

Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measures for piecewise hyperbolic maps with two directions of instability in three-dimensional spaces

XU ZHANG ¹

Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

Abstract. A class of piecewise C^2 Lozi-like maps in three-dimensional Euclidean spaces is introduced, and the existence of Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measures is studied, where the dimension of the instability is equal to two. Further, an example with computer simulations is provided to illustrate the theoretical results.

1 Introduction

The study of the existence of the invariant measure of a map is an interesting problem in dynamical systems. Sinai investigated the C^2 Anosov diffeomorphism on a compact connected Riemannian manifold, and showed that the measure has absolutely continuous conditional measure on unstable manifolds [18]. Bowen and Ruelle obtained similar results for Axiom A attractors [5]. Based on Sinai, Ruelle, and Bowen's work, the invariant Borel measure, which has absolutely continuous conditional measure on unstable manifolds with respect to the Lebesgue measure, is called the Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measure (SRB measure). For more information on SRB measure, please refer to Young's work [23].

Later, Pesin developed the non-uniformly hyperbolic theory [1, 15]. For singular systems, Katok and Strelcyn investigated the existence of invariant manifolds and obtained some similar results [11]. And, there are lots of work on the billiard systems and so on [7, 12]. In [10], Jakobson and Newhouse obtained some sufficient conditions for the existence of SRB measure for piecewise C^2 diffeomorphisms with unbounded derivatives. In [16], Sánchez-Salas provided some sufficient conditions for the existence of SRB measure for transformations with infinitely many hyperbolic branches.

In the research of two-dimensional maps, there are two important types of maps, one is the Hénon map, the other is the Lozi map. A series of work on the Hénon map obtained by Benedicks, Carlson, Young, Viana, and Wang, described the relationship between the

¹ Email address: xuzhang08@gmail.com (X. Zhang).

parameters and the dynamics deeply [2, 3, 4, 19]. There are lots of results about the Lozi map [8, 20].

The study of the SRB measure also inspires the study of the statistical properties of dynamical systems. The well-known Lasota-Yorke inequality and some generalization contributed to the development of the chaos theory greatly [6, 13]. A powerful tool in the research of the statistical properties is the transfer operator approach [17, 21, 22].

In our present work, we apply the bounded variation function method [14] and Young's idea in two-dimensional maps [20] to study the existence of SRB measure for a class of three-dimensional maps, which can be thought of as the generalization of the Lozi map in three-dimensional spaces, where the dimension of the instability is equal to two. Our results and discussions can be easily generalized to study the maps with several directions of instability in high-dimensional spaces.

The rest is organized as follows. In Section 2, the main result is introduced. In Section 3, the proof of the main results is provided. In Section 4, an example with computer simulations is given to illustrate the theoretical results.

2 Main Results

In this section, the main results are introduced and some basic concepts and lemmas are given.

Given any $0 = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_p < a_{p+1} = 1$ and $0 = b_0 < b_1 < \dots < b_q < b_{q+1} = 1$, denote

$$S_1 := \{a_1, \dots, a_p\} \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad S_2 := [0, 1] \times \{b_1, \dots, b_q\} \times [0, 1],$$

and

$$S := S_1 \cup S_2, \quad R := [0, 1]^3.$$

There is a natural partition of the set $[0, 1]^2 \setminus ((\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_p, a_{p+1}\} \times [0, 1]) \cup ([0, 1] \times \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_q, b_{q+1}\}))$. Without loss of generality, suppose this partition is

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{(p+1)(q+1)} \Omega_k = [0, 1]^2 \setminus ((\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_p, a_{p+1}\} \times [0, 1]) \cup ([0, 1] \times \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_q, b_{q+1}\})),$$

where $\Omega_{k_1} \cap \Omega_{k_2} = \emptyset$, if $k_1 \neq k_2$, and $\cup \bar{\Omega}_k = [0, 1]^2$. Assume that

$$\Omega_k \cap \{(x, u)\}_{u \in [0, 1]} = \{x\} \times (a_k(x), b_k(x)), \quad \forall x \in [0, 1], \quad 1 \leq k \leq (p+1)(q+1);$$

and

$$\Omega_k \cap \{(u, y)\}_{u \in [0,1]} = (c_k(y), d_k(y)) \times \{y\}, \quad \forall y \in [0, 1], \quad 1 \leq k \leq (p+1)(q+1).$$

So, for any $1 \leq k \leq (p+1)(q+1)$, one has

$$\overline{\Omega}_k \cap \{(x, u)\}_{u \in [0,1]} = \{x\} \times [a_k(x), b_k(x)] \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Omega}_k \cap \{(u, y)\}_{u \in [0,1]} = [c_k(y), d_k(y)] \times \{y\}.$$

Consider a map f on R such that $f(R) \subset R$ and it satisfies the following assumptions:

$$(A0). \quad f|(R-S) \text{ is a } C^2 \text{ map, } f|(R-S) \text{ and } f^{-1}|f(R-S)$$

have bounded first and second derivatives, respectively.

