

AN O-MINIMAL SZEMERÉDI-TROTTER THEOREM

SAUGATA BASU AND ORIT E. RAZ

ABSTRACT. We prove an analog of the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem in the plane for definable curves and points in any o-minimal structure over an arbitrary real closed field \mathbb{R} . One new ingredient in the proof is an extension of the well known crossing number inequality for graphs to the case of embeddings in any o-minimal structure over an arbitrary real closed field.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Szemerédi-Trotter theorem [23] on incidences between lines and points in \mathbb{R}^2 is one of the first non-trivial results in quantitative incidence theory and is considered a foundational result in discrete geometry and extremal combinatorics. The statement of the theorem is as follows.

Theorem 1. [23] *There exists a constant $C > 0$, such that given any finite set Γ of lines in \mathbb{R}^2 , and a finite set Π of points in \mathbb{R}^2 ,*

$$\text{card}(\{(p, \gamma) | p \in \Pi, \gamma \in \Gamma, p \in \gamma\}) \leq C \cdot (\text{card}(\Gamma))^{2/3} \cdot \text{card}(\Pi) + \text{card}(\Gamma) + \text{card}(\Pi).$$

Theorem 1 has been generalized later in many different ways – to algebraic curves instead of lines [15, 21], incidences between points and algebraic hypersurfaces in higher dimensions [27, 19, 5], replacing \mathbb{R} by \mathbb{C} [24, 28] etc.

It was shown in [3], that many quantitative results in the theory of arrangements of semi-algebraic sets of “constant description complexity” could be generalized to the setting where the objects in the arrangements are not necessarily semi-algebraic sets of constant description complexity, but rather are restricted to be the fibers of some fixed definable map in any o-minimal structure over a real closed field \mathbb{R} . (We refer the reader to [25, 8] for the definition and basic results on o-minimal structures.) More recently, o-minimal generalizations of results in combinatorial geometry have become a very active topic of research [7] (see also the survey article [18, §6]).

Recently, Fox et al. [10, Theorem 1.1] obtained a very far reaching generalization of Theorem 1, by extending it to the case of semi-algebraic curves of fixed description complexity. It is thus a natural question if incidence results, such as the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem, and its various generalizations can also be extended to the more general setting of o-minimal geometry. In this paper we prove the following o-minimal generalization of the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem in the plane.

Part of this research was performed while the authors were visiting the Institute for Pure and Applied Mathematics (IPAM), which is supported by the National Science Foundation. The first author was partially supported by NSF grants CCF-1618981 and DMS-1620271. The second author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1128155.

1.1. Main Result. For the rest of the paper we fix an o-minimal structure over a real closed field \mathbb{R} .

We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let V be a definable subset of $E_1 \times E_2$, where, for $i = 1, 2$, E_i is a definable set of dimension at most two. Then one of the following holds.*

(i) *There exists a constant $C > 0$, which depends on V, E_1, E_2 , such that for every finite subsets $P \subset E_1, Q \subset E_2$,*

$$\text{card}(V \cap (P \times Q)) \leq C \cdot (\text{card}(P)^{2/3} \cdot \text{card}(Q)^{2/3} + \text{card}(P) + \text{card}(Q)).$$

(ii) *There exist definable subsets $\alpha \subset E_1$ and $\beta \subset E_2$, with $\dim(\alpha), \dim(\beta) \geq 1$, such that*

$$\alpha \times \beta \subset V.$$

Theorem 3 will be an immediate consequence of the following simpler version.

Let $E = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $F = E \times E$, and $\pi_1, \pi_2 : F \rightarrow E$, and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, be the canonical projections. For definable subsets $P, Q \subset E$, there is a (definable) canonical injection $P \times Q \rightarrow F$, and we will slightly abuse notation and consider $P \times Q$ to be a (definable) subset of F .

Theorem 3. *Let $V \subset F$ be a definable subset of F . Then one of the following holds.*

(i) *There exists a constant $C_V > 0$, such that for every finite subsets $P, Q \subset E$,*

$$\text{card}(V \cap (P \times Q)) \leq C_V \cdot (\text{card}(P)^{2/3} \cdot \text{card}(Q)^{2/3} + \text{card}(P) + \text{card}(Q)).$$

(ii) *There exist definable subsets $\alpha, \beta \subset E$, $\dim(\alpha), \dim(\beta) \geq 1$, such that*

$$\alpha \times \beta \subset V.$$

Remark 1. Simultaneously with our paper Chernikov, Galvin and Starchenko [6] also announced a similar result. Their result is more general than ours (it applies to general distal structures), but the techniques behind their proof are quite different.

Remark 2. Note that in case property (ii) holds, then for any finite $P \subset \alpha, Q \subset \beta$ we have $\text{card}(V \cap (P \times Q)) = \text{card}(P) \cdot \text{card}(Q)$.

Remark 3. Note also that in case the fibers of $\pi_1|_V, \pi_2|_V$ are of dimension at most one, each point in $(p, q) \in V \cap (P \times Q)$ corresponds to an ‘‘incidence’’ of the point p with the definable curve $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(q) \cap V)$. This is the sense in which Theorem 3 can be thought of as an o-minimal version of Theorem 1. Also notice that the statement of Theorem 3 is symmetric with respect to the sets P, Q .

Remark 4. The formulation of Theorem 3 is inspired by the main results and the proofs in [14, 16, 17]. In these papers one is interested in a bound on the cardinality of a set of the form $V \cap (P \times Q)$, where $V \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ is an algebraic variety of fixed degree, and each of P, Q is a finite subset of \mathbb{R}^2 (of arbitrarily large cardinality). This problem is then interpreted as an incidence problem between points and curve in \mathbb{R}^2 . As in Theorem 3, there exists exceptional varieties for which only a trivial upper bound on the number of incidences can hold, and these exceptional cases are identified (see Lemma 10 below).

Remark 5. (Tightness). Since the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem is known to be tight, the bound in property (i) in Theorem 3 cannot be improved. As noted previously,

Chernikov, Galvin and Starchenko [6] have also considered the problem of proving incidences between points and definable curves where the definable curves come from a definable family of some fixed $d \geq 2$, and have proved a generalization of Theorem 3 using the technique of “cuttings”. It is likely that the method used in this paper can also be extended to this general situation. However, the bound in [6] for definable families of dimension $d > 2$ is not believed to be sharp (see for example [20, Theorem 1.3]), and we do not attempt to prove this more general result in this paper.

