

# SEQUENCE ENTROPY AND INDEPENDENCE IN FREE AND MINIMAL ACTIONS

JAIME GÓMEZ, IRMA LEÓN-TORRES, AND VÍCTOR MUÑOZ-LÓPEZ

ABSTRACT. For every countable infinite group that admits  $\mathbb{Z}$  as a homomorphic image, we show that for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a minimal action whose topological sequence entropy is  $\log(m)$ . Furthermore, for every countable infinite group  $G$  that contains a finite index normal subgroup  $G'$  isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^r$ , and for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we found a free minimal action with topological sequence entropy  $\log(n)$ , where  $m \leq n \leq m^{2^r [G:G']}$ . In both cases, we also show that the aforementioned minimal actions admit non-trivial independence tuples of size  $n$  but do not admit non-trivial independence tuples of size  $n + 1$  for some  $n \geq m$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Topological entropy is a measure of the complexity or unpredictability of a dynamical system. It serves as an invariant that helps to identify when two dynamical systems are not conjugate. Sequence entropy, a finer notion of entropy, was introduced by Kushnirenko ([27]) for measure preserving systems and by Goodman ([16]) for (topological) dynamical systems and is helpful to distinguish systems of zero entropy. The sequence entropy is similar to the classical entropy, the difference is that in the refinement for the sequence entropy is made using sequences of the acting group. It was noticed in [21], that the topological sequence entropy of a system can only take values of the form  $\log(n)$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ .

According to classical topological entropy, a question arise: Given a non-negative real number, can we construct a minimal dynamical system, over an amenable countable group, with the condition that the entropy of this system is the real number previously considered? Downarowicz, in [10], has answered this question in an affirmative way for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -actions; this result was extended for amenable group actions in [26, 28]. To answer this question, a particular family of dynamical systems, known as *Toeplitz subshifts*, was used. The previous question can be refined by imposing additional conditions on the dynamical system, such as freeness or unique ergodicity, see [11] and [22] for a treatment of this question for the uniquely ergodic condition in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  actions. Therefore, it seems natural to ask the same question for the topological sequence entropy of systems.

In this paper, we are interested in constructing minimal dynamical systems that have zero topological entropy but can achieve arbitrarily large, yet finite, topological sequence entropy. Moreover, for these examples we can guarantee that there exists

---

J. Gómez thanks the Physics Institute of the Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, where part of this work was done, for its hospitality.

I. León-Torres and V. Muñoz-López were supported by a CONAHCyT fellowship for their PhD studies and the grant K/NCN/000198 of the NCN.

a natural number for which the IT-tuples of the system are trivial. The first result of this document reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G$  be an infinite countable group such that  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a homomorphic image of  $G$ . For every  $m \geq 1$ , there exists a minimal subshift  $X \subseteq \{0, \dots, m-1\}^G$  with topological sequence entropy equal to  $\log(m)$ .*

In the previous theorem, if  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ , then the minimal subshift is also free, i.e., every element in this subshift has trivial stabilizer. However, when  $G \neq \mathbb{Z}$ , this is no longer true. When we regard about free dynamical systems for the question related to topological sequence entropy, we obtain the following.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $G$  be a group that contains a finite index normal subgroup  $G'$  with  $G' \cong \mathbb{Z}^r$ , for some  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . For every  $m \geq 2$ , there exists a free minimal subshift  $(X, \sigma, G)$  with zero entropy such that its topological sequence entropy is a value between  $\log(m)$  and  $\log(m^{2^r [G:G']})$ .*

To construct these examples we also use Toeplitz subshifts. These dynamical systems were defined by Jake and Keane in [23] for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -actions and [7], [8] for countable groups-actions. This family of dynamical systems has been useful by their ergodic diversity and entropy, as we can observe in the works [9], [10], [12], [26], [30] to mention some of them. Moreover, the maximal equicontinuous factor of these systems are well-known, they are called *G-odometers*. This relation between Toeplitz subshifts and *G-odometers* allow us to study the sequence entropy using independence tuples.

Independence is a combinatorial tool, introduced by Kerr and Li in [24], that helps us to study different dynamical properties, such as entropy, sequence entropy, and tameness. In the survey [13], we can see a broad overview of recent results relating of independence. We are interested in IN-tuples and IT-tuples that help us to characterize topological sequence entropy and tameness, respectively, and they allow us to calculate the topological sequence entropy through their relationship with the maximal equicontinuous factor and ergodic measures. In case of IN-tuples, positive topological sequence entropy is characterized with the existence of IN-pairs (IN-tuples of size two) of different elements. In a more general way, since IN-tuples are just the same of sequence entropy pairs, in case of tuples with different elements (see [24]), we can assert from [21] that topological sequence entropy is  $\log(n)$  where  $n$  is the natural number such that the dynamical system has an IN-tuple of size  $n$  with different elements and all IN-tuples of size  $n+1$  having at least two elements that are equals.

On the other hand, a dynamical system is called *tame* if the cardinality of its Ellis semigroup is at most that of the continuum. Moreover, IT-tuples characterize tameness as follows: A dynamical system is tame if and only if all IT-pairs are those pair of points which have same elements. In [18], it was studied the relationship between IT-tuples and the number of ergodic measures of minimal dynamical systems. We say that a dynamical system is *m-tame* if all IT-tuples of size  $m$  have at least two coordinates with the same element. A system which is not *m-tame*, for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we call it *m-untame*. From the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, we also deduce that the minimal subshifts presented in these theorems are *n-untame*, but *n+1-tame*, for  $n = m$  in Theorem 1.1, and for some  $m \leq n \leq m^{2^r [G:G']}$  in Theorem 1.2.

This work is divided as follows. In Section 2, we give basic notions concerning topological dynamics, as well as some background with respect to Toeplitz subshifts,  $G$ -odometers, independence and sequential entropy. At the end of Section 2, we discuss Theorem 1.2 for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -actions. In Section 3, we present the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is provided in Section 4, we split the cases in two, when the group is abelian finitely generated with positive free rank and when the group contains a normal subgroup which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^r$  for some  $r > 0$ .

**Acknowledgments:** The authors would like to thank Felipe García-Ramos for his guidance, insightful comments and valuable support during the development of this work. Additionally, the authors are grateful with Tobias Jäger for meaningful comments.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this article, integers, nonnegative integers and natural numbers are denoted by  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ , respectively.

**2.1. Dynamical systems and invariant measures.** Throughout this paper  $G$  represents an infinite countable group with identity  $1_G$ , and  $X$  a compact metric space. By a *dynamical system*  $(X, \varphi, G)$  we refer to a continuous action  $\varphi : G \times X \rightarrow X$ . We denote the image  $\varphi(g, x)$  as  $\varphi^g(x)$ . A system  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is called *minimal* if for every  $x \in X$  its orbit  $O_\varphi(x) = \{\varphi^g(x) : g \in G\}$  is dense in  $X$  and it is called *free* if  $\text{Stab}_\varphi(x) = \{1_G\}$  for every  $x \in X$ , where  $\text{Stab}_\varphi(x) = \{g \in G : \varphi^g(x) = x\}$  for  $x \in X$ . A Borel subset  $A \subseteq X$  is called invariant if  $\varphi^g(A) = A$  for every  $g \in G$ .

An *invariant measure* of the dynamical system  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is a Borel probability measure  $\mu$  of  $X$  that verifies  $\mu(\varphi^g(A)) = \mu(A)$ , for every  $g \in G$  and every Borel set  $A$ . An invariant measure  $\mu$  is called *ergodic* if  $\mu(A) = 0$  or  $\mu(A) = 1$  for every invariant subset  $A \subset X$ . The set of invariant measures of  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is denoted by  $M_G(X)$ . If  $\mu$  is an invariant measure of  $(X, \varphi, G)$ , the quadruple  $(X, \varphi, G, \mu)$  is called a *probability-measure-preserving (p.m.p) dynamical system*. Two p.m.p dynamical systems  $(X, \varphi, G, \mu)$  and  $(Y, \psi, G, \nu)$  are *measure conjugate* if: (i) there exist conull sets  $X' \subseteq X$  and  $Y' \subseteq Y$  satisfying  $\varphi^g(X') \subseteq X'$  and  $\psi^g(Y') \subseteq Y'$  for all  $g \in G$ , and (ii) there exists a bijective map  $f : X' \rightarrow Y'$  such that  $f, f^{-1}$  are both measurable,  $\nu(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A))$  for every measurable set  $A \subseteq Y'$ , and  $f(\varphi^g(x)) = \psi^g(f(x))$  for all  $x \in X'$  and  $g \in G$ . In this case, we say that  $f$  is a *measure conjugacy*.

Let  $(X, \varphi, G)$  and  $(Y, \psi, G)$  two dynamical systems. We say that  $(Y, \psi, G)$  is *factor* of  $(X, \varphi, G)$  through  $\pi$ , if  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  is a surjective continuous map such that  $\pi(\varphi^g x) = \psi^g(\pi(x))$  for each  $g \in G$  and  $x \in X$ . In this case, we say that  $\pi$  is a *factor map*. A factor map  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  is called *almost 1-1* if the set of points in  $Y$  having only one preimage is residual. In the case that  $X$  is minimal, this is equivalent to the existence of an element in  $Y$  with only one preimage.

A dynamical system  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is called *equicontinuous* if the family of maps  $\{\varphi^g : X \rightarrow X\}_{g \in G}$  is equicontinuous. There exists a unique factor  $(X_{\text{eq}}, \varphi_{\text{eq}}, G)$  of  $(X, \varphi, G)$  such that  $(X_{\text{eq}}, \varphi_{\text{eq}}, G)$  is equicontinuous, and if  $(Y, \psi, G)$  is an equicontinuous factor of  $(X, \varphi, G)$ , then  $(Y, \psi, G)$  is a factor of  $(X_{\text{eq}}, \varphi_{\text{eq}}, G)$ . The system  $(X_{\text{eq}}, \varphi_{\text{eq}}, G)$  is called the *maximal equicontinuous factor* and we denote by  $\pi_{\text{eq}}$  its correspondent factor map.

**2.2. Toeplitz  $G$ -subshifts and  $G$ -odometers.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite set with at least two elements endowed with the discrete topology. Consider the set

$$\Sigma^G = \{(x(g))_{g \in G} : x(g) \in \Sigma \text{ for every } g \in G\}$$

endowed with the product topology. The (left) shift action  $\sigma$  of  $G$  on  $\Sigma^G$  is defined as  $\sigma^g(x)(h) = x(g^{-1}h)$ , for all  $g, h \in G$  and  $x \in \Sigma^G$ . The dynamical system  $(\Sigma^G, \sigma, G)$  is known as a *full  $G$ -shift* (or full-shift) and each closed subset  $X \subseteq \Sigma^G$  that is a  $\sigma$ -invariant set is called a *subshift*. We also call to the system  $(X, \sigma, G)$  as a *subshift*.

An element  $x \in \Sigma^G$  is called a *Toeplitz array* or a *Toeplitz element* if for every  $g \in G$  there exists a finite index subgroup  $\Gamma$  of  $G$  such that  $\sigma^\gamma(x)(g) = x(\gamma^{-1}g) = x(g)$ , for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a subgroup of  $G$ ,  $x \in \Sigma^G$  and  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ . We define

$$\text{Per}(x, \Gamma, \alpha) = \{g \in G : x(\gamma^{-1}g) = \alpha \text{ for each } \gamma \in \Gamma\}$$

and

$$\text{Per}(x, \Gamma) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Sigma} \text{Per}(x, \Gamma, \alpha).$$

The following lemma can be found in [8].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a subgroup of  $G$  and  $x \in \Sigma^G$ . For each  $g \in G$  and  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ , it holds that*

$$\text{Per}(\sigma^g x, \Gamma, \alpha) = g \text{Per}(x, g^{-1}\Gamma g, \alpha).$$

A subgroup  $\Gamma \leq G$  is a *group of periods of  $x$*  if  $\text{Per}(x, \Gamma) \neq \emptyset$ . A group of periods  $\Gamma$  is called an *essential group of periods of  $x$*  if for every  $g \in G$  that satisfies  $\text{Per}(x, \Gamma, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Per}(\sigma^g x, \Gamma, \alpha)$  for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ , then we have  $g \in \Gamma$ .

Let  $x \in \Sigma^G$  be a Toeplitz array. A *period structure of  $x$*  is a nested sequence of finite index subgroups  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $G$  satisfying  $G = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n)$  and  $\Gamma_n$  is an essential group of periods of  $x$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . A *Toeplitz  $G$ -subshift* (or Toeplitz subshift) is the subshift generated by the closure of the  $\sigma$ -orbit of a Toeplitz array.

