

# POLYNOMIAL ERGODIC AVERAGES OF MEASURE-PRESERVING SYSTEMS ACTED BY $\mathbb{Z}^d$

RONGZHONG XIAO

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we reduce pointwise convergence of polynomial ergodic averages of general measure-preserving system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  to the case of measure-preserving system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with zero entropy. As an application, we can build pointwise convergence of polynomial ergodic averages for  $K$ -system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper, let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a Lebesgue space. Let  $\mathbb{Z}[n]$  denote all polynomials with integer coefficients.

Let  $G$  be an infinite, countable, discrete group. A tuple  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  is a measure-preserving system if there exists a group homomorphism  $\Pi : G \rightarrow \text{MPT}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  where  $\text{MPT}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  denotes the group of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ . We write  $g$  for the measure-preserving transformation  $\Pi(g)$ . When  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ , we write  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  for measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  where  $T$  denotes the measure-preserving transformation  $\Pi(1)$ .

In 1977, H. Furstenberg provided an ergodic theoretic proof for Szemerédi's theorem in [13]. From then on, convergence of polynomial ergodic averages of measure-preserving system was a fundamental part of study of ergodic theory. Normally, we focus on the following question.

**Question 1.1.** (*Furstenberg–Bergelson–Leibman conjecture* [3, Page 468]) *Let  $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_d : X \rightarrow X$  be a family of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  that generates a nilpotent group. Is it true that for any  $p_{i,j}(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n], 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m$  and for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x)$$

*exists in  $L^2(\mu)$ -norm or almost everywhere?*

For  $L^2(\mu)$ -norm case, the question had been solved completely after some works. For  $d = 1$ , H. Furstenberg and B. Weiss dealt with the form  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f_1(T^{n^2} x) f_2(T^n x)$  in [14]. B. Host and B. Kra gave an answer for linear polynomials and described the

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 37A05; Secondary: 37A30.

*Key words and phrases*. Algebraic past,  $K$ -system, Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra, Polynomial ergodic averages, Pointwise convergence.

structure of characteristic factors in [15]. Later, A. Leibman extend the result to general polynomials in [20]. For commute transformations, when  $d = m = 2$ , J.-P. Conze and E. Lesigne constructed an answer on  $L^1(\mu)$ -norm for linear polynomials in [9]. T. Tao built the result for such form  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^d f_j(T_j^n x)$  in [25]. T. Austin established same result for this form by pleasant extension in [2]. Finally, M. N. Walsh gave a complete answer for measure-preserving system acted by nilpotent group in [26].

For pointwise case, there were some progressions for this conjecture over the last few decades. When  $d = m = 1$  or  $d = 1, m = 2$  with  $p_{1,1}(n) = an, p_{1,2}(n) = bn$  where  $a$  and  $b$  are non-zero integers and  $a \neq b$ , the question is solved by J. Bourgain in [5] and [7] respectively. For distal system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}$ , W. Huang, S. Shao and X. Ye answered it for linear polynomials in [16]. For distal system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  where  $d > 1$ , S. Donoso and W. Sun established the similar result in [11]. Recently, when  $d = 1, m = 2$  and  $p_{1,1}(n) = n, \deg p_{1,2}(n) \geq 2$ , B. Krause, M. Mirek and T. Tao constructed corresponding result in [19]. To know more results, one can refer to [1, 4, 6, 18, 21, 22, 24].

In 1996, J. Derrien and E. Lesigne reduced the pointwise convergence of polynomial ergodic averages of general measure-preserving system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}$  to the case of measure-preserving system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}$  with zero entropy in [10]. Here, we state the result specifically.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be an invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $p_j(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n], 1 \leq j \leq m$ . Let  $P_\mu(T)$  be Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra (for definition, see Subsection 2.4) of measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ . Then for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m T^{p_j(n)} f_j$$

*exists almost everywhere if and only if for any  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in L^\infty(X, P_\mu(T), \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m T^{p_j(n)} h_j$$

*exists almost everywhere.*

In this paper, we extend the above result to measure-preserving system acted by  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . That is,

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_d : X \rightarrow X$  be a family of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  that generates  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $p_{i,j}(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n], 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m$ . Let  $P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  be Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra of measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ . Then for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x)$$

exists almost everywhere if and only if for any  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in L^\infty(X, P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d), \mu)$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m h_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x)$$

exists almost everywhere.

By the idea of the arguments of the proof of Theorem 1.3, we can get the following result.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_d : X \rightarrow X$  be a family of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  that generates  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $p_{i,j}(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m$ . Let  $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded sequence and  $-\infty < \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N g(n) = a < \infty$ . Let  $P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  be Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra of measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ . Then for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N g(n) \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x)$$

exists almost everywhere if and only if for any  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in L^\infty(X, P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d), \mu)$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N g(n) \prod_{j=1}^m h_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x)$$

exists almost everywhere.

By the remark after proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.3, we can get the following result.

**Corollary 1.5.** *Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_d : X \rightarrow X$  be a family of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  that generates  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $p_{i,j}(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m$ . If  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is a  $K$ -system (for definition, see Subsection 2.4), then for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x)$$

exists almost everywhere. In particular, if for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)}$  is not a constant and for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k \neq l$ ,  $T_1^{p_{1,k}(n) - p_{1,l}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,k}(n) - p_{d,l}(n)}$  is not a constant, then the limit function must be  $\prod_{j=1}^m \int f_j d\mu$ .

