

Lyapunov Exponents for Open Billiards in the Exterior of Balls

Amal Al Dowais¹

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Western Australia, Crawley 6009 WA, Australia
E-mail: amal.aldowais@research.uwa.edu.au

Luchezar Stoyanov

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Western Australia, Crawley 6009 WA, Australia
E-mail: luchezar.stoyanov@uwa.edu.au

Abstract. In this paper we consider the billiard flow in the exterior of several (at least three) balls in \mathbb{R}^3 with centres lying on a plane. We assume that the balls satisfy the no eclipse condition (H) and their radii are small compared to the distances between their centres. We prove that with respect to any Gibbs measure on the non-wandering set of the billiard flow the two positive Lyapunov exponents are different: $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > 0$.

MSC: Primary: 37D20, 37D25; Secondary: 37D40

Keywords: Lyapunov exponents, open billiard flow, Oseledets subspaces

1 Introduction

Let K be a subset of \mathbb{R}^3 of the form $K = K_1 \cup \dots \cup K_{k_0}$, where $k_0 \geq 3$ and all K_i are balls with small radii $r_i > 0$ (not necessarily the same) and centres O_i lying on a given plane Γ in \mathbb{R}^3 . Set $\Omega = \overline{\mathbb{R}^3} \setminus K$. We assume that K satisfies the following *no-eclipse condition*:

$$(H) \quad \begin{cases} \text{for every pair } K_i, K_j \text{ of different connected components of } K \\ \text{the convex hull of } K_i \cup K_j \text{ has no common points with any other} \\ \text{connected component of } K. \end{cases}$$

With this condition, the *billiard flow* ϕ_t defined on the *sphere bundle*

$$S(\Omega) = \{(q, v) : q \in \Omega, v \in \mathbf{S}^2\}$$

in the standard way is called an *open billiard flow*. It has singularities, however its restriction to the *non-wandering set* Λ has only simple discontinuities at reflection points.

Assumptions: We will assume that for some constant $d_0 > 0$ we have $d_0 < |O_i O_j| \leq 1$ for all $i \neq j$ and for each i the radius r_i of ball K_i is so that $r_i \leq r_0$ for some constant $r_0 < d_0/3$. The condition (H) implies that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ so that if q_1, q_2, q_3 are the successive reflection points of a billiard trajectory in Ω and $\nu(q_2)$ is the outward unit normal to ∂K at q_2 , then for the angle φ between $\nu(q_2)$ and $\frac{q_3 - q_2}{\|q_3 - q_2\|}$ we have $\cos \varphi \geq c_1$. Moreover, the configuration of our balls implies that there exists a global constant $c_2 < 1$ such that if the reflection points q_1 and q_3 belong to different components of K , then $\cos \varphi \leq c_2$. Thus, in the latter case always $0 < c_1 \leq \cos \varphi \leq c_2 < 1$. In what follows we will assume that the constants d_0, r_0 and c_2 satisfy $c_2 d_0 > 2r_0$.

Remark. Clearly if O_1, \dots, O_{k_0} are arbitrary points in a plane Γ so that no three of them lie on a line, then choosing sufficiently small numbers $r_i > 0$, the balls K_i with centres O_i and radii r_i ($i = 1, \dots, k_0$) satisfy the condition (H) and the above assumptions.

¹Department of Mathematics, College of Science and Arts, Najran University, Najran, Saudi Arabia; E-mail: amalduas@nu.edu.sa

Let μ be an arbitrary Gibbs measure (therefore an ergodic measure) for the shift map σ on the related symbol space Σ_A with k_0 symbols $\{1, 2, \dots, k_0\}$ (see Sect. 2). Using the natural isomorphism between the non-wondering set M_0 of the billiard ball map B and Σ_A which conjugates B with σ (see Sect. 2), we can regard μ as a measure on M_0 . Let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 > 0$ be the positive Lyapunov exponents for the billiard ball map B with respect to the measure μ .

In this note we prove the following

Theorem 1.1. *Under the above assumptions, the Lyapunov exponents λ_1 and λ_2 are distinct, i.e. $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$.*

This result may be surprising to some extent. Chernov conjectured in [Ch3] (see p.17 there; see also [Ch2]) that all positive Lyapunov exponents for a periodic Lorentz gas with spherical scatterers should be the same. We are not aware of any positive or negative results concerning this conjecture. However, as Chernov mentioned in [Ch3], it had been shown both theoretically and numerically that for 3D random Lorentz gases with a random configuration of scatterers the two positive Lyapunov exponents are different (see [LBS], [DP] and [BL]). There are probably some more recent results in this direction.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Billiard ball map vs billiard flow

For $x \in \Lambda$ and a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ the (strong) *stable* and *unstable manifolds* of size ϵ for the billiard flow are defined by

$$\widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(x) = \{y \in M : d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } t \geq 0, d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \rightarrow_{t \rightarrow \infty} 0\},$$

$$\widetilde{W}_\epsilon^u(x) = \{y \in M : d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } t \leq 0, d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \rightarrow_{t \rightarrow -\infty} 0\}.$$

Set $\widetilde{E}^u(x) = T_x \widetilde{W}_\epsilon^u(x)$ and $\widetilde{E}^s(x) = T_x \widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(x)$. For any $x = (q, v) \in M_0$ the stable/unstable manifolds for the billiard ball map B are defined similarly:

$$W_\epsilon^s(x) = \{y \in M_0 : d(B^n(x), B^n(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, d(B^n(x), B^n(y)) \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0\},$$

$$W_\epsilon^u(x) = \{y \in M_0 : d(B^{-n}(x), B^{-n}(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, d(B^{-n}(x), B^{-n}(y)) \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0\},$$

where \mathbb{N} is the set of positive integers.

Given $x = (q, v) \in M_0$ and a small $t_0 > 0$, set $y = (q + t_0 v, v)$. For a small $\epsilon > 0$ and a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ (depending on ϵ) the map

$$\Psi : W_\delta^s(x) \longrightarrow \widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y) \tag{2.1}$$

such that $\Psi(z, w) = (z + tw, w)$ for all $(z, w) \in W^u(x)$, where $t = t(z, w) > 0$, is a local diffeomorphism. In the same way there is a local diffeomorphism from $W_\delta^s(x)$ to $\widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y)$. Moreover $D\Psi(x) : T_x M_0 \longrightarrow T_y \Lambda$ is an isomorphism so that $D\Psi(x)(E^u(x)) = \widetilde{E}^u(y)$ and $D\Psi(x)(E^s(x)) = \widetilde{E}^s(y)$.

It is known (see [Si1], [Si2]) that $\widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y)$ has the form $\widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y) = \widetilde{Y}$, where

$$\widetilde{Y} = \{(p, \nu_Y(p)) : p \in Y\}$$

for some smooth 2-dimensional surface Y in \mathbb{R}^3 containing the point y such that Y is strictly concave with respect to the unit normal field ν_Y , i.e. the curvature of Y is strictly negative. In a similar way one can describe $\widetilde{W}_\epsilon^u(y)$ using a strictly convex local surface.

Returning to the map (2.1), let $x_1 = (q_1, v_1) = B(x)$, where $q_1 = q + dv$ for some $d > 0$. Define $y_1 = (q_1 + t_1 v_1, v_1)$ for some small $t_1 > 0$ (e.g. $t_1 = t_0$). Then there is a local diffeomorphism (assuming again that $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ are sufficiently small) $\Psi_1 : W_\delta^s(x_1) \rightarrow \widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y_1)$ defined as above. The stable manifold $\widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y_1) = \widetilde{Y}_1$ has the form $\widetilde{Y}_1 = \{(p_1, \nu_Y(p_1)) : p_1 \in Y_1\}$ for some smooth 2-dimensional surface Y_1 in \mathbb{R}^3 containing the point y_1 such that Y_1 is strictly concave with respect to the unit normal field ν_{Y_1} . Setting $t = d + t_1$, the following two diagrams are commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_\delta^s(x) & \xrightarrow{B} & W_\delta^s(x_1) \\ \downarrow \Psi & & \downarrow \Psi_1 \\ \widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y) = \widetilde{Y} & \xrightarrow{\phi_t} & \widetilde{W}_\epsilon^s(y_1) = \widetilde{Y}_1 \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{ccc} E^s(x) & \xrightarrow{DB(x)} & E^s(x_1) \\ \downarrow D\Psi & & \downarrow D\Psi_1 \\ E^s(y) & \xrightarrow{D\phi_t(y)} & E^s(y_1) \end{array}$$

with appropriate choices of the small constants $\delta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

For an open billiard, the billiard ball map $B : M_0 \rightarrow M_0$ is naturally isomorphic to a transitive subshift of finite type. Here we briefly describe the natural conjugacy.

