

# TOPOLOGICAL FACTORING OF ZERO DIMENSIONAL DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

N. GOLESTANI, M. HOSSEINI, H. YAHYA OGHLI

**ABSTRACT.** We show that every topological factoring between two zero dimensional dynamical systems can be represented by a sequence of morphisms between the levels of the associated ordered Bratteli diagrams. Conversely, we will prove that given an ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$  with a continuous Vershik map on it, every sequence of morphisms between levels of  $B$  and  $C$ , where  $C$  is another ordered Bratteli diagram with continuous Vershik map, induces a topological factoring if and only if  $B$  has a unique infinite min path. We present a method to construct various examples of ordered premorphisms between two decisive Bratteli diagrams such that the induced maps between the two Vershik systems are not topological factorings. We provide sufficient conditions for the existence of a topological factoring from an ordered premorphism. Expanding on the modelling of factoring, we generalize the Curtis-Hedlund-Lyndon theorem to represent factor maps between two zero dimensional dynamical systems through sequences of sliding block codes.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Topological dynamical systems on zero dimensional spaces, specifically Cantor sets, have been extensively researched over the past decades. Pioneering theorems, such as Jewett-Krieger's, support these studies, stating that every ergodic system on a probability Lebesgue space is isomorphic to a uniquely ergodic minimal system on a Cantor set [20, 21].

Some of the mostly used "models" in studying zero dimensional dynamical system are transformations acting on the shift spaces or Bratteli-Vershik systems on ordered Bratteli diagrams (see Subsection 2.2). The notion of Bratteli diagram was introduced in operator algebras and then by the celebrated work of R. Herman, I. Putnam and C. Skau [19], became a tool for studying zero dimensional systems

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54H20, 37B10, 37B05.

*Key words and phrases.* Bratteli diagram, (semi-)decisive Bratteli diagram, perfect ordering, ordered premorphism, topological factoring, Kakutani-Rokhlin partitions, quasi-section, basic set.

and absorbed a lot of investigations by people in symbolic dynamics and operator algebras [2, 8, 11, 15, 16, 23, 26, 27]. Creating a Bratteli diagram for a zero dimensional system is based on the existence of *Kakutani-Rokhlin (K-R) partitions* for them. That is a certain union of disjoint clopen sets that covers the space  $X$ . Existence of a K-R partition is equivalent to the existence of a *complete  $T$ -section*, i.e. a clopen set  $U$  that hits every orbit:

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} T^n(U) = X.$$

This equality together with the compactness of the space  $X$  leads to a K-R partition  $\mathcal{P}$ . Having a sequence of K-R partitions (*K-R system*), say  $\{\mathcal{P}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ , in such a way that for every  $n > 0$  the union of the top levels of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is contained in the union of the top levels of  $\mathcal{P}_{n-1}$ , generates a closed set  $W$  that all its clopen neighbourhoods are complete  $T$ -sections [24]. In the first version of this paper (posted on arXiv) we called such a closed set, a *weak basic set*. However, soon after we learned that the same concept has been considered in a recent paper of T. Shimomura in [29] as a *quasi-section*. Not generating different terminologies for the same concept, in the sequel we use the phrase quasi-section instead of weak basic set.

The existence of quasi-sections for a zero dimensional dynamical system  $(X, T)$  was firstly established for minimal systems on Cantor sets by I. Putnam in [25] and then for Cantor essentially minimal systems in [19], where it was shown that every singleton  $\{x\}$  that  $x$  belongs to the unique minimal subsystem, is a quasi-section set. For Cantor aperiodic systems, K. Medynets in [22] defined the concept of a "basic set" (a quasi-section that intersects every orbit at most once) and proved that every Cantor aperiodic system possesses a basic set. In the more general scenario of zero-dimensional dynamical systems, when the set of aperiodic points is dense, the system's realization through a sequence of K-R partitions can be inferred from the findings of T. Downarowicz and O. Karpel in [9, 10], where they characterized such systems as "array systems". The endeavour to represent zero-dimensional dynamical systems as K-R systems, with the convergence of top levels towards a quasi-section, was ultimately accomplished by T. Shimomura in [27], where the notion of "graph-covering models" was introduced and utilized to establish that every zero-dimensional dynamical system can be modelled as a Bratteli-Vershik system.

It turns out that if  $(X, T)$  is a zero dimensional dynamical system, then it can be modelled by a *Vershik homeomorphism*  $T_B$  on the compact space of all (partially ordered) infinite paths of an ordered Bratteli

diagram  $X_B$  that the set of its infinite maximal paths is associated to a quasi-section [29] (see also Proposition 4.4). The Vershik map is initially defined as  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$  (see Definition 2.2) and then the domain of  $T_B$  may be extended to the whole space to have  $\bar{T}_B : X_B \rightarrow X_B$  that  $\bar{T}_B$  maps  $X_B^{\max}$  into  $X_B^{\min}$  (that we call it *natural extension*). The ordering of such a diagram in which the Vershik map can be extended to the whole space is called *perfect* as was defined by S. Bezuglyi and R. Yassawi in [4, 5]. The extension is unique if and only if  $(X, T)$  has a dense set of aperiodic points [10, Theorem 3.1]. Such ordered Bratteli diagrams are called *decisive* and examples of perfect orderings on Bratteli diagrams that are not decisive were provided in [9, 10].

In this paper, we study *topological factoring* between two zero dimensional dynamical systems. We generalize the “modelling” introduced by M. Amini, G. Elliott and N. Golestani in [1], of topological factoring between two Cantor minimal systems, to the topological factoring of (any) two zero dimensional systems with respect to their K-R system realizations. In [1] the authors proved that having topological factoring from a minimal Cantor system  $(X, T)$  onto another minimal system on a Cantor set,  $(Y, S)$ , creates a sequence of (local) morphisms between the sets of vertices of the levels of Bratteli diagrams  $C = (W, E', \leq')$  and  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  associated to the two systems respectively. That is  $f : B \rightarrow C$  which is a sequence  $f = \{F_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ ,  $F_i : V_i \rightarrow W_{f_i}$ , for an increasing sequence  $\{f_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  of natural numbers together with a partial ordering on each  $F_i$  (see Definition 2.5 for details). The sequence  $\{F_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  makes edges between levels of the two diagrams with some orderings on them. This sequence is called an *ordered premorphism* and in [1] it is proved that the existence of such a sequence between two (essentially simple) Bratteli diagrams is equivalent to the existence of a topological factoring between the two Bratteli-Vershik systems:

$$\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : (X_C, T_C) \rightarrow (Y_B, S_B)$$

induced by an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$ . In fact, the ordered premorphism determines exactly where in  $(Y_B, S_B)$  an infinite path from  $(X_C, T_C)$  will be mapped under  $\alpha$ . As an application of this interpretation of topological factoring between two Bratteli-Vershik systems, in [17] it was proved that every topological factor of a *finite topological rank* essentially minimal dynamical systems on a Cantor set, is of finite topological rank. Using symbolic interpretation of ordered premorphisms, in [13] the author proved that if  $(X_C, T_C)$  is minimal and  $S_B$  is a shift map, then the topological rank of  $(Y_B, S_B)$  is at most equal to the topological rank of  $(X_C, T_C)$ .

Generalization of this theory of the one-to-one correspondence between ordered premorphisms and topological factorings is investigated here. In other words, as every zero dimensional system has a non-trivial Bratteli-Vershik representation [27], we obtain a Bratteli-Vershik representation (called ordered premorphism) for every factor map between two zero dimensional systems.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  be two zero dimensional dynamical systems and  $X_0$  and  $Y_0$  be quasi-sections for  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. If  $\alpha : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, S)$  is a topological factoring such that  $\alpha(X_0) \subseteq Y_0$  then for any perfect diagrams  $C$  and  $B$  that are  $B$ - $V$  realizations of  $(X, T, X_0)$  and  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  respectively, there exists a unique (up to equivalence) ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  such that  $\mathcal{V}(f) = \alpha$ .*

To prove the existence part of the above theorem, we present the theorem of Shimomura [29, Theorem 1.1] in the frame of Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.4 to be able to construct the ordered premorphism  $f$  inductively for all levels of  $B$  such that  $\mathcal{V}(f) = \alpha$  as in the method for the proof of [1, Proposition 4.6]. The proof of the uniqueness, is done in a more general setting in Proposition 2.9.

The converse of Theorem 1.1 is not true. Having an ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$  with at least two infinite min paths, one can construct an ordered Bratteli diagram  $C$  and an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  such that  $\mathcal{V}(f)$  is not topological factoring. We will prove in Section 2, that  $\mathcal{V}(f)$  is onto and continuous but in Section 3, we will see that the equivariant equation  $\mathcal{V}(f) \circ T_C(x) = T_B \circ \mathcal{V}(f)(x)$  may fail for  $x \in X_C^{\max}$ . However, the converse of Theorem 1.1 holds to some extent as we prove in the following theorem. To have the results in full generality, we say that an ordered Bratteli diagram is *semi-decisive* if it admits a continuous surjective extension  $\bar{T}_B$  of the Vershik map  $T_B$  to  $X_B$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $B$  be a semi-decisive ordered Bratteli diagram such that its Vershik map has a natural extension  $\bar{T}_B$  to  $X_B$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *for every semi-decisive ordered Bratteli diagram  $C$  with its natural extension  $\bar{T}_C$  and every ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$ , the induced map  $\mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is a topological factoring.*
- (2)  *$B$  has a unique infinite min path.*

As a corollary, if  $B$  is simple and its ordering is perfect, then for every diagram  $C$  with perfect ordering and every ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$ , the induced map  $\mathcal{V}(f)$  makes a topological factoring if and only if  $B$  is proper (Corollary 3.8).

To prove Theorem 1.2, we introduce a method for constructing a (semi-)decisive Bratteli diagram  $C$  associated with a given non-proper (semi-)decisive ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$  with a premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  so that the induced map  $\mathcal{V}(f) : (X_C, T_C) \rightarrow (Y_B, S_B)$  does not make topological factoring. Nevertheless, having some “structural” properties on the diagrams  $B$  and  $C$ , the existence of an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  will lead to a topological factoring. For instance, if  $C$  is simple,  $B$  is of finite rank and the map  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f)$  is finite-to-one on  $\alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$  then  $\alpha$  is a topological factoring (Proposition 2.16). It is likely that if both  $B$  and  $C$  are simple and decisive then  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f)$  is a topological factoring.

Some equivalent conditions to the existence of a topological factoring induced by a premorphism between two semi-decisive Bratteli diagrams are provided (Proposition 2.13). As a direct consequence of having topological factoring induced by a premorphism between two decisive Bratteli diagrams, we show that every non-proper decisive Bratteli diagram of rank 2 is conjugate to an odometer or it is a disjoint union of two odometers (Proposition 2.11).

Theorem 1.1 provides a combinatorial model for topological factoring between two zero dimensional dynamical systems using ordered premorphisms. This can be viewed as a generalization of the well-known Curtis–Hedlund–Lyndon theorem for modelling factor maps between two zero-dimensional dynamical systems through sequences of *sliding block codes*. To establish this result, we will prove the following theorem presented in the framework of S-adic representations of ordered Bratteli diagrams and ordered premorphisms as detailed in [8, 17]. See Section 5 for the notations used in this theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Consider zero dimensional dynamical systems  $(X, T, X_0)$  and  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  where  $X_0$  and  $Y_0$  are quasi-sections. Then there exists  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, S)$  with  $\pi(X_0) \subseteq Y_0$  if and only if for every  $K$ - $R$  systems  $\{\mathcal{P}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  and  $\{\mathcal{Q}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  for  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  and  $(X, T, X_0)$ , respectively, and the inverse limit systems associated to them, there exists a sequence of natural numbers  $\{n_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  and a sequence of sliding block codes  $\pi_i : (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{n_i}, \sigma) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i, \sigma)$  for all  $i \geq 0$  such that all the following rectangles between the inverse limit sequences commute:*

(1.1)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0, \sigma) & \xleftarrow{\gamma_1} & (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{n_1}, \sigma) & \xleftarrow{\gamma_2} & (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{n_2}, \sigma) & \xleftarrow{\gamma_3} & \cdots \xleftarrow{\quad} & (X, T, X_0) \\
 \pi_0 \downarrow & & \pi_1 \downarrow & & \pi_2 \downarrow & & & \pi \downarrow \\
 (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0, \sigma) & \xleftarrow{\beta_1} & (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1, \sigma) & \xleftarrow{\beta_2} & (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2, \sigma) & \xleftarrow{\beta_3} & \cdots \xleftarrow{\quad} & (Y, S, Y_0)
 \end{array}$$

where  $\gamma_i := \alpha_{n_i+1} \circ \alpha_{n_i+2} \circ \cdots \circ \alpha_{n_i+1}$ .

In fact, in the above theorem,  $(X, T, X_0)$  and  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  were represented as the inverse limit systems of their (intermediate) symbolic factors,  $(\tilde{Q}_i, \sigma)$  and  $(\tilde{P}_i, \sigma)$  respectively. So for every  $i \geq 1$ ,  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$  are the connecting maps between the intermediate factors. When the system  $(Y, S)$  is essentially minimal, then by Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, the argument of Theorem 1.3 is somewhat “simplified.” Indeed, in this case, there exists a sequence of morphisms  $\eta_i : \mathcal{Q}_{n_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_i^*$  that guarantee the existence of the sliding block codes  $\pi_i : (\tilde{Q}_{n_i}, \sigma) \rightarrow (\tilde{P}_i, \sigma)$  (see Proposition 5.1). Moreover, if  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  are minimal subshifts, then there exists some  $i \geq 1$  such that  $(X, T) \simeq (\tilde{Q}_{n_i}, \sigma)$  and  $(Y, S) \simeq (\tilde{P}_i, \sigma)$  where  $\simeq$  denotes conjugacy. Therefore, when we have a factor map  $\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, S)$ , this is modelled by the sliding block code  $\pi_i$  for a sufficiently large  $i$ .

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we fix some notations and for the convenience of the reader, we first recall some definitions and theorems from [15, 19, 9, 10]. Then we investigate some of the basic properties of the induced map from an ordered premorphism that are used in the sequel such as a sufficient condition for having almost one-to-one extension induced by an ordered premorphism (Lemma 2.10). Some necessary and/or sufficient conditions for having topological factoring out of an ordered premorphism between two semi-decisive Bratteli diagrams, are provided.

