

LIMIT SETS, INTERNAL CHAIN TRANSITIVITY AND ORBITAL SHADOWING OF TREE-SHIFTS DEFINED ON MARKOV-CAYLEY TREES

JUNG-CHAO BAN, NAI-ZHU HUANG, AND GUAN-YU LAI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we introduce the concepts of ω -limit sets and pseudo orbits for a tree-shift defined on a Markov-Cayley tree, extending the results of tree-shifts defined on d -trees [5,6]. Firstly, we establish the relationships between ω -limit sets and we introduce a modified definition of ω -limit set based on complete prefix sets (Theorems 1.4 and 1.9). Secondly, we introduce the concept of projected pseudo orbits and investigate the concept of the shadowing property (Theorems 1.12 and 1.14).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivations. The objective of this article is to study the ω -limit set and the shadowing properties for the shift spaces defined on Markov-Cayley trees. Before we present the main results of our investigation, we highlight the motivation behind this study.

1. (ω -limit set) If (X, T) is a dynamical system, the ω -limit set of X is undoubtedly the most important set to capture the long-term behavior, recurrence properties and the existence of attractors of the system. In this article, we will be focusing on the ω -limit set of the shift space defined on multidimensional lattices. In [22], Souza first provided the concepts of the ω -limit set of G actions where G is a group or a monoid. Motivated by the work of Souza, Meddaugh and Raines [16] introduced the concepts of an ω -limit set of shifts defined on \mathbb{Z}^d and studied the fundamental properties of an ω -limit set and established the shadowing properties. Later, Binder [5], Binder and Meddaugh [6] give various types of definitions for the ω -limit sets of a shift space defined on the free semi-group¹ with d generators (briefly, we call it the *shift on the d tree*), namely, the ω -limit sets $\omega^d(t)$, $\omega_p^d(t)$, $\omega_{F_p}^d(t)$ and $\omega_{CPS}^d(t)$ where t is an element of the given shift space. The authors identify the connections between these ω -limit sets and develop some fundamental properties of them. However, we found out that not all the definitions of the ω -limit sets for shifts on the d tree are valid if the underlined lattice, i.e., the d tree, is changed to the Markov-Cayley tree. Thus, we present a modified definition for the ω -limit set $\omega_{CPS}^M(t)$ of a shift on the Markov-Cayley tree T_M and investigate the connections among these ω -limit sets (Theorem 1.4). As it turns out, the outcomes of the shift on the Markov-Cayley tree are vastly different from those on the d tree (Example 1.5).

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37B10; Secondary 37B20.

Key words and phrases. limit sets, shadowing property, tree-shifts.

¹That is, the conventional d tree.

2. (Shadowing properties) In a dynamical system, the shadowing property stipulates that any approximate orbit can be traced by a real one. This is significant because rounding errors are common problems in floating-point calculations. We will not attempt to review the extensive literature here, referring only to ([4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21]) for background and references. In addition, for a deeper discussion of the shadowing properties for shifts on multi-dimensional lattices, for instance, the $\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{N}^d$ with $d \geq 1$ or some abelian groups, we refer the reader to [17, 21].

We confine our discussion to the shadowing property for the shift on the d tree or Markov-Cayley tree based on the above discussion. In [6, 9], the authors give the definitions for the (asymptotically) shadowing property for the shift on d tree, and show that a shift on d tree is subshift of finite type (SFT) if and only if the shift has the shadowing property. This extends the previously well-known result of shifts defined on \mathbb{N} to those defined on the d tree. Furthermore, it is proved that an m -step SFT on the d tree has the asymptotically $2^{-(m+1)}$ -shadowing property [6]. We offer modified definitions of the (asymptotically) shadowing properties for shifts on Markov-Cayley trees due to the same reason mentioned at the above paragraph. SFTs are characterized as those with the shadowing property based on the modified definition of the shadowing property (Theorem 1.12). In addition, we obtain that an m -step SFT on the Markov-Cayley tree has an asymptotically $2^{-(m+1)}$ -shadowing property. It is worth noting the previous results for shifts on the d tree are extended to a wider range of multi-dimensional shifts because the d tree is a special type of Markov-Cayley tree (Theorem 1.14).

We stress that the shifts on Markov-Cayley trees are not invariant, which is a major obstacle to this investigation. This is due to the fundamental difference between the d tree and Markov-Cayley trees. The Markov-Cayley tree is not a type of an abelian group, and the method of shifts on \mathbb{Z}^d is not applicable to this class of shifts. In the following section, the formal definitions of the shift on Markov-Cayley trees are introduced.

1.2. Tree-shifts on Markov-Cayley trees. Let $\Sigma = \{g_1, \dots, g_d\}$ be a finite set. Suppose T is an infinite, locally finite, connected graph with generator set Σ , without loops and with a distinguished point ϵ . The graph T is also called a *tree*. Let T be a tree and $g \in T$. The *follower set* $F_T(g)$ of g is defined as

$$F_T(g) = \{h \in T : gh \in T\}.$$

The focus of this article is on a wide range of trees, specifically, Markov-Cayley trees as we define them below. Let M be a $d \times d$ 0-1 matrix indexed by Σ . The associated *Markov-Cayley tree* T_M is defined by

$$T_M = \{\epsilon\} \cup \Sigma \cup \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} \{g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_n} : M(g_{i_j}, g_{i_{j+1}}) = 1, \forall 1 \leq j \leq n-1\}.$$

If M is a $d \times d$ full matrix, i.e., all entries of M are 1's, then denote T_M briefly by T_d . Let T be a tree, and we denote by

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_T = \{F_T(g) : g \in T\}$$

the *family of follower sets of T* and assume that $\mathcal{I} = \{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{|\mathcal{I}|}\}$ with $|\mathcal{I}| < \infty$ throughout this article. For $\eta \in \mathcal{I}$, define

$$T^{(\eta)} = \{g \in T : F_T(g) = \eta\}, \Delta_m^{(\eta)} = \{g \in \eta : 0 \leq |g - \epsilon| \leq m\},$$

where $|g - \epsilon| := n$ if $g = g_{i_1}g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_n}$, and $|g - \epsilon| := 0$ if $g = \epsilon$.

Example 1.1. For any $d \times d$ 0-1 matrix M , we have $\mathcal{I}_{T_M} \subseteq \{T_M, F_{T_M}(g_1), \dots, F_{T_M}(g_d)\}$.

- (1) Let M be a 2×2 full one matrix, $T_M = T_2$ (a conventional 2-tree). Since $F_{T_2}(g_1) = F_{T_2}(g_2) = T_2$, we have $\mathcal{I} = \{\eta\}$, where $\eta = T_2$. Then, $T^{(\eta)} = T_2$.




FIGURE 1. T_2 .

