

THE FURSTENBERG–ZIMMER STRUCTURE THEOREM FOR STATIONARY RANDOM WALKS

NIKOLAI EDEKO

ABSTRACT. We prove the following version of the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem for stationary actions: Any stationary action of a locally compact second-countable group is a weakly mixing extension of a measure-preserving distal system.

One of the fundamental goals in the study of dynamical systems is to understand their structure, for its intrinsic interest and as a means for classifying dynamical systems or understanding their longterm behavior. This has motivated the development of several structure theorems such as the Furstenberg–Zimmer theorem, proven independently by Furstenberg [Fur77] and Zimmer [Zim76] and best known for being instrumental to Furstenberg’s famous proof of Szemerédi’s theorem by means of a multiple recurrence property for arbitrary measure-preserving dynamical systems. This recurrence property can be derived by elementary means for the special classes of isometric systems and weakly mixing systems. While it is not true that every measure-preserving system decomposes into an isometric and weakly mixing system, the key insight behind the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem is that such a decomposition is possible in terms of *extensions*. Thereby, the theorem splits a system into a weakly mixing extension and a *distal* part built from isometric extensions.

Theorem (Furstenberg–Zimmer). *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a measure-preserving group action. Then it is a weakly mixing extension of a distal action $G \curvearrowright X_d$.*

Since, the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem has inspired numerous other development, including a version for σ -finite measure spaces [AS22a], refinements into sharper structure theorems by Host–Kra [HK05] and Ziegler [Zie07], the use of related ideas for von Neumann algebras by Popa [Pop07], and more recently extensions of the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem to the case of arbitrary group actions on arbitrary probability spaces, see [Jam21] and [EHK21]. Among the numerous applications of these structure-theoretic developments is also the existence of infinite sumsets $B_1 + \dots + B_k$ in any set of positive density, recently proved in [KMRR22] to expand on the Erdős sumset conjecture. However, there also are many natural group actions that are not measure-preserving and thus lie beyond the scope of the Furstenberg–Zimmer theory.

Many spaces come equipped with natural measures μ but most maps do not preserve this measure, though they often preserve at least the measure class $[\mu]$ of measures mutually absolutely continuous to μ which motivates the study of nonsingular dynamics, see [DS11]. For example, two generic transformations of a space will usually have no algebraic relations and thus generate a free and hence nonamenable group. Therefore, for a random walk on a compact space K , i.e., a countable continuous group action $G \curvearrowright K$ with an appropriate probability measure m on G , there does not generally exist an invariant measure. However, one can always find *stationary* measures ν satisfying the on-average invariance

$$\sum_{g \in \text{supp}(m)} m(g) g_* \nu = \nu.$$

These are the natural class of measures for random walks commonly employed in probability theory and they have been studied extensively in different contexts due to their connections to discrete Schrödinger operators and random difference equations ([BL85], [Kes73]) Diophantine approximation ([SW19], [PS20], [KL21]), as well as their relevance for results on orbit closures, equidistribution, and measure classification ([BQ11], [BQ13b], [BQ13a], [EL18], [BQ12]), and random matrix products ([Fur63a], [FK60]) which in turn are connected to different machine learning paradigms [Dur+21].

As it turns out, isometric and distal systems also may naturally occur as the building blocks of stationary actions, as the following example shows.

Example. An important and elementary class of actions that usually do not admit invariant measures are actions on projective spaces. Pick some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and let $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 2\pi)$ be angles linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . Set

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & 1 & 1 \\ \cos(\alpha) & -\sin(\alpha) & \\ \sin(\alpha) & \cos(\alpha) & \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & 1 & 1 \\ \cos(\beta) & -\sin(\beta) & \\ \sin(\beta) & \cos(\beta) & \end{pmatrix},$$

let Γ_m be the subgroup of $\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ generated by A and B , and set $m := \frac{1}{3}\delta_A + \frac{1}{3}\delta_B + \frac{1}{6}\delta_{A^{-1}} + \frac{1}{6}\delta_{B^{-1}}$. What are the stationary measures for the action of (Γ_m, m) on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3)$? It can be shown that apart from the trivial invariant measure corresponding to the unique fixed point of this system, there is a unique m -stationary measure μ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Moreover, the system $\Gamma_m \curvearrowright (\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3), \mu)$ admits as a natural factor the uniquely ergodic rotational action $\Gamma_m \curvearrowright (\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2), \nu)$; see [AS22b, Theorem 1.1] for a proof thereof in a more general setting and Example 6.5 for a different proof and a detailed discussion.

This raises the question: Is there a version of the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem for stationary actions? This seems plausible because in [Bjö17, Theorem 3.1], Björklund showed that the equivalence of weak mixing and having no nontrivial isometric factors is also true for stationary actions. Indeed, the goal of the present article is to answer this question affirmatively.

Theorem. *Let $(G, m) \curvearrowright X$ be a stationary (G, m) -action. Then it is a weakly mixing extension of a distal and measure-preserving action $G \curvearrowright X_d$.*

We prove this more generally for locally compact second countable groups G and probability measures m on G such that $\text{supp}(m)$ generates a dense subgroup of G , see Theorem 6.1. Apart from combining ideas from several previous works, this requires two new results that are of independent interest: First, at key moments, it is necessary to transfer properties from the subgroup generated by $\text{supp}(m)$ to its closure. To do this, we developed the following general continuity result (see Theorem 2.1).

Theorem. *Let G be a second countable locally compact group and $G \curvearrowright X$ a nonsingular measurable action on a standard probability space. Then the induced action of G on $L^\infty(X)$ is strongly continuous with respect to the L^1 -norm.*

Second, we significantly strengthen this result by proving in Construction 2.4 that any nonsingular measurable action of a locally compact second countable group on a standard probability space is isomorphic to a *continuous* action on a compact metric space. This simplifies several arguments and brings to light hidden continuity properties of nonsingular group actions.

The Furstenberg–Zimmer theorem for stationary actions is just one of several existing structure theorems that have meanwhile been proven for stationary actions. For example, in [NZ02] it is shown that every stationary action $(G, m) \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ for a connected noncompact semisimple Lie group with finite center admits a maximal projective factor of the form G/Q where Q is a parabolic subgroup. In [NZ02, Theorem 1] they show that if all noncompact simple factors of G are of real rank at least two, then this maximal projective factor is trivial if and only if the measure μ is not just stationary but G -invariant. An abstract version of this reminiscent of the PI structure theorem [Aus88, Chapter 14], [EGS75] was proven in [FG10, Theorem 4.3]: Every stationary action of a locally compact second countable measured group (G, m) with an admissible probability measure m is, modulo an m -proximal extension, a relatively measure-preserving extension of an m -proximal system. This structure theorem was later used in [FG13] to prove a multiple recurrence theorem for stationary actions. Whether the generalization of the Furstenberg–Zimmer theorem to stationary actions can also be used to derive multiple recurrence properties and related applications is the subject of ongoing work. We point out that simultaneously with the author, U. Bader and Y. Vigder derived essentially the same result with different techniques in a forthcoming work.

Organization. Section 1 starts with a swift review of the classical Furstenberg–Zimmer theorem and the underlying key ideas that serve as a reference and roadmap for later sections. Section 2 lays the basis for later sections by explaining how topological models allow to readily switch between factors of a nonsingular dynamical system and the C^* -subalgebras corresponding to these factors. In preparation for Section 6, Section 3 collects some tools required for working with weakly mixing and isometric extensions of nonsingular systems. As

a side-product, we prove a version of the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem for relatively measure-preserving extensions of nonsingular (not necessarily stationary) actions. Section 4 and Section 5 are respectively dedicated to the Kronecker dichotomy for stationary actions and its relative version. Finally, Section 6 concludes with a proof of the structure theorem for stationary actions and Appendix A gathers relevant background information on Hilbert modules essentially taken from [EHK21] on which the current article builds.

Terminology & assumptions. Unless otherwise specified, all Hilbert spaces are assumed to be separable, all compact spaces metrizable, all groups G locally compact and second countable (lcsc), all Haar measures m_G to be left-invariant, and all measure spaces to be standard probability spaces. We usually abbreviate probability spaces as $\mathbf{X} = (X, \Sigma, \mu)$ or (X, μ) when the σ -algebra is inessential. The typical abbreviations for measure spaces will thus be $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mu)$, $\mathbf{Y} = (Y, \nu)$, and $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, \zeta)$. If G is a lcsc group, a continuous action of G on a compact space K is a group action of G on K such that the induced map $G \times K \rightarrow K$ is continuous. Similarly, a measurable action of G on a probability space \mathbf{X} is a group action of G on \mathbf{X} such that the induced map $G \times \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ is measurable. If a group G acts on a probability space \mathbf{X} or a compact space K , we sometimes write $G \curvearrowright \mathbf{X}$ or $G \curvearrowright K$ to indicate this. A **measured group** (G, m) consists of a lcsc group G and a Borel probability measure m on G such that $\text{supp}(m)$ generates a dense subgroup of G . (We explicitly do not require the common assumption that $\text{supp}(m)$ generate G as a *semigroup*.) The convolution of two Borel probability measures μ and ν on a group G is, for Borel subsets $E \subseteq G$, defined as

$$(\mu * \nu)(E) := \int_G \int_G \mathbb{1}_E(gh) \, d\nu(h) \, d\mu(g) = \int_G (g_*\nu)(E) \, d\mu(g).$$

Convolutional powers are denoted by m^{*k} for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If μ is a probability measure on a group G , we denote by $\check{\mu}$ the measure defined by $\check{\mu}(E) = \mu(E^{-1})$ for measurable subsets $E \subseteq G$. If (G, m) is a measured group and $G \curvearrowright \mathbf{X}$ is an action on a probability space, we define the convolution $m * \mu$ as above by

$$(m * \mu)(E) := \int_G (g_*\mu)(E) \, dm(g) \quad \forall E \in \Sigma_X.$$

This can also be seen as the pushforward of $m \otimes \mu_X$ under the action $G \times X \rightarrow X$. In case $m * \mu = \mu$, we call the action of (G, m) on \mathbf{X} **stationary** and μ an m -stationary measure. By an **extension** between continuous actions $G \curvearrowright K$ and $G \curvearrowright L$ on compact spaces, we mean a G -equivariant continuous surjection $q: K \rightarrow L$. Similarly, by an extension between measurable actions $G \curvearrowright \mathbf{X}$ and $G \curvearrowright \mathbf{Y}$ on probability spaces, we mean a measure-preserving map $\pi: \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ that for every $g \in G$ is g -equivariant almost everywhere.

For a compact space K and a probability space \mathbf{X} , we denote by $C(K)$ the space of complex-valued continuous functions on K and by $L^p(\mathbf{X})$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, the space of equivalence classes of complex-valued p -integrable functions. If $\varphi: K \rightarrow L$ is a continuous map between

compact spaces, we define the corresponding **Koopman operator** by

$$T_\varphi: C(L) \rightarrow C(K), \quad f \mapsto f \circ \varphi.$$

Similarly, if $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$ is measure-preserving, we can define the Koopman operator on all L^p -spaces, $p \in [1, \infty]$, via

$$T_\varphi: L^p(Y) \rightarrow L^p(X), \quad f \mapsto f \circ \varphi.$$

In this case, T_φ is a **Markov operator** (T_φ is positive and $T_\varphi \mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{1}_X$) and even a **bi-Markov operator** ($T'_\varphi \mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{1}_X$, i.e., T_φ preserves the integral). If φ is merely a **nonsingular map**, i.e., $\varphi_*\mu_X$ and μ_Y are mutually absolutely continuous, then we can still define the Koopman operator for $p = \infty$ via the same identity. A general overview about nonsingular dynamics can be found in [DS11]. For a probability space X , we denote by $\mathbb{E}: L^p(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the expectation ($p \in [1, \infty]$), i.e., $\mathbb{E}(f) = \int_X f d\mu_X$. If $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ is a measure-preserving map between probability spaces, we denote by $\mathbb{E}_Y: L^p(X) \rightarrow L^p(Y)$ the corresponding conditional expectation where $p \in [1, \infty]$.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks A. Gorodnik and R. Nagel for helpful discussions, M. Björklund for suggesting the question, and U. Bader for an interesting discussion around the topic.

1. THE CLASSICAL FURSTENBERG–ZIMMER STRUCTURE THEOREM

In this section, we recall the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem from [Fur77] and [Zim76] and briefly review the ideas behind it. The first key idea we recall is that there is a dichotomy between two useful classes of dynamical systems, *isometric* and *weakly mixing* systems.

Definition 1.1. Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a measure-preserving action. It is called **isometric** if

$$L^2(X) = \overline{\bigcup \left\{ M \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} M \text{ is a } G\text{-invariant,} \\ \text{finite-dimensional subspace} \end{array} \right\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^2(X)}}.$$

It is called **weakly mixing** if the diagonal action $G \curvearrowright X \times X$ is ergodic.

Isometric systems earn their name since they admit isometric topological models; weakly mixing systems admit a more intuitive characterization that, however, shall not be relevant in this article, see [EFHN15, Definition 9.13, Theorem 9.19]. Every measure-preserving system has a maximal isometric factor, the so-called **Kronecker factor**, and it satisfies the following dichotomy.

Theorem 1.2 (Kronecker dichotomy). *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a measure-preserving action. Then either $G \curvearrowright X$ is weakly mixing or its Kronecker factor is nontrivial.*

Proof. The standard proof of Theorem 1.2 requires the following three ingredients that can be found in the appendix, see Reminder A.1. To state them, let $G \curvearrowright X$ and $G \curvearrowright Y$ be measure-preserving G -actions.

- The assignment

$$I: L^2(X \times Y) \rightarrow \text{HS}(L^2(X), L^2(Y)), \quad (I_k f)(y) := \int_X k(x, y) f(x) d\mu(x)$$

defines an isomorphism between $L^2(X \times Y)$ and the Hilbert space $\text{HS}(L^2(X), L^2(Y))$ of Hilbert–Schmidt operators between $L^2(X)$ and $L^2(Y)$.

- A function $k \in L^2(X \times Y)$ is G -invariant if and only if $I_k T_g = T_g I_k$ for every $g \in G$.
- A self-adjoint Hilbert–Schmidt operator $K \in \text{HS}(L^2(X))$ admits (by virtue of the spectral theorem) a canonical decomposition into finite-rank Hilbert–Schmidt operators. By continuous functional calculus, a bounded operator (such as T_φ) that commutes with K also commutes with the finite-rank operators occurring in its canonical decomposition.

With these prerequisites, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is straight-forward: If $G \curvearrowright X$ is not weakly mixing, then there is a nonconstant G -invariant function $k \in L^2(X \times X)$. The Hilbert–Schmidt operator I_k is then G -equivariant, i.e., $I_k T_g = T_g I_k$ for all $g \in G$, and by decomposing

$$I_k = \frac{I_k + I_k^*}{2} + \frac{I_k - I_k^*}{2}$$

we may assume that I_k is self-adjoint. Thus, the action of G commutes with the projections onto the eigenspaces of I_k , i.e., it leaves the finite-dimensional eigenspaces of I_k invariant. Furthermore, it can be shown that every finite-dimensional G -invariant subspace $M \subseteq L^2(X)$ can be approximated by finite-dimensional G -invariant subspaces in $L^\infty(X)$, see Lemma 3.13. Consequentially, the Kronecker factor of $G \curvearrowright X$ must be nontrivial.

Conversely, if the Kronecker factor of $G \curvearrowright X$ is nontrivial, then there exists a nontrivial finite-dimensional G -invariant subspace $M \subseteq L^\infty(X)$. The orthogonal projection $P_M: L^2(X) \rightarrow L^2(X)$ onto M then defines a nontrivial G -equivariant Hilbert–Schmidt operator and as such must be of the form $P_M = I_k$ for a nontrivial G -invariant function $k \in L^2(X \times X)$. Thus, $G \curvearrowright X$ cannot be weakly mixing in this case. \square

Historically, Furstenberg proved multiple recurrence properties for dynamical systems to derive Szemerédi’s theorem. It is easy to check these multiple recurrence properties for isometric and weakly mixing system, but not every system decomposes into these two types of systems. However, every system can be decomposed into isometric and weakly mixing *extensions*. We recall the relevant definitions and, in preparation for later sections, state them for nonsingular actions (with the exception of weakly mixing extensions which are discussed in a later section).

Definition 1.3. Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ be a measure-preserving map.

(i) The **conditional L^2 -space** of the extension is

$$L^2(X|Y) := \{f \in L^2(X) \mid \mathbb{E}_Y(|f|^2) \in L^\infty(Y)\}.$$

It is a *Hilbert module* over $L^\infty(Y)$ with multiplication and $L^\infty(Y)$ -valued scalar product given by

$$\begin{aligned} \cdot: L^\infty(Y) \times L^2(X|Y) &\rightarrow L^2(X|Y), & (f, g) &\mapsto (g \circ f) \cdot g, \\ (\cdot| \cdot)_Y: L^2(X|Y) \times L^2(X|Y) &\rightarrow L^\infty(Y), & (f, g) &\mapsto \mathbb{E}_Y(f\bar{g}). \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ be an extension of nonsingular G -actions.

(ii) The extension is called **ergodic** if every a.e. G -invariant measurable set $A \subseteq X$ is, up to some nullset, of the form $A = \pi^{-1}(B)$ for an a.e. G -invariant measurable set $B \subseteq Y$.

(iii) The extension is called **isometric** if

$$L^2(X) = \overline{\bigcup \left\{ \Gamma \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} \Gamma \text{ is a } G\text{-invariant, finitely-} \\ \text{generated } L^\infty(Y)\text{-submodule} \end{array} \right\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^2(X)}}.$$

The system $G \curvearrowright X$ is called **isometric** if the extension $X \rightarrow \text{pt}$ is isometric, i.e., if

$$L^2(X) = \overline{\bigcup \left\{ F \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} F \text{ is a } G\text{-invariant, finite-} \\ \text{dimensional subspace} \end{array} \right\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^2(X)}}.$$

(iv) The extension is called **distal** if there are an ordinal η_0 and a projective system $((X_\eta)_{\eta \leq \eta_0}, (\pi_\eta^\sigma)_{\eta \leq \sigma \leq \eta_0})$ of nonsingular G -actions such that

- $\pi_1^{\eta_0} = \pi$,
- $\pi_\eta^{\eta+1}$ is an isometric extension for every $\eta < \eta_0$,
- $X_\eta = \lim_{\mu < \eta} X_\mu$ for every limit ordinal $\eta \leq \eta_0$.

Finally, assume that $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ is an extension of measure-preserving G -actions.

(a) The extension is called **weakly mixing** if the relatively independent joining $\pi \times_Y \pi: X \times_Y X \rightarrow Y$ is an ergodic extension of Y .

Remark 1.4. From a conceptual point of view, the definition of isometric extensions of nonsingular actions should not involve $L^2(X)$ since in the nonsingular realm, there is no induced action on $L^2(X)$ or $L^2(X|Y)$. It would be more appropriate to work purely in $L^\infty(X)$ and use the equivalent definition in terms of *order closure* that requires that

$$L^\infty(X) = \text{ocl} \bigcup \left\{ \Gamma \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} \Gamma \text{ is a } G\text{-invariant, finitely-} \\ \text{generated } L^\infty(Y)\text{-submodule} \end{array} \right\}.$$

See the appendix for a discussion of order-convergence (which, for bounded sequences, is the same as almost everywhere convergence, see [EHK21, Lemma 7.5]). We shall use L^2 -closures for the sake of accessibility but the reader familiar with order convergence may wish to instead take the less common but conceptually cleaner approach.

With these notions, the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem, inspired by Furstenberg’s earlier structure theorem [Fur63b] for distal actions in topological dynamics, can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be an extension of measure-preserving G -actions. Then there are a weakly mixing extension $\alpha: X \rightarrow Y$ and a distal extension $\beta: Y \rightarrow Z$ such that the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\pi} & Z \\ & \searrow \alpha & \nearrow \beta \\ & Y & \end{array}$$

commutes.

The proof reduces essentially to the following generalization of the Kronecker dichotomy Theorem 1.2 to extensions.

