

On n-dependent groups and fields

Nadja Hempel

▶ **To cite this version:**

Nadja Hempel. On n-dependent groups and fields. 2015. hal-00933339v3

HAL Id: hal-00933339
https://hal.science/hal-00933339v3

Preprint submitted on 29 Sep 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

On n-dependent groups and fields

Nadja Hempel*

September 30, 2015

Abstract

First, an example of a 2-dependent group without a minimal subgroup of bounded index is given. Second, all infinite n-dependent fields are shown to be Artin-Schreier closed. Furthermore, the theory of any non separably closed PAC field has the IP_n property for all natural numbers n and certain properties of dependent (NIP) valued fields extend to the n-dependent context.

1 Introduction

Macintyre [18] and Cherlin-Shelah [6] have shown independently that any superstable field is algebraically closed. However, less is known in the case of supersimple fields. Hrushovski proved that any infinite perfect bounded pseudo-algebraically closed (PAC) field is supersimple [14] and conversely supersimple fields are perfect and bounded (Pillay and Poizat [19]), and it is conjectured that they are PAC. More is known about Artin-Schreier extensions of certain fields. Using a suitable chain condition for uniformly definable subgroups, Kaplan, Scanlon and Wagner showed in [16] that infinite NIP fields of positive characteristic are Artin-Schreier closed and simple fields have only finitely many Artin-Schreier extensions. The latter result was generalized to fields of positive characteristic defined in a theory without the tree property of the second kind (NTP_2 fields) by Chernikov, Kaplan and Simon [8].

We study groups and fields without the n-independence property. Theories without the n-independence property, briefly n-dependent or NIP_n theories, were introduced by Shelah in [21]. They are a natural generalization of NIP theories, and in fact both notions coincide when n equals to 1. For background on NIP theories the reader may consult [25]. It is easy to see that any theory with the $(n+1)$-independence property has the n-independence property. On the other hand, as for any natural number n the random $(n+1)$-hypergraph is $n+1$-dependent but has the n-independence property [9, Example 2.2.2], the classes of n-dependent theories form a proper hierarchy. Additionally, since all random hypergraphs are simple, the previous example shows that there are theories which are simple and n-dependent but which are not NIP. Hence one might ask if there are any non combinatorial examples of n-dependent theories which have the independence property? And furthermore, which results of NIP theories can be generalized to n-dependent theories or more specifically which results of (super)stable theories remains

*Partially supported by ANR-09-BLAN-0047 Modig and ANR-13-BS01-0006-01 ValCoMo

true for (super)simple n-dependent theories? Beyarslan [2] constructed the random n-hypergraph in any pseudo-finite field or, more generally, in any e-free perfect PAC field (PAC fields whose absolute Galois group is the profinite completion of the free group on e generators). Thus, those fields lie outside of the hierarchy of n-dependent fields.

In this paper, we first give an example of a group with a simple 2-dependent theory which has the independence property. Additionally, in this group the A-connected component depends on the parameter set A. This establishes on the one hand a non combinatorial example of a proper 2-dependent theory and on the other hand shows that the existence of an absolute connected component in any NIP group cannot be generalized to 2-dependent groups. Secondly, we find a Baldwin-Saxl condition for n-dependent groups (Section 4). Using this and connectivity of a certain vector group established in Section 5 we deduce that n-dependent fields are Artin-Schreier closed (Section 6). Furthermore, we show in Section 7 that the theory of any non separably closed PAC field has in fact the IP_n property for all natural numbers n which was established by Duret for the case n equals to 1 [10]. In Section 8 we extend certain consequences found in [16] for dependent valued fields with perfect residue field as well as in [15] by Jahnke and Koenigsmann for NIP henselian valued field to the n-dependent context.

I would like to thank my supervisors Thomas Blossier and Frank O. Wagner for useful comments during the work on this article and on first versions of this paper. Also, I like to thank Artem Chernikov for bringing this problem to my attention and to Daniel Palacín for valuable discussions around the topic.

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce n-dependent theories and state some general facts. The following definition can be found in [22, Definition 2.4].

Definition 2.1. Let T be a theory. We say that a formula $\psi(\bar{y}_0, \ldots, \bar{y}_{n-1}; \bar{x})$ in T has the *n-independence property* (IP_n) if there exists some parameters $(\bar{a}_i^j : i \in \omega, j \in n)$ and $(\bar{b}_I : I \subset \omega^n)$ in some model $\mathcal{M}$ of T such that $\mathcal{M} \models \psi(\bar{a}_{i_0}^0, \ldots, \bar{a}_{i_{n-1}}^{n-1}, \bar{b}_I)$ if and only if $(i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}) \in I$.

A theory is said to have IP_n if one of its formulas has IP_n. Otherwise we called it *n-dependent*. A structure is said to have IP_n or to be n-dependent if its theory does.

Both facts below are useful in order to proof that a theory is n-dependent as it reduces the complexity of formulas one has to consider to have IP_n. The first one is stated as Remark 2.5 [22] and afterwards proved in detail as Theorem 6.4 [9].

Fact 2.2. *A theory T is n-dependent if and only if every formula $\phi(\bar{y}_0, ..., \bar{y}_{n-1}; x)$ with $|x| = 1$ is n-dependent.*

Fact 2.3. *[9, Corollary 3.15] Let $\phi(\bar{y}_0, ..., \bar{y}_{n-1}; \bar{x})$ and $\psi(\bar{y}_0, ..., \bar{y}_{n-1}; \bar{x})$ be n-dependent formulas. Then so are $\neg\phi$, $\phi \wedge \psi$ and $\phi \vee \psi$.*

Remark 2.4. Note that a formula with at most n free variables cannot witness the n-independence property. Thus, from the previous fact it is easy to deduce that the random

n-hypergraph is n-dependent. In fact, more generally any theory in which any formula of more than n free variables is a boolean combination of formulas with at most n free variables is n-dependent.

