Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. (2010), **30**, 181–209
doi:10.1017/S0143385709000066
© *2009 Cambridge University Press*
Printed in the United Kingdom

Lowering topological entropy over subsets

WEN HUANG†, XIANGDONG YE† and GUOHUA ZHANG‡

† *Department of Mathematics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, 230026, People's Republic of China*
(e-mail: wenh@mail.ustc.edu.cn, yexd@ustc.edu.cn)

‡ *School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, People's Republic of China*
(e-mail: zhanggh@fudan.edu.cn)

(*Received* 23 *May* 2008 *and accepted in revised form* 4 *November* 2008)

Abstract. Let (X, T) be a topological dynamical system (TDS), and $h(T, K)$ the topological entropy of a subset K of X. (X, T) is *lowerable* if for each $0 \leq h \leq h(T, X)$ there is a non-empty compact subset with entropy h; it is *hereditarily lowerable* if each non-empty compact subset is lowerable; it is *hereditarily uniformly lowerable* if for each non-empty compact subset K and each $0 \leq h \leq h(T, K)$ there is a non-empty compact subset $K_h \subseteq K$ with $h(T, K_h) = h$ and K_h has at most one limit point. It is shown that each TDS with finite entropy is lowerable, and that a TDS (X, T) is hereditarily uniformly lowerable if and only if it is asymptotically h-expansive.

1. *Introduction*

Throughout the paper, by a *topological dynamical system* (TDS) (X, T) we mean a compact metric space X and a homeomorphism $T : X \to X$ (in fact our main results hold for continuous maps, see Appendix A). Let (X, T) be a TDS. It is an interesting question, considered first in [**28**], whether for any given $0 \leq h \leq h_{\text{top}}(T, X)$ there is a factor (Y, S) of (X, T) with entropy h. We remark that the answer to this question in the measure-theoretical setup is well known, but in the topological setting the answer is not completely obtained yet. In [**28**] Shub and Weiss presented an example with infinite entropy such that each non-trivial factor has infinite entropy. Moreover, Lindenstrauss [**20**] showed that the question has an affirmative answer when X is finite-dimensional; and for an extension of non-trivial minimal $\mathbb{Z}$-actions the question has an affirmative answer if it has zero mean topological dimension [**21**] which includes finite-dimensional systems, systems with finite entropy and uniquely ergodic systems. For the definition and properties of mean topological dimension see [**22**] by Lindenstrauss and Weiss.

Let (X, T) be a TDS and $K \subseteq X$. Denote by $h(T, K)$ the topological entropy of K. In this paper we study a question similar to the above one. Namely, we consider the question if for each $0 \leq h \leq h(T, X)$ there is a non-empty compact subset of X with entropy h.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We remark that the question was motivated by [**20–22, 28**] and the well-known result in fractal geometry [**11, 23**] which states that if K is a non-empty Borel subset contained in $\mathbb{R}^n$ then for each $0 \leq h \leq \dim_H(K)$ there is a Borel subset K_h of K with $\dim_H(K_h) = h$, where $\dim_H(*)$ is the Hausdorff dimension of a subset $*$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In [**30**] Ye and Zhang introduced and studied the notion of entropy points, and showed that for each non-empty compact subset K there is a countable compact subset $K_1 \subseteq K$ with $h(T, K_1) = h(T, K)$. Moreover, the subset can be chosen such that the limit points of the subset has at most one limit point (for details see [**30**, Remark 5.13]). Inspired by this fact we have the following notions.

Definition 1.1. Let (X, T) be a TDS.

(1) We say that (X, T) is *lowerable* if for each $0 \leq h \leq h(T, X)$ there is a non-empty compact subset of X with entropy h.

(2) We say that (X, T) is *hereditarily lowerable* if each non-empty compact subset is lowerable, that is, for each non-empty compact subset $K \subseteq X$ and each $0 \leq h \leq h(T, K)$ there is a non-empty compact subset K_h of K with entropy h.

(3) We say that (X, T) is *hereditarily uniformly lowerable* (HUL for short) if for each non-empty compact subset K and each $0 \leq h \leq h(T, K)$ there is a non-empty compact subset $K_h \subseteq K$ such that $h(T, K_h) = h$ and K_h has at most one limit point.

So our question can be divided further into the following questions.

Question 1.2. Is any TDS lowerable?

Question 1.3. Is any TDS hereditarily lowerable?

Question 1.4. Is any TDS hereditarily uniformly lowerable (HUL)?

We remark that lowering entropy for factors is not the same as lowering entropy for subsets. For example, in [**20**] Lindenstrauss showed that each non-trivial factor of $([0, 1]^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$ has infinite entropy, where σ is the shift. But since $(\{0, 1, \ldots, k\}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$ can be embedded as a sub-system of $([0, 1]^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$ for any $k \geq 1$, it is clear that $([0, 1]^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$ is lowerable in our sense.

In this paper, we show that each TDS with finite entropy is lowerable (this is also true when we talk about the dimensional entropy of a subset), and that a TDS is HUL if and only if it is asymptotically h-expansive. In particular, each HUL TDS has finite entropy. Moreover, a principal extension preserves the lowerable, hereditarily lowerable and HUL properties. It is not hard to construct examples with infinite entropy which are hereditarily lowerable. Thus, there are TDSs which are hereditarily lowerable but not HUL. In fact, an example with the same property, and which has finite entropy, is explored at the end of the paper. The questions remain open if there are lowerable but not hereditarily lowerable examples, or there are TDSs with infinite entropy which are not lowerable. We should remark that if $([0, 1]^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$ is hereditarily lowerable then each finite-dimensional TDS without periodic points is hereditarily lowerable (see [**21**]), and if it is not then it is a lowerable TDS with infinite entropy which is not hereditarily lowerable. We also remark that if there exists a TDS which is not lowerable (such a TDS, if exists, must have infinite entropy) then we can obtain a lowerable TDS with infinite entropy which is not

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hereditarily lowerable by considering the union of it and $([0, 1]^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$. There are also many other interesting questions related to the topic.

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 the definitions of topological entropy and dimensional entropy of subsets are given, and some basic properties are discussed. In §3 two distribution principles are stated which will be used in §4, where it is shown that each TDS with finite entropy is lowerable by using the principles and a conditional version of the Shannon–McMillan–Breiman theorem. Sections 5–7 are devoted to prove that a TDS is HUL if and only if it is asymptotically h-expansive, the main ingredients of which are some techniques developed in [**5, 10, 19, 30**]. An example with finite entropy which is hereditarily lowerable but not HUL is presented at the end of paper.

2. *Preliminary*

The discussions in this section and the next proceed for a *general TDS* (GTDS); by a GTDS (X, T) we mean a compact metric space X and a continuous mapping $T : X \to X$.

Let (X, T) be a GTDS, $K \subseteq X$ and $\mathcal{W}$ a family of subsets of X. Set $\operatorname{diam}(K)$ to be the diameter of K and put $\|\mathcal{W}\| = \sup\{\operatorname{diam}(W) \mid W \in \mathcal{W}\}$. We shall write $K \succeq \mathcal{W}$ if $K \subseteq W$ for some $W \in \mathcal{W}$ and $K \not\succeq \mathcal{W}$ otherwise. If $\mathcal{W}_1$ is another family of subsets of X, $\mathcal{W}$ is said to be *finer* than $\mathcal{W}_1$ (we shall write $\mathcal{W} \succeq \mathcal{W}_1$) when $W \succeq \mathcal{W}_1$ for each $W \in \mathcal{W}$. We shall say that a numerical function *increases* (respectively *decreases*) with respect to a set variable K or a family variable $\mathcal{W}$ if the value never decreases (respectively increases) when K is replaced by a set K_1 with $K_1 \subseteq K$ or when $\mathcal{W}$ is replaced by a family $\mathcal{W}_1$ with $\mathcal{W}_1 \succeq \mathcal{W}$. By a *cover* of X we mean a finite family of Borel subsets with union X and by a *partition* we mean a cover whose elements are disjoint. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_X$ (respectively $\mathcal{C}_X^o$, $\mathcal{P}_X$) the set of covers (respectively open covers, partitions). Observe that if $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ then $\mathcal{U}$ has a Lebesgue number $\lambda > 0$ and so $\mathcal{W} \succeq \mathcal{U}$ when $\|\mathcal{W}\| < \lambda$. If $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ and $x \in X$ then let $\alpha(x)$ be the element of α containing x. Given $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_X$, set $\mathcal{U}_1 \vee \mathcal{U}_2 = \{U_1 \cap U_2 \mid U_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2\}$, obviously $\mathcal{U}_1 \vee \mathcal{U}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\mathcal{U}_1 \vee \mathcal{U}_2 \succeq \mathcal{U}_1$. Note that $\mathcal{U}_1 \succeq \mathcal{U}_2$ need not imply that $\mathcal{U}_1 \vee \mathcal{U}_2 = \mathcal{U}_1$, and that $\mathcal{U}_1 \succeq \mathcal{U}_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{U}_1$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{U}_1 \vee \mathcal{U}_2$ in the sense that each refines the other. For each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $m \le n$ we set $\mathcal{U}_m^n = \bigvee_{i=m}^n T^{-i}\mathcal{U}$.

The following obvious fact will be used in several places and is easy to check.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and $\{\mathcal{U}_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X$. If $\|\mathcal{U}_n\| \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$ then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{U}_n \succeq \mathcal{V}$ for each $n \ge n_0$.*

2.1. *Topological entropy of subsets.* Let (X, T) be a GTDS, $K \subseteq X$ and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$. Set $N(\mathcal{U}, K)$ to be the minimal cardinality of sub-families $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ with $\bigcup \mathcal{V} \supseteq K$, where $\bigcup \mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V$. We write $N(\mathcal{U}, \emptyset) = 0$ by convention. Obviously, $N(\mathcal{U}, T(K)) = N(T^{-1}\mathcal{U}, K)$. Let

$$h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K) = \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K).$$

Clearly $h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K)$ increases with respect to $\mathcal{U}$. Define the *topological entropy of* K by

$$h(T, K) = \sup_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o} h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K),$$

and define the *topological entropy of* (X, T) by $h_{\text{top}}(T, X) = h(T, X)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let Z be a topological metric space and $f : Z \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ a generalized real-valued function on Z. The function f is called *upper semi-continuous* if $\{z \in Z \mid f(z) \geq r\}$ is a closed subset of Z for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$, equivalently,

$$\limsup_{z' \to z} f(z') \leq f(z) \quad \text{for each } z \in Z.$$

Thus, the infimum of any family of upper semi-continuous functions is also upper semi-continuous; furthermore, both the sum and supremum of finitely many upper semi-continuous functions are upper semi-continuous. In particular, the infimum of any family of continuous functions is an upper semi-continuous function.

Let (X, T) be a GTDS and 2^X its hyperspace, that is,

$$2^X = \{K \mid K \text{is a non-empty compact subset of } X\}.$$

We endow the Hausdorff metric on 2^X. Then T induces a continuous mapping $\widehat{T}$ on 2^X by $\widehat{T}(K) = TK$. The *entropy hyper-function* $H : 2^X \to [0, h_{\text{top}}(T, X)]$ of (X, T) is defined by $H(K) = h(T, K)$ for $K \in 2^X$. Then we have the follow results.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let (X, T) be a GTDS and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$. Then the following properties hold.*

(1) *$h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K) = h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, TK)$ for any $K \subseteq X$. Moreover, the entropy hyper-function H is $\widehat{T}$-invariant.*
(2) *The function $h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \bullet)$ is Borel measurable on 2^X.*
(3) *The entropy hyper-function H is Borel measurable.*

Proof. (1) is clear. (2) follows from the following fact that for any $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$, $N(\mathcal{V}, \bullet) : K \in 2^X \mapsto N(\mathcal{V}, K)$ is a u.s.c function on 2^X. (3) comes from (2). □

We may also obtain the topological entropy of subsets using Bowen's separated and spanning sets (see [**29**, pp. 168–174]). Let (X, T) be a TDS with d a metric on X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define a new metric d_n on X by

$$d_n(x, y) = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} d(T^i x, T^i y).$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $K \subseteq X$. A subset F of X is said to (n, ϵ)-*span* K *with respect to* T if for each $x \in K$, there is $y \in F$ with $d_n(x, y) \leq \epsilon$; a subset E of K is said to be (n, ϵ)-*separated with respect to* T if $x, y \in E$, $x \neq y$ implies $d_n(x, y) > \epsilon$. Let $r_n(d, T, \epsilon, K)$ denote the smallest cardinality of any (n, ϵ)-spanning set for K with respect to T and $s_n(d, T, \epsilon, K)$ denote the largest cardinality of any (n, ϵ)-separated subset of K with respect to T. We write $r_n(d, T, \epsilon, \emptyset) = s_n(d, T, \epsilon, \emptyset) = 0$ by convention. Put

$$r(d, T, \epsilon, K) = \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log r_n(d, T, \epsilon, K)$$

and

$$s(d, T, \epsilon, K) = \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log s_n(d, T, \epsilon, K).$$

Then put

$$h_*(d, T, K) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0+} r(d, T, \epsilon, K) \quad \text{and} \quad h^*(d, T, K) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0+} s(d, T, \epsilon, K).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is well known that $h_*(d, T, K) = h^*(d, T, K)$ is independent of the choice of a compatible metric d on the space X. Now, if $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ has a Lebesgue number $\delta > 0$ then, for any $\delta' \in (0, \delta/2)$ and each $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ with $\|\mathcal{V}\| \le \delta'$, one has

$$N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K) \le r_n(d, T, \delta', K) \le s_n(d, T, \delta', K) \le N(\mathcal{V}_0^{n-1}, K)$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So if $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X^o$ satisfies $\|\mathcal{U}_n\| \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$ then

$$h_*(d, T, K) = h^*(d, T, K) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} h_{\mathcal{U}_n}(T, K) = h(T, K).$$

It is also obvious that $h(T, \overline{K}) = h(T, K)$.

