The Journal of Symbolic Logic
Volume 84, Number 2, June 2019

RETRACTED - EXISTENCE OF MODELING LIMITS FOR SEQUENCES OF SPARSE STRUCTURES

JAROSLAV NEŠETŘIL AND PATRICE OSSONA DE MENDEZ

Abstract. A sequence of graphs is FO-convergent if the probability of satisfaction of every first-order formula converges. A graph modeling is a graph, whose domain is a standard probability space, with the property that every definable set is Borel. It was known that FO-convergent sequence of graphs do not always admit a modeling limit, but it was conjectured that FO-convergent sequences of sufficiently sparse graphs have a modeling limits. Precisely, two conjectures were proposed:

1. If a FO-convergent sequence of graphs is residual, that is if for every integer d the maximum relative size of a ball of radius d in the graphs of the sequence tends to zero, then the sequence has a modeling limit.
2. A monotone class of graphs $\mathcal{C}$ has the property that every FO-convergent sequence of graphs from $\mathcal{C}$ has a modeling limit if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is nowhere dense, that is if and only if for each integer p there is $N(p)$ such that no graph in $\mathcal{C}$ contains the pth subdivision of a complete graph on $N(p)$ vertices as a subgraph.

In this article we prove both conjectures. This solves some of the main problems in the area and among others provides an analytic characterization of the nowhere dense–somewhere dense dichotomy.

RETRACTED

§1. Introduction. Combinatorics is at a crossroads of several mathematical fields, including logic, algebra, probability, and analysis. Bridges have been built between these fields (notably at the instigation of Leibniz and Hilbert). From the interactions of algebra and logic is born model theory, which is founded on the duality of semantical and syntactical elements of a language. Several frameworks have been proposed to unify probability and logic, which mainly belong to two kinds: probabilities over models (Carnap, Gaifman, Scott and Kraus, Nilsson, Väänänen, Valiant,. . .), and models with probabilities (H. Friedman, Keisler and Hoover, Terwijn, Goldbring and Towsner,. . .). See [19] for a partial overview.

Recently, new bridges appeared between combinatorics and analysis, which are based on the concept of graph limits (see [21] for an in-depth exposition). Two main directions were proposed for the study of a "continuous limit" of finite graphs by means of statistics convergence:

- the *left convergence* of a sequence of (dense) graphs, for which the limit object can be either described as an *infinite exchangeable random graph* (that is a probability measure on the space of graphs over $\mathbb{N}$ that is invariant under the

Received July 30, 2016.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03C30, 03C98, 05C99, Secondary 03C45, 28E15, 03C50.
Key words and phrases. first-order properties, limit statistics, convergence of graphs, structural limit, totally Borel graph, modeling.

© 2019, Association for Symbolic Logic
0022-4812/19/8402-0002
DOI:10.1017/jsl.2018.32

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

natural action of S_ω) [2, 16], or as a *graphon* (that is a measurable function $W : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$) [5, 7, 22].

- the *local convergence* of a sequence of bounded degree graphs, for which the limit object can be either described as a *unimodular distribution* (a probability distribution on the space of rooted connected countable graphs with bounded degrees satisfying some invariance property) [3], or as a *graphing* (a Borel graph that satisfies some Intrinsic Mass Transport Principle or, equivalently, a graph on a Borel space that is defined by means of finitely many measure preserving involutions) [9].

A general unifying framework has been introduced by the authors, under the generic name "structural limits" [29]. In this setting, a sequence of structures is convergent if the satisfaction probability of every formula (in a fixed fragment of first-order logic) for a (uniform independent) random assignment of vertices to the free variables converges. The limit object can be described as a probability measure on a Stone space invariant by some group action, thus generalizing approaches of [2, 16] and [3]. This may be viewed as a natural bridge between combinatorics, model theory, probability theory, and functional analysis [31].

The existence of a graphing-like limit object, called *modeling*, has been studied in [32, 35], and the authors conjectured that such a limit object exists if and only if the structures in the sequence are sufficiently "structurally sparse". For instance, the authors conjectured that if a convergent sequence is *nondispersive* (meaning that the structures in the sequence have no "accumulation elements") then a modeling limit exists:

Conjecture 1.1 ([32]). *Every convergent residual sequence of finite structures admits a modeling limit*.

For the case of sequences of graphs from a monotone class (that is a class of finite graphs closed by taking subgraphs) the authors conjectured the following exact characterization, where *nowhere dense* classes [27, 28] form a large variety of classes of sparse graphs, including all classes with excluded minors (as planar graphs), bounded degree graphs, and graph classes of bounded expansion [24–26].


Conjecture 1.2 ([35]). *A monotone class of graphs $\mathcal{C}$ admits modeling limits if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is nowhere dense.*

Note that this conjecture is known in one direction [35]. To prove the existence of modeling limits for sequences of graphs in a nowhere dense class is the main problem addressed in this article.

Nowhere dense classes enjoy a number of (nonobviously) equivalent characterizations and strong algorithmic and structural properties [30]. For instance, deciding properties of graphs definable in first-order logic is fixed-parameter tractable on nowhere dense graph classes (which is optimal when the considered class is monotone, under a reasonable complexity theoretic assumption) [15]. Modeling limits exist for sequences of graphs with bounded degrees (as graphings are modelings), and this has been so far verified for sequences of graphs with bounded tree-depth [35], for sequences of trees [32], for sequences of plane trees and sequences of graphs with bounded pathwidth [14], and for sequences of mappings [34] (which is the simplest form of nonrelational nowhere dense structures). (See also related result on sequences of matroids [17].)

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press



In this article, we prove both Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2 in their full generality.


Our article is organized as follows: In Section 2 we recall all necessary notions, definitions, and notations. In Section 3 we will deal with limits with respect to the fragment FO_1 of all first-order formulas with at most one free variable. This is achieved by using nonstandard methods in combination with Friedman $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$ logic. In Section 4 we deduce a proof of Conjecture 1.1. In Section 5, using a characterization of nowhere denses from [33], we prove that Conjecture 1.2 holds. The strategy of the proof will be as follows (see picture bellow):

We consider an FO-convergent sequence of graphs (G_n) in a nowhere dense class. First, we mark a skeleton in the graphs in the sequence as well as their neighbours (using countably many marks). We then compute an FO_1-modeling $\mathbf{L}$ of the marked sequence (with some additional zero/nonzero properties). Then we aim to prove that $\mathbf{L}$ is actually an FO-modeling limit of the sequence. To do this, we fix some $\epsilon > 0$ and remove the edges incident to the first $m(\epsilon)$ vertices of the skeleton (operation I_1 in the picture) thus obtaining a sequence (G_n^*) which is close to being residual. This logically defined operation is continuous for our notions of convergence, and it follows that an FO_1-limit of the sequence (with the same additional zero/nonzero properties as above) can be obtained by applying the operation I_1 to $\mathbf{L}$, thus obtaining a modeling $\mathbf{L}^*$. The sequence (G_n^*) being close to be residual (with parameter related to ϵ), the modeling $\mathbf{L}^*$ is at distance less than $f(\epsilon)$ from the FO-limit of (G_n^*). Then we consider a logical operation I_2 reconstructing the adjacencies deleted by operation I_1, which is (uniformly) continuous with respect to FO-convergence. (Note that $\mathsf{I}_2 \circ \mathsf{I}_1$ is the identity mapping.) We deduce that the modeling $\mathbf{L}$ (recovered by applying I_2 on $\mathbf{L}^*$) is at distance at most ϵ from the FO-limit of the sequence (G_n) (recovered by applying I_2 on (G_n^*)). As this holds for every ϵ we deduce that $\mathbf{L}$ is a modeling FO-limit of the sequence (G_n).

Finally, we discuss some possible developments in Section 6. The scheme of the concepts involved in this article is depicted bellow; our proofs will make use of results from model theory, logic, analysis, and combinatorics.

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press



RETRACTED

§2. Preliminaries, definitions, and notations.

2.1. Structures and formulas. A *signature* is a set σ of function or relation symbols, each with a finite arity. In this article we consider finite or countable signatures. A σ-*structure* $\mathbf{A}$ is defined by its *domain* A, and by the interpretation of the symbols in σ, either as a relation $R^{\mathbf{A}}$ (for a relation symbol A) or as a function $f^{\mathbf{A}}$ (for a function symbol f). A signature σ also defines the (countable) set $\mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$ of all first-order formulas built using the relation and function symbols in σ, equality, the standard logical conjunctives, and quantification over elements of the domain. The quotient of $\mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$ by logical equivalence has a natural structure of countable Boolean algebra, the *Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra* $\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$ of $\mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$.

