

# ON IDEMPOTENT MEASURE CONJECTURE AND DECOMPOSITION OF INVARIANT MEASURES

DANIEL MAX HOFFMANN<sup>†</sup> AND TOMASZ RZEPECKI<sup>‡</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** We work with the  $*$ -product introduced in [GHK25] and  $f$ -generic types to describe the minimal ideals of invariant types and to classify ergodic Keisler measures in amenable NIP theories. Moreover, we analyze the situation around the so-called Idempotent Measure Conjecture studied in [CGK24] and [GHK25].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In [GHK25], the first author with collaborators introduced a canonical semigroup structure on the space  $S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  of global invariant types extending the type of a model, as well as a convolution operation on the corresponding space of Keisler measures. The goal of this paper is to understand the algebraic structure of the minimal ideals in this semigroup of types, and then apply it to derive properties of the invariant and idempotent Keisler measures in some contexts. In particular, we show that the natural counterparts of several results about invariant Keisler measures and types for definable groups hold.

**1.1. Overview.** In a seminal paper [New09], Newelski observed that there are deep connections between topological dynamics and model theory, leading to a long and deep line of research. Usually in model theory, we consider dynamical systems consisting of a definable group or a group of automorphisms acting on compact spaces of types, Keisler measures, or their subflows (e.g. finitely satisfiable types, invariant measures). Perhaps the most natural is the action of the automorphism group on these spaces. However the case of a definable group  $G$  acting on the types concentrated on  $G$  was studied more extensively first (cf. [New09; New12; Pil13; GPP14; KP17; BT16]). Adding Keisler measures ([Kei87]) to the picture was very fruitful (e.g. [HPP08; HP11; HPS13; HKP22]) and resulted, in particular, in very elegant results of [CS18] (description of ergodic measures for the definable group actions and a positive resolution of the original Newelski's conjecture for the definably amenable groups under NIP). A more recent, but still influential related topic is the theory of the definable convolution products of Keisler measures on a definable group ([CG22; CG23; CGK24]), which is a natural counterpart of the classical convolution product of regular Borel probability measures on a locally compact group. In this case, the classification of measures which are idempotent with respect to the definable convolution product is one of the key problems, motivated by

---

*Date:* December 1, 2025.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03C45, Secondary 37BXX, 54H15.

*Key words and phrases.* model theory, Ellis semigroup, NIP, convolutions.

<sup>†</sup>SDG. The first author is supported by the National Science Centre (Narodowe Centrum Nauki, Poland) grant no. 2021/43/B/ST1/00405.

classical results which bind together closed subgroups and idempotent measures in a bijective correspondence (cf., progressively extending the context, [KI40; Wen54; Rud59; Gli59; Coh60; Pym62]).

The dynamical systems involving actions of automorphism groups got more attention in the recent years (e.g. [KPR18; KNS19; KR20; HKP]). It is worth mentioning that the dynamical systems involving actions of closed (in the relatively definable topology) subgroups of automorphism groups cover the case of the previously mentioned actions of definable groups. This is due to the so called *affine sort construction* introduced in [GN08] and elaborated in Section 5 of [GHK25]. It turns out that many results known in the definable group case have natural counterparts for the action of automorphism groups – although the proofs often require some new techniques (e.g. a variant of Newelski’s group chunk theorem for automorphisms, cf. [GHK25, Theorem 7.25]). An interesting link between the definability patterns introduced in [Hru19] and the topological dynamics of automorphism group actions led to Theorem 4.9 in [GHK25], which served as the blueprint for definition of the  $*$ -product in [GHK25] – a counterpart to, and a generalization of, the definable convolution of measures in a definable group. Finally, the space of invariant types equipped with the  $*$ -product forms a semigroup, which seems to encode crucial data about the theory  $T$ , and we bring some evidence for that claim in the following paper.

**1.2. Definable groups versus automorphism groups.** Let us come back for a moment to the case of actions of a definable group. Assume that  $G$  is a group definable in an  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $T$  and  $M \models T$  contains all parameters from the definition of  $G$ , and all types in  $S_G(M)$  have unique global coheir extensions (e.g. this holds for  $M = \mathbb{R}$  as a field, and generally under NIP, if we pass to the Shelah expansion  $M^{\text{ext}}$ ). In [New09], it was observed that under these assumptions, the natural action of  $G(M)$  on  $S_G(M)$  admits a (unique) extension to a left-continuous associative operation  $*$  (*Newelski product*) on  $S_G(M)$ , and more generally, if coheirs are not unique, that we can find such an operation  $*$  on the compact space  $S_G^{\text{fs}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  of global types finitely satisfiable in  $M$ .

In terms of dynamics, what happens is that the space  $S_G^{\text{fs}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  ( $S_G(M)$  assuming the unique coheirs) can be considered as a  $G(M)$ -ambit (i.e. a  $G(M)$ -flow with a distinguished point  $\text{tp}(e/\mathfrak{C})$  with dense orbit) naturally isomorphic to its *Ellis semigroup*, which is a compact left-continuous semigroup for any ambit. However  $*$  can also be defined explicitly as  $p * q = \text{tp}(a \cdot b/\mathfrak{C})$  for some  $b \models q$  and  $a \models p|_{\mathfrak{C}_b}$  (cf. [New12] and [Pil13]) – in other words,  $p * q$  is obtained by applying the multiplication in  $G$  to the Morley product  $p \otimes q$ , and this formula gives us a left-continuous semigroup operation on the larger (still compact) space  $S_G^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  of global  $M$ -invariant types concentrating on  $G$ , which – unlike its subsemigroup  $S_G^{\text{fs}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  – is typically not at all a  $G(M)$ -ambit, so the existence of the semigroup operation cannot be similarly explained via topological dynamics. Moreover, we have that ([Pil13, Fact 1.6]):

$$(E(S_G(M), G(M)), \circ) \cong (S_G^{\text{fs}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$$

(see also [New09], Fact 6.1 and Theorem 6.10 from [CG22] for other variants of isomorphisms of the type as the one above).

Finally, this  $*$  operation has an affine analogue in the form of definable convolution of  $M$ -invariant Keisler measures, which yields the compact left semigroup

$\mathfrak{M}_G^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and its subsemigroup  $\mathfrak{M}_G^{\text{fs}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  ([CG22; CG23]). Keisler measures are often studied in relation to generic types (first defined in [Poi87]), which are important in stability theory. Theory of generics generalizes nicely to the case of simple theories and to the case of NIP with a definably amenable group ([CS18]), so to a definable group  $G$  with a  $G$ -invariant Keisler measure.

As  $G$ -invariant Keisler measures are idempotent with respect to the definable convolution, the natural next step in this line of research is to study idempotent measures on a (type-)definable group  $G$  which is defined in a tame way (e.g. by a generically stable type). In [CGK24], the following conjecture was studied (*fim measures* are defined in Definition 2.11, but briefly, they are the measure counterpart of the generically stable types):

**Conjecture 1.1.** Let  $G = G(\mathfrak{C})$  be a definable group and  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_G^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be fim over  $M$ . We know that then the right stabilizer  $\text{Stab}(\mu)$  of  $\mu$  is type-definable over  $M$ . Then the following are conjectured to be equivalent:

- (1)  $\mu$  is idempotent (with respect to definable convolution);
- (2)  $\mu$  is the unique right  $G$ -invariant (equivalently, the unique left  $G$ -invariant) Keisler measure concentrated on  $\text{Stab}(\mu)$ .

In particular, there is a correspondence between idempotent fim measures in  $\mathfrak{M}_G^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and the so-called  $M$ -type-definable fim subgroups of  $G(\mathfrak{C})$  (cf. [GHK25, Definition 2.24]).

The above conjecture is a way of translating [Pym62, Theorem A.4.1] (which says that in a locally compact group, the convolution-idempotent regular measures are exactly the Haar measures on compact subgroups) into the model-theoretic environment and it was confirmed in several cases: for  $G$  definable in a stable theory, for abelian  $G$ , for  $G$  definable in a NIP theory with additional assumption that the measure in question is  $G^{00}$ -invariant, and for types (i.e. Dirac measures) in rosy theories.

Now, we move to the case of actions of automorphism groups. Consider a monster model  $\mathfrak{C} \models T$  and some small  $M \preceq \mathfrak{C}$  enumerated as  $\bar{m} \in M^{\bar{x}}$ . By Theorem 4.14 (and Theorem 4.9) from [GHK25], in NIP, we have:

$$(E(S_{\bar{x}}(M), \text{Aut}(M)), \circ) \cong (S_{\bar{m}}^{\text{fs}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *),$$

where  $E(S_{\bar{x}}(M), \text{Aut}(M))$  is the Ellis group of  $S_{\bar{x}}(M)$  (considered as an  $\text{Aut}(M)$ -ambit, with the distinguished point  $\text{tp}(\bar{m}/M)$ ) and  $S_{\bar{m}}^{\text{fs}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  stands for the global types extending  $\text{tp}(\bar{m}/\emptyset)$  which are *strongly finitely satisfiable* in  $M$  (see [GHK25, Definition 2.16]), and  $*$  stands for the  $*$ -product (cf. Definitions 2.3 and 2.5). Again, this definition of  $*$  makes sense for  $M$ -invariant global types extending  $\text{tp}(\bar{m}/\emptyset)$  and so  $(S_{\bar{m}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$  forms a left-continuous compact Hausdorff semigroup (cf. Lemma 2.8). The definition of the  $*$ -product has an affine extension in the form of the  $*$ -product of Borel  $M$ -definable Keisler measures concentrated on  $\text{tp}(\bar{m}/\emptyset)$  (see Definition 2.3 for the details). The following conjecture, studied in [GHK25], is the natural counterpart and a generalization of Conjecture 1.1 (via the aforementioned affine sort construction, see the second paragraph of [GHK25, Section 6] for a more detailed discussion):

**Conjecture 1.2** (Idempotent Measure Conjecture). Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{m}}^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be fim over  $M$ . We know from [GHK25, Lemma 2.26] that  $\text{Stab}_l(\mu) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$  for some

partial type  $\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \vdash \bar{x} \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{y}$ . Then it is conjectured that the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1)  $\mu$  is an idempotent;
- (2)  $\mu$  is the unique (left)  $G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$ -invariant measure in  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

In particular, there is a correspondence between idempotent fim measures in  $\mathfrak{M}_{\bar{m}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and the so-called relatively  $\bar{m}$ -type-definable over  $M$  fim subgroups of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ .

The above conjecture puts some light on the structure of closed subgroups (in the relatively definable topology) of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ , thus it is interesting for studying automorphism groups. Mirroring the aforementioned results of [CGK24] for definable groups, Conjecture 1.2 was confirmed in [GHK25] for stable theories, NIP theories with additional assumption that the measure in question is KP-invariant, and types in all rosy theories.

**1.3. Results of this paper.** We provide results on two topics, both related to the structure of the semigroup  $(S_{\bar{m}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ : the Idempotent Measure Conjecture and the decomposition of invariant measures in NIP.

*Idempotent Measure Conjecture.* We analyzed [Pym62], [CGK24] and [GHK25] to notice some dependencies between the assumptions in the theorems confirming Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2, leading to a proof of a variant of Conjecture 1.2 with additional hypotheses in the form of Theorem 3.14. We also provide evidence that this theorem is a reasonable stepping stone in the proof of a more refined version of the full conjecture.

In more detail, we observe that (2) in Conjecture 1.2 can only hold if the support of  $\mu$  is a left-simple semigroup (see Corollary 3.10 and the surrounding discussion). In [CGK24], left-simplicity of the support is equivalent to the support transitivity for idempotent fim measures (cf. [CGK24, Proposition 3.51]). In fact, the support is left-simple for all the confirmed instances of Conjecture 1.2 (see e.g. [CGK24, Proposition 3.55], [GHK25, Theorem 6.31 and Corollary 8.25]).

Then we introduce property  $(\diamond)$ , which is extracted from the proofs of the results confirming Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2 in the stable case. Property  $(\diamond)$  is a property of the measure  $\mu$  related to invariance over small models, for instance it is true if  $\mu$  is Lascar-invariant (cf. Remark 3.11). Lemma 3.12 shows that  $(\diamond)$  follows from (2) from Conjecture 1.2, and – as a partial converse – that left-simplicity of the support together with  $(\diamond)$  and (1) imply (2) in that conjecture. We see that if Conjecture 1.2 holds, then a measure  $\mu$  which satisfies it nontrivially (i.e. satisfies (1) or (2)) must have property  $(\diamond)$ . We obtain Theorem 3.14 (and its variant for types, Theorem 3.16) which is a weaker variant of Conjecture 1.2 (with added assumptions:  $(\diamond)$ , left-simplicity of the support and replacing fim by superfim). After that, we note that the already known results confirming Conjecture 1.2 are instances of Theorems 3.14 and 3.16 (caveat: we do not claim to give new proofs of those instances, only that the existing proofs can be seen as verifying the additional hypotheses of Theorems 3.14 and 3.16). Therefore it is natural to ask if the left-simplicity of the support and the property  $(\diamond)$  follow automatically (see Questions 3.15, 3.17, 3.18).

*Decomposition of invariant measures.* The second part of the paper concerns invariant Keisler measures in NIP theories, which are important subclass of idempotent

measures. The main result here is Theorem 5.14, which gives a description of ergodic  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant measures for a countable NIP theory, analogous to the one obtained in the definable group case in [CS18].

