

# ENTROPY FOR $k$ -TREES DEFINED BY $k$ TRANSITION MATRICES

ANDRESSA PAOLA CORDEIRO, ALEXANDRE TAVARES BARAVIERA AND ALEX JENARO BECKER

ABSTRACT. In this work we consider Markov tree-shifts given by  $k$  transition matrices, one for each of its  $k$  directions. We analyse some topological properties introduced by [3] in order to answer some of the questions raised by those authors. Moreover, we provide a method to characterize the complexity function for Markov tree-shifts; this function is used to calculate the tree entropies defined by [10] and [4]. We compare both entropies in order to determine some of its properties. Finally, the characterization of the complexity function is used to calculate the entropy of all binary Markov tree-shifts over the alphabet  $\{0, 1\}$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\Sigma_d$  be the full shift on the one-dimensional space of sequences  $x = (x_n)_{n \geq 0}$  over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d - 1\}$ . From a certain point of view, shifts on trees are a natural generalization of  $\Sigma_d$ : given  $x \in \Sigma_d$ , there is only one possible “forward” position at any  $x_n$ . Now, fix an integer  $k > 1$  and allow each position to be followed along one of  $k$  directions. This is basically what a  $k$ -tree over  $\mathcal{A}$  represents. This structure is, for example, a branch of research in the context of machine learning and  $k$ -ary decision languages. See [9] and references therein.

Since the works of Aubrun and Béal [1, 2], shifts on trees has received substantial attention. Ban and Chang [4] and Petersen and Salama [10] defined entropies for tree-shifts, that we denote by  $h_{BC}$  and  $h_{PS}$ , respectively, in terms of a complexity function, as a natural generalization of the entropy of  $\Sigma_d$ . Also, in [3], the authors generalized for tree-shifts the concepts of irreducibility, mixing and chaos in the sense of Devaney and provide many results relating those properties.

When it comes to entropy, works as [10, 11, 5, 6, 7] restrict their study to  $k$ -trees whose paths are generated by a shift space  $\Sigma_d$ , called *hom tree-shifts*. In the case that  $\Sigma_d$  is a Markov shift given by a matrix  $M$ , the allowed transitions for trees of the corresponding tree-shift are also given by  $M$ , at any direction. As a consequence, these tree-shifts allow symmetric elements, or, in other words, trees  $t$  that have  $k$  copies of a tree  $t'$  attached to its root.

The entropy of the one-dimensional shift  $\Sigma_M$  whose allowed transitions are given in terms of a  $0, 1$  irreducible matrix  $M$  and the corresponding tree-shift  $\mathcal{T}_M$  has the same entropy  $h_{PS}$  if and only if, the sum of all rows of  $M$  is the same [5]. An irreducible  $M$  is also important to prove that the entropy of  $\mathcal{T}_M$  can be more than the maximum between the entropy of its corresponding irreducible blocks [6], while in dimension the equality holds.

In this work, we consider tree-shifts such that each node has  $k$  descendants, called  $k$ -trees, given by  $k$  possibly different  $d \times d$  matrices of zeros and ones. Here,  $d$  is the cardinality of the alphabet. To see that there are  $k$ -trees given by different matrices that cannot be associated to tree-shifts given by a single matrix, the reader is invited to analyse, for example, the binary three-shift  $X_{20} = (D, E)$  defined in Section 3.

The purpose of this text is to consider some topological properties of Markov  $k$ -trees, as well as construct a method to calculate its characteristic function  $p(n)$ , inspired in [10]. Also, we prove some relations and differences between  $h_{BC}$  and  $h_{PS}$  and calculate those entropies for some examples. The main importance of those examples is not only to understand our algorithm to determine entropies, but also complement the work of Ban and Chang [4], where the authors

proposed four open problems, two of them relating entropy and topological properties of tree-shifts.

Although the interest in dealing with more general tree-shifts is clear, it is not natural how to associate them to shifts in one dimension, as in hom Markov tree-shifts, if we consider different matrices. In many cases, if we analyse only the allowed words of length 2 (or any length), disregarding the direction where it is possible, we obtain the full shift of dimension 1. Again, this aspect can be seen in  $X_{20}$ , once the words 00, 01, 10, 11 are allowed in at least one of both directions.

This work is organized as follows. The main definitions are presented in Section 2. In Section 3 we follow the work of Ban and Chang [3] to generalize the definitions of irreducibility, mixing and chaos in the sense of Devaney in order to classify under these properties all the binary tree-shifts over the binary alphabet. Then, we present an algorithm to calculate the complexity function that allows us to determine the entropy of a tree-shift in Section 4. The next section is dedicated to compare the entropies proposed by Ban and Chang [4] and Petersen and Salama [10] and, in Section 6, we give upper and lower bounds for the entropy  $h_{PS}$ . Finally, in Section 7, we calculate the entropy of the tree-shifts presented in Section 3 in order to understand how our algorithm works and answer some questions that appeared in [3].

## 2. NOTATION AND MAIN DEFINITIONS

Let  $\Sigma = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$  be the set of the  $k$  generators of the free monoid  $\Sigma^*$  with the operation of concatenation whose elements are the finite words of any length and the empty word  $\epsilon$ , and let  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$  be a finite alphabet. A *labeled  $k$ -tree*  $t$ , or simply  *$k$ -tree*, is a map from  $\Sigma^*$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ . A word of  $\Sigma^*$  is called a *node* of a tree  $t$  and  $\epsilon$  corresponds to its root. Each node  $x \in \Sigma^*$  has children  $xi$ , with  $i \in \Sigma$ . If  $x$  is a node of the tree  $t$ , we denote  $t(x)$  by  $t_x$ , corresponding to the label at node  $x$  of  $t$ . We define  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  as the set  $\mathcal{A}^{\Sigma^*}$  of all  $k$ -trees on  $\mathcal{A}$ . In particular, if  $k = 2$  we call  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  a *binary tree*.

For  $t, t' \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  we define the metric  $d(t, t) = 0$  and  $d(t, t') = \frac{1}{2^n}$  otherwise, where  $n$  is the length of the shortest word  $x$  in  $\Sigma^*$  such that  $t_x \neq t'_x$ . This metric induces in  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  a topology equivalent to the usual product topology, which guarantees that  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  is a compact set. For each  $i \in \Sigma$ , define the  *$i$ -th shift*  $\sigma_i(t)$  from  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  to itself as the tree rooted at the  $i$ -th child of  $t$ , that is,  $\sigma_i(t)_x = t_{ix}$  for all  $x \in \Sigma^*$ . The compact metric space  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  equipped with the maps  $\sigma_i$  is called the *full tree-shift* over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

A *block of length  $n$* , denoted by  $\Delta_n = \cup_{i=0}^n \Sigma^i$ , is the initial subtree of height  $n$  of a tree in  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $n \geq 0$ . It has a total of  $\frac{k^{n+1}-1}{k-1}$  nodes and every node of its last level has length  $n$ . A *tree-subshift*  $X$  of  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A})$  is the set  $X_{\mathcal{F}}$  of all trees that do not contain any block of a set of *forbidden blocks*  $\mathcal{F}$ . Notice that, in this case,  $\sigma_i(X) \subset X$  for each  $i \in \Sigma$ . A block is *allowed* or *admissible* if it is not forbidden. If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a finite set, we say that  $X_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a *tree-subshift of finite type* and we can assume that all of its blocks have the same length. If this length is one, we call  $X_{\mathcal{F}}$  a *Markov tree-subshift*, and the allowed transitions can be established by at most  $k$  binary matrices  $d \times d$  for some  $d \geq 2$ , i.e. matrices whose entries are 0 or 1. It is convenient to refer tree-subshifts simply as tree-shifts.

Denote the set of all allowed blocks of length  $m$  by  $\mathcal{L}_m(X)$ . Fix  $t \in X$  and  $m$  a nonnegative integer, and define  $\phi : \mathcal{L}_m(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'$ , where  $\mathcal{A}'$  is a finite alphabet, such that  $b(x) \in \mathcal{L}_m(X)$  is the block of length  $m$  of  $t$  rooted at  $x \in \Sigma^*$ . We say that  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}')$  is a  *$m$ -block map* if  $\Phi(t)_x = \phi(b(x))$  for any  $x \in \Sigma^*$  and  $t \in X$ .

