

# A probabilistic ergodic decomposition result

Albert Raugi

IRMAR, Université de Rennes I, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

E-mail: [raugi@univ-rennes1.fr](mailto:raugi@univ-rennes1.fr)

Received 14 April 2008; accepted 1 September 2008

**Abstract.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a standard probability space. We say that a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way if any regular conditional probability  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$  satisfies, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\forall B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ,  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, B) \in \{0, 1\}$ . In this case the equality  $\mu(\cdot) = \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, \cdot) \mu(dx)$ , gives us an integral decomposition in “ $\mathfrak{B}$ -ergodic” components.

For any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$ , we denote by  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  the smallest sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing  $\mathfrak{B}$  and the collection of all sets  $A$  in  $\mathfrak{X}$  satisfying  $\mu(A) = 0$ . We say that  $\mathfrak{B}$  is  $\mu$ -complete if  $\mathfrak{B} = \overline{\mathfrak{B}}$ .

Let  $\{\mathfrak{B}_i : i \in I\}$  be a non-empty family of sub- $\sigma$ -algebras which decompose  $\mu$  in an ergodic way. Suppose that, for any finite subset  $J$  of  $I$ ,  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i} = \overline{\bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{B}_i}$ ; this assumption is satisfied in particular when the  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathfrak{B}_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , are  $\mu$ -complete. Then we prove that the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigcap_{i \in I} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.

**Résumé.** Soit  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  un espace probabilisé standard. Nous disons qu'une sous-tribu  $\mathfrak{B}$  de  $\mathfrak{X}$  décompose ergodiquement  $\mu$  si toute probabilité conditionnelle régulière  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P$  relativement à  $\mathfrak{B}$  et  $\mu$ , vérifie, pour  $\mu$ -presque tout  $x \in X$ ,  $\forall B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ,  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, B) \in \{0, 1\}$ . Dans ce cas l'égalité  $\mu(\cdot) = \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, \cdot) \mu(dx)$ , nous donne une décomposition intégrale en composantes “ $\mathfrak{B}$ -ergodiques.”

Pour toute sous-tribu  $\mathfrak{B}$  de  $\mathfrak{X}$ , nous notons  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  la plus petite sous-tribu de  $\mathfrak{X}$  contenant  $\mathfrak{B}$  et tous les sous-ensembles mesurables de  $X$  de  $\mu$ -mesure nulle. Nous disons que la tribu  $\mathfrak{B}$  est  $\mu$ -complète si  $\mathfrak{B} = \overline{\mathfrak{B}}$ .

Soit  $\{\mathfrak{B}_i : i \in I\}$  une famille non vide de sous-tribus de  $\mathfrak{X}$  décomposant ergodiquement  $\mu$ . Supposons que, pour toute partie finie  $J$  de  $I$ ,  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i} = \overline{\bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{B}_i}$ ; cette hypothèse est satisfaite si les tribus  $\mathfrak{B}_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , sont  $\mu$ -complètes. Alors la sous-tribu  $\bigcap_{i \in I} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i}$  décompose ergodiquement  $\mu$ .

MSC: 28A50; 28D05; 60A10

Keywords: Regular conditional probability; Disintegration of probability; Quasi-invariant measures; Ergodic decomposition

## 1. Introduction

There are several versions of ergodic decomposition theorems in the literature (cf. [3,4,6–8]) which give an integral decomposition of a probability measure  $\mu$ , on a standard measurable space, in ergodic components. Most of these decompositions are based on abstract results like Choquet's theorem. A probabilistic approach which can prove to be more convenient due to the properties of the conditional expectation (see [2]) is the following. Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a standard Borel probability space. Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$ . We denote by  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P$  a regular conditional probability of  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$ . We say that  $\mathfrak{B}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way if for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\forall B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ,  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, B) \in \{0, 1\}$ . In this case, the equality  $\mu(dx) = \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, \cdot) \mu(dx)$  gives us an integral decomposition in  $\mathfrak{B}$ -ergodic components.

In [7,8] Shimomura proves that the intersection of a decreasing sequence of separable sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathfrak{X}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way. He also gives an example of a standard probability space and a suitable sub- $\sigma$ -algebra for which the above decomposition is not ergodic.

Let  $\{\mathfrak{B}_i: i \in I\}$  be a non-empty family of sub- $\sigma$ -algebras which decompose  $\mu$  in an ergodic way. Suppose that, for any finite subset  $J$  of  $I$ ,  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i} = \overline{\bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{B}_i}$ . The aim of this paper is to prove that the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{B}_i$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.

