

LINEAR RESPONSE FOR INTERMITTENT MAPS WITH CRITICAL POINT

JUHO LEPPÄNEN

ABSTRACT. We consider a two-parameter family of maps $T_{\alpha,\beta} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with a neutral fixed point and a non-flat critical point. Building on a cone technique due to Baladi and Todd, we show that for a class of L^q observables $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the bivariate map $(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto \int_0^1 \phi d\mu_{\alpha,\beta}$, where $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ denotes the invariant SRB measure, is differentiable in a certain parameter region, and establish a formula for its directional derivative.

1. INTRODUCTION

For $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{\beta} \leq 1$, the following two-parameter map $T_{\alpha,\beta} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ was considered by Cui [14]:

$$T_{\alpha,\beta}(x) = \begin{cases} x(1 + 2^\alpha x^\alpha) & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}), \\ 2^\beta(x - \frac{1}{2})^\beta, & x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The map has a neutral (or indifferent) fixed point at $x = 0$ and a non-flat critical point at $x = \frac{1}{2}$, which strengthens the effect of the neutral fixed point on essential properties of the dynamics. By [14,23], piecewise convex interval maps such as $T_{\alpha,\beta}$ have a unique absolutely continuous invariant probability measure $\mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ with density $h_{\alpha,\beta}(x) \lesssim x^{-1+\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha}$. We are going to study the problem of linear response for the family (1), i.e. the differentiability of the map $(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto \int_0^1 \phi d\mu_{\alpha,\beta}$, where $\phi \in L^q$ with q sufficiently large.

Invariant measures play an important role in describing the long-term statistical behavior of dynamical systems, and understanding the robustness of these measures to perturbations is of both theoretical and practical interest. Ruelle [35,36] showed that perturbations of uniformly hyperbolic Axiom A dynamical systems result in smooth changes to the associated SRB measure. In this case, the derivative of the SRB measure can be expressed by a formula – the linear response formula – which explicitly describes the rate of change of the measure in response to the perturbation based on statistical information from the unperturbed system. Such ideas have found applications outside mathematics, for example in the areas of climate science [30,34] and neurophysiology [21]. On the other hand, mathematical investigations of linear response have resulted in extensions of Ruelle’s results to various scenarios where the system and its perturbations are sufficiently

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TOKAI UNIVERSITY, KANAGAWA, 259-1292, JAPAN.

E-mail address: leppanen@tsc.u-tokai.ac.jp.

Date: February 27, 2024.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A05, 37E05.

Key words and phrases. linear response, critical point, intermittent map, transfer operator.

This research was supported by JSPS via the project LEADER. The author is grateful to Alexey Korepanov, Yushi Nakano, and Mikko Stenlund for useful comments and suggestions, and to the anonymous referees whose comments enhanced the quality of the manuscript, leading to improvements in the presentation and the main result.

smooth and hyperbolic. In [16, 44], linear response formulas were established for perturbations of partially hyperbolic systems. There has been deep investigation about response in the setting of unimodal maps [2, 7, 9, 37, 39], providing examples of systems where the SRB measure does not vary smoothly under perturbations. Recently, linear response has also been actively studied in the context of random and extended dynamical systems; see, for instance [13, 17, 19, 25, 41]. For extensive background information on linear response, we recommend the survey [8].

Returning to the example (1), this map can be viewed as an extension of the intermittent map popularized by Liverani, Saussol and Vaienti [29], which is obtained from (1) by taking $\beta = 1$. Similar maps were studied numerically by Pomeau and Manneville [33] as models of intermittent phenomena, such as transitions to turbulence in convective fluids. The map $T_{\alpha,1}$ is uniformly expanding except at the neutral fixed point at the origin. In this case, robustness of statistical properties have been investigated for both deterministic [6, 10, 18, 27, 32, 40] and random perturbations [5]. Independently, Baladi and Todd [10] and Korepanov [27] analyzed the regularity properties of the map $\mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha) := \int_0^1 \phi d\mu_{\alpha,1}$ for $\phi \in L^q$ with $q > 1$ sufficiently large, employing different methods. In [10], a cone method was used to derive a linear response formula for the derivative of $\mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha)$, while [27] developed a mechanism through inducing and coupling to show that \mathcal{R}_ϕ is C^2 on compact subsets of $(0, 1)$. The linear response formula of [10] describes the derivative of $\mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha)$ in terms of the unperturbed system $T_{\alpha,1}$ and ϕ , together with $\partial_\alpha T_{\alpha,1}$ and the SRB measure $\mu_{\alpha,1}$. In the present paper, we give a similar description of the derivative in the case of the two-parameter family (1).




FIGURE 1. Intermittent behavior of trajectories $T_{\alpha,\beta}^n(x)$ for $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 1.5)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 1.0)$. The latter case corresponds to the standard Liverani–Saussol–Vaienti map with parameter $\alpha = 0.5$. Once the trajectory lands near $\frac{1}{2}$ in $(\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, after one iterate it will be in a small neighborhood of 0 and the larger the $\alpha\beta$ the longer it will take for the trajectory to return to the strongly chaotic region.

Statistical properties of piecewise convex interval maps, which admit both indifferent fixed points and critical points, have been previously investigated in [12, 14, 22–24]. For the map (1), Cui [14] showed that correlations associated to C^1 observables decay at the rate $O(n^{\frac{1}{\beta}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta})}(\log n)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta})})$ based on the approach of Liverani, Saussol, and Vaienti [29]. A sharper estimate of order $O(n^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}})$ for Hölder observables follows by a recent result

due to Coates, Luzzatto, and Muhammad [12, Theorem D]. Their approach, based on Young's tower method [43], applies to a wide range of full-branch maps, and also yields advanced statistical properties such as stable limit laws associated to appropriately scaled Birkhoff sums. As part of our proof of the linear response formula, we derive the same rate $O(n^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}})$ for the map (1) by applying a result due to Korepanov and Leppänen [28]. This application could be extended to treat (random or deterministic) time-dependent compositions $T_n \circ \dots \circ T_1$ of maps T_i such as (1). In the recent work [4], the same approach was used to establish decorrelation bounds in the context of mean field coupled intermittent maps.

Notation and conventions. In what follows, C, C_0, C_1, \dots denote positive constants whose values may change from one line to the next. We use $C(a, b, \dots)$ to indicate that the constant C depends only on the parameters a, b, \dots . Some other commonly used notation is listed below.

- $L^q(\mu) := L^q([0, 1], \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, where \mathcal{B} is the Borel sigma algebra of $[0, 1]$;
- m denotes the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$;
- $\mu(f) := \int_0^1 f d\mu$ for a measure μ on \mathcal{B} and an integrable function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;
- $()'$ denotes differentiation with respect to a spatial variable $x \in [0, 1]$, while ∂_i for $i = 1, 2$ denotes differentiation with respect to the i th component of the parameter vector $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta)$;
- $T_\gamma := T_{\alpha, \beta}$ for $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta)$ where $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{\beta} \leq 1$;
- $\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) = \mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha, \beta) := \int_0^1 \phi d\mu_\gamma$ where $\phi \in L^1(\mu_\gamma)$, $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{\beta} \leq 1$, and $\mu_\gamma = \mu_{\alpha, \beta}$ denotes the absolutely continuous invariant probability measure of T_γ . For $\beta < 1$ we set $\mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha, 1)$.

1.1. **Setting and main result.** For

$$\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D} := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in (0, 1) \times [1, \infty) : \alpha\beta < 1\},$$

let $f_{\gamma,1} : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $f_{\gamma,2} : [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote respectively the left and right branch of T_γ :

$$f_{\gamma,1}(x) = x(1 + 2^\alpha x^\alpha), \quad f_{\gamma,2}(x) = 2^\beta(x - \frac{1}{2})^\beta.$$

Let $g_{\gamma,1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1/2]$ and $g_{\gamma,2} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [1/2, 1]$ denote their inverses:

$$g_{\gamma,1} = f_{\gamma,1}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad g_{\gamma,2} = f_{\gamma,2}^{-1}.$$

Note that

$$g_{\gamma,2}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x^{\frac{1}{\beta}} + 1).$$

Moreover, $g_{\gamma,1}(x) \in [\frac{x}{2}, x]$ and

$$|g_{\gamma,1}(x) - x(1 - 2^\alpha x^\alpha)| \leq 2^{2\alpha} x^{2\alpha+1} \quad \forall x \in [0, 1].$$

Next, for $i = 1, 2$ and $x \in [0, 1]$, define $v_{\gamma,i}(x) = \partial_i T_\gamma(x)$ where $\partial_i T_\gamma(x)$ denotes the partial derivative of $T_\gamma(x)$ with respect to the i th component of the parameter vector $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta)$. Then,

$$v_{\gamma,1}(x) = 2^\alpha x^{1+\alpha}(\log 2 + \log x) \quad \forall x \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$$

and

$$v_{\gamma,2}(x) = (\log 2 + \log(x - \frac{1}{2}))g_{\beta,2}(x) \quad \forall x \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1].$$

Finally, set $X_{\gamma,i} = v_{\gamma,i} \circ g_{\gamma,i}$. Then,

$$X_{\gamma,1}(x) = 2^\alpha g_{\gamma,1}(x)^{1+\alpha} (\log 2 + \log g_{\gamma,1}(x)) \quad \forall x \in (0, 1]$$

and

$$X_{\gamma,2}(x) = (\log 2 + \log(\frac{1}{2}x^{\frac{1}{\beta}}))x = \frac{1}{\beta} \log(x)x \quad \forall x \in (0, 1].$$

For $\varphi \in L^1(m)$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, denote

$$\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi)(x) = g'_{\gamma,i}(x) \cdot \varphi(g_{\gamma,i}(x)),$$

so that the transfer operator \mathcal{L}_γ associated to T_γ and m satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi) = \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi) + \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi).$$

By [14, Theorem 1.1], there exists a unique absolutely continuous T_γ -invariant probability measure $\mu_\gamma = \mu_{\alpha,\beta}$ whenever $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$. For $\phi \in L^1(\mu_\gamma)$ define $\mathcal{R}_\phi : \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) = \int_0^1 \phi d\mu_\gamma.$$

We adopt the convention $\mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{R}_\phi(\alpha, 1)$ if $\beta < 1$.

With the above preparations, the main result in this paper can be stated as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (Linear response). *Let $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$. Suppose that $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that*

$$\int_0^1 |\phi(x)|^q x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-1} dx < \infty \quad (2)$$

holds for some $q > \frac{1}{1-\alpha\beta}$. Then, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\gamma^k[(X_{\gamma,i}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'] dm \quad (3)$$

is absolutely summable. Moreover, \mathcal{R}_ϕ is differentiable at γ with directional derivative

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{-v}\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) &:= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_0^1 \phi d\mu_{\gamma-\delta v} - \int_0^1 \phi d\mu_\gamma}{\delta} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} v_1 \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\gamma^k[(X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma))'] dm \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} v_2 \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\gamma^k[(X_{\gamma,2}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma))'] dm, \end{aligned}$$

for any unit vector $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Remark 1.2. If $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$, then (2) holds for all $q \geq 1$ so that \mathcal{R}_ϕ is differentiable on \mathfrak{D} . The first partial derivative $\partial_1 \mathcal{R}(\gamma)$ coincides with the linear response formula established in [10].

Remark 1.3. For a wide class of regular observables φ_1, φ_2 with $m(\varphi_1) = m(\varphi_2)$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)\|_{L^1(m)} = O(n^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

as established, for instance, by Lemma 2.9 in this paper. For $\varphi_1 = \mathbf{1}$ and $\varphi_2 = h_\gamma$ the rate is optimal if $\beta = 1$, and we guess its optimality for $\beta > 1$ as well. The rate is summable only if $\alpha\beta < 2$. However, the function $(X_{\gamma,i}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'(x)$ appearing

in (3) grows more slowly than $h_\gamma(x)$ as x tends to 0, which will be used to establish $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^k[(X_{\gamma,i}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma))']\|_{L^1(m)} < \infty$ through an application of [28, Theorem 3.8].

Remark 1.4. If $\gamma = (0, \beta)$ with $\beta \geq 1$, it can be seen by the techniques of [14] that the map $T_\gamma = T_{0,\beta}$ still has an invariant measure μ_γ with density h_γ belonging to the cone $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) = \mathcal{C}_a(0, \beta)$, defined in Section 2. In this scenario, the linear response formula continues to hold, but the proof in Section 5 necessitates modifications. We provide a concise outline of these necessary adjustments. For $\gamma = (0, \beta)$, the tail bounds in Lemmas 2.4 and 2.8 decay exponentially, implying an exponential decay rate of memory loss in (12) through [28, Theorem 3.8]. Moreover, for such γ the upper bound (15) decays exponentially, and the results in Section 3 continue to hold. Then, the main issue in repeating the steps in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is that, for $\alpha > 0$, the constant in (11) becomes large as $\alpha \searrow 0$. However, similar to [10], this issue can be circumvented by writing $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j(\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta} - \mathcal{L}_\gamma)\mathcal{L}_\gamma^{k-j-1}(\mathbf{1}) = -\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^j(\mathcal{L}_\gamma - \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta})\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^{k-j-1}(\mathbf{1})$ in (32). This decomposition together with the previously mentioned properties can be employed to derive the linear response formula.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on the approach of [10], but there are a number of subtle differences, three of which are highlighted below:

- (1) We rely on results from [28] to obtain polynomially decaying upper bounds on $\|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\phi - \psi)\|_{L^1(m)}$ that are uniform in $\gamma \in K$ for compact $K \subset \mathfrak{D}$, provided that ϕ and ψ are sufficiently regular densities. We extend these L^1 bounds to L^q bounds using a change of measure combined with interpolation, employing techniques in the spirit of [11, 31, 42]. The L^q bounds are used to obtain the linear response formula for ϕ that satisfies (2).
- (2) We avoid using the cone $\mathcal{C}_{*,1}$ constructed in [10] and lower bounds on h_γ by decomposing regular functions into linear combinations of functions in the cone from [14] (see the definition of $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$ in Section 2).
- (3) For $\beta = 1$, the linear growth of $\int_{b_\ell}^1 |h'_{\alpha,1}(x)| dx \lesssim \ell$ combined with distortion estimates were used in [10] to establish

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{x > b_\ell\}}[\mathcal{L}_{\alpha,1}^k(\mathbf{1} - h_{\alpha,1})']\|_{L^1(m)} = 0, \quad (4)$$

where b_ℓ denotes the preimage of $\frac{1}{2}$ under $(T_{\alpha,\beta}|_{[0,\frac{1}{2}]})^\ell$. For $\beta > 1$, we have $\int_{b_\ell}^1 |h'_{\alpha,\beta}(x)| dx \lesssim \ell^{1+\frac{1}{\alpha}(1-\frac{1}{\beta})}$, which produces a large term if α is small, and because of this we are unable to recover (4) by a direct application of the argument from [10], but instead we have to develop some additional technical machinery.

