

# On the existence of maximizing measures for irreducible countable Markov shifts: a dynamical proof

Rodrigo Bissacot\*

Department of Applied Mathematics, IME-USP, Brazil

rodrigo.bissacot@gmail.com

Ricardo dos Santos Freire Jr.†

Department of Mathematics, IME-USP, Brazil

rfreire@usp.br

March 1, 2022

## Abstract

We prove that if  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  is an irreducible Markov shift space over  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $f : \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is coercive with bounded variation then there exists a maximizing probability measure for  $f$ , whose support lies on a Markov subshift over a finite alphabet. Furthermore, the support of any maximizing measure is contained in this same compact subshift. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first proof beyond the finitely primitive case on the general irreducible non-compact setting. It's also noteworthy that our technique works for the full shift over positive real sequences.

**Keywords:** ergodic optimization, maximizing measures, irreducible countable Markov shift

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2000):** 37-xx, 28Dxx, 37Axx

## 1 Introduction

Given a dynamical system  $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  over a space and a real function  $f$ , the main problem in *Ergodic Optimization* is to guarantee the existence and characterize the support of the maximizing measures for the system, that is, the invariant Borel probability measures maximizing the operator  $\int f d\mu$  over the invariant Borel probabilities for  $T$ . The survey [5] is a good introduction to these problems.

If  $\Omega$  is compact, the existence of the maximizing measures is an immediate consequence of the compactness in the weak\*-topology of the set of invariant probability measures. On the other hand, in the non-compact case even the existence is a non-trivial problem. See, for instance, [2, 6, 7, 8].

---

\*Supported by FAPESP process 2011/16265-8 and CNPq process 454655/2011-8.

†Supported by FAPESP process 2011/16265-8.

We focus on the case where the space is an *irreducible* Markov shift over  $\mathbb{N}$  and the dynamics is given by the shift map, that is,  $\Omega = \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  and  $T = \sigma$ . Given  $f$  we define

$$\beta := \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}))} \int f d\mu,$$

and we assume that  $f$  is *coercive* in the sense that

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} f|_{[i]} = -\infty,$$

where  $[i] := \{x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}), \pi(x) = i\}$  is the cylinder beginning with  $i$ . Then, our main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\sigma$  be the shift on  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  with  $\mathbf{A}$  irreducible,  $f : \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function with bounded variation and coercive. Then, there is a finite set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}|_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}}$  is irreducible and*

$$\beta = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}))} \int f d\mu.$$

Furthermore, if  $\nu$  is a maximizing measure, then

$$\text{supp } \nu \subset \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})).$$

Since  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})$  is compact, it follows from the first part of the theorem that there is at least one maximizing measure supported on a subset of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ .

Similar results for *finitely primitive*<sup>1</sup> subshifts can be found in [2, 6, 7, 8, 9]. In fact, to the best of our knowledge, our result is the first beyond the finitely primitive case, except for the particular case of renewal shifts in [4].

When  $f$  is not coercive, the best known results are [2, 7] that still requires finitely primitive, which follows from the classical oscillation condition. In this case, but in the irreducible context, we're able to prove the following similar result to the ones in [2, 7]:

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\sigma$  be the shift on  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  with  $\mathbf{A}$  irreducible,  $f : \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function with bounded variation and assume there are naturals  $I_2 > I_1 > 0$  such that*

$$\sup f|_{[j]} < \beta - \epsilon \quad \forall j \geq I_1,$$

for some  $\epsilon > 0$  fixed and

$$\sup f|_{[j]} < C \quad \forall j \geq I_2,$$

where  $C$  is a constant (depending on  $I_1$ ) given in (2).

---

<sup>1</sup>The subshift is finitely primitive iff there is  $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite sub-alphabet  $\mathcal{L}$  such that any pair of symbols in the alphabet can be connected by a word of exactly  $K_0$  of symbols in  $\mathcal{L}$ . It's clearly much more stronger than primitive, when you don't require  $\mathcal{L}$  to be finite, which is stronger than irreducible, where there's no uniformity in word length connecting two symbols.

Then, there is a finite set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}|_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}}$  is irreducible and

$$\beta = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}))} \int f \, d\mu.$$

Furthermore, if  $\nu$  is a maximizing measure, then

$$\text{supp } \nu \subset \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})).$$

Our technique also points out a more natural and elementary approach to the problem of the existence of maximizing measures in the non-compact context. The proofs available up to now pass through the construction of auxiliary functions (normal forms [7] and subactions [2]) that characterize the support of the maximizing measures or, make use of the thermodynamic formalism [6, 9], where more restrictions on the dynamics and the potential  $f$  are made. We just use a well-known Parthasarathy's result [11] that says the invariant measures supported on periodic orbits are dense in the ergodic invariant measures for  $\sigma$ .

