

ON TURBULENT RELATIONS

JESÚS A. ÁLVAREZ LÓPEZ AND ALBERTO CANDEL

ABSTRACT. This paper extends the theory of turbulence of Hjorth to certain classes of equivalence relations that cannot be induced by Polish actions. It applies this theory to analyze the quasi-isometry relation and finite Gromov-Hausdorff distance relation in the space of isometry classes of pointed proper metric spaces, called the Gromov space.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Continuous relations	4
3. Classification and generic ergodicity	14
4. Turbulent uniform relations	15
5. Turbulence and generic ergodicity	18
6. A class of turbulent metric relations	24
7. The supremum metric relation	27
8. The Gromov space	29
9. The GH metric relation	32
10. The QI metric relation	39
References	41

1. INTRODUCTION

Gromov [4, Chapter 3], [3] described a space, which is called the Gromov space and denoted here by \mathcal{M}_* , whose points are isometry classes of pointed, complete, proper metric spaces, and which is endowed with a topology which resembles the compact-open topology on the space of continuous functions on \mathbf{R} . The space \mathcal{M}_* supports several equivalence relations of geometric interest. For example, the relation of being (coarsely) quasi-isometric, the relation of being at finite Gromov-Hausdorff distance, the relation of being bi-Lipschitz equivalent, and others. Their dynamic complexity was reminiscent of the complexity exhibited by the turbulent

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E15, 54H05, 54H20, 54E50.

Key words and phrases. Turbulence, generic ergodicity, classification, countable models, uniform equivalence relation, metric equivalence relation, Gromov space, Gromov-Hausdorff metric, quasi-isometry.

Research of authors supported by Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación grants MTM2011-25656 and MTM2008-02640.

group actions of Hjorth [5], and this motivated the development of the theory of turbulent relations carried out in this paper.

A section by section description of the contents of this paper now follows. In Section 2 we analyze a topology on the space of subsets of a space appropriate for working with equivalence relations. This topology is essentially the Vietoris topology [11] but the properties that we need are not found on the literature on the topic. These topological properties are of a categorical nature, and are needed to obtain a new version (Theorem 2.17) of the Kuratowski-Ulam theorem [10, p. 222] which describes how topological properties of a subset of a space over which an equivalence relation is defined translate to properties of the intersection of that set with the orbits of the equivalence relation (indeed, our version of the Kuratowski-Ulam theorem also applies to non-equivalence relations). The Kuratowski-Ulam theorem is one of key tools for studying generic ergodicity of one relation with respect to another.

In Section 3 we briefly review the basic concepts of classification of equivalence relations. Complexity of an equivalence relation is quantified by comparing that relation with one of the standard examples, like the identity relation over a space or the relation “being on the same orbit” of a group action, for instance. Two concepts used for describing the relative complexity of two equivalence relations, E over X and F over Y , are reducibility and generic ergodicity. The relation E is Borel reducible to F , denoted by $E \leq_B F$, if there is an (E, F) -invariant Borel mapping $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ (that is, θ takes equivalence classes of E into equivalence classes of F) such that the mapping $\theta : X/E \rightarrow Y/F$ induced by θ between quotient spaces is injective. The relation E is generically F -ergodic if for any (E, F) -invariant Borel mapping $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ there is a residual saturated subset $C \subseteq X$ such that the mapping $\theta : C/E \rightarrow Y/F$ is constant. These notions were mainly studied for the orbit relation E_G^X (or simply E_G) of any action of a Polish group G on a Polish space X (a Polish action $G \curvearrowright X$).

The least complex equivalence relations, called smooth or concretely classifiable, are those Borel reducible to the identity relation over a standard Borel space. For example, the equivalence relation of being isometric in the set of compact metric spaces is smooth because the space of equivalence classes of this relation is itself a Polish metric space when endowed with the Gromov-Hausdorff metric.

At a higher level of complexity are the equivalence relations that are classifiable by isomorphism classes of countable structures. A countable structure is a structure on the natural numbers that is determined by countable many relations. This set of countable structures is endowed with a Polish topology, and carries a continuous action of S_∞ , the Polish group of permutations of the natural numbers, so that two countable structures are isomorphic if and only if they are in the same orbit of this S_∞ -action. Thus, an equivalence relation over a Borel space is classifiable by countable structures if it is Borel reducible to the relation given by the action of S_∞ on the space of countable structures. A variety of examples of equivalence relations that are classifiable by countable structures and which arise in dynamical systems are given in Kechris [8], Hjorth [5, Preface].

We can also consider the class of equivalence relations that are generically $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodic for every Polish S_∞ -space Y . In particular, these equivalence relations are not classifiable by isomorphism classes of countable structures: roughly speaking, any attempt of classification of these relations by countable models becomes generically trivial.

A key concept in the analysis of the complexity of Polish group actions (classification by countable structures and generic ergodicity) is that of turbulence, introduced by Hjorth [5]. For a Polish group action to be turbulent, not only the action must be highly complex (transitive, minimal) but the group itself must be highly complex (actions of locally compact groups are not turbulent). Precisely, the action is turbulent when its orbits are dense and meager, and its local orbits are somewhere dense, where the local orbits are the orbits of any restriction of the given action to a local action of an open identity neighborhood in the group on an open subset of the space. If a Polish action $G \curvearrowright X$ is turbulent, then E_G^X is generically $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodic for any Polish S_∞ -space Y [5, Theorem 3.18]; in particular, E_G^X is not classifiable by isomorphism classes of countable structures. Moreover, assuming that E_G^X is Borel in $X \times X$ for a Polish action $G \curvearrowright X$, then E_G^X is not classifiable by isomorphism classes of countable structures if and only if X has a continuously G -embedded turbulent Polish G -space [6].

The relations of being at finite Gromov-Hausdorff distance and being quasi-isometric in the Gromov space \mathcal{M}_* are not reducible to an equivalence relation given by a Polish group action [1]. In particular, these equivalence relations are not classifiable by isomorphism classes of countable structures. However it makes sense to study whether they are generically $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodic for any Polish S_∞ -space Y , which could be done by using some appropriate version of turbulence. Therefore, the theory of turbulence for group actions needs to be amplified to a theory of turbulence for more general equivalence relations. This amplification is carried out in this paper for a class of uniform equivalence relations, which includes interesting examples like the above metric equivalence relations on the Gromov space.

A uniform equivalence relation is a pair, (\mathcal{V}, E) , consisting of a uniformity \mathcal{V} with a distinguished entourage E which is an equivalence relation. A first example of uniform equivalence relation arises from a Polish action $G \curvearrowright X$. The uniformity on X is generated by the entourages $\{(x, gx) \mid x \in X, g \in W\}$, where $\{W\}$ is a neighborhood system of the identity of G , and the equivalence relation is E_G^X . A second example arises from a distance-like mapping, $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, that satisfies the standard properties of a distance but it is allowed to have $d(x, y) = \infty$ for some $x, y \in X$. The uniformity is generated by the entourages $\{(x, x') \mid d(x, x') < \epsilon\}$, for $\epsilon > 0$, and the equivalence relation E_d is given by $x E_d y$ if and only if $d(x, y) < \infty$. The pair (d, E_d) (or simply d) is called a metric equivalence relation.

Generalizing the case of Polish actions, a uniform equivalence relation (\mathcal{V}, E) on a space X is called turbulent when the equivalence classes of E are dense and meager, and its local equivalence classes are somewhere dense, where the local

equivalence classes are the equivalence classes of the equivalence relation on any open subset $U \subseteq X$ generated by $(U \times U) \cap V$ for any entourage V of \mathcal{V} .

As said, the main goal of this paper is to develop the theory of turbulence for a class of uniform equivalence relations and then use it to analyze the complexity of several metric equivalence relations in the Gromov space, which are not reducible to Polish actions, proving that they are turbulent and, as a consequence, generically $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodic for any Polish S_∞ -space Y . This analysis begins in Section 5, where we introduce a class of metric equivalence relations, called of type I. For any metric equivalence relations of type I and any Polish S_∞ -space Y , we show that turbulence implies generic $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodicity. The results and proofs of Section 5 follow closely Hjorth's work, adapted to metric equivalence relations by using the concepts and preliminary results developed in the previous sections. The general theory is continued in Section 6, where we give a sequence of hypothesis that collective-wise will eventually guarantee that a metric equivalence relation that satisfies them is of type I and turbulent.

In Section 7, as a prelude to the study of the ‘‘turbulent dynamics’’ of the Gromov space, we study the metric equivalence relation (d_∞, E_∞) on $C(\mathbf{R})$ defined by the supremum distance, where $C(\mathbf{R})$ is equipped with the compact-open topology.

Section 8 reviews the construction of the Gromov space \mathcal{M}_* , and the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff distance with possible infinite values, d_{GH} , between isometry classes of pointed proper metric spaces. This distance defines the relation ‘‘being at finite Gromov-Hausdorff distance’’ over \mathcal{M}_* , denoted by E_{GH} . Another equivalence relation over \mathcal{M}_* introduced in this section is ‘‘being quasi-isometric,’’ denoted by E_{QI} , which turns out to be induced by a distance function with possible infinite values, d_{QI} .

Sections 9 and 10 analyze the metric equivalence relations given by (d_{GH}, E_{GH}) and (d_{QI}, E_{QI}) over \mathcal{M}_* .

Our analysis culminates in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *If (d, E) is (d_∞, E_∞) , (d_{GH}, E_{GH}) or (d_{QI}, E_{QI}) , then:*

- (i) *The metric equivalence relation (d, E) is turbulent.*
- (ii) *E is generically $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodic for every Polish S_∞ -space Y .*

Parts (ii) of this result applies to the case of Y being the S_∞ -space of countable structures and thus can be seen as justification of a metric space version of the so called Gromov's principle for discrete groups: ‘‘No statement about all finitely presented groups is both non-trivial and true.’’

2. CONTINUOUS RELATIONS

Let $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$ denote the two-point set. If X is any set, then $\mathbf{2}^X$, the set of mappings $X \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$, is naturally identified with the set of all subsets of X by means of the characteristic mapping of a subset.

If $A \subseteq X$, let

$$P_A = \{B \subseteq X \mid B \cap A \neq \emptyset\}.$$

There is a natural identification

$$\mathbf{2}^A = \mathbf{2}^X \setminus P_{X \setminus A}. \quad (1)$$

Moreover $P_\emptyset = \emptyset$ and $P_X = \mathbf{2}^X \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, and for any set $I \subseteq \mathbf{2}^X$ of subsets of X , $P_{\bigcup_{A \in I} A} = \bigcup_{A \in I} P_A$ and $P_{\bigcap_{A \in I} A} \subseteq \bigcap_{A \in I} P_A$. If X is a topological space, then $\mathbf{2}^X$ becomes a topological space when endowed with the topology that has $\{P_U \mid U \text{ open in } X\}$ as a subbase. This is called the Vietoris topology (Vietoris [16], Michael [12]). In what follows, provided that X is a topological space and unless otherwise stated, $\mathbf{2}^X$ will always be endowed with the Vietoris topology.

If \mathcal{B} is a base for a topology on X , then

$$\left\{ \bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{C}} P_U \mid \mathcal{C} \text{ is a finite subset of } \mathcal{B} \right\}$$

is a base for the Vietoris topology on $\mathbf{2}^X$. It follows in particular that $\mathbf{2}^X$ is second countable if X is second countable.

A (binary) relation, E , over sets, X and Y , is a subset $E \subseteq X \times Y$. The sets X and Y are called the *source* and *target* of E , respectively. The notation xEy means $(x, y) \in E$. For $x \in X$, the (possibly empty) set $E(x) = \{y \in Y \mid xEy\}$ is called the *target fiber* of E over x . The relation E is completely specified by its target fiber map $x \in X \mapsto E(x) \in \mathbf{2}^Y$. More generally, the notation $E(S) = \bigcup_{x \in S} E(x) \in \mathbf{2}^Y$ will be used for each $S \subseteq X$. The target fiber map can also be used to realize $E(S)$ as a subset of $\mathbf{2}^Y$; the context will clarify this ambiguity.

Definition 2.1. A relation, E , over two topological spaces, X and Y , is called *continuous* if the target fiber map $x \in X \mapsto E(x) \in \mathbf{2}^Y$ is continuous.

The following result follows directly from (1).

Lemma 2.2 ([13, Proposition 2.1]). *A relation $E \subseteq X \times Y$ is continuous if and only if, for every closed set $F \subseteq Y$, the set $\{x \in X \mid E(x) \subseteq F\}$ is closed in X .*

Let π_X and π_Y denote the factor projections of $X \times Y$ onto X and Y , respectively. If $A \subseteq X$, $B \subseteq Y$, and $x \in X$, then

$$A \cap E^{-1}(P_B) = \pi_X(E \cap (A \times B)), \quad (2)$$

$$E(x) = \pi_Y(E \cap (\{x\} \times Y)). \quad (3)$$

The following lemma is an easy consequence of (2).

Lemma 2.3. *A relation $E \subseteq X \times Y$ is continuous if and only if the restriction $\pi_X|_E : E \rightarrow X$ is an open mapping.*

If E is a relation over X and Y , then the *opposite* of E is the relation E^{op} over Y and X given by

$$E^{\text{op}} = \{(y, x) \in Y \times X \mid xEy\}.$$

The target fibers of E^{op} are $E^{\text{op}}(y) = E^{-1}(P_{\{y\}})$, and are called *source fibers* of E . Note that for all $A \subseteq X$ and all $B \subseteq Y$,

$$(E^{\text{op}})^{-1}(P_A) = E(A), \quad (4)$$

$$(E \cap (A \times B))^{\text{op}} = E^{\text{op}} \cap (B \times A). \quad (5)$$

Because of (4), $E^{\text{op}} : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^X$ is continuous if and only if, for any open set $O \subseteq X$, the set $E(O)$ is open in Y . In the case of equivalence relations, it is usually said that E is open when this property is satisfied; this term is now generalized to arbitrary relations.

Definition 2.4. A relation over topological spaces is called *open* if its opposite relation is continuous, and it is called *bi-continuous* if it is both continuous and open.

Relation E could also be open in the sense that the map $E : X \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^Y$ is open; this possible ambiguity will be clarified by the context.

If E is a symmetric relation over a space X , then the source and target fibers are equal, and are simply called *fibers* of E , and so E is bi-continuous if and only if E is continuous.

Example 2.5. The following are basic examples of continuous and bi-continuous relations.

- (i) If E is the graph of a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$, then E (respectively, E^{op}) is continuous just when f is continuous (respectively, open). In particular, the diagonal $\Delta_X \subseteq X \times X$ is a bi-continuous relation over X because it is the graph of the identity map of X .
- (ii) If $E \subseteq X \times Y$ is an open subset, then E is a bi-continuous relation over X and Y .
- (iii) If E is a continuous relation over X and Y , then $E \cap (A \times V)$ is a continuous relation over A and V , for any $A \subseteq X$ and any open $V \subseteq Y$. Thus, by (5), if E is bi-continuous, then, for all open subsets $U \subseteq X$ and $V \subseteq Y$, the relation $E \cap (U \times V)$ over U and V is bi-continuous.
- (iv) An equivalence relation is bi-continuous precisely when the saturation of any open set is an open set. In particular, the equivalence relation defined by the orbits of a continuous group action is bi-continuous, and the equivalence relation defined by the leaves of a foliated space is also bi-continuous.

For any set of relations, $R \subseteq 2^{X \times Y}$, and any $A \subseteq Y$, the following properties hold:

$$\left(\bigcup_{E \in R} E \right)^{-1}(P_A) = \bigcup_{E \in R} E^{-1}(P_A), \quad (6)$$

$$\left(\bigcap_{E \in R} E \right)^{-1}(P_A) \subseteq \bigcap_{E \in R} E^{-1}(P_A),$$

$$\left(\bigcup_{E \in R} E \right)^{\text{op}} = \bigcup_{E \in R} E^{\text{op}}, \quad (7)$$

$$\left(\bigcap_{E \in R} E \right)^{\text{op}} = \bigcap_{E \in R} E^{\text{op}}. \quad (8)$$

The following result is a direct consequence of (6) and (7).

Lemma 2.6. *If R is a set of continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relations over X and Y , then $\bigcup_{E \in R} E$ is a continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relation over X and Y .*

Remark 1. The intersection of two continuous relations is a relation that need not be continuous. For example, if E_1 and E_2 are the relations over \mathbf{R} given by the graphs of two different linear mappings $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, then $E_1 \cap E_2 = \{(0, 0)\}$ is not a continuous relation. However, the intersection of two continuous relations is continuous when one of the relations is also an open subset (Example 2.5-(ii)), as the next lemma shows.

Lemma 2.7. *Let E be a continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relation over X and Y , and let $F \subseteq X \times Y$ be an open subset. Then $E \cap F$ is continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relation over X and Y .*

Proof. Suppose that E is continuous. Let $V \subseteq Y$ be an open set. For every $x \in (E \cap F)^{-1}(P_V)$ there is $y \in (E \cap F)(x) \cap V = E(x) \cap F(x) \cap V$. Then $(x, y) \in F$ and, since F is an open subset of $X \times Y$, there are open sets $U \subseteq X$ and $W \subseteq Y$ such that $(x, y) \in U \times W \subseteq F$. By Example 2.5-(iii), $E \cap (U \times W)$ is a continuous relation over U and W , and so $(E \cap (U \times W))^{-1}(P_V)$ is open in U , hence in X . Since $x \in (E \cap (U \times W))^{-1}(P_V) \subseteq (E \cap F)^{-1}(P_V)$, this shows that $(E \cap F)^{-1}(P_V)$ is open in X , and hence that $E \cap F$ is a continuous relation.

