

EXTENSION OF LIPSCHITZ MAPS DEFINABLE IN HENSEL MINIMAL STRUCTURES

KRZYSZTOF JAN NOWAK

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish a theorem on extension of Lipschitz maps f definable in Hensel minimal, non-trivially valued fields K of equicharacteristic zero. This may be regarded as a definable, non-Archimedean, non-locally compact version of Kirszbraun's extension theorem. We proceed with double induction with respect to the dimensions of the ambient space and of the domain of f . To this end we introduce the concept of a definable open cell package with a skeleton, which along with the concept of a risometry plays a key role in our induction procedure.

1. INTRODUCTION

We are concerned with a 1-h-minimal, non-trivially valued field K of equicharacteristic zero. In other words, K is a model of a 1-h-minimal theory T in an expansion \mathcal{L} of the pure valued field language $(K, 0, 1, +, -, \cdot, \mathcal{O}_K)$. The axiomatically based theory of Hensel minimal structures was recently introduced by Cluckers–Halupczok–Rideau [4].

The main aim of this paper is to establish a theorem on extension of Lipschitz definable maps from a subset of the affine spaces K^n to K^n , which may be regarded as a definable, non-Archimedean and non-locally compact version of Kirszbraun's extension theorem [9].

The extension of Lipschitz continuous functions $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from a subset A of \mathbb{R}^n with the same constant, say 1, goes back to McShane and Whitney. The more difficult and delicate case of functions with values in \mathbb{R}^k was achieved by Kirszbraun [9].

In non-Archimedean geometry, a purely topological version of Kirszbraun's extension theorem for spherically complete, rank one valued

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 12J25, 51F30, 03C65; Secondary 32B20, 32P05, 03C98.

Key words and phrases. Non-Archimedean geometry, Hensel minimal structures, Lipschitz extension, cell decomposition, open cell package, skeleton, risometries, Jacobian property.

fields K was achieved by means of the Kuratowski–Zorn lemma in [2, Theorem 1.2]. And Lipschitz extension on ultrametric spaces, with an arbitrarily small magnification of the Lipschitz constant, was established in [3, Theorem 2.9].

Aschenbrenner–Fischer [1] achieved a definable, real version of Kirszbraun’s theorem for definably complete expansions of ordered fields.

To our best knowledge, the only definable, non-Archimedean version of Kirszbraun’s theorem was achieved by Cluckers–Martin [6] in the p -adic, thus locally compact case; and more precisely, for functions which are semi-algebraic, subanalytic or definable in an analytic structure on a finite extension of the field \mathbb{Q}_p of p -adic numbers (for the theory of which, see e.g. [7, 5]). They prove this theorem and the existence of a definable 1-Lipschitz retraction for any closed definable subset A of \mathbb{Q}_p^n , proceeding with simultaneous induction on the dimension n of the ambient space. Their construction of definable retractions makes use of some definable Skolem functions.

Also they posed the problem whether their p -adic version of Kirszbraun’s theorem and the existence of Lipschitz retractions for p -adic closed definable subsets hold in some form for other classes of valued fields, indicating that some difficulties in more general settings are the absence of definable Skolem functions in general and infiniteness of the residue field. The easier case of Lipschitz extension of definable p -adic functions on the affine line \mathbb{Q}_p was treated in [10].

We should also mention that generally local Lipschitz continuity does not imply piecewise Lipschitz continuity in the absence of definable algebraic Skolem functions or, equivalently, the condition that algebraic closure and definable closure coincide (cf. [4]). This makes the problem of definable Lipschitz extension subtler yet.

A Lipschitz continuous map $f : A \rightarrow K^m$, $A \subset K^n$, with Lipschitz constant $\epsilon \in |K|$, $\epsilon \neq 0$, will be called an ϵ -Lipschitz map (multiplicative convention).

The main aim of this paper is to establish the theorem on extending definable 1-Lipschitz maps stated below, which distinguishes two cases depending on whether the subset of elements > 1 in the value group vK has the minimal element ϵ or not. For this purpose, we introduce the concept of a definable open cell package with a skeleton, which in a sense compensate for the lack of definable algebraic Skolem functions.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $f : A \rightarrow K^m$ be a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz map on a (possibly non-closed) subset $A \subset K^n$ of dimension k .*

I. Suppose the value group $|K|$ has no minimal element among the elements > 1 . Then, for any $\epsilon \in |K|$, $\epsilon > 1$, f extends to a 0-definable ϵ -Lipschitz map $F : K^n \rightarrow K^m$.

II. Suppose the value group $|K|$ has the minimal element ϵ among the elements > 1 . Then f extends to a 0-definable $\epsilon^{\omega(k)}$ -Lipschitz map $F : K^n \rightarrow K^m$, where $\omega(k) = 2^{k-2}$ if $k \geq 2$, and $\omega(1) = \omega(0) = 0$.

Since the affine spaces K^m are equipped with the maximum norm, it suffices to prove the theorem for the case $m = 1$.

The Lipschitz constant has been increased because the initial 1-Lipschitz function f is replaced by a function g with the condition:

$$(1.1) \quad rv(g(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_k + y_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) - g(x)) = rv(y_k)$$

for a single, distinguished variable x_k ; most often it is the last variable of the package under consideration. In other words, g is a risometry onto its image with respect to the variable x_k , the concept introduced by Halupczok [8].

Remark 1.2. The key property of a risometry we use is that the image of an open ball is an open ball of the same radius. This immediately follows from [8, Lemma 2.33] and the fact 0-h-minimality implies definable spherical completeness (cf. [4, Lemma 2.1.7]).

To get such a function g , take an element $\epsilon \in K$ such that $|\epsilon| = \epsilon$ and put

$$g : A \rightarrow K, \quad g(x) := x_k + 1/\epsilon \cdot f(x).$$

Clearly, once we find a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension $G : K^n \rightarrow K$ of g , the function

$$F(x) := \epsilon(G(x) - x_k)$$

is an extension we are looking for. So from now on it will be assumed that a given function $f(x)$ satisfies a condition of type 1.1.

Actually, for the sake of the proof of the extension theorem, we need the following stronger version, which is uniform with respect to parameters from the sort RV . We state it only for the case I.

Theorem 1.3. *Consider a 0-definable family*

$$f_\lambda : A_\lambda \rightarrow K, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda \subset (RV)^s,$$

of 1-Lipschitz functions on subsets of K^n . Then, for any $\epsilon \in |K|$, $\epsilon > 1$, there exists a 0-definable family

$$F_\lambda : K^n \rightarrow K, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda$$

of ϵ -Lipschitz functions such that f_λ is the restriction of F_λ to A_λ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

We shall prove the above extension theorem by double induction on the dimension n of the ambient space K^n and on the dimension k of the subset $A \subset K^n$. Each induction step of type (n, k) , with $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$, requires the induction hypothesis of type $(n, k - 1)$ (ordinary version) and of type $(k - 1, k - 1)$ (uniform version).

While the ordinary version of the extension theorem will be applied to a given 1-Lipschitz function f restricted to some 0-definable subset in the affine space under consideration, the uniform one to some 0-definable family of 1-Lipschitz centers in order to extend them to global definable 1-Lipschitz ones. This, in turn, is used to obtain, via partitioning, open cell packages which satisfy a certain necessary package property.

Notice that each induction step, both of the first and second kind, increases the Lipschitz constant by any factor $\epsilon > 1$ if the value group vK has no minimal element among the elements > 1 , and by some power ϵ^ω if ϵ is the minimal element from among the elements > 1 . This is obvious for the first kind.

The second kind requires the following observation. Suppose that, after extension, we have got a new global ϵ -Lipschitz center $c(x')$, $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Applying the homothetic substitution of x/ϵ for x with $|\epsilon| = \epsilon$, we get the new, this time 1-Lipschitz center, and the new 1-Lipschitz function $f_1(x)$ given by the formula

$$f_1(x) := f(x'/\epsilon, x'') \quad \text{where } x'' = (x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n).$$

Then, given a global 1-Lipschitz extension $F_1(x)$ of $f_1(x)$, the function

$$F(x) := F_1(\epsilon x', x'')$$

is the desired global extension of f which is merely ϵ -Lipschitz.

The exponent $\omega = \omega(n, k)$ depends on the type (n, k) of induction step. Clearly, we get the following formulae

$$\omega(n, 0) = 0, \quad \omega(n, k) = \omega(n, k - 1) + \omega(k - 1, k - 1) \quad \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq n,$$

and hence $\omega(n, k) = \omega(k) = 2^{k-2}$ if $k \geq 2$, and $\omega(n, 0) = \omega(n, 1) = 0$.

In the proof of the extension theorem, the increase of the Lipschitz constant will be clearly indicated during the induction steps of the first type $(n, k - 1)$ (ordinary version). For simplicity, we will omit to take into account this increase in the induction step of the second type (uniform version). But both the types of induction steps are taken into account when calculating the increase of the Lipschitz constant in the theorem.

2. AUXILIARY RESULTS

We begin by introducing some necessary notation and terminology. Denote by

$$\mathcal{O}_K, \mathcal{M}_K, \tilde{K} := \mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{M}_K,$$

the valuation ring, its maximal ideal and residue field, respectively. Let $K^\times := K \setminus \{0\}$. We use multiplicative convention for the value group and valuation map:

$$|\cdot| : K^\times \rightarrow |K|, \quad |0| := 0.$$

The ultra-metric norm on the affine space K^n is the maximum norm

$$|(x_1, \dots, x_n)| := \max \{|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|\}.$$

The auxiliary sort:

$$RV(K) := G(K) \cup \{0\}, \quad G(K) := K^\times / (1 + \mathcal{M}_K),$$

plays an essential role in geometry and model theory of Henselian fields. In particular, it provides parameters for definable families of sets and maps. This is of great importance as, for instance, cell decomposition requires generally the concept of a reparametrized cell, which is a definable family of ordinary cells parametrized by RV -parameters.

We adopt the following convention: the words 0-definable and X -definable shall mean \mathcal{L} -definable and \mathcal{L}_X -definable; "definable" will refer to definable in \mathcal{L} with arbitrary parameters. In our geometric approach, most essential is which (not how) sets are definable.

