arXiv:0707.0513v1 [math.DS] 3 Jul 2007

On the zero-temperature limit of one-dimensional Gibbs measures *

J.-R. Chazottes
Centre de Physique Théorique
Ecole polytechnique–CNRS
91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France
J.-M. Gambaudo
Laboratoire J.-A. Dieudonné
Université de Nice - Sophia Antipolis–CNRS
06108 Nice Cedex 02, France
E. Ugalde
Instituto de Física
Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí
San Luis Potosí, S.L.P., 78290 México

February 4, 2014

Abstract

For a locally constant potential $\phi : A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ (where A is a finite alphabet) we prove that the family of Gibbs measures $(\mu_{\beta\phi})_\beta$ weakly converges when $\beta \to +\infty$, *i.e.*, when "temperature" goes to zero, and we identify the limiting measure (maximizing measure or ground state). Our approach is direct and relies on a version of Perron-Frobenius Theorem for matrices due to Garrett Birkhoff.

Keywords: zero-temperature limit, ground state, maximizing measure, Perron-Frobenius Theorem, Birkhoff's contraction coefficient, subshift of finite type, periodic orbits.

1 Introduction

The central problem in equilibrium statistical mechanics is the description of the set of Gibbs measures for a given interaction. More generally, families of

*This work is part of the project "CrystalDyn" supported by the "Agence Nationale de la Recherche" (ANR-06-BLAN-0070-01).

interactions are considered, with members labeled by certain parameters: inverse temperature β, magnetic field, chemical potential, etc. The ultimate goal is then to describe the set of Gibbs measures, in particular the number of extremal Gibbs measures, as a function of these parameters. This is in general a formidable task. One can start to study the set of Gibbs measures as a function of β, the remaining parameters being fixed. The "high-temperature" regime ($\beta \to 0$) is particularly simple: there is a unique Gibbs measure which is nothing but a product measure. The "low-temperature" regime ($\beta \to +\infty$), in particular its stability, is far more complicated to describe. We urge the interested reader to consult the survey article [20], especially Appendix B.2, for more information and references. Heuristically, as $\beta \to +\infty$, only configurations with minimal energy–the so-called "ground states"– "survive", the others being exponentially damped by the Boltzmann factor. However, in the general theory of zero-temperature statistical mechanics–as in statistical mechanics quite generally–the central objects are not individual configurations, but rather probability measures describing a "random" distribution of configurations, sometimes called "ground random field". Just as for nonzero temperature, such measures can be defined either via conditional probabilities or via a variational principle [20, Appendix B.2]. The set of ground random fields or ground states for a given interaction contains (but, in general, is different from) the set of all possible zero-temperature limits of the corresponding Gibbs measure. This is closely related to the phenomenon of phase transition.

It was rather surprising–at least for us–to see that, even for finite-range interactions on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}$, the picture of the zero-temperature regime was not clear, even in the simplest situation when "spins" take values in a finite set. It is well-known that in this situation Gibbs measures are nothing but Markov chains with finite state space [12, Chapter 3]. The zero-temperature limit of the one-dimensional Ising model is studied in detail in [12, Section 3.2]. In a recent paper [18], the "generic" case is studied (we shall comment on this below). Let us also mention [1] for some results concerning, among other things, Frenkel-Kontorova models.

In the realm of the thermodynamic formalism in ergodic theory [5, 16], the interest for zero-temperature Gibbs measures is recent if one excepts the unpublished manuscript [10]. Results were obtained in this direction in [7, 2, 17]. We will comment on them below. In that context, one speaks of "minimizing" or "maximizing" measures and "ergodic optimization". The problem of finding those invariant measures which maximize (or minimize) the integral of some given continuous (or more regular) potential over all invariant measures can be posed in a general context, even when Gibbs measures need not exist, but only equilibrium measures. We refer the reader to [14] and references therein. More recent contributions to this problem are found in [4, 6].

In the present work, we study the following problem. Given a locally constant potential ϕ on the full shift $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ (where A is a finite set), what is the limiting behavior of its one-parameter family of Gibbs measures $(\mu_{\beta\phi})_{\beta>0}$, as $\beta \to +\infty$? That ϕ is locally constant means that it depends only on a finite number of symbols. In the language of statistical mechanics, this is equivalent to

considering a finite-range interaction. What is known (and easy to prove) is that the support of a zero-temperature limit of a Gibbs measure is always a subshift of finite type, generically reduced to a periodic orbit. But, as the one-dimensional Ising model shows, it can be the measure of maximal entropy on a non-trivial subshift of finite type [12, Section 3.2]. In this paper, we completely solve the problem. We prove convergence and characterize the zero-temperature Gibbs measure. Our tool is the Perron-Frobenius Theorem for matrices in its enhanced version due to Garrett Birkhoff [3, 19]. We notice that it is straightforward to extend our results from $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ to $A^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

We now comment on the works mentioned above which are directly related to ours. In [7], J. Brémont shows that for any locally constant potential, the corresponding Gibbs (Markov) measure always (weakly) converges. The limiting measure is not identified. The proof is a consequence of an abstract statement of real analytic geometry. In [17], R. Leplaideur uses directly ideas of thermodynamic formalism with inducing techniques, in a slightly more general case. Namely, he considers a potential of the form $\psi + \beta\phi$, where ψ is Hölder and ϕ is locally constant. He proves existence of the limit and characterizes it. But proofs are quite involved. In [18], N. Nekhoroshev uses a matrix approach (different from ours), but looks only at the generic case, which is a Dirac measure sitting on a periodic orbit. In contrast with [7, 17], we use a direct and elementary approach, and treat all cases, contrarily to [18]. In particular, a zero-temperature Gibbs measure can have strictly positive entropy. One speaks of residual entropy in statistical mechanics. This is the case for the one-dimensional Ising model mentioned above, in the anti-ferromagnetic case and for very special values of the magnetic field.

Until now, there is no proof of convergence in the Hölder case in full generality. By an abstract argument, it is easy to prove that generically to a Hölder potential corresponds a unique "ground state". It is not difficult to prove that this imposes the convergence of the corresponding Gibbs measure to this ground state. It is still an open question to prove that generically ground states are periodic orbits (see, *e.g.*, [9] for a partial result). It is easy to see that zero-temperature Gibbs measures can be supported on subshifts which are not of finite type. The simplest, though unphysical example, is provided by taking the potential equal to the distance to a given uniquely ergodic (hence, minimal) subshift. A more physical example is given in [11] in which the configurations with minimal energy (density) are exactly the Thue-Morse subshift. We also mention the paper [2] in which the authors compute explicitly the limit $\beta^{-1} \log \mu_{\beta\phi}(C)$, for any cylinder C, when ϕ is Hölder, under the restriction that there is a unique ground state for ϕ. Let us point out that in [21], the authors construct a bounded-continuous-spin model with a bounded interaction, and a sequence of temperatures converging to zero, such that the (any) sequence of Gibbs measures at these temperatures does not converge to a ground state.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we give the necessary definitions and state a few general results. In Section 3 we characterize the subshift of finite type which turns out to be the support of the maximizing measures (ground states), for a given locally constant potential. Section

4 contains the main results while Section 5 contains the main proofs. For the reader's convenience, two appendices close the paper, one about weak distance between probability measures and the other on Perron-Frobenius Theorem "à la Birkhoff".

