Omega$  then  $G^{op}$  acts regularly too, and  $G \cong G^{op}$ , the isomorphism depending on choosing an element of  $\Omega$ .*

**Proof.** With  $y$  fixed, for each  $g \in G$  define  $g^* : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  by  $g^*(h(y)) := h(g(y))$ . Then for any  $h_1, h_2 \in G$  we have  $g^*(h_1 h_2(y)) = h_1 h_2(g(y)) = h_1(g^*(h_2(y)))$ . Thus for any  $z \in \Omega$  and  $h \in G$ , we have  $g^*(h(z)) = h(g^*(z))$ , so  $g^* \in G^{op}$ . Of course the map  $*$  :  $G \rightarrow G^{op}$  is injective, and it is an easy exercise to check that it is a homomorphism, and depends on  $y$ . Given  $\beta \in G^{op}$ , there exists unique  $g \in G$  such that  $\beta(y) = g(y)$ . Then for all  $h \in G$ , we have  $\beta(h(y)) = h\beta(y) = hg(y)$ . Thus for all  $z \in \Omega$  we have  $\beta(z) = g^*(z)$ , and so  $*$  is surjective.

Note also that  $g^*(y) = g(y)$ , from which it follows that  $G^{op}$  acts transitively, and that  $G^{op}$  acts regularly: if  $g^*(h(y)) = h(y)$  for any  $h$ , then  $h(g(y)) = h(y)$ , so  $g(y) = y$ , and  $g = 1 = g^*$ . ■

**Comment 2.3.** It follows from Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 that if  $G$  is faithful and transitive on  $\Omega$ , then both  $G$  and  $G^{op}$  act regularly.

### 3 Galois Maps

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $p$  and  $q$  be  $L$ -types over some  $A \subseteq M$ . Let  $f : q \rightarrow p$  be an  $L(A)$ -definable map on the domains of these types. We say that  $f$  is **Galois** if there is a finite group  $G$  whose elements are  $\emptyset$ -definable, and which acts  $\emptyset$ -definably as a regular permutation group on  $f^{-1}\{x\}$  for each  $x \models p$ .

Notice that for any such  $f$  we may define:  $q' := \text{tp}(f(y), y)$  for  $y \models q$ , and  $f' : q' \rightarrow p$  by projection onto the first coordinate, and then  $q$  is interdefinable with  $q'$  over  $A$ , and  $f$  with  $f'$ , and  $f'$  is again Galois with group  $G$ . Hence we will assume that  $f$  is  $L(\emptyset)$ -definable.

The following is the canonical example of a Galois map:

**Example 3.2.** Suppose that  $r$  and  $p$  are complete  $L$ -types over some  $A \subseteq M$ , and  $\tau : r \rightarrow p$  is an  $L(A)$ -definable finite-to-1 map. Then we pick  $a \models p$ , and choose an enumeration of  $\bar{b}$  of  $\tau^{-1}\{a\}$ . Then set  $q := \text{tp}^-(a, \bar{b})/A$  and let  $f : q \rightarrow p$  be projection onto the first co-ordinate.

**Lemma 3.3.** Suppose  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois, and  $\tau : q \rightarrow r$ , and  $\chi : r \rightarrow p$  are such that  $f = \chi \circ \tau$ . Put  $H := \{h \in G \mid \forall y \models q, \tau(hy) = \tau(y)\}$ . Then  $\tau : q \rightarrow_H r$  is Galois.

Furthermore  $H \triangleleft G$  if and only if  $\chi : r \rightarrow p$  is Galois, in which case it has Galois group  $G/H$ .

**Proof.** Notice that, as  $q$  and  $r$  are complete types,  $H := \{h \in G \mid \exists y \models q, \tau(hy) = \tau(y)\}$ . Given  $z \models r$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in \tau^{-1}\{z\}$ , there is a unique  $h \in G$  where  $h(y_1) = y_2$ , since  $y_1, y_2 \in f^{-1}\{\chi(z)\}$ . Clearly  $h \in H$ .

Assuming now that  $H \triangleleft G$ , given  $z_1, z_2 \in \chi^{-1}\{x\}$ , pick  $y_i \in \tau^{-1}\{z_i\}$ . Then there is unique  $g \in G$  where  $g(y_1) = y_2$ . Put  $(gH)(z_1) = z_2$ .

To see this is well-defined, pick  $y'_i \in \tau^{-1}\{z_i\}$ , and say that  $g' \in G$  where  $g'(y'_1) = y'_2$ . Now there are  $h_1, h_2 \in H$  where  $h_i(y_i) = y'_i$ . Then  $g'(h_1(y_1)) = h_2(y_2)$ , and  $(h_2^{-1}g'h_1)(y_1) = y_2$ . By regularity, it follows that  $h_2^{-1}g'h_1 = g$ , thus  $g'h_1 = h_2g = g \cdot g^{-1}h_2g$ , and so  $g'H = gH$ .