Now, suppose that  $X = X_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a tree-shift of finite type such that all blocks of  $\mathcal{F}$  have length  $m$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{L}_m(X)$  is a set of blocks that determine all the trees  $t \in X$ . Therefore, we can construct  $\phi : \mathcal{L}_m(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'$  bijective for an appropriated  $\mathcal{A}'$  and a  $m$ -block map  $\Phi : X \rightarrow Y$ , where  $Y = \Phi(X) \subset \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}')$ . In this case, we say that  $X$  and  $Y$  are *conjugated*. This implies that  $Y$  is a Markov tree-shift of finite type, and it proves the following.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Any tree-shift of finite type consisting of  $k$ -trees, up to an alphabet change by an appropriated  $m$ -block map, is a Markov tree-shift whose allowed blocks can be characterized by matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  with the same dimension.*

In [4] the authors present a different proof of this result in terms of graphs and vertex tree-shifts, however, we decided to follow the definition of conjugation introduced by [1]. When considered as a tree-shift given by matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$ , we denote  $X = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$ .

In order to disregard empty tree-shifts, coming from the lack of possible transition in one of the  $k$  directions or an irrelevant element of the alphabet, we assume that each row and column of  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  has at least one 1.

### 3. TOPOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF TREE SHIFTS

In this section, we aim to classify some tree-shifts accordingly to the definitions of irreducibility, mixing and chaos in the sense of Devaney exposed in [3]. We present these properties for a  $k$ -trees  $X$  over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ .

A  $d \times d$  matrix  $A$  with nonnegative entries is said to be *irreducible* if, for every pair  $i, j = 1, \dots, d$  there exists  $n \geq 1$  such that  $A^n(i, j) > 0$ . If there exists  $n$  satisfying this property for all  $i, j$ , then  $A$  is called *primitive*. Also, given  $x = x_1, \dots, x_n \in \Sigma^*$ , we denote  $A_x = A_{x_1} \cdots A_{x_n}$  and  $\sigma_x = \sigma_{x_n} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{x_1}$ .

A subset of words  $P \subset \Sigma^*$  is called a *prefix set* if does not exist  $x, y \in P$  and  $w \in \Sigma^*$  such that  $x = yw$ . The length of the longest word in  $P$ ,  $|P|$ , is said to be the length of  $P$ . If every word  $x \in \Sigma^*$  with length bigger than  $|P|$  has a prefix in  $P$ , we call  $P$  a *complete prefix set* (CPS).

We say that  $X$  is *irreducible* if, for each pair of allowed blocks  $u$  and  $v$  with length  $n$ , there are  $t \in X$  and a complete prefix set  $P$  whose words has length at least  $n$ , in such a way that  $u$  is the block of  $t$  rooted at  $\epsilon$  and, for each  $x \in P$ ,  $v$  is the block of  $t$  with root at  $x$ .

The tree-shift  $X$  is *mixing* if there are  $P_0, \dots, P_{d-1}$  complete prefix sets with the property that, given  $u$  and  $v$  allowed blocks in  $X$  with  $|u| = n > 0$ , there is  $t \in X$  such that  $u$  is the block of  $t$  rooted at  $\epsilon$  and  $v$  is the block of  $t$  rooted at  $wx$ , for all  $x \in P_{w_n}$ , where  $w = w_1 \cdots w_n \in \Sigma^n$ . Here,  $wx$  represents the concatenation of the words  $w$  and  $x$ . We also denote by  $w = z^j$  the concatenation of  $z \in \Sigma^*$   $j$  times. By definition, mixing implies irreducibility.

Now we want to define chaos in the sense of Devaney using the notation of tree-shifts. A *periodic point* of  $X$  is a tree  $t \in X$  such that  $\sigma_x(t) = t$  for all  $x$  in a CPS  $P$ . Moreover,  $X$  is *topologically transitive* if, given  $U, V \subset X$  open sets, there exists  $x \in \Sigma^*$  such that  $\sigma_x(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$ . We also say that  $X$  has *sensitive dependence on initial conditions* if there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that, given  $t \in X$  and  $V$  a neighborhood of  $t$ , we can find  $t' \in V$  and  $x \in \Sigma^*$  such that  $d(\sigma_x(t), \sigma_x(t')) > \delta$ .

Finally, we define  $X$  as *chaotic* (in the sense of Devaney) if

- a. periodic points are dense in  $X$ ;
- b.  $X$  is topologically transitive;
- c.  $X$  has sensitive dependence on initial conditions.

As pointed by Ban and Chang, since every tree-shift consisted by trees that are not all fixed points is expanding,  $X$  has sensitive dependence on initial conditions, what makes item c. redundant.

In [3], the authors proved a number of conditions to determine whether a tree-shift is irreducible or mixing, among which three will be needed to our purpose. The first is Corollary 3.10, presented bellow.

**Corollary 3.1.** *Suppose  $X$  is a tree-shift.*

- a. *If  $X$  is an irreducible tree-shift of finite type, then  $X$  is chaotic;*
- b. *If  $X$  is mixing, then  $X$  is chaotic.*

The following result is an extension of Theorem 4.3 from [3], once the authors considered only binary tree-shifts. Moreover, our text is slightly different from the original, since it was presented in terms of graph representation. Nevertheless, its essential implications are preserved and the proof is done analogously as in the original.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Suppose  $X = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  is a tree-shift.*

- a. *If  $X$  is irreducible, then  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  are irreducible;*
- b.  *$X$  is irreducible if and only if for each pair  $i, j \in \mathcal{A}$  there exists a CPS  $P$  such that  $A_x(i, j) > 0$  for all  $x \in P$ ;*
- c.  *$X$  is mixing if and only if there exists a CPS  $P$  such that  $A_x(i, j) > 0$  for all  $x \in P$  and  $i, j \in \mathcal{A}$ .*

We also extend the first two items of Corollary 4.4 of [3] to  $k$ -trees.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Consider  $X = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  a tree-shift consisting of  $k$ -trees.*

- a. *If  $A_1 = \dots = A_k = A$ , then  $X$  is irreducible if and only if  $A$  is irreducible;*
- b. *If  $A_1 = \dots = A_k = A$ , then  $X$  is mixing if and only if  $A$  is primitive.*

With these results, we now classify all the binary tree-shifts over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$  whose matrices has no row or column with all entries equal to zero. With this purpose, consider the following matrices:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

**Remark 1.** *The matrices  $B$ ,  $E$  and  $G$  are not irreducible,  $C$  is irreducible but not primitive and  $A$ ,  $D$  and  $F$  are primitive.*

We establish the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= (A, A), & X_2 &= (A, B), & X_3 &= (A, C), & X_4 &= (A, D), & X_5 &= (A, E), \\ X_6 &= (A, F), & X_7 &= (A, G), & X_8 &= (B, B), & X_9 &= (B, C), & X_{10} &= (B, D), \\ X_{11} &= (B, E), & X_{12} &= (B, F), & X_{13} &= (B, G), & X_{14} &= (C, C), & X_{15} &= (C, D), \\ X_{16} &= (C, E), & X_{17} &= (C, F), & X_{18} &= (C, G), & X_{19} &= (D, D), & X_{20} &= (D, E), \\ X_{21} &= (D, F), & X_{22} &= (D, G), & X_{23} &= (E, E), & X_{24} &= (E, F), & X_{25} &= (E, G), \\ & & X_{26} &= (F, F), & X_{27} &= (F, G), & X_{28} &= (G, G), \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3.4.** *If  $X$  is defined by at least one of the matrices  $B$ ,  $E$  or  $G$ , then  $X$  is not irreducible.*

*Proof.* The proof is immediate by the counterpositive of Theorem 3.2, since the presented matrices are not irreducible.  $\square$

Examples 4.5 and 4.12 of [3] prove that  $X_4$  is mixing and  $X_{21}$  is irreducible. The next result analyse the remaining cases.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Consider the matrices  $A - G$  defined above.*