$$(A1). \quad \inf \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} \right| \right\} = \lambda > 1.$$

$$(A2). \quad \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial x} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial y} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial z} \right| \right\} \leq \frac{\lambda}{8}.$$

$$(A3). \quad \text{There is } N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \lambda^N > 2 \text{ and } f_1(f^{k-1}(S_1)) \cap \{a_1, \dots, a_p\} = \emptyset,$$

$$f_2(f^{k-1}(S_2)) \cap \{b_1, \dots, b_q\} = \emptyset, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N.$$

The assumption (A1) means that the action of Df when projected onto the x -axis and y -axis is uniformly expanding, respectively.

Remark 2.1. An example satisfying all the above assumptions is given in the last section.

Definition 2.1. [20] A Borel probability measures μ on $R = [0, 1]^3$ is said to have absolutely continuous conditional measures on unstable manifolds if there exist measurable partitions $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \mathcal{P}_2 \subset \dots$ of R and measurable sets $V_1 \subset V_2 \subset V_3 \subset \dots$ such that

- (i) $\mu(V_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) each element of $\mathcal{P}_n|V_n$ is an open subset of some unstable manifold;
- (iii) if $\{\mu_c : c \in \mathcal{P}_n|V_n\}$ denotes the system of some unstable manifold and $\mathcal{P}_n|V_n$ and m_c denotes Riemannian measure on c , then for almost every $c \in \mathcal{P}_n|V_n$, one has $\mu_c \ll m_c$.

Now, we introduce the bounded variation functions [9, 14]. For any $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the support of any function $h = (h_1, h_2) \in L^1(\Omega, m)$ is contained in Ω , where m is the Lebesgue measure. Set

$$\|h\|_{BV} := \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{C}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2), \|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h \cdot \operatorname{div} \psi \, dm,$$

where $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2)$, $\operatorname{div} \psi = \partial_x \psi_1 + \partial_y \psi_2$, and \mathcal{C}_0^r represents the vector space of r -times differentiable functions with compact support. The bounded variation functions are a subset of L^1 with $\|\cdot\|_{BV}$ finite.

Lemma 2.1. [14]

(i) There exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|h\|_{L^1} \leq \|h\|_{L^2} \leq C_0 \|h\|_{BV}, \quad \forall h \in BV(\Omega);$$

(ii) for almost x and y ,

$$h(x, \cdot), h(\cdot, y) \in BV(\mathbb{R}) \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, m), \quad \forall h \in BV(\Omega);$$

(iii) for each $h \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and all $\psi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, m)$ of compact support and such that almost surely, $\psi(x, \cdot), \psi(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $\partial_x \psi(\cdot, y), \partial_y \psi(x, \cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, m)$, one has

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h \cdot \operatorname{div} \psi \, dm \right| \leq \|h\|_{BV} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty}.$$

The main result is stated as follows:

Theorem 2.1. For the map f satisfying (A0)–(A3), there exists an invariant measure, which is an SRB measure.

3 The existence of SRB measure

In this section, it is to show Theorem 2.1.

It follows from the definition of the map f that the unstable manifold are piecewise smooth surface zigzag across R , which are turning around at unknown places. To avoid

the singular set, the strategy is to construct an invariant measure μ with good dynamical behavior on a neighborhood of the singular set S .

First, given any C^2 surface $\alpha : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, suppose that (A1) and (A2) hold, it is to show that if the angle between the normal vector of the surface and the z -axis (including both the positive and negative axes) is less than 45 degrees, then the angle between the normal vector of $f(\text{graph}(\alpha))$ and the z -axis is also less than 45 degrees, except points in the image of the singular set.

The graph of α is $(x, y, \alpha(x, y))$. The normal vector is the cross product of the vectors $\langle 1, 0, \alpha_x \rangle$ and $\langle 0, 1, \alpha_y \rangle$, that is, $\langle -\alpha_x, -\alpha_y, 1 \rangle$. The cosine of the angle between the normal vector and the z -axis is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\alpha_x^2+\alpha_y^2}}$ or $\frac{-1}{\sqrt{1+\alpha_x^2+\alpha_y^2}}$. The assumption that the angle between the normal vector and the z -axis is less than 45 degrees is equivalent to

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \alpha_x^2 + \alpha_y^2}} \right| \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}. \quad (3.1)$$

Since $f(\text{graph}(\alpha)) = (f_1(x, y, \alpha), f_2(x, y, \alpha), f_3(x, y, \alpha))$, one has that the tangent vectors are

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} \right)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} \right).$$

So, the cross product is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\left(\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} + \left(\frac{\partial f_3}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} \right] \vec{i} \\ & - \left[\left(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} + \left(\frac{\partial f_3}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} \right] \vec{j} \\ & + \left[\left(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} + \left(\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} \right] \vec{k} \\ & := A\vec{i} + B\vec{j} + C\vec{k}. \end{aligned}$$

The absolute value of the cosine of the angle between the normal vector and the z -axis is $\frac{|C|}{\sqrt{A^2+B^2+C^2}}$. By (A2), (A3), and (3.1), one has that $|C| \geq |A| + |B|$, which implies that $\frac{|C|}{\sqrt{A^2+B^2+C^2}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. Hence, the angle between the normal vector and the z -axis is less than 45 degrees.

