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Abstract

We consider higher-rank Deaconu-Renault groupoids, constructed from a finite number of commuting local homeomorphisms acting on a compact metric space, and study generalized Ruelle operators and \( C^* \)-algebras associated to these groupoids. We provide a new characterization of 1-cocycles on these groupoids taking on values in a locally compact abelian group, given in terms of \( k \)-tuple of continuous functions on the unit space satisfying certain canonical identities. Using this, we develop an extended Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius theory for dynamical systems of several commuting operators (k-Ruelle triples and commuting Ruelle operators). Results on KMS states on \( C^* \)-algebras constructed from Deaconu-Renault groupoids of higher rank are derived. When the Deaconu-Renault groupoids being studied come from higher-rank graphs, our results recover existence-uniqueness results for KMS states associated to the graphs.
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1 Introduction

Let \( X \) be a compact Hausdorff space and \( \sigma : X \to X \) a local homeomorphism of \( X \) onto itself. The so-called Deaconu-Renault groupoid corresponding to the pair \( (X, \sigma) \) and its associated
$C^*$-algebra were first studied by V. Deaconu in [7] based on a construction of J. Renault in [21] in the setting of groupoids of Cuntz algebras. Deaconu adapted Renault’s construction by replacing the shift map on the infinite sequence space with a local homeomorphism. Renault further generalized this construction to local homeomorphisms defined on open subsets in [22]. We refer to the étale groupoid associated to a finite family of commuting local homeomorphisms of a compact metric space as a higher-rank Deaconu-Renault groupoid. In [26], Deaconu-Renault groupoids were generalized to the setting of partial semigroup actions. Our main purpose in this paper is the study of Deaconu-Renault groupoids of higher rank, their associated $C^*$-algebras and KMS states that arise naturally on a specific class of related dynamical systems. This is a sufficiently broad class to include higher-rank graph algebras associated to finite $k$-graphs. We develop cohomological methods to characterize 1-cocycles on these $C^*$-algebras, which in turn give rise to one-parameter automorphism groups. This leads us to study the KMS states on these $C^*$-algebras.

KMS states have their origin in equilibrium statistical mechanics and have long been a very fruitful tool in the study of operator algebras. In this paper, we study KMS states for Deaconu-Renault groupoids of higher rank by further developing a Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius (RPF) theory of dynamical systems of several commuting operators. Although an RPF theory for free abelian semigroups has been introduced by M. Carvalho, F. Rodrigues, and P. Varandas in [4] and [5], their main emphasis was on skew products, random walks, and topological entropy, whereas our emphasis here will be on the connection to the $C^*$-algebras and the use of the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operator to prove the existence of measures with appropriate properties (hence states with related properties).

In the groupoid perspective, as first explained by Renault in [21], time evolutions (dynamics) on the reduced $C^*$-algebra of a groupoid $\mathcal{G}$ are implemented by continuous real-valued 1-cocycles on $\mathcal{G}$, and the task of understanding the KMS states for these dynamics on $C^*_r(\mathcal{G})$ requires, at a minimum, identifying the measures on the unit space of $\mathcal{G}$ that are quasi-invariant. There are now refinements of Renault’s result; see, for example, work by S. Neshveyev [18] and K. Thomsen [30]. More recently, J. Christensen’s paper [6] combines quasi-invariant measures with a certain group of symmetries to describe KMS states on groupoid $C^*$-algebras for locally compact second countable Hausdorff étale groupoids.

Our analysis of the KMS states on Deaconu-Renault groupoids of rank $k$ stems from a new characterization of their continuous real-valued 1-cocycle, which in a nutshell are determined completely by a $k$-tuple of continuous real-valued functions on the unit space of the groupoid satisfying canonical identities. In so doing, we give an isomorphism between the first monoid cohomology for $\mathbb{N}^k$ with coefficients in the module $C(X,H)$, where $H$ is a locally compact abelian group, and the first continuous cocycle groupoid cohomology taking values in $H$.

We base our constructions on the established analysis of KMS states on Deaconu-Renault groupoids of rank 1 ([15], [11], [23]), together with an extended Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius theory for dynamical systems of several commuting operators, modeled on the one-dimensional theory of Ruelle [27] and P. Walters [31].

In [15], A. Kumjian and J. Renault associated KMS states to Ruelle operators constructed on a groupoid arising from a single expansive map, and in [11], M. Ionescu and A. Kumjian
related the associated states to Hausdorff measures, which led to applications to KMS states on Cuntz algebras, $C^*$-algebras arising from directed graphs, and $C^*$-algebras associated to fractafolds. In addition, Ruelle operators were used in [2]. In this paper, we generalize some of these results to Deaconu-Renault groupoids of rank $k$. In particular, we deduce that in order for the adjoint of the Ruelle operator associated to a finite family of commuting local homeomorphism to have an eigenmeasure, it is necessary and sufficient that the adjoint of the Ruelle operator corresponding to a non-trivial product of the local homeomorphisms have that same eigenmeasure, thus reducing matters to the one-dimensional case studied by P. Walters in his work.

Ruelle operators are important tools in mathematical physics, particularly thermodynamics, and yield a formulation of a “continuous” extension of the seminal Perron-Frobenius Theorem. Ruelle’s classical result, known as the “Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius (RPF) Theorem” gives a sufficient condition for a Ruelle triple to be RPF [27, 28]. In [32], building on earlier work of Bowen, P. Walters gave criteria for the RPF Theorem to hold for more general Ruelle triples $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ merely demanding that $X$ be a metric space, $\sigma$ be positively expansive and exact and that $\varphi$ satisfy a smoothness condition. We extend the RPF Theorem to certain Ruelle triples on metric spaces of type $(X, \sigma, \varphi) := \{(X, \sigma_j, \varphi_j)\}_{j=1,\ldots,k}$, where the $\sigma_i$ form a commuting family of local homeomorphisms which are positively expansive and exact, and the $\varphi_j$ satisfies the Walters criteria.

Recently there has been great interest (cf. [1, 16, 10]) in the KMS states associated to 1-parameter dynamical systems on $C^*(\Lambda)$ where $\Lambda$ is a higher-rank graph and the dynamics arise either from the canonical gauge action of $\mathbb{T}^k$ on $C^*(\Lambda)$ or from a generalized gauge action. In particular, for a finite, strongly connected $k$-graph, in [1, 16, 10], one can endow $C^*(\Lambda)$ with a (generalized) gauge dynamics and show the existence of unique KMS states. Here we are able to recover some of the results in [1, 16, 10] from a different perspective, using the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius theorem.

In a follow-up paper, we plan to extend our results to topological $k$-graphs.

We now outline the structure of the paper. Section 2 introduces classical Ruelle triples, RPF triples and Ruelle operators. These are basic objects that we will generalize to higher-dimensions in Section 4, and we review several essential results of P. Walters, R. Bowen and D. Ruelle in this section. In Section 3, we review the construction of Deaconu-Renault groupoids of higher rank, and then give an algebraic way of constructing all continuous 1-cocycles on these Deaconu-Renault groupoids taking on values values in a locally compact abelian group; we will mainly be interested in 1-cocycle taking on values in $\mathbb{R}$. In Section 4, we introduce $k$-Ruelle dynamical systems and $k$-RPF dynamical systems, which are higher-rank analogs of Ruelle triples, and the corresponding commuting Ruelle operators. In Section 5, we use the results of the previous sections to consider the Radon-Nikodym Problem for Deaconu-Renault groupoids, which provides a link between quasi-invariant measures for these groupoids and KMS states for generalized gauge dynamics. In particular, we prove that if the generalized Ruelle operator associated to a $k$-RPF system has an eigenmeasure with eigenvalue 1, then there exists a KMS-state for the generalized gauge dynamics on the $C^*$-algebra constructed from the related Deaconu-Renault groupoid. Finally, in Section 6, we apply the results obtained thus far to answer some existence and uniqueness questions.
concerning KMS states for generalized gauge dynamics associated to higher-rank graphs.

1.1 Notation and Conventions

In what follows, we adopt the following notation and conventions. By $\mathbb{N}$ we denote the monoid of natural integers $\{0,1,2,\ldots\}$ under addition, and for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 1$, let $[k] = \{1,\ldots,k\}$. For every finite nonempty set $A$, and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A^n$ denote the set of all finite words in $A$, with $A^0 = \{\emptyset\}$, with $\emptyset$ the empty word. In addition $A^* = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A^n$ will denote the set of all finite words in the alphabet $A$. Let $\mathbb{N}_+$ denote the set of positive integers, and fixing an arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, let $\text{Length} : [k]^* \to \mathbb{N}$ denote the function that maps each element of $[k]^*$ to its length. If $s \in [k]^*$ is a word with $\text{Length}(s) = n \geq 1$, we define $s(i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ by $s(i) = s_i \in [k]$, where $s_i$ is the $i$th “letter” in the word $s$. For each $s \in [k]^*$, let $\hat{s}$ denote the operation that reverses the order of the entries of $s$, that is, if $\text{Length}(s) = n$, then

$$\hat{s}(i) = s(n-i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$ 

The function $\text{Lex} : [k]^* \to [k]^*$ maps each element of $[k]^*$ to its lexicographic form, i.e., if $k = 3$ and we consider $(121) \in [3]^*$, $\text{Lex}((121)) = (112)$.

The binary operation $\cdot : [k]^* \times [k]^* \to [k]^*$ denotes concatenation on $[k]^*$, e.g. for $k = 3$, $s = (123) \in [3]^*$ and $t = (22) \in [3]^*$, we have $s \cdot t = (12322) \in [3]^*$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 1$, we let $\mathbb{N}^k$ be the monoid of $k$-tuples of natural numbers under addition. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, $n = (n(1),\ldots,n(k))$, let

$$\overline{n} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \ldots 1 & 2 \ldots 2 & \ldots & k \ldots k \\ n(1) & n(2) & \ldots & n(k) \end{pmatrix} \in [k]^*;$$

note $\text{Length}(\overline{n}) = |n| = n(1) + \ldots + n(k)$. Conversely, given $w \in [k]^*$ with $w = (w_1 w_2 \ldots w_\ell)$, define

$$\overline{w} := (w(1),w(2),\ldots,w(\ell)) \in \mathbb{N}^k,$$

where $w(j)$ is the number of $j$’s in $w$. Clearly

$$\overline{n} = n \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{w} = \text{Lex}(w).$$

For every locally compact Hausdorff space $X$, let $\mathcal{M}(X)$ denote the Banach space of finite signed Radon measures on the Borel subsets of $X$, which is isometrically isomorphic to the dual space $C_0(X,\mathbb{R})'$ of $C_0(X,\mathbb{R})$, the continuous real-valued functions on $X$ that vanish at infinity.

For every (locally) compact Hausdorff étale groupoid $\mathcal{G}$, there is a standard dense linear embedding of $C_c(\mathcal{G})$ into $C^*_r(\mathcal{G})$. However, the groupoids that we study are amenable, so unless there is a danger of confusion, we shall identify $f \in C_c(\mathcal{G})$ with its image (also denoted by $f$) in $C^*_r(\mathcal{G}) \cong C^*(\mathcal{G})$.

In this paper $X$ will always denote a (non-empty) compact Hausdorff topological space.
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2 Ruelle Triples and Ruelle Operators

We begin by defining Ruelle triples and Ruelle operators (sometimes called transfer operators) introduced in [27] in the case of totally disconnected spaces, and generalized to arbitrary compact metric spaces by P. Walters in [31] and [32]. These will be the basic objects of concern in this paper. Ruelle operators are important tools in mathematical physics, particularly thermodynamics, and yield a formulation of a “continuous” extension of the classical Perron-Frobenius Theorem. In [15], A. Kumjian and J. Renault associated KMS states to Ruelle operators constructed on a groupoid arising from a single expansive map on a compact metric space, and in [11], M. Ionescu and A. Kumjian related the associated states to a Hausdorff measure on $X$, which led to applications to KMS states on Cuntz algebras, $C^*$-algebras arising from directed graphs, and $C^*$-algebras associated to fractafolds.

Definition 2.1. (Ruelle Triples and Operators)
1. A Ruelle triple is an ordered triple $(X, T, \varphi)$, where
   (a) $X$ is a compact metric space.
   (b) $T : X \to X$ is a surjective local homeomorphism.
   (c) $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, that is, $\varphi \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, the set of of continuous functions from $X$ to $\mathbb{R}$.

2. The Ruelle operator associated to a Ruelle triple $(X, T, \varphi)$ is the bounded linear operator
   \[ R_{X,T,\varphi} : C(X, \mathbb{R}) \to C(X, \mathbb{R}) \]
   defined by:
   \[ \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}), \forall x \in X : \quad R_{X,T,\varphi}(f)(x) := \sum_{y \in T^{-1}\{x\}} e^{\varphi(y)} f(y). \]

Our goal is to extend some results from [15] and [11] from a single local homeomorphisms to commuting families of local homeomorphisms on $X$, in part by employing cohomological methods. The following lemma describes how to take the composition of two Ruelle triples associated to commuting local homeomorphisms, and their associated commuting Ruelle operators.

Lemma 2.2. (Composition of Ruelle Operators) Let $(X, S, \varphi)$ and $(X, T, \psi)$ be Ruelle triples. Then $(X, S \circ T, \varphi \circ T + \psi)$ is a Ruelle triple, and
   \[ R_{X,S,\varphi} \circ R_{X,T,\psi} = R_{X,S \circ T, \varphi \circ T + \psi}. \]
Proof. Firstly, a straightforward calculation shows that $(X, S \circ T, \varphi \circ T + \psi)$ is a Ruelle triple. Moreover, by using the set equality

$$(S \circ T)^{-1} \{x\} = \bigcup_{y \in S^{-1} \{x\}} T^{-1} \{y\},$$

for all $x \in X$, we see that for all $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $x \in X$ we have

$$[(R_{X,S,\varphi} \circ R_{X,T,\psi})(f)](x) = \left[\sum_{y \in S^{-1} \{x\}} e^\varphi(y) [R_{X,T,\psi}(f)](y) \right] = \left[\sum_{y \in S^{-1} \{x\}} \left( e^\varphi(y) \sum_{z \in T^{-1} \{y\}} e^\psi(z) f(z) \right) \right] = \left[\sum_{z \in (S \circ T)^{-1} \{x\}} e^\varphi(T(z)) + \psi(z) f(z) \right] = [R_{X,S \circ T,\varphi \circ T + \psi}(f)](x),$$

which proves the lemma.

