TILINGS, TRACES AND TRIANGLES

RODRIGO TREVIÑO

Abstract. This paper deals with random substitutions on a finite set of prototiles. The assumptions on the types of substitution rules allowed are very weak, leading to very general constructions. Using renormalization tools applied to elements from operator algebras we establish upper and lower bounds on the rate of deviations of ergodic averages for the uniquely ergodic $\mathbb{R}^d$ action on the tiling spaces obtained from such tilings. We apply the results to obtain statements about the convergence rates for integrated density of states for random Schrödinger operators obtained from aperiodic tilings in the construction.

1. Introduction

I am going to start with triangles: suppose there is a triangle with angles of the form $k\pi/p$, where $p \geq 5$ is a prime, $k \in \{1, \ldots, p-2\}$. Picking one of the angles $\theta$ with angle at least $2\pi/p$, one can subdivide the triangle into two smaller triangles by dividing the angle $\theta$ into two angles of the form $k\pi/p$. This sort of subdivision procedure starts with a triangle with angles which are integer multiples of $\pi/p$ and gives two smaller triangles of the same type. The figure below gives all the examples of this for $p = 5$, where the triangles are known as Robinson triangles and the subdivision rule is called the Penrose substitution rule. These are the only triangles whose angles are integer multiples of $\pi/5$ up to orientation.

This paper is concerned about the random application of substitution rules such as these in order to construct tilings of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and in the study of the statistical properties of such tilings. Figure 1 gives an example of the types of tilings one can get through random application of the different Penrose substitution rules on Robinson triangles depicted on the left.

Interest in random substitution tilings has surged recently, (e.g. [FS14, GM13, BD14, Rus16, RS18, ST19]). The present work can be seen as an extension or alternative to the work [ST19]. What they both have in common is the use of Bratteli diagrams to organize tilings which can be constructed from applications of substitution rules defined on the same set of prototiles and the use of subshifts as a “moduli space” of all tilings which can be obtained from a finite set of substitution rules, whereon the shift dynamics become renormalization dynamics. In [ST19] the topology of the resulting tiling spaces was well-studied and exploited to obtain statistical results for the tilings.

In this work the hypotheses for the substitution rules have been weakened significantly. Some of the main differences are, for example, that it is not assumed that a substitution rule has the same contracting rate for each prototile; here we are allowed to have “degenerate” substitution rules where one prototile is subdivided and all others are not. It is also not assumed that the
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substitutions result in tilings where tiles meet face-to-face. The resulting tilings can end up having arbitrarily many scales and arbitrary complexity, such as in the examples given in [FR08].

The reason the substitution rules from [ST19] can be relaxed has to do with the tools used here. Whereas [ST19] relied on topological tools, the tools used here come from operator algebras, although they are close in spirit to the tools used by Bufetov in his study of deviation of ergodic integrals for several classes of systems [Buf14, Buf13, BS13]. What is gained from this point of view is a relaxation of the types of substitution rules which can be studied and the types of functions which can be studied; what is lost is the access to topological information of the tiling spaces constructed in the construction. Here we also make some progress with issues of the boundary effects. By “boundary effects” I mean the following: in most studies of uniquely ergodic \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-actions on metric spaces, when \( d > 1 \), it has been usually hard to obtain information of the error terms of ergodic integrals of functions over sets of volume \( \sim T^d \) which are smaller than \( T^{d-1} \), which is the contribution of the boundary of the averaging set to the integral ([Sad11, BS13, ST18a, ST19]). These issues have been overcome in other settings of higher rank abelian actions (e.g. [CF15]), but they have remained an obstacle in the study of tilings. In this paper we show that given some set \( B \) there is a set arbitrarily-close set \( B_\varepsilon \) and a set of dilations of \( B_\varepsilon \) such that the deviation behavior along those averaging sets are fully described by the Lyapunov spectrum of our renormalization cocycle. Functionals from operator algebras called traces play a prominent role here, being the analogue to cycles in Zorich’s theory [Zor99], currents in Forni’s theory [For02], and finitely-additive measures in Bufetov’s theory [Buf14]. Our cocycle is defined on a bundle of traces analogous to the cohomology bundle used for the Kontsevich-Zorich cocycle.
In joint work with I. Putnam, the technique using traces here has also been applied to the study of ergodic averages of translation flows on flat surfaces, including those of infinite genus. In fact, for any minimal $\mathbb{R}^d$-action on a metric space, as long as one has a renormalization scheme which can be modeled by a Bratteli diagram, one should expect these techniques to work as long as the renormalization scheme is not degenerate in some sense, which is what happens for $\mathbb{R}^d$ actions on nilmanifolds.

An advantage of using a operator algebra approach is that it makes the connection to the study of random Schrödinger operators more natural. In [ST18b] it was shown that asymptotic properties of traces of random Schrödinger operators defined by certain aperiodic tilings are controlled by traces obtained through the behavior of ergodic integrals on the tiling space. Here a generalization is made and the connection is made more explicit: since traces on locally finite subalgebras of AF algebras control the behavior of the ergodic integrals for randomly constructed tilings, one can obtain traces on algebras of operators which control the asymptotic properties of the integrated density of states for so-called random Schrödinger operators.

1.1. **Statement of results.** Given a set of prototiles $\{t_1, \ldots, t_N\}$ and $N$ substitution rules $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_N\}$ on them (see the precise definition of substitution rule in §2), there is a subshift of finite type $X_\mathcal{F} \subset \Sigma_N$ which parametrizes all the tiling spaces which can be obtained by random applications of the substitution rules in $\mathcal{F}$: given $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$ there is a corresponding compact metric space (called a **tiling space**) $\Omega_x$ whose elements are tilings with hierarchical structure dictated by the point $x$ according to the substitution rules in $\mathcal{F}$.

The tiling spaces admit a $\mathbb{R}^d$ action, and for many of them this action is minimal. A measure $\mu$ on $X_\mathcal{F}$ is **minimal** if for $\mu$-almost every $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$, $\Omega_x$ admits a minimal $\mathbb{R}^d$ action. Another technical condition is that of contractivity (see Definition 5 in §3.1), which guarantees that the tiling space $\Omega_x$ actually exists. This may sound strange at first, but given the very general definition for substitution rule used here, one has to employ enough contractivity in the substitution rules to tile all of $\mathbb{R}^d$. The shift map $\sigma : X_\mathcal{F} \to X_\mathcal{F}$ defines a homeomorphism $\Phi_x : \Omega_x \to \Omega_{\sigma(x)}$. As such, the shift drives the renormalization dynamics.

The way of constructing $\Omega_x$ from $x$ is through a Bratteli diagram $B_x$: a point $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$ establishes how a sequence of substitutions from the family $\mathcal{F}$ are put together to obtain a tiling, and this sequence is represented by an infinite directed graph $B_x$ whose structure is tied to that of $\Omega_x$. As such, any point $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$ defines a $*$-algebra $LF(B_x^+)$, called a **locally finite algebra** (this
Theorem 2. Let $\Omega$ be a $d$-dimensional solenoid. Then for any $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$ and $p \in \Omega_q$,

$$\left| \int_{[0,q_n]^d} f \circ \varphi_s^+(p) \, ds - q_n^d \int_{\Omega_q} f \, d\mu \right| \leq \text{Var}(f)$$

for all $n > 0$. 


Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a repetitive tiling with finitely many prototiles. Consider the Delone set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ obtained by puncturing every prototile in its interior and forming $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}$ as the union of all the corresponding punctures on tiles of $\mathcal{T}$ which correspond to punctures of the prototiles. There is a class of operators on $\ell^2(\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}})$, called the Lipschitz operators of finite range, denoted by $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}_x$. These operators are defined in §7, but what is relevant here is that they contain operators of interest in mathematical physics, namely self-adjoint operators of the form $H = \Delta + V$, where $\Delta$ is a Laplacian-type operator and $V$ is any potential reflecting the aperiodic and repetitive nature of all tilings in $\Omega_x$. In fact, for $\mathcal{T} \in \Omega_x$ and $A \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}_x$, we have the operator $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ acting on $\ell^2(\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}})$ and this assignment is equivariant with respect to the $\mathbb{R}^d$ action on $\Omega_x$. In §7 for almost every $x \in X_F$ we define a map $\Upsilon_x : \mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}_x \to L F(\mathcal{B}_x^+)$ and define functionals $\tau_i' := \Upsilon_x \tau_i^+$ by pulling back some of the traces in $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{B}_x^+)$. Whether or not $\tau_i'$ is a trace on $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}_x)$ is dependent on the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_i^+$ (see Proposition 6). Denote by $A_{\mathcal{T}}|_B$ the restriction of $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ to the finite dimensional subspace $\ell^2(\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}} \cap B) \subset \ell^2(\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}})$ defined by $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}} \cap B$.

**Theorem 3.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a finite family of substitution rules on a finite set of prototiles $\{t_1, \ldots, t_M\}$ with $X_F \subset \Sigma_N$ parametrizing the possible tiling spaces and $\mu$ a minimal, contracting, ergodic, $\sigma$-invariant Borel ergodic probability measure. There exist numbers $\lambda_1^+ \geq \lambda_2^+ \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{d_\mu}^+ > 0$ such that for $\mu$-almost every $x$ there are traces $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{d_\mu}^+ \in \text{Tr}(\mathcal{B}_x^+)$ such that if $A \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}_x$ satisfies $\tau_i(\Upsilon_x(A)) = 0$ for all $i < j$ for some $j \leq d_\mu^+$ but $\tau_j(\Upsilon_x(A)) \neq 0$, for $B$ a good Lipschitz domain, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a set $B_\varepsilon$ which is $\varepsilon$-close to $B$ in the Hausdorff metric, a sequence $T_k \to \infty$ and a convergent sequence of vectors $\tau_k$ such that:

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log |\text{tr}(A_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T_k \cap B_{\varepsilon}})|}{\log T_k} = d \frac{\lambda_j^+}{\lambda_1^+}.$$ 

If, in addition, $d \lambda_j^+ > (d-1) \lambda_1^+$, then $\tau_j' = \Upsilon_x \tau_j$ is a trace and

$$\limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{\log |\text{tr}(A_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T \cap B})|}{\log T} \leq d \frac{\lambda_j^+}{\lambda_1^+}.$$ 

These estimates give rates of convergence for the integrated density of states (known as the Shubin-Bellissard formula) for random Schrödinger operators, generalizing the results of [ST18b]. The last section of the paper, §8, shows some experimental results for the easiest non-trivial results I could come up with using random Penrose substitutions on Robinson triangles. It strongly suggests that in this case the Lyapunov spectrum is non-singular but does have multiplicities.

**Acknowledgements.** I am deeply grateful to Lorenzo Sadun who pointed out a mistake in an earlier version of this paper. All the figures of random substitutions were obtained through Mathematica code written by Danial Ludwig, to whom I am greatly indebted. At some point we hope to have the code publicly available. This work was supported by NSF grant DMS-1665100.

2. Tilings

A tile $t$ is a compact, connected subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Here it will always be assumed that the boundary $\partial t$ of a tile has finite $d-1$ dimensional measure. A tiling $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a cover of $\mathbb{R}^d$ by tiles, where two different tiles may only intersect along their boundaries. Here we will consider only cases where the tilings are formed by a finite set of prototiles $\{t_1, \ldots, t_M\}$. That is, every tile $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is a translated copy of $t_i$ for some $i$. A patch of $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite connected union of tiles of $\mathcal{T}$. A tiling
\( T \) is called repetitive if for any patch \( \mathcal{P} \) there exists an \( R_\mathcal{P} > 0 \) such that any ball of radius \( R_\mathcal{P} \) contains a translated copy of \( \mathcal{P} \) in it. For any set \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), denote by

\[
\mathcal{O}_T(A) = \text{largest patch } \mathcal{P} \text{ of } T \text{ completely contained in } A.
\]

A tiling has **finite local complexity** if for each \( R > 0 \) there exists a finite collection of patches \( \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_{N(R)} \) such that for any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) the patch \( \mathcal{O}_T(B_R(x)) \) is a translated copy of one of the patches \( \mathcal{P}_i \).

A **substitution rule** \( \mathcal{F} \) on a finite set of prototiles \( \{t_1, \ldots, t_M\} \) is a rule which allows to express each prototile \( t_{n_i} \) in a subset \( \{t_{n_1}, \ldots, t_{n_r}\} \subset \{t_1, \ldots, t_M\} \) as the finite union of scaled copies of some of the prototiles. More precisely, suppose we identify each prototile \( t \) with a subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \), and we assume without loss of generality that this subset contains the origin in its interior. Then a substitution rule consists of a collection of scaling maps \( \mathcal{F} = \{f_{i,j,k} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d\} \) with \( i, j = 1, \ldots, M, k = 1, \ldots, r(i,j) \) such that

\[
\tag{3}
t_{n_i} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{M} \bigcup_{k=1}^{r(n_{i,j})} f_{n_{i,j,k}}(t_j)
\]

and if for any \( i \) any two maps \( f_{i,j,k} \) and \( f_{i,j',k'} \) have \( f_{i,j,k}(t_j) \cap f_{i,j',k'}(t_{j'}) \neq \emptyset \), then the intersection happens along the boundary of the images. In other words, each \( t_{n_i} \) can be tiled by scaled copies of the prototiles \( t_i \). There are two major differences with this definition and the usual definition of a substitution rule: here we do not require that the maps be contracting; it could be that \( Df_{i,j,k} = \text{Id} \) for some \( i, j, k \); and a substitution may involve only a subset of the prototiles.

We will transform tilings by two types of operations: translations and deformations. Let \( \mathcal{T} \) be a tiling of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( \tau \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Then the tiling \( \varphi_\tau(\mathcal{T}) := \mathcal{T} - \tau \) is the tiling of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) obtained by translating each tile of \( \mathcal{T} \) by the vector \( \tau \in \mathbb{R}^d \). This is the **translation** of \( \mathcal{T} \) by \( \tau \).

Define a metric on the set of all translates of \( \mathcal{T} \) by

\[
\tag{4}d(\mathcal{T}, \varphi_\tau(\mathcal{T})) = \min \left\{ 1, \bar{d}(\mathcal{T}, \varphi_\tau(\mathcal{T})) \right\},
\]

where

\[
\tag{5}\bar{d}(\mathcal{T}, \varphi_\tau(\mathcal{T})) = \inf \left\{ \varepsilon > 0 : \mathcal{O}_T \left( B_{\varepsilon} \right) = \mathcal{O}_{\varphi_\tau(\mathcal{T})} \left( B_{\varepsilon} \right) \text{ for some } \|s\| \leq \varepsilon \right\}.
\]

In words: two tilings are close if they agree on a large ball around the origin. The **tiling space** of \( \mathcal{T} \) is defined as the metric completion of all translates of \( \mathcal{T} \) with respect to the metric above:

\[
\Omega_T = \overline{\{ \varphi_\tau(\mathcal{T}) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}^d \}}.
\]

There is a natural action of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) on \( \Omega_T \) by translation, \( \varphi_\tau : \mathcal{T}' \mapsto \varphi_\tau(\mathcal{T}') \). The action being minimal is equivalent to \( \mathcal{T} \) being repetitive. As such, if \( \mathcal{T} \) is repetitive then for any two \( \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in \Omega_T \) we have that \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_2} \).

