

RATE DISTORTION DIMENSION OF RANDOM BRODY CURVES

MASAKI TSUKAMOTO

ABSTRACT. The main purpose of this paper is to propose an ergodic theoretic approach to the study of entire holomorphic curves. Brody curves are one-Lipschitz holomorphic maps from the complex plane to the complex projective space. They naturally form a dynamical system, and “random Brody curves” in the title refers to invariant probability measures on it. We study their geometric and dynamical properties. Given an invariant probability measure μ on the space of Brody curves, our first main theorem claims that its rate distortion dimension is bounded by the integral of a “potential function” over μ . This result is analogous to the Ruelle inequality of smooth ergodic theory. Our second main theorem claims that there exists a rich variety of invariant probability measures attaining equality in this “Ruelle inequality for Brody curves”. The main tools of the proofs are the deformation theory of Brody curves and the variational principle for mean dimension with potential. This approach is motivated by the theory of thermodynamic formalism for Axiom A diffeomorphisms.

1. BACKGROUNDS

The classical Nevanlinna theory studies the asymptotic value distribution of meromorphic functions in the complex plane \mathbb{C} . Meromorphic functions are holomorphic maps from \mathbb{C} to the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Hence it is natural to generalize it to the study of holomorphic curves in complex manifolds. Over almost a century, several generations of mathematicians have been developing the higher-dimensional Nevanlinna theory. Substantial progress has been made. However there still remain many fundamental questions. Readers can see a good overview in the book of Noguchi and Winkelmann [NW14].

The main purpose of this paper is to propose a new approach to the study of holomorphic curves. We develop an ergodic theoretic approach. Broadly speaking, the Nevanlinna theory and ergodic theory have a similar spirit; they both study *recurrence* of functions and orbits. Therefore one may imagine some *ergodic theory of holomorphic curves*. This paper is a serious attempt to such a theory. We explain backgrounds of the paper in this section. Our main results will be given in §2.

There are two main backgrounds for this paper. We will review them in §1.1 and §1.2 below. One is the ergodic theory of Axiom A diffeomorphisms. This is a milestone

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32H30, 37C40, 37C45.

Key words and phrases. Value distribution of holomorphic curves, Brody curve, ergodic theory, invariant measure, rate distortion dimension, mean dimension with potential, variational principle.

The author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI JP21K03227.

of smooth ergodic theory developed by several distinguished mathematicians, including Anosov, Smale, Adler, Weiss, Sinai, Ruelle and Bowen [Ano67, Sma67, AW70, Sin72, Rue73, Bow75]. Another motivation comes from the study of mean dimension of the dynamical system of Brody curves. Brody curves are one-Lipschitz holomorphic maps from \mathbb{C} to the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^N$. They form a dynamical system and Gromov [Gro99] began to study it. Roughly speaking, our main theorems show that the dynamical system of Brody curves has an ergodic theoretic structure analogous to that of Axiom A diffeomorphisms.

1.1. Ergodic theory of Axiom A diffeomorphisms. In this subsection we briefly review the ergodic theory of Axiom A diffeomorphisms [Bow75, KH95]. Although this provides a very important motivation for this paper, it is logically independent of the main results below. So readers may skip this subsection if they are unfamiliar to hyperbolic dynamics. Our exposition follows the book of Bowen [Bow75, Chapters 3 and 4].

Let M be a compact C^∞ Riemannian manifold and let $T: M \rightarrow M$ be a diffeomorphism. We assume that T satisfies **Axiom A**, namely the non-wandering set is hyperbolic and periodic points are dense in it. Let Ω be a **basic set** of (M, T) . A simple example is that $M = \mathbb{T}^2 := \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ is the two-dimensional torus and T is a hyperbolic toral automorphism, e.g. $T(x, y) = (x + y, x)$. In this case, the set of periodic points are dense in \mathbb{T}^2 , and the non-wandering set is equal to the whole space \mathbb{T}^2 . The basic set Ω is also equal to \mathbb{T}^2 .

We denote by $T_x M = E_x^s \oplus E_x^u$ ($x \in \Omega$) the splitting of the tangent space into stable and unstable directions. We define a function $\phi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the logarithm of the Jacobian of the map T in the unstable direction:

$$(1.1) \quad \phi(x) = \log |\det (dT_x: E_x^u \rightarrow E_{Tx}^u)|.$$

Let μ be a T -invariant Borel probability measure on Ω . We denote its Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy by $h_\mu(T)$. Then we have the following fundamental inequality [Bow75, Proposition 4.8 (b)]:

$$(1.2) \quad h_\mu(T) \leq \int_\Omega \phi(x) d\mu(x).$$

This inequality claims that the entropy is bounded by the average rate of the expansion of the map T . If Ω is an **attractor**, then there exists a T -invariant Borel probability measure μ^+ on Ω (called a **Sinai–Ruelle–Bowen measure**) attaining the equality [Bow75, Theorem 4.11]

$$(1.3) \quad h_{\mu^+}(T) = \int_M \phi(x) d\mu^+(x).$$

If $M = \mathbb{T}^2$ and $T(x, y) = (x + y, x)$, then $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R} \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}, 1 \right) \oplus \mathbb{R} \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}, 1 \right)$ provides the splitting into stable and unstable directions. The function $\phi(x)$ is equal to the constant $\log \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \right)$. The above inequality (1.2) gives $h_\mu(T) \leq \log \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \right)$ for all T -invariant Borel

probability measures μ on \mathbb{T}^2 . The equality holds if and only if μ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^2 .

We notice that the inequality (1.2) is a special case of the Ruelle inequality ([Rue78], [KH95, Theorem S.2.13]). For a diffeomorphism T of a compact Riemannian manifold M (not necessarily satisfying Axiom A), the Ruelle inequality claims that

$$(1.4) \quad h_\mu(T) \leq \int_M \chi_+(x) d\mu(x)$$

for all T -invariant Borel probability measures μ on M . Here $\chi_+(x)$ is the sum of positive **Lyapunov exponents** counted with multiplicity. If the map T satisfies Axiom A and the measure μ is supported on a basic set Ω , then the integral $\int_M \chi_+(x) d\mu(x)$ is equal to $\int_\Omega \phi(x) d\mu(x)$ in (1.2) by the ergodic theorem. So (1.2) is a special case of (1.4). Our first main result (Theorem 2.4 below) is an analogue of the inequality (1.2) for Brody curves.

1.2. Mean dimension of the dynamical system of Brody curves. We denote by $z = x + y\sqrt{-1}$ the standard coordinate of the complex plane \mathbb{C} . Let $\mathbb{C}P^N$ be the complex projective space equipped with the Fubini–Study metric. Let $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ be a holomorphic map. We define $|df|(z)$ as the **local Lipschitz constant** of f at z . Namely, for a tangent vector $v \in T_z\mathbb{C}$, the Fubini–Study length of $df(v) \in T_{f(z)}\mathbb{C}P^N$ is given by $|df(v)| = |df|(z) \cdot |v|$, where $|v|$ is the Euclidean length of v . More explicitly, for $f(z) = [f_0(z) : f_1(z) : \cdots : f_N(z)]$ in the homogeneous coordinate (each $f_i(z)$ is a holomorphic function), the local Lipschitz constant is give by

$$(1.5) \quad |df|^2(z) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) \log (|f_0(z)|^2 + |f_1(z)|^2 + \cdots + |f_N(z)|^2).$$

The right-hand side is always nonnegative. $|df|(z)$ is its (nonnegative) square root.

We call a holomorphic map $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ a **Brody curve** if $|df|(z) \leq 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. An importance of this notion stems from the following fundamental theorem of Brody [Bro78]: *A compact complex manifold is Kobayashi-hyperbolic if and only if it does not admit any non-constant Lipschitz holomorphic map from \mathbb{C} .* See also the papers of Duval [Duv08, Duv21] for very interesting variants of this *Bloch–Brody principle*. One can find more information about Brody curves in the book [NW14, §7.6] and papers [Ere, Cos13, CD13, Win07].

Let \mathcal{B}^N be the set of all Brody curves in $\mathbb{C}P^N$. This becomes a compact metrizable space under the compact-open topology. (A sequence $\{f_n\}$ of Brody curves converges to $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ if f_n uniformly converges to f over every compact subset of \mathbb{C} . The compactness of \mathcal{B}^N follows from the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem because Brody curves are one-Lipschitz.)

The group \mathbb{C} continuously acts on \mathcal{B}^N by

$$(1.6) \quad T: \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N, \quad (a, f(z)) \mapsto f(z + a).$$

Gromov [Gro99] began to study the mean dimension $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T)$ of this action. This is the number of parameters per unit area of the plane for describing the orbits of \mathcal{B}^N . We review the precise definition of mean dimension in §5.1. Gromov showed that ([Gro99, p. 396], [Ere])

$$\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) \leq 4N.$$

This is not sharp. For improving Gromov's estimate (and, indeed, obtaining the exact formula), we introduce the **energy density** $\rho(f)$ of Brody curves $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ by

$$(1.7) \quad \rho(f) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{a \in \mathbb{C}} \frac{1}{\pi R^2} \int_{|z-a| < R} |df|^2(z) dx dy \right).$$

We define $\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ as the supremum of $\rho(f)$ over $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$. It is known that [Tsu09a]

$$0 < \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) < 1, \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) = 1.$$

The papers [MT15, Tsu18] proved that the mean dimension is given by

$$(1.8) \quad \text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N).$$

A main purpose of this paper is to get a deeper understanding of this formula in terms of invariant probability measures.

2. MAIN RESULTS

The main object of this paper is invariant probability measures on the space of Brody curves. Let \mathcal{B}^N be the space of Brody curves in $\mathbb{C}P^N$ equipped with the continuous action of \mathbb{C} defined by (1.6). A Borel probability measure μ on \mathcal{B}^N is said to be *T-invariant* if $\mu(T^a A) = \mu(A)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and all Borel subsets $A \subset \mathcal{B}^N$. We define $\mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ as the set of all *T*-invariant Borel probability measures on \mathcal{B}^N .

It is not very common to study invariant probability measures in the context of holomorphic curve theory. So, before going into the details, we present an example for better understanding the subject:

Example 2.1. Let L and a be large positive numbers. Set

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}L + \mathbb{Z}L\sqrt{-1}, \quad K = [0, L]^2, \quad D = \{u \in \mathbb{C} \mid |u - a| \leq 1\}.$$

Λ is a lattice in \mathbb{C} and K is a fundamental domain of Λ . Let D^Λ be the product space of the infinite copies of D indexed by Λ . For $u = (u_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \in D^\Lambda$ we define a meromorphic function by

$$f_u(z) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \frac{u_\lambda}{(z - \lambda)^3}.$$

It is easy to check that $f_u(z)$ belongs to \mathcal{B}^1 as a map from \mathbb{C} to $\mathbb{C}P^1$ if L and a are chosen appropriately large (e.g. $L \gg a^3 \gg 1$). Then we can consider a continuous map

$$\Phi: K \times D^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^1, \quad (w, u) \mapsto f_u(z + w).$$

The image of this map is a T -invariant closed subset of \mathcal{B}^1 . Let \mathbf{m} be the two-dimensional Lebesgue measure on the plane. We define probability measures \mathbf{m}_1 and \mathbf{m}_2 on K and D respectively by

$$\mathbf{m}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{m}|_K}{L^2}, \quad \mathbf{m}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{m}|_D}{\pi},$$

where $\mathbf{m}|_K$ and $\mathbf{m}|_D$ denote the restrictions of the Lebesgue measure \mathbf{m} to K and D . We consider the product measure $\mathbf{m}_1 \otimes \mathbf{m}_2^{\otimes \Lambda}$ on $K \times D^\Lambda$ and define

$$\mu = \Phi_* (\mathbf{m}_1 \otimes \mathbf{m}_2^{\otimes \Lambda})$$

as the push-forward measure of $\mathbf{m}_1 \otimes \mathbf{m}_2^{\otimes \Lambda}$ under the map Φ . The measure μ is T -invariant and hence belongs to $\mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^1)$. Considering the measure μ is equivalent to considering a random function

$$f_u(z + w) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \frac{u_\lambda}{(z + w - \lambda)^3},$$

where w and u_λ ($\lambda \in \Lambda$) are independently chosen according to the uniform distributions on K and D . In general, the study of invariant probability measures on \mathcal{B}^N is equivalent to the study of such *random Brody curves*.

Our starting point is the formula $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = 2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ given in (1.8). We will see below that both sides of this formula can be expressed in terms of invariant probability measures.

First we consider the right-hand side $2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$. We define a continuous function $\psi: \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(2.1) \quad \psi(f) = 2(N + 1) |df|^2(0).$$

Here $|df|^2(0)$ is the square of the local Lipschitz constant of f at $z = 0$ defined by (1.5). Now we have (see Proposition 7.4 in §7)

$$(2.2) \quad 2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

Therefore the right-hand side of the formula $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = 2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ is expressed by using the integral of ψ over invariant probability measures.

Next we consider the mean dimension $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T)$. For connecting it to invariant measures, we need to consider *rate distortion theory* [CT06]. Rate distortion theory is the basic theory for lossy data compression method. Here “lossy” means that some data is lost in the process of compression. For example, given an image (a two-dimensional signal), JPEG (Joint Photographic Experts Group) expands it in a wavelet basis and discard small coefficients and quantizes the remaining ones. Some information is inevitably lost in this process, but the resulting image often looks similar to the original one at least for human eyes. Rate distortion theory describes a fundamental limit of such lossy data compression.

We define a metric \mathbf{d} on \mathcal{B}^N (compatible with the given topology) by¹

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbf{d}(f, g) = \max_{z \in [0, 1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

Here d_{FS} is a distance function on $\mathbb{C}P^N$ induced by the Fubini–Study metric, and $[0, 1]^2 = \{x + y\sqrt{-1} \mid 0 \leq x, y \leq 1\} \subset \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$. For a positive number ε , we denote by $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)$ the rate distortion function with respect to the metric \mathbf{d} and measure μ . The value of $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)$ is a nonnegative real number. Its precise definition will be given in §4.3. The intuitive meaning of $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)$ is as follows. Suppose that we randomly take a Brody curve $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ according to the distribution μ . The rate distortion function $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)$ measures the bits per unit area of the plane for describing f within averaged distortion bounded by ε with respect to \mathbf{d} .

We define **upper and lower rate distortion dimensions** of $(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$ by

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}, \quad \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}.$$

These are nonnegative real numbers. If the upper and lower limits coincide, we denote their common value by $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$. The rate distortion dimension was first introduced by Kawabata–Dembo [KD94] in a context of general information processing. Their original motivation is to study the asymptotic behavior (as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) of rate distortion function of signals taking values in a fractal set.

The mean dimension $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T)$ is given by²

$$(2.4) \quad \text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu).$$

From the formula $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = 2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ with (2.2) and (2.4), we conclude

$$(2.5) \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

This is a reformulation of the equation $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = 2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ in terms of invariant probability measures. Now a question naturally arises:

Problem 2.2 (Main problem). What is a relation between the integral $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$ and the rate distortion dimensions $\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$ and $\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$ for each individual invariant measure μ ?

¹This $\mathbf{d}(f, g)$ defines a metric on \mathcal{B}^N because of the unique continuation principle; if $\mathbf{d}(f, g) = 0$ then $f = g$ all over the plane. We can also consider other choices of metrics. For example,

$$\mathbf{d}'(f, g) = \max_{|z| \leq 1} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{d}''(f, g) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \max_{|z| \leq n} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

Our main results also hold for \mathbf{d}' and \mathbf{d}'' . But we use \mathbf{d} for simplicity.

²This follows from the argument of [Tsu18, §3] and the variational principle given in Theorem 5.1. See also Remark 6.6 below.

If we take the supremum over $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ then we have the equality (2.5). But we want to know a more precise result for each measure.

Example 2.3. One might naively expect an equality such as $\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$. But this does not hold in general. Let L be a large positive number and set $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}L + \mathbb{Z}L\sqrt{-1}$. Let $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ be a Λ -periodic non-constant Brody curve. Here “ Λ -periodic” means that $f(z + \lambda) = f(z)$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Such f can be constructed by using elliptic functions. Let δ_f be the delta measure at f , and we define $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ by

$$\mu = \frac{1}{L^2} \int_{[0, L]^2} T_*^u \delta_f d\mathbf{m}(u),$$

where \mathbf{m} is the two-dimensional Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{C} . Therefore μ is the uniform measure on the periodic orbit of f . Then we have

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = 0, \quad \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = \frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[0, L]^2} |df|^2 dx dy > 0.$$

This shows that the equality $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$ does not hold in general.

Our main results are the following two theorems.

Theorem 2.4. *For every invariant probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ we have*

$$(2.6) \quad \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

Theorem 2.5. *For any real number c with $0 \leq c < 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ there exists an invariant probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ satisfying*

$$(2.7) \quad \text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = c.$$

Notice that this includes the claim that the upper and lower rate distortion dimensions coincide for this measure μ .

Recall that we have

$$2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

Therefore Theorem 2.5 claims that, for every $0 \leq c < \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$, there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ satisfying (2.7). Now it is immediate to see that Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 imply the above equation (2.5):

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

Thus Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 provide a deeper understanding of the formula $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ in terms of invariant probability measures.

The inequality (2.6) of Theorem 2.4 is an analogue of the Ruelle inequality $h_\mu(T) \leq \int_\Omega \phi d\mu$ of Axiom A diffeomorphisms (1.2). Both the inequalities

$$h_\mu(T) \leq \int_\Omega \phi d\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$$

claim that the information theoretic quantities are bounded by the integral of certain “potential functions”. We will see later that there is a similarity not only in their statements (1.2) and (2.6) but also in their proofs. So we may say that Theorem 2.4 is a *Ruelle inequality for Brody curves*.

Theorem 2.5 shows that there is also an important difference between Axiom A diffeomorphisms and Brody curves. In the case of Axiom A attractors, the Sinai–Ruelle–Bowen measure (an invariant measure attaining the equality $h_\mu(T) = \int_\Omega \phi d\mu$) is unique [Bow74]. However Theorem 2.5 shows that there are uncountably many invariant measures μ attaining the equality $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$. It seems that there is no way to select one distinguished invariant measure for Brody curves.

Remark 2.6. The integral $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$ might look mysterious. Here we explain that it has a natural connection to the standard Nevanlinna theory. For a holomorphic map $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ we define its **Nevanlinna–Shimizu–Ahlfors characteristic function** [NW14, p. 9, p. 73] by

$$T(R, f) = \int_1^R \left(\int_{|z|<r} |df|^2 dx dy \right) \frac{dr}{r}, \quad (R > 1).$$

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$. We assume that μ is *ergodic*. This means that if a Borel set $A \subset \mathcal{B}^N$ satisfies $\mu(T^u A \Delta A) = 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{C}$ then $\mu(A)$ is equal to 0 or 1. Here Δ denotes the symmetric difference. Every invariant probability measure can be decomposed into ergodic measures (Ergodic Decomposition Theorem [EW11, Theorem 8.20]). The pointwise ergodic theorem implies that [EW11, Theorem 8.19]

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi r^2} \int_{|u|<r} \psi(T^u f) d\mathbf{m}(u) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$$

for μ -almost every $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$. We have

$$\int_{|u|<r} \psi(T^u f) d\mathbf{m}(u) = 2(N+1) \int_{|z|<r} |df|^2 dx dy.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2(N+1)}{\pi r^2} \int_{|z|<r} |df|^2 dx dy = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$$

for μ -almost every $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$. Then we have

$$T(R, f) = \frac{\pi R^2}{4(N+1)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu + o(R^2) \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty$$

for μ -almost every $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$. Thus the integral $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$ describes the coefficient of the leading term of $T(R, f)$ for μ -almost every Brody curve f .

