

JOINT TRANSITIVITY FOR LINEAR ITERATES

SEBASTIÁN DONOSO, ANDREAS KOUTSOGIANNIS AND WENBO SUN

ABSTRACT. We establish sufficient and necessary conditions for the joint transitivity of linear iterates in a minimal topological dynamical system with commuting transformations. This result provides the first topological analogue of the classical Berend and Bergelson joint ergodicity criterion in measure-preserving systems.

1. INTRODUCTION - MAIN RESULT

1.1. The joint ergodicity problem. Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) be a standard probability space equipped with an invertible measure-preserving transformation $T : X \rightarrow X$ (that is, $\mu(TA) = \mu(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$). We say that the quadruple (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) is a *measure-preserving system*. In particular, the latter is called *ergodic* or *weakly mixing* if the transformation T is ergodic (i.e., every T -invariant set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies $\mu(A) \in \{0, 1\}$) or weakly mixing (i.e., the transformation $T \times T$, acting on the Cartesian square $X^2 := X \times X$, is ergodic) respectively.

Given a weakly mixing measure-preserving system (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) and distinct non-zero integers a_1, \dots, a_d , we have the following independence property of the sequences $(T^{a_i n})_n$, $1 \leq i \leq d$.¹

Theorem 1.1 ([24]). *Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) be a weakly mixing measure-preserving system. Then, for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, any distinct non-zero integers a_1, \dots, a_d , and any $f_1, \dots, f_d \in L^\infty(\mu)$ we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^{a_1 n} f_1 \cdot \dots \cdot T^{a_d n} f_d = \int_X f_1 d\mu \cdot \dots \cdot \int_X f_d d\mu, \quad (1)$$

where the convergence takes place in $L^2(\mu)$.

This result, in particular its recurrence reformulation on \mathcal{B} -measurable sets of positive measure, is a crucial ingredient in Furstenberg's approach in proving Szemerédi's theorem (that is, every subset of natural numbers of positive upper density contains arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions) by recasting it as a recurrence problem.

Later, in [5], Bergelson extended Theorem 1.1 to essentially distinct integer polynomial iterates. The convergence of general multiple ergodic averages for various classes of iterates to the right-hand side of (1), also known as the "expected limit," developed to be a topic on its own (e.g., see [5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38] for various results on polynomial and Hardy field, of polynomial growth, functions); the one of *joint ergodicity*.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 37B05; Secondary: 37B02, 37B20.

Key words and phrases. Joint transitivity, topological dynamics, transitivity, proximal relations.

The first author was partially funded by Centro de Modelamiento Matemático (CMM) FB210005, BASAL funds for centers of excellence from ANID-Chile and ANID/Fondecyt/1241346. The second author was partially supported by the "Excellence in Research" program of the Special Account for Research Funds AUTH (Code 10316). The third author was partially supported by the NSF Grant DMS-2247331.

¹Throughout this paper, whenever a sequence is written as $(a(n))_n$ without specifying the range of n , it is understood as a \mathbb{Z} -sequence $(a(n))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

Definition 1.2. Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T_1, \dots, T_d)$ be a measure-preserving system with commuting and invertible transformations² and $(a_1(n))_n, \dots, (a_d(n))_n$ be integer-valued sequences. We say that $(T_1^{a_1(n)})_n, \dots, (T_d^{a_d(n)})_n$ are *jointly ergodic* (for μ) if for any $f_1, \dots, f_d \in L^\infty(\mu)$ we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T_1^{a_1(n)} f_1 \cdots T_d^{a_d(n)} f_d = \int_X f_1 d\mu \cdots \int_X f_d d\mu, \quad (2)$$

where the convergence takes place in $L^2(\mu)$ (i.e., the $L^2(\mu)$ -limit of the left-hand side of (2) exists and it takes the value of the right-hand side).

The first characterization of joint ergodicity is due to Berend and Bergelson.

Theorem 1.3 ([4]). *Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T_1, \dots, T_d)$ be a measure-preserving system with commuting and invertible transformations. Then $(T_1^n)_n, \dots, (T_d^n)_n$ are jointly ergodic (for μ) if and only if both of the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $T_i T_j^{-1}$ is ergodic (for μ) for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d, i \neq j$; and
- (ii) $T_1 \times \cdots \times T_d$ is ergodic (for $\mu^{\otimes d}$).

There is a plethora of analogous joint ergodicity characterizations for generalized linear functions [6], polynomial functions [12, 15, 22, 23], and Hardy field functions [13, 16].

The objective of this article is to prove the corresponding to Theorem 1.3 result in the topological setting.

1.2. The joint transitivity problem. A \mathbb{Z}^k -system is a tuple (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) where X is a compact metric space and $S_1, \dots, S_k: X \rightarrow X$ are homeomorphisms with $S_i S_j = S_j S_i$. We let $\langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$ denote the group generated by S_1, \dots, S_k .

In order to state the result corresponding to Theorem 1.3 in the topological setting, we start with the notion of *joint transitivity*.

Definition 1.4. Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a \mathbb{Z}^k -system, $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$ and $(a_1(n))_n, \dots, (a_d(n))_n$ be integer-valued sequences. We say that $(T_1^{a_1(n)})_n, \dots, (T_d^{a_d(n)})_n$ are *jointly transitive* if there is a G_δ -dense subset $X_0 \subseteq X$ such that for all $x \in X_0$, the set

$$\{(T_1^{a_1(n)} x, \dots, T_d^{a_d(n)} x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is dense in X^d .³

We call a \mathbb{Z}^k -system (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) *minimal* if, for any point $x \in X$, its orbit $\{S_1^{m_1} \cdots S_k^{m_k} x : (m_1, \dots, m_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k\}$ is dense in X . A system is *transitive* if there exists a point $x \in X$ whose orbit is dense; we say that any such point x is a *transitive point* (of (X, S_1, \dots, S_k)). The pioneer work of Glasner [25], established joint transitivity for sequences given by iterates of powers of a transformation in a minimal and (topologically) weakly mixing \mathbb{Z} -system (X, T) (meaning that the product system $(X \times X, T \times T)$ is transitive).

Theorem 1.5 ([25]). *Let (X, T) be a minimal weakly mixing \mathbb{Z} -system. Then, for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and distinct nonzero integers a_1, \dots, a_d , the sequences $(T^{a_1 n})_n, \dots, (T^{a_d n})_n$ are jointly transitive.*

²Naturally, by this we mean that (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) is a standard probability space and $T_1, \dots, T_d: X \rightarrow X$ are invertible measure-preserving transformations with $T_i T_j = T_j T_i$.

³In [28], the authors call the family (T_1^n, \dots, T_d^n) to be Δ -transitive. We use the term ‘‘joint transitivity’’ to emphasize the direct parallelism of Theorem 1.3 to Theorem 1.6 in the measure theoretic setting on ‘‘joint ergodicity.’’

Theorem 1.5 can be thought as the topological analogue of Theorem 1.1. This result was extended by Huang, Shao and Ye in [28], who obtained topologically joint ergodicity results under weakly mixing assumptions of several transformations but were able to deal with polynomial expressions and nilpotent group actions. Some follow-up works on this line are given in [8, 40].