Let  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a nested sequence of finite index subgroups of  $G$  such that  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_n = \{1_G\}$ . The  *$G$ -odometer* associated to  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is defined as

$$\overleftarrow{G} = \left\{ (g_n \Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} G/\Gamma_n : \varphi_n(g_{n+1} \Gamma_{n+1}) = g_n \Gamma_n, \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N} \right\},$$

where  $\varphi_n : G/\Gamma_{n+1} \rightarrow G/\Gamma_n$  is the canonical projection for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . There is a natural action of  $G$  on  $\overleftarrow{G}$  given by the left coordinate-wise multiplication, i.e.,  $\phi^g((g_n \Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) = (gg_n \Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . The dynamical system  $(\overleftarrow{G}, \phi, G)$  is a free equicontinuous minimal Cantor system and it is also known as a  *$G$ -odometer*. If  $x \in \Sigma^G$  is a Toeplitz array with period structure  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , then  $\overleftarrow{G}$  is the maximal equicontinuous factor of the Toeplitz subshift  $X = \overline{O_\sigma(x)}$  given by the factor map  $\pi_{\text{eq}} : X \rightarrow \overleftarrow{G}$ , defined as  $\pi_{\text{eq}}(x) = (g_n \Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  when  $\sigma^{g_n} x \in C_n$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where

$$C_n = \{y \in X : \text{Per}(y, \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n, \alpha), \text{ for every } \alpha \in \Sigma\}.$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $x \in \Sigma^G$  be a Toeplitz array with period structure given by  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\overline{O_\sigma(x)} \subseteq \Sigma^G$  its Toeplitz subshift associated. Let  $\overleftarrow{G}$  be the  $G$ -odometer associated to  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\pi : \overline{O_\sigma(x)} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{G}$  be the factor map from  $\overline{O_\sigma(x)}$  into  $\overleftarrow{G}$ . If  $\pi(y) = \pi(y')$  for  $y, y' \in \overline{O_\sigma(x)}$ , then  $y(g) = y'(g)$  for each  $g \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(y, g_n^{-1} \Gamma_n g_n) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(y', g_n^{-1} \Gamma_n g_n)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\pi(y) = \pi(y') = (g_n \Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $g_n \in G$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By definition, we have  $\sigma^{g_n} y, \sigma^{g_n} y' \in C_n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore,  $\text{Per}(\sigma^{g_n} y, \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(\sigma^{g_n} y', \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n, \alpha)$  for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using Lemma 2.1 we deduce that  $\text{Per}(y, g_n^{-1} \Gamma_n g_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(y', g_n^{-1} \Gamma_n g_n, \alpha) = g_n^{-1} \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n, \alpha)$  and we conclude the lemma.  $\square$

**2.3. Independence and sequential entropy.** Let  $(X, \varphi, G)$  be a dynamical system,  $\mathcal{U}$  an open cover of  $X$  and  $S = (g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  a sequence of  $G$ . The *sequence entropy* of  $(X, \varphi, G)$  with respect  $\mathcal{U}$  along  $S$  is defined as

$$h_{top}^*(X, \varphi, G, \mathcal{U}; S) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} N \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^n \varphi^{g_n^{-1}} \mathcal{U} \right),$$

where  $N(\mathcal{C})$  is the minimal cardinality among all cardinalities of subcovers of  $\mathcal{C}$ . The *topological sequence entropy* of  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is given by

$$h_{top}^*(X, \varphi, G) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}, S} h_{top}^*(X, \varphi, G, \mathcal{U}; S),$$

where the supremum is taken over all open covers of  $X$  and all sequences of  $G$ . The system  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is called *null* if  $h_{top}^*(X, \varphi, G) = 0$  and *non-null* otherwise. For a tuple  $A = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  of subsets of  $X$ , we say that a set  $J \subseteq G$  is an *independence set* for  $A$  if for every non-empty finite subset  $I \subseteq J$  and function  $s : I \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$  we have

$$\bigcap_{g \in I} \varphi^{g^{-1}} A_{s(g)} \neq \emptyset.$$

A tuple  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$  is called an *n-IN-tuple* (*n-IT-tuple*) if for any product neighborhood  $U_1 \times \dots \times U_n$  of  $x$ , the tuple  $(U_1, \dots, U_n)$  has arbitrarily large finite independence sets (has an infinite independence set). We denote the set of *n-IN-tuples* and *n-IT-tuples* by  $\text{IN}_n(X)$  and  $\text{IT}_n(X)$ , respectively. Note that  $\text{IT}_n(X) \subseteq \text{IN}_n(X)$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Remark 2.3.** *If  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is a minimal dynamical system, then the tuple  $(x, \dots, x) \in X^n$  belongs to  $\text{IT}_n(X)$  for each  $x \in X$ . Furthermore, if  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \text{IN}_n(X)$ , then  $(x_1, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \text{IN}_{n+1}(X)$ .*

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the set

$$(1) \quad \Delta^{(n)}(X) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n : x_i = x_j \text{ for some } i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, i \neq j\}$$

**Proposition 2.4** ([24, Proposition 5.4]). *Let  $(X, \varphi, G)$  be a dynamical system. The following are true:*

- (1) *Let  $(A_1, \dots, A_k)$  be a tuple of closed subsets of  $X$  which has arbitrarily large finite independence sets. Then there exists an IN-tuple,  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  with  $x_j \in A_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k$ .*
- (2)  *$\text{IN}_2(X) \setminus \Delta^{(2)}(X) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $(X, \varphi, G)$  is non-null.*
- (3)  *$\text{IN}_k(X)$  is a closed  $G$ -invariant subset of  $X^k$ .*

**Proposition 2.5** ([21, Theorem 4.4]). *Let  $(X, \varphi, G)$  be a dynamical system. Then  $h_{top}^*(X, \varphi, G) = \log(\max\{n : \text{IN}_n(X) \setminus \Delta^{(n)}(X) \neq \emptyset\})$ .*

A tuple  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$  is called *n-regionally proximal* if for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $x'_1, \dots, x'_n \in X$  such that  $d(x_i, x'_i) < \varepsilon$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and there exists

$g \in G$  such that  $d(\varphi^g x'_i, \varphi^g x'_j) < \varepsilon$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We denote by  $Q_n(X, G)$  the collection of all  $n$ -regionally proximal tuples of  $(X, \varphi, G)$ .

The following proposition relates the IN-tuples to the regionally proximal tuples of a system.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $(X, \varphi, G)$  be a dynamical system,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ . If  $x \in \text{IN}_n(X)$ , then  $x$  is a  $n$ -regionally proximal tuple. In particular, every  $n$ -IT-tuple is an  $n$ -regionally proximal tuple.*

*Proof.* Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be an  $n$ -IN-tuple. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $U_i = B(x_i, \varepsilon/2)$ . For the sets  $U_1, \dots, U_n$  there exists an independence set  $J \subseteq G$  with  $|J| \geq 2$ . Let  $g, h \in J$  with  $g \neq h$ . By independence, for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\sigma_i : \{g, h\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  given by  $\sigma_i(g) = i$  and  $\sigma_i(h) = 1$ , we have that

$$\varphi^{g^{-1}} U_i \cap \varphi^{h^{-1}} U_1 \neq \emptyset.$$

Then, there exists  $y_i \in X$  such that  $\varphi^g y_i \in U_i$  and  $\varphi^h y_i \in U_1$ . Let  $x'_i = \varphi^g y_i \in U_i$  and  $g_0 = hg^{-1}$ . Observe  $\varphi^{g_0} x'_i = \varphi^{hg^{-1}} \varphi^g y_i = \varphi^h y_i \in U_1$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Thus,  $d(\varphi^{g_0} x'_i, \varphi^{g_0} x'_j) < \varepsilon$  for every  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Since  $x'_i \in U_i$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we deduce that  $x$  is an  $n$ -regionally proximal tuple.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.7** ([18, Proposition 3.7]). *Let  $(X, \varphi, G)$  be a minimal dynamical system and assume that the maximal equicontinuous factor map is 1-1. If  $|M^{\text{erg}}(X, G)| > l - 1$ , for some  $l \geq 2$ , then  $\text{IT}_l(X) \setminus \Delta^{(l)}(X) \neq \emptyset$ . In particular, it implies that  $\text{IN}_l(X) \setminus \Delta^{(l)}(X) \neq \emptyset$ .*

**2.4.  $\mathbb{Z}$ -Toeplitz subshifts.** In this subsection, we observe that the Toeplitz subshifts constructed in [30, Section 3] satisfy a stronger version of Theorem 1.2 when  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ .

Right below, we recall the construction of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -Toeplitz sequences made in [30]: Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Sigma = \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ . Fix a sequence of positive integers  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $p_i | p_{i+1}$  and  $p_i \geq 3$ ,  $\frac{p_{i+1}}{p_i} \geq 3$ , for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider the sequence  $(\alpha_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , given by  $\alpha_i = j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$  whenever  $j \equiv i \pmod{m}$ . The Toeplitz element  $\eta \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}}$  is defined inductively.

**Step 1:** Set  $\eta(n) = \alpha_1$ , for every  $n \equiv 0$  or  $n \equiv -1 \pmod{p_1}$ .

**Step 2:** For each  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  consider  $J(1, k) = [kp_1 + 1, (k+1)p_1 - 1]$ . Define  $\eta(n) = \alpha_2$  for every  $n \in J(1, k)$  with  $k \equiv 0$  or  $k \equiv -1 \pmod{\frac{p_2}{p_1}}$ .

**Step  $i+1$ :** For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote by  $J(i, k)$  the set of elements  $n \in [kp_i, (k+1)p_i]$  for which  $\eta(n)$  has not been defined at the end of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  step. Define  $\eta(n) = \alpha_{i+1}$  for  $n \in J(i, k)$  with  $k \equiv 0$  or  $k \equiv -1 \pmod{\frac{p_{i+1}}{p_i}}$ .

It is also guaranteed that if the series  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_i}{p_{i+1}}$  converges, then the set of ergodic measures of the Toeplitz subshift  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \subseteq \Sigma^G$  is in a one-to-one correspondence with  $\Sigma$ . Furthermore, it is shown that these systems have zero entropy and the odometer  $\overleftarrow{G}$  associated to the sequence  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the maximal equicontinuous factor of  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ .

Let us recall the following lemma, which is important for the proof of Proposition 2.9.

**Lemma 2.8** ([30, Lemma 3.3]). *For every  $g \in \overleftarrow{G}$  and  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  there exists  $x \in \pi_{\text{eq}}^{-1}(g)$  with  $\eta(n) = \alpha$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n)$ . Conversely, for every  $x \in \pi_{\text{eq}}^{-1}(g)$  there exists  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  such that  $\eta(n) = \alpha$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n)$ .*

The following proposition indicates that the previous systems are the one satisfying Theorem 1.2 for  $G = \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Proposition 2.9.** *For every  $m > 1$ , there exists a free minimal subshift  $X \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  with zero entropy such that  $h_{\text{top}}^*(X, \sigma, \mathbb{Z}) = \log(m)$ ,  $\text{IT}_m(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m)}(X) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\text{IT}_{m+1}(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m+1)}(X) = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $m \geq 2$ ,  $\Sigma = \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$  and  $\eta \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}}$  the Toeplitz element defined above with periodic structure given by  $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_i}{p_{i+1}}$  converges. Let  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \subseteq \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}}$  be the Toeplitz subshift associated to  $\eta$  and  $\overleftarrow{G}$  the  $G$ -odometer associated to the sequence  $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ . In the light of Lemma 2.2, if  $x, x' \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  are distinct elements such that  $\pi(x) = \pi(x')$ , then  $x(g) = x'(g)$  for  $g \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(x', \Gamma_n)$ . Therefore, Lemma 2.8 guarantees that the map  $\pi$  is at most  $m$  to 1. Therefore, we conclude that  $Q_{m+1}(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}, G) \setminus \Delta^{(m+1)}(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) = \emptyset$ . (See for instance [1, Chapter 9]). Applying Proposition 2.6 we guarantee that  $\text{IN}_{m+1}(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) \setminus \Delta^{(m+1)}(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) = \emptyset$ .

On the other side, since this system has exactly  $m$  ergodic measures, Proposition 2.7 guarantees that  $\text{IT}_m(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) \setminus \Delta^{(m)}(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) \neq \emptyset$ . The Proposition 2.5 concludes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. MINIMAL ACTIONS

In this section we present the proof of Theorem 1.1. To complete that, we mention some facts related to cellular automata induced by a group homomorphism. See [3] for a detailed presentation of this topic.

Let  $G_1, G_2$  be countable infinite groups, and  $\Sigma$  a finite set. For each  $\phi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$  group homomorphism define the map  $\phi^* : \Sigma^{G_2} \rightarrow \Sigma^{G_1}$  by  $\phi^*(x) = x \circ \phi$ . In this section, we denote by  $\sigma_{G_i}$  the shift action of  $G_i$  on  $\Sigma^{G_i}$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , defined in Section 2.2.

**Proposition 3.1** ([3, Lemma 1 and Lemma 2]). *Let  $\phi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$  be a homomorphism group. The cellular automaton  $\phi^* : \Sigma^{G_2} \rightarrow \Sigma^{G_1}$  is continuous and  $\phi$ -equivariant. That is, for every  $g \in G_1$  and  $x \in \Sigma^{G_2}$  we have*

$$\sigma_{G_1}^g \phi^*(x) = \phi^*(\sigma_{G_2}^{\phi(g)} x).$$

*Furthermore, if  $\phi$  is surjective, then  $\phi^*$  is injective.*

Next, we relate these notions with minimal subshifts.

