

RESTRICTED PERMUTATIONS AND PERMANENTS OF INFINITE AMENABLE GROUPS

HANFENG LI AND KLAUS SCHMIDT

Dedicated to the memory of Anatoly Moiseevich Vershik

ABSTRACT. Let Γ be an infinite discrete group and $A \subset \Gamma$ a nonempty finite subset. The set of permutations σ of Γ such that $s^{-1}\sigma(s) \in A$ for every $s \in \Gamma$ can be identified with a shift of finite type $X_A \subset A^\Gamma$ over Γ . In this paper we study dynamical properties of such shift spaces, like invariant probability measures, topological entropy, and topological pressure, under the hypothesis that Γ is amenable.

In this case the topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(X_A)$ can be expressed as logarithmic growth rate of permanents of certain finite $(0,1)$ -matrices associated with right Følner sequences in Γ . Motivated by the difficulty of computing such permanents we introduce the notion of the permanent $\text{per}(f)$ for nonnegative elements f in the real group ring $\mathbb{R}\Gamma$ of Γ whose support is the alphabet A of the *SFT* X_A , and compare, for arbitrary $f \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma$, the *Fuglede-Kadison determinant* $\det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ with the permanent $\text{per}(|f|)$ of the absolute value $|f|$ of f . Although this approach is effective in only few examples, discussed below, it is interesting from a conceptual point of view that the permanent $\text{per}(f)$ of a nonnegative element $f \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma$ can be viewed as *topological pressure* of the restricted-permutation *SFT* X_A associated with the function $\log f$ on the alphabet $A = \text{supp}(f)$ of X_A .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ be a finite set, and let $X_A^{(n)}$ be the collection of all permutations σ of $\mathbb{N}_n = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ with the property that $\sigma(i) - i \in A \pmod{n}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}_n$. What can one say about the number $|X_A^{(n)}|$ of all such permutations as A remains fixed, but $n \rightarrow \infty$? Both for the history and for variations of this problem we refer to [1, 10, 12, 25, 26, 29, 30], to mention a few references.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, one is led to consider permutations σ of \mathbb{Z} which move each $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ by some element of a given finite set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$. This embeds questions about the sizes of the sets $X_A^{(n)}$, $n \geq 1$, in problems concerning the dynamics of the shift action of \mathbb{Z} on the shift-invariant set of all permutations σ of \mathbb{Z} with $\sigma(i) - i \in A$ for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. If one replaces \mathbb{Z} by \mathbb{Z}^d , $d \geq 1$, or more generally, by a countably infinite discrete amenable group Γ , the analogous problem becomes considerably more challenging: for every nonempty finite set $A \subset \Gamma$ (in symbols: $A \Subset \Gamma$), the set of permutations σ of Γ satisfying that $s^{-1}\sigma(s) \in A$ for every $s \in \Gamma$, can be identified with a shift of finite type (*SFT*) $X_A \subset A^\Gamma$ over Γ . For $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$, the study of such restricted-permutation *SFTs* was initiated in the paper [40] and subsequently developed further in [14], where the author used a correspondence between certain \mathbb{Z}^2 -*SFTs* of this form and dimer coverings of specific locally finite planar graphs to compute the topological entropy of X_A in some examples.

In the general setting of countable discrete groups Γ , these spaces X_A , $A \Subset \Gamma$, form a distinguished class of *SFTs* over Γ with interesting and only partially understood dynamical properties. We should also mention connections between restricted permutations of general groups (and, more generally, of metric spaces), *restricted orbit equivalence* of group actions (in the sense of [4, 24] or [38]), and *wobbling groups* as discussed, for example, in [21–23]. Note, however, that the restricted

Date: 24-12-31.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 37A15, 37A20, 37A35, 37B10, 37B51.

Key words and phrases. Group permutations with restricted movement, symbolic dynamics, permanents of matrices, topological entropy and pressure.

permutations considered here do not form a group (unlike the families of restricted permutations arising from orbit equivalence or in geometric group theory).

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is devoted to local entropy and local pressure for shift-actions of countable amenable groups Γ , including *SFTs* with finite alphabets over Γ (cf. e.g. [7, 11, 20]) and algebraic Γ -actions as defined in [9, 31, 39]. In Section 3 we focus on local entropy and invariant probability measures for the specific Γ -*SFTs* arising from restricted permutations of countable amenable groups Γ . In Section 4 we look in more detail at the topological entropies $h_{\text{top}}(X_A)$ of such restricted-permutation *SFTs* X_A . These can be expressed as logarithmic growth rates of permanents of certain finite $(0,1)$ -matrices associated with right Følner sequences in Γ (Proposition 3.6 and Remark 4.8).

Since the computation of permanents of $(n \times n)$ -matrices is NP-hard and conjecturally not possible in polynomial time (cf. e.g., [41]), there is little hope for general numerical results about $h_{\text{top}}(X_A)$, $A \Subset \Gamma$. One attempt to overcome the difficulty of computing explicitly the permanent of a large scalar matrix M is to search for linear operations (like sign changes) on the entries of M , resulting in a matrix M' whose determinant is equal to the permanent of M . This leads to the notion of the *permanent* $\text{per}(f)$ for nonnegative elements f in the real group ring $\mathbb{R}\Gamma$ whose support is the alphabet A of the *SFT* X_A , and to the problem of comparing, for an arbitrary element $f \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma$, the *Fuglede-Kadison determinant* $\det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ with the permanent $\text{per}(|f|)$ of the absolute value $|f|$ of f . As is to be expected from negative results about this problem ([19, 34]), this approach can succeed in only few examples, investigated in Section 5. However, from a conceptual point of view it is interesting that the permanent $\text{per}(f)$ of a nonnegative element $f \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma$ can be viewed as *topological pressure* of the restricted-permutation *SFT* X_A associated with the function $\log f$ on the alphabet $A = \text{supp}(f)$ of X_A .

In Section 6 we discuss finite approximations of the permanents $\text{per}(f)$, $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$, for residually finite amenable groups. For $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$, $\text{per}(f)$ is indeed equal to the upper limit of permanents corresponding to finite quotients of \mathbb{Z} (Corollary 6.3), but in general $\text{per}(f)$ may be larger than the \limsup of the permanents of f induced on the finite quotients of Γ (Proposition 6.1). When applying this to the function $f \equiv 1$ on A this translates into the familiar statement that the logarithmic growth rate of the number of periodic points of the *SFT* X_A is less than or equal to $h_{\text{top}}(X_A)$, but even for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^2$ equality of these two quantities is an open problem.

In the final Section 7 we apply a few known results on permanents of matrices to obtain estimates like $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \log(|A|!)$ if Γ is finitely generated with polynomial growth and $A \Subset \Gamma$ (Theorem 7.8), or $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) \geq \log \frac{|A|}{e}$ if Γ is infinite amenable and $A \Subset \Gamma$ (Corollary 7.5).

Acknowledgements. This work started while the first author was visiting the Erwin Schrödinger International Institute for Mathematics and Physics in the spring of 2020. He thanks the institute for providing a nice environment.

2. THE LOCAL PRESSURE FORMULA

2.1. The local pressure formula for shift actions. Let Γ be a countable discrete group with identity element e_Γ , and let $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ be the collection of all nonempty finite subsets of Γ .

If B is a compact metrizable space we consider the *full shift* B^Γ , furnished with the product topology, and write λ and ρ for the left and right shift actions of Γ on B^Γ , defined by

$$(\lambda^s x)_t = x_{s^{-1}t}, \quad (\rho^s x)_t = x_{ts} \quad (2.1)$$

for every $s \in \Gamma$ and $x = (x_t)_{t \in \Gamma} \in B^\Gamma$. For $\emptyset \neq F \subseteq \Gamma$, $s \in \Gamma$ and $x \in B^F$, we denote by $sx: sF \rightarrow B$ the function sending st to x_t for every $t \in F$. If F' is a subset of F we denote by $x|_{F'} = \pi_{F'}(x) \in B^{F'}$ the restriction of $x \in B^F$ to F' .

Let \mathcal{P} be a set consisting of pairs (K, \mathcal{O}) , where $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and \mathcal{O} is an open subset of B^K . We treat \mathcal{P} as a set of *forbidden patterns* and write

$$X_{\mathcal{P}} = \{x \in B^\Gamma : sx|_K = \pi_K(\lambda^s x) \notin \mathcal{O} \text{ for every } s \in \Gamma \text{ and all } (K, \mathcal{O}) \in \mathcal{P}\} \quad (2.2)$$

for the corresponding closed, left shift-invariant set of *admissible elements* in B^Γ . For given $F \subseteq \Gamma$ we denote by

$$X_{\mathcal{P},F} = \{x \in B^F : s^{-1}x|_K \notin \emptyset \text{ for every } (K, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } s \in \Gamma \text{ with } sK \subseteq F\} \quad (2.3)$$

the set of *locally admissible patterns* on F .

Note that every closed, left shift-invariant subset $X \subseteq B^\Gamma$ can be written as $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ for suitable \mathcal{P} : indeed, one may take $\mathcal{P} = \{(K, B^K \setminus \pi_K(X)) : K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)\}$.

Now assume that Γ is amenable. We use right Følner sets.

Let \mathcal{U} be a finite open cover of B . For each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ we denote by \mathcal{U}^F the finite open cover of B^F consisting of $\prod_{t \in F} U_t$ for all maps $t \mapsto U_t$ from F to \mathcal{U} . For each $Y \subseteq B^F$, we denote by $N(\mathcal{U}^F, Y)$ the minimal number of elements of \mathcal{U}^F needed to cover Y .

Denote by $\pi = \pi_{\{e_\Gamma\}}$ the coordinate map $B^\Gamma \rightarrow B$ sending each $x = (x_s) \in B^\Gamma$ to x_{e_Γ} . Then $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ is a finite open cover of B^Γ . For each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, denote by $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_F$ the open cover $\bigvee_{s \in F} s\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ of B^Γ . It is well known that the limit

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) := \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_F, X_{\mathcal{P}}) \quad (2.4)$$

exists in the sense that there is some $C \in [-\infty, +\infty)$ such that, for any neighbourhood U of C in $[-\infty, +\infty)$, there are $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{|F|} \log N(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_F, X_{\mathcal{P}}) \in U$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $|FK \Delta F| < \delta|F|$ (cf. [28, page 220]). For each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, it is easy to check that $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_F = \pi_F^{-1}(\mathcal{U}^F)$. Hence

$$N(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_F, X_{\mathcal{P}}) = N(\pi_F^{-1}(\mathcal{U}^F), X_{\mathcal{P}}) = N(\mathcal{U}^F, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

Thus

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N(\mathcal{U}^F, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

It is also easy to check that for every finite open cover \mathcal{V} of B^Γ , one has $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_K \succeq \mathcal{V}$ for some finite open cover \mathcal{U} of B and some $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. It follows that

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}} h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) \quad (2.5)$$

for \mathcal{U} ranging over finite open covers of B .

We denote by $C(B)$ the set of real-valued continuous functions on B . Let $f \in C(B)$, and let \mathcal{U} be a finite open cover of B . For each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, $Y \subseteq B^F$ and $Z \subseteq B^F$, we set

$$p_F(f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), Y) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{x \in V \cap Y} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} : \mathcal{V} \text{ is a finite cover of } B^\Gamma \text{ refining } \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_F \right\}$$

and

$$p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, Z) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{x \in V \cap Z} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} : \mathcal{V} \text{ is a finite cover of } B^F \text{ refining } \mathcal{U}^F \right\}.$$

Clearly $p_F(0, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), Y) = N(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), Y)$ and $p_F(0, \mathcal{U}, Z) = N(\mathcal{U}^F, Z)$. For any finite cover \mathcal{V} of B^Γ refining $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_F$, if we set $\mathcal{V}' = \{\pi_F(V \cap Y) : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \cup \{U \setminus \pi_F(Y) : U \in \mathcal{U}^F\}$, then \mathcal{V}' is a finite cover of B^F refining \mathcal{U}^F , and

$$\sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{x \in V \cap Y} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} = \sum_{V' \in \mathcal{V}'} \sup_{x \in (V' \times B^{\Gamma \setminus F}) \cap Y} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)}.$$

In the definition of $p_F(f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), Y)$ we may thus require that $\mathcal{V} = \pi_F^{-1}(\mathcal{V}')$ for some finite cover \mathcal{V}' of B^F refining \mathcal{U}^F . Therefore

$$p_F(f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), Y) = p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(Y)).$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f \in C(\mathbb{B})$ and let \mathcal{U} be a finite open cover of \mathbb{B} . As $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ becomes more and more right invariant, the limits $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), X_{\mathcal{P}})$ and $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F})$ exist in the same sense as in (2.4).*

Proof. We prove the assertion about $p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F})$. The proof for $p_F(f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), X_{\mathcal{P}})$ is similar.

If $X_{\mathcal{P},F_1} = \emptyset$ for some $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, then $X_{\mathcal{P},F} = \emptyset$ for all sufficiently right invariant $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, so that $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F}) = -\infty$. Thus we may assume that $X_{\mathcal{P},F} \neq \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.

We consider first the case $f \geq 0$.

For any $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $s \in \Gamma$, clearly $sX_{\mathcal{P},F} = X_{\mathcal{P},sF}$ and

$$p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F}) = p_{sF}(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},sF}).$$

For any $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, note that if \mathcal{V}_j is a finite cover of \mathbb{B}^{F_j} refining \mathcal{U}^{F_j} for $j = 1, 2$, then the sets $(V_1 \times \mathbb{B}^{F_2 \setminus F_1}) \cap (\mathbb{B}^{F_1 \setminus F_2} \times V_2)$ for $V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1$ and $V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2$ form a finite cover of $\mathbb{B}^{F_1 \cup F_2}$ refining $\mathcal{U}^{F_1 \cup F_2}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & p_{F_1 \cup F_2}(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2}) \\ & \leq \sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x \in (V_1 \times \mathbb{B}^{F_2 \setminus F_1}) \cap (\mathbb{B}^{F_1 \setminus F_2} \times V_2) \cap X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2}} e^{\sum_{s \in F_1 \cup F_2} f(x_s)} \\ & \leq \sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x \in (V_1 \times \mathbb{B}^{F_2 \setminus F_1}) \cap (\mathbb{B}^{F_1 \setminus F_2} \times V_2) \cap X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2}} e^{\sum_{s \in F_1} f(x_s)} e^{\sum_{s \in F_2} f(x_s)} \\ & \leq \sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \left(\sup_{x \in V_1 \cap \pi_{F_1}(X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2})} e^{\sum_{s \in F_1} f(x_s)} \right) \left(\sup_{x \in V_2 \cap \pi_{F_2}(X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2})} e^{\sum_{s \in F_2} f(x_s)} \right) \\ & = \left(\sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1} \sup_{x \in V_1 \cap \pi_{F_1}(X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2})} e^{\sum_{s \in F_1} f(x_s)} \right) \left(\sum_{V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x \in V_2 \cap \pi_{F_2}(X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2})} e^{\sum_{s \in F_2} f(x_s)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we use that $f \geq 0$. It follows that

$$p_{F_1 \cup F_2}(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2}) \leq p_{F_1}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_1}(X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2})) \cdot p_{F_2}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_2}(X_{\mathcal{P},F_1 \cup F_2})). \quad (2.6)$$

Now by the Ornstein-Weiss lemma [28, Theorem 4.38] the limit $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F})$ exists.

For general $f \in C(\mathbb{B})$, we can find a constant C such that $f \geq C$. Then

$$\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F}) = C + \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f - C, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P},F}). \quad \square$$

For any $f \in C(\mathbb{B})$ and any finite open cover \mathcal{U} of \mathbb{B} , we set

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), X_{\mathcal{P}}).$$

For every finite open cover \mathcal{V} of \mathbb{B}^Γ , one has $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})_K \succeq \mathcal{V}$ for some finite open cover \mathcal{U} of \mathbb{B} and some $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Thus the *topological pressure of the Γ -action λ on $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ associated to f* is

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}} P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}))$$

for \mathcal{U} ranging over finite open covers of \mathbb{B} (cf. [37, Section 5.2]).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f \in C(\mathbb{B})$ and let \mathcal{U} be a finite open cover of \mathbb{B} . Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, $X \subseteq \mathbb{B}^F$, and $\eta > 0$. Then there is an open subset W of \mathbb{B}^F such that $X \subseteq W$ and, for any $Z \subseteq W$, one has*

$$p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, Z) \leq e^\eta p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X).$$

Proof. If X is empty we may take $W = \emptyset$. Thus we may assume that X is nonempty. Then $p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X) > 0$. Let ρ be a compatible metric on B^F .

Take a finite cover \mathcal{V} of B^F refining \mathcal{U}^F such that

$$\sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{x \in V \cap X} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} < e^{\eta/2} p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X).$$

Enlarging each member of \mathcal{V} slightly, we may assume that \mathcal{V} is an open cover of B^F . For each $V \in \mathcal{V}$, take an open subset V' of B^F such that the closure of V' is contained in V and that $\mathcal{V}' = \{V' : V \in \mathcal{V}\}$ covers B^F . Take a $\delta > 0$ such that for any $x, z \in B^F$ with $\rho(x, z) < \delta$ one has

$$\left| \sum_{s \in F} f(x_s) - \sum_{s \in F} f(z_s) \right| < \eta/2.$$

Shrinking δ if necessary, we may assume that for any $V \in \mathcal{V}$, any $z \in V'$ and any $x \in B^F$ with $\rho(x, z) < \delta$, one has $x \in V$. Denote by W the set of $z \in B^F$ satisfying that $\sup_{x \in X} \rho(x, z) < \delta$. Then W is an open subset of B^F and $X \subseteq W$.

Let $Z \subseteq W$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$. For each $z \in V' \cap Z$, since $z \in W$, we can find some $x \in X$ with $\rho(x, z) < \delta$. By our choice of δ we have $x \in V$ and

$$\sum_{s \in F} f(z_s) < \eta/2 + \sum_{s \in F} f(x_s).$$

Thus

$$\sup_{z \in V' \cap Z} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(z_s)} \leq e^{\eta/2} \sup_{x \in V \cap X} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)}.$$

Therefore

$$p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, Z) \leq \sum_{V' \in \mathcal{V}'} \sup_{z \in V' \cap Z} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(z_s)} \leq e^{\eta/2} \sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{x \in V \cap X} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \leq e^{\eta} p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X). \quad \square$$

The following is the Ornstein-Weiss quasitiling theorem [28, Theorem 4.36].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $0 < \delta, \delta_1, \eta < 1$. There are $K', F_1, F_2, \dots, F_N \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta' > 0$ such that $|F_j K| < (1 + \delta)|F_j|$ for each $j = 1, \dots, N$, and for any $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ satisfying $|FK'| < (1 + \delta')|F|$ there are finite sets $C_1, \dots, C_N \subseteq \Gamma$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) *There is a set $\widehat{cF}_j \subseteq cF_j$ satisfying $|\widehat{cF}_j| \geq (1 - \eta)|cF_j|$ for every $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $c \in C_j$ such that the sets \widehat{cF}_j for $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $c \in C_j$ are pairwise disjoint;*
- (2) *$\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \bigcup_{c \in C_j} cF_j \subseteq F$ and $|\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \bigcup_{c \in C_j} \widehat{cF}_j| \geq (1 - \delta_1)|F|$.*

The next lemma establishes the upper semicontinuity for topological pressure with respect to a fixed finite open cover.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $f \in C(B)$ and let \mathcal{U} be a finite open cover of B . Let X be a closed Γ -invariant subset of B^Γ , and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there is an open subset W of B^Γ such that $X \subseteq W$ and for any closed Γ -invariant subset Y of B^Γ with $Y \subseteq W$, one has*

$$P(Y, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) \leq P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Since $P(X, f + C, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = C + P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}))$ for every constant C , replacing f by $f + C$ for a suitable C , we may assume that $f \geq 0$. Arguing as in (2.6), we have

$$p_{F_1 \cup F_2}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_1 \cup F_2}(X)) \leq p_{F_1}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_1}(X)) \cdot p_{F_2}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_2}(X))$$

for all $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Set $\|f\| = \max_{y \in B} |f(y)|$.