- (2) Let $G := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Since $F_{T_G}(g_1) = T_G$, we have $\mathcal{I} = \{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$, where $\eta_1 = T_G$ and $\eta_2 = F_{T_G}(g_2)$. Then,

$$T^{(\eta_1)} = \{g \in T_G : F_{T_G}(g) = \eta_1\} \text{ and } T^{(\eta_2)} = \{g \in T_G : F_{T_G}(g) = \eta_2\}.$$




FIGURE 2. T_G

- (3) Let $U := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. Since $F_{T_U}(g_1) = T_U$, we have $\mathcal{I} = \{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$, where $\eta_1 = T_U$ and $\eta_2 = F_{T_U}(g_2)$. Then,

$$T^{(\eta_1)} = \{g \in T_U : F_{T_U}(g) = \eta_1\} \text{ and } T^{(\eta_2)} = \{g \in T_U : F_{T_U}(g) = \eta_2\}.$$




FIGURE 3. T_U

Let \mathcal{A} be a set of finite symbols and let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}^{\Delta_m^{(\eta)}}$. The *tree-shift* $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ (or \mathcal{T}) of T associated with the *forbidden set* \mathcal{F} is defined by

$$(1.1) \quad \left\{ t = (t_g)_{g \in T} \in \mathcal{A}^T : \sigma_g(t)|_{\Delta_m^{(\eta)}} \notin \mathcal{F}, \forall \eta \in \mathcal{I}, \forall g \in T^{(\eta)}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \right\},$$

where $(\sigma_g(t))_{g'}$ = $t_{gg'}$ ($\forall g' \in \eta, \forall g \in T^{(\eta)}, \forall \eta \in \mathcal{I}$), and $t|_F = (t_g)_{g \in F}$ is the canonical projection of $t \in \mathcal{A}^T$ into \mathcal{A}^F ($\forall F \subseteq T$). When the set \mathcal{F} is finite, we call \mathcal{T} a *tree-shift of finite type* (TSFT for short). In view of (1.1), we define the *projected tree-shift* of \mathcal{T} by

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}} = \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}^{(\eta)},$$

where \sqcup denotes the disjoint union, and

$$\mathcal{T}^{(\eta)} = \bigcup_{g \in T^{(\eta)}} \{ \sigma_g(t) : t \in \mathcal{T} \}.$$

Note that if $T = T_d$, then $|\mathcal{I}| = 1$, $\Delta_m^{(\eta)} = \{g \in T_d : 0 \leq |g - \epsilon| \leq m\}$ ($\forall \eta \in \mathcal{I}$), and $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{T}$. Let $\Delta_m := \Delta_m^{(T_d)}$ and let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}^{\Delta_m}$, and the tree-shift \mathcal{T} in (1.1) can be written as

$$(1.2) \quad \left\{ t \in \mathcal{A}^{T_d} : \sigma_g(t)|_{\Delta_m} \notin \mathcal{F}, \forall g \in T_d, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \right\}.$$

The definition of (1.2) is the formal definition of the tree-shift on T_d (cf. [1, 2, 3, 18, 19]). The research topics on the dynamics of \mathcal{T} have been receiving a lot of attention lately because they exhibit phenomena that are very different from shift spaces defined on \mathbb{Z}^d . Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^T$ be a tree-shift on the tree T , and the *distance* $d(s, t)$ of $s, t \in \mathcal{T}^{(\eta)}$ for $\eta \in \mathcal{I}$ is defined by

$$(1.3) \quad d(s, t) = \inf \left\{ 2^{-m} : s|_{\Delta_m^{(\eta)}} = t|_{\Delta_m^{(\eta)}} \right\}.$$

1.3. The ω -limit sets. In this subsection, we study the ω -limit set of a shift space defined on G . Let G be a group or monoid, F be a family of subsets of G , $\sigma_g(x) : G \times X \rightarrow X$ ($g \in G$ and $x \in X$) be a G action on a compact metric space X , and $x \in X$. The *ω -limit set of x for the family F* [22] is defined by

$$(1.4) \quad \omega(x) = \bigcap_{A \in F} \overline{\{\sigma_g(x) : g \in A\}}.$$

Binder and Meddaugh [5, 6] introduced various types of ω -limit sets of a tree-shift \mathcal{T} on T_d in Definition 1.2, based on (1.4) with $G = T_d$. We say p is a *ray* in T if p is an infinite non-self-intersection path emanating from ϵ , that is,

$$p = (p_0, p_0p_1, p_0p_1p_2, \dots) = (\epsilon, g_{i_1}, g_{i_1}g_{i_2}, \dots).$$

We denote the collection of all rays in T by ∂T .

Definition 1.2. Let \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift on T_d , $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and $p \in \partial T_d$.

(1) The *ω -limit set of t* is defined as

$$(1.5) \quad \omega^d(t) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\{\sigma_g(t) : g \in T_d, |g - \epsilon| > n\}}.$$

(2) The ω -limit set of t along p is defined as

$$(1.6) \quad \omega_p^d(t) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\{\sigma_{g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \dots g_{i_k}}(t) : k \geq n\}}.$$

(3) The ω -limit set of t along followers of p is defined as

$$(1.7) \quad \omega_{F_p}^d(t) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\{\sigma_g(t) : g = g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \dots g_{i_n} g'\}}.$$

(4) The ω -limit set $\omega_{CPS}^d(t)$ of t in the sense of CPS² is defined as

$$(1.8) \quad \{s \in \mathcal{T} : \forall n \exists C_n \subseteq \mathcal{C} \text{ with } \underline{m}_{C_n} \geq n \ni \forall g \in C_n \ d(\sigma_g(t), s) < n^{-1}\},$$

where \mathcal{C} is the collection of all CPS of T , and $\underline{m}_P := \min\{|g - \epsilon| : g \in P\}$.

(5) A set $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{T_d}$ is called *invariant* if $\forall s \in S, \sigma_{g_i}(s) \in S$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

For \mathcal{T} is a tree-shift on T_M and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. The definition of an ω -limit set $\omega^M(t)$ (resp. $\omega_p^M(t)$ and $\omega_{F_p}^M(t)$) is similar to that of (1.5) (resp. (1.6) and (1.7)). The only modification is to replace the role of T_d in each definition of ω -limit sets with T_M . However, the definition of an ω -limit set of t in the sense of CPS needs to be modified as follows.

Definition 1.3. Let \mathcal{I} be the corresponding family of follower sets of a Markov-Cayley tree T_M . For any $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell \in \mathcal{I}$ with $1 \leq \ell \leq |\mathcal{I}|$, a subset C of T_M is called a $[\xi_1 : \xi_\ell]$ -CPS if C is a CPS in T_M and $\{F_{T_M}(g) : g \in C\} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell\}$. Let $\mathcal{C}^{[\xi_1 : \xi_\ell]}$ be the collection of all $[\xi_1 : \xi_\ell]$ -CPS in T_M . The ω -limit set of t in the sense of CPS is defined as

$$\omega_{CPS}^M(t) = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \bigcup_{\substack{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell \in \mathcal{I} \\ \forall i \neq j, \xi_i \neq \xi_j}} \omega_{CPS}^{M; [\xi_1 : \xi_\ell]}(t),$$

where $\omega_{CPS}^{M; [\xi_1 : \xi_\ell]}(t)$ is the set of vectors $(t_1, \dots, t_\ell) \in \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{A}^{\xi_i}$ satisfying that for all $n > 0 \exists C_n \in \mathcal{C}^{[\xi_1 : \xi_\ell]}$ with $\underline{m}_{C_n} \geq n$ such that $\forall g \in C_n$ if $F_{T_M}(g) = \xi_i$, then $d(\sigma_g(t), t_i) < n^{-1}$.