Regarding (1), the method of [14, 29] could be used instead to control $\|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\phi - \psi)\|_{L^1(m)}$, but this is sufficient for the linear response formula only for parameters $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$ with $\alpha\beta < \frac{1}{1+\beta}$ as is seen from [14, Theorem 4.4]. For parameters $\alpha\beta < 2$, another option would be to use the method from [12] instead of [28], but this would require a careful analysis of the dependence of the constants with respect to γ in the upper bounds established in [12]. Yet another plausible approach in the case $\alpha\beta < 2$ would proceed by an implementation of the explicit coupling method from [26]. For $\alpha\beta < 1$, we believe that the approach from [20, 38] based on operator renewal theory could also be successfully adapted.

We submit (1) and (2) above to have some merit if one is interested in deriving response formulas for non-autonomous or random dynamical systems. While we believe that the approach in this paper could be extended to obtain annealed or quenched linear response

formulas associated with random compositions of maps drawn from the family (1), we leave such extensions for future exploration.

Finally, we mention that, while we only consider the concrete example (1), it can be seen from the proof that some generalizations are possible. For example, the method would apply in the setting of interval maps having finitely many full branches of the form described in [14, p. 405].

Organization of the paper. In Section 2 we establish results on the rate of memory loss and other technical estimates that are needed in the subsequent sections. In Section 3 we discuss properties of the convex cones introduced in [10, 14] and show that the partial derivatives given in Theorem 1.1 are well-defined. In Section 4 we study the parameter dependence of the transfer operator \mathcal{L}_γ . Section 5 is devoted to the proof of the main result, Theorem 1.1, for observables $\phi \in L^\infty$. There are two appendices: Appendix A contains the proof of Lemma 3.2 about the invariance of a cone involving higher order derivatives. In Appendix B we explain how the the proof in Section 5 can be modified to obtain the main result in the case of observables $\phi \in L^q$.

2. LOSS OF MEMORY AND DISTORTION BOUNDS

Recall that

$$\mathfrak{D} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in (0, 1) \times [1, \infty) : \alpha\beta < 1\}.$$

Throughout this section we consider a fixed subset

$$B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}.$$

On \mathfrak{D} we define the natural partial order

$$(\alpha_1, \beta_2) \leq (\alpha_2, \beta_2) \iff \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_1 \leq \beta_2.$$

Following [14], define the convex cone

$$\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) = \{f \in L^1([0, 1]) : f \geq 0, f \text{ decreasing,} \\ x^{\alpha+1} f \text{ increasing, } \int_0^x f(t) dt \leq ax^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha} m(f)\},$$

whenever $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$. Denote by h_γ the density of the invariant measure μ_γ . It follows from [14] that if

$$a \geq a_0(\gamma) := \frac{2^{\beta+1}(1+2^\alpha)^{1+\alpha-\frac{1}{\beta}}}{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha},$$

then there exists $b > 0$ determined by a and γ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi \geq b \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma). \quad (5)$$

In particular, $h_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$ (see [14, p. 409]). Note that the cone $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$ is increasing in a , and that

$$\gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 \implies a_0(\gamma_1) \leq a_0(\gamma_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_1) \subset \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_2).$$

We can slightly generalize the invariance property of $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$ stated above:

Lemma 2.1. *For all $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$ with $\gamma \leq \gamma_u = (\alpha_u, \beta_u)$,*

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u) \subset \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$$

holds if $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{L}_\gamma \varphi \geq 0$, $\mathcal{L}_\gamma \varphi$ is decreasing, and $x^{\alpha u + 1} \mathcal{L}_\gamma \varphi(x)$ is increasing. Next, note that $T_\gamma^{-1}[0, x] \subset T_{\gamma_u}^{-1}[0, x]$ holds for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Hence,

$$\int_0^x \mathcal{L}_\gamma \varphi(t) dt = \int_{T_\gamma^{-1}[0, x]} \varphi(t) dt \leq \int_{T_{\gamma_u}^{-1}[0, x]} \varphi(t) dt = \int_0^x \mathcal{L}_{\gamma_u} \varphi(t) dt \leq am(\varphi) x^{\frac{1}{\beta u} - \alpha u},$$

provided that $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$. \square

For all $n \geq 0$, define

$$b_n = f_{\gamma, 1}^{-n}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right).$$

Moreover, let $\hat{b}_0 = 1$ and for $n \geq 1$ let $\hat{b}_n \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ be such that

$$T_\gamma(\hat{b}_n) = f_{\gamma, 1}(b_n).$$

Then, for every $n \geq 0$, T_γ^{n+1} maps both (b_{n+1}, b_n) and $(\hat{b}_{n+1}, \hat{b}_n)$ bijectively onto $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and

$$\hat{b}_{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} b_n^{\frac{1}{\beta}}. \quad (6)$$

The following bounds on b_n and \hat{b}_n are immediate consequences of Lemma 5.2 in [27] combined with (6):

Lemma 2.2. *For all $n \geq 1$,*

$$\left[\frac{1}{2^\alpha + n\alpha 2^{\alpha-1}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq b_n \leq \left[\frac{1}{2^\alpha + n\alpha(1-\alpha)2^{\alpha-1}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2^\alpha + n\alpha 2^{\alpha-1}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \leq \hat{b}_{n+1} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2^\alpha + n\alpha(1-\alpha)2^{\alpha-1}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

Moreover, there exist $C_i = C_i(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ such that

$$C_1 n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} \leq b_n - b_{n+1} \leq C_2 n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} \quad \text{and} \quad C_3 n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}-1} \leq \hat{b}_n - \hat{b}_{n+1} \leq C_4 n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}-1}.$$

Lemma 2.3. *There exist $C_i > 0$ such that, for all $\gamma \in \mathfrak{D}$ and all $n \geq 1$,*

$$|\log(T_\gamma^n)'y - \log(T_\gamma^n)'x| \leq C_1 |T_\gamma^n(y) - T_\gamma^n(x)| \quad \forall x, y \in (b_n, b_{n-1}) \quad (7)$$

and

$$|\log(T_\gamma^n)'y - \log(T_\gamma^n)'x| \leq C_2 |T_\gamma^n(y) - T_\gamma^n(x)| \quad \forall x, y \in (\hat{b}_n, \hat{b}_{n-1}). \quad (8)$$

Proof. Since both branches of T_γ have negative Schwarzian derivative, both upper bounds follow easily by applying the Koebe Principle [15, Theorem IV.1.2]: see [3, Lemma 4.8], [1, Section 2], or [14, p. 416]. \square

2.1. Loss of memory. In this section we will show a key lemma by applying a result from [28]. We start by recalling some definitions from [28].

Let $Y = [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and $\gamma \in B$. We consider the measurable partition $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\gamma)$ of $X = [0, 1]$ consisting of all the intervals $I_n = (b_{n+1}, b_n)$ and $J_n = (\hat{b}_{n+1}, \hat{b}_n)$ for $n \geq 0$. Then the first return time

$$\tau(x) = \inf\{n \geq 1 : T_\gamma^n(x) \in Y\}$$

is constant on each $a \in \mathcal{P}$: $\tau(a) := \tau|_a(x) = n + 1$ for $x \in a \in \{I_n, J_n\}$. Define the first return map

$$F_a = T_\gamma^{\tau(a)} : a \rightarrow Y,$$

and denote by m_1 the Lebesgue measure on Y normalized to probability. Note that F_a sends a diffeomorphically onto Y . For a non-negative function $\rho : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, denote by $|\rho|_{\text{LL}}$ the Lipschitz seminorm of the logarithm of ρ :

$$|\rho|_{\text{LL}} = \sup_{y \neq y' \in Y} \frac{|\log \rho(y) - \log \rho(y')|}{|y - y'|},$$

where we use the conventions $\log 0 = -\infty$ and $\log 0 - \log 0 = 0$.

Lemma 2.4. *There exist $C, K, K', \delta > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$ depending only on B , such that the following hold for all $\gamma \in B$:*

- (i) For all $y, y' \in a$ and $a \in \{J_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, $|F_a(y) - F_a(y')| \geq \lambda|y - y'|$.
- (ii) The map F_a is non-singular with Log-Lipschitz Jacobian:

$$\zeta_a = \frac{d(F_a)_*(m_1|_a)}{dm_1} \quad \text{satisfies} \quad |\zeta_a|_{\text{LL}} \leq K.$$

- (iii) For all $x, x' \in a \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq \tau(a)} |T_\gamma^j(x) - T_\gamma^j(x')| \leq K'|F_a(x) - F_a(x')|.$$

- (iv) For all $n \geq 0$, $m_1(T_\gamma^{-n}Y) \geq \delta$.
- (v) For all $n \geq 1$,

$$m_1(\tau \geq n) \leq Cn^{-\frac{1}{\alpha u \beta u}}.$$

Proof. For brevity, denote $T = T_\gamma$.

- (i) We need to show that there exists $\lambda > 1$ such that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$(T^{n+1})'(x) > \lambda \quad \forall x \in J_n. \quad (9)$$

The inductive proof on p. 417 in [14] shows that (9) holds with $\lambda = \frac{3}{2}$. For completeness, let us recall the computation: for $n = 0$, using piecewise convexity of T together with (6),

$$T'(x) \geq T'(\hat{b}_1) \geq \beta 2^{\frac{1}{\beta}} > \frac{3}{2} \quad \forall \beta > 0.$$

For $n = k + 1$, assuming (9) for $n = k$,

$$(T^{k+2})'(x) \geq (T^{k+2})'(\hat{b}_{k+2}) \geq \frac{T'(\hat{b}_{k+2})T'(b_{k+1})}{T'(\hat{b}_{k+1})} \lambda = \left(\frac{b_{k+1}}{b_k}\right)^{\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}} (1 + 2^\alpha(1 + \alpha)b_{k+1}^\alpha) \lambda,$$

where the inductive hypothesis and (6) were used. Hence, for $t = 2^\alpha b_{k+1}^\alpha$,

$$(T^{k+2})'(x) \geq \left(\frac{1}{1+t}\right)^{\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}} (1 + (1 + \alpha)t) \lambda > \frac{1 + (1 + \alpha)t}{1+t} \lambda > \lambda.$$

- (ii) For $a = J_n$ and $z \in Y$,

$$\zeta_a(z) = \frac{1}{(T^{n+1})'(z_n)},$$

where $z_n = (T^{n+1}|_{J_n})^{-1}z$. By (8),

$$|\log(T^{n+1})'(z_n) - \log(T^{n+1})'(z'_n)| \leq C|z - z'| \quad \forall z, z' \in Y.$$

- (iii) Using (i), it is easy to see that this holds with $K' = 1$.

(iv) Recalling (5), this follows from $\mathcal{L}^n(\mathbf{1}) \geq b > 0$ for all $n \geq 0$. The lower bound b depends only on B since $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$ for $a \geq 1$.

(v) By Lemma 2.2, for $n \geq 2$,

$$m_1(\tau \geq n) = 2m([\frac{1}{2}, \hat{b}_{n-1}]) \leq 2(\hat{b}_n - \frac{1}{2}) \leq 2^{\frac{1}{\beta}(\frac{1}{\alpha^2} + \frac{2}{\alpha})} n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \leq C(B)n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_u\beta_u}}.$$

□

Now, if $\gamma \in B$ and μ is a non-negative measure supported on Y , it follows that for $\lambda > 1$ and K as in the previous lemma,

$$\left| \frac{d(F_a)_*(\mu|_a)}{dm_1} \right|_{\text{LL}} \leq K + \lambda^{-1}|\mu|_{\text{LL}}.$$

For a proof of this fact, see [26, Proposition 3.1]. An immediate consequence of this is the following result, where we may choose any $K_2 > (1 - \lambda^{-1})^{-1}$ and $K_1 = K + \lambda^{-1}K_2$:

Lemma 2.5. *There exist constants $0 < K_1 < K_2$ depending only on B such that for each $\gamma \in B$, for each non-negative measure μ on Y with $|\mu|_{\text{LL}} \leq K_2$, and each $a \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma)$ with $a \subset Y$,*

$$\left| \frac{d(F_a)_*(\mu|_a)}{dm_1} \right|_{\text{LL}} \leq K_1.$$

The constants K_1 and K_2 can be chosen arbitrarily large.

Fix K_1 and K_2 as in Lemma 2.5. The following definition is an adaptation of [28, Definition 3.5].

Definition 2.6. *We say that a non-negative measure μ on X is regular, if for every $\gamma \in B$ and every $a \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma)$,*

$$\left| \frac{d(F_a)_*(\mu|_a)}{dm_1} \right|_{\text{LL}} \leq K_1.$$

Remark 2.7. Note that the measure $(F_a)_*(\mu|_a)$ is supported on Y .