In this way, we reduce our problem to analyzing the ergodic averages of periodic orbits, and the proof is essentially to carry on in details the intuitive idea: since the potential  $f$  decays to  $-\infty$  when the symbols grow, we can restrict ourselves to periodic orbits whose symbols are all small.

An important consequence in these contexts is the subordination principle, that is a direct application of the results in [3] or [10] after the reduction to the compact case by our results.

Finally, we remark that our technique can be used in more general contexts, such as the case of the full shift on  $\Sigma(\mathbb{R}^+)$ .

The paper is organized as follows: in the next section we give the precise setting and notations to prove the existence part of the theorems in section 3. In section 4, we finish the proof of the theorems showing that the support of any maximizing measure must be in the subshift over the finite alphabet built in the previous section. Finally, in section 5 we point out how our technique works in the case of sequences of positive reals.

## 2 Setting and notations

Let  $\mathbb{N}$  be the set of non-negative integers and  $\Sigma(\mathbb{N})$  be the set of sequences of elements in  $\mathbb{N}$ . Given an infinite matrix  $\mathbf{A} : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , we call by  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  the subset of  $\Sigma(\mathbb{N})$  of allowable sequences, that is:

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}) := \{x \in \Sigma(\mathbb{N}), \mathbf{A}(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1 \forall i \geq 0\}.$$

Fixed  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , we define a metric on  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  by  $d(x, y) = \lambda^k$ , where  $k$  is the first coordinate where  $x_k \neq y_k$ .

Denote by  $\pi : \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  the projection of the first coordinate, that is  $\pi(x) = \pi(x_0 x_1 x_2 \dots) = x_0$ .

We say that  $\mathbf{A}$  is *irreducible* when for any  $i, j$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  there exists a word  $w = w_1 \dots w_k$  such that  $i w j$  is an allowable word:  $\mathbf{A}(i, w_1) = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{A}(w_i, w_{i+1}) = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$  and  $\mathbf{A}(w_k, j) = 1$ .

Our dynamics is given by shift map  $\sigma : \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  where  $(\sigma(x))_i = x_{i+1}$  for all  $i \geq 0$  and we denote by  $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}))$  the set of invariant Borel probability measures for this map. It's clear that  $\sigma$  is surjective as  $\mathbf{A}$  is irreducible.

Fix a function  $f : \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and consider the  $j$ -th variation of  $f$  given by

$$V_j(f) := \sup\{f(x) - f(y) \mid \pi(\sigma^i(x)) = \pi(\sigma^i(y)) \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, j-1\},$$

and suppose that  $f$  has bounded variation, that is

$$V(f) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} V_j(f) < \infty.$$

Also, recall that we suppose that  $f$  is *coercive* in the sense that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup f|_{[i]} = -\infty,$$

where  $[i] := \{x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}), \pi(x) = i\}$  is the cylinder beginning with  $i$ .

Since  $f$  is coercive and has bounded variation, it's easy to see that  $f$  is continuous and bounded above, which implies that  $\beta$  as defined in the introduction is, in fact, well defined.

Our existence problem is to show there is a finite alphabet  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$  and a maximizing measure for  $f$ , that is, an invariant probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}))$  such that

$$\beta = \int f \, d\nu,$$

where  $\nu$  is supported on  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ , the set of allowable sequences of symbols in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

### 3 Proof of the existence results

Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma-Per}(\mathbb{N})$  be the set of periodic invariant probability measures, that is, the invariant probability measures that are supported on a periodic orbit of  $\sigma$ . This set is extremely important since we can reduce the problem into the study of periodic orbits through the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.**

$$\beta = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma-Per}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}))} \int f \, d\mu.$$

*Proof.* The Ergodic Decomposition theorem implies that

$$\beta = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma-erg}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}))} \int f \, d\mu,$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma-erg}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}))$  is the set of ergodic invariant probability measures.

By [11] the periodic invariant probability measures are dense in  $\mathcal{M}_{\sigma-erg}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}))$  and we're done.  $\square$

We denote the set of  $n$ -periodic points of  $\sigma$  by  $\text{Per}_n(\sigma)$  and the set of all  $\sigma$ -periodic orbits is  $\text{Per}(\sigma) := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \text{Per}_n(\sigma)$ .

