

CHARACTERIZATIONS OF TYPE-III BERNOULLI SCHEME

TIANYI ZHOU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we will prove alternate conditions for a type-III Bernoulli scheme to be of type-III₀, type-III_λ and type-III₁, and then conclude an alternate definition of the asymptotic ratio set of a type-III ITPFI factor.

Introduction

Bernoulli scheme is one of popular examples of a non-singular and ergodic group action defined on a standard probability space. As a result, it can be classified by its ratio set (see [Sch77]). The relation between a Bernoulli scheme and its associated ITPFI factor was studied in [Moo67], [AW69] and then [Kri70], and [Kri70] points out that when the Bernoulli scheme is of type-III, its ratio set coincides with the asymptotic ratio set of the ITPFI factor associated with the given Bernoulli scheme. In [Moo67], a precise description of a type-I, type-II₁ Bernoulli scheme is proven, along with a necessary condition for a Bernoulli scheme to be of type-III. Results in [Moo67] were later used in [AW69] to describe type-I, type-II₁ ITPFI factors, and to provide a necessary condition for an ITPFI factor to be of type-III. In [Tak69], a precise description of a type-III ITPFI factor is also proven. Also [DKQ98] and [BKV21] provide necessary conditions respectively for a two-point Bernoulli scheme to be of type-III₁ where the method in [DKQ98] is statistical while the one in [BKV21] inspires techniques that would be used in proving our main theorems. Both methods will need observations on clustered points of $\{\mu_n(1)/\mu_n(0)\}$, the set of ratio of weights of each μ_n . In the context of a two-point Bernoulli scheme, certain summability conditions will determine the type of the measure, as shown in [BKV21] and [DL19].

The goal of this paper is to prove alternate conditions that describe the set of clustered points of ratio of weights of each μ_n (as in [BKV21]) to describe each type of a type-III Bernoulli scheme. Then we will conclude an alternate definition of the asymptotic ratio set of a type-III ITPFI factor. Throughout this paper in a measure space, all equations and definitions are assumed mod 0. In the preliminary section, definitions we need and some of the historical results will be covered. In **Section 2.1**, we will first provide a description of type-III₀, type-III_λ and type-III₁ Bernoulli scheme based on the local behavior of their Radon-Nikodym cocycles. In the first part of **Section 2.2**, main theorems are proven for type-III Bernoulli scheme of unbounded type ([GS85a]). The main theorems for bounded type Bernoulli scheme (see [GS85b]) are proven in **Section 2.2**.

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. ITPFI factors.

Definition 1.1 ([AW69, Definition 2.3]). Given a countable family of Hilbert spaces $(H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where the dimension of each H_n is at most countably infinite. Suppose $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a family of vectors such that $v_n \in H_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|v_n\|$ converges to a positive number. Then the **incomplete tensor product space** (ITPS) of $(H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is denoted by:

$$H = \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (H_n, v_n)$$

For any $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $u_n \in H_n$, if $\prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|u_n\|$ converges to a positive number, by definition we have:

$$u = \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} u_n \in \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} H_n$$

Without confusion we simply say $u \in H$. Similarly, we have $v = \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} v_n \in H$. For any subset $J \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we define:

$$H(J) = \bigotimes_{n \in J} H_n, \quad v(J) = \bigotimes_{n \in J} v_n$$

Definition 1.2 ([AW69, Definition 2.4, 2.5]). In the set-up of **Definition 1.1**, let $H = \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (H_n, v_n)$ be an IPTS of $(H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S \in B(H_k)$, define:

$$\pi_k : B(H_k) \rightarrow B(H), \quad S \mapsto \left(\bigotimes_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{N} \\ n \neq k}} \text{id}_k \right) \otimes S$$

Given a sequence of von Neumann algebra $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $\mathcal{M}_n \subseteq B(H_n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define:

$$\bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_n = \left\{ \pi_n(\mathcal{M}_n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}''$$

For any subset $J \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we define:

$$\mathcal{M}(J) = \bigotimes_{n \in J} \mathcal{M}_n$$

When all \mathcal{M}_n are factors, we use $\mathcal{M} = R(H_n, \mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ to denote the factor $\bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_n$ endowed with v . When H is fixed, we will simply use $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$.

Definition 1.3 ([AW69, Definition 2.6]). Given an IPTS $H = \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (H_n, v_n)$, assume that the dimension of all H_n are at least 2. Then an **ITPFI factor** is a factor that is isomorphic to $R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ where each \mathcal{M}_n is a type- I_{m_n} factor where $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m_n \geq 2$. In particular, if for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $m_n = k$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we call $R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ an **ITPFI_k factor**.

Definition 1.4 ([AW69]). Given an ITPFI factor $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, observe that the following linear functional is a normal state defined on \mathcal{M}_n :

$$\rho_n : \mathcal{M}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad S \mapsto \langle S v_n, v_n \rangle$$

and for an arbitrary finite subset $J \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, define:

$$\rho_J = \mathcal{M}(J) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \bigotimes_{n \in J} S_n \mapsto \prod_{n \in J} \langle S v_n, v_n \rangle$$

Hence for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a positive trace-class operator $t_n \in B(H_n)$ such that $\rho_n(S) = \text{Tr}(t_n S)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\text{Sp}(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n))$ to denote the eigenvalues of ρ_n . Suppose:

$$\text{Sp}(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n)) = \{\lambda(n, i_n)\}_{1 \leq i_n \leq k_n}$$

and $\lambda_{n,1} \geq \lambda_{n,2} \geq \dots$. Similarly, for any finite subset $J \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we use $\text{Sp}(v(J)/\mathcal{M}(J))$ to denote the spectrum of the positive trace-class operator (in $B(H(J))$) that corresponds to ρ_J . If $\lambda \in \text{Sp}(v(J)/\mathcal{M}(J))$, then clearly:

$$\lambda = \prod_{n \in J} \lambda_{n, i_n}$$

where, for each $n \in J$, $1 \leq i_n \leq k_n$ and $\lambda_{n, i_n} \in \text{Sp}(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n))$.

Definition 1.5 ([AW69, Definition 3.2]). Given an ITPFI factor $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$, a finite subset $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $K \subseteq \text{Sp}(v(I)/\mathcal{M}(I))$, define $\lambda(K)$ to be the sum of elements in K . The **asymptotic ratio set** of \mathcal{M} , denoted by $r_\infty(\mathcal{M}, v)$ is the set of all non-negative real numbers x such that there exists $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ an infinite sequence of mutually disjoint finite subsets of \mathbb{N} and a family of mutually disjoint subsets $(K_n^1, K_n^2)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $K_n^1, K_n^2 \subseteq I_n$ are two disjoint subsets of non-zero eigenvalues and there exists a bijection ϕ_n from K_n^1 to K_n^2 such that the sequence $\{\lambda(K_n^1)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not summable and:

$$\lim_n \max \left\{ \left| x - \frac{\phi_n(\lambda)}{\lambda} \right| : \lambda \in K_n^1 \right\} = 0$$

Remark 1.6. According to [AW69, Corollary 2.9], in the set-up of **Definition 1.3**, $R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ is still an ITPFI factor if countably many \mathcal{M}_n are infinite type-I factors. Therefore, we shall also consider the case where infinitely many \mathcal{M}_n are infinite-dimensional.

Lemma 1.7 ([AW69, Lemma 3.14]). Given $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ an ITPFI factor, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define $u_n = \frac{v_n}{\|v_n\|}$ and define $\mathcal{M}^u = R(\mathcal{M}_n, u_n)$. We then have $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{M}^u$ and $r_\infty(\mathcal{M}, v) = r_\infty(\mathcal{M}^u, u)$.

Proposition 1.8 ([AW69, Lemma 3.6, 3.7]). In the set-up of **Definition 1.5**, $r_\infty(\mathcal{M}, v)$ is a closed subset in $[0, \infty)$ and $r_\infty(\mathcal{M}, v) \setminus \{0\}$ is a multiplicative subgroup of \mathbb{R}_+^* .

Theorem 1.9 ([AW69, Theorem 3.9]). Given $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ a ITPFI factor, $r_\infty(\mathcal{M}, v)$ must be either $\{1\}$, $\{0\}$, $\{0, 1\}$, $[0, \infty)$ or $\{0\} \cup (\lambda^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.

Definition 1.10 ([AW69, Definition 3.10]). Given $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we use R_λ to denote the ITPFT factor $R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{M}_n = M_2(\mathbb{C})$ and there exists two non-negative real numbers λ_1, λ_2 (at least one of them is non-zero) such that $\text{Sp}(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n)) = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.