In the above, the polynomial ergodic averages go along the positive integers. Next, we want to consider the polynomial ergodic averages that go along the prime numbers. That is,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(a_n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(a_n)} x)$$

where  $\mathbb{P} = \{a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_n < \dots\}$  consists of all prime numbers.

Here, we build a result for a class of special cases.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_d : X \rightarrow X$  be a family of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  that generates  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $p_j(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n], 1 \leq j \leq m$ . Let  $g : \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d\}$ . Let  $P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  be Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra of measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ . Then for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_n)} x)$$

*exists almost everywhere if and only if for any  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in L^\infty(X, P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d), \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m h_j(T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_n)} x)$$

*exists almost everywhere where  $\mathbb{P} = \{a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_n < \dots\}$  consists of all prime numbers.*

As for general case, we expect the following result.

**Conjecture 1.** *Under assumption of Theorem 1.3, then for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(a_n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(a_n)} x)$$

*exists almost everywhere if and only if for any  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in L^\infty(X, P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d), \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m h_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(a_n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(a_n)} x)$$

*exists almost everywhere where  $\mathbb{P} = \{a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_n < \dots\}$  consists of all prime numbers.*

Based on the proof of Theorem 1.6 and Theorem 1.3, if one can build maximal inequality like the form mentioned in the Theorem 2.7 for prime sequence, then there exists an affirmative answer for the Conjecture 1.

The proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.6 can be divided into two steps. At first, we reduce the general essentially bounded measurable functions to indicator functions by maximal inequality(Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 2.9). Secondly, we use the structure of Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra(Proposition 2.6) and probability theoretic method to reach our conclusion. The key points are how to choose a proper algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  and using the algebraic past to describe structure of Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Organization of the paper.** Section 2 contains some prepared notions and results. In section 3, we prove Theorem 1.3. In section 4, we show Theorem 1.6.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we review some notions and some results that will be used in later proof.

**2.1. Conditional expectation.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$ . For any  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , there exists a function  $\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A})$  that satisfies the following properties: (1)  $\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A})$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable; (2) for any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\int_A f d\mu = \int_A \mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A}) d\mu$ . Clearly,  $\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A})$  is characterized almost everywhere. The map

$$\mathbb{E}(\cdot|\mathcal{A}) : L^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$$

is called conditional expectation. In particular, when  $\mathcal{A}$  is trivial, we write  $\mathbb{E}f$  for  $\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A})$  for any  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** ([12, Theorem 5.8]) *If  $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a sequence of sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{A}_n \subset \dots$  and  $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{A}$ , then for any  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A}_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A})$$

*almost everywhere and in  $L^1(\mu)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

Next, we give a simple lemma that will be used in the later proof.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $G$  be an infinite, countable, discrete group. Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  be a measure-preserving system. Then for any  $f \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  and  $g \in G$ , we have*

$$g\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{E}(gf|g^{-1}\mathcal{A}).$$

**2.2. Entropy.** Let  $G$  be an infinite, countable, discrete amenable group. A sequence  $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  of non-empty finite subsets of  $G$  is called a **Følner sequence** if for every  $g \in G$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|gF_n \Delta F_n|}{|F_n|} = 0$ , where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the cardinality of a set.

A **measurable partition** of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is a disjoint collection of elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  whose union is  $X$ . Define

$$\mathcal{P}_X^\mu = \{\alpha : \alpha \text{ is a finite measurable partition of } (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)\}.$$

Given  $\{\alpha_i : i \in \mathcal{I}\} \subset \mathcal{P}_X^\mu$  where  $\mathcal{I}$  is an index set,  $\bigvee_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_i$  is a measurable partition with such a property that the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\bigvee_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_i$  is the minimal sub- $\sigma$ -algebra including  $\alpha_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ . When  $\mathcal{I}$  is finite, we know  $\bigvee_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_i = \{\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} A_i : A_i \in \alpha_i\}$ .

Given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X^\mu$ , we define  $H_\mu(\alpha) = \sum_{A \in \alpha} -\mu(A) \log \mu(A)$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$ , we define  $H_\mu(\alpha|\mathcal{A}) = -\int \sum_{A \in \alpha} \mathbb{E}(1_A|\mathcal{A}) \log \mathbb{E}(1_A|\mathcal{A}) d\mu$ .

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  be a measure-preserving system. The **measure-theoretic entropy of  $\mu$  relative to  $\alpha$**  is defined by

$$h_\mu(G, \alpha) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{g \in F_n} g^{-1}\alpha \right)$$

where  $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a Flølner sequence of the amenable group  $G$ . By Theorem 6.1 of [23], the limit exists and is independent of choices of Flølner sequences. The **measure-theoretic entropy of  $\mu$**  is defined by

$$h_\mu(G) = h_\mu(G, X) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X^\mu} h_\mu(G, \alpha).$$

**2.3. Algebraic past.** Given group  $G$  with identity element  $e_G$ , an **algebraic past** of  $G$  is a subset  $\Phi$  with properties (1)-(3): (1)  $\Phi \cap \Phi^{-1}$  is empty; (2)  $\Phi \cup \Phi^{-1} \cup \{e_G\} = G$ ; (3)  $\Phi \cdot \Phi \subset \Phi$ . The group  $G$  is **left-orderable** if there exists a linear ordering in  $G$  which is invariant under left translation. The group  $G$  is left-orderable if and only if there exists an algebraic past  $\Phi$  in  $G$ . Indeed, one can obtain the desired linear-order based on  $\Phi$  as follows:  $g_1$  is less than  $g_2$  (write  $g_1 <_\Phi g_2$  or  $g_1 < g_2$ ) if  $g_2^{-1}g_1 \in \Phi$ .

