

# NON-CLASSIFIABILITY OF KOLMOGOROV DIFFEOMORPHISMS UP TO ISOMORPHISM

MARLIES GERBER<sup>1</sup> AND PHILIPP KUNDE<sup>2</sup>

ABSTRACT. We consider the problem of classifying Kolmogorov automorphisms (or  $K$ -automorphisms for brevity) up to isomorphism. Within the collection of measure-preserving transformations, Bernoulli shifts have the ultimate mixing property, and  $K$ -automorphisms have the next-strongest mixing properties of any widely considered family of transformations. J. Feldman observed that unlike Bernoulli shifts, the family of  $K$ -automorphisms cannot be classified up to isomorphism by a complete numerical Borel invariant. This left open the possibility of classifying  $K$ -automorphisms with a more complex type of Borel invariant. We show that this is impossible, by proving that the isomorphism equivalence relation restricted to  $K$ -automorphisms, considered as a subset of the Cartesian product of the set of  $K$ -automorphisms with itself, is a complete analytic set, and hence not Borel. Moreover, we prove this remains true if we restrict consideration to  $K$ -automorphisms that are also  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms. This shows in a concrete way that the problem of classifying  $K$ -automorphisms up to isomorphism is intractible.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A classical question in ergodic theory, posed by J. von Neumann in 1932 [Ne32], is the isomorphism problem: classify measure-preserving transformations up to isomorphism. We let  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  denote the set of all invertible measure-preserving transformations on a fixed standard non-atomic probability space,  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ . Two elements  $S, T \in \text{Aut}(\mu)$  are said to be *isomorphic* if there exists  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\mu)$  such that  $S \circ \varphi$  and  $\varphi \circ T$  agree  $\mu$ -almost everywhere. Two great successes in the classification of measure-preserving transformations are the Halmos-von Neumann classification of ergodic elements of  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  with pure point spectrum by countable subgroups of the unit circle [HN42] and D. Ornstein's classification of Bernoulli shifts by their metric entropy [Or70]. However, the isomorphism problem remains unsolved for general ergodic measure-preserving transformations.

In more recent years, focus has shifted to the study of the logical complexity of the isomorphism problem, and a series of *anti-classification* results have appeared. These results demonstrate the complexity of the problem of classification up to

---

<sup>1</sup> Indiana University, Department of Mathematics, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA.

<sup>2</sup> Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, 30-348 Krakow, Poland. The research of P.K. is part of the project No. 2021/43/P/ST1/02885 co-funded by the National Science Centre and the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement no. 945339.

*2020 Mathematics Subject classification:* Primary: 37A35; Secondary: 37A20, 37A05, 37A25, 37C40, 03E15

*Key words:* Property K, measure-theoretic isomorphism, Kakutani equivalence, anti-classification, complete analytic, smooth ergodic theory

isomorphism, or other equivalence relations, and give some limitations on what (if any) type of classification is potentially achievable. (See [Fopp] for a discussion of a hierarchy of potential classifications.)

To describe some of the anti-classification results, we endow  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  with the weak topology. (Recall that  $T_n \rightarrow T$  in the weak topology if and only if we have  $\mu(T_n(A)\Delta T(A)) \rightarrow 0$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ .) This topology is compatible with a complete separable metric and hence makes  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  into a Polish space. Let  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\mathcal{WM}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}$  denote, respectively, the sets of ergodic, weakly mixing, mixing, and Kolmogorov automorphisms (or  $K$ -automorphisms for brevity) in  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$ . The sets  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{WM}$  form (dense)  $G_\delta$ -sets in  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$ . Thus the induced topologies on  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{WM}$  are Polish as well. Moreover, the sets  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  are Borel [Fo00, Proposition 43] and dense in  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  (denseness can be seen from [Ha44]), but these sets are meager in the sense of category [Ro48].

The strongest type of classification that is feasible for a Borel family of automorphisms in  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  is a Borel function from the family to the real numbers which is a complete invariant, that is, two automorphisms  $S$  and  $T$  in the family are isomorphic if and only if the values of the function are the same at  $S$  and  $T$ . For example, [Or70] shows that metric entropy is a complete isomorphism invariant for Bernoulli shifts. In contrast, J. Feldman [Fe74] proved that there is no Borel function from the  $K$ -automorphisms to the real numbers that is a complete isomorphism invariant.

A somewhat weaker type of classification is a Borel way of associating complete algebraic invariants to a given Borel subset of  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$ , such as the Halmos-von Neumann classification. However, G. Hjorth [Hj01] showed that there is no Borel way of associating algebraic invariants to  $\mathcal{E}$  that completely determines isomorphism. Moreover, Foreman and B. Weiss [FW04] proved that there is no generic class (that is, a dense  $G_\delta$ -set) within  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  for which there is a Borel way of associating a complete algebraic invariant.

Both of these types of classification, by a Borel function that is a complete invariant or by a Borel way of associating complete algebraic invariants for a particular family  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$ , imply that the isomorphism relation  $\mathcal{R}$ , when viewed as a subset of the Cartesian product  $\text{Aut}(\mu) \times \text{Aut}(\mu)$ , is such that  $\mathcal{R} \cap (\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F})$  is Borel. Therefore if  $\mathcal{R} \cap (\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F})$  is not Borel, the types of classification discussed above are not possible for  $\mathcal{F}$ . Hjorth [Hj01] proved that the isomorphism relation  $\mathcal{R}$  on  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$  is not a Borel set and is, in fact, a complete analytic set, which is a maximally complex analytic set. However, his proof used non-ergodic transformations in an essential way. In the case of the family  $\mathcal{E}$  of ergodic automorphisms, Foreman, D. Rudolph, and Weiss [FRW11] proved that  $\mathcal{R} \cap (\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E})$  is a complete analytic set, and hence not Borel. The results in [Hj01] and [FRW11] are among the strongest types of anti-classification results, because they show that even the weakest types of classification, as described in [Fopp], are not possible. Showing that an equivalence relation on a family in  $\mathcal{F}$  is not Borel can be interpreted as saying that there is no general method of determining—in a countable number of steps, using countable amounts of information—whether or not two transformations in the family are equivalent. This demonstrates in a concrete way that the classification problem is intractable.

In the search for classification or anti-classification results, we place increasingly stringent conditions on the family of transformations under consideration. Bernoulli shifts, which can be viewed as the most random type of transformations, have the

strongest type of classification, a complete Borel invariant. But what about classes of transformations which satisfy a randomness assumption that is stronger than ergodicity but weaker than Bernoulliness, such as weakly mixing transformations, mixing transformations, and  $K$ -automorphisms?

In 1958, A. Kolmogorov defined what are now called  $K$ -automorphisms in terms of a 0-1 law [Ko58]. V. Rokhlin and Ya. Sinai [RS61] proved that an automorphism is  $K$  if and only if it has completely positive (metric) entropy, that is, the entropy is positive with respect to every non-trivial partition.  $K$ -automorphisms have the strongest mixing properties of any widely considered family of transformations. Until Ornstein constructed a counterexample [Or73], it was unknown whether all  $K$ -automorphisms were, in fact, Bernoulli. Soon afterwards, Ornstein and P. Shields constructed a family of non-Bernoulli  $K$ -automorphisms indexed by sequences of zeros and ones, such that two automorphisms in this family are isomorphic if and only if the corresponding sequences agree except possibly at finitely many terms [OS73]. This led Feldman to the previously mentioned result that there is no complete numerical Borel isomorphism invariant for  $K$ -automorphisms.

This left open the following questions that appear in Foreman's surveys [Fo00] and [Fopp] regarding the complexity of the isomorphism equivalence relation on  $K$ -automorphisms: Is the isomorphism equivalence relation restricted to the  $K$ -automorphisms

- reducible to  $E_0$  (the minimal level of complexity possible given Feldman's result)?
- reducible to  $=^+$  (the level of complexity of the Halmos-von Neumann type of classification)?
- a Borel equivalence relation?

(The last of these questions was also posed by Newberger and is stated as Question 1.16 in [Bpp].) We prove that for the isomorphism equivalence relation  $\mathcal{R}$ , the set  $\mathcal{R} \cap (\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K})$  is a complete analytic set, and therefore not Borel, thereby providing a negative answer to all three of the above questions.

The work of [FRW11] provides not only anti-classification results, but also new methods of construction of ergodic automorphisms. The automorphisms are constructed using certain concatenations of blocks of symbols (which can also be interpreted in terms of cutting and stacking) together with equivalence relations on these blocks. In [FRW11] there are some random choices in the constructions, while in [GKpp], we obtained anti-classification results with a method based on [FRW11], but we replaced the random choices by a deterministic method using Feldman patterns. In sections 4-6 below, we utilize the transformations from [GKpp] to construct a certain family of skew products that are known to be  $K$ -automorphisms by the results of I. Meilijson [Me74]. This leads to our anti-classification results for  $\mathcal{K}$ .

Our anti-classification results also hold when the isomorphism relation is replaced by Kakutani equivalence. Two ergodic automorphisms are said to be *Kakutani equivalent* if they are isomorphic to measurable cross-sections of the same ergodic flow. Another equivalent definition is that  $T, S \in \mathcal{E}$  are Kakutani equivalent if there exist two sets  $A, B$  of positive measure such that the first return map  $T_A$  of  $T$  to  $A$  with the induced measure  $\mu_A = \mu/\mu(A)$  on  $A$  is isomorphic to the analogously defined first return map  $S_B$  of  $S$  to  $B$ . Since the Kakutani equivalence relation is weaker than isomorphism, one might expect classification to be simpler.

However, in [GKpp] we showed that the Kakutani equivalence relation on ergodic automorphisms is also a complete analytic set. In the current paper, we show that this remains true for  $K$ -automorphisms as well. The methods in [GKpp] for proving non-classifiability of ergodic automorphisms *up to Kakutani equivalence* are also useful in the current paper, even for obtaining non-classifiability of  $K$ -automorphisms *up to isomorphism*.

The classification problem (with respect to isomorphism or Kakutani equivalence) can also be restricted to the class  $\text{Diff}^\infty(M, \mu)$  of smooth diffeomorphisms of a compact manifold  $M$  that preserve a smooth measure  $\mu$ . But even with this restriction, Foreman and Weiss [FW22] proved that the isomorphism relation on smooth ergodic diffeomorphisms is a complete analytic set in  $\text{Diff}^\infty(M, \mu) \times \text{Diff}^\infty(M, \mu)$ , and therefore not Borel if  $M$  is the torus, disk, or annulus. For the case of the torus, S. Banerjee and P. Kunde [BK22] generalized this result to the real-analytic setting. In [GKpp] we obtained the analogous results for Kakutani equivalence both in the smooth and the real-analytic settings. In Section 7, we show that anti-classification results for  $K$ -automorphisms for both isomorphism and Kakutani equivalence also hold in the smooth setting. The extension to the real-analytic setting is still an open problem.

Our anti-classification results for  $K$ -automorphisms in the smooth setting hold on the five-dimensional torus, and we use a construction due to Katok [Ka80] of  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms that are  $K$  but not loosely Bernoulli, and therefore not Bernoulli. Another family of  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms that are  $K$  but not loosely Bernoulli is due to Rudolph [Ru88]. Rudolph's examples are, in fact, real-analytic five-dimensional analogs of the  $T, T^{-1}$  transformation, which S. Kalikow proved is not loosely Bernoulli [Kal82]. More recently, A. Kanigowski, F. Rodriguez Hertz, and K. Vinhage [KRV18] gave an example of a  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphism in dimension 4 that is  $K$  and loosely Bernoulli, but not Bernoulli. (It is an open problem whether there exist  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms that are  $K$  but not Bernoulli in dimension 3.)

T. Austin [Aupp] introduced a new isomorphism invariant called scenery entropy that distinguishes between some of the known non-Bernoulli  $K$ -automorphisms, including certain smooth examples. As stated in [Aupp], conditionally on an invariance principle for certain local times, this leads to a continuum of pairwise non-isomorphic smooth non-Bernoulli  $K$ -automorphisms (of the same measure entropy) on a fixed compact manifold. However, as far as we know, this invariance principle has not yet been established. In Section 7.4, which can be read independently of Sections 2–6, we indicate another construction of a continuum of  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms of the five-dimensional torus of the same measure entropy that are  $K$  and pairwise non-Kakutani equivalent (and therefore non-isomorphic). We include this explicit construction because it utilizes some of the ideas in Sections 7.1–7.3, but is much simpler. It is not known if there exists an uncountable family of pairwise non-isomorphic smooth  $K$ -automorphisms of the same entropy on a four-dimensional manifold. In particular, it is an open question if the type of construction in [KRV18], varying the skewing function, would lead to such a family.

Since  $K$ -automorphisms are mixing, we obtain anti-classification results for mixing automorphisms as a corollary. However, the results for  $K$ -automorphisms do not cover the collections of mixing or weakly mixing automorphisms in the zero entropy case. In an earlier work [Kupp2], the second author has shown that the isomorphism relation, as well as the Kakutani equivalence relation, on zero entropy

smooth weakly mixing transformations of the torus, disk, or annulus is a complete analytic set. Moreover, he also obtained this result for zero entropy real-analytic weakly mixing diffeomorphisms of the 2-torus. The methods used in [Kupp2] are very different from those in the current paper, and they utilize the “twisted” version of the Anosov-Katok construction [AK70]. The earlier work of Foreman and Weiss [FW22] in the smooth setting uses the “untwisted” version of the Anosov-Katok method, and the transformations produced are ergodic, but not weakly mixing. For the collection  $\mathcal{ZM}$  of zero entropy mixing automorphisms, it is an open question whether the isomorphism equivalence relation (or the Kakutani equivalence relation) restricted to  $\mathcal{ZM}$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathcal{ZM} \times \mathcal{ZM}$ .

Other anti-classification results were recently obtained in the context of topological conjugacy of diffeomorphisms. Two diffeomorphisms  $f$  and  $g$  of a manifold  $M$  are said to be topologically conjugate if there exists a homeomorphism  $h$  of  $M$  such that  $f \circ h = h \circ g$ . Foreman and A. Gorodetski [FGpp] showed that for a closed manifold of any dimension the topological conjugacy equivalence relation, considered as a subset of the Cartesian product of the set of  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms with itself, is not Borel. In the case of  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms of the circle with Liouvillean rotation numbers, Kunde considered the equivalence relation of topological conjugacy with the additional requirement that the conjugating map  $h$  be a  $C^r$  diffeomorphism. He proved that for each  $r$ ,  $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ , there is no complete numerical Borel invariant [Kupp].

## 2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS AND OUTLINE OF PROOFS

**2.1. Results for  $K$ -automorphisms.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a standard non-atomic probability space, and let  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}$  denote the set of all measure-preserving automorphisms of  $\Omega$  that are, respectively, ergodic, ergodic with positive entropy, and  $K$ .

To prove our anti-classification results we follow the general strategy from [FRW11]. An important tool is the concept of a reduction.

**Definition 1.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and  $A \subseteq X$ ,  $B \subseteq Y$ . A function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  *reduces*  $A$  to  $B$  if and only if for all  $x \in X$ :  $x \in A$  if and only if  $f(x) \in B$ .

Such a function  $f$  is called a *Borel (respectively, continuous) reduction* if  $f$  is a Borel (respectively, continuous) function.

$A$  being reducible to  $B$  can be interpreted as saying that  $B$  is at least as complicated as  $A$ . We note that if  $B$  is Borel and  $f$  is a Borel reduction, then  $A$  is also Borel. Equivalently, if  $f$  is a Borel reduction of  $A$  to  $B$  and  $A$  is not Borel, then  $B$  is not Borel.

**Definition 2.** If  $X$  is a Polish space and  $B \subseteq X$ , then  $B$  is *analytic* if and only if it is the continuous image of a Borel subset of a Polish space. Equivalently, there is a Polish space  $Y$  and a Borel set  $C \subseteq X \times Y$  such that  $B$  is the  $X$ -projection of  $C$ .

**Definition 3.** An analytic subset  $A$  of a Polish space  $X$  is called *complete analytic* if every analytic set can be continuously reduced to  $A$ .

If  $A$  is continuously reducible to an analytic set  $B$  and  $A$  is a complete analytic set, then so is  $B$ . There are analytic sets that are not Borel (see, for example, [Ke95, section 14]). This implies that a complete analytic set is not Borel.

In the Polish space  $\mathcal{Trees}$  (to be defined in Section 3.1), the subset consisting of trees with an infinite branch is an example of a complete analytic set [Ke95, section 27].

The map  $\Phi$  in Theorem A below provides a continuous reduction from the set of trees with an infinite branch to  $\{T \in \mathcal{K} \mid T \text{ is isomorphic to } T^{-1}\}$ .

**Theorem A.** *There is a continuous map  $\Phi : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  such that for  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  with  $V = \Phi(\mathcal{T})$ , the following conditions hold:*

- (a) *If  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch, then  $V$  and  $V^{-1}$  are isomorphic (and therefore Kakutani equivalent);*
- (b) *If  $\mathcal{T}$  does not have an infinite branch, then  $V$  and  $V^{-1}$  are not Kakutani equivalent (and therefore not isomorphic).*

To obtain our anti-classification result in Corollary A, we define the continuous embedding  $i : \text{Aut}(\mu) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mu) \times \text{Aut}(\mu)$  by  $i(T) = (T, T^{-1})$ , and note that  $i \circ \Phi$  is a continuous reduction from the set of trees with an infinite branch to  $\{(S, T) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K} \mid S \text{ is isomorphic to } T\}$ . This, together with the observation in Subsection 3.2 that the isomorphism and Kakutani equivalence relations considered as subsets of  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$  are analytic sets, yields Corollary A.

**Corollary A.** *The set  $\{(S, T) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K} : S \text{ and } T \text{ are isomorphic}\}$  is a complete analytic subset of  $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}$  and hence not a Borel set. The same is true for “isomorphic” replaced by “Kakutani equivalent”.*

To prove Theorem A, we start with the following more explicit Theorem B.

**Theorem B. Part 1.** *There is a continuous map  $\Upsilon : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that for  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  with  $U = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$ , the following conditions hold:*

- (a) *If  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch, then  $U$  and  $U^{-1}$  are isomorphic;*
- (b) *If  $\mathcal{T}$  does not have an infinite branch, then  $U$  and  $U^{-1}$  are not Kakutani equivalent (and therefore not isomorphic).*

**Part 2.** *The map  $\Upsilon$  in Part 1 can be chosen so that there is also a set  $A \in \mathcal{B}$  of positive measure such that for  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  with  $U = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$  we have:*

- (c) *The induced map  $U_A$  is a  $K$ -automorphism;*
- (d) *If  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch, then there exists  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\mu)$  such that  $\phi \circ U = U^{-1} \circ \phi$  and  $\phi(A) = A$ . Consequently,  $U_A$  is isomorphic to  $(U_A)^{-1}$ .*

Part 1 of Theorem B with  $\mathcal{H}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{E}$  is in [GKpp]. If, in addition, “Kakutani equivalent” is replaced by “isomorphic” the result was proved by M. Foreman, D. Rudolph, and B. Weiss in [FRW11], and their methods, combined with techniques from Kakutani equivalence theory (see, for example, [ORW82]), were used in [GKpp].

*Proof of Theorem A.* Theorem A follows from Theorem B by taking  $V = U_A$  equipped with the normalized induced measure  $\mu_A$ . For part (b) of Theorem A, observe that  $V$  and  $V^{-1}$  are not Kakutani equivalent if  $U$  and  $U^{-1}$  are not Kakutani equivalent.  $\square$

For  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$ , the transformation  $U = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$  in Theorem B is defined as  $U = \Psi(\mathcal{T}) \times \mathbb{B}$ , where  $\Psi(\mathcal{T})$  is the transformation constructed in sections 7–8 of [GKpp] and  $\mathbb{B}$  is the  $(1/2, 1/2)$ -Bernoulli shift. The definition of  $\Psi(\mathcal{T})$  is reviewed in Section 5 below.

