

MULTIDIMENSIONAL LOCAL LIMIT THEOREM IN DETERMINISTIC SYSTEMS AND AN APPLICATION TO NON-CONVERGENCE OF POLYNOMIAL MULTIPLE AVERAGES

ZEMER KOSLOFF AND SHREY SANADHYA

ABSTRACT. We show that for every ergodic and aperiodic probability preserving system (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) , there exists $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$, whose corresponding cocycle satisfies the d -dimensional local central limit theorem.

We use the 2-dimensional result to resolve a question of Huang, Shao and Ye and Franzikakis and Host regarding non-convergence in L^2 of polynomial multiple averages of non-commuting zero entropy transformations. Our methods also give the first examples of failure of multiple recurrence for zero entropy transformations along polynomial iterates.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a probability preserving transformation (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) , and a function $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its **sum process** is defined by $S_n(g) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g \circ T^k$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly if $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a d -dimensional map given by $f(x) = (f^{(1)}(x), \dots, f^{(d)}(x))$ for $x \in X$, then $f \circ T(x) = (f^{(1)} \circ T(x), \dots, f^{(d)} \circ T(x))$ and the sum process represents component wise summation. In other words for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$S_n(f) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^k = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (f^{(1)} \circ T^k, \dots, f^{(d)} \circ T^k).$$

We will also refer to $S_n(f)$ as the cocycle corresponding to f .

In [BD87], Burton and Denker proved the following surprising result: For every (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) an aperiodic and probability preserving system there exists a square integrable function whose corresponding cocycle satisfies a non-degenerate central limit theorem. In [Vol99], Volný proved the existence of a function f whose corresponding cocycle satisfies the central limit theorem and its corresponding sum process converges to a non-degenerate Brownian motion. In particular the variance of $S_n(f)$ grows linearly. For a comprehensive history of such results we refer the reader to the introduction of [Vol99] and [KV22].

In [KV22], it was shown by the first author and Volný that for every ergodic and aperiodic probability preserving system (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) , there exists a \mathbb{Z} valued function whose corresponding cocycle satisfies a lattice local central limit theorem. In the first part of this work, we prove the following d -dimensional lattice local central limit theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) be an ergodic and aperiodic probability preserving transformation. There exists a square integrable function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\int_X f dm = 0$, such*

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28D05, 37A05, 37A50, 37A30, 60F05, 60G10.

Key words and phrases. Local central limit theorem; Polynomial multiple convergence; Zero entropy stationary process.

that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} n^{d/2} \left| m(S_n(f) = x) - \frac{1}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{d/2}} e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}} \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

where $\sigma^2 = 2(\ln 2)^2$.

The local limit theorem of [KV22], is the $d = 1$ case of [Theorem 1.1](#).

Given S, T , two measure preserving transformations of the probability space (X, \mathcal{B}, m) and $f, g \in L^2(X, m)$ the corresponding double averages are defined by

$$\mathbb{A}_n(f, g) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f \circ T^n g \circ S^n.$$

When S and T commute, Conze and Lesigne [CL84] proved that for all $f, g \in L^\infty(m)$, $\mathbb{A}_n(f, g)$ converges in L^2 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This was extended by Bergelson and Leibman [BL02] to the case where T and S generate a nilpotent group. Given p_1 and p_2 , two integer polynomials one can ask whether the corresponding polynomial double averages

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f \circ T^{p_1(n)} g \circ S^{p_2(n)} \tag{1}$$

converge in L^2 for every $f, g \in L^\infty(X, m)$. Walsh [Wal12] showed that (1) converges in L^2 when T and S generate a nilpotent group. When S and T have positive entropy, the limit in (1) may not exist for certain bounded functions, see for example [FH23, Proposition 1.4].

The following L^2 convergence result without commutativity was proved by Frantzikinakis and Host.

Theorem. [FH23, Theorem 1.1] Let T, S be measure preserving transformations acting on a probability space (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) such that the system (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) has zero entropy. Let also $p \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$, an integer polynomial of degree greater or equal to 2. Then for every $f, g \in L^\infty(m)$, the limit

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f \circ T^n g \circ S^{p(n)}$$

exists in $L^2(\mu)$.

It was further showed in [FH23, Proposition 1.4] that the assumption that T has zero entropy is essential. The following problem was posed by Frantzikinakis and Host.

Problem. [FH23] Let T, S be measure preserving transformations acting on a probability space (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) such that the system (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) has zero entropy. Does the L^2 convergence result holds when in place of the iterates $n, p(n)$ we use the pair of iterates n, n or n^2, n^3 ?

In general, does the result hold for pairs of iterates given by arbitrary polynomials $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ with $p_1(0) = p_2(0) = 0$ and $\deg(p_1), \deg(p_2) \geq 2$?

Huang, Shao and Ye proved the following result.

Theorem. [HSY24b] Let $p_1, p_2 : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be polynomials with $\deg(p_1), \deg(p_2) \geq 5$. For any $F \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, there exist T, S , two ergodic, measure preserving transformations of

a standard probability space (X, \mathcal{X}, μ) with $h_\mu(X, T) = h_\mu(X, S) = 0$ and two measurable subsets $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$

$$\mu \left(A_1 \cap T^{-p_1(n)} A_2 \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A_2 \right) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n \in F, \\ c, & \text{if } n \notin F. \end{cases}$$

As a consequence, there exist T, S two ergodic, zero-entropy systems of a standard probability space (X, \mathcal{X}, μ) and $A_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(A_2) > 0$ such that the averages

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_{A_2} \circ T^{p_1(n)} 1_{A_2} \circ S^{p_2(n)}$$

do not converge in $L^2(\mu)$.

Huang, Shao and Ye conjecture (see [HSY24b, Conjecture 1.2]) that for any two integer polynomials p_1, p_2 with $p_1(0) = p_2(0) = 0$, the non-convergence result holds unless there exists an integer $c \neq 0$ such that $p_1(n) = cn$ and p_2 is a polynomial of degree 2 or higher. Using the 2-dimensional local limit theorem in [Theorem 1.1](#) we show the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $p_1, p_2 : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be polynomials with $\deg(p_1), \deg(p_2) \geq 2$. There exist T, S two ergodic measure preserving transformations of a standard probability space (X, \mathcal{X}, μ) , with $h_\mu(X, T) = h_\mu(X, S) = 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$, such that the averages*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_A \circ T^{p_1(n)} 1_A \circ S^{p_2(n)}$$

do not converge in $L^2(\mu)$.

Recently the non-convergence result for the iterates $p_1(n) = p_2(n) = n$ was proved (independently) by Austin [[Aus24](#)], Huang Shao and Ye [[HSY24a](#)] and Ryzikov [[Ryz24](#)]. Austin remarks that his methods give a non-convergence result for iterates of the type $p(n), p(n)$ for p a general integer polynomial of degree at least 1. As Austin's examples are Gaussian systems, the following is a simple consequence of [[Aus24](#)], its proof is given in [Appendix C](#).

Proposition 1.3. *For every $d, c \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ there exists T, S , two ergodic measure preserving transformations of a standard probability space (X, \mathcal{X}, μ) , with $h_\mu(X, T) = h_\mu(X, S) = 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$, such that the averages*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} 1_A \circ T^{cn} 1_A \circ S^{dn}$$

do not converge in $L^2(\mu)$.

The combination of [Theorem 1.2](#) and [Proposition 1.3](#) gives a full solution to the question of Frantzikinakis and Host and the conjecture of Huang, Shao and Ye.

Finally, for some special cases of polynomials, our methods give the following counterexamples for the recurrence problem for zero entropy transformations.

Theorem 1.4. *There exists $M > 0$, such that $\mathbb{N} \ni L > M$ and $d \geq 3$, there exists T, S , two ergodic measure preserving transformations of a standard probability space (X, \mathcal{X}, μ) , with $h_\mu(X, T) = h_\mu(X, S) = 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$, such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mu \left(A \cap T^{-Ln^d} A \cap S^{-Ln^d} A \right) = 0.$$

1.0.1. *Notation.* Here and throughout $\log(x)$ denotes the logarithm of x to base 2 while $\ln(x)$ is the natural logarithm of x .

Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. $\|x\| := \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^d x_j^2}$ is its Euclidean norm and $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} |x_j|$ is its supremum norm. Now when (X, \mathcal{B}, m) is a probability space and $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $\|F\|_2 = \sqrt{\int_X \|F(x)\|^2 dm(x)}$.

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank Wen Huang, Song Shao, and Xiandong Ye for communicating their results, Nikos Frantzikinakis for asking us to investigate the recurrence problem, and Dalibor Volný for remarks on early versions. This work was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation grant No. 1180/22.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF THE FUNCTION IN THEOREM 1.1

Let $2 \leq D \in \mathbb{N}$ and (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) be an ergodic and aperiodic probability preserving system. Denote by $U : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ the corresponding Koopman operator of T . Slightly more generally, if F is a function from X to \mathbb{R}^D then $UF = F \circ T$.

The function in our proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) is of the form $F = (f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(D)})$ where for each $1 \leq i \leq D$, $f^{(i)}$ is a sum of coboundaries and satisfies the local limit theorem result in dimension 1 of [\[KV22\]](#). A priori, this would not guarantee that F satisfies the multi-dimensional local limit theorem. The key point is that, we carefully construct the coboundaries in the functions together to guarantee that $S_n(F)$ can be expressed as the sum

$$S_n(F) = (Y_1(n), \dots, Y_D(n)) + Z(n),$$

where $Y_1(n), \dots, Y_D(n)$ are independent and satisfy the local limit theorem in dimension-1 and $Z(n)$ is independent from $(Y_1(n), \dots, Y_D(n))$ with a small L^2 norm.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we set,

$$p_k := \begin{cases} 2^k, & k \text{ even,} \\ 2^k + 1, & k \text{ odd,} \end{cases}$$

and $d_k := 2^{k^2}$. Similarly, let $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha_k := \frac{1}{p_k \sqrt{k \log(k)}}$ for $k \geq 2$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) be an ergodic and aperiodic probability preserving system and $D \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists $\bar{f}_k^{(i)} : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ such that:*

(a) *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$,*

$$\mu\left(\bar{f}_k^{(i)} = 1\right) = \mu\left(\bar{f}_k^{(i)} = -1\right) = \frac{\alpha_k^2}{2}.$$

(b) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the functions $\left\{\bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k, 1 \leq i \leq D\right\}$ are i.i.d.*

(c) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the functions $\left\{\bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k, 1 \leq i \leq D\right\}$ are independent of*

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \left\{\bar{f}_l^{(i)} \circ T^j : 1 \leq l < k, 1 \leq i \leq D, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k\right\}.$$

We say that a partition ξ of X is a **measurable partition** if all the atoms of ξ are measurable. A function $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **independent of the measurable partition** ξ , if for all $a < b$ and $\alpha \in \xi$

$$m(\alpha \cap [a \leq g < b]) = m(\alpha)m(a \leq g < b).$$

Proposition 2.1 is a simple consequence of the following result from [KV22].