2 Setting and generalities

For background on Gibbs measures we refer the reader to [5, 16].

We consider the (left-)shift map σ on the set $A^{\mathbb{N}}$, where A is a finite set (with $\#A \geq 2$). Elements of $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ will be denoted by $\underline{a}, \underline{b}$,... and, to make notations lighter in proofs, we will use the same symbols $\underline{a}, \underline{b}$,... for finite sequences. It will be clear from the context whether we mean a finite or an infinite sequence. Otherwise, we will use the explicit notation $\underline{a}(0:n) := \underline{a}(0)\underline{a}(1)\cdots\underline{a}(n)$. If $\underline{a}$ is a finite sequence, $[\underline{a}]$ is its associated cylinder set.

A potential $\phi : A^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous if, and only if, $\mathrm{var}_n\phi \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$, where $\mathrm{var}_n\phi := \sup\{|\phi(\underline{a}) - \phi(\underline{a}')| : \underline{a}(0:n-1) = \underline{a}'(0:n-1)\}$ is the modulus of continuity of ϕ.

Let

$$\bar{\phi} := \sup_{\eta} \int \phi \, d\eta, \tag{1}$$

where η ranges over the set of shift–invariant probability measures (endowed with the weak* topology which makes it compact). A shift-invariant measure is called a maximizing measure or a (maximizing) ground state for ϕ if it realizes this supremum. Of course, one can define minimizing measures by replacing the supremum with an infimum in the above definition. We will consider only maximizing measures, the case of minimizing measures just being a matter of sign.

At any inverse temperature $\beta > 0$ ([1]), the potential $\beta\phi$ admits an equilibrium measure (variational principle). Indeed, if $\mu_{\beta\phi}$ is such an equilibrium measure, it satisfies

$$\int \beta\phi \, d\mu_{\beta\phi} + h(\mu_{\beta\phi}) \geq \int \beta\phi d\eta + h(\eta)$$

for any shift-invariant measure η, where $h(\eta)$ is the entropy of η.

The following general result links zero-temperature limits of equilibrium equilibrium measures to maximizing measures.

Proposition 1 ([10])**.** *Let ϕ be a continuous potential. Then,*

1. *the family of equilibrium states $(\mu_{\beta\phi})_{\beta>0}$ always has a weak* accumulation point, as $\beta \to +\infty$.*
2. *Every accumulation point of $(\mu_{\beta\phi})_{\beta>0}$ is a maximizing measure for ϕ.*
3. *Every accumulation point of $(\mu_{\beta\phi})_{\beta>0}$ is of maximal entropy among the set of maximizing measures for ϕ.*

[1] We could consider $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, but we are only interested in the limit $\beta \to +\infty$.

Remark 1. *Statement (1) results by compactness of the set of shift-invariant probability measures. Statement (2) is a straightfoward consequence of the variational principle. The last statement is also a consequence of the variational principle and of the convexity of topological pressure. In the formalism of statistical mechanics of lattice systems, these statements are found in [20, Appendix B.2].*

In this paper we restrict to finite-range potentials. In analogy with statistical mechanics, we say that ϕ is of finite range r ($r \geq 1$), if

$$\phi(\underline{a}) = \phi(\underline{a}(0:r)),\ \forall \underline{a} \in A^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

In other words, ϕ is locally constant on cylinders of length $r+1$ and $\mathrm{var}_n(\phi) = 0$ for all $n > r$. In that case, for each $\beta > 0$, the potential $\beta\phi$ admits a unique equilibrium measure, which is also a Gibbs measure (in fact, a r-step Markov measure). Note that the case $r = 0$ corresponds to the trivial case of product (Bernoulli) measures.

3 The maximizing subshift of finite type

Let ϕ be a finite-range potential with range r. Since measures supported on periodic orbits are dense in the set of all shift–invariant measures, it easily follows that (1) takes the form

$$\bar{\phi} = \sup_{p\in\mathbb{N}} \max_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \frac{S_p\phi(\underline{a})}{p},$$

where $\mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})$ is the collection of periodic points of period p in $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $S_p\phi(\underline{a}) := \phi(\underline{a}) + \phi(\sigma\underline{a}) + \cdots + \phi(\sigma^{p-1}\underline{a})$.

Proposition 2. *Let ϕ be a finite-range potential of range r. Then*

$$\bar{\phi} = \max_{1\leq p\leq (\#A)^r} \left(\max_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \frac{S_p\phi(\underline{a})}{p} \right).$$

See Subsection 5.1 for the proof.

The previous proposition leads us to distinguish the following finite collection of periodic orbits,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\bar{\phi}} := \bigcup_{p=1}^{(\#A)^r} \{\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}}) :\ S_p\phi(\underline{a}) = p\bar{\phi}\}.$$

This collection generates a non–wandering subshift of finite type that we now describe. We define the set $W \subset A^{(\#A)^r+r}$ as follows. A word $\underline{b} \in W$ if, and only if, for each $1 \leq i < j \leq (\#A)^r$ such that $\underline{b}(i : i+r-1) = \underline{b}(j : j+r-1)$ we necessarily have $(\underline{b}(i : j-1))^{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{\phi}}$, where $(\underline{b}(i : j-1))^{\mathbb{N}}$ denotes the periodic sequence obtained by the infinite concatenation of $\underline{b}(i : j-1)$. The set W defines

a subshift of finite type which we denote $X_{\bar{\phi}}$. It is a topological Markov chain with alphabet $B := A^{(\#A)^r+r-1}$ whose transition matrix $\bar{M} : B \times B \to \{0,1\}$ is defined by

$$\bar{M}(\underline{b},\underline{b}') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \underline{b}(1:L-1) = \underline{b}'(0:L-2) \text{ and } \underline{b}(0:L-1)\underline{b}'(L-1) \in W \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where

$$L := (\#A)^r + r - 1. \tag{2}$$

Let us notice that from the very definition of W, we have

$$\frac{S_p\phi(\underline{a})}{p} = \bar{\phi},\ \forall p \in \mathbb{N},\ \text{iff } \underline{a} \in X_{\bar{\phi}}. \tag{3}$$

