## MAGIC: Ergodic Theory Lecture 8 - Topological entropy

Charles Walkden

March 13th 2013

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Let T be an m.p.t. of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ . Last time we defined the entropy  $h_{\mu}(T)$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

In this lecture we recap some basic facts about entropy.

Let T be an m.p.t. of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ . Last time we defined the entropy  $h_{\mu}(T)$ .

In this lecture we recap some basic facts about entropy.

In the context of a continuous transformation of a compact metric space we study how  $h_{\mu}(T)$  depends on  $\mu$ .

Let T be an m.p.t. of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ . Last time we defined the entropy  $h_{\mu}(T)$ .

In this lecture we recap some basic facts about entropy.

In the context of a continuous transformation of a compact metric space we study how  $h_{\mu}(T)$  depends on  $\mu$ .

We also relate entropy to another important quantity: topological entropy.

Let T be an m.p.t. of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ . Last time we defined the entropy  $h_{\mu}(T)$ .

In this lecture we recap some basic facts about entropy.

In the context of a continuous transformation of a compact metric space we study how  $h_{\mu}(T)$  depends on  $\mu$ .

We also relate entropy to another important quantity: topological entropy.

Throughout: metric entropy = measure-theoretic entropy =  $h_{\mu}(T)$ .

Let  $\zeta = \{A_j\}$  be a finite partition of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Let  $\zeta = \{A_j\}$  be a finite partition of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

Define the entropy of  $\zeta$ 

$$H_\mu(\zeta) = -\sum_{A\in \zeta} \mu(A)\log \mu(A).$$

Let  $\zeta = \{A_j\}$  be a finite partition of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

Define the entropy of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ 

$$H_\mu(\zeta) = -\sum_{A\in \zeta} \mu(A)\log \mu(A).$$

If  $\zeta, \eta$  are partitions then  $\zeta \lor \eta = \{A \cap B \mid A \in \zeta, B \in \eta\}.$ 

Let  $\zeta = \{A_j\}$  be a finite partition of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

Define the entropy of  $\zeta$ 

$$H_\mu(\zeta) = -\sum_{A\in \zeta} \mu(A)\log \mu(A).$$

If  $\zeta, \eta$  are partitions then  $\zeta \lor \eta = \{A \cap B \mid A \in \zeta, B \in \eta\}.$ 

If  $T: X \to X$  is measurable then  $T^{-1}\zeta = \{T^{-1}A \mid A \in \zeta\}.$ 

Let  $\zeta = \{A_j\}$  be a finite partition of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

Define the entropy of  $\zeta$ 

$$H_{\mu}(\zeta) = -\sum_{A\in \zeta} \mu(A) \log \mu(A).$$

If  $\zeta, \eta$  are partitions then  $\zeta \lor \eta = \{A \cap B \mid A \in \zeta, B \in \eta\}.$ 

If  $T: X \to X$  is measurable then  $T^{-1}\zeta = \{T^{-1}A \mid A \in \zeta\}.$ 

The entropy of T relative to  $\zeta$  is

$$h_{\mu}(T,\zeta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j} \alpha \right).$$

Let  $\zeta = \{A_j\}$  be a finite partition of a prob. space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

Define the entropy of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ 

$$H_{\mu}(\zeta) = -\sum_{A\in \zeta} \mu(A) \log \mu(A).$$

If  $\zeta, \eta$  are partitions then  $\zeta \lor \eta = \{A \cap B \mid A \in \zeta, B \in \eta\}.$ 

If  $T: X \to X$  is measurable then  $T^{-1}\zeta = \{T^{-1}A \mid A \in \zeta\}.$ 

The entropy of T relative to  $\zeta$  is

$$h_{\mu}(T,\zeta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j} \alpha \right).$$

The entropy of T is

 $h_{\mu}(T) = \sup\{h_{\mu}(T,\zeta) \mid \zeta \text{ a finite partition}\}.$ 

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆目▶ ◆目▶ 目 のへぐ

A finite partition  $\zeta$  is a generator if  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \zeta \nearrow \mathcal{B}$ . (Equiv.  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \zeta$  separates  $\mu$ -a.e. pair of points.)

A finite partition  $\zeta$  is a generator if  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \zeta \nearrow \mathcal{B}$ . (Equiv.  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \zeta$  separates  $\mu$ -a.e. pair of points.)

#### Theorem (Sinai)

Suppose T is an invertible m.p.t. and  $\zeta$  is a generator. Then

 $h_{\mu}(T) = h_{\mu}(T,\zeta).$ 

A finite partition  $\zeta$  is a generator if  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \zeta \nearrow \mathcal{B}$ . (Equiv.  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \zeta$  separates  $\mu$ -a.e. pair of points.)

#### Theorem (Sinai)

Suppose T is an invertible m.p.t. and  $\zeta$  is a generator. Then

$$h_{\mu}(T) = h_{\mu}(T,\zeta).$$

Let  $\sigma$  be the full *k*-shift with the Bernoulli  $(p_1, \ldots, p_k)$ -measure  $\mu$ . Then  $\zeta = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$  is a generator.

$$h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma,\zeta) = -\sum_{j=1}^{k} p_j \log p_j.$$

<ロト (個) (目) (目) (目) (0) (0)</p>

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  be a compact metric space with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $T: X \to X$  be continuous.

Let  $M(X) = \{ all Borel probability measures \}$ . Let  $M(X, T) = \{ all T-invariant Borel probability measures \}$ .

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  be a compact metric space with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $T: X \to X$  be continuous.

Let  $M(X) = \{ all Borel probability measures \}$ . Let  $M(X, T) = \{ all T-invariant Borel probability measures \}$ .

A sequence  $\mu_n \in M(X)$  weak\*-converges to  $\mu$  ( $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ ) if

$$\int f d\mu_n \to \int f d\mu \ \forall f \in C(X,\mathbb{R}).$$

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  be a compact metric space with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous.

Let  $M(X) = \{ all Borel probability measures \}$ . Let  $M(X, T) = \{ all T-invariant Borel probability measures \}$ .

A sequence  $\mu_n \in M(X)$  weak\*-converges to  $\mu$  ( $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ ) if

$$\int f d\mu_n 
ightarrow \int f d\mu \ orall f \in C(X,\mathbb{R}).$$

Q: How does the entropy  $h_{\mu}(T)$  vary as a function of  $\mu$ ?

Let  $\Sigma_2 = \text{full } 2\text{-sided } 2\text{-shift with shift map } \sigma$ .

Let  $\Sigma_2 = full$  2-sided 2-shift with shift map  $\sigma$ .

x is periodic with period n iff  $x = (\cdots \underbrace{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}}_{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}} \underbrace{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}}_{x_{n-1}} \cdots)$ . There are  $2^n$  points of period n.

