Scribed By: Eunjung KIM Locality of First Order Logic Week 6: 1, 3 April 2025

## **Contents**

1	Terminology	1
2	Hanf locality	2

## 1 Terminology

**Definition 1** (Substructure). For a set U of elements of a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , the substructure of  $\mathbb{A}$  induced by U is the  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}'$  defined as follows and for each  $R \in \tau$ ,

- the universe of  $\mathbb{A}$  is  $U \cup \{c^{\mathbb{A}} \mid c \text{ is a constant symbol}\},$
- each constant symbol is interpreted as the same element as in A,
- for each predicate  $R \in \tau$ , R is interpreted as  $R^{\mathbb{A}} \cap U^{\operatorname{ar}(R)}$ .

**Definition 2.** For a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , the Gaifman graph  $G(\mathbb{A})$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  is a graph whose vertex set is the universe of  $\mathbb{A}$ , and there is an edge (without any orientation) between a pair of distinct elements  $u, v \in \mathbb{A}$  if and only if there is some  $R \in \tau$  such that u, v is related in the relation  $R^{\mathbb{A}}$ . That is, there is a tuple  $\vec{a} \in R^{\mathbb{A}}$  such that  $u = a_i$  and  $v = a_j$  for some  $1 \le i, j \le \operatorname{ar}(R)$ .

The *distance* between two elements u, v of  $\mathbb{A}$  in  $\mathbb{A}$  is defined as their distance in the Gaifman graph of  $\mathbb{A}$ , denoted as  $\mathsf{dist}_{\mathbb{A}}(u, v)$ . For a tuple  $\vec{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_\ell)$  of elements of  $\mathbb{A}$ , the distance  $\mathsf{dist}_{\mathbb{A}}(\vec{u}, v)$  between  $\vec{u}$  and v in  $\mathbb{A}$  is  $\min\{\mathsf{dist}_{\mathbb{A}}(u_i, v) \mid i \in [\ell]\}$ .

**Definition 3** (r-ball, r-neighborhood). For a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb A$  and an element  $a \in \mathbb A$ , the r-ball  $B_r^{\mathbb A}(a)$  at a in  $\mathbb A$  is the set of elements of  $\mathbb A$  whose distance to a is at most r in the Gaifman graph  $G(\mathbb A)$  of  $\mathbb A$ . For a tuple  $\vec a = (a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$  of  $\mathbb A$ , the r-ball  $B_r^{\mathbb A}(\vec a)$  at  $\vec a$  in  $\mathbb A$  is defined the same way:  $B_r^{\mathbb A}(\vec a) := \{v \in \mathbb A \mid \operatorname{dist}_{\mathbb A}(\vec a,v) \leq r\}$ . The r-neighborhood of  $\vec a$  in  $\mathbb A$  is the substructure of  $\mathbb A$  induced by the r-ball at  $\vec a$ , and it is denoted by  $N_r^{\mathbb A}(\vec a)$ 

**Definition 4.** ( $\ell$ -queries) Given an integer  $\ell \geq 0$ , an  $\ell$ -query on  $\tau$ -structures is a map Q such that

- $Q(\mathbb{A}) \subseteq A^{\ell}$  for any  $\tau$ -struture  $\mathbb{A}$ ; and
- it is closed under isomorphism, that is, if two  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}$  are isomorphic by an isomorphism  $h: A \to B$ , then  $Q(\mathbb{B}) = h(Q(\mathbb{A}))$ . Here,

$$h(Q(\mathbb{A})) = \{(h(a_1), \dots, h(a_{\ell})) : (a_1, \dots, a_{\ell}) \in Q(\mathbb{A})\}.$$

In particular, we consider  $A^0$  as a singleton set so every 0-query is exactly a property on  $\sigma$ -structures.

**Definition 5.** (Definable  $\ell$ -queries) Given an  $\ell$ -query Q on  $\tau$ -structures and a logic  $\mathcal{L}$ , Q is definable in  $\mathcal{L}$  if there is a formula  $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell)$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $\tau$  such that

$$Q(\mathbb{A}) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \in A^\ell : \mathbb{A} \vDash \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_\ell)\}\$$

for every  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathbb{A}$ .

For example, the set of vertex pairs of distance exactly two is a 2-query. It is also FO-definable using the formula  $\varphi(x,y) := \exists z \ \mathsf{edge}(x,z) \land \mathsf{edge}(z,y) \land \neg(x,y)$ .

