Classification problems in ergodic theory

A descriptive set theoretic point of view

Alexander S. Kechris

January 8, 2009

Measure preserving transformations

Definition

A standard measure space is a measure space (X, μ), where X is a Polish space and μ a non-atomic Borel probability measure on X.

All such spaces are isomorphic to the unit interval with Lebesgue measure.

Definition

A measure preserving transformation on (X, μ) is a measurable bijection T such that $\mu(T(A)) = \mu(A)$, for any Borel set A.

Measure preserving transformations

Definition

A standard measure space is a measure space (X, μ), where X is a Polish space and μ a non-atomic Borel probability measure on X.

All such spaces are isomorphic to the unit interval with Lebesgue measure.

Definition

A measure preserving transformation on (X, μ) is a measurable bijection T such that $\mu(T(A)) = \mu(A)$, for any Borel set A.

Measure preserving transformations

Definition

A standard measure space is a measure space (X, μ), where X is a Polish space and μ a non-atomic Borel probability measure on X.

All such spaces are isomorphic to the unit interval with Lebesgue measure.

Definition

A measure preserving transformation on (X, μ) is a measurable bijection T such that $\mu(T(A)) = \mu(A)$, for any Borel set A.

Measure preserving transformations

Examples

- $X = \mathbb{T}$ with the usual measure; $T(z) = az$, where $a \in \mathbb{T}$, i.e., T is a rotation.
- $X = 2^{\mathbb{Z}}, T(x)(n) = x(n-1)$, i.e., the shift transformation.

Definition

A mpt T is ergodic if every T-invariant set has measure 0 or 1.

Any irrational, modulo π, rotation and the shift are ergodic.

The ergodic decomposition theorem shows that every mpt can be canonically decomposed into a (continuous) direct sum of ergodic mpt's.

Measure preserving transformations

Examples

- $X = \mathbb{T}$ with the usual measure; $T(z) = az$, where $a \in \mathbb{T}$, i.e., T is a rotation.
- $X = 2^{\mathbb{Z}}, T(x)(n) = x(n-1)$, i.e., the shift transformation.

Definition

A mpt T is ergodic if every T-invariant set has measure 0 or 1.

Any irrational, modulo π, rotation and the shift are ergodic.

The ergodic decomposition theorem shows that every mpt can be canonically decomposed into a (continuous) direct sum of ergodic mpt's.

Measure preserving transformations

Examples

- $X = \mathbb{T}$ with the usual measure; $T(z) = az$, where $a \in \mathbb{T}$, i.e., T is a rotation.
- $X = 2^{\mathbb{Z}}, T(x)(n) = x(n-1)$, i.e., the shift transformation.

Definition

A mpt T is ergodic if every T-invariant set has measure 0 or 1.

Any irrational, modulo π, rotation and the shift are ergodic.

The ergodic decomposition theorem shows that every mpt can be canonically decomposed into a (continuous) direct sum of ergodic mpt's.

Measure preserving transformations

Examples

- $X = \mathbb{T}$ with the usual measure; $T(z) = az$, where $a \in \mathbb{T}$, i.e., T is a rotation.
- $X = 2^{\mathbb{Z}}, T(x)(n) = x(n-1)$, i.e., the shift transformation.

Definition

A mpt T is ergodic if every T-invariant set has measure 0 or 1.

Any irrational, modulo π, rotation and the shift are ergodic.

The ergodic decomposition theorem shows that every mpt can be canonically decomposed into a (continuous) direct sum of ergodic mpt's.

Measure preserving transformations

Examples

- $X = \mathbb{T}$ with the usual measure; $T(z) = az$, where $a \in \mathbb{T}$, i.e., T is a rotation.
- $X = 2^{\mathbb{Z}}, T(x)(n) = x(n-1)$, i.e., the shift transformation.

Definition

A mpt T is ergodic if every T-invariant set has measure 0 or 1.

Any irrational, modulo π, rotation and the shift are ergodic.

The ergodic decomposition theorem shows that every mpt can be canonically decomposed into a (continuous) direct sum of ergodic mpt's.

Classifying measure preserving transformations

In ergodic theory one is interested in classifying ergodic mpt up to various notions of equivalence. I will consider below two such standard notions.