3 Example of a 2-dependent group without a minimal subgroup of bounded index

Let G be $\mathbb{F}_p^{(\omega)}$ where $\mathbb{F}_p$ is the finite field with p elements. We consider the structure $\mathcal{M}$ defined as $(G, \mathbb{F}_p, 0, +, \cdot)$ where 0 is the neutral element, $+$ is addition in G, and $\cdot$ is the bilinear form $(a_i)_i \cdot (b_i)_i = \sum_i a_i b_i$ from G to $\mathbb{F}_p$. This example in the case p equals 2 has been studied by Wagner in [26, Example 4.1.14]. He shows that it is simple and that the connected component G_A^0 for any parameter set A is equal to $\{g \in G : \bigcap_{a\in A} g \cdot a = 0\}$. Hence, it is getting smaller and smaller while enlarging A and whence the absolute connected component, which exists in any NIP group, does not for this example.

Lemma 3.1. *The theory of $\mathcal{M}$ eliminates quantifiers.*

Proof. Let $t_1(x;\bar{y})$ and $t_2(x;\bar{y})$ be two group terms in G and let ϵ be an element of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Observe that the atomic formula $t_1(x;\bar{y}) = t_2(x;\bar{y})$ (resp. $t_1(x;\bar{y}) \neq t_2(x;\bar{y})$) is equivalent to an atomic formula of the form $x = t(\bar{y})$ or $0 = t(\bar{y})$ (resp. $x \neq t(\bar{y})$ or $0 \neq t(\bar{y})$) for some group term $t(\bar{y})$. Note that $0 = t(\bar{y})$ as well as $0 \neq t(\bar{y})$ are both quantifier free formulas in the free variables $\bar{y}$. Furthermore, the atomic formulas $t_1(x;\bar{y}) \cdot t_2(x;\bar{y}) = \epsilon$ and $t_1(x;\bar{y}) \cdot t_2(x;\bar{y}) \neq \epsilon$ are equivalent to a boolean combination of atomic formulas of the form $x \cdot x = \epsilon_x$, $x \cdot t_i(\bar{y}) = \epsilon_i$ and $t_j(\bar{y}) \cdot t_k(\bar{y}) = \epsilon_{jk}$ (a quantifier free formula in the free variables $\bar{y}$) with $t_i(\bar{y})$ group terms and ϵ_x, ϵ_i, and ϵ_{jk} elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Thus, a quantifier free formula $\varphi(x,\bar{y})$ is equivalent to a finite disjunction of formulas of the form

$$\phi(x;\bar{y}) = \psi(\bar{y}) \wedge x \cdot x = \epsilon \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in I_0} x = t_i^0(\bar{y}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in I_1} x \neq t_i^1(\bar{y}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in I_2} x \cdot t_i^2(\bar{y}) = \epsilon_i$$

where $t_i^j(\bar{y})$ are group terms, ϵ, ϵ_i are elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$, and $\psi(\bar{y})$ is a quantifier free formula in the free variables $\bar{y}$. If I_0 is nonempty, the formula $\exists x \phi(x,\bar{y})$ is equivalent to

$$\psi(\bar{y}) \wedge \bigwedge_{j,l\in I_0} t_j^0(\bar{y}) = t_l^0(\bar{y}) \wedge t_i^0(\bar{y}) \cdot t_i^0(\bar{y}) = \epsilon \wedge \bigwedge_{j\in I_1} t_i^0(\bar{y}) \neq t_j^1(\bar{y}) \wedge \bigwedge_{j\in I_2} t_i^0(\bar{y}) \cdot t_j^2(\bar{y}) = \epsilon_j$$

for any $i \in I_0$. Now, we assume that I_0 is the empty set. If there exists an element x' such that $x' \cdot z_i = \epsilon_i$ for given $z_0, \ldots, z_m$ in G and $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$, one can always find an element x such that $x \cdot x = \epsilon$ and $x \neq v_j$ for given $v_0, \ldots, v_q$ in G which still satisfies $x \cdot z_i = \epsilon_i$ by modifying x' at a large enough coordinate. Hence, it is enough to find a quantifier free condition which is equivalent to $\exists x \bigwedge_{i\in I_2} x \cdot t_i^2(\bar{y}) = \epsilon_i$. For $i \in \mathbb{F}_p$, let

$$Y_i = \{j \in I_2 : \epsilon_j = i\}.$$

Then $\exists x \bigwedge_{i\in I_2} x \cdot t_i^2(\bar{y}) = \epsilon_i$ is equivalent to

$$\bigwedge_{i=0}^{p-1} \bigwedge_{j\in Y_i} t_j^2(\bar{y}) \notin \left\{ \sum_{k\in Y_0} \lambda_k^0 t_k^2(\bar{y}) + \cdots + \sum_{k\in Y_i\setminus j} \lambda_k^i t_k^2(\bar{y}) : \lambda_k^l \in \mathbb{F}_p, \sum_{l=1}^{i} \sum_{k\in Y_l}^{k\neq j} l \cdot_{\mathbb{F}_p} \lambda_k^l \neq i \right\}$$

which finishes the proof. □

Lemma 3.2. *The structure $\mathcal{M}$ is 2-dependent.*

Proof. We suppose, towards a contradiction, that $\mathcal{M}$ has IP_2. By Fact 2.2 we can find a formula $\phi(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1; x)$ with $|x| = 1$ which witnesses the 2-independence property. By the proof of Lemma 3.1 and as being 2-dependent is preserved under boolean combinations (Fact 2.3), it suffices to prove that none of the following formulas can witness the 2-independence property in the variables $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1; x)$:

- quantifier free formulas of the form $\psi(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)$,
- the formula $x \cdot x = \epsilon$ with ϵ in $\mathbb{F}_p$,
- formulas of the form $x = t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)$ for some group term $t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)$,
- formulas of the form $x \cdot t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = \epsilon$ for some group term $t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)$ and ϵ in $\mathbb{F}_p$.

