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Abstract. We establish uniform lower bounds on the size of the return set and the lower Banach density of return times, respectively, for \(d\)-term multiple recurrence in the ergodic Szemerédi theorem for arbitrary \(d\) depending only on the measure of the measurable set and \(d\) but otherwise independent of the system for a fixed uniformly amenable group. Our proof relies on a multiple recurrence theorem for ultraproducts of measure-preserving systems, which we obtain as a special case of an uncountable extension of Austin’s amenable multiple recurrence theorem.

1. Introduction

Our starting point is the following Kintchine-type uniformity analysis of Furstenberg’s multiple recurrence theorem by Bergelson, Host and Kra [5]:

**Theorem 1.1** (Bergelson–Host–Kra uniformity).

(i) Let \((X, \mu, T)\) be an ergodic \(\mathbb{Z}\)-system and let \(E\) be a measurable set of positive measure. Then, for every \(\varepsilon > 0\), the sets of return times

\[
\left\{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : \mu(E \cap T^n(E) \cap T^{2n}(E)) \geq \mu(E)^3 - \varepsilon \right\}
\]

\[
\left\{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : \mu(E \cap T^n(E) \cap T^{2n}(E) \cap T^{3n}(E)) \geq \mu(E)^4 - \varepsilon \right\}
\]

are both syndetic\(^1\) in \(\mathbb{Z}\).

(ii) There exists an ergodic \(\mathbb{Z}\)-system \((X, \mu, T)\) such that for all \(\ell \geq 1\) there is a measurable set \(E\) (depending on \(\ell\)) with positive probability such that

\[
\mu(E \cap T^n(E) \cap T^{2n}(E) \cap T^{3n}(E) \cap T^{4n}(E)) \leq \frac{\mu(E)^\ell}{2}
\]

for every integer \(n \neq 0\).

\(^1\)A subset \(H\) of a group \(G\) is said to be syndetic if finitely many shifts of \(H\) cover \(G\).
(iii) There exists a non-ergodic $\mathbb{Z}$-system $(X, \mu, T)$ such that for all $\ell \geq 1$ there is a measurable set $E$ (depending on $\ell$) with positive probability such that

$$\mu(E \cap T^n(E) \cap T^{2n}(E)) \leq \frac{\mu(E)^{\ell}}{2}$$

for every integer $n \not= 0$.

A similar statement as in (i) holds for single recurrence and was proved much earlier by Khintchine [24]. As the lower bound in (i) only depends on the measure of $E$ but is otherwise independent of the system $(X, \mu, T)$, the assertions in (i) (and Khintchine’s theorem) establish a uniformity for the set of single, double, and triple recurrence for ergodic measure-preserving $\mathbb{Z}$-actions. The assertions in (ii) and (iii) then surprisingly imply that such a uniformity fails for quadruple and higher recurrence and for double and higher recurrence if the hypothesis of ergodicity is removed (Khintchine’s theorem continues to hold for non-ergodic $\mathbb{Z}$-systems).

**Remark 1.2.** Chu in [8] and Chu and Zorin-Kranich in [9] prove analogues of the results in Theorem 1.1 for two commuting actions of the integers and a countable amenable group, respectively, however based on Austin’s stated extension theory rather than Host–Kra structure theory. Austin’s machinery will be also useful in this paper.

The strength of the positive results in (i) in the above theorem (and similarly, for the results of Chu and Zorin-Kranich) is an explicit lower bound in terms of a power of the measure of $E$ in line with Khintchine’s theorem. On the other hand, Furstenberg’s multiple recurrence theorem [12] asserts that for any (not necessarily ergodic) $\mathbb{Z}$-system $(X, \mu, T)$, for any set $E$ of positive measure, and for any integer $d \geq 1$ there is some $c > 0$ such that

$$\left\{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : \mu(E \cap T^n(E) \cap T^{2n}(E) \cap \cdots \cap T^{(d-1)n}(E)) \geq c \right\}$$

(1)

is syndetic in $\mathbb{Z}$.

The aim of this article is to establish a uniform version of the previous statement for arbitrary integer $d \geq 1$ and for all (not necessarily ergodic) $\mathbb{Z}$-systems. Parts (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 1.1 demonstrate that one cannot expect a uniformity result with a lower bound in terms of powers of the probability of positive measure sets. However, we will be able
to establish the existence of a uniform lower bound which only depends on the measure of $E$ and the length $d$ of the multiple return but is otherwise independent of the underlying systems.

To precisely state our result, we need the following definition.

**Definition 1.3 (Lower Banach density).** Let $\Lambda$ be a subset of $\mathbb{Z}$. We define the *lower Banach density* for $\Lambda$ to be

$$\text{BD}_\mathbb{Z}(\Lambda) := \inf \{m(\Lambda) : m \text{ invariant finitely additive probability measure on } \mathbb{Z}\}.$$  

(2)

There are other (more commonly used) definitions of lower Banach density for the group of integers (e.g., see [11, Lemma B.2]). We find the previous definition convenient since it can be generalized to arbitrary discrete amenable groups which we will be considering in short. We have the following well known characterization of syndetic subsets of the integers in terms of their lower Banach density (which in fact holds for all discrete amenable groups, see [4, Theorem 2.7(a)]).

**Proposition 1.4.** A subset $\Lambda$ of $\mathbb{Z}$ is syndetic if and only if $\text{BD}_\mathbb{Z}(\Lambda) > 0$.

We can now state our main result which gives a uniform version of Furstenberg’s multiple recurrence statement in (1).

**Theorem 1.5 (Uniform syndeticity, $\mathbb{Z}$-actions).** For every integer $d \geq 1$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $\delta, \eta > 0$ (only depending on $\varepsilon$ and $d$) such that for every (not necessarily separable or ergodic) $\mathbb{Z}$-system $(X, \mu, T)$ and every measurable set $E$ in $X$ with $\mu(E) \geq \varepsilon$ it holds

$$\text{BD}_\mathbb{Z}\left(\left\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : \mu(E \cap T^n(E) \cap T^{2n}(E) \cap \cdots \cap T^{(d-1)n}(E)) \geq \delta \right\}\right) \geq \eta.$$

In particular, the sets

$$\left\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : \mu(E \cap T^n(E) \cap T^{2n}(E) \cap \cdots \cap T^{(d-1)n}(E)) \geq \delta \right\}$$

are syndetic for all measurable sets $E$ in $X$ with $\mu(E) \geq \varepsilon$ and all $\mathbb{Z}$-systems $(X, \mu, T)$. 
In fact, we can prove a significantly more general version of Theorem 1.5 in which we can replace the group of integers $\mathbb{Z}$ by any uniformly amenable group. The notion of uniform amenability was introduced by Keller in [23]:

**Definition 1.6** (Uniform amenable groups). Let $F : \mathbb{N} \times (0,1) \to \mathbb{N}$ be a function. A discrete group $\Gamma$ is said to be **uniformly amenable** with respect to $F$ if and only if for every set $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ with cardinality $|\Lambda| \leq n$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exists a set $\Lambda' \subset \Gamma$ with cardinality $|\Lambda'| \leq F(n, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\max_{\gamma \in \Lambda} |\Lambda' \Delta \gamma \Lambda'| \leq \varepsilon |\Lambda'|.$$

For basic group-theoretic properties of uniformly amenable groups, we refer the interested reader to [23, §4], see also [7, 32]. We just mention that trivially all uniformly amenable groups are amenable, but there are amenable groups which are not uniformly amenable, see [32] for a counterexample. On the other hand, all (not necessarily countable) solvable groups are uniformly amenable. In particular, all nilpotent and abelian groups are uniformly amenable.

We can now state the generalization of Theorem 1.5 where we consider probability algebra dynamical systems (which are introduced in short) and define the lower Banach density $\text{BD}_\Gamma$ by replacing $\mathbb{Z}$ with $\Gamma$ in Definition 1.3 and considering left-invariant measures. Related to this, throughout Følner nets are left Følner nets and syndetic sets are left syndetic sets (analogous statements hold true if we replace left by right).

**Theorem 1.7** (Uniform syndeticity, amenable actions). Let $\Gamma$ be a uniformly amenable group (not necessarily countable). For every integer $d \geq 1$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $\delta, \eta > 0$ (only depending on $\varepsilon$ and $d$) such that for every (not necessarily separable or ergodic) $\Gamma^d$-system $(X, \mu, T_1, \ldots, T_d)$, where $T_1, \ldots, T_d$ are pairwise commuting $\Gamma$-actions, and every measurable set $E$ in $X$ with $\mu(E) \geq \varepsilon$, it holds

$$\text{BD}_\Gamma \left( \left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \mu(T_1^{\gamma_1}(E) \cap T_2^{\gamma_1} \circ T_1^{\gamma_1}(E) \cap \cdots \cap T_d^{\gamma_1} \circ T_{d-1}^{\gamma_1} \circ \cdots \circ T_1^{\gamma_1}(E)) \geq \delta \right\} \right) \geq \eta.$$

In particular, the sets

$$\left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \mu(T_1^{\gamma_1}(E) \cap T_2^{\gamma_1} \circ T_1^{\gamma_1}(E) \cap \cdots \cap T_d^{\gamma_1} \circ T_{d-1}^{\gamma_1} \circ \cdots \circ T_1^{\gamma_1}(E)) \geq \delta \right\}$$
are syndetic for all measurable sets $E$ in $X$ with $\mu(E) \geq \varepsilon$ and for all $\Gamma^d$-systems $(X, \mu, T_1, \ldots, T_d)$.

