

Large Deviations for Quantum Spin probabilities at temperature zero

Artur O. Lopes, Jairo K. Mengue,
Joana Mohr and Carlos G. Moreira (*)

Inst. Mat - UFRGS, Brazil and
(*) IMPA - Brazil

October 24, 2017

Abstract

We consider certain self-adjoint observables for the KMS state associated to the Hamiltonian $H = \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x$ over the quantum spin lattice $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \dots$. For a fixed observable of the form $L \otimes L \otimes L \otimes \dots$, where $L : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$, and for the zero temperature limit one can get a naturally defined stationary probability μ on the Bernoulli space $\{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. This probability is ergodic but it is not mixing for the shift map. It is not a Gibbs state for a continuous normalized potential but its Jacobian assume only two values almost everywhere. Anyway, for such probability μ we can show that a Large Deviation Principle is true for a certain class of functions. The result is derived by showing the explicit form of the free energy which is differentiable.

1 Introduction

We analyze from the point of view of Ergodic Theory a probability μ which appears in a natural way on a physical problem of quantum nature (see [2, 18]). We point out that the system we considered in this work - for the construction of the associated μ - is of quantum nature, but the analysis of the associated measure is described in terms of classical Ergodic Theory and symbolic dynamics.

Given a selfadjoint operator H acting on a finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and a temperature $T > 0$, the density operator

$$\rho_{H,T} = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{T}H}}{Z(T)},$$

where¹ $Z(T) = \text{Tr } e^{-\frac{1}{T}H}$, is called the KMS state associated to the Hamiltonian H . Among other properties $\rho_{H,T}$ maximizes

$$-\text{Tr } (H \rho) - \text{Tr } (\rho \log \rho)$$

among density operators ρ acting on \mathcal{H} . In this way the KMS state plays in Quantum Statistical Physics (see [3], [14] or [5] for general results) the role of the Gibbs state in Thermodynamic Formalism. A general reference on Quantum Mechanics is [6] (see also [9]).

The paper [18] is the main motivation for the present work. We initially recall the general setting of that paper.

The set of linear operators acting on \mathbb{C}^d will be denoted by \mathcal{M}_d . We will call $\omega = \omega_n : \underbrace{\mathcal{M}_d \otimes \mathcal{M}_d \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{M}_d}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a C^* -dynamical state if $\omega_n(I^{\otimes n}) =$

1 and $\omega_n(a) \geq 0$, if a is a non-negative element in the tensor product. It follows that $\omega_n(L_1 \otimes L_2 \otimes \dots \otimes L_n)$ is a positive number if all $L_j \in \mathcal{M}_d$ are positive, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

A state $\omega = \omega_n$, $n \geq 2$ will be defined in the following way: consider a fixed value $\beta > 0$ and a complex self-adjoint operator H , depending on two variables, $H : (\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d)$. Now for a given natural number $n \geq 2$ let $H_n = (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ be given by

$$H_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} I^{\otimes j} \otimes H \otimes I^{\otimes (n-j-2)}.$$

Set

$$\rho_\omega = \rho_{\omega_{H,\beta,n}} = \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_n})} e^{-\beta H_n},$$

and, finally, we define the state $\omega_n = \omega_{H,\beta,n}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{H,\beta,n}(L_1 \otimes L_2 \otimes \dots \otimes L_n) &= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_n})} \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_n}(L_1 \otimes L_2 \otimes \dots \otimes L_n)] \\ &= \text{Tr}(\rho_\omega L_1 \otimes L_2 \otimes \dots \otimes L_n). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

¹The notation Tr means the trace of the operator

The parameter β corresponds to $1/T$.

From the above construction, any Hamiltonian H acting on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ defines a state $\omega = \omega_{H,\beta,n}$ acting on $\underbrace{\mathcal{M}_d \otimes \mathcal{M}_d \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{M}_d}_n$. A Quantum Ising Chain is defined by a Hamiltonian of the form

$$H = -J(\sigma_1^x \otimes \sigma_2^x) - h(\sigma_1^z \otimes I),$$

where the Pauli matrices are

$$\sigma^x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

while σ_i^x , is the Pauli matrix σ^x acting on the position i of the tensor product. The associated n -Hamiltonian is

$$H_n = \sum_{i=1}^n [-J(\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x) - h(\sigma_i^z \otimes I)].$$

In the case $h = 0$ we will say that the Quantum Ising Chain has no magnetic term. This will be the case here as we will see soon.

In order to describe the construction of a naturally defined probability on the symbolic space we need some more definitions.

Let $L : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$ be a self-adjoint operator and denote by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d$ its real eigenvalues. We suppose that $\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_d\}$ denotes an orthonormal set of eigenvectors of L and $P_{\psi_j} : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$ denotes the orthogonal projection on the subspace generated by ψ_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the observable

$$L^{\otimes n} := (L \otimes L \otimes \dots \otimes L) : (\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^d) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^d)$$

has the eigenvector $(\psi_{j_1} \otimes \psi_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{j_n})$ associated to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{j_1} \cdot \lambda_{j_2} \cdots \lambda_{j_n}$. Any eigenvalue of $L^{\otimes n}$ is of this form.

The values obtained by physical measuring (associated to the observable $L^{\otimes n}$) in the finite dimensional Quantum Mechanics setting are (of course) the eigenvalues of $L^{\otimes n}$. The relevant information is the probability of each possible outcome event of measuring $L^{\otimes n}$.

For fixed $H : \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, $L : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$, $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and $\beta > 0$, we consider the C^* -state $\omega_{H,\beta,n}$ given in (1), and define the probability $\mu_{\beta,n}$ on $\Omega_n = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}^n$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\beta,n}(j_1, \dots, j_n) &= \omega_{H,\beta,n}(P_{\psi_{j_1}} \otimes P_{\psi_{j_2}} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{\psi_{j_n}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_n})} \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_n}(P_{\psi_{j_1}} \otimes P_{\psi_{j_2}} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{\psi_{j_n}})]. \end{aligned}$$

We will consider here the case where $d = 2$. We denote $\Omega = \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and for fixed β with the information of the probabilities $\mu_{\beta, n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one can produce a probability μ_{β} on Ω .

On the zero temperature limit case we consider the probabilities (if the limit exists)

$$\mu_{\infty, n} = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_{\beta, n}.$$

With this information one can get the probability of each possible outcome event of measuring via $L^{\otimes n}$. Indeed, for fixed n and a specific eigenvalue λ of $L^{\otimes n}$ we just collect all the n -strings $(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{n-1}, j_n)$ such that $\lambda = \lambda_{j_1} \cdot \lambda_{j_2} \cdots \lambda_{j_n}$ and add their individual probabilities.

For instance, in the case $d = 2$, the eigenvalues of L are the numbers $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 = -1$, then the possible eigenvalues of $L^{\otimes n}$ are also just the values 1 and -1 . The 3-strings producing the value $\lambda = -1$ are

$$\{(j_1, j_2, j_3) \mid \lambda_{j_1} \cdot \lambda_{j_2} \cdot \lambda_{j_3} = -1\} = \{(1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 1), (2, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2)\}.$$

Assumption A: In this work we consider the Quantum spin Chain with no magnetic term defined by the Hamiltonian $H = \sigma_1^x \otimes \sigma_2^x$. We consider self-adjoint operators (observable) of the form

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2(\theta) - \sin^2(\theta) & 2 \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) \\ 2 \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) & \sin^2(\theta) - \cos^2(\theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

where² $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$.

The eigenvalues of L are $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 = -1$ which are associated, respectively, to the unitary eigenvectors $\psi_1 = (\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $\psi_2 = (-\sin(\theta), \cos(\theta)) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, which are orthogonal.

We are mainly interested in the zero temperature limit case. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1. *Suppose that H and L satisfy Assumption A. Consider the probability measure μ on $\Omega = \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, such that, for any $n \geq 2$ and $\{j_1, \dots, j_n\} \in \{1, 2\}^n$, $\mu([j_1, \dots, j_n]) = \mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, where $[j_1, \dots, j_n] = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \Omega \mid x_1 = j_1, \dots, x_n = j_n\}$. Then, the probability μ is invariant and ergodic for the shift map σ acting in Ω . It is not mixing and does not have a continuous Jacobian.*

The proof of the above result is the purpose of sections 2, 3 and 4.