We are now ready to state our main result, which can be regarded as the topological version of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.6. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a minimal system and $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$. Then $(T_1^n)_n, \dots, (T_d^n)_n$ are jointly transitive if and only if both of the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $(X, T_i^{-1}T_j)$ is transitive for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, $i \neq j$; and
- (ii) $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive.

Remark 1.7. As in the measurable case with Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.6 provides a characterization for all linear iterates.

Indeed, assuming that the iterate of the T_i is $a_i n + b_i$, $a_i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, noting that the shifts by the b_i 's do not affect the denseness of the orbits, we can use the Theorem 1.6 for the functions T^{a_i} (which still belong to $\langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$).

It is important to note that the problem in the topological setting differs significantly from the one in the measurable setting as the dense G_δ subset of X might have zero measure. For example, a minimal weakly mixing system (X, T) may exhibit a discrete spectrum with respect to some invariant measure. In such a system, $(T^n)_n, \dots, (T^{dn})_n$ are jointly transitive but not jointly ergodic. In fact, any ergodic measure preserving system is measurably isomorphic to a minimal and uniquely ergodic (strongly) mixing system (see [34]).

We also want to emphasize that Theorem 1.6 fails without the minimality assumption. Indeed, in [35], Moothathu showed that there exists a non-minimal, strongly mixing shift (X, σ) such that, for every point $x \in X$, the set $\{(\sigma^n x, \sigma^{2n} x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ fails to be dense in X^2 . Because (X, σ) is strongly mixing, the \mathbb{Z}^2 -system (X, σ, σ^2) satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.6, but the sequences $(\sigma^n)_n, (\sigma^{2n})_n$ are not jointly transitive. It should be noted that there are no commuting transformations S_1, \dots, S_k that generate a minimal action and such that $\sigma \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$. One reason for this is, of course, Theorem 1.6, but this can also be seen directly in Moothathu's example, using the fact that the set of σ -periodic points of a given period have to be preserved by $\langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$, which prevents minimality.

1.3. Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we recall some notions from the theory of dynamical systems. In particular, we provide equivalent statements to joint transitivity (Lemma 2.1), and we list properties of dynamical cubes and regional proximal relations.

In Section 3 we first characterize (in Theorem 3.1) regional proximal relations for product transformations and, finally, we prove Theorem 1.6 by an inductive argument.

2. BACKGROUND MATERIAL AND USEFUL FACTS

Definitions and conventions. For any \mathbb{Z}^k -system (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) and $m = (m_1, \dots, m_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, we write $S_m := S_1^{m_1} \cdot \dots \cdot S_k^{m_k}$. So, we may write a \mathbb{Z}^k -system as $(X, (S_m)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^k})$ whenever we do not need to stress the generators. With this convention, a \mathbb{Z}^k -system is minimal if for any point $x \in X$, its orbit $\{S_m x : m \in \mathbb{Z}^k\}$ is dense in X . We adopt a similar notation for subgroups of \mathbb{Z}^k . If $G \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^k$ is a subgroup, then $(X, (S_m)_{m \in G})$ denotes the system given by the subaction of G .

We will use ρ to denote the metric on X , and slightly abusing notation, we will use ρ to denote the metric on the product space X^d as well, where $\rho((x_1, \dots, x_d), (x'_1, \dots, x'_d)) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq d} \rho(x_i, x'_i)$.

Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) and (Y, R_1, \dots, R_k) be two \mathbb{Z}^k -systems. We say that Y is a *factor* of X (or that X is an *extension* of Y) if there exists a continuous and onto map $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ (called the *factor map* from X to Y) such that $\pi \circ S_i = R_i \circ \pi$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. When π is a homeomorphism, we say that the systems are *topologically conjugate*.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between the factors and the closed invariant equivalence relations on X . Indeed, we can associate a factor map $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ with the relation $R_\pi = \{(x, y) : \pi(x) = \pi(y)\}$, and, conversely, given a closed invariant equivalence relation R , we can associate it with a factor map $X \rightarrow X/R$ being the quotient map. A factor map $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ is *almost one-to-one* if there exists a G_δ -dense subset Ω of X such that for any $x \in \Omega$, $\pi^{-1}(\pi(x)) = \{x\}$. A factor map $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ is *open* if $\pi(A) \subseteq Y$ is open whenever $A \subseteq X$ is open. Note that the latter implies that for any $x, x' \in R_\pi$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\rho(x, y) < \delta$, then there exists $y' \in X$ with $\rho(x', y') < \epsilon$ and $(x', y') \in R_\pi$.

A system (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) is *equicontinuous* if the family of functions generated by S_1, \dots, S_k is equicontinuous. Any minimal equicontinuous \mathbb{Z}^k -system is topologically conjugate to a rotation on a compact abelian group (see [2, Chapter 2]). The *maximal equicontinuous factor* of a \mathbb{Z}^k -system (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) , is the largest equicontinuous factor of it. That is, any equicontinuous factor of (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) is also a factor of the maximal one. The maximal equicontinuous factor of a minimal \mathbb{Z}^k -system is induced by the regionally proximal relation $\mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$ (see Section 2.2).

Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a \mathbb{Z}^k -system. A pair (x, y) is *proximal* if there exists a sequence $(n_i)_i$ in \mathbb{Z}^k such that $\rho(S_{n_i}x, S_{n_i}y) \rightarrow 0$ as i goes to infinity. The set of all proximal pairs is denoted by $P(X)$. It is well known that $P(X) \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$ (see, for instance, [37]). A factor map $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ is *proximal* if $R_\pi \subseteq P(X)$. Any almost one-to-one factor map between minimal systems is proximal (see [2, Chapter 11]).

2.1. Equivalent definitions for joint transitivity. The following lemma provides a couple of equivalent definitions for joint transitivity. We will use this lemma implicitly throughout this paper. Its proof is a direct generalization of [36, Lemma 2.8] (see also [28, Lemma 2.4] and [35]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a minimal \mathbb{Z}^k -system and $(a_1(n))_n, \dots, (a_d(n))_n$ be sequences with values in \mathbb{Z}^k . The following are equivalent:*

(i) *There exists a dense G_δ subset Ω of X such that the set*

$$\{(S_{a_1(n)}x, \dots, S_{a_d(n)}x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is dense in X^d for every $x \in \Omega$.

(ii) *There exists some $x \in X$ such that the set*

$$\{(S_{a_1(n)}x, \dots, S_{a_d(n)}x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is dense in X^d .

(iii) *For every non-empty open subsets U, V_1, \dots, V_d of X , there is some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that*

$$U \cap S_{-a_1(n)}V_1 \cap \dots \cap S_{-a_d(n)}V_d \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. The implication (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is obvious. We next prove that (ii) implies (iii). To this end, let $x \in X$ be such that the set

$$\{(S_{a_1(n)}x, \dots, S_{a_d(n)}x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is dense in X^d . Then, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, the set

$$X(x, m) := \{(S_{a_1(n)+m}x, \dots, S_{a_d(n)+m}x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is also dense in X^d . Now, for any non-empty open subsets U, V_1, \dots, V_d of X , by the minimality of (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) , we may find some $m \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ such that $S_mx \in U$, and since $X(x, m)$ is dense in X^d , there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $S_{a_i(n)+m}x \in V_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Therefore, the set

$$U \cap S_{-a_1(n)}V_1 \cap \dots \cap S_{-a_d(n)}V_d$$

contains the point T_mx , hence it is non-empty.

