

# UNIFORMLY POSITIVE ENTROPY OF INDUCED TRANSFORMATIONS

NILSON C. BERNARDES JR., UDAYAN B. DARJI, AND RÔMULO M. VERMERSCH

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a topological dynamical system consisting of a compact metric space  $X$  and a continuous surjective map  $T : X \rightarrow X$ . By using local entropy theory, we prove that  $(X, T)$  has uniformly positive entropy if and only if so does the induced system  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \tilde{T})$  on the space of Borel probability measures endowed with the weak\* topology. This result can be seen as a version for the notion of uniformly positive entropy of the corresponding result for topological entropy due to Glasner and Weiss.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Local entropy theory is a culmination of deep results in dynamics, ergodic theory and combinatorics. Given a dynamical system with positive entropy, it gives, in some sense, the location of where the entropy resides. We refer the reader to the survey article by Glasner and Ye [18] for general information on the subject as well as important contributions by many to the field. It is a powerful tool that can be applied in a variety of settings. For example, the second author and Kato [11], using local entropy theory, settled some old problems concerning indecomposable continua in dynamical systems. In this note we further show the power of this theory by giving a simple proof of the theorem stated in the abstract.

By a *topological dynamical system* (TDS) we mean a pair  $(X, T)$  consisting of a compact metric space  $X$  with metric  $d$  and a continuous surjective map  $T : X \rightarrow X$ . Such a TDS induces, in a natural way, the TDSs

$$(\mathcal{K}(X), \overline{T}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{M}(X), \tilde{T}).$$

In the first of these systems,  $\mathcal{K}(X)$  denotes the *hyperspace* of all nonempty closed subsets of  $X$  endowed with the *Hausdorff metric*

$$d_H(K_1, K_2) := \inf\{\delta > 0 : K_1 \subset K_2^\delta \text{ and } K_2 \subset K_1^\delta\},$$

where  $A^\delta := \{x \in X : d(x, A) < \delta\}$  is the  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $A \subset X$ , and  $\overline{T} : \mathcal{K}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(X)$  is the continuous surjective map given by

$$\overline{T}(K) := T(K) \quad (K \in \mathcal{K}(X)).$$

In the second one,  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  denotes the space of all Borel probability measures on  $X$  endowed with the *Prohorov metric*

$$d_P(\mu, \nu) := \inf\{\delta > 0 : \mu(A) \leq \nu(A^\delta) + \delta \text{ and } \nu(A) \leq \mu(A^\delta) + \delta \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{B}_X\},$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_X$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of all Borel subsets of  $X$ , and  $\tilde{T} : \mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$  is the continuous surjective map given by

$$(\tilde{T}(\mu))(A) := \mu(T^{-1}(A)) \quad (\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X), A \in \mathcal{B}_X).$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37B40; Secondary 28A33, 60B10, 54B20.

*Key words and phrases.* Continuous surjective maps, probability measures, Prohorov metric, weak\* topology, hyperspaces, dynamics.

It is well known that  $\mathcal{K}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  are compact metric spaces and that  $\overline{T}$  and  $\widetilde{T}$  are homeomorphisms whenever  $T$  is a homeomorphism. Moreover,

$$d_P(\mu, \nu) := \inf\{\delta > 0 : \mu(A) \leq \nu(A^\delta) + \delta \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{B}_X\}$$

(see p. 72 in [8]). We refer the reader to the books [21, 22] and [8, 12, 22] for a study of the spaces  $\mathcal{K}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ , respectively.

An interesting line of investigation in the area of dynamical systems is the study of the relations between the dynamics of the TDS  $(X, T)$  and the dynamics of the induced TDSs  $(\mathcal{K}(X), \overline{T})$  and  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widetilde{T})$ . Such investigations were initiated by Bauer and Sigmund [3], and later were widely developed by several authors; see [2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 17, 19, 26, 27, 29], for instance. It is worth to mention that there is a common line in these works: the search for which dynamical properties the base system  $(X, T)$  and the induced systems  $(\mathcal{K}(X), \overline{T})$  and  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widetilde{T})$  share with each other and which dynamical properties they do not share at all.