For $m \leq n$, denote by $\pi_{\leq m}$ or $\pi_{< m+1}$ the projection $K^n \rightarrow K^m$ onto the first m coordinates; put $x_{\leq m} = \pi_{\leq m}(x)$. Let $C \subset K^n$ be a non-empty 0-definable set, $j_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and

$$c_i : \pi_{< i}(C) \rightarrow K$$

be 0-definable functions $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then C is called a 0-definable cell with center tuple $c = (c_i)_{i=1}^n$ and of cell-type $j = (j_i)_{i=1}^n$ if it is of the form:

$$(2.1) \quad C = \{x \in K^n : (rv(x_i - c_i(x_{< i})))_{i=1}^n \in R\},$$

for a (necessarily 0-definable) set

$$R \subset \prod_{i=1}^n j_i \cdot G(K),$$

where $0 \cdot G(K) = 0 \subset RV(K)$ and $1 \cdot G(K) = G(K) \subset RV(K)$. One can similarly define A -definable cells.

In the absence of the condition that algebraic closure and definable closure coincide in $T = \text{Th}(K)$, i.e. the algebraic closure $\text{acl}(A)$ equals the definable closure $\text{dcl}(A)$ for any Henselian field $K' \equiv K$ and every $A \subset K'$, the following concept of reparameterized cells must come into play.

Consider a 0-definable function $\sigma : C \rightarrow RV(K)^s$. Then (C, σ) is called a 0-definable reparameterized (by σ) cell if each set $\sigma^{-1}(\xi)$, $\xi \in \sigma(C)$, is a ξ -definable cell with some center tuple c_ξ depending definably on ξ and of cell-type independent of ξ . One can always modify σ so that each $\sigma^{-1}(\xi)$ is either empty or a single twisted box.

We have the following fundamental theorem on Lipschitz cell decomposition compatible with RV -parameters (cf. [4, Theorem 5.7.3]).

Theorem 2.1. *For every 0-definable sets*

$$X \subset K^n \quad \text{and} \quad P \subset X \times RV(K)^t,$$

there exists a finite decomposition of X into 0-definable reparametrized cells (C_k, σ_k) such that the fibers of P over each twisted box of each C_k are constant or, equivalently, the fiber of P over each $\xi \in RV(K)^t$ is a union of some twisted boxes from the cells C_k .

Furthermore, one can require that each C_k is, after some coordinate permutation, a reparametrized cell of type $(1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ with 1-Lipschitz centers

$$c_\xi = (c_{\xi,1}, \dots, c_{\xi,n}), \quad \xi \in \sigma(C).$$

Such cells C_k shall be called 0-definable reparametrized Lipschitz cells.

□

Under the assumptions of the above theorem, we may regard P as a 0-definable family of subsets of X parametrized by $RV(K)^t$, and say that the cell decomposition into cells C_k is compatible with that family. This also ensures the existence of cell decompositions compatible with imaginary parameter from the auxiliary sort RV . We shall use it in Section 5 and 6 for construction of a skeleton of a 0-definable open Lipschitz cell.

Now we give some results which are indispensable for the proof of the extension theorem.

Proposition 2.2. *Let A and B be arbitrary 0-definable subsets of K^n and $f : A \cup B \rightarrow K$ a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function which vanishes on B . If the restriction $f|_A$ of f to A extends to a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $F : K^n \rightarrow K$, so does f to a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $G : K^n \rightarrow K$.*

Proof. We begin by formulating two symmetric conditions for the points of $x \in K^n$:

- (1) $\forall b \in B \exists a \in A \quad |x - a| < |x - b|;$
- (2) $\forall a \in A \exists b \in B \quad |x - b| < |x - a|.$

Note that the condition

$$(3) := \neg[(1) \vee (2)]$$

is equivalent to

$$\exists b_0 \in B, a_0 \in A \forall a \in A, b \in B \quad |x - a| \geq |x - b_0| \wedge |x - b| \geq |x - a_0|,$$

and thus condition (3) means that

$$\exists b_0 \in B, a_0 \in A \forall a \in A, b \in B \quad |x - a|, |x - b| \geq |x - a_0| = |x - b_0|.$$

It is easy to check that condition (1) holds on $A \setminus B$, condition (2) on $B \setminus A$, and condition (3) on $A \cap B$. Hence the function

$$G(x) = \begin{cases} F(x) & \text{if } x \text{ satisfies } [(1) \wedge \neg(2)], \\ 0 & \text{if } x \text{ satisfies } [(2) \vee (3)]. \end{cases}$$

is an extension of f . We shall show that G is a 1-Lipschitz function. It suffices to analyze the value $|G(x) - G(y)|$ in the only two non-trivial cases where:

- I. x satisfies $[(1) \wedge \neg(2)]$ and y satisfies (2),
- or
- II. x satisfies $[(1) \wedge \neg(2)]$ and y satisfies (3).

Case I. We first show that

$$\exists b \in B \quad |y - b| \leq |x - y|.$$

Otherwise

$$\forall b \in B \quad |y - b| > |x - y|.$$

By condition (2), for any $a \in A$ there is an element $b \in B$ such that $|y - b| < |y - a|$. Then

$$|y - b| = |x - b|, \quad |y - a| = |x - a| \quad \text{and} \quad |x - b| < |x - a|.$$

Therefore x satisfies condition (2), which is a contradiction.

By condition (1), we get $|x - a| < |x - b|$ for some $a \in A$. Then

$$|F(x) - f(a)| \leq |x - a| < |x - b|,$$

$$|f(a)| = |f(a) - f(b)| \leq |a - b| = |x - b| \quad \text{and} \quad |F(x)| \leq |x - b|.$$

Hence

$$|G(x) - G(y)| = |F(x) - 0| = |F(x)| \leq |x - b| \leq |x - y|,$$

as desired.

Case II. Since y satisfies condition (3), it follows that

$$\exists b_0 \in B, a_0 \in A \forall a \in A, b \in B \quad |y - a|, |y - b| \geq |y - a_0| = |y - b_0|.$$

Were

$$|x - y| < |y - a_0| = |y - b_0|,$$

we would get for every $a \in A$ the inequalities

$$|x - y| < |y - a_0| \leq |y - a| \quad \text{and} \quad |x - y| < |y - b_0| = |x - b_0|.$$

Hence

$$|x - a| = |y - a| \geq |y - b_0| = |x - b_0|,$$

and thus x does not satisfy condition (1), which is a contradiction.

Therefore

$$|x - y| \geq |y - a_0| = |y - b_0|,$$

and thus

$$|x - a_0| \leq |x - y|, \quad |x - b_0| \leq |x - y| \quad \text{and} \quad |a_0 - b_0| \leq |x - y|.$$

Hence

$$|F(x) - f(a_0)| \leq |x - a_0|, \quad |f(a_0)| = |f(a_0) - f(b_0)| \leq |a_0 - b_0|,$$

and thus

$$|F(x)| \leq \max\{|x - a_0|, |a_0 - b_0|\} \leq |x - y|.$$

Therefore

$$|G(x) - G(y)| = |F(x)| \leq |x - y|,$$

as desired. This finishes the proof. \square

Observe more precisely that the points x from

$\overline{A} \setminus \overline{B}$, $\overline{B} \setminus \overline{A}$, $(\overline{A} \setminus A) \cap (\overline{B} \setminus B)$, $(\overline{A} \setminus A) \cap B$, $A \cap (\overline{B} \setminus B)$, $A \cap B$,
satisfy respectively the following conditions

$$(1) \wedge \neg(2), \quad (2) \wedge \neg(1), \quad (1) \wedge (2), \quad (2) \wedge \neg(1), \quad (1) \wedge \neg(2), \quad (3);$$

here \overline{A} denotes the topological closure of a set A . Therefore the value $G(x)$ at the points x from the above subsets of K^n is respectively equal to

$$F(x), \quad 0, \quad 0, \quad 0, \quad F(x), \quad 0.$$

Hence

$$G|(A \setminus \overline{B}) = F|(A \setminus \overline{B}), \quad G|(B \setminus \overline{A}) = 0, \quad G|((\overline{A} \setminus A) \cap B) = 0,$$

$$G|(A \cap (\overline{B} \setminus B)) = F|(A \cap (\overline{B} \setminus B)), \quad G|(A \cap B) = 0.$$

We say that a 0-definable subset A of K^n has the *Lipschitz extension property*, abbreviated to *LE-property*, if every 0-definable 1-Lipschitz

function $f : A \rightarrow K$ extends to a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $F : K^n \rightarrow K$.

Corollary 2.3. (*Partition Lemma*) *Consider a finite number of 0-definable subsets A_1, \dots, A_s of K^n . If each of them has the LE-property, so does their union $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_s$.*

Proof. Induction with respect to the number s reduces the proof to the case $s = 2$. Then the conclusion follows directly from Proposition 2.2. Indeed, let $f : A_1 \cup A_2 \rightarrow K$ be a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function, F_2 be a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension of the restriction $f|_{A_2}$. Then the function

$$g := f - F_2|_{(A_1 \cup A_2)}$$

vanishes on A_2 , and thus, by Proposition 2.2, g extends to a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $F_1 : K^n \rightarrow K$. Then the function $F := F_1 + F_2$ is an extension of the initial function f , concluding the proof. \square

We still need the following

Proposition 2.4. *Every 0-definable subset $A \subset K^n$ is a finite disjoint union of 0-definable sets E that are, after some permutation of the variables, disjoint unions of the form*

$$E := \bigcup_{\eta \in \tau(D)} \bigcup_{j=1}^d \text{graph } \phi_{\eta,j} \subset K^n,$$

where

$$D = \bigcup_{\eta \in \tau(D)} D_\eta \subset K_{x \leq k}^k$$

is a 0-definable reparametrized Lipschitz open cell in $K_{x \leq k}^k$,

$$\phi_{\eta,j} : D_\eta \rightarrow K_{x > k}^{n-k}, \quad \eta \in \tau(D), \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

are 1-Lipschitz functions, and the set

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^d \text{graph } \phi_{\eta,j} \subset K^n$$

is η -definable for each $\eta \in \tau(D)$.