²The case $\theta = 0$ corresponds to $L = \sigma^z$ and the case $\theta = \pi/2$ corresponds to $L = -\sigma^z$. We will exclude these cases.

One can also show that this Jacobian assume μ -almost everywhere only the values $p = \frac{1-\sin(2\theta)}{2}$ and $1-p = \frac{1+\sin(2\theta)}{2}$. This will establish an upper and lower bounds for its entropy.

Some technical results that we need on sections 2, 3 and 4 are proved on the Appendix.

The proofs of our main results are rigorous and they will be obtained by lengthy estimations and long induction procedures from which we will finally derive explicit expressions. We believe it is worthwhile for the future study of measures obtained from more general Hamiltonians (with magnetic term for instance) to be able to establish what good dynamical properties one can expect (and which ones one can not expect).

We say that there exists a **Large Deviation Principle** (LDP for short) for the probability μ on Ω and the function $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if there exist a lower-semicontinuous function $I : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that,

a) for all closed sets $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\mu \left\{ z \text{ such that } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} A(\sigma^j(z)) \in K \right\} \right) \leq - \inf_{s \in K} I(s),$$

b) for all open sets $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\mu \left\{ z \text{ such that } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} A(\sigma^j(z)) \in B \right\} \right) \geq - \inf_{s \in B} I(s).$$

I is called the deviation function.

Item a) can be proved in great generality due to Tchebishev's inequality (see [4] or section 5 in [11]).

Item b) is more difficult to get. It can be shown to be true in the case the free energy (to be defined below) is differentiable (see [4] or section 5 in [11]).

We refer the reader to [8], [12], [7] and [15] for several results on the topic of Large Deviations for Quantum Spin Systems.

Here we will be prove the following result:

Theorem 2. *Suppose that H and L satisfy the Assumption A and let μ be the probability defined on Theorem 1. In the case $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $A(x_1, x_2, \dots) = A(x_1)$ (it depends just on the first coordinate on Ω), there*

exists a large deviation principle for μ and A . This follows from the fact that the free energy

$$c(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \int e^{t(A(x)+A(\sigma(x))+A(\sigma^2(x))+\dots+A(\sigma^{n-1}(x)))} d\mu(x)$$

exists, and is given by the expression

$$c(t) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\left[e^{tA(1)} + e^{tA(2)} \right]^2 - \sin^2(2\theta) \left[e^{tA(1)} - e^{tA(2)} \right]^2 \right) - \log(2).$$

The proof of this Theorem is on section 5. We point out that the above function $c(t)$ (the free energy) is differentiable on t . From this will follow item b) above. The deviation function I is the Legendre Transform of $c(t)$ (see [4])

We would like to thanks A. Quas for some useful comments which help us in the proof of Theorem 21.

2 Properties of the associated probability μ

Initially, let us to compute $U = e^{izH}$ for $H = \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x$ and for any complex number z . The relation $\sigma^x \circ \sigma^x = I$ is very helpful. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} U &= e^{iz(\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(iz)^j}{j!} (\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x)^j = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(iz)^j}{j!} ((\sigma^x)^j \otimes (\sigma^x)^j) \\ &= \cos(z) (I \otimes I) + i \sin(z) (\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x). \end{aligned}$$

In Quantum Statistical Mechanics (see [3]) it is natural to take $z = i\beta$, where β is real. In this case

$$B = e^{-\beta \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x} = \cos(i\beta) (I \otimes I) + i \sin(i\beta) (\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x).$$

We will use the following notation:

Notation 3. For fixed n ,

$$(\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n = \begin{cases} \underbrace{I \otimes \dots \otimes I}_{i-1} \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \underbrace{I \otimes \dots \otimes I}_{n-i-1}, & i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\} \\ \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \underbrace{I \otimes \dots \otimes I}_{n-2}, & i = 1 \\ \underbrace{I \otimes \dots \otimes I}_{n-2} \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x, & i = n-1 \end{cases}$$

Now, we compute $e^{-\beta H_n} : (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$. As $(\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n$ commutes with $(\sigma_j^x \otimes \sigma_{j+1}^x)_n$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\beta H_n} &= e^{-\beta [\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n]} = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} e^{-\beta (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [\cos(i\beta) I^{\otimes n} + i \sin(i\beta) (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n], \end{aligned}$$

where the above product represents the composition of the operators.

If $n = 4$, for instance, we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\beta H_4} &= e^{-\beta [(\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes I \otimes I) + (I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes I) + (I \otimes I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x)]} = \\ &= e^{-\beta (\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes I \otimes I)} \circ e^{-\beta (I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes I)} \circ e^{-\beta (I \otimes I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x)} = \\ &= [\cos(i\beta) (I \otimes I \otimes I \otimes I) + i \sin(i\beta) (\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes I \otimes I)] \circ \\ &= [\cos(i\beta) (I \otimes I \otimes I \otimes I) + i \sin(i\beta) (I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes I)] \circ \\ &= [\cos(i\beta) (I \otimes I \otimes I \otimes I) + i \sin(i\beta) (I \otimes I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x)]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Lemma 4. *If $H = \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x$, then $\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_n}) = \cos^{n-1}(i\beta) 2^n$.*

Proof. Note that

$$e^{-\beta H_n} = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [\cos(i\beta) I^{\otimes n} + i \sin(i\beta) (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n]$$

which results in a sum with 2^{n-1} terms. Only the term $\cos^{n-1}(i\beta) (I^{\otimes n})$ do not contain a product of σ^x . As $\text{Tr}(\sigma^x) = 0$ and

$$\text{Tr}(L_1 \otimes \dots \otimes L_n) = \text{Tr}(L_1) \cdots \text{Tr}(L_n),$$

we will get that any term which does not contain the expression $\cos^{n-1}(i\beta) (I^{\otimes n})$ will produce a null trace. Moreover, as $\text{Tr}(I) = 2$, we finally get

$$\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_n}) = \cos^{n-1}(i\beta) \text{Tr}(I^{\otimes n}) = \cos^{n-1}(i\beta) 2^n.$$

□

From now on we will consider that L satisfies the Assumption A, that is,

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2(\theta) - \sin^2(\theta) & 2 \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) \\ 2 \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) & \sin^2(\theta) - \cos^2(\theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, and we will analyze the corresponding associated observable

$$L^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{L \otimes L \otimes L \otimes \dots \otimes L}_n.$$

The eigenvalues of L are $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 = -1$, associated, respectively, to the unitary eigenvectors $v_1 = (\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $v_2 = (-\sin(\theta), \cos(\theta)) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ - which are orthogonal. The eigenvectors of $L^{\otimes n}$ are of the form

$$v_{j_1} \otimes v_{j_2} \otimes v_{j_3} \otimes v_{j_4} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{j_n},$$

where, $(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \{1, 2\}^n$.

We denote by $P_1 : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ the projection on v_1 and $P_2 : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ the projection on v_2 . In this way

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta)^2 & \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) \\ \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) & \sin(\theta)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \sin(\theta)^2 & -\cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) \\ -\cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta)^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\text{Tr } P_1 = \text{Tr } P_2 = 1$. Moreover,

$$\sigma^x(P_1) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) & \sin^2(\theta) \\ \cos^2(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$$

has trace $\beta_1 := \sin(2\theta) \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\sigma^x(P_2) = \begin{pmatrix} -\cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) & \cos^2(\theta) \\ \sin^2(\theta) & -\cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$$

has trace $\beta_2 := -\sin(2\theta) \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $\text{Tr}(\sigma^x(P_2)) = \beta_2 = -\beta_1$. Note that, if $\theta \neq \frac{\pi}{4}$, then β_1, β_2 both have modulus smaller than 1.

Notation 5.

$$\beta_1 := \sin(2\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_2 := -\sin(2\theta)$$

The probability $\mu_{\beta,n}$ of the element $(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \{1, 2\}^n$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\beta,n}(j_1, \dots, j_n) &= \frac{1}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_n})} \text{Tr}[e^{-\beta H_n}(P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n})] \\ &= \frac{1}{\cos^{n-1}(i\beta)2^n} \text{Tr} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [\cos(i\beta) I^{\otimes n} + i \sin(i\beta) (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n] (P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the relation $i \sin(\beta i) = -\cos(\beta i) + e^{-\beta}$, when $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ we get the following result

Lemma 6. *If H and L satisfy the Assumption A, then for $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$,*

$$\mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) = \frac{1}{2^n} \text{Tr} \left[\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [I^{\otimes n} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n] (P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right].$$

Taking the limit $\beta \rightarrow 0$ will simplify a lot the future computations.