As the atomic formula $\psi(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)$ does not depend on x and $x \cdot x = \epsilon$ does not depend on $\bar{y}_0$ nor $\bar{y}_1$ they cannot witness the 2-independence property in the variables $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1; x)$. Furthermore, as for given $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$, the formula $x = t(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ can be only satisfied by a single element, such a formula is as well 2-dependent. Thus the only candidate left is a formula of the form $x \cdot t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = \epsilon$ with $t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)$ some group term in G and ϵ an element of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Thus, we suppose that the formula $x \cdot t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = \epsilon$ has IP_2 and choose some elements $\{\bar{a}_i : i \in \omega\}$, $\{\bar{b}_i : i \in \omega\}$ and $\{c_I : I \subset \omega^2\}$ which witnesses it. As $t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1)$ is just a sum of elements of the tuple $\bar{y}_0$ and $\bar{y}_1$ and G is commutative, we may write this formula as $x \cdot (t_a(\bar{y}_0) + t_b(\bar{y}_1)) = \epsilon$ in which the term $t_a(\bar{y}_0)$ (resp. $t_b(\bar{y}_1)$) is a sum of elements of the tuple $\bar{y}_0$ (resp. $\bar{y}_1$). Let

$$S_{ij} := \{x : x \cdot (t_a(\bar{a}_i) + t_b(\bar{b}_j)) = \epsilon\}$$

be the set of realizations of the formula $x \cdot (t_a(\bar{a}_i) + t_b(\bar{b}_j)) = \epsilon$. Note, that an element c belongs to S_{ij} if and only if we have that $e_{ij}(c)$ defined as

$$e_{ij}(c) = c \cdot \big(t_a(\bar{a}_i) + t_b(\bar{b}_j)\big)$$

is equal to ϵ. Let i, l, j, and k be arbitrary natural numbers. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{ij}(c) &= c \cdot \big(t_a(\bar{a}_i) + t_b(\bar{b}_j)\big) \\ &= c \cdot \big((t_a(\bar{a}_i) + t_b(\bar{b}_k)) + (p-1)(t_a(\bar{a}_l) + t_b(\bar{b}_k)) + (t_a(\bar{a}_l) + t_b(\bar{b}_j))\big) \\ &= e_{ik}(c) + (p-1)e_{lk}(c) + e_{lj}(c). \end{aligned}$$

If the element c belongs to $S_{ik} \cap S_{lk} \cap S_{lj}$, the terms $e_{ik}(c)$, $e_{lk}(c)$, and $e_{lj}(c)$ are all equal to ϵ. By the equality above we get that $e_{ij}(c)$ is also equal to ϵ and so c also belongs to S_{ij}.

Let $I = \{(1,1), (1,2), (2,2)\}$. Then $c_I \in S_{22} \cap S_{12} \cap S_{11}$ but $c_I \notin S_{21}$ which contradicts the precious paragraph letting i and k be equal to 2 and l and j be equal to 1. Thus the formula $x \cdot t(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1) = \epsilon$ is 2-dependent, hence all formulas in the theory of $\mathcal{M}$ are 2-dependent and whence $\mathcal{M}$ is 2-dependent. □

4 Baldwin-Saxl condition for n-dependent theories

We shall now prove a suitable version of the Baldwin-Saxl condition [1] for n-dependent formulas.

Proposition 4.1. *Let G be a group and let $\psi(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_{n-1}; x)$ be a n-dependent formula for which the set $\psi(\bar{b}_0, \dots, \bar{b}_{n-1}; G)$ defines a subgroup of G for any parameters $\bar{b}_0, \dots, \bar{b}_{n-1}$. Then there exists a natural number m_ψ such that for any d greater or equal to m_ψ and any array of parameters $(\bar{a}_{i,j} : i < n,\ j \leq d)$ there is $\nu \in d^n$ such that*

$$\bigcap_{\eta \in d^n} H_\eta = \bigcap_{\eta \in d^n, \eta \neq \nu} H_\eta$$

where H_η is defined as $\psi(\bar{a}_{0,i_0}, \dots, \bar{a}_{n-1,i_{n-1}}; x)$ for $\eta = (i_0, \dots, i_{n-1})$.

Proof. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that for an arbitrarily large natural number m one can find a finite array $(\bar{a}_{i,j} : i < n,\ j \leq m)$ of parameters such that $\bigcap_{\eta \in m^n} H_\eta$ is strictly contained in any of its proper subintersections. Hence, for every $\nu \in m^n$ there exists c_ν in $\bigcap_{\eta \neq \nu} H_\eta \setminus \bigcap_\eta H_\eta$.

Now, for any subset J of m^n, we let $c_J := \prod_{\eta \in J} c_\eta$. Note that $c_J \in H_\nu$ whenever $\nu \in m^n \setminus J$. On the other hand, if ν is an element of J, all factors of the product except of c_ν belong to H_ν, whence $c_J \notin H_\nu$. By compactness, one can find an infinite array of parameters $(\bar{a}_{i,j} : i < n,\ j \leq \omega)$ and elements $\{c_J : J \subset \omega^n\}$ such that c_J belongs to H_ν if and only if $\nu \notin J$. Hence, the formula $\neg\psi(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_{n-1}; x)$ has IP_n and whence by Fact 2.3 the original formula $\psi(\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_{n-1}; x)$ has IP_n as well contradicting the assumption. □

5 A special vector group

For this section, we fix an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic $p > 0$ and we let $\wp(x)$ be the additive homomorphism $x \mapsto x^p - x$ on $\mathbb{K}$.

