

Topological Pressure of Discontinuous Potentials and Variational Principle for Flows

Ruolan Xiong^{✉a}

^aCollege of Mathematics and Statistics, Chongqing University, Chongqing 401331, China

Abstract

Let X be a compact metric space and $\Phi = \{\varphi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a continuous flow on X . We introduce two types of topological pressure for family of discontinuous potentials $a = \{a_t\}_{t > 0}$. First, define the topological pressure of family of measurable potentials $a = \{a_t\}_{t > 0}$ on a subset Z for flow and proof its invariant principle. The second topological pressure is defined on a invariant subset having a nested family of subsets, we also proof its invariant principle.

Keywords: dynamical system, topological pressure, flow, discontinuous potential, variational principle

2020 MSC: 37D35, 26A18

1. Introduction

Topological pressure emerged in the 1970s as an extension of topological entropy, with the purpose of measuring the complexity of motion in dynamical systems. Different potentials have varying effects on the system's motion, which topological entropy fails to reflect. Therefore, topological pressure is defined to capture the relationship between the uncertainty in the system and the potentials.

The refined definition of topological pressure was initially formulated by David Ruelle, a prominent theoretical physicist and esteemed member of the French Academy of Sciences. Drawing inspiration from the contributions of Sinai and Bowen, Ruelle introduced the concept of topological pressure in 1973, building upon the notion of "pressure" within statistical mechanics. His definition pertained specifically to Z^ν -actions that adhere to expansivity and specification on a compact metric space. He proved the following equation:

$$P(\varphi) = \max_{\mu \in I} \{s(\mu) + \mu(\varphi)\},$$

which is the variational principle([21]). In 1984, Pesin and Pitskel further extended this condition, defining the topological pressure of continuous mappings on non-compact sets([17]). In the 1960s, the concept

of topological pressure for sequences of subadditive potentials already emerged([14]). In 1988, Falconer studied the topological pressure of sequences of subadditive potentials on mixed repellers and provided a variational principle under Lipschitz conditions and bounded variation([10]). Subsequently, there have been numerous related studies on the topological pressure of sequences of subadditive potentials([7, 12, 23, 9]). In 1996, Barreira further relaxed the subadditive condition and defined the topological pressure of sequence of potentials (not necessarily subadditive) on a subsets of compact metric space([5]). Over the years, the concept of topological pressure has evolved beyond just continuous mappings in discrete dynamical systems. The topological pressure and variational principles for families of continuous potentials $a = \{a_t\}_{t>0}$ have also emerged([4]). Similar to the concept of metric entropy, there is also topological entropy in dynamical systems, which originates from topological pressure and is related to measures([13, 24, 8]).

The above conclusions are all about continuous potentials. When the potential does not satisfy continuity, does topological pressure still exist? In 2006, Mummert first defined the topological pressure of a discontinuous map λ on a subset Λ of a compact metric space (X, T) ([16]). In Mummert's study, the set Λ is represented as the union of a nested sequence of sets: $\Lambda = \bigcup_{l \geq 1} \Lambda_l$. The potential only needs to be continuous on the closure of each subset, not necessarily on the entire set. Thus, the classical topological pressure $P_{\Lambda_l}(\varphi)$ can be defined on each subset Λ_l , and then taking the supremum over l , we obtain the topological pressure on the subset Λ : $P_{\Lambda}(\varphi) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{\Lambda_l}(\varphi)$. Subsequently, Ma Xianfeng et al. extended Mummert's conclusion from a single potential to a subadditive potential sequence([15]). In 2012, J. Barral and D. J. Feng studied the topological pressure of upper semi-continuous subadditive potentials([2]). In 2016, Feng and Huang gave the definition of weighted topological pressure for upper semi-continuous entropy maps, along with a variational principle([11]). In 2017, Marc Rauch directly defined the topological pressure of measurable potentials in compact metric spaces using the Caratheodory structure theory and proved the variational principle([19]). In subsequent research, he also introduced the topological pressure and variational principle for subadditive potential sequences([20]). Additionally, topological pressure can be defined for systems with discontinuous semi-flow([1]).

There have been some results for the topological pressure of discontinuous potentials in discrete dynamical systems, but in continuous dynamical systems it remains to be studied. This paper provides two definitions of the topological pressure of discontinuous potentials with respect to the flow and introduces the corresponding variational principles for each.

First, the topological pressure of family of measurable potentials on a subset is introduced. In a continuous dynamical system (X, Φ) , given a nonempty subset $\emptyset \neq Z \subseteq X$, take the real numbers $\epsilon > 0, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. We define the topological pressure of the family of potential a on the set Z as :

$$P_Z(a) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P_Z(a, \epsilon) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = 0\},$$

where

$$M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T),$$

$$M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T) = \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t),$$

the lower bound is taken from all countably open covers $\Gamma \subseteq X \times [T, +\infty)$ that cover Z and $a(x, t, \epsilon) = \sup\{a_i(y) : y \in B_t(x, \epsilon)\}$. In the third part we can see that such definition is well-defined, stemming from the Caratheodory dimension theory of Pesin([18]). Then we have the first main conclusion of this article.

Theorem 1.1: Let (X, Φ) be a DTS without fixed point and $\mathcal{G}(a, \lambda) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{E}_\Phi(X) \cap \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X) : \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} a_t(x) = \lambda(\mu) \text{ for } \mu\text{-almost } x \in X\}$. For each subset $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{G}(a, \lambda)$ one has

$$P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) = \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

In particular, one can choose for each $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$ a Borel set $B_\mu \subseteq A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mu(B_\mu) = 1$, and $P_B(a) = \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{Y}\}$.

For the second definition, consider a Φ -invariational subset $Z \subseteq X$. Z consists of a nested subset of $\{Z_l\}_{l \geq 1}$, i.e.: $Z = \bigcup_{l \geq 1} Z_l$ and $Z_l \subseteq Z_{l+1}$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We require that a be continuous on the closure of each subset Z_l , but not necessarily on Z . The topological pressure of a on Z with respect to the flow Φ is defined as:

$$P_Z(a) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{Z_l}(a)$$

where $P_{Z_l}(a)$ is the classical topological pressure of a on Z_l . Since a is continuous on the closure of every subset Z_l , $P_{Z_l}(a)$ is well-defined. Then we have the second main conclusion of this article.

Theorem 1.2: Let a be a family of functions $\{a_t\}_{t > 0}$ with tempered variation such that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|a_t\|_\infty < +\infty$ for all $T > 0$. Let $Z = \bigcup_{l \geq 1} Z_l \subseteq X$ be a Borel Φ -invariant set and a is continuous with respect to the family of subsets $\{Z_l\}$. If there exists a continuous function $b : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$a_{t+s} - a_t \circ \varphi(x) \rightarrow \int_0^s (b \circ \varphi_u) du \tag{1.1}$$

uniformly on Z when $t \rightarrow +\infty$ for some $s > 0$, then

$$P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) = \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu : \mu \in M_Z\}.$$

Although the above two topological pressures are defined using different methods, they both reflect the relationship between the potentials and the complexity of the system's motion on a subset of a continuous dynamical system.

2. Preliminaries

Let (X, \mathcal{B}) be a measurable space and $\Phi = (\varphi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a continuous flow on X . This is, a family of homeomorphisms $\varphi_t : X \rightarrow X$ such that $\varphi_0 = id$ and $\varphi_t \circ \varphi_s = \varphi_{t+s}$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.1: A measure μ on (X, \mathcal{B}) is said to be Φ -invariant, if $\mu(\varphi_t^{-1}B) = \mu(B)$ for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. A set $Z \subseteq X$ is called Φ -invariant, if $\varphi^{-1}(Z) = Z$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. A measure μ on (X, \mathcal{B}) is said to be ergodic for the flow if every Borel Φ -invariant set $B \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies $\mu(B) = 0$ or $\mu(B) = 1$.