Let $k_0 \geq 3$ be as in Sect.1 and let $A = (A(i, j))_{i, j=1}^{k_0}$ be the $k_0 \times k_0$ matrix such that $A(i, j) = 1$ if $i \neq j$ and $A(i, i) = 0$ for all i, j . Consider the symbol space

$$\Sigma_A = \{(i_j)_{j=-\infty}^\infty : 1 \leq i_j \leq k_0, A(i_j, i_{j+1}) = 1 \text{ for all } j\},$$

with the product topology and the *shift map* $\sigma : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ given by $\sigma((i_j)) = ((i'_j))$, where $i'_j = i_{j+1}$ for all j . Given $0 < \theta < 1$, consider the *metric* d_θ on Σ_A defined by $d_\theta(z, w) = 0$ if $z = w$ and $d_\theta(z, w) = \theta^m$ if $z = (z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, w = (w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, z_i = w_i$ for $|i| < m$ and m is maximal with this property (see e.g. [B] or [PP] for general information on symbolic dynamics). Now define $R : M_0 \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ by $R(x) = \{i_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ so that $\text{pr}_1(B^j(x)) \in K_{i_j}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is well-known (see e.g. [PS]) that this is a well-defined bijection which defines a conjugacy between $B : M_0 \rightarrow M_0$ and $\sigma : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$, namely $R \circ B = \sigma \circ R$. Moreover, with an appropriate choice of $\theta \in (0, 1)$, R is a homeomorphism.

Let ϕ be a Hölder-continuous function on Σ_A with respect to a metric d_θ . The *Gibbs measure* $\mu = \mu_\phi$ defined by ϕ , is the unique σ -invariant invariant probability measure on Σ_A for which there exist two constants P (the *topological pressure* of ϕ) and $C > 0$ such that, for any cylinder $\mathcal{C}[i_0, \dots, i_{n-1}]$ and for any point z in this cylinder we have

$$C^{-1} \leq \frac{\mu(\mathcal{C}[i_0, \dots, i_{n-1}])}{e^{S_n \phi(z) - nP}} \leq C, \quad (2.2)$$

where $S_n \phi(z) = \phi(z) + \phi(\sigma(z)) + \dots + \phi(\sigma^{n-1}(z))$ (see [B] or [PP] for details). Such a measure μ is ergodic and there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that for every cylinder $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}[i_0, \dots, i_{n-1}]$ of length n we have $\mu(\mathcal{C}) < C \rho^n$.

2.2 Multiplicative Ergodic Theorem

Let f be an invertible transitive subshift of finite type over a bilateral symbol space X and let μ be an invariant probability measure. We will assume in addition that μ is ergodic. Let L be an invertible continuous linear cocycle over f acting on a continuous \mathbb{R}^d -bundle E over X . Thus, $L(x) : E(x) \rightarrow E(f(x))$ is a linear map for each $x \in X$ and

$$L^n(x) = L(f^{n-1}(x)) \circ L(f^{n-2}(x)) \circ \dots \circ L(f(x)) \circ L(x) : E(x) \rightarrow E(f^n(x))$$

for every integer $n \geq 1$.

Given an integer $p = 1, \dots, d$, let $\text{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the *Grassman manifold* of the linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d of dimension p endowed with the usual distance $d(U, V)$ between subspaces $U, V \in \text{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ defined by

$$d(U, V) = \max\{|\langle u, w \rangle| : u \in U, w \in V^\perp, \|u\| = \|w\| = 1\}.$$

The following is Oseledets' Multiplicative Ergodic Theorem stated under the above assumptions (see e.g. [Ar], [BP] or [V] for related detailed exposition and proofs; see also [BPS]).

Theorem 2.1. (Multiplicative Ergodic Theorem). *There exists a subset \mathcal{L} of X with $\mu(\mathcal{L}) = 1$ such that:*

(a) *For all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ there exists $N(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (L^n(x)^t L^n(x))^{1/2n}$.*

(b) *There exist an integer $k \geq 1$ such that the operator (matrix) $N(x)$ has k distinct eigenvalues $t_k(x) < \dots < t_1(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$.*

(c) *There exist numbers $t_k < t_{k-1} < \dots < t_2 < t_1$ such that $(t_i^{(n)}(x))^{1/n} \rightarrow t_i$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and all $i = 1, \dots, k$.*

(d) *For all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and every $j = 1, \dots, k$ the dimension $\dim(E_j^{(n)}(x)) = m_j$ is constant and there exists $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_j^{(n)}(x) = E_j(x)$ in $\text{Gr}_{m_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

(e) *For all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and every $j = 1, \dots, k$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|L^n(x) \cdot u\| = \log t_j \quad , \quad u \in E_j(x) \setminus \{0\}$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, k$.

The numbers

$$\lambda_k = \log t_k < \lambda_{k-1} = \log t_{k-1} < \dots < \lambda_2 = \log t_2 < \lambda_1 = \log t_1$$

are the (distinct) *Lyapunov exponents* of the cocycle L over f . The so called *Oseledets' subspaces* $E_i(x)$ are invariant with respect to L .

Since the billiard ball map $B : M_0 \rightarrow M_0$ is conjugate to an invertible transitive subshift of finite type (see Sect. 2.1), the above theorem applies to it.

2.3 Words' frequency in symbolic dynamics

Let Σ_A and $\sigma : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ be as in Sect. 2.1. A sequence $y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_p\}$ of symbols

$$y_i \in G_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, k_0\}$$

will be called *admissible* if $y_i \neq y_{i+1}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p-1$. Let $w = w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}$ ($k > 1$) be a word (factor) in Σ_A , i.e. an admissible sequence of symbols $w_i \in G_0$. Assuming $p \geq k$, denote by

$$|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_p)|_w$$

the number of those $i \leq p-k$ so that $(y_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{i+k-1}) = (w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1})$. That is, $|(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_p)|_w$ is the number of times the word w appears (one-to-one) as a part of y . Given $z = (i_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma_A$, the *frequency* $f_w(z)$ of w in z is defined by

$$f_w(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(i_{-n}, i_{-n+1}, \dots, i_{-1}, i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}, i_n)|_w}{2n+1}$$

whenever the limit exists. It is well-known (see e.g. Theorem 1.13 in [Ber]) that for any given w the frequency $f_w(z)$ exists for almost all $z \in \Sigma_A$ with respect to ergodic invariant measures. In our particular situation this gives the following.

Proposition 2.2. *Let μ be an ergodic invariant measure on Σ_A and let $w = w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}$ ($k > 1$) be an admissible word. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}[w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}]$ be the cylinder of length k in Σ_A defined by w . Then there exists a subset Σ'' of Σ_A with $\mu(\Sigma'') = 1$ such that $f_w(z)$ exists for all $z \in \Sigma''$ and $f_w(z) = \mu(\mathcal{C})$ for all $z \in \Sigma''$.*

Stating the above slightly differently, it follows that under the assumptions in the Proposition for every $z = (i_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma''$ there exists the limit

$$\tilde{f}_w(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{n-1})|_w}{n} = \mu(\mathcal{C}),$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}[w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}]$ as above.

Assume now that $\mu = \mu_\phi$ is a **fixed Gibbs measure** on Σ_A defined by a Hölder continuous function ϕ on Σ_A . In particular μ is ergodic (see e.g. [B] or [PP]). Then there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ so that for every cylinder \mathcal{C} in Σ_A of length n we have $\mu(\mathcal{C}) \leq C \rho^n$.

By Oseledets' Theorem, there exists a subset Σ' of Σ_A with $\mu(\Sigma') = 1$ so that for every $x \in M_0$ with $R(x) \in \Sigma'$ the formulae for the Lyapunov exponents hold for vectors in $E_j^u(x)$:

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{m} \log \|dB^m(x) \cdot u\| = \lambda_j \quad , \quad u \in E_j(x) \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Fix a subset Σ' of Σ_A with this property.

