ABSTRACT ENTROPY AND EXPANSIVENESS

M. ACHIGAR

Abstract. We give a general definition of entropy in the setting of pre-ordered semigroups following the method of the seminal paper of Adler, Konheim and McAndrew, where the notion of topological entropy for continuous maps is introduced in 1965. From our definition we obtain the basic properties exhibited by various entropy-like theories encountered in the literature, several of them being particular cases of our scheme. We also introduce a notion of expansiveness in this general context extending the notion of expansive dynamical system, which is related to the entropy in a similar fashion as in the case of the topological entropy of an expansive system.

1. Introduction

In his 1965 article [3], Adler, Konheim and McAndrew introduced the notion of topological entropy, \( h(T) \), for a continuous map \( T: X \to X \) on a compact topological space \( X \). Some of the key ingredients in the definition of this invariant are the open covers of \( X \) (denoted here as \( \alpha, \beta, \ldots \)), preimages \( T^{-1}(\alpha) \) under \( T \) of open covers, and the meet \( \alpha \wedge \beta \) of open covers (called join and denoted with \( \vee \) in [3]). In that article several useful properties were developed, such as the logarithmic law \( h(T^n) = nh(T) \), and many others. The proofs of these properties relies, among other things, on the following basic fact:

\[
T^{-1}(\alpha \wedge \beta) = T^{-1}(\alpha) \wedge T^{-1}(\beta).
\]

That is, if we consider the set \( \mathcal{C} \) of all open covers, and the map \( \lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C} \) given by \( \lambda(\alpha) = T^{-1}(\alpha) \), then \( \lambda \) preserves the operation \( \wedge \). In fact, \( \mathcal{C} \) is a semigroup with this operation so that \( \lambda \) is a semigroup homomorphism, and the topological entropy can be defined in terms of \( \lambda \).

There are also other ingredients and basic facts supporting the definition and properties of \( h(T) \). For example, the refinement relation \( \alpha \prec \beta \) between open covers, the quantity \( H(\alpha) \) of [3, Definition 1], and the monotonicity of \( \lambda \) and \( H \), but we prefer to stress only property (1) to keep the Introduction simple.

Another theory very similar to that of topological entropy is the theory of mean dimension. The mean dimension, \( \text{mdim}(T) \), of a continuous map \( T \) as before, is introduced in [8]. To obtain this definition one simply needs to replace the quantity \( H(\alpha) \) in the definition of \( h(T) \) by the quantity \( D(\alpha) \) of [8, Definition 2.1]. As \( H \) and \( D \) share the relevant basic properties, both theories also share various properties.
(and proofs). This is also the case of the theory of algebraic entropy, introduced in [10]. To get the definition of the algebraic entropy of an endomorphism \( \varphi \) of a group \( G \), one needs to replace \( C \) by the set of all finite subgroups of a group \( G \), \( \wedge \) by the sum + of subgroups, \( \preceq \) by the \( \supseteq \) relation, \( \lambda \) by the map taking a finite subgroup to its image under \( \varphi \), and the quantity \( H \) by the logarithm of the cardinality of the subgroups. In this two examples and many others the map \( \lambda: C \to C \) always preserves the semigroup operation of \( C \). However, this is not the case in some natural contexts.

For example, suppose that one wants to define a forward version of the topological entropy, that is, to consider the map \( \lambda: C \to C \) given by \( \lambda(\alpha) = T(\alpha) \). In first place, it is necessary to assume that \( T: X \to X \) is an open onto map, to guarantee that \( \lambda \) carries open covers to open covers. With these changes one can define the forward topological entropy of such a map \( T \) following the same method as for the topological entropy. However, this time \( \lambda \) does not necessarily preserves the operation \( \wedge \), but instead we can ensure that

\[
T(\alpha \wedge \beta) \preceq T(\alpha) \wedge T(\beta).
\]

That is, \( \lambda \) is not a semigroup homomorphism anymore, but it satisfies a weaker condition resembling subadditivity. We will call this type of maps lower maps. Surprisingly, it is still possible to prove various of the topological entropy theory properties in this context. To show that is one of the main contributions of the present work.

In Section 2 we consider the situation above from an abstract viewpoint, starting with a lower map \( \lambda \) acting on a general semigroup \( C \), we define his entropy and then we derive the properties. In [6], Dikranjan and Giordano Bruno made a similar development assuming that the map \( \lambda \) does preserves the operation of \( C \).

The second main contribution of this article is the introduction of the concept of expansivity in the abstract setting of a general semigroup \( C \). The usual notion of expansivity of a topological dynamical system on a compact metric space, is a particular case of our abstract expansivity, and corresponds to the case when \( C \) is the set of all open covers of the space, as in the beginning of this introduction.

Moreover, abstract expansivity and entropy interacts in the same way as in the theory of dynamical systems. A useful tool for computing topological entropy for an expansive dynamical system is the following fact: the entropy of the system coincides with the entropy of size \( \varepsilon > 0 \), if this size is smaller than an expansivity constant. We will prove an analogue of this result at the abstract level of a general semigroup \( C \). These topics are covered in Section 2.5.

1.1. Notation and conventions. Let \( X \) be a set, \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) families of subsets of \( X \), and \( A \subseteq X \). We say that \( \alpha \) is a refinement of \( \beta \), denoted \( \alpha \prec \beta \), iff for every \( A \in \alpha \) there exists \( B \in \beta \) such that \( A \subseteq B \). We also write \( A \prec B \) to mean that \( \{A\} \prec \beta \). The meet of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) is \( \alpha \wedge \beta = \{A \cap B : A \in \alpha, B \in \beta\} \). We also write
A ∧ β = \{A\} ∧ β. The union of the members of α is denoted \bigcup α. We say that α is cover iff \bigcup α = X. If A ⊆ \bigcup α then α is called a cover of A.

Let \( f: X \rightarrow Y \) be a map. If \( x \in X \) the image of \( x \) under \( f \) is denoted \( f(x) \) or \( f(x) \).

If \( A \subseteq X \) and \( α \) is a family of subsets of \( X \) we write \( fA = f(α) = \{fx : x \in A\} \) and \( fα = f(α) = \{fA : A \in α\} \). For \( B \subseteq Y \) and a family \( β \) of subsets of \( Y \) we denote \( f^{-1}B = f^{-1}(B) = \{x \in X : fx \in B\} \) and \( f^{-1}β = f^{-1}(β) = \{f^{-1}B : B \in β\} \).

For a point \( y \in Y \) we sometimes write \( f^{-1}y = f^{-1}\{y\} \). If \( X = Y \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \) we denote as usual \( f^n = f \circ \cdots \circ f \) \((n \text{ times})\) if \( n \geq 1 \), and \( f^0 = \text{id}_X \) is the identity function on \( X \). If \( f \) is bijective we denote \( f^{-n} = (f^{-1})^n \).