The set of all Φ -invariant probability measures on (X, \mathcal{B}) is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$, and the set of the ergodic probability measures is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_\Phi(X)$. For each measurable subset $Z \subseteq X$, we define $\mathcal{M}_\Phi(Z) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X) : \mu(Z) = 1\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_\Phi(Z) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{E}_\Phi(X) : \mu(Z) > 0\}$. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$, the quantity $h_\mu(\Phi) := h_\mu(\varphi_1)$.

Let (X, d) be a compact metric space. Given $x \in X$ and $t, \epsilon > 0$, we consider the set

$$B_t(x, \epsilon) = \{y \in X : d(\varphi_s(x), \varphi_s(y)) < \epsilon, s \in [0, t]\}.$$

We call $\mathcal{U} \subseteq 2^X$ to be a finite open cover of X if $\#\mu < \infty$ and $X \subseteq \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U$, where every $U \in \mathcal{U}$ is open.

Given $x \in X$ and $t > 0$, define the probability measures

$$\delta_{x,t} = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \delta_{\varphi_s(x)} ds.$$

where δ_y is the probability measure concentrated on $\{y\}$. Denote by $V_\Phi(x) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$ the set of all Φ -invariant sublimits of $\{\delta_{x,t}\}_{t>0}$ in the weak*-topology. We can proof that $V_\Phi(x) \neq \emptyset$ for every $x \in X$, and the $V_\Phi(x)$ is a compact metrizable space. The set $Z_\mu := \{x \in X : \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{x,t} = \mu\}$ is called the set of generic points of μ . Note that $\mu(Z_\mu) = 1$ if μ is ergodic.

Given $\epsilon > 0$, we say that a set $\Gamma \subseteq X \times \mathbb{R}_0^+$ covers a subset $Z \subseteq X$ if $Z \subseteq \bigcup_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} B_t(x, \epsilon)$. Let $\mathcal{G}_Z(\epsilon, T)$ be the set of all Γ satisfying $t \geq T$. Let $a = \{a_t\}_{t>0}$ be a family of function $: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with tempered variation, that is, such that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \epsilon)}{t} = 0$ where

$$\gamma_t(a, \epsilon) = \sup\{|a_t(y) - a_t(z)| : y, z \in B_t(x, \epsilon) \text{ for some } x \in X\}.$$

We write $a(x, t, \epsilon) = \sup\{a_t(y) : y \in B_t(x, \epsilon)\}$ for $(x, t) \in \Gamma$.

Definition 2.2: Fix $\emptyset \neq Z \subseteq X$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, Let

$$M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T) = \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t).$$

with the infimum taken over all countable sets $\Gamma \subseteq X \times [T, +\infty)$ covering Z . And let

$$M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T).$$

Clearly, $M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T)$ increases as T increases. We have that

$$M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = \sup_T M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T).$$

Lemma 2.3: Let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Z \subseteq X$. If $M(Z, a, \beta, \epsilon) < \infty$, then $M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = 0$ for all $\alpha > \beta$ and $T > 0$.

Proof. The case $Z = \emptyset$ is clear. Choose some $A \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $M(Z, a, \beta, \epsilon) < A$. Then $M(Z, a, \beta, \epsilon, T) < A$ for all $T > 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t) \\ &= \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \beta t) \exp(t(\beta - \alpha)) \\ &\leq A(\exp(\beta - \alpha))^T \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$. The statement is proved. □

By Lemma 2.3, the following quantity is well defined:

$$P_Z(a, \epsilon) = \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = 0\}.$$

For $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$, and $T > 0$, $B_t(x, \epsilon') \subseteq B_t(x, \epsilon)$, if $Z \subseteq \bigcup_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} B_t(x, \epsilon')$ one has $Z \subseteq \bigcup_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} B_t(x, \epsilon)$. This shows that $\mathcal{G}_z(\epsilon', T) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_z(\epsilon, T)$. Hence the following limit is also well-defined:

$$P_Z(a) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P_Z(a, \epsilon) = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} P_Z(a, \epsilon).$$

Definition 2.4: The quantity $P_Z(a)$ is called topological pressure of a on Z with respect to Φ .

For $Z = \emptyset$, we emphasize that $P_\emptyset(a) = -\infty$ for each potential a . This follows from $M(\emptyset, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T) = 0$ for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $T > 0$. Thus $P_\emptyset(a) \neq -\infty$ implies $Z \neq \emptyset$.

Next we introduce some properties of topological pressure.

Lemma 2.5: For $\epsilon > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $T > 0$, and $Y \subseteq Z \subseteq X$, The following inequalities hold:

$$M(Y, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T) \leq M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T).$$

In particular,

$$P_Y(a, \epsilon) \leq P_Z(a, \epsilon)$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$, and then

$$P_Y(a) \leq P_Z(a).$$

Proof. For a cover $\Gamma \subseteq X \times \mathbb{R}_0^+$, if Γ covers Z , then it can cover Y . Hence $M(Y, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T) \leq M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon, T)$ and then $P_Y(a, \epsilon) \leq P_Z(a, \epsilon)$, $P_Y(a) \leq P_Z(a)$. \square

Lemma 2.6: Given a set $Z \subseteq X$, suppose $Z = \bigcup_{i \in I} Z_i$, where $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $Z_i \subseteq X$ for all $i \in I$. then

$$P_Z(a) = \sup_{i \in I} P_{Z_i}(a).$$

Proof. Since $Z_i \subseteq Z$, we have $P_{Z_i}(a) \leq P_Z(a)$ for each $i \in I$ and so

$$P_Z(a) \leq \sup_{i \in I} P_{Z_i}(a).$$

Take $\alpha > \sup_{i \in I} P_{Z_i}(a, \epsilon)$. Then $M(Z_i, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = 0$ for each i . Hence given $\delta > 0$ and $T > 0$, for each i there exists $\Gamma_i \subseteq X \times [T, +\infty)$ covering Z_i such that

$$\sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma_i} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t) < \frac{\delta}{2^i}.$$

Then $\Gamma \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} \Gamma_i$ covers Z and

$$\sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x,t,\varepsilon) - \alpha t) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma_i} \exp(a(x,t,\varepsilon) - \alpha t) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\delta}{2^i} \leq \delta.$$

This gives $M(Z, a, \alpha, \varepsilon) \leq \delta$ and then $M(Z, a, \alpha, \varepsilon) = 0$ since the arbitrariness of δ . Therefore, $\alpha \geq P_Z(a, \varepsilon)$ and letting $\alpha \rightarrow \sup_{i \in I} P_{Z_i}(a, \varepsilon)$ gives

$$\sup_{i \in I} P_{Z_i}(a, \varepsilon) \geq P_Z(a, \varepsilon).$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have that $\sup_{i \in I} P_{Z_i}(a) \geq P_Z(a)$. Hence

$$P_Z(a) = \sup_{i \in I} P_{Z_i}(a).$$

□

3. Variational principle

In this section, we will introduce the variational principle of above topological pressure.

Definition 3.1: A mapping $\lambda : \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X) \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is called Lyapunov exponent.

The corresponding set $\mathcal{A}(\lambda) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X) : h_\mu(\Phi) < \infty \text{ or } \lambda(\mu) > -\infty\}$ is called the set of all allowed Φ -invariant measures with respected to λ . This means that for measures $\mu \in \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ the quantity $h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu)$ is well-defined. Fix some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$, a point $x \in X$ such that $\mu \in V_\Phi(x)$ is called allowed point with respected to λ , a and μ if

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_s} a_{t_s}(x) \leq \lambda(\mu) \quad (3.1)$$

for all sub-family $(t_s)_{s>0}$ which satisfies $\delta_{x,t_s} \rightarrow \mu$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$. The set of all those points x is denoted by $A(a, \lambda, \mu)$. For a subset $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$, denote in addition

$$A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) := \bigcup_{\mu \in \mathcal{Y}} A(a, \lambda, \mu)$$

and

$$V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) := \bigcap_{\mu \in \mathcal{Y}} V(a, \lambda, \mu).$$

Note that $A(a, \lambda, \mu)$ can be empty in the case of $\mu \notin V_\Phi(x)$ for each $x \in X$.

