Measurable Hall's theorem for actions of $\mathbb{Z}^d$

Marcin Sabok (McGill)

Arctic Set Theory, 2019

Definition

Suppose Γ is a group acting on a space X. Two subsets $A, B \subseteq X$ are Γ-*equidecomposable* if there are partitions

$$A_1, \ldots, A_n, \quad B_1, \ldots, B_n$$

of both sets

$$A = \bigcup_i A_i \quad B = \bigcup_i B_i$$

such that

$$\gamma_i A_i = B_i$$

for some $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n \in \Gamma$.

Definition

Suppose Γ is a group acting on a space X. Two subsets $A, B \subseteq X$ are Γ-*equidecomposable* if there are partitions

$$A_1, \ldots, A_n, \quad B_1, \ldots, B_n$$

of both sets

$$A = \bigcup_i A_i \quad B = \bigcup_i B_i$$

such that

$$\gamma_i A_i = B_i$$

for some $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n \in \Gamma$.

Banach–Tarski paradox

The Banach–Tarski paradox says that the unit ball and two copies of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$ are $\mathrm{Iso}(\mathbb{R}^3)$-equidecomposable.

Fact (Banach)

For Γ amenable group, preserving a probability measure μ on X and two measurable sets A, B if A and B are equidecomposable, then $\mu(A) = \mu(B)$

Fact (Banach)

For Γ amenable group, preserving a probability measure μ on X and two measurable sets A, B if A and B are equidecomposable, then $\mu(A) = \mu(B)$

Question (Tarski, 1925)

Are the unit square and the unit disc equidecomposable using isometries on $\mathbb{R}^2$?

Theorem (Laczkovich)

If $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are bounded, measurable such that $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$ and

$$\dim_{\mathrm{box}}(\partial A) < n, \quad \dim_{\mathrm{box}}(\partial B) < n,$$

then A and B are equidecomposable by translations.

Theorem (Laczkovich)

If $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are bounded, measurable such that $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$ and

$$\dim_{\text{box}}(\partial A) < n, \quad \dim_{\text{box}}(\partial B) < n,$$

then A and B are equidecomposable by translations.

Here the (upper) box dimension

$$\dim_{\text{box}}(S) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\log N(\varepsilon)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}.$$

where $N(\varepsilon)$ is the number of cubes of side length ε needed to cover S.

Remark 1

Even though the assumption on the boundary looks technical, some assumption besides the equality of measure is necessary (as shown also by Laczkovich)

Remark 1

Even though the assumption on the boundary looks technical, some assumption besides the equality of measure is necessary (as shown also by Laczkovich)

Remark 2

Laczkovich's proof did not provide measurable pieces in the decomposition.

Theorem (Grabowski, Máthé, Pikhurko, 2017)

If $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are bounded, measurable such that $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$ and

$$\dim_{\text{box}}(\partial A) < n, \quad \dim_{\text{box}}(\partial B) < n,$$

then A and B are equidecomposable by translations using measurable pieces.

Theorem (Grabowski, Máthé, Pikhurko, 2017)

If $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are bounded, measurable such that $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$ and

$$\dim_{\text{box}}(\partial A) < n, \quad \dim_{\text{box}}(\partial B) < n,$$

then A and B are equidecomposable by translations using measurable pieces.

Theorem (ZF) (Marks, Unger, 2017)

If $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are bounded, Borel such that $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$ and

$$\dim_{\text{box}}(\partial A) < n, \quad \dim_{\text{box}}(\partial B) < n,$$

then A and B are equidecomposable by translations using Borel pieces.

Action

Laczkovich constructs an action of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ on the torus $\mathbb{T}^n$ for large d, choosing $u_1, \ldots, u_d \in \mathbb{T}^n$ by

$$(k_1, \ldots, k_d) \cdot x = x + k_1 u_1 + \ldots k_d u_d$$

Action

Laczkovich constructs an action of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ on the torus $\mathbb{T}^n$ for large d, choosing $u_1, \ldots, u_d \in \mathbb{T}^n$ by

$$(k_1, \ldots, k_d) \cdot x = x + k_1 u_1 + \ldots k_d u_d$$

Cubes

For such a free action u, the orbits look like copies of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and we look at finite fragments of the orbits of the form

$$F_N^u(x) = [0, N]^d \cdot x$$

Definition (discrepancy)

Given an action $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$, a subset $A \subseteq X$ and a finite subset F of an orbit, the **discrepancy** is defined as

$$D(F, A) = |\frac{|F \cap A|}{|F|} - \mu(A)|$$

Definition (discrepancy)

Given an action $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$, a subset $A \subseteq X$ and a finite subset F of an orbit, the **discrepancy** is defined as

$$D(F, A) = |\frac{|F \cap A|}{|F|} - \mu(A)|$$

Discrepancy measures how well a subset A is equidistributed on the orbits.