It remains to show that (iii) implies (i). Let \mathcal{F} be a countable basis of the topology of X and define

$$\Omega := \bigcap_{V_1, \dots, V_d \in \mathcal{F}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{-a_1(n)}V_1 \cap \dots \cap S_{-a_d(n)}V_d.$$

It follows from (iii) that Ω is a dense G_δ set. Moreover, the set

$$\{(S_{a_1(n)}x, \dots, S_{a_d(n)}x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is dense in X^d for every $x \in \Omega$. □

2.2. Dynamical cubes and regionally proximal relations. Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a system and (G_1, G_2) be a pair of subgroups of \mathbb{Z}^k . Define the *space of (G_1, G_2) -cubes* as

$$\mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X) := \overline{\{(x, S_{g_1}x, S_{g_2}x, S_{g_1+g_2}x) : x \in X, g_1 \in G_1, g_2 \in G_2\}} \subseteq X^4.$$

(Remark that such definitions were initially introduced in [17], for the case where each G_i is generated by a single transformation.) Given $x \in X$, and (G_1, G_2) , let

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}_{G_1, G_2}}(x) := \overline{\{(S_{g_1}x, S_{g_2}x, S_{g_1+g_2}x) : g_1 \in G_1, g_2 \in G_2\}} \subseteq X^3.$$

When G_i is generated by a single element g_i we write $\mathbf{Q}_{G_i, G_i}(X)$ simply as $\mathbf{Q}_{S_{g_i}, S_{g_i}}(X)$; a similar notation is used for $\overline{\mathcal{F}_{G_i, G_i}}(x)$. Given a single subgroup G of \mathbb{Z}^k , we write

$$\mathbf{RP}_G(X) := \overline{\{(x, S_gx) : x \in X, g \in G\}} \subseteq X^2$$

(this relation is coined the prolongation relation in [3]). Note that if $(X, (S_m)_{m \in G})$ is transitive (meaning that there exists a point x such that $\{S_mx : m \in G\}$ is dense in X), then $\mathbf{RP}_G(X) = X \times X$. Similarly to [17] (or [26] for the case of a \mathbb{Z} -action), we define the relation $\mathbf{RP}_{G_1, G_2}(X)$ as the set of points $(x, y) \in X^2$ such that $(x, y, y, y) \in \mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X)$. It should be noted that if (X, G) is minimal, then $\mathbf{RP}_{G, G}(X)$ is nothing more than the classical regionally proximal relation (see [2, Chapter 9] for more information on this relation).

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a \mathbb{Z}^k -system and G_1, G_2 be subgroups of \mathbb{Z}^k .*

- (i) *Let $\sigma : X^4 \rightarrow X^4$ be the map with $\sigma(a, b, c, d) := (a, c, b, d)$. Then $\sigma(\mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X)) = \mathbf{Q}_{G_2, G_1}(X)$.*
- (ii) *Consider the system $(\mathbf{RP}_{G_1}(X), G_2^{(2)})$, where $G_2^{(2)}$ is the action given by $g(x, y) = (gx, gy)$, for all $g \in G_2$ and $(x, y) \in X^2$.⁴ Then $\mathbf{RP}_{G_2^{(2)}}(\mathbf{RP}_{G_1}(X)) = \mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X)$.*
- (iii) *If H is a subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^k , and $\mathbf{RP}_{G_1}(X) = \mathbf{RP}_{G_2}(X)$, then $\mathbf{Q}_{G_1, H}(X) = \mathbf{Q}_{G_2, H}(X)$.*
- (iv) *If G'_1, G'_2 and G_1, G_2 are subgroups of \mathbb{Z}^k such that $G'_1 \subseteq G_1$, and $G'_2 \subseteq G_2$, then $\mathbf{Q}_{G'_1, G'_2}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X)$.*

⁴Note that $\mathbf{RP}_{G_1}(X)$ is invariant under this action since G_1 and G_2 commute.

Proof. (i) and (iv) follow directly from the definitions.

To show (ii), first note that for all $x \in X$, $g_1 \in G_1$, and $g_2 \in G_2$, the point $(x, S_{g_1}x, S_{g_2}x, S_{g_1+g_2}x)$ belongs to $\mathbf{RP}_{G_2^{(2)}}(\mathbf{RP}_{G_1}(X))$ (here we naturally identify this point with $((x, S_{g_1}x), (S_{g_2}x, S_{g_1+g_2}x))$). Therefore, $\mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{G_2^{(2)}}(\mathbf{RP}_{G_1}(X))$. For the converse inclusion, it suffices to show that for any $(x, y) \in \mathbf{RP}_{G_1}(X)$ and any $g_2 \in G_2$, we have $(x, y, S_{g_2}x, S_{g_2}y) \in \mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and choose $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ so that if $z, z' \in X$ and $\rho(z, z') < \delta$, then $\rho(S_{g_2}z, S_{g_2}z') < \epsilon$. We can find $x' \in X$ and $g_1 \in G_1$ such that $\rho((x', S_{g_1}x'), (x, y)) < \delta$. It follows that $(x', S_{g_1}x', S_{g_2}x', S_{g_1+g_2}x')$ is at distance at most ϵ of $(x, y, S_{g_2}x, S_{g_2}y)$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $(x, y, S_{g_2}x, S_{g_2}y) \in \mathbf{Q}_{G_1, G_2}(X)$, as desired.

(iii) follows immediately from (ii). \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a \mathbb{Z}^k -system and let $G \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^k$ be a subgroup such that $(X, (S_m)_{m \in G})$ is transitive. Then, for any subgroup H of \mathbb{Z}^k , we have $\mathbf{Q}_{G, H}(X) = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, H}(X)$. In particular, $\mathbf{RP}_{G, G}(X) = \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$.*

Proof. Note that by Lemma 2.2 (iv), the inclusion $\mathbf{Q}_{G, H}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$ always holds. In addition, if G is transitive, since $\mathbf{RP}_G(X) = X \times X = \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$, Lemma 2.2 (iii) implies that $\mathbf{Q}_{G, H}(X) = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, H}(X)$. Using (i) and (iii) of Lemma 2.2, we get $\mathbf{Q}_{G, G}(X) = \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$, from where $\mathbf{RP}_{G, G}(X) = \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$. \square

We remark that Corollary 2.3 could also be deduced by using a proof similar to that of [17, Lemma 6.13].

The following theorem is classical (see, for instance, [2]).

Theorem 2.4. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a minimal system. Then $\mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$ is an equivalence relation, the system $X/\mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}$ is the maximal equicontinuous factor of X , and this factor is topologically conjugate to a rotation on a compact abelian group.*

2.3. The O -diagram. The following is a classical theorem in the structural theory of topological dynamical systems and will be very useful for our purposes. We state a version for \mathbb{Z}^k , giving only the information we need for our work. We note that this theorem is valid for general group actions. For further details, the interested reader may consult [10, Chapter VI, Section 3] or [2, Chapter 14].

