

# MINIMAL SYSTEMS WITH FINITELY MANY ERGODIC MEASURES

WEN HUANG, ZHENGXING LIAN, SONG SHAO, AND XIANGDONG YE

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper it is proved that if a minimal system has the property that its sequence entropy is uniformly bounded for all sequences, then it has only finitely many ergodic measures and is an almost finite to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor. This result is obtained as an application of a general criteria which states that if a minimal system is an almost finite to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor and has no infinite independent sets of length  $k$  for some  $k \geq 2$ , then it has only finitely many ergodic measures.

## 1. AN INTRODUCTION AND THE SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

In this section we first give the background of the study and then state the main results of the paper.

### 1.1. The background.

A *topological dynamical system* is a pair  $(X, T)$ , where  $X$  is a compact metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  is a homeomorphism. Denote by  $M(X)$  the set of all Borel probability measures on  $X$ . Let  $M_T(X) = \{\mu \in M(X) : T_*\mu = \mu \circ T^{-1} = \mu\}$  be the set of all  $T$ -invariant Borel measures of  $X$ . With the weak\*-topology,  $M_T(X)$  is a compact convex space. By Krylov-Bogolioubov theorem  $M_T(X) \neq \emptyset$ . Denote by  $M_T^{erg}(X)$  the set of ergodic measures of  $(X, T)$ , then  $M_T^{erg}(X)$  is the set of extreme points of  $M_T(X)$  and one can use the Choquet representation theorem to express each member of  $M_T(X)$  in terms of the ergodic members of  $M_T(X)$ . That is, for each  $\mu \in M_T(X)$  there is a unique measure  $\tau$  on the Borel subsets of the compact space  $M_T(X)$  such that  $\tau(M_T^{erg}(X)) = 1$  and  $\mu = \int_{M_T^{erg}(X)} m d\tau(m)$ , which is called the *ergodic decomposition* of  $\mu$ .

Usually, the set  $M_T^{erg}(X)$  may be very big, and thus it is interesting to consider the case when  $M_T^{erg}(X)$  is small. The extreme case is that  $M_T^{erg}(X)$  consists of only one member, and in this case  $(X, T)$  is said to be *uniquely ergodic*. Uniquely ergodic systems are common, have lots of very nice properties and are very important in the study of dynamical systems. For example, the well known Jewett-Krieger's theorem asserts that every ergodic system is measurably isomorphic to a uniquely ergodic topological system [24, 27]. The systems with only finitely many ergodic measures are also very common. For example, if  $(X, T)$  is uniquely ergodic with a unique measure  $\mu$ , then  $(X, T^n)$  ( $n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0$ ) has only finitely many ergodic measures.

While there are lots of criteria for the unique ergodicity of a system, there are very few conditions under which a system may have only finitely many ergodic measures. We now

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37B05; 54H20.

This research is supported by NNSF of China (11971455, 11731003, 11571335, 11431012).

state such a condition in [5] obtained for minimal subshifts by Boshernitzan. Let  $(\Omega, \sigma)$  be a minimal subshift over a finite alphabet. Denote by  $P(n)$  be the number of different  $n$ -blocks which appear in any  $\omega \in \Omega$ . In [5], it is shown that if there is some  $r \geq 2$  such that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (P(n) - rn) = -\infty$ , then  $|M_\sigma^{erg}(\Omega)| \leq r - 1$ ; and if  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P(n)}{n} = \alpha < \infty$ , then  $|M_\sigma^{erg}(\Omega)| \leq \max\{[\alpha], 1\}$ , where  $[\alpha]$  denotes the integer part of  $\alpha$ . Also it is shown that if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P(n)}{n} < 3$ , then the system is uniquely ergodic. We note that recently, the result was extended to a subshift of linear growth without the assumption of minimality by Cyr and Kra [7]. It was proved that a subshift of linear growth has finitely many nonatomic ergodic measures and thus has at most countably many ergodic measures (with no requirement that the measures are nonatomic).

In this paper we will give some other conditions when a system may have only finitely many ergodic measures. To look for such conditions it is natural to consider minimal systems which are close to equicontinuous ones. The class of systems we study in this paper is the collection of minimal systems having no  $k$  infinite independent sets for some  $k \geq 2$ , or no  $k$  tuples with arbitrarily long finite independent sets for some  $k \geq 2$ .

We remark that the case when  $k = 2$ , namely the tame or null systems were extensively studied in the literature. A null topological dynamical system was defined by using the notion of sequence entropy. Sequence entropy for a measure was introduced as an isomorphism invariant by Kushnirenko [30], who used it to distinguish between transformations with the same entropy and spectral invariant. In the same paper, it was also shown that an invertible measure preserving transformation has discrete spectrum if and only if it is null (the sequence entropy of the system is zero for any sequence). Let  $(X, \mathcal{X}, \mu, T)$  be an ergodic system. Then the supremum of all sequence entropies of  $T$  is either  $\log k$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  or infinite [23]. The topological sequence entropy was introduced by Goodman in [17]. Also, for a topological dynamical system  $(X, T)$ , the supremum of all topological sequence entropies (denoted by  $h_\infty(X, T)$  or  $h^*(T)$ ) is either  $\log k$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  or infinite [22]. It was shown [21] that if a minimal topological dynamical system is null (the topological sequence entropy is zero for any sequence), then it is uniquely ergodic, has discrete spectrum and is an almost one to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor.

The concept of tameness was introduced by Köhler in [26]. Here we follow the definition of Glasner [13]. A topological dynamical system  $(X, T)$  is said to be *tame* if its enveloping semigroup is separable and Fréchet, and it is said to be *non-tame* otherwise. It is known that a minimal null system is tame [25]. A structure theorem for minimal tame systems has been established in [19, 25, 14, 15], i.e., a minimal tame system is uniquely ergodic, has discrete spectrum and is an almost one to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor. Recently, a striking result proved by Fuhrmann, Glasner, Jäger and Oertel solved a long open question, i.e. the authors showed that a minimal tame system is regular [11].

In the sequel we will state the main results and some open questions. From now on we will focus on topological dynamical systems under general group actions. We start by recalling some notions.

## 1.2. Topological transformation groups.

A *topological dynamical system* (t.d.s for short) is a triple  $\mathcal{X} = (X, T, \Pi)$ , where  $X$  is a compact Hausdorff space,  $T$  is a Hausdorff topological group and  $\Pi : T \times X \rightarrow X$  is a continuous map such that  $\Pi(e, x) = x$  and  $\Pi(s, \Pi(t, x)) = \Pi(st, x)$ , where  $e$  is the unit of  $T$ ,  $s, t \in T$  and  $x \in X$ . We shall fix  $T$  and suppress the action symbol. Note that in the literatures,  $\mathcal{X}$  is also called a *topological transformation group* or a *flow*.

To be simple, we always assume that  $T$  is infinite countable and discrete, unless we state explicitly in some places. Moreover, we always assume that  $X$  is a compact metric space with metric  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ .

Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $x \in X$ , then  $\mathcal{O}(x, T) = \{tx : t \in T\}$  denotes the *orbit* of  $x$ , which is also denoted by  $Tx$ . We usually denote the closure of  $\mathcal{O}(x, T)$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{O}}(x, T)$ , or  $\overline{Tx}$ . A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is called *invariant* if  $ta \subseteq A$  for all  $a \in A$  and  $t \in T$ . When  $Y \subseteq X$  is a closed and  $T$ -invariant subset of the system  $(X, T)$  we say that the system  $(Y, T)$  is a *subsystem* of  $(X, T)$ . If  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, T)$  are two t.d.s. their *product system* is the system  $(X \times Y, T)$ , where  $t(x, y) = (tx, ty)$  for any  $t \in T$  and  $x, y \in X$ .

A t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  is called *minimal* if  $X$  contains no proper non-empty closed invariant subsets. It is easy to verify that a t.d.s. is minimal if and only if every orbit is dense.

A *factor map*  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  between the t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, T)$  is a continuous onto map which intertwines the actions; we say that  $(Y, T)$  is a *factor* of  $(X, T)$  and that  $(X, T)$  is an *extension* of  $(Y, T)$ . The systems are said to be *isomorphic* if  $\pi$  is bijective.

A t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  is *equicontinuous* if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that whenever  $x, y \in X$  with  $d(x, y) < \delta$ , then  $d(tx, ty) < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in T$ . Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. There is a smallest invariant equivalence relation  $S_{eq}$  such that the quotient system  $(X/S_{eq}, T)$  is equicontinuous [9]. The equivalence relation  $S_{eq}$  is called the *equicontinuous structure relation* and the factor  $(X_{eq} = X/S_{eq}, T)$  is called the *maximal equicontinuous factor* of  $(X, T)$ .

Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be an extension of t.d.s. We call that  $\pi$  is *finite to one* if each fiber is finite, and *almost finite to one* if there is a residual set  $Y_0 \subset Y$  such that for each  $y \in Y_0$ , the fiber of  $y$  is finite. We note that if  $(Y, T)$  is minimal this is equivalent to say that there is a finite fiber. If there is some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and a dense  $G_\delta$  set  $X_0$  of  $X$  such that for each  $x \in X_0$ , the cardinality of the fiber  $\pi^{-1}(\pi(x))$  is  $N$ , then we also call  $\pi$  is almost  $N$  to 1. If a t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  is minimal and is an almost one to one extension of some equicontinuous system then we call it an *almost automorphic* system.

## 1.3. A general criteria.

Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say that  $(X, T)$  has no  $k$ -IT-tuple if for any tuple of closed non-empty disjoint subsets  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_k$  of  $X$  there is no an infinite independence set for them, i.e. for any infinite set  $S \subseteq T$ , there is some  $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}^S$  such that

$$\bigcap_{t \in S} t^{-1} U_{a_t} = \emptyset.$$

The following is one of the main results of the paper.

**Theorem A:** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system and let  $T$  be an infinite countable discrete amenable group. If  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_{eq}, T)$  is almost finite to one, and there is some integer  $k \geq 2$  such that  $(X, T)$  has no  $k$ -IT-tuples, then  $(X, T)$  has only finitely many ergodic measures.*

Let us give a brief description of the idea of the proof. To prove Theorem A first we show that there is  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the set  $\{y \in X_{eq} : |\pi^{-1}(y)| = N\}$  is residual in  $X_{eq}$  (Proposition 2.14). Then using the hyperspace technique, we lift  $\pi$  to an open  $N$  to one map  $\pi'$  through almost one to one extensions as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xleftarrow{\sigma} & X' \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ X_{eq} & \xleftarrow{\tau} & Y' \end{array}$$

where  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are almost one-to-one extensions. We can show that the length of any IT-tuple of  $Y'$  is bounded by  $(k-1)^N$ . At the same time the number of the ergodic measures of  $Y'$  is bounded by the same number (Proposition 3.7). Since  $\pi'$  is  $N$  to one, we conclude that the number of the ergodic measures of  $X'$  is bounded by  $N(k-1)^N$ , and so does  $X$ , ending the proof. We mention that to obtain Proposition 3.7 we need to use some result (Proposition 3.2) which is a generalization of the previous one obtained by Fuhrmann, Glasner, Jäger and Oertel [11].

We have the following remarks:

- (1) In [11, Subsection 5.3], it was shown that there is a minimal system which is an at most two-to-one and almost one to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor, but exhibits two distinct ergodic invariant measures. This system has 2-IT-tuples but no 3-IT-tuples.
- (2) In Theorem A we can only prove  $(X, T)$  has only finitely many ergodic measures, and we are not able to get an upper bound only depending on  $k$ . We mention that if  $\pi$  is almost one to one, then there are at most  $k-1$  ergodic measures, see Proposition 3.7.
- (3) In fact, if  $T$  is abelian, we can show that  $(X, T)$  is an almost  $N$  to one extension with  $N \leq k-1$ . The same proof of Remark 4.2 can be applied here.

By the proof of Theorem A, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary B:** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system and let  $T$  be an infinite countable discrete amenable group. If  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_{eq}, T)$  is finite to one, then  $(X, T)$  has only finitely many ergodic measures.*

We believe that in Theorem A, the condition that  $(X, T)$  is an almost finite to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor is superfluous. To be precise, we have the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system with  $T$  infinite countable discrete. If there is some integer  $k \geq 2$  such that  $(X, T)$  has no  $k$ -IT-tuples, then  $(X, T)$  is an almost finite to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor.*

In fact this conjecture is closely related to the following one

**Conjecture 2.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal t.d.s. with  $T$  infinite countable discrete amenable and  $\pi : X \rightarrow X_{eq}$  be the factor map to the maximal equicontinuous factor of  $(X, T)$ . If  $\pi$  is proximal and not almost one to one, then for each  $k \geq 2$ , there is a  $k$ -IT tuple.*

#### 1.4. Bounded minimal systems.

We may use sequence entropy to give a very succinct criteria for systems with only finitely many ergodic measures.

In this article we focus on minimal t.d.s. with bounded topological sequence entropy. That is, there is a positive real number  $M$  such that for each increasing sequence of positive integer numbers, the topological entropy of the system along this sequence is bounded by  $M$ . This class of systems was studied in [21] and [32]. As another main result, a structure theorem for a bounded minimal system is obtained. That is,

**Theorem C:** *If  $(X, T)$  is a bounded minimal system with  $T$  abelian, then it is an almost finite to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor, and it has finitely many ergodic measures.*

Let us give a brief account of the idea of the proof. Maass and Shao [32] proved that under the assumption of the theorem we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xleftarrow{\sigma'} & X' \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi' \\ X_{eq} & \xleftarrow{\tau'} & Y' \end{array}$$

where  $X_{eq}$  is the maximal equicontinuous factor of  $X$ ,  $\sigma'$  and  $\tau'$  are proximal extensions, and  $\pi'$  is an  $N$  to one extension for some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . So it is left to prove that in fact  $\sigma'$  and  $\tau'$  are almost one to one according to Theorem A. It is done by showing that if  $(X, T)$  is minimal and  $\pi : X \rightarrow X_{eq}$  is proximal and not almost one to one, then  $h_\infty(X, T) = \infty$ , i.e.  $(X, T)$  is not bounded, see Proposition 4.10.