Also the action is regular: if  $z_1, z_2 \in \chi^{-1}\{x\}$ , then we've shown that  $gH$  where  $(gH)(z_1) = z_2$  is unique.

Conversely if  $\chi : r \rightarrow_J p$  is Galois, then define  $\nu : G \rightarrow J$  by  $\nu(g) \cdot \tau(y) := \tau(gy)$ . Then  $\nu$  is a homomorphism:  $\nu(g_1g_2) \cdot \tau(y) = \tau((g_1g_2)y) = \nu(g_1) \cdot \tau(g_2y) = \nu(g_1)\nu(g_2)\tau(y)$ .

Also  $\nu$  is surjective: let  $j \in J$ . Pick  $z_0 \in \chi^{-1}\{x\}$ ,  $y_0 \in \tau^{-1}\{z_0\}$ , and  $y_1 \in \tau^{-1}\{j(z_0)\}$ . Then there is a unique  $g \in G$  where  $g(y_0) = y_1$ , and  $\nu(g)\tau(y_0) = \tau(gy_0)$ , so  $\nu(g)(z_0) = j(z_0)$ . Thus by regularity  $\nu(g) = j$ .

Finally  $g \in \text{Ker}(\nu) \Leftrightarrow \forall y \nu(g) \cdot \tau(y) = \tau(y) \Leftrightarrow \forall y \tau(gy) = \tau(y) \Leftrightarrow g \in H$ . ■

**Comment 3.4.** If  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois over  $A$ , then writing  $\Omega_x := f^{-1}\{x\}$  for  $x \models p$ , then the category whose object-set is  $\{\Omega_x \mid x \models p\}$  and whose morphism-set is  $\text{Aut}(q(M)/A) := \{\alpha \upharpoonright_{q(M)} \mid \alpha \in \text{Aut}(M/A)\}$  forms a concrete definable **groupoid**, see [3].

## 4 Artin Classes

If  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois and  $x \in p(F)$ , then the automorphism  $\sigma$  fixes  $\Omega_x := f^{-1}\{x\}$  setwise, and thus acts as an element of  $G^{op}$  on  $\Omega_x$ . As  $G^{op} \cong G$ , we find an element  $g \in G$  corresponding to  $\sigma$ : of course  $g$  depends on the choice of isomorphism  $G^{op} \cong G$ , which in turn depends on picking an element  $y \in \Omega$  (as in Lemma 2.2). However the conjugacy class  $g^G$  is fixed: say  $\sigma(y_i) = g_i(y_i)$  where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Then there is unique  $h \in G$  where  $h(y_1) = y_2$ . Then  $hg_1(y_1) = h\sigma(y_1) = \sigma(hy_1) = \sigma(y_2) = g_2(y_2) = g_2(h(y_1))$ . Thus by regularity,  $hg_1 = g_2h$ , and  $g_1 = h^{-1}g_2h$ .

**Definition 4.1.** We call  $g^G$  the **Artin class** of  $x$ , denoted  $\text{Artin}_f(x)$ . We say that sets of the form  $X = \{x \in p(F) \mid \text{Artin}(x) \in S\}$  for some  $S \subseteq G$  closed under conjugation are **Artin-definable**.

Notice that an Artin-definable set  $X$  is definable relative to  $p(F)$ : it is the intersection of  $p(F)$  with the definable set  $\{x : \exists y (\sigma(y) = g(y)) \wedge (f(y) = x)\}$ .

We obtain the following quantifier-elimination result.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let  $p(x)$  be a complete  $L$ -type over some  $A \subseteq F$ , and  $a_1, a_2 \models p(x) \wedge \sigma(x) = x$ . Then  $\text{tp}_\sigma(a_1/A) = \text{tp}_\sigma(a_2/A)$  if and only if whenever  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois, then  $\text{Artin}_f(a_1) = \text{Artin}_f(a_2)$ .

**Proof.** Suppose that  $\text{tp}_\sigma(a_1) = \text{tp}_\sigma(a_2)$ , and  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois. Then by saturation there is  $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(M, \sigma)$  where  $\alpha(a_1) = a_2$ . Let  $b_1 \in f^{-1}\{a_1\}$ , and say  $\sigma(b_1) = g(b_1)$ . Then  $\text{Artin}(a_1) = g^G$ . But  $\alpha(\sigma(b_1)) = \alpha(g(b_1))$ , and setting  $b_2 := \alpha(b_1)$  we get  $\sigma(b_2) = g(b_2)$ , and  $b_2 \in f^{-1}\{a_2\}$ , so  $\text{Artin}_f(a_2) = g^G$ .

