

Equivalents of NOTOP

Chris Laskowski
University of Maryland

Joint work with Danielle Ulrich

ASL Annual Meeting
14 May, 2025

I. A history lesson

II. Revising the story

III. Under the hood

Throughout the whole talk, T is always a complete theory in a countable language.

History



Saharon Shelah

Definition

A (complete, countable) stable theory T is **superstable** if there do not exist c and $A_0 \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subset \dots$ with $\text{tp}(c/A_{n+1})$ forking over A_n for each n .

Theorem

If T is not superstable, then the class of uncountable models of T is chaotic. (In particular, $I(T, \kappa) = 2^\kappa$ for all $\kappa > \aleph_0$.)

Henceforth, we will assume all theories are (complete) and superstable in a countable language.

T countable, superstable

Notation:

M **a-saturated** $\leftrightarrow \mathbf{F}_{\aleph_0}^a$ -saturated model $\leftrightarrow \aleph_\epsilon$ -saturated model
means: M realizes every type in $S(\text{acl}^{eq}(A))$ for every finite $A \subseteq M$.

An **independent triple of models** (M_0, M_1, M_2) satisfies $M_0 \preceq M_1$, $M_0 \preceq M_2$, with $M_1 \downarrow_{M_0} M_2$ An **independent triple of models**

(M_0, M_1, M_2) satisfies $M_0 \preceq M_1$, $M_0 \preceq M_2$, with $M_1 \downarrow_{M_0} M_2$
(**forking independence!**)

Definition

A (countable) superstable T has **NDOP** if, for any independent triple (M_0, M_1, M_2) of a -models, any a -prime model M^* over $M_1 M_2$ is minimal over $M_1 M_2$. [If $M_1 M_2 \subseteq N \preceq M^*$, then $N = M^*$.]

Theorem (Main Gap for a -saturated models)

If T is superstable with NDOP, then every a -saturated model is a -prime and a -minimal over an independent tree $\{M_\eta : \eta \in I\}$ of a -models of size $2^{\aleph_0}$.

Theorem

If T is either unsuperstable or if T has DOP, then $I(T, \kappa) = 2^\kappa$ for all $\kappa > \aleph_0$.

Definition

A (countable) superstable T has **NOTOP** if there **does not** exist a type $p(x, y, z)$ such that for every λ and $R \subseteq \lambda^2$, there is a model M_R and $\{a_i : i \in \lambda\} \subseteq M_R$ such that for all $(i, j) \in \lambda^2$,

$$M_R \text{ realizes } p(x, a_i, a_j) \text{ if and only if } R(i, j)$$

Definition

T is **classifiable** if T is countable, superstable, NDOP, NOTOP.

1989 – 2 years after Volume 2 of Classification Theory

Theorem (Main Gap)

Let T be any complete theory in a countable language.

- ① *If T is not classifiable, the $I(T, \kappa) = 2^\kappa$ for all $\kappa > \aleph_0$.*
- ② *if T is classifiable, then every model N is **constructible** and **minimal** over an independent tree $(M_\eta : \eta \in I)$ of countable, elementary substructures.*

Computing the 13 species of uncountable spectra starts with this.

The take-away

Historically –

NOTOP was only developed/explored in the presence of NDOP!

Will see: Countable, superstable, NOTOP theories admit structure theorems, even without NDOP.

Revisionist history: NOTOP without NDOP

Recall: $\text{tp}(c/B)$ is **isolated** if there is some $\psi(x, b) \in \text{tp}(c/B)$ such that $\psi(x, b) \vdash \text{tp}(c/B)$.

Lachlan: $\text{tp}(c/B)$ is **ℓ -isolated** if, for every $\phi(x, y)$, there is $\psi(x, b) \in \text{tp}(c/B)$ such that $\psi(x, b) \vdash \text{tp}_\phi(c/B)$.

A **construction sequence over B** $(c_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma)$ satisfies $\text{tp}(c_\alpha/B \cup \{c_\beta : \beta < \alpha\})$ is isolated for all $\alpha < \gamma$.

An **ℓ -construction sequence over B** $(c_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma)$ satisfies $\text{tp}(c_\alpha/B \cup \{c_\beta : \beta < \alpha\})$ is ℓ -isolated for all $\alpha < \gamma$.