If E is a bi-continuous relation, then $E \cap F$ is a bi-continuous relation because of Example 2.5-(ii) and (8). \square

The *composition* of two relations, $E \subseteq X \times Y$ and $F \subseteq Y \times Z$, is the relation $F \circ E \subseteq X \times Z$ given by

$$F \circ E = \{ (x, z) \in X \times Z \mid \exists y \in Y \text{ such that } xEy \text{ and } yFz \}.$$

Composition of relations is an associative operation and Δ_X is its identity at X . Moreover

$$(F \circ E)^{\text{op}} = E^{\text{op}} \circ F^{\text{op}}. \quad (9)$$

If $E \subseteq X \times X$ is a relation, the symbol E^n , for positive $n \in \mathbf{N}$, denotes the n -fold composition $E \circ \cdots \circ E$, and $E^0 = \Delta_X$. If $E' \subseteq X' \times Y'$ is another relation over topological spaces, let $E \times E'$ be the relation over $X \times X'$ and $Y \times Y'$ given by

$$E \times E' = \{ (x, x', y, y') \in X \times X' \times Y \times Y' \mid xEy \text{ and } x'E'y' \}.$$

Note that

$$(E \times E')^{\text{op}} = E^{\text{op}} \times E'^{\text{op}}. \quad (10)$$

For relations $E \subseteq X \times Y$ and $G \subseteq X \times Z$, let (E, G) denote the relation over X and $Y \times Z$ given by

$$(E, G) = \{ (x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z \mid xEy \text{ and } xGz \}.$$

Lemma 2.8. *The following properties hold for relations:*

- (i) *If E and F are continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relations, then $F \circ E$ is continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relation.*
- (ii) *If E and E' are continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relations, then $E \times E'$ is a continuous (respectively, bi-continuous) relation.*
- (iii) *If E and G are continuous relations, then (E, G) is a continuous relation.*

Proof. In (i) and (ii), the statements about continuity hold because

$$\begin{aligned} (F \circ E)^{-1}(P_W) &= E^{-1}(P_{F^{-1}(P_W)}), \\ (E \times E')^{-1}(P_{V \times V'}) &= E^{-1}(P_V) \times E'^{-1}(P_{V'}), \end{aligned}$$

for $W \subseteq Z$, $V \subseteq Y$ and $V' \subseteq Y'$, and the statements about bi-continuity follow from (9) and (10). Property (iii) is a consequence of (i) and (ii) since

$$(F, G) = (F \times G) \circ (\Delta_X, \Delta_X),$$

where (Δ_X, Δ_X) is continuous because it is the graph of the diagonal mapping $x \mapsto (x, x)$. \square

A consequence of Lemma 2.8-(i) is that the continuous relations (and also the bi-continuous relations) over topological spaces are the morphisms of a category with the operation of composition. The assignment $E \mapsto E^{\text{op}}$ is a contravariant functor of the category of bi-continuous relations to itself.

Lemma 2.9. *The following properties hold for continuous relations over a topological space, X , and a second countable topological space, Y .*

- (i) *If $E \subseteq X \times Y$ is a continuous relation, then*

$$\{ x \in X \mid E(x) \text{ is dense in } Y \}$$

is a G_δ subset of X .

- (ii) *If $E, F \subseteq X \times Y$ are continuous relations and $E \subseteq F$, then*

$$\{ x \in X \mid E(x) \text{ is dense in } F(x) \}$$

is a Borel subset of X .

Proof. Let \mathcal{B} be a countable base of non-empty open sets for the topology of Y . Then Property (i) is satisfied because

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \text{ is dense in } Y\} = \bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{B}} E^{-1}(P_U),$$

the intersection of countably many open subsets of X , and Property (ii) is satisfied because

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \in X \mid E(x) \text{ is dense in } F(x)\} \\ &= \bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{B}} \{x \in X \mid x \in F^{-1}(P_U) \Rightarrow x \in E^{-1}(P_U)\} \\ &= \bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{B}} (E^{-1}(P_U) \cup (X \setminus F^{-1}(P_U))), \end{aligned}$$

the intersection of countably many Borel subsets of X (each the union of an open set and a closed set). \square

Definition 2.10. An equivalence relation over a topological space is called *topologically transitive* (respectively, *topologically minimal*) if some equivalence class is dense (respectively, every equivalence class is dense).

The following concepts and notation will be used frequently.

- Definition 2.11.** (i) A subset of a topological space is *meager* if it is the countable intersection of nowhere dense subsets.
(ii) A subset of a topological space is *residual* if it contains the intersection of countably many open, dense subsets.
(iii) A subset of a topological space has the *Baire property* if it differs from an open set in a meager set.
(iv) A topological space is *Baire* if every residual subset is dense.

Definition 2.12. Let P be a property that members of sets may or may not satisfy. Let X be a topological space.

- (i) Property P is satisfied by *residually many* members of X , and denoted by $(\forall^* x \in X)P(x)$, if the set $\{x \in X \mid P(x)\}$ is residual in X .
(ii) Property P is satisfied by *non-meagerly many* members of X , and denoted by $(\exists^* x \in X)P(x)$, if the set $\{x \in X \mid P(x)\}$ is non-meager.

Corollary 2.13. *If X is second countable and E is a topologically transitive, continuous equivalence relation over X , then, $\forall^* x \in X$, $E(x)$ is dense in X .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.9-(i), the set

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \text{ is dense in } X\}$$

is a dense G_δ subset of X . \square

Lemma 2.14. *Let X be a metrizable topological space, let Y be a second countable topological space, and let $E \subseteq X \times Y$ be a continuous relation. If every target fiber of E is a Baire space, then the following properties hold:*

(i) If A is a G_δ subset of Y , then

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap A \text{ is residual in } E(x)\}$$

is a G_δ subset of X .

(ii) If B is an F_σ subset of Y , then

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap B \text{ is non-meager in } E(x)\}$$

is an F_σ subset of X .

(iii) If B is a Borel subset of Y , then

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap B \text{ is residual in } E(x)\}$$

and

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap B \text{ is non-meager in } E(x)\}$$

are Borel subsets of X .

Proof. To prove (i), write A as an intersection $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} U_n$ of countable many open subsets $U_n \subseteq Y$, and let \mathcal{B} be a countable base for the topology of Y . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap A \text{ is residual in } E(x)\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U_n \text{ is residual in } E(x)\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U_n \text{ is dense in } E(x)\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{B}} \{x \in X \mid x \in E^{-1}(P_V) \Rightarrow x \in E^{-1}(P_{V \cap U_n})\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{B}} (E^{-1}(P_{V \cap U_n}) \cup (X \setminus E^{-1}(P_V))), \end{aligned}$$

which is a G_δ subset of X ; in fact, every $E^{-1}(P_{V \cap U_n}) \cup (X \setminus E^{-1}(P_V))$ is G_δ , because, since X is metrizable, closed subsets of X are G_δ .

Property (ii) is a consequence of (i) because, for every $B \subseteq X$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap B \text{ is non-meager in } E(x)\} \\ &= X \setminus \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap (X \setminus B) \text{ is residual in } E(x)\}. \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

To prove (iii), let \mathcal{C} be the set of all Borel subsets $B \subseteq Y$ such that, for any open subset $U \subseteq Y$, the sets

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U \cap B \text{ is residual in } E(x) \cap U\} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U \cap B \text{ is non-meager in } E(x) \cap U\} \quad (13)$$

are both Borel subsets of X .

This \mathcal{C} is a σ -algebra of subsets of Y . Indeed, it is closed under complementation, because of (11) and Example 2.5-(iii), and it is also closed under countable

intersections, because if $\{C_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is a countable set of members of \mathcal{C} , and $U \subseteq Y$ is an open set, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} C_n \text{ is residual in } E(x) \cap U\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U \cap C_n \text{ is residual in } E(x) \cap U\} \end{aligned}$$

is a Borel subset of X , hence (12), and (13) follows from this: for any countable set \mathcal{B} of open, non-empty, subsets of U that is a base for the topology of U , by [7, Proposition 8.26] (in a Baire space, a subset with the Baire property either is meager or is residual in some open set, but not both), and since the target fibers of E are Baire spaces and $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} C_n$ has the Baire property,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} C_n \text{ is non-meager in } E(x) \cap U\} \\ &= \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{B}} \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap V \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} C_n \text{ is residual in } E(x) \cap V\} \\ &= \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{B}} \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap V \cap C_n \text{ is residual in } E(x) \cap V\} \end{aligned}$$

is a Borel subset of X , and so $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} C_n \in \mathcal{C}$.

Every open subset $V \subseteq Y$ is a member of \mathcal{C} . Indeed, using Example 2.5-(iii), and applying (i) and (ii), [7, Proposition 8.26], the fact that $E(x) \cap U$ is a Baire space, and the fact that open sets are F_σ because X is metrizable, it follows that

$$\{x \in X \mid E(x) \cap U \cap V \text{ is non-meager in } E(x) \cap U\} = E^{-1}(P_{U \cap V}).$$

Consequently, \mathcal{C} is the σ -algebra of all Borel subsets of Y , which establishes (iii). \square

Lemma 2.15. *Let $E \subseteq X \times Y$ be an open relation over X and Y . If $A \subseteq B \subseteq Y$ and A is dense in B , then $E^{-1}(P_A)$ is dense in $E^{-1}(P_B)$.*

Proof. Let O be an open subset of X . Since $E(O)$ is open in Y and A dense in B ,

$$\begin{aligned} O \cap E^{-1}(P_B) \neq \emptyset &\iff E(O) \cap B \neq \emptyset \\ &\implies E(O) \cap A \neq \emptyset \iff O \cap E^{-1}(P_A) \neq \emptyset. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.16. *Let E be a bi-continuous relation over the topological spaces X and Y , and assume that Y is second countable. If B is open and dense in Y , then, $\forall^* x \in X$, $B \cap E(x)$ is open and dense in $E(x)$.*

Proof. Let $\{V_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ be a countable base for the topology of Y . Write

$$O_n = (X \setminus E^{-1}(P_{V_n})) \cup E^{-1}(P_{V_n \cap B}).$$

The boundary $\partial E^{-1}(P_{V_n})$ is a meager set in X because $E^{-1}(P_{V_n})$ is open in X . Since $V_n \cap B$ is dense in V_n , Lemma 2.15 implies that $E^{-1}(P_{V_n \cap B})$ is dense in $E^{-1}(P_{V_n})$. Hence

$$(X \setminus \overline{E^{-1}(P_{V_n})}) \cup E^{-1}(P_{V_n \cap B})$$

is open and dense in $X \setminus \partial E^{-1}(P_{V_n})$, and therefore the interior of O_n is open and dense in X . This proves that $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} O_n$ is a residual subset of X . If x is in $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} O_n$, then $E(x) \cap B$ is dense in $E(x)$, for otherwise there would be some V_n in the base for which $E(x) \cap B \cap V_n = \emptyset$ and $E(x) \cap U_n \neq \emptyset$, which conflicts with the definition of O_n . \square

The following is a generalization of the Kuratowski-Ulam Theorem [10, p. 222].

Theorem 2.17 (Cf. [7, Theorem 8.41]). *Let E be a bi-continuous relation over the topological spaces X and Y . Let Y be second countable, and let $A \subseteq Y$ have the Baire property. The following properties are satisfied:*

- (i) $\forall^* x \in X$, $A \cap E(x)$ has the Baire property in $E(x)$;
- (ii) if A is meager in Y , then, $\forall^* x \in X$, $A \cap E(x)$ is meager in $E(x)$;
- (iii) if A is residual in Y , then, $\forall^* x \in X$, $A \cap E(x)$ is residual in $E(x)$.

In addition, if X is a Baire space, $E(X)$ is dense in Y , and, $\forall^ x \in X$, $E(x)$ is a Baire space, the converses to (ii) and (iii) are also satisfied.*

Proof. Lemma 2.16 implies (iii), which in turn implies (ii).

For (i), if $A = U \triangle M$ for some meager set $M \subseteq Y$ and some open set $U \subseteq Y$, then, for all $x \in X$, $A \cap E(x)$ has the Baire property because

$$A \cap E(x) = (U \cap E(x)) \triangle (M \cap E(x)),$$

where $U \cap E(x)$ is open in $E(x)$, and, by (ii), $\forall^* x \in X$, $M \cap E(x)$ is meager in $E(x)$.

Assume now that $E(X)$ is dense in Y and that, $\forall^* x \in X$, $E(x)$ is a Baire space. Let A be a non-meager subset of Y with the Baire property. Because of [7, Proposition 8.26], there is a non-empty open $U \subseteq Y$ such that $A \cap U$ is residual in U ; hence, by (iii), $\forall^* x \in X$, $A \cap U \cap E(x)$ is residual in $U \cap E(x)$. Because of [7, Proposition 8.22], $A \cap U$ has the Baire property in X , and thus in U ; hence, by (i), $\forall^* x \in X$, $A \cap U \cap E(x)$ has the Baire property in $U \cap E(x)$. Because E is continuous and $E(X)$ is dense in Y , $E^{-1}(P_U)$ is an open non-empty subset of X . Since, $\forall^* x \in X$, $E(x)$ is also a Baire space, it follows from [7, Proposition 8.26] that, $\forall^* x \in E^{-1}(P_U)$, $A \cap E(x)$ is not meager in $E(x)$. Thus $\exists^* x \in X$ such that $A \cap E(x)$ is not meager in $E(x)$, by [7, Proposition 8.26] since X is a Baire space. This proves the converse of (ii), which in turn implies the converse of (iii). \square

Remark 2. The classical Kuratowski-Ulam Theorem (*loc. cit.*, cf. also [7, Theorem 8.41]) is obtained from Theorem 2.17 in the case of Baire spaces by taking $X = Y = X_1 \times X_2$, where X_1 and X_2 are second countable Baire spaces, and E or E^{op} equal to the equivalence relation whose equivalence classes are the fibers $\{x_1\} \times X_2$ for $x_1 \in X_1$.

Corollary 2.18. *Let X and Y be second countable Baire spaces, and let E be a bi-continuous relation over X and Y . Suppose that: $E \subseteq X \times Y$ is a Baire space, $E(X)$ is dense in Y , $E^{\text{op}}(Y)$ is dense in X and, $\forall^* x \in X$, $\forall^* y \in Y$, $E(x)$ and $E^{\text{op}}(y)$ are Baire spaces. If $F \subseteq X \times Y$ is such that $F \cap E$ has the Baire property in E , then, $\forall^* y \in E(x)$, $\forall^* x \in X$, $(x, y) \in F$ if and only if, $\forall^* x \in E^{\text{op}}(y)$, $\forall^* y \in Y$, $(x, y) \in F$.*

Proof. Lemma 2.3 implies that the restrictions of the projections π_X and π_Y to E are open mappings. Hence, by Example 2.5-(i), their corresponding graphs, $\Pi_{E,X} \subseteq E \times X$ and $\Pi_{E,Y} \subseteq E \times Y$, are bi-continuous relations. Moreover, for $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{E,X}^{\text{op}}(x) &= \{x\} \times E(x) \equiv E(x), \\ \Pi_{E,Y}^{\text{op}}(y) &= E^{\text{op}}(y) \times \{y\} \equiv E^{\text{op}}(y), \\ A \cap \Pi_{E,X}^{\text{op}}(x) &= \{x\} \times (A \cap E)(x) \equiv (A \cap E)(x), \\ A \cap \Pi_{E,Y}^{\text{op}}(y) &= (A \cap E)^{\text{op}}(y) \times \{y\} \equiv (A \cap E)^{\text{op}}(y),\end{aligned}$$

and $\Pi_{E,X}^{\text{op}}(X) = \Pi_{E,Y}^{\text{op}}(Y) = E$. Then, by Theorem 2.17 applied to E , $\Pi_{E,X}^{\text{op}}$, $\Pi_{E,Y}^{\text{op}}$ and E^{op} ,

$$\begin{aligned}\forall^* y \in E(x), \forall^* x \in X, (x, y) \in F \\ \iff \forall^* x \in X, (F \cap E)(x) \text{ is residual in } E(x) \\ \iff F \cap E \text{ is residual in } E \\ \iff \forall^* y \in Y, (F \cap E)^{\text{op}}(y) \text{ is residual in } E^{\text{op}}(y) \\ \iff \forall^* x \in E^{\text{op}}(y), \forall^* y \in Y, (x, y) \in F. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.19. *Let X and Y be second countable Baire spaces, and let $E_n \subseteq X \times Y$ be countably many bi-continuous relations over X and Y . The following properties hold:*

- (i) *If $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$ are residual subsets, then there are residual subsets $C \subseteq A$ and $D \subseteq B$ such that, for all $x \in C$, all $y \in D$ and all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, the set $D \cap E_n(x)$ is residual in $E_n(x)$ and $C \cap E_n^{\text{op}}(y)$ is residual in $E_n^{\text{op}}(y)$.*
- (ii) *If $X = Y$ and $A \subseteq X$ is a residual subset, then there is a residual subset $C \subseteq A$ such that, for all $x \in C$ and all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $C \cap E_n(x)$ is residual in $E_n(x)$.*

Proof. To prove (i), define residual subsets, $C_i \subseteq X$ and $D_i \subseteq Y$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$, by the following induction process on $i \in \mathbf{N}$. Set $C_0 = A$ and $D_0 = B$. Assuming that C_i and D_i have been defined, let

$$\begin{aligned}C_{i+1} &= \{x \in X \mid \forall^* x \in X, \forall n \in \mathbf{N}, D_i \cap E_n(x) \text{ is residual in } E_n(x)\}, \\ D_{i+1} &= \{y \in Y \mid \forall^* y \in Y, \forall n \in \mathbf{N}, C_i \cap E_n^{\text{op}}(y) \text{ is residual in } E_n^{\text{op}}(y)\}.\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.17, for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, C_i is residual in X and D_i is residual in Y , and therefore $C = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbf{N}} C_i$ is residual in A and $D = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbf{N}} D_i$ is residual in B because A and B are dense in X and Y , respectively, since X and Y are Baire spaces. Moreover, for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, all $x \in C$ and all $y \in D$, $D \cap E_n(x) = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (D_i \cap E_n(x))$ is residual in $E_n(x)$, and $C \cap E_n^{\text{op}}(y) = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (C_i \cap E_n^{\text{op}}(y))$ is residual in $E_n^{\text{op}}(y)$.