The isomorphism between two structures over the same vocabulary is defined in the usual way.

**Definition 6** (Isomorphism between two structures). *Let*  $\mathbb{A}$  *and*  $\mathbb{B}$  *be two*  $\tau$ -structures. A mapping  $\iota : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{B}$  *is an isomorphism between*  $\mathbb{A}$  *and*  $\mathbb{B}$  *if* 

- ι is a bijection,
- for every constant symbol  $c \in \tau$  and for every  $i \leq \ell$ ,  $\iota(c^{\mathbb{A}}) = c^{\mathbb{B}}$ ,
- for every predicate  $R \in \tau$  with  $\operatorname{ar}(R) = k$  and for every k-tuple  $(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in \mathbb{A}^k$ ,  $R(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$  if and only if  $R(\iota(a_1), \ldots, \iota(a_k))$ .

*We write*  $\mathbb{A} \cong \mathbb{B}$  *when there is*  $\mathbb{A}$  *is isomorphic to*  $\mathbb{B}$ .

Note that a property  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\tau$ -structures is (defined so that) closed under isomorphism. That is, if  $\mathbb{A}$  has the property  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathbb{B}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}$  then  $\mathbb{B}$  also has the property  $\mathcal{P}$ . Note also that  $\ell$ -query, a generalization of a property, defined so as to be closed under isomorphism.

Intuitively, an  $\ell$ -query Q on  $\tau$ -structures is Hanf local if the query is closed under the isomorphism of the r-neighborhood. Hanf locality is not guaranteed, and it is rather an anomaly. However, it turns out that an FO-definable  $\ell$ -query is Hanf local.

**Definition 7** (r-local isomorphism between two structures). Let  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{B}$  be two  $\tau$ -structures. We write  $\mathbb{A} \hookrightarrow_r \mathbb{B}$  if there is a bijective mapping  $\iota : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{B}$  (not necessarily isomorphism) such that for every  $a \in \mathbb{A}$ , it holds that  $N_r^{\mathbb{A}}(a) \cong \mathbb{N}_r^{\mathbb{B}}(\iota(a))$ .

When we have  $\mathbb{A} \hookrightarrow_r \mathbb{B}$ , they have the same cardinality, they may not be isomorphic but 'locally' they are isomorphic everywhere. Note that in the r-local isomorphism,  $\iota$  creates an element-to-element mapping designating 'which r-neighborhood to examine'. However,  $\iota$  is not necessarily the isomorphism which witnesses  $N_r^{\mathbb{A}}(a) \cong \mathbb{N}_r^{\mathbb{B}}(\iota(a))$ .

## 2 Hanf locality

**Definition 8** (Hanf locality of boolean query). Let  $\ell > 0$ . A property  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $\tau$ -structures is Hanf local if there is some integer r > 0 such that whenever two  $\tau$ -structures  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{B}$  satisfy  $\mathbb{A} \hookrightarrow_r \mathbb{B}$ , then  $\mathbb{A} \in \mathcal{P}$  of and only if  $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{P}$ . The smallest such integer r is called the Hanf locality rank,  $hlr(\mathcal{P})$  in short.

**Example 9.** Consider the vocabulary  $\{edge\}$ . We want to show that the property CONNECTED is not Hanf local. Suppose that it is, with the Hanf locality rank r. The idea is to demonstrate two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ 

of the same size (vertex count), (i) which are indistinguishable when you look at any r-neighborhood of  $G_1$  and the corresponding r-neighborhood, and (ii) one is connected whereas the other is not.

Take  $G_1$  as the disjoint union of two cycles, each of length 2r + 2. Let  $G_2$  be the cycle of length 4r + 4. Let  $\iota$  be an arbitrary bijection from  $G_1$  to  $G_2$ . For any vertex v of  $G_1$  or  $G_2$ , r-neighborhood at v in  $G_i$  is a path of length 2r whose two endpoints are non-adjacent. (We chose the length of each cycle of  $G_1$  as the minimum integer so as to satisfy this property.) Therefore,  $G_1 \hookrightarrow_r G_2$ . However,  $G_1$  is not connected and  $G_2$  is connected. Therefore, CONNECTED is not Hanf local!

**Theorem 10.** A FO-definable property is Hanf local.

An immediate corollary of Theorem 10, together with the observation in Example 9 that CONNECTED is not Hanf local, means that CONNECTED is not FO-definable.

## References