Theorem 1.6 (Relative Kronecker dichotomy). *An extension $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ of measure-preserving G -actions is weakly mixing if and only if there is no isometric intermediate extension of Z .*

Remark 1.7. The proof of Theorem 1.6 can be carried out in complete analogy to its special case Theorem 1.2. To that end, the L^2 -space $L^2(X)$ is replaced by the conditional L^2 -space $L^2(X|Z)$ and the conditionally independent joining $X \times_Z X$ (see [Gla03, Examples 6.3]) replaces the product $X \times X$. Since the conditional L^2 -space $L^2(X|Z)$ forms a so-called *Hilbert module* over the C^* -algebra $L^\infty(Z)$, one can make use of results from the theory of Hilbert modules. Unfortunately, general Hilbert modules fail to “relativize” Hilbert spaces in many important ways, as evidenced by the failure of results such as the Fréchet–Riesz representation theorem, complementability of closed submodules, the spectral theorem, and many other essential parts of Hilbert space theory. However, $L^2(X|Z)$ belongs to a special class of Hilbert modules, so-called *Kaplansky–Hilbert modules*, which do not suffer from these problems. We do not enter into the details of Kaplansky–Hilbert modules here and refer the reader to [EHK21] for proofs and details. In light of this, it is not surprising that the following can be shown for extensions.

- There is a natural notion of Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms on $L^2(X|Z)$ and the assignment

$$I: L^2(X \times_Z X) \rightarrow \text{HS}(L^2(X|Z)), \quad (I_k f)(x) := \int_{X_{\pi(x)}} k(x, y) f(y) \, d\mu_{\pi(x)}(y)$$

defines an isomorphism between $L^2(X \times X)$ and the Hilbert module $\text{HS}(L^2(X|Z))$ of Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms on $L^2(X|Z)$. The reader may take this isomorphism as a definition for now; a more general version Theorem 3.8 is proven in the appendix.

- A function $k \in L^2(X \times_Z X)$ is G -invariant if and only if $I_k T_g = T_g I_k$.
- A self-adjoint Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism $K \in L^2(X|Z)$ admits (by virtue of a spectral theorem) a canonical decomposition into finite-rank Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms. By some functional calculus arguments, a bounded operator (such as T_g for $g \in G$) that commutes with K also commutes with the finite-rank homomorphisms occurring in its canonical decomposition.

With these ingredients, the proof of Theorem 1.6 can be done in complete analogy to the proof of Theorem 1.2. In the following sections, we adapt these ideas to prove a similar dichotomy and structure theorem for stationary actions.

Above, we implicitly used the measure disintegration theorem which we quickly recall for later reference.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\pi: (K, \mu) \rightarrow (L, \nu)$ be a continuous measure-preserving map between compact metrizable probability spaces. Then there exist a ν -a.e. uniquely determined family $\{\mu_l \mid l \in L\}$ of probability measures on K with $\text{supp}(\mu_l) \subseteq K_l := \pi^{-1}(l)$ for ν -a.e. $l \in L$ such that for any measurable bounded function $f: K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, the assignment*

$$l \mapsto \int_{K_l} f \, d\mu_l$$

is measurable and satisfies

$$\int_L \int_{K_l} f \, d\mu_l \, d\nu(l) = \int_K f \, d\mu.$$

Moreover, π is essentially invertible if and only if for ν -almost every $l \in L$ the fiber measure μ_l is a Dirac mass.

Proof. The first part is the usual formulation and can be found in many sources, see [AGS08, Theorem 5.3.1]; we include a short proof of the invertibility statement for the sake of completeness. First, suppose π is essentially invertible, i.e., there are sets $A \subseteq K$ and $B \subseteq L$ of

full measure such that $\pi|_A: A \rightarrow B$ is bijective and its inverse $s: B \rightarrow A$ is measurable. Then for every $f \in C(K)$,

$$\langle f, \mu \rangle = \langle f, s_*\pi_*\mu \rangle = \langle f \circ s, \nu \rangle$$

and so it follows that any disintegration $(\mu_l)_{l \in L}$ of μ must agree ν -almost everywhere with the Dirac measures $(\delta_{s(l)})_{l \in B}$.

Conversely, suppose μ admits a disintegration of the form $(\mu_l)_{l \in L}$ such that for some set $B \subseteq L$ of full measure and some function $s: B \rightarrow K$, $\mu_l = \delta_{s(l)}$ for all $l \in B$. Then $\delta_{s(\cdot)}: B \rightarrow C(K)'$ is weak*-measurable, i.e., measurable w.r.t. the Borel σ -algebra of the set $\{\delta_x \mid x \in K\}$ equipped with the weak* topology. Since this set is homeomorphic to K , it follows that $s: B \rightarrow K$ is Borel measurable. Now, for all $l \in B$ one has $(\pi \circ s)(l) = l$ since $\text{supp}(\delta_{s(l)}) = \text{supp}(\mu_l) \subseteq K_l$. Thus, $\pi \circ s = \text{id}_L$ ν -a.e. Finally,

$$\mu([s \circ \pi \neq \text{id}_K]) = \int_L \mu_l([s \circ \pi \neq \text{id}_K]) \, d\nu(l) = \int_B \underbrace{\delta_{s(l)}([s \circ \pi \neq \text{id}_K])}_{=0} \, d\nu(l) = 0.$$

Thus, also $s \circ \pi = \text{id}_K$ μ -a.e., which shows that s is an essential inverse for π . \square

Remark 1.9. The uniqueness property above in particular shows that if $\pi: (K, \mu) \rightarrow (L, \nu)$ is an extension of measure-preserving G -actions for a lcsc group G , then the disintegration is also equivariant ν -a.e. in the sense that $s_*\mu_{s^{-1}l} = \mu_l$ for all $s \in G$ and ν -a.e. $l \in L$. If, more generally, π is an extension of a measure-preserving G -action on (L, ν) by a (G, m) -stationary G -action on (K, μ) , then the uniqueness of the disintegration yields that $\int_G s_*\mu_{s^{-1}l} \, dm(s) = \mu_l$ for ν -a.e. $l \in L$. If both μ and ν are merely stationary, then one can still observe that

$$\int_G s_*\mu \, dm(s) = \int_G \int_L s_*\mu_l \, d\nu(l) \, dm(s) = \int_G \int_L s_*\mu_{s^{-1}l} \frac{ds_*\nu}{d\nu}(l) \, d\nu(l) \, dm(s)$$

where we used the **Radon–Nikodym cocycle** (see [NZ00, Definition 1.3])

$$\rho_\nu: G \times L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \rho_\nu(s, l) := \frac{d(s^{-1})_*\nu}{d\nu}(l).$$

Thus, the uniqueness of disintegrations yields

$$\mu_l = \int_G \left(\frac{ds_*\nu}{d\nu}(l) \right) s_*\mu_{s^{-1}l} \, dm(s) \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-a.e. } l \in L.$$

This observation will be essential in the proof of Lemma 5.9.

2. TOPOLOGICAL MODELS FOR NONSINGULAR ACTIONS

For the proof of the main result, it will be necessary to construct *topological models*. A standard technique for doing this is the correspondence between factors of a system X and C^* -subalgebras of $L^\infty(X)$. It allows for elegant constructions and arguments involving factors/topological models and shall also be used in later sections. The ideas are not novel but

usually only presented for measure-preserving actions, see, e.g., [EFHN15, Chapter 12]. In particular, that every nonsingular action of a locally compact second countable group G on a probability space X admits a compact metric topological model on which G acts *continuously* appears to be a new result. It hinges on the following surprising continuity property of nonsingular actions that is adapted from [HP57, Theorem 10.2.3].

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a second countable locally compact group and $G \curvearrowright X$ a nonsingular measurable action on a standard probability space. Then the induced action of G on $L^\infty(X)$ is strongly continuous with respect to the L^1 -norm.*

Proof. Since the G -action is nonsingular, we can define the group homomorphism

$$\pi: G \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(L^\infty(X)) \quad g \mapsto T_{g^{-1}}.$$

Observe that for $f \in L^\infty(X)$, we can regard the map $\pi(\cdot)f$ as taking values in $L^1(X)$. Moreover, for every $h \in L^\infty(X)$ the expression

$$\langle h, \pi(g)f \rangle = \int_X f(g^{-1}x)h(x) \, d\mu(x)$$

depends measurably on g because the action $G \times X \rightarrow X$, $(g, x) \mapsto gx$ is measurable by assumption. (See [Tao11, Theorem 1.7.15] for the measure-theoretic details.) This means that $\pi(\cdot)f$ is, regarded as a map to $L^1(X)$, weakly measurable and [HP57, Theorem 3.5.3] yields that it is even strongly measurable¹ because $L^1(X)$ is separable. Thus, regarding $\pi(\cdot)f$ as a map with values in $L^1(X)$, we may integrate it in the sense of Bochner integrals.

Now, let $K \subseteq G$ be a compact set of Haar measure 1, $U \subseteq G$ a compact symmetric unit neighborhood, $h \in U$, $f \in L^\infty(X)$ and note that

$$\pi(h)f - f = \int_K \pi(g) [\pi(g^{-1}h)f - \pi(g^{-1})f] \, dm_G(g).$$

Then setting $F: UK \rightarrow L^1(X)$, $F(g) = \pi(g^{-1})f$, we obtain that F is strongly measurable and bounded since π has these properties on the compact set UK . Extending F to all of G by zero, we can regard it as an element of $L^1(G, m; L^1(X))$ that satisfies $F(h^{-1}g) = \pi(g^{-1}h)f$ for all $h \in U$, $g \in K$. Since the left-regular representation of G on $L^1(G, m_G; L^1(X))$ is strongly continuous (see Lemma 2.3 below), we know that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow e} \int_G \|F(h^{-1}g) - F(g)\|_{L^1(X)} \, dm_G(g) = 0.$$

Since for $h \in U$

$$\int_K \|F(h^{-1}g) - F(g)\|_{L^1(X)} \, dm_G(g) = \int_K \|\pi(g^{-1}h)f - \pi(g^{-1})f\|_{L^1(X)} \, dm_G(g),$$

¹This means that for each $f \in L^\infty(X)$, the map $g \mapsto \pi(g)f$ is the almost-everywhere limit of finitely-valued measurable functions.

we can conclude that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow e} \int_K \|\pi(g^{-1}h)f - \pi(g^{-1})f\|_{L^1(X)} \, d\mathbf{m}_G(g) = 0.$$

Now, fix a sequence $(h_n)_n$ in G with $h_n \rightarrow e$. Then the above convergence in $L^1(K, \mathbf{m}_G|_K)$ implies that, by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\pi(g^{-1}h_n)f - \pi(g^{-1})f\|_{L^1(X)} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{m}_G\text{-a.e. } g \in K.$$

By Lemma 2.2, it follows that also

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\pi(g) [\pi(g^{-1}h_n)f - \pi(g^{-1})f]\|_{L^1(X)} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{m}_G\text{-a.e. } g \in K.$$

Since

$$\|\pi(g) [\pi(g^{-1}h_n)f - \pi(g^{-1})f]\|_{L^\infty(X)} \leq 2\|f\|_{L^\infty(X)},$$

we may invoke the dominated convergence theorem to conclude that

$$\|\pi(h_n)f - f\|_{L^1(X)} \leq \int_K \|\pi(g) [\pi(g^{-1}h_n)f - \pi(g^{-1})f]\|_{L^1(X)} \, d\mathbf{m}_G(g) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Since the sequence $(h_n)_n$ was chosen arbitrarily, it follows that $\pi(\cdot)f$ is L^1 -continuous at $e \in G$. If $h_n \rightarrow h$ is a general convergent sequence in G , use the identity

$$\pi(h_n)f - \pi(h)f = \pi(h) \left(\pi(h^{-1}h_n)f - f \right)$$

and Lemma 2.2 to conclude that $\pi(\cdot)f$ is L^1 -continuous on all of G . \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\varphi: X \rightarrow X$ be a nonsingular map. Then the Koopman operator*

$$T_\varphi: L^\infty(X) \rightarrow L^\infty(X)$$

maps $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(X)}$ -convergent sequences that are $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X)}$ -bounded to $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(X)}$ -convergent sequences.

Proof. Let $(f_n)_n$ be a sequence in $L^\infty(X)$ that is uniformly bounded and converges to $f \in L^\infty(X)$ in the L^1 -norm. It suffices to show that every subsequence of $(T_\varphi f_n)_n$ has a subsequence that converges to $T_\varphi f$ in L^1 . Thus, replacing $(f_n)_n$ with a subsequence, we may assume that $f_n \rightarrow f$ almost everywhere. Since φ is nonsingular, it follows that $T_\varphi f_n \rightarrow T_\varphi f$ almost everywhere and the uniform boundedness assumption combined with the dominated convergence theorem yields the claim. \square

The following lemma is certainly not new and merely included for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be a locally compact group, E a Banach space and fix a left-invariant Haar measure \mathbf{m} on G . Let $p \in [1, \infty)$.*

(i) *The map*

$$L: G \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(L^p(G, m; E)), \quad (L_h f)(g) := f(h^{-1}g)$$

is a strongly continuous representation of G .

(ii) *The map*

$$R: G \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(L^p(G, m; E)), \quad (R_h f)(g) := f(gh)$$

is a strongly continuous representation of G (even though the measure is only left-invariant).

We call these representations the E -left-regular and E -right-regular representations of G .

Proof. We only need to show that L and R are strongly continuous, so pick $f \in L^p(G, m; E)$. We cannot directly invoke the dominated convergence theorem to conclude that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_G \|f(h^{-1}g) - f(g)\|^p dm(g) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|L_h f - f\|_{L^p}^p = 0$$

since the function f is not continuous. But note that the space $C_c(G, E)$ of continuous, compactly supported E -valued functions on G is dense in $L^p(G, m; E)$: To see this, it suffices to verify that for every measurable set $A \subseteq G$ of finite measure and every $e \in E$, the function $e\mathbb{1}_A$ can be approximated by $C_c(G, E)$ which follows since $\mathbb{1}_A$ can be approximated in $L^p(G, m_G)$ by functions in $C_c(G)$.

Now, pick $\varepsilon > 0$ and a function $f_\varepsilon \in C_c(G, E)$ such that $\|f - f_\varepsilon\|_{L^p}^p \leq \varepsilon$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_G \|f(h^{-1}g) - f(g)\|^p dg &\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_G \|f(h^{-1}g) - f_\varepsilon(h^{-1}g)\|^p dg \\ &\quad + \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_G \|f_\varepsilon(h^{-1}g) - f_\varepsilon(g)\|^p dg \\ &\quad + \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_G \|f_\varepsilon(g) - f(g)\|^p dg \\ &\leq \varepsilon + 0 + \varepsilon \\ &= 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, L is strongly continuous. As for R , note that even though R_g is not an isometry for all $g \in G$ in general, R_g still is a well-defined operator on $L^p(G, m; E)$ of norm $\leq \Delta(g^{-1})^{1/p}$ by elementary properties of the modular function $\Delta: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Now the proof is completely analogous to that for L , except that the modular function appears in passing in the estimate

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \int_G \|f(gh) - f_\varepsilon(gh)\|^p dg \leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \Delta(h^{-1}) \int_G \|f(g) - f_\varepsilon(g)\|^p dg \leq \varepsilon$$

but disappears again since it is continuous. □

We are now ready to discuss the construction of topological models. Note that our topological models not merely represent a measurable action on an abstract probability space as a measurable action on a compact metric probability space. Rather, we show that nonsingular actions by locally compact second countable groups always can be represented as *continuous* actions on compact metric spaces.

Construction 2.4 (Topological Models). Let $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ be a nonsingular action and $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ a factor map. Then $\mathcal{A}_\pi := T_\pi(L^\infty(Y, \nu))$ defines a G -invariant unital C^* -subalgebra of $L^\infty(X, \mu)$. Conversely, if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ is a G -invariant unital C^* -subalgebra of $L^\infty(X, \mu)$, then by Gelfand's representation theorem there exist a compact space K and a C^* -isomorphism $\Phi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C(K)$, see [Dix77, Section 1.4] or [EFHN15, Section 4.4]. Let $\nu := \Phi_*\mu \in C(K)'$ be the linear form that μ induces on $C(K)$ via Φ . By the Riesz–Markov–Kakutani representation theorem, we can identify ν with a unique probability measure on K . It is easy to verify that the measure ν must have full support since the corresponding linear form is strictly positive, i.e., $\langle f, \nu \rangle > 0$ for every nonzero $0 \leq f \in C(K)$. Since Φ preserves the measures, it is an L^1 -isometry and thus we may extend it as $\Phi: L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(K, \nu)$.

Moreover, for every $g \in G$, let $S_g: C(K) \rightarrow C(K)$ be the C^* -automorphism on $C(K)$ induced by T_g via Φ . Every C^* -automorphism S of $C(K)$ is of the form $S = T_\varphi$ for a uniquely determined homeomorphism $\varphi: K \rightarrow K$ and therefore the operators $(S_g)_{g \in G}$ are the Koopman operators associated with a uniquely determined continuous action $G \curvearrowright K$. To see that ν is nonsingular with respect to this G -action, we show that for every $g \in G$ there is an $h_g \in L^1(K, \nu)$ such that $g_*\nu = h_g\nu$. To that end, denote for every $g \in G$ by $\xi_g \in L^1(X, \mu)$ the unique function with $g_*\mu = \xi_g\mu$ that exists by virtue of the Radon–Nikodym theorem. If we denote by $\mathbb{E}_\mathcal{A}: L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ the conditional expectation onto the L^1 -closure of \mathcal{A} , then for every $f \in C(K)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K S_g f \, d\nu &= \int_X T_g \Phi^{-1}(f) \, d\mu = \int_X \Phi^{-1}(f) \xi_g \, d\mu \\ &= \int_X \Phi^{-1}(f) \mathbb{E}_\mathcal{A}(\xi_g) \, d\mu = \int_K f \underbrace{\Phi(\mathbb{E}_\mathcal{A}(\xi_g))}_{=: h_g} \, d\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for every $g \in G$ there is a unique function $h_g \in L^1(K, \nu)$ with $g_*\nu = h_g\nu$ which shows that the G -action on (K, ν) is nonsingular.

Finally, we discuss the existence of a point factor map $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (K, \nu)$: If Y and Z are standard probability spaces, an operator $T: L^1(Y) \rightarrow L^1(Z)$ is induced by an (almost everywhere uniquely determined) measure-preserving measurable map $\varphi: Z \rightarrow Y$ if and only if

$$1) \quad T\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1} \text{ and } \int_Z T f \, d\mu_Z = \int_Y f \, d\mu_Y \text{ for all } f \in L^1(Y),$$

$$2) T|f| = |Tf| \text{ for all } f \in L^1(Y),$$

see von Neumann’s theorem [EFHN15, Proposition 7.19, Theorem 7.20]. Now, if $\mathcal{A} \cong C(K)$ is a separable C^* -algebra, then K is a compact metrizable space and (K, ν) a standard probability space, so that von Neumann’s theorem shows that $\Phi^{-1}: L^1(K, \nu) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mu)$ is induced by a measure-preserving measurable map $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (K, \nu)$. It is straightforward to verify that π intertwines the G -actions and so π is a factor map. Thus, if we say that two G -invariant C^* -subalgebras $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ are **equivalent** if they have the same L^1 -closure, then separable \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are equivalent if and only if there is a point isomorphism between the corresponding topological models.

This almost completes the correspondence between factors and subalgebras, except for one problem: not every C^* -subalgebra of $L^\infty(X, \mu)$ is separable. Therefore, we would like to know that for every G -invariant C^* -subalgebra of $L^\infty(X, \mu)$, there is an equivalent G -invariant C^* -subalgebra that is separable with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X, \mu)}$ to conclude that we can always construct compact metric models.

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ be a G -invariant C^* -subalgebra. By taking a topological model $G \curvearrowright (K, \nu)$ associated to \mathcal{A} and regarding \mathcal{A} as embedded in $L^\infty(K, \nu)$, we may assume that \mathcal{A} is dense in $L^1(X, \mu)$. Since (X, μ) is a separable measure space, $L^1(X, \mu)$ is separable. It is not true that G acts strongly continuously on $L^\infty(X, \mu)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X)}$ but by Lemma 2.5 below, the set

$$\mathcal{M} := \{f \in L^\infty(X) \mid g \mapsto T_{g^{-1}}f \text{ is } \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X)}\text{-continuous}\}$$

is a C^* -subalgebra of $L^\infty(X)$ that is dense in $L^1(X)$. Thus, if $S \subseteq G$ is a countable dense subset, then we can find a separable C^* -subalgebra $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ that is S -invariant and dense in $L^1(X)$. By the strong continuity, this subalgebra must then also be G -invariant. Thus, we have shown that \mathcal{A} has an equivalent subalgebra \mathcal{A}' that is separable. There is no canonical choice for this subalgebra but if $\mathcal{B} \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ is another such subalgebra and $\pi': (X, \mu) \rightarrow (K', \nu')$ is the corresponding factor map, then von Neumann’s theorem from above shows that there is a unique essentially invertible measure-preserving G -equivariant map $\varphi: (K, \nu) \rightarrow (K', \nu')$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & (X, \mu) & \\ \pi \swarrow & & \searrow \pi \\ (K, \nu) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & (K', \nu') \end{array}$$

Thus, for every unital G -invariant C^* -subalgebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ there is (up to isomorphism) a unique standard probability factor associated to it.