For general $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ (not necessarily ergodic), $\frac{4(N+1)}{\pi R^2} T(R, f)$ still converges as $R \rightarrow \infty$ for μ -almost every $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$, and its expected value is equal to $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$:

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \left(\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{4(N+1)}{\pi R^2} T(R, f) \right) d\mu(f) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

Remark 2.7. There are several other choices of the ‘‘potential function’’ ψ . For example, for $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$, let

$$\psi_1(f) = 2(N+1) \int_{[0,1]^2} |df|^2 dx dy, \quad \psi_2(f) = \frac{2(N+1)}{\pi} \int_{|z|<1} |df|^2 dx dy.$$

Then for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi_1 d\mu = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi_2 d\mu.$$

Therefore we can also formulate our main results by using ψ_1 or ψ_2 . We decided to use the function $\psi(f) = 2(N+1)|df|^2(0)$ because this seems the simplest choice.

Example 2.8 (Continuation of Example 2.1). Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^1)$ be the measure constructed in Example 2.1. Namely μ is the distribution of a random function

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \frac{u_\lambda}{(z + w - \lambda)^3}, \quad (\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}L + \mathbb{Z}L\sqrt{-1})$$

where w and u_λ are independently chosen from the uniform distributions on $[0, L]^2$ and $\{u \in \mathbb{C} \mid |u - a| \leq 1\}$ respectively. Then we have

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^1, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \frac{2}{L^2}, \quad \int_{\mathcal{B}^1} \psi d\mu = \frac{12}{L^2}.$$

These certainly satisfy the ‘‘Ruelle inequality’’ $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^1, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^1} \psi d\mu$.

Problem 2.9. Theorem 2.5 shows that there exist many invariant measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ attaining the equality $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$. However it is not easy to investigate their properties (e.g. ergodicity, mixing property) from the construction given in the proof of Theorem 2.5. It is desirable to have a more elementary example. Can one construct an explicit example³ of $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$, like the above random function (2.8), satisfying $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$?

Organization of the paper and how to read it. We explain main ideas of the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 in §3. We review basics of mutual information and rate distortion function in §4. We explain the definitions of topological and metric mean dimensions with

³Of course, we exclude the trivial example $\mu = \delta_f$ with a constant curve f . Such a delta measure satisfies $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = 0$. It is desirable to have an example satisfying $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu > 0$

potential and a variational principle for them in §5. We also present a convenient method to calculate metric mean dimension with potential in §5. We review the deformation theory of Brody curves and prove Theorem 2.4 in §6. We prepare some results on the energy integral $\int |df|^2 dx dy$ of Brody curves f in §7. We develop a general method to construct invariant probability measures with a lower bound on rate distortion dimension in §8. By combining all the methods prepared in §§6-8, we prove Theorem 2.5 in §9.

Unfortunately this paper is rather long. About half of this paper (mainly §§7-9) is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.5. It may be reasonable to concentrate on Theorem 2.4 (a Ruelle inequality for Brody curves) at the first reading. Hopefully it will not take too much effort for readers to understand the ideas of the proof of Theorem 2.4.

§8 is probably the heaviest part of the proof of Theorem 2.5. It uses several technical facts about measure theory and mutual information prepared in §4. We recommend readers to skip technical details of §4 and §8 at the first reading if they look too cumbersome.

3. MAIN IDEA OF THE PROOFS: VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE

We explain a main idea of the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 in this section. Our proofs are based on a *variational principle* for mean dimension with potential. This approach is motivated by the theory of Axiom A diffeomorphisms. So we first review it.

3.1. The case of Axiom A diffeomorphisms. Here we briefly review the *thermodynamic formalism* for Axiom A diffeomorphisms. Readers may skip this subsection if they are totally unfamiliar to this theory.

Let M be a compact Riemannian manifold and $T: M \rightarrow M$ an Axiom A diffeomorphism. Let Ω be a basic set of T . For any continuous function $\varphi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have a quantity $P_T(\varphi)$ called the **topological pressure**. The variational principle connects it to the Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy by

$$(3.1) \quad P_T(\varphi) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\Omega)} \left(h_\mu(T) + \int_\Omega \varphi d\mu \right),$$

where $\mathcal{M}^T(\Omega)$ is the set of all invariant Borel probability measures on Ω [Wal75, Wal82, Bow75]. A measure attaining the supremum of the variational principle (3.1) is called an **equilibrium state for φ** . Equilibrium states always exist over a basic set Ω of an Axiom A diffeomorphism T because T is expansive on Ω . (The Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy $h_\mu(T)$ is upper semi-continuous with respect to μ if the given map T is expansive [Bow75, Proposition 2.19].)

Let $\phi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the logarithm of the Jacobian in the unstable direction (1.1):

$$\phi(x) = \log |\det (dT_x: E_x^u \rightarrow E_{T_x}^u)|.$$

We consider the topological pressure for the function $\varphi(x) := -\phi(x)$ (the minus of ϕ). Then we have [Bow75, Proposition 4.8 (a)]

$$P_T(-\phi) \leq 0.$$

From the variational principle (3.1), this implies that

$$h_\mu(T) \leq \int_\Omega \phi d\mu \quad \text{for every } \mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\Omega).$$

This is the Ruelle inequality (1.2) for a basic set of Axiom A diffeomorphisms. Moreover, if Ω is an attractor, then we have [Bow75, Theorem 4.11]

$$(3.2) \quad P_T(-\phi) = 0.$$

Again, by the variational principle (3.1), this implies

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\Omega)} \left(h_\mu(T) - \int_\Omega \phi d\mu \right) = 0.$$

As we already mentioned, since T is expansive on Ω , this supremum is attained by some measure $\mu^+ \in \mathcal{M}^T(\Omega)$ and we have

$$h_{\mu^+}(T) = \int_\Omega \phi d\mu^+.$$

For the function $-\phi(x)$, it is known that the equilibrium state μ^+ is unique [Bow74]. It is called the Sinai–Ruelle–Bowen measure.

3.2. The case of Brody curves. Next we consider the case of Brody curves. We explain a rough outline of the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5. The proofs are based on a variational principle for mean dimension. This theory was first introduced by Lindenstrauss and the author in the papers [LT18, LT19] and further expanded in [Tsu20, Tsu]. The general framework of the theory will be reviewed in §5.1. Here we present results suitable for the application to Brody curves.

Let \mathcal{B}^N be the space of Brody curves in $\mathbb{C}P^N$ with the natural action $T: \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$. Let \mathbf{d} be the metric on \mathcal{B}^N defined in (2.3): $\mathbf{d}(f, g) = \sup_{z \in [0,1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z))$. For any continuous function $\varphi: \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have two quantities

$$\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \varphi) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi)$$

called *mean dimension with potential* and *upper metric mean dimension with potential* respectively. (We also have a quantity $\underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi)$ called *lower metric mean dimension with potential*. But we do not need it here.) Mean dimension with potential is a “fusion” of topological dimension and topological pressure. Upper metric mean dimension

with potential is a “fusion” of upper Minkowski dimension and topological pressure. These quantities are related to rate distortion dimension via the following variational principle.

$$(3.3) \quad \text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \varphi) \leq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) + \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu \right),$$

$$(3.4) \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) + \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu \right) \leq \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi).$$

Let $\psi: \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the continuous function defined in (2.1):

$$\psi(f) = 2(N+1)|df|^2(0).$$

We consider mean dimension with potential and upper metric mean dimension with potential with respect to the potential function $\varphi := -\psi$ (the minus of ψ). The crucial equation is that

$$(3.5) \quad \text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, -\psi) = \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) = 0.$$

The proof is based on the deformation theory of Brody curves. The equation (3.5) is analogous to the equation $P_T(-\phi) = 0$ for the Axiom A attractors (3.2). Then all the four quantities in (3.3) and (3.4) are equal to zero for $\varphi = -\psi$. In particular

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) - \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu \right) = 0.$$

This implies Theorem 2.4 (a Ruelle inequality for Brody curves):

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N).$$

Therefore the key ingredients of the proof of Theorem 2.4 are the variational principle (3.4) and the equation (3.5).

Theorem 2.5 does not directly follow from the variational principle itself. We need to take a closer look at the machinery behind it. The proof of the variational principle (3.3) presents a general method to construct invariant probability measures with a good lower bound on rate distortion dimension. By combining this method with the deformation theory of Brody curves, we can construct many invariant measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ satisfying

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

This provides Theorem 2.5.

4. MUTUAL INFORMATION AND RATE DISTORTION FUNCTION

The purpose of this section is to prepare basics of mutual information and rate distortion function. Here we omit the proofs. Readers can find more details in [Tsu, §2]. Throughout this paper, $\log x$ denotes the logarithm of base 2:

$$\log x = \log_2 x \quad (x > 0).$$

4.1. Measure theoretic preparations. Here we prepare several technical notions in measure theory. They will be used in §8. We do not need them in the proof of Theorem 2.4. Readers may skip this subsection at the first reading if it looks cumbersome.

A pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is called a **measurable space** if \mathcal{X} is a set and \mathcal{A} is its σ -algebra. A triplet $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ is called a **probability space** if $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is a measurable space and \mathbb{P} is a probability measure on it.

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ be measurable spaces. A **transition probability** on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is a map $\nu: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

- for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the map $\mathcal{B} \ni B \mapsto \nu(x, B) \in [0, 1]$ is a probability measure on $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$,
- for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, the map $\mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto \nu(x, B) \in [0, 1]$ is measurable.

We often denote $\nu(x, B)$ by $\nu(B|x)$.

For a topological space \mathcal{X} , its **Borel σ -algebra** is the minimum σ -algebra containing all open subsets of \mathcal{X} . We always assume that a topological space is equipped with its Borel σ -algebra. We also assume that a finite set is always equipped with the discrete topology and the discrete σ -algebra (the set of all subsets). A topological space \mathcal{X} is called a **Polish space** if it admits a metric \mathbf{d} for which $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ is a complete metric space.

A measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is called a **standard Borel space** if it is isomorphic (as a measurable space) to some Polish space with its Borel σ -algebra. An importance of this notion comes from Theorem 4.1 below. Readers can find a detailed explanation of standard Borel spaces in the book of Srivastava [Sri98]

For two measurable spaces $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ we denote their product by $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B})$ where $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is the minimum σ -algebra containing all $A \times B$ ($A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}$). For any $E \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$, the section $E_x := \{y \in \mathcal{Y} \mid (x, y) \in E\}$ belongs to \mathcal{B} for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, if $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ is a standard Borel space, then for any transition probability ν on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and any $E \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$, the map $\mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto \nu(E_x|x) \in [0, 1]$ is measurable [Sri98, Proposition 3.4.24].

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ a measurable space. Let $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a measurable map. We denote the push-forward measure $X_*\mathbb{P}$ by $\text{Law}X$, where $X_*\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{P}(X^{-1}(A))$. We call it the **law of X** or the **distribution of X** .

The next theorem guarantees the existence of regular conditional distribution. For the proof, see [IW81, p.15 Theorem 3.3 and its Corollary] or [Gra11, p.182 Corollary 6.2].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ be standard Borel spaces, and let $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $Y: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be measurable maps. Set $\mu = \text{Law}X$. Then there exists a transition probability ν on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that for any $E \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}((X, Y) \in E) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \nu(E_x|x) d\mu(x).$$

If another transition probability ν' on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies the same property then there exists a μ -null set $N \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\nu(B|x) = \nu'(B|x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus N$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

The transition probability ν introduced in this theorem is called the **regular conditional distribution of Y given $X = x$** . We sometimes denote $\nu(B|x)$ by $\mathbb{P}(Y \in B|X = x)$. If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are finite sets, then this coincides with the notion of conditional probability in the elementary probability theory:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \in B|X = x) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(X = x, Y \in B)}{\mathbb{P}(X = x)}, \quad \text{if } \mathbb{P}(X = x) > 0.$$

In this case we denote $\nu(\{y\}|x)$ by $\nu(y|x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and call it a **conditional probability mass function**.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}), (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{C})$ be standard Borel spaces, and let X, Y, Z be random variables defined on Ω and taking values in $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ respectively. We say that X and Y are **conditionally independent given Z** if we have

$$\mathbb{P}((X, Y) \in A \times B|Z = z) = \mathbb{P}(X \in A|Z = z) \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y \in B|Z = z)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}$ and for Z_* -almost every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. Here the left-hand side is the regular conditional distribution of $(X, Y): \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ given $Z = z$.

4.2. Mutual information. The purpose of this subsection is to define mutual information and review its basic properties. Readers can find more comprehensive introduction to mutual information in the book of Cover–Thomas [CT06]. The book of Gray [Gra11] presents a mathematically sophisticated explanation.

We fix a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We assume that all random variables in this subsection are defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ be a finite set with the discrete σ -algebra. For a measurable map $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ we define its **Shannon entropy** by

$$H(X) = - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(X = x) \log \mathbb{P}(X = x).$$

Here we assume $0 \log 0 = 0$.

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ be measurable spaces. Let $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $Y: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be measurable maps. We define the **mutual information** $I(X; Y)$ in the following two steps. Intuitively $I(X; Y)$ is the amount of information shared by X and Y .

- **Step I:** Suppose \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are both finite sets. Then we define

$$I(X; Y) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(X, Y),$$

where $H(X, Y)$ is the Shannon entropy of $(X, Y): \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. $I(X; Y)$ is always nonnegative. The explicit formula is given by

$$I(X; Y) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(X = x, Y = y) \log \frac{\mathbb{P}(X = x, Y = y)}{\mathbb{P}(X = x)\mathbb{P}(Y = y)}.$$

Here we assume $0 \log \frac{0}{a} = 0$ for any $a \geq 0$.

- **Step II:** Next we define $I(X; Y)$ in general (i.e. \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} may be infinite sets). Let \mathcal{X}' and \mathcal{Y}' be arbitrary finite sets, and let $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ and $g: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ be any measurable maps. Now we can consider $I(f(X); g(Y))$ by the above Step I. We define $I(X; Y)$ as the supremum of $I(f(X); g(Y))$ over all finite sets $\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}'$ and all measurable maps $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ and $g: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$. This definition is compatible with Step I. The mutual information is nonnegative and symmetric:

$$I(X; Y) = I(Y; X) \geq 0.$$

If $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ and $g: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ are measurable maps to some measurable spaces $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{A}')$ and $(\mathcal{Y}', \mathcal{B}')$ (not necessarily finite sets) then we have $I(f(X); g(Y)) \leq I(X; Y)$.

If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ are both standard Borel spaces, then we can consider the regular conditional distribution of Y given $X = x$. Set

$$\nu(B|x) = \mathbb{P}(Y \in B | X = x), \quad (x \in \mathcal{X}, B \in \mathcal{B}).$$

We also set $\mu = \text{Law} X$. The distribution of (X, Y) is determined by μ and ν . Therefore the mutual information $I(X; Y)$ is also determined by them. So we sometimes denote $I(X; Y)$ by $I(\mu, \nu)$. An important point is that $I(\mu, \nu)$ is a concave function in μ and a convex function in ν . See Proposition 4.4 below.

In the rest of this subsection we review basic properties of mutual information without proofs. Readers can find the proofs in [Tsu, §2.2]. We need to use these properties of mutual information in §8. We do not need them in the proof of Theorem 2.4.

The next lemma immediately follows from Step I of the above definition.

Lemma 4.2. *Let X_n and Y_n ($n \geq 1$) be sequences of random variables taking values in finite sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} respectively. Suppose (X_n, Y_n) converges to (X, Y) in law⁴. Then $I(X_n; Y_n)$ converges to $I(X; Y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

⁴“Convergence in law” means that $\mathbb{P}(X_n = x, Y_n = y) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(X = x, Y = y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Lemma 4.3 (Subadditivity of mutual information). *Let X, Y, Z be three random variables taking values in standard Borel spaces $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}), (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{C})$ respectively. Suppose that X and Y are conditionally independent given Z . Then*

$$I(X, Y; Z) \leq I(X; Z) + I(Y; Z).$$

Here $I(X, Y; Z) = I((X, Y); Z)$ is the mutual information between (X, Y) and Z .

Proposition 4.4 ($I(\mu, \nu)$ is concave in μ and convex in ν). *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ be standard Borel spaces, and let $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{C}, m)$ be a probability space.*

- (1) *Let ν be a transition probability on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. Suppose that we are given a probability measure μ_z on \mathcal{X} for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that the map $\mathcal{Z} \ni z \mapsto \mu_z(A) \in [0, 1]$ is measurable for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$. We define a probability measure μ on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ by*

$$\mu(A) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \mu_z(A) dm(z), \quad (A \in \mathcal{A}).$$

Then we have

$$I(\mu, \nu) \geq \int_{\mathcal{Z}} I(\mu_z, \nu) dm(z).$$

- (2) *Let μ be a probability measure on \mathcal{X} . Suppose that we are given a transition probability ν_z on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that the map $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \ni (x, z) \mapsto \nu_z(B|x) \in [0, 1]$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C}$ for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$. We define a transition probability ν on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ by*

$$\nu(B|x) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \nu_z(B|x) dm(z), \quad (x \in \mathcal{X}, B \in \mathcal{B}).$$

Then we have

$$I(\mu, \nu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{Z}} I(\mu, \nu_z) dm(z).$$

The next proposition is a key result which connects geometry to rate distortion theory. This is essentially due to Kawabata–Dembo [KD94, Proposition 3.2]. For a subset E of a metric space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ we denote $\text{Diam}E = \sup\{\mathbf{d}(x, y) \mid x, y \in E\}$.

Proposition 4.5 (Kawabata–Dembo estimate). *Let ε and δ be positive numbers with $2\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon) \leq \delta$. Let s be a nonnegative real number. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a separable metric space with a Borel probability measure μ satisfying*

$$\mu(E) \leq (\text{Diam}E)^s \quad \text{for all Borel subsets } E \subset \mathcal{X} \text{ with } \text{Diam}E < \delta.$$

Let X and Y be random variables taking values in \mathcal{X} and satisfying $\text{Law}X = \mu$ and $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{d}(X, Y) < \varepsilon$. Then

$$I(X; Y) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - K(s + 1).$$

Here K is a universal positive constant independent of the given data $\varepsilon, \delta, s, (\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}), \mu$.

4.3. Rate distortion theory. The purpose of this subsection is to define rate distortion function. This was first introduced by Shannon [Sha48, Sha59]. Readers can find a nice introduction in the book of Cover–Thomas [CT06, Chapter 10]. Rate distortion theory for continuous-time stochastic processes was investigated by Pursley–Gray [PG77].

Let k be a natural number. We denote the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^k by \mathbf{m} . Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space. Let A be a Borel subset of \mathbb{R}^k with $\mathbf{m}(A) < \infty$. We define $L^1(A, \mathcal{X})$ as the space of all measurable maps $f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. We identify two maps if they coincide \mathbf{m} -almost everywhere. Define a metric on $L^1(A, \mathcal{X})$ by

$$D(f, g) = \int_A \mathbf{d}(f(u), g(u)) \, d\mathbf{m}(u), \quad (f, g \in L^1(A, \mathcal{X})).$$

$(L^1(A, \mathcal{X}), D)$ is a complete separable metric space [Tsu, Lemma 2.14]. Hence it is a standard Borel space with respect to the Borel σ -algebra.