For a formula ϕ with p free variables and a structure $\mathbf{A}$ we denote by $\phi(\mathbf{A})$ the set of all satisfying assignments of ϕ in $\mathbf{A}$, that is

$$\phi(\mathbf{A}) = \{(v_1, \ldots, v_p) \in A^p : \mathbf{A} \models \phi(v_1, \ldots, v_p)\}.$$

If $\mathbf{A}$ is a finite structure (or a structure whose domain is a probability space), we define the *Stone pairing* $\langle \phi, \mathbf{A} \rangle$ of ϕ and $\mathbf{A}$ as the probability of satisfaction of ϕ in $\mathbf{A}$ for a random assignments of the free variables. Hence if $\mathbf{A}$ is finite (and no specific probability measure is specified on the domain of $\mathbf{A}$) it holds

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{A} \rangle = \frac{|\phi(\mathbf{A})|}{|A|^p}.$$

Generally, if the domain of $\mathbf{A}$ is a probability space (with probability measure $\nu_{\mathbf{A}}$) and $\phi(\mathbf{A})$ is measurable then

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{A} \rangle = \nu_{\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes p}(\phi(\mathbf{A})),$$

where $\nu_{\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes p}$ denotes the product measure on A^p.

For a σ-structure $\mathbf{A}$ we denote by $\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A})$ the graph with vertex set A, such that two (distinct) vertices x and y are adjacent in $\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A})$ if both belong to some relation in $\mathbf{A}$ (that is if $\exists R \in \sigma : \{x, y\} \subseteq R^{\mathbf{A}}$).

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.2. Stone space and representation by probability measures. The term of Stone pairing comes from a functional analysis point of view: Let $S(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$ be the Stone dual of the Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$. Points of $S(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$ are equivalently described as the ultrafilters on $\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$, the homomorphisms from $\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$ to the two-element Boolean algebra, or the maximal consistent sets T of formulas from $\mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$ (point of view we shall make use of here). The space $S(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$ is a compact totally disconnected Polish space, whose topology is generated by its clopen sets

$$k(\phi) = \{T \in S(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma)) : \phi \in T\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite σ-structure (or a σ-structure on a probability space such that every first-order definable set is measurable). Identifying ϕ with the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{k(\phi)}$ of the clopen set $k(\phi)$, the map $\phi \mapsto \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}\rangle$ uniquely extends to a continuous linear form on the space $C(S(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma)))$. By Riesz representation theorem there exists a unique probability measure $\mu_{\mathbf{A}}$ such that for every $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$ it holds

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{A}\rangle = \int_{S(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))} \mathbf{1}_{k(\phi)}\, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathbf{A}}.$$

Note that the permutation group S_ω defines a (subgroup of the) group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{FO})(\sigma)$ (by permuting free variables) and acts naturally on $S(\mathrm{FO}(\sigma))$. The probability measure $\mu_{\mathbf{A}}$ associated to the structure $\mathbf{A}$ is obviously invariant under the S_ω-action.

For more details on this *representation theorem* we refer the reader to [29].

2.3. Structural limits. Let σ be a signature, and let X be a fragment of $\mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$. A sequence $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of σ-structures is *X-convergent* if $\langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle$ converges as n grows to infinity or, equivalently, if the associated probability measures $\mu_{\mathbf{A}_n}$ on $S(X)$ converge weakly [29].

In our setting, the strongest notion of convergence is FO-convergence (corresponding to the full fragment of all first-order formulas). Convergence with respect to the fragment FO_0 (of all sentences, that is of all formulas without any free variables) is called *elementary convergence*. Existence of *elementary limits* that are (at most) countable σ-structures when the signature σ is (at most) countable follows from Gödel compactness and completeness theorems and downward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem. Convergence with respect to the fragment QF^- (of all quantifier-free formulas without equality) is equivalent to the *left convergence* introduced by Lovász et al. [5, 6, 22]. (It is also equivalent to convergence with respect to the fragment QF of all quantifier-free formulas, provided that the sizes of the structures in the sequence tend to infinity.) For bounded degree graphs, convergence with respect to the fragment $\mathrm{FO}_1^{\mathrm{local}}$ of local formulas with a single free variable is equivalent to the *local convergence* introduced by Benjamini and Schramm [3]. (Recall that a formula is *local* if its satisfaction only depends on a fixed neighborhood of its free variables.) Also, in this case, local convergence is equivalent to convergence with respect to the fragment $\mathrm{FO}^{\mathrm{local}}$ of all local formulas, provided that the sizes of the structures in the sequence tend to infinity. For a discussion on the different notions of convergence arising from different choices of the considered fragment of first-order logic, we refer the interested reader to [29, 32, 35]. An important consequence of Gaifman locality theorem [13] is that a sequence of

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

σ-structures is FO-convergent if and only if it is both elementary convergent and $\mathrm{FO}^{\mathrm{local}}$-convergent [29].

Note that the equivalence of X-convergence with the weak convergence of the probability measures on $S(X)$ associated to the finite structures in the sequence is stated in [29] as a representation theorem, which generalizes both the representation of the left limit of a sequence of graphs by an infinite random exchangeable graph [2] and the representation of the local limit of a sequence of graphs with bounded degree by an unimodular distribution on the space of rooted connected countable graphs [3].

2.4. Nonstandard limit structures. A construction of a nonstandard limit object for FO-convergent sequences has been proposed in [29], which closely follows Elek and Szegedy construction for left limits of hypergraphs [10]. One proceeds as follows:

Let $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of finite σ-structures and let U be a nonprincipal ultrafilter. Let $\widetilde{A} = \prod_{i\in\mathbb{N}} A_i$ and let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation on $\widetilde{A}$ defined by $(x_n) \sim (y_n)$ if $\{n : x_n = y_n\} \in U$. Then the *ultraproduct* of the structures $\mathbf{A}_n$ is the structure $\mathbf{L} = \prod_U \mathbf{A}_i$, whose domain L is the quotient of $\widetilde{A}$ by $\sim$, and such that for each relational symbol R it holds is defined by

$$([v^1], \dots, [v^p]) \in R^{\mathbf{L}} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \{n : (v_n^1, \dots, v_n^p) \in R^{\mathbf{A}_n}\} \in U.$$

As proved by Łoś [20], for each formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_p)$ and each $v^1, \dots, v^p \in \prod_n A_n$ we have

$$\prod_U \mathbf{A}_i \models \phi([v^1], \dots, [v^p]) \quad \text{iff} \quad \{i : \mathbf{A}_i \models \phi(v_i^1, \dots, v_i^p)\} \in U.$$

In [29] a probability measure ν is constructed from the normalised counting measures ν_i of A_i via the Loeb measure construction, and it is proved that every first-order definable set of the ultraproduct is measurable. The ultraproduct is then a limit object for the sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. In particular, for every first-order formula ϕ with p free variables it holds:

$$\langle \phi, \prod_U \mathbf{A}_i \rangle = \int \cdots \int \mathbf{1}_\phi([x_1], \dots, [x_p])\, \mathrm{d}\nu([x_1]) \dots \mathrm{d}\nu([x_p]) = \lim_U \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_i \rangle.$$

Moreover, the above integral is invariant by any permutation on the order of the integrations.

However, the constructed object is difficult to handle. In particular, the sigma-algebra constructed on $\prod_U \mathbf{A}_n$ is not separable. For a discussion we refer the reader to [8, 10]. However the ultraproduct construction is used in the proof of Lemma 3.1 to prove consistency of some theories in Friedman's Q_m logic (see Section 2.6).

2.5. Modelings. By similarity with *graphings*, which are limit objects for local convergent sequences of graphs with bounded degrees [9], the authors proposed the term of *modeling* for a structure $\mathbf{A}$ built on a standard Borel space A, endowed with a probability measure $\nu_{\mathbf{A}}$, and such that every first-order definable set is Borel [35]. Such structures naturally avoid pathological behaviours (for instance, every definable set is either finite, countable, or has the cardinality of continuum). The definition of Stone pairing obviously extends to modeling by setting

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{A} \rangle = \nu^{\otimes p}(\phi(\mathbf{A})). \tag{1}$$

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

An X-convergent sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has *modeling X-limit* $\mathbf{L}$ (or simply *modeling limit* $\mathbf{L}$ when $X = \mathrm{FO}$) if $\mathbf{L}$ is a modeling such that for every $\phi \in X$ it holds

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{L}\rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle.$$

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of structures. We say that $\mathcal{C}$ *admits modeling limits* if every FO-convergent sequence of structures $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathbf{A}_n \in \mathcal{C}$ has a modeling limit.