To prove (ii), let $C_0 = A$ and, assuming that C_i has been defined, let

$$C_{i+1} = \{x \in X \mid \forall^* x \in X, \forall n \in \mathbf{N}, C_i \cap E_n(x) \text{ is residual in } E_n(x)\}.$$

By Theorem 2.17, for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, C_i is residual in X . Therefore $C = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbf{N}} C_i$ is residual in A because A is dense in X since X is a Baire space, and, for all $x \in C$ and all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $C \cap E_n(x) = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (C_i \cap E_n(x))$ is residual in $E_n(x)$. \square

3. CLASSIFICATION AND GENERIC ERGODICITY

Let X and Y be topological spaces, and let $E \subseteq X \times X$ and $F \subseteq Y \times Y$ be equivalence relations. A mapping, $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$, is called (E, F) -invariant if

$$xE x' \implies \theta(x)F\theta(x')$$

for all $x, x' \in X$. An (E, F) -invariant mapping $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ induces a mapping, $\bar{\theta} : X/E \rightarrow Y/F$, between quotient spaces.

The relation E is *Borel reducible* to F , written $E \leq_B F$, if there is an (E, F) -invariant Borel mapping $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$xE x' \iff \theta(x)F\theta(x')$$

for all $x, x' \in X$; *i.e.*, such that the quotient mapping $\bar{\theta} : X/E \rightarrow Y/F$ is injective. If $E \leq_B F$ and $F \leq_B E$, then E is said to be *Borel bi-reducible* with F , and is denoted by $E \sim_B F$.

The relation E is *generically F -ergodic* if, for any (E, F) -invariant, Baire measurable mapping $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$, there is some residual saturated $C \subseteq X$ such that $\bar{\theta} : C/(E \cap (C \times C)) \rightarrow Y/F$ is constant.

Remark 3. If E is a generically F -ergodic relation over X , then every equivalence relation over X that contains E is also generically F -ergodic.

The partial pre-order relation \leq_B establishes a hierarchy on the complexity of equivalence relations over topological spaces. Two key ranks of this hierarchy are given by the following two concepts of classification of relations.

In the first one, E is said to be *concretely classifiable* (or *smooth*, or *tame*) if $E \leq_B \Delta_{\mathbf{R}}$ (the identity relation on \mathbf{R}). This means that the equivalence classes of E can be distinguished by some Borel mapping $X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X and Y be second countable topological spaces. If E is a continuous, topologically transitive equivalence relation over X , then E is generically Δ_Y -ergodic.*

Proof. Let $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ be (E, Δ_Y) -invariant and Baire measurable. By [7, Theorem 8.38], θ is continuous on some residual saturated set $C_0 \subseteq X$. By Corollary 2.13, there is residual saturated $C_1 \subseteq X$ such that, for all $x \in C_1$, $E(x)$ is dense in X . Then $C_0 \cap C_1$ is a residual subset of X where θ is constant. \square

Remark 4. In the above proof, if X is a Baire space, then $C_0 \cap C_1 \neq \emptyset$.

Corollary 3.2 (Cf. [5, Theorem 3.2]). *Let X be a second countable space and let E be a continuous equivalence relation over X . If E is topologically transitive, then every E -saturated subset of X that has the Baire property is either residual or meager.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 3.1 to the characteristic function of the given subset. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Let X be a second countable Baire space and let E be a continuous equivalence relation over X . If E is topologically transitive and its equivalence classes are meager subsets of X , then E is not concretely classifiable.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, each $(E, \Delta_{\mathbf{R}})$ -invariant Borel map $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is constant on some residual saturated subset of X . So $\bar{\theta} : X/E \rightarrow \mathbf{R}/\Delta_{\mathbf{R}} \equiv \mathbf{R}$ cannot be injective because X is a Baire space and the equivalence classes are meager. \square

The second classification concept can be defined by using $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{N}^n}$ endowed with the product topology, which is a Polish space. Each element of $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{N}^n}$ can be considered as a structure on \mathbf{N} defined by a sequence (R_n) , where each R_n is a relation over \mathbf{N} with arity n . Two such structures are isomorphic when they correspond by some permutation of \mathbf{N} , which defines the isomorphism relation \cong over $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{N}^n}$. Then a relation E is *classifiable by countable structures* (or *models*) if $E \leq_B \cong$. This means that there is some Borel map $\theta : X \rightarrow \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{N}^n}$ such that xEx' if and only if $\theta(x) \cong \theta(x')$. Here, it is also possible to use the structures on \mathbf{N} defined by arbitrary countable relational languages, *cf.* [5, Section 2.3].

The equivalence relation defined by the action of a group G on a set X will be denoted by E_G^X ; in this case, the notation $\mathcal{O}(x)$ will be used for the orbit of each $x \in X$ instead of $E_G^X(x)$. If G is a Polish group, the set of all relations defined by continuous actions of G on Polish spaces has a maximum with respect to \leq_B , which is unique up to \sim_B and is denoted by E_G^∞ [2, 9].

As a special example, the group S_∞ of permutations of \mathbf{N} becomes Polish with the topology induced by the product topology of $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{N}}$, where \mathbf{N} is considered with the discrete topology. Then the canonical action of S_∞ on $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{N}^n}$ defines the isomorphism relation \cong over the space of countable structures, which is a representative of $E_{S_\infty}^\infty$ [5].

Classification by countable structures and generic ergodicity are well understood for equivalence relations defined by Polish actions in terms of a dynamical concept called *turbulence* which was introduced by Hjorth [5].

4. TURBULENT UNIFORM RELATIONS

A *uniform equivalence relation*, or simply a *uniform relation*, over a set, X , is a pair, (\mathcal{V}, E) , consisting of a uniformity \mathcal{V} on X and an equivalence relation E over X such that $E \in \mathcal{V}$. Note that (\mathcal{V}, E) is determined by the entourages (members of \mathcal{V}) that are contained in E , and that \mathcal{V} induces a uniform structure on each equivalence class of E .

One important example of a uniform relation is that given by the action of a topological group, G , on a set, X . This is of the form (\mathcal{V}, E_G^X) , where \mathcal{V} is the uniform structure on X generated by the entourages

$$V_W = \{ (x, gx) \mid x \in X, g \in W \}, \quad (14)$$

where W belongs to the neighborhood system of the identity of G . Thus a uniform relation over a topological space can be considered as a generalized dynamical system.

Another important example of uniform relation is the following. A *metric* (or *distance function*) with possible infinite values on a set is a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfying the usual properties of a metric (d is symmetric, equals 0 just on the diagonal of $X \times X$ and satisfies the triangle inequality). It defines an equivalence relation, E_d^X , over X given by $x E_d^X y$ if and only if $d(x, y) < \infty$. There is a uniform relation induced by d of the form (\mathcal{V}, E_d^X) , where a base of \mathcal{V} consists of the entourages

$$V_\epsilon = \{ (x, y) \in X \times X \mid d(x, y) < \epsilon \}. \quad (15)$$

The term *metric equivalence relation* (or *metric relation*) will be used for the pair (d, E_d^X) (or even for d). Like the usual metrics, metrics with possible infinite values induce a topology which has a base of open sets consisting of open balls; unless otherwise indicated, the ball of center x and radius R will be denoted by $B_X(x, R)$ or $B_d(x, R)$, or simply by $B(x, R)$.

Remark 5. Other generalizations of metrics also define uniform relations, like *pseudo-metrics with possible infinite values*, defined in the obvious way, or when the triangle inequality is replaced by the condition $d(x, y) \leq \rho(d(x, z) + d(z, y))$ for some $\rho > 0$ and all $x, y, z \in X$ (*generalized pseudo-metrics with possible infinite values*). They give rise to the concepts of *pseudo-metric relation* and *generalized pseudo-metric relation*.

Remark 6. Let d and d' be metric relations over X that induce respective uniform relations (\mathcal{V}, E) and (\mathcal{V}', E') . If $d' \leq d$, then $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{V}'$ and $E \subseteq E'$.

Definition 4.1 (Cf. [5, Definition 3.15]). Let (\mathcal{V}, E) be a uniform relation over a topological space X . For any non-empty open $U \subseteq X$ and any $V \in \mathcal{V}$ with $V \subseteq E$, the set

$$E(U, V) = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} (V \cap (U \times U))^n$$

is an equivalence relation over U called a *local equivalence relation*. The $E(U, V)$ -equivalence class of any $x \in U$ is called a *local equivalence class* of x , and is denoted by $E(x, U, V)$.

For a relation given by the action of a group G on a space X , the local equivalence classes are called *local orbits* in Hjorth [5], and the notation $\mathcal{O}(x, U, W)$ is used instead of $E_G^X(x, U, V)$ when $V = V_W$ according to (14). Similarly, for a uniform relation induced by a generalized pseudo-metric d on a set X , the notation $E_d^X(x, U, \epsilon)$ is used instead of $E_d^X(x, U, V)$ when $V = V_\epsilon$ according to (15).

Definition 4.2 (Cf. [5, Definition 3.13]). A uniform relation is called *turbulent* if:

- (i) every equivalence class is dense,
- (ii) every equivalence class is meager, and
- (iii) every local equivalence class is somewhere dense.

Remark 7. Definition 4.2 does not correspond exactly to the definition of turbulence introduced by Hjorth for Polish actions [5, Definition 3.13]. To generalize

exactly Hjorth's definition, condition (iii) of Definition 4.2 should be replaced with condition (iii')

(iii') every equivalence class meets the closure of each local equivalence class.

In fact, (i) already follows from (iii'). In the case of Polish actions, (iii) and (iii') can be interchanged in the definition of turbulence by [5, Lemmas 3.14 and 3.16]; thus Definition 4.2 generalizes Hjorth's definition. But in our setting, that equivalence is more delicate and our results become simpler by using (iii).

Remark 8. Let (\mathcal{V}, E) and (\mathcal{V}', E') be uniform relations over a topological space X such that $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{V}'$ and $E \subseteq E'$. If the local equivalence classes of (\mathcal{V}, E) are somewhere dense (Definition 4.2-(iii)), then the local equivalence classes of (\mathcal{V}', E') are also somewhere dense.

Example 4.3. The following simple examples illustrate the generalization of the concept of turbulence for uniform relations.

- (i) If E is an equivalence relation over a topological space X , then $\mathcal{V} = \{ V \subseteq X \times X \mid E \subseteq V \}$ is a uniformity on X , and (\mathcal{V}, E) is a uniform relation. Therefore E is the only entourage of \mathcal{V} contained in E , and $E(x, U, E) = E(x) \cap U$ for any open $U \subseteq X$ and all $x \in U$, so it follows that (\mathcal{V}, E) is turbulent if the equivalence classes of E are dense and meager.
- (ii) Let G be a first countable topological group whose topology is induced by a right invariant metric d_G . Suppose that G acts continuously on the left on a topological space X . Then this action induces a pseudo-metric relation d on X with $E_d^X = E_G^X$ and

$$d(x, y) = \inf\{ d_G(1_G, g) \mid g \in G, gx = y \}$$

for $(x, y) \in E_G^X$, where 1_G denotes the identity element of G . The pseudo-metric relation d induces the same uniform relation as the action of G on X , and therefore d is turbulent if and only the action is turbulent.

- (iii) Let \mathbf{Z} be the additive group of integers with the discrete topology, and let $G \subseteq \mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{N}}$ denote the topological subgroup consisting of the sequences (x_n) such that $x_n = 0$ for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbf{N}$. For some fixed irrational number θ , consider the continuous action of G on the circle $S^1 \equiv \mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}$ given by $(x_n) \cdot [r] = [r + \theta \sum_n x_n]$, where $[r]$ is the element of S^1 represented by $r \in \mathbf{R}$. The orbits of this action are dense and countable. For each $N \in \mathbf{N}$, the sets

$$W_N = \{ (x_n) \in G \mid \forall n \in \{0, \dots, N\}, x_n = 0 \}$$

are open and closed subgroups of G which form a base of neighborhoods of the identity element. The induced action of each W_N on S^1 has the same orbits as G ; so $\mathcal{O}([r], U, W_N) = U \cap \mathcal{O}([r])$ for all open $U \subseteq S^1$ and each $[r] \in U$. It follows that this action is turbulent. In fact, the uniform equivalence relation induced by this action is of the type described in (i): we have $E_G^{S^1} \subseteq V$ for each entourage V . Moreover, for any invariant metric on G , the induced pseudo-metric relation d on S^1 is determined by $d([r], [s]) = \infty$ if $\mathcal{O}([r]) \neq \mathcal{O}([s])$ and $d([r], [s]) = 0$ if $\mathcal{O}([r]) = \mathcal{O}([s])$. However, the action

of G on S^1 given by $(x_n) \cdot [r] = [r + \theta x_0]$ has the same orbits but is not turbulent: each point is a local orbit. Indeed this second action induces the same uniform equivalence relation as the action of \mathbf{Z} given by $x \cdot [r] = [r + \theta x]$, which is not turbulent because \mathbf{Z} is locally compact.

Definition 4.4 (Cf. [5, Definition 3.20]). A uniform relation (\mathcal{V}, E) on a space X is *generically turbulent* if:

- (i) $\forall^* x \in X$, the equivalence class of x is dense in X ,
- (ii) every equivalence class is meager, and
- (iii) $\forall^* x \in X$, any local equivalence class of x is somewhere dense.

A metric relation is called (*generically*) *turbulent* if the induced uniform relation is (generically) turbulent.

5. TURBULENCE AND GENERIC ERGODICITY

From now on, only metric relations over topological spaces will be considered because that suffices for the applications given in this paper. Some restriction on the topological structure of the space, and some compatibility of that structure with the metric relation will be required, and these are given in the following definition; they are restrictive enough to prove the desired results, and general enough to be satisfied in the applications.

Definition 5.1. A metric relation d on a space X is said to be of *type I* if:

- (i) X is Polish;
- (ii) the topology induced by d on X is finer or equal than the topology of X ; and
- (iii) there is a set $\mathcal{E} = \{E_n \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ of relations over X , with $E_m \subseteq E_n$ if $m \leq n$, and such that:
 - (a) each $E_n \in \mathcal{E}$ is symmetric,
 - (b) each $E_n \in \mathcal{E}$ is a G_δ subset of $X \times X$,
 - (c) for each $r > 0$, there are some $m \leq n$ in \mathbf{Z} so that, for all $x \in X$,
$$E_m(x) \subseteq B_d(x, r) \subseteq E_n(x),$$
 - (d) for each $n \in \mathbf{Z}$, there are $r, s > 0$ such that, for all $x \in X$,
$$B_d(x, r) \subseteq E_n(x) \subseteq B_d(x, s),$$
 - (e) each $E_n \in \mathcal{E}$ is continuous, and
 - (f) for all $k, m, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ and all $x \in X$, if $E_k \circ E_m \supseteq E_n$, then $E_k \cap (E_m(x) \times E_n(x))$ is an open relation over $E_m(x)$ and $E_n(x)$.

Remark 9. In Definition 5.1, observe the following:

- (i) Each $E_n \in \mathcal{E}$ is a G_δ subset of X and, for each $x \in X$, $E_n(x) \equiv E_n \cap (\{x\} \times X)$ is a G_δ subset of $X \equiv X \times \{x\}$. Therefore, by [7, Theorem 3.11], E_n and $E_n(x)$ are Polish subspaces of $X \times X$ and X , respectively; in particular, they are Baire spaces.
- (ii) Since $E_d^X = \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}} E$, a metric relation of type I is continuous by Lemma 2.6; however, its fibers need not be Polish spaces.