Theorem 2.5. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) and (Y, R_1, \dots, R_k) be two \mathbb{Z}^k -minimal systems and $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ a factor map. Then there exist two \mathbb{Z}^k -minimal systems $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{S}_1, \dots, \tilde{S}_k)$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_k)$ and factor maps $\tilde{\pi}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$, $\tilde{\sigma}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$, $\tilde{\tau}: \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$ such that the following diagram (which is called the O -diagram)*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\sigma}} & X \\ \downarrow \tilde{\pi} & & \downarrow \pi \\ \tilde{Y} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\tau}} & Y \end{array}$$

is commutative, $\tilde{\sigma}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ are almost one-to-one, and $\tilde{\pi}$ is open.

Theorem 2.5 says that, modulo almost one-to-one extensions, we may assume that the factor map is open.

3. THE PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

3.1. A characterization for the regional proximal relation for product transformations.

The following is the main tool we use in the proof of Theorem 1.6 and can be interpreted as a topological analogue of seminorm control estimates in product spaces (see [15, Lemma 5.2] or [12, Lemma 3.4] for analogous statements in the measurable setting).

Theorem 3.1. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a \mathbb{Z}^k -system and $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$. Let (Y_i, S_1, \dots, S_k) , $1 \leq i \leq d$ be factors of X , such that for all i , the factor map $\pi_i: X \rightarrow Y_i$ is open, and $R_{\pi_i} \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{T_i, T_i}(X)$. For all $1 \leq i \leq d$, let $(x_i, y_i) \in R_{\pi_i}$. Then*

$$((x_1, \dots, x_d), (y_1, \dots, y_d)) \in \mathbf{RP}_{T_1 \times \dots \times T_d}(X^d).$$

Interpreting appropriately the coordinates, this can be stated as “ $\mathbf{RP}_{T_1, T_1}(X) \times \dots \times \mathbf{RP}_{T_d, T_d}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{T_1 \times \dots \times T_d}(X^d)$.”

We need some lemmas before proving Theorem 3.1. The following lemma can be deduced from the proof of [27, Theorem 7.3.2], or using [39]. We give a proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X, T) be a \mathbb{Z} -system and let $x, y \in X$ be such that $(x, y, x) \in \overline{\mathcal{F}_{T, T}}(x)$. Then for any open neighborhood U of y , there is a sequence $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ of integers infinitely many values such that the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : T^n x \in U\}$ contains $\{a_j - a_i : j > i\}$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $B(y, \epsilon) \subseteq U$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\epsilon_i = \epsilon/2^i$. Construct a sequence $(\delta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $0 < \delta_i < \epsilon_i$ and a sequence $(m_i, n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ as follows: Let n_1, m_1 be such that $\rho(T^{n_1} x, x) < \epsilon_1$, $\rho(T^{m_1} x, y) < \epsilon_1$, and $\rho(T^{n_1+m_1} x, x) < \epsilon_1$. Pick $0 < \delta_2 < \epsilon_2$ such that $\rho(z, z') < \delta_2$ implies that $\rho(T^a z, T^a z') < \epsilon_2$ for all $|a| \leq |n_1| + |m_1|$. Take n_2, m_2 such that $\rho(T^{n_2} x, x) < \delta_2$, $\rho(T^{m_2} x, y) < \delta_2$ and $\rho(T^{n_2+m_2} x, x) < \delta_2$. (We highlight here that the numbers n_2, m_2 can be taken to be arbitrarily large.) Note that the definition of δ_2 implies that:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(T^{n_2+n_1} x, x) &< \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \quad \rho(T^{n_2+n_1+m_1} x, x) < \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \quad \rho(T^{n_2+m_2+n_1} x, x) < \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \\ \rho(T^{n_2+m_2+n_1+m_1} x, x) &< \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \quad \rho(T^{n_2+m_1} x, y) < \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(T^{n_2+m_2+m_1} x, y) < \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2. \end{aligned}$$

So, if we set $R_1 = \{n_1, n_1+m_1\}$, $P_1 = \{m_1\}$, $R_2 = \{n_2, n_2+m_2\}$, we have that $\rho(T^{a+b} x, x) < \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$ for all $a \in R_2$ and $b \in R_1$, and $\rho(T^{a+c} x, y) < \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$ for all $a \in R_2$ and $c \in P_1$ (here R stands for “return” and P for “passage”).

The idea of the proof is that return times associated with large indices are compatible with return times and passages associated with smaller indices. More precisely, inductively, suppose that we have defined δ_i, m_i and n_i for all $1 \leq i \leq l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and for the set $R_i = \{n_i, n_i + m_i\}$ and $P_i = \{m_i\}$ we have that if $a = r_{j_1} + \dots + r_{j_l}$, with $r_{j_k} \in R_{j_k}$, $j_1 < \dots < j_l$, then $\rho(T^a x, x) < \sum_{t=1}^l \epsilon_{j_t}$, and $\rho(T^{a+c} x, y) < \epsilon_k + \sum_{t=1}^l \epsilon_{j_t}$ if $c \in P_k$, $k < j_1$.

Let $0 < \delta_{i+1} < \epsilon_{i+1}$ be such that $\rho(z, z') < \delta_{i+1}$ implies that $\rho(T^a z, T^a z') < \epsilon_{i+1}$ for all $|a| \leq |n_1| + |m_1| + \dots + |n_i| + |m_i|$. Then choose n_{i+1} and m_{i+1} such that $\rho(T^{n_{i+1}} x, x) < \delta_{i+1}$, $\rho(T^{n_{i+1}+m_{i+1}} x, x) < \delta_{i+1}$, and $\rho(T^{m_{i+1}} x, y) < \delta_{i+1}$, and set $R_{i+1} = \{n_{i+1}, n_{i+1} + m_{i+1}\}$, $P_{i+1} = \{m_{i+1}\}$.

We claim that if $a = r_{j_1} + r_{j_2} + \dots + r_{j_l}$, with $r_{j_k} \in R_{j_k}$, $j_1 < \dots < j_l \leq i+1$, then $\rho(T^a x, x) < \sum_{t=1}^l \epsilon_{j_t}$, and $\rho(T^{a+c} x, y) < \epsilon_k + \sum_{t=1}^l \epsilon_{j_t}$ if $c \in P_k$, $k < j_1$.

We only need to check the case $j_l = i+1$. Assume that $r_{i+1} = n_{i+1}$ (the case $r_{i+1} = n_{i+1} + m_{i+1}$ is identical). Since $\rho(T^{n_{i+1}} x, x) < \delta_{i+1}$, and $|a - n_{i+1}| \leq |n_1| + |m_1| + \dots + |n_i| + |m_i|$, we get

$\rho(T^a x, T^{a-n_{i+1}} x) < \epsilon_{i+1}$. By induction, $\rho(T^{a-n_{i+1}} x, x) < \sum_{t=1}^{l-1} \epsilon_{j_t}$, so the triangle inequality implies that $\rho(T^a x, x) < \sum_{t=1}^l \epsilon_{j_t}$, as desired. The estimate of $\rho(T^{a+c} x, y)$ follows in a similar way.