## 2. Preliminaries

It is not necessary to work with standard Borel spaces. We only need probability space for which any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra has regular conditional probabilities. In this section we recall some results about this property. On a standard Borel space  $(X, \mathfrak{X})$ , it is well known that, for any probability measure  $\mu$  and any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$ , there exists a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mu$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$ .

**Definition 2.1.** A  $\sigma$ -algebra on a set  $X$  is called separable if it is generated by a countable sub-algebra.

**Proposition 2.2.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X})$  be a measurable space with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$ . Then two positive  $\sigma$ -finite measures are equal if they coincide on a countable algebra generating  $\mathfrak{X}$ .

**Definition 2.3.** A class  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $X$  is said to be compact if, for any sequence  $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of elements of  $\mathcal{C}$  with an empty intersection  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$ , there exists a natural integer  $p$  such that  $\bigcap_{n=0}^p C_n = \emptyset$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a probability space. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a compact subclass of  $\mathfrak{X}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $\mu$ -approximating if

$$\forall A \in \mathfrak{X} \quad \mu(A) = \sup\{\mu(C): C \in \mathcal{C}, C \subset A\}.$$

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a probability space. Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$ . We call regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$  a map  $P$  from  $X \times \mathfrak{X}$  to  $[0, 1]$  such that:

- (i) for any  $x \in X$ ,  $P(x, \cdot)$  is a probability measure on  $\mathfrak{X}$ .
- (ii) for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$ , the map  $x \in X \mapsto P(x, A)$  is a version of the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[1_A | \mathfrak{B}]$ ; that is, this map is  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable and, for any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ,

$$\int_X 1_A(x) 1_B(x) \mu(dx) = \int_X P(x, A) 1_B(x) \mu(dx).$$

Then for any non-negative (or bounded)  $\mathfrak{X}$ -measurable function  $f$ , the function  $Pf$  defined by  $Pf(x) = \int_X f(y) \times P(x, dy)$  (expectation of  $f$  with respect to the probability  $P(x, \cdot)$ ) is a version of the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f | \mathfrak{B}]$ .

**Theorem 2.6 ([5], corollaire Proposition V-4-4).** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a probability space with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing a  $\mu$ -approximating compact class.

Then, for any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$  there exists a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$ .

**Remarks.** Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a probability space with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing a  $\mu$ -approximating compact class. Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$ .

- 1. If  $P$  and  $Q$  are two regular conditional probabilities with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$  then, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , the probability measures  $P(x, \cdot)$  and  $Q(x, \cdot)$  are equal.
- 2. If  $P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$ , then for any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ , we have, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$P(x, B) = E_\mu[1_B | \mathfrak{B}](x) = 1_B(x) = \delta_x(B) \in \{0, 1\},$$

where  $\delta_x$  is the Dirac measure at the point  $x$ .

When the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  is separable, from Proposition 2.2 we can permute “for any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ” and “for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ .”

3. Let  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  be the smallest sub- $\sigma$ -algebra containing  $\mathfrak{B}$  and the collection of all sets  $A$  in  $\mathfrak{X}$  satisfying  $\mu(A) = 0$ . One sees easily that any regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  and  $\mu$ . For two sub- $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_2$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$ , the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}_1 \cap \mathfrak{B}_2}$  is not necessarily equal to  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \overline{\mathfrak{B}_2}$ ; consequently  $\mathbb{L}^2(X, \overline{\mathfrak{B}_1 \cap \mathfrak{B}_2}, \mu)$  is not necessarily equal to  $\mathbb{L}^2(X, \overline{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \overline{\mathfrak{B}_2}, \mu)$ .

### 3. Main results

Throughout this section, we assume that  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  is a probability space with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing a  $\mu$ -approximating compact class. The preceding Remark 2 leads us to introduce the following definition.

**Definition 3.1.** We say that a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way if one (and thus all) regular conditional probability  $\mathfrak{B}P$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$  satisfies, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\forall B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}P(x, B) \in \{0, 1\}$ .

From the preceding Remarks 2 and 3 it follows that:

- Any separable sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.
- If  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way then so does  $\mathfrak{B}$ . (Any regular conditional probability  $\mathfrak{B}P$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  and  $\mu$ . If  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way then, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}P(x, B) \in \{0, 1\}$  for any  $B \in \overline{\mathfrak{B}}$  and a fortiori for any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ . Which proves that  $\mathfrak{B}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.)

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$ , and let  $\mathfrak{B}P$  be a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$ . Then, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , we have the probability equalities

$$\mathfrak{B}P(y, \cdot) = \mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot) \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X$$

and consequently for any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ , we have for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\forall A \in \mathfrak{X} \quad \int_X 1_A(y) 1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(x, dy) = \int_X \mathfrak{B}P(y, A) 1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(x, dy).$$

The following proposition tells us that the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way if and only if, in the last equalities, we can permute “for any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ” and “for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ .”