For the converse, we shall define an  $L_\sigma$ -elementary bijection  $\alpha : \text{acl}_\sigma(a_1A) \rightarrow \text{acl}_\sigma(a_2A)$ . But first notice that by Remark 3.15 of [5], as  $a_iA \subseteq F$ , we have  $\text{acl}_\sigma(a_iA) = \text{acl}^-(a_iA)$ .

Now for any  $b \in \text{acl}^-(a_1A)$ , witnessed minimally by  $\theta(a_1, b)$  over  $A$ , we form  $q(x, y) := p(x) \wedge \theta(x, y)$ . By replacing  $q(x, y)$  with  $\text{tp}_L(a_1, b_1, \dots, b_n)/A$  where  $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$  is an enumeration of the realisations of  $\theta(a_1, y)$ , we may assume that projection  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois. Suppose  $\sigma(b) = g_1(b)$ , and pick  $b' \in q(a_2, M)$ , and say  $g_2(b') = \sigma(b')$ . Then as  $\text{Artin}_q(a_1) = \text{Artin}_q(a_2)$  it follows that  $g_2 = h^{-1}g_1h$  for some  $h \in G$ . Now define  $c := hb'$ , and for all  $g \in G$  define  $\alpha(g(b)) := g(c)$ . Then for any  $g \in G$ ,  $\sigma(g(c)) = \sigma(g(hb')) = gh\sigma(b') = ghg_2(b') = ghg_2h^{-1}(c) = gg_1(c)$ . Thus for all  $g \in G$ ,  $\alpha(\sigma(g(b))) = \alpha(g\sigma(b)) = \alpha(gg_1b_1) = gg_1c = \sigma(g(c))$ . By the regular action of  $G$  it follows that  $\alpha : q(a_1, M) \rightarrow q(a_2, M)$  is an  $L_\sigma$ -elementary bijection. Since  $b$  was originally chosen arbitrarily, by compactness it follows that there is an isomorphism of  $L_\sigma$ -structures  $\alpha : \text{acl}_\sigma(a_1A) \rightarrow \text{acl}_\sigma(a_2A)$ .

By Corollary 3.14 (i) of [5] it follows that  $\text{tp}_\sigma(a_1/A) = \text{tp}_\sigma(a_2/A)$ . ■

**Corollary 4.3.** Let  $D \subseteq F$  be an  $L_\sigma$ -definable set over  $A \subseteq F$ . Then  $D = D' \cup E$  where  $D'$  is a finite union of Artin-definable sets over  $A$ , and  $SU(E) < SU(D)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\{p_i : i \in I\}$  be the set of quantifier free  $L_\sigma(A)$ -types of maximal SU rank consistent with  $D$ . By Pillay's QE, see Lemma 3.17 of [5], this is the same as the set of consistent  $L(A)$ -types of maximal Morley rank, from which it follows that  $I$  is finite. Set  $D_i := p_i(F) \cap D'$ , and  $D' := \bigcup_{i \in I} D_i$ , and  $E' := D \setminus D'$ .

Proposition 4.2 above shows that there is a collection  $\{X_{jk} : j \in J, k \in K\}$  of Artin-definable subsets of  $p_i(F)$  over  $A$ , where  $D_i = \bigcup_{j \in J} \bigcap_{k \in K} X_{jk}$ . Then there are finite  $J_0, K_0$  where  $D = \bigcup_{j \in J_0} \bigcap_{k \in K_0} X_{jk}$  (if not then for every such  $J_0, K_0$  the set  $D_i \Delta (\bigcup_{j \in J_0} \bigcap_{k \in K_0} X_{jk})$  is consistent, which by compactness yields a contradiction). Thus taking common Galois covers, it follows that  $D_i$  is Artin-definable.  $\blacksquare$

## 4.1 Relationship to Pillay's QE

In Lemma 3.17 of [5], Pillay proves that any formula  $\theta(x, a)$  in  $L_\sigma$  is equivalent to one of the form  $\varphi(x, a) \wedge \exists y \psi(x, a, \overline{\sigma(y)})$  where

$$\overline{\sigma(y)} := (y, \sigma(y), \sigma^2(y), \dots, \sigma^m(y))$$

for some  $m$ , and  $\varphi(x, a)$  is the full partial  $L$ -type over  $a$  implied by  $\theta(x, a)$ , and  $\psi(x, a, \bar{z})$  is such that  $M \models \psi(x, a, \bar{z}) \rightarrow \bar{z} \in \text{acl}(xa)$ . We're interested in the case where  $a \in F$  and  $(M, \sigma) \models \theta(x, a) \rightarrow \sigma(x) = x$ . We will also assume that  $\text{Md}(\varphi(x, a)) = \text{Md}(\psi(x, a, \bar{w})) = 1$ , as any  $L_\sigma$ -formula over  $F$  is equivalent to a disjunction of formulae of this form.