Let $k = 2k'$ (for some $k' > 1$) be a fixed integer – we will say later how large it should be chosen. Given any $p, q \in G_0$, $p \neq q$, let $w_{p,q} = (p, q, p, q, \dots, p, q)$ be the word of length $k = 2k'$ involving only the symbols p and q . Being a cylinder of length k , for $\mathcal{C}_{p,q} = \mathcal{C}[w_{p,q}]$ we have $\mu(\mathcal{C}_{p,q}) \leq C \rho^k$. Set

$$\Omega_k = \bigcup_{p \neq q} \mathcal{C}_{p,q},$$

where the union is taken over all (ordered) pairs of distinct elements of G_0 . The number of these pairs is $k_0(k_0 - 1)$, so taking $k > 1$ sufficiently large, we have

$$\tilde{\delta} = \tilde{\delta}(k) = \mu(\Omega_k) \leq C k_0(k_0 - 1) \rho^k < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (2.4)$$

We now **fix an integer $k = 2k'$** so that (2.4) holds.

By using the consequence of Proposition 2.2 mentioned after it, for every word $w_{p,q}$ as above there exists a subset $\Sigma''_{p,q}$ of Σ' with $\mu(\Sigma''_{p,q}) = 1$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{n-1})|_{w_{p,q}}}{n} = \mu(\mathcal{C}_{p,q}) < \tilde{\delta} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (2.5)$$

for every $z = (i_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma''_{p,q}$. Set

$$\Sigma_0 = \bigcap_{p \neq q} \Sigma''_{p,q}, \quad (2.6)$$

where the intersection is taken over all (ordered) pairs of distinct elements of G_0 . Then $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma'$ and $\mu(\Sigma_0) = 1$.

Corollary 2.3. *For the fixed number k with (2.4) and the subset Σ_0 of Σ' defined as above, we have the following: for every $z = (i_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma_0$ there exists an integer $t_0 = t_0(z) \geq 0$ such that for every integer $t \geq t_0$ the number of those $j = 0, 1, \dots, (t-1)k$ so that amongst the entries $i_j, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_{j+k-1}$ there are at least three distinct numbers² is at least $tk/2 - k$.*

Proof. Given $z = (i_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma_0$, for every pair $p \neq q$ of numbers in G_0 there exists an integer $t_{p,q} = t_{p,q}(\xi) \geq 0$ so that

$$\frac{|(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{tk-1})|_{w_{p,q}}}{tk} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (2.7)$$

for all $t \geq t_{p,q}$. Set $t_0 = \max_{p,q \in G_0, p \neq q} t_{p,q}$. Consider an arbitrary integer $t \geq t_0$. Let t be the number of those $j = 0, 1, \dots, (t-1)k$ so that $(i_j, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_{j+k-1}) = w_{p,q}$ for some $p \neq q$ in G_0 . Then (2.7) gives $t < tk/2$. Thus, the number of the remaining numbers j between 0 and $(t-1)k$ is $> tk/2 - k$. For each of them $(i_j, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_{j+k-1}) \neq w_{p,q}$ for any $p \neq q$ in G_0 , therefore the sequence $i_j, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_{j+k-1}$ contains at least three different symbols from G_0 . This proves the corollary. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We will use the approach of Petkov and Vogel in [PV] and the formula they derived for a certain representation of the Poincaré map related to a periodic billiard trajectory. We follow Sect. 2.3 in [PS], where this formula is proved in details. In [PV] (and Sect. 2.3 in [PS]) the formula derived concerns a periodic trajectory, however a similar set-up and similar calculations can be used for general billiard trajectories. This is what we do here.

One could also use the formula of Chernov and Sinai for the curvature operators on unstable manifolds using continuous fractions (see e.g. [Ch1], [Ch2], [Si2]; see also [Ch3] and [BCST]). However for the purposes of this paper we found the formula from [PV] easier to use.

We follow the notation in Sect. 2.3 in [PS] with some small changes.

Let $\mu = \mu_\phi$ be a Gibbs measure on Σ_A defined by a Hölder continuous function ϕ on Σ_A , and let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 > 0$ be the Lyapunov exponents of the billiard ball map B on the non-wandering set M_0 with respect to μ (using here the representation map R to identify M_0 with Σ_A , etc.; see Sect. 2.1). As in Sect. 2.3, **fix an integer $k \geq 1$ with (2.4) and define the subset Σ_0 of Σ' by (2.6).**

Fix an arbitrary $\tilde{x}_0 = (p_0, v_0) \in M_0$ so that $R(\tilde{x}_0) = z \in \Sigma_0$. We may and will assume that \tilde{x}_0 is so that the billiard trajectory generated by it is never perpendicular to ∂K at a reflection point.

Take a small $\epsilon > 0$ and consider the local unstable manifold $W_\epsilon^u(x_0)$ for $x_0 = (q_0, n_X(q_0))$, for some convex local surface X in the complement of K with normal field n_X so that

$$q_0 = p_0 + t_0 n_X(q_0) \quad , \quad v_0 = n_X(q_0),$$

for some small $t_0 > 0$. That is x_0 is determined by the fixed point $\tilde{x}_0 \in M_0$. Let γ be the billiard trajectory in Ω determined by x_0 and let q_1, q_2, \dots be its successive reflection points.

Given $x = (q, n_X(q)) \in W_\epsilon^u(x_0)$, set $q_0(x) = q$, $t_0(x) = 0$ and denote by $t_1(x), t_2(x), \dots$ the times of the consecutive reflections of $\gamma(x)$ at ∂K . Then $t_j(x) = d_0(x) + d_1(x) + \dots + d_{j-1}(x)$, where $d_j(x) = \|q_{j+1}(x) - q_j(x)\|$, $0 \leq j$. Given $t \geq 0$, denote by $u_t(q_0)$ the *shift* of q_0 along the trajectory $\gamma(x)$ after time t , that is $u_t(q_0) = \text{pr}_1(\phi_t(x))$. Set

$$X_t = \{u_t(q) : q \in X\}.$$

²I.e. this is not a sequence like p, q, p, q, p, q, \dots , a repetition of two symbols only.

When $u_t(q_0)$ is not a reflection point of $\gamma(x)$, then locally near $u_t(q_0)$, X_t is a smooth convex 2-dimensional surface in \mathbb{R}^3 with "outward" unit normal given by the *direction* $\nu_t(q_0) = \text{pr}_2(\phi_t(x))$ of $\gamma(x)$ at $u_t(q_0)$.

Fix for a moment $t > 0$ such that $t_m(x) < t < t_{m+1}(x)$ for some $m \geq 1$ (a large number; later $m \rightarrow \infty$), and assume that $q_0(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq a$, is a C^3 curve on X with $q_0(0) = q_0$ such that for every $s \in [0, a]$ we have $t_m(x(s)) < t < t_{m+1}(x(s))$, where $x(s) = (q_0(s), \nu_X(q_0(s)))$. Assume also that $a > 0$ is so small that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ the reflection points $q_j(s) = q_j(x(s))$ belong to the same boundary component ∂K_{i_j} for every $s \in [0, a]$.

We will now estimate $\|d\phi_t(x) \cdot \dot{q}_0(0)\|$, where $\dot{q}_0(0) \in T_{q_0}X$.

Denote by Π_0 the hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^3 passing through the point q and orthogonal to $n_X(q)$. We will actually identify Π_0 with T_qX with the 0 at the point q , so this will be a 2-dimensional vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^3 . Let $q(u)$, $u \in U_0$, be a smooth (C^3) parametrisation of X in an open neighbourhood of q in X , where U_0 is an open disk in \mathbb{R}^2 with centre 0 and such that $q(0) = q$. Assuming U_0 is sufficiently small, we can now use it to parametrise $W_\epsilon^u(x_0)$ locally near x_0 . Namely we identify every (u, v) in $\Pi_0 \times \Pi_0$ close to $(0, 0)$ (e.g. assume $(u, v) \in U_0 \times U_0$) with the point $(x(u), w) \in W_\epsilon^u(x_0)$ so that $w = n_X(q) + v$. Set $\omega_0 = n_X(q)$.




Figure 1

Next, for any $i \geq 1$, denote by Π_i the plane in \mathbb{R}^3 passing through the point q_i and orthogonal to the line $q_i q_{i+1}$, and by ω_i the unit vector determined by the vector $\overrightarrow{q_i q_{i+1}}$. We assume that for each i the hyperplane Π_i is endowed with a linear basis such that $q_i = 0$.

