## Ambrose-Kakutani representation theorems for Borel semiflows

David McClendon Northwestern University

dmm@math.northwestern.edu http://www.math.northwestern.edu/~dmm

#### **Ambrose-Kakutani Theorem**

**Theorem** (Amb 1940, Amb-Kak 1942) Any aperiodic measure-preserving flow  $T_t$  on a standard probability space  $(X, \mathcal{X}, \mu)$  is isomorphic to a suspension flow.

A suspension flow  $(G, \mathcal{G}, \nu, S_t)$ , also called a flow under a function, looks like this:



## **Suspension semiflows**

If the return-time transformation  $\hat{S}$  in the previous picture is not injective, then we obtain a *suspension semiflow*:



## Our problem

Let

- X be an uncountable Polish space, with
- $\mathcal{B}(X)$  its  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel sets,
- $\mu$  a probability measure on  $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$  and
- $T_t: X \times \mathbb{R}^+ \to X$  an aperiodic, jointly Borel action by surjective maps preserving  $\mu$ .

Call  $(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \mu, T_t)$  a Borel semiflow.

**Question:** What Borel semiflows are isomorphic to suspension semiflows?

#### A restriction: discrete orbit branchings

For any point z not in the base of a suspension semiflow  $(G, S_t)$ ,  $\#(S_{-t}(z)) = 1$  for t small enough. So if we let

 $B = \{ z \in G : \#(S_{-t}(z)) > 1 \,\forall \, t > 0 \},\$ 

every point  $z \in G$  must satisfy:

The set of times  $t \ge 0$  where  $S_t(z) \in B$  is a discrete subset of  $\mathbb{R}^+$ .

More generally, we have the following for any suspension semiflow  $(G, S_t)$ :

Given any z, the set of times  $t_0 \ge 0$  where

$$\bigcup_{t < t_0} S_{-t} S_t(z) \neq \bigcap_{t > t_0} S_{-t} S_t(z)$$

is a discrete subset of  $\mathbb{R}^+$ .

Any Borel semiflow for which the preceding sentence holds is said to have *discrete orbit branchings*.

## Another issue: instantaneous discontinuous identifications

Suppose  $(X, T_t)$  is a Borel semiflow and that xand y are two distinct points in X ( $x \neq y$ ) with

$$T_t(x) = T_t(y) \,\forall t > 0.$$

We say that x and y are *instantaneously and* discontinuously identified (IDI) by  $T_t$ .

Define the (Borel) equivalence relation:

$$IDI = \{ (x, y) \in X^2 : T_t(x) = T_t(y) \, \forall t > 0 \}.$$

This relation must contain the diagonal  $\Delta$ . If **IDI** =  $\Delta$ , we say that  $T_t$  has no IDIs.

 $T_t$  has no IDIs if and only if  $T_{(0,\infty)}(x)$  determines x uniquely for every  $x \in X$ .

Suspension semiflows (as defined thus far) have no IDIs.

## A conjecture

We conjecture that the previously described issues are the only restrictions to isomorphism with a suspension semiflow, i.e.

**Conjecture** Any Borel semiflow with the discrete orbit branching property that has no IDIs is isomorphic to a suspension semiflow.

#### A partial result

**Theorem 1** (M) If a countable-to-1 Borel semiflow  $(X, T_t)$  is such that

1.  $T_t$  has discrete orbit branchings, and

2.  $T_t$  has no IDIs,

then  $(X, T_t)$  is isomorphic to a suspension semiflow  $(G, S_t)$ , with the caveat that the measure  $\hat{\nu}$  on the base may be  $\sigma$ -finite.

**Note:** The measure  $\nu = \hat{\nu} \times \lambda$  on *G* is a probability measure.

**Note:** Asking that  $T_t$  being countable-to-1 is virtually equivalent to asking that  $T_t$  be *bimeasurable*, that is, that  $T_t(A)$  is Borel for every  $t \ge 0$  and every Borel  $A \subseteq X$ .

#### An example with infinite base measure

Consider the map  $\widehat{S} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\widehat{S}(x) = x - \frac{1}{x}$ .

Let  $\widehat{X} = \mathbb{R} - \bigcup_n \widehat{S}^{-n}(0)$ . (This will be the base of the suspension semiflow.)

 $\widehat{S}$  :  $\widehat{X} \to \widehat{X}$  preserves Lebesgue measure, is ergodic, and is everywhere 2-to-1.

#### An example with infinite base measure

Construct a suspension semiflow with base  $\widehat{X}$ , return map  $\widehat{S}$  with height function f:



This suspension semiflow has the discrete orbit branching property but is not isomorphic to any suspension semiflow where the measure on the base is finite.