To do it, we define the notion of f-generic types for the action of automorphisms. We base our definition on the results of [HKP] and then in Theorem 4.10 show that f-generics (which in this case are simply the types not forking over  $\emptyset$ ) form the unique minimal left ideal in  $(S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ , mimicking the approach first developed by the second author and Kyle Gannon for definably amenable groups in [GR25, Section 3]. Then in Corollary 4.12, we provide a description of the semigroup structure of the support of an idempotent measure which has an f-generic type in its support – which is equivalent to being KP-invariant. A special role is played by the map  $\rho: S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  given by  $\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{m})/\mathfrak{C}) \mapsto \sigma^{-1}\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')$ , where  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  and  $\mathfrak{C}' \succeq \mathfrak{C}$  is a bigger monster model. First of all, this map is injective on the Ellis groups of  $(S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$  (by Theorem 4.10). Second, it is used in the quite precise description of KP-invariant measures in NIP (Corollary 4.12). Finally, the map  $\rho$  is crucial for the characterization of the ergodic measures in a countable, amenable NIP theory. Roughly speaking, every such a measure is induced from the normalized Haar measure on  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  via a pullback along  $\rho$  to an Ellis group in  $(S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ , see Definition 5.2 and Theorem 5.14. We see (Lemma 5.10) that, in countable NIP theory, every invariant measure is built from these basic components supported on Ellis groups of the minimal left ideal of f-generic types.

Let us comment here on a possible generalization. As we already mentioned, the affine sort construction allows us to study definable groups as closed (in the relatively definable topology) subgroups of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ . In fact, we could try to provide a more general description of ergodic measures in NIP, that is ergodic measures for the action of a closed (in the relatively definable topology) subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ . We decided to not to do this for the sake of a more transparent exposition. Moreover, the other most interesting case of such an action, i.e. the case of a definable group, is already covered in [CS18], without the assumption about the countability of the theory.

**1.4. Structure.** Section 2 contains the definition and some basic facts related to the  $*$ -product and Keisler measures. Section 3 contains the results related to the Idempotent Measure Conjecture. In Section 4 we study the notion of f-generics, proving that under NIP, if they exist, they form the unique minimal left ideal in  $S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ . The last section, Section 5, is about ergodic measures in NIP.

**1.5. Acknowledgements.** We would like to thank Krzysztof Krupiński for several helpful discussions and finding a mistake in an early draft of the paper, and Kyle Gannon for sharing his insight with the second author.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Consider an  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $T$  with monster model  $\mathfrak{C}$  and a bigger monster model  $\mathfrak{C}' \succeq \mathfrak{C}$ . Fix a small model  $M \preceq \mathfrak{C}$  and its enumeration  $\bar{m}$ , an enumeration  $\bar{c} \supseteq \bar{m}$  of  $\mathfrak{C}$  and let  $\bar{n}$  with  $\bar{m} \subseteq \bar{n} \subseteq \bar{c}$  enumerate a model  $N$  with  $M \preceq N \preceq \mathfrak{C}$  (possibly  $M = N$  or  $N = \mathfrak{C}$ ). Consider tuples of variables  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  such that  $\bar{n} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{x}}$  and  $\bar{n} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ . Furthermore, let us fix tuples of variables  $\bar{x}' \subseteq \bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}' \subseteq \bar{y}$  which correspond to the tuple  $\bar{m}$  (note that in the case of  $\bar{n} = \bar{m}$  we have that  $\bar{x}' = \bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}' = \bar{y}$ ). Because  $\bar{y}$  is a tuple also corresponding to the enumeration of model  $N$ ,

every formula  $\psi(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ , with  $\bar{b}$  from  $\mathfrak{C}$ , can be re-arranged so that  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ . We will often use this without further explanation.

We consider types extending the type  $\text{tp}(\bar{n}/\emptyset)$ , i.e. a closed subset of the space  $S_{\bar{x}}(\mathfrak{C})$  denoted by “ $S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ ”. In a similar way, we consider the space  $\mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  of Keisler measures concentrated on the type  $\text{tp}(\bar{n}/\emptyset)$ . More generally, if  $F(\bar{x})$  is a partial type (with parameters from  $\mathfrak{C}$ ) then  $S_F(\mathfrak{C})$  stands for the closed subset of  $S_{\bar{x}}(\mathfrak{C})$  of global types extending the partial type  $F(\bar{x})$ . There are other spaces involving this notational rule, e.g.  $\mathfrak{M}_F^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  stands for the space of  $M$ -invariant Keisler measures concentrated on the closed subset  $S_F(\mathfrak{C})$ . We hope it is clear and does not need further explanation.

We need a slight generalization of the definition of the  $*$ -product of Keisler measures from [GHK25], where we allow to have measures/types over longer tuple of variables (e.g. over tuples enumerating  $\mathfrak{C}$ ). Let us introduce the needed notions now. The definition involves a map given as follows. For each type  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  there exists  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  such that  $p(\bar{x}) = \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C})$ . Take  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  and consider the following map

$$h_{\bar{b}}: S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow S_{\bar{y}}(N)$$

defined by:

$$h_{\bar{b}}: \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C}) \mapsto \text{tp}(\sigma^{-1}(\bar{b})/N).$$

It turns out that  $h_{\bar{b}}$  is a well-defined continuous map. For example, continuity follows by

$$h_{\bar{b}}^{-1}[\theta(\bar{n}; \bar{y})] = [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \subseteq S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}),$$

where  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ .

**Remark 2.1.** Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ ,  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ . Then

$$((h_{\bar{b}})_* \mu)(\theta(\bar{n}; \bar{y})) = \mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})).$$

We recover the original setting of [GHK25] if  $N = M$ . However, there is a new interesting case when  $N = \mathfrak{C}$  (and then  $\bar{n} = \bar{c}$ ) for which we define the inverse of a Keisler measure:

**Definition 2.2.** For  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{c}}(\mathfrak{C})$ , we set

$$\mu^{-1} := (h_{\bar{c}})_* \mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{y}}(\mathfrak{C}).$$

In fact, in the above definition, we have  $\mu^{-1} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{c}}(\mathfrak{C})$ .

Now, let  $\text{res}_M: S_{\bar{x}}(N) \rightarrow S_{\bar{x}}(M)$  denote the standard restriction map. Sometimes, to keep track of the variables appearing in Keisler measures, we use a subscript: “ $\mu_{\bar{y}}$ ” means that the measure  $\mu$  is considered in variables  $\bar{y}$ . We consider the Morley product  $\otimes$  of Keisler measures (and the Morley product of invariant types) and so-called *fiber functions*  $F_{\mu}^{\varphi}$ . These, and many more, are standard notions in the topic of Keisler measures. The reader may consult [Sim15a] or [Gan20] for a nice exposition on Keisler measures.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{x}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be Borel  $M$ -definable and let  $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  (in variable  $\bar{x}$ ). We define a measure  $\mu * \nu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{x}}(\mathfrak{C})$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu * \nu)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &:= \left( \mu_{\bar{x}} \otimes ((h_{\bar{b}})_*(\nu_{\bar{x}}))_{\bar{y}} \right) (\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})) \\ &= \int_{q(\bar{y}) \in S_{\bar{y}}(M)} F_{\mu_{\bar{x}}}^{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})}(q) d(\text{res}_M)_* \left( ((h_{\bar{b}})_*(\nu_{\bar{x}}))_{\bar{y}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{q(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{x}}(\mathfrak{C})} \left( F_{\mu_{\bar{x}}}^{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})} \circ \text{res}_M \circ h_{\bar{b}} \right) (q) d\nu_{\bar{x}} \\
&= \int_{q(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})} \left( F_{\mu_{\bar{x}}}^{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})} \circ \text{res}_M \circ h_{\bar{b}} \right) (q) d\nu_{\bar{x}}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  and  $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\bar{x}; \bar{y}}$ .

Many properties of Keisler measures are preserved under  $*$  (cf. Lemma 4.23 in [GHK25] when working with the original definition). Here, we are interested in forming some semigroup structures, thus we provide the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** *If  $\mu, \nu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  are Borel  $M$ -definable, then  $\mu * \nu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .*

*Proof.* We omit the proof as it is a straightforward application of definitions (e.g. see the proof of Lemma 4.23 in [GHK25]).  $\square$

The special case of  $*$ -product for types does not require to assume Borel definability due to the way the Morley product works for types. More precisely:

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and  $q(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  (not necessarily  $M$ -invariant!), then we set:

$$(p * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) := \left( p(\bar{x}) \otimes h_{\bar{b}}(q(\bar{x})) \right) (\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})),$$

where  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  and  $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\bar{x}; \bar{y}}$  (cf. Definition 4.28 in [GHK25]).

Let us note that  $h_{\bar{b}}(q)$  is not a global  $M$ -invariant type (the usual situation in the definition of the Morley product for types), but the above definition still makes sense due to the  $M$ -invariance of  $p$ .

If  $p$  is additionally Borel  $M$ -definable, then  $\delta_{p*q} = \delta_p * \delta_q$  (the  $*$ -product for types coincides with the  $*$ -product for measures). And similarly to the measure case (Lemma 2.4), we have that  $p * q \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  provided  $p(\bar{x}), q(\bar{x}) \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

We also have an alternative definition of the  $*$ -product when the right argument is a type:

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be Borel  $M$ -definable,  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  (not necessarily Borel  $M$ -definable) and let  $q(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  with  $q = \text{tp}(\tau(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C})$  for some  $\tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ . Then*

$$\mu * q = \tau(\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_{\mathfrak{C}}, \text{ and} \quad (\text{Def. 2.3})$$

$$p * q = \tau(p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_{\mathfrak{C}} \quad (\text{Def. 2.5})$$

(where  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  and  $p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  stand for the unique  $M$ -invariant extensions over  $\mathfrak{C}'$ ).

*Proof.* For  $\mu$ , fix  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ . By Definition 2.3 we obtain

$$(\mu * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}(\theta(\bar{x}; \tau^{-1}(\bar{b}))) = (\tau(\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}))(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}))$$

For  $p$ , we can argue analogously (see also [GHK25, Proposition 4.29]).  $\square$

The following observation follows immediately.

**Corollary 2.7.** *For every Borel  $M$ -definable  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ , every  $p \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and every  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ , we have*

$$\sigma \cdot \mu = \mu * \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C}), \text{ and} \quad (\text{Def. 2.3})$$

$$\sigma \cdot p = p * \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C}). \quad (\text{Def. 2.5})$$

**Lemma 2.8.** *We have that  $(S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$  forms a Hausdorff compact left-continuous semigroup. In the case of  $\bar{n} = \bar{m}$ , the type  $\text{tp}(\bar{m}/\mathfrak{C})$  is its neutral element.*

*Proof.* Naturally  $S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is Hausdorff and compact as a closed subset of  $S_{\bar{x}}(\mathfrak{C})$ . Left-continuity of  $*$  follows by left-continuity of the Morley product. Alternatively, one can argue as follows. Let  $q, p, p_i \in S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ , where  $i \in I$ , and  $q = \text{tp}(\tau(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C})$  for some  $\tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ . Assume that  $(p_i)_{i \in I}$  converges to  $p$  and assume that  $p * q \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]$  for some  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ . The last thing is equivalent to  $\theta(\bar{x}; \tau^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ .

Let  $\bar{y}_0$  be a finite subtuple of  $\bar{y}$ , such that all the variables from the tuple  $\bar{y}$  appearing in  $\theta$  occur already among  $\bar{y}_0$ . Let  $\bar{b}_0$  be restriction of tuple  $\bar{b}$  to variables  $\bar{y}_0 \subseteq \bar{y}$ , i.e.  $\bar{b}_0 := \bar{b}|_{\bar{y}_0}$ . Abusing the notation, we can write  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}_0)$  in the place of  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$ . Now, let  $\bar{d}_0 \equiv_M \tau^{-1}(\bar{b}_0)$  be a tuple from  $\mathfrak{C}$ . Because  $p$  is  $M$ -invariant, we have that  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_0) \in p$ . This means that there exists  $i_0 \in I$  such that for every  $i \geq i_0$  we have  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_0) \in p_i$ . Hence  $p_i * q \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]$  for every  $i \geq i_0$ , and so  $\lim_i p_i * q \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]$ .

The associativity of  $*$  follows by the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.33 from [GHK25]. Checking that  $\text{tp}(\bar{m}/\mathfrak{C})$  is the neutral element is easy and so we skip it.  $\square$

**Remark 2.9.** Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{x}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be Borel  $M$ -definable and let  $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ . For every  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ , we have

$$(\mu * \nu)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \int_{S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})} (\mu * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) d\nu(q).$$

*Proof.* Simply note that  $(\mu * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = (F_{\mu_{\bar{x}}}^{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})} \circ \text{res}_M \circ h_{\bar{b}})(q)$  and so:

$$(\mu * \nu)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \int_{q \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})} (F_{\mu_{\bar{x}}}^{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})} \circ \text{res}_M \circ h_{\bar{b}})(q) d\nu_{\bar{y}} = \int_{q \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})} (\mu * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) d\nu(q).$$

$\square$

In the following fact, the key assumption is that we consider a partial type in small tuple of variables (i.e. in  $\bar{x}'$ ):

**Fact 2.10** (improved Lemma 6.5 from [GHK25]). *Consider a partial  $\emptyset$ -type  $F(\bar{x}'; \bar{y}') \vdash \bar{x}' \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{y}'$  and let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be Borel  $M$ -definable. The following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $G_{F, \mathfrak{C}} \cdot \mu = \{\mu\}$ ,
- (2)  $\mu * (S_{F(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})}(\mathfrak{C})) = \{\mu\}$ ,
- (3)  $\mu * \{\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma \in G_{F, \mathfrak{C}}\} = \{\mu\}$ .

