# Speedups of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers

David M. McClendon

Ferris State University Big Rapids, MI, USA

joint with Aimee S.A. Johnson (Swarthmore)

A  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  – Cantor minimal system ( $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -C.m.s.) is a pair (X, T) where X is a Cantor space and  $\mathbf{T} = {\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{v}} : \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$  is a minimal action of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  on X by homeomorphisms.

In this situation, we can write  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, ..., T_d)$  where  $T_j$  is shorthand for the action of standard basis vector  $\mathbf{e}_j$ .

If d = 2 and  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2)$ , I might call  $T_1$  the horizontal direction and  $T_2$  the vertical direction of the action.

A cone **C** is the intersection of  $\mathbb{Z}^d - \{\mathbf{0}\}$  with any open, connected subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  bounded by *d* distinct hyperplanes passing through the origin.





Let  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ -C.m.s. and let  $\mathbf{C} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$  be a cone. A **C**-cocycle is a function  $\mathbf{p} : X \times \mathbb{Z}^{d_2} \to \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$  such that for all  $x \in X$ ,

**9** p(x, 0) = 0;

Output: Interpretended in the cocycle equation

$$\mathbf{p}(x,\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{w})=\mathbf{p}(x,\mathbf{v})+\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{p}(x,\mathbf{v})}(x),\mathbf{w})$$

is satisfied for all  $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$ ; and

**3**  $\mathbf{p}(x, \mathbf{e}_j) \in \mathbf{C}$  for all  $j \in \{1, ..., d_2\}$ .

Let  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ -C.m.s. and let  $\mathbf{C} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$  be a cone. A **C**-speedup of  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$ -C.s.  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  where

$$\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{v}}(x) = \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{p}(x,\mathbf{v})}(x)$$

for some **C**-cocycle **p**.

## A picture to explain (d = 2)



Here,  $\mathbf{S} = (S_1, S_2)$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -speedup of  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2)$ . In particular, for the indicated point *x*, we have

 $\mathbf{p}(x,(1,0)) = (3,1), \quad \mathbf{p}(x,(1,1)) = (5,3), \quad \text{etc.}$ 

When d = 1, there are two cones:

$$C_+ = \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$$
 and  $C_- = \{-1, -2, -3, ...\}.$ 

A  $C_+$ -speedup looks like this:



Here "p(x)" = p(x, 1) = 3, p(x, 2) = 5, etc.

#### Question

Given a  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -C.m.s.  $(X, \mathbf{T})$ , how "similar" does a **C**-speedup  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  have to be to  $(X, \mathbf{T})$ ?

#### Restated

Given  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$ , is there a **C**-speedup of  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  which is the "same" as  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$ ?

Let  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ -C.m.s. and let  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$ -C.m.s.

#### Definition

 $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$  are **conjugate** if  $d_1 = d_2$  and there is a homeomorphism  $\Phi : X \to Y$  such that

$$\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{v}}(\phi(x)) = \Phi(\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{v}}(x))$$

for all  $x \in X$  and all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ .

**Concept:** same action, but different labels on the phase space.

Let  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ -C.m.s. and let  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$ -C.m.s.

#### Definition

 $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$  are **isomorphic** if  $d_1 = d_2$ , there is a homeomorphism  $\Phi : X \to Y$  and a group isomorphism  $\vartheta : \mathbb{Z}^{d_1} \to \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$  such that

$$\mathsf{S}^{\mathsf{v}}(\Phi(x)) = \Phi(\mathsf{T}^{\vartheta(\mathsf{v})}(x))$$

for all  $x \in X$  and all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ .

**Concept:** same action, but different labels on the phase space and different labels on the group elements.

Let  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ -C.m.s. and let  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$ -C.m.s.

#### Definition

 $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(Y, \mathbf{S})$  are **orbit equivalent** if there is a homeomorphism  $\Phi : X \to Y$  such that for every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\Phi\left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d_1}}\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{v}}(x)\right)=\bigcup_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d_2}}\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{v}}\left(\Phi(x)\right).$$

Concept: same orbit relation.

Neveu (1969): characterized functions p(x, 1) which can generate a speedup cocycle for a measure-preserving  $\mathbb{Z}$ -action

Arnoux-Ornstein-Weiss (1985): given any two ergodic Lebesgue measure-preserving  $\mathbb{Z}$ -actions  $(X, \mu, T)$  and  $(Y, \nu, S)$ , there is a **C**<sub>+</sub>-speedup of one which is (measurably) conjugate to the other (ancestor: Dye's Theorem)

Babichev-Burton-Fieldsteel (2013): relative versions of Arnoux-Ornstein-Weiss (ancestor: Rudolph's relative orbit equivalence theory)

Johnson-M (2014, 2018): versions of AOW and BBF for measure-preserving  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -actions (ancestor: Connes-Feldman-Weiss's classification of hyperfinite equivalence relations) Ash (2014): gave necessary and sufficient conditions on  $\mathbb{Z}$ -C.m.s. (X, T) and (Y, S) so that there is a  $C_+$ -speedup of (X, T) conjugate to (Y, S) (ancestor: Giordano-Putnam-Skau's classification of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -C.m.s. up to orbit equivalence)

- Johnson-M: generalized (most of) Ash's work to  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -C.m.s. (ancestor: Giordano-Matui-Putnam-Skau)
- Alvin-Ash-Ormes (2018): studied the structure of <u>bounded</u> speedups of ℤ-C.m.s., with particular emphasis on odometer actions and substitutions.