Note that not every FO-convergent sequence has a modeling limit: Consider a sequence $(G_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of graphs, where G_n is a graph of order n, with edges drawn randomly (independently) with edge probability $0 < p < 1$. Then with probability 1 the sequence $(G_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is FO-convergent. However, this sequence has no modeling limit, and even no modeling QF^--limit: Assume for contradiction that $(G_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has a modeling QF-limit $\mathbf{L}$. Because $\langle x_1 = x_2, G_n\rangle = 1/n \to 0$ the probability measure $\nu_{\mathbf{L}}$ is atomless thus L is uncountable. As L is a standard Borel space, there exists zero-measure sets $N \subset L$ and $N' \subset [0,1]$, and a bijective measure preserving map $f : L\setminus N \to [0,1]\setminus N'$. By the equivalence of QF^--convergence and left-convergence the modeling $\mathbf{L}$ defines a $\{0,1\}$-valued graphon $W : [0,1]\times[0,1] \to [0,1]$, which is a left limit of $(G_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ by:

$$W(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x, y \notin N' \text{ and } \mathbf{L} \models f^{-1}(x) \sim f^{-1}(y), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

But a left limit of $(G_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the constant graphon p, which is not weakly equivalent to W (as it should, according to [4]) thus we are led to a contradiction.

This example is prototypal, and this allows us to prove that if a monotone class of graphs admits modeling limits then this class has to be nowhere dense [35]. The proof involves the characterization of nowhere dense classes by the model theoretical notions of stability and independence property [1], their relation to VC-dimension [18], and the characterization of sequences of graphs admitting a *random-free* (i.e., almost everywhere $\{0,1\}$-valued) left limit graphon [23]. Conjecture 1.2 asserts that the converse is true as well: nowhere dense classes admit modeling limits.

2.6. H. Friedman's Q_m-logic. Friedman [11, 12] studied a logical system where the language is enriched by the quantifier "there exists x in a nonzero-measure set ...", for which he studied axiomatizations, completeness, decidability, etc. A survey including all these results was written by Steinhorn [37, 38]. In particular, H. Friedman considered specific type of models, which he calls *totally Borel*, which are (almost) equivalent to our notion of modeling: A *totally Borel structure* is a structure whose domain is a standard Borel space (endowed with implicit Borel measure) with the property that every first-order definable set (with parameters) is measurable.

In this context, Friedman introduced a new quantifier Q_m, which is to be understood as expressing "there exists nonmeasure 0 many", and initiated the study of the extension $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$ of first-order logic, whose axioms are all the usual axiom schema for first-order logic together with the following ones [38]:

M_0 $\neg(Q_m x)(x = y)$;

M_1 $(Q_m x)\Psi(x,\dots) \leftrightarrow (Q_m y)\Psi(y,\dots)$, where $\Psi(x,\dots)$ is an $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$-formula in which y does not occur and $\Psi(y,\dots)$ is the result of replacing each free occurrence of x by y;

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M_2 $(Q_m x)(\Phi \vee \Psi) \to (Q_m x)\Phi \vee (Q_m x)\Psi$;
M_3 $[(Q_m x)\Phi \wedge (\forall x)(\Phi \to \Psi)] \to (Q_m x)\Psi$;
M_4 $(Q_m x)(Q_m y)\Phi \to (Q_m y)(Q_m x)\Phi$.

The rules of inference for $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$ are the same as for first-order logic: *modus ponens* and generalization. Let the proof system just described be denoted by $\mathcal{K}_m$.

The standard semantic for Q_m is as follows: for a structure $\mathbf{M}$ on a probability space such that every first-order definable (with parameters) is measurable (for probability measure λ) it holds

$$\mathbf{M} \models Q_m x\ \phi(x, \overline{a}) \quad \iff \quad \lambda(\{x : \mathbf{M} \models \phi(x, \overline{a})\}) > 0.$$

Note that the set of $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$-sentences satisfied by $\mathbf{M}$ (for this semantic) is obviously consistent in $\mathcal{K}_m$.

The following completeness theorem has been proved by Friedman [11] (see also [38]):

THEOREM 2.1. *A set of sentences T in $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$ has a totally Borel model if and only if T is consistent in $\mathcal{K}_m$.*

It has been noted that one can require the domain of the totally Borel model to be a Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}$ with Lebesgue measure 1.

§3. Modeling FO_1-limits. Let $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an FO-convergent sequence of finite structures, and let $T(\mathbf{A})$ be the union of a complete theory of an elementary limit of $\mathbf{A}$ together with, for each first-order formula ϕ with free variables $x_1, \ldots, x_p$,

$$\text{either} \qquad (Q_m x_1) \ldots (Q_m x_p)\ \phi, \qquad \text{if } \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle > 0;$$
$$\text{or} \qquad \neg\big((Q_m x_1) \ldots (Q_m x_p)\ \phi\big), \qquad \text{if } \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle = 0.$$

The ultraproduct construction provides a model for $T(\mathbf{A})$:

LEMMA 3.1. *For every FO-convergent sequence $\mathbf{A}$ of finite structures, the theory $T(\mathbf{A})$ is consistent in $\mathcal{K}_m$.*

PROOF. Using the standard semantic for Q_m it is immediate that any ultraproduct $\prod_U \mathbf{A}_i$ is a model for $T(\mathbf{A})$ hence $T(\mathbf{A})$ is consistent in $\mathcal{K}_m$. ⊣

THEOREM 3.2. *For every FO-convergent sequence $\mathbf{A}$ of finite structures, there exists a modeling $\mathbf{M}$ whose domain M is a Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}$, and such that*:

1. *the probability measure $\nu_{\mathbf{M}}$ associated to $\mathbf{M}$ is uniformly continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure λ*;
2. *$\mathbf{M}$ is a modeling FO_1-limit of $\mathbf{A}$*;
3. *for every $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}$ it holds*

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{M} \rangle = 0 \quad \iff \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle = 0.$$

PROOF. According to Lemma 3.1 the theory $T(\mathbf{A})$ is consistent in $\mathcal{K}_m$. Hence, according to Theorem 2.1, $T(\mathbf{A})$ has a totally Borel model $\mathbf{L}$. (Furthermore, we may assume that L is a Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}$ with Lebesgue measure 1.)

For every integer k, there exists an integer $N(k)$ and formulas $\theta_1^k, \ldots, \theta_{N(k)}^k$ (with a single free variable) defining the local 1-types up to quantifier rank k in the following sense: the formulas θ_i^k are local, they have quantifier rank k, they induce

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a partition (formalized as $\theta_i^k \vdash \neg\theta_j^k$ if $i \neq j$ and $\vdash \bigvee_i \theta_i^k$), and for every local formula $\phi(x)$ with quantifier rank k and for every $1 \leq i \leq N(k)$ either it holds $\theta_i^k \vdash \phi$, or $\theta_i^k \vdash \neg\phi$.

Define $I_k = \{i : \lambda(\theta_i^k(\mathbf{L})) > 0\}$. Define the probability measure π_k on L as follows: for every Borel subset X of L define

$$\pi_k(X) = \sum_{i \in I_k} \frac{\lambda(X \cap \theta_i^k(\mathbf{L}))}{\lambda(\theta_i^k(\mathbf{L}))} \cdot \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \theta_i^k, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle. \qquad (*)$$

Obviously π_k weakly converges to some probability measure π. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be the modeling obtained by endowing $\mathbf{L}$ with the probability measure $\nu_{\mathbf{M}} = \pi$. (Thus $\phi(\mathbf{M}) = \phi(\mathbf{L})$ holds for every $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}$.) Note that $\nu_{\mathbf{M}}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to λ by construction. It follows that for every integer p the product measure $\nu_{\mathbf{M}}^{\otimes p}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the product measure $\lambda^{\otimes p}$. Hence Property (1) holds.

According to Gaifman locality theorem [13] every first-order formula in FO_1 can be expressed as a Boolean combination of sentences and local formulas with one free variable. It follows (see also [29]) that in order to prove that $\mathbf{M}$ is a modeling FO_1-limit of $\mathbf{A}$ it is sufficient to prove that it is both an elementary limit of $\mathbf{A}$ and an $\mathrm{FO}_1^{\mathrm{local}}$-limit of $\mathbf{A}$. As the complete (first-order) theory of the elementary limit of $\mathbf{A}$ is included in $T(\mathbf{A})$ the modeling $\mathbf{M}$ is an elementary limit of $\mathbf{A}$ by construction. According to $(*)$, for every integers i, k (with $i \leq N(k)$) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \theta_i^k, \mathbf{M} \rangle &= \nu_{\mathbf{M}}(\theta_i^k(\mathbf{M})) \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \pi_j(\theta_i^k(\mathbf{M})) \\ &= \pi_k(\theta_i^k(\mathbf{L})) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \theta_i^k, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

As every formula in $\mathrm{FO}_1^{\mathrm{local}}$ can be expressed as a Boolean combination of formulas θ_i^k it follows that $\mathbf{A}$ is $\mathrm{FO}_1^{\mathrm{local}}$-convergent to $\mathbf{M}$. As $\mathbf{M}$ is both an elementary limit and an $\mathrm{FO}_1^{\mathrm{local}}$-limit of $\mathbf{A}$ it is an FO_1-limit of $\mathbf{A}$. This proves property (2).