Suppose \( \mathcal{T} \) is a tiling of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) by a finite collection of prototiles. That is, there is a finite set of tiles \( \{t_1, \ldots, t_M\} \) such that every tile \( t \in \mathcal{T} \) is translation equivalent to \( t_i \) for some \( i \). For each \( i \), pick a distinguished point in the interior of the prototile \( t_i \), and then distinguish a point in the interior of each of the tiles in \( \mathcal{T} \) by the translation equivalence between the tiles and prototiles. The **canonical transversal** \( \mathcal{U}_T \subset \Omega_T \) is the set

\[
\mathcal{U}_T := \{ \mathcal{T}' \in \Omega_T : \text{the distinguished point in the tile } t \in \mathcal{T}' \text{ containing the origin is the origin}\}.
\]

If \( \mathcal{T} \) is repetitive then \( \mathcal{U}_T \) is a true transversal for the action of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) on \( \Omega_T \) since it intersects every orbit.
Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a patch of $\mathcal{T}$ and $t \in \mathcal{P}$ a choice of one of the tiles in that patch. The $(\mathcal{P}, t)$-cylinder set is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}, t} = \{ t' \in \Omega_\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{P} \text{ is a patch in } \mathcal{T}' \text{ and the distinguished point in } t \in \mathcal{P} \text{ is the origin} \}$$

and note that this is a subset of $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{T}$. In fact, the topology of $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{T}$ is generated by cylinder sets of the form $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}, t}$ and it has the structure of a Cantor set whenever $\mathcal{T}$ has finite local complexity.

Note that for two tiles $t, t' \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists a vector $\tau = \tau(\mathcal{P}, t, t')$ such that $\varphi_\tau(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}, t}) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}, t'}$.

For a patch $\mathcal{P}$ with a distinguished point in its interior and $\varepsilon > 0$ the $(\mathcal{P}, t, \varepsilon)$-cylinder set is the set

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}, t, \varepsilon} = \bigcup_{||t'|| < \varepsilon} \{ \varphi_\tau(t') : t' \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}, t} \} \subset \Omega_\mathcal{T}.$$ 

For a repetitive $\mathcal{T}$ of finite local complexity the topology of $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ is then generated by cylinder sets of the form $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}, t, \varepsilon}$ with $\mathcal{P}$ being any patch in $\mathcal{P}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ being arbitrarily small. This gives $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ a local product structure of $B_\varepsilon(0) \times \mathcal{C}$, where $B_\varepsilon(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the open ball of radius $\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{C}$ is a Cantor set.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a repetitive tiling of finite local complexity. Given a patch $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{T}$ and set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ let $L_\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P}, B)$ be the number of copies of $\mathcal{P}$ completely contained inside of $B$. Then

$$\text{freq}_\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P}) = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{L_\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P}, B_\varepsilon)}{\text{Vol}(B_\varepsilon)}$$

is the asymptotic patch frequency of $\mathcal{P}$ in $\mathcal{T}$. By (6) this gives a family of Borel measures on $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{T}$ parametrized by $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ which are invariant under the holonomies $\tau(\mathcal{P}, t, t')$. In other words, we have a function $\nu : \Omega_\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{T}) \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{T})$ is the Borel $\sigma$-algebra of $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{T}$, with $\nu(t', \mathcal{P}) = \text{freq}_\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P})$ for any patch $\mathcal{P}$. The action of $\mathbb{R}^d$ on $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ is uniquely ergodic if $\nu$ does not depend on the first coordinate, that is, $\text{freq}_\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{P})$ is independent of $\mathcal{T}$.

Given that the measures $\nu_\mathcal{T} := \nu(\mathcal{T}, \cdot)$ are holonomy-invariant, by the local product structure of $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$, they define $\mathbb{R}^d$-invariant measures on $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ which are locally of the form $\mu_\mathcal{T} = \text{Leb} \times \nu$, where $\nu$ is defined by the restriction the frequency measure $\nu_\mathcal{T}$ on the Cantor set defined by the patch $\mathcal{P}$. Whenever $\varphi_\varepsilon : \Omega_\mathcal{T} \to \Omega_\mathcal{T}$ is uniquely ergodic we will denote by $\mu$ the unique invariant measure.

2.1. Deformations. The deformation $A\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ by $A \in GL^+(d, \mathbb{R})$ is the tiling of $\mathbb{R}^d$ obtained by applying the linear transformation defined by $A$ to every tile in $\mathcal{T}$, where $GL^+(d, \mathbb{R})$ is the connected component of the identity in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$. Since the transformation is linear the boundary conditions of different tiles in $\mathcal{T}$ is respected along deformations. We will parametrize a diagonal subgroup of $GL^+(d, \mathbb{R})$ by $g_t = \text{diag}(e^t, \ldots, e^t)$.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a repetitive tiling of finite local complexity. Then for any $A \in GL^+(d, \mathbb{R})$ the tiling $A\mathcal{T}$ is repetitive and has finite local complexity. The deformation $A$ extends to all of $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ and we denote by $A\Omega_\mathcal{T} = \Omega_{A\mathcal{T}}$ the deformed tiling space. The point of view here is that $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ and $A\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ are the same topological object but have different metrics. Indeed, there is a continuous family of metrics connecting the metric on $\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ to that of $A\Omega_\mathcal{T}$: let $a \in \mathfrak{gl}(d, \mathbb{R})$ be such that $\exp(a) = A$. Then the family $\exp(at)\Omega_{\mathcal{T}}$ describes a one-parameter family of metrics starting with that of $\Omega_{\mathcal{T}}$ at $t = 0$ and ending with that of $A\Omega_\mathcal{T}$ at $t = 1$.

Suppose $\mathcal{T}' = g_t\mathcal{T}$ for some $t \neq 0$. Then any patch $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ is most likely not a patch of $\mathcal{T}'$ but $g_t\mathcal{P}$ is. So

$$L_{\mathcal{T}'}(g_t\mathcal{P}, B) = L_{g_t\mathcal{T}}(g_t\mathcal{P}, B) = L_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{P}, g_{-t}B),$$
which gives
\begin{equation}
\nu_T(g_t P) = \text{freq}_T(g_t P) = \det g_{-t} \text{freq}_T(P) = \det g_{-t} \nu_T(P).
\end{equation}

Note that along these types of deformations (uniform dilations/contractions) of a tiling space cylinder sets are preserved: the cylinder set \( C_{P,t,\epsilon} \subset \Omega_T \) becomes a cylinder set \( C_{P,t',\epsilon} \) and they depend on finite data. Patches can be identified along deformations and in such case their frequencies remain fixed. Along general deformations of \( \Omega_T \), cylinder sets \( C_{P,t,\epsilon} \) are no longer cylinder sets of the form (7) but remain open sets.

Suppose \( \varphi_s : \Omega_T \rightarrow \Omega_T \) is uniquely ergodic. For all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) the \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-action on \( g_t \Omega_T \) is uniquely ergodic and denote by \( \mu_t \) the unique \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-invariant measure on \( g_t \Omega_T \). By the local product structure of \( \Omega_T \) and the the local product structure of \( \mu_t \) of the unique \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-invariant measure on \( g_t \Omega_T \), by (8), we have that
\[
\mu_t = \text{Leb}_t \times \nu_t = \det g_t \text{Leb} \times \det g_t^{-1} \nu_0 = e^{dt} \text{Leb} \times e^{-dt} \nu_0 = \mu_0.
\]

As such, the deformation \( \Omega \mapsto A\Omega \) is a measure preserving deformation:
\[
L^2(g_t \Omega, \mu) = L^2(\Omega, \mu)
\]
for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). The deformation just deforms the metric, not the measure.

2.2. Lipschitz domains. Let \( \mathcal{H}^m \) denote the \( m \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

**Definition 1.** A set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is called \( m \)-rectifiable if there exist Lipschitz maps \( f_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, i = 1, 2, \ldots \) such that
\[
\mathcal{H}^m \left( E \setminus \bigcup_{i \geq 0} f_i(\mathbb{R}^m) \right) = 0.
\]

**Definition 2.** A Lipschitz domain \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is an open, bounded subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) for which there exist finitely many Lipschitz maps \( f_i : \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, i = 1, \ldots, L \) such that
\[
\mathcal{H}^{d-1} \left( \partial A \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^L f_i(\mathbb{R}^{d-1}) \right) = 0.
\]

Lipschitz domains have \( d - 1 \)-rectifiable boundaries.

**Definition 3.** A subset \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is a **good** Lipschitz domain if it is a Lipschitz domain and \( \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial A) < \infty \).

**Figure 2.** Random substitutions with triangles with angles which are integer multiples of \( \pi/12 \).
3. Bratteli diagrams and tilings

A Bratteli diagram \( B = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}) \) is an bi-infinite directed graph partitioned such that

\[
\mathcal{V} = \bigsqcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{V}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E} = \bigsqcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{E}_k
\]

with maps \( r, s : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{V} \) satisfying \( r(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{V}_k \) \( s(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{V}_{k-1} \) and if \( k > 1 \) and \( r(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{V}_{k+1} \) \( s(\mathcal{E}_k) = \mathcal{V}_k \) if \( k < 0 \), and with \( r^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset \) and \( s^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset \) for all \( v \in \mathcal{V} \). We assume that \( |\mathcal{V}_k| \) and \( |\mathcal{E}_k| \) are finite for every \( k \).

The positive part \( B^+ \) of \( B \) is the Bratteli diagram \( B^+ = (\mathcal{V}^+, \mathcal{E}^+) \) defined by the restriction to the non-negative indices of the data of \( B \). The negative part \( B^- \) is similarly defined.

A path in \( B \) is a finite collection of edges \( \bar{e} = (e_\ell, \ldots, e_m) \) such that \( e_i \in \mathcal{E}_i \) and \( r(e_i) = s(e_{i+1}) \) for all \( i \in \{\ell, \ldots, m-1\} \). As such the domain of the range and source maps can be extended to all finite paths by setting \( s(\bar{e}) = e_\ell \) and \( r(\bar{e}) = e_m \). Let \( \mathcal{E}_{\ell,m} \) be the set of all paths starting \( \mathcal{V}_\ell \) to \( \mathcal{V}_m \). We can extend this to infinite paths: let \( X_B^- = \mathcal{E}_{0,\infty} \) be the set of infinite paths starting at \( \mathcal{V}_0 \) and \( X_B^+ = \mathcal{E}_{-\infty,0} \) be the set of infinite paths ending at \( \mathcal{V}_0 \). The set \( X_B^\pm \) can be topologized by cylinder sets of the form

\[
C(\bar{e}) = \{ p \in X_B^\pm : (p_\ell, \ldots, p_m) = (e_\ell, \ldots, e_m) \},
\]

for some finite path \( \bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell,m} \) with \( 0 \leq \ell < m \). The set \( X_B^- \) is similarly topologized and as such the spaces \( X_B^\pm \) are compact metric spaces which are Cantor sets. The space of all bi-infinite paths on \( B \) is then

\[
X_B \subset X_B^- \times X_B^+
\]

and it inherits the subspace topology.

Two paths \( p, p' \in X_B^\pm \) are tail-equivalent if there is an \( N > 0 \) such that \( p_i = p'_i \) for all \( i > N \) and this is an equivalence relation, where we deonte classes by \( [\bar{e}] \). A minimal component of \( X_B^\pm \) is a subset of the form \( [\bar{e}] \). A Bratteli diagram \( B \) is minimal if \( [\bar{e}] = X_B^\pm \) for all \( \bar{e} \in X_B^\pm \) or, in other words, when there is only one minimal component. A measure \( \mu \) on \( X_B^\pm \) is invariant under the tail equivalence relation if for any \( N \) and paths \( p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{0,N} \) with \( r(p_1) = r(p_2) \) we have that \( \mu(C(p_1)) = \mu(C(p_2)) \).

3.1. Tilings from diagrams. Here we recall the tiling construction from [ST19]. Let \( \{t_1, \ldots, t_M\} \) be a set of prototiles and suppose that they admit \( N \) substitution rules \( \mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_N \). Given a collection \( \mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_N\} \) of substitution rules, we want to parametrize all possible tilings we can obtain by different combinations of substitutions. As such, the space that organizes all of these combinations is a \( \sigma \)-invariant, closed subset \( X_\mathcal{F} \subset \Sigma_N = \{1, \ldots, N\}^\mathbb{Z} \) of the \( N \)-shift, where \( \mathbb{Z} := \mathbb{Z} - \{0\} \), inheriting the order from \( \mathbb{Z} \). We will describe a procedure for constructing from any \( x \in X_\mathcal{F} \) a Bratteli diagram \( B_x^\pm \) and a construction assigning each path \( \bar{e} \in X_B^\pm \) a tiling \( T_{\bar{e}} \).

Pick \( x = (x^-, x^+) = (\ldots, x_{-2}, x_{-1}, x_1, x_2, \ldots) \in X_\mathcal{F} \). We will start by defining the positive part \( B_x^+ \) of the Bratteli diagram \( B_x^- \). For \( k \geq 0 \), \( B_x^- \) will have \( |\mathcal{V}_k| \) be the number of tiles used in the substitution \( \mathcal{F}_{x_{k+1}}^i \), that is, not the number of tiles which are tilted by the rule \( \mathcal{F}_{x_k}^i \), but the number of different tiles used in that substitution rule. We will order the vertices at each level and identify \( v_i \in \mathcal{V}_k^+ \) with \( t_{n_i} \) for every \( k \). Now, starting with \( k = 1 \), consider the substitution rule \( \mathcal{F}_{x_k}^i \). Then for \( v_j \in \mathcal{V}_{k-1}^+ \) and \( v_i \in \mathcal{V}_k^+ \) there are \( r(i, j) \) edges from \( v_j \) to \( v_i \), and we identify the corresponding map \( f_{i,j,k} \) with the appropriate edge \( e \in \mathcal{E}_k^+ \) and denote it by \( f_e \). Since the maps
\( f_e \) are contacting if they are of the form \( f_e(x) = \theta_e x + \tau_e \) for some \( \theta_e \leq 1 \). This notation extends to finite paths \( \bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}_{0,k} \) by \( f_e = f_{e_k} \circ \cdots \circ f_{e_1} \).

Let \( \bar{e} \in X_B^+ \) and denote by \( \bar{e}|_k \) the truncation of \( \bar{e} \) after its \( k \)th edge. In other words, \( \bar{e}|_k \in \mathcal{E}_{0,k} \).