Theorem 1.11 ([AW69, Theorem 5.9]). Given \mathcal{M} an ITPFI factor, $r_\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is an **algebraic invariance**, namely for each $x \in [0, 1]$, $x \in r_\infty(\mathcal{M})$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{M} \otimes R_x$. Therefore we can write rewrite the asymptotic ratio set of \mathcal{M} as the following:

$$r_\infty(\mathcal{M}, v) = \{x \in [0, 1] : \mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{M} \otimes R_x\} \cup \{y \in (1, \infty) : \mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{M} \otimes R_{y^{-1}}\}$$

1.2. Ratio set of a non-singular group action.

Definition 1.12. Given an ergodic non-singular group action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ on a standard measure space, a **real-valued cocycle** is a function $c : G \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies:

$$c(g_1 g_2, x) = c(g_1, x) c(g_2, g_1^{-1} x)$$

for all $x \in X$ and $g_1, g_2 \in G$. In particular, the **Radon-Nikodym cocycle** of the given G -action is defined as the following:

$$D : G \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (g, x) \mapsto \frac{d(g\mu)}{d\mu}(x)$$

and we can see for any $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and μ -almost every $x \in X$:

$$\frac{d(g_2\mu)}{d\mu}(g_1^{-1}x) = \frac{d(g_1 g_2)\mu}{d g_1 \mu}(x) \implies \frac{d(g_1 g_2)\mu}{d\mu}(x) = \frac{d g_1 \mu}{d\mu}(x) \frac{d g_2 \mu}{d\mu}(g_1^{-1}x)$$

If we let R denote the orbit equivalence of the given group action (as a subset of $X \times X$), we can define the Radon-Nikodym cocycle in the following way: for any $g \in G$ and $x \in X$:

$$D(x, gx) = \frac{d(g^{-1}\mu)}{d\mu}(x)$$

which implies for any $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and μ -almost every $x \in X$:

$$D(x, g_1 x) D(g_1 x, g_2 g_1 x) = \frac{d(g_1^{-1}\mu)}{d\mu}(x) \frac{d(g_2^{-1}\mu)}{d\mu}(g_1 x) = \frac{d(g_1^{-1} g_2^{-1} \mu)}{d\mu}(x) = D(x, g_2 g_1 x)$$

Definition 1.13. Given an ergodic non-singular group action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ on a standard measure space and a real-valued cocycle c , the **essential range** of c is the set of all real numbers r such that for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any measurable subset $B \subseteq X$ with $\mu(B) > 0$, there exist B_1, B_2 two non-negligible subsets of B and $g \in G$ such that $gB_1 \subseteq B_2$ and $|c(g, x) - r| < \epsilon$ for all $x \in B_1$. The essential range of the Radon-Nikodym cocycle is called the **ratio set** of the given group action, and is denoted by $r_G(\mu)$.

Theorem 1.14 ([Sch77, Theorem 3.9]). In the set-up of **Definition 1.13**, $r_G(\mu)$ the ratio set of a given non-singular group action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ satisfies:

- $r_G(\mu)$ is a closed subset of $[0, \infty)$.
- $r_G(\mu) \setminus \{0\}$ is a multiplicative subgroup of $(0, \infty)$.
- $r_G(\mu) = r_G(\sigma)$ for any measures σ that is equivalent to μ .

Definition 1.15. Given an ergodic non-singular group action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ on a standard measure space, μ is of:

- type-I if μ is equivalent to a purely atomic measure. When μ is of type-I, μ is of type- I_n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if μ only has n -many atoms; otherwise μ is of type- I_∞ .
- type-II if μ is equivalent to a σ -finite G -invariant measure. When μ is of type-II, μ is of type- II_1 if μ is equivalent to a finite G -invariant measure; otherwise μ is of type- II_∞ measure.
- type-III if μ is not of type-I or type-II. When μ is of type- III_0 if the ratio set of μ is $\{0, 1\}$; μ is of type- III_λ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ if the ratio set of μ is $\{0\} \cup \{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$; μ is of type- III_1 if the ratio set of μ is $[0, \infty)$.

Lemma 1.16 ([HO81, Lemma 15]). *In the set-up of Definition 1.15:*

- (1) if μ is of type-III, then 0 is in the ratio set of μ .
- (2) μ is of type-II if and only if $r_G(\mu) = \{1\}$.

1.3. Maharam extension.

Definition 1.17 ([Mah64, Definition 3.1]). Given a non-singular group action $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, the **Maharam extension** of $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is defined by:

$$G \curvearrowright X \times \mathbb{R} : g * (x, t) = (g \cdot x, t + \log D(x, g \cdot x))$$

where D is the Radon-Nikodym cocycle of $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$. In the Maharam extension, \mathbb{R} is equipped with the finite Borel measure ν such that $d\nu = \exp(-|t|)dt$. The **associated flow** of $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is the following \mathbb{R} -action on $(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)$:

$$\mathbb{R} \curvearrowright X \times \mathbb{R} : r \cdot (x, t) = (x, r + t)$$

One can check that associated flow of $G \curvearrowright X \times \mathbb{R}$ commutes with the G -action of its Maharam extension. The G -action on the space of measurable functions on the Maharam extension is defined by the following: for each measurable function F and $g \in G$:

$$\forall (x, t) \in X \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (g * F)(x, t) = F(g * (x, t)) = F(g \cdot x, t + \log D(x, g \cdot x))$$

The \mathbb{R} -action on the space of measurable functions on the Maharam extension is defined by the following: for each measurable function F and $r \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\forall (x, t) \in X \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (r \cdot F)(x, t) = F(r \cdot (x, t)) = F(x, t + r)$$

From now on, we use $L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)^G$ to denote the space of G -invariant essentially bounded functions defined in the Maharam extension of $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$.

In the set-up of **Definition 1.17**, if we let Z denote the space of ergodic components in the system and η denote the image of μ under the quotient mapping, then $L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)^G$ can be identified as $L^\infty(Z, \eta)$. Equivalently the associated flow can be viewed as the \mathbb{R} -action on $L^\infty(Z, \eta)$. According to [Kri76], the classification of μ can then be described by the kernel of the associated flow as the following:

Theorem 1.18 ([Kri76]). *In the set-up of Definition 1.17, the associated flow of $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is:*

- (1) conjugate with the translation action of \mathbb{R} on itself if and only if μ is of type-I or type-II.
- (2) trivial if and only if μ is of type- III_1 .
- (3) conjugate with translation action \mathbb{R} on $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \log \lambda$ if and only if λ is of type- III_λ .
- (4) Every orbit of the associated flow (viewed as the the action $\mathbb{R} \curvearrowright (Z, \eta)$) is η -null if and only if μ is of type- III_0 .

1.4. Bernoulli scheme.

Definition 1.19. Given a sequence of countable spaces $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, a **Bernoulli scheme** is the product space $X = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$ endowed with a product measure $\mu = \otimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n$ where each μ_n is fully supported on X_n , the σ -algebra generated by cylinder sets in X and the **synchronous tail relation** R is defined by: any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$, we have $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in R$ if and only if there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_n = y_n$ for all $n \geq N$.

Definition 1.20. In the set-up of **Definition 1.19**, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let G_n be the permutation group of X_n and $\times_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n$ be the group consisting the product group. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let e_n denote the identity of G_n . Then define:

$$G = \left\{ \mathbf{g} = (g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \times_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n : \exists m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \forall n \geq m, g_n = e_n \right\}$$

Clearly the synchronous tail relation coincides with the orbit equivalence relation associated with G that acts on X coordinate-wise. For each $g \in G$, we have:

$$\mathbf{g}\mu = \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} g_n \mu_n$$

which implies that the G -action in **Definition 1.20** is ergodic and non-singular with respect to μ . First note that the precise descriptions of type-*I* and type-*II* Bernoulli scheme are proven in [Moo67]. Then, with results in [Moo67], descriptions of type-*I* and type-*II*₁, type-*III* (resp.) IFPTI factors are proven in [AW69], [Tak69] (resp.).

Theorem 1.21 ([Moo67, Theorem 1-(1)]). *In a Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, μ is of type-*I* if and only if:*

$$(1) \quad \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(1 - \max_{a \in X_n} \mu_n(a) \right) < \infty$$

Theorem 1.22 ([Moo67, Theorem 1-(2)]). *In a Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, μ is of type-*II*₁ if and only if all X_n are finite, infinitely many X_n are not singletons and:*

$$(2) \quad \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{a \in X_n} \frac{\left| 1 - \sqrt{\mu_n(a) |X_n|} \right|^2}{|X_n|} < \infty$$

Theorem 1.23 ([AW69, Lemma 2.14], [Tak69]). *In the set-up of **Definition 1.4**, given an ITPFI factor $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ where for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{M} is an I_{k_n} factor for some $2 \leq k_n \leq \infty$, and:*

$$\text{Sp}(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n)) = \{\lambda(n, i_n)\}_{1 \leq i_n \leq k_n}$$

Without losing generality, we can assume that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_{n,1}$ is the maximum in $\text{Sp}(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n))$. Then:

- (1) \mathcal{M} is of type-*I* if and only if the sequence $(1 - \lambda_{n,1})$ is absolutely summable.
- (2) \mathcal{M} is of type-*II*₁ if and only if $k_n < \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{1 \leq i_n \leq k_n} \frac{|1 - \sqrt{\lambda_{n,i} k_n}|^2}{k_n}$$

- (3) \mathcal{M} is of type-*III* if and only if:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq k_n} \lambda_{n,i} \lambda_{n,j} \min \left(\left| \frac{\lambda_{n,i}}{\lambda_{n,j}} - 1 \right|^2, C \right) = \infty$$

for some, and hence for all $C > 0$.

2. MAIN THEOREMS

In this section, we will show that given a Bernoulli scheme, to find its ratio set, there is no need to consider all partial isomorphisms but only those that are of the form of bijections between two elementary cylinder sets of the same length. This is inspired by the definition of an asymptotic ratio set (**Definition 1.5**). We will start by discussing the correspondence between a Bernoulli scheme and an ITPFI factor.

Given a Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, suppose $2 \leq |X_n| = k_n \leq \infty$ and $\mu_n = (\mu_n(i))_{1 \leq i \leq k_n}$ can be represented as a summable positive-valued sequence. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

- if $k_n < \infty$, define $\mathcal{M}_n = M_{k_n}(\mathbb{C})$ and let ρ_n be the unique density matrix whose eigenvalues are $(\mu_n(i))_{1 \leq i \leq k_n}$. After changing coordinates, we can further assume that the set of eigenvalues of ρ_n is $(\lambda_n(i))_{1 \leq i \leq k_n}$ where $\{\lambda_n(i) : 1 \leq i \leq k_n\} = \{\mu_n(i) : 1 \leq i \leq k_n\}$ and $\lambda_n(1) \geq \lambda_n(2) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(k_n)$. Then let v_n be the unit vector such that for all $S \in \mathcal{M}_n$, $\langle Sv_n, v_n \rangle = \text{Tr}(S\rho_n)$. Put $\text{Sp}(v_n/\mathcal{M}_n) = (\lambda_n(i))_{1 \leq i \leq k_n}$.
- if $k_n = \infty$, define $\mathcal{M}_n = B(\ell^2)$ and let ρ_n be the diagonalizable operator whose eigenvalues are $(\mu_n(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. By the previous reasoning, we can assume that $(\mu_n(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing. Since $(\mu_n(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is summable, ρ_n is a trace-class operator. Then there exists a unit vector $v_n \in \ell^2$ such that for all $S \in \mathcal{K}(\ell^2)$, $\langle Sv_n, v_n \rangle = \text{Tr}(S\rho_n)$.