We analyze the following algebraic subgroups of $(\mathbb{K}, +)^n$:

Definition 5.1. For a singleton a in $\mathbb{K}$, we let G_a be equal to $(\mathbb{K}, +)$, and for a tuple $\bar{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{K}^n$ with $n > 1$ we define:

$$G_{\bar{a}} = \{(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{K}^n :\ a_0 \cdot \wp(x_0) = a_i \cdot \wp(x_i) \text{ for } 0 \leq i < n\}.$$

Recall that for an algebraic group G, we denote by G^0 the connected component of the unit element of G. Note that if G is definable over some parameter set A, its connected component G^0 coincides with the smallest A-definable subgroup of G of finite index.

Our aim is to show that $G_{\bar{a}}$ is connected for certain choices of $\bar{a}$, namely $G_{\bar{a}}$ coincides with $G^0_{\bar{a}}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let k be an algebraically closed subfield of $\mathbb{K}$, let G be a k-definable connected algebraic subgroup of $(\mathbb{K}^n, +)$ and let f be a k-definable homomorphism from*

G to $(\mathbb{K},+)$ such that for every $\bar{g} \in G$ there are polynomials $P_{\bar{g}}(X_0,\dots,X_{n-1})$ and $Q_{\bar{g}}(X_0,\dots,X_{n-1})$ in $k[X_0,\dots,X_{n-1}]$ such that

$$f(\bar{g}) = \frac{P_{\bar{g}}(\bar{g})}{Q_{\bar{g}}(\bar{g})}.$$

Then f is an additive polynomial in $k[X_0,\dots,X_{n-1}]$. In fact, there exists natural numbers $m_0,\dots,m_n$ such that f is of the form $\sum_{i=0}^{m_0} a_{i,0}X_0^{p^i} + \dots + \sum_{i=0}^{m_n} a_{i,n}X_n^{p^i}$ with coefficients $a_{i,j}$ in k.

Proof. By compactness, one can find finitely many definable subsets D_i of G and polynomials $P_i(X_0,\dots,X_{n-1})$ and $Q_i(X_0,\dots,X_{n-1})$ in $k[X_0,\dots,X_{n-1}]$ such that f is equal to $P_i(\bar{x})/Q_i(\bar{x})$ on D_i. Using [3, Lemma 3.8] we can extend f to a k-definable homomorphism $F : (\mathbb{K}^n,+) \to (\mathbb{K},+)$ which is also locally rational. Now, the functions

$$F_0(X) := F(X,0,\dots,0),\ \dots\ , F_{n-1}(X) := F(0,\dots,0,X)$$

are k-definable homomorphisms of $(\mathbb{K},+)$ to itself. Additionally, they are rational on a finite definable decomposition of $\mathbb{K}$, so they are rational on a cofinite subset of $\mathbb{K}$. Hence every F_i is an additive polynomial in $k[X]$. Thus

$$F(X_0,\dots,X_{n-1}) = F_0(X_0) + \dots + F_{n-1}(X_{n-1})$$

is an additive polynomial in $k[X_0,\dots,X_{n-1}]$ as it is a sum of additive polynomials. By [12, Proposition 1.1.5] it is of the desired form. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\bar{a} = (a_0,\dots,a_n)$ be a tuple in $\mathbb{K}^\times$. Then $G_{\bar{a}}$ is connected if and only if the set $\left\{\frac{1}{a_0},\dots,\frac{1}{a_n}\right\}$ is linearly $\mathbb{F}_p$-independent.*

Parts of the proof follows the one of [16, Lemma 2.8].

Proof. So suppose first that $\left\{\frac{1}{a_0},\dots,\frac{1}{a_n}\right\}$ is linearly $\mathbb{F}_p$-dependent. Thus we can find elements $b_0,\dots,b_{n-1}$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that

$$b_0 \cdot \frac{1}{a_0} + \dots + b_{n-1}\frac{1}{a_{n-1}} = \frac{1}{a_n}.$$

Now, let $\bar{a}'$ be the tuple $\bar{a}$ restricted to its first n coordinates and fix some element $(x_0,\dots x_{n-1})$ in $G_{\bar{a}'}$. Let t be defined as $a_0(x_0^p - x_0)$. Hence, by the definition of $G_{\bar{a}'}$, we have that t is equal to $a_i(x_i^p - x_i)$ for any $i < n$. Furthermore, we have that $(x_0,\dots,x_{n-1},x)$ belongs to $G_{\bar{a}}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
& t && = a_n(x^p - x)\\
\Leftrightarrow\ & 0 && = \frac{1}{a_n}t - (x^p - x)\\
\Leftrightarrow\ & 0 && = \frac{b_0}{a_0}t + \dots + \frac{b_{n-1}}{a_{n-1}}t - (x^p - x)\\
\Leftrightarrow\ & 0 && = b_0 \cdot (x_0^p - x_0) + \dots + b_{n-1} \cdot (x_{n-1}^p - x_{n-1}) - (x^p - x)\\
\Leftrightarrow\ & 0 && = (b_0 \cdot x_0 + \dots + b_{n-1} \cdot x_{n-1} - x)^p - (b_0 \cdot x_0 + \dots + b_{n-1}x_{n-1} - x).
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, $(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x)$ belongs to G_a if and only if $b_0 \cdot x_0 + \cdots + b_{n-1}x_{n-1} - x$ is an element of $\mathbb{F}_p$. With this formulation we consider the following subset of $G_{\bar{a}}$:

$$H = \{(x_0, \ldots x_n) \in G_{\bar{a}} : (x_0, \ldots x_{n-1}) \in G_{\bar{a}'} \text{ and } b_0 \cdot x_0 + \ldots b_{n-1}x_{n-1} - x_n = 0\}$$

This is in fact a definable subgroup of $G_{\bar{a}}$ of finite index. Hence $G_{\bar{a}}$ is not connected.