The \( k \)th approximant \( \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}) \) is the set

\[
\mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}) = \bigcup_{\bar{e}' \in \mathcal{E}_{0,k}^+} f_{\bar{e}|_k}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}'}(t_{s(\bar{e}')})
\]

viewed as a tiled patch, where the tiles are the sets \( f_{\bar{e}|_k}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}'}(t_{s(\bar{e}')}) \) for a path \( \bar{e}' \in \mathcal{E}_{0,k}^+ \) with \( r(\bar{e}') = r(\bar{e}|_k) \). The hypotheses on the maps \( f_e \) guarantee that the approximants are nested, i.e., we have the inclusion of patches

\[
\{0\} \subset t_{s(\bar{e})} \subset \mathcal{P}_1(\bar{e}) \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}) \subset \mathcal{P}_{k+1}(\bar{e}) \subset \cdots .
\]

Patches of the form \( \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}) \) are called level \( k \)-supertiles.

**Definition 4.** For \( \bar{e} \in X_B^+ \), the tiling \( \mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}} \) is the largest tiled subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) such that \( \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}) \) is a patch of \( \mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}} \) for all \( k \) and each tile of \( \mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}} \) is contained in all but finitely many of the approximants \( \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}) \). In other words,

\[
\mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}} = \bigcup_{k > 0} \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}).
\]

Recall that for each \( e \in \mathcal{E}_k^+ \), each map \( f_e \) is of the form \( f_e(x) = \theta_e x + \tau_e \), with \( \theta_e \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) and \( \tau_e \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Define functions \( S^\pm : X_B^+ \to \mathbb{R} \) as

\[
S^\pm(\bar{e}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{|k|} \sum_{i=1}^k \log \theta_{e_i}
\]

for any \( \bar{e} = (\ldots, e_{-2}, e_{-1}, e_1, e_2, \ldots) \in X_B \). The following is a basic observation which follows from the fact that \( S^+(\bar{e}) = S^+(\bar{e}') \) for any two paths which are tail-equivalent.

**Proposition 1.** Suppose \( X_B^+ \) admits a single tail-invariant probability measure. Then \( S^+ : X_B^+ \to \mathbb{R} \) is constant.

For two paths \( \bar{e}, \bar{e}' \in X_B^+ \) let

\[
\theta_k(\bar{e}, \bar{e}') = \frac{\theta_{e_1} \cdots \theta_{e_k}}{\theta_{e'_1} \cdots \theta_{e'_k}}
\]

where \( \theta_{e_i} \) is the scaling constant associated with the map \( f_{e_i} : f_{e_i}(x) = \theta_{e_i} x + \tau_{e_i} \). Note that if \( \bar{e}, \bar{e}' \) are tail equivalent then there exists an \( N \) such that \( \theta_k(\bar{e}, \bar{e}') = \theta_N(\bar{e}, \bar{e}') \) for all \( k > N \).

**Lemma 1.** Let \( \mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_N\} \) be a collection of substitution rules defined on the same set of prototiles. For \( x \in X_\mathcal{F} \) consider the Bratteli diagram \( B_x \) where the edge set \( \mathcal{E}_k \) is defined by \( \mathcal{F}_{x_k} \).

Then:

(i) \( \bar{e} \sim \bar{e}' \in X_B^+ \) if and only if there exists \( \tau \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( A = A(\bar{e}', \bar{e}) \in GL^+(d, \mathbb{R}) \) such that \( \mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}'} = A \mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}} + \tau \).

(ii) \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}}} \) only depends on the minimal component: \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}'}} \) for all \( \bar{e}' \in \overline{\{\bar{e}\}} \).
Proof. Suppose $\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*$ are tail equivalent and let $N > 0$ be such that $e_k = e_k^*$ for all $k \geq N$. By (9),

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}) = \bigcup_{\bar{e}' \in \mathcal{E}_k^+} f_{\bar{e}'}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}}(t_{s(\bar{e})}) = f_{\bar{e}^*}^{-1} \left( \bigcup_{\bar{e}' \in \mathcal{E}_k^+} f_{\bar{e}'}(t_{s(\bar{e})}) \right).$$

Now, since $r(\bar{e}|k) = r(\bar{e}^*|k)$ for all $k \geq N$,

$$f_{\bar{e}^*|k}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}^*}(\mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e})) = f_{\bar{e}^*|k}^{-1} \left( \bigcup_{\bar{e}' \in \mathcal{E}_k^+} f_{\bar{e}'}(t_{s(\bar{e})}) \right) = \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}^*).$$

Since each map $f_{\bar{e}}$ is of the form $f_{\bar{e}} = \theta, x + \tau$, we have that $f_{\bar{e}^*|k}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}} = \theta_k(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*) x + \tau_k(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*)$ for some $\tau_k(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, since $[\bar{e}] = [\bar{e}^*]$ we have that $\theta_k(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*) = \theta_N(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*)$ for all $k \geq N$. Defining $A(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*) = \theta_N(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*) \cdot \text{Id} \in GL^+(d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\tau(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*) = \tau_N(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*)$, we have that $A_k(\bar{e}) + \tau(\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*) = P_k(\bar{e}^*)$ for all $k \geq N$, so $A \mathcal{T}_e + \tau = \mathcal{T}_e^*$. Now suppose that $A \mathcal{T}_e + \tau = \mathcal{T}_e^*$ for some $A, \tau$. Then there is a smallest $N$ such that the tile containing the origin of $\mathcal{T}_e$, is part of the same level-$N$ supertile which contains the tile of $\mathcal{T}_e$ containing the origin. Since the tiles agree outside of this supertile, $\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*$ have the same tail after $e_N$.

Let $\bar{e}^* \in [\bar{e}]$ and let $\bar{e}^k \in [\bar{e}]$ be a sequence with $\bar{e}^k \to \bar{e}^*$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\bar{e}^k|k = \bar{e}^*|k$ for all $k$. Therefore we have that $\mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}^k) = \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}^*)$ for all $k$ so it follows that $\mathcal{T}_e \to \mathcal{T}_e^*$. By part i), since $\bar{e}^k \in [\bar{e}]$ there exist $A_k \in GL^+(d, \mathbb{R})$, $\tau_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $A_k \mathcal{T}_e + \tau_k = \mathcal{T}_e^*$ for all $k$, which implies that $A_k \to A^*$ for some fixed $A^* \in GL + (d, \mathbb{R})$. So we see that $\mathcal{T}_e^* = A^{-1}_k(\mathcal{T}_e - \tau_k) \to \mathcal{T}_e^*$, that is, $\mathcal{T}_e^*$ is a limit of translations of (bounded) dilations of $\mathcal{T}_e$ under the tiling metric (4). In other words, $\mathcal{T}_e^* \in \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_e}$. \qed

Let $\bar{X}_B^+ \subset X_B^+$ be the set of paths $\bar{e}$ such that $\mathcal{T}_e$ covers all of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Note that by the previous Lemma, if $B^+_x$ is minimal, then $\Omega_{\mathcal{T}_{e_1}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_{e_2}}$ for any $\bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2 \in X_B^+$. In such cases we denote the tiling space simply by $\Omega_B$ or, if $B$ is defined by a parameter $x \in X_F$, we write $\Omega_x$. The following is a consequence of the previous Lemma.

**Corollary 1.** Let $F$ a family of $N$ substitutions, $x \in X_F$, and $B_x$ be a Bratteli diagram such that the set $\mathcal{E}_k^+$ in $B_x^+$ is defined by $F_{x_k}$. Suppose $B_x^+$ is minimal. Then the assignment $\bar{e} \mapsto \mathcal{T}_e$ extends to a surjective map $\Delta_x : \bar{X}_B^+ \to \Omega_x$, where $\Omega_x$ is the canonical transversal of $\Omega_{\mathcal{T}_e}, \bar{e} \in \bar{X}_B^+$.

The following is [ST19, Proposition 2].

**Proposition 2.** Let $F$ a family of $N$ substitutions, $x \in X_F$, $B_x^+$ a minimal Bratteli diagram such that the set $\mathcal{E}_k^+$ in $B_x^+$ is defined by $F_{x_k}$. Suppose that $\mu(\bar{X}_B^+) = 1$ for any probability measure $\mu$ on $X_B^+$ which is invariant under the tail equivalence relation. Then the map $\Delta_x$ in Corollary 1 provides a bijection between measures $\mu$ on $X_B^+$ which are invariant under the tail equivalence relation and measures on $\Omega_x$ which are holonomy-invariant.
3.2. **Renormalization.** A $\sigma$-invariant probability measure on $X_F$ is called **minimal** if $\mu$-almost every $B_x$ is minimal. Note that being minimal is a $\sigma$-invariant property: $B_x$ is minimal if and only if $B_{\sigma(x)}$ is. As such, for an $\sigma$-invariant ergodic Borel probability measure $\mu$ then the set of minimal diagrams $B_x$ has either full or null measure.

Recall the asymptotic scaling functions $S^\pm : X^B_\sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ defined in (10). Note that by Proposition 1 $S^+$ is constant if there is a unique Borel probability measure $\mu$ which is invariant for the tail equivalence relation. If $B = B_x$, that is, it depends on a parameter $x \in X_F$ and has a single invariant measure, then we denote by $S_x^+$ the everywhere-constant value of $S^+_x : X^B_x \to \mathbb{R}$. Note that if $X^+_B$ admits a unique Borel probability measure which is invariant for the tail-equivalence relation then so does $X^+_B(x)$. As such, $S^+_x : X^B_{\sigma(x)} \to \mathbb{R}$ is also constant and equal to $S^+_x$. So the scaling functions are $\sigma$-invariant.

**Definition 5.** Suppose $\mu$ is a minimal Borel $\sigma$-invariant ergodic probability measure on $X_F$. Then $\mu$ is **contracting** if $S^+ \leq 0$ for $\mu$-almost every $x \in X_F$.

**Proposition 3.** Let $F$ a family of $N$ substitutions and $\mu$ a minimal, contracting, ergodic $\sigma$-invariant Borel probability measure on $X_F$. Then for $\mu$-almost every $x \in X_F$ we have that there is a unique probability measure $\mu_x$ on $X^+_{B_x}$ which is invariant under the tail equivalent relation. Moreover, we have that $\mu_x(X^+_B) = 1$ and there is a unique $\mathbb{R}^d$-invariant probability measure on $\Omega_x$.

**Proof.** For $x \in X_F$, define $\lambda : X_F \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\lambda_x = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log |\mathcal{E}^x_{0,k}|}{k},$$

for all $x \in X_F$, where $|\mathcal{E}^x_{0,k}|$ is the number of paths from $V_0$ to $V_k$ on $B_x$. Note that this is a $\sigma$-invariant function, so it is constant $\mu$-almost everywhere. Denote by $\lambda_x$ this value and $A_\mu \subset X_F$ the full $\mu$-measure set such that $\lambda_x = \lambda_\mu$ for all $x \in A_\mu$.

Let $x \in A_\mu \cap \text{supp} \mu$ be a Poincaré recurrent point and let $B_x$ be the corresponding Bratteli diagram. By minimality there exists a $k^* > 0$ such that for any $v \in V^+_0$ and $w \in V^+_k$, there is a path $\bar{p} \in \mathcal{E}^+_{k^*}$ with $s(\bar{p}) = v$ and $r(\bar{p}) = w$. Let $U_x \subset X_F$ be the cylinder set defined by $U_x = \{ y : y_i = x_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \ldots, k^* \}$ and note that $\mu(U_x) > 0$. Let $\kappa_i \to \infty$ be the sequence of first return times to $U_x$ for $x$. That is, $\sigma^{\kappa_i}(x) \in U_x$ for all $i > 0$ and $\sigma^\kappa(x) \not\in U_x$ if $k \neq k_i$ for some $i$. Note that by the definitions of $U_x$, $k_i$ and $k^*$ there is a positive matrix $M_x$ such that the number of paths between $v \in V^+_k$ and $w \in V^+_{k_i+k}$ is given by $M_x(v, w)$. Let $\lambda_{PF}$ denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of $M_x$. Then for any $\epsilon$ there exists a $C_\epsilon$ such that for $v \in V^+_k$ with $k_i \leq k^* < k_{i+1}$ we have that

$$|\mathcal{E}^+_{0,k_i}| \geq C_\epsilon \left( \frac{\lambda_x}{\epsilon^3} \right)^i.$$

Since $\mu(U_x) > 0$ it follows from the estimate above that $\lambda_\mu \geq \log \lambda_{PF} - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, so $\lambda_\mu > 0$. So for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $C_\epsilon$ so that $|\mathcal{E}^+_{0,k_i}| \geq C_\epsilon e^{(\lambda_\mu - \epsilon)k}$ for all $k > 0$. It follows from this, minimality and recurrence of $x$ that for the two quantities

$$\lambda^- := \min_{v \in \{v_1, \ldots, v_M\}} \left\{ \liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log |\mathcal{E}^+_v|}{k} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^+ := \max_{v \in \{v_1, \ldots, v_M\}} \left\{ \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log |\mathcal{E}^+_v|}{k} \right\},$$

we have that $\lambda^- = \lambda^+ \geq \lambda_{PF} > 0$. That $\mu(B_x^+) = 1$ now follows by [ST19, Lemma 3] for any Borel probability measure $\mu$ which is invariant under the tail-equivalence relation. That there is
a unique such measure follows from the main result of [Tre18], so the uniqueness of an invariant measure on $\Omega_x$ follows from Proposition 2.

Let

$$\hat{X}_B = \{(x^-, x^+) \in X_B : x^+ \in \hat{X}_B^+\}.$$  

**Proposition 4.** Let $B_x$ be minimal and suppose there exists a $c < 0$ such that $S^- x (\bar{e}) \leq c$ for all $\bar{e} \in X_{B_x}$. The map $\hat{\Delta}_x$ from Corollary 1 extends to a continuous surjective map $\Delta_x : \hat{X}_B \to \Omega_x$.

**Proof.** Let $\bar{e} = (e^-, e^+) \in \hat{X}_{B_x}$. The discussion leading to Corollary 1 shows how $e^+ \in \hat{X}_{B_x}$ determines a point in the canonical transversal $\mathcal{U}_x \subset \Omega_x = \Omega_{T_e^+}$. What $e^-$ determines is a vector $\tau_{e^-}$ so that $\Delta(\bar{e}) = \varphi_{\tau_{e^-}} (T_{e^+})$. This is done as follows. Consider the tile $t$ containing the origin in $T_{e^+}$. The assumptions about the substitution rules imply that the origin is in the interior of this tile, and it can be subdivided according to the substitution rule $F_{x, 1}$ into $|r^{-1}(v_t)| \geq 1$ tiles, where $v_t \in V_0$ is the vertex identified with the tile $t$ containing the origin. The edge $e_{-1}$ corresponds to a choice of one of the smaller tiles which make up $t$. Now, $F_{x, 2}$ gives a rule for subdividing this tile into $|r^{-1}(s(e_{-1}))| \geq 1$ smaller tiles and the edge $e_{-2}$ corresponds to choosing one of the smaller tiles in this subdivision. Carrying on recursively, after ending up with a small connected subset at level $-k$, the substitution rule $F_{x, -k}$ yields a collection of smaller pieces which make up this connected subset and the edge $e_{-k}$ of $\bar{e}$ determines a choice of one of the smaller pieces. Since $S^- (\bar{e}) \leq c$, on average, the pieces are contracting at a rate of $e^{-ck}$. Thus performing this procedure infinitely many times yields a unique point $p_{e^-} \in t$. The vector $\tau_{e^-}$ is now defined to be the unique vector which takes $p_{e^-} \in t \in T_{e^+}$ to the origin. That is, the point $\varphi_{\tau_{e^-}} (p_{e^-}) = 0$. This assignment can readily be seen to be continuous.  