Lemma 2.8. *For sufficiently large K_1 in Lemma 2.5, the following holds: If $\gamma_0 = (\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in B$ and μ is a non-negative measure on X whose density belongs to $C_a(\gamma_0)$ with $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$, then μ is regular. Moreover, there exists $C = C(a, B) > 0$ such that for all $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in B$,*

$$\mu(\{x \in X : T_\gamma^k(x) \notin Y \text{ for all } 1 \leq k < n\}) \leq Cn^{-\gamma_*}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\gamma_* = \frac{1}{\alpha_u} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_0 \right).$$

Proof. To see that μ is regular, let $\rho \in C_a(\gamma_0)$ denote the density of μ . Let $\gamma \in B$. We consider the case $a \in \{J_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}(\gamma)$, the proof for $a \in \{I_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ being similar, which we omit. For $a = J_n$ and $z \in Y$,

$$\frac{d(F_a)_*(\mu|_a)}{dm_1}(z) = \frac{\rho(z_n)}{(T_\gamma^{n+1})'(z_n)},$$

where $z_n = (T_\gamma^{n+1}|_{J_n})^{-1}z$. By (8),

$$|\log(T_\gamma^{n+1})'(z_n) - \log(T_\gamma^{n+1})'(z'_n)| \leq C|z - z'| \quad \forall z, z' \in Y.$$

It remains to show that

$$|\log \rho(z_n) - \log \rho(z'_n)| \leq C|z - z'|.$$

Suppose that $z > z'$. Then $z_n > z'_n$. Since ρ is decreasing,

$$|\log \rho(z_n) - \log \rho(z'_n)| = \log \frac{\rho(z'_n)}{\rho(z_n)}$$

and, since $x^{\alpha_0+1}\rho(x)$ is increasing,

$$\frac{\rho(z'_n)}{\rho(z_n)} = \frac{(z'_n)^{\alpha_0+1}\rho(z'_n)}{(z_n)^{\alpha_0+1}\rho(z_n)} \leq \frac{(z_n)^{\alpha_0+1}}{(z'_n)^{\alpha_0+1}}.$$

Hence,

$$|\log \rho(z_n) - \log \rho(z'_n)| \leq 2(\log z_n - \log z'_n) \leq 2\frac{1}{z'_n}|z_n - z'_n| \leq 4|z_n - z'_n| \leq C|z - z'|,$$

where the last inequality follows again by (8). We have shown that $\frac{d(F_a)_*(\mu|_a)}{dm_1}(z) \leq C$ for some $C = C(B) > 0$. The regularity of μ follows by taking K_1 sufficiently large in Lemma 2.5.

It remains to show the tail bound (10). Since $\rho \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x \in X : T_\gamma^k(x) \notin Y \text{ for all } 1 \leq k < n\}) &= \mu([0, b_{n-1}]) + \mu([\frac{1}{2}, \hat{b}_{n-1}]) \\ &= \int_0^{b_{n-1}} \rho(x) dx + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\hat{b}_{n-1}} \rho(x) dx \leq ab_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{\beta_0}-\alpha_0} + \rho(\frac{1}{2})(\hat{b}_{n-1} - \frac{1}{2}) \\ &\leq aC(B)(b_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{\beta_0}-\alpha_0} + (\hat{b}_{n-1} - \frac{1}{2})). \end{aligned}$$

Now, by applying Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x \in X : T_\gamma^k(x) \notin Y \text{ for all } 1 \leq k < n\}) \\ \leq aC(B)(n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}(\frac{1}{\beta_0}-\alpha_0)} + n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}) \leq aC(B)(n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_u}(\frac{1}{\beta_u}-\alpha_0)} + n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_u\beta_u}}). \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to establish the key lemma mentioned at the beginning of this section:

Lemma 2.9 (Loss of memory). *For all $\gamma_0 = (\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in B$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ determined by a, B, γ_0 such that the following holds: If $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_0)$ are such that $m(\phi) = m(\psi)$, where $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$, then for all $\gamma \in B$,*

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\phi - \psi)\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C(m(\psi) + m(\phi))n^{-\gamma_*}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\gamma_* = \frac{1}{\alpha_u}(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_0)$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $C' > 0$ determined by a, B such that for all $\gamma \in B$, and all $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$ with $m(\phi) = m(\psi)$, where $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\phi - \psi)\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C'(m(\psi) + m(\phi))n^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha_u\beta_u}}. \quad (12)$$

Remark 2.10. If $\alpha_0 \ll \alpha_u$, (11) gives a much better estimate than (12). This will be instrumental in the proof of the linear response formula for $\alpha\beta \geq 2$.

Proof of Lemma 2.9. Both upper bounds follow by applying [28, Theorem 3.8] in the case of the family $\mathcal{T} = \{T_\gamma\}$ consisting only of the single map T_γ with $\gamma \in B$. We provide more details below.

By Lemma 2.4, the family \mathcal{T} satisfies the conditions (NU:1)-(NU:7) from [28, Section 3.1] with constants depending only on B . Then, suppose that μ and μ' are two probability

measures on X with densities $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_0)$, where $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$. By Lemma 2.8, μ and μ' are regular. By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.8, for some $C_i = C_i(B) > 0$,

$$m_1(\tau \geq n) \leq C_1 n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_u \beta_u}},$$

and for $\nu \in \{\mu, \mu'\}$,

$$\nu(\{x \in X : T_\gamma^k(x) \notin Y \text{ for all } 1 \leq k < n\}) \leq C_2 n^{-\gamma_*}. \quad (13)$$

In the terminology of [28], this means that m_1 has tail bound $h(n) = C_1(B)n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_u \beta_u}}$ and ν has tail bound $r(n) = C_2(B)n^{-\gamma_*}$, where $\gamma_* \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_u \beta_u}$. We have verified the assumptions of [28, Theorem 3.8], which implies the existence of a constant $C = C(\gamma_*, B) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}([0,1])} \left| \int_A \mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\rho - \rho') dm \right| = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}([0,1])} |(T_\gamma^n)_* \mu(A) - (T_\gamma^n)_* \nu(A)| \leq C n^{-\gamma_*}$$

holds for all $n \geq 1$ and all $\gamma \in B$. In particular,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\rho - \rho')\|_{L^1(m)} \leq 2C n^{-\gamma_*}. \quad (14)$$

Now, (11) follows from (14) by scaling ϕ and ψ with $m(\phi)$, noting that $\phi/m(\phi) \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$.

Finally, (12) also follows by an application of Theorem [28, Theorem 3.8], because we can replace the right hand side of (13) with $C_2 n^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha_u \beta_u}}$ for densities $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$. In this case, [28, Theorem 3.8] guarantees that $\|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(\rho - \rho')\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C' n^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha_u \beta_u}}$ holds for $C' > 0$ determined by B and a .

□

2.2. Technical estimates. We assume that $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$ and denote $T = T_\gamma$.

Lemma 2.11. *For all $\ell \geq 1$, there exist $C_i = C_i(\gamma, \ell) > 0$ such that for all $m \geq 1$ the following bounds hold:*

$$\sup_{x \in (0,1): T^m(x) \geq b_\ell} \frac{1}{(T^m)'x} \leq C_1 m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}, \quad (15)$$

$$\sup_{x \in (0,1): T^m(x) \geq b_\ell} \frac{(T^m)''x}{((T^m)'x)^2} \leq C_2. \quad (16)$$

Proof. Suppose that $m, \ell \geq 1$ and $x \in [0, 1]$ are such that $T^m x \geq b_\ell$. Let $0 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_k \leq m$ be such that for all $0 \leq j \leq m$, $T^j x \in Y = [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ if and only if $j \in \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k\}$. We may assume $k \geq 1$, for otherwise the trajectory remains in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and we are in the situation of the usual intermittent map $T_{\alpha, \beta}$ with $\beta = 1$, in which case both upper bounds (are well-known and) follow easily from (7).

We have

$$(T^m)'x = (T^{m-\ell_k})'T^{\ell_k}x \cdot \prod_{j=2}^k (T^{\ell_j-\ell_{j-1}})'T^{\ell_{j-1}}x \cdot (T^{\ell_1})'x,$$

where we use the convention $T^0 = \text{id}_{[0,1]}$. Suppose $\ell_1 > 0$ i.e. $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Since $T^j x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ for $j < \ell_1$ and $T^{\ell_1} x \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have the lower bound

$$(T^{\ell_1})'x \geq (f_{\gamma,1}^{\ell_1})'b_{\ell_1} \geq C(\alpha)\ell_1^{1+\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \quad (17)$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 5.3 in [27]. Next, note that for each $2 \leq j \leq k$ we must have $T^{\ell_{j-1}}x \in [\hat{b}_{p_j}, \hat{b}_{p_{j-1}}]$, where $p_j = \ell_j - \ell_{j-1}$. Hence, $(T^{\ell_j - \ell_{j-1}})'T^{\ell_{j-1}}x > \lambda > 1$ holds by (9). On the other hand, it follows by an application of Lemma 2.3 that

$$(T^{\ell_j - \ell_{j-1}})'T^{\ell_{j-1}}x \geq C \frac{T^{p_j}(\hat{b}_{p_{j-1}}) - T^{p_j}(\hat{b}_{p_j})}{\hat{b}_{p_{j-1}} - \hat{b}_{p_j}} = \frac{C}{2} \frac{1}{\hat{b}_{p_{j-1}} - \hat{b}_{p_j}}. \quad (18)$$

Using (6), the Hölder continuity of $t \mapsto t^{\frac{1}{\beta}}$, and Lemma 2.2 we see that $\hat{b}_{p_{j-1}} - \hat{b}_{p_j} \leq C(\gamma)(\ell_j - \ell_{j-1})^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}$, so that

$$(T^{\ell_j - \ell_{j-1}})'T^{\ell_{j-1}}x \geq C(\gamma)(\ell_j - \ell_{j-1})^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

Hence,

$$(T^{\ell_j - \ell_{j-1}})'T^{\ell_{j-1}}x \geq \max\{\lambda, C(\gamma)(\ell_j - \ell_{j-1})^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}\}. \quad (19)$$

Finally, to control $(T^{m - \ell_k})'T^{\ell_k}x$, note that if $\ell_k < m$ we must have $\hat{b}_{m - \ell_k + \ell} \leq T^{\ell_k}x < \hat{b}_{m - \ell_k}$. Hence, there exists $0 \leq p < \ell$ such that $T^{\ell_k}x \in J_{m - \ell_k + p} = [\hat{b}_{m - \ell_k + p + 1}, \hat{b}_{m - \ell_k + p}]$. Since $T^{m - \ell_k}$ maps $J_{m - \ell_k + p}$ diffeomorphically onto $[b_{p+1}, b_p]$ and both branches of T have negative Schwarzian derivative, it follows by an application of the Koebe Principle [15, Theorem IV.1.2] that

$$(T^{m - \ell_k})'T^{\ell_k}x \geq C(\ell) \frac{b_p - b_{p+1}}{\hat{b}_{m - \ell_k + p} - \hat{b}_{m - \ell_k + p + 1}} \geq C(\gamma, \ell) 2b_\ell (m - \ell_k)^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}. \quad (20)$$

Gathering the estimates (17), (19), and (20), we see that for some $C_i = C_i(\gamma, \ell) > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$,

$$(T^m)'x \geq C_1(m - \ell_k + 1)^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} (\ell_1 + 1)^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot \prod_{j=2}^k \max\{\lambda, C_2(\ell_j - \ell_{j-1})^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}\}. \quad (21)$$

One of the integers $\ell_1, \ell_2 - \ell_1, \dots, \ell_k - \ell_{k-1}, m - \ell_k$ must be at least $\frac{m}{k+1}$, so that

$$(T^m)'x \geq C(\gamma, \ell) \left(\frac{m}{k+1}\right)^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \lambda^k \geq C(\gamma, \ell) m^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

This proves (15).

For (16), we write

$$\frac{(T^m)''x}{((T^m)'x)^2} = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{T''(T^jx)}{T'(T^jx)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^jx}$$

and consider elements in the sum case by case.

Case 1°: $j < \ell_1$. Since $T^jx \geq b_{\ell_1 - j}$ and $T^jx \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T''(T^jx)}{T'(T^jx)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^jx} &\leq C(\alpha) b_{\ell_1 - j}^{\alpha - 1} \frac{1}{(T^{m - \ell_1})'T^{\ell_1}x} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_1 - j})'T^jx} \\ &\leq C(\alpha) (\ell_1 - j)^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1} \frac{1}{(T^{m - \ell_1})'T^{\ell_1}x} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_1 - j})'T^jx}, \end{aligned}$$

Using (15) and (17), we see that

$$\frac{1}{(T^{m - \ell_1})'T^{\ell_1}x} \leq C(\gamma, \ell) (m - \ell_1)^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_1 - j})'T^jx} \leq C(\gamma) (\ell_1 - j)^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^j x} \leq C(\gamma, \ell)(\ell_1 - j)^{-2}(m - \ell_1)^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

Case 2°: $j = \ell_i$ for some $1 \leq i < k$. Now,

$$\frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^j x} = \frac{\beta - 1}{T^{\ell_i x} - \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i})'T^{\ell_i x}} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m - \ell_{i+1}})'T^{\ell_{i+1} x}}.$$

Since $T^{\ell_i x} \in [\hat{b}_{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i}, \hat{b}_{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i - 1}]$, (18) combined with Lemma 2.2 yields

$$\frac{\beta - 1}{T^{\ell_i x} - \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i})'T^{\ell_i x}} \leq C(\gamma) \frac{\hat{b}_{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i - 1} - \hat{b}_{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i}}{\hat{b}_{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i} - \frac{1}{2}} \leq C(\gamma)(\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i)^{-1},$$

while (15) implies

$$\frac{1}{(T^{m - \ell_{i+1}})'T^{\ell_{i+1} x}} \leq C(\gamma, \ell)(m - \ell_{i+1})^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

We conclude that

$$\frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^j x} \leq C(\gamma, \ell)(\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i)^{-1}(m - \ell_{i+1})^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

Case 3°: $j = \ell_k$. By (20) and Lemma 2.2,

$$\frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^j x} \leq C(\gamma, \ell)(m - \ell_k)^{-1}.$$

Case 4°: $\ell_i < j < \ell_{i+1}$. As in Case 1° we see that

$$\frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^j x} \leq C(\gamma, \ell)(\ell_{i+1} - j)^{-2}(m - \ell_{i+1})^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

Case 5°: $j > \ell_k$. Since $T^j x \geq b_{m-j+\ell}$, we obtain by Lemma 2.2 the upper bound

$$\frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \leq C(\alpha, \ell)(m - j)^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1}.$$

Moreover, $T^j x \in [b_{m-j+\ell}, b_{m+j}]$. Hence, we can use the argument from the proof of (20) together with Lemma 2.2 to obtain

$$\frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^j x} \leq C(\alpha, \ell)(m - j)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})'T^j x} \leq C(\alpha, \ell)(m - j)^{-2}.$$

Now, (16) follows by summing over the upper bounds obtained in each case:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{T''(T^j x)}{T'(T^j x)} \cdot \frac{1}{(T^{m-j})' T^j x} \\
& \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\ell_1-1} C_1 (\ell_1 - j)^{-2} (m - \ell_1)^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} && \text{(Case 1°)} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_2 (\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i)^{-1} (m - \ell_{i+1})^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} && \text{(Case 2°)} \\
& + C_3 (m - \ell_k)^{-1} && \text{(Case 3°)} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{\ell_i < j < \ell_{i+1}} C_4 (\ell_{i+1} - j)^{-2} (m - \ell_{i+1})^{-1 - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} && \text{(Case 4°)} \\
& + \sum_{j=\ell_k+1}^{m-1} C_5 (m - j)^{-2} && \text{(Case 5°)} \\
& \leq C(\gamma, \ell).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Besides the two bounds in Lemma 2.11, the bound (21) will be an important tool in the proof of the linear response formula.