*Proof of Part 1 (a) of Theorem B.* According to [GKpp, section 5],  $\Psi(\mathcal{T})$  is isomorphic to  $\Psi(\mathcal{T})^{-1}$  if  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch. Part (a) follows immediately.  $\square$

Part 2 of Theorem B is based on [Me74] and is proved in Section 4. The main new idea in the automorphism case of the present work occurs in the proof of Part 1 (b) in Section 6.2.

**2.2. Results for smooth  $K$ -diffeomorphisms.** If  $M$  is a finite-dimensional compact  $C^\infty$  manifold and  $\mu$  is a standard measure on  $M$  determined by a smooth volume element, we let  $\text{Diff}^\infty(M, \mu)$  denote the  $\mu$ -preserving  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms on  $M$ . Equipped with the  $C^\infty$  topology,  $\text{Diff}^\infty(M, \mu)$  is a Polish space. We can also view each element of  $\text{Diff}^\infty(M, \mu)$  as an element of  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$ , and with this interpretation, it follows from [Bj09] that  $\text{Diff}^\infty(M, \mu)$  is a Borel subset of  $\text{Aut}(\mu)$ .

In Section 7 we obtain anti-classification results for  $K$ -automorphisms that are also  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms preserving a smooth measure. Our work utilizes A. Katok's construction of smooth non-Bernoulli  $K$ -automorphisms [Ka80].

Let  $\mathbb{T}^n$  denote the  $n$ -dimensional torus, that is, the Cartesian product of  $n$  copies of  $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , and let  $\lambda_n$  denote Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{T}^n$ .

We will prove the following smooth version of Theorem A.

**Theorem C.** *There is a continuous map*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{Trees} &\rightarrow (\mathcal{K} \cap \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)) \times (\mathcal{K} \cap \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)) \\ \mathcal{T} &\mapsto (\Phi_1(\mathcal{T}), \Phi_2(\mathcal{T})) \end{aligned}$$

such that

- (a) *If  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch, then  $\Phi_1(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\Phi_2(\mathcal{T})$  are isomorphic (and therefore Kakutani equivalent);*
- (b) *If  $\mathcal{T}$  does not have an infinite branch, then  $\Phi_1(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\Phi_2(\mathcal{T})$  are not Kakutani equivalent (and therefore not isomorphic).*

As in the case of  $K$ -automorphisms, this immediately gives the following anti-classification result.

**Corollary C.** *The set*

$$\{(S, T) \in (\mathcal{K} \cap \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)) \times (\mathcal{K} \cap \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)) \mid S \text{ and } T \text{ are isomorphic}\}$$

*is a complete analytic subset of  $\text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5) \times \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$  with respect to the  $C^\infty$  topology and hence not a Borel set. The same is true for “isomorphic” replaced by “Kakutani equivalent”.*

Since the weak topology on  $\text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$  is coarser than the  $C^\infty$  topology,  $\{(S, T) \in (\mathcal{K} \cap \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)) \times (\mathcal{K} \cap \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)) \mid S \text{ and } T \text{ are isomorphic}\}$  is also a complete analytic subset of  $\text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5) \times \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$  in the weak topology.

### 3. PRELIMINARY MATERIAL

**3.1. The space of trees.** As we mentioned in Section 2.1, the collection of trees within  $\mathcal{Trees}$  that have an infinite branch is an example of a complete analytic set, and it is fundamental to our construction. We now define trees, the space  $\mathcal{Trees}$ , and infinite branches of trees.

Let  $\mathbb{N}$  be the nonnegative integers, and let  $\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$  denote the collection of finite sequences in  $\mathbb{N}$ . By convention, the empty sequence  $\emptyset$  is in  $\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$ .

**Definition 4.** A *tree* is a set  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$  such that if  $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $\sigma = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m)$  with  $m \leq n$  is an initial segment of  $\tau$ , then  $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$ . Each tree  $\mathcal{T}$  contains  $\emptyset$ , which is regarded as an initial segment of all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ .

**Definition 5.** A function  $f : \{0, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathcal{T}$  is called a *branch* of  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $n$ . The collection *Trees* consists of those trees that contain branches of arbitrarily long length. An *infinite branch* through  $\mathcal{T}$  is a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $(f(0), \dots, f(n-1)) \in \mathcal{T}$ . If a tree has an infinite branch, it is called *ill-founded*. If it does not have an infinite branch, it is called *well-founded*.

To describe a topology on the collection of trees, let  $\{\sigma_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be an enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$  with the property that every initial segment of  $\sigma_n$  is some  $\sigma_m$  for  $m \leq n$ . Under this enumeration subsets  $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$  can be identified with characteristic functions  $\chi_S : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . Such  $\chi_S$  can be viewed as members of an infinite product space  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}}$  homeomorphic to the Cantor space. Here, each function  $a : \{\sigma_m : m < n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  determines a basic open set

$$\langle a \rangle = \{\chi : \chi \upharpoonright \{\sigma_m : m < n\} = a\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}}$$

and the collection of all such  $\langle a \rangle$  forms a basis for the topology. In this topology the collection of trees is a closed (hence compact) subset of  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}}$ . Moreover, the collection *Trees* is a dense  $\mathcal{G}_\delta$  subset. Hence, *Trees* is a Polish space.

Since the topology on the space of trees was introduced via basic open sets, we can characterize continuous maps defined on *Trees* as follows.

**Fact 6.** *Let  $Y$  be a topological space. Then a map  $f : \text{Trees} \rightarrow Y$  is continuous if and only if for every open set  $O \subseteq Y$  and every  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{Trees}$  with  $f(\mathcal{T}) \in O$  there exists  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $\mathcal{T}' \in \text{Trees}$  we have:*

$$\text{if } \mathcal{T} \cap \{\sigma_n : n \leq M\} = \mathcal{T}' \cap \{\sigma_n : n \leq M\}, \text{ then } f(\mathcal{T}') \in O.$$

During our constructions the following maps will prove useful.

**Definition 7.** We define a map  $M : \text{Trees} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  by setting  $M(\mathcal{T})(s) = n$  if and only if  $n$  is the least number such that  $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{T}$  and the length  $lh(\sigma_n) = s$ . Dually, we also define a map  $s : \text{Trees} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  by setting  $s(\mathcal{T})(n)$  to be the length of the longest sequence  $\sigma_m \in \mathcal{T}$  with  $m \leq n$ .

*Remark.* When  $\mathcal{T}$  is clear from the context we write  $M(s)$  and  $s(n)$ . We also note that  $s(n) \leq n$  and that  $M$  as well as  $s$  is a continuous function when we endow  $\mathbb{N}$  with the discrete topology and  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  with the product topology.

**3.2. Isomorphism and Kakutani Equivalence.** In order to obtain Corollary A from Theorem A, we need to explain why the isomorphism and Kakutani equivalence relations are analytic subsets of  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$ . For  $S, T \in \mathcal{E}$ , we write  $S \cong T$  if  $S$  and  $T$  are isomorphic, and  $S \sim T$  if  $S$  and  $T$  are Kakutani equivalent. Then  $\{(S, T) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} : S \cong T\} = \{(S, \phi S \phi^{-1}) : S \in \mathcal{E}, \phi \in \text{Aut}(\mu)\}$ . Thus  $\{(S, T) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} : S \cong T\}$  is the image of  $\mathcal{E} \times \text{Aut}(\mu)$  under the continuous map  $(S, \phi) \mapsto (S, \phi S \phi^{-1})$ , and is therefore analytic.

To show that the Kakutani equivalence relation is an analytic subset of  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$ , we define, for every Borel set  $A \subset [0, 1]$  of positive measure, the invertible measure-preserving map  $f^A : (A, \mu_A) \rightarrow ([0, 1], \mu)$  by  $f^A(x) = \mu(A)^{-1} \mu(A \cap [0, x])$ . As in the introduction,  $\mu_A = \mu/\mu(A)$  on  $A$ , and for  $T \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $T_A$  denotes the first return map of

$T$  to  $A$ . The Borel sets  $\mathcal{B}$  form a Polish space under the metric  $d(A, B) = \mu(A\Delta B)$ , and  $\{A \in \mathcal{B} : \mu(A) > 0\}$  is an open subset of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Note that for  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $\mu(A) > 0, \mu(B) > 0$ , two automorphisms  $T, S \in \mathcal{E}$  are such that  $T_A$  is isomorphic to  $S_B$  if and only if  $f^A T_A (f^A)^{-1} \cong f^B S_B (f^B)^{-1}$ , which is true if and only if there exists  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\mu)$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad \phi f^A T_A (f^A)^{-1} = f^B S_B (f^B)^{-1} \phi.$$

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{(T, S, A, B, \phi) : T, S \in \mathcal{E}, A, B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ with } \mu(A) > 0, \mu(B) > 0, \phi \in \text{Aut}(\mu) \text{ such that equation (3.1) holds}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \times \text{Aut}(\mu)$  and the projection of  $\mathcal{A}$  to the first two coordinates is  $\{(T, S) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} : T \sim S\}$ , which is therefore analytic.

**3.3. The  $\bar{f}$  distance.** In this subsection, we present some preliminaries regarding a notion of distance between sequences of symbols introduced by Feldman [Fe76]. This distance, now called  $\bar{f}$ , is important in the study of Kakutani equivalence, and it plays a role analogous to the Hamming metric  $\bar{d}$  in Ornstein's isomorphism theory.

**Definition 8.** A *match* between two strings of symbols  $a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$  and  $b_1 b_2 \dots b_m$  from a given alphabet  $\Sigma$ , is a collection  $\mathcal{M}$  of pairs of indices  $(i_s, j_s)$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, r$  such that  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r \leq n$ ,  $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_r \leq m$  and  $a_{i_s} = b_{j_s}$  for  $s = 1, 2, \dots, r$ . Then

$$(3.2) \quad \bar{f}(a_1 a_2 \dots a_n, b_1 b_2 \dots b_m) = \frac{1 - 2 \max\{|\mathcal{M}| : \mathcal{M} \text{ is a match between } a_1 a_2 \dots a_n \text{ and } b_1 b_2 \dots b_m\}}{n + m}.$$

We will refer to  $\bar{f}(a_1 a_2 \dots a_n, b_1 b_2 \dots b_m)$  as the “ $\bar{f}$ -distance” between  $a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$  and  $b_1 b_2 \dots b_m$ , even though  $\bar{f}$  does not satisfy the triangle inequality unless the strings are all of the same length. A match  $\mathcal{M}$  is called a *best possible match* if it realizes the supremum in the definition of  $\bar{f}$ .

*Remark.* Alternatively, one can view a match as an injective order-preserving function  $\pi : \mathcal{D}(\pi) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\pi) \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$  with  $a_i = b_{\pi(i)}$  for every  $i \in \mathcal{D}(\pi)$ . Then  $\bar{f}(a_1 \dots a_n, b_1 \dots b_m) = 1 - \max \left\{ \frac{2|\mathcal{D}(\pi)|}{n+m} : \pi \text{ is a match} \right\}$ .

The next result from [GKpp, Lemma 14] provides lower bounds on the  $\bar{f}$  distance when symbols  $a_i$  and  $b_j$  are replaced by blocks  $A_{a_i}$  and  $A_{b_j}$ .

**Lemma 9** (Symbol by block replacement). *Suppose that  $A_{a_1}, A_{a_2}, \dots, A_{a_n}$  and  $A_{b_1}, A_{b_2}, \dots, A_{b_m}$  are blocks of symbols with each block of length  $L$ . Assume that  $\alpha \in (0, 1/7)$ ,  $R \geq 2$ , and for all substrings  $C$  and  $D$  consisting of consecutive symbols from  $A_{a_i}$  and  $A_{b_j}$ , respectively, with  $|C|, |D| \geq L/R$ , we have*

$$\bar{f}(C, D) \geq \alpha, \text{ if } a_i \neq b_j.$$

Then

$$\bar{f}(A_{a_1} A_{a_2} \dots A_{a_n}, A_{b_1} A_{b_2} \dots A_{b_m}) > \alpha \bar{f}(a_1 a_2 \dots a_n, b_1 b_2 \dots b_m) - \frac{1}{R}.$$

The following facts from [GKpp] will prove useful for our  $\bar{f}$  estimates as well.

**Fact 10.** Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are strings of symbols of length  $n$  and  $m$ , respectively, from an alphabet  $\Sigma$ . If  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{b}$  are strings of symbols obtained by deleting at most  $\lfloor \gamma(n+m) \rfloor$  terms from  $a$  and  $b$  altogether, where  $0 < \gamma < 1$ , then

$$(3.3) \quad \bar{f}(a, b) \geq \bar{f}(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}) - 2\gamma.$$

Moreover, if there exists a best possible match between  $a$  and  $b$  such that no term that is deleted from  $a$  and  $b$  to form  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{b}$  is matched with a non-deleted term, then

$$(3.4) \quad \bar{f}(a, b) \geq \bar{f}(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}) - \gamma.$$

Likewise, if  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{b}$  are obtained by adding at most  $\lfloor \gamma(n+m) \rfloor$  symbols to  $a$  and  $b$ , then (3.4) holds.

**Fact 11.** If  $x = x_1x_2 \cdots x_n$  and  $y = y_1y_2 \cdots y_n$  are decompositions of the strings of symbols  $x$  and  $y$  into corresponding substrings under a best possible  $\bar{f}$ -match between  $x$  and  $y$ , that is, one that achieves the minimum in the definition of  $\bar{f}$ , then

$$\bar{f}(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{f}(x_i, y_i)v_i,$$

where

$$(3.5) \quad v_i = \frac{|x_i| + |y_i|}{|x| + |y|}.$$

**Fact 12.** If  $x$  and  $y$  are strings of symbols such that  $\bar{f}(x, y) \leq \gamma$ , for some  $0 \leq \gamma < 1$ , then

$$(3.6) \quad \left( \frac{1-\gamma}{1+\gamma} \right) |x| \leq |y| \leq \left( \frac{1+\gamma}{1-\gamma} \right) |x|.$$

Even though the  $\bar{f}$  distance does not satisfy the triangle inequality for strings of different lengths, Facts 11 and 12 give us an approximative version of it.

**Fact 13.** If  $x, y, z$  are strings of symbols with  $\bar{f}(x, z) < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\bar{f}(y, z) < \frac{1}{2}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(x, y) &\leq \frac{|x| + |z|}{|x| + |y|} \bar{f}(x, z) + \frac{|z| + |y|}{|x| + |y|} \bar{f}(z, y) \\ &\leq \bar{f}(x, z) + \bar{f}(z, y) + 8 \cdot \bar{f}(x, z) \cdot \bar{f}(z, y). \end{aligned}$$

**3.4. Feldman patterns.** To construct the symbolic systems in [GKpp], the  $n$ -words in the construction sequence are built using specific patterns of blocks. These patterns are called *Feldman patterns* since they originate from Feldman's first example of an ergodic zero-entropy transformation that is not loosely Bernoulli [Fe76]. They are useful in our construction, because different Feldman patterns cannot be matched well in  $\bar{f}$  even after a finite coding.

Let  $T, N, M \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . A  $(T, N, M)$ -Feldman pattern in building blocks  $A_1, \dots, A_N$  of equal length  $L$  is one of the strings  $B_1, \dots, B_M$  that are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \left( A_1^{TN^2} A_2^{TN^2} \dots A_N^{TN^2} \right)^{N^{2M}} \\ B_2 &= \left( A_1^{TN^4} A_2^{TN^4} \dots A_N^{TN^4} \right)^{N^{2M-2}} \\ &\vdots \\ B_M &= \left( A_1^{TN^{2M}} A_2^{TN^{2M}} \dots A_N^{TN^{2M}} \right)^{N^2} \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $N$  denotes the number of building blocks,  $M$  is the number of constructed patterns, and  $TN^2$  gives the minimum number of consecutive occurrences of a building block. We also note that  $B_r$  is built with  $N^{2(M+1-r)}$  many so-called *cycles*: Each cycle winds through all the  $N$  building blocks. We refer to  $B_r$  as the  $(T, N, M)$ -Feldman pattern of type  $r$ .

We will use the following statement from [GKpp, Proposition 41] on the  $\bar{f}$ -distance between different  $(T, N, M)$ -Feldman patterns.

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $N \geq 20$ ,  $M \geq 2$ , and  $B_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq M$ , be the  $(T, N, M)$ -Feldman patterns in the building blocks  $A_1, \dots, A_N$  of equal length  $L$ . Assume that  $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{7})$ ,  $R \geq 2$ , and  $\bar{f}(C, D) > \alpha$ , for all substrings  $C$  and  $D$  consisting of consecutive symbols from  $A_{i_1}$  and  $A_{i_2}$ , respectively, where  $i_1 \neq i_2$ , with  $|C|, |D| \geq \frac{L}{R}$ .*

*Then for all  $j, k \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,  $j \neq k$ , and all sequences  $B$  and  $\bar{B}$  of at least  $TN^{2M+2}L$  consecutive symbols from  $B_j$  and  $B_k$ , respectively, we have*

$$(3.7) \quad \bar{f}(B, \bar{B}) \geq \alpha - \frac{4}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{1}{R}.$$

#### 4. CONSTRUCTION OF THE MAP $\Upsilon : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$

For  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$ , we let  $T = \Psi(\mathcal{T})$  be as in [GKpp]. This automorphism is defined as a left shift on certain bi-infinite strings of symbols in an alphabet  $\Sigma$ . These strings are concatenations of words in a construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , as we recall in Section 5 below. The map  $T$  can also be viewed as an automorphism of  $[0, 1]$  obtained from cutting and stacking subintervals of  $[0, 1]$ , where the columns in the  $n$ th tower all have the same height and the same width, and there is a one-to-one correspondence between columns in the  $n$ th tower and words in  $\mathcal{W}_n$ . The levels of a column are labeled with symbols in  $\Sigma$  that match the symbols in the corresponding word in  $\mathcal{W}_n$ . This defines a partition  $\mathcal{P}_\Sigma$  of  $[0, 1]$  that is a generating partition for  $T$ .

All of the transformations  $U = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$  in Theorem B are on the Lebesgue space  $[0, 1] \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  with the product of Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  on  $[0, 1]$  and  $(1/2, 1/2)$ -Bernoulli measure on  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ .

The cutting and stacking construction for realizing  $T = \Psi(\mathcal{T})$  on  $[0, 1]$  is done in [GKpp] in such a way that  $\Psi : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \text{Aut}([0, 1], \mu)$  is continuous. The automorphism  $U = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$  is the direct product of  $\Psi(\mathcal{T})$  and a  $(1/2, 1/2)$ -Bernoulli shift  $\mathbb{B}$ . We take the set  $A$  in Part 2 of Theorem B to be

$$(4.1) \quad A = [0, 1] \times \{(v_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \mid v_0 = 0\}.$$

*Proof of Part 2 (c) of Theorem B.* The return time to  $A$  is a geometrically distributed random variable, and according to Lemma 1 of [OS77], this implies that  $U_A$  is isomorphic to a skew product to which Meilijson's Theorem [Me74] applies. Therefore  $U_A$  is a  $K$ -automorphism. Actually the hypotheses in [Me74] are not satisfied, but, as was observed in [OS77], the proof in [Me74] can be generalized to cover the case at hand. In fact, the first proposition in [Ge97], which is essentially contained in [Me74] and [Ho88], implies exactly what we need.  $\square$

*Proof of Part 2 (d) of Theorem B.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch. From [GKpp, section 5] we know that  $T = \Psi(\mathcal{T})$  and  $T^{-1} = \Psi(\mathcal{T})^{-1}$  are isomorphic. Then by taking the product of this isomorphism and the identity on the  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  factor, we obtain an isomorphism  $\phi$  between  $U = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$  and  $U^{-1} = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})^{-1}$  such that  $\phi(A) = A$ , where  $A$  is as in (4.1).  $\square$

## 5. REVIEW OF CONSTRUCTION OF MAP $\Psi : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$

The proof of the anti-classification results in [GKpp] is based on the construction of a continuous map  $\Psi : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  such that for  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  and  $T = \Psi(\mathcal{T})$ :

- (1) If  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch, then  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are isomorphic.
- (2) If  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are Kakutani equivalent, then  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch.

