

# ENTROPY, CHAOS AND WEAK HORSESHOE FOR INFINITE DIMENSIONAL RANDOM DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

WEN HUANG AND KENING LU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the complicated dynamics of infinite dimensional random dynamical systems which include deterministic dynamical systems as their special cases in a Polish space. Without assuming any hyperbolicity, we proved if a continuous random map has a positive topological entropy, then it contains a topological horseshoe. We also show that the positive topological entropy implies the chaos in the sense of Li-Yorke. The complicated behavior exhibiting here is induced by the positive entropy but not the randomness of the system.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Entropy plays an important role in the study of behavior of dynamical systems. It measures the rate of increase in dynamical complexity as the system evolves with time. The measure-theoretic entropy was introduced in 1950's by Kolmogorov [36] and Sinai [61] for studying measurable dynamical systems. Sinai [60] studied an ergodic measure preserving automorphism  $f$  of a Lebesgue space  $(X, \mu)$  and proved that if the measure-theoretic entropy of  $f$  is positive, then  $f$  contains factor automorphisms which are isomorphic to Bernoulli shifts.

The topological entropy was first introduced in 1965 by Adler, Konheim and McAndrew for studying dynamical systems in topological spaces. In metric spaces a different definition of topological entropy was introduced by Bowen in 1971 and independently Dinaburg in 1970. A fundamental problem is to characterize the chaotic behavior of orbits of a  $C^k$  ( $k \geq 0$ ) dynamical system  $f$  topologically or geometrically (in terms of horseshoe) in the presence of positive topological entropy.

In his remarkable paper [30], A. Katok proved that for a measure preserving hyperbolic  $C^2$  diffeomorphism on a compact Riemannian manifold, the positive entropy implies the existence of a Smale horseshoe.

Without assuming any hyperbolicity, Blanchard, Glasner, Kolyada, and Maass [8] showed that for a homeomorphism on a compact metric space  $X$ , the positive topological entropy implies the chaos in the sense of Li-Yorke [39], i.e., there is a subset  $S$  of  $X$ , which is a union of countably many Cantor sets, and  $\kappa > 0$  such that for every pair  $x_1, x_2$  of distinct points in  $S$ , the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(f^n(x_1), f^n(x_2)) &= 0, \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(f^n(x_1), f^n(x_2)) &\geq \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

However, this result does not yield the existence of a horseshoe.

Recently, Lian and Young obtained remarkable results on the implication of positive entropy for infinite dimensional deterministic dynamical systems. In [41], they extended Katok's results to  $C^2$  differentiable maps with a nonuniformly hyperbolic compact invariant set supported by an invariant measure in a separable Hilbert space. In their second paper [42], Lian and Young went much further and studied a  $C^2$  semiflow in a Hilbert space and proved that if it has a nonuniformly hyperbolic

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 37D45, 37C40.

*Key words and phrases*. Chaotic behavior, positive entropy, compact random sets, random attractors, random dynamical systems, stochastic partial differential equations.

This work is partially supported by grants from NSFC (11225105, 11331007, 11431012) and NSF (1413603).

compact invariant set supported by an invariant measure, then the positive entropy implies the existence of horseshoes. In this case, the semiflow may have one simple zero Lyapunov exponent, which implies that the associated time-one map restricted to this invariant set is partially hyperbolic with one-dimensional center direction. This result is new even for flow generated by ordinary differential equations.

The proofs of the results obtained by Katok and Lian-Young rely on not only the positive of entropy but also the hyperbolic geometric structures of systems. The horseshoes are constructed by using stable and unstable manifolds.

In present paper, we study  $C^0$  infinite dimensional random dynamical systems which include deterministic dynamical systems as their special cases in a Polish space. Without assuming any hyperbolicity, we proved if a continuous random map has a positive topological entropy, then it contains a topological horseshoe. We also show that the positive topological entropy implies the chaos in the sense of Li-Yorke. The complicated behavior exhibiting here is induced by the positive entropy but not the randomness of the system.

Since there is no any hyperbolic geometric structure available, we take a different approach. We use Rohlin's theory of Lebesgues systems as a basic tool and utilize the disintegration of measures, Pinsker algebra, entropy, and ergodic theory. To overcome the obstacle due to lack of hyperbolicity, we construct an "independent" partition with an equal conditional probability measure  $\bar{\mu}_y$  for almost all  $y$  via the disintegration of a measure relative to a factor. This partition is the key for constructing the horseshoe. Other challenges are: (i) the infinite dimensional dynamical systems generated, for example, by parabolic PDEs are not invertible and (ii) the phase space is not locally compact.

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  be a probability space and  $(\theta^n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a measurable  $P$ -measure preserving dynamical system on  $\Omega$ . A discrete time random dynamical system (or a cocycle) on a metric space  $X$  over the dynamical system  $\theta^n$  is a measurable map

$$\phi(n, \cdot, \cdot) : \Omega \times X \rightarrow X, \quad (\omega, x) \mapsto \phi(n, \omega, x), \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

such that the map  $\phi(n, \omega) := \phi(n, \omega, \cdot)$  forms a cocycle over  $\theta^n$ :

$$\phi(0, \omega) = Id, \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \Omega,$$

$$\phi(n + m, \omega) = \phi(n, \theta^m \omega) \phi(m, \omega), \quad \text{for all } m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

When  $\phi(n, \omega, \cdot) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous,  $\phi(n, \omega, x)$  is called a continuous random dynamical system. Replacing  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  by  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^+$  respectively gives a continuous time random dynamical system, see Section 2 for details.

A typical example of random dynamical systems is the solution operator for a stochastic differential equation:

$$dx_t = f_0(x_t)dt + \sum_{k=1}^d f_k(x_t) \circ dB_t^k$$

where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $f_k, 0 \leq k \leq d$ , are smooth vector fields, and  $B_t = (B_t^1, \dots, B_t^d)$  is the standard  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion defined on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  and  $dB_t^k$  is the Stratonovich differential. Here,  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is the classic Wiener space, i.e.,  $\Omega = \{\omega : \omega(\cdot) \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d), \omega(0) = 0\}$  endowed with the open compact topology so that  $\Omega$  is a Polish space and  $\mathbb{P}$  is the Wiener measure. Define a measurable dynamical system  $\theta^t$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  by the Wiener shift  $(\theta^t \omega)(\cdot) = \omega(t + \cdot) - \omega(t)$  for  $t > 0$ . It is well-known that  $P$  is invariant and ergodic under  $\theta^t$ . This measurable dynamical system  $\theta^t$  is also called a metric dynamical system. It models the noise of the system.

We consider a random set  $K \in \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(X)$  and use  $K(\omega)$  to denote its  $\omega$ -section  $\{x \in X \mid (\omega, x) \in K\}$ .  $K$  is said to be invariant under  $\phi(n, \omega)(x)$  if for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

$$\phi(n, \omega)K(\omega) \subset K(\theta^n \omega) \quad P - a.s..$$

Examples of such random invariant sets in applications are the global random attractors of dissipative stochastic partial differential equations.

We study the complicated dynamics of infinite dimensional random dynamical systems restricted to random invariant sets. We assume that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is a Polish system (see Section 3) and the phase space  $X$  is a Polish space with the distance function  $d$ . We consider a continuous random dynamical system  $\phi(n, \omega, x)$  and write the time-one map  $\phi(1, \omega, x)$  as  $\phi(\omega)(x) := \phi(1, \omega, x)$ . Then  $\phi(\omega)$  is the so-called random map. This random map generates the random dynamical system:

$$\phi(n, \omega, x) = \begin{cases} \phi(\theta^{n-1}\omega) \cdots \phi(\omega)(x), & n > 0, \\ I, & n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Our main result can be stated as follows.

**Main Theorem.** *Let  $\phi$  be an injective continuous random dynamical system on a Polish space  $X$  over an ergodic Polish system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ . Let  $K$  be a random  $\phi$ -invariant set with compact  $\omega$ -section  $K(\omega)$  such that  $\phi(\omega)(K(\omega)) = K(\theta\omega)$ . If the topological entropy is positive, i.e.,*

$$h_{top}(\phi, \mathcal{K}) > 0,$$

then

- (i) *the dynamics of  $\phi$  restricted to  $K$  is chaotic;*
- (ii)  *$\phi$  restricted to  $K$  has a weak horseshoe of two symbols;*
- (iii) *in addition, if  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is a compact metric system and  $K(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  is a strongly compact random set, then  $\phi$  restricted to  $K$  has a full horseshoe of two symbols.*

$\phi$  has a weak horseshoe of two symbols if there exist subsets  $U_1, U_2$  of  $X$  such that the following properties hold

- (1)  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are non-empty, bounded, and closed and  $d(U_1, U_2) > 0$ .
- (2) there is a constant  $b > 0$  satisfying for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists  $M_{b,\omega} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any natural number  $m \geq M_{b,\omega}$ , there is a subset  $J_m \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$  with  $|J_m| \geq bm$  (positive density), and for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J_m}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j\omega)$  for any  $j \in J_m$ .

By a *full horseshoe of two symbols* we mean that there exist subsets  $U_1, U_2$  of  $X$  such that the following properties hold

- (1)  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are non-empty, bounded, and closed subsets of  $X$  and  $d(U_1, U_2) > 0$ .
- (2) there is a constant  $b > 0$  satisfying for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists  $J(\omega) \subset \mathbb{N}_0$  such that the limit  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} |J(\omega) \cap \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}|$  exists and is larger than or equal to  $b$  (positive density), and for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J(\omega)}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j\omega)$  for any  $j \in J(\omega)$ .

The horseshoe here is an extension of Smale's horseshoe. The main difference is that the time spent by the orbit  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s)$  bouncing between  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  is nonuniform.

We point out that the random dynamical systems  $\phi$  generated by both random parabolic PDEs and random wave equations are continuous and injective.

For deterministic dynamical systems, we have the following result ( see [25] for topological dynamical systems in compact metric spaces and [31] for  $C^*$ -dynamics).

**Corollary.** *Let  $f$  be an injective continuous map on a Polish space  $X$ . Let  $K$  be a compact invariant set of  $f$ . If the topological entropy is positive, i.e.,*

$$h_{top}(f, \mathcal{K}) > 0,$$

then  $f|_K$  has a full horseshoe of two symbols.

Random dynamical systems arise in the modelling of many phenomena in physics, biology, climatology, economics, etc. when uncertainties or random influences, called noises, are taken into account. These random effects are not only introduced to compensate for the defects in some deterministic models, but also are often rather intrinsic phenomena. The need for studying random dynamical systems was pointed out by Ulam and von Neumann [63] in 1945. It has flourished since the 1980's due to the discovery that stochastic ordinary differential equations generate finite dimensional random dynamical systems through the efforts of Harris, Elworthy, Baxendale, Bismut, Ikeda, Kunita, Watanabe, and others. Random dynamical systems are nonuniform in nature in terms of hyperbolicity. There is an extensive literature on the nonuniformly hyperbolic theory and the ergodic theory for both independent and identically distributed random transformations and stationary random dynamical systems, which we refer to Arnold [4], Kifer [32, 34, 33], Ledrappier and Young [37, 38], Liu and Qian [44], Liu [43], Kifer and Liu [35], and the references therein.

The study of infinite dimensional random dynamical systems was initiated by Ruelle in [54, 55] where the Oseledets' multiplicative ergodic theorem and Pesin's stable manifold theorem were established in a Hilbert space, and the notion of random attractor was introduced. Infinite dimensional random dynamical systems are usually generated by stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) and contain randomness in many ways, such as stochastic forcing, uncertain parameters, random sources or inputs, and random initial and boundary conditions. There is a vast amount of works on the ergodic theory, the existence of random attractors and the theory of invariant manifold. We do not attempt to give an exhaustive list of references. Results on ergodic theory can be found in Mane [46], Thioullent [62], Schaumlöffel and Flandoli [57], Da Prato and Zabczyk [17], E, Khanin, Mazel, and Sinai [19], Hairer and Mattingly [24], Lian and Lu [40]. For the existence of random attractors we refer to Crauel, Debussche, and Flandoli [14], Crauel and Flandoli [15], Schmalfuss [58], and Bates, Lu, and Wang [6]. Theory of random invariant manifolds can be found in Da Prato and Debussche [16], Mohammed and Scheutzow [47], Duan, Lu and Schmalfuss [18], and Mohammed, Zhang, and Zhao [48]. The problem we study here is about the complicated dynamical behavior on random invariant sets such random attractors.

We organize the paper as follows. In Section 2, we introduce basic concepts concerning random dynamical systems and random invariant sets and state our main results. In Section 3, we review some of basic concepts and results from measurable dynamical systems and introduce some basic lemmas. The proof of the main result is given in Section 4 and Section 5.

## 2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

In this section, we first review some of the basic concepts on RDS, which are taken from Arnold [4]. Then we state our main results.

**2.1. Random Dynamical Systems.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  be a probability space and  $\mathbb{T}$  denote one of the sets:  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ .  $\mathbb{T}$  is endowed with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$ . Let  $\theta = (\theta^t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  be a measurable  $P$ -measure preserving flow on  $\Omega$ , see Arnold [4].  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta^t)$  is called a metric dynamical system over the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ . This metric dynamical system models the evolution of noise of the system. For the discrete time metric dynamical system, we replace  $\mathbb{R}$  by  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

As an example, we take  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  to be the Wiener space, i.e.,  $\Omega = \{\omega : \omega(\cdot) \in C(\mathbb{R}, U), \omega(0) = 0\}$  for some separable Hilbert space  $U$  endowed with the compact open topology,  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$  and  $P$  is the Wiener measure for a trace class covariance operator  $Q$  on  $U$ . In fact,  $\Omega$  is a Polish space. We define a measurable flow  $\theta^t$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  by the Wiener shift  $(\theta^t \omega)(\cdot) = \omega(t + \cdot) - \omega(t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is well-known that  $P$  is invariant and ergodic under  $\theta^t$ .

A random dynamical system in a metric space  $X$  over the metric dynamical system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta^t)$  is a measurable map

$$\phi : \mathbb{T} \times \Omega \times X \rightarrow X, \quad (t, \omega, x) \mapsto \phi(t, \omega, x),$$

and  $\phi(t, \omega)(x) := \phi(t, \omega, x)$  forms a cocycle:

$$\phi(0, \omega) = Id, \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \Omega,$$

$$\phi(t + s, \omega) = \phi(t, \theta^s \omega) \circ \phi(s, \omega), \quad \text{for all } s, t \in \mathbb{T}, \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

When  $\phi(t, \omega, \cdot) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous,  $\phi$  is called a continuous random dynamical system.

As we mentioned in the introduction, a typical example in finite dimensional space is the solution operator of stochastic differential equations.

An infinite dimensional random dynamical system can be generated by the solutions of partial differential equations driven by a stochastic process of the form

$$u_t = \Delta u + f(u, x, \theta_t \omega), \quad x \in U$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition or the Neumann boundary, where  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a bounded region with a smooth boundary. It can also be generated by the solutions of stochastic partial differential equations of the form

$$du = (Au + F(u))dt + dW,$$

where  $A$  is an elliptic operator,  $F$  is a smooth nonlinear functional, and  $dW$  is a white noise given as the generalized temporal differential of a Wiener process with continuous paths in the phase space.

Other examples of random dynamical systems are generated by the solutions of stochastic differential equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion [21].

**2.2. Random Invariant Sets and Random Attractors.** We first recall that a multifunction  $M = (M(\omega))_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of nonempty closed sets  $M(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ , contained in  $X$  is called a *random set* if

$$\omega \mapsto \inf_{y \in M(\omega)} d(x, y)$$

is a random variable for any  $x \in X$ . A random set  $M$  is invariant for random dynamical system  $\phi$  if

$$\phi(t, \omega, M(\omega)) \subset M(\theta_t \omega) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0.$$

A random set  $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\omega)\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of  $X$  is called a *global random attractor* for  $\phi$  if the following conditions are satisfied, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}(\omega)$  is compact;
- (ii)  $\{\mathcal{A}(\omega)\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$  satisfies for  $t \geq 0$ :

$$\phi(t, \omega, \mathcal{A}(\omega)) = \mathcal{A}(\theta_t \omega);$$

- (iii)  $\{\mathcal{A}(\omega)\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$  attracts every tempered random set  $B = \{B(\omega)\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , that is,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d(\phi(t, \theta_{-t} \omega, B(\theta_{-t} \omega)), \mathcal{A}(\omega)) = 0,$$

where  $d$  is the Hausdorff semi-metric given by  $d(Y, Z) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{z \in Z} \|y - z\|_X$  for any  $Y \subseteq X$  and  $Z \subseteq X$ .