Conversely, given $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ an ITPFI factor, since for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, each v_n is a unit vector, its associated density matrix (or trace-class operator) ρ_n satisfies $\text{Tr}(\rho_n) = 1$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Sp}(v_n/\mathcal{M}(n))$ is a summable decreasing sequence indexed by $\{1, 2, \dots, k_n\}$ where $2 \leq k_n = \dim(\mathcal{M}_n) \leq \infty$, and hence defines a probability measure on $\{1, 2, \dots, k_n\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by defining $X_n = \{1, 2, \dots, k_n\}$ and $\mu_n(i) = \lambda_{n,i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k_n$, the Bernoulli scheme on (X, μ) where $X = \prod_n X_n$ and $\mu = \otimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n$ is uniquely determined by \mathcal{M} .

Proposition 2.1 ([Kri70, Proposition 2.6]). *Given a Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, let \mathcal{M} be its associated ITPFI factor. If μ is of type-III, $r_\infty(\mathcal{M}) = r_G(\mu)$.*

2.1. Ratio set of a type-III Bernoulli scheme.

Lemma 2.2. *Given a type III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, μ is of type-III₀ if and only if for any $x \in X$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $y \in X$ and there exists $K, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N \geq M$, $x_n = y_n$ whenever $n \leq N$ and $n > N + K$, and;*

$$\min \left(|D(x, y) - 1|, |D(x, y)| \right) < \epsilon$$

where $D(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Radon-Nikodym cocycle defined on the orbit equivalence relation.

Proof. Suppose μ is of type-III₀. Fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in C_M$ for some elementary cylinder set C_M with length M . By definition, there exists $B(\epsilon, 1)$, $B(\epsilon, 2) \subseteq C_M$ and a partial isomorphism $\Phi : B(\epsilon, 1) \rightarrow B(\epsilon, 2)$ such that:

$$\min \left(|D(x, \Phi(x)) - 1|, |D(x, \Phi(x))| \right) < \epsilon$$

To prove the other direction, we will first show that the 0 is in the ratio set (and clearly 1 is in the ratio set). Fix $x \in X$, $\epsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$. By assumption, there exists $y \in X$ and $N, K \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N \geq M$ such that $x_n = y_n$ whenever $n \leq N$ and $n > N + K$, and:

$$\min \left(|D(x, y) - 1|, |D(x, y)| \right) < \epsilon$$

Fix $C = C_{x_1, \dots, x_N}$ and define:

$$C_1 = C_{x_1, \dots, x_N, x_{N+1}, \dots, x_{N+K}}, \quad C_2 = C_{x_1, \dots, x_N, y_{N+1}, \dots, y_{N+K}}$$

Then define the following mapping:

$$\varphi : C_1 \rightarrow C_2, \quad x \mapsto \begin{cases} (\varphi(x))_n = x_n, & n \notin \{N+1, \dots, N+K\} \\ (\varphi(x))_n = y_n, & n \in \{N+1, \dots, N+K\} \end{cases}$$

Clearly φ is a partial isomorphism and for μ -almost each $s \in C_2$, we have either $\left| \frac{d\varphi\mu}{d\mu}(s) - 1 \right| < \epsilon$ or $\left| \frac{d\varphi\mu}{d\mu}(s) \right| < \epsilon$. Hence:

$$\min \left(\left| \frac{d\varphi\mu}{d\mu}(x) - 1 \right|, \left| \frac{d\varphi\mu}{d\mu}(x) \right| \right) = \min \left(|D(x, y) - 1|, |D(x, y)| \right) < \epsilon$$

Next fix an arbitrary measurable subset B with $\mu(B) > 0$. Fix $x \in B$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $y \in X$, $N, K \in \mathbb{N}$ be given by the assumption. Since $\mu(B) > 0$ and $x \in B$, according to [Kle20, **Martingale Convergence Theorem**] there exists N large enough (also greater than M) such that:

$$\mu(B \cap C_{x_1, \dots, x_N}) > 0$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(B \cap C_{s_1, \dots, s_N, x_{N+1}, \dots, x_{N+K}}) &= \mu(B \cap C_{s_1, \dots, s_N}) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq K} \mu_{N+i}(x_{N+i}) > 0 \\ \mu(B \cap C_{s_1, \dots, s_N, y_{N+1}, \dots, y_{N+K}}) &= \mu(B \cap C_{s_1, \dots, s_N}) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq K} \mu_{N+i}(y_{N+i}) > 0\end{aligned}$$

Next define:

$$B_1 = B \cap C_{s_1, \dots, s_N, x_{N+1}, \dots, x_{N+K}}, \quad B_2 = B \cap C_{s_1, \dots, s_N, y_{N+1}, \dots, y_{N+K}}$$

and define $\psi : B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ the same way we define φ . We then can conclude that for μ -almost every $\mathbf{s} \in B_2$, we have either $\left| \frac{d\psi\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{s}) \right| < \epsilon$ or $\left| \frac{d\psi\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{s}) - 1 \right| < \epsilon$. If $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$, then we are good. Otherwise:

- if $\mathbf{y} \in B_2$ but $\mathbf{y} \neq \psi(\mathbf{x})$, then define the following mapping:

$$\psi' : B_1 \rightarrow B_2, \quad \mathbf{s} \mapsto \begin{cases} \psi(\mathbf{s}), & \mathbf{s} \notin \{\mathbf{x}, \psi^{-1}(\mathbf{y})\} \\ \mathbf{y}, & \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{x} \\ \psi(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{s} = \psi^{-1}(\mathbf{y}) \end{cases}$$

Clearly ψ' is a partial isomorphism. Observe that:

$$\mu(B(\epsilon, 1) \setminus \{\mathbf{x}, \psi^{-1}(\mathbf{y})\}) = \mu(B(\epsilon, 1))$$

Since ψ' coincides with ψ on $B(\epsilon, 1) \setminus \{\mathbf{x}, \psi^{-1}(\mathbf{y})\}$, we then can conclude for μ -almost each $\mathbf{s} \in B(\epsilon, 2)$,

$$\left| \frac{d\psi'\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{s}) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ or } \left| \frac{d\psi'\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{s}) - 1 \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

- if $\mathbf{y} \notin B_2$, define the following mapping:

$$\psi'' : B_1 \rightarrow (B_2 \cup \{\mathbf{y}\}) \setminus \{\psi(\mathbf{x})\} \quad \mathbf{s} \mapsto \begin{cases} \psi(\mathbf{s}), & \mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y}, & \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{x} \end{cases}$$

Clearly ψ'' is a partial isomorphism. Since $\mu(B_1) = \mu(B_1 \setminus \{\mathbf{x}\})$ and ψ coincides with ψ'' on $B_1 \setminus \{\mathbf{x}\}$,

we then have $\left| \frac{d\psi''\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{s}) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ or $\left| \frac{d\psi''\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{s}) - 1 \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for μ -almost each $\mathbf{s} \in B_2$.

In general, by replacing ψ with another partial isomorphism that coincides with ψ for μ -almost every point in B_1 , we can assume that $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$, which implies that either $|D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - 1| < \epsilon$ or $|D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| < \epsilon$. We can now show that both 0 and 1 are in the ratio set. Next we need to show that there are no other values in the ratio set. Assume by contradiction that $r \in (0, 1)$ is in the ratio set. Fix an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that $\epsilon < \min(r, 1 - r)$. Fix $\mathbf{x} \in X$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and an elementary cylinder set C_M with $\mathbf{x} \in C_M$. Then by definition there exists two non-negligible sets $B(\epsilon, 1)$, $B(\epsilon, 2) \subseteq C_M$, and $\Psi : B(\epsilon, 1) \rightarrow B(\epsilon, 2)$ a partial isomorphism such that $\left| \frac{d\Psi\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{s}) - r \right| < \epsilon$ for μ -almost every $\mathbf{s} \in B(\epsilon, 2)$. Let $\mathbf{y} \in X$ and $N, K \in \mathbb{N}$ be given by the assumption.

By the same reasoning above, we can assume that $\Psi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$ so that:

$$\min \left(\left| \frac{d\Psi\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{y}) - 1 \right|, \left| \frac{d\Psi\mu}{d\mu}(\mathbf{y}) \right| \right) = \min \left(|D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - 1|, |D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \right) < \epsilon$$

which is absurd since $\epsilon < \min(r, 1 - r)$. Therefore, we can now conclude that the ratio set is equal to $\{0, 1\}$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Given a type-III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, μ is of type-III₁ if and only for any $r \in (0, 1)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{x} \in X$, and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$, there exists $\mathbf{y} \in X$ and there exists $K, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N \geq M$ such that $x_n = y_n$ whenever $n \leq N$ and $n > N + K$, and such that:*

$$|D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - r| < \epsilon$$

where $D(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Radon-Nikodym cocycle defined on the orbit equivalence.