2.2. *Dimensional entropy of subsets.* In the process of proving that each TDS with finite entropy is lowerable, we shall use a concept named dimensional entropy of subsets, which is another kind of topological entropy introduced and studied in [**4**]. Let us see how to define it.

Let (X, T) be a GTDS and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$. For $K \subseteq X$ let

$$n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } K \not\succeq \mathcal{U}, \\ +\infty & \text{if } T^i K \succeq \mathcal{U} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ k & k = \max\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid T^i(K) \succeq \mathcal{U} \text{ for each } 0 \le i \le j-1\} \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\mathfrak{C}(T, \mathcal{U}, K, k) = \Big\{\mathcal{E} \mid \mathcal{E} \text{ is a countable family of subsets of } X \text{ such that } K \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{E} \text{ and } \mathcal{E} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{k-1}\Big\}.$$

Then for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ set

$$m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda, k) = \inf_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathfrak{C}(T,\mathcal{U},K,k)} m(T, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}, \lambda),$$

where $m(T, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}, \lambda) = \sum_{E\in\mathcal{E}} e^{-\lambda n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(E)}$ and we write $m(T, \mathcal{U}, \emptyset, \lambda) = 0$ by convention. As $m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda, k)$ is decreasing with respect to k, we can define

$$m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) = \lim_{k\to+\infty} m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda, k).$$

Notice that $m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) \le m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda')$ for $\lambda \ge \lambda'$ and $m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) \notin \{0, +\infty\}$ for at most one λ [**4**]. We define *the dimensional entropy of K relative to $\mathcal{U}$* by

$$h_{\mathcal{U}}^B(T, K) = \inf\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) = 0\} = \sup\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) = +\infty\}.$$

The *dimensional entropy of K* is defined by

$$h^B(T, K) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} h_{\mathcal{U}}^B(T, K).$$

Note that $h_{\mathcal{U}}^B(T, K)$ increases with respect to $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, thus if $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X^o$ satisfies $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \|\mathcal{U}_n\| = 0$ then $\lim_{n\to+\infty} h_{\mathcal{U}_n}^B(T, K) = h^B(T, K)$.

The following results are elementary (see for example [**4**, Propositions 1 and 2]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Let (X, T) be a GTDS, $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K \subseteq X$ and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$. Then the following hold.*

(1) $h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, X) = h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, X)$ *if* $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}^o_X$, *so* $h(T, X) = h^B(T, X)$.

(2) $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} K_n) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K_n)$, *so*

$$h^B\left(T, \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} K_n\right) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h^B(T, K_n).$$

(3) *For each* $m \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $i \geq 0$, $h^B_{T^{-i}\mathcal{U}}(T^m, K) \geq h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T^m, T^i K)$, *so* $h^B(T^m, K) \geq h^B(T^m, T^i K)$.

(4) *For each* $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $h^B_{\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(T^m, K) = m h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K)$, *so* $h^B(T^m, K) = m h^B(T, K)$.

Proof. The proof of (1) is given in [**4**, Proposition 1]. The proof of (2) is obvious.

To prove (3), let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \geq 0$. Assume $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda > 0$. If $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{C}(T^m, T^{-i}\mathcal{U}, K, k)$ then $n_{T^m,\mathcal{U}}(T^i E) = n_{T^m,T^{-i}\mathcal{U}}(E) \geq k$ for each $E \in \mathcal{E}$ and so

$$T^i(\mathcal{E}) \doteq \{T^i E \mid E \in \mathcal{E}\} \in \mathfrak{C}(T^m, \mathcal{U}, T^i K, k),$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} m_{T^m,\mathcal{U}}(T^i K, \lambda, k) &\leq m(T^m, \mathcal{U}, T^i(\mathcal{E}), \lambda) = \sum_{E\in\mathcal{E}} e^{-\lambda n_{T^m,\mathcal{U}}(T^i E)} \\ &= \sum_{E\in\mathcal{E}} e^{-\lambda n_{T^m,T^{-i}\mathcal{U}}(E)} = m(T^m, T^{-i}\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}, \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $m_{T^m,\mathcal{U}}(T^i K, \lambda, k) \leq m_{T^m,T^{-i}\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda, k)$ as $\mathcal{E}$ is arbitrary. Letting $k \to +\infty$ we get $m_{T^m,\mathcal{U}}(T^i K, \lambda) \leq m_{T^m,T^{-i}\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda)$, hence $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T^m, T^i K) \leq h^B_{T^{-i}\mathcal{U}}(T^m, K)$, as $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary.

To prove (4) let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda > 0$. If $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{C}(T, \mathcal{U}, K, mn)$ then

$$n_{T^m,\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(E) = \left[\frac{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(E)}{m}\right] \geq \max\left\{n, \frac{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(E)}{m} - \frac{m-1}{m}\right\}$$

for each $E \in \mathcal{E}$, where $[a]$ denotes the integral part of a real number a, so

$$\inf_{E\in\mathcal{E}} n_{T^m,\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(E) \geq n,$$

thus $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{C}(T^m, \mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}, K, n)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} m_{T^m,\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(K, \lambda, n) &\leq m(T^m, \mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}, \mathcal{E}, \lambda) = \sum_{E\in\mathcal{E}} (e^\lambda)^{-n_{T^m,\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(E)} \\ &\leq \sum_{E\in\mathcal{E}} (e^\lambda)^{(m-1)/m - n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(E)/m} e^{(m-1)\lambda/m} \cdot m\left(T, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}, \frac{\lambda}{m}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $m_{T^m,\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(K, \lambda, n) \leq e^{(m-1)\lambda/m} m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda/m, mn)$ as $\mathcal{E}$ is arbitrary. We get

$$m_{T^m,\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(K, \lambda) \leq e^{(m-1)\lambda/m} \cdot m_{T,\mathcal{U}}\left(K, \frac{\lambda}{m}\right)$$

by letting $n \to +\infty$, hence $h^B_{\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(T^m, K) \leq m h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K)$, as $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary.

Following similar discussions we obtain $m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) \leq m_{T^m,\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(K, m\lambda)$ for each $\lambda > 0$, then $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K) \leq (1/m) h^B_{\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(T^m, K)$. That is, $h^B_{\mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}}(T^m, K) = m h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K)$. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By Proposition 2.3 (2), $h^B(T, E)$ increases with respect to $E \subseteq X$. At the same time, if $E \subseteq X$ is a non-empty countable set then $h^B(T, E) = 0$. Finally, it is worth mentioning that $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \emptyset) = h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \emptyset) = -\infty$ for any $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, and so $h^B(T, \emptyset) = h(T, \emptyset) = -\infty$; and also that when $\emptyset \neq K \subseteq X$, one has $h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K) \geq h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K) \geq 0$ for any $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, and so $h(T, K) \geq h^B(T, K) \geq 0$.

3. *Distribution principles*

In this section we shall present two important distribution principles which link Question 1.2 with ergodic theory and play a key role in the next section. We remark that the distribution principles were essentially contained in [**26**].

The first result is an obvious link between two definitions of entropy.

LEMMA 3.1. (Bridge lemma) *Let (X, T) be a GTDS, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $K \subseteq X$. Then*

$$h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K) \leq \liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K) \leq h_{\mathcal{U}}(T, K).$$

Proof. When $K = \emptyset$, the result is clear. Now we assume $K \neq \emptyset$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{T}_n = \{A_1, \ldots, A_{N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$ such that $\bigcup \mathcal{T}_n \supseteq K$. As $n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A) \geq n$ for each $A \in \mathcal{T}_n$, for each $\lambda \geq 0$ one has

$$m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda, n) \leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_n} (e^{\lambda})^{-n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A)} \leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{T}_n} (e^{\lambda})^{-n} = N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K) e^{-\lambda n},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) &\leq \liminf_{n \to +\infty} N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K) e^{-\lambda n} \\ &= \liminf_{n \to +\infty} \exp(-n(\lambda - (1/n) \log N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K))). \end{aligned}$$

So, if $\lambda > \liminf_{n \to +\infty} (1/n) \log N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K)$ then $m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) = 0$, which ends the proof. □

Let (X, T) be a GTDS, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, $K \subseteq X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $\mathfrak{M}(T, \mathcal{U}, K, n)$ to be the collection of all countable families $\mathcal{T}$ of subsets of X with

$$\bigcup \mathcal{T} \supseteq K \text{ and for each } A \in \mathcal{T},\ A \cap K \neq \emptyset,\ n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A) \geq n \text{ and } A \in \mathcal{U}_0^{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A)-1}.$$

Then for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ set

$$f_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \inf_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{M}(T,\mathcal{U},K,n)} m(T, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}, \lambda).$$

It is not hard to check that $f_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) = m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. In fact, for $\mathcal{E} \in \mathfrak{C}(T, \mathcal{U}, K, n)$, note that for each $E \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists $\widetilde{E} \in \mathcal{U}_0^{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(E)-1}$ with $E \subseteq \widetilde{E}$ and so $n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(E) = n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(\widetilde{E})$. Then let $\mathcal{T} \doteq \{\widetilde{E} \mid E \in \mathcal{E} \text{ with } E \cap K \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{M}(T, \mathcal{U}, K, n)$. Particularly, when $E \cap K \neq \emptyset$ for each $E \in \mathcal{E}$, one has $m(T, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}, \lambda) = m(T, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}, \lambda)$. This implies $f_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda) = m_{T,\mathcal{U}}(K, \lambda)$.

For a GTDS (X, T), denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the set of all Borel probability measures on X. The following two principles will be proved to be very useful.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 3.2. (Non-uniform mass distribution principle) *Let (X, T) be a GTDS, $d > 0$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $Z \subseteq X$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Assume that each element of $\mathcal{U}$ has a non-empty intersection with at most M elements of α. If there exists $Z_\theta \subseteq Z$ such that Z_θ has positive outer θ-measure (i.e. $\theta^*(Z_\theta) > 0$) and*

$$\text{for all } x \in Z_\theta, \text{ there exists } c(x) > 0 \text{ such that, for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \theta(\alpha_0^{n-1}(x)) \le c(x)e^{-nd},$$

then $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z) \ge d - \log M$. In particular, $h^B_\alpha(T, Z) \ge d$.