We denote \( \mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty) \) the set of non-negative real numbers together with the symbol \( \infty \). We extend the order and the operations of real numbers agreeing that \( a \leq \infty \) and \( a + \infty = \infty + a = a \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot a = \infty \) for all \( a \in \mathbb{R}^+ \). Note that in particular \( 0 \cdot \infty = \infty \). Functions like “sup” or “limsup” naturally extends taking values in \( \mathbb{R}^+ \).

2. Abstract entropy

2.1. Entropy spaces.

**Definition 2.1.1.** A cover space is a 3-tuple \((\mathcal{C}, \prec, \wedge)\) where \( \mathcal{C} \) is a non-empty set, \( \prec \) a pre-order in \( \mathcal{C} \) (a transitive and reflexive relation) and \( \wedge \) an associative binary operation on \( \mathcal{C} \) satisfying the following conditions:

[\text{c1}] \( \alpha \wedge \beta \prec \alpha \) and \( \alpha \wedge \beta \prec \beta \) for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \).

[\text{c2}] \( \alpha \prec \beta \prec \alpha' \wedge \beta' \) if \( \alpha \prec \alpha' \) and \( \beta \prec \beta' \), where \( \alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in \mathcal{C} \).

The structure \((\mathcal{C}, \prec, \wedge)\), also called pre-ordered semigroup, will be denoted simply as \( \mathcal{C} \). In this context an element of \( \mathcal{C} \) is called a cover, \( \prec \) is the refinement relation and \( \wedge \) the meet operation. Given \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \) such that \( \alpha \prec \beta \) (also written \( \beta \succ \alpha \)) we say that \( \alpha \) is finer than/is a refinement of/refines \( \beta \).

**Remark 2.1.2.** If \( \mathcal{C} \) is a cover space and \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{C} \), conditions \([\text{c1}]\) and \([\text{c2}]\) implies that adding factors to the product \( \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \alpha_i = \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_n \) at any place will result in a finer cover. For example, \( \alpha_1 \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha_2 \prec \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \) if \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \).

**Definition 2.1.3.** Given a cover space \( \mathcal{C} \) consider the equivalence relation \( \sim \) on \( \mathcal{C} \) defined for \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \) as \( \alpha \sim \beta \) iff \( \alpha \prec \beta \) and \( \beta \succ \alpha \). We say that \( \mathcal{C} \) (or \( \wedge \)) is commutative iff \( \alpha \wedge \beta \sim \beta \wedge \alpha \) for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \). We call \( \mathcal{C} \) a meet cover space, also called pre-lower semilattice, iff for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \) the cover \( \alpha \wedge \beta \) is a greatest lower bound for \( \{\alpha, \beta\} \), that is, if \( \gamma \prec \alpha \) and \( \gamma \prec \beta \) for some \( \gamma \in \mathcal{C} \) then \( \gamma \prec \alpha \wedge \beta \).

**Remark 2.1.4.** For a cover space \( \mathcal{C} \) it is not difficult to show that to be a meet cover space is equivalent to the condition: \( \alpha \wedge \alpha \sim \alpha \) for all \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C} \), which in turn is equivalent to the property: if \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \) and \( \alpha \prec \beta \) then \( \alpha \sim \alpha \wedge \beta \). It is also clear that a meet cover space is automatically commutative. Hence, in a product of covers of a meet cover space we can cancel repeated factors or in general factors refined by other factors of the product, for example \( \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma \wedge \alpha \sim \alpha \wedge \beta \) if \( \beta \prec \gamma \).
Remark 2.1.5. If a cover space \( C \) has a unit \( 1 \in C \), that is, \( \alpha \land 1 \sim 1 \land \alpha \sim \alpha \) for all \( \alpha \in C \), then by condition [c2] we can replace condition [c1] in Definition 2.1.1 by the simpler one: \( \alpha \prec 1 \) for all \( \alpha \in C \). This structure will be called unital cover space or pre-ordered monoid. If a cover space \( C \) has no unit element (or even if it has) we can add one, say \( 1 \notin C \), to it and get a unital cover space \( C \cup \{1\} \) extending the relation \( \prec \) and the binary operation \( \land \) in the obvious way.

Remark 2.1.6. Given a cover space \( C \) let \( C_1 = C/\sim \) be the quotient space by the equivalence relation \( \sim \) of Definition 2.1.3, and let \([\alpha] \in \mathcal{C}_1\) denote the equivalence class of \( \alpha \in C \). Define the relation \( \prec_1 \) on \( \mathcal{C}_1 \) by \([\alpha] \prec_1 [\beta] \) iff \( \alpha \prec \beta \), for \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \), and consider the binary operation \( \land_1 \) on \( \mathcal{C}_1 \) given by \([\alpha] \land_1 [\beta] = [\alpha \land \beta] \) if \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \). As can be easily checked \( \prec_1 \) is a partial order (a transitive, reflexive and antisymmetric relation) and \((\mathcal{C}_1, \prec_1, \land_1)\) is a cover space. Then, without loss of generality, we could have assumed that \( \prec \) is a partial order, rather than a pre-order, in the definition of cover spaces. But as in many examples what naturally arise are pre-orders we prefer the given definition.

Example 2.1.7. Let \( \mathcal{L} \) be a bounded distributive lattice as in [1, Definition 2.1] and \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}) \) the set of covers in \( \mathcal{L} \) endowed with the pre-order \( \prec \) and the binary operation \( \land \) as in [1, Definition 2.2]. Then \( \mathcal{C} \) is clearly a meet cover space.

Definition 2.1.8. An entropy space is a 4-tuple \((\mathcal{C}, \prec, \land, h)\) where \((\mathcal{C}, \prec, \land)\) is a cover space and \( h: \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) a function such that the following conditions hold:

- \([\text{H1}]\) \( h(\alpha) \geq h(\beta) \) if \( \alpha \prec \beta \), where \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \).
- \([\text{H2}]\) \( h(\alpha \land \beta) \leq h(\alpha) + h(\beta) \) for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \).

The function \( h \) is called entropy function. An entropy space will be denoted simply as \((\mathcal{C}, h)\) or even \( \mathcal{C} \). We say that \( \mathcal{C} \) (or \( h \)) is finite iff \( h(\alpha) < \infty \) for all \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C} \).

Remark 2.1.9. Note that from conditions [c1], [\text{H1}] and [\text{H2}] on an entropy space \( \mathcal{C} \) we have \( \max\{h(\alpha), h(\beta)\} \leq h(\alpha \land \beta) \leq h(\alpha) + h(\beta) \), for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \). Also, by condition [\text{H1}], if \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C} \) and \( \alpha \sim \beta \) then \( h(\alpha) = h(\beta) \).

