

VC-DENSITY CALCULATIONS IN PAIRS OF ORDERED VECTOR SPACES

AYHAN GÜNAYDIN AND EBRU NAYİR

ABSTRACT. We show that the VC-density of any formula in a pair of divisible ordered abelian groups is bounded by the number of parameter variables.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study pairs of divisible ordered abelian groups focusing on VC-densities of formulas. The concept of VC-dimension is defined in the context of statistical learning by Vapnik and Chervonenkis; hence the acronym VC. A dichotomy result proved independently by Sauer (in [8]) and Shelah (in [9]) allows us to define VC-density. We do not define neither the VC-dimension nor the VC-density; we refer the reader to the first of the pair of seminal papers [2] and [1].

Let A be a divisible ordered abelian group and B a dense divisible subgroup of A . We may consider A and B as structures in the language $L_{\text{oag}} := \{+, -, <, 0, 1\}$ of ordered abelian groups with a distinguished positive element by interpreting the constant 1 as a positive element of B . That way, B becomes an L_{oag} -substructure of A . Also let $L_{\text{oag}}^d := L_{\text{oag}} \cup \{U\}$ be the enrichment of L_{oag} by a unary relation symbol U . Letting (A, B) denote the L_{oag}^d -structure where U is interpreted as B , our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *The VC-density in (A, B) of a partitioned L_{oag}^d -formula $\phi(x; y)$ is at most $|y|$.*

The paper [2] relates ‘uniform definability of types over finite sets’ as defined by Guingona in [7] with VC-density; we restate this relation in the last section as Theorem 4.4. Using that result, we may afford not to get into the details of VC-theory and simply prove a stronger result on definability of types.

Divisible ordered abelian groups are nothing other than ordered vector spaces over \mathbb{Q} . Our proof generalizes very easily to dense pairs of ordered vector spaces over a fixed ordered field K . Putting this together with the previous paragraph, what we actually prove is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *The theory of dense pairs of ordered vector spaces over an ordered field K has the VC 1 property.*

The VC 1 property is a stronger version of uniform definability of types over finite sets; we introduce it in the last section of the paper, along with some known results about it.

We recall the definition of *dense pair of o-minimal structures* from [4] in Section 3. In that section, we also mention some facts on dense pairs of o-minimal structures. One of those results is that subsets of the smaller o-minimal structure that are definable in the pair are traces of definable subsets of the larger o-minimal structure. More precisely for every $X \subset N^n$ that is definable in the dense pair $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$, there is $Y \subseteq M^n$ definable in \mathcal{M} such that $X = Y \cap N^n$. We improve this result to a version that works for families of definable sets in the case of pairs of ordered vector spaces. In order to state that result, let V be an ordered vector space over an ordered field K and let W be a dense subspace. We consider (V, W) as a structure in the language expanding the language of ordered vector spaces over K augmented by a unary relation symbol. Our result is as follows.

Proposition 1.3. *Let $X \subseteq V^{n+l}$ be definable in (V, W) such that for any $t \in V^l$, the section X_t is contained in W^n . Then there are subsets S_1, \dots, S_k of V^{n+l} that are definable in the vector space V such that for each $t \in V^l$, there is $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ with $X_t = S_{i,t} \cap W^n$.*

Notations and Conventions. The set \mathbb{N} of natural numbers contains 0 and $\mathbb{N}_+ = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. We let the letters m, n, k, l vary in \mathbb{Z} , and if m is in \mathbb{N} (or \mathbb{N}_+), we simply write $m \geq 0$ (or $m > 0$).

We let the letters x, y, z denote tuples of variables, possibly with some decorations. In the same way, we do not use separate notations for elements and tuples of elements of sets. We make sure that this does not cause any confusion. One way to do so is to express lengths of tuples by the absolute value notation.

2. SEMILINEAR GEOMETRY

Our main interest is in the dense pairs of divisible ordered abelian groups, but all our arguments go through without any hassle for dense pairs of ordered vector spaces over an ordered field K . So we work in that setting.

We let L_{ovs} denote the language

$$\{+, -, 0, 1, <\} \cup \{\ell_\lambda : \lambda \in K\},$$

and T_{ovs} is the L_{ovs} -theory of ordered vector spaces over K with a distinguished positive element 1. We generally write λx in the place of $\ell_\lambda(x)$. Also, letting $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in K^n$, we use the dot-product notation $\lambda \cdot x$ or simply λx to denote $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$.