A speedup given by **C**-cocycle **p** is called **bounded** if  $\{\mathbf{p}(x, \mathbf{e}_j) : x \in X\}$  is bounded for each  $j \in \{1, ..., d\}$ .

**Note:** A speedup is bounded if and only if  $\mathbf{p}: X \times \mathbb{Z}^{d_2} \to \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$  is continuous.

#### In the rest of this talk

We will discuss bounded speedups of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers (with the aim of generalizing AAO).

 $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers were introduced by Cortez in 2004. They are defined as follows:

#### The phase space

Let

$$\mathbb{Z}^d \geq G_1 \geq G_2 \geq G_3 \geq G_4 \geq \cdots$$

be a decreasing sequence of subgroups of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , each of which have finite index in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , such that  $\bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} G_j = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Let X be the inverse limit

$$X = \lim_{\longleftarrow} (\mathbb{Z}^d/G_j).$$

 $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers were introduced by Cortez in 2004. They are defined as follows:

#### The phase space

Each element **x** of X is formally an infinite sequence of cosets, i.e. something like

$$\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1 + G_1, \mathbf{x}_2 + G_2, \mathbf{x}_3 + G_3, ...)$$

where the  $\mathbf{x}_j$  are "commensurate", i.e. since  $G_j \geq G_{j+1}$ , there is a natural map

$$\pi_j:\mathbb{Z}^d/G_{j+1}\to\mathbb{Z}^d/G_j;$$

for such a sequence to be in X we require that, for all j,

$$\pi_j(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}+G_{j+1})=\mathbf{x}_j+G_j.$$

 $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers were introduced by Cortez in 2004. They are defined as follows:

#### The action

X is a Cantor space, and also a topological group with addition defined coordinate-wise, where the addition in the  $j^{th}$  coordinate is the usual (vector) addition in the quotient group  $\mathbb{Z}^d/G_i$ .

Given any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , we can "convert"  $\mathbf{v}$  into an element of X by setting

$$\tau(\mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{v} + G_1, \mathbf{v} + G_2, \mathbf{v} + G_3, ...)$$

Define the action **T** of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  on X by  $\mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + \tau(\mathbf{v})$ . Any  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -C.m.s. conjugate to such an  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  is called a  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometer.

As an example, the dyadic odometer comes from the sequence of groups  $G_j = 2^j \mathbb{Z}$ , i.e.

$$2\mathbb{Z} \ge 4\mathbb{Z} \ge 8\mathbb{Z} \ge 16\mathbb{Z} \ge \cdots \ge 2^j\mathbb{Z} \ge \cdots$$

For  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3, ...) \in X$ , the coset  $\mathbf{x}_j$  labels the level to which  $\mathbf{x}$  belongs at the  $j^{th}$  stage when one does the traditional cutting and stacking construction:



▲□ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶

æ

If d > 1,  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers can be more complicated: as an example, consider the  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -odometer given by

$${\it G}_j = \left(egin{array}{cc} 2 & 1 \ 0 & 2 \end{array}
ight)^j \mathbb{Z}^2$$

After the first iteration of "cutting and stacking", we obtain this picture of how the action acts on the  $x_1$  coordinate:



If d > 1,  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers can be more complicated: as an example, consider the  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -odometer given by

$$G_j = \left(egin{array}{cc} 2 & 1 \ 0 & 2 \end{array}
ight)^j \mathbb{Z}^2$$

After the first iteration of "cutting and stacking", we obtain this picture of how the action acts on the  $\mathbf{x}_1$  coordinate:

Here, there is "skewing" when  $T_2$  sends cosets in the top row back to the bottom, since  $(0,2) \equiv (1,0) \mod G_1$ .

Let (X, T) be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer, and suppose (X, S) is a bounded  $C_+$ -speedup of (X, T). If S is minimal, then (X, S) is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer.

Let (X, T) be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer, and suppose (X, S) is a bounded  $C_+$ -speedup of (X, T). If S is minimal, then (X, S) is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer.

An identical result holds in higher dimensions:

#### Theorem (Johnson-M)

Let  $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$  be any cone. Let  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ -odometer, and suppose  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  is a bounded  $\mathbf{C}$ -speedup of  $(X, \mathbf{T})$ . If  $\mathbf{S}$  is minimal, then  $\mathbf{S}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$ -odometer.