**Question 1.1.** It is natural to expect that the previous theorem holds for all amenable groups also those which are not uniformly amenable. The assumption of uniform amenability is a retract of our proof method based on non-standard analysis. Is there a group or class of groups for which the statements of Theorem 1.7 fail?

**Remark 1.8.** One can replace in Theorem 1.7 the single group $\Gamma$ by a uniformly amenable set of groups $G$, and modify the statement of the theorem accordingly such that one obtains uniformity over all systems with respect to every $\Gamma \in G$. A set $G$ of discrete groups is said to be uniformly amenable with respect to some function $F : \mathbb{N} \times (0, 1) \to \mathbb{N}$ if and only if each group $\Gamma \in G$ is uniformly amenable with respect to $F$. We prove Theorem 1.7 in the case of a single group $\Gamma$, the same proof works if we replace $\Gamma$ by a uniformly amenable set of groups.

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.7 is an uncountable version of the amenable ergodic Szemerédi theorem of Austin [3]. As discussed in previous literature (e.g., see [11, 19, 21, 20, 22]), it is in a certain sense necessary to work in a pointfree category of probability algebra dynamical systems when dealing with uncountable groups and inseparable spaces, and utilizing canonical topological models of such systems to access tools such as disintegration of measures. These canonical models look weird at first glance, but turn out to have extremely favorable properties.

Let $\Gamma$ be an arbitrary not necessarily countable discrete amenable group. Let $(X, \mu)$ be a probability algebra, that is, $X$ is a $\sigma$-complete Boolean algebra and $\mu$ is a $\sigma$-additive probability measure on $X$ with the property that $\mu(E) = 0$ if and only if $E = 0$, where the last zero denotes the minimal element of the Boolean algebra $X$. We also do not assume any countability restrictions such as separability on $(X, \mu)$. We let $\text{Aut}(X, \mu)$ denote the automorphism group of $(X, \mu)$, that is the group of measure-preserving Boolean isomorphisms from $X$ to itself. Let $\Gamma^{\text{op}}$ be the opposite group and $T_1, \ldots, T_d : \Gamma^{\text{op}} \to \text{Aut}(X, \mu)$ be $d$ many commuting

---

2The use of the opposite group becomes clear in Section 2 when we formally introduce the category of probability algebra dynamical systems in which the arrows are implicitly reversed in order to make the canonical model functor covariant.
group homomorphisms, that is $T_i^\gamma \circ T_j^\gamma' = T_j^\gamma' \circ T_i^\gamma$ for all $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma^{\text{op}}$ and $1 \leq i < j \leq d$.

We have the following non-conventional ergodic theorem, where we define an $L^p$-space of a probability algebra as the $L^p$-space of its canonical model, see Section 2 for definitions.

**Theorem 1.9.** Let $\Gamma$ be a discrete amenable group, let $(X, \mu)$ be a probability algebra, let $T_1, \ldots, T_d : \Gamma^{\text{op}} \to \text{Aut}(X, \mu)$ be $d$ many commuting group homomorphisms, let $f_1, \ldots, f_d \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$, and let $(\Phi_i)$ be a left Følner net for $\Gamma$. Then the limit

$$\lim_i \frac{1}{|\Phi_i|} \sum_{\gamma \in \Phi_i} \prod_{i=1}^d (T_i^\gamma \circ \ldots \circ T_i^\gamma)^* f_i$$

exists in $L^2(X, \mu)$ and is independent of the left Følner net. Moreover, if $E \in X$ is such that $\mu(E) > 0$, then

$$\lim_i \frac{1}{|\Phi_i|} \sum_{\gamma \in \Phi_i} \mu\left( \bigcap_{i=1}^d (T_i^{\gamma^{-1}} \circ \ldots \circ T_i^{\gamma^{-1}})(E) \right) > 0.$$  

In particular, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \mu\left( \bigcap_{i=1}^d (T_i^{\gamma^{-1}} \circ \ldots \circ T_i^{\gamma^{-1}})(E) \right) > \varepsilon \right\}$$

is (left) syndetic in $\Gamma$.

We briefly discuss in which cases either of the statements in the previous theorem is known from previous literature.

- Furstenberg [12] established multiple recurrence for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$, $(X, \mu)$ separable, and $T_i = T^i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$, where $T : \mathbb{Z}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Aut}(X, \mu)$ is a group homomorphism, that is, he proved (4) when we replace the limit in (4) by limes inferior. This also implies (5) in this case. Furstenberg’s proof proceeds via an induction on a chain of factors of $(X, \mu, T)$ arising in the Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theorem [12, 13, 34, 35].

Much later, Host and Kra [18] and independently Ziegler [33] could prove the limit in (3) in the same separable $\mathbb{Z}$-case by refining Furstenberg–Zimmer structure theory by identifying the factors which are characteristic for the convergence in (3).

---

3Separability is understood in terms of the metric $d(E, F) := \mu(E \Delta F)$ on $X$, where $\Delta$ is symmetric difference.
• Multiple recurrence (when replacing the limit in (4) by limes inferior which also implies (5)) in the case of finitely many commuting $\mathbb{Z}$-actions and separable $(X, \mu)$ was established by Furstenberg and Katznelson in [14] based on a similar strategy as in [12], see also the textbook exposition [13] by Furstenberg. Austin [1] gives a simpler proof of multiple recurrence by constructing a suitable extension of the system instead of a Furstenberg–Zimmer structural analysis of factors. Norm convergence in this case for $d = 2$ was established by Conze and Lesigne [10] by structural ergodic methods, and in the general case by Tao [29] by reducing the ergodic statement to a combinatorial one, with subsequent proofs by Towsner [30], who translated Tao’s approach into a combination of non-standard analysis and ergodic theory, by Austin [2] using the ergodic extension methods developed by him, and by Host [17], who used parts of Austin’s approach and combined it with a variant of the ergodic seminorms introduced in [18].

• The case of (commuting) $\mathbb{Z}^d$-actions on separable spaces the limit (3) is covered by Austin [2] and Host [17]. A proof based on a Host–Kra–Ziegler structural analysis for ergodic $\mathbb{Z}^d$-systems is worked out by Griesmer [16].

• The multiple recurrence statements (4) and (5) when $\Gamma$ is an arbitrary countable abelian group can be deduced from the IP-recurrence theorem of Furstenberg and Katznelson [15]. The convergence statement (3) can be deduced from a straightforward adaptation of the arguments in [2, 17].

• In the more general case of a countable amenable group $\Gamma$ and separable probability algebras $(X, \mu)$, all statements in Theorem 1.9 for $d = 2$ are established in Bergelson, McCutcheon and Zhang [6]. These results are extended by the first author jointly with others to the case of uncountable $\Gamma$ and inseparable probability algebras $(X, \mu)$ in [11]. Zorin-Kranich [36] establishes the limit claim (3) in full generality by an adaptation of functional analytic methods developed by Walsh [31]. However Zorin-Kranich’s result does not give information about the limit, in particular it does not yield the multiple recurrence statements (4) and (5). These multiple recurrence statements are established in the case of countable amenable groups and separable spaces
by Austin [3] which also gives a new proof of the convergence statement by studying suitable extensions of the original system.

We also point out that Robertson [25] proved some partial results towards (3)–(5) in the case of second-countable amenable groups and separable spaces by modifying arguments in [6] to this continuous setting.

As (3) is proved by Zorin-Kranich [36] and (5) is a simple and routine consequence of (4) and the independence of the Følner net, we focus on establishing the multiple recurrence statement (4) by modifying the arguments in Austin [3]. In fact, once the basic uncountable setting is properly setup only few modifications to the arguments in [3] are required, and our contribution is to demonstrate how to develop Austin’s stated extension theory in such settings.

**Question 1.2.** Our method to obtain uniformity seems flexible: Prove an uncountable version of a known result, then use ultralimits to obtain uniformity in the countable result. This may potentially be of interest in other questions in ergodic Ramsey theory. Which?
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2. **Notation**

As we will need to work with uncountable (discrete) groups, mainly to avoid problems with null sets, our primarily objects are measure-preserving actions on probability algebras which are Boolean algebras equipped with an abstract probability measure (without an underlying point-set structure). At times, it is convenient to introduce concrete models for probability algebra dynamical systems, that is a point-set probability space equipped with a pointwise measure-preserving action which is isomorphic to the original probability algebra dynamical system in the category of probability algebra dynamical systems (all point-set probability spaces give naturally rise to a probability algebra by quotienting out their null ideal). Among these concrete (topological) models, the canonical model is particularly useful in ergodic theory due to its strong functoriality properties which for example yield a canonical disintegration of measures (a classical integration of measures does not exist for
Figure 1. The main categories and functors used in this paper (op indicates the use of the opposite category). Arrows with tails are faithful functors and arrows with two heads in one direction are full. Unlabelled functors are forgetful. The diagram is not fully commutative (even modulo natural isomorphisms), but the functors in blue form a commuting subdiagram.

canonical probability spaces which are not countably generated such as canonical models of probability algebras that are usually highly uncountable).