Let $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuous action of \mathbb{R}^k . Here \mathbb{R}^k has the standard topology and additive group structure. (We only need the case of $k = 2$ in the application to Brody curves.) Let μ be a T -invariant Borel probability measure on \mathcal{X} . Here “ T -invariant” means that $\mu(T^u A) = \mu(A)$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and all Borel subsets $A \subset \mathcal{X}$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let A be a bounded Borel subset of \mathbb{R}^k with $\mathbf{m}(A) > 0$. We define $R(\varepsilon, A)$ as the infimum of the mutual information $I(X; Y)$ where X and Y are random variables defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that

- X takes values in \mathcal{X} and its distribution is given by μ ,
- Y takes values in $L^1(A, \mathcal{X})$ and satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{m}(A)} \int_A \mathbf{d}(T^u X, Y_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) < \varepsilon.$$

Here $Y_u = Y_u(\omega)$ ($\omega \in \Omega$) is the value of $Y(\omega) \in L^1(A, \mathcal{X})$ at $u \in A$.

We define the **rate distortion function** $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)$ by

$$R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R(\varepsilon, [0, L]^k)}{L^k}.$$

This limit exists, and it is equal to the infimum of $\frac{R(\varepsilon, [0, L]^k)}{L^k}$ over $L > 0$ [Tsu, Lemma 2.17]. The value of $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)$ is a nonnegative real number.

We define the **upper and lower rate distortion dimensions** of $(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$ by

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}, \quad \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}.$$

These are nonnegative real numbers (possibly $+\infty$). When the upper and lower limits coincide, we denote the common value by $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$.

The next remark will be used in §8.2. We do not need it for the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Remark 4.6. In the above definition of $R(\varepsilon, A)$, we can assume that Y takes only finitely many values in $L^1(A, \mathcal{X})$ without loss of generality. Indeed let X and Y be random

variables satisfying the conditions in the definition of $R(\varepsilon, A)$. A priori, Y may take infinitely many values in general. However we can always find another random variable Z taking values in $L^1(A, \mathcal{X})$ such that Z takes only finitely many values and satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{m}(A)} \int_A \mathbf{d}(T^u X, Z_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) < \varepsilon, \quad I(X; Z) \leq I(X; Y).$$

Therefore, when we take the infimum, we only need to consider such random variables Z . The construction is as follows. Take a positive number τ with

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{m}(A)} \int_A \mathbf{d}(T^u X, Y_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) < \varepsilon - 2\tau.$$

The space $L^1(A, \mathcal{X})$ is separable. Hence we can find a countable dense subset $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots\}$. We define a map $F: L^1(A, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \{f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots\}$ by $F(f) = f_n$ where n is the smallest natural number satisfying $D(f, f_n) < \tau \cdot \mathbf{m}(A)$. Set $Y' = F(Y)$. Then $D(Y, Y') < \tau \cdot \mathbf{m}(A)$ and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{m}(A)} \int_A \mathbf{d}(T^u X, Y'_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) < \varepsilon - \tau.$$

We choose a natural number n_0 satisfying

$$\left(\sum_{n > n_0} \mathbb{P}(Y' = f_n) \right) \cdot \text{Diam} \mathcal{X} < \tau.$$

Define $G: \{f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots\} \rightarrow \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{n_0}\}$ by

$$G(f) = \begin{cases} f & \text{if } f \in \{f_1, \dots, f_{n_0}\} \\ f_{n_0} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Set $Z = G(Y')$. Then Z takes only finitely many values f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{n_0} and satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{m}(A)} \int_A \mathbf{d}(T^u X, Z_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) < \varepsilon, \quad I(X; Z) \leq I(X; Y') \leq I(X; Y).$$

5. TOPOLOGICAL AND METRIC MEAN DIMENSIONS WITH POTENTIAL

The purpose of this section is to prepare basics of mean dimension with potential and metric mean dimension with potential.

5.1. Definitions and variational principle. Let P be a finite simplicial complex. For a point $a \in P$ we define the **local dimension** $\dim_a P$ as the maximum of $\dim \Delta$ where Δ is a simplex of P containing a . See Figure 1. (This is the same as [Tsu20, Fig. 1].)

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space. For a positive number ε , a continuous map $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ to some topological space \mathcal{Y} is called an ε -**embedding** if we have $\text{Diam} f^{-1}(y) < \varepsilon$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Here $\text{Diam} f^{-1}(y) = \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in f^{-1}(y)} \mathbf{d}(x_1, x_2)$ is the diameter of the fiber $f^{-1}(y)$.




FIGURE 1. Here P has four vertexes (denoted by dots), four 1-dimensional simplexes and one 2-dimensional simplex. The points b and d are vertexes of P whereas a and c are not. We have $\dim_a P = \dim_b P = 2$ and $\dim_c P = \dim_d P = 1$.

Let $\varphi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. We define **ε -width dimension with potential** by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Widim}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) \\ &= \inf \left\{ \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (\dim_{f(x)} P + \varphi(x)) \mid \begin{array}{l} P \text{ is a finite simplicial complex and} \\ f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow P \text{ is an } \varepsilon\text{-embedding} \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define **ε -covering number with potential** by

$$\#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varphi, \varepsilon) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (1/\varepsilon)^{\sup_{U_i} \varphi} \mid \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{X} = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n \text{ is an open cover with} \\ \text{Diam } U_i < \varepsilon \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \end{array} \right\}.$$

When $\varphi = 0$, we denote $\#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varphi, \varepsilon)$ by $\#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varphi)$ and call it **ε -covering number**. The ε -covering number $\#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varepsilon)$ is given by the minimum integer $n \geq 1$ such that \mathcal{X} is covered by n open sets of diameter smaller than ε .

Let k be a natural number. Let $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuous action of the group \mathbb{R}^k . (As in §4.3, \mathbb{R}^k has the standard topology and additive group structure.) For a Borel subset A of \mathbb{R}^k we define a metric \mathbf{d}_A and a function φ_A on \mathcal{X} by

$$\mathbf{d}_A(x, y) = \sup_{u \in A} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y), \quad \varphi_A(x) = \int_A \varphi(T^u x) d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

Here \mathbf{m} denotes the k -dimensional Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^k . For a positive number L , we also denote $\mathbf{d}_L := \mathbf{d}_{[0, L]^k}$ and $\varphi_L := \varphi_{[0, L]^k}$ for simplicity of the notation.

We define **mean dimension with potential** by

$$\text{mdim}(\mathcal{X}, T, \varphi) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Widim}_\varepsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L)}{L^k} \right).$$

This is a topological invariant (i.e. independent of the choice of \mathbf{d}). When $\varphi = 0$, we denote $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{X}, T, \varphi)$ by $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{X}, T)$ and call it **mean dimension**. This coincides with the original definition of mean dimension introduced by Gromov [Gro99].

We define **upper and lower metric mean dimensions with potential** by

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) &= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} \right), \\ \underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) &= \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

If the upper and lower limits coincide, we denote the common value by $\text{mdim}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi)$. When $\varphi = 0$, we denote $\overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi)$ and $\underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi)$ by $\overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d})$ and $\underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d})$ respectively. They coincide with the original definition of the upper and lower metric mean dimensions introduced by Lindenstrauss and Weiss [LW00, Lin99]. We always have [Tsu, Lemma 3.3, Theorem 3.4]

$$(5.1) \quad \text{mdim}(\mathcal{X}, T, \varphi) \leq \underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) \leq \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi).$$

We denote by $\mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})$ the set of all T -invariant Borel probability measures on \mathcal{X} . The following variational principle was proved in [Tsu, Theorem 1.3, Proposition 3.5].

Theorem 5.1 (Variational principle).

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mdim}(\mathcal{X}, T, \varphi) &\leq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})} \left(\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})} \left(\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu \right) \leq \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi).\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.2. The standard variational principle for topological pressure provides the equality $P_T(\varphi) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})} (h_{\mu}(T) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu)$, whereas Theorem 5.1 presents only inequalities. This might look unsatisfactory. Indeed, we conjecture that for any continuous action $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ on a compact metrizable space \mathcal{X} and for any continuous function $\varphi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ there exists a metric \mathbf{d} on \mathcal{X} compatible with the given topology and satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mdim}(\mathcal{X}, T, \varphi) &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})} \left(\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu \right) \\ &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})} \left(\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi d\mu \right) = \text{mdim}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi).\end{aligned}$$

This is more satisfactory (if it is true). We will see later that this conjecture holds true for the dynamical system of Brody curves \mathcal{B}^N with respect to some natural choices of potential functions. See Remark 6.6 below.

5.2. Local formula of metric mean dimension with potential. Here we prepare a convenient method to calculate metric mean dimension with potential from certain local quantity. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space with a continuous function $\varphi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and a subset $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ we set

$$\#(E, \mathbf{d}, \varphi, \varepsilon) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (1/\varepsilon)^{\sup_{U_i} \varphi} \mid E \subset U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n. \text{ Each } U_i \text{ is an open set of } \mathcal{X} \text{ with } \text{Diam } U_i < \varepsilon. \right\}.$$

We also set $\#(E, \mathbf{d}, \varepsilon) := \#(E, \mathbf{d}, 0, \varepsilon)$. This is the minimum number of n such that there exist open sets U_1, \dots, U_n of \mathcal{X} satisfying $E \subset U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n$ and $\text{Diam}U_i < \varepsilon$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Let $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuous action of \mathbb{R}^k . For $\delta > 0$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we set

$$B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}) := \{y \in \mathcal{X} \mid \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}(x, y) \leq \delta\} = \{y \mid \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y) \leq \delta \text{ for all } u \in \mathbb{R}^k\}.$$

Notice that this is *not* a neighborhood of x (with respect to the original topology of \mathcal{X}) in general. Nonetheless, the next theorem shows that we can calculate metric mean dimension with potential only by studying these sets. This was proved in [Tsu, Theorem 7.1].

Theorem 5.3. *For any $\delta > 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) &= \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} \right) \right\}, \\ \underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) &= \underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next proposition is a small modification of this theorem. This is more suitable for the application to Brody curves.

Proposition 5.4.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left[\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varphi_L(x)}{L^k} \right) \right\} \right], \\ \underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left[\underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varphi_L(x)}{L^k} \right) \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

This formula may look complicated, but indeed the calculation of the right-hand sides are often much easier than the direct calculation of the left-hand sides.

Proof. We prove the formula for the upper metric mean dimension with potential. The lower case is similar. Let η be an arbitrary positive number. We take a positive number δ_0 satisfying

$$\mathbf{d}(x, y) < \delta_0 \implies |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| < \eta.$$

We take arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$.

Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $L > 0$. For every $y \in B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k})$ we have $\mathbf{d}_L(x, y) \leq \delta < \delta_0$ and hence $|\varphi_L(x) - \varphi_L(y)| < \eta L^k$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\varphi_L(x) - \eta L^k} \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon) &\leq \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L, \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\varphi_L(x) + \eta L^k} \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the logarithm and dividing them by $L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varphi_L(x)}{L^k} - \eta &\leq \frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq \frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varphi_L(x)}{L^k} + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the lower limit as $L \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varphi_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} - \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varphi_L(x)}{L^k} \right) \right| \leq \eta.$$

We take the supremum over $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. By Theorem 5.3 we have

$$\left| \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) - \overline{\lim} \sup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{x \in \mathcal{X} \ L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varphi_L(x)}{L^k} \right) \right| \leq \eta.$$

We let $\delta \rightarrow 0$:

$$\left| \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \varphi) - \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim} \sup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{x \in \mathcal{X} \ L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(x, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^k \log(1/\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varphi_L(x)}{L^k} \right) \right| \leq \eta.$$

Here $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary. So we let $\eta \rightarrow 0$ and get the claim of the proposition. \square

6. NONDEGENERATE BRODY CURVES AND THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 2.4 (a Ruelle inequality for Brody curves).

6.1. Nondegenerate Brody curves. A basic tool to study \mathcal{B}^N is the deformation theory of Brody curves developed in [Tsu09b, MT15, Tsu18]. This corresponds to the theory of stable and unstable manifolds in the case of Axiom A diffeomorphisms. The (un)stable manifold theorem requires a hyperbolicity assumption [Bow75, 3.2. Theorem]. Similarly, we need a kind of ‘‘hyperbolicity’’ (transversality) for developing the deformation theory of Brody curves. The next definition provides such a notion. This stems from a classical paper of Yosida [Yos34].

Definition 6.1. Let R be a positive number. A holomorphic map $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ is said to be R -nondegenerate if for all points $a \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$(6.1) \quad \max_{|z-a| \leq R} |df|(z) \geq \frac{1}{R}.$$

Namely, f is R -nondegenerate if every R -disk of the plane contains a point z for which we have $|df|(z) \geq 1/R$.

Notice that if f is R -nondegenerate and $R' \geq R$ then f is R' -nondegenerate. We also say that a holomorphic map $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ is **nondegenerate** if f is R -nondegenerate for some $R > 0$.

A typical example of *degenerate* (i.e. not nondegenerate) holomorphic map is a constant map. The condition (6.1) implies that f is not close to constant maps over every R -disk of

the plane⁵. A rational function is degenerate because it converges to a constant function near the infinity of the plane. A typical example of nondegenerate holomorphic maps is given by a nonconstant elliptic function.

Definition 6.1 plays a role of “hyperbolicity” in the deformation theory of Brody curves. Here we briefly review the main ideas of this theory. Given a Lipschitz holomorphic map $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$, we would like to study a deformation of f . Let $T\mathbb{C}P^N$ be the tangent bundle of $\mathbb{C}P^N$. Its Hermitian metric is given by the Fubini–Study metric. Let $E := f^*T\mathbb{C}P^N$ be the pull-back of $T\mathbb{C}P^N$ by the map $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$. This is a holomorphic vector bundle over the complex plane. Its Hermitian metric is given by the pull-back of the Fubini–Study metric. Let $\bar{\partial}: C^\infty(E) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Lambda^{0,1}(E))$ be the Dolbeault operator. We define H_f as the space of holomorphic sections u of E satisfying $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} < \infty$. This is the space of *first-order deformations*⁶. As is well-known in the standard deformation theory, we need a *transversality*⁷ for lifting the first-order deformation to true deformation. The relevant transversality condition here is the surjectivity of $\bar{\partial}: C^\infty(E) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Lambda^{0,1}(E))$ under a suitable norm restriction.

We have the Bochner formula

$$\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*\omega = \frac{1}{2}\nabla^*\nabla\omega + \Theta\omega, \quad (\omega \in C^\infty(\Lambda^{0,1}(E))).$$

Here $\bar{\partial}^*: C^\infty(\Lambda^{0,1}(E)) \rightarrow C^\infty(E)$ is the formal adjoint of $\bar{\partial}$, and ∇ is the canonical connection with respect to the Hermitian metric on E . The operator $\Theta := [\nabla_{\partial/\partial z}, \nabla_{\partial/\partial \bar{z}}]$ is the curvature. The holomorphic bisectional curvature of the Fubini–Study metric is bounded from below by 2π . Then

$$\langle \Theta\omega, \omega \rangle \geq \pi|df|^2 \cdot |\omega|^2.$$

Therefore the condition (6.1) implies that Θ has a certain positivity property.

Suppose f is nondegenerate. Then for any $\omega \in C^\infty(\Lambda^{0,1}(E))$ with $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$, by using the Bochner formula and the positivity of Θ , we can construct $F(\omega) \in C^\infty(E)$ which depends linearly on ω and satisfies

$$(6.2) \quad \bar{\partial}(F(\omega)) = \omega, \quad \|F(\omega)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}.$$

This is the transversality condition we need. From this condition, for any $u \in H_f$ with small L^∞ -norm, we can construct $\alpha(u) \in C^\infty(E)$ such that

$$\bullet \|\alpha(u)\|_{L^\infty} = O(\|u\|_{L^\infty}^2),$$

⁵More precisely, f is nondegenerate if and only if the \mathbb{C} -orbit of f does not accumulate to a constant map. This condition was first introduced by Yosida [Yos34] for meromorphic functions. The condition (6.1) is its quantitative version.

⁶The condition that a given map is holomorphic is a non-linear equation. The linearization of this equation is given by the Dolbeault operator $\bar{\partial}$. So H_f is the space of the solutions of this linearized equation.

⁷Transversality is a condition that we need for applying the implicit function theorem.

- the map $g(z) := \exp_{f(z)}(u(z) + \alpha(u)(z))$ ($z \in \mathbb{C}$) is holomorphic. Here $\exp_p: T_p\mathbb{C}P^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ is the exponential map with respect to the Fubini–Study metric.

Moreover, every holomorphic curve sufficiently close to f uniformly over the plane can be written as $g(z) = \exp_{f(z)}(u(z) + \alpha(u)(z))$.

In summary, if $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ is a nondegenerate Lipschitz holomorphic curve, then we can describe a local deformation of f by using the linear space H_f . This is the idea behind Definition 6.1.

Let λ be a positive number. We define \mathcal{B}_λ^N as the space of holomorphic maps $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ satisfying $|df|(z) \leq \lambda$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Namely it is the space of λ -Lipschitz holomorphic curves. The case $\lambda = 1$ coincides with the space of Brody curves \mathcal{B}^N . We are mainly interested in the case of $\lambda = 1$, but it is technically convenient to consider the case $\lambda > 1$ also⁸. The group \mathbb{C} acts on \mathcal{B}_λ^N by translation. We also denote it by T :

$$T: \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{B}_\lambda^N \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_\lambda^N, \quad (a, f(z)) \mapsto f(z + a).$$

We define a metric on \mathcal{B}_λ^N (also denoted by \mathbf{d}) by

$$\mathbf{d}(f, g) = \max_{z \in [0,1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

Here recall that d_{FS} is the distance function on $\mathbb{C}P^N$ defined by the Fubini–Study metric.

The following proposition is a main consequence of the deformation theory described above. This was proved in [Tsu18, Proposition 3.3]. (Indeed the paper [Tsu18, Proposition 3.3] provided a slightly stronger statement than this.)

Proposition 6.2. *For any $R > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exist⁹ positive numbers $\delta_1 = \delta_1(R)$, $C_1 = C_1(R)$ and $C_2 = C_2(\varepsilon)$ for which the following statement holds: For any R -nondegenerate $f \in \mathcal{B}_2^N$ and for any square $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ of side length $L \geq 1$ we have*

$$\#(\{g \in \mathcal{B}_2^N \mid \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}(f, g) \leq \delta_1\}, \mathbf{d}_S, \varepsilon) \leq \left(\frac{C_1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{2(N+1) \int_S |df|^2 dx dy + C_2 L}.$$

Here recall that $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and \mathbf{d}_S are metrics on \mathcal{B}_2^N defined by

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}(f, g) = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{C}} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)), \quad \mathbf{d}_S(f, g) = \sup_{u \in S} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g).$$

In particular, if $S = [0, L]^2 = \{x + y\sqrt{-1} \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 \leq x, y \leq L\}$ then $\mathbf{d}_S(f, g)$ is given by $\sup_{z \in [0, L+1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z))$.

