

Mean value theorems in multiplicative systems and joint ergodicity of additive and multiplicative actions

By DIMITRIOS CHARAMARAS

May 17, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we are concerned with the study of additive ergodic averages in multiplicative systems and the investigation of the “pretentious” dynamical behaviour of these systems. We prove a mean ergodic theorem (Theorem A) that generalises Halász’s mean value theorem for finitely generated multiplicative functions taking values in the unit circle. In addition, we obtain two structural results concerning the “pretentious” dynamical behaviour of finitely generated multiplicative systems.

Moreover, motivated by the independence principle between additive and multiplicative structures of the integers, we explore the joint ergodicity (as a natural notion of independence) of an additive and a finitely generated multiplicative action, both acting on the same probability space. In Theorem B, we show that such actions are jointly ergodic whenever no “local obstructions” arise, and we give a concrete description of these “local obstructions”. As an application, we obtain some new combinatorial results regarding arithmetic configurations in large sets of integers including refinements of a special case of Szemerédi’s theorem.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Pretentious mean ergodic theorem and pretentious ergodicity	5
1.2	A weighted version of Theorem A	7
1.3	Decomposition theorems	12
1.4	Joint ergodicity of additive and multiplicative actions	13
1.5	An application of Theorem B	15
1.6	Proof ideas	17
2	Preliminaries	18
2.1	Basics in multiplicative systems	18
2.2	An orthogonality criterion	24
3	Proof of the Results for Multiplicative Systems	25
3.1	Proof of Proposition 1.10	25
3.2	Proof of Theorem A	26

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 37A44; Secondary: 11N37, 11B30.

3.3	Proof of the corollaries of Theorem A	33
3.4	Proof of the decomposition theorems	38
3.5	Deduction of Theorem 1.1 from Theorem A	39
4	Proof of Theorem B	41
A	Spectral theorems	44
B	Elementary facts from number theory	45
C	Proof of Lemma 2.13	46
	References	49

1. Introduction

The fundamental goal of multiplicative number theory is understanding the multiplicative structure of positive integers. A central topic in this area concerns the study of mean values of multiplicative functions, whose properties are intimately linked to the structure of prime numbers. A function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called:

- (i) *multiplicative* if $f(nm) = f(n)f(m)$ holds for any coprime $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (ii) *completely multiplicative* if (i) holds for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Some well-known and important examples of multiplicative functions include the Dirichlet characters, the Liouville function λ defined to take the value -1 on each prime, the Möbius function μ which is equal to Liouville in square-free numbers and zero everywhere else and the Archimedean characters $n^{it}, t \in \mathbb{R}$, among others. Note that only the first two are completely multiplicative. The *mean value* of a bounded multiplicative function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the limit of $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (if this limit exists), and it is denoted by $M(f)$. The celebrated mean value theorem of Halász [Hal68] describes the mean value of a multiplicative function in terms of its “distance” to Archimedean characters $n^{it}, t \in \mathbb{R}$. The *distance* between two 1-bounded multiplicative functions $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined as

$$\mathbb{D}(f, g) := \left(\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1 - \operatorname{Re}(f(p)\overline{g(p)})}{p} \right)^{1/2},$$

where \mathbb{P} denotes the set of primes. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathbb{D}(f, g; N)$ similarly with the sum ranging over primes up to N . Consider the classes

$$\mathcal{M} := \{f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1 : f \text{ is multiplicative}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}^c := \{f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1 : f \text{ is completely multiplicative}\},$$

and the classes

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}} := \{f \in \mathcal{M} : f \text{ is finitely generated}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c := \{f \in \mathcal{M}^c : f \text{ is finitely generated}\},$$

where a multiplicative function is *finitely generated* if the set $\{f(p) : p \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is finite. The following is a special case of Halász’s theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Halász’s mean value theorem for finitely generated functions¹). *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$. Then $M(f)$ exists. Moreover, if $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) = \infty$, then $M(f) = 0$ and if $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) < \infty$, then*

$$M(f) = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{f(p^k)}{p^k}\right). \tag{1.1}$$

¹We refer the reader to [Eli12, Theorem 6.3] for the classic version of Halász’s mean value theorem which concerns all bounded multiplicative functions and we remark that the version stated in this paper follows from the original one, using Lemma B.3.

In particular, if $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) < \infty$, then

$$M(f) = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{f(p)}{p}\right)^{-1}. \quad (1.2)$$

The natural extension of multiplicative functions in the dynamical setting is encapsulated by what is known as multiplicative systems and the associated additive ergodic averages form the dynamical counterpart of mean values. In [BR22], Bergelson and Richter generalised several number-theoretic results by studying uniquely ergodic, finitely generated multiplicative systems in the topological setting. Motivated by their work, we will establish an ergodic-theoretic and far-reaching extension of the above version of Halász’s theorem. In addition, we will investigate the dynamical properties of multiplicative systems with respect to additive ergodic averages by adapting the “pretentious” approach² from multiplicative functions to multiplicative systems.

Definition 1.2. Let (X, μ) be a probability space³ and $S = (S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of commuting invertible measure-preserving transformations on (X, μ) . If for any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$S_{nm} = S_n \circ S_m,$$

then the measure-preserving system (X, μ, S) is called *multiplicative*. Furthermore, we say that S is a *multiplicative action on (X, μ)* .

If the above holds for any coprime $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, then both the system and the action are called *weakly multiplicative*.⁴

A multiplicative system (X, μ, S) is called *finitely generated* if S is finitely generated as an action of (\mathbb{N}, \times) , i.e., $\{S_p : p \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is a finite set.

Remark 1.3. For simplicity of notation and terminology, throughout this paper we are solely concerned with multiplicative systems. However, it would not be that hard to extend the results of this paper to weakly multiplicative systems. In most cases, the exact same proofs work for weakly multiplicative systems and this will be easy to notice. In the remaining cases, we will remark how a proof could be extended to weakly multiplicative systems. Finally, all the notions given below for multiplicative systems are defined identically for weakly multiplicative systems.

Given a multiplicative system (X, μ, S) , S induces, through the Koopman representation, an action of the multiplicative semigroup (\mathbb{N}, \times) on $L^2(X)$ by unitary operators, denoted also by $S = (S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and given by $S_n F = F \circ S_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say then that S (now viewed as a sequence of operators on $L^2(X)$, and not as a sequence of transformations on X) is a *(unitary) multiplicative action on $L^2(X)$* .

In the following example we introduce two different classes of multiplicative systems. The first class depicts why multiplicative systems are the natural ergodic extension of completely multiplicative functions, as it consists of systems induced by such functions. The second class consists of systems induced by completely additive functions. A function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called:

²This terminology refers to the utilisation of the notion of distance in the study of mean values of multiplicative functions. This term is attributed to Granville and Soundararajan (see [GS14]).

³Any probability space considered in this paper is assumed to be regular. According to [Fur81, Definition 5.5], a probability space (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) is called regular if X is a compact metric space and \mathcal{B} is the Borel σ -algebra on X . We omit writing the σ -algebra \mathcal{B} , hence we write (X, μ) instead of (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) . Moreover, whenever we write $A \subseteq X$, it is assumed that this set A is Borel measurable.

⁴Note that if (X, μ, S) is weakly multiplicative, then S does not induce an action, but by a slight abuse of terminology, we refer to it as a weakly multiplicative action.

- (i) *additive* if $f(nm) = f(n) + f(m)$ holds for any coprime $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (ii) *completely additive* if (i) holds for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

The most studied completely additive function is $\Omega(n)$, that is, the number of prime factors of n counted with multiplicity. If we count without multiplicity, then we get the function $\omega(n)$, which is additive, but not completely. The Liouville function λ is equivalently defined by $\lambda(n) = (-1)^{\Omega(n)}$.

Example 1.4. (A) Let $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$. Consider the compact subgroup $X = \overline{f(\mathbb{N})}$ of \mathbb{S}^1 , the Haar measure m_X on X and the multiplicative action $S = (S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by $S_n x = f(n)x$, $x \in X$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The multiplicative system (X, m_X, S) is induced by f and captures its behaviour. It is called the *multiplicative rotation by f* . In particular, the additive ergodic averages

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_n F \quad \text{in } L^2(X), \quad (1.3)$$

for $F \in L^2(X)$, correspond to the ergodic counterpart of the mean value of f , and if F is the identity function,⁵ then (1.3) coincides with the mean value of f in absolute value.

- (B) Let T be an invertible measure-preserving transformation on some probability space (X, μ) and $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a completely additive function. Then the system (X, μ, T^a) is a multiplicative system, induced by the function a . In particular, T^Ω is a finitely generated multiplicative action, while T^ω is a finitely generated weakly multiplicative action.

Example 1.4 (A) suggests the study of additive ergodic averages as in (1.3) as the natural next step following the study of mean values of multiplicative functions. The study of ergodic averages is a central and classical topic in ergodic theory dating back to the seminal works [vN32a] and [vN32b] of von Neumann for single-transformation measure-preserving systems. In this paper, we view invertible single-transformation measure-preserving systems as additive systems. An invertible measure-preserving system (X, μ, T) is called *additive* if $T = (T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $T_{n+m} = T_n \circ T_m$ for any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, invertible single-transformation measure preserving systems are additive and any additive system is induced by an invertible transformation.

Given a system and a σ -algebra \mathcal{A} , the *conditional expectation* $\mathbb{E}(\cdot | \mathcal{A})$ is defined as the unique map $L^2(X) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfying the following for any $F \in L^2(X)$:

- $\mathbb{E}(F | \mathcal{A})$ is \mathcal{A} -measurable,
- for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\int_A \mathbb{E}(F | \mathcal{A}) \, d\mu = \int_A F \, d\mu$.

Theorem 1.5 (von Neumann's mean ergodic theorem⁶). *Let (X, μ, T) be an additive measure preserving system and let $\mathcal{I} = \{A \subseteq X : T^{-1}A = A\}$ denote the sub- σ -algebra of invariant sets. Then for any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^n F = \mathbb{E}(F | \mathcal{I}) \quad \text{in } L^2(X).$$

Moreover, the system (X, μ, T) is ergodic if and only if for any $F \in L^2(X)$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^n F = \int_X F \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X).$$

⁵The space \mathbb{S}^1 is identified with $[0, 1)$ under the map $t \mapsto e(t)$ and under this identification the function $F(x) = e(x)$ can be written as $F(x) = x$, i.e., it is the identity function.

⁶This theorem holds even for non-invertible T , but in this paper, we are exclusively concerned with invertible transformations.

1.1. Pretentious mean ergodic theorem and pretentious ergodicity

The first main result that we present is an analogue of von Neumann's mean ergodic theorem (Theorem 1.5) for finitely generated multiplicative systems, which generalises Halász's mean value theorem for finitely generated functions (Theorem 1.1). To facilitate this, we generalise the notion of distance from multiplicative functions to multiplicative systems, and more precisely, to multiplicative actions on the Hilbert space of the L^2 functions of a multiplicative system.

Definition 1.6. Let (X, μ) be a probability space, S, R be two unitary multiplicative actions on $L^2(X)$ and $F \in L^2(X)$ be non-zero. We define *the distance between S and R with respect to F* as

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, R) := \left(\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|F\|_2^2 - \operatorname{Re}\langle S_p F, R_p F \rangle}{p} \right)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|S_p F - R_p F\|_2^2}{p} \right)^{1/2}.$$

For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathbb{D}_F(S, R; N)$ similarly with the sum ranging over primes up to N and we also define $\mathbb{D}(S, R) := \inf_{F \in L^2(X)} \mathbb{D}_F(S, R)$.⁷

Let also $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$ and suppose that R is given by $R_n G = f(n)G$ for all $G \in L^2(X)$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we define $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) := \mathbb{D}_F(S, R)$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) = \left(\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|F\|_2^2 - \operatorname{Re}\langle S_p F, f(p)F \rangle}{p} \right)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|S_p F - f(p)F\|_2^2}{p} \right)^{1/2}.$$

We usually refer to the latter as *the distance between $S_n F$ and $f(n)F$* (viewed as sequences of $L^2(X)$ functions). We finally define $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f; N) := \mathbb{D}_F(S, R; N)$ and $\mathbb{D}(S, f) := \mathbb{D}(S, R)$.

In view of Theorem 1.1, mean values of finitely generated multiplicative functions are characterised by their distance to 1. By analogy, the additive ergodic averages in (1.3) should be characterised by the distance between $S_n F$ and F . This suggests that additive ergodic averages in multiplicative systems are not controlled by invariant functions (see also Example 1.21), but rather by functions that “pretend to be invariant” in the following sense:

Definition 1.7. Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. We say that:

- (i) A function $F \in L^2(X)$ *pretends to be invariant* if $\mathbb{D}_F(S, 1) < \infty$. We write \mathcal{H}_1 for the collection of all pretentiously invariant functions.
- (ii) A measurable $A \subseteq X$ *pretends to be invariant* if $\mathbb{1}_A \in \mathcal{H}_1$. We write \mathcal{I}_{pr} for the collection of all the pretentiously invariant sets.

We will later see that \mathcal{H}_1 is a subspace of $L^2(X)$ and \mathcal{I}_{pr} is an algebra. We denote by $\sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})$ the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{I}_{pr} , that is, the smallest σ -algebra containing \mathcal{I}_{pr} .

Definition 1.8. A finitely generated system (X, μ, S) is *pretentiously ergodic* if for any $A \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}$ we have $\mu(A) \in \{0, 1\}$.

Let (X, μ, S) be a multiplicative system. Consider the operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ on the space of bounded linear operators from $L^2(X)$ to itself. Since $\left\| \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{S_{p^k}}{p^k} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{p^k} = \frac{p}{p-1} < \infty$ for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, then

$$\left(1 - \frac{S_p}{p} \right)^{-1} := \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{S_{p^k}}{p^k}$$

is a well-defined bounded linear operator from $L^2(X)$ to itself.

⁷It follows from the triangle inequality (see Lemma 2.1) that this infimum is actually a minimum.

Theorem A (Pretentious mean ergodic theorem). *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. Then for any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_n F = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{S_p}{p}\right)^{-1} \mathbb{E}(F \mid \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})) \quad \text{in } L^2(X). \quad (1.4)$$

Moreover, (X, μ, S) is pretentiously ergodic if and only if for any $F \in L^2(X)$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_n F = \int_X F \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X).$$

We remark that Theorem A is the norm convergence analogue of the pointwise result [BR22, Theorem B] concerning strongly uniquely ergodic finitely generated multiplicative dynamical systems. The latter pointwise result is a dynamical generalisation of the prime number theorem that also yields a new proof of it. In our case, Theorem A is a dynamical generalisation of Theorem 1.1 (and consequently, of the prime number theorem), but it does not yield a new proof of these results, since the theorem of Halász will be used in the proof of Theorem A.

The second statement in Theorem A suggests that pretentious ergodicity is the natural ergodicity property in the setting of additive ergodic averages in multiplicative systems, as it is characterised by convergence of the averages to the expected limit. Moreover, we will later see that the set $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p(\mathbb{E}(F \mid \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}))) \neq \mathbb{E}(F \mid \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}))\}$ in the context of Theorem A satisfies $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$ (see Lemma 2.4), which implies that the right-hand side of (1.4) always exists. Hence we have the following:

Corollary 1.9. *For any finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) , the ergodic averages in (1.3) exist for any $F \in L^2(X)$.*

This corollary does not necessarily hold in non-finitely generated systems. To see this, we can consider the example of a multiplicative rotation (cf. Example 1.4 (A)) by some non-trivial Archimedean character n^{it} , $t \neq 0$.

Proposition 1.10. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. Then we have that $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1} = L^2(X, \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}), \mu)$.*

The above proposition implies the following: for any finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) and any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(F \mid \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})) = P_1 F, \quad (1.5)$$

where $P_1 : L^2(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$ denotes the orthogonal projection operator onto the closed subspace $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$.

Proposition 1.10 yields as an immediate corollary the following spectral characterisation of pretentious ergodicity, analogous to the one known in the classical setting of additive systems.

Corollary 1.11. *A finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) is pretentiously ergodic if and only if \mathcal{H}_1 consists of constants.*

Notice now that the second statement in Theorem A is immediately deduced from the first one, using also (1.5) and Corollary 1.11: If (X, μ, S) is pretentiously ergodic, then in view of (1.5) and Corollary 1.11, for any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have that $\mathbb{E}(F \mid \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})) = \int_X \mathbb{E}(F \mid \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})) \, d\mu = \int_X F \, d\mu$, hence the right-hand side of (1.4) is equal to this integral. Similarly, one can show that if (X, μ, S) is not pretentiously ergodic, then there exists some $F \in L^2(X)$ (pick a non-constant $F \in \mathcal{H}_1$) such that

the right-hand side of (1.4) is not equal to the integral of F .

1.2. A weighted version of Theorem A

With Theorem A and Corollary 1.11, we have initiated the study of additive ergodic averages, or in other words, mean values, in multiplicative systems. To continue this venture, we further explore the pretentious dynamical behaviour of multiplicative systems. We proceed by defining analogues of total ergodicity and weak-mixing in our setting.

Definition 1.12. A finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) is called:

- *aperiodic* if for any $F \in L^2(X)$ and any $r, q \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_{qn+r} F = \int_X F \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X). \quad (1.6)$$

- *pretentiously weak-mixing* if the action $S \times S$ is pretentiously ergodic for $\mu \times \mu$.