We prove the other implication by induction on the length of the tuple $\bar{a}$ which we denote by n. Let $n = 1$, then $G_{\bar{a}}$ is equal to $(\mathbb{K}, +)$ and thus connected since the additive group of an algebraically closed field is always connected.

Let $\bar{a} = (a_0, \ldots, a_n)$ be an $(n+1)$-tuple such that $\left\{\frac{1}{a_0}, \ldots, \frac{1}{a_n}\right\}$ is linearly $\mathbb{F}_p$-independent and suppose that the statement holds for tuples of length n. Define $\bar{a}'$ to be the restriction of $\bar{a}$ to the first n coordinates. Observe that the natural map $\pi : G_{\bar{a}} \to G_{\bar{a}'}$ is surjective since $\mathbb{K}$ is algebraically closed and that

$$[G_{\bar{a}'} : \pi(G^0_{\bar{a}})] = [\pi(G_{\bar{a}}) : \pi(G^0_{\bar{a}})] \leq [G_{\bar{a}} : G^0_{\bar{a}}] < \infty.$$

Hence the definable group $\pi(G^0_{\bar{a}})$ has finite index in $G_{\bar{a}'}$. As $\left\{\frac{1}{a_0}, \ldots, \frac{1}{a_{n-1}}\right\}$ is also linearly $\mathbb{F}_p$-independent, the group $G_{\bar{a}'}$ is connected by assumption. Therefore $\pi(G^0_{\bar{a}}) = G_{\bar{a}'}$.

Now, suppose that $G_{\bar{a}}$ is not connected.

Claim. *For every $\bar{x} \in G_{\bar{a}'}$, there exists a unique $x_n \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $(\bar{x}, x_n) \in G^0_{\bar{a}}$.*

Proof of the Claim. Assume there exists $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{K}^n$ and two distinct elements x^0_n and x^1_n of $\mathbb{K}$ such that $(\bar{x}, x^0_n)$ and $(\bar{x}, x^1_n)$ are elements of $G^0_{\bar{a}}$. As $G^0_{\bar{a}}$ is a group, their difference $(\bar{0}, x^0_n - x^1_n)$ belongs also to $G^0_{\bar{a}}$. Thus, by definition of $G_{\bar{a}}$, its last coordinate $x^0_n - x^1_n$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_p$. So $(\bar{0}, \mathbb{F}_p)$ is a subgroup of $G^0_{\bar{a}}$. Take an arbitrary element $(\bar{x}, x_n)$ in $G_{\bar{a}}$. As $\pi(G^0_{\bar{a}}) = G_{\bar{a}'}$, there exists $x'_n \in \mathbb{K}$ with $(\bar{x}, x'_n) \in G^0_{\bar{a}}$. Again, the difference of the last coordinate $x'_n - x_n$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_p$. So

$$(\bar{x}, x_n) = (\bar{x}, x'_n) - (\bar{0}, x'_n - x_n) \in G^0_{\bar{a}}.$$

This leads to a contradiction, as $G^0_{\bar{a}}$ is assumed to be a proper subgroup of $G_{\bar{a}}$. □

Thus, we can fix a definable additive function $f : G_{\bar{a}'} \to \mathbb{K}$ that sends every tuple to this unique element. Note that $G_{\bar{a}}$ and hence also $G^0_{\bar{a}}$ are defined over $\bar{a}$. So the function f is defined over $\bar{a}$ as well. Now, let $\bar{x} = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ be any tuple in $G_{\bar{a}'}$ and set $L := \mathbb{F}_p(a_0, \ldots, a_n)$. Then:

$$x_n := f(\bar{x}) \in \mathrm{dcl}(\bar{a}, \bar{x}).$$

In other words, x_n is definable over $L(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ which simply means that it belongs to the purely inseparable closure $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})^{p^{-n}}$ of $L(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ by [5, Chapter 4, Corollary 1.4]. Since there exists an $l \in L(x_0)$ such that $x^p_n - x_n - a^{-1}_n l = 0$, the element x_n is separable over $L(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$. So it belongs to $L(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ which implies that there exists some mutually prime polynomials $g, h \in L[X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$ such that $x_n = h(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})/g(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$. Thus, by Lemma 5.2 the definable function $f(X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1})$ we started with is an additive polynomial in n variables over L^{alg} and there exists $c_{j,i}$ in L^{alg} and natural numbers m_j such that

$$f(X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{m_0} c_{0,i} X_0^{p^i} + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{n-1}} c_{n-1,i} X_{n-1}^{p^i}.$$

Using the identities $X_i^p - X_i = \frac{a_0}{a_i}(X_0^p - X_0)$ in $G_{\bar{a}}^0$, there are β_j in L^{alg} and $g(X_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} d_i X_0^{p^i}$ an additive polynomial in $L^{\mathrm{alg}}[X_0]$ with summands of powers of X_0 greater or equal to p such that

$$f(X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}) = g(X_0) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \beta_j \cdot X_j.$$