In the special case that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ is a unital G -invariant C^* -subalgebra that is $\|\cdot\|_{L^1}$ -dense in $L^1(X, \mu)$, the isomorphism $\Phi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C(K)$ above extends to an isometric isomorphism $\Phi: L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(K, \nu)$ and in this case we call the action $G \curvearrowright (K, \nu)$ a

topological model for $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$.² As in the discussion of factors, one can also associate an (up to isomorphy) unique **standard probability model** (K', ν') to \mathcal{A} . Since (X, μ) is a standard probability space, the isomorphism $\Phi: L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(K', \nu')$ then induces a point isomorphism $\varphi: (K', \nu') \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ by von Neumann's theorem. In what follows, we will always clarify whether we talk of the ‘‘topological model’’ or the ‘‘standard probability model’’ associated to a C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ by using the corresponding term (though almost all models will be standard). If $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$ is an extension of nonsingular G -actions and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^\infty(X)$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq L^\infty(Y)$ are L^1 -dense unital G -invariant C^* -subalgebras with $T_\pi(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, T_π induces a canonical extension $q: (K, \mu) \rightarrow (L, \nu)$ between the respective standard/topological models and we call such an extension $q: (K, \mu) \rightarrow (L, \nu)$ a **topological model for the extension** $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$. Finally, note that one can also talk about topological models without dynamics by assuming that the action of G is trivial in the above discussion.

Lemma 2.5. *Let G be a locally compact second countable group and $G \curvearrowright X$ a nonsingular action on a probability space. Then*

$$\mathcal{M} := \{f \in L^\infty(X) \mid g \mapsto T_{g^{-1}}f \text{ is } \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X)\text{-continuous}}\}$$

is a C^ -subalgebra of $L^\infty(X)$ that is dense in $L^1(X)$.*

Proof. It is elementary to check that \mathcal{M} is a C^* -subalgebra; the nontrivial part is denseness in $L^1(X)$. To prove this, we will borrow ideas from [EGK18, Theorem 3.3] where this was proven for $G = \mathbb{R}$ and measure-preserving actions. Let $(U_n)_n$ be a decreasing neighborhood base of $e \in G$ and $(\varphi_n)_n$ be a sequence in $C_c(G)$ with $\varphi_n \geq 0$, $\int_G \varphi_n \, dm_G = 1$, and $\varphi_n \subseteq U_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For notational simplicity, we exceptionally fix a right- instead of left-invariant Haar measure m_G (the otherwise appearing modular function is immaterial to the argument). Then for $f \in L^\infty(X)$ and any sequence $(h_n)_n$ in G that converges to $e \in G$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| T_{h_n^{-1}} \left(\int_{U_n} T_{g^{-1}} f \varphi_n(g) \, dm_G(g) \right) - \int_{U_n} T_{g^{-1}} f \varphi_n(g) \, dm_G(g) \right| \\ & \leq \int_G |T_{g^{-1}} f| \cdot |\varphi_n(g h_n^{-1}) - \varphi_n(g)| \, dm_G(g) \\ & \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(X)} \|R_{h_n^{-1}} \varphi_n - \varphi_n\|_{L^1(G, m_G)} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\int_{U_n} T_{g^{-1}} f \varphi_n(g) \, dm_G(g) \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover,

$$\left\| f - \int_{U_n} T_{g^{-1}} f \varphi_n(g) \, dm_G(g) \right\|_{L^1(X)} \leq \int_{U_n} \|f - T_{g^{-1}} f\|_{L^1(X)} \varphi_n(g) \, dm_G(g) \rightarrow 0$$

where we used the continuity ensured by Theorem 2.1 and the dominated convergence theorem. Thus, \mathcal{M} is dense in $L^1(X)$. \square

²Note that \mathcal{A} need *not* be separable, i.e., K need not be metrizable. We will mostly work with metrizable models but shall need this flexibility occasionally.

Lemma 2.6. *Let G be a locally compact group, K a compact metric space, and $G \curvearrowright K$ an action by continuous maps. Then this is a continuous action of G if and only if the induced action on $C(K)$ is strongly continuous.*

Proof. If the action of G is continuous, the strong continuity is easy to verify. Conversely, if the action of G on $C(K)$ is strongly continuous, then picking appropriate Urysohn functions, the continuity of the action is straight-forward to verify. \square

3. THE FURSTENBERG–ZIMMER STRUCTURE THEOREM FOR RELATIVELY MEASURE-PRESERVING EXTENSIONS

As it turns out, the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem in its “relative” formulation Theorem 1.5 for extensions does not require the involved systems to be measure-preserving. In this section, we show that virtually the same arguments apply if the extension is a *relatively measure-preserving* extension of nonsingular systems. Such extensions naturally occur, for example, in the structure theorem for stationary actions [FG10, Theorem 4.3] which asserts that every stationary action $(G, m) \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is, modulo an m -proximal extension, a measure-preserving extension of an m -proximal system. (See the next section for definitions of these terms.) Another example comes from the fact that every stationary system is a relatively measure-preserving extension of its *Radon–Nikodym factor*, the smallest factor with the same Furstenberg entropy (see [NZ00, Section 1.2]).³ This “relative” version of the Furstenberg–Zimmer theorem is of independent interest but will also be instrumental in the proof of the stationary structure theorem, see the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Definition 3.1. Let $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ be an extension of nonsingular G -actions.

- (i) The extension π is called a **relatively measure-preserving extension** if the disintegration $(\mu_y)_{y \in Y}$ of μ w.r.t. π is G -equivariant, i.e., for every $g \in G$ one has $g_*\mu_y = \mu_{gy}$ for ν -a.e. $y \in Y$.
- (ii) The extension π is called **weakly mixing** if for every ergodic relatively measure-preserving extension $\rho: (Z, \zeta) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ the relatively independent joining $(X \times_Y Z, \mu \otimes_Y \zeta) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ is an ergodic extension. The system (X, μ) is called **weakly mixing** if the extension $(X, \mu) \rightarrow \text{pt}$ is weakly mixing, i.e., if for every ergodic measure-preserving action $G \curvearrowright Y$ the diagonal action $G \curvearrowright X \times Y$ is ergodic.

Remark 3.2. The definition of weakly mixing nonsingular actions (and extensions) might seem unexpected because it appears asymmetric in that the systems $G \curvearrowright Y$ are required to be measure-preserving. A more natural first attempt at a definition of weakly mixing nonsingular actions might be to require the ergodicity of the product action $G \curvearrowright X \times X$, called **double**

³Note, however, that in both cases, the authors have stronger restrictions on their measured groups (G, m) than we do.

ergodicity in [GW16]. It is shown in [GW16, Theorem 1.1] that double ergodicity implies weak mixing but is generally strictly stronger; see [GW16, Proposition 6.1] for an example that is weakly mixing but not doubly ergodic.

In fact, [GW16] gives an entire list of possible mixing properties but settles on the definition given above for weak mixing. The rationale behind this is that the definition of weak mixing should still satisfy that weakly mixing systems are “orthogonal” to isometric systems. As we will see below, the Kronecker factor of a stationary action is *always* measure-preserving. Thus, requiring the nonexistence of correlations with measure-preserving systems will characterize that the Kronecker factor of a stationary action vanishes, whereas requiring the nonexistence of correlations with the larger class of nonsingular actions (in particular, double ergodicity) would be too strong to yield a characterization. Moreover, when working in the category of stationary actions, an additional reason for requiring measure-preservation in the multiplier property defining weak mixing is to stay within this category: while the product of a stationary and an invariant measure is always stationary, the product of two stationary measures is usually not (see [FG10, Section 3] for how to adapt the “product” to the stationary category in terms of joinings). Finally, note that the definition of weak mixing for nonsingular actions reduces to the usual notion of weak mixing if the action is measure-preserving and that every weakly mixing extension of nonsingular actions is necessarily ergodic.

Remark 3.3. Recall that an extension of nonsingular actions is, per definition, a measure-preserving map. However, it need not be a relatively measure-preserving extension. As a simple counterexample, let λ denote Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$ and take $(Y, \nu; \psi) := ([0, 1], \lambda; x \mapsto x)$, $(X, \mu; \psi) := ([0, 1]^2, \lambda^2; (x, y) \mapsto (x, y^2))$, and $\pi: X \rightarrow Y, (x, y) \mapsto x$. However, if $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ is a relatively measure-preserving extension from a measure-preserving to a nonsingular G -action, then the action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ must also be measure-preserving.

The terminology for extensions with equivariant measure disintegrations is not consistent in the literature. Sometimes a relatively measure-preserving extensions (despite being a measure-preserving map) is called a “measure-preserving factor map/extension”, see [FG10]. We will not use the terminology of “measure-preserving factor maps” to avoid this ambiguity. Rather, our definition is along the lines of [NZ00, Definition 1.7] who say that (X, μ) has “relatively G -invariant measure over (Y, ν) ”.

Finally, observe that if $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is a relatively measure-preserving extension of nonsingular G -actions, then the conditional L^2 -space $L^2(X|Z)$ is G -invariant.

The following are useful characterizations of ergodic and relatively measure-preserving extensions that we shall make repeated use of.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be an extension of nonsingular G -actions.*

- (a) *The extension is relatively measure-preserving if and only if $L^2(X|Z)$ is G -invariant and the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_Z: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^\infty(Z)$ is G -equivariant.*
- (b) *The extension is ergodic if and only if every G -invariant function $f \in L^2(X|Z)$ satisfies $f = \mathbb{E}_Z(f) \cdot \mathbb{1}_X$.*

Proof. We may assume for simplicity that $X = (X, \mu)$ and $Z = (Z, \zeta)$ are compact metric Borel probability spaces and that π is continuous. First, let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be relatively measure-preserving. Then for ζ -a.e. $z \in Z$ and every $f \in C(X)$

$$\mathbb{E}_Z(T_g f)(z) = \int_{X_z} f(gx) d\mu_z(x) = \int_{X_{gz}} f(x) d\mu_{gz}(x) = (T_g \mathbb{E}_Z f)(z).$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}_Z T_g f = T_g \mathbb{E}_Z f$ for all $f \in C(X)$ and thus \mathbb{E}_Z is G -equivariant. Conversely, suppose \mathbb{E}_Z is G -equivariant and let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq C(X)$ be a countable dense subset. Then for every $f \in C(X)$ and ζ -almost every $z \in Z$

$$\int_{X_{gz}} f(x) dg_* \mu_z(x) = \int_{X_z} f(gx) d\mu_z(x) = \mathbb{E}_Z(T_g f)(z) = (T_g \mathbb{E}_Z f)(z) = \int_{X_{gz}} f(x) d\mu_{gz}(x).$$

Since \mathcal{F} is dense in $C(X)$, its restriction to X_z is also dense in $C(X_z)$ for every $z \in Z$. Thus, for every $g \in G$ and ζ -almost every $z \in Z$, $g_* \mu_z = \mu_{gz}$. Therefore, the extension is relatively measure-preserving.

Now, if every G -invariant function $f \in L^2(X|Z)$ satisfies $f = \mathbb{E}_Z(f) \cdot \mathbb{1}_X$, plugging in characteristic functions shows that the extension π must be ergodic. Conversely, suppose the extension π is ergodic and $f \in L^2(X|Z)$ is G -invariant. If $f = \mathbb{1}_A$ is a characteristic function, the conclusion $f = \mathbb{E}_Z(f) \cdot \mathbb{1}_X$ follows swiftly from the definition of ergodic extensions. The general case follows since level sets of a G -invariant function are G -invariant which allows to approximate f via linear combinations of G -invariant characteristic functions. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.5. If a relatively measure-preserving extension $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is not ergodic, there thus exists a nonzero G -invariant function $f \in L^2(X|Z)$ such that $f \neq \mathbb{E}_Z(f) \cdot \mathbb{1}_X$. By a cut-off argument and replacing f by $f - \mathbb{E}_Z(f) \cdot \mathbb{1}_X$, one may also arrange that $f \in L^\infty(X)$ and $\mathbb{E}_Z(f) = 0$. (If the extension is not relatively measure-preserving, it is not guaranteed that $\mathbb{E}_Z(f)$ is G -invariant.) We will occasionally make repeated use of this characterization of nonergodic extensions.

Theorem 3.6 (Structure Theorem). *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be a relatively measure-preserving extension of nonsingular G -actions. Then there are a weakly mixing extension $\alpha: X \rightarrow Y$ and a*

distal extension $\beta: Y \rightarrow Z$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\pi} & Z \\ & \searrow \alpha & \nearrow \beta \\ & Y & \end{array}$$

commutes.

Similarly to the measure-preserving case, the proof reduces to the following generalization of Theorem 1.2 to extensions.

Theorem 3.7 (Relative Kronecker dichotomy). *A relatively measure-preserving extension $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ of nonsingular G -actions is weakly mixing if and only if there is no isometric intermediate extension of Z .*

The proof follows the line of reasoning used to prove Theorem 1.2 and employs the ingredients listed in Remark 1.7: the natural correspondence between Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms $K: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(Y|Z)$ and their kernels (under which G -equivariant homomorphisms correspond to G -invariant kernels) and a spectral theorem for Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms that allows for approximation by means of projections onto finitely generated submodules. We collect both ingredients below to prepare for the proof of Theorem 3.7.

Since the definition of Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms between $L^2(X|Z)$ and $L^2(Y|Z)$ requires some additional terminology, we defer the details to the appendix from which we shall use the following result. For the time being, the reader may take it as a definition of Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ and $\rho: Y \rightarrow Z$ be measure-preserving maps between standard probability spaces. Then the assignment*

$$I: L^2(X \times_Z Y|Z) \rightarrow \text{HS}(L^2(X|Z), L^2(Y|Z)), \quad (I_k f)(y) := \int_{X_{\rho(y)} \times X_{\rho(y)}} k(x, y) f(x) \, d\mu_{\rho(y)}$$

defines an isometric isomorphism between Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms and their kernels.

A quick computation proves the essential observation that, if the maps π and ρ above are relatively measure-preserving extensions of G -actions, then the Hilbert–Schmidt operator I_k intertwines the G -actions if and only if k is G -invariant for the diagonal G -action on $X \times_Z Y$.

The following lemma provides a different way to construct certain Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms which we shall need below.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be a measure-preserving map between standard probability spaces and $M \subseteq L^2(X|Z)$ an $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule. Denote by*

$$\tilde{M} := \text{cl}_{\|\cdot\|_{L^2}}(M) \cap L^2(X|Z)$$

the L^2 -closure of M within $L^2(X|Z)$. Then the following assertions are true.

(i) *$M = \tilde{M}$ if and only if $L^2(X|Z) = M \oplus M^\perp$ where*

$$M^\perp = \{f \in L^2(X|Z) \mid \forall m \in M: \mathbb{E}_Z(f\overline{m}) = 0\}.$$

(ii) *M is a finitely-generated $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule if and only if \tilde{M} is. In this case, \tilde{M} admits a finite suborthonormal basis.⁴*

(iii) *If M is a finitely-generated $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule, the orthogonal projection $P: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow \tilde{M}$ induced by the decomposition $L^2(X|Z) = \tilde{M} \oplus \tilde{M}^\perp$ is a Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism.*

Proof. These follow from [EHK21, Proposition 2.12, Proposition 2.18, Lemma 7.5(iii)] respectively. \square

The next fact we require from the appendix is the following: Given a bounded module homomorphism $T: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(Y|Z)$, i.e., a bounded operator with $T(fg) = fT(g)$ for all $f \in L^\infty(Z)$ and $g \in L^2(X|Z)$, there is a unique module adjoint T^* , i.e., an operator $T^*: L^2(Y|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$ with the property that

$$\mathbb{E}_Z(T(f) \cdot \overline{g}) = \mathbb{E}_Z(f \cdot \overline{T^*(g)}) \quad \forall f \in L^2(X|Z), g \in L^2(Y|Z).$$

As in the Hilbert space case, a module homomorphism $T: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$ is called **self-adjoint** if $T = T^*$. For a Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism $I_k \in \text{HS}(L^2(X|Z), L^2(Y|Z))$ with $k \in L^2(\overline{X \times_Z Y|Z})$ as above, $(I_k)^* = I_{k^*}$ where $k^* \in L^2(\overline{Y \times_Z X|Z})$ is defined by $k^*(y, x) = \overline{k(x, y)}$ for a.e. $(y, x) \in Y \times_Z X$. It is straight-forward to verify that the usual properties of Hilbert space adjoints are also satisfied in this setting. In particular, $T \neq 0$ if and only if $T^*T \neq 0$.

The last fact we require about Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms is the following spectral theorem.

Proposition 3.10 ([EHK21, Theorem 4.1, Proposition 6.5]). *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be a relatively measure-preserving extension of nonsingular G -actions and let $A: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$ be a self-adjoint G -equivariant Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism. Then A can be written as the order-convergent sum*

$$A = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda_j P_{M_j}$$

⁴See the appendix for a discussion of this notion.

for G -invariant functions $\lambda_j \in L^\infty(Z)$ and G -equivariant Hilbert–Schmidt projections $P_{M_j}: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$ onto finitely generated, pairwise orthogonal submodules M_j .

The key take-away from this spectral theorem is that if the operator A is nontrivial, there must be some G -invariant finitely generated $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule. (The notion of order-convergence is discussed in the appendix but is immaterial here.) Next, an observation that will facilitate the proof of Theorem 3.7 is that the characterization of weakly mixing extensions for nonsingular systems simplifies if the extension is relatively measure-preserving.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be a relatively measure-preserving extension of nonsingular G -actions. Then π is weakly mixing if and only if the relatively independent joining $\pi \times_Z \pi: X \times_Z X \rightarrow Z$ is an ergodic extension.*

Proof. It is clear that if π is weakly mixing, $\pi \times_Z \pi: X \times_Z X \rightarrow Z$ must be ergodic since weak mixing implies that $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is an ergodic and relatively measure-preserving extension. Conversely, assume $\pi \times_Z \pi: X \times_Z X \rightarrow Z$ is an ergodic extension; in particular, the extension $X \rightarrow Z$ is ergodic. Suppose π is not weakly mixing, then we can find an ergodic and relatively measure-preserving extension $\rho: Y \rightarrow Z$ of nonsingular G -actions such that the extension $\pi \times_Z \rho: X \times_Z Y \rightarrow Z$ is not ergodic. That is, there exists a nonzero G -invariant $k \in L^\infty(X \times_Z Y)$ such that $\mathbb{E}_Z(k) = 0$. Since the extension $X \times_Z Y \rightarrow Z$ is relatively measure-preserving, $\mathbb{E}_Z(k)$ is G -invariant. Since the extension $Y \rightarrow Z$ is ergodic, we can conclude that $\mathbb{E}_Y(k) = \mathbb{E}_Z(k) \cdot \mathbb{1}_Y = 0$.