Proposition 3.2: Let $f : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ be upper semi-continuous, $\lambda(\mu) := \int_X f d\mu$ and $a_t := \int_0^t f \circ \varphi_s ds$. Then one has

$$A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) = \{x \in X : V_\Phi(x) \cap \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset\},$$

$$V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) = \{x \in X : \mathcal{Y} \subseteq V_\Phi(x)\}.$$

That is both sets are independent of f .

Proof. Let $x \in X$ and $\mu \in V_\Phi(x) \cap \mathcal{Y}$. If $(t_s)_{s>0}$ is any sub-family such that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{x,t_s} = \mu$. Then

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_s} a_{t_s}(x) = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_s} \int_0^{t_s} f(\varphi_s(x)) ds = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f d\delta_{x,t_s} \leq \int_X f d\mu$$

as f is upper semi-continuous (lemma A.2(d) in [20]). Thus $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mu)$ and $\{x \in X : V_\Phi(x) \cap \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$. If $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$, then there exists a $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mu)$. By definition this means $V_\Phi(x) \cap \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset$, and hence $A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \{x \in X : V_\Phi(x) \cap \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset\}$. Let $x \in V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$, then for every $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mu)$, $\mu \in V_\Phi(x)$ and then $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq V_\Phi(x)$. We have $V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \{x \in X : \mathcal{Y} \subseteq V_\Phi(x)\}$. On the other hand, for $x \in \{x \in X : \mathcal{Y} \subseteq V_\Phi(x)\}$, one has $\mu \in V_\Phi(x)$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then there exists a subsequence $(t_l)_{l>0}$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_l} \delta_{x,t_l} = \mu$. Similarly,

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_s} a_{t_s}(x) \leq \int_x f d\mu = \lambda(\mu).$$

Hence $x \in V(a, \lambda, \mu)$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$ and then $x \in V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$, so $V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \{x \in X : \mathcal{Y} \subseteq V_\Phi(x)\}$. The statement for $V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$ holds. \square

Let $\sup \emptyset : -\infty$, then for each $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$, the quantities

$$P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) := \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{Y}\}$$

and

$$Q_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) := \inf\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{Y}\}$$

are well-defined and called upper variational pressure and lower variational pressure of λ over \mathcal{Y} respectively.

Theorem 3.3: Let λ be a Lyapunov exponent. If $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$, then one has

$$P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) \leq \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{Y}\}, \quad (3.2)$$

$$P_{V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) \leq \inf\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{Y}\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. In case the $P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) = \infty$ we are done, now we assume $P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) < \infty$. This implies $0 \leq h_\mu(\Phi) < \infty$ and $\lambda(\mu) < \infty$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$. Thus we can divide \mathcal{Y} into two parts:

$$\mathcal{Y}_{-\infty} := \{\mu \in \mathcal{Y} : \lambda = -\infty\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y}' := \{\mu \in \mathcal{Y} : \lambda > -\infty\}.$$

As a result we obtain by lemma 2.6 and $A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) = A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty}) \cup A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}')$

$$P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) = \max\{P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty})}(a), P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}')} (a)\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Now suppose we have already shown (3.2) for each $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ such that $-\infty < \lambda(\mu) < \infty$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$. Define a sequence of Lyapunov exponents $\lambda_N(\mu) := -h_\mu(\Phi) - N$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$. As the entropies are finite for all $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty}$, one has $-\infty < \lambda_N(\mu) < \infty$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition

$$A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty}) \subseteq A(a, \lambda_N, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty})$$

holds for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus by using lemma 2.5 and (3.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty})}(a) &\leq P_{A(a, \lambda_N, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty})}(a) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}_{-\infty}}(\lambda_N) \\ &= \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) - h_\mu(\Phi) - N : \mu \in \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty}\} \\ &\leq -N. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $\mathcal{Y}_{-\infty} = \emptyset$, we already have

$$P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty})}(a) = P_{\mathcal{Y}_{-\infty}}(\lambda_N) = -\infty.$$

otherwise letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}_{-\infty})}(a) = -\infty.$$

And by (3.4) we end at

$$P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) = P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}')} (a) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}'}(\lambda) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda).$$

Hence it remains to show (3.2) for all subsets $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ satisfying $h_\mu(\Phi) < \infty$ and $-\infty < \lambda(\mu) < \infty$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$. Now pick such a set \mathcal{Y} and suppose $P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) = -\infty$. This implies $\mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$; Otherwise a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$ exists such that $P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) \neq h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) > -\infty$, which is a contradiction. This means $A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) = \emptyset$. Thus $P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) = P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) = -\infty$. Therefore, without restriction we may assume

$$-\infty < P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) < \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

To proceed we need some technical lemmas.

Lemma 3.4: Let E be a finite set, given $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q) \in E^q$. Define the probability measure ν_α as

$$\nu_\alpha(e) = \frac{1}{q} \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : a_j = e\}$$

for every $e \in E$, and set the entropy of α to

$$H(\alpha) := - \sum_{e \in E} \nu_\alpha(e) \log \nu_\alpha(e).$$

Then for $h \neq 0$, one has

$$\limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{q} \log \#\{\alpha \in E^q : H(\alpha) \leq h\} \leq h.$$

For a proof of this lemma, see lemma 2.16 in [6]

Lemma 3.5: Let $x \in X$, and $\mu \in V_\Phi(X)$ such that x is allowed with respected to λ , a , and μ . Let $\delta > 0$ and $\Gamma \subseteq X \times \{1\}$ be a finite cover of X . For the open cover $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_r\}$ of X , where $V_j = B_1(x_j, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$ with $(x_j, 1) \in \Gamma$, there exists $m, p \in \mathbb{N}$ with p arbitrary large, and a sequence $U = V_{i_1} V_{i_2} \dots V_{i_p}$ such that

(a): $x \in \bigcap_{r=1}^p \varphi_{-r+1}(V_{i_r})$.

(b): There exists a subset $V \in (V^m)^k$ of U of length $km \geq p - m$ satisfying inequality

$$H(V) \leq m(h_\mu(\Phi) + \delta).$$

(c): $a_p(x) \leq p(\lambda(\mu) + 3\delta)$.

Proof. (a) and (b) are the statements of [4]. The statement (c) can be proven like lemma 4.7 (3) in [20], one can constructs an increasing sub-family $(t'_j)_{j \in \mathbb{R}}$ and corresponding vectors $\{V_{i_j}\}_{j=1}^p$ such that conditions (a)

and (b) are satisfied, and $\delta_{x,t'_j} \rightarrow \mu$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then by (3.1) one has

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t'_j} a_{t'_j}(x) \leq \lambda(\mu).$$

Thus there is an $j_0 \geq 0$ such that $a_{t'_j}(x) \leq t'_j(\lambda(\mu) + \delta)$ for all $j \leq j_0$. Hence for each $j \geq 0$ the number $p := [t'_{j+j_0}] + 1$ together with $v_{i_{j+j_0}}$ satisfies all the three conditions. \square

Continuing the proof. The first goal is to cover $A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$ with countable many suitable subsets. we fix $\delta > 0$ and a finite open cover \mathcal{U} of X such as lemma 3.5. In addition fix for each $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$ a measure $\mu_x \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mu_x)$. Choose some $u_1, u_2, \dots \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a u_i satisfying $|u_i - z| < \delta$. Now denote for $m, i \geq 1$ by $Z_{m,i}$ the set of points $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$, which meet the following criteria:

- the measure μ_x fulfills $\lambda(\mu_x) \in [u_i - \delta, u_i + \delta]$.
- All three properties in lemma 4.5 are satisfied by u_x, δ, \mathcal{U} and m .

As $\{u_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is δ -dense in \mathbb{R} and by (3.5) one has $\lambda(\mu_x) \in \mathbb{R}$, lemma 3.5 ensures for every $x \in A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$ the existence of some corresponding $m, i \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence we obtain

$$A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} Z_{m,i}.$$

For simplicity we may assume that all $Z_{m,i}$ are nonempty, else they can be called out of the union.