The study of global random attractors was initiated by Ruelle [54]. The fundamental theory of global random attractors for stochastic partial differential equations was developed by Crauel, Debussche, and Flandoli [14], Crauel and Flandoli [15], Flandoli and Schmalfuss [20], Imkeller and Schmalfuss [27], and others. It has recently attracted more attention due to new equations and models arising in applications such as stochastic infinite dimensional lattice dynamical systems [5].

Due to the unbounded fluctuations in the systems caused by the white noise, the concept of pull-back global random attractor was introduced to capture the essential dynamics with possibly extremely wide fluctuations. This is significantly different from the deterministic case.

**2.3. Main Result.** In this paper, we study the complicated dynamics of infinite dimensional random dynamical systems restricted to random invariant sets such as global attractors. We assume that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is a Polish system (see Section 3) and  $X$  is a Polish space with the distance function  $d$ . We consider a continuous random dynamical system  $\phi(n, \omega, x)$  generated by a random map  $\phi(\omega)(x)$  defined on  $X$  over the metric dynamical system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ , i.e.,

$$\phi(n, \omega, x) = \begin{cases} \phi(\theta^{n-1}\omega) \cdots \phi(\omega)(x), & n > 0, \\ I, & n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here,  $\phi(\omega) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous almost surely.

We consider a  $\phi$ -invariant random set  $K \in \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(X)$  with compact  $\omega$ -section  $K(\omega)$ . For  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $n \geq 1$ , we define

$$d_n^\omega(x, y) = \max_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} d(\phi(k, \omega, x), \phi(k, \omega, y)), \text{ for } x, y \in X.$$

A subset  $E$  of  $K(\omega)$  is called  $(\omega, n, \epsilon, \phi)$ -separated subset of  $K(\omega)$  if for all  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$ , one has  $d_n^\omega(x, y) > \epsilon$ . We denote by  $r_n(K, \omega, \epsilon, \phi)$  the maximal cardinality of all  $(\omega, n, \epsilon, \phi)$ -separated subset of  $K_\omega$ . The *topological entropy* of  $(\phi, K)$  based on Bowen and Dinaburg's definition is given by

$$h_{\text{top}}(\phi, K) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Omega} \log r_n(K, \omega, \epsilon, \phi) dP(\omega).$$

See, Bogenschutz [10] and Kifer [33] for related notions in the case of  $X$  being compact.

Let  $\phi$  be an injective continuous random dynamical system on Polish space  $X$  over an ergodic Polish system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ . Let  $K$  be a  $\phi$ -invariant random set with compact  $\omega$ -section  $K(\omega)$  such that  $\phi(\omega)(K(\omega)) = K(\theta\omega)$ . Subsets  $U_1, U_2$  of  $X$  is called *weak Horseshoe* of  $(\phi, K)$ , if the following properties hold

- (1)  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are non-empty, closed, and bounded subsets of  $X$  and  $d(U_1, U_2) > 0$ .
- (2) there is a  $b > 0$  satisfying for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists  $M_{b,\omega} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any natural number  $m \geq M_{b,\omega}$ , there is a subset  $J_m \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$  with  $|J_m| \geq bm$  (positive density), and for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J_m}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j\omega)$  for any  $j \in J_m$ .

The first result is on the existence of a weak horseshoe.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\phi$  be an injective continuous random dynamical system on Polish space  $X$  over an ergodic Polish system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ . Let  $K$  be a  $\phi$ -invariant random set with compact  $\omega$ -section  $K(\omega)$  such that  $\phi(\omega)(K(\omega)) = K(\theta\omega)$ . If  $h_{\text{top}}(\phi, K) > 0$ , then there exists a weak Horseshoe  $\{U_1, U_2\}$  for  $(\phi, K)$ .*

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  be a *compact metric system*. Namely,  $\Omega$  is a compact metric space,  $\mathcal{F}$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$  of  $\Omega$ ,  $P$  is a Borel probability measure on  $\Omega$  and  $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is a continuous map preserving the measure  $P$ .

A multifunction  $M = (M(\omega))_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of nonempty closed sets  $M(\omega), \omega \in \Omega$ , contained in  $X$  is called a *strongly compact random set* if the following conditions are satisfied, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

- (i)  $M(\omega)$  is compact.
- (ii) the function  $\omega \mapsto \inf_{y \in M(\omega)} d(x, y)$  is lower semi-continuous for any  $x \in X$ .

It is not hard to see that if a multifunction  $M = (M(\omega))_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of nonempty closed sets  $M(\omega), \omega \in \Omega$ , contained in  $X$  such that the set  $\bigcup_{\omega \in \Omega} \{\omega\} \times M(\omega)$  is a compact subset of  $\Omega \times X$ , then  $M$  is strongly compact random set.

By a *full horseshoe of two symbols* we mean that there exist subsets  $U_1, U_2$  of  $X$  such that the following properties hold

- (1)  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are non-empty, closed, and bounded subsets of  $X$  and  $d(U_1, U_2) > 0$ .

- (2) there is a constant  $b > 0$  satisfying for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists  $J(\omega) \subset \mathbb{N}_0$  such that the limit  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} |J(\omega) \cap \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}|$  exists and is larger than or equal to  $b$  (positive density), and for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J(\omega)}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$  for any  $j \in J(\omega)$ .

The second result is the existence of a full horseshoe.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $\phi$  be an injective continuous random dynamical system on Polish space  $X$  over an ergodic compact metric system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  satisfying the map  $(\omega, x) \mapsto \phi(\omega)x$  is a continuous map from  $\Omega \times X$  to  $X$ . Let  $K$  be a  $\phi$ -invariant strongly compact random set such that  $\phi(\omega)(K(\omega)) = K(\theta\omega)$ . If  $h_{top}(\phi, K) > 0$ , then there exists a full Horseshoe  $\{U_1, U_2\}$  for  $(\phi, K)$ .*

As a consequence, we have

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $\phi$  be an injective continuous on Polish space  $X$  and  $K$  be a  $\phi$ -invariant compact set. If  $h_{top}(\phi, K) > 0$ , then there exists a full Horseshoe  $\{U_1, U_2\}$  for  $(\phi, K)$ .*

The notion of Li-Yorke chaos was introduced in [39] for interval maps. With a small modification this notion can be extended to a metric space. Following the idea of Li and Yorke, a subset  $D$  of  $K(\omega)$ , is called  $\kappa$ -chaotic set for  $(\omega, \phi)$ , where  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\kappa > 0$ , if for every pair  $(x_1, x_2)$  of distinct points in  $D$ , one has

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(\phi(n, \omega, x_1), \phi(n, \omega, x_2)) = 0 \text{ and } \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(\phi(n, \omega, x_1), \phi(n, \omega, x_2)) \geq \kappa.$$

The final result is about the positive entropy implying the existence of Li-Yorke chaos.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $\phi$  be an injective continuous random dynamical system on Polish space  $X$  over an ergodic Polish system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ . Let  $K$  be a  $\phi$ -invariant random set with compact  $\omega$ -section  $K(\omega)$  such that  $\phi(\omega)(K(\omega)) = K(\theta\omega)$ . If  $h_{top}(\phi, K) > 0$ , then there exists  $\kappa > 0$  such that for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  there is a  $\kappa$ -chaotic set  $S(\omega) \subset K(\omega)$  of a union of countably many Cantor sets for  $(\omega, \phi)$ .*

### 3. BASIC CONCEPTS AND LEMMAS ON MEASURABLE DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

In this section, we review some of basic concepts and results from the theory of measurable dynamical systems and introduce several lemmas that we need for the proofs of the main theorems.

**3.1. Various Dynamical Systems.** In this paper for a probability space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  we always require that  $\mathcal{B}$  is countably generated ( $\mu$ -mod 0), that is, there exists  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{B}$  such that for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there is  $i := i(A, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $\mu(A \Delta A_i) < \epsilon$ . A *measure-theoretic dynamical system* (MDS)  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is a measure-preserving map  $T$  on a probability space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

A *Polish probability space*  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$  means that  $X$  is a separable topological space whose topology is metrizable by a complete metric,  $\mathcal{B}_X$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, and  $\mu$  is a Borel probability measure on  $X$ . A *Polish system*  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T)$  is a measure-preserving map  $T$  on a Polish space  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$ . A *Lebesgue system*  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is a measure-preserving map  $T$  on a Lebesgue space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  (see [53]). For a Polish system  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T)$ , the MDS  $(X, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, T)$  constitutes a Lebesgue system, where  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  is the completion of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_X$  with respect to  $\mu$ .

A MDS  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  is said to be a *factor* of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  if there is a measure-preserving map  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu)$  such that  $\pi T = S\pi$ . Equivalently, we say that  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is an extension of  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$ . In this case, we also say  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  is a *factor map*.

**3.2. Conditional entropy.** In this subsection, we first recall the notation of the conditional entropy of a MDS. Then we state some results about the conditional entropy. Consider an MDS  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ . A *partition* of  $X$  is a family of pairwise disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{B}$  whose union is  $X$ . For a given partition  $\alpha$  of  $X$  and  $x \in X$ , we denote by  $\alpha(x)$  the atom of  $\alpha$  containing  $x$ .

We denote the set of finite partitions of  $X$  by  $\mathcal{P}_X(\mathcal{B})$  or for simplicity  $\mathcal{P}_X$ . Given two partitions  $\alpha, \beta$  of  $X$ ,  $\alpha$  is said to be finer than  $\beta$  (denote by  $\alpha \succeq \beta$ ) if each element of  $\alpha$  is contained in some element of  $\beta$ . Let  $\alpha \vee \beta = \{A \cap B : A \in \alpha, B \in \beta\}$ .

For any given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$  and any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{B}$ , let

$$H_\mu(\alpha) = \sum_{A \in \alpha} -\mu(A) \log \mu(A) \text{ and } H_\mu(\alpha|\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{A \in \alpha} \int_X -\mathbb{E}_\mu(1_A|\mathcal{C}) \log \mathbb{E}_\mu(1_A|\mathcal{C}) d\mu,$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_\mu(1_A|\mathcal{C})$  is the conditional expectation of the characterization function  $1_A$  of  $A$  with respect to  $\mathcal{C}$ . One standard fact states that  $H_\mu(\alpha|\mathcal{C})$  increases with respect to  $\alpha$  and decreases with respect to  $\mathcal{C}$ . When  $T^{-1}\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , it is not hard to see that  $H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha|\mathcal{C})$  is non-negative and sub-additive sequence for a given  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ , so we can define

$$h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_0^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha|\mathcal{C}\right) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_0^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha|\mathcal{C}\right).$$

The *measure-theoretic entropy* of  $\mu$  with respect to  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined as

$$h_\mu(T|\mathcal{C}) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X} h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}).$$

Let  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  be a factor map between two MDSes. We define *the conditional entropy* of  $\mu$  with respect to  $\pi$  as

$$h_\mu(T|\pi) = h_\mu(T|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{D})).$$

The following result is a generalization of Abramov-Rohlin formula borrowed from [12].

**Lemma 3.1.** (*Generalized Abramov-Rohlin formula*) *Let  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  and  $\psi : (Y, \mathcal{B}, \nu, S) \rightarrow (Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  be two factor maps between two MDSes. Then  $\psi \circ \pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  is also a factor map between MDSes and*

$$h_\mu(T|\psi \circ \pi) = h_\mu(T|\pi) + h_\nu(S|\psi).$$

For a given Lebesgue system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ , let

$$\bar{X} = \{\bar{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}} : Tx_i = x_{i+1}, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

and  $(\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{T})$  be the natural extension of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  (see [53, Section 3.7]). More precisely, for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $\Pi_{n, X} : \bar{X} \rightarrow X$  with  $\Pi_{n, X}((x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = x_n$  for  $\bar{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . Set

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_n = \Pi_{n, X}^{-1}(\mathcal{B}).$$

Clearly,  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_i \supseteq \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{i+1}$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \bar{\mathcal{B}}_i$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  is a algebra of subsets of  $\bar{X}$ . The Lebesgue measure  $\bar{\mu}$  on  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  satisfies  $\bar{\mu}(\Pi_{n, X}^{-1}(A)) = \mu(A)$  for  $A \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$  is the completion of the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  with respect to  $\bar{\mu}$ . The self-map  $\bar{T}$  defined on  $\bar{X}$  by

$$\bar{T}((x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = (Tx_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} = (x_{i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

is an invertible measure-preserving map on Lebesgue space  $(\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \bar{\mu})$ . Thus,  $(\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{T})$  is an invertible Lebesgue system.

Let  $\Pi_X := \Pi_{0, X}$ . Then  $\Pi_X : (\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{T}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is a factor map, which is called *the natural extension* of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ . In [52] it is proved that  $(\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{T})$  is ergodic if and only if  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is ergodic.

The next lemma is on the entropy of the extended map conditional to the natural extension. Its proof is given in Appendix A.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\Pi_X : (\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{T}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be the natural extension of Lebesgue system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ . Then  $h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}|\Pi_X) = 0$ .*



**3.3. Relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra.** In this subsection, we recall some notations and results on the relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra.

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be an invertible Lebesgue system. A  $T$ -invariant sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  (i.e.,  $T^{-1}\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}$ ) of  $\mathcal{B}$  determines an invertible Lebesgue factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ , that is, there exists a factor map  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  between two invertible Lebesgue systems such that  $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{F}$ . This factor is unique, up to isomorphism (see for example [49, Section 4.1]).

For a factor map  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  between two invertible Lebesgue systems, there is a set of conditional probability measures  $\{\mu_y\}_{y \in Y}$  with the following properties:

- $\mu_y$  is a Lebesgue measure on  $X$  with  $\mu_y(\pi^{-1}(y)) = 1$  for all  $y \in Y$ .
- for each  $f \in L^1(X, \mu)$ , one has  $f \in L^1(X, \mu_y)$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ , the map  $y \mapsto \int_X f d\mu_y$  is in  $L^1(Y, \nu)$  and  $\int_Y (\int_X f d\mu_y) d\nu(y) = \int_X f d\mu$ .

In this case, we say that  $\mu = \int_Y \mu_y d\nu(y)$  is *disintegration of  $\mu$  relative to the factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$* . The measures  $\{\mu_y\}$  are essentially unique; that is,  $\{\mu_y\}$  and  $\{\mu'_y\}$  have the above properties, then  $\mu_y = \mu'_y$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . In particular, it follows that  $T\mu_y = \mu_{Sy}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . The conditional expectations and the conditional measures are related by

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu(f|\pi^{-1}\mathcal{D})(x) = \int_X f d\mu_{\pi(x)} \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X$$

for every  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ .

The product of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  with itself relative to factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  is the MDS

$$(X \times X, \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}, \mu \times_Y \mu, T \times T),$$

where the measure

$$(\mu \times_Y \mu)(B) = \int_Y (\mu_y \times \mu_y)(B) d\nu(y), \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}.$$

The measure  $\mu \times_Y \mu$  is  $T \times T$ -invariant and is supported on

$$R_\pi := \{(x_1, x_2) \in X \times X : \pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2)\}$$

since each measure  $\mu_y \times \mu_y$  is supported on  $\pi^{-1}(y) \times \pi^{-1}(y)$ .

In the following, we are to introduce the relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra for a factor map between two invertible Lebesgue systems. First, we recall the relative Pinsker formula from [50, p.66].

**Lemma 3.3.** (*Relative Pinsker formula*) *Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be an invertible Lebesgue systems and  $\mathcal{A}$  be a sub- $\sigma$  algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $T^{-1}\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$ . Then for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}_X$ ,*

$$h_\mu(T, \alpha \vee \beta | \mathcal{A}) = h_\mu(T, \beta | \mathcal{A}) + h_\mu(T, \alpha | \beta^T \vee \mathcal{A})$$

where  $\beta^T = \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} T^{-i}\beta$ .

Let  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  be a factor map between two invertible Lebesgue systems. Put

$$P_\mu(\pi) = \{A \in \mathcal{B} : h_\mu(T, \{A, X \setminus A\} | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = 0\}.$$

It is well known that from Lemma 3.3 it follows that  $P_\mu(\pi)$  is the smallest sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$  containing  $\{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X : h_\mu(T, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = 0\}$  and  $T^{-1}(P_\mu(\pi)) = P_\mu(\pi)$ .  $P_\mu(\pi)$  is called the *relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra* of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  with respect to  $\pi$ . Note that

$$\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq P_\mu(\pi) \subseteq \mathcal{B}.$$

There exist an invertible Lebesgue system  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  and two factor maps

$$\pi_1 : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S), \quad \pi_2 : (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S) \rightarrow (Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$$

such that  $\pi_2 \circ \pi_1 = \pi$  and  $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathcal{D}) = P_\mu(\pi)$  (see for example [49]). The factor map  $\pi_1 : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  is called *the Pinsker factor of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  with respect to  $\pi$* .