Proposition 2.2. [KV22, Proposition 2] *Let (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) be an ergodic and aperiodic probability preserving system and ξ a measurable partition of X . Given a finite set A and X_1, \dots, X_m a collection of A valued i.i.d. random variables, there exists $g : X \rightarrow A$ such that $(g \circ T^j)_{j=0}^{m-1}$ is independent of ξ and distributed as $(X_j)_{j=1}^m$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.1. We construct the functions by induction on k . First let $\xi = \{\emptyset, X\}$ be the trivial partition. Applying Proposition 2.2, we can find $g_1 : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ such that $\{g_1 \circ T^j\}_{j=0}^{D(2d_1+p_1)}$ are i.i.d. and

$$m(g_1 = 1) = m(g_1 = -1) = \frac{\alpha_1^2}{2}.$$

Setting for $J \in \{1, \dots, D\}$, $\bar{f}_1^{(J)} = U^{(J-1)(2d_1+p_1)}g_1$, the base of construction is complete. Suppose we have chosen $\bar{f}_k^{(i)} : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$, $k \leq N, i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ such that:

(a') For all $k \leq N$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$,

$$\mu\left(\bar{f}_k^{(i)} = 1\right) = \mu\left(\bar{f}_k^{(i)} = -1\right) = \frac{\alpha_k^2}{2}.$$

(b') For every $k \leq N$, the functions $\left\{\bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k, 1 \leq i \leq D\right\}$ are i.i.d.

(c') For every $k \leq N$, the functions $\left\{\bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k, 1 \leq i \leq D\right\}$ are independent of

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \left\{\bar{f}_l^{(i)} \circ T^j : 1 \leq l < k, 1 \leq i \leq D, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k\right\}.$$

Let ξ_{N+1} be the finite measurable partition of X according to the values of the (finite valued) vector function

$$\left(\bar{f}_l^{(i)} \circ T^j : 1 \leq l \leq N, 1 \leq i \leq D, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_{N+1} + p_{N+1}\right).$$

Applying Proposition 2.2 again, we obtain a function $g_{N+1} : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ such that ξ_{N+1} is independent of the $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ valued i.i.d. sequence $\{g_{N+1} \circ T^j : 0 \leq j < D(2d_{N+1} + p_{N+1})\}$ and

$$m(g_{N+1} = 1) = m(g_{N+1} = -1) = \frac{(\alpha_{N+1})^2}{2}.$$

Define for all $J \in \{1, \dots, D\}$, $\bar{f}_{N+1}^{(J)} := U^{(J-1)(2d_{N+1}+p_{N+1})}g_{N+1}$. We check that (a), (b) and (c) hold. Indeed, (a) holds since for all $J \in \{1, \dots, D\}$, $\bar{f}_{N+1}^{(J)}$ and g_{N+1} are equally distributed. As

$$\left\{\bar{f}_{N+1}^{(i)} \circ T^j : 0 \leq j \leq 2d_{N+1} + p_{N+1}, 1 \leq i \leq D\right\} = \left\{g_{N+1} \circ T^j : 0 \leq j < D(2d_{N+1} + p_{N+1})\right\},$$

part (b), follows for $N + 1$. Finally noting that being independent of ξ_{N+1} is equivalent to being independent of \mathcal{A}_{N+1} , part (c) follows for $k = N + 1$. \square

From now on let $\bar{f}_k^{(i)} : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ be the functions from Proposition 2.1. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$, let $f^{(i)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \bar{f}_k^{(i)}$, where for $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$f_k^{(i)} := \sum_{j=0}^{p_k-1} U^j \bar{f}_k^{(i)} - U^{d_k} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{p_k-1} U^j \bar{f}_k^{(i)} \right). \quad (2)$$

2.1. The local limit function in one dimension. In [KV22], Proposition 2.2 was applied to construct a sequence of functions $\bar{f}_k : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ so that

(a) For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu(\bar{f}_k = 1) = \mu(\bar{f}_k = -1) = \frac{\alpha_k^2}{2}.$$

(b) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the functions $\{\bar{f}_k \circ T^j : 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k\}$ are i.i.d.

(c) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the functions $\{\bar{f}_k \circ T^j : 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k\}$ are independent of

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \{\bar{f}_l \circ T^j : 1 \leq l < k, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k\}.$$

After this the first author and Volný defined the function $f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k$, where for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$f_k := \sum_{j=0}^{p_k-1} U^j \bar{f}_k - U^{d_k} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{p_k-1} U^j \bar{f}_k \right).$$

Theorem. If $\bar{f}_k : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ satisfies (a), (b) and (c), and f_k and f are as above, then

- [KV22, Proposition 3] $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$.
- [KV22, Theorem 4] f satisfies the local limit theorem with $\sigma^2 := 2(\ln 2)^2$. That is

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sqrt{n} \mu(S_n(f) = x) - \frac{e^{-x^2/(2n\sigma^2)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$. The functions $(f_k^{(i)})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is distributed as $(f_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$. In addition, $\bar{f}_k^{(i)} : X \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ satisfies (a), (b) and (c). Corollary 2.3, follows from the above theorem.

Corollary 2.3. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, D\}$,

(a) $f^{(i)} \in L^2(X, \mu)$.

(b) $f^{(i)}$ satisfies the local limit theorem with $\sigma^2 := 2(\ln 2)^2$. That is

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left| \sqrt{n} \mu(S_n(f^{(i)}) = x) - \frac{e^{-x^2/(2n\sigma^2)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we write

$$F_k := (f_k^{(1)}, \dots, f_k^{(D)}), \tag{3}$$

where $f_k^{(i)}$ are as in (2), for $1 \leq i \leq D$. Set $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ to be the function

$$F := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k = (f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(D)}). \tag{4}$$

We will show, using the extra independence we introduced in the construction and the arguments in [KV22], that F satisfies the multi-dimensional lattice local central limit theorem (Theorem 1.1). For convenience, we recall the statement of the Theorem below.

Theorem 2.4. The function $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^D$, satisfies the local limit theorem with $\sigma^2 := 2(\ln 2)^2$. That is

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^D} n^{D/2} \left| m(S_n(F) = x) - \frac{1}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}} \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

The proof follows similar lines as [KV22] and uses the estimates that appear there. The idea is to use the arguments in [KV22] and the extra independence we introduced in the construction of the functions above. First, We will describe the strategy of proof in [KV22] and the results we will exploit. On the way, we will correct a minor error in [KV22]

3.1. Review of the arguments and results on the local limit theorem for $d = 1$. Assume $\bar{f}_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is a sequence of functions satisfying (a), (b) and (c) in Section 2.1 and let f_k and $f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k$ be the functions defined there.

The proof of the 1-dimensional local limit theorem for $S_n(f)$ is done by decomposing

$$S_n(f) = Z_{SM}(f)(n) + \hat{Y}_f(n) + Z_{La}(f)(n),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{SM}(f)(n) &:= \sum_{\{k:d_k \leq n\}} S_n(f_k) \\ \hat{Y}_f(n) &:= \sum_{\{k:p_k < n < d_k\}} S_n(f_k) \\ Z_{La}(f)(n) &:= \sum_{\{k:n \leq p_k\}} S_n(f_k). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1. [KV22, Lemma 7] *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variables $Z_{Sm}(f)(n)$, $\hat{Y}_f(n)$, $Z_{La}(f)(n)$ are independent and*

$$\|Z_{Sm}(f)(n) + Z_{La}(f)(n)\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

Essentially, with the aid of Proposition A.1 in Appendix A, this lemma says that if one can prove the local central limit theorem for $\hat{Y}_f(n)$, then one would obtain it for $S_n(f)$. The next stage is to look at the main contributing terms in $\hat{Y}_f(n)$. To that end, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, set

$$Y_j(f, n) := \sum_{\{k:p_k \leq j+1, p_k < n < d_k\}} p_k (U^j \bar{f}_k - U^{d_k+j} \bar{f}_k),$$

and

$$\mathscr{W}_f(n) := \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} Y_j(f, n).$$

Proposition 3.2. [KV22, Proposition 9] *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variables $\mathscr{W}_f(n)$ and $S_n(f) - \mathscr{W}_f(n)$ are independent and*

$$\|S_n(f) - \mathscr{W}_f(n)\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

We note that writing $B_k := p_k \sum_{j=p_k-1}^{n-1} U^j \bar{f}_k$, we have

$$\mathscr{W}_f(n) = \sum_{\{k: p_k < n < d_k\}} (B_k - U^{d_k} B_k).$$

Now we set,

$$\hat{I}_n := \{k \in 2\mathbb{N} : p_{k+1} < n < d_k\}.$$

For $k \in \hat{I}_n$, let

$$V_k := \sum_{i=2^k}^{n-1} (p_k (U^i \bar{f}_k - U^{d_k+i} \bar{f}_k) + p_{k+1} (U^i \bar{f}_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}+i} \bar{f}_{k+1})).$$

Finally, we set

$$\mathbf{U}(f, n) := \sum_{k \in \hat{I}_n} V_k.$$

In [KV22] the local CLT is proved for the analogue of $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$ and then this is used for the deduction of local CLT for $S_n(f)$.

Remark 3.3. In [KV22], I_n is defined as the set of all even integers k such that $p_k < n < d_k$. After this the function $\mathbf{U}_n := \sum_{k \in I_n} V_k$ is defined.

Clearly for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\hat{I}_n \subset I_n$. When $\log(n-1) \notin 2\mathbb{N}$, I_n and \hat{I}_n coincide and $\mathbf{U}_n = \mathbf{U}(f, n)$. When $\log(n-1) \in 2\mathbb{N}$, then $I_n \setminus \hat{I}_n = \log(n-1)$ and

$$\mathbf{U}_n - \mathbf{U}(f, n) = V_{\log(n-1)}.$$

The following is a minor correction of the statement [KV22, Proposition 11]. We reproduce the correction of the proof here.

Proposition 3.4. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variables $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$ and $E_n := \mathscr{W}_f(n) - \mathbf{U}(f, n)$ are independent and*

$$\|E_n\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

Proof. There are three types of terms that appear in $\mathscr{W}_f(n)$ and not in $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$, and there are no terms that appear in $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$ and not in $\mathscr{W}_f(n)$.

The first term comes from the case where for some even k , $d_k \leq n < d_{k+1}$. In this case $p_{k+1} < n < d_{k+1}$ and $B_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}} B_{k+1}$ appears in $\mathscr{W}_f(n)$ and not in $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$. When this term appears, then $\sqrt{\log(n)} < k+1$. As $B_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}} B_{k+1}$ is a sum of $n - p_{k+1}$ square integrable, zero mean functions, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}_{[d_k \leq n < d_{k+1}]} \|B_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}} B_{k+1}\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j=p_{k+1}-1}^{n-1} p_{k+1}^2 \|U^j (\bar{f}_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}} \bar{f}_{k+1})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 4np_{k+1}^2 \|\bar{f}_{k+1}\|_2^2 \\ &= 4np_{k+1}^2 \alpha_{k+1}^2 = \frac{4n}{k+1} = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The second term appears when $\log(n-1) = k \in 2\mathbb{N}$. In this case $p_k < n = p_{k+1} < d_k$ so $B_k - U^{d_k} B_k$ appears in $\mathscr{W}_f(n)$ and not in $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$. Similarly to before,

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{[p_k < n = p_{k+1}]} \|B_k - U^{d_k} B_k\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j=p_k-1}^{n-1} p_k^2 \|U^j(\bar{f}_k - U^{d_k} \bar{f}_k)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 4np_k^2 \|\bar{f}_k\|_2^2 \\ &= 4np_k^2 \alpha_k^2 = \frac{4n}{k} = O\left(\frac{n}{\log(n)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The third contribution to E_n comes from the fact that for $k \in \hat{I}_n$, $p_k (U^{p_k-1} \bar{f}_k - U^{p_k-1+d_k} \bar{f}_k)$ appears in $B_k - U^{d_k} B_k$, hence in $\mathscr{W}_f(n)$, and not in $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$. We can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} E_n &= \sum_{k \in \hat{I}_n} p_k (U^{p_k-1} \bar{f}_k - U^{p_k-1+d_k} \bar{f}_k) + 1_{[\exists k \in 2\mathbb{N}: d_k \leq n < d_{k+1}]} (B_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}} B_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + 1_{[\exists k \in 2\mathbb{N}: p_k < n = p_{k+1}]} (B_k - U^{d_k} B_k). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Both E_n and $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$ are functions of the independent¹ sequence of functions

$$\mathscr{L} := \{\bar{f}_k \circ T^j : k \in \mathbb{N}, p_k < n < d_k, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k\}.$$

In addition there exists two disjoint subsets $\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B} \subset \mathscr{L}$ such that E_n is a function of \mathscr{A} and $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$ is a function of \mathscr{B} . The independence of E_n and $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$ follows from this as the functions in \mathscr{L} are independent².