Let $K: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(Y|Z)$ be the Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism I_k associated to k via the isomorphism $L^2(X \times_Z Y|Z) \cong \text{HS}(L^2(X|Z), L^2(Y|Z))$. Note that $K\mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{E}_Y(k) = 0$ and hence $K^*K\mathbb{1}_X = 0$. We claim that $K^*K: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$ is G -equivariant. To see this, we use, in this order, relative measure-preservation of π , G -invariance of k , and relative measure-preservation of ρ : For $f \in L^2(X|Z)$ and $g \in G$

$$\begin{aligned}
(K^*KT_g f)(x) &= \int_{X_{\pi(x)}} f(gx') \int_{Y_{\pi(x)}} k(x, y) \overline{k(x', y)} \, d\nu_{\pi(x)}(y) \, d\mu_{\pi(x)}(x') \\
&= \int_{X_{\pi(gx)}} f(x') \int_{Y_{\pi(x)}} k(x, y) \overline{k(g^{-1}x', y)} \, d\nu_{\pi(x)}(y) \, d\mu_{\pi(gx)}(x') \\
&= \int_{X_{\pi(gx)}} f(x') \int_{Y_{\pi(x)}} k(gx, gy) \overline{k(x', gy)} \, d\nu_{\pi(x)}(y) \, d\mu_{\pi(gx)}(x') \\
&= \int_{X_{\pi(gx)}} f(x') \int_{Y_{\pi(gx)}} k(gx, y) \overline{k(x', y)} \, d\nu_{\pi(gx)}(y) \, d\mu_{\pi(gx)}(x') \\
&= (T_g K^*K f)(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Since K^*K is G -intertwining, its kernel $k^* * k$ is G -invariant and by ergodicity of $\pi \times_Z \pi$, it follows that $k^* * k = \mathbb{E}_Z(k^* * k) \mathbb{1}_{X \times_Z X}$. Thus, $K^*K = \mathbb{E}_Z(k^* * k) \cdot \mathbb{E}_Z$. However,

$$0 = K^*K \mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{E}_Z(k^* * k) \cdot \mathbb{E}_Z(\mathbb{1}_X) = \mathbb{E}_Z(k^* * k).$$

Therefore, $K^*K = 0$, whence $K = 0$. This is a contradiction to the assumption that k is nonzero. Thus, our choice of k was impossible and π must indeed be weakly mixing. \square

The last observation we require is that, given finitely generated submodules, we can construct a corresponding isometric intermediate extensions by means of topological models. Moreover, it will be essential to know that, if the extension is relatively measure-preserving, it suffices to find the submodule in $L^2(X|Z)$ instead of $L^\infty(X)$. For the reader's convenience, we reproduce below the arguments from [EHK21, Lemma 8.3, Proposition 8.5] where these two claims are proved in the measure-preserving case.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow Z$ be an extension of nonsingular G -actions. Then*

$$\mathcal{A} := \overline{\bigcup \left\{ M \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} M \text{ is a finitely generated} \\ G\text{-invariant } L^\infty(Z)\text{-submodule} \end{array} \right\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X)}} \subseteq L^\infty(X)$$

defines a unital C^ -subalgebra that corresponds to the largest intermediate extension $X \rightarrow \tilde{Z} \rightarrow Z$ that is an isometric extension of Z .*

Proof. It is straightforward to check that the product of two finitely generated G -invariant $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodules of $L^\infty(Z)$ is again such a submodule, so $\mathcal{A} \subseteq L^\infty(Z)$ is a G -invariant C^* -subalgebra that contains $L^\infty(Z)$. As such, it gives rise to an intermediate extension $X \rightarrow \tilde{Z} \rightarrow Z$ by means of the correspondence Construction 2.4 between subalgebras and factors. It also follows from this correspondence and the definition of \mathcal{A} that this factor is the maximal isometric intermediate extension. \square

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\pi : X \rightarrow Z$ be a relatively measure-preserving extension of nonsingular G -actions. Then the following subspaces coincide:*

$$E = \overline{\bigcup \left\{ M \subseteq L^2(X|Z) \mid \begin{array}{l} M \text{ is a finitely generated} \\ G\text{-invariant } L^\infty(Z)\text{-submodule} \end{array} \right\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^2(X)}} \\ F = \overline{\bigcup \left\{ M \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} M \text{ is a finitely generated} \\ G\text{-invariant } L^\infty(Z)\text{-submodule} \end{array} \right\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{L^2(X)}}$$

Proof. We only need to prove that $F \subseteq E$. So let $M \subseteq L^2(X|Z)$ be a finitely generated G -invariant $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $M = \tilde{M}$ (see Lemma 3.9 for this notation), i.e., M equals its L^2 -closure within $L^2(X|Z)$. Pick a Z -suborthonormal basis $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ of M as provided by Lemma 3.9.

We shall construct G -invariant functions η_n with $0 \leq \eta_n \leq 1$ such that $\mathcal{B}_n := \eta_n \mathcal{B} \subseteq L^\infty(X)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta_n e_j \rightarrow e_j$ in $L^2(X)$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$. Since η_n is G -invariant, \mathcal{B}_n generates a G -invariant submodule and thus this will show that $F \subseteq E$. To find the functions η_n , let

$$e := \sum_{j=1}^d e_j \otimes_Z \bar{e}_j \in L^2(X \times_Z X|Z)$$

and

$$m := \sum_{j=1}^d |e_j|^2 \in L^2(X|Z).$$

Under the isomorphism $L^2(X \times_Z X|Z) \cong \text{HS}(L^2(X|Z))$, e is the kernel of the orthogonal projection P_M onto M . Since the extension $X \rightarrow Z$ is relatively measure-preserving, G -invariance of M , G -equivariance of P_M , and G -invariance of e are all equivalent. Thus, e is G -invariant and so is

$$|e|^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^d e_j \bar{e}_k \otimes \bar{e}_j e_k.$$

We claim that also m is G -invariant. To see this, take the conditional expectation of $|e|^2$ onto the second factor:

$$\mathbb{E}_X |e|^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^d \mathbb{E}_Z (e_j \bar{e}_k) \bar{e}_j e_k = \sum_{j,k=1}^d |e_j|_Z^2 |e_j|^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^d \|e_j|_Z e_j\|^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^d |e_j|^2 = m.$$

Thus, m is G -invariant. Now, the functions

$$\eta_n := \frac{\sqrt{m} \wedge n}{\sqrt{m} + \frac{1}{n}}$$

are G -invariant, satisfy $0 \leq \eta_n \leq 1$, $\eta_n e_j \rightarrow e_j$ and $\eta_n e_j \in L^\infty(X)$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, $F \subseteq E$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.7. First, suppose

$$(X, \mu) \xrightarrow{p} (\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\zeta}) \xrightarrow{q} (Z, \zeta)$$

is a nontrivial isometric intermediate extension of (Z, ζ) . Then there exists a finitely-generated $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule $M \subseteq L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z)$ such that M is not contained in $L^\infty(Z)$. Without loss of generality, assume that $M = \bar{M}$ and let $P_M: L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z) \rightarrow M$ be the orthogonal projection onto M . By Lemma 3.9, $P_M \in \text{HS}(L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z))$. Since relative measure-preservation is equivalent to equivariance of conditional expectations (see Lemma 3.4), the decomposition $L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z) = M \oplus M^\perp$ is readily verified to be G -invariant. Thus, P_M is G -equivariant. Via the isomorphism $\text{HS}(L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z)) \cong L^2(\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}|Z)$ from Theorem 3.8, we may write $P_M = I_k$ for a uniquely determined $k \in L^2(\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}|Z)$. As observed above, the G -equivariance of P_M

is equivalent to invariance of k since the extension is relatively measure-preserving. Since P_M does not map into $L^\infty(Z)$, it cannot be of the form $f \cdot \mathbb{E}_Z$ for some $f \in L^\infty(Z)$ and thus $k \neq \mathbb{E}_Z(k) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}}$ since otherwise $P_M = \mathbb{E}_Z(k) \cdot \mathbb{E}_Z$. This shows that the extension $\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z} \rightarrow Z$ is not ergodic. By extension, the composite extension

$$(X \times_Z X, \mu \otimes_Z \mu) \rightarrow (\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}, \tilde{\zeta} \otimes_Z \tilde{\zeta}) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$$

is not ergodic either, which proves that the extension $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is not weakly mixing.

Conversely, suppose $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is not weakly mixing. Then by Lemma 3.11, the relatively independent joining $\pi \times_Z \pi: X \times_Z X \rightarrow Z$ is not ergodic. We distinguish two cases: If the extension $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is not ergodic, then the C^* -subalgebra

$$\mathcal{A} := C^* \left(T_\pi(L^\infty(Z)), L^\infty(X)^G \right) \subseteq L^\infty(X)$$

is readily verified to lead to a nontrivial isometric extension which proves the claim. So suppose now that the extension $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is ergodic but the extension $X \times_Z X \rightarrow Z$ is not. Then, there exists a G -invariant $k \in L^\infty(X \times_Z X)$ such that k is nonzero and $\mathbb{E}_Z(k) = 0$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.11, the ergodicity and relative measure-preservation of the extension $X \rightarrow Z$ imply that also $\mathbb{E}_X(k) = 0$.

Let $K: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$ be the Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism corresponding to k . Since $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ is relatively measure-preserving, G -invariance of k translates into G -equivariance of K . Moreover, the conditions $k \neq 0$ and $K\mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{E}_X(k) = 0$ entail that $K \neq 0$ and

$$K\mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{E}_Z(k) \cdot \mathbb{1}_X = 0.$$

Therefore, K cannot be an $L^\infty(Z)$ -multiple of \mathbb{E}_Z since otherwise $K = 0$, a contradiction. By Proposition 3.10, we can write K as an order-convergent series

$$K = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda_j P_{M_j}$$

for G -invariant functions $\lambda_j \in L^\infty(Z)$ and G -equivariant Hilbert–Schmidt projections $P_{M_j}: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$ onto finitely generated, pairwise orthogonal submodules M_j .

Assume for the sake of contradiction that all M_j lie in $L^\infty(Z)$. We know that $K \neq 0$ and $K\mathbb{1}_X = 0$. By orthogonality of the submodules M_j , the sets $\lambda_j M_j \subseteq M_j$ are pairwise orthogonal for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and thus we can conclude that $\lambda_j P_{M_j} \mathbb{1}_X = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since each P_{M_j} is a $L^\infty(Z)$ -module homomorphism, it follows that $\lambda_j P_{M_j}(L^\infty(Z)) = \{0\}$. However, if $M_j \subseteq L^\infty(Z)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, then this means

$$\lambda_j P_{M_j} = 0 \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus $K = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, there must be a $j_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $M_{j_0} \not\subseteq L^\infty(Z)$. As in the first part of the proof, since the projection $P_{M_{j_0}}$ is G -equivariant, its range M_{j_0} is G -invariant and so we have found a nontrivial finitely-generated G -invariant submodule in

$L^2(X|Z)$. By Lemma 3.13, we thus find a nontrivial finitely-generated G -invariant $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule in $L^\infty(X)$ and thus Proposition 3.12 concludes the proof by providing the desired nontrivial isometric intermediate extension. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We proceed by transfinite recursion. For the induction start, set $X_0 = Z$. Now suppose μ is an ordinal and we have constructed a projective system $((X_\eta)_{\eta < \mu}, (\pi_\eta^\sigma)_{\eta \leq \sigma < \mu})$ of successive isometric extensions between factors of X .

- If μ is a limit ordinal, set $X_\mu = \lim_{\leftarrow} X_\eta$. If $X \rightarrow X_\mu$ is weakly mixing, we are done. Otherwise, repeat the induction step.
- If μ is a successor ordinal and the extension $X \rightarrow X_{\mu-1}$ is weakly mixing, we are done. Otherwise, by Theorem 3.7 there is an isometric intermediate extension $X \rightarrow X_\mu \rightarrow X_{\mu-1}$ and we repeat the induction step.

This recursion terminates after countably many steps, for otherwise $L^2(X)$ would contain an uncountable orthonormal subset. This proves the desired decomposition. \square

4. THE KRONECKER DICHOTOMY FOR STATIONARY ACTIONS

In this section, we prove a generalization of the Kronecker dichotomy Theorem 1.2 to stationary actions in Theorem 4.6, essentially following [Bjö17, Section 4]. Apart from a slight change to the proof, the only difference is that we introduce the *Kronecker factor* of a nonstationary action since it will be important for the structure-theoretic later parts. Therefore, we formulate the dichotomy in terms of the Kronecker factor, just as in Theorem 1.2.

Kronecker factors for stationary actions. We start by recalling the definitions of weak mixing, stationary actions, and discussing the Kronecker factor of a stationary action. If (G, m) is a measured group, a nonsingular measurable action $G \curvearrowright X = (X, \Sigma, \mu)$ of G on a probability space is called *m -stationary*, if $m * \mu = \mu$ where

$$m * \mu := \int_G g_* \mu \, dm(g).$$

If (G, m) is a measured group and G acts nonsingularly on a probability space X , we may define

$$P_m : L^\infty(X) \rightarrow L^\infty(X), \quad f \mapsto \int_G T_g f \, dm(g)$$

to be the **averaging Markov operator** corresponding to the nonsingular action of (G, m) on X . The nonsingular measure μ is *m -stationary* if and only if $\int P_m f \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$ for all $f \in L^\infty(X)$, i.e., if P_m is a bi-Markov operator. In this case, P_m extends to a linear contraction on $L^1(X)$.

Since the action $G \curvearrowright X$ is nonsingular, for every $s \in G$ there is a function $0 \leq h_s \in L^1(X)$ such that $s_* \mu = h_s \mu$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.1, one can verify that the function

$G \rightarrow L^1(X)$, $s \mapsto h_s$ is strongly measurable which will justify integrating it along G . Stationarity of μ can then be rephrased as

$$\int_G h_s \, dm(s) = \mathbb{1}_X.$$

A straight-forward computation yields that the adjoint $P_m^*: L^\infty(X) \rightarrow L^\infty(X)$ can be expressed as

$$P_m^* f(x) = \int_G h_s(x) f(s^{-1}x) \, dm(s).$$

Clearly, P_m^* is positive and $P_m^* \mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{1}_X$, so P_m^* is a Markov operator on $L^\infty(X)$. Moreover, since $P_m \mathbb{1}_X = \mathbb{1}_X$, P_m^* preserves the integral and is thus a bi-Markov operator on $L^1(X)$. As such, it also extends to a linear contraction on $L^1(X)$ that, using a monotone approximation argument, is given by the same expression. The reader should note the resemblance of P_m^* to comments made in Remark 1.9; this is not a coincidence and will be exploited in the proof of Lemma 5.9.

Conditional measures. We recall the following basic facts about **conditional measures** for random walks, see [BL85, Lemma II.2.1]. These are measures obtained from the martingale convergence theorem by conditioning on the random walk already having followed an infinite trajectory $\omega = \dots g_n, g_{n-1}, \dots, g_1$ and allow to naturally decompose a stationary measure according to the random walks trajectories.

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a lcsc group acting measurably on a second-countable locally compact space B , let m be a probability measure on G , and let μ be an m -stationary probability measure on B . If $X_1, X_2, \dots: (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow G$ is a sequence of i.i.d. G -valued random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with common distribution m , then the following assertions are true.*

- (i) *Let $f: B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a μ -integrable measurable function. Then there is a set $A_f \subseteq \Omega$ of measure $\mathbb{P}(A_f) = 1$ such that for every $\omega \in A_f$ the limit*

$$(\Gamma f)(\omega) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underbrace{\int_B f \, d(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu}_{=:(\Gamma_n f)(\omega)}$$

exists and defines a function $\Gamma f \in L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$.

- (ii) *The linear map*

$$\Gamma: L^1(B, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{P}), \quad f \mapsto \Gamma f$$

is a bi-Markov operator, i.e., Γ is positive, $\Gamma \mathbb{1}_B = \mathbb{1}_\Omega$, and Γ preserves the integral. In particular, Γ is an L^1 contraction.

(iii) For almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ the limit

$$\mu_\omega := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_1(\omega)_* \cdots X_n(\omega)_* \mu$$

exists in the weak* topology, i.e., for every $f \in C_0(B)$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_B f \, d(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu = \int_B f \, d\mu_\omega.$$

(iv) More generally, for every countable subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq L^1(B, \mu)$, there is a set $A_{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \Omega$ of measure $\mathbb{P}(A_{\mathcal{F}}) = 1$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\omega \in A_{\mathcal{F}}$

$$(\Gamma f)(\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_B f \, d(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu = \int_B f \, d\mu_\omega.$$

(v) The conditional measures are natural in the sense that if $\pi: (B, \mu) \rightarrow (C, \nu)$ is a measurable, measure-preserving factor map to another (necessarily stationary) action $G \curvearrowright (C, \nu)$ on a second countable locally compact space, then almost surely $\pi_* \mu_\omega = \nu_\omega$.

(vi) Conditional measures are almost surely preserved by choosing a different topological model $G \curvearrowright (B', \mu')$ for the action $G \curvearrowright (B, \mu)$, i.e., if $\pi: (B, \mu) \rightarrow (B', \mu')$ is a G -equivariant essentially invertible measurable map, then almost surely $\pi_* \mu_\omega = \mu'_\omega$.

(vii) If $f: B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a μ -integrable measurable function, then it is also μ_ω -integrable almost surely and one has the barycenter equation

$$\int_B f \, d\mu = \mathbb{E}_\omega \left(\int_B f \, d\mu_\omega \right).$$

(viii) Let $\pi: (B, \mu) \rightarrow (C, \nu)$ be a measurable, measure-preserving factor map to another stationary action $G \curvearrowright (C, \nu)$. Suppose π is relatively measure-preserving and $(\mu_c)_{c \in C}$ is a disintegration of μ over ν . Then almost surely

$$\mu_\omega = \int_C \mu_c \, d\nu(c).$$

(ix) Suppose $\omega \in \Omega$ is such that the limit μ_ω exists, then it satisfies the following invariance property: For $\lambda := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(n+1)} m^{*n}$ one has that λ -almost every $g \in G$ satisfies

$$\mu_\omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* g_* \mu.$$

Proof. By linearity, we only need to prove (i) for positive functions. For positive and measurable $f: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_\Omega \int_B f \, d(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu \, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \int_B f \, dm^{*n} * \mu = \int_B f \, d\mu.$$

This shows that $\Gamma_n f \in L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ and $\|\Gamma_n f\|_{L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{P})} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(B, \mu)}$. It is easy to verify that the sequence $(\Gamma_n f)_n$ defines a martingale, see [BL85, Lemma II.2.1]. Since its L^1 -norm is bounded by $\|f\|_{L^1(B, \mu)}$, the martingale convergence theorem shows that there is a function $\Gamma f \in L^1(\mathbb{P}, \Omega)$ such that $\Gamma_n f \rightarrow \Gamma f$ almost surely.

Assertion (ii) is readily verified using that μ is m -stationary and the inequality $|\Gamma f| \leq \Gamma|f|$ that follows from positivity. For (iii), let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq C_0(B)$ be a countable dense subset of $C_0(B)$ and choose for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$ a set A_f as in (i). If we set $A_{\mathcal{F}} := \bigcap_{f \in \mathcal{F}} A_f$, then for all $\omega \in A_{\mathcal{F}}$

$$\Gamma f(\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_B f \, d(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu$$

exists. Thus, the sequence $(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu$ of probability measures converges to some probability measure μ_ω on \mathcal{F} and hence on $C_0(B)$.

For (iv), let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq L^1(B, \mu)$ be a countable subset and let $A \subseteq \Omega$ be a subset of measure $\mathbb{P}(A) = 1$ such that for all $\omega \in A$ we have $(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu \rightarrow \mu_\omega$ in the weak* topology. We may assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{F} = \{f\}$ and that for all $\omega \in A$

$$(\Gamma f)(\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_B f \, d(X_1(\omega) \cdots X_n(\omega))_* \mu$$

exists. We claim that for almost every ω one has $(\Gamma f)(\omega) = \int_B f \, d\mu_\omega$. Recall that the smallest subspace of the bounded measurable functions $B(B)$ that contains $C_0(B)$ and is closed under bounded pointwise convergence of sequences is precisely $B(B)$. So suppose $(g_n)_n$ is a sequence of bounded measurable functions such that almost surely

$$(\Gamma g_n)(\omega) = \int_B g_n \, d\mu_\omega.$$

If the g_n are uniformly bounded and converge pointwise to $g \in B(B)$, it follows from Lebesgue's theorem that $\int_B g_n \, d\mu_\omega \rightarrow \int_B g \, d\mu_\omega$. On the other hand, $g_n \rightarrow g$ in $L^1(B, \mu)$, so $\Gamma g_n \rightarrow \Gamma g$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$. By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\Gamma g_n \rightarrow \Gamma g$ almost everywhere w.r.t. \mathbb{P} . Thus, almost surely $(\Gamma g)(\omega) = \int_B g \, d\mu_\omega$. It follows that, for every $g \in B(B)$, almost surely $(\Gamma g)(\omega) = \int_B g \, d\mu_\omega$. Repeating a similar argument using cutoffs and the dominated convergence theorem proves the statement for arbitrary $g \in L^1(B, \mu)$ and hence for the function f initially considered.