The following result is well known (see for example [8, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3] or [65, Lemma 4.1]).

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  be a factor map between two invertible Lebesgue systems. Let  $\pi_1 : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  be the Pinsker factor of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  with respect to  $(Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  and  $\mu = \int_Y \mu_y d\nu$  be the disintegration of  $\mu$  relative to the factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$ . If  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is ergodic and  $h_\mu(T|\pi) > 0$ , then*

- (1)  $\mu_y$  is non-atomic (that is  $\mu_y(\{x\}) = 0$  for each  $x \in X$ ) for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ .
- (2)  $(X \times X, \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}, \mu \times_Y \mu, T \times T)$  is ergodic.

The following result is also well known (see for example [26, Lemma 3.3]).

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  be a factor map between two invertible Lebesgue systems. Let  $P_\mu(\pi)$  be the relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  relative to  $\pi$ . If  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X$ , then*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} h_\mu(T^m, \alpha|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = H_\mu(\alpha|P_\mu(\pi)).$$

**3.4. Entropy of compact Random set.** In this subsection, we first introduce the entropy of compact random set for the random dynamical system. We then present the variational principle.

Let  $\phi(n, \omega, x)$  a random dynamical system (RDS) in a Polish space  $X$  over the metric dynamical system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ . We assume that  $\Omega$  is a Polish system. Note that  $\phi(n, \omega, x)$  is generated by a random map  $\phi(\omega)(x) := \phi(1, \omega, x)$ . We assume  $\phi(\omega) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**Definition 3.6.** *Suppose that  $\phi$  is a RDS on  $X$ . The map*

$$\Phi : \Omega \times X \rightarrow \Omega \times X, \quad (\omega, x) \rightarrow (\theta\omega, \phi(\omega)x)$$

*is said to be skew product induced by  $\phi$ .*

Let  $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{B}_X$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega \times X$  with respect to which both the canonical projections  $\Pi_X : \Omega \times X \rightarrow X$  and  $\pi_\Omega : \Omega \times X \rightarrow \Omega$  are measurable. A probability measure  $\mu$  on the measurable space  $(\Omega \times X, \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{B}_X)$  is said to have *marginal  $P$*  on  $\Omega$  if  $\mu \circ \pi_\Omega^{-1} = P$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{P}_P(\Omega \times X)$  the collection of such measures. Let  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Omega \times X, f)$  denote the set of  $\Phi$ -invariant elements of  $\mathcal{P}_P(\Omega \times X)$ . If  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is an ergodic MDS, then we may consider the set  $\mathcal{E}_P(\Omega \times X)$  of ergodic elements in  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Omega \times X, f)$ .

Let  $K \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{B}_X$  be a forward  $\phi$ -invariant random set with compact  $\omega$ -section  $K(\omega)$ . Then, there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Omega \times X)$  that is supported on  $K$ , i.e.,  $\mu(K) = 1$  (see [13] and [4, Theorem 1.6.13]). For simplicity, we denote

$$\mathcal{M}_P^K(\Omega \times X) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Omega \times X) : \mu(K) = 1\}.$$

Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$ . Then, there is a decomposition  $d\mu(\omega, x) = d\mu_\omega(x)dP(\omega)$  of  $\mu$  into its sample measures  $\mu_\omega, \omega \in \Omega$  and  $P$  (see [4] and [13, Section 3]).  $\mu_\omega(K_\omega) = 1$  for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Since  $K$  is a Borel subset of  $\Omega \times X$ ,  $K$  is also Polish space and the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_K$  of  $K$  is just  $\{A \cap K : A \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{B}_X\}$ . Thus  $(K, \mathcal{B}_K, \mu, \Phi)$  is a Polish system and  $\pi_\Omega : (K, \mathcal{B}_K, \mu, \Phi) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is a factor map between two Polish systems.

*The entropy of RDS  $\phi$  with respect to  $\mu$  is defined by*

$$h_\mu(\phi) := h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega) = h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{F})).$$

That is, the entropy of RDS  $\phi$  with respect to  $\mu$  is the entropy of  $(K, \mathcal{B}_K, \mu, \Phi)$  with respect to  $\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{F})$ . By Bogenschutz [11],

$$h_\mu(\phi) = \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi, \pi_X^{-1}\alpha|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{F})) : \alpha \text{ is a finite Borel partition of } X\}.$$

If in addition that  $P$  is ergodic, then

$$\Gamma = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_P(\Omega \times X) : \mu(K) = 1, \mu \text{ invariant for } \Phi\}$$

is a compact (in the narrow topology of  $\mathcal{P}_P(\Omega \times X)$ , which is a metrizable topology) and convex, and its extremal points are ergodic by Lemma 6.19 in [13], particularly there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_P(\Omega \times X)$  that is supported on  $K$ . We use  $\mathcal{E}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$  to denote the set of the ergodic elements of  $\mathcal{M}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$  is the set of extremal points of  $\mathcal{M}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$ , which is a Borel subset of  $\mathcal{M}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$ .

Using the approach of Kifer [33] and Lemma A.4, one has the following result.

**Proposition 3.7.** (*Variational principle*) *Let  $\phi$  be a continuous RDS on Polish space  $X$  with Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_X$  over Polish system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ . Let  $K$  be a forward  $\phi$ -invariant random set with compact  $\omega$ -section  $K(\omega)$ . Then*

$$h_{top}(\phi, K) = \sup\{h_\mu(\phi) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_P^K(\Omega \times X, \phi)\}.$$

If in addition  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is ergodic, then

$$h_{top}(\phi, K) = \sup\{h_\mu(\phi) : \mu \in \mathcal{E}_P^K(\Omega \times X, \phi)\}.$$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

In this section, we first introduce a combinatorial lemma and some results on relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra and conditional entropy of a finite measurable partition. We then prove Theorem 2.1.

**4.1. Condition Entropy and a combinatorial lemma.** Let  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  be a factor map between two invertible Lebesgue systems. Let  $\pi_1 : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  be the Pinsker factor of  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  with respect to  $(Z, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, R)$  and  $\mu = \int_Y \mu_y d\nu$  be the disintegration of  $\mu$  relative to the factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$ . It is well known that for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ ,  $\mu_y(\pi_1^{-1}(y)) = 1$ .

Given  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\alpha$  be a finite measurable partition of  $X$ . Define a function

$$h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha, y) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} H_{\mu_y}(\alpha | \bigvee_{i=1}^n T^{-i\ell} \alpha).$$

Then  $h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha, y)$  is a measurable function on  $Y$  and  $h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha, y) \leq \log \#(\alpha)$ . We have

**Lemma 4.1.**  $\int_Y h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y) = h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}))$ .

*Proof.* First, we show that

$$(4.1) \quad h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | P_\mu(\pi)).$$

Since  $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq P_\mu(\pi)$ ,  $h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) \geq h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | P_\mu(\pi))$ . Conversely, let  $\beta_k \nearrow P_\mu(\pi)$  be an increasing sequence of finite measurable partitions of  $X$ . Since  $\beta_k \subseteq P_\mu(\pi)$ ,  $h_\mu(T, \beta_k | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = 0$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover,

$$h_\mu(T^\ell, \beta_k | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) \leq h_\mu(T^\ell, \bigvee_{j=0}^{\ell-1} T^{-j} \beta_k | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = \ell h_\mu(T, \beta_k | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = 0$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence,  $h_\mu(T^\ell, \beta_k | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) = 0$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now by Lemma 3.3, for  $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) &\leq h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha \vee \beta_k | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) \\
&= h_\mu(T^\ell, \beta_k | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) + h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \bigvee_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} T^{t\ell} \beta_k \vee \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) \\
&= h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \bigvee_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} T^{t\ell} \beta_k \vee \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) \leq h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \bigvee_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} T^{t\ell} \beta_k) \\
&= \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha | \bigvee_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} T^{t\ell} \beta_k \right) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha | \bigvee_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} T^{t\ell} \beta_k \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha | \beta_k \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Fixing  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and letting  $k \nearrow +\infty$  in the above inequality we have

$$h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) \leq \frac{1}{m} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha | P_\mu(\pi) \right)$$

since  $H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha | \beta_k) \searrow H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha | P_\mu(\pi))$  when  $k \nearrow +\infty$ . Then, letting  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ , we obtain  $h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) \leq h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | P_\mu(\pi))$ . Thus, we have the equality (4.1).

Next, let  $a_n = \int_Y H_{\mu_y}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha) d\nu(y)$ . Since  $T\mu_y = \mu_{Sy}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$  and  $\nu$  is  $S$ -invariant, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a_n &= \int_Y H_{\mu_{Sy}} \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha \right) d\nu(y) = \int_Y H_{T\mu_y} \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha \right) d\nu(y) \\
&= \int_Y H_{\mu_y} \left( T^{-1} \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha \right) \right) d\nu(y) = \int_Y H_{\mu_y} \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^n T^{-i\ell} \alpha \right) d\nu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover by the monotone convergence Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (a_{n+1} - a_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Y H_{\mu_y} \left( \alpha | \bigvee_{i=1}^n T^{-i\ell} \alpha \right) d\nu(y) \\
&= \int_Y \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} H_{\mu_y} \left( \alpha | \bigvee_{i=1}^n T^{-i\ell} \alpha \right) d\nu(y) \\
&= \int_Y h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{a_n}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (a_{n+1} - a_n) = \int_Y h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y).$$

By (3.1), we have  $a_n = H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i\ell} \alpha | P_\mu(\pi))$ . Combing this with (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{A})) &= h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha | P_\mu(\pi)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{a_n}{n} \\
&= \int_Y h_\mu(T^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

The following lemma is taken from [53] (Lemma 3' in §4 No.2).

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose  $\mu_y$  is non-atomic for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . If  $B$  is a measurable set  $X$  with  $\mu_y(B) \geq r > 0$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ , then for any  $0 \leq s \leq r$  there exists a measurable set  $B_s$  such that  $B_s \subseteq B$  and  $\mu_y(B_s) = s$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ .*

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose  $\mu_y$  is non-atomic for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . If  $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $\mu \times_Y \mu(U_1 \times U_2) > 0$ , then there exist a measurable set  $A \subset Y$  with  $\nu(A) > 0$ , a positive integer  $r > 2$  and a measurable partition  $\alpha = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r\}$  of  $X$  such that  $\pi_1^{-1}(A) \cap B_i \subseteq U_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and  $\mu_y(B_j) = \frac{1}{r}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ , for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $C_i = \{y \in Y : \mu_y(U_i) > 0\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Since

$$0 < \mu \times_Y \mu(U_1 \times U_2) = \int_Y \mu_y(U_1) \times \mu_y(U_2) d\nu(y),$$

we have  $\nu(C_1 \cap C_2) > 0$ . Thus there exist a positive integer  $r > 2$  and a measurable set  $A \subseteq C_1 \cap C_2$  such that  $\nu(A) > 0$  and  $\mu_y(U_i) \geq \frac{2}{r}$  for any  $y \in A$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

Next we construct  $B_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$  by induction. Taking

$$D_1 = \pi_1^{-1}(Y \setminus A) \cup (\pi_1^{-1}(A) \cap U_1),$$

then  $\mu_y(D_1) \geq \frac{2}{r}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . By Lemma 4.2, there exists a measurable set  $B_1 \subseteq D_1$  such that  $\mu_y(B_1) = \frac{1}{r}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ , and  $B_1 \cap \pi_1^{-1}(A) \subseteq D_1 \cap \pi_1^{-1}(A) \subseteq U_1$ .

Next, by the induction hypothesis, i.e., there are measurable sets  $B_k$ , ( $1 \leq k \leq r$ ) satisfying

- (1)<sub>k</sub>  $B_k \cap B_i = \emptyset$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ ;
- (2)<sub>k</sub>  $\mu_y(B_k) = \frac{1}{r}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ ;
- (3)<sub>k</sub>  $B_k \cap \pi_1^{-1}(A) \subseteq U_k$  (when  $k > 2$ , we set  $U_k = X$ ).

If  $k = r$ , we are done. If  $k < r$ , we set

$$D_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \pi_1^{-1}(X \setminus A) \cup (\pi_1^{-1}(A) \cap (U_2) \setminus B_1) & \text{if } k = 1 \\ X \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i & \text{if } k > 1. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that  $\mu_y(D_{k+1}) \geq \frac{1}{r}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . Using Lemma 4.2 again, there exists a measurable set  $B_{k+1} \subseteq D_{k+1}$  such that  $\mu_y(B_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{r}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . Then  $B_{k+1}$  satisfies (1)<sub>k+1</sub>, (2)<sub>k+1</sub> and (3)<sub>k+1</sub>. Therefore, by induction, we obtain a measurable partition  $\alpha = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r\}$  of  $X$  such that  $\mu_y(B_k) = \frac{1}{r}$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, r$ , for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$  and  $B_i \cap \pi_1^{-1}(A) \subseteq U_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

To prove our main theorem 2.1, we also need the following consequence of Karpovsky-Milman-Alon's generalization of the Sauer-Perles-Shelah lemma [3, 29, 56, 59].

**Lemma 4.4.** ([29]) *Given  $r \geq 2$  and  $\lambda > 1$  there is a constant  $e > 0$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{\{1, 2, \dots, n\}}$  satisfies  $|S| \geq ((r-1)\lambda)^n$  then there is an  $I \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  with  $|I| \geq en$  and  $S|_I = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^I$ , i.e., for any  $u \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^I$  there is  $s \in S$  with  $s(j) = u(j)$  for any  $j \in I$ .*

**4.2. Proof of Theorem 2.1.** Assume that  $h_{top}(\phi, K) > 0$ . By Proposition 3.7 there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$  such that  $h_\mu(\phi) > 0$ . Since  $K$  is a Borel subset of  $\Omega \times X$ ,  $K$  is also Polish space and the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_K$  of  $K$  is just  $\{A \cap K : A \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{B}_X\}$ . Thus  $(K, \mathcal{B}_K, \mu, \Phi)$  is an ergodic Polish system and  $\pi_\Omega : (K, \mathcal{B}_K, \mu, \Phi) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is a factor map between two Polish systems. Recall that the entropy of RDS  $\phi$  with respect to  $\mu$  is given by

$$h_\mu(\phi) := h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega) = h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Let  $\mathcal{B}_P$  be the completion of  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to  $P$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  be the completion of  $\mathcal{B}_K$  with respect to  $\mu$ . Then  $\pi_\Omega : (K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta)$  is a factor map between two Lebesgue systems. Since  $\mathcal{B}_P = \mathcal{F} \pmod{P}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_\mu = \mathcal{B}_K \pmod{\mu}$ , it is clear that

$$h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P)) = h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{F})) = h_\mu(\phi).$$

Let  $\Pi_K : (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \rightarrow (K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi)$  be the natural extension of  $(K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi)$ . Let

$$\Pi_\Omega : (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta}) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta)$$

be the natural extension of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta)$ . Define  $\bar{\pi} : \bar{K} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$  by  $\bar{\pi}(((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = (\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  for  $((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K}$ . Then  $\bar{\pi} : (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \rightarrow (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta})$  is a factor map between two invertible Lebesgue systems and the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi) & \xleftarrow{\Pi_K} & (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \\ \downarrow \pi_\Omega & & \downarrow \bar{\pi} \\ (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta) & \xleftarrow{\Pi_\Omega} & (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta}) \end{array}$$

Now, we show

$$(4.2) \quad h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\bar{\pi}) = h_\mu(\phi) > 0.$$

In fact, since  $\pi_\Omega \circ \Pi_K = \Pi_\Omega \circ \bar{\pi}$ , we have

$$(4.3) \quad h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\pi_\Omega \circ \Pi_K) = h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\Pi_\Omega \circ \bar{\pi}).$$

By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, we have

$$(4.4) \quad h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\pi_\Omega \circ \Pi_K) = h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\Pi_K) + h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega) = h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega) = h_\mu(\phi)$$

and

$$(4.5) \quad h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\Pi_\Omega \circ \bar{\pi}) = h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\bar{\pi}) + h_{\bar{P}}(\bar{\theta}|\Pi_\Omega) = h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\bar{\pi}).$$

Using (4.3), (4.4) and (4.5), we get (4.2).