Remark 2.1.10. If \( \mathcal{C} \) is a unital entropy space with unit \( 1 \in \mathcal{C} \) we can have \( h(1) \neq 0 \). Redefining \( h(1) = 0 \) we also get an entropy space. Then we will always assume that \( h(1) = 0 \) in a unital entropy space. If an entropy space has no unit we can add one to it as in Remark 2.1.5 and define \( h(1) = 0 \) getting a unital entropy space. On the other hand, the construction of Remark 2.1.6 can be done in an entropy space defining \( h_1([\alpha]) = h(\alpha) \) if \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C} \) to get an entropy space \( \mathcal{C}_1 \).

2.2. Morphisms.

Definition 2.2.1. Let \( \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \) be entropy spaces and \( \lambda: \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathcal{C}_2 \) a monotone map, that is, \( \lambda \alpha \prec \lambda \beta \) if \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}_1 \) and \( \alpha \prec \beta \). Then \( \lambda \) is called lower map (or l-map) iff

- \([\text{L1}]\) \( \lambda(\alpha \land \beta) \prec \lambda \alpha \land \lambda \beta \) for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}_1 \), and
- \([\text{L2}]\) \( h(\lambda \alpha) \leq h(\alpha) \) for all \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1 \).
We say that $\lambda$ is an upper map (u-map for short) iff

$[U1] \quad \lambda(\alpha \land \beta) \succ \lambda\alpha \land \lambda\beta \quad \text{for all } \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}_1,$

$[U2] \quad h(\lambda\alpha) \geq h(\alpha) \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1.$

We call $\lambda$ a homomorphism iff

$[M1] \quad \lambda(\alpha \land \beta) \sim \lambda\alpha \land \lambda\beta \quad \text{for all } \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}_1,$

$[M2] \quad h(\lambda\alpha) = h(\alpha) \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1.$

If the monotone map $\lambda$ satisfies condition $[M1]$ we call it a morphism (only cover space structure involved). If it verifies conditions $[M1]$ and $[L2]$ then it is called lower morphism (or $l$-morphism), and it is called upper morphism (or $u$-morphism) iff $\lambda$ satisfies conditions $[M1]$ and $[U2]$. On the other hand, $\lambda$ is said to be an isomorphism iff $\lambda$ is a bijective homomorphism such that its inverse map $\lambda^{-1}$ is also a homomorphism. Finally, if $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ are unital cover spaces, with units denoted 1, and $\lambda: \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ verifies $\lambda 1 = 1$ then $\lambda$ is called a unital map.

We will study entropy mainly for lower maps, the upper maps will be used to connect lower maps and compare their entropies in §2.6. The diagram illustrates the relationships between the different classes of monotone maps of Definition 2.2.1.

Remark 2.2.2. Let $\lambda: \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ be a lower map and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{C}_1$. Then condition $[c2]$ implies that condition $[L1]$ generalizes to $\lambda \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \alpha_i \prec \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \lambda\alpha_i$. Analogously, $\lambda \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \alpha_i \succ \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \lambda\alpha_i$ if $\lambda$ is an upper map, with equivalence in the case morphisms.

Remark 2.2.3. Let $\lambda: \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ be a bi-monetone map between entropy spaces, that is, $\lambda$ is monotone, bijective and $\lambda^{-1}$ is monotone. Then, $\lambda$ is a lower map iff $\lambda^{-1}$ is an upper map. In particular, if $\lambda$ is a homomorphism then it is an isomorphism.

Remark 2.2.4. Compositions of l-maps are l-maps because l-maps are monotone. Then, with the entropy spaces as objects and the l-maps as arrows we obtain a category. Similarly, if we take as arrows the l-morphisms, u-maps, u-morphisms or homomorphisms we also get categories. Note that in these five categories the category isomorphisms are precisely the isomorphisms introduced in Definition 2.2.1. Compositions of morphisms are morphisms as well, again by monotonicity.

Remark 2.2.5. By Remark 2.2.4 if $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is an l-map, l-morphism, u-map, u-morphism, homomorphism or a morphism, then $\lambda^n$ is of the same class for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\lambda$ is an isomorphism then $\lambda^n$ is an isomorphism for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

2.3. Entropy. In this section we define the entropy of a map in Definition 2.3.2 and show two facts concerning it in Corollary 2.3.6 and Corollary 2.3.8.
Definition 2.3.1. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cover space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a map, $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \leq m$. We define $\alpha_n^m[\lambda] = \alpha_n^m = \bigwedge_{k=n}^m \lambda^k \alpha$. If $\lambda$ is a bijective map the above definition makes sense for $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Recall that the order of the factors matters in Definition 2.3.1 because a general cover space is not assumed to be commutative.

Definition 2.3.2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an entropy space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a map and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$. We define the entropy of $\lambda$ relative to the cover $\alpha$ and the entropy of $\lambda$ as

$$h(\lambda, \alpha) = \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} h(\alpha_n^{n-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad h(\lambda) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}} h(\lambda, \alpha),$$

respectively, where the lim sup and sup functions can take values in $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty]$.

Remark 2.3.3. In the context of Definition 2.3.2 we have that the $\mathbb{R}^+$-valued sequence $(h(\alpha_n^{n-1}))$ is increasing. Indeed, if $n \geq 1$, as $\alpha_0^0 \prec \alpha_n^{n-1}$ by condition [C1], we get $h(\alpha_0^{n-1}) \geq h(\alpha_n^{n-1})$ by condition [H1]. Hence, for a non-finite entropy space we always have $h(\lambda) = \infty$, because $h(\lambda, \alpha) = \infty$ if $\alpha$ is a cover such that $h(\alpha) = \infty$.

Lemma 2.3.4. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an entropy space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a monotone map, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\alpha \prec \beta$, then $h(\lambda, \alpha) \geq h(\lambda, \beta)$.

Proof. As $\alpha \prec \beta$ then $\lambda^k \alpha \prec \lambda^k \beta$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ because $\lambda$ is monotone. Then, for all $n \geq 1$, we have $\alpha_0^{n-1} \prec \beta_0^{n-1}$ by condition [C2], and hence $h(\alpha_0^{n-1}) \geq h(\beta_0^{n-1})$ by condition [H1]. Dividing by $n$ and taking lim sup we get $h(\lambda, \alpha) \geq h(\lambda, \beta)$. \qed

As a consequence of Lemma 2.3.4 we will be interested in the asymptotic behaviour of the covers of an entropy space as they become finer. Note that in this direction (relation $\succ$) every cover space $\mathcal{C}$ is a directed set by condition [C1], that is, for every $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ (namely $\gamma = \alpha \land \beta$) such that $\gamma \prec \alpha$ and $\gamma \prec \beta$. We will consider $\mathcal{C}$ as a directed set in this way when taking limits. Accordingly we will use the term cofinal in the sense of the following definition.

