

SOME CHARACTERIZATIONS OF DOMINATION

JAIRO BOCHI AND NICOLAS GOURMELON

ABSTRACT. We show that a cocycle has a dominated splitting if and only if there is a uniform exponential gap between singular values of its iterates. Then we consider sets Σ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ with the property that any cocycle with values in Σ has a dominated splitting. We characterize these sets in terms of existence of invariant multicones, thus extending a 2-dimensional result by Avila, Bochi, and Yoccoz. We give an example showing how these multicones can fail to have convexity properties.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a compact invariant set for a diffeomorphism T , and $E \oplus F$ is a splitting of the tangent bundle over X that is invariant by the tangent map dT . Following Smale, the splitting is called *hyperbolic* if vectors in E are uniformly expanded by dT , while vectors in F are uniformly contracted. This notion is very stringent, and many weaker forms of it are studied in the literature. One of these, that is the concern of this paper, is *domination*. A splitting $E \oplus F$ as above is called *dominated* if above each point all vectors in E are more expanded than all vectors in F . This is equivalent to E being a hyperbolic attractor and F being a hyperbolic repeller in the projective bundle. Hence domination could also be called uniform projective hyperbolicity.

This notion was important in the works of Mañé [13] and Liao [11] on Smale's Stability Conjecture. The term "dominated splitting" apparently was introduced by Mañé in [14]. The concept of domination also appeared in Ordinary Differential Equations under several different forms and names, see [12, 7, 15, 19, 16]. Among recent work in Differentiable Dynamical Systems involving domination, one can mention [4, 17, 3, 18, 9].

The concepts of hyperbolicity and domination naturally make sense in the general setting of automorphisms of vector bundles, or *linear cocycles*. In the case of bundles of the form $X \times \mathbb{R}^d$, a linear cocycle is then canonically identified to a pair (T, A) , where T is a dynamics on X and A is a family of matrices indexed by X . Such systems are widely studied in several contexts, as for example products of random matrices and Schrödinger operators [6].

Our aim is to give some characterizations of domination. Let us briefly summarize the results and the organization of this paper.

In [20], Yoccoz shows that a cocycle on a 2-dimensional vector bundle admits a hyperbolic splitting if and only if the non-conformality of the matrices of the iterates grows uniformly exponentially. Our first result extends this to any dimension, giving a necessary and sufficient criterium for domination that does not refer to any splitting. More precisely, we prove in Section 2 that a cocycle admits a dominated splitting $E \oplus F$ with $\dim E = i$ if and only if the i -eccentricity (the ratio between the i -th and $(i + 1)$ -th singular values) of the matrices of the n -th iterate increase uniformly exponentially as n goes to ∞ .

In Section 3, we deal with bundles of the form $X \times \mathbb{R}^d$. We consider families of matrices $A = \{A_x\}_{x \in X}$ that are dominated in the sense that the cocycle (T, A) admits a dominated splitting for any choice of the dynamics T . A study of dominated finite families of

Date: August 31, 2008.

Both authors were partially supported by CNPq (Brazil).

matrices in $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ was initiated by [20, 2]. An important tool is the characterization of these families by the existence of what they call *invariant multicones* in projective space. Here we find a generalization of such a description to arbitrary dimension.

Much of the results of [2] rely on the simple structure of the multicones in dimension 2. This simplicity cannot be retrieved in greater dimension. Indeed, we show in Section 4 that the connected components of the multicones may fail to have any convexity property.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Christian Bonatti for some important ideas and discussions. Also thanks to Sylvain Crovisier and Lorenzo Díaz.

2. DOMINATED SPLITTINGS FOR COCYCLES

Let V be a continuous vector bundle over a compact Hausdorff space X , and of finite dimension d . Denote by V_x the fibre over $x \in X$.

Fix on V a (continuous) inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, and let $\|\cdot\|$ be the induced norm. If $B : V_x \rightarrow V_y$ is a linear map, its norm $\|B\|$ and co-norm $\mathbf{m}(B)$ are defined respectively as the supremum and the infimum of $\|Bv\|$ over the unit vectors $v \in V_x$. We have $\mathbf{m}(B) = \|B^{-1}\|^{-1}$ when B is invertible. Let $B^* : V_y \rightarrow V_x$ be the adjoint of B . We denote by $\sigma_1(B) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_d(B)$ the singular values of B , that is, the eigenvalues of $(B^*B)^{1/2}$. We have $\sigma_1(B) = \|B\|$ and $\sigma_d(B) = \mathbf{m}(B)$.