It is easy to see that the three terms in (5) above are independent and are square integrable and have zero mean, consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_n\|_2^2 &= \left\| \sum_{k \in \hat{I}_n} p_k (U^{p_k-1} \bar{f}_k - U^{p_k-1+d_k} \bar{f}_k) \right\|_2^2 + 1_{[\exists k \in 2\mathbb{N}: d_k \leq n < d_{k+1}]} \|B_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}} B_{k+1}\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + 1_{[\exists k \in 2\mathbb{N}: p_k = n < p_{k+1}]} \|B_k - U^{d_k} B_k\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{k \in \hat{I}_n} p_k^2 \|(U^{p_k-1} \bar{f}_k - U^{p_k-1+d_k} \bar{f}_k)\|_2^2 + O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right) + O\left(\frac{n}{\log(n)}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right) + \sum_{k \in \hat{I}_n} 4p_k^2 \alpha_k^2 \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right) + \sum_{k \in \hat{I}_n} \frac{4}{k} = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

In [KV22, Theorem 13] one proves the local limit theorem for \mathbf{U}_n using the fact that it satisfies the CLT ([KV22, Corollary 12]) together with two lemmas ([KV22, Lemmas 14 and

¹by properties (b) and (c) in the construction of \bar{f}_k .

²In the proof of [KV22, Proposition 11] the problem is that $A(n)$ (see [KV22, page 558]) may appear in both \mathbf{U}_n and E_n .

Lemma 15]) regarding the Fourier transform of U_n . In [Appendix B](#), we prove analogous statements for $U(f, n)$ (see [Theorem B.3](#)) and the following theorem.

Theorem 3.5. *Writing $\sigma^2 = 2(\ln 2)^2$ then,*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sqrt{n} \mu(U(f, n) = x) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2n\sigma^2}} \right| = o(1).$$

Proof. See [Appendix B](#). □

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let $F := (f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(D)})$ be the function as in (4). The proof starts by writing $S_n(F)$ as a sum of three terms depending on the scale of k with respect to n . That is

$$S_n(F) = Z_{SM}(F)(n) + \hat{Y}_F(n) + Z_{La}(F)(n),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{SM}(F)(n) &:= \sum_{\{k: d_k \leq n\}} S_n(F_k) \\ \hat{Y}_F(n) &:= \sum_{\{k: p_k < n < d_k\}} S_n(F_k) \\ Z_{La}(F)(n) &:= \sum_{\{k: n \leq p_k\}} S_n(F_k). \end{aligned}$$

Here F_k is the function from (3).

Lemma 3.6. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variables $Z_{Sm}(F)(n), \hat{Y}_F(n), Z_{La}(F)(n)$ are independent and*

$$\|Z_{Sm}(F)(n) + Z_{La}(F)(n)\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

Proof. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $S_n(F_k)$ is a function of

$$\left\{ \bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 1 \leq i \leq D, 0 \leq j \leq d_k + p_k + n - 1 \right\}.$$

For all the k 's in the terms appearing in the sums of $Z_{La}(F)$ and $\hat{Y}_F(n)$ one has $n < d_k$. This implies that $\hat{Y}_F(n)$ is a function of

$$\left\{ \bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 1 \leq i \leq D, p_k < n < d_k, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k - 1 \right\},$$

and $Z_{La}(n)$ is a function of

$$\left\{ \bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 1 \leq i \leq D, n \leq p_k, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k - 1 \right\}.$$

Writing k^* for the first integer such that $d_k > n$, $Z_{SM}(F)$ is a function of

$$\left\{ \bar{f}_k^{(i)} \circ T^j : 1 \leq i \leq D, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_{k^*} + p_{k^*} - 1 \right\}.$$

The independence of $Z_{Sm}(F)(n), \hat{Y}_F(n)$ and $Z_{La}(F)(n)$ follows from property (c) in [Proposition 2.1](#).

For $1 \leq i \leq D$, the sequence of functions in the definition of $f^{(i)}$ satisfies conditions (a), (b) and (c) as in Section 2.1. By Lemma 3.1, for $1 \leq i \leq D$,

$$\|Z_{Sm}(f^{(i)})(n) + Z_{La}(f^{(i)})(n)\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z_{Sm}(F)(n) + Z_{La}(F)(n)\|_2^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^D \|Z_{Sm}(f^{(i)})(n) + Z_{La}(f^{(i)})(n)\|_2^2 \\ &= O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\bar{F}_k := (\bar{f}_k^{(1)}, \bar{f}_k^{(2)}, \dots, \bar{f}_k^{(D)})$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, set

$$Y_j(F, n) := \sum_{\{k: p_k \leq j+1, p_k < n < d_k\}} p_k (U^j \bar{F}_k - U^{d_k+j} \bar{F}_k),$$

and $\mathscr{W}_F(n) := \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} Y_j(F, n)$. Similar to the 1-dimensional case, writing

$$B_k(n) := p_k \sum_{j=p_k-1}^{n-1} U^j \bar{F}_k,$$

we have

$$\mathscr{W}_F(n) = \sum_{\{k: p_k < n < d_k\}} (B_k(n) - U^{d_k} B_k(n)).$$

Proposition 3.7. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variables $\mathscr{W}_F(n)$ and $S_n(F) - \mathscr{W}_F(n)$ are independent and*

$$\|S_n(F) - \mathscr{W}_F(n)\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

Proof. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Y}_F(n) &= \mathscr{W}_F(n) + \sum_{\{k: p_k < n < d_k\}} (A_k(n) + C_k(n) - U^{d_k} (A_k(n) + C_k(n))) \\ &=: \mathscr{W}_F(n) + \mathscr{L}_F(n), \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} A_k(n) &:= \sum_{j=0}^{p_k-2} (j+1) U^j \bar{F}_k, \\ C_k(n) &:= \sum_{j=n}^{n+p_k-2} (n+p_k-1-j) U^j \bar{F}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Now $\mathscr{W}_F(n)$ is a function of

$$\mathscr{L}_n := \left\{ U^j \bar{f}_k^{(i)} : p_k < n < d_k, i \in \{1, \dots, D\}, p_k - 1 \leq j \leq n - 1 \right\},$$

and as $p_k < n$, $\mathcal{Z}_F(n)$ is a function of

$$\left\{ U^j \bar{f}_k^{(i)} : p_k < n < d_k, i \in \{1, \dots, D\}, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k \right\} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n,$$

the independence of $Z_{SM}(F)(n)$, $Z_{La}(F)(n)$, $\mathcal{Z}_F(n)$ and $\mathcal{W}_F(n)$ follows from properties (b) and (c) in [Proposition 2.1](#). As

$$S_n(F) - \mathcal{W}_F(n) = Z_{SM}(F)(n) + Z_{La}(F)(n) + \mathcal{Z}_F(n) \quad (6)$$

we have established the independence of $S_n(F) - \mathcal{W}_F(n)$ and $\mathcal{W}_F(n)$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\bar{F}_k\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^D \|\bar{f}_k^{(i)}\|_2^2 = D\mu \left(\bar{f}_k^{(1)} \neq 0 \right) = D\alpha_k^2.$$

It follows from this and $\int F_k d\mu = 0$ that

$$\|A_k(n)\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{p_k-2} (j+1)^2 \|F_k\|_2^2 \leq Dp_k^3 \alpha_k^2.$$

Similarly,

$$\|C_k(n)\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=n}^{n+p_k-2} (n+p_k-1-j)^2 \|F_k\|_2^2 \leq Dp_k^3 \alpha_k^2.$$

The collection of functions $A_k(n)$, $C_k(n)$, $U^{d_k} A_k(n)$, $U^{d_k} C_k(n)$ with k in the range $p_k < n < d_k$ are independent and with integral 0, consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Z}_F(n)\|_2^2 &= \sum_{k: p_k < n < d_k} \left(\|A_k(n)\|_2^2 + \|C_k(n)\|_2^2 + \|U^{d_k} A_k(n)\|_2^2 + \|U^{d_k} C_k(n)\|_2^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4D \sum_{k: p_k < n < d_k} p_k^3 \alpha_k^2 \\ &\leq 4D \sum_{k: p_k < n < d_k} \frac{2^k}{k} = O\left(\frac{n}{\log(n)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking in view (6) and [Lemma 3.6](#), we see that

$$\|S_n(F) - \mathcal{W}_F(n)\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

□

Recall that $\hat{I}_n := \{k \in 2\mathbb{N} : p_{k+1} < n < d_k\}$. For $k \in \hat{I}_n$, let

$$V_k(F, n) := \sum_{i=2^k}^{n-1} \left(p_k (U^i \bar{F}_k - U^{d_k+i} \bar{F}_k) + p_{k+1} (U^i \bar{F}_{k+1} - U^{d_{k+1}+i} \bar{F}_{k+1}) \right).$$

Define,

$$\mathbf{U}(F, n) := \sum_{k \in \hat{I}_n} V_k(F, n) = \left(\mathbf{U}(f^{(1)}, n), \mathbf{U}(f^{(2)}, n), \dots, \mathbf{U}(f^{(D)}, n) \right). \quad (7)$$

The following is a multi-dimensional analogue of [Proposition 3.4](#).

Proposition 3.8. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variables $\mathbf{U}(F, n)$, $S_n(F) - \mathcal{W}_F(n)$ and $E_n := \mathcal{W}_F(n) - \mathbf{U}(F, n)$ are independent and*

$$\|E_n\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

Proof. The independence of $\mathbf{U}(F, n)$ and E_n from $S_n(F) - \mathcal{W}_F(n)$ follows from the definition of $\mathbf{U}(f, n)$ and (the argument of) [Proposition 3.7](#). Arguing as in the proof of [Proposition 3.4](#) one deduces the independence of $\mathbf{U}(F, n)$ and E_n and the bound of $\|E_n\|_2^2$. \square

We now turn to show the following local CLT for $\mathbf{U}(F, n)$.

Theorem 3.9.

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^D} \left| n^{D/2} m(\mathbf{U}(F, n) = x) - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{D/2}} e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}} \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

where $\sigma^2 = 2(\ln 2)^2$.

One step of the proof will make use of the following simple claim.