Proof. It makes no difference to assume $d - \log M > 0$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ set $Z_\theta^k = \{x \in Z_\theta \mid c(x) \le k\}$. Then for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta^*(Z_\theta^N) > 0$, as $Z_\theta^1 \subseteq Z_\theta^2 \subseteq \cdots$, $Z_\theta = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} Z_\theta^k$ and $\theta^*(Z_\theta) > 0$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{M}(T, \mathcal{U}, Z, n)$. If $A \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfies $A \cap Z_\theta^N \ne \emptyset$, then for each $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \in \alpha_0^{\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}-1}$ with $B \cap (A \cap Z_\theta^N) \ne \emptyset$ select $x_B \in B \cap (A \cap Z_\theta^N)$, so

$$\theta(B) = \theta(\alpha_0^{\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}-1}(x_B)) \le c(x_B)e^{-\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}d} \le Ne^{-\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}d}.$$

Since there are at most $M^{\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}}$ elements of $\alpha_0^{\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}-1}$ which have non-empty intersection with $A \cap Z_\theta^N$, we have

$$\theta^*(A \cap Z_\theta^N) \le M^{\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}} Ne^{-\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}d} = Ne^{-\min\{n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A),s\}(d-\log M)}.$$

Letting $s \to +\infty$ we obtain that $\theta^*(A \cap Z_\theta^N) \le Ne^{-n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A)(d-\log M)}$ for any $A \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfying $A \cap Z_\theta^N \ne \emptyset$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{A\in\mathcal{T}} e^{-n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A)(d-\log M)} &\ge \sum_{A\in\mathcal{T}, A\cap Z_\theta^N\ne\emptyset} e^{-n_{T,\mathcal{U}}(A)(d-\log M)} \\ &\ge \sum_{A\in\mathcal{T}, A\cap Z_\theta^N\ne\emptyset} \frac{\theta^*(A \cap Z_\theta^N)}{N} \ge \frac{1}{N}\theta^*(Z_\theta^N) > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since n and $\mathcal{T}$ are arbitrary, $f_{T,\mathcal{U}}(Z, d - \log M) \ge (1/N)\theta^*(Z_\theta^N) > 0$. So $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z) \ge d - \log M$. □

LEMMA 3.3. (Uniform mass distribution principle) *Let (X, T) be a GTDS, $c > 0$, $d > 0$, $Z \subseteq X$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$. If there exists $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that for each $x \in Z$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta(\alpha_0^{n-1}(x)) \ge ce^{-nd}$. Then $h_\alpha(T, Z) \le d$.*

Proof. If $Z = \emptyset$ then $h_\alpha(T, Z) = -\infty \le d$. In the following we assume $Z \ne \emptyset$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{T}_n = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$ be the collection of all elements of α_0^{n-1} which have non-empty intersection with Z, where $k = N(\alpha_0^{n-1}, Z)$. Take $x_i \in A_i \cap Z$, then $\theta(A_i) = \theta(\alpha_0^{n-1}(x_i)) \ge ce^{-nd}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Therefore $1 \ge \sum_{i=1}^k \theta(A_i) \ge kce^{-nd}$, that is, $N(\alpha_0^{n-1}, Z) = k \le e^{nd}/c$. Finally letting $n \to +\infty$ we know $h_\alpha(T, Z) \le d$. □

4. *Each TDS with finite entropy is lowerable*

In this section we shall give an affirmative answer to Question 1.2 for a TDS with finite entropy. In fact, we can obtain more about it. Precisely, if (X, T) is a TDS with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

finite entropy, then for each $0 \le h \le h_{\text{top}}(T, X)$ there exists a non-empty compact subset $K_h \subseteq X$ such that $h^B(T, K_h) = h(T, K_h) = h$ (for details see Theorem 4.4), particularly, (X, T) is lowerable.

Let (X, T) be a GTDS. Denote by $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ the set of all T-invariant Borel probability measures and ergodic T-invariant Borel probability measures on X, respectively. Then $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ are both convex, compact metric spaces when endowed with the weak*-topology. Denote by $\mathcal{B}_X$ the set of all Borel subsets of X.

For any given $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and any sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$, where $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ is the completion of $\mathcal{B}_X$ under μ, the *conditional informational function of* α *relevant to* $\mathcal{C}$ is defined by

$$I_\mu(\alpha|\mathcal{C})(x) = \sum_{A\in\alpha} -1_A(x) \log \mathbb{E}_\mu(1_A|\mathcal{C})(x),$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\mu(1_A|\mathcal{C})$ is the conditional expectation of 1_A with respect to $\mathcal{C}$. Let

$$H_\mu(\alpha|\mathcal{C}) = \int_X I_\mu(\alpha|\mathcal{C})(x)\, d\mu(x) = \sum_{A\in\alpha} \int_X -\mathbb{E}_\mu(1_A|\mathcal{C}) \log \mathbb{E}_\mu(1_A|\mathcal{C})\, d\mu.$$

A standard fact states that $H_\mu(\alpha|\mathcal{C})$ increases with respect to α and decreases with respect to $\mathcal{C}$. Now set

$$H_\mu(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C}) = \inf_{\beta\in\mathcal{P}_X, \beta\succeq\mathcal{U}} H_\mu(\beta|\mathcal{C})$$

for $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$. Clearly, $H_\mu(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C})$ increases with respect to $\mathcal{U}$ and decreases with respect to $\mathcal{C}$.

When $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $T^{-1}\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ in the sense of μ, it is not hard to see that $H_\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C})$ is a non-negative and sub-additive sequence for a given $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, so we can define

$$h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C}) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C}) = \inf_{n\ge1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C}).$$

Clearly, $h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C})$ also increases with respect to $\mathcal{U}$ and decreases with respect to $\mathcal{C}$. The *relative measure-theoretical* μ*-entropy of* (X, T) *relevant to* $\mathcal{C}$ is defined by

$$h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}) = \sup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{P}_X} h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}).$$

Following a similar discussion of [**15**, Lemma 2.3 (1)], one has

$$h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C}).$$

So, if $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X^o$ satisfies $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \|\mathcal{U}_n\| = 0$ then $\lim_{n\to+\infty} h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}_n|\mathcal{C}) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$, as $h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C})$ increases with respect to $\mathcal{U}$. It is not hard to see that

$$h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C}) = \frac{1}{n} h_\mu(T^n, \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C}) \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X.$$

If $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, X\} \pmod{\mu}$, for simplicity we shall write $H_\mu(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C})$, $h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}|\mathcal{C})$ and $h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$ for $H_\mu(\mathcal{U})$, $h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U})$ and $h_\mu(T, X)$, respectively.

The following result is a conditional version of Shannon–McMillan–Breiman theorem. Its proof is completely similar to the proof of Shannon–McMillan–Breiman theorem (see for example [**1**, Theorem 4.2], [**17**, Theorem II.1.5], [**14**]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THEOREM 4.1. *Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$ a T-invariant sub-σ-algebra (i.e. $T^{-1}\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}$ in the sense of μ). Then there exists a T-invariant function $f \in L^1(\mu)$ such that $\int_X f(x)\, d\mu(x) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C})$ and*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{I_\mu(\alpha_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C})(x)}{n} = f(x) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost every } x \in X \text{ and in } L^1(\mu).$$

Moreover, if μ is ergodic then $f(x) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C})$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$.

Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ the completion of $\mathcal{B}_X$ under μ. Then $(X, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, T)$ is a Lebesgue system. If $\{\alpha_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a countable family of finite partitions of X, the partition $\alpha = \bigvee_{i\in I} \alpha_i$ is called a *measurable partition*. The sets $A \in \mathcal{B}_\mu$, which are unions of atoms of α, form a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ denoted by $\widehat{\alpha}$ or α if there is no ambiguity. Every sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ coincides with a sub-σ-algebra constructed in this way (mod μ). Given a measurable partition α, put $\alpha^- = \bigvee_{n=1}^{+\infty} T^{-n}\alpha$ and $\alpha^T = \bigvee_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} T^{-n}\alpha$. Define in the same way $\mathcal{C}^-$ and $\mathcal{C}^T$ if $\mathcal{C}$ is a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$. Clearly, for a measurable partition α, $\widehat{\alpha^-} = (\widehat{\alpha})^-$ (mod μ) and $\widehat{\alpha^T} = (\widehat{\alpha})^T$ (mod μ).

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ and α the measurable partition of X with $\widehat{\alpha} = \mathcal{C}$ (mod μ). μ can be disintegrated over $\mathcal{C}$ as $\mu = \int_X \mu_x\, d\mu(x)$ where $\mu_x \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and $\mu_x(\alpha(x)) = 1$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$. The disintegration is characterized by (4.1) and (4.2) below: for every $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu_x) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost every } x \in X \quad \text{and} \\ &\quad \text{the function } x \mapsto \int_X f(y)\, d\mu_x(y) \text{ is in } L^1(X, \mathcal{C}, \mu); \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(f|\mathcal{C})(x) = \int_X f\, d\mu_x \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost every } x \in X. \tag{4.2}$$

Then, for any $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$, the following holds:

$$\int_X \left(\int_X f\, d\mu_x \right) d\mu(x) = \int_X f\, d\mu.$$

Define for μ-almost every $x \in X$ the set $\Gamma_x = \{y \in X \mid \mu_x = \mu_y\}$. Then $\mu_x(\Gamma_x) = 1$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$. Hence given any $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$, for μ-almost every $x \in X$, one has

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu(f|\mathcal{C})(y) = \int_X f\, d\mu_y = \int_X f\, d\mu_x = \mathbb{E}_\mu(f|\mathcal{C})(x) \tag{4.3}$$

for μ_x-almost every $y \in X$. Particularly, if f is $\mathcal{C}$-measurable, then for μ-almost every $x \in X$, one has

$$f(y) = f(x) \quad \text{for } \mu_x\text{-almost every } y \in X. \tag{4.4}$$

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$ a T-invariant sub-σ-algebra. If $\mu = \int_X \mu_x\, d\mu(x)$ is the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{C}$, then the following hold.*

(1) *Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ such that each element of $\mathcal{U}$ has a non-empty intersection with at most M elements of α ($M \in \mathbb{N}$). If $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)$ is the function obtained in Theorem 4.1 for T, α and $\mathcal{C}$, then for μ-almost every $x \in X$,*

$$h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z_x) \geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x) - \log M$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for any $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z_x) > 0$. Particularly, if μ is ergodic, then for μ-almost every $x \in X$,

$$h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z_x) \geq h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) - \log M$$

for any $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z_x) > 0$.

(2) *If μ is ergodic then, for μ-almost every $x \in X$, when $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z_x) > 0$ one has*

$$h^B(T, Z_x) \geq h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}).$$

Proof. (1) Note that $\lim_{n\to+\infty}(I_\mu(\alpha_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C})(x)/n) = f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$ and $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}$ is $\mathcal{C}$-measurable. Using (4.3) for all 1_B, $B \in \alpha_0^{n-1}$ and (4.4) for $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}$, there exists $X_\infty \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu(X_\infty) = 1$ such that for each $x \in X_\infty$, one can find $W_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(W_x) = 1$. Moreover, if $y \in W_x$ then we have

(a) $\lim_{n\to+\infty}(I_\mu(\alpha_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C})(y)/n) = f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(y) = f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)$;

(b) $\mathbb{E}_\mu(1_B|\mathcal{C})(y) = \mathbb{E}_\mu(1_B|\mathcal{C})(x) = \mu_x(B)$ for any $B \in \alpha_0^{n-1}$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Moreover, for any $y \in W_x$, where $x \in X_\infty$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{-\log \mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y))}{n} &= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{-\log \mathbb{E}_\mu(1_{\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)}|\mathcal{C})(y)}{n} \\ &= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{I_\mu(\alpha_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C})(y)}{n} = f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

For a given $x \in X_\infty$ let $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z_x) > 0$. Clearly $\mu_x(Z_x \cap W_x) = \mu_x(Z_x) > 0$. For $\delta > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$Z^\ell_x(\delta) = \{y \in Z_x \cap W_x \mid \mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)) \leq e^{-n(f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)-\delta)} \text{ for each } n \geq \ell\}.$$

Then $\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{+\infty} Z^\ell_x(\delta) = Z_x \cap W_x$ by (4.5). Hence there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mu_x(Z^N_x(\delta)) > 0$. For $y \in Z^N_x(\delta)$, as $\mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)) \leq e^{-n(f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)-\delta)}$ for each $n \geq N$, one has

$$\mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)) \leq c(y)e^{-n(f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)-\delta)} \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $c(y) = \max\{1, \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} e^{i(f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)-\delta)}\} \in (0, +\infty)$. Thus applying Lemma 3.2 to $Z^N_x(\delta)$ we obtain $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z^N_x(\delta)) \geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x) - \delta - \log M$, so $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z_x) \geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x) - \delta - \log M$. Note that the last inequality is true for any $\delta > 0$; one has $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z_x) \geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x) - \log M$.

(2) For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we take $\mathcal{U}_k \in \mathcal{C}^o_X$ with $\|\mathcal{U}_k\| \leq 1/k$. Using [**4**, Lemma 2] for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\alpha_{n,k} \in \mathcal{P}_X$ such that $\alpha_{n,k} \succeq (\mathcal{U}_k)_0^{n-1}$ and at most $n\#\mathcal{U}_k$ elements of $\alpha_{n,k}$ can have a point in all their closures, where $\#\mathcal{U}_k$ means the cardinality of $\mathcal{U}_k$. It is easy to construct $\mathcal{U}_{n,k} \in \mathcal{C}^o_X$ such that each element of $\mathcal{U}_{n,k}$ has a non-empty intersection with at most $n\#\mathcal{U}_k$ elements of $\alpha_{n,k}$ (see also [**4**, Lemma 1]).