We now describe the spectral decomposition of the subshift of finite type $X_{\bar{\phi}}$, *i.e.*, the decomposition of it into transitive sets, each of which being a union of cyclically permuted sets on which the appropriate iterate is topologically mixing [13]. The transition matrix $\bar{M}$ can be written in a block–diagonal form, *i.e.*, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{M} := \mathrm{diag}_{1\le i\le N}(\bar{M}_i)$, where each block $\bar{M}_i$ is a maximal irreducible submatrix of $\bar{M}$. The block $\bar{M}_i$ defines a transitive subshift of finite type $X_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i)}$, and we have

$$X_{\bar{\phi}} = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{N} X_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i)}.$$

For each $1 \le i \le N$, let d_i be the period of $\bar{M}_i$ (see, *e.g.*, [19]). Then $\bar{M}_i^{d_i} = \mathrm{diag}_{1\le j\le d_i}(P_{i,j})$, where $P_{i,j}$ is a primitive matrix, associated to the j–th class of indices of the i–th block which we denote $C_{i,j}$. The equivalence classes $C_{i,j}$ define a partition of the index set of the original matrix $\bar{M}$, so that to each $\underline{b} \in B$ corresponds a unique class $C_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}$.

Each $X_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i)}$ can be decomposed as the union

$$X_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i)} = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{d_i} Y_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i,j)},$$

where $(Y_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i,j)}, \sigma^{d_i})$ is the topologically mixing subshift of finite type associated to the matrix $P_{i,j}$. Hence, each $(Y_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i,j)}, \sigma^{d_i})$ carries a unique measure $\nu_{i,j}$ of maximal entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(Y_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i,j)}, \sigma^{d_i}) = d_i\ h_{\mathrm{top}}(X_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i)}, \sigma)$. ($h_{\mathrm{top}}(\cdot)$ denotes topological entropy.)

Finally, define

$$I_{\max} = \{1 \le i \le N : h_{\mathrm{top}}(X_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i)}, \sigma) = h_{\mathrm{top}}(X_{\bar{\phi}}, \sigma)\}, \tag{4}$$

and the probability measure

$$u_{\bar{\phi}} := \frac{\sum_{i\in I_{\max}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_i} \nu_{i,j}}{\sum_{i\in I_{\max}} d_i}. \tag{5}$$

This is the equidistributed measure on those transitive sets $X_{\bar{\phi}}^{(i)}$ having the same entropy as $X_{\bar{\phi}}$.

For later purpose, let

$$d = \mathrm{LCM}(d_i,\ 1 \le i \le N). \tag{6}$$

4 Main Results

For a finite-range potential ϕ of range r and a given $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $\mu_{\beta\phi}$ be the unique Gibbs measure (r–step Markov measure) for $\beta\phi$. For each $\beta > 0$, we define the family of measures $(\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi})_{p\in\mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi} := \frac{\sum_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \delta_{\underline{a}} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a}))}{\sum_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a}))},$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\delta_{\underline{a}}$ stands for the Dirac measure at $\underline{a}$. In words, for each $p \in \mathbb{N}$, this measure is concentrated on periodic orbits with period p which are weighted according to the potential ϕ and inverse temperature β.

We can state our main result.

Theorem 1. *Let ϕ be a finite-range potential. Then*

$$\lim_{\beta\to+\infty} \mu_{\beta\phi} = u_{\bar{\phi}} \text{ weakly},$$

where $u_{\bar{\phi}}$ is defined in (5).

This theorem says that the equilibrium measure $\mu_{\beta\phi}$ converges to the equidistribution measure on the maximizing subshift of finite type described above.

The proof Theorem 1 relies on the following two propositions. Their proofs are postponed to Section 5. In the sequel, $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot,\cdot)$ stands for the standard distance which metrizes the weak* topology of probability measures (see Appendix A).

Proposition 3. *Let ϕ be a finite-range potential and $p : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that $p(\beta) \ge e^{2C_0\beta}$. Then*

$$\lim_{\beta\to+\infty} \mathrm{dist}(\mu_{\beta\phi}, \mathcal{P}_{p(\beta)}^{\beta\phi}) = 0$$

where $C_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathrm{var}_k\phi$.

Proposition 4. *Let ϕ be a finite-range potential and d be as in* (6)*. Then, for every divergent function $p : \mathbb{R}^+ \to d\mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\lim_{\beta \to +\infty} \mathcal{P}^{\beta\phi}_{p(\beta)} = u_{\bar{\phi}} \text{ weakly},$$

where $u_{\bar{\phi}}$ is defined in (5)*.*

Proof of Theorem 1. By the triangle inequality, we have for the weak* distance between $\mu_{\beta\phi}$ and $u_{\bar{\phi}}$

$$\mathrm{dist}(\mu_{\beta\phi}, u_{\bar{\phi}}) \leq \mathrm{dist}(\mu_{\beta\phi}, \mathcal{P}^{\beta\phi}_{p(\beta)}) + \mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{P}^{\beta\phi}_{p(\beta)}, u_{\bar{\phi}}).$$

The theorem follows at once by applying Propositions 3 and 4.

5 Proofs of Propositions 2,3,4

In the sequel, we use the following compact notation.

Notation. *For real numbers x, y,*

$$x \lessgtr \pm y \text{ stands for } -y \leq x \leq y \text{ and } x \lessgtr e^{\pm y} \text{ stands for } e^{-y} \leq x \leq e^{y}. \qquad (7)$$

5.1 Proof of Proposition 2

A periodic point $\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})$ with $p \geq (\#A)^r + 1$ defines a cycle $(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{p-1})$, $v_{p-1} = v_0$, in the de Bruijn graph of order r of symbols in A, where $v_i = \underline{a}(i : i + r - 1)$, $i = 0, \ldots, p-1$. Recall that this is the directed graph whose vertices are words of length r; an arrow connects a word w to a word w' if, and only if, there is a word x of length $r-1$ such that $w = ax$ and $w' = xa'$, $a, a' \in A$; see, *e.g.*, [8, p. 155]. The potential ϕ can be seen as a linear form on the arrows in this graph equipped with real coefficients. Since a word $\underline{b} \in A^{r+1}$ can correspond to an arrow (v, v') in the graph, we use the notation $\phi(v, v') := \phi(\underline{b})$. The cycle $(v_0, v_2, \ldots, v_{p-1})$ can be decomposed as a sum (in the homological sense [15]) of elementary cycles

$$(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{p-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (v_{j_0}, v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_{q(j)-1}}),$$

This decomposition is such that each arrow appears the same number of times at each side of the equation, and an elementary cycle does not contain a vertex more than once. This implies in particular that $q(j) \leq (\#A)^r$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Hence

$$S_p\phi(\underline{a}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \phi(v_i, v_{i+1}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i=0}^{q(j)-1} \phi(v_{j_i}, v_{j_{i+1}}).$$

In turn this implies

$$\begin{aligned} S_p\phi(\underline{a}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} q(j) \left(\max_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_{q(j)}(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \frac{S_{q(j)}\phi(\underline{a})}{q(j)} \right) \\ &\leq p \max_{1\leq p\leq (\#A)^r} \left(\max_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \frac{S_p\phi(\underline{a})}{p} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\bar{\phi} \leq \max_{1\leq p\leq (\#A)^r} \left(\max_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \frac{S_p\phi(\underline{a})}{p} \right).$$

The proposition is proved.