Assertions (v) and (vi) follow from (iv). Part (vii) is a reformulation of (ii) and for statement (ix), see [BL85, Lemma II.2.1]. It remains to prove (viii), so let $\pi: (B, \mu) \rightarrow (C, \nu)$ be a measure-preserving and G -equivariant measurable map to another stationary action $G \curvearrowright (C, \nu)$.

Then by (iii), there is a set $F \subseteq \Omega$ of measure $\mathbb{P}(F) = 1$ such that for all $\omega \in F$, the following weak*-limits exist:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\omega &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)_* \mu, \\ \nu_\omega &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)_* \nu.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq C_0(B)$ be a countable dense subset and disintegrate μ over ν as $(\mu_c)_{c \in C}$. Then applying (iv) to the set

$$\mathcal{G} := \{c \mapsto \langle f, \mu_c \rangle \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

we obtain a set $G \subseteq F \subseteq \Omega$ of measure $\mathbb{P}(G) = 1$ such that for all $\omega \in G$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_C \langle f, \mu_c \rangle d(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)_* \nu(c) = \int_C \langle f, \mu_c \rangle d\nu_\omega(c).$$

Thus, the assumption that $\pi: (B, \mu) \rightarrow (C, \nu)$ is relatively measure-preserving implies that for every $\omega \in G$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_B f(x) d\mu(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_B f(x) d(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)_* \mu \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_B f(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_C \int_{X_c} f(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n x) d\mu_c(x) d\nu(c) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_C \langle f, (\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)_* \mu_c \rangle d\nu(c) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_C \langle f, \mu_{\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n c} \rangle d\nu(c) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_C \langle f, \mu_c \rangle d(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)_* \nu(c) \\ &= \int_C \langle f, \mu_c \rangle d\nu_\omega(c) \\ &= \int_C \int_{X_c} f(x) d\mu_c(x) d\nu_\omega(c).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for relatively measure-preserving extensions, the disintegration of μ_ω w.r.t. ν_ω is almost surely

$$\mu_\omega = \int_C \mu_c d\nu_\omega(c).$$

□

Remark 4.2. Before we proceed, we collect the following remarks on conditional measures.

- (i) Per definition, conditional measures can only be considered for actions on (locally) compact spaces. However, we can always choose a standard probability model and the lemma above shows that the conditional measures do not depend on the choice of topological model. We may therefore speak of conditional measures on standard probability spaces without ambiguity.
- (ii) The action in Lemma 4.1 above is measure-preserving if and only if all conditional measures μ_ω equal μ and it is called **m -proximal** if μ_ω is a Dirac measure for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$. In this case, every factor is m -proximal and in particular, there can be no nontrivial measure-preserving factor. More generally, a factor map $\pi: (B, \mu) \rightarrow (C, \nu)$ of m -stationary actions is called a **proximal factor map** if the induced maps $(B, \mu_\omega) \rightarrow (C, \nu_\omega)$ are almost surely isomorphisms.
- (iii) Note that our definition of proximal extensions differs slightly from that given in [FG10] (see the moderating text before [FG10, Proposition 1.2]). There, it is only required that the map $\pi: (X, \mu_\omega) \rightarrow (Y, \nu_\omega)$ is \mathbb{P} -almost surely μ_ω -almost everywhere one-to-one; measurability of the inverse and hence essential invertibility is not required there. However, they work in the setting of standard Borel spaces and it is a result from descriptive set theory that if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a Borel measurable map between standard Borel spaces and $A \subseteq X$ is a Borel measurable subset such that $f|_A$ is injective, then $f(A)$ is Borel measurable and $f|_A: A \rightarrow f(A)$ is a Borel isomorphism (see [Kec95, Corollary 15.2]). Thus, in the setting of standard probability spaces, the two definitions of proximal extensions are equivalent. We choose to work with the more convenient definition in terms of isomorphy to avoid further reference to descriptive set theory.

The Halmos–von Neumann representation theorem for stationary actions. Next, we turn towards the stationary version of the classical representation theorem for isometric actions.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be a nonsingular ergodic action. Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

- a) *The action of G on X is isometric.*
- b) *The action of G on X is isomorphic to a minimal action of G on a compact homogeneous space via rotations.*

If these hold and μ is m -stationary for a probability measure on G , then it is G -invariant and it is the unique m -stationary measure of the action. Moreover, the homogeneous space in b) is necessarily metrizable in this case.

Proof. Define the C^* -subalgebra

$$\mathcal{A} := \overline{\bigcup \left\{ F \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} F \text{ finite-dimensional} \\ \text{and } G\text{-invariant} \end{array} \right\}}^{L^\infty(X)}.$$

Since \mathcal{A} is G -invariant, it corresponds to a topological model $G \curvearrowright (M, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ for the action with

$$C(M) = \overline{\bigcup \left\{ F \subseteq C(M) \mid \begin{array}{l} F \text{ finite-dimensional} \\ \text{and } G\text{-invariant} \end{array} \right\}}^{C(M)}.$$

It follows that the Ellis semigroup $E(M, G)$ is a compact group of continuous maps that acts transitively and hence uniquely ergodically on M and so $G \curvearrowright M$ is isomorphic to the action $G \curvearrowright E(M, G)/\text{Stab}(x)$ for any $x \in M$.

Now suppose additionally that μ is an m -stationary ergodic measure and $X = K/H$ is a homogeneous space of some compact group K on which G acts uniquely ergodically via a map $\varphi: G \rightarrow K$. Consider a random walk of G on X with law m and let μ_ω be one of the conditional measures. Let $\lambda := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(n+1)} m^{*n}$, then Lemma 4.1 shows that for every $g \in \text{supp}(\lambda)$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_1(\omega)_* \cdots X_n(\omega)_* \mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_1(\omega)_* \cdots X_n(\omega)_* g_* \mu.$$

In other words,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(X_1(\omega)) \cdots \varphi(X_n(\omega)) \mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(X_1(\omega)) \cdots \varphi(X_n(\omega)) \varphi(g) \mu.$$

If we use that K is compact and pass to a subsequence, we may assume that $\varphi(X_1(\omega)) \cdots \varphi(X_n(\omega))$ converges to some element $k \in K$. In that case, we obtain $k\mu = kg\mu$ and hence $\mu = g\mu$. Thus, we have shown that μ is invariant under $\text{supp}(\lambda)$ and since $\text{supp}(m)$ generates G as a group, it follows that μ is G -invariant. Since the action of G on K/H is uniquely ergodic, μ must be the Haar measure. Finally, in this case, the metrizability of K/H follows purely from the fact that $L^1(X) \cong L^1(K/H)$ is separable, see Lemma 4.4. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let K be a compact group and $H \subseteq K$ a closed subgroup, let $(N_j)_{j \in J}$ be the collection of irreducible K -left-invariant subspaces of $L^2(K/H)$. Then the N_j are finite-dimensional, mutually orthogonal,*

$$L^2(K/H) = \overline{\text{lin} \{N_j \mid j \in J\}}^{L^2(K/H)}$$

and

$$C(K/H) = \overline{\text{lin} \{N_j \mid j \in J\}}^{C(K/H)}.$$

In particular, $L^2(K/H)$ is separable if and only if $C(K/H)$ is separable.

Proof. If $H = \{e\}$, the statements can be found in [Fol15, Section 5.2]. To reduce the general case to this, use the conditional expectation

$$P_H: L^2(K) \rightarrow L^2(K/H), \quad (P_H f)(x) = \int_H f(xh) \, dm(h)$$

and the fact that P_H restricts to a surjective contraction $P_H: C(K) \rightarrow C(K/H)$. \square

Corollary 4.5. *Every nonsingular action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ has a maximal isometric factor. If (G, m) is a measured group and the measure of the maximal isometric factor is m -stationary, then it has to be invariant.*

Proof. First, let

$$\mathcal{A} := \overline{\bigcup \left\{ F \subseteq L^\infty(X) \mid \begin{array}{l} F \text{ finite-dimensional} \\ \text{and } G\text{-invariant} \end{array} \right\}}^{L^\infty(X)}$$

as in the proof of Lemma 4.3 and let $G \curvearrowright (K, \nu)$ be a standard probability model for this subalgebra. It is clear from the correspondence between factors and subalgebras discussed in Construction 2.4 that this is the maximal isometric factor of $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$. For the invariance statement, we may assume without loss of generality that $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ itself is isometric. In that case, let $M \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ be a finite-dimensional G -invariant subspace. Then the action of G on M induces a map $\Phi: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M)$ which maps G to a bounded subgroup of $\text{Aut}(M)$. Thus, $\Phi(G)$ is relatively compact in $\text{Aut}(M)$; denote its closure by $K := \overline{\Phi(G)}$.

Since the Haar measure m_K is K -invariant, any m_K -stationary measure is K -invariant. Thus, G -invariance of the restriction $\mu|_M$ of μ to the subspace $M \subseteq L^\infty(X, \mu)$ is equivalent to

$$m_K * \mu|_M = \mu|_M.$$

To prove this equality, it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N m^{*n} = m_K.$$

For this, we can employ Lemma 4.3: Since $\Phi(G)$ is dense in K , the left-action of G on (K, m_K) is ergodic and isometric and thus m_K is the unique stationary measure under the G -action. Thus, Breiman's law states that for every probability measure ν on K

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N m^{*n} * \nu = m_K.$$

Setting $\nu = \delta_e$ shows that $\mu|_M$ is G -invariant. Since $G \curvearrowright (X, \nu)$ is isometric, the G -invariant finite-dimensional subspaces $M \subseteq L^\infty(X)$ are dense in $L^2(X)$. Thus, μ is G -invariant. \square

We call this maximal isometric factor the **Kronecker factor** of the system.

The Kronecker dichotomy for stationary actions. The following theorem and its proof closely follow [Bjö17, Section 4] and the proof given there. We include them for the reader's convenience since we shall generalize the arguments below.

Theorem 4.6. *A stationary action $(G, m) \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is weakly mixing if and only if its Kronecker factor is trivial.*

Proof. For the easy direction, assume that the action of G on (X, μ) is weakly mixing (and in particular, ergodic). Suppose there exists a nontrivial isometric factor (Y, ν) of (X, μ) with factor map $\pi: X \rightarrow Y$. Then ν is m -stationary and hence G -invariant by Corollary 4.5. Since (Y, ν) is a nontrivial isometric factor, there is a nontrivial finite-dimensional G -invariant subspace $M \subseteq L^\infty(Y, \nu)$ and we denote by $P_M: L^2(Y, \nu) \rightarrow M$ the corresponding orthogonal projection. The projection $P_M \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(Y, \nu))$ is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator and under the canonical identification $\text{HS}(L^2(Y, \nu)) \cong L^2(Y \times Y, \nu \otimes \nu)$, P_M corresponds to a function $k \in L^2(Y \times Y, \nu \otimes \nu)$. As explained above, the fact that P_M intertwines with the dynamics on $L^2(Y, \nu)$ implies that k is invariant under the diagonal action on $L^2(Y \times Y, \nu \otimes \nu)$. We thus obtain a nontrivial fixed function $k \in L^2(Y \times Y, \nu \otimes \nu)$ and this lifts to the nontrivial fixed function $k \circ (\pi \times \text{id}_Y) \in L^2(X \times Y, \mu \otimes \nu)$. Thus, the action of G on (X, μ) cannot be weakly mixing, a contradiction. This shows that weak mixing implies that the Kronecker factor is trivial.

Conversely, suppose that the action of G on (X, μ) is not weakly mixing; we need to show that there is a nontrivial isometric factor. So suppose $G \curvearrowright (Y, \nu)$ is an ergodic measure-preserving action such that there is a nonconstant G -invariant function $k \in L^\infty(X \times Y, \mu \otimes \nu)$. We may assume that $k \perp \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}$, i.e., $\int_{X \times Y} k \, d\mu \otimes \nu = 0$. Denote by B_1 the closed unit ball in $L^2(Y, \nu)$ endowed with the weak topology and consider the map

$$p_k: X \rightarrow B_1, \quad x \mapsto k(x, \cdot).$$

Since k is G -invariant almost everywhere, this map is almost everywhere equivariant for every $s \in G$ and thus becomes a factor map if we endow B_1 with the push-forward measure. Lemma 4.7 below shows that since G acts unitarily on $L^2(Y, \nu)$ and hence isometrically on B_1 , this measure is invariant. Thus, if we can show that

$$\Phi: B_1 \times B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f, g \mapsto \langle f, g \rangle$$

is a nonconstant invariant function on $B_1 \times B_1$, the usual Kronecker dichotomy will imply that there exists a nontrivial isometric factor which concludes the proof. That Φ is essentially nonconstant is equivalent to proving that

$$\tilde{\Phi} := \Phi \circ (p_k \times p_k): X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (x, x') \mapsto \int_Y k(x, y)k(x', y) \, d\nu(y)$$

is not essentially constant. To see this, observe that if $K: L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(Y, \nu)$ is the Hilbert–Schmidt integral operator corresponding to k under the isomorphism $L^2(X \times Y, \mu \otimes \nu) \cong \text{HS}(L^2(X, \mu), L^2(Y, \nu))$, then the kernel of the Hilbert–Schmidt integral operator K^*K is readily computed to be $\widetilde{\Phi}$. Since k is nonzero, K is nonzero. Moreover, since $\ker(K^*) = \overline{\text{ran}(K)}^\perp$, $K^*K \neq 0$. The statement that $\widetilde{\Phi}$ is not essentially constant is equivalent to K^*K not being a multiple of the orthogonal projection $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}}$ onto the constant functions. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $K^*K = c\mathbb{E}$. Then $K^*K = K^*K\mathbb{E}$ and since K^* is injective on $\text{ran}(K)$, we may cancel K^* . Thus, $K = K\mathbb{E}$ and an elementary computation shows that thus, $k = \mathbb{1}_X \otimes f$ where $f \in L^\infty(Y)$ is given by $f(y) = \int_X k(x, y) d\mu(x)$. Invariance of k translates into invariance of f . Since Y was assumed to be ergodic, we see that k is constant. This contradicts k being nonconstant, so the assumption $K^*K = c\mathbb{E}$ must have been impossible. This shows that $\widetilde{\Phi} \in L^\infty(X \times X, \mu \otimes \mu)$ is a nonconstant fixed function.

Thus, we have found a measure-preserving factor $(B_1, (p_k)_*\mu)$ and a nonconstant invariant function Φ in $L^\infty(B_1 \times B_1, (p_k)_*\mu \otimes (p_k)_*\mu)$. By the classical Kronecker dichotomy Theorem 1.2, there is a nontrivial isometric factor of this system which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.7 ([Bjö17, Lemma 4.3]). *Let H be a Hilbert space, H_w denote H endowed with the weak topology, and $(G, m) \curvearrowright (H_w, \mu)$ be a stationary action by unitary operators. Then μ is G -invariant.*

Proof. This is proved in [Bjö17, Lemma 4.3] for the case that G is countable and $\text{supp}(\mu)$ is contained in the unit ball B_1 but the general case follows as a consequence. We give a more general proof in Lemma 5.9 below. \square

One example of a weakly mixing action is given by the Poisson boundary $\Pi(G, m)$ of a measured group (G, m) which is the universal m -proximal system for (G, m) .

Theorem 4.8 ([Bjö17, Theorem 3.1]). *Let (G, m) be a countable measured group, denote its Poisson boundary by (Z, ζ) , and let $(G, \check{m}) \curvearrowright (X, \check{\mu})$ be an ergodic stationary action. Then the diagonal action $G \curvearrowright (Z \times X, \zeta \otimes \check{m})$ is ergodic.*

As a corollary, one obtains that the action of (G, m) on its Poisson boundary is weakly mixing.

5. THE RELATIVE KRONECKER DICHOTOMY FOR STATIONARY ACTIONS

The goal of this section is to extend the dichotomy Theorem 4.6 to the setting of extensions in Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ be an extension of stationary (G, m) -actions. Then exactly one of the following is true.*

- (i) *The extension π is weakly mixing.*
- (ii) *There is a nontrivial intermediate extension $(X, \mu) \rightarrow (\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\zeta}) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ such that the extension $(\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\zeta}) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is isometric and relatively measure-preserving.*

The proof of Theorem 4.6 used that the closed unit ball in a Hilbert space is a weak*-compact subset. In the relative setting, we will need to think about Hilbert bundles instead of Hilbert spaces to make an analogous statement and then adapt the invariance lemma Lemma 4.7.

Definition 5.2. A **(continuous) Hilbert bundle** $p: E \rightarrow L$ consists of topological spaces E and L and a continuous, open surjection $p: E \rightarrow L$ such that L is compact and

- (a) every fiber $E_l := p^{-1}(l)$ is a Hilbert space,
- (b) if we define $E \times_L E := \{(e, f) \in E \times E \mid p(e) = p(f)\}$, then the maps

$$\begin{aligned} +: E \times_L E &\rightarrow E, & (e, f) &\mapsto e + f, \\ \cdot: \mathbb{C} \times E &\rightarrow E, & (\lambda, e) &\mapsto \lambda e \end{aligned}$$

are continuous,

- (c) the scalar product

$$(\cdot|\cdot): E \times_L E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad (e, f) \mapsto (e|f)_{E_{p(e)}}$$

is continuous,

- (d) for each $l \in L$ one obtains a neighborhood base of $0_l \in E_l$ by considering the sets

$$\{e \in E \mid p(e) \in U, \|e\| < \varepsilon\}$$

for neighborhoods $U \subseteq L$ of l and $\varepsilon > 0$.

A map $\sigma: K \rightarrow E$ is called a **section** of the Hilbert bundle if $p \circ \sigma = \text{id}_K$. We denote the space of all continuous sections by $\Gamma(E)$ which becomes a Banach space with the natural norm $\|\sigma\| = \sup_{l \in L} \|\sigma(l)\|_{E_l}$. The bundle E is called **separable** if there is a countable subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \Gamma(E)$ such that for each $l \in L$ the set $\{\sigma(l) \mid \sigma \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is dense in E_l .

The **weak topology** on E is the initial topology induced by the maps

$$\begin{aligned} p: E &\rightarrow L, & e &\mapsto p(e) \\ (\cdot|\sigma(p(\cdot))): E &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}, & e &\mapsto (e|\sigma(p(e))) \end{aligned}$$

for $\sigma \in \Gamma(E)$. We denote E endowed with the weak topology by E_w .

A **unitary representation** or **unitary action** π of a group G on a Hilbert bundle $p: E \rightarrow L$ is a continuous group action $\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(E)$ such that there exists a continuous action $G \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(L)$ that satisfies

- $p(\pi(g)e) = gp(e)$ for every $e \in E$ and $g \in G$ and

- $\pi(g)|_{E_l}: E_l \rightarrow E_{gl}$ is a unitary operator for every $l \in L$ and $g \in G$.

Such a representation π induces an action of G on the space of sections σ of $p: E \rightarrow L$ via $(s.\sigma)_l := \pi(s)\sigma_{s^{-1}l}$.

Remark 5.3. All Hilbert bundles that occur will be continuous, so we usually simply speak of Hilbert bundles. One of the standard references for Hilbert bundles, and more generally bundles of topological vector spaces, is [Gie82]. Gierz defines Hilbert bundles somewhat differently in [Gie82, Definition 1.5] but shows in [Gie82, Theorems 2.4, 2.9] that the definition we gave above is equivalent. We emphasize that by [Gie82, Theorem 2.9], Hilbert bundles are “full”, i.e., for every element of a Hilbert bundle there is a continuous section that passes through it. In particular, the norm and weak topology on a Hilbert bundle are both Hausdorff.

We recall the following key examples for Hilbert bundles from [EK22, Definition 6.2]. Part of this is based on unpublished notes kindly shared by M. Haase in private communication.

Example 5.4. Suppose $q: K \rightarrow L$ is a continuous surjection between compact spaces and that $(\mu_l)_{l \in L}$ is a weak*-continuous family of probability measures on K such that $\text{supp}(\mu_l) \subseteq K_l$. Set

$$L_q^2(K, \mu) := \bigcup_{l \in L} L^2(K_l, \mu_l)$$

and let $p: L_q^2(K, \mu) \rightarrow L$ be the canonical map. Endow $L_q^2(K, \mu)$ with the topology generated by the sets

$$V(F, U, \varepsilon) := \left\{ f \in L_q^2(K, \mu) \mid p(f) \in U, \|f - F|_{K_{p(f)}}\|_{L^2(K_{p(f)}, \mu_{p(f)})} < \varepsilon \right\}$$

for $F \in C(K)$, open $U \subseteq L$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then it is standard to verify that $p: L_q^2(K, \mu) \rightarrow L$ defines a continuous Hilbert bundle.