In Section 3, we describe a method for constructing a (semi-)decisive Bratteli diagram  $B'$  for a given (semi-)decisive Bratteli diagram  $B$  and an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow B'$  so that the map  $\mathcal{V}(f)$  is not a topological factoring between  $(X_B, T_B)$  and  $(Y_{B'}, S_{B'})$ . This will lead to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

In Section 4, we deal with the realization of topological factorings between two zero dimensional systems  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  by ordered premorphisms to prove Theorem 1.1. We recall the notion of Kakutani-Rokhlin partitions for zero dimensional systems as was discussed in [10, 19, 22, 24]. Naturally, in this section, the ordered Bratteli diagrams constructed are perfect in the sense of [4], i.e.,  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  are realized by the Vershik maps on  $X_B$  and  $Y_C$  that are homeomorphisms.

In Section 5, we will prove the generalization of the well-known Curtis–Hedlund–Lyndon theorem for modelling factor maps between two zero-dimensional dynamical systems by sequences of sliding block codes.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Zero Dimensional Dynamical Systems.** A *zero dimensional dynamical system* is a pair  $(X, T)$  where  $X$  is a non-empty compact totally disconnected metric space and  $T$  is a homeomorphism on  $X$ . The orbit of a point  $x \in X$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{O}(x)$ , is the sequence  $(T^n x)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . If  $X$  has finitely many points then  $(X, T)$  is called a *trivial* dynamical system. If  $X$  is a Cantor space (that is, a nonempty compact metrizable totally disconnected space with no isolated points) then the system is called a *Cantor system*. Two topological dynamical systems  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  are *semi-conjugate* if there exists a surjective continuous map  $\alpha : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\alpha \circ T = S \circ \alpha$ . In this case  $(Y, S)$  is called a *factor* of  $(X, T)$ ,  $(X, T)$  is called an *extension* of  $(Y, S)$ , and  $\alpha$  is called a *factor map* or a *topological factoring*.

For a topological dynamical system  $(X, T)$  if the orbits of all points are infinite, then the system is called *aperiodic*. When all the orbits of the points are dense in  $X$ , then the system is called *minimal*. This is equivalent to the absence of non-trivial invariant closed subsets. When  $(X, T)$  has a unique minimal subsystem, the system is called *essentially minimal* [7, 9].

**2.2. Bratteli–Vershik models of zero dimensional systems.** In this subsection we recall some of the definitions related to ordered Bratteli diagrams from [4, 9, 19] and some of the main results of [9, 10].

**Definition 2.1.**

- A *Bratteli diagram*  $B = (V, E)$  consists of an infinite sequence of finite, non-empty, pairwise disjoint sets  $V_0 = \{v_0\}, V_1, V_2, \dots$ , called the *vertices*, another sequence of finite, non-empty, pairwise disjoint sets  $E_1, E_2, \dots$ , called the *edges*, and two maps  $s : E_n \rightarrow V_{n-1}, r : E_n \rightarrow V_n$ , for every  $n \geq 1$ , called the *range* and *source maps*, such that  $r^{-1}\{v\}$  is non-empty for all  $v$  in  $\cup_{n \geq 1} V_n$  and  $s^{-1}\{v\}$  is non-empty for all  $v$  in  $\cup_{n \geq 0} V_n$ . For every  $n \geq 1$  we have an *adjacency matrix*  $M_n$  of size  $|V_n| \times |V_{n-1}|$  that its entries  $M_n^{ij}$  shows the number of edges between  $v_i \in V_n$  and  $v_j \in V_{n-1}$ .
- A Bratteli diagram is called *simple* if there exists some sequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  so that

$$\forall k \geq 1 \quad M_{n_k} \cdot M_{n_k+1} \cdots M_{n_{k+1}} > 0.$$

- An *ordered Bratteli diagram*  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  consists of a Bratteli diagram  $(V, E)$  and a partial order  $\leq$  on  $E$  such that two edges  $e, e'$  in  $E$  are comparable if and only if  $r(e) = r(e')$ . In such a

diagram, we let  $E_{\max}$  and  $E_{\min}$  denote the set of maximal and minimal edges, respectively.

**Definition 2.2** ([4, 9]). Let  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  be an ordered Bratteli diagram and  $X_B$  be the the compact space of all (partially ordered) infinite paths of  $B$ .

- (1) The Vershik map  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$  is defined by

$$T_B(e_0, e_1, \dots, e_\ell, e_{\ell+1}, \dots) = (0, 0, \dots, e_\ell + 1, e_{\ell+1}, \dots)$$

where  $\ell$  is the first index that  $e_\ell$  is not the max edge in  $r^{-1}(r(e_\ell))$  and 0 denotes the min edge in  $r^{-1}(r(e_i))$  for every  $i \geq 0$ .

- (2)  $B$  is called *perfect* if the Vershik map  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$  can be extended to a homeomorphism  $T_B : X_B \rightarrow X_B$ .
- (3)  $B$  is called *decisive* if the Vershik map extends in a unique way to a homeomorphism  $\bar{T}_B$  of  $X_B$ . A zero dimensional dynamical system  $(X, T)$  will be called *Bratteli–Vershikizable* if it is conjugate to  $(X_B, T_B)$  for a decisive ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$ . So every decisive Bratteli diagram is perfect.
- (4)  $B$  is called *properly ordered* if it has a unique infinite min path and a unique infinite max path. Clearly every properly ordered Bratteli diagram is decisive.

We refer the reader to [4, 9, 10] to see various examples of perfect or decisive Bratteli diagrams.

**Lemma 2.3** ([9], Lemma 6.11). *An ordered Bratteli diagram is decisive if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

- (1) *the Vershik map and its inverse are uniformly continuous on their domains, and*
- (2) *the set of maximal paths and the set of minimal paths either both have empty interiors, or both their interiors consist of just one isolated point.*

According to [10, Proposition 1.2], the second condition in the previous lemma is equivalent to this condition: the domains of the Vershik map and its inverse are either both dense in  $X_B$  or their closures both miss one point (not necessarily the same).

The following result gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a system to be Bratteli–Vershikizable.

**Theorem 2.4** ([10], Theorem 3.1). *A zero dimensional system  $(X, T)$  is Bratteli–Vershikizable if and only if the set of aperiodic points is dense, or its closure misses one periodic orbit.*



### 2.3. Ordered Premorphisms.

**Definition 2.5** ([1], Definition 2.5). Let  $B = (V, E, \geq)$  and  $C = (W, S, \geq)$  be ordered Bratteli diagrams. By an *ordered premorphism* (or just a *premorphisms* if there is no confusion)  $f : B \rightarrow C$  we mean a triple  $(F, (f_n)_{n=0}^\infty, \geq)$  where  $(f_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  is an unbounded sequence of positive integers with  $f_0 = 0 \leq f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \dots$ ,  $F$  consists of a disjoint union  $F_0 \cup F_1 \cup F_2 \cup \dots$  together with a pair of range and source maps  $r : F \rightarrow W$ ,  $s : F \rightarrow V$ , and  $\geq$  is a partial order on  $F$  such that:

- (1) each  $F_n$  is a non-empty finite set,  $s(F_n) \subseteq V_n$ ,  $r(F_n) \subseteq W_{f_n}$ ,  $F_0$  is a singleton,  $s^{-1}\{v\}$  is non-empty for all  $v$  in  $V$ , and  $r^{-1}\{w\}$  is non-empty for all  $w$  in  $W$ ;
- (2)  $e, e' \in F$  are comparable if and only if  $r(e) = r(e')$ , and  $\geq$  is a linear order on  $r^{-1}\{w\}$ , for all  $w \in W$ ;
- (3) the diagram of  $f : B \rightarrow C$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} V_0 & \xrightarrow{E_1} & V_1 & \xrightarrow{E_2} & V_2 & \xrightarrow{E_3} & \dots \\ F_0 \downarrow & & F_1 \downarrow & & F_2 \downarrow & & \\ W_{f_0} & \xrightarrow{S_{f_0, f_1}} & W_{f_1} & \xrightarrow{S_{f_1, f_2}} & W_{f_2} & \xrightarrow{S_{f_2, f_3}} & \dots \end{array},$$

commutes. The ordered commutativity of the diagram of  $f$  means that for each  $n \geq 0$ ,  $E_{n+1} \circ F_{n+1} \cong F_n \circ S_{f_n, f_{n+1}}$ , i.e., there is a (necessarily unique) bijective map from  $E_{n+1} \circ F_{n+1}$  to  $F_n \circ S_{f_n, f_{n+1}}$  preserving the order and intertwining the respective source and range maps.

To see how the ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  induces a well-defined function  $\alpha : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  between the two Vershik systems, let  $x = (s_1, s_2, \dots)$  be an infinite path in  $X_C$ . Define the path  $\alpha(x) = (e_1, e_2, \dots)$  in  $X_B$  as follows. Fix  $n \geq 1$ . By Definition 2.5, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_0 & \xrightarrow{F_0} & W_0 \\ E_{0,n} \downarrow & & \downarrow S_{0, f_n} \\ V_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & W_{f_n} \end{array}$$

commutes, that is,  $F_0 \circ S_{0, f_n} \cong E_{0,n} \circ F_n$ . Thus, there is a unique path  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n, d_n)$  in  $E_{0,n} \circ F_n$  (in fact  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) \in E_{0,n}$  and  $d_n \in F_n$ ), corresponding to the path  $(d_0, s_1, \dots, s_{f_n})$  in  $F_0 \circ S_{0, f_n}$  where  $d_0$  is the unique element of  $F_0$ . So the path  $\alpha(x) = (e_1, e_2, \dots)$  in  $X_B$  is associated to the path  $x = (s_1, s_2, \dots)$  in  $X_C$ .

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two ordered Bratteli diagrams and  $f : B \rightarrow C$  be an ordered premorphism between them. Let  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  be its induced map. Consider the Vershik homeomorphisms  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$  and  $T_C : X_C \setminus X_C^{\max} \rightarrow X_C \setminus X_C^{\min}$ . Then*

- (1)  $\alpha : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is continuous and surjective.
- (2)  $\alpha(X_C^{\min}) \subseteq X_B^{\min}$  and  $\alpha(X_C^{\max}) \subseteq X_B^{\max}$ .
- (3)  $\alpha \circ T_C(x) = T_B \circ \alpha(x)$  for every  $x \in \alpha^{-1}(X_B \setminus X_B^{\max})$ .

*Proof.* First we show that  $\alpha$  is continuous. Let  $f = (F, (f_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}, \leq)$  as in Definition 2.5. By the definition of  $\alpha$  if  $x = (x_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}, y = (y_j)_{j=1}^{\infty} \in X_C$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $x_j = y_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq f_n$ , then  $\alpha(x)_j = \alpha(y)_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$  where  $\alpha(x) = (\alpha(x)_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$  and  $\alpha(y) = (\alpha(y)_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ . Thus

$$\alpha(C(x_1, \dots, x_{f_n})) \subseteq C(\alpha(x)_1, \dots, \alpha(x)_n)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . This shows that  $\alpha$  is continuous. Now we show that  $\alpha$  is surjective. Let  $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots)$  be in  $X_B$ , i.e., an infinite path in  $E$ . Fix  $n \geq 1$ . By Definition 2.5, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_0 & \xrightarrow{F_0} & W_0 \\ E_{0,n} \downarrow & & \downarrow S_{0,f_n} \\ V_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & W_{f_n} \end{array}$$

is ordered commutative, that is,  $F_0 \circ S_{0,f_n} \cong E_{0,n} \circ F_n$ . Thus, there is a unique path  $(e_0, s_1, \dots, s_{f_n}) \in F_{0,n} \circ S_{0,f_n}$ , corresponding to the path  $(z_1, \dots, z_n, e_n) \in E_{0,n} \circ F_n$ . Let  $x \in X_C$  be any infinite path such that  $x_j = s_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq f_n$ . Then  $\alpha(x) \in C(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  and  $\alpha^{-1}(C(z_1, \dots, z_n)) \neq \emptyset$ . We have:

$$\alpha^{-1}(C(z_1)) \supseteq \alpha^{-1}(C(z_1, z_2)) \supseteq \dots$$

also each  $\alpha^{-1}(C(z_1, \dots, z_n))$  is compact, since  $C(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is closed and  $\alpha$  is continuous. Then by compactness of  $X_C$  we have

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha^{-1}(C(z_1, \dots, z_n)) \neq \emptyset.$$

Take any  $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha^{-1}(C(z_1, \dots, z_n))$ , then  $\alpha(x) = z$  and  $\alpha$  is surjective. Note that  $\alpha^{-1}(z) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha^{-1}(C(z_1, \dots, z_n))$ .

Parts (2) and (3) follow from the definition of  $\alpha$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.7** ([1], Definition 2.10). Let  $f, g : B \rightarrow C$  be two ordered premorphisms with  $B = (V, E, \leq)$ ,  $C = (W, E', \leq)$ ,  $f = (F, (f_n)_{n \geq 0}, \leq)$ , and  $g = (G, (g_n)_{n \geq 0}, \leq)$ . It is said that  $f$  is equivalent to  $g$ ,  $f \sim g$ , if for each  $n \geq 0$  there is an  $m \geq f_n, g_n$  such that  $F_n \circ S_{f_n, m} \cong G_n \circ S_{g_n, m}$  (order isomorphism as in part (3) of Definition 2.5).

Now we recall the notion of *order isomorphism* between two finite *ordered sets* which was previously considered in the proof of [17, Proposition 5.2], and we will need it to verify isomorphism between two ordered premorphisms.

Let  $V$  and  $W$  be two finite non-empty sets. We say that  $F$  is an *ordered set of edges from  $V$  to  $W$*  if  $F$  is a finite non-empty set with a partial ordering  $\leq$  on it and with surjective source and range maps,  $s_F : F \rightarrow V$  and  $r_F : F \rightarrow W$ , such that  $e, e' \in F$  are comparable if and only if  $r_F(e) = r_F(e')$ , and the restriction of  $\leq$  to each set  $r_F^{-1}(w)$ ,  $w \in W$ , is a total ordering. We use the notation  $F : V \rightarrow W$ .

If  $G : V \rightarrow W$  is another ordered set of edges from  $V$  to  $W$ , then we say  $F$  is order isomorphic to  $G$ ,  $F \cong G$ , if there is a (necessarily unique) bijective map from  $F$  to  $G$  preserving the range and the source maps.

