

# Bernoulli decompositions and applications

Han Yu

University of St Andrews

A day in October

# Outline

**Equidistributed sequences**

**Bernoulli systems**

**Sinai's factor theorem**

## A reminder

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence in  $[0, 1]$ . It is *equidistributed* with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$  if for each (open or close or whatever) interval  $I \subset [0, 1]$  we have the following result,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N 1_I(x_n) = \lambda(I).$$

## A reminder

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence in  $[0, 1]$ . It is *equidistributed* with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$  if for each (open or close or whatever) interval  $I \subset [0, 1]$  we have the following result,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N 1_I(x_n) = \lambda(I).$$

It is enough to check the above result for each interval with rational end points.

## A reminder

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence in  $[0, 1]$ . It is *equidistributed* with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$  if for each (open or close or whatever) interval  $I \subset [0, 1]$  we have the following result,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N 1_I(x_n) = \lambda(I).$$

It is enough to check the above result for each interval with rational end points.

It is also enough to replace the indicator function with a countable dense family of continuous functions in  $C([0, 1])$ .

## Let's play a game

I will give you an equidistributed sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in  $[0, 1]$  and a small number  $\rho$ , say,  $\rho = 0.001$ . You must choose a subsequence  $K$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  with upper density  $\rho$  and minimize the Lebesgue measure of  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$ .

## Let's play a game

I will give you an equidistributed sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in  $[0, 1]$  and a small number  $\rho$ , say,  $\rho = 0.001$ . You must choose a subsequence  $K$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  with upper density  $\rho$  and minimize the Lebesgue measure of  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$ .

Bonus: Try to achieve that  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$  is nowhere dense.

## Let's play a game

I will give you an equidistributed sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in  $[0, 1]$  and a small number  $\rho$ , say,  $\rho = 0.001$ . You must choose a subsequence  $K$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  with upper density  $\rho$  and minimize the Lebesgue measure of  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$ .

Bonus: Try to achieve that  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$  is nowhere dense.

Award: You get 1000 Kinder Chocolate bars if you can let the Lebesgue measure drop below  $\rho$ .



## Let's play a game

I will give you an equidistributed sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in  $[0, 1]$  and a small number  $\rho$ , say,  $\rho = 0.001$ . You must choose a subsequence  $K$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  with upper density  $\rho$  and minimize the Lebesgue measure of  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$ .

Bonus: Try to achieve that  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$  is nowhere dense.

Award: You get 1000 Kinder Chocolate bars if you can let the Lebesgue measure drop below  $\rho$ .

Claim: **This is a fair game.**

## Let's play a game

I will give you an equidistributed sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in  $[0, 1]$  and a small number  $\rho$ , say,  $\rho = 0.001$ . You must choose a subsequence  $K$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  with upper density  $\rho$  and minimize the Lebesgue measure of  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$ .

Bonus: Try to achieve that  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K}}$  is nowhere dense.

Award: You get 1000 Kinder Chocolate bars if you can let the Lebesgue measure drop below  $\rho$ .

Claim: **This is a fair game.** Or is it?

# A result

## Lemma

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be an equidistributed sequence in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $K \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence with upper density  $\rho$ . Then  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \geq K}}$  has Lebesgue measure *at least*  $\rho$ .

# A result

## Lemma

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be an equidistributed sequence in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $K \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence with upper density  $\rho$ . Then  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \geq K}}$  has Lebesgue measure *at least*  $\rho$ .

## Proof.

There is a proof but there is no space for writing it down. □

## Choose a random subsequence

### Lemma

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be an equidistributed sequence in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $K \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence chosen randomly by including each integer  $k \in K$  independently with probability  $p \in (0, 1)$ . Then almost surely,  $\{x_n\}_{n \in K}$  is dense in  $[0, 1]$ . In fact, the new sequence equidistributes in  $[0, 1]$  if it is enumerated *properly*.

## Choose a random subsequence

### Lemma

Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be an equidistributed sequence in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $K \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence chosen randomly by including each integer  $k \in K$  independently with probability  $p \in (0, 1)$ . Then almost surely,  $\{x_n\}_{n \in K}$  is dense in  $[0, 1]$ . In fact, the new sequence equidistributes in  $[0, 1]$  if it is enumerated *properly*.

### Remark

*This holds no matter how small  $p$  is.*

## Another reminder

### Definition (Bernoulli system)

*Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite set of digits. Consider the space  $\Omega = \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$  equipped with the product topology and the cylindrical  $\sigma$ -algebra. Given a probability measure (vector)  $p$  on  $\Lambda$  we also define the product probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\Omega$ . Let  $S : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  be the left shift. Then  $(\Omega, S, \nu)$  mixing and we call it a Bernoulli system.*

## Another reminder

### Definition (Bernoulli system)

*Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite set of digits. Consider the space  $\Omega = \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$  equipped with the product topology and the cylindrical  $\sigma$ -algebra. Given a probability measure (vector)  $p$  on  $\Lambda$  we also define the product probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\Omega$ . Let  $S : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  be the left shift. Then  $(\Omega, S, \nu)$  mixing and we call it a Bernoulli system.*

The measure theoretic entropy of  $(\Omega, S, \nu)$  is equal to

$$-\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} p_{\lambda} \log p_{\lambda},$$

where  $p_{\lambda}, \lambda \in \Lambda$  is the probability vector on  $\Lambda$  which gives the measure  $\nu$  on  $\Omega$ .



## Theorem

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence with upper density  $\rho$ . Let  $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_M$  be pairwise disjoint measurable events. Suppose that  $\Omega_1 \cup \dots \cup \Omega_M$  has measure at least  $1 - \epsilon$  and  $\epsilon < \rho$ . Then for  $\nu$  almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there is an index  $i(\omega) \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  such that  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K \cap K_{\Omega_i(\omega)}(\omega)}}$  has Lebesgue measure at least  $\rho - \epsilon$ .