Let  $\Sigma_2 = \text{full } 2\text{-sided } 2\text{-shift with shift map } \sigma$ .

x is periodic with period n iff  

$$x = (\cdots \underbrace{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}}_{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}} \underbrace{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}}_{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}} \cdots)$$
. There are  $2^n$  points of period n.

Let

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x=\sigma^n x} \delta_x \in M(X,T).$$

Then  $h_{\mu_n}(\sigma) = 0$  (as  $\mu_n$  is supported on a finite set).

Let  $\Sigma_2 = \text{full } 2\text{-sided } 2\text{-shift with shift map } \sigma$ .

x is periodic with period n iff  

$$x = (\cdots \underbrace{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}}_{0} \underbrace{x_0 x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}}_{0} \cdots)$$
. There are  $2^n$  points of period n.

Let

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x=\sigma^n x} \delta_x \in M(X,T).$$

Then  $h_{\mu_n}(\sigma) = 0$  (as  $\mu_n$  is supported on a finite set).

However,  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ , where  $\mu$  = the Bernoulli (1/2, 1/2)-measure. Note  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log 2$ .

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、(E)、(O)へ(C)

Proof (sketch):

Let  $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that  $\int f \, d\mu_2$ 

# Proof (sketch): Let $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that $\int f d\mu_2$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} (\chi_{[0]}(...00...) + \chi_{[0]}(...01...) + \chi_{[0]}(...10...) + \chi_{[0]}(...11...))$

# Proof (sketch): Let $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that $\int f d\mu_2$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} (\chi_{[0]}(...00...) + \chi_{[0]}(...01...) + \chi_{[0]}(...10...) + \chi_{[0]}(...11...))$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} 2 = \frac{1}{2}$

# Proof (sketch): Let $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that $\int f \, d\mu_2$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} \left( \chi_{[0]}(...00...) + \chi_{[0]}(...01...) + \chi_{[0]}(...10...) + \chi_{[0]}(...11...) \right)$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} 2 = \frac{1}{2} = \mu(\chi_{[0]}) = \int f \, d\mu.$

# Proof (sketch): Let $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that $\int f \, d\mu_2$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} \left( \chi_{[0]}(...00...) + \chi_{[0]}(...01...) + \chi_{[0]}(...10...) + \chi_{[0]}(...11...) \right)$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} 2 = \frac{1}{2} = \mu(\chi_{[0]}) = \int f \, d\mu.$

In general,  $\int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]} d\mu_n = \int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]} d\mu$  when  $n \ge m$ .

# Proof (sketch): Let $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that $\int f \, d\mu_2$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} \left( \chi_{[0]}(...00...) + \chi_{[0]}(...01...) + \chi_{[0]}(...10...) + \chi_{[0]}(...11...) \right)$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} 2 = \frac{1}{2} = \mu(\chi_{[0]}) = \int f \, d\mu.$

In general, 
$$\int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]} \, d\mu_n = \int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]} \, d\mu$$
 when  $n \geq m$ .

Characteristic functions of intervals are continuous. Finite linear combinations of characteristic functions are dense in  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$  (by the Stone-Weierstrass theorem). Hence  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ .

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

# Proof (sketch): Let $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that $\int f \, d\mu_2$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} \left( \chi_{[0]}(...00...) + \chi_{[0]}(...01...) + \chi_{[0]}(...10...) + \chi_{[0]}(...11...) \right)$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} 2 = \frac{1}{2} = \mu(\chi_{[0]}) = \int f \, d\mu.$

In general, 
$$\int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]}\,d\mu_n=\int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]}\,d\mu$$
 when  $n\geq m$ .

Characteristic functions of intervals are continuous. Finite linear combinations of characteristic functions are dense in  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$  (by the Stone-Weierstrass theorem). Hence  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ .

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Is the entropy map upper semi-continuous? i.e. does  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu \Rightarrow \limsup_{n \to \infty} h_{\mu_n}(T) \le h_{\mu}(T)$ ?

# Proof (sketch): Let $f = \chi_{[0]}$ . Note that $\int f \, d\mu_2$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} \left( \chi_{[0]}(...00...) + \chi_{[0]}(...01...) + \chi_{[0]}(...10...) + \chi_{[0]}(...11...) \right)$ $= \frac{1}{2^2} 2 = \frac{1}{2} = \mu(\chi_{[0]}) = \int f \, d\mu.$

In general, 
$$\int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]}\,d\mu_n=\int \chi_{[i_0,...,i_{m-1}]}\,d\mu$$
 when  $n\geq m$ .

Characteristic functions of intervals are continuous. Finite linear combinations of characteristic functions are dense in  $C(X, \mathbb{R})$  (by the Stone-Weierstrass theorem). Hence  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ .

Is the entropy map upper semi-continuous? i.e. does  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu \Rightarrow \limsup_{n \to \infty} h_{\mu_n}(T) \le h_{\mu}(T)$ ?

Answer: no in general, yes in many important cases.

#### Expansive homeomorphisms

<ロ>

### Expansive homeomorphisms

Definition

A homeomorphism T is expansive if:  $\exists \delta > 0$  s.t. if  $d(T^n x, T^n y) \leq \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  then x = y.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで
### Definition

A homeomorphism T is expansive if:  $\exists \delta > 0$  s.t. if  $d(T^n x, T^n y) \leq \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  then x = y.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

### Example

A shift of finite type is expansive.

### Definition

A homeomorphism T is expansive if:  $\exists \delta > 0$  s.t. if  $d(T^n x, T^n y) \leq \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  then x = y.

### Example

A shift of finite type is expansive. Recall  $d(x, y) = 1/2^n$ , n = first disagreement. Let  $\delta < 1$ . If  $x_n \neq y_n$  then  $d(T^nx, T^ny) = 1 \ge \delta$ .

### Definition

A homeomorphism T is expansive if:  $\exists \delta > 0$  s.t. if  $d(T^n x, T^n y) \leq \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  then x = y.

### Example

A shift of finite type is expansive. Recall  $d(x, y) = 1/2^n$ , n = first disagreement. Let  $\delta < 1$ . If  $x_n \neq y_n$  then  $d(T^nx, T^ny) = 1 \ge \delta$ .

### Example

Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^k / \mathbb{Z}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k / \mathbb{Z}^k$ ,  $T_X = A_X \mod 1$  be a toral automorphism given by  $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ . Then T is expansive iff A is hyperbolic (no eigenvalues of modulus 1).

### Definition

A homeomorphism T is expansive if:  $\exists \delta > 0$  s.t. if  $d(T^n x, T^n y) \leq \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  then x = y.