Let $\mathcal{A} : V \rightarrow V$ be a vector bundle automorphism, fibering over a homeomorphism $T : X \rightarrow X$. We also call \mathcal{A} a *cocycle*. For each $x \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let $A^n(x)$ be the restriction of \mathcal{A}^n to the fibre V_x ; it is a linear map from V_x to $V_{T^n(x)}$. We write $A(x) = A^1(x)$. In the case where the vector bundle is trivial, ie, $V = X \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we can regard \mathcal{A} as a map $A : X \rightarrow GL(d, \mathbb{R})$; by abuse of notation we write $\mathcal{A} = (T, A)$.

A *splitting* $E \oplus F$ for the bundle V is a continuous family of splittings $E_x \oplus F_x = V_x$, where we require the dimensions of E_x and F_x to be constant. The dimension of E is called the *index* of the splitting. The splitting is invariant (with respect to \mathcal{A}) if $A(x) \cdot E_x = E_{T(x)}$, $A(x) \cdot F_x = F_{T(x)}$,

A splitting $V = E \oplus F$ is called *dominated* for \mathcal{A} if it is invariant and there are constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \tau < 1$ such that

$$\frac{\|A^n(x)|F_x\|}{\mathbf{m}(A^n(x)|E_x)} < C\tau^n \quad \text{for every } x \in X \text{ and every } n \geq 0.$$

It is also said that E *dominates* F . It is always possible to find an *adapted metric*, that is, an inner product such that $C = 1$, see [10].¹ Some properties about dominated splittings are collected in [5].

Our first result is:

Theorem A. *The following assertions about a vector bundle automorphism \mathcal{A} are equivalent:*

- (a) *There is a dominated splitting of index i .*
- (b) *There exist $C > 0$ and $\tau < 1$ such that $\frac{\sigma_{i+1}(A^n(x))}{\sigma_i(A^n(x))} < C\tau^n$ for all $x \in X$ and $n \geq 0$.*

Theorem A was already proved in dimension 2 by Yoccoz in [20].

Remark. One easily extends the theorem to continuous-time cocycles $t \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^t$, replacing the n -th iteration $A^n(x)$ by the time- n cocycle.

Remark. One can also consider the case where T is non-invertible and the $A(x)$ are all invertible, considering the natural extension $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ of \mathcal{A} that sends any orbit $(v_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of \mathcal{A} on its left shift $(v_{i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and saying that \mathcal{A} admits a domination of index i if and only if

¹The existence of adapted metrics justifies the informal definition of the introduction.

the invertible cocycle $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ admits a domination of index i . From Theorem A and the fact that the products of matrices that appear in the iterates \mathcal{A}^n are the same as those in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n$ one easily deduces that the theorem also holds \mathcal{A} .

Proof. First of all, let us see that the validity of each condition in Theorem A does not depend on the choice of the inner product. This independence is obvious for condition (a), and for condition (b) it is a consequence of the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C_1 > 1$ there is $C_2 > 1$ such that for any linear maps $A, N : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\|N^{\pm 1}\| \leq C_1$, we have*

$$C_2^{-1} \leq \frac{\sigma_k(NA)}{\sigma_k(A)} \leq C_2 \quad \text{for each } k = 1, \dots, d.$$

The same is true if we replace NA by AN .

Proof. We will use a few facts about exterior powers; see e.g. [1]. Let $\wedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$ indicate the k -th exterior power of \mathbb{R}^d . If $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a linear map, then it induces a linear map $\wedge^k A : \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$. The Euclidian inner product in \mathbb{R}^d induces an inner product in $\wedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$, and the corresponding operator norm satisfies

$$\|\wedge^k A\| = \sigma_1(A) \cdots \sigma_k(A).$$

Given another linear map $N : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\|N^{-1}\|^{-k} \|\wedge^k A\| \leq \|\wedge^k(NA)\| \leq \|N\|^k \|\wedge^k A\|$$

The lemma follows. □

Now we prove separately the two implications of Theorem A:

Proof that (a) implies (b). First assume $E \oplus F$ is a dominated splitting of index i . As an immediate consequence of the definition, the angle between E and F is bounded from below. By making a continuous change of the inner product (which is allowed due to the remarks above), we can assume that E_x and F_x are orthogonal at every point $x \in X$. Then for every point x , the map $A(x)^*$ sends the subspaces E_{Tx} and F_{Tx} respectively to E_x and F_x . Hence for any n , the eigenvectors of $[(A^n(x))^* A^n(x)]^{1/2}$ belong to $E_x \cup F_x$. These are of course the singular directions of $A^n(x)$. Once the ratio

$$\frac{\|A^n(x)|_{F_x}\|}{\mathfrak{m}(A^n(x)|_{E_x})}$$

becomes bigger than 1, the singular directions of $A^n(x)$ corresponding to the i biggest singular values (counted with multiplicity) are contained in E_x , and the others are contained in F_x . In particular, the ratio above equals $\sigma_i(A^n(x))/\sigma_{i+1}(A^n(x))$. Condition (b) follows. □