- i. *Tree-shifts  $X_1, X_6, X_{19}$  and  $X_{26}$  are mixing;*
- ii. *The tree-shifts  $X_3, X_{14}, X_{15}, X_{17}$  and  $X_{21}$  are irreducible but not mixing.*

*Proof.* By Remark 1,  $A$ ,  $D$  and  $F$  are primitive, then the tree-shifts  $X_1, X_{19}$  and  $X_{26}$  are mixing by Corollary 3.3. Also, considering the CPS  $P = \{0, 10, 11\}$ ,  $X_6$  is mixing by Theorem 3.2, since

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad FA = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad FF = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To prove that the tree-shifts presented in item ii. are irreducible we use Theorem 3.2, except for  $X_{14}$ , which is irreducible but not mixing by Corollary 3.3. For  $X_3$  we can consider the

complete prefix sets  $P = \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$  and  $\tilde{P} = \{0, 1\}$ . Taking  $i, j = 1, 2$ , for all  $x \in P$  we get  $A_x(i, i) > 0$  and, for all  $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{P}$  we obtain  $A_{\tilde{x}}(i, j) > 0$ ,  $i \neq j$ . It implies that  $X_3$  is irreducible. The same  $P$  and  $\tilde{P}$  work for the other cases.

It remains to prove that tree-shifts  $X_3, X_{15}, X_{17}$  and  $X_{21}$  are not mixing. We prove this to  $X_{21}$  and argument how a similar idea is used in the remaining cases. First, notice that, if there exists a CPS  $P$  satisfying Theorem 3.2, then  $0, 1 \notin P$ , since both matrices  $D$  and  $F$  have zero entries. We claim that neither element of the form  $x = (01)^j$  or  $y = (01)^j 0$  can be in  $P$ . In fact, for  $x = 01$  and  $y = 010$ ,

$$A_x = DF = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_y = DFD = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now, it is not difficult to see that, for  $x = (01)^j$ , with  $j \geq 1$ , if  $A_x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , then

$$A_{x0} = A_x D = \begin{pmatrix} c+1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{x01} = A_x DF = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c+2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

We then conclude that there is no complete prefix set  $P$  for  $X_{21}$  such that  $A_x(i, j) > 0$  for all  $i, j = 1, 2$  and all  $x \in P$ .

For the remaining tree-shifts it is sufficient to notice that  $C^{2n} = B$  and  $C^{2n+1} = C$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , therefore, there is no  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $C^N(i, j) > 0$  for all  $i, j$ .  $\square$

Finally, we determine the tree-shifts that are chaotic in the sense of Devaney. By Corollary 3.1 and Proposition 3.5 it is immediate that  $X_1, X_4, X_6, X_{19}$  and  $X_{26}$  are chaotic. The other cases are presented in the next result.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $X$  be a tree-shift. If  $X$  is defined by at least one of the matrices  $B, E$  or  $G$ , then  $X$  is not chaotic. Furthermore, the tree-shifts  $X_3, X_{14}, X_{15}, X_{17}$  and  $X_{21}$  are chaotic.*

*Proof.* We will show that periodic points are not dense in  $X_2$ , and the argument can be easily extended to the remaining cases defined by matrices  $B, E$  or  $G$ . Fix  $t \in X$  such that  $t_\epsilon = 0$  and  $t_a = 1$ . The restrictions imposed by  $B$  forces  $t_{ab^n} = 1$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Consequently, there is no periodic point  $t' \in X$  such that  $d(t, t') < 1/2$ , since there is needed for  $t'$  to have  $t'_{ab^n} = t_\epsilon = 0$  for some  $n \geq 1$ .

By the fact that  $X_{14}$  have only two points, both periodic, it is immediate that  $X_{14}$  is chaotic. We prove the density of periodic points and existence of dense orbit to  $X_3$ , and the remaining cases go straightforward using the same arguments.

Given  $t \in X_3$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we prove that there exists  $t' \in X_3$  periodic such that  $d(t, t') \leq 1/2^n$ . Consider  $\Delta_n$  the block of length  $n$  in  $t$  whose root coincides with  $t_\epsilon$ , and let it be the block of  $t'$  in the root  $t'_\epsilon$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $t_\epsilon = 0$ , and consider  $x \in \Sigma^*$  a node with  $|x| = n$ . If  $t'_x = 0$ , make your  $n$ -descendants coincide with  $\Delta_n$  in such a way that  $(\sigma_x t')_y = t'_y$  for all  $y \in \Sigma^*$  with  $|y| \leq n$ . In other words, attach  $\Delta_n$  in  $t'_x = 0$ . In the case that  $t'_x = 1$ , put  $t'_{xa} = t'_{xb} = 0$  and repeat the construction above for these nodes. By this process,  $t'$  is a periodic point, since  $\sigma_x t' = t'$  for all  $x \in P$ , where  $P$  is the CPS constituted by the points  $x$  such that  $|x| = n$  and  $t_x = 0$  and  $\tilde{x}$  with  $|\tilde{x}| = n + 1$  such that  $\tilde{x} = ya$  or  $\tilde{x} = yb$  and  $t_y = 1$ .

Finally, we prove that  $X_3$  is topologically transitive showing that it has a dense orbit. For  $i = 1, 2$  and  $n \geq 1$ , denote by  $B_{2n}(i)$  the set of all allowed blocks of  $X_3$  of length  $2n$  starting on  $i$  and notice that each element of this set has  $i$  on the node  $b^{2n}$ . We construct a dense orbit in the following way, similarly to the shift in the sequences: let  $t \in X_3$  be a tree such that  $t_\epsilon = t_a = t_{bb} = 0$  and  $t_b = t_{ab} = 1$ . Then, attach a block of  $B_2(0)$  on node  $bb$ , another block of this set on  $bbbb$ , and so on, until all blocks of  $B_2(0)$  are attached in a node of the form  $b^{2i}$ , without repeating blocks. In this way, the rightmost node of the last level of an allowed block coincides with the root of the “next” allowed block attached. Then, continue this process with the blocks of  $B_4(0), B_6(0)$ , and so on.

We repeat the same idea to blocks starting on 1: on node  $ab$ , attach a block of  $B_2(1)$ , then, on  $ab^3$ , attach a second block, and continue this process as mentioned before. One can complete the remaining nodes of  $t$  with any allowed configuration.

Therefore, we obtain a tree  $t$  on  $X_3$  in such a way that all allowed blocks of even length appears in  $t$ , as well as the allowed blocks of length odd, since any block of length  $2n - 1$  is contained in a block of length  $2n$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** *By the proof of Proposition 3.6, we see that tree-shifts defined by at least one matrix with zeros in all entries of a row except from the entry on the diagonal does not have dense periodic points, therefore, are not chaotic.*

Below, we summarize the properties proved in this section, where each  $r$  correspond to the tree-shift  $X_r$ .

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
irreducible	✓	x	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	✓
mixing	✓	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
chaotic	✓	x	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	✓
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
irreducible	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
mixing	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
chaotic	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x

As mentioned before, the main importance of these examples is not only to understand the definitions presented in a considerable number of tree-shifts, but also complement the work of Ban and Chang, in which this Section was inspired. This is done at the end of Section 7.

#### 4. CHARACTERIZATION OF THE COMPLEXITY FUNCTION

In this section we analyze the complexity function of tree-shifts consisting of  $k$ -trees, what demands a way of counting the number of configurations with a certain amount of levels. Following [10] we use a recursive method to obtain this number, that is indeed a dynamical system.

Let  $X$  be a tree-shift over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d - 1\}$  and define  $p$  the *complexity function* of  $X$  as  $p(n) = \#\mathcal{L}_n(X)$ ,  $n \geq 0$ . In other words,  $p(n)$  is the number of allowed blocks of length  $n$  of trees in  $X$ . This function is essential to determine the entropy of  $X$ , since it is defined by Ban and Chang [4] and Petersen and Salama [10], respectively, by

$$h_{BC}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log p(n)}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad h_{PS}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log p(n)}{1 + k + \dots + k^n}.$$

We present a function  $f$  and relate its  $n$ -th iterate to  $p(n)$  to provide a method to calculate  $h_{BC}$  and  $h_{PS}$  in the case where  $X$  is a Markov tree-shift.