Since the image under f of the vectors $(0,1,0,\ldots,0), (0,0,1,0,\ldots,0), \ldots, (0,\ldots,0,1)$ has to be an element of $\mathbb{F}_p$, for $0 < i < n$ the β_i's have to be elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$. On the other hand, for any element $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ of $G_{\bar{a}}^0$ we have that $a_n(x_n^p - x_n) = a_0(x_0^p - x_0)$. Replacing x_n by $f(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a_n \left[f(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})^p - f(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \right] - a_0(x_0^p - x_0) \\ &= a_n \left[g(x_0)^p - g(x_0) + (\beta_0^p x_0^p - \beta_0 x_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \beta_j (x_j^p - x_j) \right] - a_0(x_0^p - x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Using again the identities $x_i^p - x_i = \frac{a_0}{a_i}(x_0^p - x_0)$ in $G_{\bar{a}}^0$ we obtain a polynomial in one variable

$$P(X) = a_n \left[g(X)^p - g(X) + (\beta_0^p X^p - \beta_0 X) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \beta_j \frac{a_0}{a_j} (X^p - X) \right] - a_0(X^p - X)$$

which vanishes for all elements x_0 of $\mathbb{K}$ such that there exists $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}$ in $\mathbb{K}$ with $(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \in G_{\bar{a}'}$. In fact, this is true for all elements of $\mathbb{K}$. Hence, P is the zero polynomial. Notice that $g(X)$ appears in a pth-power. Since it contains only summands of power of X greater or equal to p, the polynomial $g(X)^p$ contains only summands of power of X strictly greater than p. As X only appears in powers less or equal to p in all other summands of P, the polynomial $g(X)$ has to be the zero polynomial itself. By the same argument as for the other β_j, the coefficient β_0 has to belong to $\mathbb{F}_p$ as well. Dividing by $a_0 a_n$ yields that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} \beta_j \frac{1}{a_j} (X^p - X)$$

with $\beta_n := -1$ is the zero polynomial. Thus

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} \beta_j \frac{1}{a_j} = 0$$

As β_n is different from 0 and all β_i are elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$, this contradicts the assumption and the lemma is established. □

Using Lemma 5.3, a stronger version of [16, Lemma 2.8] together with [16, Corollary 2.6], we obtain the following corollary in the same way as Kaplan, Scanlon and Wagner obtain [16, Corollary 2.9].

Corollary 5.4. *Let k be a perfect subfield of $\mathbb{K}$ and $\bar{a} \in k^n$ be as in the previous lemma. Then $G_{\bar{a}}$ is isomorphic over k to $(\mathbb{K}, +)$. In particular, for any field $K \geq k$ with $K \leq \mathbb{K}$, the group $G_{\bar{a}}(K)$ is isomorphic to $(K, +)$.*

6 Artin-Schreier extensions

Definition 6.1. Let K be a field of characteristic $p > 0$ and $\wp(x)$ the additive homomorphism $x \mapsto x^p - x$. A field extension L/K is called an *Artin-Schreier extension* if $L = K(a)$ with $\wp(a) \in K$. We say that K is *Artin-Schreier closed* if it has no proper Artin-Schreier extension i. e. $\wp(K) = K$.

In the following remark, we produce elements from an algebraically independent array of size m^n which fit the condition of Lemma 5.3.

Remark 6.2. Let $\{\alpha_{i,j} : i \in n, j \in m\}$ be a set of algebraically independent elements in $\mathbb{K}$. Then the tuple $(a_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} : (i_0,\dots,i_{n-1}) \in m^n)$ with $a_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} = \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} \alpha_{l,i_l}$ and ordered lexicographically satisfies the condition of Lemma 5.3.

Proof. Suppose that there exists a tuple of elements $(\beta_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} : (i_0,\dots,i_{n-1}) \in m^n)$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$ not all equal to zero such that

$$\sum_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})\in m^n} \beta_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} \frac{1}{a_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})}} = 0$$

Then the $\alpha_{i,j}$ satisfy:

$$\sum_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})\in m^n} \beta_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} \cdot \left(\prod_{\{(k,l)\neq(j,i_j):j\leq n-1\}} \alpha_{k,l} \right) = 0$$

which contradicts the algebraic independence of the $\alpha_{i,j}$. □

We can now adapt the proof in [16] showing that an infinite NIP field is Artin-Schreier closed to obtain the same result for a n-dependent field.

Theorem 6.3. *Any infinite n-dependent field is Artin-Schreier closed.*

Proof. Let K be an infinite n-dependent field and we may assume that it is $\aleph_0$-saturated. We work in a big algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ that contains all objects we will consider. Let $k = \bigcap_{l\in\omega} K^{p^l}$, which is a type-definable infinite perfect subfield of K. We consider the formula $\psi(x; y_0,\dots,y_{n-1}) := \exists t\ (x = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} y_i \cdot \wp(t))$ which for every tuple $(a_0,\dots,a_{n-1})$ in k^n defines an additive subgroup of $(K,+)$. Let $m \in \omega$ be the natural number given by Proposition 4.1 for this formula. Now, we fix an array of size m^n of algebraically independent elements $\{\alpha_{i,j} : i \in n, j \in m\}$ in k and set $a_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} = \prod_{l=0}^{n} \alpha_{l,i_l}$. By choice of m, there exists $(j_0,\dots,j_{n-1}) \in m^n$ such that

$$\bigcap_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})\in m^n} a_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} \cdot \wp(K) = \bigcap_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})\neq(j_0,\dots,j_{n-1})} a_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} \cdot \wp(K). \tag{6.1}$$

By reordering the elements, we may assume that $(j_0,\dots,j_{n-1}) = (m,\dots,m)$. Let $\bar{a}$ be the tuple $(a_{(i_0,\dots,i_{n-1})} : (i_0,\dots,i_{n-1}) \in m^n)$ ordered lexicographically and $\bar{a}'$ the restriction to $m^n - 1$ coordinates (one coordinate less).