If  $S : W \rightarrow U$  is another ordered set of edges, then the composition of  $F$  and  $S$  is

$$F \circ S = \{(t, g) \in F \times S : r(t) = s(g)\}$$

endowed with the reverse lexicographic order. Then  $F \circ S : V \rightarrow U$  is an ordered set of edges.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $F_1 : V_1 \rightarrow W_1$ ,  $F_2, G_2 : V_2 \rightarrow W_2$ ,  $E : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ , and  $S : W_1 \rightarrow W_2$  be ordered sets of edges and consider the following two order commutative diagrams (one by  $F_2$  and the other one by  $G_2$ ):*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_1 & \xrightarrow{F_1} & W_1 \\ E \downarrow & & \downarrow S \\ V_2 & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{F_2} \\ \xrightarrow{G_2} \end{array} & W_2 \end{array}$$

*Suppose that  $E \circ F_2 \cong F_1 \circ S \cong E \circ G_2$  with first coordinate compatible order isomorphisms (i.e., if  $\gamma : E \circ F_2 \rightarrow F_1 \circ S$  and  $\eta : E \circ G_2 \rightarrow F_1 \circ S$  are the order isomorphisms, then  $\gamma(e, f) = \eta(e', g)$  implies that  $e = e'$ , for all  $(e, f) \in E \circ F_2$  and  $(e', g) \in E \circ G_2$ ). Then  $F_2 \cong G_2$ .*

*Proof.* To prove  $F_2 \cong G_2$ , it is enough to show that if  $w \in W_2$  and

$$r_{F_2}^{-1}(w) = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}, \quad r_{G_2}^{-1}(w) = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$$

are the two totally ordered sets associated to  $F_2$  and  $G_2$  respectively, then  $m = n$  and  $s_{F_2}(f_i) = s_{G_2}(g_i)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . We first show


that the latter is true for  $i = 1$ . Let  $e_1, e'_1 \in E$  be the minimal edges in  $E$  with  $r_E(e_1) = s_{F_2}(f_1)$  and  $r_E(e'_1) = s_{G_2}(g_1)$ . Then  $(e_1, f_1)$  (resp.,  $(e'_1, g_1)$ ) is the minimal path in  $E \circ F_2$  (resp.  $E \circ G_2$ ) with range  $w$ . Since  $E \circ F_2 \cong E \circ G_2$  as ordered sets, we get  $\gamma(e_1, f_1) = \eta(e'_1, g_1)$ . Applying the assumption, we see that  $e_1 = e'_1$ . Thus  $s_{F_2}(f_1) = r_E(e_1) = s_{G_2}(g_1)$ . Let  $e_2, e'_2 \in E$  be the minimal edges in  $E$  with  $r_E(e_2) = s_{F_2}(f_2)$  and  $r_E(e'_2) = s_{G_2}(g_2)$ . Let  $k = \#r_E^{-1}(r_E(e_1))$ . Then  $(e_2, f_2)$  (resp.,  $(e'_2, g_2)$ ) is the  $(k + 1)$ -th path in  $E \circ F_2$  (resp.  $E \circ G_2$ ) with range  $w$ . Again  $E \circ F_2 \cong E \circ G_2$  implies that  $\gamma(e_2, f_2) = \eta(e'_2, g_2)$  and hence  $e_2 = e'_2$ . In particular,  $s_{F_2}(f_2) = r_E(e_2) = s_{G_2}(g_2)$ . This also shows that  $n \geq 2$  if  $m \geq 2$ . Continuing this procedure, we get  $n = m$  and  $s_{F_2}(f_i) = s_{G_2}(g_i)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two ordered Bratteli diagrams. Suppose that  $f, g : B \rightarrow C$  are two ordered premorphism between them. The surjective continuous induced maps  $\mathcal{V}(f), \mathcal{V}(g) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  are the same if and only if  $f$  and  $g$  are equivalent in the sense of [1, Definitions 2.8 and 2.10].*

*Proof.* Let  $B = (V, E, \leq)$ ,  $C = (W, S, \leq)$ , and  $f = (F, (f_n)_{n \geq 0}, \leq)$ ,  $g = (G, (g_n)_{n \geq 0}, \leq)$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}(f) = \mathcal{V}(g)$ . Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $f_n \leq g_n$ . We want to show that  $F_n \circ S_{f_n, g_n} \cong G_n$  or in other words, the following diagram commutes which implies that  $f$  is equivalent to  $g$  in the sense of [1, Definition 2.10]:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 V_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & W_{f_n} \\
 & \searrow G_n & \downarrow S_{f_n, g_n} \\
 & & W_{g_n}
 \end{array}$$


To show this, consider the following diagram:



Since  $f$  and  $g$  are ordered premorphisms, we have

$$E_{0,n} \circ G_n \cong G_0 \circ S_{0,g_n} \cong F_0 \circ S_{0,f_n} \circ S_{f_n,g_n} \cong E_{0,n} \circ F_n \circ S_{f_n,g_n}.$$

Put  $F'_n = F_n \circ S_{f_n,g_n}$  as an ordered set of edges from  $V_n$  to  $W_{g_n}$ . Then we get the following diagram:



The isomorphisms  $E_{0,n} \circ F'_n \cong F_0 \circ S_{0,g_n} \cong E_{0,n} \circ G_n$  are compatible with respect to the first coordinate. Because, if  $e, e' \in E_{0,n}$ ,  $h \in G_n$ , and  $h' \in F'_n$  and both paths  $(e, h) \in E_{0,n} \circ G_n$  and  $(e', h') \in E_{0,n} \circ F'_n$  correspond to the same path  $t \in F_0 \circ S_{0,g_n}$ , then  $e = e'$ . In fact, if we write  $t = s_0 x_1 \cdots x_{g_n}$  where  $F_0 = \{s_0\}$  and  $x_i \in S_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq g_n$ , then we can find  $x_i \in S_i$  for  $i > g_n$  such that  $x = x_1 x_2 \cdots \in X_C$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{V}(g)$ , we see that  $e = (\mathcal{V}(g)(x))_{[1,n]}$ , i.e., the path  $e$  is the initial part of the infinite path  $\mathcal{V}(g)(x) \in X_B$ . On the other hand, there is  $p \in F_n$  such that  $e'p \in E_{0,n} \circ F_n$  corresponds to the path  $s_0 x_1 \cdots x_{f_n} \in F_0 \circ S_{0,f_n}$  under the ordered isomorphism  $E_{0,n} \circ F_n \cong F_0 \circ S_{0,f_n}$ . Hence  $e'p x_{f_n+1} \cdots x_{g_n}$  corresponds to  $s_0 x_1 \cdots x_{g_n}$  under the isomorphism  $E_{0,n} \circ F_n \circ S_{f_n,g_n} \cong F_0 \circ S_{0,g_n}$ . Thus  $h' = p x_{f_n+1} \cdots x_{g_n}$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{V}(f)(x)$ , we see that  $e' = (\mathcal{V}(f)(x))_{[1,n]}$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}(f) = \mathcal{V}(g)$ , we have that  $e = e'$ . Applying Lemma 2.8, it follows that  $G_n \cong F'_n = F_n \circ S_{f_n,g_n}$  as was desired. Therefore,  $f$  is equivalent to  $g$ .

For the other direction, suppose that  $f$  is equivalent to  $g$ . Let  $x = x_1x_2\cdots \in X_C$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We show that

$$(\mathcal{V}(f)(x))_{[1,n]} = (\mathcal{V}(g)(x))_{[1,n]}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that  $f_n \leq g_n$ . By [1, Definition 2.10], there is  $k \geq g_n$  such that  $F_n \circ S_{f_n,k} \cong G_n \circ S_{g_n,k}$  as in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 V_0 & \xrightarrow{F_0 = G_0} & W_0 \\
 E_{0,n} \downarrow & & \downarrow S_{0,f_n} \\
 V_n & \xrightarrow{F_n} & W_{f_n} \\
 & \searrow G_n & \downarrow S_{f_n,g_n} \\
 & & W_{g_n} \\
 & & \downarrow S_{g_n,k} \\
 & & W_k.
 \end{array}$$

Since  $F_0 \circ S_{0,f_n} \cong E_{0,n} \circ F_n$ , there is  $e \in E_{0,n}$  and  $p \in F_n$  such that the path  $ep \in E_{0,n} \circ F_n$  corresponds to  $s_0x_1 \cdots x_{f_n} \in F_0 \circ S_{0,f_n}$ . In particular,  $r(p) = r(x_{f_n})$ . Similarly, there is  $e' \in E_{0,n}$  and  $q \in G_n$  such that  $e'q \in E_{0,n} \circ G_n$  corresponds to  $s_0x_1 \cdots x_{g_n} \in G_0 \circ S_{0,g_n}$ . (We assume that  $G_0 = F_0 = \{s_0\}$ .) On the other hand, since  $F_n \circ S_{f_n,k} \cong G_n \circ S_{g_n,k}$ , the path  $px_{f_n+1} \cdots x_k \in F_n \circ S_{f_n,k}$  corresponds to  $q'q'' \in G_n \circ S_{g_n,k}$  for some  $q' \in G_n$  and  $q'' \in S_{g_n,k}$ . Therefore, both paths  $eq'q''$  and  $e'qx_{g_n+1} \cdots x_k$  in  $E_{0,n} \circ G_n \circ S_{g_n,k}$  correspond to the same path  $s_0x_1 \cdots x_k \in F_0 \circ S_{0,k}$  under the isomorphism  $E_{0,n} \circ G_n \circ S_{g_n,k} \cong F_0 \circ S_{0,k}$ . This implies that  $eq'q'' = e'qx_{g_n+1} \cdots x_k$  and so  $e = e'$ . Consequently,

$$(\mathcal{V}(f)(x))_{[1,n]} = e = e' = (\mathcal{V}(g)(x))_{[1,n]}$$

and the proof is finished.  $\square$

*Remark.* The proof of the first part of Proposition 2.9 may simplify Definition 2.7 in the following way: two ordered premorphisms  $f, g : B \rightarrow C$  are equivalent if and only if for every  $n \geq 0$ ,  $F_n \circ S_{f_n,m} \cong G_n \circ S_{g_n,m}$  where  $m = \max(f_n, g_n)$ .

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two ordered Bratteli diagrams and  $f : B \rightarrow C$  be an ordered premorphism as in Definition 2.5. Let  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  be its induced map. If  $y = y_1 y_2 \cdots \in X_B$  and*

$$\exists K \geq 1 \forall n \geq 1 \quad \#s_f^{-1}(r(y_n)) \leq K$$

(where  $s_f$  denotes the source map of the ordered premorphism  $f$ ) then  $\#\alpha^{-1}(y) \leq K$ . In particular, if for every vertex  $v$  on  $B$ ,  $s_f^{-1}(v)$  is a singleton then  $\alpha$  is one-to-one (hence it is a homeomorphism).

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that  $\#\alpha^{-1}(y) = \{x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(m)}\}$ , where  $m > K$ . Being distinct points in  $X_C$ , after an appropriate telescoping,  $x^{(i)}$ 's can be realized as infinite paths on  $C$  such that for some sufficiently large  $\ell$ :

$$x_{[1,\ell]}^{(i)} \neq x_{[1,\ell]}^{(j)} \text{ for } 0 \leq i, j \leq m$$

where  $x_{[1,\ell]}^{(i)}$  is the initial finite path of length  $\ell$  of the point  $x^{(i)}$ . Then by definition of  $\alpha$  and Definition 2.5(3),

$$\exists f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m \in F_\ell \quad s_f(f_i) = r(y_\ell), \quad r_f(f_i) = r(x_{[1,\ell]}^{(i)}), \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

See Figure 1 as an example. In particular,  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m$  are distinct. This contradicts the assumption.  $\square$

*Remark.* In Lemma 2.10, the sufficient condition for injectivity of  $\alpha$ , is equivalent to saying that for every  $n$ , the number of finite paths from  $W_0$  to  $W_{f_n}$  on diagram  $C$  is equal to the number of finite paths from  $V_0$  to  $V_n$  on  $B$ . Moreover, when  $B$  and  $C$  are decisive,  $B$  is simple and  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is a topological factoring, if there exists one infinite path  $y = y_1 y_2 \cdots$  such that

$$\forall n \geq 1 \quad \#s_f^{-1}(r(y_n)) = 1,$$

then  $(X_C, T_C)$  is an almost 1-1 extension of  $(X_B, T_B)$ .

The following proposition can be proved by using ordered premorphisms.

**Proposition 2.11.** *If  $B$  is a non-proper decisive ordered Bratteli diagram of rank 2 then  $(X_B, T_B)$  is conjugate to an odometer or it is a disjoint union of two odometers.*

*Proof.* We first enumerate vertexes of each level  $V_i$  by  $\{v_0^i, v_1^i\}$  from left to right. Decisiveness implies that there are two infinite max paths  $y^{(k)} = y_1^{(k)} y_2^{(k)} \cdots$ ,  $k = 0, 1$ , and two infinite min paths  $x^{(k)} = x_1^{(k)} x_2^{(k)} \cdots$ ,  $k = 0, 1$ , on  $B$ . We can assume that (in fact, after an




FIGURE 1. An example illustrating the proof of Lemma 2.10. Here  $\ell = 2$ ,  $m = 4$ .

appropriate telescoping) for each  $k = 0, 1$ , the infinite max (resp. min) path  $y^{(k)}$  (resp.  $x^{(k)}$ ) is carried by  $v_k^i$ , at every level  $i$ . There are two possibilities for  $B$ :

- (1)  $T_B(y^{(k)}) = x^{(k)}$  for every  $k = 0, 1$ . Then continuity of  $T_B$  implies that after finitely many levels, there is not any cross edges between any two consecutive levels of the diagram, i.e., for sufficiently large  $i$ ,

$$\nexists e \in E_i \quad s(e) = v_k^{i-1}, \quad r(e) = v_{1-k}^i.$$

In other words, there is  $i_0 \geq 0$  such that for each infinite path  $\mathbf{e} = e_1 e_2 \cdots$  on  $B$  there exists  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  such that for every  $i \geq i_0$ ,  $s(e_i) = v_k^{i-1}, r(e_i) = v_k^i$ . This turns out to have two odometers, each one supported by a single vertex at each level. The blue diagram on the right side of Figure 3 (which is in fact related to Example 2.15) is an example of this case.