Next, let  $P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi})$  be the relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  relative to  $\bar{\pi}$ . Since  $\bar{\Phi}^{-1}(P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi})) = P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi})$  and

$$\bar{\pi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_P) \subseteq P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi}) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu,$$

there exist an invertible Lebesgue system  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  and two factor maps

$$\pi_1 : (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S), \quad \pi_2 : (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S) \rightarrow (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta})$$

between invertible Lebesgue systems such that  $\pi_2 \circ \pi_1 = \bar{\pi}$  and  $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathcal{D}) = P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi}) \pmod{\bar{\mu}}$ . That is,  $\pi_1$  is the Pinsker factor of  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  relative to  $\bar{\pi}$ .

Let  $\bar{\mu} = \int_Y \bar{\mu}_y d\nu(y)$  be the disintegration of  $\bar{\mu}$  relative to the factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$ . Let

$$(\bar{K} \times \bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})$$

be the product of  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  with itself relative to a factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$ . Recall that

$$(\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu})(B) = \int_Y (\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y)(B) d\nu(y), \quad B \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu.$$

Since  $(K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi)$  is ergodic, we have that  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  is ergodic. By (4.2),  $h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\bar{\pi}) > 0$ . By Lemma 3.4, we have

- (a1).  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ .
- (a2).  $(\bar{K} \times \bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})$  is ergodic.

Since  $(X, d)$  is a separable metric space, there exists a countable dense set  $X'$  of  $X$ . Let  $\Gamma = \{\bar{B}(x, t) : x \in X' \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{Q}, t > 0\}$ , where  $\bar{B}(x, t) = \{z \in X : d(z, x) \leq t\}$ . Clearly,  $\Gamma$  is a countable set and each element of  $\Gamma$  is a non-empty closed set of  $X$ . Let  $\Theta = \{\{U_1, U_2\} : U_1, U_2 \in \Gamma, d(U_1, U_2) > 0\}$ . Then  $\Theta$  is also a countable set. For  $U \subseteq X$ , we define

$$(4.6) \quad \tilde{U} = \{((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K} : x_0 \in U\}.$$

Recall that  $\Delta_{\bar{K}} = \{(\bar{k}, \bar{k}) : \bar{k} \in \bar{K}\}$ . It is clear that when  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic, i.e.,  $\bar{\mu}_y(\{\bar{k}\}) = 0$  for  $\bar{k} \in \bar{K}$ , we have

$$\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta_{\bar{K}}) = \int_{\bar{K}} \left( \int_{\bar{K}} 1_{\Delta_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) d\bar{\mu}_y(\bar{k}_2) \right) d\bar{\mu}_y(\bar{k}_1) = \int_{\bar{K}} \bar{\mu}_y(\{\bar{k}_1\}) d\bar{\mu}_y(\bar{k}_1) = 0$$

where  $1_{\Delta_{\bar{K}}}$  is the characterization function of  $\Delta_{\bar{K}}$ . By (a1), for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ ,  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic. Thus for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ ,  $\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta_{\bar{K}}) = 0$ . Moreover,

$$\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\Delta_{\bar{K}}) = \int_Y \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta_{\bar{K}}) d\nu(y) = 0.$$

Thus  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\bar{K} \times \bar{K} \setminus \Delta_{\bar{K}}) = 1$ . Moreover, since  $\bar{K} \times \bar{K} \setminus \Delta_{\bar{K}} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigcup_{\{U_1, U_2\} \in \Theta} (\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})^i (\widetilde{U}_1 \times \widetilde{U}_2)$  and  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}$  is  $\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi}$ -invariant, there exists  $\{U_1, U_2\} \in \Theta$  such that  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\widetilde{U}_1 \times \widetilde{U}_2) > 0$ .

In the following we want to show that  $\{U_1, U_2\}$  is a weak Horseshoe of  $(\phi, K)$ . First, it is clear that  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are non-empty, closed and bounded subsets of  $X$  and  $d(U_1, U_2) > 0$  by the definition of  $\Theta$ . We divide the remainder of the proof into three steps.

*Step 1.* Since  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$  and  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\widetilde{U}_1 \times \widetilde{U}_2) > 0$ , by Lemma 4.3, there exist a measurable set  $A \subset Y$  with  $\nu(A) > 0$ , a positive integer  $r > 2$ , and a measurable partition  $\alpha = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r\}$  of  $\bar{K}$  such that  $\pi_1^{-1}(A) \cap B_i \subseteq \widetilde{U}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and  $\bar{\mu}_y(B_j) = \frac{1}{r}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ , for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ .

By Lemma 3.5

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^m, \alpha | \bar{\pi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_P)) = H_{\bar{\mu}}(\alpha | P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi})) = \sum_{j=1}^r \int_Y -\bar{\mu}_y(B_j) \log \bar{\mu}_y(B_j) d\nu(y) = \log r.$$

Thus, there is an  $\ell > 0$  such that  $h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha | \bar{\pi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_P)) > \nu(Y \setminus A) \cdot \log r + \nu(A) \cdot \log(r-1)$ .

Let  $c := \frac{1}{3} (h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha | \bar{\pi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_P)) - (\nu(Y \setminus A) \cdot \log r + \nu(A) \cdot \log(r-1)))$ . Then  $c > 0$ . Recall that we defined  $\nu$ -a.e. on  $Y$  a function

$$h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, y) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} H_{\bar{\mu}_y}(\alpha | \bigvee_{i=1}^n \bar{\Phi}^{-i\ell} \alpha).$$

By Lemma 4.1, we have  $\int_Y h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y) = h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha | \bar{\pi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_P))$ . For  $y \in Y$ , we set

$$\delta(y) := (h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, y) - \log(r-1)) \cdot 1_A(y).$$

Since  $0 \leq h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, y) \leq \log r$ ,  $\delta(y)$  is a bounded measurable function on  $Y$  and

$$(4.7) \quad 1_A(y) \geq \frac{\delta(y)}{\log(\frac{r}{r-1})}.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Y \delta(y) d\nu(y) &= \int_A h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y) - \nu(A) \log(r-1) \\ &= \int_Y h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y) - \int_{Y \setminus A} h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, y) d\nu(y) - \nu(A) \log(r-1) \\ &\geq h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha | \bar{\pi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_P)) - \nu(Y \setminus A) \log r - \nu(A) \log(r-1) \\ &= 3c. \end{aligned}$$

By the Birkhoff ergodic Theorem,  $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} 1_A(S^{i\ell} y)$  converges  $\nu$ -a.e. to a function  $1_A^* \in L^1(\nu)$ ;  $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \delta(S^{i\ell} y)$  converges  $\nu$ -a.e. to a function  $\delta^* \in L^1(\nu)$  and  $\int_Y \delta^*(y) d\nu(y) = \int_Y \delta(y) d\nu(y) \geq 3c$ .

Note that for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\bar{\Phi}^i \bar{\mu}_y = \bar{\mu}_{S^i y}$  and  $\bar{\Phi}^i \alpha \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\bar{\mu}_y}$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ , where  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\bar{\mu}_y}$  is the completion of  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu$  under  $\bar{\mu}_y$ .

Next we define the measurable subset  $D$  of  $Y$  such that  $y \in D$  if and only if the following holds

- $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} 1_A(S^{i\ell} y) = 1_A^*(y)$ ;
- $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \delta(S^{i\ell} y) = \delta^*(y) \geq 2c$ ;
- for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\bar{\Phi}^i \bar{\mu}_y = \bar{\mu}_{S^i y}$  and  $\bar{\Phi}^i \alpha \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\bar{\mu}_y}$ .

Since  $\int_Y \delta^*(y) d\nu(y) \geq 3c$ , one has  $\nu(D) > 0$ . For  $y \in D$ , let

$$\mathcal{S}(y) = \{\ell k : k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, S^{\ell k} y \in A\} := \{a_1(y) < a_2(y) < \dots\}.$$

Then  $S^{a_i(y)} y \in A$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Put  $c_1 = \frac{c}{\ell \log(\frac{r}{r-1})}$ . Using (4.7),

$$\begin{aligned} (4.8) \quad & \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}(y) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}|}{m} \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\ell m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} 1_A(S^{i\ell} y) \geq \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\ell m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{\delta(S^{i\ell} y)}{\log(\frac{r}{r-1})} \\ &= \frac{\delta^*(y)}{\ell \log(\frac{r}{r-1})} \geq \frac{3c}{\ell \log(\frac{r}{r-1})} \\ &= 3c_1 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $E_0 = D$  and  $E_i = S^{-i} D \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} S^{-j} D$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  is ergodic and  $\nu(D) > 0$ ,  $E := \bigcup_{i=0}^{+\infty} S^{-i} D = \bigcup_{i=0}^{+\infty} E_i$  has full measure, i.e.,  $\nu(E) = 1$ .

*Step 2.* Given  $z \in E$ . There exists unique  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and unique  $y \in D$  such that  $z \in E_i$  and  $z = S^{-i}(y)$ . Put  $a_j(z) = i + a_j(y)$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $\mathcal{S}(z) = \{a_1(z) < a_2(z) < \dots\}$ . Clearly,

$$(4.9) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}(z) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}|}{m} = \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}(y) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}|}{m} \geq 3c_1 > 0$$

by (4.8).

For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$M_z(k) := \{(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k) \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{\{1, 2, \dots, k\}} : \bar{\mu}_z(\pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap (\bigcap_{t=1}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-a_t(z)} B_{j_t})) > 0\}.$$



Since  $\bar{\mu}_z(\pi_1^{-1}(z)) = 1$ ,  $\bar{\Phi}^u \bar{\mu}_y = \bar{\mu}_{S^u y}$  for any  $u \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\ell | a_t(y)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\log |M_z(k)| &\geq H_{\bar{\mu}_z} \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-a_t(z)} \alpha \right) = H_{\bar{\mu}_{S^{-i_y}}} \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-(i+a_t(y))} \alpha \right) \\
&= H_{\bar{\mu}_y} \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-a_t(y)} \alpha \right) = H_{\bar{\mu}_y} \left( \bar{\Phi}^{-a_1(y)} \alpha \mid \bigvee_{t=2}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-a_t(y)} \alpha \right) + H_{\bar{\mu}_y} \left( \bigvee_{t=2}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-a_t(y)} \alpha \right) \\
&= H_{\bar{\mu}_{S^{a_1(y)} y}} \left( \alpha \mid \bigvee_{t=2}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-(a_t(y)-a_1(y))} \alpha \right) + H_{\bar{\mu}_y} \left( \bigvee_{t=2}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-a_t(y)} \alpha \right) \\
&\geq h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, S^{a_1(y)} y) + H_{\bar{\mu}_y} \left( \bigvee_{t=2}^k \bar{\Phi}^{-a_t(y)} \alpha \right) \\
&\dots\dots\dots \\
&\geq \sum_{t=1}^k h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, S^{a_t(y)} y).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\frac{a_k(y)}{\ell} \geq k - 1$  and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\frac{a_k(y)}{\ell} + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{a_k}{\ell}} \delta(S^{\ell j} y) = \delta^*(y) \geq 2c,$$

there exists  $N_y \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $k \geq N_y$ ,  $\frac{1}{\frac{a_k(y)}{\ell} + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{a_k}{\ell}} \delta(S^{\ell j} y) \geq c$ . Thus for  $k \geq N_y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log |M_z(k)| &\geq \sum_{t=1}^k h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, S^{a_t(y)} y) \\
&= k \cdot \log(r-1) + \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{a_k}{\ell}} (h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}^\ell, \alpha, S^{\ell j} y) - \log(r-1)) \cdot 1_A(S^{\ell j} y) \\
&= k \cdot \log(r-1) + \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{a_k}{\ell}} \delta(S^{\ell j} y) \\
&\geq k \cdot \log(r-1) + \left( \frac{a_k(y)}{\ell} + 1 \right) c \\
&\geq k \cdot \log(r-1) + kc.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\lambda = 2^c$ . Then  $\lambda > 1$  and

$$|M_z(k)| \geq ((r-1)\lambda)^k$$

for  $k \geq N_y$ . By Lemma 4.4, there exists constant  $e > 0$  ( $e$  is just dependent on  $r$  and  $\lambda$ ) such that for  $k \geq N_y$  there exists  $I_{k,z} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  such that  $|I_{k,z}| \geq ek$  and  $M_z(k)|_{I_{k,z}} = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{I_{k,z}}$ .

Put  $L_{k,z} = \{a_t(z) : t \in I_{k,z}\}$ . Then for  $k \geq \max\{N_y, \frac{1}{e}\}$ , we have  $|L_{k,z}| = |I_{k,z}| \geq ek \geq 1$ ,  $J_{k,z} \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, a_k(z)\}$  and for any  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{L_{k,z}}$ , one has

$$\bar{\mu}_z(\pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap \left( \bigcap_{j \in L_{k,z}} \bar{\Phi}^{-j} B_{s(j)} \right)) > 0.$$

By (4.9), there exists  $W_z \in \mathbb{N}$  such that when  $m \geq W_z$ , one has

$$|\mathcal{S}(z) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}| \geq c_1 m \geq \max\{N_y, \frac{1}{e}\}$$

For  $m \geq W_z$ , let  $k_m(z) = |\mathcal{S}(z) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}|$ . Then  $k_m(z) \geq c_1 m \geq \max\{N_y, \frac{1}{e}\}$  and

$$\mathcal{S}(z) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\} = \{a_1(z), a_2(z), \dots, a_{k_m(z)}(z)\}.$$

Let  $J_{m,z} = L_{k_m(z),z}$ . Then  $J_{m,z} \subseteq \{a_1(z), a_2(z), \dots, a_{k_m(z)}(z)\} \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ ,

$$|J_{m,z}| = |L_{k_m(z),z}| \geq e k_m(z) \geq e c_1 m$$

and for any  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{J_{m,z}}$ , one has

$$\bar{\mu}_z(\pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap (\bigcap_{j \in J_{m,z}} \bar{\Phi}^{-j} B_{s(j)})) > 0.$$

*Step 3.* Let  $b = e c_1$ . Then  $b > 0$  and for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists  $M_{b,\omega} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any natural number  $m \geq M_{b,\omega}$  we can find  $J_m \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$  with  $|J_m| \geq b m$ , and for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J_m}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$  for any  $j \in J_m$ .

Note that

$$\Pi_\Omega \circ \pi_2 : (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta)$$

is a factor map between two Lebesgue systems. Since  $\nu(E) = 1$ , there exists  $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{B}_P$  satisfying  $P(\Omega_1) = 1$  and  $(\Pi_\Omega \circ \pi_2)^{-1}(\omega) \cap E \neq \emptyset$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega_1$ .

Given  $\omega \in \Omega_1$ . By the definition of  $\Omega_1$ , there exists  $z \in E$  such that  $\Pi_\Omega \circ \pi_2(z) = \omega$ . Let  $\pi_2(z) = (\omega_i(z))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{\Omega}$ . Then  $\omega = \Pi_\Omega((\omega_i(z))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \omega_0(z)$ . By Step 2, we can find  $W_z \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $m \geq W_z$ , there exists

$$J_{m,z} \subseteq \{a_1(z), a_2(z), \dots, a_{k_m(z)}(z)\} \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$$

with  $|J_{m,z}| \geq b m$ , and for any  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}^{J_{m,z}}$ , one has

$$(4.10) \quad \bar{\mu}_z(\pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap (\bigcap_{j \in J_{m,z}} \bar{\Phi}^{-j} B_{s(j)})) > 0.$$

We take  $M_{b,\omega} = W_z$ . For  $m \geq M_{b,\omega}$ , take  $J_m = J_{m,z}$ . Then  $J_m \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$  with  $|J_m| \geq b m$ . Next we are ready to show that for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J_m}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$  for any  $j \in J_m$ .

Given  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J_m}$ . By (4.10) we know  $\bar{\mu}_z(\pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap (\bigcap_{j \in J_m} \bar{\Phi}^{-j} B_{s(j)})) > 0$ . Thus  $\pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap (\bigcap_{j \in J_m} \bar{\Phi}^{-j} B_{s(j)}) \neq \emptyset$  and we can find  $((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap (\bigcap_{j \in J_m} \bar{\Phi}^{-j} B_{s(j)}) \subseteq \bar{K}$ . On the hand

$$\bar{\pi}(((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = (\omega_i^s)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

On the other hand

$$\bar{\pi}(((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \pi_2 \circ \pi_1(((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \pi_2(z) = (\omega_i(z))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

Hence  $(\omega_i^s)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} = (\omega_i(z))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . Particularly,  $\omega_0^s = \omega_0(z) = \omega$ . Thus  $x_0^s \in K(\omega)$  since  $(\omega, x_0^s) = (\omega_0, x_0^s) \in K$ . Take  $x_s = x_0^s$ . Then  $x_s \in K(\omega)$ . Recall that

$$\bar{K} = \{((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in K^{\mathbb{Z}} : \Phi(\omega_i, x_i) = (\omega_{i+1}, x_{i+1}) \text{ for } i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Since  $((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K}$  and  $(\omega_0^s, x_0^s) = (\omega, x_s)$ , one has  $\omega_i^s = \theta^i \omega$  and  $x_i^s = \phi(i, \omega, x_s) \in K(\theta^i \omega)$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Finally, we show that for any  $j \in J_m$ ,  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$ .