Let  $p$  and  $q$  be the generic types of  $\varphi(x, a)$  and  $\psi(x, a, \bar{z})$  respectively, and  $f : q \rightarrow p$  be projection. By exchanging  $q$  (and  $\psi$ ) with an (interdefinable) Galois cover, we may assume  $f$  is Galois with group  $G$ .

Now Pillay's QE specifies  $\theta(x, a) \wedge p(x)$  by giving the  $\sigma$ -form  $(\sigma^0, \sigma^1, \dots, \sigma^m)$  on  $q$ : for  $x \models p$ , we have  $M \models \theta(x, a) \leftrightarrow \exists y \psi(x, a, y, \sigma(y), \dots, \sigma^m(y))$ . But this is true if and only if there is  $(x, a, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m) \in f^{-1}\{x\}$  where

$$\sigma(x, a, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m) = (x, a, y_2, y_3, \dots, y_{m+1} \pmod{n})$$

which amounts to specifying the Artin class of  $x$ .

## 5 Measure

**Definition 5.1.** Given  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  Galois, and  $X := \{x \in p(F) : \text{Artin}_q(x) \in S\}$  define

$$\text{Meas}(X) := \frac{|S|}{|G|}$$

We need to show that this is well-defined. For the moment we will refer to this quantity as  $\text{Meas}_f(X)$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** Suppose that  $e : r \rightarrow_H p$  is Galois, and  $X := \{x \in p(F) : \text{Artin}_e(x) \in S\}$ . Suppose also  $j : q \rightarrow r$  and  $f = e \circ j$  is Galois. Then  $X$  can be Artin-defined via  $f$ , and  $\text{Meas}_e(X) = \text{Meas}_f(X)$ .

**Proof.** Say  $f$  is Galois with group  $G$ . By Lemma 3.3, it is immediate that  $j$  is Galois with group  $J := \{g \in G : j(y) = j(gy)\}$ , and  $G/J \cong H$  via the map  $\nu : G \rightarrow H$  by  $j(gy) = \nu(g)j(y)$ .

Now we may suppose that  $S$  is a single conjugacy class of  $H$ : say  $S = h_0^H$ . Then  $\nu^{-1}(S) = g_0^G J$ , for some  $g_0 \in \nu^{-1}\{h_0\}$ . I claim that  $X = \{x \in p(F) : \text{Artin}_f(x) \in g_0^G J\}$ . First suppose that  $x \in p(F)$  and  $\text{Artin}_f(x) \in g_0^G J$ . Then there is  $z \in f^{-1}\{x\}$  where  $\sigma(z) = g_0(z)$ . Applying  $j$  we find that  $j(\sigma(z)) = h_0 j(z)$  and so  $\sigma(j(z)) = h_0 j(z)$ , and thus  $j(z)$  witnesses that  $\text{Artin}_e(x) \in h_0^H$ .

Conversely suppose  $x \in X$  and  $y \in e^{-1}\{x\}$  where  $\sigma(y) = h_0(y)$ . Then pick  $z \in j^{-1}\{y\}$ . Then  $\sigma(z) \in j^{-1}\{h_0 y\}$ , and thus  $\sigma(z) \in g_0 J j^{-1}\{y\}$ , so  $\sigma(z) = g_0 a b z$  for some  $a, b \in J$  and thus  $\text{Artin}_f(x) \in g_0^G J$ .

$$\text{Then } \text{Meas}_f(X) = \frac{|g_0^G J|}{|G|} = \frac{|h_0^H| \cdot |J|}{|H| \cdot |J|} = \frac{|h_0^H|}{|H|} = \text{Meas}_e(X). \quad \blacksquare$$

Now we show that  $\text{Meas}(X)$  is well-defined.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Suppose that  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  and  $e : r \rightarrow_J p$  are Galois and  $X = \{x \in p(F) : \text{Artin}_q(x) \in S\} = \{x \in p(F) : \text{Artin}_r(x) \in T\}$  where  $S \subseteq G$  and  $T \subseteq J$ . Then  $\text{Meas}_q(X) = \text{Meas}_r(X)$ .*

**Proof.** This straightforward. First we replace  $q$  by  $\text{tp}(f(y), y)$  for  $y \models q$ , and  $f$  by projection on to the first co-ordinate, and similarly for  $e$  and  $r$ . Now we take a common Galois cover of  $q$  and  $r$ : let  $s := \text{tp}(x, f^{-1}\{x\}, e^{-1}\{x\})$ , and define  $\alpha : s \rightarrow q$  by projection onto the first two co-ordinates,  $\beta : s \rightarrow r$  by projection onto the first and  $(n+2)$ nd co-ordinates (where  $n = |f^{-1}\{x\}|$ ), and  $\gamma : s \rightarrow p$  by projection onto the first co-ordinate. Then  $\gamma = f \circ \alpha = e \circ \beta$  is Galois. Then by the previous lemma,  $X$  is definable via  $\gamma$  and  $\text{Meas}_f(X) = \text{Meas}_\gamma(X) = \text{Meas}_e(X)$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 6 Measure, finite additivity, and definable maps