In view of Theorem A, it is quite standard to check that another equivalent definition of (X, μ, S) being pretentiously weak-mixing is that for any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \int_X S_n F \cdot \overline{F} \, d\mu - \int_X F \, d\mu \cdot \int_X \overline{F} \, d\mu \right| = 0.$$

The term aperiodic derives from the notion of aperiodic multiplicative functions. An *aperiodic* multiplicative function is a multiplicative function whose mean value over arithmetic progressions is zero, that is to say $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(qn+r) = 0$, for any $r, q \in \mathbb{N}$. The concept of aperiodic systems is the generalisation of aperiodic functions in the dynamical setting. We remark that mean values along arithmetic progressions are essential in the study of multiplicative structures of the positive integers in arithmetic progressions. This highlights the importance of studying aperiodic systems.

It will become evident through the spectral characterisation given in Corollary 1.17 that aperiodicity is the multiplicative analogue of total ergodicity in additive systems. In additive systems, total ergodicity and weak-mixing are spectrally characterised using rational (periodic) eigenfunctions and eigenfunctions respectively. Note that in finitely generated multiplicative systems (X, μ, S) , an eigenfunction for the Koopman representation of the (N, \times) -action S is a function $F \in L^2(X)$ satisfying

$$S_n F = f(n)F, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

for some $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fig}}^c$. As already explained, invariant functions are not characteristic for the ergodic averages in (1.3). Likewise, proper eigenfunctions are not the right means to study the ergodic averages in (1.6) and they do not characterise the dynamical notions given in Definition 1.12 (see also Example 1.22). Instead, we utilise the distance introduced in Definition 1.6 to define the pretentious counterparts of eigenfunctions in multiplicative systems. Given a function $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$, we introduce the set $\mathcal{A}_f := \{g \in \mathcal{M}^c : \mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty\}$.

Definition 1.13. Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system, $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$ and $F \in L^2(X)$.

- We say that F is a *pretentious eigenfunction*, with *pretentious eigenvalue* f if $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$. We write \mathcal{H}_f for the collection of all pretentious eigenfunctions with pretentious eigenvalue f . Moreover, we define the *pretentious spectrum* of (X, μ, S) as

$$\sigma_{\text{pr}}(S) := \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{M}^c : \mathbb{D}(S, f) < \infty} \mathcal{A}_f.$$

(ii) We say that F is a *pretentious rational eigenfunction*, if $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}_\chi$ for some Dirichlet character χ . Moreover, we define the *pretentious rational spectrum* of (X, μ, S) as

$$\sigma_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) := \bigcup_{\chi: \mathbb{D}(S, \chi) < \infty} \mathcal{A}_\chi.$$

We will later see that for any $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$, \mathcal{H}_f is a subspace of $L^2(X)$ (see Lemma 2.9), and moreover, that all pretentious eigenvalues in finitely generated systems are finitely generated (see Remark 2.8).

The pretentious rational spectrum is defined using Dirichlet characters, because they capture periodicity in (\mathbb{N}, \times) . Strictly speaking, Dirichlet characters are not actual characters for this semigroup and they are not pretentious rational eigenvalues either, because they do not take values exclusively in the unit circle, as they take the value zero at most finitely many primes. To circumvent this technicality, given a Dirichlet character χ we define its *modified character* χ^* , by

$$\chi^*(n) := \begin{cases} \chi(n), & \text{if } \chi(n) \neq 0, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, since $\mathbb{D}(\chi, \chi^*) < \infty$, if χ^* is a pretentious rational eigenvalue, by a slight abuse of language, we say that χ is a pretentious rational eigenvalue.

Now we state a weighted version of Theorem A and using this we will be able to provide spectral characterisations for the notions of aperiodicity and pretentious weak-mixing. Given a set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, we let $\mathcal{P}^c := \mathbb{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, we denote the set of \mathcal{P} -free numbers by $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p \mid n \implies p \notin \mathcal{P}\}.$$

In addition, given a finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) , for any $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$, we denote the orthogonal projection operator onto the closed subspace $\overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$ by $P_f : L^2(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$.

Theorem 1.14 (Weighted pretentious mean ergodic theorem). *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. Then for any $F \in L^2(X)$ and any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c}} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n (P_f F) \quad \text{in } L^2(X), \quad (1.7)$$

where $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p(P_f F) \neq f(p)P_f F\}$.

The following corollary of Theorem 1.14 resembles Theorem 1.1 in the ergodic setting.

Corollary 1.15. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system and $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. Then the following hold:*

(i) *If $F \in L^2(X)$ is such that $P_f F$ is constant, then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F = M(\overline{f}) \cdot \int_X F \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X). \quad (1.8)$$

Therefore, the above convergence holds for all $F \in L^2(X)$, if for any non-constant $G \in L^2(X)$ we have $\mathbb{D}_G(S, f) = \infty$.

(ii) *If a non-constant $F \in L^2(X)$ satisfies $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$, then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c}} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n F \quad \text{in } L^2(X), \quad (1.9)$$

where $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p F \neq f(p)F\}$.

It can be easily checked that the right-hand sides of (1.8) and (1.9) are distinct (for non-constant functions).

One could possibly expect that in Corollary 1.15 (i) we could have the stronger statement:

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) = \infty \implies \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F = M(\overline{f}) \cdot \int_X F \, d\mu,$$

as in Theorem 1.1, but the following example shows that this is not generally the case.

Example 1.16. Let $(\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1, \mu, S)$ where μ is the Haar measure on $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ and the action S is given by $S_p(z, w) = (-z, w)$, $(z, w) \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Let $F \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$ given by $F(z, w) = \frac{z+w}{2}$, $(z, w) \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, which has $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1} F \, d\mu = 0$. Then using Theorem A.2, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}^c} g(n) \, d\mu_F(g) = \langle S_n F, F \rangle = \frac{\lambda(n) + 1}{2} = \int_{\mathcal{M}^c} g(n) \, d\left(\frac{\delta_\lambda + \delta_1}{2}\right)(g),$$

where λ is the Liouville function and δ_a denotes the Dirac point mass of a function $a \in \mathcal{M}^c$. It follows that

$$\mu_F = \frac{\delta_\lambda + \delta_1}{2}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, 1)^2 = \int_{\mathcal{M}^c} \mathbb{D}(g, 1)^2 \, d\mu_F(g) = \frac{\mathbb{D}(\lambda, 1)^2 + \mathbb{D}(1, 1)^2}{2} = \infty,$$

but on the other hand we also have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_n F \right\|_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda(n) \right| + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N 1 \right| \right) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Utilising Corollary 1.15 we will be able to establish the following spectral characterisations of aperiodicity and pretentious weak-mixing.

Corollary 1.17. *The following are equivalent for a finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) :*

- (i) S is aperiodic.
- (ii) \mathcal{H}_1 consists of constant functions and $\mathcal{H}_\chi = \{0\}$ for any non-principal Dirichlet character χ .
- (iii) S is pretentiously ergodic and $\sigma_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \mathcal{A}_1$.

Corollary 1.18. *The following are equivalent for a finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) :*

- (i) S is pretentiously weak-mixing.
- (ii) \mathcal{H}_1 consists of constant functions and $\mathcal{H}_f = \{0\}$ for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ with $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) = \infty$.
- (iii) S is pretentiously ergodic and $\sigma_{\text{pr}}(S) = \mathcal{A}_1$.
- (iv) S has no non-constant pretentious eigenfunctions.

Corollary 1.17 can be viewed as a dynamical generalisation of the following corollary of Theorem 1.1:

Corollary 1.19. *Any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$ is aperiodic if and only if $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) = \infty$ for any Dirichlet character χ .*

The next result exhibits the relation between the classical and the pretentious dynamical behaviour of finitely generated multiplicative system and is an immediate consequence of Corollaries 1.11, 1.17

and 1.18.

Corollary 1.20. *Any pretentiously ergodic (aperiodic, or pretentiously weak-mixing) finitely generated multiplicative system is ergodic (totally ergodic, or weak-mixing respectively).*

The opposite of the above does not hold in general as one can see from the next two examples.

Example 1.21. Consider the multiplicative rotation $(\mathbb{S}^1, m_{\mathbb{S}^1}, S)$ by the function $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ given by

$$f(p) = \begin{cases} e(\alpha), & \text{if } p = 2, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for some irrational $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. The only invariant functions of this system are the constants. This implies that the system is ergodic in the classical sense. To see this, any S -invariant function is also invariant under the action of the single transformation S_2 . But since this transformation is clearly ergodic, then any such function has to be almost everywhere equal to some constant. On the other hand, considering the identity function $F(z) = z$, we can see that $\mathbb{D}_F(S, 1) < \infty$, hence F is a non-constant pretentiously invariant function. We expect then that the ergodic averages of F do not converge in the expected limit. To verify this, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_n F \right\|_2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) = \frac{1}{2 + e(\alpha)} \neq 1 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} F \, dm_{\mathbb{S}^1}.$$

Consequently, S is not pretentiously ergodic.

Example 1.22. Consider the multiplicative rotation $(\mathbb{S}^1, m_{\mathbb{S}^1}, S)$ by the function $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ given by

$$f(p) = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } p = 2, \\ \chi^*(p), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for some non-principal Dirichlet character χ . This system has no rational eigenvalues, but it is easy to check that χ is a pretentious rational eigenvalue (with pretentious rational eigenfunction the identity). Thus, the system is totally ergodic with the classical sense, but far from being aperiodic. Moreover, the additive ergodic averages along arithmetic progressions are not controlled by the classical eigenfunctions and eigenvalues, but by the pretentious ones. To see this, notice that, for the identity function $F \in L^2(X)$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \bar{\chi}(n) S_n F \right\|_2 > 0,$$

which, as we will see later (see Lemma 2.13), implies that there exist some $r, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_{qn+r} F \neq \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} F \, dm_{\mathbb{S}^1} \quad \text{in } L^2(X).$$

Now applying the results stated so far, we can characterise the pretentious dynamical properties of the two classes of multiplicative systems in Example 1.4.

Corollary 1.23. *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ and (X, μ, S) be the multiplicative rotation by f . Then the following hold:*

- (i) (X, μ, S) is pretentiously ergodic if and only if $\mathbb{D}(f^k, 1) = \infty$ for any positive integer $k < |X|$.
- (ii) (X, μ, S) is aperiodic if and only if f^k is aperiodic for any positive integer $k < |X|$.

(iii) (X, μ, S) is not pretentiously weak-mixing .

For convenience we introduce the following terminology. Let $S(p)$ be a statement depending on a prime variable p and let $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S(p) \text{ is true}\}$. Then we say that S holds for:

- *almost every prime* if $\sum_{p \notin \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$,
- *many primes* if $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} = \infty$,
- *a few primes* if $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$.

Corollary 1.24. *Let $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a finitely generated completely additive function and (X, μ, T) be an additive system. Then the following hold:*

- (i) (X, μ, T^a) is pretentiously ergodic if and only if (X, μ, T) is ergodic and a satisfies:
 - for any $\frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\}$ with $(r, q) = 1$, $q \nmid a(p)$ holds for many primes, and
 - $a(p) \neq 0$ for many primes.
- (ii) (X, μ, T^a) is aperiodic if and only if (X, μ, T) is ergodic and $e(a(n)\alpha)$ is aperiodic for any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$.
- (iii) (X, μ, T^a) is pretentiously weak-mixing if and only if (X, μ, T) is weak-mixing and a satisfies the conditions of (i).

Given $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, we define the completely additive function $\Omega_{\mathcal{P}}(n)$ to be the number of prime factors of n belonging in \mathcal{P} counted with multiplicity, and the additive function $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ similarly. We also define the completely multiplicative function $\lambda_{\mathcal{P}}(n) := (-1)^{\Omega_{\mathcal{P}}(n)}$. Clearly, all these functions are finitely generated.

Remark 1.25. In this paper, we prove several results concerning the completely additive functions Ω and $\Omega_{\mathcal{P}}$. It would not be too hard to prove the same results for the additive functions ω and $\omega_{\mathcal{P}}$. It would require adapting all the proofs of this paper concerning multiplicative systems to weakly multiplicative ones.

Corollary 1.26. *Let $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be a completely additive function. Then the following hold:*

- (i) (X, μ, T^a) is pretentiously ergodic for all ergodic (X, μ, T) if and only if $a(p) \neq 0$ for many primes.
- (ii) If $a(p) = 1$ for almost every prime, then (X, μ, T^a) is aperiodic for all ergodic (X, μ, T) .

In particular, for any ergodic (X, μ, T) , the system (X, μ, T^{Ω}) is aperiodic, and for any $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ the system $(X, \mu, T^{\Omega_{\mathcal{P}}})$ is:

- pretentiously ergodic if \mathcal{P} contains many primes,
- aperiodic if \mathcal{P} contains almost every prime.

Combining Theorem A with Corollary 1.26 (or more generally, with Corollary 1.24), we immediately obtain the following known result, which can be proved independently as well (see for example, [Loy23, Theorem 2.5]).

Corollary 1.27. *For any additive system (X, μ, T) and any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^{\Omega(n)} F = \int_X F \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X).$$

This remains true if we replace Ω with $\Omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, where $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is any set containing many primes, or more generally, with any a satisfying the conditions in Corollary 1.24 (i).

This result is the norm convergence analogue of the pointwise result [BR22, Theorem A] concerning the convergence of averages of $F(T^{\Omega(n)}x)$ for all points x in uniquely ergodic systems. The same result

for (non-uniquely) ergodic systems and for almost every point x is false, as it was shown in [Loy23, Theorem 1.2].

1.3. Decomposition theorems

Decomposition theorems on Hilbert spaces play an essential role in ergodic theory, especially in the study of ergodic averages. We are concerned with decomposition theorems in which the L^2 space of a measure-preserving system is split into two components (subspaces) that exhibit contrasting behaviours. Such theorems allow us to express any L^2 function F as $F_1 + F_2$, where F_1 is “structured” and F_2 is “pseudo-random”. When studying the convergence of ergodic averages, expressing an arbitrary L^2 function in this way allows us to reduce the problem to conducting an appropriate analysis on the prescribed subspaces to which the individual components belong. The goal of this section is to generalise two of the most well-known decomposition theorems for additive systems to the setting of multiplicative systems. This is paramount to understanding the pretentious dynamical behaviour of finitely generated multiplicative systems. We remark that the first new structure theorem that we present below is a key ingredient in the proof of Theorem B.

Given an additive system (X, μ, T) , let

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{tot.erg}}(T) = \left\{ f \in L^2(X) : \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^{qn} f \right\|_2 = 0, \text{ for all } q \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{rat}}(T) = \overline{\{F \in L^2(X) : T^q F = F \text{ for some } q \in \mathbb{N}\}}.$$

A classical corollary of Theorem 1.5, which for instance can be found in [Ber96, p. 14], asserts that

$$L^2(X) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot.erg}}(T) \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{rat}}(T). \quad (1.10)$$

Our first decomposition result is an analogue of (1.10) for finitely generated multiplicative systems. Given such a system (X, μ, S) , we define the following closed subspaces of $L^2(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.rat}} &:= \overline{\text{span}\{F \in L^2(X) : F \text{ is a pretentious rational eigenfunction for } S\}} \\ &= \overline{\text{span}\{F \in L^2(X) : \text{there exists a Dirichlet character } \chi \text{ such that } \mathbb{D}_F(S, \chi) < \infty\}} \\ &= \overline{\text{span}\left(\bigcup_{\chi} \mathcal{H}_{\chi}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}} := \left\{ F \in L^2(X) : \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_{qn+r} F \right\|_2 = 0 \text{ for any } r \in \mathbb{N}, q \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

When confusion may arise, we mention the action considered by writing $\mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}}(S)$.

Theorem 1.28. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. Then we have*

$$L^2(X) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.rat}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}}.$$

Our second decomposition theorem is an analogue of the classical Jacobs-de Leeuw-Glicksberg theorem (see [DG61]), according to which the L^2 space of an additive system is decomposed as the direct sum of the subspace of almost-periodic functions (the closed subspace of L^2 spanned by eigenfunctions) and the weak-mixing component (the closed subspace of L^2 consisting of weak-mixing

functions). Now, given a finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) , we define the following closed subspaces of $L^2(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.eig}} &:= \overline{\text{span}\{F \in L^2(X) : F \text{ is a pretentious eigenfunction for } S\}} \\ &= \overline{\text{span}\{F \in L^2(X) : \text{there exists } f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \text{ such that } \mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty\}} \\ &= \text{span}\left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mathcal{H}_f\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.wm}} := \left\{ F \in L^2(X) : \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \int_X S_n F \cdot \bar{F} \, d\mu \right| = 0 \right\}.$$

When confusion may arise, we mention the action considered by writing $\mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.eig}}(S)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.wm}}(S)$.

Theorem 1.29. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. Then we have*

$$L^2(X) = \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.eig}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.wm}}.$$

1.4. Joint ergodicity of additive and multiplicative actions

For the rest of the introduction, motivated by another number-theoretic topic, we explore how additive and multiplicative actions intertwine. Gaining better understanding on the ways in which additive and multiplicative structures of positive integers interact with each other is a fundamental objective in number theory. It is generally believed that such structures are independent when no ‘‘local obstructions’’ arise. This philosophy underpins several theorems, open problems and conjectures in number theory. Chowla’s conjecture (see [Cho65]) serves as a great example to elaborate on this topic. In its simplest form -which is still open- it asserts that for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda(n) \lambda(n+h) = 0,$$

or in other words, that the sequences $(\lambda(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\lambda(n+h))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ exhibit independent asymptotic behaviour. The asymptotic independence of arithmetic functions is captured by the following notion: Given two bounded functions $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we say that f and g are (*asymptotically*) *uncorrelated* if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) \overline{g(n)} - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{g(n)} \right) \right) = 0.$$

In [BR22], Bergelson and Richter explored the concept of independence of additive and multiplicative structures in the context of topological dynamical systems, by examining when two sequences arising from an additive and a multiplicative system respectively are uncorrelated. Our next goal is to transfer the independence principle postulated in [BR22] to the setting of ergodic theory.