*Proof.* For (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), we follow the argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.5 in [GHK25]. Then, (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is obvious. To obtain (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1), we use Corollary 2.7.  $\square$

The following family of measures was introduced in [HPS13] and generalizes dfs measures (definable and finitely satisfiable). Moreover, for types the following property coincides with generic stability [CG20, Proposition 3.2].

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{x}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be Borel-definable. We say that  $\mu$  is a *fm measure* over  $M$  (a *frequency interpretation measure* over  $M$ ) if for any finite  $\bar{x}' \subseteq \bar{x}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}'; \bar{y})$  there exists a sequence of  $\mathcal{L}(M)$ -formulas  $(\theta_n(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n))_{1 \leq n < \omega}$  such that  $|\bar{x}_i| = |\bar{x}'|$  and:



- (1) for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists some integer  $n_\epsilon$  such that for every  $n \geq n_\epsilon$  and every  $\bar{a} = (\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^{(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n)}$  with  $\models \theta_n(\bar{a})$  we have

$$\sup_{b \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}} |\text{Av}(\bar{a})(\varphi(\bar{x}'; \bar{b})) - \mu(\varphi(\bar{x}'; \bar{b}))| < \epsilon,$$

- (2)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{(n)}(\theta_n(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n)) = 1$ .

We say that a fim measure  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_x^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is *super-fim* over  $M$  if  $\mu^{(n)}$  is fim for every  $n \geq 1$ .

Note that super-fim coincides with fim for Keisler measures in NIP theories ([HPS13]) and for types in NTP2 theories ([CGH23a]).

**Remark 2.12.** If  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  is fim over  $M$  [superfim over  $M$ ] then  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is fim over  $M$  [superfim over  $M$ ].

*Proof.* This is clear by the definition:  $\mathcal{L}(M)$ -formulas witnessing fim over  $M$  for  $\mu^{(n)}$ , witness fim over for the extension  $\mu^{(n)}|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ , where  $n < \omega$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.13.** Let  $\mu, \nu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{c}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be such that  $\mu$  is fim over  $M$  and  $\nu^{-1}$  is Borel  $M$ -definable. Then

$$\mu * \nu = (\nu^{-1} * \mu^{-1})^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* First, we note that  $\mu_{\bar{x}} = ((\mu_{\bar{x}})_{\bar{y}}^{-1})_{\bar{x}}^{-1}$ . We already defined  $(\mu_{\bar{x}})_{\bar{y}}^{-1}$  as pushforward  $(h_{\bar{c}})_* \mu$  along  $h_{\bar{c}}: S_{\bar{c}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow S_{\bar{y}}(\mathfrak{C})$  (taking types in variable  $\bar{x}$  to types in variable  $\bar{y}$ ). Then,  $((\mu_{\bar{x}})_{\bar{y}}^{-1})_{\bar{x}}^{-1}$  is defined in the same way after exchanging roles of  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$ , i.e.  $((\mu_{\bar{x}})_{\bar{y}}^{-1})_{\bar{x}}^{-1}$  is pushforward  $(h'_{\bar{c}})_*(\mu^{-1})$  along  $h'_{\bar{c}}: S_{\bar{c}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow S_{\bar{x}}(\mathfrak{C})$  (taking types in variable  $\bar{y}$  to types in variable  $\bar{x}$ ), given by  $h'_{\bar{c}}(\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{c}/\mathfrak{C}))) = \text{tp}(\sigma^{-1}(\bar{c})/\mathfrak{C})$ , where  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ . Of course,  $h_{\bar{c}} \circ h'_{\bar{c}} = \text{id}_{S_{\bar{c}}(\mathfrak{C})}$  and so  $\mu_{\bar{x}} = ((\mu_{\bar{x}})_{\bar{y}}^{-1})_{\bar{x}}^{-1}$ .

Let  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ . We use Theorem 5.16 from [CGH23b] (i.e. commutativity of fim measures in the Morley product):

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_{\bar{x}} * \nu_{\bar{x}})(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{c})) &= \left( \mu_{\bar{x}} \otimes ((h_{\bar{c}})_*(\nu_{\bar{x}}))_{\bar{y}} \right)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})) \\ &= (\mu_{\bar{x}} \otimes \nu_{\bar{y}}^{-1})(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})) \\ &= (\nu_{\bar{y}}^{-1} \otimes \mu_{\bar{x}})(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})) \\ &= \left( \nu_{\bar{y}}^{-1} \otimes ((\mu_{\bar{x}})_{\bar{y}}^{-1})_{\bar{x}}^{-1} \right)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})) \\ &= (\nu_{\bar{y}}^{-1} * \mu_{\bar{y}}^{-1})(\theta(\bar{c}; \bar{y})) \\ &= (\nu_{\bar{y}}^{-1} * \mu_{\bar{y}}^{-1})^{-1}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{c})) \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

### 3. IDEMPOTENT MEASURE CONJECTURE

Recall that a relatively  $\bar{m}$ -type-definable over  $M$  subgroup  $G$  of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ , i.e.  $G = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) : \models \pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})\}$  for some partial type  $\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{y}')$  over  $\emptyset$ , is (left) fim (over  $M$ ) if there exists a (left)  $G$ -invariant fim measure in  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ . One of the main goals of [GHK25] (and also of [CGK24]) is to study the following conjecture (where  $\bar{n} = \bar{m}$  and  $\bar{x}' = \bar{x}$ ):

**Conjecture 3.1** (Idempotent Measure Conjecture). Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be fim over  $M$ . We know from [GHK25, Lemma 2.26] that  $\text{Stab}_l(\mu) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$  for some partial type  $\pi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \vdash \bar{x} \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{y}$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $\mu$  is an idempotent.
- (2)  $\mu$  is the unique (left)  $G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$ -invariant measure in  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

In particular, there is a correspondence between idempotent fim measures in  $\mathfrak{M}_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and relatively  $\bar{m}$ -type-definable over  $M$  fim subgroups of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ .

The conjecture holds in all stable theories [GHK25, Corollary 8.25] and for types (i.e. Dirac measures) in all rosy (in particular in all simple and in all o-minimal) theories [GHK25, Corollary 6.21]. We already know that the implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) follows easily even without the fim assumption [GHK25, Corollary 6.7]. The difficult part is the implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). In (2) uniqueness follows automatically from the assumption that  $\mu$  is fim over  $M$  (in an arbitrary theory for fim types and for superfim measures, in particular, in NIP for measures, see [GHK25, Propostion 6.10] and [GHK25, Corollary 6.13]. Therefore the main task in showing the above conjecture is to show that for idempotent fim measures we have  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})]$ . We will investigate this here by looking at minimal left ideals.

Recall that

$$*: S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) \times S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) \rightarrow S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$$

defines a Hausdorff compact left-continuous semigroup. We can apply classical results, e.g. Fact A.8 from [Rze18], to note that there exist minimal left ideals in  $(S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ , each of them is closed and contains an idempotent.

In the case of amenable NIP theories, the entire semigroup  $(S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$  contains a unique minimal left ideal, namely the ideal of types which do not fork over  $\emptyset$  (we will understand more of the structure of this ideal later on, cf. Proposition 4.5 and Theorem 4.10). For the general case (i.e. perhaps a non-amenable, perhaps non-NIP theory), we look for unique minimal left ideals not in the entire semigroup  $(S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ , but in sub-semigroups given by supports of idempotent Keisler measures.

**3.1. Supports and stabilizers.** Let us fix  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  with  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  (e.g.  $\mu$  is fim over  $M$ ). We set:

$$\begin{aligned} S &:= \text{supp}(\mu), \\ \text{Stab}_l(\mu) &:= \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma \cdot \mu = \mu\}, \\ \text{Stab}_r(\mu) &:= \{q \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}) : \mu * q = \mu\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 3.2.**  $\text{Stab}_r(\mu)$  is closed subset of  $S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ .

*Proof.* Because  $\mu$  is  $M$ -definable, we note that  $(\mu * -): S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  is continuous. Indeed, if  $q \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ ,  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  and  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$  then

$$(\mu * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \in (r, s) \iff (F_{\mu}^{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})} \circ h_{\bar{b}})(q) \in (r, s),$$

and both  $F_{\mu}^{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})}$  and  $h_{\bar{b}}$  are continuous. It follows immediately that  $\text{Stab}_r(\mu)$  is closed.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** *If additionally  $\mu * \mu = \mu$ , then  $(S, *)$  is a Hausdorff compact left-continuous semigroup with no proper closed two-sided ideals.*

*Proof.* We notice that the proof of Proposition 8.2 from [GHK25] works well in our situation (i.e. with tuple  $\bar{n}$  in the place of tuple  $\bar{m}$ ), and so we have that  $S * S \subseteq S$ . Thus clearly  $(S, *)$  is a Hausdorff compact left-continuous semigroup.

The proof of Theorem 8.8 from [GHK25] works in our situation as well, and so we conclude that  $(S, *)$  has no proper closed two-sided ideals (i.e.  $S$  is simple).  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** Assume that  $\mu * \mu = \mu$ . By the preceding remark, it follows that  $(S, *)$  is left simple if and only if it has a unique minimal left ideal (for the nontrivial direction, notice that if the minimal left ideal is unique, it is also a right ideal).

**Fact 3.5.** By Lemma 2.26 from [GHK25] (in fact, by its slight modification taking into account that  $\bar{x}$  might be a long tuple, different from  $\bar{x}'$ ) there is a partial  $\emptyset$ -type  $\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{y}') \vdash \bar{x}' \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{y}'$  (recall that  $\bar{x}'$  corresponds to the tuple  $\bar{m}$  and  $\bar{y}'$  is its copy) such that

$$\text{Stab}_l(\mu) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}} = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) : \models \pi(\sigma(\bar{m}); \bar{m})\}.$$

Let us fix partial  $\emptyset$ -type  $\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{y}')$  as in the above fact.

**Remark 3.6.** We have that  $\text{Stab}_l(\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}'} = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}') : \models \pi(\sigma(\bar{m}); \bar{m})\}$ .

**Proposition 3.7.**  $[\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})] \subseteq \text{Stab}_r(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* We take  $q = \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C}) \in [\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})]$  with  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ . Then  $\sigma \in G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}'}$  and so  $\sigma \in \text{Stab}_l(\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})$ . For every  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$  and parameter  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu * \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C}))(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &= \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}(\theta(\bar{x}; \sigma^{-1}(\bar{b}))) \\ &= (\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) (\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \\ &= \mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \end{aligned}$$

and we see that  $\mu * q = \mu$ , i.e.  $q \in \text{Stab}_r(\mu)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** If  $\mu * \mu = \mu$  and  $L$  is a minimal left ideal of  $S = \text{supp}(\mu)$ . Then:

- for each  $q \in L$ , we have  $\text{supp}(\mu * q) \subseteq L$ ,
- if  $L \cap \text{Stab}_r(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $S = L$ .

*Proof.* Let  $L$  be a minimal left ideal of  $S$ , let  $q \in L$ . Then  $S * q = L$ . By Proposition 8.3 from [GHK25] (again, its slight modification to work with possibly longer tuple  $\bar{n}$  in the place of  $\bar{m}$ ), we have that  $\text{supp}(\mu * q)$  is contained in the closure of  $S * q$ , which is contained in  $L$ .

Now, if  $q \in L \cap \text{Stab}_r(\mu)$ , then we have immediately that

$$S = \text{supp}(\mu) = \text{supp}(\mu * q) \subseteq L \subseteq S. \quad \square$$

Theorem 4.1 from [Pym62] states that a measure on a left-simple kernel (a type of topological semigroup) is idempotent if and only if it is right invariant over its support. We adapted this idea in the following theorem, where the aforementioned properties are placed in a bit different order:

**Theorem 3.9.** Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be idempotent with  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ . The following are equivalent

- (1)  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \text{Stab}_r(\mu)$ ,
- (2)  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is left-simple, equivalently (by Remark 3.4) it has a unique minimal left ideal  $L$  (and then  $\text{supp}(\mu) = L$ ).

*Proof.* (1) implies (2) immediately by Lemma 3.8.

Now, assume (2). Consider a formula  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$  and a parameter  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{x}}$ . The following function

$$D : S \ni q \mapsto (\mu * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}))$$

is continuous. Assume that  $D$  achieves its maximum at  $q_0 \in S$ . Then, by Proposition 8.7 from [GHK25] (more precisely, by its variant for tuple  $\bar{n}$ ), we have that  $D(p * q_0) = D(q_0)$  for every  $p \in S$ . By (2) it follows that  $S = S * q_0$ , so  $D$  is constant on  $S$ .