We first derive Theorem 2 from Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 2. For each $i = 1, 2$, suppose that $E_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ and consider a cylindrical definable cell decomposition of \mathbb{R}^{d_i} adapted to E_i . Note that each cell of the decomposition is at most two-dimensional, by our assumption on E_1, E_2 .

For each cell $C \subset E_1$ (resp., $D \subset E_2$) of the decomposition there exists a definable homeomorphism $\theta_C : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\dim(C)}$ (resp., $\varphi_D : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\dim(D)}$). Let $f_{C,D} = \theta_C \times \varphi_D : C \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\dim(C)} \times \mathbb{R}^{\dim(D)}$ be the homeomorphism induced by θ_C and φ_D . Applying Theorem 3 to the sets

$$\tilde{V} := f_{C,D}(V \cap (C \times D)) \subset \mathbb{R}^{\dim(C)} \times \mathbb{R}^{\dim(D)},$$

$\tilde{P} := \theta_C(C \cap P)$, and $\tilde{Q} := \varphi_D(D \cap Q)$, and using the invertability of $f_{C,D}$, we conclude that either there exist definable $\alpha \subset E_1$, $\beta \subset E_2$ of dimension at least one, such that $\alpha \times \beta \subset V$, in which case we are done, or

$$\text{card}(V \cap (C \times D) \cap (P \times Q)) \leq C_{\tilde{V}} \cdot (\text{card}(P)^{2/3} \cdot \text{card}(Q)^{2/3} + \text{card}(P) + \text{card}(Q)).$$

Repeating the argument to each pair of cells C, D , and recalling that the number of cells is finite, this completes the proof of the theorem. \square

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.

1.2. Outline of the proof of Theorem 3. There are two main approaches to recent proofs of the classical Szemerédi-Trotter theorem in the plane. The first approach uses the well known technique of efficient partitioning the plane (using either the notion of cutting [13] or the newer method of polynomial partitioning [11]) adapted to the given set of points, and then using a divide-and-conquer argument. The technique of polynomial partitioning is as yet not available over o-minimal structures, and the “cutting lemma” argument while feasible to generalize to o-minimal structures is technically complicated (this is the approach taken in [6]). The second method, that we adapt in this paper, is due to Székely [22] who used an argument based on the “crossing number inequality” for abstract graphs due to Ajtai et al [1] and independently Leighton [12]. The definition of the “crossing number” of a graph needs to be adapted to the o-minimal setting.

We define the *definable crossing number* of graphs (Definition 2), in terms of *definable embeddings* of graphs in \mathbb{R}^2 (Definition 1), and prove the definable analog of the Euler relation for definable embeddings of planar graphs (Lemma 7). The proofs of some of the lemmas use the existence of a good (co)-homology theory for general o-minimal structures [26], and in particular we use the o-minimal version of Alexander-Lefschetz duality theorem in \mathbb{R}^2 by Edmundo and Woerheide [9].

The analog of the crossing number inequality in this definable setting (Lemma 8) then follows from Euler’s relation, using a now-standard probabilistic argument introduced first in [2, p. 285].

Using the crossing number inequality we then prove (see Lemma 1), following Székely's argument [22], that given a finite set of points and a finite set of definable curves belonging to a fixed definable family, satisfying a certain combinatorial condition on incidences (namely, that their incidence graph does not contain a $K_{2,k}$ or a $K_{k,2}$ (where $K_{s,t}$ denotes the complete bi-partite graph with the two vertex sets of cardinalities s and t respectively) for some fixed k), also satisfies the Szemerédi-Trotter bound (with the constant depending on k).

Finally, in Section 3 we establish the dichotomy in Theorem 3 via Lemmas 1, 9, and 10. This proof of the key Lemma 10 uses ideas introduced in [16] for treating the algebraic case. Theorem 3 then follows immediately from these lemmas.

2. INCIDENCE BOUND FOR DEFINABLE PSEUDO-LINES

We have the following bound for incidences between points and definable pseudo-lines in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Lemma 1. *Let $V \subset F$ be as in Theorem 3, and $k > 0$. There exists a constant $C_{V,k}$, depending only on V and the parameter k , with the following property. For every set Π of m points in \mathbb{R}^2 , and a set Γ of n definable curves in \mathbb{R}^2 , where each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is of the form $\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(q) \cap V)$ for some $q \in \mathbb{R}^2$, such that:*

- (a) *Every pair of distinct $p, p' \in \Pi$ belongs to at most k curves of Γ , and*
- (b) *Every pair of distinct $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma$ intersect in at most k points,*

we have

$$I(\Pi, \Gamma) := \text{card}(\{(p, \gamma) \mid p \in \Pi, \gamma \in \Gamma, p \in \gamma\}) \leq C_{V,k} \cdot (m^{2/3}n^{2/3} + m + n).$$

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Lemma 1. In order to prove Lemma 1 we need to use the crossing number inequality (see Lemma 8 below). The proof of this lemma for topological embeddings of graphs in \mathbb{R}^2 is quite well-known and applies in the definable context as well (for $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}$). Hence, if one is only interested in the case $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}$, one can skip the much of the rest of this section and proceed directly to the proof of Lemma 1.

We begin with a basic result that we will use from algebraic topology over arbitrary o-minimal structures.

2.1. Preliminaries from o-minimal algebraic topology. Singular homology and cohomology groups for definable sets of arbitrary o-minimal structures have been defined by Woerheide [26]. This homology theory obeys the standard axioms of Eilenberg and Steenrod. In particular, there exist exact sequences for pairs and so on. We will use the following result which is an immediate consequence of Alexander-Lefschetz duality for definable manifolds obtained by Edmundo and Woerheide [9].

Proposition 1. *Let A be a closed and bounded definable subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . Then, the number of definably connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus A$ equals $1 + \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} H^1(A, \mathbb{Q})$.*

Proof. It follows from the Alexander-Lefschetz duality theorem for definable manifolds [9, Theorem 3.5] that there is an isomorphism,

$$(2.1) \quad H^1(A, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}).$$

It follows now from (2.1) and the reduced homology exact sequence of the pair $(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2 - A)$, namely,

$$\cdots 0 \cong \tilde{H}_1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_0(\mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_0(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{Q}) \cong 0 \cdots,$$

that

$$\tilde{H}_1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}) \cong \tilde{H}_0(\mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}).$$

Since A is assumed to be bounded and hence not equal to \mathbb{R}^2 ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \tilde{H}_0(\mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}) = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} H_0(\mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q}) - 1,$$

and $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} H_0(\mathbb{R}^2 - A, \mathbb{Q})$ equals the number of definably connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 - A$. \square

We next introduce some standard notation and definitions from graph theory but adapted to the o-minimal context.