Let $B_x$ be a Bratteli diagram determined by a family of substitution rules $F_1, \ldots, F_N$ and a point $x \in X_F$. There is a natural homeomorphism $h_x : X_{B_x} \to X_{B_{\sigma(x)}}$ defined by the shifting of indices in $X_{B_x}$ by 1. This yields a homeomorphism of tiling spaces, which is proved in [ST19, Proposition 6].

**Proposition 5.** Let $F = \{F_1, \ldots, F_N\}$ be a family of substitution rules and suppose that $B_x$ is minimal. The shift $\sigma : X_F \to X_F$ induces a homeomorphism of tiling spaces $\Phi_x : \Omega_x \to \Omega_{\sigma(x)}$.  

satisfying $\Phi_x \circ \Delta_x = \Delta_{\sigma(x)} \circ h_x$. In addition, level-$k$ supertiles on $\mathcal{T}_\delta \in \Omega_z$ are mapped to level-$k-1$ supertiles on $\Phi_x(\mathcal{T}_\delta) = \mathcal{T}_{\sigma(\delta)} \in \Omega_{\sigma(x)}$.

4. LF Algebras and traces

A multimatricial algebra is a $*$-algebra of the form

$$\mathcal{M} = M_{\ell_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{\ell_n},$$

where $M_\ell$ denotes the algebra of $\ell \times \ell$ matrices over $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_1 = M_{\ell_{1,1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{\ell_{n,1}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 = M_{\ell_{1,2}} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{\ell_{n,2}}$ be multimatricial algebras and suppose $\phi : \mathcal{M}_1 \to \mathcal{M}_2$ is a unital homomorphism of $\mathcal{M}_1$ into $\mathcal{M}_2$. Then $\phi$ is determined up to unitary equivalence in $\mathcal{M}_2$ by a $\ell_{n,2} \times \ell_{n,1}$ non-negative integer matrix $A_\phi$ [Dav96, §III.2]. It follows that the inclusion of a multimatricial algebra $\mathcal{M}_0$ into a larger multimatricial algebra $\mathcal{M}_1$ is determined up to unitary equivalence by a matrix $A_0$ which roughly states how many copies of a particular subalgebra of $\mathcal{M}_0$ goes into a particular subalgebra of $\mathcal{M}_1$.

Let $B$ be a Bratteli diagram and let $A_k^+, k \in \mathbb{N}$, be the connectivity matrix at level $k$. In other words, $A_k(i, j)^+$ is the number of edges going from $v_j \in V_{k-1}$ to $v_i \in V_k$. An analogous matrix $A_k^-$ can be defined for $k < 0$. Starting with $M_0 = \mathbb{C}^{[V_0]}$ the matrices $A_k^\pm$ define two families of inclusions $i_k^\pm : \mathcal{M}_k^\pm \to \mathcal{M}_{|k|}^\pm$ (up to unitary equivalence), one for $+$ and one for $-$, where each $\mathcal{M}_k^\pm$ is a multimatricial algebra. More explicitly, if

$$\mathcal{M}_k^\pm = M_{n_1^\pm} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{n_k^\pm}$$

then starting with the vector $h^0 = (1, \ldots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{C}^{[V_0]}$ and defining $h^{k, +} = A_k^+ h^{k-1, +} = A_k^+ \cdots A_1^+ (h^0)^T$ for $k \geq 0$ and $h^{k, -} = h^{k-1, -} A_k^+ = h^0 A_1^+ \cdots A_k^+$ for $k \leq 0$, we have that

$$\mathcal{M}_k^+ = M_{h_{k, +}^*} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{h_{n_k^+}^*} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_k^- = M_{h_{k, -}^*} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{h_{n_k^-}^*}$$

and the inclusions $i_k^\pm : \mathcal{M}_k^\pm \to \mathcal{M}_{|k|}^\pm$ are defined up to unitary equivalence by the matrices $A_k^\pm$. With these systems of inclusions one can define the inductive limits

$$LF(B^+) := \bigcup_k M_k^+ = \lim_k \mathcal{M}_k^+ = \lim_{i_k^+} \mathcal{M}_k^+, \quad LF(B^-) := \bigcup_k M_k^- = \lim_k \mathcal{M}_k^- = \lim_{i_k^-} \mathcal{M}_k^-$$

which are $*$-algebras called the locally finite (LF) algebras defined by $B$. Their $C^*$-completion

$$AF(B^+) := \overline{LF(B^+)} , \quad AF(B^-) := \overline{LF(B^-)}$$

are the approximately finite-dimensional (AF) algebras defined by $B$.

**Definition 6.** A trace on a $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is a linear functional $\tau : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ which satisfies $\tau(ab) = \tau(ba)$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}^1$. The set of all traces of $\mathcal{A}$ forms a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ and it is denoted by $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A})$. A cotrace $\tau^*$ is an element of the dual vector space $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{A}) := \text{Tr}(\mathcal{A})^*$.

For $M_\ell$, the algebra of $\ell \times \ell$ matrices, $\text{Tr}(M_\ell)$ is one-dimensional and generated by the trace $\tau_\ell : a \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^\ell a_{ii}$. For a multimatricial algebra $\mathcal{M} = M_{\ell_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{\ell_n}$, the dimension of $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{M})$ is $n$ and is generated by the traces $\tau_{\ell_i} \in \text{Tr}(M_{\ell_i})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

\(^1\)There is no assumption that traces are positive (that is, $\tau(aa^*) > 0$).
Let \( i_k^+ : \mathcal{M}_{k-1}^+ \to \mathcal{M}_k^+ \) be the family of inclusions defined by the positive part of a Bratteli diagram \( B^+ \). Then there is a dual family of inclusions \( i_k^- : \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_k^-) \to \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_{k-1}^-) \) (and an analogous family \( i_k^0 : \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_k^0) \to \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_{k-1}^0) \)). The trace spaces of the LF algebras defined by a Bratteli diagram \( B \) are then the inverse limits

\[
\text{Tr}(B^+) := \lim_{\leftarrow} (i_k^+)^* \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_k^+)
\]

(13)

\[
\text{Tr}(B^-) := \lim_{\leftarrow} (i_k^-)^* \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_k^-)
\]

which are vector spaces. The respective spaces of cotrices are then

\[
\text{Tr}^+(B^+) = \lim_{\rightarrow} ((i_k^+)^*, \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_k^+)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Tr}^+(B^-) = \lim_{\rightarrow} ((i_k^-)^*, \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_k^-)).
\]

**Remark 1.** Note that since every class \([p]\) of the dimension group \( K_0(AF(B^+)) \) can be represented by an element \( p \in LF(B^+) \), the set \( \text{Tr}(B^+) \) also defines the dual space \( \text{Tr}(K_0(AF(B^+))) := \text{Tr}(K_0(AF(B^+))') \). As such, the trace spaces which will be used can be thought of as the dual of the invariant \( K_0(AF(B^+)) \).

Let \( \{B_x\} \) be a family of Bratteli diagrams parametrized by \( x \in X \subset \Sigma_N \), where \( X \) is a closed, \( \sigma \)-invariant subset of \( \Sigma_N \) (an example of this is \( X_F \), where \( F \) is a family of substitutions on \( N \) tiles, as described in §3.2). In what follows, we will focus on the invariants defined by the positive part of \( B_x \), so we will drop the \( + \) superscripts used earlier. The shift induces a \(*\)-homomorphism \( \sigma_x : \mathcal{M}_0^x \to \mathcal{M}_0^x(x) \) as follows. For \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_{|\nu_1|}) \in \mathcal{M}_0^x \), consider its image \( i_0^x a = ((i_0^x a)_1, \ldots, (i_0^x a)_{|\nu_1|}) \in \mathcal{M}_0^x \). Composing this with the evaluation by \( T_1^x \) which takes \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_{|\nu_1|}) \in \mathcal{M}_0^x \) to \( T_1^x(a) = (\tau_1(a_1), \ldots, \tau_{|\nu_1|}\(a_{|\nu_1|}) \in \mathcal{M}_0^x \), we obtain the map

\[
\sigma_x = T_1^x \circ i_0^x : a \mapsto (\tau_1(i_0^x a), \ldots, \tau_{|\nu_1|}(i_0^x a)) \in \mathcal{M}_0^x(x) \subset \mathbb{C}^{|\nu_1|}.
\]

As such, the map \( \sigma_x : \mathcal{M}_0^x = \mathbb{C}^{|\nu_0|} \to \mathbb{C}^{|\nu_1|} = \mathcal{M}_0^x(x) \) coincides with the linear map \( A_1 : \mathbb{C}^{|\nu_0|} \to \mathbb{C}^{|\nu_1|} \) defined by the first matrix of the Bratteli diagram. As such there is a dual map

\[
\sigma^* : \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_0^x(x)) \to \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_0^x) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Tr}^*(B_x^+) = \lim_{\rightarrow} \left( \text{Tr} \left( \mathcal{M}_0^x(x), \sigma^* \right) \right).
\]

(14)

Now consider the composition \( \sigma_x \circ \sigma_x = T_1^{(x)} \circ i_x^{(x)} \circ T_1^x \circ i_1^x : \mathcal{M}_0^0 \to \mathcal{M}_0^{\tau(x)} \). Since both \( \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\tau(x)}) \) and \( \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\tau(x)}) \) are isomorphic to \( \mathbb{C}^{|\nu_2|} \) and there is a canonical correspondence between their bases \( \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{|\nu_2|}\} \) and \( \{\tau'_1, \ldots, \tau'_{|\nu_2|}\} \), respectively, we have that

\[
\tau_{\ell} \left( i_1^{(x)} (T_1^x \circ i_1^x(a)) \right) = \tau'_{\ell} (i_2^{(x)} (i_1^x(a)))
\]

for all \( \ell \in \{1, \ldots, |\nu_2|\} \). So we can now write the composition in detail:

\[
T_1^{(x)} \circ i_x^{(x)} \circ T_1^x \circ i_1^x(a) = \left( \tau_1 \left( i_1^{(x)} (T_1^x \circ i_1^x(a)) \right), \ldots, \tau_{|\nu_2|} (i_1^{(x)} (T_1^x \circ i_1^x(a))) \right)
\]

(15)

\[
= \left( \tau_1 \left( i_0^x (i_1^x(a)) \right), \ldots, \tau_{|\nu_2|} (i_0^x (i_1^x(a))) \right)
\]

\[
= \left( (i_0^x)^* \tau_1(a), \ldots, (i_0^x)^* \tau_{|\nu_2|}(a) \right)
\]

\[
= \left( (A_2 A_1)^* \tau_1(a), \ldots, (A_2 A_1)^* \tau_{|\nu_2|}(a) \right).
\]
where we have abused notation slightly in using $\tau_\ell$ to denote both the $\ell^{th}$ canonical trace in $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_2^x)$ and the one in $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_1^\sigma(x))$. This immediately generalizes to

$$
\sigma_\ell := \sigma_* \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_* : \mathcal{M}_0^x \to \mathcal{M}_0^{\sigma(x)}
$$

defined by

$$
a \mapsto \left( (A_k \cdots A_1)^{\ast} \tau_1(a), \ldots, (A_k \cdots A_1)^{\ast} \tau_{|V_k^\ast|}^\tau(a) \right).
$$

(15)

4.1. The trace cocycle. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of substitution rules on the set of prototiles $t_1, \ldots, t_M$ and let $X_\mathcal{F}$ be the subshift that it defines.

Definition 7. The trace bundle $p : \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}) \to X_\mathcal{F}$ is the bundle over $X_\mathcal{F}$ where $p^{-1}(x) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$ for all $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$. The cotrace bundle $q : \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{F}) \to X_\mathcal{F}$ is the dual of the trace bundle, where $q^{-1}(x) = \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$ for all $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$.

Definition 8. The trace cocycle is the bundle map $\Theta : \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}) \to \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F})$ defined by $\Theta_x : (x, \tau') \mapsto (\sigma(x), \sigma_\ell(x))$ for all $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$, $\tau' \in \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$.

Since $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$ is a finite dimensional vector space we endow it with a norm $\| \cdot \|$. Note that for all $y \in X_\mathcal{F}$ close enough to $x$ we will have $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^y) = \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$ and thus all these spaces inherit the same norm. With a norm in every space $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$, we now appeal to Oseledets theorem. Let $\| \cdot \|_{op}$ be the operator norm. Since the maps $\sigma_\ell$ can be singular but the base transformation $\sigma : X_\mathcal{F} \to X_\mathcal{F}$ invertible, we can appeal to the semi-invertible Oseledets theorem [FLQ13] and obtain a decomposition of the trace spaces which is invariant under the dynamics.

Theorem 4 (Semi-invertible Oseledets theorem [FLQ13]). Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of substitution rules on $t_1, \ldots, t_M$ tiles and $\mu$ a minimal, contracting $\sigma$-invariant Borel ergodic probability measure on $X_\mathcal{F}$. Suppose that $\log^+ \| \sigma_* \|_{op} \in L^1_\mu$. Then there exist numbers $0 \leq \lambda_1^\pm \geq \lambda_2^\pm \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_r^\pm$, where $\lambda_i^+ > 0$ and $\lambda_i^- \leq 0$, such that for $\mu$-almost every $x$ there is a measurable, $\sigma_*$-invariant family of subspaces $V^\pm_j(x), \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$:

(i) We have $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{B}_x^+) = E^+_x \ominus E^-_x$ where

$$
E^+_x = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r^\pm} V^+_i(x),
$$

and

$$
\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^x) = \text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{B}_x^+) \ominus \mathcal{V}(x),
$$

(ii) $\sigma_* V^+_i(x) = V^+_i(\sigma(x))$ and $\sigma_* \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{V}(\sigma(x))$,

(iii) For any $v^\pm_i(x)$ in $V^\pm_i(x)$ and $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ we have that

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \| \sigma_*^{(n)} v^\pm_i \|}{n} = \lambda_i^\pm 	ext{ and } \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \| \sigma_*^{(n)} v_0 \|}{n} = -\infty.
$$

The collection of numbers $\lambda_i^\pm$ associated to the measure $\mu$ are the Lyapunov exponents of $\mu$. The set of all exponents is the Lyapunov spectrum of $\mu$.