**Definition 1.** Let  $S_m f(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} f(\sigma^i(x))$ , we use the following notation:

i) for any  $x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  let  $\beta_m(x) := \frac{1}{m} S_m f(x)$ ;

ii) for any  $x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  denote by  $\beta(x) := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \beta_m(x)$  whenever the limit exists.  
Notice that if  $x \in \text{Per}_n(\sigma)$  then the ergodic average of  $x$  is  $\beta(x) = \beta_n(x)$ ;

iii) we say that  $x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  starts in  $i$  when  $i$  is the smallest natural that appear in the coordinates of  $x$ . In particular, all symbols of  $x$  are greater or equal to  $i$  and if  $x \in \text{Per}_n(\sigma)$  we have

$$i = \min_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} \{\pi(\sigma^j(x))\};$$

iv) given a pair  $i, j$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  we say that a word  $w = w_1 \dots w_k$  connects  $i$  to  $j$  when  $i w_j$  is an allowable word:  $\mathbf{A}(i, w_1) = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{A}(w_i, w_{i+1}) = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k-1$  and  $\mathbf{A}(w_k, j) = 1$ .

Since  $\int f d\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(\sigma^i(x))$  when  $\mu$  is a periodic invariant probability supported on the orbit of  $x \in \text{Per}_n(\sigma)$ , it's clear from lemma 1 that

$$\beta = \sup_{x \in \text{Per}(\sigma)} \beta(x).$$

Then, our problem is reduced into showing the existence of a finite alphabet  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\beta = \sup_{x \in \text{Per}(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})} \beta(x). \quad (1)$$

Now we make a first cut on the symbols. The following lemma, together with lemma 1, implies that we don't have to care about periodic orbits whose symbols are all too large.

**Lemma 2.** Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $I_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $x$  starts in  $i \geq I_1$  then  $\beta_m(x) < \beta - \epsilon$  for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular, if  $x \in \text{Per}_n(\sigma)$  we have  $\beta(x) < \beta - \epsilon$ .

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is coercive, there is  $I_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\sup f|_{[j]} < \beta - \epsilon \quad \text{for all } j \geq I_1.$$

We have that

$$\beta_m(x) = \frac{1}{m} S_m f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} f(\sigma^j(x)) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sup f|_{[\pi(\sigma^j(x))]},$$

and since  $\pi(\sigma^j(x)) \geq i \geq I_1$  for all  $j = 0, \dots, m-1$ , we get

$$\beta_m(x) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sup f|_{[\pi(\sigma^j(x))]} < \beta - \epsilon.$$

□

Let us fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . If we consider the alphabet  $\mathcal{I}_1 := \{0, 1, \dots, I_1 - 1\}$  we still have a problem that maybe there are no allowable sequences only with such symbols and, besides, the shift does not need to be irreducible when restrict to such sequences. So we complete  $\mathcal{I}_1$  to a finite alphabet  $\mathcal{A}_1$  in the following manner.

We choose, for each pair  $i, j$  in  $\mathcal{I}_1$ , one word  $w = w(i, j)$  connecting  $i$  to  $j$ . Notice there is such a word since  $\mathbf{A}$  is irreducible. We denote by  $P_0$  the length of the longest of such connecting words. Let  $\mathcal{C}_1$  be the set of symbols that appear in at least one of these connecting words and then consider  $\mathcal{A}_1 := \mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$ . Since each connecting word has at most a finite number of symbols, and we have chosen  $I_1^2$  words, we have that  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is finite.

It's clear that any pair of symbols in  $\mathcal{A}_1$  can be connected using only symbols in  $\mathcal{A}_1$ . This means that  $\mathbf{A}$  restricted to  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is irreducible.

Therefore  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1) := \{x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N}), \pi(\sigma^i(x)) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \forall i \geq 0\}$  is a compact invariant subspace of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$ .

Now we can make a second cut on the alphabet and show it's enough. In fact, since  $f$  is coercive, there is  $I_2 \geq I_1$  such that

$$\sup f|_{[j]} < C := \min \{C_1, C_2\} \quad \forall j \geq I_2, \quad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &:= - (P_0 |\min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)}| + (P_0 - 1)|\beta| + 2V(f)) , \\ C_2 &:= \beta - \epsilon - V(f) . \end{aligned}$$

Below, in the proof of our key lemma 3, we create a new periodic orbit with smaller symbols by connecting two symbols in  $\mathcal{A}_1$  appearing on the orbit. First, in the case when we have chosen a non empty connecting word we need the estimate given by  $C_1$ . Otherwise, we have an empty connecting word, that is, we can connect both symbols directly, and we need the estimate given by  $C_2$ .

