## Surjunctivity of Algebraic Dynamical Systems

#### Michel Coornaert

IRMA, University of Strasbourg

"Groups, Probability, Dynamics", A Conference on the occasion of the 50th birthday of Tullio Ceccherini-Silberstein, Rome February 22–24 2017,
Sapienza – Universitá di Roma



This is joint work with Siddhartha Bhattacharya and Tullio Ceccherini-Silberstein.



This is joint work with Siddhartha Bhattacharya and Tullio Ceccherini-Silberstein.

[BCC-2017] S. Bhattacharya, T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, M. Coornaert, *Surjunctivity and topological rigidity of algebraic dynamical systems*, arXiv:1702.06201

#### A dynamical system is a triple $(X, \Gamma, \alpha)$ , where

- X is a compact metrizable topological space,
- Γ is a countable group
- $\alpha$  is a continuous action of  $\Gamma$  on X, i.e., a group morphism  $\alpha \colon \Gamma \to \mathsf{Homeo}(X)$ .

### A dynamical system is a triple $(X, \Gamma, \alpha)$ , where

- X is a compact metrizable topological space,
- Γ is a countable group
- $\alpha$  is a continuous action of  $\Gamma$  on X, i.e., a group morphism  $\alpha \colon \Gamma \to \mathsf{Homeo}(X)$ .

The space X is called the phase space of the d.s.



### A dynamical system is a triple $(X, \Gamma, \alpha)$ , where

- X is a compact metrizable topological space,
- Γ is a countable group
- $\alpha$  is a continuous action of  $\Gamma$  on X, i.e., a group morphism  $\alpha \colon \Gamma \to \mathsf{Homeo}(X)$ .

The space X is called the phase space of the d.s.

To simplify, we write

$$\gamma x := \alpha(\gamma)(x) \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X,$$

and 
$$(X,\Gamma) := (X,\Gamma,\alpha)$$
.





Let  $(X, \Gamma)$  be a d.s.



Let  $(X, \Gamma)$  be a d.s.

A map  $\tau \colon X \to X$  is equivariant if it commutes with the action, i.e.,

$$\tau(\gamma x) = \gamma \tau(x) \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X.$$

Let  $(X, \Gamma)$  be a d.s.

A map  $\tau \colon X \to X$  is equivariant if it commutes with the action, i.e.,

$$\tau(\gamma x) = \gamma \tau(x) \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X.$$

#### Definition

One says that the d.s.  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive if every injective equivariant continuous map  $\tau\colon X\to X$  is surjective.

Let  $(X, \Gamma)$  be a d.s.

A map  $\tau \colon X \to X$  is equivariant if it commutes with the action, i.e.,

$$\tau(\gamma x) = \gamma \tau(x) \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X.$$

#### Definition

One says that the d.s.  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive if every injective equivariant continuous map  $\tau\colon X\to X$  is surjective.

The term surjunctive was created by Gottschalk [Go-1973].



### Example

If the phase space X is finite, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive.



### Example

If the phase space X is finite, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive. Indeed, every injective self-mapping of a finite set is surjective.



### Example

If the phase space X is finite, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive. Indeed, every injective self-mapping of a finite set is surjective. Thus, surjunctivity is a finiteness condition.



## Example

If the phase space X is finite, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive. Indeed, every injective self-mapping of a finite set is surjective. Thus, surjunctivity is a finiteness condition.

## Example

If the phase space X is incompressible, i.e., there is no proper subset of X that is homeomorphic to X, then  $(X, \Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

### Example

If the phase space X is finite, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive. Indeed, every injective self-mapping of a finite set is surjective. Thus, surjunctivity is a finiteness condition.

## Example

If the phase space X is incompressible, i.e., there is no proper subset of X that is homeomorphic to X, then  $(X, \Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

Note that closed topological manifolds are incompressible by Brouwer's invariance of domain

### Example

If the phase space X is finite, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive. Indeed, every injective self-mapping of a finite set is surjective. Thus, surjunctivity is a finiteness condition.