- (2)  $T_B(y^{(k)}) = x^{(1-k)}$ . This time (after a telescoping of the diagram along some cofinal sequence) continuity of  $T_B$  forces existences



of cross edges between every two levels of  $B$  in a way that for every  $i \geq 1$  if

$$E_i^{(k)} = \{e_0 = e_{\min}, e_1, \dots, e_{\max}\}$$

is the set of edges ranged at  $v_k^i \in V_i$ ,  $k = 0, 1$ , then

$$\forall j = 0, 1, \dots, \max \quad s(e_j) = v_{k+j \pmod{2}}^{i-1}.$$

See the red diagrams on the left sides of Figure 2 and Figure 3. Then one can create an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  where  $C = (W, E')$  is a rank one Bratteli diagram (and so its Vershik system is clearly an odometer) such that the map  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  makes a topological factoring between the two systems. See the example in Figure 2. The diagram  $C$  has the property that for each  $i \geq 1$  the number of finite paths from  $W_0$  to  $W_i$  is equal to the total number of paths from  $V_0$  to  $V_i = \{v_0^i, v_1^i\}$ . So by Lemma 2.10,  $\alpha$  is a homeomorphism. Consequently, we have a conjugacy between the two systems.  $\square$

We consider a weaker version of decisiveness, called *semi-decisive*, to obtain more general results in studying topological factoring between two ordered Bratteli diagrams.

**Definition 2.12.** We say an ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$  is *semi-decisive* if the Vershik map  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$  has a continuous surjective extension  $\bar{T}_B : X_B \rightarrow X_B$ .

*Remark.* Every decisive ordered Bratteli diagram is semi-decisive.

**Proposition 2.13.** *Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two semi-decisive ordered Bratteli diagrams. Consider Vershik maps  $\bar{T}_B : X_B \rightarrow X_B$  and  $\bar{T}_C : X_C \rightarrow X_C$  such that  $\bar{T}_B(X_B^{\max}) \subseteq X_B^{\min}$  and  $\bar{T}_C(X_C^{\max}) \subseteq X_C^{\min}$ . Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is an ordered premorphism as in Definition 2.5 and  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is the induced continuous surjective map. Then  $\alpha$  is a topological factoring if and only if for any  $y = (e_1, e_2, \dots) \in X_B^{\max}$  and every  $x = (s_1, s_2, \dots) \in \alpha^{-1}(y)$  one of the following occurs:*

- (1)  $x \in X_C^{\max}$  and for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a minimal edge  $p_n \in F_n$  such that  $s(p_n) = r(e'_n)$  and  $r(p_n) = r(s'_{f_n})$  where  $e'_n$  is the  $n$ -th edge of  $\bar{T}_B(y)$  and  $s'_{f_n}$  is the  $f_n$ -th edge of  $\bar{T}_C(x)$ .




FIGURE 2. An example illustrating the proof of Proposition 2.11. Here  $\mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is a conjugacy.

- (2)  $x \notin X_C^{\max}$  and if  $k$  is the smallest number with  $r(s_{f_k}) = r(s'_{f_k})$  then there exist  $p_1, p_2, \dots$  in  $F$  such that for any  $n < k$ ,  $p_n$  is a minimal edge in  $F_n$ ,  $s(p_n) = r(e'_n)$  and  $r(p_n) = r(s'_{f_n})$ , and for all  $n \geq k$ ,  $p_n$  is the successor of  $d_n$  where  $d_n$ 's are those edges in  $F$  realizing  $\alpha(x) = y$  (as in the paragraph preceding [1, Lemma 3.13]).

*Proof.* First note that by Proposition 2.6(3),  $\alpha \circ T_C(x) = T_B \circ \alpha(x)$  for every  $x \in \alpha^{-1}(X_B \setminus X_B^{\max})$ . For all other points  $x \in \alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$  (by Proposition 2.6(2)), items (1) and (2) are precisely translations




FIGURE 3. Related to Example 2.15. The induced map  $\mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is not a topological factoring while  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is an ordered premorphism. Note that by the proof of Proposition 2.11 the left diagram is conjugate to 2-odometer.

of the equation  $\alpha(\bar{T}_C(x)) = \bar{T}_B(y)$  in terms of diagrams and ordered premorphism  $f$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* The condition of having  $\bar{T}_B(X_B^{\max}) \subseteq X_B^{\min}$  occurs for considerable class of Vershik systems on ordered Bratteli diagrams including decisive Bratteli diagrams. In fact, if  $B$  is semi-decisive and  $X_B$  has

no isolated points (hence, is a Cantor set) then

$$\bar{T}_B(X_B^{\max} \cap (X_B \setminus X_B^{\max})') \subseteq X_B^{\min},$$

where  $A'$  denotes the set of limit points of  $A$ . In addition, if  $\text{rank}(B) < \infty$  then  $\bar{T}_B(X_B^{\max}) \subseteq X_B^{\min}$  which follows from the fact that  $\#X_B^{\max} \leq \text{rank}(B)$ . In the sequel, we will call  $\bar{T}_B$  a *natural extension* if it satisfies the condition

$$\bar{T}_B(X_B^{\max}) \subseteq X_B^{\min}.$$

Not every extension of a Vershik map, from  $X_B \setminus X_B^{\max}$  to  $X_B$ , on a semi-decisive Bratteli diagram is natural. For example, on the diagram of [9, Example 6.15] one may define  $\bar{T}_B$  on  $X_B$  by mapping all the max paths (passing through the vertex  $w$ ) to an arbitrarily chosen non-min path.

**Corollary 2.14.** *Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two semi-decisive ordered Bratteli diagrams such that there exist natural extensions  $\bar{T}_B$  and  $\bar{T}_C$  on them. Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is an ordered premorphism and  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is the induced continuous surjective map. Suppose that for every point  $x \in \alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$  there exists a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $X_C \setminus X_C^{\max}$  such that  $\lim_n x_n = x$  and  $\alpha(x_n) \in X_B \setminus X_B^{\max}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\alpha$  is a topological factoring.*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in X_C$ . If  $x \notin \alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$  then  $x \in X_C \setminus X_C^{\max}$ , by Proposition 2.6(2). Hence  $\alpha \circ T_C(x) = T_B \circ \alpha(x)$ , by Proposition 2.6(3). Now suppose that  $x \in \alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$ . By assumption there is a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $X_C$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and  $\alpha(x_n) \in X_B \setminus X_B^{\max}$ . Thus  $x_n \notin \alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$  and hence  $\alpha \circ T_C(x_n) = T_B \circ \alpha(x_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and using continuity of  $\alpha, T_C$ , and  $T_B$ , we get  $\alpha T_C(x) = T_B \alpha(x)$ . Therefore,  $\alpha$  is a topological factoring.  $\square$

**Example 2.15.** In Figure 3, both diagrams  $B$  and  $C$  are decisive and non-proper. The Vershik map of the left diagram is minimal. The map  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is an ordered premorphism but its induced map  $\alpha$  is not a topological factoring. In fact,  $X_C = X_{C_1} \cup X_{C_2}$  and for every  $x \in X_{C_1}$  (the left wing) the factoring equation fails. Note that both diagrams are Cantor sets. Moreover, the preimages of the left max path of the left diagram  $B$  under the map  $\alpha$  are contained in  $X_C \setminus X_C^{\max}$ . In other words, there is an infinite max path on the left diagram with no max path preimage.

**Proposition 2.16.** *Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two semi-decisive ordered Bratteli diagrams such that there exist natural extensions  $\bar{T}_B$  and  $\bar{T}_C$  on  $X_B$  and  $X_C$  respectively. Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is an ordered premorphism with the induced continuous surjective map  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$ .*

If  $X_C$  has no isolated points (in particular, if  $C$  is simple and  $X_C$  is non-trivial) and  $\#\alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max}) < \infty$  (in particular, if  $B$  is of finite rank and  $\alpha$  is finite-to-one) then  $\alpha$  is a topological factoring.

*Proof.* We use Corollary 2.14. Let  $x \in \alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$ . Since  $X_C$  has no isolated points and  $\alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$  is finite, there exists a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of distinct points in  $X_C \setminus \alpha^{-1}(X_B^{\max})$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$ . Thus  $\alpha(x_n) \in X_B \setminus X_B^{\max}$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Now Corollary 2.14 implies that  $\alpha$  is a topological factoring.  $\square$

*Question.* Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two (semi-)decisive simple (hence minimal) ordered Bratteli diagrams such that there exist natural extensions  $\bar{T}_B$  and  $\bar{T}_C$  on  $X_B$  and  $X_C$  respectively. Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is an ordered premorphism and  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is the induced continuous surjective map. Is the map  $\alpha$  a topological factoring?

### 3. ORDERED PREMORPHISMS VERSUS TOPOLOGICAL FACTORING

**3.1. Construction.** Throughout this section, unless otherwise stated explicitly, we assume that  $B = (V, E, \geq)$  is an ordered Bratteli diagram,  $z \in X_B^{\min}$  and  $y \in X_B^{\max}$ . We construct an ordered Bratteli diagram  $B' = (V', E', \geq')$  and an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow B'$  such that there is  $x \in X_{B'}$  which is not an infinite max path and the induced continuous map  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_B$  satisfies

$$\alpha(x) = y \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(T_{B'}x) = z.$$

Let  $V = \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} V_n$ ,  $E = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ ,  $k_n := \#V_n$ , and  $V_n = \{v_1^n, \dots, v_{k_n}^n\}$  for  $n \geq 1$  and  $V_0 = \{v_0\}$ . We are going to add a vertex  $v_0^n$  at each level  $V_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . So

$$V'_0 = V_0, \quad V'_n = \{v_0^n\} \cup \{V_n\}, n \geq 1.$$

To define  $E'$  using  $z$  and  $y$  suppose that  $z = z_1 z_2 \dots$  and  $y = y_1 y_2 \dots$  where  $z_n, y_n \in E_n$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $r^{-1}(r(z_1)) = \{g_{1,1}, \dots, g_{1,\ell_1}\}$  and  $r^{-1}(r(y_1)) = \{h_{1,1}, \dots, h_{1,m_1}\}$  where  $g_{1,1} < g_{1,2} < \dots < g_{1,\ell_1}$  and  $h_{1,1} < h_{1,2} < \dots < h_{1,m_1}$ . Thus  $g_{1,1} = z_1$  and  $h_{1,m_1} = y_1$ . For each  $g_{1,j}$  and  $h_{1,i}$  we consider the edges  $g'_{1,j}$  and  $h'_{1,i}$  on  $E'_1$  with the range  $v_0^1$  and similar sources as  $g_{1,j}$  and  $h_{1,i}$ . So

$$E'_1 = r^{-1}(v_0^1) \cup E_1,$$

$$r^{-1}(v_0^1) = \{h'_{1,1}, \dots, h'_{1,m_1}, g'_{1,1}, \dots, g'_{1,\ell_1}\}.$$

The ordering on  $r^{-1}(v_0^1)$  is as written above. Now let  $n \geq 2$  and define  $E'_n$  as follows. Let  $r^{-1}(r(z_n)) = \{g_{n,1}, \dots, g_{n,\ell_n}\}$  and  $r^{-1}(r(y_n)) = \{h_{n,1}, \dots, h_{n,m_n}\}$  as ordered sets. Thus  $g_{n,1} = z_n$  and  $h_{n,m_n} = y_n$ . As before, for each  $g_{n,j}$  and  $h_{n,i}$  we consider distinct edges  $g'_{n,j}$  and  $h'_{n,i}$  for




FIGURE 4.  $s_n$  and  $s'_n$  are the edges in the premorphism with range  $v_0^n$ .

$E'_n$  except for  $i = m_n$  and  $j = n$  that we identify  $h'_{n,m_n}$  and  $g'_{n,1}$ . In other words,

$$E'_n = r^{-1}(v_0^n) \cup E_n,$$

$$r^{-1}(v_0^n) = \{h'_{n,1}, \dots, h'_{n,m_n} = g'_{n,1}, g'_{n,2}, \dots, g'_{n,\ell_n}\}.$$

The ordering on  $r^{-1}(v_0^n)$  is as written above. The exception we made for  $h'_{n,m_n}$  makes the following distinction for the source of this edge. In fact, for every  $1 \leq i < m_n$  and  $1 < j \leq \ell_n$  we have  $s(h'_{n,i}) = s(h_{n,i})$  and  $s(g'_{n,j}) = s(g_{n,j})$  but  $s(h'_{n,m_n}) = v_0^{n-1}$ . So  $h'_{n,m_n}$  is the only edge in  $E'_n$  with the source  $v_0^{n-1}$  for  $n \geq 2$ . Now consider the infinite path  $x = x_1 x_2 \dots$  where  $x_n = h'_{n,m_n}$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Having  $x_1 = h'_{1,m_1} < g'_{1,1}$ , one can conclude that  $x$  is not an infinite max path on  $X_{B'}$  and  $T_{B'}(x) = g'_{1,1} x_2 x_3 \dots$ .

Let us define an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow B'$  as follows. Set  $f = (F, (f_n)_{n=0}^\infty, \geq)$  where  $f_n = n$  for all  $n \geq 0$  and  $F = \cup_{n=0}^\infty F_n$  so that  $F_0$  has only one edge,  $(0, v_0)$ , with the source  $v_0 \in V_0$  and with the range  $v_0 \in V'_0$  and for every  $n \geq 1$ ,  $F_n$  is an ordered set from  $V_n$  to  $V'_n$  where  $\#F_n = \#V_n + 2$  such that for every  $v \in V_n$  there is exactly one edge in  $F_n$ , say  $(n, v)$ , from  $v \in V_n$  to  $v \in V'_n$  and there are two other edges  $s_n$  and  $s'_n$  in  $F_n$  such that

$$s(s_n) = r(z_n), \quad s(s'_n) = r(y_n), \quad r(s_n) = r(s'_n) = v_0^n \quad \text{and} \quad s'_n < s_n$$

as in Figure 4. Thus

$$F_n = \{(n, v_j^n) : 1 \leq j \leq k_n\} \cup \{s_n, s'_n\}$$

and

$$s((n, v_j^n)) = v_j^n \in V_n, \quad r((n, v_j^n)) = v_j^n \in V'_n.$$

As there is only one edge in  $F_n$  with range  $v_j^n$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq k_n$ , the ordering on  $r^{-1}(v_j^n) = \{(n, v_j^n)\}$  is trivial.