- (iii) By properties (iii)-(a),(f), for all $k, m, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ and all $x \in X$, if $E_k \circ E_n \supseteq E_m$, then $E_k \cap (E_m(x) \times E_n(x))$ is a continuous relation over $E_m(x)$ and $E_n(x)$.
- (iv) It will become clear that the general results presented in this paper hold if the metric equivalence relation is of type I only on some dense G_δ subset. For the sake of simplicity, that generality is avoided since the conditions of Definition 5.1 are satisfied in the applications to be given.
- (v) Every E_k contains the diagonal Δ_X by Definition 5.1-(iii)-(d). So $E_k \circ E_l \supseteq E_l$, for all $k, l \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Definition 5.1-(iii) holds if and only if there is a set of relations \mathcal{E}' over X such that:*

- (a') each $E \in \mathcal{E}'$ is symmetric,
- (b') each $E \in \mathcal{E}'$ is a G_δ subset of $X \times X$,
- (c') for each $r > 0$, there are some $E, F \in \mathcal{E}'$ so that, for all $x \in X$,

$$E(x) \subseteq B_d(x, r) \subseteq F(x),$$

- (d') for each $E \in \mathcal{E}'$, there are some $r, s > 0$ so that

$$B_d(x, r) \subseteq E(x) \subseteq B_d(x, s)$$

for all $x \in X$,

- (e') each $E \in \mathcal{E}'$ is continuous, and
- (f') for all $E, F, G \in \mathcal{E}'$ and $x \in X$, if $E \circ F \supseteq G$ then $E \cap (F(x) \times G(x))$ is an open relation over $F(x)$ and $G(x)$.

Proof. If \mathcal{E} satisfies (a)–(f), then it also satisfies (a')–(f').

Reciprocally, if (a')–(f') are satisfied by \mathcal{E}' , then (a)–(f) are satisfied by $\mathcal{E} = \{E_n \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$, where each E_n is chosen in \mathcal{E}' so that

$$\begin{aligned} B_d(x, n) \subseteq E_n(x) \subseteq B_d(x, n+1) & \quad \text{for integers } n \geq 0, \\ B_d(x, \frac{1}{-n+1}) \subseteq E_n(x) \subseteq B_d(x, \frac{1}{-n}) & \quad \text{for integers } n < 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 10. The variant of Definition 5.1, with the \mathcal{E}' given by Lemma 5.2 replacing \mathcal{E} , will be useful in the applications.

Lemma 5.3 (Cf. [5, Lemma 3.17]). *Let d be a metric relation of type I over a space X , and let $\mathcal{E} = \{E_n \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ be a sequence of subsets $E_n \subseteq X \times X$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 5.1. Let G be a Polish group and let Y be a Polish G -space. If $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ is an (E_d^X, E_G^Y) -invariant Borel map, then, for any neighborhood W of the identity element 1_G in G , $\forall \ell \in \mathbf{Z}$, $\forall^* x \in X$, and $\forall^* x' \in E_\ell(x)$, there is some open neighborhood U of x in X such that, $\forall k \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\forall^* x'' \in U \cap E_k(x) \cap E_\ell(x')$, $\exists g \in W$ so that $g \cdot \theta(x) = \theta(x'')$.*

Proof. Fix an open neighborhood W of 1_G in G . The result follows from Corollary 2.18 and the following Claim 1.

Claim 1. $\forall \ell \in \mathbf{Z}$, $\forall x \in X$ and $\forall^* x' \in E_\ell(x)$, there exists some open neighborhood U of x' in X such that, $\forall k \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\forall^* x'' \in U \cap E_k(x') \cap E_\ell(x)$, $\exists g \in W$ so that $g \cdot \theta(x') = \theta(x'')$.

To prove this claim, let W' be a symmetric open neighborhood of the identity $1_G \in G$ such that $W'^2 \subseteq W$. Since G is a Polish group, there are countably many elements $g_i \in G$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$, such that $G \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} W'g_i$. Therefore, given $\ell \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $x \in X$, the set $\theta(E_\ell(x)) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} W'g_i \cdot \theta(x)$. The preimage of $W'g_i \cdot \theta(x)$ via the mapping $\theta : E_\ell(x) \rightarrow Y$ is analytic in $E_\ell(x)$ because $W'g_i \cdot \theta(x)$ is analytic [7, Proposition 14.4-(ii)]. Hence it has the Baire property [7, Theorem 21.6], and so there are open subsets $O_i \subseteq E_\ell(x)$ and residual subsets $C_i \subseteq O_i$ such that $\bigcup_i O_i$ is dense in $E_\ell(x)$ and $\theta(C_i) \subseteq W'g_i \cdot \theta(x)$. By using Definition 5.1-(iii)-(f) and Remark 9-(iii),(v) applied to the relation $E_k \cap (E_\ell(x) \times E_\ell(x))$ over $E_\ell(x)$, and by Corollary 2.19-(ii) and Example 2.5-(iii), it follows that there is some residual $D_i \subseteq C_i$ such that $E_k(x') \cap D_i$ is residual in $E_k(x') \cap O_i$ for all $x' \in D_i$ and $k \in \mathbf{Z}$.

The union $A = \bigcup_i D_i$ is residual in $E_\ell(x)$. If $x' \in A$, then $x' \in D_i$ for some i and so $\theta(x') = g'g_i \cdot \theta(x)$ for some $g' \in W'$. Let U be any open neighborhood of x' in X so that $U \cap E_\ell(x) \subseteq O_i$. Then, $\forall k \in \mathbf{N}$, $U \cap E_k(x') \cap D_i$ is residual in $U \cap E_k(x') \cap E_\ell(x)$. Moreover, for each $x'' \in E_k(x') \cap D_i$, there is $g'' \in W'$ so that $\theta(x'') = g''g_i \cdot \theta(x)$. Therefore, if

$$g = g''g'^{-1} \in W'W'^{-1} \subseteq W,$$

then

$$g \cdot \theta(x') = gg'g_i \cdot \theta(x) = g''g_i \cdot \theta(x) = \theta(x''),$$

which completes the proof of Claim 1. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Under the conditions of Lemma 5.3, for every neighborhood W of the identity $1_G \in G$ and, $\forall^* x \in X$, $\exists k \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that, $\forall^* x' \in E_k(x)$, $\exists g \in W$ for which $g \cdot \theta(x) = \theta(x')$.*

Proof. Let $\ell \in \mathbf{Z}$ and let W be an open neighborhood of 1_G in G . Then, $\forall^* x \in X$ and $\forall^* x' \in E_\ell(x)$, let U be an open neighborhood of x in X satisfying the statement of Lemma 5.3. By Definition 5.1-(ii),(iii)-(c), there is $k \leq \ell$ so that $E_k(x) \subseteq U$, obtaining that, $\forall^* x'' \in E_k(x) \cap E_\ell(x')$, $\exists g \in W$ so that $g \cdot \theta(x) = \theta(x'')$. Then the result follows from Theorem 2.17, Definition 5.1-(iii)-(f) and Remark 9-(iii) with the relation $E_\ell \cap (E_\ell(x') \times E_k(x'))$ over $E_\ell(x')$ and $E_k(x')$. \square

Theorem 5.5 (Cf. [5, Theorem 3.18]). *Let d be a metric relation of type I on a space X and let Y be a Polish S_∞ -space. If there are residually many $x \in X$ for which every local equivalence class of x is somewhere dense, then E_d^X is generically $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodic.*

Proof. Let $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ be an $(E_d^X, E_{S_\infty}^Y)$ -invariant Borel map. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{E_n \mid n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ be a sequence of subsets of $E_x \subseteq X \times X$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 5.1. The sets

$$W_N = \{h \in S_\infty \mid \forall \ell \leq N, h(\ell) = \ell\},$$

with $N \in \mathbf{N}$, which are open and closed subgroups, form a base of neighborhoods of the identity $1_{S_\infty} \in S_\infty$. Define $I : X \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ by setting $I(x, N)$ equal to the least $\ell \in \mathbf{N}$ such that, $\forall^* x' \in E_{-\ell}(x)$, $\exists h \in W_N$ so that $h \cdot \theta(x) = \theta(x')$ if

there is such ℓ , and setting $I(x, N) = \infty$ if there is not such ℓ . Let \mathbf{N} and $\mathbf{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ be endowed with the discrete topologies.

Claim 2. The map I is Baire measurable.

Since $S_N = \{(y, h \cdot y) \mid y \in Y, h \in W_N\}$, $N \in \mathbf{N}$, is analytic in $Y \times Y$, and $E_{-\ell}$, $\ell \in \mathbf{N}$, is a Polish space by Remark 9-(i), the set $R_{\ell, N} = E_{-\ell} \cap (\theta \times \theta)^{-1}(S_N)$ is analytic in $E_{-\ell}$ [7, Proposition 14.4-(ii)], and therefore it has the Baire property [7, Theorem 21.6]. Hence there is an open set $U_{\ell, N} \subseteq E_{-\ell}$ such that $R_{\ell, N} \Delta U_{\ell, N}$ is meager in $E_{-\ell}$. The restriction $E_{-\ell} \rightarrow X$ of the first factor projection $X \times X \rightarrow X$ is continuous and open by Lemma 2.3, so its graph $\Pi_\ell \subseteq E_{-\ell} \times X$ is a bi-continuous relation (Example 2.5-(i)). By Theorem 2.17-(ii), there is a residual set $D_{\ell, N} \subseteq X$ such that, $\forall x \in D_{\ell, N}$, $(R_{\ell, N} \Delta U_{\ell, N}) \cap \Pi_\ell^{\text{op}}(x)$ is meager in $\Pi_\ell^{\text{op}}(x)$. Note that $\Pi_\ell^{\text{op}}(x) = \{x\} \times E_{-\ell}(x) \equiv E_{-\ell}(x)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} (R_{\ell, N} \Delta U_{\ell, N}) \cap \Pi_\ell^{\text{op}}(x) &= \{x\} \times (R_{\ell, N}(x) \Delta U_{\ell, N}(x)) \\ &\equiv R_{\ell, N}(x) \Delta U_{\ell, N}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\forall x \in D_{\ell, N}$, $R_{\ell, N}(x) \Delta U_{\ell, N}(x)$ is meager in $E_{-\ell}(x)$. On the other hand,

$$I^{-1}(\{0, \dots, \ell\}) = \bigcup_{N=0}^{\infty} (Q_{\ell, N} \times \{N\}),$$

where

$$Q_{\ell, N} = \{x \in X \mid (E_{-\ell} \cap R_N)(x) \text{ is residual in } E_{-\ell}(x)\}.$$

Since

$$Q_{\ell, N} \cap D_{\ell, N} = \{x \in D_{\ell, N} \mid (E_{-\ell} \cap U_N)(x) \text{ is dense in } E_{-\ell}(x)\},$$

it follows that $Q_{\ell, N}$ has the Baire property in X by Lemmas 2.7 and 2.9-(ii), and the proof of Claim 2 is finished.

By [7, Theorem 8.38], Claim 2, and Corollary 5.4, there is a dense G_δ subset $C_0 \subseteq X$ such that θ is continuous on C_0 , I is continuous on $C_0 \times \mathbf{N}$, and $I(C_0 \times \mathbf{N}) \subseteq \mathbf{N}$.

For $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, a non-empty open set $U \subseteq X$ and $x \in U$, define

$$\mathcal{Q}(x, U, k) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (E_k \cap (U \times U))^i(x).$$

The following properties are consequences of Definition 5.1-(iii)-(c),(d):

- for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}(x, U, k) \subseteq E_d^X(x, U, \epsilon)$ for all $x \in U$, and
- for each $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $E_d^X(x, U, \epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(x, U, k)$ for all $x \in U$.

Hence, by hypothesis, there is a residual set $C_1 \subseteq X$ such that, for any U , x and k as above, if $x \in C_1$, then $\mathcal{Q}(x, U, k)$ is somewhere dense. By Corollary 2.19-(ii), there is a residual set $C \subseteq C_0 \cap C_1$ such that, for all $x \in C$ and all $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, $E_k(x) \cap C$ is residual in $E_k(x)$.

Fix x, y in C and a complete metric inducing the topology of Y .

Claim 3. There exist sequences, (x_i) and (y_i) in C with $x_1 = x$ and $y_1 = y$, (g_i) and (h_i) in S_∞ , (U_i) and (V_i) consisting of open subsets of X , and (n_i) and (k_i) in \mathbf{N} , such that:

- (i) $g_i \cdot \theta(x) = \theta(x_i)$;
- (ii) $h_i \cdot \theta(y) = \theta(y_i)$;
- (iii) $x_{i+1} \in U_{i+1} \cap C \cap \mathcal{Q}(x_i, U_i, -n_i)$;
- (iv) $y_{i+1} \in V_{i+1} \cap C \cap \mathcal{Q}(y_i, V_i, -k_i)$;
- (v) $U_i \supseteq V_i \supseteq U_{i+1}$;
- (vi) $\text{diam}(\theta(U_i \cap C)) < 2^{-i}$;
- (vii) $(U_{i+1} \cap C) \times \{N_{i+1}\} \subseteq I^{-1}(n_{i+1})$ for

$$N_{i+1} = \max\{g_{i+1}(\ell), g_{i+1}^{-1}(\ell) \mid \ell \leq i+1\};$$

- (viii) $(V_{i+1} \cap C) \times \{K_i\} \subseteq I^{-1}(k_i)$ for

$$K_i = \max\{h_i(\ell), h_i^{-1}(\ell) \mid \ell \leq i\};$$

- (ix) $g_{j+1}(\ell) = g_{i+1}(\ell)$ and $g_{j+1}^{-1}(\ell) = g_{i+1}^{-1}(\ell)$ for $\ell \leq i+1 \leq j+1$;
- (x) $h_j(\ell) = h_i(\ell)$ and $h_j^{-1}(\ell) = h_i^{-1}(\ell)$ for $\ell \leq i \leq j$;
- (xi) $\mathcal{Q}(x_i, U_i, -n_i) \cap V_i$ is dense in V_i ; and
- (xii) $\mathcal{Q}(y_i, V_i, -k_i) \cap U_{i+1}$ is dense in U_{i+1} .

If this assertion is true, then there exist $g = \lim_i g_i$ and $h = \lim_i h_i$ in S_∞ by Claim 3-(ix),(x), and so $g \cdot \theta(x) = h \cdot \theta(y)$ by Claim 3-(i)–(vi), proving Theorem 5.5.

The construction of the sequences of Claim 3 is made by induction on $i \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $x_0 = x$, $U_0 = X$, $n_0 = 0$ and $g_0 = h_0 = 1_{S_\infty}$, and choose V_0 and k_0 so that $y \in V_0$ and

$$(V_0 \cap C) \times \{0\} \subseteq I^{-1}(k_0).$$

Suppose that all the members with indices $\leq i \in \mathbf{N}$ of these sequences have been constructed. Then x_{i+1} , g_{i+1} and U_{i+1} are constructed in the following manner. (The constructions of y_{i+1} , h_{i+1} and V_{i+1} are analogous.)

Let $U \subseteq V_i$ be a non-empty open set such that $\mathcal{Q}(y_i, V_i, -k_i) \cap U$ is dense in U , and such that $\text{diam}(\theta(U \cap C)) < 2^{-i-1}$ (which is possible because θ is continuous on C_0). Choose $x_{i+1} \in \mathcal{Q}(x_i, U_i, -n_i) \cap U$, and take $z_0, \dots, z_k \in U_i$ so that $z_0 = x_i$, $z_k = x_{i+1}$ and $z_a \in E_{-n_i}(z_{a-1})$ for $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. You may assume that $i > 0$ because (ix) does not restrict the choice of g_1 .

Claim 4. We can assume that $z_a \in C$ for all $a \in \{0, \dots, k\}$.

Claim 4 is proved by showing that for each $a \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ there exists

$$z'_a \in U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a})^{-1}(P_U) \cap C$$

so that $z'_0 = x_i$ and, for $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $z'_a \in E_{-n_i}(z'_{a-1})$; then we can choose $x'_{i+1} = z'_k$ instead of x_{i+1} , and z'_a instead of z_a . We have

$$z'_0 = x_i \in U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^k)^{-1}(P_U) \cap C.$$

Suppose that z'_a has been constructed for $a < k$. Since $z'_a \in C$ and $E_{-n_i}^{k-a-1}$ is continuous by Lemma 2.8-(i), the set

$$E_{n_i}(z'_a) \cap U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a-1})^{-1}(P_U) \cap C$$

is residual in $E_{n_i}(z'_a) \cap U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a-1})^{-1}(P_U)$. So, by Remark 9-(i), there is

$$z'_{a+1} \in E_{n_i}(z'_a) \cap U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a-1})^{-1}(P_U) \cap C,$$

as desired for the proof of Claim 4.

Continuing with the proof of Claim 3, Claim 4 gives $I(z_a, N_i) = n_i$ for all $a \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ by the induction hypothesis with Claim 3-(vii).

Claim 5. We can assume that, for each $a < k$, there exists some $f_a \in W_{N_i}$ such that $f_a \cdot \theta(z_a) = \theta(z_{a+1})$.

As in Claim 4, we show that the condition of this claim is satisfied by a new finite sequence of points

$$z'_a \in U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a})^{-1}(P_U) \cap C$$

so that $z'_0 = x_i$ and, for $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $z'_a \in E_{-n_i}(z'_{a-1})$; in particular, $I(z'_a, N_i) = n_i$ as above. This new sequence is constructed by induction on a . First, let $z'_0 = x_i$, and suppose that z'_a was constructed for all $a < k$. Since $I(z'_a, N_i) = n_i$, $\forall^* z \in E_{-n_i}(z'_a)$, $\exists f \in W_{N_i}$ so that $f \cdot \theta(z_a) = \theta(z)$. So the set of points

$$z \in E_{-n_i}(z'_a) \cap U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a-1})^{-1}(P_U) \cap C$$

such that $\exists f \in W_{N_i}$ so that $f \cdot \theta(z_a) = \theta(z)$ is residual in

$$E_{-n_i}(z'_a) \cap U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a-1})^{-1}(P_U) \cap C.$$

Hence $f_a \cdot \theta(z'_a) = \theta(z'_{a+1})$ for some $f_a \in W_{N_i}$ and some

$$z'_{a+1} \in E_{-n_i}(z'_a) \cap U_i \cap (E_{-n_i}^{k-a-1})^{-1}(P_U) \cap C$$

by Remark 9-(i), completing the proof of Claim 5.