Proof. If μ is of type-III₁, given $r \in (0, 1)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$, let C_M be an elementary cylinder set with length M such that $\mathbf{x} \in C_M$. Then since r is in the ratio set, there exists two non-negligible sets $B_1, B_2 \subseteq C_M$, and a partial isomorphism $\phi : B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ such that $|D(\mathbf{x}, \phi(\mathbf{x})) - r| < \epsilon$. Then $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is the desired \mathbf{y} . Conversely, fix an arbitrary $r \in (0, 1)$, $\epsilon \in (0, r)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in X$. Then fix a measurable subset $B \subseteq X$ with $\mu(B) > 0$. By the same technique used in the proof of **Lemma 2.2**, there exists two non-negligible subsets $B_1, B_2 \subseteq B$ with $\mathbf{x} \in B_1$, $\mathbf{y} \in B_2$ and a partial isomorphism Φ (defined the same way as φ in the proof of **Lemma 2.2**) such that $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$ and $\left| \frac{d\Phi\mu}{d\mu}(s) - r \right| < \epsilon$ for μ -almost every $s \in B_2$. We can then conclude that $r \in (0, 1)$ and, since r is arbitrarily picked, that system is of type-III₁. \square

2.2. An alternate way to describe a type-III Bernoulli scheme. Throughout this section, we will use $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ to denote a type-III Bernoulli scheme. The ideas of the proof of the case where $\limsup_n |X_n| = \infty$ are inspired by [BKV21, **Proposition 2.1**]. We will first assume that each X_n is well-ordered, namely $X_n = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ whenever X_n is infinite and $X_n = \mathbb{Z}_{m_n}$ whenever $|X_n| = m_n$ for some $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will further assume that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_n(0)$ is the maximum weight of μ . Then we will show that our main theorems are independent to permutation of each X_n , and hence can be applied to an arbitrary Bernoulli scheme.

2.2.1. When $\limsup_n |X_n| = \infty$.

Observe that $|X_n|$ is greater than 2 if and only if the set $\{0, 1, 2\} \subseteq X_n$. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|X_N| > 2$. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|X_m| > 2$ and $m \neq N$, define:

$$(3) \quad \sigma_{N,m} : X \longrightarrow X, \quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \begin{cases} (\sigma_{N,m}(\mathbf{x}))_N = 2 \text{ and } (\sigma_{N,m}(\mathbf{x}))_m = 0, & \text{if } x_N = 0 \text{ and } x_m = 1 \\ (\sigma_{N,m}(\mathbf{x}))_N = 0 \text{ and } (\sigma_{N,m}(\mathbf{x}))_m = 1, & \text{if } x_N = 2 \text{ and } x_m = 0 \\ (\sigma_{N,m}(\mathbf{x}))_n = x_n, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Recall that in **Definition 1.17**, $L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, d\mu \times d\nu)^G$ denotes all G -invariant essentially bounded functions defined on the Maharam extension of $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ where $d\nu(t) = \exp(-|t|)dt$. For any $F \in L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, d\mu \times d\nu)^G$ and an arbitrary partial isomorphism Φ , by the definition of partial isomorphism we have for any \mathbf{x} in the domain of Φ and any $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$F(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), t + \log D(\mathbf{x}, \Phi(\mathbf{x}))) = F(\mathbf{x}, t)$$

In particular, for any two different $N, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $I_N, I_m > 2$, we have that for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$(4) \quad F(\sigma_{N,m}(\mathbf{x}), t) = F(\mathbf{x}, t \pm \log D(\mathbf{x}, \sigma_{N,m}(\mathbf{x}))) = F\left(\mathbf{x}, t \pm \log \frac{\mu_N(2)\mu_m(0)}{\mu_N(0)\mu_m(1)}\right)$$

Before proving the key lemma, first we introduce the following notations. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, define:

$$X_N^* = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{N\}} X_n, \quad \mu_N^* = \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{N\}} \mu_n$$

Then (X, μ) can be identified by $(X_N, \mu_N) \times (X_N^*, \mu_N^*)$ and each $\mathbf{x} \in X$ can be rewritten as $\mathbf{x} = (x_N, \mathbf{x}_N^*)$. We let ν be the finite measure defined on \mathbb{R} such that $d\nu = e^{-|t|}dt$.

Lemma 2.4. *For any $F \in L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)^G$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $I_m > 2$, for all large enough $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:*

$$(5) \quad \left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) \right| < 2\epsilon$$

for μ_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ and ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we identify (X, μ) as $(X_N, \mu_N) \times (X_N^*, \mu_N^*)$ and for each $\mathbf{x} \in X$, we rewrite $\mathbf{x} = (x_N, \mathbf{x}_N^*)$. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For any finite subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $m \in \mathcal{F}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N > \max \mathcal{F}$, any $H \in L^\infty(X_{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathbb{R}, \mu_{\mathcal{F}} \times \nu)$ and $F_0 \in L^\infty(X_N \times X_{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathbb{R}, \mu_N \times \mu_{\mathcal{F}} \times \nu)$, observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6) \quad & \int_{X_{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathbb{R}} F_0(\sigma_{N,m}(0, x), t) H(x, t) d\mu_{\mathcal{F}}(x) d\nu(t) \\
&= \int_{X_{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathbb{R}} \left((1 - \mu_m(1)) F_0(0, x, t) + \mu_m(1) F_0(2, x, t) \right) H(x, t) d\mu_{\mathcal{F}}(x) d\nu(t)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{N,m}$ is defined in (3). Since $X_{\mathcal{F}}$ we pick in (6) is a finite union of cylinder sets, both H and F_0 in (6) can be viewed as simple functions defined on X_N^* . Also μ_N^* restricted to $X_{\mathcal{F}}$ is equal to $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$. Then (6) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
(7) \quad & \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} F_0(\sigma_{N,m}(0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu_N^*(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t) \\
&= \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} \left((1 - \mu_m(1)) F_0((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) + \mu_m(1) F_0((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) \right) H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu_N^*(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu \times \nu$ is finite and the family of cylinder sets generated the σ -algebra of X , F can be arbitrarily approximated in L^1 -norm by a function F_0 defined on $X_N \times X_{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathbb{R}$ for some finite set \mathcal{F} . Fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ a finite set such that $m \in \mathcal{F}$ and:

$$\begin{aligned}
(8) \quad & \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} \left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F_0((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) \right| H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu_N^*(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t) < \epsilon \\
& \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} \left| F((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F_0((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) \right| H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu_N^*(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t) < \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

where $H \in L^\infty(X_{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathbb{R}, \mu_{\mathcal{F}} \times \nu)$ is arbitrarily picked and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough so that $N \notin \mathcal{F}$. By (4), we also have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(9) \quad & \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} F(\sigma_{N,m}(0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t) \\
&= \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t - \log D(\sigma_{N,m}(0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), (0, \mathbf{x}_N^*))\right) H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t) \\
&= \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} (1 - \mu_m(1)) F((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) + \mu_m(1) F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)\mu_m(0)}{\mu_N(0)\mu_m(1)}\right) H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t) \\
&= \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} (1 - \mu_m(1)) F((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) + \mu_m(1) F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (7), (8) and (9), we have:

$$(10) \quad \int_{X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}} (1 - \mu_m(1)) \left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) \right| H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) d\mu_N^*(\mathbf{x}_N^*) d\nu(t) < 2\epsilon$$

Since (10) holds for all $H(\mathbf{x}_N^*, t) \in L^\infty(X_N^* \times \mathbb{R}, \mu_N^* \times \nu)$, we can now conclude for μ_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ and ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$(11) \quad \left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) \right| < 2\epsilon$$

□

Definition 2.5. Given a Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ where $X = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$ and each $X_n = \{0, 1, \dots, |X_n| - 1\}$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, define:

$$\mathcal{I}_i = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : i \in X_n\}, \quad \mathcal{N} = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : |\mathcal{I}_i| = \infty\}$$

By our assumption in this section, we will only consider the Bernoulli scheme where $\mathcal{I}_0 = \mathcal{I}_1 = \mathbb{N}$ and $|\mathcal{N}| = \infty$. For generality, we will assume that $\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}$ is also infinite in the rest of the section.

Lemma 2.6. *For any $F \in L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)^G$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $I_m, I_k > 2$, for all $N \in \mathcal{I}_i$ that is large enough, we have:*

$$\left| F((i, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((i, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_k(2)}{\mu_k(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

for μ_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ and ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Fix $F \in L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)^G$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $I_m > 2$. According to **Lemma 2.4**, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $I_N > 2$ such that:

$$\left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for μ_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ and ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Next fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $I_k > 2$. According to the proof of **Lemma 2.4**, the N we pick for (11) to hold can be arbitrarily large. Then for any $N \in \mathcal{I}_i$ with $N > k$, define:

$$\tau_{N,k} : X \longrightarrow X, \quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \begin{cases} (\tau_{N,k}(\mathbf{x}))_N = 2 \text{ and } (\tau_{N,k}(\mathbf{x}))_k = 0, & \text{if } x_N = 0 \text{ and } x_k = 2 \\ (\tau_{N,k}(\mathbf{x}))_N = 0 \text{ and } (\tau_{N,k}(\mathbf{x}))_k = 2, & \text{if } x_N = 2 \text{ and } x_k = 0 \\ (\tau_{N,k}(\mathbf{x}))_n = x_n, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Similar to $\sigma_{N,m}$, $\tau_{N,k}$ is a partial isomorphism. Observe that for μ -almost each $\mathbf{x} \in X$:

$$\log D(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{N,k}(\mathbf{x})) = \log \frac{\mu_N(2)\mu_k(0)}{\mu_N(0)\mu_k(2)}$$

Hence, replacing $\sigma_{N,m}$ by $\tau_{N,k}$ in the proof of **Lemma 2.4**, we can then assume N is large enough so that:

$$(12) \quad \left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_k(2)}{\mu_k(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Combining (11) and (12), we then have for μ_N^* -almost every \mathbf{x}_N^* and ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\left| F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_k(2)}{\mu_k(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

which implies for μ_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ and ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\left| F((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_k(2)}{\mu_k(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