Let us first see how the notion of independence can be understood in the ergodic theoretic setting, analogously to the way that is described for arithmetic functions above. Given a Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|)$, we say that two essentially bounded functions $F, G : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ are *asymptotically uncorrelated* if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N F(n) \overline{G(n)} - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N F(n) \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{G(n)} \right) \right\| = 0.$$

An additive action T and a multiplicative action S on a probability space (X, μ) are *independent* if

for any $F, G \in L^\infty(X)$, $(T^n F)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(S_n G)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are asymptotically uncorrelated as sequences in the Hilbert space $(L^2(X), \|\cdot\|_2)$. Under the natural assumptions that T is ergodic and S is pretentiously ergodic, and in view of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem A, the notion of independence coincides with that of joint ergodicity.

Definition 1.30. Let (X, μ) be a probability space, T be an ergodic additive action and S be an pretentiously ergodic multiplicative action on (X, μ) . We say that T and S are *jointly ergodic* if for any $F, G \in L^\infty(X)$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^n F \cdot S_n G = \int_X F \, d\mu \int_X G \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X),$$

or equivalently if T and S are independent.

We transfer the independence principle in the ergodic-theoretic setting as follows: “An ergodic additive action T and a pretentiously ergodic finitely generated multiplicative action S on some probability space (X, μ) are jointly ergodic when no “local obstructions” arise”. The second main theorem of this paper verifies this principle by identifying the “local obstructions” that violate the independence of such actions. What we found is that the obstructions are caused by the dependence of their (*pretentiously*) *periodic parts*.

The *spectrum* of an additive action T can be defined as

$$\sigma(T) := \{\alpha \in [0, 1) : e(\alpha) \text{ is an eigenvalue for } T\}$$

and the *rational spectrum* of T is given by

$$\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) := \sigma(T) \cap \mathbb{Q}.$$

The rational spectrum captures the *periodic behaviour* of the action T . In particular, T is totally ergodic if and only if T is ergodic and $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) = \{0\}$.

Let S be a finitely generated multiplicative action. We have seen that the dynamical behaviour of S with respect to additive ergodic averages is captured by the pretentious spectrum. The *pretentious periodic part* of S is detected by the pretentious rational spectrum $\sigma_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$. We claim that “local obstructions” between T and S occur if and only if $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T)$ and $\sigma_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$ are dependent. Hence, we shall find a way to link pretentious rational eigenvalues for S to rational numbers $\frac{r}{q}$ which induce the eigenvalues for T . To this end, we define

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \left\{ \frac{r}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} : (r, q) = 1 \text{ and } \exists \chi \in \sigma_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) \text{ primitive Dirichlet character mod } q \right\} \cup \{0\}$$

The next lemma follows immediately from Corollary 1.17.

Lemma 1.31. *A finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) is aperiodic if and only if it is pretentiously ergodic and $\tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$.*

We are now ready to state the second main theorem of this paper.

Theorem B (Joint ergodicity of actions). *Let (X, μ) be a probability space, T be an ergodic additive action on (X, μ) and S be a pretentiously ergodic finitely generated multiplicative action on (X, μ) . Then T, S are jointly ergodic if and only if $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$.*

A way to interpret this theorem is that under some natural assumptions, the independence of the actions is guaranteed by the independence of their (*pretentiously*) *periodic parts*.

Using the fact that for an ergodic T and a pretentiously ergodic S we have that $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) = \{0\}$ if and only if T is totally ergodic, and $\tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$ if and only if S is aperiodic (by Lemma 1.31), Theorem B immediately implies the following:

Corollary 1.32. *Let (X, μ) be a probability space, T be an ergodic additive action on xm and S be a pretentiously ergodic finitely generated multiplicative action on (X, μ) . If T is totally ergodic, or S is aperiodic, then T and S are jointly ergodic.*

This corollary is the norm convergence analogue of the pointwise result [BR22, Theorem C] concerning the independence (or disjointness, in the language of [BR22]) of finitely generated multiplicative dynamical systems and nilsystems.

Corollary 1.32 leads to nice applications that are to be presented in the following subsection.

1.5. An application of Theorem B

A central topic in ergodic theory is concerned with understanding the limiting behaviour of multiple ergodic averages of the form

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^{a_1(n)} F_1 \cdots T^{a_\ell(n)} F_\ell \quad \text{in } L^2, \quad (1.11)$$

for any (ergodic) additive system (X, μ, T) and any $F_1, \dots, F_\ell \in L^2(X)$, for various families of sequences $a_k : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq k \leq \ell$. The study of multiple ergodic averages was initiated in Furstenberg's seminal work [Fur77], where he gave an ergodic-theoretic proof of Szemerédi's theorem on arithmetic progressions (see [Sze75]). Furstenberg's result corresponds to the case $a_k(n) = kn$, $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ in (1.11). Subsequently to Furstenberg's work, there have been several works concerned with the averages in (1.11), where the iterates are taken along various families of sequences such as polynomials ([Ber87], [BL96], [FK05], [HK05], [BLL08]), Hardy field sequences ([Fra10], [Fra15], [KK19], [BMR24], [BMR20], [Kou21], [Fra21], [Tsi23]) or fractional prime powers ([Fra22]). Here we obtain a result on multiple ergodic averages as an application of Theorem B, which is of different flavor compared to the aforementioned ones.

Combining Corollary 1.32 with Corollary 1.26 (or more generally, with Corollary 1.24), we obtain the following:

Corollary 1.33. *For any ergodic invertible measure-preserving transformations T_1, T_2 on some probability space (X, μ) and for any $F, G \in L^2(X)$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T_1^n F \cdot T_2^{\Omega(n)} G = \int_X F \, d\mu \int_X G \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X). \quad (1.12)$$

The result remains true if we replace Ω with $\Omega_{\mathcal{P}}$, for any $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ containing almost every prime, or more generally, with any finitely generated completely additive function $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $e(a(n)\alpha)$ is aperiodic for all $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$.

Remark 1.34. A quite surprising fact in Theorem B, and consequently in Corollaries 1.32 and 1.33, is that T and S are not required to commute with each other. This makes Corollary 1.33 one of the very few results where convergence of the form (1.12) holds for non-commuting transformations. Similar results to Corollary 1.33 with Ω replaced by any increasing sequence are known to be false for non-commuting transformations (see [FLW12, Lemma 4.1]).

In the language of Frantzikinakis [Fra21], Corollary 1.33 applied for the same transformation $T_1 = T_2 = T$ says that n and $\Omega(n)$ are jointly ergodic, and more generally, that if $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is any function as in Corollary 1.33, then n and $a(n)$ are jointly ergodic.

Corollary 1.33 is equivalent to the following multiple recurrence result. Before we state it we shall give the notion of upper density. Given a set $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, the *upper density* of E is given by

$$\bar{d}(E) := \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|E \cap [1, N]|}{N}.$$

Our last results hold in the more general context where Ω is replaced by any function $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as in Corollary 1.33, and in particular by $\Omega_{\mathcal{P}}$ for any $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ containing almost every prime, but we state them only for Ω for sake of simplicity.

Corollary 1.35. *For any ergodic invertible measure-preserving transformations T_1, T_2 on some probability space (X, μ) and for any $A \subseteq X$ with $\mu(A) > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A \cap T_1^{-n} A \cap T_2^{-\Omega(n)} A) \geq \mu(A)^3.$$

In particular, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\bar{d}(\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mu(A \cap T_1^{-n} A \cap T_2^{-\Omega(n)} A) \geq \mu(A)^3 - \varepsilon\}) > 0.$$

Furstenberg's correspondence principle [Fur81, Lemma 3.17] offers a standard way in which multiple recurrence results are utilized to obtain combinatorial applications concerning the richness of arithmetic structures in large subsets of the integers. For our purposes we use the following form the correspondence:

Theorem 1.36 (Furstenberg's correspondence principle, see [Ber87, Theorem 1.1]). *Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a set of positive upper density. Then there exists an invertible additive system (X, μ, T) and a measurable set A with $\mu(A) = \bar{d}(E) > 0$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$\bar{d}(E \cap (E - n_1) \cap \dots \cap (E - n_k)) \geq \mu(A \cap T^{-n_1} A \cap \dots \cap T^{-n_k} A).$$

Combining Corollary 1.35 with Theorem 1.36 yields the following combinatorial application saying that large subsets of the positive integers contain many configurations of the form $\{m, m+n, m+\Omega(n)\}$.

Corollary 1.37. *Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a set of upper density $\delta > 0$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{(n, m) \in [1, N] \times [1, M] : m, m+n, m+\Omega(n) \in E\}|}{NM} \geq \delta^3 - \varepsilon.$$

In particular, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\{m, m+n, m+\Omega(n)\} \subseteq E$$

holds for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ in a set of positive upper density.

Remark 1.38. All the results in this subsection concerning the sequences n and $\Omega(n)$ (or n and $a(n)$, where a is as in Corollary 1.33) remain true if we replace the sequence n with any polynomial with no constant term. The same proof that we will give for n works for such polynomials, utilising also Weyl's equidistribution theorem for polynomials (see [Wey16]).

1.6. Proof ideas

We conclude the introduction with a brief discussion about the ideas and tools that are used to prove our main theorems.

Proof of Theorem A: For the proof of the pretentious mean ergodic theorem and in fact, for the proof of its weighted version (Theorem 1.14), we combine ideas and methods from ergodic theory and number theory. For the rest of this paragraph we consider a finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) . First, we prove a decomposition result in Theorem 3.1, according to which we can split $L^2(X)$ into \mathcal{H}_f and \mathcal{V}_f , for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, where \mathcal{H}_f is the subspace of $L^2(X)$ defined in Definition 1.13 (i) and \mathcal{V}_f is the closed subspace of $L^2(X)$ consisting of functions whose weighted ergodic averages converge to zero. This allows us to reduce the proof of Theorem 1.14 to dealing with weighted ergodic averages of pretentious eigenfunctions. To handle these, we adapt a classical convolution idea, that was used in [Del83] to calculate mean values of multiplicative functions in the pretentious case, to our setting. Now, to prove the decomposition $L^2(X) = \mathcal{H}_f \oplus \mathcal{V}_f$ in Theorem 3.1, we first show that $\mathcal{H}_f \perp \mathcal{V}_f$ (Proposition 3.3) and then that $\mathcal{H}_f^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{V}_f$ (Proposition 3.4). To prove the latter we use a similar method to the one used to prove such results in additive systems, and the main tools we use are the spectral theorem on unitary multiplicative actions (see Theorem A.2) along with Theorem 1.1. To establish the orthogonality of \mathcal{H}_f and \mathcal{V}_f , all we have to do is prove that if the averages of form $\overline{f(n)}S_n F$ are zero, then the same averages over a set of \mathcal{P} -free numbers, where $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ contains a few primes, is also zero (see Corollary 3.7). Its proof is quite technical and involves some number-theoretic ideas along with a simple approximation argument.

Proof of Theorem B: The proof of “ T, S are jointly ergodic $\implies \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$ ” does not rely on any of the new results that we develop on multiplicative systems. We only use Theorem A.2 along with some number-theoretic results concerning correlations of linear phases with multiplicative functions pretending to be some Dirichlet character. The proof of converse implication is more interesting and challenging, as it heavily depends on some of the new results on multiplicative systems. The critical idea in this proof is the use of decomposition theorems for both actions. We want to show that Cesàro averages of $T^n F \cdot S_n F$ converge to the product of the integrals of F and G . Assuming that the integral of G is zero, we want to show that the above averages converge to zero. Using the classical decomposition result in (1.10), we can write $F = F_{\text{tot.erg}} + F_{\text{rat}}$. Using an orthogonality criterion (Lemma 2.15), we deduce that the totally ergodic component has zero contribution to the averages in question, hence we only have to deal with the averages of $T^n F_{\text{rat}} \cdot S_n G$. Now, using the decomposition result for the multiplicative action given in Theorem 1.28, we can write $G = G_{\text{aper}} + G_{\text{pr.rat}}$. Then we are reduced to handling the averages of $T^n F_{\text{rat}} \cdot S_n G_{\text{aper}}$ and $T^n F_{\text{rat}} \cdot S_n G_{\text{pr.rat}}$. By some simple calculations, we easily see that the averages of the former expression converge to zero, while for the averages of the latter one we employ our spectral assumption along with some number-theoretic input.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Florian K. Richter for his invaluable guidance and support throughout the writing of this paper, as well as Ethan Ackelsberg, Vitaly Bergelson, Felipe Hernández Castro and Nikos Frantzikinakis for their useful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts. The author gratefully acknowledges support from the Swiss National Science Foundation grant TMSGI2-211214.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Basics in multiplicative systems

Lemma 2.1 (Triangle inequalities for the distance). *Let (X, μ, S) be a multiplicative system. Then the following hold for any $F, G \in L^2(X)$ and for any $f, g \in \mathcal{M}^c$:*

- (i) $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) \leq \mathbb{D}_F(S, g) + \|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}(f, g)$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{D}(f, g) \leq \frac{1}{\|F\|_2} (\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) + \mathbb{D}_F(S, g))$.
- (iii) $\mathbb{D}_{F+G}(S, f) \leq \mathbb{D}_F(S, f) + \mathbb{D}_G(S, f)$.
- (iv) $\mathbb{D}_{FG}(S, fg) \leq \|G\|_2 \mathbb{D}_F(S, f) + \|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}_G(S, g)$.

All the triangle inequalities are also true for the partial distances up to any $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The proofs of all the triangle inequalities are identical, so we just prove the first one.

By the triangle inequality for the $L^2(X)$ norm and by expanding the square and then by using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the middle term, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|S_p F - f(p)F\|_2^2}{p} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{(\|S_p F - g(p)F\|_2 + \|F\|_2 |f(p) - g(p)|)^2}{p} \\ &\leq \mathbb{D}_F(S, g)^2 + 2\|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}_F(S, f) \mathbb{D}(f, g) + \mathbb{D}_F(f, g)^2 = (\mathbb{D}_F(S, g) + \|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}(f, g))^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

Given a multiplicative system (X, μ, S) , $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$ and $F \in L^2(X)$ with $\|F\|_2 \leq 1$, we have that

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 \leq \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|S_p F - f(p)F\|_2}{p} \leq 4\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2, \quad (2.1)$$

and also for any $f, g \in \mathcal{M}^c$, we have that

$$\mathbb{D}(f, g)^2 \leq \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{|f(p) - g(p)|}{p} \leq 4\mathbb{D}(f, g)^2, \quad (2.2)$$

This can be easily checked, since for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| \leq 1$, it holds: $\frac{1}{2}|z - 1|^2 \leq |z - 1| \leq 2|z - 1|^2$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system and $F \in L^2(X)$ be a pretentious eigenfunction. Then the set of all pretentious eigenvalues for S corresponding to F is exactly \mathcal{A}_f , where f is any pretentious eigenvalue corresponding to F .*

Proof. Fix a pretentious eigenvalue f corresponding to F and let $g \in \mathcal{A}_f$. Then by the first triangle inequality, we have that $\mathbb{D}_F(S, g) \leq \mathbb{D}_F(S, f) + \|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty$, by assumption. On the other hand, let $g \in \mathcal{M}^c$ be a pretentious eigenvalue of S corresponding to F . Then by Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have that $\mathbb{D}(f, g) \leq \frac{1}{\|F\|_2} (\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) + \mathbb{D}_F(S, g)) < \infty$, by assumption. This shows that $g \in \mathcal{A}_f$, concluding the proof. □

Remark 2.3. In view of Lemma 2.2, whenever we consider a pretentious rational eigenvalue $f \notin \mathcal{A}_1$, we can assume that it is a Dirichlet character. Moreover, we may also assume that this Dirichlet character is primitive.

To see why the latter is true, let χ be a Dirichlet character mod q that is a pretentious rational eigenvalue and let χ_1 the unique primitive Dirichlet character inducing χ with modulus q_1 . Then $q_1 \mid q$ and we have

$$\chi(n) = \begin{cases} \chi_1(n), & \text{if } (n, q) = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\mathbb{D}(\chi_1, \chi) < \infty$, and by the first triangle inequality, it follows that χ_1 is a pretentious rational eigenfunction corresponding to the same pretentious rational eigenfunction as χ .

Consider an arbitrary finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) . It is not hard to see that for any $F \in L^2(X)$ and any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ if $S_p F = f(p)F$ for almost every prime, then F is a pretentious eigenfunction with pretentious eigenvalue f . In the next lemma, we show that the converse is also true.

Lemma 2.4. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. For any $F \in L^2(X)$ and any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$ if and only if $S_p F = f(p)F$ for almost every prime. In other words, $\mathcal{H}_f = \{F \in L^2(X) : S_p F = f(p)F \text{ for almost every prime}\}$.*

This lemma provides us with a powerful characterisation of pretentious eigenvalues that we will use several times in what follows (without explicitly referring to the lemma every time). However, we avoid using it when it is not necessary. Moreover, it yields a similar result for multiplicative functions (Lemma B.2) as an immediate consequence.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c, F \in \mathcal{H}_f$ and we shall show that $S_p F = f(p)F$ holds for almost every prime. Consider integers k, ℓ , measure-preserving transformations T_1, \dots, T_ℓ and a partition of primes $(\mathcal{P}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ with $\mathcal{P}_i = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p = T_i\}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, such that for any $1 \leq i \leq k$ we have $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i} \frac{1}{p} = \infty$ and for any $k+1 \leq i \leq \ell$ we have $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$. Moreover, there exist some integer $m \geq 1$, distinct $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{C}$ and a partition of primes $(\mathcal{P}'_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ with $\mathcal{P}'_j = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : f(p) = a_j\}$, such that for any $1 \leq j \leq m$ we have $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}'_j} \frac{1}{p} = \infty$. Here we have assumed that none of the finitely many values a_1, \dots, a_m of f is taken in a set $\mathcal{P}'_j \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ containing a few primes. We are allowed to do so, because otherwise, we can always find g that is close to f and satisfies this assumption, and we know that then $\mathcal{H}_f = \mathcal{H}_g$.