We will now define an important subclass of Ruelle triples, the RPF triples; RPF stands for Ruelle Perron Frobenius. These Ruelle triples enjoy important fixed-point properties, and admit generalizations to dynamical systems that will be described in Section 4.

**Definition 2.3.** (RPF Triples) A Ruelle triple $(X, T, \varphi)$ is said to be RPF if there exists a unique ordered pair $(\lambda, \mu)$, called the RPF pair of $(X, T, \varphi)$, such that

1. $\lambda$ is a positive real number.
2. $\mu$ is a Borel probability measure on $X$.
3. $(R_{X,T,\varphi})^\star(\mu) = \lambda \mu$, where $(R_{X,T,\varphi})^\star : \mathcal{M}(X) \to \mathcal{M}(X)$ denotes the extension of $R_{X,T,\varphi}$ to the set $\mathcal{M}(X)$ of Borel probability measures on $X$.

Ruelle’s classical result, known as the “Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius (RPF) Theorem”, generalizes the seminal Perron-Frobenius Theorem for primitive matrices to subshifts of finite type, and gives a sufficient condition for a Ruelle triple to be RPF [27, 28]. The RPF theorem below is taken from [8, Theorem 2.2].

To introduce the required notation to state the RPF theorem, fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, let $A = (A_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq k}$ be an $n \times n$ zero-one matrix with no row or column of zeros, and let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be the the associated (one-sided) subshift of finite type, namely the dynamical system $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ where $\Sigma_A$ is the compact topological subspace of the infinite product space $\prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ defined by:

$$\Sigma_A := \{ x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) \in \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} : A_{x_i, x_{i+1}} = 1, \forall i \geq 0 \},$$

$$6$$
and $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$ is the “left shift”, namely the continuous function $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$ given by

$$\sigma(x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots).$$

Moreover, given a real number $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we define a compatible metric $d$ on $\Sigma_A$ by setting, for $x, y \in \Sigma_A$, $x \neq y$ $d(x, y) = \beta^{|N(x, y)|}$, where $N(x, y)$ is the largest integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_i = y_i, \forall i < N$.

**Theorem 2.4. (Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius Theorem)** With notation as above let $\varphi$ be a continuous real-valued function defined on $\Sigma_A$. Suppose that:

1. There exists a positive integer $m \in \mathbb{N} > 0$ such that $A^m > 0$ (in the sense that all entries are $> 0$), and
2. $\varphi$ is Hölder continuous.

Then there are: a strictly positive function $h \in C(\Sigma_A, \mathbb{R})$, a Borel probability measure $\mu$ on $\Sigma_A$, and a real number $\lambda > 0$, such that

1. $(\mathcal{R}_{\Sigma_A, \sigma, \varphi})(h) = \lambda h$, and
2. $(\mathcal{R}_{\Sigma_A, \sigma, \varphi})^*(\mu) = \lambda \mu$.

In other words, $(\Sigma_A, \sigma, \varphi)$ is RPF.

In the sequel, we will also refer to the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius Theorem as the RPF Theorem. In [32], P. Walters gave criteria for the RPF Theorem to hold for more general Ruelle triples $\mathcal{R}_{X, T, \varphi}$, merely demanding that $X$ be a metric space, $T$ be positively expansive and exact, and that $\varphi$ obey some summability condition. We will now detail these results.

**Definition 2.5. (The Walters Criteria)** Let $(X, T, \varphi)$ be a Ruelle triple, and let $d$ be the metric on $X$. $(X, T, \varphi)$ is said to satisfy the The Walters Criteria if the following properties hold:

1. $T$ is positively expansive, i.e., there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all distinct $x, y \in X$, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(T^n(x), T^n(y)) \geq \epsilon$.
2. $T$ is exact, i.e., for every non-empty open subset $U$ of $X$, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T^n[U] = X$.
3. (Bowen’s Condition [3]) There exists a compatible metric $d$ on $X$ and positive numbers $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ with the property that for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and for all $x, y \in X$ we have $d(T^i(x), T^i(y)) \leq \delta$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n - 1\}$ implies

$$\left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i(x)) - \varphi(T^i(y)) \right| \leq C.$$

Note that $T$ is positively expansive if and only if there is an open neighborhood $U$ of $\Delta(X)$, the diagonal of $X$, such that for all distinct $x, y \in X$, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(T^n(x), T^n(y)) \notin U$. 
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We now recall that if \((X,T,\varphi)\) is a Ruelle triple, with \(T\) positively expansive, then there exist a compatible metric \(D\) on \(X\) (called a “Reddy metric”) satisfying [20], [33], i.e., there exists \(\tau > 0, \lambda > 1\) such that for \(x, y \in X\)

\[
D(x, y) < \tau \implies D(x, y) < \frac{1}{\lambda} D(T(x), T(y)).
\]

The following proposition is useful for showing that Bowen’s condition of Definition 2.5(3) is satisfied.

**Proposition 2.6.** Let \((X,T,\varphi)\) is a Ruelle triple, with \(T\) positively expansive. If \(\varphi\) is Hölder-continuous with respect to a compatible metric \(d\) on \(X\), then Bowen’s condition of Definition 2.5(3) is satisfied for \(d\) by \(\varphi\) with respect to \(T\).

**Proof.** We will first show that if \(\varphi\) is Hölder-continuous with respect to a Reddy metric \(D\) on \(X\), then Bowen’s condition of Definition 2.5(3) is satisfied for \(D\) by \(\varphi\) with respect to \(T\).

For, suppose that for all \(x, y \in X\)

\[
|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq K(D(x, y))^r \quad \text{for} \ r \in (0, 1].
\]

Then, choosing \(\delta = \min\{\tau, \frac{1}{\lambda}\}\), if \(n \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}\) and \(D(T^j(x), T^j(y)) < \delta\), for \(0 \leq j \leq n - 1\), we will have by the Reddy metric condition that

\[
\lambda^j D(T^{n-1-j}(x), T^{n-1-j}y) \leq D(T^{n-1}(x), T^{n-1}(y)) < \delta, \ 0 \leq j \leq n - 1,
\]

so that

\[
D(T^{n-1-j}(x), T^{n-1-j}(y)) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^{n-j} \delta, \ 0 \leq j \leq n - 1,
\]

and, changing index,

\[
D(T^i(x), T^i(y)) < \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^i \delta, \ 0 \leq i \leq n - 1.
\]

Therefore,

\[
\left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i(x)) - \varphi(T^i(y)) \right| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\varphi(T^i(x)) - \varphi(T^i(y))| \\
\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} K(D(T^i(x), T^i(y)))^r \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} K \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^i \delta^r = K \delta^r \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^r i.
\]

Letting \(\kappa = \frac{1}{\lambda}\) and using the formula for geometric progressions we get that

\[
K \delta^r \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^r i < K \delta^r \frac{1}{1 - \kappa} = \frac{K \delta^r}{1 - \kappa^r}.
\]
Taking \( C = \frac{K \delta^2}{1 - \nu} \), we see that if \( x, y \in X \) satisfy \( D(T^i(x), T^i(y)) \leq \delta \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n - 1 \), we have
\[
\left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i(x)) - \varphi(T^i(y)) \right| \leq C,
\]
which shows Bowen’s condition of Definition 2.5(3) for \( D \) by \( \varphi \) with respect to \( h \). To prove the Proposition is now enough to note that since \( X \) is compact, every two compatible metrics are uniformly equivalent, and so if one of them is H’older, so is any other compatible metric, including any Reddy metric. \( \square \)

The main results of [32] and [12] yield the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.7.** (RPF Triples) A Ruelle triple is RPF if it satisfies the Walters Criteria.

In [12], Y. Jiang and Y.-L. Ye stated analogous conditions for weakly contractive iterated-function systems for which results similar to Theorem 2.7 hold.

## 3 Continuous 1-Cocycles on Deaconu-Renault Groupoids

In this section, our objective is to give an algebraic way of constructing all continuous \( H \)-valued 1-cocycles, where \( H \) is a locally compact abelian group, on Deaconu-Renault groupoids. In later sections we will mainly be interested in the case \( H = \mathbb{R} \). We begin by recalling the definition of Deaconu-Renault groupoid.

**Definition 3.1.** (Deaconu-Renault Groupoids [7]) Let \( \sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]} \) be a \( k \)-tuple of commuting surjective local homeomorphism on the locally compact Hausdorff space \( X \). We regard \( \sigma \) as an action of \( \mathbb{N}^k \) on \( X \) by the formula \( \sigma^n = \sigma_1^{n_1} \ldots \sigma_k^{n_k} \) where \( n = (n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k \). The associated Deaconu-Renault groupoid \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \) is defined by:
\[
\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) := \{(x, p - q, y) \in X \times \mathbb{Z}^k \times X : \sigma^p(x) = \sigma^q(y), \ p, q \in \mathbb{N}^k \}.
\]

We identify \( X \) with the unit space of \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \) via the map \( x \mapsto (x, 0, x) \). The structure maps are given by \( r(x, n, y) = x, s(x, n, y) = y, \ (x, m, y)^{-1} = (y, -m, x) \), and \( (x, m, y)(y, n, z) = (x, m + n, z) \). A basis for the topology on \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \) is given by subsets of the form \( \mathcal{Z}(U, V, m, n) := U \times \{p - q\} \times V \), where \( U, V \) are open in \( X \) and \( \sigma^p(U) = \sigma^q(V) \). We will denote by \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)^{(2)} \) the set of composable pairs of \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \).

We call \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \) the Deaconu-Renault groupoid associated to \( (X, \sigma) \). The number \( k \) is called the rank of \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \).

It is well known that \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \) is an étale locally compact Hausdorff amenable groupoid (cf. [26], [7]).

**Definition 3.2.** (Groupoid 1-Cocycles)

1. Let \( \mathcal{G} \) be a groupoid and \( A \) be an abelian group. An \( A \)-valued 1-cocycle on \( \mathcal{G} \) is a function \( c : \mathcal{G} \to A \) such that for any \( (\gamma, \gamma') \) in \( \mathcal{G}^{(2)} \) we have
\[
c(\gamma \gamma') = c(\gamma) + c(\gamma').
\]
In other words, $c$ is just a groupoid homomorphism from $G$ to $A$, with $A$ being viewed as a groupoid.

2. If $G$ is a locally compact groupoid and $A$ a locally compact group, then 1-cocycle will be required to be continuous. In this case we will denote by $Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G; A)$ the set of continuous $A$-valued 1-cocycles on $G$.

It is well known that $Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G; A)$ is a group under pointwise addition and that $B^1_{\text{cont}}(G; A)$, the collection of continuous functions $c : G \to A$ such that there is a continuous function $f : G(0) \to A$ such that for all $\gamma \in G$, $c(\gamma) = f(r(\gamma)) - f(s(\gamma))$, is a subgroup of $Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G; A)$.

We define the first continuous cocycle groupoid cohomology of $G$ by

$$H^1_{\text{cont}}(G; A) := Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G; A)/B^1_{\text{cont}}(G; A).$$

Our goal is to give an algebraic characterization of the cocycles in $Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G(X, \sigma), A)$ (for a Deaconu-Renault groupoid $G(X, \sigma)$) expressed in terms of their coordinate defining functions as given in (2) below. To do so, we will introduce the following definition.

**Definition 3.3.** (The Cocycle Condition) Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ be an ordered triple with:

1. $X$ a compact metric space.
2. $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]}$ a commuting tuple of $k$ surjective local homeomorphisms of $X$.
3. $\varphi = (\varphi_i)_{i \in [k]}$ a tuple of $k$ functions in $C(X, H)$, where $H$ is a locally compact abelian group.

Then $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ is said to satisfy the Cocycle Condition of order $k$ if

$$\forall i, j \in [k] : \quad \varphi_i + \varphi_j \circ \sigma_i = \varphi_j + \varphi_i \circ \sigma_j.$$  

When the order $k$ is understood, we will omit it, and just say that $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ satisfies the Cocycle Condition.

The Cocycle condition will be the characterizing feature for Ruelle triples in the case of a finite family of commuting endomorphisms, see Definition 4.1.

In Theorem 3.6, we will make explicit how the Cocycle Condition given in Definition 3.3 is related to the construction of continuous $H$-valued 1-cocycles on Deaconu-Renault groupoids. But first we prove a combinatorial lemma.

Let $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ be a triple that satisfies Conditions (1), (2) and (3) of Definition 3.3. Define $F_{X, \sigma, \varphi} : [k]^* \to C(X, H)$ by

$$\forall s \in [k]^* \setminus \{\emptyset\} : \quad F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(s) := \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} \varphi_{s(i)} \circ \sigma \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s(j)}; \quad F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\emptyset) := 0, \quad (1)$$

where $e_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$ are the canonical generators of $\mathbb{N}^k$, and we have used vector notation to denote the powers of $\sigma$, and by convention we take the empty sum equal to 0. We will call $F_{X, \sigma, \varphi} : [k]^* \to C(X, H)$, the “aggregate function” associated to $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$.
In the formulas below we will use the established notation where \( s(i) \) denotes the \( i \)-th entry of \( s \), and \( \{e_j\}_{j=1,...,k} \) will denote the canonical generators of \( \mathbb{N}^k \) or \( \mathbb{Z}^k \).

**Lemma 3.4. (Combinatorial Lemma)** Let \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) be a triple satisfying Conditions (1), (2) and (3) of Definition 3.3. Then the following hold:

1. \( F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s \sim t) = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s) + F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(t) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(t)} e_{s(i)}} \) for all \( s, t \in [k]^* \).

2. \( \prod_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma,\varphi(i)} = \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma,\varphi}^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{s(i)}, F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s)} \) for all \( s \in [k]^* \), where tilde means to reverse the order of all the letters in the word.

3. If in addition \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) satisfies the Cocycle Condition, then

\[
\forall s, t \in [k]^*: \quad \text{Lex}(s) = \text{Lex}(t) \implies F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s) = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(t),
\]

where we denote by \( \text{Lex} \) the lexicographic order function defined in the introduction.