- Isomorphism or conjugacy: A mpt S on (X, μ) is isomorphic to a mpt T on (Y, ν), in symbols $S \cong T$, if there is an isomorphism φ of (X, μ) to (Y, ν) that sends S to T, i.e., $S = \varphi^{-1} T \varphi$.
- Unitary isomorphism: To each mpt T on (X, μ) we can assign the unitary operator $U_T : L^2(X, \mu) \to L^2(X, \mu)$ given by $U_T(f)(x) = f(T^{-1}(x))$. Then S, T are unitarily isomorphic, in symbols $S \cong^u T$, if U_S, U_T are isomorphic.

Clearly $\cong$ implies $\cong^u$ but the converse fails.

Classifying measure preserving transformations

In ergodic theory one is interested in classifying ergodic mpt up to various notions of equivalence. I will consider below two such standard notions.

- Isomorphism or conjugacy: A mpt S on (X, μ) is isomorphic to a mpt T on (Y, ν), in symbols $S \cong T$, if there is an isomorphism φ of (X, μ) to (Y, ν) that sends S to T, i.e., $S = \varphi^{-1} T \varphi$.
- Unitary isomorphism: To each mpt T on (X, μ) we can assign the unitary operator $U_T : L^2(X, \mu) \to L^2(X, \mu)$ given by $U_T(f)(x) = f(T^{-1}(x))$. Then S, T are unitarily isomorphic, in symbols $S \cong^u T$, if U_S, U_T are isomorphic.

Clearly $\cong$ implies $\cong^u$ but the converse fails.

Classifying measure preserving transformations

In ergodic theory one is interested in classifying ergodic mpt up to various notions of equivalence. I will consider below two such standard notions.

- Isomorphism or conjugacy: A mpt S on (X, μ) is isomorphic to a mpt T on (Y, ν), in symbols $S \cong T$, if there is an isomorphism φ of (X, μ) to (Y, ν) that sends S to T, i.e., $S = \varphi^{-1} T \varphi$.
- Unitary isomorphism: To each mpt T on (X, μ) we can assign the unitary operator $U_T : L^2(X, \mu) \to L^2(X, \mu)$ given by $U_T(f)(x) = f(T^{-1}(x))$. Then S, T are unitarily isomorphic, in symbols $S \cong^u T$, if U_S, U_T are isomorphic.

Clearly $\cong$ implies $\cong^u$ but the converse fails.

Classifying measure preserving transformations

In ergodic theory one is interested in classifying ergodic mpt up to various notions of equivalence. I will consider below two such standard notions.

- Isomorphism or conjugacy: A mpt S on (X, μ) is isomorphic to a mpt T on (Y, ν), in symbols $S \cong T$, if there is an isomorphism φ of (X, μ) to (Y, ν) that sends S to T, i.e., $S = \varphi^{-1} T \varphi$.
- Unitary isomorphism: To each mpt T on (X, μ) we can assign the unitary operator $U_T : L^2(X, \mu) \to L^2(X, \mu)$ given by $U_T(f)(x) = f(T^{-1}(x))$. Then S, T are unitarily isomorphic, in symbols $S \cong^u T$, if U_S, U_T are isomorphic.

Clearly $\cong$ implies $\cong^u$ but the converse fails.

Two classical classification theorems:

- (Halmos-von Neumann) An ergodic mpt has discrete spectrum if U_T has discrete spectrum , i.e., there is a basis consisting of eigenvectors. In this case the eigenvalues are simple and form a (countable) subgroup of $\mathbb{T}$. It turns out that up to isomorphism these are exactly the ergodic rotations in compact metric groups $G : T(g) = ag$, where $a \in G$ is such that $\{a^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is dense in G. For such T, let $\Gamma_T \leq \mathbb{T}$ be its group of eigenvalues. Then we have:

$$S \cong T \Leftrightarrow S \cong^u T \Leftrightarrow \Gamma_S = \Gamma_T.$$

Classifying measure preserving transformations

Two classical classification theorems:

- (Halmos-von Neumann) An ergodic mpt has discrete spectrum if U_T has discrete spectrum , i.e., there is a basis consisting of eigenvectors. In this case the eigenvalues are simple and form a (countable) subgroup of $\mathbb{T}$. It turns out that up to isomorphism these are exactly the ergodic rotations in compact metric groups G : $T(g) = ag$, where $a \in G$ is such that $\{a^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is dense in G. For such T, let $\Gamma_T \leq \mathbb{T}$ be its group of eigenvalues. Then we have:

$$S \cong T \Leftrightarrow S \cong^u T \Leftrightarrow \Gamma_S = \Gamma_T.$$

Classifying measure preserving transformations

- (Ornstein) Let $Y = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\bar{p} = (p_1, \cdots, p_n)$ a probability distribution on Y and form the product space $X = Y^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with the product measure μ. Consider the Bernoulli shift $T_{\bar{p}}$ on X. Its entropy is the real number $H(\bar{p}) = -\sum_i p_i \log p_i$. Then we have:

$$T_{\bar{p}} \cong T_{\bar{q}} \Leftrightarrow H(\bar{p}) = H(\bar{q})$$

(but all the shifts are unitarily isomorphic).