FIGURE 5. An example of the construction in Subsection 3.1

*Remark.* It is worth mentioning that in the sequel, when we apply the above method to construct an ordered Bratteli diagram  $B'$  for a given ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$ , we choose  $y \in X_B^{\max}$  and  $z \in X_B^{\min}$  such that  $\bar{T}_B(y) \neq z$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $B$  be an ordered Bratteli diagram and  $B'$  and  $f : B \rightarrow B'$  be as above. Then  $f$  is an ordered premorphism.*

*Proof.* We only need to check the ordered commutativity of  $f$ . Let  $n \geq 1$  and let  $v \in V'_n$ . Recall that  $V'_n = \{v_0^n\} \cup V_n$ . First let  $v \neq v_0^n$ . Suppose that  $r^{-1}(v) = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\} \subseteq E_n$  as an ordered set. Then the

set of paths in  $E_n \circ F_n$  with range  $v \in V'_n$  is

$$\{(e_1, (n, v)), (e_2, (n, v)), \dots, (e_n, (n, v))\}$$

as an ordered set where  $(n, v)$  is the only edge of  $F_n$  going from  $v \in V_n$  to  $v \in V_n$ . On the other hand, the set of paths in  $F_{n-1} \circ E'_n$  with range  $v \in V'_n$  is

$$\{((n-1, s(e_1)), e_1), ((n-1, s(e_2)), e_2), \dots, ((n-1, s(e_k)), e_k)\}$$

as an ordered set. Thus these two sets are ordered isomorphic. Now let  $v = v_0^n$ . Then the ordered set of paths in  $E_n \circ F_n$  with range  $v_0^n$  is

$$\{(h_{n,1}, s'_n), (h_{n,2}, s'_n), \dots, (h_{n,m_n}, s'_n), (g_{n,1}, s_n), (g_{n,2}, s_n), \dots, (g_{n,\ell_n}, s_n)\}.$$

Moreover, the ordered set of paths in  $F_{n-1} \circ E'_n$  with range  $v_0^n$  is

$$\{((n-1, s(h_{n,1})), h'_{n,1}), \dots, ((n-1, s(h_{n,m_n-1})), h'_{n,m_n-1}), (s'_{n-1}, h'_{n,m_n}), (s_{n-1}, h'_{n,m_n}), ((n-1, s(g'_{n,2})), g'_{n,2}), \dots, ((n-1, s(g'_{n,\ell_n})), g'_{n,\ell_n})\}$$

for  $n \geq 2$ . These two sets are ordered isomorphic. For  $n = 1$  the number of paths in  $E_1 \circ F_1$  with range  $v_0^1$  and those in  $F_0 \circ E'_1$  with range  $v_0^1$  are both  $\ell_1 + m_1$ . Consequently,

$$E_n \circ F_n \cong F_{n-1} \circ E'_n, \quad \forall n \geq 1$$

as ordered sets. □

We summarize the construction of  $B'$  and  $f$  and their properties as follows.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $B$  be an ordered Bratteli diagram,  $z \in X_B^{\min}$  and  $y \in X_B^{\max}$ . Consider the associated ordered Bratteli diagram  $B'$  to  $B$  with an infinite path  $x \in X_{B'}$  together with the ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow B'$  as in the previous lemma. Then for the induced continuous surjection  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_B$  the following assertions hold:*

$$(1) \quad x \in X_{B'} \setminus X_B^{\max},$$

$$\alpha(x) = y \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(T_{B'}x) = z.$$

$$(2) \quad X_B \subseteq X_{B'} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \upharpoonright_{X_B} = \text{id}.$$

$$(3) \quad B' \text{ is not simple and } f \text{ is stationary at all levels. (See Figure 5 as an example.)}$$

$$(4) \quad x \in X_{B'}^{\min} \text{ if and only if } y \in X_B^{\min}. \text{ Moreover, } T_{B'}x \in X_{B'}^{\max} \text{ if and only if } z \in X_B^{\max}.$$

$$(5) \quad \text{Every point in } X_{B'} \setminus X_B \text{ is isolated in } X_{B'}. \text{ Moreover, if } w \text{ is an isolated point of } X_B \text{ then it is isolated in } X_{B'}.$$



### 3.2. From Ordered Premorphism to Topological Factoring.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Suppose that  $B$  and  $C$  are two semi-decisive ordered Bratteli diagrams such that  $X_B$  has a unique infinite min path. Then for every ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  the induced map  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is a topological factoring, that is  $\alpha \circ \bar{T}_C = \bar{T}_B \circ \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* We show that  $\alpha \circ \bar{T}_C(x) = \bar{T}_B \circ \alpha(x)$  for every point  $x \in X_C$ . By Proposition 2.6(3), this equation holds for every point  $x \in \alpha^{-1}(X_B \setminus X_B^{\max})$ . Now suppose that  $x \in X_C^{\max}$ . Then  $\alpha(x) \in X_B^{\max}$  by Proposition 2.6(1). Let  $z$  be the unique min path of  $X_B$ . Since  $\bar{T}_B$  is a natural extension  $\bar{T}_B(\alpha(x)) = z$ . Moreover, as  $\bar{T}_C$  is also a natural extension, one can conclude that  $\bar{T}_C(x) \in X_C^{\min}$ . Hence,  $\alpha \bar{T}_C(x) \in X_B^{\min} = \{z\}$  by Proposition 2.6(2). Thus  $\alpha \circ \bar{T}_C(x) = \bar{T}_B \circ \alpha(x)$ .

Now assume that  $x \in (X_C \setminus X_C^{\max}) \setminus \alpha^{-1}(X_B \setminus X_B^{\max})$ . Then  $\alpha(x) \in X_B^{\max}$  but  $x \notin X_C^{\max}$ . From the definition of  $\alpha$  it follows that  $\alpha T_C(x)$  is a min path. Therefore,  $\alpha T_C(x) = z$  and as  $\bar{T}_B$  is a natural extension we have  $\bar{T}_B(\alpha(x)) = z$ . In conclusion,  $\alpha T_C(x) = T_B \alpha(x)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $B$  be an ordered Bratteli diagram. An infinite path  $w = e_1 e_2 \cdots$  in  $X_B$  is said to be *eventually maximal* (resp., *minimal*) if there exists an infinite max (resp., minimal) path in its forward (resp., backward) orbit. In other words, there exists  $m \geq 1$  such that  $e_n = \text{maximal}$  (resp., *minimal*) edge for every  $n \geq m$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $B$  be an ordered Bratteli diagram. Suppose that  $B'$ ,  $f : B \rightarrow B'$ ,  $z \in X_B^{\min}$ ,  $y \in X_B^{\max}$ , and  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_B$  are as in Subsection 3.1. Let  $\bar{T}_B : X_B \rightarrow X_B$  be a continuous extension of the Vershik map  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$ . Then*

- (1) *there is a continuous extension  $\bar{T}_{B'} : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_{B'}$  of the Vershik map  $T_{B'} : X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\max} \rightarrow X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\min}$  such that  $\bar{T}_{B'} \upharpoonright_{X_B} = \bar{T}_B$ .*
- (2) *If  $z$  is not eventually maximal then  $X_{B'}^{\max} = X_B^{\max}$  and  $\bar{T}_{B'}$  in (1) is unique.*
- (3) *If  $z$  is eventually maximal then  $X_{B'}^{\max} \setminus X_B^{\max}$  is a singleton, say  $\{w_0\}$ , and for any other extension  $S_{B'}$  of  $T_{B'}$ ,  $S_{B'}(w) = \bar{T}_{B'}(w)$  for all  $w \in X_{B'} \setminus \{w_0\}$ .*
- (4) *If  $B$  is semi-decisive then so is  $B'$ .*
- (5)  *$\alpha(\bar{T}_{B'}(w)) = \bar{T}_B(\alpha(w))$  for all  $w \in X_{B'} \setminus \{x\}$ .*

*Proof.* We prove (1). Consider the Vershik homeomorphism  $T_{B'} : X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\max} \rightarrow X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\min}$ . Note that  $B$  is a subdiagram of  $B'$  and there are no edges in  $E'$  with source in  $V' \setminus V$  and range in  $V$ . Thus the successor of any edge or finite path in  $E$  is the same as in  $E'$  which turns out to have  $X_B^{\max} \subseteq X_{B'}^{\max}$  and  $X_B^{\min} \subseteq X_{B'}^{\min}$ . So  $T_{B'}$  is an extension of

$T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$ . Therefore, for every point  $x$  at which both  $T_{B'}$  and  $\bar{T}_B$  are defined,  $T_{B'}(x) = \bar{T}_B(x)$ . By the construction of  $B'$  there are two possibilities for the point  $z$ :

Case I: If  $z$  is not eventually maximal then by the arguments in Construction we will have  $X_{B'}^{\max} = X_B^{\max}$  and then  $X_{B'} = (X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\max}) \cup X_B$ . So we define  $\bar{T}_{B'} = T_B \cup \bar{T}_B$ .

Case II: If  $z$  is eventually maximal then  $X_{B'}^{\max} = X_B^{\max} \cup \{w_0\}$ . Note that  $w_0$  is an isolated point of  $X_{B'}$  and

$$X_{B'} = (X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\max}) \cup X_B^{\max} \cup \{w_0\}.$$

We define  $\bar{T}_{B'} = T_{B'} \cup \bar{T}_B$  on  $X_{B'} \setminus \{w_0\}$  and  $\bar{T}_{B'}(w_0) = \bar{T}_B(\alpha(w_0))$ . (Note that any point chosen from  $X_{B'}$  for defining  $\bar{T}_{B'}(w_0)$  will give us a continuous extension of  $\bar{T}_{B'}$ .)

Now we prove that  $\bar{T}_{B'}$  is continuous. As the Vershik map  $T_{B'}$  is a homeomorphism and  $X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\max}$  is open in  $X_{B'}$ , it is enough to prove the continuity of  $\bar{T}_{B'}$  at any  $w \in X_{B'}^{\max}$ . Note that in Case II, since  $w_0$  is an isolated point,  $\bar{T}_{B'}$  is continuous at it. So we are left to prove the continuity of  $\bar{T}_{B'}$  at any point  $w \in X_B^{\max}$ . For this, it is enough to show that if  $(w_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a sequence in  $X_{B'} \setminus X_B$  converging to some  $w \in X_B^{\max}$ , then  $T_{B'}(w_n) \rightarrow \bar{T}_B(w)$  (see Figure 6). Without loss of generality we may assume that the first  $n$  edges of  $w_n$  are in  $E'$  with source in  $V_n$  and with range equal to  $v_0^{n+1}$ , and for every  $k > n + 1$  the  $k$ -th edge of  $w_n$  is the  $k$ -th edge of  $x$  (i.e.  $x_k$ ). Let  $w_n = w_n^1 w_n^2 \cdots$  where  $w_n^j \in E'_j$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . We consider  $B$  as a subdiagram of  $B'$  and so  $\alpha(w_n) \in X_{B'}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Claim.**  $T_{B'}(w_n)$  and  $T_B(\alpha(w_n))$  have the same first  $n$  edges for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

To prove the claim let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . There are two cases here: either  $w_n^{n+1} < x_{n+1}$  or  $w_n^{n+1} > x_{n+1}$ .

If  $w_n^{n+1} < x_{n+1}$  then by order commutativity of the ordered premorphism  $f$ ,  $w_n^{n+1} = h'_{n+1,j}$  which corresponds to some  $h_{n+1,j}$  with  $j < m_n$  in Construction. Thus  $s(h_{n+1,j}) = s(w_n^{n+1})$  and

$$\alpha(w_n) = w_n^1 w_n^2 \cdots w_n^n h_{n+1,j} y_{n+2} y_{n+3} \cdots$$

Then  $T_{B'} w_n$  and  $T_B(\alpha(w_n))$  have the same first edges (see Figure 7).

In the second case that  $w_n^{n+1} > x_{n+1}$  we have  $w_n^{n+1} = g'_{n+1,j}$  which corresponds to some  $g_{n+1,j}$  with  $j \leq \ell_n$  in Construction (see Figure 8). This means that  $s(g_{n+1,j}) = s(w_n^{n+1})$  (see Figure 8) and

$$\alpha(w_n) = w_n^1 w_n^2 \cdots w_n^n g_{n+1,j} z_{n+2} z_{n+3} \cdots$$




FIGURE 6. Three initial edges  $w^j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$  of the infinite path  $w$  as well as some initial edges of three infinite paths  $w_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$  are depicted. In this figure,  $w_i^j$  shows the  $j$ -th edge of the infinite path  $w_i$ .




FIGURE 7. The case  $w_n^{n+1} < x_{n+1}$ .

When  $j < \ell_n$ , the  $(n + 1)$ -th edges of  $T_{B'}(w_n)$  and  $T_B(\alpha(w_n))$  are  $g'_{n+1,j+1}$  and  $g_{n+1,j+1}$ , respectively, and the first  $n$  edges of  $T_{B'}(w_n)$  and  $T_B(\alpha(w_n))$  are the same. If  $j = \ell_n$  then as  $T_{B'}(x)$  is not an infinite max path, by Theorem 3.2(4) we see that  $z \notin X_B^{\max}$  and so there is  $t > n + 1$




FIGURE 8. The case  $w_n^{n+1} > x_{n+1}$ .




FIGURE 9.

such that  $x_t$  is not a max edge (equivalently,  $\ell_t > 1$ ) and  $x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{t-1}$  are max edges (see Figure 9).

Then the  $t$ -th edges of  $T_{B'}(w_n)$  and  $T_B(\alpha(w_n))$  are  $g'_{t,2}$  and  $g_{t,2}$  respectively, and  $T_{B'}(w_n)$  and  $T_B(\alpha(w_{n+1}))$  have the same first  $(t - 1)$  edges and hence first  $n$  edges. This finishes the proof of the claim.

Observe that, by the definition of  $\alpha$ , the first  $n$  edges of  $w_n$  and  $\alpha(w_n)$  are the same. Therefore,  $\alpha(w_n) \rightarrow w$  in  $X_B$  since  $w_n \rightarrow w$  in  $X_{B'}$ . Consequently,  $T_B(\alpha(w_n)) \rightarrow \bar{T}_B(w)$ . On the other hand, the claim implies that  $d(T_{B'}(w_n), T_B(\alpha(w_n))) \rightarrow 0$  where  $d$  is the canonical metric on  $X_{B'}$ . Hence,  $T_{B'}(w_n) \rightarrow \bar{T}_B(w)$ . This finishes the proof of part (1).