Now assume that μ is ergodic. Let $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x)$ be the function obtained in Theorem 4.1 for T^n, $\alpha_{n,k}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Then $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x)$ is T^n-invariant and $\int_X f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x)\, d\mu(x) = h_\mu(T^n, \alpha_{n,k}|\mathcal{C})$. Let $g^k_n(x) = (1/n)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(T^i x)$. Then $g^k_n(x)$ is T-invariant, as

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x)$ is T^n-invariant. Moreover, since $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$, $g^k_n(x)$ is constant and

$$g^k_n(x) \equiv \int_X g^k_n(y)\, d\mu(y) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\int_X f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(T^i y)\, d\mu(y)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\int_X f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(y)\, d\mu(y) = h_\mu(T^n, \alpha_{n,k}|\mathcal{C}) \tag{4.6}$$

for μ-almost every $x \in X$. By (1) for μ-almost every $x \in X$, if $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z_x) > 0$ then

$$h^B_{\mathcal{U}_{n,k}}(T^n, Z_x) \geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k) \quad \text{for each } k \in \mathbb{N},\ n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.7}$$

Moreover, note that $T\mu_x = \mu_{Tx}$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$, there exists a T-invariant subset $X_1 \subseteq X$ with $\mu(X_1) = 1$ such that $T\mu_x = \mu_{Tx}$ and both (4.6) and (4.7) hold for all $x \in X_1$.

Now for any given $x \in X_1$ let $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z_x) > 0$. Then $T^i x \in X_1$ and $\mu_{T^i x}(T^i Z_x) = T^i\mu_x(T^i Z_x) = \mu_x(Z_x) > 0$ for any $i \geq 0$. By (4.7), for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \geq 0$,

$$h^B(T^n, T^i Z_x) \geq h^B_{\mathcal{U}_{n,k}}(T^n, T^i Z_x) \geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(T^i x) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k).$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as $h^B(T^n, Z_x) \geq h^B(T^n, T^i Z_x)$ for each $i \geq 0$ (see Proposition 2.3 (3)), we have

$$h^B(T^n, Z_x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} h^B(T^n, T^i Z_x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(T^i x) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k))$$
$$= g^k_n(x) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k) = h_\mu(T^n, \alpha_{n,k}|\mathcal{C}) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then using Proposition 2.3 (4) we have

$$h^B(T, Z_x) = \frac{h^B(T^n, Z_x)}{n} \geq \frac{1}{n}(h_\mu(T^n, \alpha_{n,k}|\mathcal{C}) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k))$$
$$\geq \frac{1}{n}(h_\mu(T^n, (\mathcal{U}_k)_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C}) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k)) = h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}_k|\mathcal{C}) - \frac{\log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k)}{n}$$

for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now fixing $k \in \mathbb{N}$ letting $n \to +\infty$ we get $h^B(T, Z_x) \geq h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}_k|\mathcal{C})$. Finally letting $k \to +\infty$ we have $h^B(T, Z_x) \geq \lim_{k\to+\infty} h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}_k|\mathcal{C}) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$. This completes the proof of (2) since $\mu(X_1) = 1$. □

The following result is an application of Proposition 4.2.

LEMMA 4.3. *Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$ a T-invariant sub-σ-algebra. If $\mu = \int_X \mu_x\, d\mu(x)$ is the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{C}$, then the following hold.*

(1) *If $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ then for μ-almost every $x \in X$, fixing each x, for each $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists a compact subset $Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)$ of X such that $\mu_x(Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and*

$$h^B_\alpha(T, Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)) = h_\alpha(T, Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}).$$

(2) *For μ-almost every $x \in X$, fixing each x, for each $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists a compact subset $Z_x(\epsilon)$ of X such that $\mu_x(Z_x(\epsilon)) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and*

$$h^B(T, Z_x(\epsilon)) = h(T, Z_x(\epsilon)) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. (1) Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$. As $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$, by (4.5) there exists $X_\infty \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu(X_\infty) = 1$ such that for each $x \in X_\infty$, one can find $W_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(W_x) = 1$ such that for each $y \in W_x$

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C})$$

(for details see the proof of Proposition 4.2(1)). By Proposition 4.2(1), without loss of generality we may require

$$h_\alpha^B(T, Z) \geq h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) \tag{4.8}$$

for any $x \in X_\infty$ and $Z \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z) > 0$ (if necessary we take a subset of X_∞).

Let $x \in X_\infty$. Obviously, for each $y \in W_x$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n_{y,m} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $n \geq n_{y,m}$ then $-(1/n) \log \mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)) \leq h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + 1/m$, i.e. $\mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)) \geq \exp(-n(h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + 1/m))$. So for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y)) \geq \exp\left(-(n + n_{y,m})\left(h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + \frac{1}{m}\right)\right).$$

We introduce a μ_x-measurable function by defining for μ_x-almost every $y \in X$

$$c_m(y) = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\mu_x(\alpha_0^{n-1}(y))}{\exp(-n(h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + 1/m))} \geq \exp\left(-n_{y,m}\left(h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + \frac{1}{m}\right)\right) > 0.$$

Let $Z_k^m = \{y \in W_x \mid c_m(y) \geq 1/k\}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then Z_k^m is μ_x-measurable and $h_\alpha(T, Z_k^m) \leq h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + 1/m$ by Lemma 3.3. Moreover, as $\lim_{k\to+\infty} \mu_x(Z_k^m) = 1$, for each $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists a compact subset $B_\epsilon^m \subseteq Z_K^m$ for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mu_x(X \setminus B_\epsilon^m) < \epsilon/2^m$ and $h_\alpha(T, B_\epsilon^m) \leq h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + 1/m$.

For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, set $Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon) = \bigcap_{m\in\mathbb{N}} B_\epsilon^m$. Then $Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)$ is a compact subset of X,

$$\mu_x(Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)) = 1 - \mu\left(\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} X \setminus B_\epsilon^m\right) \geq 1 - \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \mu(X \setminus B_\epsilon^m) \geq 1 - \epsilon > 0$$

and

$$h_\alpha(T, Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)) \leq \inf_{m\in\mathbb{N}} h_\alpha(T, B_\epsilon^m) \leq \inf_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\left(h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) + \frac{1}{m}\right) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}).$$

Moreover, using Lemma 3.1 and (4.8) we have

$$h_\alpha^B(T, Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)) = h_\alpha(T, Z_x(\alpha, \epsilon)) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}).$$

(2) Let $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_X^o$ with $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \|\mathcal{U}_n\| = 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we take $\alpha_n \in \mathcal{P}_X$ with $\alpha_n \succeq \mathcal{U}_n$. By (1) there exists a measurable subset X' of X with $\mu(X') = 1$ such that if $x \in X'$ then for each $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a compact subset $Z_x(n, \epsilon)$ such that

$$\mu_x(Z_x(n, \epsilon)) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2^n} \quad \text{and} \quad h_{\mathcal{U}_n}(T, Z_x(n, \epsilon)) \leq h_{\alpha_n}(T, Z_x(n, \epsilon)) = h_\mu(T, \alpha_n|\mathcal{C}).$$

By Proposition 4.2(2), without loss of generality (if necessary we take a subset of X') we may require

$$h^B(T, Z) \geq h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}) \tag{4.9}$$

for any $x \in X'$ and $Z \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z) > 0$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $x \in X'$. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, set $Z_x(\epsilon) = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} Z_x(n, \epsilon)$. Then $Z_x(\epsilon)$ is a compact subset of X,

$$\mu_x(Z_x(\epsilon)) = 1 - \mu\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} X \setminus Z_x(n, \epsilon)\right) \geq 1 - \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mu(X \setminus Z_x(n, \epsilon)) \geq 1 - \epsilon > 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h(T, Z_x(\epsilon)) &= \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h_{\mathcal{U}_n}(T, Z_x(\epsilon)) \leq \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h_{\mathcal{U}_n}(T, Z_x(n, \epsilon)) \\ &\leq \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h_\mu(T, \alpha_n|\mathcal{C}) \leq h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using Lemma 3.1 and (4.9) we have if $x \in X'$ then $h^B(T, Z_x(\epsilon)) = h(T, Z_x(\epsilon)) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$. This finishes the proof of (2) since $\mu(X') = 1$. □

With the above preparations we can obtain the main result of this section.

THEOREM 4.4. *Let (X, T) be a TDS with finite entropy. Then for each $0 \leq h \leq h_{\text{top}}(T, X)$ there exists a non-empty compact subset K_h of X such that $h^B(T, K_h) = h(T, K_h) = h$. In particular, (X, T) is lowerable.*

Proof. If $h = h_{\text{top}}(T, X)$, it is true for $K_h = X$ by Proposition 2.3(1). If $h = 0$, it is true for $K_h = \{x\}$ for any $x \in X$. Now we assume $0 < h < h_{\text{top}}(T, X)$. By the variational principle there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ with $h < h_\mu(T) \leq h_{\text{top}}(T, X) < +\infty$. It is well known [**14**, Theorem 15.11] that there exists a T-invariant sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$ such that $h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}) = h$, where $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ is the completion of $\mathcal{B}_X$ under μ. Then the conclusion follows from Lemma 4.3(2). □

Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$ a T-invariant sub-σ-algebra with $\mu = \int_X \mu_x \, d\mu(x)$ the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{C}$. For μ-almost every $x \in X$, we define

$$h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \mu, x) = \inf\{h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, Z) \mid Z \in \mathcal{B}_X \text{ with } \mu_x(Z) = 1\}$$

for any given $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and

$$h^B(T, \mu, x) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \mu, x).$$

The *essential supremum* of a real-valued function f defined on a subset of X with μ-full measure is defined by

$$\mu - \sup f(x) = \inf_{\mu(X')=1} \sup_{x\in X'} f(x).$$

We are not sure of the μ-measurability of both functions, $h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \mu, x)$ and $h^B(T, \mu, x)$, with respect to $x \in X$. Whereas, using Proposition 4.2 we have the following result.

COROLLARY 4.5. *Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$ a T-invariant sub-σ-algebra. If $\mu = \int_X \mu_x \, d\mu(x)$ is the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{C}$, then the following hold.*

(1) *Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ with $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x)$ the function obtained in Theorem 4.1 for T, $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Assume that each element of $\mathcal{U}$ has a non-empty intersection with at most M elements of α ($M \in \mathbb{N}$). Then for μ-almost every $x \in X$,*

$$h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \mu, x) \geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T,\alpha}(x) - \log M$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and if μ is ergodic then

$$h^B_{\mathcal{U}}(T, \mu, x) \geq h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) - \log M.$$

(2) $\mu - \sup h^B(T, \mu, x) \geq h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$*; moreover, if μ is ergodic then $h^B(T, \mu, x) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$.*

Proof. (1) is just a direct corollary of Proposition 4.2(1).

(2) For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we take $\mathcal{U}_k \in \mathcal{C}^o_X$ with $\|\mathcal{U}_k\| \leq 1/k$. Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we take $\alpha_{n,k} \in \mathcal{P}_X$ such that $\alpha_{n,k} \succeq (\mathcal{U}_k)_0^{n-1}$ and at most $n\#\mathcal{U}_k$ elements of $\alpha_{n,k}$ can have a point in all their closures, and take $\mathcal{U}_{n,k} \in \mathcal{C}^o_X$ such that each element of $\mathcal{U}_{n,k}$ has a non-empty intersection with at most $n\#\mathcal{U}_k$ elements of $\alpha_{n,k}$.

Let $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x)$ be the function obtained in Theorem 4.1 for T^n, $\alpha_{n,k}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Then $f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x)$ is T^n-invariant and

$$\int_X f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x)\, d\mu(x) = h_\mu(T^n, \alpha_{n,k}|\mathcal{C}).$$

Then using (1), for μ-almost every $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} nh^B_{\mathcal{U}_{n,k}}(T, \mu, x) &= \inf\{nh^B_{\mathcal{U}_{n,k}}(T, Z) \mid Z \in \mathcal{B}_X \text{ with } \mu_x(Z) = 1\} \\ &\geq \inf\{h^B_{\mathcal{U}_{n,k}}(T^n, Z) \mid Z \in \mathcal{B}_X \text{ with } \mu_x(Z) = 1\} \quad \text{(by Proposition 2.3 (4))} \\ &\geq f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k) \text{ (using (1)).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu - \sup h^B(T, \mu, x) &\geq \mu - \sup h^B_{\mathcal{U}_{n,k}}(T, \mu, x) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n}\int_X (f^{\mathcal{C}}_{T^n,\alpha_{n,k}}(x) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k))\, d\mu(x) = \frac{1}{n}(h_\mu(T^n, \alpha_{n,k}|\mathcal{C}) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n}(h_\mu(T^n, (\mathcal{U}_k)_0^{n-1}|\mathcal{C}) - \log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k)) = h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}_k|\mathcal{C}) - \frac{1}{n}\log(n\#\mathcal{U}_k). \end{aligned}$$

Fixing $k \in \mathbb{N}$ letting $n \to +\infty$ in the above inequality we obtain $\mu - \sup h^B(T, \mu, x) \geq h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}_k|\mathcal{C})$. Then letting $k \to +\infty$ we obtain $\mu - \sup h^B(T, \mu, x) \geq h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$.