Take an $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\eta + \frac{P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + 2\eta}{1 - \eta} \leq P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + \varepsilon.$$

Take $0 < \delta_1 < 1$ such that $(e^{\|f\|}|\mathcal{U}|)^{\delta_1} \leq e^\eta$. Take $0 < \delta < 1$ and $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ containing e_Γ such that

$$\frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X)) = \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), X) \leq P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + \eta$$

for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ satisfying $|FK| \leq (1 + \delta)|F|$. Then we have $K', F_1, F_2, \dots, F_N \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta' > 0$ given by Lemma 2.3.

For each $1 \leq j \leq N$, by Lemma 2.2 we can find an open subset W_j of B^{F_j} such that $\pi_{F_j}(X) \subseteq W_j$ and for any $Z \subseteq W_j$ one has

$$p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, Z) \leq e^{|F_j|\eta} p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X)).$$

Set $W = \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq N} (W_j \times B^{\Gamma \setminus F_j})$. Then W is an open subset of B^Γ and $X \subseteq W$.

Let Y be a closed Γ -invariant subset of B^Γ such that $Y \subseteq W$.

For each $1 \leq j \leq N$, we have $\pi_{F_j}(Y) \subseteq W_j$, whence

$$p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(Y)) \leq e^{|F_j|\eta} p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X)).$$

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $|FK'| < (1 + \delta')|F|$. Then we have C_1, \dots, C_N given by Lemma 2.3. Set $L = F \setminus \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \bigcup_{c \in C_i} cF_i$. Note that

$$|L| \leq \delta_1 |F|$$

and

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} |F_j| = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} |cF_j| \leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} \frac{1}{1 - \eta} |\widehat{cF_j}| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \eta} |F|.$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $c \in C_j$, we have

$$p_{cF_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{cF_j}(Y)) = p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(Y)) \leq e^{|F_j|\eta} p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X)).$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(Y)) &\leq p_L(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_L(Y)) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j \leq N} \prod_{c \in C_j} p_{cF_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{cF_j}(Y)) \\ &\leq (e^{\|f\|}|\mathcal{U}|)^{|L|} \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j \leq N} \prod_{c \in C_j} (e^{|F_j|\eta} p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X))) \\ &\leq (e^{\|f\|}|\mathcal{U}|)^{\delta_1 |F|} \cdot e^{\sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} (P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + 2\eta) |F_j|} \\ &\leq e^{\eta |F|} \cdot e^{\frac{P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + 2\eta}{1 - \eta} |F|}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) &= \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(Y)) \\ &\leq \eta + \frac{P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + 2\eta}{1 - \eta} \leq P(X, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) + \varepsilon. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.5. *Let $f \in C(B)$ and let \mathcal{U} be a finite open cover of B . Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\eta > 0$. Then there is an $F' \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $F \subseteq F'$ and*

$$p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}, F'})) \leq e^\eta p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2 we can find an open subset W of B^F such that $\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}}) \subseteq W$ and for any $Z \subseteq W$ one has

$$p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, Z) \leq e^\eta p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

Take a sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $F \subseteq F_n \subseteq F_{n+1}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Gamma = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} F_n$. Then

$$\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}}) \subseteq \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_{n+1}}) \subseteq \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_n})$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We claim that there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_n}) \subseteq W$. We argue by contradiction. So we assume that $\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_n}) \not\subseteq W$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for each n we can find a $y_n \in X_{\mathcal{P}, F_n}$ such that $y_n|_F \notin W$. We take a $y'_n \in B^\Gamma$ extending y_n . Since B^Γ is compact, we can find a subsequence $(y'_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $(y'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to some $y \in B^\Gamma$.

We claim that $y \in X_{\mathcal{P}}$. Let $(K, \mathcal{O}) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $s \in \Gamma$. For all large enough k , we have $sK \subseteq F_{n_k}$, whence $s^{-1}y'_{n_k}|_K = s^{-1}y_{n_k}|_K \notin \mathcal{O}$. Since \mathcal{O} is open and $s^{-1}y'_{n_k}|_K$ converges to $s^{-1}y|_K$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we get that $s^{-1}y|_K \notin \mathcal{O}$. Thus $y \in X_{\mathcal{P}}$, as desired.

Note that $y'_{n_k}|_F = y_{n_k}|_F \notin W$ for every k . Since W is open and $y'_{n_k}|_F$ converges to $y|_F$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we get $y|_F \notin W$. This contradicts the fact that $\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}}) \subseteq W$. Thus we do find some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_n}) \subseteq W$. Then

$$p_{F_n}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_n})) \leq e^\eta p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})). \quad \square$$

Theorem 2.6. *Let $f \in C(B)$. We have*

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) = \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}', F})$$

for every finite open cover \mathcal{U} of B , where \mathcal{P}' ranges over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} . In particular,

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}} \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}} \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}', F})$$

for \mathcal{U} ranging over finite open covers of B and \mathcal{P}' ranging over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} .

Proof. Replacing f by $f + C$ for a suitable constant C , we may assume that $f \geq 0$. Set $\|f\| = \max_{y \in B} |f(y)|$.

Let \mathcal{U} be a finite open cover of B . We first show that

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}). \quad (2.7)$$

For each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, we have $X_{\mathcal{P}, F} \supseteq \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})$, so that

$$p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) \geq p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

Thus

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})) \leq \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}).$$

Set $D = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F})$. We are left to show that

$$D \leq \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

We may assume that $D \neq -\infty$. Then from Lemma 2.5 we know that $X_{\mathcal{P}} \neq \emptyset$.

It suffices to show that for any $0 < \eta < 1$, $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta > 0$ there is some $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $|FK| < (1 + \delta)|F|$ such that

$$(1 - \eta)(D - 2\eta) - \eta \leq \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

Let $0 < \eta < 1$, $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta > 0$. We may assume that $D - 2\eta > 0$. Take $0 < \delta_1 < 1$ such that $(e^{\|f\|}|\mathcal{U}|)^{2\delta_1} \leq e^\eta$. Take $0 < \delta_2 < 1$ and $K_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ containing e_Γ such that

$$\frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) \geq D - \eta$$

for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ satisfying $|FK_2| \leq (1 + \delta_2)|F|$. Then we have $K', F_1, F_2, \dots, F_N \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta' > 0$ given by Lemma 2.3. Set

$$D' = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \frac{1}{|F_j|} \log p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

Then it suffices to show that

$$(1 - \eta)(D - 2\eta) - \eta \leq D'.$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq N$, by Lemma 2.5 we can find an $E_j \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ containing e_Γ such that

$$p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_j E_j})) \leq e^{|F_j| \eta} p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}})).$$

Set $E = \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} E_j$.

Take an $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $|FK'| < (1 + \delta')|F|$ and $|FEK_2| \leq (1 + \min(\delta_1, \delta_2))|F|$. Then we have C_1, \dots, C_N given by Lemma 2.3. Set $L = FE \setminus \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \bigcup_{c \in C_j} cF_j$. Note that

$$|L| = |FE \setminus F| + \left| F \setminus \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \bigcup_{c \in C_j} cF_j \right| \leq |FEK_2 \setminus F| + \delta_1 |F| \leq 2\delta_1 |F|,$$

and

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} |F_j| = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} |cF_j| \leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} \frac{1}{1 - \eta} |\widehat{cF_j}| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \eta} |F|.$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $c \in C_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{cF_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{cF_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}, FE})) &\leq p_{cF_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{cF_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}, cF_j E_j})) \\ &= p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}, F_j E_j})) = e^{|F_j| \eta} p_{F_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{F_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}})) \leq e^{(D' + \eta)|F_j|}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{FE}(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, FE}) &\stackrel{(2.6)}{\leq} p_L(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_L(X_{\mathcal{P}, FE})) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j \leq N} \prod_{c \in C_j} p_{cF_j}(f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_{cF_j}(X_{\mathcal{P}, FE})) \\ &\leq (e^{\|f\| \|\mathcal{U}\|})^{|L|} \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j \leq N} \prod_{c \in C_j} e^{(D' + \eta)|F_j|} \\ &\leq (e^{\|f\| \|\mathcal{U}\|})^{2\delta_1 |F|} \cdot e^{\sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{c \in C_j} (D' + \eta)|F_j|} \leq e^{\eta |F|} \cdot e^{\frac{D' + \eta}{1 - \eta} |F|}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|FEK_2| \leq (1 + \delta_2)|F| \leq (1 + \delta_2)|FE|$, we have

$$D - \eta \leq \frac{1}{|FE|} \log p_{FE}(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, FE}).$$

Therefore

$$e^{(D - \eta)|F|} \leq e^{(D - \eta)|FE|} \leq p_{FE}(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, FE}) \leq e^{\eta |F|} \cdot e^{\frac{D' + \eta}{1 - \eta} |F|}.$$

It follows that

$$D - \eta \leq \eta + \frac{D' + \eta}{1 - \eta},$$

whence

$$(1 - \eta)(D - 2\eta) - \eta \leq D'$$

as desired. This proves (2.7).

Note that

$$X_{\mathcal{P}} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{P}'} X_{\mathcal{P}'}$$

for \mathcal{P}' ranging over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} . Thus by Lemma 2.4 we have

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} P(X_{\mathcal{P}'}, f, \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U})) = \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}', F})$$

for \mathcal{P}' ranging over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} . □

Remark 2.7. From Theorem 2.6 we have

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) \leq \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} \sup_{\mathcal{U}} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N(\mathcal{U}^F, X_{\mathcal{P}', F}) = \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}'})$$

for \mathcal{U} ranging over finite open covers of B and \mathcal{P}' ranging over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} . In general one might have

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) < \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}'})$$

for \mathcal{P}' ranging over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} . For example, let $B = [0, 1]$ and let \mathcal{P} be the set of $(\{e_{\Gamma}\}, (r, 1])$ for rational $0 < r < 1$. Then $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the singleton of the function $\Gamma \rightarrow \{0\}$ and $h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) = 0$. For each finite subset \mathcal{P}' of \mathcal{P} , $X_{\mathcal{P}'} = [0, t]^{\Gamma}$ for some $t \in (0, 1]$, whence $h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}'}) = \infty$.

Now let ϑ be a compatible metric on B . For each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, we define a compatible metric ϑ_F on B^F by

$$\vartheta_F(x, y) = \max_{s \in F} \vartheta(x_s, y_s).$$

For $Y \subseteq B^F$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, denote by $N_{\varepsilon}(Y, \vartheta_F)$ the maximal cardinality of $(\vartheta_F, \varepsilon)$ -separated subsets of Y , where $Z \subseteq Y$ is $(\vartheta_F, \varepsilon)$ -separated if $\vartheta_F(z, z') > \varepsilon$ for all distinct $z, z' \in Z$. Similar to the proof that topological entropy defined using open covers is the same as using separated sets, one can check easily that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{U}} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N(\mathcal{U}^F, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon}(X_{\mathcal{P}, F}, \vartheta_F)$$

for \mathcal{U} ranging over finite open covers of B , and

$$\sup_{\mathcal{U}} \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N(\mathcal{U}^F, X_{\mathcal{P}', F}) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon}(X_{\mathcal{P}', F}, \vartheta_F)$$

for \mathcal{U} ranging over finite open covers of B and \mathcal{P}' ranging over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} . Thus for $f = 0$ the second assertion of Theorem 2.6 can also be stated as the following

Corollary 2.8. *We have*

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon}(X_{\mathcal{P}, F}, \vartheta_F) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \inf_{\mathcal{P}'} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon}(X_{\mathcal{P}', F}, \vartheta_F)$$

for \mathcal{P}' ranging over finite subsets of \mathcal{P} .

2.2. The local entropy formula for algebraic actions. We denote by $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ the *integer group ring* of Γ , consisting of all finitely supported functions $f: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, written as $f = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} f_s s \in \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ with $f_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all s , and with addition, multiplication and involution defined by

$$f + g = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} (f_s + g_s) s, \quad fg = \sum_{s, t \in \Gamma} f_s g_t s t, \quad \text{and} \quad f^* = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} f_s s^{-1},$$

for all f, g in $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$. The set $\text{supp}(f) = \{s \in \Gamma: f_s \neq 0\}$ is called the *support* of $f \in \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$.

We set $X = \mathbb{T}^{\Gamma}$ and extend the left and right shift actions λ and ρ of Γ on \mathbb{T}^{Γ} in (2.1) to $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -actions by setting

$$\lambda^f x = \sum_{t \in \Gamma} f_t \lambda^t x, \quad \rho^f x = \sum_{t \in \Gamma} f_t \rho^t x, \tag{2.8}$$

for every $f = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} f_s s \in \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}^{\Gamma}$.

The additive group $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ can be identified with the Pontryagin dual of \mathbb{T}^{Γ} through the pairing

$$\langle f, x \rangle = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} f_s x_s = (\rho^f x)_{e_{\Gamma}} \tag{2.9}$$

for every $f \in \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ and $x = (x_s) \in \mathbb{T}^{\Gamma}$. In this pairing, the shifts λ^t (resp. ρ^t) on \mathbb{T}^{Γ} become dual to left (resp. right) multiplication by t^{-1} on $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$, and λ^f (resp. ρ^f) is dual to left (resp. right) multiplication by f^* on $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$.

For every subset $J \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ we set

$$X_J = \{x = (x_s) \in \mathbb{T}^\Gamma : \rho^h x = 0 \text{ for every } h \in J\}. \quad (2.10)$$

Since the shift actions λ and ρ commute, the subgroup $X_J \subseteq \mathbb{T}^\Gamma$ is λ -invariant. We denote by

$$\lambda_J = \lambda|_{X_J}$$

the restriction of λ to X_J and call (X_J, λ_J) the *algebraic* Γ -action defined by $J \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$. Note that $(X_J, \lambda_J) = (X_{(J)}, \lambda_{(J)})$, where $(J) = \mathbb{Z}\Gamma J$ is the left ideal in $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ generated by J . If $J = (f)$ is the principal ideal generated by an element $f \in \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$, $(X_f, \lambda_f) := (X_{(f)}, \lambda_{(f)})$ is called the *principal algebraic* Γ -action defined by f .

We fix $J \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ for the moment and set, for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$,

$$X_{J,F} = \{x \in \mathbb{T}^\Gamma : \rho^f x = 0 \text{ on } F \text{ for every } f \in J\}. \quad (2.11)$$

The following local entropy formula for the algebraic Γ -action (X_J, λ_J) is a straightforward consequence of Corollary 2.8.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $J \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$, and let ϑ be the usual metric $\vartheta(z + \mathbb{Z}, z' + \mathbb{Z}) = \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |z - z' - n|$ on $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then*

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_J) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J,F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F).$$

where $\bar{\vartheta}_F$ is the pseudometric

$$\bar{\vartheta}_F(x, y) = \max_{s \in F} \vartheta(x_s, y_s) \quad (2.12)$$

on \mathbb{B}^Γ .

Proof. For each $f \in J$, take a $K_f \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq K_f$, and denote by \mathcal{O}_f the open subset of \mathbb{T}^{K_f} consisting of $x \in \mathbb{T}^{K_f}$ such that $(\rho^f x)_{e_\Gamma} \neq 0_{\mathbb{T}}$. Set

$$\mathcal{P}_J = \{(K_f, \mathcal{O}_f) : f \in J\}.$$

Then $X_{\mathcal{P}_J} = X_J$.

Note that the continuous pseudometric $\bar{\vartheta}_{\{e_\Gamma\}}$ on \mathbb{T}^Γ is dynamically generating in the sense that $\sup_{s \in \Gamma} \bar{\vartheta}_{\{e_\Gamma\}}(\lambda^s x, \lambda^s y) > 0$ for all distinct $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^\Gamma$. Thus by [28, Theorem 9.38] one has

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_J) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_J, \bar{\vartheta}_F) \leq \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J,F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F).$$

In view of Corollary 2.8 it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J,F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F) \leq \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \inf_{J'} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{\mathcal{P}_{J'}, F}, \vartheta_F)$$

for J' ranging over finite subsets of J . In turn it suffices to show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J,F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F) \leq \inf_{J'} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon/2}(X_{\mathcal{P}_{J'}, F}, \vartheta_F) \quad (2.13)$$

for J' ranging over finite subsets of J .

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let J' be a finite subset of J . Take a $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $K \supseteq K_f^{-1}$ for all $f \in J'$. For each $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, denote by F'_K the set of $s \in F$ satisfying $sK \subseteq F$.

We claim that $\pi_{F'_K}(X_{J', F}) \subseteq X_{\mathcal{P}_{J'}, F'_K}$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Let $x \in X_{J', F}$. Let $s \in \Gamma$ and $f \in J'$ such that $sK_f \subseteq F'_K$. Then $s \in F'_K K_f^{-1} \subseteq F'_K K \subseteq F$. Since $x \in X_{J', F}$, we have $\rho^f x = 0_{\mathbb{T}}$ at s . It follows that $(s^{-1}(x|_{F'_K}))|_{K_f} = s^{-1}x|_{K_f} \notin \mathcal{O}_f$. Therefore $x|_{F'_K} \in X_{\mathcal{P}_{J'}, F'_K}$. This proves our claim.

Take a finite $(\vartheta, \varepsilon/2)$ -spanning subset Z of \mathbb{T} , i.e., for every $y \in \mathbb{T}$ there is some $z \in Z$ with $\vartheta(y, z) \leq \varepsilon/2$. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ be sufficiently right Følner. Then F'_K is nonempty. Take a maximal $(\vartheta_{F'_K}, \varepsilon/2)$ -separated subset Y of $X_{\mathcal{P}_{J'}, F'_K}$. Then Y is also $(\vartheta_{F'_K}, \varepsilon/2)$ -spanning in $X_{\mathcal{P}_{J'}, F'_K}$. Let $W \subseteq X_{J', F}$ be $(\bar{\vartheta}_F, \varepsilon)$ -separated. Then for each $w \in W$ we can find some $u(w) \in Z^{F \setminus F'_K} \times Y \subseteq$

\mathbb{T}^F such that $\vartheta_F(w|_F, u(w)) \leq \varepsilon/2$. Since W is $(\bar{\vartheta}_F, \varepsilon)$ -separated, the map $W \rightarrow Z^{F \setminus F'_K} \times Y$ sending w to $u(w)$ must be injective. Thus

$$|W| \leq |Z^{F \setminus F'_K} \times Y| \leq |Z|^{|F \setminus F'_K|} N_{\varepsilon/2}(X_{\mathcal{P}_{J', F'_K}}, \vartheta_{F'_K}).$$

Then

$$N_\varepsilon(X_{J', F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F) \leq |Z|^{|F \setminus F'_K|} N_{\varepsilon/2}(X_{\mathcal{P}_{J', F'_K}}, \vartheta_{F'_K}).$$

As $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ becomes more and more right invariant in the same sense as in (2.4), one has $\frac{|F \setminus F'_K|}{|F|} \rightarrow 0$ and F'_K also becomes more and more right invariant. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J', F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F) &\leq \limsup_F \frac{|F \setminus F'_K|}{|F|} \log |Z| \\ &\quad + \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon/2}(X_{\mathcal{P}_{J', F'_K}}, \vartheta_{F'_K}) \\ &\leq \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon/2}(X_{\mathcal{P}_{J', F}}, \vartheta_F). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J, F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F) &\leq \inf_{J'} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J', F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F) \\ &\leq \inf_{J'} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_{\varepsilon/2}(X_{\mathcal{P}_{J', F}}, \vartheta_F) \end{aligned}$$

for J' ranging over finite subsets of J , establishing (2.13). \square

As stated, the local entropy formula in Corollary 2.9 applies to all closed, left shift-invariant subgroups of \mathbb{T}^Γ . The local entropy formula for finitely generated algebraic actions in [31, Theorem 4.2] corresponds to the extension of Corollary 2.9 to all left shift-invariant subgroups of $(\mathbb{T}^d)^\Gamma$, $d \geq 1$. The proof of this latter extension requires only small notational changes to the argument in Corollary 2.9, as described in the following brief discussion.