Sketch of the proof of Proposition 6.2. Here is a very brief sketch of the proof. By the deformation theory, the proof boils down to a problem of estimating the ε -covering number of $B_{\delta_1}(H_f) := \{u \in H_f \mid \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq \delta_1\}$ with respect to the metric $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(S)}$. We solve this problem by using the Riemann–Roch theorem. \square

⁸We can transform every result for \mathcal{B}^N to that of \mathcal{B}_λ^N by a scale change.

⁹Here δ_1 and C_1 depend only on R and are independent of ε , while C_2 depends only on ε and is independent of R .

Proposition 6.2 provides a good control of nondegenerate Brody curves and its neighborhoods¹⁰ with respect to the metric $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}$. However some Brody curves are degenerate. They become “singularity” for our analysis. The next proposition provides a “resolution of singularity”. For $r > 0$ and a Brody curve $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ we denote

$$B_r(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}) = \{g \in \mathcal{B}^N \mid \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}(f, g) \leq r\}.$$

Notice that this is a subset of \mathcal{B}^N . We will not use this notation for other \mathcal{B}_{λ}^N ($\lambda \neq 1$). So it may not cause a confusion.

Proposition 6.3. *Let η be a positive number. There exist¹¹ $\delta_2 > 0$, $C_3 > 1$ and $R_1 = R_1(\eta) > 0$ for which the following statement holds. For any Brody curve $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ there exists a map $\Phi: B_{\delta_2}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N$ satisfying the following three conditions.*

- (1) $\Phi(f)$ is R_1 -nondegenerate.
- (2) For any $g_1, g_2 \in B_{\delta_2}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(z), \Phi(g_2)(z)) &\leq C_3 d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)), \\ d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)) &\leq C_3 \sup_{|w-z| \leq 3} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(w), \Phi(g_2)(w)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the image of Φ is contained in $\{g \in \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N \mid \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}(\Phi(f), g) \leq C_3 \delta_2\}$.

- (3) For any square $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ of side length $L \geq R_1$

$$\left| \int_S |df|^2 dx dy - \int_S |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy \right| < \eta L^2.$$

Here $|d\Phi(f)|$ is the local Lipschitz constant of the map $\Phi(f): \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$.

This statement may look technical. Its idea is as follows. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ be a degenerate Brody curve. We want to replace f with a nondegenerate one. The condition (1) means that the map Φ provides such a replacement. The condition (2) means that this replacement procedure does not distort much the metric structure around f . The condition (3) means that Φ changes the values of the energy integrals only slightly.

Proposition 6.3 is a modification of [Tsu18, Proposition 3.3]. We will prove it in §6.3.

6.2. Proof of Theorem 2.4. We prove Theorem 2.4 (a Ruelle inequality for Brody curves) here. Recall some notations: \mathcal{B}^N is the space of Brody curves in $\mathbb{C}P^N$ with the metric $\mathbf{d}(f, g) = \max_{z \in [0,1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z))$. The function $\psi: \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\psi(f) = 2(N+1) |df|^2(0).$$

For $L > 0$ the metric \mathbf{d}_L and function ψ_L are defined by

$$\mathbf{d}_L(f, g) = \max_{u \in [0, L]^2} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g) = \max_{z \in [0, L+1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)),$$

¹⁰Notice that the metrics \mathbf{d} and $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}$ define different topology. In particular, a neighborhood with respect to $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is not a neighborhood with respect to \mathbf{d} in general.

¹¹Here δ_2 and C_3 are universal constants independent of η , while R_1 depends on η .

$$(6.3) \quad \psi_L(f) = \int_{[0,L]^2} \psi(T^u f) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) = 2(N+1) \int_{[0,L]^2} |df|^2(z) \, dx dy.$$

The next theorem is a key result. This is a ‘‘Brody curve analogue’’ of the equation $P_T(-\phi) = 0$ of Axiom A attractors (3.2).

Theorem 6.4. *The topological and metric mean dimensions of $(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d})$ with respect to the potential function $-\psi$ are both zero:*

$$\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, -\psi) = \text{mdim}_M(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) = 0.$$

Proof. By (5.1) we have

$$\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, -\psi) \leq \underline{\text{mdim}}_M(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) \leq \overline{\text{mdim}}_M(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi).$$

Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}^N$ be the space of constant maps. This is a closed invariant subset of \mathcal{B}^N . The group \mathbb{C} trivially acts on it, and the function ψ is identically zero on it. Therefore we have

$$\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, -\psi) \geq \text{mdim}(\mathcal{C}, T, -\psi) = 0.$$

Hence it is enough to prove $\overline{\text{mdim}}_M(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) \leq 0$.

By Proposition 5.4

$$\overline{\text{mdim}}_M(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}^N} \underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)} - \frac{\psi_L(f)}{L^2} \right).$$

By (6.3) this can be also written as

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \overline{\text{mdim}}_M(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) \\ &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}^N} \underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)} - \frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[0,L]^2} |df|^2 \, dx dy \right). \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the right-hand side.

Let η be an arbitrary positive number with $\eta < 1$. Let $\delta_2 > 0, C_3 > 1$ and $R_1 = R_1(\eta) > 0$ be positive numbers introduced in Proposition 6.3 (resolution of singularity). Take an arbitrary $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Let $\delta_1 = \delta_1(R_1)$, $C_1 = C_1(R_1)$ and $C_2 = C_2(\varepsilon)$ be positive numbers introduced in Proposition 6.2 (covering number estimate around nondegenerate curves) with respect to these R_1 and ε .

Let $0 < \delta \leq \min(\delta_2, \delta_1/C_3)$. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ be an arbitrary Brody curve. By Proposition 6.3, there exists a map $\Phi: B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \{g \in \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N \mid \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}(\Phi(f), g) \leq C_3\delta\}$ such that

- $\Phi(f)$ is R_1 -nondegenerate,
- for any $g_1, g_2 \in B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C})$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)) \leq C_3 \max_{|w-z| \leq 3} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(w), \Phi(g_2)(w)),$$

- for any $L \geq R_1$

$$(6.5) \quad \left| \int_{[0,L]^2} |df|^2 \, dx dy - \int_{[0,L]^2} |d\Phi(f)|^2 \, dx dy \right| < \eta L^2.$$

For $g_1, g_2 \in B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_L(g_1, g_2) &= \max_{z \in [0, L+1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)) \\ &\leq C_3 \max_{w \in [-3, L+4]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(w), \Phi(g_2)(w)) \\ &= C_3 \mathbf{d}_{[-3, L+3]^2}(\Phi(g_1), \Phi(g_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \#(B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon) &\leq \# \left(\{g \in \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N \mid \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}(\Phi(f), g) \leq C_3 \delta\}, \mathbf{d}_{[-3, L+3]^2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{C_3} \right) \\ &\leq \# \left(\{g \in \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N \mid \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}(\Phi(f), g) \leq \delta_1\}, \mathbf{d}_{[-3, L+3]^2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{C_3} \right) \quad \text{by } \delta \leq \frac{\delta_1}{C_3} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_1 C_3}{\varepsilon} \right)^{2(N+1) \int_{[-3, L+3]^2} |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy + C_2(L+6)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the covering number estimate of Proposition 6.2 in the last line. We take the logarithm and divide them by L^2 :

$$\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^2} \leq \left(\frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[-3, L+3]^2} |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy + \frac{C_2(L+6)}{L^2} \right) \log \left(\frac{C_1 C_3}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Now we assume $L \geq R_1$ and use (6.5). Then the right-hand side is bounded from above by

$$\left(\frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[-3, L+3]^2} |df|^2 dx dy + \frac{2(N+1)(L+6)^2 \eta}{L^2} + \frac{C_2(L+6)}{L^2} \right) \log \left(\frac{C_1 C_3}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

We have

$$\frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[-3, L+3]^2} |df|^2 dx dy = \frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[0, L]^2} |df|^2 dx dy + O\left(\frac{1}{L}\right).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)} - \frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[0, L]^2} |df|^2 dx dy \right) \\ &\leq 2(N+1) \frac{\log(C_1 C_3)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)} + 2(N+1) \eta \frac{\log\left(\frac{C_1 C_3}{\varepsilon}\right)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C_1 = C_1(R_1(\eta))$ and C_3 are independent of ε . We take the supremum over $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ and let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}^N} \underline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\log \#(B_\delta(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}), \mathbf{d}_L, \varepsilon)}{L^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)} - \frac{2(N+1)}{L^2} \int_{[0, L]^2} |df|^2 dx dy \right) \leq 2(N+1)\eta.$$

We let $\delta \rightarrow 0$. By (6.4) we have

$$\overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) \leq 2(N+1)\eta.$$

Recall that η is an arbitrary number with $0 < \eta < 1$. Therefore we conclude

$$\overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) \leq 0.$$

□

Now we can prove Theorem 2.4. We write the statement again.

Corollary 6.5 (= Theorem 2.4). *For every invariant probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ we have*

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

Proof. By the variational principle (Theorem 5.1)

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) - \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu \leq \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi).$$

The right-hand side is zero by Theorem 6.4. Thus

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) - \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu \leq 0.$$

□

Remark 6.6. By Theorem 6.4 and the variational principle (Theorem 5.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, -\psi) &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) - \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu \right) \\ &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) - \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu \right) \\ &= \text{mdim}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, -\psi) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the conjecture stated in Remark 5.2 holds for $(\mathcal{B}^N, T, -\psi)$. We also have a similar result for the potential function $\varphi := 0$ (the function constantly equal to zero). Indeed, on the one hand, the paper [MT15, Theorem 1.1] showed that $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) \geq 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$. On the other hand, another paper [Tsu18, p. 947] proved¹² that $\overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}) \leq 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$. Since $\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) \leq \underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}) \leq \overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d})$, we have

$$\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) = \text{mdim}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}) = 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N).$$

¹²Strictly speaking, the paper [Tsu18] stated only $\underline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}) \leq 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$. However the argument of [Tsu18, pp. 947-948] can be also applied to the upper metric mean dimension without any changes. Another paper [Tsu22, §4.3] explicitly proved $\overline{\text{mdim}}_{\text{M}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}) \leq 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$.

By the variational principle (Theorem 5.1), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{mdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T) &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \\
&= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \\
&= \text{mdim}_M(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}) \\
&= 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N).
\end{aligned}$$

6.3. Proof of Proposition 6.3. In this section we prove Proposition 6.3. The proof is based on the next lemma. This was proved in [Tsu18, Lemma 4.1]. We need to introduce some notations. We define \mathcal{H}^N as the set of all holomorphic maps $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$. Let $r > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{C}$ and $q \in \mathbb{C}P^N$. We denote $D_r(p) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z - p| \leq r\}$ and $B_r(q) = \{w \in \mathbb{C}P^N \mid d_{\text{FS}}(w, q) \leq r\}$.

Lemma 6.7 (Gluing lemma). *There exist $\delta_3 > 0, R_2 > 0$ and $C_4 > 1$ for which the following statement holds. Let $p \in \mathbb{C}$, $q \in \mathbb{C}P^N, R \geq R_2$ and define $\mathcal{A} = \{f \in \mathcal{H}^N \mid f(D_R(p)) \subset B_{\delta_3}(q)\}$. Then there exists a map $\Psi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^N$ satisfying the following conditions.*

(1) For any $f \in \mathcal{A}$

$$d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), \Psi(f)(z)) \leq \frac{C_4}{|z - p|^3}, \quad (z \neq p).$$

(2) We have $\frac{1}{100} < \|d\Psi(f)\|_{L^\infty(D_{R/2}(p))} < 1$ for all $f \in \mathcal{A}$. Here $\|d\Psi(f)\|_{L^\infty(D_{R/2}(p))}$ is the maximum of the local Lipschitz constant of the map $\Psi(f)$ over the disk $D_{R/2}(p)$.

(3) For any $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z - p| \geq 1$, we have

$$\left| |df|(z) - |d\Psi(f)|(z) \right| \leq \frac{C_4}{|z - p|^3} |df|(z) + \frac{C_4}{|z - p|^3}.$$

(4) Let $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z - p| \leq 1$ we have

$$C_4^{-1} d_{\text{FS}}(\Psi(f)(z), \Psi(g)(z)) \leq d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq C_4 \sup_{|w-p| \leq 2} d_{\text{FS}}(\Psi(f)(w), \Psi(g)(w)).$$

Moreover, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z - p| \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{\text{FS}}(\Psi(f)(z), \Psi(g)(z)) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|z - p|^3}\right) d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)), \\
d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|z - p|^3}\right) d_{\text{FS}}(\Psi(f)(z), \Psi(g)(z)).
\end{aligned}$$

Sketch of the proof. We explain a brief sketch of the proof for convenience of readers. The details were given in [Tsu18, Lemma 4.1]. We can assume $p = 0$ and $q = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$ without loss of generality. Suppose $f \in \mathcal{H}^N$ satisfies $f(D_R(0)) \subset B_{\delta_2}(q)$. We assume that R is sufficiently large and δ_2 is sufficiently small. Write $f(z) = [1 : f_1(z) : \cdots : f_N(z)]$

in the homogeneous coordinates. Here $f_n(z)$ are meromorphic functions in \mathbb{C} satisfying $|f_n(z)| \lesssim \delta_2$ on $D_R(0)$. Therefore f is almost constant over the large disk $D_R(0)$. We eliminate this “almost constant region” by gluing a rational curve to f .

Let a be a positive number and consider a holomorphic map $h_a: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ defined by $h_a(z) = [1 : \frac{a}{z^3} : \cdots : \frac{a}{z^3}]$. We fix $a > 0$ so that $\|h_a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} = \frac{1}{10}$. Define $\Psi(f) \in \mathcal{H}^N$ by

$$\Psi(f)(z) = \left[1 : f_1(z) + \frac{a}{z^3} : \cdots : f_N(z) + \frac{a}{z^3} \right].$$

Geometrically $\Psi(f)$ is a “gluing” of f and h_a . We can check that it satisfies all the requirements by (rather tedious) calculations. \square

Now we can start the proof of Proposition 6.3. We write the statement again.

Proposition 6.8 (= Proposition 6.3). *Let η be a positive number. There exist $\delta_2 > 0$, $C_3 > 1$ and $R_1 = R_1(\eta) > 0$ for which the following statement holds. For any Brody curve $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ there exists a map $\Phi: B_{\delta_2}(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N$ satisfying the following three conditions.*

- (1) $\Phi(f)$ is R_1 -nondegenerate.
- (2) For any $g_1, g_2 \in B_{\delta_2}(f, \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C})$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(z), \Phi(g_2)(z)) \leq C_3 d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)),$$

$$d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)) \leq C_3 \sup_{|w-z| \leq 3} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(w), \Phi(g_2)(w)).$$

In particular, the image of Φ is contained in $\{g \in \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N \mid \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{C}(\Phi(f), g) \leq C_3 \delta_2\}$.

- (3) For any square $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ of side length $L \geq R_1$

$$\left| \int_S |df|^2 dx dy - \int_S |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy \right| < \eta L^2.$$

Proof. The proof is close to [Tsu18, Proposition 3.3]. First we recall elementary facts about infinite products: Let a_n ($n \geq 1$) be a sequence of positive numbers. If the sum $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges, then the product $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1+a_n)$ also converges. Moreover, if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n < 1$ then¹³

$$1 \leq \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1+a_n) \leq \frac{1}{1 - (\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n)}.$$

In particular, if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n < \frac{1}{2}$ then

$$(6.6) \quad 0 \leq \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1+a_n) - 1 \leq 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n.$$

Namely, if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is close to zero then $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1+a_n)$ is close to one.

¹³Let $b = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$. We have

$$\log \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1+a_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \log(1+a_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(a_n - \frac{a_n^2}{2} + \frac{a_n^3}{3} - \cdots \right) \leq b + \frac{b^2}{2} + \frac{b^3}{3} + \cdots = \log \frac{1}{1-b}.$$

We can assume $0 < \eta < 1$. We will show that the statement holds for $\delta_2 := \delta_3/4$ where δ_3 is a positive constant introduced in Lemma 6.7 (gluing lemma). Let R be a large positive number which will be fixed in (6.8) below. Set $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}(2R) + \mathbb{Z}(2R\sqrt{-1}) \subset \mathbb{C}$. This is a lattice of the plane. We enumerate its elements as $\Lambda = \{p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots\}$. We have $\mathbb{C} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_{2R}(p_n)$. We fix a small positive number $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ independent¹⁴ of R such that for any square $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ of side length $L \geq R$ we have

$$(6.7) \quad \mathbf{m}(S \cap D_{cR}(\Lambda)) < \frac{\eta}{10} L^2,$$

where \mathbf{m} denotes the two-dimensional Lebesgue measure and $D_{cR}(\Lambda) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_{cR}(p_n)$.

Various estimates in this proof are based on the following simple fact: For any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\sum_{|z-p_n| \geq cR} \frac{1}{|z-p_n|^3} \leq \frac{\text{const}}{R^3}.$$

The left-hand side is a sum over all natural numbers n with $|z-p_n| \geq cR$, and “const” in the right-hand side is a positive constant independent of z and R .

Let R_2 and C_4 be the positive constants introduced in Lemma 6.7 (gluing lemma). We choose $R > 2 + 20\delta_3 + R_2$ so large that for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$(6.8) \quad \sum_{|z-p_n| \geq cR} \frac{C_4}{|z-p_n|^3} < \min\left(\frac{\eta}{100}, \frac{\delta_3}{100R}\right).$$

A point $p_n \in \Lambda$ is said to be good if we have $\|df\|_{L^\infty(D_R(p_n))} \geq \frac{\delta_3}{4R}$. Otherwise, we say that p_n is bad. If p_n is bad then $f(D_R(p_n)) \subset B_{\delta_3/4}(f(p_n))$. Hence

$$(6.9) \quad \forall g \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}) : \quad g(D_R(p_n)) \subset B_{\delta_3/2}(f(p_n)), \quad \text{if } p_n \text{ is bad.}$$

We will apply the gluing lemma (Lemma 6.7) at each bad point p_n .

We will inductively construct maps $\Phi_n : B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^N$ ($n \geq 0$) such that

$$(6.10) \quad d_{\text{FS}}(g(z), \Phi_n(g)(z)) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{C_4}{|z-p_k|^3}, \quad (z \in \mathbb{C}, g \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})).$$

We set $\Phi_0(g) = g$. Suppose Φ_n has been constructed. If p_{n+1} is good then we set $\Phi_{n+1} = \Phi_n$. If p_{n+1} is bad then we proceed as follows. From (6.10) and (6.8), for any $g \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$ and $z \in D_R(p_{n+1})$ we have

$$d_{\text{FS}}(g(z), \Phi_n(g)(z)) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{C_4}{|z-p_k|^3} \leq \sum_{|z-p_k| \geq cR} \frac{C_4}{|z-p_k|^3} < \frac{\delta_3}{2}.$$

Here we have used a fact that $|z-p_k| \geq R > cR$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Since $g(D_R(p_{n+1})) \subset B_{\delta_3/2}(f(p_{n+1}))$, we have $\Phi_n(g)(D_R(p_{n+1})) \subset B_{\delta_3}(f(p_{n+1}))$.

Now we use the gluing lemma (Lemma 6.7) with the parameters $p = p_{n+1}$ and $q = f(p_{n+1})$: There exists a map $\Psi : \{h \in \mathcal{H}^N \mid h(D_R(p_{n+1})) \subset B_{\delta_3}(f(p_{n+1}))\} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^N$

¹⁴If we choose c for the case of $R = 1$, then the same value of c works for all $R > 0$ by a scale change.

satisfying the conditions required in Lemma 6.7. Let $g \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$. We define $\Phi_{n+1}(g) := \Psi(\Phi_n(g))$. This satisfies the following conditions.

