# **Distal NIP theories**

P. Simon

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆∃▶ ◆∃▶ = のへで

## **NIP** Theories

### Definition

A formula  $\phi(x; y)$  has the independence property if one can find some infinite set *B* such that for every  $C \subset B$ , there is  $y_C$  such that for  $x \in B$ ,

$$\phi(x;y_C)\iff x\in C.$$

A theory is NIP if no formula has the independence property.

# **NIP** Theories

## Definition

A formula  $\phi(x; y)$  has the independence property if one can find some infinite set *B* such that for every  $C \subset B$ , there is  $y_C$  such that for  $x \in B$ ,

$$\phi(x;y_C)\iff x\in C.$$

A theory is NIP if no formula has the independence property.

### Example

- Stable theories,
- o-minimal,
- ▶  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ ,
- ACVF

"Our thesis is that the picture of dependent theories is the combination of the one for stable theories and the one for the theory of dense linear orders or trees." (Shelah)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

"Our thesis is that the picture of dependent theories is the combination of the one for stable theories and the one for the theory of dense linear orders or trees." (Shelah)

It seems reasonable to look for 'stable parts' and 'order-controlled parts' of NIP structures or of types in them.

As it is not clear what a 'stable part' is, we aim first at defining its negation.

Question

What is a totally unstable NIP structure ?



As it is not clear what a 'stable part' is, we aim first at defining its negation.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Question What is a totally unstable NIP structure ?

Example

- o-minimal,
- ▶ ℚ<sub>p</sub>.

A global *M*-invariant type is *generically stable* if p is definable and finitely satisfiable in *M*.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Equivalently its Morley sequence  $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$  is totally indiscernible.

A global *M*-invariant type is *generically stable* if p is definable and finitely satisfiable in *M*.

Equivalently its Morley sequence  $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$  is totally indiscernible.

There is an equivalence :

- There are no (non-realized) generically stable types,
- ► There are no (non-constant) totally indiscernible sequences.

A global *M*-invariant type is *generically stable* if p is definable and finitely satisfiable in *M*.

Equivalently its Morley sequence  $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$  is totally indiscernible.

There is an equivalence :

- There are no (non-realized) generically stable types,
- ► There are no (non-constant) totally indiscernible sequences.

<u>Problem</u> : This condition is not stable under going from M to  $M^{eq}$ .

The indiscernible sequence  $I = I_1 + I_2 + I_3$  is *distal* if whenever

$$egin{array}{cccc} I_1+&a&+I_2&&+I_3\ I_1&&+I_2+&b&+I_3 \end{array} 
ight\}$$
 are indiscernible,

Then

$$I_1 + a + I_2 + b + I_3$$
 is indiscernible.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆∃▶ ◆∃▶ = のへで

The indiscernible sequence  $I = I_1 + I_2 + I_3$  is *distal* if whenever

$$egin{array}{cccc} I_1+&a&+I_2&&+I_3\ I_1&&+I_2+&b&+I_3 \end{array} 
ight\}$$
 are indiscernible,

Then

$$I_1 + a + I_2 + b + I_3$$
 is indiscernible.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

#### Definition

The theory T is distal if all indiscernible sequences are distal.

#### Remark

T is distal if and only if  $T^{eq}$  is distal.

#### Theorem

(T is NIP) The following are equivalent:

- T is distal,
- ► For any two invariant types p<sub>x</sub> and q<sub>y</sub>, if p<sub>x</sub> ⊗ q<sub>y</sub> = q<sub>y</sub> ⊗ p<sub>x</sub>, then p<sub>x</sub> and q<sub>y</sub> are orthogonal,

All generically stable measures are smooth.

#### Theorem

(T is NIP) The following are equivalent:

- T is distal,
- ► For any two invariant types p<sub>x</sub> and q<sub>y</sub>, if p<sub>x</sub> ⊗ q<sub>y</sub> = q<sub>y</sub> ⊗ p<sub>x</sub>, then p<sub>x</sub> and q<sub>y</sub> are orthogonal,
- All generically stable measures are smooth.

#### Theorem

It is enough to check any one of these conditions in dimension 1.

## Example

O-minimal theories and the p-adics are distal.

Let M be  $|T|^+$ -saturated, one can define a relation

 $a\downarrow^s_M b$ 

such that:



Let M be  $|T|^+$ -saturated, one can define a relation

 $a\downarrow^s_M b$ 

▲□▶▲圖▶▲圖▶▲圖▶ 圖 めへぐ

such that:

$$- a \downarrow^s_M b \iff b \downarrow^s_M a$$
,

Let *M* be  $|\mathcal{T}|^+$ -saturated, one can define a relation

 $a\downarrow^s_M b$ 

such that:

$$\begin{array}{l} - a \downarrow_M^s b \iff b \downarrow_M^s a, \\ - \text{ if } p = \operatorname{tp}(a/M) \text{ and } q = \operatorname{tp}(b/M) \text{ commute, then} \\ a \downarrow_M^s b \text{ iff } tp(a, b/M) = p \otimes q, \end{array}$$

▲□▶▲圖▶▲圖▶▲圖▶ 圖 めへぐ

Let *M* be  $|\mathcal{T}|^+$ -saturated, one can define a relation

 $a\downarrow^s_M b$ 

such that:

$$\begin{array}{l} -a \downarrow_{M}^{s} b \iff b \downarrow_{M}^{s} a, \\ -\text{ if } p = \operatorname{tp}(a/M) \text{ and } q = \operatorname{tp}(b/M) \text{ commute, then} \\ a \downarrow_{M}^{s} b \text{ iff } tp(a, b/M) = p \otimes q, \\ -\text{ if } tp(a/bM) \text{ is non-forking over } M, \text{ then } a \downarrow_{M}^{s} b, \end{array}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆∃▶ ◆∃▶ = のへで

Let *M* be  $|\mathcal{T}|^+$ -saturated, one can define a relation

 $a\downarrow^s_M b$ 

such that:

$$\begin{array}{l} - a \downarrow_{M}^{s} b \iff b \downarrow_{M}^{s} a, \\ - \text{ if } p = \operatorname{tp}(a/M) \text{ and } q = \operatorname{tp}(b/M) \text{ commute, then} \\ a \downarrow_{M}^{s} b \text{ iff } tp(a, b/M) = p \otimes q, \end{array}$$

- if 
$$tp(a/bM)$$
 is non-forking over  $M$ , then  $a \downarrow_M^s b$ ,

▲□▶▲圖▶▲圖▶▲圖▶ 圖 めへぐ

$$-\downarrow_M^s$$
 has bounded weight.

Let *M* be  $|T|^+$ -saturated, one can define a relation

 $a\downarrow^s_M b$ 

such that:

- 
$$a \downarrow_M^s b \iff b \downarrow_M^s a$$
,  
- if  $p = \operatorname{tp}(a/M)$  and  $q = \operatorname{tp}(b/M)$  commute, then  
 $a \downarrow_M^s b$  iff  $tp(a, b/M) = p \otimes q$ ,  
- if  $tp(a/bM)$  is non-forking over  $M$ , then  $a \downarrow_M^s b$ ,  
-  $\downarrow_M^s$  has bounded weight.

For stable theories, it gives the usual non-forking relation. For distal theories, it is a trivial notion.

#### Theorem

Assume that  $I_1 + I_2 + I_3$  is an indiscernible sequence and  $I_1 + I_3$  is indiscernible over A. Let  $\phi(x) \in L(A)$ , then

$$\{b \in I_2 : \models \phi(b)\}$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

is finite or co-finite in  $I_2$ .

Thank you.