

# AVERAGING FOR RANDOM METASTABLE SYSTEMS

Cecilia González-Tokman\*, Joshua Peters†

## Abstract

Random metastability occurs when an externally forced or noisy system possesses more than one state of apparent equilibrium. This work investigates a class of random dynamical systems, arising from perturbing a one-dimensional piecewise smooth expanding map of the interval with two invariant subintervals, each supporting a unique ergodic absolutely continuous invariant measure. Upon perturbation, this invariance is destroyed, allowing trajectories to randomly switch between subintervals. We show that the invariant density of the randomly perturbed system may be approximated by an explicit convex combination of the two initially invariant densities, obtained by averaging. Further, we also identify the limit of the second Oseledets space, or coherent structure, as the perturbation shrinks to zero. Our results are applied to random paired tent maps over ergodic, measure-preserving, and invertible driving systems. Finally, we provide generalisations to systems admitting more than two initially invariant sets.

---

\*School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Queensland, St Lucia QLD 4072, Australia.  
[cecilia.gt@uq.edu.au](mailto:cecilia.gt@uq.edu.au)

†School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Queensland, St Lucia QLD 4072, Australia.  
[joshua.peters@uq.net.au](mailto:joshua.peters@uq.net.au)

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Statement of main results . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Paired metastable systems and their perturbations</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	The initial system . . . . .	12
3.2	The perturbations . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Continuity of Oseledets Decomposition</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Characterisation of the limiting invariant density</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1	The weights . . . . .	17
5.2	The limiting invariant density . . . . .	27
<b>6</b>	<b>Characterisation of the second Oseledets space</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>The limiting invariant density for multiple initially invariant states</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Example: Random paired tent maps</b>	<b>41</b>
8.1	The system of concern . . . . .	41
8.2	Conditions for the unperturbed map . . . . .	42
8.3	Conditions for the perturbed map . . . . .	43

## 1 Introduction

Metastability characterises systems possessing more than one state of apparent equilibrium. Such systems appear in numerous examples of natural phenomena. In molecular dynamics, transitions between conformations are rare events allowing one to describe the resulting macroscopic dynamical behaviour through a flipping process of metastable states [54, 53]. Concerning oceanic flows, metastable systems have been used to study slow mixing regions of the ocean (called gyres), which have contributed to phenomena such as the *Great Pacific Garbage Patch* [26, 29, 25, 24, 16]. Random metastable systems arise when such transition patterns or ocean currents are subjected to external forces (e.g. changes in chemical potentials or wind patterns, respectively).

The first description of metastability can be traced back to the work of van't Hoff [57] in the study of chemical reaction-rate theory. Concerning particle systems, Kramers developed a model for chemical reactions in a double-well potential, based on Brownian motion [42]. In this direction, Lebowitz and Penrose proposed a rigorous theory of metastability in [50], where the authors investigated the escape rate and lifetime of metastable states. Building on this work, Sewell provided the first axiomatisation of metastability in the context of quantum mechanics [55]. For dynamical systems, Freidlin and Wentzell introduced the concept of large deviations on the path space to analyse the long-term behaviour of dynamical systems influenced by random perturbations [20]. This approach aims to identify the most likely path between metastable states, and was later adapted by Cassandro, Galves, Olivieri and Vares to study interacting particle systems [9]. This resulted in a variety of results related to Markovian lattice models [48]. Davies developed spectral techniques in [11, 12, 13, 14, 15] to study metastability of Markov processes. In this case, the spectrum of generators for reversible Markov processes were investigated. These results were further developed by Gaveau and Schulman [31]; and Gaveau and Moreau [30]. Closely related to spectral methods is the potential-theoretic approach to metastability, initiated by Bovier, Eckhoff, Gaynard and Klein [7]. This approach focuses on sequences of visits to metastable sets, aiming to analyse hitting times and return probabilities. Finally is the martingale approach to metastability introduced by Beltrán and Landim [4, 5]. For further details on the history of metastability, we refer the reader to [6, 43, 48] and the references therein.