Parts (2) and (3) were covered in Case I and Case II. Part (4) follows from parts (1)-(3). To prove part (5), let  $w \in X_{B'} \setminus \{x\}$ . Consider the following three cases:

(a)  $w \in X_B$ . In this case  $\alpha(w) = w$  and

$$\bar{T}_B(\alpha(w)) = \bar{T}_B(w) = \bar{T}_{B'}(w) = \alpha(\bar{T}_{B'}(w)).$$

(b)  $w \in X_{B'} \setminus X_B$  and  $w \notin X_{B'}^{\max}$ . Then  $\alpha(w) \notin X_B^{\max}$  (since  $w \neq x$ ). By Proposition 2.6(3) the desired equation is satisfied.

(c)  $w \in X_{B'} \setminus X_B$  and  $w \in X_{B'}^{\max}$ . This case happens only in Case II which means that  $w = w_0$  and by definition of  $\bar{T}_{B'}(w_0)$  and the fact that  $\alpha \upharpoonright_{X_B} = \text{id}$ , we have

$$\bar{T}_B(\alpha(w_0)) = \bar{T}_{B'}(w_0) = \alpha(\bar{T}_{B'}(w_0)).$$

This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $B$  be a decisive ordered Bratteli diagram. Suppose that  $B'$ ,  $f : B \rightarrow B'$ ,  $z \in X_B^{\min}$ ,  $y \in X_B^{\max}$ , and  $\alpha = \mathcal{V}(f) : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_B$  are as in Subsection 3.1. Then  $B'$  is decisive if and only if one of the following statements holds:*

- (1)  $z$  is not eventually maximal and  $y$  is not eventually minimal. (See Figure 10 as an example.)
- (2)  $z$  is eventually maximal,  $y$  is eventually minimal, and  $X_{B'}^{\max}$  has empty interior. (See Figure 11 as an example.)

*In particular, If  $B$  is simple and decisive such that  $X_B$  is infinite then  $B'$  is decisive.*

*Proof.* First observe that  $z$  (resp.,  $y$ ) is eventually maximal (resp., minimal) if and only if  $T_{B'}(z)$  (resp.,  $T_{B'}(y)$ ) is eventually maximal (resp., minimal). So for the backward implication first assume that (1) holds. Then  $z$  and  $T_{B'}(z)$  are not eventually maximal and eventually minimal, respectively, which means that  $X_{B'}^{\max} = X_B^{\max}$  and  $X_{B'}^{\min} = X_B^{\min}$ . Let  $\bar{T}_B : X_B \rightarrow X_B$  be the unique homeomorphism extension of  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$ . By Lemma 3.5(1) there is a continuous map  $\bar{T}_{B'} : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_{B'}$  extending both  $\bar{T}_B$  and the Vershik map  $T_{B'} : X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\max} \rightarrow X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\min}$ . Since

$$X_{B'} \setminus X_B \subseteq X_{B'} \setminus (X_{B'}^{\max} \cup X_{B'}^{\min}),$$

it follows that  $\bar{T}_{B'}(X_B) = X_B$  and  $\bar{T}_{B'}(X_{B'} \setminus X_B) = X_{B'} \setminus X_B$ . Hence,  $\bar{T}_{B'}$  is a homeomorphism extension of the Vershik map  $T_{B'}$ . Uniqueness of  $\bar{T}_{B'}$  is clear by Lemma 3.5(2). Therefore,  $B'$  is decisive.

Now assume that (2) holds. Then  $z$  and  $T_{B'}(z)$  are eventually minimal and eventually maximal, respectively. As  $z$  and  $T_{B'}(z)$  are cofinal,

$x$  is eventually maximal too. It turns out that

$$\exists m \geq 1 \forall n \geq m \quad r^{-1}(r(x_n)) = \{x_n\}.$$

and the latter means that  $X_{B'} \setminus X_B$  is a cycle, i.e., there exist  $k \geq 2$  and some  $w_1, \dots, w_k \in X_{B'}$  so that  $w_1 \in X_{B'}^{\min}$ ,  $w_k \in X_{B'}^{\max}$ ,  $w_{i+1}$  is the successor of  $w_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k-1$  and

$$X_{B'} \setminus X_B = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}.$$

Note that there is  $1 \leq j < k$  such that  $w_j = x$  and  $w_{j+1} = T_{B'}(x)$ . Moreover, each of the  $w_i$ 's are isolated points in  $X_{B'}$ . Therefore, one can define a homeomorphism extension, say  $\bar{T}_{B'}$ , of  $T_{B'} : X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\max} \rightarrow X_{B'} \setminus X_{B'}^{\min}$  by Lemma 3.5 and letting  $\bar{T}_{B'}(w_k) = w_1$ . We claim that this extension is unique. Since otherwise, if  $S : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_{B'}$  is another extension of  $T_{B'}$ , then there exists some  $t \in X_{B'}^{\min}$  such that  $T_{B'}(w_k) = t$  and  $T_{B'}(T_B^{-1}(t)) = w_1$ . By the assumption,  $T_B^{-1}(t) \in X_B^{\max}$  is not an isolated point in  $X_B$  (and hence in  $X_{B'}$  by Theorem 3.2(5)) while  $x$  is an isolated point of  $X_{B'}$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $B'$  is decisive.

For the forward implication, assume that  $B'$  is decisive and that (1) does not hold. We prove that (2) is satisfied. Let  $z$  be eventually maximal. Suppose that  $y$  is not eventually minimal. Then  $T_{B'}(x)$  is eventually maximal and  $x$  is not eventually minimal. So  $X_{B'} \setminus X_B$  is a singleton, say  $\{w\}$ , while  $X_{B'}^{\min} = X_B^{\min}$ . Since  $B'$  is decisive,  $\bar{T}_{B'}(w) \in X_B^{\min}$  and it is isolated in  $X_B$  (as  $w$  is isolated in  $X_{B'}$ ). Since  $B$  is decisive,  $\bar{T}_B^{-1}(\bar{T}_{B'}(w)) \in X_B^{\max}$  and is an isolated point of  $X_B$ . By Theorem 3.2(5) this point will be isolated in  $X_{B'}$ . Hence,  $y$  is eventually minimal. Similarly, if  $y$  is eventually minimal then  $z$  is eventually maximal. Since we had the assumption of not having (1), the conclusion is that  $z$  is eventually maximal and  $y$  is eventually minimal. So it remains to show that  $X_B^{\max}$  has empty interior. Suppose that

$$X_{B'} = X_B \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$$

as above. Recall that each  $w_i$  is isolated. If  $X_B^{\max}$  has non-empty interior, then (by decisiveness) so does  $X_B^{\min}$ . Let  $t \in X_B^{\min}$  be an isolated point of  $X_B$  (and hence  $X_{B'}$ ). Then one can define  $S : X_{B'} \rightarrow X_{B'}$  such that  $S(w_k) = t$ ,  $S(T_B^{-1}(t)) = w_1$  and  $S(w) = T_B(w)$  for all other  $w \in X_B$  which is clearly another extension of  $\bar{T}_{B'}$ , a contradiction. Consequently, (2) holds.

If  $B$  is simple then (1) happens and so  $B'$  is decisive.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $B$  be a properly ordered Bratteli diagram,  $z = x_{\min}$  and  $y = x_{\max}$ . Let  $B'$ ,  $x \in X_{B'}$  and  $f : B \rightarrow B'$  be as in Subsection 3.1. Then  $X_{B'}$  is decisive if and only if  $\#X_B = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* If  $B'$  is decisive, then each of the two statements of Proposition 3.6 imply that  $X_B$  is infinite.

Now suppose that  $X_B$  is infinite. We prove that if the statement (1) of Proposition 3.6 does not hold, then (2) is satisfied. To show this, without loss of generality, assume that  $z = z_1 z_2 \dots$  is eventually maximal. Choose  $m \geq 1$  such that  $z_n$  is a maximal edge for all  $n \geq m$ . Let  $z'_1 z'_2 \dots z'_{m-1}$  be the finite maximal path (from  $v_0$  to  $s(z_m)$ ) such that  $w = z'_1 z'_2 \dots z'_{m-1} z_m z_{m+1} \dots \in X_B^{\max}$ . By properness,  $w = y$  and therefore,  $y$  is eventually minimal. It remains to show that  $y$  is not isolated. But if  $y$  is isolated then there exists some  $k \geq m$  such that for all  $n > k$ ,  $r^{-1}(r(z_n)) = s^{-1}(s(z_n))$ . As  $X_B$  is infinite, there are at least two vertices at each level  $n > k$  which means that there are (infinite) min paths and (infinite) max paths other than  $z$  and  $y$ , contradicting properness.  $\square$

Now we have all tools in hand to prove Theorem 1.2 about relation between ordered premorphisms and topological factoring for decisive ordered Bratteli diagrams.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) is true by Proposition 3.3. For the converse suppose that  $B$  has at least two infinite min paths. Let  $y$  be an infinite max path in  $B$  and  $z \in X_B^{\min} \setminus \{\bar{T}_B(y)\}$  to make a Bratteli diagram  $B'$  with an ordered premorphism  $f$  between  $B$  and  $B'$  as in Construction. By Lemma 3.5(4),  $C := B'$  is a semi-decisive ordered Bratteli diagram such that by Theorem 3.2(1),  $\mathcal{V}(f)$  is not a topological factoring from  $X_C$  to  $X_B$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.8.** *Let  $B$  be a decisive simple ordered Bratteli diagram such that  $(X_B, T_B)$  is non-trivial. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *for every decisive ordered Bratteli diagram  $C$  and every ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$ , the induced map  $\mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is a topological factoring.*
- (2)  *$B$  is proper.*

*Proof.* (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.2. Conversely, Suppose that  $B$  is not proper. Then there exist at least two infinite max paths, say  $p, q$ , and two infinite min paths, say  $p' = \bar{T}_B(p), q' = \bar{T}_B(q)$  on it. Let  $y := p'$  and  $z := q$  to make diagram  $B'$  and ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow B'$  as in Construction. Simplicity of  $B$  and then Proposition 3.6 imply that  $B'$  is decisive. But by the choices of  $z$  and




FIGURE 10. The left diagram satisfies condition (1) of Proposition 3.6 and  $\alpha(x) = y, \alpha(T_C(x)) = z \neq T_B(y)$ .

$y, \mathcal{V}(f)$  is not topological factoring from  $B'$  onto  $B$  which contradicts (1).  $\square$

*Remark.* Theorem 1.2 shows that if  $B$  and  $C$  are decisive Bratteli diagrams and  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is an ordered premorphism, then the induced map  $\mathcal{V}(f) : X_C \rightarrow X_B$  is not necessarily a topological factoring. In fact, for every decisive non-proper ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$ , using the method described in Subsection 3.1 and Proposition 3.6, one can construct a semi-decisive Bratteli diagram  $C$  with ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  without having factoring between the two Vershik systems.






FIGURE 11. The left diagram satisfies condition (2) of Proposition 3.6 and  $\alpha(x) = y, \alpha(T_C(x)) = z \neq T_B(y) = y$ .

#### 4. FROM TOPOLOGICAL FACTORING TO ORDERED PREMORPHISMS

We are now going to model topological factorings  $\alpha : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, S)$  between zero dimensional systems, by sequences of ordered premorphisms. Let us recall from [1] that when the two systems are minimal and so both have realizations by properly ordered Bratteli diagrams (with unique maximal paths), we fix two points  $x_0 \in X$  and  $y_0 \in Y$  that  $\alpha(x_0) = y_0$  and then we construct ordered Bratteli diagrams  $B$  and  $C$  for  $(Y, S, y_0)$  and  $(X, T, x_0)$  respectively, so that the unique maximal path of  $B$  is  $y_0$  and the unique maximal path of  $C$  is  $x_0$ . The two points are in fact, the intersections of the tops of the K-R systems (see Definition 4.1) associated to the Bratteli diagrams respectively. Then one can construct an ordered premorphism matching the map  $\alpha$ .

When the two systems are not necessarily minimal, by the nice results of [27], it is still possible to realize the two systems by Vershik maps on ordered Bratteli diagrams  $B$  and  $C$ , respectively. However, we need to have some specific realizations  $B$  and  $C$  so that the modelling of  $\alpha$  by  $\mathcal{V}(f)$  for some ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$  will guarantee that

$$\mathcal{V}(f)(X_C^{\max}) \subseteq X_B^{\max}.$$

Consequently, in terms of K-R systems, we need to have the intersections of the top of the K-R system associated to  $C$  to be mapped by  $\alpha$  into the intersection of the top of the K-R systems associated to  $B$ . In other words, to model  $\alpha$  by an ordered premorphism, we need to consider the two systems as triples:  $(X, T, X_0)$  and  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  that  $X_0$  and  $Y_0$  are closed sets associated to  $X_C^{\max}$  and  $X_B^{\max}$  respectively with  $\alpha(X_0) \subseteq Y_0$ . In this regard, the following arguments are needed.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a zero dimensional dynamical system and  $W \subseteq X$  be a closed set. A *Kakutani-Rokhlin* (K-R) partition for  $(X, T, W)$  is a partition

$$\{Z(k, j) : 1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq j \leq J(k)\}$$

of clopen sets for  $X$  such that

- (1)  $T(Z(k, j)) = Z(k, j + 1)$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $1 \leq j < J(k)$ ,
- (2)  $T(\cup_{k=1}^K Z(k, J(k))) = \cup_{k=1}^K Z(k, 1)$ ,
- (3)  $W \subseteq \cup_{k=1}^K Z(k, J(k))$ .

The set  $\cup_{k=1}^K Z(k, J(k))$  is called the *top* of the partition and  $\cup_{k=1}^K Z(k, 1)$  is its *base*. A *system* of K-R partitions  $(\mathcal{P}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  for  $(X, T, W)$  is a sequence of K-R partitions in which for every  $n \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1}$  is a refinement of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , the top of  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1}$  is contained in the top of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , and  $\cup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n$  is a base for the topology of  $X$ .

**Definition 4.2** ([29]). Let  $(X, T)$  be a zero dimensional dynamical system. We say that a closed subset  $W \subseteq X$  is a *quasi-section* set if every clopen neighborhood  $U$  of  $W$  is a complete  $T$ -section in the sense of [22], i.e.,  $U$  meets every  $T$ -orbit of  $X$  at least once, equivalently,  $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} T^n(U) = X$ .