Definition 2.3.5. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an entropy space. A subset $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is called cofinal iff for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{C}'$ such that $\beta \prec \alpha$. A map $\lambda: \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathcal{C}_2$ between entropy spaces is called cofinal map iff its image $\lambda(\mathcal{C}_1)$ is a cofinal subset of $\mathcal{C}_2$.

The next easy consequence of Lemma 2.3.4 allows us to replace the “$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}}$” of Definition 2.3.2 by a “$\lim_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}'}$” for a cofinal subset $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ in the monotone case.

Corollary 2.3.6. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an entropy space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a monotone map and $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ a cofinal subset. Then $h(\lambda) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}'} h(\lambda, \alpha) = \lim_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}'} h(\lambda, \alpha)$. An $\mathbb{R}^+$-valued sequence $(a_n)$ is called subadditive iff $a_{n+m} \leq a_n + a_m$ for all $n, m$.

Lemma 2.3.7. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an entropy space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a lower map and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$. Then the sequence $(a_n)$ given by $a_n = h(\alpha_n^{n-1})$ if $n \geq 1$ is subadditive.
Proof. For $n, m \geq 1$ let $s = n + m$ denote their sum. Then we can estimate
\[ a_{n+m} = h(\bigwedge_{k=0}^{s-1} \lambda^k \alpha) \leq h(\bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-1} \lambda^k \alpha) + h(\bigwedge_{k=0}^{m-1} \lambda^k \alpha) \]
\[ \leq a_n + h(\lambda^n \bigwedge_{k=0}^{m-1} \lambda^k \alpha) \leq a_n + h(\bigwedge_{k=0}^{m-1} \lambda^k \alpha) = a_n + a_m, \]
where the first inequality comes from condition (H2), the second one from conditions [L1] and [H1], and the final from condition [L2]. Therefore $(a_n)$ is subadditive. □

By [9, Theorem 4.9], if $(a_n)$ is a subadditive sequence of non-negative real numbers then the limit $\lim_{n} \frac{a_n}{n} = \inf_{n} \frac{a_n}{n}$ exists and is finite. Therefore, by Lemma 2.3.7 and Remark 2.3.3 we see that we can replace the “$\limsup_n$” in Definition 2.3.2 by a “$\lim_n$” in the case of a lower map. We record this in the following statement.

Corollary 2.3.8. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an entropy space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a lower map and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$. Then $h(\lambda, \alpha) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} h(\alpha_0^{n-1}) = \inf_n \frac{1}{n} h(\alpha_0^{n-1}),$ and $h(\lambda, \alpha)$ is finite if $\alpha$ is finite.

2.4. Basic properties.

Lemma 2.4.1. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an entropy space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a map, $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ and $m \geq 1$. Then we have 1. $mh(\lambda, \alpha) \geq h(\lambda^m, \alpha)$. If in addition $\lambda$ is a lower map then we also have 2. $mh(\lambda, \alpha) \leq h(\lambda^m, \alpha_0^{m-1}[\lambda])$, and 3. $h(\lambda, \lambda^m \alpha) \leq h(\lambda, \alpha)$.

Proof. Firstly, we estimate $\alpha_0^{m-1}[\lambda] = \bigwedge_{k=0}^{m-1} \lambda^k \alpha \leq \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-1} \lambda^k \alpha = \alpha_0^{n-1}[\lambda^m]$, where we applied Remark 2.2.5. Therefore, by condition (H1) we have
\[ h(\lambda, \alpha) \geq \limsup_n \frac{1}{m} h(\alpha_0^{n-1}[\lambda]) \geq \limsup_n \frac{1}{m} h(\alpha_0^{n-1}[\lambda^m]) = \frac{1}{m} h(\lambda^m, \alpha), \]
and we are done. For the second assertion let $\beta = \alpha_0^{m-1}[\lambda]$. Then, if $n \geq 1$ we have
\[ \beta_0^{n-1}[\lambda^m] = \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-1} \lambda^k \beta = \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-1} \lambda^k \alpha \leq \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-1} \lambda^k \alpha, \]
where we applied conditions [L1] and [C2]. Hence, as $\lambda$ and $\lambda^m$ are lower maps (see Remark 2.2.5) we can apply Corollary 2.3.8 and condition (H1) to get
\[ h(\lambda^m, \beta) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} h(\beta_0^{m-1}[\lambda^m]) \geq \lim_n \frac{m}{nm} h(\alpha_0^{m-1}[\lambda]) = mh(\lambda, \alpha), \]
which ends the proof. For the last statement let $\beta = \lambda^m \alpha$ and $n \geq 1$. Then we have $\beta_0^{n-1} = \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-1} \lambda^k \alpha \alpha_0^{m-1}$ by condition [L1]. Hence, by conditions [H1] and [L2] we obtain $h(\beta_0^{m-1}) \leq h(\lambda^m \alpha_0^{n-1}) \leq h(\alpha_0^{n-1})$, and the result follows. □

Proposition 2.4.2. If $\mathcal{C}$ is an entropy space and $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a map then for $m \geq 1$ we have $h(\lambda^m) \leq mh(\lambda)$. If $\lambda$ is a lower map then $h(\lambda^m) = mh(\lambda)$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. For all $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ by Lemma 2.4.1(1) we know that $mh(\lambda, \alpha) \geq h(\lambda^m, \alpha)$. Then taking $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}}$ we get the first claim. For the second, firstly suppose $m \geq 1$. By Lemma 2.4.1(2) we have $mh(\lambda, \alpha) \leq h(\lambda^m, \alpha_0^{m-1}[\lambda]) \leq h(\lambda^m)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$. Taking $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}}$ we obtain $h(\lambda^m) \geq mh(\lambda)$ and hence $h(\lambda^m) = mh(\lambda)$. Finally, for $m = 0$ we have $\lambda^0 = id_{\mathcal{C}}$. As $id_{\mathcal{C}} = id_{\mathcal{C}}$ by what we already proved $h(id_{\mathcal{C}}) = 2h(id_{\mathcal{C}})$, hence $h(id_{\mathcal{C}}) = 0$ or $h(id_{\mathcal{C}}) = \infty$. In the first case we are done, and in the second what we need to prove is $\infty = 0 \cdot \infty$ which is true according to our convention. □
Lemma 2.4.3. If $\mathcal{C}$ is an entropy space and $\lambda : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ an isomorphism, then we have $h(\lambda, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2^n+1} h(\alpha^{n}_n)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. Given $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \geq 1$, by condition [M1] we have $\alpha^{n}_n \sim \lambda^{-n} a^0n$. Therefore, by conditions [H1] and [M2] we obtain $h(\alpha^{n}_n) = h(\lambda^{-n} a^0n) = h(a^0n)$. Then we deduce $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2^n+1} h(\alpha^{n}_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2^n+1} h(a^0n) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$ as claimed. □