In the context of deterministic systems, Keller and Liverani pioneered in [40] the study of metastability through a dynamical systems approach. From this perspective, they provide a precise definition of metastability using the spectrum of the so-called Perron-Frobenius operator. If the dynamical system admits a unique invariant density, then metastability is characterised entirely through the second eigenvalue of the Perron-Frobenius operator. Namely, its second eigenvalue is close to but strictly less than 1, giving rise to a dynamical system possessing slow mixing properties equipped with almost invariant (metastable) states. Such systems may emerge by adding a small perturbation to a system with two ergodic invariant measures supported on two invariant subintervals. The perturbation is made in such a way that a *hole* appears, allowing the initially invariant sets to communicate,

making the system ergodic on the entire space.

In the setting of piecewise expanding metastable systems, [32] provides a rigorous approximation for the leading and second eigenfunctions of the Perron-Frobenius operator for small hole sizes. A similar asymptotic result for the leading eigenfunction is obtained in the setting of intermittent metastable systems in [2]. Continuing in the direction of piecewise expanding metastable systems, [17] obtains an approximation for the diffusion coefficient (or standard deviation) of the Central Limit Theorem, admitted by [47]. In particular, the authors reveal that for small hole sizes, the invariant measure and diffusion coefficient for the infinite-dimensional system may be approximated by the map's induced finite state Markov chain. Many other properties of deterministic metastable systems have been investigated including escape rates [19], extreme value laws [38], and their relationship with open systems [27].

For random dynamical systems, metastability is characterised in a slightly different manner. As opposed to referring to the spectral picture of the Perron-Frobenius operator, we look to its so-called Oseledets decomposition, discovered by Oseledets in [49] and later developed by Froyland, Lloyd, and Quas in [22, 23] for Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles. Here, instead of studying eigenvalues with corresponding eigenfunctions, we look to Lyapunov exponents with corresponding Oseledets spaces. In this setting, the top Lyapunov exponent is zero with an associated Oseledets space spanned by the random invariant density of the system. Metastability is then characterised by the second Lyapunov exponent being negative but close to zero. The corresponding second Oseledets space provides a so-called coherent structure which decays asymptotically at a slow rate according to the second Lyapunov exponent.

In the direction of random metastable systems, [3] provides a generalisation of the celebrated Keller-Liverani escape rate formulae [40]. They illustrate that their techniques can be used to approximate so-called annealed invariant densities of metastable systems subject to i.i.d. random perturbations. Such invariant densities are fixed points of a so-called averaged Perron-Frobenius operator. In [28], Froyland and Stancevic study the connection between Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles of metastable systems and escape rates of random maps. Since random metastable systems are characterised by an asymptotic quantity, namely the second Lyapunov exponent, constructing examples of such systems proves to be a difficult task. In fact, [34] demonstrates that small perturbations of some random systems can result in drastic changes in the Lyapunov exponents of the Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle. More recently, focus has been placed on the approximation of the second Lyapunov exponent for piecewise expanding maps. In [10], Crimmins provides general conditions for quasi-compact Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles to admit an Oseledets decomposition that depends continuously on perturbations. This result generalises the famous Keller-Liverani perturbation theory [39], to the random setting. In the class of random metastable systems, in [35] and [36], Horan provides upper and lower estimates on the second Lyapunov exponent for so-called random paired tent maps. These estimates are refined in [33] where it is shown that the top two Lyapunov exponents are both simple, and

the only exceptional exponents outside a readily computed range.

### 1.1 Statement of main results

In this paper, we consider a Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle of so-called random paired metastable systems driven by an ergodic, invertible and measure-preserving transformation  $\sigma$  of the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The initial system  $T^0$  is deterministic and admits two unique ergodic absolutely continuous invariant measures ( $\mu_L$  and  $\mu_R$ ) with associated invariant densities ( $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$ ) supported on two invariant subintervals ( $I_L$  and  $I_R$ ). We consider small perturbations of  $T^0$ , denoted  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$ , which introduce random holes into our system (defined as  $H_{\star, \omega}^\varepsilon := (T_\omega^\varepsilon)^{-1}(I_\star^c) \cap I_\star$  for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ ), allowing trajectories to randomly switch between the initially invariant subintervals (see Figure 3), giving rise to a unique ergodic absolutely continuous invariant measure on  $I_L \cup I_R$ . The perturbations are made so that  $\mu_\star(H_{\star, \omega}^\varepsilon) = \varepsilon\beta_{\star, \omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon)$  where  $\beta_\star \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ . Juxtaposed to [3], instead of obtaining annealed (or averaged) results, we strive for quenched (or fibre-wise) descriptions of the functions spanning the top and second Oseledets spaces. This approach is advantageous as fluctuations in the functions spanning these spaces are not featured in the annealed setting.