From now on, we suppose that  $X$  is given by the matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$ . Define a dynamical system  $f : \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$  by the equation

$$f(x) = (A_1 x) * (A_2 x) \dots * (A_k x),$$

where  $*$  denotes the product  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) * (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d) = (x_1 y_1, x_2 y_2, \dots, x_d y_d)$ . Hence,

$$(1) \quad f(x)_i = (A_1 x)_i \dots (A_k x)_i = \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_1)_{ij} x_j \right) \dots \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_k)_{ij} x_j \right),$$

where  $f(x)_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th coordinate of  $f(x)$ . Moreover, given a positive real number  $\lambda$ , it is easy to see that  $f(\lambda x) = \lambda^k f(x)$ , showing that this is an homogeneous function of degree  $k$ .

Now consider the equivalence classes defined by the straight lines passing through the origin: we identify the vectors  $x$  and  $y$  if there exists some positive  $\lambda$  such that  $x = \lambda y$ . Since  $f$  is homogeneous it preserves the equivalence classes and we can see what is done by the dynamics of  $f$  on the quotient space. In this space, for  $x_d \neq 0$ , we can use the change of coordinates  $\eta_i = \frac{x_i}{x_d}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , and for  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-1}, 1)$  we define  $N : \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $F : \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$  by

$$N(\eta) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_1)_{dj} \eta_j \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_2)_{dj} \eta_j \right) \cdots \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_k)_{dj} \eta_j \right)$$

and

$$F(\eta)_i = \frac{f(x)_i}{f(x)_d} = \frac{\left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_1)_{ij} \eta_j \right) \cdots \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_k)_{ij} \eta_j \right)}{N(\eta)},$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Notice that  $F(\eta) = (F(\eta)_1, \dots, F(\eta)_{d-1}, 1)$  by definition. We then obtain, for  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ ,

$$f(x) = f(x_d \eta) = x_d^k N(\eta) F(\eta),$$

and, inductively, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$f^n(x) = f^n(x_d \eta) = x_d^{k^n} N(\eta)^{k^{n-1}} N(F(\eta))^{k^{n-2}} N(F^2(\eta))^{k^{n-3}} \cdots N(F^{n-1}(\eta)) F^n(\eta).$$

Considering the initial condition as  $x_1 = \dots = x_d = 1$ , we get  $\eta_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and

$$(2) \quad f^n(\mathbb{1}) = N(\mathbb{1})^{k^{n-1}} N(F(\mathbb{1}))^{k^{n-2}} \cdots N(F^{n-1}(\mathbb{1})) F^n(\mathbb{1}),$$

where  $\mathbb{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ .

The following result uses arguments inspired in Theorem 1.6 of [4] to prove how the iterates of  $f$  are useful to determine the complexity function of a tree-shift  $X$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *For all  $n \geq 1$  we have  $p(n) = \|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| := \sum_{j=1}^d f^n(\mathbb{1})_j$ , where  $f^n$  is given in equation (2).*

*Proof.* First, we calculate the number of blocks of length 1 with root  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ . Identify the leftmost child of the block as the first child and so on, until the rightmost child, considered the  $k$ -th child. The number of possible labels to the  $j$ -th child is given by the sum of the  $i$ -th row of  $A_j$ . So, multiplying the possibilities for all  $k$  children, we obtain the number of allowed blocks of length 1 with root  $i$  as

$$(A_1 \mathbb{1})_i \cdots (A_k \mathbb{1})_i = \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_1)_{ij} \right) \cdots \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_k)_{ij} \right) = f(\mathbb{1})_i,$$

and it implies that  $\|f(\mathbb{1})\| = p(1)$ .

Analogously, one can calculate the number of allowed blocks of length  $n+1$  with root  $i$  by relating the number of allowed blocks of length 1 starting on  $i$  and the number of allowed blocks of length  $n$  as follows. Let  $\delta_{ij}^m = 1$  if  $i$  can be followed by  $j$  on the  $m$ -th children and  $\delta_{ij}^m = 0$  otherwise,  $1 \leq m \leq k$ , and denote by  $B_n(j)$  the number of allowed blocks of length  $n$  starting on  $j$ . So, the number of allowed blocks of length  $n+1$  starting on  $i$  is

$$B_{n+1}(i) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \delta_{ij}^1 B_n(j) \right) \cdots \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \delta_{ij}^k B_n(j) \right).$$

Now, suppose that, for some  $n \geq 1$ ,  $B_n(j) = f^n(\mathbb{1})_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Since  $\delta_{ij}^m = (A_m)_{ij}$ , by equation (2) we get

$$B_{n+1}(i) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_1)_{ij} f^n(\mathbb{1})_j \right) \cdots \left( \sum_{j=1}^d (A_k)_{ij} f^n(\mathbb{1})_j \right) = f(f^n(\mathbb{1}))_i = f^{n+1}(\mathbb{1})_i.$$

Thereby, since it is true for  $n = 1$ , the proof of  $\|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| = p(n)$  for all  $n \geq 1$  follows by induction.  $\square$

By Proposition 4.1, we can write the definitions of entropy presented as

$$h_{BC}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log \|f^n(\mathbb{1})\|}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad h_{PS}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|f^n(\mathbb{1})\|}{1 + k + \cdots + k^n}.$$

**Remark 3.** One could choose any  $1 \leq \ell < d$  to define the change of coordinates  $\tilde{\eta}_i = x_i/x_\ell$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $x_\ell \neq 0$ , and the corresponding functions  $\tilde{N}$  and  $\tilde{F}$  to obtain a different but equivalent expression to  $f^n(1)$ .

**Remark 4.** Two Markov tree-shifts that are the same up to a change of alphabet have the same complexity function, and, consequently, the same entropy  $h_{BC}$  and  $h_{PS}$ . Also, tree-shifts determined by the same matrices, but in different order, have the same entropy.

## 5. COMPARING THE ENTROPIES $h_{BC}$ AND $h_{PS}$ FOR TREE-SHIFTS

In this section, we aim to show that  $h_{PS}$  is not preserved by conjugation and give a characterization to the relation between the entropy of a tree-shift of finite type and its conjugated Markov tree-shift. Moreover, we give upper bounds to both definitions of entropy in the general case in relation to  $k$  and  $d$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *The entropy  $h_{PS}$  is not a topological invariant.*

*Proof.* Consider  $X = X_{\mathcal{F}}$  a tree-shift of finite type consisting of  $k$ -trees and  $s$  the length of all forbidden blocks of  $\mathcal{F}$ , which means that all allowed blocks of  $X$  can be described in terms of a finite set  $D$  consisted by blocks of length  $s$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}' = \{0, \dots, |D| - 1\}$  be an alphabet and  $Y \subset \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}')$  the Markov tree-shift such that  $\Phi : X \rightarrow Y$  is a conjugation defined by a bijection  $\phi : D \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'$ . Denote by  $p_X$  and  $p_Y$  the complexity functions of  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. Notice that, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$p_X(n + s) = p_Y(n),$$

hence, using the relation  $1 + k + \cdots + k^n = (k^{n+1} - 1)/(k - 1)$  and since  $Y$  also consists of  $k$ -trees, we get

$$h_{PS}(Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k-1}{k^{n+1}} \log p_Y(n) = k^s \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k-1}{k^{n+s+1}} \log p_X(n + s) = k^s h_{PS}(X).$$

Whenever  $h_{PS}(X) \neq 0$  we have  $h_{PS}(X) \neq h_{PS}(Y)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.** *Aubrun and Béal presented in [1] an example of conjugacy showing that  $\phi$  needs not to be bijective. However, it is not clear how to calculate the entropy  $h_{PS}$  of the resultant tree-shift in their case or even how to connect their entropies.*