Despite the purely topological nature of Theorem A, our proof makes use of the measure-theoretic Theorem of Oseledets; see e.g. [1]. It asserts that there is a set R of full probability (i.e., R is a Borel set and $\mu(R) = 1$ for every T -invariant Borel probability measure μ) such that for all $x \in R$ the following holds:

- For every non-zero vector $v \in V_x$, the following limits exist:

$$\lambda^+(x, v) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|A^n(x) \cdot v\|,$$

$$\lambda^-(x, v) = \lim_{n \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|A^n(x) \cdot v\|.$$

Moreover the sets of values attained by both are the same and form a finite set $\{\chi_1(x) > \cdots > \chi_k(x)\}$, where $k = k(x)$.

- There is a splitting $V_x = E_x^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_x^k$ such that for each non-zero $v \in V_x$,

$$\lambda^+(x, v) \leq \chi_j(x) \quad \text{iff} \quad v \in E_x^j \oplus \cdots \oplus E_x^k,$$

$$\lambda^-(x, v) \geq \chi_j(x) \quad \text{iff} \quad v \in E_x^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_x^j.$$
- The linear maps $[A^n(x)^* A^n(x)]^{1/2n}$ converge as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ to a linear map whose eigenvalues are $\exp \chi_1(x) > \cdots > \exp \chi_k(x)$. Letting $\hat{E}_x^1, \dots, \hat{E}_x^k$ denote the respective eigenspaces, we have, for each $j = 1, \dots, k$,

$$\hat{E}_x^j \oplus \cdots \oplus \hat{E}_x^k = E_x^j \oplus \cdots \oplus E_x^k.$$

The analogous property for negative time also holds.

The points x in R are called *regular*, the numbers $\chi_j(x)$ are called the *Lyapunov exponents*; and E_x^j are called the *Oseledets spaces*. The *multiplicity* of the exponent $\chi_j(x)$ is defined as the dimension of the corresponding space E_x^j . We rewrite the Lyapunov exponents repeated according to multiplicity as $\lambda_1(x) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_d(x)$. Notice that if x is regular then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sigma_i(A^n(x)) = \lambda_i(x).$$

We can now end the proof of Theorem A:

Proof that (b) implies (a): Assume condition (b) holds for some fixed i . For each $x \in X$ and every sufficiently large n , we have $\sigma_i(A^n(x)) > \sigma_{i+1}(A^n(x))$. Then let $U_x^{(n)}$ be the eigenspace of $[(A^n(x))^* A^n(x)]^{1/2}$ associated to the singular values $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i$, and let $S_x^{(n)}$ be the eigenspace associated to the other singular values. These two spaces are orthogonal.

Claim. The sequence of spaces $S_x^{(n)}$ converges to some F_x , uniformly with respect to $x \in X$.

Proof. Let us estimate the angle $\alpha_n(x)$ between $S_x^{(n)}$ and $S_x^{(n+1)}$. Let $v \in S_x^{(n)}$ be the farthest unit vector from $S_x^{(n+1)}$. Let w be the projection of v on $U_x^{(n+1)}$ along $S_x^{(n+1)}$. Since the spaces $S_x^{(n+1)}$ and $U_x^{(n+1)}$ are orthogonal and so are their images by $A^{n+1}(x)$, we have $\|w\| = \sin \alpha_n(x)$ and

$$\|A^{n+1}(x) \cdot v\| \geq \|A^{n+1}(x) \cdot w\| \geq \sigma_i(A^{n+1}(x)) \|w\|.$$

On the other hand,

$$\|A^{n+1}(x) \cdot v\| \leq \|A(T^n x)\| \cdot \|A^n(x) \cdot v\| \leq \|A\| \sigma_{i+1}(A^n(x)).$$

Thus

$$\sin \alpha_n(x) = \|w\| \leq \frac{\|A\| \sigma_{i+1}(A^n(x))}{\sigma_i(A^{n+1}(x))}$$

Now using the assumption (b) and Lemma 1, we see that there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $\alpha_n(x) < C_1 \tau^n$ for all $x \in X$ and $n \geq 0$. The claim follows. \square

Now assume x is a regular point. Then, by assumption (b) there is a gap between the Lyapunov exponents: $\lambda_i(x) - \lambda_{i+1}(x) \geq \log \tau^{-1}$. Take $j = j(x)$ with $1 \leq j \leq k = k(x)$ such that $\chi_j(x) = \lambda_i(x)$. It follows from the definition of the spaces $S_x^{(n)}$ that their limit F_x equals $E_x^{j+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus E_x^k$. In particular $\lambda^+(x, f) \leq \chi_{j+1}(x) = \lambda_{i+1}(x)$ for every non-zero vector $f \in F_x$.