3. ABOUT CONES AND INVARIANT MEASURES

Recall that

$$\mathfrak{D} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in (0, 1) \times [1, \infty) : \alpha\beta < 1\}.$$

In this section we show that for $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$,

$$D_i := - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\gamma^k [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'] dm \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

is well-defined if $\gamma \in \mathfrak{D}$. We start by noting that $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}$ preserves the cone constructed in [14].

Lemma 3.1. *For $\gamma \in \mathfrak{D}$ define*

$$\mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma) = C^2(0, 1] \cap \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma).$$

Suppose $\gamma_u \in \mathfrak{D}$ and $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$. Then, for all $\gamma \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\gamma \leq \gamma_u$, $h_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)$ together with the following inclusions hold:

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)) \subset \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u), \quad \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)) \subset \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u), \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$ and $\gamma_u = (\alpha_u, \beta_u) \in \mathfrak{D}$ with $\gamma \leq \gamma_u$. By Lemma 2.1, we have $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)) \subset \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)$ since $\mathcal{L}_\gamma C^2(0, 1] \subset C^2(0, 1]$ clearly holds. Then $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(h_\gamma) = h_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)$ follows by the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [14]. Since $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi) = \sum_{i=1,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi)$, it remains to show that $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)) \subset \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma_u)$.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi) \geq 0$ is decreasing for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Denoting $y_1 = g_{\gamma,1}(x)$, we have

$$x^{\alpha_u+1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi)(x) = y_1^{\alpha_u+1} \varphi(y_1) \frac{(1+\xi)^{\alpha_u+1}}{1+(\alpha+1)\xi}$$

for $\xi = (2y_1)^\alpha$, from which we see that $x \mapsto x^{\alpha_u+1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi)(x)$ is increasing. Denoting $y_2 = g_{\gamma,2}(x)$, we have

$$x^{\alpha_u+1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x) = C(\alpha_u, \beta) y_2^{\alpha_u+1} \varphi(y_2) \cdot y_2^{-\alpha_u-1} (y_2 - \frac{1}{2})^{\beta\alpha_u+1},$$

from which we see that $x \mapsto x^{\alpha_u+1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x)$ is increasing. Finally, using Lemma 2.1 we see that $\int_0^x \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi) dm \leq \int_0^x \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi) dm \leq am(\varphi)x^{\frac{1}{\beta u} - \alpha_u}$. \square

Following [10], we define cones involving higher order derivatives and establish their invariance:

Lemma 3.2. For $b_1 \geq \alpha + 1$, $b_2 \geq b_1$ and $b_3 \geq b_1$, define

$$\mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)} = \{\varphi \in C^3((0, 1]) : \varphi(x) \geq 0, |\varphi'(x)| \leq \frac{b_1}{x} \varphi(x), |\varphi''(x)| \leq \frac{b_2}{x^2} \varphi(x), \\ |\varphi'''(x)| \leq \frac{b_3}{x^3} \varphi(x), \forall x \in (0, 1]\}.$$

Suppose $B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}$. There exist constants $\kappa_i > 1$ depending only on B such that if $b_1 \geq \alpha_u + 1$, $b_2 \geq \kappa_1 b_1$ and $b_3 \geq \kappa_2 b_2$, then for all $\gamma \in B$, $h_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$ together with the following inclusions hold:

$$\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}) \subset \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}, \quad \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}) \subset \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Proof. The statement concerning $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}$ follows from [10, Appendix B]. The other statements are proved in Appendix A. \square

The following simple observation is useful when dealing with regular functions that do not belong to a cone $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$:

Lemma 3.3. Let $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$. Suppose that $F \in C^2(0, 1]$ is a function such that $m(F) = 0$, and for some $C_i \geq 1$ and $0 < \delta < 1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{\beta}$,

$$|F(x)| \leq C_0 a x^{-\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad |F'(x)| \leq C_1 a x^{-\delta-1}$$

hold for all $x \in (0, 1]$. Then, $F(x) + \lambda x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$ if

$$a \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \geq a(C_0 + C_1) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{\beta}}, 4, \frac{2(\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha)}{1 - \delta} \right\}. \quad (22)$$

Remark 3.4. Note that $\lambda x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$ if $a \geq 1$.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Let us denote

$$\psi(x) = F(x) + \lambda x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1}.$$

Step 1: $\psi \geq 0$. This holds if $\lambda \geq C_0 a$.

Step 2: ψ is decreasing. We see that $\psi'(x) \leq 0$ if

$$\lambda \geq \frac{C_1 a}{1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{\beta}}.$$

Step 3: $x^{\alpha+1} \psi(x)$ is increasing. Let $\varphi(x) = x^{\alpha+1} \psi(x)$. Then,

$$\lambda \geq a4(C_0 + C_1) \implies \varphi'(x) \geq 0.$$

Step 4: $\int_0^x \psi(t) dt \leq ax^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha} m(\psi)$. Since $m(F) = 0$, we have $m(\psi) = \int_0^1 \lambda x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-1} dx = \lambda(\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha)^{-1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^x \psi(t) dt &\leq m(\psi) ax^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} \left(\frac{C_0(\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha)}{\lambda(1-\delta)} x^{1-\delta+\alpha-\frac{1}{\beta}} + \frac{1}{a} \right) \\ &\leq m(\psi) ax^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} \left(\frac{C_0(\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha)}{\lambda(1-\delta)} + \frac{1}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\lambda \geq \frac{2C_0(\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha)}{(1-\delta)} \implies \int_0^x \psi(t) dt \leq ax^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha} m(\psi).$$

Conclusion: We obtain

$$(22) \implies F(x) + \lambda x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-1} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$$

by combining the bounds established in Steps 1 through 4. \square

We record in the following two lemmas some basic properties of the functions $X_{\gamma,i}$ ($i = 1, 2$) and their derivatives, which are easy to verify.

Lemma 3.5 (Properties of $X_{\gamma,1}$). *The function $(\alpha, x) \mapsto X_{\gamma,1}(x)$ is C^2 on $(0, \infty) \times (0, 1]$. If $B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}$, there exist $C_i = C_i(B) > 0$ such that for all $x \in (0, 1]$ and all $\gamma \in B$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |X_{\gamma,1}(x)| &\leq C_0 x^{1+\alpha} (1 - \log(x)), & |X'_{\gamma,1}(x)| &\leq C_1 x^\alpha (1 - \log(x)), \\ |X''_{\gamma,1}(x)| &\leq C_2 x^{\alpha-1} (1 - \log(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.6 (Properties of $X_{\gamma,2}$). *The function $(\beta, x) \mapsto X_{\gamma,2}$ is C^2 on $(0, \infty) \times (0, 1]$. If $B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}$, there exist $C_i = C_i(B) > 0$ such that for all $x \in (0, 1]$ and all $\gamma \in B$*

$$|X_{\gamma,2}(x)| \leq C_0 \log(x^{-1})x, \quad |X'_{\gamma,2}(x)| \leq C_1 [1 - \log(x)], \quad |X''_{\gamma,2}(x)| \leq C_2 \frac{1}{x}.$$

Next, we verify that D_i is well-defined for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that $\gamma \in \mathfrak{D}$ and that $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$ for $a \geq a_0(\gamma)$ and b_1, b_2, b_3 as in Lemma 3.2. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there exist $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{C}_a(\delta, \beta)$ such that*

$$(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\psi))' = \psi_1 - \psi_2. \quad (23)$$

In particular, if $\gamma_1, \gamma \in B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}$, then for all $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$,

$$S_i = - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma_1}^k [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\psi))'] dm, \quad i \in \{1, 2\},$$

is absolutely summable.

Remark 3.8. Since $h_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$, it follows that D_i is absolutely summable for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. For $i = 1$, writing $u = (X_{\gamma,1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\psi))'$ we have $m(u) = 0$. Moreover, by Lemmas 3.5 and 3.2, there exist $C_i = C_i(\gamma, a, b_1, b_2) > 0$ such that

$$|u(x)| \leq C_1 x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} (1 - \log(x))$$

and

$$|u'(x)| \leq C_2 x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-2} (1 - \log(x)).$$

Hence, in Lemma 3.3 we may take α arbitrary small. That is, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\lambda = \lambda(\gamma, \delta, a, b_1, b_2) > 0$ such that

$$u(x) + \lambda x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \delta - 1} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\delta, \beta),$$

if $a \geq 2$. Since $\lambda x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \delta - 1} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\delta, \beta)$, the decomposition (23) follows.

For $i = 2$, we define

$$v = (X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\psi))' = X'_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\psi) + X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\psi)'$$

Then $m(v) = 0$. The upper bound $\psi(g_{\gamma,2}(x)) \leq \psi(\frac{1}{2}) \leq 2^{\alpha+1}$ combined with Lemma 3.6 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |X'_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\psi)(x)| &\leq (1 - \log(x)) \cdot g'_{\gamma,2}(x) \psi(g_{\gamma,2}(x)) \\ &\leq (1 - \log(x)) \psi(\tfrac{1}{2}) \frac{1}{T'_\gamma(g_{\gamma,2}(x))} \\ &\leq C_3 x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - 1} (1 - \log(x)), \end{aligned}$$

and, by Lemmas 3.6 and 3.2,

$$|X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(x)(\psi)'| \leq C_4 (1 - \log(x)) x \cdot a x^{-1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\psi)(x) \leq C_4 x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - 1} (1 - \log(x)).$$

Hence, $|v(x)| \leq C_5 x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - 1} (1 - \log(x))$. Similarly, using Lemmas 3.6 and 3.2, we see that $|v'(x)| \leq C_6 x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - 2} (1 - \log(x))$. Again the decomposition (23) follows by Lemma 3.3.

The decomposition (23) combined with the first part of Lemma 2.9 yields the upper bound

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\gamma_1}^k [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\psi))']\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C (m(\psi_1) + m(\psi_2)) k^{-\gamma_*},$$

for some $C > 0$ determined by a, B, γ, δ and

$$\gamma_* = \frac{1}{\alpha_u} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \delta \right).$$

For sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ we have $\frac{1}{\alpha_u} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \delta \right) > 1$. It follows that S_i is absolutely summable for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. \square

4. REGULARITY PROPERTIES OF $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)$

For sufficiently regular $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we analyze properties of the partial derivatives of $\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x)$. Since the first branch of T_γ does not depend on β and the second branch does not depend on α , we do not have to consider mixed derivatives. As before, given α and β we denote $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta)$.

Lemma 4.1. *The functions $(\alpha, y) \mapsto g_{\gamma,1}(y)$ and $(\beta, y) \mapsto g_{\gamma,2}(y)$ are both C^4 on $(0, \infty) \times (0, 1)$, and for all $x \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha, \beta > 0$,*

$$\partial_i g_{\gamma,i}(x) = -\frac{X_{\gamma,i}(x)}{f'_{\gamma,i}(g_{\gamma,i}(x))}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (24)$$

Proof. The result is an immediate consequence of the implicit function theorem applied with $F_1((\alpha, x), y) = f_{\gamma,1}(y) - x$ and $F_2((\beta, x), y) = f_{\gamma,2}(y) - x$. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $\varphi \in C^1((0, 1], \mathbb{R})$. Then, for all $x \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha, \beta > 0$, and $i \in \{1, 2\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x) &= -X'_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi)(x) - X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi' / f'_{\gamma,i})(x) + X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi f''_{\gamma,i} / (f'_{\gamma,i})^2)(x) \\ &= -(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi))'(x). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $m(\partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. These formulas are from [8]; for completeness, we give a proof in the case of $\partial_2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x)$, the proof for $\partial_1 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x)$ being the same. As the second branch of T_γ is independent of α , in the following we will denote $f_{\beta,2} = f_{\gamma,2}$, $g_{\beta,2} = g_{\gamma,2}$, $X_{\beta,2} = X_{\gamma,2}$, and $\mathcal{N}_{\beta,2} = \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}$, omitting α from the subscripts.