5.2 Proof of Proposition 3

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let ϕ be a finite-range potential (of range r). Then, there exists a constant $C = C(\phi, \#A) > 0$ such that, for all integers n, p such that $p > 2n$ and $n \geq r$, and for all $\beta > 0$, we have*

$$\mathrm{dist}(\mu_{\beta\phi}, \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}) \leq 4C\beta n e^{\beta C_0} \exp\left(-e^{-\beta C_0}\lfloor (p-2n)/n \rfloor\right) + 2^{-n}. \tag{8}$$

Proof. For each $n \geq r$ define $M : A^n \times A^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$M(\underline{a}, \underline{b}) = \begin{cases} \exp(\beta\phi(\underline{a}\,\underline{b}(n-1))) & \text{if } \underline{b}(0:n-2) = \underline{a}(1:n-1) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that M is primitive with primitivity index n, *i.e.*, $M^n > 0$.

For each $\underline{a} \in A^n$, define the column vectors $R^{\underline{a}}, L_{\underline{a}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{(\#A)^n}$ whose coordinates are given by

$$R^{\underline{a}}(\underline{b}) = \exp(\beta S_n\phi(\underline{b}\,\underline{a})) \text{ and } L_{\underline{a}}(\underline{b}) = \exp(\beta S_n\phi(\underline{a}\,\underline{b})).$$

Then we can write, for $p > 2n$,

$$\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}([\underline{a}]) = \frac{L_{\underline{a}}^\dagger M^{p-2n} R^{\underline{a}}}{\sum_{\underline{b}\in A^n} L_{\underline{b}}^\dagger M^{p-2n} R^{\underline{b}}}.$$

We now want to apply Proposition 5 of Appendix B. To this end, we first estimate τ, the Birkhoff's contraction coefficient of M^n. We have $(1-\tau)^{-1} = (1+\Gamma)/(2\Gamma) \leq \Gamma^{-1}$ and

$$\Gamma^{-1} = \max_{\underline{a},\underline{b},\underline{a}',\underline{b}'\in A^n} \left(\frac{M^n(\underline{a},\underline{b}) M^n(\underline{a}',\underline{b}')}{M^n(\underline{a},\underline{b}') M^n(\underline{a}',\underline{b})} \right)^{1/2},$$

where Γ is defined in (16). Now, for arbitrary $\underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{a}', \underline{b}' \in A^n$ we get

$$\frac{M^n(\underline{a},\underline{b}) M^n(\underline{a}',\underline{b}')}{M^n(\underline{a},\underline{b}') M^n(\underline{a}',\underline{b})} = \frac{\exp(\beta S_n\phi(\underline{a}\,\underline{b}))\ \exp(\beta S_n\phi(\underline{a}'\underline{b}'))}{\exp(\beta S_n\phi(\underline{a}\,\underline{b}'))\ \exp(\beta S_n\phi(\underline{a}'\underline{b}))} \leq \exp(2C_0\beta),$$

where $C_0 := \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathrm{var}_k \phi$. Hence

$$(1-\tau)^{-1} \leq e^{C_0\beta}, \textit{ i.e., } \tau \leq 1 - e^{-C_0\beta} < 1. \tag{9}$$

We now estimate the quantity $\tau(\underline{x})$ defined in (18) for $\underline{x} = R^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}$, uniformly in $\underline{a}$. Let δ be the projective distance on the simplex of dimension $\#A^n$, and F the transformation defined on the simplex by the transition matrix M.

Observe that

$$\delta\left(MR^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}, R^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}\right) = \log\left(\frac{\max_{\underline{b}} M^{n+1}(\underline{b},\underline{a})/M^n(\underline{b},\underline{a})}{\min_{\underline{b}} M^{n+1}(\underline{b},\underline{a})/M^n(\underline{b},\underline{a})}\right).$$

(We should normalize $R^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}$ but the result of the computations we are going to do would be the same.) An elementary estimation gives

$$\frac{M^{n+1}(\underline{b},\underline{a})}{M^n(\underline{b},\underline{a})} = \frac{\sum_{\underline{c}\in A}\exp(\beta S_{n+1}\phi(\underline{b}\,\underline{c}\,\underline{a}))}{\exp(\beta S_n\phi(\underline{b}\,\underline{a}))} \lesseqgtr \#A\ e^{\pm\beta(\|\phi\|_\infty + C_0)}.$$

From this we get

$$\max_{\underline{a}\in A^n} \delta\left(FR^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}, R^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}\right) \leq 2(\beta(\|\phi\|_\infty + C_0) + \log(\#A)).$$

This gives

$$\max_{\underline{a}\in A^n} \delta(R^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}) \leq 2n(\beta(\|\phi\|_\infty + C_0) + \log(\#A)). \tag{10}$$

Hence, using Proposition 5 with $m = p - 2n$ and $\ell = n$, and estimates (9) and (10), we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}([\underline{a}]) \lesseqgtr \frac{\mathbf{w}^\dagger R^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}\, L^\dagger_{\underline{a}}\mathbf{v}}{\displaystyle\sum_{\underline{b}\in A^n} \mathbf{w}^\dagger R^{\underline{b}}_{\underline{\ }} L^\dagger_{\underline{b}}\mathbf{v}}$$

$$\times \exp\left(\pm 4ne^{C_0\beta}\left(1-e^{-C_0\beta}\right)^{\left\lfloor\frac{p-2n}{n}\right\rfloor}(\beta(\|\phi\|_\infty + C_0) + \log(\#A))\right). \tag{11}$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} L^\dagger_{\underline{a}}\mathbf{v} &= (M^n\mathbf{v})(\underline{a}) = \rho^n\mathbf{v}(\underline{a}), \\ \mathbf{w}^\dagger R^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }} &= \left(\mathbf{w}^\dagger M^n\right)(\underline{a}) = \rho^n\mathbf{w}(\underline{a}), \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{w}^\dagger\mathbf{v} = 1$. We also have the well-known formula

$$\mathbf{w}(\underline{a})\mathbf{v}(\underline{a}) = \mu_{\beta\phi}([\underline{a}]).$$

Therefore, the expression (11) becomes

$$\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}([\underline{a}]) \lesseqgtr$$

$$\mu_{\beta\phi}([\underline{a}])\ \exp\left(\pm 4ne^{C_0\beta}\left(1-e^{-C_0\beta}\right)^{\left\lfloor\frac{p-2n}{n}\right\rfloor}(\beta(\|\phi\|_\infty + C_0) + \log(\#A))\right).$$

