

# UNIFORMLY ERGODIC PROBABILITY MEASURES

JORGE GALINDO, ENRIQUE JORDÁ AND ALBERTO RODRÍGUEZ-ARENAS

ABSTRACT. Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $G$ . We consider the convolution operator  $\lambda_1(\mu): L_1(G) \rightarrow L_1(G)$  given by  $\lambda_1(\mu)f = \mu * f$  and its restriction  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  to the augmentation ideal  $L_1^0(G)$ . Say that  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic if the Cesàro means of the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  converge uniformly to 0, that is, if  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is a uniformly mean ergodic operator with limit 0 and that  $\mu$  is uniformly completely mixing if the powers of the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  converge uniformly to 0.

We completely characterize the uniform mean ergodicity of the operator  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  and the uniform convergence of its powers and see that there is no difference between  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  and  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  in this regard. We prove in particular that  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic if and only if  $G$  is compact,  $\mu$  is adapted (its support is not contained in a proper closed subgroup of  $G$ ) and 1 is an isolated point of the spectrum of  $\mu$ . The last of these three conditions is actually equivalent to  $\mu$  being spread-out (some convolution power of  $\mu$  is not singular). The measure  $\mu$  is uniformly completely mixing if and only if  $G$  is compact,  $\mu$  is spread-out and the only unimodular value of the spectrum of  $\mu$  is 1.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A probability measure  $\mu$  on a locally compact group  $G$  defines the transition probabilities of a random walk on  $G$ . It is a common place in Ergodic Theory that the ergodicity of a random walk can be characterized in terms of the fixed points of its Markov operator. In the present case, the Markov operator is identified with the *convolution operator*  $\lambda_1(\mu): L_1(G) \rightarrow L_1(G)$ ,  $\lambda_1(\mu)f = \mu * f$ . This is reflected in the following theorem stated in Rosenblatt [25] that can be regarded as the starting point of this work.

**Theorem 1.1** (Proposition 1.2 of [25]). *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $G$ . Consider the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  that results from restricting  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  to the augmentation ideal*

$$L_1^0(G) = \left\{ f \in L_1(G) : \int f(x) dm_G(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

*The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The random walk defined by  $\mu$  is ergodic.*

---

*Date:* January 25, 2023.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 43A05; Secondary 43A20, 43A30, 46H99, 47A35.

*Key words and phrases.* ergodic measure, uniformly ergodic measure, random walk, mean ergodic operator, uniformly mean ergodic operator, convolution operator, locally compact group, measure algebra.

- (2) *The Cesàro means of the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  converge to 0 in the strong operator topology.*
- (3) *If  $f \in L_\infty(G)$  and  $\mu * f = f$ , then  $f$  is constant almost everywhere.*

If the group  $G$  is abelian or compact, the Choquet-Dény and Kawada-Itô theorems, [3, 16], show, respectively, that the random walk induced by  $\mu$  is ergodic (and we then say that  $\mu$  itself is *ergodic*) if and only if its support is not contained in a proper closed subgroup of  $G$ , i.e, if  $\mu$  is adapted. If the support of  $\mu$  is not even contained in a translate of a proper closed normal subgroup (we say then that  $\mu$  is *strictly aperiodic*),  $\mu$  has a stronger property, the strong operator limit of  $\lambda_1^0(\mu^n)$  is 0. We say then that  $\mu$  is *completely mixing*. All these facts are well-known and collected in Theorem 2.9, below.

In this paper we address the problem of characterizing ergodicity when the strong operator topology is replaced by the operator norm. Our approach will be operator-theoretic and focuses on the uniform mean ergodicity (operator norm convergence of the Cesàro means) of the operators  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  and  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  and on the uniform ergodicity of  $\mu$ , where  $\mu$  is said to be *uniformly ergodic* if  $\lim_n \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_1^0(\mu^k) \right\| = 0$ .

The subject of uniform mean ergodicity of convolution operators has been discussed in the book by Revuz, [24, Section 6.3], where uniformly ergodic convolution operators on  $L_\infty(G)$  that converge to a rank-one operator are characterized, as well as in brief incursions by Mustafayev and Topal [23, Theorem 1.2] and by the first two-named authors of the present paper [9].

After two preliminary sections, we devote Section 3 to understanding the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  in relation with uniform ergodicity and Section 4 to present a first characterization of uniform ergodicity.

In Section 5 spectral conditions are introduced. It is shown in [9] that, for an adapted measure  $\mu$  and an abelian group  $G$ ,  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if the support of  $\mu$  is contained in a compact subgroup of  $G$  and 1 is isolated in the spectrum of  $\mu$ . One of our main results here, Theorem 5.9, is that this theorem is still true when  $G$  is not abelian, and that the condition of having 1 as an isolated point of the spectrum of  $\mu$  is in fact equivalent, when  $G$  is compact and  $\mu$  is adapted, to  $\mu$  being spread-out.

We finally consider uniformly completely mixing measures, i.e. measures with  $\lim_n \|\lambda_1^0(\mu^n)\| = 0$ . If we look from the strong operator convergence point of view, it is unknown whether a strictly aperiodic, ergodic measure must necessarily be completely mixing, this is the *complete mixing problem*. The problem seems to have been coined this way in the paper by Lin and Wittman [19], but was considered before, see for instance the works of Glasner [10] and Foguel [8]. More recent contributions to the problem are [2], [5] and [15]. Our approach here provides a solution to the uniform version of this problem. We show in Theorem 5.15 that an adapted probability  $\mu \in M(G)$  is uniformly completely mixing if and only if  $G$  is compact,  $\mu$  is spread-out and  $\sigma(\mu) \cap \mathbb{T} = \{1\}$  or, equivalently, if and only if  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic and strictly aperiodic. This implies that a strictly aperiodic,

uniformly ergodic measure must necessarily be uniformly completely mixing. Quasi-compactness, of the operators  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  and  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  and  $\lambda_\infty(\mu)$  is also characterized at the end of Section 5.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We use this section to set some notations and recall a few definitions and basic known facts.

**2.1. Mean ergodic operators.** For a bounded linear operator  $T : X \rightarrow X$  on a Banach space  $X$ , we use the following notations for the iterates and averages:

$$T^n = T \circ \dots \circ T, \quad T_{[n]} = \frac{T + \dots + T^n}{n}.$$

**Definitions 2.1.** Let  $X$  be a Banach space and let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a bounded linear operator. The operator is

- (i) mean ergodic if the sequence  $(T_{[n]}x)_n$  is convergent for every  $x \in X$ .
- (ii) uniformly mean ergodic if the sequence  $(T_{[n]})_n$  is convergent in the operator norm.

If  $T$  is mean ergodic, the limit of  $(T_{[n]}x)_n$  is always a linear projection  $P : X \rightarrow X$ , satisfying  $\ker P = \overline{(I - T)X}$ . Moreover,  $X = \ker P \oplus \ker(I - T)$ .

Uniform mean ergodicity for power bounded operators is completely characterized by Lin.

**Theorem 2.2** (Theorem of [20]). Let  $T$  be a power bounded (i.e., so that  $(\|T^n\|)_n$  is a bounded sequence) linear operator. The operator  $T$  is uniformly mean ergodic if, and only if,  $(I - T)X$  is closed. The Banach space  $X$  can be then decomposed as  $X = (I - T)X \oplus \ker(I - T)$ .

Lin's theorem completed the following theorem, due to Dunford [7], which reveals that the uniform mean ergodicity of an operator can be characterized through its spectral properties. See also [17, Theorem 2.2.7] and Lin [20].

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $T$  be a power bounded linear operator on a Banach space  $X$ . Then  $T$  is uniformly mean ergodic if, and only if, either  $1 \notin \sigma(T)$  or it is a pole of order 1 of the resolvent.

For the next result, due to Yosida and Kakutani, we recall that an operator  $T$  is quasi-compact if there exists a compact operator  $K$  such that  $\|T - K\| < 1$ . By  $\sigma_p(T)$ , we will denote the point-spectrum of  $T$ , the set of its eigenvalues, and  $\mathbb{T}$  will denote the set of complex numbers of modulus 1.

**Theorem 2.4** (Theorem 4 and its Corollary in page 205 of [27]). Let  $T$  be a power bounded and quasi-compact linear operator on a Banach space  $X$ . The following assertions hold:

- (i)  $(T_{[n]})_n$  converges uniformly to a finite rank projection  $P$ .
- (ii)  $(T^n)_n$  converges to a finite rank projection  $P$  if, and only if,  $\sigma_p(T) \cap \mathbb{T} \subseteq \{1\}$ .
- (iii)  $(T^n)_n$  converges to 0 if, and only if,  $\sigma_p(T) \cap \mathbb{T} = \emptyset$ .

