Actions

A. Polymath

Abstract.

1. Preliminaries

Let $\Delta \subseteq L_{xz}(\mathcal{U})$. Given any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^x$ and $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^z$, we define the structure $\mathcal{U}^\Delta = \langle \mathcal{X}; \mathcal{Z} \rangle$. This is a 2-sorted structure whose signature L^Δ contains relation symbols for every formula $\varphi(x;z) \in \Delta$. As there is little risk of confusion, these relations symbols are also denoted by $\varphi(x;z)$, and we identify L^Δ with a subset of L.

When $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ are type definable and Δ is small, $\mathcal{U}^\Delta$ is a saturated structure. As compactness is not always required, these sets are arbitrary unless explicitly required.

In the first few sections we only work a subset of the quantifier-free fragment of L^Δ. Let $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ be the set of Boolean combinations of the sets $\varphi(\mathcal{X};b)$, for $\varphi(x;z) \in \Delta$ and $b \in \mathcal{Z}$. The same symbol is also used to denote the collection of formulas defining these sets. A $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type is a collection of $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-formulas. A $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type-definable set is one defined by a $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type of small cardinality.

We write $S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ for the set of $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-types that are maximallyfinitely consistent (in $\mathcal{X}$) – which we may conveniently identify with a sets of $\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ and negated $\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$-formulas. Note that the types in $S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ are required to be finitely consistent $\mathcal{X}$ – a piece of information that we will not display in the notation. When the types are required to be finitely consistent in some $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ we write $S_{\Delta,\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Z})$.

When $p(x)$ a type (i.e. any set of formulas) and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ we write $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$ if the inclusion $\psi(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ holds for some $\psi(x)$ that is conjunctions of formulas in $p(x)$.

Let $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}^\Delta)$. We view G as a group acting on $\mathcal{U}^\Delta$ and write $\cdot$ for such action. We write $g{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ for the natural action of $g \in G$ on $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. If $\Delta = \varphi(\mathcal{X};b)$ then $g{\cdot}\mathcal{D} = \varphi(\mathcal{X}; g{\cdot}b)$. A formula is G-invariant if the set it defines is G-invariant (i.e. fixed by the action of G).

If $p(x)$ is a $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type, we write $g{\cdot}p(x)$ for the set of formulas of the form $\varphi(\mathcal{X}; g{\cdot}b)$ for $\varphi(\mathcal{X};b) \in p$. We say that the type $p(x) \subseteq \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ is G-invariant accordingly.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Torino, via Carlo Alberto 10, 10123 Torino.

We say that a set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is syndetic under the action of G, or G-syndetic for short, if finitely many G-translates of $\mathcal{D}$ cover $\mathcal{X}$. Dually, we say that $\mathcal{D}$ is thick under the action of G or G-thick for short, if the intersection of any finitely many G-translates of $\mathcal{D}$ is consistent (in $\mathcal{X}$).

The same properties may be attributed to formulas (as these are identified with the set they define). When these properties are attributed to a type $p(x)$, we understand that they hold for every conjunction of formulas in $p(x)$.

Our terminology is taken from topological dynamics. In similars context syndetic sets are called *generic*, see eg. [Ne]. In [CK] the authors write *quasi-non-dividing* for *thick* under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}/A)$.

Notation: for $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $C \subseteq G$ we write $C{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ for $\{h{\cdot}\mathcal{D} : h \in C\}$.

In this chapter many proofs require some juggling with negations as epitomized by the following fact which is proved by spelling out the definitions

1 Fact The following are equivalent

1. $\mathcal{D}$ is not G-syndetic
2. $\neg\mathcal{D}$ is G-thick.

Define the following type

$$\Sigma_G(x) \quad = \quad \big\{\vartheta(x) \in \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z}) \ : \ \vartheta(x) \text{ is } G\text{-syndetic}\big\}.$$

2 Theorem For every $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ the following are equivalent

1. $p(x)$ is G-invariant
2. $p(x) \vdash \Sigma_G(x)$
3. $p(x)$ is G-thick.

Proof. 1⇒2. Let $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ be a G-syndetic. Pick $C \subseteq G$ be finite such that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \cup C{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$. Then $p(x)$ is finitely consistent with $x \in \cup C{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$. By completeness, $p(x) \vdash x \in h\mathcal{D}$ for some $h \in C$. Finally, by invariance, $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$.

2⇒3. Let $\varphi(x) \in p$. As $\Sigma_G(x) \cup \{\varphi(x)\}$ is finitely consistent, it cannot be that $\neg\varphi(x)$ is G-syndetic. Then from Fact 1 we obtain that $\varphi(x)$ is G-thick.