Using the elementary inequality $1 - t < e^{-t}$ valid for any $t \geq 0$, and letting

$$C := 4(\|\phi\|_\infty + C_0 + \log(\#A)),$$

we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}([\underline{a}(0:n)]) \lesseqgtr \mu_{\beta\phi}([\underline{a}(0:n)]) \ \exp\left(\pm C\beta n e^{\beta C_0} \exp(-e^{-\beta C_0} \lfloor (p-2n)/n \rfloor)\right).$$

The result follows by using Lemma 4 (Appendix A). □

We now apply the preceding lemma to prove Proposition 3. For any fixed n, we take $(p(\beta))_\beta$ so that $p(\beta) \geq e^{2C_0\beta}$. With this choice, (8) implies that

$$\lim_{\beta \to +\infty} \mathrm{dist}(\mu_{\beta\phi}, \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

But since n is arbitrary, one gets $\lim_{\beta\to+\infty} \mathrm{dist}(\mu_{\beta\phi}, \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}) = 0$, thus Proposition 3 is proved.

5.3 Proof of Proposition 4

Let $u_{p,\bar{\phi}}$ be the equidistribution measure on $\mathrm{Per}_p(X_{\bar{\phi}})$ defined by

$$u_{p,\bar{\phi}} := \frac{\sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(X_{\bar{\phi}})} \delta_{\underline{a}}}{\#\mathrm{Per}_p(X_{\bar{\phi}})}$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

For $p = md$ (where d is defined in (6)), we have the following inequalities, for any measurable set E:

$$\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(E) \lesseqgtr u_{p,\bar{\phi}}(E) \pm \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(A^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus X_{\bar{\phi}}). \tag{12}$$

Let us prove (12). For convenience we use the short-hand notations

$$Z = \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}})} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a})) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Z} = \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(X_{\bar{\phi}})} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a})).$$

For the upper bound, write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(E) &= \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(X_{\bar{\phi}}) \cap E} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a})) + \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus X_{\bar{\phi}}) \cap E} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a})) \\ &=: A + B. \end{aligned}$$

We have the trivial estimate

$$B \leq \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(A^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus X_{\bar{\phi}}).$$

Since $Z \geq \bar{Z}$, one gets by using (3)

$$A \leq \frac{1}{\bar{Z}} \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(X_{\bar{\phi}}) \cap E} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a})) = u_{p,\bar{\phi}}(E). \tag{13}$$

For the lower bound, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(E) &\geq \frac{1}{\bar{Z}} \sum_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_p(X_{\bar{\phi}})\cap E} \exp(\beta S_p\phi(\underline{a})) \times \frac{\bar{Z}}{Z} \\ &= u_{p,\bar{\phi}}(E)(1-\mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(A^{\mathbb{N}}\setminus X_{\bar{\phi}})) \\ &\geq u_{p,\bar{\phi}}(E) - \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(A^{\mathbb{N}}\setminus X_{\bar{\phi}})\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\bar{Z}/Z = \mathcal{P}_p^{\beta\phi}(X_{\bar{\phi}})$, the equality in (13) and the obvious fact that $u_{p,\bar{\phi}}(E) \leq 1$ for any mesurable set E. Therefore (12) is proved.

The proof of Proposition 4 is an immediate consequence of (12) and the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2. *Let ϕ be a finite-range potential. Then*

$$\mathrm{dist}(u_{md,\bar{\phi}}, u_{\bar{\phi}}) \to 0, \text{ when } m \to +\infty,$$

where where d is defined in (6)*.*

Lemma 3. *Let ϕ be a finite-range potential, and let $p : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{N}$ be such that $p(\beta) \to +\infty$ when $\beta \to +\infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{\beta\to+\infty} \mathcal{P}_{p(\beta)}^{\beta\phi}(A^{\mathbb{N}}\setminus X_{\bar{\phi}}) = 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $\bar{M}$ be the transition matrix of the subshift $X_{\bar{\phi}}$ defined in Section 3, with d_i, $P_{i,j}$ and d as in Section 3. For each $k > L$ (see (2) for the definition of L), $\bar{M}$ extends redundantly to $\bar{\mathcal{M}} : A^k \times A^k \to \{0,1\}$ defined by

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}}(\underline{b},\underline{b}') = \prod_{j=0}^{k-L} \bar{M}(\underline{b}(j : j+L-1), \underline{b}'(j : j+L-1)).$$

The matrix $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ inherits the block–diagonal form of $\bar{M}$, so that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}}^{md} = \mathrm{diag}_{1\leq i\leq N}\left(\mathrm{diag}_{1\leq j\leq d_i}\left(\mathcal{P}_{i,j}^{dm/d_i}\right)\right).$$

The block $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ is a primitive matrix whose maximal eigenvalue $\rho_{i,j}$ coincides with the maximal eigenvalue of $P_{i,j}$. Since $\rho_{i,j}$ does not depend on j, let us simply denote it by ρ_i. Notice that $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ has primitivity index $\mathcal{L}_{i,j} \leq \max(\ell_{i,j}, \lceil k/d_i\rceil)$, where $\ell_{i,j}$ stands for the primitivity index of $P_{i,j}$.

For $\underline{b} \in A^k$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the formula

$$\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}}^\dagger \bar{\mathcal{M}}^{md} \mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}} = \mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}}^\dagger \mathrm{diag}_{1\leq i\leq N}\big(\mathrm{diag}_{1\leq j\leq d_i}(\mathcal{P}_{i,j}^{dm/d_i})\big)\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}},$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}} : A^k \to \{0,1\}$ is the column vector with 1 at coordinate $\underline{b}$ and zero elsewhere.

For each i,j let $\mathbf{w}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{i,j}$ be the left and right maximal eigenvectors of $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$, and $\tau_{i,j}$ its contraction coefficient as defined in Appendix B. Observe that the measure $\nu_{i,j}$ (defined in Section 3) can be re-written as

$$\nu_{i,j}([\underline{b}]) = \mathbf{w}_{i,j}(\underline{b})\mathbf{v}_{i,j}(\underline{b}), \tag{14}$$

for all $\underline{b} \in A^k$.

