

# Orbit equivalence and entropy for locally finite group: detailed proof of a result of Stepin

François Le Maître

## Abstract

We give an exposition of the proof of Theorem 1 from [Ste71] which is more detailed than the original one.

Let  $\Gamma = \bigoplus_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ , denote by  $\gamma_i$  the  $i$ 'th coordinate natural generator and  $\Gamma_i = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_i \rangle = \bigoplus_{n=1}^i \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Theorem 1** (Stepin). *Let  $S, T : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X, \mu)$  be two free pmp actions of  $\Gamma$  on a standard probability space  $(X, \mu)$ , suppose that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $S(\Gamma_n)$  has the same orbits as  $T(\Gamma_n)$ , then*

$$|h(S) - h(T)| \leq \log 2.$$

*Proof.* For brevity, we let  $S_\gamma = S(\gamma)$  and  $T_\gamma = T(\gamma)$  be the pmp bijections induced by these two actions. We are going to bound the entropy of  $S$  in terms of that of  $T$ , which by symmetry will yield the desired result. The key to this bound is the following claim, which estimates how much larger the  $S(\Gamma_n)$ -saturation of a  $T(\Gamma_n)$ -invariant partition is.

**Claim.** Define by induction  $p_1 = 1$  and  $p_{k+1} = 2^k p_k^2$ . Let  $n \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a partition which is  $T(\Gamma_n)$  invariant. Then  $\bigvee_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n} S_\gamma \mathcal{P}$  is obtained by dividing each atom of  $\mathcal{P}$  in at most  $p_n$  elements.

*Proof of the claim.* The proof is by induction. For  $n = 1$  we defined  $p_1 = 1$  and our claim is clear since two involutions sharing the same orbits must be equal.

Suppose the claim has been proved at rank  $n$ , let  $\mathcal{P}$  be  $T(\Gamma_{n+1})$ -invariant. In particular  $\mathcal{P}$  is  $T(\Gamma_n)$  invariant so by our induction hypothesis if we let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the partition obtained by  $S(\Gamma_n)$ -translating  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}$  is obtained by splitting each element of  $\mathcal{P}$  into at most  $p_n$  pieces. Observe that  $\bigvee_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{n+1}} S_\gamma \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q} \vee S(\gamma_{n+1})\mathcal{Q}$  since  $\gamma_{n+1}$  is an involution commuting with  $\Gamma_n$  and  $\Gamma_{n+1} = \langle \Gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1} \rangle$ .

Observe that by freeness each  $S(\Gamma_{n+1})$ -orbit splits into two  $S(\Gamma_n)$ -orbits, and is equal to a  $T(\Gamma_{n+1})$ -orbit. Since  $S(\Gamma_n)$  has the same orbits as  $T(\Gamma_n)$ , the cocycle of  $S_{\gamma_{n+1}}$  must have its  $n + 1$  coordinate equal to 1. We thus get a partition  $(A_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma_n}$  of  $X$  such that for all  $x \in A_\gamma$ ,

$$S_{\gamma_{n+1}}(x) = T_\gamma T_{\gamma_{n+1}}(x).$$

We claim that the partition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = \{A_\gamma \cap C \cap T_\gamma T_{\gamma_{n+1}}(C') : C, C' \in \mathcal{Q}, \gamma \in \Gamma_n\}$$

refines  $\mathcal{Q}$  while being  $S(\gamma_{n+1})$ -invariant. First note that each  $A_\gamma$  is  $S_{\gamma_{n+1}}$ -invariant since it is the place where  $S_{\gamma_{n+1}}$  coincides with another fixed involution, namely  $T_\gamma T_{\gamma_{n+1}}$ . It follows from the definition of  $A_\gamma$  that we can rewrite  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = \{A_\gamma \cap C \cap S_{\gamma_{n+1}}(C') : C, C' \in \mathcal{Q}, \gamma \in \Gamma_n\}.$$

Since  $S_{\gamma_{n+1}}$  is an involution, it then easily follows that  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  is  $S_{\gamma_{n+1}}$ -invariant.