Fix $d \geq 1$, set $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{T}^d$, and write the elements of \mathbb{B} as $b = (b^{(1)}, \dots, b^{(d)})$ with $b^{(i)} \in \mathbb{T}$. By identifying each $x = (b_s)_{s \in \Gamma} \in \mathbb{B}^\Gamma$ with the d -tuple $(x^{(i)}) = (b_s^{(i)})_{s \in \Gamma}$, $i = 1, \dots, d$ of elements in \mathbb{T}^Γ we obtain a shift-equivariant isomorphism of the compact abelian groups \mathbb{B}^Γ and $(\mathbb{T}^\Gamma)^d$.

For every $h = (h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(d)}) \in (\mathbb{Z}\Gamma)^d$ and every $x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(d)}) \in (\mathbb{T}^\Gamma)^d = \mathbb{B}^\Gamma$ we set

$$\langle\langle h, x \rangle\rangle = \rho^{h^{(1)}} x^{(1)} + \dots + \rho^{h^{(d)}} x^{(d)} \in \mathbb{T}^\Gamma. \quad (2.14)$$

If we evaluate the pairing $(\mathbb{Z}\Gamma)^d \times \mathbb{B}^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^\Gamma$ in (2.14) at the coordinate e_Γ , the map $(h, x) \rightarrow \langle h, x \rangle := \langle\langle h, x \rangle\rangle_{e_\Gamma} = (\rho^{h^{(1)}} x^{(1)})_{e_\Gamma} + \dots + (\rho^{h^{(d)}} x^{(d)})_{e_\Gamma}$ is a map from $(\mathbb{Z}\Gamma)^d \times \mathbb{B}^\Gamma$ to \mathbb{T} which allows us to identify $(\mathbb{Z}\Gamma)^d$ with the Pontryagin dual $\bar{\mathbb{B}}^\Gamma$ of \mathbb{B}^Γ (as in (2.9)).

In analogy to (2.10) – (2.11) we define, for every subset $J \subseteq (\mathbb{Z}\Gamma)^d$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_J &= \{x \in \mathbb{B}^\Gamma : \langle h, x \rangle = 0_{\mathbb{T}^\Gamma} \text{ for every } h \in J\}, \\ X_{J, F} &= \{x \in \mathbb{B}^\Gamma : \langle h, x \rangle = 0 \text{ on } F \text{ for every } h \in J\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following restatement of [31, Theorem 4.2].¹

Corollary 2.10. *Let $d \geq 1$, $J \subseteq (\mathbb{Z}\Gamma)^d$, and let ϑ be a compatible metric on \mathbb{T}^d . Then*

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_J) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log N_\varepsilon(X_{J, F}, \bar{\vartheta}_F),$$

where $\bar{\vartheta}_F$ is defined as in (2.12).

¹ Note that [31, Theorem 4.2] uses the *right* shift action of Γ on $(\mathbb{T}^d)^\Gamma$ and *left* Følner sets.

2.3. The local pressure formula for subshifts. Let Γ be a countable discrete group and let B a nonempty *finite* set. As in Subsection 2.1 we assume that \mathcal{P} is a set of pairs (K, \mathcal{O}) , where $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{O} \subseteq B^K$, and define $X_{\mathcal{P}} \subseteq B^\Gamma$ by (2.2). If the set \mathcal{P} can be chosen to be finite, the space $X_{\mathcal{P}} \subseteq B^\Gamma$ is called a *shift of finite type* (or *SFT*).

For $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that a finite collection \mathcal{E} of finite subsets of Γ , with possible repetitions, is a k -cover of F , if $\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} 1_E \geq k 1_F$. The case $f = 0$ of the following lemma was proved by Downarowicz, Frej and Romagnoli [11, Lemma 6.1], who in turned followed the proof of [2, Theorem 2]. We follow the proof of [11, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 2.11. *Let $f: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and \mathcal{E} a k -cover of F . Then for each $X \subseteq B^\Gamma$ one has*

$$\sum_{x \in \pi_F(X)} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \leq \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\sum_{z \in \pi_E(X)} e^{\sum_{s \in E} f(z_s)} \right)^{1/k},$$

where as convention for $E = \emptyset$ we set $\sum_{z \in \pi_E(X)} e^{\sum_{s \in E} f(z_s)} = 1$.

Proof. For each finite set $E \subseteq \Gamma$ we set

$$\varphi(X, E) = \sum_{x \in \pi_E(X)} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)}.$$

Our convention is that $\varphi(X, \emptyset) = 1$.

We argue via induction on $|F|$. Consider first the case $|F| = 1$. Say, $F = \{t\}$. Since \mathcal{E} is a k -cover of F , we can find an $\mathcal{E}' \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ such that $|\mathcal{E}'| = k$ and $t \in E$ for every $E \in \mathcal{E}'$. Since $f \geq 0$, we have $\varphi(X, E) \geq 1$ for every $E \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\varphi(X, E) \geq \varphi(X, F)$ for every $E \in \mathcal{E}'$. Then

$$\varphi(X, F) \leq \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}'} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \leq \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k}.$$

Assume that $|F| \geq 2$ and the statement holds for each $F' \subseteq F$ with $|F'| = |F| - 1$. Fix one $t \in F$ and set $F' = F \setminus \{t\}$. Then $F' \subseteq F$ and $|F'| = |F| - 1$. We set $E' = E \setminus \{t\}$ for each $E \in \mathcal{E}$. Then $\mathcal{E}' = \{E' : E \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is a k -cover of F' .

For each $b \in B$, we set $X_b = \{x \in X : x_t = b\}$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to F', \mathcal{E}' and X_b , we have

$$\varphi(X_b, F') \leq \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}'} \varphi(X_b, E')^{1/k}. \quad (2.15)$$

We denote by \mathcal{E}_1 the set of $E \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfying $t \in E$, and by \mathcal{E}_2 the set of $E \in \mathcal{E}$ satisfying $t \notin E$. For each $b \in B$ and $E \in \mathcal{E}_2$, we have

$$\varphi(X_b, E') = \varphi(X_b, E) \leq \varphi(X, E).$$

Then for each $b \in B$ from (2.15) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(X_b, F') &\leq \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \varphi(X_b, E')^{1/k} \right) \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_2} \varphi(X_b, E')^{1/k} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \varphi(X_b, E')^{1/k} \right) \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_2} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(X, F) &= \sum_{b \in B} e^{f(b)} \varphi(X_b, F') \leq \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_2} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \right) \sum_{b \in B} e^{f(b)} \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \varphi(X_b, E')^{1/k} \\ &= \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_2} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \right) \sum_{b \in B} \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} (e^{f(b)k/|\mathcal{E}_1|} \varphi(X_b, E'))^{1/k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{E} is a k -cover of F , we have $|\mathcal{E}_1| \geq k$. As $f \geq 0$, we have $f(b)k/|\mathcal{E}_1| \leq f(b)$ for every $b \in B$. Then from the above inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(X, F) &\leq \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_2} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \right) \sum_{b \in B} \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} (e^{f(b)} \varphi(X_b, E'))^{1/k} \\ &= \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_2} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \right) \sum_{b \in B} \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \varphi(X_b, E)^{1/k}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $E \in \mathcal{E}_1$, we define a function $g_E: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $g_E(b) = \varphi(X_b, E)^{1/k}$ for $b \in B$. For each $q \geq 1$, we denote by $\|\cdot\|_q$ the ℓ_q -norm on $\ell_q(B)$ given by $\|g\|_q = \left(\sum_{b \in B} |g(b)|^q \right)^{1/q}$. By the Hölder inequality we have

$$\sum_{b \in B} \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \varphi(X_b, E)^{1/k} = \sum_{b \in B} \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} g_E(b) \leq \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \|g_E\|_{|\mathcal{E}_1|} \leq \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \|g_E\|_k = \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k}.$$

Therefore

$$\varphi(X, F) \leq \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_2} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \right) \left(\prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k} \right) = \prod_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \varphi(X, E)^{1/k}.$$

This finishes the induction step and proves the lemma. \square

Now assume that Γ is amenable. If \mathcal{U} is the finite open cover of B consisting of singletons we have

$$N(\mathcal{U}^F, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) = |X_{\mathcal{P}, F}| \text{ and } p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) = \sum_{x \in X_{\mathcal{P}, F}} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)}$$

for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $f: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. From Lemma 2.1 we get

Lemma 2.12. *The limits $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{\mathcal{P}, F}|$ and $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X_{\mathcal{P}, F}} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \right)$ exist in the same sense as in (2.4) for every $f: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

In [17], when $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ is of finite type, the limit $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{\mathcal{P}, F}|$ is called the combinatorial entropy of $X_{\mathcal{P}}$.

It is well known [11, Corollary 6.3] that

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log |\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |\pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})|.$$

Theorem 2.13. *For every $f: B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f) &= \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X_{\mathcal{P}, F}} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \right) \\ &= \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X_{\mathcal{P}, F}} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \right) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{\mathcal{P}, F}| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{\mathcal{P}, F}|.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{U} be the finite open cover of B consisting of singletons. From Theorem 2.6 we have

$$P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X_{\mathcal{P}, F}} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \right).$$

Take a constant C such that $f+C \geq 0$. We may assume that $X_{\mathcal{P}} \neq \emptyset$. A result of Downarowicz, Frej and Romagnoli [11, Proposition 3.3] says that if a function $\varphi: \mathcal{F}(\Gamma) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is Γ -invariant

in the sense that $\varphi(sF) = \varphi(F)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $s \in \Gamma$, and satisfies Shearer's inequality in the sense that $\varphi(F) \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \varphi(E)$ for any $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any k -cover \mathcal{E} of F consisting of nonempty sets, then

$$\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \varphi(F) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \varphi(F).$$

By Lemma 2.11 the functions $\varphi, \psi: \mathcal{F}(\Gamma) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$\varphi(F) = \log p_F(f + C, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})) \text{ and } \psi(F) = \log p_F(f + C, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F})$$

both are Γ -invariant and satisfy Shearer's inequality, so that

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f) &= -C + P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f + C) = -C + \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f + C, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})) \\ &= -C + \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f + C, \mathcal{U}, \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in \pi_F(X_{\mathcal{P}})} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f) &= -C + P(X_{\mathcal{P}}, f + C) = -C + \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f + C, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) \\ &= -C + \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log p_F(f + C, \mathcal{U}, X_{\mathcal{P}, F}) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X_{\mathcal{P}, F}} e^{\sum_{s \in F} f(x_s)} \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The equality $h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{\mathcal{P}, F}|$ in the case where $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and \mathcal{P} is finite is proved by Friedland [17, Theorem 2.5]. The equality $h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathcal{P}}) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{\mathcal{P}, F}|$ seems new even when $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ and \mathcal{P} is finite.

3. LOCAL ENTROPY FOR RESTRICTED PERMUTATIONS

Let Γ be a countable group, and let $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ be the group of all permutations of Γ . Fix a set $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and consider the set $\mathcal{S}_A \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ consisting of all permutations $\sigma: s \mapsto \sigma(s)$ of Γ with the property that

$$x_s^{(\sigma)} := s^{-1} \sigma(s) \in A \text{ for every } s \in \Gamma. \quad (3.1)$$

Every $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_A$ is determined completely by the point $x^{(\sigma)} = (x_s^{(\sigma)})_{s \in \Gamma} \in A^\Gamma$ in (3.1). Conversely we define, for every $F \subseteq \Gamma$ and $x = (x_s)_{s \in F} \in A^F$, a map $\varphi^{(x)}: F \rightarrow \Gamma$ by

$$\varphi^{(x)}(s) = s x_s, \quad s \in F. \quad (3.2)$$

Put

$$X_A^\iota = \{x \in A^\Gamma: \varphi^{(x)} \text{ is injective}\}, \quad X_A = \{x \in A^\Gamma: \varphi^{(x)} \text{ is bijective}\}. \quad (3.3)$$

The sets $X_A \subseteq X_A^\iota \subseteq A^\Gamma$ are closed and hence compact in the product topology, and they are invariant under the left shift action λ of Γ on A^Γ in (2.1).

Lemma 3.1. *For every $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $t \in \Gamma$, the dynamical systems (X_{At}, λ) and (X_A, λ) (resp., (X_{At}^ι, λ) and (X_A^ι, λ)) are topologically conjugate.*

Proof. For every $t \in \Gamma$ we denote by $\varrho^t \in \mathcal{S}(\Gamma)$ right multiplication by t , i.e., $\varrho^t(s) = st$ for every $s \in \Gamma$. The shift-equivariant map $\tilde{\varrho}^t: A^\Gamma \rightarrow (At)^\Gamma$, given by $(\tilde{\varrho}^t x)_s = \varrho^t(x_s) = x_s t$ for all $x = (x_s) \in A^\Gamma$ and $s \in \Gamma$, satisfies that $\tilde{\varrho}^t(X_A) = X_{At}$ (by (3.1)), and (X_A, λ) and (X_{At}, λ) are topologically conjugate. Similarly we see that (X_{At}^ι, λ) and (X_A^ι, λ) are conjugate. \square

Remark 3.2. In view of Lemma 3.1 we may assume without loss in generality that $e_\Gamma \in A$.

Proposition 3.3. *For every $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, the sets $X_A \subseteq X_A^\iota \subseteq A^\Gamma$ are SFTs.*

Proof. For any two distinct $t_1, t_2 \in A$ we put $K_{t_1, t_2} = \{e_\Gamma, t_1 t_2^{-1}\}$ and define $y^{(t_1, t_2)} \in A^{K_{t_1, t_2}}$ by $y_{e_\Gamma}^{(t_1, t_2)} = t_1$ and $y_{t_1 t_2^{-1}}^{(t_1, t_2)} = t_2$. If we set

$$\mathcal{P}_A^\iota = \{(K_{t_1, t_2}, \{y^{(t_1, t_2)}\}) : t_1, t_2 \in A, t_1 \neq t_2\}, \quad (3.4)$$

then one checks easily that, in the notation of (2.2) – (2.3), $X_{\mathcal{P}_A^\iota} = X_A^\iota$. Similarly, if

$$\mathcal{P}_A^* = \{(A^{-1}, \{z\}) : z \in A^{A^{-1}} \text{ and } z_{t^{-1}} \neq t \text{ for all } t \in A\} \quad (3.5)$$

and $\mathcal{P}_A = \mathcal{P}_A^\iota \cup \mathcal{P}_A^*$, then $X_{\mathcal{P}_A} = X_A$. \square

Now assume that Γ is amenable. We use right Følner sets.

The case $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ of the following lemma is proved in [14, Proposition 10] using the ergodic theorem, and the proof there also works for general amenable Γ . We give a different proof.

Lemma 3.4. *Let μ be a Γ -invariant Borel probability measure on X_A^ι . Then $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq X_A$.*

Proof. Let $x \in X_A^\iota \setminus X_A$. Then there is some $g \in \Gamma$ such that $g \neq s x_s$ for all $s \in \Gamma$. Denote by Y the set of $y \in X_A^\iota$ satisfying that $y = x$ on gA^{-1} . Then Y is a closed and open subset of X_A^ι containing x , and $g \neq s y_s$ for all $y \in Y$ and $s \in \Gamma$. It suffices to show that $\mu(Y) = 0$.

Suppose that $\mu(Y) > 0$. Take $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $|F(A \cup \{g\})| < (1 + \mu(Y))|F|$. Then

$$\int_{X_A^\iota} \sum_{t \in F} 1_Y(t^{-1}y) d\mu(y) = |F|\mu(Y),$$

and hence there is some $z \in X_A^\iota$ satisfying $\sum_{t \in F} 1_Y(t^{-1}z) \geq |F|\mu(Y)$. Set $W = \{t \in F : t^{-1}z \in Y\}$. Then $|W| = \sum_{t \in F} 1_Y(t^{-1}z) \geq |F|\mu(Y)$. For each $t \in W$, we have $t^{-1}z \in Y$ and hence $g \neq s(t^{-1}z)_s = s z_{ts}$ for all $s \in \Gamma$, which implies that $g \neq t^{-1} s z_s$ for all $s \in \Gamma$. Put $V = \{s z_s : s \in F\} \subseteq FA$. Then $Wg \cap V = \emptyset$, and $|V| = |F|$. Now we have

$$|F|\mu(Y) + |F| \leq |Wg| + |V| = |Wg \cup V| \leq |F(A \cup \{g\})| < (1 + \mu(Y))|F|,$$

a contradiction. \square

From Lemma 3.4 and the variational principle [28, Theorem 9.48] we obtain the following consequence which is proved in [14, Theorem 10] in the case $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Proposition 3.5. *Let Γ be a countable amenable group, and let $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Then $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = h_{\text{top}}(X_A^\iota)$.*

For discussing local entropies of the spaces X_A and X_A^ι we set, for all $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{A, F}^\iota &= \{x \in A^F : \varphi^{(x)} \text{ is injective}\}, \\ X_{A, F} &= \{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota : \varphi^{(x)}(F) \supseteq \{s \in \Gamma : sA^{-1} \subseteq F\}\}, \\ X_{A, F, F'} &= \{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota : \varphi^{(x)}(F) \supseteq F'\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

It is easily checked that, in the notation of Proposition 3.3, (3.4) – (3.5),

$$X_{\mathcal{P}_A^\iota, F} = X_{A, F}^\iota \text{ and } X_{\mathcal{P}_A, F} = X_{A, F}$$

for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.

Proposition 3.6. *We have*

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|FA^{-1}|} \log |X_{A, FA^{-1}, F}| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A, FA^{-1}, F}| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A, F}|,$$

and

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A^\iota) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A, F}^\iota| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A, F}^\iota|.$$

Proof. From Theorem 2.13 we have

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A,F}| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A,F}|, \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$h_{\text{top}}(X'_A) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X'_{A,F}| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X'_{A,F}|.$$

We are left to show that

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|FA^{-1}|} \log |X_{A,FA^{-1},F}| = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A,FA^{-1},F}|. \quad (3.8)$$

For every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ we have

$$X_{A,FA^{-1}} \subseteq X_{A,FA^{-1},F}.$$

With reference to Remark 3.2 we take it that $e_\Gamma \in A$. Then the restriction of each $x \in X_{A,FA^{-1},F}$ to F lies in $X_{A,F}$, and hence

$$|X_{A,FA^{-1},F}| \leq |X_{A,F}| \cdot |A|^{|FA^{-1} \setminus F|}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A,F}| &\leq \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|FA^{-1}|} \log |X_{A,FA^{-1}}| \\ &\leq \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|FA^{-1}|} \log |X_{A,FA^{-1},F}| \leq \liminf_F \frac{1}{|FA^{-1}|} \log |X_{A,FA^{-1},F}| \\ &\leq \liminf_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A,FA^{-1},F}| \leq \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A,FA^{-1},F}| \\ &\leq \limsup_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log (|X_{A,F}| \cdot |A|^{|FA^{-1} \setminus F|}) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log |X_{A,F}|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Now (3.8) follows from (3.9) and (3.7). \square

4. PERMANENTS FOR ELEMENTS OF THE GROUP ALGEBRA

Let Γ be a countable discrete group, $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, and let $X_A \subseteq X'_A \subseteq A^\Gamma$ be the subshifts defined in (3.3). For every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ we define $X_{A,F} \subseteq X'_{A,F} \subseteq A^F$ by (3.6).