Our first main result shows that the limiting random invariant density is a non-random convex combination of  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$ , with weights depending only on perturbations through averaged quantities. The statement of Theorem 5.4 follows. The class of random dynamical systems for which our results apply are described in Section 3.

**Theorem A.** *Let  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}([-1, 1]), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$  be a sequence of random dynamical systems of paired metastable maps  $T_\omega^\varepsilon : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  satisfying (I1)-(I6) and (P1)-(P7) (see Section 3). Denote by  $(\phi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  the random invariant density of  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . If  $\int_\Omega \beta_{L, \omega} + \beta_{R, \omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$ , then as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,*

$$\phi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_\omega^0 := \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{R, \omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L, \omega} + \beta_{R, \omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \phi_L + \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{L, \omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L, \omega} + \beta_{R, \omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \phi_R$$

*uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.*

We refer the reader to Theorem 7.2 where we provide a generalisation of Theorem A to random metastable systems with  $m \geq 2$  initially invariant sets.

Theorem A also provides us with an approximation of the limiting random invariant measures for the Markov chains in random environments driven by an ergodic, invertible and measure-preserving transformation  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  with transition matrices  $(P_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , where

$$P_\omega^\varepsilon := \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon\beta_{L, \omega} & \varepsilon\beta_{R, \omega} \\ \varepsilon\beta_{L, \omega} & 1 - \varepsilon\beta_{R, \omega} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ , entries of  $P_\omega^\varepsilon$  describe the transition probabilities between two states  $S_L$  and  $S_R$  as indicated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Transition probabilities between  $S_L$  and  $S_R$  for a fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

When  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,  $P_\omega^0 := I$  and the states  $S_L$  and  $S_R$  are invariant, giving rise to two unique ergodic invariant probability measures  $\mu_L = \delta_L$  and  $\mu_R = \delta_R$ .<sup>1</sup> We are interested in the behaviour of these Markov chains as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Indeed, if for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $\beta_\star \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ , and  $\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$ , then a consequence of Theorem A is that as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the random invariant measure of the matrix cocycle  $(P_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  converges to

$$\mu^0 := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\ \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \end{pmatrix}$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. We refer the reader to Remark 5.3 where we further address the connection between the infinite dimensional system and its induced Markov chain.

In addition to Theorem 5.4, we provide a quenched description of the function spanning the second Oseledets space as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Here we illustrate that a similar approximation proposed in [32] can be made in the random setting. The statement of Theorem 6.2 follows. The proof of this result may be found in Section 6.

**Theorem B.** *Let  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}([-1, 1]), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$  be a sequence of random dynamical systems of paired metastable maps  $T_\omega^\varepsilon : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  satisfying (I1)-(I6) and (P1)-(P7) (see Section 3). Denote by  $(\psi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  the family of functions spanning the second Oseledets spaces of  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . Choose the sign of  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  such that  $\int_{I_L} \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) > 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,*

$$\psi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \psi_\omega^0 := \frac{1}{2}\phi_L - \frac{1}{2}\phi_R$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

We structure the paper as follows. In Section 2 we introduce relevant definitions and results related to random dynamical systems and Perron-Frobenius operators. The initial system and the perturbations made to it are introduced in Section 3. Here we discuss how this gives rise to so-called random paired metastable systems. Section 4 is dedicated to showing that in the context of [10], the Oseledets decomposition for the Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle depends continuously on perturbations. This allows us to assume in Section 5 that

<sup>1</sup>We note that  $\delta_L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\delta_R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

any accumulation point of the random invariant density for the perturbed system is given by a convex combination of the initially invariant densities, allowing us to prove Theorem A. In Section 6 we prove Theorem B, providing a characterisation of the second Oseledets space and thus a description of the corresponding coherent structure. We discuss extensions of Theorem A and Theorem B in Section 7 when the initial system admits  $m \geq 2$  initially invariant sets. Finally, in Section 8, we apply our results to Horan's random paired tent maps.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we collate definitions and results relevant to this paper. Primarily, we introduce transfer operator techniques for random dynamical systems.

