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 $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$ 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 $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-type is a collection of $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-formulas. A $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-type-definable set is one defined by a $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-type of small cardinality.

We write $S_\Delta(\mathcal{Z})$ for the set of $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-types that are maximally finitely consistent (in $\mathcal{X}$). Sometimes these are conveniently identified 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 $p(x)$ 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 $G \le \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}^\Delta)$. 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 $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-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 $p(x) \subseteq \Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$ 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 $\{h{\cdot}\mathcal{D} : h \in C\}$.

---

1 Remark Let $q(x)$ be a $\Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-type. We say that $\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic relative to $q(x)$ if $q(x)$ entails $\cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ for some finite $F \subseteq G$. Dually, $\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic relative to $q(x)$ if $G{\cdot}\mathcal{D}$ is finitely consistent with $q(x)$. The notions of *wide, strong syndetic,* and *weakly thick,* which we indroduce below relitivize likewise. All results below easily relativize to any type $q(x)$. We entrust the generalization to the reader (this is only required in Fact 20).

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

---

2 Fact The following are equivalent
1. $\mathcal{D}$ is not G-syndetic
2. $\neg\mathcal{D}$ is G-thick.

Define the following type

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

---

3 Theorem For every $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathbb{Z})$ 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 $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$ 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 2 we obtain that $\varphi(x)$ is G-thick.

3⇒1. Negate 1. Let $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$ 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 $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-type. Ideally, we would like that every G-thick $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-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 $\boxed{G\text{-wide}}$ if every finite cover of $\mathcal{D}$ by $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-sets contains a set that is G-thick. 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.

---

4 Theorem For every $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$ 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 3, 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 3.

2⇒3. Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_n$ be $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-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 $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-types that are finitely consistent with $\mathcal{D}$ and are G-wide. We claim that $p(x)$ is a complete $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-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 $\Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$-sets $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_n$ 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 $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_n$ 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 3.   □

2. Connected components

Let $\boxed{G} \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U}^\Delta)$. 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.

---

5 Definition

$$\boxed{Q_G} \;=\; \{q(x) \subseteq \Sigma_G(x) \,:\, q(x) \text{ maximally } G\text{-syndetic}\}.$$

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 $q(x) \subseteq \Delta^B(\mathbb{Z})$ 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

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

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

---

6 Proposition

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

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. $\square$

---

7 Definition

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

Along the same lines as above, we define

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

By the following proposition, $G^1 \leq G^{11} \trianglelefteq G$. Note that when $\Sigma_G(x)$ is finitely consistent, it is the only element of P_G and $G^{11} = G$.

---

8 Proposition

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

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. $\square$

---

9 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 6 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 $\cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}_n = \mathfrak{X}$. Then

$$1. \quad \cup F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_n] \;\supseteq\; \cap F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_{n-1}] \,\cap\, \cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}_n$$

$$= \;\cap F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_{n-1}].$$

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. $\square$

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

A similar argument shows the following.

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

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{D}_n \in \Sigma_{G^{11}}$. Assume inductively that $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_{n-1} \neq \varnothing$. 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 $\cup F{\cdot}\mathcal{D}_n = \mathfrak{X}$. By G^{11}-invariance, $p(x)$ also entails $\cap F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_{n-1}]$. Then by (1) in the above proof $\cup F{\cdot}[\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_n] \neq \varnothing$. The consistency of $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{D}_n$ follows. $\square$

By Theorems 4 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.

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

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

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 4. As it happens, under the assumption of normality, this can be strengthened as follows.

12 Proposition Assume $H \trianglelefteq G$ and that $\Sigma_H(x)$ is finitely consistent. Then every G-syndetic $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^B(\mathcal{Z})$ 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 11 also $g^{-1}{\cdot}\,p(x)$ is H-thick. Then the proposition follows from Theorem 4. $\square$

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

if $\varepsilon(x, y)$ is a $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-definable, or type-definable, equivalence relation then $\varepsilon(x, a)$, for any $a \in \mathcal{X}$, is equivalent to a $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-formula, respectively a $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$-type.

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

---

13 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
$$G^0 \ = \ \mathrm{Stab}(\Phi^0) \ = \ \bigcap\{\mathrm{Stab}(\mathcal{D}) : \mathcal{D} \in \Phi^0\}$$
and
$$G^{00} \ = \ \mathrm{Stab}(\Phi^{00}) \ = \ \bigcap\{\mathrm{Stab}(\mathcal{Y}) : \mathcal{Y} \in \Phi^{00}\}.$$

---

14 Proposition Let $\mathcal{X}$ be type-definable. Assume that G acts transitively on $\mathcal{X}$. Then
$$G^{11} \ \leq \ G^{00} \ \leq \ G^0.$$

Proof. The inclusion $G^{00} \leq G^0$ 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 $\mathcal{Y}$. $\qquad \square$

3. Strong syndeticity

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.

In this section we summarize some well-known facts.