### Example

A shift of finite type is expansive. Recall  $d(x, y) = 1/2^n$ , n = first disagreement. Let  $\delta < 1$ . If  $x_n \neq y_n$  then  $d(T^nx, T^ny) = 1 \ge \delta$ .

### Example

Let  $T : \mathbb{R}^k / \mathbb{Z}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k / \mathbb{Z}^k$ ,  $T_X = A_X \mod 1$  be a toral automorphism given by  $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ . Then T is expansive iff A is hyperbolic (no eigenvalues of modulus 1).

Other examples: all Anosov diffeomorphisms, Smale horseshoe, solenoid,...

<ロ>

Theorem

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism of a compact metric space. Then the entropy map is upper semi-continuous: if  $\mu_n, \mu \in M(X, T), \ \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  then  $\limsup h_{\mu_n}(T) \le h_{\mu}(T)$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

### Theorem

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism of a compact metric space. Then the entropy map is upper semi-continuous: if  $\mu_n, \mu \in M(X, T), \ \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  then  $\limsup h_{\mu_n}(T) \leq h_{\mu}(T)$ .

### Proof (sketch):

**Fact:** Suppose  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is s.t.  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$  then  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$ .

### Theorem

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism of a compact metric space. Then the entropy map is upper semi-continuous: if  $\mu_n, \mu \in M(X, T), \ \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  then  $\limsup h_{\mu_n}(T) \leq h_{\mu}(T)$ .

### Proof (sketch):

**Fact:** Suppose  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is s.t.  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$  then  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$ .

If  $\zeta$  is a partition such that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \zeta$  then  $H_{\mu_j}(\zeta) \to H_{\mu}(\zeta)$ .

### Theorem

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism of a compact metric space. Then the entropy map is upper semi-continuous: if  $\mu_n, \mu \in M(X, T), \ \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  then  $\limsup h_{\mu_n}(T) \leq h_{\mu}(T)$ .

### Proof (sketch):

**Fact:** Suppose  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is s.t.  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$  then  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$ .

If  $\zeta$  is a partition such that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \zeta$  then  $H_{\mu_j}(\zeta) \to H_{\mu}(\zeta)$ . Hence

$$h_{\mu_n}(T,\zeta) \to h_{\mu}(T,\zeta).$$

### Theorem

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism of a compact metric space. Then the entropy map is upper semi-continuous: if  $\mu_n, \mu \in M(X, T), \ \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  then  $\limsup h_{\mu_n}(T) \le h_{\mu}(T)$ .

### Proof (sketch):

**Fact:** Suppose  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is s.t.  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$  then  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$ .

If  $\zeta$  is a partition such that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \zeta$  then  $H_{\mu_j}(\zeta) \to H_{\mu}(\zeta)$ . Hence

$$h_{\mu_n}(T,\zeta) \to h_{\mu}(T,\zeta).$$

Let  $\delta$  be an expansive constant. If  $\operatorname{diam}\,\zeta<\delta$  then  $\zeta$  is a generator.

### Theorem

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism of a compact metric space. Then the entropy map is upper semi-continuous: if  $\mu_n, \mu \in M(X, T), \ \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  then  $\limsup h_{\mu_n}(T) \le h_{\mu}(T)$ .

### Proof (sketch):

**Fact:** Suppose  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is s.t.  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$  then  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$ .

If  $\zeta$  is a partition such that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \zeta$  then  $H_{\mu_j}(\zeta) \to H_{\mu}(\zeta)$ . Hence

$$h_{\mu_n}(T,\zeta) \to h_{\mu}(T,\zeta).$$

Let  $\delta$  be an expansive constant. If diam  $\zeta < \delta$  then  $\zeta$  is a generator. So  $h_{\mu}(T) = h_{\mu}(T, \zeta)$  by Sinai.

### Theorem

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism of a compact metric space. Then the entropy map is upper semi-continuous: if  $\mu_n, \mu \in M(X, T), \ \mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  then  $\limsup h_{\mu_n}(T) \leq h_{\mu}(T)$ .

### Proof (sketch):

**Fact:** Suppose  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ . If  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is s.t.  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$  then  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$ .

If  $\zeta$  is a partition such that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \zeta$  then  $H_{\mu_j}(\zeta) \to H_{\mu}(\zeta)$ . Hence

$$h_{\mu_n}(T,\zeta) \to h_{\mu}(T,\zeta).$$

Let  $\delta$  be an expansive constant. If diam  $\zeta < \delta$  then  $\zeta$  is a generator. So  $h_{\mu}(T) = h_{\mu}(T, \zeta)$  by Sinai. Alter  $\zeta$  slightly to ensure  $\mu(\partial A) = 0 \ \forall A \in \zeta$ .

Let X be compact metric, let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous. Recall X compact  $\Rightarrow$  every open cover of X has a finite subcover.

Let X be compact metric, let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous. Recall X compact  $\Rightarrow$  every open cover of X has a finite subcover.

### Definition

Let  $\alpha$  be an open cover of X. Let  $N(\alpha) < \infty$  be the cardinality of the *smallest* finite subcover of X. Define the entropy of  $\alpha$  to be

$$H_{ ext{top}}(lpha) = \log N(lpha)$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Let X be compact metric, let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous. Recall X compact  $\Rightarrow$  every open cover of X has a finite subcover.

#### Definition

Let  $\alpha$  be an open cover of X. Let  $N(\alpha) < \infty$  be the cardinality of the *smallest* finite subcover of X. Define the entropy of  $\alpha$  to be

$$H_{ ext{top}}(lpha) = \log N(lpha)$$

#### Definition

Let  $\alpha = \{A_i\}$ ,  $\beta = \{B_j\}$  be open covers. The *join* is the open cover  $\alpha \lor \beta = \{A_i \cap B_j \mid A_i \in \alpha, B_j \in \beta\}$ .

Let X be compact metric, let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous. Recall X compact  $\Rightarrow$  every open cover of X has a finite subcover.

#### Definition

Let  $\alpha$  be an open cover of X. Let  $N(\alpha) < \infty$  be the cardinality of the *smallest* finite subcover of X. Define the entropy of  $\alpha$  to be

$$H_{ ext{top}}(lpha) = \log N(lpha)$$

#### Definition

Let  $\alpha = \{A_i\}$ ,  $\beta = \{B_j\}$  be open covers. The *join* is the open cover  $\alpha \lor \beta = \{A_i \cap B_j \mid A_i \in \alpha, B_j \in \beta\}$ .

#### Definition

We say  $\alpha \leq \beta$  if every element of  $\beta$  is a subset of an element of  $\alpha$ . (Example:  $\alpha \leq \alpha \lor \beta$ .) Easy check:  $\alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow H_{top}(\alpha) \leq H_{top}(\beta)$ .