For the benefit of the reader we consider the cases $n=2$ and $n=3$. These estimations are important for the induction procedure we will consider later.

Example 7. *As $\text{Tr}(\sigma^x P_{j_i}) = \beta_{j_i}$, we get*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\infty, 2}(j_1, j_2) &= \frac{1}{2^2} \text{Tr} \left[(I \otimes I - \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x) \circ (P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2}) \right] = \\ &= \frac{1}{2^2} \text{Tr} \left[P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} - \sigma^x P_{j_1} \otimes \sigma^x P_{j_2} \right] = \frac{1}{2^2} \left[1 - \beta_{j_1} \beta_{j_2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $\theta \neq \frac{\pi}{4}$, the number $1 - \beta_{j_1} \beta_{j_2}$ is positive because $|\beta_1| < 1$ and $|\beta_2| < 1$.

We also get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\infty, 3}(j_1, j_2, j_3) &= \frac{1}{2^3} \text{Tr} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} ((I \otimes I \otimes I) - (\sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x \otimes I)) \circ \\ ((I \otimes I \otimes I) - (I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x)) \circ \\ (P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes P_{j_3}) \end{array} \right\} = \\ &= \frac{1}{2^3} \left[1 - \beta_{j_1} \beta_{j_2} - \beta_{j_2} \beta_{j_3} + \beta_{j_1} \beta_{j_3} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 8. *For $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$,*

$$\mu_{\infty, n+1}(1, j_1, j_3, \dots, j_n) + \mu_{\infty, n+1}(2, j_1, j_3, \dots, j_n) = \mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, j_3, \dots, j_n).$$

The proof of this Proposition is on the Appendix (see Proposition 29).

As

$$\mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) = \frac{1}{2^n} \text{Tr} \left[\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [I^{\otimes n} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n] (P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right],$$

it follows from the commutativity of the composition of the several terms above that

$$\mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4, \dots, j_n) = \mu_{\infty, n}(j_n, j_{n-1}, j_{n-2}, \dots, j_2, j_1). \quad (3)$$

Corollary 9. *Suppose that H and L satisfy the Assumption A. There exists a probability μ on $\{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ invariant for the shift map σ , such that, for any $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$ and any cylinder $[j_1, \dots, j_n]$, we get $\mu([j_1, \dots, j_n]) = \mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, \dots, j_n)$.*

Proof. We assume $\mu_{\infty, 1}(1) = \mu_{\infty, 1}(2) = \frac{1}{2}$ and we observe that

$$\mu_{\infty, 1}(j) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \mu_{\infty, 2}(i, j) = \sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{\infty, 2}(i, j)$$

(see example 7). For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the probabilities $\mu_{\infty, n}$ and $\mu_{\infty, n+1}$ are compatible in the sense that

$$\mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_n) = \mu_{\infty, n+1}(j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_n, 1) + \mu_{\infty, n+1}(j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_n, 2).$$

This follows from (3) and Proposition 8. In this way by Kolmogorov extension Theorem we get a probability μ , on the Bernoulli space $\{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, satisfying $\mu([j_1, \dots, j_n]) = \mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is invariant for the shift map σ from Proposition 8 - which is true also for $n = 1$ (using the above definition of $\mu_{\infty, 1}$). \square

Notation 10. $\mu(j_1, \dots, j_n) = \mu([j_1, \dots, j_n])$.

We will finish this section by showing how to compute μ recursively in cylinders. The next result will be very helpful on the next sections.

Theorem 11. *Suppose H and L satisfy the Assumption A. Let μ be the probability measure defined in corollary 9. For any $n \geq 2$, we have*

$$\mu(k, j_1, \dots, j_n) = \frac{\mu(j_1, \dots, j_n)}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{(-1)^i \beta_k \beta_{j_i}}{2^{i+1}} \mu(j_{i+1}, \dots, j_n) + \frac{(-1)^n \beta_k (\beta_{j_n} - \beta_{j_{n-1}})}{2^{n+1}}. \quad (4)$$

and

$$\mu(k, j_1) = \frac{\mu(j_1)}{2} - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{4}.$$

The proof of the above Theorem is on the Appendix (see Theorem 30).

One more example will be presented.

Example 12.

$$\mu(k, j_1, j_2) = \frac{\mu(j_1, j_2)}{2} - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{8} + \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_2}}{8},$$

$$\mu(k, j_1, j_2, j_3) = \frac{\mu(j_1, j_2, j_3)}{2} - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{4} \mu(j_2, j_3) + \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_2}}{16} - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_3}}{16},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(k, j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4) &= \frac{\mu(j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4)}{2} - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{4} \mu(j_2, j_3, j_4) \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_2}}{8} \mu(j_3, j_4) - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_3}}{32} + \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_4}}{32}. \end{aligned}$$

3 μ is ergodic but it is not mixing

In this section we suppose again that H and L satisfy the Assumption A. We will show that the probability μ is **ergodic but it is not mixing**.

Proposition 13. *For any $n \geq 2$ we have that*

$$\sum_{j_2, \dots, j_n} \mu(a, b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) = \mu(a, b) \mu(c, d) + \frac{(-1)^n (\beta_b - \beta_a) (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^4}.$$

Particularly, μ is not mixing.

The proof of this Proposition is on the Appendix (see Proposition 31).

Now we will prove that μ is ergodic. Initially, we need a preliminary result:

Proposition 14. *For $n \geq 1$,*

$$\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{\beta_{k_1}} \right) \mu(k_1, \dots, k_n) + \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{k_1}} - \frac{\beta_{k_1}}{2} \right) \mu(k_2, \dots, k_n).$$

The proof of this claim is on the Appendix (see Proposition 32)

Example 15. *We remember that $\beta_1 = \sin(2\theta)$ and $\beta_2 = -\beta_1$. In the particular case that $\theta = \pi/4$ we have $\beta_1 = 1$, $\beta_2 = -1$ and, using the above Proposition, we get*

$$\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{\beta_{k_1}} \right) \mu(k_1, \dots, k_n).$$

If $k_0 = k_1$, then $\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) = 0$. We conclude that μ is supported in the periodic orbit of the point $(0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, \dots)$.

Theorem 16. For any cylinders $[a_1, \dots, a_k]$ and $[b_1, \dots, b_l]$ we have

$$\lim_N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, \dots, a_k, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) = \mu(a_1, \dots, a_k) \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l). \quad (5)$$

Particularly, μ is ergodic.

Proof. We remark that for $A = [a_1, \dots, a_k]$ and $B = [b_1, \dots, b_l]$, equation (5) means

$$\lim_N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=k+1}^{k+N} \mu(A \cap \sigma^{-n} B) = \mu(A) \mu(B).$$

It is easy to extend the above expression for any measurable sets. This will show that μ is ergodic.

We will prove (5) by induction on k . For $k = 1$, from Theorem 11, as $\beta_2 = -\beta_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) &= \frac{\mu(b_1, \dots, b_l)}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{l-2} \frac{(-1)^{n+i} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_i}}{2^{i+1}} \mu(b_{i+1}, \dots, b_l) \\ &\quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+l-1} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_{l-1}}}{2^{l+1}} + \frac{(-1)^{n+l} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_l}}{2^{l+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, there exists a constant C , such that

$$\sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) = \frac{\mu(b_1, \dots, b_l)}{2} + (-1)^n C.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) = \frac{\mu(b_1, \dots, b_l)}{2} = \mu(a_1) \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l).$$