Let (X, T) be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer, and suppose (X, S) is a bounded  $C_+$ -speedup of (X, T). If S is minimal, then (X, S) is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer which is topologically conjugate to (X, T).

Let (X, T) be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer, and suppose (X, S) is a bounded  $C_+$ -speedup of (X, T). If S is minimal, then (X, S) is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer which is topologically conjugate to (X, T).

This is too much to hope for in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  when  $d \geq 2$ .

For instance,  $\mathbf{S} = (T_2, T_1)$  is a speedup of  $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2)$  via the cocycle  $\mathbf{p}(x, (v_1, v_2)) = (v_2, v_1)$ , but such an  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  are, in general, not conjugate.

But these **S** and **T** are isomorphic. Must a minimal bounded speedup of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometer  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be isomorphic to  $(X, \mathbf{T})$ ?

Let (X, T) be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer, and suppose (X, S) is a bounded  $C_+$ -speedup of (X, T). If S is minimal, then (X, S) is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer which is topologically conjugate to (X, T).

#### Theorem (Johnson-M)

Let  $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$  be any cone containing (1,0), (0,1) and (1,1). Then, there exist  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -odometers  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  such that  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  is a bounded  $\mathbf{C}$ -speedup of  $(X, \mathbf{T})$ , but  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  are not isomorphic.

### Example of a bounded, non-isomorphic speedup

Let  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -odometer associated to the sequence of groups  $3^j \mathbb{Z} \times 2^j \mathbb{Z}$  (i.e. the product-type  $\times 3, \times 2$ -odometer).

To define the speedup cocycle **p**:

• set  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x},(1,0)) = (1,0)$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in X$ ;

set

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x},(0,1)) = \begin{cases} (0,1) & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_1 \equiv (0,0), (1,0) \text{ or } (2,0) \\ \mod (3\mathbb{Z} \times 2\mathbb{Z}) \\ (1,1) & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_1 \equiv (0,1), (1,1) \text{ or } (2,1) \\ \mod (3\mathbb{Z} \times 2\mathbb{Z}) \end{cases};$$

• extend **p** to a function on  $X \times \mathbb{Z}^2$  using the cocycle equation. Let  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  be the **C**-speedup of  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  given by **p**.

### Example of a bounded, non-isomorphic speedup

The speedup **S** has skewing that wasn't present in **T**:



### Example of a bounded, non-isomorphic speedup

The speedup **S** has skewing that wasn't present in **T**:



To show  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  are not isomorphic, we use an alternate presentation of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers found by Giordano, Putnam and Skau.

Using Pontryagin duality, they found that a  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometer  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  can be specified by a single subgroup  $H(X, \mathbf{T})$  of  $\mathbb{Q}^d$ .

This group is related to the group cohomology of the action; in fact  $H(X, \mathbf{T}) \cong H^1(X, \mathbf{T})$ , where  $H^1(X, \mathbf{T})$  is the first cohomology group of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with coefficients in the module  $C(X, \mathbb{Z})$ .

To show  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  are not isomorphic, we use an alternate presentation of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometers found by Giordano, Putnam and Skau.

Using Pontryagin duality, they found that a  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometer  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  can be specified by a single subgroup  $H(X, \mathbf{T})$  of  $\mathbb{Q}^d$ .

Furthermore, for a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometer (X, T), H(X, T) is isomorphic to the dimension group D(X, T) associated to the odometer.

In our example, we can compute

$$\begin{split} & \mathcal{H}(X,\mathbf{T}) = \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{3}\right] \times \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{2}\right] \\ & \mathcal{H}(X,\mathbf{S}) = \left\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x \in \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{3}\right], y - \frac{1}{2}x \in \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]\right\}. \end{split}$$

These groups are isomorphic (which reflects the fact that  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  are continuously orbit equivalent).

But they aren't isomorphic in a good enough way...

In our example, we can compute

$$\begin{split} & \mathcal{H}(X,\mathbf{T}) = \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{3}\right] \times \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{2}\right] \\ & \mathcal{H}(X,\mathbf{S}) = \left\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x \in \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{3}\right], y - \frac{1}{2}x \in \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]\right\}. \end{split}$$

If the odometers  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  were isomorphic, then by a theorem of Giordano, Putnam and Skau there would exist a matrix  $A \in GL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  such that  $A H(X, \mathbf{T}) = H(X, \mathbf{S})$ .

But no such A exists (elementary linear algebra argument).

While the  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  in the preceding example are not isomorphic, they are orbit equivalent. This holds in general:

#### Theorem (Johnson-M)

Let  $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$  be any cone. If  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  is a bounded  $\mathbf{C}$ -speedup of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -odometer  $(X, \mathbf{T})$ , then  $(X, \mathbf{S})$  and  $(X, \mathbf{T})$  are orbit equivalent.

When d = 1, this implies AAO, because orbit equivalent  $\mathbb{Z}$ -odometers are automatically conjugate (follows from Boyle-Tomiyama).