- (Ornstein) Let $Y = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\bar{p} = (p_1, \cdots, p_n)$ a probability distribution on Y and form the product space $X = Y^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with the product measure μ. Consider the Bernoulli shift $T_{\bar{p}}$ on X. Its entropy is the real number $H(\bar{p}) = -\sum_i p_i \log p_i$. Then we have:

$$T_{\bar{p}} \cong T_{\bar{q}} \Leftrightarrow H(\bar{p}) = H(\bar{q})$$

(but all the shifts are unitarily isomorphic).

Classifying measure preserving transformations

We will now consider the following question: Is it possible to classify, in any reasonable way, general ergodic mpt?

We will see how ideas from descriptive set theory can throw some light on this question.

Classifying measure preserving transformations

We will now consider the following question: Is it possible to classify, in any reasonable way, general ergodic mpt?

We will see how ideas from descriptive set theory can throw some light on this question.

Classification problems

I will next give a brief introduction to recent work in set theory, developed primarily over the last 15-20 years, concerning a theory of complexity of classification problems in mathematics, and then discuss its implications to the above problems.

Classification problems

A classification problem is given by:

- A collection of objects X.
- An equivalence relation E on X.

A complete classification of X up to E consists of:

- A set of invariants I.
- A map $c : X \to I$ such that $xEy \Leftrightarrow c(x) = c(y)$.

For this to be of any interest both I, c must be as explicit and concrete as possible.

Classification problems

A classification problem is given by:

- A collection of objects X.
- An equivalence relation E on X.

A complete classification of X up to E consists of:

- A set of invariants I.
- A map $c : X \to I$ such that $xEy \Leftrightarrow c(x) = c(y)$.

For this to be of any interest both I, c must be as explicit and concrete as possible.

Classification problems

A classification problem is given by:

- A collection of objects X.
- An equivalence relation E on X.

A complete classification of X up to E consists of:

- A set of invariants I.
- A map $c : X \to I$ such that $xEy \Leftrightarrow c(x) = c(y)$.

For this to be of any interest both I, c must be as explicit and concrete as possible.

Classification problems

Example

Classification of Bernoulli shifts up to isomorphism (Ornstein).
INVARIANTS: Reals

Example

Classification of ergodic measure-preserving transformations with discrete spectrum up to isomorphism (Halmos-von Neumann).
INVARIANTS: Countable subsets of $\mathbb{T}$.

Example

Classification of unitary operators on a separable Hilbert space up to isomorphism (Spectral Theorem).
INVARIANTS: Measure classes, i.e., probability Borel measures on a Polish space up to measure equivalence.

Classification problems

Example

Classification of Bernoulli shifts up to isomorphism (Ornstein).
INVARIANTS: Reals

Example

Classification of ergodic measure-preserving transformations with discrete spectrum up to isomorphism (Halmos-von Neumann).
INVARIANTS: Countable subsets of $\mathbb{T}$.

Example

Classification of unitary operators on a separable Hilbert space up to isomorphism (Spectral Theorem).
INVARIANTS: Measure classes, i.e., probability Borel measures on a Polish space up to measure equivalence.

Classification problems

Example

Classification of Bernoulli shifts up to isomorphism (Ornstein).
INVARIANTS: Reals

Example

Classification of ergodic measure-preserving transformations with discrete spectrum up to isomorphism (Halmos-von Neumann).
INVARIANTS: Countable subsets of $\mathbb{T}$.

Example

Classification of unitary operators on a separable Hilbert space up to isomorphism (Spectral Theorem).
INVARIANTS: Measure classes, i.e., probability Borel measures on a Polish space up to measure equivalence.

Classification problems

Most often the collection of objects we try to classify can be viewed as forming a "nice" space, namely a standard Borel space, i.e., a Polish (complete separable metric) space with its associated Borel structure and the equivalence relation E turns out to be *Borel* or *analytic* (as a subset of X^2).