3⇒1. Negate 1. Let $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $g \in G$ such that $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$ and $p(x) \nvdash g{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$. By completeness $p(x) \vdash x \in (\mathcal{D} \cap \neg g{\cdot}\mathcal{D})$. Clearly $\mathcal{D} \cap \neg g{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ is not G-thick as it is inconsistent with its g-translate. □

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of global G-invariant $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type. Ideally, we would like that every G-thick $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(Z)$-type extends to a global thick type. Unfortunately this is not true in general (it is an assumption with important consequences, see Section 4).

A set $\mathcal{D}$ is G-wide relative to $\mathcal{Y}$ if every finite cover of $\mathcal{D}\cap\mathcal{Y}$ by $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets contains a set that is G-thick relative to $\mathcal{Y}$. A type is G-wide if every conjunction of formulas in the type is G-wide.

In [CK] a similar property is called *quasi-non-forking*. Our use of the term *wide* is consistent with [Hr], though we apply it to a narrow context.

3 Theorem For every $\mathcal{D}\in\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ the following are equivalent

1. $\Sigma_G(x)\cup\{x\in\mathcal{D}\}$ is finitely consistent
2. there is a G-thick type $p(x)\in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ that entails $x\in\mathcal{D}$
3. $\mathcal{D}$ is G-wide.

Proof. 1⇒2. By Theorem 2, it suffices to pick any $p(x)\in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ extending the type $\Sigma_G(x)\cup\{x\in\mathcal{D}\}$.

2⇒1. By Theorem 2.

2⇒3. Let $\mathcal{C}_1,\dots,\mathcal{C}_n$ be $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets that cover $\mathcal{D}$. Pick $p(x)$ as in 2. By completeness, $p(x)\vdash x\in\mathcal{C}_i$ for some i. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}_i$ is G-thick.

3⇒2. Let $p(x)$ be maximal among the $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-types that are finitely consistent with $\mathcal{D}$ and are G-wide. We claim that $p(x)$ is a complete $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type. Suppose for a contradiction that $\vartheta(x),\neg\vartheta(x)\notin p$. By maximality there is some formula $\psi(x)$, a conjunction of formulas in $p(x)$, and some $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets $\mathcal{C}_1,\dots,\mathcal{C}_n$ that cover both $\psi(\mathcal{X})\cap\vartheta(\mathcal{X})$ and $\psi(\mathcal{X})\smallsetminus\vartheta(\mathcal{X})$ and such that no $\mathcal{C}_i$ is G-thick. As $\mathcal{C}_1,\dots,\mathcal{C}_n$ cover $\psi(\mathcal{X})$ this is a contradiction. It is only left to show that $p(x)$ is G-thick. This follows from completeness and Theorem 2. □

2. Connected components

Let $G\le\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}^\Delta)$. Unfortunately, syndeticity is not preserved under intersection. In particular $\Sigma_G(x)$ is not a G-syndetic type, and it may even be inconsistent. Then following notion is relevant.

4 Definition

$$Q_G \quad=\quad \big\{q(x)\subseteq\Sigma_G(x)\ :\ q(x)\text{ maximally }G\text{-syndetic}\big\}.$$

In other words, the types in Q_G are maximal among the subtypes of $\Sigma_G(x)$ that are closed under conjunction.

It is easy to see that Q_G is closed under the action of G. We write $\mathrm{Stab}(q)$ for the stabilizer of $q(x)\subseteq\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ in G, that is, the subgroup $\{g\in G\ :\ g\cdot q(x)=q(x)\}$. We write $\mathrm{Stab}(\mathcal{D})$ with a similar meaning. Finally we define

$$G^1 \quad=\quad \mathrm{Stab}(Q_G) \quad=\quad \bigcap_{q\in Q_G}\mathrm{Stab}(q).$$

It is easy to verify that $G^1\trianglelefteq G$.

5 Proposition

$$G^1 \quad = \quad \big\{g \in G : \mathcal{D} \cap g{\cdot}\mathcal{D} \in \Sigma_G(x) \text{ whenever } \mathcal{D} \in \Sigma_G(x)\big\}.$$

Proof. $\subseteq$. Pick any $k \in G^1$ and $\mathcal{D} \in \Sigma_G(x)$. Let $q(x) \in Q_G$ be a type containing $x \in \mathcal{D}$. From the G^1-invariance of $q(x)$ we obtain that $q(x) \vdash x \in k{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$. Then $q(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D} \cap k{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$, hence $\mathcal{D} \cap k{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic.