**2.2. Convolution operators.** We will be working with convolutions on locally compact groups. If  $G$  is a locally compact group,  $e$  will stand for its identity element and  $m_G$  for its Haar measure, the (essentially unique) Borel measure that is left invariant on a locally compact group  $G$ . The Banach space of continuous functions on  $G$  vanishing at infinity is denoted by  $C_0(G)$  and that of compactly supported functions, by  $C_{00}(G)$ . The Banach space of bounded regular measures is  $M(G) = C_0(G)^*$ . We denote by  $L_1(G, \mu)$  the Banach space of equivalence classes of integrable functions with respect to a measure  $\mu \in M(G)$ . If  $\mu = m_G$  is the Haar measure, we simply write  $L_1(G)$ . We denote by  $L_1^0(G)$  the augmentation ideal, the space of functions with integral 0. We regard  $L_1(G)$  as an ideal of  $M(G)$  through the embedding  $f \mapsto f \cdot m_G$ .

**Definitions 2.5.** Let  $\mu, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in M(G)$ . We consider

(i) the convolution of measures:

$$\langle \mu_1 * \mu_2, h \rangle = \int \int h(xy) d\mu_1(x) d\mu_2(y), \quad \text{for } h \in C_{00}(G).$$

(ii) the left convolution operators:  $\lambda_p(\mu) : L_p(G) \rightarrow L_p(G)$ ,  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , given by

$$\lambda_p(\mu)f(s) = (\mu * f)(s) = \int f(x^{-1}s) d\mu(x), \quad \text{for } f \in L_p(G), s \in G.$$

(iii) the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu) : L_1^0(G) \rightarrow L_1^0(G)$  that arises when  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is restricted to the augmentation ideal  $L_1^0(G)$ .

(iv) the convolution iterates  $\mu^n$  and the convolution averages  $\mu_{[n]}$ , respectively:  $\mu^n = \mu * \dots * \mu$  and  $\mu_{[n]} = \frac{\mu + \dots + \mu^n}{n}$ .

**2.3. Ergodic measures.** A measure  $\mu \in M(G)$  on a locally compact group  $G$  is said to be ergodic when the random walk it generates is ergodic and it is said to be completely mixing when the random walk is mixing. For an operator-theoretic approach, however, the following, equivalent, definitions are more suitable. They are, in fact, the ones chosen by most authors, see, e.g., [2, 5, 15, 19, 25] (note that Rosenblatt [25] uses the terms *ergodic by convolutions* and *mixing by convolutions*).

**Definitions 2.6.** A probability measure  $\mu \in M(G)$  is:

- (i) ergodic if  $\lim_n \|\mu_{[n]} * f\|_1 = 0$ , for all  $f \in L_1^0(G)$ . In other words, if  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is mean ergodic and the strong operator limit of the means is the null operator.
- (ii) completely mixing if the sequence of iterates  $(\lambda_1^0(\mu^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to 0 in the strong operator topology.

If in Definition 2.6 the strong operator topology is replaced by the operator norm, two new concepts arise.

**Definitions 2.7.** We say that probability measure  $\mu \in M(G)$  is:

- (i) uniformly ergodic if  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic and the operator norm limit of the means is the null operator.
- (ii) uniformly completely mixing if the sequence of iterates  $(\lambda_1^0(\mu^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to 0 in the operator norm.

The analysis of the (uniform) ergodicity or the (uniform) complete mixing of a measure  $\mu$  is heavily related to the algebraic properties of its support subgroup  $H_\mu$ . We denote by  $H_\mu$  the smallest closed subgroup of  $G$  that contains  $S_\mu$ , the support of  $\mu$ . To give a hint on this relation we need to set some definitions that have already been informally introduced.

**Definitions 2.8.** A probability measure  $\mu \in M(G)$  is:

- (i) adapted if  $H_\mu = G$ .
- (ii) strictly aperiodic if it is adapted and every normal closed subgroup satisfying  $S_\mu \subseteq xN$  for some  $x \in G$  is actually  $N = G$ .
- (iii) spread-out if  $\mu^n$  is not singular for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , i.e. if there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mu^n(A) = 1$  implies  $m_G(A) > 0$ .

We collect now some well-known facts that will be needed later on. The first two statements are proved by Lin and Wittman in Corollary 2.7 of [19]. The third statement is the Kawada-Itô theorem [16].

**Theorem 2.9.** Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure. The following assertions hold

- (1) If  $\mu$  is ergodic, then  $G = \overline{\bigcup_j \bigcup_k S_\mu^{-j} S_\mu^k}$ . Hence  $\mu$  ergodic implies that  $\mu$  is adapted.
- (2) If  $\mu$  is completely mixing, then  $G = \overline{\bigcup_j S_\mu^{-j} S_\mu^j}$ . Hence,  $\mu$  completely mixing implies that  $\mu$  is strictly aperiodic.
- (3) If  $G$  is compact,  $(\mu_{[n]})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges, in the weak\* topology of  $M(G)$ , to the Haar measure of  $H_\mu$ . If  $\mu$  is strictly aperiodic,  $(\mu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges, in the weak\* topology of  $M(G)$ , to the Haar measure of  $G$ .

**Remark 2.10.** The equivalence between complete mixing and ergodicity for strictly aperiodic measures is known to hold under some restrictions on the measure and/or the group. This is the case, for instance when the group is in [SIN] (i.e. has a neighbourhood basis consisting of sets  $U$  such that  $Ux = xU$  for every  $x \in G$ ), see [15, Theorem 5.2]. Looking from the measure side, Glasner [10] (leaning on Foguel [8]) showed that complete mixing and ergodicity are equivalent for any spread-out strictly aperiodic measure. Some other cases have been sorted out but the problem of the equivalence, *the complete mixing problem*, remains open.

**2.4. Fourier-Stieltjes transforms.** To study the spectrum of  $\mu$  when  $G$  is compact, we will rely on the Fourier-Stieltjes transform which associates every continuous irreducible unitary representation  $\pi$  of  $G$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$  with a homomorphism between  $M(G)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}_\pi)$  the bounded operators on  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$ . By a unitary representation of  $G$ , we understand a continuous homomorphism of  $G$  into the group of unitary operators on a finite dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$ , where the latter is assumed to carry the weak operator topology. A representation  $\pi$  of  $G$  on a Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}$  is *irreducible* if there is no nontrivial subspace  $V$  of  $\mathbb{H}$  such that  $\pi(G)V \subseteq V$ .

**Definition 2.11** (Fourier-Stieltjes transform). If  $\mu \in M(G)$  is a bounded measure on a compact group  $G$  and  $\pi: G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{H}_\pi)$  is a unitary representation of  $G$  on a finite dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$ , the Fourier-Stieltjes

transform of  $\mu$  at  $\pi$  is the operator  $\widehat{\mu}(\pi) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}_\pi)$  defined by

$$\langle \widehat{\mu}(\pi)\xi, \eta \rangle = \int_G \overline{\langle \pi(t)\xi, \eta \rangle} d\mu(t), \quad \text{for every } \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{H}_\pi.$$

The basic properties of Fourier-Stieltjes transforms are collected below. Statements (1), (2), (3) and (4) are proved in Section 28 of [13]. Statement (5) is Theorem 27.17 of [13].

**Theorem 2.12** (Some properties of the Fourier-Stieltjes transform). *Let  $G$  be a compact group.*

- (1) *If  $\mu_i \in M(G)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are bounded measures and  $\pi: G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{H}_\pi)$  is a unitary representation of  $G$  on a finite dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$ , then  $\widehat{\mu_1 * \mu_2}(\pi) = \widehat{\mu_1}(\pi)\widehat{\mu_2}(\pi)$ .*
- (2) *If  $\mu \neq 0$ , there is an irreducible unitary representation of  $G$  on a finite dimensional Hilbert space,  $\pi: G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{H}_\pi)$  such that*

$$\widehat{\mu}(\pi) \neq 0.$$

- (3) *If  $\mu \in M(G)$  and  $\pi$  is an irreducible unitary representation of  $G$  on a finite dimensional Hilbert space, then*

$$\sigma(\widehat{\mu}(\pi)) \subseteq \sigma(\mu).$$

- (4) *Let  $\mathbf{1}$  denote the trivial 1-dimensional representation. If  $\mathbf{1} \neq \pi$  is an irreducible representation of  $G$ , then  $\widehat{\mathbf{m}_G}(\pi) = 0$ .*
- (5) *Let  $\pi: G \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_\pi$  be an irreducible unitary representation. If  $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$ , then*

$$\int |\langle \pi(t)\xi_i, \xi_j \rangle|^2 d\mathbf{m}_G(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

We collect next two simple known facts that will be needed later on. We provide proofs for the sake of completeness.