Now we assume that μ is ergodic. First, by Proposition 4.2(2), we know $h^B(T, \mu, x) \geq h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$. Secondly using Lemma 4.3(2), there exists a measurable subset X' of X with $\mu(X') = 1$ such that if $x \in X'$ then for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a compact subset $Z_x(\ell)$ of X such that $\mu_x(Z_x(\epsilon)) \geq 1 - 1/2^\ell$ and $h^B(T, Z_x(\ell)) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$. Next for each $x \in X'$, let $Z_x = \bigcup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} Z_x(\ell)$. Then $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu(Z_x) = 1$ and $h^B(T, Z_x) = \sup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} h^B(T, Z_x(\ell)) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$. This implies $h^B(T, \mu, x) \leq h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$. Collecting terms, $h^B(T, \mu, x) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$. □

Following from the proof of Corollary 4.5, we are easy to show the following result.

COROLLARY 4.6. *Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$ a T-invariant sub-σ-algebra. If $\mu = \int_X \mu_x\, d\mu(x)$ is the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{C}$, then the following hold.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1) *If $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ then for μ-almost every $x \in X$ there exists $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ such that $\mu_x(Z_x) = 1$ and $h^B_\alpha(T, Z_x) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C})$. Moreover, $h^B_\alpha(T, \mu, x) = h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C})$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$.*

(2) *For μ-almost every $x \in X$ there exists $Z_x \in \mathcal{B}_X$ such that $\mu_x(Z_x) = 1$ and $h^B(T, Z_x) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C})$.*

Remark 4.7. We cannot expect similar results to hold for topological entropy of subsets using open covers. For example, let (X, T) be a minimal TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, X\}$ such that $0 < h_\mu(T, X) < h_{\text{top}}(T, X)$. Let $\mu = \int_X \mu_x \, d\mu(x)$ be the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mu_x = \mu$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$. Thus for μ-almost every $x \in X$, if $Z \in \mathcal{B}_X$ with $\mu_x(Z) = 1$ then $\overline{Z} = X$, which implies

$$h(T, Z) = h(T, \overline{Z}) = h_{\text{top}}(T, X) > h_\mu(T, X) = h_\mu(T, X|\mathcal{C}).$$

5. *Expansive cases*

In this section by direct construction we shall prove that each expansive TDS is HUL. Recall that we say a TDS (X, T) is *expansive* if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $x \neq y$ implies $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} d(T^n x, T^n y) > \delta$. In this case, δ is called an *expansive constant*. In particular, each symbolic TDS is expansive.

To do this let us first recall [**30**, Remark 5.13]. Let (X, T) be a TDS with metric d and E a compact subset. For each $\epsilon > 0$ and $x \in E$ we define

$$h_d(x, \epsilon, E) = \inf\{r(d, T, \epsilon, K) \mid K \text{ is a compact neighborhood of } x \text{ in } E\}.$$

Let $h(x, E) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} h_d(x, \epsilon, E)$. Its value depends only on the topology on X. The following theorem is from [**30**, Remark 5.13].

THEOREM 5.1. *Let (X, T) be a TDS with metric d and E a compact subset. Then the following hold.*

(1) *$h_d(x, \epsilon, E)$ is uniformly semi-continuous on E and $\sup_{x\in E} h(x, E) = h(T, E)$.*

(2) *For each $x \in E$ there is a countable compact subset $E_x \subseteq E$ with a unique limit point x such that $h(T, E_x) = h(x, E)$.*

(3) *There is a countable compact subset $E' \subseteq E$ with $h(T, E') = h(T, E)$. Moreover, E' can be chosen such that the set of its limit points has at most one limit point, and E' has a unique limit point if and only if there is $x \in E$ with $h(x, E) = h(T, E)$.*

The first result is the following lemma.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let (X, T) be a TDS with metric d and $K \subseteq X$ a compact subset with $h(T, K) > 0$. Then for any $0 < h < h(T, K)$ there is a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ then there is a countable compact subset $K_{h,\delta} \subseteq K$ with a unique limit point such that $s(d, T, \delta, K_{h,\delta}) = h$.*

Proof. Let $0 < h < h(T, K)$. By Theorem 5.1 there exists a countable compact subset $K_0 \subseteq K$ with a unique limit point x_0 such that $h(T, K_0) > h$, thus for some $\delta_0 > 0$ if $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ then $s(d, T, \delta, K_0) > h$. Now let $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ be fixed.

Define l_1 to be the minimal integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

there exists $B_1 \subseteq K_0$ is (n, δ)-separated with respect to T such that $|B_1| = [e^{nh}] + 2$,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $|B_1|$ means the cardinality of B_1. It is clear that l_1 is finite, as $s(d, T, \delta, K_0) > h$. Let $A_1 = D_1 \subseteq K_0$ be (l_1, δ)-separated with respect to T with $|A_1| = [e^{l_1 h}] + 1$ and $x_0 \notin A_1$.

Define l_2 to be the minimal integer $n > l_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{there exists } B_2 \subseteq (B_{d_{l_1}}(x_0, \delta) \cap K_0) \setminus A_1 \text{ is } (n, \delta)\text{-separated}\\ \text{with respect to } T \text{ such that } |B_2|\\ = [e^{nh}] - [e^{l_1 h}] + 2,\end{aligned}$$

where $B_{d_{l_1}}(x_0, \delta)$ denotes the open ball with center x_0 and radius δ (in the sense of d_{l_1}-metric). Since x_0 is the unique limit point of the countable compact subset $K_0 \subseteq K$, $K_0 \setminus ((B_{d_{l_1}}(x_0, \delta) \cap K_0) \setminus A_1)$ is a finite subset, so

$$s(d, T, \delta, (B_{d_{l_1}}(x_0, \delta) \cap K_0) \setminus A_1) = s(d, T, \delta, K_0) > h,$$

which implies that $l_2 > l_1$ is finite. Let $D_2 \subseteq (B_{d_{l_1}}(x_0, \delta) \cap K_0) \setminus A_1$ be (l_2, δ)-separated with respect to T with $|D_2| = [e^{l_2 h}] - [e^{l_1 h}] + 1$ and $x_0 \notin D_2$. Set $A_2 = A_1 \cup D_2 \not\ni x_0$. Then $|A_2| = [e^{l_2 h}] + 2$ and $A_2 \subseteq K_0$ is (l_2, δ)-separated with respect to T.

By induction there are $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots$ and $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq K_0$ such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the following hold.

(1) $x_0 \notin A_i$ and $A_{i+1} \setminus A_i \subseteq B_{d_{l_i}}(x_0, \delta) \cap K_0$.

(2) A_i is (l_i, δ)-separated with respect to T and $|A_i| = [e^{l_i h}] + i$.

Set $A_\infty = \{x_0\} \cup \bigcup_{i \geq 1} A_i \subseteq K_0$. Then $A_\infty (\subseteq K_0) \subseteq K$ is a countable compact subset with x_0 as its unique limit point in X. If $l_n \leq l < l_{n+1}$ then let $A \subseteq A_\infty$ be (l, δ)-separated with respect to T. As $A \setminus A_n \subseteq (B_{d_{l_n}}(x_0, \delta) \cap K_0) \setminus A_n$ is (l, δ)-separated with respect to T, because of the definition of l_{n+1} we have $|A \setminus A_n| \leq [e^{lh}] - [e^{l_n h}] + 1$, which implies

$$|A| \leq |A \setminus A_n| + |A_n| \leq ([e^{lh}] - [e^{l_n h}] + 1) + ([e^{l_n h}] + n) = [e^{lh}] + n + 1.$$

Then $s_l(d, T, \delta, A_\infty) \leq [e^{lh}] + n + 1$ for all $l_n \leq l < l_{n+1}$. Note that $s_{l_n}(d, T, \delta, A_\infty) \geq [e^{l_n h}] + n$, we conclude $s(d, T, \delta, A_\infty) = h$. Take $K_{h,\delta} = A_\infty$. This completes the proof. □

Before proving that each expansive TDS is HUL we need the following result.

LEMMA 5.3. *Let (X, T) be an expansive TDS with metric d and an expansive constant $\delta > 0$. Then for any compact subset $K \subseteq X$, $h(T, K) = s(d, T, \delta/2, K)$.*

Proof. Let $K \subseteq X$ be a compact subset and $\epsilon > 0$. We claim that there exists $n(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $x, y \in X$, $d^*_{n(\epsilon)}(x, y) \leq \delta/2$ implies $d(x, y) \leq \epsilon$, where $d^*_{n(\epsilon)}(x, y) = \max_{i=-n(\epsilon)}^{n(\epsilon)} d(T^i x, T^i y)$. In fact, if it is not the case then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $x_n, y_n \in X$ such that $d^*_n(x_n, y_n) \leq \delta/2$ and $d(x_n, y_n) > \epsilon$. Without loss of generality we assume $\lim_{n \to +\infty}(x_n, y_n) = (x, y)$. Then $d(x, y) \geq \epsilon$ and $d^*_m(x, y) \leq \delta/2$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, which contradicts that δ is an expansive constant of (X, T).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let E be an (m, ϵ)-separated subset of K with respect to T, then $T^{-n(\epsilon)}E$ is an $(m + 2n(\epsilon), \delta/2)$-separated subset of $T^{-n(\epsilon)}K$ with respect to T. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} s(d, T, \epsilon, K) &= \limsup_{m\to+\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log s_m(d, T, \epsilon, K) \\ &\le \limsup_{m\to+\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log s_{m+2n(\epsilon)}\left(d, T, \frac{\delta}{2}, T^{-n(\epsilon)}K\right) \\ &= s\left(d, T, \frac{\delta}{2}, T^{-n(\epsilon)}K\right) = s\left(d, T, \frac{\delta}{2}, K\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, letting $\epsilon \to 0+$ we conclude $h(T, K) = s(d, T, \delta/2, K)$. □

Now we are ready to prove the main result in this section.

THEOREM 5.4. *Each expansive TDS is HUL.*

Proof. Let (X, T) be an expansive TDS with metric d and an expansive constant $2\delta > 0$.

Let $E \subseteq X$ be a non-empty compact subset and $0 \le h \le h(T, E)$. If $h = 0$ then $h(T, \{x\}) = 0$ for any $x \in E$. Now assume $h = h(T, E) > 0$, then by Theorem 5.1 (1), $h_d(x, \delta, E)$ is uniformly semi-continuous on E and $h(T, E) = \sup_{x\in X} h(x, E)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} h(x, E) &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} \inf\{r(d, T, \epsilon, K) \mid K \text{ is a compact neighborhood of } x \text{ in } E\} \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} \inf\{s(d, T, \epsilon, K) \mid K \text{ is a compact neighborhood of } x \text{ in } E\} \\ &= h_d(x, \delta, E) \text{ (using Lemma 5.3),} \end{aligned}$$

and so $h(T, E) = \max_{x\in E} h_d(x, \delta, E)$. Suppose $x_0 \in E$ with $h_d(x_0, \delta, E)(= h(x_0, E)) = h(T, E) > 0$. By Theorem 5.1 (2) there exists a countable compact subset $K_0 \subseteq E$ with x_0 as its unique limit point such that $h(T, K_0) = h(x_0, E) = h(T, E)$. This completes the proof in the case of $h = h(T, E) > 0$.

Now assume $0 < h < h(T, E)$. By Lemma 5.2 there exist $0 < \epsilon \le \delta$ small enough and a countable compact subset $K_h \subseteq E$ with a unique limit point such that $s(d, T, \epsilon, K_h) = h$. Since 2ϵ is also an expansive constant, $h(T, K_h) = h$ by Lemma 5.3.

Thus for each non-empty compact subset E and each $0 \le h \le h(T, E)$ there is a non-empty compact subset $K_h \subseteq K$ with a unique limit point such that $h(T, K_h) = h$, that is, TDS (X, T) is HUL. □

Note that we can also introduce the HUL property for a GTDS, the results of this section remain true for a GTDS. In particular, following similar discussions, the results in Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.4 also hold for each positively expansive dynamical system. Let X be a compact metric space endowed with a continuous surjection $T : X \to X$ and a compatible metric d. Recall that we say (X, T) is *positively expansive* if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $x \ne y$ implies $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+} d(T^n x, T^n y) > \delta$ (see for example [**27**]). We also call δ an *expansive constant*.