Now consider a formula $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}$ with free variables $x_1, \ldots, x_p$. The property $\langle \phi, \mathbf{M} \rangle = 0$ is equivalent, by construction, to the property that $\lambda(\phi(\mathbf{L})) = 0$. This, in turn, is equivalent to $\neg\big((Q_m x_1) \ldots (Q_m x_p)\, \phi\big) \in T(\mathbf{A})$ (as $\mathbf{L}$ is a model of $T(\mathbf{A})$) thus (by construction) to $\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle = 0$. Hence Property (3) follows. ⊣

Theorem 3.2 immediately implies

Corollary 3.3. *Every* FO_1*-convergent sequence has a modeling* FO_1*-limit.*

§4. Modeling limits of residual sequences. We know that in general an FO-convergent sequence does not have a modeling limit (hence Corollary 3.3 does not extend to full FO). We will see that this nicely relates to sparse–dense dichotomy.

Recall that a class $\mathcal{C}$ of (finite) graphs is *nowhere dense* if, for every integer k, there exists an integer $n(k)$ such that the k-th subdivision of the complete graph $K_{n(k)}$ on $n(k)$ vertices is the subgraph of no graph in $\mathcal{C}$ [27, 30]. (Note a subgraph needs not to be induced.) Based on a characterization by Lovász and Szegedy [23] or

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

random-free graphon and a characterization of nowhere-dense classes in terms of VC-dimension (Adler and Adler [1] and Laskowski [18]) the authors derived in [35] the following necessary condition for a monotone class $\mathcal{C}$ to have modeling limits.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a monotone class of graphs. If every FO-convergent of graphs from $\mathcal{C}$ has a modeling limit then the class $\mathcal{C}$ is nowhere dense.*

However, there is a particular case where a modeling limit for an FO-convergent sequence will easily follow from Theorem 3.2. That will be done next.

DEFINITION 4.2. A sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is *residual* if, for every integer d it holds

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{v_n\in A_n} \frac{|B_d(\mathbf{A}_n, v_n)|}{|A_n|} = 0,$$

where $B_d(\mathbf{A}_n, v_n)$ denotes the set of elements of A_n at distance at most d from v_n (in the Gaifman graph of $\mathbf{A}_n$). Equivalently, $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is residual if, for every integer d, it holds

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \mathrm{dist}(x_1, x_2) \leq d, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle = 0.$$

The notion of residual sequence is linked to the one of residual modeling: A *residual modeling* is a modeling, all components of which have zero measure (that is if and only if for every integer d, every ball of radius d has zero measure).

It was proved in [32, Corollary 3] that a residual FO-convergent sequence admits a modeling FO-limit if and only if it admits a modeling $\mathrm{FO}_1^{\mathrm{local}}$-limit. A direct consequence of Theorem 3.2 is thus a positive answer to Conjecture 1.1:

COROLLARY 4.3. *Every* FO*-convergent residual sequence has a modeling limit.*

§5. Modeling limits of quasiresidual sequences. Here we prove our main result in the form of a generalization of Section 4 for quasiresidual sequences. The motivation for the introduction of the definition of quasiresidual sequences is the following:

Known constructions of modeling limits for some nowhere dense classes with unbounded degrees [14, 32, 35] are based on the construction of a countable "skeleton" on which residual parts are grafted. We shall use the same idea here for the general case. The identification of a countable skeleton will use the following characterization of nowhere dense classes proved in [33]:

THEOREM 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of graphs. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is nowhere dense if and only if for every integer d and every $\epsilon > 0$ there is an integer $N = N(d, \epsilon)$ with the following property: for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$, and every subset A of vertices of G, there is $S \subseteq A$ with $|S| \leq N$ such that no ball of radius d in $G[A \setminus S]$ has order greater than $\epsilon |A|$.*

This theorem justifies the introduction of the following relaxation of the notion of residual sequence:

DEFINITION 5.2. A sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (with $|A_n| \to \infty$) is *quasiresidual* if, for every integer d and every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an integer N such that it holds

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \inf_{S_n\in\binom{A_n}{N}} \sup_{v_n\in A_n\setminus S_n} \frac{|B_d(\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A}_n)\setminus S_n, v_n)|}{|A_n|} < \epsilon.$$

In other words, $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is quasiresidual if, for every distance d and every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an integer N so that (for sufficiently large n) one can remove at most N

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vertices in the Gaifman graph of $\mathbf{A}_n$ so that no ball of radius d will contain at least ϵ proportion of A_n.

The next result directly follows from Theorem 5.1.

COROLLARY 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a nowhere dense class of graphs and let $(G_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequences of graphs from $\mathcal{C}$ such that $|G_n| \to \infty$. Then $(G_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is quasiresidual.*

5.1. (d,ϵ)-residual sequences. We now consider a relaxation of the notion of residual sequence and show how this allows to partially reduce the problem of finding modeling FO-limits to finding modeling FO_1-limits.

DEFINITION 5.4. Let d be an integer and let ϵ be a positive real. A sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is (d,ϵ)-*residual* if it holds

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{v_n\in A_n} \frac{|B_d(\mathbf{A}_n, v_n)|}{|A_n|} < \epsilon.$$

Similarly, a modeling $\mathbf{M}$ is (d,ϵ)-*residual* if it holds

$$\sup_{v\in M} \nu_{\mathbf{M}}(B_d(\mathbf{M}, v)) < \epsilon.$$

LEMMA 5.5. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\epsilon > 0$ be a positive real. Assume $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a* FO*-convergent $(2d,\epsilon)$-residual sequence of graphs and assume $\mathbf{L}$ is a $(2d,\epsilon)$-residual modeling FO_1-limit of $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.*

Then for every d-local formula ϕ with p free variables it holds

$$|\langle\phi, \mathbf{L}\rangle - \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle\phi, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle| < p^2\epsilon.$$

PROOF. By restricting the signature to the symbols in ϕ if necessary, we can assume that the signature σ is finite. Let q be the quantifier rank of ϕ. Then there exists finitely many local formula $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_N$ with quantifier rank at most q (expressing the rank q d-local type) such that:

- every element of every model satisfies exactly one of the ξ_i (formally, $\vdash \bigvee \xi_i$ and $\vdash (\xi_i \to \neg\xi_j)$ if $i \neq j$);
- two elements x and y satisfies the same local first-order formulas of quantifier rank at most q if and only if they satisfy the same ξ_i.

Let $\zeta(x_1, \ldots, x_p)$ be the formula $\bigwedge_{1\le i<j\le p} \mathrm{d}_{>2d}(x_i, x_j)$. By d-locality of ϕ there exists a subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq [N]^p$ such that

$$\zeta \vdash \Big[\phi \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{(i_1,\ldots,i_p)\in\mathcal{X}} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{p} \xi_{i_j}(x_j)\Big].$$

Let $\widetilde{\phi} = \bigvee_{(i_1,\ldots,i_p)\in\mathcal{X}} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{p} \xi_{i_j}(x_j)$. For every structure $\mathbf{A}$ it holds

$$\langle\widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{A}\rangle = \sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_p)\in\mathcal{X}} \prod_{j=1}^{p} \langle\xi_{i_j}, \mathbf{A}\rangle.$$

As $\mathbf{L}$ is a modeling FO_1-limit of $\mathbf{A}_n$ it holds $\langle\xi_{i_j}, \mathbf{L}\rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\xi_{i_j}, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle$, hence

$$\langle\widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{L}\rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle\widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle.$$

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On the other hand, as $\zeta \vdash (\phi \leftrightarrow \widetilde{\phi})$, for every structure $\mathbf{A}$ holds

$$|\langle \phi, \mathbf{A}\rangle - \langle \widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{A}\rangle| \leq \langle \neg\zeta, \mathbf{A}\rangle \leq \binom{p}{2}\langle \mathrm{d}_{\leq 2d}, \mathbf{A}\rangle.$$

Note that $\langle \mathrm{d}_{\leq 2d}, \mathbf{A}\rangle$ is nothing but the expected measure of a ball of radius $2d$ in $\mathbf{A}$. In particular, if $\mathbf{A}$ is $(2d, \epsilon)$-residual, then it holds $|\langle \phi, \mathbf{A}\rangle - \langle \widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{A}\rangle| < \epsilon$. Thus,

$$|\langle \phi, \mathbf{L}\rangle - \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle| < p^2\epsilon. \qquad \dashv$$

5.2. Marked quasiresidual sequences. To allow an effective use of the properties of quasiresidual sequences, we use a (lifted) variant of the notion of quasiresidual sequence.

Let σ be a countable signature and let σ^+ be the signature obtained by adding to σ countably many unary symbols $\{M_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{Z_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$.