Now set $a_i = n_{i+1} + \sum_{j=1}^i (n_j + m_j)$. Note that we may further require the sequence $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ to take infinitely many values (by choosing the n_i 's and m_i 's to go to infinity) and $a_{i+l} - a_i = n_{i+l+1} + \sum_{j=i+2}^{i+l} (n_j + m_j) + m_{i+1}$. Hence, we can rewrite this as $a_{i+l} - a_i = r_{i+l+1} + \sum_{j=i+2}^{i+l} r_j + c$, where $r_j \in R_j$ and $c \in P_{i+1}$. It follows from the construction of the sequence $\{n_i, m_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ that $\rho(T^{a_{i+l}-a_i} x, y) < \sum_{t=i+1}^{i+l+1} \epsilon_t < \epsilon$, which implies that $T^{a_{i+l}-a_i} x \in U$, as was to be shown. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a minimal \mathbb{Z}^k -system, $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$ and $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ an open factor map with $R_\pi \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{T_i, T_i}(X)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_d, x'_i \in X$ with $(x_i, x'_i) \in R_\pi$, and U_z be a neighborhood of z for $z = x_1, \dots, x_d, x'_i$. There exist $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $T_i^n U_{x_i} \cap U_{x'_i} \neq \emptyset$ and $T_j^n U_{x_j} \cap U_{x_j} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d, j \neq i$.*

Proof. The set Ω_i of $\tilde{x} \in X$ such that the set $\{(a, b, c) : (\tilde{x}, a, b, c) \in \mathbf{Q}_{T_i, T_i}(X)\}$ equals $\overline{\mathcal{F}_{T_i, T_i}(\tilde{x})}$ is a dense G_δ -set of points (see, for instance, [25, Lemma 4.5]). Since π is open, we can find $\tilde{x} \in U_{x_i} \cap \Omega_i$ and $\tilde{y} \in U_{x'_i}$ with $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in R_\pi$. Because $R_\pi \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{T_i, T_i}(X)$, we have $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{x}) \in \overline{\mathcal{F}_{T_i, T_i}(\tilde{x})}$ and by Lemma 3.2, the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : T_i^n \tilde{x} \in U_{x'_i}\}$ contains a set of the form $\{a_j - a'_j : j > j'\}$ for some \mathbb{Z} -valued sequence $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ taking infinitely many values. In particular, the same is true for the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : T_i^n U_{x_i} \cap U_{x'_i} \neq \emptyset\}$. Let μ be a \mathbb{Z}^k -invariant measure on X . By the minimality of $\langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$, μ has full support. Consider the product system $(X_1 \times \dots \times X_d, \mathcal{B}(X)^{\otimes d}, \mu^{\otimes d}, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ and $U = U_1 \times \dots \times U_d$. Then $\mu^{\otimes d}(U) > 0$, and so by the proof of the Poincaré recurrence theorem, the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : \mu^{\otimes d}(U \cap (T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)^{-n} U) > 0\}$ must intersect non-trivially every set of the form $\{a_j - a'_j : j > j'\}$, which takes infinitely many values. This implies that it has non-empty intersection with $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : T_i^n U_{x_i} \cap U_{x'_i} \neq \emptyset\}$, as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and set $\epsilon_d := \epsilon$. Suppose that we have constructed $\epsilon_{r+1}, \dots, \epsilon_d > 0$ for some $1 \leq r \leq d-1$. We let $0 < \epsilon_r < \epsilon_{r+1}/2$ to be a number such that for any $z_{r+1} \in X$ with $\rho(y_{r+1}, z_{r+1}) < \epsilon_r$, there exists $x'_{r+1} \in X$ with $\rho(x'_{r+1}, x_{r+1}) < \epsilon_{r+1}/2$ such that $(x'_{r+1}, z_{r+1}) \in R_{\pi_{r+1}}$. The existence of such ϵ_r follows from the assumptions that $(x_{r+1}, y_{r+1}) \in R_{\pi_{r+1}}$, the map $X \mapsto Y_{r+1} = X/R_{\pi_{r+1}}$ is open.

For $1 \leq r \leq d$, we say that *Property r* holds if there exist $z_1, \dots, z_d \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

- $\rho(x_i, z_i) < \epsilon_r$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$;
- $\rho(y_i, z_i) < \epsilon_r$ for all $r+1 \leq i \leq d$;
- $\rho(y_i, T_i^n z_i) < \epsilon_r$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

By Lemma 3.3, Property 1 holds. Now suppose that Property r holds for some $1 \leq r \leq d-1$. Since $(x_{r+1}, y_{r+1}) \in R_{\pi_{r+1}}$ and $\rho(y_{r+1}, z_{r+1}) < \epsilon_r$, by the construction of ϵ_r , there exists $x'_{r+1} \in X$ with $\rho(x'_{r+1}, x_{r+1}) < \epsilon_{r+1}/2$ such that $(x'_{r+1}, z_{r+1}) \in R_{\pi_{r+1}}$. Let $\delta' := \min\{\epsilon_{r+1}/2, \epsilon_{r+1} - \epsilon_r\}$. Take $0 < \delta < \delta'$ such that for all $x, y \in X$, if $\rho(x, y) < \delta$, then $\rho(T^n x, T^n y) < \delta'$ (n is the one from Property r above). By Lemma 3.3, there exist $z'_1, \dots, z'_d \in X$ and $n' \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

- $\rho(z_i, z'_i) < \delta$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d, i \neq r+1$;
- $\rho(z_i, T_i^{n'} z'_i) < \delta$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d, i \neq r+1$;
- $\rho(x'_{r+1}, z'_{r+1}) < \delta$;
- $\rho(z_{r+1}, T_{r+1}^{n'} z'_{r+1}) < \delta$.

Then for all $1 \leq i \leq r$,

$$\rho(x_i, z'_i) \leq \rho(x_i, z_i) + \rho(z_i, z'_i) < \epsilon_r + \delta \leq \epsilon_{r+1}.$$

For all $r + 2 \leq i \leq d$,

$$\rho(y_i, z'_i) \leq \rho(y_i, z_i) + \rho(z_i, z'_i) < \epsilon_r + \delta \leq \epsilon_{r+1}.$$

Moreover,

$$\rho(x_{r+1}, z'_{r+1}) \leq \rho(x_{r+1}, x'_{r+1}) + \rho(x'_{r+1}, z'_{r+1}) < \epsilon_{r+1}/2 + \delta \leq \epsilon_{r+1}.$$

On the other hand, for all $1 \leq i \leq d, i \neq r + 1$, since $\rho(z_i, T_i^{n'} z_i) < \delta$, we have $\rho(T_i^n z_i, T_i^{n+n'} z_i) < \delta'$ and so

$$\rho(y_i, T_i^{n+n'} z_i) \leq \rho(y_i, T_i^n z_i) + \rho(T_i^n z_i, T_i^{n+n'} z_i) < \epsilon_r + \delta' \leq \epsilon_{r+1}.$$

Finally, since $\rho(z_{r+1}, T_{r+1}^{n'} z_{r+1}) < \delta$, we have that $\rho(T_{r+1}^n z_{r+1}, T_{r+1}^{n+n'} z_{r+1}) < \delta'$ and so

$$\rho(y_{r+1}, T_{r+1}^{n+n'} z_{r+1}) \leq \rho(y_{r+1}, T_{r+1}^n z_{r+1}) + \rho(T_{r+1}^n z_{r+1}, T_{r+1}^{n+n'} z_{r+1}) < \epsilon_r + \delta' \leq \epsilon_{r+1}.$$

In conclusion, we have that that Property $r + 1$ holds.