It is easy to see that by the Rohlin's skew-product theorem, and the fact that for each invariant measure the sequence entropy is bounded by the topological sequence entropy, each ergodic measure from Theorem C can be expressed as skew product of a Kronecker system with a periodic system. It is an interesting question to understand the finer structure of the ergodic measures. In the following we will state a question on the uniqueness of the measures.

Let us see an example first. Let  $\tau$  be the substitution  $\tau(0) = 01$  and  $\tau(1) = 10$ . By concatenating, this map can be defined on any finite word  $w = w_0 \dots w_{l-1}$  in  $\{0, 1\}$ :  $\tau(w) = \tau(w_0) \dots \tau(w_{l-1})$ . For any  $n \geq 2$  define  $\tau^n(w) = \tau(\tau^{n-1}(w))$ . Finally define  $X \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  to be the set of biinfinite binary sequences  $x$  in  $X$  such that any finite word in  $x$  is a subword of  $\tau^n(0)$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The t.d.s.  $(X, T)$ , where  $T$  is the left shift map is called a Morse system. It is well known that it is minimal and has the following structure:  $\pi_1 : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $\pi_2 : Y \rightarrow X_{eq}$  where  $\pi_1$  is a 2-to-one distal extension and  $\pi_2$  is an asymptotic extension (so almost one to one) [40]. Thus  $\pi = \pi_2 \circ \pi_1 : X \rightarrow X_{eq}$  is almost 2-to-1 and  $h_\infty(X, T) = \log 2$ . The Morse system is uniquely ergodic, and  $\pi$  is regular almost 2-to-1.

Inspired by the structure of the Morse system, we have the following question. First we give a definition. Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system and  $\pi : X \rightarrow X_{eq}$  be the extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor. Let  $\pi$  be an almost  $N$  to 1 and let  $Y_N = \{y \in X_{eq} : |\pi^{-1}(y)| = N\}$ . If  $m(Y_N) = 1$ , then we say that  $\pi$  is a *regular almost  $N$  to 1* map, where  $m$  is the Haar measure on  $X_{eq}$ . In [11], it was shown that a minimal tame system is regular.

**Question 1.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system with  $T$  abelian. Assume that  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_{eq}, T)$  is almost  $N$ -to-1 and  $h_\infty(X, T) = \log N$ . Is it true that  $(X, T)$  has a structure as  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X_{eq}$ , where  $(Y, T)$  is the maximal null factor and  $X \rightarrow Y$  is open  $N$  to one? Moreover, is it true that  $(X, T)$  is uniquely ergodic? Is it true that  $\pi$  is regular almost  $N$  to 1?*

We remark that when  $N = 1$ , it is true, that is a minimal null system is uniquely ergodic [21] and regular [11].

### 1.5. The Sarnak conjecture.

Let  $X$  be a compact metric space and  $f : X \rightarrow X$  a homeomorphism. We say that a topological dynamical system  $(X, f)$  satisfies the *Sarnak conjecture* if for every continuous function  $g$  on  $X$  and every  $x \in X$ , the Cesàro averages

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N g(f^n x) \mu(n)$$

tend to 0 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We say that a topological dynamical system  $(X, f)$  satisfies the *logarithmic Sarnak conjecture* if for every continuous function  $g$  on  $X$  and every  $x \in X$ , the logarithmic averages

$$\frac{1}{\log N} \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{g(f^n x) \mu(n)}{n}$$

tend to 0 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that the Sarnak conjecture for a system implies the logarithmic Sarnak conjecture for the same system. Frantzikinakis and Host [10] showed that if  $(X, f)$  is a t.d.s. with zero topological entropy and has countably many ergodic invariant measures. Then  $(X, f)$  satisfies the logarithmic Sarnak conjecture. Thus, together with the mentioned result of Frantzikinakis and Host [10] and Theorem C, we have

**Corollary D:** *Any bounded minimal system satisfies the logarithmic Sarnak conjecture.*

To end the section we ask

**Question 2.** *Does any bounded minimal system satisfy the Sarnak conjecture?*

We organize the paper as follows. After introducing necessary notations and results in Section 2, we prove the main results in Section 3 and Section 4. In the appendix we will give the proof of Proposition 3.2.

**Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank Hanfeng Li, Jian Li and Tao Yu for their very useful comments.



## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In the article, integers, nonnegative integers and natural numbers are denoted by  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  respectively.

## 2.1. The Ellis semigroup.

Given a t.d.s.  $(X, T)$ , the *Ellis semigroup*  $E(X, T)$  associated to  $(X, T)$  is defined as the closure of  $\{x \mapsto tx : t \in T\} \subset X^X$  in the product topology, where the semi-group operation is given by the composition [8]. On  $E(X, T)$ , we may consider the  $T$ -action given by  $E(X, T) \rightarrow E(X, T), p \mapsto tp$ . A well known result by Ellis says that  $(X, T)$  is equicontinuous if and only if  $E(X, T)$  is a topological group [1, Theorem 3, Chapter 3].

**Theorem 2.1.** [1, Theorem 6, Chapter 3] *Let  $(X, T)$  be an equicontinuous minimal t.d.s., and let  $x \in X$ . Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_x = \{p \in E(X, T) : px = x\}$ . Then  $\Gamma$  is a closed subgroup of  $E(X, T)$ ,  $T$  acts on the space of right cosets  $\{p\Gamma : p \in E(X, T)\}$ , by  $t(p\Gamma) = (tp)\Gamma, (t \in T)$ , and the system  $(E(X, T)/\Gamma, T)$  is isomorphic with  $(X, T)$ .*

*If  $T$  is abelian, then  $\Gamma = \{e\}$  and  $(X, T)$  is isomorphic to  $(E(X, T), T)$ .*

## 2.2. Independence and tameness.

One may use independence sets to give an equivalent definition of tameness.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. For a tuple  $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k)$  of subsets of  $X$ , we say that a set  $J \subseteq T$  is an *independence set* for  $A$  if for every nonempty finite subset  $I \subseteq J$  and function  $\sigma : I \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  we have

$$\bigcap_{s \in I} s^{-1} A_{\sigma(s)} \neq \emptyset.$$

**Definition 2.3.** [25] Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $n \geq 2$ . We call a tuple  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$  an *IT-tuple* (or an *IT-pair* if  $n = 2$ ) if for any product neighbourhood  $U_1 \times U_2 \times \dots \times U_n$  of  $x$  in  $X^n$  the tuple  $(U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n)$  has an infinite independence sets. We denote the set of IT-tuples of length  $n$  by  $\text{IT}_n(X, T)$ .

The diagonal of  $X^n$  is defined by

$$\Delta_n(X) = \{(x, \dots, x) \in X^n : x \in X\}$$

and put

$$\Delta^{(n)}(X) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n : \text{for some } i \neq j, x_i = x_j\}.$$

When  $n = 2$  one writes  $\Delta(X) = \Delta_2(X) = \Delta^{(2)}(X)$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** [25, Proposition 6.4] *Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $n \geq 2$ .*

- (1) *Let  $(A_1, \dots, A_n)$  be a tuple of non-empty closed subsets of  $X$  which has infinite independence sets. Then there exists an IT-tuple  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  with  $x_j \in A_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .*
- (2)  *$\text{IT}_2(X, T) \setminus \Delta_2(X)$  is nonempty if and only if  $(X, T)$  is non-tame.*
- (3)  *$\text{IT}_n(X, T)$  is a closed  $T$ -invariant subset of  $X^n$ .*
- (4) *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be a factor map. Then  $\pi^{(n)}(\text{IT}_n(X, T)) = \text{IT}_n(Y, T)$ , where  $\pi^{(n)} : X^n \rightarrow Y^n$  defined by  $\pi^{(n)}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = (\pi(x_1), \pi(x_2), \dots, \pi(x_n))$ .*
- (5) *Suppose that  $Z$  is a closed  $T$ -invariant subset of  $X$ . Then  $\text{IT}_n(Z, T) \subseteq \text{IT}_n(X, T)$ .*

### 2.3. Sequence entropy (maximal pattern entropy) and independence.

Let  $(X, T)$  be t.d.s. Consider an infinite sequence  $A = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset T$  and a finite open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ . The *topological sequence entropy* of  $\mathcal{U}$  with respect to  $(X, T)$  along  $A$  is

$$h_A(T, \mathcal{U}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n t_i^{-1} \mathcal{U}\right),$$

where  $N(\bigvee_{i=1}^n t_i^{-1} \mathcal{U})$  is the minimal cardinality among all cardinalities of subcovers of  $\bigvee_{i=1}^n t_i^{-1} \mathcal{U}$ . Recall that for open covers  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} = \{U \cap V : U \in \mathcal{U}, V \in \mathcal{V}\}$ .

The *topological sequence entropy* of  $(X, T)$  along  $A$  is

$$h_A(X, T) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}} h_A(T, \mathcal{U}),$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite open covers of  $X$ .

Finally the *sequence entropy* of  $(X, T)$  is defined by

$$h_\infty(X, T) = \sup h_A(X, T),$$

where the supremum ranges over all infinite sequences of  $T$ . The sequence entropy of a system is also called *the maximal pattern entropy* [22].

An important fact is as follows:

**Theorem 2.5.** [22] *Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. Then*

$$h_\infty(X, T) \in \{\log n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  is called

- (1) *null* if  $h_\infty(X, T) = 0$ ;
- (2) *bounded* if  $h_\infty(X, T) < \infty$ ;
- (3) *unbounded* if  $h_\infty(X, T) = \infty$ .

By an *admissible cover*  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  one means that  $\mathcal{U}$  is finite and if  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$  then  $(\bigcup_{j \neq i} U_j)^c$  has nonempty interior for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$  be a finite cover of  $X$ . One says  $\mathcal{U}$  is an *admissible cover* with respect to  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  if for each  $U_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , there exists  $j_i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $x_{j_i}$  is not in the closure of  $U_i$ .

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $n \geq 2$ . An  $n$ -tuple  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n \setminus \Delta_n(X)$  is a *sequence entropy  $n$ -tuple* ( $n$ -SET) if whenever  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  are closed mutually disjoint neighborhoods of  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  respectively, there is some infinite sequence  $A \subset T$  such that the open cover  $\mathcal{U} = \{V_1^c, \dots, V_n^c\}$  has positive sequence entropy along  $A$ , i.e.  $h_A(T, \mathcal{U}) > 0$ .

It is easy to see that an  $n$ -tuple  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n \setminus \Delta_n(X)$  is an  $n$ -SET if and only if for any admissible open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  with respect to  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  one has  $h_A(T, \mathcal{U}) > 0$  for some sequence  $A \subset T$ .

For  $n \geq 2$  one denotes by  $SE_n(X, T)$  the set of  $n$ -SET. In the case  $n = 2$  one speaks about pairs instead of tuples and one writes  $SE(X, T)$ . The proof of the following result is analogous to the corresponding one in [3] (see [3, Propositions 2, 3, 4 and 5]).



**Proposition 2.8.** [32, Proposition 2.6.] *Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $n \geq 2$ .*

- (1) *If  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \dots, U_n\}$  is an admissible open cover of  $X$  with  $h_A(T, \mathcal{U}) > 0$  for some sequence  $A \subset T$ , then for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  there exists  $x_i \in U_i^c$  such that  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is an  $n$ -SET.*
- (2)  *$SE_n(X, T) \cup \Delta_n(X)$  is a nonempty closed  $T$ -invariant subset of  $X^n$ .*
- (3) *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be a factor map. Then  $\pi^{(n)}(SE_n(X, T)) = SE_n(Y, T)$ .*
- (4) *Let  $W$  be a closed  $T$ -invariant subset of  $(X, T)$ .  $SE_n(W, T) \subseteq SE_n(X, T)$ .*

By Proposition 2.8, a system  $(X, T)$  is null if and only if  $SE(X, T) = \emptyset$ .

One may use independence to characterize sequence entropy tuples.

**Definition 2.9.** [25] Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $n \geq 2$ . We call a tuple  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$  an *IN-tuple* (or an *IN-pair* if  $n = 2$ ) if for any product neighbourhood  $U_1 \times U_2 \times \dots \times U_n$  of  $x$  the tuple  $(U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n)$  has arbitrarily large finite independence sets. We denote the set of IN-tuples of length  $n$  by  $IN_n(X, T)$ .

Note that for  $IN_n(X, T)$ , we have the similar properties listed in Proposition 2.4. The following result explain the relations between IN-tuples and sequence entropy tuples.

**Theorem 2.10.** [25, Theorem 5.9] *Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq 2$ . Then*

$$SE_n(X, T) \cup \Delta_n(X) = IN_n(X, T).$$

The following lemma is proved in [22].

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s., and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq 2$ . Then  $h_\infty(X, T) \geq \log n$  if and only if  $SE_n(X, T) \setminus \Delta^{(n)}(X) \neq \emptyset$ .*

We will also use the following result in the sequel.

**Theorem 2.12.** [32, Theorems 3.8, 3.9] *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system with  $T$  abelian and  $\pi : X \rightarrow X_{eq}$  be the extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor. Let  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in X$  such that  $\pi(x_1) = \dots = \pi(x_n)$ . If  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is minimal, then  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in SE_n(X, T) \cup \Delta_n(X)$ .*

In fact, the same proof yields that  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in IT_n(X, T)$ .

## 2.4. Some facts about hyperspaces.

Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff topological space. Let  $2^X$  be the collection of nonempty closed subsets of  $X$  endowed with the Hausdorff topology. A basis for this topology on  $2^X$  is given by

$$\langle U_1, \dots, U_n \rangle = \left\{ A \in 2^X : A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i \text{ and } A \cap U_i \neq \emptyset \text{ for every } i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\},$$

where each  $U_i \subseteq X$  is open. When  $X$  is a metric space, then  $2^X$  is also a metric space. Let  $d$  be the metric on  $X$ , then one may define a metric on  $2^X$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(A, B) &= \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : A \subset B_\varepsilon[B], B \subset B_\varepsilon[A]\} \\ &= \max\{\max_{a \in A} d(a, B), \max_{b \in B} d(b, A)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $d(x, A) = \inf_{y \in A} d(x, y)$  and  $B_\varepsilon[A] = \{x \in X : d(x, A) < \varepsilon\}$ . The metric  $d_H$  is called the *Hausdorff metric* of  $2^X$ .

