

# Closure properties of the class of Uniform Sweeping-out transformations

Jonathan L. King\*

*University of Florida, Gainesville 32611-2082, squash@math.ufl.edu*

ABSTRACT. Uniform sweeping-out is closed under countable cartesian product and under inverse limits.

A measure-preserving transformation  $(S: X, \mu)$  on a probability space is ***uniform sweeping-out*** if for any set  $A$  of positive mass and any  $\varepsilon$  there exists  $N$  such that: Any collection  $\mathbb{K}$  of integers will satisfy

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} S^k A\right) > 1 - \varepsilon$$

if  $\#\mathbb{K} \geq N$ . Nat Friedman introduced this property in [F]. Our goal here is to affirmatively answer a question of Friedman by showing that the class of uniform sweeping-out transformations is closed under countable cartesian product. The proof is a second application of the conditional expectation argument of [K] followed by a counting argument. I am indebted to Nat Friedman and Dan Rudolph who pointed out that uniform sweeping-out has a “mixinglike” characterization. This provoked the “lightly-mixing” characterization which is (C0) below and suggested dusting off the argument which shows that the class of lightly-mixing maps is closed under cartesian product. It is not known (in the category of weak-mixing transformations) whether uniform sweeping-out is implied by the existence of a dense family of sets  $A$  each of which sweeps-out uniformly.

Our cartesian product result appears now, rather than in 1988 when it was done, because it is now known that uniform sweeping-out is strictly weaker than mixing. (That mixing implies u.s.o appears in [F].) Terry Adams [A] has recently announced that the lightly-mixing example of [F,K] has the stronger uniform sweeping-out property. Yet it is not mixing; indeed, not even partial-mixing.

**A “lightly-mixing” characterization.** Each of the following two properties is equivalent to uniform sweeping-out. For a  $\beta \in [0, 1]$  let  $\text{Indices}_\beta(A, B)$  represent the set of indices  $k$  satisfying  $\mu(S^k A \cap B) \leq \beta$ . The function  $\text{Zero}(\cdot, \cdot)$  below is a uniform bound on the cardinality of such a

---

\*Partially supported by

set of indices. In the sequel  $\delta$  and  $\varepsilon$  are numbers in  $(0, 1)$ . The phrase  $a := b$  means that the expression  $b$  *defines* the (new) symbol  $a$ .

(C0) *For any set  $A$  of positive mass, any  $\varepsilon$ , there exists  $M := \text{Zero}(A, \varepsilon)$  such that for any set  $B$  with  $\mu(B) \geq \varepsilon$ :*

$$\#\text{Indices}_0(A, B) < M.$$

If  $S$  satisfies (C0) then, given any collection  $\mathbb{K}$  with  $\#\mathbb{K} \geq M$ , let  $B$  be the complement of the union  $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} S^k A$ . Were  $\mu(B)$  at least  $\varepsilon$  we could apply (C0) to obtain a contradiction. Hence any  $M$  iterates of  $A$  sweep out more than  $1 - \varepsilon$  of the space.

A similar argument shows the converse, that uniform sweeping-out implies (C0).  $\blacklozenge$

(C1) *For any set  $A$  of positive mass, any  $\varepsilon$ , there exists  $M := \text{Small}(A, \varepsilon)$  and positive number  $\delta := \text{Size}(A, \varepsilon)$  such that for any set  $B$  with  $\mu(B) \geq \varepsilon$ :*

$$\#\text{Indices}_\delta(A, B) < M.$$

Evidently (C1) implies (C0). Conversely, fix  $\varepsilon$ ,  $A$ , and  $M := \text{Zero}(A, \varepsilon/2)$ . Set  $\delta := \varepsilon/2M$ . Fix any  $B$  of mass at least  $\varepsilon$ . Suppose there were a collection  $\mathbb{K}$ ,  $\#\mathbb{K} = M$ , of indices  $k$  such that  $\mu(S^k A \cap B) \leq \delta$ . Then the difference set

$$B' := B \sim \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} S^k A$$

has mass at least  $\varepsilon/2$ . Yet  $\text{Indices}_0(A, B')$  contains  $\mathbb{K}$ , a contradiction. We conclude that the quantity  $\text{Small}_\delta(A, \varepsilon)$  is dominated by  $M$ .  $\blacklozenge$

*Remark.* For the properties above, to emphasize the dependence on the transformation  $S$  we may write  $\text{Zero}(A, \varepsilon; S)$ , etc.