It is well known that the extension of a TDS to the hyperspace can dramatically increase the system's complexity. For instance, an example was given in [15] (see also [25]) of a zero topological entropy system  $(X, T)$  whose hyperspace extension  $(\mathcal{K}(X), \overline{T})$  has positive topological entropy. As another example, it was proved in [4, 6] that for the generic homeomorphism  $h$  of the Cantor space  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ , the TDS  $(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}, h)$  has no Li-Yorke pair (in particular, it has zero topological entropy), but its hyperspace extension  $(\mathcal{K}(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}), \overline{h})$  is uniformly distributionally chaotic and has infinite topological entropy.

The situation for the extension  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widetilde{T})$  is completely different, at least from the point of view of topological entropy. Indeed, a deep and surprising result due to Glasner and Weiss [17] asserts that if  $(X, T)$  has zero topological entropy, then so does  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widetilde{T})$ . A corresponding result for the notion of null system was obtained by Kerr and Li [23]: if  $(X, T)$  is null, then so is  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widetilde{T})$ . Recall that  $(X, T)$  is said to be *null* if the topological sequence entropy of  $(X, T)$  is zero for any increasing sequence of natural numbers. Recently, Qiao and Zhou [28] obtained such a result for the notion of sequence entropy, which unified the above-mentioned results of Glasner-Weiss and Kerr-Li. We observe that the converses of these results are trivially true, since  $(X, T)$  can be regarded as a subsystem of  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widetilde{T})$ .

Our goal is to investigate the relationships between these systems for the notion of *uniformly positive entropy* (UPE). This notion was introduced by Blanchard [9] as a candidate for an analogue in topological dynamics for the notion of a  $K$ -process in ergodic theory. In fact, in that paper he proved that every non-trivial factor of an UPE system has positive topological entropy and, shortly after, he proved that an UPE system is disjoint from every minimal zero entropy system [10]. Although an UPE system is topologically weakly mixing but not always strongly mixing [10], Glasner and Weiss [16] proved that UPE is a necessary condition for a TDS  $(X, T)$  to have a  $T$ -invariant probability measure  $\mu$  of full support whose corresponding measurable dynamical system  $(X, T, \mu)$  is a  $K$ -process.

In this short note we prove that  $(X, T)$  has UPE if and only if so does  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \widetilde{T})$ . This result can be seen as a version of the Glasner-Weiss theorem [17] for the notion of uniformly positive entropy. In the proof of this result we will use local entropy theory; more precisely, we will use the characterization of UPE by means of the notion of an independence set given by Huang and Ye [20] (see also Kerr and Li [24]). Moreover, we will also use an important technique developed by Glasner and Weiss [17] which connects linear operators to combinatorics.

We point out that Huang and Ye [20] proved the corresponding result for the hyperspace, i.e., a TDS  $(X, T)$  has UPE if and only if  $(\mathcal{K}(X), \overline{T})$  has UPE.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Recall that the Prohorov metric  $d_P$  on  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  induces the so-called *weak\* topology*, that is, the topology whose basic open neighborhoods of  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  are the sets of the form

$$\mathbb{V}(\mu; f_1, \dots, f_k; \varepsilon) := \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X) : \left| \int_X f_i d\nu - \int_X f_i d\mu \right| < \varepsilon \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k \right\},$$

where  $k \geq 1$ ,  $f_1, \dots, f_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are continuous functions and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$\mathcal{M}_n(X) := \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i} \in \mathcal{M}(X) : x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \text{ not necessarily distinct} \right\},$$

where  $\delta_x$  denotes the unit mass concentrated at the point  $x$  of  $X$ . It is classical that  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_n(X)$  is dense in  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}_n(X)$  is  $\tilde{T}$ -invariant, we can consider the TDS  $(\mathcal{M}_n(X), \tilde{T})$ , where we are also denoting by  $\tilde{T}$  the corresponding restricted map. It will be convenient to denote  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  by  $\mathcal{M}_\infty(X)$ .