For $k = 2$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, a_2, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) \\ &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \frac{\mu(a_2, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l)}{2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2}}{4} \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l) + \sum_{i=1}^{l-2} \frac{(-1)^{1+n+i} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_i}}{2^{i+2}} \mu(b_{i+1}, \dots, b_l) \\ &\quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+l} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_{l-1}}}{2^{l+2}} + \frac{(-1)^{1+n+l} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_l}}{2^{l+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using similar computations as above for the case $k = 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, a_2, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) \\
&= \frac{\mu(b_1, \dots, b_l)}{4} + \sum_{i=1}^{l-2} \frac{(-1)^{n+i} \beta_{a_2} \beta_{b_i}}{2^{i+2}} \mu(b_{i+1}, \dots, b_l) \\
&\quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+l-1} \beta_{a_2} \beta_{b_{l-1}}}{2^{l+2}} + \frac{(-1)^{n+l} \beta_{a_2} \beta_{b_l}}{2^{l+2}} \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2}}{4} \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l) + \sum_{i=1}^{l-2} \frac{(-1)^{1+n+i} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_i}}{2^{i+2}} \mu(b_{i+1}, \dots, b_l) \\
&\quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+l} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_{l-1}}}{2^{l+2}} + \frac{(-1)^{1+n+l} \beta_{a_1} \beta_{b_l}}{2^{l+2}},
\end{aligned}$$

that is, there exists a constant C , such that

$$\sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, a_2, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2}}{4} \right) \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l) + (-1)^n C.$$

Therefore, as from example 7 we have that $\left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\beta_{a_1} \beta_{a_2}}{4} \right) = \mu(a_1, a_2)$, then,

$$\lim_N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a_1, a_2, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) = \mu(a_1, a_2) \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l).$$

Now, we suppose that for a fixed k_0 and any a_1, \dots, a_k , $k \leq k_0$, the equation (5) holds. We want to prove that for any $a \in \{1, 2\}$, and any $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{1, 2\}^k$, $2 \leq k \leq k_0$, we get

$$\lim_N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) = \mu(a, a_1, \dots, a_k) \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l).$$

From Proposition 14,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) \\
&= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_a}{\beta_{a_1}} \right) \mu(a_1, \dots, a_k, j_1, \dots, j_l, b_1, \dots, b_l) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \frac{\beta_a}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{a_1}} - \frac{\beta_{a_1}}{2} \right) \mu(a_2, \dots, a_k, j_1, \dots, j_l, b_1, \dots, b_l).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the induction hypothesis and Proposition 14 again we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} \mu(a, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, j_1, \dots, j_n, b_1, \dots, b_l) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_a}{\beta_{a_1}} \right) \mu(a_1, \dots, a_k) \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l) \\
&\quad + \frac{\beta_a}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{a_1}} - \frac{\beta_{a_1}}{2} \right) \mu(a_2, \dots, a_k) \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l) \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_a}{\beta_{a_1}} \right) \mu(a_1, \dots, a_k) + \frac{\beta_a}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{a_1}} - \frac{\beta_{a_1}}{2} \right) \mu(a_2, \dots, a_k) \right] \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l) \\
&= [\mu(a, a_1, \dots, a_k)] \mu(b_1, \dots, b_l).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows the claim for all cylinder sets as wanted. \square

4 μ it is not a Gibbs probability for a continuous potential

We continue to suppose that H and L satisfy the Assumption A.

We denote

$$\begin{aligned}
a(k_0, k_1) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{\beta_{k_1}} \right), \\
b(k_0, k_1) &= \frac{1}{4} \beta_{k_0} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{k_1}} - \beta_{k_1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \beta_1^2 \right) = \mu(1, 1).$$

where $k_0, k_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, $\beta_1 = \sin(2\theta)$ and $\beta_2 = -\beta_1$. The possible values of $a(k_0, k_1)$ and $b(k_0, k_1)$ are:

- a) if $k_0 = k_1$, then $a(k_0, k_1) = 0$ and $0 < b(k_0, k_1) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \beta_1^2) = \gamma < \frac{1}{4}$;
- b) if $k_0 \neq k_1$, then $a(k_0, k_1) = 1$ and $-\frac{1}{4} < b(k_0, k_1) = \frac{1}{4}(\beta_1^2 - 1) = -\gamma < 0$.

From Proposition 14,

$$\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) = a(k_0, k_1) \mu(k_1, \dots, k_n) + b(k_0, k_1) \mu(k_2, \dots, k_n). \quad (6)$$

Proposition 17. *Suppose $\theta \neq \pi/4$. Then, μ is positive on cylinders sets.*

Proof. It can be checked directly that any cylinder of size 1, 2 or 3 has a positive probability. Suppose that $\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n) > 0$ for any cylinder set of size n . As μ is stationary

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(x_0, \dots, x_n) &= \mu(1, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) + \mu(2, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq \mu(x_0, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ &= a(x_0, x_0)\mu(x_0, \dots, x_n) + b(x_0, x_0)\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \gamma\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n) > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Then, the result follows easily by induction. \square

We get also a corollary about the Jacobian J (which formally could be more properly called the inverse Jacobian - particular case of Lebesgue measure) of μ . Define for $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$,

$$J_\mu(x) = J(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(x_0, \dots, x_n)}{\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n)},$$

if, the limit exists. It is known that for any invariant measure ν , the Jacobian J_ν is well defined for ν a.e. x and can be seen as the Radon-Nikodym derivative of ν over the inverse branches of σ (see [16], [13], [11] or [17]).

Moreover, the entropy satisfies $h(\mu) = -\int \log J_\mu d\mu$.

We say that f is normalized if for any $x \in \Omega$ we have $\sum_{\sigma(y)=x} e^{f(y)} = 1$ (see [16]).

If ν is the equilibrium measure of a Lipschitz normalized function f , then $J_\nu = e^f$ (see [16]).

From (6), for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\frac{\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)} = a(k_0, k_1) + b(k_0, k_1) \frac{\mu(k_2, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}, \quad (7)$$

then, we get the following:

Corollary 18.

$$J(k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots) = a(k_0, k_1) + b(k_0, k_1) \frac{1}{J(k_1, k_2, k_3, \dots)}. \quad (8)$$

Remark: We have that $\gamma \leq J \leq 1 - \gamma$.

Indeed, denote by $J^n(x) := \frac{\mu(x_0, \dots, x_n)}{\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n)}$, $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots)$. From (7) we get

$$J^n(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) = a(x_0, x_1) + b(x_0, x_1) \frac{1}{J^{n-1}(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)}.$$

It follows that

$$1 \geq J^{n+1}(x_0, x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) = \gamma \frac{1}{J^n(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)}, \quad (9)$$

and, then

$$J^n(x_0, x_1, \dots) \geq \gamma,$$

for any n and $x = x_0, x_1, \dots \in \Omega$.

As the sum $J^n(1, x_2, x_3, \dots) + J^n(2, x_2, x_3, \dots) = 1$ we get also that $J^n \leq 1 - \gamma$. Finally, we observe that $J(x) = \lim_n J^n(x)$, if the limit exists.

Proposition 19. *The limit of the sequence $\frac{\mu(x_0, \dots, x_n)}{\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n)}$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$, does not exist for $x = 1^\infty = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$.*

Proof. from (7) we get

$$\frac{\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)} = a(k_0, k_1) + b(k_0, k_1) \frac{\mu(k_2, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}, \quad (10)$$

where $a(1, 1) = 0$ and $0 < b(1, 1) = \gamma < 1$. Then

$$\frac{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n+1})}{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_n)} = \gamma \frac{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n-1})}{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_n)}.$$

As $\frac{\mu(1,1)}{\mu(1)} = 2\gamma$ we get, by induction,

$$\frac{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n+1})}{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_n)} = 1/2,$$

for n even, and

$$\frac{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n+1})}{\mu(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_n)} = 2\gamma,$$

for n odd. Therefore, $J(1^\infty)$ does not exist. \square

Let $h(\mu)$ be the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy of μ . We will use the following definition of Gibbs state:

Definition 20. Suppose f is a continuous potential $f : \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that, for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have $\sum_{\sigma(y)=x} e^{f(y)} = 1$. Then, if ν is a σ -invariant probability such that:

$$\sup_{\rho} \left\{ h(\rho) + \int f d\rho \right\} = h(\nu) + \int f d\nu,$$

we say that ν is a Gibbs state for f .