Proof. We shall apply cell decomposition with reparametrized cells parametrizing single twisted boxes. We may assume that A is, after some coordinate permutation, a 0-definable reparametrized Lipschitz cell C of dimension k of type $(1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Put

$$D := \pi_{\leq k}(C) = \bigcup_{\xi} D_\xi \quad \text{with} \quad D_\xi := \pi_{\leq k}(C_\xi) \subset K_{x \leq k}.$$

The restriction

$$p : \bigcup_{\xi} \text{graph}(c_{\xi,k+1}, \dots, c_{\xi,n}) \rightarrow D$$

of the projection $\pi_{\leq k}$ has of course finite, thus uniformly bounded fibres; say, of maximum cardinality l . Since D is the union of the interiors $\text{int}(D_d)$ of the sets

$$D_d := \{x_1 \in D : \# p^{-1}(x_1) = d\}, \quad d \leq l,$$

and of a set of dimension $< k$, we can assume, by a routine induction argument, that $D = \text{int}(D_d)$, and thus that the constant cardinality of the fibers of p is d . Therefore the 0-definable family

$$D_{\bar{\xi}} := \left\{ u \in \bigcap_{j=1}^d D_{\xi_j} : \# \{c_{\xi_1, > k}(u), \dots, c_{\xi_d, > k}(u)\} = d \right\},$$

with $\bar{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \in \sigma(C)^d$, covers D , and even is its partition. Indeed, the first assertion follows from that we have

$$D_{\lambda} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \bar{\xi}} D_{\bar{\xi}}.$$

for $\lambda \in \sigma(C)$, and the second from that a reparametrized cell is a disjoint union of cells.

Now it follows from Theorem 2.1 that D is a finite disjoint union of 0-definable reparametrized Lipschitz cells D_l compatible with that family. Throwing away pieces of lower dimension and treating them by induction, we can thus assume that

$$D = \bigcup \{D_{\eta} : \eta \in \tau(D)\},$$

is one of the open reparametrized cells of the decomposition. Then, since each cell (actually, a single twisted box) D_{η} is contained in exactly one of the sets $D_{\bar{\xi}}$ with $\bar{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d)$, we can put

$$\phi_{\eta,j} := c_{\xi_j}|_{D_{\eta}} : D_{\eta} \rightarrow K^{n-k}, \quad \eta \in \tau(D), \quad j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then the set

$$E := \bigcup_{\eta \in \tau(D)} \bigcup_{j=1}^d \text{graph } \phi_{\eta,j} \subset K^n,$$

is η -definable and we are done. \square

Remark 2.5. In the notation of the above proof, each function $\phi_{\eta,j}$ with $\eta \in \tau(D)$ and $d = 1, \dots, d$ is $(\eta, \bar{\xi})$ -definable if $D_{\eta} \subset D_{\bar{\xi}}$. Moreover, the set $\bar{\xi}$ is η -definable.

3. WHEN ALGEBRAIC SKOLEM FUNCTIONS ARE AVAILABLE

In order to make the proof of the extension theorem easier to follow, we first outline the case where definable algebraic Skolem functions are available; or, equivalently, where algebraic closure and definable closure coincide. Then, in analogy with o-minimal geometry, cell decomposition is of finitary character (cf. [4], Theorem 5.2.4 with the following addenda). Let us emphasize that the general case without definable algebraic Skolem functions is much more involved.

We start with Lipschitz extension on the affine line. Consider a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $f : A \rightarrow K$ with $A \subset K$. If A is of dimension zero, then A is finite and it is easy to check that the function

$$F : K \ni x \mapsto \frac{\sum f(A(x))}{\# A(x)} \in K,$$

where

$$A(x) := \{a \in A : |x - a| = \min \{|x - s| : s \in A\}\},$$

is a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension of f we are looking for. (This applies directly to the general case as well.) By Corollary 2.3, it remains to consider the case where $A = C$ is an open 0-definable cell with a center c . As explained in the Introduction, in the proof we analyze a 0-definable risometry g determined by f . In the sequel, we shall introduce a concept of the skeleton of an open (also reparametrized) cell, which is crucial for our proof of the extension theorem. In particular, using this concept, we show in the next section that the image $g(C)$ is an open 0-definable cell with a center d , and the formula $g(c) = d$ gives an extension of g which is a risometry too; eventually a 0-definable risometry $G : K \rightarrow K$ that extends g is given by an explicit formula (Corollaries 4.8 and 4.9).

The above reasoning can be continued by induction for the ambient spaces of higher dimensions. However, the technical details for reparametrized cells are far more complicated than for ordinary cells of finitary character. We illustrate this by analyzing Lipschitz extension of a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $f : C \rightarrow K$ on a 1-Lipschitz cell C of dimension 1 in the plane K^2 . C is then the graph of a 1-Lipschitz center $c : D \rightarrow K$ defined on an open cell in $D \subset K$. By the induction hypothesis, c extends to a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function on K , denoted by the same letter c for simplicity, $c : K \rightarrow K$. Applying the bi-Lipschitz transformation of the plane

$$K^2 \ni (x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_1, x_2 - c(x_1)) \in K^2,$$

we can reduce the extension problem to the case where the function f is defined on an open subset D of the x_1 -axis of the plane. Again, by the induction hypothesis, the function f extends to a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function F defined on the x_1 -axis; and next, in an obvious way, to the whole plane K^2 . This reasoning is indeed much easier in comparison with the proof for reparametrized cells from Section 5, Case II.

4. LIPSCHITZ EXTENSION ON THE AFFINE LINE

By Corollary 2.3, it suffices to consider the case where

$$A = C = \bigcup_{\xi} C_{\xi}$$

is an 0-definable reparametrized open cell; and further, as explained in Section 1, that $f : C \rightarrow K$ satisfies condition 1.1, which means that f is a risometry onto its image.

The concept of a 0-definable reparametrized open cell is especially simply on the affine line (and only for dimension 1). Indeed, the set of centers $c_{\xi} \in K$ of C is of course finite, and consists of some d distinct points $\{c_1, \dots, c_d\} \subset K$. Put

$$C_i := \bigcup \{C_{\xi} : c_{\xi} = c_i\} \subset K$$

and

$$R_i := \bigcup \{R_{\xi} : c_{\xi} = c_i\} \subset G(K) \subset RV(K);$$

clearly each set C_i and R_i is c_i -definable for $i = 1, \dots, d$. But the auxiliary sort RV is stably embedded (cf. [4, Proposition 2.6.12]) and even more, as indicated below.

Remark 4.1. For any $a \in K$, every $\{a\}$ -definable set $X \subset RV(K)^n$ is $\chi(a)$ -definable for a 0-definable map

$$\chi : K \rightarrow RV(K)^t$$

with some $t \in \mathbb{N}$. This follows directly from the proof of *loc.cit.*

Hence each C_i is a ξ_i -definable open cell for some $\xi_i \in RV(K)^t$, and thus we have proved the following

Proposition 4.2. *Every 0-definable reparametrized open cell C in K is actually the disjoint union of a finite 0-definable family of open cells C_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$.*

We are now going to introduce the concept of a skeleton of C . Though this can be done in arbitrary Hensel minimal structures, with no additional conditions, we first suppose for simplicity that the infima

$$(4.1) \quad \rho(c_i) := \inf \{|x - c_i| : x \in C_i\} \in |K|$$

are well defined for $i = 1, \dots, d$. In the general case where such infima do not exist, the reasoning below can be repeated verbatim with $\rho(c_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, replaced by the Dedekind cuts determined by the closed downward subsets of all elements of $|K|$ which are smaller than the sets

$$\left\{ |x - c_i| : x \in \bigcup \{ \sigma^{-1}(\xi) : c_\xi = c_i \} \right\}.$$

Indeed, they only serve to group the centers of cells under study.

Remark 4.3. For any Dedekind cut ρ on the value group $|K|$ and an $r \in |K|$, the strong inequalities $r < \rho$ and $\rho < r$ have a clear meaning. The equality $\rho = r$ means that the cut ρ represents the value r .

Write the 0-definable set of the values $\rho(c_i)$ in the ascending order:

$$r_0 := 0 < r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_s;$$

take $r_0 = 0$ if 0 occurs among the $\rho(c_i)$. For $i = 0, \dots, s$, $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, let $c_{i,j}$ be the centers with $\rho(c_{i,j}) = r_i$; obviously, $s \leq d$ and

$$s_0 + s_1 + \dots + s_s = d.$$

Remark 4.4. For each $i = 0, \dots, s$, the finite set $\{c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,s_i}\}$ is 0-definable, because so is each singleton r_i .

We can canonically define, by modifying the initial centers, a *skeleton* $S(C)$ of C , which is a 0-definable set of centers satisfying the following metric condition:

$$(4.2) \quad \rho(c_{i,j}) = r_i \quad \text{and} \quad |c_{i,j} - c_{p,k}| > r_p \quad \text{for} \quad i \leq p.$$

- At level 0, all the centers $c_{0,j}$ will be added to the skeleton without modification.

- At level 1, first remove from the centers $c_{1,j}$, for construction of skeleton only, all those for which

$$|c_{1,j} - c_{0,k}| \leq r_1$$

for some k . Note that, for any such removed center $c_{1,j}$, the cell $C_{1,j}$ is also a cell with center $c_{0,k}$ (with the same set $R_{1,j}$).

Next notice that the equivalence relation

$$a \sim b \Leftrightarrow |a - b| \leq r_1$$

partitions the set of the remaining centers from among $c_{1,j}$ into equivalence classes. Any equivalence class is a maximal subset of that set, say $c_{1,j_1}, \dots, c_{1,j_l}$, such that

$$|c_{1,j_k} - c_{1,j_q}| \leq r_1 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k, q \leq l.$$

It is easy to check that either the arithmetic average

$$c := \frac{c_{1,j_1} + \dots + c_{1,j_l}}{l}$$

lies in no cell $C_{1,j_1}, \dots, C_{1,j_l}$, or it lies in a ball of radius r_1 from exactly one of those cells, say C_{1,j_k} . We can thus replace each center c_{1,j_q} from such a maximal set with c or c_{1,j_k} (without change of the set R_{1,j_q}), according as the former or latter condition holds, and add such a new center to the skeleton. In this manner, any such equivalence class determines one point to be added to the skeleton. By Remark 4.4, the set of centers from the skeleton, obtained at this level 1, form a 0-definable set satisfying condition 4.2 for $0 \leq i \leq 1$.