We consider the groups $G_{\bar{a}}$ and respectively $G_{\bar{a}'}$ defined as in Definition 5.1. Using Remark 6.2 and Corollary 5.4 we obtain the following commuting diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{\bar{a}} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & G_{\bar{a}'} \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ (\mathbb{K}, +) & \xrightarrow{\rho} & (\mathbb{K}, +) \end{array}$$

As the vertical isomorphisms are defined over k, this diagram can be restricted to K. Note that π and therefore also ρ stays onto for this restriction by equality (6.1) and that the size of $\ker(\rho)$ has to be p. Choose a nontrivial element c in the kernel of ρ and let ρ' be equal to $\rho(c \cdot x)$. Observe that ρ' is still a morphism from $(\mathbb{K}, +)$ to $(\mathbb{K}, +)$, its restriction to K is still onto and its kernel is equal to $\mathbb{F}_p$. Then [16, Remark 4.2] ensures that ρ' is of the form $a \cdot (x^p - x)^{p^n}$ for some a in K. Finally, let $l \in K$ be arbitrary. Since $\rho' \restriction K$ is onto and X^{p^n} is an inseparable polynomial in characteristic p, there exists $h \in K$ with $l = h^p - h$. As $l \in K$ was arbitrary, we get that $\wp(K) = K$ and we can conclude. □

The proof of [16, Corollary 4.4] adapts immediately and yields the following corollary.

Corollary 6.4. *If K is an infinite n-dependent field of characteristic $p > 0$ and L/K is a finite separable extension, then p does not divide $[L : K]$.*

7 Non separably closed PAC field

The goal of this section is to generalize a result of Duret [10], namely that the theory of a non separably closed PAC field has the IP property. To do so we need the following two facts.

Fact 7.1. *[10, Lemme 6.2] Let K be a field and k be a subfield of K which is PAC. Let p be a prime number which does not coincide with the characteristic of K such that k contains all pth roots of unity and there exists an element in k that does not have a pth root in K. Let $(a_i : i \in \omega)$ be a set of pairwise different elements of k and let I and J be finite disjoint subsets of ω, then K realizes*

$$\{\exists y(y^p = x + a_i) : i \in I\} \cup \{\neg\exists y(y^p = x + a_j) : j \in J\}.$$

Fact 7.2. *[10, Lemme 2.1] Every finite separable extension of a PAC field is PAC.*

Theorem 7.3. *Let K be a field and k be a subfield of K which is a non separably closed PAC field and relatively algebraically closed in K. Then, the theory of K has the n-independence property.*

Proof. If k is countable, we may work in an elementary extension of the tuple (K, k) for which it is uncountable. As k is non separably closed, there exists a proper Galois extension l of k. Let p be a prime number that divides the degree of l over k. Then there is a separable extension k' of k such that the Galois extension l over k' is of degree p. We may distinguish two cases:

(1) The characteristic of k is equal to p. As l is a cyclic Galois extension of degree p of k', a field of characteristic p, it is an Artin-Schreier extension of k'. We pick α such that $k' = k(\alpha)$ and let $K' = K(\alpha)$. As k' is separable over k, it is relatively algebraically closed in K' by [17, p.59]. Hence K' admits an Artin-Schreier extension and consequently its theory has IP_n by Theorem 6.3. As it is an algebraic extension of K, thus interpretable in K, the theory $\mathrm{Th}(K)$ has IP_n as well.

(2) The characteristic of k is different than p. Since l is a separable extension of k', we can find an element β of l such that l is equal to $k'(\beta)$. Let ω be a primitive p-root of unity and let $k'_\omega = k'(\omega)$ and $l_\omega = l(\omega)$. Note that l_ω is equal to $k'_\omega(\beta)$ and that the degree $[l_\omega : k'_\omega]$ is at most p and the degree $[k'_\omega : k']$ is strictly smaller than p. Additionally, we have:

$$[l_\omega : k'_\omega] \cdot [k'_\omega : k'] = [l_\omega : k'] = [l_\omega : l] \cdot [l : k'] = [l_\omega : l] \cdot p.$$

Thus $[l_\omega : k'_\omega]$ is divisible by p and hence equal to p. Furthermore, the conjugates of β over k'_ω are the same as over k'. Hence, as l is a Galois extension of k', they are contained in l and whence in l_ω. Thus, the field l_ω is a cyclic Galois extension of the field k'_ω and k'_ω contains the p-roots of unity. In other words, l_ω is a Kummer extension of k'_ω of degree p. So there exists an element δ in k'_ω that does not have a p root in it. Furthermore, as k'_ω is a finite separable extension of k, it is also PAC by Fact 7.2 and it is relatively algebraically closed in $K'_\omega = K'(\omega)$ by [17, p.59]. Thus, the element δ has no p-root in K'_ω as well. Let $\{a_{i,j} : j < n, i \in \omega\}$ be a set of algebraic independent elements of k'_ω which exists as it is an uncountable field. This ensures that $\prod_{l=0}^{n-1} a_{i_l,l} \neq \prod_{l=0}^{n-1} a_{j_l,l}$ for $(i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}) \neq (j_0, \ldots, j_{n-1})$. Thus we may apply Fact 7.1 to K'_ω, k'_ω and the infinite set $\{\prod_{l=0}^{n-1} a_{i_l,l} : (i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$. We deduce that for the formula $\varphi(y; x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) = \exists z(z^p = y + \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i)$ and for any disjoint finite subsets I and J of $\mathbb{N}^n$ there exists an element in K'_ω that realizes

$$\{\varphi(y; a_{i_0,0}, \ldots, a_{i_{n-1},n-1})\}_{(i_0,\ldots,i_{n-1})\in I} \cup \{\neg\varphi(y; a_{j_0,0}, \ldots, a_{j_{n-1},n-1})\}_{(j_0,\ldots,j_{n-1})\in J}$$

Thus $\mathrm{Th}(K'_\omega)$ has the IP_n property by compactness. As again K'_ω is interpretable in K, we can conclude that the theory of K has the IP_n property as well. □

Corollary 7.4. *The theory of any non separably closed PAC field has the IP_n property.*

In the special case of pseudo-finite fields or, more generally, e-free PAC fields the previous corollary is a consequence of a result of Beyarslan proved in [2], namely that one can interpret the n-hypergraph in any such field.