Let us now recall some definitions and notations from entropy theory. In what follows, all logarithms are in base 2. Let  $(X, T)$  be a TDS. Given covers  $\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_n$  of  $X$ , let

$$\mathcal{U}_1 \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{U}_n := \{U_1 \cap \dots \cap U_n : U_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{U}_n\}.$$

The *entropy* of an open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  is defined by

$$H(\mathcal{U}) := \log N(\mathcal{U}),$$

where  $N(\mathcal{U})$  denotes the minimum cardinality of a subcover of  $\mathcal{U}$ . The *topological entropy of  $T$  with respect to  $\mathcal{U}$*  is defined by

$$h_{\text{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\mathcal{U}^{n-1}),$$

where  $\mathcal{U}^{n-1} := \mathcal{U} \vee T^{-1}\mathcal{U} \vee \dots \vee T^{-(n-1)}\mathcal{U}$ , and the *topological entropy of  $T$*  is given by

$$h_{\text{top}}(T) := \sup_{\mathcal{U}} h_{\text{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}),$$

where the supremum is taken over all open covers of  $X$ . The notion of topological entropy was introduced by Adler, Konheim and McAndrew [1]. It plays a fundamental role in topological dynamics and its applications. Finally, an open cover  $\mathcal{U} = \{U, V\}$  of  $X$  consisting of two sets is called a *standard cover* if both  $U$  and  $V$  are non-dense in  $X$ . The TDS  $(X, T)$  is said to have *uniformly positive entropy* (UPE) if  $h_{\text{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}) > 0$  for every standard cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ . The notion of UPE is due to Blanchard [9].

The following useful characterization of UPE was given by Huang and Ye [20, Theorem 7.4(i)] (see also Kerr and Li [24]).

**Theorem 0.** *A TDS  $(X, T)$  has UPE if and only if every pair  $(U, V)$  of disjoint nonempty open sets in  $X$  has an independence set of positive density.*

Recall that a set  $I \subset \mathbb{N}$  is said to be an *independence set* for a tuple  $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k)$  of subsets of  $X$  if

$$\bigcap_{j \in I} T^{-j}(A_{\sigma(j)}) \neq \emptyset$$

for every nonempty finite subset  $J$  of  $I$  and every function  $\sigma : J \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Recall also that a subset  $I$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  has *positive density* if the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|I \cap \{1, \dots, n\}|}{n}$$

exists and is nonzero, where  $|K|$  denotes the cardinality of the subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{N}$ .

### 3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

**Lemma 1.** *The sets of the form*

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{W}(U_1, \dots, U_k; \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k) := \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X) : \nu(U_i) > \eta_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k\},$$

where  $k \geq 1$ ,  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  are nonempty disjoint open sets in  $X$  and  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k$  are positive real numbers with  $\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_k < 1$ , form a basis for the weak\* topology on  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathbb{W} := \mathbb{W}(U_1, \dots, U_k; \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k)$ . By inner regularity, there are compact sets  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  in  $X$  such that  $C_i \subset U_i$  and  $\mu(C_i) > \eta_i$  for all  $i$ . Let  $\delta > 0$  be so small that  $C_i^\delta \subset U_i$  and  $\mu(C_i) - \delta > \eta_i$  for all  $i$ . Then  $d_P(\nu, \mu) < \delta$  implies

$$\nu(U_i) \geq \nu(C_i^\delta) \geq \mu(C_i) - \delta > \eta_i \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, k\},$$

that is,  $\nu \in \mathbb{W}$ . This proves that  $\mathbb{W}$  is open in  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ .

Now, take an open ball  $B_{d_P}(\mu; \varepsilon)$  in  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  and choose  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$ . We claim that there exist disjoint open sets  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  in  $X$  such that

$$(2) \quad \text{diam } U_i < \delta \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$$

and

$$(3) \quad \mu(U_1) + \dots + \mu(U_k) > 1 - \delta/2.$$

Indeed, let  $\{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$  be an open cover of  $X$  by sets with diameters  $< \delta$ . Let  $C_0 := \emptyset$  and let  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  be compact sets in  $X$  such that

$$C_i \subset V_i \setminus (C_0 \cup \dots \cup C_{i-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(V_i \setminus (C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_i)) < \frac{\delta}{2k} \quad (i \in \{1, \dots, k\}).$$

Since  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  are disjoint and since (2) and (3) hold with  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  instead of  $U_1, \dots, U_k$ , it is clear that there exist  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  with the desired properties. Moreover, we may assume  $\mu(U_i) > 0$  for all  $i$ . Let  $Y := X \setminus (U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_k)$ . For each  $i$ , take  $\eta_i > 0$  with  $\mu(U_i) - \frac{\delta}{2k} < \eta_i < \mu(U_i)$ . We shall prove that

$$\mu \in \mathbb{W}(U_1, \dots, U_k; \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k) \subset B_{d_P}(\mu; \varepsilon).$$

It is clear that  $\mu \in \mathbb{W}(U_1, \dots, U_k; \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k)$ . Pick  $\nu \in \mathbb{W}(U_1, \dots, U_k; \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k)$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}_X$ . Let  $I := \{1 \leq i \leq k : A \cap U_i \neq \emptyset\}$ . Since  $\mu(Y) < \delta/2$  and  $A^\delta \cap U_i = U_i$  whenever  $i \in I$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(A^\delta) &\geq \sum_{i \in I} \nu(A^\delta \cap U_i) = \sum_{i \in I} \nu(U_i) > \sum_{i \in I} \eta_i > \sum_{i \in I} \mu(A \cap U_i) - \frac{\delta}{2} \\ &= \mu(A) - \mu(A \cap Y) - \frac{\delta}{2} > \mu(A) - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that  $d_P(\nu, \mu) \leq \delta < \varepsilon$ . □

**Lemma 2.** *Given nonempty open sets  $\mathbb{U}_0, \mathbb{U}_1$  in  $\mathcal{M}_n(X)$ , where  $1 \leq n \leq \infty$ , there exist  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and nonempty open sets  $U_{0,1}, \dots, U_{0,m}, U_{1,1}, \dots, U_{1,m}$  in  $X$  such that*

$$(4) \quad \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_{k,i}} \in \mathbb{U}_k \quad \text{whenever } x_{k,1} \in U_{k,1}, \dots, x_{k,m} \in U_{k,m} \quad (k \in \{0, 1\}).$$

Moreover, we can take  $m = n$  if  $n < \infty$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 1, there is an open set  $\mathbb{W}_k$  of the form  $\mathbb{W}(V_{k,1}, \dots, V_{k,j_k}; \eta_{k,1}, \dots, \eta_{k,j_k})$  in  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  such that

$$(5) \quad \emptyset \neq \mathbb{W}_k \cap \mathcal{M}_n(X) \subset \mathbb{U}_k \quad (k \in \{0, 1\}).$$

Assume  $n < \infty$  and take

$$(6) \quad \mu_k := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{y_{k,i}} \in \mathbb{W}_k \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Put  $m := n$ . For each  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , if  $y_{k,i} \in V_{k,j}$  for some (necessarily unique)  $j \in \{1, \dots, j_k\}$ , let  $U_{k,i}$  be an open neighborhood of  $y_{k,i}$  with  $U_{k,i} \subset V_{k,j}$ , and if  $y_{k,i} \notin V_{k,1} \cup \dots \cup V_{k,j_k}$ , put  $U_{k,i} := X$ . We claim that (4) holds. Indeed, take  $x_{k,1} \in U_{k,1}, \dots, x_{k,n} \in U_{k,n}$ . By (5), it is enough to show that

$$(7) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_{k,i}} \in \mathbb{W}_k.$$

Let  $r_{k,j} := |\{1 \leq i \leq n : y_{k,i} \in V_{k,j}\}|$  and  $s_{k,j} := |\{1 \leq i \leq n : x_{k,i} \in V_{k,j}\}|$ . Since  $y_{k,i} \in V_{k,j}$  implies  $x_{k,i} \in U_{k,i} \subset V_{k,j}$ , we have that  $r_{k,j} \leq s_{k,j}$ . Thus, by (6),

$$\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_{k,i}} \right) (V_{k,j}) = \frac{s_{k,j}}{n} \geq \frac{r_{k,j}}{n} = \mu_k(V_{k,j}) > \eta_{k,j},$$

for every  $1 \leq j \leq j_k$ , which proves (7).