Now consider the partition $\{\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_j : 1 \leq i \leq \ell, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ of the primes and let

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{\substack{k+1 \leq i \leq \ell \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_j.$$

Clearly, $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \ell \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_j} \frac{\|S_p F - f(p)F\|_2^2}{p} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \|T_i F - a_j F\|_2^2 \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_j} \frac{1}{p} + \text{O}(1). \quad (2.3)$$

Claim. For any $1 \leq i \leq k$ there exists a unique $1 \leq j(i) \leq m$ such that $|\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_{j(i)}| = \infty$.

Proof of Claim. Fix $1 \leq i \leq k$. Assume for contradiction that for any $1 \leq j \leq m$, $|\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_j| < \infty$. Since $(\mathcal{P}'_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ is a partition of primes, it follows that $|\mathcal{P}_i| < \infty$, yielding a contradiction. Thus, there exists some j satisfying the claim. Now suppose again for contradiction that there exist $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq m$ such that $|\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_{j_1}| = |\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_{j_2}| = \infty$. Then we have, by (2.3), that $a_{j_1} F = T_i F = a_{j_2} F$, since otherwise we would have $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) = \infty$. It follows that $a_{j_1} = a_{j_2}$, yielding a contradiction, and concluding the proof of the claim. \triangle

Note that the Claim implies that $m \leq k$. Moreover, by the Claim, for any $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we have that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i} \frac{1}{p} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_j} \frac{1}{p} = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_{j(i)}} \frac{1}{p} + \text{O}(1),$$

and since $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i} \frac{1}{p} = \infty$, it follows that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_{j(i)}} \frac{1}{p} = \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

Using the Claim again, (2.3) becomes

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \|T_i F - a_{j(i)} F\|_2^2 \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_{j(i)}} \frac{1}{p} + O(1). \quad (2.5)$$

Combining (2.4) and (2.5), and using that $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$, we have that $T_i F = a_{j(i)} F$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, we proved that if $S_p F \neq f(p)F$, then p must belong in the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}} := \mathcal{P} \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq j(i)}} \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_j \right),$$

which is exactly the complement of $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} \mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}'_{j(i)}$. Then it follows that $\sum_{p \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$. This concludes the proof. \square

We continue with some useful results concerning the spectral measures of L^2 functions in multiplicative systems (see Theorem A.2). Throughout, we consider \mathcal{M}^c equipped with the pointwise convergence topology and the Borel σ -algebra. Moreover, the set \mathcal{A}_f , for any $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$, is Borel measurable. To see why, observe that for any $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$ and any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $\mathbb{D}(\cdot, f; N)$ is continuous, hence the set $\{g \in \mathcal{M}^c : \mathbb{D}(g, f; N) \leq k\}$ is Borel measurable for any integer $k \geq 0$. It follows that $\{g \in \mathcal{M}^c : \mathbb{D}(g, f) \leq k\}$ is Borel measurable for any $k \geq 0$ and then \mathcal{A}_f is also Borel measurable, as a countable union of Borel measurable sets.

Now, for any multiplicative system (X, μ, S) and any $F \in L^2(X)$, we denote by μ_F the unique finite Borel measure in \mathcal{M}^c satisfying

$$\langle S_n F, F \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{M}^c} f(n) \, d\mu_F(f).$$

Moreover, for any finite Borel measure ν on \mathcal{M}^c , we define, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $e_n \in L^2(\mathcal{M}^c, \nu)$, $e_n(f) := f(n)$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let (X, μ, S) be a multiplicative system, $F \in L^2(X)$ and consider a measurable set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}^c$ such that $\mu_F(\mathcal{A}) > 0$. Then there exists $G \in L^2(X)$ such that μ_G is supported on \mathcal{A} .*

Proof. We may assume that $\|F\|_2 = 1$ and we will find $G \in L^2(X)$ with $\|G\|_2 = 1$ such that μ_G is supported on \mathcal{A} . By Theorem A.2, there is a unitary isomorphism Φ from $L^2(\mathcal{M}^c, \mu_F)$ to the cyclic sub-representation of $L^2(X)$ which is generated by F . Consider the non-zero function $\mu_F(\mathcal{A})^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \in L^2(\mathcal{M}^c, \mu_F)$ and let $G \in L^2(X)$ be the image of this element under Φ . This isomorphism also conjugates S_n to multiplication by e_n for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, applying Theorem A.2 twice, first for G and then for F , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}^c} f(n) \, d\mu_G(f) &= \int_X S_n G \cdot \overline{G} \, d\mu = \int_{\mathcal{M}^c} f(n) \mu_F(\mathcal{A})^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(f) \overline{\mu_F(\mathcal{A})^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(f)} \, d\mu_F(f) \\ &= \mu_F(\mathcal{A})^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{A}} f(n) \, d\mu_F(f) = \int_{\mathcal{M}^c} f(n) \, d(\mu_F(\mathcal{A})^{-1} \mu_F|_{\mathcal{A}})(f). \end{aligned}$$

By uniqueness of the spectral measure, it follows that $\mu_G = \mu_F(\mathcal{A})^{-1} \mu_F|_{\mathcal{A}}$, and hence we have that

μ_G is supported on \mathcal{A} . Moreover, using again Theorem A.2, it is easy to check that $\|G\|_2 = 1$. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. Then, for any $F \in L^2(X)$, the spectral measure μ_F of F is supported on $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$.*

Proof. Suppose that for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $S_p \in \{T_1, \dots, T_d\}$, for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and some measure preserving transformations T_1, \dots, T_d on X . Let $F \in L^2(X)$, let μ_F be its spectral measure with respect to the (\mathbb{N}, \times) action S , and let ν_F be its spectral measure with respect to the $(\mathbb{N}^d, +)$ action induced by T_1, \dots, T_d . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S_n F = T_1^{k_1} \dots T_d^{k_d} F$. Therefore, by applying Theorem A.2 for S and Theorem A.1 for S_n , it follows that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}^c} f(n) \, d\mu_F(f) = \int_X S_n F \cdot \overline{F} \, d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} e(k_1 x_1 + \dots + k_d x_d) \, d\nu_F(x_1, \dots, x_d).$$

This defines a map $\eta : (\mathbb{N}, \times) \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}^d, +)$, which induces a map $\widehat{\eta} : \mathbb{T}^d = \widehat{(\mathbb{N}^d, +)} \rightarrow \widehat{(\mathbb{N}, \times)} = \mathcal{M}^c$ such that η maps the measure ν_F to the measure μ_F . The map η is given by $\widehat{\eta}(x_1, \dots, x_d)(n) = e(\langle (x_1, \dots, x_d), \eta(n) \rangle_{(\mathbb{N}^d, +)})$, where $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{(\mathbb{N}^d, +)} := x_1 y_1 + \dots + x_d y_d$ for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d), \mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$. By assumption, the map η is finitely generated, since for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}^c} f(p) \, d\mu_F(f) \in \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}} e(x_i) \, d(\nu_F)_i : i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \right\},$$

where $(\nu_F)_i$ is the projection of the measure ν_F on the i -th coordinate (or equivalently, the spectral measure of F with respect to T_i). Therefore, $\widehat{\eta}$ is finitely generated. Moreover, since μ_F is the push-forward of ν_F with respect to $\widehat{\eta}$, it follows that μ_F is supported on a subset of $\widehat{\eta}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and any $f \in \widehat{\eta}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is finitely generated. The result then follows. \square

It follows from the previous lemma that for any finitely generated multiplicative system and any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have

$$\langle S_n F, F \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} f(n) \, d\mu_F(f).$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. For any $F \in L^2(X)$ and any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mathbb{D}(g, f)^2 \, d\mu_F(g). \quad (2.6)$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\mathcal{H}_f \subseteq \{F \in L^2(X) : \mu_F \text{ is supported on } \mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c\} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{H}_f}. \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. Let $F \in L^2(X)$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. We may assume that $\|F\|_2 = 1$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, by Theorem A.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_F(S, f; N)^2 &= \sum_{p \leq N} \frac{\|F\|_2^2 - \text{Re}\langle S_p F, f(p) F \rangle}{p} = \sum_{p \leq N} \frac{1 - \text{Re}\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} g(p) \overline{f(p)} \, d\mu_F(g)\right)}{p} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mathbb{D}(g, f; N)^2 \, d\mu_F(g). \end{aligned}$$

For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\Psi_N, \Psi : \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, by $\Psi_N(g) = \mathbb{D}(g, f; N)^2$, $\Psi(g) = \mathbb{D}(g, f)^2$. Then $(\Psi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence converging pointwise to Ψ , so by the monotone convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mathbb{D}(g, f; N)^2 d\mu_F(g) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mathbb{D}(g, f)^2 d\mu_F(g).$$

This completes the proof of (2.6).

Now we prove (2.7). The first inclusion is immediate by (2.6). Thus, we show the second inclusion. Let F, f be as above and assume that μ_F is supported on $\mathcal{A}'_f := \mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. For any integer $k \geq 0$, we define the Borel measurable set $\mathcal{A}'_{f,k} = \{g \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c : \mathbb{D}(g, f) \leq k\}$. Since the sequence $(\mathcal{A}'_{f,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing and the union of all the sets in the sequence is the set \mathcal{A}'_f , we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_F(\mathcal{A}'_{f,k}) = \mu_F(\mathcal{A}'_f) = 1,$$

hence $\mu_F(\mathcal{A}'_{f,k}) \geq 1/2$ for all sufficiently large k . Therefore, we may assume that $\mu_F(\mathcal{A}'_{f,k}) \geq 1/2 > 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. Consider the unitary isomorphism Φ from $L^2(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c, \mu_F)$ to the cyclic sub-representation of $L^2(X)$ which is generated by F , as guaranteed by Theorem A.2. For each $k \geq 0$, we let $F_k = \Phi(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}'_{f,k}})$, and since $\mu_F(\mathcal{A}'_{f,k}) > 0$, then, as we did in the proof of Lemma 2.5, we can show that μ_{F_k} is supported on $\mathcal{A}'_{f,k}$. Then, by (2.6), we have that $\mathbb{D}_{F_k}(S, f) \leq k$, hence $F_k \in \mathcal{H}_f$ for all $k \geq 0$. Now, by the dominated convergence theorem, we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|F_k - F\|_2^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_X |F_k - F|^2 d\mu = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_X |\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}'_{f,k}} - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}'_f}|^2 d\mu = 0.$$

This shows that $F \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$, establishing the second conclusion. The proof of (2.7), and hence the proof of the lemma, is complete. \square

Remark 2.8. In any finitely generated multiplicative system, (2.7) implies that all the pretentious eigenvalues are finitely generated.

Now we establish some interesting properties of the subspaces \mathcal{H}_f .

Lemma 2.9. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system and $f \in \mathcal{M}^c$. Then \mathcal{H}_f is a subspace of $L^2(X)$.*

Proof. Let $F, G \in \mathcal{H}_f$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. By the third triangle inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{D}_{aF+bG}(S, f) \leq |b| \|G\|_2 \mathbb{D}_{aF}(S, f) + |a| \|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}_{bG}(S, f) = |b| \|G\|_2 \mathbb{D}_F(S, f) + |a| \|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}_G(S, f) < \infty.$$

Thus, $aF + bG \in \mathcal{H}_f$. This shows that \mathcal{H}_f is a subspace of $L^2(X)$. \square

Lemma 2.10. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system and $f, g \in \mathcal{M}^c$. Then $\mathcal{H}_f = \mathcal{H}_g$ if and only if $\mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty$. In fact, if $\mathbb{D}(f, g) = \infty$, then $\mathcal{H}_f \perp \mathcal{H}_g$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\|F\|_2, \|G\|_2 \leq 1$.

Suppose first that $\mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty$. Then by the first triangle inequality, it follows that $\mathcal{H}_f = \mathcal{H}_g$.

Now suppose that $\mathbb{D}(f, g) = \infty$. Let $F \in \mathcal{H}_f$ and $G \in \mathcal{H}_g$. Suppose, for sake of contradiction, that $\langle F, G \rangle \neq 0$. We have that

$$\langle F, G \rangle (1 - \overline{f(p)g(p)}) = \langle S_p F - f(p)F, S_p G \rangle + \langle f(p)F, S_p G - g(p)G \rangle,$$

hence, by the triangle inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{|\langle F, G \rangle (1 - f(p)\overline{g(p)})|}{p} \leq \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|S_p F - f(p)F\|_2 \|G\|_2}{p} + \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\|F\|_2 \|S_p G - g(p)G\|_2}{p},$$

which, in view of (2.1) and (2.2) gives that

$$|\langle F, G \rangle| \mathbb{D}(f, g)^2 \leq 4\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 + 4\mathbb{D}_G(S, g)^2.$$

Since $\langle F, G \rangle \neq 0$, the left-hand side of the above diverges, while the right-hand side converges, by assumption. This yields a contradiction. Therefore, $\langle F, G \rangle = 0$, showing that $\mathcal{H}_f \perp \mathcal{H}_g$. \square

The following remark concerning the subspaces \mathcal{H}_f and constant functions will be useful later.

Remark 2.11. Given a multiplicative system (X, μ, S) , for any constant function $F \in L^2(X)$, we have that $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 = \|F\|_2^2 \mathbb{D}(f, 1)^2$. So, in finitely generated systems, we have that \mathcal{H}_f contains the constants if $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) < \infty$, and it does not contain any constant otherwise.

In Proposition 1.10, we saw that in any finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) , $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$ coincides with the square-integrable $\sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})$ -measurable functions. In the next lemma, we see that \mathcal{I}_{pr} is an algebra, and this fact will be useful to show that Theorem A implies Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.12. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system. Then \mathcal{I}_{pr} is an algebra.*

Proof. To show that \mathcal{I}_{pr} is an algebra, we show that it contains X and it is closed under complements and finite intersections:

- $\mathbb{1}_X = 1$ and so $X \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}$.
- Let $A \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{1}_{A^c}}(S, 1)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\mu(S_p^{-1} A^c \Delta A^c)}{p} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\mu(S_p^{-1} A \Delta A)}{p} = \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{1}_A}(S, 1)^2 < \infty,$$

hence, $A^c \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}$.

- Let $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}$. Then we have

$$\left(S_p^{-1} \bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i \right) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_j \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^k (S_p^{-1} A_j \setminus A_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i \right) \setminus \left(S_p^{-1} \bigcap_{j=1}^k A_j \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^k (A_j \setminus S_p^{-1} A_j),$$

hence we have

$$\left(S_p^{-1} \bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i \right) \Delta \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_j \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^k (S_p^{-1} A_j \Delta A_j).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{1}_{\bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i}}(S, 1)^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\mu((S_p^{-1} \bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i) \Delta (\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_j))}{p} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\mu(S_p^{-1} A_j \Delta A_j)}{p} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{1}_{A_j}}(S, 1)^2 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

The next result is a simple lemma that provides us with characterisations for aperiodic systems and aperiodic L^2 functions.

Lemma 2.13. *Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system and $F \in L^2(X)$. Then the following are equivalent for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$:*

- (i) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_{qn+r} F = \int_X F \, d\mu$ in $L^2(X)$, for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (ii) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e(\frac{rn}{q}) S_n F = \begin{cases} \int_X F \, d\mu, & \text{if } q \mid r, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ in $L^2(X)$, for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (iii) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) S_n F = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \int_X F \, d\mu, & \text{if } \chi = \chi_0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ in $L^2(X)$, for any Dirichlet character χ of modulus q , where χ_0 denotes the principal character of this modulus.⁸

This lemma is proved in the Appendix C.

2.2. An orthogonality criterion

The following lemma is a variant of a classical result of Kátai concerning complex-valued arithmetic functions (see [Dab75, Lemma 1], [Kát86, Eq. (3.1)], [BSZ13, Theorem 2]; see also [FH17, Proposition 9.5]), which we are stating for arbitrary Hilbert spaces.

Lemma 2.14. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and $A(n) \in \mathcal{H}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a set of positive relative density⁹ such that for any distinct $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \langle A(p_1 n), A(p_2 n) \rangle = 0,$$

then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N A(n) \right\| = 0.$$

If $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}$, then Lemma 2.14 reduces to the classical statement of the lemma whose proof can be found in the above mentioned references. Replacing the complex-valued arithmetic function with an arithmetic function taking values on a Hilbert space, and the modulus with the norm on this Hilbert space, does not affect the proof at all, hence there is no need to repeat it here.

As a consequence we obtain the following orthogonality criterion that is a key ingredient in proving Theorem B.

Lemma 2.15. *Let (X, μ) be probability space, T be an additive and S be a finitely generated multiplicative action on (X, μ) . Let also $b : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and $F \in L^2(X)$ with $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. If for any distinct $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{P}$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \int_X T^{b(p_1 n) - b(p_2 n)} F \cdot \bar{F} \, d\mu = 0,$$

then for any $G \in L^2(X)$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^{b(n)} F \cdot S_n G \right\|_2 = 0.$$

⁸ χ_0 always stands for a principal character.

⁹We say that the set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ has positive relative density if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]|}{\pi(N)}$ exists and is positive, where $\pi(N) := |\{p \in \mathbb{P} : p \leq N\}|$.