Let $\mathcal{L} = \max_{i,j} \mathcal{L}_{i,j}$. Fix an arbitrary $\underline{b} \in B$. By using the same kind of spectral decomposition as in Section 3, there is a unique class of indices $C_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}$ of the matrix $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ which is associated to this $\underline{b}$. By Proposition 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}}^{\dagger}\bar{\mathcal{M}}^{md}\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}} &= \mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}}^{\dagger}\,\mathrm{diag}_{1\le i\le N}\left(\mathrm{diag}_{1\le j\le d_i}(\mathcal{P}_{i,j}^{dm/d_i})\right)\,\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}} \\
&\begin{matrix}\le\\ \ge\end{matrix} \rho_{i(\underline{b})}^{dm/d_{i(\underline{b})}}\mathbf{v}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})\mathbf{w}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})\exp\left(\pm\frac{\delta_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})\tau_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}^{\lfloor m/\ell\rfloor}}{1-\tau_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where d is defined in (6) and where $\delta_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b}) := \delta(\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}})$ where to this $\underline{b}$ is associated the class of indices $C_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}$.

Let $\tau = \max_{i,j}\tau_{i,j}$, $\bar{\delta} = \max_{i,j}\max_{\underline{b}\in C_{i,j}}\delta_{i,j}(\underline{b})$, and $\rho_{\max} = \max_{1\le i\le N}\rho_i$. It is well-known that $h_{\mathrm{top}}(X_{\bar{\phi}},\sigma) = \log\rho_{\max}$, and $h_{\mathrm{top}}(X^{(i)}\bar{\phi},\sigma) = \log\rho_i$ for $1\le i\le N$. Hence $I_{\max} = \{1\le i\le N : \rho_i = \rho_{\max}\}$ where $I_{\max}$ is defined in (4). Notice that $\tau<1$ and $0\le\bar{\delta}<+\infty$. For each $m\in\mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{dm,\bar{\phi}}([\underline{b}]) &= \frac{\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}}^{\dagger}\bar{\mathcal{M}}^{md}\mathbf{e}_{\underline{b}}}{\sum_{\tilde{\underline{b}}\in B}\mathbf{e}_{\tilde{\underline{b}}}^{\dagger}\bar{\mathcal{M}}^{md}\mathbf{e}_{\tilde{\underline{b}}}} \\
&\begin{matrix}\le\\ \ge\end{matrix} \frac{\left(\frac{\rho_{i(\underline{b})}}{\rho_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{dm}{d_{i(\underline{b})}}}\mathbf{v}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})\mathbf{w}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})}{\sum_{\tilde{\underline{b}}\in B}\left(\frac{\rho_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}})}}{\rho_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{dm}{d_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}})}}}\mathbf{v}_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}}),j(\tilde{\underline{b}})}(\underline{b})\mathbf{w}_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}}),j(\tilde{\underline{b}})}(\underline{b})}\exp\left(\pm 2\frac{\bar{\delta}\tau^{\lfloor m/\ell\rfloor}}{1-\tau}\right) \\
&\begin{matrix}\le\\ \ge\end{matrix} \frac{\left(\frac{\rho_{i(\underline{b})}}{\rho_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{dm}{d_{i(\underline{b})}}}\mathbf{v}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})\mathbf{w}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})}{\sum_{i\in I_{\max}}d_i + \sum_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}})\notin I_{\max}}\left(\frac{\rho_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}})}}{\rho_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{dm}{d_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}})}}}\mathbf{v}_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}}),j(\tilde{\underline{b}})}(\underline{b})\mathbf{w}_{i(\tilde{\underline{b}}),j(\tilde{\underline{b}})}(\underline{b})} \\
&\qquad\times\exp\left(\pm 2\frac{\bar{\delta}\tau^{\lfloor m/\ell\rfloor}}{1-\tau}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there are constants $C>0$ and $0<\lambda<1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{dm,\bar{\phi}}([\underline{b}]) &\begin{matrix}\le\\ \ge\end{matrix} \frac{\left(\frac{\rho_{i(\underline{b})}}{\rho_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{dm}{d_{i(\underline{b})}}}\mathbf{v}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})\mathbf{w}_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}(\underline{b})}{\sum_{i\in I_{\max}}d_i}\exp\left(\pm C\lambda^m\right) \\
&\begin{matrix}\le\\ \ge\end{matrix} \frac{\left(\frac{\rho_{i(\underline{b})}}{\rho_{\max}}\right)^{\frac{dm}{d_{i(\underline{b})}}}\nu_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}([\underline{b}])}{\sum_{i\in I_{\max}}d_i}\exp\left(\pm C\lambda^m\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (14).

There are two possible cases: either $i(\underline{b}) \notin I_{\max}$, and then $\lim_{m\to+\infty} u_{dm}([\underline{b}]) = 0$, or $i(\underline{b}) \in I_{\max}$, in which case

$$\lim_{m\to+\infty} u_{dm,\bar{\phi}}([\underline{b}]) = \frac{\nu_{i(\underline{b}),j(\underline{b})}([\underline{b}])}{\sum_{i\in I_{\max}} d_i}.$$

Since $k > L$ is arbitrary, the lemma follows.

Proof of Lemma 3. Let $p : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{N}$ be an increasing function, and $u = \lim_{k\to+\infty} \mathcal{P}^{\beta_k\phi}_{p(\beta_k)}$ be a weak* accumulation point. This is a shift-invariant measure. Since

$$u(A^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus X_{\bar{\phi}}) = \sum_{\underline{b}\in B:\ [\underline{b}]\cap X_{\bar{\phi}}=\emptyset} u([\underline{b}])$$

it is enough to prove the lemma that $u([\underline{b}]) = 0$ for all $\underline{b} \in B$ (recall that $B = A^{(\#A)^r+r-1}$) such that $[\underline{b}] \cap X_{\bar{\phi}} = \emptyset$.

For $\underline{b} \in B$ such that $[\underline{b}] \cap X_{\bar{\phi}} = \emptyset$, define

$$\epsilon = \epsilon(\underline{b}) := \max\left\{ S_p\phi(\underline{a}) :\ \underline{a} \in [\underline{b}] \cap \left(\bigcup_{p=L}^{(\#A)^L} \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}}) \right) \right\},$$

where $L := (\#A)^r + r - 1$, and

$$m = m(\underline{b}) := \left\lceil \frac{1 + (2r - 2 + L)(\max\phi - \min\phi)}{\epsilon} \right\rceil. \tag{15}$$

Since $S_p\phi(\underline{a}) < p\bar{\phi}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\underline{a} \in \mathrm{Per}_p(A^{\mathbb{N}}) \cap [\underline{b}]$, then $\epsilon > 0$ (remember (3)).