Now, assume  $n = \infty$ . Since  $\bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_t(X)$  is dense in  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ , we can take

$$(8) \quad \nu_k := \frac{1}{t_k} \sum_{i=1}^{t_k} \delta_{z_{k,i}} \in \mathbb{W}_k \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, 1\}.$$

For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, t_k\}$ , let  $A_{k,i}$  be an open neighborhood of  $z_{k,i}$  with  $A_{k,i} \subset V_{k,j}$  if  $z_{k,i} \in V_{k,j}$  (put  $A_{k,i} := X$  if  $z_{k,i} \notin V_{k,1} \cup \dots \cup V_{k,j_k}$ ). Put  $m := t_0 t_1$  and produce a sequence  $U_{0,1}, \dots, U_{0,m}$  (resp.  $U_{1,1}, \dots, U_{1,m}$ ) by putting each  $A_{0,i}$  (resp. each  $A_{1,i}$ ) exactly  $t_1$  (resp.  $t_0$ ) times. By reasoning as in the previous paragraph, we obtain (4) from (5) and (8).  $\square$

We will also need the following result [17, Proposition 2.1]:

**Lemma 3.** *Given constants  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $b > 0$ , there exist constants  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $c > 0$  such that the following property holds for every  $m \geq m_0$ : if  $\varphi : \ell_1^k \rightarrow \ell_\infty^m$  is a linear map with  $\|\varphi\| \leq 1$ , and if  $\varphi(B_{\ell_1^k})$  contains more than  $2^{bm}$  points that are  $\varepsilon$ -separated, then  $k \geq 2^{cm}$ .*

We observe that  $\ell_1^k$  denotes the vector space  $\mathbb{R}^k$  endowed with the  $\ell_1$ -norm, that is,  $\|(r_1, \dots, r_k)\| := |r_1| + \dots + |r_k|$ , and that  $\ell_\infty^m$  denotes the vector space  $\mathbb{R}^m$  endowed with the  $\ell_\infty$ -norm, that is,  $\|(s_1, \dots, s_m)\| := \max\{|s_1|, \dots, |s_m|\}$ . Moreover,  $B_{\ell_1^k}$  denotes the closed unit ball of the Banach space  $\ell_1^k$ .

**Theorem 4.** *For every TDS  $(X, T)$ , the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $(X, T)$  has UPE;
- (ii)  $(\mathcal{M}_n(X), \tilde{T})$  has UPE for some  $1 \leq n \leq \infty$ ;
- (iii)  $(\mathcal{M}_n(X), \tilde{T})$  has UPE for every  $1 \leq n \leq \infty$ .

*Proof.* (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let us consider first the case  $n = \infty$ . Suppose that  $(\mathcal{M}(X), \tilde{T})$  has UPE. Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_0, U_1\}$  be a standard cover of  $X$ . We have to prove that  $h_{\text{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}) > 0$ . For this purpose, let  $V_0$  and  $V_1$  be nonempty open sets in  $X$  with

$$V_0 \subset U_0 \setminus \overline{U_1}, \quad V_1 \subset U_1 \setminus \overline{U_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{V_0} \cap \overline{V_1} = \emptyset.$$

Define

$$\mathbb{V}_0 := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) : \mu(V_0) > 0.9\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{V}_1 := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) : \mu(V_1) > 0.9\},$$

which are disjoint nonempty open sets in  $\mathcal{M}(X)$ . By Theorem 0, the pair  $(\mathbb{V}_0, \mathbb{V}_1)$  has an independence set  $I \subset \mathbb{N}$  of positive density. Let  $b > 0$  and  $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that

$$\frac{|I \cap \{1, \dots, m\}|}{m} > b \quad \text{whenever } m \geq m_1.$$

Put  $\varepsilon = 0.5$  and let  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $c > 0$  be the constants associated to  $\varepsilon$  and  $b$  according to Lemma 3. Fix  $m \geq \max\{m_0, m_1\}$  and choose a subcover  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{k_m}\}$  of  $\mathcal{U}^{m-1}$  with minimum cardinality. Let

$$B_1 := A_1 \quad \text{and} \quad B_i := A_i \setminus (A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_{i-1}) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq k_m.$$