For integers d, i we define the formulas $\delta_{d,i}$ and $\hat{\delta}_d$ as

$$\delta_{d,i}(x_1) := (\exists z)\ \mathrm{d}_{\leq d}(x_1, z) \wedge M_i(z), \tag{2}$$

$$\hat{\delta}_d(x_1) := (\exists z)\ \mathrm{d}_{\leq d}(x_1, z) \wedge Z_d(z). \tag{3}$$

In other words, $\delta_{d,i}(x)$ holds if x belongs to the ball of radius d centered at the element marked M_i, and $\hat{\delta}_d(x)$ holds if x belongs to the d-neighborhood of elements marked by Z_d.

Definition 5.6. A sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n^+)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (with $|A_n^+| \to \infty$) of σ^+-structures is a *marked quasiresidual* sequence if the following condition holds:

- For every integers i, n it holds $|M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+)| \leq 1$ (i.e., at most one element in $\mathbf{A}_n^+$ is marked by M_i);
- For every distinct integers i, j and every integer n, no element of $\mathbf{A}_n^+$ is marked both M_i and M_j;
- For every integer d there is a nondecreasing unbounded function $F_d : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with the property that for every integer n it holds

$$Z_d(\mathbf{A}_n^+) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{F_d(n)} M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+); \tag{4}$$

- For every integer d and every positive real $\epsilon > 0$ there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{v_n \in A_n^+ \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+)} \frac{|B_d(\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A}_n^+) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+), v_n)|}{|A_n^+|} < \epsilon. \tag{5}$$

(In other words, every ball of radius d in $\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A}_n^+) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+)$ contains less than ϵ proportion of all the vertices, as soon as n is sufficiently large.)
- For every integer d the following limit equality holds:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \hat{\delta}_d, \mathbf{A}_n^+\rangle = \lim_{m\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \bigwedge_{i=1}^m \delta_{d,m}, \mathbf{A}_n^+\rangle. \tag{6}$$

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The main purpose of this admittedly technical definition is to allow to make use of the sets S_n arising in the definition of quasiresidual sequences by first-order formula, by means of the marks M_i. The role of the marks Z_d is to allow a kind of limit exchange. (Note that $\delta_{d,i}(\mathbf{A}^+)$ is nothing but the ball of radius d of $\mathbf{A}^+$ centered at the element marked by M_i.)

LEMMA 5.7. *For every quasiresidual sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of σ-structures there exists an* FO*-convergent marked quasiresidual sequence $(\mathbf{B}_n^+)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of σ-structures such that $(\mathrm{Forget}(\mathbf{B}_n^+))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a subsequence of $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where* Forget *stands for the operation of "forgetting" labels M_i and Z_d.*

PROOF. Let σ' be the signature obtained by adding to σ countably many unary symbols $\{M_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the σ'-structure $\mathbf{A}'_n$ has the σ'-structure obtained from $\mathbf{A}_n$ by defining marks M_i are assigned in such a way that for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that letting $S_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} M_i(\mathbf{A}'_n)$ it holds

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{v_n\in A'_n\setminus S_n} \frac{|B_d(\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A}'_n)\setminus S_n, v_n)|}{|A'_n|} < \epsilon.$$

This is obviously possible, thanks to the definition of a quasiresidual sequence.

Considering an FO-convergent subsequence we may assume that $(\mathbf{A}'_n)$ is FO-convergent.

For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the constant

$$\alpha_d = \lim_{m\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \bigvee_{i=1}^{m} \delta_{d,i}, \mathbf{A}'_n\rangle.$$

(Note that the values $\lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\bigvee_{i=1}^{m}\delta_{d,i}, \mathbf{A}'_n\rangle$ exist as $(\mathbf{A}'_n)$ is FO-convergent and that they form, for increasing m, a nondecreasing sequence bounded by 1.)

Then for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a nondecreasing function $F_d : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lim F_d(n) = \infty$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \bigvee_{i=1}^{F(n)} \delta_{d,i}, \mathbf{A}'_n\rangle = \alpha_d.$$

Then we define $\mathbf{A}_n^+$ to be the sequence obtained from $\mathbf{A}'_n$ by marking by Z_d all the elements in $\bigcup_{i=1}^{F_d(n)} M_i(\mathbf{A}'_n)$. Now we let $(\mathbf{B}_n^+)$ to be a converging subsequence of $(\mathbf{A}_n^+)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. ⊣

Let ζ_d be the formula asserting that the ball of radius d centered at x_1 contains x_2 but no element marked Z_d, that is

$$\zeta_d := \mathrm{d}_{\le d}(x_1, x_2) \wedge (\forall z)(\mathrm{d}_{\le d}(x_1, z) \to \neg Z_d(z)).$$

LEMMA 5.8. *Let $(\mathbf{A}_n^+)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a marked quasiresidual sequence. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \zeta_d, \mathbf{A}_n^+\rangle = 0.$$

PROOF. Assume for contradiction that $a = \lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\zeta_d, \mathbf{A}_n^+\rangle$ is strictly positive.

According to the definition of a marked quasiresidual sequence, there exists an integer m such that no ball of radius d in $\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A}_n^+) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+)$ contains more than $(a/2)|A_n|$ elements. Let n_0 be such that $F_d(n_0) \ge m$, and let $n_1 \ge n_0$ be such that $\langle\zeta_d, \mathbf{A}_n^+\rangle > a/2$ holds for every $n \ge n_1$.

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Then there exists v such that the ball of radius d centered at v contains no element marked Z_d (hence no element marked $M_1, \ldots, M_m$) and contains more than $(a/2)|A_n|$ elements, what contradicts the fact that this ball is a ball of radius d in $\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A}_n^+) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+)$. ⊣

In general, a modeling FO_1-limit of a (d,ϵ)-residual sequence does not need to be (d',ϵ')-residual. However, if we consider a sequence that is also marked quasiresidual, and if we assume that the modeling FO_1-limit satisfies the additional properties asserted by Theorem 3.2 then we can conclude that the modeling is $(d/4,\epsilon)$-residual, as proved in the next lemma.

LEMMA 5.9. *Let $(\mathbf{A}_n^*)$ be a marked residual $(4d,\epsilon)$-residual sequence and let $\mathbf{L}^*$ be a modeling with the properties asserted by Theorem* 3.2 *then $\mathbf{L}^*$ is (d,ϵ)-residual.*

PROOF. We first prove that the set Υ of vertices $v \in L^*$ such that the ball of radius $2d$ centered at v has measure greater than ϵ has zero measure. According to Lemma 5.8, it holds $\lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\zeta_{2d}, \mathbf{A}_n^*\rangle = 0$ hence $\langle\zeta_{2d}, \mathbf{L}^*\rangle = 0$. This implies that the set V of x_1 such that the ball of radius $2d$ centered at x_1 contains no element marked Z_{2d} and has measure at least ϵ has zero measure. Hence we only have to consider vertices v in the $2d$-neighborhood of $Z_{2d}(\mathbf{L}^*)$. Let

$$\alpha_{2d} = \lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\bigvee_{i=1}^{m}\delta_{2d,i}, \mathbf{A}_n*\rangle.$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists $m(k)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\bigvee_{i=1}^{m(k)}\delta_{2d,i}, \mathbf{A}_n^*\rangle > \alpha_{2d} - 1/k, \tag{7}$$

which means that at least $\alpha_{2d} - 1/k$ proportion of $\mathbf{L}^*$ is at distance at most $2d$ from elements marked $M_1, \ldots, M_{m(k)}$.

However, according to (6), and as $\mathbf{L}^*$ is a modeling FO_1-limit of $(\mathbf{A}_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ it holds

$$\alpha_{2d} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\hat{\delta}_{2d}, \mathbf{A}_n^*\rangle = \langle\hat{\delta}_{2d}, \mathbf{L}^*\rangle,$$

which means that a α_{2d} proportion of $\mathbf{L}^*$ is at distance at most $2d$ from elements marked Z_{2d} (which include elements marked $M_1, \ldots, M_{m(k)}$). Thus the set N_k of vertices in the $2d$-neighborhood of $Z_{2d}(\mathbf{L}^+)$ but not in the $2d$-neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{m(k)} M_i(\mathbf{L}^*)$ has measure at most $1/k$.

Let v be in the $2d$-neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{m(k)} M_i(\mathbf{L}^*)$. Then the ball of radius $2d$ centered at v is included in the ball of radius $4d$ centered at a vertex marked M_i, for some $i \leq m(k)$. But this ball has measure $\langle\delta_{4d,i}, \mathbf{L}^*\rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty}\langle\delta_{4d,i}, \mathbf{A}_n^*\rangle$. As the sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n^+)$ is $(4d,\epsilon)$-residual, it holds $\langle\delta_{4d,i}, \mathbf{A}_n^*\rangle < \epsilon$ for sufficiently large n. Hence the ball of $\mathbf{L}^*$ of radius $2d$ centered at v (which is included in the ball of radius $4d$ centered at the vertex marked M_i) has measure less than ϵ.