(A) We have $d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_n(g)(z), \Phi_{n+1}(g)(z)) \leq \frac{C_4}{|z-p_{n+1}|^3}$. Hence the induction hypothesis (6.10) is satisfied by Φ_{n+1} and the inductions process works.

(B) We have $\frac{1}{100} < \|d\Phi_{n+1}(g)\|_{L^\infty(D_{R/2}(p_{n+1}))} < 1$.

(C) For $|z - p_{n+1}| \geq 1$ we have

$$||d\Phi_{n+1}(g)|(z) - |d\Phi_n(g)|(z)| \leq \frac{C_4}{|z - p_{n+1}|^3} |d\Phi_n(g)|(z) + \frac{C_4}{|z - p_{n+1}|^3}.$$

(D) Let $g_1, g_2 \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$. For $|z - p_{n+1}| \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_{n+1}(g_1)(z), \Phi_{n+1}(g_2)(z)) &\leq C_4 d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_n(g_1)(z), \Phi_n(g_2)(z)), \\ d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_n(g_1)(z), \Phi_n(g_2)(z)) &\leq C_4 \sup_{|w-p_{n+1}| \leq 2} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_{n+1}(g_1)(w), \Phi_{n+1}(g_2)(w)). \end{aligned}$$

For $|z - p_{n+1}| \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_{n+1}(g_1)(z), \Phi_{n+1}(g_2)(z)) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|z - p_{n+1}|^3}\right) d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_n(g_1)(z), \Phi_n(g_2)(z)), \\ d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_n(g_1)(z), \Phi_n(g_2)(z)) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|z - p_{n+1}|^3}\right) d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_{n+1}(g_1)(z), \Phi_{n+1}(g_2)(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the conditions (A), (C) and (D) trivially holds if p_{n+1} is good. Recall that $\Phi_{n+1} = \Phi_n$ if p_{n+1} is good.

From the condition (A), for any $g \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$ and any compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sup_{z \in K} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi_n(g)(z), \Phi_{n+1}(g)(z)) < \infty.$$

Hence the sequence $\Phi_n(g)$ ($n \geq 1$) converges uniformly over every compact subset of the plane \mathbb{C} . So we can define $\Phi(g) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(g)$ as a holomorphic map from \mathbb{C} to $\mathbb{C}P^N$.

From the conditions (B) and (C), we have that for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$|d\Phi(g)|(z) \leq \left(1 + \sum_{|z-p_n| > R/2} \frac{C_4}{|z-p_n|^3}\right) \prod_{|z-p_n| > R/2} \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|z-p_n|^3}\right).$$

From (6.6) and (6.8) with $R/2 > cR$ (recall $c \in (0, 1/2)$),

$$|d\Phi(g)|(z) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{100}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\eta}{50}\right) < 1 + \eta.$$

Therefore Φ defines a map from $B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$ to $\mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N$. Similarly, we have $\Phi_n(g) \in \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $g \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$. Recall that $0 < \eta < 1$ and hence $\mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N \subset \mathcal{B}_2^N$. Then, from the condition (C), for $|z - p_{n+1}| \geq 1$ and $g \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$

$$(6.11) \quad ||d\Phi_{n+1}(g)|(z) - |d\Phi_n(g)|(z)| \leq \frac{3C_4}{|z - p_{n+1}|^3}.$$

We would like to check the condition (1) in the statement. For each p_n we can find a point $z \in D_R(p_n)$ such that

$$\max(|df|(z), |d\Phi_n(f)|(z)) \geq \frac{\delta_3}{4R}.$$

Indeed, if p_n is good then we have $\|df\|_{L^\infty(D_R(p_n))} \geq \frac{\delta_3}{4R}$. If p_n is bad, then we have $|d\Phi_n(f)|(z) \geq \frac{1}{100} > \frac{\delta_3}{4R}$ for some $z \in D_{R/2}(p_n)$ by the condition (B). (Here recall that $R > 20\delta_3$ and hence $\frac{1}{100} > \frac{\delta_3}{4R}$.) By (6.11) and (6.8)

$$|d\Phi(f)|(z) \geq \frac{\delta_3}{4R} - \sum_{|z-p_k| \geq R} \frac{3C_4}{|z-p_k|^3} \geq \frac{\delta_3}{4R} - \frac{3\delta_3}{100R} > \frac{\delta_3}{10R}.$$

Since $\mathbb{C} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_{2R}(p_n)$, the holomorphic map $\Phi(f)$ is R_1 -nondegenerate for $R_1 := 3R + \frac{10R}{\delta_3}$. This has shown the condition (1).

Next we consider the condition (2). Let $g_1, g_2 \in B_{\delta_3/4}(f, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}})$. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, from the condition (D)

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(z), \Phi(g_2)(z)) &\leq C_4 \prod_{|z-p_n| \geq 1} \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|z-p_n|^3}\right) d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)) \\ &\leq 2C_4(1 + C_4)d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z)). \end{aligned}$$

$$d_{\text{FS}}(g_1(z), g_2(z))$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \prod_{|z-p_n| \geq 1} \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|z-p_n|^3}\right) \sup_{|w-z| \leq 3} \left\{ C_4 \prod_{|w-p_n| \geq 1} \left(1 + \frac{C_4}{|w-p_n|^3}\right) d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(w), \Phi(g_2)(w)) \right\} \\ &\leq 4C_4(1 + C_4)^2 \sup_{|w-z| \leq 3} d_{\text{FS}}(\Phi(g_1)(w), \Phi(g_2)(w)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence Φ satisfies the condition (2) in the statement with the constant $C_3 := 4C_4(1 + C_4)^2$.

Finally we consider the condition (3). For $|z - p_{n+1}| \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &||d\Phi_n(f)|^2(z) - |d\Phi_{n+1}(f)|^2(z)| \\ &= (|d\Phi_n(f)|(z) + |d\Phi_{n+1}(f)|(z)) ||d\Phi_n(f)|(z) - |d\Phi_{n+1}(f)|(z)| \\ &\leq \frac{12C_4}{|z - p_{n+1}|^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used (6.11) and $|d\Phi_n(f)|, |d\Phi_{n+1}(f)| \leq 2$. Hence for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus D_{cR}(\Lambda)$

$$||d\Phi(f)|^2(z) - |df|^2(z)| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{12C_4}{|z - p_n|^3} < \frac{\eta}{2},$$

by (6.8). Let $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ be any square of side length $L \geq R$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_S |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy - \int_S |df|^2 dx dy \right| &\leq \left| \int_{S \setminus D_{cR}(\Lambda)} |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy - \int_{S \setminus D_{cR}(\Lambda)} |df|^2 dx dy \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{S \cap D_{cR}(\Lambda)} |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy - \int_{S \cap D_{cR}(\Lambda)} |df|^2 dx dy \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right-hand side is smaller than $\frac{\eta L^2}{2}$. The second term is bounded from above by $4 \mathbf{m}(S \cap D_{cR}(\Lambda))$. This is smaller than $\frac{\eta L^2}{2}$ by the choice of c in (6.7). Therefore we conclude

$$\left| \int_S |d\Phi(f)|^2 dx dy - \int_S |df|^2 dx dy \right| < \eta L^2.$$

This shows the condition (3). \square

The next corollary was first proved in [MT15, Theorem 1.7]. This will be used in §9.

Corollary 6.9. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a nondegenerate Brody curve $g: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ satisfying $\rho(g) > \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) - \varepsilon$.*

Proof. By the definition of $\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ there exists $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ with $\rho(f) > \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) - \varepsilon$. Let η be a small positive number satisfying

$$(6.12) \quad \frac{\rho(f)}{(1+\eta)^2} - \frac{\eta}{(1+\eta)^2} > \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) - \varepsilon.$$

Applying Proposition 6.3 to f , we can find a nondegenerate curve $h \in \mathcal{B}_{1+\eta}^N$ satisfying

$$\left| \int_S |dh|^2 dx dy - \int_S |df|^2 dx dy \right| < \eta \mathbf{m}(S)$$

for all sufficiently large squares $S \subset \mathbb{C}$. Define a nondegenerate curve $g: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ by $g(z) = h\left(\frac{z}{1+\eta}\right)$. We have

$$|dg|(z) = \frac{1}{1+\eta} |dh|\left(\frac{z}{1+\eta}\right) \leq 1.$$

For any $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|z-a| \leq R} |dg|^2(z) dx dy &= \frac{1}{(1+\eta)^2} \int_{|z-a| \leq R} |dh|^2\left(\frac{z}{1+\eta}\right) dx dy \\ &= \int_{\left|z - \frac{a}{1+\eta}\right| \leq \frac{R}{1+\eta}} |dh|^2(z) dx dy \\ &\geq \int_{\left|z - \frac{a}{1+\eta}\right| \leq \frac{R}{1+\eta}} |df|^2(z) dx dy - \pi \left(\frac{R}{1+\eta}\right)^2 \eta - O(R). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\rho(g) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi R^2} \sup_{a \in \mathbb{C}} \int_{|z-a| \leq R} |dg|^2(z) dx dy \geq \frac{\rho(f)}{(1+\eta)^2} - \frac{\eta}{(1+\eta)^2} > \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) - \varepsilon.$$

Here we have used (6.12) in the last step. \square

7. ENERGY INTEGRAL OF BRODY CURVES

In this section we prepare some miscellaneous results on the energy integral $\int |df|^2 dx dy$ of Brody curves $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$. We will use them in §9.2.

The next lemma tells us that the asymptotic value of the integral $\int |df|^2 dx dy$ does not depend so sensitively on the choice of f .

Lemma 7.1. *There exist positive numbers δ_4 and C_5 such that if $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^N$ satisfy $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}(f, g) \leq \delta_4$ then for any square $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ of side length $L \geq 1$ we have*

$$\left| \int_S |df|^2 dx dy - \int_S |dg|^2 dx dy \right| < C_5 L.$$

Proof. Let ω be the Fubini-Study Kähler form of $\mathbb{C}P^N$. We have the basic identity $f^*\omega = |df|^2 dx dy$ for holomorphic maps $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$. Let $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a square of side length $L \geq 1$. We denote by S^c the complement of S in the plane \mathbb{C} . Set $d(z, S^c) = \inf\{|z - w| \mid w \in S^c\}$ where $|z - w|$ is the Euclidean length.

We choose a smooth function $\varphi: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\varphi(z) = 0$ on S^c and that $\varphi(z) = 1$ if $d(z, S^c) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We can assume

$$\left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial y} \right| \leq \text{const}$$

where the right-hand side is an universal positive constant independent of S and L .

We choose $\delta_4 > 0$ smaller than the injectivity radius of $\mathbb{C}P^N$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and two points $p, q \in \mathbb{C}P^N$ with $d_{\text{FS}}(p, q) \leq \delta_4$, we denote by $\gamma(p, q, t)$ the point which divides the minimum geodesic segment between p and q in the ratio $t : (1 - t)$. Namely $\gamma(p, q, t)$ is the point on the minimum geodesic segment between p and q satisfying $d_{\text{FS}}(p, \gamma(p, q, t)) = t d_{\text{FS}}(p, q)$. In particular, $\gamma(p, q, 0) = p$ and $\gamma(p, q, 1) = q$.

For $0 \leq t \leq 1$ we define a C^∞ (not necessarily holomorphic) map $f_t: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ by $f_t(z) = \gamma(f(z), g(z), t\varphi(z))$. For $z \in S^c$ we have $f_t(z) = f(z)$ for every t . Hence $\{f_t\}$ provides a homotopy between f_0 and f_1 relative to S^c . This implies that

$$\int_S f_0^* \omega = \int_S f_1^* \omega.$$

We have $f_0(z) = \gamma(f(z), g(z), 0) = f(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence

$$\int_S f_0^* \omega = \int_S f^* \omega = \int_S |df|^2 dx dy.$$

If $d(z, S^c) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ then $f_1(z) = \gamma(f(z), g(z), 1) = g(z)$. Hence

$$\int_S f_1^* \omega = \int_S g^* \omega + O(L) = \int_S |dg|^2 dx dy + O(L).$$

Here the implicit constant in $O(L)$ is universal. Therefore we have

$$\left| \int_S |df|^2 dx dy - \int_S |dg|^2 dx dy \right| \leq \text{Const} \cdot L.$$

□

Next we review the Ornstein–Weiss lemma. This lemma (also known as Ornstein–Weiss’ quasi-tiling machinery) was first developed by Ornstein–Weiss [OW87] in the context of amenable group actions. Here we state it only for \mathbb{C} -actions.

For $r > 0$ and $A \subset \mathbb{C}$, we define $\partial_r A$ as the set of $z \in \mathbb{C}$ for which the disk $D_r(z)$ intersects both with A and the complement A^c . A sequence of bounded Borel subsets $A_n \subset \mathbb{C}$ ($n \geq 1$) with $\mathbf{m}(A_n) > 0$ is said to be a **Følner sequence** if we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{m}(\partial_r A_n)}{\mathbf{m}(A_n)} = 0$ for any $r > 0$. For example, $D_n(0)$ and $[0, n]^2$ ($n \geq 1$) are both Følner sequences of \mathbb{C} .

The following is the Ornstein–Weiss lemma. For the proof, see Gromov [Gro99, p. 336].

Theorem 7.2 (Ornstein–Weiss lemma). *Let h be a nonnegative function defined on the set of bounded Borel subsets of \mathbb{C} such that*

- (1) $h(A \cup B) \leq h(A) + h(B)$ for disjoint A and B ,
- (2) $h(A) \leq h(B)$ if $A \subset B$,
- (3) $h(a + A) = h(A)$ for $a \in \mathbb{C}$, where $a + A = \{a + x \mid x \in A\}$.

Then for any Følner sequence $\{A_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ of \mathbb{C} , the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(A_n)}{\mathbf{m}(A_n)}$ exists and its value is independent of the choice of the Følner sequences.

Recall that the energy density of Brody curves $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ was defined by

$$\rho(f) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{a \in \mathbb{C}} \frac{1}{\pi R^2} \int_{|z-a| \leq R} |df|^2(z) dx dy \right).$$

Corollary 7.3. *For any $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$ we have*

$$\rho(f) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{a \in \mathbb{C}} \frac{1}{L^2} \int_{a+[0,L]^2} |df|^2(z) dx dy \right).$$

Here $a + [0, L]^2 = \{a + x + y\sqrt{-1} \mid 0 \leq x, y \leq L\}$.

Proof. Apply the Ornstein–Weiss lemma to $h(A) := \sup_{a \in \mathbb{C}} \int_{a+A} |df|^2(z) dx dy$. □

Finally we explain that $\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}^N} \rho(f)$ can be expressed in terms of invariant probability measures. We mentioned this result in (2.2). This will not be used in the proofs of the main theorems. But it is a basic result which initially motivated the research of the paper.

Recall that the potential function $\psi: \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ was defined by $\psi(f) = 2(N+1)|df|^2(0)$.

Proposition 7.4.

$$2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu.$$

Proof. For simplicity of the notation, we set $\varphi(f) = |df|^2(0)$ for $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$. We will prove $\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu$.

First we show that $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu \leq \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$. This step is close to the argument of Remark 2.6. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$. By the pointwise ergodic theorem [EW11, Theorem 8.19], the limit

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi R^2} \int_{|u| \leq R} \varphi(T^u f) d\mathbf{m}(u)$$

exists for μ -almost every $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$, and its expected value is equal to $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu$. Namely we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \left(\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi R^2} \int_{|z| \leq R} |df|^2(z) dx dy \right) d\mu(f) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu.$$

We have

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi R^2} \int_{|z| \leq R} |df|^2(z) dx dy \leq \rho(f) \leq \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N).$$

Hence $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu \leq \rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{B}^N$. Next we show that there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu = \rho(f)$. By the definition, there exist sequences of points $a_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and positive numbers R_n with $R_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\rho(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi R_n^2} \int_{D_{R_n}(a_n)} |df|^2 dx dy.$$

We define a (not necessarily invariant) Borel probability measure μ_n on \mathcal{B}^N by

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{\pi R_n^2} \int_{D_{R_n}(a_n)} T_*^u \delta_f d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

Here δ_f is the delta measure at f . By choosing a subsequence (also denoted by μ_n), we can assume that μ_n converges to a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ in the weak* topology. We have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \varphi d\mu_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi R_n^2} \int_{D_{R_n}(a_n)} |df|^2 dx dy = \rho(f).$$

□

8. GENERAL METHOD TO BOUND THE RATE DISTORTION DIMENSION FROM BELOW

In the proof of Theorem 2.5 we will need a method to construct invariant probability measures with a good lower bound on rate distortion dimension. The paper [Tsu, §6] developed a general method for that purpose in the course of proving the variational principle for mean dimension with potential (Theorem 5.1). However the formulation of [Tsu] is not suitable for the application to Brody curves. The purpose of this section is to reformulate various techniques in [Tsu] more suitable for the application.

This section is rather technical. The main result of this section is Proposition 8.7. We will use it in §9. We recommend readers to read only Definition 8.1 and the statement (not the proof) of Proposition 8.7 and skip to §9 at the first reading.

8.1. Tame growth of covering numbers and \mathbb{Z}^k -actions. The next definition was first introduced in [LT18, Condition 3].

Definition 8.1. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space. It is said to have the **tame growth of covering numbers** if for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$(8.1) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^\delta \log \#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varepsilon) = 0.$$

Here recall that $\#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varepsilon)$ is the minimum number n such that there exists an open covering $\mathcal{X} = U_1 \cup \cdots \cup U_n$ with $\text{Diam}U_i < \varepsilon$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

The condition (8.1) is rather mild. Every compact subset of the Euclidean space satisfies it with respect to the Euclidean metric. A metric \mathbf{d} on the infinite dimensional cube $[0, 1]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ defined by $\mathbf{d}(x, y) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{-|n|} |x_n - y_n|$ has the tame growth of covering numbers. It is known that every compact metrizable space admits a metric having the tame growth of covering numbers [LT18, Lemma 4]. We will see later that the metric $\mathbf{d}(f, g) = \max_{z \in [0, 1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z))$ on the space of Brody curves \mathcal{B}^N also has the tame growth of covering numbers (Proposition 9.2).

Throughout this paper, we have been studying continuous actions of \mathbb{R}^k (especially, actions of $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R}^2$). For developing a method to construct appropriate invariant measures, we also need to consider actions of the discrete subgroup \mathbb{Z}^k . So we prepare some notations about them. For a natural number L we denote $[L] = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, L-1\}^k$. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space, and let $T: \mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuous action of the group \mathbb{Z}^k . For a finite (nonempty) subset $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^k$, we define metrics $\mathbf{d}_A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ on \mathcal{X} by

$$\mathbf{d}_A^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y) = \max_{u \in A} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y), \quad \bar{\mathbf{d}}_A^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{u \in A} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y).$$

Here “ \mathbb{Z} ” indicates that these are defined for \mathbb{Z}^k -actions. For a natural number L , we also denote $\mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}} = \mathbf{d}_{[L]}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{[L]}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $0 < \eta < 1$ and let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space having the tame growth of covering numbers. There exists a positive number $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\eta, \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ for which the following statement holds. Let δ, s, C be positive numbers and L a natural number. Let $T: \mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a continuous action of \mathbb{Z}^k on \mathcal{X} . Suppose a Borel probability measure ν on \mathcal{X} satisfies*

$$(8.2) \quad \nu(A) \leq (C \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}))^{sL^k}$$

for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}) < \delta$. Then we also have

$$(8.3) \quad \nu(A) \leq \left\{ 4^{\frac{1}{s(1-\eta)}} (2C)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}} \text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}) \right\}^{(1-\eta)sL^k}$$

for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}) < \min\left(\varepsilon_0, (\delta/2)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}\right)$.