Now fix $Z_{m,i} \neq \emptyset$ and denote for each $q \geq 1$

$$R_q := \{V \in (\mathcal{U}^m)^q : H(V) \leq m(P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 2\delta)\} \quad (3.6)$$

Pick some $x \in Z_{m,i}$, then by lemma 4.5 one can find arbitrary large $N \geq 1$ and corresponding $q \leq \frac{N}{m}$, $U \in \mathcal{U}^N$, $V \in (\mathcal{U}^m)^q$ satisfying

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{m} H(V) \leq h_{\mu_x}(\Phi) + \delta \leq h_{\mu_x}(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu_x) - u_i + 2\delta \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 2\delta.$$

This means $V \in R_q$ and especially

$$0 \leq m(P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 2\delta) \quad (3.7)$$

Applying lemma 3.4 to (3.6) and (3.7), there exists a $q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{q} \log(\#R_q) \leq m(P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 3\delta)$$

for all $q \geq q_0$. Fix $N \geq N_0 := q_0 m$, count all vectors U which can appear in the above situation for any $x \in Z_{m,i}$, and denote that number by b_N , namely,

$$b_N = \# \bigcup_{x \in Z_{m,i}} \{U \in \mathcal{U}^N : U \text{ satisfies (a) (b) and (c)}\}.$$

Hence, as $q \geq q_0$:

$$b_N \leq (\#\mathcal{U})^m (\#R_q) \leq (\#\mathcal{U})^m \exp(qm(P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 3\delta)).$$

This means, as $N = qm + r$ for some corresponding $0 \leq r \leq m$,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log b_N \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (m \log(\#\mathcal{U}) + qm(P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 3\delta)) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 3\delta.$$

As a result there exists some $N_1 \geq N_0$ such that

$$b_N \leq \exp(N(P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) - u_i + 4\delta)) \quad (3.8)$$

for all $N \geq N_1$.

For each $l \geq N_1$ we define the collection Γ_l containing all $U \in \bigcup_{N \geq l} \mathcal{U}^N$ which satisfying the properties of lemma 3.5 for some $x \in Z_{m,i}$. This is a cover of $Z_{m,i}$, denote as Γ'_l . Note that by lemma 3.5 for each $U \in \Gamma_l$ one has

$$a_{N'}(x) \leq N'(u_i + 3\delta) \quad (3.9)$$

where $N' = m(U)$ and $m(U)$ is the number of elements in U . Hence we can estimate for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $l \geq N_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} M(Z_{m,i}, a, \alpha, \delta, l) &\leq \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma'_l} \exp(-\alpha t + t(u_i + 3\delta)) \\ &\leq \sum_{N=l}^{\infty} b_N \exp(-\alpha N + N(u_i + 3\delta)) \\ &\leq \sum_{N=l}^{\infty} (\exp(-\alpha + P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) + 7\delta))^N \end{aligned}$$

Here the last step we used the estimate (4.8). Now for every $\alpha > P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) + 7\delta$, we obtain

$$\beta := \exp(-\alpha + P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) + 7\delta) < 1$$

and hence

$$M(Z_{m,i}, a, \alpha, \delta) \leq \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{N=l}^{\infty} \beta^N = 0.$$

This means $P_{Z_{m,i}}(a, \delta) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) + 7\delta$ for fixed $Z_{m,i}$. To finish the proof we take the supreme for over all m, i and apply that $A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} Z_{m,i}$ together with lemma 3.5:

$$P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a, \delta) = \sup_{m,i} P_{Z_{m,i}}(a, \delta) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) + 7\delta.$$

Finally Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ results $P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda)$

For the second statement, fix $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$. As $V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq A(a, \lambda, \mu)$, one has by lemma 3.4 and (3.2)

$$P_{V(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) \leq P_{A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})}(a) \leq h_{\mu}(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu).$$

Taking the infimum over all $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$, yields the result. \square

Theorem 3.6: Let (X, Φ) be a compact metric space without fixed points. Fix $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_{\Phi}(X)$ and let $(a_t)_{t>0}$ be a Borel measurable potential on (X, Φ) . Suppose there exists a constant $b \in [-\infty, +\infty]$ and a Borel set $B \subseteq X$ satisfying $\mu(B) > 0$, such that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} a_t(x) \leq b \quad (3.10)$$

for each $x \in B$. Then if $h_{\mu}(\Phi) + b$ is well-defined, one has

$$P_B(a) \geq h_{\mu}(\Phi) + b.$$

Proof. we need following lemma.

Lemma 3.7[22]: Let (X, Φ) be a compact metric space without fixed points. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_{\Phi}(X)$ and define $h_{\mu}(x, \epsilon, t) := -\frac{1}{t} \log \mu(B_t(x, \epsilon))$. Then one has

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_{\mu}(x, \epsilon, t) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_{\mu}(x, \epsilon, t) = h_{\mu}(\Phi) \quad (3.11)$$

for μ -almost $x \in X$.

Let $G \subseteq B$ such that (3.11) holds for each $x \in G$. Note that $\mu(G) > 0$. Assume first $h_{\mu}(\Phi) + b$ is finite. Let $\epsilon > \epsilon' > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. Define the Borel sets

$$G^{\delta, \epsilon} := \{x \in G : \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_{\mu}(x, \epsilon, t) > h_{\mu}(\Phi) - \delta\}.$$

then $G^{\delta, \epsilon} \subseteq G^{\delta, \epsilon'}$ and $G = \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} G^{\delta, \epsilon}$, hence: $0 < \mu(G) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu(G^{\delta, \frac{1}{m}})$. This shows that there is an $\epsilon_{\delta} > 0$ such that $0 < \mu(G^{\delta, \epsilon_{\delta}}) \leq \mu(G^{\delta, \epsilon})$ for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_{\delta}$. For each $x \in G^{\delta, \epsilon_{\delta}}$ there exists a minimal $T(\delta, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that:

$$\exp(-t(h_{\mu}(\Phi) - \delta)) \geq \mu(B_t(x, \epsilon_{\delta})), \quad (3.12)$$

$$\frac{1}{t}a_t(x) \geq b - \delta. \quad (3.13)$$

for all $t \geq T(\delta, x)$. Define for each $T > 0$ the Borel sets:

$$G^{\delta, \epsilon_\delta, T} := \{x \in G^{\delta, \epsilon_\delta} : x \text{ satisfies (3.12) and (3.13) for all } t \geq T\}.$$

There exists an $M(\delta) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $0 < \mu(G^{\delta, \epsilon_\delta, M(\delta)}) \leq \mu(G^{\delta, \epsilon_\delta, M})$ for all $M \geq M(\delta)$. Now define $A_\delta := G^{\delta, \epsilon_\delta, M(\delta)}$. If $\Gamma = \{(x_l, t_l)\}_{l \in L}$ is an cover of A_δ such that $t_l \geq M$, then $\Gamma^* := \{(x_l, t_l)\}_{l \in L'}$ is also an cover of A_δ , where $L' := \{l \in L : B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta \neq \emptyset\}$, and $B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta \subseteq B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon)$. Fix $0 < \epsilon < \frac{\epsilon_\delta}{2}$ and $M \geq M(\delta)$. Fix $y_l \in B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta$ and let $x \in B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta$. Then $d(\varphi_t(y_l), \varphi_t(x)) \leq d(\varphi_t(y_l), \varphi_t(x_l)) + d(\varphi_t(x_l), \varphi_t(x)) \leq 2\epsilon < \epsilon_\delta$ for all $0 \leq t \leq t_l$. Thus $B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta \subseteq B_{t_l}(y_l, \epsilon_\delta)$ for all $l \in L'$. Hence, as $y_l \in A_\delta$ for all $l \in L'$

$$\exp(-t_l(h_\mu(\Phi) - \delta)) \geq \mu(B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta). \quad (3.14)$$

In addition, one has by (3.13)

$$a_{t_l}(B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta) = \sup_{x \in B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta} a_{t_l}(x) \geq t_l(b - \delta). \quad (3.15)$$

Hence, setting $\alpha_\delta := h_\mu(\Phi) + b - 2\delta$, one has using (3.14) and (3.15)

$$\exp(-t_l \alpha_\delta + a_{t_l}(B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta)) \geq \mu(B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta)$$

for all $l \in L'$. Thus, for each cover $\Gamma = \{(x_l, t_l)\}_{l \in L}$ of A_δ that $t_l \geq M$, where $0 < \delta < \frac{\epsilon_\delta}{2}$ and $M \geq M(\delta)$.