The class of uniform sweeping-out transformations is evidently closed under powers and roots since

$$\text{Zero}(A, \varepsilon; S^n) \leq \text{Zero}(A, \varepsilon; S) \leq |n| \cdot \text{Zero}(A, \varepsilon; S^n)$$

for any non-zero integer  $n$ .

**Cartesian Product.** Fix  $(S: X, \mu)$  and  $(T: \widehat{X}, \widehat{\mu})$ , two uniform sweeping-out transformations. Our goal is to show that  $S \times T$  is uniform sweeping-out by showing it to satisfy (C0). Fix some set  $\mathbf{V} \subset X \times \widehat{X}$  of positive mass. We shall compute an upper bound for

$$\text{Zero}(\mathbf{V}, 2\varepsilon; S \times T)$$

in terms of  $\text{Small}(\mathbf{V}, \varepsilon; S)$  and  $\text{Small}(\mathbf{V}, \varepsilon; T)$ .

Given a point  $z \in X$  let  $\mathbf{V}_z$  denote the cross-section of  $\mathbf{V}$  above  $z$ ; thus  $\mathbf{V}_z$  is the subset of  $\widehat{X}$  such that  $\{z\} \times \mathbf{V}_z$  equals  $[\{z\} \times \widehat{X}] \cap \mathbf{V}$ . By standard measurability arguments, the following holds for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $z$ . Set  $\widehat{A} := \mathbf{V}_z$ . Then for any positive  $\widehat{\delta}$  the set

$$V := \{x \mid \widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{V}_x \triangle \widehat{A}) \leq \widehat{\delta}\} \tag{1}$$

has positive  $\mu$ -mass. Consider  $z$  and  $\widehat{A}$  as henceforth fixed. Define the quantities

$$\widehat{M} := \text{Small}(\widehat{A}, \varepsilon; T) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\delta} := \text{Size}(\widehat{A}, \varepsilon; T).$$

For this  $\widehat{\delta}$ , define  $V$  as in (1). Finally, set

$$M := \text{Small}(V, \varepsilon; S) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta := \text{Size}(V, \varepsilon; S).$$

Wishing to establish (C0) for  $S \times T$ , it suffices to show that

$$\text{Zero}(\mathbf{V}, 2\varepsilon; S \times T) \leq M + \widehat{M}/\delta.$$

Fix any set  $\mathbf{W} \subset X \times \widehat{X}$  with mass at least  $2\varepsilon$ . Set

$$W := \{x \mid \widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{W}_x) \geq \varepsilon\}$$

and note that  $\mu(W) \geq \varepsilon$  follows by a Fubini argument. Define a function  $f: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$f(k) := \mu\{x \in W \mid \widehat{\mu}(T^k \widehat{A} \cap \mathbf{W}_x) \leq \widehat{\delta}\}.$$

This function measures the probability that a fiber  $\mathbf{W}_x$  has  $k$  in its bad set  $\text{Indices}_{\widehat{\delta}}(\widehat{A}, \mathbf{W}_x)$ . Let  $\mathbf{1}[\cdot]$  denote the Dirac function where  $\mathbf{1}[\text{true}] = 1$  and  $\mathbf{1}[\text{false}] = 0$ . By Fubini, the sum  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f(k)$  equals

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \int_W \mathbf{1}[\widehat{\mu}(T^k \widehat{A} \cap \mathbf{W}_x) \leq \widehat{\delta}] d\mu(x) &= \int_W \sum_k \mathbf{1}[\widehat{\mu}(T^k \widehat{A} \cap \mathbf{W}_x) \leq \widehat{\delta}] d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_W \#\text{Indices}_{\widehat{\delta}}(\widehat{A}, \mathbf{W}_x) d\mu(x) \leq \mu(W) \cdot \widehat{M}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the inequality

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f(k) \leq \widehat{M}$$

whose usefulness arises from the fact that although  $f(\cdot)$  depends on the set  $\mathbf{W}$ , the bound  $\widehat{M}$  does not.