We now establish a difference between  $h_{BC}$  and  $h_{PS}$  in regard to their upper bonds.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $X$  be a tree-shift consisting of  $k$ -trees over  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ . Then*

$$0 \leq h_{PS}(X) \leq \log d \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq h_{BC}(X) \leq \log k.$$

*Also, whenever  $h_{PS}(X) > 0$ , we obtain  $h_{BC}(X) = \log k$ .*



*Proof.* Suppose  $X$  is given by the matrices

$$A_1 = A_2 = \dots = A_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,  $(F^n(\varphi))_i = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq d$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $N(\varphi) = (\varphi_1 + \dots + \varphi_{d-1} + 1)^k$ , what implies that  $N(F^n(\mathbb{1})) = d^k$  for all  $n$ . In consequence,

$$\|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| = d^{k^n} d^{k^{n-1}} \dots d^k d.$$

So, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{PS}(X) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 + k + \dots + k^n} \log(d^{k^n} d^{k^{n-1}} d^{k^{n-2}} \dots d^k d) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1 + k + \dots + k^n}{1 + k + \dots + k^n} \log d \right) \\ &= \log d \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h_{BC}(X) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \log(d^{k^n} d^{k^{n-1}} \dots d^k d) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log((k^n + k^{n-1} + \dots + 1) \log d) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left( \frac{k^{n+1} - 1}{k - 1} \log d \right) \\ &= \log k. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the tree-shift  $X$  has the maximal entropy in both cases since the matrices considered generate the maximal number of allowed blocks of length 1, or, in other words, any tree-shift over the same alphabet as  $X$  is a restriction of  $X$ , and consequently, has at most the same number of allowed blocks of length  $n$  as  $X$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now, suppose that  $X$  is a tree-shift such that

$$h_{PS}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k-1}{k^{n+1}} \log \|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| = \log c > 0.$$

Then, by properties of limits, for any sufficient large  $n$  there exists  $\varepsilon_n \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\log \|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| = \frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1} (\log c + \varepsilon_n)$$

and  $|\varepsilon_n| \rightarrow 0$ . So, we get

$$\log \|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| = \log \left( c^{\frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1}} e^{\frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1} \varepsilon_n} \right).$$

Consequently, for  $n$  sufficiently large we can write

$$\|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| = c^{\frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1}} e^{\frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1} \varepsilon_n},$$

what implies that

$$h_{BC}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \log \left( c^{\frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1}} e^{\frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1} \varepsilon_n} \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left( \frac{k^{n+1}}{k-1} (\varepsilon_n + \log c) \right) = \log k.$$

□

By Proposition 5.2,  $h_{BC}$  is a topological invariant for tree-shifts with positive  $h_{PS}$ . However, this property is not interesting in the sense that all of these tree-shifts have the same entropy  $h_{BC}$ . It implies that, possibly, the richness of  $h_{BC}$  is showed by tree-shifts with zero  $h_{PS}$ .

6. UPPER AND LOWER BOUNDS FOR THE ENTROPY  $h_{PS}$  OF MARKOV TREE-SHIFTS

In the previous section we presented an upper bound for the entropy  $h_{PS}$  of any tree-shift. In this section, we consider a tree-shift of the form  $X = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  to provide another upper bound and a lower bound depending on the matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$ .

First, we fix the vector norm

$$\|v\|_m = \|(v_1, \dots, v_d)\| = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} |v_i|$$

and the corresponding operator norm  $\|\cdot\|_{op}$  for the matrices, defined as

$$\|M\|_{op} = \sup_{\|v\|_m=1} \|Mv\|_m.$$

It is easy to see that if  $M$  has non-negative entries then this norm corresponds to the maximum among the sum of the elements in each row of the matrix  $M$ . Considering these norms, we get the following result:

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $X = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  be a tree-shift over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ . Then,*

$$h_{PS}(X) \leq \frac{1}{k}(\log d + \log \|A_1\|_{op} + \dots + \log \|A_k\|_{op}).$$

*Proof.* For a point  $x$  with non-negative entries we have

$$|(A_i x)_j| \leq \|A_i\|_{op} \|x\|_m.$$

Hence, by the definition of  $f$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(\mathbb{1})\| &= |(A_1 \mathbb{1})_1| |(A_2 \mathbb{1})_1| \dots |(A_k \mathbb{1})_1| + \dots + |(A_1 \mathbb{1})_d| |(A_2 \mathbb{1})_d| \dots |(A_k \mathbb{1})_d| \\ &\leq d \|A_1\|_{op} \|\mathbb{1}\|_m \|A_2\|_{op} \|\mathbb{1}\|_m \dots \|A_k\|_{op} \|\mathbb{1}\|_m \\ &= d \|A_1\|_{op} \|A_2\|_{op} \dots \|A_k\|_{op}. \end{aligned}$$

By iterating  $f$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we get

$$\|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| \leq d^{1+k+\dots+k^{n-1}} \|A_1\|_{op}^{1+k+\dots+k^{n-1}} \dots \|A_k\|_{op}^{1+k+\dots+k^{n-1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{PS}(X) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1+k+\dots+k^n} \log \|f^n(\mathbb{1})\| \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1+k+\dots+k^{n-1}} (\log d + \log \|A_1\|_{op} + \dots + \log \|A_k\|_{op}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k^n - 1}{k^{n+1} - 1} (\log d + \log \|A_1\|_{op} + \dots + \log \|A_k\|_{op}) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} (\log d + \log \|A_1\|_{op} + \dots + \log \|A_k\|_{op}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Using Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 6.1, we obtain, for  $X = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ ,

$$(3) \quad h_{PS}(X) \leq \min\{\log d, (\log d + \log \|A_1\|_{op} + \dots + \log \|A_k\|_{op})/k\}.$$

**Example 6.2.** *Consider  $X$  the tree-shift given by the matrices*

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2, \dots, A_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

*By Theorem 6.1,*

$$h_{PS}(X) \leq \frac{\log 2 + \log 2 + 4 \log 1}{5} = \frac{2}{5} \log 2 < \log 2,$$

*what shows that, in this case, Theorem 6.1 provides a better upper bound for the entropy than Proposition 5.2. However, if all  $A_1, \dots, A_5$  had norm 2, the upper bound given by Theorem 6.1 would be  $\frac{6}{5} \log 2$ , so, in this case, Proposition 5.2 would be more suitable.*

We can also provide a lower bound for a Markov tree-shift in terms of its matrices depending on another Markov tree-shift. For this purpose, we write  $A \geq B$  for  $A, B$   $d \times d$  matrices if  $A_{ij} \geq B_{ij}$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ .

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $X = (A_1, A_2)$  and  $Y = (A_1, A_3)$  be binary tree-shifts. If  $A_2 \geq A_3$ , then  $h_{PS}(X) \geq h_{PS}(Y)$ .*

*Proof.* In fact,  $f_X(\mathbb{1})_i \geq f_Y(\mathbb{1})_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq d$  by definition, and the inequality is preserved by the iterates of these functions. Consequently,

$$h_{PS}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|f_X^n(\mathbb{1})\|}{1 + k + \dots + k^n} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|f_Y^n(\mathbb{1})\|}{1 + k + \dots + k^n} = h_{PS}(Y).$$

□

**Remark 6.** *Using repeatedly Proposition 6.3, one can prove that, if  $X = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  and  $Y = (B_1, \dots, B_k)$  are tree-shifts with  $d \times d$  matrices such that  $A_i \geq B_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , then  $h_{PS}(X) \geq h_{PS}(Y)$ . In particular, if  $h_{PS}(Y) > 0$ , we can guarantee that  $h_{PS}(X) > 0$ .*

*Now, suppose that  $A_i \geq M$  for some irreducible  $M$  and define  $Z$  the tree-shift whose all  $k$  transitions are given by  $M$ . Then, by [10, 11] and our previous argument, we get*

$$h_{PS}(X) \geq h_{PS}(Z) \geq h_{top}(\Sigma_M),$$

where  $\Sigma_M$  is the one-dimension Markov subshift given by  $M$ .