Claim 3.10. *For every $z_1, \dots, z_m, y_1, \dots, y_m$ real numbers such that $\max_{1 \leq m} |z_i|, \max_{1 \leq m} |y_i| \leq C$,*

$$\left| \prod_{i=1}^m z_i - \prod_{i=1}^m y_i \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m C^{m-1} |z_i - y_i|.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.9. Fix $1 \leq i \leq D$. By construction, the functions $\tilde{f}_k^{(i)} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, satisfy conditions (a),(b) and (c) in Subsection 2.1. By [Theorem 3.5](#),

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sqrt{n} \mu(\mathbf{U}(f^{(i)}, n) = x) - \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right| = o(1).$$

We conclude that there exists $0 < r_n \rightarrow 0$ so that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq D} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sqrt{n} \mu(\mathbf{U}(f^{(i)}, n) = x) - \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right| \leq r_n \quad (8)$$

and there exists $C > 0$ such that for all large n ,

$$\text{for all } x \in \mathbb{Z}, \max_{1 \leq i \leq D} (\sqrt{n} \mu(\mathbf{U}(f^{(i)}, n) = x)) \leq C. \quad (9)$$

Now $\mathbf{U}(f^{(i)}, n)$ is a function of

$$\left\{ U^j \tilde{f}_k^{(i)} : p_k < n < d_k, 0 \leq j \leq 2d_k + p_k \right\}.$$

We may further assume that $C > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} = \max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2n}}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}$. By properties (b) and (c) in [Proposition 2.1](#), $\mathbf{U}(f^{(1)}, n), \dots, \mathbf{U}(f^{(D)}, n)$ are independent. By this and [claim 3.10](#), for all

$x \in \mathbb{Z}^D$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| n^{D/2} m(\mathbf{U}(F, n) = x) - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{D/2}} e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}} \right| &= \left| \prod_{i=1}^D \sqrt{n} m(\mathbf{U}(f^{(i)}, n) = x_i) - \frac{e^{-\sum_{i=1}^D \frac{x_i^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^D C^{D-1} \left| \sqrt{n} m(\mathbf{U}(f^{(i)}, n) = x_i) - \frac{e^{-\frac{x_i^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right| \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a routine application of the triangle inequality and (9). Taking into account (8) we have shown that for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^D$,

$$\left| n^{D/2} m(\mathbf{U}(F, n) = x) - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{D/2}} e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}} \right| \leq DC^{D-1} r_n = o(1).$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Write

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(F) &= \mathbf{U}(F, n) + (S_n(F) - \mathbf{U}(F, n)) \\ &= \mathbf{U}(F, n) + (S_n(F) - \mathcal{W}_F(n)) + (\mathcal{W}_F(n) - \mathbf{U}(F, n)) \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.8, $\mathbf{U}(F, n)$ and $S_n(F) - \mathbf{U}(F, n)$ are independent. In addition by Proposition 3.7 and Proposition 3.8,

$$\|S_n(F) - \mathbf{U}(F, n)\|_2^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right).$$

The claim now follows from Theorem 3.9 and Proposition A.1. \square

4. DIVERGENCE OF NON-CONVENTIONAL ERGODIC AVERAGES

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2. Our proof uses an idea of Huang, Shao, and Ye from [HSY24b], which is to consider T a skew product extension of an irrational rotation by a function satisfying the local central limit theorem. After this, they define S as a carefully chosen transformation that is isomorphic to T .

There are two notable differences in our construction. First, our skew product extension is an extension by a \mathbb{Z}^2 full-shift, and the function satisfies the 2-dimensional local central limit theorem. The second is that, if we would then proceed similarly to [HSY24b], we would obtain the result for polynomials of degree 3 or higher. In order to also include polynomials of degree 2, we define S by using a detailed study of the range process of the cocycle at polynomial times (see Subsection 4.2).

4.1. Construction of the ergodic system (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, T) . We denote by $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ the unit circle. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Q}$, let $R_\alpha : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ be the irrational rotation defined by $R_\alpha(y) = (y + \alpha) \bmod 1$. Let λ be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T} . Thus $(\mathbb{T}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}), \lambda, R_\alpha)$ is an ergodic measure preserving system, where $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$ is the Borel sigma algebra generated by open sets in \mathbb{T} .

By Theorem 1.1 for $d = 2$, there exists a Borel function, $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, given by $f(y) = (f^{(1)}(y), f^{(2)}(y))$ for $y \in \mathbb{T}$, such that the corresponding 2-dimensional ergodic sums process

$S_n(f) : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, given by

$$S_n(f)(y) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f \circ R_\alpha^k(y),$$

satisfies the lattice local central limit theorem. In this section, we fix such a Borel function f .

Let $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ be the space of 2-dimensional arrays of $\{0, 1\}$. For $v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we denote by $\sigma_v : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ the 2-dimensional shift, given by for every $\omega \in \Sigma$

$$(\sigma_v \omega)(u) = \omega(u + v).$$

We endow Σ with the stationary (infinite) product measure $\nu = \left(\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_1\right)^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ with marginals $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, and consider the \mathbb{Z}^2 Bernoulli shift $(\Sigma, \mathcal{B}(\Sigma), \nu, \sigma)$. Here $\mathcal{B}(\Sigma)$ is the Borel sigma algebra generated by cylinder sets in Σ . We define (X, \mathcal{X}, μ) to be the Cartesian product space $\mathbb{T} \times \Sigma$, endowed with product measure, in other words

$$(X, \mathcal{X}, \mu) := (\mathbb{T} \times \Sigma, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\Sigma), \lambda \times \nu).$$

Let $T : \mathbb{T} \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \Sigma$ be the skew product of R_α and f defined by

$$T(y, \omega) = (R_\alpha(y), \sigma_{f(y)}(\omega)).$$

The skew product T is a measure preserving transformation of (X, \mathcal{X}, μ) and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$T^n(y, \omega) = (R_\alpha^n(y), \sigma_{S_n(f)(y)}(\omega)). \quad (10)$$

For $v = (v^1, v^2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we define the rectangle centered at the origin with side lengths $(2v^1 + 1)$ and $(2v^2 + 1)$ by,

$$U_v := \{-v^1, \dots, 0, \dots, v^1\} \times \{-v^2, \dots, 0, \dots, v^2\}. \quad (11)$$

For $a \in \{0, 1\}^{U_v}$, we denote by $[a]_v$ the cylinder set defined by a and U_v

$$[a]_v := \{\omega \in \Sigma : \omega(i, j) = a(i, j), \forall (i, j) \in U_v\}. \quad (12)$$

Proposition 4.1. *(X, \mathcal{X}, μ, T) is an ergodic measure preserving system.*

Proof. Fix $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\lambda(B_1) > 0$ and $\lambda(B_2) > 0$. For $v = (v^1, v^2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and $u = (u^1, u^2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, fix cylinder sets $[a_1]_v$ and $[a_2]_u$. Denote by $m(u, v) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ the vector

$$m(u, v) := 2 \cdot (\max\{u^1 + 1, v^1 + 1\}, \max\{u^2 + 1, v^2 + 1\}).$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$M_n = \{y \in \mathbb{T} : \|S_n(f)(y)\|_\infty \leq \|m(u, v)\|_\infty\}.$$

Thus,

$$\mu(B_1 \times [a_1]_v \cap T^{-n}(B_2 \times [a_2]_u)) = \int_{\Sigma} \int_{\mathbb{T}} 1_{B_1 \cap R_\alpha^{-n} B_2}(y) \cdot 1_{\sigma_{-S_n(f)(y)}[a_2]_u \cap [a_1]_v}(\omega) d\lambda(y) d\nu(\omega).$$

For all $p \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $\|p\|_\infty > \|m(u, v)\|_\infty$,

$$\nu(\sigma_{-p}[a_2]_u \cap [a_1]_v) = \nu([a_2]_u) \cdot \nu([a_1]_v).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B_1 \times [a_1]_v \cap T^{-n}(B_2 \times [a_2]_u)) &\geq \int_{\Sigma} \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus M_n} 1_{B_1 \cap R_{\alpha}^{-n} B_2}(y) \cdot 1_{\sigma_{-S_n(f)}(y)[a_2]_u \cap [a_1]_v}(\omega) d\lambda(y) d\nu(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus M_n} 1_{B_1 \cap R_{\alpha}^{-n} B_2}(y) \cdot \nu([a_2]_u) \nu([a_1]_v) d\lambda(y) \\ &\geq (\lambda(B_1 \cap R_{\alpha}^{-n} B_2) - \lambda(M_n)) \cdot \nu([a_2]_u) \nu([a_1]_v). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get,

$$\mu(B_1 \times [a_1]_v \cap T^{-n}(B_2 \times [a_2]_u)) \geq (\lambda(B_1 \cap R_{\alpha}^{-n} B_2) - \lambda(M_n)) \cdot \nu([a_2]_u) \nu([a_1]_v). \quad (13)$$

By [Theorem 1.1](#), for $d = 2$ and $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, there exists $N(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n > N(i, j)$, we have

$$\left| n \cdot \lambda(S_n(f) = (i, j)) - \frac{e^{-\frac{\|(i,j)\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi\sigma^2)} \right| < \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)}.$$

Hence for all $n > N(i, j)$,

$$\lambda(S_n(f) = (i, j)) < \frac{e^{-\frac{\|(i,j)\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{n(2\pi\sigma^2)} + \frac{1}{n(2\pi\sigma^2)} \leq \frac{2}{n(2\pi\sigma^2)}.$$

Let $K = \max_{\{(i,j): \|(i,j)\|_{\infty} \leq \|m(u,v)\|_{\infty}\}} N(i, j)$. Then for any $n > K$, we have

$$\lambda(M_n) = \sum_{\{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2: \|(i,j)\|_{\infty} \leq \|m(u,v)\|_{\infty}\}} \lambda(S_n(f) = (i, j)) \leq \frac{(2 \cdot (\|m(u,v)\|_{\infty} + 1))^2}{n(2\pi\sigma^2)}.$$

Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(M_n) = 0$ and by ergodicity of R_{α} ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\lambda(B_1 \cap R_{\alpha}^{-n} B_2) - \lambda(M_n)) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \lambda(B_1 \cap R_{\alpha}^{-n} B_2) = \lambda(B_1) \lambda(B_2).$$

We deduce from this and (13) that,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu(B_1 \times [a_1]_v \cap T^{-n}(B_2 \times [a_2]_u)) &\geq \lambda(B_1) \lambda(B_2) \cdot \nu([a_2]_u) \nu([a_1]_v) \\ &\geq \mu(B_1 \times [a_1]_v) \cdot \mu(B_2 \times [a_2]_v). \end{aligned}$$

Since $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$ were arbitrary positive λ -measures sets, and $[a_1]_v, [a_2]_u \in \Sigma$ were arbitrary cylinder sets and T is measure preserving, it follows that for any positive μ -measure $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu(A \cap T^{-n} B) \geq \mu(A) \cdot \mu(B).$$

In other words for any positive μ -measure $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mu(A \cap T^{-n} B) \geq 0$. Hence (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, T) is ergodic. \square

For $y \in \mathbb{T}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the set

$$A_N(y) = \{S_n(f)(y) : 0 \leq n \leq N-1\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

Note that for $y \in \mathbb{T}$, the cardinality of $A_N(y)$ can be at most N .

Lemma 4.2. For a.e. $y \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A_N(y)|}{N} = 0.$$

The proof of the lemma uses the notion of recurrent cocycles. Given a probability preserving system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}, R)$ and a function $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, its corresponding cocycle is **recurrent** if for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}(B \cap R^{-n}B \cap \{|S_n(h)| < \epsilon\}) > 0.$$

Proof. Since $S_n(f)$ satisfies the 2-dimensional local central limit theorem, $S_n(f)/\sqrt{n}$ converges weakly to a 2-dimensional normal distribution. By [Sch98, Con99]³ the cocycle $S_n(f)$ is recurrent. Now as $S_n(f)$ is \mathbb{Z}^2 valued, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\lambda(B \cap R_\alpha^{-n}B \cap \{S_n(f) = (0, 0)\}) > 0.$$

This implies that

$$\lambda(x \in \mathbb{T} : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, S_n(f) \neq (0, 0)) = 0.$$

The claim now follows from [DGK21, Proposition 2.1]. □

Now we show that the measure theoretic entropy of (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, T) is zero.

Proposition 4.3. $h_\mu(X, T) = 0$.

