

A quantitative dichotomy for Lyapunov exponents of non-dissipative SDEs with an application to electrodynamics

Jacob Bedrossian*

Chi-Hao Wu[†]

June 4, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we derive a quantitative dichotomy for the top Lyapunov exponent of a class of non-dissipative SDEs on a compact manifold in the small noise limit. Specifically, we prove that in this class, either the Lyapunov exponent is zero for all noise strengths, or it is positive for all noise strengths and that the decay of the exponent in the small-noise limit cannot be faster than linear in the noise parameter. As an application, we study the top Lyapunov exponent for the motion of a charged particle in randomly-fluctuating magnetic fields, which also involves an interesting geometric control problem.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	5
3	Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2	11
4	An application to positive Lyapunov exponent in electrodynamics	13
A	Optimality for the decay bound in Theorem 1.1	31
	References	33

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is twofold. First, we give a quantitative dichotomy for the (top) Lyapunov exponent of non-dissipative SDEs on a compact manifold with noise parameter $\epsilon > 0$. For this family of SDEs, the Lyapunov exponent is either zero for all $\epsilon > 0$, or strictly positive for all $\epsilon > 0$ and is bounded from below as $\lambda \gtrsim \epsilon$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Second, as an application of our result, we study conditions under which the motion of a charged particle in stochastically fluctuating magnetic fields has a positive top Lyapunov exponent.

Throughout, we will assume (M, g) is an n -dimensional compact, connected, smooth Riemannian manifold, unless otherwise stated. For the metric on the tangent bundle TM , we choose the Sasaki metric induced by g . Let $x_t \in M$ be an Itô diffusion driven by smooth vector fields X_0, X_1, \dots, X_r with a small noise parameter $\epsilon \geq 0$,

$$dx_t = X_0(x_t) dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k, \quad (1.1)$$

2010 *Mathematics subject classification*. Primary: 37H15, 35H10. Secondary: 37D25, 58J65, 35B65

*Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA jacob@math.ucla.edu. Both authors were supported by NSF Award DMS-2108633.

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA chwu93@math.ucla.edu.

where \circ denotes the Stratonovich formulation and $\{W_t^k\}_{k=1}^r$ are i.i.d. one-dimensional Brownian motions defined on the canonical stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t)$. It is a standard result that the smoothness of the vector field implies that the diffusion process generates a flow of diffeomorphisms almost surely [14]. For each $\omega \in \Omega$, denote $\phi_{t,\omega} : M \rightarrow M$ as the flow of diffeomorphisms associated with the noise path ω ; i.e.

$$\phi_{t,\omega}(x) = x_t, \quad (1.2)$$

where x_t solves (1.3). Denote $D_x \phi_{t,\omega}$ as its linearization at $x \in M$. If the Markov process (x_t) has a unique stationary measure μ and a mild integrability condition is satisfied, then the Furstenberg-Kesten theorem [11] guarantees a unique top Lyapunov exponent λ_1 and a total Lyapunov exponent λ_Σ , such that for $\mu \times \mathbf{P}$ -a.e. x and ω , the following limits hold

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\epsilon) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |D_x \phi_{t,\omega}| \\ \lambda_\Sigma(\epsilon) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |\det D_x \phi_{t,\omega}|. \end{aligned}$$

See Section 2.1 for more details.

Denote $\mathbb{S}M$ as the unit tangent bundle, where each fiber is the unit sphere in the tangent space,

$$\mathbb{S}_x M = \{z \in T_x M : g_x(z, z) = 1\}.$$

For $z \in \mathbb{S}_x M$, denote

$$z_t = \frac{D_x \phi_{t,\omega}(x)z}{|D_x \phi_{t,\omega}(x)z|}.$$

We define the *projective process* on the sphere bundle $w_t = (x_t, z_t) \in \mathbb{S}M$, which is a standard tool in dynamical systems for studying Lyapunov exponents. The process (w_t) is an Itô diffusion solving the following SDE:

$$dw_t = \tilde{X}_0(w_t) dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^r \tilde{X}_k(w_t) \circ dW_t^k, \quad (1.3)$$

where \tilde{X}_k 's are defined as

$$\tilde{X}_k(w) = \begin{pmatrix} X_k(x) \\ (1 - z \otimes z) \nabla_x X_k(x)z \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.4)$$

Throughout, we will assume that the projective process satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition and is irreducible (see Section 2.1 for more details).

(H) The collection $\{\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition in $\mathbb{S}M$; i.e. the Lie algebra generated by $\{\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_k\}_{k=1}^r$ spans the tangent space of $\mathbb{S}M$ at every point.

(I) The process w_t^ϵ is irreducible in the sense that $\exists t > 0$ such that $\forall w \in \mathbb{S}M$ and all open sets $U \subseteq \mathbb{S}M$,

$$P_t(w, U) > 0.$$

Note that hypoellipticity and irreducibility of (w_t) imply the same for (x_t) . A consequence of (H) and (I) is that the stationary measures are unique and admit smooth, strictly positive densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure; we denote ρ^ϵ and f^ϵ for the stationary densities of x_t^ϵ and w_t^ϵ respectively. Note that some authors take ϵ instead of $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ for the scaling of the strength of the noise; we will make corresponding adjustment when stating the related quantitative results.

The small noise asymptotics of Lyapunov exponents have been studied in several previous works. For instance, [1] studied a random oscillator and found $\lambda_1^\epsilon = O(\epsilon)$, [4] studied the perturbation of a two-dimensional Hamiltonian system and found $\lambda_1^\epsilon = O(\epsilon^{1/3})$, and [8] studied the perturbation of a non-Hamiltonian system and found $\lambda_1^\epsilon = O(\epsilon)$. For more work in this direction, see [9], [18], [3] and [21]. The work [5] introduced a new method for estimating the Lyapunov exponents of SDEs based on regularity estimates of the projective density f^ϵ and used the method to prove the lower bound $\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon^{-1} \lambda = \infty$ for a range of SDEs, including Lorenz 96 and Galerkin truncation of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations [6].

To our knowledge, there is no example in the literature of an SDE with a Lyapunov exponent that behaves as $0 < \lambda \ll \epsilon$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Our main theorem addresses whether or not this is possible for non-dissipative SDEs; specifically, our result excludes the possibility of superlinear decay as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ for the class of SDE (1.1).

Theorem 1.1 (Quantitative dichotomy). *Let (M, g) , (x_t) , and (w_t) be as above and additionally assume that the SDE is non-dissipative, i.e.*

$$\lambda_\Sigma(\epsilon) = 0.$$

Assume (H) and (I) holds. For each $\epsilon > 0$, denote the associated top Lyapunov exponent λ_1^ϵ . Then exactly one of the following holds:

1. $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \geq C$;
2. $\lambda_1^\epsilon = 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$.

Another natural question is whether it is possible to introduce additional independent noise to a system with a positive Lyapunov exponent and reduce the Lyapunov exponent to zero. The following corollary is a result of the proof of Theorem 1.1 (note that no smallness assumption is made).

Corollary 1.2. *Let M be a connected, compact, Riemannian manifold as above. Suppose the diffusion process*

$$dx_t = X_0(x_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k$$

satisfies the non-degeneracy conditions (H) and (I), and

$$dy_t = X_0(y_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r X_k(y_t) \circ dW_t^k + X_{r+1}(y_t) \circ W_t^{r+1},$$

where $\{W_t^k\}_{k=1}^{r+1}$ are independent Brownian motions. Denote $\lambda_1(x)$, $\lambda_1(y)$, $\lambda_\Sigma(x)$ and $\lambda_\Sigma(y)$, the top Lyapunov exponents and the summations of the Lyapunov exponents for x_t and y_t , respectively. Then under the assumption that $\lambda_\Sigma(x) = \lambda_\Sigma(y) = 0$, we have

$$\lambda_1(x) > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda_1(y) > 0.$$

As an application, we study the motion of a charged particle in a fluctuating magnetic field assumed to be parallel to the z -axis. The motion of a charged particle in a magnetic field is governed by the Lorentz force,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{v} \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}} &= \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}, t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, z)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_x, v_y, v_z)$ are vectors in \mathbb{R}^3 for the position and the velocity, and \mathbf{B} is the magnetic field. Since the magnetic field is parallel to the z axis, we consider only the planar motion in the x - y plane (as the motion of the particle in the z direction is trivial). In particular, we assume

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ B(x, y, t) \end{bmatrix},$$

and consider the dynamics on the x - y plane; the system is then reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= v_x \\ \dot{y} &= v_y \\ \dot{v}_x &= v_y B \\ \dot{v}_y &= -v_x B. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, we can reduce the system further by observing that the magnetic field does not change the kinetic energy of the particle. Hence, we can express the velocity in polar coordinates, $(v_x, v_y) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)$ and without loss of generality assume $r = 1$ (unit speed) to obtain the following system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \cos \theta \\ \dot{y} &= \sin \theta \\ \dot{\theta} &= B(x, y, t). \end{aligned}$$

Using stochasticity to model a fluctuating time-inhomogeneity, our main application is the following.

Theorem 1.3. *Consider the diffusion process*

$$\begin{aligned} dx_t &= \cos \theta_t dt \\ dy_t &= \sin \theta_t dt \\ d\theta(t) &= dt + \sum_{k=1}^5 \sqrt{\epsilon} B_k(x_t, y_t) \circ dW_t^k, \end{aligned}$$

where $B_1 = 1$, $B_2 = \sin x$, $B_3 = \cos x$, $B_4 = \sin y$ and $B_5 = \cos y$. Then

$$\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0 \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \geq C > 0.$$

Remark 1.4. Note that Corollary 1.2 implies that adding more fluctuating modes to the magnetic field does not alter the result (although it may affect the constant C).

To fit the notations for the general framework, we denote in the following sections $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x, y, \theta) \in \mathbb{T}^3$, and (v_1, v_2, v_3) the projective coordinates on \mathbb{S}^3 .

1.1 A remark on the à la Furstenberg invariance principle

One interesting corollary of Theorem 1.1 is that positive Lyapunov exponent can be verified for all $\epsilon > 0$ by checking a condition only at $\epsilon = 1$ for non-dissipative systems. Here, we outline a classical method for inferring positive Lyapunov exponents for volume-preserving SDEs. The approach, originating from Furstenberg [10], has been adapted into different versions by various authors, with [2, 7] being particularly relevant. The version we present here is from [7].

Consider an SDE on an n -dimensional connected, compact Riemannian manifold M ,

$$dx_t = X_0(x_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k.$$

It is volume preserving if and only if $\operatorname{div} X_0 = \operatorname{div} X_1 = \dots = \operatorname{div} X_r = 0$. Under the volume-preserving hypothesis, we can consider an induced process on the special linear bundle $SLM \rightarrow M$. For each $x \in M$, one may consider an element in $SL_x M$ as an ordered basis $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\} \subseteq T_x M$ such that the parallelepiped spanned by these vectors has volume 1. The induced process on SLM is

$$\begin{aligned} dx_t &= X_0(x_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k \\ du_{j,t} &= \nabla_{u_{j,t}} X_0(x_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r \nabla_{u_{j,t}} X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n, \end{aligned}$$

where ∇Y denote the covariant derivative of a smooth vector field Y on M .

A sufficient condition for a positive Lyapunov exponent is given in [7] as the following:

(H'_1) $\operatorname{Lie}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r) = T_x M$ for all $x \in M$;

(H'_2) $\operatorname{Lie}_u(Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r) = T_u SLM$ for some $u \in SLM$.

Condition (H'_1) is the standard parabolic Hörmander condition for the base process. Condition (H'_2) ensures that the support of the induced process on SLM with initial u will have a non-empty interior, which is crucial for applying Furstenberg's argument to conclude $\lambda_1 > 0$. For further details, readers can refer to [7]. Consequently, if (1.1) satisfies conditions (H), (I), and (H'_2), then not only is $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ (already a consequence of [7]), but we also obtain the slightly more quantitative estimate: $\exists C > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \geq C.$$

The structure of the rest of the paper is as follow: Section 2 revisits basic properties of Lyapunov exponents, provides some notes on hypoellipticity and irreducibility, and reviews certain results from [5]. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is presented in Section 3, followed by the proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 4. A discussion on the sharpness of the decay bound in Theorem 1.1 is provided in Section A.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Lyapunov exponents

The existence of the Lyapunov exponents is guaranteed by multiplicative ergodic theorem [2, 17, 20, 24]; in fact, there exists an almost surely constant Lyapunov spectrum when one has ergodicity.