Fix a model V of T_{ovs} . Before proving some results on sets definable in V , we recall some well-known results on them; we refer the reader to the last section of Chapter 1 in van den Dries' book ([5]) for the details. (There,

the language does not contain 1, but that is immaterial for our discussions here.) We use the dot-product notation for tuples of elements of V as well.

Sets definable in V are precisely the *semilinear sets*: they are formed as finite unions of sets of the form

$$(2.1) \quad \{v \in V^n : f_1(v) = \cdots = f_s(v) = 0, g_1(v) < 0, \dots, g_t(v) < 0\},$$

where $f_1, \dots, f_s, g_1, \dots, g_t$ are *affine functions*; that is they are functions $V^n \rightarrow V$ given as

$$x \mapsto a + \lambda x,$$

where $a \in V$ and $\lambda \in K^n$. This basically means that T_{ovs} has quantifier elimination in L_{ovs} .

Hence from now on, we refer to sets definable in V as semilinear sets. Similarly, *semilinear function* means ‘function definable in the ordered vector space V ’.

It is also well-known that semilinear functions are locally affine, in the sense that there is a decomposition of the domain into finitely many semilinear sets such that the function agrees with an affine function on each of those semilinear sets.

Let $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ be an affine function, say $f(x) = a + \lambda x$. Define

$$N_f := \{v \in V^n : f(v) = a\} = \{v \in V : \lambda v = 0\}$$

and

$$C_f := \{(\lambda_1 v, \lambda_2 v, \dots, \lambda_n v) : v \in V\}.$$

They are both semilinear subspaces of V^n and it is easy to see that they intersect trivially. Moreover, f is injective on C_f and $f(v) = f(w)$ if and only if $v - w \in N_f$.

We claim that $V^n = C_f + N_f$. This is clear if f is constant, so suppose that is it not. This amounts to the assumption that not all components of λ are 0. Let $\hat{f} : V^n \rightarrow V^n$ to be the linear function given by

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto (\alpha \lambda_1 (\lambda \cdot x), \dots, \alpha \lambda_n (\lambda \cdot x)),$$

where $\alpha = (\lambda_1^2 + \cdots + \lambda_n^2)^{-1}$. Note that $f(\hat{f}(v)) = f(v)$ for all $v \in V^n$, and the kernel and image of \hat{f} are N_f and C_f respectively. Now let $v \in V^n$ and put $w := \hat{f}(v)$. Then $w \in C_f$. Also $f(w) = f(\hat{f}(v)) = f(v)$ and hence $v - w \in N_f$. This proves that $V^n = C_f + N_f$ and thus $V^n = C_f \oplus N_f$.

For $k, l \geq 0$, we let ${}_k\pi : V^{k+l} \rightarrow V^k$ and $\pi_l : V^{k+l} \rightarrow V^l$ denote the projections onto the first k coordinates and the last l coordinates respectively. If $X \subseteq V^{k+l}$ and $t \in V^l$, then we let X_t denote the section of X over t . So $X_t = {}_k\pi(\pi_l^{-1}(t))$. For a function $f : V^{k+l} \rightarrow V$ and $t \in V^l$, we let $f_t : V^k \rightarrow V$ denote the function defined as $f_t(x) = f(x, t)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let W be a subspace of V , S a subset of V^n , and $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ an affine function. Then*

$$f(S \cap W^n) = f(C_f \cap W^n) \cap f(S).$$

Proof. Let $f(x) = a + \lambda x$ for some $a \in V$ and $\lambda \in K^n$.

Suppose that $b \in f(S \cap W^n)$, say $b = f(w)$ for some $w \in S \cap W^n$. It is clear that $b \in f(S)$. Since $V^n = C_f \oplus N_f$, $w = v_1 + v_2$ for some $v_1 \in C_f$, $v_2 \in N_f$. Then $v_1 = (\lambda_1 v_3, \dots, \lambda_n v_3)$ for some $v_3 \in V$. Since $f(w) = f(v_1)$, we get $\lambda w = \lambda v_1$. Therefore $v_3 \in W$ and $v_1 \in W^n$, and hence

$$b = f(w) = f(v_1) \in f(C_f \cap W^n).$$

For the converse inclusion, note that since $\widehat{f}(S) \subseteq C_f$ and f is injective on C_f we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(C_f \cap W^n) \cap f(S) &= f(C_f \cap W^n) \cap f(\widehat{f}(S)) \\ &= f(C_f \cap W^n \cap \widehat{f}(S)) \\ &= f(\widehat{f}(S) \cap W^n). \end{aligned}$$