**Proposition 3.3.** Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$ , and let  $\mathfrak{B}P$  be a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$ .

Then the two following assertions are equivalent:

- $\mathfrak{B}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way;
- For  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot)$ .

In this case, for any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{B}$  and any regular conditional probability  $\mathfrak{C}P$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{C}$  and  $\mu$ , for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mathfrak{C}P(x, \cdot)$ ; that is, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\forall (A, B) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{B} \quad \int_X \mathfrak{B}P(y, A) 1_B(y) \mathfrak{C}P(x, dy) = \int_X 1_A(y) 1_B(y) \mathfrak{C}P(x, dy).$$

Moreover, this assertion is true for any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$  such that, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\mathfrak{C}P \mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_X \mathfrak{C}P(x, dy) \mathfrak{B}P(y, \cdot) = \mathfrak{C}P(x, \cdot).$$

This last property is satisfied when  $\mathfrak{C}$  is a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{B}$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a probability space with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing a  $\mu$ -approximating compact class. Let  $\{\mathfrak{B}_i: i \in I\}$  be a non-empty family of sub- $\sigma$ -algebras which decompose  $\mu$  in an ergodic way. We suppose that, for any finite subset  $J$  of  $I$ ,  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i} = \bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{B}_i$ .*

*Then the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{B}_i$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.*

#### 4. Proof of the results

Throughout this section, we assume that  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  is a probability space with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing a  $\mu$ -approximating compact class. For any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$ , we denote by  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P$  a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mu$ .

##### 4.1. Proof of Lemma 3.2

Let  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$ . The functions  $g(x) = {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, A)$  and  $(g(x))^2$  are  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable. Therefore, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$${}^{\mathfrak{B}}Pg(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[g|\mathfrak{B}](x) = g(x) \quad \text{and} \quad {}^{\mathfrak{B}}Pg^2(x) = g^2(x) = ({}^{\mathfrak{B}}Pg(x))^2.$$

From the Cauchy–Schwarz equality it follows that, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, A) = g(x) = g(y) = {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, A) \quad \text{for } {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X.$$

The first assertion of the lemma is then a consequence of Proposition 2.2.

For any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $y \in X$ ,

$${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, B) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[1_B|\mathfrak{B}](y) = 1_B(y).$$

As  $\mu(dy) = \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, dy)\mu(dx)$ , for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$1_B(y) = {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, B) \quad \text{for } {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X.$$

Hence, for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X 1_A(y)1_B(y){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, dy) &= \int_X 1_A(y){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, B){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, dy) \\ &= \int_X 1_A(y){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, B){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, dy) \quad (\text{first assertion}) \\ &= {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, A){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, B) \\ &= \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, A)1_B(y){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, dy) \\ &= \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, A)1_B(y){}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, dy) \quad (\text{first assertion}). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The Proposition 2.2 allows us to permute “for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$ ” and “for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ .”

##### 4.2. Proof of Proposition 3.3

Let  $X_0$  be a measurable subset of  $X$  such that  $\mu(X_0) = 1$  and for any  $x \in X_0$ ,

$${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, \cdot) = {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, \cdot) \quad \text{for } {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X.$$

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) If the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way, then there exists a measurable subset  $X_1$  of  $X$  such that  $\mu(X_1) = 1$  and for any  $x \in X_1$ ,

$$\forall B \in \mathfrak{B} \quad \mathfrak{B}P(x, B) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

For  $x \in X_0 \cap X_1$ , we have for any  $(A, B) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{B}$ ,

$$\int_X 1_A(y)1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(x, dy) = \mathfrak{B}P(x, A) \mathfrak{B}P(x, B) = \int_X \mathfrak{B}P(y, A)1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(x, dy),$$

which shows that, for any  $x \in X_0 \cap X_1$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot)$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) Assume there exists a measurable subset  $X_2$  of  $X$  such that  $\mu(X_2) = 1$  and for any  $x \in X_2$ ,

$$\forall A \in \mathfrak{X} \quad \mathfrak{B}P(y, A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot)}[1_A | \mathfrak{B}](y) \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X.$$

Then for  $x \in X_0 \cap X_2$ , we have, for any  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ,

$$\mathfrak{B}P(x, B) = \mathfrak{B}P(y, B) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot)}[1_B | \mathfrak{B}](y) = 1_B(y) \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X.$$

Hence the assertion (i).