In this section we collect important properties of the construction of  $\Psi$  in sections 7–8 of [GKpp].

The transformation  $T = \Psi(\mathcal{T})$  can be obtained from a cutting and stacking construction on  $[0, 1]$  (as mentioned in Section 4) or from a construction of a symbolic left shift  $(\mathbb{K}, \text{sh})$  that we will abbreviate by  $\mathbb{K}$ . When taking the second approach, for each  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$ , the symbolic system is built using a construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n(\mathcal{T}) \mid \sigma_n \in \mathcal{T}\}$  in a basic alphabet  $\Sigma$  of cardinality  $2^{12}$ , where for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{T}$  the set  $\mathcal{W}_n = \mathcal{W}_n(\mathcal{T})$  of allowed  $n$ -words depends only on  $\mathcal{T} \cap \{\sigma_m : m \leq n\}$ . Then

$$\mathbb{K} = \{(\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}} \mid \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, (\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{ is a bi-infinite concatenation of } n\text{-words}\}.$$

The inverse  $T^{-1}$  could be viewed as a right shift on  $\mathbb{K}$ . Instead we will always regard it as a left shift on  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K})$ . Here, we write  $\text{rev}(w)$  for the reverse string of a finite or infinite string  $w$ . In particular, if  $x$  is in  $\mathbb{K}$  we define  $\text{rev}(x)$  by setting  $\text{rev}(x)(k) = x(-k)$ . Then for a collection  $W$  of words,  $\text{rev}(W)$  is the collection of reverses of words in  $W$  and  $\{\text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n(\mathcal{T})) \mid \sigma_n \in \mathcal{T}\}$  is a construction sequence for  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K})$ .

The structure of the tree  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  is also used to build a sequence of groups  $G_s(\mathcal{T})$  as follows. Here, the index  $s$  indicates *level*  $s$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ , which consists of those elements of  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $s$ . We define  $G_0(\mathcal{T})$  to be the trivial group and assign to each level  $s > 0$  a so-called *group of involutions*

$$G_s(\mathcal{T}) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}, lh(\tau)=s} (\mathbb{Z}_2)_{\tau}.$$

Each  $(\mathbb{Z}_2)_{\tau}$  is a copy of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , and we let  $g_{\tau}$  denote its generator. We have a well-defined notion of *parity* for elements in such a group of involutions: an element is called *even* if it can be written as the sum of an even number of generators. Otherwise, it is called *odd*.

For levels  $0 < s < t$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  we have a canonical homomorphism  $\rho_{t,s} : G_t(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow G_s(\mathcal{T})$  that sends  $g_{\tau}$  to  $g_{\sigma}$  where  $\sigma$  is the initial segment of  $\tau$  with  $lh(\sigma) = s$ .

The map  $\rho_{t,0}$  is the trivial homomorphism  $\rho_{t,0} : G_t(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow G_0(\mathcal{T}) = \{0\}$ . A tree  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  has an infinite branch if and only if there is an infinite sequence  $(g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$  of generators  $g_s \in G_s(\mathcal{T})$  with  $\rho_{t,s}(g_t) = g_s$  for  $t > s > 0$ .

During the construction one uses the following finite approximations: For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we let  $G_0^n(\mathcal{T})$  be the trivial group and for  $s > 0$  we let

$$G_s^n(\mathcal{T}) = \sum \{(\mathbb{Z}_2)_\tau \mid \tau \in \mathcal{T} \cap \{\sigma_m : m \leq n\}, lh(\tau) = s\}.$$

We also introduce the finite approximations  $\rho_{t,s}^{(n)} : G_t^n(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow G_s^n(\mathcal{T})$  to the canonical homomorphisms.

In the following, we simplify notation by reindexing  $\{\mathcal{W}_n(\mathcal{T}) \mid \sigma_n \in \mathcal{T}\}$  and  $\{G_s^n(\mathcal{T}) \mid \sigma_n \in \mathcal{T}\}$  as  $\{\mathcal{W}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{G_s^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , respectively. To describe their construction, let  $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a decreasing sequence of positive numbers such that

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \epsilon_n < \infty.$$

During the course of construction one also defines a fast growing sequence of positive integers  $(e(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and an increasing sequence of prime numbers  $(\mathfrak{p}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  (see equations (8.5) and (8.7) in [GKpp]).

We now collect important properties of the construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We start by setting  $\mathcal{W}_0 = \Sigma$ .

- (E1) All words in  $\mathcal{W}_n$  have the same length  $h_n$  and the cardinality  $|\mathcal{W}_n|$  is a power of 2.
- (E2) There are  $f_n, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that every word in  $\mathcal{W}_{n+1}$  is built by concatenating  $k_n$  words in  $\mathcal{W}_n$  and such that every word in  $\mathcal{W}_n$  occurs in each word of  $\mathcal{W}_{n+1}$  exactly  $f_n$  times. The number  $f_n$  is a product of  $\mathfrak{p}_n^2$  and powers of 2. Clearly, we have  $k_n = f_n |\mathcal{W}_n|$ .
- (E3) If  $w = w_1 \dots w_{k_n} \in \mathcal{W}_{n+1}$  and  $w' = w'_1 \dots w'_{k_n} \in \mathcal{W}_{n+1}$ , where  $w_i, w'_i \in \mathcal{W}_n$ , then for any  $k \geq \lfloor \frac{k_n}{2} \rfloor$  and  $1 \leq i \leq k_n - k$ , we have  $w_{i+1} \dots w_{i+k} \neq w'_{i+1} \dots w'_{i+k}$ .

*Remark.* In particular, these specifications say that  $\{\mathcal{W}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a uniquely readable and strongly uniform construction sequence as defined in [FW19a, section 3.3]. Hence, the corresponding symbolic system  $\mathbb{K}$  has a unique non-atomic ergodic shift-invariant measure by [FW19a, Lemma 11].

For each  $s \leq s(n)$ , there is an equivalence relation  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  on  $\mathcal{W}_n$  satisfying the following specifications. To start, we let  $\mathcal{Q}_0^0$  be the equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{W}_0 = \Sigma$  which has one equivalence class, that is, any two elements of  $\Sigma$  are equivalent.

- (Q4) Suppose that  $n = M(s)$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . There is a specific number  $J_{s(n),n} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that each word in  $w_n \in \mathcal{W}_n$  is a concatenation  $w_n = w_{n,1} \dots w_{n,J}$  of  $J = J_{s(n),n}$  strings of equal length, where each  $w_{n,i}$  is a concatenation of  $(n-1)$ -words. Then any two words in the same  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  class agree with each other except possibly on initial or final strings of length at most  $\frac{\epsilon_n}{2} \frac{h_n}{J_{s(n),n}}$  on the segments  $w_{n,i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, J_{s(n),n}$ .
- (Q5) For  $n \geq M(s) + 1$  we can consider words in  $\mathcal{W}_n$  as concatenations of words from  $\mathcal{W}_{M(s)}$  and define  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  as the product equivalence relation of  $\mathcal{Q}_s^{M(s)}$ .<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Given an equivalence relation  $\mathcal{Q}$  on a set  $X$  we define the *product equivalence relation*  $\mathcal{Q}^n$  on  $X^n$  by setting  $x_0 \dots x_{n-1} \sim x'_0 \dots x'_{n-1}$  if and only if  $x_i \sim x'_i$  with respect to  $\mathcal{Q}$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ .

(Q6)  $\mathcal{Q}_{s+1}^n$  refines  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  and each  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  class contains  $2^{4e(n)}$  many  $\mathcal{Q}_{s+1}^n$  classes.<sup>2</sup>

Each equivalence relation  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  will induce an equivalence relation on  $\text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$ , which we will also call  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$ , as follows:  $\text{rev}(w), \text{rev}(w') \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  are equivalent with respect to  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  if and only if  $w, w' \in \mathcal{W}_n$  are equivalent with respect to  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$ .

*Remark.* In case that the exponent is not relevant we will refer to the  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  as  $\mathcal{Q}_s$ . For  $u \in \mathcal{W}_n$  we write  $[u]_s$  for its  $\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  class.

In [FRW11, section 5] and [GKpp, section 4.2.2] the equivalence relations  $\mathcal{Q}_s$  are used to define a canonical sequence of factors  $\mathbb{K}_s$  and  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K}_s)$  with factor maps  $\pi_s : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_s$  and  $\pi_{s',s} : \mathbb{K}_{s'} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_s$  for all  $s' > s$ .

We now list specifications on actions by the groups of involutions  $G_s^n$ .

- (A7)  $G_s^n$  acts freely on  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  and the  $G_s^n$  action is subordinate<sup>3</sup> to the  $G_{s-1}^n$  action on  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_{s-1}^n$  via the canonical homomorphism  $\rho_{s,s-1}^{(n)} : G_s^n \rightarrow G_{s-1}^n$ .
- (A8) Suppose  $n > M(s)$ . We view  $G_s^n = G_s^{n-1} \oplus H$ . Then the action of  $G_s^{n-1}$  on  $\mathcal{W}_{n-1}/\mathcal{Q}_s^{n-1}$  is extended to an action on  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  by the skew diagonal action.<sup>4</sup> In particular,  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  is closed under the skew diagonal action by  $G_s^{n-1}$ .

*Remark 15.* Let  $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $g \in G_s^m$  for some  $m \geq M(s)$ . Suppose that  $g$  has odd parity. Since  $g$  acts on  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  by the skew-diagonal action by (A8), it induces for all  $n > m$  a map  $\eta_g : \mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n \rightarrow \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  by the diagonal action. Then  $g$  yields a shift-equivariant isomorphism  $\mathbb{K}_s \rightarrow \text{rev}(\mathbb{K}_s)$  that we denote by  $\eta_g$  as well (see [GKpp, Lemma 37]).

In case that  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  has an infinite branch, then there is an infinite sequence  $(g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$  of canonical generators  $g_s \in G_s(\mathcal{T})$  with  $\rho_{t,s}(g_t) = g_s$  for  $t > s > 0$ . Hereby we obtain a coherent sequence of isomorphisms  $\eta_{g_s}$  between  $\mathbb{K}_s$  and  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K}_s)$  satisfying  $\pi_{s+1,s} \circ \eta_{g_{s+1}} = \eta_{g_s} \circ \pi_{s+1,s}$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  by (A7). This yields an isomorphism between  $\mathbb{K}$  and  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K}) \cong \mathbb{K}^{-1}$  (see [GKpp, section 5] for details).

To exclude Kakutani equivalence between  $\mathbb{K}$  and  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K})$  for  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  without an infinite branch,  $n$ -words are constructed by substituting Feldman patterns of  $s$ -equivalence classes of  $(n-1)$ -words into Feldman patterns of  $(s-1)$ -equivalence classes of  $(n-1)$ -words. In this iteration of substitution steps one determines parameters  $T_s, M_s$  recursively and proceeds as follows:

- (1) We divide the  $2^{4e(n-1)}$  many  $s$ -classes contained in any  $[A]_{s-1} \in \mathcal{W}_{n-1}/\mathcal{Q}_{s-1}^{n-1}$  into  $2^{t_s}$  tuples of the form  $([A_1]_s, [A_2]_s, \dots, [A_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$  such that each tuple intersects each  $\ker(\rho_{s,s-1}^{(n-1)})$  orbit exactly once and the tuples are images of

<sup>2</sup>Given two equivalence relations  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  on a set  $X$  we say that  $\mathcal{R}$  *refines*  $\mathcal{Q}$  if considered as sets of ordered pairs we have  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ .

<sup>3</sup>Suppose  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are equivalence relations on a set  $X$  with  $\mathcal{R}$  refining  $\mathcal{Q}$ ,  $G$  and  $H$  are groups with  $G$  acting on  $X/\mathcal{Q}$  and  $H$  acting on  $X/\mathcal{R}$ ,  $\rho : H \rightarrow G$  is a homomorphism. Then we say that the  $H$  action is *subordinate* to the  $G$  action if for all  $x \in X$ , whenever  $[x]_{\mathcal{R}} \subset [x]_{\mathcal{Q}}$  we have  $h[x]_{\mathcal{R}} \subset \rho(h)[x]_{\mathcal{Q}}$ .

<sup>4</sup>If  $G$  is a group of involutions with a collection of canonical generators that acts on  $X$ , then the canonical *skew diagonal action* of  $G$  on  $X^n$  is defined by

$$g(x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-1}) = \begin{cases} g x_0 g x_1 \dots g x_{n-1}, & \text{if } g \in G \text{ is of even parity,} \\ g x_{n-1} g x_{n-2} \dots g x_0, & \text{if } g \in G \text{ is of odd parity.} \end{cases}$$

each other under the action by  $\ker(\rho_{s,s-1}^{(n-1)})$ . Here,  $N_{s+1} = 2^{4e(n-1)-t_s}$  with  $t_s \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$2^{t_s} = |\ker(\rho_{s,s-1}^{(n-1)})|.$$

We note that for  $i \neq j$  the  $G_s^{n-1}$  orbit of  $[A_i]_s$  does not intersect the  $G_s^{n-1}$  orbit of  $[A_j]_s$ .

- (2) We choose a set  $\Gamma_{s-1} \subset \mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_{s-1}^n$  that intersects each orbit of the skew-diagonal action by the group  $\text{im}(\rho_{s,s-1}^{(n-1)})$  exactly once.
- (3) We construct a collection of  $M_{s+1}$  different  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman patterns, where the tuple of building blocks is to be determined in step (6).
- (4) By the induction assumption of the substitution step, each  $[w]_{s-1} \in \Gamma_{s-1}$  can be decomposed into a concatenation of different  $(T_s, N_s, M_s)$ -Feldman patterns.
- (5) Let  $K_s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $K_s |\ker(\rho_{s,s-1}^{(n-1)})| = 2^{4e(n)}$ . For each  $[w]_{s-1} \in \Gamma_{s-1}$  we choose  $K_s$  many different concatenations of  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman patterns. We enumerate these choices by  $\{1, \dots, K_s\}$ .
- (6) Let  $[w]_{s-1} \in \Gamma_{s-1}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, K_s\}$ . We decompose  $[w]_{s-1}$  into repetitions  $[A]_{s-1}^{T_s}$  of single classes. For the  $i$ -th such repetition we substitute the  $i$ -th Feldman pattern occurring in  $j$  using one of the subordinate building tuples from step (1). In fact, the actual tuple is chosen by cycling through the possible ones. Let  $\Omega'_s$  be the collection of such strings obtained for all  $[w]_{s-1} \in \Gamma_{s-1}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, K_s\}$ .
- (7) Then we let  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n = G_s^{n-1}\Omega'_s$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  is closed under the skew-diagonal action by  $G_s^{n-1}$  and each  $[w]_{s-1} \in \mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_{s-1}^n$  contains  $2^{4e(n)}$  many  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  classes by the choice of  $K_s$  in step (5).
- (8) By (6) and (7), each element in  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  is a concatenation of different  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman patterns, the so-called  $s$ -Feldman patterns. We will call the sequence of  $s$ -pattern types that appear in an element of  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  its  $s$ -pattern structure. We note that a particular type of  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman pattern can occur in different elements  $[w]_s, [w']_s \in \mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  only if  $[w]_s = g[w']_s$  for some nontrivial  $g \in G_s^{n-1}$ . In this case the building tuples of that particular type of  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman pattern are disjoint from each other by step (1).

By this construction in [GKpp, sections 7-8] we obtain the following statement on  $\bar{f}$ -distances.

**Lemma 16** ([GKpp], Proposition 56). *For every  $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  there is  $0 < \alpha_s < \frac{1}{8}$  such that for every  $n \geq M(s)$  we have*

$$(5.2) \quad \bar{f}(W, W') > \alpha_s$$

*on any substrings  $W$  and  $W'$  of at least  $\frac{h_n}{R_n}$  consecutive symbols in any words  $w, w' \in \mathcal{W}_n$  with  $[w]_s \neq [w']_s$ .*

The sequence  $(\alpha_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  is decreasing. Here, the numbers  $R_n$  are determined inductively [GKpp, eq. (8.6)]. Even though  $R_n \rightarrow \infty$ , strings of length  $h_n/R_n$  are long enough to contain many Feldman patterns of equivalence classes of  $(n-1)$ -words.

Lemma 16 also allows us to show in the following lemma that a substantial string of consecutive symbols from an  $s$ -pattern with the building tuple traversed in reverse order, is  $\bar{f}$ -apart from any string in  $\mathbb{K}$ . We use this statement in the proof

of Lemma 19, where we adapt methods from [ORW82, chapter 13] to exclude the existence of good  $\bar{f}$ -codes between Feldman patterns of different types.

**Lemma 17.** *Suppose that the  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman pattern of type  $r$  appears with building blocks  $([A_1]_s, [A_2]_s, \dots, [A_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$  in some  $[w]_s \in \mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$ . Let  $F$  be a finite string of symbols in  $\Sigma$  of length  $|F| \geq 2^{e(n-1)}T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2M_{s+1}+2}h_{n-1}$  such that  $F$  is part of the  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman pattern of type  $r$  with building blocks  $([A_{N_{s+1}}]_s, \dots, [A_1]_s)$  (that is, the building tuple is traversed in opposite order). Then*

$$(5.3) \quad \bar{f}(F, D) > \frac{\alpha_s}{2}$$

for any finite string  $D$  in  $\mathbb{K}$ .

*Proof.* Assume that there is a string  $D$  in  $\mathbb{K}$  with  $\bar{f}(F, D) \leq \frac{\alpha_s}{2}$  and let  $\pi$  be a best possible match between  $F$  and  $D$ . Then

$$(5.4) \quad 1 - 3\frac{\alpha_s}{2} < \frac{1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{2}}{1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{2}} \leq \frac{|D|}{|F|} \leq \frac{1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{2}}{1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{2}} < 1 + 3\frac{\alpha_s}{2}$$

by Fact 12. In particular,  $D$  has to lie within at most three  $s$ -patterns and we decompose  $D$  into  $D = D_1D_2D_3$ , where the substrings  $D_i$  belong to different  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -patterns. Furthermore, for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , let  $F_i$  denote the substring of  $F$  matched to  $D_i$  under  $\pi$ . (Some of the substrings  $D_i, F_i$  could be empty.)

If  $\bar{f}(F_i, D_i) > \frac{\alpha_s}{2}$ , then we stop examining this case.

Otherwise, we have  $\frac{1}{2} < 1 - 3\frac{\alpha_s}{2} < \frac{|D_i|}{|F_i|} < 1 + 3\frac{\alpha_s}{2} < 2$  by the same estimate as in (5.4). If  $|D_i| < 2T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2M_{s+1}+2}h_{n-1}$ , then we ignore the strings  $D_i$  and  $F_i$  in the following considerations. This might increase the  $\bar{f}$ -distance by at most  $8/2^{e(n-1)}$  by Fact 10. If  $|D_i| \geq 2T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2M_{s+1}+2}h_{n-1}$ , then  $|F_i| \geq T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2M_{s+1}+2}h_{n-1}$ . In case that the  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman pattern types of  $D_i$  and  $F_i$  are different from each other, these lengths allow the application of Lemma 14 and we obtain

$$\bar{f}(F_i, D_i) > \alpha_s - \frac{4}{2^{2e(n-1)-0.5t_s}} - \frac{1}{R_{n-1}}.$$

In the next step, we investigate the case that the  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman pattern types of  $D_i$  and  $F_i$  agree with each other, that is, the type is  $r$ . We recall from step (8) in the substitution process that in the construction of  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  the only other occurrences of that Feldman pattern of type  $r$  come with other tuples of building blocks that are disjoint from  $([A_1]_s, [A_2]_s, \dots, [A_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$ . In both possible scenarios (either disjoint tuples of building blocks or the building blocks are traversed in opposite directions), we can apply the symbol by block replacement lemma in Lemma 9 and obtain

$$\bar{f}(F_i, D_i) > \alpha_s \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{4e(n-1)-t_s}}\right) - \frac{1}{R_{n-1}}.$$

Altogether, we conclude (5.3) by Fact 11.  $\square$

The repetitions of  $s$ -classes in  $s$ -Feldman patterns and the choices of building tuples in step (6) guarantee the following statement on uniformity of occurrences of substitution instances (see [GKpp, Lemma 46] and [GKpp, Remark 52]).