Given  $j \in J_m$ . Since  $z \in E$ , there exists unique  $i_* \geq 0$  and unique  $y \in D$  such that  $z \in E_{i_*}$  and  $z = S^{-i_*}(y)$ . Note that

$$J_m = J_{m,z} \subseteq \{a_1(z), a_2(z), \dots, a_{k_m(z)}(z)\} = \{i_* + a_1(y), i_* + a_2(y), \dots, i_* + a_{k_m(z)}(y)\},$$

we have  $j - i_* \in \{a_1(y), a_2(y), \dots, a_{k_m(z)}(y)\}$  and so  $S^{j-i_*}(y) \in A$ , that is,  $S^j(z) \in A$ . Since  $((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \pi_1^{-1}(z) \cap \bar{\Phi}^{-j} B_{s(j)}$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi}^j(((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) &\in \bar{\Phi}^j(\pi_1^{-1}(z)) \cap B_{s(j)} = \pi_1^{-1}(S^j z) \cap B_{s(j)} \\ &\subseteq \pi_1^{-1}(A) \cap B_{s(j)} \subseteq \widetilde{U_{s(j)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover as  $\bar{\Phi}^j(((\omega_i^s, x_i^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = ((\omega_{i+j}^s, x_{i+j}^s))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , using (4.6) we know  $x_j^s \in U_{s(j)}$ . Combing this with  $x_j^s = \phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in K(\theta^j \omega)$ , this shows  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)}$  and completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

In this section, we prove a stronger result than Theorem 2.1 when  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is a compact metric system and  $K(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  is a strongly compact random set. We show that there is a full horseshoe for  $(\phi, K)$  instead of a weak horseshoe. As a consequence, we have a full horseshoe for a continuous deterministic dynamical systems  $\phi$  on a compact invariant set  $K$  with positive topological entropy.

**Proof of Theorem 2.2.** By Theorem 2.1 there exist subsets  $U_1, U_2$  of  $X$ , a constant  $b > 0$  and  $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $P(\Omega_0) = 1$  such that

- (1)  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are non-empty closed bounded subsets of  $X$  and  $d(U_1, U_2) > 0$ .
- (2) for each  $\omega \in \Omega_0$ , there exists  $M_{b,\omega} \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any natural number  $m \geq M_{b,\omega}$ , there is a subset  $J_m(\omega) \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$  with  $|J_m(\omega)| \geq bm$  (positive density), and for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J_m(\omega)}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$  for any  $j \in J_m(\omega)$ .

Let  $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  and  $T : \Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  be the map such that  $T(\omega, u) = (\theta\omega, \sigma u)$  for  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $u = (u(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ , where  $\sigma u = (u_{n+1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is the left shift map on  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ . Clearly  $\Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  is a compact metric space and  $T$  is a continuous self-map on  $\Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ .

Consider the subset  $Y$  of  $\Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  such that  $(\omega, u) \in Y$  if and only if for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^J$ , put  $J = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : u(n) = 1\}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$  for any  $j \in J$ . We have the following claim.

*Claim.*  $T(Y) \subseteq Y$  and  $Y$  is a closed subset of  $\Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ .

*Proof of claim.* If  $(\omega, u) \in Y$ , let  $J = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : u(n) = 1\}$  and  $J_\sigma = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : (\sigma u)(n) = 1\}$ . Then  $J_\sigma + 1 \subset J$ . Now for any  $t \in \{1, 2\}^{J_\sigma}$ , we can find  $s \in \{1, 2\}^J$  such that  $t(n) = s(n+1)$  for  $n \in J_\sigma$ . As  $(\omega, u) \in Y$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$  for any  $j \in J$ . Thus let  $x_t = \phi(\omega)(x_s)$ . Then  $x_t \in K(\theta\omega)$  and  $\phi(j, \theta\omega, x_t) = \phi(j+1, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j+1)} \cap K(\theta^j \theta\omega)$  for any  $j \in J_\sigma$ . Hence  $(\theta\omega, \sigma u) \in Y$ . This implies  $T(Y) \subseteq Y$ .

Next let  $(\omega^i, u^i) \in Y$  and  $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} (\omega^i, u^i) = (\omega, u)$  in  $\Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ . Let  $J_i = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : u^i(n) = 1\}$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $J = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : u(n) = 1\}$ . If  $J = \emptyset$ , then it is clear that  $(\omega, u) \in Y$  by the definition of  $Y$ . Now suppose  $J \neq \emptyset$ , and let  $N = \min\{n \in J\}$ .

Given  $s \in \{1, 2\}^J$ . Note that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} u^i = u$ . There exist  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots$  such that

$$J_{i_k} \cap \{0, 1, \dots, N+r\} = J \cap \{0, 1, \dots, N+r\}$$

for each  $1 \leq r \leq k$ . Now for each  $k$ , we take  $s^k \in \{1, 2\}^{J_{i_k}}$  such that  $s^k(j) = s(j)$  for  $j \in J \cap \{0, 1, \dots, N+k\}$ . As  $(\omega^{i_k}, u^{i_k}) \in Y$ , there exists  $x_{s^k} \in K(\omega^{i_k})$  with  $\phi(j, \omega^{i_k}, x_{s^k}) \in U_{s^k(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega^{i_k})$  for any  $j \in J_{i_k}$ . Without loss generality, we assume that the limit  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} x_{s^k}$  exists (if necessarily we take subsequence) and let  $x_s := \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} x_{s^k}$ .

Firstly, as  $x_{s^k} \in K(\omega^{i_k})$  and the function  $\omega \mapsto \inf_{y \in M(\omega)} d(x, y)$  is lower semi-continuous for any  $x \in X$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{y \in K(\omega)} d(x_s, y) &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{y \in K(\omega^{i_k})} d(x_s, y) \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{y \in K(\omega^{i_k})} (d(x_s, x_{s^k}) + d(x_{s^k}, y)) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $x_s \in K(\omega)$ .

Given  $n \in J$ . As the map  $(\omega, x) \mapsto \phi(\omega)x$  is a continuous map, one has

$$\phi(n, \omega, x_s) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi(n, \omega^{i_k}, x_{s^k}).$$

Combing this with the fact that

$$\phi(n, \omega^{i_k}, x_{s^k}) \in U_{s^k(n)} \cap K(\theta^n \omega^{i_k}) = U_{s(n)} \cap K(\theta^n \omega^{i_k})$$

for  $k \geq n$  and the function  $\omega \mapsto \inf_{y \in M(\omega)} d(x, y)$  is lower semi-continuous for any  $x \in X$ , one has  $\phi(n, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(n)}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{y \in K(\theta^n \omega)} d(\phi(n, \omega, x_s), y) &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{y \in K(\theta^n \omega^{i_k})} d(\phi(n, \omega, x_s), y) \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{y \in K(\theta^n \omega^{i_k})} (d(\phi(n, \omega, x_s), \phi(n, \omega^{i_k}, x_{s^k})) + d(\phi(n, \omega^{i_k}, x_{s^k}), y)) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\phi(n, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(n)} \cap K(\theta^n \omega)$  for  $n \in J$ . This implies  $(\omega, u) \in Y$ . Hence  $Y$  is a closed subset of  $\Omega \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . This completes the proof of claim.  $\square$

Let  $G_P$  be the set of all generic points of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ , that is,  $\omega \in G_P$  if and only if  $P = \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \delta_{\theta^j \omega}$  in the weak\*-topology. By Birkhoff pointwise ergodic Theorem,  $P(G_P) = 1$  as  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is ergodic.

As  $P(G_P \cap \Omega_0) = 1$ , we take  $\omega_* \in G_P \cap \Omega_0$ . By the above (2), for any natural number  $m \geq M_{b, \omega_*}$ , there is a subset  $J_m(\omega_*) \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$  with  $|J_m(\omega_*)| \geq bm$  (positive density), and for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J_m(\omega_*)}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega_*)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega_*, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega_*)$  for any  $j \in J_m(\omega_*)$ .

For  $m \geq M_{b, \omega_*}$ . Let  $v_m \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  with  $v_m(n) = 1$  if and only if  $n \in J_m(\omega_*)$ , that is,  $\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : v_m(n) = 1\} = J_m(\omega_*)$ . Clearly  $(\omega_*, v_m) \in Y$ . Assume  $\mu_m = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \delta_{T^j(\omega_*, v_m)}$  for  $m \geq M_{b, \omega_*}$ . Then each  $\mu_m$  is a Borel probability on  $Y$ . Let  $\mu = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_{m_i}$  be a limit point of  $\{\mu_m\}$  in the weak\*-topology. Clearly,  $\mu$  is a  $T$ -invariant Borel probability on  $Y$ .

Let  $\pi : Y \rightarrow \Omega$  be the projection of coordinate. Then  $\mu \circ \pi^{-1} = P$ . In fact, for any continuous function  $f \in C(\Omega)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} f d\mu \circ \pi^{-1} &= \int_Y f \circ \pi d\mu = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Y f \circ \pi d\mu_{m_i} \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} f \circ \pi(T^j(\omega_*, v_{m_i})) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} f(\theta^j \omega_*) \\ &= \int_{\Omega} f dP \end{aligned}$$

the last equality comes from the fact  $\omega_*$  is a generic point of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ . Thus  $\mu \circ \pi^{-1} = P$ .

Let  $[1] = \{(\omega, u) \in Y : u(0) = 1\}$ . Then  $[1]$  is a closed and open subset of  $Y$ . Note that  $T^j(\omega, u) = (\theta^j \omega, \sigma^j u)$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mu([1]) &= \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \mu_{m_i}([1]) = \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m_i} |\{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m_i - 1\} : (\sigma^j v_{m_i})(j) = 1\}| \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m_i} |\{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m_i - 1\} : v_{m_i}(j) = 1\}| \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m_i} |J_{m_i}(\omega_*)| \\ &\geq b. \end{aligned}$$

By the ergodic decomposition,  $\mu \circ \pi^{-1} = P$  and the fact that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is ergodic, we know that there exists a  $T$ -invariant ergodic Borel probability measure  $\nu$  on  $Y$  with  $\nu([1]) \geq \mu([1]) \geq b$  and  $\nu \circ \pi^{-1} = P$ . Let  $G_\nu$  be the set of all generic points of  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu, T)$ , that is,  $(\omega, u) \in G_\nu$  if and only if  $\nu = \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \delta_{T^j(\omega, u)}$  in the weak\*-topology. Then  $G_\nu$  is a Borel subset of  $Y$ , and  $\nu(G_\nu) = 1$  by Birkhoff pointwise ergodic Theorem.

Let  $\Omega_1 = \pi(G_\nu)$ . Then  $\Omega_1$  is a  $P$ -measurable set since it is the continuous image of a Borel set. Thus  $P(\Omega_1) = \nu \circ \pi^{-1}(\Omega_1) = \nu(\pi^{-1}(\Omega_1)) = 1$ . Now for  $\omega \in \Omega_1$ , there exists  $u_\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  such that  $(\omega, u_\omega) \in G_\nu$ . Let  $J(\omega) = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : u_\omega(n) = 1\}$ . As  $(\omega, u_\omega) \in G_\nu$  and  $[1]$  is closed and open, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \nu([1]) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \delta_{T^j(\omega, u_\omega)}([1]) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} |\{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\} : (\sigma^j u_\omega)(0) = 1\}| \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} |\{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\} : u_\omega(j) = 1\}| \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} |J(\omega) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}| \end{aligned}$$

Thus the limit  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{m} |J(\omega) \cap \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m\}|$  exists and is larger than or equal to  $b$ , as  $\nu([1]) \geq b$ . Note that  $(\omega, u_\omega) \in Y$ . By the definition of  $Y$ , one has for any  $s \in \{1, 2\}^{J(\omega)}$ , there exists  $x_s \in K(\omega)$  with  $\phi(j, \omega, x_s) \in U_{s(j)} \cap K(\theta^j \omega)$  for any  $j \in J(\omega)$ . Summing up the above discussion,  $\{U_1, U_2\}$  is a full Horseshoe for  $(\phi, K)$  and completes the proof of the Theorem.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

To prove this theorem, we also need the following result due to Mycielski (see [1, Theorem 5.10] and [2, Theorem 6.32]).

**Lemma 6.1.** (*Mycielski*) *Let  $Y$  be a perfect compact metric space and  $C$  a symmetric dense  $G_\delta$  subset of  $Y \times Y$ . Then there exists a dense Mycielski subset  $K \subseteq Y$  such that  $K \times K \subseteq C \cup \Delta_Y$ , where  $\Delta_Y = \{(y, y) : y \in Y\}$ .*

**Proof of Theorem 2.4.** Assume that  $h_{top}(\phi, K) > 0$ . By Proposition 3.7 there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_P^K(\Omega \times X)$  such that  $h_\mu(\phi) > 0$ . Since  $K$  is a Borel subset of  $\Omega \times X$ ,  $K$  is also Polish space and the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_K$  of  $K$  is just  $\{A \cap K : A \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{B}_X\}$ . Thus  $(K, \mathcal{B}_K, \mu, \Phi)$  is an ergodic Polish system and  $\pi_\Omega : (K, \mathcal{B}_K, \mu, \Phi) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$  is a factor map between two Polish systems. Recall that the entropy of RDS  $\phi$  with respect to  $\mu$  is given by

$$h_\mu(\phi) := h_\mu(\Phi | \pi_\Omega) = h_\mu(\Phi | \pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Let  $\mathcal{B}_P$  be the completion of  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to  $P$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  be the completion of  $\mathcal{B}_K$  with respect to  $\mu$ . Then  $\pi_\Omega : (K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta)$  is a factor map between two Lebesgue systems. Since

$\mathcal{B}_P = \mathcal{F} \pmod{P}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_\mu = \mathcal{B}_K \pmod{\mu}$ , it is clear that

$$h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P)) = h_\mu(\Phi|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{F})) = h_\mu(\phi).$$

Let  $\Pi_K : (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \rightarrow (K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi)$  be the natural extension of  $(K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi)$ . Let

$$\Pi_\Omega : (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta}) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta)$$

be the natural extension of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta)$ . Define  $\bar{\pi} : \bar{K} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$  by  $\bar{\pi}(((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = (\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  for  $((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K}$ . Then  $\bar{\pi} : (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \rightarrow (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta})$  be a factor map between two invertible Lebesgue systems and the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi) & \xleftarrow{\Pi_K} & (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \bar{\pi} \\ (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P, P, \theta) & \xleftarrow{\Pi_\Omega} & (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta}) \end{array}$$

We divide the remainder of the proof into four steps.

*Step 1.* Let  $P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi})$  be the relative Pinsker  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  relative to  $\bar{\pi}$ . Since  $\bar{\Phi}^{-1}(P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi})) = P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi})$  and

$$\bar{\pi}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_P) \subseteq P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi}) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu,$$

there exist an invertible Lebesgue system  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$  and two factor maps

$$\pi_1 : (\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S), \quad \pi_2 : (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S) \rightarrow (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_P, \bar{P}, \bar{\theta})$$

between invertible Lebesgue systems such that  $\pi_2 \circ \pi_1 = \bar{\pi}$  and  $\pi_1^{-1}(\mathcal{D}) = P_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\pi}) \pmod{\bar{\mu}}$ . That is,  $\pi_1$  is the Pinsker factor of  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  relative to  $\bar{\pi}$ .

Let  $\bar{\mu} = \int_Y \bar{\mu}_y d\nu(y)$  be the disintegration of  $\bar{\mu}$  relative to the factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$ . Let

$$(\bar{K} \times \bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})$$

be the product of  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  with itself relative to a factor  $(Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S)$ . Recall that

$$(\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu})(B) = \int_Y (\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y)(B) d\nu(y), \quad B \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu.$$

Since  $(K, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, \Phi)$  is ergodic, we have that  $(\bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi})$  is ergodic. By (4.2) in the proof of Theorem 2.1,  $h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{\Phi}|\bar{\pi}) > 0$ . Moreover by Lemma 3.4, we have

- (a1).  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ .
- (a2).  $(\bar{K} \times \bar{K}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})$  is ergodic.