**Corollary 2.13.** *Let  $G$  be a compact group and  $\mu \in M(G)$  a bounded measure.*

- (a) *For every irreducible representation  $\pi$  and every  $\xi \in \mathbb{H}_\pi$ ,  $\|\xi\| = 1$ , there is  $f_{\pi, \xi} \in L_1(G)$  such that  $\widehat{f_{\pi, \xi}}(\pi)\xi = \xi$ .*
- (b) *If  $\mu$  is adapted and  $\pi$  is an irreducible unitary representation of  $G$  with  $1 \in \sigma(\widehat{\mu}(\pi))$ , then  $\pi = \mathbf{1}$ , the one-dimensional trivial representation.*

*Proof.* We first prove (a). Define  $f_{\pi, \xi}$  by

$$f_{\pi, \xi}(t) = n \langle \pi(t)\xi, \xi \rangle,$$

where  $n = \dim \mathbb{H}_\pi$ . Since  $\pi$  is continuous for the weak operator topology,  $f_{\pi, \xi} \in L_1(G)$ . If  $\{\xi, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$  containing  $\xi$ , Statement (5) of Theorem 2.12, shows that  $\langle \widehat{f_{\pi, \xi}}(\pi)\xi, \xi \rangle = 1$  and that  $\langle \widehat{f_{\pi, \xi}}(\pi)\xi, \xi_j \rangle = 0$ , for every  $j = 2, \dots, n$ . It follows that  $\widehat{f_{\pi, \xi}}(\pi)\xi = \xi$ .

The proof of (b) is standard. Assume that  $\mu$  is an adapted measure and that  $\pi$  is an irreducible representation of  $G$  with  $1 \in \sigma(\widehat{\mu}(\pi))$ . There is

therefore  $\xi \in \mathbb{H}_\pi$ ,  $\|\xi\| = 1$ , with

$$1 = \int \overline{\langle \pi(t)\xi, \xi \rangle} d\mu(t).$$

Since  $|\langle \pi(t)\xi, \xi \rangle| \leq 1$ , for every  $t \in G$ , it follows that  $\langle \pi(t)\xi, \xi \rangle = 1$  for every  $t \in S_\mu$ , and so that  $\pi(t)\xi = \xi$  for every  $t \in S_\mu$ . We have then that

$$S_\mu \subseteq N_\xi := \{t \in G : \pi(t)\xi = \xi\}.$$

Since  $N_\xi$  is a closed subgroup of  $G$ , adaptedness of  $\mu$  implies that  $N_\xi = G$ . As  $\mathbb{H}_\pi$  cannot contain proper subspaces invariant under  $\pi$ , we conclude that  $\pi = \mathbf{1}$ .  $\square$

### 3. THE NORM OF $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$

The ergodicity properties of the measure  $\mu$  derive from those of the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ . While the norm of  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is always  $\|\mu\|$ , see [11, Page 47], that is not necessarily the case for  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ . It suffices to observe that, when  $G$  is a compact group,  $\lambda_1^0(\mathbf{m}_G) = 0$ . We see in this section that invariance of  $\mu$  (and, *a fortiori*, compactness of  $G$ ) is the only obstacle against the equality  $\|\lambda_1^0(\mu)\| = \|\mu\|$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  satisfy  $\|\mu\| \leq 1$ . Then*

$$\|\lambda_1^0(\mu)\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{x \in G} \|\mu - \mu * \delta_x\|.$$

*Proof.* Consider a two-sided approximate identity  $\{e_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$  in  $L_1(G)$ , with  $\|e_\alpha\| = 1$  for every  $\alpha \in \Lambda$ , see [6, Proposition 9.1.8]. It is then easy to prove that  $\{e_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$  converges to  $\delta_e$  in the  $\sigma(M(G), C_0(G))$ -topology. Since convolution is separately  $\sigma(M(G), C_0(G))$ -continuous, we have that  $(\mu - \mu * \delta_x) * e_\alpha$  converges to  $\mu - \mu * \delta_x$  in the  $\sigma(M(G), C_0(G))$ -topology.

This Proposition is actually based on the simple equality,

$$(1) \quad \mu * (e_\alpha - \delta_x * e_\alpha) = (\mu - \mu * \delta_x) * e_\alpha \quad (x \in G \text{ and } \alpha \in \Lambda).$$

One can first use functions  $f_n \in C_0(G)$  so that  $\|\mu - \mu * \delta_x\| \leq |\langle \mu - \mu * \delta_x, f_n \rangle| + 1/(2n)$  to show that, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is  $\alpha_n \in \Lambda$  with

$$\|\mu - \mu * \delta_x\| \leq \|(\mu - \mu * \delta_x) * e_{\alpha_n}\| + \frac{1}{n}.$$

From this, using (1) and taking into account that  $e_\alpha - \delta_x * e_\alpha \in L_1^0(G)$ , we have

$$\|\mu - \mu * \delta_x\| \leq \|\lambda_1^0(\mu)\| \|e_{\alpha_n} - \delta_x * e_{\alpha_n}\| + \frac{1}{n}, \text{ for each } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and hence

$$\|\mu - \mu * \delta_x\| \leq 2\|\lambda_1^0(\mu)\|,$$

yielding the result.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group that is not compact and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  with  $\|\mu\| = 1$ . Then  $\|\lambda_1^0(\mu)\| = 1$ .*

*Proof.* We first assume that  $S_\mu$  is compact. Then there is  $x \in G$  such that  $S_\mu \cap S_\mu x = \emptyset$  which implies that  $\|\mu - \delta_x * \mu\| = 2$ . We can apply then Lemma 3.1 and obtain that  $\|\lambda_1^0(\mu)\| = 1$ .

In general, we can always find a sequence  $\mu_n$  of measures with compact support such that  $\mu_n$  converges in norm to  $\mu$ . Since  $\|\lambda_1^0(\mu_n)\| = 1$  for every  $n$ ,  $\|\lambda_1^0(\mu)\|$  must be 1 as well.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu$  be a probability measure. If  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic, then  $G$  is compact.*

*Proof.* The measure  $\mu_{[n]}$  is again a probability measure. If  $G$  is not compact, Proposition 3.2 shows that  $\|\lambda_1^0(\mu_{[n]})\| = 1$  and, hence,  $\mu$  cannot be uniformly ergodic.  $\square$

The previous Corollary could have also been deduced from the following Proposition which should be compared to Theorem 2.9 (1).

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure with support  $S_\mu$ . If  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic, then there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$G = \bigcup_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} S_\mu^{-j} S_\mu^k.$$

*Proof.* We proceed by contradiction. Assume  $G \neq \bigcup_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} S_\mu^{-j} S_\mu^k$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Since  $S_{\mu_{[n]}} = \bigcup_{j=1}^n S_\mu^j$ , the assumption implies that  $G \neq S_{\mu_{[n]}}^{-1} S_{\mu_{[n]}}$  and therefore, that, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $x_n \in G$  such that  $S_{\mu_{[n]}} \cdot x_n \cap S_{\mu_{[n]}} = \emptyset$ . From this, we have that  $\|\mu_{[n]} - \mu_{[n]} * \delta_{x_n}\| = 2$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and we conclude, upon applying Lemma 3.1, that  $\mu$  is not uniformly ergodic.  $\square$

#### 4. UNIFORM MEAN ERGODICTY OF CONVOLUTION OPERATORS

We approach in this section a characterization (Theorem 4.6) of uniform mean ergodicity of the operators  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  and  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  in terms of how close  $\mu$  is to  $\mathfrak{m}_{H_\mu}$ .

Our attention is dragged right away to measures with  $H_\mu$  compact. This is because of the following result proved in [9, Theorem 5.4].

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability. Then  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is mean ergodic if and only if  $H_\mu$  is compact.*

We first see that we can restrict our work to adapted measures (and compact groups).

**4.1. Reduction to the adapted case.** Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a bounded measure. We will use the symbol  $\underline{\mu}$  to denote the measure  $\mu$  when seen as a measure in  $M(H_\mu)$ . We see here that  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $\lambda_1(\underline{\mu})$  is.

We first note the relation between uniform convergence of powers and Cesàro means of the convolution operator  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  with the weak\*-convergence of convolution powers and Cesàro means of the measure itself.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure.*



(a) The operator  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $H_\mu$  is compact and

$$\lim_n \|\lambda_1(\mu_{[n]} - m_{H_\mu})\| = 0.$$

(b) The sequence  $(\lambda_1(\mu^n))$  is norm convergent if and only if  $H_\mu$  is compact and

$$\lim_n \|\lambda_1(\mu^n - m_{H_\mu})\| = 0$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.1,  $H_\mu$  must be compact whenever  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic.