So it follows from induction that Property d holds, which means that there exist $(z_1, \dots, z_d) \in X^d$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\rho((x_1, \dots, x_d), (z_1, \dots, z_d)) < \epsilon \text{ and } \rho((y_1, \dots, y_d), (T_1^n z_1, \dots, T_d^n z_d)) < \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we have that $((x_1, \dots, x_d), (y_1, \dots, y_d)) \in \mathbf{RP}_{T_1 \times \dots \times T_d}(X^d)$. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 3.1, we have:

Proposition 3.4. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a minimal \mathbb{Z}^k -system and $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$. Suppose that $(X, T_1), \dots, (X, T_d)$ are transitive. Then $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive if and only if $(Y^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive, where $Y = X/\mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$.*

Proof. The “only if” part is straightforward. Now assume that $(Y^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive. By the O-diagram (Theorem 2.5), we may consider almost one-to-one extensions \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y} of X and Y respectively such that the projection $\tilde{\pi}: \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$ is open. Note that $(\tilde{X}, T_1), \dots, (\tilde{X}, T_d)$ and $(\tilde{Y}^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ are also transitive, because this property is preserved under almost one-to-one extensions (see [1]). We now show that $(\tilde{X}^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive, which implies that $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive.

Note that since \tilde{X} is an almost one-to-one extension of X , we have that $\tilde{X}/\mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(\tilde{X})$ and $X/\mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$ are conjugate, so we have that $R_{\tilde{\pi}}$ is a subset of $\mathbf{RP}_{T_i, T_i}(\tilde{X})$ for all i . To see this, by only assuming that $\tilde{\sigma}$ is proximal (which covers the almost one-to-one case), let q be the projection from \tilde{X} to $X/\mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$. It suffices to show that $R_q \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(\tilde{X})$. Let \tilde{x}, \tilde{x}' with $q(\tilde{x}) = q(\tilde{x}')$. Then $(\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{x}), \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{x}')) \in \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$. We can find $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{y}') \in \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(\tilde{X})$ such that $(\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{y}), \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{y}')) = (\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{x}), \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{x}'))$. It follows that $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}), (\tilde{x}', \tilde{y}') \in P(\tilde{X})$ (the proximal relation on \tilde{X}). Since $P(\tilde{X}) \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(\tilde{X})$, and this is an equivalence relation, we conclude $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}') \in \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(\tilde{X})$.⁵

Let U, V be nonempty open subsets of \tilde{X}^d . Then $\tilde{\pi}^{\times d}(U)$ and $\tilde{\pi}^{\times d}(V)$ are nonempty open sets, where $\tilde{\pi}^{\times d} := \tilde{\pi} \times \dots \times \tilde{\pi}$ (d -times). Since $(\tilde{Y}^d, S_1 \times \dots \times S_d)$ is transitive, there exist $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in U$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tilde{\pi}^{\times d}(T_1^n x_1, \dots, T_d^n x_d) \in \tilde{\pi}^{\times d}(V)$. That is, there exists $(x'_1, \dots, x'_d) \in V$ such that $(T_i^n x_i, x'_i) \in R_{\tilde{\pi}}(\tilde{X})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $B((x_1, \dots, x_d), \epsilon) \subseteq U$ and $B((x'_1, \dots, x'_d), \epsilon) \subseteq V$. Take $\delta > 0$ so that $\rho(a, b) < \delta$ implies $\rho(T_i^{-n} a, T_i^{-n} b) < \epsilon$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. By Theorem 3.1, as $R_{\tilde{\pi}}(\tilde{X}) \subseteq \mathbf{RP}_{T_i, T_i}(\tilde{X})$, we obtain $((T_1^n x_1, \dots, T_d^n x_d), (x'_1, \dots, x'_d)) \in \mathbf{RP}_{T_1 \times \dots \times T_d}(\tilde{X}^d)$. Therefore, there exist $(y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \tilde{X}^d$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\rho((y_1, \dots, y_d),$

⁵This should be a well-known result; we chose to present its short proof (which simplifies the one of [11, Lemma 5.3] that covers the \mathbb{Z} case and almost one-to-one extensions) for completeness.

$(T_1^n x_1, \dots, T_d^n x_d) < \delta$ and $\rho((T_1^m y_1, \dots, T_d^m y_d), (x'_1, \dots, x'_d)) < \delta$. It follows that $(T_1^{-n} y_1, \dots, T_d^{-n} y_d) \in U$ and $(T_1^{m+n} T_1^{-n} y_1, \dots, T_d^{m+n} T_d^{-n} y_d) \in V$. Using Lemma 2.1, we conclude that $(\tilde{X}^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive. \square

3.2. The proof of Theorem 1.6. In this last subsection, we prove Theorem 1.6. We start with its forward direction, which is almost straightforward.

Proof of the forward direction of Theorem 1.6. We use Lemma 2.1 implicitly throughout the proof. Assume that $(T_1^n)_n, \dots, (T_d^n)_n$ are jointly transitive. Equivalently, for all V_0, \dots, V_d nonempty and open subsets of X , there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$V_0 \cap T_1^{-n} V_1 \cap \dots \cap T_d^{-n} V_d \neq \emptyset. \quad (3)$$

To show (i), pick any $i \neq j$, and let U_0, U_1 be non-empty opens sets. Setting $V_i = U_0, V_j = U_1$ and $V_k = X$ for all $k \in \{0, \dots, d\} \setminus \{i, j\}$, it follows from (3) that $T_i^{-n} V_i \cap T_j^{-n} V_j \neq \emptyset$, or $U_0 \cap (T_i^{-1} T_j)^{-n} U_1 \neq \emptyset$. To show (ii), pick any point x for which $\{(T_1^n x, \dots, T_d^n x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is dense in X . Then the point (x, \dots, x) is a transitive point for $T_1 \times \dots \times T_d$. \square

It remains to show the inverse direction of Theorem 1.6. To this end, we first need a couple of statements. In particular, the first one will allow us to run an inductive argument.