Next, notice that assumption (b) implies

$$\frac{\sigma_{d+1-i}(A^{-n}(x))}{\sigma_{d-i}(A^{-n}(x))} < C \tau^n, \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } n \geq 0.$$

Thus we can apply a symmetric argument iterating backwards and conclude that for every $x \in X$ there is a space E_x of dimension i , depending continuously on x , that

equals $E_x^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_x^j$ whenever x is a regular point. If e is a non-zero vector in E_x , then $\lambda^+(x, e)$ (as well as $\lambda^-(x, e)$) is at least $\lambda_i(x)$.

Hence for every regular point x and every non-zero vectors $e \in E_x, f \in F_x$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{\|A^n(x) \cdot f\|}{\|A^n(x) \cdot e\|} \text{ exists and is at most } \log \tau.$$

Now consider the continuous fibre bundle $\hat{X} \rightarrow X$ whose fibre over x is $P(E_x) \times P(F_x)$, where the letter P denotes projectivization. Let $\hat{T} : \hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{X}$ be the obvious bundle map induced by \mathcal{A} . Let $\psi : \hat{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\psi(x, \bar{e}, \bar{f}) = \log \frac{\|A(x) \cdot f\|}{\|A(x) \cdot e\|}$$

where e, f are unit vectors in the directions of \bar{e}, \bar{f} , respectively. The Birkhoff averages of ψ under \hat{T} are:

$$\psi_n(x, \bar{e}, \bar{f}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \psi \circ \hat{T}^m(x, \bar{e}, \bar{f}) = \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{\|A^n(x) \cdot f\|}{\|A^n(x) \cdot e\|}.$$

Therefore for every \hat{T} -invariant probability measure ν in \hat{X} , the sequence ψ_n converges at ν -almost every point, and the limit is at most $\log \tau$. Since \hat{T} is a homeomorphism of the compact space \hat{X} , and ψ is continuous, it follows from a standard Krylov-Bogoliubov argument that given any $\tau < \kappa < 1$, there exists n_0 such that for every $n \geq n_0$ we have $\psi_n < \log \kappa$ *uniformly* over \hat{X} . For $n = n_0$, this means that

$$\frac{\|A^{n_0}(x)|_{F_x}\|}{\mathfrak{m}(A^{n_0}(x)|_{E_x})} < \kappa \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

This proves that $V = E \oplus F$ is indeed a splitting, and is dominated for \mathcal{A} . \square

3. DOMINATED SETS

In this part, Σ is a compact subset of $\text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$.

Definition. The set Σ is called *dominated of index i* iff there exist $C > 0$ and $0 < \tau < 1$ such that for any finite sequence A_1, \dots, A_N in Σ we have

$$\frac{\sigma_{i+1}(A_1 \cdots A_N)}{\sigma_i(A_1 \cdots A_N)} < C\tau^N.$$

where $\sigma_i(M)$ denotes, as before, the i -th singular value of the matrix M .

An i -dimensional vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^d is called an *i -plane*. The Grassmannian $G(i, d)$ is defined as the set of i -planes. The linear group $\text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$ naturally acts on $G(i, d)$. Given a subset $C \subset G(i, d)$, we denote by Σ^*C the image of C by the action of Σ , that is the subset $\{A \cdot E ; A \in \Sigma, E \in C\}$ of $G(i, d)$. A subset C of $G(i, d)$ is said to be (*strictly*) *invariant* by Σ if (the closure of) Σ^*C is included in (the interior of) C .

For any $C \subset G(i, d)$ we denote by PC the subset of $P\mathbb{R}^d = G(1, d)$ of directions that are included in some element of C .

Theorem B. *Let $\Sigma \subset \text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$ be a compact set. The following four statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *The set Σ is dominated of index i .*
- (b) *For any dynamics $T : X \rightarrow X$ and any map $A : X \rightarrow \text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$ whose image is contained in Σ , the cocycle (T, A) has a dominated splitting of index i .*
- (c) *There exists a non-empty subset $C \subset G(i, d)$ that is strictly invariant by Σ , and there is a $(d - i)$ -plane that is transverse to all elements of C .*

- (d) *There exists a subset $C \subset P\mathbb{R}^d$ that is strictly invariant by Σ , that contains the projection PE of some i -plane E and that does not intersect the projection PF of some $(d-i)$ -plane F .*

Scholium. *The sets C of conditions (c) and (d) can be chosen so that they have a finite number of connected components (respectively in $G(i, d)$ and $P\mathbb{R}^d$), and their closures are pairwise disjoint.*

Our results motivate the following definition, corresponding to that given in [2] for $d = 2$ and $i = 1$:

Definition. A set C that satisfies condition (c) and has finitely many connected components with pairwise disjoint closures is called an *(unstable) multicone of index i* for Σ .

