# The Scott Isomorphism Theorem

#### Julia F. Knight

University of Notre Dame

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

# Outline

- 1.  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$  formulas
- 2. Computable infinitary formulas
- 3. Scott sentences
- 4. Scott rank, result of Montalbán
- 5. Scott ranks of computable structures
- 6. Questions answered, thanks to Harrison-Trainor
- 7. Return to Montalbán
- 8. Effective version of Montalbán
- 9. Classes of countable structures
- 10. Result of A. Miller and effective version
- 11. Scott sentences for finitely generated groups

12. What happens most of the time?

# Formulas of $L_{\omega_1\omega}$

 $L_{\omega_1\omega}$  formulas are infinitary formulas in which the disjunctions and conjunctions are over countable sets, and the strings of quantifiers are finite.

We consider only formulas with finitely many free variables. Bringing the negations inside, we get a kind of *normal form*. Formulas in this normal form are classified as  $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  or  $\Pi_{\alpha}$ , for  $\alpha < \omega_1$ .

#### Classification

- 1.  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  is  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Pi_0$  if it is finitary quantifier-free,
- 2. for 0 < lpha <  $\omega_1$ ,
  - (a) φ(x̄) is Σ<sub>α</sub> if it is a countable disjunction of formulas (∃ū)ψ(x̄, ū), where ψ(x̄, ū) is Π<sub>β</sub> for some β < α,</li>
    (b) φ(x̄) is Π<sub>α</sub> if it is a countable conjunction of formulas (∀ū)ψ(x̄, ū), where ψ(x̄, ū) is Σ<sub>β</sub> for some β < α.</li>

# Computable infinitary formulas

For a computable language L, the *computable infinitary L*-formulas are formulas of  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$  in which the infinite disjunctions and conjunctions are over c.e. sets.

These formulas are classified as computable  $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  or computable  $\Pi_{\alpha}$  for  $\alpha < \omega_1^{CK}$ .

#### Sample formulas

(1) Suppose G is a group generated by  $\bar{a}$ . To say that  $\langle \bar{x} \rangle \cong \langle \bar{a} \rangle$ , we take the  $\Pi_1$  formula

$$\bigwedge_{G\models w(\bar{a})=e} w(\bar{x})=e \& \bigwedge_{G\models w(\bar{a})\neq e} w(\bar{x})\neq e$$
.

The formula is computable  $\Pi_1$  if the group G is computable.

(2) To say that  $\bar{x}$  generates G, we take the computable  $\Pi_2$  formula

$$(\forall y)\bigvee_w w(\bar{x})=y$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## Scott Isomorphism Theorem

**Scott (1964)**. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a countable structure for a countable language L. Then there is a sentence of  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$ , a *Scott sentence*, whose countable models are just the isomorphic copies of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

To obtain a Scott sentence, Scott first found formulas  $\varphi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x})$  that define the orbits of the tuples  $\bar{a}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . He then took the conjunction of the following:

$$\rho_{\emptyset} = (\forall x) \bigvee_{b} \varphi_{b}(x) \& \bigwedge_{b} (\exists x) \varphi_{b}(x)$$

 $\rho_{\bar{a}} = (\forall \bar{u}) [\varphi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{u}) \to ((\forall x) \bigvee_{b} \varphi_{\bar{a},b}(\bar{u},x) \& \bigwedge_{b} (\exists x) \varphi_{\bar{a},b}(\bar{u},x))]$ 

The complexity of an optimal Scott sentence measures the internal complexity of A.

There are different definitions of Scott rank.

**Montalbán**. The *Scott rank* of A is the least  $\alpha$  s.t. A has a  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence.

**Theorem (Montalbán)**.  $\mathcal{A}$  has Scott rank  $\alpha$  iff the orbits of all tuples in  $\mathcal{A}$  are defined by  $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  formulas (with no parameters).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

I will return to this result.

**Nadel (1974)**. For a computable structure  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $SR(\mathcal{A}) \leq \omega_1^{CK} + 1$ .

There are well-known examples of computable structures with various computable ranks. The "Harrison ordering", of type  $\omega_1^{CK}(1+\eta)$ , has rank  $\omega_1^{CK}+1$ . There are computable structures of rank  $\omega_1^{CK}$ .

Scott rank  $\omega_1^{CK}$ 

Until recently, the known examples of computable structures of rank  $\omega_1^{CK}$  were all obtained from a certain kind of tree. The computable infinitary theory was  $\aleph_0$ -categorical.

Question (Millar-Sacks, 2008, Calvert-Goncharov-K-Millar, 2009). Is there a computable structure of Scott rank  $\omega_1^{CK}$  whose computable infinitary theory is not  $\aleph_0$ -categorical?

Harrison-Trainor-Igusa-K. Yes.

**Definition**. A computable structure  $\mathcal{A}$  of high Scott rank is *computably approximable* if every computable infinitary sentence true in  $\mathcal{A}$  is also true in some computable structure of low Scott rank.