**Example 2.3.** When  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $\Phi$  be  $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n < 0\}$ . Then we can get the natural linear order of  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Example 2.4.** For each  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and for any  $A_1, \dots, A_d > 0$ , the  $\Phi = \{(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{there exists } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\} \text{ such that } \sum_{l=1}^{d-k} A_l n_l = 0 \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, j-1 \text{ and } \sum_{l=1}^{d-j} A_l n_l < 0\}$  is an algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ .

**2.4. Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra.** Let  $G$  be an infinite, countable, discrete amenable group. The **Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra** of measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  is defined as

$$P_\mu(G) = \{A \in \mathcal{B} : h_\mu(G, \{A, A^c\}) = 0\}.$$

If  $P_\mu(G)$  is trivial, we say that  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  is a **Kolmogorov system**(write  $K$ -system).

When  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ , we can describe the structure of  $P_\mu(G)$  based on the natural linear-order of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Similarly, for general case, we can give the structure of  $P_\mu(G)$  by algebraic past that plays same role as the natural linear-order of  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** ([17, Theorem 3.1]) *Let  $G$  be a countable discrete infinite amenable group with algebraic past  $\Phi$ , and let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  be a measure-preserving system. Then for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}_X^\mu$ ,*

$$h_\mu(G, \alpha \vee \beta) = h_\mu(G, \beta) + H_\mu(\alpha | \beta_G \vee \alpha_\Phi),$$

where  $\beta_G = \bigvee_{g \in G} g\beta$  and  $\alpha_\Phi = \bigvee_{g \in \Phi} g\alpha$ .

Based on the Theorem 2.5, we can get the following results.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $G$  be a countable discrete infinite amenable group with algebraic past  $\Phi$  and identity element  $e_G$ , and let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  be a measure-preserving system. Then*

$$P_\mu(G) \supset \bigvee_{\beta \in \mathcal{P}_X^\mu} \bigwedge_{g \in \Phi \cup \{e_G\}} g\beta_\Phi.$$

*Proof.* Select  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X^\mu$  and fix it. Choose  $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_X^\mu$  such that  $\beta \subset \bigwedge_{g \in \Phi \cup \{e_G\}} g\alpha_\Phi$ . Then  $\beta_G \subset \alpha_\Phi$ . And

$$H_\mu(\alpha \vee \beta | \alpha_\Phi \vee \beta_\Phi) \leq H_\mu(\alpha \vee \beta | \alpha_\Phi) = H_\mu(\alpha | \alpha_\Phi).$$

By Theorem 2.5, we know  $h_\mu(G, \alpha) = H_\mu(\alpha | \alpha_\Phi)$ . Then

$$H_\mu(\alpha \vee \beta | \alpha_\Phi \vee \beta_\Phi) = h_\mu(G, \beta) + H_\mu(\alpha | \beta_G \vee \alpha_\Phi) = H_\mu(\alpha | \alpha_\Phi) + H_\mu(\beta | \beta_\Phi).$$

So  $\beta \subset P_\mu(G)$ .  $\square$

## 2.5. Maximal ergodic theorem.

**Theorem 2.7.** ([18, Theorem 1.2.(iii)]) *Let  $d_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_{d_1} : X \rightarrow X$  be a family of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  that generates a nilpoent group of step two. Assume that  $p_1, \dots, p_{d_1} \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$  and let  $d_2 = \max\{\deg p_j(n) : 1 \leq j \leq d_1\}$ . Then for any  $f \in L^p(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,  $p > 1$ , there exists a constant  $c(d_1, d_2, p)$  such that*

$$\left\| \sup_{N \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f(T_1^{p_1(n)} \dots T_{d_1}^{p_{d_1}(n)} x) \right| \right\|_p \leq c(d_1, d_2, p) \|f\|_p.$$

Based on the ideas of proof of Corollary 2.2 of [10] and Theorem 2.7, we can get the following result.

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$  be given. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_d : X \rightarrow X$  be a family of invertible measure-preserving transformations of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  that generates a nilpoent group of step two. Assume that  $p_{1,j}, \dots, p_{d,j} \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$  and let  $q_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$  be positive real number with  $\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{q_j} < 1$ . Then*

$$\{(f_1, \dots, f_m) : \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \text{ exists almost everywhere}\}$$

*is closed in  $L^{q_1}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu) \times \dots \times L^{q_m}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .*

The following theorem focus on the polynomial ergodic averages that go along primes.

**Theorem 2.9.** ([24, Theorem 1.2]) *Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be a measure-preserving system. Given  $q(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$  and  $p > 1$ , then for any  $f \in L^p(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , there exists a constant  $c(p, q, T)$  such that*

$$\left\| \sup_{N \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} T^{q(a_n)} f \right| \right\|_p \leq c(p, q, T) \|f\|_p$$

where  $\mathbb{P} = \{a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_n < \dots\}$  consists of all prime numbers.