Now let $b \in f(C_f \cap W^n) \cap f(S)$. So there is $w \in \widehat{f}(S) \cap W^n$ with $f(w) = b$. Say $w = \widehat{f}(s)$ for $s \in S$. Then $b = f(w) = f(\widehat{f}(s)) = f(s)$. As $w \in W^n$, we have $s \in W^n$. Therefore $b = f(s) \in f(S \cap W^n)$. \square

Corollary 2.2. *Let W be a subspace of V , S a subset of V^n , and $f : V^n \rightarrow V$ an affine function. Then*

$$f(S \cap W^n) = (f(0) + W) \cap f(S).$$

Proof. Just note that $f(\lambda_1 v, \dots, \lambda_n v) = f(0) + (\lambda_1^2 + \dots + \lambda_n^2)v$ and use the previous lemma. \square

Since semilinear maps are piecewise affine, we get the following consequence of the corollary above.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $S \subseteq V^{n+l}$ and $f : V^{n+l} \rightarrow V$ be semilinear. Then there are semilinear $T_1, \dots, T_r \subseteq V^{1+l}$ and affine $g_1, \dots, g_r : V^l \rightarrow V$ such that for every subspace W of V and $t \in V^l$ we have*

$$f_t(S_t \cap W^n) = \bigcup_{i=1}^r (g_i(t) + W) \cap T_{i,t}$$

Proof. Let $U_1, \dots, U_n \subseteq V^{n+l}$ be semilinear and $h_1, \dots, h_r : V^{n+l} \rightarrow V$ affine such that $V^{n+l} = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_r$ and $f|_{U_i} = h_i|_{U_i}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.

For $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ put $S_i := U_i \cap S$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(S_t \cap W^n) &= f_t\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^r S_{i,t} \cap W^n\right) \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^r f_t(S_{i,t} \cap W^n) \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^r h_{i,t}(S_{i,t} \cap W^n) \end{aligned}$$

Using Corollary 2.2, for all $t \in V^l$, we get

$$h_{i,t}(S_{i,t} \cap W^n) = (h_{i,t}(0) + W) \cap h_{i,t}(S_{i,t}).$$

Clearly, for each i , there is a semilinear set $T_i \subseteq V^{1+l}$ such that $T_{i,t} = h_{i,t}(S_{i,t})$ for all $t \in V^l$. Letting $g_i : V^l \rightarrow V$ be defined as $g_i(x) = h_i(0, x)$, we obtain the desired conclusion. \square

3. DENSE PAIRS OF O-MINIMAL STRUCTURES

Let $L \supseteq \{+, -, 0, 1, <\}$ be a language and T a complete o-minimal L -theory extending the theory of ordered abelian groups with a distinguished positive element 1. Let $L^d := L \cup \{U\}$, where U is a new unary relation symbol. A *dense pair* of models of T is an L^d -structure (\mathcal{M}, \dots, N) , where $\mathcal{M} \models T$, N is the universe of an L^d -structure \mathcal{N} , which is a proper elementary substructure of \mathcal{M} , and N is dense in M . We denote such a dense pair simply as $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$. Throughout this section, *definable* means ‘*definable in the L^d -structure $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ with parameters*’, and when we want to emphasize the parameters, say A , we write A -definable. In contrast with this, *L -definable* means *definable in the L -structure \mathcal{M} without parameters*, and to emphasize parameters we write $L(A)$ -definable. When L is L_{ovs} , we keep the terminology from the previous section and use ‘semilinear’ interchangeably with ‘ $L(M)$ -definable’.

It is clear that being a dense pair is expressible in L^d and it is shown in [4] that the L^d -theory of such pairs is indeed complete; we denote that theory by T^d . We get the following information on definable sets as byproducts of the proof of completeness.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ be a model of T^d .*

- (1) *Every \emptyset -definable subset of M^n can be defined by a boolean combination of formulas of the form*

$$\exists y_1 \cdots \exists y_m (U(y_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge U(y_m) \wedge \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m)),$$

where ϕ is an L -formula.

- (2) *A set $X \subseteq N^n$ is definable if and only if there is an $L(M)$ -definable subset S of M^n such that $X = S \cap N^n$.*

Below we prove a strengthening of the second part of this theorem for models of T_{ovs}^d ; namely a version that is uniform on definable families.