**Proposition 3.2.** *If  $X \subseteq \Sigma^{G_2}$  is a minimal subshift, then  $\phi^*(X) \subseteq \Sigma^{G_1}$  is a minimal subshift.*

*Proof.* The previous proposition guarantees that  $\phi^*(X)$  is a subshift in  $\Sigma^{G_1}$ . Suppose that  $X$  is minimal subshift. Let  $y, y' \in \phi^*(X)$ . There exist  $x, x' \in X$  such that  $y = \phi^*(x)$  and  $y' = \phi^*(x')$ . We aim to prove that  $y' \in \overline{O_{\sigma_{G_1}}(y)}$ . Using that  $X$  is minimal, there exists a sequence  $(h_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq G_2$  such that  $\sigma_{G_2}^{h_i} x \rightarrow x'$  when  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . As  $\phi^*$  is continuous, we obtain that  $\phi^*(\sigma_{G_2}^{h_i} x) \rightarrow \phi^*(x')$  when  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, the fact

that  $\phi$  is surjective implies the existence of  $g_i \in G_1$  satisfying  $\phi(g_i) = h_i$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Finally, the  $\phi$ -equivariance of  $\phi^*$  implies that  $\sigma_{G_1}^{g_i} \phi^*(x) \rightarrow \phi^*(x')$  when  $i \rightarrow \infty$  as we wanted.  $\square$

In the following proposition, we describe the relation between  $\phi$ -equivariant maps and IN-tuples of a minimal subshift. This gives us a generalization of [24, Proposition 5.4 (4)].

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\phi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$  be a surjective group homomorphism, and let  $X \subseteq \Sigma^{G_2}$  and  $Y \subseteq \Sigma^{G_1}$  be minimal subshifts. If  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  is a surjective continuous map that is  $\phi$ -equivariant, then  $(\pi \times \cdots \times \pi)(\text{IN}_n(X)) = \text{IN}_n(Y)$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in (\pi \times \cdots \times \pi)(\text{IN}_n(X))$  and  $V_1 \times \cdots \times V_n$  a product neighborhood of  $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . There exists  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{IN}_n(X)$  such that  $y_i = \pi(x_i)$ , for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $U_i = \pi^{-1}(V_i)$ , for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . If  $J' \subseteq G_2$  is an independence set for  $(U_1, \dots, U_n)$ , for each  $h \in J'$  consider  $g_h \in G_1$  such that  $\phi(g_h) = h$ .

We claim that  $J = \{g_h \in G_1 : h \in J'\} \subseteq G_1$  is an independence set for  $(V_1, \dots, V_n)$ . Indeed, let  $s : J \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  be an arbitrary function and define  $s' : J' \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  as  $s'(h) := s(g_h)$ ,  $h \in J'$ . Using that  $J' \subseteq G_2$  is an independence set for  $(U_1, \dots, U_n)$ , there exists  $x \in \bigcap_{h \in J'} \sigma_{G_2}^{h^{-1}} U_{s'(h)}$ . Consequently,  $\pi(\sigma_{G_2}^h x) = \sigma_{G_1}^{g_h} \pi(x) \in V_{s(g_h)}$  for each  $g_h \in J$ . Therefore,  $\pi(x) \in \bigcap_{g_h \in J} \sigma_{G_1}^{g_h^{-1}} U_{s(g_h)}$ , which implies that  $J$  is an independence set for  $(V_1, \dots, V_n)$ . Furthermore, we have that  $|J| = |J'|$ . Since  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{IN}_n(X)$ , the tuple  $(U_1, \dots, U_n)$  has arbitrarily large finite independence sets. Hence,  $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \text{IN}_n(Y)$ .

Conversely, let  $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \text{IN}_n(Y)$ . Assume that  $y_1 \neq y_i$  for each  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $\overline{B}_k(y)$  denote the closed ball in  $Y$  of radius  $\frac{1}{k}$  and center in  $y \in Y$ , i.e.,  $\overline{B}_k(y) = \overline{B(y, \frac{1}{k})}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $Y$  is a metric space, there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\overline{B}_k(y_1) \cap \overline{B}_k(y_i) = \emptyset$  for every  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$  and  $k \geq K$ . As before, for  $k \geq K$ , we can guarantee that if  $J$  is an independence set for  $(\overline{B}_k(y_1), \dots, \overline{B}_k(y_n))$ , then  $\phi(J)$  is an independence set for  $(\pi^{-1}(\overline{B}_k(y_1)), \dots, \pi^{-1}(\overline{B}_k(y_n)))$ .

Now, we prove that  $|\phi(J)| = |J|$ . Let  $g, h \in J$  be such that  $g \neq h$ . Consider  $s_0 : J \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  given by  $s_0(g) = 1$  and  $s_0(h) = 2$ . Then, there exists  $y \in \pi(X)$  such that  $\sigma_{G_1}^g y \in \overline{B}_k(y_1)$  and  $\sigma_{G_1}^h y \in \overline{B}_k(y_2)$ . Using that  $\pi$  is surjective, there exists  $x \in X$  such that  $\pi(x) = y$  and by the  $\phi$ -equivariance of  $\pi$  we conclude  $\pi(\sigma_{G_2}^{\phi(g)} x) = \sigma_{G_1}^g y$  and  $\pi(\sigma_{G_2}^{\phi(h)} x) = \sigma_{G_1}^h y$ . Thus,  $\sigma_{G_2}^{\phi(g)} x \in \pi^{-1}(\overline{B}_k(y_1))$  and  $\sigma_{G_2}^{\phi(h)} x \in \pi^{-1}(\overline{B}_k(y_2))$ , which is only possible if  $\phi(g) \neq \phi(h)$  since these sets are disjoint.

For each  $k \geq K$ , the proposition 2.4 guarantees that there exists an  $n$ -IN tuple  $(x_k^1, \dots, x_k^n)$  in  $\pi^{-1}(\overline{B}_k(y_1)) \times \cdots \times \pi^{-1}(\overline{B}_k(y_n))$ . Since  $\text{IN}_n(X)$  is closed, then, possibly after taking a subsequence,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k^i = z_i$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \text{IN}_n(X)$ . On the other hand, the definition of the tuples  $(x_k^1, \dots, x_k^n)$  guarantees  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi(x_k^i) = y_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Therefore, we obtain  $y_i = \pi(z_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and we conclude the proof by assuming that the elements in the  $n$ -tuple are pairwise different. Otherwise, we use Remark 2.3 to restrict to the previous case.  $\square$



**Remark 3.4.** *The conclusion of the previous proposition holds even if we replace IN-tuples with IT-tuples.*

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $G$  be a group such that  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a homomorphic image of  $G$  with the group homomorphism given by  $\phi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $X \subseteq \{0, \dots, m-1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  be the Toeplitz subshift presented in subsection 2.4. From Proposition 3.2, we know that  $\phi^*(X)$  is a minimal subshift of  $\{0, \dots, m-1\}^G$  such that  $\text{Ker}(\phi)$  is contained in the stabilizer of each element  $y \in \phi^*(X)$ , i.e.,  $\text{Ker}(\phi) \subseteq \bigcap_{y \in \phi^*(X)} \text{Stab}(y)$ . Therefore, using the fact that  $\phi^*$  is injective along with Theorem 2.9 and Proposition 3.3 we conclude that  $\text{IN}_m(\phi^*(X)) \setminus \Delta^{(m)}(\phi^*(X)) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\text{IN}_{m+1}(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m+1)}(X) = \emptyset$ . The same conclusion holds if we replace IN with IT. Hence, we conclude the proof by using Proposition 2.5.  $\square$

#### 4. FREE MINIMAL ACTIONS

Recall that every infinite minimal  $\mathbb{Z}$ -dynamical system is free. However, when the acting group is different from  $\mathbb{Z}$ , this is no longer true. Consequently, the notion of freeness becomes more relevance (see, for instance, [14], [17]). Moreover, this notion has proven useful in characterizing the residually finiteness of a group through the existence of some free Toeplitz subshift (see [26]).

In this section, we provide a proof of Theorem 1.2. That is, we describe the zero entropy minimal free actions with bounded positive sequence entropy. Firstly, we focus on finitely generated abelian groups and afterward, we provide a proof for groups that have a normal subgroup isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  for some  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . To this end, we begin by recalling the construction of the Toeplitz arrays made in [6].

**4.1. Toeplitz arrays.** Let  $G$  be a countable infinite group,  $\Sigma = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  for  $n \geq 2$ , and  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  a strictly decreasing sequence of normal subgroups of finite index of  $G$  such that  $\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_i = \{1_G\}$ . Lemma 2.9 in [6] guarantees the existence of an increasing sequence of finite sets  $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $G$  such that for each  $i \geq 1$ ,

- $D_i$  is a fundamental domain of  $G/\Gamma_i$ .
- $\{1_G\} \subseteq D_i \subseteq D_{i+1}$ .
- $G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} D_i$ .
- For each  $i < j$ ,  $D_j = \bigcup_{\gamma \in D_j \cap \Gamma_i} \gamma D_i$ .

Let  $(\alpha_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \Sigma$  be the sequence given by  $\alpha_i = j \in \Sigma$  when  $i \equiv j \pmod{n}$ . The sequence  $\eta \in \Sigma^G$  is defined as follows:

**Step 1:** Let  $J(0) = 1_G$ , and define  $\eta(g) = \alpha_1$  for every  $g \in \Gamma_1$ .

**Step 2:** Define  $J(1) = D_1 \setminus \Gamma_1$ . For every  $h \in J(1)$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_2$ ,  $\eta(\gamma h) = \alpha_2$ .

**Step m+1:** Consider

$$J(m) = D_m \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} J(i)\Gamma_{i+1}.$$

Define  $\eta(\gamma h) = \alpha_{m+1}$  for every  $h \in J(m)$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{m+1}$ .

This construction defines a Toeplitz array  $\eta$  such that  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a period structure for  $\eta$ . Therefore, there exists a factor map  $\pi : \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{G}$ , where  $\overleftarrow{G}$  is the  $G$ -odometer associated to  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and also it is the maximal equicontinuous factor of

$\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ . Furthermore, when  $G$  is amenable and

$$(2) \quad [\Gamma_i : \Gamma_{i+1}] > \frac{1}{1 - 1/2^{(1/2)^{i+1}}}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N},$$

$\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  has exactly  $n$  ergodic measures with zero entropy.

The following lemma and corollary were proved in [6]. We provide the proofs of these statements in order to clarify the discussion in Section 4.3.

**Lemma 4.1** ([6, Lemma 4.11]). *For every  $i \geq 1$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ , there exists  $l \geq i$  such that  $\gamma J(i) \subseteq \Gamma_{l+1} J(l)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $J(i) = D_i \setminus \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_i)$ , we have  $\gamma J(i) \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_i) = \emptyset$ . This implies that

$$\gamma J(i) \subseteq \bigcup_{l \geq i} \Gamma_{l+1} J(l).$$

Let  $l = \min\{k \geq i : \gamma J(i) \cap \Gamma_{k+1} J(k) \neq \emptyset\}$ . Let  $u \in J(i)$  be such that  $\gamma u = \gamma_{l+1} v_l$ , for some  $v_l \in J(l)$  and  $\gamma_{l+1} \in \Gamma_{l+1}$ . Since  $v_l \in D_l$ , there exist  $v \in D_i$  and  $\gamma' \in \Gamma_i \cap D_l$  such that  $v_l = \gamma' v$ . The relation  $\gamma u = \gamma_{l+1} v_l$  implies  $v = u$  and  $\gamma = \gamma' \gamma'_{l+1}$ , for some  $\gamma'_{l+1} \in \Gamma_{l+1}$ . Thus if  $s \in J(i)$  then  $\gamma s = \gamma' \gamma'_{l+1} s = \gamma' s \gamma''_{l+1}$ , for some  $\gamma''_{l+1} \in \Gamma_{l+1}$ . This implies that  $\gamma s \in \Gamma_{l+1} D_l \subseteq \Gamma_{l+1} J(l) \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^{l-1} \Gamma_{k+1} J(k)$ . The choice of  $l$  implies that  $\gamma s \in \Gamma_{l+1} J(l)$ , and then  $\gamma J(i) \subseteq \Gamma_{l+1} J(l)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.2** ([6, Corollary 4.12]). *For every  $i \geq 0$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ , there exists  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  such that*

$$\eta(g) = \alpha \text{ for every } g \in \gamma J(i).$$

*Proof.* The case  $i = 0$  is trivial. Suppose that  $i \geq 1$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ .

From Lemma 4.1, there exists  $l \geq i$  such that  $\gamma J(i) \subseteq \Gamma_{l+1} J(l)$ . By the definition of  $\eta$  we get  $\eta(g) = \alpha_{l+1}$ , for every  $g \in \gamma J(i)$ .  $\square$

For  $x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ , let  $\pi(x) = (t_i(x) \Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \overleftarrow{G}$  be the image of  $x$  in  $\overleftarrow{G}$ ,  $t_i(x) \in D_i$ , and  $\text{Aper}(x)$  the subset in  $G$  given by

$$\text{Aper}(x) = G \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Per}(x, t_i(x)^{-1} \Gamma_i t_i(x)).$$

**Remark 4.3.** *The subset  $\text{Aper}(x)$  depends only on  $\pi(x)$ . That is, for  $x, y \in \pi^{-1}(\{\pi(x)\})$  it holds  $\text{Aper}(x) = \text{Aper}(y)$ . Moreover, by the definition of  $\pi : \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{G}$  and Lemma 2.2, we obtain  $x(g) = y(g)$ , for each  $g \in G \setminus \text{Aper}(x)$ .*

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  and  $\pi(x) = (t_i(x) \Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $t_i(x) \in D_i$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . It holds that the map  $x|_{t_i(x)^{-1} \gamma J(i)}$  is constant for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ . That is, there exists  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  such that  $x(d) = \alpha$  for every  $d \in t_i(x)^{-1} \gamma J(i)$ . In particular,  $x(d) = \alpha$  for every  $d \in (t_i(x)^{-1} \gamma D_i) \cap \text{Aper}(x)$ .*

*Proof.* By definition of  $\pi$ ,  $x \in \sigma^{(t_i(x))^{-1}} C_i$ . Since  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  is minimal, there exists a sequence  $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq G$  such that  $\sigma^{g_k} \eta$  converges to  $x$ . Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\sigma^{(t_i(x))^{-1}} C_i$  is a clopen set, we deduce that there exists  $k'_i \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\sigma^{g_j} \eta \in \sigma^{(t_i(x))^{-1}} C_i$  for every  $j \geq k'_i$ . Consequently, for each  $j \geq k'_i$ , there exists  $\gamma_i^j \in \Gamma_i$  satisfying  $g_j = (t_i(x))^{-1} \gamma_i^j$ . Since  $\sigma^{(t_i(x))^{-1} \gamma_i^j} \eta \rightarrow x$  when  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$  we can pick  $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$  (which depends on  $\gamma$ ) with  $k_i \geq k'_i$  so that  $(t_i(x))^{-1} \gamma J(i) \subseteq D_{k_i}$ . Moreover, there exists  $t_{k_i} \in \mathbb{N}$  so that  $\sigma^{g_j} \eta \in \sigma^{(t_i(x))^{-1}} C_i$  and  $\sigma^{g_j} \eta(d) = x(d)$  for

every  $d \in D_{k_i}$ ,  $j \geq t_{k_i}$ . For  $d = (t_i(x))^{-1}\gamma d_i \in (t_i(x))^{-1}\gamma J(i)$ , we have  $\sigma^{g_j}\eta(d) = \eta(g_j^{-1}d) = \eta((\gamma_i^j)^{-1}t_i(x)d) = \eta((\gamma_i^j)^{-1}\gamma d_i)$ . Since  $\eta|_{(\gamma_i^j)^{-1}\gamma J(i)}$  is constant by the previous corollary, we deduce that  $x|_{(t_i(x))^{-1}\gamma J(i)}$  is constant.

Furthermore, for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$

$$\begin{aligned} (t_i(x))^{-1}\gamma D_i \cap \text{Aper}(x) &\subseteq t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma D_i \cap (G \setminus \text{Per}(x, t_i(x)^{-1}\Gamma_i t_i(x))) \\ &= t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma D_i \cap (G \setminus \text{Per}(\sigma^{(t_i(x))^{-1}}\eta, t_i(x)^{-1}\Gamma_i t_i(x))) \\ &= t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma D_i \cap (G \setminus \text{Per}(\sigma^{t_i(x)^{-1}}\eta, t_i(x)^{-1}\Gamma_i t_i(x))) \\ &= (t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma)(D_i \setminus \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_i)) \\ &= t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma J(i). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**4.2. Abelian finitely generated groups.** Let  $G$  be a torsion-free finitely generated abelian group of rank  $r > 1$ , i.e.,  $G = \mathbb{Z}^r$ . Let  $S = \{\pm \tilde{e}_j : 1 \leq j \leq r\}$  be the canonical symmetric set of generators of  $G$ . That is,  $\tilde{e}_j$  is the element  $\tilde{e}_j = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ , where the element 1 is in the  $j$ -th position.

For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\Gamma_i$  be the subgroup given by

$$(3) \quad \Gamma_i = \langle p_j^i \tilde{e}_j : 1 \leq j \leq r \rangle_G,$$

where  $(p_j^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $p_j^i \rightarrow \infty$  when  $i \rightarrow \infty$  and  $p_j^i | p_j^{i+1}$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . Up to taking subsequences, if necessary, we can assume that  $p_j^i > 2i + 1$  and that  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies (2). Now, for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  consider  $D'_i \subseteq G$  as some set of the form

$$(4) \quad D'_i = \{(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r : -q_{1,j}^i \leq x_j < q_{2,j}^i, 1 \leq j \leq r\},$$

for some  $q_{t,j}^i > i$ ,  $t \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $q_{1,j}^i + q_{2,j}^i = p_j^i$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and  $D'_i \subseteq D'_{i+1}$ . Observe that  $(D'_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of finite subsets of  $G$  such that  $D'_i$  is a fundamental domain of  $G/\Gamma_i$  and  $G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} D'_i$ . The proof of Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 in [9] guarantees the existence of a sequence of natural numbers  $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and a sequence of finite subsets of  $G$ ,  $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , such that

- $D_1 = D'_1$ .
- $D_i = \bigcup_{\gamma \in D'_{n_i} \cap \Gamma_{n_{i-1}}} \gamma + D_{i-1} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in D_i \cap \Gamma_{n_{i-1}}} \gamma + D_{i-1}$ , for  $i \geq 2$ .
- $D'_i \subseteq D_i$ . In particular,  $G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} D_i$ .
- $D_i$  is a fundamental domain of  $G/\Gamma_{n_i}$ .
- $\bar{0} = (0, \dots, 0) \in D_i \subseteq D_{i+1}$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Følner sequence for  $G$ .

Notice  $D_i$  has the form given in (4),  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, if necessary, we can take a subsequence of  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $n_i = i$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $d \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ , denote by  $B(d, m)$  the hypercube in  $\mathbb{Z}^r$  which is centered at  $d = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$  and whose sides measure  $2m + 1$ , i.e.,

$$(5) \quad B(d, m) = \{(z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r : -m \leq z_i - d_i \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq r\}.$$

Define  $b(m) := |B(\bar{0}, m)|$ . Then, for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\frac{b(m+1)}{b(m)} = \left(1 + \frac{2}{2m+1}\right)^r = 1 + \frac{1}{2m+1}y'.$$

Note that  $\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}y'$  goes to 0 as  $m$  goes to infinity. Therefore, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for each  $m \geq m_0$

$$(6) \quad \frac{b(m+s)}{b(m)} < 1 + \varepsilon.$$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $n, s \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $d \in D_n$ . If  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{n+s}$  is such that  $d \in \gamma + D_{n+s}$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{2^r}b(s) \leq |B(d, s) \cap \gamma + D_{n+s}|.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{n+s}$  be such that  $d \in \gamma + D_{n+s}$ . Since  $D_{n+s}$  has the form described in (4), it holds that at least one of the sets  $d + O$  is contained in  $\gamma + D_{n+s}$ , where

$$O = \{(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r : 0 \leq \epsilon_j x_j \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq r\},$$

for some  $\epsilon_j \in \{-1, 1\}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . The set  $O$  contains a  $\frac{1}{2^r}$  part of the hypercube  $[-s, s]^r$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^r$ . Thus,  $|O \cap B(\bar{0}, s)| \geq \frac{|B(\bar{0}, s)|}{2^r}$ , as we desired.  $\square$

For  $n \geq 2$ , let  $\Sigma = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\eta \in \Sigma^G$  the Toeplitz array presented in 4.1 associated to the sequence  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  given by (3) and  $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  the sequence of fundamental domains for  $G/\Gamma_i$  previously presented. The subshift  $X = \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  denotes the Toeplitz subshift associated to  $\eta$ .

Recall that for  $x \in X$  we denote  $\pi(x) = (t_i(x) + \Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  as the image under the map  $\pi : X \rightarrow \overleftarrow{G}$  from  $X$  to its maximal equicontinuous factor  $\overleftarrow{G}$ , where  $t_i(x) \in D_i$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . For each  $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$ , denote by  $T_\zeta(x)$  the union of sets of the form  $-t_j(x) + \gamma_j^\zeta + D_j$ , where for each  $j \geq 0$ ,  $\gamma_{i+j}^\zeta$  is the only element in  $\Gamma_{i+j}$  such that  $-t_{i+j}(x) + \gamma_{i+j}^\zeta + D_{i+j} \supseteq -t_{i+(j-1)}(x) + \gamma_{i+(j-1)}^\zeta + D_{i+(j-1)}$  and  $\gamma_i^\zeta = \zeta$ , i.e.,

$$T_\zeta(x) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} -t_{i+j}(x) + \gamma_{i+j}^\zeta + D_{i+j}.$$

**Remark 4.6.** *If  $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ , then  $-t_i(x) + \zeta + D_i = -t_i(y) + \zeta + D_i$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$ . Hence,  $T_\zeta(x) = T_\zeta(y)$ .*

**Lemma 4.7.** *For each  $x \in X$ , there exist  $\beta \leq 2^r$  and  $\zeta_{n_i} \in \Gamma_{n_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \beta$ , such that*

$$G = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\beta} T_{\zeta_{n_i}}(x).$$

*Proof.* Since  $G = -t_n(x) + \Gamma_n + D_n$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist finite elements  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_s \in \Gamma_n$  such that  $B(\bar{0}, n) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^s (-t_n(x) + \gamma_i + D_n)$  satisfies that  $(-t_n(x) + \gamma_i + D_n) \cap B(\bar{0}, n) \neq \emptyset$ . We also remark that are the only elements that satisfy the previous condition. Therefore, we conclude

$$G = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\beta} T_{\zeta_{n_i}}(x),$$

for some  $\beta \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $\zeta_{n_i} \in \Gamma_{n_i}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \beta$ .

Now, we prove that  $\beta \leq 2^r$ . By contradiction, assume that  $\beta > 2^r$ . Thus, for some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $\beta' \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $\beta \geq \beta' > 2^r$  and  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{\beta'} \in \Gamma_{n_0}$  such that

the sets  $T_{\zeta_i}(x), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \beta'\}$  are pairwise disjoint,  $B(\bar{0}, n_0) \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\beta'} -t_{n_0}(x) + \gamma_i + D_{n_0}$  and  $T_{\zeta_i}(x) \cap B(\bar{0}, n_0) \neq \emptyset$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq \beta'$ . Therefore, we have that  $-t_{n_0}(x) + \zeta_i + d_i \in B(\bar{0}, n_0)$  for some  $d_i \in D_{n_0}, 1 \leq i \leq \beta'$ . Consequently,  $B(-t_{n_0}(x) + \zeta_i + d_i, s) \subseteq B(\bar{0}, n_0 + s)$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, we have

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\beta'} B(-t_{n_0}(x) + \zeta_i + d_i, s) \cap (-t_{n_0+s}(x) + \gamma_{n_0+s}^{\zeta_i} + D_{n_0+s}) \subseteq B(\bar{0}, n_0 + s),$$

for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , which implies

$$(7) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\beta'} |B(-t_{n_0}(x) + \zeta_i + d_i, s) \cap (-t_{n_0+s}(x) + \gamma_{n_0+s}^{\zeta_i} + D_{n_0+s})| \leq b(n_0 + s).$$

Using (6) with  $\varepsilon < \frac{\beta'}{2^r} - 1$  and  $s = n_0$ , we obtain that there exists  $s \geq 1$  such that

$$\frac{b(n_0 + s)}{b(s)} < 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Combining this with (7) and Lemma 4.5 we obtain

$$\frac{\beta'}{2^r} b(s) < (1 + \varepsilon) b(s),$$

which is a contradiction with the choice of  $\varepsilon$ . Thus,  $\beta \leq 2^r$  and we conclude the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $x \in X$  be a non-Toeplitz element and  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . For every  $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$  there exists  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  such that  $x(d) = \alpha$  for every  $d \in T_\zeta(x) \cap \text{Aper}(x)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d, d' \in T_\zeta(x) \cap \text{Aper}(x)$ . By the construction of  $T_\zeta(x)$  there exists  $j_0 \geq 0$  such that  $d, d' \in -t_{i+j_0}(x) + \gamma_{i+j_0}^\zeta + D_{i+j_0}$ . Using Lemma 4.4, we obtain that  $x(d) = x(d')$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.9.** *It holds that  $|\pi^{-1}(\{\pi(x)\})| \leq |\Sigma|^{2^r}$  for every  $x \in X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in X$  and  $\bar{g} = \pi(x)$ . If  $x$  is a Toeplitz element, we already know that  $|\pi^{-1}(\bar{g})| = |\{x\}| = 1$ . Assume  $x \in X$  is a non-Toeplitz element. Lemma 4.7 guarantees a decomposition of  $G$  using at most  $2^r$  sets of the form  $T_\zeta$  for some  $\zeta \in \Gamma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Remark 4.3 implies that for  $y, z \in \pi^{-1}(\{\bar{g}\})$ , it holds that  $y(g) = z(g)$  for each  $g \in G \setminus \text{Aper}(x)$ . On the other hand, Lemma 4.8 implies that for each  $y \in \pi^{-1}(\{\bar{g}\}), y|_{T_\zeta(x) \cap \text{Aper}(x)}$  is constant. Thus,  $\pi^{-1}(\{\bar{g}\})$  has at most  $|\Sigma|^{2^r}$  elements.  $\square$

The previous proposition and Proposition 2.6 imply the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.10.** *If  $s > |\Sigma|^{2^r}$ , then  $\text{IN}_s(X) \setminus \Delta^{(s)}(X) = \emptyset$ .*

**Corollary 4.11.** *It holds that  $\log(m) \leq h_{top}^*(X, \sigma, \mathbb{Z}^r) \leq \log(m^{2^r}), \text{IT}_m(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m)}(X) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\text{IT}_{m^{2^r}+1}(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m^{2^r}+1)}(X) = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* As a consequence of (2),  $X$  has exactly  $m$  ergodic measures. Therefore,  $\text{IT}_m(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m)}(X) \neq \emptyset$  by Proposition 2.7. We conclude the proof by using Corollary 4.10 and Proposition 2.5.  $\square$

The statement below is a version of Theorem 1.2 for  $G = \mathbb{Z}^r$ , and it is a direct consequence of Corollary 4.11.