*Remark 18.* Let  $w \in \mathcal{W}_n$  and  $[P_{n-1}]_s$  be a  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman pattern in  $[w]_s$  with building blocks from the tuple  $([A_1]_s, \dots, [A_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$  in  $\mathcal{W}_{n-1}/\mathcal{Q}_s^{n-1}$ . Then for every  $i = 1, \dots, N_{s+1}$  each  $a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{W}_{n-1}$  with  $[a_{i,j}]_s = [A_i]_s$  is substituted the same number of times into each occurrence of  $[A_i]_s^{T_{s+1} \cdot 2^{t_{s+1}}}$  in  $[P_{n-1}]_s$  within  $w$ .

We end our review of the constructions in [GKpp] with the observation that at each stage we can choose the number of concatenations of different Feldman-patterns arbitrarily large. This allows us to produce sufficiently many substitution instances of each  $n$ -word to guarantee requirement (R9) below.

## 6. COMPLETION OF PROOFS OF THEOREMS A AND B

**6.1. Shift space description of the process.** As described in Section 5, the transformation  $T$  was constructed as a symbolic system  $\mathbb{K}$  using a construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Given this construction sequence, the transformation  $U = T \times \mathbb{B} = \Upsilon(T)$  is isomorphic to the left shift,  $\text{sh}$ , on a sequence space that we now describe. Let

$$\mathbb{S} = \{(\sigma_j, v_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in (\Sigma \times \{0, 1\})^{\mathbb{Z}} : \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, (\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{ is a bi-infinite concatenation of } n\text{-words from } \mathcal{W}_n\},$$

with the topology induced from the product topology on  $(\Sigma \times \{0, 1\})^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . We abbreviate  $(\mathbb{S}, \text{sh})$  by  $\mathbb{S}$ . Define for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the set

$$\mathcal{V}_n = \{(w, v) \mid w \in \mathcal{W}_n \text{ and } v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}\}.$$

Since the construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniquely readable and strongly uniform, the symbolic system  $\mathbb{K}$  has a unique non-atomic shift-invariant measure  $\nu'$ . By putting

$$\nu(\langle(w, v)\rangle) = \frac{\nu'(\langle w \rangle)}{2^{h_n}}$$

for each cylinder set  $\langle(w, v)\rangle$  with  $(w, v) \in \mathcal{V}_n$ , we define a  $\text{sh}$ -invariant measure  $\nu$  on the Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{S}$  which is the same as the product of  $\nu'$  and the  $(1/2, 1/2)$ -Bernoulli measure.

We will often refer to the sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  as *shadings* of  $n$ -words. That is, for the pair  $(w, v) \in \mathcal{V}_n$  we regard the  $w_j$  entry in  $w$  as *shaded* if  $v_j = 1$  and *unshaded* if  $v_j = 0$ .

As mentioned at the end of Section 5 we can concatenate sufficiently many Feldman patterns to produce a large number  $f_n$  of occurrences of each  $n$ -word  $w_i$  in each  $(n+1)$ -word  $w$ . Then the law of large numbers allows us to obtain the following ‘‘almost uniformity’’ of shadings of  $w_i$  within shadings of  $w$ .

(R9) For  $w \in \mathcal{W}_{n+1}$  a proportion of at least  $\frac{999}{1000}$  of the shadings  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}}$  are such that for all  $w_i \in \mathcal{W}_n$  and  $v_j \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  the number  $R_{i,j}$  of times the shading  $v_j$  appears with  $w_i$  satisfies

$$(6.1) \quad \left| \frac{R_{i,j}}{f_n} - \frac{1}{2^{h_n}} \right| < \frac{1}{2 \cdot 2^{h_n}}.$$

**6.2. Proof of Non-Kakutani Equivalence.** Since  $\mathbb{S} \cong \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$  has positive entropy, any Kakutani equivalence between  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{S}^{-1} \cong \text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  would have to be an even equivalence.<sup>5</sup> Thus, to prove part (b) in Theorem B it remains to show that under the assumption that the tree  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{Trees}$  does not have an infinite branch,  $\mathbb{S}$  is not evenly equivalent to  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ . A generalization of Proposition 3.2 in [ORW82, p. 92] given in [GKpp, section 9.2] guarantees the existence of a consistent sequence of well-approximating finite codes in  $\bar{f}$  between two evenly equivalent transformations (see properties (C1) and (C2) below for details). To exclude the existence of such a sequence of finite codes from  $\mathbb{S}$  to  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  in case  $\mathcal{T}$  does not have an infinite branch, we use the method of [ORW82, chapter 13] and properties of the construction from [GKpp]. This generalizes section 9.3 of [GKpp].

Here, a *code* of length  $2K + 1$  is a function  $\phi : (\Sigma \times \{0, 1\})^{\mathbb{Z} \cap [-K, K]} \rightarrow \Sigma \times \{0, 1\}$ . Given such a code  $\phi$  of length  $2K + 1$  the *stationary code*  $\bar{\phi}$  on  $(\Sigma \times \{0, 1\})^{\mathbb{Z}}$  determined by  $\phi$  is defined as  $\bar{\phi}(s)$  for any  $s \in (\Sigma \times \{0, 1\})^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , where for any  $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\bar{\phi}(s)(l) = \phi(s \upharpoonright [l - K, l + K]).$$

In this setting,  $\bar{\phi}(s) \upharpoonright [-N, N]$  denotes the string of symbols

$$\bar{\phi}(s)(-N) \bar{\phi}(s)(-N + 1) \dots \bar{\phi}(s)(N - 1) \bar{\phi}(s)(N)$$

in  $(\Sigma \times \{0, 1\})^{2N+1}$ .

*Remark.* There is an ambiguity in applying a code  $\phi$  of length  $2K + 1$  to blocks of the form  $s \upharpoonright [a, b]$ : It does not make sense to apply it to the initial string  $s \upharpoonright [a, a + K - 1]$  or the end string  $s \upharpoonright [b - K + 1, b]$ . However, if  $b - a$  is large with respect to the code length  $2K + 1$ , we can fill in  $\phi(s) \upharpoonright [a, a + K - 1]$  and  $\phi(s) \upharpoonright [b - K + 1, b]$  arbitrarily and it makes a negligible difference to the  $\bar{f}$  distance. We refer to the general phenomenon of ambiguity or disagreement at the beginning and end of strings as *end effects*. Strings are always chosen long enough such that end effects can be neglected in our  $\bar{f}$  estimates.

We show in Lemma 20 that a well-approximating finite code  $\phi$  can be identified with an element of the group action. A key step in the proof is Lemma 19. Here, we show for substantial substrings  $E$  and  $\bar{E}$  of  $s$ -Feldman patterns  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$  of different types that there is a one-to-one correspondence between shadings  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{|E|}$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi(E, v), (\bar{E}, \bar{v}))$  is small and shadings  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{|E|}$  such that  $\phi(E, v')$  is  $\bar{f}$ -apart from any substring in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ . This says that the code cannot work well on at least half of the shadings. To show the existence of such a shading  $v'$  we decompose  $\bar{E}$  into complete cycles  $\bar{C}_k$  of its  $s$ -Feldman pattern  $\bar{P}$  and look at the string  $C_k$  with its associated shading  $v_k$  whose image under the code  $\phi$  is matched to such a cycle  $\bar{C}_k$  under a best possible  $\bar{f}$ -match. We then build a reshuffling  $v'_k$  of the shading  $v_k$  such that  $\phi(C_k, v'_k)$  is  $\bar{f}$ -close to a cycle where the  $s$ -classes of words are traversed in the opposite direction. Such a string is  $\bar{f}$ -apart from any string in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  by Lemma 17. To build such a reshuffling it is crucial that all substitution instances of the  $s$ -classes in the complete cycle occur the same number of times by Remark 18. We visualize the building of reshufflings in Figures 6.1 and 6.2.

<sup>5</sup>Two transformations  $S : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$  and  $T : (Y, \nu) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$  are said to be *evenly equivalent* if there are subsets  $A \subseteq X$  and  $B \subseteq Y$  of equal measure  $\mu(A) = \nu(B) > 0$  such that  $S_A$  and  $T_B$  are isomorphic to each other.

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $E$  and  $\bar{E}$  be strings of symbols in  $\Sigma$  that are substitution instances of  $s$ -Feldman patterns  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$  of  $\mathcal{Q}_s^{n-1}$  equivalence classes, respectively, where  $n-1 \geq M(s)$ . Assume  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$  are different types of  $s$ -Feldman patterns, and  $E$  and  $\bar{E}$  both have length at least  $\frac{|P|}{2^{2e(n-1)}}$ . Suppose  $\phi$  is a code of length  $K$ , where  $h_{n-1}$  is large compared to  $K$ . Then there is a one-to-one map from shadings  $v$  in  $\{0, 1\}^{|E|}$  such that*

$$\bar{f}(\phi(E, v), (\bar{E}, \bar{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s^2}{2000}$$

for some  $\bar{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{|\bar{E}|}$  to shadings  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{|E|}$  such that

$$\bar{f}(\phi(E, v'), (\bar{D}, \bar{u})) > \frac{\alpha_s}{20}$$

for all strings  $(\bar{D}, \bar{u})$  in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ .

*Proof.* Recall from the construction in [GKpp] that the  $s$ -Feldman patterns are  $(T_{s+1}, N_{s+1}, M_{s+1})$ -Feldman patterns with  $N_{s+1} = 2^{4e(n-1)-t_s}$ . Accordingly the length of  $s$ -patterns is  $|P| = T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2M_{s+1}+3}h_{n-1}$  and the maximum cycle length is  $T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2M_{s+1}+1}h_{n-1}$ . In particular, there are at least  $2^{4e(n-1)}$  complete cycles of  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$  in  $E$  and  $\bar{E}$ , respectively. We delete partial cycles of  $\bar{P}$  which might increase the  $\bar{f}$  distance by at most  $\frac{2}{2^{4e(n-1)}}$ .

We denote the tuple of building blocks for  $[P]_s$  by  $([A_1]_s, \dots, [A_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$  and the tuple of building blocks for  $[\bar{P}]_s$  by  $([\bar{A}_1]_s, \dots, [\bar{A}_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$ . Moreover, let  $r$  and  $\bar{r}$  denote the types of  $s$ -Feldman pattern of  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$ , respectively. We look at cycles  $\bar{C}_k$  in  $\bar{P}$ . Then we decompose such a cycle  $\bar{C}_k$  into the substitution instances  $\bar{C}_{k,i}$  of maximum consecutive repetitions  $[\bar{A}_i]_s^{T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2\bar{r}}}$  of the same  $s$ -class. Let  $C_k$  and  $C_{k,i}$  denote the strings in  $P$  matched under a best possible  $\bar{f}$ -match to  $\bar{C}_k$  and  $\bar{C}_{k,i}$ , respectively. For a proportion of at least  $1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{10}$  of the indices in  $E$  we have that they lie in some  $C_{k,i}$  satisfying

$$(6.2) \quad 1 - 3\frac{\alpha_s}{80} < \frac{1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{80}}{1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{80}} \leq \frac{|C_{k,i}|}{|\bar{C}_{k,i}|} \leq \frac{1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{80}}{1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{80}} < 1 + 3\frac{\alpha_s}{80}$$

by Fact 12. We ignore those indices that lie in or are matched to some  $C_{k,i}$  violating inequality (6.2). This might increase the  $\bar{f}$ -distance by at most  $\frac{\alpha_s}{4}$ . Now we distinguish between the two possible cases  $r < \bar{r}$  and  $r > \bar{r}$ .

- In the first instance, let  $r < \bar{r}$ , that is, the cycle length  $T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2r+1}h_{n-1}$  in  $P$  is smaller than the length  $|\bar{C}_{k,i}| = T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2\bar{r}}h_{n-1}$  of maximum repetition of the same  $s$ -class in  $\bar{P}$ . Since  $|C_{k,i}| > (1 - 3\frac{\alpha_s}{80}) \cdot |\bar{C}_{k,i}|$  by (6.2), there are at least  $\lfloor (1 - 3\frac{\alpha_s}{80})N_{s+1}^{2(\bar{r}-r)-1} - 2 \rfloor$  complete cycles in each  $C_{k,i}$ . We reduce each  $C_{k,i}$  to this repetition of  $\lfloor (1 - 3\frac{\alpha_s}{80})N_{s+1}^{2(\bar{r}-r)-1} - 2 \rfloor$  many cycles and delete the other symbols. By (6.2) this might increase the  $\bar{f}$  distance by at most  $\frac{12\alpha_s}{80} + \frac{5}{N_{s+1}}$ . By Remark 18 each  $C_{k,i}$  now contains each substitution instance of each  $([A_1]_s, \dots, [A_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$  the same number of times. Furthermore, let  $v_{k,i}$  denote the shading of  $C_{k,i}$ . Since every  $C_{k,i}$  contains each substitution instance of each  $([A_1]_s, \dots, [A_{N_{s+1}}]_s)$  the same number of times, there is a reshuffling  $v'_{k,i}$  of the shading  $v_{k,N_{s+1}-i}$  such that each substitution instance on  $(C_{k,i}, v'_{k,i})$  is paired with the same shadings as on  $(C_{k,N_{s+1}-i}, v_{k,N_{s+1}-i})$ . In fact, we build this reshuffling as follows: if




FIGURE 6.1. Illustration of the reshuffling procedure in case of Feldman pattern types  $r < \bar{r}$ .

$\nu \in \{0, 1\}^{h_{n-1}}$  is the  $\ell$ -th shading occurring with a substitution instance  $w \in \mathcal{W}_{n-1}$  in  $(C_{k, N_{s+1}-i}, v_{k, N_{s+1}-i})$ , then in  $v'_{k,i}$ , we take  $\nu$  to be the shading associated with the  $\ell$ -th occurrence of that substitution instance  $w$  in  $C_{k,i}$ . In particular, the images  $\phi(C_{k,i}, v'_{k,i})$  and  $\phi(C_{k, N_{s+1}-i}, v_{k, N_{s+1}-i})$  are close to each other in  $\bar{f}$ .

- We now turn to the case  $r > \bar{r}$ , that is, the length  $T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2r}h_{n-1}$  of maximum repetitions of the same  $s$ -class in  $P$  is larger than the cycle length  $T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2\bar{r}+1}h_{n-1}$  in  $\bar{P}$ . For a proportion of at most  $1/N_{s+1}$ , the strings  $C_k$  overlap substitution instance of two different  $s$ -classes. We ignore those. Otherwise, for some  $m \in \{1, \dots, N_{s+1}\}$  each  $C_{k,i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N_{s+1}$ , contains a repetition of at least  $\lfloor (1 - \frac{3\alpha_s}{80})N_{s+1} - 2 \rfloor$  many  $[A_m]_s^{T_{s+1}N_{s+1}^{2\bar{r}-1}}$ . This string contains each substitution instance of  $[A_m]_s$  the same number of times. We reduce  $C_{k,i}$  to this string and delete the other symbols. By (6.2) this might increase the  $\bar{f}$  distance by at most  $\frac{12\alpha_s}{80} + \frac{5}{N_{s+1}}$ . Since every  $C_{k,i}$  contains each substitution instance of  $[A_m]_s$  the same number of times, we can build a reshuffling  $v'_{k,i}$  of the shading  $v_{k, N_{s+1}-i}$  as in the other case such that each substitution instance on  $(C_{k,i}, v'_{k,i})$  is paired with the same shadings as on  $(C_{k, N_{s+1}-i}, v_{k, N_{s+1}-i})$ . As in the other case, the images  $\phi(C_{k,i}, v'_{k,i})$  and  $\phi(C_{k, N_{s+1}-i}, v_{k, N_{s+1}-i})$  are close to each other in  $\bar{f}$ .

In both cases  $r < \bar{r}$  and  $r > \bar{r}$ , we obtain, for each string  $C_{k,1} \dots C_{k, N_{s+1}}$ , a new shading such that the image under the code  $\phi$  is  $\bar{f}$ -close to a cycle of the  $s$ -pattern  $\bar{P}$  traversed in the opposite direction. Thus, we obtain a new shading  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{|E|}$



*Outline of Proof:* If  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$ , then it follows from a straightforward estimate on the length of strings in (6.3) that there can be at most one  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $|\bar{A} \cap \bar{w}| \geq (1 - \delta)|\bar{w}|$ . The harder part is to show that there is exactly one such word  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  and that it has to be of the form  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_g[w]_s$  for a unique  $g \in G_s$ , that is, the  $s$ -pattern structure of  $w$  and  $\bar{w}$  has to be the same. This will follow from an application of Lemma 19 saying that for substantial substrings  $E$  and  $\bar{E}$  of  $s$ -Feldman patterns of different types there is a one-to-one map from shadings  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{|E|}$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi(E, v), (\bar{E}, \bar{v}))$  is small to shadings  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{|E|}$  such that  $\phi(E, v')$  is  $\bar{f}$ -apart from any substring in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ . Thus, the code cannot work well on at least half of the shadings if  $w$  and  $\bar{w}$  have a different  $s$ -pattern structure.

We now turn to the detailed proof.

*Proof.* Our initial requirement on the size of  $n$  is that  $h_{n-1}$  be much larger than the length of the code, so that end effects are negligible for  $(n - 1)$ -words. Let  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  be a shading of  $w$  such that there is a string  $(\bar{A}, \bar{v})$  in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  with  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$ . By Fact 12 we know from  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$  that

$$(6.3) \quad 1 - 3\varepsilon \leq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \leq \frac{|\bar{A}|}{h_n} \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \leq 1 + 3\varepsilon.$$

Hence, there can be at most one  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $|\bar{A} \cap \bar{w}| \geq (1 - \delta)|\bar{w}|$ .

**Claim 21.** *Suppose that there is no such  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$ . Then there exists another shading  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v'), (\bar{D}, \bar{u})) > 2\varepsilon$  for all strings  $(\bar{D}, \bar{u})$  in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ .*

*In fact, there will be an one-to-one map from shadings  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon \text{ for a string } (\bar{A}, \bar{v}) \text{ in } \text{rev}(\mathbb{S}), \text{ where there is} \\ \text{no } \bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n) \text{ with } |\bar{A} \cap \bar{w}| \geq (1 - \delta)|\bar{w}|, \end{aligned}$$

*to shadings  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that*

$$\bar{f}(\phi(w, v'), (\bar{D}, \bar{u})) > 2\varepsilon \text{ for all strings } (\bar{D}, \bar{u}) \text{ in } \text{rev}(\mathbb{S}).$$

We prove Claim 21 below. It implies that for a proportion of at least  $1 - 2\theta$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , for any string  $(\bar{A}, \bar{v})$  in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  with  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$ , there must be exactly one  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $|\bar{A} \cap \bar{w}| \geq (1 - \delta)h_n$ . By the same method of proof, one also obtains that  $w$  and  $\bar{w}$  need to have the same  $s$ -pattern structure. By the construction in [GKpp], this only happens if their equivalence classes  $[w]_s$  and  $[\bar{w}]_s$  lie on the same orbit of the group action by  $G_s^n$  (recall from step (5) that substitution instances not lying on the same  $G_s^n$  orbit were constructed as a different concatenation of different Feldman patterns). We have seen in Remark 15 that an element  $g \in G_s^n$  of odd parity induces  $\eta_g : \mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n \rightarrow \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  that preserves the order of  $s$ -Feldman patterns, while an element  $g \in G_s^n$  of even parity would induce a map  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n \rightarrow \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  that reverses the order of  $s$ -Feldman patterns. By Lemma 16 and the freeness of the group action according to specification (A7) we conclude that there is a unique  $g \in G_s$ , which has to be of odd parity, with  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_g[w]_s$ . This yields Lemma 20.