Given any $i \geq 0$ and a pair $(u, v) \in \Pi_i \times \Pi_i$ sufficiently close to $(0, 0)$, let $\ell(u, v)$ be the oriented line passing through u and having direction $\omega_i + v$. Here we identify the point v with the vector v . If (u, v) is sufficiently close to $(0, 0)$, then $\ell(u, v)$ intersects transversally ∂K at some point $p = p(u, v)$ close to q_{i+1} . Let $\ell'(u, v)$ be the oriented line symmetric to $\ell(u, v)$ with respect to the tangent plane $T_p(\partial K)$ to ∂K at p , and let u' be the intersection point of $\ell'(u, v)$ with Π_{i+1} (clearly such a point exists for (u, v) close to $(0, 0)$). There is a unique $v' \in \Pi_{i+1}$ such that $\omega_{i+1} + v'$ has the direction of the line $\ell'(u, v)$ (see Figure 1). Thus, we obtain a map

$$\Phi_{i+1} : \Pi_i \times \Pi_i \ni (u, v) \mapsto (u', v') \in \Pi_{i+1} \times \Pi_{i+1},$$

defined for (u, v) in a small neighbourhood of $(0, 0)$. The smoothness of this map follows from the smoothness of the billiard flow.

Just like we did with Π_0 , let Π_m be the plane in \mathbb{R}^3 passing through the point $u_t(q)$ and orthogonal to $n_{X_t}(u_t(q))$. Let $q_m(u)$, $u \in U_m$, be a smooth (C^3) parametrisation of X_t in an open neighbourhood of $u_t(q)$ in X_t , where U_m is an open disk in \mathbb{R}^2 with centre 0 and such that $q_m(0) = u_t(q)$. Again we will assume that U_m is sufficiently small and then we can use it to parametrise $W_\epsilon^u(x(t))$ locally near $x(t)$, simply by identifying every (u_m, v_m) in $\Pi_m \times \Pi_m$ close to $(0, 0)$ with the point $(x(u_m), w_m) \in W_\epsilon^u(x(t))$ so that $w_m = n_{X_t}(u_t(q)) + v_m$. Set $\omega_{m+1} = n_{X_t}(u_t(q))$.

Consider the (locally defined) composition

$$\Phi = \Phi_m \circ \dots \circ \Phi_1 : \Pi_0 \times \Pi_0 \longrightarrow \Pi_m \times \Pi_m,$$

and the linear map³

$$P_\gamma^{(m)} = d\Phi(0, 0) : \Pi_0 \times \Pi_0 \longrightarrow \Pi_m \times \Pi_m.$$

It follows from the above definitions that there exists a natural (local) conjugacy⁴

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Pi_0 \times \Pi_0 & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \Pi_m \times \Pi_m \\ \downarrow \Omega_0 & & \downarrow \Omega_m \\ W_\epsilon^u(x_0) = \tilde{X} & \xrightarrow{\phi_t} & W_\epsilon^u(x_t(q)) = \tilde{X}_t \end{array}$$

which defines a conjugacy between the corresponding linearizations:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Pi_0 \times \Pi_0 & \xrightarrow{P_\gamma^{(m)}} & \Pi_m \times \Pi_m \\ \downarrow D\Omega_0 & & \downarrow D\Omega_m \\ E^u(\tilde{X}) & \xrightarrow{D\phi_t(x_0)} & E^u(\tilde{X}_t) \end{array}$$

Moreover the smooth maps Ω_0 and Ω_m have uniformly bounded derivatives, so there exists a constant $T > 0$ independent of x_0 , m and t so that

$$\frac{1}{C} \|P_\gamma^{(m)}(u, v)\| \leq \|D\phi_t(x_0) \cdot (D\Phi(0, 0) \cdot (u, v))\| \leq C \|P_\gamma^{(m)}(u, v)\|$$

for all $(u, v) \in \Pi_0 \times \Pi_0$. In particular when $u = 0$ we can naturally identify $D\Omega_0(0, v)$ with $v \in E^u(q_0)$, so we get

$$\frac{1}{C} \|\text{pr}_2(P_\gamma^{(m)}(0, v))\| \leq \|D\phi_t(x_0) \cdot v\| \leq C \|\text{pr}_2(P_\gamma^{(m)}(0, v))\| \quad (3.1)$$

for all $v \in E^u(q_0)$ (with sufficiently small $\|v\|$), where we denote $\text{pr}_2(u', v') = v'$ for all $(u', v') \in \Pi_i \times \Pi_i$ and all i . Therefore, for the *Lyapunov exponent* $\lambda(v)$ at the point x_0 in the direction of v we get

$$\lambda(v) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \log \|\text{pr}_2(P_\gamma^{(m)}(0, v))\|. \quad (3.2)$$

Next, we describe the representation of $P_\gamma^{(m)}$ given in Sect. 2.3 in [PS].

Set $d_i = \|q_{i-1} - q_i\|$ and let $\alpha_i = T_{q_i}(\partial K)$ be the *tangent hyperplane* to ∂K at q_i . Let $\sigma_i : \mathbb{R}^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be the *symmetry* with respect to α_i , and let Π'_i be the hyperplane passing through q_i and orthogonal to ω_{i-1} ($i \geq 1$). Then Π'_i is parallel to Π_{i-1} and

$$\sigma_i(\omega_{i-1}) = \omega_i \quad , \quad \sigma_i(\Pi'_i) = \Pi_i$$

³In the case of a periodic trajectory γ , $P_\gamma^{(m)}$ is called the *Poincaré map* of γ . Here however we do not assume γ to be periodic.

⁴The top map Φ is only defined locally, essentially from $U_0 \times U_0$ to $U_m \times U_m$.

(see Figure 2). We identify Π'_i with Π_{i-1} using the translation along the line $q_{i-1}q_i$ ($i \geq 1$). Let

$$\pi_i : \Pi'_i \longrightarrow \alpha_i$$

be the *projection* along the vector ω_{i-1} . For the outward *unit normal field* $\nu_i = \nu_i(q)$ to ∂K for $q \in \partial K$, we have $\theta_i = 2\langle \nu_i, \omega_i \rangle > 0$. From the Assumptions in Sect. 1, there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of q , x_0 and i so that

$$\langle \nu_i, \omega_i \rangle \geq c_1 > 0$$

for all i . Thus, $\theta_i \geq 2c_1 > 0$ for all i .

The *second fundamental form* of ∂K at q_i is defined by $\langle G_i(\xi), \eta \rangle$ for $\xi, \eta \in \alpha_i$, where

$$G_i = d\nu_i(q_i) : \alpha_i \longrightarrow \alpha_i.$$

Since this is a symmetric form, there exists a unique symmetric linear map

$$\tilde{\psi}_i : \Pi_i \longrightarrow \Pi_i \tag{3.3}$$

such that

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_i \sigma_i(\xi'), \sigma_i(\eta') \rangle = -2\langle \omega_{i-1}, \nu_i \rangle \langle G_i(\pi_i(\xi')), \pi_i(\eta') \rangle = \theta_i \langle G_i(\pi_i(\xi')), \pi_i(\eta') \rangle \tag{3.4}$$

for all $\xi', \eta' \in \Pi'_i$; then $\xi = \sigma_i(\xi')$, $\eta = \sigma_i(\eta') \in \Pi_i$.

Since we identify the hyperplanes Π_{i-1} and Π'_i (using the projection along the line $q_{i-1}q_i$) we have $\sigma_i(\Pi_{i-1}) = \Pi_i$. Consider the compositions

$$s_i = \sigma_i \circ \sigma_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_1. \tag{3.5}$$

Then $s_i(\Pi_0) = \Pi_i$ and $s_i^{-1}(\Pi_i) = \Pi_0$. Define the symmetric linear map ψ_i by

$$\psi_i = s_i^{-1} \circ \tilde{\psi}_i \circ s_i : \Pi_0 \longrightarrow \Pi_0. \tag{3.6}$$

Then we can write

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & d_i I \\ \psi_i & I + d_i \psi_i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_i^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & s_i^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & d_i I \\ \tilde{\psi}_i & I + d_i \tilde{\psi}_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s_i & 0 \\ 0 & s_i \end{pmatrix},$$

so this defines a linear map $\Pi_0 \times \Pi_0 \longrightarrow \Pi_0 \times \Pi_0$. Now the argument in Sect. 2.3 in [PS] yields the following (see Theorem 2.3.1 in [PS]):

Lemma 3.1. *Under the assumptions and conventions above, the map*

$$P_\gamma^{(m)} : \Pi_0 \times \Pi_0 \longrightarrow \Pi_m \times \Pi_m$$

is a linear symplectic map which has the following matrix representation

$$P_\gamma^{(m)} = \begin{pmatrix} s_m & 0 \\ 0 & s_m \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} I & d_m I \\ \psi_m & I + d_m \psi_m \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} I & d_1 I \\ \psi_1 & I + d_1 \psi_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.7}$$

where ψ_i is given by (3.6) for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