We want to show that  $\text{Meas}$  is well-behaved under finite disjoint unions. The case where  $X$  and  $Y$  are given by different Artin-sets under the same Galois map is trivial:  $\text{Meas}(X \sqcup Y) = \frac{|S|+|T|}{|G|}$ . To reduce to this case, given  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  and  $e : r \rightarrow_J p$  defining  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively, we simply take a common Galois cover:  $s := \text{tp}(x, f^{-1}\{x\}, e^{-1}\{x\})$ , and  $g : s \rightarrow_G p$  by projection onto the first co-ordinate.

We now need to show that  $\text{Meas}$  is well-behaved under definable maps.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Suppose that  $q$  and  $p$  are complete  $L$ -types over  $k \subset F$ , and  $\alpha : q \rightarrow p$  is an  $L$ -definable finite-to-1 map over  $k$ . Suppose  $X$  is an Artin-definable (over  $k$ ) subset of  $q(F)$ , and  $\alpha \upharpoonright_X$  is  $l$ -to-1. Set  $Y := \alpha(X)$ . Then  $l = \frac{\text{Meas}(X)}{\text{Meas}(Y)}$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose  $X$  is defined via  $\beta : s \rightarrow q$ . Then define

$$r := \text{tp}(y, \alpha^{-1}\{y\}, \beta^{-1}\{\alpha^{-1}\{y\}\})$$

Then, we replace  $q$  with  $\text{tp}(\alpha(x), x)$  for  $x \models q$ , and  $\alpha$  with projection on to the first co-ordinate. Let  $e : r \rightarrow q$  be projection on to the first two co-ordinates, and  $f : r \rightarrow p$  be projection on to the first co-ordinate. Then  $f = \alpha \circ e$ .

Moreover  $f$  is Galois with group  $G$  say, and as noted previously, setting  $H := \{h \in G : e(z) = e(hz) \text{ for } z \in q\}$ , we find that  $e$  is Galois with group  $H$ . Further  $X$  can be defined via  $e$ . Say  $X = \{x \in q(F) : \text{Artin}_e(x) \in S\}$ . For the moment we will deal with the case that  $S$  is a single conjugacy class of  $H$ , say  $S = g_0^H$ .

Also we find that  $Y = \{y \in p(F) : \text{Artin}_f(y) \in g_0^G\}$ : if  $x \in X$  then there is  $z \in e^{-1}\{x\}$  where  $\sigma(z) = g_0(z)$ , and thus there is  $z \in f^{-1}\{\alpha(x)\}$  where  $\sigma(z) = g_0(z)$ , and thus  $\text{Artin}_f(\alpha(x)) \in g_0^G$ ; conversely if  $\text{Artin}_f(y) \in g_0^G$  then there is  $z \in f^{-1}\{y\}$  where  $\sigma(z) = g_0(z)$ , and as  $g_0 \in H$  we have  $e(g_0z) = e(z) = x$ , say, so  $x \in X$  and  $y = \alpha(x)$ , and so  $y \in Y$ .

Now set  $A := \{a \models q : \sigma(a) = g_0(a)\}$ . Then  $e(A) = X$  since if  $\sigma(a) = g_0(a)$  then  $e(\sigma(a)) = e(g_0(a))$ , and  $\sigma(e(a)) = e(a)$ , so  $e(a) \in q(F)$ . Also if  $y \in e(A)$  then clearly  $\text{Artin}_e(y) \in g_0^H$ .

Similarly  $f(A) = Y$ . Moreover  $e \upharpoonright_A$  has fibres of size  $|C_H(g_0)|$ : for  $a, b \in A$ , we have  $e(a) = e(b)$  if and only if  $b = g(a)$  for some  $g \in H$ . Also for  $a, b \in A$  we have  $g_0(a) = \sigma(a)$  and  $g_0(b) = \sigma(b)$ . So  $g_0(g(a)) = \sigma(g(a)) = g(\sigma(a)) = g(g_0(a))$ . Thus by regularity  $gg_0 = g_0g$ , and  $g \in C_H(g_0)$ .

Similarly  $f \upharpoonright_A$  has fibres of size  $|C_G(g_0)|$ , and therefore  $\alpha \upharpoonright_X$  has fibres of size  $\frac{|C_G(g_0)|}{|C_H(g_0)|} = \frac{|g_0^H|}{|H|} \cdot \frac{|G|}{|g_0^G|} = \frac{\text{Meas}(X)}{\text{Meas}(Y)}$  as required.