We will now introduce the category of probability algebra dynamical systems and the canonical model functor, see Figure 1. For a comprehensive background, references, and any unexplained concepts which are used in the sequel, we refer the interested reader to [22].

Definition 2.1 (Categories & functors).

(i) We denote by \textbf{AbsMbl} the category of abstract measurable spaces which we define as the opposite category of the category of \(\sigma\)-complete Boolean algebras and \(\sigma\)-complete Boolean homomorphisms.

(ii) We denote by \textbf{PrbAlg} the opposite category of the category of probability algebras and measure-preserving Boolean homomorphisms. Note that the category \textbf{PrbAlg} has arbitrary inverse limits (e.g., see [22]), a fact which will be useful for us later.

(iii) We denote by \textbf{Hilb} the category of complex Hilbert spaces and linear isometries.

(iv) We denote by \textbf{CHPrb} the category of compact Hausdorff spaces equipped with a Baire-Radon probability measure and measure-preserving continuous functions.

(v) Given a (discrete) group \(\Gamma\), we can turn a category \(C = \textbf{Hilb}, \textbf{PrbAlg}, \textbf{CHPrb}\) into a dynamical category \(C_{\Gamma}\) as follows. Given an object \(X\) in \(C\), we can associate with \(X\) the group \(\text{Aut}(X)\) of its automorphisms in \(C\). The dynamical category \(C_{\Gamma}\) now
consists of pairs \((X, T)\) where \(X\) is a \(C\)-object and \(T : \Gamma \to \text{Aut}(X)\) a group homomorphism. A \(C\Gamma\)-morphism is a \(C\)-morphism which intertwines with the \(\Gamma\)-actions.

(vi) The abstraction functor \(\text{Abs}\) maps a concrete measurable space \((X, \Sigma_X)\) to the \(\text{AbsMbl}\)-object \(\Sigma_X\) and a measurable function \(f : (X, \Sigma_X) \to (Y, \Sigma_Y)\) to the \(\text{AbsMbl}\)-morphism \(f^* : \Sigma_X \to \Sigma_Y\) where \(f^*\) is the (opposite) pullback map \(f^*(E) := f^{-1}(E), E \in \Sigma_Y\).

We apply the \(\text{Abs}\)-functor to a concrete probability space \((X, \Sigma_X, \mu)\) and obtain an abstract probability space \((\Sigma_X, \mu)\). Let \(I_\mu = \{E \in \Sigma_X : \mu(E) = 0\}\) be the ideal of \(\mu\)-null sets. Then the quotient Boolean algebra \(X_\mu := \Sigma_X / I_\mu\) is \(\sigma\)-complete. We can lift the measure \(\mu\) to \(X_\mu\) in a natural way, and by an abuse of notation, we denote this lift by \(\mu\) again. The tuple \((X_\mu, \mu)\) is a probability algebra, and we define \(\text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}(X, \Sigma_X, \mu_X) := (X_\mu, \mu)\). If \(f : (X, \Sigma_X, \mu) \to (Y, \Sigma_Y, \nu)\) is a measure-preserving function, then the pullback map \(f^*\) maps the ideal \(I_\nu\) to the ideal \(I_\mu\). We obtain a \(\textbf{PrbAlg}\)-morphism \(\text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}(f) : (X_\mu, \mu) \to (Y_\nu, \nu)\).

(vii) The canonical model functor \(\text{Conc}\) reverses the process described in the previous item in such a way that the composition \(\text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs} \circ \text{Conc}\) is naturally isomorphic to the identity on \(\textbf{PrbAlg}\).

Let \((X, \mu)\) be a probability algebra. Let \(Z = Z_X\) be the Stone space of the Boolean algebra \(X\), that is the space of all non-zero Boolean homomorphisms from \(X\) to the trivial algebra \(\{0, 1\}\). The Stone space \(Z\) can be identified with a closed subset of the compact Hausdorff space \(\{0, 1\}^X\). For each \(E \in X\) let \(\kappa(E) = \{\phi \in Z : \phi(E) = 1\}\). Then \(\text{Clopen}(Z) = \{\kappa(E) : E \in X\}\) is the basis of clopen sets for the product topology on \(Z\). Thus \(Z\) is 0-dimensional and since it is also compact Hausdorff it is totally disconnected. Let \(\mathcal{B}a(Z)\) be the Baird\(^4\) \(\sigma\)-algebra on \(Z\) and let \(\mathcal{M}\) denote the ideal of meager sets in \(\mathcal{B}a(Z)\). The quotient algebra \(\mathcal{B}a(Z) / \mathcal{M}\) is a \(\sigma\)-complete Boolean algebra. By the Loomis–Sikorski theorem, the quotient algebra \(\mathcal{B}a(Z) / \mathcal{M}\) is isomorphic to \(X\) in the category of \(\sigma\)-complete Boolean algebras. Moreover it follows from the Baire category theorem that every set in \(E \in \mathcal{B}a(Z)\) can be represented as \(F \Delta M\) for a unique clopen set \(F\) and \(M \in \mathcal{M}\) where \(\Delta\) denotes symmetric difference.

\(^4\)Recall that on a compact Hausdorff space, the Baire \(\sigma\)-algebra is the smallest \(\sigma\)-algebra rendering all continuous functions measurable.
As $\text{C}^\text{open}(Z)$ is also isomorphic to $X$ in the category of Boolean algebras due to the Stone representation theorem, we can define a probability measure $\mu_Z : \mathcal{B}a(Z) \to [0, 1]$ by $\mu_Z(E) = \mu(\kappa^{-1}(F))$ where $F$ is the unique clopen set such that $E = F \Delta M$ for some $M \in \mathcal{M}$. We define the canonical model of $(X, \mu)$ to be the CHPrb-space $\text{Conc}(X, \mu) := (Z, \mathcal{B}a(Z), \mu_Z)$. Note that the null ideal $I_{\mu_Z} = \mathcal{M}$, and thus $\text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}(Z, \mathcal{B}a(Z), \mu_Z)$ is isomorphic to $(X, \mu)$ in PrbAlg.

Let $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \nu)$ be a PrbAlg-morphism. We define $\text{Conc}(f) : Z_X \to Z_Y$ by

$\text{Conc}(f)(\theta) = \theta \circ \phi$.

(viii) Next we define the $L^2$-functor. Let $(X, \mu)$ be a PrbAlg-space with canonical model $\text{Conc}(X, \mu) = (Z, \mathcal{B}a(Z), \mu_Z)$ as constructed previously. We define the $L^2$-functor on objects by $L^2(X, \mu) := L^2(Z, \mathcal{B}a(Z), \mu_Z)$. If $\pi : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \nu)$ is a PrbAlg-morphism, then $L^2(\pi) : L^2(Y, \nu) \to L^2(X, \mu)$ is defined by the Koopman operator $L^2(\pi)(f) := \pi^* f$ where $\pi^* f := f \circ \text{Conc}(\pi)$.

(ix) Similarly, we define the dynamical version of the functors $\text{Abs} \circ \text{Alg}$, $\text{Conc}$, and $L^2$.

A significant feature of the canonical model $\text{Conc}(X) = (Z_X, \mathcal{B}a(Z_X), \mu_{Z_X})$ of a PrbAlg-space $X = (X, \mu)$ is the strong Lusin property (cf. [22, Section 7]), which states that the commutative von Neumann algebra $L^\infty(Z_X, \mathcal{B}a(Z_X), \mu_{Z_X})$ is isomorphic to the commutative $C^*$-algebra $C(Z_X)$ of continuous functions on $Z_X$ in the category of unital $C^*$-algebras. In CHPrb-spaces with the strong Lusin property every equivalence class of bounded measurable functions has a continuous representative. A very useful consequence of this property is that it comes with a canonical disintegration of measures:

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $\Gamma$ be a discrete group. Let $\pi : (X, \mu, T) \to (Y, \nu, S)$ be a PrbAlg$_{\Gamma}$-morphism. Then there exists a unique Baire–Radon probability measure $\mu_y$ on $Z_X$ for each $y \in Z_Y$ which depends continuously on $y$ in the vague topology in the sense that $y \mapsto \int_{Z_X} f \, d\mu_y$ is continuous for every $f$ in the space of continuous functions $C(Z_X)$, and such that

$$\int_{Z_X} f(x) g(\text{Conc}(\pi)(x)) \, d\mu_{Z_X}(x) = \int_{Z_Y} \left( \int_{Z_X} f \, d\mu_y \right) g \, d\mu_{Z_Y}$$

(6)

for all $f \in C(Z_X)$, $g \in C(Z_Y)$. Furthermore, for each $y \in Z_Y$, $\mu_y$ is supported on the compact set $\text{Conc}(\pi)^{-1}([y])$, in the sense that $\mu_y(E) = 0$ whenever $E$ is a measurable set disjoint from
\[\text{Conc}(\pi)^{-1}(\{y\}). \] (Note that this conclusion does not require the fibers \(\text{Conc}(\pi)^{-1}(\{y\})\) to be Baire measurable.) Moreover, we have \(\mu_{S_{Zy}(y)} = (T_{Zx})^* \mu_y\) for all \(y \in Z_y\) and \(y \in \Gamma\).