According to Claim 5, $f_i^* \cdot \theta(x_i) = \theta(x_{i+1})$ for $f_i^* = f_{k-1} \cdots f_0 \in W_{N_i}$. Then let $g_{i+1} = f_i^* g_i$. Moreover we can take some open neighborhood U_{i+1} of x_{i+1} in U and some $n_{i+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{diam}(\theta(U_{i+1} \cap C)) < 2^{-i-1}$ and

$$(U_{i+1} \cap C) \times \{N_{i+1}\} \subseteq I^{-1}(n_{i+1}),$$

where N_{i+1} is defined according Claim 3-(vii). These choices of x_{i+1} , g_{i+1} , U_{i+1} and n_{i+1} satisfy the conditions of Claim 3. \square

Remark 11. The proofs of Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.5 are directly inspired by those of [5, Lemma 3.17 and Theorem 3.18].

6. A CLASS OF TURBULENT METRIC RELATIONS

Let X be a set, and let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_{R,r} \subseteq X \times X \mid R, r > 0\}$ be a set of relations over X that satisfy the following hypothesis.

- Hypothesis 1.* (i) $\bigcap_{R,r>0} U_{R,r} = \Delta_X$;
(ii) each $U_{R,r}$ is symmetric;
(iii) if $R \leq S$, then $U_{R,r} \supseteq U_{S,r}$ for all $r > 0$;
(iv) $U_{R,r} = \bigcup_{s<r} U_{R,s}$ for all $R, r > 0$; and
(v) there is some function $\phi : (\mathbf{R}_+)^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ such that, for all $R, S, r, s > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} R &\leq \phi(R, r), \\ (R \leq S, r \leq s) &\implies \phi(R, r) \leq \phi(S, s), \\ U_{\phi(R,r+s),r} \circ U_{\phi(R,r+s),s} &\subseteq U_{R,r+s}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hypothesis 1, the sets $U_{R,r}$ form a base of entourages of a Hausdorff uniformity, also denoted by \mathcal{U} , on X . This uniformity is metrizable because the entourages $U_{n,1/n}$, $n \in \mathbf{Z}_+$, form a countable base for it.

For each $r > 0$, let $E_r = \bigcap_{R>0} U_{R,r}$. This set is symmetric by Hypothesis 1-(ii); moreover

$$E_s \circ E_r \subseteq E_{r+s}, \quad (16)$$

for $r, s > 0$, by Hypothesis 1-(v).

Lemma 6.1. *For $R, r > 0$ and $S = \phi(\phi(R, r), r)$ (where ϕ is the function given in Hypothesis 1-(v)), the set $U_{S,r} \subseteq \text{Int}(U_{R,r})$.*

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in U_{S,r}$. By Hypothesis 1-(iv), there is some $r_0 < r$ such that $(x, y) \in U_{S,r_0}$. Let $r_1 = \frac{r-r_0}{2}$. By Hypothesis 1-(v),

$$\begin{aligned} U_{S,r_1} \circ U_{S,r_0} \circ U_{S,r_1} &\subseteq U_{\phi(\phi(R,r), \frac{r+r_0}{2}), r_1} \circ U_{\phi(\phi(R,r), \frac{r+r_0}{2}), r_0} \circ U_{\phi(R,r), r_1} \\ &\subseteq U_{\phi(R,r), \frac{r+r_0}{2}} \circ U_{\phi(R,r), r_1} \subseteq U_{R,r}. \end{aligned}$$

So, by Hypothesis 1-(ii), $U_{S,r_1}(x) \times U_{S,r_1}(y) \subseteq U_{R,r}$, which implies that $(x, y) \in \text{Int}(U_{R,r})$. \square

Corollary 6.2. *For each $r > 0$, the set $E_r = \bigcap_{R>0} \text{Int}(U_{R,r})$.*

Hypothesis 1-(iii) and Corollary 6.2 imply that $E_r = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{Int}(U_{n,r})$ for all $r > 0$ and so E_r is a G_δ subset of $X \times X$. Hence the relations E_r satisfy Proposition 5.2-(a'),(b').

Let $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be defined by

$$d(x, y) = \inf\{r > 0 \mid (x, y) \in E_r\}, \quad (17)$$

where $\inf \emptyset = \infty$, so $d(x, y) = \infty$ if $x \notin \bigcup_{r>0} E_r(y)$. It easily follows from Hypothesis 1 that d is a metric relation over X . Note also that, for $0 < r < s$,

$$B_d(x, r) \subseteq E_r(x) \subseteq B_d(x, s),$$

and therefore

$$E_d^X = \bigcup_{r>0} E_r, \quad (18)$$

and $B_d(x, r) \subseteq U_{R,r}(x)$ for all $R, r > 0$ and all $x \in X$, which implies that the topology induced by d on X is finer than the topology induced by the uniformity \mathcal{U} on X . Consequently, d satisfies conditions (ii) of Definition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2-(c'),(d') with the relations E_r .

Example 6.3. Let $d_R, R > 0$, be pseudo-metrics on a set, X , such that

$$R \leq S \implies d_R \leq d_S, \quad (19)$$

$$(\forall R > 0, d_R(x, y) = 0) \implies x = y. \quad (20)$$

Then the sets

$$U_{R,r} = \{ (x, y) \in X \times X \mid d_R(x, y) < r \}$$

satisfy Hypothesis 1; in particular, Hypothesis 1-(v) holds with $\phi(R, r) = R$ since the triangle inequality of each d_R and (19) give

$$U_{R,r} \circ U_{S,s} \subseteq U_{\min\{R,S\}, r+s}, \quad (21)$$

for all $R, S, r, s > 0$. It follows that $U_{R,r}(x)$ is open for all $x \in X$ and all $R, r > 0$. In this case, the relations $U_{R,r}$ induce the topology defined by the set of pseudo-metrics $\{d_R\}$, and the corresponding sets E_r define the metric relation $d = \sup_{R>0} d_R$.

For d (the metric equivalence relation given by (17)) satisfies the remaining conditions of Definition 5.1, further hypothesis are required.

- Hypothesis 2.* (i) X is a Polish space (with the topology induced by the uniformity \mathcal{U});
(ii) for all $R, r, s > 0$ and $x \in X$, if $y \in E_s(x)$, then there are some $T, t > 0$ such that $U_{T,t}(y) \subseteq E_s \circ U_{R,r}(x)$; and,
(iii) for all $r, s > 0$ and $x \in X$, if $y \in E_s(x)$ and V is a neighborhood of y in X , then there is a neighborhood W of y in X such that

$$E_r(W) \cap E_r(E_s(x)) \subseteq E_r(V \cap E_s(x)).$$

Proposition 6.4. *If \mathcal{U} satisfies Hypothesis 2, then d is of type I.*

Proof. It only remains to show that d satisfies Proposition 5.2-(e'),(f').

Hypothesis 2-(ii) simply means that E_s is open and hence continuous because it is symmetric.

Let $r, s, t > 0, x \in X$ and $y \in E_s(x)$. Suppose that $E_r \circ E_s \supseteq E_t$, and let V be a neighborhood of y in X . By Hypothesis 2-(iii), there is some open neighborhood W of y in X such that

$$E_r(W) \cap E_t(x) \subseteq E_r(W) \cap E_r(E_s(x)) \subseteq E_r(V \cap E_s(x)).$$

Since $E_r(W)$ is open in X , this proves that $E_r \cap (E_s(x) \times E_t(x))$ is an open relation over $E_s(x)$ and $E_t(x)$. \square

Remark 12. In some applications, the following condition, which is stronger than Hypothesis 2-(ii), is satisfied: for all $R, r, s > 0$, there are some $T, t > 0$ such that $U_{T,t} \circ E_s \subseteq E_s \circ U_{R,r}$. This means that each E_s is “uniformly open” (or “uniformly continuous,” because it is symmetric).

The metric equivalence relation d will be shown to be turbulent under the following additional hypothesis.

- Hypothesis 3.* (i) E_d^X has more than one equivalence class;
(ii) for each x, y in X and each $R, r > 0$, there is $s > 0$ such that $U_{R,r}(x) \cap E_s(y) \neq \emptyset$; and
(iii) for each $x \in X$ and each $R, r > 0$, there are $S, s > 0$, a dense subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq U_{S,s}(x) \cap E_d^X(x)$, and a d -dense subset of \mathcal{D} such that every pair of points in \mathcal{D} can be joined by a d -continuous path in $U_{R,r}(x)$.

Lemma 6.5. *The relation E_d^X is minimal.*

Proof. This follows from Hypothesis 3-(ii) and (18). \square

Lemma 6.6. *If $r < s$, then, for all $x \in X$, $\overline{E_r(x)} \subseteq E_s(x)$.*

Proof. If $y \in \overline{E_r(x)}$ and $R > 0$, then $U_{\phi(R,s),s-r}(y) \cap U_{\phi(R,s),r}(x) \neq \emptyset$. So $y \in \bigcap_{R>0} U_{R,s} = E_s(x)$ by Hypothesis 1-(ii),(v). \square

Lemma 6.7. *For all $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, $\text{Int}(E_r(x)) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{Int}(E_r(x)) \neq \emptyset$. Then, for each $y \in X$, the intersection $E_s(y) \cap E_r(x) \neq \emptyset$ for some $s > 0$, by Lemma 6.5 and (18). Therefore $y \in E_{r+s}(x)$ by (16). So $X = E_d^X(x)$ by (18), contradicting Hypothesis 3-(i). \square

Proposition 6.8. *The relation E_d^X is turbulent.*

Proof. The relation E_d^X is minimal by Lemma 6.5. Each equivalence class of E_d^X is meager by Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7 and (18). Finally, the local equivalence classes of E_d^X are somewhere dense because of Hypothesis 3-(iii). \square

Theorem 5.5, and Propositions 6.4 and 6.8 have the following immediate consequence.

Proposition 6.9. *For any Polish S_∞ -space Y , the relation E_d^X is generically $E_{S_\infty}^Y$ -ergodic.*

Remark 13. If we also assume that, for all $r > 0$ and residually many $x, y \in X$, there exists $s_0 > 0$ such that $E_s(y) \setminus E_r(x)$ is dense in $E_s(y)$ for all $s > s_0$, then the proof of [5, Theorem 8.2] can be adapted to show that $E_d^X \not\leq_B E_G^Y$ for any Polish group G and any Polish G -space Y . However the proof is not given because, in the applications, this is proved in [1].

7. THE SUPREMUM METRIC RELATION

A concrete case of Example 6.3 is $C(\mathbf{R})$, the space of real valued continuous functions on \mathbf{R} endowed with the compact-open topology, and the supremum metric relation, d_∞ , which is induced by the supremum norm, $\| \cdot \|_\infty$, defined by $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}} |f(x)|$. For each $R > 0$, let d_R be the pseudo-metric on $C(\mathbf{R})$ induced by the semi-norm $\| \cdot \|_R$ given by $\|f\|_R = \sup_{|x| < R} |f(x)|$. Clearly, this set $\{d_R \mid R > 0\}$ of pseudo-metrics satisfies the conditions (19) and (20), and induces the compact-open topology of $C(\mathbf{R})$. Moreover $d_\infty = \sup_{R > 0} d_R$. In this case, each $U_{R,r}$ (respectively, E_r) consists of the pairs (f, g) that satisfy $\|f - g\|_R < r$ (respectively, $|f(x) - g(x)| < r$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$).

Write $E_\infty = E_{d_\infty}^{C(\mathbf{R})}$, and $B_\infty(f, r) = B_{d_\infty}(f, r)$ for each $f \in C(\mathbf{R})$ and $r > 0$. Then $f E_\infty g$ if and only if $f - g$ is bounded; in particular, the bounded functions of $C(\mathbf{R})$ form an equivalence class of E_∞ .

Theorem 1.1 for (d_∞, E_∞) follows from Propositions 6.4 and 6.8–6.9 once Hypotheses 1–3 are shown to hold.

Remark 14. Let $C_b(\mathbf{R}) \subseteq C(\mathbf{R})$ be the subset of bounded continuous functions. The sum of functions makes the space $C(\mathbf{R})$ into a Polish group, and $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ into a subgroup. The orbit relation of the action of $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ on $C(\mathbf{R})$ given by translation is E_∞ and there is no Polish topology on $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ with respect to which this action is continuous [1].

For instance, consider the restriction of the compact-open topology to $C_b(\mathbf{R})$. Then the action of $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ on $C(\mathbf{R})$ is continuous, $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ is metrizable because $C(\mathbf{R})$ is completely metrizable, and $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ is separable because it contains $C_0(\mathbf{R})$, which is dense in $C(\mathbf{R})$ and separable (by the Stone-Weierstrass theorem). But $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ is not completely metrizable with the compact-open topology; in particular, it is not closed in $C(\mathbf{R})$.

Consider now the topology on $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ induced by $\| \cdot \|_\infty$. Then the action of $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ on $C(\mathbf{R})$ is continuous, and $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ is completely metrizable; indeed, it is a Banach algebra with $\| \cdot \|_\infty$. However $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ is not separable with $\| \cdot \|_\infty$, which can be shown as follows. For each $x \in \{\pm 1\}^{\mathbf{Z}}$, let $\tilde{x} \in C_b(\mathbf{R})$ be the function whose graph is the union of segments between all consecutive points in the graph of x . Then $\{B_\infty(\tilde{x}, 1) \mid x \in \{\pm 1\}^{\mathbf{Z}}\}$ is an uncountable set of disjoint open subsets of $C_b(\mathbf{R})$. So $C_b(\mathbf{R})$ is not second countable, and therefore it is not separable.

According to Example 6.3, the sets $U_{R,r}$ satisfy Hypothesis 1 and induce d_∞ . In this case, the inclusion (16) becomes the equality

$$E_r \circ E_s = E_{r+s} \tag{22}$$

for all $r, s > 0$; this holds because, if $g \in E_{r+s}(f)$, then

$$f + \frac{s}{r+s}(g-f) \in E_r(g) \cap E_s(f).$$

It is well known that $C(\mathbf{R})$ is Polish (Hypothesis 2-(i)). The following lemma shows that Hypothesis 2-(ii) is satisfied in this case.

Lemma 7.1. *For all $R, r, s > 0$, $U_{R,r} \circ E_s = E_s \circ U_{R,r} = U_{R,r+s}$.*

Proof. If $S \geq R$, then, for all $f, g, h \in C(\mathbf{R})$,

$$d_R(f, h) \leq d_R(f, g) + d_R(g, h) \leq d_R(f, g) + d_S(g, h),$$

because $d_R \leq d_S$. This implies that $U_{R,r} \circ U_{S,s}$ and $U_{S,s} \circ U_{R,r}$ are both contained in $U_{R,r+s}$, which in turn implies that $U_{R,r} \circ E_s$ and $E_s \circ U_{R,r}$ are both contained in $U_{R,r+s}$.

To prove the reverse inclusions, let $f \in C(\mathbf{R})$ and $g \in U_{R,r+s}(f)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h_0 &= f + \frac{s}{r+s}(g-f) \in U_{R,s}(f) \cap U_{R,r}(g), \\ h_1 &= f + \frac{r}{r+s}(g-f) \in U_{R,r}(f) \cap U_{R,s}(g). \end{aligned}$$

By continuity, $h_0 \in U_{S,s}(f)$ and $h_1 \in U_{S,s}(g)$ for some $S > R$. Let $\lambda : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be any continuous function such that $\text{supp } \lambda \subseteq [-S, S]$ and $\lambda \equiv 1$ on $[-R, R]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f + \lambda(h_0 - f) &\in E_s(f) \cap U_{R,r}(g), \\ g + \lambda(h_1 - g) &\in U_{R,r}(f) \cap E_s(g), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $g \in (U_{R,r} \circ E_s)(f) \cap (E_s \circ U_{R,r})(f)$. \square

Corollary 7.2. *If $R, S, r, s > 0$, then $U_{R,r} \circ U_{S,s} = U_{\min\{R,S\}, r+s}$.*

Proof. The inclusion “ \subseteq ” is (21), and “ \supseteq ” follows from Lemma 7.1. \square

Lemma 7.3. *If $T, r, s, t > 0$, $f \in C(\mathbf{R})$ and $g \in E_s(f)$ are such that $U_{T,t'}(g) \subseteq U_{T,s}(f)$ for some $t' > t$, then*

$$U_{T,t+r}(g) \cap E_{r+s}(f) = E_r(U_{T,t}(g) \cap E_s(f)). \quad (23)$$

Proof. The inclusion “ \supseteq ” follows from (16) and Lemma 7.1. To prove “ \subseteq ”, let $h \in U_{T,t+r}(g) \cap E_{r+s}(f)$. By (22) and Lemma 7.1, there are $g_0 \in E_r(h) \cap U_{T,t}(g)$ and $f_0 \in E_r(h) \cap E_s(f)$. By continuity, $g_0 \in U_{T',t}(g) \subseteq U_{T',s}(f)$ for some $T' > T$. Let $\lambda : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be any continuous function such that $\text{supp } \lambda \subseteq [-T', T']$ and $\lambda \equiv 1$ on $[-T, T]$. Then

$$f_0 + \lambda(g_0 - f_0) \in E_r(h) \cap U_{T,t}(g) \cap E_s(f),$$

and so $h \in E_r(U_{T,t}(g) \cap E_s(f))$. \square

Corollary 7.4. *The supremum metric relation d_∞ satisfies Hypothesis 2-(iii).*

Proof. Let $r, s > 0$, $f \in C(\mathbf{R})$, $g \in E_s(f)$, and V a neighborhood g in $C(\mathbf{R})$. Since V can be chosen as small as desired, we can assume that $V = U_{T,t}(g)$ for some $T, t > 0$. Since $g \in E_s(f) \subseteq U_{T,s}(f)$, there is $t' > 0$ such that $U_{T,t'}(g) \subseteq U_{T,s}(f)$, and we can also suppose that $t < t'$, obtaining (23) by Lemma 7.3. But (23) gives the inclusion of Hypothesis 2-(iii) for $W = V$ by (22) and Lemma 7.1. \square

The fact that E_∞ has more than one class (Hypothesis 3-(i)) is obvious because $d_\infty(f, g) = \infty$ if f is bounded and g unbounded. Hypotheses 3-(ii),(iii) is a consequence of the following lemmas.