Then we can complete  $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{0, 1, \dots, I_2 - 1\}$  into a finite alphabet  $\mathcal{A}_2$  in the same way we did with  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , with the same dynamical properties. It's also clear that we can take  $\mathcal{A}_2$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}_2$ .

We need some control over the ergodic average on parts of a given orbit. For that purpose, the following definition is convenient:

**Definition 2.** *Let  $x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  and  $w = x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+m}$  be a word appearing on  $x$ . Then:*

1. *the ergodic average of the word  $w = x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+m}$  on the orbit  $x$  is*

$$\kappa(\ell, m|x) = \kappa(w|x) := \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{j=0}^m f(\sigma^{\ell+j}(x));$$

2. if  $r < m$  we define

$$\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) = \kappa_r(w|x) := \frac{1}{r+2} \left( f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) + \sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^{\ell+j}(x)) \right).$$

The following facts shows the relation between the previous definition and the ergodic average of a periodic orbit.

**Fact 1.** *Let  $x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  be a periodic orbit for  $\sigma$  such that  $\beta(x) \geq \beta - \epsilon$  and  $x \notin \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ . Then, there is at least one word  $x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+m}$  appearing in  $x$  such that*

1.  $\kappa(\ell, m|x) \geq \beta(x)$ ;
2.  $x_\ell < I_1$ ,  $x_{\ell+m} \geq I_2$ ; and
3.  $x_{\ell+j} < I_2$  for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\beta(x) \geq \beta - \epsilon$ , lemma 1 implies that  $x$  starts in  $i < I_1$ .

And because  $x \notin \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ , we have that there is at least one symbol greater or equal to  $I_2$  appearing on  $x$ , as by construction we have that  $\mathcal{I}_2 \subset \mathcal{A}_2$ .

This shows that there is at least one word appearing in  $x$  satisfying both properties 2 and 3. For each such word, we may take it to be the longest one satisfying such properties, and in this sense let us call it a maximal word.

Since  $x$  is periodic, there is at most a finite number of such maximal words appearing in  $x$ . Also, if a symbol on  $x$  is not on any of these maximal words, it must be greater or equal to  $I_1$ , otherwise it would be possible to extend a maximal word, which is absurd.

We can write a period of  $x$  as a concatenation of maximal and non maximal words, that is,  $w_0 \dots w_k$  represents a period of  $x$  and each word  $w_j$  for  $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$  is either maximal or has only symbols greater or equal to  $I_1$ . Let  $\ell_j$  be the length of the word  $w_j$  and we get

$$\beta(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^k \ell_j \kappa(w_j|x).$$

Let  $\bar{\ell}$  be a word  $w_{\bar{\ell}}$  such that  $\kappa(w_{\bar{\ell}}|x) = \max_{j \in \{0, \dots, k\}} \{\kappa(w_j|x)\}$ . Then

$$\beta(x) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^k \ell_j \kappa(w_{\bar{\ell}}|x) = \kappa(w_{\bar{\ell}}|x).$$

As in lemma 2, if  $w_{\bar{\ell}}$  is not one of the maximal words, then  $\kappa(w_{\bar{\ell}}|x) < \beta - \epsilon$ . Since  $\beta(x) \geq \beta - \epsilon$ ,  $w_{\bar{\ell}}$  must be one of the maximal words and our claim follows taking  $x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+m} := w_{\bar{\ell}}$ .  $\square$

**Fact 2.** *Let  $x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+m}$  be the word given by fact 1 and  $r < m$  be the greatest integer such that  $x_{\ell+r} \in \mathcal{I}_1$ . Then*

$$\kappa(\ell, m|x) \leq \kappa_r(\ell, m|x).$$

*Proof.* In fact, we have by definition that

$$\kappa(\ell, m|x) = \frac{1}{m+1} \left( (r+2)\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) + \sum_{j=r+1}^{m-1} f(\sigma^{\ell+j}(x)) \right)$$

and since  $\pi(\sigma^{\ell+j}(x)) \geq I_1$  for  $j \geq r+1$ , from the same argument of lemma 2 it follows that

$$\kappa(\ell, m|x) \leq \frac{1}{m+1} ((r+2)\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) + (m-r-1)(\beta - \epsilon)),$$

and recall from fact 1 that  $\kappa(\ell, m|x) \geq \beta(x) \geq \beta - \epsilon$  and so

$$\kappa(\ell, m|x) \leq \frac{r+2}{m+1} \kappa_r(\ell, m|x) + \frac{m-r-1}{m+1} \kappa(\ell, m|x).$$