- At level 2, first remove from the centers $c_{2,j}$, for construction of skeleton only, all those for which

$$|c_{2,j} - c_{0,k}| \leq r_2 \quad \text{or} \quad |c_{2,j} - c_{1,k}| \leq r_2$$

for some k . Next reason as before.

- Further, repeat the above construction at level 3 for the centers $c_{3,j}$, and so on. This canonical process leads eventually to a unique 0-definable set of centers $S(C) = \{c_1, \dots, c_d\}$ satisfying condition 4.2, sometimes regarded as a d -tuple too. Then we say that the reparametrized cell C is with a *skeleton* (C) . It is easy to see that $S(C) \cap C = \emptyset$ and that center exchange in the construction of skeleton does not change the distance from the center.

The points of the skeleton are not 0-definable individually, but the skeleton is a 0-definable finite set. And the initial reparametrized open cell C is the finite union of open cells

$$\{x_1 \in K : rv(x_1 - c_i) \in R_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

with a 0-definable family $R_1 \times \dots \times R_d \subset G(K)^d$, called an open cell package determined by the skeleton $S(C)$ and that family. We say that this 0-definable package is determined by the family

$$(c_1, R_1), \dots, (c_d, R_d).$$

Remark 4.5. In view of the above, the extension problem on the affine line comes down to extending Lipschitz 0-definable functions from such a finitary 0-definable open cell package.

Remark 4.6. Observe that a skeleton $S(C)$ of a reparametrized cell C depends on the initial set of centers of C . Furthermore, there are finitely many configurations, say

$$\mathfrak{C}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{C}_N, \quad N = N(d),$$

of the initial d -tuples (c_1, \dots, c_d) of centers c_i or, more precisely, of d -tuples of pairs $(c_i, \rho(c_i))_{i=1}^d$, such that for each of which the skeleton is given by a unique formula (built from the d -tuples and some arithmetic averages after a suitable choice, as described above) depending only on a given configuration.

In the sequel, we shall still need the following lemma whose proof uses the concept of skeleton.

Proposition 4.7. *Let \mathcal{B} be a 0-definable family of disjoint open balls in K which satisfies the following condition: for all balls $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, $B_1 \neq B_2$, with radii $r_1, r_2 \in |K| \setminus \{0\}$, respectively, we have*

$$|b_1 - b_2| = \max\{r_1, r_2\} \quad \text{for every } b_1 \in B_1, b_2 \in B_2.$$

Then \mathcal{B} is a 0-definable cell in K . Since Hensel minimality admits adding constants, the conclusion holds for a ξ -definable family as well.

Proof. The union of \mathcal{B} is a finite union of 0-definable reparametrized open cells C_i . It follows from the assumed condition that the skeleton of each of those reparametrized cells consist of one point, and that all those points must coincide. Hence the conclusion follows. \square

As observed in Remark 1.2, the image $f(B)$ of an open ball B under a definable risometry $f : B \rightarrow K$ is an open ball of the same radius. Hence and by Proposition 4.7, we get

Corollary 4.8. *Let $f : C \rightarrow K$ be a 0-definable risometry of a 0-definable open cell $C \subset K$, with a center c , onto its image. Then $f(C)$ is a 0-definable cell with a center d , and the function*

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C, \\ d & \text{if } x = c. \end{cases}$$

is a risometry onto its image too. The same conclusion holds for a ξ -definable risometry as well. \square

Since the image of an open box $B_1 \times \dots \times B_k \subset K^k$ under a risometry with respect to each variable separately is an open box with radius equal to the maximum of the radii of the balls B_1, \dots, B_k , the above corollary can be easily generalized to higher dimensions, which will be crucial in the sequel. The ξ -definable versions will be combined with model theoretical compactness.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $C \subset K^k$ be a 0-definable open cell with zero centers and $f : C \rightarrow K$ a risometry with respect to each variable separately. Then $f(C)$ is a 0-definable cell with a center d , and the function*

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C, \\ d & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

is a risometry onto its image too. The same conclusion holds for a ξ -definable risometry as well. \square

We also obtain the following

Corollary 4.10. *Let $f : C \rightarrow K$ be a 0-definable risometry of a 0-definable reparametrized open cell C , with a skeleton $S(C)$, onto its image. (By Proposition 4.2, C is actually a finite disjoint union of open cells C_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$.) Then the image $D := f(C)$ is a 0-definable reparametrized open cell which is the finite disjoint union of open cells*

$$D_i := f(C_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Further f induces a 0-definable function

$$f_s : S(C) \rightarrow S(D)$$

between the skeletons of C and D , respectively, and the function

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C, \\ f_s(x) & \text{if } x \in S(C). \end{cases}$$

is a risometry of $C \cup S(C)$ onto $D \cup S(D)$ too.

Proof. While the first conclusion immediately follows directly from Corollary 4.8, the second one is a straightforward consequence of the very construction of skeleton. \square

Now we turn to the extension problem. The function $f : C \rightarrow K$ under study is a risometry onto its image. Consider its extension

$$\tilde{f} : C \cup S(C) \rightarrow D \cup S(D)$$

from Corollary 4.10. Then the function

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \tilde{f}(x) & \text{if } x \in C \cup S(C), \\ \frac{\sum \tilde{f}(S(x))}{\# S(x)} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where

$$S(x) := \{a \in S(C) : |x - a| = \min \{|x - s| : s \in S(C)\}\},$$

is a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension of f we are looking for. \square

The above extension procedure can be split into the following two steps, which will be especially convenient for higher dimensional ambient spaces. First observe that the function

$$g : K \ni x \mapsto \frac{\sum \tilde{f}(S(x))}{\# S(x)} \in K$$

is 1-Lipschitz continuous, and next that so is the extension of

$$\tilde{f} - g|(C \cup S(C))$$

by zero through the complement $K \setminus (C \cup S(C))$.

5. LIPSCHITZ EXTENSION ON THE AFFINE PLANE

Consider a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $f : A \rightarrow K$ with $A \subset K^2$. By LE-property, we can assume that $A = C$ is a 0-definable reparametrized Lipschitz cell of dimension $k = 0$, $k = 1$ or $k = 2$.

Case I. When $k = \dim C = 0$, the set A has a finite number d of points, say

$$A = \{(u_i, v_{i,j}) \in K^2 : i = 1, \dots, s, j = 1, \dots, d_i\}.$$

Denote by

$$A_{u_i} := \{v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,d_i}\}$$

the fiber of A over u_i . Even this case is a bit laborious. Put

$$\delta_1 := \min\{|u_i - u_j| : i \neq j\}, \quad \delta_2 := \min\{|u_i - u_j| : |u_i - u_j| > \delta_1\},$$

and so on. In this fashion, we get a finite increasing sequence

$$\delta_1 < \delta_2 < \dots < \delta_t < \delta_{t+1} = \infty, \quad t \leq s.$$

We shall canonically extend the function f on the successive δ_k -neighbourhoods A^δ of A , where

$$A^\delta := \bigcup_{x \in A} B(x, \delta), \quad B(x, \delta) := \{y \in K^2 : |y - x| < \delta\}.$$

Observe that if $\Phi : E \rightarrow K$ is a 1-Lipschitz function on a finite subset E of K , then so is its extension

$$(5.1) \quad \omega(\Phi) : K \ni v \mapsto \frac{\sum f(E(v))}{\# E(v)} \in K,$$

where

$$E(v) := \{w \in E : |v - w| = \min\{|v - s| : s \in E\}\},$$

is a 1-Lipschitz extension of ϕ .

For 1-Lipschitz functions $\phi_i : E_i \rightarrow K$ on finite sets $E_i \subset K$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $\delta \in |K|$, define the function

$$\Phi = \Phi(\phi_1, \delta, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_p) : \bigcup_{i=1}^p E_i \rightarrow K$$

by putting

$$\Phi(v) = \phi_1(v) \quad \text{if } v \in E_1,$$

and

$$\Phi(v) = \frac{\sum_{i=2}^p \sum \phi_i(B \cap E_i)}{\sum_{i=2}^p \#(B \cap E_i)} \quad \text{if } v \in B \cap \bigcup_{i=2}^p E_i,$$

for any open ball

$$B \subset \bigcup_{i=2}^p E_i^\delta \setminus E_1^\delta$$

of radius δ .

We begin by extending a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $f : A \rightarrow K$ from the finite set A on the δ_1 -neighbourhood of A . Consider any maximal subset B_1 of $\pi_{<2}(A) = \{u_1, \dots, u_s\}$ that satisfies the following condition

$$(\Lambda_1) \quad |u - u'| = \delta_1 \quad \text{for every } u, u' \in B, \quad u \neq u';$$

say, $B = \{u_1, \dots, u_p\}$. Consider the functions

$$\phi_i : A_{u_i} \rightarrow K, \quad \phi_i(v_{i,j}) := f(u_i, v_{i,j}), \quad i = 1, \dots, p, \quad j = 1, \dots, d_i$$

and

$$\Phi = \Phi(\phi_1, \delta_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_p).$$

Put

$$\tilde{f}_{B_1,1}(u, v) = \omega(\Phi)(v), \quad (u, v) \in \bigcup_{k=1}^p \bigcup_{j=1}^{d_k} B(u_1, \delta_1) \times B(v_{k,j}, \delta_1);$$

note that the function $\tilde{f}(u, v)$ is in fact constant with respect to the variable $u \in B(u_1, \delta_1)$.

Similarly, one can canonically define the functions

$$\tilde{f}_{B_1,i}(u, v) = \omega(\Phi)(v), \quad (u, v) \in \bigcup_{k=1}^p \bigcup_{j=1}^{d_i} B(u_i, \delta_1) \times B(v_{k,j}, \delta_1),$$

the function \tilde{f}_{B_1} by gluing the functions $\tilde{f}_{B_1,1}, \dots, \tilde{f}_{B_1,p}$, and then a unique function \tilde{f}_1 by gluing the functions \tilde{f}_{B_1} where B_1 runs over all maximal sets that satisfy condition Λ_1 .

It is not difficult to check that all the functions \tilde{f}_{B_1} are 1-Lipschitz on the λ_1 -neighbourhood of the finite set

$$A(B_1) := B_1 \times \{v_{i,j} : i = 1, \dots, p, j = 1, \dots, d_i\},$$

and \tilde{f}_1 is a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension of f to the δ_1 -neighbourhood of a finite subset of K^2 containing A .

