

# Sublogarithmic-Transcendental Series

- Adele Padgett, University of California - Berkeley
- Fields program on Tame Geometry, Transseries, and Applications to Analysis + Geometry.  
Geometry and Model theory seminar - January 18, 2022

## Background

- 1991 - Wilkie proves  $(\mathbb{R}, <, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \exp)$  is model complete,  
hence o-minimal
- 1994 - Miller proves "Exponentiation is hard to avoid"

## Growth Dichotomy

Let  $\mathcal{R} = (\mathbb{R}, <, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \dots)$

$\mathcal{R}$  is **polynomially bounded** if for every definable function  $f$ ,  
 $\exists m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall x > m$ ,  $|f(x)| \leq x^n$

Thm (Miller): If  $\mathcal{R}$  is o-minimal and not polynomially bounded, then the exponential function is definable in  $\mathcal{R}$ .

$\mathcal{R}$  is **exponentially bounded** if for every definable function  $f$ ,  
 $\exists m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall x > m$ ,  $|f(x)| \leq e^{\dots e^x}$   $\hookrightarrow n$  times

Question: Are there o-minimal structures that are not exponentially bounded?

"Transcendental"

Kneser (1943): There is a real-analytic function  $E$  satisfying  
 $E(x+1) = \exp E(x)$  and  $E(0) = 1$

Long-term goal: Show that  $(\mathbb{R}_{\text{an}}, \exp, E)$  is  $\omega$ -minimal.

Lemma (van den Dries, Macintyre, Marker): Suppose  $T = \text{Th}(\mathbb{R}, <, +, \cdot, 0, 1, \dots)$  has quantifier elimination. Then  $T$  is  $\omega$ -minimal iff for each term  $t(x)$ ,  $\exists m \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

- $t(x) > 0$  for all  $x > m$
- $t(x) = 0$  for all  $x > m$
- $t(x) < 0$  for all  $x > m$

① Find a language  $\mathcal{L}_E$  in which  $\text{Th}(\mathbb{R}_{\text{an}}, \exp, E)$  has Q.E.

- $<, +, -, \cdot, 0, 1$
- Restricted analytic functions: a symbol  $\tilde{f}$  for each  $f \in \mathbb{R}\{\bar{x}\} = \text{power series in } \bar{x} \text{ that converge in a nbd of } [0, 1]^{\mathbb{R}(\bar{x})}$   
 Interpret  $\tilde{f}$  by  $\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & x \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{R}(x)} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$
- $\exp, \log$
- $E, \frac{1}{E}, E', E'', \dots, (E')^{-1}, (E'')^{-1}, \dots$

② Show the germs at  $+\infty$  of  $\mathcal{L}_E$ -terms are ordered (this's work)

- Build a field of formal sublogarithmic-transexponential

- transseries, into which the field of germs of  $\mathcal{L}_E$ -terms embeds
- Transseries field induces an order on field of germs

### Other fields of transexponential transseries

"Corps de Transséries" - Schmeling PhD thesis (2001)

- Build fields of transseries closed under some countable ordinal iterates of  $\log, \exp$

ex.  $e_1 = \exp$ ,  $e_2 = \exp \circ \exp$ ,  $e_\omega = E$

"Hyperserial Fields" - Bagayoko, van der Hoeven, Kaplan (2021)

- Build a field of transseries closed under all ordinal iterates of  $\exp, \log$

### High level overview

- Derive some basic info from difference eq.  $E(x+1) = \exp E(x)$

- Formal transseries construction:

① Show that relatively simple finite formal sums can be ordered in a way that matches true germs of  $\mathcal{L}_E$ -terms, under some assumptions

② Adapt the logarithmic-exponential transseries construction of van den Dries, Macintyre, Marker, to show that given " $E(x)$ -monomials" satisfying some assumptions, we can build an ordered field of series closed under  $\exp, \log, \text{restr. an. func.}$   
 $\hookrightarrow$  via ①

③ Starting from the log-exp transseries, inductively close off under  $E, E', \dots, L$ .  
 At stage  $n$ : Having built  $F_n$ , run ② on elements of  $F_n$ . Then assemble the many fields ② gives you into a new field  $F_{n+1}$  with more closure under  $E, E', \dots, L$

What can we deduce from  $E(x+1) = \exp E(x)$  ?