Proof. First, note that we may assume that $|G| \leq 1$ and then using that any such G can be written as $G = \frac{1}{2}(G_1 + G_2)$ for some G_1, G_2 with $|G_1| = |G_2| = 1$, we may further assume that $|G| = 1$. Since S is finitely generated, there exist invertible measure-preserving transformations T_1, \dots, T_d on (X, μ) such that $\{S_p : p \in \mathbb{P}\} = \{T_1, \dots, T_d\}$. We define for each $1 \leq i \leq d$ the set $\mathcal{P}_i = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p = T_i\}$ and then we have $\mathbb{P} = \bigcup_{i=1}^d \mathcal{P}_i$. It follows that there exists some $1 \leq i_0 \leq d$ such that $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}_{i_0}$ has positive relative density. We now define $A(n) = T^{b(n)}F \cdot S_n G$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and then, in view of Lemma 2.14, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \langle A(p_1 n), A(p_2 n) \rangle = 0 \quad \forall p_1 \neq p_2 \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (2.8)$$

For any distinct $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(p_1 n), A(p_2 n) \rangle &= \int_X T^{b(p_1 n)} F \cdot T^{b(p_2 n)} \overline{F} \cdot S_n(T_{i_0} G) \cdot S_n(T_{i_0} \overline{G}) \, d\mu \\ &= \int_X T^{b(p_1 n)} F \cdot T^{b(p_2 n)} \overline{F} \cdot S_n(T_{i_0} |G|^2) \, d\mu \\ &= \int_X T^{b(p_1 n)} F \cdot T^{b(p_2 n)} \overline{F} \, d\mu = \int_X T^{b(p_1 n) - b(p_2 n)} F \cdot \overline{F} \, d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

thus, (2.8) holds, concluding the proof. \square

Remark 2.16. The proof of Lemma 2.14 is an application of the Turán-Kubilius inequality. Doing the proof, one could easily check that the assumption there could be weakened as follows: for any distinct $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ p_1, p_2 \nmid n}}^N \langle A(p_1 n), A(p_2 n) \rangle = 0.$$

Using this strengthened form of Lemma 2.14, Lemma 2.15 can be shown to hold in the more general case of S being weakly multiplicative.

3. Proof of the Results for Multiplicative Systems

3.1. Proof of Proposition 1.10

First we show that $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1} \subseteq L^2(X, \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}), \mu)$. It is enough to show that $\mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq L^2(X, \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}), \mu)$, and hence it suffices to show that functions of \mathcal{H}_1 are $\sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})$ -measurable.

Let $F \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and we may assume that it is real valued. Then $S_p F = F$ for almost every p . Let $A = \{x \in X : F(x) < a\}$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Notice that $S_p^{-1} A \Delta A \subseteq \{x \in X : F(S_p x) \neq F(x)\}$, thus for almost every prime we have $\mu(S_p^{-1} A \Delta A) = 0$. This implies that $A \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})$, which shows that F is $\sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})$ -measurable, establishing the first inclusion.

For the other inclusion, we claim that $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1} = L^2(X, \mathcal{C}, \mu)$, for some sub- σ -algebra \mathcal{C} of the Borel and then we will show that $\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. By [FK91, Lemma 3.1], the claim is equivalent to the following statement: $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$ is a closed subspace of $L^2(X)$, containing the constants, and there is a set of bounded functions \mathcal{U} that is dense in $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$, such that for any $F, G \in \mathcal{U}$, we have $FG \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$ is indeed a closed subspace of $L^2(X)$ and the fact that it contains the constants can be readily checked, it is enough to show the last assertion.

Let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{H}_1 \cap L^\infty(X)$. This is a set of bounded functions that is dense in $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$. Let $F, G \in \mathcal{U}$. Then $\mathbb{D}_F(S, 1) < \infty, \mathbb{D}_G(S, 1) < \infty$ and $FG \in L^2(X)$. Then, by the third triangle inequality in Lemma 2.1,

we have that

$$\mathbb{D}_{FG}(S, 1) \leq \|G\|_2 \mathbb{D}_F(S, 1) + \|F\|_2 \mathbb{D}_G(S, 1) < \infty,$$

which shows that $FG \in \mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$.

We have proved that $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1} = L^2(X, \mathcal{C}, \mu)$ for some σ -algebra \mathcal{C} . Now observe that by the definition of \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{I}_{pr} , we have that $\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, and then $\sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Hence, $L^2(X, \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}), \mu) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$. This concludes the proof.

3.2. Proof of Theorem A

We will now prove Theorem 1.14, which implies Theorem A. For the rest of this subsection, we fix a finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, S) . For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, we define \mathcal{V}_f to be the closed subspace of $L^2(X)$ given by

$$\mathcal{V}_f := \left\{ F \in L^2(X) : \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 = 0 \right\}.$$

The fact that this a closed subspace can be easily checked. We begin by proving the following decomposition result.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, we have*

$$L^2(X) = \overline{\mathcal{H}_f} \oplus \mathcal{V}_f.$$

Combining Lemma 2.10 and Theorem 3.1 we have that for any $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ with $\mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty$, it holds that $\mathcal{V}_f = \mathcal{V}_g$. In other words, we have the following:

Corollary 3.2. *For any $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ with $\mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty$ and any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) S_n F = 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(X)$$

if and only if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N g(n) S_n F = 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(X).$$

To prove Theorem 3.1, we split it into the following two propositions.

Proposition 3.3. *For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, we have $\mathcal{H}_f \perp \mathcal{V}_f$.*

Proposition 3.4. *Let $F \in L^2(X)$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. If $F \perp \mathcal{H}_f$, then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 = 0.$$

Consequently, we have $\mathcal{H}_f^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{V}_f$.

We remark that we shall not need the full strength of Theorem 3.1 to prove Theorem 1.14, as Proposition 3.4 is enough. Nevertheless, the full strength of Theorem 3.1 will be useful in the proof of Theorem 1.28.

We start with the proof of Proposition 3.3, for which we need several preliminary results that we

are going to state and prove below.

For simplicity we adopt the notation $\mathbb{E}_{n \in A} a(n) := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{n \in A} a(n)$ for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and any arithmetic function a . For any $F \in L^2(X)$, any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ and any $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbb{E}_{n \in A \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F\|_2$ exists always, and it is a function in $L^2(X)$. We denote this function by $\mathbb{E}_{n \in A} \overline{f(n)} S_n F$, that is to say that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in A} \overline{f(n)} S_n F := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{n \in A \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2.$$

In addition, whenever we write

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in A} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \mathbb{E}_{n \in B} \overline{g(n)} S_n G$$

for some $F, G \in L^2(X)$, some $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, and some $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, it is implied that the equality is in $L^2(X)$, which means that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{n \in A \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F - \mathbb{E}_{n \in B \cap [1, N]} \overline{g(n)} S_n G \right\|_2 = 0.$$

Proposition 3.5. *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, $F \in \mathcal{V}_f$ and $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ be finite. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = 0.$$

Proof. The proof of the proposition consists of two steps. First, we write $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_s\}$, where $s = |\mathcal{P}| \in \mathbb{N}$.

Claim 1. For any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{(p_i - 1) \overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i + 1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^s S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right).$$

Proof of Claim 1. First we show that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F$ exists. To see this, by Theorem A.2, we have that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 = \frac{N}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|} \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} g(n) \right|^2 d\mu_F(g) \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.1)$$

Notice that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}$ is completely multiplicative and takes only two values, so, by [GS14, Corollary 2.1.12] the absolute value of the limit of the averages of $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} g(n)$ exists (and in fact, the mean value of this function also exists, since it is finitely generated). Then, using the dominated convergence theorem and (3.1), it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F$ and $\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F$ exist, and moreover, they satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \frac{1}{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}})} \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F.$$

Now we prove the claim by induction on $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $s = 1$ and then we write $\mathcal{P} = \{p\}$. Notice that we can express the natural numbers as

$$\mathbb{N} = \bigsqcup_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} p^k \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}},$$

where throughout we use the symbol \bigsqcup to denote a disjoint union. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{p^k \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p)^k}{p^k} S_{p^k} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p^k} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p)^k}{p^k} S_{p^k} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \leq N/p^k} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p)^k}{p^k} S_{p^k} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) \\
&= d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p)^k}{p^k} S_{p^k} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{(p-1)f(p)^k}{p^{k+1}} S_{p^k} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where all the limits are in $L^2(X)$. This proves the base case of the induction. Now let $s \geq 2$ and suppose that the statement is true for all the positive integers smaller than s . Let $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P} \setminus \{p_s\} = \{p_1, \dots, p_{s-1}\}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{s-1} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^{s-1} \frac{(p_i - 1) \overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right). \quad (3.2)$$

Now we notice that the set of \mathcal{P}' -free numbers can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'} = \bigsqcup_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} p_s^{k_s} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

Therefore, as we did in the base case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F &= \sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'}} \mathbb{1}_{p_s^{k_s} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p_s)^{k_s}}{p_s^{k_s}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'} \cap [1, N]|} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'} \cap [1, N/p_s^{k_s}]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p_s)^{k_s}}{p_s^{k_s}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'}} \mathbb{1}_{[1, N/p_s^{k_s}]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) \\
&= \sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p_s)^{k_s}}{p_s^{k_s}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}}(n) \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) \\
&= \frac{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}})}{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}'})} \sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{f(p_s)^{k_s}}{p_s^{k_s}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) \\
&= \sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{(p_s - 1) \overline{f(p_s)^{k_s}}}{p_s^{k_s+1}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right), \quad (3.3)
\end{aligned}$$

where all the limits are taken in $L^2(X)$. Substituting (3.3) to (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \\
&= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{s-1} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^{s-1} \frac{(p_i - 1) \overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) \left(\sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{p_s - 1}{p_s^{k_s+1}} \overline{f(p_s)^{k_s}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{(p_i - 1) \overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^s S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction and concludes the proof of the claim. \triangle

Claim 2. For any function $G \in L^2(X)$ satisfying

$$\sum_{k_1, \dots, k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{\overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^s S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) G = 0,$$

it holds that $G = 0$.

Proof of Claim 2. We also prove this claim by induction on $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $s = 1$ and then we write $\mathcal{P} = \{p\}$. Then for any $G \in L^2(X)$, we have that

$$0 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{\overline{f(p)^k}}{p^{k+1}} S_{p^k} G = \frac{1}{p} S_1 G + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\overline{f(p)^k}}{p^{k+1}} S_{p^k} G = \frac{1}{p} S_1 G + \frac{1}{p} S_1 \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{\overline{f(p)^k}}{p^{k+1}} S_{p^k} G \right) = \frac{1}{p} S_1 G$$

and therefore, $G = 0$. This proves the base case of the induction. Now let $s \geq 2$ and suppose that the statement is true for all positive integers smaller than s . Let $G \in L^2(X)$ satisfying the assumption of the claim. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{\overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^s S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) G \\ &= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{s-1} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^{s-1} \frac{\overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) \left(\sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{\overline{f(p_s)^{k_s}}}{p_s^{k_s+1}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} G \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by induction hypothesis, it follows that the function $\tilde{G} := \sum_{k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \frac{\overline{f(p_s)^{k_s}}}{p_s^{k_s+1}} S_{p_s^{k_s}} G \in L^2(X)$ satisfies $\tilde{G} = 0$. Then, by the base case, this implies that $G = 0$, concluding the induction, and hence, the proof of the claim. \triangle

Since $F \in \mathcal{V}_f$, it follows by Claim 1 that

$$\sum_{k_1, \dots, k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{(p_i - 1) \overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^s S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) = 0$$

and so,

$$\sum_{k_1, \dots, k_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{\overline{f(p_i)^{k_i}}}{p_i^{k_i+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^s S_{p_i^{k_i}} \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right) = 0.$$

Then by applying Claim 2, for the function $G = \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F$, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = 0$. This concludes the proof of the proposition. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ containing a few primes. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a finite $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta = 1 - \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}})} + 1\right)^{-1} > 0$. Since $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$, there exists some $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P} \\ p > N_\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{p} < \delta.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \leq N_\varepsilon\}$ which is a finite subset of \mathcal{P} . Then we have

$$d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) = d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon}) - d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) = d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) \left(\frac{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon})}{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}})} - 1 \right) = d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-1} - 1 \right)$$

$$\leq d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) \left(\left(1 - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-1} - 1 \right) < d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) ((1 - \delta)^{-1} - 1) = \varepsilon.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 3.7. *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, $F \in \mathcal{V}_f$ and $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ containing a few primes. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n F = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$, then $d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) > 0$. Consider a finite set $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) < \frac{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}})\varepsilon}{4}$, as guaranteed by Lemma 3.6. Now by Proposition 3.5, for any N large (depending on ε), we have

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Then for any N large, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|} \left\| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|} \left\| \sum_{n \in (\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon}) \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \cap [1, N]|}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 + \frac{|(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) \cap [1, N]|}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|} \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 + 2 \frac{|(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) \cap [1, N]|}{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} S_n F \right\|_2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + 2 \frac{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}})}{d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}})} < \varepsilon.$$

Since ε was arbitrary, the result follows. \square

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.3, which will follow quite easily from Corollary 3.7.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, and let $F \in \mathcal{H}_f$ and $G \in \mathcal{V}_f$. Then the set $\mathcal{P} := \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p F \neq f(p)F\}$ satisfies $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$. It follows by Corollary 3.7 that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} \overline{f(n)} S_n G = 0$. So for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\langle F, G \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} \langle S_n F, S_n G \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} \langle f(n)F, S_n G \rangle = \left\langle F, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n G \right\rangle.$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$|\langle F, G \rangle| \leq \|F\|_2^2 \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} \overline{f(n)} S_n G \right\|_2^2.$$

Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, yields that $\langle F, G \rangle = 0$. This proves that $\mathcal{H}_f \perp \mathcal{V}_f$. \square

We continue by proving Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $F \in L^2(X)$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. Suppose that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 > 0.$$

Our goal is to show that $F \notin \mathcal{H}_f$. By Theorem A.2, it follows from the assumption that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N g(n) \overline{f(n)} \right|^2 d\mu_F(g) > 0,$$

where μ_F is the spectral measure of F . It follows by Theorem 1.1 that

$$\mu_F(\mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c) = \mu_F(\{g \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c : \mathbb{D}(g, f) < \infty\}) > 0.$$

Now we define the non-zero function $\delta_f \in L^2(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c, \mu_F)$ by

$$\delta_f(g) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } g \in \mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which satisfies $\int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \delta_f d\mu_F > 0$. Consider the unitary isomorphism Φ from $L^2(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c, \mu_F)$ to the cyclic sub-representation of $L^2(X)$ generated by F , as guaranteed by Theorem A.2. This isomorphism conjugates S_n to multiplication by e_n and also maps 1 to F . Let $G = \Phi(\delta_f) \in L^2(X)$. Then we have

$$\langle F, G \rangle = \langle 1, \delta_f \rangle_{L^2(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c, \mu_F)} = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \delta_f d\mu_F > 0.$$

By Theorem A.2 once again, we have that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} g(n) d\mu_G(g) = \int_X S_n G \cdot \overline{G} d\mu = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} g(n) \delta_f(g) \overline{\delta_f(g)} d\mu_F(g) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} g(n) d(\delta_f \mu_F)(g).$$

By uniqueness of the spectral measure, it follows that $\mu_G = \delta_f \mu_F$, which implies that μ_G is supported on $\mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. It follows by Lemma 2.7 that $G \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$, and since F and G are not orthogonal, we obtain that $F \notin \mathcal{H}_f$. This concludes the proof. \square

Recall that our goal is to prove Theorem 1.14. The following is an obvious corollary of Proposition 3.4, which will be useful to this end.

Corollary 3.8. *For any $F \in L^2(X)$ and any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n (P_f F) \right\|_2 = 0.$$

In view of Corollary 3.8, we see that in order to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.14, we need to calculate the ergodic averages $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F$, for $F \in \mathcal{H}_f$. In the next proposition, we do it for $F \in \mathcal{H}_f$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ and $F \in \mathcal{H}_f$. Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c}} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n F \quad \text{in } L^2(X),$$

where $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p F \neq f(p)F\}$.

Proof. We begin by defining a completely multiplicative sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $L^2(X)$ functions and a finitely generated completely multiplicative function h given by

$$G_p = \begin{cases} S_p F, & p \in \mathcal{P} \\ 0, & p \in \mathcal{P}^c \end{cases}, \quad \text{and} \quad h(p) = \begin{cases} 0, & p \in \mathcal{P} \\ f(p), & p \in \mathcal{P}^c \end{cases}$$

respectively. Then we observe that

$$S_n F = \sum_{ab=n} G_a \cdot h(b).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} \sum_{ab=n} G_a h(b) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^N \overline{f(a)} G_a \sum_{b \leq N/a} \overline{f(b)} h(b) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n \left(\mathbb{E}_{m \leq N/n} \overline{f(m)} h(m) \right) + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

We set $K(M) = \mathbb{E}_{m \leq M} \overline{f(m)} h(m)$ for any $M > 0$. For any positive integers $M < N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n K\left(\frac{N}{n}\right) - K(N) \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n \right\|_2 = \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n \left(K\left(\frac{N}{n}\right) - K(N) \right) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{n=1}^M \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n \left(K\left(\frac{N}{n}\right) - K(N) \right) \right\|_2 + \sum_{n=M+1}^N \left\| K\left(\frac{N}{n}\right) - K(N) \right\|_\infty \frac{|\overline{f(n)}|}{n} \|G_n\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^M \frac{1}{n} \left\| K\left(\frac{N}{n}\right) - K(N) \right\|_2 + 2 \sum_{n=M+1}^N \frac{\|G_n\|_2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $M < N$ so that $N/M \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n K\left(\frac{N}{n}\right) - K(N) \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n \right\|_2 \leq 2 \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n > M} \frac{\|G_n\|_2}{n} = 0,$$

since $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\|G_n\|_2}{n} = \|F\|_2 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c}} \frac{1}{n} = \|F\|_2 \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} \leq \|F\|_2 \exp\left(\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p}\right) < \infty$. Thus, for large N , we can rewrite (3.4) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F &= \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} h(n) \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} G_n \right) + o(1) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]} 1 \right) \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n F \right) + o(1) = \frac{|\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap [1, N]|}{N} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n F + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

where equalities are taken in $L^2(X)$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F = d(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c}} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n F = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c}} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n F \quad \text{in } L^2(X).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

We are now ready to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.14.