It follows that the set Υ (of the vertices v such that the ball of radius $2d$ centered at v has measure at least ϵ) is included in $V \cup \bigcap_k N_k$ hence has zero measure.

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now assume for contradiction that there exists a vertex v such that the ball B of radius d centered at v has measure at least ϵ. Then for every $w \in B$ the ball of radius $2d$ centered at v has measure at least ϵ, which contradicts the fact that the set Υ has zero measure. ⊣

5.3. Color coding and mark elimination. We now consider how to turn a marked quasiresidual into a (d, ϵ)-residual marked quasiresidual sequence.

The idea here is to encode each relation R with arity $k > 1$ with $m^k - 1$ relations plus a sentence. The sentence expresses the behaviour of R when restricted to elements marked $M_1, \dots, M_m$. The $m^k - 1$ relations expresses which tuples of nonmarked elements can be extended (and how) with elements marked $M_1, \dots, M_m$ to form a k-tuple of R.

As above, let σ^+ be a countable signature with unary relations M_i and Z_i. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

We define the signature σ^{*m} as the signature obtained from σ^+ by adding, for each symbol $R \in \sigma$ with arity $k > 1$ the relation symbols $N^R_{I,f}$ of arity $k - |I|$, where $\emptyset \neq I \subsetneq [k]$ and $f : I \to [m]$.

Let $\mathbf{A}^+$ be a σ^+-structure.

We define the structure $\mathrm{Encode}_m(\mathbf{A}^+)$ as the σ^{*m}-structure $\mathbf{A}^*$, which has same domain as $\mathbf{A}^+$, same unary relations, and such that for every symbol $R \in \sigma^+$ with arity $k > 1$, for every $\emptyset \neq I \subsetneq [k]$ and $f : I \to [m]$, denoting $i_1 < \cdots < i_\ell$ the elements of $[k] \setminus I$ and $i_{\ell+1}, \dots, i_k$ the elements of I, it holds

$$\mathbf{A}^* \models N^R_{I,f}(v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_\ell})$$
$$\iff \mathbf{A}^+ \models \bigwedge_{j=1}^{\ell} \bigwedge_{r=1}^{m} \neg M_r(v_{i_j}) \wedge \Big[(\exists v_{i_{\ell+1}}, \dots, v_{i_k})\big(R(v_1, \dots, v_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=\ell+1}^{k} M_{f(i_j)}(v_{i_j})\big)\Big]$$

and

$$\mathbf{A}^* \models R(v_1, \dots, v_k)$$
$$\iff \mathbf{A}^+ \models R(v_1, \dots, v_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} \neg M_j(v_i).$$

Note that the Gaifman graph of $\mathbf{A}^*$ can be obtained from the Gaifman graph of $\mathbf{A}^+$ by removing all edges incident to a vertex marked $M_1, \dots, M_m$.

We now explicit how the relation R in $\mathbf{A}^+$ can be retrieved from $\mathbf{A}^*$.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R \in \sigma$ with arity $k > 1$, and $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq [m]^k$ let $\eta^{\mathcal{Z},m}_R(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ be defined as follows:

$$\eta^{\mathcal{Z},m}_R := \bigvee_{(i_1,\dots,i_k)\in\mathcal{Z}} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} M_{i_j}(x_i) \vee \Big[R(x_1, \dots, x_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} \neg M_j(x_i)\Big]$$
$$\vee \bigvee_{\emptyset\neq I\subseteq[k]} \bigvee_{f:I\to[m]} \Big[N_{I,f}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_\ell}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in I} M_{f(i)}(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k]\setminus II} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} \neg M_j(x_i)\Big]$$

and let $\varsigma^{\mathcal{Z}}_R$ be the following sentence, which expresses that $\mathcal{Z}$ encodes the set of all the tuples of elements marked $M_1, \dots, M_m$ in R.

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$\varsigma_R^{\mathcal{Z}} := \Big[\bigwedge_{(i_1,\dots,i_k)\in\mathcal{Z}} (\exists x_1,\dots,x_k)\big(R(x_1,\dots,x_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} (M_{i_j}(x_i))\big)\Big]$$
$$\wedge \neg\Big[\bigvee_{(i_1,\dots,i_k)\in[m]^k\setminus\mathcal{Z}} (\exists x_1,\dots,x_k)\big(R(x_1,\dots,x_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} (M_{i_j}(x_i))\big)\Big].$$

The following lemma sums up the main properties of our construction.

LEMMA 5.10. *Let $\mathbf{A}^+$ be a σ^+-structure, and let $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathrm{Encode}_m(\mathbf{A}^+)$. Let $R \in \sigma$ be a relation symbol with arity $k > 1$. Then*

- *there exists a unique subset $\mathcal{Z}$ of $[m]^k$ such that $\mathbf{A}^+ \models \varsigma_R^{\mathcal{Z}}$*
- *for this $\mathcal{Z}$ and for every $v_1,\dots,v_k \in A^+$ it holds*

$$\mathbf{A}^+ \models R(v_1,\dots,v_k) \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{A}^* \models \eta_R^{\mathcal{Z},m}(v_1,\dots,v_k).$$

PROOF. This lemma straightforwardly follows from the above definitions. ⊣

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed.

An *elimination theory* is a set T_m containing, for each $R \in \sigma$ with arity $k > 1$, exactly one sentence $\varsigma_R^{\mathcal{Z}}$ (for some $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq [m]^k$). For a σ^+-structure $\mathbf{A}^+$, the *elimination theory of* $\mathbf{A}^+$ is the set of all sentences $\varsigma_R^{\mathcal{Z}}$ satisfied by $\mathbf{A}^+$.

For a formula $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$, we define the *elimination formula* $\widehat{\phi}$ of ϕ with respect to an elimination theory T_m as the formula obtained from ϕ by replacing each occurence of relation symbol R with arity $k > 1$ by the formula $\eta_R^{\mathcal{Z},m}$, where $\mathcal{Z}$ is the unique subset of $[m]^k$ such that $\varsigma_R^{\mathcal{Z}} \in T_m$.

It directly follows from Lemma 5.10 that if $\mathbf{A}^+$ is a σ^+-structure which satisfies all sentences in an elimination theory T_m, then for every formula $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$, denoting $\widehat{\phi}$ the elimination formula of ϕ with respect to T_m it holds

$$\mathrm{Encode}_m(\mathbf{A}^+) \models \widehat{\phi}(v_1,\dots,v_p) \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{A}^+ \models \phi(v_1,\dots,v_p). \tag{8}$$

5.4. Modeling limits of quasiresidual sequences. Let us recall Gaifman locality theorem.

THEOREM 5.11 ([13]). *Every first-order formula $\psi(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ is equivalent to a Boolean combination of t-local formulae $\chi(x_{i_1},\dots,x_{i_s})$ and basic local sentences of the form*

$$\exists y_1 \dots y_m \Big(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{m} \phi(y_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{1\le i<j\le m} \mathrm{d}_{>2r}(y_i,y_j)\Big)$$

where ϕ is r-local. Furthermore $r \le 7^{\mathrm{qr}(\psi)-1}$, $t \le 7^{\mathrm{qr}(\psi)-1}/2$, $m \le n + \mathrm{qr}(\psi)$, and, if ψ is a sentence, only basic local sentences occur in the Boolean combination.

From this theorem we deduce:

LEMMA 5.12. *Let $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an elementary convergent sequence of σ-structures. Then for every formula $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$ with quantifier rank q there exists a $7^{q-1}/2$-local formula $\widetilde{\phi}$ and an integer n_0 such that for every $n \ge n_0$ it holds $\phi(\mathbf{A}_n) = \widetilde{\phi}(\mathbf{A}_n)$.*

PROOF. According to Theorem 5.11 ϕ is equivalent to a Boolean combination of sentences and $7^{q-1}/2$-local formulas. Putting it in disjunctive normal form and considering all Boolean combinations of the sentences, we get that ϕ is equivalent to

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$\bigvee_{i=1}^{N} \theta_i \wedge \psi_i$, for some sentences $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N$ and $7^{q-1}/2$-local formulas $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N$, with the additional property that in every model exactly one of the sentences θ_i is satisfied. (Formally we require $\vdash \bigvee_i \theta_i$ and $\vdash (\theta_i \to \neg\theta_j)$ for $i \neq j$.) As $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is elementary convergent, there exists $1 \leq a \leq N$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{A}_n \models \theta_a$ for every $n \geq n_0$. Let $\widetilde{\phi} = \psi_a$. Then the result follows from $\theta_a \vdash (\phi \leftrightarrow \psi_a)$. ⊣

We can now prove our main result, which directly implies Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2.