We also have the following

**Proposition 6.4.** *Let  $X$  be a tree-shift over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$  given by matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  and suppose that the maximal row sum of each  $A_i$  is 1. Then  $h_{PS}(X) = h_{BC}(X) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows noticing that  $p(n) = d$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . □

## 7. THE ENTROPY OF ALL BINARY TREE-SHIFTS OVER THE ALPHABET $\{0, 1\}$

In this section our aim is to use the expression of  $f^n(\mathbb{1})$ , given in equation (2), and Proposition 4.1 to calculate the entropy of some examples, namely all binary tree-shifts over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$  whose matrices has no row or column with all entries equal to zero. The remaining cases has trivially zero entropy. Using Propositions 5.2 and 6.4 we can easily find  $h_{BC}$  for each case. Also, we use the results below and Section 3 to answer Problem 3 and partially Problem 4 of [3] at the end of this section.

We first present explicitly the functions  $f$ ,  $F$  and  $N$  for  $k = d = 2$ . For the binary tree-shift  $X = (P, Q)$ , we have

$$f(x) = (Px) * (Qx)$$

and, using the coordinates  $\eta_i = \frac{x_i}{x_2}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $x \neq 0$ , we get

$$N(\eta) = (P_{21}\eta_1 + P_{22})(Q_{21}\eta_1 + Q_{22})$$

and

$$F(\eta)_i = \frac{f(x)_i}{f(x)_2} = \frac{(P_{i1}\eta_1 + P_{i2})(Q_{i1}\eta_1 + Q_{i2})}{N(\eta)}.$$

It is convenient to consider the new coordinates  $\tilde{\eta}_i = x_i/x_1$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $x_1 \neq 0$ , with correspondent functions

$$\tilde{N}(\tilde{\eta}) = (P_{11} + P_{12}\tilde{\eta}_i)(Q_{11} + Q_{12}\tilde{\eta}_i)$$

and

$$\tilde{F}(\tilde{\eta})_i = \frac{f(x)_i}{f(x)_1} = \frac{(P_{i1} + P_{i2}\tilde{\eta}_i)(Q_{i1} + Q_{i2}\tilde{\eta}_i)}{\tilde{N}(\tilde{\eta})}.$$

Hence

$$f^n \left( \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) = N(\mathbb{1})^{2^{n-1}} N(F(\mathbb{1}))^{2^{n-2}} N(F^2(\mathbb{1}))^{2^{n-3}} \dots N(F^{n-1}(\mathbb{1})) \begin{pmatrix} F^n(\mathbb{1})_1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

that is equivalent to

$$f^n \left( \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \tilde{N}(1)^{2^{n-1}} \tilde{N}(\tilde{F}(1))^{2^{n-2}} \tilde{N}(\tilde{F}^2(1))^{2^{n-3}} \dots \tilde{N}(\tilde{F}^{n-1}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \tilde{F}^n(1)_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Remark 7.** *If  $X$  and  $Y$  are two tree-shifts such that the functions  $F$  and  $N$  corresponding to  $X$  coincide with  $\tilde{F}$  and  $\tilde{N}$  corresponding to  $Y$ , by Remark 3 these tree-shifts have the same number of allowed blocks of length  $n$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, since  $d = 2$  it is easy to see that these cases represent the same tree-shift, up to an alphabet change.*

We consider matrices  $A - G$  defined in Section 3 and, in all cases, we omit the subindex of  $\eta_i$ , writing  $\eta$  when referring to both  $\eta_1$  and  $(\eta_1, 1)$  and, in a similar way, we write  $1$  for  $(1, 1)$ . It should not cause confusion when considering the context. Moreover, since  $F(\eta) = (F(\eta)_1, 1)$ , we shall refer to  $F(\eta)_1$  simply as  $F(\eta)$ . Analogous to  $\tilde{\eta}$  and  $\tilde{F}(\tilde{\eta})$ . Finally, denote by  $(\text{Fib}(k))_{k \geq 1} = (1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, \dots)$  the Fibonacci sequence.

In Proposition 5.2 we proved that  $h_{PS}(X_1) = \log 2$ . The remaining cases are studied below.

**7.1. Case 1.**  $X_2 = (A, B)$  and  $X_3 = (A, C)$

For the tree-shift  $X_2$ , we have  $F(\eta) = \eta$  and  $N(\eta) = \eta + 1$ , then  $N(F^j(1)) = 2$  for all  $j \geq 1$ . It implies that

$$\|f^n(1)\| = 2^{2^{n-1}} 2^{2^{n-2}} \dots 2(1+1),$$

and, consequently,  $h_{PS}(X_2) = \frac{1}{2} \log 2$ . By Remark 7,  $X_2$  and  $X_3$  have the same entropy.

**7.2. Case 2.**  $X_4 = (A, D)$  and  $X_6 = (A, F)$

For  $X_4$  we have  $F(\eta) = 1 + 1/\eta$  and  $N(\eta) = \eta(\eta + 1)$ , then

$$F^j(1) = \frac{\text{Fib}(j+2)}{\text{Fib}(j+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad N(F^j(1)) = \frac{\text{Fib}(j+3) \text{Fib}(j+2)}{\text{Fib}(j+1)^2}, \quad j \geq 0.$$

After some simplifications, we obtain, for  $n \geq 3$ ,

$$\|f^n(1)\| = \text{Fib}(3)^{2^{n-1}} \text{Fib}(4)^{2^{n-2}} \text{Fib}(5)^{2^{n-3}} \dots \text{Fib}(n)^{2^2} \text{Fib}(n+1)^2 \text{Fib}(n+2) \text{Fib}(n+3).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{PS}(X_4) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_{\ell=2}^n \frac{1}{2^\ell} \log \text{Fib}(\ell+1) + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log(\text{Fib}(n+2) \text{Fib}(n+3)) \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \log \text{Fib}(n+1). \end{aligned}$$

We were not able to determine the value of  $h_{PS}(X_4)$ , however, it is possible to present some upper and lower bounds for  $h_{PS}$  taking advantage of the fact that we can easily calculate many terms of its series. For the lower bound, we consider

$$h_{PS}(X_4) \geq \sum_{n=2}^5 \frac{1}{2^n} \log \text{Fib}(n+1) = 0,47616 = \log 1,60988.$$

Moreover, since  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{2^n} = 2$  and  $\text{Fib}(n) < 2^n$  for all  $n \geq 7$ , we get, for an upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{PS}(X_4) &= \sum_{n=2}^5 \frac{1}{2^n} \log \text{Fib}(n+1) + \sum_{n=6}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \log \text{Fib}(n+1) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=2}^5 \frac{1}{2^n} \log \text{Fib}(n+1) + \sum_{n=6}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \log 2^{n-2} \\ &\leq 0,47617 + \frac{1}{4} \log 2 \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} \frac{n}{2^n} \leq 0,58448 \approx \log 1,79404. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that these bounds can naturally be improved by considering more terms for the lower bound, which were not our aim here.

By Remark 7,  $X_4$  and  $X_6$  have the same entropy.

**7.3. Case 3.**  $X_5 = (A, E)$  and  $X_7 = (A, G)$

For  $X_5$  we get  $F^j(1) = 1/(j+1)$  and  $N(F^j(1)) = ((j+2)/(j+1))^2$ ,  $j \geq 1$ . Then,

$$\|f^n(1)\| = 2^{2^{n-1}} 3^{2^{n-2}} \cdots n^2(n+1)(n+2),$$

and, since  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \log(x)/2^x = 0$ ,

$$h_{PS}(X_5) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_{\ell=2}^{n+1} \frac{1}{2^\ell} \log \ell + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log(n+1) \right) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \log n.$$

We could not determine the value of  $h_{PS}(X_5)$  from the limit above. However, we use the same approach as in [10]. Consulting the sequence  $(\|f^n(1)\|)_{n \geq 0} = (2, 6, 48, 2880, \dots)$  on the Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences (OEIS) [12], we obtain Sequence A088679, in which  $a_0 = 0$ ,  $a_1 = 1$  and  $a_n = a_{n-1}^2 n / (n-1)$ ,  $n > 1$ . We also get that  $a_n$  is asymptotic to

$$b_n = \gamma^{2^n} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n^2} - \frac{6}{n^3} + \frac{25}{n^4} - \frac{137}{n^5} + \dots \right),$$

where  $\gamma \approx 1, 289066$ , what means that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = 1$ . One can easily show that  $p(n) = a_{n+2}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ , and, since  $0 < \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n^2} - \frac{6}{n^3} + \frac{25}{n^4} - \frac{137}{n^5} + \dots \right) \leq 1$  for all  $n > 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{PS}(X_5) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log p(n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log b_{n+2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log \gamma^{2^{n+2}} \\ &= 2 \log \gamma \approx 0, 507836. \end{aligned}$$

Tree-shifts  $X_5$  and  $X_7$  have the same entropy by Remark 7.