Proposition 3.5. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a minimal \mathbb{Z}^k -system, $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$, and $R_2 := T_2 T_1^{-1}, \dots, R_d := T_d T_1^{-1}$. If $(X, R_2), \dots, (X, R_d)$ and $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ are transitive, then $(X^{d-1}, R_2 \times \dots \times R_d)$ is transitive.*

Proof. Since $(X, R_2), \dots, (X, R_d)$ are transitive, by Corollary 2.3, we have $\mathbf{RP}_{R_2, R_2}(X) = \dots = \mathbf{RP}_{R_d, R_d}(X) = \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$, which is an equivalence relation since (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) is minimal. By Proposition 3.4, it suffices to show that $(Y^{d-1}, R_2 \times \dots \times R_d)$ is transitive, where $Y = X / \mathbf{RP}_{\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{Z}^k}(X)$. By Theorem 2.4 we have that (Y, S_1, \dots, S_k) is a rotation on a compact abelian group, so we may write $T_i(y) = y + \alpha_i$ for $\alpha_i \in Y$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Since $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive, we get that $(Y^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive, hence minimal. (This holds because rotations are distal, and in this class, transitivity and minimality are equivalent conditions—e.g., see [2, Chapters 2 and 5].)

Take $y \in Y$ and $(y_2, \dots, y_d) \in Y^{d-1}$. Since $(Y^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is minimal, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists n such that $\rho(y + n\alpha_1, y) < \epsilon$, and $\rho(y + n\alpha_i, y_i) < \epsilon$, for all $2 \leq i \leq d$. It follows that $\rho(y + n(\alpha_i - \alpha_1), y_i) < 2\epsilon$ for all $2 \leq i \leq d$, and since y, y_2, \dots, y_d are arbitrary, we get that $(Y^{d-1}, R_2 \times \dots \times R_d)$ is minimal. Proposition 3.4 allows us to conclude. \square

The following lemma is a generalization of [8, Lemma 2.9] (see also [33, Lemma 3]).

Lemma 3.6. *Let (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) be a \mathbb{Z}^k -system and $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \langle S_1, \dots, S_k \rangle$. Let $(R_j)_{1 \leq j \leq N}$ be a finite sequence of continuous maps from X to X . Assume that $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive. Then for all non-empty open sets V_1, \dots, V_d , there exists $n_j \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq j \leq N$, and for each $1 \leq i \leq d$ a non-empty open subset \tilde{V}_i of V_i such that*

$$T_i^{-n_j} R_j^{-1} \tilde{V}_i \subseteq V_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq N, 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Proof. We use induction on N . Since $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive, there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $T_i^{-n_1} R_1^{-1} V_i \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Set $\tilde{V}_i = V_i^{(1)} := T_i^{-n_1} R_1^{-1} V_i \cap V_i$. This completes the proof for the case $N = 1$.

Now assume that for some $N \geq 2$, we have constructed $n_1, \dots, n_{N-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_1 < \dots < n_{N-1}$, and for each $1 \leq i \leq d$ a sequence of non-empty open sets $V_i \supseteq V_i^{(1)} \supseteq \dots \supseteq V_i^{(N-1)}$ such that

$$T_i^{-n_j} R_j^{-1} V_i^{(m)} \subseteq V_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq m \leq N-1, 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Let $U_i := R_N^{-1} V_i^{(N-1)}$. Since $(X^d, T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)$ is transitive, there exists $n_N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_N > n_{N-1}$ such that $T_i^{-n_N} U_i \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. This implies that

$$V_i \cap T_i^{-n_N} R_N^{-1} V_i^{(N-1)} = V_i \cap T_i^{-n_N} U_i \neq \emptyset.$$

Let

$$V_i^{(N)} := V_i^{(N-1)} \cap (T_i^{-n_N} R_N^{-1})^{-1} V_i.$$

Then $V_i^{(N)} \subseteq V_i^{(N-1)}$ is a non-empty open set and $T_i^{-n_N} R_N^{-1} V_i^{(N)} \subseteq V_i$. Since $V_i^{(N)} \subseteq V_i^{(N-1)}$, we also have that

$$T_i^{-n_j} R_j^{-1} V_i^{(N)} \subseteq V_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq N-1, 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

This completes the induction step, and we are done by setting $\tilde{V}_i := V_i^{(N)}$. \square

Proof of the inverse direction of Theorem 1.6. There is nothing to prove when $d = 1$. Now we assume that Theorem 1.6 holds for $d-1$ for some $d \geq 2$ and we prove it for d . By Proposition 3.5, conditions (i) and (ii) imply that $(X^{d-1}, T_2 T_1^{-1} \times \dots \times T_d T_1^{-1})$ is transitive. On the other hand, we have that $(T_i T_1^{-1})^{-1} (T_j T_1^{-1}) = T_i^{-1} T_j$ is transitive for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d, i \neq j$. So, by induction hypothesis, we have that $((T_2 T_1^{-1})^n)_n, \dots, ((T_d T_1^{-1})^n)_n$ are jointly transitive.

For $m = (m_1, \dots, m_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, let $S_m B := S_1^{m_1} \dots S_k^{m_k} B$. Let U, V_1, \dots, V_d be open and nonempty. We wish to show that there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$U \cap T_1^{-n} V_1 \cap \dots \cap T_d^{-n} V_d \neq \emptyset.$$

Since (X, S_1, \dots, S_k) is minimal, there exists a finite set $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^k$ such that $X = \bigcup_{r \in F} S_r U$. By assumption (ii) and Lemma 3.6, there exist non-empty open sets $\tilde{V}_1, \dots, \tilde{V}_d$ and for all $r \in F$ some $n_r \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$(T_1 \times \dots \times T_d)^{n_r} (S_k \times \dots \times S_1 (\tilde{V}_1 \times \dots \times \tilde{V}_d)) \subseteq V_1 \times \dots \times V_d$$

for all $r \in F$. Since $(T_2 T_1^{-1})^n, \dots, (T_d T_1^{-1})^n$ are jointly transitive, we can find $m = m(F) \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\tilde{V}_1 \cap (T_2 T_1^{-1})^{-m} \tilde{V}_2 \cap \dots \cap (T_d T_1^{-1})^{-m} \tilde{V}_d \neq \emptyset.$$

Take $x \in \tilde{V}_1$ such that $T_i^m T_1^{-m} x \in \tilde{V}_i$ for all $2 \leq i \leq d$, and write $y = T_1^{-m} x$. Let $r \in F$ be such that $z := S_r y \in U$. Then $T_i^{m+n_r} z = T_i^{m+n_r} S_r y = T_i^{n_r} S_r (T_i T_1^{-1})^m x \in T_i^{n_r} S_r (\tilde{V}_i) \subseteq V_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. It follows that $z \in U \cap T_1^{-(m+n_r)} V_1 \cap \dots \cap T_d^{-(m+n_r)} V_d$. \square

We close this article with the following widely open problem. Due to Theorem 1.6 and recent developments in the theory of topological factors, we believe that there will be numerous results in the joint transitivity problem in the near future.