Let  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of subsets of  $X$ . Define

$\liminf A_i = \{x \in X : \text{for any neighbourhood } U \text{ of } x, U \cap A_i \neq \emptyset \text{ for all but finitely many } i\};$

$\limsup A_i = \{x \in X : \text{for any neighbourhood } U \text{ of } x, U \cap A_i \neq \emptyset \text{ for infinitely many } i\};$

We say that  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  converges to  $A$ , denoted by  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i = A$ , if

$$\liminf A_i = \limsup A_i = A.$$

Let  $X, Y$  be two compact Hausdorff topological spaces. Let  $F : Y \rightarrow 2^X$  be a map and  $y \in Y$ . We say that  $F$  is *upper semi-continuous (u.s.c.)* at  $y$  if for any open set  $U$  of  $X$  such that  $F(y) \subset U$ , then  $\{y' \in Y : F(y') \subset U\}$  is a neighbourhood of  $y$ . If  $F$  is u.s.c. at every point of  $Y$ , then we say that  $F$  is u.s.c. It is easy to see that  $F$  is u.s.c. at  $y$  if and only if whenever  $\lim y_i = y$ , one has that  $\limsup F(y_i) \subset F(y)$ . If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous map, then it is easy to verify that

$$F = f^{-1} : Y \rightarrow 2^X, y \mapsto f^{-1}(y)$$

is u.s.c.

We say  $F$  is *lower semi-continuous (l.s.c.)* at  $y$  if for any open set  $U$  of  $X$  such that  $F(y) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\{y' \in Y : F(y') \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$  is a neighbourhood of  $y$ . If  $F$  is l.s.c. at every point of  $Y$ , then we say that  $F$  is l.s.c. It is easy to see that  $F$  is l.s.c. at  $y$  if and only if whenever  $\lim y_i = y$ , one has that  $\liminf F(y_i) \supset F(y)$ .

We have the following well known result, for a proof see [29, p.70-71] and [28, p.394].

**Theorem 2.13.** *Let  $X, Y$  be compact metric spaces. If  $F : Y \rightarrow 2^X$  is u.s.c. (or l.s.c.), then the points of continuity of  $F$  form a dense  $G_\delta$  set in  $Y$ .*

Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. We can induce a system on  $2^X$ . The action of  $T$  on  $2^X$  is given by  $tA = \{ta : a \in A\}$  for each  $t \in T$  and  $A \in 2^X$ . Then  $(2^X, T)$  is a t.d.s. and it is called the *hypersapce system*.

## 2.5. Fundamental extensions.

Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. Fix  $(x, y) \in X^2$ . It is a *proximal* pair if  $\inf_{t \in T} d(tx, ty) = 0$ ; it is a *distal* pair if it is not proximal. Denote by  $P(X, T)$  and  $D(X, T)$  the sets of proximal and distal pairs of  $(X, T)$  respectively. They are also called the proximal and distal relations. A t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  is *distal* if  $D(X, T) = X^2 \setminus \Delta(X)$ . Any equicontinuous system is distal.

Let  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  be t.d.s. and let  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  be a factor map. One says that:

- (1)  $\pi$  is an *open* extension if it is open as a map;
- (2)  $\pi$  is a *semi-open* extension if the image of every nonempty open set of  $X$  has nonempty interior;
- (3)  $\pi$  is a *proximal* extension if  $\pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2)$  implies  $(x_1, x_2) \in P(X, T)$ ;
- (4)  $\pi$  is a *distal* extension if  $\pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2)$  and  $x_1 \neq x_2$  implies  $(x_1, x_2) \in D(X, T)$ ;
- (5)  $\pi$  is an *equicontinuous or isometric* extension if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2)$  and  $d(x_1, x_2) < \delta$  imply  $d(tx_1, tx_2) < \varepsilon$  for any  $t \in T$ ;

(6)  $\pi$  is a *group extension* if there exists a compact Hausdorff topological group  $K$  such that the following conditions hold:

- (a)  $K$  acts continuously on  $X$  from the right: the right action  $X \times K \rightarrow X$ ,  $(x, k) \mapsto xk$  is continuous and  $t(xk) = (tx)k$  for any  $t \in T$  and  $k \in K$ ;
- (b) the fibers of  $\pi$  are the  $K$ -orbits in  $X$ :  $\pi^{-1}(\{\pi(x)\}) = xK$  for any  $x \in X$ .

Note that a group extension is equicontinuous, and an equicontinuous extension is distal.

## 2.6. Almost finite to one extensions.

In this subsection we collect some known properties about finite to one extensions and almost finite to one extensions.

Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be an extension of t.d.s. Let  $\pi^{-1} : Y \rightarrow 2^X, y \mapsto \pi^{-1}(y)$ . Then it is easy to verify that  $\pi^{-1}$  is a u.s.c. map, and by Theorem 2.13, the set  $Y_c$  of continuous points of  $\pi^{-1}$  is a dense  $G_\delta$  subset of  $Y$ . Let

$$\tilde{Y} = \overline{\{\pi^{-1}(y) : y \in Y\}} \text{ and } Y' = \overline{\{\pi^{-1}(y) : y \in Y_c\}},$$

where the closure is taken in  $2^X$ . It is obvious that  $Y' \subseteq \tilde{Y} \subseteq 2^X$ . Note that for each  $A \in \tilde{Y}$ , there is some  $y \in Y$  such that  $A \subseteq \pi^{-1}(y)$ , and hence  $A \mapsto y$  define a map  $\tau : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$ . It is easy to verify that  $\tau : (\tilde{Y}, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  is a factor map. Now we show that if  $(Y, T)$  is minimal then  $(Y', T)$  is a minimal t.d.s. and it is the unique minimal subsystem in  $(\tilde{Y}, T)$ . To see this, let  $(M, T)$  be a minimal subsystem of  $(\tilde{Y}, T)$ . Since  $(Y, T)$  is minimal,  $\tau : M \rightarrow Y$  is surjective. Let  $y_0 \in Y_c$  and  $A \in M$  with  $\tau(A) = y_0$ . By the definition of  $\tau$ ,  $A \subseteq \pi^{-1}(y_0)$ . Since  $A \in M \subseteq \tilde{Y}$ , there is some sequence  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq Y$  such that  $\pi^{-1}(y_i) \rightarrow A, i \rightarrow \infty$ . As  $A \subseteq \pi^{-1}(y_0)$ , it follows that  $y_i \rightarrow y_0, i \rightarrow \infty$ . By the fact  $y_0 \in Y_c$ , we have that  $\pi^{-1}(y_i) \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(y_0), i \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus  $A = \pi^{-1}(y_0)$ . To sum up, we have showed that for each  $y_0 \in Y_c$ ,  $\pi^{-1}(y_0)$  is a minimal point of  $(2^X, T)$  and

$$\{\pi^{-1}(y_0) : y_0 \in Y_c\} \subseteq M.$$

Thus  $Y' = \overline{\{\pi^{-1}(y_0) : y_0 \in Y_c\}} \subseteq M$ . Since  $M$  is minimal,  $Y' = M$ . That is,  $(Y', T)$  is the unique minimal subsystem in  $(\tilde{Y}, T)$  and  $\tau : Y' \rightarrow Y$  is an almost one to one extension. Note the this result was given by Veech in [39], and see also [2, 35, 38] for generalizations.

Using this result we can give some equivalent conditions for almost finite to one extensions.

**Proposition 2.14.** *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be an extension with  $(Y, T)$  being minimal. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\pi$  is almost finite to one, i.e. some fiber is finite;
- (2) There exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $Y_0 = \{y \in Y : |\pi^{-1}(y)| = N\}$  is residual, i.e. it contains a dense  $G_\delta$  subset of  $Y$ ;
- (3) There exist  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $y_0 \in Y$  such that  $|\pi^{-1}(y_0)| = N$  and  $\pi^{-1}(y_0)$  is a minimal point of  $(2^X, T)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\pi^{-1} : Y \rightarrow 2^X, Y_c$  and  $Y'$  etc. be defined as above.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): If  $\pi$  is almost finite to one, then the set  $Y_f := \{y_0 \in Y : |\pi^{-1}(y_0)| < \infty\}$  is not empty. Put  $N := \min_{y_0 \in Y_f} |\pi^{-1}(y_0)|$ . Then  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Take any  $y \in Y_c$  and  $y_0 \in Y_f$ . Since  $(Y, T)$  is minimal, there is some sequence  $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset T$  such that  $\lim_i t_i y_0 = y$ . Note that

$|\pi^{-1}(t_i y_0)| = |\pi^{-1}(y_0)|$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $y \in Y_c$ . It follows that  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| \leq |\pi^{-1}(y_0)| < \infty$ . This implies that  $Y_c \subset Y_f$  and

$$Y_c \subset Y_0 = \{y \in Y : |\pi^{-1}(y)| = N\}.$$

Thus we have that  $Y_0$  is residual.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Assume that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $Y_0 = \{y \in Y : |\pi^{-1}(y)| = N\}$  is residual. Note that  $Y' = \overline{\{\pi^{-1}(y_0) : y_0 \in Y_c\}}$  is minimal and for all  $y_0 \in Y_c$ ,  $\pi^{-1}(y_0)$  is a minimal point of  $(2^X, T)$ . Thus we have (3) by taking  $y \in Y_0 \cap Y_c$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): It is obvious.  $\square$

**Remark 2.15.** (1) Almost finite to one extensions can be defined not only for metric systems but also compact Hausdorff systems. We refer [35] for more details, where it was called *generalized almost finite extension*.

(2) By definition it is obvious that a finite to one extension is almost finite to one. But in general, an almost finite to one extension may not be finite to one. For example, for Rees' example [33],  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_{eq}, T)$  is an almost one to one extension, and for any  $y \in X_{eq}$ , either  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| = 1$  or  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| = \infty$ .

(3) There is some example such that  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  be a finite to one extension i.e.  $y \in Y$ ,  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| < \infty$ , but  $\sup_{y \in Y} |\pi^{-1}(y)| = \infty$  (see [37, Example 5.7.]).

**Lemma 2.16.** Let  $A = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\} \in 2^X$  and  $\{t_i\}_i$  be a net of  $T$ . Then in  $2^X$ , we have that

$$\lim_i t_i A = \lim_i t_i \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} = \{\lim_i t_i x_1, \dots, \lim_i t_i x_N\}$$

if all limits exist.

*Proof.* First by definition it is easy to see that  $\{\lim_i t_i x_1, \dots, \lim_i t_i x_N\} \subseteq \lim_i t_i A$ . Now let  $x \in \lim_i t_i A$ . By the definition of Hausdorff metric, for each  $i$ , there is some  $z_i \in A$  such that  $t_i z_i \rightarrow x$ . Since  $A$  is a finite set, one may assume  $z_i$  is constant, i.e.  $z_i = z \in A$ . Thus  $x = \lim_i t_i z$ . Thus  $\lim_i t_i A \subseteq \{\lim_i t_i x_1, \dots, \lim_i t_i x_N\}$ .  $\square$

By Lemma 2.16, we have:

**Corollary 2.17.** Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be an extension with  $(Y, T)$  being minimal. If  $\pi$  is an almost  $N$  to one extension for some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the cardinality of each element of  $Y'$  is  $N$ , where  $(Y', T)$  is the minimal system defined at the beginning of this subsection.

The following result is well known, and for completeness we include a proof.

**Lemma 2.18.** Let  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  be a finite to one extension (i.e.  $\pi^{-1}(y)$  is finite for all  $y \in Y$ ) of the minimal systems  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, T)$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1)  $\pi$  is open;
- (2)  $\pi$  is distal;
- (3)  $\pi$  is equicontinuous;

- (4)  $\pi$  is a factor of a finite group extension, i.e. there are extensions  $\pi' : Z \rightarrow X, \phi : Z \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\phi = \pi \circ \pi'$  and  $\phi$  is a finite group extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xleftarrow{\pi'} & Z \\ \pi \downarrow & \searrow \phi & \\ Y & & \end{array}$$

In this case there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\pi$  is an  $N$ -to-1 map.

*Proof.* (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Fix  $y \in Y$  such that  $|\pi^{-1}(\{y\})| = \min_{z \in Y} |\pi^{-1}(\{z\})|$ . Let  $\pi^{-1}(\{y\}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ . From openness of  $\pi$  one has that

$$\pi^{-1}(\{\lim_i t_i y\}) = \lim_i \pi^{-1}(\{t_i y\}) = \{\lim_i t_i x_1, \dots, \lim_i t_i x_N\}$$

for any sequence  $\{t_i\} \subset T$  having that all limits exist, and that the cardinality of the set is  $N$ . Hence, by minimality, all fibers of  $\pi$  have the same cardinality  $N$ , which proves the map is constant to one.

Now we show that  $\pi$  is equicontinuous. First we have the following claim:

Claim : There is some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that if  $(x, x') \in R_\pi$  and  $d(x, x') < \varepsilon_0$  then  $x = x'$ .

If Claim does not hold, then for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there is  $(x_k, x'_k) \in R_\pi$  with  $d(x_k, x'_k) < 1/k$  and  $x_k \neq x'_k$ . Let  $y_k = \pi(x_k) = \pi(x'_k)$  and assume  $y_k \rightarrow y \in Y, k \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $\pi$  is open,  $\pi^{-1}(\{y_k\}) \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(\{y\}), k \rightarrow \infty$  in the Hausdorff topology. Note that  $\pi$  is  $N$  to 1 extension, and  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| = |\pi^{-1}(y_k)| = N$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\pi^{-1}(y) = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  and let  $U_1, \dots, U_N$  be disjoint closed neighbourhoods of  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  with  $\delta = \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq N} d(U_i, U_j) > 0$ . Then for large enough  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1/k < \delta$ , each  $U_1, \dots, U_N$  contains just one point of  $\pi^{-1}(y_k)$  and  $x_k, x'_k$  are in the different neighbourhoods which implies  $d(x_k, x'_k) > \delta > 1/k$ . A contradiction! Hence we have Claim.