By assumption, $\{0, 1, 2\} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, so the desired inequality for an arbitrary $i \in \mathcal{N}$ can be proved by the same reasoning. Fix $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and for any $N \in \mathcal{I}_i$ with $N > m$, $N > k$, define:

$$\sigma_{N,m}^i : X \longrightarrow X, \quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \begin{cases} (\sigma_{N,m}^i(\mathbf{x}))_N = 2 \text{ and } (\sigma_{N,m}^i(\mathbf{x}))_m = 0, & \text{if } x_N = i \text{ and } x_m = 1 \\ (\sigma_{N,m}^i(\mathbf{x}))_N = i \text{ and } (\sigma_{N,m}^i(\mathbf{x}))_m = 1, & \text{if } x_N = 2 \text{ and } x_m = 0 \\ (\sigma_{N,m}^i(\mathbf{x}))_n = x_n, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and:

$$\tau_{N,k}^i : X \longrightarrow X, \quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \begin{cases} (\tau_{N,k}^i(\mathbf{x}))_N = 2 \text{ and } (\tau_{N,k}^i(\mathbf{x}))_k = 0, & \text{if } x_N = i \text{ and } x_k = 2 \\ (\tau_{N,k}^i(\mathbf{x}))_N = i \text{ and } (\tau_{N,k}^i(\mathbf{x}))_k = 2, & \text{if } x_N = 2 \text{ and } x_k = 0 \\ (\tau_{N,k}^i(\mathbf{x}))_n = x_n, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Observe that for μ -almost every $\mathbf{x} \in X$:

$$\log D(\mathbf{x}, \sigma_{N,m}^i(\mathbf{x})) = \log \frac{\mu_N(2)\mu_m(0)}{\mu_N(i)\mu_m(1)}, \quad \log D(\mathbf{x}, \tau_{N,k}^i(\mathbf{x})) = \log \frac{\mu_N(2)\mu_k(0)}{\mu_N(i)\mu_k(2)}$$

Similarly, replacing $\sigma_{N,m}$ by $\sigma_{N,m}^i$ or $\tau_{N,k}^i$ in the proof of **Lemma 2.4**, there exists $N \in \mathcal{I}_i$ with:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((i, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(i)}\right) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ & \left| F((2, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((i, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_k(2)}{\mu_k(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_N(2)}{\mu_N(i)}\right) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \end{aligned}$$

which implies μ_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ and ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$(13) \quad \left| F((i, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((i, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(1)}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_k(2)}{\mu_k(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

□

Remark 2.7. In Lemma 2.6, by adjusting the definition of the partial isomorphism $\sigma_{N,m}^i$ and $\tau_{N,k}^i$, we further have that for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, for any $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ with $i, j \neq 0$ and for any $m \in \mathcal{I}_i$, $k \in \mathcal{I}_j$, we have whenever $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough:

$$(14) \quad \left| F((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(i)}{\mu_m(0)} + \log \frac{\mu_k(j)}{\mu_k(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

for any $l \in X_N$, ν_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ and for ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ whenever $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough. Suppose for some $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ and for some $r, s \in (0, 1)$, there exists $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ two infinite subsets of \mathbb{N} such that $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_i$, $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_j$ and:

$$\lim_n \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} = r, \quad \lim_n \frac{\mu_{k_n}(j)}{\mu_{k_n}(0)} = s$$

Let $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1)$ with $\lim_n \epsilon_n = 0$. Without losing generality (or restrict to a subsequence), suppose for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\left| \log \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} - \log r \right| = \left| \log \frac{\mu_{k_n}(j)}{\mu_{k_n}(0)} - \log s \right| = o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$$

Therefore:

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| F((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} + \log \frac{\mu_{k_n}(j)}{\mu_{k_n}(0)}\right) \right| \\ &= \left| F((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log r + \log s \pm o\left(\frac{2}{n}\right)\right) \right| < \epsilon_n \end{aligned}$$

for each $l \in X_N$, ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and μ_N^* -almost every $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$ whenever $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough. According to (13), whenever (15) holds, we can replace $(0, \mathbf{x}_N^*)$ in (15) by (l, \mathbf{x}_N^*) for any $l \in X_N$.

Remark 2.8. To prove the main theorem, we will need the following result: given an integrable function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, \nu)$, there exists a sequence of differentiable function $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_n \|f_n - f\|_1 = 0$. Then there exists a strictly increasing sequence of integers $(N_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|f_m - f_n\|_1 < \frac{1}{2^k}$ whenever $m, n \geq N_k$. Observe that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$f_{N_k} = f_{N_1} + \sum_{1 \leq i < k} f_{N_{i+1}} - f_{N_i}, \quad g_k = |f_{N_1}| + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} |f_{N_{i+1}} - f_{N_i}|$$

Clearly $\sup_k \|g_k\|_1 < \infty$. Hence f_{N_k} converges absolutely (hence unconditionally) ν -almost everywhere to some $\tilde{f} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, \nu)$. By **Bounded Convergence Theorem**, we have:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\tilde{f}(t) - f(t)| d\nu(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \lim_k f_{N_k}(t) - f(t) \right| d\nu(t) = \lim_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f_{N_k}(t) - f(t)| d\nu(t) = \lim_k \|f_{N_k} - f\|_1 = 0$$

which implies $\tilde{f} = f$, or $(f_{N_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ also converges to f ν -almost everywhere.

We are now ready to prove the precise description of those three types of type-III, under the assumption that (X, R, μ) is of type-III and that infinitely many X_n satisfies that $|X_n| > 2$. By our assumption that $\limsup_n |X_n| = \infty$, we must have \mathcal{N} (see **Definition 2.5**) is an infinite set. For generality, we can also assume that $\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}$ is infinite. According to (15), for every $i, j \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}$, the clustered points of both of the following sets will be in the associated flow:

$$\bigcup_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \left\{ \log \frac{\mu_n(i)}{\mu_n(0)} + \log \frac{\mu_k(j)}{\mu_k(0)} : n \in \mathcal{I}_i, k \in \mathcal{I}_j \right\}, \quad \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \bigcup_{i \notin \mathcal{N}} \left\{ \log \frac{\mu_n(j)}{\mu_n(0)} + \log \frac{\mu_m(i)}{\mu_m(0)} : n \in \mathcal{I}_j, m \in \mathcal{I}_i \right\}$$

For each $i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}$, define:

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{M}_i = \left\{ \frac{\mu_m(i)}{\mu_m(0)} : m \in \mathcal{I}_i \right\}$$

Recall that we assume that for each μ_n in $\mu = \otimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n$, $\mu_n(0)$ is the maximum weight. Hence for all $i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathcal{M}_i \subseteq (0, 1)$ and clustered points of \mathcal{M}_i must be in $[0, 1]$.

Theorem 2.9. *Given a type-III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, if $\limsup_n |X_n| = \infty$, μ is of type-III₁ if and only if one of the following is true:*

(i) *the set of clustered points of the following set (presumably infinite)*

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{M}_F = \bigcup_{i \notin \mathcal{N}} \left\{ \frac{\mu_m(i)}{\mu_m(0)} : m \in \mathcal{I}_i \right\}$$

contains 0 or there exists $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that the multiplicative group generated by cluster points of $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_F$ is $(0, \infty)$.

(ii) *there exists two different $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_j$ either has 0 as one of its clustered points, or all clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_j$ are non-zero and the multiplicative group generated by clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_j$ is $(0, \infty)$.*

(iii) *for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and r_i a clustered point of \mathcal{M}_i such that $|r_i| < \epsilon$. Equivalently:*

$$\inf_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (\liminf \mathcal{M}_i) = 0$$

where, by $\liminf \mathcal{M}_i$, each \mathcal{M}_i is viewed as a sequence of numbers

Proof. We will first consider the case where (ii) is true. The proof of this case will be based on (15). We will start from the case where there exists $r, s \in (0, 1)$, two index set $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_i$, $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_j$ such that:

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\{ \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} &\subseteq \mathcal{M}_i, & \lim_n \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} &= r \\ \left\{ \frac{\mu_{k_n}(j)}{\mu_{k_n}(0)} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} &\subseteq \mathcal{M}_j, & \lim_n \frac{\mu_{k_n}(j)}{\mu_{k_n}(0)} &= s \end{aligned}$$

and the multiplicative group generated by r and s is the entire $(0, \infty)$. Fix $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1)$ and $F \in L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)^G$. According to **Remark 2.8** (in particular (15)), whenever $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough, for ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and μ_N^* -almost each $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$:

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} &\forall l \in X_N, \left| F \left((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t \pm o \left(\frac{2}{n} \right) \right) - F((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log r + \log s) \right| < \epsilon_n \\ &\implies \left| F \left(\mathbf{x}, t \pm o \left(\frac{2}{n} \right) \right) - F(\mathbf{x}, t + \log r + \log s) \right| < \epsilon_n \end{aligned}$$

As (19) holds for all large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can then conclude that $\log rs$ is in the associated flow, or rs is in the ratio set. If for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, clustered points of \mathcal{M}_i are non-zero and there exists two different $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ such that the multiplicative group generated by clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_j$ is $(0, \infty)$, there exists r_i , a clustered point of \mathcal{M}_i , and r_j a clustered point of \mathcal{M}_j such that r_i and r_j are rationally independent. Then fix $l \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i, j\}$ and let r_l be a clustered point of \mathcal{M}_l . By the same reasoning, we will then have $r_l r_i$ and $r_l r_j$ in the ratio set.

Since r_i, r_j are rationally independent, so are $r_l r_i$ and $r_l r_j$, and hence the ratio set of μ is $(0, \infty)$. This proves that when the second condition in (ii) is satisfied, μ is of type-III₁.