This is a rather technical statement. Roughly speaking, it says that, under the assumption of tame growth of covering numbers, the two metrics $\mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}$ behave similarly in the sense that the estimate $\nu(A) \leq (C \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}))^{sL^k}$ implies a similar estimate $\nu(A) \leq (C' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}))^{(1-\eta)sL^k}$. (The precise form of the constant C' is not relevant to the argument in the sequel.) Conversely, the estimate $\nu(A) \leq (C' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}))^{(1-\eta)sL^k}$ obviously implies $\nu(A) \leq (C \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}))^{(1-\eta)sL^k}$ because we have $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Proof. Set $M(\varepsilon) = \log \#(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}, \varepsilon)$. From the condition of tame growth of covering numbers, we can find $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ we have

$$(8.4) \quad M(\varepsilon)^{\varepsilon^\eta} < 2.$$

Suppose a Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ satisfies $\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}) < \min(\varepsilon_0, (\delta/2)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}})$. We will show (8.3). Set $\tau = \text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}})$. We can assume $\tau > 0$. There is an open covering $\mathcal{X} = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_M$ with $M = M(\tau)$ and $\text{Diam}(U_m, \mathbf{d}) < \tau$ for all $1 \leq m \leq M$. From (8.4) we have $M^{\tau^\eta} < 2$.

Pick and fix a point $a \in A$. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We have $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, a) \leq \tau$ and hence

$$|\{u \in [L] \mid \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u a) > \tau^{1-\eta}\}| < \tau^\eta L^k.$$

Hence

$$(8.5) \quad A \subset \bigcup_{\substack{E \subset [L] \\ |E| < \tau^\eta L^k}} B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}}).$$

Here E runs over all subsets of $[L] = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, L-1\}^k$ of cardinality smaller than $\tau^\eta L^k$, and $B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}})$ is the ball of radius $\tau^{1-\eta}$ centered at a with respect to $\mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y) = \max_{u \in [L] \setminus E} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y)$.

Let $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r\} \subset [L]$ with $r < \tau^\eta L^k$. We have

$$\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_r \leq M} (T^{-e_1} U_{m_1} \cap T^{-e_2} U_{m_2} \cap \dots \cap T^{-e_r} U_{m_r}).$$

Hence

$$B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}}) = \bigcup_{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_r \leq M} (B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}}) \cap T^{-e_1} U_{m_1} \cap T^{-e_2} U_{m_2} \cap \dots \cap T^{-e_r} U_{m_r}).$$

The diameter of $B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}}) \cap T^{-e_1} U_{m_1} \cap T^{-e_2} U_{m_2} \cap \dots \cap T^{-e_r} U_{m_r}$ with respect to the metric $\mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is at most $2\tau^{1-\eta} < \delta$. By applying the estimate (8.2) to the sets $B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}}) \cap T^{-e_1} U_{m_1} \cap T^{-e_2} U_{m_2} \cap \dots \cap T^{-e_r} U_{m_r}$, we get

$$\nu(B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}})) \leq M^r (2C\tau^{1-\eta})^{sL^k}.$$

Since $r < \tau^\eta L^k$ and $M^{\tau^\eta} < 2$, we have

$$\nu(B_{\tau^{1-\eta}}(a, \mathbf{d}_{[L] \setminus E}^{\mathbb{Z}})) \leq 2^{L^k} (2C\tau^{1-\eta})^{sL^k}.$$

The number of the choices of $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_r\} \subset [L]$ is at most 2^{L^k} . Therefore, by (8.5)

$$\nu(A) \leq 2^{L^k} \cdot 2^{L^k} (2C\tau^{1-\eta})^{sL^k} = \left\{ 4^{\frac{1}{s(1-\eta)}} (2C)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}} \tau \right\}^{(1-\eta)sL^k}.$$

□

8.2. Constructing invariant measures with a lower bound on rate distortion dimension. We need the following elementary lemma. This was proved in [LT18, Appendix].

Lemma 8.3. *Let A be a finite set and let μ_n ($n \geq 1$) be a sequence of probability measures on A . Suppose that μ_n converges to a probability measure μ in the weak* topology, i.e. $\mu_n(a) \rightarrow \mu(a)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for every $a \in A$. Then there exists a sequence of probability measures π_n on $A \times A$ such that*

- π_n is a coupling between μ_n and μ , namely the first and second marginals of π_n are given by μ_n and μ respectively,
- π_n converges to $(\text{id} \times \text{id})_* \mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak* topology, namely

$$\pi_n(a, b) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mu(a) & (\text{if } a = b) \\ 0 & (\text{if } a \neq b) \end{cases}.$$

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space with a continuous \mathbb{R}^k -action $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. For a positive number L we define a metric $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L$ on \mathcal{X} by

$$\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L(x, y) = \frac{1}{L^k} \int_{[0, L]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y) \, d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

Here \mathbf{m} denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^k .

Proposition 8.4. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space with a continuous action $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Let s be a positive number and L_n ($n \geq 1$) a sequence of positive numbers with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n = \infty$. Let ν_n ($n \geq 1$) be a sequence of (not necessarily invariant) Borel probability measures on \mathcal{X} . Define*

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0, L_n]^k} T_*^u \nu_n \, d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

We assume the following two conditions.

- (1) There exist positive numbers δ and C such that we have

$$(8.6) \quad \nu_n(A) \leq (C \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n}))^{sL_n^k}.$$

for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n}) < \delta$.

- (2) μ_n converges to some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak* topology.

Then we have

$$\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \geq s.$$

We note that the condition (2) is a mild assumption. The space of all Borel probability measures on \mathcal{X} is compact in the weak* topology. Hence, even if we do not assume (2), we can always take an appropriate subsequence $\{\mu_{n_i}\}$ which converges to some Borel probability measure μ . From the definition of μ_n , the limit μ becomes T -invariant

Proof. The following argument was essentially given in the proof of [Tsu, Theorem 6.3]. But the statement of [Tsu, Theorem 6.3] is substantially different from this proposition. (It studies a relation between rate distortion dimension and mean Hausdorff dimension with potential.) So we provide a full proof for completeness. The proof is rather long. Readers may skip it at the first reading.

First we note that if we define a metric \mathbf{d}' on \mathcal{X} by $\mathbf{d}'(x, y) = C\mathbf{d}(x, y)$ then we have $\nu_n(A) \leq (\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n})^{sL_n^k})$ for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n}) < C\delta$. We have $\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}', \mu) = \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$. Therefore we can assume $C = 1$ in (8.6) without loss of generality. Namely, from the beginning, we assume

$$(8.7) \quad \nu_n(A) \leq (\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n})^{sL_n^k})$$

for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n}) < \delta$.

Let $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)$ ($\varepsilon > 0$) be the rate distortion function with respect to the measure μ . We will prove

$$(8.8) \quad R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - Ks \quad \text{for sufficiently small } \varepsilon > 0.$$

Here K is the universal positive constant introduced in the Kawabata–Dembo estimate (Proposition 4.5). The estimate (8.8) implies $\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)} \geq s$.

Let ε be a positive number with $2\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon) < \delta$. Let M be a positive number, and let X and Y be random variables satisfying the following two conditions.

- X takes values in \mathcal{X} and its distribution is μ .
- Y takes values in $L^1([0, M]^k, \mathcal{X})$ with

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^v X, Y_v) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right) < \varepsilon.$$

The aim of the argument below is to prove the lower bound on the mutual information

$$(8.9) \quad \frac{1}{M^k} I(X; Y) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - Ks.$$

Once this is proved, we will get $\frac{1}{M^k} R(\varepsilon, [0, M]^k) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - Ks$ and hence (8.8). For this purpose, we can assume that the random variable Y takes only finitely many values in $L^1([0, M]^k, \mathcal{X})$ by Remark 4.6. Namely, we assume that there is a finite subset $\mathcal{Y} \subset L^1([0, M]^k, \mathcal{X})$ such that Y takes values only in \mathcal{Y} .

We choose a positive number τ satisfying $\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^v X, Y_v) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right) < \varepsilon - 3\tau$. We take a measurable partition $\mathcal{X} = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_\alpha$ (disjoint union) such that $\text{Diam}(P_i, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_M) < \tau$ and $\mu(\partial P_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \alpha$. We pick a point $x_i \in P_i$ for

each i and set $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_\alpha\}$. We define a map $\mathcal{P}: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$ by $\mathcal{P}(P_i) = \{x_i\}$. We consider the random variable $\mathcal{P}(X)$. This takes values in A and satisfies $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_M(\mathcal{P}(X), X) < \tau$ almost surely. Hence

$$(8.10) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^v \mathcal{P}(X), Y_v) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right) < \varepsilon - 2\tau.$$

The distribution of $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is given by the push-forward measure $\mathcal{P}_* \mu$.

Let $\mathcal{P}_* \mu_n$ ($n \geq 1$) be the push-forward measures of μ_n by \mathcal{P} . They converges to $\mathcal{P}_* \mu$ in the weak* topology by $\mu(\partial P_i) = 0$. By Lemma 8.3, we can take random variables X_n ($n \geq 1$) such that

- X_n takes values in A and its distribution is given by $\mathcal{P}_* \mu_n$,
- for each $x_i, x_j \in A$ we have $\mathbb{P}(X_n = x_i, \mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \rightarrow \delta_{ij} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}(X) = x_j)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,
- X_n and Y are conditionally independent given $\mathcal{P}(X)$.

Now, for each $x_i \in A$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_n = x_i, Y = y) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha} \mathbb{P}(X_n = x_i, Y = y \mid \mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha} \mathbb{P}(X_n = x_i \mid \mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \mathbb{P}(Y = y \mid \mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha} \mathbb{P}(X_n = x_i, \mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \mathbb{P}(Y = y \mid \mathcal{P}(X) = x_j) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}(X) = x_i) \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y = y \mid \mathcal{P}(X) = x_i) \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}(X) = x_i, Y = y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by (8.10)

$$(8.11) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^v X_n, Y_v) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right) < \varepsilon - 2\tau \quad \text{for large } n$$

because the left-hand side converges to $\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^v \mathcal{P}(X), Y_v) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The pair (X_n, Y) takes values in a finite set $A \times \mathcal{Y}$ and its distribution converges to Law $(\mathcal{P}(X), Y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence by Lemma 4.2

$$(8.12) \quad I(\mathcal{P}(X); Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(X_n; Y).$$

We will estimate $I(X_n; Y)$ from below.

For $x \in A$ and $y \in L^1([0, M]^k, \mathcal{X})$, we define a conditional probability mass function by

$$q_n(y \mid x) = \mathbb{P}(Y = y \mid X_n = x).$$

This is zero if $y \notin \mathcal{Y}$. For $x \in A$ with $\mathbb{P}(X_n = x) = 0$, the function $q_n(\cdot | x)$ may be arbitrary.

We define a finite set $\Lambda_n \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ by

$$\Lambda_n = \left\{ (Mm_1, Mm_2, \dots, Mm_k) \mid m_i \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq m_i \leq \frac{L_n}{M} - 2 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq k \right\}.$$

Let $v \in [0, M)^k$. We have

$$\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} (v + \lambda + [0, M)^k) \subset [0, L_n)^k.$$

Here the left-hand side is a disjoint union. We set

$$E_{n,v} = [0, L_n)^k \setminus \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} (v + \lambda + [0, M)^k).$$

See Figure 2. (This figure was given in [Tsu, Figure 3].)




FIGURE 2. The big square is $[0, L_n)^k$ and small squares are $v + \lambda + [0, M)^k$ ($\lambda \in \Lambda_n$). The shadowed region is $E_{n,v}$.

We fix a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. We will denote functions constantly equal to x_0 also by x_0 . For $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $f \in L^1([0, L_n)^k, \mathcal{X})$ we define a conditional probability mass function $\sigma_{n,v}(f | x)$ by

$$(8.13) \quad \sigma_{n,v}(f | x) = \delta_{x_0}(f|_{E_{n,v}}) \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} q_n(f|_{v+\lambda+[0,M)^k} | \mathcal{P}(T^{v+\lambda}x)).$$

For each fixed x , this is nonzero only for finitely many f . Here $f|_{E_{n,v}}$ is the restriction of f to $E_{n,v}$, and δ_{x_0} is the delta measure at the constant function $x_0 \in L^1(E_{n,v}, \mathcal{X})$. The function $f|_{v+\lambda+[0,M)^k}$ is the restriction of f to $v + \lambda + [0, M)^k$ and naturally identified with an element of $L^1([0, M)^k, \mathcal{X})$.

We define a transition probability σ_n on $\mathcal{X} \times L^1([0, L_n)^k, \mathcal{X})$ by

$$\sigma_n(B | x) = \frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0, M)^k} \sigma_{n,v}(B | x) d\mathbf{m}(v), \quad (x \in \mathcal{X}, B \subset L^1([0, L_n)^k, \mathcal{X})).$$

Here $\sigma_{n,v}(B | x) = \sum_{f \in B} \sigma_{n,v}(f | x)$. We take random variables Z_n and W_n such that

- Z_n takes values in \mathcal{X} and its distribution is given by ν_n ,
- W_n takes values in $L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})$ with

$$\mathbb{P}(W_n \in B \mid Z_n = x) = \sigma_n(B \mid x), \quad (x \in \mathcal{X}, B \subset L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})).$$

Claim 8.5. *If n is sufficiently large then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0, L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, (W_n)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. For each $v \in [0, M]^k$, we take a random variable $W_n(v)$ such that $W_n(v)$ takes values in $L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})$ with $\mathbb{P}(W_n(v) = f \mid Z_n = x) = \sigma_{n,v}(f \mid x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $f \in L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0, L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, (W_n)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) = \frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0, L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) d\mathbf{m}(v).$$

Let $v \in [0, M]^k$. Since $[0, L_n]^k = E_{n,v} \cup \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} (v + \lambda + [0, M]^k)$ (disjoint union) and $\mathbf{m}(E_{n,v}) \leq \text{const} \cdot L_n^{k-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0, L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{E_{n,v}} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{v+\lambda+[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) \\ &\leq C' L_n^{k-1} + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{v+\lambda+[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here C' is a positive constant independent of v and n . Note that $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_M(x, \mathcal{P}(x)) < \tau$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{v+\lambda+[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) &= \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u T^{v+\lambda} Z_n, W_n(v)_{v+\lambda+u}) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u T^{v+\lambda} Z_n, T^u \mathcal{P}(T^{v+\lambda} Z_n)) \, d\mathbf{m}(u)}_{=M^k \bar{\mathbf{d}}_M(T^{v+\lambda} Z_n, \mathcal{P}(T^{v+\lambda} Z_n)) < M^k \tau} \\ &\quad + \int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u \mathcal{P}(T^{v+\lambda} Z_n), W_n(v)_{v+\lambda+u}) \, d\mathbf{m}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{v+\lambda+[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) \\ (8.14) \quad & \leq M^k \tau + \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0, M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u \mathcal{P}(T^{v+\lambda} Z_n), W_n(v)_{v+\lambda+u}) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) \\ & = M^k \tau + \sum_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} \int_{[0, M]^k} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) q_n(f \mid x) d(\mathcal{P}_* T_*^{v+\lambda} \nu_n(x)) \right) d\mathbf{m}(u). \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we have used that the distribution of $(\mathcal{P}(T^{v+\lambda}Z_n), W_n(v)|_{v+\lambda+[0,M]^k})$ is given by $\mathcal{P}_*T_*^{v+\lambda}\nu_n(x)q_n(f|x)$. This follows from the definition of $\sigma_{n,v}$ in (8.13).

We sum up the estimate (8.14) over $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$ and use $M^k|\Lambda_n| \leq L_n^k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) \\ & \leq C' L_n^{k-1} + \tau L_n^k + \sum_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} \int_{[0,M]^k} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) q_n(f|x) d \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathcal{P}_* T_*^{v+\lambda} \nu_n(x) \right) \right\} d\mathbf{m}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this over $v \in [0, M]^k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0,M]^k} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) d\mathbf{m}(v) \\ & \leq C' L_n^{k-1} M^k + \tau L_n^k M^k \\ & + \sum_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} \int_{[0,M]^k} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) q_n(f|x) d \left(\int_{[0,M]^k} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathcal{P}_* T_*^{v+\lambda} \nu_n(x) \right) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right) \right\} d\mathbf{m}(u). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,M]^k} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathcal{P}_* T_*^{v+\lambda} \nu_n \right) d\mathbf{m}(v) & = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \int_{\lambda+[0,M]^k} \mathcal{P}_* T_*^v \nu_n d\mathbf{m}(v) \\ & = \int_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} (\lambda+[0,M]^k)} \mathcal{P}_* T_*^v \nu_n d\mathbf{m}(v) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} (\lambda + [0, M]^k)$ is contained in $[0, L_n]^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) q_n(f|x) d \left(\int_{[0,M]^k} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathcal{P}_* T_*^{v+\lambda} \nu_n(x) \right) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right) \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) q_n(f|x) d \underbrace{\left(\int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathcal{P}_* T_*^v \nu_n(x) d\mathbf{m}(v) \right)}_{L_n^k \mathcal{P}_* \mu_n(x)} \\ & = L_n^k \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) q_n(f|x) d(\mathcal{P}_* \mu_n(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{[0,M]^k} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) d\mathbf{m}(v) \\
& \leq C' L_n^{k-1} M^k + \tau L_n^k M^k + L_n^k \sum_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} \int_{[0,M]^k} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) q_n(f|x) d(\mathcal{P}_* \mu_n(x)) \right\} d\mathbf{m}(u) \\
& = C' L_n^{k-1} M^k + \tau L_n^k M^k + L_n^k \sum_{f \in \mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\int_{[0,M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, f_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) q_n(f|x) d(\mathcal{P}_* \mu_n(x)) \\
& = C' L_n^{k-1} M^k + \tau L_n^k M^k + L_n^k \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0,M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u X_n, Y_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have used that the distribution of (X_n, Y) is given by $q_n(f|x) \mathcal{P}_* \mu_n(x)$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, (W_n)_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) \\
& = \frac{1}{L_n^k M^k} \int_{[0,M]^k} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, W_n(v)_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) d\mathbf{m}(v) \\
& \leq \frac{C'}{L_n} + \tau + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0,M]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u X_n, Y_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The third term in the last line is smaller than $\varepsilon - 2\tau$ for large n by (8.11). Thus we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^u Z_n, (W_n)_u) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) < \varepsilon$$

for sufficiently large n . □

Claim 8.6. *For all n we have*

$$\frac{1}{L_n^k} I(Z_n; W_n) \leq \frac{1}{M^k} I(X_n; Y).$$

Proof. The proof is based on Lemma 4.3 (the subadditivity of mutual information) and Proposition 4.4 (the convexity and concavity of mutual information).