Note that if M is a $d \times d$ full one matrix, then $\mathcal{I}_{T_M} = \{T_d\}$. Thus, $\omega_{CPS}^M(t) = \omega_{CPS}^d(t)$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{T_M}$. A set $S \subseteq \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}^\eta$ is *invariant* if for all $s \in S$, $\sigma_{g_i}(s) \in S$ ($\forall \sigma_{g_i}(s) \neq \emptyset$). In [5, Theorem 4.20], the author establishes the basic properties of those ω -limit sets and proved that

$$(1.9) \quad \omega_{CPS}^d(t) \subseteq \omega_p^d(t) \subseteq \omega_{F_p}^d(t) \subseteq \omega^d(t), \quad \forall p \in \partial T_d, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

First, we prove some basic properties of these ω -limit sets and remark that the first inclusion of (1.9) is not generally true only when $T_M = T_d$ (Theorem 1.4 (4) is the same result as [5, Theorem 4.20]). For the relation of $\omega_{CPS}^M(t)$ with other ω -limit sets, we have the following theorem. Let A be a collection of vectors in \mathbb{R}^i for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. If all coordinates of any vectors of A are in the set B , then we write $A \trianglelefteq B$. Otherwise, $A \not\trianglelefteq B$.

Theorem 1.4. Let T_M be a Markov-Cayley tree, $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{T_M}$ be a tree-shift, p be a ray in ∂T_M and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. The following assertions hold true.

²A *prefix set* P is a subset of T such that no element in P is a prefix of another. A finite prefix P is a *complete prefix set* (CPS) if $\forall g \in T$ with $|g - \epsilon| \geq \max\{|g - \epsilon| : g \in P\}$ has a prefix in P .

- (1) $\omega^M(t)$ and $\omega_{F_p}^M(t)$ are invariant.
- (2) $\omega_p^M(t) \subseteq \omega_{F_p}^M(t) \subseteq \omega^M(t) \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}}$.
- (3) $\omega_{CPS}^M(t) \trianglelefteq \omega^M(t)$
- (4) If M is a full matrix, then

$$(1.10) \quad \omega_{CPS}^M(t) \trianglelefteq \omega_p^M(t) \subseteq \omega_{F_p}^M(t) \subseteq \omega^M(t).$$

Example 1.5 illustrates Theorem 1.4 and also provides an example that shows there exists a Markov-Cayley tree T_U , a tree-shift $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{T_U}$, two rays $p, q \in \partial T_M$, and a $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that

- (1) $\omega_q^U(t)$ is not invariant.
- (2) $\omega_p^U(t) \not\subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and $\omega_{CPS}^U(t) \not\subseteq \mathcal{T}$.
- (3) $\omega_{CPS}^U(t) \not\subseteq \omega_{F_p}^U(t)$.

Example 1.5. Let T_U be a Markov tree (see Figure 3). Let $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1\}^{T_U}$, $t = 0^{T_U} \in \mathcal{T}$, $p = (\epsilon, g_2, g_2^2, \dots)$ and $q = (\epsilon, g_1, g_1^2, \dots)$ be two rays in T_U . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^U(t) &= \{0^{T_U}, 0^{F_{T_U}(g_2)}\}, \\ \omega_p^U(t) &= \{0^{F_{T_U}(g_2)}\}, \\ \omega_q^U(t) &= \{0^{T_U}\}, \\ \omega_{F_p}^U(t) &= \{0^{F_{T_U}(g_2)}\}, \\ \omega_{CPS}^U(t) &= \{(0^{T_U}, 0^{F_{T_U}(g_2)})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\omega_q^U(t) = \{0^{T_U}\}$ and $\sigma_{g_2}(0^{T_U}) = 0^{F_{T_U}(g_2)} \notin \omega_q^U(t)$, we have that $\omega_q^U(t)$ is not invariant.

Let \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift on T_d , it is proved that the set of $\{\omega_p^d(t) : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$ possesses a fine structure, say internally chain transitive (ICT).

Definition 1.6 (ICT property for shifts on T_d). Let \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift on T_d .

- (1) Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and an $g = g_{i_1}g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_n} \in T_d$, an ε -chain indexed by g is a sequence $\{t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}\}$ of \mathcal{T} such that $d(\sigma_{g_{i_j}}(t_j), t_{j+1}) < \varepsilon$, $\forall 1 \leq j \leq n$.
- (2) A closed subset Y of \mathcal{T} is *internally chain transitive* ($Y \in \text{ICT}$) if for every $y, y' \in Y$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a $g \in T_d$ and an ε -chain $\{t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}\}$ indexed by g with $t_1 = y$ and $t_{n+1} = y'$.

In [5, Theorem 4.23], the author shows that the set ICT is closed, and in [5, Theorem 4.25], the author proves that the collection of ω_p -limit sets in \mathcal{T} belong to the set of ICT and equals to ICT when \mathcal{T} is a TSFT [5, Corollary 4.34]. Our goal is to extend those previous results to the class of \mathcal{T} 's, which are defined on the Markov-Cayley tree T_M . In this situation, the definition of ICT is no longer valid and we demonstrate the suitable definition below.

Definition 1.7 (PICT for shifts on T_M). Let M be an irreducible matrix and T_M is the corresponding Markov-Cayley tree.

- (1) For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $g = g_{i_1}g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_n} \in T_M$, a ε -projected chain indexed by g on $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a sequence $\{t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}\}$ of $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $d(\sigma_{g_{i_j}}(t_j), t_{j+1}) < \varepsilon$, $\forall 1 \leq j \leq n$.

- (2) A closed subset $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ of $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}^{(\eta)} = \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}}$ is *projected internally chain transitive* (write $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} \in \text{PICT}$) if for every $y, y' \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a $g \in T_M$ and an ε -projected chain $\{t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}\}$ of $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ indexed by g with $t_1 = y$ and $t_{n+1} = y'$.

Example 1.8. For $m, n \geq 1$, let $g = g_1^m g_2^n \in T_U$. Then, we have $F_{T_U}(g_1^i) = T_U \neq F_{T_U}(g_2) = F_{T_U}(g_1^m g_2^j)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ (see Figure 3). This provides a rationale for defining PICT as replacing \mathcal{T} in ICT with $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}}$.

We have the following results.

Theorem 1.9. *Let \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift defined on a Markov-Cayley tree T_M . The following assertions hold true.*

- (1) *PICT is closed.*
- (2) $\mathcal{W}_p^M := \{\omega_p^M(t) : t \in \mathcal{T}\} \subseteq \text{PICT}$.
- (3) *If \mathcal{T} is a TSFT, then $\mathcal{W}_p^M = \text{PICT}$.*

1.4. Shadowing and asymptotically shadowing properties. The (asymptotically) shadowing property for tree-shifts on T_d is introduced.

Definition 1.10. Let \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift defined on T_d .

- (1) An *orbit* of \mathcal{T} is a function $\mathcal{O} : T_d \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{O}(g) \in \mathcal{T}$ for all $g \in T_d$.
- (2) For $\delta > 0$, a δ -*pseudo orbit* is a function $\mathcal{O} : T_d \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that for $g \in T_d$ and $g_i \in \Sigma$ we have $d(\sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_i)) < \delta$.
- (3) A δ -pseudo orbit \mathcal{O} is ε -*shadowed* by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ if $d(\sigma_g(t), \mathcal{O}(g)) < \varepsilon$ for all $g \in T_d$.
- (4) A tree-shift \mathcal{T} has the *shadowing property* if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for any δ -pseudo orbit \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{T} is ε -shadowed by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

For \mathcal{T} is a tree-shift on T_d , it is proved that \mathcal{T} is an TSFT if and only if \mathcal{T} has the shadowing property ([5, Theorem 4.55], [9, Theorem 3.6]). The well-known and analogous result of a \mathbb{N} shift is extended by this result. The analogous result of the \mathbb{Z}^d (or \mathbb{N}^d) shifts can be found in [17]. Below is the list of the new definitions of the shadowing property for the tree shift on T_M .