6. *A HUL TDS is asymptotically h-expansive*

In this section we shall answer Question 1.4 partially. Note that the invertibility can be removed for TDSs considered in this section without changing our results.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We discuss two classes of weak expansiveness: the h-expansiveness and asymptotical h-expansiveness, introduced by Bowen [**3**] and Misiurewicz [**24**], respectively. Let (X, T) be a GTDS with metric d. For each $\epsilon > 0$ we define

$$h_T^*(\epsilon) = \sup_{x \in X} h(T, \Phi_\epsilon(x)) \quad \text{where } \Phi_\epsilon(x) = \{y \in X \mid d(T^n x, T^n y) \leq \epsilon \text{ if } n \geq 0\}.$$

(X, T) is called *h-expansive* if there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $h_T^*(\epsilon) = 0$, and is called *asymptotically h-expansive* if $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0+} h_T^*(\epsilon) = 0$. It is shown by Bowen [**3**] that positively expansive systems, expansive homeomorphisms, endomorphisms of a compact Lie group and axiom A diffeomorphisms are all h-expansive, by Misiurewicz [**25**] that every continuous endomorphism of a compact metric group is asymptotically h-expansive if it has finite entropy, and by Buzzi [**7**] that any C^∞ diffeomorphism on a compact manifold is asymptotically h-expansive.

In this section we prove that each HUL TDS is asymptotically h-expansive.

The following two results seem very technical but interesting in themselves; they are needed in proving the main result of this section.

THEOREM 6.1. *Let (X, T) be a TDS. Then for any compact subset $K \subseteq X$ with $h(T, K) > 0$, there is a countable infinite compact subset $K_\infty \subseteq K$ such that $h(T, K_\infty) = 0$.*

Proof. First, there is a countable compact subset $K_0 = \{x, x_1, x_2, \ldots\} \subseteq K$ such that $h = h(T, K_0) > 0$ and $\lim_{n \to +\infty} x_n = x$ (using Theorem 5.1).

Let d be a metric on (X, T). For sufficiently small $\epsilon_1 > 0$ let $K_1 \subseteq K_0$ be the subset constructed in Lemma 5.2 such that $s(d, T, \epsilon_1, K_1) = h/2$. Now if K_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is constructed, for a more smaller $0 < \epsilon_{n+1} < \epsilon_n$, by Lemma 5.2 we let K_{n+1} be a proper compact subset of K_n with $s(d, T, \epsilon_{n+1}, K_{n+1}) = h/(n+2)$. In fact, we can require that $\lim_{n \to +\infty} \epsilon_n = 0$. Now let $K_\infty = \{x, y_1, y_2, \ldots\}$ be a subset of K_0, where $y_n \in K_n \setminus K_{n+1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

It is clear that $K_\infty \subseteq K$ is a countable infinite compact subset, and

$$s(d, T, \epsilon_n, K_\infty) \leq s(d, T, \epsilon_n, K_n) \leq \frac{h}{n}$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as $K_\infty \setminus \{y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}\} \subseteq K_n$. Hence we have

$$h(T, K_\infty) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} s(d, T, \epsilon_n, K_\infty) = 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

LEMMA 6.2. *Let (X, T) be a TDS. Assume that $\{B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq 2^X$ satisfies $\lim_{n \to +\infty} B_n = \{x_0\}$ (in the sense of Hausdorff metric) for some $x_0 \in X$ and*

$$\inf_{J \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \lim_{n \to +\infty} \sup_{j \geq J} \operatorname{diam}(T^j B_n) = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Let $x_n \in B_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$h\left(T, \bigcup_{n=1}^{+\infty} B_n \cup \{x_0\}\right) = \max\left\{\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} h(T, B_n), h(T, \{x_i\}_0^\infty)\right\}. \tag{6.2}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If in addition $x_0 \notin B_n$ *for each* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *then any countable compact subset of* $\bigcup_{n=1}^{+\infty} B_n \cup \{x_0\}$ *with a unique limit point* x_0 *has entropy at most* $h(T, \{x_i\}_0^\infty)$.

Proof. Let d be a metric on (X, T) and $\epsilon > 0$. Thus by (6.1) there exist $i_\epsilon,\ j_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $i \geq i_\epsilon$ then $\epsilon_i < \epsilon/4$, where $\epsilon_i = \sup_{j \geq j_\epsilon} \operatorname{diam}(T^j B_i)$. Set $X_1 = T^{j_\epsilon}(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} B_i \cup \{x_0\})$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let E_n be an (n, ϵ)-separated subset of X_1 with respect to T with $s_n(d, T, \epsilon, X_1) = |E_n|$. It is clear that if $i \geq i_\epsilon$ then $|E_n \cap T^{j_\epsilon} B_i| \leq 1$, and if $y \in E_n \cap T^{j_\epsilon} B_i$ then $d_n(y, T^{j_\epsilon} x_i) \leq \epsilon_i < \epsilon/4$. Say $E_n \cap T^{j_\epsilon}(\bigcup_{i \geq i_\epsilon} B_i) = \{y_1, \ldots, y_l\}$. For each $1 \leq r \leq l$, there exists $i_r \geq i_\epsilon$ such that $y_r \in E_n \cap T^{j_\epsilon} B_{i_r}$. Let $F_n = \{T^{j_\epsilon} x_{i_1}, \ldots, T^{j_\epsilon} x_{i_r}\}$. For each $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 \leq l$,

$$d_n(T^{j_\epsilon} x_{i_{r_1}}, T^{j_\epsilon} x_{i_{r_2}}) \geq d_n(y_{r_1}, y_{r_2}) - (d_n(y_{r_1}, T^{j_\epsilon} x_{i_{r_1}}) + d_n(y_{r_2}, T^{j_\epsilon} x_{i_{r_2}})) > \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Hence, F_n is an $(n, \epsilon/2)$-separated subset of $T^{j_\epsilon}(\{x_i\}_0^\infty)$ with respect to T, which implies $s_n(d, T, \epsilon/2, T^{j_\epsilon}(\{x_i\}_0^\infty)) \geq l$. Note that $G_n \doteq E_n \cap T^{j_\epsilon}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{i_\epsilon - 1} B_i)$ is an (n, ϵ)-separated subset of $T^{j_\epsilon}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{i_\epsilon - 1} B_i)$ with respect to T, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_n(d, T, \epsilon, X_1) = |E_n| &\leq |G_n \cup \{y_1, \ldots, y_l\} \cup \{T^{j_\epsilon} x_0\}| \leq |G_n| + l + 1 \\ &\leq s_n\left(d, T, \epsilon, T^{j_\epsilon}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{i_\epsilon - 1} B_i\right)\right) + s_n\left(d, T, \frac{\epsilon}{2}, T^{j_\epsilon}(\{x_i\}_0^\infty)\right) + 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} s\left(d, T, \epsilon, \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} B_i \cup \{x_0\}\right) &= s(d, T, \epsilon, X_1) \\ &\leq \max\left\{s\left(d, T, \epsilon, T^{j_\epsilon}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{i_\epsilon - 1} B_j\right)\right), s\left(d, T, \frac{\epsilon}{2}, T^{j_\epsilon}(\{x_i\}_0^\infty)\right)\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{s\left(d, T, \epsilon, \bigcup_{j=1}^{i_\epsilon - 1} B_j\right), s\left(d, T, \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \{x_i\}_0^\infty\right)\right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{\max_{1\leq j\leq i_\epsilon - 1} h(T, B_i), h(T, \{x_i\}_0^\infty)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain the direction '$\leq$' of (6.2). The other direction is obvious.

If in additional $x_0 \notin B_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $K \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{+\infty} B_n \cup \{x_0\}$ be any countable compact subset with a unique limit point x_0. Set $B_n' = K \cap B_n$. Then B_n' is finite for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as x_0 is the unique limit point of K and $x_0 \notin B_n'$. So we have $\{B_n' \cup \{x_n\}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq 2^X$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h(T, K) \leq h(T, K \cup \{x_i\}_{i=0}^\infty) &= h\left(T, \bigcup_{n=1}^{+\infty}(B_n' \cup \{x_n\}) \cup \{x_0\}\right) \\ &= \max\left\{\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, B_n' \cup \{x_n\}), h(T, \{x_i\}_0^\infty)\right\} \text{ (using (6.2))} \\ &= h(T, \{x_i\}_0^\infty) (\text{as } B_n' \cup \{x_n\} \text{is a finite subset for each } n \in \mathbb{N}). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark 6.3. Without the assumption of (6.1), in general Lemma 6.2 does not hold.

For example, let $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of X with limit $x \in X$ and $h(T, \{x, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}) = a > 0$.

By Theorem 6.1 there is a sub-sequence $\{n_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $h(T, \{x, x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \ldots\}) = 0$. Let $B_j = \{x_{n_{j-1}}, x_{n_{j-1}+1}, \ldots, x_{n_j-1}\}$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $n_0 = 1$. Then $\lim_{j\to+\infty} \operatorname{diam}(B_j) = 0$ and $h(T, \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} B_j \cup \{x\}) = a > 0$, but

$$\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, B_j) + h(T, \{x, x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \ldots\}) = 0.$$

In fact, for a good choice of the sub-sequence $\{n_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the above construction, we can require that $h(T, \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} B_{k_i} \cup \{x\}) = a > 0$ for any sub-sequence $\{k_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. This is done as follows.

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we can select a sub-sequence $\{m_k^j\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} \frac{\log s_{m_k^j}(d, T, 1/j, \{x_l \mid l \geq n_i\})}{m_k^j} = s\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \{x_l \mid l \geq n_i\}\right)\left(= s\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \{x, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}\right)\right)$$

for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We may assume (replace the sequences $\{n_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{m_k^j\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ by sub-sequences if necessary)

$$s_{m_i^j}\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \{x_l \mid n_i \leq l < n_{i+1}\}\right) \geq \exp(m_i^j(s(d, T, 1/j, \{x, x_1, x_2, \cdots\}) - 1/i)) \quad \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq i.$$

Let $B_j = \{x_{n_{j-1}}, x_{n_{j-1}+1}, \ldots, x_{n_j-1}\}$. Then

$$\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, B_j) + h(T, \{x, x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \ldots\}) = 0.$$

Now for any sub-sequence $\{k_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we have that if $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq j \leq k_l$ then

$$s_{m_{k_l}^j}\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} B_{k_i} \cup \{x\}\right) \geq s_{m_{k_l}^j}\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, B_{k_l}\right) \geq \exp\left(m_{k_l}^j\left(s\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \{x, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}\right) - \frac{1}{k_l}\right)\right),$$

which implies that for each fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$s\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \{x, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}\right) \geq s\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} B_{k_i} \cup \{x\}\right) \geq \limsup_{l\to+\infty} \frac{1}{m_{k_l}^j} \log s_{m_{k_l}^j}\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} B_{k_i} \cup \{x\}\right) \geq s\left(d, T, \frac{1}{j}, \{x, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}\right).$$

Then letting $j \to +\infty$ we have $h(T, \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} B_{k_i} \cup \{x\}) = h(T, \{x, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}) = a$.

Now we are ready to prove the main result in this section.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THEOREM 6.4. *Each HUL TDS is asymptotically h-expansive.*

Proof. Let (X, T) be a HUL TDS with metric d. Assume the contrary that (X, T) is not asymptotically h-expansive, i.e. $a = h^*(T) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} h^*_T(\epsilon) > 0$. Then there exist a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$ with limit x and a sequence $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers with limit 0 such that $\lim_{i\to+\infty} h(T, \Phi_{\epsilon_i}(x_i)) = a$. There are two cases.

Case 1. There exist infinitely many $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \notin \Phi_{\epsilon_i}(x_i)$. Thus without loss of generality we assume $x \notin \Phi_{\epsilon_i}(x_i)$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since (X, T) is HUL, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we can take a countable infinite compact subset $X_i \subseteq \Phi_{\epsilon_i}(x_i)$ with a unique limit point y_i such that $a_i \doteq h(T, X_i) < a$ and $\lim_{i\to+\infty} a_i = a$. Clearly, $\lim_{i\to+\infty} y_i = x$. Moreover, by Theorem 6.1 we may assume that $h(T, \{x, y_1, y_2, \ldots\}) = 0$ (if necessary we take a sub-sequence).