**Question:** What conditions ensure isomorphism with a suspension semiflow where the measure on the base is finite?

#### Some ingredients of the proof

**Lemma 1** (Krengel 1976, Lin & Rudolph 2002) Every Borel semiflow has a measurable crosssection F with measurable return-time function  $r_F$  bounded away from zero.



**Consequence:** Every  $x \in X$  can be written  $x = T_t(y)$  where  $y \in F$  and  $0 \le t < r_F(y)$ .

#### **Another lemma**

**Lemma 2** There is a countable list of Borel functions  $j_i$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^+$  whose domains J(i) are Borel subsets of X so that x has an orbit branching at time  $t_0$ , i.e.

$$\bigcup_{t < t_0} T_{-t} T_t(z) \neq \bigcap_{t > t_0} T_{-t} T_t(z),$$

if and only if  $j_i(x) = t_0$  for some *i*.



#### More on Lemma 2

To establish Lemma 2, consider the set

 $B^* = \{(x,t) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^+ : x \text{ has orbit branching}$ at time  $t\}.$ 

Since each  $T_t$  is countable-to-1, for any Borel  $A \subseteq X$ ,  $T_t(A)$  is Borel for each  $t \ge 0$ . Using this, one can show that  $B^*$  is a Borel set.

Since  $B^*$  must have countable sections by assumption, the Lusin-Novikov theorem applies.

## Combining the two lemmas

Superimpose the pictures from the previous two lemmas:



### **Cutting and rearranging**

Make a new section  $G_1$  (with return time function g) consisting of F together with all orbit branchings of  $T_t$ :



#### Obtaining an isomorphism

With respect to this new section, every  $x \in X$ can be written *uniquely* as  $x = T_t(y)$  where  $y \in G_1$  and  $0 \le t < g(y)$ . This allows for an isomorphism between  $(X, T_t)$  and the suspension semiflow over  $G_1$ .



#### Finite measures on the base

**Theorem 2** (M) If a countable-to-1 Borel semiflow  $(X, T_t)$  is such that

1.  $T_t$  has no IDIs, and

2. there is some c > 0 such that if x has orbit branchings at times t and t', then |t-t'| > c,

then  $(X, T_t)$  is isomorphic to a suspension semiflow  $(G, S_t)$  where the measure on the base is finite.

**Proof:** Adapt the preceding argument to construct a section  $G_1$  with return-time function bounded away from zero.

## What if the semiflow has IDIs?

**Definition:** Start with the following:

1. Two standard Polish spaces  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

2. A  $\sigma$ -finite Borel measure  $\hat{\nu}$  on  $G_1 \cup G_2$ .

3. A measurable function  $g : G_1 \to \mathbb{R}^+$  with  $\int g \, d\hat{\nu} = 1$ .

4. A measurable map  $\sigma : G_1 \cup G_2 \rightarrow G_1$  such that  $\sigma|_{G_1} = id$ .

5. A measurable map  $\widehat{S} : G_1 \to G_1 \cup G_2$ .

Now let G be the set

$$\left\{ (z,t) \in G_1 \times \mathbb{R}^+ : 0 \le t < g(z) \right\} \bigcup (G_2 \times \{0\})$$

(endowed with subspace product topology) and define the Borel semiflow  $S_t$  on G as indicated in the picture on the next slide:

#### **Suspension semiflows with IDIs**

## **Definition (continued):**



 $(G, S_t)$  is called a *suspension semiflow with IDIs*. Notice that for any  $x \in G_2$ ,  $(x, \sigma(x)) \in IDI$ .

# An Ambrose-Kakutani type theorem with IDIs

**Theorem 3** (*M*) A countable-to-1 Borel semiflow  $(X, T_t)$  is isomorphic to a suspension semiflow with IDIs if and only if  $T_t$  has discrete orbit branchings.

## Questions

Suppose one considered a Borel semiflow that is not necessarily countable-to-1.

**Q1.** Is the discrete orbit branching property sufficient to guarantee isomorphism with a suspension semiflow with IDI?

**Q2.** How complicated can the **IDI** relation be? In particular, when does the relation **IDI** have a Borel selector?

- Always?
- If the semiflow has discrete orbit branchings?

## More questions

**Q3.** Given a Borel semiflow  $(X, T_t)$ , can one choose a Polish topology on X with the same Borel sets as the original topology such that the action  $T_t$  is jointly continuous?

**A3.** No, if  $IDI \neq \Delta$ .

**Conjecture** If  $T_t$  has no IDIs, then Q3 has an affirmative answer.

**Theorem 4** (*M*) For countable-to-1 Borel semiflows with discrete orbit branchings and no IDIs, the conjecture holds.