For example, in studying mpt the appropriate space is the Polish group of mpt of a fixed (X, μ), with the so-called weak topology. Isomorphism then corresponds to conjugacy in that group, which is an analytic equivalence relation. Similarly unitary isomorphism is an analytic equivalence relation.

Classification problems

Most often the collection of objects we try to classify can be viewed as forming a "nice" space, namely a standard Borel space, i.e., a Polish (complete separable metric) space with its associated Borel structure and the equivalence relation E turns out to be *Borel* or *analytic* (as a subset of X^2).

For example, in studying mpt the appropriate space is the Polish group of mpt of a fixed (X, μ), with the so-called weak topology. Isomorphism then corresponds to conjugacy in that group, which is an analytic equivalence relation. Similarly unitary isomorphism is an analytic equivalence relation.

Equivalence relations and reducibility

The theory of equivalence relations studies the set-theoretic nature of possible (complete) invariants and develops a mathematical framework for measuring the complexity of classification problems.

The following simple concept is basic in organizing this study.

Equivalence relations and reducibility

The theory of equivalence relations studies the set-theoretic nature of possible (complete) invariants and develops a mathematical framework for measuring the complexity of classification problems.

The following simple concept is basic in organizing this study.

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Definition

Let $(X, E), (Y, F)$ be equivalence relations. E is (Borel) reducible to F, in symbols

$$E \leq_B F,$$

if there is Borel map $f : X \to Y$ such that

$$x \; E \; y \Leftrightarrow f(x) \; F \; f(y).$$

Intuitive meaning:

- The classification problem represented by E is at most as complicated as that of F.
- F-classes are complete invariants for E.

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Definition

Let $(X, E), (Y, F)$ be equivalence relations. E is (Borel) reducible to F, in symbols

$$E \leq_B F,$$

if there is Borel map $f : X \to Y$ such that

$$x \; E \; y \Leftrightarrow f(x) \; F \; f(y).$$

Intuitive meaning:

- The classification problem represented by E is at most as complicated as that of F.
- F-classes are complete invariants for E.

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Definition

Let $(X,E),(Y,F)$ be equivalence relations. E is (Borel) reducible to F, in symbols

$$E \leq_B F,$$

if there is Borel map $f : X \to Y$ such that

$$x \; E \; y \Leftrightarrow f(x) \; F \; f(y).$$

Intuitive meaning:

- The classification problem represented by E is at most as complicated as that of F.
- F-classes are complete invariants for E.

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Definition

Let $(X,E),(Y,F)$ be equivalence relations. E is (Borel) reducible to F, in symbols

$$E \leq_B F,$$

if there is Borel map $f : X \to Y$ such that

$$x \; E \; y \Leftrightarrow f(x) \; F \; f(y).$$

Intuitive meaning:

- The classification problem represented by E is at most as complicated as that of F.
- F-classes are complete invariants for E.

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Definition

E is bi-reducible to F if E is reducible to F and vice versa.

$$E \sim_B F \Leftrightarrow E \leq_B F \text{ and } F \leq_B E.$$

We also put:

Definition

$$E <_B F \Leftrightarrow E \leq_B F \text{ and } F \not\leq_B E.$$

Definition

E is bi-reducible to F if E is reducible to F and vice versa.

$$E \sim_B F \Leftrightarrow E \leq_B F \text{ and } F \leq_B E.$$

We also put:

Definition

$$E <_B F \Leftrightarrow E \leq_B F \text{ and } F \not\leq_B E.$$

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Example

(Isomorphism of Bernoulli shifts) $\sim_B$ $(=_{\mathbb{R}})$

Example

(Isomorphism of ergodic discrete spectrum mpt) $\sim_B E_c$,
where E_c is the equivalence relation on $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$(x_n)\ E_c\ (y_n) \Leftrightarrow \{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

Example

(Isomorphism of unitary operators) $\sim_B \mathrm{ME}$,
where ME is the equivalence relation on the Polish space of probability Borel measures on $\mathbb{T}$ given by

$$\mu \mathrm{ME} \nu \Leftrightarrow \mu \ll \nu \text{ and } \mu \ll \nu$$

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Example

(Isomorphism of Bernoulli shifts) $\sim_B$ $(=_{\mathbb{R}})$

Example

(Isomorphism of ergodic discrete spectrum mpt) $\sim_B E_c$,
where E_c is the equivalence relation on $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$(x_n)\ E_c\ (y_n) \Leftrightarrow \{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