**Question (Goncharov-K, 2002)**. Is every computable structure of non-computable rank computably approximable?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Harrison-Trainor. No.

### Harrison-Trainor

**Definition**. For an  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$  sentence  $\varphi$ , the *Scott spectrum* is the set of Scott ranks of countable models of  $\varphi$ .

**Harrison-Trainor**. Assuming *PD*, *S* is the Scott spectrum of a sentence of  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$  iff there is a  $\Sigma_1^1$  class *C* of linear orderings for which one of the following holds:

- 1. S is the set of well-founded parts of orderings in  $\ensuremath{\mathcal{C}}$
- 2. S is the set of orderings obtained from those in C by collapsing the non-well-founded part to a single element,

3. S is union of the sets in (1) and (2).

**Montalbán**.  $\mathcal{A}$  has a  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence iff the orbits of all tuples are defined by  $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  formulas.  $\Leftarrow$ : If the formulas  $\varphi_{\bar{a}}$  are  $\Sigma_{\alpha}$ , then the Scott sentence given by Scott is  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 $\Rightarrow$ : We use a special kind of "consistency property".

#### Consistency properties

**Makkai**. A consistency property is a non-empty countable set C of finite sets S of sentences obtained by substituting constants from  $\omega$  for the free variables in an  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$  formula, s.t.

- 1. for  $S \in C$ , if  $\varphi \in S$ , then for each sub-formula  $\psi(\bar{x})$  of  $\varphi$ , and each  $\bar{c}$ , there exists  $S' \supseteq S$  with  $\psi(\bar{c})$  or  $neg(\psi(\bar{c}))$  in S',
- 2. for  $S \in C$ , if  $\varphi \in S$ , where  $\varphi = \bigwedge_i (\forall \bar{u}_i) \varphi_i(\bar{u}_i)$ , then for each i and  $\bar{c}$ , there exists  $S' \supseteq S$  with  $\varphi_i(\bar{c}) \in S'$ ,
- 3. for  $S \in C$ , if  $\varphi \in S$ , where  $\varphi = \bigvee_i (\exists \bar{u}_i) \varphi_i(\bar{u}_i)$ , then for some i and  $\bar{c}$ , there exists  $S' \supseteq S$  with  $\varphi_i(\bar{c}) \in S'$ ,
- 4. for  $S \in C$ , for each finitary quantifier-free *L*-formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  and  $\bar{c}$ , there exists  $S' \supseteq S$  with  $\pm \varphi(\bar{c}) \in S'$ .

### Added condition

Let  $\varphi$  be a  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence for  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\varphi = \bigwedge_i (\forall \bar{u}_i) \varphi_i(\bar{u}_i)$ , where  $\varphi_i(\bar{u}_i) = \bigvee_j (\exists \bar{v}_{i,j}) \psi_{i,j}(\bar{u}_i, \bar{v}_{i,j})$ . A consistency property satisfying the following added condition yields a model of  $\varphi$ .

5. for  $S \in C$ , for each *i* and appropriate  $\bar{c}$ , there exist *j*,  $\bar{d}$ , and  $S' \supseteq S$  with  $\psi_{i,j}(\bar{c}, \bar{d}) \in S'$ .

Montalbán's C consists of finite sets S of sentences, each  $\Sigma_{\beta}$  or  $\Pi_{\beta}$  for some  $\beta < \alpha$ , s.t. some interpretation of the constants in A makes the sentences true.

#### Impossible condition

Suppose for a tuple  $\bar{a}$  in A, we try to add the following condition.

 For each appropriate c̄, there is a Π<sub>α</sub> formula ψ(x̄) true of ā s.t. for some S' ⊇ S, neg(ψ(c̄)) ∈ S'.

Now, it is no longer true that for each  $S \in C$ , there is an interpretation of the constants that makes the sentences true in A. For some  $S \in C$ , with conjunction  $\chi(\bar{c}, \bar{d})$ , we have

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\forall \bar{x})[(\exists \bar{u})\chi(\bar{x},\bar{u}) \to \psi(\bar{x})]$$

for all  $\Pi_{\alpha}$  formulas  $\psi$  true of  $\bar{a}$ .

For each  $\bar{a}$ , let  $\varphi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x})$  be a  $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  formula generating the complete  $\Pi_{\alpha}$ -type of  $\bar{a}$ .

We can show that the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of finite functions taking  $\bar{a}$  to  $\bar{b}$  satisfying  $\varphi_{\bar{a}}$  has the back-and-forth property.

Hence, for each  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\varphi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x})$  defines the orbit. This proves Montalbán's Theorem.

**Alvir-K-McCoy**. If  $\mathcal{A}$  has a computable  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence, then the orbits of all tuples are defined by computable  $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  formulas.

The sentences in  $S \in C$  are substitution instances of sub-formulas of the Scott sentence, or finitary quantifier-free.

**Note**: There is a computable structure A s.t. the orbits of all tuples are defined by finitary quantifier-free formulas, but there is no computable  $\Pi_2$  sentence.

# A. Miller

**A. Miller (1983)**. If A has a  $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence and a  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence, then it has a d- $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  Scott sentence.