We will now write down some of the above formulae a bit differently. Let

$$\tilde{\pi}_i : \Pi_i \longrightarrow \alpha_i$$

be the *projection* along the vector ω_i . For the symmetry $\sigma_i : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ through the plane $\alpha_i = T_{q_i}(\partial K)$ we have

$$\sigma_i(\xi) = \xi - 2\langle \xi, \nu_i \rangle \nu_i,$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Since $\theta_i = 2\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle = -2\langle \omega_{i-1}, \nu_i \rangle$, we have

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_i(\xi), \eta \rangle = \theta_i \langle G_i(\tilde{\pi}_i(\xi)), \tilde{\pi}_i(\eta) \rangle \quad (3.8)$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \Pi_i$, where we used (3.4) and the fact that $\pi_i(\xi') = \pi_i(\sigma_i(\xi')) = \tilde{\pi}_i(\xi)$ for $\xi' \in \Pi'_i$ and $\xi = \sigma_i(\xi') \in \Pi_i$. The latter follows from the formula for σ_i and

$$\pi_i(\xi') = \xi' - \frac{\langle \xi', \nu_i \rangle}{\langle \omega_{i-1}, \nu_i \rangle} \omega_{i-1} \quad , \quad \tilde{\pi}_i(\xi) = \xi - \frac{\langle \xi, \nu_i \rangle}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle} \omega_i \quad (3.9)$$

for all $\xi' \in \Pi'_i$ and all $\xi \in \Pi_i$ (or just use simple geometry).




Figure 2

We now continue with the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Assume that the centres O_i of the balls K_i are all in the plane Γ . It is easy to see that under this assumption all billiard trajectories in the non-wandering set M_0 are lying in Γ . Thus, the whole billiard trajectory q_0, q_1, \dots lies in the plane Γ , so **all vectors ω_i and normals ν_i are in this plane, so perpendicular to $n = (0, 0, 1)$** . All planes Π_i are then perpendicular to Γ , so from the identifications we made, we can assume $n \in \Pi_i$ for all i . (Identifying all Π_i with the corresponding parallel 2-dimensional planes in \mathbb{R}^3 through 0.) All tangent planes α_i are also perpendicular to Γ and each of them is identified with a corresponding parallel plane in \mathbb{R}^3 through 0.

Now the second fundamental form G_i acts in a very simple way on α_i , namely

$$G_i(\xi) = \kappa_i \xi$$

for all $\xi \in \alpha_i$, where $\kappa_i = 1/r_i$. Now (3.8) implies

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_i(\xi), \eta \rangle = \kappa_i \theta_i \langle \tilde{\pi}_i(\xi), \tilde{\pi}_i(\eta) \rangle \quad (3.10)$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \Pi_i$. For each i denote by E_i the 1-dimensional subspace of Π_i which is perpendicular to Γ . This is just a line through 0 in Π_i which contains the normal vector $n = (0, 0, 1)$ to Γ . Assuming $\Pi_i \neq \alpha_i$ (which we do), it follows that

$$E_i = \Pi_i \cap \alpha_i.$$

Since $E_i \perp \Gamma$, it is perpendicular to all vectors in the plane. In particular, $E_i \perp \nu_i$, so $\tilde{\pi}_i(\xi) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in E_i$. Now (3.10) yields

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_i(\xi), \eta \rangle = \kappa_i \theta_i \langle \xi, \eta \rangle$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in E_i$. Therefore the restriction of $\tilde{\psi}_i$ to the subspace E_i is

$$(\tilde{\psi}_i)|_{E_i} = \kappa_i \theta_i I, \quad (3.11)$$

where I is the identity operator. A similar formula holds for ψ_i , so now for the operator

$$P_\gamma^{(m)} : E_0 \times E_0 \longrightarrow E_m \times E_m$$

we obtain the following matrix representation

$$(P_\gamma^{(m)})|_{E_0 \times E_0} = \begin{pmatrix} s_m & 0 \\ 0 & s_m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & d_m I \\ \kappa_m \theta_m I & (1 + \kappa_m d_m \theta_m) I \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} I & d_1 I \\ \kappa_1 \theta_1 I & (1 + \kappa_1 d_1 \theta_1) I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.12)$$

Set $F_i = \Pi_i \cap \Gamma$. This is then an one-dimensional subspace of Π_i contained in Γ . Since $\sigma_i(\Pi_{i-1}) = \Pi_i$, we have $\sigma_i(F_{i-1}) = F_i$, and so $s_m(F_0) = F_m$.

Clearly, $\omega_i \perp F_i$, since $\omega_i \perp \Pi_i$. Let p_i be the projection of ν_i in Π_i , i.e.

$$p_i = \nu_i - \langle \nu_i, \omega_i \rangle \omega_i.$$

Then $p_i \in \text{span}(\nu_i, \omega_i) \subset \Gamma$ and moreover $p_i \in F_i$. Assuming that the billiard trajectory generated by \tilde{x}_0 is never perpendicular to ∂K (by the choice of \tilde{x}_0), i.e. $\nu_i \neq \omega_i$ for all i , we have $p_i \neq 0$. Set

$$f_i = \frac{p_i}{\|p_i\|}.$$

Since $f_i \in F_i$ and F_i is one-dimensional, $F_i = \{s f_i : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

We will now calculate $\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i)$ using (3.10). First, (3.9) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\pi}_i(p_i) &= p_i - \frac{\langle p_i, \nu_i \rangle}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle} \omega_i \\ &= \nu_i - \langle \nu_i, \omega_i \rangle \omega_i - \frac{\langle \nu_i - \langle \nu_i, \omega_i \rangle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle} \omega_i \\ &= \nu_i - \langle \nu_i, \omega_i \rangle \omega_i - \frac{1}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle} \omega_i + \langle \nu_i, \omega_i \rangle \omega_i \\ &= \nu_i - \frac{1}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle} \omega_i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|\tilde{\pi}_i(p_i)\|^2 = 1 - 2 + \frac{1}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2} = \frac{1 - \langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2}.$$

Now (3.10) yields

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_i(p_i), p_i \rangle = \kappa_i \theta_i \|\tilde{\pi}_i(p_i)\|^2 = \kappa_i \theta_i \frac{1 - \langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2}.$$

Since $\|p_i\|^2 = 1 - \langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2$, it follows that

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_i(f_i), f_i \rangle = \frac{\kappa_i \theta_i}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2}. \quad (3.13)$$

We will now show that $\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) \in F_i$. For any $\xi \in E_i$, using (3.10) again and the fact that $\tilde{\pi}_i(\xi) = \xi$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\psi}_i(f_i), \xi \rangle &= \kappa_i \theta_i \langle \tilde{\pi}_i(f_i), \xi \rangle \\ &= \kappa_i \theta_i \left\langle f_i - \frac{\langle f_i, \nu_i \rangle}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle} \omega_i, \xi \right\rangle = \kappa_i \theta_i \langle f_i, \xi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This yields $\langle \tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) - \kappa_i \theta_i f_i, \xi \rangle = 0$ for all $\xi \in E_i$, so $\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) - \kappa_i \theta_i f_i \in E_i^\perp$, i.e. it is in the plane Γ . Since, $\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) - \kappa_i \theta_i f_i \in \Pi_i$, we must have $\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) - \kappa_i \theta_i f_i \in F_i$, i.e. $\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) - \kappa_i \theta_i f_i$ is parallel to f_i . In particular, $\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) = t f_i$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Now (3.13) implies $t = \frac{\kappa_i \theta_i}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2}$. Hence

$$\tilde{\psi}_i(f_i) = \kappa_i \tilde{\theta}_i f_i, \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\tilde{\theta}_i = L_i \theta_i \geq \theta_i \quad , \quad L_i = \frac{1}{\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle^2} \geq 1$$

for all i .

It follows from the Assumptions in Sect. 1.1 that there exists a global constant $c_2 < 1$ such that if the reflection points q_{i-1} and q_{i+1} (i.e. the ones before and after q_i) belong to different components of K , then $\langle \omega_i, \nu_i \rangle \leq c_2$. Therefore in such a case we have

$$L_i \geq L = \frac{1}{c_2^2} > 1, \quad (3.15)$$

where $L > 1$ defined here is a global constant.