By Lemma 6.2,

$$h\Big(T, \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} X_i \cup \{x\}\Big) = \max\left\{\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, X_i), h(T, \{x, y_1, y_2, \ldots\})\right\} = a,$$

so there exists a countable infinite compact subset $A \subseteq \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} X_i \cup \{x\}$ with a unique limit point z such that $h(T, A) = a > 0$. By assumptions, if $z = x$ then each $A_i \doteq A \cap X_i$ is a finite subset, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} h(T, A) &\le h(T, A \cup \{y_1, y_2, \ldots\}) \\ &= \max\left\{\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, A_i \cup \{y_i\}), h(T, \{x, y_1, y_2, \ldots\})\right\} \text{ (using Lemma 6.2)} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction with $h(T, A) = a > 0$. Thus $z \neq x$, and so $z \in X_v$ for some $v \in \mathbb{N}$. Put $r = d(z, x)/2$, then $r > 0$ follows from $x \notin \Phi_{\epsilon_v}(x_v)$. Since $\{x\}$ is the limit of $\{X_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ (in the sense of Hausdorff metric H_d), there exists $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $i > L$ then $d(z, X_i) \ge d(z, x) - H_d(X_i, \{x\}) > r$. Thus $(\bigcup_{i>L} X_i \cup \{x\}) \cap A$ is a finite set, as z is the unique limit point of A and $d(z, (\bigcup_{i>L} X_i \cup \{x\}) \cap A) \ge r$. Therefore

$$h(T, A) = h\Big(T, A \cap \bigcup_{1\le i\le L} X_i\Big) \le \max_{1\le i\le L} h(T, X_i) = \max_{1\le i\le L} a_i < a,$$

which contradicts the assumption made at the start of the proof.

Case 2. $x \in \Phi_{\epsilon_i}(x_i)$ for each large enough $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Without loss of generality we assume that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \Phi_{\epsilon_i}(x_i)$ and so $\Phi_{\epsilon_i}(x_i) \subseteq \Phi_{2\epsilon_i}(x)$. So $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} h(T, \Phi_\epsilon(x)) = a$. As $h(T, \Phi_\epsilon(T^k x)) \ge h(T, \Phi_\epsilon(x))$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, then $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} h(T, \Phi_\epsilon(T^k x)) = a$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $\{x, Tx, T^2x, \ldots\}$ is infinite, we fix a point $y \in \omega(x, T) \doteq \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \overline{\{T^j x \mid j \ge n\}}$. Then for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 < d(y, T^{k_i}x) < 1/i$. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, as $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0+} h(T, \Phi_\epsilon(T^{k_i}x)) = a$, we may take $0 < \eta_i < d(y, T^{k_i}x)$ such that $h(T, \Phi_{\eta_i}(T^{k_i}x)) > \min\{a(1 - 1/i), i\}$. Let $y_i = T^{k_i}x$, then $\lim_{i\to+\infty} y_i = y$ and $\lim_{i\to+\infty} h(T, \phi_{\eta_i}(y_i)) = a$ and $y \notin \Phi_{\eta_i}(y_i)$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By a similar proof to Case 1, it is impossible. Hence, x must have a finite orbit, and we may assume that x is a periodic point (if necessary we replace x by $T^k x$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be the period of x. Since $T(\Phi_\epsilon(T^k x)) \subseteq \Phi_\epsilon(T^{k+1}x)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $\bigcup_{i=0}^{l-1} \Phi_\epsilon(T^i x)$ is compact and T-invariant (i.e. $T(\bigcup_{i=0}^{l-1} \Phi_\epsilon(T^i x)) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^{l-1} \Phi_\epsilon(T^i x)$) for any $\epsilon > 0$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Y_n = \bigcup_{i=0}^{l-1} \Phi_{1/n}(T^i x)$. Then (Y_n, T) is a sub-system of (X, T) and $h_{\text{top}}(T, Y_n) \geq h(T, \Phi_{1/n}(x)) \geq a$. By the variational principle, there exists $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}^e(Y_n, T)$ such that $h_{\mu_n}(T, Y_n) > \min\{a(1 - 1/n), n\}$. Obviously, $\mu_n(\{x\}) = 0$ and $\mu_n(\Phi_{1/n}(x)) \geq 1/l$. Thus, we can take a compact subset $K_n \subseteq \Phi_{1/n}(x)$ such that $\mu_n(K_n) > 0$ and $x \notin K_n$. By a classic result of Katok [**16**, Theorem 1.1] (see also [**30**, Theorem 3.7]), we know that

$$h(T, K_n) \geq h_{\mu_n}(T, Y_n) > \min\left\{a\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right), n\right\},$$

as $\mu_n(K_n) > 0$. As (X, T) is HUL, there is a countable compact subset $X_n \subseteq K_n$ with a unique limit point y_n such that $h(T, X_n) = a_n = \min\{a(1 - 1/n), n\} < a$. Clearly, $x \notin X_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as $x \notin K_n$. Again by a similar proof to Case 1, we know that this is impossible. Thus, (X, T) must be asymptotically h-expansive. □

7. *Properties preserved by a principal extension*

Combined with the results obtained in §§5 and 6, in this section we shall answer question 1.4 by proving that a TDS is HUL if and only if it is asymptotically h-expansive. Moreover, we present a hereditarily lowerable TDS with finite entropy which is not HUL. As a byproduct, we show that principal extension preserves the properties of lowering, hereditary lowering and HUL.

Let (X, T) and (Y, S) be GTDSs. We say that $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ is a *factor map* if π is a continuous surjective map and $\pi \circ T = S \circ \pi$. Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs. The *relative topological entropy of* (X, T) *with respect to* π is defined as follows:

$$h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi) = \sup_{y \in Y} h(T, \pi^{-1}(y)).$$

Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs. It is easy to check that on Y the function $y \mapsto h(T, \pi^{-1}(y))$ is S-invariant and Borel measurable. Thus for each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(Y, S)$ we may define

$$h(T, X|\nu) = \int_Y h(T, \pi^{-1}(y))\, d\nu(y).$$

In particular, if ν is ergodic then $h(T, \pi^{-1}(y)) = h(T, X|\nu)$ for ν-a.e $y \in Y$. Thus we have the following.

PROPOSITION 7.1. *Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs. Then for each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^e(Y, S)$ there exists a countable compact set $K \in 2^X$ with $h(T, K) = h(T, X|\nu)$.*

Now let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. Note that the sub-$\sigma$-algebra $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_Y) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_X$ satisfies $T^{-1}\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_Y) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_Y)$ in the sense of μ. We define *relative measure-theoretical μ-entropy of* (X, T) *with respect to* π as

$$h_\mu(T, X|\pi) = h_\mu(T, X|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_Y)).$$

The following results are proved in [**10**] and [**19**].

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 7.2. *Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs. Then the following hold.*

(1) *One has*

$$h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(Y,S)} h(T, X|\nu) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}^e(Y,S)} h(T, X|\nu).$$

(2) *For each $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(Y, S)$,*

$$h(T, X|\nu) = \sup\{h_\mu(T, X|\pi) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T), \pi\mu = \nu\}.$$

(3) *For each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$, $h_\mu(T, X) = h_\mu(T, X|\pi) + h_{\pi\mu}(S, Y)$.*

We have proved that each expansive TDS is HUL. In fact, the same conclusion holds for a more general case. To prove this, first we shall prove the following Bowen's type theorem which is interesting in itself. We remark that the idea of the proof is inspired by the proof of [**2**, Theorem 17].

THEOREM 7.3. *Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs and $E \in 2^X$. Then*

$$h(S, \pi(E)) \le h(T, E) \le h(S, \pi(E)) + h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi).$$

In particular, if (Y, S) has finite entropy then for each $E \in 2^X$,

$$h(T, E) - h(S, \pi(E)) \le h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi).$$

Proof. By the continuity of π, it is easy to obtain $h(S, \pi(E)) \le h(T, E)$. Thus it remains to prove $h(T, E) \le h(S, \pi(E)) + h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi)$. If $h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi) = +\infty$, this is obvious. Now we suppose that $a = h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi) < +\infty$. Let d_X and d_Y be the metrics on (X, T) and (Y, S), respectively.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. By Lemma 7.2 (1), for each $y \in Y$ we may choose $m(y) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a + \alpha \ge h(T, \pi^{-1}(y)) + \alpha \ge \frac{1}{m(y)} \log r_{m(y)}(d_X, T, \epsilon, \pi^{-1}(y)). \tag{7.1}$$

Let E_y be an $(m(y), \epsilon)$-spanning set of $\pi^{-1}(y)$ with respect to T with the minimum cardinality. Then $U_y \doteq \bigcup_{z \in E_y} B_{m(y)}(z, 2\epsilon)$ is an open neighborhood of $\pi^{-1}(y)$, where $B_{m(y)}(z, 2\epsilon)$ denotes the open ball in X with center z and radius 2ϵ (in the sense of $(d_X)_{m(y)}$-metric). Since the map $\pi^{-1} : Y \to 2^X$, $y \mapsto \pi^{-1}(y)$ is upper semi-continuous, there exists an open neighborhood W_y of y for which $\pi^{-1}(W_y) \subseteq U_y$. By the compactness of Y there exist $\{y_1, \ldots, y_k\} \subseteq Y$ such that $\mathcal{W} \doteq \{W_{y_1}, \ldots, W_{y_k}\}$ forms an open cover of Y.

Let $\delta > 0$ be a Lebesgue number of $\mathcal{W}$ and $M = \max\{m(y_1), \ldots, m(y_k)\}$. Let $\pi(E)_n$ be any (n, δ)-spanning set for $\pi(E)$ with respect to S with the minimum cardinality. For each $y \in \pi(E)_n$ and $0 \le j < n$, pick $c_j(y) \in \{y_1, \ldots, y_k\}$ with $\overline{B(S^j(y), \delta)} \subseteq W_{c_j(y)}$, where $B(S^j(y), \delta)$ denotes the open ball in Y with center $S^j(y)$ and radius δ. Now define recursively $t_0(y) = 0$ and $t_{s+1}(y) = t_s(y) + m(c_{t_s(y)}(y))$ $(s \in \mathbb{Z}_+)$ until one gets a $t_{q+1}(y) \ge n$; set $q(y) = q \le t_q(y)$.

For any $y \in \pi(E)_n$ and $z_0 \in E_{c_{t_0(y)}(y)}$, $z_1 \in E_{c_{t_1(y)}(y)}, \ldots, z_{q(y)} \in E_{c_{t_{q(y)}(y)}(y)}$ we define

$$V(y; z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_{q(y)}) = \{u \in X \mid (d_X)_{m(c_{t_s(y)}(y))}(T^{t_s(y)}(u), z_s) < 2\epsilon, 0 \le s \le q(y)\}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Obviously, for each $y \in \pi(E)_n$, the number of permissible tuples $(z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_{q(y)})$ is

$$N_y = \prod_{s=0}^{q(y)} r_{m(c_{t_s(y)}(y))}(d_X, T, \epsilon, \pi^{-1}(c_{t_s(y)}(y))). \tag{7.2}$$

Then we have (using (7.1) and (7.2))

$$N_y \le \prod_{s=0}^{q(y)} e^{(a+\alpha)m(c_{t_s(y)}(y))} = e^{(a+\alpha)(t_{q(y)}(y)+m(c_{t_{q(y)}(y)}(y)))} \le e^{(a+\alpha)(n+M)}. \tag{7.3}$$

Note that if F is an $(n, 4\epsilon)$-separated subset of E with respect to T then, for each permissible tuple $(z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_{q(y)})$, $V(y; z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_{q(y)}) \cap F$ has at most one element, and

$$\bigcup_{y\in\pi(E)_n} \left(\bigcup_{z_s \in E_{c_{t_i(y)}(y)}, 0\le s\le q(y)} V(y; z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_{q(y)}) \right) \supseteq E.$$

Thus combining (7.3) we have

$$s_n(d_X, T, 4\epsilon, E) \le \sum_{y\in\pi(E)_n} N_y \le r_n(d_Y, S, \delta, \pi(E)) e^{(a+\alpha)(n+M)}.$$

Letting $n \to +\infty$ one has $s(d_X, T, 4\epsilon, E) \le r(d_Y, S, \delta, \pi(E)) + a + \alpha \le h(S, \pi(E)) + a + \alpha$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ are arbitrary, we obtain $h(T, E) \le h(S, \pi(E)) + a$. This finishes the proof. □

As a direct consequence of Theorem 7.3, we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 7.4. *Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs. If (Y, S) has finite entropy, then*

$$\sup_{E\in 2^X} (h(T, E) - h(S, \pi(E))) = h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi).$$

Proof. On one hand we know $\sup_{E\in 2^X}(h(T, E) - h(S, \pi(E))) \le h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi)$ by Theorem 7.3. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{E\in 2^X} (h(T, E) - h(S, \pi(E))) &\ge \sup_{y\in Y}(h(T, \pi^{-1}(y)) - h(S, \{y\})) \\ &= \sup_{y\in Y} h(T, \pi^{-1}(y)) = h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a factor map between GTDSs. We say that π is a *principal factor map* (or (X, T) is a *principal extension of* (Y, S)) if $h_\mu(T, X) = h_{\pi\mu}(S, Y)$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. This was introduced and studied firstly by Ledrappier [**18**].