Now we turn to the case where  $S$  is a union of conjugacy classes of  $H$ . First we decompose  $Y$  into sets defined by single conjugacy classes of  $G$ . Say  $Y = Y_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup Y_n$ . Then decompose  $X = X_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup X_n$ , where  $X_i = X \cap \alpha^{-1}(Y_i)$ , and for each  $X_i$  we again decompose it into sets defined by a single conjugacy class of  $H$ : say  $X_i = X_{i1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup X_{im(i)}$ . Then for each  $X_{ij}$  the above gives us that  $\alpha \upharpoonright_{X_{ij}}$  is  $\frac{\text{Meas}(X_{ij})}{\text{Meas}(Y_i)}$ -to-1. Hence  $\alpha \upharpoonright_{X_i}$  is  $\frac{\sum_j \text{Meas}(X_{ij})}{\text{Meas}(Y_i)}$ -to-1, that is to say  $\frac{\text{Meas}(X_i)}{\text{Meas}(Y_i)}$ -to-1. Moreover as the  $Y_i$  are disjoint it follows that  $\text{Meas}(X_i) = l \cdot \text{Meas}(Y_i)$  for every  $i$ . Thus summing we find that  $\frac{\sum_i \text{Meas}(X_i)}{\sum_i \text{Meas}(Y_i)} = l$ , and so  $\frac{\text{Meas}(X)}{\text{Meas}(Y)} = l$  as required.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 6.2.** *Suppose now that  $\beta : p \rightarrow r$  is an  $L$ -definable map where the fibres have Morley degree 1. Suppose  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois, and  $X = \{x \in p(F) : \text{Artin}_f(x) \in S\}$ . Then  $\beta(X) = r(F)$  (hence this has measure 1) and the fibres of  $\beta \upharpoonright_X$  each have measure equal to  $\text{Meas}(X)$ .*

**Proof.** Given  $y \models r$ , put  $p_y := \alpha^{-1}\{y\}$ , and  $q_y := f^{-1}(p_y)$ , and  $f_y := f \upharpoonright_{q_y}$ . Then  $f_y : q_y \rightarrow_G p_y$  is Galois, and if  $y \in r(F)$  then the fibre of  $\alpha \upharpoonright_x$  above  $y$  is  $X_y = \{x \in p_y(F) : \text{Artin}_{f_y}(x) \in S\}$ , which has measure  $\frac{|S|}{|G|}$ .

Furthermore given  $y \in r(F)$ , the fibre  $p_y$  has Morley degree 1 by assumption. Hence for any  $g \in G$ , it must contain a solution of  $\sigma(x) = g(x)$  by the existential

closure of SMA (see Lemma 3.8 of [5]). ■

**Lemma 6.3.** *Suppose now that  $\gamma : p \rightarrow r$  is an  $L$ -definable map on stationary  $L$ -types all over  $k \subseteq F$ . Then there are  $q$ ,  $\alpha : p \rightarrow q$ , and  $\beta : q \rightarrow r$ , where  $\beta$  is finite-to-1,  $\alpha$  has fibres of Morley degree 1, and  $\gamma = \beta \circ \alpha$ .*

**Proof.** Given  $x \models r$ , define  $p_x := \gamma^{-1}\{x\}$ . Suppose that  $p_x^1$  is a component of  $p_x$  over  $\text{acl}_L(kx)$  of Morley degree 1. Let  $c := \text{Cb}(p_x^1)$ . By EI we may assume  $c \in M^m$ . Then let  $q := \text{tp}(c/k)$ . Clearly  $c \in \text{acl}(xk)$ , and so the result follows. ■

**Comment 6.4.** For any definable map  $\gamma : X \rightarrow p$  where  $X \subseteq q(F)$  is Artin-definable, and where  $\gamma, p, q$  are defined over  $k \subseteq F$ , there is  $\bar{\gamma} : q \rightarrow p$  where  $\bar{\gamma} \upharpoonright_X = \gamma$  since  $q \vdash \exists y(\gamma(x) = y)$ .

**Lemma 6.5.** *Suppose that  $q$  and  $p$  are complete  $L$ -types over  $A \subset F$ , and  $\alpha : q \rightarrow p$  is an  $L$ -definable map over  $A$ . Then there are  $\alpha : q \rightarrow r$  and  $\beta : r \rightarrow p$ , such that  $\beta \circ \alpha = f$ , and the fibres of  $\alpha$  have Morley degree 1, and  $\beta$  is finite-to-1.*

**Proof.** Let  $c$  be the canonical base of a component of  $f^{-1}\{x\}$ , and set  $r := \text{tp}(c/A)$ . By EI we may assume that  $c \in M$ . Then the result follows. ■

## 7 Extending measure to definable sets

We want to extend the measure to general definable sets. This will be routine using 4.3, but first we need the following lemma:

**Lemma 7.1.** *Suppose that  $p, q$  are complete stationary  $L$ -types over  $A \subseteq F$ , and  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  is Galois. Say  $X = \{x \in p(F) \mid \text{Artin}_q(x) \in S\}$ .*