Let $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ be the *complex group ring* of Γ , i.e., the set of all finitely supported maps $f: s \mapsto f_s$ from Γ to \mathbb{C} . For $f, g \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ we denote by $f \cdot g$ the *pointwise product* of f and g , i.e. $(f \cdot g)_s = f_s g_s$ for all $s \in \Gamma$ (this is *not* the usual multiplication in $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$, which we write as $(f, g) \mapsto fg$). We embed Γ in $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ by identifying each $s \in \Gamma$ with the element in $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ given by

$$s_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t = s, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In this notation every $f \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ is a finite sum of the form $f = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} f_s s$. For every $f = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} f_s s \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ we denote by $f^* = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} \overline{f_{s^{-1}}} s \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ the *adjoint* of f and observe that $(ff^*)_{e_\Gamma} = (f^*f)_{e_\Gamma} = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} |f_s|^2 > 0$ whenever f is nonzero. The *real and integer group rings* $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}\Gamma \subset \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ are the subrings of all real- and integer-valued elements of $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$, and we put $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = \{r \in \mathbb{R}: r \geq 0\}$, $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} = \mathbb{Z} \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and write $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ for the sets of nonnegative elements in $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ and $\mathbb{R}\Gamma$.

For $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ and $A, F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ we set

$$\text{per}_{A,F}(f) = \sum_{x \in X_{A,F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{per}'_{A,F}(f) = \sum_{x \in X'_{A,F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s}. \quad (4.1)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.*

- (1) For any $s \in \Gamma$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, $\text{per}_{A_s, F}(fs) = \text{per}_{A, F}(f) = \text{per}_{sA, F_{s^{-1}}}(sf)$ and $\text{per}'_{A_s, F}(fs) = \text{per}'_{A, F}(f) = \text{per}'_{sA, F_{s^{-1}}}(sf)$;
- (2) For any $s \in \Gamma$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, $\text{per}_{A, sF}(f) = \text{per}_{A, F}(f)$ and $\text{per}'_{A, sF}(f) = \text{per}'_{A, F}(f)$;
- (3) Assume that f is nonzero and put $\varkappa = \min_{\{s \in \Gamma: f_s > 0\}} f_s > 0$. For any $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ one has

$$\frac{\text{per}_{A, F_1 \cup F_2}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_1 \cup F_2|}} \leq \frac{\text{per}_{A, F_1}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_1|}} \cdot \frac{\text{per}_{A, F_2}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_2|}},$$

and

$$\frac{\text{per}'_{A, F_1 \cup F_2}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_1 \cup F_2|}} \leq \frac{\text{per}'_{A, F_1}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_1|}} \cdot \frac{\text{per}'_{A, F_2}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_2|}}.$$

- (4) For any $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, $\text{per}_{A, F}(f \cdot g) \leq \text{per}_{A, F}(f) \cdot \text{per}_{A, F}(g)$ and $\text{per}'_{A, F}(f \cdot g) \leq \text{per}'_{A, F}(f) \cdot \text{per}'_{A, F}(g)$.

Proof. (1) and (2) are obvious.

(3): We prove the first inequality. The second inequality is proved similarly. Let $x \in X_{A, F_1 \cup F_2}$. Then $\pi_{F_j}(x) \in X_{A, F_j}$ for $j = 1, 2$. If $f_{x_s} \neq 0$ for all $s \in F_1 \cap F_2$, then

$$\varkappa^{|F_1 \cap F_2|} \prod_{s \in F_1 \cup F_2} f_{x_s} \leq \left(\prod_{s \in F_1 \cap F_2} f_{x_s} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{s \in F_1 \cup F_2} f_{x_s} \right) = \left(\prod_{s \in F_1} f_{x_s} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{s \in F_2} f_{x_s} \right),$$

and hence

$$\frac{\prod_{s \in F_1 \cup F_2} f_{x_s}}{\varkappa^{|F_1 \cup F_2|}} \leq \frac{\prod_{s \in F_1} f_{x_s}}{\varkappa^{|F_1|}} \cdot \frac{\prod_{s \in F_2} f_{x_s}}{\varkappa^{|F_2|}}. \quad (4.2)$$

If $f_{x_s} = 0$ for some $s \in F_1 \cap F_2$, then (4.2) holds trivially. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{per}_{A, F_1 \cup F_2}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_1 \cup F_2|}} &= \sum_{x \in X_{A, F_1 \cup F_2}} \frac{\prod_{s \in F_1 \cup F_2} f_{x_s}}{\varkappa^{|F_1 \cup F_2|}} \leq \sum_{x \in X_{A, F_1 \cup F_2}} \frac{\prod_{s \in F_1} f_{x_s}}{\varkappa^{|F_1|}} \cdot \frac{\prod_{s \in F_2} f_{x_s}}{\varkappa^{|F_2|}} \\ &\leq \frac{\text{per}_{A, F_1}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_1|}} \cdot \frac{\text{per}_{A, F_2}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F_2|}}. \end{aligned}$$

(4): We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}_{A, F}(f \cdot g) &= \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}} \prod_{s \in F} (f \cdot g)_{x_s} = \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \prod_{t \in F} g_{x_t} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{x \in X_{A, F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{x \in X_{A, F}} \prod_{t \in F} g_{x_t} \right) \\ &= \text{per}_{A, F}(f) \cdot \text{per}_{A, F}(g). \end{aligned}$$

The proof for $\text{per}'_{A, F}(f \cdot g) \leq \text{per}'_{A, F}(f) \cdot \text{per}'_{A, F}(g)$ is similar. \square

Now assume that Γ is amenable. As in (2.4) – (2.5) we use right Følner sets.

Lemma 4.2. *The limit $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A, F}(f)$ exists in $[-\infty, +\infty)$, i.e., there is some $C \in [-\infty, +\infty)$ such that for any neighborhood U of C in $[-\infty, +\infty)$ there are $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A, F}(f) \in U$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $|FK \triangle F| < \delta|F|$. Also the limit $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A, F}(f)$ exists in $[-\infty, +\infty)$.*

Proof. We may assume that $f \neq 0$ and put $\varkappa = \min_{\{s \in \Gamma: f_s > 0\}} f_s > 0$. From Lemma 4.1 (2) – (3) and the Ornstein-Weiss lemma [28, Theorem 4.38] we know that the limits

$$\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \frac{\text{per}_{A, F}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F|}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \frac{\text{per}'_{A, F}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F|}}$$

exist. Then

$$\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A, F}(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \frac{\text{per}_{A, F}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F|}} + \log \varkappa$$

and

$$\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A,F}(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \frac{\text{per}'_{A,F}(f)}{\varkappa^{|F|}} + \log \varkappa. \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.3. *When $\text{supp}(f) = \{s \in \Gamma : f_s > 0\} \subseteq A$, the limits $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f)$ and $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A,F}(f)$ do not depend on the choice of A .*

Proof. The statement about $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A,F}(f)$ is obvious. We shall prove the statement about $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f)$. The case $f = 0$ is trivial. Thus we may assume that $f \neq 0$. From Lemma 4.1 (1) we know that $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A_s,F}(fs)$ for every $s \in A^{-1}$. Thus we may assume that $e_\Gamma \in \text{supp}(f)$. It suffices to show that

$$\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A_1,F}(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A_2,F}(f)$$

for $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A_2$. Put $L_i = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A_i,F}(f)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Clearly $L_1 \leq L_2$. Thus it suffices to show that $L_1 \geq L_2$. We may assume that $L_2 > -\infty$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there are some $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{|F'|} \log \text{per}_{A_2,F'}(f) \geq L_2 - \varepsilon$ for every $F' \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ satisfying that $|FA_2^{-1}K \setminus F'| < \delta|F'|$.

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ be such that $|FA_2^{-1}K \setminus F| < \delta|F|$. Put $F' = FA_2^{-1} \supseteq F$. Then $|F'K \setminus F'| \leq |FA_2^{-1}K \setminus F| < \delta|F| \leq \delta|F'|$, and hence $\frac{1}{|F'|} \log \text{per}_{A_2,F'}(f) \geq L_2 - \varepsilon$.

If we define $X_{A_1,F',F}$ as in (3.6), then

$$\text{per}_{A_2,F'}(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X_{A_1,F',F}} \prod_{s \in F'} f_{x_s}.$$

Note that for each $x \in X_{A_1,F',F}$ the restriction of x to F lies in $X_{A_1,F}$, and that $\prod_{s \in F'} f_{x_s} \leq \|f\|_\infty^{|F' \setminus F|} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X_{A_1,F',F}} \prod_{s \in F'} f_{x_s} &\leq \|f\|_\infty^{|F' \setminus F|} \sum_{x \in X_{A_1,F',F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \leq \|f\|_\infty^{|F' \setminus F|} |A_1|^{|F' \setminus F|} \sum_{x \in X_{A_1,F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \\ &= (\|f\|_\infty |A_1|)^{|F' \setminus F|} \text{per}_{A_1,F}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$e^{|F'|L_2 - \varepsilon} \leq \text{per}_{A_2,F'}(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X_{A_1,F',F}} \prod_{s \in F'} f_{x_s} \leq (\|f\|_\infty |A_1|)^{|F' \setminus F|} \text{per}_{A_1,F}(f).$$

It follows that

$$L_1 = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A_1,F}(f) \geq \lim_F \frac{|F'|L_2 - \varepsilon - |F' \setminus F| \log(\|f\|_\infty |A_1|)}{|F|} = L_2 - \varepsilon.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain that $L_1 \geq L_2$, as claimed. \square

Definition 4.4. Let Γ be a countable discrete group, $0 \neq f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$, and let $A = \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.

(1) If Γ is finite we denote by

$$\text{per}(f) = \frac{1}{|\Gamma|} \sum_{x \in X_A} \prod_{s \in \Gamma} f_{x_s} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{per}'(f) = \frac{1}{|\Gamma|} \sum_{x \in X'_A} \prod_{s \in \Gamma} f_{x_s}$$

the *permanent* and the *injective permanent* of f .

(2) If Γ is infinite and amenable we call

$$\text{per}(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X_{A,F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{per}'(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X'_{A,F}} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right)$$

the *permanent* and the *injective permanent* of f , where the limits are taken along right Følner sequences.

Remark 4.5. When $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ is nonzero, setting $\varkappa = \max_{s \in \Gamma} f_s$ in (4.1), we have that $\text{per}_{A,F}(f) \geq \varkappa^{|F|}$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, so that $\text{per}^t(f) \geq \text{per}(f) \geq \log \varkappa > -\infty$. Also, for the function $\log f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $A = \text{supp}(f)$, by Theorem 2.13 we have $\text{per}(f) = P(X_A, \log f)$ and $\text{per}^t(f) = P(X_A^t, \log f)$.

Question 4.6. Is there any reasonable way to define $\text{per}(f)$ for all (i.e. not necessarily amenable) countably infinite groups Γ ?

Remark 4.7. For $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\Gamma$ with infinite support, one can define $\text{per}(f)$ as

$$\sup_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma) \\ A \subset \text{supp}(f)}} \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f) = \lim_{\substack{A \nearrow \text{supp}(f), \\ A \subset \text{supp}(f)}} \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f),$$

since $\lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f)$ increases in A .

Remark 4.8. For any nonempty finite subset A of Γ , taking $f \in \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ to be the indicator function of A , we get from Proposition 3.6 that $\text{h}_{\text{top}}(X_A) = \text{per}(f)$ and $\text{h}_{\text{top}}(X_A^t) = \text{per}^t(f)$.

We list some basic properties of $\text{per}(f)$ and $\text{per}^t(f)$. Item (5) is the analogue of the Chollet conjecture for permanents of positive semidefinite matrices (cf. [8], [44, Section 6]).

Proposition 4.9. *The following hold:*

- (1) For any $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ and $s \in \Gamma$, we have $\text{per}(fs) = \text{per}(f) = \text{per}(sf)$ and $\text{per}^t(fs) = \text{per}^t(f) = \text{per}^t(sf)$.
- (2) For any $f, g \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ with $f \leq g$, we have $\text{per}(f) \leq \text{per}(g)$ and $\text{per}^t(f) \leq \text{per}^t(g)$.
- (3) For any $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ and $C > 0$, we have $\text{per}(Cf) = \text{per}(f) + \log C$ and $\text{per}^t(Cf) = \text{per}^t(f) + \log C$.
- (4) For any $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, the maps $f \mapsto \text{per}(f)$ and $f \mapsto \text{per}^t(f)$ are continuous on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^A$.
- (5) For any $f, g \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$, we have $\text{per}(f \cdot g) \leq \text{per}(f) + \text{per}(g)$ and $\text{per}^t(f \cdot g) \leq \text{per}^t(f) + \text{per}^t(g)$.
- (6) Let G be an amenable group containing Γ , and let $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$. Denote by $\text{per}_\Gamma(f)$ (resp. $\text{per}_\Gamma^t(f)$) and $\text{per}_G(f)$ (resp. $\text{per}_G^t(f)$) the (resp. injective) permanents of f as elements of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}G$, respectively. Then $\text{per}_\Gamma(f) = \text{per}_G(f)$ and $\text{per}_\Gamma^t(f) = \text{per}_G^t(f)$.

Proof. (1) follows from (1) of Lemma 4.1.

(2) and (3) are obvious.

For (4), we shall prove the statement about $\text{per}(f)$. The proof for the statement about $\text{per}^t(f)$ is similar. Fix $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. It follows from (2) and (3) that the map $f \mapsto \text{per}(f)$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^A$ and that when $\text{supp}(g) = A$, the map $f \mapsto \text{per}(f)$ on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^A$ is continuous at g . Thus to prove (4) it suffices to show that when $\text{supp}(g) \subsetneq A$, the map $f \mapsto \text{per}(f)$ on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^A$ is upper semicontinuous at g . If Γ is finite this is obvious. Thus we may assume that Γ is infinite. By (3) we may assume that $\|g\|_\infty = 1$.

Let $D > \text{per}(g)$. Take $\beta > 0$ with $\text{per}(g) < D - 4\beta$. Take $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for any $W \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $|WK \setminus W| < \delta|W|$ we have $\frac{1}{|W|} \log \text{per}_{A,W}(g) \leq D - 3\beta$. By Stirling's approximation formula there is some $0 < \kappa < 1/2$ such that for any nonempty finite set F the number of subsets W of F with $|W| \geq (1 - \kappa)|F|$ is at most $e^{\beta|F|}$ (see for example [6, Appendix A]). Take $0 < \eta < \kappa$ such that $2\eta/(1 - \eta) < \delta$ and $|A|^\eta < e^\beta$.

Take $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that $2|A|\varepsilon^\eta < e^D$ and $\log(1 + \varepsilon) < \beta$. Denote by U the set of $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^A$ satisfying that $f_s < (1 + \varepsilon)g_s$ for all $s \in \text{supp}(g)$ and $f_s < \varepsilon$ for all $s \in A \setminus \text{supp}(g)$. Then U is an open neighborhood of g in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^A$. Now it suffices to show $\text{per}(f) < D$ for every $f \in U$.

Let $f \in U$. Then $\|f\|_\infty \leq 2$. Denote by h the element of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ which coincides with f on $\text{supp}(g)$ and vanishes on $\Gamma \setminus \text{supp}(g)$. For $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ denote by $X_{A,F,\eta}$ the set of $x \in X_{A,F}$ satisfying that $|x^{-1}(\text{supp}(g))| \geq (1 - \eta)|F|$. For each $x \in X_{A,F} \setminus X_{A,F,\eta}$ we have $\prod_{t \in F} f_{xt} \leq$

$2^{|F|} \varepsilon^{\eta|F|}$. Thus

$$\sum_{x \in X_{A,F} \setminus X_{A,F,\eta}} \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \leq \sum_{x \in X_{A,F} \setminus X_{A,F,\eta}} 2^{|F|} \varepsilon^{\eta|F|} \leq |A|^{|F|} 2^{|F|} \varepsilon^{\eta|F|} < e^{D|F|}.$$

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ such that $|FK \setminus F| < \eta|F|$. For each $W \subseteq F$ with $|W| \geq (1 - \eta)|F|$ we have

$$|WK \setminus W| \leq |FK \setminus W| \leq |FK \setminus F| + |F \setminus W| < \eta|F| + \eta|F| \leq \frac{2\eta}{1 - \eta}|W| < \delta|W|,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|W|} \log \text{per}_{A,W}(h) &\leq \frac{1}{|W|} \log \text{per}_{A,W}((1 + \varepsilon)g) \\ &= \log(1 + \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{|W|} \log \text{per}_{A,W}(g) \leq \beta + D - 3\beta = D - 2\beta. \end{aligned}$$

For each $x \in X_{A,F,\eta}$, putting $F_x = x^{-1}(\text{supp}(g)) \subseteq F$ we have $|F_x| \geq (1 - \eta)|F|$ and that the restriction of x on F_x lies in X_{A,F_x} . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,\eta}} \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} &= \sum_{W \subseteq F, |W| \geq (1-\eta)|F|} \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,\eta}, F_x=W} \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \\ &\leq \sum_{W \subseteq F, |W| \geq (1-\eta)|F|} \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,\eta}, F_x=W} \prod_{t \in W} f_{x_t} \\ &\leq \sum_{W \subseteq F, |W| \geq (1-\eta)|F|} |A|^{\eta|F|} \text{per}_{A,W}(h) \\ &\leq \sum_{W \subseteq F, |W| \geq (1-\eta)|F|} e^{\beta|F|} e^{|W|(D-2\beta)} \\ &\leq e^{\beta|F|} e^{\beta|F|} e^{|F|(D-2\beta)} = e^{|F|D}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\text{per}_{A,F}(f) = \sum_{x \in X_{A,F} \setminus X_{A,F,\eta}} \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} + \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,\eta}} \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \leq e^{F|D} + e^{|F|D} = 2e^{|F|D}.$$

Since Γ is infinite, it follows that

$$\text{per}(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f) \leq D.$$

(5) follows from (4) of Lemma 4.1.

(6): We prove $\text{per}_\Gamma(f) = \text{per}_G(f)$. The proof for $\text{per}_\Gamma^t(f) = \text{per}_G^t(f)$ is similar. We may assume that $f \neq 0$. Put $A = \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Let U_Γ and U_G be neighborhoods of $\text{per}_\Gamma(f)$ and $\text{per}_G(f)$ in \mathbb{R} respectively. Then it suffices to show that $U_\Gamma \cap U_G \neq \emptyset$.

Set $\varkappa = \max_{s \in A} f_s$. Then there are a convex neighborhood V_Γ of $\text{per}_\Gamma(f)$ in \mathbb{R} and $0 < \delta < 1$ such that for any $0 \leq \eta \leq \delta$, $a \in [\log \varkappa, \log \varkappa + \log |A|]$, and $b \in V_\Gamma$, one has $\eta a + (1 - \eta)b \in U_\Gamma$.

Take $K_\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ containing e_Γ , $K_G \in \mathcal{F}(G)$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $F_\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $|F_\Gamma K_\Gamma| < (1 + \varepsilon)|F_\Gamma|$ one has $\frac{1}{|F_\Gamma|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_\Gamma}(f) \in V_\Gamma$, and that for any $F_G \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ with $|F_G K_G| < (1 + \varepsilon)|F_G|$ one has $\frac{1}{|F_G|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_G}(f) \in U_G$.