Theorem 2.1 (multiplicative ergodic theorem). *Let μ be an ergodic stationary measure for x_t and suppose that*

$$\mathbf{E} \int \sup_{t \in (0,1)} (\log^+ |D_x \phi_{t,\omega}| + \log^+ |(D_x \phi_{t,\omega})^{-1}|) dx < \infty.$$

Then there is a deterministic number $l \leq d$, a $\mathbb{P} \times \mu$ -measurably-varying, almost-surely invariant flag of linear subspaces $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^{l+1}$ such that for almost-every (ω, x) ,

$$\emptyset = F_{l+1}(\omega, x) \subset F_l(\omega, x) \dots \subset F_1(\omega, x) = T_x M,$$

and a set of deterministic numbers $-\infty < \lambda_l < \dots < \lambda_1$ so that $\mathbb{P} \times \mu$ -a.e.

$$\lambda(\omega, x, v) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|D_x \phi_{t, \omega} v\|}{\|v\|} = \lambda_k \quad \text{for } v \in F_k(\omega, x) \setminus F_{k+1}(\omega, x).$$

Let $d_k = \dim F_k(\omega, x) - \dim F_{k+1}(\omega, x)$.

Our assumptions that M is compact and the vector fields are smooth imply the integrability conditions required for Theorem 2.1; refer to [2]. Here, λ_1 represents the top Lyapunov exponent, which quantifies the typical stability of the system. Let $\lambda_\Sigma = \sum_{k=1}^l d_k \lambda_k$ denote the sum of the Lyapunov spectrum. We define a system as *non-dissipative* if $\lambda_\Sigma = 0$.

Next, we review some key results from [5], where the authors proposed a Fisher information scheme for studying the small noise asymptotics of the top Lyapunov exponent. Let ρ^ϵ and f^ϵ denote the stationary density for x_t^ϵ and w_t^ϵ , respectively. The existence of such stationary distributions is established using the Krylov-Bogoliubov procedure, and is guaranteed when M is compact. The uniqueness and the smoothness of the densities are deduced from irreducibility and Hörmander's theorem, utilizing the Doob-Khasminskii theorem [19]. Under assumptions (H) and (I), the stationary densities are everywhere positive [12]. Define the Fisher information

$$FI(\rho^\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_M \frac{|X_k^* \rho^\epsilon|^2}{\rho^\epsilon} dx,$$

$$\widetilde{FI}(f^\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{SM} \frac{|\widetilde{X}_k^* f^\epsilon|^2}{f^\epsilon} dw.$$

A key observation in [5] is the following formula relating the Lyapunov exponents to the Fisher information. This formula can be proven either through the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula or through the relative entropy formulas in [2].

Theorem 2.2 ([5] Proposition 3.2 (Fisher Information Identity)). *Under the assumption that (M, g) is a connected, compact Riemannian manifold, and under the assumptions (H) and (I), the following formulas hold:*

$$FI(\rho^\epsilon) = -\frac{\lambda_\Sigma^\epsilon}{\epsilon},$$

$$\widetilde{FI}(f^\epsilon) = \frac{n\lambda_1^\epsilon - 2\lambda_\Sigma^\epsilon}{\epsilon}.$$

An immediate consequence of Theorem 2.2 is an infinitesimal characterization of the positive top Lyapunov exponent. For non-dissipative systems ($\lambda_\Sigma = 0$), Theorem 2.2 implies

$$0 = n\lambda_1^\epsilon = \epsilon \widetilde{FI}(f^\epsilon) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widetilde{X}_k^* f^\epsilon = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, r.$$

Furthermore, if we make use of the Kolmogorov equation,

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_\epsilon^* f^\epsilon = \widetilde{X}_0^* f^\epsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \left(\widetilde{X}_k^* \right)^2 f^\epsilon = \widetilde{X}_0^* f^\epsilon.$$

We can then combine the above to obtain

$$0 = \lambda_1^\epsilon \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widetilde{X}_k^* f^\epsilon = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, r. \quad (2.1)$$

In other words, f^ϵ has to be invariant under the flow generated by X_k for $k = 0, 1, \dots, r$. This provides a convenient method to check the positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent; refer to Section 4. This observation also forms the core of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

An important result in [5] is the following dichotomy, which applies to (1.1):

Theorem 2.3 ([5] Proposition 6.1). *Under the assumption that (M, g) is a connected, compact Riemannian manifold, and under the assumptions (H) and (I), the following formulas hold:*

1. *Either*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} = \infty;$$

2. *Or the zero-noise flow w_t^0 admits a stationary density f^0 , and a subsequence of f^ϵ converges to f^0 in L^1 .*

2.2 Hypoellipticity and irreducibility of diffusion processes

In this section, we include some discussion about hypoellipticity and irreducibility of diffusion processes and its consequences.

Let us start with some general remarks on hypoellipticity and irreducibility. We introduce a more adaptable condition for hypoellipticity based on results from [16]. We will be working with a diffusion process on a manifold N ,

$$dy_t = Y_0(y_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r Y_k(y_t) \circ dW_t^k. \quad (2.2)$$

In our context, N can be either the compact base manifold M or its sphere bundle SM . Let us start by listing several fundamental concepts. Let \mathcal{B} be the Borel σ -algebra, and $(N, \mathcal{B}, \lambda)$ be the measure space with Riemannian volume measure λ . Denote $B_b(N, \mathcal{B})$ as the set of bounded Borel functions, and $\mathcal{M}(N, \mathcal{B})$ as the set of Borel probability measures. Let $P_t(y, dz)$ be the transition kernel associated with the diffusion process. The diffusion process is linked to a Markov semigroup on bounded Borel functions $P_t : B_b(N, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow B_b(N, \mathcal{B})$ given by

$$P_t f(y) = \int f(z) P_t(y, dz),$$

with the corresponding dual action on the set of probability measures $P_t^* : \mathcal{M}(N, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(N, \mathcal{B})$,

$$P_t^* \mu(A) = \int_A \mu(dy) P_t(y, dz).$$

For SDEs in Stratonovich form, the generator is

$$\mathcal{L} = Y_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^r Y_k^2,$$

and the adjoint operator is

$$\mathcal{L}^* = Y_0^* + \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^r (Y_k^*)^2,$$

where $Y_l^* = -Y_l - \operatorname{div} Y_l$ for $l = 0, 1, \dots, r$.

Smoothing properties of the Markov semigroups are typically obtained by using Hörmander's hypoelliptic regularity theory (or parabolic regularity if the generator is elliptic). As mentioned in the previous section, hypoellipticity hinges on a condition known as the parabolic Hörmander condition, which concerns the vector fields $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$. Note that this condition is equivalent to verifying the elliptic Hörmander's condition for $\{\partial_t - Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ in $T \times N$, where T denotes some open time interval; i.e., the Lie algebra generated by $\{\partial_t - Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ spans the tangent space of $T \times N$ at each point. Indeed, it is clear that

we can only get the vector ∂_t from $\partial_t - Y_0$; hence, in order to verify the elliptic spanning condition, we need that the Lie algebra generated by $\{[\partial_t - Y_0, Y_k], Y_k\}_{k=1}^r$ spans the tangent space of N . However,

$$[\partial_t - Y_0, Y_k] = -[Y_0, Y_k] \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, r,$$

we see it is equivalent to verify the parabolic spanning condition in N . In particular, the following are equivalent

1. $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition.
2. $\{\partial_t - Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfies the elliptic Hörmander condition.

Hypoellipticity is usually checked by verifying the parabolic Hörmander condition at every point of the manifold. However, if the coefficients are analytic, then it suffices to check the conditions only on a certain subset of points; this observation is based on the following theorem:

Theorem 2.4 ([16] Lemma 2.8.1). *Let $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ be a collection of analytic vector fields on an open subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. If there exists $x_0 \in U$ such that*

$$\text{Lie}_{x_0}\{Y_1, \dots, Y_r\} \simeq \mathbb{R}^k,$$

for some $1 \leq k < d$, then there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{V} of x_0 and a k -dimensional analytic manifold V defined in \mathcal{V} such that $x_0 \in V$ and for all x

$$\text{Lie}_x\{Y_1, \dots, Y_r\} \subseteq T_x V, \quad \forall x \in V \cap \mathcal{V}.$$

To apply Theorem 2.4 for studying parabolic Hörmander condition in a general setting, we recall some notions in geometry for the readers' convenience. An analytic manifold is a smooth manifold such that the transition maps are real analytic. Let $\{(U_i, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be the charts defining the smooth structure on N for some index set I , and let $\pi : TN \rightarrow N$ be the canonical projection such that

$$\pi(p, v) = p \quad \text{for } (p, v) \in T_p N \quad \text{and } p \in N.$$

One can define a natural smooth structure on the tangent bundle TN through the charts $\psi_i : \pi^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U \times \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\psi_i : \sum_{j=1}^n v^j \frac{\partial}{\partial y^j} \Big|_p \mapsto (y^1(p), \dots, y^n(p), v^1, \dots, v^n) \quad \forall p \in N.$$

In this setting, a vector field $Y : N \rightarrow TN$ is a section such that $\pi \circ Y = id_N$, and it is smooth if Y is a smooth map between N and TN . Similarly, if N is an analytic manifold, then so is TN , and the notion of analytic vector fields is then defined similarly. For more details, readers can refer to [15], [23].

Using Lemma 2.4, a more adaptable Hörmander condition is formulated below:

- (H1) At each point $y \in N \setminus B$, the vector fields $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfy the parabolic Hörmander condition, where B is a set of points which locally lies on some $d - 1$ -dimensional smooth sub-manifold.
- (H2) At each point $y \in B$, there exists a local chart (φ, U) such that

$$\varphi(U \cap B) \subseteq O,$$

where O is a $d - 1$ -dimensional smooth submanifold described by the zero set of some smooth function $\Phi(y_1, \dots, y_d) = 0$ in the local coordinate. Moreover, there exists some $k = 0, 1, \dots, r$ such that $Y_k \Phi \neq 0$.

Corollary 2.5. *Let N be an analytic manifold. If $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ is a collection of analytic vector fields on N , then the following are equivalent:*

1. *The collection $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfies (H1) and (H2).*
2. *The collection $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition.*

Proof. Parabolic Hörmander condition implies (H1) and (H2) is immediate, so we focus on the other direction. As we discussed in the beginning of this section, the collection $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfying the parabolic Hörmander condition on N is equivalent to $\{\partial_t - Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfying the elliptic Hörmander condition on $T \times N$. For convenience, we denote $Z_0 = \partial_t - Y_0$ and $Z_k = Y_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, r$.

Given $p_0 \in B$, there exists a neighborhood $U \subseteq N$ of p_0 , and a coordinate chart $\psi : T \times U \rightarrow T \times \mathbb{R}^d$ defined as $\psi(t, p) = (t, \varphi(p))$ for $(t, p) \in T \times U$ such that

$$\psi(T \times \{p_0\}) \subseteq T \times \{y \in \varphi(U) : \Phi(y) = 0\},$$

where $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the smooth function described in (H2). By defining $\Psi : \psi(T \times U) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via

$$\Psi(t, y) = \Phi(y),$$

we have that

$$T \times \{y \in \varphi(U) : \Phi(y) = 0\} = \{(t, y) \in \psi(T \times U) : \Psi(t, y) = 0\}.$$

Suppose by contradiction that

$$\text{Lie}_{(t_0, y_0)} \{Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_r\} \simeq \mathbb{R}^k, \quad 1 \leq k < d + 1$$

for some $(t_0, y_0) \in \psi(T \times \{p_0\})$; here, we abuse notations and use the same symbols for the vector fields in local coordinates. By Theorem 2.4, there exists a k -dimensional analytic manifold $V \subseteq \psi(T \times U)$ such that $(t_0, y_0) \in V$, and

$$\text{Lie}_{(t, y)} \{Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_r\} \subseteq T_{(t, y)}V, \quad \forall (t, y) \in V. \quad (2.3)$$

By (H2), there exists a vector field $Y_k, k \in \{0, \dots, r\}$, such that $Y_k \Phi(t_0, y_0) \neq 0$, which further implies that

$$Z_k \Psi(t_0, y_0) = Y_k \Phi(y_0) \neq 0.$$

Hence, the integral curve defined by the following initial value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}(s) &= Z_k(z(s)), \\ z(0) &= (t_0, y_0) \end{aligned}$$

cannot lie in $\{\Psi(t, y) = 0\}$; in particular, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that for all $0 < s < \epsilon_1$, $z(s) \notin \{\Psi(t, y) = 0\}$. By (2.3), there exists $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that for all $0 < s < \epsilon_2$, $z(s) \in V$. Hence,

$$z(s) \in V \cap \{\Psi(t, y) = 0\}^c$$

for $0 < s < \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2\}$. However, by (H1)

$$\text{Lie}_z \{Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_r\} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \quad \forall z \in \{\Psi(t, y) = 0\}^c,$$

this leads to a contradiction. □

To illustrate the use of Corollary 2.5, let us consider a family of vector fields $\{Y_0; Y_1\}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 , where $Y_0 = y^n \partial_x$ and $Y_1 = \partial_y$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A routine calculation shows that

$$[Y_1, Y_0] = ny^{n-1} \partial_x,$$

and we observe that $\{Y_1, [Y_1, Y_0]\}$ spans $T_{(x,y)}\mathbb{R}^2$ except when $y = 0$. To explicitly verify that $\{Y_0; Y_1\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition in \mathbb{R}^2 , one needs to compute at least n brackets. However, by using conditions (H1) and (H2), one can see that the parabolic Hörmander condition is true immediately after computing $[Y_1, Y_0]$. Adopting the notation from (H1) and (H2),

$$B = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y = 0\},$$

and thus B lies within the zeroes of $\Phi(x, y) = y$. Since $(Y_1 \Phi)(x, 0) = 1 \neq 0$, conditions (H1) and (H2) are satisfied. Consequently, we conclude that the family $\{Y_0; Y_1\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition by Corollary 2.5.