Example

(Isomorphism of unitary operators) $\sim_B \mathrm{ME}$,
where ME is the equivalence relation on the Polish space of probability Borel measures on $\mathbb{T}$ given by

$$\mu \mathrm{ME} \nu \Leftrightarrow \mu \ll \nu \text{ and } \mu \ll \nu$$

Equivalence relations and reducibility

Example

(Isomorphism of Bernoulli shifts) $\sim_B$ $(=_{\mathbb{R}})$

Example

(Isomorphism of ergodic discrete spectrum mpt) $\sim_B E_c$,
where E_c is the equivalence relation on $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$(x_n)\ E_c\ (y_n) \Leftrightarrow \{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

Example

(Isomorphism of unitary operators) $\sim_B \mathrm{ME}$,
where ME is the equivalence relation on the Polish space of probability Borel measures on $\mathbb{T}$ given by

$$\mu \mathrm{ME} \nu \Leftrightarrow \mu \ll \nu \text{ and } \mu \ll \nu$$

Borel cardinality theory

The preceding concepts can be also interpreted as the basis of a "definable" or Borel cardinality theory for quotient spaces.

- $E \leq_B F$ means that there is a Borel injection of X/E into Y/F, i.e., X/E has Borel cardinality less than or equal to that of Y/F, in symbols
$$|X/E|_B \leq |Y/F|_B$$
- $E \sim_B F$ means that X/E and Y/F have the same Borel cardinality, in symbols
$$|X/E|_B = |Y/F|_B$$
- $E <_B F$ means that X/E has strictly smaller Borel cardinality than Y/F, in symbols
$$|X/E|_B < |Y/F|_B$$

The preceding concepts can be also interpreted as the basis of a "definable" or Borel cardinality theory for quotient spaces.

- $E \ \leq_B \ F$ means that there is a Borel injection of X/E into Y/F, i.e., X/E has Borel cardinality less than or equal to that of Y/F, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ \leq \ |Y/F|_B$$

- $E \ \sim_B \ F$ means that X/E and Y/F have the same Borel cardinality, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ = \ |Y/F|_B$$

- $E \ <_B \ F$ means that X/E has strictly smaller Borel cardinality than Y/F, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ < \ |Y/F|_B$$

Borel cardinality theory

The preceding concepts can be also interpreted as the basis of a "definable" or Borel cardinality theory for quotient spaces.

- $E \ \leq_B \ F$ means that there is a Borel injection of X/E into Y/F, i.e., X/E has Borel cardinality less than or equal to that of Y/F, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ \leq \ |Y/F|_B$$

- $E \ \sim_B \ F$ means that X/E and Y/F have the same Borel cardinality, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ = \ |Y/F|_B$$

- $E \ <_B \ F$ means that X/E has strictly smaller Borel cardinality than Y/F, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ < \ |Y/F|_B$$

Borel cardinality theory

The preceding concepts can be also interpreted as the basis of a "definable" or Borel cardinality theory for quotient spaces.

- $E \ \leq_B \ F$ means that there is a Borel injection of X/E into Y/F, i.e., X/E has Borel cardinality less than or equal to that of Y/F, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ \leq \ |Y/F|_B$$

- $E \ \sim_B \ F$ means that X/E and Y/F have the same Borel cardinality, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ = \ |Y/F|_B$$

- $E \ <_B \ F$ means that X/E has strictly smaller Borel cardinality than Y/F, in symbols

$$|X/E|_B \ < \ |Y/F|_B$$

Types of classification

An equivalence relation E on X is called concretely classifiable if $E \leq_B (=_Y)$, for some Polish space Y, i.e., there is a Borel map $f : X \to Y$ such that $xEy \Leftrightarrow f(x) = f(y)$.

Thus isomorphism of Bernoulli shifts is concretely classifiable but isomorphism of ergodic discrete mpt is not concretely classifiable.

An equivalence relation is called classifiable by countable structures if it can be Borel reduced to isomorphism of countable structures (of some given type, e.g., groups, graphs, linear orderings, etc.). It turns out that isomorphism (and unitary isomorphism) of ergodic discrete spectrum mpt is classifiable by countable structures but (K-Sofronidis) ME and thus isomorphism of unitary operators is not.

Types of classification

An equivalence relation E on X is called concretely classifiable if $E \leq_B (=_Y)$, for some Polish space Y, i.e., there is a Borel map $f : X \to Y$ such that $xEy \Leftrightarrow f(x) = f(y)$.