Take $F \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ with $|F(K_\Gamma \cup K_G)| < (1 + \delta\varepsilon)|F|$. Then there are some $W \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ and $F_s \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ for each $s \in W$ such that $s\Gamma \neq t\Gamma$ for all distinct $s, t \in W$ and F is the disjoint union of sF_s for $s \in W$. Denote by W' the set of $s \in W$ satisfying $|F_s K_\Gamma| < (1 + \varepsilon)|F_s|$. Put $F_{W'} = \bigcup_{s \in W'} sF_s$ and $F_{W \setminus W'} = \bigcup_{s \in W \setminus W'} sF_s$. Then

$$\delta\varepsilon|F| \geq |FK_\Gamma| - |F| = \sum_{s \in W} (|sF_s K_\Gamma| - |sF_s|) \geq \sum_{s \in W \setminus W'} (|sF_s K_\Gamma| - |sF_s|) \geq \varepsilon|F_{W \setminus W'}|,$$

and hence $|F_{W \setminus W'}| \leq \delta|F|$.

Note that $X_{A,F}$ can be identified with $\prod_{s \in W} X_{A,F_s}$ naturally. Thus

$$\text{per}_{A,F}(f) = \sum_{x \in X_{A,F}} \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} = \prod_{s \in W} \sum_{x \in X_{A,F_s}} \prod_{t \in F_s} f_{x_t} = \prod_{s \in W} \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f),$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f) \\ &= \frac{|F_{W'}|}{|F|} \sum_{s \in W'} \frac{|F_s|}{|F_{W'}|} \cdot \frac{1}{|F_s|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f) + \frac{|F_{W \setminus W'}|}{|F|} \sum_{s \in W \setminus W'} \frac{|F_s|}{|F_{W \setminus W'}|} \cdot \frac{1}{|F_s|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f). \end{aligned}$$

For each $s \in W$, $\varkappa^{|F_s|} \leq \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f) \leq |A|^{|F_s|} \varkappa^{|F_s|}$, and hence $\log \varkappa \leq \frac{1}{|F_s|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f) \leq \log |A| + \log |\varkappa|$. It follows that

$$\sum_{s \in W \setminus W'} \frac{|F_s|}{|F_{W \setminus W'}|} \cdot \frac{1}{|F_s|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f) \in [\log \varkappa, \log \varkappa + \log |A|].$$

For each $s \in W'$, we have $\frac{1}{|F_s|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f) \in V_\Gamma$. Since V_Γ is convex, we have $\sum_{s \in W'} \frac{|F_s|}{|F_{W'}|} \cdot \frac{1}{|F_s|} \log \text{per}_{A,F_s}(f) \in V_\Gamma$. From our choice of V_Γ and δ we get $\text{per}_{A,F}(f) \in U_\Gamma$. Since $\text{per}_{A,F}(f) \in U_G$, we conclude that $U_\Gamma \cap U_G \neq \emptyset$. \square

Proposition 4.10. *For any $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\Gamma$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq A$, we have*

$$\text{per}(f) = \text{per}'(f) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A,F}(f).$$

Proof. We may assume that $f \neq 0$.

Consider first the case $A = \text{supp}(f)$. We have the function $\log f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 3.4 and the variational principle [37, Theorem 5.2.7] we have $P(X_A, \log f) = P(X_A^t, \log f)$. Then from Remark 4.5 we have

$$\text{per}(f) = P(X_A, \log f) = P(X_A^t, \log f) = \text{per}'(f).$$

According to Theorem 2.13 we have

$$\text{per}(f) = P(X_A, \log f) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f),$$

and

$$\text{per}'(f) = P(X_A^t, \log f) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A,F}(f).$$

Now consider the general case $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Take a decreasing sequence $(f^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}^A$ with limit f . Then by Proposition 4.9 we have that $\text{per}(f) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{per}(f^{(n)})$ and $\text{per}'(f) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{per}'(f^{(n)})$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}(f) &= \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{per}(f^{(n)}) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f^{(n)}) \\ &= \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f^{(n)}) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A,F}(f). \end{aligned}$$

The proof for $\text{per}'(f) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A,F}(f)$ is similar. \square

Proposition 4.11. *The following hold:*

- (1) For any $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\Gamma$, we have $\text{per}(f) = \text{per}(f^*)$;
- (2) For any $f, g \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\Gamma$, we have $\text{per}(fg) \geq \text{per}(f) + \text{per}(g)$.

Proof. (1). By Proposition 4.10 it suffices to show that $\text{per}^\iota(f) = \text{per}^\iota(f^*)$. By symmetry it suffices to show that $\text{per}^\iota(f) \leq \text{per}^\iota(f^*)$. We may assume that $f \neq 0$. Put $A = \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Then $A^{-1} = \text{supp}(f^*)$.

Let $C > \text{per}^\iota(f^*)$. Take $\varepsilon > 0$ with $C > \text{per}^\iota(f^*) + 2\varepsilon$.

Take $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ containing e_Γ and $\delta > 0$ such that for any $F' \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $|F'K| < (1+\delta)|F'|$ we have $\frac{1}{|F'|} \log \text{per}_{A^{-1}, F'}^\iota(f^*) \leq C - 2\varepsilon$.

By Stirling's approximation formula (see for example [6, Appendix A]) there is some $0 < \delta' < 1/2$ such that for each nonempty finite set W the number of subsets of W with cardinality at most $\delta'|W|$ is at most $e^{\varepsilon|W|}$.

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ with $|FAK| < (1 + \min(\delta', \delta))|F|$. Denote by $\Theta^\iota(A, F)$ the set of $F' \subseteq FA$ satisfying $|F'| = |F|$. For each $F' \in \Theta^\iota(A, F)$, we have

$$|F'K| \leq |FAK| < (1 + \delta)|F| = (1 + \delta)|F'|,$$

and hence $\text{per}_{A^{-1}, F'}^\iota(f^*) \leq e^{|F'|(C-2\varepsilon)}$. For each $F' \in \Theta^\iota(A, F)$, we also have

$$|F'| = |F| \geq \frac{1}{1 + \delta'} |FAK| \geq \frac{1}{1 + \delta'} |FA| \geq (1 - \delta')|FA|.$$

Thus $|\Theta^\iota(A, F)| \leq e^{\varepsilon|FA|} \leq e^{2\varepsilon|F|}$.

For each $x \in X_{A, F}^\iota$, the set $F' = \varphi^{(x)}(F) = \{sx_s : s \in F\}$ lies in $\Theta^\iota(A, F)$ (cf. (3.2)). If we set $\bar{x}_{sx_s} = x_s^{-1}$ for every $s \in F$, we obtain a point $\bar{x} \in (A^{-1})^{F'}$ with the property that $\bar{x} \in X_{A^{-1}, F'}^\iota$ and $\prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} = \prod_{t \in F'} f_{\bar{x}_t}^*$.

For each $F' \in \Theta^\iota(A, F)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota : \varphi^{(x)}(F) = F'} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} &= \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota : \varphi^{(x)}(F) = F'} \prod_{t \in F'} f_{\bar{x}_t}^* \leq \sum_{\bar{x} \in X_{A^{-1}, F'}^\iota} \prod_{t \in F'} f_{\bar{x}_t}^* \\ &= \text{per}_{A^{-1}, F'}^\iota(f^*) \leq e^{|F'|(C-2\varepsilon)} = e^{|F|(C-2\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}_{A, F}^\iota(f) &= \sum_{F' \in \Theta^\iota(A, F)} \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota : \varphi^{(x)}(F) = F'} \prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \\ &\leq \sum_{F' \in \Theta^\iota(A, F)} e^{|F|(C-2\varepsilon)} = |\Theta^\iota(A, F)| e^{|F|(C-2\varepsilon)} \leq e^{|F|C}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\text{per}^\iota(f) = \lim_{F \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{A, F}^\iota(f) \leq C$. Letting $C \rightarrow \text{per}^\iota(f^*)$ we obtain that $\text{per}^\iota(f) \leq \text{per}^\iota(f^*)$, as desired.

(2) By Proposition 4.10 it suffices to show that $\text{per}^\iota(fg) \geq \text{per}^\iota(f) + \text{per}^\iota(g)$. We may assume that $f, g \neq 0$. Put $A = \text{supp}(f)$ and $B = \text{supp}(g)$. Then $AB = \text{supp}(fg)$.

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. For each $x \in X_{A, F}^\iota$, put $F_x = \{sx_s : s \in F\}$, and denote by Ξ_x the set of $y \in B^F$ for which the map $w : F_x \rightarrow B$, sending $t = sx_s$ for $s \in F$ to y_s , lies in X_{B, F_x}^ι . For each $z \in X_{AB, F}^\iota(fg)$, we have

$$\prod_{s \in F} (fg)_{z_s} = \sum_{x \in A^F, y \in B^F, xy = z} \prod_{s \in F} (f_{x_s} g_{y_s}) \geq \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota} \sum_{y \in \Xi_x, xy = z} \prod_{s \in F} (f_{x_s} g_{y_s}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}_{AB, F}^\iota(fg) &= \sum_{z \in X_{AB, F}^\iota} \prod_{s \in F} (fg)_{z_s} \geq \sum_{z \in X_{AB, F}^\iota} \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota} \sum_{y \in \Xi_x, xy = z} \prod_{s \in F} (f_{x_s} g_{y_s}) \\ &= \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota} \sum_{y \in \Xi_x} \prod_{s \in F} (f_{x_s} g_{y_s}) = \sum_{x \in X_{A, F}^\iota} \left(\prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right) \sum_{y \in \Xi_x} \prod_{s \in F} g_{y_s} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{x \in X_{A,F}'} \left(\prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right) \sum_{w \in X_{B,F_x}'} \prod_{t \in F_x} g_{w_t} = \sum_{x \in X_{A,F}'} \left(\prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right) \text{per}_{B,F_x}^{\iota}(g) \\
&\geq \sum_{x \in X_{A,F}'} \left(\prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right) e^{|F_x| \text{per}^{\iota}(g)} = \sum_{x \in X_{A,F}'} \left(\prod_{s \in F} f_{x_s} \right) e^{|F| \text{per}^{\iota}(g)} \\
&= \text{per}_{A,F}^{\iota}(f) e^{|F| \text{per}^{\iota}(g)} \geq e^{|F| \text{per}^{\iota}(f)} e^{|F| \text{per}^{\iota}(g)} = e^{|F|(\text{per}^{\iota}(f) + \text{per}^{\iota}(g))},
\end{aligned}$$

where the 2nd and 3rd inequalities come from Proposition 4.10. Applying Proposition 4.10 again, we obtain that

$$\text{per}^{\iota}(fg) = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)} \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}_{AB,F}^{\iota}(fg) \geq \text{per}^{\iota}(f) + \text{per}^{\iota}(g). \quad \square$$

Remark 4.12. In general, for $f, g \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$, the identity $\text{per}(fg) = \text{per}(f) + \text{per}(g)$ may fail. Take, for example, $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ and identify $\mathbb{R}\Gamma$ with $\mathbb{R}[x^{\pm 1}]$. If $f = 1 + x$ and $g = f^* = 1 + x^{-1}$, we have $\text{per}(fg) = \text{per}(x + 2 + x^{-1}) \geq \text{per}(x + 1 + x^{-1}) = \text{h}_{\text{top}}(X_A) > 0$ for $A = \{-1, 0, 1\} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z})$, while $\text{per}(f) = \text{per}(g) = \text{h}_{\text{top}}(X_B) = 0$ for $B = \{0, 1\} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z})$.

5. PERMANENT VS DETERMINANT

For any $f = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} f_s s \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ we put $|f| = \sum_{s \in \Gamma} |f_s| s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$. Abusing notation in (2.8) a little we denote, for every $f \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$, by $\lambda^f: \ell^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow \ell^2(\Gamma)$ the bounded linear operator extending left multiplication by f on $\mathbb{C}\Gamma \subset \ell^2(\Gamma)$.

For any $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, we write ι_F for the natural embedding $\ell^2(F) \rightarrow \ell^2(\Gamma)$ and Υ_F for the projection $\ell^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow \ell^2(F)$. For $f \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$, set $\lambda_F^f := \Upsilon_F \circ \lambda^f \circ \iota_F \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(F))$, the algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\ell^2(F)$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}(F)$ the set of all permutations of F . For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(F)$, put $\text{sgn}(\sigma) = 1$ if σ is even and -1 if σ is odd. In the canonical basis of $\ell^2(F)$, λ_F^f is represented by a square matrix $M = (M_{s,t})_{s,t \in F}$ such that $M_{s,t} = f_{st^{-1}}$. Thus

$$\det \lambda_F^f = \det M = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(F)} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{s \in F} M_{s,\sigma(s)} = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(F)} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{s \in F} f_{s\sigma(s)^{-1}}.$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. For each $x \in X_{A,F}'$, denote by $\varphi^{(x)}$ the injective map $t \mapsto tx_t$ from F into Γ as in (3.2). Denote by $\Theta^{\iota}(A, F)$ the set of $F' \subseteq FA$ satisfying $|F'| = |F|$, and by $\Theta(A, F)$ the set of $F' \in \Theta^{\iota}(A, F)$ satisfying $\{t \in \Gamma: tA^{-1} \subseteq F'\} \subseteq F'$. For each $F' \in \Theta^{\iota}(A, F)$, take a bijection $\psi_{F'}: F' \rightarrow F$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $f \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ be nonzero. Put $A = \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. For any $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, we have*

$$\det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{ff^*} = \sum_{F' \in \Theta^{\iota}(A, F)} \left| \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right|^2,$$

where $X_{A,F,F'}$ is defined in (3.6).

Proof. Denote by $Q(F)$ the set of $(x, y) \in A^F \times A^F$ satisfying that the map

$$\sigma_{xy^{-1}}: t \mapsto tx_t y_t^{-1}$$

is a permutation of F . For each $x \in A^F$, denote by $Q(F)_x$ the set of $y \in A^F$ satisfying that $(x, y) \in Q(F)$.

For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(F^{-1})$, we have

$$\prod_{s \in F^{-1}} (ff^*)_{s\sigma(s)^{-1}} = \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A^{(F^{-1})} \\ x_s y_s^{-1} = s\sigma(s)^{-1} \forall s \in F^{-1}}} \prod_{s \in F^{-1}} (f_{x_s} \overline{f_{y_s}}) \quad s = t^{-1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\substack{x,y \in A^{(F^{-1})} \\ x_{t^{-1}} y_{t^{-1}}^{-1} = t^{-1} \sigma(t^{-1})^{-1} \forall t \in F}} \prod_{t \in F} (f_{x_{t^{-1}}} \overline{f_{y_{t^{-1}}}}) \quad x_{t^{-1}} = x'_t, y_{t^{-1}} = y'_t \\
&= \sum_{\substack{x',y' \in A^F \\ tx'_t y_t^{-1} = \sigma(t^{-1})^{-1} \forall t \in F}} \prod_{t \in F} (f_{x'_t} \overline{f_{y'_t}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{ff^*} &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(F^{-1})} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{s \in F^{-1}} (ff^*)_{s\sigma(s)^{-1}} \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(F^{-1})} \sum_{\substack{x',y' \in A^F \\ tx'_t y_t^{-1} = \sigma(t^{-1})^{-1} \forall t \in F}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{t \in F} (f_{x'_t} \overline{f_{y'_t}}) \quad \sigma'(t) = \sigma(t^{-1})^{-1} \\
&= \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}(F)} \sum_{\substack{x',y' \in A^F \\ tx'_t y_t^{-1} = \sigma'(t) \forall t \in F}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma') \prod_{t \in F} (f_{x'_t} \overline{f_{y'_t}}) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(F)} \sum_{\substack{x,y \in A^F \\ tx_t y_t^{-1} = \sigma(t) \forall t \in F}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{t \in F} (f_{x_t} \overline{f_{y_t}}) \tag{5.1} \\
&= \sum_{(x,y) \in Q(F)} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} (f_{x_t} \overline{f_{y_t}}) \\
&= \sum_{x \in A^F} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $x \in A^F \setminus X_{A,F}^t$. Then there are distinct $s, t \in F$ such that $sx_s = tx_t$. Denote by τ the permutation of F exchanging s and t and fixing all other elements of F . For each $y \in Q(F)_x$, we have

$$sx_s(y \circ \tau)_s^{-1} = sx_s y_t^{-1} = tx_t y_t^{-1} = \sigma_{xy^{-1}}(t) = (\sigma_{xy^{-1}} \circ \tau)(s),$$

and similarly,

$$tx_t(y \circ \tau)_t^{-1} = (\sigma_{xy^{-1}} \circ \tau)(t),$$

while for any $g \in F \setminus \{s, t\}$, we have

$$gx_g(y \circ \tau)_g^{-1} = gx_g y_g^{-1} = \sigma_{xy^{-1}}(g) = (\sigma_{xy^{-1}} \circ \tau)(g).$$

It follows that for each $y \in Q(F)_x$, we have

$$y \circ \tau \in Q(F)_x \text{ and } \sigma_{x(y \circ \tau)^{-1}} = \sigma_{xy^{-1}} \circ \tau.$$

In particular, $y \mapsto y \circ \tau$ is a permutation of $Q(F)_x$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}} &= \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{x(y \circ \tau)^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{(y \circ \tau)_t}} \\
&= \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}} \circ \tau) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}} \\
&= - \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}},
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y(t)}} = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

From (5.1) and (5.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{f f^*} &= \sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F}^l} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}} \\ &= \sum_{F' \in \Theta^l(\mathbf{A}, F)} \sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $x \in \mathbf{A}^F$ and $y \in Q(F)_x$, we have the permutation $\sigma_{xy^{-1}}$ of F , whence we can set

$$z^{(x, y)} = y \circ (\sigma_{xy^{-1}})^{-1} \in \mathbf{A}^F.$$

Let $x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F}^l$ and $y \in Q(F)_x$. For any $t \in F$, setting $s = \sigma_{xy^{-1}}(t) \in F$, we have $z_s^{(x, y)} = y_t$, whence

$$tx_t = tx_t y_t^{-1} y_t = \sigma_{xy^{-1}}(t) y_t = s z_s^{(x, y)}. \quad (5.3)$$

For any distinct $s, s' \in F$, since $\sigma_{xy^{-1}}$ is a permutation of F , we can find $t, t' \in F$ with $s = \sigma_{xy^{-1}}(t)$, $s' = \sigma_{xy^{-1}}(t')$, and $t \neq t'$. Since $x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F}^l$, we have $tx_t \neq t'x_{t'}$. Therefore

$$s z_s^{(x, y)} \stackrel{(5.3)}{=} tx_t \neq t'x_{t'} \stackrel{(5.3)}{=} s' z_{s'}^{(x, y)}.$$

This shows that $z^{(x, y)} \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F}^l$.

Let $F' \in \Theta^l(\mathbf{A}, F)$ and $x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l$. For each $y \in Q(F)_x$, we have

$$F' = \{tx_t : t \in F\} \stackrel{(5.3)}{=} \{s z_s^{(x, y)} : s \in F\},$$

whence $z^{(x, y)} \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l$. We claim that the map $Q(F)_x \rightarrow X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l$ sending y to $z^{(x, y)}$ is injective.

Indeed, let $y, y' \in Q(F)_x$ with $z^{(x, y)} = z^{(x, y')}$. For each $s \in F$, since $\sigma_{xy^{-1}}$ and $\sigma_{x(y')^{-1}}$ are permutations of F , we can find $t, t' \in F$ such that $\sigma_{xy^{-1}}(t) = s$ and $\sigma_{x(y')^{-1}}(t') = s$. Then

$$tx_t \stackrel{(5.3)}{=} s z_s^{(x, y)} = s z_s^{(x, y')} \stackrel{(5.3)}{=} t'x_{t'}.$$

Since $x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F}^l$, we get $t = t'$. It follows that $\sigma_{xy^{-1}} = \sigma_{x(y')^{-1}}$ and hence $y = y'$. This proves our claim.