Theorem 2.9 (3) shows that  $\mu_{[n]}$  converges to  $m_{H_\mu}$  in the  $\sigma(M(H_\mu), C_0(H_\mu))$ -topology. This implies right away convergence in the  $\sigma(M(G), C_0(G))$ -topology. The weak\*-SOT sequential continuity of  $\lambda_1$ , see [9, Proposition 3.1], then shows that once we assume that either  $\lambda_1(\mu_{[n]})$  or  $\lambda_1(\mu^n)$  is convergent, the limit must be to  $\lambda_1(m_{H_\mu})$ .  $\square$

The desired equivalence is now an immediate consequence of the last Proposition, after recalling that  $\|\lambda_1(\nu)\| = \|\nu\|$ , for every  $\nu \in M(G)$ , see [11, Page 47].

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$ . The operator  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $\lambda_1(\underline{\mu})$  is. Furthermore,  $(\lambda_1(\mu^n))$  is norm convergent in  $\mathcal{L}(L_1(G))$  if and only if  $(\lambda_1(\underline{\mu}^n))$  is norm convergent in  $\mathcal{L}(L_1(H_\mu))$ .*

**4.2. Uniform mean ergodicity of  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  vs uniform mean ergodicity of  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ .** Theorem 4.1 shows that the operators  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  and  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  are very different from the point of view of mean ergodicity. If  $G$  is abelian and  $\mu \in M(G)$  is adapted, the operator  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is always mean ergodic (this is the Choquet-Deny theorem, [3]) but  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  will only be mean ergodic when  $G$  is compact, the case  $\mu = \delta_1 \in M(\mathbb{Z})$  is a particularly simple case. The situation is completely different in the uniform case.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X)$  be a bounded operator on a Banach space  $X$  and let  $X_0$  be a hyperplane of  $X$  that is left invariant under  $T$ , i.e., with  $T(X_0) \subseteq X_0$ . Then  $T$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $T|_{X_0}$  is.*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $T$  uniformly mean ergodic implies that  $T|_{X_0}$  is uniformly mean ergodic.

Assume now that  $T|_{X_0}$  is uniformly mean ergodic. The ergodic decomposition of Theorem 2.2 yields then

$$X_0 = (I - T)(X_0) \oplus \ker(I - T|_{X_0}).$$

Since  $X_0$  is a hyperplane, there is  $y \in X$  such that  $X = X_0 \oplus \langle y \rangle$ . This shows that  $X = (I - T)(X_0) \oplus \ker(I - T|_{X_0}) \oplus \langle y \rangle$ .

Let now  $a, b \in X_0$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ , be such that  $b = Tb$  and

$$(I - T)y = (I - T)a + b + \alpha y,$$

and define  $\tilde{y} = b + \alpha y$ . Then  $\tilde{y} \in (I - T)(X)$ . We now check that  $(I - T)(X) = (I - T)(X_0) \oplus \langle \tilde{y} \rangle$ . Pick to that end an arbitrary  $x = x_0 + \beta y \in X$ ,  $x_0 \in X_0$ ,

$\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (I - T)x &= (I - T)x_0 + \beta(I - T)y \\ &= (I - T)x_0 + \beta(I - T)a + \beta(b + \alpha y) \\ &\in (I - T)X_0 + \langle \tilde{y} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Having proved that  $(I - T)(X) = (I - T)(X_0) \oplus \langle \tilde{y} \rangle$ , we see that  $(I - T)(X)$  is closed and, hence, that  $T$  is uniformly mean ergodic by Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure. The operator  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic.*

**4.3. A first characterization.** We can now prove a simple characterization of uniform mean ergodicity that completes the one given by Revuz in [24, Section 6.3]. This characterization will be completed in the next section by adding a spectral condition. The spectral analysis will also make it easier to prove an analog characterization of measures with  $\lambda_1(\mu^n)$  uniformly convergent.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $G$  be a compact group and  $\mu \in M(G)$  be an adapted probability measure. The following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic.
- (2)  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic.
- (3)  $\mu$  is spread-out.
- (4)  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is quasi-compact.
- (5)  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is quasi-compact.

*Proof.* Proposition 4.2 and Corollary 4.5 prove that (1) and (2) are equivalent.

If  $\mu$  is not spread-out, then  $\mu_{[n]}$  is a singular measure for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . It follows that

$$\|\lambda_1(\mu_{[n]} - m_G)\| = \|\mu_{[n]} - m_G\| \geq 1, \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We deduce from Proposition 4.2 that (2) implies (3).

Assume that Condition (3) holds. There exist then  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $f \in L_1(G)$  such that  $\mu^n = f m_G + \mu_s$ , with  $\mu_s$  singular with respect to  $m_G$  and  $\|\mu_s\| < 1$ . This yields  $\|\lambda_1(\mu^n) - \lambda_1(f m_G)\| = \|\mu^n - f m_G\| = \|\mu_s\| < 1$ . Since  $\lambda_1(f m_G)$  is a compact operator by Theorem 4 of [1], we get that  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is quasi-compact.

If  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is quasi-compact, so will be its restriction  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  to  $L_1^0(G)$ . So (4) implies (5).

Finally, (5) implies (2) by Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 4.5.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** By Proposition 4.3 and Corollary 3.3, Theorem 4.6 actually characterizes uniform mean ergodicity of  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  for any probability measure and every locally compact group.

## 5. SPECTRAL CHARACTERIZATION OF UNIFORMLY ERGODIC PROBABILITY MEASURES

The deep connection between uniform ergodicity and spectral properties of operators is set forth in Theorem 2.3. It is right away clear that a uniformly mean ergodic operator cannot have 1 as an accumulation point of

its spectrum. If dealing with a normal operator defined on a Hilbert space, then the converse is true under mild conditions. This is the departing point of the following result proved as Theorem 4.10 in our previous paper [9].

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure with  $\mu^* * \mu = \mu * \mu^*$ . Then  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $H_\mu$  is compact and 1 is an isolated point of  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu)) = \sigma(\mu)$ .*

As already done in the preceding theorem, we will use  $\sigma(\mu)$  and  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu))$  interchangeably. If one notes that when an invertible operator on  $L_1(G)$  commutes with right translations, then so does its inverse, this is a consequence of Wendel's theorem [26]: if  $T$  is an operator on  $L^1(G)$  that commutes with right translations, then  $T = \lambda_1(\nu)$  for some  $\nu \in M(G)$ .

The main objective of this section is to remove the normality condition in Theorem 5.1,  $\mu^* * \mu = \mu * \mu^*$ , and, therefore, have a full spectral characterization of uniformly ergodic measures.

**5.1. When 1 is an accumulation of  $\sigma(\mu)$ ,  $\mu$  adapted.** Our analysis will rely on the well-known Riesz idempotent operators that spectral sets induce. We describe them below for the convenience of the reader.

**Theorem 5.2** (Riesz idempotent operator, Theorem 4.20 of [18]). *Let  $X$  be a Banach space and  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ . Assume that  $\Delta$  is a closed and open subset of  $\sigma(T)$ . Consider a function  $\psi: \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that is analytic on an open set  $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  that contains  $\sigma(T)$  and satisfies*

$$\psi(\Delta) = \{1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(\sigma(T) \setminus \Delta) = \{0\}.$$

*The function  $\psi$  then defines, through Riesz Functional Calculus (see Theorem 4.7 from [4]), an operator  $E_\Delta \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ , with the following properties:*

- (1)  $E_\Delta$  is a projection,
- (2) If  $S \in \mathcal{L}(X)$  and  $ST = TS$ , then  $E_\Delta S = SE_\Delta$ ,
- (3)  $\sigma(TE_\Delta) = \Delta \cup \{0\}$ ,
- (4)  $\sigma\left(T|_{E_\Delta(X)}\right) = \Delta$ .

We now need a few Lemmas. The first one can be stated in terms of multipliers of Banach algebras. Recall that a right multiplier  $M$  of a Banach algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  is a bounded linear operator  $M: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $M(a, b) = aM(B)$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a Banach algebra and let  $M_1, M_2: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  be two commuting right multipliers of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that  $M_2$  is a projection and set  $J := M_2(\mathcal{A})$ . If  $M_1|_J$  is invertible, then there is a right multiplier  $M': \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $M'|_J = \left(M_1|_J\right)^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C := \left(M_1|_J\right)^{-1}$  and define  $\tilde{C}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  by

$$\tilde{C} = C \circ M_2.$$

Since  $\tilde{C}|_J = C$ , it will be enough to check that  $\tilde{C}$  is a right multiplier.