Thus isomorphism of Bernoulli shifts is concretely classifiable but isomorphism of ergodic discrete mpt is not concretely classifiable.

An equivalence relation is called classifiable by countable structures if it can be Borel reduced to isomorphism of countable structures (of some given type, e.g., groups, graphs, linear orderings, etc.). It turns out that isomorphism (and unitary isomorphism) of ergodic discrete spectrum mpt is classifiable by countable structures but (K-Sofronidis) ME and thus isomorphism of unitary operators is not.

Types of classification

An equivalence relation E on X is called concretely classifiable if $E \leq_B (=_Y)$, for some Polish space Y, i.e., there is a Borel map $f : X \to Y$ such that $xEy \Leftrightarrow f(x) = f(y)$.

Thus isomorphism of Bernoulli shifts is concretely classifiable but isomorphism of ergodic discrete mpt is not concretely classifiable.

An equivalence relation is called classifiable by countable structures if it can be Borel reduced to isomorphism of countable structures (of some given type, e.g., groups, graphs, linear orderings, etc.). It turns out that isomorphism (and unitary isomorphism) of ergodic discrete spectrum mpt is classifiable by countable structures but (K-Sofronidis) ME and thus isomorphism of unitary operators is not.

Classification of mpt

Theorem (Hjorth, 2001)

Isomorphism and unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt cannot be classified by countable structures.

This has been recently strengthened as follows:

Theorem (K, 2007)

Unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt is Borel bireducible , i.e., has exactly the same complexity, as measure equivalence. Measure equivalence is Borel reducible to isomorphism of ergodic mpt.

Also very recently Foreman-Rudolph-Weiss, 2008, showed that isomorphism is not Borel, and therefore isomorphism of ergodic mpt is strictly more complicated than unitary isomorphism.

Classification of mpt

Theorem (Hjorth, 2001)

Isomorphism and unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt cannot be classified by countable structures.

This has been recently strengthened as follows:

Theorem (K, 2007)

Unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt is Borel bireducible , i.e., has exactly the same complexity, as measure equivalence. Measure equivalence is Borel reducible to isomorphism of ergodic mpt.

Also very recently Foreman-Rudolph-Weiss, 2008, showed that isomorphism is not Borel, and therefore isomorphism of ergodic mpt is strictly more complicated than unitary isomorphism.

Classification of mpt

Theorem (Hjorth, 2001)

Isomorphism and unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt cannot be classified by countable structures.

This has been recently strengthened as follows:

Theorem (K, 2007)

Unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt is Borel bireducible , i.e., has exactly the same complexity, as measure equivalence. Measure equivalence is Borel reducible to isomorphism of ergodic mpt.

Also very recently Foreman-Rudolph-Weiss, 2008, showed that isomorphism is not Borel, and therefore isomorphism of ergodic mpt is strictly more complicated than unitary isomorphism.

Classification of mpt

Theorem (Hjorth, 2001)

Isomorphism and unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt cannot be classified by countable structures.

This has been recently strengthened as follows:

Theorem (K, 2007)

Unitary isomorphism of ergodic mpt is Borel bireducible , i.e., has exactly the same complexity, as measure equivalence. Measure equivalence is Borel reducible to isomorphism of ergodic mpt.

Also very recently Foreman-Rudolph-Weiss, 2008, showed that isomorphism is not Borel, and therefore isomorphism of ergodic mpt is strictly more complicated than unitary isomorphism.

Actions of countable groups

More generally one also considers in ergodic theory the problem of classifying measure preserving actions of countable (discrete) groups Γ on standard measure spaces. The case $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ corresponds to the case of single transformations. We will now look at this problem from the point of view of the preceding theory.

Actions of countable groups

We will consider again isomorphism (also called conjugacy) and unitary isomorphism of actions. Two actions of the group Γ are isomorphic if there is a measure-preserving isomorphism of the underlying spaces that conjugates the actions. They are unitarily isomorphic if the corresponding unitary representations (the Koopman representations) are isomorphic.

We can form again in a canonical way a standard Borel space $A(\Gamma, X, \mu)$ of all measure-preserving actions of Γ on (X, μ) and then isomorphism and unitary isomorphism become analytic equivalence relations on this space. We can therefore study their complexity using the concepts introduced earlier.