To prove the last assertion of the proposition we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $\mathfrak{C}$  be two sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathfrak{X}$  such that  $\mathfrak{C} \subset \mathfrak{B}$ . Then for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , we have the probability equalities*

$$\mathfrak{C}P \mathfrak{B}P(x, \cdot) = \mathfrak{B}P \mathfrak{C}P(x, \cdot) = \mathfrak{C}P(x, \cdot).$$

**Proof.** For any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$ , we have the classical  $\mu$ -almost everywhere equalities

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbb{E}_\mu[1_A | \mathfrak{B}] | \mathfrak{C}] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbb{E}_\mu[1_A | \mathfrak{C}] | \mathfrak{B}] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[1_A | \mathfrak{C}].$$

Moreover, if  $f$  and  $g$  are non-negative (or bounded) measurable functions, we know that:  $f = g$   $\mu$ -a.e.  $\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\mu[f | \mathfrak{B}] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[g | \mathfrak{B}]$   $\mu$ -a.e. It follows that, for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$ ,

$$\mathfrak{C}P \mathfrak{B}P(x, A) = \mathfrak{B}P \mathfrak{C}P(x, A) = \mathfrak{C}P(x, A) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost every } x \in X.$$

Then the result follows from Proposition 2.2. □

Assume (ii), for  $\mu$ -almost every  $z \in X$ , we have: for any  $(A, B) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{B}$ ,

$$\int_X 1_A(y)1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(z, dy) = \int_X \mathfrak{B}P(y, A)1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(z, dy).$$

As  $\mu(dz) = \int_X \mathfrak{C}P(x, dz)\mu(dx)$ , for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$  and  $\mathfrak{C}P(x, \cdot)$ -almost every  $z \in X$ , for any  $(A, B) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{B}$ ,

$$\int_X 1_A(y)1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(z, dy) = \int_X \mathfrak{B}P(y, A)1_B(y) \mathfrak{B}P(z, dy).$$

Integration by  $\mathfrak{C}P(x, dz)$  gives us, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\forall (A, B) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{B} \quad \int_X 1_A(y)1_B(y) \mathfrak{C}P \mathfrak{B}P(x, dy) = \int_X \mathfrak{B}P(y, A)1_B(y) \mathfrak{C}P \mathfrak{B}P(x, dy).$$

Then the result follows from Lemma 4.1.

4.3. Proof of Theorem 3.4

Case of two  $\sigma$ -algebras

We need the following result.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. Let  $\mathfrak{F}_1$  [resp.  $\mathfrak{F}_2$ ] be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{F}$ ; we call  $P_1$  [resp.  $P_2$ ] the operator of conditional expectation relative to  $\mathfrak{F}_1$  [resp.  $\mathfrak{F}_2$ ] on the space  $\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .*

*Then, for  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , the sequences of functions*

$$\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (P_1 P_2)^k f \right)_{n \geq 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (P_2 P_1)^k f \right)_{n \geq 1}$$

*converge  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost everywhere and in norm  $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$  towards  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[f | \overline{\mathfrak{F}_1} \cap \overline{\mathfrak{F}_2}]$ .*

**Proof.** It's a consequence of the classical ergodic theorem of E. Hopf (see [5], Proposition V-6-3). To identify the limit we note that:  $P_2 P_1$  is the dual operator of  $P_1 P_2$  and, as the operators  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are idempotent, the common limit is  $P_1$ - and  $P_2$ -invariant (see also [1]). □

Let  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_2$  be two sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathfrak{X}$  decomposing  $\mu$  in an ergodic way which satisfy  $\overline{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \overline{\mathfrak{B}_2} = \overline{\mathfrak{B}_1 \cap \mathfrak{B}_2}$ . We set  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{B}_1 \cap \mathfrak{B}_2$ .

The above theorem tells us that, for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  the sequence of functions  $(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (\mathfrak{B}_1 P \mathfrak{B}_2 P)^k f)_{n \geq 1}$  converges  $\mu$ -a.e. and in  $\mathbb{L}^1(\mu)$ -norm towards  $\overline{\mathcal{C}} P f = \mathcal{C} P f$ .

As  $\mu(\cdot) = \int_X \mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot) \mu(dx)$ , it follows that, for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , the sequence of functions  $(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (\mathfrak{B}_1 P \mathfrak{B}_2 P)^k f)_{n \geq 1}$  converges  $\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)$ -a.e. towards  $\mathcal{C} P f$ .

We call  $X_0$  a measurable subset of  $X$ , such that  $\mu(X_0) = 1$  and for any  $x \in X_0$ , for  $i \in 1, 2$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}_i P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}_i$  and  $\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)$  (Proposition 3.3).