Let  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then

$$aCM_2(b) = CM_1(aCM_2(b)) = C(aM_1CM_2(b)) = C(aM_2(b)).$$

It follows that

$$a\tilde{C}(b) = C(aM_2(b)) = C(M_2(ab)) = \tilde{C}(ab).$$

□

The second Lemma is a well-known Linear Algebra fact.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H})$  be commutative linear operators on the finite dimensional complex Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}$ . If  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  is an eigenvalue of  $T_1$ , there is an eigenvector of  $T_1$  associated to  $z$  that is also an eigenvector for  $T_2$ .*

*Proof.* Just consider  $V_z$ , the linear subspace of all eigenvectors of  $T_1$  associated to  $z$ . Since  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  commute,  $T_2|_{V_z} : V_z \rightarrow V_z$  is again a linear operator. All eigenvectors of  $T_2|_{V_z}$  are then eigenvectors of  $T_1$  associated to  $z$  that are also eigenvectors of  $T_2$ . □

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $G$  be a compact group and  $\mu \in M(G)$  be an adapted probability measure. If 1 is an isolated point of  $\sigma(\mu)$ , then  $\mu$  is spread-out.*

*Proof.* Since  $\{1\}$  is open and closed in  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu))$ , there is  $0 < r < 1$  small enough such that  $B(1, r) \cap \sigma(\mu) = \{1\}$ , where  $B(z, r)$  denotes the ball of radius  $r$  centered in  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . Now we consider  $K := \overline{B(0, 1 + \frac{r}{2})} \setminus B(1, r) \cup \overline{B(1, \frac{r}{2})}$ . Clearly,  $\sigma(\mu) \subseteq K$ . Define  $\psi$  on  $K$  as

$$\psi(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{when } z \in \overline{B(0, 1 + \frac{r}{2})} \setminus B(1, r), \\ 1, & \text{when } z \in \overline{B(1, \frac{r}{2})}. \end{cases}$$

Since the function  $\psi$  can be analytically extended to an open set  $\Lambda$  containing  $K$ , the Riesz Functional Calculus defines an operator  $E_1 = \psi(\lambda_1(\mu)) \in \mathcal{L}(L_1(G))$  with the properties stated in Theorem 5.2. Properties (1) and (2) of that Theorem show that  $E_1$  is a projection that commutes with right translations. The classical Wendel's theorem (see [26]) shows then that  $E_1 = \lambda_1(\nu)$  for some idempotent  $\nu \in M(G)$ .

Let  $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{H}_\pi)$  be an irreducible representation of  $G$ , different from  $\mathbf{1}$ , the trivial one-dimensional representation. Assume that  $\hat{\nu}(\pi) \neq 0$ .

If the only eigenvalue of  $\hat{\nu}(\pi)$  was 0, the characteristic polynomial of  $\hat{\nu}(\pi)$  would be  $P(z) = z^n$  and the Cayley-Hamilton theorem would imply that  $(\hat{\nu}(\pi))^n = 0$ . But  $\nu$  is idempotent and  $(\hat{\nu}(\pi))^n = \widehat{\nu^n}(\pi) = \hat{\nu}(\pi)$ . With this and Lemma 5.4, we conclude that there are  $z_0, z \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $z_0 \neq 0$ , and  $\xi \in \mathbb{H}_\pi$ ,  $\xi \neq 0$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nu}(\pi)\xi &= z_0 \xi & \text{and} \\ \hat{\mu}(\pi)\xi &= z \xi. \end{aligned}$$

The measure  $\nu$  being idempotent we have that, actually,  $z_0 = 1$ . Hence,  $(\widehat{\mu * \nu})(\pi)\xi = z\xi$ . As we know that  $\sigma(\mu * \nu) = \{0, 1\}$  (statement (3) of

Theorem 5.2) and that 1 cannot be an eigenvalue of  $\widehat{\mu}(\pi)$  (we are using here Corollary 2.13 (b)), it follows from (3) of Theorem 2.12 that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\nu}(\pi)\xi &= \xi \text{ and} \\ \widehat{\mu}(\pi)\xi &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Statement (4) of Theorem 5.2 shows that  $0 \notin \sigma\left(\lambda_1(\mu)|_{\nu*L^1(G)}\right)$ . There is therefore an operator  $C: \nu*L^1(G) \rightarrow \nu*L^1(G)$  inverse to  $\lambda_1(\mu)|_{\nu*L^1(G)}$ .

We now apply Lemma 5.3 to  $M_1 = \lambda_1(\mu)$  and  $M_2 = \lambda_1(\nu)$ . The conclusion of the Lemma together with Wendel's theorem provides us with a measure  $\sigma \in M(G)$  such that

$$(2) \quad \sigma * \mu * \nu * f = \nu * f, \quad \text{for every } f \in L^1(G).$$

Let  $f_{\pi,\xi} \in L^1(G)$  be as defined in Corollary 2.13 (a). If we take Fourier-Stieltjes transforms in Equation (2) with  $f = f_{\pi,\xi}$  and apply them to the representation  $\pi$  and then to the vector  $\xi$  (equation (2) is actually used in the third equality), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\xi &= \widehat{\nu}(\pi)\xi = \widehat{\nu}(\pi)\widehat{f_{\pi,\xi}}(\pi)\xi \\ &= \widehat{\sigma}(\pi)\widehat{\mu}(\pi)\widehat{\nu}(\pi)\widehat{f_{\pi,\xi}}(\pi)\xi \\ &= \widehat{\sigma}(\pi)\widehat{\mu}(\pi)\xi = 0.\end{aligned}$$

This is in contradiction with our choice of  $\xi$ . It follows that  $\widehat{\nu}(\pi) = 0$  for every  $\pi$  different from the trivial one-dimensional representation  $\mathbf{1}$ .

Since  $\widehat{\nu}(\mathbf{1}) = 1$  (it has to be a nonzero idempotent complex number), we conclude that  $\widehat{\nu}(\pi) = \widehat{m_G}(\pi)$  for every irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $G$  and, hence, (Theorem 2.12, statement (2)) that  $\nu = m_G$ .

We have thus that  $E_1 = \psi(\lambda_1(\mu)) = \lambda_1(m_G)$ . We finally observe that, since  $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$  is connected and  $\psi$  can be holomorphically extended to an open set containing  $K$ , there is, by Runge's theorem (see [4, Corollary III.8.5]), a sequence  $(\psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of polynomials such that  $\lim \psi_n = \psi$  uniformly on  $K$ . Having identified  $E_1 = \psi(\lambda_1(\mu))$  with  $\lambda_1(m_G)$ , we see that  $\lambda_1(m_G) = \lim \psi_n(\lambda_1(\mu))$ . The fact that  $\lambda_1: M(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(L^1(G))$  is a linear isometry yields that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with

$$\|m_G - \psi_n(\mu)\| < \varepsilon.$$

Now,  $\psi_n$  being a polynomial, functional calculus shows that, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are  $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $(\alpha_{j,n})_{j=0}^{k_n} \subset \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\psi_n(\mu) = \sum_{j=0}^{k_n} \alpha_{j,n} \mu^j$ , which implies that not all  $\mu^k$  can be singular, since singular measures constitute a closed subspace of  $M(G)$ .  $\square$

## 5.2. Connecting the spectrum of $\lambda_1(\mu)$ with that of $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ and $\lambda_1(\underline{\mu})$ .

We see in this subsection that once 1 is an accumulation point in some of the convolution operators  $\lambda_1(\mu)$ ,  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  or  $\lambda_1(\underline{\mu})$ , it is in an accumulation point in the other two. This leads to clean characterizations of uniform ergodicity where any of them can be used.

The following notations concerning a bounded operator  $T: X \rightarrow X$  on a Banach space  $X$  will prove useful in this section. The symbol  $\sigma_{ap}(T)$  will denote the approximate spectrum of  $T$ . We recall that  $z \in \sigma_{ap}(T)$

whenever there exists a sequence  $(x_n)$  in the unit sphere of  $X$  such that  $\lim \|T(x_n) - zx_n\| = 0$ . If  $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\partial A$  will denote the boundary of  $A$  and  $\text{Acc}(A)$  will stand for the set of cluster points of a set  $A$ .

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a continuous and linear operator on a Banach space  $X$  with  $\|T\| = 1$ . Then,  $1 \in \text{Acc}(\sigma(T))$  if, and only if,  $1 \in \text{Acc}(\sigma_{ap}(T))$ .*

*Proof.* One direction is obvious, we prove the other one. Assume that  $1 \in \text{Acc}(\sigma(T))$ . Then, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is  $z_n \in \sigma(T) \cap \{w \in \mathbb{C} : d(w, 1) \leq \frac{1}{n}\} \setminus \{1\}$  where  $d$  here stands for the Euclidean distance in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

Let  $t_n = \sup\{t \geq 0 : [z_n - ti, z_n + ti] \subseteq \sigma(T)\}$ , where  $[z_n - ti, z_n + ti]$  denotes the obvious vertical segment in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Since  $\sigma(T)$  is a compact set, one can choose correctly the sign so that  $w_n = z_n \pm t_n i \in \partial\sigma(T)$ .