**Corollary 4.12.** *Let  $r \geq 2$ . For every  $m \geq 2$ , there exists a free minimal subshift  $X \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}^{\mathbb{Z}^r}$  with zero entropy such that  $\log(m) \leq h_{top}^*(X, \sigma, \mathbb{Z}^r) \leq \log(m^{2^r})$ ,  $\text{IT}_m(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m)}(X) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\text{IT}_{m^{2^r+1}}(X) \setminus \Delta^{(m^{2^r+1})}(X) = \emptyset$ .*

**4.3. Virtually  $\mathbb{Z}^r$  groups.** Let  $G$  be a group with a finite index normal subgroup  $G'$  that is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^r$ , for some  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  the sequence of finite index subgroups of  $\mathbb{Z}^r$  subgroups given in (3) with the extra property given in (2). Let  $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $(D'_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequences defined in Section 4.2. We slightly abuse notation by assuming that the sequences  $(\Gamma_n)$ ,  $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(D'_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  are sequences of  $G'$  instead of  $\mathbb{Z}^r$ . Since  $G'$  is a subgroup of finite index in  $G$ , there exists a finite subset  $R \subseteq G$  such that  $R$  is a set of representatives for  $G/G'$  that contains  $1_G$ . The sequence  $(D_i R)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $D_i R = \{dr \in G : d \in D_i, r \in R\}$ , is the adequate sequence for the construction in this case. This sequence has the following properties: For each  $i \geq 1$ ,

- $1_G \in D_i R$  and  $D_i R$  is a set of representatives for  $\Gamma_i \backslash G$ , the set of right cosets of  $\Gamma_i$  in  $G$ .
- $D_i R \subseteq D_{i+1} R$ .
- $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} D_i R = G$ .
- $D_{i+1} R = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_i \cap D_{i+1}} \gamma D_i R$ .

Moreover, it satisfies the left Følner condition.

**Lemma 4.13.** *It holds that  $(D_i R)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a left Følner sequence for  $G$ , i.e., for every  $g \in G$*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|D_i R g \setminus D_i R|}{|D_i R|} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Notice that for each  $g \in G$ , there exists  $d \in G'$  and  $s \in R$  such that  $g = ds$ . Let  $r \in R$ . As  $G'$  is normal in  $G$ , there exists  $d_r \in G'$  such that  $rd = d_r r$ . Therefore,  $rg = d_r r s = d_r t_r s_r$ , where  $rs = t_r s_r$  for some  $t_r \in G'$  and  $s_r \in R$ . Thus, for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|D_i R g \setminus D_i R|}{|D_i R|} &= \frac{|\left(\bigcup_{r \in R} D_i d_r t_r s_r\right) \setminus D_i R|}{|D_i R|} \\ &\leq \sum_{r \in R} \frac{|d_r t_r D_i s_r \setminus D_i R|}{|D_i R|} \\ &\leq \sum_{r \in R} \frac{|d_r t_r D_i R \setminus D_i R|}{|D_i R|} \\ &= \sum_{r \in R} \frac{|d_r t_r D_i \setminus D_i|}{|D_i|}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof concludes using the fact that  $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Følner sequence for  $G'$ .  $\square$

Denote  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, m, \beta\}$ , where  $\beta$  is a symbol that is not in  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ . Given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we construct  $\eta \in \Sigma^G$  in such a way that its subshift associated,  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ , satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1.2. This construction is analogous to that presented in [6], except that in this case  $\Gamma_i$  is not necessarily normal in  $G$  and the tiling condition for the sequence  $(D_i R)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  differs from that assumed in [6]. Let  $(\alpha_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence defined by  $\alpha_i = j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  if  $i \equiv j \pmod{m}$ . We define  $\eta \in \Sigma^G$  as follows:

**Step 1:** Consider  $J(0) = \{1_G\}$ . Define  $\eta(g) = \alpha_1$  for every  $g \in \Gamma_1 J(0)$ , and  $\eta(g) = \beta$  for each  $g \in \Gamma_1(R \setminus \{1_G\})$ .

**Step 2:** Consider  $J(1) = D_1 \setminus J(0)\Gamma_1$ . Define  $\eta(g) = \alpha_2$  for every  $g \in \Gamma_2 J(1)R$ .

**Step  $n + 1$ :** Let

$$J(n) = D_n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \Gamma_{i+1} J(i).$$

Define  $\eta(g) = \alpha_{n+1}$  for each  $g \in \Gamma_{n+1} J(n)R$ .

This construction yields a Toeplitz array in  $\Sigma^G$ . Next, we need some technical lemmas that describe the behavior of the sets  $J(n)$  and the period set of  $\eta \in \Sigma^G$  as constructed before. The following lemma is proven similarly to [6, Lemma 4.2]

**Lemma 4.14.** *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , it holds that*

$$J(n) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in (D_n \cap \Gamma_{n-1}) \setminus \{1_G\}} \gamma J(n-1).$$

**Lemma 4.15.** *For every  $n \geq 1$  it is true that*

$$\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \Gamma_{i+1} J(i)R.$$

Furthermore,  $\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_1, \beta) = \Gamma_1(R \setminus \{1_G\})$  and  $\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_1, \alpha_1) = \Gamma_1$ .

*Proof.* From the construction, it follows that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \Gamma_{i+1} J(i)R \subseteq \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n)$ . Now, if  $g \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \Gamma_{i+1} J(i)R$  we can consider  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ ,  $r \in R$  and  $d \in D_n$  so that  $g = \gamma dr$ . Moreover, we have  $dr \in (D_n R \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n)) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \Gamma_{i+1} J(i)R$  and it in turn implies  $d \in J(n)$ . This is a contradiction with the fact that for every  $\gamma \in (\Gamma_n \cap D_{n+1}) \setminus \{1_G\}$  we have that  $\eta(\gamma dr) = \alpha_{n+2}$  and  $\eta(dr) = \alpha_{n+1}$ . The second part of the lemma follows analogously.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.16.** *For every  $n \geq 2$  and  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , it holds*

$$\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n R = (\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n)R.$$

*Proof.* Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Consider  $dr \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n R$ , where  $d \in D_n$  and  $r \in R$ . Lemma 4.15 implies that  $d \in J(i)$  for some  $i \leq n-1$ . Furthermore, we conclude that  $\eta(\gamma dr) = \eta(\gamma d) = \alpha$  for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{i+1}$ , in particular, for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ . Therefore,  $d \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n$  and consequently,  $\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n R \subseteq (\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n)R$ . For the converse, if  $dr \in (\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n)R$ , then  $d \in J(i)$  for some  $i \leq n-1$  and the definition of  $\eta$  implies that  $\eta(\gamma dr) = \eta(\gamma d)$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ . Therefore,  $dr \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n R$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.17.** *The sequence  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a period structure for  $\eta$ .*

*Proof.* We use induction on  $i$ : For  $i = 1$ , let us assume that for some  $g \in G$

$$(8) \quad \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_1, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Per}(\sigma^g \eta, \Gamma_1, \alpha), \text{ for each } \alpha \in \Sigma.$$

There exist  $d \in G'$  and  $r \in R$  such that  $g = dr$ . Assume that  $r \neq 1_G$ . Using that  $\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_1, \beta) = \Gamma_1(R \setminus \{1_G\})$ , we obtain  $\eta(g^{-1}\gamma r') = \beta$  for every  $r' \in R \setminus \{1_G\}$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$ . In particular,  $\eta(r^{-1}d^{-1}r) = \beta$ . By definition of  $\eta$ ,  $r^{-1}dr \in \Gamma_1(R \setminus \{1_G\})$ , which is a contradiction since  $r^{-1}dr \in G'$ . Thus,  $r = 1_G$ . From (8) and the fact that

$G'$  is commutative, we deduce  $g^{-1} \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_1, \alpha_1)$  and consequently,  $g^{-1} \in \Gamma_1$ , as we desired.

Assume the result is true for  $i - 1 \geq 1$ . Let  $g \in G$  be such that  $\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_i, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Per}(\sigma^g \eta, \Gamma_i, \alpha)$  for each  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m, \beta\}$ . For each  $\gamma_{i-1} \in \Gamma_{i-1}$ , there exist  $\gamma \in D_i \cap \Gamma_{i-1}$  and  $\gamma_i \in \Gamma_i$  so that  $\gamma_{i-1} = \gamma \gamma_i$ . If  $w \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_{i-1}, \alpha)$ , then  $\gamma w \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_{i-1}, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_i, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Per}(\sigma^g \eta, \Gamma_i, \alpha)$ . Therefore,  $\alpha = \sigma^g \eta(\gamma w) = \sigma^g \eta(\gamma \gamma_i w) = \sigma^g \eta(\gamma_{i-1} w)$ , it means that  $w \in \text{Per}(\sigma^g \eta, \Gamma_{i-1}, \alpha)$ . Using the hypothesis of induction we conclude that  $g \in \Gamma_{i-1}$ .

If  $g \in \Gamma_{i-1} \setminus \Gamma_i$ , there exists  $\gamma \in (\Gamma_{i-1} \cap D_i) \setminus \{1_G\}$  and  $\gamma_i \in \Gamma_i$  such that  $g^{-1} = \gamma \gamma_i$ . If  $h \in J(i-1) \subseteq \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_i, \alpha_i) \subseteq \text{Per}(\sigma^g \eta, \Gamma_i, \alpha_i)$ , then  $\sigma^g \eta(\gamma' h) = \eta(g^{-1} \gamma' h) = \alpha_i$  for every  $\gamma' \in \Gamma_i$ . In particular, we have  $\eta(\gamma h) = \alpha_i$ . But this gives us a contradiction with the fact that  $\gamma h \in J(i) \subseteq \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_{i+1}, \alpha_{i+1})$  and  $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_{i+1}$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Consider the (right)  $G$ -odometer given by

$$\overleftarrow{G} = \{(\Gamma_n g_n) \in \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_n \setminus G : \Gamma_n g_{n+1} = \Gamma_n g_n, \text{ for each } n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where  $\Gamma_n \setminus G$  is the set of right cosets of  $\Gamma_n$  in  $G$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The left action  $\varphi$  of  $G$  on  $\overleftarrow{G}$  is given by  $\varphi^g((\Gamma_n g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) = (\Gamma_n g_n g^{-1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  for each  $g \in G$  and  $(\Gamma_n g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \overleftarrow{G}$ . Recall that the dynamical system  $(\overleftarrow{G}, \varphi, G)$  is uniquely ergodic. We denote this invariant measure by  $\mu$ . The previous proposition and [8, Proposition 7] guarantee that  $(\overleftarrow{G}, \varphi, G)$  is the maximal equicontinuous factor of  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  with factor map given by  $\pi : \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{G}$ ,  $\pi(x) = (\Gamma_n g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  if and only if  $x \in \sigma^{g_n^{-1}} C_n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where

$$C_n = \{x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} : \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha), \text{ for every } \alpha \in \Sigma\}.$$

and  $\{\sigma^{v^{-1}} C_n : v \in D_n R\}$  is a clopen partition of  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  (see [8]).

Now, we prove that  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  has exactly  $m$  ergodic measures. For that, we use the procedure used in [6].