Given a relatively measure-preserving extension $p: X \rightarrow Y$ of nonsingular actions of a lsc group G , one can associate to it a canonical Hilbert bundle. To see this, observe that if we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &:= \{f \in L^\infty(X) \mid g \mapsto T_{g^{-1}}f \text{ is } \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X)\text{-continuous}}\}, \\ \mathcal{B} &:= \{f \in L^\infty(Y) \mid g \mapsto T_{g^{-1}}f \text{ is } \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(X)\text{-continuous}}\}, \end{aligned}$$

then since the extension is relatively measure-preserving, $\mathbb{E}_Y(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}$ (use Lemma 3.4) and so by Lemma 2.5, these C^* -algebras gives rise to a topological model $q: (K, \mu_K) \rightarrow (L, \mu_L)$ for the extension $p: X \rightarrow Y$. The corresponding conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_q: L^1(K, \mu_K) \rightarrow L^1(L, \mu_L)$ then restricts to a continuous operator $\mathbb{E}_q: C(K) \rightarrow C(L)$.

For $l \in L$, let $\delta_l \in M(L) \cong C(L)'$ be the Dirac measure in l and set $\mu_l := \mathbb{E}'_q \delta_l \in C(K)'$. Since $\mathbb{E}_q: C(K) \rightarrow C(L)$ is continuous, this defines a weak*-continuous family of probability

measures on K . That $\text{supp}(\mu_l) \subseteq K_l$ for every $l \in L$ follows from the fact that \mathbb{E}_q is a $C(L)$ -module homomorphism. Since \mathbb{E}_q preserves the integral of functions, for $f \in C(K)$

$$\int_L \int_{K_l} f \, d\mu_l \, d\mu_L(l) = \int_L \int_{K_l} \langle f, \mathbb{E}'_q \delta_l \rangle \, d\mu_L(l) = \int_L (\mathbb{E}_L f)(l) \, d\mu_L(l) = \int_K f \, d\mu_K.$$

Thus, $(\mu_l)_{l \in L}$ is a disintegration of μ_K and, as above, we can associate the Hilbert bundle $L^2_q(K, (\mu_l)_{l \in L})$ to it. The upside that one obtains a continuous Hilbert bundle comes at the price that this Hilbert bundle is in no way separable, even if the initial probability spaces X and Y were separable. The following lemma provides a remedy to this drawback.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $p: X \rightarrow Y$ be a relatively measure-preserving extension of nonsingular G -actions where G is a lcsc group. Then there is a topological model $q: (K, \mu) \rightarrow (L, \nu)$ of continuous G -actions on compact metric spaces such that μ admits a unique weak*-continuous G -equivariant disintegration over (L, ν) .*

Proof. We start with the canonical (not necessarily metrizable) topological model $q: (K, \mu) \rightarrow (L, \nu)$ constructed in Example 5.4. Let $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq C(K)$ be a separable G -invariant C^* -subalgebra of $C(K)$ that is dense in $L^1(K, \mu)$ and let

$$\mathbb{E}_L: C(K) \cong L^\infty(K, \mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(L, \nu) \cong C(L)$$

be the conditional expectation. Let $\mathcal{B}_1 := C_G^*(\mathbb{E}_L(\mathcal{A}_1)) \subseteq C(L)$ be the G -invariant C^* -subalgebra generated by $\mathbb{E}_L(\mathcal{A}_1)$. Recursively define two increasing sequences of separable, G -invariant C^* -subalgebras via $\mathcal{A}_{n+1} := C_G^*(\mathcal{A}_n \cup T_q(\mathcal{B}_n))$ and $\mathcal{B}_{n+1} := C_G^*(\mathbb{E}_L(\mathcal{A}_{n+1}))$. Set

$$\mathcal{A} := \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_n}^{\|\cdot\|_{C(K)}}, \quad \mathcal{B} := \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}_n}^{\|\cdot\|_{C(L)}}.$$

By construction, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq C(K)$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq C(L)$ are G -invariant, separable C^* -subalgebras that are dense in $L^1(K, \mu)$ and $L^1(L, \nu)$, respectively. Moreover, $T_q(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and the conditional expectation restricts to a G -equivariant map $\mathbb{E}_L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$. Thus, the resulting topological model $q': (K', \mu') \rightarrow (L', \nu')$ has a G -equivariant weak*-continuous disintegration $(\mu'_l)_{l \in L'}$ given by the adjoint of the conditional expectation via $\mu'_l := \mathbb{E}'_L \delta_l$. This is unique due to the disintegration theorem Theorem 1.8. \square

It is not hard to show that the closed “unit ball” in a Hilbert bundle is compact in the weak topology. This can be found in [Ren12, Proposition 2.7] and also follows from [Gie82, Proposition 15.3]. Both work with slightly different definitions of the weak(*) topology but it is not hard to show that they are all equivalent.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $p: E \rightarrow L$ be a Hilbert bundle over a compact space. Then every norm-bounded subset of E is relatively compact in the weak topology. In particular, the weakly closed set $B_1 := \{x \in E \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$ is weakly compact.*

Remark 5.7. If $p: E \rightarrow L$ is a separable Hilbert bundle over a compact *metric* space, then the weak topology on E is metrizable. To see this, use the Stone–Weierstrasse theorem for Hilbert bundles (see [Gie82, Theorem 4.2]) that states: If $M \subseteq \Gamma(E)$ is a submodule that is dense in each fiber of E , then M is dense in $\Gamma(E)$. From this, it follows that for a separable Hilbert bundle over a compact metric space, $\Gamma(E)$ is a separable Banach space. With this knowledge, writing down a compatible metric for the weak topology on E reduces to standard arguments.

In [Bjö17, Lemma 3.3] it is shown that a bounded harmonic function for a stationary (G, m) -action on a probability space is necessarily almost everywhere G -invariant. Below, we adapt this proof to show that the assumption of boundedness is not required and that the same statement is also true for functions that are harmonic under the adjoint random walk which we expressed earlier via the operator $P_m^*: L^1(X) \rightarrow L^1(X)$

$$P_m^* f(x) = \int_G h_s(x) f(s^{-1}x) \, dm(s)$$

where $h_s := \frac{ds_s \mu}{d\mu}$. We collect this invariance statement here as we shall exploit the underlying idea in the proof of Lemma 5.9 below to prove a similar statement in the case of Hilbert bundles.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $(G, m) \curvearrowright X$ be a stationary action on a probability space and $f \in L^1(X)$. If $P_m f = f$ or $P_m^* f = f$, then f is G -invariant.*

Proof. Recall the general fact that if $T: L^1(X) \rightarrow L^1(X)$ is a bi-Markov operator, then $\text{fix}(T) = \{f \in L^1(X) \mid Tf = f\}$ is a closed sublattice, i.e., $f \in \text{fix}(T)$ implies $|f| \in \text{fix}(T)$. To see this, note that since T is positive, $|Tf| \leq T|f|$ and since T preserves the integral,

$$\int_X |f| \, d\mu = \int_X |Tf| \, d\mu \leq \int_X T|f| \, d\mu = \int_X |f| \, d\mu.$$

Thus, $|f| = T|f|$ so that $\text{fix}(T) \subseteq L^1(X)$ is indeed a sublattice. In particular, the sublattice $\text{fix}_{L^\infty}(T) = \text{fix}(T) \cap L^\infty(X)$ is dense in $\text{fix}(T)$ (use that $\mathbb{1}_X \in \text{fix}(T)$ in order to employ a cut-off approximation). Moreover, $\text{fix}_{L^\infty}(T)$ is a closed sublattice in $L^\infty(X)$ and thus [EFHN15, Theorem 7.23] shows that $\text{fix}_{L^\infty}(T)$ is a C^* -subalgebra of $L^\infty(X)$.

As we have seen, both P_m and P_m^* are bi-Markov operators on $L^1(X)$, so it is clear that to prove the claim, we may restrict ourselves to real-valued functions $f \in L^\infty(X)$. The case $P_m f = f$ can be proved just as the case of countable G (see [Bjö17, Lemma 3.3]), so we only

prove the completely analogous case $P_m^* f = f$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_X \int_G h_s(x) \left(f(x) - f(s^{-1}x) \right)^2 dm(s) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_X \int_G h_s(x) \left(f(x)^2 - 2f(x)f(s^{-1}x) + f(s^{-1}x)^2 \right) dm(s) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_G \int_X f(x)^2 d(s_*\mu)(x) dm(s) - 2 \int_X f(x) P_m^* f(x) d\mu(x) + \int_X \left(P_m^*(f^2) \right)(x) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_X f^2(x) - 2f^2(x) + f^2(x) d\mu(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used stationarity of μ for the first term, $f \in \text{fix}(P_m^*)$ for the second, and for the third we exploited that $f^2 \in \text{fix}(P_m^*)$. Thus, f is invariant under m -almost every $s \in G$. By Theorem 2.1, this extends to all $s \in \text{supp}(m)$ and since $\text{supp}(m)$ generates a dense subgroup of G , applying Theorem 2.1 again, we conclude that f is G -invariant. \square

We are now ready to prove the key observation that will enable us to derive that the isometric extensions in the structure theorem for stationary actions are, in fact, relatively measure-preserving. To that end, recall that if $p: E \rightarrow Z$ is a Hilbert bundle, then E_w denotes E endowed with the weak topology.

Lemma 5.9. *Let $\pi: (G, m) \curvearrowright (E_w, \xi)$ be a unitary and stationary action where $p: E \rightarrow Z$ is a separable Hilbert bundle over a compact metrizable space Z . Let $\zeta := p_*\xi$. Then $p: (E_w, \xi) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is a relatively measure-preserving extension of (G, m) -actions.*

Proof. First, we assume that ξ is supported on the weakly compact unit cylinder $B := \{e \in E \mid \|e\| \leq 1\}$. Since the Hilbert bundle is separable, Theorem 1.8 combined with Remark 5.7 allows us to disintegrate the measure ξ over Z as $(\xi_z)_{z \in Z}$. We need to show that $\pi(s)_*\xi_{s^{-1}z} = \xi_z$ for all $s \in G$ and ζ -almost every $z \in Z$.

To prove this invariance, it suffices to consider special functions: Since $p: E \rightarrow Z$ is a separable bundle, there is a countable fiberwise dense sequence $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\Gamma(E)$. By the Stone–Weierstrass theorem, a dense subspace of $C(B)$ can be constructed if one takes the linear span of the constant function $\mathbb{1}_B$ and the functions $\varphi: B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of the form

$$\varphi(v) = (u_1(p(v))|v) \cdots (u_k(p(v))|v).$$

It thus suffices to prove

$$\int_{B_z} \varphi(v) d\pi(s)_*\xi_{s^{-1}z}(v) = \int_{B_z} \varphi(v) d\xi_z(v) \quad \text{for } \zeta\text{-a.e. } z \in Z$$

for each of these generating functions $\varphi(v) = (u_1(p(v))|v) \cdots (u_k(p(v))|v)$. Denote by \mathcal{F} the countable collection of these functions and $\text{fix } \varphi \in \mathcal{F}$.

By means of the disintegration, we can expand the expression

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{B_z} \varphi(v) \, d\pi(s)_* \xi_{s^{-1}z}(v) &= \int_{B_z} (u_1(p(v))|v) \cdots (u_k(p(v))|v) \, d\pi(s)_* \xi_{s^{-1}z}(v) \\
 &= \int_{B_{s^{-1}z}} (u_1(z)|\pi(s)v) \cdots (u_k(z)|\pi(s)v) \, d\xi_{s^{-1}z}(v) \\
 &= \left((u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k)(z) \left| \pi^{\otimes k}(s) \underbrace{\int_{B_{s^{-1}z}} v \otimes \cdots \otimes v \, d\xi_{s^{-1}z}(v)}_{=:\sigma_{s^{-1}z}} \right. \right) \\
 &= \left((u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k)(z) \left| \pi^{\otimes k}(s) \sigma_{s^{-1}z} \right. \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, we defined a section $\sigma: Z \rightarrow E^{\otimes k}$ by $\sigma_z := \int_{B_z} v \otimes \cdots \otimes v \, d\xi_z(v)$ using that $p(v) = z$ for $v \in \text{supp}(\xi_z)$ for ζ -a.e. $z \in Z$ since $\text{supp}(\xi_z) \subseteq p^{-1}(z)$ for ζ -a.e. $z \in Z$. Note that the vector-valued integral $\sigma_z = \int_{B_z} v \otimes \cdots \otimes v \, d\xi_z(v)$ is understood in the weak sense, i.e., it is the unique vector $\sigma_z \in E_z^{\otimes k}$ with

$$\forall e \in E_z^{\otimes k}: \quad (e|\sigma_z) = \int_{B_z} (e|v \otimes \cdots \otimes v) \, d\xi_z(v)$$

that exists by virtue of the Riesz–Fréchet representation theorem. Our goal is to show that ζ -a.e. $\pi^{\otimes k}(s)\sigma_{s^{-1}z} = \sigma_z$ which will prove the equivariance of the disintegration. Set $h_s^\zeta := \frac{ds_*\zeta}{d\zeta}$ for every $s \in G$. As observed in Remark 1.9, by virtue of the uniqueness statement in Theorem 1.8 the disintegration $(\xi_z)_{z \in Z}$ is stationary in the sense that

$$(1) \quad \int_G h_s^\zeta(z) \pi(s)_*(\xi_{s^{-1}z}) \, dm(s) = \xi_z \quad \text{for } \zeta\text{-a.e. } z \in Z.$$

Combine this with the definition of σ to conclude that

$$(2) \quad \sigma_z = \int_G h_s^\zeta(z) \pi^{\otimes k}(s) \sigma_{s^{-1}z} \, dm(s) \quad \text{for } \zeta\text{-a.e. } z \in Z.$$

We may therefore attempt to proceed as in the proof of Lemma 5.8 to prove that σ is G -invariant under the action of G , i.e., $\sigma_z = (s.\sigma)_z = \pi^{\otimes k}(s)\sigma_{s^{-1}z}$. We first perform the computation

mimicking Lemma 5.8 and justify measurability of all occurring functions afterwards.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_Z \int_G h_s^\zeta(z) (\sigma_z - (s.\sigma)_z | \sigma_z - (s.\sigma)_z) dm(s) d\zeta(z) \\
&= \int_Z \int_G h_s^\zeta(z) \left((\sigma_z | \sigma_z) - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\sigma_z | \pi^{\otimes k}(s) \sigma_{s^{-1}z}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\pi^{\otimes k}(s) \sigma_{s^{-1}z} | \pi^{\otimes k}(s) \sigma_{s^{-1}z}) \right) dm(s) d\zeta(z) \\
&= \int_G \int_Z \|\sigma_z\|^2 d(s_*\zeta)(z) dm(s) - 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_Z \left(\sigma_z \left| \int_G h_s^\zeta(z) \pi^{\otimes k}(s) \sigma_{s^{-1}z} dm(s) \right. \right) d\zeta(z) \\
&\quad + \int_Z \int_G h_s^\zeta(z) (\sigma_{s^{-1}z} | \sigma_{s^{-1}z}) dm(s) d\zeta(z) \\
&= \int_Z \|\sigma_z\|^2 - 2\|\sigma_z\|^2 d\zeta(z) + \int_G \int_Z (\sigma_{s^{-1}z} | \sigma_{s^{-1}z}) d(s_*\zeta)(z) dm(s) \\
&= - \int_Z \|\sigma_z\|^2 d\zeta(z) + \int_Z \int_G (\sigma_z | \sigma_z) dm(s) d\zeta(z) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that it is here that we use the unitarity of π . Thus, if we can prove that the maps

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & z &\mapsto ((s.\sigma)_z | (s.\sigma)_z)_{E_z} && (s \in \operatorname{supp}(m)), \\
Z &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, & z &\mapsto ((s.\sigma)_z | \sigma_z)_{E_z} && (s \in \operatorname{supp}(m)).
\end{aligned}$$

are measurable, we will have shown that σ is invariant under $\operatorname{supp}(m)$ and hence G . To prove the measurability of $z \mapsto (\sigma_z | \sigma_z)$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\sigma_z | \sigma_z) &= \left(\int_{B_z} v \otimes \cdots \otimes v d\xi_z(v) \left| \int_{B_z} w \otimes \cdots \otimes w d\xi_z(w) \right. \right) \\
&= \int_{B_z \times B_z} (v \otimes \cdots \otimes v | w \otimes \cdots \otimes w) d\xi_z \otimes \xi_z(v, w).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(\xi_z \otimes \xi_z)_{z \in Z}$ is the disintegration of the relatively independent joining $\xi \otimes_Z \xi$, it follows that the map $z \mapsto (\sigma_z | \sigma_z)$ is measurable. Proving the measurability for the other scalar products requires merely notational adjustments. Thus, $s.\sigma = \sigma$ for m -almost every $s \in G$.

We now return to our initial computation and thus obtain for ζ -a.e. $z \in Z$ and m -almost every $s \in G$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_z} \varphi(v) d\pi(s)_* \xi_{s^{-1}z}(v) &= (u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k(z) | (s.\sigma)_z) \\
&= (u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k(z) | \sigma_z) \\
&= \int_{B_z} \varphi(v) d\xi_z(v).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ was arbitrary and \mathcal{F} countable, the disintegration $(\xi_z)_{z \in Z}$ indeed satisfies the desired equivariance for m -almost every $s \in G$. Using the characterization of relative measure-preservation in terms of conditional expectations, see Lemma 3.4 and the continuity theorem Theorem 2.1, this extends to all $s \in \text{supp}(m)$ and the closed subgroup generated by $\text{supp}(m)$ which proves G -equivariance.

Finally, assume $\text{supp}(\xi)$ is not necessarily contained in B . Since G acts unitarily, the weakly compact set $B_n := \{e \in E \mid \|e\| \leq n\}$ is G -invariant for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and the same arguments as above show that any disintegration of $\xi_n := \frac{1}{\xi(B_n)}\xi|_{B_n}$ is G -equivariant almost everywhere provided that $\xi(B_n) > 0$. By the disintegration theorem Theorem 1.8, $(\xi_z|_{B_n})_{z \in Z}$ is a disintegration of $\xi|_{B_n}$ and as such it is G -equivariant almost everywhere. Now, for any weakly measurable set $A \subseteq E_w$

$$\xi_z(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_z|_{B_n}(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\xi(B_n)} \xi_z|_{B_n}(A).$$

Thus, the disintegration $(\xi_z)_{z \in Z}$ is also G -equivariant almost everywhere. \square

Remark 5.10. U. Bader pointed out to the author that the weak and norm Borel σ -algebras coincide for a separable Hilbert space. The same is likely true for separable Hilbert bundles over compact metrizable spaces but we do not flesh out the details since we do not require this equality here. Knowing this, E_w (E endowed with the weak topology) may be replaced by E in Lemma 5.9.

Proof of the dichotomy. Now that we have proven the generalization Lemma 5.9 of the invariance lemma Lemma 4.7, we are ready to prove the dichotomy Theorem 5.1. Recall from Lemma 3.9 that for a subset $M \subseteq L^2(X|Z)$ we denote the L^2 -closure of M within $L^2(X|Z)$ by \tilde{M} .

Proof of Theorem 5.1. First, assume the extension $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is weakly mixing (and in particular, ergodic). Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that

$$(X, \mu) \xrightarrow{p} (\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\zeta}) \xrightarrow{q} (Z, \zeta)$$

is a nontrivial relatively measure-preserving isometric intermediate extension of (Z, ζ) . Then there exists a finitely-generated $L^\infty(Z)$ -submodule $M \subseteq L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z)$ such that M is not contained in $L^\infty(Z)$. Without loss of generality, assume that $M = \tilde{M}$ and let $P_M: L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z) \rightarrow M$ be the orthogonal projection onto M . By Lemma 3.9, $P_M \in \text{HS}(L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z))$. Since relative measure-preservation is equivalent to equivariance of conditional expectations (see Lemma 3.4), the decomposition $L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z) = M \oplus M^\perp$ is readily verified to be invariant. Thus, P_M is G -equivariant. Via the isomorphism $\text{HS}(L^2(\tilde{Z}|Z)) \cong L^2(\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}|Z)$ from Theorem 3.8, we may write $P_M = I_k$ for a uniquely determined $k \in L^2(\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}|Z)$. As observed above, the G -equivariance of P_M is equivalent to invariance of k . Since P_M does not map into $L^\infty(Z)$,

$k \neq \mathbb{E}_Z(k) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}}$ which shows that the extension $\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z} \rightarrow Z$ is not ergodic. By extension, the composite extension

$$(X \times_Z \tilde{Z}, \mu \otimes_Z \tilde{\zeta}) \rightarrow (\tilde{Z} \times_Z \tilde{Z}, \tilde{\zeta} \otimes_Z \tilde{\zeta}) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$$

is not ergodic either, which proves that the extension $X \rightarrow Z$ is not weakly mixing.