*Proof of Claim 21.* By assumption, there is no  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $|\bar{A} \cap \bar{w}| \geq (1 - \delta)|\bar{w}|$ . Since we know  $|\bar{A}| \geq (1 - 3\varepsilon)|\bar{w}|$ , there have to be two words  $\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2 \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$

such that  $\bar{A}$  is a substring of  $\bar{w}_1\bar{w}_2$  and

$$(6.4) \quad |\bar{A} \cap \bar{w}_j| \geq (\delta - 3\varepsilon) \cdot |\bar{w}_j| > \frac{180}{\alpha_s} \varepsilon h_n \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

Then the beginning of  $\phi(w, v)$  is matched with a string in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  associated with the end of  $\bar{w}_1$ , while the end of  $\phi(w, v)$  is matched with a string in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  associated with the beginning of  $\bar{w}_2$ . There are two possible cases: Either at least one of  $\bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2$  has a different  $s$ -pattern structure from that of  $w$ , or  $\bar{w}_1$  and  $\bar{w}_2$  have the same  $s$ -pattern structure as  $w$ . Here we point out that the Feldman pattern types in the  $s$ -pattern structure of the beginning and end of  $w$  are different from each other by construction. (Recall from step (5) that substitution instances were constructed as a concatenation of different Feldman patterns.)

To investigate both cases we denote by  $\bar{A}_j$  the part of  $\bar{A}$  corresponding to  $\bar{w}_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . Let  $\pi$  be a best possible match in  $\bar{f}$  between  $\phi(w, v)$  and  $(\bar{A}, \bar{v})$ . Then we denote the parts in  $\phi(w, v)$  corresponding to  $(\bar{A}_j, \bar{v}_j)$  under  $\pi$  by  $\phi(A_j, v_j)$ . Since  $\pi$  is a map on the indices, we can also view it as a map between  $\phi(A_j, v_j)$  and  $(\bar{A}_j, \bar{v}_j)$ .

We note that  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$  requires  $\bar{f}(\phi(A_j, v_j), (\bar{A}_j, \bar{v}_j)) < \frac{\alpha_s}{60}$  for both  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  because otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) \\ &= \frac{|A_1| + |\bar{A}_1|}{|w| + |\bar{A}|} \cdot \bar{f}(\phi(A_1, v_1), (\bar{A}_1, \bar{v}_1)) + \frac{|A_2| + |\bar{A}_2|}{|w| + |\bar{A}|} \cdot \bar{f}(\phi(A_2, v_2), (\bar{A}_2, \bar{v}_2)) \\ &\geq \frac{\frac{180}{\alpha_s} \varepsilon h_n}{h_n + (1 + 3\varepsilon)h_n} \cdot \frac{\alpha_s}{60} > \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

by Fact 11 and our length estimate on  $\bar{A}_j$  in (6.4). Then Fact 12 and inequality (6.4) yield

$$(6.5) \quad |A_j| \geq \frac{1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{60}}{1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{60}} \cdot |\bar{A}_j| > (1 - 3\frac{\alpha_s}{60}) \cdot \frac{180}{\alpha_s} \varepsilon h_n > \frac{160}{\alpha_s} \varepsilon h_n$$

for both  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ .

In order to have  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$ , we need to have  $\bar{f}(\phi(A_j, v_j), (\bar{A}_j, \bar{v}_j)) < \varepsilon$  for at least one  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ .

**Claim 22.** *There is a one-to-one map from shadings  $v_j \in \{0, 1\}^{|A_j|}$  such that*

$$(6.6) \quad \bar{f}(\phi(A_j, v_j), (\bar{A}_j, \bar{v}_j)) < \varepsilon$$

*to shadings  $v'_j \in \{0, 1\}^{|A_j|}$  such that*

$$\bar{f}(\phi(A_j, v'_j), (\bar{D}_j, \bar{u}_j)) > \frac{\alpha_s}{30}$$

*for all strings  $(\bar{D}_j, \bar{u}_j)$  in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ .*

We prove Claim 22 below. Suppose that  $(\bar{D}, \bar{u})$  is any string in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  with length  $|\bar{D}| < (1 + 6\varepsilon)h_n < 1.5h_n$  (otherwise, we have  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v'), (\bar{D}, \bar{u})) > 2\varepsilon$  by Fact 12). For every shading  $v$  of  $w$ , we write  $v = (v_1, v_2)$ , where  $v_j$  is the shading of  $w_j$ . If equation (6.6) holds with  $j = 1$ , define  $v' = (v'_1, v_2)$ ; otherwise define

$v' = (v_1, v'_2)$ . We combine the result from Claim 22 with the estimate on  $|A_j|$  from (6.5) to conclude using Fact 11 that the shading  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  is such that

$$(6.7) \quad \bar{f}(\phi(w, v'), (\bar{D}, \bar{u})) \geq \frac{|A_j| + |\bar{D}_j|}{|w| + |\bar{D}|} \cdot \frac{\alpha_s}{30} > \frac{2}{5} \cdot \frac{160}{\alpha_s} \varepsilon \cdot \frac{\alpha_s}{30} > 2\varepsilon.$$

Clearly the map  $v \mapsto v'$  is one-to-one in each of these two cases separately. If there were  $v = (v_1, v_2)$  such that equation (6.6) holds for  $j = 1$  and  $\tilde{v} = (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$  such that (6.6) does not hold for  $j = 1$ , then it is not possible to have  $v_2 = \tilde{v}'_2$  since  $v_2 = \tilde{v}'_2$  would imply  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) > 2\varepsilon$ , by the estimate in (6.7), which contradicts the assumption that  $\bar{f}(\phi(w, v), (\bar{A}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$ . Therefore the map  $v \mapsto v'$  is one-to-one. This finishes the proof of Claim 21.  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 22.* Since  $\bar{f}(\phi(A_j, v_j), (\bar{A}_j, \bar{v}_j)) < \varepsilon$ , we have  $|A_j| \geq \frac{160}{\alpha_s} \varepsilon h_n$  by (6.5). Hence, for sufficiently large  $n$  the strings  $A_j$  and  $\bar{A}_j$  are longer than  $h_n/2^{e(n-1)}$ . In particular, there are at least  $2^{6e(n-1)}$  complete  $s$ -Feldman patterns (out of building blocks in  $\mathcal{W}_{n-1}/\mathcal{Q}_s^{n-1}$ ) in  $A_j$  and  $\bar{A}_j$ . Moreover, all of them have the same length. (If we are in Case 2,  $s(n) = s(n-1) + 1$ , of the construction in [GKpp, section 8.2] we ignore the strings coming from  $\mathcal{W}^{\dagger\dagger}$ , which might increase the  $\bar{f}$  distance by at most  $\frac{2}{p_n}$  according to the length portion of strings from  $\mathcal{W}^{\dagger\dagger}$  in words of  $\mathcal{W}_n$  and Fact 10.) We complete partial  $s$ -patterns at the beginning and end of  $A_j$  and  $\bar{A}_j$ , which might increase the  $\bar{f}$  distance by at most  $\frac{2}{2^{6e(n-1)}}$  according to Fact 10 as well. The augmented strings obtained in this way are denoted by  $A_{j,aug}$  and  $\bar{A}_{j,aug}$ , respectively, and we decompose them into the  $s$ -Feldman patterns:

$$A_{j,aug} = P_{j,n-1,1} \cdots P_{j,n-1,m} \quad \bar{A}_{j,aug} = \bar{P}_{j,n-1,1} \cdots \bar{P}_{j,n-1,\bar{m}}.$$

In the next step, we write  $A_{j,aug}$  and  $\bar{A}_{j,aug}$  as

$$A_{j,aug} = E_{j,1} \cdots E_{j,t} \quad \bar{A}_{j,aug} = \bar{E}_{j,1} \cdots \bar{E}_{j,t},$$

where  $E_{j,i}$  and  $\bar{E}_{j,i}$  are maximal substrings such that  $E_{j,i} \subseteq P_{j,n-1,\ell(i)}$  and  $\bar{E}_{j,i} \subseteq \bar{P}_{j,n-1,\bar{\ell}(i)}$  correspond to each other under  $\pi$ . In particular, we have  $t \geq 2^{6e(n-1)}$ .

If  $A_j$  and  $\bar{A}_j$  lie in  $w$  and  $\bar{w}_j$  with the same  $s$ -pattern structure, then  $|A_{j'}| > \frac{160}{\alpha_s} \varepsilon h_n$  for  $j' \neq j$  from (6.5) and  $\bar{f}(\phi(A_j, v_j), (\bar{A}_j, \bar{v}_j)) < \varepsilon$  together imply that the Feldman pattern types of  $P_{j,n-1,\ell(i)}$  and  $\bar{P}_{j,n-1,\bar{\ell}(i)}$  cannot be the same.

If the  $s$ -pattern structures of  $w$  and  $\bar{w}_j$  are different from each other, then we have at most one pair of  $E_{j,i}$  and  $\bar{E}_{j,i}$  where the type of Feldman pattern coincides. We delete this possible pair. This might increase the  $\bar{f}$  distance by at most  $\frac{2}{2^{6e(n-1)}}$  according to Fact 10 because we have  $t \geq 2^{6e(n-1)}$ .

Thus, in the following we can assume that all pairs  $E_{j,i}$  and  $\bar{E}_{j,i}$  lie in Feldman patterns of different type.

After completing the partial  $s$ -patterns and deleting at most one pair of  $E_{j,i}$  and  $\bar{E}_{j,i}$ , we still have  $\bar{f}(\phi(A_{j,aug}, v_{j,aug}), (\bar{A}_{j,aug}, \bar{v}_{j,aug})) < 2\varepsilon < \frac{\alpha_s^4}{4 \cdot 10^6}$  if  $n$  is sufficiently large. Hence, a proportion of at least  $1 - \frac{\alpha_s^2}{100}$  of the indices have to lie in pairs  $E_{j,i}$  and  $\bar{E}_{j,i}$  with  $\bar{f}(\phi(E_{j,i}, v_{j,i}), (\bar{E}_{j,i}, \bar{v}_{j,i})) < \frac{\alpha_s^2}{2000}$ .

If  $\bar{f}(\phi(E_{j,i}, v_{j,i}), (\bar{E}_{j,i}, \bar{v}_{j,i})) < \frac{\alpha_s^2}{2000}$ , then we have

$$(6.8) \quad 1 - \frac{1}{2^4} < \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2^5}}{1 + \frac{1}{2^5}} \leq \frac{|E_{j,i}|}{|\bar{E}_{j,i}|} \leq \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2^5}}{1 - \frac{1}{2^5}} < 1 + \frac{1}{2^3}$$

by Fact 12. Since a string well-matched with  $P_{j,n-1,\ell}$  has to lie within at most three consecutive patterns in  $\overline{A}_{j,aug}$ , in each  $P_{j,n-1,\ell}$  there are at most two segments  $E_{j,i}$  with  $|E_{j,i}| < \frac{|P_{j,n-1,\ell}|}{2^{2e(n-1)}}$ . For their corresponding segments we also get  $|\overline{E}_{j,i}| < \frac{|P_{j,n-1,\ell}|}{2^{2e(n-1)-1}}$  by the estimate in (6.8). By the same reasons, there are at most two segments  $\overline{E}_{j,i}$  with  $|\overline{E}_{j,i}| < \frac{|P_{j,n-1,\ell}|}{2^{2e(n-1)}}$  in each  $\overline{P}_{j,n-1,\ell}$  and we can also bound the lengths of their corresponding strings. Altogether, the proportion of symbols in those situations is at most  $\frac{1}{2^{2e(n-1)-4}}$  and we ignore them in the following consideration.

Hence, we consider the case that both  $|E_{j,i}|$  and  $|\overline{E}_{j,i}|$  are at least  $\frac{|P_{j,n-1,\ell}|}{2^{2e(n-1)}}$ . This allows us to apply Lemma 19. Combining it with the previous estimates, we conclude the existence of a  $v'_j \in \{0, 1\}^{|A_j|}$  such that

$$\overline{f}(\phi(A_j, v'_j), (\overline{D}_j, \overline{u}_j)) > \frac{\alpha_s}{20} - \frac{2}{\mathfrak{p}_n} - \frac{4}{2^{e(n-1)}} - 2\frac{\alpha_s^2}{100} > \frac{\alpha_s}{30}$$

for all strings  $(\overline{D}_j, \overline{u}_j)$  in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ . This finishes the proof of Claim 22.  $\square$

Altogether, we completed the proof of Lemma 20.  $\square$

Assume  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  are evenly equivalent. From [GKpp, Corollary 71] applied to  $\mathbb{S}$  there exists a sequence of finite codes  $(\phi_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  from  $\mathbb{S}$  to  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  such that for every  $0 < \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$  there exists  $N = N(\gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that for  $N \geq N(\gamma)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and all sufficiently large  $n$  (how large depends on  $N, \gamma$ , and  $k$ ) there is a collection  $\mathcal{V}'_n \subset \mathcal{V}_n$  that includes at least  $1 - \gamma$  of the strings in  $\mathcal{V}_n$  and the following condition holds: For  $(w, v) \in \mathcal{V}'_n$  there exists  $(\overline{A}, \overline{v})$  that occurs with positive frequency in the  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  process and we have

$$\overline{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\overline{A}, \overline{v})) < \gamma,$$

and

$$\overline{f}(\phi_N(w, v), \phi_{N+k}(w, v)) < \gamma.$$

We apply it with  $\gamma = \gamma_s = \frac{\alpha_s^8}{4 \cdot 10^{24}}$  for  $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  to obtain  $N(s) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that for every  $N \geq N(s)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  there is  $n(s, N, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  sufficiently large so that for all  $n \geq n(s, N, k)$  the hypothesis of Lemma 20 with  $\theta = \sqrt{\gamma_s}$ ,  $\delta = \delta_s = \frac{\alpha_s^6}{10^{22}}$ ,  $\varepsilon = \gamma_s$ , and  $\phi = \phi_N$  holds, and there exists a collection  $\mathcal{W}'_n$  of  $n$ -words (that includes at least  $1 - \sqrt{\gamma_s}$  of the  $n$ -words) satisfying the following properties:

- (C1) For  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$  we have for a proportion of at least  $1 - \sqrt{\gamma_s}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  that there exists  $z = z(w, v) \in \text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  such that  $z \upharpoonright [0, h_n - 1]$  occurs with positive frequency in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  and

$$\overline{f}(\phi_N(w, v), z \upharpoonright [0, h_n - 1]) < \frac{\alpha_s^8}{4 \cdot 10^{24}}.$$

- (C2) For  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$  we have for a proportion of at least  $1 - \sqrt{\gamma_s}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  that

$$\overline{f}(\phi_N(w, v), \phi_{N+k}(w, v)) < \frac{\alpha_s^8}{4 \cdot 10^{24}}.$$

Then we can prove the following analogue of [GKpp, Lemma 75].

**Lemma 23.** *Suppose that  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  are evenly equivalent and let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . There is a unique  $g_s \in G_s$  such that for every  $N \geq N(s)$  and sufficiently large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$  that for a proportion of at least  $\frac{99}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  there is  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w]_s$  and some shading sequence  $\bar{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that*

$$(6.9) \quad \bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}, \bar{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4},$$

where  $(\phi_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of finite codes as described above and  $\mathcal{W}'_n$  is the associated collection of  $n$ -words satisfying properties (C1) and (C2).

Moreover,  $g_s \in G_s$  is of odd parity and the sequence  $(g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies  $g_s = \rho_{s+1, s}(g_{s+1})$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Outline of Proof:* An application of Lemma 20 will imply that for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$  there is a large proportion of shadings such that (6.9) holds for  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_{n+1})$  with  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w]_s$  for some  $g_s \in G_s$ . The hard part is to show that actually the same group element of  $G_s$  works for all words in  $\mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$ . This is the content of Claim 24. Its proof bases upon the observation that a good  $\bar{f}$  match between  $\phi_N(w, v)$  and  $(\bar{w}, \bar{v})$  has to respect the  $s$ -pattern structure in  $w$ , that is, if  $w = P_1 \dots P_r$  is the decomposition into  $s$ -patterns and  $\bar{w} = \bar{P}_1 \dots \bar{P}_r$  is the corresponding decomposition under a best possible  $\bar{f}$ -match between  $\phi_N(w, v)$  and  $(\bar{w}, \bar{v})$ , then most of the  $[\bar{P}_i]_s$  have to lie in  $\eta_{g_s}[P_i]_s$ . Since the classes within the building tuple of  $P_i$  have disjoint  $G_s$  orbits by steps (1) and (8) of the construction in Section 5, we can show that for a large proportion of shaded  $n$ -words  $(w_j, v_j)$  there has to be  $\bar{w}_j \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\bar{w}_j]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w_j]_s$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(w_j, v_j), (\bar{w}_j, \bar{v}_j))$  is small for some shading sequence  $\bar{v}_j \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ . Using assumption (R9) this implies that for a large proportion of  $n$ -words  $w_j$  we have for a large proportions of shadings  $v_j$  that there is  $\bar{w}_j \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\bar{w}_j]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w_j]_s$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(w_j, v_j), (\bar{w}_j, \bar{v}_j))$  is small. This will allow us to conclude that the same group element of  $G_s$  works for all words in  $\mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$ .

Afterwards we show that the same group element  $g_s \in G_s$  works for all  $\phi_N$  with  $N \geq N(s)$ . Here, we use that images under  $\phi_N$  and  $\phi_{N+k}$  are  $\bar{f}$ -close to each other, while the properties from the construction in [GKpp] yield that distinct  $s$ -classes have  $\bar{f}$  distance at least  $\alpha_s$  by Lemma 16 and that the action by  $G_s$  is free by specification (A7).

In a final step we combine these properties with specification (A7) (the  $G_{s+1}^n$  action is subordinate to the  $G_s^n$  action) to show that the sequence  $(g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  must satisfy  $g_s = \rho_{s+1, s}(g_{s+1})$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* In the first part of the proof we fix  $N \geq N(s)$ . For  $n \geq n(s, N, 1)$  we see from property (C1) that for any  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$  there is a proportion of at least  $1 - \sqrt{\gamma_s}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that there exists  $z \in \text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  with

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), z \upharpoonright [0, h_n - 1]) < \gamma_s = \frac{\alpha_s^8}{4 \cdot 10^{24}} < \frac{\alpha_s}{200} \cdot \delta_s.$$

We denote  $(\bar{A}, \hat{v}) := z \upharpoonright [0, h_n - 1]$  in  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$ . By Lemma 20 we obtain for a proportion of at least  $1 - 2\sqrt{\gamma_s}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  that there is exactly one  $\bar{w} = \bar{w}(w, v) \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $|\bar{A} \cap \bar{w}| \geq (1 - \delta_s)|\bar{w}|$  and  $\bar{w}$  must be of the form  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_g[w]_s$  for a unique  $g = g(w, v) \in G_s$ , which is of odd parity.

Thus, we conclude that there is some shading sequence  $\bar{v} = \bar{v}(w, v) \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that

$$(6.10) \quad \bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}, \bar{v})) < \gamma_s + \delta_s < 10^{-20} \alpha_s^6.$$

We now show that one group element of  $G_s$  works for  $\phi_N$  and all words in  $\mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$ .