It is well-known that the definable closure in an o-minimal structure gives rise to a pregeometry; we denote it as dcl. We call the independence given by dcl, the dcl-*independence*.

Definition 3.2. Let $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and $(\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{N}')$ be two models of T^d and suppose that $(\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{N}') \subseteq (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$. We say that \mathcal{M}' and \mathcal{N}' are *free over \mathcal{N}'* in \mathcal{M} if any $X \subseteq M'$ that is dcl-independent (in \mathcal{M}) over N' remains dcl-independent over N .

The following criterion for being an elementary structure is Corollary 2.7 of [4].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and $(\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{N}')$ be models of T^d such that $(\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{N}')$ is a substructure of $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ and \mathcal{M}' and \mathcal{N}' are free over \mathcal{N}' in \mathcal{M} . Then $(\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{N}') \preceq (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$.*

The next result is proved in [6] in a more general setting than dense pairs of o-minimal structures.

Theorem 3.4 (Lemma 3.3 of [6]). *Let $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$ be model of T^d and let $X \subseteq M^{1+l}$ be definable. Then there are $m, n, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ there are*

- definable subsets $S_{i,1}, \dots, S_{i,p}$ of M^{n+l} such that $S_{i,j,t} \subseteq N^n$ for all $t \in M^l$,
- $L(M)$ -definable functions $h_{i,1}, \dots, h_{i,p} : M^{n+l} \rightarrow M$,
- a definable function $a_i : M^l \rightarrow M \cup \{\infty\}$,

such that for $t \in M^l$,

- i. $-\infty = a_0(t) \leq a_1(t) \leq \dots \leq a_m(t) = \infty$ is a decomposition of M , and
- ii. one of the following holds:
 - (a) $[a_{i-1}(t), a_i(t)] \cap X_t = V_{i,t}$ or
 - (b) $[a_{i-1}(t), a_i(t)] \cap X_t = (M \setminus V_{i,t}) \cap [a_{i-1}(t), a_i(t)]$,

where $V_{i,t} = \bigcup_{j=1}^p h_{i,j,t}(S_{i,j,t})$.

Now we focus on the case of ordered vector spaces; so T is T_{ovs} . We denote models of T_{ovs}^d as (V, W) . We first prove a version of the second part of Theorem 3.1 that takes the parameters into account.

Lemma 3.5. *Let (V, W) be a model of T_{ovs}^d and let $X \subseteq W^n$ be A -definable. Then $X = S \cap W^n$ for a semilinear set $S \subseteq V^n$ defined over A .*

Proof. Let $V' = \text{dcl}(A)$. Clearly, V' is a model of T_{ovs} and hence $V' \preceq V$. Put $W' = V' \cap W$. We also have $W' \preceq W$.

If $V' = W'$, then $V' \subseteq W$ and hence $A \subseteq W$. Then the conclusion easily follows from the first part of Theorem 3.1.

So we may assume $W' \neq V'$ and thus (V', W') is a model of T_{ovs}^d . Moreover by Theorem 3.3, we have $(V', W') \preceq (V, W)$. As $A \subseteq V'$, the set $X(V') := X \cap (V')^n$ is definable in (V', W') and $X(V') \subseteq (W')^n$.

Now applying part (2) of Theorem 3.1, there is a semilinear subset S' of $(V')^n$ such that

$$S' \cap (W')^n = X(V').$$

It is clear that S' is indeed $L_{\text{ovs}}(A)$ -definable. So let $\phi(x)$ be an $L_{\text{ovs}}(A)$ -formula defining S' and let S be the set defined in V by $\phi(x)$. Since $(V', W') \preceq (V, W)$, we get that

$$S \cap W^n = X.$$

□

The result below is the promised strengthening of part (2) of Theorem 3.1; it is Proposition 1.3 from the Introduction.