Actions of countable groups

We will consider again isomorphism (also called conjugacy) and unitary isomorphism of actions. Two actions of the group Γ are isomorphic if there is a measure-preserving isomorphism of the underlying spaces that conjugates the actions. They are unitarily isomorphic if the corresponding unitary representations (the Koopman representations) are isomorphic.

We can form again in a canonical way a standard Borel space $A(\Gamma, X, \mu)$ of all measure-preserving actions of Γ on (X, μ) and then isomorphism and unitary isomorphism become analytic equivalence relations on this space. We can therefore study their complexity using the concepts introduced earlier.

Theorem (Foreman - Weiss, Hjorth, 2004)

For any infinite countable group Γ, isomorphism of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of Γ is not classifiable by countable structures.

Theorem (K, 2007)

For any infinite countable group Γ, unitary isomorphism of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of Γ is not classifiable by countable structures.

Except for abelian Γ, where we have the same picture as for $\mathbb{Z}$, it is unknown however how these equivalence relations relate to ME.

Actions of countable groups

Theorem (Foreman - Weiss, Hjorth, 2004)

For any infinite countable group Γ, isomorphism of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of Γ is not classifiable by countable structures.

Theorem (K, 2007)

For any infinite countable group Γ, unitary isomorphism of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of Γ is not classifiable by countable structures.

Except for abelian Γ, where we have the same picture as for $\mathbb{Z}$, it is unknown however how these equivalence relations relate to ME.

Actions of countable groups

Theorem (Foreman - Weiss, Hjorth, 2004)

For any infinite countable group Γ, isomorphism of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of Γ is not classifiable by countable structures.

Theorem (K, 2007)

For any infinite countable group Γ, unitary isomorphism of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of Γ is not classifiable by countable structures.

Except for abelian Γ, where we have the same picture as for $\mathbb{Z}$, it is unknown however how these equivalence relations relate to ME.

Orbit equivalence

There is an additional important concept of equivalence between actions, called orbit equivalence. The study of orbit equivalence is a very active area today that has its origins in the connections between ergodic theory and operator algebras and the pioneering work of Dye.

Definition

Given an action of the group Γ on X we associate to it the orbit equivalence relation E_Γ^X, whose classes are the orbits of the action. Given measure-preserving actions of two groups Γ and Δ on spaces (X, μ) and (Y, ν), resp., we say that they are orbit equivalent if there is an isomorphism of the underlying measure spaces that sends E_Γ^X to E_Δ^Y.

Thus isomorphism clearly implies orbit equivalence but not vice versa.

Orbit equivalence

There is an additional important concept of equivalence between actions, called orbit equivalence. The study of orbit equivalence is a very active area today that has its origins in the connections between ergodic theory and operator algebras and the pioneering work of Dye.

Definition

Given an action of the group Γ on X we associate to it the orbit equivalence relation E_Γ^X, whose classes are the orbits of the action. Given measure-preserving actions of two groups Γ and Δ on spaces (X, μ) and (Y, ν), resp., we say that they are orbit equivalent if there is an isomorphism of the underlying measure spaces that sends E_Γ^X to E_Δ^Y.

Thus isomorphism clearly implies orbit equivalence but not vice versa.

Orbit equivalence

There is an additional important concept of equivalence between actions, called orbit equivalence. The study of orbit equivalence is a very active area today that has its origins in the connections between ergodic theory and operator algebras and the pioneering work of Dye.

Definition

Given an action of the group Γ on X we associate to it the orbit equivalence relation E_Γ^X, whose classes are the orbits of the action. Given measure-preserving actions of two groups Γ and Δ on spaces (X, μ) and (Y, ν), resp., we say that they are orbit equivalent if there is an isomorphism of the underlying measure spaces that sends E_Γ^X to E_Δ^Y.

Thus isomorphism clearly implies orbit equivalence but not vice versa.

Here we have the following classical result.

Theorem (Dye, 1959; Ornstein - Weiss, 1980)

Every two free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of amenable groups are orbit equivalent.

Thus there is a single orbit equivalence class in the space of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of an amenable group Γ.

Orbit equivalence

Here we have the following classical result.

Theorem (Dye, 1959; Ornstein - Weiss, 1980)

Every two free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of amenable groups are orbit equivalent.

Thus there is a single orbit equivalence class in the space of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of an amenable group Γ.

Orbit equivalence

Here we have the following classical result.

Theorem (Dye, 1959; Ornstein - Weiss, 1980)

Every two free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of amenable groups are orbit equivalent.