If  $\pi$  is not equicontinuous, then there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there are  $(x_k, x'_k) \in R_\pi$  and  $t_k \in T$  with  $d(x_k, x'_k) < 1/k$  and  $d(t_k x_k, t_k x'_k) \geq \varepsilon$ . By Claim, this is impossible. Thus  $\pi$  is equicontinuous.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2): It is obvious by definition.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Given any  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ . Since  $Y$  is minimal, there is a sequence  $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  such that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} t_i y_1 = y_2$  and the limit  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \pi^{-1}(t_i y_1)$  exists. Since  $\pi^{-1}(t_i y_1) = t_i \pi^{-1}(y_1)$ ,  $\pi$  is distal and  $\pi^{-1}$  is a u.s.c. map, one has

$$|\pi^{-1}(y_2)| \geq |\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \pi^{-1}(t_i y_1)| = |\pi^{-1}(y_1)|.$$

By symmetry, one also has  $|\pi^{-1}(y_1)| \geq |\pi^{-1}(y_2)|$ . Thus

$$|\pi^{-1}(y_2)| = |\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \pi^{-1}(t_i y_1)| = |\pi^{-1}(y_1)| < \infty$$

and so  $\pi^{-1}(y_2) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} t_i \pi^{-1}(y_1)$ . This implies that  $Y' = \{\pi^{-1}(y) : y \in Y\}$  and all fibers of  $\pi$  have the same cardinality since  $y_1, y_2$  are arbitrary. Since  $Y'$  is closed, we have

$$Y' = \{\pi^{-1}(y) : y \in Y\} = \overline{\{\pi^{-1}(y) : y \in Y\}} = \tilde{Y},$$

and so  $Y_c = Y$ , i.e.  $\pi$  is open.

Now have showed that (1)-(3) are equivalent. Next we show they are equivalent to (4). It is easy to see that (4) implies (1). We will show that (2) implies (4). Let  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  be an  $N$  to 1 distal extension. Fix a point  $y_0 \in Y$ , and let  $\pi^{-1}(y_0) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$ . Let  $z_0 = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in X^N$ , and

$$Z = \overline{\mathcal{O}}(z_0, T) \subseteq X^N.$$

Since  $\pi$  is distal,  $z_0$  is a minimal point of  $(X^N, T)$  and  $(Z, T)$  is a minimal system. Define  $\pi' : Z \rightarrow X$  by  $(z_1, \dots, z_N) \mapsto z_1$ , i.e. the projection on the first coordinate, and  $\phi = \pi \circ \pi' : Z \rightarrow Y$ . It is easy to verify that  $\pi', \phi$  are factor maps. It is left to show  $\phi$  is a finite group extension, that is there exists a finite group  $K$  such that  $K$  acts continuously on  $X$  from the right, and the fibers of  $\phi$  are the  $K$ -orbits in  $Z$ :  $\phi^{-1}(\{\phi(z)\}) = zK$  for any  $z \in Z$ .

Let  $E_{y_0} = \{\sigma : \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \rightarrow \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} : \exists t_i \in T \text{ such that } t_i y_0 \rightarrow y_0, t_i x_j \rightarrow \sigma(x_j), j = 1, \dots, N\}$ . It is easy to verify that  $E_{y_0}$  is subgroup of the permutation group on  $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  and

$$(1) \quad E_{y_0} x_0 = \{\sigma(x_0) : \sigma \in E_{y_0}\} = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$$

for all  $x_0 \in \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ .

For each  $\sigma \in E_{y_0}$ , define a map  $H_\sigma : Z \rightarrow Z$  such that for any convergent net  $t_i \in T$  (i.e., the limit  $\lim_i t_i z_0$  exist)

$$H_\sigma(\lim_i t_i z_0) = \lim_i t_i \sigma z_0,$$

where  $\sigma z_0 = (\sigma(x_1), \dots, \sigma(x_N))$ . First we need to show that  $H_\sigma$  is well defined. If there are nets  $\{t_i\}_i$  and  $\{t'_i\}_i$  such that  $\lim_i t_i z_0 = \lim_i t'_i z_0$ . Then for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $\lim_i t_i x_j = \lim_i t'_i x_j$ . It follows that  $\lim_i t_i \sigma(x_j) = \lim_i t'_i \sigma(x_j)$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . That is,

$$H_\sigma(\lim_i t_i z_0) = \lim_i t_i \sigma z_0 = \lim_i t'_i \sigma z_0 = H_\sigma(\lim_i t'_i z_0),$$

and  $H_\sigma$  is well defined. In a similar way, we can verify that  $H_\sigma$  is a homeomorphism for all  $\sigma \in E_{y_0}$ , and  $H_{\sigma\sigma'} = H_\sigma H_{\sigma'}$  for all  $\sigma, \sigma' \in E_{y_0}$ . Now let

$$K = \{H_\sigma : \sigma \in E_{y_0}\}.$$

Then  $K$  is a finite group acts continuously on  $X$  and by (1) we can show that  $\phi^{-1}(\{\phi(z)\}) = zK$  for any  $z \in Z$ . That is,  $\phi$  is finite group extension of  $Y$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.19.** (1) For the equivalence of (1)-(3), see [32] or [40, Chapter V, 6.5]. In general,  $\pi$  is equicontinuous if and only if it is a factor of a group extension [1, Chapter 14, Theorem 1]. Here (4) is only a special case of this result, and our proof of (4) follows from the one of [1, Chapter 14, Theorem 1].

(2) In general, an open finite to one extension may not be a finite group extension. For example, Let  $G$  be a non-abelian finite group with a non normal subgroup  $H$ . Let  $X = G/H$ ,  $T = G$ , and let  $Y$  be the trivial system. Then  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  is an open finite to one extension but not a finite group extension.

To end this section we cite Sacker-Sell's result, which give more information about finite to one extensions.

**Theorem 2.20.** [34] *Let  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  be an extension of t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, T)$ . Assume that  $(Y, T)$  is minimal. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*



- (1)  $\pi$  is distal and for some  $y_0 \in Y$ ,  $|\pi^{-1}(y_0)| = N$ , where  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (2)  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| = N$  for all  $y \in Y$ , where  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (3)  $X$  is an  $N$ -fold covering of  $Y$ , i.e.  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| = N$  for all  $y \in Y$  and for each  $y \in Y$  there is an open neighbourhood  $V$  of  $y$  such that  $\pi^{-1}(V)$  consists of  $N$  disjoint open sets  $U_i$  and  $\pi|_{U_i} : U_i \rightarrow V$  is a homeomorphism,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

Finally, if any of these hold, then  $X$  can be expressed as the disjoint union  $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k$  of compact minimal sets, where each  $X_i$  is an  $n_i$ -fold covering of  $Y$  and  $n_1 + \dots + n_k = N$ .

In [34], another main result is that an open finite-to-one extension of an equicontinuous system is an equicontinuous one again as long as the phase group was semicompactly generated (i.e., there is a compact  $K \subset T$  such that every open  $V \supset K$  generates  $T$ ).

### 3. SYSTEMS WITH FINITELY MANY ERGODIC MEASURES

In this section we prove one of the main results, i.e. Theorem A. According to Proposition 2.14 it remains to show

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system with  $T$  amenable group. If  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_{eq}, T)$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1)  $\pi$  is almost  $N$  to one for some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (2)  $(X, T)$  is bounded non-tame, i.e.  $\text{IT}_k(X, T) \setminus \Delta^{(k)} = \emptyset$  for some  $k \geq 2$ ,

then  $|M_T^{\text{erg}}(X)| \leq N(k-1)^N$ .

#### 3.1. Some propositions and lemmas.

To prove Theorem 3.1, we need the following result which was proved to be true for  $k = 2$  in [11, Proposition 3.3].

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $H$  be a locally compact second countable Hausdorff topological group with left Haar measure  $\Theta_H$ , and let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \geq 2$ . Suppose that  $V_1, \dots, V_k \subset H$  are compact subsets that satisfy*

- (i)  $\overline{\text{int } V_i} = V_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ,
- (ii)  $\text{int}(V_i) \cap \text{int}(V_j) = \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq k$ ,
- (iii)  $\Theta_H(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} V_i) > 0$ .

Further, assume that  $T \subset H$  is a dense subgroup and  $\mathcal{G} \subset H$  is a residual set. Then there exists an infinite set  $I \subset T$  such that for all  $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}^I$  there exists  $h \in \mathcal{G}$  with the property that

$$(2) \quad h \in \bigcap_{t \in I} t^{-1} \text{int}(V_{a_t}), \quad \text{i.e. } th \in \text{int}(V_{a_t}) \text{ for any } t \in I.$$

The proof of the above proposition will be given in the appendix.

In this subsection, the group  $T$  is assumed to be an amenable group. Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. and  $x_0 \in X$ . Let  $\Phi = \{\Phi_N\}_{N \geq 1}$  be a Følner sequence of  $T$  and  $\mu \in M_T(X)$ . We say that  $x_0$  is *generic for  $\mu$  along  $\Phi$*  if

$$\frac{1}{|\Phi_N|} \sum_{t \in \Phi_N} \delta_{tx_0} \rightarrow \mu, \text{ weakly}^* \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\delta_x$  is the Dirac mass at  $x$ . This is equivalent to that for all  $f \in C(X)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{|\Phi_N|} \sum_{t \in \Phi_N} f(tx_0) \rightarrow \int f d\mu, \quad N \rightarrow \infty.$$

A Følner sequence  $\Phi = \{\Phi_N\}_{N \geq 1}$  is *tempered* if there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $N$

$$\left| \bigcup_{k < N} \Phi_k^{-1} \Phi_N \right| \leq C |\Phi_N|.$$

Note that every Følner sequence admits a tempered Følner subsequence [31].

**Theorem 3.3.** [31] *Let  $T$  be an amenable group acting on a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{X}, \mu)$  by measure preserving transformation, and let  $\Phi = \{\Phi_N\}_{N \geq 1}$  be a tempered Følner sequence. Then for any  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$ , there is a  $T$ -invariant  $f^* \in L^1(X, \mu)$  such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\Phi_N|} \sum_{t \in \Phi_N} f(tx) = f^*(x) \quad a.e.$$

In particular, if the  $T$  action is ergodic,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\Phi_N|} \sum_{t \in \Phi_N} f(tx) = \int f(x) d\mu(x) \quad a.e.$$

By Theorem 3.3, it is easy to show the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. with  $T$  amenable group,  $\mu \in M_T^{erg}(X)$  and  $\Phi = \{\Phi_N\}_{N \geq 1}$  a tempered Følner sequence. Then  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$  is generic for  $\mu$  along  $\Phi$ .*

We will not use the following lemma in the paper, and it is of independent interest.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be a group extension with respect to a group  $K$ , where  $T$  is amenable. If  $\mu \in M_T^{erg}(X)$  is also  $K$ -invariant, then  $\pi_*^{-1}(\pi_*\mu) = \{\mu\}$ .*

*Thus if for each  $\nu \in M_T^{erg}(Y)$  there is some ergodic element  $\mu \in \pi_*^{-1}(\nu)$  is  $K$ -invariant, then  $|M_T^{erg}(X)| = |M_T^{erg}(Y)|$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.10 of [12]. Recall that  $\pi$  is a group extension if there exists a compact Hausdorff topological group  $K$  such that the following conditions hold:  $K$  acts continuously on  $X$  from the right: the right action  $X \times K \rightarrow X$ ,  $(x, k) \mapsto xk$  is continuous and  $t(xk) = (tx)k$  for any  $t \in T$  and  $k \in K$ ; the fibers of  $\pi$  are the  $K$ -orbits in  $X$ :  $\pi^{-1}(\{\pi(x)\}) = xK$  for any  $x \in X$ .

Suppose that  $x_0$  is any generic point for  $\mu$  along some tempered Følner sequence  $\Phi$ . Then for any  $k \in K$  and any continuous  $f \in C(X)$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\Phi_N|} \sum_{t \in \Phi_N} f(tx_0k) = \int f(xk) d\mu(x) = \int f(x) d\mu(x) \quad a.e.$$

and so  $x_0k$  is also a  $\mu$ -generic point. Thus, if  $x_0$  is  $\mu$ -generic, the whole fiber of  $\pi(x_0)$  is  $\mu$ -generic.

Suppose now that  $\eta$  is any ergodic measure on  $X$  such that  $\pi_*\eta = \pi_*\mu$ . Then by Corollary 3.4, there is some  $\mu$ -generic point  $x_0 \in X$  and  $\eta$ -generic point  $x_1 \in X$  along

the same tempered Følner sequence such that  $\pi(x_0) = \pi(x_1)$ . By above the whole fiber of  $\pi(x_0)$  is  $\mu$ -generic, and hence  $x_1$  is also  $\mu$ -generic. It follows that  $\eta = \mu$ . That is,  $\pi_*^{-1}(\pi_*\mu) = \{\mu\}$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

What we will use is the following.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be a finite to one extension, where  $T$  is amenable and there is some  $N$  such that  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| \leq N, \forall y \in Y$ . If  $(Y, T)$  has finitely many ergodic measures, then so does  $(X, T)$ . In fact,  $|M_T^{erg}(X)| \leq |M_T^{erg}(Y)| \cdot N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\pi_* : M_T(X) \rightarrow M_T(Y), \mu \mapsto \mu \circ \pi^{-1}$ . Then  $\pi_*$  is a surjective affine map and maps  $M_T^{erg}(X)$  onto  $M_T^{erg}(Y)$ . If  $|M_T^{erg}(X)| > |M_T^{erg}(Y)| \cdot N$ , then there are  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{N+1} \in M_T^{erg}(X)$  and  $\nu \in M_T^{erg}(Y)$  such that

$$\pi_*(\mu_1) = \pi_*(\mu_2) = \dots = \pi_*(\mu_{N+1}) = \nu.$$

Suppose  $W_i$  are the collection of  $\mu_i$ -generic points along some Følner sequence,  $1 \leq i \leq N+1$ . By Lusin theorem,  $\pi(W_i)$  is an analysis set, therefore it is  $\nu$ -measurable. One has that

$$\nu \left( \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq N+1} \pi(W_i) \right) = 1.$$

In particular,  $\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq N+1} \pi(W_i) \neq \emptyset$  and let  $y \in \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq N+1} \pi(W_i)$ .