*Let  $F \supseteq B \supseteq A$ , and let  $p', q'$  be the unique non-forking extensions of  $p$  and  $q$  respectively to  $B$ .*

*Then  $f \upharpoonright_{q'} : q' \rightarrow_G p'$  is Galois, and setting  $X' := X \cap p'(F)$ , we find that  $X' = \{x \in p'(F) \mid \text{Artin}_{q'}(x) \in S\}$ , and  $\text{Meas}(X') = \text{Meas}(X)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $x \models p'$ . Then  $x \downarrow_A^- B$ , say  $U(x/B) = U(x/A) = n$ . Also  $x \models p$ , so let  $y \in f^{-1}\{x\}$ . Then  $U(xy/B) = U(x/B) + U(y/B) = U(y/Bx) + U(x/B)$ . But  $x$  and  $y$  are interalgebraic over  $A$  (and hence over  $B$ ), so  $U(x/Bx) = U(y/Bx) = 0$ . Thus  $U(y/B) = n$  and similarly  $U(y/A) = n$ , so  $y \downarrow_A^- B$ , and thus  $y \models q'$ .

Hence  $f^{-1}\{x\} \subseteq q'(M)$ , and so  $G$  acts on  $f \upharpoonright_{q'}$  exactly as for  $f$ . The result follows. ■

**Definition 7.2.** *Let  $D \subseteq F$  be an  $L$ -definable set over  $a \subseteq F$  in the  $L$ -structure  $F$ . By Proposition 4.10 and Lemma 3.17 of [5], we can suppose  $D$  is  $L_\sigma$ -definable in  $(M, \sigma)$ , say by  $\varphi(x, a) \wedge \exists y \psi(x, a, \sigma(y))$  where  $\sigma(y) := (y, \sigma(y), \sigma^2(y), \dots, \sigma^m(y))$  for some  $m$ , and  $\varphi(x, a)$  is the full partial  $L$ -type over*



$a$  implied by  $D$ , and  $M \models \psi(x, a, \bar{z}) \rightarrow \bar{z} \in \text{acl}(xa)$ . Suppose  $\text{Md}(\varphi(x, a)) = n$ , then we can split  $\varphi(x, a)$  into  $\varphi_1(x, b), \dots, \varphi_n(x, b)$  over  $A := \text{acl}(a)$ , each of degree 1.

We can write  $D_i := \varphi_i(M, b) \wedge \exists y \psi(x, a, \overline{\sigma(y)})$ . Then by 4.3  $D_i$  is (up to a set of lower rank) a finite union of Artin-definable sets. We define the measure of  $D_i$  and then  $D$  by additivity. This is well-defined by 7.1.

It is straightforward to check that the behaviour under definable maps and disjoint unions carries across to this.

**Lemma 7.3.** *Given an  $L$ -formula  $\theta(x, y, a)$  to be interpreted in the  $L$ -structure  $F$ , there are finitely many dimension/measure pairs  $(d, \mu)$  which the family of sets  $\theta(F, b, a)$  take as  $b$  varies in  $F$ .*

**Proof.** As in the definition above, we parse this in  $(M, \sigma)$  as a finite disjunction of sets of the form  $\varphi(x, y, a) \wedge \exists z \psi(x, y, a, \overline{\sigma(z)})$ , where  $\text{Md}(\varphi(x, y, a)) = \text{Md}(\psi(x, y, a, \bar{w})) = 1$ . Bearing in mind Comment 4.1 above, it is enough to observe that for each such formula, as  $(c, b, a, \bar{d}) \models \psi$  varies,  $\text{Mult}(\bar{d}/abc)$  is bounded (by compactness). Thus there is a bound on the size of the Galois groups, and hence there are only finitely many possible Artin classes, and thus measures, to consider. ■

**Lemma 7.4.** *Given an  $L$ -formula  $\theta(x, y, a)$  to be interpreted in the  $L$ -structure  $F$ , for each dimension/measure pair  $(d, \mu)$  there is an  $L$ -formula  $\delta_{(d, \mu)}(x, a)$  which defines the set of  $b$  such that  $(\text{Dim}, \text{Meas})(\theta(x, b, a)) = (d, \mu)$ .*

**Proof.** Again we consider  $\theta$  as  $\varphi(x, y, a) \wedge \exists z \psi(x, y, a, \overline{\sigma(z)})$ . By the definability of types, we may define those  $b$  for which  $\varphi(x, b, a)$  and  $\psi(x, b, a, \bar{w})$  complete to specific stationary  $L$ -types in  $M$   $p(x)$  and  $q(x, \bar{w})$  respectively. Then for each Galois map  $f : q \rightarrow p$ , by Lemma 7.3 above, there are only finitely many Artin-classes to consider, and the result follows from the relative definability of Artin-sets as remarked after 4.1 above. ■

## 8 Galois Maps and DMP

In this section we present a result of Hasson and Hrushovski, see Lemma 3.3 of [4]: loosely, a strongly minimal set has DMP if and only if for Galois maps, being automorphic is a definable property. We drop our standing assumptions, now  $M \models T$  is strongly minimal with QE.