**7.4. Case 4.**  $X_8 = (B, B)$ ,  $X_9 = (B, C)$  and  $X_{14} = (C, C)$

In any case we get  $F^j(1) = 1$  and  $N(F^j(1)) = 1$  for all  $j \geq 1$ . Therefore, the entropy  $h_{PS}$  of any of these systems is zero.

**7.5. Case 5.**  $X_{10} = (B, D)$  and  $X_{12} = (B, F)$

For  $X_{10}$  we have  $F^j(1) = j+1$  and  $N(F^j(1)) = j+1$ . Then,

$$\|f^n(1)\| = 2^{2^{n-2}} 3^{2^{n-3}} \cdots n(n+2),$$

and Case 3 gives  $h_{PS}(X_{10}) = \frac{1}{2} h_{PS}(X_5) = \log \gamma \approx 0, 253918$ . Remark 7 guarantees that  $h_{PS}(X_{10}) = h_{PS}(X_{12})$ .

**7.6. Case 6.**  $X_{11} = (B, E)$  and  $X_{13} = (B, G)$

Consider the tree-shift  $X_{11}$ . We get  $\tilde{N}(\tilde{\eta}) = 1$  and, for any  $j \geq 1$ ,  $\tilde{F}^j(1) = c_j$ , where  $c_1 = 2$  and  $c_j = c_{j-1}(c_{j-1} + 1)$ . Then

$$\|f^n(1)\| = c_n + 1$$

and

$$h_{PS}(X_{11}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log(c_n + 1) := \xi.$$

From OEIS, the sequence  $(c_n)_{n \geq 1} = (2, 6, 42, 1806, \dots)$  coincides with Sequence A007018 and  $c_n$  is the integer directly below the real number  $\theta^{2^n} - 1/2$ , where  $\theta \approx 1, 597910$ . We now prove that  $h_{PS}(X_{11}) = \frac{1}{2} \log \theta$ , and this value is approximately 0, 234348.

Indeed, since

$$c_n - \left( \theta^{2^n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) = \delta_n < 1$$

for each  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\log(c_n + 1) = \log\left(\theta^{2^n} + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_n\right).$$

Also,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \left( \log\left(\theta^{2^n} + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_n\right) - \log \theta^{2^n} \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \left( \log \frac{\theta^{2^n} + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_n}{\theta^{2^n}} \right) = 0,$$

what implies that

$$h_{PS}(X_{11}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log(\theta^{2^n} + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log \theta^{2^n} = \frac{1}{2} \log \theta.$$

We use Remark 7 to guarantee that the entropy of  $X_{11}$  and  $X_{13}$  is the same.

**7.7. Case 7.**  $X_{15} = (C, D)$  and  $X_{17} = (C, F)$

For the tree-shift  $X_{15}$  we obtain  $N(\eta) = \eta^2$  and  $F^j(1) = e_j/e_{j-1}^2$ , where  $e_0 = 1$ ,  $e_1 = 2$  and  $e_j = e_{j-2}^2(e_{j-2}^2 + e_{j-1})$ . Then,

$$\|f^n(1)\| = e_n + e_{n-1}^2$$

and, as a consequence,

$$h_{PS}(X_{15}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log(e_n + e_{n-1}^2) := \alpha.$$

We could not find a reference on OEIS to neither sequence  $(e_n)_{n \geq 0} = (1, 2, 3, 28, 333, 875728, \dots)$  nor  $(\|f^n(1)\|)_{n \geq 1} = (3, 7, 37, 1117, 986617, \dots)$  to obtain a good approximation for the entropy of  $X_{15}$ . However, we can estimate an upper bound to  $h_{PS}$  better than  $\log 2$ , given by equation (3), using the number of allowed blocks of length 2 as follows.

Each configuration on the last level of the allowed blocks of length 1 appears only once. It suggests that the configuration of the last level of a block of any length totally determines it. However, more restrictions appear in regard to blocks of length  $n \geq 2$ , what can be seen by  $\|f^2(1)\| = 7$ ,  $\|f^3(1)\| = 37$  and so on. In particular, it implies that there exist seven different configurations for the last level of a block of length 2. For the reason that one can choose  $2^{n-2}$  blocks of length 2 for the last line of a block of length  $n \geq 2$ , we see that  $7^{2^{n-2}}$  is an upper bound to the number of allowed blocks of length  $n \geq 2$ . Therefore,

$$h_{PS}(X_{15}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log 7^{2^{n-2}} = \frac{1}{8} \log 7.$$

The reader can easily find a more refined upper bound for the entropy using  $\|f^m(1)\|$  for some  $m > 2$  if needed.

Now, to prove that this entropy is positive, we present a (not optimal) lower bound. We can easily see that  $\|f^n(1)\| > 2^{2^{n-1}}$  for  $n = 1, \dots, 4$ . So, supposing that the same works for some  $i \geq 4$ , we find

$$\|f^{i+1}(1)\| = e_{i+1} + e_i^2 > e_{i+1} = e_{i-1}^2(e_{i-1}^2 + e_i) > 2^{2^{i-1}} e_{i-1}^2 > 2^{2^{i-1}} e_{i-1} > 2^{2^{i-1}} 2^2 = 2^{2^i},$$

so  $\|f^n(1)\| > 2^{2^{n-1}}$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Consequently,

$$h_{PS}(X_{15}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log 2^{2^{n-1}} = \frac{1}{4} \log 2.$$

We then conclude that  $\frac{1}{4} \log 2 < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{8} \log 7$ , or yet,  $0, 173286 \leq \alpha \leq 0, 243239$ .

Once more, Remark 7 guarantees that the entropy of  $X_{15}$  and  $X_{17}$  coincide.

**7.8. Case 8.**  $X_{16} = (C, E)$  and  $X_{18} = (C, G)$

Regarding to the tree-shift  $X_{16}$ , for each  $j \geq 1$  we get  $F^j(1) = \text{Fib}(j+1)/\text{Fib}(j+2)$  and  $N(F^j(1)) = \text{Fib}(j+1)\text{Fib}(j+3)/\text{Fib}(j+2)^2$ . Therefore,

$$\|f^n(1)\| = \text{Fib}(3)^{2^{n-3}} \text{Fib}(4)^{2^{n-4}} \dots \text{Fib}(n) \text{Fib}(n+3).$$

We then get

$$h_{PS}(X_{16}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \log \text{Fib}(n+1) = \frac{1}{4} h_{PS}(X_4).$$

By Case 2, we obtain  $0, 11903 \leq h_{PS}(X_{16}) \leq 0, 14613$ , and, by Remark 7,  $X_{16}$  and  $X_{18}$  have the same entropy.

**7.9. Case 9.**  $X_{19} = (D, D)$  and  $X_{26} = (F, F)$

Regarding to  $X_{19}$ , we obtain  $N(\eta) = \eta^2$  and  $F^j(1) = r_j/r_{j-1}^2$ , where  $r_0 = 1, r_1 = 2^2, r_j = (r_{j-1} + r_{j-2}^2)^2$ . Therefore,

$$\|f^n(1)\| = r_n + r_{n-1}^2.$$

Thus,

$$h_{PS}(X_{19}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \log(r_n + r_{n-1}^2)^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log r_n.$$

Using the Online Encyclopedia of Integers Sequences, Petersen and Salama [10] proved that  $h_{PS}(X_{19})$  is approximately 0, 509. By Remark 7 this is also the entropy of  $X_{26}$ .