Proof. For any finite partition ξ of $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$,

$$h_\mu(T | R_\alpha, \xi) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}} H_\nu \left(\bigvee_{n=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{-S_n(f)(y)} \xi \right) d\lambda(y),$$

where we set $S_0(f) := (0, 0)$. Note that for $y \in \mathbb{T}$, the cardinality of $\bigvee_{n=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{-S_n(f)(y)} \xi$ is bounded above by $|\xi|^{|A_n(y)|}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(T | R_\alpha, \xi) &\leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log |\xi|^{|A_n(y)|} d\lambda(y) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|A_N(y)|}{N} \log |\xi| d\lambda(y), \\ &= \log |\xi| \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|A_N(y)|}{N} d\lambda(y). \end{aligned}$$

We now apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem and use Lemma 4.2 to obtain,

$$h_\mu(T | R_\alpha, \xi) \leq \log |\xi| \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|A_N(y)|}{N} d\lambda(y) = \log |\xi| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A_N(y)|}{N} d\lambda(y) = 0.$$

Since

$$h_\mu(T | R_\alpha) = \sup_{\xi} h_\mu(T | R_\alpha, \xi),$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite measurable partitions of Σ , we get $h_\mu(T | R_\alpha) = 0$. By the Abramov-Rokhlin formula [AR62],

$$h_\mu(X, T) = h_\lambda(\mathbb{T}, R_\alpha) + h_\mu(T | R_\alpha) = 0.$$

□

³Note that $\|f\| \in L^2(\lambda)$ so our cocycle also satisfies the extra condition in [Con99]

4.2. Construction of the ergodic system (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, S) . In this subsection, we discuss the construction of (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, S) and show that it is isomorphic to the system (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, T) constructed in Subsection 4.1. Let $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ be the function as in Subsection 4.1. In other words the 2-dimensional ergodic sums process $S_n(f) : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, satisfies the lattice local central limit theorem ([Theorem 1.1](#)). Let $p : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, be a polynomial, for $y \in \mathbb{T}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$\mathbf{R}_N^{(p)}(y) := \{S_{p(k)}(f)(y) : 1 \leq k \leq N\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad (14)$$

and

$$\mathbf{R}^{(p)}(y) := \{S_{p(k)}(f)(y) : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2. \quad (15)$$

In rest of the section, we will work with polynomials with positive leading coefficient. Note that if the statement of [Theorem 1.2](#) holds for polynomials with positive leading coefficient than it also holds for polynomials with negative leading coefficient by replacing T or S (or both) with T^{-1} and S^{-1} respectively.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $p : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a polynomial with a positive leading coefficient and $\deg(p) \geq 2$, then for Lebesgue almost every $y \in \mathbb{T}$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}(y)|}{n} = 1.$$

The proposition essentially follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $p : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a polynomial with a positive leading coefficient and $\deg(p) \geq 2$, then we have*

$$(a) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|)}{n} = 1.$$

(b) *There exists $K > 0$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n > M$, we have*

$$n - K\sqrt{n} \leq \mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|) \leq n.$$

(c) *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\text{Var}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|) \leq C n^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $n_k = k^4$. We define,

$$B_k := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{T} : \left| \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_k} - 1 \right| > k^{-1/4} \right\}.$$

By [Lemma 4.5.\(b\)](#), for $n_k > M$, there exists $K > 0$ so that

$$\left| \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}|)}{n_k} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{K}{k^2}.$$

Hence for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k > 16K^4$ we have,

$$B_k \subset \left\{ y \in \mathbb{T} : \left| \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_k} - \mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}|) \right| > \frac{1}{2}k^{-1/4} \right\}.$$

Finally using Markov's inequality, [Lemma 4.5.\(c\)](#) and $n_k = k^4$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(B_k) &\leq \lambda\left(\left|\frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_k} - \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}|}{n_k}\right)\right| > \frac{1}{2}k^{-1/4}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{4\text{Var}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}|}{n_k}\right)}{(n_k)^2 k^{-1/2}} \leq 4Ck^{-\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C > 0$ is as in [Lemma 4.5\(c\)](#). Thus it follows $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_k) < \infty$. We conclude from the Borel–Cantelli lemma that

$$\lambda\left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_k\right) = 0.$$

Thus for almost every $y \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_k} = 1. \quad (16)$$

Observe that for $y \in \mathbb{T}$, the sequence $n \mapsto |\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}(y)|$ is monotone increasing. Thus for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_k \leq n < n_{k+1}$, we get

$$\frac{n_k}{n_{k+1}} \cdot \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_k} \leq \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_{k+1}} \leq \frac{|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}(y)|}{n} \leq \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_{k+1}}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_k} \leq \frac{n_{k+1}}{n_k} \cdot \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_{k+1}}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_{k+1}}$$

By (16), for almost every $y \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{n_k}{n_{k+1}} \cdot \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_k}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_k} \right) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{n_{k+1}}{n_k} \cdot \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{n_{k+1}}^{(p)}(y)|}{n_{k+1}} \right) = 1.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

To prove [Lemma 4.5](#), we will need the following simple claim.

Claim 4.6. *Let $p : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a polynomial with a positive leading coefficient and $\deg(p) \geq 2$. Then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma > 0$ so that for every $n > N$ and $1 < k < n$,*

$$p(n) - p(k) \geq \gamma(n + (n - k)^2).$$

Proof. Let $p(n) = \sum_{i=0}^t c_i n^i$, where $t \geq 2$ and $c_t > 0$. Set $b_n = p(n+1) - p(n)$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_n}{(n+1)^t - n^t} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p(n+1) - p(n)}{(n+1)^t - n^t} = c_t > 0.$$

Thus there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq M$,

$$b_n \geq \frac{c_t}{2}((n+1)^t - n^t) > 0.$$

For $n > k \geq M$,

$$\begin{aligned} p(n) - p(k) &= \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} b_j \geq \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \frac{c_t}{2} ((j+1)^t - j^t) \\ &= \frac{c_t}{2} (n^t - k^t) \\ &= \frac{c_t}{2} (n-k) \left(\sum_{l=0}^{t-1} k^l n^{t-1-l} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} k^l n^{t-1-l} &\geq n^{t-1} + k^{t-1} \\ &\geq n + k = 2k + (n-k). \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that for all $n > k \geq M$,

$$\begin{aligned} p(n) - p(k) &\geq \frac{c_t}{2} ((n-k)^2 + k(n-k)) \\ &\geq \frac{c_t}{2} \left((n-k)^2 + \frac{n}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the last inequality holds as $k, (n-k) \geq 1$ and at least one of them is no smaller than $\frac{n}{2}$. In addition,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\min_{1 \leq j < M} |p(n) - p(j)|}{n^t} = c_t > 0$$

and $n^2 + n = O(n^t)$. The claim follows by a standard argument. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.5. For $2 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$A_k := \{x \in \mathbb{T} : \forall l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}, S_{p(k)}(f)(x) \neq S_{p(l)}(f)(x)\}.$$

Note that for $y \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}(y)| := 1 + \sum_{k=2}^n 1_{A_k}(y).$$

For every $l < k$,

$$S_{p(k)}(f) - S_{p(l)}(f) = S_{p(k)-p(l)}(f) \circ R_\alpha^{p(l)}$$

Now using the local central limit theorem ([Theorem 1.1](#)) for $d = 2$, this implies the existence of a constant $\beta > 0$, such that for every $1 \leq l < k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(S_{p(k)}(f) - S_{p(l)}(f) = (0, 0)) &= \lambda(S_{p(k)-p(l)}(f) \circ R_\alpha^{p(l)} = (0, 0)) \\ &= \lambda(S_{p(k)-p(l)}(f) = (0, 0)) \leq \frac{\beta}{p(k) - p(l)}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\deg(p) \geq 2$, it follows from [Claim 4.6](#), that there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $n > M$ and $1 \leq k < n$, we have

$$\lambda(S_{p(n)}(f) = S_{p(k)}(f)) \leq \frac{c}{n + (n-k)^2}. \quad (17)$$

For every $N > M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\mathbb{T} \setminus A_N) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \lambda(S_{p(N)}(f) = S_{p(k)}(f)) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \frac{c}{N + (N-k)^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \frac{c}{N + k^2} \\ &\leq c \int_1^N \frac{dx}{N + x^2} \leq \frac{\pi c}{\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for all $N > M$,

$$1 - \frac{\pi c}{\sqrt{N}} \leq \lambda(A_N) \leq 1.$$

To see [item \(a\)](#), observe that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|)}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(1 + \sum_{N=2}^n \lambda(A_N) \right) = 1.$$

[Item \(b\)](#) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|) &\geq \sum_{N=M}^n \left(1 - \frac{\pi c}{\sqrt{N}} \right), \\ &\geq n - K\sqrt{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $K > 0$, is a constant. To see [item \(c\)](#) note that by [item \(b\)](#) and the fact that for all $y \in \mathbb{T}$, $|R_n^{(p)}(y)| \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|) &= \mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|^2) - (\mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}|))^2, \\ &\leq n^2 - (n - C\sqrt{n})^2, \\ &\leq 2Cn^{\frac{3}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Fix $y \in \mathbb{T}$. Let $R^{(p)}(y) \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ be as defined in [\(15\)](#). Observe that for every $z \in R^{(p)}(y)$ there exists a minimal $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $S_{p(n)}(f)(y) = z$. We define

$$K^{(p)}(y) := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \forall 1 \leq m < n, S_{p(m)}(f)(y) \neq S_{p(n)}(f)(y), S_{p(n)}(f)(y) \neq (0, 0)\} \subset \mathbb{N}. \quad (18)$$

to be the collection of all such points. The results on the range give the following.

Corollary 4.7. *Let $p : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a polynomial with a positive leading coefficient and $\deg(p) \geq 2$, then for Lebesgue almost every $y \in \mathbb{T}$, $K^{(p)}(y)$ has Banach density one.*

Proof. For every $z \in \mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}(y) \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ there exists a unique $k \in K^{(p)}(y) \cap [0, n]$ such that $S_{p(k)}(f)(y) = z$. Hence it follows,

$$\left| \left| \mathbf{R}_n^{(p)}(y) \right| - \left| K^{(p)}(y) \cap [0, n] \right| \right| \leq 1.$$

The claim follows from this and Proposition 4.4. \square

Choose two increasing sequences of natural numbers $(N_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ and $(M_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ such that:

- For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $N_k < M_k < N_{k+1}$.
- $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_k}{N_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{k+1}}{M_k} = \infty$.

We define $J \subset \mathbb{N}$ via,

$$J := \mathbb{N} \cap \uplus_{k=1}^\infty (N_k, M_k] \quad (19)$$

It is immediate that,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|J \cap [0, M_k]|}{M_k} = 1 \text{ and } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|J \cap [0, N_k]|}{N_k} = 0.$$

In particular J is of lower Banach density 0 and of upper Banach density 1. Let $p_1, p_2 : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be polynomials with positive leading coefficients and $\deg(p_1), \deg(p_2) \geq 2$. Let $D \subset \mathbb{T}$ be the set of all points $y \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p_1)}(y)|}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbf{R}_n^{(p_2)}(y)|}{n} = 1.$$

By Proposition 4.4, D has full measure. For $y \in D$, we define

$$\mathcal{K}_y = K^{(p_1)}(y) \cap K^{(p_2)}(y) \cap J. \quad (20)$$

Observe that by Corollary 4.7 and its proof, for all $y \in D$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$S(j, y) := \{S_{p_j(n)}(f)(y) : n \in \mathcal{K}_y\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2,$$

is infinite and contains distinct terms. For $y \in D$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, the complement of $S(j, y)$ is also infinite. To see this observe that for $y \in D$, we have

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty \left(\mathbf{R}_{N_{k+1}}^{(p_j)}(y) \setminus \mathbf{R}_{M_k}^{(p_j)}(y) \right) \subset \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus S(j, y).$$

Since for all $y \in D$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbf{R}_{N_{k+1}}^{(p_j)}(y) \setminus \mathbf{R}_{M_k}^{(p_j)}(y)|}{N_{k+1}} = 1,$$

it follows that $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus S(j, y)$ is infinite for $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, the mapping $\Theta_j : D \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$, defined by

$$\Theta_j(y) := S(j, y) \quad (21)$$

is measurable because of the following claim.