Irreducibility is usually reduced to studying certain control problems via the Stroock-Varadhan support theorem [22]. Before we proceed, let us establish some terminologies from geometric control theory following [13]. Given a family of vector fields \mathcal{F} , a continuous curve $\eta : [0, t] \rightarrow N$ is an integral curve of \mathcal{F} , if there exists a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m = t$ and vector fields V_1, \dots, V_m in \mathcal{F} such that

$$\dot{\eta}(t) = V_i(\eta(t)) \quad \text{for } t_{i-1} < t < t_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

We denote $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(y, t)$ the reachable set of \mathcal{F} with initial y at time t , to be the union of all the values of the integral curves of \mathcal{F} starting from y at time t . We also define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(y, \leq T) = \bigcup_{t \leq T} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(y, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(B, t) = \bigcup_{y \in B} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(y, t) \quad \text{for } B \subseteq N.$$

For the accessible set of the control problem associated with the diffusion process by the Stroock-Varadhan support theorem, we have the family of vector fields

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = Y_0 + \mathcal{Y} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y} = \text{span}\{Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}.$$

Let

$$\phi_{t,y}^\alpha = y + \int_0^t Y_0(\phi_{s,y}^\alpha) ds + \sum_{k=1}^r \int_0^t Y_k(\phi_{s,y}^\alpha) \alpha_k(s) ds,$$

where $\alpha(s) = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ is a piecewise constant control with finite partition. The reachable set is then

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}_0}(y, t) = \bigcup_{\alpha} \phi_{t,y}^\alpha.$$

Theorem 2.6 (Stroock-Varadhan support theorem; [22]). *If there exists $t > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}_0}(y, t) = N \quad \forall y \in N,$$

then for each $y \in N$ and every U open in N ,

$$P_t(y, U) > 0.$$

An important consequence of $\{Y_0; Y_1, \dots, Y_r\}$ satisfying the parabolic Hörmander condition is that the accessible set $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}_0}(y, t)$ has a non-empty interior for $t > 0$; see Proposition 5.10 of [5] and Theorem 3 in Section 3.1 of [13]. By an argument as in the proof of Theorem 13 in Section 3.4 of [13], we then only need to check

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}_0}(y, t)} = N \quad \forall y \in N. \quad (2.4)$$

If there are certain directions along which the speed of the process is uniformly bounded, condition (2.4) can be tricky to verify. This is the case for our charged particles example, since the magnetic field does not change the kinetic energy. To verify the irreducibility for the associated projective process, we use a two-step strategy to separate the control problems for the base manifold and the unit tangent space; see Section 4.2 for details.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2

In this section, we present the proof for the quantitative dichotomy, Theorem 1.1, where uniqueness of the stationary density plays an important role.

Proof. Regarding the dichotomy Theorem 1.1 of the parameterized SDEs, we first show that if $\lambda_1^{\epsilon_0} = 0$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$, then $\lambda_1^\epsilon = 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. Indeed, via (2.1),

$$0 = \tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_0} \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, r.$$

In particular, this shows

$$0 = \tilde{X}_0^* f^{\epsilon_0} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} (\tilde{X}_k^*)^2 f^{\epsilon_0} \quad \forall \epsilon > 0,$$

which due to unique ergodicity implies

$$f^{\epsilon_0} = f^\epsilon \quad \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{X}_k^* f^\epsilon = \tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_0} = 0, \quad \epsilon > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, r \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda_1^\epsilon = 0 \quad \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

This shows that $\lambda_1^{\epsilon_0} = 0$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ implies $\lambda_1^\epsilon = 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$.

Now suppose $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, but that

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} = 0.$$

Then we may pick a subsequence $\{\epsilon_n\}_n$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n = 0$, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_1^{\epsilon_n}}{\epsilon_n} = 0;$$

our goal is to show that this hypothesis will lead to $\lambda_1^\epsilon = 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, a contradiction.

By Theorem 2.2, we have

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d\lambda_1^{\epsilon_n}}{\epsilon_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{SM} \frac{|\tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_n}|^2}{f^{\epsilon_n}} dw, \quad (3.1)$$

which implies $\tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_n} / \sqrt{f^{\epsilon_n}}$ converges strongly in $L^2(dw)$ to 0. Also, Theorem 2.3 implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{SM} |f^{\epsilon_n} - f^0| dw = 0,$$

for some invariant density of the zero-noise dynamics $f^0 \in L^1(dw)$, up to extracting a further subsequence of $\{f^{\epsilon_n}\}$.

We claim that

$$\tilde{X}_k^* f^0 = 0 \quad \forall k = 0, 1, \dots, r,$$

in the weak sense. For $k = 0$, it is automatic, since f^0 is a stationary density for the zero-noise flow; our focus will be on $k = 1, \dots, r$. Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(SM)$,

$$\int_{SM} \phi \tilde{X}_k^* f^0 dw = \int_{SM} \phi \tilde{X}_k^* (f^0 - f^{\epsilon_n}) dw + \int_{SM} \phi \tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_n} dw.$$

The first term goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ due to the $L^1(dw)$ convergence,

$$\left| \int_{SM} \phi \tilde{X}_k^* (f^0 - f^{\epsilon_n}) dw \right| = \left| \int_{SM} \tilde{X}_k \phi (f^0 - f^{\epsilon_n}) dw \right| \leq \|\tilde{X}_k \phi\|_{L^\infty(dw)} \|f^0 - f^{\epsilon_n}\|_{L^1(dw)}.$$

For the second term.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{SM} \phi \tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_n} dw \right| &= \left| \int_{SM} \phi \sqrt{f^{\epsilon_n}} \frac{\tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_n}}{\sqrt{f^{\epsilon_n}}} dw \right| \leq \left(\int_{SM} \phi^2 f^{\epsilon_n} dw \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{SM} \frac{|\tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_n}|^2}{f^{\epsilon_n}} dw \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(dw)} \|\tilde{X}_k^* f^{\epsilon_n} / \sqrt{f^{\epsilon_n}}\|_{L^2(dw)}, \end{aligned}$$

which converges to 0 due to our hypothesis (3.1).

Finally, we demonstrate how the above leads to a contradiction. Under our hypothesis (3.1), we deduced

$$\tilde{X}_k^* f^0 = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, r,$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{L}^* f^0 = \tilde{X}_0^* f^0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \left(\tilde{X}_k^* \right)^2 f^0 = 0.$$

By unique ergodicity, this implies $f^1 = f^0$, and

$$0 = FI(f^0) = FI(f^1),$$

which is a contradiction. □

Now we prove Corollary 1.2.

Proof. By contradiction, we assume that $\lambda_1(x) > 0$ and $\lambda_1(y) = 0$. Denote $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the stationary densities for the projective processes associated with x_t and y_t respectively. Using Fisher information formula, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(y) = 0 &\Leftrightarrow \tilde{X}_k^* g = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, r+1. \\ &\Rightarrow \tilde{X}_k^* g = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, r. \\ &\Rightarrow \left[\tilde{X}_0^* + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \left(\tilde{X}_k^* \right)^2 \right] g = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that g solves the same Kolmogorov equation that f solves; under assumptions (H) and (I), such density is unique, so $f = g$. This contradicts that $\lambda_1(x) > 0$. □

4 An application to positive Lyapunov exponent in electrodynamics

In this section, we apply Theorem 1.1 to prove our result about the electrodynamics under fluctuating magnetic fields, Theorem 1.3. We will show that $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, assuming hypoellipticity and irreducibility; the verification of hypoellipticity and irreducibility is postponed to Section 4.1 and Section 4.2. As a consequence, we also get

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \geq C.$$

A calculation shows

$$\tilde{X}_0 = [\cos x_3, \sin x_3, 1] \cdot \nabla_x + [-v_3 \sin x_3 - \alpha v_1, v_3 \cos x_3 - \alpha v_2, -\alpha v_3] \cdot \nabla_v, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\tilde{X}_1 = [0, 0, 1] \cdot \nabla_x, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\tilde{X}_2 = [0, 0, \sin x_1] \cdot \nabla_x + v_1 \cos x_1 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\tilde{X}_3 = [0, 0, \cos x_1] \cdot \nabla_x - v_1 \sin x_1 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\tilde{X}_4 = [0, 0, \sin x_2] \cdot \nabla_x + v_2 \cos x_2 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\tilde{X}_5 = [0, 0, \sin x_1] \cdot \nabla_x - v_2 \sin x_2 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v, \quad (4.6)$$

where $\alpha = -v_3 v_1 \sin x_3 + v_3 v_2 \cos x_3$. Also, $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_0 = 5v_3(v_1 \sin x_3 - v_2 \cos x_3)$, $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_1 = 0$, $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_2 = -5v_3 v_1 \cos x_1$, $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_3 = 5v_3 v_1 \sin x_1$, $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_4 = -5v_3 v_2 \cos x_2$ and $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_5 = 5v_3 v_2 \sin x_2$. By Theorem 1.1, a necessary and sufficient condition for $\lambda_1^\epsilon = 0$ for $\epsilon > 0$ is that

$$\begin{aligned} [\cos x_3, \sin x_3, 1] \cdot \nabla_x g + [-v_3 \sin x_3 - \alpha v_1, v_3 \cos x_3 - \alpha v_2, -\alpha v_3] \cdot \nabla_v g \\ = -5v_3(v_1 \sin x_3 - v_2 \cos x_3), \end{aligned}$$

$$[0, 0, 1] \cdot \nabla_x g = 0,$$

$$[0, 0, \sin x_1] \cdot \nabla_x g + v_1 \cos x_1 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v g = 5v_3 v_1 \cos x_1,$$

$$[0, 0, \cos x_1] \cdot \nabla_x g - v_1 \sin x_1 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v g = -5v_3 v_1 \sin x_1,$$

$$[0, 0, \sin x_2] \cdot \nabla_x g + v_2 \cos x_2 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v g = 5v_3 v_2 \cos x_2,$$

$$[0, 0, \sin x_1] \cdot \nabla_x g - v_2 \sin x_2 [-v_3 v_1, -v_3 v_2, 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v g = -5v_3 v_2 \sin x_2,$$

where $g = \log f$ and f is the stationary density for the projective process. The system can be further reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} [\cos x_3 \sin x_3 \ 0] \cdot \nabla_x g + [-v_3 \sin x_3 - \alpha v_1 \ v_3 \cos x_3 - \alpha v_2 \ -\alpha v_3] \cdot \nabla_v g \\ = -5v_3(v_1 \sin x_3 - v_2 \cos x_3), \end{aligned}$$

$$[0 \ 0 \ 1] \cdot \nabla_x g = 0,$$

$$[-v_3 v_1 \ -v_3 v_2 \ 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v g = 5v_3,$$

since the second equation implies $\partial_{x_3} g = 0$. In particular, if we take $a(x_3) = (0, 0, x_3, 1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3})$, then the equations become

$$\begin{aligned} [\cos x_3 \sin x_3 \ 0] \cdot \nabla_x g + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} [-\sin x_3 - b(x_3) \ \cos x_3 - b(x_3) \ -b(x_3)] \cdot \nabla_v g \\ = \frac{5}{3} (\cos x_3 - \sin x_3), \quad (4.7) \end{aligned}$$

$$[0 \ 0 \ 1] \cdot \nabla_x g = 0, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\frac{1}{3} [-1 \ -1 \ 2] \cdot \nabla_v g = \frac{5}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad (4.9)$$

where $b(x_3) = (\cos x_3 - \sin x_3)/3$; moreover,

$$\partial_{x_3} g = 0 \Rightarrow \partial_{x_3} \nabla g = \nabla \partial_{x_3} g = 0 \Rightarrow (\nabla g)(a(x_3)) = (\nabla g)(a(0)) \quad \text{for } x_3 \in [0, 2\pi].$$