Thus there is a single orbit equivalence class in the space of free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions of an amenable group Γ.

Orbit equivalence

The situation for non-amenable groups has taken much longer to untangle. For simplicity, below "action" will mean "free, ergodic, measure-preserving action". Schmidt, 1981, showed that every non-amenable group which does not have Kazhdan's property (T) admits at least two non-orbit equivalent actions and Hjorth, 2005, showed that every non-amenable (i.e., infinite) group with property (T) has continuum many non-orbit equivalent actions. So every non-amenable group has at least two non-orbit equivalent actions.

Orbit equivalence

For general non-amenable groups though very little was known about the question of how many non-orbit equivalent actions they might have. For example, until recently only finitely many distinct examples of non-orbit equivalent actions of the free (non-abelian) groups were known. Gaboriau – Popa, 2005, finally showed that the free groups have continuum many non-orbit equivalent actions. In an important extension, Ioana, 2007, showed that every group that contains a free subgroup has continuum many such actions. However there are examples of non-amenable groups that contain no free subgroups (Olshanski).

Orbit equivalence

Finally, last year the question was completely resolved by Epstein.

Theorem (Epstein, 2007)

Every non-amenable group admits continuum many non-orbit equivalent free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions.

Finally, last year the question was completely resolved by Epstein.

Theorem (Epstein, 2007)

Every non-amenable group admits continuum many non-orbit equivalent free, ergodic, measure-preserving actions.

This still leaves open the possibility that there may be a concrete classification of actions of some non-amenable groups up to orbit equivalence. However the following has been now proved by combining very recent work of Ioana-K-Tsankov and the work of Epstein.

Theorem (Epstein-Ioana-K-Tsankov, 2008)

Orbit equivalence of free, ergodic, measure preserving actions of any non-amenable group is not classifiable by countable structures.

Thus we have a very strong dichotomy:

- If a group is amenable, it has exactly one action up to orbit equivalence.
- If it non-amenable, then orbit equivalence of its actions is unclassifiable in a strong sense.

Orbit equivalence

This still leaves open the possibility that there may be a concrete classification of actions of some non-amenable groups up to orbit equivalence. However the following has been now proved by combining very recent work of Ioana-K-Tsankov and the work of Epstein.

Theorem (Epstein-Ioana-K-Tsankov, 2008)

Orbit equivalence of free, ergodic, measure preserving actions of any non-amenable group is not classifiable by countable structures.

Thus we have a very strong dichotomy:

- If a group is amenable, it has exactly one action up to orbit equivalence.
- If it non-amenable, then orbit equivalence of its actions is unclassifiable in a strong sense.

This still leaves open the possibility that there may be a concrete classification of actions of some non-amenable groups up to orbit equivalence. However the following has been now proved by combining very recent work of Ioana-K-Tsankov and the work of Epstein.

Theorem (Epstein-Ioana-K-Tsankov, 2008)

Orbit equivalence of free, ergodic, measure preserving actions of any non-amenable group is not classifiable by countable structures.

Thus we have a very strong dichotomy:

- If a group is amenable, it has exactly one action up to orbit equivalence.
- If it non-amenable, then orbit equivalence of its actions is unclassifiable in a strong sense.

This still leaves open the possibility that there may be a concrete classification of actions of some non-amenable groups up to orbit equivalence. However the following has been now proved by combining very recent work of Ioana-K-Tsankov and the work of Epstein.

Theorem (Epstein-Ioana-K-Tsankov, 2008)

Orbit equivalence of free, ergodic, measure preserving actions of any non-amenable group is not classifiable by countable structures.

Thus we have a very strong dichotomy:

- If a group is amenable, it has exactly one action up to orbit equivalence.
- If it non-amenable, then orbit equivalence of its actions is unclassifiable in a strong sense.

Orbit equivalence

This still leaves open the possibility that there may be a concrete classification of actions of some non-amenable groups up to orbit equivalence. However the following has been now proved by combining very recent work of Ioana-K-Tsankov and the work of Epstein.

Theorem (Epstein-Ioana-K-Tsankov, 2008)

Orbit equivalence of free, ergodic, measure preserving actions of any non-amenable group is not classifiable by countable structures.

Thus we have a very strong dichotomy:

- If a group is amenable, it has exactly one action up to orbit equivalence.
- If it non-amenable, then orbit equivalence of its actions is unclassifiable in a strong sense.