'Poor man's ω -stability'

Facts:

- If T is ω -stable, then for every set B , the isolated types are dense in $S(B)$, hence constructible models exist over every set.
- If T is countable, superstable, then for every set B , the ℓ -isolated types are dense in $S(B)$, hence ℓ -constructible models exist over every set.

Independent triples of models

An **Independent triple of models** (M_0, M_1, M_2) satisfies $M_0 \preceq M_1$, $M_0 \preceq M_2$, and $M_1 \downarrow_{M_0} M_2$.

Question: For an independent triple of models, how easy is it to complete $M_1 M_2$ to a model?

- (Rarely) $M_1 M_2$ itself will be a model (e.g., theory of equality)
- Sometimes $\text{acl}(M_1 M_2)$ will be a model (e.g., vector spaces or algebraically closed fields)
- (T countable, superstable) There always is an ℓ -constructible model over $M_1 M_2$.

Revisionist definitions

Suppose T is countable and superstable.

- **Property A:** For every independent triple of countable models (M_0, M_1, M_2) , every ℓ -isolated $\text{tp}(c/M_1M_2)$ is isolated.

Fact: Property A implies every ℓ -constructible model over M_1M_2 is constructible over M_1M_2 .

- **Property B:** For every independent triple of countable models (M_0, M_1, M_2) , every ℓ -constructible model over M_1M_2 is minimal over M_1M_2 .

Theorem (L-Ulrich)

For T countable, superstable,

- 1 *Property A is equivalent to NOTOP.*
- 2 *Property B implies NDOP, and $A + B$ is equivalent to T classifiable.*

Recall: T is classifiable iff every $N \models T$ is **constructible** and **minimal** over an independent tree $(M_\eta : \eta \in I)$ of countable, elementary substructures.

Theorem (L-Ulrich)

Suppose T is countable, superstable, with Property A (NOTOP).

- 1 Every $N \models T$ is **atomic** over an independent tree $(M_\eta : \eta \in I)$ of countable, elementary substructures;
- 2 There is a constructible model $N' \preceq N$ over $\bigcup\{M_\eta : \eta \in I\}$;
- 3 If $N' \preceq N'' \preceq N$, then $N' \preceq_{\infty, \omega} N'' \preceq_{\infty, \omega} N$, i.e., all three models are back-and-forth equivalent.

Contrast:

- If T is classifiable, then every model N has a tree $(M_\eta : \eta \in I)$ of countable, elementary substructures that determines N up to isomorphism over the tree.
- If T is countable, superstable, NOTOP, then every model N has a tree $(M_\eta : \eta \in I)$ of countable, elementary substructures that determines N up to back and forth equivalence over the tree.

'Under the hood'

Say $\overline{M} = (M_0, M_1, M_2)$, $\overline{N} = (N_0, N_1, N_2)$ are independent triples of models (of any size). Define $\overline{M} \sqsubseteq \overline{N}$ iff $M_i \preceq N_i$ for each i , $N_0 \downarrow_{M_0} M_1 M_2$, $N_1 \downarrow_{N_0 M_1} M_2$ and $N_2 \downarrow_{N_0 M_2} M_1$.

Credo: (Indep triples, $\sqsubseteq$) acts very much like $(\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}), \preceq)$.

- If $\overline{M} \sqsubseteq \overline{N}$ then $M_1 M_2 \subseteq_{TV} N_1 N_2$;
- (ULS) For any $\overline{M}$, there is $\overline{N} \sqsupseteq \overline{M}$ consisting of a-models
- (DLS) For any $\overline{N}$ and any $X \subseteq N_1 N_2$ with $|X| \leq \kappa$, there is $\overline{M} \sqsubseteq \overline{N}$ with $X \subseteq M_1 M_2$ and $|M_1 M_2| \leq \kappa$.

Definition (Harrington)

Suppose $\overline{M} = (M_0, M_1, M_2)$ is any independent triple. We say c is V -dominated by $\overline{M}$ if, $c \perp_{M_1 M_2} N_1 N_2$ for every $\overline{N} \supseteq \overline{M}$.

New: We say T has V -DI if for all c and for all $\overline{M}$, if c is V -dominated by $\overline{M}$, then $\text{tp}(c/M_1 M_2)$ is isolated.

Fact: For any c and $\overline{M}$,

- If $\text{tp}(c/M_1 M_2)$ is ℓ -isolated, then c is V -dominated by $\overline{M}$.
- If, in addition, each M_i is a -saturated, then the converse holds.