*Remark.* If  $W$  is a quasi-section for  $(X, T)$  and  $U$  a clopen neighbourhood of  $W$ , then every point  $x \in U$  is recurrent to  $U$ , i.e., there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $T^n(x) \in U$ . In fact, since  $U$  is a  $T$ -section we have  $X = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} T^n(U)$  and so  $X = \cup_{n=-N}^N T^n(U)$  for some  $N \geq 1$ . Then

$$X = T^{-(N+1)}(X) = \bigcup_{n=-2N-1}^{-1} T^n(U).$$

In [22] the notion of *basic set* is defined which is a quasi-section  $W$  with the extra property that  $W$  meets every  $T$ -orbit of  $X$  at most once. For more properties of basic sets, see [28].

The following lemma together with Propositions 4.4 and Corollary 4.6 may be considered as an alternative proof for [29, Theorem 1.1]. The proofs of Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.4 have similar arguments as in

the proofs of [24, Lemma 2.2] and [29, Theorem 1.1] but the proof of Corollary 4.6 uses ordered premorphism arguments.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a zero dimensional dynamical system and  $A \subseteq X$  be a non-empty clopen set which is a complete  $T$ -section. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be an arbitrary partition of  $X$  into clopen sets. Then there is a K-R partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  for  $(X, T)$  such that the top of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is  $A$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  refines  $\mathcal{P}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof for existence of a K-R partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  that its top is  $A$  is as [24, Lemma 2.2]. Then one can apply the method described in the proof of [25, Lemma 3.1] to make  $\mathcal{Q}$  finer than the given  $\mathcal{P}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $(X, T)$  be a zero dimensional dynamical system and  $W \subseteq X$  be a closed non-empty set. The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *There is a perfect ordered Bratteli diagram  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  and a conjugacy  $\gamma : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_B, T_B)$  such that  $\gamma(W) = X_B^{\max}$ .*
- (2) *There is a system of K-R partitions  $\{\mathcal{P}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  for  $(X, T, W)$  such that*

$$\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} Z_n = W$$

where  $Z_n$  is the top of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ ,  $n \geq 0$ .

- (3)  *$W$  is a quasi-section for  $(X, T)$ .*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Let  $B$  and  $\gamma : X \rightarrow X_B$  be as in (1). Let  $(\mathcal{Q}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  be the standard sequence of K-R partitions obtained from  $B$  (see, e.g., the description preceding [1, Proposition 3.11]), that is,

$$\mathcal{Q}_0 = \{X_B\}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_n = \{U(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) : (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) \in E_{1,n}\}.$$

Let  $W_n$  denote the top of  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ . Then  $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} W_n = X_B^{\max}$ . Let

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \{\gamma^{-1}(L) : L \in \mathcal{Q}_n\}, \quad Z_n = \gamma^{-1}(W_n), \quad n \geq 0.$$

Then  $\{\mathcal{P}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is a system of K-R partition for  $(X, T)$  such that  $Z_n$  is the top of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  and

$$\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} Z_n = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma^{-1}(W_n) = \gamma^{-1}(X_B^{\max}) = W.$$

- (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) is very similar to the case of properly ordered Bratteli diagrams where for a given system of K-R partitions, an ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$  is constructed and a natural homeomorphism  $\gamma : X \rightarrow X_B$  is defined (see [19, Section 4] and the paragraph following [1, Lemma 3.4]). Observe that  $B$  is perfect

since  $\gamma \circ T \circ \gamma^{-1} : X_B \rightarrow X_B$  is a homeomorphism extension of the Vershik map  $T_B : X_B \setminus X_B^{\max} \rightarrow X_B \setminus X_B^{\min}$ .

- (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) First note that the top (and the base) of every K-R partition of  $(X, T)$  is a complete  $T$ -section. Thus every  $Z_n$  is a complete  $T$ -section. Let  $A$  be a clopen subset of  $X$  with  $W \subseteq A$ . Since  $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} Z_n = W$ , it follows that there is some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $Z_n \subseteq A$ , since otherwise one can choose  $x_n \in Z_n \setminus A$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Passing to a subsequence, it can be assumed that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  for some  $x \in X$ . Then  $Z_1 \supseteq Z_2 \supseteq \dots$  implies that  $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n = W$ . But  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq X \setminus A$  and  $A$  is clopen, so we get that  $x \in X \setminus A$  contradicting  $W \subseteq A$ . Hence  $A$  contains some complete  $T$ -section  $Z_n$  and therefore  $A$  is a complete  $T$ -section.
- (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) If  $W$  is a quasi-section and  $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is any decreasing sequence of clopen sets with  $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} Z_n = W$  (which exist as  $X$  is zero dimensional) then using Lemma 4.3 repeatedly, we can construct the desired sequence of K-R partitions.  $\square$

Now we have the tools for modelling a factoring map  $\alpha : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, S)$  in terms of ordered premorphisms.

Let  $W$  be a quasi-section for  $(X, T)$ . A *Bratteli-Vershik realization* (B-V) of  $(X, T, W)$  is a perfect ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$  satisfying conditions (1)-(3) of Proposition 4.4.

Now we present the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let  $(\mathcal{P}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  and  $(\mathcal{Q}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  be the systems of K-R partitions for  $(X, T, X_0)$  and  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  supporting the Bratteli-Vershik realizations  $C = (V, E, \leq)$  and  $B = (W, S, \leq)$ , respectively. We proceed by the method described in the third paragraph after [1, Lemma 3.6] to obtain a cofinal increasing sequence  $(f_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  in  $\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  and a sequence of edges  $(F_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  leading to an ordered premorphism  $f = (F, (f_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}, \leq) : B \rightarrow C$  such that  $\mathcal{V}(f) = \gamma_2 \circ \alpha \circ \gamma_1^{-1}$  where  $\gamma_1 : X \rightarrow X_B$  and  $\gamma_2 : Y \rightarrow Y_C$  are as in Proposition 4.4(1). The main point that the same method works here is that for each  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ , the induced partition

$$\alpha^{-1}(\mathcal{Q}_n) = \{\alpha^{-1}(L) : L \in \mathcal{Q}_n\}$$

of  $X$  is a K-R partition such that its top contains  $X_0$  as  $\alpha(X_0) \subseteq Y_0$  and the top of  $\mathcal{Q}_n$  contains  $Y_0$ . Since the intersection of the top of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ 's equals  $X_0$ , we may find a large enough  $f_n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_{f_n}$  refines  $\alpha^{-1}(\mathcal{Q}_n)$  and the top of  $\mathcal{P}_{f_n}$  is contained in the top of  $\alpha^{-1}(\mathcal{Q}_n)$  (see the proof of (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of Proposition 4.4). The uniqueness (up to equivalence) of  $f$  follows from Proposition 2.9.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  be two zero dimensional dynamical systems. If  $\alpha : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, S)$  is a topological factoring then there are B-V realizations  $C$  and  $B$  for  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  respectively such that  $B$  and  $C$  are perfect and there exists an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$ .*

*Proof.* By [27],  $(X, T)$  has some B-V realization  $C$ . Then by Proposition 4.4 (or [29, Theorem 1.1]), one can find quasi-section  $X_0$  associated to the set of infinite maximal paths of the Bratteli diagram. By the topological factoring,  $Y_0 = \alpha(X_0)$  is a quasi-section for  $(Y, S)$ . Now one can apply Theorem 1.1 to model  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  by an appropriate Bratteli diagram  $B$  with an ordered premorphism  $f : B \rightarrow C$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.6.** *Any two B-V realizations for a zero dimensional dynamical system  $(X, T, W)$ , where  $W$  is a quasi-section, are equivalent.*

*Proof.* Let  $B$  and  $C$  be two B-V representations for  $(X, T, W)$ . Consider

$$\alpha = \text{id} : (X, T) \rightarrow (X, T).$$

By Theorem 1.1, there are ordered premorphisms

$$f : B \rightarrow C, \quad g : C \rightarrow B$$

such that

$$\mathcal{V}(f) = \alpha = \text{id}, \quad \mathcal{V}(g) = \alpha^{-1} = \text{id}.$$

Then  $gf : B \rightarrow B$  and  $fg : C \rightarrow C$  are ordered premorphisms (see [1, Definition 2.7] for composition of two ordered premorphisms) and

$$\mathcal{V}(gf) = \mathcal{V}(f)\mathcal{V}(g) = \text{id} = \mathcal{V}(\text{id}_B), \quad \mathcal{V}(fg) = \mathcal{V}(\text{id}_C)$$

where  $\text{id}_B : B \rightarrow B$  and  $\text{id}_C : C \rightarrow C$  are the identity premorphisms. By Proposition 2.9,

$$gf \sim \text{id}_B, \quad fg \sim \text{id}_C.$$

Therefore,  $[g][f] = [\text{id}_B]$  and  $[f][g] = [\text{id}_C]$ . Thus  $[f] : B \rightarrow C$  is an isomorphism of ordered Bratteli diagrams. It turns out that  $B$  and  $C$  are isomorphic in the category of ordered Bratteli diagrams and hence they are equivalent by [1, Proposition 2.9]. The proof is finished here.

There is an alternative proof for this corollary using a K-R partition argument. Let  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  and  $C = (W, S, \leq)$  be two B-V realizations of  $(X, T, W)$  obtained from K-R systems  $\{\mathcal{P}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  and  $\{\mathcal{Q}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ , respectively. Let  $Z_n$  and  $W_n$  be the top levels of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ , respectively for every  $n \geq 0$ . Set  $n_0 = 0$  and  $n_1 = 1$ . Since

$$\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} Z_n = W = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} W_n$$

and  $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_n$  is a basis for the topology of  $X$ , there exists  $n_2 > n_1$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}_{n_2}$  refines  $\mathcal{P}_{n_1}$  and  $W_{n_2} \subseteq Z_{n_1}$  (the latter follows from an argument similar to the one in the proof of (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of Proposition 4.4). Similarly, there is  $n_3 > n_2$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_{n_3}$  refines  $\mathcal{Q}_{n_2}$  and  $Z_{n_3} \subseteq W_{n_2}$ . Continuing this procedure, we obtain a strictly increasing sequence  $\{n_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  such that

$$\mathcal{P}_{n_1} \geq \mathcal{Q}_{n_2} \geq \mathcal{P}_{n_3} \geq \mathcal{Q}_{n_4} \geq \dots$$

and

$$Z_{n_1} \supseteq W_{n_2} \supseteq Z_{n_3} \supseteq W_{n_4} \supseteq \dots$$

Put  $R_0 = \{X\}$ ,  $R_k = \mathcal{P}_{n_k}$  for all odd  $k$ , and  $R_k = \mathcal{Q}_{n_k}$  for every even  $k$ . Then  $\{R_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  is a K-R system for  $(X, T, W)$  and gives an ordered Bratteli diagram  $D$  which is a B-V realization for  $(X, T, W)$  and telescoping it along odd (resp., even) levels equals the telescoping of  $B$  (resp.,  $C$ ) along  $\{n_{2k+1}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$  (resp.,  $\{n_{2k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ ). Thus  $B$  and  $C$  are equivalent.  $\square$

*Remark.* Let us recall that by the results of [19, 25, 29], for a zero dimensional dynamical system  $(X, T)$ , there exists a singleton quasi-section  $\{x_0\}$  if and only if  $(X, T)$  is essentially minimal. Indeed, when  $\{x_0\}$  is a quasi-section for  $(X, T)$  then there exists a perfect ordered Bratteli diagram  $B$  with a conjugacy  $\gamma : (X, T) \rightarrow (X_B, T_B)$  that  $\gamma(\{x_0\}) = X_B^{\max}$  (see also Proposition 4.4). In particular,  $X_B^{\max}$  is a singleton and therefore,  $X_B^{\min}$  is a singleton. Thus  $(X, T, x_0)$  is essentially minimal. Conversely, when  $(X, T)$  is essentially minimal, by [19, Theorem 1.1], any point  $x_0$  in the unique minimal subset, is a quasi-section.

## 5. TOPOLOGICAL FACTORING, ORDERED PREMOPPHISMS AND INVERSE LIMIT SYSTEMS

By the well-known theorem of Curtis-Hedlund-Lyndon, topological factoring between two subshift systems can be modelled by a local rule called *the sliding block code* between the two systems [18]. In this section, we go through the proof of a generalization of this theorem for zero dimensional dynamical systems. We see in Theorem 1.3 that in this general case, the factoring is defined by a sequence of sliding block codes.