Now define  $x_n$  as the intersection of the line  $1 - \frac{1}{n} + ti$  with  $\mathbb{T}$ , the boundary of  $\mathbb{D}$ , the unit disk, so  $x_n = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \pm \frac{\sqrt{2n-1}}{n}i$ . Since  $\sigma(T) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ , we have that, by construction,  $0 \leq t_n \leq \frac{\sqrt{2n-1}}{n}$ . This concludes the proof, for  $w_n \in \partial\sigma(T) \subseteq \sigma_{ap}(T)$  [4, Chapter VII, Proposition 6.7], and we have just seen that  $\lim_n w_n = \lim_n z_n = 1$ . □

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure on a non-compact group  $G$ . Then  $\sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) = \sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1(\mu))$ .*

*Proof.* We only have to show that  $\sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1(\mu)) \subseteq \sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1^0(\mu))$ . To that end, let  $z \in \sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1(\mu))$ , then there is a sequence  $(f_n)_n \subseteq L_1(G)$ , with  $\|f_n\|_1 = 1$  and satisfying  $\lim_n \|\mu * f_n - zf_n\| = 0$ . Since, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\|\lambda_1^0(f_n \cdot m_G)\| = 1$ , by Proposition 3.2, there exists  $g_n \in L_1^0(G)$ , with  $\|g_n\|_1 = 1$  such that  $\frac{1}{2} < \|f_n * g_n\|_1 \leq 1$ .

We conclude by observing that  $(f_n * g_n) / \|f_n * g_n\|_1 \in L_1^0(G)$  and that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mu * \frac{f_n * g_n}{\|f_n * g_n\|_1} - z \cdot \frac{f_n * g_n}{\|f_n * g_n\|_1} \right\| &\leq 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu * f_n * g_n - z \cdot f_n * g_n\|_1 \\ &\leq 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu * f_n - z \cdot f_n\|_1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 5.8.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure.*

- (a) *1 is isolated in  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu))$  if and only if 1 is not an accumulation point of  $\sigma(\lambda_1^0(\mu))$ .*
- (b) *1 is isolated in  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu))$  if and only if 1 is isolated in  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\underline{\mu}))$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove (a). Our argument will be different depending on whether  $G$  is compact or not.

If  $G$  is compact, the map  $f \mapsto (f - \int f dm_G) \oplus \int f dm_G$  establishes a linear isometry between  $L_1(G)$  and  $L_1^0(G) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ . Moreover, since both the closed hyperplane  $L_1^0(G)$  and its complement are  $\lambda_1(\mu)$ -invariant, we can decompose  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  as  $\lambda_1(\mu) = \lambda_1^0(\mu) \oplus \text{Id}$ . It follows that  $\sigma(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) \cup \{1\} = \sigma(\lambda_1(\mu))$ , which certainly implies the result.

If  $G$  is not compact, Propositions 5.6 and 5.7 together yield directly the result.

We now prove Statement (b). Since  $M(H_\mu) \subseteq M(G)$  as unitary Banach algebras, it follows

$$\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu)) = \sigma(\mu) \subseteq \sigma(\underline{\mu}) = \sigma(\lambda_1(\underline{\mu})).$$

Again, we just have to show that if 1 is an accumulation point of  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\underline{\mu}))$  then 1 also accumulates in  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu))$ . We can deduce from Proposition 5.6 that it suffices to show that  $\sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1(\underline{\mu})) \subseteq \sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1(\mu))$ . Let  $\lambda \in \sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1(\underline{\mu}))$ . There is  $f_n \in L_1(H_\mu)$  such that  $\|f_n\| = 1$  and  $\lim_n \|\mu * f_n - \lambda f_n\| = 0$ . Now, we observe that, for every  $n$ ,  $f_n \, \text{dm}_H \in M(G)$  and  $1 = \|f_n\| = \|\lambda_1(f_n \, \text{dm}_H)\|$ , there will be therefore  $g_n \in L_1(G)$ ,  $\|g_n\| = 1$ , such that  $\|\lambda_1(f_n)(g_n)\| = \|f_n * g_n\| > \frac{1}{2}$ . Choosing  $h_n := (1/\|f_n * g_n\|)f_n * g_n \in L_1(G)$  we get

$$\lim_n \|\mu * h_n - \lambda h_n\| = 0,$$

and  $\lambda \in \sigma_{ap}(\lambda_1(\mu))$ . □

**5.3. The spectral characterizations.** The results of the previous subsections can now be put to work.

We first characterize uniform ergodicity of measures.

**Theorem 5.9.** *Let  $G$  be a compact group and  $\mu \in M(G)$  be an adapted probability measure. The following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic.
- (2)  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic.
- (3)  $\mu$  is spread-out.
- (4)  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is quasi-compact.
- (5)  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is quasi-compact.
- (6) 1 is an isolated point of  $\sigma(\mu)$

*Proof.* Statements (1)-(5) have already been shown to be equivalent, Theorem 4.6. Statement (2) implies Statement (6) by Theorem 2.3 together with the equality  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\mu)) = \sigma(\mu)$ . Statement (6) implies Statement (3), by Theorem 5.5. □

We can also characterize uniform mean ergodicity of  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  for any  $\mu \in M(G)$ , in terms of  $\mu$  itself. Recall that we denote by  $\underline{\mu}$ , the measure  $\mu$  seen as a measure in  $M(H_\mu)$ .

**Theorem 5.10.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is a uniformly mean ergodic operator.
- (2)  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is a uniformly mean ergodic operator.
- (3) The measure  $\underline{\mu}$  is uniformly ergodic.
- (4)  $H_\mu$  is compact and 1 is an isolated point of  $\sigma(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* The equivalence of the first three statements follows from Theorem 5.9 and Corollary 4.5. If Corollary 3.3 is taken into account, Theorem 5.9 also shows that these three statements are equivalent to  $H_\mu$  being compact and 1 being isolated in  $\sigma(\lambda_1(\underline{\mu}))$ . We conclude with Corollary 5.8 (b). □

The operator  $\lambda_\infty(\mu) : L_\infty(G) \longrightarrow L_\infty(G)$ , defined by  $f \mapsto \mu * f$  can also be encompassed in these characterizations.

**Corollary 5.11.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure. The following statement is equivalent to the Statements (1)-(4) of Theorem 5.10.*

(5)  $\lambda_\infty(\mu)$  is mean ergodic.

*Proof.* Denote by  $\mu^*$  the measure on  $G$  defined by  $\langle \mu^*, h \rangle = \overline{\langle \mu, \tilde{h} \rangle}$  for every  $h \in C_0(G)$ , where  $\tilde{h}(s) = \overline{h(s^{-1})}$  for each  $s \in G$ . Then  $\mu^*(A) = \mu(A^{-1})$  whenever  $A$  is  $\mu$ -measurable and  $\lambda_\infty(\mu^*)$  is the operator adjoint to  $\lambda_1(\mu)$ , [12, Theorem 20.23]. Since inverse sets of Haar-null sets are Haar-null, and  $(\mu^*)^n = (\mu^n)^*$ , [12, Theorem 20.22]),  $\underline{\mu}$  will be spread-out if and only if  $\underline{\mu^*}$  is. Theorem 5.10 then shows that  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $\lambda_1(\mu^*)$  is. Since the adjoint of a uniformly mean ergodic operator is uniformly mean ergodic as well and  $\lambda_\infty(\mu)$  is the adjoint of  $\lambda_1(\mu^*)$ , the equivalence of Statement (5) here and Statement (1) of Theorem 5.10 follows. We conclude from Lotz's theorem [22, Theorem 5], which ensures that a power bounded operator on  $L^\infty(G)$  is uniformly mean ergodic whenever it is ergodic. Clearly,  $\lambda_\infty(\mu)$  is power bounded, since  $\|\lambda_\infty(\mu)\| \leq \|\mu\|$  by Theorem 20.12 of [12].  $\square$

**Remark 5.12.** The authors of [23] observe that Host and Parreau's characterization of the measures  $\mu \in M(G)$  such that  $\mu * L_1(G)$  is closed in  $M(G)$  [14] implies that  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic if and only if  $\mu$  is of the form  $\mu = \delta_e + \lambda * \theta$ , with  $\lambda$  an invertible measure and  $\theta$  an idempotent measure. Hence, Theorem 5.9 and Theorem 5.10 together show that this description for probability measures is equivalent to  $H_\mu$  being compact and  $\underline{\mu}$  being spread-out.

**5.4. Uniform convergence of powers of convolution operators.** Our results on uniform ergodicity can also be translated to uniform complete mixing and, more generally, the convergence of powers of  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  and  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ . We start with a couple of results on strictly aperiodic measures. Recall (Theorem 2.9) that a completely mixing measure is always strictly aperiodic.

The first result is well-known when  $G$  is abelian.