8 Applications to valued fields

In [16] the authors deduce that an NIP valued field of positive characteristic p has to be p-divisible simply by the fact that infinite NIP fields are Artin-Schreier closed [16, Proposition 5.4]. Thus their result generalizes to our framework.

For the rest of the section, we fix some natural number n.

Corollary 8.1. *If (K, v) is an n-dependent valued field of positive characteristic p, then the value group of K is p-divisible.*

Together with Corollary 6.4, we can conclude the following analogue to [16, Corollary 5.10].

Corollary 8.2. *Every n-dependent valued field of positive characteristic p whose residue field is perfect, is Kaplansky, i.e.*

- *the value group is p-divisible;*
- *the residue field is perfect and does not admit a finite separable extension whose degree is divisible by p.*

Now, we turn to the question whether an n-dependent henselian valued field can carry a nontrivial definable henselian valuation. Note that by a definable henselian valuation v on K we mean that the valuation ring of (K, v), i. e. the set of elements of K with non-negative value, is a definable set in the language of rings. We need the following definition:

Definition 8.3. Let K be a field. We say that its absolute Galois group is *universal* if for every finite group G there exist a finite extensions L of K and a Galois extension M of L such that $\mathrm{Gal}(M/L) \cong G$.

As any finite extension of an n-dependent field K of characteristic $p > 0$ is still n-dependent and of characteristic p, one cannot find a finite extensions $L \subseteq M$ of K such that their Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(M/L)$ is of order p. Hence any n-dependent field of positive characteristic has a non-universal absolute Galois group. Note that Jahnke and Koenigsmann showed in [15, Theorem 3.15] that a henselian valued field whose absolute value group is non universal and which is neither separably nor real closed admits a non-trivial definable henselian valuation. Hence this gives the following result which is a generalization of [15, Corollary 3.18]:

Proposition 8.4. *Let (K, v) be a non-trivially henselian valued field of positive characteristic p which is not separably closed. If K is n-dependent then K admits a non-trivial definable henselian valuation.*

REFERENCES

[1] John T. Baldwin, Jan Saxl: *Logical stability in group theory*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A 21(3), pages 267-276, (1976)

[2] Özlem Beyarslan: *Random hypergraphs in pseudofinite fields*, Journal of the Inst. of Math. Jussieu 9, pages 29-47, (2010)

[3] Thomas Blossier: *Subgroups of the additive group of a separably closed field*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 13, pages 169-216, (2005)

[4] Nicolas Bourbaki: *Algèbre. Chapitre 5. Corps commutatifs*, Hermann

[5] Elisabeth Bouscaren: *Model theory and algebraic geometry : an introduction to E. Hrushovski's proof of the geometric Mordell-Lang conjecture*, Springer Verlag, (1998)

[6] Gregory Cherlin, Saharon Shelah: *Superstable fields and groups*, Annals Math Logic 18, pages 227-270, (1980)

[7] Artem Chernikov: *Theories without the tree property of the second kind*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 165 (2), pages 695-723 (2014)

[8] Artem Chernikov, Itay Kaplan, Pierre Simon: *Groups and fields with NTP_2*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 143 (1), pages 395-406 (2015)

[9] Artem Chernikov, Daniel Palacín, Kota Takeuchi: *On n-dependence*, submitted, arXiv:1411.0120 (2014)

[10] Jean Louis Duret: *Les corps faiblement algébriquement clos non séparablement clos ont la propriété d'indépendance*, Model Theory of Algebra and Arithmetic (proc. Karpacz), Lectures Notes in Mathematics, vol. 834, pages 136162. Springer-Verlag (1979)

[11] Pierre Gabiel Michel Demazure: *Groupes Algébriques*, Tome I, North-Holland (1970)

[12] David Goss: *Basic structures of function field arithmetic*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1996)

[13] James E. Humphreys: *Linear Algebraic Groups*, Springer Verlag, second edition, (1998)

[14] Ehrud Hrushovski: *Pseudo-finite fields and related structures*, Model theory and applications, Quad. Mat. 11, pages 151-212, (2002)

[15] Franziska Jahnke, Jochen Koenigsmann: *Definable henselian valuations*, submitted arXiv:1210.7615 (2012)

[16] Itay Kaplan, Thomas Scanlon, Frank O. Wagner: *Artin Schreier extensions in NIP and simple fields*, Israel J. Math., 185:141-153, (2011)

[17] Serge Lang: *Introduction to algebraic geometry*, Addison-Wesley publishing company

[18] Angus Macintyre: *ω_1-categorical fields*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 70, no. 3, pages 253 - 270, (1971)

[19] Anand Pillay, Bruno Poizat: *Corps et Chirurgie*, J. Symb. Log., vol. 60(2), pages 528-533, (1995)

[20] Bruno P. Poizat: *Groupe Stables*, Nur Al-Mantiq Wal-Ma'rifah, Villeurbanne, France, (1987)

[21] Saharon Shelah: *Strongly dependent theories*, Israel J Math 204, pages 1-83 (2014)

[22] Saharon Shelah: *Definable groups for dependent and 2-dependent theories*, arXiv:math/0703045 (2012)

[23] Jean-Pierre Serre: *Corps Locaux*, Hermann, (1962)

[24] Thomas Scanlon: *Infinite stable fields are Artin-Schreier closed*, note (http://math.berkeley.edu/ scanlon/papers/ASclos.pdf), (1999)

[25] Pierre Simon: *A guide to NIP theories*, to be published in the Lecture Notes in Logic series, ASL and Cambridge University Press, arXiv:1208.3944 (2012)

[26] Frank O. Wagner: *Simple Theories*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, (2000)

Université de Lyon; CNRS; Université Lyon 1; Institut Camille Jordan UMR5208, 43 boulevard du 11 novembre 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France

E-mail address: hempel@math.univ-lyon1.fr