Now we get a similar formula to (3.12) for the operator

$$P_\gamma^{(m)} : F_0 \times F_0 \longrightarrow F_m \times F_m,$$

namely we have the following matrix representation

$$(P_\gamma^{(m)})_{|F_0 \times F_0} = \begin{pmatrix} s_m & 0 \\ 0 & s_m \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} I & d_m I \\ \kappa_m \tilde{\theta}_m I & (1 + \kappa_m d_m \tilde{\theta}_m) I \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} I & d_1 I \\ \kappa_1 \tilde{\theta}_1 I & (1 + \kappa_1 d_1 \tilde{\theta}_1) I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.16)$$

Set for brevity

$$a_i = \kappa_i \theta_i \quad , \quad \tilde{a}_i = \kappa_i \tilde{\theta}_i \geq a_i \quad , \quad b_i = 1 + \kappa_i d_i \theta_i \quad , \quad \tilde{b}_i = 1 + \kappa_i d_i \tilde{\theta}_i \geq b_i.$$

Lemma 3.2. *For every $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ there exist functions*

$$\Delta_j^{(1)} = \Delta_j^{(1)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^j) \quad , \quad \Delta_j^{(2)} = \Delta_j^{(2)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^j),$$

$$\Delta_j^{(3)} = \Delta_j^{(3)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^j) \quad , \quad \Delta_j^{(4)} = \Delta_j^{(4)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^j)$$

which are polynomials of $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_j; d_1, \dots, d_j; \theta_1, \dots, \theta_j$ with positive coefficients in front of all terms such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & d_j I \\ a_j I & b_j I \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} I & d_1 I \\ a_1 I & b_1 I \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_j^{(1)} I & \Delta_j^{(2)} I \\ \Delta_j^{(3)} I & \Delta_j^{(4)} I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. For $j = 1$ the statement is obviously true. Assuming the statement is true for some $j \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} I & d_{j+1} I \\ a_{j+1} I & b_{j+1} I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & d_j I \\ a_j I & b_j I \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} I & d_1 I \\ a_1 I & b_1 I \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I & d_{j+1} I \\ a_{j+1} I & b_{j+1} I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_j^{(1)} I & \Delta_j^{(2)} I \\ \Delta_j^{(3)} I & \Delta_j^{(4)} I \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (\Delta_j^{(1)} + d_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(3)}) I & (\Delta_j^{(2)} + d_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)}) I \\ (a_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(1)} + b_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(3)}) I & (a_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(2)} + b_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)}) I \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{j+1}^{(1)} I & \Delta_{j+1}^{(2)} I \\ \Delta_{j+1}^{(3)} I & \Delta_{j+1}^{(4)} I \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{j+1}^{(1)} &= \Delta_j^{(1)} + d_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(3)}, & \Delta_{j+1}^{(2)} &= \Delta_j^{(2)} + d_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)}, \\ \Delta_{j+1}^{(3)} &= a_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(1)} + b_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(3)}, & \Delta_{j+1}^{(4)} &= a_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(2)} + b_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. ■

Setting

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(1)} &= \Delta_j^{(1)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\tilde{\theta}_i\}_{i=1}^j), & \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(2)} &= \Delta_j^{(2)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\tilde{\theta}_i\}_{i=1}^j), \\ \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(3)} &= \Delta_j^{(3)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\tilde{\theta}_i\}_{i=1}^j), & \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(4)} &= \Delta_j^{(4)}(\{\kappa_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{d_i\}_{i=1}^j; \{\tilde{\theta}_i\}_{i=1}^j), \end{aligned}$$

as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we get the following

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & d_j I \\ \tilde{a}_j I & \tilde{b}_j I \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} I & d_1 I \\ \tilde{a}_1 I & \tilde{b}_1 I \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(1)} I & \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(2)} I \\ \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(3)} I & \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(4)} I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.18)$$

Now combining (3.2) with the representations (3.12) and (3.17), and also (3.16) and (3.18) we obtain the following consequence concerning Lyapunov exponents.

Corollary 3.3. *For all $v \in E_0$ and $\tilde{v} \in F_0$ with $\|v\| = \|\tilde{v}\| = 1$ we have*

$$\lambda(v) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \log \Delta_m^{(4)}, \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$\lambda(\tilde{v}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \log \tilde{\Delta}_m^{(4)}. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. For $v \in E_0$, (3.12) and (3.17) imply

$$P_\gamma^{(m)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_m & 0 \\ 0 & s_m \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_m^{(1)} I & \Delta_m^{(2)} I \\ \Delta_m^{(3)} I & \Delta_m^{(4)} I \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_m^{(2)} s_m(v) \\ \Delta_m^{(4)} s_m(v) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.21)$$

Therefore

$$\text{pr}_2 \left(P_\gamma^{(m)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s_m(v) \end{pmatrix} \right) = \Delta_m^{(4)} s_m(v).$$

Since $\|s_m(v)\| = \|v\|$, now (3.19) follows from the above and (3.2).

In a similar way one proves (3.20). ■

Recall from the proof of Lemma 3.2 that

$$\Delta_{j+1}^{(2)} = \Delta_j^{(2)} + d_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)} \quad , \quad \Delta_{j+1}^{(4)} = a_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(2)} + b_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)}. \quad (3.22)$$

Similarly,

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{j+1}^{(2)} = \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(2)} + d_{j+1} \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(4)} \quad , \quad \tilde{\Delta}_{j+1}^{(4)} = \tilde{a}_{j+1} \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(2)} + \tilde{b}_{j+1} \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(4)}. \quad (3.23)$$

We set $\Delta_0^{(2)} = \tilde{\Delta}_0^{(2)} = \Delta_0^{(4)} = \tilde{\Delta}_0^{(4)} = 1$.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $j \geq 1$ we have*

$$\Delta_j^{(2)} \leq \Delta_j^{(4)} \quad , \quad \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(2)} \leq \tilde{\Delta}_j^{(4)}. \quad (3.24)$$

Proof. We will prove the first half of the above; the other is similar.

For $j = 1$ the statement is true. Assume it is true for some $j \geq 1$. Then (3.22) implies

$$\Delta_{j+1}^{(2)} = \Delta_j^{(2)} + d_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)} \leq 2\Delta_j^{(4)},$$

since $d_{j+1} \leq 1$. This and $b_{j+1} = 1 + \kappa_{j+1}\theta_{j+1}d_{j+1} \geq 2$ (see the Assumptions in Sect. 1) imply

$$\Delta_{j+1}^{(4)} = a_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(2)} + b_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)} \geq b_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)} \geq 2\Delta_j^{(4)} \geq \Delta_{j+1}^{(2)}.$$

By induction $\Delta_i^{(2)} \leq \Delta_i^{(4)}$ for all $i \geq 1$. ■

Here we used $\kappa_i = 1/r_i \geq 1/r_0$, so $\kappa_i\theta_i \geq c_2/r_0 > 2$ for all i (see the Assumptions in Sect. 1). From the definitions, $\tilde{b}_i \geq b_i$ for all i . Since $L_i \geq L > 1$ whenever q_{i-1}, q_i, q_{i+1} belong to distinct balls, it follows that

$$\tilde{b}_i = 1 + \kappa_i d_i \tilde{\theta}_i \geq 1 + \kappa_i d_i \theta_i L$$

for such i . Set

$$I = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq m, \tilde{b}_i > b_i\}.$$

Then

$$\tilde{b}_i - b_i \geq \kappa_i d_i \theta_i (L - 1) \geq c = \text{const} > 0$$

for $i \in I$. We choose $c \leq 1$ so that then $\tilde{b}_i \geq b_i \geq c$ for all i .

Similarly,

$$\tilde{a}_i - a_i = \kappa_i \theta_i (L - 1) \geq c = \text{const} > 0,$$

assuming the global constants $\kappa_i = 1/r_i$ are sufficiently large (see the Assumptions in Sect. 1). Since a_i and \tilde{a}_i are uniformly bounded above and below by global positive constants, there exists a global constant $C > 0$ so that

$$\tilde{a}_i \geq a_i + c \geq a_i(1 + c/C).$$

Choose a small global constant $s > 0$, with $1 + c/C \geq e^s$. Then $\tilde{a}_i \geq e^s a_i$ for all i . In a similar way we deal with \tilde{b}_i and b_i , so we get

$$\tilde{a}_i \geq e^s a_i \quad , \quad \tilde{b}_i \geq e^s b_i \quad (3.25)$$

for all $i \in I$. For $i \notin I$ we simply have $\tilde{a}_i = a_i$ and $\tilde{b}_i = b_i$. We assume $s > 0$ is sufficiently small so that $e^s \leq 1 + d_0$.