**Remark 3.5.** Equation (2) allows us to extend \( F \) to a map \( F : \mathbb{N}^k \to C(X, H) \) by setting

\[
F(n) := F(\overline{n}), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}^k.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( s, t \in [k]^* \). We have

\[
F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s \sim t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s-t)} \varphi(s-t)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s-t}(j)}
\]

length(s)+length(t)

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)+\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(s-t)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s-t}(j)}
\]

length(s)

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)+\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(s-t)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s-t}(j)} + \sum_{i=\text{Length}(s)+1}^{\text{Length}(s)+\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(s-t)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s-t}(j)}
\]

length(s)

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)} + \sum_{i=\text{Length}(s)+1}^{\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)}
\]

length(t)

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)} + \sum_{i=\text{Length}(s)+1}^{\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)}
\]

length(t)

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)} + \sum_{i=\text{Length}(s)+1}^{\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)}
\]

length(t)

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)} + \sum_{i=\text{Length}(s)+1}^{\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)}
\]

length(t)

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} \varphi(s)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s}(j)} + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(t)} \varphi(t)(i) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{t}(j)} \right) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{s}(j)}
\]
\[= F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s) + F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(t) \circ \sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{s(i)}},\]

which establishes (1).

To prove (2), we use induction on \(\text{Length}(s)\). When \(\text{Length}(s) = 0\), i.e., \(s = \emptyset\), (2) is vacuously true as

\[
\sigma^0 = \text{Id}_X; \\
F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\emptyset) = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\emptyset) = 0_{C(X,H)}; \\
\prod_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} R_{X,\sigma_{s(i)}},\varphi_{s(i)} = \text{Id}_{C(X,H)} = R_{X,\text{Id}_X,0_{C(X,H)}}.
\]

For the inductive step, suppose now that (2) is true for some \(s \in [k]^*\), and let \(t = s \bowtie l\) for some \(l \in [k]\). (Here \(l\) is the word consisting of the one letter \(\ell\).) Then

\[
\sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(t)} e_{t(i)}} = \sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)+1} e_{(i-\ell)(i)}} \\
= \sigma^{\sum_{i=2}^{\text{Length}(s)+1} e_{(i-\ell)(i)} + e_\ell} \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{(i-\ell)(i+1)} + e_\ell \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{(\ell i)(i)} \\
= \sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{t(i)} \circ \sigma_\ell}.
\]

where we recall that tilde means to reverse the order of all the letters in the word. By (1) we also have

\[
F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\tilde{t}) = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(l \bowtie \tilde{s}) = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(l) + F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\tilde{s}) \circ \sigma_\ell = \varphi_\ell + F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\tilde{s}) \circ \sigma_\ell = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\tilde{s}) \circ \sigma_\ell + \varphi_\ell.
\]

If we now apply Definition 2.2 and the induction hypothesis, we obtain

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(t)} R_{X,\sigma_{t(i)},\varphi_{t(i)}} = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} R_{X,\sigma_{s(i)},\varphi_{s(i)}} \right) \circ R_{X,\sigma_\ell,\varphi_\ell} \\
= R_{X,\sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{s(i)},F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\tilde{s}) \circ \sigma_\ell}} \\
= R_{X,\sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(s)} e_{(i),F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\tilde{s}) \circ \sigma_\ell + \varphi_\ell}}} \\
= R_{X,\sigma^{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(t)} e_{t(i),F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\tilde{t})}}}
\]

The induction step is now complete, and therefore (2) is true for all \(s \in [k]^*\).

To prove (3), suppose that \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) satisfies the Cocycle Condition and that \(s, t \in [k]^*\) have the same length and interchange values at two consecutive coordinates, i.e., the following conditions hold:

- There exists \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(\text{Length}(s) = n = \text{Length}(t)\), so that \(s\) and \(t\) are both in \([k]^n\).
There exists an \( m \in \{1, \ldots, n - 1\} \) such that

\[
\forall i \in \{1, s, n\} : \quad s(i) = \begin{cases} 
  t(i), & \text{if } i \in \{1, s, n\} \setminus \{m, m + 1\}; \\
  t(i + 1), & \text{if } i = m; \\
  t(i - 1), & \text{if } i = m + 1.
\end{cases}
\]

We claim that \( F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s) = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(t) \). Indeed, for all \( x \in X \),

\[
F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s) = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{m, m + 1\}} \varphi_{s(i)} \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s(j)}} \circ \varphi_s(m) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} e_{s(j)}} + \varphi_s(m+1) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m} e_{s(j)}},
\]

\[
F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(t) = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{m, m + 1\}} \varphi_{t(i)} \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{t(j)}} + \varphi_t(m) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} e_{t(j)}} + \varphi_t(m+1) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m} e_{t(j)}}.
\]

But since

\[
\sum_{i \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\} \setminus \{m, m + 1\}} \varphi_{s(i)} \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{s(j)}} = \sum_{i \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\} \setminus \{m, m + 1\}} \varphi_{t(i)} \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{t(j)}},
\]

it suffices to show that

\[
\varphi_s(m) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} e_{s(j)}} + \varphi_s(m+1) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m} e_{s(j)}} = \varphi_t(m) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} e_{t(j)}} + \varphi_t(m+1) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m} e_{t(j)}}.
\]

However this latter equality is true by the Cocycle Condition because

\[
\varphi_s(m) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} e_{s(j)}} + \varphi_s(m+1) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m} e_{s(j)}} = \varphi_t(m) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} e_{t(j)}} + \varphi_t(m+1) \circ \sigma_{\sum_{j=1}^{m} e_{t(j)}}.
\]

Since every word in \([k]^n\) can be put into lexicographic form via a finite number of value-interchanges at consecutive coordinates, if \( \text{Lex}(s) = \text{Lex}(t) \), then \( F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(s) = F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(t) \). This establishes (3).

We present below a characterization of all the continuous \( H \)-valued 1-cocycles on Deaconu- Renault groupoids in both algebraic and operator-theoretic terms. This result serves as a foundation for the remainder of our paper.
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Theorem 3.6. (Cocycle Characterization) Let \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) be a triple that satisfies Conditions (1), (2) and (3) of Definition 3.3. Then Statements 1 and 2 below are equivalent, and if in addition we take the locally compact group \(H\) equal to \(\mathbb{R}\), all of the statements 1, 2, and 3 below are equivalent:

1. **Algebraic characterization:** \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) satisfies the Cocycle Condition.

2. There exists \(c \in \mathbb{Z}_1^{\text{cont}}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma), H)\) such that \(c(x, e_i, \sigma_i(x)) = \varphi_i(x)\) for all \(i \in [k]\) and \(x \in X\).

3. **Ruelle operator characterization:** \((\mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma_i, \varphi_i})_{i \in [k]}\) is a commuting \(k\)-tuple of Ruelle operators.

Moreover the cocycle \(c\) in (2) is unique, and every \(c \in \mathbb{Z}_1^{\text{cont}}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma), H)\) arises from this construction.

**Proof.** \((1) \implies (2):\) Assume (1). Let us first show that there exists a function \(c : \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \to H\) such that for every \(x, y \in X, m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k\) such that \(\sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y)\) we have

\[
c(x, l, y) = [F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{m})](x) - [F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{n})](y).
\]

where \(F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}\) is as in Equation (1). To show that \(c\) is well defined we must show that given \(m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{N}^k\) that satisfy

\[
\sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y), \quad \sigma^p(x) = \sigma^q(y) \quad \text{and} \quad m - n = p - q,
\]

we have

\[
[F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{m})](x) - [F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{n})](y) = [F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{p})](x) - [F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{q})](y).
\]

For the next construction, we write

\[
m = (m(1), m(2), \ldots, m(k)), \quad n = (n(1), n(2), \ldots, n(k)),
\]

\[
p = (p(1), p(2), \ldots, p(k)), \quad \text{and} \quad q = (q(1), q(2), \ldots, q(k)).
\]

We denote by \(a \lor b\) the element of \(\mathbb{N}^k\) obtained by taking the max of the corresponding coordinates in \(a\) and \(b\).

Since \(m - n = p - q\), we have

\[
m(i) - n(i) = p(i) - q(i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k,
\]

so that

\[
m(i) - p(i) = n(i) - q(i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k.
\]

We now define \(r \in \mathbb{N}^k\) by

\[
r = (r(1), r(2), \ldots, r(k)),
\]

where

\[
r(i) = p(i) - m(i) = q(i) - n(i), \quad \text{if} \quad p(i) - m(i) > 0,
\]

and
and \( r(i) = 0 \) if \( p(i) - m(i) \leq 0 \). Define \( s \in [k]^* \) by

\[
s := \overline{r} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ldots & 1 & 2 & \ldots & 2 & \ldots & k & \ldots & k \end{pmatrix} \in [k]^*;
\]

where for \( r(j) = 0 \) we insert the empty word in the symbol \( j \) (i.e. zero entries of \( j \)).

So \( s \in [k]^* \), and one can check that \( \text{Lex}(\overline{m} \bowtie s) = \overline{m} \lor \overline{p} \) and \( \text{Lex}(\overline{n} \bowtie s) = \overline{n} \lor \overline{q} \).

Then by Lemma 3.4,

\[
\begin{align*}
[F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m} \lor \overline{p})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n} \lor \overline{q})](y) \\
= [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m} \bowtie s)](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n} \bowtie s)](y) & \quad \text{(By the Cocycle Condition,)} \\
= ([F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m})](x) + [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n})](\sigma^m(x))) - ([F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m})](y) + [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n})](\sigma^n(y))) \\
= [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n})](y). & \quad (\text{As } \sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y).)
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, if we pick any \( t \in [k]^{< \infty} \) such that \( \text{Lex}(\overline{p} \bowtie t) = \overline{m} \lor \overline{p} \) and \( \text{Lex}(\overline{q} \bowtie t) = \overline{n} \lor \overline{q} \), we have

\[
[F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m} \lor \overline{p})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n} \lor \overline{q})](y) = [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{p})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{q})](y).
\]

Hence, as desired,

\[
[F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n})](y) = [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{p})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{q})](y).
\]

Next, we show that \( c \) is an \( H \)-valued 1-cocycle on \( G(X, \sigma) \).

We start by noticing that if \( (x, k, y) \in G(X, \sigma) \) with \( \sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y), \ k = m - n \) for some \( m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k \), and if \( (y, l, z) \in G(X, \sigma) \) with \( \sigma^p(y) = \sigma^q(z), \ l = p - q \) for some \( p, q \in \mathbb{N}^k \), then \( \sigma^{m+p}(x) = \sigma^{n+q}(y) \), then \( \sigma^{m+p}(x) = \sigma^{n+q}(y) \). Therefore

\[
c(x, k, y) + c(y, l, z) = ([F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m} + \overline{p})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n} + \overline{p})](y)) \\
+ ([F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n} + \overline{p})](y) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n} + \overline{q})](z)) \\
= [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{m} + \overline{p})](x) - [F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\overline{n} + \overline{q})](z) \\
= c(x, k + l, z) \\
= c((x, k, y)(y, l, z)).
\]

which shows that \( c \) is an \( H \)-valued 1-cocycle.

To see that \( c \) is continuous, let \( ((x_i, l_i, y_i))_{i \in I} \) be a net in \( G(X, \sigma) \) that converges to \( (x, l, y) \in G(X, \sigma) \), with \( l = m - n \) for some \( m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k \) such that \( \sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y) \). Then \( \lim_{i \in I} x_i = x \) and \( \lim_{i \in I} y_i = y \). Also, for all \( i \in I \) sufficiently large, \( l_i = l \) and \( \sigma^m(x_i) = \sigma^n(y_i) \). By using the continuity of \( F_{X,\sigma,\varphi} \) at \( \overline{m} \) and \( \overline{n} \), it follows that

\[
\lim_{i \in I} c(x_i, l_i, y_i) = \lim_{i \in I} c(x_i, l, y_i)
\]
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Finally, we show that \(c\) is unique. Suppose that \((x, l, y) \in \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)\), with \(l = m - n\) for some \(m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k\) such that \(\sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y)\). Now note that we can decompose \((x, l, y)\) as

\[
(x, l, y) = \frac{1}{P} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m} (\sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{m(j)}(x), e_{m(i)}, \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i} e_{m(j)}(x)}) \right),
\]

where we set

\[
P = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{m(j)}(y), e_{m(i)}, \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i} e_{m(j)}(y)}) \right).
\]

If \(c' \in Z^1_{\text{cont}}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma), H)\) also satisfies \(c'(x, e_i, \sigma_i(x)) = \varphi_i(x)\) for all \(i \in [k]\) and \(x \in X\), then clearly

\[
c'(x, l, y) = [F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{m})](x) - [F_{X, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{n})](y) = c(x, l, y)
\]

by Equation (3). Hence, \(c' = c\).

(2) \implies (1): Assume (2). Then we have for all \(i, j \in [k]\) that \(\forall \, x \in X\):

\[
(x, e_i, \sigma_i(x))(\sigma_i(x), e_j, \sigma_j(\sigma_i(x))) = (x, e_i + e_j, \sigma_j(\sigma_i(x)))
\]

\[
= (x, e_j + e_i, \sigma_i(\sigma_j(x)))
\]

\[
= (x, e_j, \sigma_j(x))(\sigma_j(x), e_i, \sigma_i(\sigma_j(x))),
\]

and consequently, for all \(x \in X\)

\[
\varphi_i(x) + \varphi_j(\sigma_i(x)) = c(x, e_i, \sigma_i(x)) + c(\sigma_i(x), e_j, \sigma_j(\sigma_i(x)))
\]

\[
= c((x, e_i, \sigma_i(x))(\sigma_i(x), e_j, \sigma_j(\sigma_i(x))))
\]

\[
= c((x, e_j, \sigma_j(x))(\sigma_j(x), e_i, \sigma_i(\sigma_j(x))))
\]

\[
= c(x, e_j, \sigma_j(x)) + c(\sigma_j(x), e_i, \sigma_i(\sigma_j(x)))
\]

\[
= \varphi_j(x) + \varphi_i(\sigma_j(x)),
\]

which yields (1).

We now suppose that \(H = \mathbb{R}\).