**Claim 24.** *There is a unique  $g_s \in G_s$  such that for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$  we have for a proportion of at least  $\frac{99}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}}$  that there is  $\bar{w} = \bar{w}(w, v) \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_{n+1})$  with  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w]_s$  and some shading sequence  $\bar{v} = \bar{v}(w, v) \in \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}}$  such that*

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}, \bar{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}.$$

In order to prove Claim 24, we repeat the argument from (6.10) for a word  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$  which is a concatenation of  $n$ -words by construction. Hence, for a proportion of at least  $1 - 2\sqrt{\gamma_s}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}}$ ,

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{there is a unique } g_s = g_s(w, v) \in G_s \text{ and some } \bar{w} = \bar{w}(w, v) \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_{n+1}) \\ &\text{with } [\bar{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w]_s \text{ and some shading sequence } \bar{v} = \bar{v}(w, v) \in \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}} \\ &\text{such that } \bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}, \bar{v})) < 10^{-20} \alpha_s^6. \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 25.** *For every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$  there is a collection  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(w) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}}$  with  $|\mathcal{S}| \geq \frac{99}{100} 2^{h_{n+1}}$  such that for each  $v \in \mathcal{S}$  we have for the  $g_s = g_s(w, v) \in G_s$  from (6.11) that for a proportion of at least  $\frac{8}{10}$  of  $n$ -blocks  $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$  and for a proportion of at least  $\frac{8}{10}$  of all shading sequences  $\tilde{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  there is  $\hat{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\hat{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[\tilde{w}]_s$  and  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(\tilde{w}, \tilde{v}), (\hat{w}, \hat{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}$  for some shading sequence  $\hat{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ .*

*Proof of Claim 25.* Combining the requirement (6.11) with property (R9), there is a collection  $\mathcal{S}' \subset \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}}$  with  $|\mathcal{S}'| > \frac{499}{500} 2^{h_{n+1}}$  of shading sequences  $v$  satisfying (6.1) and that there is a unique  $g_s = g_s(w, v) \in G_s$  and  $\bar{w} = \bar{w}(w, v) \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_{n+1})$  with  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w]_s$  and some shading sequence  $\bar{v} = \bar{v}(w, v) \in \{0, 1\}^{h_{n+1}}$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}, \bar{v})) < 10^{-20} \alpha_s^6$ .

We decompose  $w$  into its  $s$ -Feldman patterns:  $w = P_1 \dots P_r$ . For each  $v \in \mathcal{S}'$  we also decompose  $(w, v) = (P_1, v_1) \dots (P_r, v_r)$  with  $v_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|P_i|}$ .

Consider those  $(P_i, v_i)$  for which there exists a substring  $(\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{v}_i)$  of length at least  $\frac{\alpha_s^4}{10^{12}} |P_i|$  and a  $(\hat{P}, \hat{v})$ , where  $\hat{P}$  is a substring of some element of  $G_s[w]_s$  and of different pattern type from  $P_i$ , with  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{v}_i), (\hat{P}, \hat{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s^2}{2000}$ . For such  $(P_i, v_i)$  let  $v'_i$  be the reshuffling from Lemma 19 according to the first pattern type that occurs in such a  $\hat{P}$ . For the other  $i$ 's, let  $v'_i = v_i$ . Let  $v' = v'_1 \dots v'_r$ . This map  $v \mapsto v'$  is one-to-one. If  $v'_i \neq v_i$  for at least  $\frac{1}{500}$  of the  $i$ 's, then  $v' \notin \mathcal{S}'$ . So there is a collection  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{S}'$  with  $|\mathcal{S}| > \frac{498}{500} 2^{h_{n+1}}$  for which  $v'_i = v_i$  for all but  $\frac{1}{500}$  of the  $i$ 's.

Let  $v \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $(\bar{w}, \bar{v}) = (\bar{P}_1, \bar{v}_1) \dots (\bar{P}_r, \bar{v}_r)$  with  $\bar{v}_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|\bar{P}_i|}$  be the decomposition corresponding to  $(w, v) = (P_1, v_1) \dots (P_r, v_r)$  under a best possible  $\bar{f}$ -match between  $\phi_N(w, v)$  and  $(\bar{w}, \bar{v})$ . According to Fact 11 the proportion of such substrings  $(P_i, v_i)$  with

$$(6.12) \quad \bar{f}(\phi_N(P_i, v_i), (\bar{P}_i, \bar{v}_i)) < 10^{-17} \alpha_s^6$$

is at least  $\frac{499}{500}$ . Thus, for a proportion of at least  $\frac{249}{250}$  of  $i$ 's we have that (6.12) holds and  $v'_i = v_i$ .

Choose  $i$  such that (6.12) holds and  $v'_i = v_i$ . After applying  $\phi_N$  to any substring of  $(P_i, v_i)$  of length at least  $\frac{\alpha_s^4}{10^{12}}|P_i|$  the  $\bar{f}$  distance to a corresponding part of  $(\bar{P}_i, \bar{v}_i)$  must be less than  $\frac{\alpha_s^2}{2000}$ . Since  $v_i = v'_i$  there exists a substring  $(\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{v}_i)$  of  $(P_i, v_i)$  such that  $|\tilde{P}_i| > (1 - \frac{\alpha_s^4}{10^{12}})|P_i|$  and  $\phi_N(\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{v}_i)$  is matched to a string  $(\hat{P}_i, \hat{v}_i)$  in  $(\bar{P}_i, \bar{v}_i)$ , where  $\hat{P}_i$  is of the same pattern type as  $P_i$ , that is,  $[\hat{P}_i]_s$  must lie in  $\eta_{g_s}[P_i]_s$  for  $g_s = g_s(w, v)$ . For each of those  $(P_i, v_i)$  we have

$$(6.13) \quad \bar{f}(\phi_N(P_i, v_i), (\hat{P}_i, \hat{v}_i)) < \frac{\alpha_s^4}{10^{11}}.$$

We deduce from (6.13) that for a proportion of at least  $\frac{998}{1000}$  of the shaded  $n$ -blocks  $(w_{i,l}, v_{i,l})$  occurring as substitution instances in  $(P_i, v_i)$  we have

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N(w_{i,l}, v_{i,l}), (\hat{A}_{i,l}, \hat{v}_{i,l})) < \frac{\alpha_s^4}{2 \cdot 10^7}$$

for a string  $(\hat{A}_{i,l}, \hat{v}_{i,l})$  in  $(\hat{P}_i, \hat{v}_i)$ .

Overall, for a proportion of at least  $\frac{124}{125}$  of the shaded  $n$ -blocks  $(w_{i,l}, v_{i,l})$  occurring as substitution instances in  $(w, v)$  we have  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(w_{i,l}, v_{i,l}), (\hat{A}_{i,l}, \hat{v}_{i,l})) < \frac{\alpha_s^4}{2 \cdot 10^7}$  for a string  $(\hat{A}_{i,l}, \hat{v}_{i,l})$  in  $(\hat{P}_i, \hat{v}_i)$ . Since  $v \in \mathcal{S}$  we obtain from (6.1) that for a proportion of at least  $\frac{8}{10}$  of  $n$ -blocks  $w_{i,l} \in \mathcal{W}_n$  we have for a proportion of at least  $\frac{9}{10}$  of all shading sequences  $v_{i,l} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  that

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N(w_{i,l}, v_{i,l}), (\hat{A}_{i,l}, \hat{v}_{i,l})) < \frac{\alpha_s^4}{2 \cdot 10^7} = \frac{\alpha_s}{200} \cdot \frac{\alpha_s^3}{10^5}$$

for a string  $(\hat{A}_{i,l}, \hat{v}_{i,l})$  in  $(\hat{P}_i, \hat{v}_i)$ . Then Lemma 20 implies that for these  $n$ -blocks  $w_{i,l}$  for a proportion of at least  $\frac{8}{10}$  of all shading sequences  $v_{i,l} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  there is exactly one  $\bar{w}_{i,l} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $|\hat{A}_{i,l} \cap \bar{w}_{i,l}| \geq (1 - \frac{\alpha_s^3}{10^5})h_n$  and  $\bar{w}_{i,l}$  must be of the form  $[\bar{w}_{i,l}]_s = \eta_{h_{i,l}}[w_{i,l}]_s$  for a unique  $h_{i,l} \in G_s$ , which is of odd parity. As in (6.10), we also get

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N(w_{i,l}, v_{i,l}), (\bar{w}_{i,l}, \bar{v}_{i,l})) < \frac{\alpha_s^4}{2 \cdot 10^7} + \frac{\alpha_s^3}{10^5} < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}$$

for some shading sequence  $\bar{v}_{i,l} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ . Since  $[\hat{P}_i]_s$  is contained in  $\eta_{g_s}([P_i]_s)$  and the  $s$ -equivalence classes within the building tuple of  $P_i$  have disjoint  $G_s$  orbits by step (1) of the construction in Section 5, we obtain that the  $h_{i,l}$  are equal to  $g_s$ . Thus, for  $g_s = g_s(w, v)$  and for a proportion of at least  $\frac{8}{10}$  of  $n$ -blocks  $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$  we have for a proportion of at least  $\frac{8}{10}$  of all shading sequences  $\tilde{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  that there is  $\hat{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\hat{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[\tilde{w}]_s$  and  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(\tilde{w}, \tilde{v}), (\hat{w}, \hat{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}$  for some shading sequence  $\hat{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 24.* Suppose now that there are words  $w, w' \in \mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$  and shadings  $v \in \mathcal{S}(w)$ ,  $v' \in \mathcal{S}(w')$  such that the statement of Claim 25 holds for elements  $g_s(w, v), g_s(w', v') \in G_s$  with  $g_s(w, v) \neq g_s(w', v')$ . Then for a proportion of at least  $\frac{6}{10}$  of all  $n$ -words  $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$  and a proportion of at least  $\frac{6}{10}$  of all shading sequences  $\tilde{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  the conclusion of Claim 25 holds simultaneously for  $g_s(w, v)$  and  $g_s(w', v')$ . In particular, there exist  $\hat{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$ ,  $\hat{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ ,  $\hat{w}, \hat{w}' \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$ ,  $\hat{v}, \hat{v}' \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  with  $[\hat{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s(w, v)}[\tilde{w}]_s$ ,  $[\hat{w}']_s = \eta_{g_s(w', v')}[\tilde{w}]_s$ ,  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(\tilde{w}, \tilde{v}), (\hat{w}, \hat{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}$ ,

and  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(\tilde{w}, \tilde{v}), (\hat{w}', \hat{v}')) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}$ . By the triangle inequality this implies

$$\bar{f}((\hat{w}, \hat{v}), (\hat{w}', \hat{v}')) < \frac{\alpha_s}{2}$$

and therefore  $\bar{f}(\hat{w}, \hat{w}') < \frac{\alpha_s}{2}$ . This contradicts  $[\hat{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s(w,v)}[\tilde{w}]_s \neq \eta_{g_s(w',v')}[\tilde{w}]_s = [\hat{w}']_s$  and Lemma 16. Hence, there is a unique group element  $g_s \in G_s$  working for all  $(n+1)$ -words  $w$  in  $\mathcal{W}'_{n+1}$  and all shadings in  $\mathcal{S}(w)$ .  $\square$

In the next step in the proof of Lemma 23, we check that the same group element  $g_s \in G_s$  works for all  $\phi_N$ ,  $N \geq N(s)$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . For  $n \geq n(s, N, k)$ , property (C2) guarantees that for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$ , for a proportion of at least  $1 - \sqrt{\gamma_s}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , we have  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), \phi_{N+k}(w, v)) < \alpha_s^4$ . On the one hand, let  $g_s$  be the element in  $G_s$  such that for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$ , for a proportion of at least  $\frac{99}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , there exist  $\bar{w} \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\bar{w}]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w]_s$  and some shading sequence  $\bar{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}, \bar{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}$ . On the other hand, let  $h \in G_s$  such that for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$ , for a proportion of at least  $\frac{99}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , there exist  $\bar{w}' \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\bar{w}']_s = \eta_h[w]_s$  and some shading sequence  $\bar{v}' \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that  $\bar{f}(\phi_{N+k}(w, v), (\bar{w}', \bar{v}')) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}$ . Assume  $g_s \neq h$ . Then  $[\bar{w}']_s = \eta_h[w]_s \neq \eta_{g_s}[w]_s = [\bar{w}]_s$ . However, for a proportion of at least  $\frac{97}{100}$  of shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{f}((\bar{w}, \bar{v}), (\bar{w}', \bar{v}')) \\ & \leq \bar{f}((\bar{w}, \bar{v}), \phi_N(w, v)) + \bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), \phi_{N+k}(w, v)) + \bar{f}(\phi_{N+k}(w, v), (\bar{w}', \bar{v}')) \\ & < \frac{\alpha_s}{4} + \alpha_s^4 + \frac{\alpha_s}{4} < \alpha_s. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts Lemma 16. Thus, we conclude that  $g_s \in G_s$  works for all  $\phi_N$  with  $N \geq N(s)$ .

Suppose that for some  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $g'_s := \rho_{s+1,s}(g_{s+1}) \neq g_s$ . Let  $N \geq N(s+1)$ . Let  $n$  be sufficiently large such that  $g'_s \in G_s^n$  and Claim 24 holds. Let  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$ . Then  $\eta_{g'_s}[w]_s \neq \eta_{g_s}[w]_s$ , and by applying Claim 24, we obtain for a proportion of at least  $\frac{99}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , the existence of  $\bar{w}_1 \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\bar{w}_1]_s = \eta_{g_s}[w]_s$  and some shading sequence  $\bar{v}_1 \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}_1, \bar{v}_1)) < \frac{\alpha_s}{4}.$$

Similarly, Claim 24 yields for a proportion of at least  $\frac{99}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , the existence of  $\bar{w}_2 \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n)$  with  $[\bar{w}_2]_{s+1} = \eta_{g_{s+1}}[w]_{s+1}$  and some shading sequence  $\bar{v}_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{h_n}$  such that

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}_2, \bar{v}_2)) < \frac{\alpha_{s+1}}{4}.$$

Since the  $G_{s+1}^n$  action is subordinate to the  $G_s^n$  action on  $\mathcal{W}_n/\mathcal{Q}_s^n$  by specification (A7), we see that  $[\bar{w}_2]_{s+1} = \eta_{g_{s+1}}[w]_{s+1}$  lies in  $\eta_{g'_s}[w]_s$ . Hence,  $[\bar{w}_2]_s = \eta_{g'_s}[w]_s \neq \eta_{g_s}[w]_s = [\bar{w}_1]_s$ , which implies  $\bar{f}((\bar{w}_1, \bar{v}_1), (\bar{w}_2, \bar{v}_2)) > \alpha_s$  by Lemma 16. On the other hand, for a proportion of at least  $\frac{98}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in$

$\{0, 1\}^{h_n}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{f}((\bar{w}_1, \bar{v}_1), (\bar{w}_2, \bar{v}_2)) \\ & \leq \bar{f}((\bar{w}_1, \bar{v}_1), \phi_N(w, v)) + \bar{f}(\phi_N(w, v), (\bar{w}_2, \bar{v}_2)) \\ & < \frac{\alpha_s}{4} + \frac{\alpha_{s+1}}{4} < \frac{\alpha_s}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction shows that  $(g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  must satisfy  $g_s = \rho_{s+1, s}(g_{s+1})$  for all  $s$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Part 1 (b) in Theorem B.* If the positive entropy systems  $\mathbb{S} = \Upsilon(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\mathbb{S}^{-1} \cong \text{rev}(\mathbb{S})$  are Kakutani equivalent, then they have to be evenly equivalent. Then the conclusion of Lemma 23 implies that the tree  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch.  $\square$

## 7. PROOF OF THEOREM C

**7.1. Construction of  $K$ -diffeomorphisms  $\Phi_i(\mathcal{T})$ .** As in Section 2.2,  $\mathbb{T}^n = (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^n$  and  $\lambda_n$  denotes Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{T}^n$ . To build the  $K$ -diffeomorphisms  $\Phi_i(\mathcal{T}) \in \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  in Theorem 27, we follow an approach in [Ka80]. We start with a  $C^\infty$  Anosov diffeomorphism  $g$  of  $\mathbb{T}^2$  that preserves  $\lambda_2$ . Note that  $g$  is ergodic by [An67] and therefore topologically transitive. We can choose a  $C^\infty$  function  $\varphi : \mathbb{T}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$  with  $\|\text{d}\varphi\|$  close to 0 so that there exists a closed orbit  $x, gx, \dots, g^{n-1}x$ , for  $g$  such that

$$(7.1) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(g^j(x)) \neq n \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi \, \text{d}\lambda_2.$$

This condition implies that the cohomology equation

$$\psi(gx) - \psi(x) = \varphi(x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi \, \text{d}\lambda_2$$

has no continuous solution  $\psi$ , that is,  $\varphi$  is not cohomologous to a constant. In order for the Bernoulli shift  $\mathbb{B}$  in Proposition 28 below to be the  $(1/2, 1/2)$  Bernoulli shift, we also require  $\varphi$  to be chosen so that

$$(7.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi \, \text{d}\lambda_2 = \frac{h_{\lambda_2}(g)}{\log 2},$$

where  $h_{\lambda_2}(g)$  denotes the entropy of  $g$  with respect to  $\lambda_2$ . As we shall see below, the required bound on  $\|\text{d}\varphi\|$  depends only on  $g$ . Therefore, once  $g$  is chosen, we let  $\varphi$  be a small  $C^1$  perturbation of the constant function on the right side of (7.2) that achieves (7.1) by making a small change in a neighborhood of  $x$  not including  $gx, \dots, g^{n-1}x$ , while maintaining the value of the integral in (7.2).

If  $F^s : \text{Trees} \rightarrow \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \lambda_2)$  is as in [GKpp, section 10], and  $T = F^s(\mathcal{T})$  for some  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{Trees}$ , let  $S^t$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , be the special flow over  $T$  with roof function identically equal to 1. As usual,  $(y, 1)$  is identified with  $(Ty, 0)$ . That is,  $S^t$  is defined on  $(\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]) / ((y, 1) \sim (Ty, 0))$ . Let  $T_{g, \varphi}$  be the skew product defined by  $T_{g, \varphi}(x, (y, t)) = (gx, S^{\varphi(x)}(y, t))$ , for  $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^2$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , with  $(x, y, 1)$  identified with  $(x, Ty, 0)$ . Then  $T_{g, \varphi}$  preserves  $\lambda_5$ , and according to [Ka80],  $T_{g, \varphi}$  is a  $K$ -automorphism. However, the identification on  $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]$  is  $(x, Ty, 0) \sim (x, y, 1)$ , which depends on  $T$ .

To change  $T_{g, \varphi}$  to a  $K$ -automorphism  $\tilde{T}_{g, \varphi}$  that is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{T}^5$  with the usual identification, we will apply Proposition 26.

**Proposition 26.** *For each  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$ , the map  $T = F^s(\mathcal{T}) \in \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \lambda_2)$  constructed in [GKpp, section 10] is  $C^\infty$  isotopic to the identity through diffeomorphisms that preserve  $\lambda_2$ . Moreover, the map taking  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  to the isotopy from  $\text{Id}$  to  $T = F^s(\mathcal{T})$  can be chosen to be a continuous function from  $\mathcal{Trees}$  to  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1], \mathbb{T}^2)$ .*

*Proof.* In the application of the Anosov-Katok method that is used in [GKpp, section 10], we may construct each  $T$  in the image of  $F^s$  to be as close as we like in the  $C^\infty$  topology to a fixed rotation  $R_{\alpha_0}(y_1, y_2) = (y_1 + \alpha_0, y_2)$  of the first coordinate in  $\mathbb{T}^2$  (compare with [FW19a, Remark 39]). By [Hi76, Chapter 2, Theorem 1.7] any  $C^\infty$  map that is sufficiently close in the  $C^1$  topology to a given  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphism is itself a diffeomorphism. Therefore we may assume that for each  $u \in [0, 1]$  and each  $T$  in the image of  $F^s$  the map  $uT + (1 - u)R_{\alpha_0}$  is a diffeomorphism. Let  $\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a monotone increasing  $C^\infty$  function such that  $\beta(t) = p$  in a neighborhood of  $p$  for  $p = 0, 1/2$ , and  $1$ . The requirement that  $\beta = 1/2$  in a neighborhood of  $1/2$  is needed to make the isotopy  $J_t$  below be  $C^\infty$ . The requirement that  $\beta(t) = p$  in neighborhoods of  $p$  for  $p = 0, 1$  is used later in our construction to make a smooth identification between  $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}$  and  $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{1\}$ . Let  $J_t : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$  for  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  be the  $C^\infty$  isotopy from  $\text{Id}$  to  $T$  given by  $J_t = R_{2\beta(t)\alpha_0}$ , for  $0 \leq t \leq 1/2$ ;  $(2 - 2\beta(t))R_{\alpha_0} + 2(\beta(t) - 1/2)T$ , for  $1/2 < t \leq 1$ .