**Proposition 5.13.** *Let  $G$  be a compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a strictly aperiodic probability measure. Consider an irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $G$ . If  $z \in \sigma(\hat{\mu}(\pi)) \cap \mathbb{T}$ , then  $\pi = \mathbf{1}$  the trivial one-dimensional representation.*

*Proof.* We first argue as we did in Corollary 2.13, to deduce that there is  $\xi \in \mathbb{H}_\pi$  such that

$$S_\mu \subseteq \{t \in G : \pi(t)\xi = z\xi\}.$$

If we now put  $N_\xi = \{t \in G : \pi(t)\xi = \xi\}$  we see that

$$S_\mu \subseteq N_G(N_\xi),$$

where, as usual,  $N_G(N_\xi) = \{x \in G : xN_\xi = N_\xi x\}$ , the normalizer of  $N_\xi$ . Since  $N_G(N_\xi)$  is a closed subgroup of  $G$  and  $\mu$  is adapted, we conclude that  $N_G(N_\xi) = G$ , i.e., that  $N_\xi$  is normal. As  $S_\mu \subseteq t_0 N_\xi$ , for any  $t_0 \in S_\mu$ , strict aperiodicity of  $\mu$  leads us to  $N_\xi = G$ , which is impossible for any irreducible representation  $\pi \neq \mathbf{1}$ .  $\square$



**Corollary 5.14.** *Let  $G$  be a compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a strictly aperiodic probability measure. Then  $\sigma_p(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) \cap \mathbb{T} = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* If  $z \in \mathbb{T}$  is an eigenvalue of  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ , then there is  $0 \neq f \in L_1^0(G)$  such that  $\mu * f = zf$ . One can then find an irreducible representation  $\pi$  of  $G$  such that  $\hat{f}(\pi) \neq 0$ . Pick  $\xi \in \mathbb{H}_\pi$  such that  $\hat{f}(\pi)\xi \neq 0$ . Since  $\hat{\mu}(\pi) \cdot \hat{f}(\pi)\xi = z\hat{f}(\pi)\xi$ ,  $\hat{f}(\pi)\xi$  is an eigenvector of  $\hat{\mu}(\pi)$  with eigenvalue  $z$ . Proposition 5.13 then shows that  $\pi = \mathbf{1}$  which would lead to  $\hat{f}(\pi) = 0$ , for  $f \in L_1^0(G)$ . This contradiction shows that there are no unimodular eigenvalues of  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.15.** *Let  $G$  be a compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be an adapted probability measure. The following assertions are equivalent.*

- (1) *The sequence  $(\lambda_1(\mu^n))$  is norm convergent.*
- (2) *The measure  $\mu$  is uniformly completely mixing.*
- (3)  *$\mu$  is spread-out and strictly aperiodic.*
- (4)  *$\mu$  is spread-out and  $\sigma(\mu) \cap \mathbb{T} = \{1\}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $G$  is compact  $\lambda_1(\mu) = \lambda_1^0(\mu) \oplus \text{Id}$ , hence (1) and (2) are equivalent by Proposition 4.2. Condition (2) implies that  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic and  $\mu$  is completely mixing. Uniform ergodicity implies that  $\mu$  is spread-out (Theorem 5.9). Completely mixing and Lin-Wittmann's Theorem 2.9 (b) yield that  $\mu$  is strictly aperiodic. Hence (2) implies (3).

If we assume (3), then  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is quasi-compact by Theorem 5.9, and Corollary 5.14 yields  $\sigma_p(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) \cap \mathbb{T} = \emptyset$ . Theorem 2.4 implies then that  $(\|\lambda_1^0(\mu^n)\|)$  is convergent to 0, hence we have (2). Statements (1)-(3) are thus shown to be equivalent.

Assume that the first three equivalent conditions hold. In a Banach algebra the elements whose sequence of powers is convergent to 0 are those whose spectral radius is smaller than 1, hence (2) implies  $r(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) < 1$ . Since  $\sigma(\mu) = \sigma(\lambda_1(\mu)) = \sigma(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) \cup \{1\}$ , (4) necessarily holds.

Suppose conversely that (4) holds. Then  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic (Theorem 5.9) and  $1 \notin \sigma(\lambda_1^0(\mu))$ , for otherwise also  $1 \in \sigma(\lambda_1^0(\mu_{[n]}))$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , against uniform ergodicity. Using again that  $\sigma(\mu) = \sigma(\lambda_1(\mu)) = \sigma(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) \cup \{1\}$  we conclude that  $r(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) < 1$ , which is equivalent to (2).  $\square$

**Remark 5.16.** The previous Theorem contains the uniform version of Glasner's theorem [10]: if  $\mu$  is spread-out, then  $\mu$  is uniformly completely mixing if and only if it is uniformly ergodic. It also contains the solution to the uniform complete mixing problem: a uniformly ergodic and strictly aperiodic measure is necessarily uniformly completely mixing.

If we do not assume  $\mu$  to be adapted, Theorem 5.15 can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 5.17.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu \in M(G)$  be a probability measure. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  *$(\lambda_1(\mu^n))$  is convergent in  $(\mathcal{L}(L_1(G)), \|\cdot\|)$ .*
- (2)  *$(\lambda_1^0(\mu^n))$  is convergent in  $(\mathcal{L}(L_1^0(G)), \|\cdot\|)$ .*
- (3)  *$\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  is uniformly mean ergodic and  $(\lambda_1^0(\mu^n))$  is convergent in  $\mathcal{L}(L_1^0(G))$  endowed with the SOT topology.*

- (4)  $H_\mu$  is compact and the measure  $\underline{\mu}$  is uniformly ergodic and strictly aperiodic.

*Proof.* (1) implies (2) and (2) implies (3) are trivial. Assertion (3) implies that  $\underline{\mu}$  is uniformly ergodic by Theorem 5.10. This implies that  $\sigma_p(\lambda_1^0(\mu)) \cap \mathbb{T} \subseteq \{1\}$ . By Theorem 5.9,  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$  must be quasi-compact. Theorem 2.4 proves then that  $\underline{\mu}$  is uniformly completely mixing, which is equivalent to our assertion (4) by Theorem 5.15 (via Corollary 3.3). That Statement (4) implies (1) follows from Theorem 5.15 and Corollary 4.3.  $\square$

If  $G$  is connected, we can drop the condition of strict aperiodicity from Theorem 5.15.

**Theorem 5.18.** *Let  $G$  be a compact connected group and  $\mu \in M(G)$ , be an adapted probability measure. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mu$  is uniformly completely mixing.
- (2)  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic.
- (3)  $\mu$  is spread-out.

*Proof.* After Theorem 5.17, we only have to prove that  $\mu$  is strictly aperiodic when  $\mu$  is uniformly ergodic.

Let  $\mu$  be uniformly ergodic. We proceed by contradiction and assume that there are a proper normal closed subgroup  $H$  and a point  $x \in G$  such that  $S_\mu \subseteq xH$ . Note that  $m_G(H) = 0$ , for else it would be open and, bearing in mind that  $G$  is connected, we would have  $H = G$ . Now we have

$$\bigcup_{1 \leq j, k \leq n} S_\mu^{-j} S_\mu^k \subseteq \bigcup_{j=-n}^n x^j H,$$

for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $m_G(H) = 0$  we can apply Proposition 3.4, to conclude that  $\mu$  is not uniformly mean ergodic.  $\square$

If  $G$  is abelian but not connected, measures failing to satisfy Theorem 5.18 can always be constructed.

*Example 5.19.* Let  $G$  be a compact, abelian, *non-connected* group. Then  $G$  has a maximal proper normal subgroup  $H$  which is open (since  $\hat{G}$  is not torsion-free [12, 24.25], there must exist  $\chi \in \hat{G}$  such that  $\langle \chi \rangle$  has a prime number of elements, then  $H = \langle \chi \rangle^\perp$ ).

Define the measure by  $\mu = \mathbf{1}_{xH} m_G$ , for some  $x \notin H$ . It is easy to see that  $H \subsetneq \langle xH \rangle$ , while the maximality of  $H$  shows that  $\overline{H_\mu} = \overline{\langle xH \rangle} = G$ .

The measure  $\mu$  is hence adapted and spread-out, but it is not strictly aperiodic by construction.

Commutativity is essential in the above example. If  $G$  is a simple group or, more generally, if  $G$  admits no nontrivial continuous characters (see [19, Lemma 3.4]), then every adapted measure is strictly aperiodic.

**5.5. A characterization of quasi-compactness of convolution operators.** Next theorem should be compared to Theorem 2 from [21] and Theorem 3.4 of [24], where the equivalence between (1) and (2) below is proved for a more general class of operators.

**Theorem 5.20.** *Let  $G$  be a locally compact group and let  $\mu$  be a probability measure. Let  $T$  stand for  $\lambda_1(\mu)$ ,  $\lambda_\infty(\mu)$  or  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ . The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The operator  $T$  is quasi-compact.*
- (2)  *$(T_{[n]})$  is norm convergent to a finite dimensional projection.*
- (3)  *$G$  is compact,  $H_\mu$  is open in  $G$  and  $\underline{\mu}$  is spread-out.*

*Proof.* That Statement (1) implies Statement (2) is the Yosida-Kakutani theorem, Theorem 2.4.