Assume that the second condition of (i) is satisfied. Then there exists non-zero two clustered points r, s of $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_F$ such that r and s are rationally independent. By the same reasoning, we have both rs and r^2 are in the ratio set. Since r and s are rationally independent, r^2 and rs are rationally independent, and hence the ratio set of μ is of type-III₁.

Next we will prove that μ is of type-III₁ whenever the first case in condition (ii) is satisfied, and the same conclusion follows when the first case in condition (i) is satisfied. Without confusion, we will pick r and clustered point of \mathcal{M}_i and s a clustered point of \mathcal{M}_j as in (18) but instead assume that $r = 0$. According to (14), for an arbitrary $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, whenever $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough, we have:

$$\left| F(\mathbf{x}, t) - F\left(\mathbf{x}, t + \log \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} + \log \frac{\mu_{k_n}(j)}{\mu_{k_n}(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

for ν -almost each $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and μ -almost every $\mathbf{x} \in X$. In this case we cannot use the little- o notation as $\log \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)}$ will diverge to $-\infty$. As we are using notations introduced in (18) and $s \in [0, 1]$, it suffices to only consider:

$$(20) \quad \left| F(\mathbf{x}, t) - F\left(\mathbf{x}, t + \log \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

as the following sequence:

$$\left\{ \log \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} + \log \frac{\mu_{k_n}(j)}{\mu_{k_n}(0)} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

will diverge to $-\infty$ regardless of the value of s . Fix $\mathbf{x} \in X$. By **Remark 2.8**, there exists a sequence of differentiable functions $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that the sequence $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ in $\|\cdot\|_1$ and pointwise ν -almost everywhere. Since $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \nu)$, we can assume each h_n has compact support, which will not cause conflict with our assumption that $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges pointwise to $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ ν -almost everywhere. Suppose that the support of each h_n is contained in a closed finite interval I_n . We use $|I_n|$ to denote the length (or Lebesgue measure) of I_n .

First, fix $(\delta_M) \subseteq (0, 1)$ such that $\delta_M \rightarrow 0$. Fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $n \geq m'$, (20) holds for ν -almost each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for $\epsilon = \delta_M$. Let \mathcal{P}_M be a finite δ_M -net of $[-M, M]$. Then let $N'(M) \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that:

$$(21) \quad \forall n' \geq N'(M), \quad \max_{t \in \mathcal{P}_M} |F(\mathbf{x}, t) - h_{n'}(t)| < \delta_M$$

By our assumption, for all large enough $l \in \mathbb{N}$ with $l \geq m'$, we have:

$$(22) \quad \left| \log \frac{\mu_{m_l}(i)}{\mu_{m_l}(0)} \right| > 2 \max(|I_{N'(M)}|, M)$$

Fix $l \in \mathbb{N}$ so that (22) holds. Combining (21) and (20), we have:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{P}_M, \quad \left| h_{N'(M)}(t) - h_{N'(M)}\left(t \pm \log \frac{\mu_{m_l}(i)}{\mu_{m_l}(0)}\right) \right| < 2\delta_M$$

According to (22), we have:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{P}_M, \quad t \pm \log \frac{\mu_{m_l}(i)}{\mu_{m_l}(0)} \notin I_{N'(M)} \quad \implies \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{P}_M, \quad h_{N'(M)}\left(t \pm \log \frac{\mu_{m_l}(i)}{\mu_{m_l}(0)}\right) = 0$$

which implies:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{P}_M, \quad |h_{N'(M)}(t)| < 2\delta_M$$

Next, for the $M + 1$ case, consider $m'' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $n \geq m''$, (20) holds for ν -almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for $\epsilon = \delta_{M+1}$. Next let \mathcal{P}_{M+1} be a finite δ_{M+1} -net that contains \mathcal{P}_M . Then we can find $N'(M + 1)$ so that:

$$\forall n' \geq N'(M + 1), \quad \max_{t \in \mathcal{P}_{M+1}} |F(\mathbf{x}, t) - h_{n'}(t)| < \delta_{M+1}$$

which is (21) but with M replaced by $M + 1$. Then find $l' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (22) holds with m_l replaced by $m_{l'}$ and $N'(M)$ replaced by $N'(M + 1)$. As a result, we will have that:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{P}_{M+1}, \quad |h_{N'(M+1)}(t)| < 2\delta_{M+1}.$$

For each $M \in \mathbb{N}$, put $f_M = h_{N'(M)}$. We then have $(f_M)_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ in $\|\cdot\|_1$ and pointwise ν -almost everywhere. Since $\delta_M \rightarrow 0$ and each \mathcal{P}_M is a finite δ_M -net of $[-M, M]$, for two fixed different points $t, t' \in [-M, M]$, we have:

$$|f_{M'}(t) - f_{M'}(t')| \leq 4\delta_{M'} < \delta_M$$

whenever $M' \geq M$ is large enough. Suppose that there exists $t, t' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(\mathbf{x}, t) \neq F(\mathbf{x}, t')$. Define:

$$\delta = |F(\mathbf{x}, t) - F(\mathbf{x}, t')|$$

Fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t, t' \in [-M, M]$ and $\delta_M < 3\delta$. Next fix $M' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M' > M$ such that:

$$(23) \quad |f_{M'}(t) - F(\mathbf{x}, t)| < \frac{\delta}{3}, \quad |f_{M'}(t) - f_{M'}(t')| < \frac{\delta_M}{3}, \quad |f_{M'}(t') - F(\mathbf{x}, t')| < \frac{\delta}{3}$$

With the choice of M' and M that make all inequalities in (23) hold, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= |F(\mathbf{x}, t) - F(\mathbf{x}, t')| \\ &\leq |f_{M'}(t) - F(\mathbf{x}, t)| + |f_{M'}(t) - f_{M'}(t')| + |f_{M'}(t') - F(\mathbf{x}, t')| \\ &< \frac{\delta}{3} + \frac{\delta_M}{3} + \frac{\delta}{3} < \delta \end{aligned}$$

which is absurd. Therefore, we can now conclude $F(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is a constant function. Since $\mathbf{x} \in X$ is arbitrarily fixed and $F \in L^\infty(X \times \mathbb{R}, \mu \times \nu)^G$ is also arbitrarily fixed, we can then conclude the associated flow is trivial when 0 is a clustered point of \mathcal{M}_i for some $i \in \mathcal{N}$, and hence prove that μ is of type-III₁ when the first case in condition (ii) is true. Similarly, when the first case in condition (i) is true, \mathcal{M}_F will contain a sequence converging to zero. Replacing $\left\{ \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} \right\}$ by that sequence in (20), then the rest will follow the same way. Similarly, if:

$$\inf_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (\liminf \mathcal{M}_i) = 0$$

then there exists a sequence in $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{M}_i$, which is converging to zero. Replacing $\left\{ \frac{\mu_{m_n}(i)}{\mu_{m_n}(0)} \right\}$ by that sequence in (20) and the rest will follow. We can now conclude that when any one of conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) hold, μ is of type-III₁.

Conversely, suppose that the system (X, R, μ) is of type-III₁. Assume by contradiction that all of the following are true (namely, all of conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) are false):

- (a) the set of cluster points of \mathcal{M}_F is included in $(0, 1]$, namely $\liminf \mathcal{M}_F > 0$ and for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the multiplicative group generated by clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_F$ is either cyclic or trivial.
- (b) for any two different $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, $\liminf \mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_j > 0$ and the multiplicative group generated by clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_j$ is either trivial or cyclic.
- (c) there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that:

$$\delta < \inf_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (\liminf \mathcal{M}_i)$$

According to condition (c), the clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_F \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{M}_i$ is finite and are all non-zero. By condition (a) and (b), any two different clustered points in $\mathcal{M}_F \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{M}_i$ are rationally dependent. Therefore, there exists $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that the set of clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_F \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{M}_i$ is a finite subset of $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}$. Therefore, for any $K, M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \geq M$ that is large enough, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf \left\{ \inf \left\{ \left| \lambda^n - \prod_{N+1 \leq k \leq N+K} \frac{\mu_k(x_k)}{\mu_k(y_k)} \right| : x_k, y_k \in X_k(N+1 \leq k \leq N+K) \right\} : n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \\
&= \inf \left\{ \inf \left\{ \left| \lambda^n - \prod_{N+1 \leq k \leq N+K} \frac{\mu_k(x_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \left(\frac{\mu_k(y_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \right)^{-1} \right| : x_k, y_k \in X_k(N+1 \leq k \leq N+K) \right\} : n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} < \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

According to the description of the Radon-Nikodym cocycle in the proof of **Lemma 2.2** and **Lemma 2.3**, we can then conclude the essential range of the Radon-Nikodym derivative is $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \cup \{1\}$, which contradicts our assumption that μ is of type-III₁. \square

Theorem 2.10. *Given a type-III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, if $\limsup_n |X_n| = \infty$, μ is of type-III _{λ} for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ if and only if the set of cluster points of $\mathcal{M}_F \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{M}_i$ is a finite subset of $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}$, and the multiplicative group generated by that set of clustered points is $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ (definitions of each \mathcal{M}_i , $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and \mathcal{M}_F can be found in (16) and (17)).*

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_F \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{M}_i$. First assume \mathcal{F} is a finite subset of $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}$ and multiplicative group generated by \mathcal{F} is $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Then there exists $r, s \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $rs^{-1} = \lambda$. Similarly by (19) we have both r^2 and rs are in the ratio set, and hence λ is in the ratio set. Also, since \mathcal{F} is a finite subset of $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}$, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and whenever $N \geq M$ that is large enough, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf \left\{ \inf \left\{ \left| \lambda^n - \prod_{N+1 \leq k \leq N+K} \frac{\mu_k(x_k)}{\mu_k(y_k)} \right| : x_k, y_k \in X_k(N+1 \leq k \leq N+K) \right\} : n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \\
(24) \quad &= \inf \left\{ \inf \left\{ \left| \lambda^n - \prod_{N+1 \leq k \leq N+K} \frac{\mu_k(x_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \left(\frac{\mu_k(y_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \right)^{-1} \right| : x_k, y_k \in X_k(N+1 \leq k \leq N+K) \right\} : n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \\
&= \min \left\{ \inf \left\{ \left| s - \prod_{N+1 \leq k \leq N+K} \frac{\mu_k(x_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \left(\frac{\mu_k(y_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \right)^{-1} \right| : x_k, y_k \in X_k(N+1 \leq k \leq N+K) \right\} : s \in \mathcal{F} \right\} < \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

Assume by contradiction that there exists $r \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that r is in the ratio set and:

$$\delta = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} |\lambda^n - r|$$

According to the description of the Radon-Nikodym cocycle in the proof of **Lemma 2.2** and **Lemma 2.3**, by letting ϵ be δ in (24), our assumption that r can be approached by values of the Radon-Nikodym cocycle contradicts (24). Therefore, the ratio set of μ is of type-III _{λ} , or μ is of type-III _{λ} .