For  $n \geq 1$ , define  $\eta_n \in \Sigma^G$  as

$$\eta_n(\gamma D_n R) = \eta(D_n R), \text{ for every } \gamma \in \Gamma_n,$$

that is,  $\eta_n(\gamma g) = \eta(g)$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$  and  $g \in D_n R$ . Thus we have  $\sigma^\gamma(\eta_n) = \eta_n$ , for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ , which implies that  $O_\sigma(\eta_n) = \{\sigma^{u^{-1}}(\eta_n) : u \in D_n R\}$ . From this, we can define the following periodic measures on  $\Sigma^G$ ,

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{|D_n R|} \sum_{u \in D_n R} \delta_{\sigma^{u^{-1}}(\eta_n)}.$$

Let  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $[i]$  be the subset of all  $x \in \Sigma^G$  such that  $x(1_G) = i$ .

For every  $n$  such that  $n + 1 \equiv i \pmod{m}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n([i]) &= \frac{|J(n)R| + |\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, i) \cap D_n R|}{|D_n R|} \geq \frac{|J(n)R|}{|D_n R|} = 1 - \frac{|D_n \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n)|}{|D_n|}, \\ \mu_n([j]) &= \frac{|\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, j) \cap D_n R|}{|D_n R|} \leq \frac{|D_n \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n)|}{|D_n|}, \text{ for } j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i\}, \\ \mu_n([\beta]) &= \frac{|\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \beta) \cap D_n R|}{|D_n R|} = \frac{1}{|D_1|} \left(1 - \frac{1}{|R|}\right) \leq d. \end{aligned}$$



Notice that  $d_n = \frac{|D_n R \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n)|}{|D_n R|} = \frac{|D_n \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n)|}{|D_n|}$  define an increasing sequence converging to some  $d \in [0, 1]$ . The same applies for the sequence  $(d_{n,j})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $d_{n,j} = \frac{|D_n R \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_{n,j})|}{|D_n R|}$ . This implies that every accumulation point  $\mu$  of  $(\mu_{i+sm-1})_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mu([i]) &= 1 - d + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, i) \cap D_n|}{|D_n|} \geq 1 - d, \\ \mu([j]) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, j) \cap D_n R|}{|D_n R|} = t_j \leq d \text{ for every } j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next proposition implies that  $\eta$  is irregular and is proved in the exact manner as [6, Proposition 4.5] thanks to Lemma 4.16. After this, we can guarantee that  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  has exactly  $m$  ergodic measures.

**Proposition 4.18** ([6, Proposition 4.5]). *For the Toeplitz array  $\eta$  defined above we have*

$$1 - d_{n+1} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{|D_1|}\right) \prod_{j=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{|D_j|}{|D_{j+1}|}\right), \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies that  $d < 1 - d$ .

**Remark 4.19.** The previous proposition implies that  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  has at least  $m$  different invariant measures  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m$  over  $\Sigma^G$ , where  $\nu_j$  is a limit point of the sequence  $(\mu_{j+sm-1})_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ , for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Furthermore, if  $\mu$  is an accumulation point of  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  then there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\mu([j]) = \nu_i([j])$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, m, \beta\}$ . Taking subsequences of  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we can assume that  $(\mu_{j+sm-1})_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $\nu_j$ , for every  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . In other words, we can assume that  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m$  are the unique limit points of  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

Note that the limit points  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m$  are supported on  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ . Indeed, let  $U \subseteq \Sigma^G$  be a cylinder given by fixing the coordinates of its points in a finite set  $F \subseteq G$ . Observe that

$$\mu_n(U) = \frac{|\{v \in \partial_F D_n R : \sigma^{v^{-1}} \eta_n \in U\}|}{|D_n R|} + \frac{|\{v \in D_n R \setminus \partial_F D_n R : \sigma^{v^{-1}} \eta_n \in U\}|}{|D_n R|},$$

where  $\partial_F D_n R = \{v \in D_n R : vF \not\subseteq D_n R\}$ . Since  $(D_n R)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a left Følner sequence, the first term of the sum goes to zero as  $n$  goes to  $\infty$ . This implies that  $\nu_i(U) > 0$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , only if  $U$  intersects the orbit of  $\eta$ . Thus, the measures  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m$  are supported on  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ .

At this moment, we have that  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m$  are different invariant measures on  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ . In the following we prove that they are the only ergodic measures for the system. For this construction, Lemma 4.1 is also true, which implies the following corollary, the proof of which is similar to Corollary 4.2.

**Corollary 4.20.** *For every  $i \geq 1$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ , there exists  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that*

$$\eta(g) = \alpha \text{ for every } g \in \gamma J(i)R.$$

Recall that  $\{\sigma^{v^{-1}} C_n : v \in D_n R\}$  is a clopen partition of  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ , where

$$C_n = \{x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} : \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha), \text{ for every } \alpha \in \Sigma\}.$$

For every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , let  $C_{n,i} = \{x \in C_n : x(g) = i \text{ for every } g \in J(n)R\}$ . Corollary 4.20 implies that  $\{C_{n,i} : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$  is a covering of  $C_n$ . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \{\sigma^{v^{-1}} C_{n,i} : 1 \leq i \leq m, v \in D_n R\}$$

is a clopen partition of  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ .

**Lemma 4.21.** *For every  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , we have*

- (1)  $C_{n+1} \subseteq C_{n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ , and
- (2)  $\sigma^{\gamma^{-1}} C_{n+1,j} \subseteq C_{n,j}$ , for every  $\gamma \in (\Gamma_n \cap D_{n+1}) \setminus \{1_G\}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n) \subseteq \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_{n+1})$ , we have  $C_{n+1} \subseteq C_n$ . Furthermore,  $D_n R \subseteq \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_{n+1})$ , which implies that  $x(D_n R) = \eta(D_n R)$ , for every  $x \in C_{n+1}$ . In particular,  $x(g) = \eta(g) = \alpha_{n+1}$ , for every  $g \in J(n)R$ . From this we get that  $C_{n+1} \subseteq C_{n,\alpha_{n+1}}$ .

Using that  $C_{n+1,j} \subseteq C_n$ , we get that for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ ,  $\sigma^{\gamma^{-1}} C_{n+1,j} \subseteq C_n$ . On the other hand, if  $\gamma \in (\Gamma_n \cap D_{n+1}) \setminus \{1_G\}$  and  $y \in C_{n+1,j}$ , then Corollary 4.20 implies that  $\sigma^{\gamma^{-1}}(y)(g) = y(\gamma g) = j$ , for every  $g \in J(n)R$ . This shows that  $\sigma^{\gamma^{-1}} C_{n+1,j} \subseteq C_{n,j}$ .  $\square$

Let  $\Delta$  be the convex set generated by the set of vectors  $\{\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_m\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ , where

$$\vec{t}_i = (t_1, \dots, t_{i-1}, 1 - d + t_i, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_m, t_\beta),$$

with

$$t_\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|D_n R \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha)|}{|D_n R|}, \text{ for each } \alpha \in \Sigma.$$

That is,

$$\Delta = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \vec{t}_i : \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i = 1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Since the vectors  $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_m$  are linearly independent, the convex set  $\Delta$  is a simplex.

**Proposition 4.22.** *The map  $p : M_G(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) \rightarrow \Delta$ , given by  $p(\mu) = (\mu([1]), \dots, \mu([m]), \mu([\beta]))$ , for  $\mu \in M_G(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)})$ , is an affine surjective map such that  $p(\nu_i) = \vec{t}_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ , set  $a_{n,\alpha} = |D_n R \cap \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha)|$ .

Let  $C_{0,\alpha} = [\alpha] \cap \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ . Note that for every  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$

$$C_{0,\alpha} = \bigcup_{g \in J(n)R} \sigma^{g^{-1}} C_{n,\alpha} \cup \bigcup_{g \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \cap D_n R} \sigma^{g^{-1}} C_n.$$

Therefore, for every invariant probability measure  $\mu \in M_G(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)})$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(C_{0,\alpha}) &= |J(n)R| \mu(C_{n,\alpha}) + a_{n,\alpha} \mu(C_n) \\ &= (|J(n)R| + a_{n,\alpha}) \mu(C_{n,\alpha}) + a_{n,\alpha} \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{\alpha\}} \mu(C_{n,j}) \\ &= \frac{|J(n)R| + a_{n,\alpha}}{|D_n R|} \mu(C_{n,\alpha}) |D_n R| + \frac{a_{n,\alpha}}{|D_n R|} \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{\alpha\}} \mu(C_{n,j}) |D_n R|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking a subsequence  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  so that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(C_{n_k, j})|D_{n_k}R| = \lambda_j \in [0, 1]$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we get

$$\mu(C_{0, \alpha}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{t}_j(\alpha) \lambda_j, \text{ with } \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j = 1.$$

On the other hand,

$$C_{0, \beta} = \bigcup_{g \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \beta) \cap D_n R} \sigma^{g-1} C_n.$$

Thus,

$$\mu(C_{0, \beta}) = \frac{1}{|D_1|} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{|R|} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{t}_j(\beta) \lambda_j.$$

This implies that  $p(\mu) = (\mu(C_{0,1}), \dots, \mu(C_{0,m}), \mu(C_{0,\beta}))$  belongs to  $\Delta$ . Moreover, we have that  $p(\nu_i) = \vec{t}_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . That  $p$  is affine and surjective follows by its definition.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.23.** *Let  $p$  be the map introduced in Proposition 4.22. If  $\mu, \nu \in M_G(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)})$  satisfy  $p(\mu) = p(\nu)$ , then  $\mu|_{\mathcal{P}_n} = \nu|_{\mathcal{P}_n}$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $n \geq 1$ , Lemma 4.21 implies that for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$  we have

$$C_{n,i} = \begin{cases} \bigcup_{\gamma \in (D_{n+1} \cap \Gamma_n) \setminus \{1_G\}} \sigma^{\gamma-1} C_{n+1,i} & \text{if } i \neq \alpha_{n+1} \\ \bigcup_{\gamma \in (D_{n+1} \cap \Gamma_n) \setminus \{1_G\}} \sigma^{\gamma-1} C_{n+1, \alpha_{n+1}} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^m C_{n+1,j} & \text{if } i = \alpha_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

Thus if  $\mu \in M_G(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)})$ , then

$$\mu(C_{n,i}) = \begin{cases} \left( \frac{|D_{n+1}|}{|D_n|} - 1 \right) \mu(C_{n+1,i}) & \text{if } i \neq \alpha_{n+1} \\ \left( \frac{|D_{n+1}|}{|D_n|} - 1 \right) \mu(C_{n+1, \alpha_{n+1}}) + \sum_{j=1}^m \mu(C_{n+1,j}) & \text{if } i = \alpha_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we have  $A_n \mu^{(n+1)} = \mu^{(n)}$ , where  $\mu^{(n)} = (\mu(C_{n,1}), \dots, \mu(C_{n,m}))$  and  $A_n$  is the  $m \times m$  integer matrix given by

$$A_n(i, j) = \begin{cases} \frac{|D_{n+1}|}{|D_n|} - 1 & \text{if } i = j \neq \alpha_{n+1} \\ \frac{|D_{n+1}|}{|D_n|} & \text{if } i = j = \alpha_{n+1} \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \text{ and } i \neq \alpha_{n+1} \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq j \text{ and } i = \alpha_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

Since the matrices  $A_n$  have linearly independent columns, they are invertible. Hence,

$$\mu^{(n+1)} = A_n^{-1} \dots A_1^{-1} \mu^{(1)}.$$

To connect  $\mu^{(1)}$  and  $p(\mu)$  we consider the  $m+1 \times m$  matrix  $A_0$  given by

$$A_0(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 + |J(1)R| & \text{if } i = j = 1 \\ |J(1)R| & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } 2 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } j \neq 1 \\ |R| - 1 & \text{if } i = m+1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From Lemma 4.21 and the definition of the  $C_{1,j}$ 's we obtain

$$C_{0,i} = \begin{cases} \bigcup_{g \in J(1)R} \sigma^{g^{-1}} C_{1,1} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^m C_{1,j} & \text{if } i = 1 \\ \bigcup_{g \in J(1)R} \sigma^{g^{-1}} C_{1,i} & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq m \\ \bigcup_{g \in R \setminus \{1_G\}} \sigma^{g^{-1}} C_1 & \text{if } i = \beta. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\mu(C_{0,i}) = \begin{cases} (1 + |J(1)R|)\mu(C_{1,1}) + \sum_{j=2}^m \mu(C_{1,j}) & \text{if } i = 1 \\ |J(1)R|\mu(C_{1,i}) & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq m \\ \sum_{j=1}^m (|R| - 1)\mu(C_{1,j}) & \text{if } i = \beta. \end{cases}$$

Thus, considering the  $m + 1$  coordinate for  $i = \beta$ , we obtain  $p(\mu) = A_0 \mu^{(1)}$ . As the rank of the matrix  $A_0$  is  $m$ , there exists an  $m \times m + 1$  matrix  $A_L$  such that  $A_L A_0$  is the  $m \times m$  identity map. Consequently,  $\mu^{(1)} = A_L p(\mu)$  and this concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Inspired by [6, Remark 4.16] and [5, Proposition 18], we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.24.** *The map  $p : M_G(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) \rightarrow \Delta$  introduced in Proposition 4.22 is injective.*

*Proof.* Consider the set

$$\partial \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} = \bigcup_{g \in G} \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bigcup_{v \in D_n R \setminus D_n R g} \sigma^v C_{n,i}.$$

We claim that for every  $\mu \in M_G(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)})$ ,  $\mu(\partial \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) = 0$ . Indeed,

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bigcup_{v \in D_n R \setminus D_n R g} \sigma^{v^{-1}} C_{n,i} \right) = |D_n R \setminus D_n R g| \sum_{i=1}^m \mu(C_{n,i}) = \frac{|D_n R \setminus D_n R g|}{|D_n R|}$$

Thus,

$$\mu \left( \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bigcup_{v \in D_n R \setminus D_n R g} \sigma^{v^{-1}} C_{n,i} \right) \leq \lim \frac{|D_n R \setminus D_n R g|}{|D_n R|} = 0.$$

Consequently,  $\mu(\partial \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}) = 0$ . It means that the measures in  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  are determined by their values in the set of the partitions  $\mathcal{P}_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

On the other hand, let  $x, y \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  be two different elements such that  $x, y \in \sigma^{v_n^{-1}} C_{n,i}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $v_n \in D_n R$ . The latter implies that  $x(v_n^{-1} D_n R) = y(v_n^{-1} D_n R)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, as they are different elements, there exists  $g \notin \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} v_n^{-1} D_n R$  with  $x(g) \neq y(g)$ . Thus, we obtain that  $v_n \in D_n R \setminus D_n R g^{-1}$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and consequently,  $x, y \in \partial \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ . It means that the elements in  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \setminus \partial \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  are separated by the atoms generated by  $(\mathcal{P}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Consequently, every open set in  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  is a countable disjoint union of sets in the partitions  $(\mathcal{P}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and a set in  $\partial \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Propositions 4.22 and 4.24.