Proposition 2.4.4. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a commutative entropy space and $\lambda : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ an isomorphism, then $h(\lambda) = h(\lambda^{-1})$ and moreover $h(\lambda^m) = |m|h(\lambda)$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Given $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \geq 1$ we have $\alpha^{n}_n[\lambda] \sim \alpha^{n}_n[\lambda^{-1}]$ by commutativity, and hence $h(\alpha^{n}_n[\lambda]) = h(\alpha^{n}_n[\lambda^{-1}])$ by condition [H1]. Thus, by Lemma 2.4.3 we obtain $h(\lambda, \alpha) = h(\lambda^{-1}, \alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$, and therefore $h(\lambda) = h(\lambda^{-1})$. To complete the proof it is enough to apply Proposition 2.4.2. □

Lemma 2.4.5. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a commutative entropy space, $\lambda : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ is a morphism, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}$, then $h(\lambda, \alpha \land \beta) \leq h(\lambda, \alpha) + h(\lambda, \beta)$.

Proof. Given $n \geq 1$ we have $(\alpha \land \beta)^{n}_0 \sim \alpha^{n-1}_0 \land \beta^{n-1}_0$ by commutativity and condition [M1]. Then $h((\alpha \land \beta)^{n-1}_0) = h(\alpha^{n-1}_0 \land \beta^{n-1}_0) \leq h(\alpha^{n-1}_0) + h(\beta^{n-1}_0)$ by condition [H2]. Form this the claim follows dividing by $n$ and taking $\limsup_{n \to \infty}$. □

Remark 2.4.6. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a commutative entropy space and $\lambda : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ is a morphism, from Lemma 2.3.4 and Lemma 2.4.5 we deduce that the function $h^\lambda : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ given by $h^\lambda(\alpha) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$, is actually an entropy function for the cover space $\mathcal{C}$. We do not develop any application of this remark in this work but we point out that it gives a source of new entropy functions on a given entropy space. For example, as can be easily checked any lower map $\mu$ for $(\mathcal{C}, h)$ such that $\mu \lambda < \lambda \mu$ (see condition [L3] in Definition 2.6.1) is a lower map for $(\mathcal{C}, h^\lambda)$ too, so maybe it could be useful to study pairs $(\lambda, \mu)$ of commuting morphisms comparing the quantities $h^\lambda(\mu)$ and $h^\mu(\lambda)$ for the concrete entropy theories generalized here.

2.5. Generators and expansiveness. In this section we extend these notions from the theory of topological dynamical systems to our context.

Definition 2.5.1. Let $\mathcal{C}$ a cover space and $\lambda : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a map. A cover $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ is called positive generator for $\lambda$ iff for all $\beta \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha^{m}_0[\lambda] \prec \beta$. If a positive generator $\alpha$ for $\lambda$ exists we call $\lambda$ positively expansive, or positively $\alpha$-expansive. If $\lambda$ is bijective, a cover $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ is said to be a generator for $\lambda$ iff for every $\beta \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha^{m}_0[\lambda] \prec \beta$. If a generator $\alpha$ for $\lambda$ exists we say that $\lambda$ is expansive, or $\alpha$-expansive.

In our motivating example discussed in the Introduction, that is, a topological dynamical system $(X, T)$ where $T$ is a continuous map on a compact space $X$, we have that the associated map $\lambda$ is positively expansive according to Definition 2.5.1 iff $T$ is positively refinement expansive as in [2, Definition 3.17], which in turn is equivalent to the usual positive expansivity of $T$ on a metric space (see
[4, p. 40] when $X$ has the Hausdorff separation property. If $T$ is a homeomorphism an analogous statement relating expansivity of $\lambda$, refinement expansivity of $T$ and the usual metric expansivity holds, as explained in [1, §1] and [2, Theorems 3.13 and 2.7]. In [1, Definition 2.4] a notion of expansivity coherent with the previous ones is given at the intermediate level of lattices (see Example 2.1.7) between expansivity in cover spaces and refinement expansivity.

In [7, Definition 2.4] a definition of topological generator is introduced, showing that the existence of a generator is equivalent to metric expansivity in [7, Theorem 3.2]. This notion of generator is more restrictive than the one corresponding to Definition 2.5.1 at the topological level, the latter being the notion of refinement expansivity cover of [2], which in turn corresponds to the expansivity covers of [1] at the lattice level.

**Lemma 2.5.2.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a meet entropy space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a morphism, $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $h(\lambda, \alpha_m^n) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$, and $h(\lambda, \alpha_m^{-n}) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$ if $\lambda$ is an isomorphism.

**Proof.** Cancelling repeated factors (see Remark 2.1.4) we get $(\alpha_0^n)^{n-1} \sim \alpha_0^{n+n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then, $h(\lambda, \alpha_0^n) = \lim sup \frac{1}{n} h(\alpha_0^n) = \lim sup \frac{1}{n} h(\alpha_0^{n+n-1}) = \lim sup \frac{m+n}{m+n} h(\alpha_0^{n+n-1}) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$. For the last statement, note that we have $(\alpha_0^{-n})^{n-1} \sim \lambda^{-m} \alpha_0^{2m+n-1}$, then $h((\alpha_0^{-n})^{n-1}) = h(\lambda^{-m} \alpha_0^{2m+n-1}) = h(\lambda_0^{2m+n-1})$ by condition [M2], and the result follows similarly. \[\square\]

The following result, which generalizes [7, Theorem 2.6], indicates that it would be interesting to discover new examples of expansivity in the existing entropy theories in order to compute entropy. In [5] the authors start a work in this direction in the category of commutative rings.

**Proposition 2.5.3.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a meet entropy space. If $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ is a positively expansive morphism with positive generator $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$, then $h(\lambda) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$, and this quantity is finite if $h$ is finite and $\lambda$ is a lower morphism. If $\lambda$ is an expansive isomorphism with generator $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ then $h(\lambda) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$, and is finite if $h$ is finite.

**Proof.** For a positive generator $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ the subset $\mathcal{C}' = \{\alpha_0^n[\lambda] : m \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is cofinal. Then by Corollary 2.3.6 and Lemma 2.5.2 we see that $h(\lambda) = h(\lambda, \alpha)$. The finiteness claim follows from Corollary 2.3.8. The statement about expansive isomorphisms is obtained similarly by Lemma 2.4.3. \[\square\]

Next we extend Definition 2.5.1 and Proposition 2.5.3. This will be used in §2.8.