The same theorem tells us that, for any  $x \in X_0$  and for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot))$ , the sequence of functions  $(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (\mathfrak{B}_1 P \mathfrak{B}_2 P)^k f)_{n \geq 1}$  converge  $\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)$ -a.e. and in  $\mathbb{L}^1(\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot))$ -norm towards  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)}[f | \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_2}]$  where, for  $i = 1$  or  $2$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_i}$  is the  $\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)$ -completed  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{B}_i$ .

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a countable subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$  generating  $\mathfrak{X}$ . From above and Lemma 3.2, it follows that, for  $\mu$ -almost any  $x \in X$ , for any  $A \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\text{for } \mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X, \quad \mathcal{C} P(x, A) = \mathcal{C} P(y, A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)}[1_A | \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_2}](y).$$

We deduce that, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\forall (A, C) \in \mathcal{X} \times (\widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_2}) \quad \int_X 1_A(y) 1_C(y) \mathcal{C} P(x, dy) = \int_X \mathcal{C} P(y, A) 1_C(y) \mathcal{C} P(x, dy).$$

These equalities extend to the couples  $(A, C) \in \mathfrak{X} \times (\widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_2})$  (Proposition 2.2).

Since  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{B}_1 \cap \mathfrak{B}_2 \subset \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_1} \cap \widetilde{\mathfrak{B}_2}$ , the above equalities show that, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathcal{C} P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C} P(x, \cdot)$ . From the Proposition 3.3, the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{C}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.

Case of a sequence of  $\sigma$ -algebras

Let  $(\mathfrak{B}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathfrak{X}$  which decompose  $\mu$  in an ergodic way and satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4.

For any  $n \geq 2$ , we have

$$\overline{\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathfrak{B}_i} \subset \overline{\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} \mathfrak{B}_i \cap \mathfrak{B}_n} \subset \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i}.$$

From our hypothesis, it follows that

$$\overline{\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathfrak{B}_i} = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i}$$

and consequently

$$\overline{\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathfrak{B}_i} = \overline{\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} \mathfrak{B}_i \cap \mathfrak{B}_n} = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_i}.$$

We set

$$\forall n \geq 1 \quad \mathfrak{C}_n = \bigcap_{k=1}^n \mathfrak{B}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{C} = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathfrak{B}_k.$$

From the case treated previously, we prove by induction that, for any  $n \geq 1$ , the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{C}_n$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way. From Proposition 3.3, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\forall (A, C) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{C}_n \quad \int_X 1_A(y) 1_C(y) \mathfrak{C}_n P(x, dy) = \int_X \mathfrak{C}_n P(y, A) 1_C(y) \mathfrak{C}_n P(x, dy).$$

The decreasing martingale theorem implies that, for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[1_A | \mathfrak{C}_n](x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu[1_A | \mathfrak{C}](x)$ . Consequently, for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathfrak{C}_n P(x, A) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathfrak{C} P(x, A)$ .

As  $\mu(\cdot) = \int_X \mathfrak{C} P(x, \cdot) \mu(dx)$ , it follows that: for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\text{for } \mathfrak{C} P(x, \cdot)\text{-almost every } y \in X, \quad \mathfrak{C}_n P(y, A) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathfrak{C} P(y, A).$$

While limiting itself to elements  $C$  of  $\mathfrak{C}$ , the dominated convergence theorem implies that, for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\forall C \in \mathfrak{C} \quad \int_X 1_A(y) 1_C(y) \mathfrak{C} P(x, dy) = \int_X \mathfrak{C} P(y, A) 1_C(y) \mathfrak{C} P(x, dy).$$

Now from Proposition 2.2, we can permute “for any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$ ” and “for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,” which shows that  $\mathfrak{C}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.

The preceding proof shows the following corollary which improves Shimomura’s result.

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let  $(\mathfrak{B}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathfrak{X}$ . If for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigcap_{i=0}^n \mathfrak{B}_i$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way, then the intersection  $\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{B}_i$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.*

*Case of an uncountable family of  $\sigma$ -algebras*

We need the following lemmas.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$  be a separable Hilbert space. Let  $\{V_i : i \in I\}$  a noncountable family of closed vector subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then there exists a countable subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $\bigcap_{i \in I} V_i = \bigcap_{i \in J} V_i$ .*