First, we verify that

$$\partial_2 g'_{\beta,2}(x) = -\frac{X'_{\beta,2}(x)}{f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))} + X_{\beta,2} \frac{f''_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))}{(f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x)))^3}. \quad (25)$$

For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small we have $g'_{\beta+\delta,2}(x) - g'_{\beta,2}(x) = I + II$, where

$$I = \frac{f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x)) - f'_{\beta+\delta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))}{f'_{\beta+\delta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))} \quad \text{and} \quad II = \frac{f'_{\beta+\delta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x)) - f'_{\beta+\delta,2}(g_{\beta+\delta,2}(x))}{f'_{\beta+\delta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))f'_{\beta+\delta,2}(g_{\beta+\delta,2}(x))}.$$

By Taylor's theorem, for any $y \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$,

$$f'_{\beta+\delta,2}(y) = f'_{\beta,2}(y) + \partial_2 f'_{\beta,2}(y) \cdot \delta + O(\delta^2),$$

where $\partial_2 f'_{\beta,2}(y) = (\partial_2 f_{\beta,2})'(y) = v'_{\beta,2}(y)$, since $(\beta, y) \mapsto f_{\beta,2}(y)$ is C^2 . It follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{I}{\delta} = -\frac{v'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))}{(f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x)))^2} = -\frac{X'_{\beta,2}(x)}{f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))}.$$

By a similar computation, using Taylor's theorem together with $g_{\beta+\delta,2}(y) - g_{\beta,2}(y) = O(\delta)$, we see that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{II}{\delta} = \frac{X_{\beta,2}}{f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))} \cdot \frac{f''_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x))}{(f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x)))^2}.$$

Hence, (25) holds. Using (24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_2 \mathcal{L}_{\alpha,\beta}(\varphi)(x) &= \partial_2 \mathcal{N}_{\beta,2}(\varphi)(x) = \partial_2 g'_{\beta,2}(x) \cdot \varphi(g_{\beta,2}(x)) + g'_{\beta,2}(x) \varphi'(g_{\beta,2}(x)) \cdot \partial_\alpha g_{\beta,2}(x) \\ &= \partial_2 g'_{\beta,2}(x) \cdot \varphi(g_{\beta,2}(x)) - X_{\beta,2} \frac{\varphi'(g_{\beta,2}(x))}{(f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x)))^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last term may be written as

$$X_{\beta,2} \frac{\varphi'(g_{\beta,2}(x))}{(f'_{\beta,2}(g_{\beta,2}(x)))^2} = X_{\beta,2} \mathcal{N}_{\beta,2}(\varphi'/f'_{\beta,2})(x),$$

and, using (25), the first term may be written as

$$\partial_2 g'_{\beta,2}(x) \cdot \varphi(g_{\beta,2}(x)) = -X'_{\beta,2} \mathcal{N}_{\beta,2}(\varphi)(x) + X_{\beta,2} \mathcal{N}_{\beta,2}(\varphi f''_{\beta,2}/(f'_{\beta,2})^2)(x).$$

□

Lemma 4.3. *If $\varphi \in C^3((0, 1])$, then $(\alpha, x) \mapsto X_{\gamma,1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi)(x)$ and $(\beta, x) \mapsto X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x)$ are C^3 on $(0, \infty) \times (0, 1)$, and for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x) &= (\partial_i X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi))'(x) + X'_{\gamma,i} (X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi))'(x) + X_{\gamma,i} (X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi))''(x). \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $m(\partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)) = 0$.

Proof. Using Lemma 4.1 we see that $(\alpha, x) \mapsto X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi)(x)$ and $(\beta, x) \mapsto X_{\gamma,2}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x)$ are C^3 . Then, by Lemma 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x) &= [\partial_i(X_{\gamma,i}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi))]'(x) \\ &= (\partial_i X_{\gamma,i}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi))'(x) + X'_{\gamma,i}\partial_i\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi)(x) + X_{\gamma,i}(\partial_i\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi))'(x),\end{aligned}$$

and now the desired formula for $\partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x)$ follows by another application of Lemma 4.2. Finally, we have $m(\partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)) = \partial_i m(\partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)) = 0$ by Lemma 4.2, where the use of Leibniz integral rule is justified by (27) and (29) below. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)} \cap C_a(\gamma_u)$, $m(\varphi) = 1$, where $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$ and b_i are as in Lemma 3.2. Then, for any $0 < \tilde{\alpha} < \alpha$, there exist $C_i > 0$ depending only on $B, a, b_1, b_2, b_3, \tilde{\alpha}$, such that*

$$|\partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x)| \leq C_0 x^{-\kappa} \quad \text{and} \quad |(\partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi))'(x)| \leq C_1 x^{-\kappa+1}, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\kappa < 1 + (\alpha_u - \tilde{\alpha}) - \frac{1}{\beta_u}.$$

In particular, there exist $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}_a(\alpha_u - \tilde{\alpha}, \beta_u)$ such that

$$\partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi) = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\varphi_i\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C'_i, \quad (28)$$

where $C'_i > 0$ depend only on $B, a, b_1, b_2, b_3, \tilde{\alpha}$.

Proof. To obtain the desired upper bound on $\partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x)$ we have to control each of the three terms in (26). Let us denote them respectively by E_1, E_2 and E_3 . By a direct computation, we see that

$$|\partial_1 X_{\gamma,1}(x)| \leq C(B)x^{1+\alpha}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_1 X'_{\gamma,1}(x)| \leq C(B)x^\alpha(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2.$$

These upper bounds together with Lemmas 3.5 and 3.2 yield

$$|E_1| = |(\partial_1 X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi))'(x)| \leq C_1(B, a, b_1)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_u - 1 + \alpha}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2,$$

$$|E_2| = |X'_{\gamma,1}(X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi))'(x)| \leq C_2(B, a, b_1)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_u - 1 + 2\alpha}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2,$$

$$|E_3| = |X_{\gamma,1}(X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi))''(x)| \leq C_3(B, a, b_1, b_2)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_u - 1 + 2\alpha}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2.$$

Hence the first inequality in (27) holds. For the second inequality we have to differentiate each of the three terms E_i . We have

$$E'_1 = (\partial_1 X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi))''(x) = \partial_1 X''_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi) + 2\partial_1 X'_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}'_{\gamma,1}(\varphi) + \partial_1 X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}''_{\gamma,1}(\varphi).$$

Using $|\partial_1 X''_{\gamma,1}(x)| \leq C(B)x^{\alpha-1}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2$, Lemma 3.2, and the bounds on $\partial_1 X_{\gamma,1}(x)$ and $\partial_1 X'_{\gamma,1}(x)$ above we see that

$$|E'_1| \leq C_1(B, a, b_1, b_2)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_u - 2 + \alpha}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2.$$

Using Lemmas 3.5 and 3.2 we obtain $|E'_j| \leq C_j(B, a, b_1, b_2, b_3)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_u - 2 + \alpha}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2$ for $j = 2, 3$, so that the second inequality in (27) holds. Now, (28) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.3 and the first inequality in (27). \square

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that $\gamma \in B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)} \cap C_a(\gamma_u)$, $m(\varphi) = 1$, where $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$ and b_i are as in Lemma 3.2. Then for any $0 < \tilde{\alpha}_u < \alpha_u$ there exist $C_i > 0$ depending only on $B, a, b_1, b_2, b_3, \tilde{\alpha}_u$ such that*

$$|\partial_2^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x)| \leq C_0 x^{-\kappa} \quad \text{and} \quad |(\partial_2^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi))'(x)| \leq C_1 x^{-\kappa+1}, \quad (29)$$

where

$$\kappa < 1 + \tilde{\alpha}_u - \frac{1}{\beta_u}.$$

In particular, there exist $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}_a(\tilde{\alpha}_u, \beta_u)$ such that

$$\partial_2^2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi) = \varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\varphi_i\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C'_i, \quad (30)$$

where $C'_i > 0$ depend only on $B, a, b_1, b_2, b_3, \tilde{\alpha}_u$.

Proof. Denote each of the three terms in (26) respectively by E_1, E_2 and E_3 . The upper bounds

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x)| &\leq C_1(B)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u}-1}, \\ |\partial_2 X_{\gamma,2}(x)| &\leq C_2(B)\log(x^{-1})x \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_2 X'_{\gamma,2}(x)| \leq C_3(B)(1 + \log(x^{-1})) \end{aligned}$$

combined with Lemmas 3.6 and 3.2 yield

$$|E_1| = |(\partial_2 X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi))'(x)| \leq C_1(B, a, b_1)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u}-1}(1 + \log(x^{-1})),$$

$$|E_2| = |X'_{\gamma,2}(X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi))'(x)| \leq C_2(B, a, b_1)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u}-1}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2,$$

$$|E_3| = |X_{\gamma,2}(X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi))''(x)| \leq C_3(B, a, b_1, b_2)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u}-1}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2.$$

Hence, the first inequality in (29) holds. To obtain the second inequality in (29) we differentiate E_1 ,

$$E'_1 = (\partial_2 X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi))''(x) = \partial_2 X''_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi) + 2\partial_2 X'_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}'_{\gamma,2}(\varphi) + \partial_2 X_{\gamma,2} \mathcal{N}''_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)$$

and observe that $|\partial_2 X''_{\gamma,2}(x)| \leq Cx^{-1}$. Using Lemma 3.2, together with the bounds on $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x)$, $\partial_2 X_{\gamma,2}(x)$, $\partial_2 X'_{\gamma,2}(x)$, and $\partial_2 X''_{\gamma,2}$ above we arrive at the upper bound

$$|E'_1| \leq C_1(B, a, b_1, b_2)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u}-2}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2.$$

By Lemmas 3.6 and 3.2, $|E'_j| \leq C_j(B, a, b_1, b_2, b_3)x^{\frac{1}{\beta_u}-2}(1 + \log(x^{-1}))^2$ for $j = 2, 3$, so that the second inequality in (29) holds. Now, (30) follows by Lemma 3.3 combined with the first inequality in (29). \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1 FOR $\phi \in L^\infty$

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 for $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$. The generalization to L^q observables will be carried out in Appendix B. The proof for $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$ is based on the approach of [10] and relies on results established in the previous sections.

Let $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$. The task is to show that

$$\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma + \delta) - \mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) - D \cdot \delta = o(\|\delta\|)$$

as $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) \rightarrow 0$, where $D = (D_1, D_2)$ and, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$D_i = - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\gamma^k [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'] dm.$$

By Lemma 3.7, D_1 and D_2 are well-defined. Let $\gamma_u = (\alpha_u, \beta_u) = (\alpha, \beta) + (\delta_*, \delta_*)$ and $\alpha_\ell = \alpha - \delta_*$, where $\delta_* > 0$ is sufficiently small such that

$$B := [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}.$$

In the rest of the proof we only consider δ with $\gamma + \delta \in B$.

By Lemma 2.9,

$$\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma + \delta) - \mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) = \int_0^1 \phi \circ T_{\gamma+\delta}^k dm - \int_0^1 \phi \circ T_\gamma^k dm + O(\|\phi\|_\infty k^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha u \beta u}})$$

for all $k \geq 1$, where the constant in the error term depends only on γ and δ_* . Let $\xi > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(\gamma, \delta_*) > 0$, such that for

$$k \geq k_0(\xi, \delta, B) := \lceil \mathbf{c} \|\delta\|^{-(1+\xi)\frac{\alpha u \beta u}{1-\alpha u \beta u}} \rceil$$

we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma + \delta) - \mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) - D \cdot \delta}{\|\delta\|} = P_k + O(\|\phi\|_\infty \|\delta\|^\xi),$$

where

$$P_k := \frac{\int_0^1 \phi \circ T_{\gamma+\delta}^k dm - \int_0^1 \phi \circ T_\gamma^k dm - D \cdot \delta}{\|\delta\|}. \quad (31)$$

It remains to show that $P_k \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

For $\varphi \in C^3(0, 1]$ and $x \in (0, 1]$, Lemma 4.3 combined with Taylor's theorem gives the formula

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta} - \mathcal{L}_\gamma)(\varphi)(x) &= \partial_1 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x) \delta_1 + \partial_2 \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi)(x) \delta_2 \\ &\quad + \delta_1^2 \int_0^1 (1-t) \partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t}(\varphi)(x) dt + \delta_2^2 \int_0^1 (1-t) \partial_2^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t}(\varphi)(x) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by writing

$$\int_0^1 \phi \circ T_{\gamma+\delta}^k dm - \int_0^1 \phi \circ T_\gamma^k dm = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j (\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta} - \mathcal{L}_\gamma) \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{k-j-1}(\mathbf{1}) dm, \quad (32)$$

we obtain the decomposition

$$P_k = Q_k^{(1)} + Q_k^{(2)} + R_k^{(1)} + R_k^{(2)}, \quad (33)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_k^{(i)} &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \delta_i \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) dm - D_i \delta_i}{\|\delta\|}, \\ R_k^{(i)} &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t}(\varphi_j) dm \cdot (1-t) \delta_i^2 dt}{\|\delta\|}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\varphi_j = \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{k-j-1}(\mathbf{1})$. The interchange of the order of integration in $R_k^{(i)}$ can be justified by applying Fubini's theorem together with Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5.

5.1. Limit of $R_k^{(i)}$. We show that if δ_* is sufficiently small, then

$$\sup_{\|\delta\| \leq \delta_*, \|\delta'\| \leq \delta_*} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta'}(\varphi_j)\|_{L^1(m)} < \infty, \quad (34)$$

which implies that for some $C > 0$,

$$|R_k^{(i)}| \leq \frac{C \|\phi\|_\infty \delta_i^2}{\|\delta\|} \leq C \|\phi\|_\infty \|\delta\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Suppose $i = 1$. By Lemma 4.3, $m(\partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta'}(\varphi_j)) = 0$. Moreover, since $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u) \cap \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$, it follows from Lemma 4.4 that

$$\partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta'}(\varphi_j) = (\psi_1^{(\delta')} - m(\psi_1^{(\delta')})) - (\psi_2^{(\delta')} - m(\psi_2^{(\delta')})), \quad (35)$$

where $\psi_i^{(\delta')} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\delta_*, \beta_u)$ and $\|\psi_i^{(\delta')}\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C_i(\gamma, \delta_*, a, b_1, b_2, b_3) < \infty$ for all δ' with $\|\delta'\| \leq \delta_*$. Since $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$ contains constant functions, Lemma 2.9 implies the upper bound

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_1^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta'}(\varphi_j)\|_{L^1(m)} \leq \sum_{t=1,2} \|\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j (\psi_t^{(\delta')} - m(\psi_t^{(\delta')}))\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C j^{-\gamma_*},$$

where $C = C(\gamma, \delta_*, a, b_1, b_2, b_3) > 0$ is a constant and

$$\gamma_* = \frac{1}{\alpha_u} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \delta_* \right).$$

The obtained upper bound is summable over j if $\delta_* < \frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_u$, which holds whenever δ_* is sufficiently small. Consequently, (34) holds for $i = 1$. For $i = 2$ the proof is the same, except that Lemma 4.5 is applied instead of Lemma 4.4 to obtain the decomposition of $\partial_2^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta'}(\varphi_j)$.