Let \(\pi : (X, \mu, T) \to (Y, \nu, S)\) be a \PrbAlg\_\Gamma\-morphism and let \(\text{Conc}(\pi) : Z_X \to Z_Y\) be its canonical representation. For every \(f \in L^2(\text{Conc}(Y))\), the composition \(\text{Conc}(\pi)^* f\) is an element of \(L^2(\text{Conc}(X))\) since \(\text{Conc}(\pi)\) is measure-preserving. In fact, \(\{\text{Conc}(\pi)^* f : f \in L^2(\text{Conc}(Y))\}\) is a closed \(\Gamma\)-invariant subspace of \(L^2(\text{Conc}(X))\). Thus we can identify \(L^2(\text{Conc}(Y))\) with the closed subspace \(\text{Conc}(\pi)^* (L^2(\text{Conc}(Y)))\) in \(L^2(\text{Conc}(X))\). Using this identification, we can define a conditional expectation operator \(\mathbb{E}(\cdot|Y)\) from \(L^2(\text{Conc}(X))\) to \(L^2(\text{Conc}(Y))\). Since \(L^\infty\) is dense in \(L^2\) in the \(L^2\) topology and by Theorem 2.2, we obtain the disintegration of measures

\[\mathbb{E}(\cdot|Y)(y) = \int_{Z_X} f \, d\mu_y\]

almost surely for all \(f \in L^2(\text{Conc}(X))\).

An important application is a canonical construction of relatively independent products. Indeed, let \(\pi_1 : (X_1, \mu_1, T_1) \to (Y, \nu, S)\), \(\pi_2 : (X_2, \mu_2, T_2) \to (Y, \nu, S)\) be two \PrbAlg\_\Gamma\-morphisms. Let \((\mu_1^y)_{y \in Z_Y}\) and \((\mu_2^y)_{y \in Z_Y}\) be the corresponding canonical disintegration of measures. Define the probability measure

\[\mu_{Z_{X_1} \times Z_{X_2}}(E) := \int_{Z_Y} \mu_1^y \times \mu_2^y(E) \, d\mu_{Z_Y}\]

for all \(E \in \mathcal{B}(Z_{X_1}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Z_{X_2})\). Then

\[(Z_{X_1} \times Z_{X_2}, \mathcal{B}(Z_{X_1}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Z_{X_2}), \mu_{Z_{X_1} \times Z_{X_2}}, T_{Z_{X_1} \times T_{X_2}})\]

is a \text{CHPrb}\_\Gamma\-object coming with two \text{CHPrb}\_\Gamma\-morphisms \(\psi_1 : Z_{X_1} \times Z_{X_2} \to Z_{X_1}\) and \(\psi_2 : Z_{X_1} \times Z_{X_2} \to Z_{X_2}\). Applying the functor \text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}, we obtain a \PrbAlg\_\Gamma\-object \((X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \times \mu_2, T_1 \times T_2)\) and the two \PrbAlg\_\Gamma\-morphisms \text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}(\psi_1), \text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}(\psi_2)\) satisfying the
following commutative diagram in $\text{PrbAlg}_\Gamma$:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X_1 \times_Y X_2 \\
\downarrow \text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}(\psi_1) & & \downarrow \text{Alg} \circ \text{Abs}(\psi_2) \\
X_1 & \leftarrow & X_2 \\
\downarrow \pi_1 & & \downarrow \pi_2 \\
\leftarrow Y & & \leftarrow \end{array}
\]

3. Proof of Theorem 1.7

Assuming Theorem 1.9, we prove Theorem 1.7. Throughout this section, fix a uniformly amenable group $\Gamma$.

The proof goes by contradiction. Thus we assume there are $d \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $n \geq 1$ there are a $\Gamma^d$-system

\[ (X_n, \mu_n, T_n = (T_{n,1}, \ldots, T_{n,d})) \]

and $E_n \in X_n$ with $\mu_n(E_n) \geq \varepsilon$ such that

\[
\text{BD} \left( \left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \mu(T_{n,1}^{\gamma-1}(E_n) \cap T_{n,2}^{\gamma-1} \circ T_{n,1}^{\gamma-1}(E_n) \cap \cdots \cap T_{n,d}^{\gamma-1} \circ T_{n,d-1}^{\gamma-1} \circ \cdots \circ T_{n,1}^{\gamma-1}(E_n)) \geq 1/n \right\} \right) \leq 1/n.
\]

To derive a contradiction, we construct a $\Gamma^d$-system $(X, \mu, T)$ from $(X_n, \mu_n, T_n)$ that contains a set $E \in X$ with $\mu(E) \geq \varepsilon$ (obtained from the $E_n$) contradicting the assertions in Theorem 1.9. The construction of $(X, \mu, T)$ via an ultralimit process is routine; we refer the interested reader to [11] for details. We give a sketch of it next.

Fix a non-principal ultrafilter $p$ on $\mathbb{N}$. The key property of uniform amenable groups we need is the following result of Keller.

**Lemma 3.1.** A (discrete) group $\Gamma$ is uniformly amenable if and only if its ultrapower $\Gamma^*$ is amenable.

**Proof.** See [23] Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 5.3. \qed

Now let us pass to canonical models

\[(\tilde{X}_n, \mathcal{B}a(\tilde{X}_n), \mu_n, \tilde{T}_n)\]
for each $n$. We let $X^* = \prod_{n \to p} \tilde{X}_n$ be the ultraproduct of the sets $\tilde{X}_n$, and denote by

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \prod_{n \to p} E_n : (E_n) \in \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}(\tilde{X}_n) \right\},$$

the algebra of internal subsets of $X^*$. On which we can define the Loeb premeasure

$$\mu^* : \mathcal{A} \to [0, 1], \quad \mu^* \left( \prod_{n \to p} E_n \right) := \text{st} (\lim_{n \to p} \tilde{\mu}_n(E_n)),$$

where $\text{st}$ denotes the standard part function. As is well known $\mu^*$ extends to a countably additive probability measure $\mu$ on the $\sigma$-algebra of sets generated by $\mathcal{A}$. By a slight abuse of notation, we let $(X, \mu)$ denote the probability algebra associated to $(X^*, \sigma(\mathcal{A}), \mu)$.

For each $i = 1, \ldots, d$, and for every $\gamma^* = \lim_{n \to p} \gamma_n \in \Gamma^*$ and $\prod_{n \to p} E_n \in \mathcal{A}$, define

$$(\tilde{T}_i^*)^{\gamma^*} \left( \prod_{n \to p} E_n \right) := \prod_{n \to p} \tilde{T}_i^{\gamma_n}(E_n)$$

One checks that $(\tilde{T}_i^*)^{\gamma^*}$ is a well-defined $\Gamma^*$-action by Boolean automorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ which preserves the finitely additive probability measure $\mu^*$. By density and continuity, we can extend the $\tilde{T}_i^*$-actions to abstract $\textbf{PrbAlg}$-actions $T_i : \Gamma^* \to \text{Aut}(X, \mu)$. We obtain an abstract $(\Gamma^*)^d$-system $(X, \mu, T)$.

Now we need two lemmas (which were proven in [11] first) on ultralimits of (lower) Banach densities. We sketch the proof, and refer for further details to [11].

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $(m_n)$ be a sequence of $\Gamma$-invariant finitely additive probability measures $m_n : \mathcal{P}(\Gamma) \to [0, 1]$ (where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes power set). Then we can associate to $(m_n)$ a $\Gamma^*$-invariant finitely additive probability measure $m : \mathcal{P}(\Gamma^*) \to [0, 1]$.

**Proof.** By Łos’s theorem, the Loeb measure

$$m(A^*) := \text{st} (\lim_{n \to p} m_n(A_n))$$

is a $\Gamma^*$-invariant finitely additive probability measure on the algebra of internal subsets $A^* = \prod_{n \to p} A_n$ of $\Gamma^*$. We can extend $M(1_{A^*}) := m(A^*)$ to the closed linear hull $D$ of $\{ 1_{A^*} : A^* \subset \}$.
The following lemma follows from chasing definitions.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( A = \prod_{n \to p} A_n \) be an internal subset of \( \Gamma^* \). Then we have

\[
\text{st}(\lim_{n \to p} \text{BD}(A_n)) = \inf \{ \text{st}(\lim_{n \to p} m_n(A_n)) : m_n \in \mathcal{M}, n \in \mathbb{N} \},
\]

where \( \mathcal{M} \) is the collection of \( \Gamma \)-invariant finitely additive probability measures on \( \mathcal{P}(\Gamma) \).

We continue the proof of Theorem 1.7.