Let X be compact metric, let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous. Recall X compact  $\Rightarrow$  every open cover of X has a finite subcover.

### Definition

Let  $\alpha$  be an open cover of X. Let  $N(\alpha) < \infty$  be the cardinality of the *smallest* finite subcover of X. Define the entropy of  $\alpha$  to be

$$H_{ ext{top}}(lpha) = \log N(lpha)$$

#### Definition

Let  $\alpha = \{A_i\}, \beta = \{B_j\}$  be open covers. The *join* is the open cover  $\alpha \lor \beta = \{A_i \cap B_j \mid A_i \in \alpha, B_j \in \beta\}.$ 

#### Definition

We say  $\alpha \leq \beta$  if every element of  $\beta$  is a subset of an element of  $\alpha$ . (Example:  $\alpha \leq \alpha \lor \beta$ .) Easy check:  $\alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow H_{top}(\alpha) \leq H_{top}(\beta)$ .

### Definition

 $T^{-1}\alpha$  is the open cover  $\{T^{-1}A \mid A \in \alpha\}$ .

### Definition

The topological entropy of  ${\mathcal T}$  relative to the open cover  $\alpha$  is

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(T, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mathrm{top}} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j} \alpha \right).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

### Definition

The topological entropy of T relative to the open cover  $\alpha$  is

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(T, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mathrm{top}} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j} \alpha \right).$$

#### Remark

The limit exists as  $H_n = H_{top} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j} \alpha \right)$  is subadditive:  $H_{n+m} \leq H_n + H_m$ .

### Definition

The topological entropy of T relative to the open cover  $\alpha$  is

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(T,\alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mathrm{top}} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j} \alpha \right).$$

#### Remark

The limit exists as  $H_n = H_{top} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j} \alpha \right)$  is subadditive:  $H_{n+m} \leq H_n + H_m$ .

### Definition

The topological entropy of T is

$$h_{top}(T) = \sup\{h_{top}(T, \alpha) \mid \alpha \text{ is an open cover of } X\}.$$

Let X be compact metric with metric d. Let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Let X be compact metric with metric d. Let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous.

Let  $d_n(x, y) = \max_{0 \le j \le n-1} d(T^j x, T^j y)$ . The balls in this metric are

$$B_n(x,\varepsilon) = \{y \mid d(T^jx,T^jy) < \varepsilon, 0 \le j \le n-1\}.$$

Let X be compact metric with metric d. Let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous.

Let  $d_n(x, y) = \max_{0 \le j \le n-1} d(T^j x, T^j y)$ . The balls in this metric are

$$B_n(x,\varepsilon) = \{y \mid d(T^jx,T^jy) < \varepsilon, 0 \le j \le n-1\}.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

So x, y are  $d_n$ -close if the first n points in the orbits of x, y are close.

Let X be compact metric with metric d. Let  $T : X \to X$  be continuous.

Let  $d_n(x, y) = \max_{0 \le j \le n-1} d(T^j x, T^j y)$ . The balls in this metric are

$$B_n(x,\varepsilon) = \{y \mid d(T^jx, T^jy) < \varepsilon, 0 \le j \le n-1\}.$$

So x, y are  $d_n$ -close if the first n points in the orbits of x, y are close.

Idea: suppose we can't distinguish two orbits if they are close for the first *n* iterates. How many such orbits are there?

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のへの

### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $F \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning if the  $d_n$ -balls of radius  $\varepsilon$  and centres in F covers X:

$$X = \bigcup_{x \in F} B_n(x, \varepsilon).$$

### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $F \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning if the  $d_n$ -balls of radius  $\varepsilon$  and centres in F covers X:

$$X = \bigcup_{x \in F} B_n(x, \varepsilon).$$

We want to make spanning sets as *small* as possible. Let  $p_n(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the smallest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning set.

### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $F \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning if the  $d_n$ -balls of radius  $\varepsilon$  and centres in F covers X:

$$X = \bigcup_{x \in F} B_n(x, \varepsilon).$$

We want to make spanning sets as *small* as possible. Let  $p_n(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the smallest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning set.

Let 
$$p(\varepsilon) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_n(\varepsilon)$$
.

#### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $F \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning if the  $d_n$ -balls of radius  $\varepsilon$  and centres in F covers X:

$$X = \bigcup_{x \in F} B_n(x, \varepsilon).$$

We want to make spanning sets as *small* as possible. Let  $p_n(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the smallest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning set.

Let 
$$p(\varepsilon) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_n(\varepsilon)$$
.

Let  $h_{spanning}(T) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} p(\varepsilon)$ .

#### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \ne y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

#### Remark

 $p_n(\varepsilon) \leq q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$ then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

# Remark

 $p_n(\varepsilon) \leq q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 



- 3
#### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

#### Remark

 $p_n(\varepsilon) \leq q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

Let *E* be  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ .



・ロット 全部 マート・ キャー

#### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \ne y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

#### Remark

 $p_n(\varepsilon) \leq q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

Let *E* be  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ . Then *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning.



・ロット 全部 マート・ キャー

#### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

#### Remark

$$p_n(\varepsilon) \leq q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2).$$

Let *E* be  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ . Then *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning.



#### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

#### Remark

$$p_n(\varepsilon) \leq q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2).$$

Let *E* be  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ . Then *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning.



#### Definition

Let  $n \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ .  $E \subset X$  is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if:  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$  then  $d_n(x, y) > \varepsilon$ .

We want to make separated sets as large as possible. Let  $q(\varepsilon)$  be the cardinality of the largest  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated set.

#### Remark

$$p_n(\varepsilon) \leq q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2).$$

Let *E* be  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ . Then *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -spanning. Hence  $p_n(\varepsilon) \le q_n(\varepsilon)$ .



・ロト ・聞 ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

Remark (continued)  $p_n(\varepsilon) \le q_n(\varepsilon) \le p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Remark (continued)  $p_n(\varepsilon) \le q_n(\varepsilon) \le p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

Suppose *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ .

Suppose F is  $(n, \varepsilon/2)$ -spanning of cardinality  $p_n(\varepsilon/2)$ .

Remark (continued)  $p_n(\varepsilon) \le q_n(\varepsilon) \le p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

Suppose *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ .

Suppose *F* is  $(n, \varepsilon/2)$ -spanning of cardinality  $p_n(\varepsilon/2)$ .

For every  $x \in E$  there exists a  $y \in F$  such that  $x \in B_n(y, \varepsilon/2)$ .