## Example

If the phase space X is incompressible, i.e., there is no proper subset of X that is homeomorphic to X, then  $(X, \Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

Note that closed topological manifolds are incompressible by Brouwer's invariance of domain

#### Example

If  $(X,\Gamma)$  satisfies the descending chain condition, i.e., every decreasing sequence

$$X = X_0 \supset X_1 \supset X_2 \supset \dots$$

of closed invariant subsets eventually stabilizes, then  $(X, \Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

### Example

If the phase space X is finite, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive. Indeed, every injective self-mapping of a finite set is surjective. Thus, surjunctivity is a finiteness condition.

## Example

If the phase space X is incompressible, i.e., there is no proper subset of X that is homeomorphic to X, then  $(X, \Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

Note that closed topological manifolds are incompressible by Brouwer's invariance of domain

### Example

If  $(X,\Gamma)$  satisfies the descending chain condition, i.e., every decreasing sequence

$$X = X_0 \supset X_1 \supset X_2 \supset \dots$$

of closed invariant subsets eventually stabilizes, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

Minimal d.s. and, more generally, d.s. in which all proper closed invariant subsets are finite satisfy the d.c.c.

5 / 18



Let  ${\mathcal S}$  be a compact metrizable space and  $\Gamma$  a countable group.



Let S be a compact metrizable space and  $\Gamma$  a countable group. The shift over the group  $\Gamma$  and the alphabet space S is the d.s.  $(S^{\Gamma}, \Gamma)$ , where



Let S be a compact metrizable space and  $\Gamma$  a countable group.

The shift over the group  $\Gamma$  and the alphabet space S is the d.s.  $(S^{\Gamma}, \Gamma)$ , where

- $S^{\Gamma} = \{x \colon \Gamma \to S\}$  with the product topology;
- $\bullet$   $\Gamma$  acts on  $S^{\Gamma}$  by

$$(\gamma x)(\gamma') := x(\gamma^{-1}\gamma') \quad \forall \gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma, \forall x \in S^{\Gamma}.$$



Let S be a compact metrizable space and  $\Gamma$  a countable group.

The shift over the group  $\Gamma$  and the alphabet space S is the d.s.  $(S^{\Gamma}, \Gamma)$ , where

- $S^{\Gamma} = \{x \colon \Gamma \to S\}$  with the product topology;
- $\Gamma$  acts on  $S^{\Gamma}$  by

$$(\gamma x)(\gamma') := x(\gamma^{-1}\gamma') \quad \forall \gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma, \forall x \in S^{\Gamma}.$$

## Theorem (Gromov-Weiss)

If S is finite and  $\Gamma$  sofic, then  $(S^{\Gamma}, \Gamma)$  is surjunctive.



Let S be a compact metrizable space and  $\Gamma$  a countable group.

The shift over the group  $\Gamma$  and the alphabet space S is the d.s.  $(S^{\Gamma}, \Gamma)$ , where

- $S^{\Gamma} = \{x \colon \Gamma \to S\}$  with the product topology;
- $\Gamma$  acts on  $S^{\Gamma}$  by

$$(\gamma x)(\gamma') := x(\gamma^{-1}\gamma') \quad \forall \gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma, \forall x \in S^{\Gamma}.$$

## Theorem (Gromov-Weiss)

If S is finite and  $\Gamma$  sofic, then  $(S^{\Gamma}, \Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

It is unknown if the preceding theorem remains valid for any group  $\Gamma$  (Gottschalk conjecture).



Let  $(X,\Gamma)$  be a d.s. and d a compatible metric on X.



Let  $(X,\Gamma)$  be a d.s. and d a compatible metric on X.

#### **Definition**

One says that  $(X,\Gamma)$  is expansive if

$$\exists \varepsilon > 0, \forall x \neq y \in X, \exists \gamma \in \Gamma \text{ such that } d(\gamma x, \gamma y) \geq \varepsilon.$$



Let  $(X,\Gamma)$  be a d.s. and d a compatible metric on X.