**Definition 2.5.4.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ a cover space, $\lambda: \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a map and $\A \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Then $\A$ is called positive generator system for $\lambda$ iff for all $\beta \in \mathcal{C}$ there exist $\alpha \in \A$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_0^m[\lambda] \prec \beta$. In that case $\lambda$ is called positively $\A$-expansive. If $\lambda$ is bijective, $\A$ is said to be a generator system for $\lambda$ and $\lambda$ is called $\A$-expansive iff for every $\beta \in \mathcal{C}$ there exist $\alpha \in \A$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_0^m[\lambda] \prec \beta$.

A proof similar to that of Proposition 2.5.3 shows the following result.
Corollary 2.5.5. Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a meet entropy space, \( \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \) and \( \lambda : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C} \) a positively \( \mathcal{A} \)-expansive morphism/\( \mathcal{A} \)-expansive isomorphism, then \( h(\lambda) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} h(\lambda, \alpha) \).

2.6. Comparison of entropies.

Definition 2.6.1. For \( i = 1, 2 \) let \( \mathcal{C}_i \) be an entropy space and \( \lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i \) a map. We say that \( \mu \) is a map from \( \lambda_1 \) to \( \lambda_2 \), and denote \( \mu : \lambda_1 \to \lambda_2 \) or \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} \lambda_2 \), iff \( \mu : \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathcal{C}_2 \) is a map. Let \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} \lambda_2 \) a map. We call \( \mu \) a lower connection iff \( \mu \) is a lower map (conditions [L1] and [L2]) verifying

\[ [L3] : \mu \lambda_1 \alpha \prec \mu \lambda_2 \alpha \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1. \]

Analogously, if \( \mu \) is an upper map (conditions [U1] and [U2]) and

\[ [U3] : \mu \lambda_1 \alpha \succ \mu \lambda_2 \alpha \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1, \]

then \( \mu \) is called upper connection. We say that \( \mu \) is a connection iff \( \mu \) is a homomorphism (conditions [M1] and [M2]) and

\[ [M3] : \mu \lambda_1 \alpha \sim \mu \lambda_2 \alpha \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1, \]

A connection which is an isomorphism is called a conjugation. If there exists a conjugation \( \lambda_1 \to \lambda_2 \) we say that \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are conjugate.

Remark 2.6.2. For \( i = 1, 2, 3 \) let \( \mathcal{C}_i \) be an entropy space and \( \lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i \) a map. If \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} \lambda_2 \xrightarrow{\nu} \lambda_3 \) are lower connections, upper connections or connections, then their composition is again a lower connection, upper connection or connection \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu \nu} \lambda_3 \).

If \( \mu : \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathcal{C}_2 \) is a bi-monotone map (see Remark 2.2.3) we have that \( \mu : \lambda_1 \to \lambda_2 \) is a lower/upper connection iff \( \mu^{-1} : \lambda_2 \to \lambda_1 \) is an upper/lower connection. In particular, a bi-monotone connection is a conjugation. Finally, note that if \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} \lambda_2 \) is a lower connection, upper connection or a connection and \( \lambda_2 \) is monotone, then \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu^k} \lambda_2^k \) is a lower connection, upper connection or a connection for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

Lemma 2.6.3. For \( i = 1, 2 \) let \( \mathcal{C}_i \) be an entropy space, \( \lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i \) a map such that \( \lambda_2 \) is monotone and \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1 \).

1. If \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} \lambda_2 \) is an upper connection then \( h(\lambda_1, \alpha) \leq h(\lambda_2, \mu \alpha) \).
2. If \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} \lambda_2 \) is a lower connection then \( h(\lambda_1, \alpha) \geq h(\lambda_2, \mu \alpha) \).
3. If \( \lambda_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} \lambda_2 \) is a connection then \( h(\lambda_1, \alpha) = h(\lambda_2, \mu \alpha) \).

Proof. For the first assertion consider \( n \geq 1 \) and let \( \beta = \mu \alpha \). Then we have

\[ \mu \alpha^{n-1}[\lambda_1] = \mu \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-2} \lambda_1^k \alpha \supseteq \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-2} \mu \lambda_1^k \alpha \supseteq \bigwedge_{k=0}^{n-2} \lambda_2^k \mu \alpha = \beta^{n-1}[\lambda_2], \]

where we applied condition [U1] in the first inequality and conditions [U3] and [C2] in the second. Hence, using conditions [U2] and [H1] we estimate \( h(\alpha^{n-1}[\lambda_1]) \leq h(\mu \alpha^{n-1}[\lambda_1]) \leq h(\beta^{n-1}[\lambda_2]) \), and we conclude that \( h(\lambda_1, \alpha) \leq h(\lambda_2, \beta) \) as desired.

For the second statement, note that the proof given before works with the inequalities reversed, but this time arguing with conditions [L1], [L2] and [L3] instead of [U1], [U2] and [U3], showing that \( h(\lambda_1, \alpha) \geq h(\lambda_2, \mu \alpha) \) for all \( \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_1 \). Finally, the last assertion follows directly from the first two because to be a connection is the same as to be a lower and upper connection simultaneously. \( \Box \)
Proposition 2.6.4. For $i = 1, 2$ let $\mathcal{C}_i$ be an entropy space and $\lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i$ a map such that $\lambda_2$ is monotone. Then the following statements hold.

1. If $\lambda_1 \Rightarrow \lambda_2$ is an upper connection then $h(\lambda_1) \leq h(\lambda_2)$.
2. If $\lambda_1 \Rightarrow \lambda_2$ is a cofinal lower connection then $h(\lambda_1) \geq h(\lambda_2)$.
3. If $\lambda_1 \Rightarrow \lambda_2$ is a cofinal connection then $h(\lambda_1) = h(\lambda_2)$.
4. If $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are conjugate then $h(\lambda_1) = h(\lambda_2)$.

Proof. For the first assertion simply take $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_i}$ in the inequality of Lemma 2.6.3(1). The second follows similarly form Lemma 2.6.3(2) applying Corollary 2.3.6 when taking $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_i}$. The last two claims are consequence of the first two. $\square$

2.7. Products, direct limits and coproducts. In this section we consider products, direct limits and coproducts of entropy spaces and compute the entropy of induced maps.

Construction 2.7.1. Let $I$ be a non-empty finite set, for $i \in I$ let $\mathcal{C}_i$ be an entropy space and let $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$ denote generic elements of the Cartesian product $\mathcal{C} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$. We introduce an entropy space structure in $\mathcal{C}$ as follows: we consider the product pre-order, the binary operation and the entropy function defined as $(\alpha_i) \prec (\beta_i)$ iff $\alpha_i \prec \beta_i$ for all $i \in I$, $(\alpha_i) \land (\beta_i) = (\alpha_i \land \beta_i)$, and $h : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $h((\alpha_i)) = \sum_{i \in I} h(\alpha_i)$, respectively. Then $\mathcal{C} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$ is said to be the product entropy space of the family $(\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I}$ and the lower morphisms $\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}_i$ given by $(\alpha_i) \mapsto \alpha_i$ are called canonical maps.