*Step 2.* We define a metric  $\rho$  on  $X^{\mathbb{Z}}$  as follows:

$$\rho((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{2^{|i|}} \frac{d(x_i^1, x_i^2)}{1 + d(x_i^1, x_i^2)} \quad \text{for } (x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$A_n = \{((\omega_i^1, x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, ((\omega_i^2, x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K} \times \bar{K} : \rho((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) < \frac{1}{n}\}$$

and

$$B_n = \bar{K} \times \bar{K} \setminus A_n = \{((\omega_i^1, x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, ((\omega_i^2, x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K} \times \bar{K} : \rho((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \geq \frac{1}{n}\}.$$

Then  $A_n, B_n$  are measurable subsets of  $\bar{K} \times \bar{K}$ . Now we claim:

**Claim 1:**  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n) = 1$  and  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(A_n) > 0$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* Let  $\Delta = \{((\omega_i^1, x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, ((\omega_i^2, x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\} \in \bar{K} \times \bar{K} : x_i^1 = x_i^2 \text{ for each } i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Then

$$\bar{K} \times \bar{K} \setminus \Delta = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n.$$

Hence to show  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n) = 1$ , it is sufficient to show that  $\bar{\mu} \times \bar{\mu}(\Delta) = 0$ . For  $y \in Y$ ,  $\pi_2(y) \in \Omega$  and  $\bar{\mu}_y(\bar{\pi}^{-1}(\pi_2(y))) = 1$ . Hence

$$\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta) = \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\bar{\pi}^{-1}(\pi_2(y)) \times \bar{\pi}^{-1}(\pi_2(y)) \cap \Delta) = \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta_{\bar{K}})$$

where  $\Delta_{\bar{K}} = \{(\bar{k}, \bar{k}) : \bar{k} \in \bar{K}\}$ .

It is clear that when  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic, i.e.,  $\bar{\mu}_y(\{\bar{k}\}) = 0$  for  $\bar{k} \in \bar{K}$ , we have

$$\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta_{\bar{K}}) = \int_{\bar{K}} \left( \int_{\bar{K}} 1_{\Delta_{\bar{K}}}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) d\bar{\mu}_y(\bar{k}_2) \right) d\bar{\mu}_y(\bar{k}_1) = \int_{\bar{K}} \bar{\mu}_y(\{\bar{k}_1\}) d\bar{\mu}_y(\bar{k}_1) = 0$$

where  $1_{\Delta_{\bar{K}}}$  is the characterization function of  $\Delta_{\bar{K}}$ . By (a1) in step 1, for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ ,  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic. Thus for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ ,  $\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta) = \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta_{\bar{K}}) = 0$ . Moreover,

$$\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\Delta) = \int_Y \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(\Delta) d\nu(y) = 0.$$

This implies  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n) = 1$ .

Next, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we are to show  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(A_n) > 0$ . For  $\bar{z} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , we define

$$B_\rho(\bar{z}, n) = \{\bar{x} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}} : \rho(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) < \frac{1}{2n}\}.$$

Since  $(X, d)$  is a separable metric space,  $(X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho)$  is also separable. Thus there exist  $\{\bar{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq X^{\mathbb{Z}}$  such that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_\rho(\bar{z}_i, n) = X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . Put

$$D_i = \{((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K} : (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in B_\rho(\bar{z}_i, n)\}.$$

Then  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} D_i = \bar{K}$  and there exists  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\bar{\mu}(D_r) > 0$ . It is clear that  $D_r \times D_r \subseteq A_n$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(A_n) &\geq \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(D_r \times D_r) = \int_Y \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(D_r \times D_r) d\nu(y) \\ &= \int_Y (\bar{\mu}_y(D_r))^2 d\nu(y) \geq \left( \int_Y \bar{\mu}_y(D_r) d\nu(y) \right)^2 = \bar{\mu}(D_r)^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Claim 1. □

*Step 3.* Let

$$\bar{\Omega}_0 = \{(\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{\Omega} : \phi(\omega_i) : X \rightarrow X \text{ is continuous and } K_{\omega_i} \text{ is compact subset of } X \text{ for each } i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Since  $\phi(\omega) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous and  $K_\omega$  is compact subset of  $X$  for  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the set

$$\Omega_0 := \{\omega \in \Omega : \phi(\omega) : X \rightarrow X \text{ is continuous and } K_\omega \text{ is compact subset of } X\}$$

is full measure, that is  $P(\Omega_0) = 1$ . Note that  $\bar{\Omega}_0 = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Pi_{n, \Omega}^{-1}(\Omega_0)$ , we have  $\bar{P}(\bar{\Omega}_0) = 1$  since for each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\bar{P}(\Pi_{n, \Omega}^{-1}(\Omega_0)) = P(\Omega_0) = 1$ . Moreover

$$(6.1) \quad \nu(\pi_2^{-1}(\bar{\Omega}_0)) = \bar{P}(\bar{\Omega}_0) = 1.$$

By the step 2, there exists  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(B_r) > 0$ . Let

$$W = \{(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) \in \bar{K} \times \bar{K} : \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} 1_{A_n}((\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})^i(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2)) = \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(A_n) > 0$$

$$\text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} 1_{B_r}((\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})^i(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2)) = \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(B_r) > 0\}$$

where  $1_E$  is the characterization function of  $E \subseteq \bar{K} \times \bar{K}$ . Then,  $W$  is a Borel subset of  $\bar{K} \times \bar{K}$  and by the Birkhoff ergodic theorem  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(W) = 1$  since  $\bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}$  is ergodic (see (a2) in Step 1). Let

$$Y_0 = \{y \in Y : \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(W) = 1, \mu_y \text{ is non-atomic}\} \cap \pi_2^{-1}(\bar{\Omega}_0).$$

Note that  $1 = \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(W) = \int_Y \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(W) d\nu(y)$  since  $\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(W) = 1$  for  $\nu$ -a.e.  $y \in Y$ . Combing this with (6.1) and (a1) in Step 1, we have  $\nu(Y_0) = 1$ .

For  $y \in Y$ , let  $(\omega_i(y))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} := \pi_2(y) \in \bar{\Omega}$  and

$$\bar{K}_y = \{(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} K_{\omega_i(y)} : \phi(\omega_i(y))(x_i) = x_{i+1} \text{ for each } i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

For simplicity, we identify  $(\Omega \times X)^{\mathbb{Z}}$  with  $\Omega^{\mathbb{Z}} \times X^{\mathbb{Z}}$  as follow:

$$((\omega_i, x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in (\Omega \times X)^{\mathbb{Z}} \simeq ((\omega_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in \Omega^{\mathbb{Z}} \times X^{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Clearly

$$\pi_1^{-1}(y) \subseteq \bar{\pi}^{-1}(\pi_2(y)) \subseteq \{\pi_2(y)\} \times \bar{K}_y.$$

Put  $\kappa = \frac{1}{8r}$ , we have the following claim.

*Claim 2.* For  $y \in Y_0$ ,  $\bar{K}_y$  is a compact subset of  $(X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho)$  and there exists a Mycielski subset  $D_y$  of  $\bar{K}_y$  such that for each pair  $((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$  of distinct points in  $D_y$ , we have

$$(6.2) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \geq 4\kappa \text{ and}$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = 0$$

where  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

*Proof of Claim 2.* Let  $y \in Y_0$ . First by the choice of  $Y_0$ ,  $\phi(\omega_i(y)) : (X, d) \rightarrow (X, d)$  is continuous and  $K_{\omega_i(y)}$  is compact subset of  $(X, d)$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , where  $(\omega_i(y))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} := \pi_2(y)$ . Thus  $\prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} K_{\omega_i(y)}$  is a compact subset of  $(X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho)$ . Since  $\bar{K}_y$  is a closed subset of  $\prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} K_{\omega_i(y)}$ ,  $\bar{K}_y$  is also a compact subset of  $(X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho)$ . We define

$$E_y = \{(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K}_y : \bar{\mu}_y(\{\pi_2(y)\} \times (U \cap \bar{K}_y)) > 0 \text{ for any open neighborhood } U \text{ of}$$

$$(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{ in } (X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho)\}$$

Since  $\bar{\mu}_y(\pi_1^{-1}(y)) = 1$  and  $\pi_1^{-1}(y) \subseteq \{\pi_2(y)\} \times \bar{K}_y$ , we have  $\bar{\mu}_y(\{\pi_2(y)\} \times \bar{K}_y) = 1$ . Moreover,  $E_y$  is a closed subset of  $\bar{K}_y$  since  $\bar{K}_y$  is compact. Thus  $E_y$  is compact and  $\bar{\mu}_y(\{\pi_2(y)\} \times E_y) = 1$ . Note that  $\bar{\mu}_y$  is non-atomic,  $E_y$  is a perfect set. Hence,  $(E_y, \rho)$  is a perfect compact metric space.

For  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , put

$$D_n(y) = \{((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in E_y \times E_y : \text{there exists } k \geq n$$

$$\text{such that } \rho((\phi(k, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(k, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) > 4\kappa\}$$



and

$$P_{n,m}(y) = \{((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in E_y \times E_y : \text{there exists } p \geq n \\ \text{such that } \rho((\phi(p, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(p, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) < \frac{1}{m}\}.$$

Since  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mapsto (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a continuous map from  $(X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho)$  to itself,  $D_n(y)$  and  $P_{n,m}(y)$  are both open subsets of  $(E_y \times E_y, \rho \times \rho)$ . Let

$$C(y) = \left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n(y) \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} P_{n,m}(y) \right) \right).$$

Then  $C(y)$  is a  $G_\delta$  subset of  $E_y \times E_y$  and for any  $((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in C(y)$ ,  $((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$  satisfies (6.2). We claim  $C(y)$  is dense in  $E_y \times E_y$ . If this is not true, then there exist open subsets  $U_1, U_2$  of  $X^{\mathbb{Z}}$  such that  $(U_1 \times U_2) \cap (E_y \times E_y) \neq \emptyset$  and  $(U_1 \times U_2) \cap C(y) = \emptyset$ . Since  $\bar{\mu}_y(\{\pi_2(y)\} \times E_y) = 1$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y((\pi_2(y) \times (U_1 \cap E_y)) \times (\pi_2(y) \times (U_2 \cap E_y))) \\ &= \bar{\mu}_y(\pi_2(y) \times (U_1 \cap E_y)) \bar{\mu}_y(\pi_2(y) \times (U_2 \cap E_y)) \\ &= \bar{\mu}_y(\pi_2(y) \times U_1) \bar{\mu}_y(\pi_2(y) \times U_2) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combing this with the fact  $\bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(W) = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y(((\pi_2(y) \times (U_1 \cap E_y)) \times (\pi_2(y) \times (U_2 \cap E_y))) \cap W) \\ &= \bar{\mu}_y \times \bar{\mu}_y((\pi_2(y) \times U_1) \times (\pi_2(y) \times U_2)) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Particularly,  $((\pi_2(y) \times (U_1 \cap E_y)) \times (\pi_2(y) \times (U_2 \cap E_y))) \cap W \neq \emptyset$ . Hence there exist  $(z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in U_1 \cap E_y$  and  $(z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in U_2 \cap E_y$  such that  $((\omega_i(y), z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\omega_i(y), z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in W$ .

Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $((\omega_i(y), z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\omega_i(y), z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in W$ , we have

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} 1_{B_r}((\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Psi})^i((\omega_i(y), z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\omega_i(y), z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})) = \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(B_r) > 0$$

Hence there exists  $k \geq n$  such that  $(\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})^k((\omega_i(y), z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\omega_i(y), z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in B_r$ . Note that

$$\bar{\Phi}^k((\omega_i(y), z_i^j)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = ((\theta^k \omega_i(y), \phi(k, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$$

for  $j = 1, 2$ . Thus, we have

$$\left( ((\theta^k \omega_i(y), \phi(k, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, ((\theta^k \omega_i(y), \phi(k, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \right) \in B_r.$$

Thus  $\rho((\phi(k, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(k, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \geq \frac{1}{r} > 4\kappa$ . Hence

$$(6.3) \quad ((z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in D_n(y).$$

Since  $((\omega_i(y), z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\omega_i(y), z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in W$ , we have

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} 1_{A_m}((\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})^i(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2)) = \bar{\mu} \times_Y \bar{\mu}(A_m) > 0.$$

Thus there exists  $p \geq n$  such that  $(\bar{\Phi} \times \bar{\Phi})^p((\omega_i(y), z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\omega_i(y), z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in A_m$ . Note that

$$\bar{\Phi}^p((\omega_i(y), z_i^j)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = ((\theta^p \omega_i(y), \phi(p, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$$

for  $j = 1, 2$ . We have

$$\left( ((\theta^p \omega_i(y), \phi(p, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, ((\theta^p \omega_i(y), \phi(p, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \right) \in A_m.$$

Thus  $\rho((\phi(p, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(p, \omega_i(y), z_i^j))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) < \frac{1}{m}$ . Hence

$$(6.4) \quad ((z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in P_{n,m}(y).$$

Since (6.3) and (6.4) are true for any  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $((z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in C(y)$ . Therefore  $((z_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (z_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in (U_1 \times U_2) \cap C(y)$ , a contradiction with  $(U_1 \times U_2) \cap C(y) = \emptyset$ . This shows that  $C(y)$  is a dense  $G_\delta$  subset of  $E_y \times E_y$ .

Using Lemma 6.1 for  $(C(y), E_y)$ , there exists a dense Mycielski subset  $D_y \subseteq E_y$  such that  $D_y \times D_y \subseteq C \cup \Delta_{E_y}$ , where  $\Delta_{E_y} = \{(\bar{x}, \bar{x}) : \bar{x} \in E_y\}$ . Clearly,  $D_y \subseteq E_y \subseteq \bar{K}_y$  and if  $((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$  is a pair of distinct points in  $D_y$ , then  $((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \in C(y)$  and hence  $((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$  satisfies (6.2). This completes the proof of Claim 2.  $\square$

*Step 4.* For  $P$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  there exists a Mycielski chaotic set  $S_\omega \subset K_\omega$  for  $(\omega, \phi)$ .

Note that

$$\Pi_\Omega \circ \pi_2 : (Y, \mathcal{D}, \nu, S) \rightarrow (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}_P, \theta)$$

is a factor map between two Lebesgue systems. Since  $\nu(Y_0) = 1$ , there exists  $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{B}_P$  satisfying  $P(\Omega_1) = 1$  and  $(\Pi_\Omega \circ \pi_2)^{-1}(\omega) \cap Y_0 \neq \emptyset$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega_1$ .

Let  $\omega \in \Omega_1$ . Then there exists  $y \in Y_0$  such that  $\Pi_\Omega \circ \pi_2(y) = \omega$ . Since  $\pi_2(y) = (\omega_i(y))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , we have  $\omega = \omega_0(y)$ . By Claim 2, we can find a Mycielski subset  $D_y$  of  $\bar{K}_y$  such that for each pair  $((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$  of distinct points in  $D_y$ , we have

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) &\geq 4\kappa \text{ and} \\ \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\eta : \bar{K}_y \rightarrow K_\omega$  be the natural projection of coordinate with  $\eta((x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = x_0$  for  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . Put  $S_\omega = \eta(D_y)$ . Then  $S_\omega \subseteq K_\omega$ . In the following we show that  $S_\omega$  is a Mycielski chaotic set for  $(\omega, f)$ . Firstly we claim the map  $\eta : D_y \rightarrow S_\omega$  is injective. If this is not true, then there exist two distinct points  $(x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  in  $D_y$  such that  $\eta((x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \eta((x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}})$ , i.e.,  $x_0^1 = x_0^2$ . Since  $(x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K}_y$ , we have

$$(6.6) \quad x_i^1 = \phi(i, \omega_0(y), x_0^1) = \phi(i, \omega_0(y), x_0^2) = x_i^2$$

for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Now for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$(\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} = (x_{i+n}^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{ and } (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} = (x_{i+n}^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}.$$

Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((x_{i+n}^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_{i+n}^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = 0$$

where the last equality comes from (6.6), a contradiction with

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \geq \kappa$$

since  $(x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are distinct points in  $D_y$ . This shows that  $\eta : D_y \rightarrow S_\omega$  is injective.

Since  $D_y$  is a Mycielski set,  $D_y = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} C_j$  where each  $C_j$  is cantor set. Since  $\eta : (C_j, \rho) \rightarrow (\eta(C_j), d)$  is one to one surjective continuous map and  $C_j$  is compact subset of  $(X^{\mathbb{Z}}, \rho)$ ,  $\eta : C_j \rightarrow \eta(C_j)$  is homeomorphism. Thus  $\eta(C_j)$  is a cantor set. Hence  $S_\omega = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \eta(C_j)$  is also a mycielski set of  $K_\omega$ .