Denote $z_0 = (x_0, y_0) = (\nabla_x g(a(x_3)), \nabla_v g(a(x_3)))$ and integrate (4.7) along intervals $[0, \pi]$, $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ and $[0, \pi/3]$,

$$[0 \ 2 \ 0] \cdot x_0 + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}} [-4 \ 2 \ 2] \cdot y_0 = -\frac{10}{3} \quad (4.10)$$

$$[2 \ 0 \ 0] \cdot x_0 + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}} [-2 \ 4 \ -2] \cdot y_0 = \frac{10}{3} \quad (4.11)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} [\sqrt{3} \ 1 \ 0] \cdot x_0 + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{3}} [-2 - \sqrt{3} \ 1 + 2\sqrt{3} \ 1 - \sqrt{3}] \cdot y_0 = \frac{5}{6}(\sqrt{3} - 1). \quad (4.12)$$

Then (4.9), (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) shows that z_0 solves a linear system $Az = b$, where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{2}{3} \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -\frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}} & \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} & \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} & \frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{2+\sqrt{3}}{6\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1+2\sqrt{3}}{6\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{6\sqrt{3}} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{5}{\sqrt{3}} \\ -\frac{10}{3} \\ \frac{10}{3} \\ \frac{5(\sqrt{3}-1)}{6} \end{bmatrix}.$$

However, using Gaussian elimination, we have the row equivalence,

$$[A \ b] \sim C = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $*$ denotes unimportant entries; this implies that the linear system $Az = b$ is inconsistent, and therefore such z_0 cannot exist, a contradiction to our hypothesis that $\lambda_1^\epsilon = 0$ for $\epsilon > 0$; hence, our proof is finished.

4.1 Hypoellipticity

In this section, we check the parabolic Hörmander condition (H) for the projective process w_t ; the parabolic Hörmander condition for the base process x_t is clear, so we omit it. Specifically, we showed the following

Theorem 4.1. *For w in \mathbb{ST}^3 such that $v_3 \neq \pm 1$, the following collection spans $T_w \mathbb{ST}^3$*

$$\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_k, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0], [\tilde{X}_1, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]], [\tilde{X}_k, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]], [\tilde{X}_k, [\tilde{X}_1, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]]], \quad k = 2, \dots, 5.$$

Before we proceed, let us explain how this is enough to show hypoellipticity. To check (H1), we see that Theorem 4.1 implies that the spanning condition is checked except at

$$B = \{w \in \mathbb{ST}^3 : v_3 = \pm 1\},$$

and B is contained in the hypersurfaces defined by $\{v_1 = 0\}$ and $\{v_2 = 0\}$. Denote $\Phi_1(x, v) = v_1$ and $\Phi_2(x, v) = v_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{X}_0\Phi_1 &= -v_3 \sin x_3 - \alpha v_1 \\ \tilde{X}_0\Phi_2 &= v_3 \cos x_3 - \alpha v_2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha = -v_3 v_1 \sin x_3 + v_3 v_2 \cos x_3$. In particular,

$$\left[\tilde{X}_0\Phi_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, 0, 0, \pm 1)\right]^2 + \left[\tilde{X}_0\Phi_2(x_1, x_2, x_3, 0, 0, \pm 1)\right]^2 = \sin^2 x_3 + \cos^2 x_3 = 1.$$

This implies at least one of $\tilde{X}_0\Phi_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, 0, 0, \pm 1)$ and $\tilde{X}_0\Phi_2(x_1, x_2, x_3, 0, 0, \pm 1)$ is non-vanishing, which implies (H2). By Corollary 2.5, Theorem 4.1 is enough to show that the parabolic Hörmander condition holds everywhere.

4.1.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We verify the spanning condition for $\{v_3 \neq \pm 1\}$ by considering a moving frame (a collection of vector fields which form an orthonormal basis at each point),

$$\begin{aligned}e_1 &= [1 \ 0 \ 0] \cdot \nabla_x \\ e_2 &= [0 \ 1 \ 0] \cdot \nabla_x \\ e_3 &= [0 \ 0 \ 1] \cdot \nabla_x \\ e_4 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} [-v_3 v_1 \ -v_3 v_2 \ 1 - (v_3)^2] \cdot \nabla_v \\ e_5 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} [-v_2 \ v_1 \ 0] \cdot \nabla_v.\end{aligned}$$

One can see that e_4 and e_5 is not defined at $v_3 = \pm 1$; therefore, this moving frame is only valid for $v_3 \neq \pm 1$. We record a basic formula, and the brackets of the basis.

Lemma 4.2. *Let a, b be smooth functions, then*

$$[a e_i, b e_j] = -(b e_j a) e_i + (a e_i b) e_j + ab [e_i, e_j]; \quad (4.13)$$

moreover,

$$[e_i, e_j] = 0$$

for $(i, j) \notin \{(4, 5), (5, 4)\}$, and

$$[e_4, e_5] = \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} e_5.$$

Proof. For (4.13), note that

$$\begin{aligned}[a e_i, b e_j] &= (a e_i b) e_j + b (a e_i) e_j - (b e_j a) e_i - a (b e_j) e_i \\ &= -(b e_j a) e_i + (a e_i b) e_j + ab [e_i, e_j].\end{aligned}$$

For the commutators of the basis, it is clear that $[e_i, e_j] = 0$ for $(i, j) \neq (4, 5)$; for $(i, j) = (4, 5)$,

$$\begin{aligned}e_4 e_5 &= [-v_3 v_1 \ -v_3 v_2 \ 1 - (v_3)^2] \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{1-(v_3)^2} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{1-(v_3)^2} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{v_3 v_2}{(1-(v_3)^2)^2} & \frac{v_3 x'}{(1-(v_3)^2)^2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \nabla_v + \text{2nd order operator} \\ &= 0 + \text{2nd order operator},\end{aligned}$$

where we write the second order term implicitly, since it will eventually be cancelled. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} e_5 e_4 &= \begin{bmatrix} -v_2 & v_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{v_3}{1-(v_3)^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{v_3}{1-(v_3)^2} & 0 \\ -\frac{v_1}{(1-(v_3)^2)^2} & -\frac{v_2}{(1-(v_3)^2)^2} & -\frac{v_3}{(1-(v_3)^2)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \nabla_v + \text{2nd order operator} \\ &= -\frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} e_5 + \text{2nd order operator.} \end{aligned}$$

We can deduce our claim by combining the above two calculations. \square

Our next step is to see how the \tilde{X}_k 's are represented in this frame. It is a standard linear algebra exercise, and we record the result below with details omitted.

Lemma 4.3. *For the \tilde{X}_k 's, we have the following representation*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_0 &= \cos x_3 e_1 + \sin x_3 e_2 + e_3 + \frac{(v_3)^2}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_1 \sin x_3 - v_2 \cos x_3) e_4 \\ &\quad + \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_2 \sin x_3 + v_1 \cos x_3) e_5, \\ \tilde{X}_1 &= e_3, \\ \tilde{X}_k &= B_k e_3 + (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, \quad k = 2, \dots, 5. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $B_2 = \sin x_1$, $B_3 = \cos x_1$, $B_4 = \sin x_2$ and $B_5 = \cos x_2$.

Our strategy is to represent a collection of commutators of the vector fields \tilde{X}_k 's in this moving frame, and then verify the collection satisfies the spanning condition.

Lemma 4.4. *For w in $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}^3$ such that $v_3 \neq \pm 1$, the following vector fields are represented in $\{e_1, \dots, e_5\}$ as*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_1 &= \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \tilde{X}_k &= \mathbf{a}_k \\ [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0] &= \mathbf{a}_6 \\ [\tilde{X}_1, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] &= \mathbf{a}_7 \\ [\tilde{X}_k, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] &= \mathbf{a}_{6+k} \\ [\tilde{X}_k, [\tilde{X}_1, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]]] &= \mathbf{a}_{10+k}, \end{aligned}$$

for $k = 2, \dots, 5$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_1 &= [0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0] \\ \mathbf{a}_k &= [0 \ 0 \ B_k \ v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k \ 0] \\ \mathbf{a}_6 &= \left[-\sin x_3 \ \cos x_3 \ 0 \ \frac{(v_3)^2}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_1 \cos x_3 + v_2 \sin x_3) \ -\frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (-v_2 \cos x_3 + v_1 \sin x_3) \right] \\ \mathbf{a}_7 &= \left[-\cos x_3 \ -\sin x_3 \ 0 \ -\frac{(v_3)^2}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_1 \sin x_3 - v_2 \cos x_3) \ -\frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_2 \sin x_3 + v_1 \cos x_3) \right] \\ \mathbf{a}_{6+k} &= a_k \mathbf{a}_7 + \left[0 \ 0 \ b_k \ c_k \ (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) \frac{1}{1-(v_3)^2} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) \right] \\ \mathbf{a}_{10+k} &= a'_k \mathbf{a}_6 + \left[0 \ 0 \ b'_k \ c'_k \ -(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) \frac{1}{1-(v_3)^2} (v_1 \cos x_3 + v_2 \sin x_3) \right], \end{aligned}$$

and $a_k, b_k, c_k, a'_k, b'_k, c'_k$ are smooth functions.

Proof. The representations of $\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \dots, \tilde{X}_5$ follow directly from Lemma 4.3. We start with \mathbf{a}_6 ,

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0] &= [e_3, \cos x_3 e_1 + \sin x_3 e_2 + e_3 \\ &\quad + \frac{(v_3)^2}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}}(v_1 \sin x_3 - v_2 \cos x_3) e_4 + \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}}(v_2 \sin x_3 + v_1 \cos x_3) e_5], \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0] &= -\sin x_3 e_1 + \cos x_3 e_2 + \frac{(v_3)^2}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}}(v_1 \cos x_3 + v_2 \sin x_3) e_4 \\ &\quad + \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}}(v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5; \end{aligned}$$

this gives \mathbf{a}_6 . The calculation of \mathbf{a}_7 can be done similarly.

Now, we compute \mathbf{a}_{6+k} for $k = 2, \dots, 5$. Due to bilinearity of the Lie bracket, we have

$$[\tilde{X}_k, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] = [B_k e_3, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] + [(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]].$$

We compute each term separately; starting with

$$\begin{aligned} [B_k e_3, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] &= (-B_k \cos x_3 e_1 + \partial_{x_1} B_k \sin x_3 e_3) + (-B_k \sin x_3 e_1 - \partial_{x_2} B_k \cos x_3 e_3) \\ &\quad + B_k \frac{(v_3)^2}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (-v_1 \sin x_3 + v_2 \cos x_3) e_4 + B_k \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (-v_2 \sin x_3 - v_1 \cos x_3) e_5, \end{aligned}$$

which reduces to

$$[B_k e_3, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] = B_k [\tilde{X}_1, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] + (\partial_x B_k \sin x_3 - \partial_y B_k \cos x_3) \tilde{X}_1.$$

Then we consider

$$\begin{aligned} &[(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] \\ &= [(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0] - \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5] \\ &\quad + [(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5]. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$[\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0] - \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5$$

has zero component in the direction e_5 , one can see that

$$[(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0] - \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5] = \alpha e_4,$$

where α is a smooth function. For the second term,

$$[(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1-(v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5] = \alpha'' e_4 + \alpha''' e_5 + \alpha'''' [e_4, e_5],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha''' &= (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4 \left(\frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1 - (v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) \right) \\ \alpha'''' &= (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1 - (v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3),\end{aligned}$$

and e_4 denotes the directional derivative. One can show

$$\alpha''' e_5 = (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha'''' [e_4, e_5] &= (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1 - (v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1 - (v_3)^2}} e_5 \\ &= (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) \frac{(v_3)^2}{1 - (v_3)^2} e_5,\end{aligned}$$

which we can substitute back into the above to get

$$\begin{aligned}\left[(v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) e_4, \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{1 - (v_3)^2}} (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) e_5 \right] &= \alpha'' e_4 \\ &\quad + (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) \frac{1}{1 - (v_3)^2} e_5.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}[\tilde{X}_k, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] &= B_k [\tilde{X}_1, [\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_0]] + (\partial_x B_k \sin x_3 - \partial_y B_k \cos x_3) \tilde{X}_1 + \alpha'' e_4 \\ &\quad + (v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k) (v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3) \frac{1}{1 - (v_3)^2} e_5,\end{aligned}$$

which shows our claim for \mathbf{a}_{6+k} where $k = 2, \dots, 5$. The calculation for \mathbf{a}_{10+k} where $k = 2, \dots, 5$ can be done similarly. \square

Finally, we are in the position to verify Theorem 4.1; we show the collection in the previous lemma gives a spanning set of the tangent space in $\{v_3 \neq \pm 1\}$.