If $(\lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I}$ is family of maps then the map $\prod_{i \in I} \lambda_i : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ given by $(\alpha_i) \mapsto (\lambda_i \alpha_i)$ is called the induced product map.

If in Construction 2.7.1 the maps $\lambda_i$ are monotone, l-maps, l-morphisms, u-maps, u-morphisms, homomorphisms, morphisms or isomorphisms, then so is $\prod_{i \in I} \lambda_i$.

Proposition 2.7.2. Let $I$ be a non-empty finite set, for $i \in I$ let $\mathcal{C}_i$ be an entropy space and $\lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i$ a map. Then $h(\prod_{i \in I} \lambda_i) \leq \sum_{i \in I} h(\lambda_i)$. If in addition $\lambda_i$ is lower map for all $i \in I$ then $h(\prod_{i \in I} \lambda_i) = \sum_{i \in I} h(\lambda_i)$.

Proof. Denote $\lambda = \prod_{i \in I} \lambda_i$. Given $\alpha = (\alpha_i) \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$ and $n \geq 1$ it can be shown that $\alpha_i^{n-1}[\lambda] = (\alpha_i^{n-1}[\lambda_i])$, hence $h(\alpha_i^{n-1}[\lambda]) = \sum_{i \in I} h(\alpha_i^{n-1}[\lambda_i])$. Dividing by $n$, taking lim sups and then sups we get the inequality. If the maps $\lambda_i$ are lower maps, by Corollary 2.3.8 we can take lims instead of limsup getting an equality. $\square$

Construction 2.7.3. We briefly describe a construction of direct limits for entropy spaces. Given a non-empty directed set $(I, \leq)$, a family $(\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I}$ of entropy spaces and $\Phi = (\varphi_{ij} : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_j)_{i \leq j}$ a coherent family of homomorphisms, that is $\varphi_{ik} \varphi_{ij} = \varphi_{ij}$ if $i \leq j \leq k$, consider $\bigcup_i \mathcal{C}_i$, the disjoint union of the $\mathcal{C}_i$’s, and let $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{C}_i$ and $\beta_j \in \mathcal{C}_j$ denote generic elements of this set. Let $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_i \mathcal{C}_i/\approx$ be the quotient space by the equivalence relation $\approx$ defined as $\alpha_i \approx \beta_j$ iff there exists $k \geq i, j$ such that $\varphi_{ik} \alpha_i = \varphi_{jk} \beta_j$, and let $[\alpha_i]$ denote the equivalence class of $\alpha_i$. Define a pre-order in $\mathcal{C}$ by $[\alpha_i] < [\beta_j]$ iff $\varphi_{ik} \alpha_i < \varphi_{jk} \beta_j$ for some $k \geq i, j$, a binary operation
[\alpha_i \land \beta_j] = [\varphi_{ik} \alpha_i \land \varphi_{jk} \beta_j] \text{ where } k \geq i, j, \text{ and an entropy function } h((\alpha_i)) = h(\alpha_i).

Then \( \mathcal{C} \) is an entropy space denoted \( \mathcal{C} = \lim_i \mathcal{C}_i \) and called direct limit entropy space of the \( \mathcal{C}_i \)'s. The canonical maps \( \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}, \alpha_i \mapsto [\alpha_i] \), are homomorphisms.

If \( (\lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I} \) is a family of maps compatible with \( \Phi \), that is, \( \varphi_{ij} \lambda_i = \lambda_j \varphi_{ij} \) if \( i \leq j \), then the induced limit map \( \lim_i \lambda_i : \lim_i \mathcal{C}_i \to \lim_i \mathcal{C}_i \) is \( [\alpha_i] \mapsto [\lambda_i \alpha_i] \).

If in Construction 2.7.3 the maps \( \lambda_i \) are monotone, l-maps, l-morphisms, u-maps, u-morphisms, homomorphisms, morphisms or isomorphisms, then so is \( \lim_i \lambda_i \).

**Proposition 2.7.4.** For a directed family of monotone maps between entropy spaces \( (\lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I} \) compatible with a coherent family of homomorphisms \( (\varphi_{ij} : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_j)_{i,j \in I} \), we have \( h(\lim_i \lambda_i) = \sup_i h(\lambda_i) = \lim_i h(\lambda_i) \).

**Proof.** Denote \( \mathcal{C} = \lim_i \mathcal{C}_i \), \( \lambda = \lim_i \lambda_1 \) and for \( i \in I \) let \( \mu_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C} \) be the canonical map. For \( i \in I \), \( \lambda_i \xrightarrow{\mu_i} \lambda \) is a connection, then by Lemma 2.6.3(3) we know that that \( h(\lambda_1, \alpha_1) = h(\lambda, \mu_1 \alpha_1) \) for all \( \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{C}_i \). As \( \mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{i \in I} \mu_i \mathcal{C}_i \) we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda & = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}} h(\lambda, \alpha) = \sup_{i \in I} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_i} h(\lambda, \mu_i \alpha) = \sup_{i \in I} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_i} h(\lambda_i, \alpha_i) = \sup_{i \in I} h(\lambda_i).
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, note that \( \lambda_i \xrightarrow{\varphi_{ij}} \lambda_j \) is a connection for all \( i \leq j \), then \( h(\lambda_i) \leq h(\lambda_j) \) by Proposition 2.6.4(1). Thus the net \( (h(\lambda_i))_{i \in I} \) is increasing and we are done. \( \square \)

**Construction 2.7.5.** Let \( (\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I} \) be a family of unital entropy spaces (see Remark 2.1.10) with units denoted \( 1 \). The coproduct entropy space of the \( \mathcal{C}_i \)'s is the set

\[
\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i = \{(\alpha_i)_{i \in I} \in \times_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i : \alpha_i \neq 1 \text{ only for finitely many } i \}'s\},
\]

with the entropy space structure given by the pre-order, the binary operation, and the entropy function defined for elements \( (\alpha_i) \) and \( (\beta_i) \) as \( (\alpha_i) \prec (\beta_i) \) iff \( \alpha_i \prec \beta_i \) for all \( i \in I \), \( (\alpha_i) \land (\beta_i) = (\alpha_i \land \beta_i) \), and \( h((\alpha_i)) = \sum_{i \in I} h(\alpha_i) \). The canonical maps \( \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}, \alpha_i \mapsto (\alpha_i)_{j \in I} \), where \( \alpha_i \prec \alpha_j \) if \( j = i \) or 1 otherwise, are homomorphisms for all \( i \in I \).