We next claim that the map $Q(F)_x \rightarrow X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l$ sending y to $z^{(x, y)}$ is surjective. Let $z \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l$. We have the bijections $\varphi^{(x)}, \varphi^{(z)} : F \rightarrow F'$, whence we have the permutation $(\varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ \varphi^{(x)}$ of F . Set

$$y = z \circ ((\varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \in \mathbf{A}^F.$$

For each $t \in F$, setting $s = (\varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ \varphi^{(x)}(t) \in F$, we have

$$y_t = z_s \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^{(z)}(s) = \varphi^{(x)}(t),$$

and hence

$$\sigma_{xy^{-1}}(t) = tx_t y_t^{-1} = \varphi^{(x)}(t) y_t^{-1} = \varphi^{(z)}(s) z_s^{-1} = s = ((\varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ \varphi^{(x)})(t).$$

Thus

$$\sigma_{xy^{-1}} = (\varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ \varphi^{(x)} \in \mathcal{S}(F). \quad (5.4)$$

Therefore $y \in Q(F)_x$, and

$$z^{(x, y)} = y \circ (\sigma_{xy^{-1}})^{-1} = y \circ ((\varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ \varphi^{(x)})^{-1} = z.$$

This proves our claim. Thus the map $Q(F)_x \rightarrow X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l$ sending y to $z^{(x, y)}$ is a bijection, and (5.4) holds for $z = z^{(x, y)}$.

For each $F' \in \Theta^l(\mathbf{A}, F)$ we have

$$\sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}^l} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}} \quad \text{since } (\sigma_{xy^{-1}})^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}(F)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{(y \circ (\sigma_{xy^{-1}})^{-1})t}} \\
&= \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{z_t^{(x,y)}}} \\
&\stackrel{(5.4)}{=} \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{z \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}((\varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{z_t}} \\
&= \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{z \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}((\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(z)})^{-1} \circ (\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)})) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{z_t}} \\
&= \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{z \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}((\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(z)})^{-1}) \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{z_t}} \\
&= \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{z \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(z)}) \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{z_t}} \\
&= \left(\sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{z \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(z)}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{z_t}} \right) \\
&= \left| \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{ff^*} &= \sum_{F' \in \Theta^l(A,F)} \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \left(\prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right) \cdot \sum_{y \in Q(F)_x} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_{xy^{-1}}) \prod_{t \in F} \overline{f_{y_t}} \\
&= \sum_{F' \in \Theta^l(A,F)} \left| \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right|^2. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

For comparing permanents and determinants we assume in the following discussion that Γ is infinite and amenable. In order to unburden notation a little we denote by $\det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ the *Fuglede-Kadison determinant* of the linear operator $\lambda^f \in \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\Gamma))$ introduced in [18].

Proposition 5.2. *For every $f \in \mathbb{C}\Gamma$ we have $\operatorname{per}(|f|) \geq \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$.*

Proof. We may assume that $f \neq 0$. Put $A = \operatorname{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.

From [18] we have $\det_{\text{FK}}(f) = \det_{\text{FK}}(f^*) = \frac{1}{2} \det_{\text{FK}}(ff^*)$. By [31, Theorem 1.4] we have $\det_{\text{FK}}(ff^*) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{ff^*}$. By Proposition 4.10 we have $\operatorname{per}(|f|) = \operatorname{per}^l(|f|) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \operatorname{per}_{A,F}^l(|f|)$. Thus it suffices to show

$$\det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{ff^*} \leq \left(\operatorname{per}_{A,F}^l(|f|) \right)^2$$

for every $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.

Indeed, according to Lemma 5.1,

$$\det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{ff^*} = \sum_{F' \in \Theta^l(A,F)} \left| \sum_{x \in X_{A,F,F'}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t} \right|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{F' \in \Theta^i(\mathbf{A}, F)} \left(\sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}} \prod_{t \in F} |f|_{x_t} \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{F' \in \Theta^i(\mathbf{A}, F)} \sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F, F'}} \prod_{t \in F} |f|_{x_t} \right)^2 \\ &= (\text{per}'_{\mathbf{A}, F}(|f|))^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.3. In general, for $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ the identity $\text{per}(f) = \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ will fail. For example, if we put $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{R}\Gamma = \mathbb{R}[x^{\pm 1}]$ as in Remark 4.12, and if $f = (1+x)(1+x^{-1}) = x^{-1} + 2 + x$, we have $\text{per}(f) \geq \text{per}(x^{-1} + 1 + x) = h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathbf{A}}) > 0$ for $\mathbf{A} = \{-1, 0, 1\} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z})$, while $\det_{\text{FK}}(f) = 2\det_{\text{FK}}(1+x) = 0$.

However, the problem of finding possible connections between $\text{per}(f)$ and $\det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ is intriguing. Both these quantities arise naturally in dynamical contexts: if f is the indicator function of a set $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, Remark 4.8 shows that $\text{per}(f)$ is the topological entropy of the restricted permutation space $X_{\mathbf{A}} \subseteq \mathbf{A}^\Gamma$; on the other hand, if $f \in \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ is arbitrary, $\det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ is the topological entropy of the principal algebraic Γ -action (X_f, λ_f) arising from f ([9, 31, 33]). At least for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$, the explicit value of $\det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ is given by the logarithmic Mahler measure of f ([33]), allowing straightforward numerical calculations and, in special cases, explicit arithmetical formulas for $h_{\text{top}}(\lambda_f) = \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$ (cf. e.g., [3]). On the other hand, the complexity of computing the permanent of an $n \times n$ (0,1)-matrix is *NP-hard* and conjecturally not possible in polynomial time (cf. [41]). This doesn't give much hope for general results concerning explicit values of $\text{per}(f)$, $f \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\mathbb{Z}^d]$, or, indeed, of $h_{\text{top}}(X_{\mathbf{A}})$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

In view of the difficulty of computing the permanent of a large matrix M one may try to search for linear operations (like sign changes) on the entries of M , resulting in a matrix M' whose determinant is equal to the permanent of M . Although this approach works only under severe restrictions (cf. e.g., [19, 34]), it is the motivation for the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $h \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ be nonzero and let $\mathbf{A} = \text{supp}(h) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Let $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}\Gamma$ such that $|f| = h$ for every $f \in W$. Assume that there are a right Følner sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for Γ and a set $H_n \subseteq F_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $|H_n|/|F_n| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (2) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $F' \in \Theta(\mathbf{A}, F_n)$ and $y \in \mathbf{A}^{H_n}$, there is some $f \in W$ so that the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{x_t}$ is the same for all $x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F_n, F'}$ satisfying $x|_{H_n} = y$.

Then $\text{per}(h) = \max_{f \in W} \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$.

Proof. By Proposition 5.2 it suffices to show that $\text{per}(h) \leq \max_{f \in W} \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$. From [18] we have $\det_{\text{FK}}(f) = \det_{\text{FK}}(f^*) = \frac{1}{2} \det_{\text{FK}}(ff^*)$ for each $f \in W$. By [31, Theorem 1.4] we have $\det_{\text{FK}}(ff^*) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \det \lambda_{F^{-1}}^{ff^*}$ for each $f \in W$. We may assume that $F_n \setminus H_n \neq \emptyset$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a right Følner sequence and $|H_n|/|F_n| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the sequence $(F_n \setminus H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also right Følner.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in W$. From Lemma 5.1 we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f\|_2^{2|H_n|} \det \lambda_{(F_n \setminus H_n)^{-1}}^{ff^*} \\ &= \left(\sum_{y \in \mathbf{A}^{H_n}} \prod_{t \in H_n} |f_{y_t}| \right)^2 \left(\sum_{F' \in \Theta^i(\mathbf{A}, F_n \setminus H_n)} \left| \sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F_n \setminus H_n, F'}} \text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n \setminus H_n} f_{x_t} \right|^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbf{A}^{H_n}} \sum_{F' \in \Theta^i(\mathbf{A}, F_n \setminus H_n)} \left| \sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F_n \setminus H_n, F'}} \text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \left(\prod_{t \in H_n} f_{y_t} \right) \left(\prod_{t \in F_n \setminus H_n} f_{x_t} \right) \right|^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{y \in X'_{\mathbf{A}, H_n}} \sum_{\substack{F' \in \Theta^i(\mathbf{A}, F_n \setminus H_n) \\ F' \cap \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) = \emptyset}} \left| \sum_{x \in X_{\mathbf{A}, F_n \setminus H_n, F'}} \text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \left(\prod_{t \in H_n} f_{y_t} \right) \left(\prod_{t \in F_n \setminus H_n} f_{x_t} \right) \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

For any $y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l$ and $F' \in \Theta^l(\mathbb{A}, F_n \setminus H_n)$ satisfying $F' \cap \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) = \emptyset$, the set $F'' = F' \cup \varphi^{(y)}(H_n)$ lies in $\Theta^l(\mathbb{A}, F_n)$. Denote by $\psi_{F'', y}$ the bijection $F'' \rightarrow F_n$ which is equal to $\psi_{F'}$ and $(\varphi^{(y)})^{-1}$ on F' and $\varphi^{(y)}(H_n)$ respectively. Fixing such y, F' and F'' , there is a natural 1-1 correspondence between $x \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n \setminus H_n, F'}$ and $z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''}$ equal to y on H_n , given by $z = x$ on $F_n \setminus H_n$ and $z = y$ on H_n . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l} \sum_{\substack{F' \in \Theta^l(\mathbb{A}, F_n \setminus H_n) \\ F' \cap \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) = \emptyset}} \left| \sum_{x \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n \setminus H_n, F'}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \left(\prod_{t \in H_n} f_{yt} \right) \left(\prod_{t \in F_n \setminus H_n} f_{xt} \right) \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{F'' \in \Theta^l(\mathbb{A}, F_n)} \sum_{\substack{y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l \\ \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F''}} \left| \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'', y} \circ \varphi^{(z)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{zt} \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{F'' \in \Theta^l(\mathbb{A}, F_n)} \sum_{\substack{y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l \\ \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F''}} \left| \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F'', y} \circ \psi_{F''}^{-1}) \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F''} \circ \varphi^{(z)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{zt} \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{F'' \in \Theta^l(\mathbb{A}, F_n)} \sum_{\substack{y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l \\ \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F''}} \left| \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F''} \circ \varphi^{(z)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{zt} \right|^2 \\
&\geq \sum_{F'' \in \Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)} \sum_{\substack{y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l \\ \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F''}} \left| \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F''} \circ \varphi^{(z)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{zt} \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For each $F'' \in \Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)$ and $y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l$ satisfying $\varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F''$, by condition (2) we can find some $f^{(F'', y)} \in W$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \operatorname{sgn}(\psi_{F''} \circ \varphi^{(z)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{zt}^{(F'', y)} \right| = \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \prod_{t \in F_n} |f_{zt}^{(F'', y)}| = \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \prod_{t \in F_n} h_{zt}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
|W| \cdot \|h\|_2^{2|H_n|} \max_{f \in W} \det \lambda_{(F_n \setminus H_n)^{-1}}^{ff*} &\geq \sum_{f \in W} \|f\|_2^{2|H_n|} \det \lambda_{(F_n \setminus H_n)^{-1}}^{ff*} \\
&\geq \sum_{F'' \in \Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)} \sum_{\substack{y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l \\ \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F''}} \left(\sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \prod_{t \in F_n} h_{zt} \right)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|\Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)| \cdot |\mathbb{A}|^{|H_n|}} \left(\sum_{F'' \in \Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)} \sum_{\substack{y \in X_{\mathbb{A}, H_n}^l \\ \varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F''}} \sum_{\substack{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''} \\ z|_{H_n} = y}} \prod_{t \in F_n} h_{zt} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)| \cdot |\mathbb{A}|^{|H_n|}} \left(\sum_{F'' \in \Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)} \sum_{z \in X_{\mathbb{A}, F_n, F''}} \prod_{t \in F_n} h_{zt} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Theta(\mathbb{A}, F_n)| \cdot |\mathbb{A}|^{|H_n|}} (\operatorname{per}_{\mathbb{A}, F_n}(h))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by Stirling's approximation formula we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log |\Theta(A, F_n)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log |\Theta'(A, F_n)| = 0.$$

Since Γ is infinite, by condition (1) we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log (|W| \cdot \|h\|_2^{2|H_n|}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log |A|^{|H_n|} = 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{f \in W} \det_{\text{FK}}(f) &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n \setminus H_n|} \log \max_{f \in W} \det \lambda_{(F_n \setminus H_n)^{-1}}^{ff^*} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log \max_{f \in W} \det \lambda_{(F_n \setminus H_n)^{-1}}^{ff^*} \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log \text{per}_{A, F_n}(h) = \text{per}(h). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Let $F, A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $F' \in \Theta(A, F)$. For each $x \in X_{A, F, F'}$ and $g \in F \setminus F'$ there is a unique $n_{x, g} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g) \in F \cap F'$ for all $1 \leq j < n_{x, g}$ and $(\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x, g}}(g) \in F' \setminus F$.

Recall that a total order on Γ is *left invariant* if for any $s, t, g \in \Gamma$, one has $s < t$ if and only if $gs < gt$. The group Γ is *left orderable* if it has a left invariant total order.

Lemma 5.5. *Let Γ be given a left invariant total order. Let $f \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma$ be nonzero with $A = \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ and $F' \in \Theta(A, F)$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $s \geq e_\Gamma$ for all $s \in A$;
- (2) $f_{e_\Gamma} > 0$ if $e_\Gamma \in A$;
- (3) The map $F \setminus F' \rightarrow F' \setminus F$ sending g to $(\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x, g}}(g)$ is the same for all $x \in X_{A, F, F'}$;
- (4) For each $g \in F \setminus F'$, the sign of $(-1)^{n_{x, g}} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x, g}-1} f_{(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g)}$ is the same for all $x \in X_{A, F, F'}$.

Then the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t}$ is the same for all $x \in X_{A, F, F'}$.

Proof. Since the conclusion does not depend on the choice of $\psi_{F'}$, we may assume that $\psi_{F'}(h) = h$ for all $h \in F \cap F'$.

Let $x \in X_{A, F, F'}$. Denote by C_x the set of cycles of $\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}$ intersecting with $F \setminus F'$. For each $C \in C_x$, list the elements of $C \cap (F \setminus F')$ as $g_{C,1}, \dots, g_{C,k_C}$ in the order appearing in C . Then C is

$$\begin{aligned} (g_{C,1}, \dots, (\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x, g_{C,1}}-1}(g_{C,1}), \psi_{F'} \circ (\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x, g_{C,1}}}(g_{C,1}) = \\ g_{C,2}, \dots, (\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x, g_{C,2}}-1}(g_{C,2}), \dots, g_{C,k_C}, \dots, (\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x, g_{C,k_C}}-1}(g_{C,k_C})). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{|C|-1} \prod_{t \in C} f_{x_t} &= (-1)^{-1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k_C} n_{x, g_{C,i}}} \prod_{i=1}^{k_C} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x, g_{C,i}}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g_{C,i})}} \\ &= (-1)^{-1 + \sum_{g \in C \cap (F \setminus F')} n_{x, g}} \prod_{g \in C \cap (F \setminus F')} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x, g}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{C \in C_x} (-1)^{|C|-1} \prod_{t \in C} f_{x_t} &= \prod_{C \in C_x} (-1)^{-1 + \sum_{g \in C \cap (F \setminus F')} n_{x, g}} \prod_{g \in C \cap (F \setminus F')} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x, g}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g)}} \\ &= (-1)^{|C_x|} \prod_{g \in F \setminus F'} (-1)^{n_{x, g}} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x, g}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g)}}. \end{aligned}$$

By condition (1) any cycle of $\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}$ not contained in C_x is trivial. By condition (2) the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t}$ is the same as the sign of $\prod_{C \in C_x} (-1)^{|C|-1} \prod_{t \in C} f_{x_t}$, and hence is the same as the sign of $(-1)^{|C_x|} \prod_{g \in F \setminus F'} (-1)^{n_{x,g}} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x,g}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})j(g)}}$. By condition (4) the sign of $\prod_{g \in F \setminus F'} (-1)^{n_{x,g}} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x,g}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})j(g)}}$ is the same for all $x \in X_{A,F,F'}$. By condition (3) the partition of $F \setminus F'$ consisting of $C \cap (F \setminus F')$ for $C \in C_x$ is the same for all $x \in X_{A,F,F'}$, thus $|C_x|$ is the same for all $x \in X_{A,F,F'}$. Therefore the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F} f_{x_t}$ is the same for all $x \in X_{A,F,F'}$. \square

Example 5.6. Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^2$ equipped with the lexicographic order $(n_1, n_2) > (m_1, m_2)$ if $n_1 > m_1$ or $n_1 = m_1$ and $n_2 > m_2$. Let $f = a - bu_1 + cu_2 + du_1u_2 \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma = \mathbb{R}[u_1^\pm, u_2^\pm]$ for $a, b, c, d > 0$. Put $A = \text{supp}(f) = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Then the conditions (1) and (2) of Lemma 5.5 hold. Let $F = \{0, \dots, n\} \times \{0, \dots, m\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ for $n, m \geq 100$, and let $F' \in \Theta(A, F)$. We claim that the conditions (3) and (4) of Lemma 5.5 hold. Let $x \in X_{A,F,F'}$. From the shape of A we know that for any distinct $g, h \in F \setminus F'$, the paths $g, \varphi^{(x)}(g), \dots, (\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x,g}}(g)$ and $h, \varphi^{(x)}(h), \dots, (\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x,h}}(h)$ do not cross each other. Since $F \setminus F' \subseteq \{(0, k) : 0 \leq k \leq m\} \cup \{(k, 0) : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ and $F' \setminus F \subseteq \{(n+1, k) : 0 \leq k \leq m+1\} \cup \{(k, m+1) : 0 \leq k \leq n+1\}$, we conclude that condition (3) of Lemma 5.5 holds. Let $g = (i, k) \in F \setminus F'$ and put $(\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x,g}}(g) = (i', k') \in F' \setminus F$. For each $s \in A$, denote by n_s the number of $0 \leq j \leq n_{x,g} - 1$ satisfying $x_{(\varphi^{(x)})j(g)} = s$. Then $n_{(0,1)} + n_{(1,1)} = k' - k$, $n_{(1,0)} + n_{(1,1)} = i' - i$, and $n_{(0,1)} + n_{(1,0)} + n_{(1,1)} = n_{x,g}$. Note that the sign of $(-1)^{n_{x,g}} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x,g}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})j(g)}}$ is the same as the sign of $(-1)^{n_{x,g}} (-1)^{n_{(1,0)}}$. But

$$(-1)^{n_{x,g}} (-1)^{n_{(1,0)}} = (-1)^{n_{x,g} - n_{(1,0)}} = (-1)^{n_{(0,1)} + n_{(1,1)}} = (-1)^{k' - k}.$$

Thus condition (4) of Lemma 5.5 holds. This proves our claim. Now from Lemmas 5.5 and 5.4 we get $\text{per}(|f|) = \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$.