- $E(x+1) > E(x)^n$  all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

- $E'(x+1) = e^{E(x)} \cdot E'(x) = \underline{E(x+1) E'(x)}$

$$\rightarrow \underline{E^{(d)}(x+1)} = E(x+1) \left( \underline{E'(x)^d + \binom{d}{2} E'(x)^{d-2} E''(x) + \dots + E^{(d)}(x)} \right)$$

$\hookrightarrow$  Bell polynomial in  $E'(x), \dots, E^{(d)}(x)$

- $\underline{E(x)^{1+r}} > \underline{E^{(d)}(x)}$  all  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, d \in \mathbb{N}$

- $\underline{E(x+c)} > \underline{E^{(d)}(x)^r}$  all  $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}, d \in \mathbb{N}, r \in \mathbb{R}$

Intuition: Shifting  $\Rightarrow$  powers  $>$  derivatives

## Intuition for ①

Usually, the sign of a transseries is defined to be the sign of its leading coefficient.

This will not work for us.

ex.  $\underbrace{E(x)E''(x) > E'(x)^2}$

but  $\overbrace{E(x)E''(x) - 2E'(x)^2} < 0$   
 $\rightarrow \underbrace{-E_0(x)^2 E_1(x)^2 + E_0(x)^2 E_1(x) E_2(x)}$

Fix (Boshernitzan 1986): Defines a sequence of functions

by  $E_0(x) = E(x)$ ,  $E_{d+1}(x) = \frac{E_d'(x)}{E_d(x)}$

Facts: -  $E^{(d)}(x)$  can be expressed as a poly in  $E_0(x), \dots, E_d(x)$

$\Rightarrow$  -  $\underline{E_d(x)} > \underline{E_{d+1}(x)^n}$  all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

## ① Ordering (relatively simple) finite sums

$k$ : ordered field, coefficients + exponents come from  $k$

$X$ : set of formal variables,  $\underline{X} \subset L \rightsquigarrow$  ordered field

Defn. Let  $G$  be the multiplicative abelian group generated by  $\underline{E^{(d)}(x)^a}$  for  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . The  $E$ -sums are  $\underline{k[G]}$

- Let  $H$  be the (lexicographically ordered) mult. ab. group gen. by  $E_d(x)^a$  for  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{K}$ . The  $E_x$ -sums are  $\underline{k\langle\langle H \rangle\rangle}$

### Assumptions

- For all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , all  $x, y \in X$  with  $x > y$ , all  $a \in \mathbb{K}$ 
  - $E(x-m) > k$  ( $E(x-m) = \log \dots - \log E(x) > k$ )  
 $\hookrightarrow m$  times
  - $\rightarrow E(x-m) > E(y-m)^a$
- There is a map  $r: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$  such that for all  $x, y \in X$  with  $x > y$ , we have  $x - y < r(x,y)$   
 i.e.  $\forall x, y \in X$   $\underline{E(x)} < E(y+1) = e^{\underline{E(y)}}$

Define a map  $\sigma: k[G] \rightarrow k\langle\langle H \rangle\rangle$  so that

$\sigma(s) :=$  "s rewritten in terms of Bochneritz's seq"

$$\sigma(E^{(d)}(x)^a) = \sigma(E^{(d)}(x)^a)$$

$$\rightarrow = \left( E_0(x) E_1(x)^d + \dots \right)^a$$

$$\rightarrow = E_0(x)^a E_1(x)^{da} \left( 1 + \frac{\dots}{E_0(x) E_1(x)^d} \right)^a$$

$$:= E_0(x)^a E_1(x)^{da} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{a}{n} \left( \frac{\dots}{E_0(x) E_1(x)^d} \right)^n \leftarrow$$

Lemma If  $X$  and  $k$  satisfy the above assumptions, then  $\sigma$  is injective. Hence, the order on  $k(H)$  induces an order on  $k[G]$ .

Upshot: Knowing how to "correctly" order finite sums of the form in  $k[G]$  (to match the true order on germs of  $k$ -terms) will be enough to "correctly" order infinite series later on.

## ② Adapt the log-exp transseries construction to E monomials

van den Dries, Macintyre, and Marker's construction:

- start with  $k((x^k))$ ,  $k$  is ordered exponential field

Inductively add new, larger monomials for increasing levels of exponentiation.

stage  $n$ :  $K_n \ni s = \overset{\text{Supp } s > 1}{\sum} s^\infty + c + s^\varepsilon$  (rel. to  $K_{n-1}$ )

$K_{n+1} = K_n((e(A)))$  where  $A = \{s \in K_n : \text{Supp } s > 1\}$

End up with  $k((x^{-1}))^e$ , an exponential field

Define embedding  $\varphi : k((x^{-1}))^e \hookrightarrow k((x^{-1}))^e$  so that  $\forall s \in k((x^{-1}))^e$ ,  $\varphi(s)$  has a logarithm

$$\langle E(x)^a \rangle$$

What goes wrong if we start with  $G$  instead of  $x^k$ ?