Theorem 21. μ is not a Gibbs state for a continuous potential.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that μ is Gibbs for a continuous function f . Denote by \mathcal{L}_f the Ruelle operator for f (see [16]). Note that $\mathcal{L}_f(1) = 1$. It follows that exists a probability γ that is a fixed point of the dual operator \mathcal{L}_f^* , that is, for any continuous function $g : \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int \sum_i e^{f(i, x_1, x_2, \dots)} g(i, x_1, x_2, \dots) d\gamma(x) = \int g(x) d\gamma(x).$$

This shows that e^f is almost everywhere equal to the Jacobian of γ ($J_\gamma = e^f$ a.e.), because it is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of γ in the inverse branches. Following the arguments of Proposition 3.4 in [16] we get

$$\sup_{\rho} \left\{ h(\rho) + \int f d\rho \right\} = h(\gamma) + \int f d\gamma = 0.$$

By hypothesis we conclude that $h(\mu) + \int f d\mu = h(\gamma) + \int f d\gamma = 0$. Following the arguments of Proposition 3.4 in [16] again, we get that μ is a fixed point of the dual operator \mathcal{L}_f^* . This means that for any function φ we have

$$\int \mathcal{L}_f(\varphi) d\mu = \int \varphi d\mu.$$

Taking $\varphi = I_{(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)}$ we get that $\mathcal{L}_f(\varphi)(x) = I_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)}(x) e^{f(i_0 x)}$. Therefore,

$$\mu(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = \int_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)} e^{f(i_0 x)} d\mu(x),$$

and, hence

$$\frac{\mu(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)}{\mu(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)} = \frac{\int_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)} e^{f(i_0 x)} d\mu(x)}{\mu(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)}.$$

The right hand side is an average of values of e^f over decreasing cylinder sets. Since e^f is assumed to be a continuous function, it converges uniformly

in the sequence $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n \dots)$ to $e^{f(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n \dots)}$. Then, for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have that for any $x = (i, x_1, \dots, x_n, \dots)$ the limit,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(i, x_1, \dots, x_n)}{\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n)} = e^{f(i, x_1, \dots, x_n, \dots)},$$

exists. This is a contradiction because, from Proposition 19, this property is not true for $x = (1^\infty)$. □

We will make some final remarks about J . According to (8), $J : \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown function which satisfies the property:

$$\begin{aligned} J(k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots) &= a(k_0, k_1) + b(k_0, k_1) \frac{1}{J(k_1, k_2, k_3, \dots)} \\ &= a(k_0, k_1) + b(k_0, k_1) \frac{1}{a(k_1, k_2) + b(k_1, k_2) \frac{1}{J(k_2, k_3, k_4, \dots)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{\mu(k_0, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)} = a(k_0, k_1) + b(k_0, k_1) \frac{1}{a(k_1, k_2) + b(k_1, k_2) \frac{1}{\dots a(k_{n-1}, k_n) + b(k_{n-1}, k_n) \frac{1}{1/2}}},$$

then, we obtain the following result:

Lemma 22.

$$\begin{aligned} J(k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots) &= \lim_n \frac{\mu(k_0, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)} \\ &= \lim_n \left[a(k_0, k_1) + b(k_0, k_1) \frac{1}{a(k_1, k_2) + b(k_1, k_2) \frac{1}{\dots a(k_{n-1}, k_n) + b(k_{n-1}, k_n) \frac{1}{1/2}}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

if the limit exists.

In this sense J has an expression in continued fraction (see expression (b) in page 2 in [19] for the general setting).

We want to show that (when exists) J assume only two possible values. In the proof, the following lemma will be used.

Lemma 23. For any $n \geq 1$ and $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \{1, 2\}$ we have

$$\frac{\mu(1, 2, 2, 1, 1, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(2, 2, 1, 1, k_1, \dots, k_n)} = \frac{\mu(1, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}.$$

Particularly, J is not defined in $(1, 2, 2, 1)^\infty = (1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, \dots)$

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{\mu(1, 2, 2, 1, 1, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(2, 2, 1, 1, k_1, \dots, k_n)} = 1 - \gamma \frac{1}{0 + \gamma \frac{1}{1 - \gamma \frac{1}{0 + \gamma \frac{1}{\frac{\mu(1, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}}}}} = \frac{\mu(1, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}.$$

Particularly,

$$\frac{\mu(1, 2, 2, 1, \dots, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2)}{\mu(2, 2, 1, \dots, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2)} = \frac{\mu(1, 2)}{\mu(2)} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \beta_1^2),$$

while

$$\frac{\mu(1, 2, 2, 1, \dots, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1)}{\mu(2, 2, 1, \dots, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1)} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

This proves that J is not defined in $(1, 2, 2, 1)^\infty$. □

Proposition 24. *The only possible (convergent) values of J are $p = \frac{1+\beta_1}{2}$, or $1 - p = \frac{1-\beta_1}{2}$.*

Proof. Remember that

- a) if $k_0 = k_1$, then $a(k_0, k_1) = 0$ and $b(k_0, k_1) = \gamma = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \beta_1^2)$
- b) if $k_0 \neq k_1$, then $a(k_0, k_1) = 1$ and $b(k_0, k_1) = -\gamma = \frac{1}{4}(\beta_1^2 - 1)$.

In this way the value of J does not change if we permute 1 and 2 in the sequence $(k_0, k_1, \dots) \in \{1, 2\}^\mathbb{N}$. For example

$$J(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, \dots) = J(2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, \dots)$$

(if the limit exists). Therefore, we will introduce another code. For each given sequence $k \in \{1, 2\}^\mathbb{N}$, $k = (k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots)$ we associate a new sequence $m = m(k) = (m_0, m_1, m_2, \dots) \in \{a, b\}^\mathbb{N}$ by the rule: $m_i = a$ if $k_i = k_{i+1}$ and $m_i = b$ if $k_i \neq k_{i+1}$. So, we are looking if there is a change, or not, in the string k by using the rules $\underbrace{11}_a, \underbrace{22}_a, \underbrace{12}_b, \underbrace{21}_b$.

For example, given a sequence k of the form

$$k = (1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, \dots),$$

then, we associate $m = (b, b, a, b, \dots)$. Clearly, we can consider J defined over $\{a, b\}^\mathbb{N}$, from $J(m(k)) := J(k)$.

It can be checked that:

$$\begin{aligned}
J(a, a, m_3, \dots) &= J(m_3, m_4, \dots) \\
J(a, b, m_3, \dots) &= \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{J(m_3, m_4, \dots)}} \\
J(b, a, m_3, \dots) &= 1 - J(m_3, m_4, \dots) \\
&\text{and} \\
J(b, b, m_3, \dots) &= 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{J(m_3, m_4, \dots)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In this way when looking to sequences m , the finite strings with $(aa)^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, can be deleted (when J converges). That is,

$$J(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_j, a, a, m_{j+2}, \dots) = J(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_j, m_{j+2}, \dots).$$

Furthermore, it can be checked that

$$J(a, b, a, b, m_5, m_6, \dots) = J(b, a, b, a, m_5, m_6, \dots) = J(m_5, m_6, m_7, \dots).$$

In this way, if the fraction expansion $J(m)$ exists, then one can show that this value does not change if we delete finite parts of the sequence where appears $baba$ or $abab$.

In a first moment we consider only the possibility of deleting or including the string aa in the sequence. From Proposition 19 we obtain that if $m = (m_1, \dots, m_k, a, a, a, \dots)$, then $J(m)$ is not defined. For the other cases we consider the letters of m as block of length 2

$$m = ([m_1, m_2], [m_3, m_4], [m_5, m_6], \dots).$$

As we are interested in the value of J , we can assume that no blocks have the form $[a, a]$ (we can delete them), and, also that no blocks have the form $[b, b]$, because we can change this one for the pair of blocks $[b, a], [a, b]$.

From now on it is natural to consider one level up of symbolic representation. We get a new code introducing a new dictionary where we associate $\alpha = ab$ and $\beta = ba$. In this way, for $m = (m_0, m_1, m_2, \dots) = ([m_0, m_1], [m_2, m_3], \dots)$ we associate $w = (w_0, w_1, w_2, \dots)$, where $w_i = \alpha$, if $[m_{2i}, m_{2i+1}] = [a, b]$, and $w_i = \beta$, if $[m_{2i}, m_{2i+1}] = [b, a]$.

We need to study the possible values of J over $\{\alpha, \beta\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. First we remark that the string α, α in w corresponds to the string a, b, a, b in m , which can be deleted without changes of the value of J . From Lemma 23 we get that J is not defined if $w = (w_1, \dots, w_k, \alpha, \alpha, \alpha, \dots)$. For any other w there is some

sequence w' with the same value for J and such that w' does not contain α, α . Furthermore, the same argument can be applied for the string β, β in w . The conclusion is that for any sequence where J is well defined, it is equal to $J(\alpha, \beta, \alpha, \beta, \alpha, \dots)$ or $J(\beta, \alpha, \beta, \alpha, \beta, \dots)$.