Based on the ideas of proof of Corollary 2.2 of [10] and Theorem 2.9, we can get the following result.

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $G$  be an infinite, countable, discrete group. Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, G)$  be a measure-preserving system. Given  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $q_j$  be positive real number with  $\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{q_j} < 1$ ,  $p_j(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ , and  $g_j \in G$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Then*

$$\{(f_1, \dots, f_d) : \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^d g_j^{p_j(a_n)} f_j \text{ exists almost everywhere}\}$$

*is closed in  $L^{q_1}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu) \times \dots \times L^{q_d}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  where  $\mathbb{P} = \{a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_n < \dots\}$  consists of all prime numbers.*

### 3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

First, we introduce a lemma that will be used in the proof.

**Lemma 3.1.** ([8, Theorem 5.1.2]) *Let  $X_n (n \geq 1)$  be a sequence of random variables of probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{D}, \nu)$  with  $\mathbb{E}X_n = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}|X_n|^2 \leq M$  where  $M > 0$ . And for any  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \neq n$ ,  $\mathbb{E}X_n X_m = 0$ . Then  $\frac{1}{n} S_n \rightarrow 0$  almost everywhere as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  where  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ .*

Next, we will provide a simple argument for a special case to express our basic idea of the proof.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 1.3, let  $A$  and  $B$  be two measurable sets with positive measure. Then there exists a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d)$*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} 1_B T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} 1_A - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} \mathbb{E}(1_B | \mathcal{A}) T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow 0$$

*almost everywhere as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly, we know  $\deg(n^2 + 2(-n^2)) \geq 1$ ,  $\deg(3n^2 + 2(8n^2)) \geq 1$  and  $\deg((3n^2 - n^2) + 2(8n^2 - (-n^2))) \geq 1$ . By Example 2.4, we know  $\Phi = \{(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{there exists } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\} \text{ such that } \sum_{l=1}^{d-k} A_l n_l = 0 \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, j-1 \text{ and } \sum_{l=1}^{d-j} A_l n_l < 0\}$  is an algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  when  $A_i = 1$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq d$  with  $i \neq 2$  and  $A_2 = 2$ .

To be convenient, we view  $\vec{n}$  as  $T_1^{n_1} \dots T_d^{n_d}$  where  $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . When  $n > 0$ , we have

$$(n^2, -n^2, 0, \dots, 0) <_{\Phi} (3n^2, 8n^2, 0, \dots, 0).$$

For any  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_g$  is a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{h1_A : h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and } g \leq_{\Phi} h\}$  and  $\{h1_B : h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and } g \leq_{\Phi} h\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{A}_g$ . Note that  $\Phi^{-1}$  is still an algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Use the definition of  $\mathcal{A}$  and Proposition 2.6, we know that  $\mathcal{A} \subset P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ .



Next, we verify that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) (1_A - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}_g)) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) = 0$$

almost everywhere for any  $g \in \Phi^{-1}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{J}_n = \mathcal{A}_{g+(n^2, -n^2, 0, \dots, 0)}$ . Let  $X_n = 1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) (1_A - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}_g)) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x)$ . Then there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > N$ ,  $(1_A - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}_g)) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x)$  is  $\mathcal{J}_{n+1}$ -measurable and  $1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x)$  is  $\mathcal{J}_n$ -measurable.

That is, when  $n > N$ ,  $X_n$  is  $\mathcal{J}_{n+1}$ -measurable. And  $\mathbb{E}(X_n | \mathcal{J}_n) = 0$ .

For any  $n > m > N$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n X_m) = \mathbb{E}(X_m \mathbb{E}(X_n | \mathcal{J}_n)) = 0.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) (1_A - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}_g)) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) = 0$$

almost everywhere.

Likely, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (1_B - \mathbb{E}(1_B | \mathcal{A}_g)) (T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) = 0$$

almost everywhere for any  $g \in \Phi^{-1}$ . By Theorem 2.7, for any  $g \in \Phi^{-1}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \left( \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) (1_A - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A})) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) \right| \right) d\mu \\ & \leq \int \left( \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) (1_A - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}_g)) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) \right| \right) d\mu \\ & + \int \left( \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) (\mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}_g) - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A})) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) \right| \right) d\mu \\ & \leq c(d, 2, 2) \|\mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}_g) - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A})\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.1, we know that for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_B(T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) (1_A - \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A})) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Likely, we can know that for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (1_B - \mathbb{E}(1_B | \mathcal{A})) (T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} x) \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}) (T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} x) = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Take sum for (3.1) and (3.2) and we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} 1_B T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} 1_A - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} T_1^{3n^2} T_2^{8n^2} \mathbb{E}(1_B | \mathcal{A}) T_1^{n^2} T_2^{-n^2} \mathbb{E}(1_A | \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow 0$$

almost everywhere as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

Clearly, the special case reflects a fact that we can use the polynomial ergodic averages that come from  $(X, P_\mu(\mathbb{Z}^d), \mu)$  to consider the polynomial ergodic averages come from  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

Now, let us be back to the proof of Theorem 1.3. Before this, we need a lemma. In the following lemma, we consider such situation:

Under the assumption of Theorem 1.3. Let  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  and fix them. Assume that  $p_{i,j}(0) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m$ . To be convenient, we view  $\vec{n}$  as  $T_1^{n_1} \dots T_d^{n_d}$  where  $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Moreover, we assume that for each  $1 \leq j \leq m, (p_{1,j}(n), \dots, p_{d,j}(n))$  is not a constant and for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k \neq l, (p_{1,k}(n) - p_{1,l}(n), \dots, p_{d,k}(n) - p_{d,l}(n))$  is not a constant. Clearly, there exist  $A_1, \dots, A_d > 0$  such that there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > N_0$ , for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,

$$\deg \left( \sum_{i=1}^d A_i p_{i,j}(n) \right) \geq 1$$

and there exists  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > N_1$ , for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k \neq l$ ,

$$\deg \left( \sum_{i=1}^d A_i (p_{i,k}(n) - p_{i,l}(n)) \right) \geq 1.$$

By Example 2.4, we know  $\Phi = \{(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{there exists } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\} \text{ such that } \sum_{l=1}^{d-k} A_l n_l = 0 \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, j-1 \text{ and } \sum_{l=1}^{d-j} A_l n_l < 0\}$  is an algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . To be convenient, suppose that

$$(p_{1,l}(n), \dots, p_{d,l}(n)) <_\Phi (p_{1,k}(n), \dots, p_{d,k}(n))$$

for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k < l$  when  $n > N_2$  where  $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_g$  is a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{h f_l : 1 \leq l \leq d, h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and } g \leq_\Phi h\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{A}_g$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *For any  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_1^{p_{1,k}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,k}(n)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A})) (T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x). \\ & \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A}) (T_1^{p_{1,l}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(n)} x) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

almost everywhere as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $g_{j_0} \in \Phi^{-1}$  such that  $\|\mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}) - \mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A})\|_2 < \epsilon$  by Theorem 2.1. By Theorem 2.7, let  $\tilde{d} = \max\{\deg p_{i,j}(n) : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \left( \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_1^{p_{1,k}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,k}(n)} x) (\mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}) - \mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A})) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. (T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l|\mathcal{A})(T_1^{p_{1,l}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(n)} x) \right| \right) d\mu \\ & \leq \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \|f_k\|_\infty \left\| \sup_{N \geq 1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} |\mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}) - \mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A})|(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \right\|_2 \\ & \prod_{l=j+1}^m \|f_l\|_\infty \leq \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \|f_k\|_\infty c(d, \tilde{d}, 2) \epsilon \prod_{l=j+1}^m \|f_l\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

So we only need to verify that as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_1^{p_{1,k}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,k}(n)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}))(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \\ & \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l|\mathcal{A})(T_1^{p_{1,l}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(n)} x) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Let  $K = \max\{N_2, N_1, N_0\}$ . There exists  $L_j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $L_j > K$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > L_j$ , we have one of the following two equalities:

$g_{j_0} + (p_{1,j}((n-1)Q+i), \dots, p_{d,j}((n-1)Q+i)) <_\Phi (p_{1,j}(nQ+i), \dots, p_{d,j}(nQ+i))$ ,  
 $g_{j_0} + (p_{1,j}((n+1)Q+i), \dots, p_{d,j}((n+1)Q+i)) <_\Phi (p_{1,j}(nQ+i), \dots, p_{d,j}(nQ+i))$   
for any  $0 \leq i \leq Q-1$  since when  $n > N_0$ ,  $\deg(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i p_{i,j}(n)) \geq 1$ . Choose any  $0 \leq i \leq Q-1$  and fix it. Let

$$\begin{aligned} X_{j,n} &= \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_1^{p_{1,k}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,k}(nQ+i)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) \\ & (T_1^{p_{1,j}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(nQ+i)} x) \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l|\mathcal{A})(T_1^{p_{1,l}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(nQ+i)} x). \end{aligned}$$

For any  $n > L_j$ , we define  $\mathcal{J}_{j,n} = \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0} + (p_{1,j}(nQ+i), \dots, p_{d,j}(nQ+i))}$ .

Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E}(f_l|\mathcal{A})(T_1^{p_{1,l}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(nQ+i)} x)$$

is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable for  $l > j$ . And

$$(f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j|\mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}))(T_1^{p_{1,j}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(nQ+i)} x)$$

is  $\mathcal{J}_{j,n-1}(\mathcal{J}_{j,n+1})$ -measurable. For  $l < j$ , there exists  $M_j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $M_j > L_j$  such that if  $n > M_j$ ,  $f_l(T_1^{p_{1,l}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(nQ+i)} x)$  is  $\mathcal{J}_{j,n}$ -measurable since when  $n > K$ , for any  $1 \leq k \leq j-1$ ,

$$\deg \left( \sum_{i=1}^d A_i(p_{i,k}(n) - p_{i,j}(n)) \right) \geq 1$$

and

$$(p_{1,j}(n), \dots, p_{d,j}(n)) <_{\Phi} (p_{1,k}(n), \dots, p_{d,k}(n)).$$

To sum up, when  $n > M_j$ ,  $X_{j,n}$  is  $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\mathcal{J}_{n+1})$ -measurable. Use that fact that

$$(p_{1,j}(nQ+i), \dots, p_{d,j}(nQ+i))^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}} = \mathcal{J}_{j,n}$$

and Lemma 2.2, we know

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}((p_{1,j}(nQ+i), \dots, p_{d,j}(nQ+i)) \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}) | \mathcal{J}_{j,n}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}((p_{1,j}(nQ+i), \dots, p_{d,j}(nQ+i)) f_j | \mathcal{J}_{j,n}). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} | \mathcal{J}_{j,n}) = 0$ . For any  $n > m > M_j$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} X_{j,m}) = \mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} \mathbb{E}(X_{j,m} | \mathcal{J}_{j,m})) = 0$$

or

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} X_{j,m}) = \mathbb{E}(X_{j,m} \mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} | \mathcal{J}_{j,n})) = 0.$$