**Counting the set of bad  $k$ .** Suppose  $k$  is such that  $[S \times T]^k \mathbf{V} \cap \mathbf{W}$  has zero mass. For  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x$  then  $\widehat{\mu}(T^k(\mathbf{V}_{S^{-k}x}) \cap \mathbf{W}_x)$  equals zero. Thus if  $x \in S^k V$  then

$$\widehat{\mu}(T^k \widehat{A} \cap \mathbf{W}_x) \leq \widehat{\delta} \tag{2}$$

by (1). In particular, (2) holds for every  $x \in S^k V \cap W$ . Thus  $f(k) \geq \mu(S^k V \cap W)$ . This last quantity will exceed  $\delta$  if  $k$  is chosen outside of  $\mathbb{K} := \text{Indices}_{\delta}(V, W; S)$ . As a consequence

$$\#\text{(Indices}_0(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}; S \times T) \sim \mathbb{K}) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{f(k)}{\delta}.$$

Since the righthand quantity is dominated by  $\widehat{M}/\delta$  we may conclude that

$$\#\text{Indices}_0(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}; S \times T) \leq \#\mathbb{K} + \widehat{M}/\delta \leq M + \widehat{M}/\delta$$

as desired. ♦

---

**Countable Cartesian Products**


---

In order to pass from finite to countable cartesian products we need to show that the class “Uniform Sweeping-out” is closed under inverse limits.

Given  $(T: X, \mu)$  and a factor algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  recall that the *conditional probability* function  $\mathcal{P}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}]$  is canonically defined by the equality

$$\int_F \mathcal{P}[B | \mathcal{F}](x) d\mu(x) = \mu(B \cap F)$$

for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and measurable  $B$ .

INVERSE LIMIT LEMMA. *Given  $(T: X, \mu)$  and an increasing tower  $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \dots$  of factor algebras whose join is the entire  $\sigma$ -algebra. Then*

$$T|_{\mathcal{F}_n} \text{ uniform sweeping-out for all } n \implies T \text{ uniform sweeping-out.}$$

PROOF. Fix  $\varepsilon$  and a set  $A$  of positive mass. Pick  $\mathcal{F} \in \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_n$  sufficiently far out in the sequence that  $A$  is nearly  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable: Choose it so that  $\mu(F)$  is positive, where

$$F := \{x \mid \mathcal{P}[A | \mathcal{F}](x) > 1 - \varepsilon\}.$$

Let  $N$  be the constant arising from the uniform sweeping-out of  $T|_{\mathcal{F}}$ ; thus for any collection  $\#\mathbb{K} \geq N$  of integers,  $\mu(\mathbf{F}) > 1 - \varepsilon$  where  $\mathbf{F}$  denotes the union  $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} T^k F$ . Let  $\mathbf{A} := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} T^k A$ . Consider a point  $x \in \mathbf{F}$ , say,  $x \in T^k F$ . Then

$$\mathcal{P}[\mathbf{A} | \mathcal{F}](x) \geq \mathcal{P}[T^k A | \mathcal{F}](x) = \mathcal{P}[A | \mathcal{F}](T^{-k} x) > 1 - \varepsilon$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of  $F$ . Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} T^k A\right) &= \int \mathcal{P}[\mathbf{A} | \mathcal{F}] d\mu \geq \int_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{P}[\mathbf{A} | \mathcal{F}] d\mu \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbf{F}} 1 - \varepsilon d\mu \\ &= \mu(\mathbf{F}) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon) > (1 - \varepsilon)^2 > 1 - 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus any  $N$  iterates of  $A$  sweep out all but  $2\varepsilon$  of the space. ♦

## REFERENCES

- [A] T.M. Adams, *Uniformly sweeping out does not imply mixing*, Submitted..
- [F] N.A. Friedman, *Mixing on Sequences*, Can. J. Math. **35** (1983), 339–352.
- [F,K] N.A. Friedman, J.L. King, *Rank one lightly mixing*, Israel J. Math. **73** #3 (1991), 281–288.
- [K] J.L. King, *Lightly mixing is closed under countable products*, Israel J. Math. **62** #3 (1988), 341–346.