2.2. Graph-theoretic notation and definition.

Notation 1. A *simple graph* G is a pair $(V(G), E(G))$ where $V(G)$ is a finite nonempty set and $E(G)$ is a set of subsets of $V(G)$, each of cardinality 2. We refer the elements of $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ as *vertices* and *edges*, respectively. A *path* in G is a sequence (w_1, \dots, w_r) of elements of $V(G)$, such that $\{w_i, w_{i+1}\} \in E(G)$, for every $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$. A *cycle* in G is a path (w_1, \dots, w_r) such that $w_1 = w_r$. We say that G is *connected*, if for every $u \neq v \in V(G)$ there exists a path (w_1, \dots, w_r) in G such that $w_1 = u$ and $w_r = v$.

Definition 1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph. A *definable embedding*, ϕ_G , of G in \mathbb{R}^2 consists of

- (A) A finite subset $V_{\phi_G} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, each of whose elements is labeled by a unique element of V (abusing notation we will denote each element of V_{ϕ_G} by its label);
- (B) For each edge $e = \{v, v'\} \in E$, a continuous definable embedding $\phi_e : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, satisfying $\{\phi_e(0), \phi_e(1)\} = \{v, v'\}$ and $\phi_e(t) \notin V_{\phi_G}$, for every $t \in (0, 1)$. We denote by η_e the image of ϕ_e in \mathbb{R}^2 , and by $\hat{\eta}_e$ the image of $\phi_e|_{(0,1)}$. We denote by E_{ϕ_G} the set $\cup_{e \in E} \{\eta_e\}$.

For a definable embedding ϕ_G , we will denote by $\text{Im}(\phi_G)$ the closed and bounded definable set $(\bigcup_{e \in E} \eta_e) \cup V_{\phi_G}$. We denote by F_{ϕ_G} the set of definably connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_G)$, and refer to an element of F_{ϕ_G} as a *face* of the embedding.

Definition 2. Given a definable embedding ϕ_G of G in \mathbb{R}^2 , we define the set

$$EC(\phi_G) = \{(e, e') \in E(G)^2 \mid e \neq e' \text{ and } \hat{\eta}_e \cap \hat{\eta}_{e'} \neq \emptyset\}$$

We define the *crossing number*, $\text{cr}(G)$, of G by

$$\text{cr}(G) = \min_{\phi_G} \text{card}(EC(\phi_G)),$$

where the min is taken over all definable embeddings of G . Clearly, $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) \leq (\text{card}(E(G)))^2$, for any embedding ϕ_G of G , and hence $\text{cr}(G)$ is finite.

If $\text{cr}(G) = 0$ we call G *definably planar*.

We are now in a position to prove the o-minimal version of the crossing number inequality. We begin with some basic results.

Lemma 2. *Let G be a simple connected graph. Assume that G is definably planar and let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$. Let $\eta \in E_{\phi_G}$ and $f \in F_{\phi_G}$. If $\mathring{\eta} \cap \text{clos}(f) \neq \emptyset$, then $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f)$.*

Proof. For contradiction, assume that $\mathring{\eta} \cap \text{clos}(f) \neq \emptyset$ but $\eta \not\subset \text{clos}(f)$. Clearly, in this case also $\mathring{\eta} \not\subset \text{clos}(f)$.

By definition, η is the image of a definable continuous function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. Then for some $a \in (0, 1)$ we have $\phi(a) \in \mathring{\eta} \cap \text{clos}(f)$ but

$$\phi([a - \varepsilon, a + \varepsilon]) \not\subset \text{clos}(f),$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small. Indeed, by our assumption there exists $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\phi(t_0) \in \text{clos}(f)$.

Then one of the sets $\{t \in (t_0, 1) \mid \phi(t) \notin \text{clos}(f)\}$ or $\{t \in (0, t_0) \mid \phi(t) \notin \text{clos}(f)\}$ is nonempty (otherwise, $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f)$). Suppose without loss of generality that $\{t \in (t_0, 1) \mid \phi(t) \notin \text{clos}(f)\} \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$a := \inf\{t \in (t_0, 1) \mid \phi(t) \notin \text{clos}(f)\}.$$

(and we must have $a \neq 1$).

Put $x_0 := \phi(a)$, and consider a cylindrical definable cell decomposition, \mathcal{D} , of \mathbb{R}^2 , satisfying the frontier condition and adapted to x_0 and $\text{Im}(\phi_G)$ (see [4, Theorem 3.20] for the existence of such a cylindrical definable decomposition).

Consider the cells of \mathcal{D} that contain x_0 in their closure. By the structure of a two-dimensional cylindrical decomposition, we can order these cells (say in a counter-clockwise direction). Let $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_N = \gamma_0$ be the ordered sequence of one-dimensional cells (note that each γ_i is either the graph of a definable continuous function of the first coordinate or a vertical segment). Let s_0, \dots, s_{N-1} be the sector (i.e. two-dimensional) cells, such that $\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1} \subset \text{clos}(s_i)$. Since \mathcal{D} is assumed to be adapted to x_0 and $\text{Im}(\phi_G)$, there exist $i, j, 0 \leq i, j \leq N, i \neq j$, such that for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, $\gamma_i \supset \phi((a - \varepsilon, a))$ and $\gamma_j \supset \phi((a, a + \varepsilon))$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $i = 0$.

Now observe that $\gamma_k \cap \text{Im}(\phi_G) = \emptyset$ for all $k \neq 0, j$. Moreover, if $\gamma_k \cap \text{Im}(\phi_G) = \emptyset$, then the sector cells s_{k-1}, s_k are contained in the same face of ϕ_G . That is, s_0, \dots, s_{j-1} are contained in some $f_0 \in F_{\phi_G}$, and s_j, \dots, s_N are contained in some $f_j \in F_{\phi_G}$ (possibly, $f_0 = f_j$). Finally, one of the sector cells must be contained in f since $x_0 \in \text{clos}(f)$. Thus $f \in \{f_0, f_j\}$. Suppose without loss of generality that $f = f_0$. So all the sector cells s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{j-1} must be contained in f , and this implies that $\gamma_0, \gamma_j \subset \text{clos}(f)$, which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3. *Let G be a simple connected graph. Assume that G is definably planar and let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$. Then every $\eta \in E_{\phi_G}$ is contained in the closure of at most two distinct faces $f, f' \in F_{\phi_G}$.*

Proof. Let $\eta \in E_{\phi_G}$ and let $x_0 = \phi_e(a) \in \mathring{\eta}$.