Lemma 4.8. *The map $\mathcal{O} : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow 2^J$ given by $\mathcal{O}(y) := \mathcal{K}_y$, is Borel.*

Proof. Enumerate J in increasing order and consider 2^J endowed with product topology based on the enumeration. We define for $n \in J$,

$$B_n := \bigcap_{i \in \{1,2\}} \{y \in \mathbb{T} : \forall 1 \leq j < n, S_{p_i(n)}(f)(y) - S_{p_i(j)}(f)(y) \neq (0,0) \text{ and } S_{p_i(n)}(f)(y) \neq (0,0)\}.$$

Since f is measurable, $B_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$. For $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$ and $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$, define

$$A^\epsilon := \begin{cases} A, & \epsilon = 1, \\ \mathbb{T} \setminus A, & \epsilon = 0. \end{cases}$$

For $F \subset J$ finite and $z \in \{0,1\}^F$, let $[z]_F$ be the corresponding cylinder set given by

$$[z]_F = \{\eta \in \{0,1\}^J : \eta(i) = z(i), \forall i \in F\}.$$

The map \mathcal{O} is measurable because for all $F \subset J$ finite and $z \in \{0,1\}^F$,

$$\mathcal{O}^{-1}([z]_F) = \bigcap_{n \in F} (B_n)^{z_n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}).$$

□

In what follows, for $y \in D$, we will define a permutation $\pi_y : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, such that π_y maps

$$(0,0) \mapsto (0,0), \quad \text{and} \quad S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y) \mapsto S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y), \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{K}_y. \quad (22)$$

To this effect, for $y \in D$ we fix an enumeration of $\mathcal{K}_y = \{k_1(y) < k_2(y) < \dots\}$. For ease of notation, when y is known, we will denote $\mathcal{K}_y = \{k_1 < k_2 < \dots\}$. Thus for $y \in D$ and $j \in \{1,2\}$, we enumerate $S(j,y) = \{S_{p_j(k_i)}(f)(y)\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$. For $y \in D$ and $j \in \{1,2\}$ we set

$$L(j,y) = \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus (S(j,y) \cup \{(0,0)\}) = \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus (\{S_{p_j(k_i)}(f)(y)\}_{i=1}^\infty \cup \{(0,0)\}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^2. \quad (23)$$

$L(j,y)$ is also infinite as discussed above. Let $L(j,y) := \{\ell(j,y)_1, \ell(j,y)_2, \dots\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ be an enumeration of the set $L(j,y)$. For $y \in D$, $j \in \{1,2\}$, we have partition of \mathbb{Z}^2 of the form

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \{(0,0)\} \cup S(j,y) \cup L(j,y) = \{(0,0)\} \cup \{S_{p_j(k_i)}(f)(y)\}_{i=1}^\infty \cup \{\ell(j,y)_i\}_{i=1}^\infty.$$

For $y \in D$, $j \in \{1,2\}$, let $\pi_{p_j,y} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, be a bijective map given by,

$$\pi_{p_j,y}(i) := \begin{cases} (0,0), & \text{for } i = 0; \\ S_{p_j(k_i)}(f)(y), & \text{for } i \geq 1; \\ \ell(j,y)_{-i}. & \text{for } i \leq -1. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

For $y \in D$, we define a map, $\pi_y : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$, by

$$\pi_y = \pi_{p_1,y} \circ \pi_{p_2,y}^{-1}. \quad (25)$$

Note that π_y is a permutation of \mathbb{Z}^2 and it satisfies (22) as needed.

Let $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ and define a metric on the permutations of \mathbb{Z}^2 by for all bijections $\pi, \eta : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$,

$$d(\pi, \eta) := 2^{-\inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \pi(a_n) \neq \eta(a_n)\}} + 2^{-\inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \pi^{-1}(a_n) \neq \eta^{-1}(a_n)\}}.$$

The space of permutations of \mathbb{Z}^2 with this metric is a Polish space. Below we argue that the for Lebesgue almost every $y \in \mathbb{T}$, $y \mapsto \pi_y$ is a measurable map to the permutations of \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Lemma 4.9. *The map $y \mapsto \pi_y$ is a measurable map from $D \subset \mathbb{T}$ to the permutations of \mathbb{Z}^2 .*

Proof. To see this note that [Lemma 4.8](#), implies that the map Θ_j defined in [\(21\)](#) is measurable for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. By definition of $L(j, y)$, (see [\(23\)](#)) it follows that the map $y \mapsto L(j, y)$ from D to $2^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ is measurable for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. This together with the definition of $\pi_{p_j, y}$ and π_y implies that $y \mapsto \pi_y$ is a measurable map from $D \subset \mathbb{T}$ to the permutations of \mathbb{Z}^2 . \square

Recall that $X = \mathbb{T} \times \Sigma$ where $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$. For $y \in D$, let π_y be as above, we set $\Psi_{\pi_y} : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ to be the map

$$\Psi_{\pi_y}(\omega)(i, j) := \begin{cases} \omega(0, 0), & \text{for } (i, j) = (0, 0); \\ 1 - \omega(\pi_y(i, j)) = 1 - \omega(S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)), & \text{for } (i, j) = S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y), n \in \mathcal{K}_y; \\ \omega(\pi_y(i, j)), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Let $Q : X \rightarrow X$ be given by,

$$Q(y, \omega) := \begin{cases} (y, \Psi_{\pi_y}\omega), & \text{for } y \in D; \\ (y, \omega), & \text{for } y \in \mathbb{T} \setminus D. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

We finally define, $S : X \rightarrow X$ as,

$$S := Q^{-1} \circ T \circ Q. \quad (28)$$

Observe that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $y \in D \cap R_\alpha^{-n}D$ and $\omega \in \Sigma$, we have

$$S^n(y, \omega) = (y + n\alpha, (\Psi_{\pi_{y+n\alpha}}^{-1} \circ \sigma_{S_n(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_{\pi_y})(\omega)). \quad (29)$$

We argue that (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, S) is an ergodic measure preserving system with zero entropy since the map Q defined in [\(27\)](#) is an invertible measure preserving transformation.

In order to prove that the map $Q : X \rightarrow X$, defined in [\(27\)](#) is an invertible measure preserving transformation we will rely on Souslin's Theorem (see [[Kec95](#), Theorem 14.12]) which says that if $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a Borel bijection, then f is a Borel isomorphism (in other words f^{-1} is also a Borel map).

Proposition 4.10. *(X, \mathcal{X}, μ, Q) is an invertible measure preserving system.*

Proof. The map Q is a bijection, hence by Souslin's theorem if Q^{-1} is measurable, then Q is a Borel isomorphism. Fix $y \in \mathbb{T}$. For every $F \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $z \in \{0, 1\}^F$, define $z(y) \in \{0, 1\}^{\pi_y(F)}$ as follows, if $y \in D$ then,

$$z(y)_{\pi_y(j)} := \begin{cases} 1 - z_{\pi_y(j)}, & j \in S(1, y) \cap F \\ z_{\pi_y(j)}, & j \in F \setminus S(1, y), \end{cases}$$

and if $y \notin D$ then $z(y) = z$ and π_y is the identity map on \mathbb{Z}^2 . Now for every set of the form $B \times [z]_F \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}) \times \mathcal{B}(\Sigma)$,

$$Q(B \times [z]_F) := \{(y, \omega) : y \in B \text{ and } \omega|_{\pi_y(F)} = z(y)\}.$$

By [Lemma 4.9](#), and the measurability of $y \mapsto S(1, y)$, it follows that $Q(B \times [z]_F) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}) \times \mathcal{B}(\Sigma)$. Hence the map Q^{-1} is measurable. The map Q is measure preserving since for every

$B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$, $F \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ finite and $z \in \{0, 1\}^F$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(Q(B \times [z]_F)) &= \int_B \nu([z(y)]_F) d\lambda(y), \text{ by Fubini theorem} \\ &= \int_B 2^{-|F|} d\lambda(y) = \mu(B \times [z]_F). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.11. (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, S) is an ergodic measure preserving system with $h_\mu(X, S) = 0$.

Proof. This follows from Proposition 4.10, Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.3. □

Theorem 1.2 directly follows from the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.12. Let $A = D \times [0]_{(0,0)}$, then for the two increasing sequence of natural numbers $(N_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ and $(M_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ (as in the definition of J , see (19)), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=0}^{N_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A) \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n=0}^{M_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A) = 0.$$

Proof. Note that $(y, \omega) \in D \times \Sigma \cap T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A$ if and only if $y \in D$, $T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega) \in D \times [0]_{(0,0)}$ and $S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega) \in D \times [0]_{(0,0)}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set,

$$\begin{aligned} B(n) &:= D \times \Sigma \cap T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A \\ &= \{(y, \omega) \in X : y \in D, \text{ and } T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega), S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega) \in D \times [0]_{(0,0)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definitions of $T^{p_1(n)}$ and $S^{p_2(n)}$ (see (10) and (29)), we get

$$B(n) = \{(y, \omega) \in X : y \in D, \sigma_{S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)}(\omega)(0, 0) = 0, \text{ and } (\Psi_{\pi_y + n\alpha}^{-1} \circ \sigma_{S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_{\pi_y})(\omega)(0, 0) = 0\}.$$

Observe that for $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{\omega}) \in D \times \Sigma$, we have $(\Psi_{\tilde{y}}^{-1} \tilde{\omega})(0, 0) = \tilde{\omega}(0, 0)$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} B(n) &= \{(y, \omega) \in X : y \in D, \sigma_{S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)}(\omega)(0, 0) = 0, \text{ and } (\sigma_{S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_{\pi_y})(\omega)(0, 0) = 0\} \\ &= \{(y, \omega) \in X : y \in D, (\omega)(S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)) = 0, \text{ and } (\Psi_{\pi_y} \omega)(S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)) = 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

If $n \notin \mathcal{K}_y$, then either $\pi_y(S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)) = S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)$ and

$$\Psi_{\pi_y}(S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)) = \omega(S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y))$$

or $\pi_y(S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)) \neq S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)$ and then $\Psi_{\pi_y}(S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y))$ and $\omega(S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y))$ are independent. By this and the definition of Ψ_{π_y} we have for all $y \in D$ and $n \notin \mathcal{K}_y$

$$\nu\left(\omega \in \Sigma : \sigma_{S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)}(\omega)(0, 0) = 0, \text{ and } (\sigma_{S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_{\pi_y})(\omega)(0, 0) = 0\right) \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