Assume that $u([\underline{b}]) > 0$. Then Poincaré's recurrence theorem ensures the existence of $n_0 = n_0(\underline{b}) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tilde{\underline{b}} \in A^{n_0}$ such that $\underline{b}$ occurs $m + 1$ times in $\tilde{\underline{b}}$, and such that $u([\tilde{\underline{b}}]) > 0$. Now, for each $\tilde{\underline{a}} \in A^{n_0}$ satisfying $[\tilde{\underline{a}}] \cap X_{\bar{\phi}} \neq \emptyset$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathcal{P}^{\beta_k\phi}_{p_k}([\tilde{\underline{b}}])}{\mathcal{P}^{\beta_k\phi}_{p_k}([\tilde{\underline{a}}])} &= \frac{\displaystyle\sum_{\underline{b}\in \mathrm{Per}_{p_k}(A^{\mathbb{N}}):\ \underline{b}(0:n_0-1)=\tilde{\underline{b}}} e^{\beta_k S_{p_k}\phi(\underline{b})}}{\displaystyle\sum_{\underline{a}\in \mathrm{Per}_{p_k}(A^{\mathbb{N}}):\ \underline{b}(0:n_0-1)=\tilde{\underline{a}}} e^{\beta_k S_{p_k}\phi(\underline{a})}} \\
&\le \frac{e^{\beta_k(S_{n_0-r+1}\phi(\tilde{\underline{b}})+2(r-1)\max\phi)} \displaystyle\sum_{\underline{b}\in A^{p_k-n_0}} e^{\beta_k S_{p_k-n_0-r+1}\phi(\underline{b}(n_0:p_k-1))}}{e^{\beta_k(S_{n_0-r+1}\phi(\tilde{\underline{a}})+2(r-1)\min\phi)} \displaystyle\sum_{\underline{a}\in A^{p_k-n_0}} e^{\beta_k S_{p_k-n_0-r+1}\phi(\underline{a}(n_0:p_k-1))}} \\
&= \frac{e^{\beta_k(S_{n_0-r+1}\phi(\tilde{\underline{b}})+2(r-1)\max\phi))}}{e^{\beta_k(S_{n_0-r+1}\phi(\tilde{\underline{a}})+2(r-1)\min\phi))}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $S_{n_0-r+1}\phi(\tilde{\underline{b}}) \le (n_0 - r + 1 - L)\bar{\phi} - m\epsilon + L\max\phi$, $S_{n_0-r+1}\phi(\tilde{\underline{a}}) \ge (n_0 - r + 1 - L)\bar{\phi} + L\max\phi$, and $\mathcal{P}^{\beta_k\phi}_{p_k}([\tilde{\underline{a}}]) \le 1$, by using (15) we get

$$\mathcal{P}^{\beta_k\phi}_{p_k}([\tilde{\underline{b}}]) \le \exp(\beta_k(-m\epsilon + (L + 2r - 2)(\max\phi - \min\phi))) \le \exp(-\beta_k),$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $u([\tilde{\underline{b}}]) = 0$, a contradiction.

A On weak* distance

We state and prove a useful lemma about weak* distance.

Lemma 4. *Let ν, μ be probability measures on $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ and such that $\mu[\underline{a}(0:n)] \overset{\leq}{\geq} \nu[\underline{a}(0:n)] \exp(\pm\epsilon)$ (see (7) for the notation) for all $\underline{a}(0:n)$. Then*

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mu, \nu) \leq 4\epsilon + 2^{-n},$$

for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

Proof. Recall that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mu, \nu) := \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} 2^{-n} \max_{\underline{a}(0:n)} \left| \mu[\underline{a}(0:n)] - \nu[\underline{a}(0:n)] \right|.$$

For all $k \leq n$ we have

$$\sum_{\underline{a}(0:k)} \left| \mu[\underline{a}(0:k)] - \nu[\underline{a}(0:k)] \right| \leq \sum_{\underline{a}(0:k)} (e^{\epsilon} - 1) \mu[\underline{a}(0:k)] = e^{\epsilon} - 1 \,.$$

Hence

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mu, \nu) \leq (e^{\epsilon} - 1) \sum_{k=0}^{n} 2^{-k} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{+\infty} 2^{-k} = 2(e^{\epsilon} - 1) + 2^{-n}.$$

To end the proof observe that $e^{\epsilon} - 1 \leq 2\epsilon$ for $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$. □

B Perron-Frobenius Theorem and Birkhoff's contraction coefficient

For a non-negative $q \times q$ matrix M define

$$\Gamma := \begin{cases} \min\limits_{i,j,k,l} \sqrt{\dfrac{M(i,j)M(k,l)}{M(i,l)M(k,j)}} & \text{if } M > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

The *Birkhoff's coefficient* [3] of M is $\tau := (1 - \Gamma)/(1 + \Gamma)$.

Consider the function $\delta : (\mathbb{R}^+)^q \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^q \to \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by

$$\delta(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) = \log \left(\frac{\max_i \underline{x}(i)/\underline{y}(i)}{\min_i \underline{x}(i)/\underline{y}(i)} \right).$$

On the q-simplex

$$\Delta_q := \{\underline{x} \in (0,1)^q : |\underline{x}|_1 = 1\}$$

δ is the projective (Hilbert) distance (and where $|\underline{x}|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^{q} \underline{x}(i)$). Now define $F : \Delta_q \to \Delta_q$ be such that

$$F\underline{x} := \frac{M\underline{x}}{|M\underline{x}|_1}.$$

For a primitive matrix M, F is non-expansive on the metric space (Δ_q, δ). Recall that a non–negative matrix M is said to be primitive if there exists an integer $\ell \geq 1$ such that $M^\ell > 0$. The smallest such integer is the *primitivity index* of M. If M is positive, then F is a contraction with contraction coefficient $\tau < 1$, *i.e.*,

$$\delta(F\underline{x}, F\underline{y}) \leq \tau\delta(\underline{x}, \underline{y}), \ \forall \ \underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \Delta_q.$$

A proof of this inequality can be easily deduced from the proof of [19, Theorem 3.12, p. 108].

We can state the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *Let M be a non–negative, primitive, $q \times q$ matrix with primitivity index ℓ. Then:*

- *It has only one maximal eigenvalue $\rho > 0$ with an associated unique right-eigenvector $\mathbf{v} \in \Delta_q$, and a unique left-eigenvector $\mathbf{w} > 0$ such that $\mathbf{w}^\dagger \mathbf{v} = 1$.*
- *For any $\underline{x} \in \Delta_q$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$M^m\underline{x} \lesseqgtr \rho^m(\mathbf{w}^\dagger\underline{x})\mathbf{v} \exp\left(\pm\frac{\tau^{\lfloor m/\ell \rfloor}\delta(\underline{x})}{1-\tau}\right), \tag{17}$$

with

$$\delta(\underline{x}) := \ell\delta(\underline{x}, F\underline{x}). \tag{18}$$

Proof. The first item is the classical Perron–Frobenius Theorem, see, *e.g.*, [19, Chapter 1]).