This is based on a result of D. Miller showing that if A and B are disjoint  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$  subsets of Mod(L), closed under isomorphism, then there is a separator that is d- $\Sigma_{\alpha}$ . Moreover, the separator can be taken to be closed under isomorphism.

We get the effective version of A. Miller's result.

Alvir-K-McCoy. If  $\mathcal{A}$  has a computable  $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence and a computable  $\Pi_{\alpha+1}$  Scott sentence, then it has a computable d- $\Sigma_{\alpha}$  Scott sentence.

# Finitely generated groups

#### K-Saraph.

- 1. Every finitely generated group has a  $\Sigma_3$  Scott sentence.
- 2. Every computable finitely generated group has a computable  $\Sigma_3$  Scott sentence.

#### Proof.

Let G be generated by the *n*-tuple  $\bar{a}$ . We write

$$(\exists \bar{x})[\langle \bar{x} \rangle \cong \langle \bar{a} \rangle \& (\forall y) \bigvee_{w} w(\bar{x}) = y]$$

I had conjectured the following.

**Conjecture 1**. Every finitely generated group has a d- $\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence.

**Conjecture 2**. For a computable finitely generated group, there is a computable  $d-\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence.

The conjectures hold for free groups (Carson-Harizanov-Knight-Lange-McCoy-Morozov-Quinn-Safranski-Wallbaum), Abelian groups (Saraph), dihedral groups (Saraph, Raz), and polycyclic, lamplighter and Baumslag-Solitar groups (Ho).

## Counterexample

**Definition (Harrison-Trainor-Ho)**. A finitely generated group G is *self-reflexive* if for some generating tuple  $\bar{a}$ , there exists  $\bar{b}$  generating a proper subgroup  $H \cong G$  s.t. all existential formulas true of  $\bar{b}$  are true of  $\bar{a}$ .

#### Harrison-Trainor-Ho.

1. A self-reflective group cannot have a  $d-\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence.

2. There is a computable self-reflexive group.

Exactly when is there a  $d-\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence?

**Alvir-K-McCoy**. For a finitely generated group G, there is a d- $\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence iff the orbit of some (every) generating tuple is defined by a  $\Pi_1$  formula.

**Remark**: A finitely generated group is self-reflective iff the orbit of some generating tuple is not defined by a  $\Pi_1$  formula.

**Alvir-K-McCoy**. For a computable finitely generated group G, there is a computable d- $\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence iff the orbit of some (every) generating tuple is defined by a computable  $\Pi_1$  formula.

### Proof of first result

Let G be finitely generated. We show that G has a d- $\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence iff the orbit of some (every) generating tuple is defined by a  $\Pi_1$  formula.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): If there is a d- $\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence, then there is a  $\Pi_3$ Scott sentence. By Montalbán, the orbit of every tuple is defined by a  $\Sigma_2$  formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}) = \bigvee_i (\exists \bar{u}_i) \varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{u}_i)$ . If  $\bar{a}$  is a generating tuple, and  $G \models \varphi_i(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ , then we have  $G \models \bar{b} = \bar{w}(\bar{a})$ . The orbit of  $\bar{a}$  is defined by the  $\Pi_1$  formula  $\varphi_i(\bar{x}, \bar{w}(\bar{x}))$ .

 $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$ : If the orbit of some generating tuple  $\bar{a}$  is defined by a  $\Pi_1$  formula, then for each  $\bar{b}$ , the orbits of  $\bar{b}$  is defined by a  $\Sigma_2$  formula. By Montalbán, there is a  $\Pi_3$  Scott sentence. By A. Miller, there is a  $d-\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence.

#### Alternative to A. Miller

**Ho**. For a finitely generated group G, if there is a  $\Sigma_2$  formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$ , satisfied in G, and s.t. every tuple satisfying  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  generates G, then G has a d- $\Sigma_2$  Scott sentence.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Ho proved the effective version.

Gromov asked about typical, or random, or average, finitely generated groups. There are different ways to make this precise.

**Schupp and Kapovich**. Let  $N_s$  be the number of presentations of groups, with a fixed *n*-tuple of generators, and with one relator of length  $\leq s$ . Let  $N_s(P)$  be the number of these presentations s.t. the group has property P. Consider  $\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{N_s(P)}{N_s}$ .

If the limit exists and is 1, then we say that the typical group on n generators and with one relator has property P.

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

# Theory of free groups

By results of Sela, all non-Abelian free groups have the same elementary first order theory  $T_F$ .

**Conjecture**. For each  $n \ge 2$ , and each finitary sentence  $\varphi$  in the language of groups, then the typical group on n generators and with 1 relator satisfies  $\varphi$  if  $\varphi \in T_F$ .

The conjecture says that if *P* is the property of satisfying  $\varphi$ , then

$$\lim_{s\to\infty}\frac{N_s(P)}{N_s}$$

exists, with value 0 or 1, and the value is 1 just in case  $\varphi \in T_F$ .