Let $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{N-1}$ and s_0, \dots, s_{N-1} be as in the proof of Lemma 2. Also without loss of generality assume that $\gamma_0 \supset \phi_e((a - \varepsilon, a))$, and let $1 < j < N$ such that $\gamma_j \supset \phi_e((a, a + \varepsilon))$, for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$.

Then, following the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2, we get that s_0, \dots, s_{j-1} must be contained in the same face of ϕ_G , and s_{j+1}, \dots, s_N must also be contained in the same face of ϕ_G . Now notice that for any $f \in F_{\phi_G}$, $x_0 \in \text{clos}(f)$ implies (using Lemma 2) that $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f)$. It follows that there are at most two faces in F_{ϕ_G} whose closures contain η . \square

Lemma 4. *Let G be a simple connected graph. Assume that G is definably planar and let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$. Assume further that $\text{card}(F_{\phi_G}) \geq 2$. Then there exists $\eta \in E_{\phi_G}$ such that $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f) \cap \text{clos}(f')$ for some distinct $f, f' \in F_{\phi_G}$.*

Proof. Since $\text{card}(F_{\phi_G}) \geq 2$, there exist $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that lie in some distinct faces $f_p, f_q \in F_{\phi_G}$. Since V_{ϕ_G} is a finite set of points, and hence $H^1(V_{\phi_G}, \mathbb{Q}) = 0$, we have using Proposition 1 that $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus V_{\phi_G}$ is definably connected. Consider a definable path $\tau : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus V_{\phi_G}$ such that $\tau(0) = p$ and $\tau(1) = q$. Note that, for every $f \in F_{\phi_G}$, we have $\text{clos}(f) \setminus f \subset \text{Im}(\phi_G)$. Indeed, for $x \in \text{clos}(f) \setminus f$ it follows immediately from the definable curve selection lemma [8, Theorem 2] that $f \cup \{x\}$ is definably connected, and since f is a definably connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_G)$, $x \in \text{Im}(\phi_G)$.

In particular, for p, q as above, we have $q \notin \text{clos}(f_p)$.

Let

$$t_0 := \sup\{t \in [0, 1] \mid \tau(t) \in \text{clos}(f_p)\}.$$

Since $q \notin \text{clos}(f_p)$, we have $t_0 < 1$. So $\tau(t_0) \in \text{clos}(f_p)$ and $\tau(t) \notin \text{clos}(f_p)$, for every $t \in (t_0, 1]$.

By construction, no neighborhood of $\tau(t_0)$ is contained in f_p , and hence necessarily $\tau(t_0) \in \text{clos}(f_p) \setminus f_p$. By our argument above, $\tau(t_0) \in \text{Im}(\phi_G)$. Moreover, since the image of τ avoids vertices in V_{ϕ_G} , we have $\tau(t_0) \in \hat{\eta}$, for some $\eta \in E_{\phi_G}$. By Lemma 2, we get $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f_p)$.

Note that every definable open neighborhood B of $\tau(t_0)$, as it is not contained in f_p , must have a non-empty intersection with $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{clos}(f_p)$, and this intersection is a definable open set. Since $\text{Im}(\phi_G)$ is a one-dimensional definable set, every such neighborhood B necessarily intersects $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\text{clos}(f_p) \cup \text{Im}(\phi_G))$. That is,

$$\tau(t_0) \in \text{clos}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\text{clos}(f_p) \cup \text{Im}(\phi_G))).$$

Since the closure of a definable set is the union of the closures of its definably connected components, it follows that $\tau(t_0)$ is in the closure of some definably connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\text{clos}(f_p) \cup \text{Im}(\phi_G))$.

Note that $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\text{clos}(f) \cup \text{Im}(\phi_G)) = \cup_{f' \in F_{\phi_G} \setminus \{f_p\}} f'$. That is, $\tau(t_0) \in \text{clos}(f')$, for some $f' \in F_{\phi_G} \setminus \{f_p\}$. By Lemma 2, we have $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f')$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5. *Let G be a simple connected graph. Assume that G is definably planar and let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$. If $\text{card}(E(G)) \geq 3$, then, for every face $f \in F_{\phi_G}$, the closure $\text{clos}(f)$ contains at least three edges of G .*

Proof. Fix $f \in F_{\phi_G}$, and put $Z := \text{Im}(\phi_G) \cap \text{clos}(f)$. By Lemma 2, Z is a union of some elements of $E_{\phi_G} \cup V_{\phi_G}$. Let G_f denote the abstract graph that corresponds to the elements composing Z , in the above sense, and let ϕ_{G_f} denote the definable embedding induced by ϕ_G restricted to the elements of G_f .

Observe that necessarily $f \in F_{\phi_{G_f}}$. Indeed, a definable path from a point of f to a point of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\text{Im}(\phi_G) \cup f)$ necessarily intersect $\text{clos}(f) \setminus f$.

Assume first that $\text{card}(F_{\phi_{G_f}}) = 1$, that is, $F_{\phi_{G_f}} = \{f\}$. Then $\text{clos}(f) = \mathbb{R}^2$, and hence f intersects every open subset of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_{G_f})$. Since the intersection is open (and nonempty) and $\text{Im}(\phi_G)$ is one-dimensional, f must have a non-empty

intersection also with $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_G)$. Hence, $\text{card}(F_{\phi_G}) = 1$ and $\text{clos}(f) = \mathbb{R}^2$. In particular, $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f)$, for every $\eta \in E_{\phi_G}$. This completes the proof for this case.

Assume next that $\text{card}(F_{\phi_{G_f}}) \geq 2$. It follows from Lemma 6 that G_f contains a cycle. Hence, $\text{card}(E_{G_f}) \geq 3$. \square

Lemma 6. *If T is a non-empty, connected graph without cycles, then $\text{card}(F_{\phi_T}) = 1$, for any definable embedding ϕ_T .*

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of Definition 1, that $\text{Im}(\phi_T)$ is a definable, closed, bounded and definably contractible subset of \mathbb{R}^2 . Hence, $\mathbb{H}^1(T, \mathbb{Q}) = 0$, and the lemma follows immediately from Proposition 1. \square

We prove an analogue of Euler's formula for definably planar graphs.