The following result is a direct consequence of Lemma 7.2 and Theorem 7.3.

COROLLARY 7.5. *Let $\pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S)$ be a principal factor map betweens GTDSs. If (Y, S) has finite entropy then $h_{\text{top}}(T, X|\pi) = 0$ and $h(T, K) = h(S, \pi(K))$ for all $K \in 2^X$.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A characterization of asymptotical h-expansiveness is obtained recently by Boyle and Downarowicz as the following [**5**, Theorem 8.6].

LEMMA 7.6. *A TDS (X, T) is asymptotically h-expansive if and only if it admits a principal extension to a symbolic TDS.*

Then question 1.4 is answered as follows.

THEOREM 7.7. *A TDS (X, T) is asymptotically h-expansive if and only if it is HUL.*

Proof. First, each HUL TDS is asymptotically h-expansive by Theorem 6.4.

Now assume that TDS (X, T) is asymptotically h-expansive and by Lemma 7.6 let $\pi : (X', T') \to (X, T)$ be a principal factor map with (X', T') a symbolic TDS. Then $h_{\text{top}}(T, X) \le h_{\text{top}}(T', X') < +\infty$ (as (X', T') is a symbolic TDS), and so for each $E \in 2^{X'}$, we have $h(T', E) = h(T, \pi(E))$ by Corollary 7.5. Given $E \in 2^X$, since (X', T') is an expansive TDS, then using Theorem 5.4 we have that for each $0 \le h \le h(T, E) = h(T', \pi^{-1}(E))$ there exists a countable compact subset $X'_h \subseteq \pi^{-1}(E)$ with at most a limit point in X' such that $h(T', X'_h) = h$. Now set $X_h = \pi(X'_h) \subseteq E$. So $X_h \subseteq X$ is a countable compact subset with at most a limit point in X and $h(T, X_h) = h(T', X'_h) = h$. That is, TDS (X, T) is HUL. □

Moreover, combining with Corollary 7.5 and Theorem 7.7 we claim that principal extension preserves the properties of lowering, hereditary lowering and HUL.

PROPOSITION 7.8. *Let $\pi : (X', T') \to (X, T)$ be a principal factor map between TDSs. If (X, T) has finite entropy then the following hold.*

(1) *(X', T') is asymptotically h-expansive if and only if so is (X, T).*
(2) *(X', T') is lowerable (respectively hereditarily lowerable, HUL) if and only if so is (X, T).*

Proof. (1) is only a special case of Ledrappier's result about principal extensions [**18**, Thorem 3]. (2) follows directly from Corollary 7.5, Theorem 7.7 and (1). □

It is not hard to construct examples with infinite entropy which are hereditarily lowerable. Thus, there are TDSs which are hereditarily lowerable but not HUL. In fact, an example with the same property which has finite entropy exists.

Example 7.9. There exists a hereditarily lowerable TDS (X, T) with finite entropy which is not HUL. The detailed construction is given as follows.

Take countable copies of the full shift over $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and embed them into B_n with $\{B_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of disjoint compact balls in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $(0, 0) \notin B_n \to \{(0, 0)\}$ (in the sense of Hausdorff metric). Let (X, T) be the TDS of the union of $\{(0, 0)\}$ with these copies, where T is the shift if it is restricted on each copy and $(0, 0) \mapsto (0, 0)$. Then $h_{\text{top}}(T, X) = \log 2$ (using the classical variational principle). For each copy we may take $C_n \subseteq B_n$ with entropy $a_n < \log 2$ such that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} a_n = \log 2$ (using Theorem 4.4). Then $h(T, \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} C_n \cup \{(0, 0)\}) = \log 2$. By definition it is not hard to see that any countable compact subset of X with a unique limit point $(0, 0)$ must have zero entropy,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which implies that each countable compact subset of $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} C_n \cup \{(0,0)\}$ with a unique limit point has entropy smaller strictly than log 2. Thus (X, T) is not HUL.

Now we claim that (X, T) is hereditarily lowerable. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we take $x_n \in B_n$. Then it is not hard to see that $h(T, \{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \cup \{(0,0)\}) = 0$. Let $K \in 2^X$ and $0 \le h \le h(T, K)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $K_n = K \cap B_n$. Since B_n is HUL (see Theorem 5.4), we may take $K_n^h \in 2^{K_n}$ with $h(T, K_n^h) = \min\{h, h(T, K_n)\}$. Using Lemma 6.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, K_n) &= \max\left\{\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, K_n \cup \{x_n\}), h(T, \{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \cup \{(0,0)\})\right\} \\ &= h\left(T, \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (K_n \cup \{x_n\}) \cup \{(0,0)\}\right) \ge h(T, K) \ge h.\end{aligned}$$

This implies $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, K_n^h) = h$. Let $K_h = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} K_n^h \cup \{(0,0)\} \in 2^K$. Then using Lemma 6.2 again one has $h(T, K_h) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} h(T, K_n^h) = h$. This means that K is lowerable, and so (X, T) is a hereditarily lowerable TDS. This ends the example.

It is not difficult to show that the above example (by a small modification) has a symbolic extension with the same entropy, which is not a principal one (see [**5**] for other examples of the same type). Thus it is an interesting question if each system having a symbolic extension is hereditarily lowerable.

Acknowledgements. The authors are supported by a grant from Ministry of Education (20050358053), NSFC and 973 Project (2006CB805903). The first author is supported by FANEDD (Grant No 200520) and the third author is supported by NSFC (10801035).

We thank Feng [**12**] for asking the question whether each non-empty compact subset is lowerable. His question gave us the first motivation for the research. We also thank the referees of the paper for their careful reading and useful suggestions which greatly improved the writing of the paper.

A. *Appendix. Non-invertible case*

In this appendix we want to explain that our main results hold for GTDSs. Note that we can also introduce the lowerable, hereditarily lowerable, HUL and asymptotically h-expansive properties for a GTDS. Let (X, T) be a GTDS. If T is surjective, we can use the standard natural extension as follows.

Assume that d is a metric on X. We say (X_T, S) is the *natural extension* of (X, T), if $X_T = \{(x_1, x_2, \ldots) : T(x_{i+1}) = x_i, x_i \in X, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, which is a sub-space of the product space $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} X$ with the compatible metric d_T defined by

$$d_T((x_1, x_2, \ldots), (y_1, y_2, \ldots)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(x_i, y_i)}{2^i}.$$

Moreover, $S : X_T \to X_T$ is the shift homeomorphism, i.e. $S(x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots) = (T(x_1), x_1, x_2, \ldots)$. The following observation is easy.

THEOREM A.1. *Let (X_T, S) be the natural extension of (X, T) with T surjective. Then (X_T, S) is lowerable (respectively hereditarily lowerable, HUL, asymptotically h-expansive) if and only if so is (X, T).*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Let $\pi_1 : X_T \to X$ be the projection to the first coordinate. Observe that $\operatorname{diam}(S^n \pi_1^{-1}(x)) \to 0$ for each $x \in X$. This implies that $h(S, \pi_1^{-1}(x)) = 0$ for each $x \in X$, and hence $h_{\text{top}}(S, X_T|\pi_1) = \sup_{x \in X} h(S, \pi_1^{-1}(x)) = 0$. By Theorem 7.3, (X_T, S) is lowerable (respectively hereditarily lowerable, HUL) if and only if so is (X, T).

Since $h(S, \pi_1^{-1}(x)) = 0$ for each $x \in X$, π_1 is a principal extension by Lemma 7.2. Now as a principal extension preserves the property of asymptotical h-expansiveness (see [**18**, Theorem 3]), (X_T, S) is asymptotically h-expansive if and only if so is (X, T).

If T is not surjective, we will construct a surjective system (X', T') such that the dynamical properties of (X, T) and (X', T') are 'very close' as follows.

Let

$$X' = X \times \{0\} \cup X \times \{1/n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Moreover, put $T'(x, 0) = (x, 0)$, $T'(x, 1/(n+1)) = (x, 1/n)$ and $T'(x, 1) = (Tx, 1)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in X$.

It is not hard to check that (X', T') is lowerable (respectively hereditarily lowerable, HUL, asymptotically h-expansive) if and only if so is (X, T). Collecting terms, one has the following.

THEOREM A.2. *Let (X, T) be a GTDS. Then (X, T) is HUL if and only if it is asymptotically h-expansive, and if (X, T) has finite entropy then it is lowerable.*

REFERENCES

[1] T. Bogenschütz. Entropy pressure, and a variational principle for random dynamical systems. *Random and Computational Dynamics* **1** (1992/1993), 99–116.

[2] R. Bowen. Entropy for group endomorphisms and homogeneous spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **153** (1971), 401–414.

[3] R. Bowen. Entropy-expansive maps. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **164** (1972), 323–331.

[4] R. Bowen. Topological entropy for noncompact sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **184** (1973), 125–136.

[5] M. Boyle and T. Downarowicz. The entropy theory of symbolic extensions. *Invent. Math.* **156** (2004), 119–161.

[6] M. Boyle, D. Fiebig and U. Fiebig. Residual entropy, conditional entropy and subshift covers. *Forum Math.* **14** (2002), 713–757.

[7] J. Buzzi. Intrinsic ergodicity of smooth interval maps. *Israel J. Math.* **100** (1997), 125–161.

[8] T. Downarowicz. Entropy of a symbolic extension of a dynamical system. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **21** (2001), 1051–1070.

[9] T. Downarowicz. Entropy structure. *J. Anal. Math.* **96** (2005), 57–116.

[10] T. Downarowicz and J. Serafin. Fiber entropy and conditional variational principles in compact non-metrizable spaces. *Fund. Math.* **172** (2002), 217–247.

[11] K. J. Falconer. *Fractal Geometry—Mathematical Foundations and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1990.

[12] D. Feng. Private communication.

[13] H. Furstenberg. *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1981.

[14] E. Glasner. *Ergodic Theory via Joinings (Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 101)*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.

[15] W. Huang, X. Ye and G. H. Zhang. A local variational principle for conditional entropy. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **26** (2006), 219–245.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[16] A. Katok. Lyapunov exponents, entropy and periodic orbits for diffeomorphisms. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **51** (1980), 137–173.
[17] Y. Kifer. *Ergodic Theory of Random Transformations (Progress in Probability and Statistics, 10)*. Birkhäuser Boston, Cambridge, MA, 1986.
[18] F. Ledrappier. *A Variational Principle for the Topological Conditional Entropy (Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 729)*. Springer, Berlin, 1979, pp. 78–88.
[19] F. Ledrappier and P. Walters. A relativised variational principle for continuous transformations. *J. London Math. Soc.* **16**(2) (1977), 568–576.
[20] E. Lindenstrauss. Lowering topological entropy. *J. Anal. Math.* **67** (1995), 231–267.
[21] E. Lindenstrauss. Mean dimension, small entropy factors and an embedding theorem. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **89** (1999), 227–262.
[22] E. Lindenstrauss and B. Weiss. Mean topological dimension. *Israel J. Math.* **115** (2000), 1–24.
[23] P. Mattila. *Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces, Fractals and Rectifiability (Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 44)*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
[24] M. Misiurewicz. Diffeomorphism without any measure with maximal entropy. *Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci.* **21** (1973), 903–910.
[25] M. Misiurewicz. Topological conditional entropy. *Studia Math.* **55** (1976), 175–200.
[26] Y. Pesin. *Dimension Theory in Dynamical Systems. Contemporary Views and Applications (Chicago Lectures in Mathematics)*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1998.
[27] D. Richeson and J. Wiseman. Positively expansive dynamical systems. *Topology Appl.* **154** (2007), 604–613.
[28] M. Shub and B. Weiss. Can one always lower topological entropy?*Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **11** (1991), 535–546.
[29] P. Walters. *An Introduction to Ergodic Theory (Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 79)*. Springer, New York, NY, 1982.
[30] X. Ye and G. H. Zhang. Entropy points and applications. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **359** (2007), 6167–6186.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385709000066 Published online by Cambridge University Press