By construction, we have \( \mu(E^*) \geq \varepsilon \) where \( E^* = \prod_{n \to p} E_n \) and the \( E_n \) are as in (7). By Theorem 1.9 there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that

\[
D := \text{BD} \left( \{ \gamma \in \Gamma^* : \mu((T_1^*)^{-1}(E^*) \cap (T_2^*)^{-1}(E^*) \cap \cdots \cap (T_d^*)^{-1}(E^*)) \geq \delta \} \right) > 0.
\]

Let

\[
A_n = \{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \mu_n(T_{n,1}^* (E_n) \cap T_{n,2}^* (E_n) \cap \cdots \cap T_{n,d}^* (E_n) \cap T_{n,d-1}^* (E_n) \cap \cdots \cap T_{d,1}^* (E_n)) \geq \delta \}.
\]

By Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3

\[
D \leq \text{st}(\lim_{n \to p} \text{BD}(A_n)). \tag{9}
\]

By (7), the set

\[
R = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{BD}(A_n) \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\}
\]

contains all but finitely many \( n \). Since the Fréchet filter is contained in any non-principal ultrafilter, we must have \( R \in \wp \). Therefore it follows from (9) that \( D \) must be zero; however this contradicts (8). This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.7.
4. Proof of Theorem 1.9

The proof of Theorem 1.9 is a modification of Austin’s original proof. Our modifications aim at facilitating Austin’s proof to be carried out in a setup where spaces may not be standard Borel and groups may not be countable. We start by sketching out its strategy, single out the basic modifications required in order to carry out that strategy in an uncountable environment, and end by providing the details of those required modifications. Once this is set, we will refrain from repeating Austin’s proof verbatim, as the reader can equally read this proof in Austin’s original paper and we won’t be able to say it better.

Let \((X, \mu)\) be an arbitrary probability algebra, let \(\Gamma\) be an arbitrary discrete amenable group, and let \((\Phi_i)\) be a left Følner net for \(\Gamma\). Let \(d \geq 1\) be an integer and \(T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_d\) be commuting group homomorphisms \(T_i : \Gamma \to \text{Aut}(X, \mu)\), that is \(T_i^\gamma \circ T_j^\eta = T_j^\eta \circ T_i^\gamma\) for all \(\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma\) and \(1 \leq i < j \leq d\) (the automorphism group \(\text{Aut}(X, \mu)\) is taken in the category \(\text{PrbAlg}\)). We denote by \((\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2, \ldots, \tilde{T}_d)\) the corresponding canonical model.

We want to show the claim (4) in Theorem 1.9. This is achieved as follows. Consider the set of \(d\)-fold couplings on \(\tilde{X}^d\), which is the collection of Baire probability measures on \((\tilde{X}^d, \mathcal{B}(\tilde{X}^d))\) all of whose coordinate projections are \(\tilde{\mu}\). The set of \(d\)-fold couplings is convex and weak∗-compact in the Banach space dual of \(C(\tilde{X}^d)\). By Theorem 4.1 for each \(x \in \tilde{X}\), the averages

\[
\frac{1}{|\Phi_i|} \sum_{\gamma \in \Phi_i} \delta_{\tilde{T}_i^\gamma x, \tilde{T}_2^\gamma x, \ldots, \tilde{T}_d^\gamma x}
\]

exist in \(L^2(X, \mu)\) and are independent of the choice of the (left) Følner net \((\Phi_i)\).

**Theorem 4.1 (Zorin-Kranich’s convergence theorem).** Let \(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_d \in L^\infty(X, \mu)\). Then the limit

\[
\lim_i \frac{1}{|\Phi_i|} \sum_{\gamma \in \Phi_i} \prod_{i=1}^d (T_i^\gamma \circ \ldots \circ T_1^\gamma)^* f_i
\]

exists in \(L^2(X, \mu)\) and is independent of the choice of the (left) Følner net \((\Phi_i)\).
converge weakly to a measure $\lambda$ in the set of $d$-fold couplings, where we abbreviated by $\tilde{T}_1^\gamma \circ \tilde{T}_2^\gamma \circ \cdots \circ \tilde{T}_i^\gamma$. This weak convergence implies that

$$\frac{1}{|\Phi_i|} \sum_{\gamma \in \Phi_i} \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{T}_1^{\gamma_1}(E) \cap \tilde{T}_2^{\gamma_2}(E) \cap \cdots \cap \tilde{T}_i^{\gamma_i}(E)) \to \lambda(E^d)$$

for all $E \in \mathcal{B}a(\tilde{X})$. In order to establish multiple recurrence, it suffices to show that $\lambda(E_1 \times E_2 \times \cdots \times E_d) = 0$ implies $\tilde{\mu}(E_1 \cap E_2 \cap \cdots \cap E_d) = 0$.

Austin’s strategy is to verify this last implication by passing first to a suitable extension of the $\Gamma^d$-system $(X, \mu, T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_d)$, called a sated extension, to which he can then apply his modification of Tao’s Infinitary Removal Lemma from \cite{28}. This modified Infinitary Removal Lemma and how it implies multiple recurrence via sated extensions is explained in the beginning of Section 5 in \cite{3}. The modifications needed to extend these arguments to our uncountable setup, apart from the modifications to the very basic setup already introduced in Section 2, are

(i) Construction of sated extensions for probability algebra dynamical systems.

(ii) Extension of a factor map relative to a subgroup to the whole group for probability algebra dynamical systems.

These modifications are carried out in the next two sections.

4.1. **PrbAlg$_d$-sated extensions.** In this section, we verify that probability algebra dynamical systems admit sated extensions.

Recall that if $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2,$ and $I$ are closed subspaces of a Hilbert space, then $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are said to be relatively orthogonal over $I$ if for any $u \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $v \in \mathcal{H}_2$, we have $\langle u, v \rangle = \langle P_I u, P_I v \rangle$, where we denote by $P_\mathcal{H}$ the orthogonal projection onto the closed subspace $\mathcal{H}$.

The following simple characterization of relative orthogonality will be useful.

**Lemma 4.2.** Suppose $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2,$ and $I$ are closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. If in addition $I \subset \mathcal{H}_2$, then $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are relatively orthogonal over $I$ if and only if for any $u \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $P_I(u) = P_{\mathcal{H}_2}(u)$.

**Proof.** Suppose $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are relatively orthogonal over $I$. Fix $u \in \mathcal{H}_1$. For any $v \in \mathcal{H}_2$, $\langle u, v \rangle = \langle P_I u, P_I v \rangle = \langle P_I u, v \rangle$. Since $P_I u \in \mathcal{H}_2$, we have $P_{\mathcal{H}_2} u = P_{\mathcal{H}_2}(P_I u) = P_I u$.
Conversely, suppose for any vector in $\mathcal{H}_1$, its projection on $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are the same. For any $u \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $v \in \mathcal{H}_2$, we have

$$\langle P_I u, P_I v \rangle = \langle P_I u, v \rangle = \langle P_H u, v \rangle = \langle u, v \rangle.$$ 

□

**Definition 4.3 (PrbAlg$_{\Gamma}$-sated extensions).** A functorial $\sigma$-subalgebra is a functor $F$ from the category $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$ to the category $\text{AbsMbl}$ which sends any $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-object $X = (X, \mu)$ to a $\sigma$-subalgebra $F(X) \subset X_{\text{Bool}}$, and any $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism $\pi : (Y, \nu) \to (X, \mu)$ to the restriction $F(\pi) : F(Y) \to F(X)$ of the $\text{AbsMbl}$-morphism $\pi_{\text{AbsMbl}} : Y_{\text{Bool}} \to X_{\text{Bool}}$.

More generally, a functorial $L^2$-subspace of $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-spaces is a composition of functors $V = W \circ L^2$, where $W$ is a functor from the category $\text{Hilb}_{\Gamma}$ to $\text{Hilb}$ sending any object $\mathcal{H}$ to a closed subspace $V(\mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{H}$ and any morphism $\phi$ from a $\text{Hilb}_{\Gamma}$-object $\mathcal{H}$ to a $\text{Hilb}_{\Gamma}$-object $\mathcal{K}$ to the restriction $V(\phi) : V(\mathcal{H}) \to V(\mathcal{K})$.

Let $V$ be a functorial $L^2$-subspace of $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-spaces. A $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-space $X = (X, \mu)$ is said to be $V$-sated if for any $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism $\pi : (Y, \nu) \to (X, \mu)$, the subspaces $\pi^*(L^2(X))$ and $V(Y)$ of $L^2(Y)$ are relatively orthogonal over their common further subspace $\pi^*(V(X))$.

A $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism $\pi : (Y, \nu) \to (X, \mu)$ is said to be relatively $V$-sated if for any further $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism $\psi : (Z, \lambda) \to (Y, \nu)$, the subspaces $(\pi \circ \psi)^*(L^2(X))$ and $V(Z)$ are relatively orthogonal over $\psi^*(V(Y))$.

For the remainder of this section, we fix a functorial $L^2$-subspace $V$. By Lemma 4.2 and the inclusion relation $\pi^*(V(X)) \subset V(Y)$, we have the following useful characterization of a sated space: $X$ is $V$-sated if and only if for any $h \in L^2(X)$, $\pi^*(P_{V(X)}(h)) = P_{V(Y)}(\pi^*(h))$.

**Lemma 4.4.** Suppose that $\pi : Y \to X$ is a relatively $V$-sated $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism and $\phi : Z \to Y$ is a $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism. Then $\pi \circ \phi : Z \to X$ is relatively $V$-sated.