Lemma 7 (Euler's formula). *Let G be a simple connected graph. Assume that G is definably planar and let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$. Then*

$$(2.2) \quad \text{card}(V) - \text{card}(E) + \text{card}(F_{\phi_G}) = 2.$$

Proof. We prove by induction on the number of faces $\text{card}(F)$. Let G be as in the statement and let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G , such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$ and $\text{card}(F(\phi_G)) = 1$.

We claim that G has no cycles. Indeed, suppose, for contradiction, that G has a cycle (w_1, \dots, w_r) , and put $e_i := \{w_i, w_{i+1}\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$.

Let $M = \cup_{i=1}^{r-1} \text{Im}(\phi_{e_i})$. Notice that each $\text{Im}(\phi_{e_i})$ is definably homeomorphic to $[0, 1]$, and $\text{Im}(\phi_{e_i}) \cap \text{Im}(\phi_{e_j})$ is empty if $i - j \neq 1, -1 \pmod{r}$, and is a point otherwise. This implies using a standard Mayer-Vietoris argument that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}^i(M, \mathbb{Q}) &\cong \mathbb{Q}, i = 0, 1, \\ &\cong 0, \text{ else.} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 1 now implies that $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus M$ has exactly two definably connected components.

This further implies that $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_G)$ has at least two definably connected components, contradicting our assumption. Thus G is cycle free, as claimed.

Since G is connected, it is necessarily a tree. Hence $\text{card}(E(G)) = \text{card}(V(G)) - 1$, and the identity (2.2) holds for this case. This proves the base case.

Assume that the lemma holds for every simple connected graph H and a definable embedding ϕ_H , with $\text{card}(EC(\phi_H)) = 0$ and $\text{card}(F(\phi_H)) = n$, $n \geq 1$. Let G be a simple connected graph and let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G , such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$ and $\text{card}(F(\phi_G)) = n + 1 \geq 2$.

By Lemma 4, there exist $\eta = \eta_e \in E_{\phi_G}$ and some distinct $f, f' \in F_{\phi_G}$, such that $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f) \cap \text{clos}(f')$. Consider the graph G' , such that $V(G') = V(G)$ and $E(G') = E(G) \setminus \{e\}$. Let $\phi_{G'}$ be the definable embedding that identifies with ϕ_G for all vertices and all edges excluding e . As usual, let $F_{\phi_{G'}}$ denote the set of faces induced by $\phi_{G'}$.

We claim that

$$(2.3) \quad F_{\phi_{G'}} = (F_{\phi_G} \setminus \{f, f'\}) \cup \{f \cup f' \cup \eta\}$$

Note that $U \cup \{x\}$ is definably connected, for every definably connected U and $x \in \text{clos}(U)$ (see the proof of Lemma 4). This implies that $f \cup f' \cup \eta \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_{G'})$ is definably connected.

Recall that a definably connected set is also definably pathwise connected. Consider $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $p \in f_p, q \in f_q$, and $f_p \neq f_q \in F_{\phi_G}$. Assume that $f_p \cup f_q$ is contained in a definably connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_{G'})$.

Let $\tau : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{Im}(\phi_{G'})$ be a definable path such that $\tau(0) = p$ and $\tau(1) = q$. We may assume, without loss of generality, that the image of τ does not intersect any other face of F_{ϕ_G} ; otherwise, replace q with a point of this face, and restrict τ to a subinterval of $[0, 1]$. Then

$$\text{Im}(\tau) \subset f_p \cup f_q \cup \eta^\circ.$$

Moreover, $\text{Im}(\tau)$ necessarily intersects η° in a point x such that $x \in \text{clos}(f_p) \cap \text{clos}(f_q)$. By Lemma 2, $\eta \subset \text{clos}(f_p) \cap \text{clos}(f_q)$. Hence, applying Lemma 3, we necessarily have $\{f_p, f_q\} = \{f, f'\}$. This proves (2.3).

By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\text{card}(V(G')) - \text{card}(E(G')) + \text{card}(F_{\phi_{G'}}) = 2,$$

or

$$\text{card}(V(G)) - (\text{card}(E(G)) - 1) + (\text{card}(F_{\phi_G}) - 1) = 2.$$

This completes the proof. \square

It follows from Lemma 5 and Lemma 7 that, for every connected definably planar graph G , with $\text{card}(V(G)) \geq 4$, we have

$$(2.4) \quad \text{card}(E) \leq 3 \cdot \text{card}(V) - 6.$$

Indeed, let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = 0$. By Lemma 5, the closure of every $f \in F_{\phi_G}$ contains at least three distinct edges in E_{ϕ_G} , and, for every $e \in E$, η_e is contained in the closures of at most two elements of F_{ϕ_G} . Thus, $3 \cdot \text{card}(F_{\phi_G}) \leq 2 \cdot \text{card}(E)$. Combined with Lemma 7, the inequality (2.4) follows.

We conclude with an extension of the crossing number inequality, applicable to definable embeddings of graphs in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Lemma 8 (crossing number inequality). *Let G be a simple connected graph, such that $\text{card}(E(G)) > 4 \cdot \text{card}(V(G))$. Then*

$$(2.5) \quad \text{cr}(G) \geq \frac{\text{card}(E)^3}{64 \cdot \text{card}(V)^2}.$$

The proof of Lemma 8 is now very standard (see for example, [2, p. 285]) using the basic results on embeddings of graphs over general o-minimal structures developed above. We include it in the appendix (Section 4).

Proof of Lemma 1. Let Π, Γ be as in the statement.

There exists a constant $C = C(V)$, such that each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ can be partitioned into a disjoint union of at most C monotone, definable curves and at most C points (see [4] for definition of monotone). Let Γ_γ denote this set of curves. Let $\Gamma' = \cup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \Gamma_\gamma$. By construction,

$$I(\Pi, \Gamma) \leq I(\Pi, \Gamma') + Cn$$

and $\text{card}(\Gamma') \leq Cn$.

Let $\Pi'' \subset \Pi$ be the subset defined by

$$\Pi'' = \{p \in \Pi \mid \text{card}(\{\gamma \in \Gamma' \mid p \in \Gamma'\}) \leq 1\}.$$

Let $\Pi' = \Pi \setminus \Pi''$.