Next consider any maximal subset B_2 of $\pi_{<2}(A) = \{u_1, \dots, u_s\}$ that satisfies the following condition

$$(\Lambda_2) \quad |u - u'| \leq \delta_2 \text{ for every } u, u' \in B, u \neq u'.$$

Every such subset B_2 is a union of subsets B_1 considered above. Since the sets $A(B_1)$ have constant fibres over the points of B_1 , we can now handle subsets B_1 of the sets B_2 similarly as we did points of the sets B_1 before. In this fashion, again we can canonically achieve 1-Lipschitz extensions \tilde{f}_{B_2} of \tilde{f}_1 on the λ_2 -neighbourhood of a finite set $A(B_2)$ with constant fibres over the points of B_2 , and then a unique 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension \tilde{f}_2 of f to the δ_2 -neighbourhood of a finite subset of K^2 containing A .

Repeating the above, we eventually achieve a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension \tilde{f}_{t+1} of f to the affine space K^2 , we are looking for. \square

Remark 5.1. There are finitely many configurations of d points of the graphs of 1-Lipschitz 0-definable functions f on finite sets A , based on the distances between them, such that for each of which the foregoing canonical extension procedure yields a 1-Lipschitz 0-definable extension of f given by a unique formula depending on those points. In a similar fashion, this procedure carries over to the canonical Lipschitz extension from finite 0-definable subsets A of the affine spaces K^n .

Case II. Suppose $k = \dim C = 1$. Making use of Corollary 2.3 and Proposition 2.4, we can assume that $A = C$ is a disjoint union of the form

$$C = \bigcup_{\xi \in \Xi} \bigcup_{j=1}^d \text{graph } \phi_{\xi,j} \subset K^2,$$

where

$$D = \bigcup_{\xi \in \Xi} D_\xi \subset K_{x_1}^1$$

is a 0-definable reparametrized open cell in K_{x_1} . We can of course assume that D is a 0-definable open cell package with a skeleton

$$S(D) = \{c_1, \dots, c_s\} \subset K_{x_1}.$$

The construction of centers in the definition of a skeleton and a package, introduced in Case III considered below in this section, can be repeated almost verbatim to the above family of functions. We can thus assume that C is a 0-definable package which consists of finitely many graphs of functions

$$\text{graph } \phi_j(x_1), \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

defined on D such that every function ϕ_j is 1-Lipschitz on each ball of D . The union of images

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^d \phi_j(D) \subset K_{x_2}$$

is the union of a 0-definable open cell package E , with a skeleton

$$S(E) = \{d_1, \dots, d_t\} \subset K_{x_2},$$

and of a finite number of points $d_{t+1}, \dots, d_u \in K_{x_2}$.

As explained in Section 1 after Theorem 1.1, we can require that, after a suitable modification, f satisfy condition 1.1 with respect to the variable x_1 . In other words, we can require that the function $f(x_1, \phi_j(x_1))$ be a risometry for each $j = 1, \dots, d$. The image $f(C)$ is the union of a 0-definable open cell package H with a skeleton $S(H) = \{a_1, \dots, a_p\}$ and of a finite number of points.

First, we shall extend f on the set P of relevant pairs (c_i, d_j) . Clearly,

$$D_i := \{x \in D : |x_1 - c_i| < \min\{|c_j - c_i| : j \neq i\}\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s,$$

is a family of non-empty sets. For any fixed i , the union of images

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^d \phi_j(D_i) \subset K_{x_2}$$

is the union of an open cell package E_i , whose skeleton $S(E_i)$ is a subset of $S(E)$, and a finite number of points from among $d_{t+1}, \dots, d_u \in K_{x_2}$.

For a fixed $d_j \in S(E_i)$, take a ball B from E_i that is next only to d_j and a ball B' from D_i that meets one of the pre-images $\phi_j^{-1}(B)$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Since the centers under study are skeletons and f is a risometry with respect to x_1 , the image

$$f(\text{graph } \phi_j|_{B'})$$

is next to a unique center from the skeleton $S(H)$, say a_k . It is not difficult to check that a_k is independent of the choice of B' . We can thus extend f to a 1-Lipschitz function by putting

$$\tilde{f}(c_i, d_j) := a_k, \quad d_j \in S(E_i).$$

Similarly, for a relevant point d_j with $j \in \{t+1, \dots, u\}$, we put

$$\tilde{f}(c_i, d_j) := a_k$$

when the image

$$f(\text{graph } \phi_j^{-1}(d_j))$$

is next to a unique center $a_k \in S(H)$.

But we have already considered the case where A is a subset of the affine plane of dimension 0 (Case I). Therefore there exists a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function $g : K^2 \rightarrow K$ that agrees with the function f on the set P of the relevant pairs (c_i, d_j) . This reduces the problem to the case where f is a 1-Lipschitz function on $C \cup P$ which vanishes on P . Now let

$$f_{x_1} : C_{x_1} \ni x_2 \mapsto f(x) \in K, \quad x_1 \in D,$$

be the restriction of f to the fiber C_{x_1} of C over x_1 . Then the function $F : K^2 \rightarrow K$ given by the formula

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \omega(f_{x_1})(x_2) & \text{if } x_1 \in D, \\ 0 & \text{if } x_1 \notin D, \end{cases}$$

is a 1-Lipschitz extension of f we are looking for; here the function $\omega(\Phi)$ is given by formula 5.1. Indeed, consider two points $x, y \in K^2$. Suppose x_1 and y_1 lie in distinct balls of the package D with centers $c_i, c_l \in S(D)$, respectively; equality $i = l$ is allowed. Then

$$|x - y| \geq |x_1 - y_1| \geq \max\{|x_1 - c_i|, |y_1 - c_l|\},$$

and hence the assertion follows immediately. The case where one of the points does not lie in D is similar. Finally, if x and y lie in a common ball of D , the assertion follows from that all the functions ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_d are 1-Lipschitz on every ball of D . This solves Case II. \square

Case III. Finally, suppose $k = \dim C = 2$. By LE-property, we can assume that $A = C$ is a 0-definable reparametrized open cell in K^2 :

$$C = \bigcup_{\xi} C_{\xi} \subset K^2, \quad C_{\xi} = \sigma^{-1}(\xi), \quad \xi \in \sigma(C),$$

where $\sigma : C \rightarrow (Kv)^s$ is a 0-definable function. Every set $C_{\xi} := \sigma^{-1}(\xi)$, $\xi \in \sigma(C)$, is a ξ -definable Lipschitz open cell with some center tuple c_{ξ} of the form

$$(5.2) \quad C_{\xi} = \{x \in K^2 : (rv(x_1 - c_{\xi,1}), rv(x_2 - c_{\xi,2}(x_1))) \in R_{\xi}\}$$

with some 0-definable families of center tuples $c_{\xi} = (c_{\xi,1}, c_{\xi,2})$ and of sets $R_{\xi} \subset G(K)^2$.

We begin by defining a *skeleton* of the reparametrized Lipschitz open cell C . It will be done via a suitable finite 0-definable partitioning of the set

$$D := \pi_1(C) = \bigcup_{\xi} D_{\xi}, \quad \text{where } D_{\xi} := \pi_1(C_{\xi}) \subset K_{x_1},$$

up to a subset of lower dimension, which will not affect our solution to the extension problem in view of Corollary 2.3 and the induction hypothesis. The restriction

$$p : \bigcup_{\xi} \text{graph}(c_{\xi,2}) \rightarrow D$$

of the projection π_1 has of course finite, thus uniformly bounded fibres; say, of maximum cardinality l . Since D is the union of the interiors $\text{int}(D_d)$ of the sets

$$D_d := \{x_1 \in D : \# p^{-1}(x_1) = d\}, \quad d \leq l,$$

and of a (finite) set of dimension < 1 , we can assume that $D = \text{int}(D_d)$, and thus, as before in Case II, that the constant cardinality of the fibers of p is d . Therefore the 0-definable family

$$D_{\bar{\xi}} := \left\{ x_1 \in \bigcap_{j=1}^d D_{\xi_j} : \# \{c_{\xi_1,2}(x_1), \dots, c_{\xi_d,2}(x_1)\} = d \right\},$$

where $\bar{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \in \sigma(C)^d$, covers D . Indeed, we have

$$D_{\lambda} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \bar{\xi}} D_{\bar{\xi}}$$

for $\lambda \in \sigma(C)$. At the cost of a further finite 0-definable partitioning of D , we can also require that all (ordered) fibers

$$(c_{\xi_1,2}(x_1), \dots, c_{\xi_d,2}(x_1))$$

of p , regarded as d -tuples, have the same configuration with respect to construction of skeleton on the affine line.

Next, we wish to find a certain special 0-definable cell decomposition of D which is finer than the covering $\{D_{\bar{\xi}} : \bar{\xi} \in \sigma(C)^d\}$. To this end consider a 0-definable family

$$\Lambda_a := \{\bar{\xi} \in \sigma(C)^d : a \in D_{\bar{\xi}}\}, \quad a \in D,$$

of subsets of $\sigma(C)^d$. What will be used here is the fact that the auxiliary sort RV is stably embedded (cf. [4, Proposition 2.6.12]). By Remark 4.1 and model theoretical compactness, there exists a 0-definable map

$$\chi : K \rightarrow RV(K)^s$$

such that each set Λ_a is $\chi(a)$ -definable and the family

$$\Lambda_{\chi(a)} := \Lambda_a, \quad \chi(a) \in \chi(D),$$

is well defined and 0-definable, too, because Λ_a is defined by a formula $\varphi(\bar{\xi}, \chi(a))$. Therefore the 0-definable equivalence relation

$$R(\chi(a), \chi(b)) \iff \Lambda_{\chi(a)} = \Lambda_{\chi(b)}, \quad a, b \in D,$$

allows us to code the same fibres from among $\Lambda_{\chi(a)}$ with $\chi(a) \in \chi(D)$, by the imaginary elements (equivalence classes) induced by R :

$$\ulcorner \Lambda_{\chi(a)} \urcorner = [\chi(a)]_R = [\chi(a)].$$

In other words, we can parametrize the same fibres from among $\Lambda_{\chi(a)}$ by the imaginary elements $[\chi(a)]$ with $\chi(a) \in \chi(D)$. Consider the two 0-definable families

$$S_a = S_{\chi(a)} = S_{[\chi(a)]} := \bigcap_{a \in D_{\bar{\xi}}} D_{\bar{\xi}} = \bigcap_{\bar{\xi} \in \Lambda_a} D_{\bar{\xi}} = \bigcap_{\bar{\xi} \in \ulcorner \Lambda_{\chi(a)} \urcorner} D_{\bar{\xi}}$$

and

$$T_a = T_{\chi(a)} = T_{[\chi(a)]} := \{b \in S_{[\chi(a)]} : \Lambda_{\chi(b)} = \Lambda_{\chi(a)}\}$$

parametrized by $\chi(a) \in \chi(D)$, and also by the imaginary elements $[\chi(a)] \in \chi(D)/R$. The second family is of course a partition of D .