Let $p_x : R \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $p_y : R \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the projection onto the x -axis and y -axis, respectively. The Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ is denoted by m . If μ is a measure on

R , then $f_*\mu$ is defined by $f_*\mu(E) = \mu(f^{-1}(E))$. Let $J = [a, b] \times [c, d] \subset [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ be a closed rectangle and $\alpha : J \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^2 function with the normal vector very close to the z -axis. Then the image of $\text{graph}(\alpha)$ under the map f is a union of finitely many smooth surfaces, which are denoted by $\{L_i(\alpha)\}$. Similarly, set the smooth surfaces of $f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))$ as $\{L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}\}$ such that $f(L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}) = \cup_j L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k j}$. Let μ_0 be the measure on $\text{graph}(\alpha)$ such that $(p_x \times p_y)_*\mu_0$ is the normalized Lebesgue measure on J , set $\mu_k := (f^k)_*\mu_0$. By (A1) and (A2), one has that $(p_x \times p_y)_*\mu_k|_{L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure m . The density of $(p_x \times p_y)_*\mu_k|_{L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}}$ and $(p_x \times p_y)_*\mu_k$ are denoted by $\rho_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}$ and $\hat{\rho}_k$, respectively. So, one has that $\sum_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k} \rho_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k} = \hat{\rho}_k$.

If $N > 1$, where N is specified in (A3), we could define the sets $L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}$ and $L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k j}$ as above for the map f^N . Without loss of generality, assume that $N = 1$ in the following discussions, that is, $\lambda > 2$.

In the following discussions, fix $L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}$ and $L_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k j}$. Set $(p_x \times p_y)L_{i_1 \dots i_k} = \cup_{j=1}^s B_j$, where each B_j is contained in some $\bar{\Omega}_{j'}$, such that $\Omega_{j'_1} \cap \Omega_{j'_2} = \emptyset$, where $B_{j'_1} \subset \bar{\Omega}_{j'_1}$, $B_{j'_2} \subset \bar{\Omega}_{j'_2}$, and $j'_1 \neq j'_2$. So, for the given j , there is a unique B_{j+} such that $f(B_{j+}) = L_{i_1 \dots i_k j}$. Set $D_{j-} = (p_x \times p_y)L_{i_1 \dots i_k j}$. Define the following map $T : B_{j+} \rightarrow D_{j-}$:

$$T(x, y) := (p_x \times p_y) \circ f \circ (p_x \times p_y)^{-1}(x, y).$$

By (A0) and (A1), one has that T is C^2 between B_{j+} and D_{j-} ,

$$\left| \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial x} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial y} \right| \geq \lambda \text{ and } \left| \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial y} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial x} \right| \geq \lambda,$$

where $T = (T_1, T_2)$. Set $T^{-1} := (T_1^{-1}, T_2^{-1})$.

Next, it is to study the density of the invariant measure on the unstable manifolds. And, it is to show the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. For the given surface α as above, there exist an invariant Borel probability measure μ on α and a function $\rho : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of bounded variation such that $d((p_x \times p_y)_*\mu) = \rho dm$.

Proof. For the given surface α , it is to show that there is a positive constant M such that $\|\hat{\rho}_k\|_{BV([0,1]^2)} \leq M$.

Suppose $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ with $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\|\phi\|_\infty \leq 1$. It follows from direct calculation that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k j}\|_{BV} &= \sum_j \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \rho_{i_1 \dots i_k j}(x, y) \left(\frac{\partial \phi_1(x, y)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \phi_2(x, y)}{\partial y} \right) dx dy \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}(T_1^{-1}(x, y), T_2^{-1}(x, y))}{\det(DT(T_1^{-1}(x, y), T_2^{-1}(x, y)))} \left(\frac{\partial \phi_1(x, y)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \phi_2(x, y)}{\partial y} \right) dx dy \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}(x, y) \left(\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial x} \circ T + \frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial y} \circ T \right) dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