It is clear from (3.22) and (3.23) that $\Delta_j^{(2)}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_j^{(2)}$ grow exponentially with j . E.g. (3.22) and (3.24) give

$$\Delta_{j+1}^{(2)} = \Delta_j^{(2)} + d_{j+1} \Delta_j^{(4)} \geq (1 + d_{j+1}) \Delta_j^{(2)}$$

for all j , so $\Delta_j^{(2)} \geq \prod_{i=1}^j (1 + d_i) \geq (1 + d_0)^j$. In a similar way one can see that $\Delta_j^{(4)}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_j^{(4)}$ also grow exponentially with j . However we need more precise estimates, and we need to compare the growth of $\tilde{\Delta}_j^{(4)}$ with that of $\Delta_j^{(4)}$.

Denote by $i_0 > 0$ the largest integer so that $i_0 \notin I$. Then $i_0 < k$. Set

$$u_i = v_i = 1 \quad , \quad 0 \leq i \leq i_0. \quad (3.26)$$

Lemma 3.5. *There exist sequences $\{t_i\}_{i \geq i_0}^\infty$ and $\{s_i\}_{i \geq i_0}^\infty$ of non-negative numbers so that*

$$u_{i+1} = e^{t_{i+1}} u_i \quad , \quad v_i = e^{s_i} u_i \quad (3.27)$$

for all $i \geq i_0$, $u_i \geq 1$ for all $i \geq 1$, and

$$\tilde{\Delta}_i^{(2)} \geq u_i \Delta_i^{(2)} \quad (3.28)$$

and

$$\tilde{\Delta}_i^{(4)} \geq v_i \Delta_i^{(4)} \quad (3.29)$$

for all $i \geq i_0$. Moreover we can choose these sequences so that

$$0 \leq t_{i+1} < s_i \quad (3.30)$$

for $i \geq i_0$ and

$$s_i \geq s/2 \quad , \quad i \in I. \quad (3.31)$$

Proof. We will do the construction by induction. For $0 \leq i \leq i_0$ we use (3.26).

Let us check (3.28) and (3.29) for $i = i_0$. By (3.22), (3.23) and $u_{i_0} = v_{i_0} = 1$ we get

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i_0}^{(2)} = \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0-1}^{(2)} + d_{i_0} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0-1}^{(4)} \geq \Delta_{i_0-1}^{(2)} + d_{i_0} \Delta_{i_0-1}^{(4)} = \Delta_{i_0}^{(2)} = u_{i_0} \Delta_{i_0}^{(2)},$$

and

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i_0}^{(4)} = \tilde{a}_{i_0} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0-1}^{(2)} + \tilde{b}_{i_0} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0-1}^{(4)} = a_{i_0} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0-1}^{(2)} + b_{i_0} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0-1}^{(4)} \geq a_{i_0} \Delta_{i_0-1}^{(2)} + b_{i_0} \Delta_{i_0-1}^{(4)} = v_{i_0} \Delta_{i_0}^{(4)}.$$

Next, recall that for $i = i_0$ we have $i_0 + 1 \in I$. Set $t_{i_0+1} = 0$ and $u_{i_0+1} = 1 = e^{t_{i_0+1}} u_{i_0}$. Then clearly

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i_0+1}^{(2)} \geq u_{i_0+1} \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)}.$$

Now set $s_{i_0+1} = s$ and $v_{i_0+1} = e^{s_{i_0+1}} u_{i_0+1} = e^s$. Then (3.23), (3.22) and $i_0 + 1 \in I$ imply

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i_0+1}^{(4)} = \tilde{a}_{i_0+1} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0}^{(2)} + \tilde{b}_{i_0+1} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0}^{(4)} \geq e^s a_{i_0+1} \Delta_{i_0}^{(2)} + e^s b_{i_0+1} \Delta_{i_0}^{(4)} = e^s \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(4)},$$

so (3.29) holds with i replaced by $i_0 + 1$.

Let us now show that we can choose $t_{i_0+2} > 0$ so that setting $u_{i_0+2} = e^{t_{i_0+2}} u_{i_0+1} = e^{t_{i_0+2}}$, (3.28) holds with i replaced by $i_0 + 2$. First, using the above and (3.23) we get

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i_0+2}^{(2)} = \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0+1}^{(2)} + d_{i_0+2} \tilde{\Delta}_{i_0+1}^{(4)} \geq \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)} + d_{i_0+2} e^s \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(4)}.$$

Now, using (3.22), we have $d_{i_0+2} \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(4)} = \Delta_{i_0+2}^{(2)} - \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)}$, so the above implies

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i_0+2}^{(2)} \geq \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)} + e^s (\Delta_{i_0+2}^{(2)} - \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)}) = e^s \Delta_{i_0+2}^{(2)} - (e^s - 1) \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)}. \quad (3.32)$$

However, by (3.22) and (3.24),

$$\Delta_{i_0+2}^{(2)} = \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)} + d_{i_0+2} \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(4)} \geq (1 + d_0) \Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)},$$

therefore

$$\Delta_{i_0+1}^{(2)} \leq \frac{\Delta_{i_0+2}^{(2)}}{1 + d_0}.$$

Combining this with (3.32) implies

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i_0+2}^{(2)} \geq \left(e^s - \frac{e^s - 1}{1 + d_0} \right) \Delta_{i_0+2}^{(2)} = \left(\frac{d_0 e^s + 1}{1 + d_0} \right) \Delta_{i_0+2}^{(2)}.$$

Since $\frac{d_0 e^s + 1}{1 + d_0} > 1$, there exists $t_{i_0+2} > 0$ so that

$$0 < t_{i_0+2} < s = s_{i_0+1} \quad , \quad \frac{d_0 e^s + 1}{1 + d_0} \geq e^{t_{i_0+2}}.$$

Choose an arbitrary $t_{i_0+2} > 0$ with the above and set $u_{i_0+2} = e^{t_{i_0+2}} = e^{t_{i_0+2}} u_{i_0+1}$.

Assume that u_i, t_i, v_i, s_i have been constructed for some $i \geq i_0 + 1$ so that (3.27)–(3.30) hold for i . We will now define $u_{i+1}, t_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, s_{i+1}$. For the first two we will essentially repeat the previous argument.

Using (3.23) and (3.27), (3.29) for i , we get

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}^{(2)} = \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(2)} + d_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(4)} \geq u_i \Delta_i^{(2)} + d_{i+1} v_i \Delta_i^{(4)} = u_i \Delta_i^{(2)} + d_{i+1} e^{s_i} u_i \Delta_i^{(4)}.$$

Now, using (3.22), we have $d_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(4)} = \Delta_{i+1}^{(2)} - \Delta_i^{(2)}$, so the above yields

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}^{(2)} \geq u_i \left(\Delta_i^{(2)} + e^{s_i} (\Delta_{i+1}^{(2)} - \Delta_i^{(2)}) \right) = u_i \left(e^{s_i} \Delta_{i+1}^{(2)} - (e^{s_i} - 1) \Delta_i^{(2)} \right). \quad (3.33)$$

From (3.22) and (3.24), $\Delta_{i+1}^{(2)} = \Delta_i^{(2)} + d_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(4)} \geq (1 + d_0) \Delta_i^{(2)}$, so $\Delta_i^{(2)} \leq \frac{\Delta_{i+1}^{(2)}}{1 + d_0}$. Using this in (3.33) gives

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}^{(2)} \geq u_i \left(e^{s_i} - \frac{e^{s_i} - 1}{1 + d_0} \right) \Delta_{i+1}^{(2)} = u_i \left(\frac{d_0 e^{s_i} + 1}{1 + d_0} \right) \Delta_{i+1}^{(2)}.$$

Since $\frac{d_0 e^{s_i} + 1}{1 + d_0} > 1$, there exists $t_{i+1} > 0$ so that

$$0 < t_{i+1} < s_i \quad , \quad \frac{d_0 e^{s_i} + 1}{1 + d_0} \geq e^{t_{i+1}}. \quad (3.34)$$

Choose $t_{i+1} > 0$ with these properties and set $u_{i+1} = e^{t_{i+1}} u_i$. Then the above gives $\tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}^{(2)} \geq u_{i+1} \Delta_{i+1}^{(2)}$, so (3.28) holds with i replaced by $i + 1$. We will impose another condition on t_{i+1} later.