Fix  $q \in S$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &= (\mu * \mu)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \int_{p \in S} (\mu * p)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) d\mu(p) \\ &= \int_{p \in S} D(p) d\mu(p) = D(q) = (\mu * q)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})). \end{aligned}$$

Because  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})$  was arbitrary, we see that  $\mu * q = \mu$  for every  $q \in S$ . Hence  $\text{supp}(\mu) = S \subseteq \text{Stab}_r(\mu)$ .  $\square$

Recall that to prove Conjecture 3.1, we need to show that  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})]$ . By combining Proposition 3.7 with Theorem 3.9, we have the following picture

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{supp}(\mu) \\ \downarrow \\ \subseteq \mid \iff \text{left-simple} \\ \downarrow \\ [\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})] \subseteq \text{Stab}_r(\mu) \end{array}$$

yielding as a corollary:

**Corollary 3.10.** *If  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})]$  (i.e. if  $\mu$  is support transitive in the terminology of [CGK24, Definition 3.46]), then  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is left-simple.*

Therefore, we consider replacing the original first point in Conjecture 3.1 with the following:

- (1)  $\mu$  is idempotent and  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is left-simple.

**3.2. Restrictions and summary.** In this subsection we focus on Conjecture 3.1, thus we ease the notation by setting  $\bar{n} = \bar{m}$  (and so  $\bar{x} = \bar{x}'$ ). Recall that  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{m}}^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq S_{\bar{m}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

We introduce the following property:

$$(\diamond) \quad (\forall \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}'), \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{m})/\mathfrak{C}) \in \text{supp}(\mu)) (\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \text{ is } \sigma^{-1}[M]\text{-invariant})$$

**Remark 3.11.** A standard argument shows that if  $\mu$  is Lascar-invariant then so is  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ , which trivially implies  $(\diamond)$  for  $\mu$ .

**Lemma 3.12.** (1) *If  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})]$  then  $(\diamond)$ .*

- (2) *Assume that  $\mu$  be idempotent, superfm over  $M$  with left-simple  $\text{supp}(\mu)$ , then the converse holds as well, i.e.  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})]$  and  $(\diamond)$  are equivalent.*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  be such that  $\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{m})/\mathfrak{C}) \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ .

First, assume  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})]$ , it means that  $\sigma \in G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}'}$ . Hence  $\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  (by Remark 3.6) and so  $\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is  $M$ -invariant. Thus  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is  $\sigma^{-1}[M]$ -invariant.

For the proof of the second point, assume  $(\diamond)$ , in particular  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is  $\sigma^{-1}[M]$ -invariant. By Theorem 3.9, we know that  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \text{Stab}_r(\mu)$ . If  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$  then, by Proposition 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{m})) &= \left( \mu * \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{m})/\mathfrak{C}) \right)(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{m})) \\ &= \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}(\theta(\bar{x}; \sigma^{-1}(\bar{m}))) = (\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{m})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $(\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_M = \mu|_M = (\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_M$ .

Because  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is  $\sigma^{-1}[M]$ -invariant,  $\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  must be  $M$ -invariant. Because  $\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is Borel definable (as a shift of a Borel  $M$ -definable measure) and  $M$ -invariant,  $\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is Borel  $M$ -definable by Corollary 2.2 from [CGH23b].

Because  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is superfim over  $M$  by Remark 2.12 and Borel  $M$ -definable, and  $\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is Borel  $M$ -definable, we may use Lemma 6.12 from [GHK25] to conclude that  $(\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_M = (\sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_M$  implies  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = \sigma \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ . It means that  $\sigma \in \text{Stab}_l(\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}'}$ . Therefore  $\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{m})/\mathfrak{C}) \in [\pi(\bar{x}'; \bar{m})]$  as expected.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.13.** *Suppose  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is a superfim over  $M$  and idempotent. We know that  $\text{Stab}_l(\mu) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$  for some partial type  $\pi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \vdash \bar{x} \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{y}$ . Consider the following conditions:*

- (1)  $\mu$  satisfies  $(\diamond)$ ,
- (2)  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is left-simple (equivalently,  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \text{Stab}_r(\mu)$ ),
- (3)  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})]$ ,
- (4)  $\mu$  is the unique (left)  $G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$ -invariant measure in  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{Borel}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

Then  $(1) \wedge (2)$  is equivalent to each of (3) and (4).

*Proof.* Notice that (4) contains (3), while (3) implies (4), by [GHK25, Corollary 6.13]. The equivalence in (2) holds by Theorem 3.9. To see that (3) implies (2) we combine Proposition 3.7 with Theorem 3.9. By Lemma 3.12, we have that (3) implies (1), and moreover  $(1) \wedge (2)$  implies (3). Putting these implications together finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.14.** *Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be superfim over  $M$  and let  $(\diamond)$  hold. We know from [GHK25, Lemma 2.26] that  $\text{Stab}_l(\mu) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$  for some partial type  $\pi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \vdash \bar{x} \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{y}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mu$  is an idempotent and  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is left-simple.
- (2)  $\mu$  is the unique (left)  $G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$ -invariant measure in  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{Borel}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

*Proof.* As was already mentioned, (2) implies that  $\mu$  is idempotent by [GHK25, Lemma 6.5 and Proposition 6.6]. The conclusion follows easily by Lemma 3.13.  $\square$

There are 4 differences between the statement of Theorem 3.14 and Conjecture 3.1:

- (1) Considering the space  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{Borel}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  instead of  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  in the second point.  
This technical assumption is natural outside of the NIP context.
- (2) The measure  $\mu$  is superfim over  $M$  instead of being fim over  $M$ .  
In case of the NIP theories, the class of superfim measures coincides with the class of fim measures. Under NTP2, for types, the class of superfim (i.e. super generically stable) types coincides with the class of fim (generically stable) types. Thus most of the special cases of Conjecture 3.1 confirmed in [CGK24; GHK25] (except for the case of abelian type-definable group,

cf. [CGK24, Theorem 3.45] and the case of types in rosy theories [GHK25, Corollary 6.21]) fall into the superfim case.

- (3) Property  $(\diamond)$  holds.

This is a new assumption. However, by Lemma 3.12(1), we see that every (idempotent) measure for which Conjecture 3.1 holds (and every so-called *generically transitive measure*) must satisfy  $(\diamond)$ .

- (4) In the first point, the measure  $\mu$  is assumed to have left-simple support. See the discussion at the end of the previous subsection, where we argue that left-simplicity of  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is necessary to have  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq [\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})]$  which is the main difficulty in showing that (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) in Conjecture 3.1. One of the main cases for which Conjecture 3.1 is confirmed is the case of stable theories, and in stable theories left-simplicity of  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  holds (cf. Proposition 8.18 in [GHK25]).

**Question 3.15.** Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be fim over  $M$  [superfim over  $M$ ], idempotent and let  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  be left-simple. Does  $(\diamond)$  follow?

Note that if the answer to Question 3.15 is positive, then in Theorem 3.14, we can drop the  $(\diamond)$  hypothesis.

Now, let us see how the main confirmed cases of Conjecture 3.1 for measures can be recovered using Theorem 3.14.

- *Stable case* (cf. [CG22, Theorem 5.8], [CGK24, Proposition 3.55] and [GHK25, Corollary 8.25])

In the stable case, all invariant measures over models are definable (in particular Borel definable), so (1) makes no difference. As mentioned earlier, superfim coincides with fim for stable theories (both for types and measures), so difference (2) vanishes. By Proposition 8.18 from [GHK25], also difference (4) vanishes. Property  $(\diamond)$  is new, but it was obtained in the proof of [GHK25, Lemma 8.21] ( $(\diamond)$  corresponds to  $\sigma \cdot \hat{\mu}|_M$  not forking over  $M$  there), where Newelski's Group Chunk Theorem for automorphism groups was applied, cf. [GHK25, Theorem 7.25].

- *NIP+KP-invariant case* (cf. [CG23, Theorem 4.11]), [GHK25, Corollary 6.32, Theorem 6.31])

Here we consider Conjecture 3.1 with the additional assumption that  $\mu$  is KP-invariant ( $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant). Again, by NIP,  $M$ -invariant measure is Borel definable (corresponding to (1)) and superfim coincides with fim (cf. (2)). Then, if  $\mu$  is KP-invariant, it is Lascar-invariant and  $(\diamond)$  follows (by Remark 3.11, i.e. (3)). Moreover, we will see later that KP-invariance implies that  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is left-simple (see the proof of Corollary 4.13 and Corollary 4.12(3)), which corresponds to (4).

Now, we will restate Theorem 3.14 separately for the case of types, where we can make several simplifications.

**Theorem 3.16.** Let  $p \in S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be generically stable over  $M$  and let  $(\diamond)$  hold (for  $\mu = p$ ). We know that  $\text{Stab}(p) = G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$  for some partial type  $\pi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \vdash \bar{x} \equiv_{\emptyset} \bar{y}$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $p$  is an idempotent.
- (2)  $p$  is the unique (left)  $G_{\pi, \mathfrak{C}}$ -invariant type in  $S_{\pi(\bar{x}; \bar{m})}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

*Proof.* Again, we have that (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) follows by [GHK25, Lemma 6.5] and [GHK25, Proposition 6.6].

Now, let us assume (1). Obviously,  $\text{supp}(\delta_p)$  is left-simple. We would like to use Lemma 3.12, but for that  $p$  needs to be superfim. However, we can follow the proof of Lemma 3.12(2) to notice that in the case of types we do not need to assume that  $p$  is superfim. Indeed, the only place where we need it is the use of [GHK25, Lemma 6.12] and instead of that we can use [PT11, Proposition 2.1(iv)] which gives the same conclusion for generically stable types. The uniqueness in (2) follows by [GHK25, Proposition 6.10].  $\square$

[CGK24, Proposition 2.37] and in [GHK25, Corollary 6.21] show that Conjecture 3.1 holds for types in rosy theories. By Lemma 3.12, we have that every idempotent fim measure in a rosy theory satisfies  $(\diamond)$ . And again, showing property  $(\diamond)$  was crucial for the proofs of [CGK24, Proposition 2.37] (see also Proposition 2.30 there) and in [GHK25, Corollary 6.21].

**Question 3.17.** Let  $p \in S_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be idempotent and fim over  $M$ . Does  $(\diamond)$  follow?

We see that to show Conjecture 3.1 we need to study Questions 3.15 and 3.17. Removing the assumption on left-simplicity in the first point of Theorem 3.14 might be possible due to the stability hidden behind the notion of a fim/superfim measure/type:

**Question 3.18.** Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be fim over  $M$  [superfim over  $M$ ] and idempotent. Is  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  left-simple?

#### 4. F-GENERICIS

In this section, we define the notion of f-generics. After that, we observe good properties of the  $*$ -product when f-generics are involved. In NIP, this leads to results on the minimal ideals of the semigroup  $(S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$  and better understanding of semigroup structure of the support of an idempotent Keisler measures.

**4.1. f-generics and minimal ideals.** We start with introducing the notion of f-generics and showing that they form a minimal left ideal (provided they exist in a NIP theory  $T$ ).

Recall that  $M \preceq N \preceq \mathfrak{C}$ ,  $\bar{m} \in M^{\bar{x}'}$  enumerates  $M$ ,  $\bar{m} \subseteq \bar{n} \in N^{\bar{x}}$  enumerates  $N$ , and  $\bar{x}' \subseteq \bar{x}$ . Moreover,  $\mathfrak{C}' \preceq \mathfrak{C}''$  are a larger and larger monster models containing  $\mathfrak{C}$ . We define the following map

$$\rho: S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{Lasc}}(T)$$

$$\rho(\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C})) := \sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}')$$

and its variant, denoted  $\rho': S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}') \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{Lasc}}(T)$ , with  $\mathfrak{C}' \preceq \mathfrak{C}''$  in the place of  $\mathfrak{C} \preceq \mathfrak{C}'$ . Note that  $\rho: S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  for  $T$  being  $G$ -compact.

Moreover, recall that  $\text{Stab}_l(\mu) := \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma_*\mu = \mu\}$ , where  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{C})$ . In particular,  $\text{Stab}_l(p) = \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma \cdot p = p\}$  for  $p \in S(\mathfrak{C})$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *If  $p$  is a global type extending the type of a model (e.g.  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ ) then  $\text{Stab}_l(p) \leq \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}) \leq \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ .*

*Proof.* The natural surjection from types to the Galois group is  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -equivariant, and the stabiliser of any point in  $\text{Gal}(T)$  is  $\text{Autf}_L(\mathfrak{C})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** Let  $(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ . Assuming NIP, the following are equivalent by [HKP, Fact 2.22] (based on [HP11, Proposition 2.11]):

- (1)  $p$  does not fork over  $\emptyset$ ,
- (2) the orbit  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot p$  is bounded,
- (3)  $p$  is Lascar-invariant (i.e.  $\text{Autf}_L(\mathfrak{C}) \leq \text{Stab}_l(p)$  and so  $\text{Autf}_L(\mathfrak{C}) = \text{Stab}_l(p)$  by Proposition 4.1),
- (4)  $p$  is KP-invariant (i.e.  $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) \leq \text{Stab}_l(p)$  and so  $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) = \text{Autf}_L(\mathfrak{C}) = \text{Stab}_l(p)$  by Proposition 4.1).

Without NIP, we have that  $(4) \Rightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (1)$ . Indeed, we have that  $(2) \Leftrightarrow (3)$  by [HKP, Fact 4.4],  $(4) \Rightarrow (3)$  is trivial, and  $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$  is standard. Note also that trivially  $(3) \Leftrightarrow (4)$  in  $G$ -compact theories, in particular  $(3) \Leftrightarrow (4)$  in amenable theories by the main result of [HKP] (i.e. amenable theories are  $G$ -compact).