Proof. We will first prove Theorem B, and then explain how the scholium follows.

The *universal Σ -valued cocycle* is the linear cocycle (T, A) on $X \times \mathbb{R}^d$ where X is the set of \mathbb{Z} -indexed sequences in Σ , the dynamics $T: X \rightarrow X$ is the shift, and $A: X \rightarrow \text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$ maps $x = (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X$ to x_0 .

It is easy to see that (b) is equivalent to:

- (b') The universal Σ -valued cocycle admits a dominated splitting of index i .

By Theorem A, conditions (a) and (b') are equivalent. We are going to prove that:

$$(c) \Rightarrow (d) \Rightarrow (b') \Rightarrow (c).$$

Proof that (c) implies (d). Let C be as in (c). Then the projection PC of C on $P\mathbb{R}^d$ is the good candidate to satisfy (d). Indeed, since C strictly invariant by Σ , we have

$$\overline{\Sigma^*PC} = \overline{P(\Sigma^*C)} \subset P(\overline{\Sigma^*C}) \subset P(\text{int } C) \subset \text{int}(PC).$$

In other words, PC as well is strictly invariant by Σ . □

If a, b, c, d are distinct points in the extended real line $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, then their cross-ratio is defined as the real number

$$[a, b, c, d] = \frac{c-a}{b-a} \cdot \frac{d-b}{d-c}.$$

By taking projective morphisms, the definition is extended to any projective line.

Proof that (d) implies (b'). Let C be a subset of $P\mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfies all the conditions of (d). Let (T, A) be the universal Σ -valued cocycle. Let \mathcal{C} be the cone field $X \times C$ and \mathcal{C}^n the n -th iterate of \mathcal{C} by (T, A) . Let \mathcal{C}^∞ be the intersection $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}^n$ and denote by \mathcal{C}_x^n the fibre of \mathcal{C}^n above x , for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Claim. For all $x \in X$ the fibre \mathcal{C}_x^∞ is a projective vector space.

This claim and its proof are adapted from an idea of Christian Bonatti for diffeomorphisms.

Proof of the claim. It suffices to prove that for any pair $u \neq v$ of points in \mathcal{C}_x^∞ , the projective line D spanned by them is contained in \mathcal{C}_x^∞ . We reason by contradiction. Assume that D is not contained in \mathcal{C}_x^∞ . Then by compactness we find two vectors $e \neq f$ in the boundary $\partial_D \mathcal{C}_x^\infty$ of $\mathcal{C}_x^\infty \cap D$ relative to D . By definition of \mathcal{C}^∞ , we find sequences e_n, f_n in $\partial_D \mathcal{C}_x^n$ such that e_n tends to e and f_n to f . Then the cross-ratio $[e_{n+1}, e_n, f_n, f_{n+1}]$ tends to ∞ as n tends to ∞ . Taking the n -th preimage of these quadruplets by (T, A) , we find sequences a_n, d_n in $\partial \mathcal{C}^1$ and b_n, c_n in $\partial \mathcal{C}$ such that the cross-ratio $[a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n]$ is defined and tends to infinity. This would imply in particular that the distance between $\partial \mathcal{C}^1$ and $\partial \mathcal{C}$ is zero, which is absurd, by compactness and strict invariance of the cone field. The claim is proved. □

We write $\mathcal{C}_x^\infty = PE_x$. Notice that the complement cone field $\mathcal{D} = (X \times P\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \mathcal{C}$ is strictly invariant for the inverse cocycle $(T, A)^{-1}$. Therefore we build an invariant field of vector spaces $\mathcal{D}_x^\infty = PF_x$. The field \mathcal{C} contains an i -dimensional bundle and \mathcal{D} contains a $(d-i)$ -dimensional bundle, therefore E and F are vector bundles of respective dimensions i and $d-i$. Besides the angle between the two bundles is bounded from below by strict invariance of the cone fields.

Let Γ^ϵ be the cone around E formed by the directions $v = v_E + v_F$ where $v_E \in E$, $v_F \in F$ and $\|v_F\| \leq \epsilon\|v_E\|$. For ϵ small enough, Γ^ϵ is in the interior of \mathcal{C} . By definition of E , for n great enough Γ^ϵ contains the n -th iterate of \mathcal{C} . As it is well-known (see [5]), this implies that $E \oplus F$ is a dominated splitting. \square

Avila, Bochi, and Yoccoz [2] already showed that (b') implies (c) in dimension 2. Building an adapted metric, we find a simple proof that extends it to greater dimensions.