**Definition 2.1.** A *semi-invertible random dynamical system* is a tuple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$ , where the base  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is an *invertible*,<sup>2</sup> measure-preserving transformation of the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ ,  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  is a Banach space, and  $\mathcal{L} : \Omega \rightarrow L(X)$  is a family of bounded linear operators of  $X$ , called the generator.<sup>3</sup>

**Remark 2.2.** For convenience, whenever we refer to a random dynamical system, we assume it is semi-invertible. That is, the base map  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is invertible, but its generators need not be.

In general,  $X$  can be any given Banach space. In this paper, we will be interested in  $X$  being the Banach space of functions with *bounded variation*.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $(S, \mathcal{D}, \mu)$  be a measure space with  $S = [a, b]$ . The space  $BV_\mu(S)$  is called the space of *bounded variation* on  $S$  where

$$\|f\|_{BV_\mu(S)} = \inf_{\tilde{f}=f \mu\text{-a.e.}} \text{var}(\tilde{f}) + \|f\|_{L^1(\mu)}$$

and  $\text{var}(f)$  is the total variation of  $f$  over  $S$ ;

$$\text{var}(f) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n |f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})| \mid n \geq 1, a \leq x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n \leq b \right\}.$$

Elements of  $BV_\mu(S)$ , denoted  $[f]_\mu$ , are equivalence classes of functions with bounded variation on  $S$ . In this paper, we consider functions  $f \in BV(S)$  with norm  $\|f\|_{BV(S)} = \text{var}(f) + \|f\|_{L^1(\mu)}$  and emphasise that  $f$  is identified through a representative of minimal variation from the equivalence class  $[f]_\mu$ .

We associate with a *non-singular transformation*  $T$  a unique *Perron-Frobenius operator*. Since it describes the evolution of ensembles of points, or densities, such operators serve as a powerful tool when studying the statistical behaviour of trajectories of  $T$ .

<sup>2</sup> $\sigma^{-1}$  is measurable and exists for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

<sup>3</sup>Here  $L(X)$  denotes the space of bounded linear operators preserving the Banach space  $X$ .

**Definition 2.4.** A measurable function  $T : I \rightarrow I$  on a measure space  $(I, \mathcal{D}, \mu)$  is a *non-singular transformation* if  $\mu(T^{-1}(D)) = 0$  for all  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\mu(D) = 0$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $(I, \mathcal{D}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $T : I \rightarrow I$  be a non-singular transformation. The *Perron-Frobenius operator*,  $\mathcal{L}_T : L^1(\mu) \rightarrow L^1(\mu)$ , associated with  $T$  is

$$\mathcal{L}_T(f)(x) := \sum_{y \in T^{-1}(x)} \frac{f(y)}{|T'(y)|}.$$

In certain cases,  $\mathcal{L}_T$  may be restricted (or extended) to a bounded linear operator on another Banach space (e.g.  $X = \text{BV}(I)$ ) in which case the operators are still referred to as Perron-Frobenius operators. Combining Definition 2.1 and Definition 2.5, one can construct a random dynamical system from a family of Perron-Frobenius operators  $(\mathcal{L}_{T_\omega})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  associated with the set of non-singular transformations  $(T_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . This forms a Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle.

**Remark 2.6.** For notational purposes we denote by  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  the family of Perron-Frobenius operators associated with the family of non-singular transformations  $(T_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ .

**Example 2.7** (Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle). Consider a random dynamical system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$ , where  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is an invertible, ergodic and measure-preserving transformation, and its generators  $\mathcal{L} : \Omega \rightarrow L(X)$  are Perron-Frobenius operators associated with the non-singular transformations  $T_\omega$  of the measure space  $(I, \mathcal{D}, \mu)$ , given by  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega$ . This gives rise to a Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle

$$(n, \omega) \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega^{(n)} = \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{L}_\omega.$$

Here the evolution of a density  $f$  is governed by a cocycle of Perron-Frobenius operators driven by the base dynamics  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ . That is, if  $f$  represents the initial mass distribution in the system, then  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(n)}$  describes the mass distribution after the application of  $T_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega} \circ \cdots \circ T_\omega$ .