This together with Fubini's Theorem implies that

$$\text{for all } n \notin \mathcal{K}_y, \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A) = \mu(B(n)) \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Now we calculate,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=0}^{N_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=M_{k-1}+1}^{N_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $J \cap [M_{k-1}, N_k - 1] = \emptyset$, hence if $n \in [M_{k-1} + 1, N_k - 1]$, then $n \notin \mathcal{K}_y$. Hence it follows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=0}^{N_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A) \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=M_{k-1}+1}^{N_k-1} \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Similarly, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n=0}^{M_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A) \\ & = \int_X \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n=0}^{M_k-1} (1_A \circ T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega)) \circ (1_A \circ S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega)) d\mu \\ & \leq \frac{N_k}{M_k} + \int_X \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{K}_y \cap [N_k, M_k-1]} (1_A \circ T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega)) \circ (1_A \circ S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega)) d\mu \\ & + \int_X \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n \in [N_k, M_k-1] \setminus \mathcal{K}_y} (1_A \circ T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega)) \circ (1_A \circ S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega)) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that (26) implies that for $(y, \omega) \in D \times \Sigma$ and $n \in \mathcal{K}_y$,

$$(\Psi_{\pi_y \omega})(S_{p_2(n)}(f)(y)) = 1 - \omega(S_{p_1(n)}(f)(y)).$$

Taking into consideration (30) we conclude that for all $(y, \omega) \in D \times \Sigma$ and $n \in \mathcal{K}_y$,

$$(1_A \circ T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega)) \circ (1_A \circ S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega)) = 0.$$

Hence, as $\frac{N_k}{M_k} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n=0}^{M_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)} A \cap S^{-p_2(n)} A) \\ & = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n \in [N_k, M_k-1] \setminus \mathcal{K}_y} (1_A \circ T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega)) \circ (1_A \circ S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega)) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$g_k := \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n \in [N_k, M_k-1] \setminus \mathcal{K}_y} (1_A \circ T^{p_1(n)}(y, \omega)) \circ (1_A \circ S^{p_2(n)}(y, \omega)).$$

It follows from the definition of \mathcal{K}_y (see (20)), that the map $\mathbb{T} \ni y \mapsto [N_k, M_k - 1] \cap \mathcal{K}_y$ is measurable. Hence the map, $\mathbb{T} \ni y \mapsto [N_k, M_k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{K}_y$ is measurable. This implies that for

every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the map g_k is measurable. Also for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$g_k(y, \omega) \leq \frac{|[N_k, M_k - 1] \setminus \mathcal{K}_y|}{M_k} \leq 1.$$

From [Corollary 4.7](#) and the definition of \mathcal{K}_y , it follows that for $y \in D$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|[N_k, M_k - 1] \cap \mathcal{K}_y|}{M_k} = 1$$

This implies that $g_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Thus by using Bounded Convergence Theorem,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M_k} \sum_{n=0}^{M_k-1} \mu(T^{-p_1(n)}A \cap S^{-p_2(n)}A) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_X g_k = 0.$$

□

4.3. Proof of Theorem 1.4. The proof of [Theorem 1.4](#) is by modifying the construction of S . Let $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ be a function as in [Subsection 4.1](#) and for an integer polynomial p , write

$$\mathbf{C}_p := \{y \in \mathbb{T} : \forall n \neq j, n, j \in \mathbb{N}, S_{p(n)}(f)(y) \neq S_{p(j)}(f)(y), \text{ and } S_{p(n)}(f)(y) \neq (0, 0)\}.$$

Proposition 4.13. *There exists $M > 0$, such that if $p(n) = Ln^d$ with $\mathbb{N} \ni L > M$ and $d \geq 3$, then $\lambda(\mathbf{C}_p) > 0$.*

We begin with the following variant of [claim 4.6](#).

Claim 4.14. *For all $d \geq 3$ and $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > k$,*

$$n^d - k^d \geq n^2 + (n - k)^3.$$

Proof. Since for all $d \geq 3$ and integers $k < n$,

$$n^d - k^d \geq n^3 - k^3,$$

it remains to prove the bound for $d = 3$. The bound now follows from,

$$\begin{aligned} n^3 - k^3 &= (n - k)(n^2 + kn + k^2) \\ &= (n - k)((n - k)^2 + 3kn) \quad \text{since } 3k(n - k) > n \\ &\geq (n - k)^3 + n^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.13. Let $p(n) = Ln^d$ with $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \geq 3$. For $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \neq j$ define,

$$\mathbf{C}_p(n, j) = \{y \in \mathbb{T} : n, j \in \mathbb{N}, S_{p(n)}(f)(y) \neq S_{p(j)}(f)(y)\}$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}_p(n, 0) = \{y \in \mathbb{T} : S_{p(n)}(f)(y) = (0, 0)\}.$$

Observe that,

$$\mathbf{C}_p = \mathbb{T} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{C}_p(n, 0) \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{C}_p(n, m) \right).$$

As in the proof of [Lemma 4.5](#), using the local central limit theorem ([Theorem 1.1](#)) for $d = 2$, there exists $\beta > 0$, such that for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m > n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(C_p(n, m)) &= \lambda(S_{p(m)}(f) - S_{p(n)}(f) = (0, 0)) = \lambda(S_{p(m)-p(n)}(f) \circ R_\alpha^{p(n)} = (0, 0)) \\ &= \lambda(S_{p(m)-p(n)}(f) = (0, 0)) \leq \frac{\beta}{p(m) - p(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

By [claim 4.14](#), we have

$$p(m) - p(n) = L(m^d - n^d) > L(m^2 + (m - n)^3).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{m=n+1}^{\infty} C_p(n, m)\right) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \lambda(C_p(n, m)) < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta}{L(m^2 + (m - n)^3)} \\ &< \frac{\beta}{L} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + t^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 + t^3}$ is finite, we see that for all large enough $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lambda\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{m=n+1}^{\infty} C_p(n, m)\right) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Similarly, as $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p(n)}$ is finite, a similar argument shows that for all large enough $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\lambda(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} C_p(n, 0)) < 1/2$. Hence, $\lambda(C_p) > 0$ as needed. \square

Recall that $X = \mathbb{T} \times \Sigma$ where $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$. For $y \in C_p$, we set $\Psi_y : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ to be the map

$$\Psi_y(\omega)(i, j) := \begin{cases} 1 - \omega(S_{p(n)}(f)(y)), & \text{for } (i, j) = S_{p(n)}(f)(y), \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \\ \omega(i, j), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Let $V : X \rightarrow X$ be given by,

$$V(y, \omega) := \begin{cases} (y, \Psi_y(\omega)), & \text{for } y \in C_p; \\ (y, \omega), & \text{for } y \in \mathbb{T} \setminus C_p. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

We finally define, $S : X \rightarrow X$ as,

$$S := V^{-1} \circ T \circ V. \quad (33)$$

where $T : X \rightarrow X$ is the skew product of R_α and f as defined in [Subsection 4.1](#). Observe that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $y \in C_p \cap R_\alpha^{-n}C_p$ and $\omega \in \Sigma$, we have

$$S^n(y, \omega) = (y + n\alpha, (\Psi_{y+n\alpha}^{-1} \circ \sigma_{S_n(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_y)(\omega)). \quad (34)$$

It follows from an argument similar to [Proposition 4.10](#) that (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, V) is an invertible measure preserving system. Hence it follows that (X, \mathcal{X}, μ, S) is isomorphic to T , consequently S is an ergodic measure preserving system with $h_\mu(X, S) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $M > 0$ as in Proposition 4.13 and p a polynomial of the form $p(n) = Ln^d$ with $L > M$ and $d \geq 3$. Define $A = \mathbb{C}_p \times [0]_{(0,0)}$ and note that by Proposition 4.13,

$$\mu(A) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(\mathbb{C}_p) > 0.$$

We claim that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu(A \cap T^{-p(n)}A \cap S^{-p(n)}A) = 0.$$

Indeed, if $(y, \omega) \in A \cap T^{-p(n)}A \cap S^{-p(n)}A$, then $y, y + n\alpha \in \mathbb{C}_p$ and

$$\omega(S_{p(n)}(f)(y)) = \Psi_{y+n\alpha}^{-1} \circ \sigma_{S_{p(n)}(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_y(\omega)(0, 0).$$

For all $y \in \mathbb{C}_p$, $(0, 0) \notin \{S_{p(n)}(f)(y)\}_{n=1}^\infty$. Consequently, for all $y \in \mathbb{T}$, such that $y, y + n\alpha \in \mathbb{C}_p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{y+n\alpha}^{-1} \circ \sigma_{S_{p(n)}(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_y(\omega)(0, 0) &= \Psi_{y+n\alpha}^{-1} \left(\sigma_{S_{p(n)}(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_y(\omega) \right) (0, 0) \\ &= \sigma_{S_{p(n)}(f)(y)} \circ \Psi_y(\omega)(0, 0) \\ &= \Psi_y(\omega) (S_{p(n)}(f)(y)) \\ &= 1 - \omega(S_{p(n)}(f)(y)) \neq \omega(S_{p(n)}(f)(y)). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu(A \cap T^{-p(n)}A \cap S^{-p(n)}A) = \mu(\emptyset) = 0.$$

□

APPENDIX A.

The following is a multi-dimensional version of [KV22, Proposition 18]. Its proof is similar to the 1-dimensional case. Recall that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^D$, $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of x .

Proposition A.1. *Suppose that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $X_n = Y_n + Z_n$ where Y_n, Z_n are independent \mathbb{Z}^D valued random variables and $\mathbb{E}(\|Z_n\|^2) = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}\right)$ and $\sigma > 0$. If*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^D} \left| n^{D/2} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = x) - \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n}}}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \right| = o(1) \quad (35)$$

then

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^D} \left| n^{D/2} \mathbb{P}(X_n = x) - \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n}}}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \right| = o(1)$$

Proof. Let $a(n) := \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt[8]{\log(n)}}$ and $C := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\sqrt{\log(n)}}{n} \mathbb{E}(\|Z_n\|^2) < \infty$. By Markov's inequality, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z_n\| > a(n)) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt[4]{\log(n)}}.$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}^D$. As Y_n and Z_n are independent we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = x) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^D} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = x - z) \mathbb{P}(Z_n = z).$$

We split the sum into $\|z\| > a(n)$ and $\|z\| \leq a(n)$.

By (35), there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^D$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_n = x - z) \leq \frac{\alpha}{n^{D/2}}.$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\|z\| > a(n)} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = x - z) \mathbb{P}(Z_n = z) &\leq \sum_{\|z\| > a(n)} \frac{\alpha}{n^{D/2}} \mathbb{P}(Z_n = z) \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{n^{D/2}} \mathbb{P}(\|Z_n\| > a(n)) \leq \frac{C\alpha}{n^{D/2} \sqrt[4]{\log(n)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

We now turn to look at the sum when $\|z\| \leq a(n)$. Firstly if $\|x\| > \sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)}$, then for all $n > 3$, $a(n) < \frac{\|x\|}{2}$. Consequently for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\|z\| \leq a(n)$,

$$\|x - z\| \geq \|x\| - \|z\| > \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)}.$$

This and (35) imply that for all $n > 3$ and uniformly on $\|z\| \leq a(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = x - z) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x-z\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} + o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{e^{-\frac{(\log(n))^{2/9}}{4\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} + o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right) = o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for such x ,

$$\sum_{\|z\| \leq a(n)} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = x - z) \mathbb{P}(Z_n = z) = o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right).$$

Taking in mind that for all x with $\|x\| \geq \sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)}$,

$$e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}} \leq e^{-\frac{(\log(n))^{2/9}}{2n\sigma^2}} = o(1),$$

we have shown that

$$\sup_{\|x\| > \sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)}} \left| n^{D/2} \mathbb{P}(X_n = x) - \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n}}}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \right| = o(1). \quad (37)$$

When $\|x\| \leq \sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)}$, then for all z with $\|z\| \leq a(n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|x - z\|^2 - \|x\|^2 \right| &\leq 2|\langle x, z \rangle| + \|z\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x\| \|z\| + \|z\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \left(\sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)} \right) a(n) = \frac{2n}{(\log(n))^{1/72}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for all z with $\|z\| \leq a(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = x - z) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x-z\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} + o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right) \\ &= e^{\pm \frac{2}{(\log(n))^{1/72}\sigma^2}} \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} + o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here the term $1 + o(n^{-D/2})$ is uniform over all x, z with $\|x\| \leq \sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)}$ and $\|z\| \leq a(n)$. It follows that for such x ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\|z\| \leq a(n)} \mathbb{P}(Y_n = x - z) \mathbb{P}(Z_n = z) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right)\right) \mathbb{P}(\|Z_n\| \leq a(n)) \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{1}{n^{D/2}}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\sup_{\|x\| \leq \sqrt{n} \sqrt[9]{\log(n)}} \left| n^{D/2} \mathbb{P}(X_n = x) - \frac{e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}}}{(2\pi n\sigma^2)^{D/2}} \right| = o(1). \quad (38)$$

The claim now follows from (36), (37) and (38). \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5

Recall that writing $I_n := \{k \in 2\mathbb{N} : p_k < n < d_k\}$ and $\mathbf{U}_n := \sum_{k \in I_n} V_k$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\phi_n(t) := \mathbb{E}_m(\exp(it\mathbf{U}_n))$$

In [KV22] the following is proved.