---

15 Lemma 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 $\mathcal{X} = \cup F \cdot \mathcal{D}'$ for some finite $F \subseteq G$. Note that
$$\begin{aligned}
\cup F \cdot \mathcal{B} \ &= \ \cup F \cdot [\mathcal{C}' \cap \mathcal{D}'] \\
&\supseteq \ (\cap F \cdot \mathcal{C}') \cap (\cup F \cdot \mathcal{D}') \\
&= \ \cap F \cdot \mathcal{C}'
\end{aligned}$$

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

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

Note that $\Sigma_{G^1}(x) \subseteq {}^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x)$ by Theorem 9.

---

16 Corollary (Alex Kruckman) Then $^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x)$ is finitely consistent, strongly G-syndetic, and G-invariant. Moreover, $^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x)$ is the maximal G-syndetic G-invariant type and

$$^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x) \quad = \quad \bigcap_{q \in Q_G} q(x).$$

Proof. Strong G-syndeticity is an immediate consequence of Lemma 15. 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.

As for the final equality, inclusion $\supseteq$ is clear because the r.h.s. is closed under conjunction. Conversely, let $\mathcal{D}$ a set in the r.h.s. Then any G-translation of $\mathcal{D}$ also belong to the r.h.s. As this is closed under conjunction $\cap F \cdot \mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic for every finite $F \subseteq G$.   □

---

17 Proposition For every $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta^{\mathsf{B}}(\mathcal{Z})$ the following are equivalent
1. $^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x) \cup \{x \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is finitely consistent
2. $\mathcal{D}$ is weakly G-thick.

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

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

The following theorem asserts that weak thickness is partition regular.

---

18 Theorem If $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is weakly G-thick then $\mathcal{B}$ or $\mathcal{C}$ is weakly G-thick.

Proof. As $^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x)$ is closed under conjunction. If $x \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is finitely consistent with $^{\mathsf{s}}\Sigma_G(x)$ then so is one of the two sets. Then the treorem follows from the above proposition.   □

4. A tamer landscape

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

> **19 Theorem** The following are equivalent
> 1. G-thick $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-sets are G-wide
> 2. G-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-sets are closed under intersection
> 3. G-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-sets are strongly G-syndetic
> 4. weakly G-thick $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-sets are G-thick.

Proof. Clearly 2⇔3⇔4.

1⇒2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be G-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-sets. Suppose for a contradiction that $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}$ is not G-syndetic. Then $\neg(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D})$ is G-thick. By (1) and Theorem 4 there is a G-invariant type $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathbb{Z})$ that is finitely consistent and such that $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}$. By completeness either $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{C}$ or $p(x) \vdash x \notin \mathcal{D}$. But Theorem 3 says that $p(x)$ entails both $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, a contradiction.

4⇒1. By Theorem 18. $\qquad\square$

Let $q(x)$ be a $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-type. We say that $q(x)$ is $\boxed{G\text{-stationary}}$ if it extends to a unique G-invariant $p(x) \in S_\Delta(\mathbb{Z})$.

The notions of relative syndeticity/thickness are defined in Remark 1. It is easy to verify that the above theorem relativize to any type $q(x)$.

The conditions in Theorem 19 together with stationarity, produce further simplification.

> **20 Fact** Let $q(x)$ be G-stationary. Assume that the equivalent conditions in Theorem 19 hold relative to $q(x)$. Then the following are equivalent
> 1. $\mathcal{D}$ is G-syndetic relative to $q(x)$
> 2. $\mathcal{D}$ is G-wide/thick relative to $q(x)$.

Proof. Work relatively to $q(x)$.

1⇒2. Assume (1), then $\Sigma_G(x)$ is finitely consistent. Then G-syndetic $\Delta^{\mathrm{B}}(\mathbb{Z})$-sets are G-thick. Finally, they are G-wide by (1) in Theorem 19. (Stationarity is not required in this direction.)

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

5. Random graph

> **21 Theorem** Work in a monster model $\mathcal{U}$ of the random graph. For any $n \geq 2$ the following formula is syndetic under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{U})$
> $$\varphi(x, a) \ = \ r(x, a_1) \leftrightarrow r(x, a_2) \leftrightarrow \cdots\cdots \leftrightarrow r(x, a_n)$$
> where $a := \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$.

Proof. Let $b^1, \ldots, b^n$ be tuples of length n with disjoint ranges that have the same type as a (over $\varnothing$). Let C be the set of tuples $c = \langle c_1, \ldots, c_n \rangle$ such that $c_i \in \text{range}(b^i)$. When we pick the b^i, we can do so in such a way that every tuple $c \in C$ has the same type as a.

We claim that the following disjunction is a tautology

$$\bigvee_{c \in C} \varphi(x, c) \ \lor \ \bigvee_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(x, b^i)$$

Fix x. If $\varphi(x, b^i)$ holds for some i, then we are done. Otherwise, for every i we have some k such that $r(x, b_k^i)$ holds (as well as some h such that $r(x, b_h^i)$ does not). Let $c_i = b_k^i$ for some k such that $r(x, b_k^i)$ holds. Then $\varphi(x, c)$ holds. $\qquad\square$

6. 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.