Proof. Our goal is to show that $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{15}\}$ spans \mathbb{R}^5 when $v_3 \neq \pm 1$. First of all, we observe that

$$\mathbf{a}_{k,4} = v_1 \partial_{x_1} B_k + v_2 \partial_{x_2} B_k \quad \text{for } k = 2, \dots, 5$$

cannot all vanish at the same time. Indeed,

$$\mathbf{a}_{2,4} = v_1 \cos x_1, \quad \mathbf{a}_{3,4} = -v_1 \sin x_1, \quad \mathbf{a}_{4,4} = v_2 \cos x_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{a}_{5,4} = -v_2 \sin x_2,$$

and we know v_1 and v_2 cannot vanish at the same time, since $(v_1)^2 + (v_2)^2 = 1 - (v_3)^2 > 0$; hence, we may pick some $k_1 \in \{2, \dots, 5\}$ such that $\mathbf{a}_{k_1,4} \neq 0$.

Next, denote

$$\mathbf{b}_{6+k} = \mathbf{a}_{6+k} - a_k \mathbf{a}_7 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}_{10+k} = \mathbf{a}_{10+k} - a_k \mathbf{a}_6$$

for $k = 2, \dots, 5$; our goal is to show that there exists \mathbf{b}_{k_2} in $\{\mathbf{b}_8, \mathbf{b}_9, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{15}\}$ such that $\mathbf{b}_{k_2,5}$ does not vanish. This reduces to showing that

$$v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3 \quad \text{and} \quad v_1 \cos x_3 + v_2 \sin x_3$$

cannot vanish at the same time. By contradiction, we suppose otherwise, and we may without loss of generality assume $\cos x_3$ and v_1 are not zero. Then

$$v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3 = v_1 \cos x_3 + v_2 \sin x_3 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{v_2}{v_1} = \tan x_3 = -\frac{v_1}{v_2}.$$

Also, $v_1 \cos x_3 + v_2 \sin x_3 = 0$ implies that $\sin x_3$ and v_2 are also non-vanishing under our hypothesis. We then deduce

$$\frac{v_2}{v_1} = -\frac{v_1}{v_2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad -(v_1)^2 = (v_2)^2,$$

which is possible if and only if $v_1 = v_2 = 0$; this is a contradiction, since $(v_1)^2 + (v_2)^2 = 1 - (v_3)^2 > 0$. Hence, we may pick $k_2 = 6 + k_1$ if $v_2 \cos x_3 - v_1 \sin x_3 \neq 0$ or $k_2 = 10 + k_1$ if $v_1 \cos x_3 + v_2 \sin x_3 \neq 0$.

Finally, we conclude that $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_{k_1}, \mathbf{a}_6, \mathbf{a}_7, \mathbf{a}_{k_2}\}$ spans \mathbb{R}^5 . Indeed, by putting these vectors together, we obtain a matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{---} & \mathbf{a}_1 & \text{---} \\ \text{---} & \mathbf{a}_{k_1} & \text{---} \\ \text{---} & \mathbf{a}_6 & \text{---} \\ \text{---} & \mathbf{a}_7 & \text{---} \\ \text{---} & \mathbf{a}_{k_2} & \text{---} \end{bmatrix},$$

which is row equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * & \alpha & 0 \\ -\sin x_3 & \cos x_3 & 0 & * & * \\ -\cos x_3 & -\sin x_3 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & \beta \end{bmatrix},$$

where $*$ are the unimportant entries, and α, β are non-zero. It is clear that the matrix is row equivalent to the block matrix,

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\sin x_3 & \cos x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\cos x_3 & -\sin x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix},$$

where the first block is an orthogonal matrix, and the second block is of full rank. So the entire matrix is of full rank, and the proof is completed. \square

4.2 Irreducibility

In this section, we verify the irreducibility for the projective process w_t . In the following, we will use subscripts such as x and v to denote the associated components of a given position or vector field.

Recall that for a given family of vector fields \mathcal{F} , a continuous curve $\eta : [0, t] \rightarrow N$ is an integral curve of \mathcal{F} if there is a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m = t$ and vector fields V_1, \dots, V_m in \mathcal{F} such that

$$\dot{\eta}(t) = V_i(\eta(t)) \quad \text{for} \quad t_{i-1} < t < t_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

In the following, we will construct our control scheme iteratively: hence, it is convenient to define the extension of an integral curve. We say an integral curve $\tilde{\eta} : [0, t'] \rightarrow N$ is an extension of $\eta : [0, t] \rightarrow N$, if

1. $[0, t] \subseteq [0, t']$
2. $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, t]} = \eta$
3. $\tilde{\eta}|_{[t, t']}$ is an integral curve of \mathcal{F} .

To simplify our notation, we often just use the same notation for the extension and the original function, when it is clear from the context.

Let us start with the control problem for the base process x_t . An important point is that we only need X_0 and X_1 to get the irreducibility of the base process.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{F}' = X_0 + \text{span } X_1$. There exists $T_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}'}(x', T_1)} = \mathbb{T}^3 \quad \forall x' \in \mathbb{T}^3. \quad (4.14)$$

Moreover, given an open neighborhood V of (x'_1, x'_2) in \mathbb{T}^2 and $t \geq 0$,

$$\overline{\{(\phi_t^1, \phi_t^2) \in V : \phi_t = (\phi_t^1, \phi_t^2, \phi_t^3) \text{ is an integral curve of } \mathcal{F}' \text{ with initial } x'\}} \neq \emptyset, \quad (4.15)$$

i.e., we can fix the position in (x_1, x_2) around its initial.

Proof. Given a initial x' and $c \neq 0$, a straightforward calculation shows the integral curve of

$$\phi_t = x' + \int_0^t X_0(\phi_s) ds + \int_0^t (-1 + c)X_1(\phi_s) ds.$$

is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t^1 &= x'_1 - \frac{1}{c} \sin(x'_3) + \frac{1}{c} \sin(x'_3 + ct) \\ \phi_t^2 &= x'_2 + \frac{1}{c} \cos(x'_3) - \frac{1}{c} \cos(x'_3 + ct) \\ \phi_t^3 &= x'_3 + ct. \end{aligned}$$

One can observe that the trajectory of (ϕ_t^1, ϕ_t^2) forms a circle passing through (x'_1, x'_2) with radius $1/c$ and center $(x'_1 - \sin(x'_3)/c, x'_2 + \cos(x'_3)/c)$. By adjusting c , we may join any two points in the x_1 - x_2 plane by such circle. In particular, there exists T'_1 such that

$$\overline{\{(\phi_t^1, \phi_t^2) \in \mathbb{T}^2 : \phi_t = (\phi_t^1, \phi_t^2, \phi_t^3) \text{ is an integral curve of } \mathcal{F}' \text{ with initial } x', t \leq T'_1\}} = \mathbb{T}^2.$$

Note also that by picking $c \gg 1$ we can trap (ϕ_t^1, ϕ_t^2) in any open neighborhood of its initial position (x'_1, x'_2) , so (4.15) is proved.

Finally, we deduce the controllability of x_t . Let $T_1 > T'_1$. Fix U a target open set, \tilde{U} a open subset of U , and $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_{X_0}(\tilde{U}, \epsilon) \subset U.$$

We may without loss of generality assume $U = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$, and $\tilde{U} = \tilde{I}_1 \times \tilde{I}_2 \times \tilde{I}_3$, where I_k and \tilde{I}_k are open sets in \mathbb{T} for $k = 1, 2, 3$. We follow the steps below to obtain (4.14); some pictures explaining the strategy are in Figure 1.

1. Construct an integral curve $\psi : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ of \mathcal{F}' such that $(\psi_t^1, \psi_t^2) \in \tilde{I}_1 \times \tilde{I}_2$.

2. Extend ψ to an integral curve $\psi : [0, T_1 - \epsilon] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ of \mathcal{F}' such that $(\psi_{T_1 - \epsilon}^1, \psi_{T_1 - \epsilon}^2) \in \tilde{I}_1 \times \tilde{I}_2$.
3. Extend ψ to an integral curve $\psi : [0, T_1 - \epsilon + \gamma^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ such that

$$\psi_{T_1 - \epsilon + \gamma^{-1}} = \psi_{T_1 - \epsilon} + \int_0^{1/\gamma} X_0(\psi_s) ds + \int_0^{1/\gamma} \gamma c' X_1(\psi_s) ds$$

for some $\gamma \gg 1$ and suitable c' , so that $\psi_{T_1 - \epsilon + \gamma^{-1}} \in \tilde{U}$.

4. Finally, extend ψ to an integral curve $\psi : [0, T_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ of \mathcal{F}' such that

$$\psi_{T_1} = \psi_{T_1 - \epsilon + 1/\gamma} + \int_0^{\epsilon - 1/\gamma} X_0(\psi_s) ds.$$

Due to our choice of ϵ , and the fact that $\psi_{T_1 - \epsilon + 1/\gamma} \in \tilde{U}$, we have $\psi_{T_1} \in U$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.5. □

To control the projective process, our strategy is to split the control problem into two parts, one on the unit sphere, and the other one on the base manifold. To coordinate the two control problems, we use the topological property of the even-dimensional sphere, hairy ball theorem. First, we move the component on the sphere to the points where $\nabla_x X_0 v$ vanishes. Second, we use X_0 and X_1 to achieve the control in the (x_1, x_2) component of the base manifold. Finally, we finish the control problem on the sphere and the x_3 component of the base manifold to close the argument.

Let us make a few observations. Before projecting onto the tangent plane of $S_x \mathbb{T}^3$, the v -component of \tilde{X}_0 is

$$\nabla_x X_0 v = [-v_3 \sin x_3 \quad v_3 \cos x_3 \quad 0].$$

Using the diffusion vector field \tilde{X}_1 , we can move instantaneously along the x_3 -direction; therefore it makes sense to consider the following auxilliary vector fields by letting x_3 be $0, \pi/2, \pi$ and $3\pi/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{0,1} &:= (1 - \Pi_v) \nabla_x X_0(x_1, x_2, 0)v = (1 - \Pi_v) [0 \quad v_3 \quad 0], \\ Y_{0,2} &:= (1 - \Pi_v) \nabla_x X_0(x_1, x_2, \pi/2)v = (1 - \Pi_v) [-v_3 \quad 0 \quad 0], \\ Y_{0,3} &:= (1 - \Pi_v) \nabla_x X_0(x_1, x_2, \pi)v = (1 - \Pi_v) [0 \quad -v_3 \quad 0], \\ Y_{0,4} &:= (1 - \Pi_v) \nabla_x X_0(x_1, x_2, 3\pi/2)v = (1 - \Pi_v) [v_3 \quad 0 \quad 0]. \end{aligned}$$

One can see that these vector fields vanish when $v_3 = 0$, and they allow us to move in the directions transversal to v_3 -direction when $v_3 \neq 0$. Next, we obtain from the v -component of the diffusion vector fields,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= v_1 [-v_3 v_1 \quad -v_3 v_2 \quad 1 - (v_3)^2], \\ Y_2 &= v_2 [-v_3 v_1 \quad -v_3 v_2 \quad 1 - (v_3)^2]. \end{aligned}$$


Define the auxiliary vector fields $\mathcal{G} = \cup_{k=1}^4 Y_{0,k} \cup \text{span}\{Y_1, Y_2\}$ on \mathbb{S}^2 . An important observation is

Theorem 4.6. *There exists $T > 0$ such that*


$$\{v_3 = 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq T) \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{S}^2.$$

Moreover, $\forall \epsilon > 0$


$$\overline{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(\{v_3 = 0\}, \leq \epsilon)} = \mathbb{S}^2.$$




(a) Step 1: (x_1, x_2) move to the red neighborhood




(b) Step 2: (x_1, x_2) idle inside the red neighborhood.