Definition 1.11. Let \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift defined on T_M .

- (1) A *projected orbit* of \mathcal{T} is a function $\mathcal{O} : T_M \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{O}(g) \in \mathcal{T}^{(\eta)}, \forall g \in T_M^{(\eta)}, \forall \eta \in \mathcal{I}.$$

- (2) Let $\delta > 0$, a *projected pseudo orbit* of \mathcal{T} if

$$d(\sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_i)) < \delta, \forall g_i \in \Sigma \text{ with } gg_i \in T_M.$$

- (3) Let $\varepsilon > 0$, a *projected pseudo orbit* \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{T} is ε -*shadowed* by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$ if $d(\sigma_g(t), \mathcal{O}(g)) < \varepsilon$ for all $g \in T_M$.
- (4) A tree-shift has the *shadowing property* if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that every δ -projected pseudo orbit \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{T} is ε -shadowed by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

We characterize the shadowing property for tree-shifts on T_M in Theorem 1.12.

Theorem 1.12. *Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{T_M}$ be a tree-shift. Then \mathcal{T} is a TSFT if and only if \mathcal{T} has the shadowing property.*

The asymptotically shadowing property for tree-shift \mathcal{T} on T_M is defined.

Definition 1.13. Let \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift on T_M .

- (1) An *asymptotically projected pseudo orbit* \mathcal{O} is a projected pseudo orbit of \mathcal{T} and $\lim_{|g-\epsilon|\rightarrow\infty} d(\sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_i)) = 0$ for all $g, gg_i \in T_M^3$.
- (2) A δ -projected pseudo orbit \mathcal{O} is called an *asymptotically δ -projected pseudo orbit* \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{T} if it is also an asymptotic projected pseudo orbit.
- (3) A projected pseudo orbit \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{T} is *asymptotically shadowed* by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$ if for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(\sigma_g(t), \mathcal{O}(g)) < \varepsilon$ for all $g \in T_M$ with $|g - \epsilon| > n$.
- (4) A tree-shift \mathcal{T} has the *asymptotically δ -shadowing property* if every asymptotically δ -projected pseudo orbit of \mathcal{T} is asymptotically shadowed by a point of \mathcal{T} .

We prove that a m -step TSFT possesses the asymptotically shadowing property. The analogous result of the tree-shift on T_d [5, Theorem 4.61] can be extended to those on T_M by Theorem 1.14.

Theorem 1.14. *Every m -step TSFT $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{T_M}$ has the asymptotically $2^{-(m+1)}$ -shadowing property.*

In the remainder of this article, we provide the complete proof for Theorems 1.4 and 1.9 in Section 2, and Theorems 1.12 and 1.14 in Section 3.

2. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.4 AND 1.9

Before we prove the Theorem 1.4, the following lemma is needed.

Lemma 2.1. *The set $\omega^M(t)$ is equal to*

$$(2.1) \quad \left\{ s \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}^\eta : \forall n > 0, \exists \omega_n \in T_M \text{ with } |\omega_n - \epsilon| > n \ni d(\sigma_{\omega_n}(t), s) < n^{-1} \right\}.$$

Proof. For any $s \in \omega^M(t)$, by (1.5), we have that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$s \in \overline{\{\sigma_g(t) : g \in T_M \text{ with } |g - \epsilon| > n\}}.$$

Then, there exists a sequence $\{w_{n,i}\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq T_M$ with $|w_{n,i} - \epsilon| > n$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(\sigma_{w_{n,i}}(t), s) = 0.$$

By (2.2), there exists $m(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $i \geq m(n)$, then

$$d(\sigma_{w_{n,i}}(t), s) < n^{-1}.$$

Let $w_n = w_{n,m(n)} \in T_M$. We have $|w_n - \epsilon| > n$ and

$$d(\sigma_{w_n}(t), s) = d(\sigma_{w_{n,m(n)}}(t), s) < n^{-1}.$$

Thus, s in (2.1).

Conversely, if s in (2.1), then $s \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}^\eta$ such that

$$\forall n > 0, \exists w_n \in T_M \text{ with } |w_n - \epsilon| > n \ni d(\sigma_{w_n}(t), s) < n^{-1}.$$

³That is, for every $\delta > 0$, there is an integer n such that $|g - \epsilon| > n$ such that $d(\sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_i)) < \delta$ for all $g, gg_i \in T_M$.

Note that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\sigma_{w_{n+i}}(t)\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \{\sigma_g(t) : g \in T_M \text{ with } |g - \epsilon| > n\}$ (since $|w_{n+i} - \epsilon| > n + i > n$) and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(\sigma_{w_{n+i}}(t), s) < \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (n + i)^{-1} = 0.$$

Hence,

$$s \in \overline{\{\sigma_g(t) : g \in T_M \text{ with } |g - \epsilon| > n\}}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, $s \in \omega^M(t)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4.

(1) We first prove that $\omega^M(t)$ is invariant. For $s \in \omega^M(t)$ and $n > 0$, according to Lemma 2.1, there exists $g \in T_M$ with $|g - \epsilon| > 2n$ such that $d(\sigma_g(t), s) < (2n)^{-1}$. Then, for any $g_i \in \Sigma$ with $gg_i \in T_M$, we have

$$d(\sigma_{gg_i}(t), \sigma_{g_i}(s)) < 2 \cdot d(\sigma_g(t), s) < 2 \cdot (2n)^{-1} = n^{-1}$$

Moreover, $|gg_i - \epsilon| = |g - \epsilon| + 1 > 2n + 1 > n$. By Lemma 2.1 again, $\sigma_{g_i}(s) \in \omega^M(t)$ for all $\sigma_{g_i}(s) \neq \emptyset$ hence $\omega^M(t)$ is invariant.

The proof of invariance of $\omega_{F_p}^M(t)$ is similar to $\omega^M(t)$, so we omit it here.

(2) The proof is directly obtained by the definitions of $\omega^M(t)$, $\omega_p^M(t)$ and $\omega_{F_p}^M(t)$.
 (3) Let T_M be a Markov Cayley tree, and \mathcal{T} be a tree-shift on T_M and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. If $\omega_{CPS}^M(t) = \emptyset$, then it is clear that $\omega_{CPS}^M(t) \trianglelefteq \omega^M(t)$. If $\omega_{CPS}^M(t) \neq \emptyset$, then for any $v \in \omega_{CPS}^M(t)$, there exist $1 \leq \ell \leq |\mathcal{I}|$ and $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$v = (t_1, \dots, t_\ell) \in \omega_{CPS}^{M; [\xi_1: \xi_\ell]}(t),$$

and for any $n > 0$, there exists $C_n \in \mathcal{C}^{[\xi_1: \xi_\ell]}$ with $\underline{m}_{C_n} > n$ such that

$$\forall g \in C_n, \text{ if } F_{T_M}(g) = \xi_i, \text{ then } d(\sigma_g(t), t_i) < n^{-1}.$$

This implies that for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and for such fixed n , there exists an $w_i \in C_n$ with $F_{T_M}(w_i) = \xi_i$ and $|w_i - \epsilon| > n$ such that

$$d(\sigma_{w_i}(t), t_i) < n^{-1}.$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$t_i \in \omega^M(t), \forall 1 \leq i \leq \ell.$$

Thus, $\omega_{CPS}^M(t) \trianglelefteq \omega^M(t)$.

(4) The proof of (1.10) is quickly obtained by (1.9). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.9.