Each map  $J_t$  is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{T}^2$ , but it need not preserve  $\lambda_2$  for those values of  $t$  that are in  $(1/2, 1)$  where  $\beta(t) \neq 1/2, 1$ . We will compose  $J_t$  with another diffeomorphism  $L_t : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$  such that  $L_t$  is the identity for  $t$  in neighborhoods of  $0$  and  $1$ , and  $(L_t \circ J_t)_*\lambda_2 = \lambda_2$ . This step is done using Moser's Theorem [Mo65], but we will show how to construct  $L_t$  explicitly in terms of Fourier series in order to demonstrate the  $C^\infty$  dependence of  $L_t$  on  $t$  along with the continuous dependence of  $L_t \circ J_t$  in  $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1], \mathbb{T}^2)$  on  $\mathcal{T}$ .

We follow Moser's argument as presented in [KH95, Theorem 5.1.27]. Fix  $t \in [0, 1]$  and use coordinates  $y = (y_1, y_2)$  on  $\mathbb{T}^2$ . Let  $\Omega_0$  and  $\Omega_1$  be the two-forms representing  $(J_t)_*\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_2$ , respectively. Let  $\Omega' := \Omega_1 - \Omega_0$ . Since  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \Omega' = 0$ ,  $\Omega' = d\Theta$  for some one-form  $\Theta$ . (This follows from the fact that the top deRham cohomology group is  $\mathbb{R}$ .) To find such a one-form  $\Theta$ , we write

$$\Omega' = f(y_1, y_2) dy_1 \wedge dy_2.$$

Since  $f$  is a real-valued  $C^\infty$  function with  $\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f d\lambda_2 = 0$ , we have

$$f(y_1, y_2) = \sum_{(n,m) \in (\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}) \setminus \{(0,0)\}} a_{(n,m)} \exp(i(ny_1 + my_2)),$$

where  $\bar{a}_{-(n,m)} = a_{(n,m)}$  and the Fourier coefficients  $a_{(n,m)}$  decay faster than any polynomial rate, that is,  $|a_{(n,m)}| \cdot \|(n, m)\|^k \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|(n, m)\| \rightarrow \infty$  for every positive integer  $k$  (see [Fo92, Theorem 2.6]). Let  $\Theta = p(y_1, y_2)dy_1 + q(y_1, y_2)dy_2$ . We need

$$(7.3) \quad \frac{\partial q}{\partial y_1} - \frac{\partial p}{\partial y_2} = f(y_1, y_2).$$

We choose

$$p(y_1, y_2) = p(y_2) = -\text{Re} \left[ \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \neq 0} \frac{a_{(0,m)}}{im} \exp(imy_2) \right],$$

and

$$q(y_1, y_2) = \operatorname{Re} \left[ \sum_{n, m \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0} \frac{a(n, m)}{in} \exp(i(ny_1 + my_2)) \right].$$

Then the Fourier coefficients of  $p$  and  $q$  also decay faster than any polynomial rate, and therefore  $p$  and  $q$  are  $C^\infty$  functions. Clearly (7.3) is satisfied.

The rest of the Moser construction proceeds as in [KH95]. With the explicit choice of  $\Theta$  given above, the map  $L_t$  with  $(L_t)_*(J_t)_*\lambda_2 = \lambda_2$  that is obtained depends continuously in the  $C^\infty$  topology on  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Moreover, because  $T = F^s(\mathcal{T})$  depends continuously in the  $C^\infty$  topology on  $\mathcal{T}$ , so does the isotopy  $I_t := L_t \circ J_t$ .  $\square$

Let  $I : \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$  be the isotopy constructed in the proof of Proposition 26. Then  $I_u(y) = I(y, u)$  satisfies  $I_u = \operatorname{Id}$  for  $u$  in a neighborhood of 0,  $I_u = T$  for  $u$  in a neighborhood of 1, and  $I_u \in \operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \lambda_2)$ , for  $0 \leq u \leq 1$ . Let  $\tilde{S}^t$  be the  $C^\infty$  flow on  $\mathbb{T}^3 = (\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]) / ((y, 1) \sim (y, 0))$ , defined by  $\tilde{S}^t(z, u) = (I_{u+t}(I_u^{-1}(z)), u + t)$ , for nonnegative  $u$  and  $t$  with  $u + t \leq 1$ . For  $u + t = 1$ ,  $\tilde{S}(z, u) = (T(I_u^{-1}(z)), 1) \sim (T(I_u^{-1}(z)), 0)$ . Define

$$\psi : (\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]) / ((Ty, 0) \sim (y, 1)) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3 = (\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1]) / ((y, 0) \sim (y, 1))$$

$$\text{by } \psi(y, u) = (I_u(y), u), \text{ for } y \in \mathbb{T}^2, 0 \leq u \leq 1.$$

Since  $\psi(y, 1) = (T(y), 1) \sim (T(y), 0) = \psi(T(y), 0)$ ,  $\psi$  is well-defined. Moreover,  $\psi$  preserves  $\lambda_3$ , because each  $I_u$  preserves  $\lambda_2$ . For nonnegative  $u$  and  $t$  with  $u + t \leq 1$ , we have

$$\psi(S^t(y, u)) = \psi(y, u + t) = (I_{u+t}(y), u + t),$$

and

$$\tilde{S}^t(\psi(y, u)) = \tilde{S}^t(I_u(y), u) = (I_{u+t}(I_u^{-1}(I_u(y))), u + t) = (I_{u+t}(y), u + t).$$

Therefore  $\psi$  gives an isomorphism between the flows  $S^t$  and  $\tilde{S}^t$ .<sup>6</sup> Consequently, the transformation  $\tilde{T}_{g, \varphi}$  defined by  $\tilde{T}_{g, \varphi}(x, y, t) = (gx, \tilde{S}^{\varphi(x)}(y, t))$  is isomorphic to  $T_{g, \varphi}$ , and  $\tilde{T}_{g, \varphi} \in \operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$ . We now state the following concretization of Theorem C.

**Theorem 27.** *For a fixed choice of  $g$  and  $\varphi$  as above and the continuous map  $F^s : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \cap \operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \lambda_2)$  constructed in [GKpp, section 10], let  $\Phi_j : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \cap \operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , be the maps defined by  $\Phi_1(\mathcal{T}) = \tilde{T}_{g, \varphi}$ , and  $\Phi_2(\mathcal{T}) = (\tilde{T}^{-1})_{g, \varphi}$ , where  $T = F^s(\mathcal{T})$ . If we use the topology on  $\mathcal{K} \cap \operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$  induced by the  $C^\infty$  topology on  $\operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$ , then  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  are continuous. Moreover,  $\Phi_1(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\Phi_2(\mathcal{T})$  satisfy the properties of Theorem C.*

*Proof.* The continuity of  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  follows from Proposition 26 and the method of construction of  $\tilde{T}_{g, \varphi}$  from  $T$ . Since  $T_{g, \varphi}$  and  $\tilde{T}_{g, \varphi}$  are isomorphic, and  $(T^{-1})_{g, \varphi}$  and  $(\tilde{T}^{-1})_{g, \varphi}$  are isomorphic, to prove part (a) of Theorem C, it suffices to prove that if  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch, then  $T_{g, \varphi}$  and  $(T^{-1})_{g, \varphi}$  are isomorphic. This is immediate from the fact that  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are isomorphic, which follows from part (1) of Proposition 24 and its generalization in Theorem 25 in [GKpp].

The proof of part (b) of Theorem C follows from Propositions 28 and 29 below.  $\square$

<sup>6</sup>The same method can be used to obtain anti-classification results for isomorphism and Kakutani equivalence of smooth ergodic measure-preserving  $\mathbb{R}$ -flows on  $\mathbb{T}^3$  from the anti-classification results for smooth diffeomorphisms of  $\mathbb{T}^2$  in [FW22] and [GKpp] via a suspension.

The following Proposition 28 is based partly on an argument of Thouvenot presented in [KRV18, section 3].

**Proposition 28.** *If  $T$  is an ergodic automorphism of  $\mathbb{T}^2$  preserving  $\lambda_2$ , then  $T_{g,\varphi}$  is Kakutani equivalent to  $T \times \mathbb{B}$ , where  $\mathbb{B}$  is the  $(1/2, 1/2)$  Bernoulli shift on  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let

$$X_{g,\varphi} = \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq t \leq \varphi(x)\} / ((x, \varphi(x)) \sim (g(x), 0)),$$

and let  $S_1^t$  be the flow on  $X_{g,\varphi}$  built as the flow under  $\varphi$  over the transformation  $g$ . Let

$$X_T = \{(y, s) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq s \leq 1\} / ((y, 1) \sim (T(y), 0)),$$

and let  $S_2^t = S^t$  be the flow on  $X_T$  built as the flow under the function identically equal to 1 over the transformation  $T$ . Define  $U^r$  as the diagonal flow on  $X_{g,\varphi} \times X_T$  given by  $U^r(x, t, y, s) = (S_1^r(x, t), S_2^r(y, s))$ . Consider two canonical sections of this flow:

$$X_1 = \{(x, 0), (y, s) : x, y \in \mathbb{T}^2, 0 \leq s \leq 1\}$$

and

$$X_2 = \{(x, t), (y, 0) : x, y \in \mathbb{T}^2, 0 \leq t \leq \varphi(x)\}.$$

The first return map for  $X_1$  is  $T_{g,\varphi}$ , and the first return map to  $X_2$  is  $(x, t, y) \mapsto (S_1^1(x, t), T(y))$ . This is a direct product of the time one map  $S_1^1$  of the flow  $S_1^t$  on  $X_{g,\varphi}$  and the transformation  $T$ .

If  $\|d\varphi\|$  is sufficiently small compared to the expansion factor of  $g$  in the unstable direction, then the expansion effect of the flow  $S_1^t$  in directions close to the unstable direction in the base of  $X_{g,\varphi}$  overcomes the skewing effect in the flow direction, and similarly in the stable direction. Thus for sufficiently small  $\|d\varphi\|$ , depending only of  $g$ , the flow  $S_1^t$  is Anosov. Since  $g$  is transitive, so is  $S_1^t$ .

According to Anosov's alternative [An67] (see also [Do98]), an Anosov flow is a suspension with a constant roof function over an Anosov diffeomorphism or each strong unstable manifold and each strong stable manifold is dense in the space. The first alternative is not true for  $S_1^t$  because  $\varphi$  is chosen so that it is not cohomologous to a constant. Therefore the second alternative holds for  $S_1^t$ , and according to a theorem for transitive Anosov flows due to Bunimovič [Bu74, Theorem 2], this implies that  $S_1^t$  is Bernoulli. In particular, the time one map  $S_1^1$  is Bernoulli.

By Abramov's formula, the entropy of  $S_1^1$  is  $h_{\lambda_2}(g) / \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi d\lambda_2$ . Thus, by our assumption (7.2),  $S_1^1$  has entropy  $\log 2$ , which is the entropy of  $\mathbb{B}$ . Therefore the first return map to  $X_2$  is isomorphic to  $T \times \mathbb{B}$ . Since the first return maps to two cross-sections of an ergodic flow are Kakutani equivalent [Ka43],  $T_{g,\varphi}$  is Kakutani equivalent to  $T \times \mathbb{B}$ .  $\square$

To complete the proof of part (b) of Theorem C, it now suffices to prove Proposition 29 (see Section 7.3). Proposition 29 is the main step in the proof of Theorem C.

**Proposition 29.** *If  $T = F^s(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  does not have an infinite branch, then  $T \times \mathbb{B}$  is not Kakutani equivalent to  $T^{-1} \times \mathbb{B}$ , where  $\mathbb{B}$  is the  $(1/2, 1/2)$  Bernoulli shift on  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ .*

Proposition 29 is the counterpart of Part 1 (b) of Theorem B for circular systems.

**7.2. Review of circular systems.** In this subsection we review the construction of the continuous reduction  $F^s : \mathcal{Trees} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \cap \text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \lambda_2)$  from [GKpp, section 10] such that for  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$  and  $T = F^s(\mathcal{T})$ :

- (1) If  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch, then  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are isomorphic.
- (2) If  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are Kakutani equivalent, then  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch.

A key ingredient in this passage to the smooth category is a functor  $\mathcal{F}$  from [FW19b] that takes our construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  from Section 5 to a construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n^c\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of a so-called *circular symbolic system* in the alphabet  $\Sigma \cup \{b, e\}$ , where  $b, e$  are two additional symbols (called *spacers*) not contained in our basic alphabet  $\Sigma$  of cardinality  $2^{12}$ . These symbolic systems were introduced in [FW19a, section 4]. By [FW19a, Theorem 60] circular systems can be realized by the Anosov-Katok method as area-preserving  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  provided that another sequence  $(l_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of parameters grows sufficiently fast.

To review the definition of the functor we define a circular construction sequence  $\{\mathcal{W}_n^c\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and bijections  $c_n : \mathcal{W}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_n^c$  by induction:

- Let  $\mathcal{W}_0^c = \Sigma$  and  $c_0$  be the identity map.
- Suppose that  $\mathcal{W}_n, \mathcal{W}_n^c$  and  $c_n$  have already been defined. We construct  $\mathcal{W}_{n+1}$  following the steps described in Section 5. In particular, we recall that every word in  $\mathcal{W}_{n+1}$  is built by concatenating  $k_n$  words in  $\mathcal{W}_n$  by specification (E2). Then we define numbers

$$q_{n+1} = k_n l_n q_n^2$$

and

$$p_{n+1} = p_n k_n l_n q_n + 1,$$

where we set  $p_0 = 0$  and  $q_0 = 1$ . Furthermore, for  $n > 0$  we let  $j_{q_n} = q_n$  and  $j_i \in \{0, \dots, q_n - 1\}$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, q_n - 1$ , be such that

$$j_i \equiv (p_n)^{-1} i \pmod{q_n}.$$

If  $n = 0$  we take  $j_0 = 0$ . With these numbers we introduce the *circular operator*

$$\mathcal{C}_n(c_n(w_0), c_n(w_1), \dots, c_n(w_{k_n-1})) = \prod_{i=0}^{q_n-1} \prod_{j=0}^{k_n-1} \left( b^{q_n-j_i} (c_n(w_j))^{l_n-1} e^{j_i} \right).$$

Then we define

$$\mathcal{W}_{n+1}^c = \{ \mathcal{C}_n(c_n(w_0), c_n(w_1), \dots, c_n(w_{k_n-1})) : w_0 w_1 \dots w_{k_n-1} \in \mathcal{W}_{n+1} \}$$

and the map  $c_{n+1}$  by setting

$$c_{n+1}(w_0 w_1 \dots w_{k_n-1}) = \mathcal{C}_n(c_n(w_0), c_n(w_1), \dots, c_n(w_{k_n-1})).$$

We note that each word in  $\mathcal{W}_{n+1}^c$  has length  $k_n l_n q_n^2 = q_{n+1}$ .

We denote the resulting symbolic system by  $\mathbb{K}^c$ .

*Remark.* Using the operator

$$\mathcal{C}_n^r(w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{k_n-1}) = \prod_{i=0}^{q_n-1} \prod_{j=0}^{k_n-1} \left( e^{q_n-j_{i+1}} w_{k_n-j-1}^{l_n-1} b^{j_{i+1}} \right)$$

we can give a construction sequence  $\{\text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n^c)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  for  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K}^c) \cong (\mathbb{K}^c)^{-1}$  via

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_{n+1}^c) = \\ \{\mathcal{C}_n^r(\text{rev}(c_n(w_0)), \text{rev}(c_n(w_1)), \dots, \text{rev}(c_n(w_{k_n-1}))) : w_0 w_1 \dots w_{k_n-1} \in \mathcal{W}_{n+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we will use the following map from substrings of the underlying system  $\mathbb{K}$  to the circular system  $\mathbb{K}^c$ :

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(w_s w_{s+1} \dots w_t) = \prod_{j=s}^t \left( b^{q_n - j_i} (c_n(w_j))^{l_n - 1} e^{j_i} \right)$$

for any  $0 \leq i \leq q_n - 1$  and  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq k_n - 1$ . We also have the map

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,i}^r(w_s w_{s+1} \dots w_t) = \prod_{j=0}^{t-s} \left( e^{q_n - j_{i+1}} (\text{rev}(c_n(w_{t-j})))^{l_n - 1} b^{j_{i+1}} \right)$$

from substrings of  $\mathbb{K}$  into  $\text{rev}(\mathbb{K}^c)$ .

In [GKpp, section 10.4] we obtained the following  $\bar{f}$  estimates for the circular systems corresponding to our constructions described in Section 5.

**Lemma 30** ([GKpp], Proposition 90). *For every  $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  there is  $0 < \alpha_s^c < \alpha_s$  such that for every  $n \geq M(s)$  we have*

$$(7.4) \quad \bar{f}(\mathcal{A}, \bar{\mathcal{A}}) > \alpha_s^c$$

on any substrings  $\mathcal{A}, \bar{\mathcal{A}}$  of at least  $q_n/R_n^c$  consecutive symbols in  $c_n(w)$  and  $c_n(\bar{w})$ , respectively, for  $w, \bar{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$  with  $[w]_s \neq [\bar{w}]_s$ .

As in Lemma 16, the sequence  $(\alpha_s^c)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  is decreasing. Furthermore,  $R_1^c = R_1$  (with  $R_1$  from the sequence  $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in Lemma 16), and  $R_n^c = \lfloor \sqrt{l_{n-2}} \cdot k_{n-2} \cdot q_{n-2}^2 \rfloor$  for  $n \geq 2$ .

**7.3. Proof of Proposition 29.** Let  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Trees}$ . We look at the symbolic systems  $\mathbb{S}_1^c := \mathbb{K}^c \times \mathbb{B}$  and  $\mathbb{S}_2^c := \text{rev}(\mathbb{K}^c) \times \mathbb{B}$ , where  $\mathbb{K}^c \cong F^s(\mathcal{T})$  is the circular system described in section 7.2. By making small adjustments to the arguments from Section 6.2 we prove that  $\mathbb{S}_1^c$  and  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$  are not Kakutani equivalent if  $\mathcal{T}$  does not have an infinite branch. We start with the following analogues of Lemmas 19 and 20.