In (i) of the above theorem we have made the identicification of the cotrace space $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{B}_x^+)$ with subspace of $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^x)$ which consists of vectors which are not in the kernel of $\sigma_*^{(k)}$ for all $k > 0$. This is justified by (14). Thus the restriction of $\sigma_*$ to $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{B}_x^+)$ is the linear map on the cotrace space induced by the shift $\sigma$. There is an analogous, dual, invariant decomposition of $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{B}_x^+)$ as $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{B}_x^+) = T^+_x \ominus T^-_x$ where

$$
T^+_x = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r^\pm} T^+_i(x),
$$

and

$$
\text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_0^x) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{B}_x^+) \ominus T^\infty(x),
$$
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Denote by \( \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{|V^+_0|}\} \) the standard basis of \( \text{Tr}(M^+_0) \) and by \( \{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{|V^+_0|}\} \) the dual basis for \( \text{Tr}^*(M^+_0) \). Oseledets theorem above gives a canonical identification of \( \text{Tr}^*(B^+_x) \) with a subspace of \( \text{Tr}^*(M^+_0) \), so any cotrace in \( \text{Tr}^*(B^+_x) \) can be written as

\[
\tau^* = \sum_{i=1}^{|V^+_0|} \beta_i(\tau^*) \delta_i \in \text{Tr}^*(B^+_x) \subset \text{Tr}^*(M^+_0).
\]

We now define a map

\[
j^+_x : \text{Tr}^*(B^+_x) \to LF(B^+_x) \subset AF(B^+_x)
\]
as follows. For \( \tau^* \in \text{Tr}^*(B^+_x) \), the image \([a_{\tau^*}] = [j^+_x(\tau^*)]\) is defined through its representative in \( M^+_0 \):

\[
j^+_x(\tau^*) = \left( \beta_1(\tau^*), \ldots, \beta_{|V^+_0|}(\tau^*) \right) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{|V^+_0|} \mathbb{C} = M^+_0,
\]

which is well-defined by the expression (16). We denote by \([a_{\tau^*}] = [j^+_x(\tau^*)]\) its class in \( LF(B^+_x) \). Note that by (15), we have that

\[
j^+_x(\sigma_*(v)) = \left( \tau_1(i^*_1 j^+_x(v)), \ldots, \tau_{|V^+_0|}(i^*_{|V^+_0|} j^+_x(v)) \right) \in \mathbb{C}^{|V^+_0|} = M^{\sigma(x)}_0,
\]

where \( \tau_\ell \) is the canonical generator for \( \text{Tr}(M_{\ell^0}) \), the trace space for the \( \ell^0 \text{th} \) summand of the multimatrix algebra \( M^+_x \). In general, (15) gives

\[
j^+_x(\sigma_*(k)(v)) = \left( \tau_1(i^*_k \cdots i^*_1 j^+_x(v)), \ldots, \tau_{|V^+_0|}(i^*_k \cdots i^*_1 j^+_x(v)) \right) = \left( \sigma_*(k) \tau_1(j^+_x(v)), \ldots, \sigma_*(k) \tau_{|V^+_0|}(j^+_x(v)) \right) \in \mathbb{C}^{|V^+_0|} = M^{\sigma^*(k)}_0,
\]

where \( \sigma_*(k) \) is the dual to \( \sigma^*(k) \).

**Lemma 2.** Let \( \mu \) be a minimal, contracting \( \sigma \)-invariant ergodic probability measure on \( X_F \). Then

\[
S^+ = -\frac{\lambda^+_1}{d}.
\]

**Proof.** For an Oseledets-typical \( x \in X_F \), the leading exponent \( \lambda^+_1 \) gives the exponential rate of increase of the number of paths starting from \( V^+_0 \) of length \( k > 0 \) in \( B^+_x \). Since the paths of length \( k \) are in bijection with tiles in \( k \)-approximants, the number of paths of length \( k \) also give estimates on the volumes of patches for level-\( k \) supertiles. Thus \( \lambda^+_1 \) gives the exponential rate of increase of volume supertiles. Since the function \( S^+ \) measures the exponential rate of expansion of random substitutions, \( dS^+_\mu \) measures the exponential rate of volume expansion. The result follows. \( \square \)

**Figure 4.** Random substitutions with triangles with angles which are integer multiples of \( \pi/29 \).
5. Ergodic integrals

Throughout this section we assume that we are working with a minimal, contracting, ergodic \( \sigma \)-invariant Borel probability measure on \( X_F \). This means that \( S^\pm_x = S^\pm_\mu < 0 \) for \( \mu \)-almost every \( x \). Throughout this section we assume that \( x \in X_F \) is an Oseledets typical, Poincaré recurrent point for which we have \( S^\pm_x = S^\pm_\mu \). Let

\[
\hat{X}^0_{B_x} := \left\{ \bar{\epsilon} \in \hat{X}_B : \Delta_x(\bar{\epsilon}) \in \mathcal{U}_x \right\}.
\]

**Definition 9.** Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of substitution tilings on the tiles \( t_1, \ldots, t_M \) and let \( \Omega_x = \Delta_x(\hat{X}_{B_x}) \) be the tiling space given by the minimal Bratteli diagram \( B_x \). A **spanning system of patches** for \( \Omega_x \) is a collection \( \Gamma = \{ \Gamma_k \}_{k \geq 0} \) of sets of patches \( \Gamma_k = \{ \mathcal{P}_v \}_{v \in V^+_k} \) with the following properties: for each \( v \in V^+_k \) there is a path \( \bar{e}_v = (\bar{e}_v^-, \bar{e}_v^+) = (\ldots, e_{-2}, e_{-1}, e_1, e_2, \ldots) \in \hat{X}^0_{B_x} \) with \( r(\bar{e}_v^+|k) = v \) and in that case \( \mathcal{P}_v = \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{e}_v^+) \).

A spanning system of patches gives a catalogue of all the supertiles in a given space. Along with this catalogue we can find a subset of the tiling space itself which corresponds to each of the patches in this catalogue. More specifically, given a spanning system of patches \( \Gamma \) there is a corresponding system of **plaques**. For each patch \( \mathcal{P}_v \) given by the system \( \Gamma \), the corresponding plaque in \( \Omega_x \) is

\[
\mathcal{P}_v' := \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{P}_v} \varphi_t(\mathcal{T}_v) \subset \Omega_x.
\]

We will denote by \( X^0_{B_x} \subset \hat{X}^0_{B_x} \) the set of paths parametrized by \( V^+ \) which give the spanning system of patches \( \Gamma \). Recall by Lemma 1 that as long as \( B \) is minimal then for any \( \bar{\epsilon} \in \hat{X}_{B_x} \) and \( v \in V^+ \) we have that \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v} = g_{\bar{\epsilon},v} \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v^+} \), for some constant \( c_{\bar{\epsilon},v} \in \mathbb{R} \). That is, the tiling spaces (as metric spaces) of \( \mathcal{T}_v \) and \( \mathcal{T}_v^+ \) are small deformations of each other. In particular if \( \mathcal{P} \) is a patch for tilings in \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v^+} \) then \( g_{\bar{\epsilon},v} \mathcal{P} \) is a patch for tilings in \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v} \).

Let \( \mathcal{L}(\Omega_x) \) be the set of Lipschitz functions on \( \Omega_x \) and for each \( f \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega_x) \) denote by \( L_f \) the Lipschitz constant. Given a spanning system of patches \( \Gamma \) and \( \bar{\epsilon} \in \hat{X}^0_{B_x} \) we define for \( f \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega_x) \) and each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) the vector (20)

\[
V^k_\mathcal{F}(f, \bar{\epsilon}) = \left( \int_{g_{\bar{\epsilon},e_1}} f \circ \varphi_s(\mathcal{T}_{\bar{\epsilon}e_1}) \, ds, \ldots, \int_{g_{\bar{\epsilon},e_1}} f \circ \varphi_s(\mathcal{T}_{\bar{\epsilon}e_1}) \, ds \right) \in \mathbb{C} |V^+_k|
\]

where the constants \( c_{\bar{\epsilon},e_1} \in \mathbb{R} \) are defined in the preceding paragraph. The reason these constants are needed is the following: although all tiling spaces \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v^1} \) and \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v^2} \) are the same topologically for any \( \bar{\epsilon}_1, \bar{\epsilon}_2 \in \hat{X}_{B_x} \), they differ as metric spaces since each is a small deformation of the other. As such the \( \mathbb{R}^d \) action on \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v^1} \) is a small rescaling of the same action as viewed on \( \Omega_{\mathcal{T}_v^2} \), so we need a base metric through which we measure the \( \mathbb{R}^d \) action on this tiling space, and thus we need a choice of path \( \bar{\epsilon} \in \hat{X}^0_{B_x} \) in (20).

Since \( \dim \operatorname{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^{\sigma^k(x)}) = |V^+_k| \) there is a canonical isomorphism between \( \operatorname{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^{\sigma^k(x)}) \) and \( \mathbb{C} |V^+_k| \) taking the dual of the generator \( \tau_{e_1} \in \operatorname{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_1) \) to the \( i \)-th standard basis vector in \( \mathbb{C} |V^+_k| \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, |V^+_k| \), where \( \mathcal{M}_0^{\sigma^k(x)} = M_{e_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{|V^+_k|} \). As such, we can think of each \( V^k_\mathcal{F}(f, \bar{\epsilon}) \)
as an element of $\text{Tr}^*(\mathcal{M}_0^{k(x)})$, we can compare $V_{\Gamma}^{k+1}(f, \bar{e})$ with $\sigma_* V_{\Gamma}^k(f, \bar{e})$. The $i^{th}$ component of the difference is

$$\left| (V_{\Gamma}^{k+1}(f, \bar{e}) - \sigma_* V_{\Gamma}^k(f, \bar{e}))_i \right| =$$

$$\left| \int_{g \in \mathcal{P}_{v_i}} f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{v_i}}^+ \right) ds - \sum_{e' \in r^{-1}(v_i)} \int_{g \in \mathcal{P}_{s(e')}} f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{s(e')}}^+ \right) ds \right|.$$  \tag{21}

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, -S^+_{\mu})$. Since each patch $\mathcal{P}_v$ for $v \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}^+$ is the union of patches given by level-$k$ supertiles, for any edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_{k+1}^+$ the transverse distance between the plaques $\mathcal{P}_{r(e)}'$ and $\mathcal{P}_{s(e)}'$ is

$$d(\mathcal{P}_{r(e)}', \mathcal{P}_{s(e)}') \leq C_\varepsilon e^{(S^+_{\mu} + \varepsilon)k}$$

where the constant $C_\varepsilon$ is independent of $e$ and only depends on the family $\mathcal{F}$, $\mu$ and $\varepsilon$. For $v_i \in \mathcal{V}_k^+$ and $\varepsilon \in r^{-1}(v_i)$, let

$$\mathcal{P}_{v_i,e} := f_{e_{v_i}^{-1}}^{-1} \circ f_e \left( \bigcup_{e' \in E_{0,k-1}^+: r(e') = s(e)} f_{e'}(t_{s(e')}) \right).$$

As such, there are the decompositions of each $\mathcal{P}_{v_i}$ as patches tiled by level-$k - 1$ supertiles:

$$\mathcal{P}_{v_i} = \bigcup_{e \in r^{-1}(v_i)} \mathcal{P}_{v_i,e} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_{v_i}' = \bigcup_{e \in r^{-1}(v_i)} \mathcal{P}_{v_i,e}'. \tag{22}$$

Returning to (21), using (22), (23) and the Lipschitz property:

$$\left| \int_{g \in \mathcal{P}_{v_i}} f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{v_i}}^+ \right) ds - \sum_{e' \in r^{-1}(v_i)} \int_{g \in \mathcal{P}_{s(e')}} f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{s(e')}}^+ \right) ds \right|$$

$$= \left| \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v_i)} \int_{g \in \mathcal{P}_{s(e)}} f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{v_i}}^+ \right) ds - f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{s(e)}}^+ \right) ds \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v_i)} \int_{g \in \mathcal{P}_{s(e)}} \left| f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{v_i}}^+ \right) - f \circ \varphi_s \left( \mathcal{T}_{e_{s(e)}}^+ \right) \right| ds$$

$$\leq \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v_i)} L_f C_\varepsilon e^{(S^+_{\mu} + \varepsilon)k} \left\| f \circ \varphi_s (\mathcal{T}_{e_{v_i}}^+) \right\|_{L_f}$$

$$\leq \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v_i)} L_f C_\varepsilon e^{(S^+_{\mu} + \varepsilon)k} \text{Vol}(g_{e_{v_i}(e)} \mathcal{P}_{s(e)}) \left\| f \right\|_{\infty}$$

$$\leq \sum_{e \in r^{-1}(v_i)} C_{f,\varepsilon} e^{(S^+_{\mu} + \varepsilon)k} e^{(\varepsilon - S_\mu)k} \left\| f \right\|_{\infty} \leq C_{f,\varepsilon} e^{2ek}. \tag{24}$$

We now invoke Bufetov’s approximation Lemma [Buf14, Lemma 2.8]. By the estimate above we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\left\| V_{\Gamma}^{k+1}(f, \bar{e}) - \sigma_* V_{\Gamma}^k(f, \bar{e}) \right\| \leq C_\varepsilon e^{2ek},$$

$$\left\| V_{\Gamma}^{k+1}(f, \bar{e}) - \sigma_* V_{\Gamma}^k(f, \bar{e}) \right\|$$
for all \( k > 0 \) so Bufetov’s approximation Lemma yields a \( a_{f, \Gamma} \in E_{\varepsilon}^{+} \subset \text{Tr}^{*}(B_{x}^{+}) \subset \text{Tr}^{*}(M_{0}^{x}) \) with the property that

\[
\| j^{+}_{\sigma^{k+1}_{x}}(\sigma^{(k)}_{*}a_{f, \Gamma}) - V^{k+1}_{\Gamma}(f, \varepsilon) \| \leq C_{\varepsilon}e^{2\varepsilon k}
\]

for all \( k > 0 \). Thus we get a map

\[
i^{+}_{\Gamma} : \mathcal{L}(\Omega_{x}) \to \text{Tr}^{*}(B_{x}^{+})
\]

with \( i^{+}_{\Gamma}(f) = a_{f, \Gamma} \) as defined above for any \( f \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega_{x}) \). By composition with the map \( j^{+}_{x} \) in (17) we get a map \( j^{+}_{x} \circ i^{+}_{\Gamma} : \mathcal{L}(\Omega_{x}) \to L_{f}^{*}(B_{x}^{+}) \).

5.1. **Proof of the upper bound (2).** For a tiling \( T \) of \( \mathbb{R}^{d} \) of finite local complexity and a good Lipschitz domain \( B \) with nonempty interior, we denote by \( T \cdot B \) the set \( (T \cdot \text{Id})B \) and by \( O_{T}^{-}(B) \) all the tiles of \( T \) which are completely contained in \( B \). The following was proved in [ST19, Lemma 8].