Let us see that (2) implies (3). If (2) holds, then  $H_\mu$  is compact, by Corollary 5.11. We now proceed by contradiction and suppose that  $G$  is either noncompact or that  $G$  is compact and  $H_\mu$  is not open in  $G$ . In both cases, we can choose a sequence  $(x_k) \subseteq G \setminus H_\mu$  such that  $(H_\mu x_k)$  is a disjoint sequence of compact subsets of  $G$ . We fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . One can get a compact neighbourhood of the identity  $U$  such that  $H_\mu x_i U \cap H_\mu x_j U = \emptyset$  whenever  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ . To find  $U$ , first we choose inductively compact neighbourhoods of the identity  $U_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $H_\mu x_i \cap H_\mu x_l U_l = \emptyset$  when  $1 \leq l < i \leq n$  and  $H_\mu x_i U_i \cap H_\mu x_j = \emptyset$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ . The set  $U := \cap_{i=1}^n U_i$  satisfies the required condition. We observe that if  $f_i$  is the characteristic function of  $x_i U$  then  $\text{supp}(m_{H_\mu} * f_i) = H_\mu x_i U$  for each  $i \neq j \leq n$ . Hence the dimension of  $\lambda_1(m_{H_\mu})(L_1(G))$  and the dimension of  $\lambda_\infty(m_{H_\mu})(L_\infty(G))$  are at least  $n$ . By observing how the convolution operator acts on  $f_{ij} = f_i - f_j$ ,  $i \neq j$ , we get also that the dimension of  $\lambda_1^0(m_{H_\mu})(L_1^0(G))$  is at least  $n$ . Since  $n$  is arbitrary, we get that, in all the considered cases, the projection limit of  $T_{[n]}$  is not compact.

We see finally that Statement (3) implies Statement (1). If  $G$  is compact and  $\underline{\mu}$  is spread-out, then there exists  $n$  such that  $\mu^n$  and  $m_{H_\mu}$  are not singular. If we assume in addition  $H_\mu$  to be open in  $G$ , then  $\mu^n$  and  $m_G$  are not singular either. Hence,  $\lambda_1(\mu)$  is quasicompact. □

**Remark 5.21.** In Theorem 5.17, we have seen that for  $T = \lambda_1^0(\mu)$ , the sequence  $(T^n)$  is norm convergent if and only if  $T$  is uniformly mean ergodic and the sequence  $(T^n)$  is SOT convergent. One could wonder if this statement holds for any operator. It does not. Let  $a = (a_n)$  be a sequence of numbers such that  $\lim a_n = -1$  and  $|a_n| < 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The multiplication operator  $M_a : l_1(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow l_1(\mathbb{N})$ ,  $(b_n) \mapsto (a_n b_n)$  satisfies  $\|M_a\| = 1$  and  $1 \notin \sigma(M_a) = \{a_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{-1\}$ , hence  $M_a$  is uniformly mean ergodic by Theorem 2.2. Moreover  $M_a$  is easily seen to be SOT-convergent to 0. However  $\|M_a^n\| = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The statement is valid for any quasi-compact operator  $T$ , by Theorem 2.4, since  $\sigma_p(T) \cap \mathbb{T} \subseteq \{1\}$  whenever  $(T^n)$  is a SOT convergent sequence. In Theorem 5.20 we see that in general uniform mean ergodicity and SOT convergence of the sequence  $(\lambda_1^0(\mu^n))$  does not imply quasi-compactness of  $\lambda_1^0(\mu)$ .

**Acknowledgements.** The contribution of Jorge Galindo to this article is part of the grant PID2019-106529GB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. Support of grant UJI-B2019-08, funded by Universitat Jaume I, is also acknowledged.

The research of E. Jordá was partially supported by the project PID2020-119457GB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF A way of making Europe”. The research of E. Jordá is also partially supported by GVA-AICO/2021/170.

Alberto Rodríguez-Arenas acknowledges the support of Acció 3.2 POS-DOC/2020/14 of UJI. The research was supported partially by the grant PID2019-106529GB-I00 funded MCIN/ AEI /10.13039/501100011033.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C.A. Akemann, Some mapping properties of the group algebras of a compact group. *Pacific J. Math.* 22 (1967), 1–8.
- [2] M. Anoussis and D. Gatzouras. On mixing and ergodicity in locally compact motion groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 625:1–28, 2008.
- [3] G. Choquet and J. Deny. Sur l'équation de convolution  $\mu = \mu * \sigma$ . *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 250:799–801, 1960.
- [4] J. B. Conway. *A course in functional analysis*, volume 96 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1990.
- [5] C. Cuny. Weak mixing of random walks on groups. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 16(4):923–933 (2004), 2003.
- [6] H. G. Dales, P. Aiena, J. Eschmeier, K. Laursen, and G. A. Willis. *Introduction to Banach algebras, operators, and harmonic analysis*, volume 57 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [7] N. Dunford. Spectral theory. I. Convergence to projections. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 54:185–217, 1943.
- [8] S. R. Foguel. Iterates of a convolution on a non abelian group. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. B (N.S.)*, 11(2):199–202, 1975.
- [9] J. Galindo and E. Jordà. Ergodic properties of convolution operators. *J. Operator Theory*, 86(2):469–501, 2021.
- [10] S. Glasner. On Choquet-Deny measures. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. B (N.S.)*, 12(1):1–10, 1976.
- [11] F. P. Greenleaf. *Invariant means on topological groups and their applications*. Van Nostrand Mathematical Studies, No. 16. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1969.
- [12] E. Hewitt and K. A. Ross. *Abstract harmonic analysis. Vol. I: Structure of topological groups. Integration theory, group representations*. Academic Press Inc., Publishers, New York, 1963.
- [13] E. Hewitt and K. A. Ross. *Abstract harmonic analysis. Vol. II: Structure and analysis for compact groups. Analysis on locally compact Abelian groups*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970.
- [14] B. Host and F. Parreau. Sur un problème de i. Glicksberg: les idéaux fermés de type fini de  $m(g)$ . *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 28:143–164, 1978.
- [15] W. Jaworski. Ergodic and mixing probability measures on [SIN] groups. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 17(3):741–759, 2004.
- [16] Y. Kawada and K. Itô. On the probability distribution on a compact group. I. *Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan (3)*, 22:977–998, 1940.
- [17] U. Krengel. *Ergodic theorems*, volume 6 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1985. With a supplement by Antoine Brunel.
- [18] C. S. Kubrusly. *Spectral theory of operators on Hilbert spaces*. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012.
- [19] M. Lin and R. Wittmann. Convergence of representation averages and of convolution powers. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 88:125–157, 1994.
- [20] M. Lin. On the uniform ergodic theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 43:337–340, 1974.
- [21] M. Lin. Quasi-compactness and uniform ergodicity of Markov operators. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. B (N.S.)* 11 (1975), no. 4, 345–354 (1976).

- [22] H. P. Lotz. Uniform convergence of operators on  $L^\infty$  and similar spaces. *Math. Z.* 190 (1985), no. 2, 207–220.
- [23] H. Mustafayev and H. Topal. Ergodic properties of convolution operators in group algebras. *Colloq. Math.*, 165(2):321–340, 2021.
- [24] D. Revuz. *Markov chains*, volume 11 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1984.
- [25] J. Rosenblatt. Ergodic and mixing random walks on locally compact groups. *Math. Ann.*, 257(1):31–42, 1981.
- [26] J. G. Wendel. Left centralizers and isomorphisms of group algebras. *Pacific J. Math.*, 2:251–261, 1952.
- [27] K. Yosida and S. Kakutani. Operator-theoretical treatment of Markoff's process and mean ergodic theorem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 42(1):188–228, 1941.

JORGE GALINDO, INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO DE MATEMÁTICAS Y APLICACIONES (IMAC),  
UNIVERSIDAD JAUME I, E-12071, CASTELLÓN, SPAIN.  
E-MAIL: [jgalindo@uji.es](mailto:jgalindo@uji.es)

ENRIQUE JORDÁ, EPS ALCOY, INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA  
Y APLICADA IUMPA, UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE VALÈNCIA, PLAZA FERRÁNDIZ Y  
CARBONELL S/N E-03801 ALCOY, SPAIN,  
E-MAIL: [ejorda@mat.upv.es](mailto:ejorda@mat.upv.es)

ALBERTO RODRÍGUEZ-ARENAS, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD  
JAUME I, E-12071, CASTELLÓN, SPAIN.  
E-MAIL: [arenasa@uji.es](mailto:arenasa@uji.es)