From now on we are interested in to determine what are the possible two values of J . Consider the transformation

$$x \rightarrow f_1(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{x}}.$$

The string $\beta\alpha$ means $baab$, which corresponds to $J(m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots) = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{J(m_3, m_4, \dots)}}$. Note that if the expansion $J(m_3, m_4, \dots)$ exists for the string (m_3, m_4, \dots) , then it also exists the one for $J(m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots)$. In this way $f_1(J(m_3, m_4, \dots)) = J(m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots)$.

Consider now f_2 defined by

$$x \rightarrow f_2(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{1-x}}.$$

The string $\alpha\beta$ means $abba$, that is, it corresponds to $J(m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots) = \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{1 - J(m_3, m_4, \dots)}}$. In this way $f_2(J(m_3, m_4, \dots)) = J(m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots)$.

Note that the fixed points for both functions $f_1(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{x}}$ and $f_2(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma^{-1} - \frac{1}{1-x}}$ are the same: $p = \frac{1+\beta_1}{2}$ and $1-p = \frac{1-\beta_1}{2}$. Furthermore, the interval $[1-p, p]$ is invariant by f_1 and also by f_2 . The point p is a global attractor for f_1 in $(1-p, p]$, and, $1-p$ is a global attractor for f_2 in $[1-p, p)$.

As we have seen in Lemma 22 it is natural to truncate $J(k_0, k_1, k_2, \dots)$ (at level r for instance) by taking in the last position r , in the expansion of J , the value $1/2$. As $1/2 \in [1-p, p]$ (in fact is its center), and the interval $[1-p, p]$ is left invariant by the diffeomorphisms $g_a(x) = \frac{\gamma}{x}$ and $g_b(x) = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{x}$, when the limit exists the successive truncations should converge to p or to $1-p$.

Then, the only possible (convergent) values attained by the continuous fraction expansion of J in Lemma 22 are p or $1-p$.

□

From the above Proposition one can estimate the entropy of μ via the expression $h(\mu) = - \int \log J_\mu d\mu$.

5 A Large Deviation Principle for μ

We assume that H and L satisfy the Assumption A.

We want to prove the Theorem 2. In this way denote

$$c(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \int e^{t(A(z)+A(\sigma(z))+A(\sigma^2(z))+\dots+A(\sigma^{n-1}(z)))} d\mu(z),$$

for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

The function $c(t)$ is called the free energy on the point t for the probability μ and the classical observable A (see [4]). As we said before it is a classical result that if c is differentiable then a Large Deviation Principle is true for μ and A (see [11] for a proof with details). In this case the deviation function I is the Legendre transform of c (see [4] or [11]).

We will show the explicit expression of $c(t)$ which is clearly a differentiable function - therefore, will follow the LDP claim of Theorem 2. More precisely, we will prove the following result.

Proposition 25. *If $A : \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depends only on the first coordinate of x , then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$c(t) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\left[e^{tA(1)} + e^{tA(2)} \right]^2 - \left[\beta_1 e^{tA(1)} + \beta_2 e^{tA(2)} \right]^2 \right) - \log(2).$$

Note that the explicit expression of $c(t)$ permits to estimate explicitly (via Legendre transform) the deviation function I (and, so the M above).

Suppose $A : \{1, 2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function. We define, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$Q_n(t) = \int e^{t(A(x_0)+A(x_1)+\dots+A(x_n))} d\mu(x) = \sum_{j_0} \sum_{j_1} \dots \sum_{j_n} e^{t(A(j_0)+A(j_1)+\dots+A(j_n))} \mu(j_0, j_1, \dots, j_n).$$

Denote $\alpha(t) = \sum_j \beta_j e^{tA(j)}$ and $\delta(t) = \sum_j e^{tA(j)}$. Note that $|\alpha(t)| < |\delta(t)|$.

Before studying the general case of Q_n we will consider an example.

Example 26. *We will compute $Q_3(t)$. From example 12,*

$$\mu(j_0, j_1, j_2, j_3) = \frac{\mu(j_1, j_2, j_3)}{2} - \frac{\beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_1}}{4} \mu(j_2, j_3) + \frac{\beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_2}}{16} - \frac{\beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_3}}{16},$$

then, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_3(t) &= \sum_{j_0} \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2} \sum_{j_3} e^{t(A(j_0)+A(j_1)+A(j_2)+A(j_3))} \mu(j_0, j_1, j_2, j_3) = \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j_0} e^{tA(j_0)} \right] \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2} \sum_{j_3} e^{t(A(j_1)+A(j_2)+A(j_3))} \mu(j_1, j_2, j_3) + \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4} \left[\sum_{j_0} e^{tA(j_0)} \beta_{j_0} \right] \left[\sum_{j_1} e^{tA(j_1)} \beta_{j_1} \right] \sum_{j_2, j_3} e^{t(A(j_2)+A(j_3))} \mu(j_2, j_3) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{16} \sum_{j_0} \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2} \sum_{j_3} e^{t(A(j_0)+A(j_1)+A(j_2)+A(j_3))} \beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_2} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{16} \sum_{j_0} \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2} \sum_{j_3} e^{t(A(j_0)+A(j_1)+A(j_2)+A(j_3))} \beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_3} = \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \delta(t) Q_2(t) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_1(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we will extend the above ideas for a more general result.

Theorem 27. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$Q_n(t) = \left[\begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{2} \delta(t) Q_{n-1}(t) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-2}(t) + \frac{1}{8} \delta(t) \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-3}(t) \\ - \frac{1}{16} \delta(t)^2 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-4}(t) + \frac{1}{32} \delta(t)^3 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-5}(t) - \dots + \\ + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^{n-2}} \delta(t)^{n-4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_2(t) + \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n-1}} \delta(t)^{n-3} \alpha(t)^2 Q_1(t) \end{array} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Proof. By definition

$$Q_n(t) = \sum_{j_0} \sum_{j_1} \dots \sum_{j_n} e^{t(A(j_0)+A(j_1)+\dots+A(j_n))} \mu(j_0, j_1, \dots, j_n).$$

From equation (13)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(j_0, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) &= \frac{\mu(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n)}{2} - \frac{\beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_1}}{2^2} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n) + \\
&\quad \frac{\beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_2}}{2^3} \mu(j_3, j_4, \dots, j_n) - \frac{\beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_3}}{2^4} \mu(j_4, j_5, \dots, j_n) + \dots \\
&+ \frac{(-1)^{n-2} \beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_{n-2}}}{2^{n-1}} \mu(j_{n-1}, j_n) + \frac{(-1)^{n-1} \beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_{n-1}}}{2^{n+1}} + \frac{(-1)^n \beta_{j_0} \beta_{j_n}}{2^{n+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_n(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j_0} e^{tA(j_0)} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_n} e^{t(A(j_1)+\dots+A(j_n))} \mu(j_1, \dots, j_n) - \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2^2} \sum_{j_0} e^{tA(j_0)} \beta_{j_0} \sum_{j_1} e^{tA(j_1)} \beta_{j_1} \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_n} e^{t(A(j_2)+\dots+A(j_n))} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2^3} \sum_{j_0} e^{tA(j_0)} \beta_{j_0} \sum_{j_1} e^{tA(j_1)} \sum_{j_2} e^{tA(j_2)} \beta_{j_2} \sum_{j_3, \dots, j_n} e^{t(A(j_3)+\dots+A(j_n))} \mu(j_3, \dots, j_n) \\
&\quad \dots + \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n+1}} \sum_{j_0} e^{tA(j_0)} \beta_{j_0} \sum_{j_n} e^{tA(j_n)} \beta_{j_n} \sum_{j_2} e^{tA(j_2)} \dots \sum_{j_{n-1}} e^{tA(j_{n-1})}
\end{aligned}$$

(using the definitions of $\alpha(t)$ and $\delta(t)$)