$\supseteq$. Pick any $g \notin G^1$. Then $q(x) \neq g{\cdot}q(x)$ for some $q(x) \in Q_G$. Let $\varphi(x) \in q$ such that $q(x) \nvdash g{\cdot}\varphi(x)$. By maximality, $\psi(x) \wedge g{\cdot}\varphi(x)$ is not G-syndetic for some $\psi(x) \in q$. As $q(x)$ is closed under conjunction, we can assume $\varphi(x) = \psi(x)$, then g does not belong to the set on the r.h.s. □

6 Definition

$$P_G \quad = \quad \big\{p(x) \subseteq \Sigma_G(x) : p(x) \text{ maximally finitely consistent}\big\}.$$

Along the same lines as above, we define

$$G^{11} \quad = \quad \mathrm{Stab}(P_G) \quad = \quad \bigcap_{p \in P_G} \mathrm{Stab}(p).$$

By the following proposition, $G^1 \leq G^{11} \trianglelefteq G$. We do not know if the inclusion is strict.

7 Proposition

$$G^{11} \quad = \quad \big\{g \in G : q(x) \cup g{\cdot}q(x) \text{ is finitely consistent for every } q(x) \in Q_G\big\}.$$

Proof. $\subseteq$. Pick any $k \in G^{11}$ and $q(x) \in Q_G$. Let $p(x) \in P_G$ be a type containing $q(x)$. From the G^{11}-invariance of $p(x)$ we obtain that $p(x) \vdash k{\cdot}q(x)$. Then $q(x) \cup k{\cdot}q(x)$ is finitely consistent.

$\supseteq$. Pick any $g \notin G^{11}$. Then $q(x) \cup g{\cdot}q(x)$ is not finitely consistent for some $q(x) \in Q_G$. Let $\varphi(x) \in q$ such that $\varphi(x) \wedge g{\cdot}\varphi(x)$ is inconsistent. But $\varphi(x) \in p$ then g does not belong to the set on the r.h.s. □

8 Theorem Any finite conjunction of formulas in $\Sigma_{G^1}(x)$ is G-syndetic. In particular $\Sigma_{G^1}(x)$ is finitely consistent.

Proof. Notice that from Proposition 5 it easily follows that for every $\mathcal{D} \in \Sigma_G$ and every finite $F \subseteq G^1$ the set $\cap F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic.

Let $\mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_n \in \Sigma_{G^1}$. Assume inductively that $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_{n-1}$ is G-syndetic. Let $F \subseteq G^1$ be such that $\cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}_n = \mathcal{X}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 1. \qquad \cup F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_n] \quad &\supseteq \quad \cap F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_{n-1}] \;\cap\; \cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}_n \\ &= \quad \cap F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_{n-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

This last set is G-syndetic by the inductive hypothesis and what remarked above. The G-syndeticity of $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_n$ follows. □

Unfortunately, we are unable to conclude that the intersection of G^1-syndetic sets is G^1-syndetic.

A similar argument shows the following.

9 Theorem $\Sigma_{G^{11}}(x)$ is finitely consistent.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}_1,\dots,\mathcal{D}_n \in \Sigma_{G^{11}}$. Assume inductively that $\mathcal{D}_1\cap\dots\cap\mathcal{D}_{n-1}\neq\varnothing$. As the $\mathcal{D}_i$ are in particular G-syndetic, some $p(x)\in P_G$ entails this disjunction. Let $F\subseteq G^{11}$ be such that $\cup F\cdot\mathcal{D}_n=\mathcal{X}$. By G^{11}-invariance, $p(x)$ also entails $\cap F\cdot[\mathcal{D}_1\cap\dots\cap\mathcal{D}_{n-1}]$. Then by (1) in the above proof $\cup F\cdot[\mathcal{D}_1\cap\dots\cap\mathcal{D}_n]\neq\varnothing$. The consistency of $\mathcal{D}_1\cap\dots\cap\mathcal{D}_n$ follows. □

By Theorems 3 from the above theorems it follows that G^1-syndetic sets are G^1-wide, similarly for G^{11}. But we can do better. First, we remark a useful consequence of normality.

10 Remark Assume $H\trianglelefteq G$. For every $\mathcal{D}\subseteq\mathcal{X}$ and every $g\in G$

$$\mathcal{D} \text{ is } H\text{-foo} \quad\Rightarrow\quad g\cdot\mathcal{D} \text{ is } H\text{-foo},$$

where *foo* can be replaced by *syndetic, invariant, thick, wide.* In particular, the type $\Sigma_H(x)$ is G-invariant.