Will see later that V -DI is still another equivalent of NOTOP.

Theorem (L-Ulrich)

V-DI implies PMOP (existence of a constructible model over independent triples of models of any size).

Remark: The above was proved by Shelah, and reproved by Hart, both under the assumption of NDOP.

On page 619 of *Classification Theory* (1987), Shelah writes:

“Remark. Really “without the dop” is not necessary, this will be shown in a subsequent paper.”

Local versions of NDOP

Fact: T has NDOP iff for all independent triples (M_0, M_1, M_2) of a-models and for all a-prime M^* over $M_1 M_2$, every regular type $r \not\perp M^*$ is $\not\perp M_1$ or $\not\perp M_2$.

Fact: $\not\perp$ induces an equivalence relation on the set of regular types.

Let $\mathbf{P}$ be any union of $\not\perp$ -classes of regular types.

Definition: T has $\mathbf{P}$ -NDOP iff for all independent triples (M_0, M_1, M_2) of a-models and for all a-prime M^* over $M_1 M_2$, every regular $r \not\perp M^*$ with $r \in \mathbf{P}$ is $\not\perp M_1$ or $\not\perp M_2$.

Thesis: NOTOP implies 'some amount of DOP', i.e., $\mathbf{P}$ -NDOP for some choice of $\mathbf{P}$.

Example: A (stationary) regular type r is **eni** (eventually non-isolated) if there is some finite set d on which r is based and stationary with $r|d$ non-isolated. Call a $\mathcal{L}$ -class C of regular types eni if at least one $r \in C$ is eni.

Theorem (L-Shelah, 2015)

If T is ω -stable, then T has eni-NDOP iff T has NOTOP.

Thus, $\Leftarrow$ implies that NOTOP implies NDOP for all $\mathcal{L}$ -classes of eni types.

Motivating Question: Can this equivalence extend to countable, superstable theories?

A new class of regular types

Fact: $\not\sim$ is actually an equivalence relation on the (larger) class of stationary, **weight one** types.

Definition(Baisalov, 1990) A regular type r is $\mathbf{P}_e$ if $r \not\sim p(x, d)$ for some stationary, weight one $p(x, d)$ that is non-isolated.

Obviously, $\text{eni} \subseteq \mathbf{P}_e$. For T ω -stable, T has $\mathbf{P}_e$ -NDOP iff T has eni-NDOP iff T has NOTOP.

But there are examples of countable, superstable $\mathbf{P}_e$ -DOP theories with eni-NDOP.

Some equivalents

Theorem (L-Ulrich)

The following are equivalent for a countable, superstable T :

- 1 **Property A** (for every independent triple of *countable* models $\overline{M}$, $\text{tp}(c/M_1M_2)$ ℓ -isolated implies $\text{tp}(c/M_1M_2)$ isolated);
- 2 T is V-DI;
- 3 T has $\mathbf{P}_e$ -NDOP and countable PMOP (there exists a constructible model over every independent triple of *countable* models);
- 4 T has $\mathbf{P}_e$ -NDOP and full PMOP (there exists a constructible model over every independent triple of models);
- 5 T has NOTOP.

An amusing corollary

Recall: T has OTOP iff if there is a type $p(x, y, z)$ such that for every λ and $R \subseteq \lambda^2$, there is a model M_R and $\{a_i : i \in \lambda\} \subseteq M_R$ such that for all $(i, j) \in \lambda^2$,

M_R realizes $p(x, a_i, a_j)$ if and only if $R(i, j)$

T has **linear OTOP** iff if there is a type $p(x, y, z)$ such that for every linear order $(L, \leq_L)$, there is a model M_L and $\{a_i : i \in L\} \subseteq M_L$ such that for all $(i, j) \in L^2$,

M_L realizes $p(x, a_i, a_j)$ if and only if $i \leq_L j$

Corollary

For countable, superstable T , OTOP is equivalent to linear OTOP.

On adding constants

Good news: If a countable, superstable theory has OTOP, then any expansion by adding countably many constants will also have OTOP (hence, we may assume our type $p(x, y, z)$ witnessing OTOP has countably many parameters).

Danger: There is a countable, superstable theory T with OTOP, but if we add $2^{\aleph_0}$ constants naming a saturated model, then the expanded theory is categorical in all $\kappa > 2^{\aleph_0}$.

Thanks for listening!