Proof of Theorem 1.14. In view of Corollary 3.8, it suffices to show that the convergence in Proposition 3.9 holds for functions in $\overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$.

Let $F \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists some $G \in \mathcal{H}_f$ such that $\|F - G\|_2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and let $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p G \neq f(p)G\}$. By Proposition 3.9, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n G - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n G \right\|_2 = 0.$$

Then by triangle inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n G \right\|_2 \\
& \leq \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n G \right\|_2 \\
& \quad + \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n G - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n G \right\|_2 \\
& \quad + \left\| \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n G - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n F \right\|_2 \\
& \leq \|F - G\|_2 + \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n G - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n G \right\|_2 \\
& \quad + \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \|F - G\|_2 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{1}{n} \\
& < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n G - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n G \right\|_2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{1}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

By sending $N \rightarrow \infty$, and using Euler products, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c} \cap [1, N]} \frac{\overline{f(n)}}{n} S_n G \right\|_2 \\
& \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}^c}} \frac{1}{n} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} = \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since ε was arbitrary, the result follows. \square

3.3. Proof of the corollaries of Theorem A

Proof of Corollary 1.15. (i) Let $F \in L^2(X)$ and we may assume that $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. Assume that $P_f F$ is constant. By Remark 2.11, we have that

$$P_f F = \int_X P_f F \, d\mu = \begin{cases} \int_X F \, d\mu, & \text{if } \mathbb{D}(f, 1) < \infty, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = 0.$$

It follows by Theorem 1.14 that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2 = 0$$

and the proof of (i) is complete.

(ii) Assuming that we have proved the result for zero integral functions, if F is any non-constant $L^2(X)$ function satisfying $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$, we define the non-constant, zero integral function $G = F - \int_X F \, d\mu$.

Then $\mathbb{D}_G(S, f) < \infty$ and so we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F - M(\overline{f}) \cdot \int_X F \, d\mu \right\|_2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n G \right\|_2 > 0.$$

Therefore it suffices to show it for zero integral functions. Let $F \in L^2(X)$ be such a function and suppose that $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$. It follows from Lemma 2.7 that μ_F is supported on $\mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. Then by Theorem A.2 and the dominated convergence theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2^2 &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} g(n) \right|^2 \, d\mu_F(g) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} |M(\overline{f}g)|^2 \, d\mu_F(g) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} |M(g)|^2 \, d\nu_F(g), \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $\nu_F = \overline{f} \mu_F$ and is supported on $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$.

Let $g \in \mathcal{A}_1$ be finitely generated. We define the function

$$h(p) := 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{g(p)}{p}\right)^{-1} = \frac{1 - g(p)}{p - g(p)} = \frac{p - pg(p) - \overline{g(p)} + 1}{|p - g(p)|^2},$$

and by Theorem 1.1, we have

$$|M(g)|^2 \gg \left| \prod_{p>5} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{g(p)}{p}\right)^{-1} \right|^2 = \left| \prod_{p>5} (1 - h(p)) \right|^2 = \exp \left(2 \sum_{p>5} \log |1 - h(p)| \right). \quad (3.6)$$

Now, we have that

$$\text{Re}(h(p)) = \frac{(p+1)(1 - \text{Re}(g(p)))}{|p - g(p)|^2} \leq 2 \frac{1 - \text{Re}(g(p))}{|p - g(p)|}, \quad (3.7)$$

and then clearly $\text{Re}(h(p)) \in [0, 1)$. Combining (3.6) and (3.7) and using the inequality $\log(1-x) \geq -\frac{x}{1-x}$ for $x \in [0, 1)$ and the fact that $x \mapsto -\frac{x}{1-x}$ is decreasing in $[0, 1)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |M(g)|^2 &\gg \exp \left(2 \sum_{p>5} \log(1 - \text{Re}(h(p))) \right) \geq \exp \left(-2 \sum_{p>5} \frac{\text{Re}(h(p))}{1 - \text{Re}(h(p))} \right) \\ &\geq \exp \left(-4 \sum_{p>5} \frac{1 - \text{Re}(g(p))}{|p - g(p)| - 2(1 - \text{Re}(g(p)))} \right) > \exp \left(-16 \sum_{p>5} \frac{1 - \text{Re}(g(p))}{p} \right) \\ &\geq \exp(-16\mathbb{D}(g, 1)^2), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where the second last inequality follows from that $|p - g(p)| - 2(1 - \text{Re}(g(p))) \geq p - 5 > \frac{p}{4}$ for all primes $p > 5$. It follows by (3.5) and (3.8) that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2^2 \gg \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \exp(-16\mathbb{D}(g, 1)^2) \, d\nu_F(g).$$

Then, by Jensen's inequality for the convex function e^{-x} , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \overline{f(n)} S_n F \right\|_2^2 &\gg \exp \left(-16 \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mathbb{D}(g, 1)^2 \, d\nu_F(g) \right) = \exp \left(-16 \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mathbb{D}(g, f)^2 \, d\mu_F(g) \right) \\ &= \exp(-16\mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.17. By Lemma 2.13, S is aperiodic if and only if for any Dirichlet character χ and any $F \in L^2(X)$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) S_n F = \begin{cases} \int_X F \, d\mu, & \text{if } \chi = \chi_0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, in view of Corollary 3.2, Theorem A and Corollary 1.11, it suffices to show that the following are equivalent:

- (a) For any $F \in L^2(X)$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) S_n F \right\|_2 = 0$ holds for all $\chi \neq \chi_0$.
- (b) $\mathcal{H}_\chi = \{0\}$ for all $\chi \neq \chi_0$.
- (c) $\sigma_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \mathcal{A}_1$.

(a) is equivalent to that $\mathcal{V}_\chi = L^2(X)$ for all $\chi \neq \chi_0$, which, in view of Theorem 3.1, is equivalent to (b). Now (b) and (c) are equivalent by definition. This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.18. At first, notice that (ii) and (iv) are obviously equivalent. Moreover, in view of Corollary 1.11, the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) follows from the equivalence:

$$\mathcal{H}_f = \{0\}, \forall f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fig}}^c \text{ with } \mathbb{D}(f, 1) = \infty \iff \sigma_{\text{pr}}(S) = \mathcal{A}_1,$$

which is true by definition. It remains to show that (i) and (iv) are equivalent.

(i) \implies (iv) Suppose that S is pretentiously weak-mixing, thus, $S \times S$ is pretentiously ergodic. We let $F \in L^2(X)$ be a pretentious eigenfunction with corresponding pretentious eigenvalue $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fig}}^c$ and we define the function $G \in L^2(X \times X)$ by $G(x, y) = F(x) \overline{F(y)}$. Then, by the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (S_p \times S_p)G - G \|_{L^2(X \times X)} \\ & \leq \| S_p F \otimes S_p \overline{F} - (f(p)F) \otimes S_p \overline{F} \|_{L^2(X \times X)} + \| (f(p)F) \otimes S_p \overline{F} - G \|_{L^2(X \times X)} \\ & = \| S_p F \otimes S_p \overline{F} - (f(p)F) \otimes S_p \overline{F} \|_{L^2(X \times X)} + \| (f(p)F) \otimes S_p \overline{F} - (f(p)F) \otimes \overline{(f(p)F)} \|_{L^2(X \times X)} \\ & = 2 \| F \|_2 \| S_p F - f(p)F \|_2, \end{aligned}$$

and then by (2.1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_G(S \times S, 1)^2 & \leq \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\| (S_p \times S_p)G - G \|_{L^2(X \times X)}^2}{p} \leq 4 \| F \|_2^2 \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{\| S_p F - f(p)F \|_2^2}{p} \leq 8 \| F \|_2^2 \mathbb{D}_F(S, f)^2 \\ & < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that G is pretentiously invariant with respect to $S \times S$, and then it follows by Corollary 1.11 that G is constant and hence, F is constant.

(iv) \implies (i) On the other hand, suppose that S has no non-constant pretentious eigenfunctions. It follows that $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_f$ also consists of constants. We want to show that for any $F \in L^2(X)$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \int_X S_n F \cdot \overline{F} \, d\mu - \int_X F \, d\mu \int_X \overline{F} \, d\mu \right| = 0.$$

which is an equivalent definition of S being pretentiously weak-mixing. It is enough to show this for non-constant functions with zero integral. Let $F \in L^2(X)$ be a non-constant function with $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. Since the averages of a sequence converge to zero if and only if the averages of the

square of the sequence converges to zero, it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \int_X S_n F \cdot \overline{F} \, d\mu \right|^2 = 0.$$

By Theorem A.2 and by expanding the square, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \int_X S_n F \cdot \overline{F} \, d\mu \right|^2 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} f(n) \, d\mu_F(f) \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} f(n) \, d\mu_F(f) \right) \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \overline{g(n)} \, d\mu_F(g) \right) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \times \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) \overline{g(n)} \, d(\mu_F \times \mu_F)(f, g). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

We claim that for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ we have $\mu_F(\mathcal{A}_f) = 0$. Suppose for contradiction that there exists some $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ such that $\mu_F(\mathcal{A}_f) > 0$. Then by Lemma 2.5, there exists a function $G \in L^2(X)$ such that $\mu_G(\mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c) = 1$. It can be seen by the proof of Lemma 2.5, that G is non-constant since F is non-constant. Since μ_G is supported on \mathcal{A}_f , then it follows by Lemma 2.7 that $G \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$, but this contradicts the fact that $\overline{\mathcal{H}_f}$ consists of constants. Now we define $\Delta = \{(f, g) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \times \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c : \mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty\}$. Then, by Tonelli's theorem, we have that

$$(\mu_F \times \mu_F)(\Delta) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \mu_F(\mathcal{A}_f) \, d\mu_F(f) = 0.$$

It follows by Theorem 1.1 that for any $(f, g) \in \text{supp}(\mu_F \times \mu_F)$, we have $M(f\overline{g}) = 0$. The result then follows by sending $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.9) and using the dominated convergence theorem. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.23. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ and consider (X, μ, S) to be the multiplicative rotation by f .

(i) In view of Corollary 1.11 it is enough to show that \mathcal{H}_1 consists of constants if and only if $\mathbb{D}(f^k, 1) = \infty$ for any $k < |X|$. Recall that $X = \overline{f(\mathbb{N})}$ and notice that this space is either \mathbb{S}^1 (if and only if $f(p) = e(\alpha)$ for $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and some irrational α), or finite (if and only if for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $f(p)$ is some rational phase). We treat each case separately:

(a) Suppose that $X = \mathbb{S}^1$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f^k \neq 1$. Moreover, the dual space of X is $\widehat{X} = \{x^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \simeq \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, $L^2(X)$ functions can be written as

$$F = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k x^k \quad \text{in } L^2(X), \quad (3.10)$$

where $c_k \in \mathbb{S}^1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose first that \mathcal{H}_1 consists of constants. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, the $L^2(X)$ function $F_k(x) = x^k$ satisfies $S_p F_k \neq F_k$ for many primes. But $S_p F_k = f(p)^k F_k$, hence $f(p)^k \neq 1$ for many primes. It follows that $\mathbb{D}(f^k, 1) = \infty$, and this holds for all $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. On the other hand, suppose that $\mathbb{D}(f^k, 1) = \infty$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. hence for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ as well. Let $F \in L^2(X)$, as in (3.10), be a pretentiously invariant function. We want to show that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, $c_k = 0$. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. By assumption, $f(p)^k \neq 1$ for many primes and also $S_p F = F$ for almost every prime. It follows that there exists some $p_0 \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $f(p_0)^k \neq 1$ and $S_{p_0} F = F$. Using (3.10), it is not hard to see that $S_{p_0} F = F$ implies that either $c_k = 0$ or $f(p_0)^k = 1$, but the latter case is excluded, therefore we have $c_k = 0$. This shows \mathcal{H}_1 consists of constants, concluding the proof in the first case.

(b) Suppose that X is finite. Then $f^{|X|} = 1$ and the dual space of X is $\widehat{X} = \{x^k : 0 \leq k < |X|\}$,

hence $L^2(X)$ functions are expressed in the form

$$F = \sum_{0 \leq k < |X|} c_k x^k \quad \text{in } L^2(X),$$

where $c_k \in \mathbb{S}^1$ for all $0 \leq k < |X|$. The proof now is identical to the previous case.

The proof of the (i) is complete.

(ii) In view of Corollary 1.17, and by using (i), we have to show that for any non-principal Dirichlet character χ , $\mathcal{H}_\chi = \{0\}$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{D}(f^k, \chi) = \infty$. The proof of this is identical to that of (i).

(iii) Clearly, the identity $F(x) = x$ is a non-constant pretentious eigenfunction, so in view of Corollary 1.18, S is not pretentiously weak-mixing. \square

Before we move to the proof of the next result we need the following lemma:

Lemma 3.10. *Let $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a finitely generated additive function. Then for any $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and for any Dirichlet character χ , we have $\mathbb{D}(e(a(n)\alpha), \chi) = \infty$.*

Proof. The non-zero values of any Dirichlet character $\chi \bmod q$ are the $\phi(q)$ -roots of unity. On the other hand, if α is an irrational number, then the function $e(a(n)\alpha)$ does not take values on the roots of unity at all. Hence $e(a(p)\alpha) \neq \chi(p)$ for almost every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and in particular, $\mathbb{D}(e(a(n)\alpha), \chi) = \infty$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.24. Let $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a finitely generated completely additive function, (X, μ, T) an additive system and consider the finitely generated multiplicative system (X, μ, T^a) .

(i) First, we observe that if \mathcal{H}_1 consists of constants, then the space of T -invariant functions also does. In view of Corollary 1.11, this implies that pretentious ergodicity of T^a implies ergodicity of T . Thus, assuming that (X, μ, T) is ergodic, it suffices to show that T^a is pretentiously ergodic if and only if a satisfies:

- for any $\frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\}$ with $(r, q) = 1$, $q \nmid a(p)$ holds for many primes, and
- $a(p) \neq 0$ for many primes.

Then, using Theorem A, Theorem A.1, Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 3.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T^a \text{ is pretentiously ergodic} &\iff \forall F \in L^2(X), \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^{a(n)} F = \int_X F \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X) \\ &\iff \forall \alpha \in \sigma(T) \setminus \{0\}, \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e(a(n)\alpha) = 0 \\ &\iff \forall \alpha \in \sigma(T) \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{D}(e(a(n)\alpha), 1) = \infty \\ &\iff \forall \frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\} \text{ with } (r, q) = 1, \mathbb{D}(e(a(n)\frac{r}{q}), 1) = \infty \\ &\iff \forall \frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\} \text{ with } (r, q) = 1, \text{ the set} \\ &\quad \mathcal{P} := \{p \in \mathbb{P} : a(p)\frac{r}{q} \notin \mathbb{Z}\} \text{ contains many primes,} \end{aligned}$$

and since we can express $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : a(p) \neq 0\} \cap \{p \in \mathbb{P} : q \nmid a(p)\}$, the result follows.

(ii) Similarly, assuming that (X, μ, T) is ergodic, it suffices to show that T^a is aperiodic if and only if $e(a(n)\alpha)$ is aperiodic for any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Then, using Theorem A.1, Theorem 1.1, Lemma B.1 and Lemma 3.10, we have:

$$T^a \text{ is aperiodic} \iff \forall F \in L^2(X), \forall r, q \in \mathbb{N}, \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^{a(qn+r)} F = \int_X F \, d\mu \quad \text{in } L^2(X)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iff \forall \alpha \in \sigma(T) \setminus \{0\}, \forall r, q \in \mathbb{N}, \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e(a(qn+r)\alpha) = 0 \\
&\iff \forall \alpha \in \sigma(T) \setminus \{0\}, \forall \chi, \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) e(a(n)\alpha) = 0 \\
&\iff \forall \alpha \in \sigma(T) \setminus \{0\}, \forall \chi, \mathbb{D}(e(a(n)\alpha), \chi) = \infty \\
&\iff \forall \alpha \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\}, \forall \chi, \mathbb{D}(e(a(n)\alpha), \chi) = \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which, in view of Theorem 1.1, is equivalent to that $e(a(n)\alpha)$ is aperiodic for any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$.

(iii) Finally, we have that T^a is pretentiously weak-mixing if and only if $T^a \times T^a = (T \times T)^a$ is pretentiously ergodic (by definition), which, in view of (i), is equivalent to that $T \times T$ is ergodic and a satisfies the condition in (i) which eventually, is equivalent to that T is weak-mixing and a satisfies the condition in (i). This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.26. (i) This follows from Corollary 1.24 (i).