Now, punctual construction of skeleton from Section 3, performed here over parameters $x_1 \in D$, leads to e new centers

$$c_{1,2}(x_1), \dots, c_{e,2}(x_1)$$

with a number $e \leq d$ independent of x_1 , which are produced from the initial d centers $c_{\xi_1}, \dots, c_{\xi_d}$ by the same formulae. We call the graphs of those new centers (or their union) *a skeleton* of C at level 2 (i.e. with respect to the variable x_2). Those centers are 1-Lipschitz on each set $T_a = T_{\chi(a)} = T_{[\chi(a)]}$. Indeed, each $c_{j,2}$ over each set $T_{\chi(a)}$ is built from the centers $\bar{\xi}$ for every $\bar{\xi} \in \Lambda_a$ as one of them or an average (construction of skeleton on the affine line). Furthermore, the part $C \cap \pi_1^{-1}(T_{[\chi(a)]})$ of C over each $T_{[\chi(a)]}$ is the union of e open sets

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^e \{x \in T_{[\chi(a)]} \times K : (rv(x_1 - c_{\xi,1}), rv(x_2 - c_{j,2}(x_1))) \in R_{[\chi(a)],j}\},$$

where $R_{[\chi(a)],j}$ is the union of all $R_{\bar{\xi}}$ with $c_{\xi,2}(a) = c_{j,2}(a)$. We call it an open cell package determined by those centers and that family.

It follows from Theorem 2.1 that D is a finite disjoint union of 0-definable reparametrized Lipschitz cells D_l compatible with the family

$T_{\chi(a)}$. By LE-property and the induction hypothesis on the dimension k of the subset A , we can assume, throwing away pieces of lower dimension, that

$$D = \bigcup \{D_\eta : \eta \in \tau(D)\},$$

is one of those open cells. Then each set $T_a = T_{[\chi(a)]}$ is a union of some twisted boxes (here balls) of D . We can also assume that D is a 0-definable package determined by a family

$$(c_{1,1}, R_1), \dots, (c_{q,1}, R_q).$$

Summing up, for each η , the skeleton consists of the same number of graphs of those new e 1-Lipschitz centers over D_η , which are not η -definable individually, but their union is η -definable.

Further, we have the following presentation

$$C = \bigcup_{i=1}^q \bigcup_{j=1}^e C_{i,j}, \quad C_{i,j} := \bigcup_{\lambda_1 \in R_i} C_{i,j,\eta},$$

for the 0-definable family

$$C_{i,j,\lambda_1} := \{x \in K^2 : rv(x_1 - c_{i,1}) = \lambda_1, rv(x_2 - c_{j,2}(x_1)) \in R_{i,j,\lambda_1}\},$$

where

$$R_{i,j,\lambda_1} := \{\lambda_2 \in G(K) : \text{for some } \xi \text{ one has: } c_{\xi,1} = c_{i,1}, c_{\xi,2}|D_{\lambda_1} = c_{j,2}|D_{\lambda_1}, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in R_\xi\}.$$

Then we shall say that C is a 0-definable open cell package determined by the finitary skeleton

$$(c_{i,1}), (c_{j,2}(x_1)), \quad i = 1, \dots, q, \quad j = 1, \dots, e,$$

and the infinitary part

$$(R_i, R_{i,j,\lambda_1}), \quad i = 1, \dots, q, \quad j = 1, \dots, e, \quad \lambda_1 \in R_i,$$

expressed equivalently by the 0-definable family

$$R_{i,j} \subset G(K)^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, q, \quad j = 1, \dots, e,$$

with

$$R_{i,j} := \{\lambda \in G(K)^2 : \lambda_2 \in R_{i,j,\lambda_1}\}.$$

Then we get

$$C_{i,j} = \{x \in K^2 : (rv(x_1 - c_i), rv(x_2 - c_j(x_1))) \in R_{i,j}\}.$$

By the LE-property and induction hypothesis, the extension problem in Case III comes down, via throwing away pieces of lower dimension, to extending Lipschitz 0-definable functions from such a 0-definable open cell package.

Remark 5.2. The above constructions of a total skeleton and a 0-definable open cell packages can be recursively repeated for 0-definable reparametrized open cells in the affine spaces K^k . In Section 6, it will be applied in the extension problem on the affine spaces K^k .

As indicated before, we can assume without loss of generality that the function f satisfies condition 1.1 with respect to the variable x_2 . Hence and by Corollary 4.10, the images

$$(5.3) \quad f(C_{i,j} \cap (\{x_1\} \times K)), \quad x_1 \in D_i,$$

form a family of cells. Since the defining formulae for their centers depend on configurations rather than on parameters (canonical character of the construction of skeleton), this is, by model theoretical compactness, a 0-definable family of cells with some 0-definable family of centers

$$d_{i,j}(x_1), \quad i = 1, \dots, q, \quad j = 1, \dots, e.$$

At this stage, our objective is to extend f on the graphs of the centers $c_{1,2}, \dots, c_{e,2}$.

To this end, consider the following package property

$$(5.4) \quad R_{i,j,\lambda_1} \subset \{\lambda_2 \in G(K) : |\lambda_2| \leq |\lambda_1|\} \quad \text{for all } i, j, \lambda_1.$$

In order to ensure this package property, we can, without loss of generality due to the LE-property, partition the package C into two 0-definable open cell packages C' and C'' via modification of the sets $R_{i,j,\lambda_1} \subset G(K)$ by putting

$$R'_{i,j,\lambda_1} := \{\lambda_2 \in R_{i,j,\lambda_1} : |\lambda_2| \leq |\lambda_1|\}$$

and

$$R''_{i,j,\lambda_1} := \{\lambda_2 \in R_{i,j} : |\lambda_2| > |\lambda_1|\}.$$

The package C' satisfies of course property 5.4.

On the other hand, observe that the package C'' has constant fibres over each twisted box (here ball) of the package D'' . To solve this case, we use the induction hypothesis (uniform version) on the dimension n of the ambient space, applied to the centers of the package C . Without loss of generality, we can thus assume that the restrictions $c_{j,2}|_{D_{\lambda_1}}$ of the centers of the package, are global 1-Lipschitz functions on K . Obviously, they form a 0-definable family of functions (denoted by the same letters for simplicity):

$$c_{j,2,\lambda_1} : K \rightarrow K, \quad i = 1, \dots, q, \quad j = 1, \dots, e, \quad \lambda_1 \in R_i.$$

Hence we obtain a finite 0-definable family of the origins

$$\mathfrak{D} := \{(c_{i,1}, c_{j,2,\lambda_1}(c_{i,1})) : i, j, \lambda_1\} = \{O_1, \dots, O_s\} \subset K^2.$$

It is not difficult to check, after swapping the roles of variables x_1 and x_2 , that C'' is a 0-definable open cell package with 0-definable family of constant centers of the form:

$$c_1'' \in K_{x_2}, \quad c_2''(x_2) = c_2'' = c_{i,1} \quad \text{with some } (c_2'', c_1'') \in \mathfrak{D}.$$

With the variables x_1, x_2 swapped in this way, the package C'' satisfies property 5.4 too.

Remark 5.3. Such an exchange of variables, or rather reordering the variables x_1, \dots, x_n , will be applied in the higher dimensional case in order to ensure the analogue of package property 5.4 for dimension n .

Observe now that the very definition of an open cell package with property 5.4, along with that the centers of the package C are 1-Lipschitz on every relevant twisted box (here ball) of the package, imply the following estimates:

$$(5.5) \quad |d_{i,j}(y) - d_{i',j'}(z)| \leq |y - z|, \quad y \in D_i, \quad z \in D_{i'},$$

if $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$; and if $(i, j) = (i', j')$ and y, z that lie in distinct balls of the package; and also if y, z lie in a common ball

$$\{x_1 \in K : rv(x_1 - c_{i,1}) = \lambda_1\}, \quad c_i = c_{i'}, \quad \lambda_1 \in R_i,$$

but $|y - z| \geq |\lambda_2|$ for some λ_2 such that $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in R_{i,j}$.

Hence the function \tilde{f} will be 1-Lipschitz, if so are the functions $d_{i,j}$. And, furthermore, we can analyse each function $d_{i,j}$ separately on each relevant ball B of the package; say, on the ball

$$B := \{x_1 \in K : rv(x_1 - c_{i,1}) = \lambda_1\} \quad \text{for some } \lambda_1 \in R_1.$$

We shall use the valuative Jacobian property (cf. [4, Lemma 2.8.5]) applied to global functions extending the functions $d_{i,j}$ by zero outside their natural domains. Hence there exists a finite 0-definable set $Z \subset K$, independent of a single ball B , such that the quotients

$$(5.6) \quad \frac{|d_{i,j}(y) - d_{i,j}(z)|}{|y_1 - z_1|}, \quad i = 1, \dots, q, \quad j = 1, \dots, e,$$

are constant for any two distinct points $y, z \in B$ that lie in a ball next to Z .

Further, since the centers $c_{j,2}(x_1)$ are 1-Lipschitz on B and f is a risometry with respect to the variable x_2 , it is easy to check that

$$(5.7) \quad |d_{i,j}(y) - d_{i,j}(z)| \leq |y - z|$$

for any two points $y, z \in B$ such that $|y - z| \geq |\lambda_2|$ for some $\lambda_2 \in G(K)$ with $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in R_{i,j}$.

Hence and by estimates 5.6, the function $d_{i,j}$ is 1-Lipschitz on B if there is some $\lambda_2 \in G(K)$ such that $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in R_{i,j}$ and $|\lambda_1| > |\lambda_2|$.