#### **Definition**

One says that  $(X,\Gamma)$  is expansive if

$$\exists \varepsilon > 0, \forall x \neq y \in X, \exists \gamma \in \Gamma \text{ such that } d(\gamma x, \gamma y) \geq \varepsilon.$$

This definition does not depend on the choice of the compatible metric d.



Let  $(X, \Gamma)$  be a d.s. and d a compatible metric on X.

#### Definition

One says that  $(X,\Gamma)$  is expansive if

$$\exists \varepsilon > 0, \forall x \neq y \in X, \exists \gamma \in \Gamma \text{ such that } d(\gamma x, \gamma y) \geq \varepsilon.$$

This definition does not depend on the choice of the compatible metric d. A point in X is called periodic if its orbit is finite.

Let  $(X, \Gamma)$  be a d.s. and d a compatible metric on X.

#### Definition

One says that  $(X,\Gamma)$  is expansive if

$$\exists \varepsilon > 0, \forall x \neq y \in X, \exists \gamma \in \Gamma \text{ such that } d(\gamma x, \gamma y) \geq \varepsilon.$$

This definition does not depend on the choice of the compatible metric d. A point in X is called periodic if its orbit is finite.

## Theorem (CC-2015)

If  $(X,\Gamma)$  is expansive and the periodic points are dense in X, then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive.





Neither expansiveness nor density of periodic points alone can guarantee surjunctivity.



Neither expansiveness nor density of periodic points alone can guarantee surjunctivity.

### Example

Consider the subshift  $X \subset \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  consisting of all bi-infinite sequences of 0s and 1s with at most one chain of 1s.

Neither expansiveness nor density of periodic points alone can guarantee surjunctivity.

### Example

Consider the subshift  $X \subset \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  consisting of all bi-infinite sequences of 0s and 1s with at most one chain of 1s.

Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z})$  is expansive but not surjunctive.

Neither expansiveness nor density of periodic points alone can guarantee surjunctivity.

### Example

Consider the subshift  $X \subset \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  consisting of all bi-infinite sequences of 0s and 1s with at most one chain of 1s.

Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z})$  is expansive but not surjunctive.

The map  $\tau\colon X\to X$  which replaces each word 10 by 11 is equivariant, continuous, injective but not surjective.

Neither expansiveness nor density of periodic points alone can guarantee surjunctivity.

### Example

Consider the subshift  $X \subset \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  consisting of all bi-infinite sequences of 0s and 1s with at most one chain of 1s.

Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z})$  is expansive but not surjunctive.

The map  $\tau\colon X\to X$  which replaces each word 10 by 11 is equivariant, continuous, injective but not surjective.

### Example

Let S be any compact metrizable space.



Neither expansiveness nor density of periodic points alone can guarantee surjunctivity.

### Example

Consider the subshift  $X \subset \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  consisting of all bi-infinite sequences of 0s and 1s with at most one chain of 1s.

Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z})$  is expansive but not surjunctive.

The map  $\tau\colon X\to X$  which replaces each word 10 by 11 is equivariant, continuous, injective but not surjective.

### Example

Let S be any compact metrizable space.

Then periodic points for the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -shift are dense in  $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$ .

Neither expansiveness nor density of periodic points alone can guarantee surjunctivity.

### Example

Consider the subshift  $X \subset \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  consisting of all bi-infinite sequences of 0s and 1s with at most one chain of 1s.

Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z})$  is expansive but not surjunctive.

The map  $\tau: X \to X$  which replaces each word 10 by 11 is equivariant, continuous, injective but not surjective.

#### Example

Let S be any compact metrizable space.

Then periodic points for the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -shift are dense in  $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$ .

However, if S is compressible (e.g. S is the unit interval [0,1], or the infinite-dimensional

torus  $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ , or the Cantor set) then  $(X,\mathbb{Z})$  is not surjunctive.

Algebraic dynamical systems



# Algebraic dynamical systems

#### Definition

An algebraic dynamical system is a d.s.  $(X, \Gamma)$ , where

- X is a compact metrizable topological group;
- $\bullet$   $\Gamma$  is a countable group acting on X by continuous group morphisms.