Note that each point in Π'' contributes at most one incidence to our counting, and thus

$$(2.6) \quad I(\Pi, \Gamma) \leq I(\Pi', \Gamma') + m + Cn.$$

We construct a graph $G = (V, E)$ as follows. Every point of Π' corresponds to a vertex of G . Every pair of points $p, q \in \Pi'$ that lie *consecutively* on a curve $\gamma \in \Gamma'$ are connected by an edge in G . Note that a pair of vertices can lie consecutively on more than one curve of Γ' . Nevertheless, such a pair will contribute only one edge to G . Using our assumption (a) we get

$$(2.7) \quad I(\Pi', \Gamma') \leq k \cdot \text{card}(E) + n,$$

where the additive factor n compensates for the at most one incidence that we lose on each curve (a curve incident to r points, contributes exactly $r - 1$ edges to the graph, counting with multiplicity).

Let $G_i = (V_i, E_i)$ denote the connected components of G (i.e. maximal connected induced subgraphs). Recall that each vertex of V corresponds (injectively) to a point of Π' . Let Γ'_i denote the subset of curves $\gamma \in \Gamma'$, such that γ is incident to one of the points that corresponds to a vertex of V_i . Put $m_i := \text{card}(V_i)$ and $N_i := \text{card}(\Gamma'_i)$. Observe that $V = \bigcup_i V_i$, $E = \bigcup_i E_i$, and $\Gamma' = \bigcup_i \Gamma'_i$ are disjoint unions, and hence

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_i m_i = m, \quad \text{card}(E) = \sum_i \text{card}(E_i), \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i N_i = \text{card}(\Gamma') \leq Cn.$$

Let i be fixed. Note that property (b) in Lemma 1 implies that $\text{cr}(G_i) \leq \binom{N_i}{2}k$, since each crossing is induced by a pair of curves of Γ'_i that intersect. By definition, the graph G_i is simple and connected. Applying Lemma 8 to G_i , we get

$$(2.9) \quad \text{card}(E_i) \leq C_0 k^{1/3} m_i^{2/3} N_i^{2/3} + 4m_i,$$

for some absolute constant C_0 . Combining (2.8), (2.9), and Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{card}(E) &= \sum_i \text{card}(E_i) \\ &\leq C_0 k^{1/3} \sum_i m_i^{2/3} N_i^{2/3} + 4 \sum_i m_i \\ &\leq C_0 k^{1/3} (Cn)^{1/3} \sum_i m_i^{2/3} N_i^{1/3} + 4m \\ &\leq C_0 k^{1/3} (Cn)^{1/3} m^{2/3} \left(\sum_i N_i \right)^{1/3} + 4m \\ &\leq C' k^{1/3} m^{2/3} n^{2/3} + 4m. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the inequalities (2.6) and (2.7) imply

$$I(\Pi, \Gamma) \leq C_{V,k} \left(m^{2/3} n^{2/3} + m + n \right),$$

where $C_{V,k}$ is a constant that depends only on V and the parameter k . □

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *Let $S_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, $S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ be definable sets of dimensions k_1, k_2 , respectively. Let $W \subset S_1 \times S_2$ be a $(k_1 + k_2)$ -dimensional definable subset of $S_1 \times S_2$. Then there exist $S'_i \subset S_i$ definable with $\dim S'_i = k_i$, for $i = 1, 2$, such that $S'_1 \times S'_2 \subset W$.*

Proof. For each $i = 1, 2$, consider a cylindrical definable cell decomposition of \mathbb{R}^{d_i} adapted to S_i . It is easy to see that $\dim(W \cap (C \times D)) = k_1 + k_2$, for some cells $C \subset S_1$ and $D \subset S_2$ of the respective decompositions, where $\dim(C) = k_1$ and $\dim(D) = k_2$. Indeed, otherwise we would have had $\dim(W \cap (S_1 \times S_2)) < k_1 + k_2$, contradicting our assumption on W .

By properties of the decomposition, there exist definable homeomorphisms $\theta_C : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k_1}$ and $\theta_D : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$. Let $f = \theta_C \times \theta_D : C \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$ be the homeomorphism induced by θ_C and θ_D . Then $W' := f(W \cap (C \times D))$, is a $(k_1 + k_2)$ -dimensional definable set contained in $\mathbb{R}^{k_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$. In particular, W' contains an open set of $\mathbb{R}^{k_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$, and hence there exist open sets $I \subset \mathbb{R}^{k_1}$ and $J \subset \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$, such that $I \times J \subset W'$. Letting $S'_1 := \theta_C^{-1}(I)$ and $S'_2 := \theta_D^{-1}(J)$ the lemma follows. \square

Let us introduce some notation. For $p, q \in E$, we define

$$\gamma_q := \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(q) \cap V)$$

and

$$\gamma_p^* := \pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(p) \cap V).$$

For $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$, we let

$$Y_i := \{q \mid \dim(\gamma_q) = i\}$$

and

$$X_i := \{p \mid \dim(\gamma_p^*) = i\}.$$

Lemma 10. *Let V be a three-dimensional definable set and let X_1, Y_1 be as above. Let $P, Q \subset E$ be finite subsets. Assume that $P \subset X_1$, $Q \subset Y_1$, and that, for every $p \in P$ and every $q \in Q$, each of the sets*

$$U_{1,q} := \{q' \in Y_1 \mid \dim(\gamma_q \cap \gamma_{q'}) \geq 1\},$$

$$U_{2,p} := \{p' \in X_1 \mid \dim(\gamma_p^* \cap \gamma_{p'}^*) \geq 1\}$$

is zero-dimensional. Then property (i) in the statement of Theorem 3 holds.

Proof. Our assumption on $U_{1,q}$ and $U_{2,p}$ implies that for some constant M , which depends only on V ,

$$|U_{1,q}| \leq M \text{ and } |U_{2,p}| \leq M,$$

for every $p \in X_1$, $q \in Y_1$.

Let $G = G(P)$ denote the graph defined by

$$V(G) = P,$$

$$E(G) = \{(p, p') \in V(G(P)) \mid \dim(\pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(p) \cap V) \cap \pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(p') \cap V)) = 1\}.$$

Notice that G has maximum vertex degree at most M , so we can color the graph with $M + 1$ colors. In other words, we can partition P into $M + 1$ sets P_i , so that for any pair of distinct $p, p' \in P_i$ the set

$$\pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(p) \cap V) \cap \pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(p') \cap V)$$

is finite, and hence bounded by some constant N , which depends only on V .

Similarly, there exists a partition of Q into at most $M + 1$ sets Q_j so that

$$\pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(q) \cap V) \cap \pi_1(\pi_2^{-1}(q') \cap V)$$

is finite and of cardinality at most a constant depending only on V (which we can again take to be N), for every pair of distinct $q, q' \in Q_j$.