5.2. Limit of $Q_k^{(i)}$. To complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, it remains to show that

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_k^{(i)}| &= \left| \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \delta_i \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) dm - D_i \delta_i}{\|\delta\|} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) dm - D_i \right| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, where $k = k_0(\xi, \delta, B) = \lceil \mathbf{c} \|\delta\|^{-(1+\xi) \frac{\alpha_u \beta_u}{1 - \alpha_u \beta_u}} \rceil$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Recalling $\partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) = (X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))'$, by Lemma 3.7 there exists $N_\varepsilon > 1$ such that whenever $\|\delta\|$ is sufficiently small, i.e. k is sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) dm - D_i \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{j=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))'] dm - \sum_{j=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\gamma^j [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'] dm \right| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \int \phi \cdot (\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \mathcal{L}_\gamma^j) [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))'] dm \right| \\ &+ \left| \sum_{j=0}^{N_\varepsilon} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_\gamma^j [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))'] - (X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'] dm \right| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall $\varphi_j = \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{k-j}(\mathbf{1})$. Hence, it suffices to show that whenever k is sufficiently large,

$$\|(\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \mathcal{L}_\gamma^j) [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))']\|_{L^1(m)} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq N_\varepsilon, \quad (36)$$

and

$$\|(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))' - (X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'\|_{L^1(m)} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq N_\varepsilon, \quad (37)$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4N_\varepsilon(1+\|\phi\|_\infty)}$.

5.2.1. $i = 1$. For (36), we use Lemma 3.7 to decompose

$$(X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j))' = \psi_1^{(j)} - \psi_2^{(j)}$$

for some $\psi_r^{(j)} \in \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \mathcal{L}_\gamma^j)[(X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j))']\|_1 \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^j \sum_{r=1,2} \|(\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta} - \mathcal{L}_\gamma)\mathcal{L}_\gamma^\ell \psi_r^{(j)}\|_{L^1(m)} \\ & = \sum_{\ell=0}^j \sum_{r=1,2} \left\| \delta_1 \int_0^1 \partial_1 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^\ell \psi_r^{(j)} dt + \delta_2 \int_0^1 \partial_2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^\ell \psi_r^{(j)} dt \right\|_{L^1(m)} \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^j \sum_{r=1,2} \left[|\delta_1| \int_0^1 \|\partial_1 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^\ell \psi_r^{(j)}\|_{L^1(m)} dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. + |\delta_2| \int_0^1 \|\partial_2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^\ell \psi_r^{(j)}\|_{L^1(m)} dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the L^1 contraction property of \mathcal{L}_γ was used in the first inequality. Now $\mathcal{L}_\gamma^\ell \psi_r^{(j)} \in \mathcal{C}_a^{(2)}(\gamma)$ so that, by Lemmas 3.5 and 4.2

$$\|\partial_i \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^\ell \psi_r^{(j)}\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C(\gamma, \delta_*, a) < \infty.$$

This establishes (36).

To show (37), we first use Lemmas 3.5 and 2.9 to derive the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|X'_{\gamma,1}(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j) - \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma))\|_{L^1(m)} & \leq C(\alpha) \|\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j) - \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma)\|_{L^1(m)} \\ & \leq C(\alpha) \|\varphi_j - h_\gamma\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C(\gamma)(k - N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $k > N_\varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j))' - (X_{\gamma,1}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma))'\|_{L^1(m)} \\ & \leq \|X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma)]'\|_{L^1(m)} + C(\gamma)(k - N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

The remaining term will be controlled using Lemma 2.11 and (21).

Let $\ell > 1$ be an integer whose value will be fixed later. We decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & \|X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma)]'\|_{L^1(m)} \\ & \leq \int_0^{b_\ell} |X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma)]'| dm \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

$$+ \int_{b_\ell}^1 |X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,1}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma)]'| dm. \tag{39}$$

By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.2, for $\varphi \in \{\varphi_j, h_\gamma\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (38) & \leq C(\gamma, a, b_1) \int_0^{b_\ell} x^{1+\alpha}(1 - \log(x)) \cdot x^{-1} x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-1} dx \\ & \leq C(\gamma, a, b_1) \int_0^{b_\ell} (1 - \log(x)) \cdot x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} dx \leq C(\gamma, a, b_1) b_\ell^{\frac{1}{\beta}} (1 - \log(b_\ell)) \leq C(\gamma, a, b_1) \ell^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $|X_{\gamma,1}| \leq C(\alpha) < \infty$, a change of variable, and Lemma 2.9, we see that

$$(39) \leq C(\alpha) \int_{b_\ell}^1 |[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j - h_\gamma)]'| dm \leq C(\gamma) \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} \|\varphi_j - h_\gamma\|_{L^1(m)} + C(\gamma) \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 |\varphi'_j - h'_\gamma| dm \\ \leq C(\gamma, \ell) \left((k - N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} + \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 |\varphi'_j - h'_\gamma| dm \right).$$

It remains to control

$$I := \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 |\varphi'_j - h'_\gamma| dm = \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 |[\mathcal{L}_\gamma^m(u)]'| dm, \quad (40)$$

where $u = \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{k-j-m}(\mathbf{1} - h_\gamma)$ and $m = \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$. We have $|[\mathcal{L}_\gamma^m(u)]'(x)| \leq E_1(x) + E_2(x)$, where

$$E_1(x) = \sum_{y \in T_\gamma^{-m}x} \frac{\frac{1}{(T_\gamma^m)'y} |u'(y)|}{(T_\gamma^m)'y} = \mathcal{L}_\gamma^m \left(\frac{|u'|}{(T_\gamma^m)'} \right) (x) \quad \text{and} \quad E_2(x) = \sum_{y \in T_\gamma^{-m}x} \frac{\frac{(T_\gamma^m)''y}{((T_\gamma^m)'y)^2} |u(y)|}{(T_\gamma^m)'y}.$$

Claim 5.1. There exists $C = C(\gamma, \ell, a, b_1) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 E_1(x) dx \leq C k^{-\frac{1}{(\alpha+1)\beta}}.$$

Proof of Claim 5.1. For brevity, denote $T = T_\gamma$. We have

$$\int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 E_1(x) dx = \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx \\ = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1] \cap [b_{j+1},b_j]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx + \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1] \cap [\frac{1}{2},1]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx.$$

Since u is the difference of two densities in $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$, $|u'|$ is bounded on $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Hence, an application of (15) yields the upper bound

$$\int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1] \cap [\frac{1}{2},1]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx \leq C(a, b_1, \gamma, \ell) m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

To control the remaining integral, we let $1 < p \ll m$ be an integer whose value will be fixed later, and decompose

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1] \cap [b_{j+1},b_j]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx \\ = \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1] \cap [b_{j+1},b_j]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx + \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1] \cap [b_p, \frac{1}{2}]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx. \quad (41)$$

The second integral in (41) is estimated using properties of densities in $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$ together with (15) and Lemma 2.2: for some constant $C = C(\gamma, \ell, a, b_1) > 0$,

$$\int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1},1] \cap [b_p, \frac{1}{2}]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx \leq C m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \int_{b_p}^{\frac{1}{2}} x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-2} dx \\ \leq C m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} b_p^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-1} \leq C m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} p^{1+\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

For the first integral in (41), note that if $x \in T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1}, 1] \cap [b_{j+1}, b_j]$, then starting from x it will take $j + 1$ iterates until the trajectory first enters $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, and so in (21) we have $\ell_1 = j + 1$ if $j < m$. It follows that, for some constant $C = C(\ell, \gamma) > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{(T^m)'x} \leq C \min\{j, m\}^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

holds whenever $j \geq 0$ and $x \in T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1}, 1] \cap [b_{j+1}, b_j]$. Then, using properties of densities in $\mathcal{C}_a(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$ together with Lemma 2.2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1}, 1] \cap [b_{j+1}, b_j]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx \\ &= \sum_{j=p}^{m-1} \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1}, 1] \cap [b_{j+1}, b_j]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx + \int_{T^{-m}[b_{\ell+1}, 1] \cap [0, b_m]} \frac{|u'(x)|}{(T^m)'x} dx \\ &\leq \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} C j^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \int_{[b_{j+1}, b_j]} |u'(x)| dx + C m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \int_{[b_{\ell+m+1}, 1]} |u'(x)| dx \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} j^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} |[b_{j+1}, b_j]| b_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-2} + C_2 m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} b_{\ell+m+1}^{\frac{1}{\beta}-\alpha-1} \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{j=p}^{\infty} j^{-2-\frac{2}{\alpha}} j^{\frac{2}{\alpha}+1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} + C_2 m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}+1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \\ &\leq C_1 p^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} + C_2 m^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_i = C_i(\gamma, \ell, a, b_1) > 0$.

We have established

$$\int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 E_1(x) dx \leq C \left(m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} + m^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} p^{1+\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} + p^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} + m^{-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \right).$$

The desired upper bound follows by choosing $p = O(m^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{(\alpha+1)\beta}})$, and by recalling that $m = \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$. \square

Claim 5.2. There exists $C = C(\gamma, \ell, a) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 E_2(x) dx \leq C(k - 2N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

Proof of Claim 5.2. By (16),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 E_2(x) dx &= \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 \sum_{y \in T_\gamma^{-m}x} \frac{\frac{(T_\gamma^m)''y}{((T_\gamma^m)'y)^2} |u(y)|}{(T_\gamma^m)'y} dx \\ &\leq C \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 \sum_{y \in T_\gamma^{-m}x} \frac{|u(y)|}{(T_\gamma^m)'y} dx = C \int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_\gamma^m(|u|) dm \leq C \|u\|_{L^1(m)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the L^1 contraction property of \mathcal{L}_γ was used in the last inequality. Recalling $u = \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{k-j-m}(\mathbf{1} - h_\gamma)$ and $m = \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$, it follows by an application of Lemma 2.9 that

$$\int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 E_2(x) dx \leq C(k - 2j)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \leq C(k - 2N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}}.$$

□

By Claims 5.1 and 5.2,

$$I \leq C \left(k^{-\frac{1}{(\alpha+1)\beta}} + (k - 2N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \right),$$

and so it follows that

$$(39) \leq C \left(k^{-\frac{1}{(\alpha+1)\beta}} + (k - 2N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \right),$$

where $C = C(\gamma, \ell, a, b_1) > 0$. Combining this with the estimate on (38) obtained earlier, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (X_{\gamma,1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(\varphi_j))' - (X_{\gamma,1} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,1}(h_\gamma))' \|_{L^1(m)} \\ & \leq C_1(\gamma, a) \ell^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha\beta}} + C_2(\gamma, \ell, a, b_1) \left(k^{-\frac{1}{(\alpha+1)\beta}} + (k - 2N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, fix ℓ sufficiently large such that the first term is smaller than $\tilde{\varepsilon}/2$. Then for all sufficiently large k (depending on ℓ) the second term is smaller than $\tilde{\varepsilon}/2$. We have established (37).

5.2.2. $i = 2$. We obtain (36) as in the case $i = 1$, using Lemma 3.7. For (37), we first apply the estimate on $X'_{\gamma,2}$ from Lemma 3.6 together with $|\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x)| \leq C(\gamma)x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1}$ for $\varphi \in \{\varphi_j, h_\gamma\}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \| X'_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j) - \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)] \|_{L^1(m)} \\ & \leq \int_0^{x_*} |X'_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j) - \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)]| dx \\ & \quad + \int_{x_*}^1 |X'_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j) - \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)]| dx \\ & \leq C(\gamma) \log(x_*^{-1}) x_*^{\frac{1}{\beta}} + C(\gamma) \log(x_*^{-1}) \|\varphi_j - h_\gamma\|_{L^1(m)} \end{aligned}$$

for any $x_* \in (0, 1)$. Then, an application of Lemma 2.9 together with a suitable choice of x_* yields

$$\| X'_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j) - \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)] \|_{L^1(m)} \leq C(\gamma)(k - N_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta})},$$

from which we see that

$$(37) \leq \| X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)]' \|_{L^1(m)} + C(\gamma)(k - N_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta})}.$$

For the remaining term, as in the case $i = 1$, we let $\ell > 1$ be a number whose value is fixed later and decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & \| X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)]' \|_{L^1(m)} \\ & \leq \int_0^{b_\ell} |X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)]'| dm \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

$$+ \int_{b_\ell}^1 |X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j)]' - X_{\gamma,2}[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(h_\gamma)]'| dm. \tag{43}$$

By Lemmas 3.6 and 3.2 combined with $|\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x)| \leq Cx^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1}$ for $\varphi \in \{\varphi_j, h_\gamma\}$, we have

$$(42) \leq C \int_0^{b_\ell} x \log(x^{-1}) \cdot x^{-1} x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} dx \leq C \int_0^{b_\ell} \log(x^{-1}) \cdot x^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} dx \\ \leq C \log(b_\ell^{-1}) b_\ell^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \leq C \ell^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\alpha\beta}},$$

for some $C = C(a, b_1, \gamma) > 0$ independent of ℓ .