Recall that when $\Sigma_H(x)$ is finitely consistent then H-syndetic sets are H-wide, see Theorem 3. As it happens, under the assumption of normality, this can be strengthened as follows.

11 Proposition Assume $H\trianglelefteq G$ and that $\Sigma_H(x)$ is finitely consistent. Then every G-syndetic $\mathcal{D}\in\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ is H-wide. In particular all types in Q_G are G^{11}-wide.

Proof. Let $p(x)\in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ be finitely consistent with $\Sigma_H(x)$. As $\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic, by completeness $p(x)\vdash x\in g\cdot\mathcal{D}$ for some $g\in G$. Equivalently, $g^{-1}\cdot p(x)\vdash x\in\mathcal{D}$. As $p(x)$ is H-thick, by Remark 10 also $g^{-1}\cdot p(x)$ is H-thick. Then the proposition follows from Theorem 3. □

When the context suggests it, $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ will denote the broader class that includes also formulas obtained substituting y for x and is closed under Boolean connectives. A $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-definable equivalence relation is an equivalence relation defined by some formula $\varepsilon(x,y)\in\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$. We define $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type-definable equivalence relations similarly. Note that if $\varepsilon(x,y)$ is a $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-definable, or type-definable, equivalence relation then $\varepsilon(x,a)$, for any $a\in\mathcal{X}$, is equivalent to a $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-formula, respectively a $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type.

An equivalence relation is bounded if it has a small number of equivalence classes.

12 Definition Let Φ^0 be the collection of sets that are equivalence classes of a bounded G-invariant $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type-definable equivalence relation. Let Φ^{00} be the collection of sets that are equivalence classes of a bounded G-invariant $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type-definable equivalence relation. Define

$$G^0 \quad = \quad \mathrm{Stab}(\Phi^0) \quad = \quad \bigcap\{\mathrm{Stab}(\mathcal{D}) \ : \ \mathcal{D} \in \Phi^0\}$$

and

$$G^{00} \quad = \quad \mathrm{Stab}(\Phi^{00}) \quad = \quad \bigcap\{\mathrm{Stab}(\mathcal{Y}) \ : \ \mathcal{Y} \in \Phi^{00}\}.$$

13 Proposition Let $\mathcal{X}$ be type-definable. Assume that G acts transitively on $\mathcal{X}$. Then

$$G^{11} \quad \le \quad G^{00} \quad \le \quad G^0.$$

Proof. The inclusion $G^{00} \le G^0$ is trivial. Let $\mathcal{Y} \in \Phi^{00}$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \in \Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$. Then a small number of G-translates of $\mathcal{D}$ cover $\mathcal{X}$. Therefore, by compactness, $\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic. Then the type defining $\mathcal{Y}$ is G-syndetic. Then this type extends to some $p(x) \in P_G$. By G^{11}-invariance $p(x)$ entails also $k{\cdot}\mathcal{Y}$ for every $k \in G^{11}$. Then k is in the stabilizer of $\mathcal{Y}$. □

3. Strong syndeticity

Work relative to some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. A set $\mathcal{D}$ is strongly G-syndetic if for every finite $F \subseteq G$ the set $\cap F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic (recall that $F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ stands for $\{h{\cdot}\mathcal{D} : h \in F\}$). Dually, we say that $\mathcal{D}$ is weakly G-thick if for some finite $F \subseteq G$ the set $\cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ is thick. Again, the same properties may be attributed to formulas and types when every conjunction of formulas in the type has the property.

⚠ In topological dynamic, strong syndedic sets are called *thickly syndetic* and weak thickness is called *piecewise syndetic*. Newelski in [Ne] says *weak generic* for weakly thick. These are terminologies that defy my intuition.

14 Lemma Work relative to some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The intersection of two strongly G-syndetic sets is strongly G-syndetic.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be strongly G-syndetic and let $C \subseteq G$ be an arbitrary finite set. It suffices to prove that $\mathcal{B} = \cap C{\cdot}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D})$ is G-syndetic. Clearly $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}' \cap \mathcal{D}'$, where $\mathcal{C}' = \cap C{\cdot}\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}' = \cap C{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}'$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ are both strongly G-syndetic. In particular $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}'$ for some finite $F \subseteq G$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{B} \quad &= \quad \cup F{\cdot}\big[\mathcal{C}' \cap \mathcal{D}'\big] \\ &\supseteq \quad \big(\cap F{\cdot}\mathcal{C}'\big) \cap \big(\cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}'\big) \\ &= \quad \cap F{\cdot}\mathcal{C}' \end{aligned}$$

As $\mathcal{C}'$ is strongly G-syndetic, $\cap F{\cdot}\mathcal{C}'$ is G-syndetic. Therefore $\cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{B}$ is also G-syndetic. The G-syndeticity of $\mathcal{B}$ follows. □

Define the following type

$$\boxed{{}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x)} \quad = \quad \big\{\vartheta(x) \in \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z}) \,:\, \vartheta(x) \text{ is strongly } G\text{-syndetic relative to } \mathcal{Y}\big\}.$$

Note that Theorem 8 shows that $\Sigma_{G^1}(x) \subseteq {}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x)$.