Remark (continued)  $p_n(\varepsilon) \le q_n(\varepsilon) \le p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

Suppose *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ .

Suppose *F* is  $(n, \varepsilon/2)$ -spanning of cardinality  $p_n(\varepsilon/2)$ .

For every  $x \in E$  there exists a  $y \in F$  such that  $x \in B_n(y, \varepsilon/2)$ .

This map  $E \rightarrow F : x \mapsto y$  is injective.

Remark (continued)  $p_n(\varepsilon) \le q_n(\varepsilon) \le p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

Suppose *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ .

Suppose *F* is  $(n, \varepsilon/2)$ -spanning of cardinality  $p_n(\varepsilon/2)$ .

For every  $x \in E$  there exists a  $y \in F$  such that  $x \in B_n(y, \varepsilon/2)$ .

This map  $E \to F : x \mapsto y$  is injective. (If not, then  $x, x' \in E$  could map to the same  $y \in F$ . Then  $d_n(x, x') \leq d_n(x, y) + d_n(y, x) < \varepsilon$ . Then x = x' as E is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated.)

Remark (continued)  $p_n(\varepsilon) \le q_n(\varepsilon) \le p_n(\varepsilon/2).$ 

Suppose *E* is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated of cardinality  $q_n(\varepsilon)$ .

Suppose *F* is  $(n, \varepsilon/2)$ -spanning of cardinality  $p_n(\varepsilon/2)$ .

For every  $x \in E$  there exists a  $y \in F$  such that  $x \in B_n(y, \varepsilon/2)$ .

This map  $E \to F : x \mapsto y$  is injective. (If not, then  $x, x' \in E$  could map to the same  $y \in F$ . Then  $d_n(x, x') \leq d_n(x, y) + d_n(y, x) < \varepsilon$ . Then x = x' as E is  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated.)

Hence  $q_n(\varepsilon) \leq p_n(\varepsilon/2)$ .

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶ - 国 - のへぐ

#### Hence

$$h_{\text{spanning}}(T) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_n(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log q_n(\varepsilon).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

#### Hence

$$h_{\text{spanning}}(T) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_n(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log q_n(\varepsilon).$$

## Theorem (Bowen)

The definition of topological entropy using open sets agrees with the definition of topological entropy using spanning/separated sets.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

#### Hence

$$h_{\text{spanning}}(T) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_n(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log q_n(\varepsilon).$$

## Theorem (Bowen)

The definition of topological entropy using open sets agrees with the definition of topological entropy using spanning/separated sets.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

#### Proof (sketch):

Careful analysis using Lebesgue numbers of open covers...

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲≣▶ ▲≣▶ = 差 = のへで

Let  $\alpha = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  be a finite open cover.

Let  $\alpha = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  be a finite open cover. For each x look at the sequence of elements of  $\alpha$  the orbit of x visits. This codes the orbit of x by a bi-infinite sequence of symbols from  $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Let  $\alpha = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  be a finite open cover. For each x look at the sequence of elements of  $\alpha$  the orbit of x visits. This codes the orbit of x by a bi-infinite sequence of symbols from  $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ .

This coding may not be 'nice':

Let  $\alpha = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  be a finite open cover. For each x look at the sequence of elements of  $\alpha$  the orbit of x visits. This codes the orbit of x by a bi-infinite sequence of symbols from  $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ .

This coding may not be 'nice': different points may have the same coding, the coding may not be unique, the set of all sequences may be complicated (eg: not of finite type).

Let  $\alpha = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  be a finite open cover. For each x look at the sequence of elements of  $\alpha$  the orbit of x visits. This codes the orbit of x by a bi-infinite sequence of symbols from  $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ .

This coding may not be 'nice': different points may have the same coding, the coding may not be unique, the set of all sequences may be complicated (eg: not of finite type).

 $\alpha$  is a (topological) generator if each sequence codes at most one point.

Let  $\alpha = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  be a finite open cover. For each x look at the sequence of elements of  $\alpha$  the orbit of x visits. This codes the orbit of x by a bi-infinite sequence of symbols from  $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ .

This coding may not be 'nice': different points may have the same coding, the coding may not be unique, the set of all sequences may be complicated (eg: not of finite type).

 $\alpha$  is a (topological) generator if each sequence codes at most one point. Precisely,  $\alpha$  is a generator if for each sequence  $(i_j)_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}$ 

$$\operatorname{card} \bigcap_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-j} \overline{A_{i_j}} = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲≣▶ ▲≣▶ = 差 = のへで

Proposition

T has a (topological) generator iff T is expansive.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

## Proposition

T has a (topological) generator iff T is expansive.

## Proof (sketch):

Suppose T is expansive with expansive constant  $\delta$ . Consider the open cover by balls of radius  $\delta/2$ . Let  $\alpha$  be a finite subcover. Then  $\alpha$  is a (topological) generator.

## Proposition

T has a (topological) generator iff T is expansive.

## Proof (sketch):

Suppose T is expansive with expansive constant  $\delta$ . Consider the open cover by balls of radius  $\delta/2$ . Let  $\alpha$  be a finite subcover. Then  $\alpha$  is a (topological) generator.

The converse is slightly more involved.

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲≣▶ ▲≣▶ = 差 = のへで

## Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

Proof (sketch):



### Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Proof (sketch):

**Step 1:** Clearly  $h_{top}(T, \alpha) \leq h_{top}(T)$ .

### Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Proof (sketch):

**Step 1:** Clearly  $h_{top}(T, \alpha) \leq h_{top}(T)$ .

**Step 2:** diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to 0$ .

### Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

Proof (sketch):

**Step 1:** Clearly  $h_{top}(T, \alpha) \leq h_{top}(T)$ .

**Step 2:** diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to 0$ . (If diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to \varepsilon_0 > 0$  then two points could have the same coding - contradicting  $\alpha$  being a generator.)

#### Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

Proof (sketch):

**Step 1:** Clearly  $h_{top}(T, \alpha) \leq h_{top}(T)$ .

**Step 2:** diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to 0$ . (If diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to \varepsilon_0 > 0$  then two points could have the same coding - contradicting  $\alpha$  being a generator.)

**Step 3:** Let  $\beta$  be any open cover. Let r > 0 be a Lebesgue number for  $\beta$ .

#### Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

Proof (sketch):

**Step 1:** Clearly  $h_{top}(T, \alpha) \leq h_{top}(T)$ .

**Step 2:** diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to 0$ . (If diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to \varepsilon_0 > 0$  then two points could have the same coding - contradicting  $\alpha$  being a generator.)

**Step 3:** Let  $\beta$  be any open cover. Let r > 0 be a Lebesgue number for  $\beta$ . Choose *n* s.t. diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \leq r$ . Then  $\beta \leq \bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha$ .

#### Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

Proof (sketch):

**Step 1:** Clearly  $h_{top}(T, \alpha) \leq h_{top}(T)$ .

**Step 2:** diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to 0$ . (If diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to \varepsilon_0 > 0$  then two points could have the same coding - contradicting  $\alpha$  being a generator.)

**Step 3:** Let  $\beta$  be any open cover. Let r > 0 be a Lebesgue number for  $\beta$ . Choose *n* s.t. diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \leq r$ . Then  $\beta \leq \bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha$ . Then  $h_{\text{top}}(T,\beta) \leq h_{\text{top}}\left(T,\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha\right) = h_{\text{top}}(T,\alpha)$ .
# Calculating topological entropy using generators

### Proposition

Let T be an expansive homeomorphism & let  $\alpha$  be a generator. Then  $h_{top}(T) = h_{top}(T, \alpha)$ .

Proof (sketch):

**Step 1:** Clearly  $h_{top}(T, \alpha) \leq h_{top}(T)$ .

**Step 2:** diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to 0$ . (If diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \to \varepsilon_0 > 0$  then two points could have the same coding - contradicting  $\alpha$  being a generator.)

**Step 3:** Let  $\beta$  be any open cover. Let r > 0 be a Lebesgue number for  $\beta$ . Choose *n* s.t. diam  $\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha \leq r$ . Then  $\beta \leq \bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha$ . Then  $h_{\text{top}}(T,\beta) \leq h_{\text{top}}(T,\bigvee_{j=-n}^{n} T^{-j} \alpha) = h_{\text{top}}(T,\alpha)$ . Take the supremum over all  $\beta$ .

▲ロト ▲圖 → ▲ 国 ト ▲ 国 - の Q @

Let  $\sigma: \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided *k*-shift.

Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Note  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\Sigma_k$ . It's clear that  $\alpha$  is a (top.) generator.

・ロト・日本・モート モー うへぐ

Let  $\sigma: \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided *k*-shift.

Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Note  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\Sigma_k$ . It's clear that  $\alpha$  is a (top.) generator.

Note  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha$  is the open cover of  $\Sigma_k$  into all cylinders of length n. There are  $k^n$  of these and all of them are needed to cover  $\Sigma_k$ .

Let  $\sigma: \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided *k*-shift.

Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Note  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\Sigma_k$ . It's clear that  $\alpha$  is a (top.) generator.

Note  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha$  is the open cover of  $\Sigma_k$  into all cylinders of length n. There are  $k^n$  of these and all of them are needed to cover  $\Sigma_k$ . Hence

 $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\sigma)$ 

Let  $\sigma: \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided *k*-shift.

Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Note  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\Sigma_k$ . It's clear that  $\alpha$  is a (top.) generator.

Note  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha$  is the open cover of  $\Sigma_k$  into all cylinders of length n. There are  $k^n$  of these and all of them are needed to cover  $\Sigma_k$ . Hence

$$h_{top}(\sigma) = h_{top}(\sigma, \alpha) =$$

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided *k*-shift.

=

Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Note  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\Sigma_k$ . It's clear that  $\alpha$  is a (top.) generator.

Note  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha$  is the open cover of  $\Sigma_k$  into all cylinders of length n. There are  $k^n$  of these and all of them are needed to cover  $\Sigma_k$ . Hence

$$h_{\text{top}}(\sigma) = h_{\text{top}}(\sigma, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha\right)$$

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided *k*-shift.

Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Note  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\Sigma_k$ . It's clear that  $\alpha$  is a (top.) generator.

Note  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha$  is the open cover of  $\Sigma_k$  into all cylinders of length n. There are  $k^n$  of these and all of them are needed to cover  $\Sigma_k$ . Hence

$$h_{top}(\sigma) = h_{top}(\sigma, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{top} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha \right)$$
$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log k^n = \log k.$$

▲ロト ▲圖 → ▲ 国 ト ▲ 国 - の Q @

Let A be an irreducible  $k \times k$  0 - 1 matrix. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$  be the shift of finite type. Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Again, this open cover is a generator.

Let A be an irreducible  $k \times k$  0 - 1 matrix. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$  be the shift of finite type. Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Again, this open cover is a generator.

Now  $H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log(\text{no. of cylinders of length } n \text{ in } \Sigma_A).$ 

Let A be an irreducible  $k \times k$  0 - 1 matrix. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$  be the shift of finite type. Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Again, this open cover is a generator.

Now 
$$H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log(\text{no. of cylinders of length } n \text{ in } \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}).$$

Number of words in  $\Sigma_A$  of length *n* starting at *i* and ending at *j* is  $(A^n)_{i,j}$ .

Let A be an irreducible  $k \times k$  0 - 1 matrix. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$  be the shift of finite type. Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Again, this open cover is a generator.

Now 
$$H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log(\text{no. of cylinders of length } n \text{ in } \Sigma_A).$$

Number of words in  $\Sigma_A$  of length *n* starting at *i* and ending at *j* is  $(A^n)_{i,j}$ . Hence number of cylinders of length *n* is  $\sum_{i,j=1}^k (A^n)_{i,j} = ||A^n||$ .

Let A be an irreducible  $k \times k$  0 - 1 matrix. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$  be the shift of finite type. Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Again, this open cover is a generator.

Now 
$$H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log(\text{no. of cylinders of length } n \text{ in } \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}).$$

Number of words in  $\Sigma_A$  of length *n* starting at *i* and ending at *j* is  $(A^n)_{i,j}$ . Hence number of cylinders of length *n* is  $\sum_{i,j=1}^k (A^n)_{i,j} = ||A^n||$ .

Hence

 $h_{top}(\sigma) = h_{top}(\sigma, \alpha)$ 

Let A be an irreducible  $k \times k$  0 - 1 matrix. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$  be the shift of finite type. Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Again, this open cover is a generator.

Now 
$$H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log(\text{no. of cylinders of length }n \text{ in }\Sigma_A).$$

Number of words in  $\Sigma_A$  of length *n* starting at *i* and ending at *j* is  $(A^n)_{i,j}$ . Hence number of cylinders of length *n* is  $\sum_{i,j=1}^k (A^n)_{i,j} = ||A^n||$ .

Hence

$$h_{\text{top}}(\sigma) = h_{\text{top}}(\sigma, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha\right)$$

Let A be an irreducible  $k \times k$  0 - 1 matrix. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$  be the shift of finite type. Let  $\alpha = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . Again, this open cover is a generator.

Now 
$$H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log(\text{no. of cylinders of length }n \text{ in }\Sigma_A).$$

Number of words in  $\Sigma_A$  of length *n* starting at *i* and ending at *j* is  $(A^n)_{i,j}$ . Hence number of cylinders of length *n* is  $\sum_{i,j=1}^k (A^n)_{i,j} = ||A^n||$ .