In the other case, we get $|\lambda_1| = |\lambda_2|$ for all $\lambda_2 \in G(K)$ such that $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in R_{i,j}$ by package property 5.4. Then the family of the images defining the function $d_{i,j}(x_1)$ is constant, i.e. independent of x_1 , because the center $c_{j,2}(x_1)$ is 1-Lipschitz on B ; and also constant is the function $d_{i,j}$ because of the canonical character of its construction and estimates 5.7.

In this fashion, we achieve 1-Lipschitz centers $\tilde{d}_{i,j}$, which together form a 0-definable family. For simplicity we drop tilde over $d_{i,j}$.

Now, put

$$\partial C := \bigcup_{i,j} \text{graph}(c_{i,j}).$$

Again by estimates 5.5, the function $\tilde{f} : C \cup \partial C \rightarrow K$ given by the formula

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C, \\ d_{i,j}(x_1) & \text{if } x \in \text{graph}(c_{i,j}) \subset \partial C, \end{cases}$$

is a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension of f .

Since we have already considered the case where the set A is of dimension < 2 , there exists a 0-definable ϵ -Lipschitz function

$$g : K^2 \rightarrow K$$

that agrees with the function \tilde{f} on the set ∂C . In this manner, the problem can be reduced to the case where f is an ϵ -Lipschitz function which vanishes on the set ∂C . Then, finally, since C is an open cell package, the function

$$F : K^2 \rightarrow K$$

given by the formula

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C \cup d(C), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is a 0-definable ϵ -Lipschitz extension of the function f we are looking for. \square

The uniform version of the theorem follows by model theoretical compactness, because the foregoing constructions are canonical. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3 for the affine plane.

6. LIPSCHITZ EXTENSION FOR HIGHER DIMENSIONS

To establish the extension theorem for higher dimension, we shall proceed with double induction on the dimension n of the ambient space and the dimension k of the subset A . We briefly outline our strategy, which is similar, although more technical compared to the planar case. The canonical extension in the case $k = 0$ can be constructed similarly as in the case of the affine plane.

For the case $k > 0$, we shall consider 0-definable open cell packages of dimension k . They are determined by a skeleton which consists of the following sequences of centers

$$(c_{j,1}), j = 1, \dots, d_1, \dots, (c_{j,k}(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})), j = 1, \dots, d_k,$$

and an infinitary part

$$R_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \subset G(K)^k, \quad j_i = 1, \dots, d_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

which yield the presentation

$$C = \bigcup_{j_1, \dots, j_k} C_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \quad \text{with} \quad C_{j_1, \dots, j_k} :=$$

$$\{x \in K^k : (rv(x_1 - c_{j_1}), \dots, rv(x_k - c_k(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}))) \in R_{j_1, \dots, j_k}\}.$$

Further, we shall need the following package property, being a higher dimensional analogue of property 5.4:

$$(6.1) \quad R_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \subset \{\lambda \in G(K)^k : |\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots |\lambda_k|\}.$$

for all j_1, \dots, j_k , which can be obtained by reordering the variables, as outlined below.

The reasoning here is similar, although more technical in comparison with the planar case. We can assume, using the induction hypothesis (uniform version) on the dimension k of the set A , that the restrictions of each center

$$c_{j_1, \dots, j_k}, \quad j_i = 1, \dots, d_i, \quad i = 2, \dots, k,$$

of the skeleton to every twisted box of the packet contained in K^{i-1} are global 1-Lipschitz functions. This will be illustrated by the following example. Suppose that after an appropriate partition we have obtained the case where

$$R_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} \subset \{\lambda \in G(K)^4 : |\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_4| > |\lambda_2| \geq |\lambda_3|\}.$$

Then we can replace the center $c_{j_4,4}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by a new one of the form

$$c_{j_4,4}(x_1, c_{j_2,2}(x_1), c_{j_3,3}(x_1, c_{j_2,2}(x_1))),$$

which is independent of x_2, x_3 . With the variables x_1, x_4, x_2, x_3 re-ordered in this way, the package is determined by sequences of centers of the form

$$c_{j_1,1}, c_{j_4,4}(x_1, c_{j_2,2}(x_1), c_{j_3,3}(x_1, c_{j_2,2}(x_1))), c_{j_2,2}(x_1), c_{j_3,3}(x_1, x_2),$$

which satisfies Property 6.1. This canonical procedure, performed for all sequences of centers, provides eventually a 0-definable packet as output.

Now we can readily return to the proof of the extension theorem. As before, we shall separately treat the cases $0 < k < n$ and $k = n$, starting from the latter for pedagogical reasons.

For $0 < k < n$, we shall first proceed with induction on the dimension n of the ambient space (applied here to dimensions $\leq k - 1 < n$) to globally and uniformly extend some centers under study, in order to ensure Property 6.1 (cf. Remark 5.3); and next, with induction on the dimension k of the set $A \subset K^n$ to globally extend the restriction of a given function f on a subset of dimension $k - 1$.

For $k = n$, we shall first proceed with induction on the dimension n of the ambient space (applied here to dimensions $< n$) to globally and uniformly extend some centers under study, in order to ensure package property 6.1. And next, using induction on the dimension k of the set $A \subset K^n$, to globally extend the restriction of a given function f on a subset of dimension $n - 1$.

Case I. Suppose $A \subset K^n$ and $\dim A = n$. By the LE-property and induction hypothesis, the extension problem comes down, via throwing away pieces of lower dimension, to extending Lipschitz 0-definable functions from a 0-definable open cell package $A = C$ determined by a skeleton

$$(c_{j,1}), j = 1, \dots, d_1, \dots, (c_{j,n}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})), j = 1, \dots, d_n,$$

and an infinitary part

$$R_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \subset G(K)^n, \quad j_i = 1, \dots, d_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

As in the planar case, our objective is to extend f on the graphs of the centers $c_{1,n}, \dots, c_{j_n,n}$ using package property 6.1. Again, we can assume without loss of generality that f satisfies condition 1.1 with respect to the variable x_n . Hence and by Corollary 4.10, the images

$$(6.2) \quad f(C_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \cap (\{(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})\} \times K)),$$

$(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \pi_{<n}(D_{j_1, \dots, j_n})$, form a 0-definable family of cells with some 0-definable family of centers

$$d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}).$$

Set

$$\partial C := \bigcup_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \text{graph}(c_{j_1, \dots, j_n}),$$

and extend f to the function $\tilde{f} : C \cup \partial C \rightarrow K$ by putting

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C, \\ d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) & \text{if } x \in \text{graph}(c_{j_1, \dots, j_n}) \subset \partial C. \end{cases}$$

The very definition of an open cell package with property 6.1, along with that the centers of the packet C are 1-Lipschitz on every relevant twisted box of the packet, imply the following estimates:

$$(6.3) \quad |d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(y) - d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(z)| \leq |y - z|$$

for any $y, z \in K^{n-1}$ that lie in distinct twisted boxes in K^{n-1} of the package, or lie in a common twisted box determined by the center $c_{j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}}$ and a value

$$\lambda' \in \pi_{<n}(R_{j_1, \dots, j_n}),$$

but $|y - z| \geq |\lambda_n|$ for some λ_n such that $(\lambda', \lambda_n) \in R_{j_1, \dots, j_n}$.

Hence the function \tilde{f} will be 1-Lipschitz, if so are the functions d_{j_1, \dots, j_n} . And further, we can analyse each function d_{j_1, \dots, j_n} separately on each relevant twisted box of the package. (We argued likewise in the planar case.)

Since each twisted box is (uniformly) 1-bi-Lipschitz with the associated box (with zero centers), one can limit oneself to only analyse the function $d := d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}$ defined on a single box

$$B := \{(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in K^{n-1} : (rv(x_1), \dots, rv(x_{n-1})) = \lambda'\}$$

with $\lambda' = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \in G(K)^{n-1}$. As before (cf. estimates 5.6), we shall use the claim below, which is a parametric version of the valuative Jacobian property applied to global functions extending the functions d_{j_1, \dots, j_n} by zero outside their natural domains.

We still need some notation:

$$x^{(i)} = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{n-1})$$

and

$$d^{(a^i)}(x_i) := d(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, x_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{n-1})$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Claim 6.1. There exist nowhere-dense 0-definable subsets

$$Z_i \subset K^{n-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

independent of a single twisted box B , such that the projections $\pi_{\neq i}|Z_i$ have finite fibres, and for each point $a^{(i)} \in \pi_{\neq i}(B)$ the quotients

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{|d^{a^{(i)}}(y) - d^{a^{(i)}}(z)|}{|y - z|}$$

are constant for any two distinct points $y, z \in K_{x_i}$ that lie in a ball in the affine space $\{a^{(i)}\} \times K_{x_i}$ next to $Z_i \cap (\{a^{(i)}\} \times K_{x_i})$.

This follows immediately from the ordinary Jacobian property by model theoretical compactness. \square

Further, as in the planar case, since the centers c_{j_1, \dots, j_n} are 1-Lipschitz on B and f is a risometry with respect to the variable x_n , we easily obtain the estimates

$$(6.5) \quad |d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(y) - d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(z)| \leq |y - z|$$

for any two points $y, z \in B$ such that $|y - z| \geq |\lambda_n|$ for some $\lambda_n \in G(K)$ with $(\lambda', \lambda_n) \in R_{j_1, \dots, j_n}$.

Hence and by estimates 6.4, each function d_{j_1, \dots, j_n} is 1-Lipschitz on B if

$$|\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_{n-1}| > \lambda_n$$

for some $\lambda_n \in G(K)$ such that $(\lambda', \lambda_n) \in R_{j_1, \dots, j_n}$.

In the other case, it follows from package property 6.1 that

$$|\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_p| > |\lambda_{p+1}| = \dots = |\lambda_{n-1}| = |\lambda_n|$$

for all $\lambda_n \in G(K)$ such that $(\lambda', \lambda_n) \in R_{i,j}$. Then the family of the images defining the function $d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is independent of the variables x_{p+1}, \dots, x_{n-1} , because the center $c_{j_n, n}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is 1-Lipschitz on B ; and so is the function $d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(x_1, \dots, x_p)$ because of the canonical character of its construction and estimates 6.5.