**Proof.** We easily see that the orthogonal complement  $V^\perp$  of  $V = \bigcap_{i \in I} V_i$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  is equal to  $\overline{\text{Vect}(\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i^\perp)}$  (the closure of the subspace generated by  $\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i^\perp$ ). We choose a dense sequence of vectors  $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of  $\text{Vect}(\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i^\perp)$  in  $V^\perp$ . The Schmidt orthonormalization process allows us to extract a maximal orthonormal system; that is, an Hilbert basis  $(e_n)_{n \geq 1}$  de  $V^\perp$ . For any  $p \geq 1$ ,  $e_p$  is a finite linear combination of vectors from  $\{u_n : n \geq 1\}$ ; each  $u_n$  is itself a finite linear combination of vectors of  $\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i^\perp$ . Therefore, there exists a countable subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that,  $\forall p \geq 1$ ,  $e_p \in \text{Vect}(\bigcup_{i \in J} V_i^\perp)$ . Hence  $V^\perp = \overline{\text{Vect}(\bigcup_{i \in J} V_i^\perp)}$  and  $V = \bigcap_{i \in J} V_i$ . □

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\mathfrak{B}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$  which decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way. Let  $\mathfrak{C}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{B}$  such that, for any bounded  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable function  $f$ , there exists a bounded  $\mathfrak{C}$ -measurable function  $g$  satisfying  $f = g$   $\mu$ -a.e.*

*Then  $\mathfrak{C}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.*

**Proof.** From Proposition 3.3, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  ${}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(x, \cdot)$ , that is,

$$\forall (A, B) \in \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{B} \quad \int_X 1_A(y) 1_B(y) {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(x, dy) = \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, A) 1_B(y) {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(x, dy).$$

In these equalities, we have to replace  ${}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, A)$  by  ${}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(y, A)$ . From Proposition 2.2, we can restrict our equalities to  $A \in \mathcal{X}$  a separable sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$  generating  $\mathfrak{X}$ .

Let  $f$  be a bounded  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable function. There exists a bounded  $\mathfrak{C}$ -measurable function  $g$  such that  $f = g$   $\mu$ -a.e. Then we have,  $\mu$ -a.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[f|\mathfrak{B}] = f = g = \mathbb{E}_\mu[g|\mathfrak{C}] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f|\mathfrak{C}].$$

It follows that, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $y \in X$ ,

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{X} \quad {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, A) = {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(y, A).$$

Now from  $\mu(dy) = \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(x, dy) \mu(dx)$  we deduce that, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , for  ${}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(x, \cdot)$ -almost every  $y \in X$ ,

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{X} \quad {}^{\mathfrak{B}}P(y, A) = {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(y, A)$$

and consequently, for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\forall (A, B) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathfrak{B} \quad \int_X 1_A(y) 1_B(y) {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(x, dy) = \int_X {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(y, A) 1_B(y) {}^{\mathfrak{C}}P(x, dy).$$

Hence the result. □

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $\{\mathfrak{B}_n: n \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$  be a sequence of sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathfrak{X}$  satisfying, for any  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq n} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_k} = \overline{\bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathfrak{B}_k}$ .*

*Then  $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_k} = \overline{\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{B}_k}$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$ . From the decreasing martingale theorem, we have,  $\mu$ -almost everywhere,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ f \middle| \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_k} \right] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ f \middle| \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq n} \overline{\mathfrak{B}_k} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ f \middle| \overline{\bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathfrak{B}_k} \right] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ f \middle| \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathfrak{B}_k \right] = \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ f \middle| \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathfrak{B}_k \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Hence the result. □

Consider the separable Hilbert space  $\mathbb{L}^2(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$ . It is well known that, for each sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$ , the space  $\mathbb{L}^2(X, \mathfrak{B}, \mu)$  is identified to a closed subspace of  $\mathbb{L}^2(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  and the conditional expectation relative to  $\mathfrak{B}$  is identified to the orthogonal projection onto this closed subspace.

Let  $\{\mathfrak{B}_i: i \in I\}$  be an uncountable family of  $\mu$ -complete sub- $\sigma$ -algebras which decompose  $\mu$  in an ergodic way and satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4. From the Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6, there exists a countable subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that

$$\mathbb{L}^2 \left( X, \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{B}_i, \mu \right) \subset \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathbb{L}^2(X, \mathfrak{B}_i, \mu) = \bigcap_{i \in J} \mathbb{L}^2(X, \mathfrak{B}_i, \mu) = \mathbb{L}^2 \left( X, \bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{B}_i, \mu \right).$$



It follows that for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(X, \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{B}_i, \mu)$  there exists a function  $g \in \mathcal{L}^2(X, \bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{B}_i, \mu)$  such that  $f = g$ ,  $\mu$ -a.e. According to the case treated previously, we know that the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{B}_i$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way. Then the result follows from Lemma 4.5.

### 5. Examples and applications

1. Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  be a probability space with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing a  $\mu$ -approximating compact class. Let  $\tau$  be an invertible bi-measurable transformation of  $(X, \mathfrak{X})$  such that  $\mu$  is quasi-invariant for the action of  $\tau$ . We consider the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{J} = \mathfrak{J}_\tau$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$  defined by  $\mathfrak{J} = \{B \in \mathfrak{X} : \tau^{-1}(B) = B\}$ . Then the following result is well known.