As  $|\pi^{-1}(z)| \leq N, \forall z \in Y$ , it follows that there are  $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N+1\}$  such that  $W_i \cap W_j \neq \emptyset$ . It contradicts with the fact  $\mu_i \perp \mu_j$ . Thus we have that  $|M_T^{erg}(X)| \leq |M_T^{erg}(Y)| \cdot N$ .  $\square$

### 3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1.

In the subsection we give the proof of Theorem 3.1. The following proposition is a key step to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $(Y', T)$  be a minimal t.d.s. and  $\tau : (Y', T) \rightarrow (X_{eq}, T)$  be the factor to the its maximal equicontinuous factor. If  $\tau$  is almost one to one, and  $\text{IT}_l(Y') \setminus \Delta^{(l)} = \emptyset$  for some  $l \geq 2$ , then  $|M_T^{erg}(Y')| \leq l - 1$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.1, let  $Y = X_{eq} = G/\Gamma$ , where  $G = E(X_{eq})$  is the Ellis semigroup and  $\Gamma$  is a closed subgroup of  $E(X_{eq})$ . Since  $(X_{eq}, T)$  is equicontinuous,  $G = E(X_{eq})$  is a compact Hausdorff group. Let the left Haar probability measure of  $G$  be  $\Theta_G$ , and the probability measure  $m$  induced by  $\Theta_G$  is the unique  $T$ -invariant probability measure of  $(Y, T)$ . Let  $\phi : G \rightarrow Y = G/\Gamma$  be the factor map. Then  $\phi$  is open and  $m = \phi_*(\Theta_G) = \Theta_G \circ \phi^{-1}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y' & & (G, \Theta_G) \\ \tau \downarrow & \swarrow \phi & \\ (Y = G/\Gamma, m) & & \end{array}$$

Set for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} X_k &= \{x \in Y' : |\tau^{-1}(\tau(x))| = k\}, & Y_k &= \tau(X_k); \\ X_\infty &= \{x \in Y' : |\tau^{-1}(\tau(x))| = \infty\}, & Y_\infty &= \tau(X_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

By definition,  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}$  is a disjoint family of  $X_{eq}$  and  $\{Y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}$  is a disjoint family of  $Y$ . We remark that  $Y_1$  is a dense  $G_\delta$ -set as  $\tau$  is almost one to one.

Let  $2^{Y'}$  be the hyperspace of  $Y'$  with Hausdorff metric  $d_H$ . Consider the map

$$F = \tau^{-1} : Y \rightarrow 2^{Y'}, \quad y \mapsto \tau^{-1}(\{y\}).$$

Then  $F$  is upper semi-continuous and hence Borel measurable. And define

$$G : 2^{Y'} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0, \infty\}, \quad A \mapsto |A|.$$

Recall that the Hausdorff metric on  $2^{Y'}$  is defined as follows:

$$d_H(A, B) = \sup_{y \in A} \inf_{y' \in B} d_{Y'}(y, y') + \sup_{y' \in B} \inf_{y \in A} d_{Y'}(y, y').$$

Let  $A_0 \in 2^{Y'}$ . If  $|A_0| = M$  for some finite  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we may put  $A_0 = \{y_1, \dots, y_M\}$ . Let  $\varepsilon_0 = \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} d_{Y'}(y_i, y_j)$ . Notice that if  $d_H(A_0, A) < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$ , then  $|A| \geq M$ . If  $|A_0| = \infty$ , then for arbitrary  $M'$ , one can choose  $\{y'_1, \dots, y'_{M'}\} \subset A_0$ . Similarly find  $\varepsilon_{M'} = \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq M'} d_{Y'}(y'_i, y'_j)$ , then  $|A| \geq M'$  if  $d_H(A_0, A) < \frac{\varepsilon_{M'}}{2}$ . Equivalently, this can be expressed as

$$\liminf_{A \rightarrow A_0} G(A) \geq G(A_0).$$

That is,  $G$  is lower semi-continuous. It follows that  $G \circ F : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0, \infty\}$  is Borel measurable. Note that  $Y_k = (G \circ F)^{-1}(k)$ ,  $Y_k$  is Borel measurable for each  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0, \infty\}$ . And hence  $X_k = \tau^{-1}(Y_k)$  is Borel measurable for each  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0, \infty\}$ . Thus  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}$  and  $\{Y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}$  are measurable and  $T$ -invariant.

Since  $\{Y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}$  are disjoint measurable  $T$ -invariants and  $m$  is ergodic, there is only one  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  such that  $m(Y_{k_0}) = 1$  and  $m(Y_k) = 0$  for all  $k \neq k_0$ .

Now we show that  $(Y', T)$  has at most  $l - 1$  ergodic measures. If not, assume that  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_l$  be  $l$  distinct ergodic measures of  $(Y', T)$ . Let  $W_i$  be the set of  $\mu_i$ -generic points for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$ . By Lusin theorem,  $\{\tau(W_i)\}_{i=1}^l$  are universally measurable as they are analytic sets. Since  $(Y, T)$  is uniquely ergodic, one has that

$$\tau_*(\mu_1) = \dots = \tau_*(\mu_l) = m.$$

It follows that  $m(\tau(W_1)) = m(\tau(W_2)) = \dots = m(\tau(W_l)) = 1$  and hence

$$m\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^l \tau(W_i) \cap Y_{k_0}\right) = 1.$$

In particular,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^l \tau(W_i) \cap Y_{k_0} \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $z \in \bigcap_{i=1}^l \tau(W_i) \cap Y_{k_0}$ . Thus  $|\tau^{-1}(z)| \geq l$  and we have that  $k_0 \geq l$ .

Recall  $2^{Y'} = \{A \subset Y' : A \text{ compact and non-empty}\}$  and  $F : Y \rightarrow 2^{Y'}, y \mapsto \tau^{-1}(\{y\})$ . Then  $F$  is upper semi-continuous and hence measurable. By Lusin's Theorem, there is some compact set  $K \subseteq Y_{k_0}$  such that  $m(K) > 0$  and  $F|_K : K \rightarrow 2^{Y'}$  is continuous. Let  $m|_K$  be the measure restricted on  $K$  of  $m$ . Since  $m(Y_{k_0}) = 1$ , one has that

$$K \cap Y_{k_0} \cap \text{supp}(m|_K) \neq \emptyset.$$

Let  $y_0 \in K \cap Y_{k_0} \cap \text{supp}(m|_K)$ . Then  $|\tau^{-1}(y_0)| = k_0 \geq l$  and  $m(V \cap K) > 0$  for any neighbourhood  $V$  of  $y_0$ .

Choose distinct elements  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_l \in \tau^{-1}(y_0)$  and let  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4} \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq l} d(\xi_i, \xi_j)$ . Let  $U_i = \overline{B_\varepsilon(\xi_i)}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . Then  $U_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l$  is proper, i.e.,  $U_i$  is a compact subset with  $\text{int}(U_i) = U_i$ . We will show that  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_l$  is an infinite independent tuple of  $(Y, T)$ , i.e. there is some infinite set  $I \subseteq T$  such that

$$\bigcap_{t \in I} t^{-1}U_{a_t} \neq \emptyset, \text{ for all } a \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}^I.$$

Let  $V'_i = \tau(U_i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . By Lemma A.2,  $V'_i$  is proper for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$ , i.e.  $\text{int}(V'_i) = V'_i$ .

We claim that  $\text{int}(V'_i) \cap \text{int}(V'_j) = \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq l$ . In fact, if there is some  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq l$  such that  $\text{int}(V'_i) \cap \text{int}(V'_j) \neq \emptyset$ , then

$$\text{int}(V'_i) \cap \text{int}(V'_j) \cap Y_1 \neq \emptyset,$$

as  $Y_1$  is a dense  $G_\delta$  set. Let  $y' \in \text{int}(V'_i) \cap \text{int}(V'_j) \cap Y_1$ . Then there are  $x_i \in U_i$  and  $x_j \in U_j$  such that  $y' = \tau(x_i) = \tau(x_j)$ , which contradict with  $y' \in Y_1$ .

Since  $F$  is continuous on  $K$ , one can choose  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $y \in B_\delta(y_0) \cap K$  one has that  $d_H(F(y), F(y_0)) < \varepsilon$ . By the definition of Hausdorff metric, the fibre  $F(y) = \tau^{-1}(y)$  intersects all  $U_1, \dots, U_l$ , so that

$$y \in \bigcap_{i=1}^l V'_i.$$

Therefore,  $B_\delta(y_0) \cap K \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^l V'_i$  and hence

$$m\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^l V'_i\right) \geq m(B_\delta(y_0) \cap K) > 0.$$

Set  $V_i = \phi^{-1}(V'_i)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . Since  $\phi$  is open,  $V_1, \dots, V_l$  are proper,

$$\text{int}(V_i) \cap \text{int}(V_j) = \phi^{-1}(\text{int}(V'_i)) \cap \phi^{-1}(\text{int}(V'_j)) = \emptyset$$

for  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq l$  and

$$\Theta_G\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^l V_i\right) = m\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^l V'_i\right) > 0.$$

Let  $\mathcal{G} = \phi^{-1}(Y_1)$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}$  is also residual. By Proposition 3.2, there is an infinite  $I \subseteq T$  such that for all  $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}^I$  there exists  $h \in \mathcal{G}$  with the property that

$$h \in \bigcap_{t \in I} t^{-1}\text{int}(V_{a_t}).$$

Hence

$$\phi(h) \in \bigcap_{t \in I} t^{-1}\text{int}(V'_{a_t}).$$

Note that  $\phi(h) \in Y_1$ ,  $|\tau^{-1}(\phi(h))| = 1$ . Set  $\tau^{-1}(\phi(h)) = \{x_0\}$ . Then

$$x_0 \in \bigcap_{t \in I} t^{-1} U_{a_t}.$$

That is,  $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_l)$  is a  $l$ -IT-tuple over  $\tau$ , a contradiction! The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Now we are ready to show Theorem 3.1.**

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Assume that  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_{eq}, T)$  is almost  $N$  to one, and  $X$  is bounded non-tame, i.e.  $\text{IT}_k \setminus \Delta^{(k)} = \emptyset$  for some  $k \geq 2$ . Let  $Y = X_{eq}$ . We will divide the proof into the following steps.

**Step 1: Lift  $\pi$  to an open  $N$  to one map through almost one to one extensions.**

Recall that  $(2^X, T)$  is the hyperspace system of  $(X, T)$ , which is defined by

$$T \times 2^X \rightarrow 2^X : (t, A) \mapsto tA = \{ta : a \in A\}, \quad t \in T, A \in 2^X.$$

Let  $M_N(X) = \{A \in 2^X : |A| \leq N\}$ . Then it is easy to see that  $M_N(X)$  is a  $T$ -invariant and closed subset of  $2^X$ , and hence  $(M_N(X), T)$  is a subsystem of  $(2^X, T)$ .

Let  $Y_c$  be the set of continuous points of  $\pi^{-1} : Y \rightarrow 2^X$ . By Proposition 2.14, for each point  $y \in Y_c$  one has that  $\pi^{-1}(y)$  is a minimal point of  $(2^X, T)$  and  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| = N$ . Let

$$Y' = \overline{\{\pi^{-1}(y) : y \in Y_c\}}.$$

By Subsection 2.6,  $(Y', T)$  is minimal and by Corollary 2.17  $|A| = N$  for all  $A \in Y'$ . Hence  $(Y', T)$  is a minimal subsystem of  $(M_N(X), T)$ . Note that for each  $A \in Y'$ , there is some  $y \in Y$  such that  $A \subseteq \pi^{-1}(y)$ , and hence  $A \mapsto y$  define  $\tau : Y' \rightarrow Y$  such that for all  $y \in Y_c$ ,  $\tau(\pi^{-1}(y)) = y$ . Since  $\pi^{-1}$  is continuous at points of  $Y_c$ ,  $\tau^{-1}(y) = \{\pi^{-1}(y)\}$  for all  $y \in Y_c$ , i.e.  $\tau$  is almost one to one.

If  $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \in Y'$ , it is easy to verify that

$$\tau : Y' \rightarrow Y : A = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \rightarrow \pi(x_1).$$

Let

$$X' = \{(x, A) \in X \times Y' : x \in A\}.$$

Then  $(X', T)$  is a subsystem of  $(X \times Y', T)$ . Let  $\sigma$  and  $\pi'$  be the projections:

$$\sigma : X' \rightarrow X, (x, A) \mapsto x; \text{ and } \pi' : X' \rightarrow Y', (x, A) \mapsto A.$$

For each  $y \in Y_c$  and  $x \in \pi^{-1}(y)$ ,  $\sigma^{-1}(x) = \{(x, \pi^{-1}(y))\}$ , i.e.  $\sigma$  is an almost one-to-one extension. Notice that for  $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \in Y'$ ,

$$\pi'^{-1}(A) = \{(x, A) : x \in A\} = \{(x_i, \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}.$$

It follows that  $\pi' : (X', T) \rightarrow (Y', T)$  is an open  $N$  to one extension.

To sum up, we have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xleftarrow{\sigma} & X' \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ Y & \xleftarrow{\tau} & Y' \end{array}$$



where  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are almost one-to-one extensions,  $\pi'$  is an open  $N$  to one extension.<sup>1</sup>

**Step 2: The length of any IT-tuple for  $Y'$  is not more than  $(k-1)^N$ .**

Let  $(X^N, T)$  be the product system. Define

$$p : X^N \rightarrow M_N(X) : (x_1, \dots, x_N) \mapsto \{x_1, \dots, x_N\},$$

which is a continuous map. We also have the following commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X^N & \xrightarrow{T} & X^N \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\ M_N(X) & \xrightarrow{T} & M_N(X) \end{array}$$

Since there is some integer  $k \geq 2$  such that  $(X, T)$  has no  $k$ -IT-tuples, we claim that there is some  $l \leq (k-1)^N$  such that  $\text{IT}_{l+1}(Y', T) \setminus \Delta^{(l+1)}(Y') = \emptyset$ , i.e.  $(Y', T)$  has no  $l+1$  IT-tuples.