One could try to use Proposition 4.5 from [HKP] to show that  $(2) \Rightarrow (4)$  in Remark 4.2, but for that we should know that  $\text{Stab}_l(p)$  is relatively type-definable subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$  (which is the case for definable types, cf. Lemma 2.26 in [GHK25]).

**Definition 4.3.** We say that  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is (left)  $f$ -generic if its  $(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -)orbit is bounded, equivalently, its left stabiliser is equal to  $\text{Autf}_L(\mathfrak{C})$ . Let  $\text{fGen} \subseteq S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  denote the set of all  $f$ -generic types in  $S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** (NIP) A theory  $T$  is amenable if and only if  $f$ -generics (in the sense of Definition 4.3) exist.

*Proof.* Simply combine Remark 4.2 (or [HKP, Fact 2.22]) and [HKP, Fact 2.23].  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** (NIP) If  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  is an  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant measure, then every type in the support of  $\mu$  is  $f$ -generic.

*Proof.* Let  $p(\bar{x})$  be a type in the support of  $\mu$ . Then  $p$  does not fork over  $\emptyset$  by a standard argument, and so by Remark 4.2 it is  $f$ -generic.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** Let  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be an  $f$ -generic. Then  $p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is an  $f$ -generic, i.e.  $\text{Stab}_l(p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) = \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}')$ . Consequently,  $\rho'$  is injective on the  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ -orbit of  $p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that if  $\bar{b}_1 \equiv_{\text{Lasc}} \bar{b}_2$ , then  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_1) \in p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  if and only if  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_2) \in p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ . Let  $\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2 \in \mathfrak{C}$  be such that  $\bar{b}_j \equiv_M \bar{c}_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Then,  $\bar{c}_1 \equiv_{\text{Lasc}} \bar{b}_1 \equiv_{\text{Lasc}} \bar{b}_2 \equiv_{\text{Lasc}} \bar{c}_2$ , and since  $p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \supseteq p$  is  $M$ -invariant and  $p$  is  $\text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant, we have that

$$\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_1) \in p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \Leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_1) \in p \Leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_2) \in p \Leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_2) \in p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$$

To prove the injectivity, consider  $\sigma', \tau' \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  such that

$$\rho'(p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})(\sigma')^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}') = \rho'(\sigma' \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) = \rho'(\tau' \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) = \rho'(p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})(\tau')^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}').$$

Hence,  $(\tau')^{-1} \sigma' \in \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}') = \text{Stab}_l(p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})$  and

$$\tau' \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = \tau' \cdot ((\tau')^{-1} \sigma') \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = \sigma' \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 4.7.** Suppose  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is  $f$ -generic,  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ . Let  $q_0 := \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{m})/M)$  and let  $q$  be any extension of  $q_0$  in  $S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  (e.g.  $q$  can be a coheir of  $\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/M)$ ). Then we have  $\sigma \cdot p = p * q$ .



*Proof.* Let  $\tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  be such that  $q = \text{tp}(\tau(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C})$ , and let  $\sigma' \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  be an arbitrary extension of  $\sigma$ .

Note that by the choice of  $q_0$ , the image of  $\tau$  in  $\text{Gal}_{\text{Lasc}}(T)$  (via the quotient map  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}') \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')/\text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}')$ ) is the same as the image of  $\sigma'$ . Then

$$\rho'(\tau \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) = \rho'(p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) \cdot \tau^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}') = \rho(p) \cdot (\sigma')^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}') = \rho'(\sigma' \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}).$$

Since  $\rho'$  is injective on the orbit of  $p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  and we have  $\sigma' \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = (\sigma \cdot p)|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ , it follows that  $(\sigma \cdot p)|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = \tau \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ . Hence  $(\sigma \cdot p)|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = \tau \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = (p * q)|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.8.** *If  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is  $f$ -generic then  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot p = p * S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ .*

*Proof.*  $\subseteq$  is immediate by Lemma 4.7.

For  $\supseteq$ , take any  $q \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and let  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$  be such that  $\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{m})/M) = q|_{\bar{x}, M}$ . Then by Lemma 4.7,  $\sigma \cdot p = p * q$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $p \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ , then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $p$  is  $f$ -generic,
- (2)  $p * S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C})$  is bounded.

*Proof.* The first condition implies the second by Lemma 4.7. The converse follows immediately from Corollary 2.7.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.10.** *If  $T$  is an amenable NIP theory then:*

- (1) the set  $\text{fGen}$  is a two-sided ideal of  $(S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ ,
- (2) for each  $p(\bar{x}) \in \text{fGen}$ , we have that  $p * S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) = \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot p$  is an Ellis group in  $S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  (in particular, it is a minimal right ideal),
- (3)  $\text{fGen}$  is the unique minimal left ideal in  $(S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ ,
- (4) the Ellis groups in  $(S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$  are exactly the  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -orbits of  $f$ -generic types,
- (5) the map  $\rho: S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  is injective on Ellis groups in  $(S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ .

*Proof.* Being left ideal in (1) follows by Corollary 4.9, and being right ideal follows by Corollary 4.8 and the definition of an  $f$ -generic.

Now, we argue for (2). Take any  $f$ -generic  $p(\bar{x}) \in S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ . Then by Corollary 4.8,  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot p$  is a right ideal in  $(S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ , so it contains a minimal idempotent  $u = \sigma_0 \cdot p$  (i.e.  $u * S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is a minimal right ideal). Then  $u$  is also  $f$ -generic and  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot p = \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot u$  and  $u * S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) = p * S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ , so without loss of generality  $p = u$ .

Note that for each  $q \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot u$ , we have  $q * u = q$ . Indeed, let  $\tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$  be such that  $\text{tp}(\tau(\bar{m})/M) \subseteq u$ . By Lemma 4.7 we have

$$\rho(u) = \rho(u * u) = \rho(\tau \cdot u) = \rho(u)\tau^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}),$$

hence  $\tau \in \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ . As  $q$  is an  $f$ -generic, we have  $q * u = \tau \cdot q$  (by Lemma 4.7). Then, since  $\tau \in \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$  and  $q$  is  $f$ -generic,  $\tau \cdot q = q$ .

It follows that  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot u = (\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot u) * u = (u * S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)) * u$ , which is an Ellis group (of the right ideal of all  $f$ -generic types in  $S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ ), because  $u$  is a minimal idempotent.

For (3), note that by (2), Ellis groups are right ideals, so the minimal left ideal is unique and contained in  $\text{fGen}$  by (1). This minimal left ideal is a union of all Ellis groups. By (2), each  $f$ -generic type is in an Ellis group, hence in the minimal left ideal and we see that  $\text{fGen}$  must be equal to the minimal left ideal.

The fourth condition follows easily from the first three points. The fifth follows from the fourth and the definition of  $f$ -generic.  $\square$

Let us note that Theorem 4.10 and its proof are parallel to their analogues for definable groups by the second author and Kyle Gannon in [GR25, Section 3]. There is also a similar earlier result (also for definable groups) [Pil13, Lemma 2.3].

**4.2. Idempotent measures with  $f$ -generics.** In this subsection, we notice that Conjecture 3.1 holds in amenable NIP theories provided there is an  $f$ -generic in the support of the considered Keisler measure. Before that, we analyze structure of the support of an idempotent measure which has an  $f$ -generic type in its support.

Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  be idempotent with  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$ . Let  $S := \text{supp}(\mu)$ , which is a compact Hausdorff left-continuous sub-semigroup in  $(S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M), *)$ . Recall that  $\rho: S_e^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  is given by  $\rho(\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{c})/\mathfrak{C})) = \sigma^{-1}\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')$ , where  $\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{c})/\mathfrak{C}) \in S_e^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ .

**Corollary 4.11.** *(NIP) Suppose there is an  $f$ -generic type in  $S$ . Then the natural homomorphism  $\rho|_S: S \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  is injective on Ellis groups.*

*Proof.* Immediate by Proposition A.4 and Theorem 4.10.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.12.** *(NIP) Suppose there is an  $f$ -generic type in  $S$ . Then:*

- (1)  $\mu$  is  $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant,
- (2) the kernel of  $\rho|_S$  consists exactly of the idempotents in  $S$ ,
- (3)  $S$  is left simple,
- (4) the product of idempotents in  $S$  is idempotent,
- (5)  $S$  is of the form  $G \times J$ , where  $G$  is a subgroup of  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  and  $J$  is a semigroup of idempotents (isomorphic to  $J_1 \times J_2$ , where  $J_1$  is a left semigroup and  $J_2$  is a right semigroup).
- (6)  $G = \rho[\text{supp}(\mu)] = \text{supp}(\rho_*\mu)$  and  $(\rho_*\mu)|_G$  is the normalized Haar measure on the closed (in the logic topology) subgroup  $G \leq \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$ . Moreover,  $\text{Stab}_I(\mu) \leq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$  is the preimage of  $G \leq \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  via the canonical quotient map  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})/\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ .

*Proof.* By Remark A.1, if  $S$  contains an  $f$ -generic type then  $S \subseteq f\text{Gen}$ . By NIP,  $\mu$  is  $M_0$ -invariant for every small model  $M_0$ , i.e.  $\mu$  is  $\text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant. Then  $\mu$  is  $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant since  $\text{Autf}_{\text{Lasc}}(\mathfrak{C}) = \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ .

For the proof of (2), suppose  $p \in \ker \rho|_S$ . Then since  $S$  is simple,  $p$  is in an Ellis group  $pSp$ . If  $u \in pSp$  is idempotent, then  $u \in \ker \rho|_S$ , and since  $\rho$  is injective on  $pSp$ , it follows that  $p = u$ . This gives us (1).

(4) follows since all idempotents are in  $\ker \rho|_S$  and  $\ker \rho|_S$  is a subsemigroup.

For (5), let  $G \leq \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  be the image of  $\rho|_S$  and  $J := \ker \rho|_S$  is the set of idempotents in  $S$ . Then it is easy to see that  $S \cong G \times J$ .

For (6), we need to note that  $\text{supp}(\rho_*\mu) = \rho[\text{supp}(\mu)]$  which follows since  $\rho$  is a continuous open map,  $\rho^{-1}\rho[A] = \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot A$  and  $\mu$  is  $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant. Then we use Theorem 6.30 from [GHK25].  $\square$

**Corollary 4.13.** *(NIP) Conjecture 3.1 holds for measures having an  $f$ -generic type in their support.*

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{n} = \bar{m}$  and consider an idempotent  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{m}}^{\text{def}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  with  $S = \text{supp}(\mu)$  as above. If  $S \cap f\text{Gen} \neq \emptyset$  then  $\mu$  is  $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant by Corollary 4.12(1). Then, we apply Theorem 6.31 from [GHK25].  $\square$

## 5. DECOMPOSING INVARIANT MEASURES

In this section we assume that  $T$  is NIP and we aim to describe  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant measures by a decomposition into canonical invariant measures living on the Ellis groups of the minimal left ideal  $\text{fGen}$ . In other words we will describe the ergodic Keisler measures, similarly to what was done in [CS18] for the case of a definable group. We adapted the proofs from sections 3 and 4 from [CS18] to work in the case of the automorphism group.

We start with setting the backstage. Of course, we assume that there is at least one invariant Keisler measure, i.e. we assume that  $T$  is an amenable NIP theory. Recall that  $M \preceq N \preceq \mathfrak{C}$  and  $M$  is small. We have also enumerations  $\bar{m} \subseteq \bar{n} \subseteq \bar{c}$  of  $M$ ,  $N$  and  $\mathfrak{C}$  respectively. Moreover  $\bar{x}'$  and  $\bar{y}'$  are copies of a tuple of variables related to  $\bar{m}$ , and  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  are copies of a tuple of variables related to  $\bar{n}$ .

**5.1. Almost pullback.** Recall, that we have the following map

$$\begin{aligned} \rho: S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C}) &\rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T) \\ \rho(\text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C})) &:= \sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $S := S_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  and let  $I := \text{fGen} \subseteq S$ . For every  $p \in I$ ,  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) \cdot p = p * S$  is an Ellis group of the minimal left ideal  $I$  (by Theorem 4.10). Moreover, there is  $u^2 = u \in I$  such that  $p * S = u * I$  and the restriction of  $\rho$ :

$$\rho|_{u*I}: u * I \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$$

is continuous, bijective homomorphism of groups (note that  $u * I$  may not be compact, so it does not immediately follow that  $\rho|_{u*I}$  is a topological isomorphism). Let  $r_{\mathfrak{C}}: \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')/\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})/\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C})$  be the canonical isomorphism of Kim-Pillay groups.

**Lemma 5.1.** *The inverse of  $\rho|_{u*I}$  is a Borel map. In particular  $\rho|_{u*I}$  is a Borel group isomorphism (i.e. it is a Borel group isomorphism whose inverse is also Borel).*

*Proof.* To see that the inverse of  $\rho|_{u*I}$  is a Borel map we check that for every  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  the set  $\rho[[\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap u * I]$  is a Borel subset of  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$ .