We have $I(Z_n; W_n) = I(\nu_n, \sigma_n)$ and $\sigma_n = \frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0,M]^k} \sigma_{n,v} d\mathbf{m}(v)$. By Proposition 4.4 (1) (the convexity of mutual information in transition probabilities),

$$(8.15) \quad I(\nu_n, \sigma_n) \leq \frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0,M]^k} I(\nu_n, \sigma_{n,v}) d\mathbf{m}(v).$$

Let $W_n(v)$ ($v \in [0, M]^k$) be the random variable introduced in the proof of Claim 8.5. (Namely, it takes values in $L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})$ and its conditional distribution given $Z_n = x$ is $\sigma_{n,v}(f|x)$.) We have $I(\nu_n, \sigma_{n,v}) = I(Z_n; W_n(v))$. Let $W_n(v)|_{v+\lambda+[0,M]^k}$ ($\lambda \in \Lambda_n$) and $W_n(v)|_{E_{n,v}}$ be the restrictions of $W_n(v)$ to $v + \lambda + [0, M]^k$ and $E_{n,v}$ respectively. They are

conditionally independent given Z_n by the definition of the measure $\sigma_{n,v}$. By Lemma 4.3 (the subadditivity of mutual information),

$$I(Z_n; W_n(v)) \leq I(Z_n; W_n(v)|_{E_{n,v}}) + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} I(Z_n; W_n(v)|_{v+\lambda+[0,M]^k}).$$

We have

$$I(Z_n; W_n(v)|_{E_{n,v}}) = 0 \quad \text{because } W_n(v)|_{E_{n,v}} = x_0 \text{ almost surely,}$$

$$I(Z_n; W_n(v)|_{v+\lambda+[0,M]^k}) = I(\mathcal{P}(T^{v+\lambda}Z_n); W_n(v)|_{v+\lambda+[0,M]^k}) = I(\mathcal{P}_*T_*^{v+\lambda}\nu_n, q_n).$$

Hence $I(\nu_n, \sigma_{n,v}) \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} I(\mathcal{P}_*T_*^{v+\lambda}\nu_n, q_n)$. By (8.15)

$$\begin{aligned} I(\nu_n, \sigma_n) &\leq \frac{1}{M^k} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \int_{[0,M]^k} I(\mathcal{P}_*T_*^{v+\lambda}\nu_n, q_n) \, d\mathbf{m}(v) \\ &= \frac{1}{M^k} \int_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} (\lambda+[0,M]^k)} I(\mathcal{P}_*T_*^v\nu_n, q_n) \, d\mathbf{m}(v) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^k} \int_{[0,L_n]^k} I(\mathcal{P}_*T_*^v\nu_n, q_n) \, d\mathbf{m}(v). \end{aligned}$$

We apply Proposition 4.4 (2) (the concavity of mutual information in probability measure) and get

$$\frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0,L_n]^k} I(\mathcal{P}_*T_*^v\nu_n, q_n) \, d\mathbf{m}(v) \leq I\left(\frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathcal{P}_*T_*^v\nu_n \, d\mathbf{m}(v), q_n\right) = I(\mathcal{P}_*\mu_n, q_n).$$

Thus

$$I(Z_n; W_n) = I(\nu_n, \sigma_n) \leq \frac{L_n^k}{M^k} I(\mathcal{P}_*\mu_n, q_n) = \frac{L_n^k}{M^k} I(X_n; Y).$$

□

We define a metric D_n on $L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})$ by

$$D_n(f, g) = \frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0,L_n]^k} \mathbf{d}(f(u), g(u)) \, d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

We define a map $F_n: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})$ by $F_n(x) = (T^u x)_{u \in [0,L_n]^k}$. This is an isometric embedding with respect to the metrics $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n}$ and D_n .

Consider the random variable $F_n(Z_n)$. Its distribution is given by the push-forward measure $(F_n)_*\nu_n$. By the estimate (8.7), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(F_n(Z_n) \in A) = \nu_n(F_n^{-1}(A)) \leq (\text{Diam}(F_n^{-1}(A), \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n}))^{sL_n^k} \leq (\text{Diam}(A, D_n))^{sL_n^k}$$

for all Borel subsets $A \subset L^1([0, L_n]^k, \mathcal{X})$ with $\text{Diam}(A, D_n) < \delta$. By Claim 8.5 we have $\mathbb{E}[D_n(F_n(Z_n), W_n)] < \varepsilon$ for all large n .

Noting $2\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon) < \delta$, we apply the Kawabata–Dembo estimate (Proposition 4.5) to the pair $(F_n(Z_n), W_n)$ and get

$$I(F_n(Z_n); W_n) \geq sL_n^k \log(1/\varepsilon) - K(sL_n^k + 1) \quad \text{for large } n.$$

Here K is an universal constant. We have $I(F_n(Z_n); W_n) = I(Z_n; W_n)$ because F_n is an embedding. By Claim 8.6

$$\frac{1}{M^k} I(X_n; Y) \geq \frac{1}{L_n^k} I(Z_n; W_n) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - K \left(s + \frac{1}{L_n^k} \right) \quad \text{for large } n.$$

We let $n \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that $I(\mathcal{P}(X); Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(X_n; Y)$. Now we have

$$\frac{1}{M^k} I(\mathcal{P}(X); Y) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - Ks.$$

Thus we get the estimate (8.9):

$$\frac{1}{M^k} I(X; Y) \geq \frac{1}{M^k} I(\mathcal{P}(X); Y) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - Ks.$$

This shows that $\frac{1}{M^k} R(\varepsilon, [0, M]^k) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - Ks$ and hence $R(\mathbf{d}, \mu, \varepsilon) \geq s \log(1/\varepsilon) - Ks$. \square

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space with a continuous action $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Recall that, for a subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, we defined a metric \mathbf{d}_A on \mathcal{X} by $\mathbf{d}_A(x, y) = \sup_{u \in A} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y)$. In particular, we denoted $\mathbf{d}_L = \mathbf{d}_{[0, L]^k}$ for a positive number L .

In the next proposition, we need to consider a \mathbb{R}^k -action and its restriction to the discrete subgroup \mathbb{Z}^k simultaneously. Recall that, for a natural number L , we defined metrics $\mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}$ on \mathcal{X} by

$$\mathbf{d}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y) = \max_{u \in [L]} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y), \quad \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{u \in [L]} \mathbf{d}(T^u x, T^u y),$$

where $[L] = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, L-1\}^k$.

In Proposition 8.4, we considered the “ L^1 -metric” $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_L$. However this is not suitable for the application to Brody curves. We would like to replace it with the “ L^∞ -metric” \mathbf{d}_L . The next proposition provides such a result. This will be used in §9.2.

Proposition 8.7. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ be a compact metric space with a continuous \mathbb{R}^k -action $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Suppose that $(\mathcal{X}, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)$ has the tame growth of covering numbers and that there exist $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $C > 0$ and a natural number ℓ such that*

$$(8.16) \quad \mathbf{d}_{a+[0, L]^k}(x, y) \leq C (\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)_{L+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and all natural numbers L . Let L_n and M_n ($n \geq 1$) be sequences of positive numbers with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n = \infty$. Let ν_n be a sequence of Borel probability measures on \mathcal{X} . Define

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{L_n^k} \int_{[0, L_n]^k} T_*^u \nu_n \, d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

Assume the following two conditions.

(1) *There exist positive numbers δ and C' such that we have*

$$\nu_n(A) \leq (C' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{L_n}))^{M_n}$$

for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{L_n}) < \delta$.

(2) μ_n converges to $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{X})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak* topology.

Then we have

$$\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \geq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_n}{L_n^k}.$$

We notice that the metric $(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)_{L+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ in the right-hand side of (8.16) is given by

$$(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)_{L+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y) = \max_{u \in [L+\ell]} \bar{\mathbf{d}}_1(T^u x, T^u y) = \max_{u \in [L+\ell]} \int_{[0,1]^k} \mathbf{d}(T^{u+v} x, T^{u+v} y) d\mathbf{m}(v).$$

Proof. By replacing L_n with $\lceil L_n \rceil$, we can assume that L_n are natural numbers. If $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_n}{L_n^k}$ is zero then the statement is trivial. So we assume that it is positive. By taking a subsequence, we can also assume that the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_n}{L_n^k}$ exists. Let s and η be arbitrary positive numbers with $s < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_n}{L_n^k}$ and $0 < \eta < 1$. We will show that $\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \geq (1 - \eta)s$. Once this is proved, we get the result by letting $s \rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_n}{L_n^k}$ and $\eta \rightarrow 0$.

There is a natural number n_0 such that we have $M_n > s(L_n + \ell)^k$ for $n \geq n_0$. We assume $n \geq n_0$ below.

Set $\nu'_n = T_*^{-a} \nu_n$. We have

$$\frac{1}{(L_n + \ell)^k} \int_{[0, L_n + \ell]^k} T_*^u \nu'_n d\mathbf{m}(u) \rightarrow \mu \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ in the weak* topology.}$$

If a Borel subset A of \mathcal{X} satisfies $\text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{a+[0, L_n]^k}) < \delta$, then $\text{Diam}(T^a A, \mathbf{d}_{[0, L_n]^k}) < \delta$ and hence

$$\nu'_n(A) = \nu_n(T^a A) \leq (C' \cdot \text{Diam}(T^a A, \mathbf{d}_{[0, L_n]^k}))^{M_n} = (C' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{a+[0, L_n]^k}))^{M_n}.$$

Set $D = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_1$. We have $\bar{D}_L^{\mathbb{Z}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L$ for any natural number L . Suppose a Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ satisfies $\text{Diam}(A, D_{L_n+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}) < \min(\frac{\delta}{C}, \frac{1}{CC'})$. By (8.16) we have $\text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{a+[0, L_n]^k}) < \delta$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \nu'_n(A) &\leq (C' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{a+[0, L_n]^k}))^{M_n} \\ &\leq (CC' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, D_{L_n+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}))^{M_n} \quad \text{by (8.16)} \\ &\leq (CC' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, D_{L_n+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}))^{s(L_n+\ell)^k}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have used $CC' \cdot \text{Diam}(A, D_{L_n+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}) < 1$ and $M_n > s(L_n + \ell)^k$.

Let $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\eta, \mathcal{X}, D)$ be the positive number introduced in Lemma 8.2. By Lemma 8.2, if a Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ satisfies $\text{Diam}(A, \bar{D}_{L_n+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}) < \min(\varepsilon_0, (\frac{\delta}{2C})^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}, (\frac{1}{2CC'})^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}})$ then we have

$$\nu'_n(A) \leq \left\{ 4^{\frac{1}{s(1-\eta)}} (2CC')^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}} \text{Diam}(A, \bar{D}_{L_n+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}) \right\}^{(1-\eta)s(L_n+\ell)^k}.$$

Since $\bar{D}_{L_n+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n+\ell}$, we also have

$$\nu'_n(A) \leq \left\{ 4^{\frac{1}{s(1-\eta)}} (2CC')^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}} \text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n+\ell}) \right\}^{(1-\eta)s(L_n+\ell)^k}$$

for any Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Diam}(A, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{L_n+\ell}) < \min\left(\varepsilon_0, \left(\frac{\delta}{2C}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}, \left(\frac{1}{2CC'}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}\right)$. Now we can use Proposition 8.4 and conclude $\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{X}, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \geq (1-\eta)s$. \square

9. CONSTRUCTION OF EXTREMAL MEASURES: PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 2.5. We prepare technical results on the metric structure of the space of Brody curves in §9.1. We prove Theorem 2.5 in §9.2.

9.1. Metric structure of the space of Brody curves. We would like to apply Proposition 8.7 to Brody curves. Proposition 8.7 requires two conditions on the metric structure of the given \mathbb{R}^k -actions. Namely, given a compact metric space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ with a continuous action $T: \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, it requires that $(\mathcal{X}, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)$ has the tame growth of covering numbers and that there exist $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $C > 0$ and a natural number ℓ such that we have $\mathbf{d}_{a+[0,L]^k}(x, y) \leq C (\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)_{L+\ell}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x, y)$ for every natural number L . The purpose of this subsection is to show that the metric on the space of Brody curves satisfies them.

Recall that \mathcal{B}^N is the space of Brody curves in $\mathbb{C}P^N$ with the natural action $T: \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$ and that we defined the metric \mathbf{d} on it by

$$\mathbf{d}(f, g) = \max_{z \in [0,1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

Lemma 9.1. *Let $a = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}$. For $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^N$ and any natural number L we have*

$$\mathbf{d}_{a+[0,L]^2}(f, g) \leq 4 (\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)_{L+1}^{\mathbb{Z}}(f, g).$$

Proof. For every $u \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]^2$ we have

$$\max_{z \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g).$$

Hence

$$\max_{z \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq 4 \int_{[0, \frac{1}{2}]^2} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g) \, d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{[1, \frac{3}{2}] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) &\leq 4 \int_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \\ \max_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \times [1, \frac{3}{2}]} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) &\leq 4 \int_{[0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) \\ \max_{[1, \frac{3}{2}]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) &\leq 4 \int_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1]^2} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g) \, d\mathbf{m}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{d}(T^a f, T^a g) = \max_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right]^2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq 4 \int_{[0,1]^2} \mathbf{d}(T^u f, T^u g) \, d\mathbf{m}(u) = 4\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1(f, g).$$

For any natural number L

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{a+[0,L]^2}(f, g) &= \mathbf{d}_L(T^a f, T^a g) \\ &= \max_{z \in [0, L+1]^2} d_{\text{FS}}((T^a f)(z), (T^a g)(z)) \\ &= \max_{u \in [L+1]} \mathbf{d}(T^{a+u} f, T^{a+u} g) \\ &\leq \max_{u \in [L+1]} 4\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1(T^u f, T^u g) \\ &= 4(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)_{L+1}^{\mathbb{Z}}(f, g). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 9.2. *Let A be a bounded subset of \mathbb{C} . Then $(\mathcal{B}^N, \mathbf{d}_A)$ has the tame growth of covering numbers. In particular, $(\mathcal{B}^N, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_1)$ has the tame growth of covering numbers.*

Proof. We have $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_1(f, g) \leq \mathbf{d}_1(f, g)$. Hence the latter statement follows from the former. The following proof was inspired by the argument of Gromov [Gro99, pp. 393-394].

First we note that the diameter and injectivity radius of the Fubini–Study metric of $\mathbb{C}P^N$ are both equal to $\sqrt{\pi}/2 = 0.8862\dots$ in our normalization¹⁵.

We fix a small positive number r , say $r = \frac{1}{10}$. Set $S = [0, r]^2$. We also set $S_n = [-nr, (n+1)r]^2$ for $n \geq 0$. We have $S = S_0 \subset S_1 \subset S_2 \subset \dots$

Let δ be a positive number much smaller than r and satisfying $r/\delta \in \mathbb{Z}$. We will fix δ in Claim 9.3 below. (Indeed $\delta = 10^{-10}$ is enough if $r = \frac{1}{10}$.) Set $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}\delta + \mathbb{Z}\delta\sqrt{-1}$. This is a lattice of the plane \mathbb{C} . The proof is divided into several claims.

Claim 9.3. *We can choose $\delta > 0$ so small that for any $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^N$*

$$\max_{z \in S} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq C_6 \max_{z \in S \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) + \frac{1}{2} \max_{z \in S_1} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

Here C_6 is an universal positive constant. Notice that $S \cap \Lambda$ is a finite set.

Proof. If $d_{\text{FS}}(f(0), g(0)) > \frac{1}{10}$ then

$$\max_S d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq \text{Diam } \mathbb{C}P^N < 1 \leq 10 \max_{S \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)),$$

and hence the claim holds for $C_6 \geq 10$. Therefore we assume $d_{\text{FS}}(f(0), g(0)) \leq \frac{1}{10}$.

By symmetry we can also assume $f(0) = [1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$ without loss of generality. Then both $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ ($z \in S_1$) belong to the $(1/2)$ -neighborhood of $[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$ in $\mathbb{C}P^N$. Let $f(z) = [1 : f_1(z) : \dots : f_n(z)]$ and $g(z) = [1 : g_1(z) : \dots : g_n(z)]$. All

¹⁵We normalize the metric so that the standard $\mathbb{C}P^1 \subset \mathbb{C}P^N$ has unit area.

$f_i(z)$ and $g_i(z)$ are holomorphic functions over S_1 . Set $F(z) = (f_1(z), \dots, f_N(z))$ and $G(z) = (g_1(z), \dots, g_N(z))$. We have

$$C^{-1}|F(z) - G(z)| \leq d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq C|F(z) - G(z)| \quad (z \in S_1).$$

By Cauchy's estimate on the derivative,

$$\|F' - G'\|_{L^\infty(S)} \leq C' \|F - G\|_{L^\infty(S_1)}.$$

For any point $z \in S$ there exists $z' \in S \cap \Lambda$ with $|z - z'| \leq \delta$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|F - G\|_{L^\infty(S)} &\leq \|F - G\|_{\ell^\infty(S \cap \Lambda)} + \delta \|F' - G'\|_{L^\infty(S)} \\ &\leq \|F - G\|_{\ell^\infty(S \cap \Lambda)} + C'\delta \|F - G\|_{L^\infty(S_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\max_S d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq C^2 \max_{S \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) + C^2 C' \delta \max_{S_1} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

We choose $\delta > 0$ with $C^2 C' \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$. □

Claim 9.4. For $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^N$ and every natural number m we have

$$\max_{z \in S_m} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq C_6 \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} 2^{m-n} \max_{z \in S_n \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

Proof. S_1 consists of 9 squares congruent to S . We apply the argument of Claim 9.3 to each square and get

$$\max_{S_1} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq C_6 \max_{S_1 \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) + \frac{1}{2} \max_{S_2} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

By repeating this argument, for every $n \geq 0$ we have

$$\max_{S_n} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq C_6 \max_{S_n \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) + \frac{1}{2} \max_{S_{n+1}} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)).$$

Combining these estimates, we get the claim. □

Let $(\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda$ be the infinite product of the copies of $\mathbb{C}P^N$ indexed by Λ . We define a metric D on $(\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda$ by

$$D(u, v) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \max_{\lambda \in S_n \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(u_\lambda, v_\lambda).$$

Let A be a bounded subset of \mathbb{C} . We choose a natural number m so that S_m contains $A + [0, 1]^2$. Then $\mathbf{d}_A(f, g) \leq \max_{S_m} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z))$. By Claim 9.4

$$(9.1) \quad \mathbf{d}_A(f, g) \leq 2^m C_6 \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \max_{z \in S_n \cap \Lambda} d_{\text{FS}}(f(z), g(z)) \leq 2^m C_6 \cdot D(f|_\Lambda, g|_\Lambda).$$

Here $f|_\Lambda$ and $g|_\Lambda$ are the restrictions of f and g to Λ . They are elements of $(\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda$.

The estimate (9.1) shows that the map

$$Q: \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda, \quad f \mapsto f|_\Lambda$$

is injective and that the inverse map $Q^{-1}: Q(\mathcal{B}^N) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$ is Lipschitz with respect to the metrics D and \mathbf{d}_A . Therefore it is enough to show the next claim for proving that $(\mathcal{B}^N, \mathbf{d}_A)$ has the tame growth of covering numbers.

Claim 9.5. *The space $((\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda, D)$ has the tame growth of covering numbers.*

Proof. First we recall a terminology: Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a compact metric space. For $\varepsilon > 0$, a subset A of \mathcal{X} is said to be an ε -**spanning set** if for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists $a \in A$ with $d(x, a) < \varepsilon$. If A is an ε -spanning set then $\#(X, d, 3\varepsilon) \leq |A|$.