Proof that (b') implies (c). Assuming (b'), we will find a set C satisfying the conditions (c) that has finitely many connected components, and such that these components have disjoint closures. Let $X \times \mathbb{R}^d = E^u \oplus E^s$ be the dominated splitting for the universal Σ -valued cocycle.

Claim. If $x = (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ then E_x^s depends only on the future (x_0, x_1, \dots) , while E_x^u depends only on the past (\dots, x_{-2}, x_{-1}) .

Proof. For each point x , let us say that an $(d-i)$ -plane F satisfies property $\mathcal{P}(x)$ if for every i -plane E transverse to F , there are $C > 0$ and $\tau < 1$ such that $\|A^n(x)|F\| < C\tau^n \mathfrak{m}(A^n(x)|E)$ for every $n \geq 0$. Then $E^s(x)$ is the only i -plane that satisfies $\mathcal{P}(x)$. Since $\mathcal{P}(x)$ only depends on the future, so does E_x^s . Symmetrically, we see that E_x^u is a function of the past. \square

We regard the bundles of the dominated splitting as continuous maps $E^u : \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow G(i, d)$, $E^s : \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow G(d-i, d)$. Let C^u and C^s be their respective images. These two sets are compact, and transverse (in the sense that PC^u and PC^s are disjoint). Indeed, for any $x = (x_k)$ and $y = (y_k)$, we have $E_x^u = E_y^u$ and $E_x^s = E_y^s$ where $z = (\dots, x_{-2}, x_{-1}, y_0, y_1, \dots)$, so transversality follows.

Let C^{tr} be the (open) subset of $G(i, d)$ formed by the i -planes that are transverse to C^s . We are going to define a metric d_∞ on this set. Start fixing any Riemannian metric d_0 on $G(i, d)$. Then let

$$d_n(E, F) = \sup_{A \in \Sigma^{*n}} d(A \cdot E, A \cdot F) \quad \text{for } E, F \in C^{\text{tr}}.$$

Notice that d_n goes uniformly exponentially fast to zero on compact subsets of $C^{\text{tr}} \times C^{\text{tr}}$. Indeed, for any $E \in C^{\text{tr}}$, the subbundle $X \times E$ of $X \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is transverse to E^s . Hence, by compactness of X and domination, the positive iterates of $X \times E$ converge exponentially fast to E^u , and the speed of convergence does not depend locally on E . Therefore the series $d_\infty = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} d_i$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $C^{\text{tr}} \times C^{\text{tr}}$. In particular, d_∞ is a metric on C^{tr} that induces the same topology as d_0 .

Notice that if $E \neq F \in C^{\text{tr}}$ then for any $A \in \Sigma$ we have $d_\infty(A \cdot E, A \cdot F) < d_\infty(E, F)$. We call d_∞ an *adapted metric*.

Consider the open ϵ -neighborhood C_ϵ^u of C^u with respect to the d_∞ metric. Since C^u is compact, C_ϵ^u has finitely many connected components. The number of connected components of C_ϵ^u decreases when ϵ increases. Hence one can choose ϵ such that the number of connected components of C_ν^u is the same as for C_ϵ^u , for some $\nu > \epsilon$. Then the connected components of C_ϵ^u are isolated. Finally, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ such that $\Sigma^* C_\delta^u \subset C_\epsilon^u$. Thus C_ϵ^u satisfies all the conditions of (c). \square

This ends the proof of Theorem B.

Proof of the Scholium. First, in the proof that (b') implies (c) we already showed that C can be found with the required additional properties, namely its connected components C_1, \dots, C_k have disjoint closures. Now let $C' \subset P\mathbb{R}^d$ be the union of the sets $\overline{PC_i}$. Since $\overline{C} = \overline{C_1} \cup \dots \cup \overline{C_k}$ is strictly invariant by Σ , the set C' is also closed and strictly invariant by Σ . It clearly has a finite number of connected components. Thus C' satisfies (d) and the required additional properties. \square

4. AN EXAMPLE

We follow the definition of [8] and say that a set $C \subset P\mathbb{R}^d = G(1, d)$ is *semiconvex* if for any projective line Δ , the intersection of Δ and C is connected. A familiar example is given by:

$$C = P\{(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d; u \in \mathbb{R}^i, v \in \mathbb{R}^{d-i}, \|v\| \leq a\|u\|\}, \quad \text{where } a > 0;$$

(Notice that in this example C is *not* the projectivization of a convex cone in \mathbb{R}^d , say if $i = 2$ and $d = 3$.)

We say that a multicone $C \subset G(i, d)$ is *locally semiconvex* if each of its connected components C_k is such that PC_k is semiconvex.