**Lemma 3.** For a good Lipschitz domain \( B \) with nonempty interior, tiling \( \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon} \in \Omega_{x} \) and \( T > 0 \) there exists an integer \( n = n(T, B) \) and a decomposition

\[
O_{\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon}}^{-}(T \cdot B) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} \bigcup_{j=1}^{M(i)} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\kappa^{(i)}_{j}} t^{(i)}_{j,k}
\]

where \( t^{(i)}_{j,k} \) is a level-\( i \) super tile of type \( j \) with

(i) \( \kappa_{j}^{(n)} \neq 0 \) for some \( j \) and \( \text{Vol}(T \cdot B) \leq K_{1}\theta_{\varepsilon}^{-d} \),

(ii) \( \sum_{j=1}^{M(i)} \kappa_{j}^{(i)} \leq K_{2}\text{Vol}((\partial(T \cdot B))\theta_{\varepsilon}^{-d-1} \) for \( i = 0, \ldots, n - 1 \).

(iii) \( R_{1}\theta_{\varepsilon}^{-1} < T < R_{2}\theta_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \) and \( n(R_{2}T, B) > n(T, B) \).

for some \( K_{1}, K_{2}, R_{1}, R_{2} > 0 \).

Let \( B \) be Lipschitz domain and \( T > 1 \). For \( \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon} \in \Omega_{x} \) consider a level-\( i \) super tile \( t^{(i)}_{j,k} \) of type \( j \) given by the decomposition given by Lemma 3 and \( f \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega_{x}) \). For any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and spanning system \( \Gamma \), as in (24), one has that

\[
\left| \int_{t^{(i)}_{j,k}} f \circ \varphi_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon}) \, ds - \int_{g_{\varepsilon,v_{j}}(\mathcal{T}_{v_{j}})} f \circ \varphi_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon}) \right| \leq C_{\varepsilon}Le^{2\varepsilon i}
\]

with \( v_{j} \in V^{+}_{\varepsilon} \). Combining this with (25) we have that

\[
\left| \int_{t^{(i)}_{j,k}} f \circ \varphi_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{T}) \, ds - j^{+}_{\sigma^{(i)}_{x}}(\sigma^{(i)}_{*}i^{+}_{\Gamma}(f)) \right| \leq C_{\varepsilon}e^{2\varepsilon i},
\]

where \( C_{\varepsilon} \) only depends on \( \varepsilon \) and \( \mathcal{F} \). For any Oseledets regular \( x \) and a generating trace \( \tau^{x,k}_{\varepsilon} \in \text{Tr}(M_{0}^{x}(x)) \) there is a decomposition

\[
\tau^{x,k}_{\varepsilon} = \sum_{m=1}^{d_{\varepsilon}} b_{m,\ell,k}^{x} \tau_{m,k}^{x} + b_{\infty,\ell,k} \tau_{\infty,\ell},
\]
where $\tau_{m,k}^\pm \in T_m^\pm(\sigma^k(x))$ and $\tau_{\infty,k} \in T_\infty^\infty(\sigma^k(x))$ are unit vectors. Note that in such decomposition there is a $N$ such that $|b_{m,\ell,k}| \leq N$ for all indices. This follows from the fact that $\tau_{m,k}^\pm$ are unit vectors, $\tau_{\ell}^\ell$ are generating traces (i.e. unit vectors), and we are dealing with finite dimensional vector spaces. Since $i_T^+(f) \in E_x^+$, using (19) it follows that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}_{T\cdot B}^\infty} f \circ \varphi_s(T\cdot B) \, ds = \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} M(i) \kappa_j^{(i)} \int_{\mathcal{O}_{T\cdot B}^\infty} f \circ \varphi_s(T\cdot B) \, ds$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} M(i) \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa_j^{(i)}} \left( j_x^+ (i_T^+(f)) \right) + O(2e^i) \right)$$

(29)

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa_j^{(i)}} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{d_m^+} b_{m,\ell,i} \sigma_m^+ (j_x^+ (i_T^+(f))) + O(2e^i) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa_j^{(i)}} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{d_m^+} b_{m,\ell,i} \left\| \sigma_m^+ \right\|_{V_m^\infty(x)} \left( \tau_{m,0}^+ (j_x^+ (i_T^+(f))) + O(2e^i) \right) \right).$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, the bounds in Lemma 3 give

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{O}_{T\cdot B}^\infty} f \circ \varphi_s(T\cdot B) \, ds \right| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} M(i) \left( C_1 \sum_{m=1}^{d_m^+} \tau_{m,0}^+ (j_x^+ (i_T^+(f))) e^{(\lambda_m^+ + \varepsilon)i} \right)$$

(30)

$$\leq C_2 \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} \text{Vol}(\partial(T\cdot B)) (\theta_{e_1} \cdots \theta_{e_n})^{d-1} \sum_{m=1}^{d_m^+} \tau_{m,0}^+ (j_x^+ (i_T^+(f))) e^{(\lambda_m^+ + \varepsilon)i}$$

$$\leq C_3 \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} (\theta_{e_{i+1}} \cdots \theta_{e_n})^{d-1} \sum_{m=1}^{d_m^+} \tau_{m,0}^+ (j_x^+ (i_T^+(f))) e^{(\lambda_m^+ + \varepsilon)i}$$

where the fact that $\text{Vol}(\partial(T\cdot B)) (\theta_{e_1} \cdots \theta_{e_n})^{d-1} \leq C_3 (\theta_{e_{i+1}} \cdots \theta_{e_n})^{1-d}$ was used. This last estimate is a straightforward consequence of the estimates in Lemma 3 and the fact that $\text{Vol}(\partial(T\cdot B)) \sim \text{Vol}(T\cdot B)^{d-1}$ for Lipschitz domains $B$ and large $T$. If $\tau_{m,0}^+ (j_x^+ (i_T^+(f))) = 0$ for all $m = 1, \ldots, r-1$ but $\tau_{r,0}^+ (j_x^+ (i_T^+(f))) \neq 0$ for some $r \leq d_m^+$, then

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{O}_{T\cdot B}^\infty} f \circ \varphi_s(T\cdot B) \, ds \right| \leq C_4 \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} (\theta_{e_{i+1}} \cdots \theta_{e_n})^{1-d} \tau_{r,0}^+ ([a_f]) e^{(\lambda_r^+ + \varepsilon)i}.$$

(31)

Now, since for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have by Lemma 2:

$$(\theta_{e_{i+1}} \cdots \theta_{e_n})^{1-d} \leq C_5 e^{(\varepsilon-S_{n}^+)(n-i)(d-1)} = C_6 e^{(\frac{\lambda_r^+ + \varepsilon}{d})^{(n-i)(d-1)}}$$
for some $C''_\varepsilon > 0$, it follows that

\begin{equation}
\left| \int_{\mathcal{O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T \cdot B)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_\varepsilon) \, ds \right| \leq C_5 \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} e^{\left( \frac{\lambda_i^+}{d} + \varepsilon \right) (n-i)(d-1)} e^{(\lambda_i^+ + \varepsilon) i} = C_5 \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} e^{\left( \frac{\lambda_i^+}{d} + \varepsilon \right) (i-n)(1-d)} e^{(\lambda_i^+ + \varepsilon) i}
\end{equation}

\begin{align*}
&= C_5 \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} \exp \left[ \left( \lambda_i^+ - \lambda_1^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(2-d) \right) i + \left( \lambda_i^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(d-1) \right) n \right] \\
&= C_5 \exp \left[ \left( \lambda_1^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(d-1) \right) n \right] \sum_{i=0}^{n(T)} \exp \left[ \left( \lambda_i^+ - \lambda_1^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(2-d) \right) i \right] \\
&= C_6 \exp \left[ \left( \lambda_1^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(d-1) \right) n \right] \left( 1 - \exp \left[ \left( \lambda_i^+ - \lambda_1^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(2-d) \right) (n+1) \right] \right) \\
&\leq C_7 \exp \left[ \max \left\{ \lambda_i^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(d-1), \lambda_i^+ + \varepsilon \right\} n \right].
\end{align*}

Defining

\[ \tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon}^+ := \max \left\{ \lambda_1^+ \frac{d-1}{d} + \varepsilon(d-1), \lambda_i^+ + \varepsilon \right\} \]

and using (iii) from Lemma 3, we have that

\begin{equation}
\log \left| \int_{\mathcal{O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T \cdot B)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_\varepsilon) \, ds \right| \leq \log \left( C_7 + \tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon} n(T) \right) \leq \log \left( C_7 + \tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon} n(T) \right) = \log \left( C_7 + \tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon} n(T) \right).
\end{equation}

Recall that by Lemma 2 we have that

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \theta_{\varepsilon_{1,n}}^{-1}}{n} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \theta_i^{-1} = \frac{\lambda_1}{d}, \]

so it follows from (33) that

\begin{equation}
\limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{\log \left| \int_{\mathcal{O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T \cdot B)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_\varepsilon) \, ds \right|}{\log T} \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \left( C_7 + \tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon} n(T) \right)}{\log (R_1^{-1}) + \log \theta_{\varepsilon_{1,n}}^{-1}} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon}}{\lambda_1} d.
\end{equation}

Now, since

\begin{equation}
\left| \int_{T \cdot B} f \circ \varphi_s(T_\varepsilon) \, ds \right| \leq \left| \int_{\mathcal{O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T \cdot B)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_\varepsilon) \, ds \right| + \left| \int_{T \cdot B \setminus \mathcal{O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T \cdot B)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_\varepsilon) \, ds \right|
\end{equation}

\[ \leq C_8 e^{\tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon} n(T)} + O(\partial(T \cdot B)) = C_8 e^{\tilde{\lambda}_{r, \varepsilon} n(T)} + O(T^{d-1}), \]

this completes the proof of the bound (2).
5.2. Special averaging sets and proof of (1). Let \( x \in X_F \) be a Poincaré-recurrent, Oseledets-regular point and \( T_\varepsilon \in \Omega_x \) for some \( \bar{e} = (\bar{e}^-, \bar{e}^+) = (\ldots, e_{-2}, e_{-1}, e_1, e_2, \ldots) \in \bar{X}_{B_\varepsilon} \). For any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a \( T_\varepsilon > 0 \) such that

- \( T^{-1} \cdot {\mathcal O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T \cdot B) \) is \( \varepsilon \)-close to \( B \) in the Hausdorff metric,
- \( {\mathcal O}_{T_\varepsilon} \) contains a ball of radius twice the minimal radius so that every ball of such radius contains a copy of every prototile in its interior.

for all \( T > T_\varepsilon \). Pick some \( T_s > T_\varepsilon \) and define \( B_\varepsilon = T_s^{-1} \cdot {\mathcal O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T_s \cdot B) \) and \( {\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) = T_s B_\varepsilon = {\mathcal O}_{T_\varepsilon}(T_s \cdot B) \), which is a patch for all tilings in \( \Omega_x \). The set \( B_\varepsilon \) is at most \( \varepsilon \) close to \( B \) in the Hausdorff metric.

Let \( k_i \to \infty \) denote the recurrence times, \( \sigma^{k_i}(x) \to x \), and suppose that \( \sigma^{k_i}(\bar{e}) \) converges to \( \bar{e}^* = (\ldots, e_{-2}^*, e_{-1}^*, e_1^*, e_2^*, \ldots) \in \bar{X}_{B_\varepsilon} \) along these times. Let \( k_\varepsilon \) be the smallest integer so that for all \( v \in V_0^+ \) and \( w \in V_{k_\varepsilon}^+ \) there is a path \( p \in E_{0,k_\varepsilon}^+ \) with \( s(p) = v \) and \( r(p) = w \). It follows that there is a \( k_\varepsilon' \geq k_\varepsilon \) and finite set of paths \( E_{B_\varepsilon}^0 \subset E_{0,k_\varepsilon}^+ \) such that for all \( p \in E_{B_\varepsilon}^0 \) one has that \( r(p) = r(\bar{e}^*_{k_\varepsilon'}) \) and such that the patch \( {\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) \) decomposes as

\[
{\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) = \varphi_{\tau_\varepsilon} \left( \bigcup_{\bar{e}' \in E_{B_\varepsilon}} f_{\bar{e}^*_{k_\varepsilon'}}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}'}(t_{s(\bar{e}')} \right) \subset {\mathcal P}_{k_\varepsilon'}(\bar{e}),
\]

where \( \tau_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is completely determined by the negative part of \( \bar{e} \). By the choice of \( T_s \) the patch \( {\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) \) is decomposed as the union of tiles

\[
{\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^M \bigcup_{j=1}^{\kappa(\ell)} t_{\ell,j},
\]

where \( t_{\ell,j} \) is a translate of the prototile \( t_\ell \). Note that the number of tiles in the decomposition (37) is \( |E_{B_\varepsilon}^0| \) from (36).

By minimality, there is a smallest \( k_\varepsilon > k_\varepsilon' \) such that there is a path \( p' \in E_{k_\varepsilon,k_\varepsilon}^+ \) with \( s(p') = r(\bar{e}^*_{k_\varepsilon'}) \) and \( r(p') = r(\bar{e}^*_{k_\varepsilon}) \). This gives a finite set of paths \( E_{B_\varepsilon}^+ \subset E_{0,k_\varepsilon}^+ \) obtained by concatenating \( p' \) to every path \( \bar{e}' \in E_{B_\varepsilon}^0 \). As such, the patch decomposes as

\[
{\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) = \varphi_{\tau_\varepsilon} \left( \bigcup_{\bar{e}' \in E_{B_\varepsilon}} f_{\bar{e}^*_{k_\varepsilon'}}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}'}(t_{s(\bar{e}')} \right).
\]

Considering the patch

\[
{\mathcal P}_{\varepsilon}^*(\bar{e}) = \bigcup_{\bar{e}' \in E_{B_\varepsilon}} f_{\bar{e}^*_{k_\varepsilon'}}^{-1} \circ f_{\bar{e}'}(t_{s(\bar{e}')} \subset {\mathcal P}_{k_\varepsilon}(\bar{e}^*),
\]

by Lemma 1, there is a \( c_{\bar{e},\bar{e}^*} \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \tau_{\bar{e},\bar{e}^*} \in \mathbb{R}^d \) such that \( {\mathcal P}_{\varepsilon}^*(\bar{e}) = g_{\bar{e},\bar{e}^*} \varphi_{\tau_{\bar{e},\bar{e}^*}} {\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) + \tau_{\bar{e},\bar{e}^*} \).

Let me take the time here to describe what is about to be done. So far we have constructed a set \( B_\varepsilon \) which is \( \varepsilon \)-close to \( B \), but it is of specialy type, by dilating it by \( T_s \), it corresponds to a patch which has been denoted by \( {\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) \). Now, since \( x \) is Poincaré recurrent, it there is a sequence of times \( k_i \to \infty \) such that all the tilings in \( \Omega_{\sigma^{k_i}(x)} \) admit \( {\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) \) as a patch. Recall that by Proposition 5 patches in \( \Omega_{\sigma^{k_i}(x)} \) correspond to “superpatches” in \( \Omega_x \), that is, patches in \( \Omega_x \) made up of level-\( k_i \) supertiles. So we want to dilate \( {\mathcal P}_\varepsilon(\bar{e}) \) along a sequence of times \( T_i \) so that, up to a small translation, it becomes a patch of level-\( k_i \) supertiles. In what follows all the superpatches and
dilation constants will be worked out. We do all this because the integrals along this sequence of superpatches can be controlled very well.