Lemma 7.5. *For every $f, g \in C(\mathbf{R})$ and every $R, r > 0$, if $s > d_{R'}(f, g)$ for some $R' > R$, then $U_{R,r}(f) \cap E_s(g) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a continuous function such that $\text{supp } \lambda \subseteq [-R', R']$ and $\lambda \equiv 1$ on $[-R, R]$. Then $g + \lambda(f - g) \in U_{R,r}(f) \cap E_s(g)$. \square

Lemma 7.6. *For every $R, r > 0$ and every $f \in C(\mathbf{R})$, the set $U_{R,r}(f) \cap E_\infty(f)$ is d_∞ -path connected.*

Proof. For every $g \in U_{R,r}(f) \cap E_\infty(f)$, the mapping $t \mapsto tf + (1 - t)g$ defines a d_∞ -continuous path in $U_{R,r}(f) \cap E_\infty(f)$ from g to f . \square

Remark 15. The symmetric relations over $C(\mathbf{R})$ with fibers the balls $B_\infty(f, r)$ cannot be used instead of the relations E_r to show that d_∞ is of type I. For instance, each ball $B_\infty(f, r)$ is not G_δ in $C(\mathbf{R})$; otherwise it would be Polish, and therefore it would be a Baire space with the induced topology. But \emptyset is residual in $B_\infty(f, r)$ for all $r > 0$, as the following argument shows. Let (r_n) and (R_n) be sequences such that $0 < r_n \uparrow r$ and $0 < R_n \uparrow \infty$. For each n , let U_n be the set of functions $g \in B_\infty(f, r)$ such that

$$\sup_{|x| > R_n} |f(x) - g(x)| > r_n.$$

The sets U_n are open and dense in $B_\infty(f, r)$ and their intersection is empty.

8. THE GROMOV SPACE

In this section, we recall from [1] some basic definitions and properties concerning the Gromov space, and also prove some new results.

Let M be a metric space and let d_M , or simply d , be its distance function. The *Hausdorff distance* between two non-empty subsets, $A, B \subseteq M$, is given by

$$H_d(A, B) = \max \left\{ \sup_{a \in A} \inf_{b \in B} d(a, b), \sup_{b \in B} \inf_{a \in A} d(a, b) \right\}.$$

Note that $H_d(A, B) = H_d(\overline{A}, \overline{B})$, and $H_d(A, B) = 0$ if and only if $\overline{A} = \overline{B}$. Also, it is well known and easy to prove that H_d satisfies the triangle inequality, and that its restriction to the set of non-empty compact subsets of M is finite valued, and defines there a complete metric if M is complete.

Let M and N be arbitrary non-empty metric spaces. A metric on $M \sqcup N$ is called *admissible* if its restrictions to M and N are d_M and d_N , where M and N are identified with their canonical injections in $M \sqcup N$. The *Gromov-Hausdorff distance* (or *GH distance*) between M and N is defined by

$$d_{GH}(M, N) = \inf_d H_d(M, N),$$

where the infimum is taken over all admissible metrics d on $M \sqcup N$. It is well known that $d_{GH}(M, N) = d_{GH}(\overline{M}, \overline{N})$, where \overline{M} and \overline{N} denote the completions of M and N , $d_{GH}(M, N) = 0$ if \overline{M} and \overline{N} are isometric, d_{GH} satisfies the triangle inequality, and $d_{GH}(M, N) < \infty$ if \overline{M} and \overline{N} are compact.

There is also a pointed version of d_{GH} which satisfies analogous properties: the (*pointed*) *Gromov-Hausdorff distance* (or *GH distance*) between two pointed metric spaces, (M, x) and (N, y) , is defined by

$$d_{GH}(M, x; N, y) = \inf_d \max\{d(x, y), H_d(M, N)\}, \quad (24)$$

where the infimum is taken over all admissible metrics d on $M \sqcup N$.

If X is any metric space and $f : M \rightarrow X$ and $g : N \rightarrow X$ are isometric injections, then it is also well known that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{GH}(M, N) &\leq H_{d_X}(f(M), g(N)), \\ d_{GH}(M, x; N, y) &\leq \max\{d_X(f(x), g(y)), H_{d_X}(f(M), g(N))\}; \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

indeed, these inequalities follow by considering, for each $\epsilon > 0$, the unique admissible metric d_ϵ on $M \sqcup N$ satisfying, for all $u \in M$ and $v \in N$,

$$d_\epsilon(u, v) = d_X(f(u), g(v)) + \epsilon.$$

A metric space, or its distance function, is called *proper* (or *Heine-Borel*) if every open ball has compact closure. This condition is equivalent to the compactness of the closed balls, which means that the distance function to a fixed point is a proper function. Any proper metric space is complete and locally compact, and its cardinality is not greater than the cardinality of the continuum. Therefore it may be assumed that their underlying sets are subsets of \mathbf{R} . With this assumption, it makes sense to consider the set \mathcal{M}_* of isometry classes, $[M, x]$, of pointed proper metric spaces, (M, x) . The set \mathcal{M}_* is endowed with a topology introduced by M. Gromov [4, Section 6], [3], which can be described as follows.

For a metric space X , two subspaces, $M, N \subseteq X$, two points, $x \in M$ and $y \in N$, and a real number $R > 0$, let $H_{d_X, R}(M, x; N, y)$ be given by

$$H_{d_X, R}(M, x; N, y) = \max \left\{ \sup_{u \in B_M(x, R)} d_X(u, N), \sup_{v \in B_N(y, R)} d_X(v, M) \right\}.$$

Then, for $R, r > 0$, let $U_{R, r} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_* \times \mathcal{M}_*$ denote the subset of pairs $([M, x], [N, y])$ for which there is an admissible metric, d , on $M \sqcup N$ so that

$$\max\{d(x, y), H_{d, R}(M, x; N, y)\} < r.$$

The following lemma is obtained exactly like (25).

Lemma 8.1. *For $([M, x], [N, y]) \in \mathcal{M}_* \times \mathcal{M}_*$ to be in $U_{R, r}$ it suffices that there exists a metric space, X , and isometric injections, $f : M \rightarrow X$ and $g : N \rightarrow X$, such that*

$$\max\{d_X(f(x), g(y)), H_{d_X, R}(f(M), f(x); g(N), g(y))\} < r.$$

The following notation will be used: for a relation E on \mathcal{M}_* and $[M, x] \in \mathcal{M}_*$, $E([M, x])$ will be simply written as $E(M, x)$, and for a metric relation d on \mathcal{M}_* and $[M, x], [N, y] \in \mathcal{M}_*$, $d([M, x], [N, y])$ will be denote by $d(M, x; N, y)$.

The sets $U_{R, r}$ satisfy Hypothesis 1 [1, Lemma 2.1]; in particular, Hypothesis 1-(v) is satisfied as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 8.2 ([1, Lemma 2.1-(v)]). *If $R, r, s > 0$, then $U_{S,r} \circ U_{S,s} \subseteq U_{R,r+s}$, where $S = R + 2 \max\{r, s\}$.*

Since the sets $U_{R,r}$ satisfy Hypothesis 1, they form a base of entourages for a metrizable uniformity on \mathcal{M}_* . Endowed with the induced topology, \mathcal{M}_* is what is called the *Gromov space*. It is well known that \mathcal{M}_* is a Polish space (see e.g. Gromov [4] or Petersen [14]); in particular, the set of the pointed finite metric spaces with \mathbb{Q} -valued metrics is a countable dense subset of \mathcal{M}_* .

Some relevant subspaces of \mathcal{M}_* are defined by the following classes of metric spaces: proper ultrametric spaces, proper length spaces, connected complete Riemannian manifolds, connected locally compact simplicial complexes, connected locally compact graphs and finitely generated groups (via their Cayley graphs).

The following (generalized) dynamics can be considered on \mathcal{M}_* :

The canonical metric relation: The *canonical partition* E_{can} is defined by varying the distinguished point; i.e., as a relation, E_{can} consists of all the pairs $([M, x], [M, y])$, M a proper metric space M and $x, y \in M$. There is a canonical map $M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*$, $x \mapsto [M, x]$, which defines an embedding $\text{Isom}(M) \setminus M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*$ whose image is $E_{\text{can}}(M, x)$ for any $x \in M$. Note that $\mathcal{M}_*/E_{\text{can}}$ can be identified to the set of isometry classes of proper metric spaces.

The GH metric relation: It is defined by the pointed GH distance d_{GH} . The notation $E_{GH} = E_{d_{GH}}^{\mathcal{M}_*}$ will be used. Since $E_{\text{can}} \subseteq E_{GH}$, the quotient set \mathcal{M}_*/E_{GH} can be identified to the set of classes of proper metric spaces defined by the relation of being at finite GH distance.

The Lipschitz metric relation: The *Lipschitz partition*, E_{Lip} , is defined by the existence of pointed bi-Lipschitz bijections. It is induced by the *Lipschitz metric relation*, d_{Lip} , which is defined by using the infimum of the logarithms of the dilation constants of bi-Lipschitz bijections.

The QI metric relation: The *quasi-isometric partition* (or *QI partition*), E_{QI} , is the smallest equivalence relation over \mathcal{M}_* that contains $E_{GH} \cup E_{\text{Lip}}$. It is induced by the *quasi-isometric metric relation* (or *QI relation*), d_{QI} , defined as the largest metric relation over \mathcal{M}_* smaller than both d_{GH} and d_{Lip} (cf. [15, Lemma 6]). The quotient set \mathcal{M}_*/E_{QI} can be identified to the set of quasi-isometry classes of proper metric spaces.

The dilation flow: It is the multiplicative flow defined by $\lambda \cdot [M, x] = [\lambda M, x]$, where λM denotes M with its metric multiplied by λ . This flow is used to define the asymptotic and tangent cones.

In Sections 9 and 10, we will study the GH and QI metric relations and prove Theorem 1.1 for them. Some technical results and concepts related to the definition of \mathcal{M}_* to be used in those sections are given presently.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $[M, x], [N, y] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $r > 0$. If d is an admissible metric on $M \sqcup N$ such that $d(x, y) < r$ and $H_d(M, N) < r$, then d is proper.*

Proof. For every $v \in N$,

$$d_N(y, v) \leq d(x, y) + d(x, v) < r + d(x, v)$$

and so

$$B_d(x, R) \subseteq B_M(x, R) \sqcup B_N(y, R + r)$$

for all $R > 0$. The statement follows from this because M and N are proper. \square

Lemma 8.4. *Let $[M, x], [N, y], [P, z] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $R, r > 0$. Suppose that the pointed metric spaces $(B_P(z, R + 2r), z)$ and $(B_N(y, R + 2r), y)$ are isometric, and that there is an admissible metric, d , on $M \sqcup N$ such that $d(x, y) < r$ and $H_{d,R}(M, x; N, y) < r$. Then there exists a proper admissible metric, d' , on $M \sqcup P$ such that $d'(x, z) < r$ and $H_{d',R}(M, x; P, z) < r$.*

Proof. Let $A = B_M(x, R + 2r)$, $B = B_N(y, R + 2r)$ and $C = B_P(z, R + 2r)$, and let $\phi : (B, y) \rightarrow (C, z)$ be an isometry. Let d' be the admissible metric on $M \sqcup P$ satisfying, for $u \in M$ and $w \in P$,

$$d'(u, w) = \inf\{d_M(u, u') + d(u', v) + d_P(\phi(v), w) \mid u' \in A, v \in B\}.$$

Note that, for $u \in A$ and $v \in B$, $d'(u, \phi(v)) = d(u, v)$; in particular, $d'(x, z) < r$.

For each $u \in B_M(x, R)$, there is $v \in N$ such that $d(u, v) < r$. Since

$$d_N(y, v) \leq d(y, x) + d_M(x, u) + d(u, v) < R + 2r,$$

this $v \in B_N(y, R + 2r)$. So $d'(u, \phi(v)) = d(u, v) < r$, and therefore $d'(u, P) < r$. Similarly, $d'(w, M) < r$ for all $w \in B_P(z, R)$, obtaining $H_{d',R}(M, x; P, z) < r$.

For each $S > 0$ and $w \in P \cap B_{d'}(x, S)$, there is $v \in B$ such that $d(x, v) + d_P(\phi(v), w) < S$. So

$$d_P(z, w) \leq d_P(z, \phi(v)) + d_P(\phi(v), w) < R + 2r + S,$$

obtaining

$$B_{d'}(x, S) \subseteq B_M(x, S) \sqcup B_P(z, R + 2r + S).$$

Hence $\overline{B_{d'}(x, S)}$ is compact since M and P are proper. This shows that d' is proper. \square

9. THE GH METRIC RELATION

For each $r > 0$, let $E_r \subseteq \mathcal{M}_* \times \mathcal{M}_*$ be the symmetric relation whose fibers are $E_r(M, x) = \bigcap_{R>0} U_{R,r}(M, x)$, where $U_{R,r}(M, x)$ is as defined in Section 8. The notation $B_{GH}(M, x; r) = B_{d_{GH}}([M, x], r)$ will be used.

Lemma 9.1. *If $0 < r < s$, then*

$$B_{GH}(M, x; r) \subseteq E_r(M, x) \subseteq B_{GH}(M, x; s).$$

Proof. The first inclusion is obvious. To verify the second one, let $[N, y]$ be any member of $E_r(M, x)$. For each $R > 0$ there exists an admissible metric, d_R , on $M \sqcup N$ such that $d_R(x, y) < r$ and $H_{d_R,R}(M, x; N, y) < r$. Let ω be a free ultrafilter on $[0, \infty)$. Then there is a unique admissible metric, d , on $M \sqcup N$ such that, for all $u \in M$ and $v \in N$,

$$d(u, v) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \omega} d_R(u, v) + \frac{s - r}{2}.$$

For each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\Omega \in \omega$ such that, for all $R \in \Omega$,

$$d(u, v) < d_R(u, v) + \frac{s-r}{2} + \epsilon,$$

and thus

$$d(x, y) \leq d_R(x, y) + \frac{s-r}{2} + \epsilon < \frac{s+r}{2} + \epsilon.$$

Because this holds for each $\epsilon > 0$,

$$d(x, y) \leq \frac{s+r}{2} < s.$$

Next, for every $u \in M$, if $R \in \Omega$ is $> d(x, u)$, then $d_R(u, N) < r$, and so $d(u, N) < s$ as before. Similarly, $d(v, M) < s$ for all $v \in N$. Therefore $H_d(M, N) < s$. \square

Corollary 9.2. *The metric relation over \mathcal{M}_* defined by the sets $U_{R,r}$ is d_{GH} .*

By Propositions 6.4, 6.8 and 6.9, and Corollary 9.2, the case of (d_{GH}, E_{GH}) in Theorem 1.1 follows by showing that the sets $U_{R,r}$ also satisfy Hypotheses 2 and 3. It was already noted that \mathcal{M}_* is Polish (Hypothesis 2-(i)).

Lemma 9.3. *If $R, r, s > 0$, then $U_{R+2r+s,s} \circ U_{R,r} \subseteq E_s \circ U_{R,r}$.*

Proof. Let $S = R + 2r + s$. If $[M, x] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $[N, y] \in U_{S,s} \circ U_{R,r}(M, x)$, then there is $[P, z] \in U_{R,r}(M, x) \cap U_{S,s}(N, y)$. This means that there are admissible metrics, d on $M \sqcup P$ and \bar{d} on $N \sqcup P$, such that $d(x, z) < r$, $H_{d,R}(M, x; P, z) < r$, $\bar{d}(y, z) < s$ and $H_{\bar{d},S}(N, y; P, z) < s$. Moreover, because of Lemma 8.4, \bar{d} may be assumed to be a proper metric. The subset

$$P' = (N \setminus B_N(y, S)) \sqcup \overline{B_P(z, S)} \subseteq N \sqcup P$$

is closed and so it becomes a proper metric space when endowed with the metric induced by \bar{d} .

Claim 6. The pointed metric space (P', z) satisfies $d_{GH}(N, y; P', z) < s$.