(1) Let $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} \in \overline{\text{PICT}}$, we claim that $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} \in \text{PICT}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, choosing $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Z^{(\eta)} \in \text{PICT}$ with

$$(2.3) \quad d' \left(\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}, \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Z^{(\eta)} \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{6},$$

where $d'(\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}, \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Z^{(\eta)}) := \max\{d(a, b) : a \in Y^{(\eta)}, b \in Z^{(\eta)}, \eta \in \mathcal{I}\}$ (for simplicity, we write $d' = d$). By (2.3), for any $y, y' \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$, there exist $z, z' \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Z^{(\eta)}$ such that $d(y, z) < \frac{\varepsilon}{6}$ and $d(y', z') < \frac{\varepsilon}{6}$.

Since $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Z^{(\eta)} \in \text{PICT}$, there exists an $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ -projected chain ($\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ -PC) of $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Z^{(\eta)}$ indexed by $g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_n} \in T_M$, and denoted by $\{z = z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n+1} = z'\}$, such that $d(\sigma_{g_{i_j}}(z_j), z_{j+1}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.

By (2.3) again, we can choose $y = y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n+1} = y' \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ such that

$$d(y_i, z_i) < \frac{\varepsilon}{6}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n+1.$$

Then, for $1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_j}}(y_j), y_{j+1}\right) &\leq d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_j}}(y_j), \sigma_{g_{i_j}}(z_j)\right) + d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_j}}(z_j), z_{j+1}\right) + d(z_{j+1}, y_{j+1}) \\ &< 2 \cdot d(y_j, z_j) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\ &< 2 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{6} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\{y = y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n+1} = y'\}$ is an ε -PC of $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ indexed by $g_{i_1}g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_n} \in T_M$. Hence, $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} \in \text{PICT}$. Therefore, PICT is closed.

(2) We first claim that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $p = (\varepsilon, g_{i_1}, g_{i_1}g_{i_2}, \dots) \in \partial T_M$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists an $N(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that if $n \geq N$ then $d(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_n}}(t), \omega_p^M(t)) < \varepsilon$. Arguing contrapositively, we have an increasing sequence of integers $\{n_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ with

$$d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_{n_j}}}(t), \omega_p^M(t)\right) \geq \varepsilon.$$

By passing to a subsequence if necessary, $\{\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_{n_j}}}(t)\}_{j=1}^\infty$ converges to a point $s \in \omega_p^M(t)$. This is contradictory to $d(s, \omega_p^M(t)) \geq \varepsilon$. This ends the proof of the claim.

Let $\omega_p^M(t) \in \mathcal{W}_p^M$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. By the above claim, there exists an $N > 0$ such that if $n > N$ then

$$(2.4) \quad d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_n}}(t), \omega_p^M(t)\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

By (2.4), for any $y, y' \in \omega_p^M(t)$, there are $m, n > N$ such that

$$d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_n}}(t), y\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \text{ and } d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_m}}(t), y'\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

W.L.O.G, let $n < m$. By (2.4) again, for any $n < j < m$, there is $y_j \in \omega_p^M(t)$ such that

$$d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_j}}(t), y_j\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Denoting $y = y_n$ and $y' = y_m$, we now verify that $\{y = y_n, y_{n+1}, \dots, y_m = y'\}$ is an ε -PC of $\omega_p^M(t)$ indexed by $g = g_{i_n} \cdots g_{i_m}$. For $n \leq j < m$,

$$\begin{aligned} d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_{j+1}}}(y_j), y_{j+1}\right) &\leq d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_{j+1}}}(y_j), \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_{j+1}}}(t)\right) + d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_{j+1}}}(t), y_{j+1}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \cdot d\left(y_j, \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_j}}(t)\right) + d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_{j+1}}}(t), y_{j+1}\right) \\ &< 2 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\omega_p^M(t) \in \text{PICT}$.

(3) Let \mathcal{T} be a m -step TSFT. By (2) of Theorem 1.9, we have $\mathcal{W}_p^M \subseteq \text{PICT}$. It remains to show that $\text{PICT} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_p^M$. Let $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} \in \text{PICT}$, we claim that

$$\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} = \omega_p^M(t) \text{ for some } t \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } p \in \partial T_M.$$

For $r \geq m + 1$, let $\{x_i^r\}_{i=0}^{n_r} \subseteq \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ be a sequence that 2^{-r} covers $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ (That is, $\forall x \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$, $\exists 0 \leq i \leq n_r \ni d(x, x_i^r) < 2^{-r}$). Such n_r is finite since

$$\left| \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \left\{ y|_{\Delta_r^{(\eta)}} : y \in Y^{(\eta)} \right\} \right| \leq \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \left| \left\{ y|_{\Delta_r^{(\eta)}} : y \in Y^{(\eta)} \right\} \right| \leq \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} |\mathcal{A}|^{|\Delta_r^{(\eta)}|} < \infty.$$

Since $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} \in \text{PICT}$, there exists a 2^{-r} -PC from x_i^r to x_{i+1}^r indexed by u_i where u_i begins with x_i^r and ends with x_{i+1}^r . By concatenating these chains, we can obtain a 2^{-r} -PC $\{x_0^r = y_0^r, \dots, y_{\ell_r}^r = x_{n_r}^r\}$ from x_0^r to $x_{n_r}^r$ indexed by $v_1^r \cdots v_{\ell_r}^r$ and for each $0 \leq i \leq n_r$ there exists $0 \leq j \leq \ell_r$ such that $x_i^r = y_j^r$.

Let

$$\{z_i\}_{i=0}^\infty := \left\{ y_0^{m+1}, \dots, y_{\ell_{m+1}}^{m+1} = y_0^{m+2}, y_1^{m+2}, \dots, y_{\ell_{m+2}}^{m+2} = y_0^{m+3}, y_1^{m+3}, \dots \right\},$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} p &:= (\epsilon, v_1^{m+1}, v_1^{m+1}v_2^{m+1}, \dots, v_1^{m+1} \cdots v_{\ell_{m+1}}^{m+1}, v_1^{m+1} \cdots v_{\ell_{m+1}}^{m+1}v_2^{m+2}, \dots) \\ &:= (\epsilon, g_{i_1}, g_{i_1}g_{i_2}, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\{z_i\}_{i=0}^\infty \subseteq \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ and $p \in \partial T_M$. Note that

$$(2.5) \quad d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_{j+1}}}(z_j), z_{j+1}\right) < 2^{-(m+1)}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N},$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad \forall n > m + 1, \exists k_n \ni d\left(\sigma_{g_{i_{j+1}}}(z_j), z_{j+1}\right) < 2^{-n}, \quad \forall j > k_n.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} t|_g &:= z_0|_g, \quad \forall g \in T_M \text{ with } g \neq g_{i_1}g', \\ \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_n}}(t)|_\epsilon &:= z_n|_\epsilon, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_j}}(t)|_g &:= z_j|_g, \quad \forall g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_j} g \in T_M \text{ with } g \neq g_{i_{j+1}}g'. \end{aligned}$$

Since for $g = g_j g' \in T_M$ with $g_j \neq g_{i_1}$, we have

$$(2.7) \quad \sigma_g(t)|_{\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} = \sigma_g(z_0)|_{\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} \notin \mathcal{F}.$$

Since for $g = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_s} g_j g' \in T_M$ ($s \geq 1$) with $g_j \neq g_{i_{s+1}}$, we have

$$(2.8) \quad \sigma_g(t)|_{\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} = \sigma_{g_j g'}(z_{i_s})|_{\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} \notin \mathcal{F}.$$