Next, we will define s_{i+1} and $v_{i+1} = e^{s_{i+1}} u_{i+1}$ so that (3.29) holds with i replaced by $i + 1$. There are two cases to consider.

First assume that $i + 1 \notin I$. Then (3.23), (3.27) and the inductive assumptions yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}^{(4)} &= \tilde{a}_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(2)} + \tilde{b}_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(4)} = a_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(4)} \\
&\geq a_{i+1} u_i \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} v_i \Delta_i^{(4)} = a_{i+1} u_i \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} e^{s_i} u_i \Delta_i^{(4)} \\
&= e^{t_i+1} u_i \left(a_{i+1} e^{-t_i+1} \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} e^{s_i-t_i+1} \Delta_i^{(4)} \right) \\
&= u_{i+1} \left(a_{i+1} e^{-t_{i+1}} \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} e^{s_i-t_{i+1}} \Delta_i^{(4)} \right). \tag{3.35}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we need to define $v_{i+1} = e^{s_{i+1}} u_{i+1}$ so that

$$u_{i+1} \left(a_{i+1} e^{-t_{i+1}} \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} e^{s_i-t_{i+1}} \Delta_i^{(4)} \right) \geq v_{i+1} \Delta_{i+1}^{(4)} = e^{s_{i+1}} u_{i+1} \left(a_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(4)} \right).$$

The latter is equivalent to

$$b_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(4)} \left(e^{s_i-t_{i+1}} - e^{s_{i+1}} \right) \geq a_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(2)} \left(e^{s_{i+1}} - e^{-t_{i+1}} \right). \tag{3.36}$$

To simplify the above, notice that

$$\frac{b_{i+1}}{a_{i+1}} = \frac{1 + d_{i+1} a_{i+1}}{a_{i+1}} = \frac{1}{a_{i+1}} + d_{i+1} \geq d_0.$$

This and (3.24) imply

$$\frac{b_{i+1}}{a_{i+1}} \cdot \frac{\Delta_i^{(4)}}{\Delta_i^{(2)}} \geq d_0.$$

Hence to satisfy (3.36) it is enough to have

$$d_0 \left(e^{s_i-t_{i+1}} - e^{s_{i+1}} \right) \geq e^{s_{i+1}} - e^{-t_{i+1}},$$

that is

$$d_0 \left(e^{s_i-t_{i+1}-s_{i+1}} - 1 \right) \geq 1 - e^{-(t_{i+1}+s_{i+1})}. \tag{3.37}$$

Clearly $1 - e^{-(t_{i+1}+s_{i+1})}$ is close to 0 when $t_{i+1} + s_{i+1}$ is close to 0, while $d_0 \left(e^{s_i-t_{i+1}-s_{i+1}} - 1 \right)$ is close to $d_0(e^{s_i} - 1) > 0$. Thus, (3.37) holds when $t_{i+1} > 0$ and $s_{i+1} > 0$ are chosen sufficiently close to 0. So, to finish with the case under consideration we just choose arbitrary $t_{i+1} > 0$ and $s_{i+1} > 0$ with $0 < t_{i+1} + s_{i+1} < s_i$ so that (3.34) and (3.37) hold. Then (3.36) holds as well and as observed earlier, it implies $\tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}^{(4)} \geq v_{i+1} \Delta_{i+1}^{(4)}$, i.e. (3.29) holds with i replaced by $i + 1$.

Next, consider the case $i + 1 \in I$. Then (3.23) and the inductive assumptions give

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}^{(4)} &= \tilde{a}_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(2)} + \tilde{b}_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(4)} \geq e^s \left(a_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^{(4)} \right) \\
&\geq e^s \left(a_{i+1} u_i \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} v_i \Delta_i^{(4)} \right) = e^s \left(a_{i+1} u_i \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} e^{s_i} u_i \Delta_i^{(4)} \right) \\
&\geq e^s u_i \left(a_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(2)} + b_{i+1} \Delta_i^{(4)} \right) = e^s u_i \Delta_{i+1}^{(4)} \\
&= e^{s-t_{i+1}} u_{i+1} \Delta_{i+1}^{(4)}. \tag{3.38}
\end{aligned}$$

In this case we just take $t_{i+1} < s/2$ so that (3.34) holds and set $s_{i+1} = s - t_{i+1} > s/2$ and $v_{i+1} = e^{s_{i+1}} u_{i+1}$. Then (3.29), (3.30) and (3.31) hold with i replaced by $i + 1$.

This completes the induction. ■

To finish with the proof of Theorem 1.1 we will use the fact that $z \in \Sigma_0$, the set defined by (2.6), and the number k with (2.4); see Sect. 2.3 above. We can assume that $m = km'$ for some $m' \geq 6$. Then, by Corollary 2.3, for $\ell = |I|$ we have $\ell \geq m/2 - k > m/3$. For $v \in E_0$ and $\tilde{v} \in F_0$ with $\|v\| = \|\tilde{v}\| = 1$, (3.19), (3.20), (3.29) and (3.31) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\tilde{v}) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \log \tilde{\Delta}_m^{(4)} \geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \log(e^{\ell s/2} \Delta_m^{(4)}) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \left(\frac{\ell s}{2} + \log \Delta_m^{(4)} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{s}{6} + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \log \Delta_m^{(4)} = \frac{s}{6} + \lambda(v). \end{aligned}$$

The above shows that we must have $\lambda_1 = \lambda(\tilde{v})$ for $\tilde{v} \in F_0$ and $\lambda_2 = \lambda(v)$ for $v \in E_0$ and also that $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. ■

References

- [Ar] Arnold, L.: Random Dynamical Systems. Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin (1998).
- [BCST] Bálint, P., Chernov, N., Szász, D., Tóth, I.P.: Geometry of multi-dimensional dispersing billiards. *Asterisque* **286** 119-150 (2003)
- [BP] Barreira, L., Pesin, Ya.: Lyapunov exponents and smooth ergodic theory. Univ. Lect. Series 23, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I. (2002)
- [Ber] Bernales, P. A. C. Invariant measures in symbolic dynamics : a topological, combinatorial and geometrical approach. HAL: <https://theses.hal.science>, 2020.
- [BL] Bouchaud, J.-P., Le Doussal, P.: Numerical study of a d -dimensional periodic Lorentz gas with universal properties. *J. Statist. Phys.* **41**, 225-248 (1985)
- [B] Bowen, R.: Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms. Lect. Notes in Maths. **470**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1975)
- [BPS] Barreira, L., Pesin, Ya., Sarig, O.: Smooth ergodic theory and nonuniformly hyperbolic dynamics. In: Handbook of Dynamical Systems; Vol. 1, No. PART B, Ch. 2 (2006)
- [Ch1] Chernov, N.: Structure of transversal leaves in multidimensional semidispersing billiards. *Funct. Anal. and Appl.* **16**, 35-46 (1982)
- [Ch2] Chernov, N.: A new proof of Sinai's formula for entropy of hyperbolic billiards. Its applications to Lorentz gas and stadium. *Funct. Anal. and Appl.* **25**, 204 - 219 (1991)
- [Ch3] Chernov, N.: Entropy, Lyapunov exponents, and Mean Free Path for Biliards. *J. Stat. Phys.* **88**, 1-29 (1997)
- [DP] Dellago, Ch., Posch, H.A.: Lyapunov spectrum and the conjugate pairing rule for a thermostatted random Lorentz gas: numerical simulations. *Phys. Rev. Lett* **78**, 211 (1997)
- [LBS] Latz, H., Van Beijeren, H., Dorfman, J.R.: Lyapunov spectrum and the conjugate pairing rule for a thermostatted random Lorentz gas: kinetic theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett* **78**, 207 (1997)
- [PP] Parry, W., Pollicott, M.: Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics. *Astérisque* **187-188**, (1990).
- [PS] Petkov, V., Stoyanov, L.: Geometry of the generalized geodesic flow and inverse spectral problems. 2nd edition. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester (2017)
- [PV] V. Petkov, P. Vogel: La représentation de l'application de Poincaré correspondant aux rayons périodiques réfléchissants. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. A* 296 (1983), 633-635.
- [Si1] Sinai, Ya.: Dynamical systems with elastic reflections. *Russian Math. Surveys* **25**, 137-190 (1970)
- [Si2] Sinai, Ya.: Development of Krylov's ideas. An addendum to: N.S.Krylov "Works on the foundations of statistical physics". Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, pp. 239-281 (1979)
- [V] Viana, M.: Lectures on Lyapunov exponents. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2014)