**Proof.** Let $\psi : W \to Z$ be a $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism. Fix $f \in L^2(X)$ and $g \in V(W)$. We want to show

$$\langle \pi \circ \phi \circ \psi \rangle_{L^2(W)} = \langle \psi^* P_{V(Z)}, ((\pi \circ \phi)^* f), g \rangle_{L^2(W)}.$$
(see Figure 2). Applying the definition of relative satedness of $Y \xrightarrow{\pi} X$ to the further extension $\phi \circ \psi \circ \phi \rightarrow Y$, we have

$$\langle (\pi \circ \phi) \ast f, g \rangle_{L^2(W)} = \langle (\phi \circ \psi) \ast P_{V(Y)}(\pi^* f), g \rangle_{L^2(W)}.$$

It remains to prove $P_{V(Z)}((\pi \circ \phi)^* f) = \phi^* P_{V(Y)}(\pi^* f)$. By the relative satedness of $Y \xrightarrow{\pi} X$ applied to the further extension $Z \xrightarrow{\phi} Y$, $V(Z)$ and $(\pi \circ \phi)^*(L^2(X))$ are relatively orthogonal over $\phi^*(V(Y))$. Lemma 4.2 gives the desired result. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 4.5.** Let $(A, \leq)$ be a directed set with no maximal element and $((X_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}, (\pi_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2})_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in A, \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2})$ be an inverse system of $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-spaces with inverse limit $(X, (\pi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A})$. Further assume that for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in A$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ the $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism $\pi_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}$ is relatively $V$-sated. Then the inverse limit $X$ is $V$-sated.

**Proof.** Each $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism $\pi_\alpha : X \rightarrow X_\alpha$ is relatively $V$-sated because we can factorize $\pi_\alpha = \pi_{\alpha, \alpha'} \circ \pi_{\alpha'}$ for some $\alpha < \alpha'$ and apply Lemma 4.4. Let $\psi : Y \rightarrow X$ be an arbitrary further $\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}$-morphism. For any $g \in V(Y)$ and $f \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \pi_\alpha^*(L^2(X_\alpha))$, we have

$$\langle \psi^* f, g \rangle_{L^2(Y)} = \langle \psi^* P_{V(X)}(f), g \rangle_{L^2(Y)}.$$
Since $\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \pi_\alpha^*(L^2(X_\alpha))$ is dense in $L^2(X)$, $f$ in the last equation can be replaced by any function in $L^2(X)$. Thus, $V(Y)$ and $\psi^*(L^2(X))$ are relatively orthogonal over $\psi^*(V(X))$, and so $X$ is $V$-sated.

□

**Lemma 4.6.** Every $\text{PrbAlg}_g$-space $X$ has a relatively $V$-sated extension.

**Proof.** We enumerate all elements of $L^2(X)$ as $\{f_\beta\}_{\beta < \alpha'}$ for some limit ordinal number $\alpha'$. For each ordinal $\gamma < \alpha'$, we let $A_\gamma = \{f_\beta : \beta' \leq \gamma\}$. Define a well-ordering on the set $\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha'} A_\gamma$ by the relation

$$(\gamma_1, f_{\beta_1}) < (\gamma_2, f_{\beta_2}) \Longleftrightarrow \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \text{ or } (\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 \text{ and } \beta_1 < \beta_2).$$

Since $\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha'} A_\gamma$ is well ordered, there exists an ordinal $\alpha$ and an order-preserving bijection $\Psi$ from $\{\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ to $\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha'} A_\gamma$. Since $\alpha'$ is a limit ordinal, for each $\gamma < \alpha'$ there is some $\gamma < \gamma' < \alpha'$. As a result, there is no maximal element in $\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha'} A_\gamma$; in other words, $\alpha$ is a limit ordinal as well.

Let $\Phi = \Pi \circ \Psi$ where $\Pi$ is the projection mapping to the second coordinate. For each $\gamma < \alpha$ and $f_{\beta'} \in L^2(X)$, we claim that there exists $\tau > \gamma$ such that $\Phi(\tau) = f_{\beta'}$. Suppose $\Psi(\gamma) = (\beta, g)$. We let $\beta_{\max} := \max\{\beta, \beta'\} + 1 < \alpha'$ and then $\Psi^{-1}(\beta_{\max}, f_{\beta'})$ is the desired $\tau$. The intuition is, when enumerating $L^2(X)$ by $\Phi$, each function appears not only infinitely many times but also arbitrarily late.

Resorting to transfinite induction, we construct a $\text{PrbAlg}_g$-extension $X_\beta$ of $X$ for every $\beta < \alpha$ and a $\text{PrbAlg}_g$-morphism $\phi_\beta^\epsilon$ from $X_\beta$ to $X_\gamma$ for every $\gamma < \beta < \alpha$. Set $X_0 := X$. Suppose $\epsilon \leq \alpha$ is an ordinal and for each $\gamma < \beta < \epsilon$, $X_\beta$ and $\phi_\beta^\epsilon$ have been constructed.

Case 1: $\epsilon$ is the successor of $\epsilon - 1$. For any $\text{PrbAlg}_g$-extension $\eta : Z \to X_{\epsilon - 1}$, we have

$$||P_{V(Z)}((\phi_\epsilon^{\epsilon - 1} \circ \eta)^* \Phi(\epsilon))||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\epsilon - 1})}((\phi_\beta^{\epsilon - 1})^* \Phi(\epsilon))||_2 \leq ||\Phi(\epsilon)||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\epsilon - 1})}((\phi_\beta^{\epsilon - 1})^* \Phi(\epsilon))||_2$$

since every orthogonal projection is a contraction. Hence, we find a $\text{PrbAlg}_g$-extension $\phi_{\epsilon - 1}^\epsilon : X_\epsilon \to X_{\epsilon - 1}$ such that the difference

$$||P_{V(X_\epsilon)}((\phi_\beta^{\epsilon - 1} \circ \phi_{\epsilon - 1}^\epsilon)^* \Phi(\epsilon))||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\epsilon - 1})}((\phi_\beta^{\epsilon - 1})^* \Phi(\epsilon))||_2$$
is at least half its supremum value over all extensions $\eta : Z \to X_{\gamma}$. For any $\gamma < \epsilon - 1$, we set $\phi_{\gamma}^\epsilon = \phi_{\gamma}^{\epsilon - 1} \circ \phi_{\epsilon - 1}^\epsilon$.

Case 2: $\epsilon$ is a limit ordinal. Let $(Z_{\epsilon}, (\psi_{\beta})_{\beta < \epsilon})$ be the inverse limit of the inverse system $(X_{\beta})_{\beta < \epsilon}, (\phi_{\gamma \leq \beta})_{\gamma \leq \beta < \epsilon}$). Let $\psi_\epsilon : X_{\epsilon} \to Z_{\epsilon}$ be a PrbAlg-$\eta$-extension such that the difference

$$||P_{V(X_{\gamma})}((\psi_\epsilon \circ \psi_{\beta}^\epsilon)^* \Phi(\epsilon))||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\gamma})}((\psi_{\beta}^\epsilon)^* \Phi(\epsilon))||_2$$

is at least half its supremum possible value over all extensions of $Z_{\epsilon}$. Set $\phi_{\epsilon}^\gamma = \psi_{\epsilon} \circ \psi_{\epsilon}$.

We now show that $\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha : X_{\alpha} \to X$ is relatively $V$-sated. Let $\pi : Y \to X_{\alpha}$ be an arbitrary further extension. By Lemma 4.2, it is equivalent to showing that for any $f \in L^2(X)$,

$$P_{V(Y)}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha \circ \pi)^* f) = \pi^* P_{V(X_{\alpha})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f).$$

Since $\pi^*(V(X_{\alpha})) \subset V(Y)$, it suffices to show

$$||P_{V(Y)}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha \circ \pi)^* f)||_2 \leq ||P_{V(X_{\alpha})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2.$$

Suppose by contradiction, $||P_{V(Y)}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha \circ \pi)^* f)||_2 > ||P_{V(X_{\alpha})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2$. We know $||P_{V(X_{\gamma})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2$ is increasing in $\gamma$ and bounded above by $||f||_2$. By the construction of $\Phi$, $f$ appears in the image of $\Phi$ infinitely many times. There exists an ordinal $\gamma$ large enough such that $\Phi(\gamma) = f$ and one of the following holds:

(i) $\gamma$ is a successor and

$$||P_{V(X_{\gamma})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\epsilon)^* f)||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\gamma - 1})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^{\gamma - 1})^* f)||_2 < \frac{1}{2} \left(||P_{V(Y)}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha \circ \pi)^* f)||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\alpha})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2\right).$$

(ii) $\gamma$ is a limit ordinal and

$$||P_{V(X_{\gamma})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\gamma)^* f)||_2 - ||P_{V(Z_{\gamma})}((\psi_{\gamma})^* f)||_2 < \frac{1}{2} \left(||P_{V(Y)}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha \circ \pi)^* f)||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\alpha})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2\right)$$

where $Z_{\gamma}$ is as above.