Proposition 3.6. *Let (V, W) be a model of T_{ovs}^d , and let $X \subseteq V^{n+l}$ be definable such that $X_t \subseteq W^n$ for any $t \in V^l$. Then there are semilinear sets $S_1, \dots, S_k \subseteq V^{n+l}$ such that for each $t \in V^l$, there is $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ with $X_t = S_{i,t} \cap W^n$.*

Proof. Suppose that X is A -definable and let y be a tuple of variables of length l . Given an $L_{\text{ovs}}(A)$ -definable $S \subseteq V^{n+l}$, let $\phi_S(y)$ denote the formula expressing $X_y \neq S_y \cap W^n$ and consider the following set of formulas:

$$\{\phi_S(y) : S \subseteq V^{n+l} \text{ is } L_{\text{ovs}}(A)\text{-definable}\}.$$

If the conclusion of the proposition does not hold, then this set is finitely satisfiable in (V, W) . Therefore there is an elementary extension (V^*, W^*) of (V, W) and $t^* \in (V^*)^n$ such that

$$X_{t^*}^* \neq S_{t^*}^* \cap (W^*)^n,$$

for any $L_{\text{ovs}}(A)$ -definable S , where X^* and S^* denote the realizations of X and S in (V^*, W^*) . However, applying Lemma 3.5 to $X_{t^*}^*$, there is an $L_{\text{ovs}}(A \cup \{t^*\})$ -definable set $T \subseteq V^n$ such that $X_{t^*}^* = T \cap (W^*)^n$ and such a T is of the form $S_{t^*}^*$ for some $L_{\text{ovs}}(A)$ -definable $S \subseteq (V^*)^{n+l}$. This contradiction finishes the proof. □

Remark. Note that it follows from this proof that the semilinear sets as in the statement are $L(A)$ -definable, provided that X is A -definable. Also we have $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^r X \cap S_i$.

Theorem 3.7. *Let (V, W) be a model of T_{ovs}^d . Let $h : V^{n+l} \rightarrow V$ be semilinear and $X \subseteq V^{n+l}$ definable such that $X_t \subseteq W^n$ for each $t \in V^l$.*

Then there are affine functions $g_1, \dots, g_q : V^l \rightarrow V$ and semilinear sets $T_1, \dots, T_q \subseteq V^{1+l}$ such that for each $t \in V^l$ we have

$$h_t(X_t) = \bigcup_{k=1}^q (g_k(t) + W) \cap T_{k,t}.$$

Proof. Let $S_1, \dots, S_k \subseteq V^{n+l}$ be as in Proposition 3.6. Then

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^k X \cap S_i$$

and hence for all $t \in V^l$, we have

$$X_t = \bigcup_{i=1}^k X_t \cap S_{i,t} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k S_{i,t} \cap W^n.$$

Therefore using Proposition 2.3, we get

$$h_t(X_t) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k h_t(S_{i,t} \cap W^n) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \bigcup_{j=1}^{r_j} (g_{ij}(t) + W) \cap T_{i,j,t}.$$

for some affine g_{i1}, \dots, g_{ir_i} and semilinear $T_{i,1}, \dots, T_{i,r_i}$.

After an appropriate re-indexing, we get the desired result. \square

Using this theorem, we may write the sets $V_{i,t}$ as in Theorem 3.4 as a finite union of cosets of N intersect some semilinear sets. Applying cell decomposition to those semilinear sets and refining the sequence $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_m$ suitably, we get the following.

Corollary 3.8. *Let (V, W) be a model of T_{ovs}^d and let $X \subseteq V^{1+l}$ be definable. Then there are $m, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ there are*

- *semilinear functions $g_{i,1}, \dots, g_{i,p} : V^l \rightarrow V$,*
- *a definable function $a_i : V^l \rightarrow V \cup \{\infty\}$,*

such that for $t \in V^l$,

- i. *$-\infty = a_0(t) \leq a_1(t) \leq \dots \leq a_m(t) = \infty$ is a decomposition of V , and*
- ii. *for each i , one of the following holds:*
 - (a) *$[a_{i-1}(t), a_i(t)] \cap X_t = [a_{i-1}(t), a_i(t)] \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^p g_{i,j}(t) + W$ or*
 - (b) *$[a_{i-1}(t), a_i(t)] \cap X_t = [a_{i-1}(t), a_i(t)] \cap (V \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^p g_{i,j}(t) + W)$.*

4. UDTFS AND VC-DENSITY

The concept of ‘uniform definability of types over finite sets’ is introduced in [7]. The definition below is a variant of the original definition as it appears in [2]. Below \mathcal{M} is a structure in a language L and its theory is denoted by T . We deal with *partitioned L -formulas* $\phi(x; y)$, which means that the set of free variables of ϕ are partitioned into two: *object variables* $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and *parameter variables* $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$.

