

**CM-triviality
and
Geometric Elimination of Imaginaries**

**Ikuo Yoneda
Department of Mathematics
Tokai University**

18/7/2007

1 Introduction

Hrushovski gave a counterexample to the Zilber's conjecture on strongly minimal sets by **Generic Relational Structures**, i.e. relational countable structures constructed by amalgamating relational finite structures.

Generic relational structures are usually ...

CM-TRIVIAL.

To show the CM-triviality
of generic structures, we needed two steps.

- 1st step:
Show weak elimination of imaginaries.
- 2nd step:
Working in the real sort, show CM-triviality.

Following these two steps,

I proved CM-triviality of
Herwig's weight ω small theory, and
Baldwin-Shi's stable generic structures.

A question comes up :

Is there a way to show CM-triviality **without showing Weak Elimination of Imaginaries?**

I find the following answer.

THE MAIN RESULT

In simple theories with elimination of hyper-imaginaries,

CM-triviality **in the real sort** (I will define)

↓

Geometric elimination of imaginaries

+

CM-triviality in the original sense, firstly
introduced by Hrushovski.

2 Set-up

From now on, let T be a simple theory with elimination of hyperimaginaries and \overline{M} be a sufficiently saturated model of T .

(Hyper-)imaginary elements are equivalence classes of (type-)definable equivalence relations.

We work in \overline{M}^{eq} , the eq-structure, consisting of imaginary elements.

3 CM-triviality

Hrushovski's Definition for CM-triviality

T is CM-trivial, if for any $a, A, B \subset \overline{M}^{\text{eq}}$ with $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(aA) \cap \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B) = \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$,

$$\text{Cb}(\text{stp}(a/A)) \subseteq \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\text{Cb}(\text{stp}(a/B))).$$

- $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(*)$ denotes algebraic closure in \overline{M}^{eq}

Equivalently,

for any a , $A = \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$, $B = \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B) \subset \overline{M}^{\text{eq}}$,

$$a \downarrow_A B \Rightarrow a \downarrow_{A \cap \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(a, B)} B.$$

- We are working in the eq-structure,
not in the real sort.

My Definition for CM-triviality

T is CM-trivial **in the real sort**, if,
for any \bar{a} , $A = \text{acl}(A)$, $B = \text{acl}(B) \subset \bar{M}$,

$$\bar{a} \downarrow_A B \Rightarrow \bar{a} \downarrow_{A \cap \text{acl}(\bar{a}, B)} B.$$

- Notice that everything is **in the real sort**.

IND/I

T has the independence over intersections (IND/I),
if, for any \bar{a} , $A = \text{acl}(A)$, $B = \text{acl}(B) \subset \bar{M}$

$$\bar{a} \underset{A}{\downarrow} B, \quad \bar{a} \underset{B}{\downarrow} A \Rightarrow \bar{a} \underset{A \cap B}{\downarrow} AB.$$

- Notice that everything is **in the real sort**.

Proposition A

CM-triviality **in the real sort** \Rightarrow IND/I.

The key point of the proof: Assume $\bar{a} \downarrow_A B$, $\bar{a} \downarrow_B A$, $A = \text{acl}(A)$, $B = \text{acl}(B)$.

By $\bar{a} \downarrow_B AB$, $\text{acl}(\bar{a}, B) \cap AB = B$ follows.
So we have

$$B \cap A \subseteq \text{acl}(\bar{a}, B) \cap A \subseteq (\text{acl}(\bar{a}, B) \cap AB) \cap A \subseteq B \cap A.$$

By CM-triviality **in the real sort**, we have

$$\bar{a} \downarrow_{\text{acl}(\bar{a}, B) \cap A} B.$$

Proposition B IND/I \Leftrightarrow GEI.

Geometric Elimination of Imaginaries

means that

for any $\mathbf{i} \in \overline{M}^{\text{eq}}$, there exists $\bar{\mathbf{a}} \subset \overline{M}$ such that

$$\mathbf{i} \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}),$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}} \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\mathbf{i}).$$

The proof of “**IND/I** \Rightarrow **GEI**.”

Fix $\mathbf{i} = \bar{a}_E$. Take \bar{b}, \bar{c} such that $\bar{b}, \bar{c} \models \text{tp}(\bar{a}/\mathbf{i})$ and $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}$ are independent over \mathbf{i} .

By $\bar{a} \downarrow_{\bar{b}} \bar{c}, \bar{a} \downarrow_{\bar{c}} \bar{b}$ and **IND/I**, we have

$$\bar{a} \quad \downarrow \quad \bar{b}, \bar{c}. \\ \text{acl}(\bar{b}) \cap \text{acl}(\bar{c})$$

Let $\mathbf{A} = \text{acl}(\bar{b}) \cap \text{acl}(\bar{c})$.

As $\mathbf{i} \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(\bar{a})$, we have “ $\mathbf{i} \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\mathbf{A})$ ”.

By $\bar{b} \downarrow_{\mathbf{i}} \bar{c}$, we see “ $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\mathbf{i})$ ”.

Under GEI,
CM-triviality **in the real sort**=CM-triviality.

Main Theorem

CM-triviality **in the real sort**
↓
GEI+CM-triviality.

Two Remarks

(1) Simple generic structures have the following NICE characterization of non-forking;

$$\mathbf{A} \downarrow_{\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}} \mathbf{B} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{A} \otimes_{\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}} \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B} = \text{cl}_{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B})$$

for any $\mathbf{A} = \text{acl}(\mathbf{A}), \mathbf{B} = \text{acl}(\mathbf{B}) \subset \overline{\mathbf{M}}$.

From this, we can check that simple generic structures are CM-trivial **in the real sort**.

Main Theorem directly shows the CM-triviality of simple generic structures.

(2)

CM-triviality **in the real sort**

\Updownarrow

CM-triviality in the original sense.

In [E], D.Evans gave an ω -categorical $SU = 1$ CM-trivial structure \mathcal{C} without WEI interpreted in an ω -categorical $SU = 2$ generic binary graph. I checked \mathcal{C} does not have GEI.

Remark on IND/I

In pregeometric surgical theories, $\text{IND/I} \Rightarrow \text{GEI}$.

In O-minimal case, “ $\text{IND/I} \Rightarrow \text{EI}$ ” **only** holds.

ENDING : 4 Problems on CM-triviality

- (1) In stable theories, does CM-triviality imply CM-triviality **in the real sort?**

(2) Is any superstable CM-trivial theory ω -stable?

This is a generalization of Baldwin's
Problem: Is any superstable ω -saturated generic structure ω -stable?

(3) Recall that n-ampleness is defined in the eq-structures.

non-1-ampleness \Leftrightarrow One-basedness \Rightarrow
non-2-ampleness \Leftrightarrow CM-triviality \Rightarrow
non-3-ampleness \Rightarrow non-4-ampleness $\Rightarrow \dots$

- Define non-3-ampleness **in the real sort**.
And does it imply GEI?

(4) In Zariski geometries, local modularity is equivalent to CM-triviality.

- In O-minimal theories,
is local modularity equivalent to CM-triviality?

References

- [E] D.M.Evans, \aleph_0 -categorical structures with a predimension, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 116 (2002), 157-186.
- [G] Jerry Gagelman, Stability in geometric theories, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 132 (2005), 313-326.

- [H] Ehud Hrushovski, A new strongly minimal sets, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 88 (1993), 147-166.
- [Y] Ikuo Yoneda, Forking and some eliminations of imaginaries, submitted, October 2006.