For all $i$ large enough the set $\mathcal{E}_{k_i,k_i+k_i}$ is a copy of $\mathcal{E}_{0,k_i}$ and as such it contains a copy $\mathcal{E}_B$ of $\mathcal{E}_{B_i}$. In other words, since $\mathcal{E}_i^+$ is determined by $\mathcal{T}_{x_j}$ and $x_{k_i+j} = x_j$ for all large $i$ and $0 < j \leq k_{i\varepsilon}$ (by Poincaré recurrence), we can make the identification $\mathcal{E}_{k_i+j}^+ = \mathcal{E}_j^+$ for all large $i$. Moreover, since $k_{i\varepsilon} \geq k_x$, for $i$ large enough there is a path from $v$ to $r(\bar{e}_{k_i+k_i})$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}_{k_i}$. Define the patches

$$
\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e}) := \bigcup_{\mathcal{E}_{k_i}} f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} \circ f_{e_0}(t_{a(e')}^i)
$$

and note that

$$
\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e}) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{E}_{k_i}} f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} \circ f_{e_0}(t_{a(e')}^i) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{E}_{k_i}} f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} \circ f_{e_0} \circ f_{e'}(t_{a(e')}^i)
$$

$$
= \bigcup_{\mathcal{E}_{k_i}} f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} \left( \bigcup_{e_0 \in \mathcal{E}_{k_i}} f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} \circ f_{e_0} \circ f_{e'}(t_{a(e')}^i) \right) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{E}_{k_i}} f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} \left( \bigcup_{e_0 \in \mathcal{E}_{k_i}} f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} \circ f_{e_0}(t_{a(e')}^i) \right)
$$

Thus, setting $t_{i,j}^{(i)} := f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} (g_{e_0,e^*} T_{e} + \tau_{e,e^*}^i)$ by (37) it follows that

$$
\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^M \bigcup_{j=1}^{\kappa(i)} t_{i,j}^{(i)}
$$

which expresses $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e})$ as the union of level-$k_i$ superpatches of $\mathcal{T}_{\bar{e}}$.

**Lemma 4.** There is a compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for all $i$ large enough there exists a $T_i > 0$ and $\tau_i \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $T_i \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e}) + \tau_i) = \mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e})$.

**Proof.** By (39) we have that

$$
\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e}) = f_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} (g_{e_0,e^*} T_{e} \cdot B_e + \tau_{e,e^*}^i) = \theta_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} (e_{e_0,e^*} T_{e} \cdot B_e + \tau_{e,e^*}^i)
$$

for some $\tau_{e,e^*}^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Defining $T_i := \theta_{\bar{e}^{-1}}^{k_i} e_{e_0,e^*} T_{e}$ we have that $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}^i(\bar{e}) = T_i \cdot B_e + \tau_{e,e^*}^i$. By our assumption of recurrence we have that there exists a $R_{e}$ such that for all $i$ large enough, the patch $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}}(\bar{e})$ is found in any ball of radius $R_{e}$ around any point in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for any $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{E}_{0,k_i}$. In other words, level-$k_i$
supertiles in $\Omega_x$ correspond to tiles in $\Omega_{\sigma^{k_i}(x)}$ and the difference in scales is precisely $T_i$. By this relationship of scale, by repetitivity, in any ball of radius $T_i R e$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\sigma^{k_i}(\xi)}$ contains a copy of the patch $\mathcal{P}_i (\bar{e})$. So without loss of generality we can assume that $\tau_{\xi, \bar{e}}^i \in B_{T_i R e}(0)$. Finally, letting $\tau_i = T_i^{-1} \tau_{\xi, \bar{e}}^i$, we get that $T_i \cdot (\mathcal{P}_i(\bar{e}) + \tau_i) = \mathcal{P}_x (\bar{e})$.

5.2.1. **Implicit upper bound.** Let $f \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega_x)$. By (39) for all $i$ large enough there is the decomposition

$$
\int_{\mathcal{P}_i (\bar{e})} f \circ \varphi_s (T_\xi) \, ds = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \kappa (\ell) \left( j^+_{\sigma^{k_i}(x)} (\sigma^{(k_i)}_s i^+_T (f)) \right)_\ell + O(e^{2\varepsilon' k_i})
$$

which, after choosing $\varepsilon' > 0$ and using (27) and (28), becomes, as in (29)

$$
\int_{\mathcal{P}_i (\bar{e})} f \circ \varphi_s (T_\xi) \, ds = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \kappa (\ell) \sigma^{(k_i)} (i^+_T (f)) + O(e^{2\varepsilon' k_i})
$$

(40)

$$
= \sum_{\ell=1}^M \kappa (\ell) \sum_{m=1}^{d^+_m} b_{m, \ell, k_i} \tau^+_{m, \ell, k_i} (j^+_m i^+_T (f)) + O(e^{2\varepsilon' k_i})
$$

So if $\tau^{+}_{m, 0} (j^+_m i^+_T (f))) = 0$ for all $m < r$ but $\tau^{+}_{r, 0} (j^+_m i^+_T (f))) \neq 0$,

$$
\int_{\mathcal{P}_i (\bar{e})} f \circ \varphi_s (T_\xi) \, ds = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \kappa (\ell) \sum_{m=1}^{d^+_m} b_{m, \ell, k_i} \sigma^{(k_i)}_s (j^+_m i^+_T (f)) + O(e^{2\varepsilon' k_i})
$$

(41)

for all $i$, from which it follows that

$$
\left| \int_{T_i (B_{e} + \tau_i)} f \circ \varphi_s (T_\xi) \, ds \right| \leq C e^{(\lambda^+_r + \varepsilon') k_i}
$$

for all $i$. Since $T_i$ is proportional to $\theta^{+1}_{\ell k_i}$, we can estimate as in (31)-(34) to obtain

$$
\limsup_{i \to \infty} \frac{\log \left| \int_{T_i (B_{e} + \tau_i)} f \circ \varphi_s (T_\xi) \, ds \right|}{\log T_i} \leq \frac{\lambda^+_r + \varepsilon'}{\lambda^+_k}
$$

5.2.2. **Implicit lower bound.** We partition the set of indices $\{1, \ldots, M\}$ into two sets $I^+, I^0$. An index $\ell$ is in $I^+$ if

$$
\limsup_{i \to \infty} \left| \left( j^+_{\sigma^{k_i}(x)} (\sigma^{(k_i)}_s i^+_T (f)) \right)_\ell \right| > 0,
$$

and $\ell \in I^0$ otherwise, where we recall $\pi^+_{\ell, x} : \text{Tr}^* (\mathcal{M}_0) \to V^+_e (x)$ is the corresponding projection to the $\ell^{th}$ positive Oseledets subspace. The set $I^+$ is not empty because 1) by assumption,
\[ \tau^+_\ell([a_f]) = 0 \] for all \( \ell < r \) and \( \tau^+_r([a_f]) \neq 0 \), meaning that \( \pi^+_{\ell,r} x^+_I f = 0 \) for all \( \ell < r \) but \( \pi^+_{r,r} x^+_I f \neq 0 \); and 2) all norms are equivalent in finite dimensional vector spaces.

Now we recall (40) and express it with indices according to the partition \( I^+, I^0 \):

\[
\int_{P^I_i(e)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_e) \, ds = \sum_{\ell \in I^+} \kappa(\ell) \left( j^+_\sigma_{ki}(x) \left( \sigma^I_s(\tau^+_I f) \right) \right)_{\ell} + \sum_{\ell \in I^0} \kappa(\ell) \left( j^+_\sigma_{ki}(x) \left( \sigma^I_s(\tau^+_I f) \right) \right)_{\ell} + O(e^{2\varepsilon k_i}),
\]

which, after rearranging, using the triangle inequality, and rearranging again, we get

\[
\left| \int_{P^I_i(e)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_e) \, ds \right| \geq \sum_{\ell \in I^+} \kappa(\ell) \left( j^+_\sigma_{ki}(x) \left( \sigma^I_s(\tau^+_I f) \right) \right)_{\ell} - \sum_{\ell \in I^0} \kappa(\ell) \left( j^+_\sigma_{ki}(x) \left( \sigma^I_s(\tau^+_I f) \right) \right)_{\ell} + O(e^{2\varepsilon k_i})
\]

\[
\geq C^+ \left\| \sigma^I_s \pi^+_r x^+_I f \right\|
\]

for all \( i \) and some \( C^+ > 0 \) small enough. Using Lemma 2,

\[
\limsup_{i \to \infty} \log \left( \int_{P^I_i(e)} f \circ \varphi_s(T_e) \, ds \right) \geq \limsup_{i \to \infty} \frac{\log C^+ \left\| \sigma^I_s \pi^+_r x^+_I f \right\|}{\log T_i}
\]

\[
= \limsup_{i \to \infty} \frac{k_i \log \left\| \sigma^I_s \pi^+_r x^+_I f \right\|}{\log T_i}
\]

\[
= \frac{d}{\lambda^+_I} \lambda^+_I.
\]

**Figure 5.** Random substitutions with triangles with angles which are integer multiples of \( \pi/8 \).

### 6. Solenoids and the Denjoy-Koksma inequality

For a function \( f : X \to \mathbb{R} \) on a Cantor set \( X \) and a clopen subset \( C \subset X \), define

\[
\text{Var}(f, C) := \sup_{x,y \in C} |f(x) - f(y)|
\]

and, for a partition \( P = \{P_1, \ldots, P_n\} \) of \( X \) into disjoint clopen subsets, define

\[
\text{Var}(f, P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(f, P_i).
\]

Finally, let \( \text{Var}(f) = \sup_P \text{Var}(f, P) \), where the supremum is taken over all partitions of \( X \) into clopen disjoint subsets. A function \( f : X \to \mathbb{R} \) on a Cantor set \( X \) has **bounded variation** if \( \text{Var}(f) < \infty \).
Definition 10. Let $\Omega$ be a the tiling space of an aperiodic, repetitive tiling of finite local complexity. A continuous function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ has **bounded variation** if there is a $V_f < \infty$ such that $\text{Var}(f|_U) \leq V_f$ for all transversals $U \subset \Omega$.

The set of continuous functions on $\Omega$ with bounded variation is denoted by $BV(\Omega)$. Let $\bar{q} = (q_1, q_2, \ldots) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, where $q_k > 1$ for all $k$. For any such $\bar{q}$ we will denote $q_{(n)} = q_1 \cdots q_n$.

Definition 11. A $d$-dimensional solenoid is the tiling space $\Omega_{\bar{q}}$ associated to a family of substitutions $\mathcal{F}$ on a single prototile $t_1 = \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^d$. The Bratteli diagram $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{q}}$ for such tiling spaces have a single vertex at every level and $|\mathcal{E}_k| = q_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and it is also required here that $\theta_e = q_k^{-d}$ for any $e \in \mathcal{E}_k$. In this case the family $\mathcal{F}$ is allowed to be infinite.

Remark 2. The definition for a solenoid above is slightly more general than the usual definition of a solenoid as an inverse limit of $\mathbb{T}^d$ under maps of the form $q_n \cdot \text{Id}$.

In this section we prove a type of bound known as a Denjoy-Koksma inequality for solenoids. There is a good introduction to the Denjoy-Koksma inequality by C. Matheus [Mat].

**Theorem.** Let $\Omega_{\bar{q}}$ be a $d$-dimensional solenoid. Then for any $f \in BV(\Omega_{\bar{q}})$ and $p \in \Omega_{\bar{q}}$,

\[
\left| \int_{[0,q_{(n)}]} f \circ \varphi_{\bar{s}}(p) \, ds - q_{(n)}^d \int_{\Omega_{\bar{q}}} f \, d\mu \right| \leq \text{Var}(f)
\]

for all $n > 0$.

It seems reasonable to conjecture that a Denjoy-Koksma inequality holds for any tiling space $\Omega_x$ where $K_0(AF(\mathcal{B}_x^+)) \subset \mathbb{Q}$.

**Proof.** Let $X^+_\bar{q} := X^+_B\bar{q}$. Since any substitution in the family $\mathcal{F}$ forces the border, the map $\Delta_{\bar{q}} : X^+_{\bar{q}} \to \cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is a homeomorphism of Cantor sets. As such, the topology of $\cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is generated by the image of cylinder subsets of $X^+_{\bar{q}}$ under the map $\Delta_{\bar{q}}$. As such, for every $k > 0$, there are $q_{(k)}^d$ pairwise-disjoint cylinder sets $\mathcal{C}_i^k \subset \cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$ parametrized by $i \in \{1, \ldots, q_{(k)}\}^d$, one for each path $p \in \mathcal{E}_{0,k}$, whose union is $\cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Moreover, since it is well known that $X^+_{\bar{q}}$ admits a unique tail-invariant Borel probability measure, by Proposition 2, we have that $\nu(\mathcal{C}_i^k) = q_{(k)}^{-d}$ for all $i$ for the unique holonomy-invariant measure $\nu$ on $\cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

For any $\bar{e} = (\bar{e}^{-}, \bar{e}^{+}) \in X_{\bar{q}}$, the $k^{th}$ approximant $P_k(\bar{e}^{+})$ is a tiled cube of side length $q_{(k)}$ containing the origin, and it is tiled by $q_{(k)}^d$ tiles isometric to $[0, 1]^d$. For $T_{\bar{e}} = \Delta_{\bar{q}}(\bar{e}) \in \cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$, there exists a vector $\tau_{\bar{e}} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^d$ such that $\varphi_{\tau_{\bar{e}}}(T_{\bar{e}}) \in \cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$. By Lemma 1, there exist $q_{(k)}^d$ vectors $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{q_{(k)}^d}$ such that $\varphi_{\tau_i}(T_{\bar{e}}) \in \mathcal{C}_i^k$. In other words, the points $\{\varphi_{\tau_i}(T_{\bar{e}})\}_i$ $q_{(k)}^d$-equidistribute in $\cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

In fact, more is true: the vectors $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{q_{(k)}^d}$ can be chosen to be nice elements of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. In particular, one can choose them to be the elements of the set $\{1, \ldots, q_{(k)}\}^d$. First, note that for any $s \in \{1, \ldots, q_{(k)}\}^d$, $\varphi_{s + \tau_{\bar{e}}}(T_{\bar{e}}) \in \cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$. This follows from the fact that there is a single prototile (a unit cube) in the tiling and its center is the puncture. Thus, since $\varphi_{\tau_{\bar{e}}}(T_{\bar{e}}) \in \cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$, it follows that $\varphi_{s + \tau_{\bar{e}}}(T_{\bar{e}}) \in \cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Moreover, for any $s \neq s' \in \{1, \ldots, q_{(k)}\}^d$, it follows that $\Delta_{\bar{q}}^{-1}(\varphi_{s + \tau_{\bar{e}}}(T_{\bar{e}}))|_k \neq \Delta_{\bar{q}}^{-1}(\varphi_{s' + \tau_{\bar{e}}}(T_{\bar{e}}))|_k$, so they $q_{(k)}^d$-equidistribute in $\cup_{\mathcal{Q}}$.  