Conversely, suppose (X, R, μ) is of type-III _{λ} for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. By the same reasoning based on (24), we have \mathcal{F} is necessarily a subset of $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}$, or the ratio set will contain other numbers outside of $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Since $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, if \mathcal{F} is infinite, we will have:

$$\inf_{i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}} (\liminf (\mathcal{M}_i \cup \mathcal{M}_F)) = 0$$

According to **Theorem 2.9**, this will imply that μ is of type-III₁. Therefore \mathcal{F} must be a finite subset of $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}$. Therefore, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $N \geq M$ is large enough, we have (24) holds. If $\lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ then clearly the multiplicative group generated by \mathcal{F} is $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Otherwise, assume by contradiction that the multiplicative group generated by \mathcal{F} is $\{\lambda^{kn}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ for some integer $k \geq 2$. In this case we must have $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{\lambda^{kn}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \{1\}$. Put:

$$\delta' = |\lambda^k - \lambda| = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} |\lambda^{kn} - \lambda|$$

According to the description of the Radon-Nikodym cocycle in the proof of **Lemma 2.3** and **Lemma 2.4**, since λ is in the ratio set, for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and whenever $N \geq M$ is large enough, we have:

$$\min \left\{ \left| \lambda - \prod_{N+1 \leq k \leq N+K} \frac{\mu_k(x_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \left(\frac{\mu_k(y_k)}{\mu_k(0)} \right)^{-1} \right| : x_k, y_k \in X_k (N+1 \leq k \leq N+K) \right\} < \delta'$$

which is absurd. Therefore, we must have the multiplicative group generated by \mathcal{F} is $\{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. \square

Theorem 2.11. *Given a type-III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, if $\limsup_n |X_n| = \infty$, μ is of type-III₀ if and only if the set of clustered points of $\mathcal{M}_F \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{M}_i$ is $\{1\}$.*

Proof. The conclusion follows immediately by **Theorem 2.9** and **Theorem 2.10**. \square

Remark 2.12. *We will now show that descriptions in **Theorem 2.9**, **2.10** and **2.11** are independent to permutation in each X_n as each X_n at the very beginning is assumed to be a discrete countable set. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let π_n be a permutation of X_n . Without losing generality we can assume that $\pi_n(0) = 0$ so that $\mu_n(\pi_n(0))$ has the biggest weight in X_n . It suffices to show that both (14) (or (15)) are independent to permutation.*

Recall that in **Definition 2.5** we define \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{I}_i for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$. For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$ define:

$$\mathcal{J}_i = \{\pi_n^{-1}(i) : n \in \mathcal{I}_i\}$$

Since $\limsup_n |X_n| = \infty$ and \mathcal{N} is infinite, the following set is infinite:

$$\{i \in \mathcal{N} : \mathcal{J}_i \text{ infinite}\}$$

Fix two different $i, j \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that both \mathcal{J}_i and \mathcal{J}_j are infinite. Then there exists $(i_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_i$, $(j_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_j$ such that for each $m \in \mathcal{I}_i$, $\pi_m(i_m) = i$ and for each $k \in \mathcal{I}_j$, $\pi_k(j_k) = j$. Then similar to how we deduce (14), for each $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and each $m \in \mathcal{I}_i$, $k \in \mathcal{I}_j$, whenever $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough:

$$\left| F((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((0, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(\pi_m(i_m))}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_k(\pi_k(j_k))}{\mu_k(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

for ν -almost each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and μ_N^* -almost each $\mathbf{x}_N^* \in X_N^*$. Then similar to how we deduced (15), we then have:

$$\left| F((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t) - F\left((l, \mathbf{x}_N^*), t + \log \frac{\mu_m(\pi_m(i_m))}{\mu_m(0)} - \log \frac{\mu_k(\pi_k(j_k))}{\mu_k(0)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

for each $l \in X_N$. When we permute each X_n by π_n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, instead of looking at clustered points of

$\left\{ \frac{\mu_m(i)}{\mu_m(0)} \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{I}_i}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we consider $\left\{ \frac{\mu(\pi_m(i_m))}{\mu_m(0)} \right\}_{m \in \mathcal{I}_i}$ where $(i_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_i$ and $\pi_m(i_m) = i$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

and this will not affect the proof **Theorem 2.9**, **2.10**, **2.11**. Therefore, **Theorem 2.9**, **2.10**, **2.11** can also be applied to a general Bernoulli scheme.

Corollary 2.13. *Given a type-III ITPFI factor $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ where each \mathcal{M}_n is an I_{k_n} factor for some $2 \leq k_n \leq \infty$. Suppose $\limsup_n k_n = \infty$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_{n,1}$ is the maximum in $\text{Sp}(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n))$. Define:*

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{n,i}}{\lambda_{n,1}} : 1 \leq i \leq k_n \right\}$$

and let Λ be the set of clustered points in $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_n$. Then \mathcal{M} is of:

- (1) type-III₁ if and only if $0 \in \Lambda$ or the multiplicative group generated by $\Lambda \setminus \{0\}$ is $(0, \infty)$.
- (2) type-III _{λ} for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ if and only if $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \setminus \{1\}$ is a finite subset of $(\lambda^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.
- (3) type-III₀ if and only if $\Lambda = \{1\}$.

Proof. The conclusion follows immediately by the correspondence between an ITPFI factor and its associated Bernoulli scheme, **Proposition 2.1**, **Theorem 2.9**, **2.10**, **2.11**. \square

2.2.2. When $\limsup_n |X_n| < \infty$.

According to **Lemma 2.2** and **Lemma 2.3**, the ratio set of a type-III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, R, \mu)$ is determined by the multiplicative group generated by the clustered points of fractions of weights of μ_n . Therefore, we can remove finitely many X_n from $X = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$ without changing its type. According to [GS85b], an ITPFI factor $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ where $\limsup_n k_n < \infty$ is isomorphic to an **ITPFI**₂ factor (see **Definition 1.3**). From now on it suffices to only consider the case where $X = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. We only consider the case where, given that $\mu = \otimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n$, $\mu_n(0) > \mu_n(1)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1)$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$(25) \quad \mu_n(0) = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_n}, \quad \mu_n(1) = \frac{\lambda_n}{1 + \lambda_n}$$

Lemma 2.14 ([DL19, Lemma 1.3]). *In $G \curvearrowright (X, \mu)$ where $X = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and μ is described by a sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1)$ as in (25), suppose for some $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, $\lim_n \lambda_n = \lambda$. Then:*

- if $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is summable, then μ is equivalent to the following measure on $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$:

$$\bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \lambda}, \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda} \right)$$

and hence μ is of type-III _{λ} when $\lambda \neq 1$, or of type-II₁ when $\lambda = 1$.

- if $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not summable, then μ is of type-III₁.

Theorem 2.15 ([HO81], [HOO76]). *In general, given two ergodic non-singular group action $G_i \curvearrowright (X_i, \mu_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$), each of which is on a standard measure space, consider the product group action $(G_1 \times G_2) \curvearrowright (X_1 \times X_2, \mu_1 \times \mu_2)$:*

- (1) if μ_1 (μ_2 resp.) is of type-II₁, $\mu_1 \times \mu_2$ is of same type of μ_2 (μ_1 resp.).
- (2) if μ_1 or μ_2 is of type-III₁, then so is $\mu_1 \times \mu_2$.
- (3) if for some $r, s \in (0, 1)$ such that μ_1 is of type-III _{r} and μ_2 is of type-III _{s} , then $\mu_1 \times \mu_2$ is of type-III₁ if the multiplicative group generated by r and s is $(0, \infty)$; otherwise, $\mu_1 \times \mu_2$ is of type-III _{λ} for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that the multiplicative group generated by r and s is $(\lambda^n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

First we fix a type-III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ where $X = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mu = \otimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n$ where $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is defined by $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1)$ as in (25). Define Λ to be the set of clustered points of $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and clearly $\Lambda \subseteq [0, 1]$. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, define $\mathcal{N}(\lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to be an infinite subset such that:

$$\lim_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda} \lambda_n = \lambda$$

If there exist two different $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$, the intersection of $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\lambda')$ is at most finite. With the sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that defines each μ_n (and hence μ) as in (25), there exists $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1)$ such that $\lim_n \epsilon_n = 0$ and:

$$(26) \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \lambda_n = \begin{cases} \lambda e^{-\epsilon_n}, & \lambda \neq 0, n \in \mathcal{N}(\lambda) \\ 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n}, & \lambda = 0, n \in \mathcal{N}(0) \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2.16. *Given a type-III Bernoulli scheme $G \curvearrowright (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ where $X = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mu = \otimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n$ is defined by (25) and (26), if $\Lambda = \{0, 1\}$, then μ is of type-III₀.*