Hence

$$h_{\text{top}}(\sigma) = h_{\text{top}}(\sigma, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\text{top}}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha\right)$$
$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|A^n\| = \log \lambda$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  is the largest eigenvalue of A, by the spectral radius formula.

<□▶ < @▶ < @▶ < @▶ < @▶ < @ > @ < のQ @</p>

We can relate metric and topological entropy

We can relate metric and topological entropy

### Theorem (The variational principle)

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric X. Then

$$h_{\text{top}}(T) = \sup\{h_{\mu}(T) \mid \mu \in M(X,T)\}.$$

We can relate metric and topological entropy

### Theorem (The variational principle)

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric X. Then

$$h_{ ext{top}}(T) = \sup\{h_{\mu}(T) \mid \mu \in M(X, T)\}.$$

#### Remark

There are examples to show that this supremum need not be achieved.

We can relate metric and topological entropy

### Theorem (The variational principle)

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric X. Then

$$h_{ ext{top}}(T) = \sup\{h_{\mu}(T) \mid \mu \in M(X,T)\}.$$

#### Remark

There are examples to show that this supremum need not be achieved.

### Definition

Let  $M_{\max}(X, T) = \{ \mu \in M(X, T) \mid h_{top}(T) = h_{\mu}(T) \}$  denote the set of all *measures of maximal entropy*.

Proposition

If the entropy map is upper semi-continuous then  $M_{\max}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

## Proposition

If the entropy map is upper semi-continuous then  $M_{\max}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$ . Proof: an upper semi-continuous function on a compact metric space achieves its supremum. Note that M(X, T) is a compact metric space.

## Proposition

If the entropy map is upper semi-continuous then  $M_{\max}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$ . Proof: an upper semi-continuous function on a compact metric space achieves its supremum. Note that M(X, T) is a compact metric space.

#### Remark

Hence expansive homeomorphisms always have at least one measure of maximal entropy.

In many cases, there is a *unique* measure of maximal entropy.

<ロ>

### Proposition

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided k-shift. Then the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

## Proposition

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided k-shift. Then the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

Proof.

We know the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is  $\log k$ .

## Proposition

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided k-shift. Then the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

### Proof.

We know the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is log k. We know the entropy of the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is log k.

## Proposition

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided k-shift. Then the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

### Proof.

We know the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is log k. We know the entropy of the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is log k. We show: if  $\mu \in M(X, T)$  has  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log k$  then  $\mu$  is the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure.

## Proposition

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided k-shift. Then the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

### Proof.

We know the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is  $\log k$ . We know the entropy of the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is  $\log k$ . We show: if  $\mu \in M(X, T)$  has  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log k$  then  $\mu$  is the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure.

Let  $\zeta = \{[1], \dots, [k]\}$ . This is a generator, so by Sinai's thm  $\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma, \zeta)$ .

### Proposition

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided k-shift. Then the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

#### Proof.

We know the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is  $\log k$ . We know the entropy of the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is  $\log k$ . We show: if  $\mu \in M(X, T)$  has  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log k$  then  $\mu$  is the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure.

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Let  $\zeta = \{[1], \ldots, [k]\}$ . This is a generator, so by Sinai's thm  $\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma, \zeta)$ .

Note that 
$$h_\mu(\sigma,\zeta) \leq rac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(igvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j}lpha
ight)$$

## Proposition

Let  $\sigma : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_k$  be the full two-sided k-shift. Then the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

### Proof.

We know the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is  $\log k$ . We know the entropy of the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure is  $\log k$ . We show: if  $\mu \in M(X, T)$  has  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log k$  then  $\mu$  is the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure.

Let  $\zeta = \{[1], \dots, [k]\}$ . This is a generator, so by Sinai's thm  $\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma, \zeta)$ .

Note that 
$$h_{\mu}(\sigma,\zeta) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha \right)$$
 (as  $H_n = H_{\mu} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha \right)$  is subadditive, so  $\frac{1}{n} H_n \to \inf_n \frac{1}{n} H_n = h_{\mu}(\sigma,\zeta)$ ).

# **Proof continued**

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲臣▶ ▲臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

# Proof continued

We need the following fact:

Fact If  $\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$  is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \leq \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

# Proof continued

We need the following fact:

Fact If  $\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$  is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \le \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ ,  $1 \le i \le \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

log k

・ロト ・日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ 日 ・ うへの
We need the following fact:

Fact If  $\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$  is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \leq \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

 $\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma)$ 

We need the following fact:

Fact  
If 
$$\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$$
 is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \leq \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

$$\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma, \zeta)$$

We need the following fact:

Fact If  $\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$  is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \leq \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

$$\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma, \zeta) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu} \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha \right)$$

We need the following fact:

Fact  
If 
$$\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$$
 is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \leq \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ ,  
 $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

$$\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma,\zeta) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \log k^{n} = \log k.$$

Hence  $H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log k^n$ .

We need the following fact:

Fact  
If 
$$\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$$
 is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \leq \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ ,  
 $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

$$\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma,\zeta) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \log k^{n} = \log k.$$

Hence  $H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log k^n$ . So by the fact, each element of  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha$  has the same measure  $1/k^n$ .

We need the following fact:

Fact  
If 
$$\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$$
 is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \le \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$   
 $1 \le i \le \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

$$\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma,\zeta) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \log k^{n} = \log k.$$

Hence  $H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log k^n$ . So by the fact, each element of  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha$  has the same measure  $1/k^n$ . Hence  $\mu$  assigns measure  $1/k^n$  to each cylinder.

We need the following fact:

Fact  
If 
$$\eta = \{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$$
 is a finite partition then  $H(\eta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mu(A_i) \log A_i \le \log \ell$  with equality iff  $\mu(A_i) = 1/\ell$ .  
 $1 \le i \le \ell$ .

(This follows from concavity of  $-t \log t$ .) So

$$\log k = h_{\mu}(\sigma) = h_{\mu}(\sigma,\zeta) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \sigma^{-j} \alpha\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \log k^{n} = \log k.$$

Hence  $H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha\right) = \log k^n$ . So by the fact, each element of  $\bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1}\sigma^{-j}\alpha$  has the same measure  $1/k^n$ . Hence  $\mu$  assigns measure  $1/k^n$  to each cylinder. So  $\mu$  and the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure agree on cylinders. By the Kolmogorov Extension Theorem,  $\mu$  is the Bernoulli  $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$ -measure.