Given  $f : q \rightarrow_G p$  Galois over  $a$ , and  $b \models p$ , let

$$A := \{\alpha \upharpoonright_{f^{-1}\{b\}} : \alpha \in \text{Aut}(M/b)\}$$

Then of course  $A \leq G^{\text{op}}$ .

**Lemma 8.1.** *If  $p$  is stationary, then  $\text{Md}(q) = |G : A|$ .*

**Proof.** Say  $\text{Md}(q) = n$ , and  $q_1(y, ac), \dots, q_n(y, ac)$  are the nonforking extensions. We define a map  $(G^{\text{op}} : A) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  by  $gA \mapsto i$  where  $g(q_1) = q_i$ . Notice that this is well-defined: if  $d, d' \models q_1$ , then there is  $a \in A$  where  $a(d_1) = d_2$ .

We show that this is a bijection. Pick  $b \models p$  independent over  $c$ . Then, as  $p$  is stationary,  $f^{-1}\{b\}$  must contain  $d_i \models q_i$  for each  $i$ . Say  $\beta_i \in G^{\text{op}}$  is such that  $\beta_i(d_1) = d_i$ . Then  $\beta_i \circ \beta_j^{-1}(d_j) = d_i$  and thus  $\beta_i \circ \beta_j^{-1} \notin A$ , and so  $|G : A| \geq n$ .

Conversely suppose  $g^{-1}h \in A$ . Then there is  $a \in A$  such that  $g^{-1}h(d_1) = a(d_1)$ , and of course  $a(d_1) \models q_1$  so  $h(d_1) = g(a(d_1))$ , and  $h(q_1) = g(q_1)$ . ■

**Definition 8.2.** A Galois map is *automorphic* if  $A = G^{\text{op}}$ .

**Theorem 8.3** (Hasson, Hrushovski, [4]). *T has the DMP if and only if being automorphic is definable, in the following sense:*

*if  $f_a : q_a \rightarrow_G p_a$  is an automorphic Galois map, then there is  $\varphi \in \text{tp}(a)$  such that whenever  $a' \models \varphi$  then  $f_{a'} : q_{a'} \rightarrow_G p_{a'}$  is automorphic too.*

**Proof.** Suppose  $\theta(\bar{x}, a)$  is a strongly minimal formula. Without loss of generality, we'll assume for generic  $\bar{b} \models \theta$ , that  $\text{MR}(b_1/a) = 1$  and  $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}(b_1 a)$ . Then define  $f : \theta(M^n, a) \rightarrow M$  by projection on to the first co-ordinate. Then pick  $c \in M$  generic over  $a$ , and let  $q_a := \text{tp}(f^{-1}\{c\}/a)$ , and  $p_a$  be the generic 1-type in  $M$  over  $a$ . As  $q_a$  is interdefinable with the generic type of  $\theta$  over  $a$ , it is stationary over  $a$ . Thus  $f_a : q_a \rightarrow_G p_a$  is automorphic.

If automorphicity is definable, then there is  $\varphi \in \text{tp}(a)$  which defines this. Thus for any  $a' \models \varphi$ , we have  $q_{a'}$  is stationary over  $a'$ , and so the generic type of  $\theta(\bar{x}, a')$  is stationary over  $a'$ , and thus  $\theta(\bar{x}, a')$  is strongly minimal.

Conversely if automorphicity is not definable, then we assume that  $f_a : q_a \rightarrow_G p_a$  is a counterexample to this. So for any  $\varphi \in \text{tp}(a)$  there exists  $a' \models \varphi$  such that  $f_{a'} : q_{a'} \rightarrow_G p_{a'}$  is not automorphic, and thus  $q_{a'}$  is not stationary, and so the generic type of  $\theta(\bar{x}, a')$  is not stationary, and thus  $\theta(\bar{x}, a')$  is not strongly minimal. ■

## References

- [1] H. D. Macpherson, R. Elwes A Survey Of Asymptotic Classes and Measurable Structures in *Model Theory with Applications to Algebra and Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- [2] E. Hrushovski, Pseudo-finite fields and related structures, in *Model theory and Applications*, Quaderni di Matematica Volume 11
- [3] E. Hrushovski, Groupoids, Imaginaries and Internal Covers, arXiv:math.LO/0603413

- [4] A. Hasson, E.Hrushovski DMP in Strongly Minimal Structures, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, to appear
- [5] A. Pillay, Lecture notes on strongly minimal sets (and fields) with a generic automorphism, Unpublished, 2005