THEOREM 5.13. *Every quasiresidual FO-convergent sequence has a modeling limit.*

PROOF. Let $(A_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an FO-convergent quasiresidual sequence. According to Lemma 5.7, up to considering a subsequence, there exists an FO-convergent marked quasiresidual sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n^+)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of σ-structures such that $\mathrm{Forget}(\mathbf{A}_n^+) = \mathbf{A}_n$.

Let $\mathbf{L}^+$ be a modeling with properties asserted by Theorem 3.2, and let $\mathbf{L} = \mathrm{Forget}(\mathbf{L}^+)$. Our aim is to prove that $\mathbf{L}$ is a modeling limit of the sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Let $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$ be a formula with quantifier rank q and p free variables, and let $\epsilon > 0$ be a positive real.

Let $d = 7^{q-1}/2$ and let m and n_0 be integers such that for every $n \geq n_0$ no ball of radius $8d$ in $\mathrm{Gaifman}(\mathbf{A}_n) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} M_i(\mathbf{A}_n^+)$ contains at least $(\epsilon/p^2)|A_n|$ vertices.

Let $\mathbf{A}_n^* = \mathrm{Encode}_m(\mathbf{A}_n^+)$. Each relation of $\mathbf{A}_n^*$ being defined by a fixed formula from relations of $\mathbf{A}_n^+$, the sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is FO-convergent and $\mathbf{L}^* = \mathrm{Encode}_m(\mathbf{L}^+)$ is a modeling FO_1-limit of $(\mathbf{A}_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying additional properties asserted by Theorem 3.2.

Let T_m be the elimination theory of $\mathbf{L}^+$ (as defined above). As $\mathbf{L}^+$ is an FO_1-limit (hence an elementary limit) of $(\mathbf{A}_n^+)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ there exists $n_1 \geq n_0$ such that for every symbol $R \in \sigma$ with arity $k > 1$ used in ϕ, if $\varsigma_R^{\mathbb{Z}} \in T_m$ then $\mathbf{A}_n^+ \models \varsigma_R^{\mathbb{Z}}$ holds for every $n \geq n_1$. Let $\widehat{\phi}$ be the elimination formula of ϕ with respect to T_m. Note that $\widehat{\phi}$ has also quantifier rank at most q. According to Lemma 5.10, for every $n \geq n_1$ it holds $\widehat{\phi}(\mathbf{A}_n^*) = \phi(\mathbf{A}_n^+)$. Thus, as $\phi(\mathbf{A}_n^+) = \phi(\mathbf{A}_n)$ (as ϕ only uses symbols in σ) it holds

$$\forall n \geq n_1 \qquad \langle \widehat{\phi}, \mathbf{A}_n^* \rangle = \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle. \tag{9}$$

As $\mathbf{L}^*$ satisfies T_m we get

$$\langle \widehat{\phi}, \mathbf{L}^* \rangle = \langle \phi, \mathbf{L} \rangle. \tag{10}$$

Note that by our choice of m the sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n^*)$ is $(8d, \epsilon/p^2)$-residual hence by Lemma 5.9 the modeling $\mathbf{L}^*$ is $(2d, \epsilon/p^2)$-residual.

According to Lemma 5.12 there exists a d-local formula $\widetilde{\phi}$ and an integer $n_2 \geq n_1$ such that for every $n \geq n_2$ it holds $\widehat{\phi}(\mathbf{A}_n^*) = \widetilde{\phi}(\mathbf{A}_n^*)$ hence

$$\forall n \geq n_2 \qquad \langle \widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{A}_n^* \rangle = \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n \rangle. \tag{11}$$

As $\mathbf{L}^*$ is elementary limit of $(\mathbf{A}_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ it similarly holds

$$\langle \widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{L}^* \rangle = \langle \phi, \mathbf{L} \rangle. \tag{12}$$

According to Lemma 5.5 (as $\widetilde{\phi}$ is d-local, $(\mathbf{A}_n^*)$ is $(8d, \epsilon/p^2)$-residual and $\mathbf{L}^*$ is $(2d, \epsilon/p^2)$-residual) it holds

$$|\langle \widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{L}^* \rangle - \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \widetilde{\phi}, \mathbf{A}_n^* \rangle| < \epsilon.$$

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hence by (11) and (12) it holds

$$|\langle \phi, \mathbf{L}\rangle - \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle| < \epsilon. \tag{13}$$

As (13) holds for every $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\langle \phi, \mathbf{L}\rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \phi, \mathbf{A}_n\rangle.$$

As this holds for every formula $\phi \in \mathrm{FO}(\sigma)$, we conclude that $\mathbf{L}$ is a modeling limit of $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. ⊣

From Theorem 5.1 it follows that any FO-convergent sequence of graphs from a nowhere dense class is quasiresidual thus from Theorem 5.13 directly follows a proof of Conjecture 1.2. (Recall that the reverse direction was proved in [35].)

COROLLARY 5.14. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a monotone class of graphs. Then $\mathcal{C}$ has modeling limits if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is nowhere dense.*

§6. Further comments.

6.1. Approximation. Let A and B be measurable subsets of the domain L of the modeling limit of an FO-convergent sequence $(\mathbf{A}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of finite structures. Assume that every element in A has at least b neighbours in B and every element in B has at most a neighbours in A.

The *strong finitary mass transport principle* asserts that in such a case it should hold

$$b\, v_{\mathbf{L}}(A) \le a\, v_{\mathbf{L}}(B). \tag{14}$$

It is easily checked that if both A and B are first-order definable (without parameters) then (14) holds: let $A = \phi(\mathbf{L})$ and $B = \psi(\mathbf{L})$. Define

$$\phi'(x) := \phi(x) \wedge (\exists y_1 \dots y_b) \bigwedge_{i=1}^{b} \Big((y_i \sim x) \wedge \psi(y_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i<j\le b} (y_i \neq y_j) \Big),$$

$$\psi'(x) := \psi(x) \wedge \neg(\exists y_1 \dots y_{a+1}) \bigwedge_{i=1}^{a+1} \Big((y_i \sim x) \wedge \phi(y_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i<j\le a+1} (y_i \neq y_j) \Big).$$

Then $v_{\mathbf{L}}(A) = v_{\mathbf{L}}(\phi'(\mathbf{L}))$ and $v_{\mathbf{L}}(B) = v_{\mathbf{L}}(\psi'(\mathbf{L}))$. As $b\,\langle \phi', \mathbf{A}_n\rangle \le a\,\langle \psi', \mathbf{A}_n\rangle$ holds for every integer n (as $\mathbf{A}_n$ is finite), by continuity we deduce $b\, v_{\mathbf{L}}(A) \le a\, v_{\mathbf{L}}(B)$.

However, it is not clear whether an FO-convergent sequence of graphs from a nowhere dense class has a modeling limit that satisfies the strong finitary mass transport principle. This can be formulated as

CONJECTURE 6.1. *One can require a version of the strong mass transport principle.*

6.2. Characterization. In this context, it is natural to propose the following generalization of Aldous-Lyons conjecture.

CONJECTURE 6.2. *Let $\mathbf{L}$ be a modeling such that*:

- *the theory of $\mathbf{L}$ has the finite model property.*

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- *every interpretation of* $\mathbf{L}$ *satisfies the finitary mass transport principle. Precisely, for every first-order formulas* α, β, γ *such that*

$$\alpha(x) \vdash (\exists y_1 \dots y_b) \bigwedge_{i=1}^{b} \Big(\gamma(y_i, x) \wedge \beta(y_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i<j\le b} (y_i \neq y_j) \Big),$$

$$\beta(x) \vdash \neg(\exists y_1 \dots y_{a+1}) \bigwedge_{i=1}^{a+1} \Big(\gamma(x, y_i) \wedge \alpha(y_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i<j\le a+1} (y_i \neq y_j) \Big)$$

it holds

$$b\,\langle \alpha, \mathbf{L} \rangle \le a\,\langle \beta, \mathbf{L} \rangle.$$

- *for every integer* d *there is an integer* N *such that* $\mathbf{L}$ *does not contain the* d*-th subdivision of* K_N.

Then $\mathbf{L}$ *is the FO-limit of a sequence of finite graphs.*

Note that there may be weaker versions of the finitary mass transport principle nontrivially equivalent for it. See for instance what happens with mappings [36].

Note that the last condition implies that there exists no integer d such that $\mathbf{L}$ includes the d-subdivision of $K_{\aleph_0, 2^{\aleph_0}}$, thus $\mathbf{L}$ has a countable skeleton, that is there are $s_1, \dots, s_n, \dots \in L$ such that for every integer d and every $\epsilon > 0$ there is N with the property

$$\sup_{v \in L \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_N\}} \nu_{\mathbf{L}}(B_d(\mathbf{L} - \{s_1, \dots, s_N\}, v)) \le \epsilon.$$

6.3. $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$-theory of modelings.