By direct computation, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial(\phi_1 \circ T)}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial(\phi_1 \circ T)}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial x} \circ T \\ \frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial y} \circ T \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial(\phi_2 \circ T)}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial(\phi_2 \circ T)}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial x} \circ T \\ \frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial y} \circ T \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial x} \circ T + \frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial y} \circ T \\ &= \left([(DT)^{-1}]_{11} \frac{\partial(\phi_1 \circ T)}{\partial x} + [(DT)^{-1}]_{21} \frac{\partial(\phi_2 \circ T)}{\partial x} \right) \\ &\quad + \left([(DT)^{-1}]_{12} \frac{\partial(\phi_1 \circ T)}{\partial y} + [(DT)^{-1}]_{22} \frac{\partial(\phi_2 \circ T)}{\partial y} \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left([(DT)^{-1}]_{11} \phi_1 \circ T + [(DT)^{-1}]_{21} \phi_2 \circ T \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left([(DT)^{-1}]_{12} \phi_1 \circ T + [(DT)^{-1}]_{22} \phi_2 \circ T \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\phi_1 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [(DT)^{-1}]_{11} + \phi_2 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [(DT)^{-1}]_{21} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \phi_1 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial y} [(DT)^{-1}]_{12} + \phi_2 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial y} [(DT)^{-1}]_{22} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$DT = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial y} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$DT^{-1} = \frac{1}{\partial_x T_1 \partial_y T_2 - \partial_x T_2 \partial_y T_1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial y} & -\frac{\partial T_2}{\partial x} \\ -\frac{\partial T_1}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial x} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} [(DT)^{-1}]_{11} & [(DT)^{-1}]_{12} \\ [(DT)^{-1}]_{21} & [(DT)^{-1}]_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.3)$$

Given any k , $1 \leq k \leq (p+1)(q+1)$, for any $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \setminus ((\{a_1, \dots, a_p\} \times [0, 1]) \cup ([0, 1] \times \{b_1, \dots, b_q\}))$, set

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{1,k}(x, y) &:= [(DT)^{-1}]_{11}\phi_1 \circ T(x, y)\mathbb{1}_{p_x(\bar{\Omega}_k)}(x) + [(DT)^{-1}]_{21}\phi_2 \circ T(x, y)\mathbb{1}_{p_y(\bar{\Omega}_k)}(y), \\ \Phi_{2,k}(x, y) &:= [(DT)^{-1}]_{12}\phi_1 \circ T(x, y)\mathbb{1}_{p_x(\bar{\Omega}_k)}(x) + [(DT)^{-1}]_{22}\phi_2 \circ T(x, y)\mathbb{1}_{p_y(\bar{\Omega}_k)}(y), \\ \Phi_{1,k}^-(y) &:= \Phi_{1,k}(c_k(y), y), \quad \Phi_{1,k}^+(y) := \Phi_{1,k}(d_k(y), y), \\ \Phi_{2,k}^-(x) &:= \Phi_{2,k}(x, a_k(x)), \quad \Phi_{2,k}^+(x) := \Phi_{2,k}(x, b_k(x)).\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.3), (A2), and (A3) that there exist $\delta > 0$ and $\tau > 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{(x,y) \in [0,1]^2} \sup \left\{ \sum_{k: [x-\delta, x+\delta] \cap [c_k(y), d_k(y)] \neq \emptyset} \|\mathbb{1}_{[c_k(y), d_k(y)]}(\cdot)[(DT)^{-1}](\cdot, y)\|_\infty, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{k: [y-\delta, y+\delta] \cap [a_k(x), b_k(x)] \neq \emptyset} \|\mathbb{1}_{[a_k(x), b_k(x)]}(\cdot)[(DT)^{-1}](x, \cdot)\|_\infty \right\} \leq \tau^{-1}.\end{aligned}\quad (3.4)$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{1,k,y}(v) &:= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } v \in (-\infty, c_k(y) - \delta) \\ \Phi_{1,k}^-(y)(v - c_k(y) + \delta)\delta^{-1}, & \text{if } v \in [c_k(y) - \delta, c_k(y)] \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in [c_k(y), d_k(y)] \\ \Phi_{1,k}^-(y)(d_k(y) + \delta - v)\delta^{-1}, & \text{if } v \in (d_k(y), d_k(y) + \delta) \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in [d_k(y) + \delta, +\infty), \end{cases} \\ \eta_{2,k,x}(v) &:= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } v \in (-\infty, a_k(x) - \delta) \\ \Phi_{2,k}^-(x)(v - a_k(x) + \delta)\delta^{-1}, & \text{if } v \in [a_k(x) - \delta, a_k(x)] \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in [a_k(x), b_k(x)] \\ \Phi_{2,k}^+(x)(b_k(x) + \delta - v)\delta^{-1}, & \text{if } v \in (b_k(x), b_k(x) + \delta) \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in [b_k(x) + \delta, +\infty). \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Phi}_{1,k}(x, y) &:= \Phi_{1,k}(x, y) + \eta_{1,k,y}(x), \quad \bar{\Phi}_{2,k}(x, y) := \Phi_{2,k}(x, y) + \eta_{2,k,x}(y), \\ \Theta_1(x, y) &:= \sum_k \bar{\Phi}_{1,k}(x, y), \quad \Theta_2(x, y) := \sum_k \bar{\Phi}_{2,k}(x, y).\end{aligned}$$