Let  $(X, T, X_0)$  be a zero dimensional dynamical system with a quasi-section  $X_0$ . Consider the sequence of K-R partitions  $\{\mathcal{Q}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  for  $(X, T, X_0)$  as in Proposition 4.4(2), where  $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \{X\}$ . Then there exists a truncation map  $\tau_k : X \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k$  defined by  $\tau_k(x) = U$  where  $U$

is the unique element in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  that  $x \in U$ . So the natural projections  $\tilde{\tau}_k : X \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_k^{\mathbb{Z}}$  are defined by

$$(5.1) \quad \tilde{\tau}_k(x) = (\tau_k(T^n x))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}.$$

It turns out that at each level  $k$ , we have a subshift system  $(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_k, \sigma)$ , also known as a *symbolic factor* of  $(X, T)$  with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ :

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_k, \sigma) \text{ where } \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_k = \tilde{\tau}_k(X) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_k^{\mathbb{Z}}, \quad \sigma(\tilde{\tau}_k(x)) = \tilde{\tau}_k(Tx).$$

As  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  refines  $\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}$ , there is a natural map  $\mathcal{Q}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{k-1}$  sending  $U \in \mathcal{Q}_k$  to  $V \in \mathcal{Q}_{k-1}$  where  $U \subseteq V$ . This map can be considered as a 1-block map inducing a sliding block code  $\alpha_k : (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_k, \sigma) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{k-1}, \sigma)$ . Note that  $\alpha_k \circ \tilde{\tau}_k = \tilde{\tau}_{k-1}$  for all  $k \geq 1$ , since

$$(5.2) \quad \alpha_k(\tilde{\tau}_k(x)) = \alpha_k((\tau_k(T_B^n(x)))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) = (\tau_{k-1}(T_B^n(x)))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} = \tilde{\tau}_{k-1}(x).$$

Consequently, we have the following inverse system whose inverse limit is conjugate to  $(X, T)$ :

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0, \sigma) \xleftarrow{\alpha_1} (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_1, \sigma) \xleftarrow{\alpha_2} (\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_2, \sigma) \xleftarrow{\alpha_3} \dots \longleftarrow (X, T, X_0)$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** First assume that  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  is a topological factoring with  $\pi(X_0) \subseteq Y_0$ . Consider the inverse limit systems associated to the two systems as described above. Suppose that  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are the metrics on  $C$  and  $B$ , respectively that are compatible with the topologies on  $X$  and  $Y$ . By the proof of Theorem 1.1, there exists a strictly increasing sequence of non-negative integers  $(f_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  that leads to the existence of an ordered premorphism  $f$  between the two Bratteli diagrams. So for every  $i$ , let  $n_i := f_i$  and consider the sequence of K-R partitions  $\{\mathcal{Q}_{n_i}\}_{i \geq 0}$ . Then the maps  $\pi_k$ 's can be well-defined by using the natural projections  $\tilde{\tau}_{n_k} : X \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{n_k}$  and  $\tilde{\tau}'_k : Y \rightarrow \tilde{P}_k$ . Indeed, for every  $k \geq 0$  we have

$$\pi_k : \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{n_k} \rightarrow \tilde{P}_k, \quad \pi_k(\tilde{\tau}_{n_k}(x)) := \tilde{\tau}'_k(\pi(x))$$

which make topological factorings between the associated local subshifts. In other words, by (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_k \circ \sigma(\tilde{\tau}_{n_k}(x)) &= \pi_k \tilde{\tau}_{n_k} \circ T(x) = \tilde{\tau}'_k(\pi(Tx)) = \tilde{\tau}'_k(S\pi(x)) \\ &= \sigma \circ \tilde{\tau}'_k(\pi(x)) \\ &= \sigma \circ \pi_k(\tilde{\tau}_{n_k}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (5.1) and (5.2), for every  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_k \circ \pi_k(\tilde{\tau}_{n_k}(x)) &= \beta_k(\tilde{\tau}'_k(\pi(x))) \\
&= \beta_k((\tau'_k(S^n(\pi(x))))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) \\
&= (\tau'_{k-1}(S^n(\pi(x))))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \\
&= \tilde{\tau}'_{k-1}(\pi(x)) \\
&= \pi_{k-1}(\tilde{\tau}_{n_{k-1}}(x)) \\
&= \pi_{k-1} \circ \gamma_k(\tilde{\tau}_{n_k}(x)).
\end{aligned}$$

For the other direction, assume that for  $(X, T, X_0)$ ,  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  and their associated K-R partitions  $\{\mathcal{Q}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  and  $\{\mathcal{P}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  respectively, there exists a sequence  $\{n_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  such that the Diagram 1.1 exists and all the rectangles in that commute. Then it is straightforward that the map

$$\pi : (X, T, X_0) \rightarrow (Y, S, Y_0)$$

defined by

$$\pi(x) := \varprojlim_i \pi_i(\tilde{\tau}_{n_i}(x)), \quad x \in X$$

is a topological factoring and  $\pi(X_0) \subseteq Y_0$ .  $\square$

We recall the S-adic representation of an ordered Bratteli diagram form [8] and [17, Subsection 2.4]. Let  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  be an ordered Bratteli diagram. Then  $\sigma^B = (\sigma_i^B : V_i \rightarrow V_{i-1}^*)_{i \geq 1}$  is defined for  $i \geq 2$  by

$$\sigma_i^B(v) = s(e_1(v))s(e_2(v)) \cdots s(e_k(v))$$

where  $\{e_j(v) : j = 1, \dots, k(v)\}$  is the ordered set of the edges in  $E_i$  with range  $v$ , and for  $i = 1$ ,  $\sigma_1^B : V_1^* \rightarrow E_1^*$ , is defined by  $\sigma_1^B(v) = e_1(v) \cdots e_\ell(v)$  where  $e_1(v), \dots, e_\ell(v)$  are all the edges in  $E_1$  with range  $v \in V_1$  and  $e_1(v) < \cdots < e_\ell(v)$ . Note that by concatenation, one can extend  $\sigma_i^B$  as  $\sigma_i^B : V_i^* \rightarrow V_{i-1}^*$ . Also, recall that  $\sigma_{(i,j]}^B = \sigma_{i+1}^B \circ \sigma_{i+2}^B \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_j^B$  is a morphism from  $V_j^*$  to  $V_i^*$  for  $0 \leq i \leq j$ . We say that a morphism  $\sigma : A^* \rightarrow B^*$  is letter-surjective if for any  $b \in B$  there is  $a \in A$  such that  $b$  appears in  $\sigma(a)$ .

Now consider  $(Y, S, Y_0)$  and  $(X, T, X_0)$  with their associated B-V models  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  and  $C = (W, E', \leq)$ , respectively. Having the ordered premorphism  $f = (F, (f_k)_{k=0}^\infty, \geq)$  (see Definition 2.5 for notations), for each  $k \geq 1$  the set of edges  $F_k$  induces a morphism  $\eta_k : W_{n_k} \rightarrow V_k^*$ . To see this, suppose that  $w \in W_{n_k}$ . By the definition of  $F_k$ , there exists an ordered set of edges in  $F_k$ , say  $\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m\}$  such that for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $s(g_i) \in V_k$ , i.e. the source of the edge  $g_i$  is a vertex in  $V_k$ . Then

$$(5.3) \quad \eta_k(w) = s(g_1)s(g_2) \cdots s(g_m).$$



This can naturally be extended to  $W_{n_k}^*$  by concatenation. Then ordered commutativity of the premorphism  $f$  implies that

$$\forall k \geq 1, \quad \eta_{k-1} \circ \sigma_{(n_{k-1}, n_k]}^C = \sigma_k^B \circ \eta_k.$$

where  $\sigma_i^B : V_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i^*$  and  $\sigma_i^C : W_{i+1} \rightarrow W_i^*$ ,  $i \geq 1$  are the morphisms between consecutive levels of the Bratteli diagrams  $B$  and  $C$  respectively and  $\sigma_{(n_i, n_{i+1}]}^C = \sigma_{n_{i+1}}^C \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{n_i+1}^C$ . In other words, we have the following sequence of commutative (rectangular) diagrams:

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} W_0 & \xleftarrow{\sigma_{(0, n_1]}^C} & W_{n_1}^* & \xleftarrow{\sigma_{(n_1, n_2]}^C} & W_{n_2}^* & \xleftarrow{\xi_{(n_2, n_3]}} & \cdots \\ \eta_0 \downarrow & & \eta_1 \downarrow & & \eta_2 \downarrow & & \\ V_0 & \xleftarrow{\sigma_1^B} & V_1^* & \xleftarrow{\sigma_2^B} & V_2^* & \xleftarrow{\sigma_3^B} & \cdots \end{array}$$

Note that for every  $i \geq 0$ , the morphism  $\eta_i : W_{n_i} \rightarrow V_i^*$  is in the opposite direction of  $F_i : V_i \rightarrow W_{n_i}$  (used in the previous sections). In fact, they essentially coincide, meaning that  $\eta_i$  is the S-adic interpretation of  $F_i$ .

We know that each tower  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_i$  (resp.  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ ),  $i \geq 1$  is associated with a vertex  $v \in V_i$  (resp.  $w \in W_i$ ) and all the edges terminating at it from  $V_{i-1}$  (resp.  $W_{i-1}$ ). Therefore, for each tower  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Q}_{n_i}$ , the morphism  $\eta_k$  specifies a stacking of  $m$  towers of  $\mathcal{P}_i$  as in equation (5.3). Then we have the following proposition as a corollary of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $(X, T)$  and  $(Y, S)$  be zero dimensional dynamical systems with quasi-sections  $X_0$  and  $\{y_0\}$  respectively. Then there exists a topological factoring  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  with  $\pi(X_0) = \{y_0\}$  if and only if for every B-V models  $C = (W, E', \leq)$  and  $B = (V, E, \leq)$  for  $(X, T, X_0)$  and  $(Y, S, \{y_0\})$  respectively, there exists an increasing sequence  $\{n_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  of non-negative integers with  $n_0 = 0$ , and non-erasing letter-surjective morphisms  $\eta_i : V_{n_i}^* \rightarrow W_i^*$  for every  $i \geq 0$ , the following diagram commutes:*

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_{n_i}^* & \xleftarrow{\sigma_{(n_i, n_{i+1}]}^C} & W_{n_{i+1}}^* \\ \eta_i \downarrow & & \eta_{i+1} \downarrow \\ V_i^* & \xleftarrow{\sigma_{i+1}^B} & V_{i+1}^* \end{array}$$

**Acknowledgements.** We are grateful to Reem Yassawi for helpful discussions and her comments on the final version of the introduction. We would also like to thank Bastian Espinoza for introducing [26] to us

which led us to go through more recent publications of T. Shimomura, specifically [27, 28, 29].

The research of the first author was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No.1402460117) and a grant from INSF (4029595). The research of the second author was fully supported by the EPSRC grant number EP/V007459/2. The project initiated during the second author's appointment at The Open University.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Amini, G. A. Elliott, and N. Golestani, The category of ordered Bratteli diagrams, *Canad. J. Math.* **73** (2021), 1-28.
- [2] S. Bezuglyi, A.H. Dooley and K. Medynets, The Rokhlin lemma for homeomorphisms of a Cantor set. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **133** (2005), no. 10, 2957-2964.
- [3] S. Bezuglyi and O. Karpel, Bratteli diagrams: structure, measures, dynamics, *Dynamics and numbers* **669** (2016), 1-36.
- [4] S. Bezuglyi, J. Kwiatkowski, R. Yassawi, Perfect orderings on finite rank Bratteli diagrams. *Canad. J. Math.*, **66** (2014), 57-101.
- [5] S. Bezuglyi and R. Yassawi, Orders that yield homeomorphisms on Bratteli diagrams *Dyn. Syst.* **32** (2017), no. 2, 249-282.
- [6] O. Bratteli, Inductive limits of finite dimensional C\*-algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **171** (1972), 195-234.
- [7] M. Brin and G. Stuck, *Introduction to Dynamical Systems*, LMS, 2002.
- [8] S. Donoso, F. Durand, A. Maass, S. Petite, Interplay between finite rank minimal Cantor systems,  $\mathcal{S}$ -adic subshifts and their complexity, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **374** (2021), no. 5, 3453-3489.
- [9] T. Downarowicz and O. Karpel, Dynamics in dimension zero a survey, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Sys.* **38** (2018), no. 3, 1033-1062.
- [10] T. Downarowicz and O. Karpel, Decisive Bratteli-Vershik Models, *Studia Math.* **247** (2019), no. 3, 251-271.
- [11] T. Downarowicz and A. Maass, Finite-rank Bratteli-Vershik diagrams are expansive, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **28** (2008), no. 3, 739-747.
- [12] F. Durand and D. Perrin, Dimension groups and dynamical systems—substitutions, Bratteli diagrams and Cantor systems. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 196. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 2022. vii+584 pp. ISBN: 978-1-108-83688-9.
- [13] B. Espinoza, Symbolic factors of  $\mathcal{S}$ -adic subshifts of finite alphabet rank, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **43** (2023), no. 5, 1511–1547.
- [14] H. Furstenberg and B. Weiss, On almost 1-1 extensions, *Israel J. Math.* **65** (1989), no. 3, 311-322.
- [15] T. Giordano, I.F. Putnam, and C.F. Skau, Topological orbit equivalence and C\*-crossed products, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **469** (1995), 51-111.
- [16] E. Glasner and B. Weiss, Weak orbit equivalence of Cantor minimal systems, *Internat. J. Math.* **6** (1995), 559-579.
- [17] N. Golestani and M. Hosseini, On topological rank of factors of Cantor minimal systems, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **42** (2022), 2866-2889.
- [18] G. A. Hedlund, Endomorphisms and automorphisms of the shift dynamical system, *Math. Systems Theory* **3** (1969), 320–375.

- [19] R.H. Herman, I.F. Putnam, and C.F. Skau, Ordered Bratteli diagrams, dimension groups and topological dynamics, *Internat. J. Math.* **3** (1992), 827-864.
- [20] R.I. Jewett, The prevalence of uniquely ergodic systems, *J. Math. Mech.* **19** (1970), 717-729.
- [21] W. Krieger, On unique ergodicity, L. Le Cam, J. Neyman and E.L. Scott (eds), *Proc. VIth Berkeley Symp. on Math. Statistics and Probability*, **2** (1972), 327-346.
- [22] K. Medynets, Cantor aperiodic systems and Bratteli diagrams, *C. R., Math., Acad. Sci. Paris*, **342**(1) (2006), 43-46.
- [23] N. Ormes, Strong orbit realization for minimal homeomorphisms, *J. Anal. Math.*, **71** (1997), 103-133.
- [24] Y.T. Poon, AF-subalgebras of certain crossed products, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **20** (1990), 527-537.
- [25] I.F. Putnam, The C\*-algebras associated with minimal homeomorphisms of the cantor set, *Pacific J. Math.* **136** (1989), 329-353.
- [26] T. Shimomura, Finite rank Bratteli-Vershik homeomorphisms are expansive, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **145** (2017), no. 10, 43-4362.
- [27] T. Shimomura, Bratteli-Vershik models and graph covering models, *Adv. in Math.*, **367** (2020), 107127.
- [28] T. Shimomura, On some properties of basic sets, arXiv:2112.13233v2 [math.DS], (2022).
- [29] T. Shimomura, Refinement of Bratteli-Vershik Models, arXiv:2010.02617v5 [math.DS], (2023).
- [30] F. Sugisaki, Almost one-to-one extensions of Cantor minimal systems and order embeddings of simple dimension groups, *Munster J. Math.* **4** (2011), 141-169.
- [31] A.V. Vershik, Uniform algebraic approximations of shift and multiplication operators, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **259** (1981), 526-529. English translation: *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **24** (1981), 97-100.
- [32] A.V. Vershik, A theorem on periodical Markov approximation in ergodic theory, *Zapiski Nauchn. Semin. LOMI* **115** (1982), 72-82. English translation: *Ergodic theory and related topics* (Vitte, 1981), Mathematical Research **12** Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 195-206, 1982.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY, TEHRAN, IRAN

*Email address:* n.golestani@modares.ac.ir

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, QUEEN MARY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, MILE END ROAD LONDON E1 4NS, UK

*Email address:* m.hosseini@qmul.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY, TEHRAN, IRAN

*Email address:* hamed.yahyaoghli@modares.ac.ir