(ii) Suppose that $a(p) = 1$ holds for almost every $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Suppose for sake of contradiction that there exist a Dirichlet character χ and some $\frac{r}{q} \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mathbb{D}(e(a(n)\frac{r}{q}), \chi) < \infty$. Hence, $e(a(p)\frac{r}{q}) = \chi(p)$ for almost every $p \in \mathbb{P}$. On the other hand, the assumption gives that $e(a(p)\frac{r}{q}) = e(\frac{r}{q})$ for almost every $p \in \mathbb{P}$. Combining the previous, we have that $\chi(p)$ is equal to the fixed number $e(\frac{r}{q})$ for almost every $p \in \mathbb{P}$, but since the non-zero values of any Dirichlet character mod s are equidistributed in the $\phi(s)$ roots of unity, it follows that χ is principal. Then, $e(\frac{r}{q}) = 1$, which is not possible since $\frac{r}{q} \in (0, 1)$. This yields a contradiction. It follows by Corollary 1.24 (ii) that (X, μ, T^a) is aperiodic for any ergodic (X, μ, T) . This concludes the proof. \square

3.4. Proof of the decomposition theorems

Here we prove the two decompositions theorems, namely Theorem 1.28 and Theorem 1.29. The proof of the first one will follow easily by Theorem 3.1 and the following simple lemma.

Lemma 3.11. *For any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^{\varepsilon}$, we have that*

$$\left(\text{span} \left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_f \right) \right)^{\perp} = \left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_f \right)^{\perp}.$$

Proof. Let $F \in \left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_f \right)^{\perp}$ and $G \in \text{span} \left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_f \right)$. Then there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{C}$, $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{A}$ and $G_i \in \mathcal{H}_{f_i}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, such that

$$G = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i G_i.$$

It follows that

$$\langle F, G \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \langle F, G_i \rangle = 0,$$

since by assumption, $\langle F, G_i \rangle = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$. This shows that

$$\left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_f \right)^{\perp} \subseteq \left(\text{span} \left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_f \right) \right)^{\perp}.$$

The other inclusion is obvious. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.28. We want to show that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.rat}}^\perp$. First, we show that

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}} = \bigcap_{\chi} \mathcal{V}_\chi, \quad (3.11)$$

where the intersection is over all the Dirichlet characters χ .

By Remark 2.11, it follows that for any $F \in \mathcal{V}_1$, we have $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. Clearly, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_1$, thus, for any $F \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}}$, we have $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. Therefore, (3.11) follows from Lemma 2.13.

Now, using (3.11), Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.11 for \mathcal{A} being the collection of all Dirichlet characters, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}} = \bigcap_{\chi} \mathcal{V}_\chi = \bigcap_{\chi} \mathcal{H}_\chi^\perp = \left(\bigcup_{\chi} \mathcal{H}_\chi \right)^\perp = \left(\text{span} \left(\bigcup_{\chi} \mathcal{H}_\chi \right) \right)^\perp = \left(\overline{\text{span} \left(\bigcup_{\chi} \mathcal{H}_\chi \right)} \right)^\perp = \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.rat}}^\perp.$$

The proof of the theorem is complete. \square

To prove Theorem 1.29, we will use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of non-negative real numbers and let $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a set with positive natural density. If $\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} w_n = 0$, then $\mathbb{E}_{n \in D} w_n = 0$.*

The above result is classical and easy to show, thus its proof is omitted.

Proof of Theorem 1.29. Let $F \in L^2(X)$ be a pretentious eigenfunction and let $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.wm}}$. Then there exists some $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ such that $\mathbb{D}_F(S, f) < \infty$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p F \neq f(p)F\}$ and then $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$. Then we have

$$|\langle F, G \rangle| = \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} |\langle S_n F, S_n G \rangle| = \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} |f(n) \langle F, S_n G \rangle| = \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} |\langle F, S_n G \rangle|.$$

In view of Lemma 3.12, if we set $w_n = |\langle F, S_n G \rangle|$ and $D = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}$ with natural density

$$d(D) = \prod_{p \notin \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \geq \exp \left(- \sum_{p \notin \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} \right) > 0,$$

then we have that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} w_n = 0$, since G is pretentiously weak-mixing, and then it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{P}}} |\langle F, S_n G \rangle| = \mathbb{E}_{n \in D} w_n = 0.$$

Hence, we have that $\langle F, G \rangle = 0$ and this shows that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.eig}}^\perp \perp \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.wm}}$. It remains to prove that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.eig}}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.wm}}$. Let $F \notin \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.wm}}$. Then, as in the proof of Corollary 1.18, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \times \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) \overline{g(n)} \, d(\mu_F \times \mu_F)(f, g) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left| \int_X S_n F \cdot \overline{F} \, d\mu \right|^2 > 0.$$

Let $\Delta = \{(f, g) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \times \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c : \mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty\}$ and then it follows by Theorem 1.1 that $(\mu_F \times \mu_F)(\Delta) > 0$. By Tonelli's theorem, it follows that there exists some $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ such that $\mu_F(\mathcal{A}_f \cap \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c) > 0$. Now, as we argued in the proof of Proposition 3.4, we can find some $G \in L^2(X)$ such that $\mathbb{D}_G(S, f) < \infty$ and $\langle F, G \rangle > 0$. This shows that $F \notin \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.eig}}^\perp$. The proof is complete. \square

3.5. Deduction of Theorem 1.1 from Theorem A

Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$ such that $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) = \infty$. We want to show that $M(f) = 0$. Let $X = \overline{f(\mathbb{N})}$, μ be the Haar measure on X and S be the multiplicative rotation by f , that is to say, $S_n(x) = f(n)x$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $F \in L^2(X)$ be the identity function. It suffices to show

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_n F \right\|_2 = 0.$$

In view of Theorem A, we have to show that $\mathbb{E}(F | \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})) = 0$. Since $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) = \infty$ and f is finitely generated, $S_p F \neq F$ holds for many primes, and consequently, $f(p) \neq 1$ holds for many primes. Let $A \subseteq X$ be a measurable set that pretends to be invariant. Then $S_p^{-1}A = A$ holds for almost every prime, and consequently, $f(p)A = A$ holds for almost every prime. It follows that there exists some $p_0 \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $f(p_0) \neq 1$ and $f(p_0)A = A$. We write $f(p_0) = e(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and we distinguish cases for α :

- (i) If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$, then A is invariant under a rational rotation, and so it has the form of the following disjoint union:

$$A = \bigsqcup_{j=0}^{q-1} e\left(\frac{j}{q}\right)B,$$

for some measurable set $B \subseteq X$, where q is the denominator of α . Then

$$\int_A F \, d\mu = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \int_{e(j/q)B} x \, d\mu(x) = \int_B \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} e\left(-\frac{j}{q}\right)x \, d\mu(x) = 0,$$

since $\sum_{j=0}^{q-1} e(-j/q) = 0$.

- (ii) If $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then A is invariant under an irrational rotation, and since irrational rotations are ergodic with respect to the Haar measure, then the set A is trivial in the sense that $\mu(A) \in \{0, 1\}$. Then clearly, $\int_A F \, d\mu = 0$.

It follows that for any $A \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}$, we have $\int_A F \, d\mu = 0$. Now let $B \in \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. By Lemma 2.12, \mathcal{I}_{pr} is an algebra, and so there exists $A \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}}$ such that $\mu(A \Delta B) < \varepsilon$. Then we have that

$$\left| \int_B F \, d\mu \right| = \left| \int_A F \, d\mu + \int_{B \setminus A} F \, d\mu \right| = \left| \int_{B \setminus A} F \, d\mu \right| \leq \mu(B \setminus A) < \varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, it follows that $\int_B F \, d\mu = 0$. This holds for any $B \in \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})$, so we have that $\mathbb{E}(F | \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})) = 0$. This shows that $M(f) = 0$.

Suppose now that $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) < \infty$. Let, as before, (X, μ, S) be the multiplicative rotation by f and $F \in L^2(X)$ be the identity. By assumption, we have that the set $\mathcal{P} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : f(p) \neq 1\}$ satisfies $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$. For any $G \in L^2(X)$, we have that $\{p \in \mathbb{P} : S_p G \neq G\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, hence $G \in \mathcal{H}_1$. This shows that $L^2(X) = \mathcal{H}_1$ and in particular, we have that $\mathbb{E}(F | \sigma(\mathcal{I}_{\text{pr}})) = F$. By Theorem A, since $\|F\|_2 = 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) - \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{f(p)}{p}\right)^{-1} \right|^2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) - \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{f(p^k)}{p^k}\right) \right|^2 \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n)x - \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{f(p^k)x}{p^k}\right) \right|^2 \, d\mu(x) \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_n F - \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{S_{p^k} F}{p^k}\right) \right\|_2^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete for completely multiplicative function.

Extending Theorem A to all weakly multiplicative systems (with exactly the same formulation)

would similarly yield the more general case of f being multiplicative, but not necessarily completely, of Theorem 1.1.

4. Proof of Theorem B

Recall that in Theorem B, we have to treat ergodic averages of the form

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^n F \cdot S_n G.$$

The main idea is to decompose both F and G into two distinct components that exhibit opposite behaviours, namely one (pretentiously) periodic and one totally ergodic (or aperiodic), utilizing (1.10) and Theorem 1.28 respectively. In this way we are reduced into dealing with ergodic averages of $T^n F \cdot S_n G$ with the advantage of having more information regarding the behaviour of $T^n F$ and $S_n G$. Hence, the proof of Theorem B heavily depends on our previous results on multiplicative systems.

For the rest of this section, we fix a probability space (X, μ) , an ergodic additive action T and an pretentiously ergodic completely multiplicative action S on (X, μ) . To prove Theorem B, we need the two lemmas below.

First let us remark that for any Dirichlet character χ and any rational α it is not hard to check that the limit

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) \chi(n)$$

exists. Then, combining Lemma B.4 with [DD82, Corollary 2], it follows that for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$ with $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty$ the limit

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n)$$

also exists.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $q, q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and χ be a primitive Dirichlet character mod q_0 such that $q_0 \nmid q$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{an}{q}\right) \chi(n) = 0 \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Using (B.1), for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $K = K(N)$ such that $K \rightarrow \infty$ and $K/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{an}{q}\right) \chi(n) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K e\left(\frac{a}{q}(n + qk)\right) \chi(n + qk) + O\left(\frac{K}{N}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{an}{q}\right) \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \chi(n + qk)\right) + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau(\bar{\chi})} \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ (m, q_0)=1}}^{q_0} \bar{\chi}(m) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{mn}{q_0} + \frac{an}{q}\right)\right) \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K e\left(\frac{mqk}{q_0}\right)\right) + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\ll \max_{\substack{1 \leq m \leq q_0 \\ (m, q_0) = 1}} \left| \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K e\left(\frac{mqk}{q_0}\right) \right| + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1) = o_{K \rightarrow \infty}(1) + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1) = o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1),$$

since for any $1 \leq m \leq q_0$ with $(m, q_0) = 1$, we have that $q_0 \nmid mq$, because $q_0 \nmid q$. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $r, q, q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(r, q) = 1$ and χ be a primitive Dirichlet character mod q_0 . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) \chi(n) = 0$.
- (ii) $q_0 \neq q$.
- (iii) *There exists some $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$ with $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n) = 0$.*

Proof. (i) \implies (ii) Assume that $q_0 = q$. Then, using (B.1), we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) \chi(n) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{a=1}^q e\left(\frac{ra}{q}\right) \chi(a) = \frac{\tau(\chi) \overline{\chi}(q-r)}{q} \neq 0,$$

since $\tau(\chi) \neq 0$ by the fact that χ is primitive and $\overline{\chi}(q-r) \neq 0$ by the fact that $(r, q) = 1$.

(ii) \implies (i) Assume that $q_0 \neq q$. Then, using (B.3) and then (B.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) \chi(n) &= \sum_{a=1}^{q_0} \chi(a) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q_0}}} e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{q_0} \sum_{a=1}^{q_0} \chi(a) \sum_{b=1}^{q_0} e\left(-\frac{ba}{q_0}\right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\left(\frac{r}{q} + \frac{b}{q_0}\right)n\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{q_0} \sum_{a=1}^{q_0} \chi(a) \sum_{\substack{b=1 \\ qq_0 \mid (rq_0 + qb)}}^{q_0} e\left(-\frac{ba}{q_0}\right) + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1) = \frac{\tau(\chi)}{q_0} \sum_{\substack{b=1 \\ qq_0 \mid (rq_0 + qb)}}^{q_0} \overline{\chi}(b) + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Suppose that $qq_0 \mid (rq_0 + qb)$. Then $rq_0 + qb = kqq_0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $(r, q) = 1$, then there exists unique $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $1 = xr + yq$, thus $q_0 = xrq_0 + yqq_0 = xkqq_0 - xqb + yqq_0$. It follows that $q \mid q_0$ and since $q \neq q_0$, we have that $q_0 = k_1q$ for some integer $k_1 > 1$. Therefore, $rk_1q + qb = kk_1q^2$, hence $rk_1 + b = kk_1q$. It follows that $k_1 \mid b$. Therefore, $k_1 \mid (b, q_0)$, implying that $(b, q_0) > 1$, thus $\overline{\chi}(b) = 0$. We proved that for any $1 \leq b \leq q_0$ such that $qq_0 \mid (rq_0 + qb)$, we have $\overline{\chi}(b) = 0$. Then, the averages on the left-hand side of (4.1) converge to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

(i) \implies (iii) This is obvious.

(iii) \implies (i) Assume that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) \chi(n) \neq 0.$$

Since (ii) \implies (i), it follows that $q_0 = q$, i.e., χ is primitive mod q . By Lemma B.4, for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$ with $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty$, we have $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p} (1 - f(p) \overline{\chi}(p)) < \infty$. Using this along with that q is the conductor of χ , it follows from the formula given in [DD82, Remark 2.1.1] that for any such f , we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n) \neq 0.$$

The proof of the lemma is complete. \square

Finally, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let (X, μ) be a probability space, T be an additive action and S be a finitely generated multiplicative action. Then $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$ if and only if for any $\frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\}$ and for any $q_0 \mid q$, we have $\frac{r}{q_0} \notin \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$.*

Proof. We just show that if $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$, then for any $\frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\}$ and for any $q_0 \mid q$, we have $\frac{r}{q_0} \notin \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$. The other implication is obvious.

Suppose that there exist $\frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \setminus \{0\}$ and $q_0 \mid q$ such that $\frac{r}{q_0} \in \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$. Letting $s = \frac{q}{q_0} \in \mathbb{N}$, since $\frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T)$, we have that $\frac{r}{q_0} = \frac{rs}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T)$, hence the non-zero rational number $\frac{r}{q_0}$ belongs in $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$. This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem B. Assume that T, S are jointly ergodic. Let $\frac{r}{q} \in \sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$ and suppose for sake of contradiction that $r \neq 0$. Recall that by definition of $\tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$, we have $(r, q) = 1$. Then there exists $F \in L^2(X)$ such that $TF = e(\frac{r}{q})F$. Since $r \neq 0$, we have that $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. Moreover, there exist $G \in L^2(X)$ and a primitive Dirichlet character $\chi \bmod q$ such that $\mathbb{D}_G(S, \chi) < \infty$. Since T is ergodic and F is an eigenfunction, we have that $|F| = 1$. Then, using Theorem A.2 and Lemma 2.7, since T, S are jointly ergodic, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^n F \cdot S_n G \right\|_2^2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_X |F|^2 \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) S_n G \right|^2 \, d\mu \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) S_n G \right|^2 \, d\mu = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \cap \mathcal{A}_\chi} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n) \right|^2 \, d\mu_G(f) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \cap \mathcal{A}_\chi} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n) \right|^2 \, d\mu_G(f) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \cap \mathcal{A}_\chi} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n) \right|^2 \, d\mu_G(f), \end{aligned}$$

where μ_G is the spectral measure of G and the inequality holds by Fatou's lemma. It follows that there exists some $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c \cap \mathcal{A}_\chi$ such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n) = 0.$$

By Lemma 4.2, the last equation implies that the conductor of χ is not q , yielding a contradiction. Hence, $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$.

On the other hand, we assume that $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$. Let $F, G \in L^2(X)$ and we may assume that $\int_X G \, d\mu = 0$. Hence we shall prove that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N T^n F \cdot S_n G \right\|_2 = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

In view of (1.10), we decompose F as $F = F_{\text{rat}} + F_{\text{tot.erg}}$, for some unique $F_{\text{rat}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{rat}}(T)$ and $F_{\text{tot.erg}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot.erg}}(T)$. By Lemma 2.15, we see that the contribution of $F_{\text{tot.erg}}$ in the ergodic averages in (4.2) is zero. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that $F \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{rat}}(T)$ and a simple approximation argument allows to further assume that F is a rational eigenfunction for T . Then there exist $r, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $TF = e(\frac{r}{q})F$, and so (4.2) is reduced to

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) S_n G \right\|_2 = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

We may assume that $r \neq 0$ (since otherwise (4.3) follows from pretentious ergodicity of S) and also that $(r, q) = 1$. Now, by Theorem 1.28, we can decompose G as $G = G_{\text{pr.rat}} + G_{\text{aper}}$, for some unique $G_{\text{pr.rat}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$ and $G_{\text{aper}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{aper}}(S)$. By definition, the contribution of G_{aper} in the ergodic averages in (4.3) is zero. Therefore, we may assume that $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S)$. A simple approximation argument allows to assume that G is a finite linear combination of pretentious rational eigenfunctions and then, by the triangle inequality for the L^2 norm, we may eventually assume that G is a pretentious rational eigenfunction for S . So there exists some Dirichlet character χ such that $\mathbb{D}_G(S, \chi) < \infty$ and we may assume that χ is primitive (or 1 in which case the result follows trivially). Let q_0 be the conductor of χ . In view of Lemma 4.3, the assumption $\sigma_{\text{rat}}(T) \cap \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{pr.rat}}(S) = \{0\}$ implies that $q_0 \nmid q$, which implies that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{an}{q}\right) \chi(n) = 0, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N},$$

by Lemma 4.1, and this is equivalent to that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \bar{\psi}(n) \chi(n) = 0, \quad \forall \text{ Dirichlet character } \psi \text{ mod } q,$$

by Lemma B.1. In view of Theorem 1.1, the latter is equivalent to that $\mathbb{D}(\chi, \psi) = \infty$ for any Dirichlet character ψ modulo q . Combining Lemma 2.10 and Theorem 3.1, it follows that $\mathcal{H}_\chi \subseteq \mathcal{H}_\psi^\perp = \mathcal{V}_\psi$, thus $G \in \mathcal{V}_\psi$ for any Dirichlet character ψ modulo q , and then it follows from Lemma 2.13 that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{an}{q}\right) S_n G \right\|_2 = 0 \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In particular, this gives (4.3) and so concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

A. Spectral theorems

Theorem A.1 (Spectral theorem on unitary operators, see [EW13, Theorem B.12]). *Let (X, μ, T) be an additive system. For each $F \in L^2(X)$, there exists a unique finite Borel measure μ_F in \mathbb{S}^1 such that*

$$\langle T^n F, F \rangle = \int_0^1 e(nt) \, d\mu_F(t).$$

Moreover, there exists a unitary isomorphism Φ from $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1, \mu_F)$ to the cyclic sub-representation of $L^2(X)$ which is generated by F under T , that conjugates T with multiplication by $e(t)$.