By the construction above, $\bar{\Phi}_{1,k}$ and $\bar{\Phi}_{2,k}$ are continuous functions, and for $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \setminus ((\{a_1, \dots, a_p\} \times [0, 1]) \cup ([0, 1] \times \{b_1, \dots, b_q\}))$, by (3.4) and $\|\phi\|_\infty \leq 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{j=1,2} |\Theta_j(x, y)| &\leq \sup \left\{ \sum_k \left(\sup_{x \in [c_k(y), d_k(y)]} |\Phi_{1,k}(x, y)| \right) \mathbb{1}_{[c_k(y), d_k(y)]}(x), \right. \\ &\left. \sum_k \left(\sup_{y \in [a_k(x), b_k(x)]} |\Phi_{2,k}(x, y)| \right) \mathbb{1}_{[a_k(x), b_k(x)]}(y) \right\} \leq \tau^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Further, set

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_1(x, y) &:= \sum_k \int_0^x \partial_v \bar{\Phi}_{1,k}(v, y) dv = \int_0^x \sum_k \partial_v \bar{\Phi}_{1,k}(v, y) dv, \\ \Theta_2(x, y) &:= \sum_k \int_0^y \partial_v \bar{\Phi}_{2,k}(x, v) dv = \int_0^y \sum_k \partial_v \bar{\Phi}_{2,k}(x, v) dv.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div}\Theta(x, y) &= \partial_x \Theta_1 + \partial_y \Theta_2 \\ &= \sum_k \left(\partial_x \{[(DT)^{-1}]_{11} \phi_1 \circ T + [(DT)^{-1}]_{21} \phi_2 \circ T\} \mathbb{1}_{[c_k(y), d_k(y)]} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \partial_y \{[(DT)^{-1}]_{12} \phi_1 \circ T + [(DT)^{-1}]_{22} \phi_2 \circ T\} \mathbb{1}_{[a_k(x), b_k(x)]} \right) \\ &\quad + \delta^{-1} \sum_k \left(\Phi_{1,k}^-(y) \mathbb{1}_{[a_k(x), b_k(x)]} - \Phi_{1,k}^+(y) \mathbb{1}_{[a_k(x), b_k(x)]} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Phi_{2,k}^-(x) \mathbb{1}_{[c_k(y), d_k(y)]} - \Phi_{2,k}^+(x) \mathbb{1}_{[c_k(y), d_k(y)]} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.1, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_j \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \rho_{i_1 \dots i_k j} \cdot \operatorname{div} \phi dx dy \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \rho_{i_1 \dots i_k} \cdot \operatorname{div} \Theta dx dy + \frac{2 \|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}\|_1}{\tau \delta} \\ & + \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \rho_{i_1 \dots i_k} \sum_k \left(\phi_1 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [(DT)^{-1}]_{11} + \phi_2 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [(DT)^{-1}]_{21} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \phi_1 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial y} [(DT)^{-1}]_{12} + \phi_2 \circ T \frac{\partial}{\partial y} [(DT)^{-1}]_{22} \right) dx dy \right| \\ & \leq \frac{\|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}\|_{BV([0,1]^2)}}{\tau} + \frac{2 \|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}\|_1}{\tau \delta} + C_0 \|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}\|_1 \\ & \leq \frac{\|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}\|_{BV([0,1]^2)}}{\tau} + C_1 \|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}\|_1.\end{aligned}$$

Set $\beta_k := \sum_{i_1 \dots i_k} \|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k}\|_{BV([0,1]^2)}$. One has that

$$\beta_{k+1} = \sum_{i_1 \dots i_k} \left(\sum_j \|\rho_{i_1 \dots i_k j}\|_{BV} \right) \leq C_1 + \frac{1}{\tau} \beta_k.$$

Hence, for any k ,

$$\|\hat{\rho}_k\|_{BV([0,1]^2)} \leq \beta_k \leq C_1 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right)^i := M < \infty.$$

Thus, one has that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\rho}_k \right\|_{BV} \leq M.$$

Hence, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that the sequence $\{n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\rho}_k\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is precompact in $L^1([0, 1]^2, m)$. There exists a convergent subsequence, denoted by ρ , the corresponding measure is convergent in the weak star topology, which is a Borel probability measure μ .

This completes the proof. \square

By Lemma 3.1, one has

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu(f^k D(S, \delta \lambda^{-k})) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu(D(S, \delta \lambda^{-k})) \leq 4(p+1)(q+1)\delta M \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-k} < \infty,$$

where $D(S, \delta)$ is the δ -neighborhood of the singular set S , M is specified in the proof of Lemma 3.1. It follows from the Borel-Cantelli Lemma that w is in $f^k D(S, \delta \lambda^{-k})$ for at most finitely many k , μ -a.e., that is, for μ almost everywhere w , there is $\delta(w) > 0$ such that $f^{-k}w \notin D(S, \delta(w)\lambda^{-k})$ for all $k > 0$, implying the existence of local unstable manifold $W_{\delta(w)}^u(w)$ by [11].