As  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{k_m}\}$  is minimal, we have that  $B_i \neq \emptyset$  for every  $i$ . Let

$$M := [t_{i,j}]_{1 \leq i \leq k_m, 0 \leq j \leq m-1}$$

be a  $k_m \times m$  matrix of 0's and 1's such that

$$B_i \subset U_{t_{i,0}} \cap T^{-1}(U_{t_{i,1}}) \cap T^{-2}(U_{t_{i,2}}) \cap \dots \cap T^{-(m-1)}(U_{t_{i,m-1}}),$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq k_m$ . Consider the linear map  $\varphi : \ell_1^{k_m} \rightarrow \ell_\infty^m$  given by

$$\varphi(r_1, \dots, r_{k_m}) := [r_1 \ \dots \ r_{k_m}] M.$$

Clearly,  $\|\varphi\| \leq 1$ . Let  $J := I \cap \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Since  $I$  is an independence set for  $(\mathbb{V}_0, \mathbb{V}_1)$ , for each  $\sigma : J \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , there exists  $\mu_\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  such that

$$\tilde{T}^j(\mu_\sigma) \in \mathbb{V}_{\sigma(j)} \quad \text{for all } j \in J.$$

Let  $\sigma, \sigma' : J \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be distinct functions and let  $s \in J$  be such that  $\sigma(s) \neq \sigma'(s)$ . Let us assume  $\sigma(s) = 1$  and  $\sigma'(s) = 0$ . Then,

$$\mu_\sigma(T^{-s}(V_1)) > 0.9 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\sigma'}(T^{-s}(V_0)) > 0.9.$$

Since

$$T^{-s}(V_1) \subset \bigcup \{B_i : t_{i,s} = 1\} \subset T^{-s}(U_1)$$

(for the first inclusion use the fact that  $T^{-s}(V_1)$  and  $T^{-s}(U_0)$  are disjoint), we obtain

$$\mu(T^{-s}(V_1)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k_m} t_{i,s} \mu(B_i) \leq \mu(T^{-s}(U_1)) \quad (\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)).$$

Hence, the  $s^{\text{th}}$  coordinates of the points

$$\varphi(\mu_\sigma(B_1), \dots, \mu_\sigma(B_{k_m})) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(\mu_{\sigma'}(B_1), \dots, \mu_{\sigma'}(B_{k_m}))$$

are greater than 0.9 and smaller than 0.1, respectively, showing that these points are  $\varepsilon$ -separated. Since  $|J| > bm$ , there are more than  $2^{bm}$  functions  $\sigma$ . This shows that  $\varphi(B_{\ell_1^{k_m}})$  contains more than  $2^{bm}$  points that are  $\varepsilon$ -separated. Thus, by Lemma 3,  $k_m \geq 2^{cm}$ . This implies that  $h_{\text{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}) \geq c > 0$ , as desired.

Now, suppose that  $(\mathcal{M}_n(X), \tilde{T})$  has UPE for some  $2 \leq n < \infty$ . Given disjoint nonempty open sets  $U_0, U_1$  in  $X$ , consider

$$\mathbb{U}_0 := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_n(X) : \mu(U_0) > \frac{n-1}{n} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{U}_1 := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_n(X) : \mu(U_1) > \frac{n-1}{n} \right\},$$

which are disjoint nonempty open sets in  $\mathcal{M}_n(X)$ . Since  $(\mathcal{M}_n(X), \tilde{T})$  has UPE, the pair  $(\mathbb{U}_0, \mathbb{U}_1)$  has an independence set  $I \subset \mathbb{N}$  of positive density. Hence, given  $J \subset I$  nonempty and finite, and given  $\sigma : J \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , we have that

$$\bigcap_{j \in J} \tilde{T}^{-j}(\mathbb{U}_{\sigma(j)}) \neq \emptyset.$$

If  $\mu := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$  belongs to the above intersection, then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{T^j x_i} \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma(j)} \quad \text{for all } j \in J.$$