By our assumption on  $\mathcal{P}$ , the pmp bijection  $T_\gamma T_{\gamma_{n+1}}$  permutes the elements of  $\mathcal{P}$ , each which was cut into at most  $p_n$  pieces of the form  $C$  or  $C'$  when obtaining  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Since  $|\Gamma_n| = 2^n$ , we get from the first definition of  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ , namely

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = \{A_\gamma \cap C \cap T_\gamma T_{\gamma_{n+1}}(C') : C, C' \in \mathcal{Q}, \gamma \in \Gamma_n\}$$

that  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  was obtained by cutting each element of  $\mathcal{P}$  into at most  $2^n \times p_n \times p_n$  pieces. As a consequence<sup>1</sup>, each element of  $\mathcal{P}$  will be split in at most  $2^n \times p_n \times p_n = p_{n+1}$  pieces when first constructing  $\mathcal{Q}$  and then constructing  $\mathcal{Q} \vee S_{\gamma_{n+1}} \mathcal{Q} = \bigvee_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{n+1}} S_\gamma \mathcal{P}$ . This finishes the proof of the induction.  $\square_{\text{claim}}$

We can now compare entropies. Given a finite set of pmp bijections  $F$  and a partition  $\mathcal{R}$ , we denote by

$$\mathcal{R}^F = \bigvee_{T \in F} T(\mathcal{R})$$

the partition generated by the  $T$ -translates of  $\mathcal{R}$  for  $T \in F$ . Fix a finite partition  $\mathcal{R}$ . Then by definition  $h(T(\Gamma), \mathcal{R}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{H(\mathcal{R}^{T(\Gamma_n)})}{2^n}$ .

Now let  $\mathcal{Q}_n = (\mathcal{R}^{T(\Gamma_n)})^{S(\Gamma_n)}$ , which refines  $\mathcal{R}^{S(\Gamma_n)}$ . By our previous claim applied to  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{R}^{T(\Gamma_n)}$ ,

$$H(\mathcal{Q}_n) \leq H(\mathcal{P}^{T(\Gamma_n)}) + \log p_n$$

(this follows by conditioning on the elements of  $\mathcal{P}^{T(\Gamma_n)}$  since these have been split in at most  $p_n$  pieces and a partition in  $p_n$  pieces has entropy at most  $\log p_n$ ). In particular  $\frac{H(\mathcal{Q}_n)}{2^n} \leq \frac{\log p_n}{2^n}$ . Now  $\log p_{n+1} = 2 \log p_n + n \log 2$  so

$$\frac{\log p_{n+1}}{2^{n+1}} = \frac{\log p_n}{2^n} + \frac{n \log 2}{2^{n+1}}.$$

Since the series  $\sum_n \frac{n \log 2}{2^{n+1}}$  converges to  $\log 2$ , we conclude that

$$h(S(\Gamma), \mathcal{R}) \leq h(T(\Gamma), \mathcal{R}) + \log 2 \leq h(T) + \log 2$$

Taking a supremum over all  $\mathcal{R}$  we get

$$h(S) \leq h(T) + \log 2,$$

and the result follows by symmetry.  $\square$

<sup>1</sup>Note that here we do not claim (and it might very well not be the case) that  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  is  $S(\Gamma_{n+1})$ -invariant, we only need that it is  $S(\gamma_{n+1})$ -invariant.

**Remark 2.** In particular, the above theorem says that if we restrict orbit equivalence of  $\Gamma$ -actions by requiring it to take  $\Gamma_n$ -orbits to  $\Gamma_n$ -orbits for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we get countably many different actions up to this finer equivalence relation on actions. We should also mention that Stepin refines the above result and gets continuum many such actions in [Ste71, Theorem 2], which uses Theorem 1. Vershik obtained a similar result to Stepin's in the same journal issue as Stepin [Ver71]. Moreover, another result of Vershik shows that given  $S, T : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X, \mu)$ , there is a sequence  $(n_k)$  and an orbit equivalence which takes  $S(\Gamma_{n_k})$  orbits to  $T(\Gamma_{n_k})$ -orbits for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  [Ver68]. The above result shows that in general, one cannot take  $n_k = k$ .

## References

- [Ste71] A. M. Stepin. On entropy invariants of decreasing sequences of measurable partitions. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 5(3):237–240, 1971.
- [Ver68] A. M. Vershik. Theorem on lacunary isomorphisms of monotonic sequences of partitions. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 2(3):200–203, 1968.
- [Ver71] A. M. Vershik. Continuum of pairwise nonisomorphic diadic sequences. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 5(3):182–184, 1971.