Now, it is to show Theorem 2.1.

Pick some w such that $\text{graph}(\alpha) = W_{\delta(w)}^u(w)$ exists. Fix this $W_{\delta(w)}^u(w)$ as a smooth surface α . For $\delta > 0$, set $\Lambda_\delta := \{w \in R : d(f^{-k}w, S) \geq \delta \lambda^{-k}, \forall k \geq 0\}$ and $\Lambda_0 := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mu(\Lambda_\delta)$.

Next, it is to define a sequence of measurable partitions $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \mathcal{P}_2 \subset \mathcal{P}_3 \subset \dots$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{U_{i,j}\}_{1 \leq i,j \leq 2^n}$ be a partition of R , where $U_{i,j} = \{(x, y, z) : \frac{i-1}{2^n} \leq x \leq \frac{i}{2^n}, \frac{j-1}{2^n} \leq y \leq \frac{j}{2^n}, 0 \leq z \leq 1\}$. For $w \in U_{i,j} \cap \Lambda_{1/2^n}$, set $c(w) := W_{1/2^n}^u(w) \cap U_{i,j}$, $V_n := \cup_{w \in \Lambda_{1/2^n}} c(w)$, and $\mathcal{P}_n := \{c(w) : w \in V_n\} \cup \{R - V_n\}$.

Fix a partition \mathcal{P}_n , it is to define a sequence of measures $\{\tilde{\mu}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as follows: since $\mu_k = f_*^k \mu_0$ is defined on $f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))$ and $f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))$ is a finite union of smooth surfaces, let $\tilde{\mu}_k$ be μ_k annihilated on those parts of its support that only partially cross some $\tilde{U}_{i,j}$, that is, the support of $\tilde{\mu}_k$ consists of all of the sets V_0 satisfying that there is a smooth component of $f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))$, denoted by W_0 , such that $V_0 \subset W_0$ and $(p_x \times p_y)V_0 = \cup_{i_0, j_0} (p_x \times p_y)(U_{i_0, j_0})$.

Next, it is to show that given any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $n = n(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for the fixed partition \mathcal{P}_n and sufficiently large k , $\tilde{\mu}_k(R) > 1 - \epsilon$. For $w \in (\text{support}(\mu_k) - \text{support}(\tilde{\mu}_k))$, w is either in a small piece, which only partially crosses some $\tilde{U}_{i,j}$, or the distance between

w and a cusp in $f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))$ is less than $1/2^{n(\epsilon)}$. Hence, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \tilde{\mu}_k(R) &= \mu_k(\text{support}(\mu_k) - \text{support}(\tilde{\mu}_k)) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i\{w : d(f^{-i}w, S) \leq 2^{-n(\epsilon)}\lambda^{-i}\} + \mu_k(\{\text{the boundary of } f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))\}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i\{w : d(fw, S) \leq 2^{-n(\epsilon)}\lambda^{-i}\} + \mu_k(\{\text{the boundary of } f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))\}) \\
&\leq 4M(p+1)(q+1)2^{-n(\epsilon)} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda^{-i} + \mu_k(\{\text{the boundary of } f^k(\text{graph}(\alpha))\}),
\end{aligned}$$

where M is specified in the proof of Lemma 3.1. The first term is very close to zero as $n(\epsilon)$ goes to positive infinite, the second term goes to zero as k goes to positive infinite. For the given ϵ , take a sufficiently large $n(\epsilon)$, the corresponding partition $\mathcal{P}_{n(\epsilon)}$ is denoted by $\tilde{U}_{i,j}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq 2^{n(\epsilon)}$.

Since $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \mu_k \rightarrow \mu$ in the weak topology, there exists a subsequence $\{n_{i_j}\}$ of $\{n_i\}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_{i_j}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{i_j}} \tilde{\mu}_k \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}$ in the weak topology. It follows from the definitions of $\tilde{\mu}_k$ and μ_k that one has that $\tilde{\mu} \ll \mu$ and $0 \leq d\tilde{\mu}/d\mu \leq 1$. So, by taking $n(\epsilon)$ large enough, one has that $\tilde{\mu}$ is equivalent to μ except on a set with the μ -measure less than ϵ .