Assume that Σ is an i -dominated set, and hence has unstable multicone of index i . It is natural to look for multicones with additional good properties. (For example, [2] considers so-called tight multicones.) It is possible to prove that a locally semiconvex unstable multicone of index i always exists, provided i equals 1 or $d - 1$.² We will not prove this fact here, but we will show that it unfortunately does not hold without assuming $i \neq 1, d - 1$. More precisely, we show the following:

Theorem C. *There is a continuous map $A: [0, 1] \rightarrow GL(4, \mathbb{R})$ such that the set $\text{Im}(A)$ is dominated of index 2, and such that $\text{Im}(A)$ has no locally semiconvex unstable (nor stable) multicone of index 2. Moreover, these properties persists by C^0 -perturbations of A .*

We begin with a geometrical construction:

Lemma 2. *There are two continuous one-parameter families of lines $L_1(t), L_2(t)$ in \mathbb{R}^3 , where t runs in $[0, \pi]$, with the following properties:*

- *There are four points $a \in L_1(0), b \in L_2(\pi), c \in L_1(\pi), d \in L_2(0)$ belonging to the oriented x -axis \mathbb{X} such that $a < b < c < d$.*
- *For every t, s , the lines $L_1(t)$ and $L_2(s)$ are skew.*

Proof. We take usual coordinates x, y, z in the space \mathbb{R}^3 . Consider the curves

$$\gamma_1(t) = (t - \sin t, \frac{1}{2} \sin t, 0), \quad \gamma_2(t) = (\frac{3\pi}{2} - t + \sin t, -\frac{1}{2} \sin t, 0), \quad t \in [0, \pi],$$



and their endpoints $a = \gamma_1(0), c = \gamma_1(\pi), d = \gamma_2(0), b = \gamma_2(\pi)$. See Figure 1. Let $v_i(t) = \gamma'_i(t) / \|\gamma'_i(t)\|$. Let $L_i(t)$ be the line containing the point $\gamma_i(t)$ and parallel to the vector $v_i(t) + (0, 0, 1)$. Notice that no lines $L_1(t)$ and $L_2(s)$ are parallel. Next consider the (ruled) surfaces $S_i = \bigcup_t L_i(t)$; see Figure 2. We are left to prove that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$.

Let S_i^+ and S_i^- be the intersections of S_i with the half-spaces $\{z > 0\}$ and $\{z < 0\}$, respectively. Then $S_i = S_i^- \sqcup \text{Im}(\gamma_i) \sqcup S_i^+$. Moreover, each S_i^\pm is the graph of a function z_i^\pm defined on a region P_i^\pm of the xy plane. The regions P_1^- and P_2^- are disjoint. On the other hand, $P_1^+ \cap P_2^+$ has two connected components K_1 and K_2 ; see again Figure 1. On K_1 we have

$$z_1^+ \leq \text{diam}(K_1) < \text{dist}(b, K_1) \leq z_2^+,$$

thus the surfaces do not intersect over K_1 . Symmetrically, the same holds on K_2 . \square

²This leads to interesting dichotomies between i -dominated sets and i -elliptic sets (sets Σ that contain matrices M_1, \dots, M_k such that the i -th and $(i+1)$ -th eigenvalues of the product $M_k \dots M_1$ are complex and conjugate).

FIGURE 1. The curves γ_1, γ_2 and their tangents at the points a, b, c, d .FIGURE 2. The ruled surfaces S_1, S_2 , and the plane $z = 0$.

We remark that the domain of definition above may be extended to some slightly larger interval $[-\epsilon, \pi + \epsilon]$ so that the two families of lines are still skew. Now by transversality of the ruled surfaces L_i and the x -axis \mathbb{X} , one sees that for any C^0 -perturbation L'_i of the families L_i one has:

- two points $a \in L'_1(t_1), c \in L'_1(t_2)$ and two points $b \in L'_2(s_1), d \in L'_2(s_2)$ belonging to \mathbb{X} such that $a < b < c < d$.
- For every t, s , the lines $L'_1(t)$ and $L'_2(s)$ are skew.

Now viewing \mathbb{R}^3 as the subset of points $[x : y : z : 1]$ of $P\mathbb{R}^4$, we have the straightforward consequence:

Lemma 3. *There are two continuous one-parameter families $D_1(t), D_2(s) \in G(2, 4)$, $t, s \in [0, 1]$ such that:*

- every plane $D_1(t)$ is transverse to every plane of $D_2(s)$,
- there is a plane P that contains four lines a, c in planes of $\text{Im}(D_1)$ and b, d in planes of $\text{Im}(D_2)$ such that for some cyclic order in the circle $\mathbb{P}(P)$ we have $a < b < c < d < a$.