There is the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(-\alpha_\delta t + a_t(B_t(x, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta)) &\geq \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma^*} \exp(-\alpha_\delta t + a_t(B_t(x, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta)) \\ &\geq \sum_{l \in L'} \mu(B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta) \\ &\geq \mu\left(\bigcup_{l \in L'} B_{t_l}(x_l, \epsilon) \cap A_\delta\right) \\ &= \mu(A_\delta). \end{aligned}$$

This shows $M(A_\delta, a, \epsilon, \alpha_\delta) \geq \mu(A_\delta) > 0$, and hence by lemma 2.5 and lemma 2.3

$$P_B(a, \epsilon) \geq P_{A_\delta}(a, \epsilon) \geq \alpha_\delta = h_\mu(\Phi) + b - 2\delta$$

for all $0 < \epsilon < \frac{\epsilon_\delta}{2}$. Now letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$ shows that $P_B(\Phi) \geq h_\mu(\Phi) + b$, if $h_\mu(\Phi)$ is finite.

If $b = \infty$, replace (3.13) by $\frac{1}{t}a_t(x) \geq \frac{1}{\delta}$ and if $h_\mu(\Phi) = \infty$, replace (3.12) by $\exp(-\frac{t}{\delta}) \geq \mu(B_t(x, \epsilon))$ and set $G^{\delta, \epsilon} := \{x \in G : \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_\mu(x, \epsilon, t) > \frac{1}{\delta}\}$. Then the proof works in the same way. \square

Next we proof the theorem 1.1.

Proof. By theorem 3.3, $P_{A(a,\lambda,\mathcal{Y})}(a) \leq P_{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda)$. For each $\mu \in \mathcal{Y}$, there is a Borel set $B_\mu \subseteq Z_\mu = \{x \in X : \delta_{t,x} \rightarrow \mu\}$ such that $\mu(B_\mu) = 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} a_t(x) = \lambda(\mu)$ for all $x \in B_\mu$. Hence $B_\mu \subseteq A(a, \lambda, \mu) \subseteq A(a, \lambda, \mathcal{Y})$, and this shows by theorem 3.6 and lemma 2.6 that

$$h_\mu(\Phi) + \lambda(\mu) = P_{\{\mu\}}(\lambda) \leq P_{B_\mu}(a) \leq P_{A(a,\lambda,\mathcal{Y})}(a).$$

Taking the supremum on the left side yields the result. \square

4. Topological pressure based on nested set strings

In this section we will introduce other definition of topology pressure for discontinuous potential $(a_t)_{t>0}$. Before that, let's review the definition of topological pressure for continuous potentials on compact metric space (X, Φ) .

Let Φ be a continuous flow on (X, d) and $a = (a_t)_{t>0}$ be a family of continuous function $a_t: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with tempered variation. Given $\epsilon > 0$, for each $Z \subseteq X$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t) \quad (4.1)$$

with the infimum taken over all countable sets $\Gamma \subseteq X \times [T, +\infty)$ covering Z . and let

$$\underline{M}(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t) \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\overline{M}(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t) \quad (4.3)$$

with the infimum taken over all countable sets $\Gamma \subseteq X \times \{T\}$ covering Z . When α does from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$, the above quantities (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3) jump from $+\infty$ to 0 at unique values and so one can define

$$P_Z(a, \epsilon) = \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = 0\},$$

$$\underline{P}_Z(a, \epsilon) = \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \underline{M}(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = 0\},$$

$$\overline{P}_Z(a, \epsilon) = \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \overline{M}(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) = 0\}.$$

Theorem 4.1: For any family of continuous functions a with tempered variation and any set $Z \subseteq X$, the limits

$$P_Z(a) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P_Z(a, \epsilon), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\underline{P}_Z(a) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \underline{P}_Z(a, \epsilon)$$

and

$$\overline{P}_Z(a) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{P}_Z(a, \epsilon)$$

exists.

Proof. Take $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$ and $\Gamma \subseteq X \times \mathbb{R}_0^+$ with $Z \subseteq \bigcup_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} B_t(x, \delta)$. Since $B_t(x, \delta) \subseteq B_t(x, \epsilon)$, one has $Z \subseteq \bigcup_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} B_t(x, \epsilon)$. Let

$$\gamma(\epsilon) = \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \epsilon)}{t}.$$

Given $\eta > 0$, $Z \in B_t(x, \epsilon)$, we have

$$a_t(y) - a_t(z) \leq |a_t(y) - a_t(z)| \leq \gamma_t(a, \epsilon) \leq t(\gamma(\epsilon) + \eta)$$

for any large t . Thus,

$$a_t(y) \leq \sup_{(x,y) \in B_t(x, \delta)} [a_t(z) + t(\gamma(\epsilon) + \eta)] \leq a(x, t, \delta) + t(\gamma(\epsilon) + \eta).$$

and

$$a(x, t, \epsilon) \leq a(x, t, \delta) + t(\gamma(\epsilon) + \eta)$$

for any large t . Therefore,

$$M(Z, a, \alpha, \epsilon) \leq M(Z, a, \alpha - \gamma(\epsilon) - t, \delta),$$

and so

$$P_z(a, \epsilon) \leq \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : M(Z, a, \alpha - \gamma(\epsilon) - t, \delta) = 0\} = P_z(a, \delta) + \gamma(\epsilon) + \eta.$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we have

$$P_Z(a, \epsilon) - \gamma(\epsilon) - \eta \leq \underline{\lim}_{\delta \rightarrow 0} P_Z(a, \delta).$$

Since a is tempered variational we have $\gamma(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, which together with the arbitrariness of η yields the inequality

$$\overline{\lim}_{\delta \rightarrow 0} P_Z(a, \epsilon) \leq \underline{\lim}_{\delta \rightarrow 0} P_Z(a, \delta).$$

This shows that $P_Z(a)$ is well-defined. The existence of the other two limits can be established in a similar way. \square

The number $P_Z(a)$ is called non-additive topological pressure of the family a on Z , while $\underline{P}_Z(a)$ and $\overline{P}_Z(a)$ are called: respectively, the non-additive lower and upper capacity topological pressure of a on Z . Clearly:

$$P_Z(a) \leq \underline{P}_Z(a) \leq \overline{P}_Z(a).$$

If $Z_1 \subseteq Z_2$, then: $P_{Z_1}(a) \leq P_{Z_2}(a)$, $\overline{P}_{Z_1}(a) \leq \overline{P}_{Z_2}(a)$, $\underline{P}_{Z_1}(a) \leq \underline{P}_{Z_2}(a)$

Next we introduce the topological pressure of discontinuous potentials.

Let X be a compact metric space, and $\Phi : X \rightarrow X$ a continuous flow. Consider any Φ -invariant subset $Z \subseteq X$ possessing a nested family of subsets $\{Z_l\}_{l \geq 1}$. The Z and the Z_l are not required to be compact; the Z_l are not required to be Φ -invariant. Consider a family of measurable functions $a = (a_t)_{t > 0} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we say that a is continuous with respect to the family of subsets $\{Z_l\}$ if a_t is continuous on the closure of each Z_l for all $t > 0$. The potential function a is not necessarily continuous on Z . we define the topological pressure of a on Z , with respect to Φ as:

$$P_Z(a) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{Z_l}(a),$$

where $P_{Z_l}(a)$ is the topological pressure of a on Z_l as defined above. We show that the topological pressure does not depend on the choice of the family of sets $\{Z_l\}$.