For any $a, b, c, d > 0$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \det_{\text{FK}}(a + bu_1 + cu_2 - du_1u_2) &= \det_{\text{FK}}(a - bu_1 + cu_2 + du_1u_2) \\ &= \text{per}(a + bu_1 + cu_2 + du_1u_2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Example 5.7. Let Γ be an amenable group with a subgroup G isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^2 . Fix an isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow G$ and denote by s and t the images of $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ respectively. For any $a, b, c, d > 0$, from (5.5) we have

$$\det_{\text{FK},G}(a + bs + ct - dst) = \det_{\text{FK},G}(a - bs + ct + dst) = \text{per}_G(a + bs + ct + dst), \quad (5.6)$$

where $\det_{\text{FK},G}$ and per_G denote the Fuglede-Kadison determinant and the permanent arising from elements in $\mathbb{C}G$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}G$ respectively. Let $u \in \Gamma$. By Proposition 4.9 we have

$$\text{per}_G(f) = \text{per}_\Gamma(f) = \text{per}_\Gamma(uf) = \text{per}_\Gamma(fu)$$

for all $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}G$. It is also easy to see from the definition of Fuglede-Kadison determinant that

$$\det_{\text{FK},G}(f) = \det_{\text{FK},\Gamma}(f) = \det_{\text{FK},\Gamma}(uf) = \det_{\text{FK},\Gamma}(fu)$$

for all $f \in \mathbb{C}G$. Therefore, for any $a, b, c, d > 0$, from (5.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \det_{\text{FK},\Gamma}(au + bsu + ctu - dstu) &= \det_{\text{FK},\Gamma}(au - bsu + ctu + dstu) \\ &= \text{per}_\Gamma(au + bsu + ctu + dstu). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Now let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^2$, and let G be the image of \mathbb{Z}^2 under the embedding $\mathbb{Z}^2 \hookrightarrow \Gamma$ given by $(1, 0) \mapsto s := (1, 1)$ and $(0, 1) \mapsto t := (1, -1)$. Also let $u = (-1, 0) \in \Gamma$. Then (5.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \det_{\text{FK},\Gamma}(au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + cu_2^{-1} - du_1) &= \det_{\text{FK},\Gamma}(au_1^{-1} - bu_2 + cu_2^{-1} + du_1) \\ &= \text{per}_\Gamma(au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + cu_2^{-1} + du_1) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a, b, c, d > 0$, where $\mathbb{R}\Gamma = \mathbb{R}[u_1^\pm, u_2^\pm]$.

For any $a, b > 0$, a simple calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & (au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + bu_2^{-1} - au_1)^*(au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + bu_2^{-1} - au_1) \\ &= 2a^2 + 2b^2 - a^2u_1^2 - a^2u_1^{-2} + b^2u_2^2 + b^2u_2^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{per}_\Gamma(au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + bu_2^{-1} + au_1) \\ &= \det_{\text{FK}, \Gamma}(au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + bu_2^{-1} - au_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \det_{\text{FK}, \Gamma}((au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + bu_2^{-1} - au_1)^*(au_1^{-1} + bu_2 + bu_2^{-1} - au_1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \det_{\text{FK}, \Gamma}(2a^2 + 2b^2 - a^2u_1^2 - a^2u_1^{-2} + b^2u_2^2 + b^2u_2^{-2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \log(2a^2 + 2b^2 - 2a^2 \cos(4\pi x) + 2b^2 \cos(4\pi y)) \, dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_{1/4}^{5/4} \log(2a^2 + 2b^2 - 2a^2 \cos(4\pi x) + 2b^2 \cos(4\pi y)) \, dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \log(2a^2 + 2b^2 - 2a^2 \cos(4\pi x) - 2b^2 \cos(4\pi y)) \, dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \log(2a^2 + 2b^2 - 2a^2 \cos(2\pi x) - 2b^2 \cos(2\pi y)) \, dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \log(2a^2 + 2b^2 - 2a^2 \cos(\pi x) - 2b^2 \cos(\pi y)) \, dx dy. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

When $a = b = 1$, the penultimate term in (5.8) is what appears in [14, Theorem 6]. The last term in (5.8) is (up to a factor of 2) what appears in [27, (17)]. The growth rate of periodic points of perfect matching is calculated in Section 4 of [27], and it is stated on page 1220 there that the rate is given by [27, (17)].

Example 5.8. Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^2$, equipped with the lexicographic order $(n_1, n_2) > (m_1, m_2)$ if $n_1 > m_1$ or $n_1 = m_1$ and $n_2 > m_2$. Let $f = a + bu_1 + cu_2 \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma = \mathbb{R}[u_1^\pm, u_2^\pm]$ for $a, b, c > 0$. Put $A = \text{supp}(f) = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0)\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Then the conditions (1) and (2) of Lemma 5.5 hold. Let $F = \{0, \dots, n\} \times \{0, \dots, m\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ for $n, m \geq 100$, and let $F' \in \Theta(A, F)$. We claim that the conditions (3) and (4) of Lemma 5.5 hold. Let $x \in X_{A, F, F'}$. The argument in Example 5.6 shows that condition (3) of Lemma 5.5 holds. Let $g = (i, k) \in F \setminus F'$ and put $(\varphi^{(x)})^{n_{x, g}}(g) = (i', k') \in F' \setminus F$. For each $s \in A$, denote by n_s the number of $0 \leq j \leq n_{x, g} - 1$ satisfying that $x_{(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g)} = s$. Then $n_{(0,1)} = k' - k$, $n_{(1,0)} = i' - i$, and $n_{(0,1)} + n_{(1,0)} = n_{x, g}$. Note that the sign of $(-1)^{n_{x, g}} \prod_{j=0}^{n_{x, g}-1} f_{x_{(\varphi^{(x)})^j(g)}}$ is the same as the sign of $(-1)^{n_{x, g}}$. But

$$(-1)^{n_{x, g}} = (-1)^{n_{(0,1)} + n_{(1,0)}} = (-1)^{k' - k + i' - i}.$$

Thus condition (4) of Lemma 5.5 holds. This proves our claim. Now from Lemmas 5.5 and 5.4 we get that $\text{per}(f) = \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$.

When $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$, we may assume that $\{0, K\} \subseteq A = \text{supp}(f) \subseteq A_K = \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$. Put $F_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. When $n > 2K + 1$ and $x \in X_{A, F_n}$, the value $|\{t - K \leq m < t: \varphi^{(x)}(m) \geq t\}|$ is the same for all integers $K \leq t \leq n$. Denote this number by $a(x)$. In fact, $a(x) = |\varphi^{(x)}(F_n) \cap [t, \infty)| - (n - t + 1)$ for every integer $K \leq t \leq n$. Thus $a(x)$ is determined by $\varphi^{(x)}(F_n)$. Then we may write $a(x)$ as $a(\varphi^{(x)}(F_n))$. For each $F' \in \Theta(A, F_n)$, take $\psi_{F'}$ to be the unique increasing bijection $F' \rightarrow F_n$. Then for each $F' \in \Theta(A, F_n)$ and $x \in X_{A, F_n, F'}$, putting $b(x)$ to be the number of $(s, t) \in F_n \times F_n$ satisfying $s < t$ and $\varphi^{(x)}(s) > \varphi^{(x)}(t)$, one has $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) = (-1)^{b(x)}$. For each $t \in F_n$, denote by $b_t(x)$ the number of $s \in F_n \cap [t - K, t - 1]$ satisfying $\varphi^{(x)}(s) > \varphi^{(x)}(t)$. Then $b(x) = \sum_{t \in F_n} b_t(x)$.

Example 5.9. Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ and $f = au^2 + bu - c \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma = \mathbb{R}[u^\pm]$ for $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Put $A = \text{supp}(f) = \{0, 1, 2\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. We claim that $W = \{f\}$ satisfies the condition in Lemma 5.4 for $F_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $H_n = \{0, 1, \dots, 20\} \cup \{n - 20, \dots, n\}$. Let $n \geq 100$. Put $V_n = F_n \cap [10, n - 10]$. Fix $F' \in \Theta(A, F_n)$ and $y \in X_{A, H_n}^y$ satisfying $\varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F'$. Let $x \in X_{A, F_n, F'}$ be equal to y on H_n . When $a(F') = 0$, one has $b_t(x) = 0$ and $x_t = 0$ for all $t \in V_n$; $b_t(x) = 1$ when $a(F') = 1$, $x_t = 0$, and $t \in V_n$; $b_t(x) = 0$ when $a(F') = 1$, $x_t \geq 1$, and $t \in V_n$; when $a(F') = 2$, one has $b_t(x) = 0$ and $x_t = 2$ for all $t \in V_n$. Thus when $a(F') = 1$ or 2 , the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{x_t}$ is $(-1)^{b(x) + |x^{-1}(0)|} = (-1)^{|x^{-1}(0) \setminus V_n| + \sum_{t \in H_n \setminus V_n} b_t(x)}$, which is determined by y . When $a(F') = 0$, the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{x_t}$ is $(-1)^{b(x) + |x^{-1}(0)|} = (-1)^{|x^{-1}(0) \setminus V_n| + |V_n| + \sum_{t \in H_n \setminus V_n} b_t(x)}$, which is determined by y . From Lemma 5.4 we conclude that $\text{per}(|f|) = \det_{\text{FK}}(f)$.

Example 5.10. Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ and $K \geq 2$. Let $h = au^K + bu^{K-1} + c \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma = \mathbb{R}[u^\pm]$ for $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Put $A = \text{supp}(h) = \{0, K - 1, K\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. We claim that $W = \{f^{(1)} = au^K + bu^{K-1} - c, f^{(2)} = au^K + bu^{K-1} + c\}$ satisfies the condition in Lemma 5.4 for $F_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $H_n = \{0, 1, \dots, 4K\} \cup \{n - 4K, \dots, n\}$. Let $n \geq 100K$. Put $V_n = F_n \cap [2K, n - 2K]$. Fix $F' \in \Theta(A, F_n)$ and $y \in X_{A, H_n}^y$ satisfying $\varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F'$. Let $x \in X_{A, F_n, F'}$ equal to y on H_n . Then $b_t(x) = a(F')$ when $x_t = 0$ and $t \in V_n$; $b_t(x) = 0$ when $x_t \neq 0$ and $t \in V_n$. Thus when $a(F')$ is odd, the sign of

$$\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{x_t}^{(1)}$$

is equal to

$$(-1)^{b(x) + |x^{-1}(0)|} = (-1)^{|x^{-1}(0) \setminus V_n| + \sum_{t \in H_n \setminus V_n} b_t(x)},$$

which is determined by y . When $a(F')$ is even, the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{x_t}^{(2)}$ is $(-1)^{b(x)} = (-1)^{\sum_{t \in H_n \setminus V_n} b_t(x)}$, which is determined by y . From Lemma 5.4 we conclude that $\text{per}(h) = \max(\det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(1)}), \det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(2)}))$.

In Example 5.10, could $\det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(1)}) < \det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(2)})$ for some $a, b, c > 0$?

Example 5.11. Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ and $K \geq 3$. Let $h = au^K + bu^{K-1} + cu + d \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma = \mathbb{R}[u^\pm]$ for $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Put $A = \text{supp}(h) = \{0, 1, K - 1, K\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. We claim that $W = \{f^{(1)} = au^K + bu^{K-1} + cu - d, f^{(2)} = au^K + bu^{K-1} - cu + d\}$ satisfies the condition in Lemma 5.4 for $F_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $H_n = \{0, 1, \dots, 4K\} \cup \{n - 4K, \dots, n\}$. Let $n \geq 100K$. Put $V_n = F_n \cap [2K, n - 2K]$. Fix $F' \in \Theta(A, F_n)$ and $y \in X_{A, H_n}^y$ satisfying $\varphi^{(y)}(H_n) \subseteq F'$. Let $x \in X_{A, F_n, F'}$ equal to y on H_n . Then $b_t(x) = a(F')$ when $x_t = 0$ and $t \in V_n$; $b_t(x) = a(F') - 1$ when $x_t = 1$ and $t \in V_n$; $b_t(x) = 0$ when $x_t \geq K - 1$ and $t \in V_n$. Thus when $a(F')$ is odd, the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{x_t}^{(1)}$ is $(-1)^{b(x) + |x^{-1}(0)|} = (-1)^{|x^{-1}(0) \setminus V_n| + \sum_{t \in H_n \setminus V_n} b_t(x)}$, which is determined by y . When $a(F')$ is even, the sign of $\text{sgn}(\psi_{F'} \circ \varphi^{(x)}) \prod_{t \in F_n} f_{x_t}^{(2)}$ is $(-1)^{b(x) + |x^{-1}(1)|} = (-1)^{|x^{-1}(1) \setminus V_n| + \sum_{t \in H_n \setminus V_n} b_t(x)}$, which is determined by y . From Lemma 5.4 we conclude that $\text{per}(h) = \max(\det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(1)}), \det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(2)}))$.

In Example 5.11, could $\det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(1)}) < \det_{\text{FK}}(f^{(2)})$ for some $a, b, c, d > 0$?

6. APPROXIMATION BY FINITE QUOTIENT GROUPS

In this section we discuss briefly finite approximations of permanents $\text{per}(f)$, $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$, for residually finite amenable groups.

Let Γ be amenable, $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$, $A := \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, and let $\Delta \subset \Gamma$ be a finite-index normal subgroup such that $(AA^{-1}) \cap \Delta = \{e_\Gamma\}$. We denote by $\pi_{\Gamma/\Delta}: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma/\Delta$ the quotient map $s \mapsto s\Delta$ as well as the induced homomorphism $\mathbb{C}\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}(\Gamma/\Delta)$.

We define $X_A \subseteq A^\Gamma$ by (3.1) – (3.3), set $\tilde{A} = \pi_{\Gamma/\Delta}(A) \subseteq \Gamma/\Delta$, and denote by $\tilde{S}_{\tilde{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\Gamma/\Delta)$ the set of all permutations $\tilde{\sigma}$ of Γ/Δ with

$$\tilde{x}_{\tilde{s}} = \tilde{s}^{-1} \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{s}) \in \tilde{A}$$

for every $\tilde{s} \in \Gamma/\Delta$. We define $X_{\tilde{A}} \subseteq \tilde{A}^{\Gamma/\Delta}$ exactly as in (3.1) – (3.3), with Γ and A replaced by Γ/Δ and \tilde{A} , respectively. For every $y \in X_{\tilde{A}}$, the composition $y \circ \pi_{\Gamma/\Delta}$ lies in X_A (actually it is an element of \tilde{A}^Γ , but since the restriction of $\pi_{\Gamma/\Delta}$ to A is injective by assumption we can abuse notation and treat it as an element of $X_A \subseteq A^\Gamma$ which is invariant under λ^t for every $t \in \Delta$ (cf. (2.1)). Conversely, every $x' \in \text{Fix}_\Delta(X_A) = \{x \in X_A : \lambda^t x = x \text{ for every } t \in \Delta\}$ arises in this manner. It follows that

$$|\text{Fix}_\Delta(X_A)| = |X_{\tilde{A}}|$$

and

$$\text{per}(\pi_{\Gamma/\Delta}(f)) = \frac{1}{|\Gamma/\Delta|} \log \left(\sum_{y \in X_{\tilde{A}}} \prod_{\tilde{s} \in \Gamma/\Delta} \pi_{\Gamma/\Delta}(f)_{y_{\tilde{s}}} \right).$$

Let Γ be amenable and residually finite, and let $(\Delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of finite-index normal subgroups such that $\bigcap_m \bigcup_{n \geq m} \Delta_n = \{e_\Gamma\}$. By [43] there is a right Følner sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of Γ such that π_{Γ/Δ_n} maps F_n bijectively to Γ/Δ_n for every n and $A \subset F_n$ for every $n \geq N$, say.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\Gamma$. Then $\text{per}(f) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{per}(\pi_{\Gamma/\Delta_n}(f))$.*

Proof. We assume that $f \neq 0$ and set $A = \text{supp}(f) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.

For every $n \geq 1$ we put $A^{(n)} = \pi_{\Gamma/\Delta_n}(A)$ and $f^{(n)} = \pi_{\Gamma/\Delta_n}(f)$. For every $y \in X_{A^{(n)}} \subset (A^{(n)})^{\Gamma/\Delta_n}$, the composition $y \circ \pi_{\Gamma/\Delta_n}$ lies in $(A^{(n)})^\Gamma$. If $n \geq N$, we may view $y \circ \pi_{\Gamma/\Delta_n}$ as an element of A^Γ whose restriction to F_n lies in X_{A, F_n} . In the notation of (4.1) we obtain that

$$\text{per}_{A, F_n}(f) = \sum_{x \in X_{A, F_n}} \prod_{s \in F_n} f_{x_s} \geq \sum_{y \in X_{A^{(n)}}} \prod_{\tilde{t} \in \Gamma/\Delta_n} f_{y_{\tilde{t}}}^{(n)}.$$

According to Definition 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}(f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log \text{per}_{A, F_n}(f) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\Gamma/\Delta_n|} \log \left(\sum_{y \in X_{A^{(n)}}} \prod_{\tilde{t} \in \Gamma/\Delta_n} f_{y_{\tilde{t}}}^{(n)} \right) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{per}(f^{(n)}). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

For $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$, $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, and $\Delta_n = n\mathbb{Z}$, the inequality $\text{per}(f) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{per}(\pi_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}}(f))$ in Proposition 6.1 is actually an equality. This is a consequence of the following classical result, essentially taken from [32, Theorem 4.3.6. and Exercise 4.4.3.]

Proposition 6.2. *Let B be a nonempty finite set, $Y \subseteq B^{\mathbb{Z}}$ a shift of finite type (as defined in Subsection 2.3), and let λ be the (left) shift action (2.1) of \mathbb{Z} on $B^{\mathbb{Z}}$. For every $N \geq 1$ we denote by $\text{Fix}_N(Y) = \{y \in Y : \lambda^N y = y\}$ the set of periodic points in Y with period N . Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \left(\sum_{y \in \pi_{\{0, \dots, N-1\}}(Y)} \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \phi(y_k) \right) = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \left(\sum_{y \in \text{Fix}_N(Y)} \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \phi(y_k) \right)$$

for every map $\phi : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

By applying Proposition 6.2 to the SFT $X_A \subset A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and the function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we obtain the identity

$$\lim_{|J| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|J|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in X_{A, J}} \prod_{k \in J} f(x_k) \right) = \lim_{|J| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|J|} \log \left(\sum_{x \in \pi_J(X_A)} \prod_{k \in J} f(x_k) \right)$$

$$= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \left(\sum_{x \in \text{Fix}_N(X_A)} \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} f(x_k) \right),$$

where the limits are taken over increasing intervals $J = [i, \dots, j] \subset \mathbb{Z}$, and where $X_{A,J} \subset A^J$ is defined as in (3.6) or (2.3). As indicated in Remark 4.5, $\text{per}(f)$ coincides with the topological pressure $P(X_A, \log f)$ with $A = \text{supp}(f)$, which gives us equality in Proposition 6.1.

Corollary 6.3. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Then $\text{per}(f) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{per}(\pi_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}}(f))$.*

Even for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^2$, the analogue of Corollary 6.3 is not known except under very restrictive conditions. We refer to [40, § 6] and [14] for background and a few examples.

7. BOUNDS FOR PERMANENTS

Although the problem of calculating of $h_{\text{top}}(X_A)$, $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$, doesn't seem tractable in general, some of the known results on permanents of matrices lead to useful estimates on the topological entropies of these spaces. For general reference on permanents we refer to [36] and [42, Chapters 11 and 12].

We recall that the *permanent* of a matrix $B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{C})$ with $m \leq n$ is defined as

$$\text{per}(B) = \sum_{\sigma} \prod_{i=1}^m b_{i\sigma(i)},$$

where σ ranges over all injective maps $\{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that the permanent does not change if we exchange two rows or two columns of B . Thus we can talk about $\text{per}(B)$ for any $B \in M_{F_1, F_2}(\mathbb{C})$ where F_1 and F_2 are nonempty finite sets with $|F_1| \leq |F_2|$.