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} \delta(t) Q_{n-1}(t) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-2}(t) + \frac{1}{8} \delta(t) \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-3}(t) - \frac{1}{16} \delta(t)^2 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-4}(t) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{32} \delta(t)^3 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-5}(t) - \dots + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^{n-2}} \delta(t)^{n-4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_2(t) \\
&\quad + \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n-1}} \delta(t)^{n-3} \alpha(t)^2 Q_1(t) + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^{n+1}} \alpha(t)^2 \delta(t)^{n-2} + \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n+1}} \alpha(t)^2 \delta(t)^{n-2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \delta(t) Q_{n-1}(t) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-2}(t) + \frac{1}{8} \delta(t) \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-3}(t) - \frac{1}{16} \delta(t)^2 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-4}(t) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{32} \delta(t)^3 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-5}(t) - \dots + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^{n-2}} \delta(t)^{n-4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_2(t) + \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n-1}} \delta(t)^{n-3} \alpha(t)^2 Q_1(t).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 28.

$$Q_{n+2}(t) = \frac{\delta(t)^2 - \alpha(t)^2}{4} Q_n(t).$$

Proof. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_n(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \delta(t) Q_{n-1}(t) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-2}(t) + \frac{1}{8} \delta(t) \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-3}(t) - \frac{1}{16} \delta(t)^2 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-4}(t) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{32} \delta(t)^3 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-5}(t) - \dots + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^{n-2}} \delta(t)^{n-4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_2(t) + \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{n-1}} \delta(t)^{n-3} \alpha(t)^2 Q_1(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same formula applied in $Q_{n-1}(t)$ we get

$$Q_{n-1}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \delta(t) Q_{n-2}(t) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-3}(t) + \frac{1}{8} \delta(t) \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-4}(t) - \frac{1}{16} \delta(t)^2 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-5}(t) +$$

$$\frac{1}{32} \delta(t)^3 \alpha(t)^2 Q_{n-6}(t) - \dots + \frac{(-1)^{n-2}}{2^{n-3}} \delta(t)^{n-5} \alpha(t)^2 Q_2(t) + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^{n-2}} \delta(t)^{n-4} \alpha(t)^2 Q_1(t).$$

If we replace Q_{n-1} in the first equation for the right hand side of the second equation we get:

$$Q_n(t) = \frac{\delta(t)^2 - \alpha(t)^2}{4} Q_{n-2}(t).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 25: From the above result we get as a corollary that $Q_n(t)$ grows exponentially like $e^{\frac{\sqrt{\delta(t)^2 - \alpha(t)^2}}{2}}$. In this way for each fixed t :

$$\begin{aligned} c(t) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log Q_n(t) = \log \frac{\sqrt{\delta(t)^2 - \alpha(t)^2}}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\left[\sum_{j_0} e^{t A(j_0)} \right]^2 - \left[\sum_{j_0} \beta_{j_0} e^{t A(j_0)} \right]^2 \right) - \log(2). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

□

The above function c is differentiable on t .

6 Appendix

On the Appendix we will give the proof of several technical results which were used before.

Proposition 29. For $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$,

$$\mu_{\infty, n+1}(1, j_1, j_3, \dots, j_n) + \mu_{\infty, n+1}(2, j_1, j_3, \dots, j_n) = \mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, j_3, \dots, j_n).$$

Proof. As $P_1 \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n} + P_2 \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n} = I \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_{\infty, n+1}(1, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) + \mu_{\infty, n+1}(2, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (I \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[I^{\otimes n+1} \circ \prod_{i=2}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (I \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we use the expression

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left[-(\sigma_1^x \otimes \sigma_2^x)_{n+1} \circ \prod_{i=2}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (I \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] = 0,$$

which follows from $\mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^x) = 0$.

Note also that, for any B_1, \dots, B_n , we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}(I \otimes B_1 \otimes \dots \otimes B_n) = 2 \mathrm{Tr}(B_1 \otimes \dots \otimes B_n).$$

Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_{\infty, n+1}(1, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) + \mu_{\infty, n+1}(2, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \mathrm{Tr} \left[I^{\otimes n+1} \circ \prod_{i=2}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (I \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} \mathrm{Tr} \left[\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [I^{\otimes n} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_n] (P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\ &= \mu_{\infty, n}(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 30. *Suppose H and L satisfy the Assumption A. Let μ be the probability measure defined in Corollary 9. For any $n \geq 2$, we have*

$$\mu(k, j_1, \dots, j_n) = \frac{\mu(j_1, \dots, j_n)}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{(-1)^i \beta_k \beta_{j_i}}{2^{i+1}} \mu(j_{i+1}, \dots, j_n) + \frac{(-1)^n \beta_k (\beta_{j_n} - \beta_{j_{n-1}})}{2^{n+1}}. \quad (13)$$

and

$$\mu(k, j_1) = \frac{\mu(j_1)}{2} - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{4}.$$

Proof. For $n = 1$ the above result can be verified directly, because

$$\mu(k, j_1) = \frac{1 - \beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(j_1) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

For $n \geq 2$, we have

$$\mu(k, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \mathrm{Tr} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (P_k \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[I^{\otimes n+1} \circ \prod_{i=2}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (P_k \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[(\sigma_1^x \otimes \sigma_2^x)_{n+1} \circ \prod_{i=2}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (P_k \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mu(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[\prod_{i=2}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (\sigma^x(P_k) \otimes \sigma^x(P_{j_1}) \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mu(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[I^{\otimes n+1} \circ \prod_{i=3}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (\sigma^x(P_k) \otimes \sigma^x(P_{j_1}) \otimes P_{j_2} \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[(\sigma_2^x \otimes \sigma_3^x)_{n+1} \circ \prod_{i=3}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (\sigma^x(P_k) \otimes \sigma^x(P_{j_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mu(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{4} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left[\prod_{i=3}^n [I^{\otimes n+1} - (\sigma_i^x \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^x)_{n+1}] (\sigma^x(P_k) \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes \sigma^x(P_{j_2}) \otimes \dots \otimes P_{j_n}) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Using similar computations we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(k, j_1, \dots, j_n) &= \frac{1}{2} \mu(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{2^2} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n) + \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_2}}{2^3} \mu(j_3, \dots, j_n) \\
&\quad + \dots + \frac{(-1)^{n-2} \beta_k \beta_{j_{n-2}}}{2^{n-1}} \mu(j_{n-1}, j_n) + \\
&\quad + \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2^{n+1}} \text{Tr} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (+ \underbrace{(I \otimes \dots \otimes I)}_{n+1} - (I \otimes I \otimes \dots \otimes I \otimes \sigma^x \otimes \sigma^x)) \circ \\ (\sigma^x P_k \otimes P_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma^x P_{j_{n-1}} \otimes P_{j_n}) \end{array} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mu(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) - \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_1}}{2^2} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n) + \frac{\beta_k \beta_{j_2}}{2^3} \mu(j_3, \dots, j_n) - \dots \\
&\quad \dots + \frac{(-1)^{n-2} \beta_k \beta_{j_{n-2}}}{2^{n-1}} \mu(j_{n-1}, j_n) + \frac{(-1)^{n-1} \beta_k \beta_{j_{n-1}}}{2^{n+1}} + \frac{(-1)^n \beta_k \beta_{j_n}}{2^{n+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 31. For any $n \geq 2$ we have that

$$\sum_{j_2, \dots, j_n} \mu(a, b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) = \mu(a, b)\mu(c, d) + \frac{(-1)^n(\beta_b - \beta_a)(\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^4}.$$

Particularly, μ is not mixing.