Let us prove the second item. Since M is primitive with primitivity index ℓ, then F is non–expansive, and F^ℓ is a contraction with contraction coefficient τ, *i.e.*,

$$\delta(F\underline{x}, F\underline{y}) \leq \delta(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \text{ and } \delta(F^\ell\underline{x}, F^\ell\underline{y}) \leq \tau\delta(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \ \forall \underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \Delta_q.$$

The contraction mapping theorem ensures that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} F^n\underline{x} = \mathbf{v}$ for all $\underline{x} \in \Delta_q$, where $\mathbf{v}$ is the unique fixed point for F, *i.e.*, the unique positive eigenvector for M. For each $\underline{x} \in \Delta_q$, $s < s'$ and $t \in \{0, 1, ..., \ell - 1\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(F^{\ell s+t}\underline{x}, F^{\ell s'+t}\underline{x}) &\leq \sum_{k=s}^{s'-1} \delta(F^{\ell k}F^t\underline{x}, F^{\ell(k+1)}F^t\underline{x}) \leq \sum_{k=s}^{s'-1} \tau^k\delta(F^t\underline{x}, F^{\ell+t}\underline{x}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=s}^{s'-1} \tau^k\delta(\underline{x}, F^\ell\underline{x}) \leq \tau^s\delta(\underline{x}, F^\ell\underline{x}) \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \tau^k \\
&\leq \frac{\tau^s\delta(\underline{x}, F^\ell\underline{x})}{1-\tau}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, letting $s' \to +\infty$, we obtain

$$\delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \lim_{s' \to \infty} \delta(F^{\ell s+t} \underline{x}, F^{\ell s'+t} \underline{x}) \leq \tau^{\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell} \rfloor} \frac{\delta(\underline{x}, F^\ell \underline{x})}{1-\tau} \tag{19}$$

where $m := \ell s + t$.

Let $C_m(\underline{x}) := (\max_i\{(M^m \underline{x})(i)/\mathbf{v}(i)\} \min_i\{(M^m \underline{x})(i)/\mathbf{v}(i)\})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Since $M^m \underline{x} = |M^m \underline{x}|_1 F^m \underline{x}$, we have

$$\delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \log \left(\frac{(\max_i (M^m \underline{x})(i)/\mathbf{v}(i)}{\min_i (M^m \underline{x})(i)/\mathbf{v}(i)} \right),$$

hence

$$\exp(\delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v})/2) C_m(\underline{x}) = \max_i (M^m \underline{x})(i)/\mathbf{v}(i)$$

and

$$\exp(-\delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v})/2) C_m(\underline{x}) = \min_i (M^m \underline{x})(i)/\mathbf{v}(i),$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq q$. Therefore $M^m \underline{x} \lesseqgtr C_m(\underline{x}) \mathbf{v} \exp(\pm \delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v})/2)$. Multiplying both sides from the left by $\mathbf{w}^\dagger$, we get

$$C_m(\underline{x}) \lesseqgtr (\rho^n \mathbf{w}^\dagger \underline{x}) \exp(\pm \delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v})/2),$$

whence

$$M^m \underline{x} \lesseqgtr (\rho^n \mathbf{w}^\dagger \underline{x}) \mathbf{v} \exp(\pm \delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v})).$$

To finish the proof, we observe that

$$\delta(\underline{x}, F^\ell \underline{x}) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \delta(F^j \underline{x}, F^{j+1} \underline{x}) \leq \ell \delta(\underline{x}, F \underline{x}) =: \ell \delta(\underline{x}).$$

Thus, using (19) and the fact that F is non-expansive one gets the bound

$$\delta(F^m \underline{x}, \mathbf{v}) \leq \tau^{\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell} \rfloor} \frac{\ell \delta(\underline{x})}{1-\tau}.$$

Therefore we obtain (17). □

References

[1] N. Anantharaman: *On the zero-temperature or vanishing viscosity limit for certain Markov processes arising from Lagrangian dynamics*. J. Eur. Math. Soc. **6** (2004), no. 2, 207–276.

[2] A. Baraviera, A. O. Lopes, Ph. Thieullen: *A large deviation principle for the equilibrium states of Hölder potentials: the zero temperature case*. Stoch. Dyn. **6** (2006), no. 1, 77–96.

[3] G. Birkhoff: *Projective contraction of a cone equipped with its associated Hilbert metric*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1957), 219–227.

[4] T. Bousch: *Nouvelle preuve d'un théorème de Yuan et Hunt*. Manuscript, 2006.

[5] R. Bowen: *Equilibrium States and the Ergodic Theory of Anosov Diffeomorphisms*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **470**, Springer–Verlag, 1975.

[6] X. Bressaud, A. Quas: *Rates of approximation of minimizing measures*. Nonlinearity **20** (2007), 845–853.

[7] J. Brémont: *Gibbs measures at temperature zero*. Nonlinearity (2003) **16**, 419–426.

[8] K. H. Rosen (ed.): *Handbook of discrete and combinatorial problems*. CRC Press, 2000.

[9] G. Contreras, A. O. Lopes, Ph. Thieullen: *Lyapunov minimizing measures for expanding maps of the circle*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **21** (2001), no. 5, 1379–1409.
Version for subshifts of finite type available at `http://www.cimat.mx/~gonzalo/papers/index.html`.

[10] J.-P. Conze, Y. Guivarc'h: *Croissance des sommes ergodiques et principe variationnel*. Unpublished manuscript (1995).

[11] C. Gardner, J. Miękisz, C. Radin, A. van Enter: *Fractal symmetry in an Ising model*. J. Phys. A **22** (1989), no. 21, L1019–L1023.

[12] H.-O. Georgii: *Gibbs measures and phase transitions*. de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics **9**, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin (1988).

[13] B. Hasselblatt, A. Katok (eds): *Handbook of Dynamical Systems*, Volume 1A, Elsevier, 2002.

[14] O. Jenkinson: *Ergodic optimization*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **15** (2006), no. 1, 197–224.

[15] S. Kalpazidou: *Cycle representations of Markov processes*. Second edition. Applications of Mathematics **28**. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer, 2006.

[16] G. Keller: *Equilibrium States in Ergodic Theory*. London Mathematical Society Student Texts **42**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.

[17] R. Leplaideur: *A dynamical proof for the convergence of Gibbs measures at temperature zero*. Nonlinearity **18** (2005), 2847-2880.

[18] N. N. Nekhoroshev: *Asymptotics of Gibbs measures in one-dimensional lattice models*. Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. **59** (2004), no. 1, 10–15.

[19] E. Seneta: *Non-negative Matrices and Markov Chains*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer-Verlag, 1981.

[20] A. C. D. van Enter, R. Fernández, A. Sokal: *Regularity Properties and Pathologies of Position-Space Renormalization-Group Transformations: Scope and Limitations of Gibssian Theory*. J. Stat. Phys. **72** (1993), nos. 5/6, 879–1165.

[21] A. C. D. van Enter, W. M. Ruszel: *Chaotic temperature dependence at zero temperature*. J. Stat. Phys. **127** (2007), no. 3, 567–573.