Theorem (Laczkovich)

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be measurable such that

$$\mu(A) > 0, \quad \dim_{\text{box}}(\partial A) < n$$

and let

$$d > \frac{2n}{n - \dim_{\text{box}}(\partial A)}.$$

For almost all $u \in (\mathbb{T}^n)^d$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that for all x and all N we have

$$D(F_N^u(x), A) \leq \frac{M}{N^{1+\varepsilon}}.$$

The $\varepsilon > 0$ is crucial in both proofs of Grabowski–Máthé–Pikhurko and Marks–Unger.

The $\varepsilon > 0$ is crucial in both proofs of Grabowski–Máthé–Pikhurko and Marks–Unger.

Note

Some discrepancy estimates are natural as the size of the boundary of $[0, N]^d$ relative to its size is of the form

$$\frac{2d}{N}.$$

Definition (equidistrubution)

A set $A \subseteq X$ is **equidistributed** with respect to an action $\mathbb{Z}^d \curvearrowright X$ if there exists $M > 0$ such that for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, for all N we have

$$D(F_N(x), A) \leq \frac{M}{N}$$

Note that if $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is a finitely generated group action, and A, B are equidecomposable, then they must satisfy a version of the Hall marriage theorem

Note that if $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is a finitely generated group action, and A, B are equidecomposable, then they must satisfy a version of the Hall marriage theorem

Definition (Hall condition)

Suppose $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is a finitely generated group action and $A, B \subseteq X$. The pair A, B satisfies the **Hall condition** if for every (μ-a.e.) $x \in X$ and every finite subset F of the orbit of x we have

$$|A \cap F| \leq |B \cap \mathrm{ball}(F)|$$

Note that if $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is a finitely generated group action, and A, B are equidecomposable, then they must satisfy a version of the Hall marriage theorem

Definition (Hall condition)

Suppose $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is a finitely generated group action and $A, B \subseteq X$. The pair A, B satisfies the **Hall condition** if for every (μ-a.e.) $x \in X$ and every finite subset F of the orbit of x we have

$$|A \cap F| \leq |B \cap \mathrm{ball}(F)|$$

Here, $\mathrm{ball}(F)$ means the ball in the Cayley graph metric on the orbit. In general, this definition depends on the set of generators and we say that A, B satisfy the Hall condition is the above is **true for some set of generators**.

Fact

If A, B are equidecomposable, then A, B satisfy the Hall condition

Fact

If A, B are equidecomposable, then A, B satisfy the Hall condition

Proof

Suppose $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ are used in the decomposition. Add them as generators and then the equidecomposition is a perfect matching in the Cayley graph.

Question (Miller, 1996)

Is there a Borel version of the Hall marriage theorem?

Question (Miller, 1996)

Is there a Borel version of the Hall marriage theorem?

As stated, the question has a negative answer, provided by the Banach-Tarski paradox.

Question (Miller, 1996)

Is there a Borel version of the Hall marriage theorem?

As stated, the question has a negative answer, provided by the Banach-Tarski paradox.

If a measurable version of the Hall marriage theorem were true, then any two equidecomposable sets would be equidecomposable with measurable pieces...

Theorem (Marks–Unger)

Let G be a locally finite bipartite Borel graph with Borel bipartition B_0, B_1. Suppose that for some $\varepsilon > 0$ we have that for every finite set F contained in B_0 or B_1 we have

$$|F| \leq (1+\varepsilon)|\mathrm{ball}(F)|.$$

Then there exists a Baire measurable perfect matching in G.

Theorem (Marks–Unger)

Let G be a locally finite bipartite Borel graph with Borel bipartition B_0, B_1. Suppose that for some $\varepsilon > 0$ we have that for every finite set F contained in B_0 or B_1 we have

$$|F| \leq (1+\varepsilon)|\mathrm{ball}(F)|.$$

Then there exists a Baire measurable perfect matching in G.

Note that ε appears both in the above result and in the circle squaring results...

Theorem (S.–Cieśla)

Suppose Γ is an infinite f.g. abelian group and $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is a free pmp action. Suppose $A, B \subseteq X$ are measurable, equidistributed and $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$. TFAE

- A, B satisfy the Hall condition μ-a.e.
- A, B are Γ-equidecomposable μ-a.e.
- A, B are Γ-equidecomposable μ-a.e. using μ-measurable pieces.

Theorem (S.–Cieśla)

Suppose Γ is an infinite f.g. abelian group and $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is a free pmp action. Suppose $A, B \subseteq X$ are measurable, equidistributed and $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$. TFAE

- A, B satisfy the Hall condition μ-a.e.
- A, B are Γ-equidecomposable μ-a.e.
- A, B are Γ-equidecomposable μ-a.e. using μ-measurable pieces.