Conversely, suppose $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is not weakly mixing. Then there exists an ergodic relatively measure-preserving extension $q: (Y, \nu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ such that the relatively independent joining $(X \times_Z Y, \mu \otimes_Z \nu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is not an ergodic extension. This means that there is a nonconstant G -invariant function $k \in L^\infty(X \times_Z Y, \mu \otimes_Z \nu)$ such that k is not of the form $f \cdot (\mathbb{1}_X \otimes_Z \mathbb{1}_Y)$ for any $f \in L^\infty(Z)$. By Lemma 5.5 and Construction 2.4, we may choose standard probability models and thus assume that X, Y , and Z are compact metric spaces, that $q: (Y, \nu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is continuous, and that the disintegration of ν with respect to q and ζ is weak*-continuous. By Example 5.4, we thus obtain a natural continuous Hilbert bundle with total space $E = \bigcup_{z \in Z} L^2(Y_z, \nu_z)$. By Proposition 5.6 and Remark 5.7, $B_E := \{e \in E \mid \|e\| \leq 1\}$ is a compact metric space with respect to the weak topology on E . We claim that, after identifying k with one of its representatives,

$$p_k: X \rightarrow B_E, \quad x \mapsto k(x, \cdot)$$

is measurable with respect to the weak Borel σ -algebra on B_E . To see this, note that $C(X \times_Z Y)$ is dense in $L^\infty(X \times_Z Y, \mu \otimes_Z \nu)$ with respect to the L^1 -norm so that we can find a sequence $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C(X \times_Z Y)$ that converges to k in $L^1(X \times_Z Y, \mu \otimes_Z \nu)$. Using a cut-off argument and passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $|k_n| \leq 1$ and that $k_n(x, y) \rightarrow k(x, y)$ for $\mu \otimes_Z \nu$ -a.e. $(x, y) \in X \times_Z Y$. Let $F \subseteq X \times_Z Y$ be a set of full measure where this convergence holds. Setting k_n and k to zero on F^c , we may assume that $k_n(x, y) \rightarrow k(x, y)$ for every $(x, y) \in X \times_Z Y$. Therefore, by dominated convergence, $p_{k_n}(x) \rightarrow p_k(x)$ for every $x \in X$. Since p_{k_n} is continuous with respect to the weak topology on B_E and the pointwise limit of a sequence of measurable functions taking values in a metric space is again measurable, p_k is measurable.

Since for every $s \in G$, k is almost everywhere s -equivariant, for every $s \in G$ the map $p_k: X \rightarrow B_E$ is s -equivariant almost everywhere. Thus, p_k yields a factor map $p_k: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (B_E, (p_k)_* \mu)$ of stationary (G, m) -actions. Since the extension $q: (Y, \nu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is relatively measure-preserving, the induced G -action on E is unitary. This allows for the (only) application of the stationarity assumption: We can now apply Lemma 5.9 to see that also the extension $(B_E, (p_k)_* \mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is relatively measure-preserving. Our goal is to show that $(B_E \times_Z B_E, (p_k)_* \mu \otimes_Z (p_k)_* \mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is not an ergodic extension and to derive from this the existence of an isometric intermediate extension by means of the Kronecker dichotomy Theorem 3.7 for nonsingular systems. Showing that $(B_E \times_Z B_E, (p_k)_* \mu \otimes_Z (p_k)_* \mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is not an ergodic extension is equivalent to finding a G -invariant function $\Phi \in L^\infty(B_E \times_Z B_E, (p_k)_* \mu \otimes_Z (p_k)_* \mu)$ that does not lie in $L^\infty(Z, \zeta)$, i.e., is not of the form $\Phi = \mathbb{E}_Z(\Phi) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{B_E \times_Z B_E}$.

To find such a Φ , let $K: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(Y|Z)$ be the Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism I_k induced by k and consider $K^*K: L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z)$. An explicit computation shows that the kernel of K^*K is given by the convolution of the kernel of K with itself, i.e., the G -invariant function

$$\tilde{\Phi}: X \times_Z X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (x, x') \mapsto \int_{Y_{q(x)}} k(x, y) \overline{k(x', y)} \, d\nu_{q(x)}(y).$$

Set $\Phi: B_E \times_Z B_E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $(e, f) \mapsto (e|f)$; then $\tilde{\Phi}$ factorizes as $\tilde{\Phi} = \Phi \circ (p_k \times_Z p_k)$. Now,

$$\Phi = \mathbb{E}_Z(\Phi) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{B_E \times_Z B_E} \iff \tilde{\Phi} = \mathbb{E}_Z(\tilde{\Phi}) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X \times_Z X}.$$

Thus, to conclude the proof that the extension $(B_E \times_Z B_E, (p_k)_*\mu \otimes (p_k)_*\mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is not ergodic, we shall prove that $\tilde{\Phi} = \mathbb{E}_Z(\tilde{\Phi}) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X \times_Z X}$ is impossible.

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $\tilde{\Phi} = \mathbb{E}_Z(\tilde{\Phi}) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X \times_Z X}$. Via the isomorphism $L^2(X \times_Z X) \cong \text{HS}(L^2(X|Z), L^2(X|Z))$, this means that $K^*K = \mathbb{E}_Z(\tilde{\Phi}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_Z$. We thus see that $K^*K = K^*K\mathbb{E}_Z$ and since K^* is injective on the range of K , we can cancel K^* and conclude that $K = K\mathbb{E}_Z$. Comparing the kernels of these two Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms, one readily verifies that this implies that $k = \mathbb{1}_X \otimes_Z f$ where

$$f: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad y \mapsto \int_{X_{q(y)}} k(x, y) \, d\mu_{q(y)}(x).$$

Since k is G -invariant, $f \in L^\infty(Y)$ must be G -invariant. However, the extension $q: (Y, \nu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ was assumed to be ergodic, so $f = \mathbb{E}_Z(f) \cdot \mathbb{1}_Y$. Thus, $k = \mathbb{E}_Z(f) \mathbb{1}_X \otimes_Z \mathbb{1}_Y$, i.e., k is a fixed function coming from the factor (Z, ζ) . However, we assumed k not to be of this form, a contradiction. Thus, our assumption that $\tilde{\Phi} = \mathbb{E}_Z(\tilde{\Phi}) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{X \times_Z X}$ must have been false.

To summarize: we have found a G -invariant function $\Phi \in L^\infty(B_E \times_Z B_E)$ that is not of the form $\Phi = \mathbb{E}_Z(\Phi) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{B_E \times_Z B_E}$, so the extension $(B_E \times_Z B_E, (p_k)_*\mu \otimes (p_k)_*\mu) \rightarrow (Z, \zeta)$ is not ergodic. The Furstenberg–Zimmer dichotomy for nonsingular actions Theorem 3.7 now shows the existence of the desired relatively measure-preserving isometric intermediate extension. \square

As a corollary, we show that m -proximal extensions (defined in Remark 4.2) are always weakly mixing.

Corollary 5.11. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be an m -proximal extension of stationary (G, m) -actions. Then π is weakly mixing.*

Proof. By the dichotomy Theorem 5.1, it suffices to show that a proximal and relatively measure-preserving extension must be an isomorphism. So suppose $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ is an extension with these two properties and assume without loss of generality that X and Y are

compact metrizable spaces. Since π is relatively measure-preserving, Lemma 4.1 shows that if $\mu = \int_Y \mu_y d\nu(y)$ is the disintegration of μ w.r.t. ν , then almost surely

$$\mu_\omega = \int_Y \mu_y d\nu_\omega(y).$$

Since π is proximal, μ_y is a Dirac measure ν_ω -almost everywhere for almost every ω . Note that the set $\{y \in Y \mid \mu_y \text{ is Dirac}\}$ is measurable since the set of Dirac measures in the compact space Y is compact. Now, by the barycenter equation

$$\nu(\{y \in Y \mid \mu_y \text{ is Dirac}\}) = \int_\Omega \nu_\omega(\{y \in Y \mid \mu_y \text{ is Dirac}\}) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = 1.$$

Thus, π is an isomorphism by Theorem 1.8. \square

6. STRUCTURE THEOREM FOR STATIONARY ACTIONS

The main structure theorem is now an easy consequence of the stationary Kronecker dichotomy.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ be an extension of stationary (G, m) -actions. Then there are a weakly mixing extension $\alpha: X \rightarrow X_d$ and a distal and relatively measure-preserving extension $\beta: X_d \rightarrow Z$ such that the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\pi} & Z \\ & \searrow \alpha & \nearrow \beta \\ & X_d & \end{array}$$

commutes.

Corollary 6.2. *Let $(G, m) \curvearrowright X$ be a stationary (G, m) -action. Then it is a weakly mixing extension of a distal and measure-preserving action $G \curvearrowright X_d$.*

Remark 6.3. It is important to remember that if $\pi: (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ is a factor map from a nonsingular to a measure-preserving G -action, then $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ need not be measure-preserving, even though π is by definition a measure-preserving map. See Remark 3.3 for a counterexample.

Similar to the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem and its nonsingular version Theorem 3.6, we will obtain the required tower of isometric extensions for stationary actions by iteratively applying the dichotomy proven in Theorem 5.1. If a stationary action always had a maximal measure-preserving factor, one could circumvent this and directly use Theorem 3.6 to avoid repeating the same argument. However, a system without a maximal measure-preserving factor can be found in [FG10, Example 11].

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We proceed by transfinite recursion. For the induction start, set $X_0 = Z$. Now suppose μ is an ordinal and we have constructed a projective system $((X_\eta)_{\eta < \mu}, (\pi_\eta^\sigma)_{\eta \leq \sigma < \mu})$ of isometric and measure-preserving extensions.

- If μ is a limit ordinal, set $X_\mu = \lim_{\leftarrow} X_\eta$. If $X \rightarrow X_\mu$ is weakly mixing, we are done. Otherwise, repeat the induction step.
- If μ is a successor cardinal and the extension $X \rightarrow X_{\mu-1}$ is weakly mixing, we are done. Otherwise, by Theorem 5.1 there is a relatively measure-preserving isometric intermediate extension $X \rightarrow X_\mu \rightarrow X_{\mu-1}$ and we repeat the induction step.

This recursion terminates after countably many steps, for otherwise $L^2(X)$ would contain an uncountable orthonormal subset. This proves the desired decomposition. \square

Remark 6.4. Furstenberg’s multiple recurrence theorem is trivially true for weakly mixing transformations since they are weakly mixing of all orders, see [EFHN15, Theorem 9.31]. Since weakly mixing is a generic property (see [Hal44, Theorem 2] or [Alp76, Theorem 3]), this shows that for “most” measure-preserving transformations, Furstenberg’s structure theorem and the multiple recurrence theorem are trivially true. However, the Furstenberg structure theorem also holds for arbitrary group actions and in the general setting it is not true that generic actions are weakly mixing, i.e., have no Kronecker factor. A trivial example are compact groups for which every action is purely Kronecker. More generally, if a second-countable locally compact group G has property (T), then the measure-preserving ergodic (hence, weakly mixing) actions are not only not generic but nowhere dense, and if G does not have property (T), then the measure-preserving weakly mixing actions are generic, i.e., a dense G_δ -set (see [KP08, Theorem 4.2]). For stationary actions of groups with property (T), the situation is similar, though there even are examples of groups without property (T) for which a generic stationary action is not ergodic, see [BHT17].

Example 6.5. Pick some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and let $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 2\pi)$ be angles linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . Set

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & 1 & 1 \\ \cos(\alpha) & -\sin(\alpha) & \\ \sin(\alpha) & \cos(\alpha) & \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & 1 & 1 \\ \cos(\beta) & -\sin(\beta) & \\ \sin(\beta) & \cos(\beta) & \end{pmatrix},$$

let Γ_m be the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ generated by A and B , and set $m := \frac{1}{3}\delta_A + \frac{1}{3}\delta_B + \frac{1}{6}\delta_{A^{-1}} + \frac{1}{6}\delta_{B^{-1}}$. What are the stationary measures for the action of (Γ_m, m) on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3)$? Certainly, $[1 : 0 : 0]$ is a fixed point and so the corresponding Dirac mass is an invariant measure for Γ_m . To classify the stationary probability measures on the Γ_m -invariant complement $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus [1 : 0 : 0]$, we consider the two-fold Γ_m -equivariant cover $\mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus [1 : 0 : 0]$. Being a finite cover, this map is proper and hence every stationary measure on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus [1 : 0 : 0]$ lifts to a stationary measure on $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$ which justifies passing to the cover. The action of A on $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$

takes the form

$$A \begin{pmatrix} r \\ \cos(\vartheta) \\ \sin(\vartheta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma r + \cos(\vartheta) + \sin(\vartheta) \\ \cos(\vartheta + \alpha) \\ \sin(\vartheta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix}$$

Similar expressions hold for B , A^{-1} , and B^{-1} . Thus, the action of a general $g \in \Gamma_m$ on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$ is of the form

$$\rho_g: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1, \quad \rho_g(r, p) = (a_g r + b_g(p), R_g p)$$

where R_g is a rotation on \mathbb{S}^1 (which we usually abbreviate by just g), $a: \Gamma_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\times$ is a group homomorphism, and $b_g: \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function for each $g \in \Gamma_m$.

Suppose there is an m -stationary probability measure μ on the Γ_m -invariant set $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$. We will derive a concrete description of μ which, a posteriori, will show that such a measure μ exists and is unique. Let $\pi: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ denote the natural projection. Since α and β were assumed to be algebraically independent, the action of Γ_m on \mathbb{S}^1 is uniquely ergodic, so the push-forward $\nu := \pi_* \mu$ of μ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{S}^1 .

Disintegrate μ as

$$\mu = \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \mu_p \otimes \delta_p \, d\nu(p).$$

Then due to the invariance of ν , we can use the uniqueness of disintegrations to conclude that for $g \in \Gamma_m$ the disintegration of $g_* \mu$ is given by

$$(g_* \mu)_p = a_g \mu_{g^{-1}p} + b_g(g^{-1}p) \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-a.e. } p \in \mathbb{S}^1$$

where the expression $a_g \mu_{g^{-1}p} + b_g(g^{-1}p)$ is to be understood as a dilation followed by a translation. Iterating this, we see that for $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} ((\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)_* \mu)_p &= a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_n} \mu_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)^{-1}p} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_{k-1}} b_{\omega_k} \left((\omega_1 \cdots \omega_k)^{-1} p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the affine maps contract on average w.r.t. m , i.e.,

$$\sum_{g \in \Gamma_m} m(g) \log(a_g) < 1,$$

the strong law of large numbers yields that $a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_n} \rightarrow 0$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$. As $b_g(p)$ is bounded uniformly in $p \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and $g \in \text{supp}(m)$, the series

$$s_\omega(p) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_{k-1}} b_{\omega_k} \left((\omega_1 \cdots \omega_k)^{-1} p \right)$$

converges absolutely almost surely. We want to show that $a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_n} \mu_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)^{-1} p}$ almost surely converges to δ_0 in the weak* topology. However, to determine the conditional measures μ_ω , it suffices to prove this along a subsequence.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since for almost every $p \in S^1$ one has $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mu_p([-M, M]) = 1$, there exists an $M > 0$ such that

$$\nu \left(\underbrace{\left\{ p \in S^1 \mid \mu_p([-M, M]) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right\}}_{=: A_\varepsilon} \right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Since the action of (Γ_m, m) on S^1 admits the unique stationary measure ν , Breiman's law shows that for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$ and every $p \in S^1$, the sequence $(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n p)_n$ equidistributes towards ν . In particular, we can find a subsequence $(n_k)_k$ such that $R_{\omega_1} \cdots R_{\omega_{n_k}} \rightarrow \text{id}$ and thus $R_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})^{-1}} \rightarrow \text{id}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{1}_{A_\varepsilon} \circ R_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})^{-1}} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{\|\cdot\|_{L^1}} \mathbb{1}_{A_\varepsilon}$$

and by replacing $(n_k)_k$ with a subsequence, we may assume that this convergence holds almost surely. Thus, for almost every $p \in A_\varepsilon$, eventually $(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})^{-1} p$ stays in A_ε .

For $\delta > 0$, let $f_\delta \in C_c(\mathbb{R})$ with $f_\delta|_{[-\delta, \delta]} \equiv 1$ and such that f_δ vanishes outside $[-2\delta, 2\delta]$. Then since $a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_n} \rightarrow 0$, we see that along the subsequence $(n_k)_k$, for almost every $p \in A_\varepsilon$

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle f_\delta, a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_{n_k}} \mu_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})^{-1} p} \right\rangle \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})^{-1} p}([-M, M]) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Sending ε to 0 and employing a diagonalization argument, we can find a set A of full measure and replace $(n_k)_k$ with a subsequence such that for every $p \in A$

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle f_\delta, a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_{n_k}} \mu_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})^{-1} p} \right\rangle = 1.$$

Since $\delta > 0$ was chosen arbitrarily, we see that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{\omega_1} \cdots a_{\omega_{n_k}} \mu_{(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})^{-1} p} = \delta_0.$$

To summarize: we have shown that along the subsequence $(n_k)_k$, almost surely, $(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n_k})_* \mu$ does not just converge in the weak* topology but also almost all of its fiber measures with respect to ν converge in the weak* topology. Necessarily, they converge to the fiber measures of μ_ω :

$$(\mu_\omega)_p = \delta_{s_\omega(p)} \otimes \delta_p = \delta_{(s_\omega(p), p)}.$$

Thus, if an m -stationary measure μ exists on $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$, then

$$\mu = \int_{\Omega} \int_{S^1} \delta_{(s_\omega(p), p)} d\nu(p) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$$

which proves that there is at most one such measure. To prove that the measure defined by this integral is indeed m -stationary, for $g \in \Gamma_m$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, denote by $g.\omega \in \Omega$ the concatenation $(g, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$. A quick computation shows that

$$s_{g.\omega}(p) = a_g s_\omega(g^{-1}p) + b_g(g^{-1}p).$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{g \in \text{supp}(m)} m(g) g_* \mu &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{S^1} \sum_{g \in \text{supp}(m)} m(g) \delta_{(a_g s_\omega(p) + b_g(p), gp)} \, d\nu(p) \, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{S^1} \sum_{g \in \text{supp}(m)} m(g) \delta_{(a_g s_\omega(g^{-1}p) + b_g(g^{-1}p), p)} \, d\nu(p) \, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{S^1} \sum_{g \in \text{supp}(m)} m(g) \delta_{(s_{g.\omega}(p), p)} \, d\nu(p) \, d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{S^1} \delta_{(s_\omega(p), p)} \, d\nu(p) \, d(m \otimes \mathbb{P})(\omega) \\ &= \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\bar{\mu}$ denote the pushforward of μ under the map $\mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus [1 : 0 : 0]$ and $\bar{\nu}$ denote the pushforward of ν under the map $S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We have already seen that for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, the conditional measure μ_ω admits the disintegrations

$$\mu_\omega = \int_{S^1} \delta_{(s_\omega(p), p)} \, d\nu(p).$$

To translate this into an expression for $\bar{\mu}_\omega$, observe that the identity

$$s_\omega(p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n \left((0, \omega_1 \cdots \omega_n)^{-1} p \right) \right)$$

shows that $s_\omega(-p) = -s_\omega(p)$, so $s_\omega : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be regarded as a map $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since conditional measures are natural, a quick computation shows that

$$\bar{\mu}_\omega = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \delta_{[s_\omega(p):p]} \, d\bar{\nu}([p]).$$

By Theorem 1.8, this shows that the factor map $(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3), \bar{\mu}_\omega) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2), \bar{\nu})$ is an isomorphism. Thus, the extension $(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3), \bar{\mu}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2), \bar{\nu})$ is proximal and hence weakly mixing by Corollary 5.11.