Since for $g = \epsilon$ and $u \in \Delta_m^{(T_M)}$, if $u = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_\ell}$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq m$), then, by (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &d(z_{i_\ell}, \sigma_u(z_0)) = d(z_{i_\ell}, \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_\ell}}(z_0)) \\ &\leq d(z_{i_\ell}, \sigma_{g_{i_\ell}}(z_{i_{\ell-1}})) + d(\sigma_{g_{i_\ell}}(z_{i_{\ell-1}}), \sigma_{g_{i_\ell}}(\sigma_{g_{i_{\ell-1}}}(z_{i_{\ell-2}}))) \\ &\quad + \cdots + d(\sigma_{g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_\ell}}(z_{i_1}), \sigma_{g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_\ell}}(\sigma_{g_{i_1}}(z_0))) \\ (2.9) \quad &\leq d(z_{i_\ell}, \sigma_{g_{i_\ell}}(z_{i_{\ell-1}})) + 2 \cdot d(z_{i_{\ell-1}}, \sigma_{g_{i_{\ell-1}}}(z_{i_{\ell-2}})) \\ &\quad + \cdots + 2^{\ell-1} \cdot d(z_{i_1}, \sigma_{g_{i_1}}(z_0)) \\ &< 2^{-(m+1)}(1 + \cdots + 2^{\ell-1}) \leq 2^{-(m+1)}(1 + \cdots + 2^{m-1}) < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(2.10) \quad \sigma_u(t)|_\epsilon = \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_s}}(t)|_\epsilon = z_{i_s}|_\epsilon = \sigma_u(z_0)|_\epsilon.$$

If $u = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_s} g_\ell g'$ with $g_\ell \neq g_{i_{s+1}}$, then, by (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(\sigma_{g_\ell g'}(z_{i_s}), \sigma_u(z_0)) &= d(\sigma_{g_\ell g'}(z_{i_s}), \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_s} g_\ell g'}(z_0)) \\ &\leq 2^{|g_\ell g' - \epsilon|} \cdot d(z_{i_s}, \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_s}}(z_0)) \\ &< 2^{|g_\ell g' - \epsilon|} \cdot 2^{-(m+1)}(1 + \cdots + 2^{s-1}) < 1. \quad (\text{since } |g_\ell g' - \epsilon| + s \leq m) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(2.11) \quad \sigma_u(t)|_\epsilon = \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_s} g_\ell g'}(t)|_\epsilon = \sigma_{g_\ell g'}(z_{i_s})|_\epsilon = \sigma_u(z_0)|_\epsilon.$$

Hence by (2.10) and (2.11), we obtain

$$(2.12) \quad t|_{\Delta_m^{(T_M)}} = z_0|_{\Delta_m^{(T_M)}} \notin \mathcal{F}.$$

Since for $g = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_s}$ ($s \geq 1$) and $u \in \Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}$, if $u = g_{i_{s+1}} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}}$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq m$), then, by (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_{i_{s+\ell}}, \sigma_u(z_{i_s})) &= d(z_{i_{s+\ell}}, \sigma_{g_{i_{s+1}} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_s})) \\ &\leq d(z_{i_{s+\ell}}, \sigma_{g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_{s+\ell-1}})) + d(\sigma_{g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_{s+\ell-1}}), \sigma_{g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_{s+\ell-1}})) \\ &\quad + \cdots + d(\sigma_{g_{i_{s+2}} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_{s+1}}), \sigma_{g_{i_{s+2}} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_{s+1}})) \\ (2.13) \quad &\leq d(z_{i_{s+\ell}}, \sigma_{g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_{s+\ell-1}})) + 2 \cdot d(z_{i_{s+\ell-1}}, \sigma_{g_{i_{s+\ell-1}}}(z_{i_{s+\ell-2}})) \\ &\quad + \cdots + 2^{\ell-1} \cdot d(z_{i_{s+1}}, \sigma_{g_{i_{s+1}}}(z_{i_s})) \\ &< 2^{-(m+1)}(1 + \cdots + 2^{\ell-1}) \leq 2^{-(m+1)}(1 + \cdots + 2^{m-1}) < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(2.14) \quad \sigma_{gu}(t)|_\epsilon = \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(t)|_\epsilon = z_{i_{s+\ell}}|_\epsilon = \sigma_u(z_{i_s})|_\epsilon.$$

If $u = g_{i_{s+1}} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}} g_j g'$ with $g_j \neq g_{i_{s+\ell+1}}$, then, by (2.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(\sigma_{g_j g'}(z_{i_{s+\ell}}), \sigma_u(z_{i_s})) &= d(\sigma_{g_j g'}(z_{i_{s+\ell}}), \sigma_{g_{i_{s+1}} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}} g_j g'}(z_{i_s})) \\ &\leq 2^{|g_j g' - \epsilon|} \cdot d(z_{i_{s+\ell}}, \sigma_{g_{i_{s+1}} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}}}(z_{i_s})) \\ &< 2^{|g_j g' - \epsilon|} \cdot 2^{-(m+1)}(1 + \cdots + 2^{\ell-1}) < 1. \quad (\text{since } |g_j g' - \epsilon| + \ell \leq m) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(2.15) \quad \sigma_{gu}(t)|_\epsilon = \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_{s+\ell}} g_j g'}(t)|_\epsilon = \sigma_{g_j g'}(z_{i_{s+\ell}})|_\epsilon = \sigma_u(z_{i_s})|_\epsilon.$$

Hence by (2.14) and (2.15), we obtain

$$(2.16) \quad t|_{g\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} = z_{i_s}|_{\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} \notin \mathcal{F}.$$

Therefore, by (2.7), (2.8), (2.12) and (2.16), we have $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Now, we already construct a $\omega_p^M(t)$ with above $p \in \partial T_M$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. It remains to verify that

$$\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)} = \omega_p^M(t).$$

For $y \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ and $n' > m + 1$, since $\{x_i^r\}_{i=0}^{n_r}$ is 2^{-r} covering of $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$, we have that there exist $r \geq n' + 1$ and $0 \leq s \leq n_r$ such that

$$(2.17) \quad d(y, x_s^r) < 2^{-(n'+1)},$$

and, by (2.6) and definitions of t and p , there exists $j > k_{n'+1}$ such that

$$(2.18) \quad \sigma_{g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_j}}(t)|_{\Delta_{n'+1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_{i_j}))}} = x_s^r|_{\Delta_{n'+1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_{i_j}))}}.$$

By (2.17) and (2.18), we have

$$d(y, \sigma_{g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_j}}(t)) \leq d(y, x_s^r) + d(x_s^r, \sigma_{g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_j}}(t)) < 2^{-(n'+1)} + 2^{-(n'+1)} = 2^{-n'}.$$

Thus, $y \in \omega_p^M(t)$.

Conversely, for $y \in \omega_p^M(t)$, by the definition of $\omega_p^M(t)$, we have

$$\forall n' > m + 1, \exists \{y_{n', i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \{\sigma_{g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_j}}(t) : j \geq k_{n'}\} \ni \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(y, y_{n', i}) = 0,$$

where $k_{n'}$ defined in (2.6). Then, by (2.6), there exists $y_{n'} \in \{y_{n', i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$(2.19) \quad d(y, y_{n'}) < 2^{-n'},$$

where $y_{n'} = \sigma_{g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_{s(n')}}}(t)$ for some $s(n') \geq k_{n'}$.