If \( (\lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I} \) is a family of unital maps, that is \( \lambda_i 1 = 1 \) for all \( i \in I \), the induced coproduct map is \( \bigoplus_{i \in I} \lambda_i : \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i \to \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i, (\alpha_i) \mapsto (\lambda_i \alpha_i) \).

If in Construction 2.7.5 the maps \( \lambda_i \) are monotone, l-maps, l-morphisms, u-maps, u-morphisms, homomorphisms, morphisms or isomorphisms, then so is \( \bigoplus_{i \in I} \lambda_i \).

Finite coproducts are the “same” as products.

**Corollary 2.7.6.** For a family of unital entropy spaces \( (\mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I} \) and a family of monotone unital maps \( (\lambda_i : \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_i)_{i \in I} \) we have \( h(\bigoplus_{i \in I} \lambda_i) \leq \sum_{i \in I} h(\lambda_i) \) with equality if \( \lambda_i \) is a lower map for all \( i \in I \).

**Proof.** The coproduct \( \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i \) is (isomorphic to) the direct limit \( \lim_F \bigtimes_{i \in F} \mathcal{C}_i \), where \( F \) runs over the directed set \( J \) of finite subsets of \( I \) ordered by inclusion, \( \bigtimes_{i \in F} \mathcal{C}_i \) is the finite product entropy space as in Construction 2.7.1, and the coherent homomorphisms are \( \varphi_{EF} : \bigtimes_{i \in E} \mathcal{C}_i \to \bigtimes_{i \in F} \mathcal{C}_i, \varphi_{EF}((\alpha_i)_{i \in E}) = (\alpha_E j)_{j \in F} \), for finite subsets \( E \subseteq F \) of \( I \) and \( \alpha_E j = \alpha_j \) if \( j \in E \) or 1 otherwise. The monotone map
we have $\alpha\lambda$, is (conjugate to) the one induced in the direct limit by the compatible family of monotone maps $(X_{i \in F}, \lambda_i)_{F \in J}$ where $X_{i \in F}$ is the finite product of maps. By Proposition 2.7.2 we know that $h(X_{i \in F}, \lambda_i) \leq \sum_{i \in F} h(\lambda_i)$. Then applying Proposition 2.6.4(d) and Proposition 2.7.4 we get $h(\bigoplus_{i \in I} \lambda_i) = h(\lim_F X_{i \in F}\lambda_i) = \lim_F h(X_{i \in F}, \lambda_i) \leq \lim_F \sum_{i \in F} h(\lambda_i) = \sum_{i \in I} h(\lambda_i)$ as desired. The case of lower maps follows similarly because Proposition 2.7.2 gives an equality. \hfill \Box

2.8. Shifts.

**Definition 2.8.1.** Let $C$ be a unital cover space and $I = \mathbb{N}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$. Consider the coproduct cover space $C^I = \bigoplus_{i \in I} C^i$, and define the map $s^I : C^I \to C^I$ given by $s^I(\alpha_i)_{i \in I} = (\alpha_{i-1})_{i \in I}$, where we agree that $\alpha_{-1} = 1$ for the case $I = \mathbb{N}$. Either of these two maps is called forward shift. Given a unital map $\lambda : C \to C$ we also consider a map $s^I_\lambda : C^I \to C^I$, which coincides with $s^I$ if $\lambda = id_C$, defined by $s^I_\lambda(\alpha_i)_{i \in I} = (\lambda \alpha_{i-1})_{i \in I}$, that is, $s^I_\lambda = s^I \lambda = \lambda^I s^I$, where $\lambda^I : C^I \to C^I$ is the coproduct map $\lambda^I = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \lambda$, $\lambda^I(\alpha_i)_{i \in I} = (\lambda \alpha_i)_{i \in I}$. Finally, given a cover $\alpha \in C$, define $\overline{\alpha} = (\alpha_0)_{i \in I} \in C^I$ where $\alpha_0 = \alpha$ if $i = 0$ or $\alpha_0 = 1$ otherwise.

**Lemma 2.8.2.** Let $C$ be a unital cover space and $\lambda : C \to C$ a unital cofinal monotone map. Then $s^\infty_\lambda$ is positively $\mathcal{A}_N$-expansive in the sense of Definition 2.5.4 where $\mathcal{A}_N = \{\overline{\alpha} \in C^\infty : \alpha \in C\}$. If $\lambda$ is a unital bi-monotone map then $s^\infty_\lambda$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-expansive bijection where now $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{\overline{\alpha} \in C^\mathbb{Z} : \alpha \in C\}$.

Proof. Given $(\alpha_i)_{i \in N} \in C^\infty$, let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_i = 1$ if $i > m$. As $\lambda$ is monotone and cofinal then so is $\lambda^k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence there exist $\beta_k \in C$ such that $\lambda^k \beta_k \prec \alpha_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\beta = \bigwedge_{k=0}^m \beta_k$, so that $\lambda^k \beta \prec \alpha_k$ for $0 \leq k \leq m$. Then we have $\overline{\beta} \in \mathcal{A}_2$ and $\overline{\beta} \in \mathcal{A}_N$, showing that $s^\infty_\lambda$ is $\mathcal{A}_N$-expansive. The statement about $s^\infty_\lambda$ follows similarly. \hfill \Box

For a meet entropy space $C$ we denote $h(C) = \sup_{\alpha \in C} h(\alpha) = h(id_C)$.

**Proposition 2.8.3.** Let $C$ be a unital meet entropy space and $\lambda : C \to C$ a unital cofinal lower morphism. Then $h(s^\infty_\lambda) \leq h(C)$, with equality if $\lambda$ is also a homomorphism. If $\lambda$ is a unital isomorphism then $h(s^\infty_\lambda) = h(C)$. In particular for the forward shifts we have $h(s^\infty_\lambda) = h(s^\infty) = h(C)$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in C$ and $\overline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}_N \subseteq C^\infty$ as in Lemma 2.8.2. For $n \geq 1$ we have

$$h((\alpha, \lambda \alpha, \ldots, \lambda^{n-1} \alpha, 1, 1, \ldots)) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} h(\lambda^k \alpha) \leq nh(\alpha),$$

where the last inequality, given by condition [1.2], is an equality if $\lambda$ is a homomorphism by condition [M2]. Dividing by $n$ and taking $\lim \sup_n$ we get $h(s^\infty_\lambda, \overline{\alpha}) \leq h(\alpha)$. As $\lambda$ is a morphism one can check that $s^\infty_\lambda$ is a morphism too. Then, by Lemma 2.8.2 and Corollary 2.5.5 we have $h(s^\infty_\lambda) = \sup \{h(s^\infty_\lambda, \overline{\alpha}) : \overline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}_N\} \leq \sup_{\alpha \in C} h(\alpha)$, with equality if $\lambda$ is a homomorphism. The assertion on $s^\infty_\lambda$ follows similarly. \hfill \Box
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