To prove property (i), it suffices to show that there exists a constant C_V depending only on V , such that

$$\text{card}(V \cap (P_i \times Q_j)) \leq C_V \cdot (\text{card}(P_i)^{2/3} \cdot \text{card}(Q_j)^{2/3} + \text{card}(P_i) + \text{card}(Q_j)),$$

for every pair $1 \leq i, j \leq M$.

Fix $1 \leq i, j \leq M$ and put $\Pi := Q_j$ and $\Gamma := \{\gamma_p \mid p \in P_i\}$ where

$$\gamma_p := \pi_2(\pi_1^{-1}(p) \cap V).$$

By definition, $q \in \gamma_p$ if and only if $(p, q) \in V$. Note also that

$$\text{card}(\gamma \cap \gamma') \leq N,$$

for every pair of distinct $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma$, and that

$$\text{card}(\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid p, p' \in \gamma\}) \leq N,$$

for every pair of distinct $p, p' \in \Pi$.

Now apply Lemma 1. □

Proof of Theorem 3. First observe that if $\dim(V) = 4$, then it follows immediately from Lemma 9, with $S_1 = S_2 = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $W = V$, that property (ii) of the theorem holds. So we can assume that $\dim(V) \leq 3$.

Our strategy is to try to bound the quantity $\text{card}(V \cap (P \times Q))$, as in property (i), and, in each step, prove that if the bound fails, then property (ii) of the theorem must hold. Since $\dim(V) \leq 3$, we have $\dim X_i, \dim Y_i \leq 3 - i$, for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. In particular, X_3 and Y_3 are finite. Hence the cardinality of each of $P \cap X_3$ and $Q \cap Y_3$ is bounded by a constant that depends only on V . Thus, we have

$$\text{card}(V \cap (P \times (Q \cap Y_3))) + \text{card}(V \cap (P \cap X_3) \times Q) \leq C_0(\text{card}(P) + \text{card}(Q)),$$

for some $C_0 > 0$ which depends only on V . A similar argument shows that

$$\text{card}(V \cap (P \times (Q \cap Y_0))) + \text{card}(V \cap (P \cap X_0) \times Q) \leq C_1(\text{card}(P) + \text{card}(Q)),$$

for some $C_1 > 0$ which depends only on V .

Next, we bound the cardinality of $V \cap (P \times (Q \cap Y_2))$ (unless property (ii) holds). Let

$$Y_2^* := \{p \in E \mid \dim(\gamma_p^* \cap Y_2) \geq 1\}.$$

Note that the definition of Y_2^* is independent of P, Q and depends only on V .

Assume first that $\dim Y_2^* \geq 1$. Then the set

$$\{(p, q) \in F \mid p \in Y_2^*, q \in Y_2, (p, q) \in V\} \subset V$$

is of dimension $\dim(Y_2^*) + 1$ and it is contained in the set $Y_2^* \times Y_2$. Recalling that $\dim(Y_2) = 1$, and applying Lemma 9 to conclude that there exists definable sets $\alpha, \beta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\dim \alpha = \dim Y_2^* \geq 1$ and $\dim \beta = 1$, such that $\alpha \times \beta \subset V$. This completes the proof of the theorem for this case.

Hence, we can assume $\dim Y_2^* = 0$. Since Y_2^* is finite, $\text{card}(Y_2^*)$ is bounded from above by a constant C_2 which depends only on V . Hence, $\text{card}(P \cap Y_2^*) \leq C_2$, and in particular,

$$\text{card}(V \cap ((P \cap Y_2^*) \times (Q \cap Y_2))) \leq C_2 \cdot \text{card}(Q).$$

Note also that for $p \in P \setminus Y_2^*$ we have $\text{card}(\gamma_p^* \cap Y_2^*) \leq C_2$. Hence,

$$\text{card}(V \cap ((P \setminus Y_2^*) \times (Q \cap Y_2))) = C_2 \cdot \text{card}(P).$$

We conclude that

$$\text{card}(V \cap (P \times (Q \cap Y_2))) \leq C_2 \cdot (\text{card}(P) + \text{card}(Q)).$$

Symmetrically, it follows that

$$\text{card}(V \cap ((P \cap X_2) \times Q)) \leq C_3 \cdot (\text{card}(P) + \text{card}(Q)),$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$ which depends only on V , unless property (ii) of the theorem holds.

We are left to bound the cardinality of $V \cap ((P \cap X_1) \times (Q \cap Y_1))$. Without loss of generality, we can assume in what follows, that $P \subset X_1$ and $Y \subset Y_1$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &:= \{(q, q') \in Y_1 \times Y_1 \mid \dim(\gamma_q \cap \gamma_{q'}) \geq 1\}, \\ U_2 &:= \{(p, p') \in X_1 \times X_1 \mid \dim(\gamma_p^* \cap \gamma_{p'}^*) \geq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $q \in Y_1$ (resp. $p \in X_1$) we will denote by $U_{1,q}$ (resp. $U_{2,p}$), the definable set $\pi_1^{-1}(q) \cap U_1$ (resp. $\pi_1^{-1}(p) \cap U_2$).

Assume first that $\dim(U_{1,q}) \geq 1$, for some fixed $q \in Y_1$. By definition, $\dim(\gamma_q \cap \gamma_{q'}) \geq 1$. Thus, the set

$$\{(p, q') \in \gamma_q \times U_{1,q} \mid (p, q') \in V\}$$

is of dimension $\dim(U_{1,q}) + 1$. By Lemma 9, this implies that there exist definable $\alpha, \beta \subset E$, such that $\dim \alpha = \dim U_{1,q} \geq 1$, $\dim \beta = 1$ and $\alpha \times \beta \subset V$. Thus property (ii) of the theorem holds for this case. Symmetrically, property (ii) of the theorem holds in case $\dim(U_{2,p}) \geq 1$.