(1) \implies (3): Assume (1). Then for all \(i, j \in [k]\), Theorem 2.2 tells us that

\[
\mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_i} \circ \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_j} = \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_j} \circ \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_i + \varphi_j} = \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_i + \varphi_j} \circ \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_i + \varphi_j} = \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_i} \circ \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_j},
\]

which yields (3).
Definition 3.8. (Semigroup Cocycles) Let $S = (\sigma_i \circ \sigma_j)^{-1}[\{z\}] = (\sigma_j \circ \sigma_i)^{-1}[\{z\}]$

is finite, we can use Urysohn’s Lemma to find an $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ such that $f(x) = 1$ and $f(y) = 0$ for all $y \in S \setminus \{x\}$. Then

$$e^{\varphi_i(\sigma_j(x)) + \varphi_j(x)} = \left[ (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i} \circ \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_j,\varphi_j})(f) \right](z)$$

$$= \left[ (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_j,\varphi_j} \circ \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i})(f) \right](z)$$

$$= e^{\varphi_j(\sigma_i(x)) + \varphi_i(x)},$$

which implies $\varphi_i(\sigma_j(x)) + \varphi_j(x) = \varphi_j(\sigma_i(x)) + \varphi_i(x)$. As $x \in X$ is arbitrary, we therefore obtain (1). \qed

Example 3.7. With notation as in the above theorem, if $\varphi_i$ is constant for each $i$, then $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ satisfies the cocycle condition.

We now remark on some generalizations of Theorem 4.5 to more general modules, which, although not used in the remainder of the paper, could be of independent interest.

Definition 3.8. (Semigroup Cocycles) Let $S$ be a semigroup, and let $A$ be an $S$-module, so that $A$ is an abelian group and there exists a homomorphism $\pi : S \to \text{End}(A)$. When there is no danger of confusion, for $s \in S$ and $a \in A$, we denote by $sa \in A$ the element $\pi(s)(a)$ of $A$.

Define $Z^1(S, A)$ to be the set of $A$-valued 1-cocycle on $S$, that is, $Z^1(S, A)$ is the set of functions

$$Z^1(S, A) = \{ \gamma : S \to A \mid \gamma(st) = \gamma(s) + s\gamma(t), \forall s, t \in S \}.$$  
 A function $\gamma : S \to A$ is said to be an $A$-valued 1-coboundary if there is an $a \in A$ such that $\gamma(s) = a - sa$ for all $s \in S$, in which case we write $\gamma = \gamma_a$. Let $B^1(S, A)$ denote the collection of all $A$-valued 1-coboundaries.

Routine computations show that $Z^1(S, A)$ forms a group under addition, that every 1-coboundary is a 1-cocycle and that $B^1(S, A)$ is a subgroup of $Z^1(S, A)$. We verify that every 1-coboundary is in fact a 1-cocycle. Let $a \in A$ and $s, t \in S$, then we have

$$\gamma_a(st) = a - (st)a = a - \pi(st)(a) = a - \pi(s)(a) + \pi(s)(a) - \pi(s)(\pi(t)(a))$$

$$= a - sa + sa - \pi(s)(\pi(t)(a)) = a - sa + sa - s(ta)$$

$$= \gamma_a(s) + s \gamma_a(t).$$

Hence, $B^1(S, A) \subset Z^1(S, A)$. Moreover we define the first group cohomology of $S$ with coefficients in $A$ by $H^1(S, A) := Z^1(S, A)/B^1(S, A)$.

Example 3.9. In the context of a Deaconu-Renault groupoid $\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)$, we can make $A = C(X, H)$ into an $S = \mathbb{N}^k$-module by defining

$$\pi_n(f)(x) := f(\sigma^n(x)),$$
for all \( n \in \mathbb{N}^k, f \in C(X, H) \) and \( x \in X \). In this setting, the proof of Theorem 3.6 can be reinterpreted to yield

**Proposition 3.10.** Let \( S = \mathbb{N}^k, A \) be an \( S \)-module and let \( (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in A^k \) be a \( k \)-tuple. Then there is a \( c \in Z^1(S, A) \) such that \( c(e_i) = a_i, 1 \leq i \leq k \), if and only if

\[
\forall i, j \in [k], \ i \neq j : \ a_i + e_i a_j = a_j + e_j a_i.
\]

Moreover, every cocycle \( c \in Z^1(S, A) \) corresponds to a \( k \)-tuple \( (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in A^k \) satisfying the above equations. Also, such a \( k \)-tuple \( (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \) corresponds to a coboundary \( c_a \) in \( B^1(S, A) \) if and only if \( a_i = a - e_i a, 1 \leq i \leq k \).

**Proof.** The first part of the statement is just a recasting of Theorem 3.6 to the \( \mathbb{N}^k \)-module setting.

As for the statement about coboundaries, suppose that the \( k \)-tuple \( (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in A^k \) gives rise to a cocycle \( c \) that is a coboundary, so that \( c = c_a \) for some \( a \in A \). Then by definition

\[
a_i = c(e_i) = c_a(e_i) = a - e_i a, \ 1 \leq i \leq k.
\]

On the other hand, if \( c_a \in B^1(S, A) \) for some \( a \in A \), then setting \( A \ni a_i := a - e_i a, 1 \leq i \leq k \), we verify that

\[
a_i + e_i a_j = a - e_i a + e_i (a - e_j a) = a - e_i a + e_i a - e_i (e_j a)
\]

\[
= a + 0 - e_j (e_i a) = a - e_j a + e_j (a - e_i a) = a_j + e_j a_i,
\]

so that the \( k \)-tuple \( (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in A^k \) satisfies the required condition. \( \square \)

In the setting of a Deaconu-Renault groupoid \( G(X, \sigma) \), with \( A = C(X, H) \) as in Example 3.9, Proposition 3.10 outlines the relationship between \( Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G(X, \sigma), A) \) and semigroup cocycles.

**Proposition 3.11.** Let \( G(X, \sigma) \) be a Deaconu-Renault groupoid, with \( A = C(X, H) \) an \( \mathbb{N}^k \)-module as in Example 3.9. Then there is an isomorphism

\[
\Phi : Z^1(\mathbb{N}^k, A) \longrightarrow Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G(X, \sigma), H)
\]

such that

\[
\Phi(c) = \varphi,
\]

where, by means of Proposition 3.10, \( c \in Z^1(\mathbb{N}^k, C(X, H)) \) is determined by the \( k \)-tuple \( (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k) \in [C(X, H)]^k \), and \( \varphi \) is the cocycle associated to \( (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k) \) by Theorem 3.6.

Moreover, this correspondence preserves addition of cocycles and sends coboundaries to coboundaries, so \( \Phi \) is a group isomorphism and it induces an isomorphism \( H^1(\mathbb{N}^k, C(X, H)) \cong H^1_{\text{cont}}(G(X, \sigma), H) \).

**Proof.** It is clear that the given correspondence preserves the group operations between \( Z^1(\mathbb{N}^k, C(X, H)) \) and \( Z^1_{\text{cont}}(G(X, \sigma), H) \), and Proposition 3.11 shows that this correspondence is a bijection. It only remains to show that our correspondence sends \( B^1(\mathbb{N}^k, C(X, H)) \) onto
$B_{cont}^1(G(X,\sigma),H)$. But if there exists $f \in C(X,H)$ such that $\varphi_i = f - e_i f$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and we define

$$\varphi_i(x) = f(x) - (e_i f)(x) = f(x) - f(\sigma^{e_i}(x)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k,$$

it is not hard to compute the corresponding element of $Z^1_{cont}(G(X,\sigma),H)$. Let $(x,1,y) \in G(X,\sigma)$ for $l = m - n$ with $\sigma^m(x) = \sigma^n(y)$. Then the corresponding cocycle in $Z^1_{cont}(G(X,\sigma),H)$ is given by

$$c_f(x,l,y) = f(x) - f(y),$$

so is evidently the coboundary corresponding to $f \in C(X,H)$. It is clear that this correspondence is one–to–one and onto from $B_1(N^k,C(X,H))$ onto $B_{cont}^1(G(X,\sigma),H)$. By the Fundamental Theorem for group homomorphisms, this correspondence projects to an isomorphism

$$H^1(N^k,C(X,H)) \cong H^1_{cont}(G(X,\sigma),H).$$

With notation as above, we conjecture that $H^n(N^k,C(X,H)) \cong H^n_{cont}(G(X,\sigma),H)$ for every $n$.

## 4 Ruelle Dynamical Systems

We now introduce the main objects of our study: k-Ruelle dynamical systems, which are higher-rank analogs of Ruelle triples.

**Definition 4.1.** (k-Ruelle Dynamical Systems) A $k$-Ruelle dynamical system is an ordered triple $(X,\sigma,\varphi)$ that satisfies Condition (1), (2), and (3) of Definition 3.3 and the Cocycle Condition. For a $k$–Ruelle dynamical system $(X,\sigma,\varphi)$ we will denote by $c_{X,\sigma,\varphi}$ the unique $c \in Z^1_{cont}(G(X,\sigma),H)$ such that $\forall i \in [k], \forall x \in X$ we have

$$c(x,e_i,\sigma(x)) = \varphi_i(x).$$

Note that the existence of such a 1-cocycle is guaranteed by Theorem $\ref{thm:existence_of_1-cocycle}$. In Definition 4.1, we could have replaced the Cocycle Condition by any of its equivalent formulations in Theorem 3.6. However the Cocycle Condition usually is the easiest of the three equivalent conditions in Theorem 3.6 to verify and work with.

In analogy with RPF triples, we define

**Definition 4.2.** (RPF Dynamical Systems) A k–Ruelle dynamical system $(X,\sigma,\varphi)$ is said to be k–RPF if there exists a unique ordered pair $(\lambda,\mu)$ (called the k–RPF pair of $(X,\sigma,\varphi)$) with the following properties:

1. $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in [k]}$ is a $k$-tuple of positive real numbers.
2. $\mu$ is a regular Borel probability measure on $X$.
3. $(R_{X,\sigma,\varphi})^*(\mu) = \lambda_i \mu$ for each $i \in [k]$ (Notation as in Definition 2.3(3)).

If $(X,\sigma,\varphi)$ is RPF, we shall denote its associated RPF pair by $(\lambda^{X,\sigma,\varphi},\mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi})$. 
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The next result generalizes the RPF Theorem 2.4 to Ruelle dynamical systems.

**Theorem 4.3.** A $k$–Ruelle dynamical system $(X, \sigma, \phi)$ is $k$–RPF if $(X, \sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)})$ is an RPF triple for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$.

**Proof.** Suppose that there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that $(X, \sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)})$ is an RPF triple, and let $(\lambda, \mu)$ denote its RPF pair. Theorem 3.6 tells us that $\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_j,\phi_j}$ commute for all $i, j \in [k]$, and
\[
\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)}} = \prod_{i=1}^k \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_{(i)}^{(n)}}
\]
by both Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.6, so $\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)}}$ must commute for all $i \in [k]$.

Now fix $i \in [k]$. Since $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*$ and $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)}})^*$ commute, we have
\[
(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)}})^*((\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu)) = (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*((\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)}})^*(\mu))
\]
\[
= (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\lambda \mu)
\]
\[
= \lambda (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu).
\]

Hence, $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu)$ is an eigenmeasure of $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)}})^*$ with eigenvalue $\lambda$. As $\forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ we have
\[
\int_X f \, d(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu) = \int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i}(f) \, d\mu \geq 0,
\]
it follows that $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu)$ is a non-negative measure on $X$. Furthermore, by the surjectivity of $\sigma_i$,
\[
\int_X 1_X \, d(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu) = \int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i}(1_X) \, d\mu > 0,
\]
so $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu)$ is a positive measure. It follows that
\[
\frac{1}{\int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i}(1_X) \, d\mu} (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu)
\]
is a probability eigenmeasure of $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)}})^*$ with eigenvalue $\lambda$. Since $(X, \sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\phi(n)})$ is RPF, we must have
\[
\left(\lambda, \frac{1}{\int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i}(1_X) \, d\mu} (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu)\right) = (\lambda, \mu),
\]
which yields
\[
(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i})^*(\mu) = \left(\int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\phi_i}(1_X) \, d\mu\right) \mu.
\]
Now if $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i \in [k]}$ is a $k$-tuple in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and $\nu$ a probability regular Borel measure $\nu$ on $X$ such that for all $i \in [k]$: 

$$(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i})^*(\nu) = \alpha_i \nu,$$

then we get

$$(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma^n,F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\mathbf{n})})^*(\nu) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_{\mathbf{m}(i)},\varphi_{\mathbf{m}(i)}})^* \right)^n(\nu) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i^{\mathbf{m}(i)} \nu = \alpha^n \nu,$$

where we denote by $|n|$ the length of $n$. As $\alpha^n > 0$ and $(X, \sigma^n, F_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\mathbf{n}))$ is RPF, we also obtain $(\alpha^n, \nu) = (\lambda, \mu)$, so $\nu = \mu$. Hence, for all $i \in [k]$: 

$$\alpha_i \mu = \left( \int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_{\mathbf{m}(i)},\varphi_{\mathbf{m}(i)}} (1_X) \, d\mu \right) \mu,$$

which yields $\alpha_i = \int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_{\mathbf{m}(i)},\varphi_{\mathbf{m}(i)}} (1_X) \, d\mu$ for all $i \in [k]$. Therefore, $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ is $k$-RPF. 

We will now give two examples of $k$–Ruelle dynamical systems.

**Example 4.4.** For $k \in \mathbb{N}, k > 1$, let $X = \mathbb{Z}_k^{\mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ be equipped with the product topology. Define a commuting $k$-tuple $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]}$ of surjective local homeomorphisms on $X \forall i \in [k]$, and for all $x \in X$, by

$$\sigma_i(x) := (x_{n+1} + (i - 1))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}.$$

We want to verify the Walters Criteria, see Definition 2.5, and in order to do so we will check that $\sigma_i$ is positively expansive and exact for each $i \in [k]$.

Define a $([k] \times \mathbb{N}_{>0})$-indexed family $(W_{i,n})_{(i,n) \in [k] \times \mathbb{N}}$ of open subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_k$ by

$$W_{i,n} := \begin{cases} 
\{i\}, & n = 1; \\
\mathbb{Z}_k, & n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}. 
\end{cases}$$

for all $i \in [k]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also define a $k$-family $(V_i)_{i \in [k]}$ of open subsets of $X$ by $V_i := \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} W_{i,n}$ for each $i \in [k]$. A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\Delta(X) \subseteq U := \{(x,y) \in X \times X \mid x_1 = y_1\} = \bigcup_{i \in [k]} V_i \times V_i.$$

To deduce that $\sigma_i$ is positively expansive for each $i \in [k]$, simply observe that if $x, y \in X$ are distinct, then $(\sigma_i^{-m}(x), \sigma_i^{-m}(y)) \notin U$, where $m := \min(\{n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \mid x_n \neq y_n\})$.