Notation:  $K_{\Omega'}(\omega) = \{k : S^k(\omega) \in \Omega'\}$  (Entering sequence)

## Theorem

*Let  $K \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence with upper density  $\rho$ . Let  $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_M$  be pairwise disjoint measurable events. Suppose that  $\Omega_1 \cup \dots \cup \Omega_M$  has measure at least  $1 - \epsilon$  and  $\epsilon < \rho$ . Then for  $\nu$  almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there is an index  $i(\omega) \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  such that  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K \cap K_{\Omega_i(\omega)}(\omega)}}$  has Lebesgue measure at least  $\rho - \epsilon$ .*

Notation:  $K_{\Omega'}(\omega) = \{k : S^k(\omega) \in \Omega'\}$  (Entering sequence)

Main point:  $\Omega_i, i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  can have very small measures.

Convince yourself by choosing  $K = \mathbb{N}$ , in this case the result trivially holds in a much stronger sense.

## Theorem

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence with upper density  $\rho$ . Let  $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_M$  be pairwise disjoint measurable events. Suppose that  $\Omega_1 \cup \dots \cup \Omega_M$  has measure at least  $1 - \epsilon$  and  $\epsilon < \rho$ . Then for  $\nu$  almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there is an index  $i(\omega) \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  such that  $\overline{\{x_n\}_{n \in K \cap K_{\Omega_i(\omega)}(\omega)}}$  has Lebesgue measure at least  $\rho - \epsilon$ .

Notation:  $K_{\Omega'}(\omega) = \{k : S^k(\omega) \in \Omega'\}$  (Entering sequence)

Main point:  $\Omega_i, i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  can have very small measures.

Convince yourself by choosing  $K = \mathbb{N}$ , in this case the result trivially holds in a much stronger sense.

## Proof.

Cuius rei demonstrationem mirabilem sane detexi hanc marginis exiguitas non caperet. □

# Sinai's factor theorem

## Definition (Factor)

A measurable dynamical system is in general denoted as  $(X, \mathcal{X}, S, \mu)$  where  $X$  is a set with  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{X}$  and measure  $\mu$  and a measurable map  $S : X \rightarrow X$ . Given two dynamical systems  $(X, \mathcal{X}, S, \mu), (X_1, \mathcal{X}_1, S_1, \mu_1)$ , a measurable map  $f : X \rightarrow X_1$  is called a factorization map and  $(X_1, \mathcal{X}_1, S_1, \mu_1)$  is called a factor of  $(X, \mathcal{X}, S, \mu)$  if  $\mu_1 = f\mu$  and  $f \circ S = S_1 \circ f$ .

## Theorem

Given an ergodic dynamical system  $(X, T, \mu)$  with positive entropy  $h(T, \mu) > 0$ , any Bernoulli system  $(\Omega, S, \nu)$  with entropy  $h(S, \nu) \leq h(T, \mu)$  is a factor of  $(X, T, \mu)$ .

## A motivating exercise

Let  $\alpha$  be an irrational number and  $d$  is an arbitrary real number. Try to compute the (upper/lower) box dimension of the sequence  $\{n\alpha + 2^n d\}_{n \geq 1}$ .

## A motivating exercise

Let  $\alpha$  be an irrational number and  $d$  is an arbitrary real number. Try to compute the (upper/lower) box dimension of the sequence  $\{n\alpha + 2^n d\}_{n \geq 1}$ .

Hint: Consider the case for  $d$  being of 'zero entropy' and then use Sinai's factor theorem to treat the case for the 'positive entropy' case.

## A challenging exercise

Let  $L \subset [0, 1]$  be a compact set. Define the following *sparseness indicating sequence* of  $L$  around  $a \in L$ ,

$$W(L, a) = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \exists b \in L, |b - a| \in [2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1}]\}.$$

## A challenging exercise

Let  $L \subset [0, 1]$  be a compact set. Define the following *sparseness indicating sequence* of  $L$  around  $a \in L$ ,

$$W(L, a) = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \exists b \in L, |b - a| \in [2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1}]\}.$$

We say that  $L$  is sparse if the upper density of  $W(L, a)$  is 0 for all  $a \in L$ .



## A challenging exercise

Let  $L \subset [0, 1]$  be a compact set. Define the following *sparseness indicating sequence* of  $L$  around  $a \in L$ ,

$$W(L, a) = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \exists b \in L, |b - a| \in [2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1}]\}.$$

We say that  $L$  is sparse if the upper density of  $W(L, a)$  is 0 for all  $a \in L$ .

Let  $A_2, A_3 \subset [0, 1]$  be  $\times 2, \times 3$  invariant closed sets respectively. Show that  $L = A_2 \cap A_3$  is sparse if  $\dim_H A_2 + \dim_H A_3 < 1$ .

## A challenging exercise

Let  $L \subset [0, 1]$  be a compact set. Define the following *sparseness indicating sequence* of  $L$  around  $a \in L$ ,

$$W(L, a) = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \exists b \in L, |b - a| \in [2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1}]\}.$$

We say that  $L$  is sparse if the upper density of  $W(L, a)$  is 0 for all  $a \in L$ .

Let  $A_2, A_3 \subset [0, 1]$  be  $\times 2, \times 3$  invariant closed sets respectively. Show that  $L = A_2 \cap A_3$  is sparse if  $\dim_H A_2 + \dim_H A_3 < 1$ .

### Remark

*This implies that  $\dim_H L = 0$ . (A recent result by Wu and by Shmerkin)*

Thanks.

P.S. The solutions of the exercises can be provided upon request.