The *random fixed points* of the Perron-Frobenius operator are of interest in random dynamical systems.

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$  be a random dynamical system, with associated non-singular transformations  $T_\omega : I \rightarrow I$ . A family  $(\mu_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is called a *random invariant measure* for  $(T_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  if  $\mu_\omega$  is a probability measure on  $I$ , for any Borel measurable subset  $D$  of  $I$  the map  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega(D)$  is measurable, and

$$\mu_\omega(T_\omega^{-1}(D)) = \mu_{\sigma\omega}(D)$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . A family  $(h_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is called a *random invariant density* for  $(T_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  if  $h_\omega \geq 0$ ,  $h_\omega \in L^1(\mu)$ ,  $\|h_\omega\|_{L^1(\mu)} = 1$ , the map  $\omega \mapsto h_\omega$  is measurable, and

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega h_\omega = h_{\sigma\omega}$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . We also say  $(h_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is a *random fixed point* of  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ .



**Remark 2.9.** If the random invariant measure  $(\mu_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue, we refer to it as a random absolutely continuous invariant measure (RACIM). In this case, its density  $(h_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega} = (\frac{d\mu_\omega}{d\text{Leb}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is a random invariant density.

**Definition 2.10.** The cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  on a Banach space  $X$  is *strongly measurable* if for any fixed  $f \in X$ ,  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega f$  is  $(\mathcal{F}_\Omega, \mathcal{F}_X)$ -measurable.

In this definition,  $\mathcal{F}_\Omega$  denotes the  $\sigma$ -algebra over  $\Omega$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_X$  denotes the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $X$ .

**Remark 2.11.** In the case that  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is strongly measurable we call  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$  a strongly measurable random dynamical system.

In some cases one cannot obtain strong measurability of  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  in which case one can hope that on  $X$ , the mapping  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega f$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous, a concept introduced by Thieullen in [56]. This gives rise to a  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous random dynamical system.

**Definition 2.12.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a Borel probability space and  $(Y, \tau)$  a topological space. A mapping  $\mathcal{L} : \Omega \rightarrow Y$  is said to be  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous if  $\Omega$  can be expressed as a countable union of Borel sets such that the restriction of  $\mathcal{L}$  to each of them is continuous.

**Remark 2.13.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$  be a random dynamical system. If its generators  $\mathcal{L} : \Omega \rightarrow L(X)$ , given by  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega$ , are  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous with respect to the norm topology on  $L(X)$ , then the cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is called  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous, and the tuple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$  is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous random dynamical system.

The asymptotic behaviour of the spectral picture for the Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle is of great interest when studying the statistical properties of random systems.

**Definition 2.14.** The *index of compactness* of an operator  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  denoted  $\alpha(\mathcal{L}_\omega)$ , is the infimum of those real numbers  $t$  such that the image of the unit ball in  $X$  under  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  may be covered by finitely many balls of radius  $t$ .

The index of compactness provides a notion of ‘how far’ an operator is from being compact. This definition was extended by Thieullen to random compositions of operators in [56].

**Definition 2.15.** The *asymptotic index of compactness* for the cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  on  $X$  is

$$\kappa(\omega) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \alpha(\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(n)}).$$

We call the cocycle *quasi-compact* if  $\kappa < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(n)}\| =: \lambda_1(\omega)$ , whose limit exists for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and is independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$ , by the Kingman sub-additive ergodic theorem [41], under the assumption that  $\int \log \|\mathcal{L}_\omega\| d\mathbb{P}(\omega) < \infty$ . The limit  $\lambda_1(\omega)$  is referred to as the top Lyapunov exponent of the cocycle, and under some assumptions on the random dynamical system, one can obtain a spectrum of these exponents through multiplicative ergodic theorems. One example is *Oseledets decomposition* which splits  $X$  into  $\omega$ -dependent subspaces which decay/expand according to its associated Lyapunov exponent  $\lambda_i(\omega)$ . These are constant  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e. when  $\sigma$  is ergodic.