Moreover, the same properties hold for C^0 perturbations of D_1, D_2 .

If $D_1(t)$ and $D_2(s)$ are as in the lemma, then the sets $\Gamma_1 = \bigcup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_1(t)$ and $\Gamma_2 = \bigcup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_2(t)$ cannot be semiconvex cones. Fix disjoint open neighborhoods $C_1 \supset \Gamma_1$ and $C_2 \supset \Gamma_2$ in $G(2, 4)$. Now let $\lambda > 1$ and define $A(t) \in GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ for $t \in [0, 1]$ as the linear map that coincides with $\lambda \cdot \text{Id}$ on $D_1(t)$ and with $\lambda^{-1} \cdot \text{Id}$ on $D_2(t)$. Fixing λ large enough, we have that C_1 and C_2 are strictly invariant by the sets $\Sigma = \{A(t)\}$ and $\{A(x)^{-1}\}$, respectively. Any unstable multicone of index 2 of Σ has a connected component PC that contains the set Γ_1 and cannot intersect Γ_2 . By Lemma 3, the projective set PC is not semiconvex. Hence Σ does not admit any locally semiconvex unstable multicone of index 2. By symmetry, the same holds replacing unstable by stable. It is clear that these properties persist by C^0 -perturbations of A . This ends the proof of Theorem C.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arnold, L. *Random Dynamical Systems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [2] Avila, A.; Bochi, J.; Yoccoz, J.-C. Uniformly hyperbolic finite-valued $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -cocycles. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.0133>
- [3] Bochi, J.; Viana, M. The Lyapunov exponents of generic volume preserving and symplectic maps. *Annals of Math.* 161 (2005), 1423–1485.
- [4] Bonatti, C.; Díaz, L. J.; Pujals, E. R. A C^1 -generic dichotomy for diffeomorphisms: weak forms of hyperbolicity or infinitely many sinks or sources. *Ann. of Math.* 158 (2003), 355–418.
- [5] Bonatti, C.; Díaz, L. J.; Viana, M. *Dynamics beyond uniform hyperbolicity: A global geometric and probabilistic perspective*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [6] Bougerol, P.; Lacroix, J. *Products of random matrices with applications to Schrödinger operators*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1985.
- [7] Bylov, B. F.; Vinograd, R. E.; Grobman, D. M.; Nemyckii, V. V. Theory of Lyapunov exponents and its application to problems of stability. (Russian.) Izdat. “Nauka”, Moscow 1966.
- [8] de Groot, J.; de Vries, H. Convex sets in projective space. *Compositio Math.* 13 (1958), 113–118.
- [9] Díaz, L. J. How to put a stop to domination once and for all (and what comes afterwards). In: *Partially hyperbolic dynamics, laminations, and Teichmüller flow*, 3–33, Fields Inst. Commun., 51, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [10] Gourmelon, N. Adapted metrics for dominated splittings. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 27 (2007), 1839–1849.
- [11] Liao, Shan Tao. On the stability conjecture. *Chinese Ann. Math.* 1 (1980), 9–30.
- [12] Lillo, J. C. Perturbations of nonlinear systems. *Acta Math.* 103 (1960), 123–138.
- [13] Mañé, R. Contributions to the stability conjecture. *Topology* 17 (1978), 383–396.
- [14] Mañé, R. Oseledec’s theorem from the generic viewpoint. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Vol. 1, 2 (Warsaw, 1983), 1269–1276, PWN, Warsaw, 1984.
- [15] Millionshchikov, V. M. Systems with integral division which are everywhere dense in the set of all linear systems of differential equations. (Russian.) *Differ. Uravn.* 5 (1969), 1167–1170.
- [16] Palmer, K. J. Exponential separation, exponential dichotomy and spectral theory for linear systems of ordinary differential equations. *J. Differential Equations* 46 (1982), 324–345.
- [17] Pujals, E. R. Tangent bundles dynamics and its consequences. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Vol. III (Beijing, 2002), 327–338, Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.
- [18] Pujals, E. R. From hyperbolicity to dominated splitting. In: *Partially hyperbolic dynamics, laminations, and Teichmüller flow*, 89–102, Fields Inst. Commun., 51, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [19] Sacker, R. J.; Sell, G. R. A spectral theory for linear differential systems. *J. Differential Equations* 27 (1978), 320–358.
- [20] Yoccoz, J.-C. Some questions and remarks about $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles. In: *Modern Dynamical Systems and Applications*, 447–458. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL

URL: www.mat.puc-rio.br/~jairo

E-mail address: jairo@mat.puc-rio.br

IMPA, RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL

E-mail address: nicolas@impa.br