(c) Step 3: (x_1, x_2) drift inside the blue neighborhood.



(d) Step 3: x_3 move to the red neighborhood.



(e) Step 4: (x_1, x_2) drift inside the blue neighborhood.



(f) Step 4: x_3 drift inside the blue neighborhood.

Figure 1: In these pictures, the blue region represents the target neighborhood, the red region represents the smaller neighborhood inside, and the black line represents the trajectory.

The control problem of the auxiliary family \mathcal{G} is closely related to projective irreducibility. First, we show that we can approximate the integral curves of \mathcal{G} arbitrarily well with the v -component of vector fields in $\mathcal{F} = \tilde{X}_0 + \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $w' = (x', v')$, $w'' = (x'', v'') \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}^3$. Let*

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_t &= v' + \int_0^t Y(\varphi_s) ds \quad \text{for } Y \in \{Y_{0,1}, Y_{0,2}, Y_{0,3}, Y_{0,4}\} \\ \phi_{t/\gamma} &= v' + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \gamma Y(\phi_s) ds \quad \text{for } Y \in \text{span}\{Y_1, Y_2\}, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}$$

Denote M and L constants depending on the sup-norm and the Lipschitz constant of the vector fields. Then for all $0 < \delta \ll 1$, there exist controls α and β such that $\psi_{t+\delta}^\alpha(w'')$ and $\psi_{t/\gamma}^\beta(w'')$ are the integral curves of \mathcal{F} with initial w'' under the controls α and β respectively, and

$$\left| \left(\psi_{t+\delta}^{\alpha,4}, \psi_{t+\delta}^{\alpha,5}, \psi_{t+\delta}^{\alpha,6} \right) - \varphi_t \right| \leq (|v'' - v'| + \delta M) e^{Lt} \quad (4.16)$$

$$\left| \left(\psi_{t/\gamma}^{\beta,4}, \psi_{t/\gamma}^{\beta,5}, \psi_{t/\gamma}^{\beta,6} \right) - \phi_{t/\gamma} \right| \leq \left(\frac{Mt}{\gamma} + |v' - v''| \right) e^{2Lt}. \quad (4.17)$$

Proof. If $Y \in \{Y_{0,1}, Y_{0,2}, Y_{0,3}, Y_{0,4}\}$, we may consider $Y = Y_{0,1}$ without loss of generality. We pick the control $\alpha = (\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^5) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^5$,

$$\alpha(s) = -(1 + \frac{x_3''}{\delta}) \mathbf{e}_1 \chi_{[0,\delta)}(s) - \mathbf{e}_1 \chi_{[\delta,\infty)}(s)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^5$ is the unit vector in the first entry; this control moves the x_3 component from x_3'' to 0 within time δ , and then fixes the x_3 component after time δ . Let

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{t+\delta}^\alpha(w'') &= w'' + \int_0^{t+\delta} \tilde{X}_0(\psi_s^\alpha(w'')) ds + \int_0^{t+\delta} \tilde{X}_1(\psi_s^\alpha(w'')) \alpha^1(s) ds \\ \tilde{\psi}_t &= \psi_\delta^\alpha(w'') + \int_0^t \tilde{X}_0(\tilde{\psi}_s) ds - \int_0^t \tilde{X}_1(\tilde{\psi}_s) ds \\ \varphi_t(v') &= v' + \int_0^t Y_{0,1}(\varphi_s(v')) ds,\end{aligned}$$

where $\psi^\alpha(w'')$ is the trajectory under the control α with initial w'' , $\tilde{\psi}$ is an auxiliary trajectory for estimation, and $\varphi(v')$ is the trajectory we aim to approximate. We have

$$\left(\tilde{\psi}_t^4, \tilde{\psi}_t^5, \tilde{\psi}_t^6 \right) - \varphi_t = \left(\psi_\delta^{\alpha,4}(w''), \psi_\delta^{\alpha,5}(w''), \psi_\delta^{\alpha,6}(w'') \right) - v' + \int_0^t Y_{0,1}(\tilde{\psi}_s) ds - \int_0^t Y_{0,1}(\varphi_s) ds,$$

which by Grönwall inequality implies

$$\left| \left(\tilde{\psi}_t^4, \tilde{\psi}_t^5, \tilde{\psi}_t^6 \right) - \varphi_t \right| \leq \left| \left(\psi_\delta^{\alpha,4}(w''), \psi_\delta^{\alpha,5}(w''), \psi_\delta^{\alpha,6}(w'') \right) - v' \right| e^{Lt} \quad (4.18)$$

$$\leq \left(|v'' - v'| + \left| \int_0^\delta \tilde{X}_0(\psi_s^\alpha(w'')) ds \right| \right) e^{Lt}, \quad (4.19)$$

where L depends on the Lipschitz constant of the vector fields, and the integral involving \tilde{X}_1 vanishes due to $(\tilde{X}_1^4, \tilde{X}_1^5, \tilde{X}_1^6) = 0$. Also, we have

$$\psi_{t+\delta}^\alpha(w'') = \tilde{\psi}_t \quad (4.20)$$

by construction. Combining (4.19) and (4.20),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(\psi_{t+\delta}^{\alpha,4}, \psi_{t+\delta}^{\alpha,5}, \psi_{t+\delta}^{\alpha,6} \right) - \varphi_t \right| &= \left| \left(\tilde{\psi}_t^4, \tilde{\psi}_t^5, \tilde{\psi}_t^6 \right) - \varphi_t \right| \\ &\leq \left(|v'' - v'| + \left| \int_0^\delta \tilde{X}_0(\psi_s^\alpha(w'')) ds \right| \right) e^{Lt} \leq (|v'' - v'| + \delta M) e^{Lt}, \end{aligned}$$

where M depends on the sup norm of the vector fields; this shows (4.16).

If $Y \in \{Y_1, Y_2\}$, we may consider $Y = Y_1$ without loss of generality. At least one of $\cos^2 x_1''$ and $\sin^2 x_1''$ is greater than or equal to $1/2$. For definiteness, we assume $|\cos x_1''| \geq \cos^2(x_1'') \neq 1/2$. Given $\gamma > 0$, we pick the control $\beta = (\beta^1, \dots, \beta^5) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^5$,

$$\beta(s) = \frac{\gamma}{\cos x_1''} \mathbf{e}_2,$$

where $\mathbf{e}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^5$ is the unit vector in the second entry. We then consider the following

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{t/\gamma}^\beta &= w'' + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \tilde{X}_0(\psi_s^\beta) ds + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \frac{\gamma}{\cos x_1''} \tilde{X}_2(\psi_s^\beta) ds \\ \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma} &= w'' + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \frac{\gamma}{\cos x_1''} \tilde{X}_2(\tilde{\psi}_s) ds \\ \phi_{t/\gamma} &= v' + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \gamma Y_1(\phi_s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_{t/\gamma}^\beta$ is the trajectory under the control β with initial w'' , $\tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma}$ is an auxiliary trajectory for estimation, and $\phi_{t/\gamma}$ is the trajectory we aim to approximate.

$$\psi_{t/\gamma}^\beta - \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma} = \int_0^{t/\gamma} \tilde{X}_0(\psi_s^\beta) ds + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \frac{\gamma}{\cos x_1''} \tilde{X}_2(\psi_s^\beta) ds - \int_0^{t/\gamma} \frac{\gamma}{\cos x_1''} \tilde{X}_2(\tilde{\psi}_s) ds,$$

which we may apply Grönwall inequality to get

$$\left| \psi_{t/\gamma}^\beta - \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma} \right| \leq \frac{Mt}{\gamma} e^{Lt/|\cos x_1''|}. \quad (4.21)$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^4, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^5, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^6 \right) - \phi_{t/\gamma} &= v'' - v' + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \frac{\gamma}{\cos x_1''} \left(\tilde{X}_2^4, \tilde{X}_2^5, \tilde{X}_2^6 \right) (\tilde{\psi}_s) ds - \int_0^{t/\gamma} \gamma Y_1(\phi_s) ds \\ &= v'' - v' + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \frac{\cos \tilde{\psi}_s^1}{\cos x_1''} \gamma Y_1 \left((\tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^4, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^5, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^6) \right) ds - \int_0^{t/\gamma} \gamma Y_1(\phi_s) ds \\ &= v'' - v' + \int_0^{t/\gamma} \gamma \left[Y_1 \left((\tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^4, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^5, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^6) \right) - Y_1(\phi_s) \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to the x_1 -component of \tilde{X}_2 is zero, and so $\tilde{\psi}_s^1 = x_1''$. Again, by Grönwall inequality

$$\left| \left(\tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^4, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^5, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^6 \right) - \phi_{t/\gamma} \right| \leq |v' - v''| e^{Lt}. \quad (4.22)$$

Combining (4.21) and (4.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \left(\psi_{t/\gamma}^{\beta,4}, \psi_{t/\gamma}^{\beta,5}, \psi_{t/\gamma}^{\beta,6} \right) - \phi_{t/\gamma} \right| &\leq \left| \psi_{t/\gamma}^{\beta} - \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma} \right| + \left| \left(\tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^4, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^5, \tilde{\psi}_{t/\gamma,v}^6 \right) - \phi_{t/\gamma} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{Mt}{\gamma} e^{Lt/|\cos x_1''|} + |v' - v''| e^{Lt} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{Mt}{\gamma} + |v' - v''| \right) e^{Lt/|\cos x_1''|} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{Mt}{\gamma} + |v' - v''| \right) e^{2Lt}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a corollary, we have the integral curves of \mathcal{G} can be approximated arbitrarily well by the projection of integral curves of \mathcal{F} on to \mathbb{S}^2 .

Corollary 4.8. *Let $\varphi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ be an integral curve of \mathcal{G} with initial v' , and U be an open neighborhood of φ_T in \mathbb{S}^2 . Let $x' \in \mathbb{T}^3$ and $w' = (x', v')$. Then for all $\delta > 0$, there exists $0 < T' \leq T + \delta$, and an integral curve of \mathcal{F} , $\psi : [0, T'] \rightarrow \mathbb{ST}^3$, such that*

- $\psi_0 = w'$,
- $(\psi_{T'}^4, \psi_{T'}^5, \psi_{T'}^6) \in U$.

Proof. Let $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = T$ be the partition such that for $m = 1, \dots, n$

$$\dot{\varphi}_t = Y_{k_m}(\varphi_t) \quad \text{for } t_{m-1} < t < t_m,$$

and some $Y_{k_m} \in \mathcal{G}$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, we will prove by induction on n that there exist $0 < T' \leq T + \delta$ and an integral curve ψ of \mathcal{F} such that

$$\left| (\psi_{T'}^4, \psi_{T'}^5, \psi_{T'}^6) - \varphi_{t_n} \right| < \epsilon. \quad (4.23)$$

When $n = 1$, there are two cases. For the first case,

$$\varphi_{t_1} = v' + \int_0^{t_1} Y_{k_1}(\varphi_s) ds, \quad Y_{k_1} \in \{Y_{0,1}, Y_{0,2}, Y_{0,3}, Y_{0,4}\},$$

then we can apply Theorem 4.7 and the fact that $(\psi_0^4, \psi_0^5, \psi_0^6) = v'$ to get a control α such that

$$\left| \left(\psi_{t_1+\delta}^{\alpha,4}, \psi_{t_1+\delta}^{\alpha,5}, \psi_{t_1+\delta}^{\alpha,6} \right) - \varphi_{t_1} \right| \leq \delta M e^{Lt_1},$$

where $\delta > 0$ can be arbitrarily small, and the claim is satisfied by taking $\delta = \epsilon M^{-1} e^{-Lt_1}$. For the second case

$$\varphi_{t_1} = v' + \int_0^{t_1} c Y_{k_1}(\varphi_s) ds, \quad c \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{k_1} \in \{Y_1, Y_2\},$$

and for $\gamma \gg 1$ we can consider the accelerated version of the integral curve,

$$\phi_{t_1/\gamma} = v' + \int_0^{t_1/\gamma} \gamma c Y_{k_1}(\phi_s) ds.$$

Then we can apply Theorem 4.7 and the fact that $(\psi_0^4, \psi_0^5, \psi_0^6) = v'$ to get a control β such that

$$\left| \left(\psi_{t_1/\gamma}^{\beta,4}, \psi_{t_1/\gamma}^{\beta,5}, \psi_{t_1/\gamma}^{\beta,6} \right) - \phi_{t_1/\gamma} \right| \leq \frac{Mt_1}{\gamma} e^{2Lt_1},$$

where $\gamma > 0$ can be arbitrarily large, and the claim is satisfied by taking $\gamma = \epsilon^{-1} M t_1 \exp(2L t_1)$. Therefore, the base case is proved.