Using $|X_{\gamma,2}| \leq C(\gamma)$ together with a change of variable, we obtain

$$(43) \leq C(\gamma) \int_{b_\ell}^1 |[\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi_j - h_\gamma)]'| dm \\ \leq C(\gamma) \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(2-\frac{1}{\beta})} \|\varphi_j - h_\gamma\|_{L^1(m)} + C(\gamma) \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(1-\frac{1}{\beta})} \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 |\varphi'_j - h'_\gamma| dm \\ \leq C(\gamma) \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(2-\frac{1}{\beta})} \|\varphi_j - h_\gamma\|_{L^1(m)} + C(\gamma) \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(1-\frac{1}{\beta})} \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 |\varphi'_j - h'_\gamma| dm,$$

and now it follows by applying Lemma 2.9 that

$$(43) \leq C(\gamma) \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(2-\frac{1}{\beta})} (k - N_\varepsilon)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}} + C(\gamma) \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(1-\frac{1}{\beta})} \int_{b_{\ell+1}}^1 |\varphi'_j - h'_\gamma| dm.$$

The remaining integral is exactly the same as (40), and thus to complete the proof of (37) we may repeat the argument for $i = 1$.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.2

Since $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi) = \sum_{i=1,2} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi)$, it suffices to verify the statement concerning $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}$.

Lemma A.1. *There exist (absolute) constants $\kappa_i > 1$ such that, if $b_1 \geq 1$, $b_2 \geq \kappa_1 b_1$, and $b_3 \geq \kappa_2 b_2$, then for all $\beta \geq 1$, $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}) \subset \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$. We identify conditions on b_1, b_2 and b_3 that guarantee $\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi) \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$. Let $x \in (0, 1)$. Throughout this proof we denote $y = g_{\gamma,2}(x) \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and $T = T_\gamma$.

Step 1: $|\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)'(x)| \leq \frac{b_1}{x} \varphi(x)$. We have

$$|\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)'(x)| = \left| -\frac{T''_\gamma(y)}{(T'_\gamma(y))^3} \varphi(y) + \frac{1}{(T'_\gamma(y))^2} \varphi'(y) \right| \\ \leq \frac{\varphi(y)}{T'_\gamma(y)} \left\{ \frac{T''_\gamma(y)}{(T'_\gamma(y))^2} + \frac{b_1}{y T'_\gamma(y)} \right\} \\ = \frac{b_1}{x} \mathcal{N}_{\beta,2}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \left\{ \frac{T_\gamma(y)}{b_1} \left(\frac{T''_\gamma(y)}{(T'_\gamma(y))^2} + \frac{b_1}{y T'_\gamma(y)} \right) \right\},$$

where $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1, b_2, b_3}^{(3)}$ was used in the second inequality. The term inside curly brackets is equal to

$$\frac{2^\beta (y - \frac{1}{2})^\beta}{b_1} \left[\frac{\beta - 1}{\beta 2^\beta (y - \frac{1}{2})^\beta} + \frac{b_1}{y \beta 2^\beta (y - \frac{1}{2})^{\beta-1}} \right] \\ = \frac{1}{b_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} \right) + \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{2y\beta} \leq 1,$$

whenever $b_1 \geq 1$.

Step 2: $|\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)''(x)| \leq \frac{b_2}{x^2}\varphi(x)$. Using $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1,b_2,b_3}^{(3)}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)''(x)| \\ & \leq \frac{b_2}{x^2}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x) \left\{ \frac{(T(y))^2}{y^2} \frac{1}{(T'(y))^2} + 3 \frac{(T(y))^2 b_1}{b_2} \frac{T''(y)}{y (T'(y))^3} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{T(y)^2 |T'''(y)|}{b_2 (T'(y))^3} + 3 \frac{T(y)^2 T''(y)^2}{b_2 (T'(y))^4} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The term inside curly brackets is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2y}\right)^2 + 3 \frac{b_1 y - \frac{1}{2}\beta - 1}{b_2 y} \frac{\beta - 1}{\beta^2} + \frac{|\beta - 2|(\beta - 1)}{\beta^2 b_2} + \frac{3}{b_2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta}\right)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{3b_1}{2b_2} + \frac{1}{b_2} + \frac{3}{b_2} \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

if $b_2 \geq 12b_1 \geq 1$.

Step 3: $|\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)'''(x)| \leq \frac{b_3}{x^3}\varphi(x)$. Again by using $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{b_1,b_2,b_3}^{(3)}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)'''(x)| & \leq \varphi(y) \left[10 \frac{T''(y)|T'''(y)|}{(T'(y))^6} + 5 \frac{(T''(y))^3}{(T'(y))^7} + \frac{|T^{(4)}(y)|}{(T'(y))^5} \right] \\ & \quad + |\varphi'(y)| \left[15 \frac{(T''(y))^2}{(T'(y))^6} + 4 \frac{|T'''(y)|}{(T'(y))^5} \right] \\ & \quad + 6|\varphi''(y)| \frac{T''(y)}{(T'(y))^5} + |\varphi'''(y)| \frac{1}{(T'(y))^4} \\ & \leq \frac{b_3}{x^3}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \frac{10(T(y))^3}{b_3} \left[\frac{T''(y)|T'''(y)|}{(T'(y))^5} + \frac{(T''(y))^3}{(T'(y))^6} + \frac{|T^{(4)}(y)|}{(T'(y))^4} \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{b_3}{x^3}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \frac{15b_1(T(y))^3}{b_3 y} \left[\frac{(T''(y))^2}{(T'(y))^5} + \frac{|T'''(y)|}{(T'(y))^4} \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{b_3}{x^3}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \frac{6b_2(T(y))^3}{b_3 y^2} \frac{T''(y)}{(T'(y))^4} + \frac{b_3}{x^3}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \frac{(T(y))^3}{y^3} \frac{1}{(T'(y))^3} \\ & \leq \frac{b_3}{x^3}\mathcal{N}_{\gamma,2}(\varphi)(x) \left\{ \frac{(T(y))^3}{y^3 (T'(y))^3} + \frac{15b_2}{b_3} \left[\frac{(T(y))^3}{y^2} \frac{T''(y)}{(T'(y))^4} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \frac{(T(y))^3}{y} \left(\frac{(T''(y))^2}{(T'(y))^5} + \frac{|T'''(y)|}{(T'(y))^4} \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + (T(y))^3 \left(\frac{T''(y)|T'''(y)|}{(T'(y))^5} + \frac{(T''(y))^3}{(T'(y))^6} + \frac{|T^{(4)}(y)|}{(T'(y))^4} \right) \right] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\xi = 1 - \frac{1}{2y} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The term inside curly brackets is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\beta} \xi^3 + \frac{15b_2}{b_3} \left[\frac{\beta - 1}{\beta^3} \xi^2 + \frac{(\beta - 1)^2}{\beta^3} \xi + \frac{|\beta - 2|(\beta - 1)}{\beta^3} \xi + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{|\beta - 1|(\beta - 1)^2}{\beta^4} + \frac{(\beta - 1)^3}{\beta^3} + \frac{|\beta - 3||\beta - 2|(\beta - 1)}{\beta^3} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{8} + \frac{90b_2}{b_3} \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $b_3 \geq 103b_2$.

□

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1 FOR $\phi \in L^q$

For $\phi \in L^q$ with q sufficiently large, the linear response formula of Theorem 1.1 can be shown by modifying the proof for $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$ using a trick which involves a change of measure and interpolation.

B.1. Loss of memory in L^p . In this section we assume that $\gamma = (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{D}$, and that $B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] \subset \mathfrak{D}$, where $\gamma_u = (\alpha_u, \beta_u) = \gamma + (\delta_*, \delta_*)$ and $\alpha_\ell = \alpha - \delta_*$ for a small $\delta_* > 0$.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma$ denote the transfer operator associated to T_γ and \tilde{m} , where \tilde{m} denotes the measure defined by $\tilde{m}(A) = \int_A g dm$ with $g(x) = x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1}$. For $\varphi \in L^1(\tilde{m})$ we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^n(\varphi) = g^{-1} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(g\varphi) \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

The following extension of Lemma 2.9 is derived using similar techniques to those found in [11, 31, 42].

Lemma B.1.

(i) If $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded, then for $a \geq a_0(\gamma)$,

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^n \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{m})} \leq a \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{m})} \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

(ii) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p > 1$. Then, the following holds for any sufficiently small $\delta_* = \delta_*(\gamma, \varepsilon, p) > 0$, and any $\gamma_0 = (\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in B$, $\gamma_1 = (\alpha_1, \beta_1) \in B$: there exists a constant C determined by $a, \gamma_0, p, \varepsilon, \gamma, \delta_*$ such that for all $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_0)$ with $m(\phi) = m(\psi)$ and $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$,

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq C(m(\psi) + m(\phi)) n^{-\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} \gamma_*}, \quad (44)$$

where

$$\gamma_* = \frac{1}{\alpha_u} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_0 \right).$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $C' > 0$ determined by $a, p, \varepsilon, \gamma, \delta_*$ such that

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq C'(m(\psi) + m(\phi)) n^{\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} (1 - \frac{1}{\alpha_u \beta_u})}. \quad (45)$$

Proof. (i) If $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and $x \in (0, 1]$,

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^n \varphi(x)| = |g^{-1} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(g\varphi)(x)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{m})} g^{-1} \mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(g)(x).$$

Note that $g \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$ for $a \geq a_0(\gamma_u)$. It follows by Lemma 2.1 that $\mathcal{L}_\gamma^n(g) \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma)$. Thus,

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^n \varphi(x)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{m})} g^{-1}(x) \cdot a x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1} \leq a \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{m})}.$$

(ii) Since $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_0) \subset \mathcal{C}_a(\gamma_u)$,

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)](x)| \leq g^{-1}(x) (|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n(\phi)| + |\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n(\psi)|)(x) \leq 2am(\phi) x^{-\delta_* (1 + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta + \delta_*)}}).$$

Hence, for any $q \geq 1$,

$$\int_0^1 |\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]|^q d\tilde{m} \leq (2am(\phi))^q \int_0^1 x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1 - q\delta_* (1 + \frac{1}{\beta(\beta + \delta_*)})} dx < \infty,$$

whenever δ_* is sufficiently small. Next, interpolation is used to obtain

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^1(\tilde{m})}^{\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})}^{1 - \frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}},$$

where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} + \frac{1-1/(p+\varepsilon)}{q}$. For sufficiently small δ_* depending on γ, ε, p , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} &\leq (am(\phi))^{1-\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}} C \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^1(\tilde{m})}^{\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq (am(\phi))^{1-\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}} C \|\mathcal{L}_{\gamma_1}^n(\phi - \psi)\|_{L^1(m)}^{\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

for some constant $C = C(p, \varepsilon, \gamma, \delta_*) > 0$. Hence, by (11),

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma_1}^n [g^{-1}(\phi - \psi)]\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq C' m(\phi) n^{-\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\alpha_u} (\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \alpha_0)},$$

for some constant $C = C(a, \gamma_0, p, \varepsilon, \gamma, \delta_*) > 0$. This proves (44). Similarly we obtain (45) by applying (12) instead of (11). \square

B.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1 for L^q -observables. Let $\gamma \in \mathfrak{D}$, and let $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that

$$\int_0^1 |\phi(x)|^q x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1} dx < \infty$$

holds for some $q > q_0 := \frac{1}{1-\alpha\beta}$. This means that $\phi \in L^q(\tilde{m})$ if we set $g(x) = x^{\frac{1}{\beta} - \alpha - 1}$ in the definition of \tilde{m} . In this situation, Theorem 1.1 can be proved by an argument similar to the one for $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$, but applying Lemma B.1 together with Hölder's inequality instead of Lemma 2.9. We provide details below about what has to be changed from the proof for $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$.

Let $\gamma_u = (\alpha_u, \beta_u) = \gamma + (\delta_*, \delta_*) \in \mathfrak{D}$ for a small but fixed $\delta_* > 0$, and set $B = [\alpha_\ell, \alpha_u] \times [1, \beta_u] = [\alpha - \delta_*, \alpha + \delta_*] \times [1, \beta + \delta_*]$. Let p denote the Hölder conjugate of q . Note that

$$q > q_0 \iff p < \frac{1}{\alpha\beta} \iff 1 < \frac{1}{p\alpha\beta}.$$

First, we verify that D_i is still well-defined for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By a change of measure followed by an application of Hölder's inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 |\phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma}^k [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))']| dm &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 |\phi \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma}^k [g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))']| d\tilde{m} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|\phi\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma}^k [g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))']\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.7, $(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'$ can be written as a difference of two functions in $\mathcal{C}_a(\delta_*, \beta)$. Making δ_* smaller if necessary, Lemma B.1 allows us to derive the estimate

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 |\phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma}^k [(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))']| dm \leq C \|\phi\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k^{-\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} \gamma_*},$$

where $\gamma_* = \frac{1}{\alpha_u} (\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \delta_*)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen to be arbitrarily small. Since $1 < \frac{1}{p\alpha\beta}$, we can guarantee $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k^{-\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} \gamma_*} < \infty$ by choosing ε and δ_* sufficiently small, and so it follows that D_i is absolutely summable for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Suppose that $\|\delta\| \leq \delta_*$. Again, by a change of measure followed by applications of Hölder's inequality and Lemma B.1, we see that for arbitrarily small ε ,

$$\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma + \delta) - \mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) = \int_0^1 \phi \circ T_{\gamma+\delta}^k dm - \int_0^1 \phi \circ T_\gamma^k dm + O(\|\phi\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})} k^{\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} (1 - \frac{1}{\alpha_u \beta_u})})$$

for all $k \geq 1$, where the constant in the error term is determined by $p, \varepsilon, \gamma, \delta_*$. Let $\xi > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(p, \varepsilon, \gamma, \delta_*) > 0$, such that for

$$k \geq k_0(\xi, \delta, B, p) := \lceil \mathbf{c} \|\delta\|^{-(1+\xi)(p+\varepsilon)\frac{\alpha_u \beta_u}{1-\alpha_u \beta_u}} \rceil$$

we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma + \delta) - \mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) - D \cdot \delta}{\|\delta\|} = P_k + O(\|\phi\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})} \|\delta\|^\xi),$$

where P_k is as in (31). Now, to obtain $\mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma + \delta) - \mathcal{R}_\phi(\gamma) - D \cdot \delta = o(\|\delta\|)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we only need to show that the terms $Q_k^{(i)}$ and $R_k^{(i)}$ ($i = 1, 2$) in the decomposition (33) vanish as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