Note the fact that for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_1^{p_{1,k}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,k}(n)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) (T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A})(T_1^{p_{1,l}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(n)} x) \right| \\ &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{i=0}^{Q-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_1^{p_{1,k}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,k}(nQ+i)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) \right. \\ & \quad \left. (T_1^{p_{1,j}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(nQ+i)} x) \cdot \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A})(T_1^{p_{1,l}(nQ+i)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,l}(nQ+i)} x) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1, we can get (3.4). This finishes the proof.  $\square$

Now, we are about to prove Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Without loss of generality, we can assume  $p_{i,j}(n) \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m$  and they satisfy the following properties:

- (1) For any  $1 \leq i \leq d, l \leq j \leq m$ ,  $p_{i,j}(0) = 0$ .
- (2) For each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $(p_{1,j}(n), \dots, p_{d,j}(n))$  is not a constant and for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k \neq l$ ,  $(p_{1,k}(n) - p_{1,l}(n), \dots, p_{d,k}(n) - p_{d,l}(n))$  is not a constant.

- (3) There exist  $A_1, \dots, A_d > 0$  such that there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > N_0$ , for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,

$$\deg \left( \sum_{i=1}^d A_i p_{i,j}(n) \right) \geq 1$$

and there exists  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > N_1$ , for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k \neq l$ ,

$$\deg \left( \sum_{i=1}^d A_i (p_{i,k}(n) - p_{i,l}(n)) \right) \geq 1.$$

- (4) Let  $\Phi = \{(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{there exists } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\} \text{ such that } \sum_{l=1}^{d-k} A_l n_l = 0 \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, j-1 \text{ and } \sum_{l=1}^{d-j} A_l n_l < 0\}$ . By Example 2.4, we know it is an algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . And

$$(p_{1,l}(n), \dots, p_{d,l}(n)) <_{\Phi} (p_{1,k}(n), \dots, p_{d,k}(n))$$

for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k < l$  when  $n > N_2$  where  $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ .

First, we prove the sufficiency.

Let  $f_j = 1_{A_j}$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$  where  $A_j \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $0 < \mu(A_j)$ . For any  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_g$  is a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{hf_l : 1 \leq l \leq d, h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and } g \leq_{\Phi} h\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{A}_g$ . Note that  $\Phi^{-1}$  is still an algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Use the definition of  $\mathcal{A}$  and Proposition 2.6, we know  $\mathcal{A} \subset P_{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ .

Use Lemma 3.3 and take sum along  $j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , we get

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A})(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \rightarrow 0$$

for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Use linear property, sufficient condition and Theorem 2.8, we know for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^{\infty}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \rightarrow L(f_1, \dots, f_m)$$

almost everywhere as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  where  $L(f_1, \dots, f_m) \in L^{\infty}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

As for necessity, it is clear. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** In fact, we can describe the form of  $L(f_1, \dots, f_m)$  when  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is a  $K$ -system.

Next, we verify that  $L(f_1, \dots, f_m) = \prod_{j=1}^m \int f_j d\mu$  for any  $f_j \in L^{\infty}(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume  $f_j \geq 0$  for any  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .

Select simple function sequences  $\{\phi_j^k\}_{k \geq 1}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$  such that  $\phi_j^k \rightarrow f_j$  in  $L^2(\mu)$  and  $\|\phi_j\|_{\infty} \geq \|\phi_j^k\|_{\infty}$  for any  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $I_k = \int \phi_1^k d\mu \dots \int \phi_m^k d\mu$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m \phi_j^k(T_1^{p_{1,j}(n)} \dots T_d^{p_{d,j}(n)} x) \rightarrow I_k$$

for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(\mu)$ , there exists  $K > 0$  such that

$$K > \max\left\{ \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m, j \neq k} \|f_j\|_\infty : 1 \leq k \leq m \right\}.$$

By Theorem 2.7, there exists  $C > 0$  such that

$$\|L(f_1, \dots, f_m) - I_k\|_2 \leq CK \sum_{j=1}^m \|f_j - \phi_j^k\|_2.$$

Then  $L(f_1, \dots, f_m) = \prod_{j=1}^m \int f_j d\mu$ .

#### 4. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Before the proof, we need a lemma. In the following lemma, we consider such situation:

Under the assumption of Theorem 1.6. Let  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  and fix them. Assume that  $p_j(0) = 0, 1 \leq j \leq m$ . To be convenient, we view  $\vec{n}$  as  $T_1^{n_1} \dots T_d^{n_d}$  where  $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Let  $\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_d$  denote the natural basis of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . That is, for any  $1 \leq i \leq d$ ,  $\vec{e}_i = (n_1, \dots, n_d)$  where  $n_1 = \dots = n_{i-1} = n_{i+1} = \dots = n_d = 0$  and  $n_i = 1$ . Moreover, we assume that for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $p_j(n)$  is not a constant and for any  $1 \leq k < l \leq m$ , if  $g(k) = g(l)$ , then  $p_k(n) - p_l(n)$  is not a constant. Clearly, there exist  $A_1, \dots, A_d > 0$  such that there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > N_0$ , for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $\deg(A_{g(j)} p_j(n)) \geq 1$  and there exists  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > N_1$ , for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k \neq l$ ,  $\deg(A_{g(k)} p_k(n) - A_{g(l)} p_l(n)) \geq 1$ .