**Definition 2.16.** Consider a random dynamical system  $\mathcal{R} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$ . An *Oseledets splitting* for  $\mathcal{R}$  consists of isolated (exceptional) Lyapunov exponents

$$\infty > \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \lambda_\ell > \kappa \geq -\infty,$$

where the index  $\ell \geq 1$  is allowed to be finite or countably infinite, and Oseledets subspaces  $V_1(\omega), \dots, V_\ell(\omega), W(\omega)$  such that for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  we have

- (a)  $\dim(V_i(\omega)) = m_i < \infty$ ;
- (b)  $\mathcal{L}_\omega V_i(\omega) = V_i(\sigma\omega)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\omega W(\omega) \subseteq W(\sigma\omega)$ ;
- (c)  $V_1(\omega) \oplus \cdots \oplus V_\ell(\omega) \oplus W(\omega) = X$ ;
- (d) for  $f \in V_i(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(n)} f\| \rightarrow \lambda_i$ ;
- (e) for  $f \in W(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(n)} f\| \leq \kappa$ .

**Theorem 2.17** ([23, Theorem 17]). *Let  $\Omega$  be a Borel subset of a separable complete metric space,  $\mathcal{F}$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra and  $\mathbb{P}$  a Borel probability. Let  $X$  be a Banach space and consider a random dynamical system  $\mathcal{R} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$  with base transformation  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  an ergodic homeomorphism, and suppose that the generator  $\mathcal{L} : \Omega \rightarrow L(X)$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous and satisfies*

$$\int \log^+ \|\mathcal{L}_\omega\| d\mathbb{P}(\omega) < \infty.$$

*If  $\kappa < \lambda_1$ ,  $\mathcal{R}$  admits a unique  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous Oseledets splitting.*

We refer to the set of all  $\lambda_i$  as the Lyapunov spectrum of the Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . We recall that in Theorem 2.17 the Lyapunov spectrum and asymptotic index of compactness are constant for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  since  $\sigma$  is ergodic. When the Oseledets splitting of  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  can be decomposed into fast and slow spaces, by adopting the same terminology of [10], we call this a *hyperbolic Oseledets splitting*.

**Definition 2.18.** Suppose that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$  is a random dynamical system with an Oseledets splitting of dimension  $d$ .<sup>4</sup> For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$  let  $E_i(\omega) = \bigoplus_{j \leq i} V_j(\omega)$  and  $F_i(\omega) = \left( \bigoplus_{j > i} V_j(\omega) \right) \oplus W(\omega)$ . We say that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, X, \mathcal{L})$  has a *hyperbolic Oseledets splitting* up to dimension  $d$  if there exists a  $\sigma$ -invariant set  $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$  of full  $\mathbb{P}$ -measure such that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$  the families of subspaces  $(E_i(\omega))_{\omega \in \Omega'}$  and  $(F_i(\omega))_{\omega \in \Omega'}$  form the equivariant fast and slow spaces, respectively, for a hyperbolic splitting of the restriction of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  to  $\mathbb{X}' = \bigsqcup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \{\omega\} \times I$  when  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  is considered as an element of  $\text{End}(\mathbb{X}, \sigma)$  where  $\mathbb{X} = \bigsqcup_{\omega \in \Omega} \{\omega\} \times I$ .<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup>The Oseledets splitting has dimension  $d$  if  $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i = d$  where  $\dim(V_i(\omega)) = m_i$  from Definition 2.16(a).

<sup>5</sup> $\text{End}(\mathbb{X}, \sigma)$  denotes the set of all bounded linear endomorphisms of  $\mathbb{X}$  covering  $\sigma$  (if  $\pi$  denotes the projection of  $\mathbb{X}$  onto  $\Omega$  then  $\pi \circ \mathcal{L}_\omega = \sigma \circ \mathcal{L}_\omega$ ).

As opposed to studying the asymptotic index of compactness, one can often prove that the Perron-Frobenius operator cocycle is quasi-compact by showing the collection  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  satisfies a *uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality*.

**Definition 2.19.** We say that  $\mathcal{L}_\omega : (X, \|\cdot\|) \rightarrow (X, \|\cdot\|)$  satisfies a *uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality* with constants  $C_1, C_2, r, R > 0$  and  $0 < r < R \leq 1$ , if for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $f \in X$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(n)} f\| \leq C_1 r^n \|f\| + C_2 R^n |f|$$

where  $|\cdot|$  is a weak norm on  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ .<sup>6</sup>

In the proceeding sections, we will consider perturbations of Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles. One way to quantify the size of perturbations is through the *operator triple norm*.