Let $\Delta(x; y)$ be a finite set of partitioned L -formulas; let $m = |x|$ and $n = |y|$. Given a subset $B \subseteq M^n$, a set of L -formulas that are either of the form $\phi(x; b)$ or of the form $\neg\phi(x; b)$, where $\phi \in \Delta$ and $b \in B$ is called a Δ -type over B if it is maximally consistent in T . (In many sources this is called a *complete* Δ -type.) We denote the set of Δ -types over B as $S^\Delta(B)$.

Definition 4.1. A finite set $\Delta(x; y)$ has *uniform definability of types over finite sets (UDTFS) with d parameters (in \mathcal{M})* if there are collections

$$(\phi^1(y, y_1, \dots, y_d))_{\phi \in \Delta}, \dots, (\phi^r(y, y_1, \dots, y_d))_{\phi \in \Delta}$$

such that for every finite $B \subseteq M^n$ and $p \in S^\Delta(B)$ there are $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $b_1, \dots, b_d \in B$ such that for every $b \in B$

$$\phi(x, b) \in p \iff \mathcal{M} \models \phi^i(b, b_1, \dots, b_d).$$

The collections $(\phi^1(y, y_1, \dots, y_d))_{\phi \in \Delta}, \dots, (\phi^r(y, y_1, \dots, y_d))_{\phi \in \Delta}$ as in this definition are said to *define* Δ .

It is shown in [3] that in any structure with NIP, every singleton $\{\phi(x; y)\}$ has UDTFS with d parameters for some d . So the same holds for any dense pair (V, W) of models of T_{ovs} . We are aiming to show that in such a pair, any finite $\Delta(x; y)$ with a single object variable actually has UDTFS with a single parameter. While doing this, we use a few results from [2]. We start with the following, which is Corollary 5.6 in [2].

Theorem 4.2. *Let Φ be a set of partitioned formulas in a single object variable x such that*

- *every partitioned formula with object variable x is equivalent in T to a Boolean combination of formulas from Φ .*
- *every finite subset of Φ has UDTFS with d parameters.*

Then every finite set of L -formulas with a single object variable has UDTFS with d parameters.

In [2], a structure satisfying the conclusion of this theorem is said to have the *VC d property*; we will be using this terminology as well. Another result from [2] is that every weakly o-minimal structure has VC 1 property; Theorem 6.1. In particular, any model of T_{ovs} has VC 1 property. The proof of that theorem can be modified in a trivial way to give a proof of a slight generalization as follows.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{M} = (M, <, \dots)$ be an expansion of a dense linear order $(M, <)$. Let Φ be a set of partitioned formulas with single object variable x such that for every $\phi(x; y) \in \Phi$, there is $N_\phi \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $b \in M^{|y|}$, the definable set $\phi(\mathcal{M}, b)$ is a union of at most N_ϕ many singletons and open intervals. Then every finite subset of Φ has UDTFS with a single variable in \mathcal{M} .*

The main reason we are interested in UDTFS is its relations with VC-density. As declared in the Introduction, we do not get into the details of VC-density and we refer the reader to [2]; we simply rely on the following.

Theorem 4.4 (Corollary 5.8 of [2]). *Suppose that \mathcal{M} has VC 1 property. Then the VC-density of every formula $\phi(x, y)$ is bounded by $|y|$.*

In this theorem, x is of arbitrary length. Also this bound is best in some sense; namely we cannot hope to find a smaller bound on the VC-densities of *all* formulas with fixed parameter variable.

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.2, and Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of this result combined with Theorem 4.4 above.

Theorem 4.5. *Any model (V, W) of T_{ovs}^d has VC 1 property.*

Proof. Let x be a single variable. Let Φ_1 be the collection of partitioned L_{ovs}^d -formulas of the form $f(y) < x < g(y)$, where y is a tuple of variables and f and g are functions definable in the pair (V, W) . Also let Φ_2 be the set of L_{ovs}^d -formulas of the form $U(x - g(y))$, where y is a tuple of variables and g is an affine function. Put $\Phi := \Phi_1 \cup \Phi_2$. By Corollary 3.8, every partitioned L_{ovs}^d -formula with object variable x is equivalent in (V, W) to a boolean combination of elements of Φ . Therefore by Theorem 4.2, it is enough to show that every finite subset of Φ has UDTFS with a single variable. So let Δ be a finite subset of Φ . Possibly after adding some dummy variables into some formulas in Δ , we may assume that the parameter variables of elements of Δ is a fixed tuple y of length n . For $i = 1, 2$, let $\Delta_i := \Delta \cap \Phi_i$.