It is to show that there is a transverse measure $\tilde{\mu}_T$ for the measure $\tilde{\mu}$ such that for $\tilde{\mu}_T$ -a.e. $c \in \mathcal{P}_{n(\epsilon)}$, one has that $\tilde{\mu}_c \ll m_c$. Denote $\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ as the density of $(p_x \times p_y)_*(\tilde{\mu}_k|L_{i_1 \dots i_k})$. For $1 \leq i, j \leq 2^{n(\epsilon)}$, $\tilde{U}_{i,j}$, any i_1, \dots, i_k , it is to show that either

$$\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k} = 0 \text{ on } (p_x \times p_y)\tilde{U}_{i,j},$$

or

$$\frac{\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k}(w_1)}{\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k}(w_2)} \leq M_1, \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \in (p_x \times p_y)\tilde{U}_{i,j},$$

where M_1 is a positive constant independent on the choice of i_1, \dots, i_k . If L_{i_1, \dots, i_k} does not cross the full $\tilde{U}_{i,j}$, then $\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k} = 0$ on $(p_x \times p_y)\tilde{U}_{i,j}$. Suppose that there are subsets $E_0, E_1, \dots, E_k \subset [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ with $E_k \subset (p_x \times p_y)\tilde{U}_{i,j}$, and diffeomorphic map $h_l : E_{l-1} \rightarrow E_l$ such that $\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k}|(p_x \times p_y)\tilde{U}_{i,j} = \det((h_k \circ \dots \circ h_1)^{-1})$.

Suppose $w_1 = (x_1, y_1)$ and $w_2 = (x_2, y_2)$. It follows from the assumption that $f|(R - S)$

has bounded first and second derivatives that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\det DT(w_1) - \det DT(w_2)| \\
&= \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x T_1(w_1) & \partial_y T_1(w_1) \\ \partial_x T_2(w_1) & \partial_y T_2(w_1) \end{pmatrix} - \det \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x T_1(w_2) & \partial_y T_1(w_2) \\ \partial_x T_2(w_2) & \partial_y T_2(w_2) \end{pmatrix} \right| \\
&= |(\partial_x T_1(w_1)\partial_y T_2(w_1) - \partial_y T_1(w_1)\partial_x T_2(w_1)) \\
&\quad - (\partial_x T_1(w_2)\partial_y T_2(w_2) - \partial_y T_1(w_2)\partial_x T_2(w_2))| \\
&\leq |\partial_x T_1(w_1)(\partial_y T_2(w_1) - \partial_y T_2(w_2))| + |\partial_y T_2(w_2)(\partial_x T_1(w_1) - \partial_x T_1(w_2))| \\
&\quad + |\partial_y T_1(w_1)(\partial_x T_2(w_1) - \partial_x T_2(w_2))| + |\partial_x T_2(w_2)(\partial_y T_1(w_1) - \partial_y T_1(w_2))| \\
&\leq C_1|w_1 - w_2|,
\end{aligned}$$

where C_1 is a positive constant. Further, since $\left| \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial x} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial y} \right| \geq \lambda$, $\left| \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial y} \right| - \left| \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial x} \right| \geq \lambda$, (A0), and (3.3), it follows from direct calculation that

$$|\log \det DT^{-1}(w_1) - \log \det DT^{-1}(w_2)| \leq C_2|w_1 - w_2|,$$

where C_2 is a positive constant. The last inequality implies that

$$\frac{\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k}(w_1)}{\tilde{g}_{i_1 \dots i_k}(w_2)} \leq M_1, \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \in (p_x \times p_y)\tilde{U}_{i,j},$$

where M_1 is independent on i_1, \dots, i_k .

This completes the whole proof.

Remark 3.1. It is easy to obtain similar results for maps with several directions of instability in high-dimensional spaces.

Remark 3.2. Some statistical properties of these maps could be obtained by using the transfer operator methods with some proper function spaces.

4 Example

In this section, we give an example to illustrate the results in Theorem 2.1 by computer simulations. The software Mathematica draws the pictures of the simulations.

Example 4.1. Consider the map $f = (f_1(x, y, z), f_2(x, y, z), f_3(x, y, z)) : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, where

$$f_1(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} k_1x + k_2(y + z) & \text{if } x \in [0, 1/3] \\ -k_1(x - 1/3) + k_1/3 + k_2(y + z) & \text{if } x \in [1/3, 2/3] ; \\ k_1(x - 2/3) + k_2(y + z) & \text{if } x \in [2/3, 1] \end{cases}$$

$$f_2(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} k_1y + k_2(x + z) & \text{if } y \in [0, 1/3] \\ -k_1(y - 1/3) + k_1/3 + k_2(x + z) & \text{if } y \in [1/3, 2/3] ; \\ k_1(y - 2/3) + k_2(x + z) & \text{if } y \in [2/3, 1] \end{cases}$$

$$f_3(x, y, z) = k_3x,$$

and satisfies the following assumptions: $k_1 > 2 + 2k_2$, $2k_2 + k_1/3 \leq 1$, $k_1 \geq 10k_2 > 0$, and $0 < k_3 < (k_1 - 2k_2)/8$. It is easy to verify that this map satisfies all the assumptions in Theorem 2.1 with $N = 1$.