Then (using the fact that  $\rho$  is a homomorphism to get the second line and then Lemma 4.7 to get the last line),

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\mathfrak{C}}\rho[[\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap u * I] &= r_{\mathfrak{C}}\{\rho(u * q) : q \in I, u * q \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\} \\ &= r_{\mathfrak{C}}\{\rho(q) : q \in I, u * q \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\} \\ &= \{r_{\mathfrak{C}}\rho(q) : q \in I, u * q \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\} \\ &= \{\sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}), \sigma(u) \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\} \end{aligned}$$

and this set is Borel (even constructible) by the discussion after Fact 2.23 in [HKP]. As  $r_{\mathfrak{C}}$  is a homeomorphism, we have that also  $\rho[[\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap u * I]$  is Borel (even constructible).  $\square$

Let  $h_{\mathfrak{C}}$  and  $h_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  be the unique normalized Haar measures on

$$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})/\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) \cong \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')/\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'),$$

respectively. The set in the last exposed line in the above proof has the same  $h_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -measure as its inverse, the set

$$\{\sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}), \sigma(u) \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\}$$

which is the image  $d_u(U)$  of  $U = [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]$  via a variant of the map  $d_u$  from Definition 2.2 in [New14].

**Definition 5.2.** Let  $p \in I$ ,  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ . We define

$$\mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) := h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\rho\left([\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * S\right)\right).$$

Note that the above defined  $\mu_p$  is induced by the pullback of  $h_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  to the Borel group  $p * S$  via the Borel isomorphism  $\rho|_{p * S}$ . However,  $p * S$  is not necessarily a closed subset (and so a closed subgroup)<sup>1</sup> and thus  $\mu_p$  is not simply the pullback of  $h_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  but rather a way of measuring the trace of clopen/closed subsets of  $S$  in  $p * S$ . In this section, we will see that such a point of view is correct and that there is no ambiguity in computing the measure on the closure of  $p * S$ .

Let us also note, that in the context of finitely satisfiable types and measures on a definable group, the other approach (i.e. taking precisely the pullback of  $h_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  to the Ellis group, considered with  $\tau$ -topology) was undertaken in Proposition 4.15 of [CGK24], leading to Theorem 1.6/Corollary 5.18 there. This approach required additional assumption on countability of  $M$ , so the revised Newelski's conjecture follows and gives us that the  $\tau$ -topology is Hausdorff. In contrast, for invariant types, it is not even clear what the analogue of the  $\tau$ -topology should be.

**Lemma 5.3.** *If  $p \in I$  then  $\mu_p \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$  and  $\text{supp}(\mu_p) \subseteq \overline{p * S}$ .<sup>2</sup>*

*Proof.* We could check directly that  $\mu_p \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$ , but let us do in a different way to explain the relation with some results of [HKP].

In the discussion after [HKP, Fact 2.23], authors define an  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant finitely additive probability measure  $\mu$  on the relatively  $\bar{n}$ -definable subsets of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ . After applying [HKP, Proposition 2.12] (and parts of its proof), we transfer  $\mu$  over the space of types via the isomorphism of the Boolean algebra of clopen subsets of  $S_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$  and the algebra of relatively definable subsets of  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$  given by  $[\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \mapsto A_{\theta, \bar{n}, \bar{b}} (= \{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}) : \models \theta(\sigma(\bar{n}), \bar{b})\})$  to obtain an  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant Keisler measure  $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{n}}(\mathfrak{C})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &= \mu(A_{\theta, \bar{n}, \bar{b}}) = h_{\mathfrak{C}}\left(\left\{\sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma(p) \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\right\}\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}}\left(\left\{\sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}) : \sigma(p) \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\right\}\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}}\left(r_{\mathfrak{C}}\rho\left([\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * S\right)\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\rho\left([\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * S\right)\right) = \mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})), \end{aligned}$$

so  $\mu_p$  is the  $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ -invariant measure  $\tilde{\mu}$ .

Now, let us argue for  $\text{supp}(\mu_p) \subseteq \overline{p * S}$ . If  $q \in \text{supp}(\mu_p)$  and  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in q$  then

$$0 < \mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\rho\left([\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * S\right)\right).$$

Hence  $[\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * S \neq \emptyset$  and so  $q \in \overline{p * S}$ . □

<sup>1</sup>For example, it is not the case in a real closed field expanded by an affine copy of  $S^1$ .

<sup>2</sup>In fact if  $p$  is “almost periodic” in the sense that  $\overline{p * S} = \overline{q * S}$  for every  $q \in \overline{p * S}$ , then  $\text{supp}(\mu_p) = \overline{p * S}$ .

**5.2. Approximation lemmas.** Now, we need to prove several auxiliary results on approximating measures. Let  $p \in I$ ,  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  and let  $K \subseteq I$ . We set

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p} &:= \{\sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') : \sigma \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), K} &:= \{A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p} \cdot \tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') : p \in K, \tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 5.4.**  $\mathcal{F}_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), K}$  has finite VC-dimension.

*Proof.* Assume that  $\{\sigma_1 \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'), \dots, \sigma_n \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')\}$  is shattered by  $\mathcal{F}_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), K}$  and take  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ . There exists  $p_J \in K$  and  $\tau_J \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} j \in J &\iff \sigma_j \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \in A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p_J} \cdot \tau_J \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \\ &\iff \sigma_j \tau_J^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \in A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p_J} \\ &\iff \sigma_j \tau_J^{-1} \cdot p_J|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \supseteq \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \\ &\iff \tau_J^{-1} \cdot p_J|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \supseteq \theta(\bar{x}; \sigma_j^{-1}(\bar{b})). \end{aligned}$$

Now, for every  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\bar{a}_J \models \tau_J^{-1} \cdot p_J|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  (in a bigger monster  $\mathfrak{C}''$ ), and, for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\bar{b}_j := \sigma_j^{-1}(\bar{b})$ . We have

$$j \in J \iff \models \theta(\bar{a}_J; \bar{b}_j)$$

and so the size of the shattered set, i.e.  $n$ , is bounded by the VC-dimension of  $\theta^{\text{opp}}(\bar{y}; \bar{x})$ .  $\square$

**Fact 5.5** (Fact 2.1 in [CS18]). *For every  $k > 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there is  $N < \omega$  such that: If  $(X, \mu)$  is a probability space and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  has VC-dimension  $\leq k$  and satisfies*

- (1) *every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  is measurable,*
- (2) *for every  $n < \omega$ , the function  $f_n : X^{\times n} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , given by*

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |\text{Av}(x_1, \dots, x_n; F) - \mu(F)|,$$

*is measurable,*

- (3) *for every  $n < \omega$ , the function  $g_n : X^{\times 2n} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , given by*

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n) \mapsto \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |\text{Av}(x_1, \dots, x_n; F) - \text{Av}(y_1, \dots, y_n; F)|,$$

*is measurable,*

*then there exist  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in X$  such that for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  we have*

$$\mu(F) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}(x_1, \dots, x_N; F) \left( := \frac{1}{N} |\{j \leq N : x_j \in F\}| \right).$$

**Remark 5.6.** Note that given any  $M \models T$  and  $\kappa$ , we can find an elementary extension  $N \succeq M$  which is  $\kappa$ -saturated and such that for every  $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ ,  $N|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  is  $\kappa$ -strongly homogeneous as a model of  $T|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  (this follows from compactness and a standard book-keeping argument, and follows from  $\kappa$ -bigness as defined in [Hod93, Chapter 10]). In particular, we may assume that the monster model  $\mathfrak{C}$  (and  $\mathfrak{C}'$ ) is also a monster model for all reducts of  $T$ .

In the proof of the following lemma, at some point, we need to show that a certain analytic set in  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  is measurable. This follows easily by a general theorem for Polish groups (saying that analytic sets are universally measurable), thus we repeat the strategy from [CS18, Lemma 3.21] and pass to a countable sublanguage of  $\mathcal{L}$  to work with a Kim-Pillay group which is Polish. However, in contrast to the definable group case from [CS18], we encounter some issues. In [CS18], where

the acting group  $G$  (i.e. the definable group) remains unchanged after passing to a countable sublanguage containing the definition of  $G$ , we have that being an  $f$ -generic in [CS18] (given in terms of  $G$ -dividing) is preserved after passing to the sublanguage. In our case, the acting group is the group of automorphisms, which depends on the choice of the sublanguage. To address this issue, we could avoid all the problems by assuming that the language  $\mathcal{L}$  is countable, or we could consider a special class of  $f$ -generics which remain  $f$ -generic after passing to a countable sublanguage<sup>3</sup>. We decided to include a more general formulation of Lemma 5.7 to present possible tactic to extend our results in the future, and to assume countability of  $\mathcal{L}$  just after Lemma 5.7 to avoid a less natural formulation of several results.

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $K$  be countable and assume that for every  $p(\bar{x}) \in K$  there exists a countable  $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  containing  $\theta$  such that  $p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  is an  $f$ -generic in  $T|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  (i.e.  $p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  does not fork over  $\emptyset$ ).*

*Then  $\mathcal{F}_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),K}$  satisfies every point of the assumptions of Fact 5.5 for the probability space  $(\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T), h_{\mathfrak{C}'})$ .*

*Proof.* We already discussed the Borelness of sets of the form  $A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$  (cf. the proof of Lemma 5.1 for  $p|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  which is  $f$ -generic by Lemma 4.6). This is enough to deduce the first point of the assumptions of Fact 5.5.

Let us argue for the second point of the assumptions of Fact 5.5. Take  $n < \omega$ , we need to show that the map  $f_n: \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)^{\times n} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(g_1, \dots, g_n) &= \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),K}} |\text{Av}(g_1, \dots, g_n; F) - h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(F)| \\ &= \sup_{p \in K} \sup_{\tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')} \left| \text{Av}(g_1, \dots, g_n; A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p} \cdot \tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')) - h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}) \right| \end{aligned}$$

is measurable. Because  $K$  is countable, it is enough to show that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')} \left| \text{Av}(g_1, \dots, g_n; A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p} \cdot \tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')) - h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}) \right|$$

is a measurable map for every  $p \in K$ , which will follow if we can show that for a fixed  $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  the set

$$\begin{aligned} A_J := \{(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)^{\times n} : (\exists \tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')) \\ (g_j \in A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p} \cdot \tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')) \iff j \in J\} \end{aligned}$$

is measurable. To do it we will pass to a Polish group via a continuous epimorphism.

Let  $\mathcal{L}_0$  be a countable sublanguage of  $\mathcal{L}$  containing  $\theta(\bar{x};\bar{y})$  given in the assumptions of this lemma for  $p$ . Set  $T_0$  to be the reduct of  $T$  to  $\mathcal{L}_0$ . We can assume that  $\mathfrak{C}'$  is also a monster model for  $T_0$ , see Remark 5.6. The formula  $\sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \mapsto \sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'|_{\mathcal{L}_0})$  defines a continuous homomorphism  $P: \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T) \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T_0)$  (follows immediately from the fact that every type-definable set in  $\mathfrak{C}'|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  is type-definable in  $\mathfrak{C}'$ ). Consider a compact subgroup  $\mathcal{G} := P[\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)] \leq \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T_0)$ , which is a Polish group since  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T_0)$  is a Polish group.

<sup>3</sup>Not all  $f$ -generics are like that, even not in amenable NIP. For example, let  $(R, \leq)$  be a sufficiently saturated dense linear ordering, let  $A \preceq R$  be a submodel of uncountable cofinality, and set  $\mathcal{L}_A = \{\leq\} \cup \{a : a \in A\}$ . Let  $p \in S_1(R)$  be the type of an element “just after  $A$ ”. This  $p$  is  $\emptyset$ -invariant (in the language  $\mathcal{L}_A$ ) and so  $f$ -generic. On the other hand, the uncountable cofinality implies that for every countable  $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  containing  $\leq$ , in  $p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  there will a formula of the form  $a \leq x \leq b$ , where  $b > A$  and  $a \in A$  is strictly greater than the constants remaining in  $\mathcal{L}_0$ . This formula clearly 2-divides in  $R|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$ . Thus,  $p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  is not an  $f$ -generic.

Note that the normalized Haar measure on  $\mathcal{G}$  is the pushforward of the Haar measure on  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$ . Indeed, note that the pushforward of the Haar measure is clearly invariant, and it is easy to check (using compactness) that it is inner regular, which by finiteness implies that it is also outer regular, and the conclusion follows by the uniqueness of the Haar measure.

The preimage (via  $P$ ) of a Haar-null set in  $\mathcal{G}$  is Haar-null in  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  and the preimage of a Haar-measurable set in  $\mathcal{G}$  is Haar-measurable in  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$ . The first part follows because a null set is contained in a null  $G_\delta$  set. Then, regularity implies that a measurable set is the symmetric difference of a Borel set and a null set. As preimages preserve symmetric difference, the second part follows.

Now, we need to show that  $P^{-1}[P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]] = A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$ . For this, assume that  $\sigma, \tau \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  are such that  $P(\sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')) = P(\tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'))$ , i.e.  $\sigma^{-1}\tau \in \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'|_{\mathcal{L}_0})$ . If  $\sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \in A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$  then  $\sigma \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})]$ . We have that  $p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  is an f-generic in  $T_0$  and so  $(p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = (p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  is an f-generic in  $T_0$  (by Lemma 4.6). Consequently,  $(p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is  $\text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'|_{\mathcal{L}_0})$ -invariant and we obtain

$$\sigma((p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) = \sigma(\sigma^{-1}\tau((p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'})) = \tau((p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})] &\iff \sigma((p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_{\mathcal{L}_0}) \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})] \\ &\iff \sigma((p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})] \\ &\iff \tau((p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})] \\ &\iff \tau((p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_{\mathcal{L}_0}) \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})] \\ &\iff \tau \cdot p|_{\mathfrak{C}'} \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if  $\sigma \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \in A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$  then  $\tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \in A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$  and  $P^{-1}[P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]] \subseteq A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$ . The other inclusion follows by definition.