By Example 2.4, we know  $\Phi = \{(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \text{there exists } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\} \text{ such that } \sum_{l=1}^{d-k} A_l n_l = 0 \text{ for } k = 0, \dots, j-1 \text{ and } \sum_{l=1}^{d-j} A_l n_l < 0\}$  is an algebraic past of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . To be convenient, suppose that  $p_l(n) \vec{e}_{g(l)} <_\Phi p_k(n) \vec{e}_{g(k)}$  for any  $1 \leq k, l \leq m$  with  $k < l$  when  $n > N_2$  where  $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_g$  is a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{h f_l : 1 \leq l \leq d, h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and } g \leq_\Phi h\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{g \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{A}_g$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *For any  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we have*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_{g(k)}^{p_k(a_n)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A})) (T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_n)} x) \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A})(T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_n)} x) \rightarrow 0$$

almost everywhere as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.*  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists g_{j_0} \in \Phi^{-1}$  such that  $\|\mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}) - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A})\|_2 < \epsilon$  by Theorem 2.1. By Theorem 2.9, we have

$$\int \left( \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} T_{g(k)}^{p_k(a_n)} f_k T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_n)} (\mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}) - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A})) \cdot \prod_{l=j+1}^m T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_n)} \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A}) \right| \right) d\mu \leq \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \|f_k\|_\infty c(2, p_j, T_{g(j)}) \epsilon \prod_{l=j+1}^m \|f_l\|_\infty.$$

So we only need to verify that as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_{g(k)}^{p_k(a_n)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) (T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_n)} x) \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A}) (T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_n)} x) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.1)$$

almost everywhere.

Let  $K = \max\{N_0, N_1, N_2\}$ . There exists  $L_j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $L_j > K$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $n > L_j$ , we have  $g_{j_0} + p_j(a_{(n-1)Q+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)} <_{\Phi} p_j(a_{nQ+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)}$  or  $g_{j_0} + p_j(a_{(n+1)Q+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)} <_{\Phi} p_j(a_{nQ+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)}$  for any  $0 \leq i \leq Q-1$ . Choose any  $0 \leq i \leq Q-1$  and fix it. Let

$$X_{j,n} = \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_{g(k)}^{p_k(a_{nQ+i})} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) (T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_{nQ+i})} x) \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A}) (T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_{nQ+i})} x).$$

For any  $n > L_j$ , we define  $\mathcal{J}_{j,n} = \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0} + p_j(a_{nQ+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)}}$ .

Clearly,  $\mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A}_j) (T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_{nQ+i})} x)$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable for  $l > j$ . And  $(f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) (T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_{nQ+i})} x)$  is  $\mathcal{J}_{j,n-1}(\mathcal{J}_{j,n+1})$ -measurable. For  $l < j$ ,  $T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_{nQ+i})} f_l$  is  $\mathcal{J}_{j,n}$ -measurable since there exists  $M_j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $M_j > L_j$  such that when  $n > M_j$ ,  $p_j(n) \vec{e}_{g(j)} + g_{j_0} <_{\Phi} p_l(n) \vec{e}_{g(l)}$  for any  $1 \leq l \leq j-1$ . To sum up, when  $n > M_j$ ,  $X_{j,n}$  is  $\mathcal{J}_{j,n-1}(\mathcal{J}_{j,n+1})$ -measurable. Use that fact that  $(p_j(a_{nQ+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)})^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}} = \mathcal{J}_{j,n}$  and Lemma 2.2, we know

$$\mathbb{E}((p_j(a_{nQ+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)}) \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}}) | \mathcal{J}_{j,n}) = \mathbb{E}((p_j(a_{nQ+i}) \vec{e}_{g(j)}) f_j | \mathcal{J}_{j,n}).$$

So  $\mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} | \mathcal{J}_{j,n}) = 0$ . When  $n > m > M_j$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} X_{j,m}) = \mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} \mathbb{E}(X_{j,m} | \mathcal{J}_{j,m})) = 0$$

or

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} X_{j,m}) = \mathbb{E}(X_{j,m} \mathbb{E}(X_{j,n} | \mathcal{J}_{j,n})) = 0.$$

Note the fact that for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_{g(k)}^{p_k(a_n)} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) (T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_n)} x) \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A}) (T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_n)} x) \right| \\ &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{i=0}^{Q-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} f_k(T_{g(k)}^{p_k(a_{nQ+i})} x) (f_j - \mathbb{E}(f_j | \mathcal{A}_{g_{j_0}})) (T_{g(j)}^{p_j(a_{nQ+i})} x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \prod_{l=j+1}^m \mathbb{E}(f_l | \mathcal{A}) (T_{g(l)}^{p_l(a_{nQ+i})} x) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1, we can get (4.1). This finishes the proof.  $\square$