By the definitions of  $\mathbb{U}_0$  and  $\mathbb{U}_1$ , this implies that

$$\{T^j x_1, \dots, T^j x_n\} \subset U_{\sigma(j)} \quad \text{for all } j \in J.$$

Thus,

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \bigcap_{j \in J} T^{-j}(U_{\sigma(j)}),$$

proving that the above intersection is nonempty. Thus,  $I$  is an independence set of positive density for the pair  $(U_0, U_1)$ . By Theorem 0,  $(X, T)$  has UPE.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): Suppose that  $(X, T)$  has UPE. Fix  $1 \leq n \leq \infty$  and let  $\mathbb{U}_0, \mathbb{U}_1$  be disjoint nonempty open sets in  $\mathcal{M}_n(X)$ . By Lemma 2, there exist an integer  $m \geq 1$  and nonempty open sets  $U_{0,1}, \dots, U_{0,m}, U_{1,1}, \dots, U_{1,m}$  in  $X$  such that

$$(9) \quad R_m(U_{0,1} \times \dots \times U_{0,m}) \subset \mathbb{U}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad R_m(U_{1,1} \times \dots \times U_{1,m}) \subset \mathbb{U}_1,$$

where  $R_m(x_1, \dots, x_m) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_i}$ . Moreover, we may assume  $m = n$  if  $n < \infty$ . Let  $X_m := X \times \dots \times X$  ( $m$  times) and  $T_m := T \times \dots \times T$  ( $m$  times). Note that  $\tilde{T} \circ R_m = R_m \circ T_m$ . Since  $\mathbb{U}_0 \cap \mathbb{U}_1 = \emptyset$ , (9) implies that

$$(10) \quad (U_{0,1} \times \dots \times U_{0,m}) \cap (U_{1,1} \times \dots \times U_{1,m}) = \emptyset.$$

Since any finite product of UPE systems is a UPE system [14], the TDS  $(X_m, T_m)$  has UPE. Hence, by (10) and Theorem 0, there exists  $I \subset \mathbb{N}$  of positive density such that

$$\bigcap_{j \in J} T_m^{-j}(U_{\sigma(j),1} \times \dots \times U_{\sigma(j),m}) \neq \emptyset$$

for every nonempty finite subset  $J$  of  $I$  and every function  $\sigma : J \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . For such a  $J$  and such a  $\sigma$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{j \in J} \tilde{T}^{-j}(\mathbb{U}_{\sigma(j)}) &\supset \bigcap_{j \in J} \tilde{T}^{-j}(R_m(U_{\sigma(j),1} \times \dots \times U_{\sigma(j),m})) \\ &\supset \bigcap_{j \in J} R_m(T_m^{-j}(U_{\sigma(j),1} \times \dots \times U_{\sigma(j),m})) \\ &\supset R_m\left(\bigcap_{j \in J} T_m^{-j}(U_{\sigma(j),1} \times \dots \times U_{\sigma(j),m})\right) \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $I$  is an independence set of positive density for the pair  $(\mathbb{U}_0, \mathbb{U}_1)$ . Thus, by Theorem 0,  $(\mathcal{M}_n(X), \tilde{T})$  has UPE.  $\square$