CONJECTURE 6.3. *For a modeling* $\mathbf{A}$*, the knowledge of all* $\langle \phi, \mathbf{A} \rangle$ *(for first-order formulas* ϕ*) is sufficient to deduce the complete* $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$*-theory of* $\mathbf{A}$.

As a support for Conjecture 6.3 consider the following $\mathcal{L}(Q_m)$ sentences (where ϕ is a first-order formula):

$$\Phi: \quad (\exists y)\,(Q_m x)\,\phi(x, y),$$
$$\Psi: \quad (\forall y)\,(Q_m x)\,\phi(x, y).$$

Then it is easily checked that

$$\mathbf{M} \models \Phi \iff \langle (\exists y)\,\phi(x_1, y) \wedge \phi(x_2, y), \mathbf{M} \rangle > 0,$$
$$\mathbf{M} \models \Psi \iff \lim_{k\to\infty} \langle (\exists y)\,\neg\phi(x_1, y) \vee \dots \vee \neg\phi(x_k, y), \mathbf{M} \rangle^{1/k} = 0.$$

Acknowledgments. Supported by grant ERCCZ LL-1201 and CE-ITI P202/12/G061, and by the European Associated Laboratory "Structures in Combinatorics" (LEA STRUCO). Supported by grant ERCCZ LL-1201 and by the European Associated Laboratory "Structures in Combinatorics" (LEA STRUCO).

REFERENCES

[1] H. ADLER and I. ADLER, *Interpreting nowhere dense graph classes as a classical notion of model theory*. ***European Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 36 (2014), pp. 322–330.

[2] D. ALDOUS, *Representations for partially exchangeable arrays of random variables*. ***Journal of Multivariate Analysis***, vol. 11 (1981), pp. 581–598.

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[3] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm, *Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs*. ***Electronic Journal of Probability***, vol. 6 (2001), no. 23, p. 13.

[4] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, and L Lovász, *Moments of two-variable functions and the uniqueness of graph limits*. ***Geometric and Functional Analysis***, vol. 19 (2012), no. 6, pp. 1597–1619.

[5] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. T. Sós, B. Szegedy, and K. Vesztergombi, *Graph limits and parameter testing*, ***Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing***, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, 2006, pp. 261–270.

[6] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. T. Sós, and K. Vesztergombi, *Counting graph homomorphisms*, ***Topics in Discrete Mathematics*** (M. Klazar, J. Kratochvíl, M. Loebl, J. Matoušek, R. Thomas, and P. Valtr, editors), Algorithms and Combinatorics, vol. 26, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2006, pp. 315–371.

[7] ———, *Convergent sequences of dense graphs I*: *Subgraph frequencies, metric properties and testing*. ***Advances in Mathematics***, vol. 219 (2008), no. 6, pp. 1801–1851.

[8] C. T. Conley, A. S. Kechris, and R. D. Tucker-Drob, *Ultraproducts of measure preserving actions and graph combinatorics*. ***Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems***, vol. 33 (2012), no. 2, pp. 334–374.

[9] G. Elek, *Note on limits of finite graphs*. ***Combinatorica***, vol. 27 (2007), pp. 503–507.

[10] G. Elek and B. Szegedy, *Limits of hypergraphs, removal and regularity lemmas. A nonstandard approach*, 2007, arXiv:0705.2179v1 [math.CO].

[11] H. M. Friedman, *Addendum to on the logic of measure and category I*, Ohio State University, manuscript, 1979.

[12] ———, *Borel structures and mathematics*, manuscript, 1979.

[13] H. Gaifman, *On local and nonlocal properties*, ***Proceedings of the Herbrand Symposium, Logic Colloquium '81*** (J. Stern, editor), Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 107, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1982, pp. 105–135.

[14] J. Gajarský, P. Hliněný, T. Kaiser, D. Kráľ, M. Kupec, J. Obdržálek, S. Ordyniak, and V. Tůma, *First-order limits of sparse graphs*: *Plane trees and path-width*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1504.08122v1, 2015.

[15] M. Grohe, S. Kreutzer, and S. Siebertz, *Deciding first-order properties of nowhere dense graphs*, ***Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing,*** Association for Computing Machinery, New York, 2014, pp. 89–98.

[16] D. Hoover, *Relations on probability spaces and arrays of random variables*, Technical report, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ, 1979.

[17] F. Kardoš, D. Kráľ, A. Liebenau, and L. Mach, *First-order convergence of matroids*, 2015, arXiv:1501.06518v1 [math.CO].

[18] M. C. Laskowski, *Vapnik-Chervonenkis classes of definable sets*. ***The Journal of the London Mathematical Society***, vol. 45 (1992), no. 2, pp. 377–384.

[19] H. Leitgeb, *Probability in logic*, ***The Oxford Handbook of Probability and Philosophy*** (A. Hájek and C. Hitchcock, editors), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2016, pp. 681–704.

[20] J. Łoś, *Quelques remarques, théorèmes et problèmes sur les classes définissables d'algèbres*, ***Mathematical Interpretation of Formal Systems*** (L. E. J. Brouwer, E. W. Beth, and A. Heyting, editors), Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1955, pp. 98–113.

[21] L. Lovász, ***Large Networks and Graph Limits***, Colloquium Publications, vol. 60, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.

[22] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy, *Limits of dense graph sequences*. ***Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B***, vol. 96 (2006), pp. 933–957.

[23] ———, *Regularity partitions and the topology of graphons*, ***An Irregular Mind*** (***Szemerédi is 70***) (I. Bárány and J. Solymosi, editors), Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies, vol. 21, Springer, Berlin, 2010, pp. 415–446.

[24] J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez, *Grad and classes with bounded expansion I. Decompositions*. ***European Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 29 (2008), no. 3, pp. 760–776.

[25] ———, *Grad and classes with bounded expansion II. Algorithmic aspects*. ***European Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 29 (2008), no. 3, pp. 777–791.

[26] ———, *Grad and classes with bounded expansion III. Restricted graph homomorphism dualities*. ***European Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 29 (2008), no. 4, pp. 1012–1024.

[27] ———, *First-order properties on nowhere dense structures*, this Journal, vol. 75 (2010), no. 3, pp. 868–887.

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[28] ———, *On nowhere dense graphs*. ***European Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 32 (2011), no. 4, pp. 600–617.

[29] ———, *A model theory approach to structural limits*. ***Commentationes Mathematicæ Universitatis Carolinæ***, vol. 53 (2012), no. 4, pp. 581–603.

[30] ———, ***Sparsity* (*graphs, structures, and algorithms*)**, Algorithms and Combinatorics, vol. 28, Springer, Berlin, 2012, p. 465.

[31] ———, *First-order limits, an analytical perspective*. ***European Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 52 Part B (2016), pp. 368–388. Recent Advances in Graphs and Analysis (special issue).

[32] ———, *Modeling limits in hereditary classes*: *Reduction and application to trees*. ***Electronic Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 23 (2016), no. 2, p. #P2.52.

[33] ———, *Structural sparsity*. ***Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk***, vol. 71 (2016), no. 1, pp. 85–116. (***Russian Mathematical Surveys***, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 79–107).

[34] ———, *Limits of mappings*. ***European Journal of Combinatorics***, vol. 66 (2017), pp. 145–159. Selected papers of EuroComb15 (special issue).

[35] ———, ***A Unified Approach to Structural Limits (With Application to the Study of Limits of Graphs with Bounded Tree-Depth)***, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, to appear.

[36] ———, *Approximation of mappings*. ***Building Bridges II***, 2018, submitted.

[37] C. Steinhorn, *Borel structures for first-order and extended logics*, ***Harvey Friedman's Research on the Foundations of Mathematics*** (A. Sčědrov, L. A. Harrington, M. D. Morley, and S. G. Simpson, editors), Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 117, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1985, pp. 161–178.

[38] ———, *Chapter XVI Borel structures and measure and category logics*, ***Model-Theoretic Logics*** (J. Barwise and S. Feferman, editors), Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, vol. 8, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985, pp. 579–596.

COMPUTER SCIENCE INSTITUTE OF CHARLES UNIVERSITY (IUUK AND ITI)
MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁM.25, 11800 PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC
E-mail: nesetril@iuuk.mff.cuni.cz

CENTRE D'ANALYSE ET DE MATHÉMATIQUES SOCIALES (CNRS, UMR 8557)
190-198 AVENUE DE FRANCE, 75013 PARIS, FRANCE
and
COMPUTER SCIENCE INSTITUTE OF CHARLES UNIVERSITY (IUUK)
MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁM.25, 11800 PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC
E-mail: pom@ehess.fr

RETRACTED

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2018.32 Published online by Cambridge University Press