Thus, by (2.19),

$$y|_{\Delta_{n'}^{(F_{T_M}(g_{i_{s(n')}}))}} = y_{n'}|_{\Delta_{n'}^{(F_{T_M}(g_{i_{s(n')}}))}} = z_{s(n')}|_{\Delta_{n'}^{(F_{T_M}(g_{i_{s(n')}}))}},$$

where $z_{s(n')} \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$. Hence,

$$d(y, z_{s(n')}) < 2^{-n'}.$$

Thus,

$$(2.20) \quad \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} d(y, z_{s(n')}) = 0.$$

Since $z_{s(n')} \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ and $\bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$ is closed, and (2.20), we have $y \in \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} Y^{(\eta)}$. The proof is complete. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.12 AND 1.14

Proof of Theorem 1.12. We first prove that if \mathcal{T} is a TSFT then \mathcal{T} has the shadowing property. Let \mathcal{T} be an m -step TSFT with the forbidden set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}^{\Delta_m^{(\eta)}}$.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\delta = 2^{-s} < \min\{2^{-m}, \varepsilon\}$ ($s \in \mathbb{Z}$) and let \mathcal{O} be a δ -projected pseudo orbit (δ -PPO) of \mathcal{T} . Define $t \in \mathcal{A}^{T_M}$ by

$$t|_g = \mathcal{O}(g)|_\varepsilon, \quad \forall g \in T_M.$$

We claim that $t \in \mathcal{T}$, that is, no member of \mathcal{F} appears in t . For any $g \in T_M$, since \mathcal{O} is a δ -PPO, we have

$$d(\sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_i)) < \delta, \quad \forall g_i \in \Sigma \text{ with } gg_i \in T_M.$$

Then, for $gg_{i_1} \dots gg_{i_k} \in T_M$ with $1 \leq k \leq s$, we have

$$d(\sigma_{g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_k}}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_{i_1} \dots gg_{i_k})) < 2^{k-1} \cdot \delta < 2^{-1}.$$

This implies that

$$\sigma_{g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_k}}(\mathcal{O}(g))|_\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(gg_{i_1} \dots gg_{i_k})|_\varepsilon.$$

Thus, for any $u = g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_k} \in \Delta_s^{(F_{T_M}(g))}$, we have

$$\sigma_u(\mathcal{O}(g))|_\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(gu)|_\varepsilon =: t|_{gu}.$$

Hence,

$$(3.1) \quad t|_{g\Delta_s^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} = \mathcal{O}(g)|_{\Delta_s^{(F_{T_M}(g))}}.$$

Since $m < s$, we have

$$t|_{g\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} = \mathcal{O}(g)|_{\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} \notin \mathcal{F}.$$

Therefore, $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Furthermore, by (3.1), we have that $\forall g \in T_M$,

$$d(\sigma_g(t), \mathcal{O}(g)) < 2^{-s} < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, \mathcal{O} is ε -shadowed by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and hence \mathcal{T} has the shadowing property.

Conversely, arguing contrapositively, if \mathcal{T} is not a TSFT, then we claim that for any $\delta > 0$, there is a δ -PPO of \mathcal{T} which can not be 1-shadowed by any point in \mathcal{T} . Note that if \mathcal{T} is not a TSFT, then \mathcal{T} is not a m -step TSFT for all $m \geq 0$. Then, for any $m \geq 1$, there exist a positive integer $m' > m + 2$ and a member $P \in \mathcal{F}$ with $P \in \cup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}_{m'}^{\Delta(\eta)}$ such that no member of $\mathcal{F} \cap \cup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}_n^{\Delta(\eta)}$ appears in P for all $0 \leq n \leq m' - 1$.

Fix a $\delta > 0$, choosing $1 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\delta > 2^{-m}$. Then, there exist an $m' > m + 2$ and a member $P \in \mathcal{F} \cap \cup_{\eta \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}_{m'}^{\Delta(\eta)}$ as above. Note that T_M is a Markov-Cayley tree, $\mathcal{I} = \{T_M, F_{T_M}(g_1), \dots, F_{T_M}(g_d)\}$. Thus, $P \in \mathcal{A}_{m'}^{\Delta(\eta)}$ for some $\eta \in \{T_M, F_{T_M}(g_1), \dots, F_{T_M}(g_d)\}$.

If $\eta = T_M$, then there exist points $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}^{(T_M)}$ and $t_i \in \mathcal{T}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}$ ($1 \leq i \leq d$) such that

$$t_0|_{\Delta_{m'-1}^{(\eta)}} = P|_{\Delta_{m'-1}^{(\eta)}} \quad \text{and} \quad t_i|_{\Delta_{m'-1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} = P|_{g_i \Delta_{m'-1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}}.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) &:= t_0, \\ \mathcal{O}(g_i) &:= t_i, \quad (\forall 1 \leq i \leq d), \\ \mathcal{O}(g_i g) &:= \sigma_g(t_i), \quad (\forall g_i g \in T_M). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} &= \sigma_{g_i}(t_0)|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} = P|_{g_i \Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} \\ &= t_i|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} = \mathcal{O}(g_i)|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(3.2) \quad d(\sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)), \mathcal{O}(g_i)) \leq 2^{-(m'-2)} < 2^{-m} < \delta.$$

Since for $g = g_i g'$, $g g_j \in T_M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{g_j}(\mathcal{O}(g)) &= \sigma_{g_j}(\mathcal{O}(g_i g')) = \sigma_{g_j}(\sigma_{g'}(t_i)) \\ &= \sigma_{g' g_j}(t_i) = \mathcal{O}(g_i g' g_j) = \mathcal{O}(g g_j), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(3.3) \quad d(\sigma_{g_j}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(g g_j)) = 0 < \delta, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

Hence by (3.2) and (3.3), \mathcal{O} is a δ -PPO of \mathcal{T} . Now, if \mathcal{O} is 1-shadowed by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$, then

$$(3.4) \quad t|_g = \mathcal{O}(g)|_\varepsilon, \quad \forall g \in T_M.$$

This implies $t|_{\Delta_{m'}^{(\eta)}} = P$. Since $P \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $t \notin \mathcal{T}$, which is contradictory to $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

If $\eta = F_{T_M}(g_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq d$, then there exist points $s_0 \in \mathcal{T}^{(T_M)}$ and $s_j \in \mathcal{T}^{(F_{T_M}(g_j))}$ ($\forall g_i g_j \in T_M$) such that

$$s_0|_{g_i \Delta_{m'-1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} = P|_{\Delta_{m'-1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} \quad \text{and} \quad s_j|_{\Delta_{m'-1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_j))}} = P|_{g_j \Delta_{m'-1}^{(F_{T_M}(g_j))}}.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}(g) &:= \sigma_g(s_0), \text{ if } g \in T_M \text{ and } g \neq g_i g', \\ \mathcal{O}(g_i) &:= \sigma_{g_i}(s_0), \\ \mathcal{O}(g_i g_j g) &:= \sigma_g(s_j), \text{ if } g_i g_j g \in T_M.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)) = \sigma_{g_\ell}(s_0) = \mathcal{O}(g_\ell),$$

we have

$$(3.5) \quad d(\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)), \mathcal{O}(g_\ell)) = 0 < \delta, \quad \forall 1 \leq \ell \leq d.$$

Since for $g, gg_\ell \in T_M$ with $g \neq g_i g'$,

$$\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(g)) = \sigma_{g_\ell}(\sigma_g(s_0)) = \sigma_{gg_\ell}(s_0) = \mathcal{O}(gg_\ell),$$

we have

$$(3.6) \quad d(\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_\ell)) = 0 < \delta.$$