Now, assume the hypothesis is true for $n = l$, so there exists $T'' > 0$ such that

$$|(\psi_{T''}^4, \psi_{T''}^5, \psi_{T''}^6) - \varphi_{t_l}| < \epsilon;$$

we will prove that it is also true for $n = l + 1$. By taking $(\psi_{T''}^4, \psi_{T''}^5, \psi_{T''}^6)$ and φ_{t_l} as our new initial conditions, we apply Theorem 4.7 to extend ψ to get either

$$|(\psi_{T''+\delta}^4, \psi_{T''+\delta}^5, \psi_{T''+\delta}^6) - \varphi_{t_{l+1}}| \leq (|(\psi_{T''}^4, \psi_{T''}^5, \psi_{T''}^6) - \varphi_{t_l}| + \delta M) e^{L(t_{l+1}-t_l)}$$

for $\delta > 0$ arbitrarily small, or

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\psi_{T''+(t_{l+1}-t_l)/\gamma}^4, \psi_{T''+(t_{l+1}-t_l)/\gamma}^5, \psi_{T''+(t_{l+1}-t_l)/\gamma}^6 \right) - \phi_{t_{l+1}} \right| \\ & \leq \left(|(\psi_{T''}^4, \psi_{T''}^5, \psi_{T''}^6) - \varphi_{t_l}| + \frac{M(t_{l+1} - t_l)}{\gamma} \right) e^{2L(t_{l+1}-t_l)} \end{aligned}$$

for $\gamma > 0$ arbitrarily large. This concludes our proof. \square

As a consequence, we have the controllability for the projective process. Let us see how it is done before we move on to prove theorem 4.5.

Theorem 4.9. *There exists $T' > 0$ such that*

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}(w, T')} = \mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}^3.$$

Proof. Suppose we want to obtain a control to go from $w' = (x', v')$ to a neighborhood U of $w'' = (x'', v'')$; we may assume that U is of the form $U = (I_1 \times \dots \times I_6) \cap \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2$, where I_k 's are open intervals for $k = 1, \dots, 6$. By Theorem 4.6, there exists an integral curve of \mathcal{G} with the partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m = T_1$ such that

$$\phi_0 = v', \quad \phi_{T_1} \in (I_4 \times I_5 \times I_6) \cap \mathbb{S}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{T_1-\epsilon_1} \in \{v_3 = 0\},$$

where $\epsilon_1 > 0$ can be arbitrarily small. By definition,

$$\dot{\phi}_t = Y_i \in \mathcal{G} \quad \text{for} \quad t_{i-1} < t < t_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

and we can apply Corollary 4.8 to get an integral curve $\varphi = (\varphi^1, \varphi^2, \dots, \varphi^6) : [0, T_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}^3$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ such that

- $(\varphi_0^4, \varphi_0^5, \varphi_0^6) = v'$.
- $(\varphi_{T_2}^4, \varphi_{T_2}^5, \varphi_{T_2}^6) \in (I_4 \times I_5 \times I_6) \cap \mathbb{S}^2$.
- $(\varphi_{T_2-\epsilon_2}^4, \varphi_{T_2-\epsilon_2}^5, \varphi_{T_2-\epsilon_2}^6) \in \{v_3 = 0\}$, where ϵ_2 is a small positive number depending on ϵ_1 .

It is possible to achieve the third bullet point, since we can pick ϕ so that $\phi_u \in \{v_3 > 0\}$ and $\phi_{u'} \in \{v_3 < 0\}$ for some $u < T_1 - \epsilon_1 < u'$. By approximating ϕ well enough, φ will have to cross $\{v_3 = 0\}$ by continuity.

Now, observe that both

$$\left(\tilde{X}_0^4, \tilde{X}_0^5, \tilde{X}_0^6 \right) = \left(\tilde{X}_1^4, \tilde{X}_1^5, \tilde{X}_1^6 \right) = 0$$

for $\{(x, v) \in \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2 : v_3 = 0\}$; hence, we can use \tilde{X}_0 and \tilde{X}_1 to control the position in the x -direction without changing the position in v -direction, once we are in $\{(x, v) \in \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2 : v_3 = 0\}$. By Theorem 4.5, we construct an integral curve $\tilde{\varphi} : [0, T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}^3$ such that

- $\tilde{\varphi}_t = \varphi_t$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_2 - \epsilon_2$.
- $(\tilde{\varphi}_t^4, \tilde{\varphi}_t^5, \tilde{\varphi}_t^6) = (\tilde{\varphi}_{T_2 - \epsilon_2}^4, \tilde{\varphi}_{T_2 - \epsilon_2}^5, \tilde{\varphi}_{T_2 - \epsilon_2}^6)$ for $T_2 - \epsilon_2 \leq t \leq T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_2$.
- $(\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_2}^1, \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_2}^2, \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_2}^3) \in I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$.

To finish our proof, first observe that there exists $0 < \epsilon_3 < \epsilon_2$ and open neighborhood \tilde{U} of $\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_2}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{X}_0}(\tilde{U}, \leq \epsilon_3) \subset U.$$

Again, we may assume \tilde{U} is of the form $\tilde{U} = (\tilde{I}_1 \times \dots \times \tilde{I}_6) \cap \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2$, where \tilde{I}_k 's are open intervals for $k = 1, \dots, 6$. We extend our integral curve to $\tilde{\varphi} : [0, T_3 + T_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}^3$ in the following steps:

1. If necessary, use Theorem 4.5 to obtain a control such that

$$(\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3}^1, \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3}^2) \in \tilde{I}_1 \times \tilde{I}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_2}^k = \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3}^k \quad \text{for } k = 4, 5, 6.$$

2. By Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 4.7, there exists some $k \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and some $\gamma \gg 1$ such that

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1}} = \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3} + \int_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3}^{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + 1/\gamma} \tilde{X}_0(\tilde{\varphi}_s) \pm \gamma \tilde{X}_k(\tilde{\varphi}_s) ds,$$

$T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1} < T_3 + T_2$, and

$$(\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1}}^4, \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1}}^5, \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1}}^6) \in \tilde{I}_4 \times \tilde{I}_5 \times \tilde{I}_6;$$

the sign in front of \tilde{X}_k depends on the direction we are moving.

3. Pick some $\tilde{\gamma} \gg 1$ such that

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}} = \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1}} + \int_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + 1/\gamma}^{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + 1/\gamma + 1/\tilde{\gamma}} \tilde{X}_0(\tilde{\varphi}_s) + \tilde{\gamma} \tilde{X}_1(\tilde{\varphi}_s) ds,$$

$T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{-1} < T_3 + T_2$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}} \in \tilde{U}$.

4. Finally, consider

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2} = \tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + \gamma^{-1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}} + \int_{T_3 + T_2 - \epsilon_3 + 1/\gamma + 1/\tilde{\gamma}}^{T_3 + T_2} \tilde{X}_0(\tilde{\varphi}_s) ds;$$

due to the way we pick ϵ_3 , we have $\tilde{\varphi}_{T_3 + T_2} \in U$.

□

We break the proof of Theorem 4.6 into several lemmas. First, we observe that

$$N_0 = \{v_3 = 0\}, \quad N_1 = \{v_1 = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_2 = \{v_2 = 0\}$$

are the sets where the vector fields Y_0, Y_1 and Y_2 vanish respectively.




Figure 2: A picture for the vector field $(-v_3(v_1)^2, v_1(1 - (v_3))^2)$.

Lemma 4.10. *The non-trivial orbits of Y_1 and Y_2 cover $\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{v_3 = \pm 1\}$,*

$$\mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{v_3 = \pm 1\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^2 \bigcup_{\{(v,t) \in \mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : Y_k(v) \neq 0\}} e^{tY_k}(v),$$

and every non-trivial orbit of Y_1 and Y_2 intersects N_0 ,

$$\bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} e^{tY_k}(v) \cap N_0 \neq \emptyset, \quad v \in \{v \in \mathbb{S}^2 : Y_k(v) \neq 0\}, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Proof. By symmetry, we may focus on studying the orbits of Y_1 . The orbits of Y_1 are partitioned into three parts,

$$N_{1,-} = \{v_1 < 0\}, \quad N_1 = \{v_1 = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_{1,+} = \{v_1 > 0\}.$$

The orbits in N_1 are trivial, and the orbits in $N_{1,-}$ and $N_{1,+}$ are symmetric; therefore, we can focus on analyzing $N_{1,+}$. In particular, we study the projected orbits to the (v_1, v_3) -plane,

$$\frac{dv_1}{dt} = -v_3(v_1)^2 \tag{4.24}$$

$$\frac{dv_3}{dt} = v_1(1 - (v_3)^2). \tag{4.25}$$

We include a picture of the vector field in Figure 2 for reference.

To show that every orbit in $N_{1,+}$ must pass through the equator N_0 . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^2v_3}{dt^2} &= -v_3(v_1)^2(1 - (v_3)^2) - 2(v_1)^2v_3(1 - (v_3)^2) \\ &= -3(v_1)^2v_3(1 - (v_3)^2),\end{aligned}$$

which is positive when $v_3 < 0$, zero when $v_3 = 0$ and negative when $v_3 > 0$; this suggests the system is accelerating upward in the lower half, and accelerating downward in the upper half. This and the fact that

$$\frac{dv_3}{dt} = v_1(1 - (v_3)^2) > 0 \quad \text{in } N_{1,+}$$

imply every orbit in $N_{1,+}$ passes through N_0 . □

Another thing we need is an estimate of how far right one can be when we reach N_0 , if we start the system from, say, $(v_1, -\epsilon) \in N_{1,+}$. Let t be the time at which the system hits N_0 . Then

$$\begin{aligned}0 = v_3(t) &= -\epsilon + \int_0^t v_1(s)(1 - (v_3(s))^2) ds \\ &\leq -\epsilon + \int_0^t v_1(0)(1 - \epsilon^2) ds = -\epsilon + v_1(0)(1 - \epsilon^2)t,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that the system is accelerating upward in the lower part of $N_{1,+}$. This gives an upper bound for t ,

$$t \leq \frac{\epsilon}{v_1(0)(1 - \epsilon^2)}.$$

For $v_1(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}v_1(t) &= v_1(0) + \int_0^t -v_3(s)(v_1(s))^2 ds \\ &\leq v_1(0) + \int_0^t \epsilon(v_1(s))^2 ds \\ &\leq v_1(0) + \epsilon t \leq v_1(0) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{v_1(0)(1 - \epsilon^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if we take $(v_1(0), v_3(0)) = (\epsilon, -\epsilon)$, then

$$v_1(t) \leq \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon^2}{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon^2)} < 3\epsilon, \tag{4.26}$$

where the last inequality is true if we take for example $\epsilon^2 < 1/2$. Estimate (4.26) gives the following lemma.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $\mathcal{G}' = \text{span}\{Y_1, Y_2\}$. For all $t > 0$ and $\epsilon < 1/9$,*

$$N_0 \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}'}(\{v_3 = \pm\epsilon\}, \leq t).$$

Now we are ready to prove theorem 4.5. The main idea is to use Y_0 to go across orbits of Y_1 and Y_2 in a subset of S^2 , then use Y_1 and Y_2 to move instantaneously within their orbits.