Since $N \setminus P' \subseteq B_N(y, S)$ and $P' \setminus N = \overline{B_P(z, S)}$, the Hausdorff distance

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\bar{d}}(N, P') &= \max \left\{ \sup_{v \in B_N(y, S)} \bar{d}(v, P'), \sup_{w \in B_P(z, S)} \bar{d}(w, N) \right\} \\ &\leq H_{\bar{d},S}(N, y; P, z) < s, \end{aligned}$$

and so Claim 6 follows from (25).

From Claim 6 and Corollary 9.2, it follows that $[P', z] \in E_s(N, y)$.

Claim 7. $B_{P'}(z, R + 2r) = B_P(z, R + 2r)$.

The inclusion “ \supseteq ” of this identity is obviously true. To prove that the reverse inclusion “ \subseteq ” is also true, it suffices to note that $B_{P'}(z, R + 2r) \cap N = \emptyset$, which is true because, if there is $v \in B_{P'}(z, R + 2r) \cap N$, then

$$d_N(y, v) \leq \bar{d}(y, z) + \bar{d}(z, v) < s + R + 2r = S,$$

which contradicts that $B_N(y, S) \cap P' = \emptyset$.

From Claim 7 and Lemma 8.4, it follows that $[P', z] \in U_{R,r}(M, x)$. Hence $[N, y] \in E_s \circ U_{R,r}(M, x)$. \square

A subset A of a metric space X is called a *net* (as defined in [4, Definition 2.14]) if there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $d_X(u, A) \leq \epsilon$ for all $u \in X$, and it is called *separated* if there is $\delta > 0$ such that $d_X(a, b) \geq \delta$ for all $a, b \in A$ with $a \neq b$; the terms ϵ -net and δ -separated are also used in these cases.

A separated subset of a metric space is discrete and therefore closed. Hence, every separated subset of a proper metric space is a proper metric space when endowed with the induced metric.

If $A \subseteq X$ is an ϵ -net of a metric space, (X, d_X) , then $H_{d_X}(X, A) \leq \epsilon$. So, if A is endowed with the induced metric from (X, d_X) , then $d_{GH}(X, x; A, x) \leq \epsilon$ for every $x \in A$ by (25). Therefore, if in addition X is proper and A is separated, then, for any $\delta > \epsilon$, $[A, x] \in E_\delta(X, x)$ by Lemma 9.1.

Lemma 9.4. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. For each metric space M and each ϵ -separated subset $S \subseteq M$, there exists an ϵ -separated ϵ -net of M that contains S .*

Proof. By Zorn's lemma, the set of ϵ -separated subsets of M that contain S , ordered by inclusion, has a maximal element. It is easily checked that that maximal element is an ϵ -net. \square

The following is a ‘‘converse’’ to Lemma 8.2.

Lemma 9.5. *If $R, r, s > 0$, then $U_{R,r+s} \subseteq U_{R,s} \circ U_{R,r}$.*

Proof. Let $[M, x] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $[N, y] \in U_{R,r+s}(M, x)$. Then there is an admissible metric, d , on $M \sqcup N$ such that $d(x, y) < r_0 + s_0$ and $H_{d,R}(M, x; N, y) < r_0 + s_0$ for some $r_0 \in (0, r)$ and $s_0 \in (0, s)$. By Lemma 8.4, d may be assumed to be a proper metric.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $r_0 + 2\epsilon < r$ and $s_0 + 2\epsilon < s$. By Lemma 9.4, there are ϵ -separated ϵ -nets, A of $B_M(x, R)$ and B of $B_N(y, R)$, such that $x \in A$ and $y \in B$.

For each $u \in B_M(x, R)$, there is $v \in N$ such that $d(u, v) < r_0 + s_0$. Then there is $v' \in B$ so that $d_N(v, v') \leq \epsilon$. So

$$d(u, v') \leq d(u, v) + d_N(v, v') < r_0 + s_0 + \epsilon,$$

which implies $d(u, B) < r_0 + s_0 + \epsilon$. Similarly, for all $v \in B_N(y, R)$, $d(v, A) < r_0 + s_0 + \epsilon$.

Let Σ denote the set of pairs $(u, v) \in A \times B$ such that $d(u, v) < r_0 + s_0 + \epsilon$ and $\min\{d_M(x, u), d_N(y, v)\} < R$; in particular, $(x, y) \in \Sigma$. The set Σ is finite because A and B are separated and d is proper. For each $(u, v) \in \Sigma$, let $I_{u,v}$ be the interval $[0, d(u, v)] \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ of length $d(u, v)$, and let $d_{u,v}$ be its standard metric. Let $h : \bigsqcup_{(u,v) \in \Sigma} \partial I_{u,v} \rightarrow M \sqcup N$ be a map that restricts to a bijection $h : \partial I_{u,v} \rightarrow \{u, v\}$ for all $(u, v) \in \Sigma$. Then let

$$\widehat{P} = (M \sqcup N) \cup_h \bigsqcup_{(u,v) \in \Sigma} I_{u,v}.$$

The spaces M , N and each $I_{u,v}$ may be viewed as subspaces of \widehat{P} ; in particular, $\partial I_{u,v} \equiv \{u, v\}$ in \widehat{P} . Let \widehat{P} be endowed with the metric \hat{d} whose restriction to $M \sqcup N$ is d , whose restriction to each $I_{u,v}$ is $d_{u,v}$, and such that, for all $(u, v), (u', v') \in \Sigma$, $w \in I_{u,v}$ and $w' \in I_{u',v'}$,

$$\hat{d}(w, w') = \min\{d_{u,v}(w, u) + d_M(u, u') + d_{u',v'}(u', w'), \\ d_{u,v}(w, v) + d_N(v, v') + d_{u',v'}(v', w')\}.$$

Let $P \subseteq \widehat{P}$ be the finite subset consisting of the points $w \in I_{u,v}$ with $(u, v) \in \Sigma$ and

$$d_{u,v}(w, u) = \frac{r_0 + \epsilon}{r_0 + s_0 + 2\epsilon} d(u, v).$$

Let z be the unique point in $P \cap I_{x,y}$, and consider the restriction of \hat{d} to P .

If $(u, v) \in \Sigma$ and w is the unique point in $P \cap I_{u,v}$, then

$$\hat{d}(u, w) \leq d_{u,v}(u, w) < \frac{r_0 + \epsilon}{r_0 + s_0 + 2\epsilon} d(u, v) < r_0 + \epsilon.$$

So $\hat{d}(x, z) < r_0 + \epsilon < r$, and, for all $u \in A$ and $w \in P$, $\hat{d}(u, P) < r_0 + \epsilon$ and $\hat{d}(w, M) < r_0 + \epsilon$. Since A is an ϵ -net in $B_M(x, R)$, it also follows that, for all $u \in B_M(x, R)$, $\hat{d}(u, P) < r_0 + 2\epsilon$. Similarly, $\hat{d}(y, z) < s$, and, for all $v \in B_N(y, R)$ and $w \in P$, $\hat{d}(v, P) < s_0 + 2\epsilon$ and $\hat{d}(w, N) < s_0 + \epsilon$. Thus

$$H_{\hat{d}, R}(M, x; P, z) \leq r_0 + 2\epsilon < r, \quad H_{\hat{d}, R}(N, y; P, z) \leq s_0 + 2\epsilon < s,$$

and so $[P, z] \in U_{R,r}(M, x) \cap U_{R,s}(N, y)$ by Lemma 8.1. Therefore $[N, z] \in U_{R,s} \circ U_{R,r}(M, x)$. \square

Hypothesis 2-(ii) results from the next corollary.

Corollary 9.6. *For $R, r, s > 0$, $U_{T,r} \circ E_s \subseteq E_s \circ U_{R,r}$, where*

$$T = R + 2r + s + 2 \max\{r, s\}.$$

Proof. Let $S = R + 2r + s$. By Lemmas 8.2, 9.3 and 9.5,

$$U_{T,r} \circ E_s \subseteq U_{T,r} \circ U_{T,s} \subseteq U_{S,r+s} \subseteq U_{S,s} \circ U_{R,r} \subseteq E_s \circ U_{R,r}. \quad \square$$

Hypothesis 2-(iii) is the statement of the next lemma.

Lemma 9.7. *Let $[M, x] \in \mathcal{M}_*$, $s > 0$ and $[N, y] \in E_s(M, x)$. If $r > 0$ and V is a neighborhood of $[N, y]$ in \mathcal{M}_* , then there is a neighborhood W of $[N, y]$ in \mathcal{M}_* such that*

$$E_r(W) \cap E_r(E_s(M, x)) \subseteq E_r(V \cap E_s(M, x)).$$

Proof. By Lemma 8.4, there are $S > 0$ and an open neighborhood W of $[N, y]$ in \mathcal{M}_* such that, for all $[N', y'] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $[N'', y''] \in W$, if $(B_{N'}(y', S), y')$ is isometric to $(B_{N''}(y'', S), y'')$, then $[N', y'] \in V$. Since $[N, y] \in U_{T,s}(M, x)$ for $T = S + s + r$, we also assume that $W \subseteq U_{T,s}(M, x)$.

For each $[P, z] \in E_r(W) \cap E_r(E_s(M, x))$, there are $[N_1, y_1] \in W$ and $[N_2, y_2] \in E_s(M, x)$ such that $[P, z] \in E_r(N_1, y_1) \cap E_r(N_2, y_2)$, and admissible, proper (by Lemma 8.4) metrics, d_1 on $M \sqcup N_1$ and \bar{d}_1 on $N_1 \sqcup P$, so that $d_1(x, y_1) < s$,

$H_{d_1, T}(M, x; N_1, y_1) < s$, $\bar{d}_1(y_1, z) < r$ and $H_{\bar{d}_1, T}(N_1, y_1; P, z) < r$. Let (T_n) be a sequence in \mathbf{R} with $T_n \uparrow \infty$ and $T_0 > T$; set also $T_{-1} = T$. For each $n \in \mathbf{N}$, let $(N_{2,n}, y_{2,n})$ be an isometric copy of (N_2, y_2) . Then there are admissible, proper (by Lemma 8.4) metrics, $d_{2,n}$ on $M \sqcup N_{2,n}$ and $\bar{d}_{2,n}$ on $N_{2,n} \sqcup P$, such that $d_{2,n}(x, y_{2,n}) < s$, $H_{d_{2,n}, T_n}(M, x; N_{2,n}, y_{2,n}) < s$, $\bar{d}_{2,n}(y_{2,n}, z) < r$ and $H_{\bar{d}_{2,n}, T_n}(N_{2,n}, y_{2,n}; P, z) < r$.

Let d denote the metric on $M \sqcup N_1 \sqcup (\bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} N_{2,n}) \sqcup P$ which extends d_1 , \bar{d}_1 , $d_{2,n}$ and $\bar{d}_{2,n}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and such that, for $u \in M$ and $w \in P$,

$$d(u, w) = \inf \{ d_1(u, v_1) + \bar{d}_1(v_1, w), \\ d_{2,n}(u, v_{2,n}) + \bar{d}_{2,n}(v_{2,n}, w) \mid v_1 \in N_1, v_{2,n} \in N_{2,n}, n \in \mathbf{N} \},$$

for $v_1 \in N_1$ and $v_{2,n} \in N_{2,n}$,

$$d(v_1, v_{2,n}) = \inf \{ d_1(v_1, u) + d_{2,n}(u, v_{2,n}), \\ \bar{d}_1(v_1, w) + \bar{d}_{2,n}(w, v_{2,n}) \mid u \in M, w \in P \},$$

and, for $v_{2,m} \in N_{2,m}$ and $v_{2,n} \in N_{2,n}$ with $m \neq n$,

$$d(v_{2,m}, v_{2,n}) = \inf \{ d_{2,m}(v_{2,m}, u) + d_{2,n}(u, v_{2,n}), \\ \bar{d}_{2,m}(v_{2,m}, w) + \bar{d}_{2,n}(w, v_{2,n}) \mid u \in M, w \in P \}.$$

Since the metrics d_1 , \bar{d}_1 , and $d_{2,n}$ and $\bar{d}_{2,n}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, are proper, the metric d is proper as well. The set

$$N' = \overline{B_{N_1}(y_1, T)} \sqcup \left(\bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\overline{B_{N_{2,n}}(y_{2,n}, T_n)} \setminus B_{N_{2,n}}(y_{2,n}, T_{n-1}) \right) \right)$$

is closed in $M \sqcup N_1 \sqcup (\bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} N_{2,n}) \sqcup P$, and therefore it becomes a proper metric space with the restriction of d .

Then $H_d(M, x; N', y_1) < s$ and $H_d(N', y_1; P, z) < r$, as in Claim 6, and so $d_{GH}(M, x; N', y_1) < s$ and $d_{GH}(N', y_1; P, z) < r$ by (25), which in turn implies $[N', y_1] \in E_s(M, x) \cap E_r(P, z)$ by Lemma 9.1. On the other hand, like in Claim 7, it follows that $B_{N'}(y_1, S) = B_{N_1}(y_1, S)$ and so $[N', y_1] \in V$ because $[N_1, y_1] \in W$. Therefore $[P, z] \in E_r(V \cap E_s(M, x))$. \square

Hypothesis 3-(i) is plainly true: the relation E_{GH} has more than one equivalence class because the GH distance between a bounded metric space and an unbounded one is always infinite.

Hypothesis 3-(ii) is a consequence of the next lemma.

Lemma 9.8. *If $[M, x], [N, y] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $R, r > 0$, then there is $s > 0$ such that $U_{R,r}(M, x) \cap E_s(N, y) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let A and B denote the balls of radius $R + 2r$ in M and N with centers x and y , respectively. Let $s_0 > d_{GH}(A, x; B, y)$ and let d be an admissible metric on

$A \sqcup B$ such that $d(x, y) < s_0$ and $H_d(A, B) < s_0$. Let d' be the admissible metric on $M \sqcup N$ satisfying, for all $u \in M$ and $v \in N$,

$$d'(u, v) = \inf\{d_M(u, u') + d(u', v') + d_N(v', v) \mid u' \in A, v' \in B\}.$$

By the proof of Lemma 8.4, the metric d' is proper, and its restriction to $A \sqcup B$ equals d ; in particular, $d'(x, y) < s_0$.

Let A' and B' denote the balls of radius $R + 2r + s_0$ in M and N with centers x and y , respectively. The set $N' = \overline{A'} \sqcup (N \setminus B')$ is closed in $M \sqcup N$, and therefore it becomes a proper metric space with the restriction of d' . Take any

$$s > \max\{s_0, R + 2r + d'(x, N \setminus B')\}.$$

If $N \setminus B' \neq \emptyset$, then, for all $v \in N \setminus B'$ and $u \in \overline{A'}$,

$$d'(u, v) \leq d_M(u, x) + d'(x, v) < R + 2r + d'(x, v),$$

and so

$$H_{d'}(\overline{A'}, N \setminus B') \leq R + 2r + d'(x, N \setminus B') < s.$$

It follows that $H_{d'}(N, N') < s$, and so $d_{GH}(N, y; N', x) < s$ by (25). Therefore $[N', x] \in E_s(N, y)$ by Lemma 9.1. Also, like in Claim 7, $B_{N'}(x, R + 2r) = A$, and therefore $[N', x] \in U_{R,r}(M, x)$ by Lemma 8.4. \square

Hypothesis 3-(iii) is verified as follows. Let $R, r > 0$ and $[M, x] \in \mathcal{M}_*$. Let $S > R$ and $s > 0$ be such that $s < r$ and $R + 2 \max\{s, r - s\} < S$, and let \mathcal{D} denote the set of points $[N, y] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ such that there is some admissible metric, d , on $M \sqcup N$ so that $d(x, y) < s$, $H_{d,S}(M, x; N, y) < s$ and $H_d(M, N) < \infty$.

Lemma 9.9. \mathcal{D} is a dense subset of $U_{S,s}(M, x) \cap E_{GH}(M, x)$.

Proof. By its definition, the set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq U_{S,s}(M, x) \cap E_{GH}(M, x)$. It must to be shown that, for every $T, t, t' > 0$ and $[N, y] \in U_{S,s}(M, x) \cap B_{GH}(M, x; t')$, the intersection $U_{T,t}(N, y) \cap \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. Let (N_1, y_1) and (N_2, y_2) be two isometric copies of (N, y) . There are admissible metrics, d_1 on $M \sqcup N_1$ and d_2 on $M \sqcup N_2$, such that $d_1(x, y_1) < s$, $H_{d_1,R}(M, x; N_1, y_1) < s$, $d_2(x, y_2) < t'$ and $H_{d_2}(M, N_2) < t'$. Let \hat{d} denote the metric on $M \sqcup N_1 \sqcup N_2$ whose restrictions to $M \sqcup N_1$ and $M \sqcup N_2$ are d_1 and d_2 , respectively, and such that, for all $v_1 \in N_1$ and $v_2 \in N_2$,

$$\hat{d}(v_1, v_2) = \inf\{d_1(v_1, u) + d_2(u, v_2) \mid u \in M\}.$$

Since d_2 is proper by Lemma 8.3, and d_1 can be assumed to be proper by Lemma 8.4, the metric \hat{d} is proper as well. Let

$$T' = \max\{S, T\} + 2 \max\{s, t\} + t' + s,$$

let $A = B_M(x, T' + 2t')$, $B_1 = B_{N_1}(y_1, T')$ and $B_2 = B_{N_2}(y_2, T')$, and set $N' = \overline{B_1} \sqcup (N_2 \setminus B_2)$. Since N' is closed in $M \sqcup N_1 \sqcup N_2$, it becomes a proper metric space with the restriction of \hat{d} . We have $\hat{d}(x, y_1) = d_1(x, y_1) < s$. With arguments used in Claims 6 and 7, we obtain $H_{\hat{d},R}(M, x; N', y_1) < s$ and

$$H_{\hat{d}}(M, N') < \max\{H_{d_1}(A, B_1), t'\} < \infty.$$

It follows that $[N', y_1]$ satisfies the condition to be in \mathcal{D} with the restriction of \hat{d} to the subset $M \sqcup N'$ of $M \sqcup N_1 \sqcup N_2$. Also, since $\hat{d}(y_1, y_2) \leq t' + s$, the proof of Claim 7 leads to

$$B_{N'}(y_1, T + 2t) = B_{N_1}(y_1, T + 2t) \equiv B_N(y, T + 2t),$$

and therefore $[N', y_1] \in U_{T,t}(N, y)$ by Lemma 8.4. \square

Let \mathcal{E} be the set of those $[M, x] \in \mathcal{D}$ such that M is separated (in itself). It easily follows from Lemma 9.4 that \mathcal{E} is d_{GH} -dense in \mathcal{D} . Take any $\epsilon > 0$ such that $s + 2\epsilon < r$ and $R + 2 \max\{s + \epsilon, r - s - \epsilon\} < S$. Let A be a separated ϵ -net of M that contains x , whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 9.4, and consider the restriction of d_M to A . Observe that $[A, x] \in E_{r-s-\epsilon}(M, x)$ because $r - s - \epsilon > \epsilon$. Then the proof of Hypothesis 3-(iii) is completed by the following lemma.

