

# Isomorphism and conjugacy

• Most areas of mathematics have a notion of when two systems are equivalent.

• Isomorphic groups, homeomorphic topological spaces, isometric metric spaces.

• In Topological dynamics the notion is topological conjugacy

$$X \xrightarrow{f} X$$

$$Y \xrightarrow{g} Y$$

$\alpha$  is a homeomorphism,  $(X, f)$  is topologically conjugate to  $(Y, g)$ . They have all the same dynamics in topological sense

There are two notions of equivalence in ergodic theory arising from two notions of equivalence in measure theory: isomorphism and conjugacy.

We need a bit of measure theory first

DEF: A probability measure space is called complete if every subset of a measure zero set is measurable.

(2) The completion of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is  $(X, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu)$  where  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  is the smallest sigma algebra that contains both  $\mathcal{B}$  and all the subsets of  $\mu$ -measure zero sets.

Example If  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$

Borel's completion is often called the Lebesgue measurable sets

DEF: The probability spaces  $(X, \mathcal{B}_1, \mu_1)$  and

$(X_2, \mathcal{B}_2, \mu_2)$  are isomorphic if  $\exists M_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$ ,

and bi-measurable bijection

$$M_1: (M_1) \rightarrow M_2$$

bi-measure preserving

RK  $M_1$  has the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $M_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_2$  and measure  $M_1$

restricted to  $M_1$ .

measure - theoretically

So the spaces are the same

NOTE after we neglect a set of measure zero from

both spaces.

Example! Let  $D \subseteq [0,1]$  be all points of the form

$$\frac{k}{2^n} \quad 0 \leq k \leq 2^n. \quad D_2 \subseteq \Sigma_2^+ \text{ be all sequences that do not end with } 00 \text{ or } 10 \text{ and } \psi: \Sigma_2^+ \rightarrow [0,1]$$

do not end with 00 or 10 and  $\psi: \Sigma_2^+ \rightarrow [0,1]$   
via  $\psi(\Sigma) = \frac{S_0}{2} + \frac{S_1}{2^2} + \frac{S_2}{2^3} + \dots$

Give  $\Sigma_2^+$  the  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -Bernoulli measure and  $[0,1]$  Lebesgue measure. Then  $\psi: \Sigma_2^+ \rightarrow [0,1]$  is a measure preserving and

$D_2$  and  $D$  both have measure zero.

$\psi$  is bijective and  $\psi$  is a bi-measure preserving isomorphism. So the probability measure spaces are isomorphic.

5

• An atom for a probability measure space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is a point  $x$  with  $\mu(\{x\}) > 0$ . The space is called nonatomic if it has no atoms

• It turns out that with topological hypothesis Probability spaces are isomorphic to Lebesgue measure

• Theorem If  $X$  is separable metric,  $\mathcal{B}$  its Borels and  $\mu$  a nonatomic probability measure  $\Rightarrow (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is isomorphic to  $[0, 1]$  with Lebesgue and Lebesgue measure. The completion of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is isomorphic to  $[0, 1]$  with Lebesgue measurable sets (i.e. the completion of Lebesgue) and Lebesgue measure.

• A space isomorphic to Lebesgue is called Lebesgue space.

Another more mathematically elegant way to deal with measure zero sets (that is harder to work with in examples) is to use measure algebras

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a probability measure space. As in our homework, define an equivalence relation for  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$  as  $A \sim B \iff \mu(A \Delta B) = 0$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  be the collection of equivalence classes. Define

$$[A]^c = [A^c], \quad [A] \cap [B] = [A \cap B]$$

$$[A] \cup [B] = [A \cup B]$$

These are all well defined

This makes  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  into a Boolean  $\sigma$ -algebra i.e. Finally,

all the  $\sigma$ -algebra properties hold. Also well-defined.

$$\mu([B]) = \mu(B) \text{ is also well-defined.}$$

$(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}, \mu)$  is the associated measure algebra

me. measure algebras

7

DEF Given  $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{B}_1, \mu_1)$ ,

$(\mathcal{B}_2, \mu_2)$  are said to be isomorphic if there

is a bijection  $\Phi: \mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_1$  that preserves

countable unions and countable intersections  
complements, and  $\mu_1(\Phi(B)) = \mu_2(B) \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}_2$ .

(as defined above) and  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  are isomorphic, re

If their measure algebras are isomorphic, re  
measure spaces are said to be conjugate

Remarks (1) isomorphism  $\Rightarrow$  conjugacy

Proof!  $\Phi: \mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_1$  via  $\Phi(B) = \underbrace{\Phi^{-1}(M_2 \cap B)}$

(2) conjugacy  $\not\Rightarrow$  isomorphism in general

Trivial example

$$\mathfrak{X}_1 = \{x\}, \mathcal{B}_1 = \{\emptyset, \{x\}, \phi\}, \mu_1(\{x\}) = 1$$

$$\mathfrak{X}_2 = \{y, z\}, \mathcal{B}_2 = \{\emptyset, \{x\}, \{z\}, \mu(\{x, z\}) = 1$$

Both measure algebras contain  $\phi$  and another set

but a set of measure zero cannot be omitted from the result mapped

$\mathfrak{X}_2$  and have [the only zero measure set in  $\mathcal{B}_2$  is  $\phi$ .  
bijectively to  $\mathfrak{X}_1$ ]

But! Theorem If  $\mathfrak{X}_1$  are separable metric  
and  $\mathcal{B}_1$  are Borels we have isomorphism  $\Leftrightarrow$   
conjugacy.



• Remark on Lebesgue Space: Some books allow a Lebesgue space to have a countable set of atoms and it is then isomorphic to  $[0,1]$  with Lebesgue

union a countable set of atoms.

• It is common in Ergodic Theory to restrict

to Lebesgue Spaces.

• A 3rd way to compare probability spaces is via their  $L^p$  spaces, most importantly,  $L^2(\mu)$

• The first observation is that when

$\mathbb{X}_1$  and  $\mathbb{X}_2$  are metric spaces with  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$

Borel measures, then both  $L^2(\mu_1)$  and  $L^2(\mu_2)$  are separable and thus have a countable

basis.

• This means they are also metric unitarily i.e.

∃ bijective linear map  $W: L^2(\mu_2) \rightarrow L^2(\mu_1)$

with  $\forall \alpha, \beta \in L^2(\mu_2)$

$$\langle W\alpha, W\beta \rangle = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$$

Thus  $L^2$  alone will not distinguish

probability spaces

The probability structure

• But  $L^2(\mu)$  has an additional structure for bounded  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

• of pointwise multiplication for bounded  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

• This turns out to give the tool to classify

• up to measure conjugacy.

Theorem  $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{B}_1, \mu_1)$  are probability spaces.

They are conjugate  $\Leftrightarrow \exists$  a bijective linear

map  $V: L^2(\mu_2) \rightarrow L^2(\mu_1)$  such that

$$\forall \alpha, \beta \in L^2(\mu_2)$$

$$(a) \langle V\alpha, V\beta \rangle = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \text{ bounded functions}$$

$$(b) V \text{ and } V^{-1} \text{ map bounded functions}$$

to bounded functions (pt wise multiplication)

$$(c) (V\alpha)(V\beta) = V(\alpha\beta) \text{ when ever } \alpha, \beta \text{ are bounded}$$

equivalence

R.K: Recall that  $L^2(\mu)$  consists of equivalence classes up to measure zero, so, for example,  $\alpha$

bounded meas  $\exists$  full measure set  $B$  and

constant  $K$  so that  $|\alpha(x)| < K$  when  $x \in B$ .