By Proposition 4.3, there are collections $(\phi^1(y, y_1))_{\phi \in \Delta_1}, \dots, (\phi^s(y, y_1))_{\phi \in \Delta_1}$ such that given finite $B \subseteq V^n$ and $q \in S^{\Delta_1}(B)$, there are $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $b_q \in B$ such that for every $\phi \in \Delta_1$ and for every $b \in B$ we have

$$\phi(x, b) \in q \iff V \models \phi^i(b, b_q).$$

Enumerate Δ_2 as $\psi_1(x; y), \dots, \psi_r(x; y)$, where $\psi_j(x; y)$ is $U(x - g_j(y))$ for some affine function $g_j : V^n \rightarrow V$.

Let $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, r + 1\}$. First for $\phi \in \Delta_1$, define $\phi^{ij}(y, y_1)$ to be $\phi^i(y, y_1)$; note that this does not depend on j . Now let $\phi \in \Delta_2$, say $\phi = \psi_k$ and suppose that $j \neq r + 1$. Then define $\psi_k^{ij}(y, y_1)$ to be

$$U(g_k(y) - g_j(y_1)).$$

Finally we let $\psi_k^{i, r+1}(y, y_1)$ be

$$\bigwedge_{j=1}^r \neg U(g_k(y) - g_j(y_1)).$$

We claim that the collections $(\phi^{ij})_{\phi \in \Delta}$ ($i = 1, \dots, s$, $j = 1, \dots, r + 1$) define Δ . So fix $B \subseteq V^n$ and $q \in S^{\Delta}(B)$. For $i = 1, 2$, let q_i be the part of q that arises from Δ_i . Note that $q_i \in S^{\Delta_i}(B)$.

Take $b_{q_1} \in B$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $(\phi^i(y, b_{q_1}))_{\phi \in \Delta_1}$ that defines q_1 . First suppose that the formula $x - g_j(b_{q_1}) \in W$ is in q_2 for some j . Then the realization of q_2 is simply $g_j(b_q) + W$. This also means that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $b \in B$, the formula $x - g_k(y) \in W$ is in q if and only if $g_k(b) + W = g_j(b_q) + W$. This means that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ we have

$$\psi_k(x, b) \in q \iff \psi_k^{ij}(b, b_q).$$

Therefore the collection $(\phi^{ij}(y, b_q))_{\phi \in \Delta}$ defines q in this case.

It is easy to see using a similar argument that in the case that $U(x - g_j(b_q))$ is not in q for all j , the collection $(\phi^{i, r+1}(y, b_q))_{\phi \in \Delta}$ defines q . □

REFERENCES

- [1] Matthias Aschenbrenner, Alf Dolich, Deirdre Haskell, Dugald Macpherson, and Sergei Starchenko. Vapnik-Chervonenkis density in some theories without the independence property, II. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.*, 54(3-4):311–363, 2013.
- [2] Matthias Aschenbrenner, Alf Dolich, Deirdre Haskell, Dugald Macpherson, and Sergei Starchenko. Vapnik-Chervonenkis density in some theories without the independence property, I. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(8):5889–5949, 2016.
- [3] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. Externally definable sets and dependent pairs II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(7):5217–5235, 2015.
- [4] Lou van den Dries. Dense pairs of o-minimal structures. *Fund. Math.*, 157:61–78, 1998.
- [5] Lou van den Dries. *Tame topology and o-minimal structures*, volume 248 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [6] Pantelis E. Eleftheriou, Ayhan Günaydin, and Philipp Hieronymi. Structure theorems in tame expansions of o-minimal structures by a dense set. *Israel J. Math.*, 239(1):435–500, 2020.
- [7] Vincent Guingona. On uniform definability of types over finite sets. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 77(2):499–514, 2012.
- [8] N. Sauer. On the density of families of sets. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A*, 13:145–147, 1972.
- [9] Saharon Shelah. A combinatorial problem; stability and order for models and theories in infinitary languages. *Pacific J. Math.*, 41:247–261, 1972.

BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ, İSTANBUL, TURKEY
 Email address: ayhan.gunaydin@bogazici.edu.tr

BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ, İSTANBUL, TURKEY
 Email address: ebru.nayir@std.bogazici.edu.tr