Problem 3.7. *Obtain the analogous to Theorem 1.6 joint transitivity characterizations for iterates that come from polynomial and Hardy field of polynomial growth functions, for which the corresponding results in the measure theoretic setting are known.*

Acknowledgments. After sharing our findings with D. Charamaras, F. K. Richter, and K. Tsinas, we were informed that, by using elementary methods, they had obtained a special case of Theorem 1.6. Given the distinct nature of the methods, the two groups have decided not to publish their results together.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Akin and E. Glasner. Residual properties and almost equicontinuity. *J. Anal. Math.*, 84:243–286, 2001. [9](#)
- [2] J. Auslander. *Minimal flows and their extensions*, volume 153 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1988. Notas de Matemática, 122. [Mathematical Notes]. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [10](#)
- [3] J. Auslander and M. Guerin. Regional proximality and the prolongation. *Forum Math.*, 9(6):761–774, 1997. [5](#)
- [4] D. Berend and V. Bergelson. Jointly ergodic measure-preserving transformations. *Israel J. Math.*, 49(4):307–314, 1984. [2](#)
- [5] V. Bergelson. Weakly mixing PET. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 7(3):337–349, 1987. [1](#)
- [6] V. Bergelson, A. Leibman, and Y. Son. Joint ergodicity along generalized linear functions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 36(7):2044–2075, 2016. [2](#)
- [7] V. Bergelson, J. Moreira, and F. K. Richter. Multiple ergodic averages along functions from a Hardy field: Convergence, recurrence and combinatorial applications. *Adv. Math.*, 443:Paper No. 109597, 2024. [1](#)
- [8] Y. Cao and S. Shao. Topological mild mixing of all orders along polynomials. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(3):1163–1184, 2022. [3](#), [10](#)
- [9] Q. Chu, N. Frantzikinakis, and B. Host. Ergodic averages of commuting transformations with distinct degree polynomial iterates. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 102(5):801–842, 2011. [1](#)
- [10] J. de Vries. *Elements of topological dynamics*, volume 257 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1993. [6](#)
- [11] S. Donoso, F. Durand, A. Maass, and S. Petite. On automorphism groups of low complexity subshifts. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 36(1):64–95, 2016. [9](#)
- [12] S. Donoso, A. Ferré Moragues, A. Koutsogiannis, and W. Sun. Decomposition of multicorrelation sequences and joint ergodicity. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 44(2):432–480, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#)
- [13] S. Donoso, A. Koutsogiannis, B. Kuca, K. Tsinas, and W. Sun. Joint ergodicity for commuting transformations along hardy field functions (temporary title). In preparation. [2](#)
- [14] S. Donoso, A. Koutsogiannis, and W. Sun. Pointwise multiple averages for sublinear functions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 40(6):1594–1618, 2020. [1](#)
- [15] S. Donoso, A. Koutsogiannis, and W. Sun. Seminorms for multiple averages along polynomials and applications to joint ergodicity. *J. Anal. Math.*, 146(1):1–64, 2022. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#)
- [16] S. Donoso, A. Koutsogiannis, and W. Sun. Joint ergodicity for functions of polynomial growth. 2023. To appear in Israel Journal of Mathematics. [2](#)
- [17] S. Donoso and W. Sun. Dynamical cubes and a criteria for systems having product extensions. *J. Mod. Dyn.*, 9:365–405, 2015. [5](#), [6](#)
- [18] N. Frantzikinakis. Multiple recurrence and convergence for Hardy sequences of polynomial growth. *J. Anal. Math.*, 112:79–135, 2010. [1](#)
- [19] N. Frantzikinakis. A multidimensional Szemerédi theorem for Hardy sequences of different growth. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(8):5653–5692, 2015. [1](#)
- [20] N. Frantzikinakis. Joint ergodicity of sequences. *Adv. Math.*, 417:Paper No. 108918, 63, 2023. [1](#)
- [21] N. Frantzikinakis and B. Kra. Polynomial averages converge to the product of integrals. *Israel J. Math.*, 148:267–276, 2005. [1](#)
- [22] N. Frantzikinakis and B. Kuca. Joint ergodicity for commuting transformations and applications to polynomial sequences. 2022. Preprint. arXiv:2207.12288. [2](#)
- [23] N. Frantzikinakis and B. Kuca. Seminorm control for ergodic averages with commuting transformations and pairwise dependent polynomial iterates. 2022. To appear in Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems. [2](#)
- [24] H. Furstenberg. Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions. *J. Anal. Math.*, 31:204–256, 1977. [1](#)

- [25] E. Glasner. Topological ergodic decompositions and applications to products of powers of a minimal transformation. *J. Anal. Math.*, 64:241–262, 1994. [2](#), [8](#)
- [26] B. Host, B. Kra, and A. Maass. Nilsequences and a structure theorem for topological dynamical systems. *Adv. Math.*, 224(1):103–129, 2010. [5](#)
- [27] W. Huang, S. Shao, and X. Ye. Nil Bohr-sets and almost automorphy of higher order. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 241(1143):v+83, 2016. [7](#)
- [28] W. Huang, S. Shao, and X. Ye. Topological correspondence of multiple ergodic averages of nilpotent group actions. *J. Anal. Math.*, 138(2):687–715, 2019. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [29] D. Karageorgos and A. Koutsogiannis. Integer part independent polynomial averages and applications along primes. *Studia Math.*, 249(3):233–257, 2019. [1](#)
- [30] A. Koutsogiannis. Integer part polynomial correlation sequences. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 38(4):1525–1542, 2018. [1](#)
- [31] A. Koutsogiannis. Multiple ergodic averages for variable polynomials. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(9):4637–4668, 2022. [1](#)
- [32] A. Koutsogiannis and W. Sun. Total joint ergodicity for totally ergodic systems. 2023. Preprint. arXiv:2302.12278. [1](#)
- [33] D. Kwietniak and P. Oprocha. On weak mixing, minimality and weak disjointness of all iterates. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 32(5):1661–1672, 2012. [10](#)
- [34] E. Lehrer. Topological mixing and uniquely ergodic systems. *Israel J. Math.*, 57(2):239–255, 1987. [3](#)
- [35] T. K. S. Moothathu. Diagonal points having dense orbit. *Colloq. Math.*, 120(1):127–138, 2010. [3](#), [4](#)
- [36] J. Qiu. Polynomial orbits in totally minimal systems. *Adv. Math.*, 432:Paper No. 109260, 34, 2023. [4](#)
- [37] S. Shao and X. Ye. Regionally proximal relation of order d is an equivalence one for minimal systems and a combinatorial consequence. *Adv. Math.*, 231(3-4):1786–1817, 2012. [4](#)
- [38] K. Tsinas. Joint ergodicity of Hardy field sequences. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 376(5):3191–3263, 2023. [1](#)
- [39] W. A. Veech. The equicontinuous structure relation for minimal Abelian transformation groups. *Amer. J. Math.*, 90:723–732, 1968. [7](#)
- [40] R. F. Zhang and J. J. Zhao. Topological multiple recurrence of weakly mixing minimal systems for generalized polynomials. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)*, 37(12):1847–1874, 2021. [3](#)

(Sebastián Donoso) DEPARTAMENTO DE INGENIERÍA MATEMÁTICA AND CENTRO DE MODELAMIENTO MATEMÁTICO, UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE & IRL 2807 - CNRS, BEAUCHEF 851, SANTIAGO, CHILE
Email address: sdonoso@dim.uchile.cl

(Andreas Koutsogiannis) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI, THESSALONIKI, 54124, GREECE
Email address: akoutsogiannis@math.auth.gr

(Wenbo Sun) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VIRGINIA TECH, 225 STANGER STREET, BLACKSBURG, VA, 24061, USA
Email address: swenbo@vt.edu