Indeed, suppose that there is  $l > (k-1)^N$  and  $(y'_1, \dots, y'_l) \in \text{IT}_l(Y', T) \setminus \Delta^{(l)}(Y')$ . Then there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $\tau(y'_j) = y$  for  $1 \leq j \leq l$ . From Proposition 2.4 (4), there exists an  $l$ -IT-tuple  $(c_1, \dots, c_l) \in (X^N)^l$  such that  $p(c_j) = y'_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq l$ . Suppose  $c_j = (x_i^{(j)})_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ . Notice that  $\pi(x_i^{(j)}) = \tau(y'_j) = y$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq l$ .

As  $l > (k-1)^N$ , there exists some  $1 \leq i \leq N$  such that  $|\{x_i^{(j)} : 1 \leq j \leq l\}| \geq k$ . Thus one can choose a  $k$ -tuple  $(c_{n_1}, \dots, c_{n_k})$  such that  $x_i^{(n_r)} \neq x_i^{(n_s)}$  for  $1 \leq r < s \leq k$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , let  $p_i : X^N \rightarrow X$  be the projection to the  $i$ -th coordinate. It is clear that  $p_i$  is a factor map, which implies that  $(x_i^{(n_1)}, \dots, x_i^{(n_k)})$  is a  $k$  IT-tuple by Proposition 2.4 (4) again. This is a contradiction, and thus the claim is proved.

**Step 3: Count the member of ergodic measures of  $X$ .**

Thus if one can show that  $Y'$  has finitely many ergodic measures, then by Lemma 3.6 so does  $X$ . In fact we will show that  $|M_T^{\text{erg}}(Y')| \leq l \leq (k-1)^N$ . Hence by Lemma 3.6,

$$|M_T^{\text{erg}}(X)| \leq |M_T^{\text{erg}}(X')| \leq N|M_T^{\text{erg}}(Y')| \leq Nl \leq N(k-1)^N.$$

Now it is left to show that  $|M_T^{\text{erg}}(Y')| \leq l \leq (k-1)^N$ . Assume the contrary that  $|M_T^{\text{erg}}(Y')| \geq (k-1)^N + 1$ . Then by Proposition 3.7,  $\text{IT}_{(k-1)^N+1} \setminus \Delta^{((k-1)^N+1)} \neq \emptyset$ . This contracts to the claim in Step 2. So,  $|M_T^{\text{erg}}(Y')| \leq l \leq (k-1)^N$ , and the proof is completed.  $\square$

### 3.3. A Corollary.

Corollary B follows from the following result:

**Corollary 3.8.** *Let  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, T)$  be minimal systems with  $T$  amenable. If  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  is finite to one and  $(Y, T)$  has finitely many ergodic measures, then so does  $(X, T)$ .*

**Remark 3.9.** Note that if  $\sup_{y \in Y} |\pi^{-1}(y)| < \infty$ , then the result is obvious by Lemma 3.6. But there is some system, for all  $y \in Y$ ,  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| < \infty$ , but  $\sup |\pi^{-1}(y)| = \infty$  (see [37, Example 5.7.]). We need to take care of this case.

<sup>1</sup>See [39] for the construction of the general case.

*Proof of Corollary 3.8.* As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, set for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$Y_k = \{y \in Y : |\pi^{-1}(y)| = k\};$$

$$Y_\infty = \{y \in Y : |\pi^{-1}(y)| = \infty\}.$$

Then  $\{Y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}}$  are disjoint measurable  $T$ -invariants sets. Since  $\pi$  is finite to one,  $Y_\infty = \emptyset$  and  $Y = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} Y_k$ . For each ergodic measure  $m$  on  $Y$ , there is only one  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m(Y_{k_0}) = 1$  and  $m(Y_k) = 0$  for all  $k \neq k_0$ . Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.6, there are finitely many ergodic measures in  $\pi_*^{-1}(m)$ . Since  $(Y, T)$  has finitely many ergodic measures, it follows that  $(X, T)$  has only finitely many ergodic measures.  $\square$

#### 4. THE STRUCTURE OF BOUNDED SYSTEMS

In this section we will prove Theorem C. First we will give the structure of bounded systems, that is:

**Theorem 4.1.** *If  $(X, T)$  is a bounded minimal system with  $T$  abelian, then it is an almost finite to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor.*

**Remark 4.2.** One may give a more precise version of Theorem 4.1 as follows:

*If  $(X, T)$  is a minimal system with  $T$  abelian and  $h_\infty(X, T) = \log N$ , then it is an almost  $N'$  to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor, where  $N' \leq N$ .*

The fact  $N' \leq N$  follows from Theorem 2.12. In fact, if  $\pi : X \rightarrow X_{eq}$  is almost  $N'$  to one, then by Proposition 2.14, there exists  $y_0 \in Y$  such that  $|\pi^{-1}(y_0)| = N'$  and  $\pi^{-1}(y_0)$  is a minimal point of  $(2^X, T)$ . Let  $\pi^{-1}(y_0) = \{x_1, \dots, x_{N'}\}$ . Then by Theorem 2.12,  $(x_1, \dots, x_{N'}) \in SE_{N'}(X, T)$ . Thus  $\log N' \leq h_\infty(X, T) = \log N$  by Lemma 2.11, and hence  $N' \leq N$ .

For the Morse minimal system  $(X, T)$ ,  $h_\infty(X, T) = \log 2$ , and it is almost 2 to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor. In general, one can not get that  $N' = N$ . For example, for the substitution minimal system  $(X, T)$  in [17, Proposition 5.1],  $h_\infty(X, T) = \log 2$ , but it is an almost one to one extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor.

We also remark that Theorem 4.1 is in fact an improvement of a previous result obtained by Maass and Shao in [32].

**Proposition 4.3.** [32] *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system with  $T$  abelian. If  $(X, T)$  is bounded, then  $(X, T)$  has the following structure:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xleftarrow{\sigma'} & X' \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi' \\ Y = X_{eq} & \xleftarrow{\tau'} & Y' \end{array}$$

where  $X_{eq}$  is the maximal equicontinuous factor of  $X$ ,  $\sigma'$  and  $\tau'$  are proximal extensions, and  $\pi'$  is a finite to one equicontinuous extension.

**Remark 4.4.** In [32], all results are stated under  $\mathbb{Z}$ -actions, and they hold for systems with  $T$  abelian.

Thus, to prove Theorem 4.1, we need to show  $\sigma'$  and  $\tau'$  in Proposition 4.3 are actually almost one-to-one, and hence  $\pi$  is almost finite to one. To do this, first we need some notions introduced in [20, 41].

Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s.. and let  $U \subseteq X$  be a non-empty open subset,  $\delta > 0$  and  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $r \geq 2$ . Set

$$(3) \quad N(U, \delta; r) = \{t \in T : \exists x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r \in U \text{ such that } \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(tx_i, tx_j) > \delta\}.$$

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s.. and  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  ( $r \geq 2$ ). We say that  $(X, T)$  is *multiple  $r$ -sensitive* if there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and any finite non-empty open subsets  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_k$  of  $X$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k N(U_i, \delta; r) \neq \emptyset$ .

The following proposition relates the multiple sensitivity and sequence entropy.

**Proposition 4.6.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a t.d.s. with  $T$  abelian, and let  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $r \geq 2$ . If  $(X, T)$  is multiple  $r$ -sensitive, then there is some sequence  $A \subset T$  such that  $h_A(X, T) \geq \log r$ .

In particular,  $h_\infty(X, T) \geq \log r$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows the arguments of the proof of in [41, Theorem 1.4] for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -actions. Since  $(X, T)$  is multiple  $r$ -sensitive, there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k N(U_i, 2\delta; r) \neq \emptyset$  for any finite non-empty open subsets  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_k$  of  $X$ . Let  $\alpha$  be an open cover of  $X$  with  $\text{diam}(\alpha) < \delta$ . We will show that there is some sequence  $A \subset T$  such that  $h_A(T, \alpha) \geq \log r$ .

**Claim:** There exist a sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $T$  and a set of non-empty open subsets  $\{V_s\}_{s \in \Omega}$  of  $X$ , where  $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^i$  such that

- (1) if  $t$  is a sub-word of  $s$ , then  $V_s \subseteq V_t$ ;
- (2) for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  one has that

$$\min_{s \neq s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m} \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \text{dist}(t_i V_s, t_i V_{s'}) > \delta.$$

*Proof of Claim.* We prove the claim by induction. Since  $(X, T)$  is multiple  $r$ -sensitive, there is some  $t_1 \in T$  and  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r \in X$  such that

$$\min_{1 \leq s_1 \neq s'_1 \leq r} d(t_1 x_{s_1}, t_1 x_{s'_1}) > 2\delta.$$

Then we choose open neighborhood  $U_{s_1}$  of  $t_1 x_{s_1}$  for all  $s_1 \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  such that

$$\min_{1 \leq s_1 \neq s'_1 \leq r} \text{dist}(U_{s_1}, U_{s'_1}) > \delta.$$

Set  $V_{s_1} = t_1^{-1} U_{s_1}$  for  $s_1 \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ . Then we have that

$$\min_{s \neq s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}} \max_{i=1} \text{dist}(t_i(V_s), t_i(V_{s'})) > \delta.$$

Thus we have our first step.

Now assume that there exist a sequence  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m$  of  $T$  and a set of non-empty open subsets  $\{V_s\}_{s \in \Omega_m}$  of  $X$ , where  $\Omega_m = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^i$  such that

- (1)<sub>m</sub> if  $t \in \Omega_m$  is a sub-word of  $s \in \Omega_m$ , then  $V_s \subseteq V_t$ ;

$(2)_m$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  one has that

$$\min_{s \neq s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^j} \max_{1 \leq i \leq j} \text{dist}(t_i V_s, t_i V_{s'}) > \delta.$$

Since  $(X, T)$  is multiple  $r$ -sensitive,

$$\bigcap_{s \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m} N(V_s, 2\delta; r) \neq \emptyset.$$

Pick  $t_{m+1} \in \bigcap_{s \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m} N(V_s, 2\delta; r)$ . By the definition, for each  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m$ , one can

find  $x_{(s,1)}, x_{(s,2)}, \dots, x_{(s,r)} \in V_s$  such that

$$\min_{1 \leq s_{m+1} \neq s'_{m+1} \leq r} d(t_{m+1} x_{(s,s_{m+1})}, t_{m+1} x_{(s',s'_{m+1})}) > 2\delta.$$

Then we choose a non-empty open neighbourhood  $U_{(s,s_{m+1})}$  of  $t_{m+1} x_{(s,s_{m+1})}$  for each  $(s, s_{m+1}) \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{m+1}$  with

$$\min_{1 \leq s_{m+1} \neq s'_{m+1} \leq r} \text{dist}(U_{(s,s_{m+1})}, U_{(s',s'_{m+1})}) > \delta.$$

Set  $V_{(s,s_{m+1})} = V_s \cap t_{m+1}^{-1} U_{(s,s_{m+1})}$  for all  $(s, s_{m+1}) \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{m+1}$ . Then it is easy to verify that

$$\min_{s \neq s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{m+1}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \text{dist}(t_i V_s, t_i V_{s'}) > \delta.$$

The proof of Claim is completed.  $\square$

For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $s, s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m$ , one has that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{s \neq s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m} \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(t_i(x_s), t_i(x_{s'})) \\ & \geq \min_{s \neq s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m} \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \text{dist}(t_i V_s, t_i V_{s'}) \\ & > \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\text{diam} \alpha < \delta$ ,  $x_s$  and  $x_{s'}$  will not be in the same element of  $\bigvee_{i=1}^m t_i^{-1} \alpha$  whenever  $s \neq s' \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^m$ . Thus,  $N(\bigvee_{i=1}^m t_i^{-1} \alpha) \geq r^m$ , which implies that  $h_A(T, \alpha) \geq \log r$ , where  $A = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ . In particular,  $h_\infty(X, T) \geq h_A(X, T) \geq \log r$ .  $\square$

We also need the following lemmas to show the next proposition.

**Lemma 4.7.** [6, Remark 8.] *Let  $\pi_i : (X_i, T) \rightarrow (Y_i, T)$  be proximal extensions for  $i \in I$ . Then  $\prod_{i \in I} \pi_i : \prod_{i \in I} X_i \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} Y_i$  is also proximal.*

**Lemma 4.8.** [1, Lemma 6.17] *Let  $(X, T)$  be a topological system, let  $x \in X$  and let  $y$  be a minimal point, with  $x$  and  $y$  proximal. Let  $U$  be a neighbourhood of  $y$ . Then there is a  $t \in T$  such that  $tx, ty \in U$ .*

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be an extension between t.d.s. with  $(Y, T)$  being minimal. If  $\pi$  is not almost finite to one, then for each fixed  $r \geq 2$ , there exist a constant  $\delta_r > 0$  such that for each  $y \in Y$ , there are  $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \pi^{-1}(y)$  with*

$$\min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(x_i, x_j) > \delta_r.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $r \geq 2$  and let  $\pi^{-1} : Y \rightarrow 2^X, y \mapsto \pi^{-1}(y)$ . Then  $\pi^{-1}$  is a u.s.c. map, and by Theorem 2.13, the set  $Y_c$  of continuous points of  $\pi^{-1}$  is a dense  $G_\delta$  subset of  $Y$ . Let  $y_0 \in Y_c$  be a continuous point of  $\pi^{-1}$ .