Now, reordering the last expression

$$\frac{r+2}{m+1} \kappa(\ell, m|x) \leq \frac{r+2}{m+1} \kappa_r(\ell, m|x),$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

Let  $\delta := \min\{C_1, C_2\} - \sup f|_{\cup_{j \geq I_2} [j]} > 0$ , where the constants are from (2). The following lemma is the key to complete the proof of theorem 1.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $x \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  be any periodic orbit for  $\sigma$  such that  $x \notin \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$  and  $\beta(x) \geq \beta - \epsilon$ . Then, there is a periodic orbit  $z \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$  such that  $\beta(z) > \beta(x)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider  $x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+m}$  the word given by fact 1, and  $r < m$  the greatest integer such that  $x_{\ell+r} \in \mathcal{I}_1$ .

Now, take  $z = (\overline{x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+r} w})$ , that is, the orbit made by repetition of the word  $x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+r} w$ , where  $w$  is the word of size  $q$  connecting  $x_{\ell+r}$  to  $x_\ell$  made of symbols in  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , chosen in the definition of  $\mathcal{A}_1$ .

Notice that both  $x_\ell$  and  $x_{\ell+r}$  are in  $\mathcal{I}_1$  by facts 1 and 2, but  $x_{\ell+r+1}$  may not be in  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , and it's important for our estimates bellow that we use only connecting symbols in  $\mathcal{A}_1$ .

By facts 1 and 2, we know that  $\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) \geq \kappa(\ell, m|x) \geq \beta(x)$ . So, we're left to show that  $\beta(z) - \delta_1 \geq \kappa_r(\ell, m|x)$  for some  $\delta_1 > 0$ .

In fact, we have

$$\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) = \frac{1}{r+2} \left( f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) + \sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^{\ell+j}(x)) \right),$$

and since  $f$  has bounded variation and  $x_{\ell+j} = z_j$  for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ , we have that

$$\sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^{\ell+j}(x)) \leq \sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^j(z)) + V(f),$$



so we get

$$\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) \leq \frac{1}{r+2} \left( f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) + \sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^j(z)) + V(f) \right). \quad (3)$$

Recall that  $\pi(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) \geq I_2$  and from (2) and the definition of  $\delta$  we have that

$$f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) \leq \sup f|_{\cup_{j \geq I_2} [j]} = \min\{C_1, C_2\} - \delta \leq C_i - \delta, \quad (4)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ .

We have 2 cases to consider:  $q \geq 1$  and  $q = 0$ .

First, assume that  $q \geq 1$  and recall from (4) and  $C_1$  in (2) that

$$f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) \leq -P_0 |\min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)}| - 2V(f) + (1 - P_0)|\beta| - \delta.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^q f(\sigma^{r+j}(z)) &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} f(\sigma^j(z_{\text{aux}})) - V(f) \\ &\geq q \min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)} - V(f) \\ &\geq -P_0 |\min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)}| - V(f), \end{aligned}$$

where  $z_{\text{aux}}$  is any point in  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)$  starting by the word  $w$ . For example, we can take  $z_{\text{aux}}$  a periodic point, connecting  $w_q$  to  $w_1$  just like we did to obtain  $z$ .

In this way, we get in the previous inequality

$$f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) \leq \sum_{j=1}^q f(\sigma^{r+j}(z)) - V(f) + (1 - P_0)|\beta| - \delta.$$

Applying this to (3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_r(\ell, m|x) &\leq \frac{1}{r+2} \left( \sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^j(z)) + \sum_{j=1}^q f(\sigma^{r+j}(z)) + (1 - P_0)|\beta| - \delta \right) \\ &= \frac{r+1+q}{r+2} \beta(z) + \frac{1-P_0}{r+2} |\beta| - \frac{\delta}{r+2} \\ &= \beta(z) + \frac{1}{r+2} ((q-1)\beta(z) + (1 - P_0)|\beta| - \delta), \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\beta(z) \leq \beta \leq |\beta|$ , we have that

$$(q-1)\beta(z) \leq (q-1)|\beta| \leq (P_0 - 1)|\beta|,$$

implying that  $(q-1)\beta(z) + (1 - P_0)|\beta| \leq 0$ . Therefore

$$\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) \leq \beta(z) - \frac{\delta}{r+2} := \beta(z) - \delta_1,$$

as we wanted.