Theorem 4.2: Assume that an Φ -invariant subset $Z \subseteq X$ has two nested families of subsets $\{A_l\}$ and $\{B_l\}$ which exhaust Z , let $\{a_t : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{t > 0}$ be continuous with respect to both $\{A_l\}$ and $\{B_l\}$. Then

$$P_Z(a) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{A_l}(a) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{B_l}(a).$$

Proof. Set $P'_Z(a) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{A_l}(a)$, and $P''_Z(a) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{B_l}(a)$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an n such that $P_{A_n}(a) \geq P'_Z(a) - \epsilon$, as the B_l exhaust Z , we can write $A_n = \bigcup_{m \geq 1} (A_n \cap B_m)$. As a is continuous on the closure of A_n and each B_m , we have

$$P_{A_n}(a) = \sup_{m \geq 1} P_{A_n \cap B_m}(a) \leq \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{B_m}(a) = P''_Z(a).$$

Thus $P''_Z(a) \geq P'_Z(a) - \epsilon$ for every ϵ . Reversing the roles of $P'_Z(a)$ and $P''_Z(a)$ gives the result. \square

We continue to assume that Φ is a continuous flow on a compact metric space X . Let $\mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$ be the set of Φ -invariant probability measures on X and $\mathcal{E}_\Phi(X)$ be the set of ergodic probability measures on x . Given a Borel Φ -invariant set $Z \subseteq X$, For convenience, let $\mathcal{M}_Z := \mathcal{M}_\Phi(Z)$. Given $x \in X$ and $t > 0$, consider the Borel Φ -invariant set

$$\mathcal{L}(Z) = \{x \in Z : V_\Phi(x) \cap \mathcal{M}_Z \neq \emptyset\}$$

and

$$Z_\mu = \{x \in Z : V_\Phi(x) = \{\mu\}\}.$$

For each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\Phi(X)$, let $h_\mu(\Phi) = h_\mu(\varphi_1)$.

Now we proof theorem 1.2.

Proof. We will divide the proof process into three steps.

Step 1:Some auxiliary content.

Take $x \in \mathcal{L}(Z)$ and $\mu \in V_\Phi(X) \cap \mathcal{M}_Z$, given $\delta > 0$, there exists an increasing sequence $\{t_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{R}_0^+ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{t_j} \int_0^{t_j} b(\varphi_s(x)) ds - \int_Z b d\mu \right| < \delta$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that

$$\left| \frac{a_{t_j}(x)}{t_j} - \int_Z b d\mu \right| \leq \left| \frac{a_{t_j}(x)}{t_j} - \frac{1}{t_j} \int_0^{t_j} b(\varphi_s(x)) ds \right| + \delta \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover, let $b_t = a_{t+s} - a_t \circ \varphi_s - \int_0^s (b \circ \varphi_u) du$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t - ns \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_t - \int_0^t (b \circ \varphi_u) du &= a_t - a_{t-s} \circ \varphi_s - \int_0^s (b \circ \varphi_u) du + a_{t-s} \circ \varphi_s - \int_t^{t+s} (b \circ \varphi_u) du \\ &= b_{t-s} + [a_{t-s} - \int_0^{t-s} (b \circ \varphi_u) du] \circ \varphi_s \\ &= b_{t-s} + b_{t-2s} \circ \varphi_s + [a_{t-2s} - \int_0^{t-2s} (b \circ \varphi_u) du] \circ \varphi_{2s}. \end{aligned}$$

and so, proceeding inductively,

$$a_t - \int_0^t (b \circ \varphi_u) du = \sum_{k=0}^n b_{t-ks} \circ \varphi_{(k-1)s} + a_{t-ns} \circ \varphi_{ns} - \int_0^{t-ns} (b \circ \varphi_u) du. \quad (4.6)$$

Hence, it follows from (4.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{a_{t_j}(x)}{t_j} - \int_Z b d\mu \right| &\leq \left| \frac{a_{t_j}(x)}{t_j} - \frac{1}{t_j} \int_0^{t_j} b(\varphi_s(x)) ds \right| + \delta \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t_j} \sum_{k=1}^n \|b_{t_j-ks}\|_\infty + \frac{\|a_{t_j-ns}\|_\infty + (t_j - ns)\|b\|_\infty}{t_j} + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $n_j = \lfloor \frac{t_j}{s} \rfloor$, then $t_j - n_j s \leq s$ and since $\sup_{t \in [0, s]} \|a_t\|_\infty \leq +\infty$, we have

$$\frac{\|a_{t_j - n_j s}\|_\infty + (t_j - n_j s)\|b\|_\infty}{t_j} < \delta$$

for any sufficiently large j . Hence, by (1.1) and since $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|a_t\|_\infty \leq +\infty$ for all $T > 0$, taking $n = n_j$, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{a_{t_j}(x)}{t_j} - \int_Z b d\mu \right| \leq \frac{1}{t_j} \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \|b_{t_j-ks}\|_\infty + 2\delta \leq 3\delta$$

again for any sufficiently large j .

Now let E be a finite set. Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k) \in E^k$, we define a probability measure μ on E by

$$\mu_c(e) = \frac{1}{k} \#\{j : c_j = e\}$$

for $e \in E$. moreover, let: $H(c) = - \sum_{e \in E} \mu_c(e) \log \mu_c(e)$.

Step 2: proof that $P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) \leq \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu : \mu \in M_Z\}$.

As $\mathcal{L}(Z) = \bigcup_{l \geq 1} (\mathcal{L}(Z)) \cap Z_l$, we have that

$$P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) = \sup_{l \geq 1} P_{\mathcal{L}(Z) \cap Z_l}(a).$$

We show that for every $l \geq 1$, $P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) \leq \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu : \mu \in M_Z\}$.

let the $\lambda(\mu)$ in lemma 3.5 be $\int_Z b d\mu$, then we obtain following lemma.

Lemma 4.4: Given $x \in \mathcal{L}(Z) \cap Z_l$, and $\mu \in V_\Phi(X) \cap M_Z$, let $\Gamma \subseteq X \times \{1\}$ be a finite cover of X for the open cover $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_r\}$ of X , where $V_j = B_1(x_j, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$ with $(x_j, 1) \in \Gamma$, there exists $m, p \in \mathbb{N}$ with p arbitrary large, and a sequence $U = V_{i_1} V_{i_2} \dots V_{i_p}$ such that

(a): $x \in \bigcap_{r=1}^p \varphi_{-r+1} V_{i_r}$ and $a_p(x) \leq p(\int_Z b d\mu + 3\delta)$.

(b): there exists a subset $V \in (\mathcal{V}^m)^k$ of U of length $km \geq p - m$ satisfying the inequality

$$H(V) \leq m(h_\mu(\Phi) + \delta).$$

Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$, let $Z_{m,u}$ be the set of points $x \in \mathcal{L}(Z) \cap Z_l$ such that the two properties in lemma 4.4 hold for some $\mu \in V_\Phi(X) \cap M_Z$ with: $\int_Z b d\mu \in [u - \delta, u + \delta]$. Moreover, let n_p be the number of all sequences $U \in \mathcal{V}^p$ satisfying the same two properties for some $x \in Z_{m,u}$. this means that

$$n_p = \# \bigcup_{x \in Z_{m,u}} \{U \in \mathcal{V}^p : U \text{ satisfies (a), (b)}\}.$$

Proceeding as lemma 5.3 in [3] one can show that

$$n_p \leq \exp[p(h_\mu(\Phi|_Z) + 2\delta)] = \exp[p(h_\mu(\Phi) + 2\delta)]$$

for any sufficiently large p (since $\mu(Z) = 1$).