Proof. From Theorem 11 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(a, b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) &= \frac{\mu(b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d)}{2} - \frac{\beta_a \beta_b}{2^2} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) + \\ &+ \frac{\beta_a \beta_{j_2}}{2^3} \mu(j_3, j_4, \dots, j_n, c, d) - \frac{\beta_a \beta_{j_3}}{2^4} \mu(j_4, j_5, \dots, j_n, c, d) + \dots \\ &+ \frac{(-1)^n \beta_a \beta_{j_n}}{2^{n+1}} \mu(c, d) + \frac{(-1)^{n+1} \beta_a (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{j_2=1}^2 \frac{\beta_a \beta_{j_2}}{2^3} \mu(j_3, j_4, \dots, j_n, c, d) = 0,$$

because $\beta_2 = -\beta_1$ and j_2 only appears in β_{j_2} . In general, for $k = 2, \dots, n$

$$\sum_{j_k=1}^2 \frac{\beta_a \beta_{j_k}}{2^{k+1}} = 0.$$

Therefore, we will separate with - the notation $\sum_{k=2}^n \beta_{j_k}(\dots)$ - all terms that contain $\frac{\beta_a \beta_{j_k}}{2^{k+1}}$. In this way

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(a, b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) &= \frac{\mu(b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d)}{2} - \frac{\beta_a \beta_b}{2^2} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) + \\ &+ \frac{(-1)^{n+1} \beta_a (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+3}} + \sum_{k=2}^n \beta_{j_k}(\dots) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d)}{2} - \frac{\beta_b \beta_{j_2}}{2^2} \mu(j_3, \dots, j_n, c, d) \right] + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\beta_b \beta_{j_3}}{2^3} \mu(j_4, \dots, j_n, c, d) - \frac{\beta_b \beta_{j_4}}{2^4} \mu(j_5, \dots, j_n, c, d) \right] + \dots \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{(-1)^{n-1} \beta_b \beta_{j_n}}{2^n} \mu(c, d) + \frac{(-1)^n \beta_b (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+2}} \right] - \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{\beta_a \beta_b}{2^2} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) + \frac{(-1)^{n+1} \beta_a (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+3}} + \sum_{k=2}^n \beta_{j_k}(\dots) = \\
& = \frac{\mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d)}{2^2} - \frac{\beta_a \beta_b}{2^2} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) + \\
& + \frac{(-1)^n \beta_b (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+3}} + \frac{(-1)^{n+1} \beta_a (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+3}} + \sum_{k=2}^n \beta_{j_k}(\dots) = \\
& = \mu(a, b) \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) + \frac{(-1)^n (\beta_b - \beta_a) (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+3}} + \sum_{k=2}^n \beta_{j_k}(\dots).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu(a, b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) = \\
& \mu(a, b) \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) + \frac{(-1)^n (\beta_b - \beta_a) (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^{n+3}} + \sum_{k=2}^n \beta_{j_k}(\dots).
\end{aligned}$$

We know that μ is stationary, so

$$\sum_{j_2, \dots, j_n} \mu(j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) = \mu(c, d).$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j_2, \dots, j_n} \mu(a, b, j_2, \dots, j_n, c, d) = \mu(a, b) \mu(c, d) + \frac{(-1)^n (\beta_b - \beta_a) (\beta_c - \beta_d)}{2^4}.$$

From the above for $(a, b) = (1, 2)$ and $(c, d) = (2, 1)$ we finally get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\sigma^{-2n}(c, d) \cap (a, b)) \neq \mu(a, b) \mu(c, d),$$

and, this shows that μ is not mixing (see [13] or [17]). This also implies that for some continuous functions there is no decay of correlation to 0. \square

Proposition 32. For $n \geq 1$,

$$\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{\beta_{k_1}} \right) \mu(k_1, \dots, k_n) + \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{k_1}} - \frac{\beta_{k_1}}{2} \right) \mu(k_2, \dots, k_n).$$

Proof. The cases $n = 1, 2$ correspond to the equations

$$\mu(k_0, k_1) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{\beta_{k_1}} \right) \mu(k_1) + \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{k_1}} - \frac{\beta_{k_1}}{2} \right),$$

and,

$$\mu(k_0, k_1, k_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{\beta_{k_1}} \right) \mu(k_1, k_2) + \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{k_1}} - \frac{\beta_{k_1}}{2} \right) \mu(k_2),$$

which can be checked directly from example 7 and definition $\mu(k) = 1/2$, $k = 1, 2$.

For $n \geq 2$, from (13) we get the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\beta_{k_0}} &= \frac{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\beta_{k_0}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{(-1)^i \beta_{k_i} \mu(k_{i+1}, \dots, k_n)}{2^i} \\ &\quad + (-1)^n \frac{\beta_{k_n} - \beta_{k_{n-1}}}{2^n} \\ &= \frac{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\beta_{k_0}} - \frac{\beta_{k_1} \mu(k_2, \dots, k_n)}{2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} \frac{(-1)^i \beta_{k_i} \mu(k_{i+1}, \dots, k_n)}{2^i} + (-1)^n \frac{\beta_{k_n} - \beta_{k_{n-1}}}{2^n}, \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\beta_{k_1}} &= \frac{\mu(k_2, \dots, k_n)}{2\beta_{k_1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-3} \frac{(-1)^i \beta_{k_{i+1}} \mu(k_{i+2}, \dots, k_n)}{2^{i+1}} \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n-1} \frac{\beta_{k_n} - \beta_{k_{n-1}}}{2^n} \\ &= \frac{\mu(k_2, \dots, k_n)}{2\beta_{k_1}} + \sum_{j=2}^{n-2} \frac{(-1)^{j-1} \beta_{k_j} \mu(k_{j+1}, \dots, k_n)}{2^j} \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n-1} \frac{\beta_{k_n} - \beta_{k_{n-1}}}{2^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\beta_{k_0}} + \frac{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\beta_{k_1}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\mu(k_1, \dots, k_n)}{\beta_{k_0}} - \frac{\beta_{k_1} \mu(k_2, \dots, k_n)}{2} \right) + \left(\frac{\mu(k_2, \dots, k_n)}{2\beta_{k_1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mu(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{\beta_{k_1}} \right) \mu(k_1, \dots, k_n) + \frac{\beta_{k_0}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2\beta_{k_1}} - \frac{\beta_{k_1}}{2} \right) \mu(k_2, \dots, k_n).$$

□

References

- [1] H. Araki, Gibbs states of a one dimensional quantum lattice, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 14, pp 120-157 (1969)
- [2] T. Benoist, V. Jaksic, Y. Pautrat and C-A. Pillet, On entropy production of repeated quantum measurements I. General theory, *Arxiv* (2015)
- [3] O. Bratelli and D. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics*, Vol 1, Springer (2010)
- [4] R. Ellis. *Entropy, Large Deviations, and Statistical Mechanics*. Springer Verlag. (2005)
- [5] D. Evans, *Quantum Symmetries on Operator Algebras*, Oxford Press (1998)
- [6] S. Gustafson and I. Sigal, *Mathematical concepts of Quantum Mechanics*, Springer Verlag (2000)
- [7] F. Hiai, Fumio, M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa, Large deviations and Chernoff bound for certain correlated states on a spin chain. *J. Math. Phys.* 48 (2007), no. 12, 123301, 19 pp.
- [8] J. L. Lebowitz, M. Lenci and H. Spohn, Large deviations for ideal quantum systems, *J. Math. Phys.* 41: 1224–1243 (2000)
- [9] A. O. Lopes, *Introdução à Matemática da Mecânica Quântica*. manuscript (2017)
<http://mat.ufrgs.br/~alopes/hom/livroquantum.pdf>
- [10] A. O. Lopes, Entropy, Pressure and Large Deviation. In: Goles E., Martinez S. (eds) *Cellular Automata, Dynamical Systems and Neural Networks*. Mathematics and Its Applications, vol 282. Springer, Dordrecht (1994)

- [11] A. O. Lopes, Thermodynamic Formalism, Maximizing Probabilities and Large Deviations. manuscript (2017)
<http://mat.ufrgs.br/~alopes/hom/notesformtherm.pdf>
- [12] M. Lenci and L. Rey-Bellet, Large deviations in quantum lattice systems: one-phase region. *J. Stat. Phys.* 119 (2005), no. 3–4, 715–746.
- [13] R. Mañé, Ergodic Theory and Differentiable Dynamics, Springer Verlag (2011)
- [14] J. Parkinson and D. Farnell, An introduction to quantum spin systems, Springer Verlag (2010)
- [15] Y. Ogata, Large deviations in quantum spin chains. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 296 (2010), no. 1, 3568.
- [16] W. Parry and M. Pollicott. Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics. *Asterisque*, 187–188, (1990).
- [17] M. Pollicott and M. Yuri, Dynamical Systems and Ergodic Theory, Academic Press (1998)
- [18] W. de Roeck, C. Maes, K. Netockny and M. Schitz, Locality and nonlocality of classical restrictions of quantum spin systems with applications to quantum large deviations and entanglement, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 56, 023301 (2015)
- [19] H. Wall, Analytic Theory of continued fractions, Chelsea Publishig (1967)