APPENDIX A. HILBERT–SCHMIDT HOMOMORPHISMS ON CONDITIONAL L^2 -SPACES

Given probability spaces X and Y , one has an isomorphism $L^2(X \times Y) \cong \text{HS}(L^2(X), L^2(Y))$ of Hilbert spaces given by mapping a function $k \in L^2(X \times Y)$ to the corresponding Hilbert–Schmidt integral operator $I_k : L^2(X) \rightarrow L^2(Y)$. The goal of this appendix is to explain the proof of a more general version of this theorem for conditional L^2 -spaces.

Reminder A.1. We begin by recalling the relevant basic facts on Hilbert–Schmidt operators. Many sources only consider Hilbert–Schmidt operators on a single Hilbert space, but we will need to understand operators between different spaces below, so we choose the general setting. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be Hilbert spaces. A bounded operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is called a **Hilbert–Schmidt operator** if for some/any orthonormal basis $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathcal{H}

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|Te_n\|^2 < +\infty.$$

This expression is independent of the chosen orthonormal basis and so we can define the **Hilbert–Schmidt norm** of T as

$$\|T\|_{\text{HS}} := \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|Te_n\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with respect to some orthonormal basis. Denote the collection of all Hilbert–Schmidt operators from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{K} by $\text{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and recall that $\text{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ is again a Hilbert space with the inner product $(T|S) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (Te_n|Se_n)$.

If X and Y are probability spaces, then every function $k \in L^2(X \times Y)$ gives rise to a Hilbert–Schmidt operator

$$I_k : L^2(X) \rightarrow L^2(Y), \quad I_k f(y) := \int_X k(x, y) f(x) d\mu_X(x).$$

This assignment $k \mapsto I_k$ turns out to be a unitary isomorphism $L^2(X \times Y) \cong \text{HS}(L^2(X), L^2(Y))$. We refer the reader to [Sun16, Section 3.3.1] for proofs of these statements. We also prove a more general version of this for *conditional L^2 -spaces* below, see Theorem 3.8.

As discussed in the main text, in the study of extensions $\pi : X \rightarrow Z$ of dynamical systems, the Hilbert space $L^2(X)$ is often replaced by the conditional L^2 -space $L^2(X|Z)$. $L^2(X|Z)$ is a **Hilbert module** over $L^\infty(Z)$, i.e., it is an $L^\infty(Z)$ -module via the action

$$L^\infty(Z) \times L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X|Z), \quad (f, g) \mapsto (f \circ \pi) \cdot g$$

and has an $L^\infty(Z)$ -valued inner product induced by the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_Z : L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^\infty(Z)$,

$$(\cdot|\cdot) : L^2(X|Z) \times L^2(X|Z) \rightarrow L^\infty(Z), \quad (f, g) \mapsto \mathbb{E}_Z(f\bar{g}).$$

As it turns out, general Hilbert modules are rather ill-behaved and do not satisfy many of the classical results from Hilbert space theory such as the Riesz–Fréchet representation theorem, existence of orthonormal bases, the spectral theorem, . . . Fortunately, $L^2(X|Z)$ belongs to a special class of Hilbert modules, so-called **Kaplansky–Hilbert modules**, which do satisfy counterparts for all classical Hilbert space results. Kaplansky–Hilbert modules differ from general Hilbert modules E over a commutative C^* -algebra \mathbb{A} in that \mathbb{A} is a **Stone algebra**, i.e., every bounded subset of real elements has a supremum in \mathbb{A} , and E satisfies a

completeness property with respect to *order convergence*. The fact that $L^2(X|Z)$ and $L^\infty(Z)$ satisfy these completeness properties corresponds to them satisfying a completeness property with respect to almost everywhere convergence see [EHK21, Proposition 7.6 and Lemma 7.5] and [EFHN15, Corollary 7.8]. We forego the precise definition of (Kaplansky–)Hilbert modules since the only example we require is the conditional L^2 -space $L^2(X|Z)$; we refer the reader to [EHK21, Sections 1 and 2] for the details.

Given a Hilbert module E over a C^* -algebra A , the induced \mathbb{A} -valued norm given by

$$|\cdot|_{\mathbb{A}}: E \rightarrow \mathbb{A}, \quad x \mapsto \sqrt{(x|x)}.$$

Quoting from [EHK21, Definition 1.5], this \mathbb{A} -valued norm induces a notion of order-convergence as follows: a net $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ in \mathbb{A} **decreases to 0** if

$$i \leq j \implies 0 \leq f_j \leq f_i \quad \text{and} \quad \inf\{f_i | i \in I\} = 0.$$

A net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in E **order-converges** to $x \in E$ (in symbols: $\text{o-lim}_\alpha x_\alpha = x$), if there is a net $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ in \mathbb{A} decreasing to zero and satisfying

$$\forall i \in I \exists \alpha_i \forall \alpha \geq \alpha_i: |x_\alpha - x| \leq f_i.$$

A mapping $f: E \rightarrow F$ between Hilbert modules is **order-continuous** if $\text{o-lim}_\alpha x_\alpha = x$ in E implies $\text{o-lim}_\alpha f(x_\alpha) = f(x)$ whenever $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ is a net in and x an element of E .

A **morphism** of Hilbert modules E and F over a commutative C^* -algebra \mathbb{A} is a bounded linear operator $T: E \rightarrow F$ such that $T(fx) = fTx$ for all $f \in \mathbb{A}$ and $x \in E$. The space of all morphisms from E to F is denoted by $\text{Hom}(E; F)$ and the **dual module** of a Hilbert module E is defined as $E^* := \text{Hom}(E; \mathbb{A})$. A morphism of Hilbert modules is called an **isomorphism** if it is bijective. By a theorem of Lance [Lan94], an isomorphism $T: E \rightarrow F$ is isometric if and only if it is \mathbb{A} -**isometric**, i.e., if it preserves the \mathbb{A} -valued norms of E and F . In particular, isometric isomorphisms of Hilbert modules are automatically order-continuous.

Moreover, for a Hilbert module E , there generally does not exist an orthonormal basis. To account for this, a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq E$ is called **suborthonormal** if it consists of pairwise orthogonal elements with $(e|e)^2 = (e|e)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{S}$ and such a suborthonormal system is called a **suborthonormal basis** if it is maximal with respect to set inclusion. It can be shown that every Kaplansky–Hilbert module admits a suborthonormal basis, see [EHK21, Proposition 2.11], and that for every suborthonormal basis $\mathcal{B} \subseteq E$ and every $x \in E$ one has the order limit

$$x = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} (x|e)e.$$

We recall the definition of Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms between Hilbert–Kaplansky modules from [EHK21, Section 2.6].

Definition A.2. Let E and F be Kaplansky–Hilbert modules over a Stone algebra \mathbb{A} . Moreover, let \mathcal{F} be the family of all finite suborthonormal subsets of E . A homomorphism $A \in \text{Hom}(E; F)$ is called a **Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphism** if

$$|A|_{\text{HS}} := \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}} |Ax|_{\mathbb{A}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mid \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F} \right\}$$

exists in $\mathbb{A}_+ = \{f \in \mathbb{A} \mid f \geq 0\}$, i.e., if the subset of \mathbb{A} in the above expression is bounded in \mathbb{A} . We write $\text{HS}(E; F)$ for the \mathbb{A} -module of all Hilbert–Schmidt homomorphisms from E to F and $\text{HS}(E)$ if $E = F$.

Lemma A.3. Suppose E and F are Kaplansky–Hilbert modules over a Stone algebra \mathbb{A} and let \mathcal{F} be the collection of finite suborthonormal subsets of E . Then the map

$$\text{HS}(E, F) \times \text{HS}(E, F) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}, \quad (A, B) \mapsto (A|B)_{\text{HS}} := \text{o-lim}_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}} (Ax|Bx)$$

makes $\text{HS}(E, F)$ a Kaplansky–Hilbert module over \mathbb{A} . Moreover, if \mathcal{B} is a suborthonormal basis of E , then

$$(A|B)_{\text{HS}} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}} (Ax|Bx) \quad (A, B \in \text{HS}(E))$$

is an order-convergent series whose limit is independent of the choice of suborthonormal basis.

The key result of this appendix is the following correspondence between certain fiberwise integral operators and their kernels.

Theorem A.4. Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ and $\rho: Y \rightarrow Z$ be measure-preserving maps between standard probability spaces. Then the assignment

$$I: L^2(X \times_Z Y|Z) \rightarrow \text{HS}(L^2(X|Z), L^2(Y|Z)), \quad (I_k f)(y) := \int_{X_{\rho(y)} \times X_{\rho(y)}} k(x, y) f(x) d\mu_{\rho(y)}$$

defines an isometric isomorphism of Hilbert modules.

For the case $X = Y$ and $\pi = \rho$, this was already shown in [EHK21]; we shall closely follow the arguments there and will not introduce new ideas beyond that. The usual approach in the Hilbert space case is to observe the isomorphisms of Hilbert spaces

- 1) $L^2(X \times Y) \cong L^2(X) \otimes L^2(Y)$,
- 2) $L^2(X) \cong L^2(X)^*$, $f \mapsto (\cdot|\bar{f})$ by the Riesz–Fréchet representation theorem, and
- 3) $L^2(X)^* \otimes L^2(Y) \cong \text{HS}(L^2(X), L^2(Y))$.

Combined, these yield the canonical isomorphism $I: L^2(X \times Y) \rightarrow \text{HS}(L^2(X), L^2(Y))$ of Hilbert spaces. Below, we collect the precise formulation of the three isomorphisms 1), 2), and 3) in the more general context of Kaplansky–Hilbert modules. We start with the first isomorphism.

Theorem A.5. *Let $\pi: X \rightarrow Z$ and $\rho: Y \rightarrow Z$ be measure-preserving maps between probability spaces. Then there is a unique isometric Hilbert module isomorphism*

$$W: L^2(X|Z) \otimes L^2(Y|Z) \rightarrow L^2(X \times_Z Y|Z)$$

with $W(f \otimes g) = (T_\pi f) \cdot (T_\rho g)$.

For a proof, see [EHK21, Theorem 7.11] and [EHK21, Section 2.7] for background information on the tensor product of Hilbert–Kaplansky modules. We recall the second isomorphism, a Riesz–Fréchet theorem for Kaplansky–Hilbert modules, from [EHK21, Theorem 2.13].

Theorem A.6. *Let E be a Kaplansky–Hilbert module over a Stone algebra \mathbb{A} . Then the mapping*

$$\Theta: E \rightarrow E^* = \text{Hom}(E; \mathbb{A}), \quad y \mapsto \bar{y} := (\cdot|y)$$

is \mathbb{A} -antilinear, bijective, and satisfies $|y| = |\bar{y}|$ for $y \in E$.

As a consequence, there is a canonical isometric isomorphism $L^2(X|Z) \cong L^2(X|Z)^*$ of Hilbert modules by means of the assignment $f \mapsto (\cdot|\bar{f})$. Moreover, one can also derive from Theorem A.6 that every morphism $A: E \rightarrow F$ between Kaplansky–Hilbert modules admits an **adjoint morphism** $A^*: E \rightarrow F$ that is uniquely determined by the property $(Ae|f) = (e|A^*f)$ for all $e \in E$ and $f \in F$, see [EHK21, Corollary 2.14]. As for Hilbert spaces, it is immediate that A^*A and AA^* are zero if and only if A is.

The counterpart for the third and final isomorphism $\text{HS}(L^2(X), L^2(Y)) \cong L^2(X)^* \otimes L^2(Y)$ requires the following simple generalization of finite rank operators: Given Kaplansky–Hilbert modules E and F as well as elements $x \in E$ and $y \in F$, one can define the operator

$$A_{y,x}: E \rightarrow F, \quad z \mapsto (z|x)y.$$

This is a bounded homomorphism of Hilbert modules. A finite sum of such operators is called a **homomorphism of \mathbb{A} -finite rank**.

Proposition A.7. *Let E and F be Kaplansky–Hilbert modules over a Stone algebra \mathbb{A} . Then there is a unique isometric Hilbert module isomorphism*

$$V: E^* \otimes F \rightarrow \text{HS}(E, F)$$

with $V(\bar{x} \otimes y) = A_{y,x}$ for all $x \in E$ and $y \in F$.

For a proof and the details of tensor products of Kaplansky–Hilbert modules, see [EHK21, Section 2.7], in particular [EHK21, Proposition 2.25]. There, the statement is proven for the case $E = F$ but the proof for the general case differs only in straightforward notational adjustments.

As in the case of Hilbert spaces, simply combine Theorem A.5, Theorem A.6, and Proposition A.7 to derive the desired isomorphism in Theorem A.4.

REFERENCES

- [AGS08] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré, *Gradient Flows in Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*, Birkhäuser, 2008.
- [Alp76] S. Alpern, New proofs that weak mixing is generic, *Invent. Math.* (1976).
- [AS22a] M. Amini and J. Swid, A Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem for σ -finite measure spaces, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci.: Math. Sci.* 132 no. 16 (2022).
- [AS22b] R. Aoun and C. Sert, Stationary probability measures on projective spaces for block-Lyapunov dominated systems, (Feb. 16, 2022). arXiv: 2202.08014v3 [math.DS].
- [Aus88] J. Auslander, *Minimal Flows and their Extensions*, Elsevier, 1988.
- [BHT17] L. Bowen, Y. Hartman, and O. Tamuz, Generic stationary measures and actions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 369 no. 7 (2017), 4889–4929.
- [Bjö17] M. Björklund, Random walks on countable groups, *Isr. J. Math.* 217 (2017), 371–382.
- [BL85] O. Bougerol and J. Lacroix, *Products of Random Matrices with Applications to Schrödinger Operators*, Birkhäuser, 1985.
- [BQ11] Y. Benoist and J.-F. Quint, Mesures stationnaires et fermés invariants des espaces homogènes (I), *Ann. Math.* 174 (2011), 1111–1162.
- [BQ12] Y. Benoist and J. Quint, Introduction to random walks on homogeneous spaces, *Jpn. J. Math.* 7 (2012), 135–166.
- [BQ13a] Y. Benoist and J.-F. Quint, Stationary measures and invariant subsets of homogeneous spaces (II), *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 26 (2013), 659–734.
- [BQ13b] Y. Benoist and J.-F. Quint, Stationary measures and invariant subsets of homogeneous spaces (III), *Ann. Math.* 178 (2013), 1017–1059.
- [Dix77] J. Dixmier, *C*-Algebras*, North-Holland, 1977.

- [DS11] A. I. Danilenko and C. E. Silva, “Ergodic Theory: Non-singular Transformations”. *Mathematics of Complexity and Dynamical Systems*. Ed. by R. A. Meyers. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2011, 329–356.
- [Dur+21] A. Durmus et al., “On the Stability of Random Matrix Product with Markovian Noise: Application to Linear Stochastic Approximation and TD Learning”. *Proceedings of Thirty Fourth Conference on Learning Theory*. Ed. by M. Belkin and S. Kpotufe. Vol. 134. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 15–19 Aug 2021, 1711–1752.
- [EFHN15] T. Eisner, B. Farkas, M. Haase, and R. Nagel, *Operator Theoretic Aspects of Ergodic Theory*, vol. 272 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [EGK18] N. Edeko, M. Gerlach, and V. Kühner, Measure-preserving semiflows and one-parameter Koopman semigroups, *Semigr. Forum* 98 (2018), 48–63.
- [EGS75] R. Ellis, S. Glasner, and L. Shapiro, Proximal-isometric (PI) flows, *Adv. Math.* 17 (1975), 213–260.
- [EHK21] N. Edeko, M. Haase, and H. Kreidler, A Decomposition Theorem for Unitary Group Representations on Kaplansky-Hilbert Modules and the Furstenberg-Zimmer Structure Theorem, (Apr. 10, 2021). arXiv: 2104.04865v1 [math.DS].
- [EK22] N. Edeko and H. Kreidler, Uniform enveloping semigroupoids for groupoid actions, *J. Anal. Math.* (2022), to appear.
- [EL18] A. Eskin and E. Lindenstrauss, Random walks on locally homogeneous spaces. *preprint* (2018).
- [FG10] H. Furstenberg and E. Glasner, “Stationary Dynamical Systems”. *Dynamical Numbers: Interplay between Dynamical Systems and Number Theory*. Ed. by S. Kolyada et al. AMS, 2010, 1–28.
- [FG13] H. Furstenberg and E. Glasner, “Recurrence for Stationary Group Actions”. *From Fourier Analysis and Number Theory to Radon Transforms and Geometry*. Ed. by H. M. Farkas, R. C. Gunning, M. I. Knopp, and B. A. Taylor. Springer, 2013, 283–291.
- [FK60] H. Furstenberg and H. Kesten, Products of Random Matrices, *Ann. Math. Statist.* 31 no. 2 (1960), 457–469.
- [Fol15] G. B. Folland, *A Course in Abstract Harmonic Analysis*, 2nd edition. CRC press, 2015.
- [Fur63a] H. Furstenberg, Noncommuting random products, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 108 (1963), 377–428.

- [Fur63b] H. Furstenberg, The structure of distal flows, *Amer. J. Math.* 85 no. 3 (1963), 477–515.
- [Fur77] H. Furstenberg, Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions, *J. Anal. Math.* 31 (1977), 204–256.
- [Gie82] G. Gierz, *Bundles of Topological Vector Spaces and Their Duality*, Springer, 1982.
- [Gla03] E. Glasner, *Ergodic Theory via Joinings*, AMS, 2003.
- [GW16] E. Glasner and B. Weiss, Weak mixing properties for non-singular actions, *Ergod. Theory Dyn. Syst.* 36 no. 7 (2016), 2203–2217.
- [Hal44] P. R. Halmos, In general a measure-preserving transformation is mixing, *Ann. Math.* 45 (1944), 786–792.
- [HK05] B. Host and B. Kra, Nonconventional ergodic averages and nilmanifolds, *Ann. Math. (2)* 161 (2005), 397–488.
- [HP57] E. Hille and R. S. Phillips, *Functional Analysis and Semi-Groups*, vol. 31 of Colloquium Publications, American Mathematical Society, 1957.
- [Jam21] A. Jamneshan, *An uncountable Furstenberg-Zimmer structure theory*. 2021. arXiv: 2103.17167 [math.DS].
- [Kec95] A. S. Kechris, *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Springer, 1995.
- [Kes73] H. Kesten, Random difference equations and Renewal theory for products of random matrices, *Acta Math.* 131 (1973), 207–248.
- [KL21] O. Khalil and M. Luethi, Random Walks, Spectral Gaps, and Khintchine’s Theorem on Fractals, (Jan. 14, 2021). arXiv: 2101.05797v3 [math.DS].
- [KMRR22] B. Kra, J. Moreira, F. K. Richter, and D. Robertson, Infinite Sumsets in Sets with Positive Density, (June 3, 2022). arXiv: 2206.01786v1 [math.DS].
- [KP08] D. Kerr and M. Pichot, Asymptotic Abelianness, weak mixing, and property T, *J. reine angew. Math.* 623 (2008), 213–235.
- [Lan94] E. C. Lance, Unitary operators on Hilbert C*-modules, *Bull. London. Math. Soc.* 26 (1994), 363–366.
- [NZ00] A. Nevo and R. J. Zimmer, Rigidity of Furstenberg entropy for semisimple Lie group actions, *Ann. Sci. de l’Ecole Norm. Supérieure, Série 4* 33 no. 3 (2000), 321–343.
- [NZ02] A. Nevo and R. J. Zimmer, A structure theorem for actions of semisimple Lie groups, *Ann. Math.* 156 no. 2 (2002), 565–594.

- [Pop07] S. Popa, Cocycle and orbit equivalence superrigidity for malleable actions of w-rigid groups, *Invent. Math.* 170 (2007), 243–295.
- [PS20] R. Prohaska and C. Sert, Markov random walks on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on fractals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 373 (2020), 8163–8196.
- [Ren12] J. Renault, Continuous bounded cocycles, *Proceedings of EU-NCG 4th Annual Meeting* (2012), 121–135.
- [Sun16] V. Sunder, *Operators on Hilbert Space*, Springer, 2016.
- [SW19] D. Simmons and B. Weiss, Random walks on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on fractals, *Invent. Math.* 216 (2019), 337–394.
- [Tao11] T. Tao, *An Introduction to Measure Theory*, vol. 126 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [Zie07] T. Ziegler, Universal characteristic factors and Furstenberg averages, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 20 (2007), 53–97.
- [Zim76] R. J. Zimmer, Extensions of ergodic group actions, *Illinois J. Math.* 20 (1976), 373–409.