**Corollary 4.25.** *The dynamical system  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  has exactly  $m$  ergodic measures given by  $\nu_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .*

Next, we guarantee that these measures have zero entropy. First, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , define

$$E_n = \{x \in \Sigma^G : \text{Per}(x, \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha), \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Sigma\},$$

and

$$E_{n,i} = \{x \in E_n : x(g) = i, g \in J(n)R\}.$$

Note that  $E_n \cap \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} = C_n$  and  $E_{n,i} \cap \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} = C_{n,i}$ . Moreover, we have that  $\sigma^\gamma E_n = E_n$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$  as shown in [8, Lemma 7]. This, in turn, implies that  $E_n$  and  $E_{n,i}$  are closed sets in  $\Sigma^G$ .

**Lemma 4.26.** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a clopen subset  $V_n$  in  $\Sigma^G$  such that  $E_n \subseteq V_n$  and  $V_n \cap \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} = C_n$ . Furthermore, this implies that the same is true if we replace  $E_n$  by  $E_{n,i}$ , for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .*

*Proof.* As  $E_n$  is closed, the set  $A_n := \Sigma^G \setminus E_n = \bigcup_{i \in I} W_i$  is open, where  $I$  is a countable set and  $W_i \subseteq \Sigma^G$  is a clopen set,  $i \in I$ . Furthermore,  $A_n \cap \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} = \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \setminus C_n$ . Since  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \setminus C_n$  is a compact set in  $\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ , there exists a finite set  $I' \subseteq I$  such that  $(\bigcup_{i \in I'} W_i) \cap \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} = \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \setminus C_n$ . The set  $V_n := \Sigma^G \setminus (\bigcup_{i \in I'} W_i)$  is the clopen subset in  $\Sigma^G$  with the required properties.

The second part is a direct consequence of the first part, as  $E_{n,i}$  is the intersection of  $E_n$  with a clopen set in  $\Sigma^G$ .  $\square$

Following [6], for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m$  we define the set  $Z_{i,k}$  as follows.

$$Z_{i,k} = \bigcup_{v \in D_{i+km-1}R} \sigma^{v^{-1}} C_{i+km-1,i}.$$

**Lemma 4.27.** *Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n < m$ . It holds that*

$$\text{Per}(\eta_m, \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha), \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Sigma.$$

*In other words,  $\eta_m \in E_n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  and  $dr \in \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha)$ , with  $r \in R$  and  $d \in D_n$ . For every  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n$ , there exist  $\gamma' \in \Gamma_m$  and  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_n \cap D_m$  such that  $\gamma = \gamma'\tilde{\gamma}$ . Using that  $\tilde{\gamma}d \in D_m$ , we obtain  $\eta_m(\gamma dr) = \eta_m(\gamma'\tilde{\gamma}dr) = \eta(\tilde{\gamma}dr) = \alpha$ . This implies that  $\text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha) \subseteq \text{Per}(\eta_m, \Gamma_n, \alpha)$ .

Now, assume there exists  $dr \in J(k)R \cap \text{Per}(\eta_m, \Gamma_n, \alpha)$  for some  $n < k$ ,  $r \in R$  and  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ . Note that  $k$  can be taken less than  $m$ . Otherwise, Lemma 4.15 implies that  $d = \tilde{\gamma}\tilde{d}$  where  $\tilde{\gamma} \in (\Gamma_m \cap D_k) \setminus \{1_G\}$ , and  $\tilde{d} \in J(m)$ . Assume then  $n < k \leq m$ .

As  $dr \in D_m R$ , we have  $\eta_m(dr) = \eta(dr) = \alpha = \alpha_{k+1}$ . By Lemma 4.15, there exist  $\gamma \in (\Gamma_{k-1} \cap D_k) \setminus \{1_G\}$  and  $d' \in J(k-1)$  such that  $d = \gamma d'$ . Thus,  $\eta_m(dr) = \eta_m(\gamma d'r) = \eta_m(d'r) = \eta(d'r) = \alpha_k$ , which is a contradiction since  $\alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k+1}$ . If  $dr \in J(n)R \cap \text{Per}(\eta_m, \Gamma_n, \alpha)$ , then  $\eta_m(dr) = \eta(dr) = \alpha = \alpha_{n+1}$ . For every  $\gamma \in (\Gamma_n \cap D_{n+1}) \setminus \{1_G\}$  it holds that  $\gamma dr \in J(n+1)R$  by using Lemma 4.15. Therefore, as  $n+1 \leq m$ , we conclude  $\alpha = \eta_m(\gamma dr) = \eta(\gamma dr) = \alpha_{n+2}$  and again, we obtain a contradiction.

Thus,  $\text{Per}(\eta_m, \Gamma_n, \alpha) = \text{Per}(\eta, \Gamma_n, \alpha)$ , and we conclude the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.28.** *For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , it holds that  $\nu_i(Z_{i,k}) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $s, k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $s > k$ . Lemma 4.27 implies  $\eta_{i+sm-1} \in E_{i+km-1}$ . As  $wJ(i+km-1) \subseteq J(i+sm-1)$  for every  $w \in (\Gamma_{i+km-1} \cap D_{i+sm-1}) \setminus \{1_G\}$  by Lemma 4.14, then the definition of  $\eta$  implies that  $\sigma^{v^{-1}}\eta|_{J(i+km-1)R} \equiv i$  for every  $v \in \Gamma_{i+km-1} \cap D_{i+sm-1}$ . Consequently,  $\sigma^{v^{-1}}\eta_{i+sm-1} \in E_{i+km,i}$  for every  $v \in \Gamma_{i+km-1} \cap D_{i+sm-1} \subseteq G'$  since  $G'$  is abelian. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{|D_{i+km-1}R|} = \frac{|\Gamma_{i+km-1} \cap D_{i+sm-1}|}{|D_{i+sm-1}R|} \leq \eta_{i+sm-1}(E_{i+km-1,i}).$$

Using the Portmanteau Theorem, Lemma 4.26 and the fact that the sequence  $(\mu_{i+tm-1})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges weakly to  $\nu_i$ , we conclude

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{i+sm-1}(E_{i+km-1,i}) \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{i+sm-1}(V_{i+km-1,i}) = \nu_i(C_{i+km-1,i}),$$

where  $V_{i+km-1,i}$  are the clopen sets given by Lemma 4.26. This concludes the proof since  $Z_{i,k}$  is a disjoint union of translations of the set  $C_{i+km-1,i}$ .  $\square$

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.28

**Corollary 4.29.** *For every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , it holds that  $\nu_i(A_i) = 1$ , where*

$$A_i = \bigcap_{g \in G} \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma^g Z_{i,k}.$$

We will use the set  $A_i$  defined in the previous corollary to guarantee that  $\pi|_{A_i}$  is a measure conjugacy between  $(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}, \sigma, \nu_i)$  and  $(\overleftarrow{G}, \varphi, \mu)$ , where  $\mu$  is the unique invariant measure for the  $G$ -odometer  $(\overleftarrow{G}, \varphi)$  associated to  $\eta$ . The following lemma follows the same structure as [6, Lemma 5.7]. We add the proof for completeness.

**Lemma 4.30.** *Let  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $A_i$  be defined in Corollary 4.29. Then, the map  $\pi|_{A_i} : A_i \rightarrow \pi(A_i)$  is injective.*

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in A_i$  be such that  $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ . Let  $g \in G$ . As  $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ , there exists  $w \in D_{i+k_g m-1}R$  so that  $x, y \in \sigma^{w^{-1}}C_{i+k_g m-1}$  and hence,  $\sigma^{g^{-1}}x, \sigma^{g^{-1}}y \in \sigma^{(wg)^{-1}}C_{i+k_g m-1}$ . If  $v \in D_{i+k_g m-1}R$  satisfies  $wg \in \Gamma_{i+k_g m-1}v$ , then  $\sigma^{g^{-1}}x, \sigma^{g^{-1}}y \in \sigma^{v^{-1}}C_{i+k_g m-1}$ . On the other hand, since  $x, y \in A_i$ , there exists  $k_g \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x, y \in \sigma^{k_g}Z_{i,k_g}$ . Hence,  $\sigma^{g^{-1}}x, \sigma^{g^{-1}}y \in \sigma^{v^{-1}}C_{i+k_g m-1,i}$ . Therefore,  $\sigma^{g^{-1}}x = \sigma^{v^{-1}}x'$  and  $\sigma^{g^{-1}}y = \sigma^{v^{-1}}y'$  for some  $x', y' \in C_{i+k_g m-1,i}$ . Thus, we have that  $x'(s) = y'(s)$  for every  $s \in D_{i+k_g m-1}$  and in particular,  $x'(v) = y'(v)$ . As  $x(g) = x'(v)$  and  $y(g) = y'(v)$ , we conclude that  $x(g) = y(g)$ . Since this is true for every  $g \in G$ , we deduce that  $x = y$  and that  $\pi|_{A_i}$  is injective.  $\square$

Inspired by [6, Proposition 5.8], we have the following.

**Proposition 4.31.** *For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , the p.m.p systems  $(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}, \sigma, G, \nu_i)$  and  $(\overleftarrow{G}, \varphi, G, \mu)$ , with  $\mu$  being the unique measure of  $(\overleftarrow{G}, \varphi)$ , are measure conjugate.*

*Proof.* Let  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Lemma 4.30 guarantees that  $\pi|_{A_i} : A_i \rightarrow \pi(A_i)$  is bijective. Since  $A_i$  is an invariant Borel set we deduce that  $\pi(A_i)$  is a Borel set and  $\pi|_{A_i}$  is a measurable map with measurable inverse which is  $G$ -equivariant (see, for instance, [15, Theorem 2.8]). Since  $\overleftarrow{G}$  is uniquely ergodic, we obtain  $\nu_i(\pi|_{A_i}^{-1}(B)) = \mu(B)$  for every Borel set  $B \subseteq \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ . This finishes the proof since by Corollary 4.29 we have that  $\nu_i(A_i) = \mu(\pi(A_i)) = 1$ .  $\square$

Using the variational principle and the previous proposition we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.32.** *For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , the p.m.p system  $(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}, \sigma, \nu_i)$  has zero entropy. This implies that the dynamical system  $(\overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}, \sigma)$  has zero topological entropy.*

For the last part, we count the fibers of the map  $\pi : \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{G}$  as in the previous subsection. The following lemma is shown in the same manner as Lemma 4.4 by using the sequence  $(D_i R)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

**Lemma 4.33.** *Let  $x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  and  $\pi(x) = (\Gamma_i t_i(x))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $t_i(x) \in D_i R$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . It holds that the map  $x|_{t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma J(i)R}$  is constant for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma_i$ , i.e., there exists  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $x(d) = \alpha$  for every  $d \in t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma J(i)R$ . In particular,  $x(d) = \alpha$  for every  $d \in (t_i(x)^{-1}\gamma D_i R) \cap \text{Aper}(x)$ .*

**Remark 4.34.** For  $x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ , we denote by  $\pi(x) = (\Gamma_i t_i(x))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $t_i(x) \in D_i R$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . In a similar way as in the previous subsection, for each  $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$ , we denote by  $T_\zeta(x)$  the union of sets of the form  $t_j(x)^{-1}\gamma_j^\zeta D_j R$ , where for each  $j \geq 0$ ,  $\gamma_{i+j}^\zeta$  is the unique element in  $\Gamma_{i+j}$  such that  $t_{i+j}(x)^{-1}\gamma_{i+j}^\zeta D_{i+j} R \supseteq t_{i+(j-1)}(x)^{-1}\gamma_{i+(j-1)}^\zeta D_{i+(j-1)} R$  and  $\gamma_i^\zeta = \zeta$ , i.e.,

$$T_\zeta(x) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} t_{i+j}(x)^{-1}\gamma_{i+j}^\zeta D_{i+j} R.$$

For  $\bar{y} \in \overleftarrow{G}$  and  $x, y \in \pi^{-1}(\bar{y})$  we observe that  $t_i(x)^{-1}\zeta D_i R = t_i(y)^{-1}\zeta D_i R$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$  since  $t_i(x) = t_i(y)$ . Hence,  $T_\zeta(x) = T_\zeta(y)$ .