Lemma 9.10. *Any point of \mathcal{E} can be joined to $[A, x]$ by a d_{GH} -continuous path in $U_{R,r}(M, x)$.*

Proof. For any $[N, y] \in \mathcal{E}$, there is some admissible metric, d , on $M \sqcup N$ such that $d(x, y) < s$, $s_0 := H_{d,S}(M, x; N, y) < s$ and $s_1 := H_d(M, N) < \infty$. Moreover d is proper by Lemma 8.3. Observe that $H_{d,S}(A, x; N, y) < s_0 + \epsilon$ and $H_d(A, N) \leq s_1 + \epsilon$.

Let Σ be the set of pairs $(u, v) \in A \times N$ such that $d(u, v) \leq s_1 + \epsilon$ and, if $u \in B_A(x, S)$ or $v \in B_N(y, S)$, then $d(u, v) \leq s_0 + \epsilon$; in particular, $(x, y) \in \Sigma$. Like in the proof of Lemma 9.5, define $I_{u,v}$ and $d_{u,v}$ for each $(u, v) \in \Sigma$, as well as $h : \bigsqcup_{(u,v) \in \Sigma} \rightarrow A \sqcup N$,

$$\hat{P} = (A \sqcup N) \cup_h \bigsqcup_{(u,v) \in \Sigma} I_{u,v},$$

and the metric \hat{d} on \hat{P} . Since d is proper and A and N are separated, the d -balls in $A \sqcup N$ are finite. Therefore, any ball in \hat{P} is contained in a finite union of segments $I_{u,v}$, and so \hat{P} is proper.

For each $t \in I = [0, 1]$, let $P_t \subseteq \hat{P}$ be the subset consisting of the points $w \in I_{u,v}$ with $d_{u,v}(w, u) = t d(u, v)$ for $(u, v) \in \Sigma$, and let z_t denote the unique point of $P_t \cap I_{x,y}$. Each P_t is a discrete subspace of \hat{P} , and it therefore becomes a proper metric space with the restriction of \hat{d} . Moreover $(P_0, z_0) = (A, x)$ and $(P_1, z_1) = (N, y)$. For all $t, t' \in I$, $(u, v) \in \Sigma$, $w \in P_t \cap I_{u,v}$ and $w' \in P_{t'} \cap I_{u,v}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(w, w') &= d_{u,v}(w, w') = d(u, v) |t - t'| \\ &\leq \begin{cases} (s_1 + \epsilon) |t - t'| & \text{for arbitrary } (u, v) \in \Sigma \\ (s_0 + \epsilon) |t - t'| & \text{if } u \in B_A(x, S) \text{ or } v \in B_N(y, S). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Thus $\hat{d}(z_t, z_{t'}) \leq (s_0 + \epsilon) |t - t'|$ and $H_{\hat{d}}(P_t, P_{t'}) \leq (s_1 + \epsilon) |t - t'|$. By (25), it follows that $[P_t, z_t] \in E_{GH}(M, x)$ for all $t \in I$, and the mapping $t \mapsto [P_t, z_t]$ is d_{GH} -continuous.

From (26), it also follows that $\hat{d}(u, P_t) \leq (s_0 + \epsilon)t$ for all $u \in B_A(x, S)$ and $t \in I$. Moreover the ball $B_{P_t}(z_t, S)$ is contained in the union of the segments $I_{u,v}$

for $(u, v) \in \Sigma$ with $u \in B_A(x, S)$ or $v \in B_N(y, S)$. So $\hat{d}(w, P_t) \leq (s_0 + \epsilon)t$ for all $w \in B_P(z_t, S)$ by (26). It follows that

$$H_{\hat{d}, S}(A, x; P_t, z_t) \leq (s_0 + \epsilon)t < s + \epsilon,$$

obtaining

$$[P_t, z_t] \in U_{S, s+\epsilon}(A, x) \subseteq U_{S, s+\epsilon} \circ E_{r-s-\epsilon}(M, x) \subseteq U_{R, r}(M, x)$$

by Lemmas 8.1 and 8.2. \square

Hypotheses 1-3 have just been proved, and that suffices to confirm Theorem 1.1 for (d_{GH}, E_{GH}) .

Remark 16. As in Remark 15, it can be proved that, for all $r > 0$, \emptyset is residual in $B_{GH}(M, x; r)$ if M is unbounded. In this case, for sequences $0 < r_n \uparrow r$ and $0 < R_n \uparrow \infty$, consider the sets U_n consisting of the points $[N, y] \in B_{GH}(M, x; r)$ such that

$$H_d \left(M \setminus \overline{B_M(x, R_n)}, N \setminus \overline{B_N(y, R_n)} \right) > r_n$$

for every admissible metric, d , on $M \sqcup N$.

10. THE QI METRIC RELATION

Since $d_{QI} \leq d_{GH}$ and Theorem 1.1 is already proved for d_{GH} , Remarks 6 and 8 imply that the proof of Theorem 1.1 for d_{QI} only requires the next proposition.

Proposition 10.1. *The fibers of E_{QI} are meager in \mathcal{M}_* .*

The proof of Proposition 10.1 requires an analysis of d_{QI} , which in turn requires an analysis of d_{GH} and d_{Lip} .

A map between metric spaces, $\phi : M \rightarrow N$, is called *bi-Lipschitz* if there is some $\lambda \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} d_M(u, v) \leq d_N(\phi(u), \phi(v)) \leq \lambda d_M(u, v)$$

for all $u, v \in M$. The term *λ -bi-Lipschitz* may be also used in this case.

A (*coarse*) *quasi-isometry* of M to N is a bi-Lipschitz bijection $\phi : A \rightarrow B$ for nets $A \subseteq M$ and $B \subseteq N$. The existence of a quasi-isometry of M to N is equivalent to the existence of a finite sequence of metric spaces $M = M_0, \dots, M_{2k} = N$ such that $d_{GH}(M_{2i-2}, M_{2i-1}) < \infty$ and such that there is a bi-Lipschitz bijection $M_{2i-1} \rightarrow M_{2i}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. A *pointed (coarse) quasi-isometry* is defined in the same way, by using a pointed bi-Lipschitz bijection between nets that contain the distinguished points. The existence of a pointed quasi-isometry has an analogous characterization involving pointed Gromov-Hausdorff distances and pointed bi-Lipschitz bijections.

As noted in Section 8, d_{Lip} is the metric equivalence relation over \mathcal{M}_* defined by setting $d_{Lip}(M, x; N, y)$ equal to the infimum of the set of $r \geq 0$ for which there is a pointed e^r -bi-Lipschitz bijection $\phi : (M, x) \rightarrow (N, y)$.

The distance $d_{QI}(M, x; N, y)$ equals the infimum of all sums

$$\sum_{i=1}^k d_{GH}(M_{2i-2}, x_{2i-2}; M_{2i-1}, x_{2i-1}) + d_{\text{Lip}}(M_{2i-1}, x_{2i-1}; M_{2i}, x_{2i})$$

for finite sequences $[M, x] = [M_0, x_0], \dots, [M_{2k}, x_{2k}] = [N, y]$ in \mathcal{M}_* . For $[M, x] \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $r > 0$, the notation $B_{\text{Lip}}(M, x; r) = B_{d_{\text{Lip}}}([M, x], r)$ and $B_{QI}(M, x; r) = B_{d_{QI}}([M, x], r)$ will be used.

Lemma 10.2. *For $r > 0$ and $R \geq q > p > 2r$, if $[N, y] \in U_{R,r}(M, x)$ and $B_M(x, q) \setminus \overline{B_M(x, p)} \neq \emptyset$, then $B_N(y, q + 2r) \setminus \overline{B_N(y, p - 2r)} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, there is an admissible metric d on $M \sqcup N$ such that $d(x, y) < r$ and $H_{d,R}(M, x; N, y) < r$, and there is $u \in M$ such that $p < d(x, u) < q$. Since $H_{d,R}(M, x; N, y) < r$, there is $v \in N$ such that $d(u, v) < r$. Then

$$d_N(y, v) \leq d(x, u) + d(y, x) + d(u, v) < q + 2r,$$

and, similarly, $d_N(y, v) > p - 2r$. \square

Corollary 10.3. *If $d_{GH}(M, x; N, y) < r$ and $q > p > 2r$ are such that $B_M(x, q) \setminus \overline{B_M(x, p)} \neq \emptyset$, then $B_N(y, q + 2r) \setminus \overline{B_N(y, p - 2r)} \neq \emptyset$.*

Lemma 10.4. *If $d_{\text{Lip}}(M, x; N, y) < r$ and $p > q > 0$ are such that $B_M(x, q) \setminus \overline{B_M(x, p)} \neq \emptyset$, then $B_N(y, e^r q) \setminus \overline{B_N(y, e^{-r} p)} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, there is a pointed e^r -bi-Lipschitz bijection $\phi : (M, x) \rightarrow (N, y)$, and there is $u \in M$ such that $p < d(x, u) < q$. Then

$$d_N(y, \phi(u)) \leq e^r d_M(x, u) < e^r q,$$

and, similarly, $d_N(y, \phi(u)) > e^{-r} p$, showing the result. \square

Proof of Proposition 10.1. The pointed compact metric spaces form an equivalence class of E_{GH} which is meager in \mathcal{M}_* by Theorem 1.1-(i) for (d_{GH}, E_{GH}) . Moreover any metric space bi-Lipschitz equivalent to a bounded one is also bounded. So the pointed compact metric spaces also form a class of E_{QI} . Thus, to prove Proposition 10.1, it is enough to consider the fiber $E_{QI}(M, y)$ for any unbounded proper metric space M . Hence there are sequences $p_n, q_n \uparrow \infty$ such that $q_n > p_n > 0$ and $B_M(x, q_n) \setminus \overline{B_M(x, p_n)} \neq \emptyset$.

Claim 8. Let $r, s > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $p_n > 2r$ and $2s < e^{-r}(q_n - 2r)$. If $[N, y] \in \overline{B_{QI}(M, x; r)}$, then

$$B_N(y, e^r(q_n + 2r) + 2s) \setminus \overline{B_N(y, e^{-r}(p_n - 2r) - 2s)} \neq \emptyset. \quad (27)$$

For the proof, let $S > e^r(q_n + 2r)$. Since $[N, y] \in \overline{B_{QI}(M, x; r)}$, there is a finite sequence, $[M, x] = [M_0, x_0], \dots, [M_{2k}, x_{2k}]$ in \mathcal{M}_* such that $[M_{2k}, x_{2k}] \in U_{S,s}(N, y)$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^k d_{GH}(M_{2i-2}, x_{2i-2}; M_{2i-1}, x_{2i-1}) + d_{\text{Lip}}(M_{2i-1}, x_{2i-1}; M_{2i}, x_{2i}) < r.$$

Let $r_1, \dots, r_{2k} > 0$ be such that $\sum_{j=1}^{2k} r_j < r$ and, for $j \in \{1, \dots, 2k\}$,

$$r_j > \begin{cases} d_{GH}(M_{j-1}, x_{j-1}; M_j, x_j) & \text{if } j \text{ is odd} \\ d_{\text{Lip}}(M_{j-1}, x_{j-1}; M_j, x_j) & \text{if } j \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\bar{r}_j = \sum_{a=1}^j r_a$. Arguing by induction on j , using Corollary 10.3 and Lemma 10.4, it follows that

$$B_{M_j}(x_j, e^{\bar{r}_j}(q_n + 2\bar{r}_j)) \setminus \overline{B_{M_{2k}}(x_{2k}, e^{-\bar{r}_j}(q_n - 2\bar{r}_j))} \neq \emptyset$$

for all j . So

$$B_{M_{2k}}(x_{2k}, e^r(q_n + 2r)) \setminus \overline{B_{M_{2k}}(x_{2k}, e^{-r}(q_n - 2r))} \neq \emptyset.$$

Then (27) follows by Lemma 10.2, completing the proof of Claim 8.

Claim 9. For each $r > 0$, $B_{QI}(M, x; r)$ is nowhere dense in \mathcal{M}_* .

Let $[N, y] \in \overline{B_{QI}(M, x; r)}$. Given $S, s > 0$, there is some $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $p_n > 2r$ and $S < e^{-r}(q_n - 2r) - 2s$. Thus (27) is satisfied with these $[N, y]$, r , s and n . Let

$$N' = N \setminus \left(B_N(y, e^r(q_n + 2r) + 2s) \setminus \overline{B_N(y, e^{-r}(q_n - 2r) - 2s)} \right).$$

With the restriction of d_N , N' is a proper metric space with $B_{N'}(y, S) = B_N(y, S)$, obtaining $[N', y] \in U_{S,s}$. But $[N', y] \notin \overline{B_{QI}(M, x; r)}$ by Claim 8 because

$$B_{N'}(y, e^r(q_n + 2r) + 2s) \setminus \overline{B_{N'}(y, e^{-r}(p_n - 2r) - 2s)} = \emptyset.$$

So $U_{S,s}(N, y) \not\subseteq \overline{B_{QI}(M, x; r)}$. Then Claim 9 follows since s can be chosen arbitrarily small, and S arbitrarily large by choosing n arbitrarily large.

Since $E_{QI}(M, x) = \bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} B_{QI}(M, x; r)$, Claim 9 concludes the proof of Proposition 10.1. \square

REFERENCES

1. J.A. Álvarez López and A. Candel, *Non-reduction of relations in the Gromov space to Polish actions*, to appear in Notre Dame J. Form. Log., preprint arXiv:1501.02606.
2. H. Becker and A.S. Kechris, *The descriptive set theory of Polish group actions*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 232, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996. MR 1425877 (98d:54068)
3. M. Gromov, *Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps. Appendix by Jacques Tits*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1981), no. 53, 53–73. MR 623534 (83b:53041)
4. ———, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 152, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1999, Based on the 1981 French original [MR0682063 (85e:53051)], With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes, Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates. MR 1699320 (2000d:53065)
5. G. Hjorth, *Classification and orbit equivalence relations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 75, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000. MR 1725642 (2000k:03097)
6. ———, *A dichotomy theorem for turbulence*, J. Symbolic Logic **67** (2002), no. 4, 1520–1540. MR 1955250 (2004b:03069)
7. A.S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 156, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. MR 1321597 (96e:03057)

8. ———, *Descriptive dynamics*, Descriptive set theory and dynamical systems (Marseille-Luminy, 1996), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 277, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 231–258. MR 1774428 (2001j:37038)
9. A.S. Kechris and B.D. Miller, *Topics in orbit equivalence*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1852, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. MR 2095154 (2005f:37010)
10. C. Kuratowski, *Topologie. Vol. I*, Monografie Matematyczne, Tom 20, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw, 1958, 4ème éd. MR 0090795 (19,873d)
11. B.L. McAllister, *Hyperspaces and multifunctions, the first half century (1900–1950)*, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. (3) **26** (1978), no. 2, 309–329. MR 501288 (80g:54001)
12. E. Michael, *Topologies on spaces of subsets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **71** (1951), 152–182. MR 0042109 (13,54f)
13. ———, *Continuous selections. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **63** (1956), 361–382. MR 0077107 (17,990e)
14. P. Petersen, *Riemannian geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 171, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998. MR 1480173 (98m:53001)
15. F. Plastria, *Asymmetric distances, semidirected networks and majority in Fermat-Weber problems*, Ann. Oper. Res. **167** (2009), 121–155. MR 2506484 (2010f:90078)
16. L. Vietoris, *Bereiche zweiter Ordnung*, Monatsh. Math. Phys. **32** (1922), no. 1, 258–280. MR 1549179

DEPARTAMENTO DE XEOMETRÍA E TOPOLOXÍA, FACULTADE DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDADE DE SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA, 15782 SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA, SPAIN
E-mail address: `jesus.alvarez@usc.es`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT NORTHRIDGE, 18111 NORDHOFF STREET, NORTHRIDGE, CA 91330, U.S.A.
E-mail address: `alberto.candel@csun.edu`