We can follow the proof of the classical Denjoy-Koksma inequality now for the dynamics restricted to \( \bar{U}_q \) [Mat]. For \( \bar{e} \in \bar{U}_q \):

\[
\left| \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} f \circ \varphi_i(T_{\bar{e}}) - q_d \int_{\bar{U}_q} f \, d\nu \right| = \left| \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} \frac{1}{\nu(C_i^k)} \int_{C_i^k} (f \circ \varphi_i(T_{\bar{e}}) - f(x)) \, d\nu(x) \right| \\
\leq \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} \frac{1}{\nu(C_i^k)} \int_{C_i^k} |f \circ \varphi_i(T_{\bar{e}}) - f(x)| \, d\nu(x) \leq \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} \sup_{y, z \in C_i^k} |f(y) - f(z)| \\
\leq \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} \text{Var}(f, C_i^k) \leq \text{Var}(f).
\]

(44)

Finally, note that if \( p \in \Omega_q \) and \( y \in [0, 1]^d \) such that \( p \in \mathcal{U}_q^y \) then

\[
\int_{[0, q_n]} f \circ \varphi_s(p) \, ds = \int_{[0, 1]^d} \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} f \circ \varphi_{i+s}(p) \, ds.
\]

Putting it all together, let \( p \in \Omega_q \) and \( y \in [0, 1]^d \) such that \( p \in \mathcal{U}_q^y \). Then:

\[
\left| \int_{[0, q_n]} f \circ \varphi_s(p) \, ds - q_d \int_{\Omega_q} f \, d\mu \right| = \left| \int_{[0, 1]^d} \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} f \circ \varphi_{i+s}(p) \, ds - q_d \int_{[0, 1]^d} \mathcal{U}_q^y \int_{\mathcal{U}_q^y} f \, d\nu \varphi_s(y) \, ds \right| \\
\leq \int_{[0, 1]^d} \left| \sum_{i \in \{0, \ldots, q(k) - 1\}^d} f \circ \varphi_{i+s}(p) \right| - q_d \int_{\mathcal{U}_q^y} \int_{\mathcal{U}_q^y} f \, d\nu \varphi_s(y) \, ds \left| ds \\
\leq \int_{[0, 1]^d} \text{Var}(f) \, ds = \text{Var}(f).
\]

(46)
7. Random Schrödinger operators

This section will focus on applications of the results of §5 to algebras of operators coming from the tiling spaces obtained by collections of substitution rules. Although it is natural in such cases to focus on the $C^*$-algebras of operators obtained, here the focus is on $*$-algebras which are dense in the $C^*$-algebras of usual interest. This is because the traces obtained are only densely defined and one loses all but one trace by going to the completion $C^*$-algebras. This is mentioned for the curious reader wondering how one completes the algebras constructed; it is not relevant for the work here.

For a family $\mathcal{F}$ on substitutions defined on the same set of prototiles and $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$ let $B_x$ be the associated Bratteli diagram as constructed in §3 and assume $B_x$ is minimal. Recall that by construction, any tile $t$ on any tiling $T \in \Omega$ has a distinguished point in its interior, and they correspond to the placement of the origin inside of the prototiles $\{t_1, \ldots, t_M\}$. These distinguished points are called punctures in [Kel95]. Once the punctures have been chosen on the interior of the prototiles, there exists a $\varrho > 0$ such that any ball of radius less than $\varrho$ centered at the puncture of a tile $t \in T \in \Omega_x$ does not intersect the boundary of $t$, and this holds for all $x \in X_\mathcal{F}$ and $T \in \Omega_x$. Let $\Lambda_T$ be the set of punctures of $T$, that is, the union of all distinguished points of all tiles of $T$ and define

$$G_x := \{(p, T', q) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \Omega_x \times \mathbb{R}^d : p, q \in \Lambda_T\}.$$

**Definition 12.** A kernel of finite range is a function $k \in C(G_x)$ such that

(i) $k$ is bounded;

(ii) $k$ has finite range. In other words there is a $R_k > 0$ such that $k(p(T, q)) = 0$ whenever $|p - q| > R_k$;

(iii) $k$ is $\mathbb{R}^d$-invariant: $k(p - t, \varphi_t(T), q - t) = k(p, T, q)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The set of all kernels of finite range associated to $\Omega_x$ are denoted by $K_x^{fin}$. For any $k \in K_x^{fin}$ there is a family of representations $\{\pi_T\}_{T \in \Omega_x}$ in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\Lambda_T))$ defined, for $k \in K_x^{fin}$ by

$$\langle K_T \delta_p, \delta_q \rangle = \langle (\pi_T k) \delta_p, \delta_q \rangle = k(p, T, q).$$

The family $\{K_T\}$ parametrized by $\Omega_x$ is bounded in the product $\prod_{T \in \Omega_x} \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\Lambda_T))$. Defining a convolution product as

$$(a \cdot b)(p, T, q) = \sum_{x \in \Lambda_T} a(p, T, x)b(x, T, q)$$

and involution by $k^*(p, T, q) = \overline{k(q, T, p)}$, $K_x^{fin}$ has the structure of a $*$-algebra. It follows that the map $\pi : K_x^{fin} \to \prod_T \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\Lambda_T))$ is a faithful $*$-representation. The image is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_x^{fin}$ and it is the algebra of operators of finite range. The completion of this algebra is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_x$.

**Definition 13.** The set of Lipschitz kernels of finite range consists of kernels $k \in K_x^{fin}$ for which there are constants $R_k, T_k > 0$ such that if for two $T_1, T_2 \in \Omega_x$ one has that $B_{R_k}(0) \cap \Lambda_{T_1} = B_{R_k}(0) \cap \Lambda_{T_2}$ then for any $p, q \in B_{R_k}(0) \cap \Lambda_{T_1}$ one has that $|k(p, T_1, q) - k(p, T_2, q)| \leq \frac{L_k}{R_k}$.
The set of Lipschitz kernels of finite range is denoted by \( \mathcal{LK}_{x}^{fin} \subset \mathcal{K}_{x}^{fin} \). The image of \( \mathcal{LK}_{x}^{fin} \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{LA}_{x} = \pi \mathcal{LK}_{x}^{fin} \subset A_{x}^{fin} \) and it is the set of Lipschitz operators of finite range. It should be pointed out that most operators of interest in mathematical physics, such as operators of the form \( H = \Delta + V \), where \( V \) is a "localized" potential on defined on \( T \), are contained in the set \( \mathcal{LA}_{x} \).

Let \( u : \mathbb{R}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be a smooth bump function of integral 1, compactly supported in a disk of radius less than \( \rho \). This defines a family of functions \( w_{u,T} : \mathcal{LA}_{x} \rightarrow C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{d}) \) parametrized by \( \Omega_{x} \) as follows. For \( A = \pi k \in A_{x}^{fin} \) and \( A_{T} = \pi_{T} k \in B(\ell^{2}(\Lambda_{T})) \), let \( f_{A_{T}}^{u} \) be defined by
\[
f_{A_{T}}^{u}(t) = w_{u,T}(A)(t) = \sum_{p \in \Lambda_{T}} A_{T}(p,p) u(p-t).
\]

**Lemma 5.** There exists a function \( h = h_{A}^{u} \in \mathcal{L}(\Omega_{x}) \) such that \( f_{A_{T}}^{u}(t) = h \circ \varphi_{t}(T) \).

**Proof.** The assignment \( T \mapsto f_{A_{T}}^{u}(0) \) defines a function \( f_{A}^{u}(0) : \Omega_{x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \). Note that for \( T, T' \in \Omega_{x} \) with \( d(T, T') \leq \varepsilon \), one has for some \( k \in \mathcal{LK}_{x}^{fin} \)
\[
|f_{A_{T}}^{u}(0) - f_{A_{T'}}^{u}(0)| = |k(0,T,0) - k(0,T',0)| u(0) \leq u(0) L_{k,\varepsilon},
\]
so this is a Lipschitz function on \( \Omega_{x} \) with Lipschitz constant \( L_{k} u(0) \).

The function \( T \mapsto f_{A}^{u}(0) \) can be extended to \( \Omega_{y} \) by choosing a neighborhood \( U \) of \( \Omega_{x} \) of size \( r_{u} \) and a product chart \( \phi_{u} : U \rightarrow B_{u}(0) \times \Omega_{x} \) and noting that the function defined by \( h = \phi_{u}^{*} \bar{u} \), where \( \bar{u}(t,T) = f_{A_{T}}^{u}(0) u(t) \) with \( \|t\| < r_{u} \), defines a Lipschitz function on \( \Omega_{x} \). That this gives \( f_{A_{T}}^{u}(t) = h \circ \varphi_{t}(T) \) follows from the \( \mathbb{R}^{d} \) invariance of the kernel \( k \) used to define \( A \).

Let \( \mathcal{M}_{u} : \mathcal{LA}_{x} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\Omega_{x}) \) be the map given by Lemma 5 and denote the composition \( \Upsilon_{u,\Gamma} := j_{x}^{+} \circ i_{t}^{+} \circ \mathcal{M}_{u} : \mathcal{LA}_{x} \rightarrow LF(B_{x}^{+}) \). We can define functionals \( \tau'_{i} : \mathcal{LA}_{x} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \) by pullback \( \Gamma'_{i} = \Upsilon_{u,\Gamma}^{*} \tau_{i}^{+} \), i.e., \( \tau'_{i}(A) = \tau_{i}^{+}(\Upsilon_{u,\Gamma}^{*}(A)) \), for \( A \in \mathcal{LA}_{x} \), where \( \tau_{i}^{+} \in T_{i}^{+}(x) \). The functionals \( \tau'_{i} \) may or may not be traces. By [ST18b, Proposition 1], we know some cases when they are.

**Proposition 6.** Let \( F_{1}, \ldots, F_{N} \) be a collection of substitution rules on a set of prototiles \( t_{1}, \ldots, t_{M} \) and \( \mu \) a minimal, contracting, \( \sigma \)-invariant ergodic Borel probability measure on \( X_{F} \). Then for \( \mu \)-almost every \( x \), for a spanning system of patches \( \Gamma \) on \( \Omega_{x} \), the functional \( \tau'_{i} = \Upsilon_{u,\Gamma}^{*} \tau_{i}^{+} \) is a trace if \( \frac{\lambda_{i}^{+}}{\lambda_{1}^{+}} > \frac{d-1}{d} \). So \( \Upsilon_{u,\Gamma} \) induces a map on traces
\[
\Upsilon_{u,\Gamma}^{*} : \text{Tr}(B_{x}^{+})^{++} \rightarrow \text{Tr}(\mathcal{LA}_{x}),
\]
where \( \text{Tr}(B_{x}^{+})^{++} \) is the subspace of \( \text{Tr}(B_{x}^{+}) \) generated by traces \( \tau_{i}^{+} \) which satisfy \( \frac{\lambda_{i}^{+}}{\lambda_{1}^{+}} > \frac{d-1}{d} \).

### 7.1. Proof of Theorem 3

Let \( d_{t}^{++} \) be the dimension of the subspace \( \text{Tr}(B_{x}^{+})^{++} \). Define the \( d_{t}^{++} \) traces in \( \text{Tr}(\mathcal{LA}_{x}) \) to be \( \{\tau_{1}, \ldots, \tau_{d_{t}^{++}}^{+}\} \), where \( \tau_{i} \in \Upsilon_{u,\Gamma}^{*} T_{i}^{+}(x) \) is any non-zero element. Now pick \( A_{T} \in \mathcal{LA}_{x} \), a good Lipschitz domain \( B \) and \( T > 0 \). First, note that for two smooth bump functions \( u, u' \) of compact support in a ball of radius less than \( \rho \) and integral 1, it follows that
\[
\left| \int_{\partial T(E)} \mathcal{M}_{u} A \circ \varphi_{t}(T) - \mathcal{M}_{u'} A \circ \varphi_{t}(T) \, dt \right| = 0, \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\left| \int_{E} \mathcal{M}_{u} A \circ \varphi_{t}(T) - \mathcal{M}_{u'} A \circ \varphi_{t}(T) \, dt \right| = O(|\partial E|).
\]
for any measurable $E$ of finite volume. In addition, one has that

$$\left| \left| \left| \left| \mathrm{tr} \left( A_T |_{O^-(E)} \right) - \int_{O^-(E)} M_u A \circ \varphi_t(T) \, dt \right) \right| \right| = 0$$

(48)

$$\left| \left| \left| \left| \mathrm{tr} \left( A_T |_E \right) - \int_E M_u A \circ \varphi_t(T) \, dt \right) \right| \right| = O(|\partial E|).$$

for any measurable set $E$ of finite volume, where the second estimate is from [ST18b, Equation (22)]. Thus, if $\tau_i(A) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$ for some $r < d^{++} \mu$ but $\tau_r(A) \neq 0$, by (33) it follows that for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$|\mathrm{tr} (A_T |_{T \cdot B})| = \left| \int_{T \cdot B} M_u A \circ \varphi_t(T) \, dt \right| + O(\partial(T \cdot B))$$

(49)

$$\leq \max \left\{ C_{\varepsilon, A} \tau_r(A) T^{d \lambda^+_1 + d \varepsilon}, O(T^{d-1}) \right\}$$

independent of which bump function $u$ was used by (47). Thus by (34) and (35), if $d \lambda^+_r \geq (d-1) \lambda^+_1$, then

$$\limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{\log |\mathrm{tr} (A_T |_{T \cdot B})|}{\log T} \leq \frac{\lambda^+_1}{\lambda^+_r}. d.$$
Thus there are four substitution rules (none of which is primitive) we would like to consider, and they can be described by the edge set they define in a Bratteli diagram:

For \( p \in (0, 1) \), let \( \mu_p \) be the Bernoulli measure on \( \Sigma_4 \) which gives the cylinder set \( \mu_p(C_1) = p \) and \( \mu_p(C_2) = 1 - p \), where \( C_i = \{ x \in \Sigma_4 : x_1 = i \} \). The typical points for the measure \( \mu_p \) then give tiling spaces \( \Omega_x \) which are obtained from tilings which were constructed, on average by applications of the substitution \( M_1 \) with probability \( p \) and substitution \( M_2 \) with probability \( 1 - p \). Figure 9 shows the (normalized) spectrum as a function of \( p \). It seems like the spectrum is symmetric: for every normalized Lyapunov exponent \( \lambda \) we have that \( -\lambda \) is also a Lyapunov exponent. Moreover, there seems to be no exponent of value 0 for any \( p \), and for small enough values of \( p \) we have that \( d\lambda^+ / \lambda^+ \geq 1 \) (thus getting information from the second upper bound in Theorem 1). Finally, for every \( p \) there are 10 Lyapunov exponents (not all distinct) and traces which describe the deviation behavior of ergodic integrals on \( \Omega_x \) for \( \mu_p \)-almost every \( x \) along the special averaging subsets given in Theorem 1.
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Random substitutions with triangles with angles which are integer multiples of $\pi/11$.

**Figure 10.** Random substitutions with triangles with angles which are integer multiples of $\pi/11$.
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