To our knowledge, this provides the first positive answer to Miller's question.

Corollary

Suppose Γ is an infinite f.g. abelian group and $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is a free pmp action. Suppose $A, B \subseteq X$ are measurable, equidistributed and $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$.

Corollary

Suppose Γ is an infinite f.g. abelian group and $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is a free pmp action. Suppose $A, B \subseteq X$ are measurable, equidistributed and $\mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0$.

If A, B are equidecomposable, then A, B are equidecomposable using μ-measurable pieces.

This generalizes the measurable circle squaring by Grabowski, Máthé and Pikhurko

This generalizes the measurable circle squaring by Grabowski, Máthé and Pikhurko

The proof of corollary uses the following lemma.

Lemma (Grabowski, Máthe, Pikhurko)

If A, B are equidecomposable and μ-a.e. equidecomposable using measurable pieces, then A, B are equidecomposable using measurable pieces.

Lemma (Grabowski, Máthe, Pikhurko)

If A, B are equidecomposable and μ-a.e. equidecomposable using measurable pieces, then A, B are equidecomposable using measurable pieces.

Proof

Suppose

$$A_1, \ldots, A_n, \quad B_1, \ldots, B_n,$$

with $\gamma_i A_i = B_i$ witness that A, B are equidecomposable and

$$A_1^*, \ldots, A_m^*, \quad B_1^*, \ldots, B_m^*$$

are measurable with $\delta_j A_j^* = B_j^*$ witness that A, B are μ-a.e. equidecomposable. That means that $A \setminus \bigcup_i A_i^*$ and $B \setminus \bigcup_i B_I^*$ have measure zero.

Proof

Let N be a measure zero set containing both the $A \setminus \bigcup_i A_i^*$ and $B \setminus \bigcup_i B_I^*$ and Γ-invariant. Then note that

$$\gamma_i(A_i \cap N) = B_i \cap N$$

and

$$\delta_j(A_i^* \setminus N) = B_i^* \setminus N$$

so

$$A_1 \cap N, \ldots, A_n \cap N, \quad A_1^* \setminus N, \ldots A_m^* \setminus N$$

and

$$B_1 \cap N, \ldots, B_n \cap N, \quad B_1^* \setminus N, \ldots B_m^* \setminus N$$

witness equidecomposition using measurable sets.

The main trick

The main trick in the proof of Hall's theorem is the use of **Mokobodzki's medial means**, which exist under the assumption of CH.

The main trick

The main trick in the proof of Hall's theorem is the use of **Mokobodzki's medial means**, which exist under the assumption of CH.

However, the use of CH is not necessary as follows from the following absoluteness lemma

Lemma

Let $V \subseteq W$ be two models of ZFC. Suppose in V we have a standard Borel space X with a Borel probability measure μ, two Borel subsets $A, B \subseteq X$ and $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is a Borel pmp action of a countable group Γ.

Lemma

Let $V \subseteq W$ be two models of ZFC. Suppose in V we have a standard Borel space X with a Borel probability measure μ, two Borel subsets $A, B \subseteq X$ and $\Gamma \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ is a Borel pmp action of a countable group Γ.

The statement that the sets A and B are Γ-equidecomposable μ-a.e. using μ-measurables pieces is absolute between V and W.

Proof

This statement an be written as

$$\exists x_1, \ldots, x_n \ \bigwedge_{i \leq n} \mathsf{BorelCode}(x_i)) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \neq j} x_i^{\#} \cap x_j^{\#} = \emptyset$$

$$\wedge\ \forall^{\mu} x\ (x \in A \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^{n} x \in x_i^{\#}) \wedge\ \forall^{\mu} x\ (x \in B \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^{n} x \in \gamma_i x_i^{\#})$$

and thus is it $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_2$

Definition

A *medial mean* is a linear functional $\mathrm{m} : \ell_\infty \to \mathbb{R}$ which is

- positive, i.e. $\mathrm{m}(f) \geq 0$ if $f \geq 0$,
- normalized, i.e. $\mathrm{m}(1_\mathbb{N}) = 1$
- and shift invariant, i.e. $\mathrm{m}(Sf) = \mathrm{m}(f)$ where $Sf(n+1) = f(n)$.

Definition

A *medial mean* is a linear functional $\mathrm{m} : \ell_\infty \to \mathbb{R}$ which is

- positive, i.e. $\mathrm{m}(f) \geq 0$ if $f \geq 0$,
- normalized, i.e. $\mathrm{m}(1_{\mathbb{N}}) = 1$
- and shift invariant, i.e. $\mathrm{m}(Sf) = \mathrm{m}(f)$ where $Sf(n+1) = f(n)$.

Theorem (Mokobodzki)

Under CH, there exists a median mean which is universally measurable on $[0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Thank you.