### Example (Arnold's cat)

This the a.d.s.  $(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ , where the action of  $\mathbb{Z}$  on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  is generated by the cat map  $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_2, x_1 + x_2)$ .



## Example (Arnold's cat)

This the a.d.s.  $(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ , where the action of  $\mathbb{Z}$  on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  is generated by the cat map  $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_2, x_1 + x_2).$ 

## Example

More generally, if  $\Gamma$  is a countable subgroup of  $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ , then  $(\mathbb{T}^n, \Gamma)$  is an a.d.s.



## Example (Arnold's cat)

This the a.d.s.  $(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ , where the action of  $\mathbb{Z}$  on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  is generated by the cat map  $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_2, x_1 + x_2)$ .

### Example

More generally, if  $\Gamma$  is a countable subgroup of  $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ , then  $(\mathbb{T}^n, \Gamma)$  is an a.d.s.

## Example

Let S be a compact metrizable topological group (e.g. S is a finite discrete group, or S is a compact Lie group, or  $S = \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{N}}$ , or  $S = \mathbb{Z}_p$  the group of p-adic integers) and  $\Gamma$  a countable ghroup. Then the shift  $(S^{\Gamma}, \Gamma)$  is an a.d.s.



## Example

Let M be a countable  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module.

#### Example

Let M be a countable  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module. Let  $X_M = \widehat{M}$  denote the Pontryagin dual of M, i.e., the set of all continuous group morphisms

$$x \colon M \to \mathbb{T}$$

with the topology of pointwise convergence.



#### Example

Let M be a countable  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module. Let  $X_M = \widehat{M}$  denote the Pontryagin dual of M, i.e., the set of all continuous group morphisms

$$x: M \to \mathbb{T}$$

with the topology of pointwise convergence. Then  $X_M$  is a compact metrizable abelian group and  $\Gamma$  acts on  $X_M$  by

$$(\gamma x)(m) := x(\gamma^{-1}m) \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X_M, \forall m \in M.$$



#### Example

Let M be a countable  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module. Let  $X_M = \widehat{M}$  denote the Pontryagin dual of M, i.e., the set of all continuous group morphisms

$$x: M \to \mathbb{T}$$

with the topology of pointwise convergence. Then  $X_M$  is a compact metrizable abelian group and  $\Gamma$  acts on  $X_M$  by

$$(\gamma x)(m) := x(\gamma^{-1}m) \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X_M, \forall m \in M.$$

One says that  $(X_M, \Gamma)$  is the a.d.s. associated with M.



#### Example

Let M be a countable  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module. Let  $X_M = M$  denote the Pontryagin dual of M, i.e., the set of all continuous group morphisms

$$x \colon M \to \mathbb{T}$$

with the topology of pointwise convergence. Then  $X_M$  is a compact metrizable abelian group and  $\Gamma$  acts on  $X_M$  by

$$(\gamma x)(m) := x(\gamma^{-1}m) \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X_M, \forall m \in M.$$

One says that  $(X_M, \Gamma)$  is the a.d.s. associated with M. This yields a one-to-one correspondence between countable  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -modules and a.d.s.  $(X,\Gamma)$  with X abelian (cf. [Sch]).



The algebraic descending chain condition



The algebraic descending chain condition

#### **Definition**

One says that an a.d.s.  $(X,\Gamma)$  satisfies the algebraic descending chain condition if every decreasing sequence

$$X = X_0 \supset X_1 \supset X_2 \supset \dots$$

of closed invariant subgroups eventually stabilizes.



The algebraic descending chain condition

#### Definition

One says that an a.d.s.  $(X,\Gamma)$  satisfies the algebraic descending chain condition if every decreasing sequence

$$X = X_0 \supset X_1 \supset X_2 \supset \dots$$

of closed invariant subgroups eventually stabilizes.