In this fashion, we achieve centers $\tilde{d}_{j_1, \dots, j_n}$, which together form a 0-definable family. For simplicity, we drop tilde over d_{j_1, \dots, j_n} .

Now, put

$$\mathfrak{d}C := \bigcup_{i,j} \text{graph}(c_{i,j}).$$

Again by estimates 6.3, the function $\tilde{f} : C \cup \partial C \rightarrow K$ given by the formula

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C, \\ d_{j_1, \dots, j_n}(x_1) & \text{if } x \in \text{graph}(c_{j_1, \dots, j_n}) \subset \partial C, \end{cases}$$

is a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz extension of f . For simplicity, we drop the tilde over f .

By the induction hypothesis, the extension theorem holds for the sets A of dimension $< n$. Hence there exists a 0-definable ϵ -Lipschitz function

$$g : K^n \rightarrow K$$

that agrees with the function f on the set ∂C . In this manner, the problem can be reduced to the case where f is an ϵ -Lipschitz function which vanishes on the set ∂C . Then, finally, since C is an open cell package with package property 5.4, the function

$$F : K^n \rightarrow K$$

given by the formula

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C \cup d(C), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is a 0-definable ϵ -Lipschitz extension of the function f we are looking for. \square

Remark 6.2. The foregoing extension procedure is one performed on the line K_{x_n} , with respect to parameters (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) from K^{n-1} , and controlled by the valuative Jacobian property with parameter.

Case II. Fix $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and assume that the extension theorem holds both in the affine spaces of dimensions $< n$, and for subsets A of K^n of dimension $< k$.

As in the planar case, we can assume without loss of generality, using Proposition 2.4 and the LE-property, that $f : A \rightarrow K$ is a 0-definable 1-Lipschitz function, and A is a 0-definable package which consists of finitely many graphs $\text{graph } \phi_j(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ of maps

$$\phi_j = (\phi_{j,1}, \dots, \phi_{j,n-k}) : D \rightarrow K^{n-k}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

defined on a 0-definable open cell package D in the affine space K^k , with package property 5.4, such that every map ϕ_j is 1-Lipschitz on each twisted box of D .

For the package D , we keep the notation from the beginning of this section. We are going to repeat the extension procedure for the plane

from Section 5, Case II, arranged now for a version with parameters (x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) from K^{k-1} . We shall thus extend f on a subset

$$\mathfrak{N} \subset \partial D \times K^{n-k}$$

with finite fibers over ∂D , which gives control over further 1-Lipschitz extension of the function f ; here

$$\partial D := \bigcup_{j=1}^{d_k} \text{graph}(c_{j,k}).$$

However, this situation is more difficult because we are now dealing with the graphs of maps with target K^{n-k} . We describe the procedure for one fixed parameter

$$x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) \in \pi_{<k}(D).$$

Denote by $D_{x'}$ and $C_{x'}$ the packages in the line K_{x_k} and in $K_{x_k} \times K^{n-k}$ induced by the package D , and by $\partial D_{x'}$ the part of ∂D lying over x' .

As explained in Section 1 after Theorem 1.1, we can require that f satisfy condition 1.1 with respect to the variable x_k ; more precisely, the function $f(x_1, \dots, x_k, \phi_j(x_1, \dots, x_k))$ be a risometry with respect to the variable x_k , $j = 1, \dots, d$.

The unions of images

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^d \phi_{j,l}(D_{x'}) \subset K_{x_l}, \quad l = k+1, \dots, n,$$

are some 0-definable open cell packages $E_{x',l}$, with skeletons

$$S(E_{x',l}) = \{d_{1,1}, \dots, d_{l,t_l}\} \subset K_{x_l},$$

and of some finite sets $T_{x',l} = d_{i,t+1}, \dots, d_{l,u} \in K_{x_l}$.

Further, the image $f(C_{x'})$ is the union of a 0-definable open cell package $H_{x'}$ with a skeleton $S(H_{x'}) = \{a_1, \dots, a_p\}$ and of a finite number of points.

For any point $(x', c_{i,k}(x')) \in \partial D$, the family $D_{x',i}$ of those balls of $D_{x'}$ that are closer to $(x', c_{i,k}(x'))$ than to any other points of $(x', c_{j,k}(x'))$, $j \neq i$, is well defined by the very definition of a package. Define the packages $E_{x',i,l}$ for $D_{x',i}$ as the packages $E_{x',l}$ for $D_{x'}$, $l = k+1, \dots, n$. Their skeletons $S(E_{x',i,l})$ are subsets of $S(E_{x',l})$.

Put

$$N_{x'} := \partial D_{x'} \times \prod_{l=k+1}^n (S(E_{x',l}) \cup T_{x',l}) \subset K^n.$$

An n -tuple $(x', c_{i,k}(x'), d) \in N_{x'}$ is relevant if there exist balls B_l next to d_l from the packages $E_{x',i,l}$, respectively, such that one of the pre-images

$$\phi_j^{-1}(B_l \times \dots \times B_n), \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

meets the package $D_{x',i}$; say meets a ball B' from $D_{x',i}$. Denote by $\mathfrak{N}_{x'}$ the set of those relevant points.

Now we wish to extend f on the set $\mathfrak{N}_{x'}$. Given a point

$$(x', c_{i,k}(x'), d) \in \mathfrak{N}_{x'},$$

take balls B_l , $l = k+1, \dots, n$, and B' as above. Since the centers under study are skeletons and f is a risometry with respect to x_k , the image

$$\tilde{f}(\text{graph } \phi_j|B')$$

is next to a unique center from the skeleton $S(H_{x'})$, say a_q . It is not difficult to check that a_k is independent of the choice of B' . Then we put

$$f(x', c_{i,k}(x'), d) := a_q.$$

In this manner, we obtain a 0-definable extension \tilde{f} of f on the set \mathfrak{N} . We argued likewise in the planar case (Section 5, Case II) with the function f defined on the graphs of a finite 0-definable family of functions ϕ_j , but without parameters x' .

The function \tilde{f} is 1-Lipschitz because D is an open cell package with package property 5.4, $H_{x'}$, $x' \in \partial D$, are open cell packages, the maps ϕ_j are 1-Lipschitz and f is a risometry with respect to the variable x_k . These properties make it possible to control the distance between given two points of the domain versus the distance between other points and sets involved in the construction. We leave the details for the reader. For simplicity, we drop the tilde over f .

By the induction hypothesis, the extension theorem holds for the sets A of dimension $< k$. Hence there exists a 0-definable ϵ -Lipschitz function

$$g : K^n \rightarrow K$$

that agrees with the function f on the set \mathfrak{N} . In this manner, the problem can be reduced to the case where f is an ϵ -Lipschitz function which vanishes on the set \mathfrak{N} . Then, finally, since D is an open cell package with package property 5.4, the function

$$F : K^n \rightarrow K$$

given by the formula

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in A \cup \mathfrak{N}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is a 0-definable ϵ -Lipschitz extension of the function f we are looking for. \square

As in the planar case, the uniform version of the theorem follows by model theoretical compactness, because the foregoing constructions are canonical. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

We wish to conclude with the following comments. Firstly, a related problem, which has not yet been solved, is the question of the existence of 1-Lipschitz definable retractions on a closed definable subset of an affine space.

Secondly, our recent paper [15] studies geometry and topology of Hensel minimal structures with a natural condition imposed on the auxiliary sort RV , covering many classical non-Archimedean structures such as, for instance, valued fields with analytic structure. Among the main results achieved there are the existence of the limit, the closedness theorem, non-Archimedean versions of the Łojasiewicz inequality, an embedding theorem for regular definable spaces, and the definable ultranormality and ultraparacompactness of definable Hausdorff LC-spaces. Some of those results for Henselian fields, without and with analytic structure, were provided in our previous papers [11, 13, 14, 12]. Theorems on extending continuous definable functions and definable retractions on closed subsets are given in our paper [16].

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aschenbrenner, A. Fischer, *Definable versions of theorems by Kirszbraum and Helly*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **102** (2011), 468–502.
- [2] R. Bhaskaran, *The structure of ideals in the Banach algebra of Lipschitz functions over valued fields*, Compositio Math. **48** (1983), 25–34.
- [3] N. Brodskiy, J. Dydak, J. Higes, A. Mitra, *Dimension zero at all scales*, Topology and its Applications **154** (2007), 2729–2740.
- [4] R. Cluckers, I. Halupczok, S. Rideau, *Hensel minimality I*, Forum Math. Pi, **10** (2022), e11.
- [5] R. Cluckers, L. Lipshitz, *Fields with analytic structure*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **13** (2011), 1147–1223.
- [6] R. Cluckers, F. Martin, *A definable p -adic analogue of Kirszbraum’s theorem on extension of Lipschitz maps*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **17** (2018), 39–57.
- [7] J. Denef, L. van den Dries, *p -adic and real subanalytic sets*, Ann. Math. **128** (1988), 79–138.

- [8] I. Halupczok, *Non-Archimedean Whitney stratifications*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **109** (2014), 1304–1362.
- [9] M.D. Kirszbraun, *Über die zusammenziehende und Lipschitzsche Transformationen*, Fund. Math. **22** (1934), 77–108.
- [10] T. Kuijpers, *Lipschitz extension of definable p -adic functions* Math. Log. Q. **61** (2015), 151–158.
- [11] K.J. Nowak, *Some results of algebraic geometry over Henselian rank one valued fields*, Sel. Math. New Ser. **23** (2017), 455–495.
- [12] K.J. Nowak, *Definable transformation to normal crossings over Henselian fields with separated analytic structure*, Symmetry **11** (7) (2019), 934.
- [13] K.J. Nowak, *A closedness theorem and applications in geometry of rational points over Henselian valued fields*, J. Singul. **21** (2020), 212–233.
- [14] K.J. Nowak, *A closedness theorem over Henselian fields with analytic structure and its applications*. In: Algebra, Logic and Number Theory, Banach Center Publ. **121**, Polish Acad. Sci. (2020), 141–149.
- [15] K.J. Nowak, *Tame topology in Hensel minimal structures*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **176** (2025), 103540.
- [16] K.J. Nowak, *On closed definable subsets in Hensel minimal structures*, arXiv: 2403.08039 [math.LO].

Institute of Mathematics
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science
Jagiellonian University
ul. Profesora S. Łojasiewicza 6
30-348 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: nowak@im.uj.edu.pl