Theorem B.1. (a) [KV22, Corollary 12] $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{U}_n$ converges in distribution to a centered normal random variable with variance⁴ $\sigma^2 = 2(\ln(2))^2$.

(b) [KV22, Lemma 14] There exists $c > 0$ such that for all $\sqrt[4]{n} \leq x \leq \pi\sqrt{n}$,

$$\left| \phi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \right| \leq \exp(-x\sqrt[4]{n}) \leq \exp(-d\sqrt{|x|}).$$

where $d = \frac{c}{\sqrt{\pi}}$.

(c) [KV22, Lemma 15] There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L > 0$ such that for all $n > N$ and $|x| \leq \sqrt[4]{n}$,

$$\left| \phi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \right| \leq \exp(-Lx^2).$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write $Z_n := \mathbf{U}_n - \mathbf{U}(f, n)$ and set

$$\varphi_n(t) := \mathbb{E}_m(\exp(itZ_n))$$

⁴There is a typo in the definition of σ^2 in [KV22, Corollary 12]

Lemma B.2. Z_n converges in probability to 0, and there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n > N$, we have

$$\min_{|t| \leq \pi} |\varphi_n(t)| \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. By Remark 3.3,

$$Z_n = 1_{[\log(n-1) \in 2\mathbb{N}]} V_{\log(n-1)}.$$

When $\log(n-1) \in 2\mathbb{N}$, we have $p_{\log(n-1)} = n-1$ and $p_{\log(n-1)+1} = n$. Consequently, writing $k = \log(n-1)$, we have

$$V_{\log(n-1)} = (n-1) (U^{n-1} f_k - U^{d_k+n-1} f_k) + n (U^n f_{k+1} - U^{d_k+n} f_{k+1}).$$

In this case, since $V_{\log(n-1)}$ is a sum of square integrable zero mean random variables, we deduce that

$$\|V_{\log(n-1)}\|_2^2 \leq 2((n-1)^2 \alpha_k^2 + n^2 \alpha_{k+1}^2) \leq \frac{8}{\log(n)},$$

where the last inequality holds since

$$n\alpha_{k+1} \leq (n-1)\alpha_k < \frac{n-1}{(n-1)\sqrt{\log(n-1)}}.$$

A simple argument using Markov's inequality shows that Z_n converges to 0 in probability (hence to δ_0 in distribution).

As $\mathbb{E}_m(Z_n) = 0$, it follows from [Dur10, Theorem 3.3.8 and formula (3.3.3)] that for all $t \in [-\pi, \pi]$,

$$\varphi_n(t) = 1 - \frac{t^2 \|Z_n\|_2^2}{2} \pm t^2 \|Z_n\|_2^2.$$

The second claim is now a consequence of the second moment estimate since

$$\sup_{|t| \leq \pi} t^2 \|Z_n\|_2^2 \leq \frac{8\pi}{\log(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

□

Finally let $\psi_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be defined by

$$\psi_n(t) := \mathbb{E}_m(\exp(itU(f, n)))$$

Theorem B.3. (a) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}U(f, n)$ converges in distribution to a centered normal random variable with variance $\sigma^2 = 2(\ln 2)^2$.

(b) There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $n > N$ and $\sqrt[4]{n} \leq x \leq \pi\sqrt{n}$,

$$\left| \psi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \right| \leq 2 \exp(-c\sqrt[4]{n}) \leq 2 \exp(-d\sqrt{|x|}).$$

where $d = \frac{c}{\sqrt{\pi}}$.

(c) There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L > 0$ such that for all $n > N$ and $|x| \leq \sqrt[4]{n}$,

$$\psi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-Lx^2).$$

Proof. Since $U(f, n) = U_n - Z_n$, we deduce [item \(a\)](#) from [Theorem B.1.\(a\)](#) and [Lemma B.2](#). In order to prove [item \(b\)](#) and [item \(c\)](#), note that Z_n and $U(f, n)$ are independent and $U_n = U(f, n) + Z_n$. This implies that for all $|x| \leq \pi\sqrt{n}$, we have

$$\phi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = \psi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \varphi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (39)$$

By [Lemma B.2](#) for all large n we have

$$\sup_{|x| \leq \sqrt{n}\pi} \left| \varphi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \right| \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (40)$$

Items [\(b\)](#) and [\(c\)](#) follow from [\(39\)](#), [\(40\)](#), [Theorem B.1.\(b\)](#) and [Theorem B.1.\(c\)](#). \square

Now we are ready to prove [Theorem 3.5](#).

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Recall that $\psi_n(t)$ is the characteristic function of $U(f, n)$. By Fourier inversion formula for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ we get,

$$\mu(U(f, n) = m) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi_n(t) e^{-itm} dt.$$

By change of variables $t = \frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}$ we get,

$$\sqrt{n}\mu(U(f, n) = m) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi\sqrt{n}}^{\pi\sqrt{n}} \psi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) e^{-(ixm)/\sqrt{n}} dx.$$

Observe that,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-m^2/2n\sigma^2} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\sigma^2 x^2/2} e^{-(ixm)/\sqrt{n}} dx.$$

Hence we need to show

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi\sqrt{n}}^{\pi\sqrt{n}} \psi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) e^{-(ixm)/\sqrt{n}} dx - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\sigma^2 x^2/2} e^{-(ixm)/\sqrt{n}} dx \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Since,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \pi\sqrt{n}} e^{-\sigma^2 x^2/2} e^{-(ixm)/\sqrt{n}} dx \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

using triangular inequality, we need to show

$$\int_{-\pi\sqrt{n}}^{\pi\sqrt{n}} \left| \psi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) - e^{-\sigma^2 x^2/2} \right| dx \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

By [Theorem B.3.\(a\)](#), $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}U(f, n)$ converges in distribution to a normal law with $\sigma^2 = 2(\ln 2)^2$. We use Levy's continuity theorem to deduce that that characteristic function converges pointwise. In other words for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Psi_n(x) := \mathbf{1}_{[-\pi\sqrt{n}, \pi\sqrt{n}]}(x) \left| \psi_n\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right) - e^{-\sigma^2 x^2/2} \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Note that by [Theorem B.3](#) items (b) and (c), for large n and $|x| \leq \pi \sqrt{n}$ the function $\Psi_n(x)$ is bounded by an integrable function, hence we can apply dominated convergence theorem to conclude

$$\int_{-\pi \sqrt{n}}^{\pi \sqrt{n}} \left| \psi_n \left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}} \right) - e^{-\sigma^2 x^2 / 2} \right| dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Psi_n(x) dx \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

□

APPENDIX C. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.3

A probability preserving system (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) is a **Gaussian automorphism** if there exists $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$ such that

- $\int f d\mu = 0$.
- The process $\{f \circ T^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is Gaussian and the σ -algebra generated by the functions $\{f \circ T^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathcal{B} \bmod \mu$.

A Gaussian automorphism is spectrally determined and as a consequence for every $d \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ it has a d 'th root. That is there exists S a probability preserving transformation of (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) such that $T = S^d$. In addition, when T is an ergodic, zero-entropy, Gaussian automorphism then its d 'th root is also an ergodic, zero-entropy, Gaussian automorphism,

Proof of [Proposition 1.3](#). By the main theorem in [[Aus24](#)], there exists S, T two ergodic, zero entropy Gaussian automorphisms of a probability space (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) and $f \in L^2(\mu)$ such that the averages

$$\mathbb{A}_n(f, f) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^k f \circ S^k$$

do not converge in $L^2(\mu)$, As S and T are Gaussian automorphisms, there exists R, Q , two ergodic, zero-entropy, Gaussian automorphisms of (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) such that $R^c = T$ and $Q^d = S$. Since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$B_n(f, f) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f \circ R^{cn} f \circ Q^{dn} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^k f \circ S^k,$$

the averages $B_n(f, f)$ do not converge in $L^2(\mu)$. □

REFERENCES

- [AR62] L. M. Abramov and V. A. Rohlin. Entropy of a skew product of mappings with invariant measure. *Vestnik Leningrad. Univ.*, 17(7):5–13, 1962.
- [Aus24] Tim Austin. Non-convergence of some non-commuting double ergodic averages. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2407.08630, July 2024.
- [BD87] Robert Burton and Manfred Denker. On the central limit theorem for dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 302(2):715–726, 1987.
- [BL02] V. Bergelson and A. Leibman. A nilpotent Roth theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 147(2):429–470, 2002.
- [CL84] Jean-Pierre Conze and Emmanuel Lesigne. Théorèmes ergodiques pour des mesures diagonales. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 112(2):143–175, 1984.
- [Con99] J.-P. Conze. Sur un critère de récurrence en dimension 2 pour les marches stationnaires, applications. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(5):1233–1245, 1999.
- [DGK21] George Deligiannidis, Sébastien Gouëzel, and Zemer Kosloff. The boundary of the range of a random walk and the Følner property. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26:Paper No. 110, 39, 2021.
- [Dur10] Rick Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 31 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, fourth edition, 2010.

- [FH23] Nikos Frantzikinakis and Bernard Host. Multiple recurrence and convergence without commutativity. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 107(5):1635–1659, 2023.
- [HSY24a] Wen Huang, Song Shao, and Xiangdong Ye. A counterexample on multiple convergence without commutativity. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2407.10728, July 2024.
- [HSY24b] Wen Huang, Song Shao, and Xiangdong Ye. A counterexample on polynomial multiple convergence without commutativity. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 152(1):149–168, 2024.
- [Kec95] Alexander S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [KV22] Zemer Kosloff and Dalibor Volný. Local limit theorem in deterministic systems. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 58(1):548–566, 2022.
- [Ryz24] Valery V. Ryzhikov. Non-commuting transformations with non-converging 2-fold ergodic averages. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2407.13741, July 2024.
- [Sch98] Klaus Schmidt. On joint recurrence. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 327(9):837–842, 1998.
- [Vol99] Dalibor Volný. Invariance principles and Gaussian approximation for strictly stationary processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(8):3351–3371, 1999.
- [Wal12] Miguel N. Walsh. Norm convergence of nilpotent ergodic averages. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 175(3):1667–1688, 2012.

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, JERUSALEM, 9190401, ISRAEL.

Email address: `zemer.kosloff@mail.huji.ac.il`

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, JERUSALEM, 9190401, ISRAEL.

Email address: `shrey.sanadhya@mail.huji.ac.il`