B.2.1. *Limit of $R_k^{(i)}$* . Recall that

$$R_k^{(i)} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t}(\varphi_j) dm \cdot (1-t) \delta_i^2 dt}{\|\delta\|}.$$

By (35), if δ_* is sufficiently small, there exists a decomposition

$$\partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}(\varphi_j) = (\psi_1^{(\delta)} - m(\psi_1^{(\delta)}) - (\psi_2^{(\delta)} - m(\psi_2^{(\delta)})),$$

where $\psi_i^{(\delta)} \in \mathcal{C}_a(\delta_*, \beta_u)$ and $\|\psi_i^{(\delta)}\|_{L^1(m)} \leq C_i(a, b_1, b_2, b_3, \gamma, \delta_*) < \infty$ holds for all δ with $\|\delta\| \leq \delta_*$. Then, a change of measure, combined with applications of Hölder's inequality and Lemma B.1, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |\phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t}(\varphi_j)| dm &= \int_0^1 |\phi \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma+\delta}^j g^{-1} \partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t}(\varphi_j)| d\tilde{m} \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma+\delta}^j g^{-1} \partial_i^2 \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta t}(\varphi_j)\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq C \|\phi\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})} j^{-\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} \gamma_*}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(a, b_1, b_2, b_3, \gamma, p, \varepsilon, \delta_*) > 0$ is a constant and

$$\gamma_* = \frac{1}{\alpha_u} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \delta_* \right).$$

Since $\frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{\alpha\beta} > 1$, for sufficiently small ε and δ_* we have $\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\alpha_u} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_u} - \delta_* \right) > 1$ so that the obtained upper bound is summable with respect to j . Hence, for $\phi \in L^q(\tilde{m})$ we still have $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} R_k^{(i)} = 0$.

B.2.2. *Limit of $Q_k^{(i)}$* . We want to show that

$$|Q_k^{(i)}| \leq \left| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) dm - D_i \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, where $\varphi_j = \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{k-j}(\mathbf{1})$.

As in the case of D_i above, we see that $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) dm$ is absolutely summable. It follows that, for $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$, there exists $N = N(\tilde{\varepsilon}) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j \partial_i \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varphi_j) dm - D_i \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{j=0}^N \int \phi \cdot (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j) [g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))]' d\tilde{m} \right| \\ & + \left| \sum_{j=0}^N \int_0^1 \phi \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j [g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))]' - g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))]' d\tilde{m} \right| + \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $\|\delta\|$ is sufficiently small, i.e. k is sufficiently large. Hence, for $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} Q_k^{(i)} = 0$ it suffices to establish the following two properties (for a redefined $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ depending on $\|\phi\|_{L^q(\tilde{m})}$ and N):

$$\|(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j) [g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))]'\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq N, \quad (47)$$

and

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j [g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))]' - g^{-1}(X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))]'\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq N. \quad (48)$$

For convenience, we denote $\psi = (X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(\varphi_j))'$ and $\hat{\psi} = (X_{\gamma,i} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma,i}(h_\gamma))'$. For (47), since ψ can be written as a difference of two functions in $C_a(\gamma)$, we can argue as in (46) to obtain

$$\|(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j) g^{-1} \psi\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} \leq C \|(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j) g^{-1} \psi\|_{L^1(\tilde{m})}^{\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}} = C \|(\mathcal{L}_{\gamma+\delta}^j - \mathcal{L}_\gamma^j) \psi\|_{L^1(m)}^{\frac{1}{p+\varepsilon}}$$

for some constant C and $\varepsilon > 0$ whenever $\|\delta\| \leq \delta_*$ is sufficiently small. Hence, (47) follows by (36).

For (48), since $g^{-1}\psi$ is and $g^{-1}\hat{\psi}$ are bounded by Lemma 3.7, we can use item (i) of Lemma B.1 to derive the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j (g^{-1}\psi - g^{-1}\hat{\psi})\|_{L^p(\tilde{m})} & \leq \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j (g^{-1}\psi - g^{-1}\hat{\psi})\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{m})}^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j (g^{-1}\psi - g^{-1}\hat{\psi})\|_{L^1(\tilde{m})}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\gamma^j (g^{-1}\psi - g^{-1}\hat{\psi})\|_{L^1(\tilde{m})}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & = C \|\mathcal{L}_\gamma^j (\psi - \hat{\psi})\|_{L^1(m)}^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \|\psi - \hat{\psi}\|_{L^1(m)}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the L^1 contraction property of \mathcal{L}_γ was used, and $C > 0$ is a constant determined by a, b_1, γ, p . Now, (48) follows by (37).

REFERENCES

- [1] Romain Aimino, Huyi Hu, Matthew Nicol, Andrei Török, and Sandro Vaienti. Polynomial loss of memory for maps of the interval with a neutral fixed point. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(3):793–806, 2015. doi:10.3934/dcds.2015.35.793.
- [2] Magnus Aspenberg, Viviane Baladi, Juho Leppänen, and Tomas Persson. On the fractional susceptibility function of piecewise expanding maps. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(2):679–706, 2022. doi:10.3934/dcds.2021133.
- [3] Wael Bahsoun, Christopher Bose, and Yuejiao Duan. Decay of correlation for random intermittent maps. *Nonlinearity*, 27(7):1543–1554, 2014. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/27/7/1543.
- [4] Wael Bahsoun and Alexey Korepanov. Statistical aspects of mean field coupled intermittent maps. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, pages 1–13, 2023. doi:10.1017/etds.2023.53.
- [5] Wael Bahsoun, Marks Ruziboev, and Benoît Saussol. Linear response for random dynamical systems. *Adv. Math.*, 364:107011, 44, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2020.107011.
- [6] Wael Bahsoun and Benoît Saussol. Linear response in the intermittent family: differentiation in a weighted C^0 -norm. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 36(12):6657–6668, 2016. doi:10.3934/dcds.2016089.
- [7] Viviane Baladi. On the susceptibility function of piecewise expanding interval maps. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 275(3):839–859, 2007. doi:10.1007/s00220-007-0320-5.
- [8] Viviane Baladi. Linear response, or else. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Seoul 2014. Vol. III*, pages 525–545. Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014.
- [9] Viviane Baladi and Daniel Smania. Fractional susceptibility functions for the quadratic family: Misiurewicz-Thurston parameters. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 385(3):1957–2007, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00220-021-04015-z.
- [10] Viviane Baladi and Mike Todd. Linear response for intermittent maps. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 347(3):857–874, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00220-016-2577-z.
- [11] Leonid A. Bunimovich and Yaofeng Su. Maximal large deviations and slow recurrences in weakly chaotic systems. *Adv. Math.*, 432:Paper No. 109267, 58, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2023.109267.
- [12] Douglas Coates, Stefano Luzzatto, and Mubarak Muhammad. Doubly intermittent full branch maps with critical points and singularities. 2022. Preprint. arXiv:2209.12725.
- [13] Harry Crimmins and Yushi Nakano. A spectral approach to quenched linear and higher-order response for partially hyperbolic dynamics. 2021. Preprint. arXiv:2105.11188.
- [14] Hongfei Cui. Invariant densities for intermittent maps with critical points. *J. Difference Equ. Appl.*, 27(3):404–421, 2021. doi:10.1080/10236198.2021.1900142.
- [15] Wellington De Melo and Sebastian Van Strien. *One-dimensional dynamics*, volume 25. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [16] Dmitry Dolgopyat. On differentiability of SRB states for partially hyperbolic systems. *Invent. Math.*, 155(2):389–449, 2004. doi:10.1007/s00222-003-0324-5.
- [17] Davor Dragičević, Paolo Giulietti, and Julien Sedro. Quenched linear response for smooth expanding on average cocycles. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 399(1):423–452, 2023. doi:10.1007/s00220-022-04560-1.
- [18] Jorge Milhazes Freitas and Mike Todd. The statistical stability of equilibrium states for interval maps. *Nonlinearity*, 22(2):259–281, 2009. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/22/2/002.
- [19] S. Galatolo and P. Giulietti. A linear response for dynamical systems with additive noise. *Nonlinearity*, 32(6):2269–2301, 2019. doi:10.1088/1361-6544/ab0c2e.
- [20] Sébastien Gouëzel. Sharp polynomial estimates for the decay of correlations. *Israel J. Math.*, 139:29–65, 2004. doi:10.1007/BF02787541.
- [21] Tim Herfurth and Tatjana Tchumatchenko. How linear response shaped models of neural circuits and the quest for alternatives. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 46:234–240, 2017.
- [22] Tomoki Inoue. Asymptotic stability of densities for piecewise convex maps. *Ann. Polon. Math.*, 57(1):83–90, 1992. doi:10.4064/ap-57-1-83-90.
- [23] Tomoki Inoue. Weakly attracting repellers for piecewise convex maps. *Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math.*, 9(3):413–430, 1992. doi:10.1007/BF03167275.
- [24] Tomoki Inoue and Hisayoshi Toyokawa. Invariant measures for random piecewise convex maps. 2023. Preprint. arXiv:2303.10873.
- [25] Péter Koltai, Han Cheng Lie, and Martin Plonka. Fréchet differentiable drift dependence of Perron-Frobenius and Koopman operators for non-deterministic dynamics. *Nonlinearity*, 32(11):4232–4257, 2019. doi:10.1088/1361-6544/ab1f2a.

- [26] A. Korepanov, Z. Kosloff, and I. Melbourne. Explicit coupling argument for non-uniformly hyperbolic transformations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 149(1):101–130, 2019. [doi:10.1017/S0308210518000161](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0308210518000161).
- [27] Alexey Korepanov. Linear response for intermittent maps with summable and nonsummable decay of correlations. *Nonlinearity*, 29(6):1735–1754, 2016. [doi:10.1088/0951-7715/29/6/1735](https://doi.org/10.1088/0951-7715/29/6/1735).
- [28] Alexey Korepanov and Juho Leppänen. Loss of memory and moment bounds for non-stationary intermittent dynamical systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 385(2):905–935, 2021. [doi:10.1007/s00220-021-04071-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-021-04071-5).
- [29] Carlangelo Liverani, Benoît Saussol, and Sandro Vaienti. A probabilistic approach to intermittency. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(3):671–685, 1999. [doi:10.1017/S0143385799133856](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856).
- [30] Valerio Lucarini and Stefania Sarno. A statistical mechanical approach for the computation of the climatic response to general forcings. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, 18(1):7–28, 2011.
- [31] Matthew Nicol, Felipe Perez Pereira, and Andrew Török. Large deviations and central limit theorems for sequential and random systems of intermittent maps. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 41(9):2805–2832, 2021. [doi:10.1017/etds.2020.90](https://doi.org/10.1017/etds.2020.90).
- [32] Isaia Nisoli and Toby Taylor-Crush. Rigorous computation of linear response for intermittent maps. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 190(12):Paper No. 192, 49, 2023. [doi:10.1007/s10955-023-03174-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10955-023-03174-8).
- [33] Yves Pomeau and Paul Manneville. Intermittent transition to turbulence in dissipative dynamical systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 74(2):189–197, 1980.
- [34] Francesco Ragone, Valerio Lucarini, and Frank Lunkeit. A new framework for climate sensitivity and prediction: a modelling perspective. *Climate dynamics*, 46(5):1459–1471, 2016.
- [35] David Ruelle. Differentiation of SRB states. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 187(1):227–241, 1997. [doi:10.1007/s002200050134](https://doi.org/10.1007/s002200050134).
- [36] David Ruelle. A review of linear response theory for general differentiable dynamical systems. *Nonlinearity*, 22(4):855–870, 2009. [doi:10.1088/0951-7715/22/4/009](https://doi.org/10.1088/0951-7715/22/4/009).
- [37] David Ruelle. Structure and f -dependence of the A.C.I.M. for a unimodal map f is Misiurewicz type. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 287(3):1039–1070, 2009. [doi:10.1007/s00220-008-0637-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-008-0637-8).
- [38] Omri Sarig. Subexponential decay of correlations. *Invent. Math.*, 150(3):629–653, 2002. [doi:10.1007/s00222-002-0248-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-002-0248-5).
- [39] Julien Sedro. Pre-threshold fractional susceptibility functions at Misiurewicz parameters. *Nonlinearity*, 34(10):7174–7184, 2021. [doi:10.1088/1361-6544/ac20a3](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6544/ac20a3).
- [40] Fanni M. Sélley. Differentiability of the diffusion coefficient for a family of intermittent maps. *J. Dyn. Control Syst.*, 29(3):787–804, 2023. [doi:10.1007/s10883-022-09617-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10883-022-09617-x).
- [41] Fanni M. Sélley and Matteo Tanzi. Linear response for a family of self-consistent transfer operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 382(3):1601–1624, 2021. [doi:10.1007/s00220-021-03983-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-021-03983-6).
- [42] Yaofeng Su. Vector-valued almost sure invariance principles for (non)stationary and random dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 375(7):4809–4848, 2022. [doi:10.1090/tran/8609](https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/8609).
- [43] Lai-Sang Young. Recurrence times and rates of mixing. *Israel J. Math.*, 110:153–188, 1999. [doi:10.1007/BF02808180](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02808180).
- [44] Zhiyuan Zhang. On the smooth dependence of SRB measures for partially hyperbolic systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 358(1):45–79, 2018. [doi:10.1007/s00220-018-3088-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-018-3088-x).