Therefore, we can assume that $\dim(U_{2,p}) = \dim(U_{1,q}) = 0$, for every $p \in X_1$ and $q \in Y_1$. Property (i) of the theorem now follows from Lemma 10. \square

REFERENCES

1. M. Ajtai, V. Chvátal, M. M. Newborn, and E. Szemerédi, *Crossing-free subgraphs*, Theory and practice of combinatorics, North-Holland Math. Stud., vol. 60, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982, pp. 9–12. MR 806962 [3](#)
2. N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, *The probabilistic method*, A Wiley-Interscience Publication, 2000 (third edition). [3](#), [9](#)
3. S. Basu, *Combinatorial complexity in o-minimal geometry*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **100** (2010), 405–428. [1](#)
4. Saugata Basu, Andrei Gabrielov, and Nicolai Vorobjov, *Triangulations of monotone families I: two-dimensional families*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **111** (2015), no. 5, 1013–1051. MR 3477228 [6](#), [9](#)
5. Saugata Basu and Martin Sombra, *Polynomial partitioning on varieties of codimension two and point-hypersurface incidences in four dimensions*, Discrete & Computational Geometry (2015), 1–27 (English). [1](#)
6. A. Chernikov, D. Galvin, and S. Starchenko, *Cutting lemma and Zarankiewicz’s problem in distal structures*, ArXiv e-prints (2016). [2](#), [3](#)

7. A. Chernikov and S. Starchenko, *Regularity lemma for distal structures*, ArXiv e-prints (2015). [1](#)
8. M. Coste, *An introduction to o-minimal geometry*, Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, Pisa, 2000, Dip. Mat. Univ. Pisa, Dottorato di Ricerca in Matematica. [1](#), [7](#)
9. Mário J. Edmundo and Arthur Woerheide, *The Lefschetz coincidence theorem in o-minimal expansions of fields*, Topology Appl. **156** (2009), no. 15, 2470–2484. MR 2546949 [3](#), [4](#)
10. J. Fox, J. Pach, A. Sheffer, A. Suk, and J. Zahl, *A semi-algebraic version of Zarankiewicz’s problem*, ArXiv e-prints (2014). [1](#)
11. Larry Guth and Nets Hawk Katz, *On the Erdős distinct distances problem in the plane*, Ann. of Math. (2) **181** (2015), no. 1, 155–190. MR 3272924 [3](#)
12. F. T. Leighton, *Complexity issues in VLSI*, Foundations of Computing Series, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1983. [3](#)
13. J. Matoušek, *Lectures on discrete geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 212, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. MR 1899299 (2003f:52011) [3](#)
14. H. Nassajian Mojarrad, T. Pham, C. Valculescu, and F. de Zeeuw, *Schwartz-Zippel bounds for two-dimensional products*, ArXiv e-prints (2015). [2](#)
15. János Pach and Micha Sharir, *On the number of incidences between points and curves*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **7** (1998), no. 1, 121–127. MR 1611057 [1](#)
16. O. E. Raz, M. Sharir, and F. de Zeeuw, *Polynomials vanishing on Cartesian products: The Elekes-Szabó theorem revisited*, Duke Math. J. **2**, [4](#)
17. O. E. Raz, M. Sharir, and F. de Zeeuw, *The Elekes-Szabó theorem in four dimensions*, ArXiv e-prints (2016). [2](#)
18. T Scanlon, *O-minimality*, Gazette Mathématique **149** (2016), 33–39. [1](#)
19. M. Sharir and N. Solomon, *Incidences between points and lines in \mathbb{R}^4* , Discrete Comput. Geom. [1](#)
20. M. Sharir and J. Zahl, *Cutting Algebraic Curves into Pseudo-segments and Applications*, ArXiv e-prints (2016). [3](#)
21. Micha Sharir, Adam Sheffer, and Joshua Zahl, *Improved bounds for incidences between points and circles*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **24** (2015), no. 3, 490–520. MR 3326429 [1](#)
22. László A. Székely, *Crossing numbers and hard Erdős problems in discrete geometry*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **6** (1997), no. 3, 353–358. MR 1464571 [3](#), [4](#)
23. E. Szemerédi and W. T. Trotter, Jr., *Extremal problems in discrete geometry*, Combinatorica **3** (1983), 381–392. [1](#)
24. Csaba D. Tóth, *The Szemerédi-Trotter theorem in the complex plane*, Combinatorica **35** (2015), no. 1, 95–126. MR 3341142 [1](#)
25. L. van den Dries, *Tame topology and o-minimal structures*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 248, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. MR 1633348 (99j:03001) [1](#)
26. Arthur Anderson Woerheide, *O-minimal homology*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1996, Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. MR 2695178 [3](#), [4](#)
27. Joshua Zahl, *An improved bound on the number of point-surface incidences in three dimensions*, Contrib. Discrete Math. **8** (2013), no. 1, 100–121. MR 3118901 [1](#)
28. ———, *A Szemerédi–Trotter Type Theorem in \mathbb{R}^4* , Discrete Comput. Geom. **54** (2015), no. 3, 513–572. MR 3392965 [1](#)

4. APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 8. Let G be as in the statement. Let ϕ_G be a definable embedding of G , with $EC(\phi_G) = \text{cr}(G)$.

Let E'' be a minimal subset of E with the property that E'' has a nonempty intersection with each element of $EC(\phi_G)$. Note that it follows from this definition that $\text{card}(E'') \leq \text{card}(EC(\phi_G)) = \text{cr}(G)$. Let $E' = E \setminus E''$.

By construction, the graph $G' = (V, E')$ is definably planar and has the same number of vertices as G . Moreover, $\text{card}(E') \geq \text{card}(E) - \text{cr}(G)$. By the inequality (2.4) applied to the graph G' , we also have $\text{card}(E') \leq 3 \cdot \text{card}(V) - 6$. Thus,

$$(4.1) \quad \text{cr}(G) \geq \text{card}(E) - 3 \cdot \text{card}(V).$$

So (4.1) holds for any simple graph $G = (V, E)$ with $\text{card}(V) \geq 4$.

We now use a probabilistic argument to obtain a sharper inequality. Let G be as above and consider G'' a random subgraph of G obtained by taking each vertex of G to lie in G'' independently with probability p , and taking an edge of G to lie in G'' if and only if its two vertices were chosen to lie in G'' . Let v'' and e'' denote the number of edges and vertices of G'' , respectively. By (4.1), we have $\text{cr}(G'') \geq e'' - 3 \cdot v''$. Taking expectation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{cr}(G'')] \geq \mathbb{E}[e''] - 3 \cdot \mathbb{E}[v''],$$

or

$$p^4 \cdot \text{cr}(G) \geq p^2 \cdot \text{card}(E) - 3p \cdot \text{card}(V).$$

Now if we assume $\text{card}(E) > 4 \cdot \text{card}(V)$ and set $p = 4 \cdot \text{card}(V) / \text{card}(E)$, we obtain

$$(4.2) \quad \text{cr}(G) \geq \frac{\text{card}(E)^3}{64 \cdot \text{card}(V)^2}. \quad \square$$

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47906, U.S.A.
E-mail address: `sbasu@math.purdue.edu`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, PRINCETON NJ 08540, USA
E-mail address: `oritraz@ias.edu`