Define  $f : X^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows

$$(w_1, \dots, w_r) \mapsto \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(w_i, w_j).$$

It is easy to verify that  $f$  is a continuous function. Since  $\pi$  is not almost finite to one and  $(Y, T)$  is minimal,  $\pi^{-1}(y_0)$  is an infinite set. Choose distinct points  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_r \in \pi^{-1}(y_0)$ . Then

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_r) = \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(z_i, z_j) > 0.$$

Let  $\delta = \frac{1}{2}f(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ . By the continuity of  $f$ , there are open neighborhoods  $U_1, \dots, U_r$  of  $z_1, \dots, z_r$  such that for all  $(z'_1, \dots, z'_r) \in U_1 \times \dots \times U_r$ ,

$$|f(z'_1, \dots, z'_r) - f(z_1, \dots, z_r)| < \delta.$$

In particular, we have that for all  $(z'_1, \dots, z'_r) \in U_1 \times \dots \times U_r$ ,

$$(4) \quad \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(z'_i, z'_j) = f(z'_1, \dots, z'_r) > f(z_1, \dots, z_r) - \delta = \delta.$$

Since  $y_0 \in Y_c$  is a continuous point of  $\pi^{-1}$ , there is an open neighbourhood  $V$  of  $y_0$  such that for all  $y' \in V$ ,

$$(5) \quad \pi^{-1}(y') \cap U_j \neq \emptyset, \forall 1 \leq j \leq r.$$

Since  $(Y, T)$  is minimal, there exist  $t_1, \dots, t_k \in T$  such that  $\bigcup_{s=1}^k t_s V = Y$ . By the continuity of  $t_1, \dots, t_k \in T$ , there exists  $\delta_r > 0$  such that if  $x, x' \in X$  with  $d(x, x') \leq \delta_r$ , then

$$\max_{1 \leq s \leq k} d(t_s^{-1}x, t_s^{-1}x') \leq \delta.$$

Now for a given  $y \in Y$ , there is some  $s(y) \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  such that  $t_{s(y)}^{-1}y \in V$ . Then by (5), we can find  $x'_1 \in \pi^{-1}(t_{s(y)}^{-1}y) \cap U_1, \dots, x'_r \in \pi^{-1}(t_{s(y)}^{-1}y) \cap U_r$ . Moreover, by (4) one has that

$$\min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(x'_i, x'_j) > \delta.$$

Let  $x_i = t_{s(y)}x'_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ . Then  $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \pi^{-1}(y)$ , and by the choice of  $\delta_r$ , one has that

$$\min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(x_i, x_j) > \delta_r.$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

For  $T = \mathbb{Z}$ , the following Proposition 4.10 is the consequence of [41, Theorem 1.3] and [41, Theorem 3.4]. We will give a direct proof here for t.d.s. under abelian group actions. First recall some notions about subsets of  $T$ .

A subset  $S \subset T$  is *syndetic* if there exists a finite  $F \subset T$  such that  $FS = T$ . A subset  $L \subset T$  is called *thick* if for every finite set  $F \subset T$  one has that

$$L \cap \bigcap_{\gamma \in F} \gamma L \neq \emptyset.$$

Note that  $S \subset T$  is syndetic if and only if  $S \cap L \neq \emptyset$  for every thick set  $L \subset T$ ; and  $L \subset T$  is thick if and only if  $L \cap S \neq \emptyset$  for every syndetic set  $S \subset T$ .

The following proposition is the key to improve Proposition 4.3.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be an extension between minimal systems with  $T$  abelian. If  $\pi$  is proximal but not almost one to one, then  $(X, T)$  is multiple  $r$ -sensitive for all  $r \geq 2$ . In particular,  $h_\infty(X, T) = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\pi$  is proximal but not almost one-to-one, by Proposition 2.14  $\pi$  is not almost finite to one. Thus by Lemma 4.9 for each fixed  $r \geq 2$ , there exists a constant  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $y \in Y$ , there are  $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \pi^{-1}(y)$  with

$$\min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} d(x_i, x_j) > 3\delta.$$

**Claim:** *For any non-empty open subset  $U$  of  $X$  and  $F = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_L\} \in T$  with  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is some  $m \in T$  such that*

$$mF = \{mt_1, mt_2, \dots, mt_L\} \subseteq N(U, \delta; r),$$

*i.e.  $N(U, \delta; r)$  is thick.*

*Proof of Claim.* Since  $(X, T)$  is minimal,  $\pi$  is semi-open. Hence for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ ,  $\text{int}(\pi(t_i U)) \neq \emptyset$  and let  $y_i \in \text{int}(\pi(T^i U))$ . Choose points  $z_{i1}, z_{i2}, \dots, z_{ir} \in \pi^{-1}(y_i)$  such that

$$\min_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq r} d(z_{ij}, z_{ik}) > 3\delta.$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq L$  and  $1 \leq t \leq r$ , set

$$W_{it} = B(z_{it}, \delta) \cap \pi^{-1}(\text{int}(\pi(t_i U))),$$

where  $B(x, a) = \{y \in X : d(x, y) < a\}$ .

Since  $(X, T)$  is minimal, the set of minimal points in  $rL$  product system  $(X^{rL}, T)$  is dense. Choose a minimal point  $(p_{it})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq L \\ 1 \leq t \leq r}}$  in  $\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq L \\ 1 \leq t \leq r}} W_{it}$ . Then by the definition of  $W_{it}$ , for each  $1 \leq i \leq L$  and  $1 \leq t \leq r$  there is some  $x_{it} \in U$  such that

$$\pi(t_i x_{it}) = \pi(p_{it}).$$

By Lemma 4.7, in the product system  $(X^{rL}, T)$ , points  $(p_{it})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq L \\ 1 \leq t \leq r}}$  and  $(t_i x_{it})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq L \\ 1 \leq t \leq r}}$  are proximal. Thus it follows from Lemma 4.8 that there is some  $m \in T$  such that

$$m((t_i x_{it})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq L \\ 1 \leq t \leq r}}) \in \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq L \\ 1 \leq t \leq r}} W_{it}.$$

That is,

$$mt_i x_{it} \in W_{it}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, L\}, t \in \{1, \dots, r\}.$$

By the construction of  $W_{it}$ , one has that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, L\}$

$$\min_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq r} \text{dist}(W_{ij}, W_{ik}) > \delta.$$

It follows that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, L\}$

$$\min_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq r} d(mt_i x_{ij}, mt_i x_{ik}) > \delta,$$



which means that  $mF = \{mt_1, mt_2, \dots, mt_L\} \subseteq N(U, \delta; r)$ .  $\square$

Now we show that  $(X, T)$  is multiple  $r$ -sensitive. Let  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_k$  be non-empty open subsets of  $X$ . Fix a point  $x_0 \in X$ . Since  $(X, T)$  is minimal, there exist  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k \in T$  such that  $t_1 x_0 \in U_1, t_2 x_0 \in U_2, \dots, t_k x_0 \in U_k$ . Thus there is some open neighborhood  $U$  of  $x_0$  such that

$$t_1 U \subseteq U_1, t_2 U \subseteq U_2, \dots, t_k U \subseteq U_k.$$

By Claim,  $N(U, \delta; r)$  is thick, there is some  $m \in T$  such that

$$\{mt_1, mt_2, \dots, mt_k\} \subseteq N(U, \delta; r).$$

It is easy to verify that

$$m \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k N(U_i, \delta; r).$$

Thus  $(X, T)$  is multiple  $r$ -sensitive. The proof is completed.  $\square$

For  $n \geq 2$  one writes  $(X^n, T)$  for the  $n$ -fold product system  $(X \times \dots \times X, T)$ .

**Lemma 4.11.** [17, Proposition 2.4] *For a t.d.s.  $(X, T)$  with  $T$  abelian, and any sequence  $A \subset T$  we have*

$$h_A(X^n, T) = nh_A(X, T)$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 4.12.** [17, Proposition 2.5] *Let  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$  be an extension with  $T$  abelian and  $A \subset T$  be a sequence. If  $\pi$  is at most  $N$  finite to one, i.e.  $|\pi^{-1}(y)| \leq N$  for all  $y \in Y$ , then  $h_A(X, T) \leq h_A(Y, T) + \log N$ .*

Now we are ready to show prove Theorem 4.1.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* First by Proposition 4.3, we have that  $(X, T)$  has the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xleftarrow{\sigma'} & X' \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ Y = X_{eq} & \xleftarrow{\tau'} & Y' \end{array}$$

where  $\sigma'$  and  $\tau'$  are proximal extensions,  $\pi'$  is a  $N$  to one extension for some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\pi$  is the maximal equicontinuous factor. Now we show that  $\tau'$  and  $\sigma'$  is almost one-to-one, and hence  $\pi$  is almost finite to one.

Assume that  $\tau'$  is not almost one-to-one, then by Proposition 4.10,  $h_\infty(Y') = \infty$ . By the construction of diagram in Proposition 4.3 (See [32] for details), every point of  $Y' \subseteq 2^X$  consists of  $N$  distinct elements of  $X$ . Let  $M_N(X) = \{A \in 2^X : |A| \leq N\}$ . Then  $M_N(X)$  is a closed subset of  $2^X$ . It is clear that  $Y' \subset M_N(X)$  and thus  $h_\infty(M_N(X), T) = \infty$ .

Define  $p : X^N \rightarrow M_N(X)$  such that  $p((x_1, \dots, x_N)) = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ . We have the following commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X^N & \xrightarrow{T} & X^N \\
p \downarrow & & \downarrow p \\
M_N(X) & \xrightarrow{T} & M_N(X)
\end{array}$$

This implies that  $h_\infty(X^N, T) = \infty$ , a contradiction by Lemma 4.11. Thus,  $\tau'$  is almost one to one and  $h_\infty(Y') < \infty$ .

Since  $\pi'$  is finite to one, by Lemma 4.12  $h_\infty(X') \leq h_\infty(Y') + \log N < \infty$ . By Proposition 4.10,  $\sigma'$  is also almost one to one. Thus  $\pi$  is almost finite to one. The proof is completed.  $\square$

A minimal system  $(X, T)$  is called *pointed distal* if there is some point  $x_0 \in X$ , the only point proximal to  $x_0$  is itself. By Veech's structure for pointed distal systems and Theorem 4.1, any bounded minimal system under abelian group action is pointed distal. Thus we have

**Corollary 4.13.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a minimal system with  $T$  abelian. If  $(X, T)$  is not pointed distal, then  $h_\infty(X, T) = \infty$ .*

#### APPENDIX A. THE PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.2

The proof of Proposition 3.2 basically is similar to the one of [11, Proposition 3.3.]. For the completeness, we include a proof.

From now on,  $k$  is a fixed natural number with  $k \geq 2$ . Let  $\Sigma_n = \{1, \dots, k\}^n$  and  $\Sigma_* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$ . Denote by  $|a|$  the length of a word  $a \in \Sigma_*$ . Let  $H$  be a locally compact second countable Hausdorff topological group with left Haar measure  $\Theta_H$ . By Birkhoff-Kakutani theorem there exists a left invariant metric  $d$  (see [36] for example). Let  $e$  be the unit element.

Let  $\Theta_H^r$  be the right Haar measure on  $H$ . If  $C \subset H$  is a compact set with positive measure and we set

$$\eta^C(\varepsilon) = \frac{\Theta_H^r(B_\varepsilon(C))}{\Theta_H^r(C)} - 1,$$

where  $B_\varepsilon(C) = \{x \in H : d(x, c) < \varepsilon\}$ . Since  $\Theta$  is regular,  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \eta^C(\varepsilon) = 0$ .

When  $k = 2$ , the following lemma is Lemma 3.5. in [11].

**Lemma A.1.** *Suppose that  $C \subset H$  is a compact set with  $\Theta_H^r(C) > 0$  and  $\{\xi_a\}_{a \in \Sigma_*}$  is a family of elements  $\xi_a \in H$ . Let  $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of positive real numbers such that*

$$\varepsilon_n \geq \sup_{a \in \Sigma_n} d(e, \xi_a).$$

*For  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , let  $\delta_j^n = \sum_{\ell=j}^n \varepsilon_\ell$ . Further, given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a \in \Sigma_n$ , let  $\gamma_a = \xi_{a_1} \xi_{a_1 a_2} \cdots \xi_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} = \prod_{j=1}^n \xi_{a_1, \dots, a_j}$ . Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$(6) \quad \Theta_H^r \left( \bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_n} C \gamma_a^{-1} \right) \geq \Theta_H^r(C) \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n k^{j-1} (k-1) \eta^C(\delta_j^n) \right).$$

*Proof.* We prove the lemma by induction on  $n$ . When  $n = 1$ , note that  $\{\xi_a\}_{|a|=1} = \{\xi_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , one has that

$$d(e, \gamma_i^{-1}) = d(e, \gamma_i) = d(e, \xi_i) \leq \varepsilon_1.$$

Thus  $\bigcup_{i=1}^k C\gamma_i^{-1} \subset B_{\delta_1^1}(C)$ , where  $\delta_1^1 = \varepsilon_1$ . As  $\Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^1}(C)) = (1 + \eta^C(\delta_1^1))\Theta_H^r(C)$ , one has that

$$\Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^1}(C) \setminus C\gamma_i^{-1}) = \eta^C(\delta_1^1)\Theta_H^r(C).$$

Thus one has that

$$\Theta_H^r\left(B_{\delta_1^1}(C) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k C\gamma_i^{-1}\right)\right) = \Theta_H^r\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k (B_{\delta_1^1}(C) \setminus C\gamma_i^{-1})\right) \leq k\eta^C(\delta_1^1)\Theta_H^r(C),$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_H^r\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k (C\gamma_i^{-1})\right) &\geq \Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^1}(C)) - k\eta^C(\delta_1^1)\Theta_H^r(C) \\ &= \Theta_H^r(C) \left(1 - (k-1)\eta^C(\delta_1^1)\right). \end{aligned}$$

The base case is done.