Proof. Let $S_{\epsilon,\pm}$ be the stripes where ϵ will be determined later,

$$S_{\epsilon,+} = \mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{\epsilon \leq v_3 \leq 1 - \epsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\epsilon,-} = \mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{-1 + \epsilon \leq v_3 \leq -\epsilon\}.$$

First, we show that there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that

$$S_{\epsilon,+} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_1) \quad \forall v \in S_{\epsilon,+} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\epsilon,-} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_1) \quad \forall v \in S_{\epsilon,-}. \quad (4.27)$$

By symmetry, we focus on studying $S_{\epsilon,+}$. A few properties of the collection \mathcal{G} :

- $Y_{0,1} = -Y_{0,3}$ and $Y_{0,2} = -Y_{0,4}$
- For all $v \in S_{\epsilon,+}$, $\text{span}\{Y_{0,k}, Y_l\} = T_v\mathbb{S}^2$ for some $(k, l) \in \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}$.

Given $v \in S_{\epsilon,+}$, suppose $\text{span}\{Y_{0,k}, Y_l\} = T_v\mathbb{S}^2$. For some neighborhood U of 0 in \mathbb{R}^2 , we may consider $g : U \rightarrow S_{\epsilon,+}$, defined as

$$g(t_1, t_2) = e^{t_2 Y_l} \circ e^{t_1 Y_{0,k}}(v),$$

where the exponential denote the flow generated by the vector field. One can see that $g(0, 0) = v$, and by letting

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_t(v) &= v + \int_0^t Y_{0,k}(\varphi_s(v)) ds \\ \psi_t(v') &= v' + \int_0^t Y_l(\psi_s(v')) ds, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$g(t_1, t_2) = \varphi_{t_1}(v) + \int_0^{t_2} Y_l(\psi_s(\varphi_{t_1}(v))) ds.$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{t_1} g(0, 0) &= \dot{\varphi}_{t_1}(v) + \int_0^{t_2} \nabla(Y_l \circ \varphi_s) \cdot \dot{\varphi}_{t_1}(v) ds \Big|_{(t_1, t_2) = (0, 0)} = Y_{0,k}(v) \\ \partial_{t_2} g(0, 0) &= Y_l(v), \end{aligned}$$

and the two vectors are linearly independent; hence, by inverse function theorem, there exists a neighborhood \tilde{U} of 0 such that $\tilde{U} \subseteq U$ and $g : \tilde{U} \rightarrow g(\tilde{U})$ is a diffeomorphism. Define

$$t(v) = 2 \max\{|t_1|, |t_2|\}_{(t_1, t_2) \in \tilde{U}}.$$

Since $Y_{0,k}$ and $-Y_{0,k}$ are both in \mathcal{G} , the above discussion implies that

$$g(\tilde{U}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t(v)).$$

For each $v \in S_{\epsilon,+}$, there exists a neighborhood of 0, $U_v \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, and a diffeomorphism $g_v : U_v \rightarrow g_v(U_v)$ such that $v = g(0, 0)$. Since $S_{\epsilon,+}$ is compact, we may cover it with finitely many open neighborhood $\{g_{v_i}(U_{v_i})\}_{i=1}^N$, and this shows

$$S_{\epsilon,+} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}\left(v, \leq \sum_{i=1}^N t(v_i)\right) \quad \forall v \in S_{\epsilon,+}.$$

Denote

$$S_+ = \{v \in \mathbb{S}^2 : v_3 \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad S_- = \{v \in \mathbb{S}^2 : v_3 \leq 0\}.$$

Next, we show that by picking $\epsilon \ll 1$ there exists $t_2 > 0$ such that

$$S_{\epsilon,+} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_2) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall v \in S_+ \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\epsilon,-} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_2) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall v \in S_-. \quad (4.28)$$

By symmetry, we focus on studying S_+ . We observe that if $1 - \epsilon < v_3 < 1$, then by Lemma 4.10, for any $\delta > 0$

$$N_0 \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq \delta) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall v \in \{v \in S_+ : 1 - \epsilon < v_3 < 1\};$$

moreover, since the integral curves are continuous, it also implies

$$S_{\epsilon,+} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq \delta) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall v \in \{v \in S_+ : 1 - \epsilon < v_3 < 1\}.$$

If $0 \leq v_3 < \epsilon$, we may without loss of generality assume $v_3 = 0$ due to Lemma 4.10. Then by picking $\epsilon < 1/9$, we may apply Lemma 4.11 to conclude for all $\delta > 0$

$$S_{\epsilon,+} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq \delta) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall v \in \{v \in S_+ : 0 \leq v_3 < \epsilon\}.$$

If $v_3 = 1$, since $Y_{0,1} \neq 0$ at $(0, 0, 1) \in S_+$, there exists some $t'_2 > 0$ such that

$$v' = e^{t'_2 Y_{0,1}}(0, 0, 1) \neq (0, 0, 1),$$

and the previous two cases apply to v' . In conclusion, we may take $t_2 = t'_2 + \delta$ for arbitrary $\delta > 0$, and $\epsilon < 1/9$ so that

$$S_{\epsilon,+} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_2) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall v \in S_+.$$

Finally, by combining (4.27) and (4.28), we obtain

$$S_{\epsilon,+} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_1 + t_2) \quad \forall v \in S_+ \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\epsilon,-} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_1 + t_2) \quad \forall v \in S_-. \quad (4.29)$$

By Lemma 4.11, (4.29) further implies for all $\delta > 0$,

$$N_0 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_1 + t_2 + \delta) \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (4.30)$$

By Lemma 4.10, (4.30) implies $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}(v, \leq t_1 + t_2 + \delta)$ is dense in \mathbb{S}^2 for all v in \mathbb{S}^2 . \square

A Optimality for the decay bound in Theorem 1.1

In the following examples, we investigate the sharpness of the decay bound obtained in Theorem 1.1. The first example shows that the linear decay obtained in Theorem 1.1 is optimal in general. The second example shows that there are cases with sublinear decay. We consider diffusion processes on $M = \mathbb{T}^2$ with Euclidean metric.

Example A.1. Let $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. Consider the process

$$dx_t^\epsilon = \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^4 X_k(x_t^\epsilon) \circ dW_k,$$

where

$$X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \sin x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad X_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sin x_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A straightforward calculation shows it is associated with the projective process

$$dw_t^\epsilon = \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^4 \tilde{X}_k(w_t^\epsilon) \circ dW_k,$$

where

$$\tilde{X}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{X}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{X}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \sin x_2 \\ 0 \\ (1 - v_1^2)v_2 \cos x_2 \\ -v_1 v_2^2 \cos x_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{X}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sin x_1 \\ -v_1^2 v_2 \cos x_1 \\ v_1(1 - v_2^2) \cos x_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and we have $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_1 = \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_2 = 0$, $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_3 = -4v_1 v_2 \cos x_2$ and $\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_4 = -4v_1 v_2 \cos x_1$. One can check that the processes are hypoelliptic and irreducible.

First, we show that λ_1^ϵ decays exactly linearly as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, and therefore our bound cannot be improved in general. Indeed,

$$0 = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f^\epsilon = \epsilon \sum_k \left(\tilde{X}_k^* \right)^2 f^\epsilon = \epsilon \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_1^* f^\epsilon \quad \Rightarrow \quad f^\epsilon = f^1,$$

where we used the unique ergodicity. This implies

$$d\lambda_1^\epsilon = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int \frac{|\tilde{X}_k^* f^\epsilon|^2}{f^\epsilon} dw = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int \frac{|\tilde{X}_k^* f^1|^2}{f^1} dw.$$

Next, we show that $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Denote $g^\epsilon = \log f^\epsilon$. By contradiction, we assume $\lambda_1^\epsilon = 0$ and therefore by (2.1),

$$\tilde{X}_k^* f = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, 4 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad -\tilde{X}_k g = \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, 4, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where f is the stationary density for w_t^ϵ . Using (A.1) for $k = 1, 2$, we have g is independent of x_1 and x_2 , and therefore

$$\nabla g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \nabla_v g \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{x_k} \nabla g = \nabla \partial_{x_k} g = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now, consider (A.1) for $k = 3$, we have

$$-((1 - v_1^2)v_2 \cos x_2 \quad -v_1 v_2^2 \cos x_2) \cdot \nabla_v g = \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_3 = 0 \quad \text{for } (x, v) = \left(0, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \right);$$

this in particular implies $\nabla_v g(0, \pi/2, \sqrt{2}/2, \sqrt{2}/2) = c(v_1, v_2)^t$ for some constant c . However, this is absurd, since (A.2) would imply

$$\nabla_v g = c \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } (x, v) = \left(0, x_2, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \right),$$

where x_2 can be arbitrary. We may consider for instance $x_2 = 0$ to see (A.1) can not hold, since

$$\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_3 = -2,$$

which is not equal to

$$-\tilde{X}_3 g = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} c \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

This is a contradiction.

Example A.2. This example is meant to explain why it is impossible to obtain an upper bound for

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon}.$$

Let $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. Consider the process

$$dx_t^\epsilon = X_0(x_t^\epsilon) dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^4 X_k(x_t^\epsilon) \circ dW_k,$$

where X_k are the same as in Example A.1, and $X_0 = X_3$; the process is again elliptic and irreducible. By the results in [5], the shearing in the deterministic dynamics implies

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} = \infty.$$

References

- [1] L. Arnold, G. Papanicolaou, and V. Wihstutz, *Asymptotic analysis of the lyapunov exponent and rotation number of the random oscillator and applications*, Siam Journal on Applied Mathematics **46** (1986), no. 3, 427–450.
- [2] P. H Baxendale, *Lyapunov exponents and relative entropy for a stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **81** (1989), 521–554.
- [3] P. H Baxendale and L. Goukasian, *Lyapunov exponents of nilpotent itô systems with random coefficients*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **95** (2001), 219–233.
- [4] P. H Baxendale and L. Goukasian, *Lyapunov exponents for small random perturbations of hamiltonian systems*, Annals of probability (2002), 101–134.
- [5] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith, *A regularity method for lower bounds on the lyapunov exponent for stochastic differential equations*, Invent. math **227** (2022), 429–516.
- [6] J. Bedrossian and S. Punshon-Smith, *Chaos in stochastic 2d galerkin-navier-stokes*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **405** (2022), no. 4.
- [7] A. Carverhill, *Furstenberg’s theorem for nonlinear stochastic system*, Probability theory and related fields **74** (1987), 529–534.
- [8] R. E. L. Deville, N. S. Namachchivaya, and Z. Rapti, *Stability of a stochastic two-dimensional non-hamiltonian system*, Siam Journal on Applied Mathematics **71** (2011), no. 4, 1458–1475.
- [9] E.I.Auslender and G. N. Mil’shtein, *Asymptotic expansions of the liapunov index for linear stochastic systems with small noise*, Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics **46** (1982), no. 3, 227–283.
- [10] H. Furstenberg, *Noncommuting random products*, Trans. AMS **108** (1963), 377–428.
- [11] H. Furstenberg and H. Kesten, *Products of random matrices*, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics **31** (1960), no. 2, 457–469.
- [12] D. P. Herzog and J. C. Mattingly, *A practical criterion for positivity of transition densities*, Nonlinearity **28** (2015).
- [13] V. Jurdjevic, *Geometric control theory*, Cambridge university press, 1997.
- [14] H. Kunita, *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*, Cambridge university press, 1997.
- [15] J. M. Lee, *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, Springer New York, NY, 2012.
- [16] O. A. Oleĭnik and E. V. Radkevič, *Second order equations with nonnegative characteristic form*, American Mathematical Society, 1973.
- [17] V. I. Oseledets, *A multiplicative ergodic theorem. characteristic llyapunov, exponents of dynamical systems*, Trudy Moskovskogo Matematicheskogo Obshchestva **19** (1968), 179–210.
- [18] M. A. Pinsky and V. Wihstutz, *Lyapunov exponents of nilpotent itô systems*, Stochastic **25** (1998), no. 1, 43–57.
- [19] G. D. Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [20] M. S Raghunathan, *A proof of oseledets’s multiplicative ergodic theorem*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **32** (1979), 356–362.
- [21] R. B. Sowers, *On the tangent flow of a stochastic differential equation with fast drift*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **353** (2000), no. 4, 1321–1334.
- [22] D. W Stroock and S R S Varadhan, *On the support of diffusion processes with applications to the strong maximum principle*, Proceedings of the Sixth Berkley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability **3** (1972), 333–359.
- [23] V. S. Varadarajan, *Lie groups, lie algebras, and their representation*, Springer, 1984.
- [24] P. Walters, *A dynamical proof of the multiplicative ergodic theorem*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **335** (1993), no. 1, 245–257.