15 Corollary Work relative to some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Then ${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ is finitely consistent, strongly G-syndetic, and G-invariant.

Moreover, ${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ is the maximal G-syndetic G-invariant type and

$${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x) \quad = \quad \bigcap_{q \in Q_{G,\mathcal{Y}}} q(x).$$

Where $Q_{G,\mathcal{Y}}$ is as in Definition 4 but relativized to $\mathcal{Y}$.

Proof. Strong G-syndeticity is an immediate consequence of Lemma 14. Finite consistency is a consequence of syndeticity. Finally, G-invariance is clear because any translate of a strongly G-syndetic formula is also strongly G-syndetic. □

16 Corollary Work relative to some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. For every $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ the following are equivalent

1. ${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x) \cup \{x \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is finitely consistent
2. $\mathcal{D}$ is weakly G-thick.

Proof. 1⇒2. If ${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x) \cup \{x \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is finitely consistent, then $\neg\mathcal{D}$ is strongly G-syndetic. From Fact 1, we obtain that $\neg\mathcal{D}$ not being strongly G-syndetic is equivalent to $\mathcal{D}$ being weakly G-thick.

2⇒1. Suppose ${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{D}$. Then $\neg\mathcal{D}$ is strongly G-syndetic. From Fact 1, $\mathcal{D}$ is not weakly G-thick. □

The following theorem asserts that weak thickness is partition regular.

17 Theorem Work relative to some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. If $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is weakly G-thick then $\mathcal{B}$ or $\mathcal{C}$ is weakly G-thick.

Proof. As ${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ is closed under conjunction. If $x \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is finitely consistent with ${}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_{G,\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ then so is one of the two sets. □

4. A tamer landscape

Under suitable assumptions some notions introduced in this chapter coalesce, and we are left with a tamer landscape.

18 Theorem Work relative to some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The following are equivalent

1. H-thick $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets are H-wide
2. H-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets are closed under intersection
3. H-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets are strongly H-syndetic
4. weakly H-thick $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets are H-thick.

Proof. Clearly 2⇔3⇔4.

1⇒2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be H-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets. Suppose for a contradiction that $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}$ is not H-syndetic. Then $\neg(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D})$ is H-thick. By 1 and Theorem 3 there is a H-invariant type $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ that is finitely consistent in $\mathcal{Y}$ and such that $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}$. By completeness either $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{C}$ or $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{D}$. This is a contradiction because by Theorem 2 $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{C}$ and $p(x) \vdash x \in \mathcal{D}$.

4⇒1. By Theorem 17 □

A subset $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is H-stationary if there exists a unique H-invariant $p(x) \in S_{\Delta,\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Z})$. When $\Sigma_{H,\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ is consistent, by 1 in Theorem 3 this is equivalent to requiring that $\mathcal{D}$ and $\neg\mathcal{D}$ are not both wide relative to $\mathcal{Y}$. The conditions in Theorem 18 together with stationarity, produce further simplification.

19 Fact Work relative to some given $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Assume the equivalent conditions in Theorem 18 hold. Suppose that the set $\mathcal{Y}$ is H-stationary. Then the following are equivalent

1. $\mathcal{D}$ is H-syndetic
2. $\mathcal{D}$ is H-wide.

Proof. 1⇒2. By assumption, $\Sigma_{H,\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ is consistent. Then H-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-sets are H-thick by Corollary **??**. Finally, they are H-wide by 1 in Theorem 18. (Stationarity is not required in this direction.)

2⇒1. If $\mathcal{D}$ was not H-syndetic then $\neg\mathcal{D}$ would be H-thick and therefore, by the assumption, H-wide. This contradicts H-stationarity. □

5. Notes and references

[CK] Artem Chernikov and Itay Kaplan, *Forking and dividing in* NTP_2 *theories*, J. Symbolic Logic (2012).

[Ne] Ludomir Newelski, *Topological dynamics of definable group actions*, J. Symbolic Logic (2009).

[Hr] Ehud Hrushovski, *Stable group theory and approximate subgroups*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **25** (2012), no. 1, 189–243.