**Proposition 5.1.** *The  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{J}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.*

**Proof.** An idea of the proof is the following. We consider the contraction  $T$  of  $\mathbb{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  defined by

$$Tf(x) = f \circ \tau^{-1}(x) \frac{d(\tau(\mu))}{d(\mu)}(x).$$

Replacing  $\tau$  by  $\tau^{-1}$  we obtain the inverse operator  $T^{-1}$ .

From the Chacon–Ornstein ergodic theorem, one proves [2] that, with obvious notations: for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$  and for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,

$$\sum_{k=-n}^n T^k f(x) / \sum_{k=-n}^n T^k 1(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathfrak{J}P f(x).$$

One sees easily that there exists a measurable subset  $X_0$  of  $X$  such that  $\mu(X_0) = 1$  and for any  $x \in X_0$  the probability  $\mathfrak{J}P(x, \cdot)$  is  $\tau$ -quasi-invariant with  $\frac{d(\tau \mathfrak{J}P(x, \cdot))}{d\mathfrak{J}P(x, \cdot)} = \frac{d(\tau \mu)}{d\mu}$ .

Then the same ergodic theorem tells us that, for any  $x \in X_0$ , for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{J}P(x, \cdot))$  and for  $\mathfrak{J}P(x, \cdot)$ -almost every  $y \in X$ ,

$$\sum_{k=-n}^n T^k f(y) / \sum_{k=-n}^n T^k 1(y) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{J}P(x, \cdot)}[f | \mathfrak{J}](x).$$

As in the first case of Theorem 3.4, we prove that for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathfrak{J}P$  is a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{J}$  and  $\mathfrak{J}P(x, \cdot)$ . The result follows from Proposition 3.3. □

In [3], Greshchonig and Schmidt consider the case of a Borel action of a locally compact second countable group  $G$  on a standard probability space  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu)$ ; that is, a group homomorphism  $g \mapsto \tau_g$  from  $G$  into the group  $\text{Aut}(X)$  of Borel automorphisms of  $X$  such that the map  $(g, x) \mapsto \tau_g x$  from  $G \times X$  to  $X$  is Borel and  $\mu$  is quasi-invariant under each  $\tau_g, g \in G$ . They prove that the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigcap_{g \in G} \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_g}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.

The Theorem 3.4 makes it possible to find and improve this result.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $\{\tau_i : i \in I\}$  be a non-empty family of Borel automorphisms of  $X$ . Then the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_i}$  of  $\mathfrak{X}$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.*

**Proof.** Taking into account the Proposition 5.1, it is enough to show that, for any finite subset  $J$  of  $I$ ,  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \overline{\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_i}} = \overline{\bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_i}}$ .

Let  $f$  be a  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \overline{\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_i}}$ -measurable function. We set  $X_0 = \bigcap_{i \in J} \{f \circ \tau_i = f\}$ ; we have  $\mu(X_0) = 1$ .

We call  $G$  the algebraic subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(X)$  generated by the Borel automorphisms  $\{\tau_i : i \in J\}$ ;  $G$  is a countable subset of  $\text{Aut}(X)$ . The subset  $X_1 = \bigcap_{s \in G} s X_0$  of  $X_0$  belongs to  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_i}$  and  $\mu(X_1) = 1$ . Then the function  $g = f 1_{X_1}$  is  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{J}_{\tau_i}$ -measurable and  $f = g \mu$ -a.e. Which shows that  $f$  is  $\bigcap_{i \in J} \overline{\mathfrak{J}_{\tau_i}}$ -measurable. □

2. Let  $(X, \mathfrak{X}, \mu, \tau)$  be a dynamical system with a polish space and a not necessarily invertible transformation. We denote by  $(Y, \mathfrak{Y}, \lambda, \eta)$  the natural extension of our dynamical and by  $\pi$  the natural projection of  $Y$  onto  $X$ . With obvious notations, one sees easily that  $f$  is  $\mathfrak{J}_\eta \cap \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X})$ -measurable (resp.  $\overline{\mathfrak{J}_\eta \cap \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X})}$ -measurable) if and only if there exists  $g \in \mathfrak{J}_\tau$  such that  $f = g \circ \pi$  (resp.  $f = g \circ \pi$   $\lambda$ -a.e.). It follows that

$$\overline{\mathfrak{J}_\eta \cap \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X})} = \overline{\mathfrak{J}_\eta \cap \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X})}.$$

We know that the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{J}_\eta$  decomposes  $\lambda$  in an ergodic way. The  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X})$  is separable. Therefore the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{J}_\eta \cap \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{X})$  decomposes  $\lambda$  in an ergodic way.