#### Remark

When X is abelian and  $M=\widehat{x}$ , this is equivalent to saying that the  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module M is Noetherian



# Topological rigidity

If X is a topological group, one says that a map  $f: X \to X$  is affine if there exist a continuous group morphism  $a: X \to X$  an  $b \in X$  such that

$$f(x) = a(x) \cdot b \quad \forall x \in X.$$



# Topological rigidity

If X is a topological group, one says that a map  $f: X \to X$  is affine if there exist a continuous group morphism  $a: X \to X$  an  $b \in X$  such that

$$f(x) = a(x) \cdot b \quad \forall x \in X.$$

#### **Definition**

One says that an a.d.s.  $(X,\Gamma)$  is topologically rigid if every equivariant continuous map  $f:X\to X$  is affine.



# Topological rigidity

If X is a topological group, one says that a map  $f: X \to X$  is affine if there exist a continuous group morphism  $a: X \to X$  an  $b \in X$  such that

$$f(x) = a(x) \cdot b \quad \forall x \in X.$$

#### Definition

One says that an a.d.s.  $(X,\Gamma)$  is topologically rigid if every equivariant continuous map  $f:X\to X$  is affine.

## Proposition (BCC-2017)

If an a.d.s. is topologically rigid and satisfies the a.d.c.c. then it is surjunctive.



Surjunctivity of algebraic dynamical systems for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ 



# Surjunctivity of algebraic dynamical systems for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$

## Theorem (BCC-2017)

Let  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  be an expansive algebraic dynamical system (with X possibly non-abelian). Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is surjunctive.



# Surjunctivity of algebraic dynamical systems for $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z}^d$

## Theorem (BCC-2017)

Let  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  be an expansive algebraic dynamical system (with X possibly non-abelian). Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is surjunctive.

#### Proof.

By a result in [KS-1989], periodic points are dense.



Surjunctivity of algebraic dynamical systems for  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ 

## Theorem (BCC-2017)

Let  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  be an expansive algebraic dynamical system (with X possibly non-abelian). Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is surjunctive.

### Proof.

By a result in [KS-1989], periodic points are dense.

### Theorem (BCC-2017)

Let  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  be an algebraic dynamical system. Suppose that X is abelian and that  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  satisfies the algebraic descending chain condition (i.e.,  $\widehat{X}$  is Noetherian as a  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module). Then  $(X, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is surjunctive.



A solenoid is a compact connected metrizable abelian group with finite topological dimension.



A solenoid is a compact connected metrizable abelian group with finite topological dimension. Solenoids are precisely the Pontryagin duals of countable torsion-free discrete abelian groups of finite rank, i.e., additive subgroups of finite-dimensional rational vector spaces.



A solenoid is a compact connected metrizable abelian group with finite topological dimension. Solenoids are precisely the Pontryagin duals of countable torsion-free discrete abelian groups of finite rank, i.e., additive subgroups of finite-dimensional rational vector spaces.

### Theorem (BCC-2017)

Let  $(X,\Gamma)$  be an algebraic dynamical system. Suppose that X is a solenoid and that  $(X,\Gamma)$  is expansive. Then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive.



If  $\Gamma$  is a countable group, then there is a  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]$ -module structure on

$$\ell^2(\Gamma) := \{ f \colon \Gamma \to \mathbb{C} : \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |f(\gamma)|^2 < \infty \}$$

induced by the convolution product  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma] \times \ell^2(\Gamma) \to \ell^2(\Gamma)$ .



If  $\Gamma$  is a countable group, then there is a  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]$ -module structure on

$$\ell^2(\Gamma) := \{ f : \Gamma \to \mathbb{C} : \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |f(\gamma)|^2 < \infty \}$$

induced by the convolution product  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma] \times \ell^2(\Gamma) \to \ell^2(\Gamma)$ .

#### Definition

One says that a countable group  $\Gamma$  satisfies the  $\ell^2$ -zero-divisor conjecture if  $\ell^2(\Gamma)$  is torsion free as a  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]$ -module.



If  $\Gamma$  is a countable group, then there is a  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]$ -module structure on

$$\ell^2(\Gamma) := \{ f \colon \Gamma \to \mathbb{C} : \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |f(\gamma)|^2 < \infty \}$$

induced by the convolution product  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]\times \ell^2(\Gamma)\to \ell^2(\Gamma).$ 

#### Definition

One says that a countable group  $\Gamma$  satisfies the  $\ell^2$ -zero-divisor conjecture if  $\ell^2(\Gamma)$  is torsion free as a  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]$ -module.