Note that, by  $P^{-1}[P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]] = A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$ , we have that  $g_j \in A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p} \cdot \tau$  if and only if  $P(g_j) \in P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}] \cdot P(\tau)$ , and hence

$$P[A_J] = \{(h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathcal{G}^{\times n} : (\exists h \in \mathcal{G})(h_j h^{-1} \in P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}] \iff j \in J)\}$$

Then using again  $P^{-1}[P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]] = A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}$ , we conclude that  $P^{-1}[P[A_J]] = A_J$ . Thus we are done with this part of the proof if we can show that  $P[A_J]$  is Haar-measurable in  $\mathcal{G}$ . This is our next step.

Consider the set

$$A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}}^{\mathcal{L}_0} = \{\tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}'|_{\mathcal{L}_0}) \in \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T_0) : \tau((p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'}) \in [\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b})]\}$$

which is Borel since  $p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$  is f-generic (even constructible, cf. the proof of Lemma 5.1 or the discussion after Fact 2.23 in [HKP]). We have (using  $(p|_{\mathcal{L}_0})|_{\mathfrak{C}'} = (p|_{\mathfrak{C}'})|_{\mathcal{L}_0}$ ) that  $P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}] = \mathcal{G} \cap A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p|_{\mathcal{L}_0}}^{\mathcal{L}_0}$  and so  $P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathcal{G}$ . It is not hard to see that  $P[A_J]$  is the image under projection  $\mathcal{G}^{\times(n+1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}^{\times n}$  onto the last  $n$  coordinates of the set

$$\begin{aligned} B_J &:= \bigcap_{j \in J} \{(h, h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathcal{G}^{\times(n+1)} : h_j h^{-1} \in P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]\} \\ &\cap \bigcap_{j \notin J} \{(h, h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathcal{G}^{\times(n+1)} : h_j h^{-1} \notin P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]\}. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $B_J$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathcal{G}^{\times(n+1)}$  because  $P[A_{\theta(\bar{x};\bar{b}),p}]$  is Borel and the group operations in  $\mathcal{G}$  are continuous. Thus  $P[A_J]$  is an analytic subset of Polish group  $\mathcal{G}$  and as such,  $P[A_J]$  is universally measurable (by Theorem 29(7) in [Kec95]), in particular  $P[A_J]$  is Haar-measurable as expected.

In a similar way we can show that, for every  $n < \omega$ , the map  $g_n : \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)^{\times 2n} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  from the third point of the assumptions of Fact 5.5 is measurable.  $\square$

From now until Remark 5.15, we assume that **the language  $\mathcal{L}$  is countable**.

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ , and let  $K \subseteq I$  be countable. Then there exist  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  such that for every  $p \in K$  and every  $q \in S$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &= \mu_{p*q}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p * q | \mathfrak{C}'\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left| \{j \leq n : \theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p * q | \mathfrak{C}'\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.7, there exist  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  such that for every  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  and every  $p \in K$  we have

$$h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p} \cdot \sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \tau_j \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \in A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p} \cdot \sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')\right).$$

Note that

$$\tau_j \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \in A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p} \cdot \sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') \iff \sigma \cdot p | \mathfrak{C}' \ni \theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})),$$

$$h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p} \cdot \sigma^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}')) = h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p})$$

and so

$$(\dagger) \quad h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p}) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \sigma \cdot p | \mathfrak{C}' \ni \theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}))\right),$$

for every  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  and every  $p \in K$ .

Let  $q \in S$  with  $q = \text{tp}(\sigma(\bar{n})/\mathfrak{C})$  for some  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$ . Then  $p * q = (\sigma \cdot p | \mathfrak{C}')|_{\mathfrak{C}}$ , so  $\sigma \cdot p | \mathfrak{C}' = p * q | \mathfrak{C}'$  (i.e. the unique  $M$ -invariant extension of  $p * q$  over  $\mathfrak{C}'$ ) and

$$(\dagger\dagger) \quad \text{Av}\left(j; \sigma \cdot p | \mathfrak{C}' \ni \theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}))\right) = \text{Av}\left(j; p * q | \mathfrak{C}' \ni \theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}))\right).$$

Now let us take care of the left-hand side, we have by Corollary 4.8:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p}) &= h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\{\tau \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') : \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \tau \cdot p | \mathfrak{C}'\}\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\{\tau^{-1} \text{Autf}_{\text{KP}}(\mathfrak{C}') : \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}) \in \tau \cdot p | \mathfrak{C}'\}\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\{\rho(r) : r \in S, p * r \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\}\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\{\rho(p)^{-1} \rho(p * r) : r \in S, p * r \in [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\}\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\rho(p)^{-1} \rho([\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * S)\right) \\ &= h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\rho([\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * S)\right) = \mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})), \end{aligned}$$

and since  $p * q * S = p * S$  (because  $p * S$  is a minimal right ideal, by Theorem 4.10) we have

$$(\dagger \dagger \dagger) \quad h_{\mathfrak{C}'}(A_{\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}), p}) = h_{\mathfrak{C}'}\left(\rho([\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})] \cap p * q * S)\right) = \mu_{p*q}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})).$$



Putting  $(\dagger), (\dagger\dagger), (\dagger\dagger\dagger)$  together, we obtain

$$\mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \mu_{p*q}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \theta((\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p * q | \mathfrak{C}'),\right),$$

as expected.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.9.** *If  $p \in I$  and  $q \in \overline{p * S}$  then  $\mu_p = \mu_q$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . By Proposition 5.8 applied to set  $K = \{p, q\}$ , we obtain  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  such that for every  $r \in S$ ,

$$\mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \mu_{p*r}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \theta((\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p * r | \mathfrak{C}'),\right),$$

$$\mu_q(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \mu_{q*r}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \theta((\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in q * r | \mathfrak{C}'),\right).$$

Let  $r \in S$  extend  $\text{tp}(\text{id}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\bar{m})/M)$ . Then  $q * r = \text{id}_{\mathfrak{C}} \cdot q = q$  (by Lemma 4.7), and so also

$$\mu_q(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \theta((\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in q | \mathfrak{C}'),\right).$$

Let  $\bar{y}_0$  be a finite subtuple of  $\bar{y}$  of all variables among  $\bar{y}$  occurring in  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ , i.e.  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) = \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}_0)$ . Consider  $\bar{b}_0 := \bar{b}|_{\bar{y}_0}$ , and for each  $j \leq n$  take  $\bar{d}_j \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}_0}$  such that  $\bar{d}_j \equiv_M \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}_0)$ . Because  $q \in \overline{p * S}$ , there exist  $t \in S$  such that for every  $j \leq n$  we have

$$\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_j) \in q \iff \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_j) \in p * t.$$

Hence, for every  $j \leq n$  it is

$$\theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in q | \mathfrak{C}' \iff \theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p * t | \mathfrak{C}'.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_q(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &\approx_\epsilon \text{Av}\left(j; \theta((\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in q | \mathfrak{C}'),\right) \\ &= \text{Av}\left(j; \theta((\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p * t | \mathfrak{C}'),\right) \\ &\approx_\epsilon \mu_{p*t}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, we conclude that  $\mu_q(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b}))$  for every  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ .  $\square$

### 5.3. Ergodic decomposition.

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then there exist  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq I$  such that for every  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  we have*

$$\mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_\epsilon \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} \mu_{p_i}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})).$$

*Proof.* By classical results on NIP (e.g. Proposition 7.11 in [Sim15a]) and Proposition 4.5, there exist  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq I$  such that for every  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  we have

$$\mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \text{Av}\left(p_1, \dots, p_n; [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})]\right).$$

We will show that these  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  work.

After applying Proposition 5.8 for  $K = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ , for every  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  there exist  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  such that for every  $i \leq n$  we have

$$\mu_{p_i}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \text{Av}\left(\theta(\bar{x}; \tau_i^{-1}(\bar{b})) \in p_i | \mathfrak{C}'),\right).$$

So let  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$  and take  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  as above. Let  $\bar{y}_0$  be a finite subtuple of  $\bar{y}$  containing all variables among  $\bar{y}$  occurring in  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ , and let  $\bar{b}_0 := \bar{b}|_{\bar{y}_0}$ . For every  $j \leq m$  take  $\bar{d}_j \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}_0}$  such that  $\bar{d}_j \equiv_M \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}_0)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} \mu_{p_i}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &\approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \delta_{p_i|_{\mathfrak{C}'}}(\theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}))) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} \delta_{p_i|_{\mathfrak{C}'}}(\theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}))) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} \delta_{p_i}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_j)) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \text{Av}(p_1, \dots, p_n; [\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_j)]) \\
&\approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_j)) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}(\theta(\bar{x}; \tau_j^{-1}(\bar{b}))) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} (\tau_j \cdot \mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'})(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \leq m} \mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \\
&= \mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu|_{\mathfrak{C}'}$  is the unique  $\emptyset$ -invariant extension of  $\mu$  over  $\mathfrak{C}'$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.11.** *Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$ ,  $p \in I$ . If  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \overline{p * S}$  then  $\mu = \mu_p$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ . By Lemma 5.10, there exist  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \overline{p * S}$  such that

$$\mu(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_{\epsilon} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} \mu_{p_i}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})).$$

Because  $p_i \in \overline{p * I}$ , Proposition 5.9 implies that  $\mu_{p_i} = \mu_p$  for every  $i \leq n$ . Now, the conclusion follows easily.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.12.** *The map*

$$I \ni p \mapsto \mu_p \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$$

*is continuous.*

*Proof.* Let  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}}$ ,  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ , and consider

$$Y := \{p \in I : r \leq \mu_p(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \leq s\}.$$

We want to show that  $Y$  is closed in  $I$ , i.e.  $Y = \overline{Y}$ .

Let  $q \in \overline{Y}$ , so there is a net  $(p_j)_{j \in J} \subseteq Y$  converging to  $q$ . Let  $M_0 \preceq \mathfrak{C}$  be countable. Since  $q, p_j$  are f-generics, they are  $M_0$ -invariant. In particular,  $q|_{\theta}, p_j|_{\theta} \in \text{Inv}_{\theta}(M_0)$  and

$$q|_{\theta} \in \overline{\{p_j|_{\theta} : j \in J\}}.$$

As  $\text{Inv}_{\theta}(M_0)$  is a Rosenthal compactum, there is a sequence  $(p_{j_n})_{n < \omega}$  such that  $(p_{j_n}|_{\theta})_{n < \omega} \rightarrow q|_{\theta}$  in  $\text{Inv}_{\theta}(M_0)$  (cf. Proposition 2.15 in [Sim15b]; note that here we use the hypothesis that the language is countable).

Let  $\bar{y}_0$  be a finite subtuple of  $\bar{y}$  containing all variables among  $\bar{y}$  which occur in  $\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{y})$ , let  $\bar{b}_0 := \bar{b}|_{\bar{y}_0}$ . Consider  $\epsilon > 0$  and apply Proposition 5.8 to the set

$K = \{q\} \cup \{p_{j_n} : n < \omega\}$  and  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$  to find  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}')$  and  $\bar{d}_k \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{y}_0}$  such that for every  $k \leq m$  we have  $\bar{d}_k \equiv_M \tau_k^{-1}(\bar{b}_0)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_q(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &\approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \text{Av}\left(k; \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_k) \in q\right) = \text{Av}\left(k; \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_k) \in q|_{\theta}\right), \\ \mu_{p_{j_n}}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) &\approx_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \text{Av}\left(k; \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_k) \in p_{j_n}\right) = \text{Av}\left(k; \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_k) \in p_{j_n}|_{\theta}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for every  $n < \omega$ . There is  $n_0 < \omega$  such that for every  $n \geq n_0$

$$\text{Av}\left(k; \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_k) \in p_{j_n}|_{\theta}\right) = \text{Av}\left(k; \theta(\bar{x}; \bar{d}_k) \in q|_{\theta}\right).$$

Therefore, for every  $n \geq n_0$  we have

$$\mu_{p_{j_n}}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \approx_{\epsilon} \mu_q(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})).$$

Because each  $p_{j_n}$  belongs to  $Y$ , we have that  $r \leq \mu_{p_{j_n}}(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \leq s$ , and thus (since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary)  $\mu_q(\theta(\bar{x}; \bar{b})) \in \bigcap_{\epsilon > 0} (r - \epsilon, s + \epsilon) = [r, s]$ . Hence  $q \in Y$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.13.** (1)  $\{\mu_p : p \in I\}$  is closed subset of  $\mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$ .

(2) For every  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$ , the set  $\{p \in I : \mu_p = \mu\}$  is a subflow in  $(I, \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}))$ .

*Proof.* The set considered in the first point is image of a compact set by a continuous map (Lemma 5.12), thus it is closed.