Finally, assume that  $q = 0$ . That means  $z = (\overline{x_\ell \dots x_{\ell+r}})$ .

From (4) and  $C_2$  in (2) we have that

$$f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) \leq \beta - \epsilon - V(f) - \delta,$$

and from (3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_r(\ell, m|x) &\leq \frac{1}{r+2} \left( f(\sigma^{\ell+m}(x)) + \sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^j(z)) + V(f) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{r+2} \left( \sum_{j=0}^r f(\sigma^j(z)) + \beta - \epsilon - \delta \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r+2} ((r+1)\beta(z) + \beta - \epsilon - \delta) \\ &= \beta(z) + \frac{\beta - \epsilon - \beta(z)}{r+2} - \frac{\delta}{r+2}, \end{aligned}$$

and since by facts 1 and 2 we have  $\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) \geq \beta - \epsilon$ , the last inequality also implies that

$$\beta(z) + \frac{\beta - \epsilon - \beta(z)}{r+2} \geq \beta - \epsilon,$$

from which we have that  $\beta - \epsilon - \beta(z) \leq 0$ , and so

$$\kappa_r(\ell, m|x) \leq \beta(z) - \frac{\delta}{r+2} = \beta(z) - \delta_1,$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** It's important to realize that in lemma 3 we've proved that exchanging  $x_{\ell+m} \geq I_2$  for  $w$ , we have increased by at least  $\delta > 0$  in the ergodic sums. That is,  $S_{m+1}f(\sigma^\ell(x)) + \delta \leq S_p f(z)$ , where  $p$  is the period of  $z$ . This will be important in the next section.

Now we're able to complete the proofs of the existence of a maximizing measure.

*Proof of the existence in Theorem 1.* Recall that our problem is reduced into proving (1), and that lemma 1 implies that

$$\beta = \sup_{x \in \text{Per}(\sigma)} \beta(x).$$

Let  $x^n \in \text{Per}(\sigma)$  for all  $n$  be a sequence of periodic orbits such that  $\beta(x^n) \rightarrow \beta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and, so, we can assume  $\beta(x^n) \geq \beta - \epsilon$ .

We take  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_2$  as defined before, and then lemma 3 shows that, for each  $n$  there is a periodic point  $z^n \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $\beta(z^n) \geq \beta(x^n)$ .<sup>2</sup> Therefore, as  $\beta(x^n) \rightarrow \beta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so does  $\beta(z^n)$ , and we're done.  $\square$

<sup>2</sup>Notice that  $z^n$  here may be taken as  $x^n$  if  $x^n \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ .

*Proof of the existence in Theorem 2.* The theorem follows in the same way. In fact, in the proof of theorem 1 we only use the fact that  $f$  is coercive to guarantee the existence of  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  satisfying the hypothesis given, and to guarantee that  $\delta > 0$ . In this case, it's enough to consider  $\delta := \min\{C_1, C_2\} - \sup f|_{[x_{\ell+m}]} > 0$ .  $\square$

## 4 Proof that $\text{supp } \nu \subset \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ for any $\nu$ maximal

Let us keep the same notation from the previous section, in particular recall that  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_2$ . The proof for theorems 1 and 2 are similar, so we make no distinction here.

We know from the previous section that there is at least one maximal measure whose support is in  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ . Besides, from lemma 3, we also know that there is no periodic maximal measure whose support is not contained in  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ .

Now consider  $\nu$  a non periodic maximal measure for  $f$  and by contradiction suppose that  $\text{supp } \nu \not\subset \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ . By the Ergodic Decomposition theorem we can suppose  $\nu$  is ergodic.

The key step now is to build an invariant periodic measure using a generic point on  $\text{supp } \nu$ , whose ergodic average is strictly greater than  $\beta$ , which is absurd and proves our result. It's convenient to consider  $\beta = 0$  here.<sup>3</sup>

Let  $x = (x_0x_1x_2\dots) \in \text{supp } \nu$  be a generic point such that  $\beta_m(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and  $x$  is recurrent. Because of lemma 2, we can assume without loss of generality that  $x_0 < I_1$ .

Since  $\text{supp } \nu \not\subset \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ , there is a symbol  $I \geq I_2$  appearing in the expression of  $x$ .