Now we will show that $\sigma_i$ is exact for each $i \in [k]$. Let $U$ be a non-empty cylindrical open subset of $X$, i.e., $U = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n$, with $V_n$ open for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and there is an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $V_n = \mathbb{Z}_k$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq m}$. Hence, $\sigma_i^{-m}(U) = X$ for each $i \in [k]$, which means that $\sigma_i$ is exact.
Let \( d : X \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) denote the compatible metric on \( X \) defined by:
\[
d(x, y) := 2^{-\min\{n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \mid x_n \neq y_n\}},
\]
for all \( x, y \in X \), where \( \min(\emptyset) := \infty \) by convention.

Now, let \((a_i)_{i \in [k]} \in \mathbb{R}^k\), and define \( \varphi : X \to \mathbb{R} \) by, for all \( i \in [k] \) and for all \( x \in X \)
\[
\varphi(x) := a_i \iff \sum_{n=1}^k x_n = i - 1 \pmod{k}.
\]

Clearly, \( \varphi \) is continuous. Indeed, we note that the value of \( \varphi \) at \( x \in X \) only depends on the first \( k \) components of \( x \), so that if \( x, y \in X \) and \( d(x, y) < 2^{-k} \), then \( \varphi(x) = \varphi(y) \) so that \( |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| = 0 \) in that case. One therefore computes, for all \( x, y \in X \)
\[
|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq 2^k \left( \max_{i,j \in [k]} |a_i - a_j| \right) d(x, y),
\]
which implies that \( \varphi \) is Hölder-continuous with respect to \( d \).

Let \((c_i)_{i \in [k]} \in \mathbb{R}^k\). Then for all \( i, j \in [k] \) and for all \( x \in X \)
\[
(\varphi + c_i 1_X)(\sigma_j(x)) - (\varphi + c_j 1_X)(\sigma_i(x))
\]
\[
= (\varphi + c_i 1_X) \left( \sum_{n=1}^k (x_n + (j - 1)) \right) - (\varphi + c_j 1_X) \left( \sum_{n=1}^k (x_n + (i - 1)) \right)
\]
\[
= (\varphi + c_i 1_X) \left( \sum_{n=1}^k x_n \right) - (\varphi + c_j 1_X) \left( \sum_{n=1}^k x_n \right)
\]
\[
= c_i - c_j
\]
\[
= (\varphi + c_i 1_X)(x) - (\varphi + c_j 1_X)(x).
\]

Therefore, \( \left( X, (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]}, (\varphi + c_i 1_X)_{i \in [k]} \right) \) is a Ruelle dynamical system, and since the Ruelle triple \((X, \sigma_i, \varphi_i)\) satisfies the Walters Criteria of Definition 2.5 for each \( i \in [k] \), we conclude that \( \left( X, (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]}, (\varphi + c_i 1_X)_{i \in [k]} \right) \) is \( k \)-RPF.

The next example is special as it exhibits an RPF dynamical system on a non-Cantor set space.

**Example 4.5.** Let \( n = (n_i)_{i \in [k]} \) be a \( k \)-tuple, \( n_i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\} \), and define a commuting \( k \)-tuple \( \sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]} \) of surjective local homeomorphisms on \( \mathbb{T} \) by:
\[
\sigma_i(z) := z^{n_i}
\]
for all \( i \in [k] \) and \( z \in \mathbb{T} \). The local homeomorphism \( \sigma_i \) is expansive for each \( i \in [k] \) by [29], top of p. 176.
Now let $U$ be a non-empty open subset of $\mathbb{T}$. Then there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha < \beta$ and
\[
\{e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T} \mid \alpha < \theta < \beta\} \subseteq U.
\]
Let $i \in [k]$, and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2\pi \leq m|n_i|(|\beta - \alpha|)$. Then
\[
\sigma_i^m[U] \supseteq \sigma_i^m[\{e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T} \mid \alpha < \theta < \beta\}]
= \{e^{imn_i\theta} \in \mathbb{T} \mid \alpha < \theta < \beta\}
= \{e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T} \mid \theta \text{ between } mn_i\alpha \text{ and } mn_i\beta\}
= \mathbb{T},
\]
so $\sigma_i$ is exact.

Let $d$ denote the angular-distance metric on $\mathbb{T}$, i.e., for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$:
\[
d(e^{i\alpha}, e^{i\beta}) = \pi - |\mod_{2\pi}(|\alpha - \beta|) - \pi|.
\]
The metric $d$ generates the standard topology on $\mathbb{T}$.

Define a $k$-tuple $\varphi = (\varphi_i)_{i \in [k]}$ in $C(X, \mathbb{C})$ by
\[
\forall i \in [k], \forall z \in \mathbb{T} : \quad \varphi_i(z) = z^{n_i} - z.
\]
A straightforward calculation shows that $\varphi_i$ is Hölder-continuous with respect to $d$ for each $i \in [k]$.

We also have, for all $i, j \in [k]$ and $\forall z \in \mathbb{T}$,
\[
\varphi_i(z) + \varphi_j(\sigma_i(z)) = (z^{n_i} - z) + (\sigma_i(z)^{n_j} - \sigma_i(z))
= (z^{n_j} - z) + (\sigma_j(z)^{n_i} - \sigma_j(z))
= \varphi_j(z) + \varphi_i(\sigma_j(z)),
\]
so $\varphi_i + \varphi_j \circ \sigma_i = \varphi_j + \varphi_i \circ \sigma_j$. The Cocycle Condition thus holds, but in $\mathbb{C}$ as the $\varphi_i$’s are $\mathbb{C}$-valued.

Now let $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous additive map (e.g., $f(z) = \text{Re}(z)$). As $f$ is then Hölder-continuous with respect to the Euclidean metrics on $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{R}$, $f \circ \varphi_i$ is also Hölder-continuous with respect to $d$, and by the additivity of $f$, for every $\forall i, j \in [k]$,
\[
(f \circ \varphi_i) + (f \circ \varphi_j) \circ \sigma_i = f \circ (\varphi_i + \varphi_j \circ \sigma_i) = f \circ (\varphi_j + \varphi_i \circ \sigma_j) = (f \circ \varphi_j) + (f \circ \varphi_i) \circ \sigma_j,
\]
so that $\left(\mathbb{T}, \sigma, (f \circ \varphi_i)_{i \in [k]}\right)$ is a Ruelle dynamical system. As the Ruelle triple $\left(\mathbb{T}, \sigma, f \circ \varphi_i\right)$ satisfies the Walters Criteria for each $i \in [k]$, we conclude that $\left(\mathbb{T}, \sigma, (f \circ \varphi_i)_{i \in [k]}\right)$ is $k$-RPF.

**Example 4.6.** Fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}, d > 1$, define the following two commuting local homeomorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^2$, for $z_j \in \mathbb{T}$, by
\[
\sigma_1(z_1, z_2) := (z_1^d, z_2^d), \quad \sigma_2(z_1, z_2) := (z_1z_2^{-1}, z_1z_2).
\]
Since all the eigenvalues of the associated matrices \( M_{\sigma_1} = \begin{pmatrix} d & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \) and \( M_{\sigma_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \) have modulus larger than 1, \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \) are toral endomorphisms that are are positively expansive and exact (see [17], proof of Theorem 1). In this case, we can choose the functions \( \varphi_j := c_j \) to be constants. Therefore the Ruelle triple \((T^2, \sigma, c)\) satisfies the Walters Criteria for each \( i \in [2] \), and so \((T^2, \sigma, c)\) is 2-RPF.

The next example is a combination of Examples 4.5 and 4.4.

**Example 4.7.** Let \( X = \mathbb{Z}_k^{N>0} \), with \( k \in \mathbb{N}, k > 1 \). For fixed \( I \in [k] \) and \( J \in \mathbb{N}, J > 1 \), define local homeomorphisms \( \sigma_I, \sigma_J : X \times \mathbb{T} \to X \times \mathbb{T} \), by the following formula. For all \((x, z) \in X \times \mathbb{T}\) set:

\[
\sigma_I((x, z)) := ((x_{n+1} + (I - 1))_{n \in \mathbb{N}>0}, z),
\]

\[
\sigma_J((x, z)) := (x, z^J).
\]

It is clear that \( \sigma_I, \sigma_J \) commute and are exact. So the composition \( \sigma_I \circ \sigma_J \) is positively expansive and exact. By the proceeding as in Examples 4.5 and 4.4, and using Theorem 4.3 with \( k = 2 \) and \((n_1, n_2) = (1, 1)\), the resulting Ruelle triple satisfies the Walters Criteria and so is 2-RPF.

**Example 4.8.** We will now compute Ruelle eigenvalues and eigenmeasures for the \( k \)-RPF dynamical system \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\), with \( X := \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \{0, 1\} \) and \( \sigma := (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \) defined, for \( x = (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \) by

\[
\sigma_1(x) := (x_{n+1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2(x) := (x_{n+1} + 1)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}.
\]

Moreover, for fixed \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{R} \), define \( \varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \) by the following equation, where, below, addition is considered modulo 2:

\[
\varphi_1(x) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } x_0 + x_1 = 0; \\ b, & \text{if } x_0 + x_1 = 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_2(x) = c.
\]

We will first determine the eigenvalues \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \) of the associated Ruelle operator, namely \( \lambda_1 = e^a + e^b \), and that \( \lambda_2 = 2e^c \).

We will start by establishing that \( \lambda_1 = e^a + e^b \). For, recall that

\[
(\mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_1})^* (\mu) = \lambda_1 \mu,
\]

which implies

\[
\int_X \chi_{Z(0)} \, d(\mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_1})^* (\mu) = \int_X \chi_{Z(0)} \, d(\lambda_1 \mu) = \lambda_1 \int_X \chi_{Z(0)} \, d\mu = \lambda_1 \mu(Z(0)).
\]

Moreover

\[
\lambda_1 \mu(Z(0)) = \int_X \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_1} (\chi_{Z(0)}) \, d\mu = \int_X \left[ \mathcal{R}_{X, \sigma, \varphi_1} (\chi_{Z(0)}) \right] (x) \, d\mu(x)
\]

\[
= \int_X \left[ \sum_{\sigma_1(y) = x} \chi_{Z(0)}(y)e^{\varphi_1(y)} \right] \, d\mu(x)
\]
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\[
\int_{Z(0)} \left[ \sum_{\sigma(x)=y} \chi_{Z(0)}(y)e^{\varphi_1(y)} \right] \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) + \int_{Z(1)} \left[ \sum_{\sigma(x)=y} \chi_{Z(0)}(y)e^{\varphi_1(y)} \right] \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x)
= \int_{Z(0)} e^a \, \mathrm{d}\mu + \int_{Z(1)} e^b \, \mathrm{d}\mu = e^a \mu(Z(0)) + e^b \mu(Z(1)).
\]

By using the equality
\[
\int_X \chi_{Z(1)} \, \mathrm{d}(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma,\varphi})^*(\mu) = \int_X \chi_{Z(1)} \, \mathrm{d}(\lambda_1 \mu),
\]
we similarly get
\[
\lambda_1 \mu(Z(1)) = e^b \mu(Z(0)) + e^a \mu(Z(1)).
\]
Since \(\mu(X) = 1\), by summing the equations above, we get \(\lambda_1 = e^a + e^b\).

To prove that \(\lambda_2 = 2e^c\), recall that
\[
(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma,\varphi})^*(\mu) = \lambda_2 \mu,
\]
which implies, when we integrate over \(Z(0)\), with straightforward calculations similar to the \(\lambda_1\) case, that
\[
\lambda_2 \mu(Z(0)) = e^c \mu(X) = e^c.
\]
However, if we integrate over \(Z(1)\), with analogous calculations, we have that
\[
\lambda_2 \mu(Z(1)) = e^c.
\]
Since \(\mu(X) = 1\), by adding the above equations, we obtain \(\lambda_2 = 2e^c\). We also notice that the above equations imply \(\mu(Z(0)) = \mu(Z(1)) = \frac{1}{2}\).

We will now explicitly determine the eigenmeasure \(\mu\) on all of the cylinder sets, thus proving that \(\mu\) is defined on the cylinder sets of \(X\) according to the following probability diagram.
More in detail, we claim that

\[ \mu(Z(x_0 x_1 \ldots x_n)) = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{\psi(x_j+x_{j+1})} \frac{e^a + e^b}{e^a + e^b}, \]  

(4)

where \( \psi : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{a, b\} \) is given by \( \psi(0) = a \) and \( \psi(1) = b \).

In the above formula, note that when \( n = 0 \), the resulting product is empty, and so by convention equal to to 1. Therefore \( \mu(Z(x_0)) = \frac{1}{2} \) for all \( x_0 \in \{0, 1\} \).

We will prove Equation (4) by induction. Since we have already shown that \( \mu(Z(0)) = \mu(Z(1)) = \frac{1}{2} \), we only need to demonstrate the induction step. Suppose that the formula is true for some \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \( x_0, \ldots, x_{n+1} \in \{0, 1\} \). Since \((\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_1,\varphi_1}^*)^* (\mu) = \lambda_1 \mu = (e^a + e^b) \mu \), we have

\[
\int_X \chi_z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1}) \ d(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_1,\varphi_1}^*)^*(\mu) = \int_X \chi_z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1}) \ d(\lambda_1 \mu) = (e^a + e^b) \mu (Z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1}))
\]

and

\[
(e^a + e^b) \mu (Z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1})) = \int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_1,\varphi_1} (\chi_z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1})) \ d\mu
\]

\[
= \int_X \left[ \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_1,\varphi_1} (\chi_z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1})) \right] (x) \ d\mu (x)
\]

\[
= \int_X \left[ \sum_{\sigma_1 (y) = x} \chi_z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1})(y) e^{\varphi_1(y)} \right] \ d\mu (x)
\]

\[
= \int_{Z(x_1 \ldots x_{n+1})} \left[ \sum_{\sigma_1 (y) = x} \chi_z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1})(y) e^{\varphi_1(y)} \right] \ d\mu (x)
\]

\[
= \int_{Z(x_1 \ldots x_{n+1})} e^{\psi(x_0+x_1)} \ d\mu
\]

\[
= \mu (Z(x_1 \ldots x_{n+1})) e^{\psi(x_0+x_1)}.
\]

By using the induction hypothesis we then get

\[
\mu (Z(x_0 \ldots x_{n+1})) = \frac{1}{e^a + e^b} \cdot \mu (Z(x_1 \ldots x_{n+1})) e^{\psi(x_0+x_1)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{e^{\psi(x_j+x_{j+1})} e^{\psi(x_0+x_1)}}{e^a + e^b}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \prod_{j=0}^{n} \frac{e^{\psi(x_j+x_{j+1})}}{e^a + e^b},
\]

thus proving the induction step.
5 The Radon-Nikodym Problem and KMS States

This section addresses the Radon-Nikodym Problem for Deaconu-Renault groupoids, which provides a link between quasi-invariant measures for these groupoids and KMS states for generalized gauge dynamics on the associated $C^*$-algebra. As a result, there will be a heavier emphasis on measure theory and topology than the previous sections.