For each $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, the collection of all sequences $U \in \mathcal{V}^p$ satisfying the two properties in lemma 4.4 for some $x \in Z_{m,u}$ and $p \geq \tau$ cover the set $Z_{m,u}$, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} M(z_{m,u}, a, \alpha, \epsilon) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{\Gamma} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a_t(x, t, \epsilon) - \alpha t) \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{p=\tau}^{+\infty} n_p \exp[-\alpha p + p(\int_Z b d\mu + 3\delta) + \gamma_p(a, \epsilon)] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{p=\tau}^{+\infty} \exp[p(h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu + 5\delta - \alpha + \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \epsilon)}{t})] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{p=\tau}^{+\infty} \beta^p \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta = \exp(-\alpha + c + 5\delta + \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \epsilon)}{t})$ and $c = \sup\{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu : \mu \in M_Z\}$.

thus, we obtain

$$M(z_{m,u}, a, \alpha, \epsilon) \leq \overline{\lim}_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{p=\tau}^{+\infty} \beta^p. \quad (4.7)$$

For

$$\alpha > c + 5\delta + \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \epsilon)}{t}. \quad (4.8)$$

we have $\beta < 1$ and so it from (4.7) that

$$M(z_{m,u}, a, \alpha, \epsilon) \leq \overline{\lim}_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{p=\tau}^{+\infty} \beta^p = 0 \text{ and } \alpha > P_{Z_{m,u}}(a, \epsilon). \quad (4.9)$$

Now take points u_1, u_2, \dots, u_r , such that for each $u \in [\min b, \max a]$ there exists $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ with $|u - u_j| < \delta$. Then: $\mathcal{L}(Z) \cap Z_l = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i=1}^r Z_{m,u_i}$ and so it follows from (4.9) and (4.10) together with the lemma 2.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} c + 5\delta + \overline{\lim}_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \epsilon)}{t} &\geq \overline{\lim}_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{m, u_i} P_{Z_{m,u}}(a, \epsilon) \\ &= \overline{\lim}_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}(Z) \cap Z_l}(a, \epsilon) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{L}(Z) \cap Z_l}(a). \end{aligned}$$

Since the arbitrariness of δ and l and a has tempered variation, we find that

$$P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) \leq c = \sup \{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu : \mu \in M_Z\}.$$

Step 3: proof $P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) \geq \sup \{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu : \mu \in M_Z\}$.

Lemma 4.5: For each $\mu \in M_Z$ there exists a Φ -invariant function $\bar{b} \in \mathbf{L}^1(x, \mu)$ such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_t}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (b \circ \varphi_u) du = \bar{b}.$$

Proof. it follows from (4.6) that

$$\left| \frac{a_t(x)}{t} - \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t b(\varphi_u(x)) du \right| \leq \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^n \|b_{t-ks}\|_\infty + \frac{\|a_{t-ns}\|_\infty + (t-ns)\|b\|_\infty}{t}.$$

Let $n = \lceil \frac{t}{s} \rceil$, then $t - ns \leq s$ and since $\sup_{t \in [0, s]} \|a_t\|_\infty < +\infty$, we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} (\|a_{t-ns}\|_\infty + (t-ns)\|b\|_\infty) < \infty.$$

Since $\sup_{t \in [0, t]} \|a_t\|_\infty < +\infty$ for all $T > 0$, it follows from (1.1) that $\frac{1}{t}(a_t - \int_0^t b \circ \varphi_u du) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on Z when $t \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, since $b \in \mathbf{L}^1(x, \mu)$, by Birkhoff's ergodic theorem for flows there exists a Φ -invariant function $\bar{b} \in \mathbf{L}^1(x, \mu)$ such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t b \circ \varphi_u du = \bar{b}$$

μ -almost everywhere and in $\mathbf{L}^1(x, \mu)$. This yields the desired statement. \square

Lemma 4.6: For each ergodic measure $\mu \in M_Z$, we have

$$P_Z(a) \geq h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu.$$

Proof. we will show that there exists an l so that: $P_{Z_l}(a) \geq h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$, a measurable partition $\xi = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}$ of X and an open cover $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$ of X for some $k \geq m$ such that:

(a): $\text{diam } c_j \leq \epsilon, \bar{v}_i \subseteq c_i$ and $\mu(c_i \setminus v_i) < \delta^2$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

(b): The set $E = \bigcup_{i=m+1}^k v_i$ has measure $\mu(E) < \delta^2$.

Now we consider a measure ν in the ergodic decomposition of μ with respect to the time-1 map φ_1 . The later is described by a measure τ —in the space \mathcal{M}' of φ_1 -invariant probability measure that is concentrated on the ergodic measure (with respect to φ_1). Note that $\nu(E) < \delta$ for ν in a set $\mathcal{M}_\delta \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$ of positive τ —measure such that $\tau(\mathcal{M}_\delta) \rightarrow 1$ when $\delta \rightarrow 0$ since

$$\delta^2 > \mu(E) = \int_{\mathcal{M}'} \nu(E) d\tau(\nu) \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}' \setminus \mathcal{M}_\delta} \nu(E) d\tau(\nu) \geq \delta \tau(\mathcal{M}' \setminus \mathcal{M}_\delta).$$

For each $x \in Z$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $t_n(x)$ be the number of integers $l \in [0, n)$ such that $\varphi_1^l(x) \in E$. By Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, since ν is ergodic for φ_1 we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t_n(x)}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \chi_E(\varphi_1^j(x)) = \int_X d\nu = \nu(E) \quad (4.10)$$

for ν —almost every $x \in X$. On the other hand, by lemma 4.5 and Birkhoff's ergodic theorem we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{a_t(x)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (b \circ \varphi_u) du = \int_Z b d\mu \quad (4.11)$$

for μ —almost every $x \in X$. By (4.10) and (4.11) and Egrov's theorem, there exists $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_\delta, n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a measurable set $A_1 \subseteq Z$ with $\nu(A_1) \geq 1 - \delta$ such that

$$\frac{t_n(x)}{n} < 2\delta \text{ and } \left| \frac{a_n(x)}{n} - \int_Z b d\mu \right| < \delta \quad (4.12)$$

for every $x \in A_1$ and $n > n_1$.

Moreover, let $\xi_n = \bigcap_{j=0}^n \varphi_1^{-j}(\xi|_{Z_l})$ where $\xi|_{Z_l}$ is the partition induced by ξ on Z_l . It from the Shannon-Mcmillian-Breiman theorem and Egrov's theorem that there exists $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a measurable set $A_2 \subseteq Z$

with $\nu(A_2) \geq 1 - \delta$ such that

$$\nu(\xi_n(x)) \geq \exp[(-h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi) + \delta)n] \quad (4.13)$$

for every $x \in A_2$ and $n > n_2$. Take $p = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$, and $A = A_1 \cap A_2$. Note that $\nu(A) \geq 1 - 2\delta$. By construction, properties (4.12) and (4.13) holds for every $x \in A$ and $n > p$.

Since the $\{Z_i\}$ are nested and exhaust Z , we can choose l so that $\nu(Z_l) > 1 - \delta$. We have that: $\nu(Z_l) \cap A > 1 - 3\delta$. Now let Δ be a Lebesgue number of the cover \mathcal{V} and $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ such that $2\bar{\epsilon} < \Delta$. Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, take $q \geq p$ such that for each $n \geq q$ there exists a set $\Gamma \subseteq X \times [n, +\infty)$ covering z with

$$\left| \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \bar{\epsilon}) - \alpha t) - M(Z_l, a, \alpha, \bar{\epsilon}) \right| < \delta \quad (4.14)$$

Given $b \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Gamma_b = \{(x, b) \in \Gamma : B_b(x, \bar{\epsilon}) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$ and define $B_b = \bigcup_{(x,t) \in \Gamma_b} B_t(x, \bar{\epsilon})$. One can proceed as in the proof of lemma 2 in [17] to show that

$$\#\Gamma_b \geq \nu(B_b \cap A) \exp[h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi)l - (1 + 2 \log \#\xi)l\delta] \quad (4.15)$$

for each $b \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, let L_b be the number of elements c of ξ_b such that $c \cap B_b \cap A \neq \emptyset$. It follows from (4.13) that

$$\nu(B_b \cap A) \leq \sum_{c \in B_b \cap A \neq \emptyset} \nu(c) \leq L_b \exp[(-h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi) + \delta)b]. \quad (4.16)$$

Note that by eventually making $\bar{\epsilon}$ sufficiently small, for each $x \in Z$ there exists $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_b \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $B_b(x, \bar{\epsilon}) \subseteq V$, where $V = \bigcap_{j=1}^b \varphi_1^{-b+1} v_{i_j}$ (this follows readily from the uniform continuity of the map $(t, x) \mapsto \varphi_t(x)$ on the compact set $[0, 1] \times X$). Given $(x, b) \in \Gamma_b$, we have $B_b(x, \bar{\epsilon}) \cap A_1 \neq \emptyset$. Hence, it follows from the first inequality in (4.12) that the number $S_{(x,b)}$ of elements c of the partition ξ_b such that $c \cap B_b(x, \bar{\epsilon}) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ satisfies $S_{(x,b)} \leq m^{2\delta b} = \exp(2\delta b \log m)$. Therefore,

$$L_b \leq \sum_{(x,b) \in \Gamma_b} S_{(x,b)} \leq \#\Gamma_b \exp(2\delta b \log m). \quad (4.17)$$

Inequality (4.15) follows readily from (4.16) and (4.17).