Let  $P$  be a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{J}_\tau$  and  $\mu$ . Let  $Q$  be a regular conditional probability with respect to  $\mathfrak{C}$  and  $\lambda$ . For any  $A \in \mathfrak{X}$  and  $C \in \mathfrak{J}_\tau$  we have:

$$\int_X P(x, A) 1_C(x) \mu(dx) = \int_X 1_A(x) 1_C(x) \mu(dx)$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Y P(\pi(y), A) 1_C(\pi(y)) \lambda(dy) &= \int_Y 1_A(\pi(y)) 1_C(\pi(y)) \lambda(dy) \\ &= \int_Y \mathbb{E}_\lambda[1_A \circ \pi | \mathfrak{C}](y) 1_C(\pi(y)) \lambda(dy) \\ &= \int_Y Q(y, \pi^{-1}(A)) 1_C(\pi(y)) \lambda(dy). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Which proves, via the Proposition 2.2, that

$$\text{for } \lambda\text{-almost every } y \in Y, \quad P(\pi(y), \cdot) = Q(y, \pi^{-1}(\cdot))$$

and the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{J}_\tau$  decomposes  $\mu$  in an ergodic way.

3. Let  $P$  be a transition probability on a measurable space  $(X, \mathfrak{X})$  with a separable  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{X}$  containing a  $\mu$ -approximating compact class.

We denote by  $\Pi$  the set of  $P$ -invariant probability measures on  $(X, \mathfrak{X})$ :

$$\pi \in \Pi \iff \int_X f(x) \pi P(dx) = \int_X P f(x) \pi(dx) = \int_X f(x) \pi(dx)$$

for any non-negative or bounded measurable function  $f$  on  $X$ . We assume that  $\Pi \neq \emptyset$ .

For any  $\pi \in \Pi$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{B}_\pi$  the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{X}$  defined by:

$$\mathfrak{B}_\pi = \{A \in \mathfrak{X}: P 1_A = 1_A \pi\text{-a.e.}\}$$

and we set  $\mathfrak{B} = \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathfrak{B}_\pi$ .

Let  $\pi \in \Pi$ . Let  $f$  be a bounded  $\mathfrak{B}_\pi$ -measurable function on  $X$ . The function  $g$ , defined by

$$g(x) = \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} P^k f(x),$$

satisfies  $g = f \pi$ -a.e. and  $Pg \leq g$ . From the latter inequality, it follows that, for any  $\sigma \in \Pi$ ,  $Pg = g$   $\sigma$ -a.e. and  $g$  is  $\mathfrak{B}$ -measurable. We deduce that  $\mathfrak{B}_\pi = \mathfrak{B}$   $\pi$ -a.e.

From the Hopf theorem ([3], Proposition V-6-3), for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathfrak{X}, \pi)$ , the sequences of functions

$$\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{d((f\pi)P^k)}{d\pi} \right)_{n \geq 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} P^k f \right)_{n \geq 1}$$

converge  $\pi$ -almost everywhere and in norm  $\mathbb{L}^1(\pi)$  towards  $\mathfrak{B}_\pi P f = \mathfrak{B} P f$ . As in Example 1, one deduces that  $\mathfrak{B}$  decomposes  $\pi$  in an ergodic way.

## Acknowledgments

I wish to thank B. Bekka and S. Gouëzel for helpful discussions and the referees for their careful reading and valuable comments.

## References

- [1] D. L. Burkholder and Y. S. Chow. Iterates of conditional expectations operators. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **12** (1961) 490–495. MR0142144
- [2] J.-P. Conze and A. Raugi. On the ergodic decomposition for a cocycle. Preprint, 2007. (pdf version “ReducErg.pdf” in personal university site.)
- [3] G. Greschonig and K. Schmidt. Ergodic decomposition of quasi-invariant probability measures. *Colloq. Math.* **84/85** (2000) 495–514. MR1784210
- [4] J. Kerstan and A. Wakolbinger. Ergodic decomposition of probability laws. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **56** (1981) no. 3 399–414. MR0621119
- [5] J. Neveu. *Bases Mathématiques du Calcul des Probabilités*. Masson, Paris, 1964. MR0198504
- [6] K. Schmidt. A probabilistic proof of ergodic decomposition. *Sankhyā Ser. A* **40** (1978) no. 1 10–18. MR0545459
- [7] H. Shimomura. Ergodic decomposition of quasi-invariant measures. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **14** (1978) no. 2 359–381. MR0509194
- [8] H. Shimomura. Remark to the ergodic decomposition of measures. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **26** (1990) no. 5 861–865. MR1082320