Now, we argue for the second point. Let  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$  and take for  $q \in S$  a coheir of  $\text{tp}(\sigma(m)/M)$ . Then, by Lemma 4.7, we have  $\sigma \cdot p = p * q \in p * I$ . This implies  $\mu_{\sigma \cdot p} = \mu_{p * q} = \mu_p$ . Moreover,  $\{p \in I : \mu_p = \mu\}$  is closed as preimage of  $\{\mu\}$  via a continuous map.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.14.** Let  $T$  be a countable amenable NIP theory. Then the ergodic measures in  $\mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$  are exactly the measures  $\mu_p$  (cf. Definition 5.2) for  $p \in \text{fGen}$ , i.e.:

$$\{\mu_p : p \in \text{fGen}\} = \{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset) : \mu \text{ is ergodic in } \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)\}$$

*Proof.* ( $\subseteq$ ): Let  $p \in I = \text{fGen}$ . We claim that  $\mu_p \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$  is ergodic. Suppose towards contradiction that  $\mu_p = t\mu_1 + (1-t)\mu_2$  for some  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$  and  $0 < t < 1$ . Then  $\text{supp}(\mu_1), \text{supp}(\mu_2) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mu_p) \subseteq \bar{p} * \bar{S}$ . Then  $\mu_1 = \mu_p = \mu_2$  by Corollary 5.11.

( $\supseteq$ ): Let  $Y := \{\mu_p : p \in I\}$ . By Lemma 5.10 and the standard Shelah's trick,  $\mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset) = \overline{\text{conv}(Y)}$ . Then a classical fact (e.g. Fact 4.1 in [CS18]) implies that all the extreme points of  $\mathfrak{M}_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, \emptyset)$  (i.e. the ergodic measures) are contained in the closure of  $Y$ , which is equal to  $Y$  by Corollary 5.13.(1).  $\square$

**5.4. Stable case.** For the next two remarks, we do not assume countability of the language.

**Remark 5.15.** Fix  $p \in I$ . Then:

- (1) If  $T$  is stable, then  $p * - : S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M) \rightarrow S_n^{\text{inv}}(\mathfrak{C}, M)$  is continuous and  $p * I$  is closed.
- (2) If  $p * I$  is closed in  $S_n(\mathfrak{C})$ , then  $(p * I, *)$  is a Hausdorff compact group isomorphic to  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$ .
- (3) If  $p * I$  is closed in  $S_n(\mathfrak{C})$ , then  $\mu_p$  restricted to  $p * I$  is the unique Haar measure on  $p * I$ , in particular  $\text{supp}(\mu_p) = p * I$ .

*Proof.* For the proof of the first point, note that  $*$ -product is right-continuous in the stable case, which follows easily from the definability of types invariant over models. Then  $p * I$  is compact as the image of the compact set  $I$  under continuous map  $p * -$ .

Now, we proceed to the proof of the second point. If  $p * I$  is compact, then  $\rho: p * I \rightarrow \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$  is a homeomorphism (as a continuous bijection between compact spaces), so  $p * I$  is a compact topological group (with the induced topology) isomorphic to  $\text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.16.** Arguing as in [GHK25, Proposition 7.23.(1)], we can show that if  $T$  is stable, then  $\text{fGen}$  has a unique idempotent and so  $(\text{fGen}, *)$  is a profinite topological group isomorphic to  $\text{Gal}_{\text{Sh}}(T) = \text{Gal}_{\text{KP}}(T)$ .

#### APPENDIX A. SEMIGROUPS

**Remark A.1.** If  $S \leq S'$  is a simple semigroup and  $I$  is a two-sided ideal in  $S'$  intersecting  $S$ , then  $I$  contains  $S$ : if  $s \in S \cap I$ , then  $S = SsS \subseteq S'sS' \subseteq I$ .

**Remark A.2.** If  $S \leq S'$  is a subsemigroup and  $I$  is the minimal ideal of  $S'$ ,  $S$  intersects  $I$ , and  $S$  has a minimal ideal. Then  $S \cap I$  is the minimal ideal of  $S$ . (Indeed, by minimality,  $S \cap I$  contains the minimal ideal of  $S$ , which is left simple.)

**Proposition A.3.** Suppose  $S'$  is a compact left topological semigroup,  $S \leq S'$  is a closed subsemigroup. Suppose furthermore that there is exactly one minimal left ideal  $I$  of  $S'$  intersecting  $S$ . Then  $I \cap S$  is the unique minimal left ideal of  $S$ .

*Proof.* Notice that  $I \cap S$  is left simple: it is a closed subsemigroup of  $I$ , so it is compact, and as such, it contains a minimal left ideal  $I''$  of  $I \cap S$ . We claim that  $I'' = I \cap S$ . Indeed, let  $u \in I''$  be idempotent, and let  $s \in I \cap S$  be arbitrary. Then, since  $u, s \in I$ , which is a minimal left ideal in  $S'$ , we have that  $su = s \in (I \cap S)I'' = I''$ .

On the other hand,  $I \cap S$  is the intersection with  $S$  of the minimal two-sided ideal of  $S'$  (since  $I$  is the unique minimal left ideal of  $S'$  intersecting  $S$ ), and so it is a two-sided ideal of  $S$ . Since it is left simple, it follows that it is a minimal left ideal in itself, and hence also in  $S$ .  $\square$

**Proposition A.4.** Suppose  $S'$  is a compact left topological semigroup,  $S \leq S'$  closed subsemigroup which intersects the minimal ideal of  $S'$ . Then Ellis groups of  $S$  are subgroups of Ellis groups of  $S'$ .

*Proof.* Since  $S$  is closed, it is compact, so it has a minimal ideal. It follows that the minimal ideal in  $S$  is contained in the minimal ideal of  $S'$ . Since the Ellis groups are simply the maximal subgroups of the minimal ideal, the conclusion follows.  $\square$


#### REFERENCES


- [BT16] Itai Ben Yaacov and Todor Tsankov. “Weakly almost periodic functions, model-theoretic stability, and minimality of topological groups”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 368.11 (2016), pp. 8267–8294. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: 10.1090/tran/6883. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/6883>.

- [CG20] Gabriel Conant and Kyle Gannon. “Remarks on generic stability in independent theories”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 171.2 (2020), p. 102736. ISSN: 0168-0072. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2019.102736>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168007219300995>.
- [CG22] Artem Chernikov and Kyle Gannon. “Definable convolution and idempotent Keisler measures”. In: *Israel J. Math.* 248.1 (2022), pp. 271–314. ISSN: 0021-2172,1565-8511. DOI: 10.1007/s11856-022-2298-2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11856-022-2298-2>.
- [CG23] Artem Chernikov and Kyle Gannon. “Definable convolution and idempotent Keisler measures, II”. In: *Model Theory* 2.2 (2023), pp. 185–232. ISSN: 2832-9058,2832-904X. DOI: 10.2140/mt.2023.2.185. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2140/mt.2023.2.185>.
- [CGH23a] Gabriel Conant, Kyle Gannon, and James E. Hanson. “Generic stability, randomizations, and NIP formulas”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01801* (2023).
- [CGH23b] Gabriel Conant, Kyle Gannon, and James E. Hanson. “Keisler measures in the wild”. In: *Model Theory* 2(1) (2023), pp. 1–67.
- [CGK24] Artem Chernikov, Kyle Gannon, and Krzysztof Krupiński. *Definable convolution and idempotent Keisler measures III. Generic stability, generic transitivity, and revised Newelski’s conjecture*. 2024. arXiv: 2406.00912 [math.LO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00912>.
- [Coh60] Paul J Cohen. “On a conjecture of Littlewood and idempotent measures”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 82.2 (1960), pp. 191–212.
- [CS18] Artem Chernikov and Pierre Simon. “Definably amenable NIP groups”. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 31.3 (2018), pp. 609–641. ISSN: 0894-0347,1088-6834. DOI: 10.1090/jams/896. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/jams/896>.
- [Gan20] Kyle Gannon. “Approximation Theorems for Keisler Measures”. PhD thesis. University of Notre Dame, 2020.
- [GHK25] Kyle Gannon, Daniel Max Hoffmann, and Krzysztof Krupiński. *Convolution semigroups for automorphism dynamics*. 2025. arXiv: 2507.23503 [math.LO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.23503>.
- [Gli59] Irving Glicksberg. “Convolution semigroups of measures”. In: *Pacific J. Math.* 9 (1959), pp. 51–67.
- [GN08] Jakub Gismatullin and Ludomir Newelski. “ $G$ -compactness and groups”. In: *Arch. Math. Logic* 47.5 (2008), pp. 479–501.
- [GPP14] Jakub Gismatullin, Davide Penazzi, and Anand Pillay. “On compactifications and the topological dynamics of definable groups”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 165.2 (2014), pp. 552–562. ISSN: 0168-0072. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2013.07.020>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016800721300119X>.
- [GR25] Kyle Gannon and Tomasz Rzepecki. “Upside down and backwards”. forthcoming. 2025.
- [HKP] E. Hrushovski, K. Krupiński, and A. Pillay. “On first order amenability”. Available on [https://www.math.uni.wroc.pl/kkrup/amenable\\_theories\\_9.pdf](https://www.math.uni.wroc.pl/kkrup/amenable_theories_9.pdf).

- [HKP22] Ehud Hrushovski, Krzysztof Krupiński, and Anand Pillay. “Amenability, connected components, and definable actions”. In: *Selecta Mathematica New Series* 16 (28 2022).
- [Hod93] Wilfrid Hodges. *Model Theory*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [HP11] Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay. “On NIP and invariant measures”. In: *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 13.4 (2011), pp. 1005–1061. DOI: DOI10.4171/JEMS/274.
- [HPP08] Ehud Hrushovski, Ya’acov Peterzil, and Anand Pillay. “Groups, measures, and the NIP”. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 21.2 (2008), pp. 563–596. ISSN: 0894-0347,1088-6834. DOI: 10.1090/S0894-0347-07-00558-9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-07-00558-9>.
- [HPS13] Ehud Hrushovski, Anand Pillay, and Pierre Simon. “Generically stable and smooth measures in NIP theories”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 365.5 (2013), pp. 2341–2366.
- [Hru19] Ehud Hrushovski. “Definability patterns and their symmetries”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01129* (2019).
- [Kec95] A.S. Kechris. *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*. Springer, 1995.
- [Kei87] H. Jerome Keisler. “Measures and forking”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 34 (2 1987), pp. 119–169.
- [KI40] Yukiyo Kawada and Kiyosi Itô. “On the probability distribution on a compact group. I”. In: *Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan (3)* 22 (1940), pp. 977–998.
- [KNS19] Krzysztof Krupiński, Ludomir Newelski, and Pierre Simon. “Boundedness and absoluteness of some dynamical invariants in model theory”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 19 (2019).
- [KP17] Krzysztof Krupiński and Anand Pillay. “Generalised Bohr compactification and model-theoretic connected components”. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 163.2 (2017), pp. 219–249. DOI: 10.1017/S0305004116000967.
- [KPR18] Krzysztof Krupiński, Anand Pillay, and Tomasz Rzepecki. “Topological dynamics and the complexity of strong types”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 228 (2018), pp. 863–932.
- [KR20] Krzysztof Krupiński and Tomasz Rzepecki. “Galois groups as quotients of Polish groups”. In: *J. Math. Log.* 20.3 (2020), pp. 2050018, 48. ISSN: 0219-0613,1793-6691. DOI: 10.1142/S021906132050018X. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S021906132050018X>.
- [New09] Ludomir Newelski. “Topological dynamics of definable groups actions”. In: *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 74 (2009), pp. 50–72.
- [New12] Ludomir Newelski. “Model theoretic aspects of the Ellis semigroup”. In: *Israel J. Math.* 190 (2012), pp. 477–507.
- [New14] Ludomir Newelski. “Topological Dynamics of Stable Groups”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 79.4 (2014), pp. 1199–1223. DOI: 10.1017/jsl.2014.25.
- [Pil13] Anand Pillay. “Topological dynamics and definable groups”. In: *J. Symbolic Logic* 78.2 (2013), pp. 657–666. ISSN: 0022-4812,1943-5886. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.jsl/1368627070>.
- [Poi87] Bruno Poizat. *Groupes stables*. Nur Al-Mantiq Wal-Ma’rifah, 1987.

- [PT11] Anand Pillay and Predrag Tanović. *Generic stability, regularity, and quasiminimality*. In: *Models, logics, and higher-dimensional categories*. Ed. by Bradd T Hart et al. CRM proceedings & lecture notes. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, Sept. 2011.
- [Pym62] J. S. Pym. “Idempotent measures on semigroups”. In: *Pacific J. Math.* 12 (1962), pp. 685–698.
- [Rud59] Walter Rudin. “Idempotent measures on Abelian groups”. In: *Pacific J. Math.* 9 (1959), pp. 195–209.
- [Rze18] Tomasz Rzepecki. “Bounded invariant equivalence relations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05113* (2018).
- [Sim15a] Pierre Simon. *A Guide to NIP Theories*. Lecture Notes in Logic. Cambridge University Press, 2015. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781107415133.
- [Sim15b] Pierre Simon. “Rosenthal compacta and NIP formulas”. In: *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 231.1 (2015), pp. 81–92. ISSN: 0016-2736.
- [Wen54] J. G. Wendel. “Haar measure and the semigroup of measures on a compact group”. In: *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 5 (1954), pp. 923–929.

<sup>†</sup> INSTYTUT MATEMATYKI, UNIwersYTET WARSZAWSKI, WARSZAWA, POLAND  
*Email address:* `daniel.max.hoffmann@gmail.com`  
*URL:*  0000-0002-4514-269X, <https://sites.google.com/site/danielmaxhoffmann/>

<sup>‡</sup> INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, UNIwersYTET WROCLAWSKI, WROCLAW, POLAND  
*Email address:* `tomasz.rzepecki@math.uni.wroc.pl`  
*URL:*  0000-0001-9786-1648, <https://fricas.org/~rzepecki/>