**Definition 2.20.** Let  $\mathcal{L}_\omega : (X, \|\cdot\|) \rightarrow (X, \|\cdot\|)$  where  $X$  is a Banach space equipped strong and weak norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $|\cdot|$ , respectively. The *operator triple norm* of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  is

$$\|\|\mathcal{L}_\omega\|\| := \sup_{\|f\|=1} |\mathcal{L}_\omega f|.$$

Finally, we make use of Landau notation throughout the paper. In the following definitions we consider functions  $f, g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Definition 2.21.** We write  $f(x) = O_{x \rightarrow a}(g(x))$  if there exists  $M, \delta > 0$  such that for all  $x$  satisfying  $|x - a| < \delta$ ,

$$|f(x)| \leq M|g(x)|.$$

**Definition 2.22.** We write  $f(x) = o_{x \rightarrow a}(g(x))$  if for all  $C > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $x$  satisfying  $|x - a| < \delta$ ,

$$|f(x)| \leq C|g(x)|.$$

**Remark 2.23.** In many situations the constants  $C, M$  involved in the above asymptotic approximations may depend on a second variable, say  $\omega$ . In this case we write  $f(x) = O_{\omega, x \rightarrow a}(g(x))$  and  $f(x) = o_{\omega, x \rightarrow a}(g(x))$ , respectively.

### 3 Paired metastable systems and their perturbations

In this section we introduce a class of random dynamical systems with two metastable states. We define these maps as perturbations of an autonomous system possessing two initially invariant intervals  $I_L$  and  $I_R$  which both support a unique absolutely continuous invariant measure (ACIM). Upon perturbation, so-called *random holes* emerge, allowing trajectories to switch between  $I_L$  and  $I_R$ . This gives rise to systems with a unique random absolutely continuous invariant measure, describing the long-term statistical behaviour of paired metastable systems.

---

<sup>6</sup>Recall that  $|\cdot|$  is a weak norm on  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  if there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $|f| \leq C\|f\|$  for all  $f \in X$ .

### 3.1 The initial system

Let  $I = [-1, 1]$  be equipped with a Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ , and Lebesgue measure  $\text{Leb}$ . Suppose that  $T^0 : I \rightarrow I$  is a piecewise  $C^2$  uniformly expanding map with two invariant subintervals. This means  $T^0$  satisfies the following conditions.

**(I1)** Piecewise  $C^2$ .

There exists a critical set  $\mathcal{C}^0 = \{-1 = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_d = 1\}$  such that for each  $i = 0, \dots, d-1$ , the map  $T^0|_{(c_i, c_{i+1})}$  extends to a  $C^2$  function  $\hat{T}_i^0$  on a neighbourhood of  $[c_i, c_{i+1}]$ .

**(I2)** Uniform expansion.

$$\inf_{x \in I \setminus \mathcal{C}^0} |(T^0)'(x)| > 1.$$

**(I3)** Existence of boundary point.

There is a boundary point  $b \in (-1, 1)$  such that the sets  $I_L := [-1, b]$  and  $I_R := [b, 1]$  are invariant under  $T^0$ .<sup>7</sup>

Denote by  $\mathcal{L}^0$  the Perron-Frobenius operator associated with  $T^0$  acting on  $(\text{BV}(I), \|\cdot\|_{\text{BV}(I)})$  with weak norm  $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})}$ .

**Remark 3.1.** Thanks to [18], conditions **(I1)** and **(I2)** ensure that the Perron-Frobenius operator associated with  $T^0$  acting on  $(\text{BV}(I), \|\cdot\|_{\text{BV}(I)})$  satisfies a Lasota-Yorke inequality. This fact will be used when we wish to emphasise that  $\mathcal{L}^0$  is quasi-compact.

Note that the dynamics of the initial system is autonomous, thus for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , the existence of an ACIM of bounded variation for  $T^0|_{I_\star}$  is guaranteed by the classical work of Lasota and Yorke [44]. We assume in addition the following.