Every torsion-free elementary amenable group (and hence every torsion-free solvable-by-finite group) satisfies the  $\ell^2$ -zero-divisor conjecture [L-1991].



If  $\Gamma$  is a countable group, then there is a  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]$ -module structure on

$$\ell^2(\Gamma) := \{ f \colon \Gamma \to \mathbb{C} : \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |f(\gamma)|^2 < \infty \}$$

induced by the convolution product  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]\times\ell^2(\Gamma)\to\ell^2(\Gamma).$ 

#### Definition

One says that a countable group  $\Gamma$  satisfies the  $\ell^2$ -zero-divisor conjecture if  $\ell^2(\Gamma)$  is torsion free as a  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]$ -module.

Every torsion-free elementary amenable group (and hence every torsion-free solvable-by-finite group) satisfies the  $\ell^2$ -zero-divisor conjecture [L-1991].

#### Definition

Let  $(X,\Gamma)$  be an a.d.s. and let  $\mu$  denote the Haar measure on X. One says that  $(X,\Gamma)$  is mixing if

$$\lim_{\gamma \to \infty} \mu(A \cap \gamma B) = \mu(A) \cdot \mu(B)$$

for all measurable subsets  $A, B \subset X$ .





The following result was already obtained in [BW-2005] for the particular case  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

The following result was already obtained in [BW-2005] for the particular case  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

## Theorem (BCC-2017)

Let  $(X,\Gamma)$  be an algebraic dynamical system such that

- X is abelian,
- $(X,\Gamma)$  is mixing;
- $\Gamma$  satisfies the  $\ell^2$ -zero-divisor conjecture;
- $\widehat{X}$  is a torsion  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module.

Then  $(X, \Gamma)$  is topologically rigid.



The following result was already obtained in [BW-2005] for the particular case  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

## Theorem (BCC-2017)

Let  $(X,\Gamma)$  be an algebraic dynamical system such that

- X is abelian,
- $(X,\Gamma)$  is mixing;
- $\Gamma$  satisfies the  $\ell^2$ -zero-divisor conjecture;
- $\widehat{X}$  is a torsion  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module.

Then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is topologically rigid.

## Corollary (BCC-2017)

If in addition  $(X,\Gamma)$  satisfies the a.d.c.c. (i.e.,  $\widehat{X}$  is a Noetherian  $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma]$ -module), then  $(X,\Gamma)$  is surjunctive.

## References



#### References

- [B-2000] S. Bhattacharya, *Orbit equivalence and topological conjugacy of affine actions on compact abelian groups*, Monatsh. Math., 129 (2000), 89–96.
- [BW-2005] S. Bhattacharya, T. Ward, *Finite entropy characterizes topological rigidity on connected groups*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 25 (2005), 365–373.
- [BCC-2015] T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, M. Coornaert, *Expansive actions of countable amenable groups, homoclinic pairs, and the Myhill property*, Illinois J. Math. **59** (2015), no. 3, 597–621.
- [Go-1973] W. Gottschalk, *Some general dynamical notions*, pp. 120–125, Springer Lect. Notes in Math., 318, 1973.
- [Gr-1999] M. Gromov, Endomorphisms of symbolic algebraic varieties, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 1 (1999), 109–197.
- [KS-1989] B. Kitchens, K. Schmidt, Automorphisms of compact groups, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 9 (1989), 691-735.
- [L-1991] P.A. Linnell, Zero divisors and group von Neumann algebras, Pacific J. Math. 149 (1991), 349–364.
- [S-1995] K. Schmidt, "Dynamical systems of algebraic origin," vol. 128 of Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995.
- [Wei-2000] B. Weiss, *Sofic groups and dynamical systems*, (Ergodic theory and harmonic analysis, Mumbai, 1999) Sankhya Ser. A. **62** (2000), 350–359.