Since $||P_{V(X_{\gamma})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2 \geq ||P_{V(X_{\gamma - 1})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^{\gamma - 1})^* f)||_2$ when $\gamma$ is a successor and $||P_{V(X_{\alpha})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2 \geq ||P_{V(Z_{\gamma})}((\psi_{\gamma})^* f)||_2$ when $\gamma$ is a limit ordinal, we have

$$||P_{V(X_{\gamma})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\gamma)^* f)||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\gamma - 1})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^{\gamma - 1})^* f)||_2 < \frac{1}{2} \left(||P_{V(Y)}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha \circ \pi)^* f)||_2 - ||P_{V(X_{\alpha})}((\phi_{\epsilon}^\alpha)^* f)||_2\right),$$
or
\[
\|P_{V(X)}((\phi_0^\gamma)^* f)\|_2 - \|P_{V(Z)}((\psi_0^\gamma)^* f)\|_2 < \frac{1}{2} \left(\|P_{V(Y)}((\phi_0^\alpha \circ \pi)^* f)\|_2 - \|P_{V(Z)}((\psi_0^\gamma)^* f)\|_2\right),
\]
either of which contradicts our choice of \(X_\gamma\). Thus we have \(\phi_0^\alpha : X_\alpha \to X\) is relatively \(V\)-sated. □

The two lemmas above give the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.7.** If \(V\) is a functorial \(L^2\)-subspace of \(\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}\)-spaces, then for every \(\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}\)-space \(X = (X, \mu)\), there is a \(\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}\)-morphism \(\pi : Y \to X\) such that \(Y = (Y, \nu)\) is \(V\)-sated.

### 4.2. Extending factors relative to subgroups.

In this section, we show how to extend a factor map relative to a subgroup to a factor map of the whole group. The corresponding result for countable groups and standard Borel spaces is [3, Theorem 2.1].

**Theorem 4.8.** Let \(\Gamma\) be an arbitrary discrete group, not necessarily countable or amenable. Let \(H\) be a subgroup of \(\Gamma\). Let \(X = (X, \mu, T)\) be a \(\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}\)-system and \(Y = (Y, \nu, S)\) a \(\text{PrbAlg}_{H}\)-system. Denote by \(X_H = (X, \mu, T|_H)\) the \(\text{PrbAlg}_{H}\)-system where \(T|_H\) is the restriction of the group homomorphism \(T : \Gamma \to \text{Aut}(X, \mu)\) to \(H\). If \(\beta : Y \to X\) is a \(\text{PrbAlg}_{H}\)-factor map, then there are a \(\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}\)-system \(Z = (Z, \theta, R)\), a \(\text{PrbAlg}_{\Gamma}\)-extension \(\pi : Z \to X\), and a \(\text{PrbAlg}_{H}\)-extension \(\alpha : Z_H \to Y\) such that the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Z_H & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y \\
\downarrow{\pi} & & \downarrow{\beta} \\
X_H & & \\
\end{array}
\]

commutes in \(\text{PrbAlg}_{H}\).

**Proof.** We construct \(Z\), \(\alpha\), and \(\pi\) as follows. First, we pass to the canonical models \(\tilde{X} = (\tilde{X}, \mathcal{B}(\tilde{X}), \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{T})\), \(\tilde{Y} = (\tilde{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\tilde{Y}), \tilde{\nu}, \tilde{S})\), and \(\tilde{\beta}\) of \(X\), \(Y\), and \(\beta\), respectively. Second, we construct a \(\text{CH}_{\Gamma}\)-system \((\tilde{Z}, \tilde{R})\) and \(\text{CH}_{\Gamma}\)-maps \(\tilde{\alpha}\) and \(\tilde{\pi}\) satisfying a related commutative diagram in the dynamical category \(\text{CH}_{\Gamma}\). Third, we construct a probability measure \(\tilde{\theta}\) on \((\tilde{Z}, \mathcal{B}(\tilde{Z}))\) and show that it preserves the \(\tilde{R}\)-action. Finally, we verify that this \(\text{CHPrb}_{\Gamma}\)-system satisfies the right commutative diagram. We can then map this diagram to the dynamical categories of probability algebras using the deletion and abstraction functors \(\text{Alg}\) and \(\text{Abs}\).
Step 1: we build a \( CH_f \)-system \((\tilde{Z}, \tilde{R})\). Let

\[
\tilde{Z} := \{(y_\gamma)_\gamma \in \tilde{Y}^\Gamma : y_{\eta \gamma} = \tilde{S}^{y_\gamma -1} y_\gamma \text{ and } \tilde{\beta}(y_\gamma) = \tilde{T}^{y_\gamma -1} \tilde{\beta}(y_\gamma) \text{ for all } \gamma \in \Gamma, \eta \in H\}
\]

where \( e \) is the identity of \( \Gamma \). Note that \( \tilde{Z} \) is a compact subspace of \( \tilde{Y}^\Gamma \) (this basically follows from the fact that \( \tilde{S}, \tilde{T} \) act by homeomorphisms and \( \tilde{\beta} \) is continuous). We can define a \( CH_f \)-action \( \tilde{R} : \Gamma \to \text{Aut}(\tilde{Z}) \) by

\[
\tilde{R}_\gamma ((y_\gamma)_\gamma) := (y_{(y_\gamma)\gamma})_\gamma.
\]

(One easily checks that \( \tilde{Z} \) is an \( \tilde{R} \)-invariant set so that \( \tilde{R} \) is well defined).

We set \( \tilde{\alpha} : \tilde{Z} \to \tilde{Y} \) to be \( \tilde{\alpha}((y_\gamma)_\gamma) := y_e \) and \( \tilde{\pi} := \tilde{\beta} \circ \tilde{\alpha} \). By construction, the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{Z} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{R}} & \tilde{X} \\
\xrightarrow{\tilde{\alpha}} & & \xleftarrow{\tilde{\beta}} \\
\tilde{Y} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}} & \\
\end{array}
\]

commutes in the dynamical category \( CH_H \). By construction of \( \tilde{Z} \), the map \( \tilde{\pi} \) is also a \( CH_f \)-factor map.

Endow the space \( \tilde{Z} \) with the Baire \( \sigma \)-algebra \( Ba(\tilde{Z}) \), which coincides with the restriction of \( Ba(\tilde{Y}^\Gamma) = Ba(\tilde{Y})^{\otimes \Gamma} \) to \( \tilde{Z} \) by \([21]\) Lemma 2.1. In particular, the maps in the previous diagram preserve Baire measurability.

Step 2: we construct a probability measure \( \tilde{\nu} \) on \((\tilde{Z}, Ba(\tilde{Z}))\). Let \( \{\nu_x\}_{x \in \tilde{X}} \) be the canonical disintegration of \( \tilde{\nu} \) with respect to the factor map \( \tilde{\beta} : \tilde{Y} \to \tilde{X} \). For each \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) and \( x \in \tilde{X} \), define \( \tilde{\nu}_{\gamma,x} \) on \((\tilde{Y}^\Gamma, Ba(\tilde{Y}^\Gamma))\) by

\[
\tilde{\nu}_{\gamma,x}(E) := \nu_x(\{y \in \tilde{Y} : (\tilde{S}^{y_\gamma -1} y_{\eta \gamma})_{\eta \gamma \in \gamma H} \in E\}).
\]

Since we can identify the Baire \( \sigma \)-algebra \( Ba(\tilde{Y}^\gamma H) \) with the product \( \sigma \)-algebra \( Ba(\tilde{Y})^{\otimes \gamma H} \), it follows that \( \tilde{\nu}_{\gamma,x} \) is well defined by first verifying cylinder sets and then applying the \( \pi-\lambda \) theorem.

By the axiom of choice, we pick a representative from each left coset \( \gamma H \) an element \( \omega \) and denote their collection by \( \Omega \). We identify \( \tilde{Y}^\Gamma = \prod_{\omega \in \Omega} \tilde{Y}_{\omega}^{\omega H} \) so as to define a probability measure

\[
\tilde{\nu}'_x := \otimes_{\omega \in \Omega} \tilde{\nu}_{\omega, \tilde{Y}_{\omega H}^{-1}} x.
\]
on $Ba(\tilde{Y}) = Ba(\tilde{Y}^H)^\otimes \Omega$. We show that the definition of $\tilde{\nu}_x$ is independent from the choice of representatives. If $x \in X$, $A \in Ba(\tilde{Y}^H)$, and $\nu_1 = \nu_2 \eta_1$, which means $\gamma_1 H = \gamma_2 H$, then we have

$$
\tilde{\nu}_{\gamma_1, \Gamma^{\gamma_1}}(E) = \nu_{\Gamma^{\gamma_1}}(\{ y : (\tilde{S}^\eta \gamma_1) y) \gamma_1 H \in E \})
$$

$$
\tilde{\nu}_{\gamma_1, \Gamma^{\gamma_1}}(E) = \nu_{\gamma_2 \eta_2 \Gamma^{\gamma_2}}(\{ y : (\tilde{S}^\eta \gamma_2) y) \gamma_2 H \in E \})
$$

$$
\tilde{\nu}_{\gamma_1, \Gamma^{\gamma_1}}(E) = \nu_{\gamma_2 \eta_2 \Gamma^{\gamma_2}}(\{ y : (\tilde{S}^\eta \gamma_2) y) \gamma_2 H \in E \})
$$

Therefore, we need to check the well-definedness of $\tilde{\nu}_x$ independent from the choice of representatives.