Now suppose that Equation (6) holds for  $n$ , all sets  $C \subset H$  and all collection  $\{\xi_a\}_{a \in \Sigma^*}$  and  $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as above. Let  $\xi_a^{(i)} = \xi_{ia}$  and  $\gamma_a^{(i)} = \xi_i^{-1} \cdot \gamma_{ia}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and  $a \in \Sigma_*$ . Notice that

$$\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in \Sigma_{n+1}} = \{\xi_i \gamma_a^{(i)}\}_{1 \leq i \leq k, a \in \Sigma_n}.$$

Thus it holds that

$$\bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_{n+1}} C\gamma_a^{-1} = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left( \left( \bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_n} C(\gamma_a^{(i)})^{-1} \right) \xi_i^{-1} \right).$$

Let  $J_i = \left( \bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_n} C(\gamma_a^{(i)})^{-1} \right)$ . By the induction hypothesis, one has that

$$\Theta_H^r(J_i \xi_i^{-1}) = \Theta_H^r(J_i) \geq \Theta_H^r(C) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^n k^{j-1}(k-1)\eta^C(\delta_{j+1}^{n+1})\right).$$

Notice that  $J_i \xi_i^{-1} \subset B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Therefore, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Theta_H^r \left( \bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_{n+1}} C \gamma_a^{-1} \right) = \Theta_H^r \left( \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} (J_i \xi_i^{-1}) \right) \\
& = \Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C)) - \Theta_H^r \left( B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C) \setminus \left( \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} J_i \xi_i^{-1} \right) \right) \\
& = \Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C)) - \Theta_H^r \left( \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} (B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C) \setminus J_i \xi_i^{-1}) \right) \\
& \geq \Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C)) - \sum_{i=1}^k \Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C) \setminus J_i \xi_i^{-1}) \\
& = -(k-1) \Theta_H^r(B_{\delta_1^{n+1}}(C)) + \sum_{i=1}^k (\Theta_H^r(J_i \xi_i^{-1})) \\
& \geq \Theta_H^r(C) \left( k \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n k^{j-1} (k-1) \eta^C(\delta_{j+1}^{n+1}) \right) - (k-1)(1 + \eta^C(\delta_1^{n+1})) \right) \\
& = \Theta_H^r(C) \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} k^{j-1} (k-1) \eta^C(\delta_j^{n+1}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

Given metric spaces  $X$  and  $H$ , a continuous map  $\beta : X \rightarrow H$  is called almost one-to-one if  $X_0 = \{x \in X : \beta^{-1}(\{\beta(x)\}) = \{x\}\}$  is dense in  $X$ . Points in  $X_0$  are called injectivity points of  $\beta$ . Recall that a compact subset  $W$  of a metric space  $X$  is called *proper* if  $\text{int}(\overline{W}) = W$ .

**Lemma A.2.** [11, Lemma 2.4] *Suppose that  $X, H$  are metric spaces and  $\beta : X \rightarrow H$  is an almost one-to-one continuous map. Then images of proper subsets of  $X$  under  $\beta$  are proper subsets of  $H$ .*

Now we give the proof of Proposition 3.2.

*Proof of Proposition 3.2.* As  $\mathcal{G}$  is a residual set, assume that  $\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n$ , where each  $G_n$  is an open and dense subset of  $H$ . We will construct an infinite sequence of point  $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $T$ , a sequence  $\{r(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of positive real numbers, a collection  $\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in \Sigma_*}$  in  $H$  and a collection  $\{U_a\}_{a \in \Sigma_*}$  of compact subsets of  $H$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a = a_1 a_2 \dots a_n \in \Sigma_n$ ,

$$(I_n) \quad U_a = \overline{B_{r(n)}(\gamma_a)} \subset (t_n^{-1} \text{int}(V_{a_n})) \cap G_n;$$

$$(II_n) \quad \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_{a_i} \subset U_a.$$

(III<sub>n</sub>)  $\sup_{a \in \Sigma_n} d(e, \xi_a) \leq \varepsilon_n$ , where  $\{\xi_a\}_{a \in \Sigma_*}$  is a family of elements  $\xi_a \in H$  defined by  $\gamma_a = \xi_{a_1} \xi_{a_1 a_2} \dots \xi_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} = \prod_{j=1}^n \xi_{a_1, \dots, a_j}$ .

Once we have  $(I_n), (II_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then it will prove the statement. Firstly, we are to see that  $t_i \neq t_j$  for any  $i \neq j \in \mathbb{N}$ . In fact, given  $i \neq j \in \mathbb{N}$ . We take  $n = \max\{i, j\}$  and  $a = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n \in \Sigma_n$  with  $a_i \neq a_j$ . Then by  $I_n$  one has  $t_i(U_a) \subset \text{int}(V_{a_i})$  and  $t_j(U_a) \subset \text{int}(V_{a_j})$ . Combing this with the fact  $\text{int}(V_{a_i}) \cap \text{int}(V_{a_j}) = \emptyset$  (see (ii)), one has  $t_i \neq t_j$ .

Next let  $I = \{t_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then  $I$  is an infinite set of  $T$ . For  $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}^I$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , Let  $a^{(n)} = a_{t_1} a_{t_2} \dots a_{t_n}$ . By  $(II_n)$ ,  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_{a^{(n)}}$  is a nested intersection of compact sets and therefore non-empty. By  $(I_n)$ , any  $h \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_{a^{(n)}}$  has the property that  $h \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $t_n h \in \text{int}(V_{a_{t_n}})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus one has (2).

We will construct  $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{r(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in \Sigma_*}$  and  $\{U_a\}_{a \in \Sigma_*}$  by induction on  $|a| = n$ . Let

$$C = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} V_i.$$

As  $\Theta_H$  and  $\Theta_H^r$  are mutually absolutely continuous, one has that  $\Theta_H^r(C) > 0$ . We fix a sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of positive real numbers such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} k^{j-1} (k-1) \eta^C(\delta_j^\infty) < 1,$$

where  $\delta_j^n$  are defined as in Lemma A.1.

First we show the case  $n = 1$ . Since  $T$  is a dense subgroup, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\bigcup_{t \in T} t B_\varepsilon(e) = H$ . Choose  $t_1 \in T$  such that  $(t_1 B_{\varepsilon_1}(e)) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . As  $C \subset V_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , one has that

$$(t_1 B_{\varepsilon_1}(e)) \cap V_i \neq \emptyset.$$

As  $\overline{\text{int}(V_i)} = V_i$ , one has that

$$(t_1 B_{\varepsilon_1}(e)) \cap \text{int}(V_i) \neq \emptyset \text{ for any } 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

Since  $G_1$  is an open dense subset, it follows for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,

$$G_1 \cap B_{\varepsilon_1}(e) \cap t_1^{-1} \text{int}(V_i) \neq \emptyset$$

is a non-empty open set. Now for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , choose  $\gamma_i \in H$  and  $r(1) > 0$  such that

$$U_i = \overline{B_{r(1)}(\gamma_i)} \subset G_1 \cap B_{\varepsilon_1}(e) \cap t_1^{-1} \text{int}(V_i).$$

Let  $\xi_a = \gamma_a$  for  $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , one has that

$$\sup_{a \in \Sigma_1} d(e, \xi_a) \leq \varepsilon_1.$$

Thus the base case is done.

Suppose now that  $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $\{r(i)\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i}$  and  $\{U_a\}_{a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i}$  have been chosen and satisfy  $(I_n)$ ,  $(II_n)$  and  $(III_n)$ . By Lemma A.1 and  $(III_n)$ , one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_H^r\left(\bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_n} C \gamma_a^{-1}\right) &\geq \Theta_H^r(C) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^n k^{j-1} (k-1) \eta^C(\delta_j^n)\right) \\ &\geq \Theta_H^r(C) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^n k^{j-1} (k-1) \eta^C(\delta_j^\infty)\right) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_n} C\gamma_a^{-1} \neq \emptyset$ , and choose  $h \in \bigcap_{a \in \Sigma_n} C\gamma_a^{-1}$ . Thus  $\gamma_a \in h^{-1}C$  for all  $a \in \Sigma_n$ . Choose  $t_{n+1} \in T$  close enough to  $h$  and  $r'(n+1) < r(n)$  such that

$$t_{n+1}^{-1}C \cap B_{r'(n+1)}(\gamma_a) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for all } a \in \Sigma_n.$$

Since  $C = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} V_i$  and  $V_i = \overline{\text{int}(V_i)}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , one has that

$$(t_{n+1}^{-1}\text{int}(V_i)) \cap B_{r'(n+1)}(\gamma_a) \neq \emptyset, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k$$

are non-empty open sets. As  $G_{n+1}$  is open and dense, it follows that

$$(t_{n+1}^{-1}\text{int}(V_i)) \cap B_{r'(n+1)}(\gamma_a) \cap G_{n+1} \neq \emptyset, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k$$

are non-empty open sets. Now for each  $a \in \Sigma_n, i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , there exists  $\gamma_{ai} \in H$  and  $r(n+1) > 0$  such that

$$U_{ai} = \overline{B_{r(n+1)}(\gamma_{ai})} \subset (t_{n+1}^{-1}\text{int}(V_i)) \cap B_{r'(n+1)}(\gamma_a) \cap G_{n+1}.$$

Notice that

$$U_{ai} \subset B_{r'(n+1)}(\gamma_a) \subset \overline{B_{r(n)}(\gamma_a)} = U_a,$$

and one has  $(I_{n+1})$  and  $(II_{n+1})$ . Recall that  $\xi_{ai} = \gamma_a^{-1}\gamma_{ai}$  for all  $a \in \Sigma_n, i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . One has that for all  $a \in \Sigma_n, i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,

$$d(e, \xi_{ai}) = d(e, \gamma_a^{-1}\gamma_{ai}) = d(\gamma_a, \gamma_{ai}) \leq r'(n+1) \leq \varepsilon_{n+1},$$

which is  $(III_n)$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Auslander, *Minimal flows and their extensions*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies 153 (1988), North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [2] J. Auslander and S. Glasner, *Distal and highly proximal extensions of minimal flows*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 26 (1977), no. 4, 731–749.
- [3] F. Blanchard, *A disjointness theorem involving topological entropy*, Bull. de la Soc. Math. de France 121 (1993), 465–478.
- [4] F. Blanchard, B. Host, A. Maass, *Topological Complexity*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 20 (2000), 641–662.
- [5] M. Boshernitzan, *A unique ergodicity of minimal symbolic flows with linear block growth*, J. Analyse Math. 44 (1984/85), 77–96.
- [6] J. Clay, *Proximity relations in transformation groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 108 (1963), 88–96.
- [7] V. Cyr and B. Kra, *Counting generic measures for a subshift of linear growth*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 21(2019), no. 2, 355–380.
- [8] R. Ellis, *A semigroup associated with a transformation group*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 94, 1960, 272–281.
- [9] R. Ellis and W. Gottschalk, *Homomorphisms of transformation groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 94, 1960, 258–271.
- [10] N. Frantzikinakis, B. Host, *The logarithmic Sarnak conjecture for ergodic weights*, Ann. of Math. (2) 187 (2018), no. 3, 869–931.
- [11] G. Fuhrmann, E. Glasner, T. Jäger and C. Oertel, *Irregular model sets and tame dynamics*, arXiv: 1811.06283.
- [12] H. Furstenberg, *Recurrence in ergodic theory and combinatorial number theory*, M. B. Porter Lectures. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1981.
- [13] E. Glasner, *On tame dynamical systems*, Colloq. Math. 105 (2006), no. 2, 283–295.



- [14] E. Glasner, *The structure of tame minimal dynamical systems*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 27 (2007), no. 6, 1819–1837.
- [15] E. Glasner, *The structure of tame minimal dynamical systems for general groups*, Invent. Math. 211 (2018), no. 1, 213–244.
- [16] E. Glasner, *Ergodic theory via joinings*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 101. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [17] T.N.T Goodman *Topological sequence entropy*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 29 (1974), 331–350.
- [18] E. Hewitt and K. A. Ross, *Abstract harmonic analysis. Vol. I: Structure of topological groups. Integration theory, group representations*, Springer, New York, NY, 1963.
- [19] W. Huang, *Tame systems and scrambled pairs under an Abelian group action*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 26 (2006), 1549–1567.
- [20] W. Huang, S. Kolyada, G. Zhang, *Analogues of Auslander-Yorke theorems for multi-sensitivity*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 2017.
- [21] W. Huang, S. Li, S. Shao and X. Ye, *Null systems and sequence entropy pairs*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 23 (2003), no.5, 1505–1523.
- [22] W. Huang, X. Ye, *Combinatorial lemmas and applications to dynamics*, Adv. Math. 220 (2009), no. 6, 1689–1716.
- [23] P. Hulse, *Sequence entropy and subsequence generators*, J. London Math. Soc., (2) 26(1982), 441–450.
- [24] R.I. Jewett, *The prevalence of uniquely ergodic systems*, J. Math. Mech. 19 (1969/1970), 717–729.
- [25] D. Kerr, H. Li, *Independence in topological and  $C^*$ -dynamics*. Math. Ann. 338 (2007), no. 4, 869–926.
- [26] A. Köhler, *Enveloping semigroups for flows*, Proc. R. Irish Acad. Sect. A 95 (1995), 179–191.
- [27] W. Krieger, *On unique ergodicity*, Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971), Vol. II: Probability theory, pp. 327–346, Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1972.
- [28] K. Kuratowski, *Topology, Vol. I*, Acad. Press, New York, N.Y., 1966.
- [29] K. Kuratowski, *Topology, Vol. II*, Acad. Press, New York, N.Y., 1968.
- [30] A. G. Kushnirenko, *On metric invariants of entropy type*, Russian Math. Surveys 22 (1967), 53–61.
- [31] E. Lindenstrauss, *Pointwise theorems for amenable groups*, Invent. Math. 146 (2001), no. 2, 259–295.
- [32] A. Maass and S. Shao, *Structure of bounded topological-sequence-entropy minimal systems*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., Vol 76, No.3 (2007), 702–718.
- [33] M. Rees, *A point distal transformation of the torus*, Israel J. Math. 32 (1979), no. 2-3, 201–208
- [34] R. J. Sacker and G. R. Sell, *Finite extensions of minimal transformation groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 190 (1974), 325–334.
- [35] P. Shoenfeld, *Highly proximal and generalized almost finite extensions of minimal sets*, Pacific J. Math. 66 (1976), no. 1, 265–280.
- [36] R. Struble, *Metrics in locally compact groups*, Compositio Mathematica, 28 (1974), 217–222.
- [37] X. Ye, R. Zhang, *On sensitive sets in topological dynamics*. Nonlinearity 21 (2008), no. 7, 1601–1620.
- [38] V.S. Varadarajan, *Groups of automorphisms of Borel spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 109(1963), 191–220.
- [39] W. A. Veech, *Point-distal systems*, Amer. J. Math., 92(1970), 205–242.
- [40] J. de Vries, *Elements of Topological Dynamics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (1993), Dordrecht.
- [41] Y. Zou, *Stronger Version Sensitivity, Almost Finite to One Extension and Maximal Pattern Entropy*, Commun. Math. Stat. (2017), 1–17.

WU WEN-TSUN KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS, USTC, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF CHINA, HEFEI,  
ANHUI, 230026, P.R. CHINA.

*E-mail address:* wenh@mail.ustc.edu.cn

*E-mail address:* lianzx@mail.ustc.edu.cn

*E-mail address:* songshao@ustc.edu.cn

*E-mail address:* yexd@ustc.edu.cn