**Definition 5.1.** (Pull-Back and Quasi-Invariant Measures) Let $\mu$ be a Borel probability measure defined on the Borel sets of the compact metric space $X$ with associated Borel $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{B}(X)$, and let $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]}$ be a commuting $k$-tuple of surjective local homeomorphisms on $X$. Define regular Borel measures $s^*\mu$ and $r^*\mu$ on $G(X, \sigma)$ by:

\[
(s^*\mu)(B) := \int_X \left( \sum_{\gamma \in G(X, \sigma)_x} \chi_B(\gamma) \right) \, d\mu(x),
\]

\[
(r^*\mu)(B) := \int_X \left( \sum_{\gamma \in G(X, \sigma)^x} \chi_B(\gamma) \right) \, d\mu(x),
\]

for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(G(X, \sigma))$ where we denoted by $G(X, \sigma)_x$ (resp. $G(X, \sigma)^x$) the set of arrows in $G(X, \sigma)$ with source $x$ (resp. range $x$). We then say that $\mu$ is quasi-invariant for $G(X, \sigma)$ if $s^*\mu$ and $r^*\mu$ are equivalent to one another, in which case a Radon-Nikodym derivative for $\mu$ is any measurable function on $G(X, \sigma)$ in the same equivalence class (with respect to the equivalence relation module sets of measure zero) as $\frac{dr^*\mu}{ds^*\mu}$ [21, Section 3].

The following Lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 5.3.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $T : X \to Y$ be a local homeomorphism of topological spaces from the compact metric space $X$ to the metric space $Y$. Then $\sup_{y \in Y} \text{Card}(T^{-1}([y])) < \infty$.

**Proof.** This follows from the definition of local homeomorphism and the fact that $X$ is compact. \qed

The following Theorem is a generalization of Proposition 4.2 of [23] from rank-one Deaconu-Renault groupoids to the higher rank case, and characterizes the solutions of the Radon-Nykodym problem in this general setting. Its proof is quite technical, although in part it is possible to rely on the steps given in Renault’s proof in [23].

**Theorem 5.3.** Let $(X, \sigma, \phi)$ be a $k$-RPF dynamical system and $\mu$ a Borel probability measure on $X$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. $\mu$ is quasi-invariant for $G(X, \sigma)$, and the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{dr^*\mu}{ds^*\mu}$ is the continuous function $e^{c_{X, \sigma, \phi}}$ on $G(X, \sigma)$.

---

1By [34, pp. 91–92] any measure on a locally compact and second countable space that is finite on compact sets is Radon, and hence regular.
2. \((\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i})^*(\mu) = \mu\) for each \(i \in [k]\).

\[\text{Proof.}\] Assume that (1) holds. Then, fixing \(i \in [k]\), we see that \(\mu\) must be quasi-invariant for the Deaconu-Renault subgroupoid \(\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma_i) := \{(x, le_i, y) : x, y \in X, \ell = m-n, \sigma^m_i(x) = \sigma^n_i(y), n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}\) of \(\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)\) determined by the singly–generated system \((X,\sigma_i)\). Thus, by Proposition 4.2 of [23], and using its notation, we have that

\[t_{\varphi_i}^* \mu = \mu.\]

Or, in our notation, this means exactly that

\[\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i}^*(\mu) = \mu.\]

Since this has been shown for arbitrary \(i \in [k]\), this establishes \((1) \implies (2)\).

Conversely, assume (2) holds. Through various steps, we first show that \(\mu\) is quasi–invariant for \(\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)\). Fixing \(i \in [k]\), we have for all \(f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})\) and \(x \in X\) that

\[\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i}(f \circ \sigma_i)(x) = \sum_{y \in \sigma_i^{-1}\{x\}} e^{\varphi_i(y)}(f \circ \sigma_i)(y) = \sum_{y \in \sigma_i^{-1}\{x\}} e^{\varphi_i(y)} f(x) = [f \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i}(1_X)](x),\]

which yields

\[\int_X f \ d(\sigma_i \mu) = \int_X f \circ \sigma_i \ d\mu = \int_X f \circ \sigma_i \ d((\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i})^*(\mu)) = \int_X \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i}(f \circ \sigma_i) \ d\mu = \int_X f \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i}(1_X) \ d\mu.\]

We thus obtain, by using the Riesz representation theorem \(^2\), that for all \(A \in \mathcal{B}(X)\)

\[(\sigma_i \mu)(A) = \int_X \chi_A \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i,\varphi_i}(1_X) \ d\mu.\]

This immediately implies that \((\sigma_i \mu) = \mu \circ \sigma_i^{-1} \ll \mu, i = 1,\ldots,k.\)

The fact that \(\mu(A) = 0\) implies that \(\mu(\sigma_i(A)) = 0\) for all \(i = 1,\ldots,k\), is shown in Proposition 4.2 of [23].

\(^2\)A finite Borel measure on a compact metrizable space is automatically regular.
We now remark that for any \( B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)) \), we will have \( \mu \circ s(B) = 0 \) if and only if \( (s^*\mu)(B) = 0 \). To see this, we recall that for all \( B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)) \),

\[
(s^*\mu)(B) = \int_X \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)_x} \chi_B(\gamma) \right) \, d\mu(x).
\]

As \( s \) is a local homeomorphism, by Lemma 5.2, there is an \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \sup_{x \in X} \text{Card}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)_x) = N \), so for all \( x \in X \),

\[
\chi_s(B)(x) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)_x} \chi_B(\gamma) \leq N \chi_s(B)(x).
\]

Integrating the above inequalities over \( X \), we get for all \( B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)) \)

\[
\mu(s(B)) \leq (s^*\mu)(B) \leq N \mu(s(B)),
\]

which implies that \( \mu(s(B)) = 0 \) if and only if \( (s^*\mu)(B) = 0 \).

Using a similar technique, we can prove that for \( B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)) \), we have \( \mu(r(B)) = 0 \) if and only if \( (r^*\mu)(B) = 0 \).

We now deduce that for any \( B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)) \), we have \( \mu(r(B)) = 0 \) if and only if \( \mu(s(B)) = 0 \).

For, observe that for all \( B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)) \),

\[
s(B) \subseteq \bigcup_{m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k} (\sigma^m)^{-1}(\sigma^n(r(B))) \quad \text{and} \quad r(B) \subseteq \bigcup_{m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k} (\sigma^m)(\sigma^n)^{-1}(s(B))).
\]

From this, we can use mathematical induction, the fact that \( \sigma_i \) and \( \sigma_j \) commute for \( i, j \in [k] \), and our earlier remarks, to deduce that if \( \mu(r(B)) = 0 \), then for any \( m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k \), \( (\sigma^m)^{-1}(\sigma^n(r(B))) \) is a set of \( \mu \)-measure 0. It then follows by monotonicity and countable additivity of \( \mu \) that

\[
\mu(s(B)) \leq \mu\left( \bigcup_{m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k} (\sigma^m)^{-1}(\sigma^n(r(B))) \right) = 0,
\]

so that if \( \mu(r(B)) = 0 \), then \( \mu(s(B)) = 0 \). The same method shows that if \( \mu(s(B)) = 0 \), then \( \mu(r(B)) = 0 \).

All of these facts taken together imply that for a fixed \( B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)) \), we have \( (r^*\mu)(B) = 0 \) if and only if \( \mu(r(B)) = 0 \) if and only if \( \mu(s(B)) = 0 \) if and only if \( (s^*\mu)(B) = 0 \). Therefore, \( (r^*\mu) \) and \( (s^*\mu) \) are equivalent as Borel measures on \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \), i.e., they have the same sets of measure zero. But this means exactly that \( \mu \) is quasi-invariant for \( \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma) \). If we let \( D \) be a Radon-Nikodym derivative of \( r^*\mu \) with respect to \( s^*\mu \), then for every \( i \in [k] \) and for all \( f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}) \) we have

\[
\int_X f \, d\mu = \int_X \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X, \sigma)^s} f(r(\gamma)) \chi_{S_i}(\gamma) \right) \, d\mu(x).
\]
\[
\int_X f \, d\mu = \int_X f(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma),\varphi})^*(\mu) \\
= \int_X \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma),\varphi}(f) \, d\mu \\
= \int_X \left( \sum_{y \in \sigma_{i}^{-1}(x)} e^{\varphi_i(y)} f(y) \right) \, d\mu(x) \\
= \int_X \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)x} e^{\varphi_i(r(\gamma))} f(r(\gamma)) \chi_{\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)}(\gamma) \, d\mu(x) \\
= \int_{\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)} e^{\varphi_2(r(\gamma))} f(r(\gamma)) \chi_{\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)}(\gamma) \, d(\mathcal{R}^*\mu)(\gamma) \\
= \int_{\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)} f(r(\gamma)) \chi_{\mathcal{G}(X,\sigma)}(\gamma) e^{\varphi_2(r(\gamma))} \, d(\mathcal{R}^*\mu)(\gamma).
\]

Hence, \( D(\gamma) = e^{\varphi_2(r(\gamma))} \) for almost all \( \gamma \in S_i \). By [21], Proposition I.3.3, \( D \) is a measurable \( \mathbb{R}^\times \)-valued 1-cocycle on \( \mathcal{G}(X,\sigma) \), and \( D = a.e. \, e^{\varphi_2(r(\gamma))} \), which by assumption is continuous. Therefore, \( e^{\varphi_2(r(\gamma))} \) is a continuous Radon-Nikodym cocycle associated to the quasi-invariant measure \( \mu \) on \( X \) with respect to the groupoid \( \mathcal{G}(X,\sigma) \), and we have established \( (2) \implies (1) \).

To illustrate the particular problem of existence of KMS states arising in the context of Deaconu-Renault groupoids of rank greater than one, we will present the following example, for which there are no KMS states even though the k-PRF condition is satisfied.

**Example 5.4.** In [19] D. Olesen and G. Pedersen prove that for the Cuntz algebra \( \mathcal{O}_N \), \( N \geq 2 \), which is also the \( C^* \)-algebra associated to the Deaconu-Renault groupoid on \( X_N := \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} [N] \) with the standard shift \( \sigma_N \), there is exactly one KMS state at the inverse temperature value \( \beta = \ln N \) associated to the canonical gauge actions \( \sigma_N \) of \( \mathbb{R} \) on \( \mathcal{O}_N \) with \( \varphi_N = 1 \). Note that \( X_N = \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} [N] \) is also the infinite path space of the groupoid associated to \( \mathcal{O}_N \).

Now take \( X = X_2 \times X_3 \), and define \( \sigma = (\sigma_2, \sigma_3) \), where \( \sigma_j \) is the standard shift on \( X_j \); also set \( \varphi = (\varphi_2 = 1, \varphi_3 = 1) \). Note that the shift corresponding to \( (1, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \) is expansive and exact. Therefore \( (X, \sigma, \varphi) \) is 2-RPF. Consider the automorphism group \( \alpha = \alpha_2 \otimes \alpha_3 \) defined on the \( C^* \)-algebra corresponding to \( (X, \sigma, \varphi) \), which is the tensor product of the \( C^* \)-algebras
$O_2 \otimes O_3$. Suppose that for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a state $\omega$ on this tensor product $C^*$-algebra that satisfies the KMS condition for the automorphism group $\alpha$. Then, $\omega$ restricted to the subalgebra $O_2 \otimes \text{Cl}_{O_3}$ satisfies the KMS condition for $\alpha$ only at $\beta = \ln(2)$, whereas $\omega$ restricted to the subalgebra $\text{Cl}_{O_2} \otimes O_3$ satisfies the KMS condition for $\alpha$ only at $\beta = \ln(3)$. Therefore there cannot be any KMS states for the $C^*$-algebra $O_2 \otimes O_3$ associated to $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ for the automorphism group $\alpha = \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2$.

We are now in a position to introduce the generalized gauge dynamics of a $k$–RPF dynamical system.

**Definition 5.5.** (Generalized Gauge Dynamics of an RPF Dynamical System) The generalized gauge dynamics of a $k$–RPF dynamical system $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ is by definition the $\mathbb{R}$-dynamical system $(C^*(G(X, \sigma)), \alpha_{X,\sigma,\varphi})$ defined by:

$$(\alpha_{t_{X,\sigma,\varphi}}(f))(\gamma) := e^{itc_{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\gamma)} f(\gamma),$$

for all $f \in C_c(G(X, \sigma))$, $\gamma \in G(X, \sigma)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where here we are implicitly using the canonical embedding of $C_c(G(X, \sigma))$ into $C^*(G(X, \sigma))$.

The following result may be found in [21]; see also the discussion preceding Proposition 3.2 of [15].

**Proposition 5.6.** ([21]) Let $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ be a $k$-RPF dynamical system, and let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for every quasi-invariant measure $\mu$ for $(X, \sigma)$ with continuous Radon-Nikodym derivative $e^{-\beta c_{X,\sigma,\varphi}}$, there exists a KMS$_\beta$-state $\omega$ for the generalized gauge dynamics of $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ that is uniquely determined by:

$$\omega(f) = \int_X f(x, 0, x) \, d\mu,$$

for all $f \in C_c(G(X, \sigma))$.