Since $\tilde{\nu}_x$ is independent from the choice of representatives, we conclude that the product probability measure $\tilde{\nu}_x$ is independent from the choice of representatives.

Next, we define a measure $\tilde{\nu}_x$ on $(\tilde{Z}, Ba(\tilde{Z}))$ by

$$
\tilde{\nu}_x(E \cap \tilde{Z}) := \tilde{\nu}_x(E)
$$

for each $E \in Ba(\tilde{Y})$. Note that $\tilde{Z}$ is a closed subset of $\tilde{Y}$ but may not be Baire measurable. Therefore, we need to check the well-definedness of $\tilde{\nu}_x$. It suffices to show that

$$
E \in Ba(\tilde{Y}) \text{ and } E \cap \tilde{Z} = \emptyset \Rightarrow \tilde{\nu}_x(E) = 0.
$$

Since $Ba(\tilde{Y}) = Ba(\tilde{Y})^\otimes \Omega$, $E$ depends on only countably many coordinates. Hence there exists $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that $E = E' \times \otimes_{\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}} \tilde{Y}$ where $E' \in Ba(\tilde{Y})^\otimes \Omega$. Let

$$
\tilde{Z}^* = \{ (y_\gamma) \gamma \in \tilde{Y} : y_\gamma \eta = \tilde{S}^\eta \gamma_1 y_\gamma \text{ and } \tilde{\beta}(y_\gamma) = \tilde{\alpha}^\eta \gamma_1 \tilde{\beta}(y_\gamma) \text{ for all } i \geq 1 \text{ and } \gamma_\eta \in \{\gamma_i : i \geq 1\} \}.
$$

Since $\tilde{Z} \cap E = \emptyset$ implies $\tilde{Z}^* \cap E = \emptyset$, in order to show $\tilde{\nu}_x(E) = 0$, it suffices to show $\tilde{\nu}_x(\tilde{Z}^*) = 1$ (since $\tilde{Z}^*$ only depends on countable many coordinates, it is guaranteed to be Baire measurable). We group the $\gamma_i$ according to the left cosets $\omega H$ they belong to. So suppose
\( \{ \gamma_i \} = \bigcup_i \{ \omega_{i,j} \}, \) where each \( \eta_{i,j} \in H, \) \( \omega_i \in \Omega. \) For each \( \omega_i, \) we have

\[
\tilde{\nu}_{\omega_i, \tilde{T}_i^{-1}} \left( (y_{\omega_{i,j}})_{\omega_i \in H} : y_{\omega_{i,j}} = \tilde{S}^{\eta_{j,1}}_{i} y_{\omega_i}, \tilde{\beta}(y_{\omega_i}) = \tilde{T}^\omega_{i,j} x \right) = 1.
\]

Note that

\[
\otimes_{i=1}^\infty \left( (y_{\omega_{i,j}})_{\omega_i \in H} : y_{\omega_{i,j}} = \tilde{S}^{\eta_{j,1}}_{i} y_{\omega_i}, \tilde{\beta}(y_{\omega_i}) = \tilde{T}^\omega_{i,j} x \right) \times \otimes_{\omega \neq \omega_i} \hat{\gamma}_{\omega} H \subseteq \hat{Z}^*.
\]

Thus \( \tilde{\nu}'(\hat{Z}^*) = 1 \) and consequently, \( \tilde{\nu}_x \) is well defined.

For any set \( A = A' \cap \hat{Z} \in \mathcal{B}a(\hat{Z}) \) where \( A' \in \mathcal{B}a(\hat{Y}) \), we aim to prove the mapping \( x \mapsto \tilde{\nu}_x(A) \) is Baire measurable. Suppose there are \( \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m \in \Omega, \eta_{1,1}, \ldots, \eta_{m,1} \in H \) for each \( i \leq m, \) and \( A_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}a(\hat{Y}) \) for all \( i \leq m \) and \( j \leq n_i \) such that \( A' = \{(y_\gamma)_\gamma : y_{\omega_{i,j}} \in A_{i,j} \forall i \leq m, j \leq n_i \}. \) Then

\[
\tilde{\nu}'(A') = \prod_{i=1}^m \tilde{\nu}_{\omega_i, \tilde{T}_i^{-1}} \left( (y_{\omega_{i,j}})_{\omega_i \in H} : y_{\omega_{i,j}} \in A_{i,j} \text{ for any } j \leq n_i \right)
\]

\[
= \prod_{i=1}^m \tilde{\nu}_{\tilde{T}_i^{-1}} \left( \tilde{S}^{\eta_{1,1}}_{i} A_{1,1} \cap \cdots \cap \tilde{S}^{\eta_{m,1}}_{i} (A_{m,1}) \right).
\]

Since \( x \mapsto \nu_x \) is Baire measurable and the product of finitely many Baire measurable functions is still Baire measurable. It follows that \( x \mapsto \tilde{\nu}_x(A) \) is Baire measurable whenever \( A' \in \mathcal{B}a(\hat{Y}), \) as the cylinder sets generate \( \mathcal{B}a(\hat{Y}). \) As a result, we are able to define

\[
\tilde{\theta} := \int_{\hat{X}} \tilde{\nu}_x d\hat{\mu}(x).
\]

Observe that each \( \tilde{\nu}_x(\hat{Z}) = \tilde{\nu}'(\hat{Y}) = 1. \) Therefore, \( \tilde{\theta} \) is a probability measure as well.

Step 3: we verify that \( (\hat{Z}, \mathcal{B}a(\hat{Z}), \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{R}) \) is a \( \text{CHPrb}_{\Gamma} \)-system satisfying the desired diagram.

We claim that \( \tilde{R} \) is a measure-preserving transformation. Suppose \( \gamma' \in \Gamma, x \in \hat{X}, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m \in \Omega, \eta_{1,1}, \ldots, \eta_{m,n_i} \in H \) for each \( i \leq m, \) and \( A_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}a(\hat{Y}) \) for all \( i \leq m \) and \( j \leq n_i. \) Then we obtain

\[
\tilde{R}^\gamma \tilde{\nu}'(\{(y_\gamma)_\gamma : y_{\omega_{i,j}} \in A_{i,j} \forall i \leq m, j \leq n_i \})
\]

\[
= \tilde{\nu}'(\{(y_{\gamma'})_{\gamma'} : y_{(\gamma')^{-1}\omega_{i,j}} \in A_{i,j} \forall i \leq m, j \leq n_i \})
\]

\[
= \prod_{i=1}^m \tilde{\nu}_{\tilde{T}_{i}^{-1} \gamma'} \left( \tilde{S}^{\eta_{1,1}}_{i} (A_{1,j}) \cap \cdots \cap \tilde{S}^{\eta_{m,n_i}}_{i} (A_{m,j}) \right)
\]

\[
= \tilde{\nu}'_{\tilde{T}_{i}^{-1} \gamma'} \{(y_\gamma)_\gamma : y_{\omega_{i,j}} \in A_{i,j} \forall i \leq m, j \leq n_i \}.
\]
where the last two equalities follow from two applications of (11) (while in the first applications we work with family of representatives \((\gamma')^{-1} \Omega\) instead of \(\Omega\)). Therefore, \(\tilde{R}_{\gamma'}^x \tilde{\nu}'_x = \tilde{\nu}'_{T_{\gamma'}^x} \).

By the definition of \(\tilde{\nu}_x\), \(\tilde{R}_{\gamma'}^x \tilde{\nu}_x = \tilde{\nu}_{T_{\gamma'}^x} \). Since \(\tilde{\mu}\) is \(\tilde{T}\)-invariant, integrating \(\tilde{R}_{\gamma'}^x \tilde{\nu}_x = \tilde{\nu}_{T_{\gamma'}^x} \) over \(\tilde{\mu}\) gives \(\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{R}_{\gamma'}^x \tilde{\nu}_x \).

Recall that the map \(\tilde{\alpha}\) is a \(\text{CHH}_{\bar{H}}\)-factor map. Moreover, for any \(x \in \tilde{X}\), we have \(\tilde{\alpha}^* \tilde{\nu}_x = \nu_x\) by observing that for any \(A \in \mathcal{B}(\tilde{Y})\),

\[
\tilde{\nu}_x(\alpha^{-1} A) = \tilde{\nu}'_x(A \times \otimes_{y \neq \gamma \in \Gamma} Y) = \nu_x(A).
\]

Therefore,

\[
\tilde{\alpha}^* \tilde{\theta} = \int_{\tilde{X}} \tilde{\alpha}^* \tilde{\nu}_x \tilde{\mu}(dx) = \int_{\tilde{X}} \tilde{\nu}_x \tilde{\mu}(dx) = \tilde{\nu},
\]

which shows that \(\tilde{\alpha}\) is a \(\text{CHPrb}_{\bar{H}}\)-factor map.

It remains to show that \(\tilde{\pi}\) is a \(\text{CHPrb}_{\Gamma}\)-factor map, but this is a direct consequence of (12):

\[
\tilde{\pi}^* \tilde{\theta} = \beta^* \tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\mu}.
\]
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