**7.10. Case 10.**  $X_{23} = (E, E)$  and  $X_{28} = (G, G)$

For  $X_{28} = (G, G)$  we obtain  $F(\eta) = (\eta + 1)^2$  and  $N(\eta) = 1$ . Then, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|f^n(1)\| = s_n + 1,$$

where  $s_1 = 4$  and  $s_n = (s_{n-1} + 1)^2, n > 1$ . The sequence  $(\|f^n(1)\|)_{n \geq 1} = (4, 25, 676, 458329, \dots)$ , corresponds to Sequence A004019 from OEIS. We then get that  $s_{n+1}$  is the integer closer to  $\ell^{2^n} - 1$ , where  $\ell \approx 2, 258518$ . By arguments similar to the ones used in Case 6, we obtain

$$h_{PS}(X_{28}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log(s_n + 1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log \ell^{2^n} \approx \frac{1}{2} \log 2, 258518 \approx 0, 407354.$$

Once more, Remark 7 guarantees that the entropy of  $X_{23}$  and  $X_{28}$  are the same.

**7.11. Case 11.**  $X_{20} = (D, E), X_{21} = (D, F), X_{25} = (E, G)$  and  $X_{27} = (F, G)$

In any case, we obtain  $N(F^j(1)) = 2$  for all  $j \geq 0$ , so

$$\|f^n(1)\| = 2^{2^{n-1}} 2^{2^{n-2}} \dots 2(1+1),$$

and, for  $\ell \in \{20, 21, 25, 27\}$ ,

$$h_{PS}(X_\ell) = \log 2 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = \frac{1}{2} \log 2.$$

**7.12. Case 12.**  $X_{22} = (D, G)$  and  $X_{24} = (E, F)$

Considering  $X_{22}$ , we get  $N(\eta) = \eta$  and  $F(\eta) = (1 + \eta)(1 + 1/\eta)$ , thus  $F^j(1) = u_j / \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} u_i$ , where  $u_0 = 1, u_1 = 4$  and  $u_j = (u_{j-1} + \prod_{i=1}^{j-2} u_i)^2$  for all  $j \geq 2$ . We then obtain

$$\|f^n(1)\| = u_n + \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i,$$

so  $h_{PS}(X_{22}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \log u_n$ .

As in Case 7, OEIS do not provide an approximation for this entropy, so we use a similar argument as to estimate  $h_{PS}(X_{15})$ . We have  $(\|f^n(1)\|)_{n \geq 1} = (5, 29, 941, 893891, \dots)$ , and estimating the entropy using the number of allowed blocks of length 2 provides a number greater than  $\log 2$ . However, choosing  $\|f^3(1)\|$  and using Proposition 6.3 and Case 5, we obtain

$$0, 2539 < h_{PS}(X_{22}) \leq \frac{1}{24} \log 941 \approx 0, 427934 < \log 2.$$

Using Remark 7 we conclude that the entropy of  $X_{22}$  and  $X_{24}$  coincides.

Now we are able to present a partial negative answer to two open problems cited by Ban and Chang in [3], since the remaining cases are not related to entropy, therefore, out of the scope of this text. We first enunciate them using our notation.

*Problem 3.* Suppose  $X$  is a tree-shift. Does  $h_{BC}(X) > 0$  imply the chaos of  $X$ ?

*Problem 4.* Suppose  $X$  is an irreducible tree-shift of finite type. Is  $h_{BC}(X) > 0$ ? Does  $X$  being a mixing tree-shift imply  $h_{BC}(X) > 0$ ?

Notice that answering negatively to these questions considering  $h_{PS}$  instead of  $h_{BC}$  shall led to the same answer for their problems. By Proposition 3.6 and Case 1,  $X_2$  is an example of non chaotic tree-shift with positive entropy, both  $h_{PS}$  and  $h_{BC}$ . Moreover, by Proposition 3.4,  $X_{14}$  presented in Case 4 is irreducible but has zero entropy. We then had answered Problem 3 and the first question of Problem 4. We also can partially answer the second question, or, in other words, we provide a class of Markov tree-shifts where there is no counterexample for this question.

In Proposition 6.4 we proved that tree-shifts given by matrices with only one 1 on each row have zero entropy, both  $h_{BC}$  and  $h_{PS}$ . Then, by Corollary 3.3, if there exists such tree-shift that is mixing, it has to be defined by at least two different matrices, once neither matrix with maximal row sum 1 is primitive. However, the product of any two matrices with only one 1 on each row and column is a matrix with the same property, what contradicts Theorem 3.2. It implies that, if there exist a counterexample to the second question of Problem 4 that is a Markov tree-shift, it has to be defined by at least one matrix with maximal row sum  $M > 1$ .

## 8. CONSIDERATIONS AND QUESTIONS

In Proposition 4.1, we give a way to determine the entropy of a tree-shift of finite type by its conjugated Markov tree-shift. The formula in equation (2) allows us to study many curious  $k$ -trees in an easier way.

For example, let  $k = 2$  and  $A, B, C, D$  binary  $d \times d$  matrices. Let  $t$  be a binary tree whose transitions from even to odd levels are given by  $A$  (on the first direction) and  $B$  (on the second direction) and from odd to even levels are given by  $C$  and  $D$  on a similar way. Define  $X$  the tree-shift closed to elements as  $t$  and its orbits. One can determine the entropy of  $X$  by conjugating it to a binary tree-shift given by two matrices, using Proposition 4.1 and the formula in Theorem 5.1. This structure of tree-shifts is addressed in [8].

Some questions still remain.

**Question 1.** Can we easily associate the entropy  $h_{PS}$  of the tree-shifts  $X = (A, B)$  and  $Y = (A, A, B, B)$ , for any matrices  $A$  and  $B$ ?

It is not difficult to notice that  $N_Y(\eta)_i = N_X(\eta)_i^2$  and  $F_Y(\eta)_i = F_X(\eta)_i^2$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq d$ , but the recurrence sequences generated are complicated. This question has a natural extension to more general tree-shifts.

**Question 2.** How to determine a lower bound for the entropy in the general case?

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. AUBRUN, M.-P. BÉAL, *Tree-shifts of finite type*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **459** (2012), 16-25.
- [2] N. AUBRUN, M.-P. BÉAL, *Sofic tree-shifts*, Theory Comput. Syst. **53** (2013), no. 4, 621-644.
- [3] J.-C. BAN, C.-H. CHANG, *Tree-shifts: Irreducibility, mixing, and the chaos of tree-shifts*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369** (2017), no. 12, 8389-8407.
- [4] J.-C. BAN, C.-H. CHANG, *Tree-shifts: the entropy of tree-shifts of finite type*, Nonlinearity **30** (2017), no. 7, p. 2785-2804.
- [5] J.-C. BAN, C.-H. CHANG, W.-G. HU, G.-Y. LAI, Y.-L. WU, *Characterization and topological behavior of homomorphism tree-shifts*, Topol. Appl. **302** (2021), 107848.
- [6] J.-C. BAN, C.-H. CHANG, W.-G. HU, Y.-L. WU, *On structure of topological entropy for tree-shift of finite type*, J. Diff. Equa. **292** (2021), 325-353
- [7] J.-C. BAN, C.-H. CHANG, W.-G. HU, Y.-L. WU, *Topological entropy for shifts of finite type over  $\mathbb{Z}$  and trees*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **903** (2022), 24-32.
- [8] J.-C. BAN, N.-Z. HUANG, *Comutativity of entropy for nonautonomous systems on trees*, Jour. Math. Anal. Appl. **517903** (2023).
- [9] S.-H. CHA, *On the  $k$ -ary Tree Combinatorics*, CSIS Technical Reports, (2011), n 284.
- [10] K. PETERSEN, I. SALAMA, *Tree shift topological entropy*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **473** (2018), 64-71.
- [11] K. PETERSEN, I. SALAMA, *Entropy on regular trees*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **40** (2020), no. 7, 4445-4477. 2019.
- [12] *The Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, <https://oeis.org>.