Observe that by the second inequality in (4.12) we have

$$\sup_{B_b(x, \bar{\epsilon})} a_b \geq b \left(\int_Z b d\mu - \delta \right) - \gamma_b(a, \bar{\epsilon})$$

for all $b \geq q$ and $(x, b) \in \gamma_b(a, \bar{\epsilon})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \bar{\epsilon}) - \alpha t) &\geq \sum_{b=q}^{+\infty} \sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma_b} \exp(\sup_{B_b(x, \bar{\epsilon})} a_b - \alpha b) \\ &\geq \sum_{b=q}^{+\infty} \# \Gamma_b \exp\left[(-\alpha + \int_Z b d\mu - \delta)b - \gamma_b(a, \bar{\epsilon})\right] \\ &\geq \sum_{b=q}^{+\infty} \nu(B_b \cap A) \exp\left[(h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi) + \int_Z b d\mu - \frac{\gamma_b(a, \bar{\epsilon})}{b} - \alpha)b - 2(1 + \log \# \xi)b\delta\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality one can also assume that δ is sufficiently small such that

$$\alpha < h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi) + \int_Z b d\mu - \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \bar{\epsilon})}{t} - 2(1 + \log \# \xi)\delta - \delta,$$

then

$$\sum_{(x,t) \in \Gamma} \exp(a(x, t, \bar{\epsilon}) - \alpha t) \geq \sum_{b=t}^{+\infty} \nu(B_b \cap A) \geq 1 - 2\delta,$$

and so it follows from (4.14) that $M(Z_l, a, \alpha, \bar{\epsilon}) \geq 1 - 3\delta > 0$. Therefore, $P_{Z_l}(a, \epsilon) \geq \alpha$, which implies that

$$P_{Z_l}(a, \epsilon) \geq h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi) + \int_Z b d\mu - \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \bar{\epsilon})}{t}.$$

Finally, we consider measurable partition ξ_b and open covers \mathcal{V}_b as before with $\epsilon = \frac{1}{b}$. For each b take $\bar{\epsilon}_b > 0$ such that $2\bar{\epsilon}_b < \frac{1}{b}$ is a Lebesgue number of the cover ν_b . Since $\text{diam} \xi_b \rightarrow 0$ when $b \rightarrow +\infty$, it follows that

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow +\infty} h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi_b) = h_\nu(\varphi_1).$$

Moreover, since the family a has tempered variation property, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Z_l}(a) &= \lim_{b \rightarrow +\infty} P_{Z_l}(a, \bar{\epsilon}_b) \geq \lim_{b \rightarrow +\infty} h_\nu(\varphi_1, \xi_b) + \int_Z b d\mu - \lim_{b \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\gamma_t(a, \bar{\epsilon}_b)}{t} \\ &= h_\nu(\varphi_1) + \int_Z b d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating with respect to ν gives

$$P_{Z_l}(a) \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}_b} h_\nu(\varphi_1) d\tau(\nu) + \int_Z b d\nu.$$

and letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ yields the inequality:

$$P_{Z_l}(a) \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}'} h_\nu(\varphi_1) d\tau(\nu) + \int_Z b d\nu = h_\nu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\nu.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

When $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_Z$ is ergodic, Z_μ is a nonempty Φ -invariant subset of $\mathcal{L}(Z)$ with $\mu(Z_\mu) = 1$. Hence, it follows from lemma 4.6 that

$$P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) \geq h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_{Z_\mu} b d\mu = h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu.$$

When $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_Z$ is arbitrary, one can decompose X into ergodic components and the previous argument shows that

$$P_{\mathcal{L}(Z)}(a) \geq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_Z} \{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu\}.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

It follows from theorem 4.3 that if $V_\Phi(X) \cap M_Z \neq \emptyset$ for each $x \in Z$, and so in particular if Z is compact and Φ -invariant, then

$$P_Z(a) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_Z} \{h_\mu(\Phi) + \int_Z b d\mu\}.$$

References

- [1] L. Backes and F. Rodrigues, Topological pressure for discontinuous semiflows and a variational principle for impulsive dynamical systems, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 59:303–330, 2022
- [2] J. Barral and D. Feng, Weighted thermodynamic formalism on subshifts and applications, *Asian J. Math.* 16: 319–352, 2012
- [3] L. Barreira, Thermodynamic formalism and applications to dimension theory, *Progress in Mathematics.* 294:xii+297, 2011
- [4] L. Barreira and C. Holanda, Nonadditive topological pressure for flows, *Nonlinearity.* 33: 3370–3394, 2020
- [5] L. M. Barreira, A non-additive thermodynamic formalism and applications to dimension theory of hyperbolic dynamical systems, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems.* 16: 871–927, 1996
- [6] R. Bowen, Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics.* 470:viii+75, 2008
- [7] Y. Cao, D. Feng and W. Huang, The thermodynamic formalism for sub-additive potentials, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 20:639–657, 2008
- [8] Y. Cao, H. Hu and Y. Zhao, Nonadditive measure-theoretic pressure and applications to dimensions of an ergodic measure, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems.* 33:831–850, 2013
- [9] W. Cheng, Y. Zhao and Y. Cao, Pressures for asymptotically sub-additive potentials under a mistake function, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 32:487–497, 2012
- [10] K. J. Falconer, A subadditive thermodynamic formalism for mixing repellers, *J. Phys. A.* 21: L737–L742, 1988
- [11] D. Feng, and W. Huang, Lyapunov spectrum of asymptotically sub-additive potentials, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 297: 1–43, 2010
- [12] D. Feng, and W. Huang, Variational principle for weighted topological pressure, *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9).* 106:411–452, 2016
- [13] L. He, J. Lv and L. Zhou, Definition of measure-theoretic pressure using spanning sets, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.).* 20:709–718, 2004
- [14] J. F. C. Kingman, The ergodic theory of subadditive stochastic processes, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B.* 30:499–510, 1968
- [15] X. Ma, E. Chen and Y. Pei, Thermodynamic formalism for subadditive sequence of discontinuous functions, *Anal. Theory Appl.* 26: 174–185, 2010
- [16] A. Mummert, A variational principle for discontinuous potentials, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems.* 27: 583–594, 2007
- [17] Y. B. Pesin and B. S. Pitskel, Topological pressure and the variational principle for noncompact sets, *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 18: 50–63, 96, 1984
- [18] Y. B. Pesin, Dimension theory in dynamical systems, *Chicago Lectures in Mathematics: Contemporary views and applications.* xii+304, 1997
- [19] M. Rauch, Variational principles for the topological pressure of measurable potentials, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S.* 10: 367–394, 2017
- [20] M. Rauch, Variational principles for topological pressure, *issertation, Jena, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena,* 2018
- [21] D. Ruelle, Statistical mechanics on a compact set with Z^{ν} action satisfying expansiveness and specification, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 187: 237–251, 1973
- [22] Y. Wang, E. Chen, Z. Lin, and T. Wu, Bowen entropy of sets of generic points for fixed-point free flows, *J. Differ. Equations.*

269:9846–9867, 2020

[23] Y. Zhao and Y. Cao, On the topological pressure of random bundle transformations in sub-additive case, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 342:715–725, 2008

[24] Y. Zhao and Y. Cao, Measure-theoretic pressure for subadditive potentials, *Nonlinear Anal.* 70:2237–2247, 2009