It is not necessarily the case that every KMS$_\beta$-state for the generalized gauge dynamics of a $k$–RPF dynamical system $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ originates from a quasi-invariant measure for $(X, \sigma)$ with $e^{-\beta c_{X,\sigma,\varphi}}$ as a continuous Radon-Nikodym derivative, as described above. However, A. Kumjian and J. Renault showed in [15, Proposition 3.2] that this is indeed the case if $c_{X,\sigma,\varphi}^{-1}[[0]]$ is a principal sub-groupoid of $G(X, \sigma)$.

Using Theorem 5.3 and Proposition 5.6, we can now prove the following result.

**Theorem 5.7.** Let $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ be a $k$–RPF dynamical system and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ be such that $(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma,\beta \varphi})^*(\mu) = \mu$ for each $i \in [k]$, where $\mu$ is an eigenmeasure for the corresponding Ruelle operator with eigenvalue 1, see Definition 2.1(2). Then there exists a KMS$_\beta$ state as in Proposition 5.6 for the generalized gauge dynamics corresponding to $(X, \sigma, \beta \varphi)$.

Even if the $k$-RPF dynamical system does not satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 5.3 or Proposition 5.6 we can modify the 1-cocycle $\varphi$ to obtain a new 1-cocycle $\{\varsigma_i(x)\}_{i \in [k]}$ that does satisfy those hypotheses. The following theorem was motivated by [10, Proposition 4.4], which was in turn based on [16, Remark 5.25 and Proposition 5.8].
**Theorem 5.8.** Let \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) be a k-RPF dynamical system. With notation as in Proposition 4.2, for \(i \in [k]\) and \(x \in X\), define:

\[
\varsigma_i(x) := \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}) - \varphi_i(x), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \text{ and } \varsigma(x) = (\varsigma_1(x), \ldots, \varsigma_k(x)).
\]

Then \((X, \sigma, \varsigma)\) is a k–Ruelle dynamical system and \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\varsigma}\) is a quasi-invariant measure for \((X, \sigma)\), with continuous Radon-Nikodym derivative \(e^{-c_{X,\sigma,\varsigma}}\). Moreover \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\varsigma} = \mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\) so that \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\varsigma}\) corresponds by Proposition 5.6 to a KMS-state for the generalized gauge dynamics of \((X, \sigma, \varsigma)\).

**Proof.** Since the \(\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in [k]}\) satisfy the cocycle condition we get, for all \(i, j \in [k]\) and \(x \in X\)

\[
(\varphi_i - \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}))(x) + (\varphi_j - \ln(\lambda_j^{X,\sigma,\varphi})) \circ \sigma_i(x)
\]

\[
= (\varphi_i + \varphi_j \circ \sigma_i)(x) - \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}) - \ln(\lambda_j^{X,\sigma,\varphi})
\]

\[
= (\varphi_j + \varphi_i \circ \sigma_j)(x) - \ln(\lambda_j^{X,\sigma,\varphi}) - \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi})
\]

\[
= (\varphi_j - \ln(\lambda_j^{X,\sigma,\varphi}))(x) + (\varphi_i - \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi})) \circ \sigma_j(x).
\]

Hence \(\{(\varphi_i - \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}))\}_{i \in [k]}\), and therefore \(\{\varsigma_i(x) := \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}) - \varphi_i(x)\}_{i \in [k]}\) also satisfy the cocycle condition, so that \((X, \sigma, \varsigma)\) is a k–Ruelle dynamical system. Similarly \((X, \sigma, -\varsigma)\) is a k–Ruelle dynamical system too.

Suppose that \((\alpha_i)_{i \in [k]}\) is a \(k\)-tuple in \(\mathbb{N}_{>0}\) and \(\nu\) is a regular Borel probability measure on \(X\) such that \(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, -\varsigma_i}^\ast(\nu) = \alpha_i \nu\) for all \(i \in [k]\). Then for each \(i \in [k]\), the equalities

\[
\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, -\varsigma_i} = \mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, \varphi_i - \ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi})1_X} = e^{-\ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi})}\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, \varphi_i} = \frac{1}{\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}}\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, \varphi_i},
\]

imply

\[
(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, \varphi_i})^\ast(\nu) = \left(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, -\varsigma_i}\right)^\ast(\nu) = \lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, -\varsigma_i})^\ast(\nu) = \lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\alpha_i \nu.
\]

As \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) is RPF, it follows that \(\nu = \mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\) and \(\alpha_i = 1\) for each \(i \in [k]\), so \((X, \sigma, -\varsigma)\) is RPF too. Moreover by Definition 4.2 we have \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\varsigma} = \mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\).

Now, as \(\mathcal{R}_{X,\sigma_i, -\varsigma_i}^\ast(\mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}) = \mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\) for all \(i \in [k]\), Theorem 5.3 tells us that \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\) is quasi-invariant for \((X, \sigma)\), with continuous Radon-Nikodym derivative \(e^{c_{X,\sigma,\varsigma}} = e^{-c_{X,\sigma,\varsigma}}\). Therefore, by Proposition 5.6, \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\) corresponds to a KMS-state for the generalized gauge dynamics of \((X, \sigma, \varsigma)\). 

The following corollary then easily follows.
Corollary 5.9. Let \((X, \sigma, \varphi)\) be a \(k\)-RPF dynamical system, and let \(\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+\). Define, with notation as in Proposition 4.2, for \(i \in [k]\) and \(x \in X\)

\[
\zeta_i(x) := \frac{\ln(\lambda_i^{X,\sigma,\varphi}x) - \varphi_i(x)}{\beta}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \text{ and } \zeta(x) = (\zeta_1(x), \ldots, \zeta_k(x)).
\]

Then \((X, \sigma, \zeta)\) is a \(k\)-RPF dynamical system and \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\zeta} = \mu^{X,\sigma,\varphi}\) is a quasi-invariant measure for \((X, \sigma)\), with continuous Radon-Nikodym derivative \(e^{-\beta c_{X,\sigma,\zeta}}\). Consequently, \(\mu^{X,\sigma,\zeta}\) corresponds by Proposition 5.6 to a \(\text{KMS}_\beta\)-state for the generalized gauge dynamics of \((X, \sigma, \zeta)\).

6 KMS States Associated to Higher-Rank Graphs

In this section, we shall use the results obtained thus far to answer existence-uniqueness questions on KMS states for generalized gauge dynamics associated to finite higher-rank graphs.

In what follows, \(\mathbb{N}^k\) is viewed as a countable category with a single object \(0\) and composition of morphisms implemented by +.

Definition 6.1. (k-Graphs [13]) A higher-rank graph \(\Lambda\) of rank \(k\) or, more briefly, a \(k\)-graph is a countable category \(\Lambda\) equipped with a functor \(d : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^k\) — called the degree functor — such that the factorization property holds: For every \(\lambda \in \Lambda\) and \(m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k\) such that \(d(\lambda) = m + n\), there are unique \(\mu, \nu \in \Lambda\) that satisfy the following conditions:

1. \(d(\mu) = m\) and \(d(\nu) = n\).

2. \(\lambda = \mu \nu\).

For notational convenience, we will adopt the following \(k\)-graph-theoretic terminology. Given a \(k\)-graph \(\Lambda\) with degree functor \(d\), for each \(n \in \mathbb{N}^k\), let \(\Lambda^n := d^{-1}(n)\). The elements of \(\Lambda^0\) are called the vertices of \(\Lambda\), and it can be shown that \(\text{Obj}(\Lambda) = \Lambda^0\). The elements of \(\Lambda^e_i\), for \(e_i\) a canonical generators of \(\mathbb{N}^k\), are called the edges of \(\Lambda\). Also let

\[
\begin{align*}
  v\Lambda := \{ \lambda \in \Lambda \mid r(\lambda) = v \}, & \quad v\Lambda^n := \{ \lambda \in \Lambda^n \mid r(\lambda) = v \}, \\
  v\Lambda w := \{ \lambda \in \Lambda \mid s(\lambda) = w \text{ and } r(\lambda) = v \}, & \quad v\Lambda^n w := \{ \lambda \in \Lambda^n \mid s(\lambda) = w \text{ and } r(\lambda) = v \}.
\end{align*}
\]

A \(k\)-graph \(\Lambda\) is called finite if \(\text{Card}(\Lambda^n) < \infty\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}^k\), \(\Lambda\) is said to be source-free if \(v\Lambda^n \neq \emptyset\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}^k\) and \(v \in \Lambda^0\), and \(\Lambda\) is said to be row-finite if \(v\Lambda^n\) is finite for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}^k\) and \(v \in \Lambda^0\).

Moreover, a \(k\)-graph morphism from a \(k\)-graph \(\Lambda\) to another \(\Lambda'\) is a degree-preserving functor \(f : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda'\).

Definition 6.2. (Strong Connectivity and Primitivity [1, 13, 14]) Let \(\Lambda\) be a \(k\)-graph. Then \(\Lambda\) is said to be strongly connected if \(v\Lambda w \neq \emptyset\) for all \(v, w \in \Lambda^0\), while \(\Lambda\) is said to be primitive if there is an \(n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}\) such that \(v\Lambda^n w \neq \emptyset\) for all \(v, w \in \Lambda^0\). Evidently, primitivity is a stronger condition than strong connectivity.
Remark 6.3. Note that $\mathbb{N}^k$ may itself be regarded as a $k$-graph with one vertex. It is called the \textit{trivial $k$-graph} and is both finite and primitive.

Example 6.4. (see [13, Example 1.7(ii)]) Consider the countable category $\Omega_k$ whose underlying set is

$$\Omega_k := \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{N}^k \mid m \leq n\}$$

and whose range map, source map, and morphisms are defined as follows:

- If $(m, n) \in \Omega_k$, then $s(m, n) := (n, n)$ and $r(m, n) := (m, m)$, so that $((k, l), (m, n)) \in \Omega^2_k$ is composable if and only if $l = m$.

- If $(l, m), (m, n) \in \Omega_k$, then $(l, m)(m, n) := (l, n)$.

If we equip $\Omega_k$ with the degree functor $d : \Omega_k \to \mathbb{N}^k$ defined by: $d(m, n) := n - m$ for $(m, n) \in \Omega_k$, then $\Omega_k$ is a $k$-graph. Note that $\Omega_k$ is both source-free and row-finite but neither finite nor strongly connected.

For the remainder of this section, we shall make the following standing assumptions:

The $k$-graph $\Lambda$ is source-free, finite, primitive, and non-empty. \hspace{1cm} (5)

We will now detail more $k$-graphs structures.

Definition 6.5. (Infinite Path Space [13]) Let $\Lambda$ be a $k$-graph satisfying the standing assumptions of (5). The \textit{infinite-path space} of $\Lambda$, denoted by $\Lambda^\infty$, is defined by:

$$\Lambda^\infty := \{f : \Omega_k \to \Lambda \mid f \text{ is a } k\text{-graph morphism}\}.$$ 

As $\Lambda$ is source-free and finite, $\Lambda^\infty$ becomes a non-empty compact Hausdorff space when given the topology generated by the base consisting of cylinder sets, i.e., non-empty compact subsets of the form, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$,

$$Z(\lambda) := \{x \in \Lambda^\infty \mid x(0, d(\lambda)) = \lambda\}.$$ 

We can then define a commuting $k$-tuple $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in [k]}$ of local homeomorphisms of $\Lambda^\infty$ by setting, for all $i \in [k]$, for all $x \in \Lambda^\infty$, and $(m, n) \in \Omega_k$:

$$[\sigma_i(x)](m, n) := x(m + e_i, n + e_i).$$

We call the $k$-tuple $\sigma$ the \textit{shift} on $\Lambda$, and it is easy to see that, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}^k$, for all $x \in \Lambda^\infty$, and $(m, n) \in \Omega_k$:

$$[\sigma^l(x)](m, n) = x(m + l, n + l).$$

Furthermore, it can be shown that $\sigma_i$ is surjective for each $i \in [k]$. We refer the reader to [13] for details.

We now state the following lemma whose standard proof we omit, see for example [9, Proposition 2.15].
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Lemma 6.6. Let $\Lambda$ be a $k$-graph satisfying the standing assumptions (5). Define $\rho_\Lambda : \Lambda^\infty \times \Lambda^\infty \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where for all $x, y \in \Lambda^\infty$ we set $\rho_\Lambda(x, y) := 2^{-N_{xy}}$, with:

$$N_{xy} := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid x(np, (n + 1)p) \neq y(np, (n + 1)p)\},$$

$(1)_{i \in [k]} \leq p$, and $\min(\emptyset) := \infty$ by convention. Then $\rho_\Lambda$ is a metric on $\Lambda^\infty$ compatible with the cylinder set topology.

Lemma 6.7. Let $\Lambda$ be a $k$-graph satisfying the standing assumptions of (5). For $(1)_{i \in [k]} \leq p$, $\sigma^p$ is positively expansive and exact.

Proof. If $x, y \in \Lambda^\infty$ are distinct, then $x(np, (n + 1)p) \neq y(np, (n + 1)p)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From this, one easily verifies that $\rho_\Lambda((\sigma^p)^n(x), (\sigma^p)^n(y)) = 1$. Hence, $\sigma^p$ is positively expansive.

Next, let $\lambda \in \Lambda$ — we need to show that $\sigma^{np}[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)] = \Lambda^\infty$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\Lambda$ is primitive, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that $v\Lambda^nw \neq \emptyset$ for all $v, w \in \Lambda^0$. Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\lambda) + n \leq np$. Let $y \in \Lambda^\infty$. As $\Lambda$ is source-free, we can find a $\mu \in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{np-d(\lambda)-n}$. Next, let $\nu \in s(\mu)\Lambda^ny(0, 0)$. Then $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$ forms a composable triple, and as $y(0, 0) = s(\lambda\mu\nu)$, Proposition 2.3 of [13] tells us that there is an $x \in \Lambda^\infty$ such that $y = \sigma^{d(\lambda\mu\nu)}(x) = \sigma^{np}(x)$ and

$$\lambda\mu\nu = x(0, np) = x(0, d(\lambda)) x(d(\lambda), np - n) x(np - n, np).$$

By the Factorization Property, we get $x(0, d(\lambda)) = \lambda$, so $x \in \mathcal{Z}(\lambda)$. Hence, $y \in \sigma^{np}[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)]$, and since $y \in \Lambda^\infty$ is arbitrary, we obtain $\sigma^{np}[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)] = \Lambda^\infty$. Therefore, $\sigma^{np}$ is exact. \qed

Let $(\varphi)_{i \in [k]}$ be a $k$-tuple of continuous real-valued functions on $\Lambda^\infty$ satisfying the conditions in Definition 3.3 so that if the conditions of Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 4.3 are satisfied, $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi)$ will be $k$-RFP.