We are also interested in a version of the spectral theorem on unitary multiplicative actions. Recall that $(\widehat{\mathbb{N}}, \times) = \mathcal{M}^c$ and that $e_n(f) = f(n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem A.2 (Spectral theorem on unitary multiplicative actions, cf. [Fol16, (1.47)]). *Let (X, μ, S) be a multiplicative system. For each $F \in L^2(X)$, there exists a unique finite Borel measure μ_F in \mathcal{M}^c such that*

$$\langle S_n F, F \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{M}^c} f(n) \, d\mu_F(f).$$

Moreover, there exists a unitary isomorphism Φ from $L^2(\mathcal{M}^c, \mu_F)$ to the cyclic sub-representation of $L^2(X)$ which is generated by F under the action S , that conjugates S_n with multiplication by e_n , for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If (X, μ, S) is finitely generated in Theorem A.2, then we can replace \mathcal{M}^c with $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}^c$. This follows from Lemma 2.6. In addition, if the system is weakly multiplicative, we have \mathcal{M} in place of \mathcal{M}^c .

B. Elementary facts from number theory

We start with a classical result for aperiodic functions, which the analogue of Lemma 2.13 for multiplicative functions.

Lemma B.1. *Let f be a bounded multiplicative function. The following are equivalent for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$:*

- (i) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(qn + r) = 0$ for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (ii) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) f(n) = 0$ for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (iii) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) f(n) = 0$ for any Dirichlet character χ of modulus q .

We omit the proof, since it is very similar with that of Lemma 2.13, which we show later in the appendix.

Now we state some useful classical identities that relate Dirichlet characters, linear phases and arithmetic progressions. Given a Dirichlet character χ of some modulus q , $\tau(\chi) := \sum_{m=1}^q e\left(\frac{m}{q}\right) \chi(m)$ is the Gauss sum of χ , and if χ is primitive, then $|\tau(\chi)| = q^{\frac{1}{2}}$, in particular, $\tau(\chi) \neq 0$. Moreover, we denote by ϕ the classical Euler's totient function. We state the following classical identities:

$$\chi(n) = \frac{1}{\tau(\bar{\chi})} \sum_{m=1}^q \bar{\chi}(m) e\left(\frac{mn}{q}\right), \quad \forall \text{ primitive Dirichlet character } \chi \bmod q. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{n \equiv r \pmod{q}} = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \bar{\chi}(r) \chi(n), \quad \forall r, q \in \mathbb{N}, (r, q) = 1. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{n \equiv r \pmod{q}} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{a=1}^q e\left(\frac{a}{q}(n-r)\right), \quad \forall r, q \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Moreover, concerning the distance of multiplicative functions, we have the following triangle inequalities (see [GS14]): For any multiplicative functions $f, g, f', g', h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ and any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{D}(f, g; N) \leq \mathbb{D}(f, h; N) + \mathbb{D}(h, g; N) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{D}(ff', gg'; N) \leq \mathbb{D}(f, g; N) + \mathbb{D}(f', g'; N).$$

We conclude this appendix with some classical results on multiplicative functions.

Lemma B.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$. Then $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) < \infty$ if and only if $f(p) = 1$ for almost every prime.*

The above lemma follows from Lemma 2.4 but it can be proved independently as well. It is used implicitly several times in the paper.

Lemma B.3. *For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$, any Dirichlet character χ and any $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi \cdot n^{it}) = \infty$.*

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and χ be a Dirichlet character. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in [0, 1)$ be distinct numbers such that for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $f(p) \in \{e(\alpha_1), \dots, e(\alpha_d)\}$. It suffices to show that $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi^* \cdot n^{it}) = \infty$ for the modified character χ^* . Now there exists some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\chi^*(p)^k = 1$ for all primes p . We consider the multiplicative function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ given by $g(p) = (f(p) \overline{\chi^*(p)})^k$, and then there exist distinct $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d \in [0, 1)$ such that $g(p) \in \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d\}$ for any $p \in \mathbb{P}$. For each $j = 1, \dots, d$, we

set $\mathcal{P}_j = \{p \in \mathbb{P}: g(p) = e(\beta_j)\}$. Now by the triangle inequality for the distance of multiplicative functions, we have that $k\mathbb{D}(f, \chi^* \cdot n^{it}) \geq \mathbb{D}(g, n^{ikt})$, so that it is enough to show that $\mathbb{D}(g, n^{ikt}) = \infty$. We see that

$$\mathbb{D}(g, n^{ikt})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_j} \frac{1 - \operatorname{Re}(e(\beta_j)p^{-ikt})}{p}.$$

Hence, the result will follow immediately by showing the following claim: For any $z \in \mathbb{S}^1$, and for any $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, we have $\mathbb{D}(z, n^{it}) = \infty$.

We now prove the claim. Let $z \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}(z, n^{it}; N)^2 &= \sum_{p \leq N} \frac{1 - \operatorname{Re}(zp^{-it})}{p} \geq \sum_{\exp((\log N)^{2/3+\varepsilon}) \leq p \leq N} \frac{1 - \operatorname{Re}(zp^{-it})}{p} \\ &\geq \sum_{\exp((\log N)^{2/3+\varepsilon}) \leq p \leq N} \frac{1}{p} - \left| \sum_{\exp((\log N)^{2/3+\varepsilon}) \leq p \leq N} \frac{zp^{-it}}{p} \right| \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{3} - \varepsilon\right) \log \log N - \left| \sum_{\exp((\log N)^{2/3+\varepsilon}) \leq p \leq N} \frac{1}{p^{1+it}} \right| + O(1), \end{aligned}$$

and so, it suffices to show that the second term in the last step of the above equation is $O(1)$. But this term is equal to $|\log(\zeta(1 + \frac{1}{\log N} + it)) - \log(\zeta(1 + \frac{1}{(\log N)^{2/3+\varepsilon}} + it))| + O(1)$, and this is $O(1)$, by the Vinogradov-Korobov zero-free region for the Riemann zeta function (see [Ric67]). \square

Lemma B.4. *For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$ and any Dirichlet character χ , we have that $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty$ if and only if $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}(1 - f(p)\overline{\chi}(p)) < \infty$.*

Proof. By the previous trick with the modified character, it is enough to show that $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}(1 - f(p)) < \infty$ provided that $\mathbb{D}(f, 1) < \infty$. By Lemma B.2, the assumption implies that $f(p) = 1$ fails only in a set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ containing a few primes. Therefore, we have $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}(1 - f(p)) = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$. \square

C. Proof of Lemma 2.13

Proof of Lemma 2.13. Let (X, μ, S) be a finitely generated multiplicative system and $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

(i) \implies (ii) Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. The assertion in case that $q \mid r$ is obvious, so we assume that $q \nmid r$ and we let $F \in L^2(X)$. We may assume that $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) S_n F \right\|_2 &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{a=1}^q \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q}}}^N e\left(\frac{rn}{q}\right) S_n F \right\|_2 \\ &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{a=1}^q e\left(\frac{ra}{q}\right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{n \equiv a \pmod{q}} S_n F \right) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq a \leq q} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N/q} \sum_{0 \leq n < N/q} S_{qn+a} F \right\|_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (i).

(ii) \implies (iii) Let $F \in L^2(X)$ and suppose that $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. By (B.1), we have that for any primitive Dirichlet character χ of modulus q ,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) S_n F \right\|_2 = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{\tau(\overline{\chi})} \sum_{a=1}^q \overline{\chi}(a) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{an}{q}\right) S_n F \right) \right\|_2$$

$$\ll \max_{1 \leq a \leq q} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N e\left(\frac{an}{q}\right) S_n F \right\|_2 = 0.$$

Now for any Dirichlet character χ , we consider the primitive character χ_1 inducing χ , which also has modulus q . As we have already seen, we have $\mathbb{D}(\chi, \chi_1) < \infty$, and then using Corollary 3.2, it follows that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) S_n F \right\|_2 = 0,$$

showing the (ii) under the assumption $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$.

Now let $F \in L^2(X)$ be arbitrary and consider the zero-integral function $G = F - \int_X F \, d\mu$. Then we have that for any Dirichlet character of modulus q ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) S_n F \right\|_2 \leq \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) S_n G \right\|_2 + \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) \right) \cdot \int_X F \, d\mu$$

and since

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \chi(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\phi(q)}, & \text{if } \chi = \chi_0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where χ_0 is the principal character of modulus q , the result follows.

(iii) \implies (i) Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d = (r, q)$ and write $r = r_1 d$ and $q = q_1 d$ with $(r_1, q_1) = 1$. Let $F \in L^2(X)$ and we may assume that $\int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. Then $\int_X S_d F \, d\mu = \int_X F \, d\mu = 0$. By (B.2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N S_{qn+r} F \right\|_2 &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=q+r}^{qN+r} \mathbb{1}_{n \equiv r \pmod{q}} S_n F \right\|_2 \\ &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=q_1+r_1}^{q_1 N+r_1} \mathbb{1}_{n \equiv r_1 \pmod{q_1}} S_{dn} F \right\|_2 \\ &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{\phi(q_1)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q_1}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=q_1+r_1}^{q_1 N+r_1} \chi(n) S_n(S_d F) \right) \right\|_2 \\ &\ll \max_{\chi \pmod{q_1}} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=q_1+r_1}^{q_1 N+r_1} \chi(n) S_n(S_d F) \right\|_2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since any Dirichlet character of modulus q_1 has also modulus q . This concludes the proof. \square

Remark C.1. The proof of Lemma 2.13 can be extended to all finitely generated weakly multiplicative actions. The only part that is not straightforward in this case is the proof of (iii) \implies (i), but one could adapt an argument of Delange in [Del83, pp. 136-138] to handle it.

References

- [Ber87] V. BERGELSON, Weakly mixing PET, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **7** no. 3 (1987), 337–349.
- [BL96] V. BERGELSON and A. LEIBMAN, Polynomial extensions of van der Waerden’s and Szemerédi’s theorems, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **9** no. 3 (1996), 725–753.

- [BLL08] V. BERGELSON, A. LEIBMAN, and E. LESIGNE, Intersective polynomials and the polynomial Szemerédi theorem, *Adv. Math.* **219** no. 1 (2008), 369–388.
- [Ber87] V. BERGELSON, Ergodic Ramsey theory, in *Logic and combinatorics (Arcata, Calif., 1985)*, *Contemp. Math.* **65**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 63–87.
- [Ber96] V. BERGELSON, Ergodic Ramsey theory—an update, in *Ergodic theory of \mathbf{Z}^d actions (Warwick, 1993–1994)*, *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.* **228**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 1–61.
- [BMR20] V. BERGELSON, J. MOREIRA, and F. K. RICHTER, Single and multiple recurrence along non-polynomial sequences, *Adv. Math.* **368** (2020), 107146, 69.
- [BMR24] V. BERGELSON, J. MOREIRA, and F. K. RICHTER, Multiple ergodic averages along functions from a hardy field: Convergence, recurrence and combinatorial applications, *Adv. Math.* **443** (2024), 109597.
- [BR22] V. BERGELSON and F. K. RICHTER, Dynamical generalizations of the prime number theorem and disjointness of additive and multiplicative semigroup actions, *Duke Math. J.* **171** no. 15 (2022), 3133–3200.
- [BSZ13] J. BOURGAIN, P. SARNAK, and T. ZIEGLER, Disjointness of Moebius from horocycle flows, in *From Fourier analysis and number theory to Radon transforms and geometry*, *Dev. Math.* **28**, Springer, New York, 2013, pp. 67–83.
- [Cho65] S. CHOWLA, The Riemann hypothesis and Hilbert’s tenth problem, *Norske Vid. Selsk. Forh. (Trondheim)* **38** (1965), 62–64.
- [Dab75] H. DABOUSSI, Fonctions multiplicatives presque périodiques b, *Astérisque* **24** no. 25 (1975), 321–324.
- [DD82] H. DABOUSSI and H. DELANGE, On multiplicative arithmetical functions whose modulus does not exceed one, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **26** no. 2 (1982), 245–264.
- [Del83] H. DELANGE, Sur les fonctions arithmétiques multiplicatives de module ≤ 1 , *Acta Arith.* **42** no. 2 (1983), 121–151.
- [DG61] K. DELEEuw and I. GLICKSBERG, Applications of almost periodic compactifications, *Acta Math.* **105** (1961), 63–97.
- [EW13] M. EINSIEDLER and T. WARD, *Ergodic theory with a view towards number theory*, **259**, Springer, 2013.
- [Ell12] P. D. ELLIOTT, *Probabilistic number theory I: Mean-value theorems*, **239**, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [Fol16] G. B. FOLLAND, *A course in abstract harmonic analysis*, **29**, CRC press, 2016.
- [Fra10] N. FRANTZIKINAKIS, Multiple recurrence and convergence for Hardy sequences of polynomial growth, *J. Anal. Math.* **112** (2010), 79–135.
- [Fra15] N. FRANTZIKINAKIS, A multidimensional Szemerédi theorem for Hardy sequences of different growth, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **367** no. 8 (2015), 5653–5692.
- [Fra21] N. FRANTZIKINAKIS, Joint ergodicity of sequences, *arXiv:2102.09967* (2021).
- [Fra22] N. FRANTZIKINAKIS, Joint ergodicity of fractional powers of primes, *Forum Math. Sigma* **10** (2022), Paper No. e30, 30.
- [FH17] N. FRANTZIKINAKIS and B. HOST, Higher order Fourier analysis of multiplicative functions and applications, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **30** no. 1 (2017), 67–157.

- [FK05] N. FRANTZIKINAKIS and B. KRA, Polynomial averages converge to the product of integrals, **148**, 2005, *Probability in mathematics*, pp. 267–276.
- [FLW12] N. FRANTZIKINAKIS, E. LESIGNE, and M. WIERDL, Random sequences and pointwise convergence of multiple ergodic averages, *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* (2012), 585–617.
- [Fur77] H. FURSTENBERG, Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions, *J. Analyse Math.* **31** (1977), 204–256.
- [Fur81] H. FURSTENBERG, *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*, Princeton University Press, 1981.
- [FK91] H. FURSTENBERG and Y. KATZNELSON, A density version of the Hales–Jewett theorem, *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique* **57** no. 1 (1991), 64–119.
- [GS14] A. GRANVILLE and K. SOUNDARARAJAN, *Multiplicative number theory: The pretentious approach*, Book manuscript in preparation, 2014.
- [Hal68] G. HALÁSZ, Über die Mittelwerte multiplikativer zahlentheoretischer Funktionen, *Acta Mathematica Hungarica* **19** no. 3-4 (1968), 365–403.
- [HK05] B. HOST and B. KRA, Nonconventional ergodic averages and nilmanifolds, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **161** no. 1 (2005), 397–488.
- [KK19] D. KARAGEORGOS and A. KOUTSOGIANNIS, Integer part independent polynomial averages and applications along primes, *Studia Math.* **249** no. 3 (2019), 233–257.
- [Kát86] I. KÁTAI, A remark on a theorem of H. Daboussi, *Acta Mathematica Hungarica* **47** no. 1-2 (1986), 223–225.
- [Kou21] A. KOUTSOGIANNIS, Multiple ergodic averages for tempered functions, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **41** no. 3 (2021), 1177–1205.
- [Loy23] K. LOYD, A dynamical approach to the asymptotic behavior of the sequence $\Omega(n)$, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **43** no. 11 (2023), 3685–3706.
- [vN32a] J. VON NEUMANN, Proof of the quasi-ergodic hypothesis, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **18** no. 1 (1932), 70–82.
- [vN32b] J. VON NEUMANN, Zur Operatorenmethode in der klassischen Mechanik, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **33** no. 3 (1932), 587–642.
- [Ric67] H.-E. RICHERT, Zur Abschätzung der Riemannschen Zetafunktion in der Nähe der Vertikalen $\sigma=1$, *Mathematische Annalen* **169** no. 1 (1967), 97–101.
- [Sze75] E. SZEMERÉDI, On sets of integers containing k elements in arithmetic progression, *Acta Arithmetica* **27** no. 1 (1975), 199–245 (eng).
- [Tsi23] K. TSINAS, Joint ergodicity of Hardy field sequences, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **376** no. 5 (2023), 3191–3263.
- [Wey16] H. WEYL, Über die Gleichverteilung von Zahlen mod. Eins, *Math. Ann.* **77** no. 3 (1916), 313–352.

Dimitrios Charamaras
 ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE (EPFL)
dimitrios.charamaras@epfl.ch