Proof. Let D denote the Radon-Nikodym cocycle as in the proof of **Lemma 2.2**. Under our assumption, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$, observe that:

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \log D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}(0)} (-1)^{x_n - y_n} (-\epsilon_n - \log(1 - e^{-\epsilon_n})) \right) + \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}(1)} (-1)^{x_n - y_n} (-\epsilon_n + \log \lambda) \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}(0)} (-1)^{x_n - y_n} \left| \log(1 - e^{-\epsilon_n}) \right| \right) + \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}(0) \cup \mathcal{N}(1)} (-1)^{y_n - x_n} \epsilon_n \right) \end{aligned}$$

Indeed since $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in R$, $\log D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a finite sum. Fix $\mathbf{x} \in X$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$. To prove that μ is of type- III_0 , according to **Lemma 2.2**, we need to find the desired $\mathbf{y} \in X$, $N, K \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N \geq M$ such that $x_n = y_n$ for all $n \notin \{N+1, N+2, \dots, N+K\}$ and:

$$\log D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \quad \text{or} \quad |\log D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| > \frac{1}{\epsilon}$$

First fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. We can then find $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $|\log \delta| > \epsilon^{-1}$. Next fix $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that:

$$\forall n \geq N_1, \quad \left| \log(1 - e^{-\epsilon_n}) \right| > |\log \delta|$$

Since $\Lambda = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{N}(0)$ must be infinite and we either have $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}(0)$, or can replace N_1 by a larger integer from $\mathcal{N}(0)$. We can further assume that N_1 is large enough so that ϵ_n is negligible compared to ϵ^{-1} . Then clearly there exists $\mathbf{y} \in X$ such that $y_n = x_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{N_1\}$ and $x_{N_1} \neq y_{N_1}$. In this case, we have $|\log D(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| > \epsilon^{-1}$. □

Theorem 2.17. *In the set-up of **Proposition 2.16**, μ is of type- III_λ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ if and only if all of the following are true:*

- (1) *the multiplicative group generated by Λ is $(\lambda^n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.*
- (2) *for each $s \in \Lambda$, the sequence $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(s)}$ is summable.*

Proof. First we assume that μ is of type- III_λ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Let D denote the Radon-Nikodym cocycle. If there exists $r \in (0, 1)$ such that $r \in \Lambda$ and $r \notin \{1\} \cup (\lambda^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, according to (27) and the reasoning in the proof of **Proposition 2.16**, $\log r$ is in the essential range of $\log D$, and hence r is in the ratio set of μ , which is absurd. Therefore, Λ must be a subset of $\{1\} \cup \{\lambda^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. For each $t \in \Lambda$, observe that:

$$(28) \quad (\{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}, \mu) = \left(\prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}(t)} \{0, 1\}, \bigotimes_{n \in \mathcal{N}(t)} \mu_n \right) \times \left(\prod_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}(t)} \{0, 1\}, \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}(t)} \mu_n \right)$$

where we use \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{M}_t , \mathcal{M}^t to denote the ITPFI factors, each of which is respectively associated with the first, second and third Bernoulli scheme in (28). If there exists $t \in \Lambda$ such that $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(t)}$ is not summable, then \mathcal{M}_t is of type- III_1 according to **Lemma 2.14**. Then \mathcal{M} is of type- III_1 by **Theorem 2.15**, which contradicts our assumption. We can now assume for all $t \in \Lambda$, $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(t)}$ is summable, and hence $\mathcal{M}_t \cong R_t$ according to **Lemma 2.14**, where R_t is defined in **Definition 1.10**. In this case we have:

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{M} \cong \bigotimes_{t \in \Lambda} R_t$$

Then the asymptotic ratio set of \mathcal{M} is the closure of the multiplicative group generated by Λ . According to **Proposition 2.1**, we must have $\lambda \in \Lambda$ as we assume μ is of type- III_λ . Conversely, when both conditions are true, we can rewrite \mathcal{M} as in (29). Then the conclusion follows by **Proposition 2.1**. □

Theorem 2.18. *In the set-up of **Proposition 2.16**, μ is of type- III_1 if and only if one of the following is true:*

- *there exists $t \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$ such that $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(t)}$ is not summable.*
- *for each $s \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$, $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(s)}$ is summable and the multiplicative group generated by Λ is $(0, \infty)$.*

Proof. First we let \mathcal{M} denote the ITPFI factor associated with the given Bernoulli scheme. For any $t \in \Lambda$, we have $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{M}_t \otimes \mathcal{M}^t$ where \mathcal{M}_t is the ITPFI factor associated with the first Bernoulli scheme in (28) and \mathcal{M}^t is associated with the second one in (28). If, for some $s \in \Lambda$, $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(s)}$ is not summable, according to **Lemma 2.14** and **Theorem 2.15**, \mathcal{M} is of type- III_1 . If the second condition holds instead, then for all $s \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{M}_s \cong R_s$ according to **Lemma 2.14**. Then for all $s \in \Lambda$:

$$\mathcal{M} \otimes R_s \cong (\mathcal{M}^s \otimes R_s) \otimes R_s \cong \mathcal{M}^s \otimes (R_s \otimes R_s) \cong \mathcal{M}$$

which implies that Λ is included in the asymptotic ratio set of \mathcal{M} , and hence the ratio set of μ is $[0, \infty)$ according to **Proposition 2.1**.

Conversely, assume that μ is of type-III₁. Again by **Proposition 2.1** the asymptotic ratio set of \mathcal{M} is $[0, \infty)$. Suppose that for all $s \in \Lambda$, $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(s)}$ is summable. Then we can rewrite \mathcal{M} as in (29), and hence the asymptotic ratio set of \mathcal{M} is the closure of the multiplicative group generated by Λ . We then can conclude that the multiplicative group generated by Λ is $(0, \infty)$. \square

Corollary 2.19. *Suppose $\mathcal{M} = R(\mathcal{M}_n, v_n)$ is a type-III ITPFI₂ factor where for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\mathrm{Sp}\left(v(n)/\mathcal{M}(n)\right) = \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_n}, \frac{\lambda_n}{1 + \lambda_n} \right\}$$

and the sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is defined by a vanishing sequence $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, 1)$ as in (26). Let Λ denote the set of clustered points of $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let $\mathcal{N}(\lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\lim_{n \in \mathcal{N}(\lambda)} \lambda_n = \lambda$. Then \mathcal{M} is of:

- (1) *type-III₁ if one of the following is true:*
 - *there exists $t \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$ such that $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(t)}$ is not summable.*
 - *for each $s \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$, $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(s)}$ is summable and the multiplicative group generated by Λ is $(0, \infty)$.*
- (2) *type-III _{λ} for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ if and only if for each $s \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$, $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathcal{N}(s)}$ is summable and the multiplicative group generated by Λ is $(\lambda^n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.*
- (3) *type-III₀ if and only if $\Lambda = \{0, 1\}$.*

REFERENCES

- [AW69] Huzihiro Araki and E. J. Woods, *A classification of factors*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. Ser. A **4** (1968/69), 51–130. MR 244773
- [BKV21] Michael Björklund, Zemer Kosloff, and Stefaan Vaes, *Ergodicity and type of nonsingular Bernoulli actions*, Invent. Math. **224** (2021), no. 2, 573–625. MR 4243020
- [DKQ98] Anthony H. Dooley, Ivo Klemeš, and Anthony N. Quas, *Product and Markov measures of type III*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **65** (1998), no. 1, 84–110. MR 1646621
- [DL19] Alexandre I. Danilenko and Mariusz Lemańczyk, *K-property for Maharam extensions of non-singular Bernoulli and Markov shifts*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **39** (2019), no. 12, 3292–3321. MR 4027550
- [GS85a] T. Giordano and G. Skandalis, *Krieger factors isomorphic to their tensor square and pure point spectrum flows*, J. Funct. Anal. **64** (1985), no. 2, 209–226. MR 812392
- [GS85b] ———, *On infinite tensor products of factors of type I₂*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **5** (1985), no. 4, 565–586. MR 829858
- [HO81] Toshihiro Hamachi and Motosige Osikawa, *Ergodic groups of automorphisms and Krieger’s theorems*, Seminar on Mathematical Sciences, vol. 3, Keio University, Department of Mathematics, Yokohama, 1981. MR 617740
- [HOO76] Toshihiro Hamachi, Yukimasa Oka, and Motosige Osikawa, *Flows associated with ergodic non-singular transformation groups*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **11** (1975/76), no. 1, 31–50. MR 390172
- [Kle20] Achim Klenke, *Probability theory—a comprehensive course*, third ed., Universitext, Springer, Cham, ©2020. MR 4201399
- [Kri70] Wolfgang Krieger, *On the Araki-Woods asymptotic ratio set and non-singular transformations of a measure space*, Contributions to Ergodic Theory and Probability (Proc. Conf., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio, 1970), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 160, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1970, pp. 158–177. MR 414823
- [Kri76] ———, *On ergodic flows and the isomorphism of factors*, Math. Ann. **223** (1976), no. 1, 19–70. MR 415341
- [Mah64] D. Maharam, *Incompressible transformations*, Fund. Math. **56** (1964), 35–50. MR 169988
- [Moo67] Calvin C. Moore, *Invariant measures on product spaces*, Proc. Fifth Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Probability (Berkeley, Calif., 1965/66), Vol. II: Contributions to Probability Theory, Part 2, Univ. California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1967, pp. 447–459.
- [Sch77] Klaus Schmidt, *Cocycles on ergodic transformation groups*, Macmillan Lectures in Mathematics, vol. 1, Macmillan Co. of India, Ltd., Delhi, 1977. MR 578731
- [Tak69] Osamu Takenouchi, *On type classification of factors constructed as infinite tensor products*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. Ser. A **4** (1968/69), 467–482. MR 247497