Let A be an irreducible 0 - 1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . We show how to construct the measure of maximal entropy.

Let A be an irreducible 0 - 1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . We show how to construct the measure of maximal entropy.

Theorem (Perron-Frobenius)

Let A be a non-negative irreducible matrix. Then

Let A be an irreducible 0-1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . We show how to construct the measure of maximal entropy.

#### Theorem (Perron-Frobenius)

Let A be a non-negative irreducible matrix. Then

 there is a positive maximal eigenvalue λ > 0 s.t. all other eigenvalues satisfy |λ<sub>j</sub>| < λ, moreover λ is simple;</li>

Let A be an irreducible 0-1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . We show how to construct the measure of maximal entropy.

#### Theorem (Perron-Frobenius)

Let A be a non-negative irreducible matrix. Then

- there is a positive maximal eigenvalue λ > 0 s.t. all other eigenvalues satisfy |λ<sub>j</sub>| < λ, moreover λ is simple;</li>
- ▶ there are positive left- and right-eigenvectors  $u = (u_1, ..., u_k)$ ,  $v = (v_1, ..., v_k)^T$ ,  $\sum u_i = \sum v_i = 1$ , s.t.  $uA = \lambda u$ ,  $Av = \lambda v$ .

Let A be an irreducible 0 - 1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . We show how to construct the measure of maximal entropy.

#### Theorem (Perron-Frobenius)

Let A be a non-negative irreducible matrix. Then

- there is a positive maximal eigenvalue λ > 0 s.t. all other eigenvalues satisfy |λ<sub>j</sub>| < λ, moreover λ is simple;</li>
- ▶ there are positive left- and right-eigenvectors  $u = (u_1, ..., u_k)$ ,  $v = (v_1, ..., v_k)^T$ ,  $\sum u_i = \sum v_i = 1$ , s.t.  $uA = \lambda u$ ,  $Av = \lambda v$ .

Apply Perron-Frobenius to A and define  $P_{i,j} = \frac{A_{i,j}v_j}{\lambda v_i}$ ,  $p_i = \frac{u_iv_i}{c}$ , where  $c = \sum_{j=1}^k u_j v_j$ .

Let A be an irreducible 0 - 1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . We show how to construct the measure of maximal entropy.

#### Theorem (Perron-Frobenius)

Let A be a non-negative irreducible matrix. Then

- there is a positive maximal eigenvalue λ > 0 s.t. all other eigenvalues satisfy |λ<sub>j</sub>| < λ, moreover λ is simple;</li>
- ▶ there are positive left- and right-eigenvectors  $u = (u_1, ..., u_k)$ ,  $v = (v_1, ..., v_k)^T$ ,  $\sum u_i = \sum v_i = 1$ , s.t.  $uA = \lambda u$ ,  $Av = \lambda v$ .

Apply Perron-Frobenius to A and define  $P_{i,j} = \frac{A_{i,j}v_j}{\lambda v_i}$ ,  $p_i = \frac{u_iv_i}{c}$ , where  $c = \sum_{j=1}^k u_j v_j$ .

Then P is stochastic and pP = p.

Let A be an irreducible 0-1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . We show how to construct the measure of maximal entropy.

#### Theorem (Perron-Frobenius)

Let A be a non-negative irreducible matrix. Then

- there is a positive maximal eigenvalue λ > 0 s.t. all other eigenvalues satisfy |λ<sub>j</sub>| < λ, moreover λ is simple;</li>
- ▶ there are positive left- and right-eigenvectors  $u = (u_1, ..., u_k)$ ,  $v = (v_1, ..., v_k)^T$ ,  $\sum u_i = \sum v_i = 1$ , s.t.  $uA = \lambda u$ ,  $Av = \lambda v$ .

Apply Perron-Frobenius to A and define  $P_{i,j} = \frac{A_{i,j}v_j}{\lambda v_i}$ ,  $p_i = \frac{u_iv_i}{c}$ , where  $c = \sum_{j=1}^k u_jv_j$ .

Then *P* is stochastic and pP = p. We define the *Parry measure* to be the Markov measure

$$\mu[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n] = p_{i_0} P_{i_0, i_1} \cdots P_{i_{n-1}, i_n}.$$

Recall that for a Markov measure  $\mu$  given by the stochastic matrix P we have  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = -\sum_{i,j} p_i P_{i,j} \log P_{i,j}$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Recall that for a Markov measure  $\mu$  given by the stochastic matrix P we have  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = -\sum_{i,j} p_i P_{i,j} \log P_{i,j}$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

It's an easy check that the Parry measure  $\mu$  has  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log \lambda$ .

Recall that for a Markov measure  $\mu$  given by the stochastic matrix P we have  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = -\sum_{i,j} p_i P_{i,j} \log P_{i,j}$ .

It's an easy check that the Parry measure  $\mu$  has  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log \lambda$ .

We already know that the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is log  $\lambda$ . Hence the Parry measure is *a* measure of maximal entropy.

Recall that for a Markov measure  $\mu$  given by the stochastic matrix P we have  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = -\sum_{i,j} p_i P_{i,j} \log P_{i,j}$ .

It's an easy check that the Parry measure  $\mu$  has  $h_{\mu}(\sigma) = \log \lambda$ .

We already know that the topological entropy of  $\sigma$  is log  $\lambda$ . Hence the Parry measure is *a* measure of maximal entropy.

#### Proposition

Let A be an irreducible 0 - 1 matrix with corresponding shift of finite type  $\Sigma_A$ . Then the Parry measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy.

<ロト (個) (目) (目) (目) (0) (0)</p>

Many other dynamical systems have measures of maximal entropy. Lebesgue measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy for a linear hyperbolic toral automorphism.

Many other dynamical systems have measures of maximal entropy. Lebesgue measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy for a linear hyperbolic toral automorphism.

If the dynamical system T is 'hyperbolic' (in an appropriate sense, but this includes: Anosov diffeomorphisms, Axiom A diffeos on basic sets such as the Smale horseshoe, (in continuous time) geodesic flows on compact negatively curved Riemannian manifolds) then there is a unique measure of maximal entropy.

Many other dynamical systems have measures of maximal entropy. Lebesgue measure is the unique measure of maximal entropy for a linear hyperbolic toral automorphism.

If the dynamical system T is 'hyperbolic' (in an appropriate sense, but this includes: Anosov diffeomorphisms, Axiom A diffeos on basic sets such as the Smale horseshoe, (in continuous time) geodesic flows on compact negatively curved Riemannian manifolds) then there is a unique measure of maximal entropy.

These measures of maximal entropy can often be related to the spectral properties (=maximal eigenvalue) of an associated operator. We will discuss this further in the next lecture.