Fix $k_1 = 2.4$, $k_2 = 0.08$, and $k_3 = 0.25$. Figures 1 and 2 are the simulation diagrams with different initial values. In Figure 1, the initial value is taken as $(0.2, 0.1, 0.5)$. In Figure 2, the initial value is taken as $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$. In Figure 1, the chaotic dynamical behavior is observed. In Figure 2, a “regular” orbit is observed. From these simulations, we guess that there might exist two ergodic components. It is an interesting problem to prove or disprove the existence of at least two ergodic components.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Sheldon Newhouse for his encouragement, comments, and providing many useful references.

I devote this work to my grandmother, she moved to heaven in 2014. She will always be in my heart.

References

- [1] L. Barreira, Ya. Pesin, Lectures on Lyapunov Exponents and Smooth Ergodic Theory, Univ. Lect. Series. Vol 23, Amer. Math. Soc. 2002
- [2] M. Benedicks, L. Carleson, The dynamics of the Hénon map, Ann. Math.133 (1991), 73–169.

- [3] M. Benedicks, M. Viana, Solution of the basin problem for Hénon-like attractors, *Invent. Math.* 143 (2001), 375–434.
- [4] M. Benedicks, L. S. Young, Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle measure for certain Hénon maps, *Invent. Math.* 112 (1993), 541–576.
- [5] R. Bowen, Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 470, Springer, New York, 1975.
- [6] A. Boyarsky, P. Góra, *Laws of Chaos. Invariant measures and Dynamical Systems in One Dimensions*, Probability and its applications, Birkhäuser., Boston, MA, 1997
- [7] N. Chernov, R. Markarian, *Chaotic Billiards*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, Vol. 127, Amer. Math. Soc. 2006.
- [8] P. Collet, Y. Levy, Ergodic Properties of the Lozi Mappings, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 93 (1984), 461–481.
- [9] L. C. Evans, R. F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions (Studies in Advanced Mathematics)*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992.
- [10] M. Jakobson, S. Newhouse, A two-dimensional version of the folklore theorem, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* 2 (1996) 89–105.
- [11] A. Katok, J. M. Strelcyn, *Invariant Manifolds, Entropy and Billiards, Smooth Maps with Singularities*, with the collaboration of A. Ledrappier and F. Przytycki, *Lect. Notes. Math.* vol 1222, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, London, Paris, Tokyo, 1986.
- [12] F. Ledrappier, Propriétés ergodiques des mesure de Sinai. *Publ. Math. IHES* 59 (1984), 163–188.
- [13] A. Lasota, J. A. Yorke, On the existence of invariant measures for piecewise monotonic transformations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 186 (1973) 481–488.
- [14] C. Liverani, Multidimensional expanding maps with singularities: a pedestrian approach, *Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys.* 33 (2013), 168–182.
- [15] Ya. B. Pesin, Families of invariant manifolds corresponding to non-zero characteristics exponents, *Math. USSR-Izv.* 10 (1978), 1261–1305.
- [16] F. Sánchez-Salas, Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measures for piecewise hyperbolic transformations, *Divulgaciones Matemáticas* 9 (2001), 35–54.
- [17] O. M. Sarig, Subexponential decay of correlations, *Invent. Math.* 150 (2002) 629–653,

- [18] Ya. G. Sinai, Gibbs measures in ergodic theory, *Russ. Math. Surveys* 27, 4 (1972), 21–69.
- [19] Q. Wang, L. S. Young, Strange attractors with one direction of instability, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 218 (2001), 1–97.
- [20] L. S. Young, Bowen-Ruelle measures for certain piecewise hyperbolic maps, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 287 (1985), 41–48.
- [21] L. S. Young, Statistical properties of dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity, *Ann. Math.* 147 (1998), 558–650.
- [22] L. S. Young, Recurrence times and rates of mixing, *Isr. J. Math.* 110 (1999), 153–188.
- [23] L. S. Young, What are SRB measures, and which dynamical systems have them? *J. Statistical Physics*, 108 (2002), 733–7554.

List of Figure Captions

Figure 1. The chaotic attractor of map in Example 4.1 with $k_1 = 2.4$, $k_2 = 0.08$, and $k_3 = 0.25$, where the initial value is taken as $(0.2, 0.1, 0.5)$.

Figure 2. The chaotic attractor of map in Example 4.1 with $k_1 = 2.4$, $k_2 = 0.08$, and $k_3 = 0.25$, where the initial value is taken as $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$.




Figure 1: The chaotic attractor of map in Example 4.1 with $k_1 = 2.4$, $k_2 = 0.08$, and $k_3 = 0.25$, where the initial value is taken as $(0.2, 0.1, 0.5)$.




Figure 2: The chaotic attractor of map in Example 4.1 with $k_1 = 2.4$, $k_2 = 0.08$, and $k_3 = 0.25$, where the initial value is taken as $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$.