A matrix $B \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ is called *doubly stochastic* if all entries are nonnegative and all row-sums and column-sums are equal to 1. We denote by Ω_n the set of all $n \times n$ doubly stochastic matrices.

We shall need the following result [42, Theorem 12.1], known as *the van der Waerden conjecture*, proved independently by Falikman (without the uniqueness part) [15] and Egoryčev [13].

Theorem 7.1 (van der Waerden Conjecture). *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \in \Omega_n$, one has*

$$\text{per}(B) \geq \frac{n!}{n^n},$$

and the equality holds exactly when all entries of B are $\frac{1}{n}$.

Let Γ be a discrete group. Let $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\Gamma}$ and $A, F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. We denote by $B_{F, FA, f}$ the matrix in $M_{F, FA}(\mathbb{R})$ with value f_s at (t, ts) for all $t \in F$ and $s \in A$. In the notation of (4.1) we have

$$\text{per}(B_{F, FA, f}) = \text{per}'_{A, F}(f).$$

Now assume that Γ is infinite and amenable.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\Gamma}$ with $\|f\|_1 = 1$. Then*

$$\text{per}'(f) \geq \log \frac{1}{e},$$

where $e = 2.71828 \dots$ is the Euler number.

Proof. We fix an $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ containing $\text{supp}(f) \cup \{e_{\Gamma}\}$.

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. We define a matrix $C_{FA, f} \in M_{FA}(\mathbb{R})$ as follows. For each $s \in \text{supp}(f)$, we take a bijection $\sigma_s: FA \rightarrow FA$ such that $\sigma_s(t) = ts$ for all $t \in F$. For any $t_1, t_2 \in FA$, we set

$$(C_{FA, f})_{t_1, t_2} = \sum_{s \in \text{supp}(f), \sigma_s(t_1) = t_2} f_s.$$

Then

$$(C_{FA, f})_{t_1, t_2} = (B_{F, FA, f})_{t_1, t_2}$$

for all $t_1 \in F$ and $t_2 \in FA$. That is, $B_{F,FA,f}$ is a submatrix of $C_{FA,f}$.

For any $t_2 \in FA$, we have

$$\sum_{t_1 \in FA} (C_{FA,f})_{t_1, t_2} = \sum_{t_1 \in FA} \sum_{s \in \text{supp}(f), \sigma_s(t_1)=t_2} f_s = \sum_{s \in \text{supp}(f)} f_s = 1.$$

For any $t_1 \in FA$, we have

$$\sum_{t_2 \in FA} (C_{FA,f})_{t_1, t_2} = \sum_{t_2 \in FA} \sum_{s \in \text{supp}(f), \sigma_s(t_1)=t_2} f_s = \sum_{s \in \text{supp}(f)} f_s = 1.$$

Thus $C_{FA,f}$ is a doubly stochastic matrix. From Theorem 7.1 we have

$$\text{per}(C_{FA,f}) \geq \frac{|FA|!}{|FA|^{|FA|}}.$$

Denote by Φ the set of injective maps $\phi: F \rightarrow FA$, and by Ψ the set of bijections $\psi: FA \rightarrow FA$. For each $\phi \in \Phi$, denote by Ψ_ϕ the set of $\psi \in \Psi$ extending ϕ , and by Ψ'_ϕ the set of $\psi \in \Psi_\phi$ satisfying $(C_{FA,f})_{t, \psi(t)} > 0$ for all $t \in FA \setminus F$. For each $t \in FA \setminus F$, the t -row of $C_{FA,f}$ has at most $|\text{supp}(f)|$ positive entries. Thus

$$|\Psi'_\phi| \leq |\text{supp}(f)|^{|FA \setminus F|}$$

for every $\phi \in \Phi$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{per}(C_{FA,f}) &= \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \prod_{t \in FA} (C_{FA,f})_{t, \psi(t)} = \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi_\phi} \prod_{t \in FA} (C_{FA,f})_{t, \psi(t)} \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi'_\phi} \prod_{t \in FA} (C_{FA,f})_{t, \psi(t)} \\ &= \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi'_\phi} \left(\prod_{t \in F} (B_{F,FA,f})_{t, \phi(t)} \right) \left(\prod_{t \in FA \setminus F} (C_{FA,f})_{t, \psi(t)} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi'_\phi} \prod_{t \in F} (B_{F,FA,f})_{t, \phi(t)} = \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} |\Psi'_\phi| \prod_{t \in F} (B_{F,FA,f})_{t, \phi(t)} \\ &\leq |\text{supp}(f)|^{|FA \setminus F|} \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} \prod_{t \in F} (B_{F,FA,f})_{t, \phi(t)} \\ &= |\text{supp}(f)|^{|FA \setminus F|} \text{per}(B_{F,FA,f}) = |\text{supp}(f)|^{|FA \setminus F|} \text{per}'_{A,F}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\text{per}'_{A,F}(f) \geq |\text{supp}(f)|^{-|FA \setminus F|} \frac{|FA|!}{|FA|^{|FA|}}.$$

Since Γ is infinite, $|F| \rightarrow \infty$ as F becomes more and more right invariant. Therefore, using Stirling's approximation formula, we get

$$\text{per}'(f) = \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \text{per}'_{A,F}(f) \geq \lim_F \frac{1}{|F|} \log \left(|\text{supp}(f)|^{-|FA \setminus F|} \frac{|FA|!}{|FA|^{|FA|}} \right) = \log \frac{1}{e}. \quad \square$$

Remark 7.3. Prior to the resolution of the van der Waerden conjecture by Falikman and Egoryčev, Friedland [16] proved a weaker result that

$$\text{per}(B) \geq 1/e^n$$

for all $B \in \Omega_n$. In the proof of Lemma 7.2 it suffices to use this weaker result.

Theorem 7.4. For every $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\Gamma$ we have

$$\text{per}(f) \geq \log \frac{\|f\|_1}{e}.$$

Proof. This is obvious when $f = 0$. Thus we may assume $f \neq 0$. We have

$$\text{per}(f) = \text{per}^t(f) = \text{per}^t\left(\frac{f}{\|f\|_1}\right) + \log \|f\|_1 \geq \log \frac{1}{e} + \log \|f\|_1 = \log \frac{\|f\|_1}{e},$$

where the first equality is from Proposition 4.10, the second equality is from Proposition 4.9.(3), and the inequality is from Lemma 7.2. \square

Corollary 7.5. *Let $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Then*

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A) \geq \log \frac{|A|}{e}.$$

Furthermore, the following are equivalent:

- (1) $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = 0$.
- (2) $|A| = 1$ or $|A| = 2$ with $A = \{s, t\}$ such that st^{-1} has infinite order.

Proof. Let f be the characteristic function of A . From Remark 4.8 we have $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = \text{per}(f)$. Then the inequality follows from Theorem 7.4.

If $|A| \geq 3$, then $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) \geq \log \frac{|A|}{e} > 0$.

If $|A| = 1$, then clearly $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = 0$.

Now assume that $|A| = 2$. Say, $A = \{s, t\}$. Set $A' = At^{-1} = \{e_\Gamma, st^{-1}\}$. Denote by G the subgroup of Γ generated by st^{-1} . By parts (1) and (6) of Proposition 4.9 we have that

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = \text{per}_\Gamma(f) = \text{per}_\Gamma(ft^{-1}) = \text{per}_G(ft^{-1})$$

is equal to the topology entropy of the action $G \curvearrowright Y_{A'}$, where $Y_{A'}$ is defined similar as $X_{A'}$ replacing Γ by G .

If st^{-1} has infinite order, then G is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , so that $h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = h_{\text{top}}(Y_{A'}) = 0$.

If st^{-1} has finite order, then

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A) = h_{\text{top}}(Y_{A'}) = \frac{1}{|G|} \log |Y_{A'}| \geq \frac{1}{|G|} \log 2 > 0. \quad \square$$

The case $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ of the second assertion of Corollary 7.5 was proved in [40, Corollary 5.3].

We also need the following result of Brègman [5] [36, Theorem 6.2.1], which proves a conjecture of Minc in [35].

Theorem 7.6. *Let B be an $n \times n$ $(0, 1)$ -matrix with row sums r_1, \dots, r_n . Then*

$$\text{per}(B) \leq \prod_{i=1}^n (r_i!)^{1/r_i},$$

where as convention we set $(0!)^{1/0} = 1$.

A finitely generated group Γ has *polynomial growth* if, given a finite generating subset S of Γ satisfying $e_\Gamma \in S = S^{-1}$, there is a polynomial g such that $|S^n| \leq g(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This definition does not depend on the choice of S . The theorems of Wolf and Gromov state that a finitely generated group has polynomial growth exactly when it is virtually nilpotent. We also need the following result of Deninger [9, Proposition 6.1].

Lemma 7.7. *Let Γ be a finitely generated group of polynomial growth. Then there is a right Følner sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of Γ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|F_n K \setminus F_n|}{|F_n|} \log(1 + |F_n K \setminus F_n|) = 0 \quad (7.1)$$

for all $K \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$.

Theorem 7.8. *Assume that Γ is finitely generated of polynomial growth and infinite. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. Then*

$$h_{\text{top}}(X_A) \leq \frac{1}{|A|} \log(|A|!).$$

Proof. Replacing A by At^{-1} for some $t \in A$, we may assume that $e_\Gamma \in A$. Let f be the characteristic function of A .

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$. We denote $\{t \in \Gamma : tA^{-1} \subseteq F\}$ by $\text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)$. We define a matrix $D_{FA,f} \in M_{FA}(\mathbb{R})$ via

$$(D_{FA,f})_{t_1,t_2} = \begin{cases} (B_{F,FA,f})_{t_1,t_2} & \text{if } t_1 \in F \\ 1 & \text{if } t_1 \in FA \setminus F \text{ and } t_2 \in FA \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F) \\ 0 & \text{if } t_1 \in FA \setminus F \text{ and } t_2 \in \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F) \end{cases}$$

for $t_1, t_2 \in FA$. Then $B_{F,FA,f}$ is a submatrix of $D_{FA,f}$. Note that every injective map $\phi: F \rightarrow FA$ extends to a (not necessarily unique) bijections $\psi: FA \rightarrow FA$. If $\phi(F) \supseteq \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)$, then necessarily $(D_{FA,f})_{t,\psi(t)} = 1$ for all $t \in FA \setminus F$. It follows that

$$\text{per}(D_{FA,f}) \geq |X_{A,F}|,$$

where $X_{A,F}$ is defined in (3.6).

Note that $D_{FA,f}$ is a $(0, 1)$ -matrix. For each $t \in F$, the sum of the t -row of $D_{FA,f}$ is $|A|$. For each $t \in FA \setminus F$, the sum of the t -row of $D_{FA,f}$ is $|FA \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)|$. By Theorem 7.6 we have

$$\text{per}(D_{FA,f}) \leq (|FA \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)|!)^{|FA \setminus F|/|FA \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)|} (|A|!)^{|F|/|A|}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |FA \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)| &\leq |FA \setminus F| + |F \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)| \leq |FA \setminus F| + |A| \cdot |FA^{-1} \setminus F| \\ &\leq (|A| + 1)|F(A \cup A^{-1}) \setminus F|. \end{aligned}$$

Also note that $((n+1)!)^{1/(n+1)} \geq (n!)^{1/n}$ for all nonnegative integers n . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |X_{A,F}| &\leq (|FA \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)|!)^{|FA \setminus F|/|FA \setminus \text{Int}_{A^{-1}}(F)|} (|A|!)^{|F|/|A|} \\ &\leq (((|A| + 1)|F(A \cup A^{-1}) \setminus F|)!)^{|FA \setminus F|/((|A|+1)|F(A \cup A^{-1}) \setminus F|)} (|A|!)^{|F|/|A|} \\ &\leq (((|A| + 1)|F(A \cup A^{-1}) \setminus F|)!)^{1/(|A|+1)} (|A|!)^{|F|/|A|}. \end{aligned}$$

Since Γ has polynomial growth, by Lemma 7.7 we can find a right Følner sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (7.1). By Proposition 3.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\text{top}}(X_A) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log |X_{A,F_n}| \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \log \left((((|A| + 1)|F_n(A \cup A^{-1}) \setminus F_n|)!)^{1/(|A|+1)} (|A|!)^{|F_n|/|A|} \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|F_n| \cdot (|A| + 1)} \log((|F_n(A \cup A^{-1}) \setminus F_n|)!) + \frac{1}{|A|} \log(|A|!) \\ &= \frac{1}{|A|} \log(|A|!), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we use that $|F_n| \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since Γ is infinite, and in the second equality we use Stirling's approximation formula and (7.1). \square

Question 7.9. Could we remove the polynomial growth condition in Theorem 7.8?

REFERENCES

- [1] Vladimir Baltić, *On the number of certain types of strongly restricted permutations*, Appl. Anal. Discrete Math. **4** (2010), no. 1, 119–135.
- [2] Béla Bollobás and Andrew Thomason, *Projections of bodies and hereditary properties of hypergraphs*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **27** (1995), no. 5, 417–424.
- [3] David W. Boyd, *Mahler's measure and special values of L-functions*, Experiment. Math. **7** (1998), no. 1, 37–82.
- [4] Mike Boyle and Jun Tomiyama, *Bounded topological orbit equivalence and C^* -algebras*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **50** (1998), no. 2, 317–329.

- [5] L. M. Brègman. *Certain properties of nonnegative matrices and their permanents*. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **211** (1973), 27–30; translation in *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **14** (1973), 945–949.
- [6] Tullio Ceccherini-Silberstein, Michel Coornaert, and Hanfeng Li, *Expansive actions with specification of sofic groups, strong topological Markov property, and surjectivity*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **286** (2024), no. 9, Paper No. 110376, 26 pp.
- [7] Nishant Chandgotia and Tom Meyerovitch, *Borel subsystems and ergodic universality for compact \mathbb{Z}^d -systems via specification and beyond*, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **123** (2021), no. 3, 231–312.
- [8] John Chollet, *Unsolved Problems: Is there a permanent analogue to Oppenheim’s inequality?*, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **89** (1982), no. 1, 57–58.
- [9] Christopher Deninger, *Fuglede-Kadison determinants and entropy for actions of discrete amenable groups*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **19** (2006), no. 3, 737–758.
- [10] Persi Diaconis, Ronald Graham, and Susan P. Holmes, *Statistical problems involving permutations with restricted positions*, *State of the art in probability and statistics (Leiden, 1999)*, *IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser.*, vol. 36, Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH, 2001, pp. 195–222.
- [11] Tomasz Downarowicz, Bartosz Frej, and Pierre-Paul Romagnoli, *Shearer’s inequality and infimum rule for Shannon entropy and topological entropy*, *Dynamics and numbers*, *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 669, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2016, pp. 63–75.
- [12] Kenneth Edwards and Michael A. Allen, *Strongly restricted permutations and tiling with fences*, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **187** (2015), 82–90.
- [13] Georgii P. Egorychev, *The solution of van der Waerden’s problem for permanents*, *Adv. in Math.* **42** (1981), no. 3, 299–305.
- [14] Dor Elimelech, *Permutations with restricted movement*, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **41** (2021), no. 9, 4319–4349.
- [15] D. I. Falikman, *Proof of the van der Waerden conjecture on the permanent of a doubly stochastic matrix*, *Mat. Zametki* **29** (1981), no. 6, 931–938, 957 (Russian).
- [16] Shmuel Friedland, *A lower bound for the permanent of a doubly stochastic matrix*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **110** (1979), no. 1, 167–176.
- [17] ———, *On the entropy of \mathbb{Z}^d subshifts of finite type*, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **252** (1997), 199–220.
- [18] Bent Fuglede and Richard V. Kadison, *Determinant theory in finite factors*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **55** (1952), 520–530.
- [19] Peter M. Gibson, *Conversion of the permanent into the determinant*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **27** (1971), 471–476.
- [20] Michael Hochman and Tom Meyerovitch, *A characterization of the entropies of multidimensional shifts of finite type*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **171** (2010), no. 3, 2011–2038.
- [21] Kate Juschenko and Nicolas Monod, *Cantor systems, piecewise translations and simple amenable groups*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **178** (2013), no. 2, 775–787.
- [22] Kate Juschenko and Mikael de la Salle, *Invariant means for the wobbling group*, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin* **22** (2015), no. 2, 281–290.
- [23] Kate Juschenko, *Amenability of discrete groups by examples*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, vol. 266, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2022.
- [24] Janet Whalen Kammeyer and Daniel J. Rudolph, *Restricted orbit equivalence for ergodic \mathbb{Z}^d actions. I*, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **17** (1997), no. 5, 1083–1129.
- [25] Irving Kaplansky, *Symbolic solution of certain problems in permutations*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **50** (1944), 906–914.
- [26] Irving Kaplansky and John Riordan, *The problem of the rooks and its applications*, *Duke Math. J.* **13** (1946), 259–268.
- [27] Pieter W. Kasteleyn, *The statistics of dimers on a lattice I. The number of dimer arrangements on a quadratic lattice*, *Physica* **27** (1961), 1209–1225.
- [28] David Kerr and Hanfeng Li, *Ergodic theory, independence and dichotomies*, *Springer Monographs in Mathematics*, Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [29] Torleiv Kløve, *Generating functions for the number of permutations with limited displacement*, *Electron. J. Combin.* **16** (2009), no. 1, Research Paper 104, 11 pp.
- [30] Derrick H. Lehmer, *Permutations with strongly restricted displacements*, *Combinatorial theory and its applications, I-III (Proc. Colloq., Balatonfüred, 1969)*, *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, vol. 4, North-Holland, Amsterdam-London, 1970, pp. 755–770.
- [31] Hanfeng Li and Andreas Thom, *Entropy, determinants, and L^2 -torsion*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **27** (2014), no. 1, 239–292.
- [32] Douglas Lind and Brian Marcus, *An introduction to symbolic dynamics and coding*, 2nd ed., *Cambridge Mathematical Library*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2021.
- [33] Douglas Lind, Klaus Schmidt, and Tom Ward, *Mahler measure and entropy for commuting automorphisms of compact groups*, *Invent. Math.* **101** (1990), no. 3, 593–629.
- [34] Marvin Marcus and Henryk Minc, *On the relation between the determinant and the permanent*, *Illinois J. Math.* **5** (1961), 376–381.
- [35] Henryk Minc, *Upper bounds for permanents of $(0, 1)$ -matrices*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **69** (1963), 789–791.

- [36] ———, *Permanents, with a foreword by Marvin Marcus*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 6, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1978.
- [37] Jean Moulin Ollagnier, *Ergodic theory and statistical mechanics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1115, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [38] Daniel J. Rudolph, *Restricted orbit equivalence*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **54** (1985), no. 323, v+150.
- [39] Klaus Schmidt, *Dynamical systems of algebraic origin*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 128, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995.
- [40] Klaus Schmidt and Gabriel Strasser, *Permutations of \mathbb{Z}^d with restricted movement*, Studia Math. **235** (2016), no. 2, 137–170.
- [41] Leslie G. Valiant, *The complexity of computing the permanent*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **8** (1979), no. 2, 189–201.
- [42] Jacobus H. van Lint and Richard M. Wilson, *A course in combinatorics*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [43] Benjamin Weiss, *Monotileable amenable groups*, Topology, ergodic theory, real algebraic geometry, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 202, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001, pp. 257–262.
- [44] Fuzhen Zhang, *An update on a few permanent conjectures*, Spec. Matrices **4** (2016), 305–316.

HANFENG LI: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260-2900, U.S.A.
Email address: hfli@math.buffalo.edu

K. SCHMIDT: MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1, 1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA
Email address: klaus.schmidt@univie.ac.at