Finally, we prove that  $S_\omega$  is a chaotic set for  $(\omega, \phi)$ . Let  $(x^1, x^2)$  is a pair of distinct points in  $S_\omega$ . Then there exist  $(x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in D_y$  such that  $x_0^1 = x^1$  and  $x_0^2 = x^2$ . On the one hand, by (6.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(\phi(n, \omega, x^1), \phi(n, \omega, x^2)) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d((\phi(n, \omega_0(y), x_0^1), \phi(n, \omega_0(y), x_0^2))) \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(f_\omega^n(x^1), f_\omega^n(x^2)) = 0$ .

On the other hand, we take  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, |i| \geq L} \frac{1}{2^i} < \frac{1}{2}\kappa$ . By (6.5)

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho((\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) \geq 4\kappa.$$

Hence there exist natural numbers  $n_j, j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $L < n_1 < n_2 < \dots$  and

$$\rho((\phi(n_j, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\phi(n_j, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) > \frac{7}{2}\kappa.$$

Since  $(x_i^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \bar{K}_y$ , we have that  $\phi(\omega_i(y))x_i^1 = x_{i+1}^1$  and  $\phi(\omega_i(y))x_i^2 = x_{i+1}^2$  for  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Moreover for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(\phi(n_j, \omega_i(y), x_i^1))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} = (x_{i+n_j}^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $(\phi(n_j, \omega_i(y), x_i^2))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} = (x_{i+n_j}^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . Thus  $\rho((x_{i+n_j}^1)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (x_{i+n_j}^2)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) > \frac{7}{2}\kappa$  for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

$$\sum_{i, |i| \leq L} \frac{1}{2^{|i|}} \frac{d(x_{i+n_j}^1, x_{i+n_j}^2)}{1 + d(x_{i+n_j}^1, x_{i+n_j}^2)} > \frac{7}{2}\kappa - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, |i| \geq L} \frac{1}{2^i} \geq 3\kappa$$

for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $i_j \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $|i_j| \leq L$  such that

$$\frac{d(x_{i_j+n_j}^1, x_{i_j+n_j}^2)}{1 + d(x_{i_j+n_j}^1, x_{i_j+n_j}^2)} \geq \kappa,$$

which implies  $d(x_{i_j+n_j}^1, x_{i_j+n_j}^2) \geq \kappa$ . Let  $m_j = i_j + n_j > 0$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $d(x_{m_j}^1, x_{m_j}^2) \geq \kappa$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} m_j = +\infty$ . Since

$$x_{m_j}^1 = \phi(m_j, \omega_0(y), x_0^1) = \phi(m_j, \omega, x^1) \text{ and } x_{m_j}^2 = \phi(m_j, \omega_0(y), x_0^2) = \phi(m_j, \omega, x^2) \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}$$

we have that  $d(\phi(m_j, \omega, x^1), \phi(m_j, \omega, x^2)) = d(x_{m_j}^1, x_{m_j}^2) \geq \kappa$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and hence

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(\phi(n, \omega, x^1), \phi(n, \omega, x^2)) \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} d(\phi(m_j, \omega, x^1), \phi(m_j, \omega, x^2)) \geq \kappa.$$

Summarizing the above, we have that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(\phi(n, \omega, x^1), \phi(n, \omega, x^2)) = 0 \text{ and } \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(\phi(n, \omega, x^1), \phi(n, \omega, x^2)) \geq \kappa$$

for a pair  $(x^1, x^2)$  of distinct points in  $S_\omega$ . This shows that  $S_\omega$  is a chaotic set for  $(\omega, f)$  and completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. PROOF OF BASIC LEMMAS AND PROPOSITIONS

In this appendix, we give the proof of Lemma 3.2, and several basic facts and their proofs about the ergodic decomposition, which we used in previous sections.

**Proof of Lemma 3.2** For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $\Pi_{n,X} : \bar{X} \rightarrow X$  with  $\Pi_{n,X}((x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = x_n$  for  $\bar{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . Put

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_n = \Pi_{n,X}^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_X)$$

and  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \bar{\mathcal{B}}_i$ . Clearly,

$$(A.1) \quad \bar{\mathcal{B}}_i \supseteq \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{i+1}$$

for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  is a sub-algebra of  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$  and the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  is equal to  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$  (mod  $\bar{\mu}$ ). Thus for any  $A \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $A_\epsilon \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  such that  $\bar{\mu}(A \Delta A_\epsilon) < \epsilon$ , where  $A \Delta A_\epsilon = (A \setminus A_\epsilon) \cup (A_\epsilon \setminus A)$  (see [64, Theorem 0.7]).

Let  $\alpha = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{X}}$  with  $k \geq 2$ . For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $\delta = \delta(k, m) > 0$  such that for any  $\beta = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{X}}$ , if

$$\bar{\mu}(\alpha \Delta \beta) := \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}(A_i \Delta B_k) < \delta$$

then  $H_\mu(\alpha|\beta) < \frac{1}{m}$  (see for example [64, Lemma 4.15]).

For  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ , we take  $A'_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  with  $\bar{\mu}(A_i \Delta A'_i) < \frac{\delta}{k^3}$ . Let  $A'_k = X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} A'_j$ . Then  $A'_k \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  and

$$\bar{\mu}(A_k \Delta A'_k) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j \Delta A'_j\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu(A_j \Delta A'_j) < \frac{\delta}{k^2}$$

where the first inequality comes from the fact

$$A_k \Delta A'_k = \left(X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j\right) \Delta \left(X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} A'_j\right) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} (A_j \Delta A'_j).$$

Then let  $C_1 = A'_1$  and

$$C_i = A'_i \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} C_j = A'_i \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} A'_j$$

for  $i = 2, \dots, k$ . Clearly,  $C_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}}$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $\gamma := \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{X}}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{X}} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \bar{\mathcal{B}}_i$ , by (A.1) we have  $i_* \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $C_i \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{-i_*}$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Thus, there exists  $D_i \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\Pi_{-i_*, X}^{-1}(D_i) = C_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Let  $\tau = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_k\}$ . Then  $\tau \in \mathcal{P}_X$  and

$$\gamma = \Pi_{-i_*, X}^{-1} \tau = \bar{T}^{-i_*} \Pi_{0, X}^{-1} \tau = \bar{T}^{-i_*} \Pi_X^{-1} \tau.$$

For  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_i \Delta C_i &= (A_i \setminus C_i) \cup (C_i \setminus A_i) \subseteq (A_i \setminus (A'_i \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} A'_j)) \cup (A'_i \setminus A_i) \\ &= (A_i \setminus A'_i) \cup (A_i \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} A'_j) \cup (A'_i \setminus A_i) = (A_i \Delta A'_i) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} A_i \cap A'_j\right) \\ &\subseteq (A_i \Delta A'_i) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} (A_i \cap A_j) \cup (A_i \cap (A'_j \setminus A_j))\right) = (A_i \Delta A'_i) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} A_i \cap (A'_j \setminus A_j)\right) \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^i (A_j \Delta A'_j). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $\bar{\mu}(A_i \Delta C_i) \leq \sum_{j=1}^i \mu(A_j \Delta A'_j) < \frac{\delta}{k}$ . Thus  $\bar{\mu}(\alpha \Delta \gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\mu}(A_i \Delta C_i) < \delta$ . By the choice of  $\delta$ , we know  $H_{\bar{\mu}}(\alpha|\gamma) < \frac{1}{m}$ .

Now for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-i} \alpha | \Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B})\right) &= H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-i} \alpha | \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0\right) = H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-(i+i_*)} \alpha | \bar{T}^{-i_*} \bar{\mathcal{B}}_0\right) \\
&\leq H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-(i+i_*)} \alpha | \bar{T}^{-i_*} \Pi_X^{-1}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \tau\right)\right) = H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-(i+i_*)} \alpha | \bar{T}^{-i_*} \left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-i} \Pi_X^{-1} \tau\right)\right) \\
&= H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-(i+i_*)} \alpha | \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-j} \gamma\right) \leq H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n+i_*-1} \bar{T}^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-j} \gamma\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n+i_*-1} H_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-j} \gamma) \leq \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} H_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}^{-i} \alpha | \bar{T}^{-i} \gamma) + \sum_{i=n}^{n+i_*-1} H_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}^{-i} \alpha) \right) \\
&= (nH_{\bar{\mu}}(\alpha | \gamma) + i_* H_{\bar{\mu}}(\alpha)).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}, \alpha | \Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B})) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{T}^{-i} \alpha | \Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B})\right) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} (nH_{\bar{\mu}}(\alpha | \gamma) + i_* H_{\bar{\mu}}(\alpha)) \\
&= H_{\bar{\mu}}(\alpha | \gamma) < \frac{1}{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $m$  is arbitrary,  $h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}, \alpha | \Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B})) = 0$ . This implies  $h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T} | \Pi_X) = 0$  since  $\alpha$  is arbitrary. The proof is complete.  $\square$

Next, we investigate the ergodic decomposition of conditional entropy. Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be an invertible Lebesgue system. We consider the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra

$$I_{\mu}(T) = \{A \in \mathcal{B} : \mu(T^{-1}A \Delta B) = 0\}.$$

It is well known that there exists a factor map  $\phi : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T) \rightarrow (E, \mathcal{E}, \eta, id_E)$  between two invertible Lebesgue systems such that  $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) = I_{\mu}(T) \pmod{\mu}$  and  $(X, \mathcal{B}_e, \mu_e, T)$  is an ergodic invertible Lebesgue system for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ , where  $id_E$  is the identity map from  $E$  to itself,  $\mu = \int_E \mu_e d\eta(e)$  is the disintegration of  $\mu$  relative to the factor  $(E, \mathcal{E}, \eta, id_E)$ , and  $(X, \mathcal{B}_e, \mu_e)$  is the corresponding Lebesgue space for  $e \in E$  in this disintegration (see [53], [22, Theorem 3.42]). More precisely, conditional probability measures  $\{\mu_e\}_{e \in E}$  with the following properties:

- $\mu_e$  is a Lebesgue measure on  $X$  with  $\mu_e(\phi^{-1}(e)) = 1$  for all  $y \in Y$ .
- for each  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , one has  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}_e, \mu_e)$  for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ , the map  $e \mapsto \int_X f d\mu_e$  is in  $L^1(E, \eta)$  and  $\int_E \left(\int_X f d\mu_e\right) d\eta(e) = \int_X f d\mu$ . Particularly, for each  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , one has  $A \in \mathcal{B}_e$  for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ .

The disintegration  $\mu = \int_E \mu_e d\eta(e)$  is called the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ . The following result is well known (see [53, Theorem 8.11], [28] or [22, Theorem 15.12]).

**Lemma A.1.** (*Ergodic decomposition of entropy for partition*) *Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be an invertible Lebesgue system and  $\mu = \int_E \mu_e d\eta(e)$  be the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ . Then for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X(\mathcal{B})$ ,*

$$h_{\mu}(T, \alpha) = \int_E h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha) d\eta(e).$$

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be a MDS. Then for any  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}_X$ ,*

$$\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta\right) = h_{\mu}(T, \alpha \vee \beta) - h_{\mu}(T, \alpha).$$

*Proof.* For  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}_X$ , let  $a_n = H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, for  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+m} &= H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n+m-1} T^{-i}\alpha \middle| \bigvee_{i=0}^{n+m-1} T^{-i}\beta\right) \\ &\leq H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha \middle| \bigvee_{i=0}^{n+m-1} T^{-i}\beta\right) + H_\mu\left(T^{-n}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\alpha\right) \middle| \bigvee_{i=0}^{n+m-1} T^{-i}\beta\right) \\ &\leq a_n + H_\mu\left(T^{-n}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\alpha\right) \middle| T^{-n}\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\beta\right)\right) \\ &= a_n + a_m. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.9 in [64],  $\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} a_n$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha \middle| \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha \middle| \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left( \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}(\alpha \vee \beta)\right) - H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta\right) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}(\alpha \vee \beta)\right) - \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta\right) \\ &= h_\mu(T, \alpha \vee \beta) - h_\mu(T, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma.  $\square$

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be an invertible Lebesgue system. A sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  is called *countably generated* if there exists  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all  $A_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma A.3.** (*Ergodic decomposition of conditional entropy for partition*) Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be an invertible Lebesgue system,  $\mu = \int_E \mu_e d\eta(e)$  be the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  be a countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $T^{-1}\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Then, for each  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X(\mathcal{B})$ ,

$$h_\mu(T, \alpha | \mathcal{C}) = \int_E h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha | \mathcal{C}) d\eta(e).$$

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}_e, \mu_e, T)$  be the corresponding Lebesgue systems for  $e \in E$  in the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is a countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}$ , there exists  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ . Let  $\alpha = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\} \in \mathcal{P}_X(\mathcal{B})$ . Since  $A \in \mathcal{B}_e$  for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$  when  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , one has that for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ ,  $\{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\} \cup \{A_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_e$ . Thus for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_e$  contains the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{C} \cup (\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} T^i \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k\})$  since  $\mathcal{B}_e$  is  $\sigma$ -algebra and  $T^{-1}\mathcal{B}_e = \mathcal{B}_e$ .

Let  $\beta_j = \bigvee_{i=1}^j \{A_i, X \setminus A_i\}$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , when  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ , we have  $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta_j \nearrow \mathcal{C} \pmod{\mu}$  and  $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta_j \nearrow \mathcal{C} \pmod{\mu_e}$  for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ . Thus,

$$(A.2) \quad H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha | \mathcal{C}\right) = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha \middle| \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta_j\right) = \inf_{j \geq 1} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i}\alpha \middle| \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\beta_j\right).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) &= \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \mathcal{C} \right) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \left( \inf_{j \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) \right) \\
&= \inf_{j \geq 1} \left( \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) \right) \\
&= \inf_{j \geq 1} (h_\mu(T, \alpha \vee \beta_j) - h_\mu(T, \beta_j)). \quad (\text{by lemma A.2})
\end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\begin{aligned}
(A.3) \quad h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) &= \inf_{j \geq 1} \left( \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) \right) \\
&= \inf_{j \geq 1} (h_\mu(T, \alpha \vee \beta_j) - h_\mu(T, \beta_j)).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(A.4) \quad h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) &= \inf_{j \geq 1} \left( \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu_e} \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) \right) \\
&= \inf_{j \geq 1} (h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha \vee \beta_j) - h_{\mu_e}(T, \beta_j)).
\end{aligned}$$

Using (A.3), Lemma A.1, Lemma A.2, and (A.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
h_\mu(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) &= \inf_{j \geq 1} (h_\mu(T, \alpha \vee \beta_j) - h_\mu(T, \beta_j)) \\
&= \inf_{j \geq 1} \int_E (h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha \vee \beta_j) - h_{\mu_e}(T, \beta_j)) d\eta(e) \\
&= \inf_{j \geq 1} \int_E \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu_e} \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) d\eta(e) \\
&= \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_E \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu_e} \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) d\eta(e) \\
&= \int_E \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left( \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu_e} \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) \right) d\eta(e) \\
&\quad (\text{by Monotone convergence Theorem}) \\
&= \int_E \inf_{j \geq 1} \left( \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H_{\mu_e} \left( \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha | \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \beta_j \right) \right) d\eta(e) \\
&= \int_E h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha|\mathcal{C}) d\eta(e).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma.  $\square$

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T)$  be a Polish system. Let  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  be the completion of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_X$  with respect to  $\mu$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, T)$  is a Lebesgue system. Put

$$\bar{X} = \{\bar{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}} : Tx_i = x_{i+1}, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

and let  $\Pi_X : (\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu, \bar{\mu}, \bar{T}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T)$  be the natural extension of  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T)$ .

Let  $\bar{\mu} = \int_E \bar{\mu}_e d\eta(e)$  be the ergodic decomposition of  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $(\bar{X}, (\bar{\mathcal{B}}_\mu)_e, \bar{\mu}_e, \bar{T})$  be the corresponding Lebesgue systems for  $e \in E$  in the ergodic decomposition of  $\bar{\mu}$ . Since  $\Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_X)$  is a countably generated

sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mu}}$ , one knows that for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ ,  $\Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_X) \subset (\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\mu})_e$ . Therefore, for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ , letting  $\mu_e(A) = \bar{\mu}_e(\Pi_X^{-1}A)$  for  $A \in \mathcal{B}_X$ , we have that  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu_e, T)$  is an ergodic Polish system. It is clear that for any  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$ , one has that  $f \circ \Pi_X \in L^1(\bar{X}, \Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_X), \bar{\mu})$ . Hence the map  $e \in E \mapsto \int_X f(x) d\mu_e(x) (= \int_{\bar{X}} f \circ \Pi_X d\bar{\mu}_e)$  is  $\eta$ -measurable and

$$\int_E \left( \int_X f d\mu_e \right) d\eta(e) = \int_E \left( \int_{\bar{X}} f \circ \Pi_X d\bar{\mu}_e \right) d\eta(e) = \int_{\bar{X}} f \circ \Pi_X d\bar{\mu} = \int_X f d\mu.$$

That is, for any  $f \in L^1(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu)$ , one has

$$(A.5) \quad \text{the map } e \in E \mapsto \int_X f(x) d\mu_e(x) \text{ is } \eta\text{-measurable and } \int_E \left( \int_X f d\mu_e \right) d\eta(e) = \int_X f d\mu.$$

In this case, we say that  $\mu = \int_E \mu_e d\eta(e)$  is the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ .

**Lemma A.4.** *Let  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu, S)$  be a factor map between two Polish systems and  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu, S)$  be ergodic. If  $\mu = \int_E \mu_e d\eta(e)$  is the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ , then*

- (1) *for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ ,  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu_e, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu, S)$  is a factor map between two Polish systems.*
- (2)  *$h_\mu(T|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_Y)) = \int_E h_{\mu_e}(T|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_Y)) d\eta(e)$ . That is,  $h_\mu(T|\pi) = \int_E h_{\mu_e}(T|\pi) d\eta(e)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{B}_\nu$  be the completion of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_Y$  with respect to  $\nu$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  be the completion of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_X$  with respect to  $\mu$ . Then  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}_\nu, \nu, S)$  is a factor map between two Lebesgue systems.

Put

$$\bar{X} = \{\bar{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X^{\mathbb{Z}} : Tx_i = x_{i+1}, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

and let  $\Pi_X : (\bar{X}, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\mu}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{T}) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T)$  be the natural extension of  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu, T)$ . Let  $\bar{\mu} = \int_E \bar{\mu}_e d\eta(e)$  the ergodic decomposition of  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $(\bar{X}, (\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\mu})_e, \bar{\mu}_e, \bar{T})$  be the corresponding Lebesgue systems for  $e \in E$  in the ergodic decomposition of  $\bar{\mu}$ . Since  $\Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_X)$  is a countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\mu}$ , one knows that for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ ,  $\Pi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_X) \subset (\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\mu})_e$ . For  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ , letting  $\mu_e(A) = \bar{\mu}_e(\Pi_X^{-1}A)$  for  $A \in \mathcal{B}_X$ , then  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu_e, T)$  is an ergodic Polish system and  $\mu = \int_E \mu_e d\eta(e)$  is the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ .

For  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ , we define  $\nu_e(B) = \mu_e(\pi^{-1}(B))$  for  $B \in \mathcal{B}_Y$ . Then  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu_e, S)$  is an ergodic Polish system and  $\pi : (X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu_e, T) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu_e, S)$  is a factor map between two Polish systems. Thus, the property (1) in the lemma follows from the following claim.

**Claim:** For  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ ,  $\nu_e = \nu$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Since  $Y$  is a Polish space, there are finite Borel-measurable partitions  $\beta_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  of  $Y$  such that  $\beta_1 \preceq \beta_2 \preceq \dots$  and  $\mathcal{B}_Y$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all  $\beta_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the algebra generated by  $\{A : A \in \beta_i \text{ for some } i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}$  is a countable set and  $\mathcal{D}$  generates the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_Y$ . Define

$$Y(\nu) = \{y \in Y : \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_A(S^i y) = \nu(A) \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{D}\}$$

where  $1_A$  is the characterization function of  $A$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}$  is a countable set,  $Y(\nu) \in \mathcal{B}_Y$  and  $\nu(Y(\nu)) = 1$  by the Birkhoff ergodic theorem. Since  $\int_E \mu_e(\pi^{-1}(Y(\nu))) d\eta(e) = \mu(\pi^{-1}(Y(\nu))) = \nu(Y(\nu)) = 1$ , one has  $\mu_e(\pi^{-1}(Y(\nu))) = 1$  for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ . That is,  $\nu_e(Y(\nu)) = \mu_e(\pi^{-1}(Y(\nu))) = 1$  for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ . Thus, to show  $\nu_e = \nu$  for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ , it is sufficient to show that if  $e \in E$  such that  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu_e, S)$  is an ergodic Polish system and  $\nu_e(Y(\nu)) = 1$ , then  $\nu_e = \nu$ .

Let  $e \in E$  such that  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y, \nu_e, S)$  is an ergodic Polish system and  $\nu_e(Y(\nu)) = 1$ . Set

$$\mathcal{F}_e = \{B \in \mathcal{B}_Y : \nu_e(B) = \nu(B)\}.$$

We want to show  $\mathcal{F}_e = \mathcal{B}_Y$ .



By the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, there exists  $y \in Y(\nu)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_A(S^i y) = \nu_e(A) \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{D}.$$

By the definition of  $Y(\nu)$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_A(S^i y) = \nu(A)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{D}$ . Hence,  $\nu_e(A) = \nu(A)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{D}$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_e$ . Note that  $\mathcal{F}_e$  is a monotone class. Thus,  $\mathcal{F}_e = \mathcal{B}_Y$  follows from that the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{D}$  is the monotone class generated by  $\mathcal{D}$ . This completes the proof of Claim.  $\square$

Next, we prove the property (2). Since  $X$  is Polish space, there are finite Borel-measurable partitions  $\alpha_i$  of  $X$  such that  $\alpha_1 \preceq \alpha_2 \preceq \dots$  and the small  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  is  $\mathcal{B}_X$ . Thus for any a  $T$ -invariant Borel probability measure  $\lambda$  on  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X)$  and any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{B}_X$  with  $T^{-1}\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , one has

$$(A.6) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} h_\lambda(T, \alpha_i | \mathcal{C}) = h_\theta(T | \mathcal{C}).$$

Since  $\Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y)$  is a countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{B}_X$  and

$$\bar{T}^{-1}(\Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y)) = \Pi_X^{-1}(T^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y)) = \Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}(S^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y)) \subseteq \Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y),$$

one has for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(A.7) \quad h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}, \Pi_X^{-1}(\alpha_i) | \Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y)) = \int_E h_{\bar{\mu}_e}(\bar{T}, \Pi_X^{-1}(\alpha_i) | \Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y)) d\eta(e)$$

by lemma A.3. Note that

$$h_\mu(T, \alpha_i | \pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y) = h_{\bar{\mu}}(\bar{T}, \Pi_X^{-1}(\alpha_i) | \Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y))$$

and

$$h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha_i | \pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y) = h_{\bar{\mu}_e}(\bar{T}, \Pi_X^{-1}(\alpha_i) | \Pi_X^{-1}(\pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y))$$

for  $\eta$ -a.e.  $e \in E$ . Combing this with (A.7), one has

$$(A.8) \quad h_\mu(T, \alpha_i | \pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y) = \int_E h_{\mu_e}(T, \alpha_i | \pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y) d\eta(e).$$

Let  $i \rightarrow +\infty$  in (A.8), we have

$$h_\mu(T | \pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y) = \int_E h_{\mu_e}(T | \pi^{-1}\mathcal{B}_Y) d\eta(e)$$

by (A.6) and the monotone convergence Theorem. The proof of this lemma is complete.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Akin, Lectures on Cantor and Mycielski sets for dynamical systems, Chapel Hill Ergodic Theory Workshops (Contemporary Mathematics, 356). American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, 21-79.
- [2] E. Akin, J. Auslander and E. Glasner, The topological dynamics of Ellis actions, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 195(913) (2008).
- [3] N. Alon, On the density of sets of vectors, Discrete Math. 46 (1983) 199-202.
- [4] L. Arnold, Random Dynamical Systems, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. xvi+586 pp.
- [5] P. W. Bates, H. Lisei, and K. Lu, Attractors for stochastic lattice dynamical systems, Stoch. Dyn. 6(2006), 1-21.
- [6] P. W. Bates, K. Lu, and B. Wang, Random attractors for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations on unbounded domains, J. Differential Equations 246(2009), 845-869.
- [7] A. Bensoussan and F. Flandoli, Stochastic inertial manifold, Stochastics Stochastics Rep., 53(1-2):13-39, 1995.
- [8] F. Blanchard, E. Glasner, S. Kolyada and A. Maass, On Li-Yorke pairs, J. Reine Angew. Math. 547(2002), 51-68.
- [9] F. Blanchard and W. Huang, Entropy sets, weakly mixing sets and entropy capacity, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems 20(2008), 275-311.
- [10] T. Bogenschütz, Entropy, pressure, and a variational principle for random dynamical systems, Random Comput. Dynam. 1(1992), 99-116.

- [11] T. Bogenschütz, Equilibrium states for random dynamical systems, PhD Thesis, Institut für Dynamische Systeme, Universität Bremen, 1993.
- [12] T. Bogenschütz and H. Crauel, The Abramov-Rokhlin Formula, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1514, Springer, 1992, 32-35.
- [13] H. Crauel, Random Probability Measures on Polish Spaces, Taylor and Francis, London, 2002.
- [14] H. Crauel, A. Debussche, and F. Flandoli, Random Attractors, J. Dyn. Diff. Eq. 9(1997), 307-341.
- [15] H. Crauel and F. Flandoli, Attractors for random dynamical systems, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 100(1994), 365-393.
- [16] G. Da Prato and A. Debussche, Construction of stochastic inertial manifolds using backward integration, Stochastics Stochastics Rep., 59(3-4):305-324, 1996.
- [17] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, Ergodicity for Infinite Dimensional Systems, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [18] J. Duan, K. Lu, and B. Schmalfuss, Invariant manifolds for stochastic partial differential equations, Ann. Probab. 31 (2003), no. 4, 2109-2135.
- [19] Weinan. E, K. Khanin, A. Mazel, and Ya. Sinai, Invariant measures for Burgers equation with stochastic forcing, Ann. of Math. (2) 151 (2000), no. 3, 877-960.
- [20] F. Flandoli and B. Schmalfuss, Random attractors for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation with multiplicative noise, Stochastics and Stochastic Rep. 59(1996), 21-45.
- [21] M. Garrido-Atienza, K. Lu and B. Schmalfuss, Random dynamical systems for stochastic partial differential equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B, 14(2010), 473-493.
- [22] E. Glasner, Ergodic theory via joinings, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 101. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [23] E. Glasner, J.P. Thouvenot and B. Weiss, Entropy theory without a past, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 20 (2000), no. 5, 1355-1370.
- [24] M. Hairer and J. Mattingly, Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing, Ann. of Math. (2) 164 (2006), no. 3, 993-1032.
- [25] W. Huang and X. Ye, A local variational relation and applications, Israel Journal of Mathematics, 151(2006), 237-280.
- [26] W. Huang, X. Ye and G. Zhang, Relative topological Pinsker factors, Relative U.P.E. and C.P.E. extension, Israel Journal of Mathematics, 158(2007), 249-283.
- [27] P. Imkeller and B. Schmalfuss, The conjugacy of stochastic and random differential equations and the existence of global attractors, J. Dyn. Diff. Eq. 13(2001), 215-249.
- [28] K. Jacobs, Ergodic decomposition of the Kolmogoroff-Sinai invariant, 1963 Ergodic Theory (Proc. Internat. Sympos., Tulane Univ., New Orleans, La., 1961) pp. 173-190 Academic Press, New York.
- [29] M. G. Karpovskiy and V. D. Milman, Coordinate density of sets of vectors, Discrete Math. 24 (1978), 177C184.
- [30] A. Katok, Lyapunov exponents, entropy and periodic orbits for diffeomorphisms, Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math. 51(1980), 137-173.
- [31] D. Kerr and H. Li, Independence in topological and  $C^*$ -dynamics, Math. Ann. 338(2007), 869-926.
- [32] Y. Kifer, Ergodic Theory of Random Transformations, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1986.
- [33] Y. Kifer, On the topological pressure for random bundle transformations, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2 202(2001), 197-214.
- [34] Y. Kifer, Random perturbations of dynamical systems, Progress in Probability and Statistics, **16**, Birkhuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [35] Y. Kifer and P.D. Liu, Random dynamics. Handbook of dynamical systems, Vol. 1B, 379-499, Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam, 2006.
- [36] A.N. Kolmogorov, New Metric Invariant of Transitive Dynamical Systems and Endomorphisms of Lebesgue Spaces, Doklady of Russian Academy of Sciences, (1958), 119, N5, 861-864.
- [37] F. Ledrappier and L-S. Young, Dimension formula for random transformations, Comm. Math. Phys. 117 (1988), 529-548.
- [38] F. Ledrappier and L-S. Young, Entropy formula for random transformations, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 80 (1988), 217-240.
- [39] T.Y. Li and J.A. Yorke, Period three implies chaos, Amer. Math. Monthly 82 (1975), 985-992.
- [40] Z. Lian and K. Lu, Lyapunov exponents and invariant manifolds for random dynamical systems in a Banach space, Memoirs of AMS. 206(2010) no.967.
- [41] Z. Lian and L-S. Young, Lyapunov exponents, periodic orbits and horseshoes for mappings of Hilbert Spaces, Annales Henri Poincaré to appear.
- [42] Z. Lian and L-S. Young, Lyapunov Exponents, Periodic Orbits and Horseshoes for Semiflows on Hilbert Spaces, Journal of American Mathematical Society to appear.

- [43] P.D. Liu, Dynamics of random transformations: smooth ergodic theory, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 21(2001), 1279-1319.
- [44] P-D. Liu and M. Qian, Smooth ergodic theory of random dynamical systems, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1606. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [45] K. Lu and B. Schmalfuss, Invariant manifolds for stochastic wave equations, J. Differential Equations, 236 (2007), no. 2, 460–492.
- [46] R. Mañé, Lyapunov exponents and stable manifolds for compact transformations, In J. Palis, editor, Geometric Dynamics pages 522-577, 1983. Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Volume 1007.
- [47] S-E. A. Mohammed and M. Scheutzow, The stable manifold theorem for stochastic differential equations. Ann. Probab. 27 (1999), no. 2, 615–652.
- [48] S-E. A. Mohammed, T. Zhang, and H. Zhao. The stable manifold theorem for semilinear stochastic evolution equations and stochastic partial differential equations, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, 105 pages (to appear).
- [49] W. Parry, Entropy and generators in ergodic theory, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam 1969.
- [50] W. Parry, Topics in ergodic theory, Cambridge Tracks in Mathematics 75 (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1981).
- [51] V.A. Rohlin, On the fundamental ideas of measure theory, Amer. Math. Soc. Translation 1952, (1952). no. 71, 55 pp.
- [52] V.A. Rohlin, Exact endomorphisms of a Lebesgue space, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. 25 (1961), 499-530.
- [53] V.A. Rohlin, Lectures on the theory of entropy of transformations with invariant measures, Russian Math. Surveys 22(5) (1967), 3-56.
- [54] D. Ruelle, Characteristic exponents for a viscous fluid subjected to time dependent forces, Comm. Math. Phys. 93(1984), 285-300.
- [55] D. Ruelle, Characteristic exponents and invariant manifolds in Hilbert space, Ann. of Math. 115 (1982), no. 2, 243–290.
- [56] N. Sauer, On the density of families of sets, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A 13 (1972), 145-147.
- [57] K-U. Schaumlöffel and F. Flandoli, A multiplicative ergodic theorem with applications to a first order stochastic hyperbolic equation in a bounded domain. Stochastics Stochastics Rep. 34 (1991), no. 3-4, 241–255.
- [58] B. Schmalfuss, The random attractor of the stochastic Lorenz system, ZAMP, 48:951–975, 1997.
- [59] S. Shelah, A combinatorial problem; stability and order for models and theories in infinitary languages, Pacific J. Math. 41 (1972), 247-261.
- [60] Ya. G. Sinai, On a weak isomorphism of transformations with invariant measure, Mat. Sb. (N.S.), 63 (105)1964, 23C42, .
- [61] Ya. G. Sinai, On the Notion of Entropy of a Dynamical System, Doklady of Russian Academy of Sciences, (1959), 124, 768-771.
- [62] P. Thieullen, Fibres dynamiques asymptotiquement compacts-exposants de Lyapunov. Entropie. Dimension, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Anal. Non linéaire, 4(1):49-97, 1987.
- [63] S.M. Ulam and J. von Neumann, Random ergodic theorems, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 51(1945), 660.
- [64] P. Walters, An Introduction to Ergodic Theory, Springer, Berlin, 1982.
- [65] G.H. Zhang, Relative entropy, asymptotic pairs and chaos, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 73 (2006), no. 1, 157-172.

(Wen Huang) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN UNIVERSITY, CHENGDU 610064, SICHUAN, P. R. CHINA, AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF CHINA, HEFEI 230026, ANHUI, P. R. CHINA

*E-mail address*, W. Huang: wenh@mail.ustc.edu.cn

(Kening Lu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY, PROVO, UTAH 84602, USA

*E-mail address*, k. Lu: klu@math.byu.edu