As for Ruelle dynamical systems, there is a version of the RPF Theorem for $k$-graphs.

Theorem 6.8. Let $\Lambda$ be a $k$-graph satisfying the standing assumptions of (5). Suppose that there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}^k$, with $(1)_{i \in [k]} \leq p$, such that $F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{p}) : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is Hölder-continuous with respect to $\rho_\Lambda$. Then the triple $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi)$ is a $k$-RPF dynamical system.

Proof. By Theorem 2.7, Lemma 6.6, and Lemma 6.7, the Ruelle triple $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma^p, F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\overline{p}))$ satisfies the Walters Criteria, so by Theorem 4.3, $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi)$ is a $k$-RPF dynamical system. \qed

Note that Proposition 4.3, Theorem 2.4, and the hypothesis Theorem 6.8 will guarantee the existence of a Borel measure $\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}$ on $\Lambda^\infty$. We will now establish some useful properties of this measure.

Proposition 6.9. Let $\Lambda$ be a $k$-graph satisfying the standing assumptions of (5). Suppose that $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi)$ is a $k$-RPF dynamical system. Then, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$:

$$\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) = (\lambda^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi})^{-d(\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))} e^{[\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(d(\lambda))](\lambda x)} \, d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(x),$$
where \( \lambda^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi} \) denotes the \( k \)-tuple of RPF eigenvalues corresponding to \((\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi)\).

**Proof.** Fix an arbitrary \( \lambda \in \Lambda \). For every \( i \in [k] \), we have \((R_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda))^\ast (\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}) = \lambda_i^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi} \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi} \). Hence,

\[
(R_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma(d\lambda), F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)})^\ast (\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}) = \prod_{i=1}^{[d(\lambda)]} (R_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma(d\lambda), \varphi(d\lambda)}(i))^\ast (\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}) = (\prod_{i=1}^{[d(\lambda)]} \lambda_i^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}) \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi} = (\lambda^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi})^d(\lambda) \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}.
\]

So integrating \( \chi_{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)} \in C(\Lambda^\infty, \mathbb{R}) \) with respect to the equal measures on the left and right hand side of the above equation and using the definition of \((R_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma(d\lambda), F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)})^\ast \) yields:

\[
\int_{\Lambda^\infty} \left[ \sum_{y \in \Lambda^\infty, \sigma^{d(\lambda)(y)}(x) = x} e^{[F_{\Lambda, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)](y)} \chi_{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)}(y) \right] d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(x) = (\lambda^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi})^d(\lambda) \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)).
\]

If \( x \in \Lambda^\infty \setminus \mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda)) \), then there does not exist a \( y \in \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) \) such that \( \sigma^{d(\lambda)}(y) = x \), so

\[
\sum_{y \in \Lambda^\infty, \sigma^{d(\lambda)}(y) = x} e^{[F_{\Lambda, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)](y)} \chi_{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)}(y) = 0.
\]

It thus follows that

\[
\int_{\Lambda^\infty} \left[ \sum_{y \in \Lambda^\infty, \sigma^{d(\lambda)}(y) = x} e^{[F_{\Lambda, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)](y)} \chi_{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)}(y) \right] d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(x) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))} \left[ \sum_{y \in \Lambda^\infty, \sigma^{d(\lambda)}(y) = x} e^{[F_{\Lambda, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)](y)} \chi_{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)}(y) \right] d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(x).
\]

Given an \( x \in \mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda)) \), there exists precisely one \( y \in \mathcal{Z}(\lambda) \) such that \( \sigma^{d(\lambda)}(y) = x \), namely, \( \lambda x \). Consequently,

\[
\int_{\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))} \left[ \sum_{y \in \Lambda^\infty, \sigma^{d(\lambda)}(y) = x} e^{[F_{\Lambda, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)](y)} \chi_{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)}(y) \right] d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(x) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))} e^{[F_{\Lambda, \sigma, \varphi}(d\lambda)](\lambda x)} d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(x).
\]
Therefore,
\[
\int_{\mathcal{Z}(\sigma(\lambda))} e^{\left[F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(d(\lambda))\right](\lambda x)} \, d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(x) = (\lambda^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}) d(\lambda) \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)),
\]
and a simple rearrangement of terms yields the proposition. □

We list an important positivity property of the measure $\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}$ in the event that $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi)$ is a $k$-RPF dynamical system.

**Corollary 6.10.** Let $\Lambda$ be a $k$-graph satisfying the standing assumptions of (5). Suppose that $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi)$ is a $k$-RPF dynamical system. Then $\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) > 0$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

**Proof.** Suppose by way of contradiction that there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) = 0$. By Lemma 6.7, if $(1)_{i \in [k]} \leq p$, $\sigma^p$ is positively expansive and exact. But then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma^np(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) = \Lambda^\infty$. We now use Proposition 4.2 of [23] again to deduce that
\[
\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\Lambda^\infty) = \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\sigma^np(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda))) = \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) = 0.
\]
Since we know that $\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\Lambda^\infty) = 1$, this gives us a contradiction, and we must have $\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) > 0$, so we have established the corollary. □

Recall that if $\Lambda$ is a $k$-graph, and $H$ is an abelian group, a map $h : \Lambda \to H$ is called a categorical 1-cocycle if $h(\lambda \mu) = h(\lambda) + h(\mu)$ whenever $(\lambda, \mu)$ is composable. In the case when $H = \mathbb{R}$ and the image of $h$ lies entirely inside the nonnegative real numbers, $h$ was called an “$\mathbb{R}^+$-functor” in [10].

Next, observe that, if $h$ is a categorical 1-cocycle taking values in $\mathbb{R}$, a routine calculation shows that the functions $\varphi^{h, \theta}_i : \Lambda^\infty \to \mathbb{R}$, $i \in [k]$ defined for all $i \in [k]$, and for all $x \in \Lambda^\infty$ by:
\[
\varphi^{h, \theta}_i(x) = -\theta h(x(0, e_i))
\]
satisfy the cocycle condition and therefore determine a groupoid 1-cocycle on $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma)$ taking on values in $\mathbb{R}$ by Lemma 3.4. Hence, $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta})$ is a $k$-Ruelle dynamical system.

Example 5.4 has shown that an automorphism group on a $C^*$-algebra coming from $(X, \sigma, \varphi)$ need not have a KMS state. However we can construct a new cocycle from $\varphi$ giving rise to a different dynamics for which a KMS state does exist by using Theorem 5.8 and other results. The following theorem was first proved in a different way in Proposition 4.4. in [10].

**Theorem 6.11 ([10]).** Let $\Lambda$ be a $k$-graph satisfying the standing assumptions of (5). Let $h : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ be a nonnegative categorical 1-cocycle, and let $\theta$ be a positive real number. Let $\varphi^{h, \theta}$ be the 1-cocycle associated to $h$ as defined above. Then $(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta})$ is a $k$-RPF dynamical system and for each $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, so is
\[
\left(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \left(\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left(\lambda^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}_i \varphi^{h, \theta}_i\right)\right)_{i \in [k]}\right).
\]
The associated generalized state $\omega$ on $C^*_r(G(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma)) \cong C^*(\Lambda)$ uniquely determined by

$$\omega(\sigma(f)) = \int_{\Lambda^\infty} f(x,0,x) \, d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty,\sigma,\varphi^{h,\theta}} \quad \text{for all } f \in C_c(G(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma))$$

is a KMS$_\beta$-state for the dynamics determined by the cocycle $\varsigma$ given by:

$$\varsigma = \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \ln \left( \Lambda^{\Lambda^\infty,\sigma,\varphi^{h,\theta}} \right) - \varphi^{h,\theta}_i \right) \right)_{i \in [k]};$$

moreover $\mu^{x,\sigma,\varsigma} = \mu^{x,\sigma,\varphi}$.

**Proof.** Fix an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$. We will first prove that the function $f : \Lambda^\infty \to \mathbb{R}$ defined, for every $\forall x \in \Lambda^\infty$, by:

$$f(x) := h(x(0,n))$$

is Hölder-continuous with respect to $\rho_{\Lambda}$. As $\Lambda^n$ is finite, $h$ clearly achieves both a minimum value $m$ and a maximum value $M$ on $\Lambda^n$. Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \leq N\underline{p}$, with $(1)_{i \in [k]} \leq \underline{p}$.

For $x, y \in \Lambda^\infty$ such that $\rho_{\Lambda}(x,y) < \frac{1}{2N}$, then for all $j \in [N]$, $x(j\underline{p}, (j+1)\underline{p}) = y(j\underline{p}, (j+1)\underline{p})$,

so $x(0,N\underline{p}) = y(0,N\underline{p})$, which yields $x(0,n) = y(0,n)$ by the Factorization Property. Consequently,

$$\forall x, y \in \Lambda^\infty : \quad |f(x) - f(y)| = |h(x(0,n)) - h(y(0,n))| \leq N(M - m)\rho_{\Lambda}(x,y).$$

As $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ is arbitrary, it follows that $\varphi^{h,\theta}_i$ is Hölder-continuous with respect to $\rho_{\Lambda}$ for each $i \in [k]$.

Now let us proceed to demonstrate that $F_{\Lambda^\infty,\sigma,\varphi^{h,\theta}}(\overline{p})$ is Hölder-continuous with respect to $\rho_{\Lambda}$. Indeed, for all $x \in \Lambda^\infty$:

$$\left[ F_{\Lambda^\infty,\sigma,\varphi^{h,\theta}}(\overline{p}) \right](x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Length}(\overline{p})} \left( \varphi^{h,\theta}_{\overline{p}(i)} \left( \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{\overline{p}(j)}}(x) \right) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\lvert \overline{p} \rvert} \left( \varphi^{h,\theta}_{\overline{p}(i)} \left( \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{\overline{p}(j)}}(x) \right) \right)$$

$$= -\sum_{i=1}^{\lvert \overline{p} \rvert} \theta h \left( \left[ \sigma^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{\overline{p}(j)}}(x) \right](0, e_{\overline{p}(i)}) \right)$$

$$= -\sum_{i=1}^{\lvert \overline{p} \rvert} \theta h \left( x \left( \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{\overline{p}(j)}, \sum_{j=1}^{i} e_{\overline{p}(j)} \right) \right)$$

$$= -\theta h \left( \prod_{i=1}^{\lvert \overline{p} \rvert} x \left( \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e_{\overline{p}(j)}, \sum_{j=1}^{i} e_{\overline{p}(j)} \right) \right)$$
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\[-\theta h \left( x \left( 0, \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{P}|} e_p(j) \right) \right) = -\theta h(0, p),\]

so by the first paragraph of this proof, the desired conclusion is obtained. Applying Theorem 6.8 we conclude that \((\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta})\) is a \(k\)-RPF dynamical system.

It now follows from Theorem 5.8 that

\[
\left( \Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \ln(\lambda_i^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}) - \varphi_i^{h, \theta} \right) \right)_{i \in [k]} \right)
\]

is also a \(k\)-RPF dynamical system, with \(\mu^{X, \sigma, \varphi} = \mu^{X, \sigma, \varphi}\) by Theorem 5.8. By Proposition 5.6, the state \(\omega\) on \(C^*(\mathcal{G}(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma)) \cong C^*(\Lambda)\) that is uniquely determined by, for all \(f \in C_c(\mathcal{G}(\Lambda^\infty, \sigma))\)

\[
\omega(\sigma(f)) = \int_{\Lambda^\infty} f(x, 0, x) \, d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}
\]

is a KMS\(_\beta\)-state for the generalized gauge dynamics of this particular \(k\)-RPF dynamical system.

The following corollary gives more information about the measure \(\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}\) and relates it to the eigenvalues of the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operator.

**Corollary 6.12.** Let \(\Lambda\) be a \(k\)-graph satisfying the standing assumptions of (5), and let \(h : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\), let \(\theta \in \mathbb{R}^\times\) be as in Theorem 6.11. Let \(\varphi^{h, \theta}\) be the cocycle defined there, and let \(\theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}\). Then, for all \(\lambda \in \Lambda\),

\[
\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) = \left( \lambda_i^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}} \right)^{-d(\lambda)} e^{-\theta h(\lambda)} \mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}(\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda)));
\]

where \(\varphi^{h, \theta}\) is the \(k\)-tuple in \(C(\Lambda^\infty, \mathbb{R})\) that is defined, for all \(i \in [k]\) and for all \(x \in \Lambda^\infty\), by:

\[
\varphi_i^{h, \theta}(x) := -\theta h(x(0, e_i)).
\]

**Proof.** We already know from Theorem 7.9 that, for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}^k\) and for all \(x \in \Lambda^\infty\),

\[
\left[ F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}(\overline{n}) \right](x) = -\theta h(x(0, n)).
\]

Hence, for every \(\lambda \in \Lambda\), if \(x \in \mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))\), then

\[
\left[ F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}(\overline{\lambda}) \right](\lambda x) = -\theta h((\lambda x)(0, d(\lambda))) = -\theta h(\lambda).
\]

Consequently, by the Proposition 6.9, for all \(\lambda \in \Lambda\):

\[
\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) = \left( \lambda_i^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}} \right)^{-d(\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))} e^{\left[ F_{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}(\overline{d(\lambda)}) \right](\lambda x)} \, d\mu^{\Lambda^\infty, \sigma, \varphi^{h, \theta}}(x)
\]
\[
\left( \lambda^{A_{\infty}, \sigma, \varphi^h, \theta} \right)^{-d(\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))} e^{-\varphi^h(\lambda)} d\mu^{A_{\infty}, \sigma, \varphi^h, \theta}(x) \\
= \left( \lambda^{A_{\infty}, \sigma, \varphi^h, \theta} \right)^{-d(\lambda)} e^{-\varphi^h(\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))} 1 d\mu^{A_{\infty}, \sigma, \varphi^h, \theta}(x) \\
= \left( \lambda^{A_{\infty}, \sigma, \varphi^h, \theta} \right)^{-d(\lambda)} e^{-\varphi^h(\lambda)} \mu^{A_{\infty}, \sigma, \varphi^h, \theta}(\mathcal{Z}(s(\lambda))).
\]

The corollary is therefore proven. \qed
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