Given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. We can take a $(\varepsilon/10)$ -spanning set A of $\mathbb{C}P^N$ with $|A| \leq (C/\varepsilon)^{2N}$. We choose a natural number n_0 so that $\sum_{n \geq n_0} 2^{-n} \text{Diam}(\mathbb{C}P^N) < \frac{\varepsilon}{10}$ and $n_0 \leq \log(1/\varepsilon) + C'$. We have

$$|\Lambda \cap S_{n_0}| \leq C'' n_0^2 \leq C'' (\log(1/\varepsilon) + C')^2.$$

Fix a point $p \in \mathbb{C}P^N$. We define a finite subset $B \subset (\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda$ as the set of $u \in (\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda$ satisfying $u_\lambda \in A$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda \cap S_{n_0}$ and $u_\lambda = p$ outside of $\Lambda \cap S_{n_0}$. Then B is a $(\varepsilon/3)$ -spanning set of $(\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda$. We have

$$\#((\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda, D, \varepsilon) \leq |B| \leq |A|^{|\Lambda \cap S_{n_0}|} \leq \left(\frac{C}{\varepsilon}\right)^{2NC''(\log(1/\varepsilon)+C')^2}.$$

Then for any positive number τ we have

$$\varepsilon^\tau \log \#((\mathbb{C}P^N)^\Lambda, D, \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^\tau \cdot 2NC'' (\log(1/\varepsilon) + C')^2 \log(C/\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0).$$

□

□

9.2. Proof of Theorem 2.5. We need to recall some notations of §6.1. Let $T\mathbb{C}P^N$ be the tangent bundle of $\mathbb{C}P^N$ with the Fubini–Study metric. Let $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ be a Brody curve. Let $E := f^*T\mathbb{C}P^N$ be the pull-back of $T\mathbb{C}P^N$ by f . This is a holomorphic vector bundle over the plane \mathbb{C} . Its Hermitian metric is given by the pull-back of the Fubini–Study metric. Let H_f be the space of holomorphic sections u of E satisfying $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} < \infty$. The pair $(H_f, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})})$ is a (possibly infinite dimensional) complex Banach space. We set $B_r(H_f) = \{u \in H_f \mid \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq r\}$ for $r > 0$.

The next two propositions were proved in [MT15, Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.2].

Proposition 9.6. *Let $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ be a nondegenerate holomorphic map with $\|df\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} < 1$. Then there exists $r_1 > 0$ and a map $\mathcal{F}: B_{r_1}(H_f) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$ such that*

- (1) $\mathcal{F}(0) = f$,
- (2) for any $u, v \in B_{r_1}(H_f)$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$|d_{\text{FS}}(\mathcal{F}(u)(z), \mathcal{F}(v)(z)) - |u(z) - v(z)|| \leq \frac{1}{8} \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}.$$

Proposition 9.7. *Let $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ be a nondegenerate Brody curve. For any square $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ of side length $L > 2$ there exists a finite dimensional complex linear subspace $V \subset H_f$ satisfying the following two conditions.*

(1) *The complex dimension of V is bounded from below by*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V \geq (N + 1) \int_S |df|^2(z) dx dy - C_f L,$$

where C_f is a positive constant depending only on f and independent of S and L .

(2) *For all $u \in V$ we have $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq 2 \|u\|_{L^\infty(S)}$.*

Sketch of the proofs of Propositions 9.6 and 9.7. Proposition 9.6 is a consequence of the deformation theory described in §6.1. In the notations of §6.1, the map $\mathcal{F}: B_{r_1}(H_f) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$ is given by $\mathcal{F}(u)(z) = \exp_{f(z)}(u(z) + \alpha(u)(z))$ for $u \in B_{r_1}(H_f)$.

Proposition 9.7 follows from the Riemann–Roch theorem and analytic machinery developed for nondegenerate Brody curves (in particular, a right inverse F of the Dolbeault operator $\bar{\partial}: \Omega^0(E) \rightarrow \Omega^{0,1}(E)$ given in (6.2)). \square

Theorem 9.8. *Let $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ be a nondegenerate holomorphic map with $\|df\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} < 1$. Then there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ satisfying*

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = 2(N + 1)\rho(f).$$

Proof. We apply Proposition 9.6 to f . We take a positive number r such that

$$(9.2) \quad r \leq r_1, \quad \frac{9r}{8} \leq \delta_4.$$

Here r_1 and δ_4 are the positive numbers introduced in Proposition 9.6 and Lemma 7.1 respectively. By Proposition 9.6 there exists a map $\mathcal{F}: B_r(H_f) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$ such that $\mathcal{F}(0) = f$ and $|d_{\text{FS}}(\mathcal{F}(u)(z), \mathcal{F}(v)(z)) - |u(z) - v(z)|| \leq \frac{1}{8} \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}$ for $u, v \in B_r(H_f)$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Then for any $u \in B_r(H_f)$

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{C}}(f, \mathcal{F}(u)) \leq \frac{9}{8} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq \frac{9r}{8} \leq \delta_4.$$

By Lemma 7.1 we have

$$(9.3) \quad \left| \int_S |df|^2 dx dy - \int_S |d(\mathcal{F}(u))|^2 dx dy \right| < C_5 L$$

for any square $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ of side length $L \geq 1$.

From Corollary 7.3 we have $\rho(f) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{L^2} \sup_{a \in \mathbb{C}} \int_{a+[0,L]^2} |df|^2 dx dy \right)$. Then there are $a_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $L_n > 0$ ($n \geq 1$) such that $L_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\rho(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L_n^2} \int_{a_n+[0,L_n]^2} |df|^2 dx dy.$$

We can assume $L_n > 2$ for all n . Set $S_n = a_n + [0, L_n]^2$. We apply Proposition 9.7 to f and S_n . Then there is a finite dimensional complex linear subspace $V_n \subset H_f$ such that

- $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_n \geq (N+1) \int_{S_n} |df|^2 dx dy - C_f L_n$,
- for every $u \in V_n$ we have $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq 2 \|u\|_{L^\infty(S_n)}$.

Denote $B_r(V_n) = \{u \in V_n \mid \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq r\}$. Let m_n be the Lebesgue measure on $B_r(V_n)$ normalized so that $m_n(B_r(V_n)) = 1$. For any Borel subset $A \subset B_r(V_n)$ we have

$$(9.4) \quad m_n(A) \leq \left(\frac{\text{Diam}(A, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})})}{r} \right)^{2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_n}$$

because A is contained in a ball of radius $\text{Diam}(A, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}) := \sup_{u, v \in A} \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}$.

We define a (not necessarily invariant) Borel probability measure ν_n on \mathcal{B}^N by $\nu_n = (T^{a_n} \circ \mathcal{F})_* m_n$. This is the push-forward of m_n by the map $T^{a_n} \circ \mathcal{F}: B_r(V_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$.

Let $u, v \in B_r(V_n)$. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$|u(z) - v(z)| \leq d_{\text{FS}}(\mathcal{F}(u)(z), \mathcal{F}(v)(z)) + \frac{1}{8} \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}.$$

Taking the supremum over $z \in S_n = a_n + [0, L_n]^2$, we get

$$\|u - v\|_{L^\infty(S_n)} \leq \mathbf{d}_{L_n}(T^{a_n} \mathcal{F}(u), T^{a_n} \mathcal{F}(v)) + \frac{1}{8} \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}.$$

Since $\|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq 2 \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(S_n)}$, we have

$$\|u - v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq \frac{8}{3} \mathbf{d}_{L_n}(T^{a_n} \mathcal{F}(u), T^{a_n} \mathcal{F}(v)).$$

Hence for any subset $A \subset \mathcal{B}^N$ we have

$$\text{Diam}(B_r(V_n) \cap ((T^{a_n} \circ \mathcal{F})^{-1} A), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}) \leq \frac{8}{3} \cdot \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{L_n}).$$

By (9.4)

$$\nu_n(A) = m_n((T^{a_n} \circ \mathcal{F})^{-1} A) \leq \left(\frac{8}{3r} \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{L_n}) \right)^{2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_n}.$$

Therefore if $\text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{L_n}) \leq \frac{3r}{8}$ then we have

$$(9.5) \quad \nu_n(A) \leq \left(\frac{8}{3r} \text{Diam}(A, \mathbf{d}_{L_n}) \right)^{2(N+1) \int_{S_n} |df|^2 dx dy - 2C_f L_n}.$$

Define a Borel probability measure μ_n on \mathcal{B}^N by

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{L_n^2} \int_{[0, L_n]^2} T_*^u \nu_n d\mathbf{m}(u).$$

By taking a subsequence (also denoted by μ_n), we can assume that μ_n converges to some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ in the weak* topology.

Now we would like to use Proposition 8.7. By Lemma 9.1 and Proposition 9.2, the metric structure of \mathcal{B}^N satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 8.7. Therefore we can apply Proposition 8.7 to μ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) &\geq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L_n^2} \left(2(N+1) \int_{S_n} |df|^2 dx dy - C_f L_n \right) \\ &= 2(N+1)\rho(f). \end{aligned}$$

Next we will show that

$$(9.6) \quad \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = 2(N+1)\rho(f).$$

Once this is proved, we have

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = 2(N+1)\rho(f)$$

by Theorem 2.4, and hence we can conclude

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = 2(N+1)\rho(f).$$

Thus it is enough to show (9.6).

From the definitions of μ and μ_n

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu_n \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \left(\frac{1}{L_n^2} \int_{[0, L_n]^2} \psi(T^u g) d\mathbf{m}(u) \right) d\nu_n(g) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \left(\frac{2(N+1)}{L_n^2} \int_{[0, L_n]^2} |dg|^2 dx dy \right) d\nu_n(g). \end{aligned}$$

By (9.3), for ν_n -almost every g we have

$$\left| \int_{[0, L_n]^2} |dg|^2 dx dy - \int_{a_n + [0, L_n]^2} |df|^2 dx dy \right| < C_5 L_n.$$

Thus

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2(N+1)}{L_n^2} \int_{a_n + [0, L_n]^2} |df|^2 dx dy = 2(N+1)\rho(f).$$

□

Now we can prove Theorem 2.5. We write the statement again.

Theorem 9.9 (= Theorem 2.5). *For any real number c with $0 \leq c < 2(N+1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$ there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ such that*

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = c.$$

Proof. The statement is trivial for $c = 0$. (Any delta measure at a constant curve satisfies the statement.) So assume $0 < c < 2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$. By Corollary 6.9, there exists a nondegenerate Brody curve $g: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^N$ satisfying $c < 2(N + 1)\rho(g)$. Set

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{c}{2(N + 1)\rho(g)}}.$$

We have $0 < \lambda < 1$. Define $f(z) = g(\lambda z)$. This is a nondegenerate holomorphic curve with $\|df\|_{L^\infty} = \lambda \|dg\|_{L^\infty} < 1$. Applying Theorem 9.8 to f , we can construct $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ satisfying

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = 2(N + 1)\rho(f).$$

We have

$$\rho(f) = \lambda^2 \rho(g) = \frac{c}{2(N + 1)}.$$

□

We have finished all the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5. Lastly, we briefly discuss an open problem. This paper is a starting point of the ergodic study of entire holomorphic curves. There definitely exist plenty of open problems and new research directions. But here we mention just one problem directly related to the results of this paper.

Theorem 2.5 shows that we can construct a rich variety of invariant probability measures μ on \mathcal{B}^N satisfying $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$. However it is not easy to detect their ergodic theoretic properties (e.g. ergodicity, mixing properties) from the above proof. Hence we propose the following problem.

Problem 9.10. Let $0 < c < 2(N + 1)\rho(\mathbb{C}P^N)$. Is there an ergodic measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ satisfying $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = c$? We notice that this does not (at least, directly) follow from the ergodic decomposition theorem. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ be the measure given by Theorem 2.5. Namely it satisfies $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = c$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$ be the set of ergodic measures on \mathcal{B}^N , and let

$$\mu = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \nu d\lambda(\nu)$$

be the ergodic decomposition of μ . Here λ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$. Then we have

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \nu) d\lambda(\nu).$$

Notice that here we consider upper rate distortion dimension. For lower rate distortion dimension, we have a similar inequality in the reverse direction¹⁶. We also have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\nu \right) d\lambda(\nu).$$

By Theorem 2.4 (a Ruelle inequality for Brody curves),

$$\overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \nu) \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\nu$$

for all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$. It follows from $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\mu$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\nu \right) d\lambda(\nu) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \nu) d\lambda(\nu) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\nu \right) d\lambda(\nu). \end{aligned}$$

The left-most side and the right-most side are the same. Hence we conclude that

$$(9.7) \quad \overline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \nu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\nu$$

for λ -almost every $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)$. Therefore we have obtained ergodic measures ν satisfying the equation (9.7). However we do not have control of the lower rate distortion dimension of these measures ν . So we cannot conclude $\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \nu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\nu$. We even do not know whether there exists a single ergodic measure ν on \mathcal{B}^N satisfying

$$\text{rdim}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \nu) = \int_{\mathcal{B}^N} \psi d\nu > 0.$$

If Problem 9.10 is affirmatively solved, then we can also ask the mixing properties of these measures μ .

REFERENCES

- [AW70] Roy L. Adler, Benjamin Weiss, Similarity of automorphisms of the torus, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* **98** (1970).
- [Ano67] D. V. Anosov, Geodesic flows on closed Riemannian manifolds with negative curvature, *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **90** (1967) 1–235.
- [Bow74] Rufus Bowen, Some systems with unique equilibrium states, *Math. Systems Theory* **8** (1974/75) 193–202.
- [Bow75] Rufus Bowen, Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms, *Lect. Notes in Math.* **470** (1975).
- [Bro78] Robert Brody, Compact manifolds and hyperbolicity, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **235** (1978) 213–219.

¹⁶Namely we have

$$\underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \mu) \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}^T(\mathcal{B}^N)} \underline{\text{rdim}}(\mathcal{B}^N, T, \mathbf{d}, \nu) d\lambda(\nu).$$

- [Cos13] Bernardo Freitas Paulo Da Costa, Deux exemples sur la dimension moyenne d'un espace de courbes de Brody, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **63** (2013) 2223-2237.
- [CD13] Bernardo Freitas Paulo Da Costa, Julien Duval, Sur les courbes de Brody dans $P^n(\mathbf{C})$, *Math. Ann.* **355** (2013) 1593-1600.
- [CT06] Thomas M. Cover, Joy A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*, second edition, Wiley, New York, 2006.
- [Duv08] Julien Duval, Sur le lemme de Brody, *Invent. Math.* **173** (2008) 305-314.
- [Duv21] Julien Duval, Around Brody lemma, Hyperbolicity properties of algebraic varieties, 1-12, *Panor Synthèses*, 56 Société Mathématique de France, Paris 2021.
- [EW11] Manfred Einsiedler, Thomas Ward, *Ergodic theory with a view toward number theory*, *Grad. Texts in Math.*, 259 Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011.
- [Ere] Alexandre Eremenko, Normal holomorphic curves from parabolic regions to projective spaces, preprint, Purdue university (1998), arXiv: 0710.1281.
- [Gra11] Robert M. Gray, *Entropy and information theory*, second edition, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [Gro99] Misha Gromov, Topological invariants of dynamical systems and spaces of holomorphic maps: I, *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.* **2** (1999) 323-415.
- [IW81] Nobuyuki Ikeda, Shinzo Watanabe, *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, second edition, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York; Kodansha, Ltd., Tokyo, 1989.
- [KH95] Anatole Katok, Boris Hasselblatt, *Introduction to modern theory of dynamical systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [KD94] Tsutomu Kawabata, Amir Dembo, The rate distortion dimension of sets and measures, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 1564-1572, Sep. 1994.
- [Lin99] Elon Lindenstrauss, Mean dimension, small entropy factors and an embedding theorem, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **89** (1999) 227-262.
- [LT18] Elon Lindenstrauss, Masaki Tsukamoto, From rate distortion theory to metric mean dimension: variational principle, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, No. 5, pp. 3590-3609, May, 2018.
- [LT19] Elon Lindenstrauss, Masaki Tsukamoto, Double variational principle for mean dimension, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **29** (2019) 1048-1109.
- [LW00] Elon Lindenstrauss, Benjamin Weiss, Mean topological dimension, *Israel J. Math.* **115** (2000) 1-24.
- [MT15] Shinichiroh Matsuo, Masaki Tsukamoto, Brody curves and mean dimension, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **28** (2015) 159-182.
- [NW14] Junjiro Noguchi, Jörg Winkelmann, *Nevanlinna theory in several complex variables and diophantine approximation*, Springer Tokyo 2014.
- [OW87] Donald S. Ornstein, Benjamin Weiss, Entropy and isomorphism theorems for actions of amenable groups, *J. Analyse Math.* **48** (1987) 1-141
- [PG77] Michael B. Poursley, Robert M. Gray, Source coding theorems for stationary, continuous-time stochastic processes, *Ann. Probab.* **5** (1977) 966-986.
- [Rue73] David Ruelle, Statistical mechanics on a compact set with \mathbb{Z}^{ν} action satisfying expansiveness and specification, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **185** (1973) 237-251.
- [Rue78] David Ruelle, An inequality for the entropy of differentiable maps, *Bol. Soc. Bras. Mat.* **78** 83-87.
- [Sha48] C. E. Shannon, A mathematical theory of communication, *Bell Syst. Tech. J.* **27** (1948) 379-423, 623-656.
- [Sha59] C. E. Shannon, Coding theorems for a discrete source with a fidelity criterion, *IRE Nat. Conv. Rec.*, Pt. 4, pp. 142-163, 1959.

- [Sin72] Yakov G. Sinai, Gibbs measures in ergodic theory, *Russian Math. Surveys* **27** (1972) 21-69.
- [Sma67] S. Smale, Differentiable dynamical systems, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **73** (1967) 747-817.
- [Sri98] S. M. Srivastava, *A course on Borel sets*, Grad. Texts in Math., 180, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998
- [Tsu09a] Masaki Tsukamoto, A packing problem for holomorphic curves, *Nagoya Math. J.* **194** (2009) 33-68.
- [Tsu09b] Masaki Tsukamoto, Deformation of Brody curves and mean dimension, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **29** (2009) 1641-1657.
- [Tsu18] Masaki Tsukamoto, Mean dimension of the dynamical system of Brody curves, *Invent. math.* **211** (2018) 935-968.
- [Tsu20] Masaki Tsukamoto, Double variational principle for mean dimension with potential, *Adv. Math.* **361** (2020) 106935.
- [Tsu22] Masaki Tsukamoto, Remark on the local nature of metric mean dimension, *Kyushu J. Math.* **76** (2022) 143-162.
- [Tsu] Masaki Tsukamoto, Variational principle for mean dimension with potential of \mathbb{R}^d -actions: I, arXiv:2310.03989.
- [Wal75] Peter Walters, A variational principle for the pressure of continuous transformations, *Amer. J. Math.* **17** (1975) 937-971.
- [Wal82] Peter Walters, *An introduction to ergodic theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
- [Win07] Jörg Winkelmann, On Brody and entire curves, *Bull. Soc. math. France*, **135** (2007) 25-46.
- [Yos34] Kōsaku Yosida, On a class of meromorphic functions, *Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan* **16** (1934) 227-235.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: `tsukamoto@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`