Since for $g_i g_\ell \in T_M$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(g_i))|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_\ell))}} &= \sigma_{g_\ell}(\sigma_{g_i}(s_0))|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_\ell))}} = \sigma_{g_i g_\ell}(s_0)|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_\ell))}} \\ &= P|_{g_\ell \Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_\ell))}} = s_\ell|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_\ell))}} = \mathcal{O}(g_i g_\ell)|_{\Delta_{m'-2}^{(F_{T_M}(g_\ell))}},\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(3.7) \quad d(\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(g_i)), \mathcal{O}(g_i g_\ell)) \leq 2^{-(m'-2)} < 2^{-m} < \delta.$$

Since for $g_i g_j g_\ell \in T_M$,

$$\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(g_i g_j g)) = \sigma_{g_\ell}(\sigma_g(s_j)) = \sigma_{gg_\ell}(s_j) = \mathcal{O}(g_i g_j g_\ell),$$

we have

$$(3.8) \quad d(\sigma_{g_\ell}(\mathcal{O}(g_i g_j g)), \mathcal{O}(g_i g_j g_\ell)) = 0 < \delta.$$

Hence by (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8), \mathcal{O} is a δ -PPO of \mathcal{T} . Now, if \mathcal{O} is 1-shadowed by a point $t \in \mathcal{T}$, then by (3.4), we have $t|_{g_i \Delta_{m'}^{(F_{T_M}(g_i))}} = P \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus, $t \notin \mathcal{T}$. The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.14. Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{(T_M)}$ be an m -step TSFT. For any asymptotic $2^{-(m+1)}$ -projected pseudo orbit ($2^{-(m+1)}$ -APPO) \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{T} , define

$$t|_g := \mathcal{O}(g)|_\epsilon, \quad \forall g \in T_M.$$

We claim that $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and \mathcal{O} is asymptotically shadowed by t . Since \mathcal{O} is $2^{-(m+1)}$ -APPO hence $2^{-(m+1)}$ -PPO, we have

$$t|_{g \Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} = \mathcal{O}(g)|_{\Delta_m^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} \notin \mathcal{F}, \quad \forall g \in T_M.$$

Since \mathcal{T} is an m -step TSFT, we have $t \in \mathcal{T}$. It remains to show that \mathcal{O} is asymptotically shadowed by t . For any $\delta > 0$, since \mathcal{O} is $2^{-(m+1)}$ -APPO hence APPO, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall g, gg_i \in T_M$ with $|g - \epsilon| > n$,

$$(3.9) \quad d(\sigma_{g_i}(\mathcal{O}(g)), \mathcal{O}(gg_i)) < \delta \cdot 2^{-1}.$$

Let $m' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{-(m'+1)} < \delta \cdot 2^{-1} \leq 2^{-m'}$. Equation (3.9) gives that

$$\mathcal{O}(g)|_{g'} = \mathcal{O}(gg')|_\epsilon, \quad \forall |gg' - g| \leq m', \quad \forall g, gg' \in T_M \text{ with } |g - \epsilon| > n.$$

Thus,

$$t|_{g\Delta_{m'}^{(F_{T_M}(g))}} = \mathcal{O}(g)|_{\Delta_{m'}^{(F_{T_M}(g))}}, \forall g \in T_M \text{ with } |g - \epsilon| > n.$$

Hence,

$$d(\sigma_g(t), \mathcal{O}(g)) \leq 2^{-m'} < \delta, \forall g \in T_M \text{ with } |g - \epsilon| > n.$$

The proof is complete. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ban is partially supported by the National Science and Technology Council, ROC (Contract NSTC 111-2115-M-004-005-MY3). Lai is partially supported by the National Science and Technology Council, ROC (Contract NSTC 111-2811-M-004-002-MY2).

REFERENCES

1. N. Aubrun and M.-P. Beal, *Tree-shifts of finite type*, Theoretical Computer Science **459** (2012), 16–25.
2. J.-C. Ban and C.-H. Chang, *Tree-shifts: Irreducibility, mixing, and chaos of tree-shifts*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **369** (2017), 8389–8407.
3. ———, *Tree-shifts: The entropy of tree-shifts of finite type*, Nonlinearity **30** (2017), 2785–2804.
4. A. Barwell, C. Good, and P. Oprocha, *Shadowing and expansivity in subspaces*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **219** (2012), no. 3, 223–243.
5. K. Binder, *Limit sets in finitely-generated free group and monoid actions*, Ph.D. thesis, 2019.
6. K. Binder and J. Meddaugh, *Limit sets and internal transitivity in free group actions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.07382 (2019).
7. W. R. Brian, J. Meddaugh, and B. E. Raines, *Chain transitivity and variations of the shadowing property*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **35** (2015), no. 7, 2044–2052.
8. H. Bruin, *Topological and ergodic theory of symbolic dynamics*, vol. 228, American Mathematical Society, 2022.
9. D. Bucki, *On the stability and shadowing of tree-shifts of finite type*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04456 (2024).
10. C. Good and J. Meddaugh, *Orbital shadowing, internal chain transitivity and limit sets*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **38** (2018), no. 1, 143–154.
11. C. Good, J. Meddaugh, and J. Mitchell, *Shadowing, internal chain transitivity and α -limit sets*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **491** (2020), no. 1, 124291.
12. M. Kulczycki, D. Kwietniak, and P. Oprocha, *On almost specification and average shadowing properties*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **224** (2014), no. 3, 241–278.
13. D. Kwietniak and P. Oprocha, *A note on the average shadowing property for expansive maps*, Topology and its Applications **159** (2012), no. 1, 19–27.
14. J. Li and P. Oprocha, *Shadowing property, weak mixing and regular recurrence*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations **25** (2013), 1233–1249.
15. J. Meddaugh and B. E. Raines, *Shadowing and internal chain transitivity*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **222** (2013), no. 3, 279–287.

16. ———, *The structure of limit sets for \mathbb{Z}^d actions*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems **34** (2014), no. 11, 4765–4780.
17. P. Oprocha, *Shadowing in multi-dimensional shift spaces*, Colloquium Mathematicum, vol. 110, Instytut Matematyczny Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2008, pp. 451–460.
18. K. Petersen and I. Salama, *Tree shift topological entropy*, Theoretical Computer Science **743** (2018), 64–71.
19. ———, *Entropy on regular trees*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems **40** (2020), no. 7, 4453.
20. S. Y. Pilyugin, *Shadowing in dynamical systems*, Springer, 2006.
21. S. Y. Pilyugin and S. B. Tikhomirov, *Shadowing in actions of some abelian groups*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **179** (2003), no. 1, 83–96.
22. J. Souza, *On limit behavior of semigroup actions on noncompact spaces*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **140** (2012), no. 11, 3959–3972.

(Jung-Chao Ban) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL CHENGCHI UNIVERSITY, TAIPEI 11605, TAIWAN, ROC.

MATH. DIVISION, NATIONAL CENTER FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCE, NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY, TAIPEI 10617, TAIWAN. ROC.

Email address: jcban@nccu.edu.tw

(Nai-Zhu Huang) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL CHENGCHI UNIVERSITY, TAIPEI 11605, TAIWAN, ROC.

Email address: naizhu7@gmail.com

(Guan-Yu Lai) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL CHENGCHI UNIVERSITY, TAIPEI 11605, TAIWAN, ROC.

Email address: gylai@nccu.edu.tw