**Lemma 4.35.** *For each  $x \in X$ , there exist  $\alpha \leq 2^r[G : G']$  and  $\zeta_{n_i} \in \Gamma_{n_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \alpha$ , such that*

$$G = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\alpha} T_{\zeta_{n_i}}(x).$$

*Proof.* For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , consider  $t_n(x) = d_n(x)r(x)$  for  $d_n(x) \in D_n$  and  $r(x) \in R$  ( $r(x)$  is the same for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ). Since  $G = t_n(x)^{-1}\Gamma_n D_n R$ , there exist finite elements  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_s \in \Gamma_n$  such that  $B(n, 1_{G'})R \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^s t_n(x)^{-1}\gamma_i D_n R$  satisfying that for each  $1 \leq j \leq s$ , there exists  $r \in R$  with  $t_n(x)^{-1}\gamma_j D_n R \cap B(n, 1_{G'})r' \neq \emptyset$ . These are the only elements that satisfy the previous condition. Thus,

$$G = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\alpha} T_{\zeta_{n_i}}(x), \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \text{ and } \zeta_{n_i} \in \Gamma_{n_i}, 1 \leq i \leq \alpha.$$

We claim that  $\alpha \leq 2^r[G : G']$ . Indeed, assume  $\alpha > 2^r[G : G']$ . Thus, for some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $\alpha' \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $\alpha \geq \alpha' > 2^r[G : G']$ , and  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{\alpha'} \in \Gamma_{n_0}$  in such a way that the sets  $T_{\zeta_i}(x), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \alpha'\}$ , are pairwise disjoint,  $B(n_0, 1_{G'})R \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\alpha'} t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_i D_{n_0} R$  and for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \alpha'\}$ , there exists  $r \in R$  with  $t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_i D_{n_0} R \cap B(n_0, 1_{G'})r \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $r \in R$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_{\alpha_r}$  be all the different elements in  $\{1, \dots, \alpha'\}$  such that  $B(n_0, 1_{G'})r \subseteq \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\alpha_r} t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_{i_j} D_{n_0} R$  with  $t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_{i_j} D_{n_0} R \cap B(n_0, 1_{G'})r \neq \emptyset, 1 \leq j \leq \alpha_r$ . We have that  $\sum_{r \in R} \alpha_r = \alpha'$ . If  $\alpha_r \leq 2^r$  for every  $r \in R$ , then  $\alpha' \leq 2^r[G : G']$ . Therefore, there should be  $r \in R$  such that  $\alpha_r > 2^r$ . By our assumption, there exist elements  $d_1, \dots, d_{i_{\alpha_r}} \in D_{n_0}$  and  $r' \in$

$R$  such that  $t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_{i_j}d_jr' \in B(1_G, n_0)r$ . Consequently,  $B(s, t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_{i_j}d_jr') \subseteq B(n_0 + s, 1_{G'})r$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, for  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\alpha_r} B(s, t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_{i_j}d_jr') \cap (t_{n_0+s}(x)^{-1}\gamma_{n_0+s}^{\zeta_{i_j}}D_{n_0+s}r') \subseteq B(n_0 + s, 1_G)r,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} b(n_0 + s) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_r} |B(s, t_{n_0}(x)^{-1}\zeta_{i_j}d_jr') \cap (t_{n_0+s}(x)^{-1}\gamma_{n_0+s}^{\zeta_{i_j}}D_{n_0+s}r')| \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_r} |B(s, d_j) \cap (\zeta_{i_j}^{-1}\gamma_{n_0}^s(x)\gamma_{n_0+s}^{\zeta_{i_j}}D_{n_0+s})| \end{aligned}$$

Now, we conclude the proof using Lemma 4.5 as in Lemma 4.7.  $\square$

As in the previous subsection, by using Lemma 4.33, we deduce the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.36.** *Let  $x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$  be a non-Toeplitz element and  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . For every  $\zeta \in \Gamma_i$  we have that there exists  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $x(d) = \alpha$  for every  $d \in T_\zeta(x) \cap \text{Aper}(x)$ .*

**Proposition 4.37.** *For every  $x \in \overline{O_\sigma(\eta)}$ , it holds that  $|\pi^{-1}(\{\pi(x)\})| \leq m^{2^r[G:G']}$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* When the group  $G$  is assumed to be isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^r$ , for some  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , the result follows from Corollary 4.12. Now, when it is assumed that  $[G : G'] \geq 2$ , the result follows directly from Corollary 4.25, Corollary 4.32, Proposition 4.37, Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.6.  $\square$

**Remark 4.38.** *In section 4.2 we have used a specific sequence  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of finite index subgroups of  $G$  to take advantage of the structure of the sequence of fundamental domains given by  $(D_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Nevertheless, the same can be proved whether we use a sequence  $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  where instead of taking the canonical generators of  $\mathbb{Z}^r$  in (3) we consider a set of  $r$  elements in  $\mathbb{Z}^r$  which are  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linearly independent and some modification in (5). Besides using the geometry of  $\mathbb{Z}^r$ , we suspect that an analogous procedure works whether we suppose that the group  $G$  is a torsion-free finitely generated group of sub-exponential growth.*

## 5. QUESTIONS

**Question 5.1.** *Are there versions of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 2.9 for uniquely ergodic systems?*

**Question 5.2.** *Is Theorem 1.2 still valid when  $G$  is assumed to be a essentially amenable group, a polycyclic group, a solvable group or a finitely generated group of sub-exponential growth?*

A dynamical system  $(X, \varphi, G)$  such that  $\text{IT}_2(X) \setminus \Delta^{(2)}(X) = \emptyset$  is called *tame* (see [24]). For an  $n$ -Tame system we mean a dynamical system that no contains  $n$ -IT-tuples with different elements. Theorem 1.2 guarantees that for a group  $G$  containing a finite index normal subgroup that is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^r$ , for some  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , it is always possible that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , to find  $m \geq n$  such that there exists a  $G$ -dynamical systems that is  $m + 1$ -tame but not  $m$ -tame.



**Question 5.3.** *Is there a group  $G$  where all 3-tame dynamical systems over this group are tame?*

In [24], there was constructed a Toeplitz subshift  $X$  over  $\mathbb{Z}$  such that it is tame but nonnull. In other words, this Toeplitz subshift satisfies that  $\text{IT}_2(X) \setminus \Delta^{(2)}(X) = \emptyset$  but  $\text{IN}_2(X) \setminus \Delta^{(2)}(X) \neq \emptyset$ . Note that for the examples and groups treated in this document, we have that  $\text{IT}_n(X) \setminus \Delta^{(n)}(X) = \emptyset$  if and only if  $\text{IN}_n(X) \setminus \Delta^{(n)}(X) = \emptyset$ . This suggests the following question.

**Question 5.4.** *Given a countable infinite group  $G$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Are there examples of dynamical systems such that  $\text{IT}_n(X) \setminus \Delta^{(n)}(X) = \emptyset$  and  $\text{IN}_n(X) \setminus \Delta^{(n)}(X) \neq \emptyset$ ?*

## REFERENCES

- [1] Auslander, J.; *Minimal flows and their extensions*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies Notas de Matemática, 153 122, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.
- [2] Blanchard, F.; A disjointness theorem involving topological entropy, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **121** (1993), no. 4, 465–478.
- [3] Castillo-Ramirez, A., Sanchez-Alvarez, M., Vazquez-Aceves, A. and Zaldivar-Corichi, A.; A generalization of cellular automata over groups. *Comm. Algebra* **51** (2023), no. 7, 3114–3123.
- [4] Ceccherini-Silberstein, T. G. and D’Adderio, M.; *Topics in groups and geometry—growth, amenability, and random walks*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, [2021].
- [5] Cecchi-Bernales, P. and Cortez, M. I.; Invariant measures for actions of congruent monotileable amenable groups, *Groups Geom. Dyn.* **13** (2019), no. 3, 821–839.
- [6] Cecchi-Bernales, P., Cortez, M. I. and Gómez, J.; Invariant measures of Toeplitz subshifts on non-amenable groups, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **44** (2024), no. 11, 3186–3215.
- [7] Cortez, M. I.;  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  Toeplitz arrays, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **15** (2006), no. 3, 859–881;
- [8] Cortez, M. I. and Petite, M. I.;  $G$ -odometers and their almost one-to-one extensions, *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* **78** (2008), no. 1, 1–20
- [9] Cortez, M. I. and Petite, S.; Invariant measures and orbit equivalence for generalized Toeplitz subshifts, *Groups Geom. Dyn.* **8** (2014), no. 4, 1007–1045.
- [10] Downarowicz, T.; The Choquet simplex of invariant measures for minimal flows, *Israel J. Math.* **74** (1991), no. 2-3, 241–256.
- [11] Drewlo, J.; Strictly ergodic Toeplitz  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -subshifts with arbitrary entropy. 2024. arXiv: 2410.21915.
- [12] Fuhrmann, G. and Kwietniak, D.; On tameness of almost automorphic dynamical systems for general groups. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **52** (2020), no.1, 24–42.
- [13] García-Ramos, F., and Li, H.; Local entropy theory and applications. arXiv:2401.10012.
- [14] Elek, G.; Free minimal actions of countable groups with invariant probability measures, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **41** (2021), no. 5, 1369–1389.
- [15] Glasner, E.; *Ergodic theory via joinings*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 101, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [16] Goodman, T. N. T.; Topological sequence entropy, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **29** (1974), 331–350.
- [17] Hjorth, G. and Molberg, M.; Free continuous actions on zero-dimensional spaces, *Topology Appl.* **153** (2006), no. 7, 1116–1131.
- [18] Huang, W., Lian, Z., Shao, S. and Ye, X.; Minimal systems with finitely many ergodic measures. *J. Funct. Anal.* **280** (2021), no. 12, Paper No. 109000, 42 pp.
- [19] Huang, W., Li, S. M., Shao, S. and Ye, X. D.; Null systems and sequence entropy pairs. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **23** (2003), no.5, 1505–1523.
- [20] Huang, W., Maass, A. and Ye, X. D.; Sequence entropy pairs and complexity pairs for a measure, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **54** (2004), no. 4, 1005–1028.
- [21] Huang, W. and Ye, X. D.; Combinatorial lemmas and applications to dynamics. *Adv. Math.* **220** (2009), no. 6, 1689–1716.
- [22] Iwanik, A. and Lacroix, Y.; Some constructions of strictly ergodic non-regular Toeplitz flows, *Studia Math.* **110** (1994), no. 2, 191–203.

- [23] Jacobs, K. and Keane, M. S.; 0 – 1-sequences of Toeplitz type, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeits-theorie und Verw. Gebiete* **13** (1969), 123–131.
- [24] Kerr, D. and Li, H.; Independence in topological and  $C^*$ -dynamics. *Math. Ann.* 338 (2007), no. 4, 869–926.
- [25] Kerr, D. and Li, H.; Combinatorial independence and sofic entropy, *Commun. Math. Stat.* **1** (2013), no. 2, 213–257.
- [26] Krieger, F.; Sous-décalages de Toeplitz sur les groupes moyennables résiduellement finis, *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* **75** (2007), no. 2, 447–462.
- [27] Kushnirenko, A. G.; Metric invariants of entropy type, *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* **22** (1967), no. 5(137), 57–65.
- [28] Lacka, M. and Straszak, M.; Quasi-uniform convergence in dynamical systems generated by an amenable group action, *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* **98** (2018), no. 3, 687–707.
- [29] Löh, C.; *Geometric group theory*, Universitext, Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [30] Williams, S.; Toeplitz minimal flows which are not uniquely ergodic. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **67** (1984), no. 1, 95–107.

J. GÓMEZ, MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS  
*Email address:* `j.a.gomez.ortiz@math.leidenuniv.nl`

I. LEÓN-TORRES, PHYSICS INSTITUTE, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE SAN LUIS POTOSÍ, MÉXICO.  
*Email address:* `yooirma@gmail.com`

V. MUÑOZ-LÓPEZ, PHYSICS INSTITUTE, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE SAN LUIS POTOSÍ, MÉXICO.  
*Email address:* `soygenn@gmail.com`