- A logarithm of  $E(x)$  will not naturally arise in part 2

$$\log E(x) = E(x-1) + \log E'(x-1)$$

$$= E(x-1) + E(x-2) + \dots + E(x-m) + \log E'(x-m)$$

- Some monomials in  $G$  are "small" relative to others

ex.  $\frac{E'(x)^{1/2}}{E(x)^{1/2}}, E(x) \in G$  but  $\exp\left(\frac{E'(x)^{1/2}}{E(x)^{1/2}}\right) = \exp(E'(x-1)^{1/2}) < E(x)$

- •  $G$  has reverse well ordered subsets of asymptotic monomials

ex.  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n E(x)^{1/n} \quad \underline{E'(x)^{2-2/n}} \quad E''(x)^{1/n} \quad \leftarrow$

Recall:  $\underline{E(x)E''(x)} > E'(x)^2$  but  $E(x)E''(x) - 2E'(x)^2 < 0$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E(x)E''(x)}{E'(x)^2} = 1$$

Solutions?

- Include  $\log E'(x)^a, x \in X, a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , as monomials at stage 0.

(Also strengthen lemma of ①)

- Include  $\exp$  ("small" infinite el. of  $G$ ) as monomials at stage 0.

At later stages, only add new monomials for  $\exp$  ("large")



adaptation of part 1

• Just don't allow infinite sums of "close" monomials.

let  $G_{\star}$  = our full group of starting monomials ( $\bar{b}$ , logs, exp(small))

for  $g, h \in G_{\star}$ , formalize  $g \sim h$  "close"

let  $\underbrace{k((b_{\star}))}_{\text{stage 0}} \sim :=$  ring whose el. are sums of the form  $s = \sum_{g \in G_{\star}} c_g g$  where

- $\text{Supp}(s) = \{g : c_g \neq 0\}$  is reverse well ordered
- For each  $w \in G_{\star}/\sim$ ,  $\{g \in w : c_g \neq 0\}$  is finite

$k((b_{\star}))_{\sim}$  can be ordered via  $\textcircled{1}$ ,

if  $X, k$  satisfy the assumptions

Part 2: Close under log (and exp,  $(\cdot)^{-1}$ )

ex 1.  $\log E(x)$  =  $E(x-1)$   $\notin$  part 1 construction

ex 2.  $\exp\left(\frac{E(x)}{E'(x)}\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\frac{E(x)}{E'(x)}\right)^n}{n!} \notin$  part 1 construction

$\left(\frac{E(x)}{E'(x)}\right)^n \sim \frac{E(x)}{E'(x)} = \frac{1}{E'(x-1)}$

ex 3.  $\frac{1}{E'(x) + E(x)} = \frac{1}{E'(x)} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{E(x)}{E'(x)}} \right) = \frac{1}{E'(x)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( -\frac{E(x)}{E'(x)} \right)^n$

Let  $X^{-m} = \{x^{-m} : x \in X\}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$

Let  $K_{X^{-m}}$  = ring built from  $k, X^{-m}$  via part 1

$$D_X(k) = \varinjlim (K_X \hookrightarrow K_{X^{-1}} \hookrightarrow \dots)$$

↳ an ordered exponential-logarithmic field

③ Use ② repeatedly to build a field closed under  $E, E', \dots, k$

Let  $k = \text{Th}(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \exp, E)$

Let  $F_0 = k((\tau^{-1}))^{\text{loc}}$ ,  $\tau \succ k$

For  $f, g \in F_0$ , define  $f \approx g$  if  $f-g$  is finite

Idea:

- The finite subsets of  $(F_0 / \approx)_{+\infty}$  form a directed set.
- For each finite subset, we will use ② to build a field.

- $\alpha_1$  smallest

Let  $X_{\alpha_1} \subset \alpha_1$  be maximal satisfying assumptions

Run ② to build  $D_{X_{\alpha_1}}(k')$

- $\alpha_2$  2<sup>nd</sup> smallest  
 let  $X_{\alpha_2} \subset \alpha_2$  be maximal satisfying assumptions

Run (2) to build  $D_{X_{\alpha_2}} (D_{X_{\alpha_1}}(k'))$

⋮

- $F_1$  will be the direct limit of this directed system.

- Inductively build  $F_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$N_k = \varinjlim (F_0 \hookrightarrow F_1 \hookrightarrow \dots)$$

↑  
 Field of germs of  $\mathcal{L}_E$ -terms