We want to modify  $x$  into a new point  $z$  such that  $z$  is periodic and  $\beta(z) > 0$ . Since this periodic orbit induces an invariant periodic measure  $\mu$  that has  $\int f d\mu = \beta(z) > 0$ , this gives a contradiction with the fact that we took  $\nu$  a maximizing measure, and we're done. Notice that there's no need for  $z$  to be in  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_2)$  for this to work.

Let  $i$  be the smallest integer such that  $x_i = I$ , and consider  $b < i$  the greatest integer such that  $x_b < I_1$  and  $a > i$  the smallest integer such that  $x_a < I_1$ .

In this way, we find a word  $w$  beginning with  $x_b$  and ending in  $x_a$  such that between them there are only symbols greater or equal to  $I_1$  and at least one symbol equal to  $I \geq I_2$ . We aim at exchanging  $w$  for  $\tilde{w}$ , which is another word beginning in  $x_b$  and ending in  $x_a$  but between them we put, if necessary, a connecting word  $y$  made of symbols in  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ . That is,  $\tilde{w} = x_b y x_a$  (but maybe  $\tilde{w} = x_b x_a$ ).

Let  $m_1$  be the size of the prefix of  $x$  finishing precisely after the first appearance of  $w$  in the expression of  $x$ . Exchanging  $w$  for  $\tilde{w}$ , and using the same calculations<sup>4</sup> in the proof of lemma 3, we get  $x^1$  with a modified new prefix of size  $\tilde{m}_1$  such that  $S_{m_1} f(x) + \delta \leq S_{\tilde{m}_1} f(x^1)$ .

We can repeat this process with the next appearances of  $w$  in the expression

<sup>3</sup>This is easily done by considering  $f - \beta$ .

<sup>4</sup>Notice that, in fact, the calculations are a little bit easier here since we're only looking for the ergodic sums and not the averages. See remark 1.

of  $x$ , and after  $k$  exchanges, we get a new point  $x^k$  such that

$$S_{m_k}f(x) + k\delta \leq S_{\tilde{m}_k}f(x^k).$$

Then, let  $N$  be an integer such that  $(N-1)\delta \geq P_0|\min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)}| + 2V(f)$ . Therefore, we have

$$S_{\tilde{m}_N}f(x^N) \geq S_{m_N}f(x) + \delta + P_0|\min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)}| + 2V(f). \quad (5)$$

Applying Atkinson's lemma [1], we get  $\ell \geq m_N$  such that  $|S_{\ell}f(x)| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ . Fix  $m \leq \ell$  as the greatest integer such that  $x_m < I_1$ . It's clear that  $m \geq m_N$ . Also, since  $x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{\ell}$  are greater or equal to  $I_1$ , from the choice of  $I_1$  on lemma 2, we have that  $S_m f(x) \geq S_{\ell} f(x)$  and so we get

$$S_m f(x) \geq -\frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (6)$$

Notice that  $S_m f(x) = S_{m_N} f(x) + S_{m-m_N} f(\sigma^{m_N}(x))$ . Let  $\tilde{m}$  is the position of  $x_m$  in  $x^N$  after the  $N$  exchanges we made, and since by the definition of  $x^N$  we have  $\sigma^{m_N}(x) = \sigma^{\tilde{m}_N}(x^N)$ , we also have that  $\tilde{m} - \tilde{m}_N = m - m_N$ . Therefore

$$S_{\tilde{m}}f(x^N) = S_{\tilde{m}_N}f(x^N) + S_{m-m_N}f(\sigma^{m_N}(x))$$

and using (5) we get

$$S_{\tilde{m}}f(x^N) \geq S_m f(x) + \delta + P_0|\min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)}| + 2V(f). \quad (7)$$

Now, let  $u$  be a word in  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)$  of size  $q$  connecting  $x_m (=x_{\tilde{m}})$  to  $x_0$ , and let  $z \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbb{N})$  be the periodic point given by the repetition of the word  $x_0^N x_1^N \dots x_{\tilde{m}-1}^N u$ , that is, the prefix of size  $\tilde{m}$  of  $x^N$  concatenated with  $u$ . Let  $p = \tilde{m} + q$  be the period of  $z$ .