#### 4. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank the referee for valuable suggestions which improved the exposition of the article.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. L. Adler, A. G. Konheim and M. H. McAndrew, *Topological entropy*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **114** (1965), 309–319.
- [2] E. Akin, J. Auslander and A. Nagar, *Dynamics of induced systems*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **37** (2017), no. 7, 2034–2059.
- [3] W. Bauer and K. Sigmund, *Topological dynamics of transformations induced on the space of probability measures*, Monatsh. Math. **79** (1975), 81–92.
- [4] N. C. Bernardes Jr. and U. B. Darji, *Graph theoretic structure of maps of the Cantor space*, Adv. Math. **231** (2012), no. 3-4, 1655–1680.
- [5] N. C. Bernardes Jr., A. Peris and F. Rodenas, *Set-valued chaos in linear dynamics*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **88** (2017), no. 4, 451–463.
- [6] N. C. Bernardes Jr. and R. M. Vermersch, *Hyperspace dynamics of generic maps of the Cantor space*, Canad. J. Math. **67** (2015), no. 2, 330–349.
- [7] N. C. Bernardes Jr. and R. M. Vermersch, *On the dynamics of induced maps on the space of probability measures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **368** (2016), no. 11, 7703–7725.
- [8] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999.
- [9] F. Blanchard, *Fully positive topological entropy and topological mixing*, Symbolic Dynamics and Its Applications (New Haven, CT, 1991), 95–105, Contemp. Math., 135, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.
- [10] F. Blanchard, *A disjointness theorem involving topological entropy*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **121** (1993), no. 4, 465–478.
- [11] U. B. Darji and H. Kato, *Chaos and indecomposability*, Adv. Math. **304** (2017), 793–808.
- [12] R. M. Dudley, *Real Analysis and Probability*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 74, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [13] L. Fernández and C. Good, *Shadowing for induced maps of hyperspaces*, Fund. Math. **235** (2016), no. 3, 277–286.
- [14] E. Glasner, *A simple characterization of the set of  $\mu$ -entropy pairs and applications*, Israel J. Math. **102** (1997), no. 1, 13–27.
- [15] E. Glasner and B. Weiss, *Dynamics and entropy of the space of measures*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **317** (1993), no. 3, 239–243.
- [16] E. Glasner and B. Weiss, *Strictly ergodic, uniform positive entropy models*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **122** (1994), no. 3, 399–412.
- [17] E. Glasner and B. Weiss, *Quasi-factors of zero entropy systems*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (1995), no. 3, 665–686.
- [18] E. Glasner and X. Ye, *Local entropy theory*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **29** (2009), no. 2, 321–356.
- [19] J. L. G. Guirao, D. Kwietniak, M. Lampart, P. Oprocha and A. Peris, *Chaos on hyperspaces*, Nonlinear Anal. **71** (2009), no. 1-2, 1–8.
- [20] W. Huang and X. Ye, *A local variational relation and applications*, Israel J. Math. **151** (2006), 237–279.
- [21] A. Illanes and S. B. Nadler Jr., *Hyperspaces: Fundamentals and Recent Advances*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1999.
- [22] A. S. Kechris, *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [23] D. Kerr and H. Li, *Dynamical entropy in Banach spaces*, Invent. Math. **162** (2005), no. 3, 649–686.
- [24] D. Kerr and H. Li, *Independence in topological and  $C^*$ -dynamics*, Math. Ann. **338** (2007), no. 4, 869–926.
- [25] D. Kwietniak and P. Oprocha, *Topological entropy and chaos for maps induced on hyperspaces*, Chaos Solitons Fractals **33** (2007), no. 1, 76–86.
- [26] J. Li, P. Oprocha and X. Wu, *Furstenberg families, sensitivity and the space of probability measures*, Nonlinearity **30** (2017), no. 3, 987–1005.
- [27] J. Li, K. Yan and X. Ye, *Recurrence properties and disjointness on the induced spaces*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **35** (2015), no. 3, 1059–1073.
- [28] Y. Qiao and X. Zhou, *Zero sequence entropy and entropy dimension*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **37** (2017), no. 1, 435–448.
- [29] K. Sigmund, *Affine transformations on the space of probability measures*, Astérisque **51** (1978), 415–427.



DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO, CAIXA POSTAL 68530, RIO DE JANEIRO, RJ, 21945-970, BRAZIL.

*Email address:* ncbernardesjr@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISVILLE, KY 40208-2772, USA.

*Email address:* ubdarj01@louisville.edu

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, CENTRO DE CIÊNCIAS FÍSICAS E MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA, FLORIANÓPOLIS, SC, 88040-900, BRAZIL.

*Email address:* romulo.vermersch@gmail.com