Based on the Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 2.10, the proof of Theorem 1.6 is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Remark 4.2.** *a. The core of proof of Theorem 1.6 is the fact that prime sequence is strictly increasing. By this phenomenon, we know that if there exists relative maximal inequality for a strictly increasing(decrease) integer sequence, then one can build a result like Theorem 1.6 for this sequence.*

*b. Under the assumption of Theorem 1.6 and  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is a  $K$ -system. Repeat the similar argument of the Remark 3.4, we know the following result:*

*If for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $p_j(n)$  is not a constant and for any  $1 \leq k < l \leq m$ , if  $g(k) = g(l)$ , then  $p_k(n) - p_l(n)$  is not a constant. Then for any  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in L^\infty(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(T_{g^{(j)}}^{p_j(a_n)} x) = \prod_{j=1}^m \int f_j d\mu$$

*almost everywhere.*

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is supported by NNSF of China (11971455, 12031019, 12090012). The author's thanks go to Professor Wen Huang and Professor Song Shao for their suggestions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] I. Assani. Multiple recurrence and almost sure convergence for weakly mixing dynamical systems. *Isr. J. Math.*, 103:111–124, 1998.
- [2] T. Austin. On the norm convergence of non-conventional ergodic averages. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 30(2):321–338, 2010.
- [3] V. Bergelson and A. Leibman. A nilpotent Roth theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 147(2):429–470, 2002.
- [4] J. Bourgain. An approach to pointwise ergodic theorems. Geometric aspects of functional analysis, Isr. Semin. 1986–87, Lect. Notes Math., 1317:204–223, 1988.
- [5] J. Bourgain. On the maximal ergodic theorem for certain subsets of the integers. *Isr. J. Math.*, 61(1):39–72, 1988.
- [6] J. Bourgain. On the pointwise ergodic theorem on  $L^p$  for arithmetic sets. *Isr. J. Math.*, 61(1):73–84, 1988.
- [7] J. Bourgain. Double recurrence and almost sure convergence. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 404:140–161, 1990.
- [8] K. Chung. *A course in probability theory*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 2000.
- [9] J.-P. Conze and E. Lesigne. Théorèmes ergodiques pour des mesures diagonales. (Ergodic theorems for diagonal measures). *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr.*, 112:143–175, 1984.
- [10] J. Derrien and E. Lesigne. A pointwise polynomial ergodic theorem for exact endomorphisms and  $K$ -systems. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. Stat.*, 32(6):765–778, 1996.
- [11] S. Donoso and W. Sun. Pointwise convergence of some multiple ergodic averages. *Adv. Math.*, 330:946–996, 2018.
- [12] M. Einsiedler and T. Ward. *Ergodic theory. With a view towards number theory*, volume 259. London: Springer, 2011.
- [13] H. Furstenberg. Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions. *J. Anal. Math.*, 31:204–256, 1977.



- [14] H. Furstenberg and B. Weiss. A mean ergodic theorem for  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^n x)g(T^{n^2} x)$ . In *Convergence in ergodic theory and probability. Papers from the conference, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA, June 23–26, 1993*, pages 193–227. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.
- [15] B. Host and B. Kra. Nonconventional ergodic averages and nilmanifolds. *Ann. Math. (2)*., 161(1):397–488, 2005.
- [16] W. Huang, S. Shao, and X. Ye. Pointwise convergence of multiple ergodic averages and strictly ergodic models. *J. Anal. Math.*, 139(1):265–305, 2019.
- [17] W. Huang, L. Xu, and Y. Yi. Asymptotic pairs, stable sets and chaos in positive entropy systems. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 268(4):824–846, 2015.
- [18] A. D. Ionescu, Á. Magyar, M. Mirek, and T. Z. Szarek. Polynomial averages and pointwise ergodic theorems on nilpotent groups. *Invent. Math.*, 231(3):1023–1140, 2023.
- [19] B. Krause, M. Mirek, and T. Tao. Pointwise ergodic theorems for non-conventional bilinear polynomial averages. *Annals of Mathematics.*, 195(3):997–1109, 2022.
- [20] A. Leibman. Convergence of multiple ergodic averages along polynomials of several variables. *Isr. J. Math.*, 146:303–315, 2005.
- [21] E. Lesigne. Sur la convergence ponctuelle de certaines moyennes ergodiques. (On the pointwise convergence of some ergodic means). *C. R. Acad. Sci, Paris, Sér. I.*, 298:425–428, 1984.
- [22] E. Lesigne. Théorèmes ergodiques ponctuels pour des mesures diagonales. Cas des systèmes distaux. (Pointwise ergodic theorems for diagonal measures. The distal systems case). *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. Stat.*, 23:593–612, 1987.
- [23] E. Lindenstrauss and B. Weiss. Mean topological dimension. *Isr. J. Math.*, 115:1–24, 2000.
- [24] R. Nair. On polynomials in primes and J. Bourgain’s circle method approach to ergodic theorems II. *Stud. Math.*, 105(3):207–233, 1993.
- [25] T. Tao. Norm convergence of multiple ergodic averages for commuting transformations. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 28(2):657–688, 2008.
- [26] M. N. Walsh. Norm convergence of nilpotent ergodic averages. *Ann. Math. (2)*., 175(3):1667–1688, 2012.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF CHINA, HEFEI, ANHUI, 230026, PR CHINA

*Email address:* xiaorz@mail.ustc.edu.cn