**Lemma 31.** *Let  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$  be  $s$ -Feldman patterns in  $\mathbb{K}$  of  $\mathcal{Q}_s^{n-1}$  equivalence classes, where  $n-1 \geq M(s)$ . Furthermore, let  $0 \leq i_1, i_2 < q_{n-1}$  and  $\mathcal{G}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}$  be substrings of  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_1}(P)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_2}^r(\bar{P})$ , respectively. Assume  $P$  and  $\bar{P}$  are different types of  $s$ -Feldman patterns, and  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$  both have length at least  $\frac{|P| \cdot l_{n-1} q_{n-1}}{2^{2e(n-1)} h_{n-1}}$ . Suppose  $\phi$  is a code of length  $K$  from  $\mathbb{S}_1^c$  to  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$ , where  $q_{n-1}$  is large compared to  $K$ . Then there is a one-to-one map from shadings  $v$  in  $\{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{G}|}$  such that*

$$\bar{f}(\phi(\mathcal{G}, v), (\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \bar{v})) < \frac{(\alpha_s^c)^2}{2000}$$

for some  $\bar{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{|\bar{\mathcal{G}}|}$  to shadings  $v' \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{G}|}$  such that

$$\bar{f}(\phi(\mathcal{G}, v'), (\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{u})) > \frac{\alpha_s^c}{20}$$

for all strings  $(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{u})$  in  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows along the lines of Lemma 19 since the analogue of Lemma 17 also holds true in circular systems.  $\square$

**Lemma 32.** *Let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{6}$ ,  $0 < \delta < \frac{(\alpha_s^c)^3}{4 \cdot 10^4}$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{\alpha_s^c}{200} \delta$ , and  $\phi$  be a finite code from  $\mathbb{S}_1^c$  to  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$ . For  $n$  sufficiently large (depending only on the code length,  $s$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\varepsilon$ ), for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}_n$  and  $0 \leq i_1 < q_{n-1}$  such that for a proportion of at least  $1 - \theta$  of the shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1}}$  of  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_1}(w)$  there is a string  $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{v})$  in  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$  with  $\bar{f}(\phi(\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_1}(w), v), (\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$ , the following condition holds for at least a proportion  $1 - 2\theta$  of the shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1}}$  of  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_1}(w)$ : For every string  $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{v})$  in  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$  with  $\bar{f}(\phi(\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_1}(w), v), (\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{v})) < \varepsilon$  there must be exactly one string of the form  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_2}^r(\tilde{w})$  with  $|\bar{\mathcal{A}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_2}^r(\tilde{w})| \geq (1 - \delta)k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1}$  for some  $0 \leq i_2 < q_{n-1}$ ,  $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$ . Moreover,  $\tilde{w}$  must be of the form  $[\tilde{w}]_s = g[w]_s$  for a unique  $g = g(w, v) \in G_s$ , which is necessarily of odd parity.*

*Proof.* Following the proof of Lemma 20 we assume that there are  $\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2 \in \mathcal{W}_n$  and  $0 \leq i_{2,1}, i_{2,2} < q_{n-1}$  with  $|\bar{\mathcal{A}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_{2,j}}^r(\tilde{w}_j)| \geq (\delta - 3\varepsilon)k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . We denote by  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j$  the part of  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_{2,j}}^r(\tilde{w}_j)$ . Furthermore,  $\phi(\mathcal{A}_j, v_j)$  denotes the parts in  $\phi(\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_1}(w), v)$  corresponding to  $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j, \bar{v}_j)$  under a best possible  $\bar{f}$  match. In order to prove the circular counterpart of Claim 22 we divide  $\mathcal{A}_j$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j$  into circular images  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_1}(P_{n-1, \ell})$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i_{2,j}}^r(\bar{P}_{n-1, \ell})$ , where  $P_{n-1, \ell}$  and  $\bar{P}_{n-1, \ell}$  are  $s$ -Feldman patterns in  $w$  and  $\tilde{w}_j$ , respectively. Then the proof follows along the lines of Lemma 20 using Lemma 31.  $\square$

Assume  $\mathbb{S}_1^c$  and  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$  are evenly equivalent. This time we apply [GKpp, Corollary 71] to  $\mathbb{S}_1^c$  with  $\gamma = \gamma_s^c := \frac{(\alpha_s^c)^8}{4 \cdot 10^{24}}$  for  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We obtain a sequence of finite codes  $(\phi_\ell^c)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  from  $\mathbb{S}_1^c$  to  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$  and a collection  $\mathcal{W}'_n \subset \mathcal{W}_n$  (that includes at least  $1 - \sqrt{\gamma_s^c}$  of the  $n$ -words) such that for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$  and  $0 \leq i < q_{n-1}$  the circular strings  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i}(w)$  satisfy analogues of properties (C1) and (C2).

**Lemma 33.** *Suppose that  $\mathbb{S}_1^c$  and  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$  are evenly equivalent and let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . There is a unique  $g_s \in G_s$  such that for every  $N \geq N(s)$  and sufficiently large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have for every  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n$  that for a proportion of at least  $\frac{99}{100}$  of possible shading sequences  $v \in \{0, 1\}^{q_n}$  there is  $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$  with  $[\tilde{w}]_s = g_s[w]_s$  and some shading sequence  $\tilde{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{q_n}$  such that*

$$(7.5) \quad \bar{f}(\phi_N^c(c_n(w), v), (\text{rev}(c_n(\tilde{w})), \tilde{v})) < \frac{\alpha_s^c}{4},$$

where  $(\phi_\ell^c)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of finite codes as described above.

Moreover,  $g_s \in G_s$  is of odd parity and the sequence  $(g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies  $g_s = \rho_{s+1, s}(g_{s+1})$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $w \in \mathcal{W}'_n \subset \mathcal{W}_n$  and we recall that  $c_n(w) = \prod_{i=0}^{q_n-1} \mathcal{C}_{n-1, i}(w)$ . As in the proof of Lemma 23 we use property (C1) to choose  $n$  sufficiently large such that for a proportion of at least  $1 - \sqrt{\gamma_s^c}$  of possible shading sequences  $v_i \in \{0, 1\}^{k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1}}$  there exists  $z \in \mathbb{S}_2^c$  with

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N^c(\mathcal{C}_{n-1, i}(w), v_i), z \upharpoonright [0, k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1} - 1]) < \gamma_s^c.$$

We denote  $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_i, \hat{v}_i) := z \upharpoonright [0, k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1} - 1]$  in  $\mathbb{S}_2^c$ . By Lemma 32 with  $\delta_s^c = \frac{(\alpha_s^c)^6}{10^{22}}$  we have for a proportion of at least  $1 - 2\sqrt{\gamma_s^c}$  of possible shading sequences that there is a string of the form  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1, j_i}^r(\tilde{w})$  with  $|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_i \cap \mathcal{C}_{n-1, j_i}^r(\tilde{w})| \geq (1 - \delta_s^c)k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1}$

for some  $0 \leq j_i < q_{n-1}$  and  $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_n$ , where  $\tilde{w}$  must be of the form  $[\tilde{w}]_s = g[w]_s$  for a unique  $g = g(w, v) \in G_s$  of odd parity. By Fact 10 we conclude

$$\bar{f}(\phi_N^c(\mathcal{C}_{n-1,i}(w), v_i), (\mathcal{C}_{n-1,j_i}^r(\tilde{w}), \bar{v}_i)) < \gamma_s^c + \delta_s^c$$

for some shading sequence  $\bar{v}_i \in \{0, 1\}^{k_{n-1}l_{n-1}q_{n-1}}$ . Since this holds true for every  $i \in \{0, \dots, q_{n-1} - 1\}$  and the newly introduced spacers occupy a proportion of at most  $\frac{1}{l_{n-1}}$ , we obtain for  $n$  sufficiently large that

$$\bar{f}\left(\phi_N^c(c_n(w), v), \left(\prod_{i=0}^{q_{n-1}-1} \mathcal{C}_{n-1,i}^r(\tilde{w}), \tilde{v}\right)\right) < \gamma_s^c + \delta_s^c + \frac{2}{l_{n-1}} < \frac{(\alpha_s^c)^6}{10^{20}}$$

for some shading sequence  $\tilde{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{q_n}$ . The word  $\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}_0\tilde{w}_1 \dots \tilde{w}_{k_{n-1}-1} \in \mathcal{W}_n$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=0}^{q_{n-1}-1} \mathcal{C}_{n-1,i}^r(\tilde{w}) &= \mathcal{C}_{n-1}^r(\text{rev}(c_{n-1}(\tilde{w}_0)), \text{rev}(c_n(\tilde{w}_1)), \dots, \text{rev}(c_n(\tilde{w}_{k_{n-1}-1}))) \\ &= \text{rev}(c_n(\tilde{w})) \in \text{rev}(\mathcal{W}_n^c) \end{aligned}$$

and  $[\tilde{w}]_s = g_s[w]_s$ .

The rest of the proof follows along the lines of Lemma 23.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 29.* Since the systems  $T \times \mathbb{B} \cong \mathbb{S}_1^c$  and  $T^{-1} \times \mathbb{B} \cong \mathbb{S}_2^c$  have the same positive entropy, a Kakutani equivalence has to be an even equivalence. Then the conclusion of Lemma 33 implies that the tree  $\mathcal{T}$  has an infinite branch.  $\square$

#### 7.4. A continuum of pairwise non-Kakutani equivalent $K$ -diffeomorphisms.

We now indicate an explicit construction of a continuum of pairwise non-Kakutani equivalent  $K$ -diffeomorphisms in  $\text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^5, \lambda_5)$  of the same metric entropy. This is not needed for the proof of Theorem C, but it illustrates some of the techniques in Sections 7.1–7.3 in a simpler context. As we explain at the end of this subsection, Theorem C also holds if we consider only  $K$ -diffeomorphisms of constant metric entropy. Then the existence of an uncountable family of pairwise non-Kakutani equivalent  $K$ -diffeomorphisms of the same metric entropy already follows, because, in general, any analytic equivalence relation in a Polish space with only countably many equivalence classes must be Borel: The equivalence classes partition the space into analytic sets, and the complement of each equivalence class is therefore a countable union of analytic sets, which is itself analytic. Hence each equivalence class is analytic and co-analytic, which by a theorem of Suslin [Ke95, Section 14.C] implies that it is Borel. Thus the equivalence relation is the countable union of Cartesian products of these equivalence classes with themselves, which is Borel.

Two sequences  $(x_n)$  and  $(y_n)$  in  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  are said to be  $E_0$  equivalent if there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x_n = y_n$  for all  $n \geq N$ . Ornstein, Rudolph, and Weiss [ORW82, Chapter 12] constructed a family of zero-entropy measure-preserving automorphisms indexed by sequences in  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  such that two automorphisms in this family are Kakutani equivalent if and only if the corresponding sequences are  $E_0$  equivalent. (In the language of descriptive set theory this means that  $E_0$  reduces to Kakutani equivalence in this family.) The cardinality of the collection of  $E_0$  equivalence classes in  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  is that of the continuum, because the map from  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  to  $E_0$  equivalence classes that takes  $(x_n)$  to the equivalence class containing

$(x_0, x_0, x_1, x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$  is one-to-one. There are two known methods for obtaining families in  $\text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \lambda_2)$  indexed by sequences in  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that two diffeomorphisms in the family are Kakutani equivalent if and only if the corresponding sequences are  $E_0$  equivalent. The first is due to M. Benhenda [Be15].

A second way of obtaining such a family of diffeomorphisms in  $\text{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2, \lambda_2)$  is to start with the family of automorphisms from [ORW82] as above, and view them as odometer-based systems as described in [FW19b]. Then apply the functor in [FW19b] to map these odometer-based systems to circular-based systems, which can be realized as  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms of  $\mathbb{T}^2$  that preserve  $\lambda_2$ . At the time that [FW19b] was written, it was an open question (due to Thouvenot) whether Kakutani equivalence (or non-Kakutani equivalence) is preserved under this functor. So it was not clear that there would still be a continuum of pairwise non-Kakutani equivalent transformations after applying the functor in [FW19b]. In fact, in general, neither Kakutani equivalence nor non-Kakutani equivalence is preserved under this functor [GK22], but they are in this particular situation, because the circular operator  $\mathcal{C}_n$  (see Subsection 7.2) maps each Feldman pattern in the odometer-based system to repetitions of a Feldman pattern in the circular system, once the  $b$ 's and  $e$ 's added at stage  $n$  are removed. The argument in [ORW82, Chapter 12] that shows that two automorphisms corresponding to  $E_0$  inequivalent sequences are not Kakutani equivalent generalizes to the systems obtained after applying the functor.

For each  $T$  in the family of zero-entropy diffeomorphisms of  $\mathbb{T}^2$  that is obtained either by [Be15] or by [FW19b], we construct the  $K$ -diffeomorphism  $T_{g,\varphi}$  as in Subsection 7.1. Then by Proposition 28,  $T_{g,\varphi}$  is Kakutani equivalent to  $T \times \mathbb{B}$ , where  $\mathbb{B}$  is the  $(1/2, 1/2)$  Bernoulli shift on  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . Finally, the argument in [ORW82, Chapter 13] shows that for  $T$  and  $S$  in the above family corresponding to  $E_0$  inequivalent sequences,  $T \times \mathbb{B}$  is not Kakutani equivalent to  $S \times \mathbb{B}$ . (This is similar to the proof of our Proposition 29, but the argument is simpler because no equivalence relations on words are involved.) Therefore  $T_{g,\varphi}$  is not Kakutani equivalent to  $S_{g,\varphi}$ .

By a formula for the entropy of a skew product due to D. Newton [Ne69], each  $T_{g,\varphi}$  has the same metric entropy as  $g$ . Since the same  $g$  is used in the construction of all of the  $K$ -diffeomorphisms in our family, they all have the same metric entropy. (Note: Although it did not matter for the proof of Theorem C, Newton's formula also implies that all of the  $K$ -diffeomorphisms that are in the images of the maps  $\Phi_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , constructed in the proof of Theorem 27 have the same metric entropy.)

**Acknowledgements.** We thank M. Foreman and J.-P. Thouvenot for helpful conversations that initiated this work, and we are grateful to A. Kanigowski for his valuable feedback on an earlier draft. The first author thanks Jagiellonian University for its hospitality during part of the time that this paper was written, and we thank Indiana University for supporting a research visit by the second author.

## REFERENCES

- [An67] D. Anosov: Geodesic flows on closed Riemannian manifolds with negative curvature. Proc. Steklov Inst. 90, 1967.
- [AK70] D. Anosov and A. Katok: New examples in smooth ergodic theory. Ergodic diffeomorphisms. Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč. 23: 3–36, 1970.
- [Aupp] T. Austin: Scenery entropy as an invariant of RWRS processes. Preprint, arXiv: 1405.1468.
- [BK22] S. Banerjee and P. Kunde: Real-analytic realization of uniform circular systems and some applications. J. Anal. Math. 148: 399–445, 2022.

- [Be15] M. Benhenda: An uncountable family of pairwise non-Kakutani equivalent smooth diffeomorphisms. *J. Anal. Math.* 127: 129–178, 2015.
- [Bj09] A.-D. Bjork: Criteria for rank-one transformations to be weakly mixing, and the generating property. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor; PhD Thesis, University of California, Irvine, 2009.
- [Bu74] L. Bunimovič: On a class of special flows. *Math. USSR Izv.* 8: 219–232, 1974.
- [Bpp] J. Buzzi et al: Open questions in descriptive set theory and dynamical systems. Preprint, arXiv:2305.00248.
- [Do98] D. Dolgopyat: On decay of correlations in Anosov flows. *Annals of Mathematics* 147 (2): 357–390, 1998.
- [Fe74] J. Feldman: Borel structures and invariants for measurable transformations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 46: 383–394, 1974.
- [Fe76] J. Feldman: New K-automorphisms and a problem of Kakutani. *Israel J. Math.*, 24 (1): 16–38, 1976.
- [Fo92] G. Folland: Fourier analysis and its applications. Wadsworth, Pacific Grove, CA, 1992.
- [Fo00] M. Foreman: A descriptive view of ergodic theory. In: *Descriptive set theory and dynamical systems (Marseille-Luminy, 1996)*, 87–171, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 277, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [Fopp] M. Foreman: The complexity of the structure and classification of dynamical systems. Preprint, arXiv:2203.10655.
- [FGpp] M. Foreman and A. Gorodetski: Anti-classification results for smooth dynamical systems. Preliminary report. Preprint, arXiv:2206.09322.
- [FRW11] M. Foreman, D. Rudolph, and B. Weiss: The conjugacy problem in ergodic theory. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 173(3): 1529–1586, 2011.
- [FW04] M. Foreman and B. Weiss: An anti-classification theorem for ergodic measure-preserving transformations. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 6, no. 3: 277–292, 2004.
- [FW19a] M. Foreman and B. Weiss: A symbolic representation for Anosov-Katok systems. *J. Anal. Math.*, 137(2): 603–661, 2019.
- [FW19b] M. Foreman and B. Weiss: From odometers to circular systems: A global structure theorem. *J. Mod. Dyn.*, 15: 345–423, 2019.
- [FW22] M. Foreman and B. Weiss: Measure preserving diffeomorphisms of the torus are unclassifiable. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 24 (8): 2605–2690, 2022.
- [Ge97] H. Georgii: Mixing properties of induced random transformations. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 17 (4): 839–847, 1997.
- [GK22] M. Gerber and P. Kunde: Loosely Bernoulli odometer-based systems whose corresponding circular systems are not loosely Bernoulli. *Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems* 42 (3): 917–973, 2022.
- [GKpp] M. Gerber and P. Kunde: Anti-classification results for the Kakutani equivalence relation. Preprint, arXiv:2109.06086.
- [Ha44] P. Halmos: In general a measure preserving transformation is mixing. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 45: 786–792, 1944.
- [HN42] P. Halmos and J. von Neumann: Operator methods in classical mechanics. II. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 43: 332–350, 1942.
- [Hi76] M. Hirsch: *Differential Topology*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 33. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- [Hj01] G. Hjorth: On invariants for measure preserving transformations. *Fund. Math.*, 169 (1): 51–84, 2001.
- [Ho88] W. den Hollander: Mixing properties for random walk in random scenery. *Ann. Probab.* 16: 1788–1802, 1988.
- [Ka43] S. Kakutani: Induced measure preserving transformations. *Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo*, 19: 635–641, 1943.
- [Kal82] S. Kalikow:  $T, T^{-1}$  transformation is not loosely Bernoulli. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 115: 393–409, 1982.
- [KRV18] A. Kanigowski, F. Rodriguez Hertz & K. Vinhage: On the non-equivalence of the Bernoulli and K-properties in dimension four. *J. Mod. Dyn.* 13: 221–250, 2018.
- [Ka80] A. Katok: Smooth non-Bernoulli K-automorphisms. *Invent. Math.* 61 (3): 291–299, 1980.

- [KH95] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt: Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [Ke95] A. Kechris: Classical descriptive set theory. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 156. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [Ko58] A. Kolmogorov: A new metric invariant of transient dynamical systems and automorphisms in Lebesgue spaces. (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) 119: 861–864, 1958.
- [Kupp] P. Kunde: There is no complete numerical invariant for smooth conjugacy of circle diffeomorphisms. Preprint, arXiv:2209.02137.
- [Kupp2] P. Kunde: Anti-classification results for weakly mixing diffeomorphisms. Preprint, arXiv:2303.12900.
- [Me74] I. Meilijson: Mixing properties of a class of skew-products. Israel J. Math. 19: 266–270, 1974.
- [Mo65] J. Moser: On the volume elements on a manifold. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 120: 286–294, 1965.
- [Ne32] J. von Neumann: Zur Operatorenmethode in der klassischen Mechanik. (German) Ann. of Math. (2), 33 (3): 587–642, 1932.
- [Ne69] D. Newton: On the entropy of certain classes of skew-product transformations. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 21: 722–726, 1969.
- [Or70] D. Ornstein: Bernoulli shifts with the same entropy are isomorphic. Advances in Math. 4: 337–352, 1970.
- [Or73] D. Ornstein: An example of a Kolmogorov automorphism that is not a Bernoulli shift. Advances in Math. 10: 49–62, 1973.
- [ORW82] D. Ornstein, D. Rudolph and B. Weiss: Equivalence of measure preserving transformations. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 37, no. 262, 1982.
- [OS73] D. Ornstein and P. Shields: An uncountable family of K-automorphisms. Advances in Math. 10, 63–88, 1973.
- [OS77] D. Ornstein and M. Smorodinsky: Ergodic flows of positive entropy can be time changed to become K-flows. Israel J. Math. 26 (1): 75–83, 1977.
- [Ro48] V. Rokhlin: A “general” measure-preserving transformation is not mixing. (Russian) Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) 60: 349–351, 1948.
- [RS61] V. Rokhlin and Y. Sinai: The structure and properties of invariant measurable partitions. (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 141: 1038–1041, 1961.
- [Ru88] D. Rudolph: Asymptotically Brownian skew products give non-loosely Bernoulli K-automorphisms. Invent. Math. 91 (1): 105–128 (1988).