Similarly to the proof of lemma 3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} S_p f(z) &= S_{\tilde{m}}f(z) + S_q f(\sigma^{\tilde{m}}(z)) \\ &\geq S_{\tilde{m}}f(x^N) - V(f) + S_q f(\sigma^{\tilde{m}}(z)) \\ &\geq S_{\tilde{m}}f(x^N) - 2V(f) - P_0|\min f|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathcal{A}_1)}|, \end{aligned}$$

and by (7) we get

$$S_p f(z) \geq S_m f(x) + \delta,$$

so that by (6) we have

$$S_p f(z) \geq \frac{\delta}{2},$$

and we're finally done, since

$$\beta(z) = \frac{1}{p}S_p f(z) \geq \frac{\delta}{2p} > 0.$$

## 5 The case of $\Sigma(\mathbb{R}^+)$

In the case of the full shift  $\sigma$  on  $\Sigma(\mathbb{R}^+) := \mathbb{R}^{+\mathbb{N}}$ , the sequences of positive reals, where the shift is the same as before, and all sequences are allowable, the previous technique works. In fact the proof of the theorem is easier, since the proof of lemma 3 is restricted to the case when we don't need any further symbols to create the orbit  $z$ .

In particular, we only need to consider the second constant in (2).

Finally, we notice that in this case the fact that  $f$  is coercive and has bounded variation does not imply that  $f$  is bounded above, so we have to make this hypothesis to guarantee the existence of  $\beta$ .

In this way, we get the following theorem, that is an analogous to corollary 6.2 in [7]:

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\sigma$  be the full shift on  $\Sigma(\mathbb{R}^+)$  and  $f : \Sigma(\mathbb{R}^+) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded above function with bounded variation and assume there are real numbers  $I_2 > I_1 > 0$  such that*

$$\sup f|_{[j]} < \beta - \epsilon \quad \forall j \geq I_1,$$

for some  $\epsilon > 0$  fixed and

$$\sup f|_{[j]} < \min f|_{\Sigma([0, I_1])} - V(f) \quad \forall j \geq I_2.$$

Then, we have that

$$\beta = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma([0, I_2]))} \int f d\mu.$$

Furthermore, if  $\nu$  is a maximizing measure, then

$$\text{supp } \nu \subset \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma([0, I_2])).$$

In the case when  $f$  is coercive, we have the following:

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $\sigma$  be the full shift on  $\Sigma(\mathbb{R}^+)$  and  $f : \Sigma(\mathbb{R}^+) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded above function with bounded variation and coercive. Then, there is  $I > 0$  such that*

$$\beta = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma([0, I]))} \int f d\mu.$$

Furthermore, if  $\nu$  is a maximizing measure, then

$$\text{supp } \nu \subset \mathcal{M}_\sigma(\Sigma([0, I])).$$

## Acknowledgments

The authors are very grateful to the Professor Fábio A. Tal for all the helpful comments and suggestions, especially for pointing out Atkinson's lemma to us, and to Professor Rafael Rigão Souza for the careful reading and feedback.

## References

- [1] G. Atkinson, Recurrence of co-cycles and random walks, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **2** (1976), 486-488.
- [2] R. Bissacot and E. Garibaldi, Weak KAM methods and ergodic optimal problems for countable Markov shifts, *Bulletin of the Brazilian Mathematical Society* **41** (2010), 321-338.
- [3] T. Bousch, La condition de walters, *Annales Scientifiques de l'cole Normale Suprieure* **34** (2001), 287-311.
- [4] G. Iommi, Ergodic optimization for renewal type shifts, *Monatshefte für Mathematik* **150** (2007), 91-95.
- [5] O. Jenkinson, Ergodic optimization, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, Series A* **15** (2006), 197-224.
- [6] O. Jenkinson, R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbański, Zero temperature limits of Gibbs-equilibrium states for countable alphabet subshifts of finite type, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **119** (2005), 765-776.
- [7] O. Jenkinson, R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbański, Ergodic optimization for countable alphabet subshifts of finite type, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **26** (2006), 1791-1803.
- [8] O. Jenkinson, R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbański, Ergodic optimization for non-compact dynamical systems, *Dynamical Systems* **22** (2007), 379-388.
- [9] I. D. Morris, Entropy for zero-temperature limits of Gibbs-equilibrium states for countable-alphabet subshifts of finite type, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **126** (2007), 315-324.
- [10] I. D. Morris, A sufficient condition for the subordination principle in ergodic optimization, *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* **39** (2007), 214-220.
- [11] K. R. Parthasarathy, On the category of ergodic measures, *Illinois Journal of Mathematics* **5** (1961), 648-656.