**(I4)** Unique ACIMs on initially invariant sets.

For  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $T^0|_{I_\star}$  has only one ACIM  $\mu_\star$ , whose density is denoted by  $\phi_\star := d\mu_\star/d\text{Leb}$ .

**(I4)** implies that all ACIMs of  $T^0$  may be expressed as convex combinations of those ergodic measures supported on  $I_L$  and  $I_R$ . Conditions guaranteeing that **(I4)** is satisfied are outlined in [44, Theorem 1].

Define the set of all points belonging to  $H^0 := (T^0)^{-1}(\{b\}) \setminus \{b\}$  as infinitesimal holes.

**(I5)** No return of the critical set to infinitesimal holes.

For every  $k > 0$ ,  $T^{0(k)}(\mathcal{C}^0) \cap H^0 = \emptyset$ .

---

<sup>7</sup>That is for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $(T^0|_{I_\star})^{-1}(I_\star) \subset I_\star$ .

As discussed in [32, Section 2.1], condition **(I5)** is essential to ensure that for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , each unique invariant density  $\phi_\star$ , guaranteed by **(I4)**, is continuous at all points in  $I_\star \cap H^0$ . Finally, we require that for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , the invariant densities  $\phi_\star$  are positive at each point in  $I_\star \cap H^0$ .

**(I6)** Positive ACIMs at infinitesimal holes.

$\phi_L$  is positive at each of the points in  $H^0 \cap I_L$ , and  $\phi_R$  is positive at each of the points in  $H^0 \cap I_R$ .

Condition **(I6)** is satisfied if, for example, the maps  $T^0|_{I_\star}$  are weakly covering for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$  [46].<sup>8</sup>

### 3.2 The perturbations

In what follows, let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $\omega \in \Omega$ . We consider  $C^2$ -small perturbations of  $T^0 : I \rightarrow I$ , denoted  $T^\varepsilon : \Omega \times I \rightarrow I$ , driven by an ergodic transformation  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ .<sup>9</sup> This means  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  and  $T^\varepsilon : \Omega \times I \rightarrow I$  satisfy the following.

**(P1)** Ergodic driving and finite range.

$\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is an ergodic,  $\mathbb{P}$ -preserving homeomorphism of the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ ; for all  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , the mapping  $\omega \mapsto T_\omega^\varepsilon$  has finite range; and the skew-product

$$(\omega, x) \mapsto (\sigma\omega, T_\omega^\varepsilon(x))$$

is measurable with respect to the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}$  on  $\Omega \times I$ .

**(P2)**  $C^2$ -small perturbations.

There exists a critical set  $\mathcal{C}_\omega^\varepsilon = \{-1 = c_{0,\omega}^\varepsilon < \dots < c_{d,\omega}^\varepsilon = 1\}$  such that for each  $i = 0, \dots, d$ ,  $\omega \mapsto c_{i,\omega}^\varepsilon$  is measurable and  $\varepsilon \mapsto c_{i,\omega}^\varepsilon$  is  $C^2$ . Furthermore, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that:

- (a) for  $i = 1, \dots, d-2$ ,  $[c_i + \delta, c_{i+1} - \delta] \subset [c_{i,\omega}^\varepsilon, c_{i+1,\omega}^\varepsilon] \subset [c_i - \delta, c_{i+1} + \delta]$ ,<sup>10</sup>
- (b) for  $i = 0, \dots, d$ ,  $c_{i,\omega}^\varepsilon$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to its corresponding point  $c_i \in \mathcal{C}^0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and
- (c) for  $i = 0, \dots, d-1$ , there is a  $C^2$  extension  $\hat{T}_{i,\omega}^\varepsilon : [c_i - \delta, c_{i+1} + \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of  $T_\omega^\varepsilon|_{(c_{i,\omega}^\varepsilon, c_{i+1,\omega}^\varepsilon)}$  that converges in  $C^2$ , and uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to the  $C^2$  extension  $\hat{T}_i^0 : [c_i - \delta, c_{i+1} + \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of  $T^0|_{(c_i, c_{i+1})}$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

<sup>8</sup>A piecewise expanding map  $T^0 : I \rightarrow I$  with critical set  $\mathcal{C}^0 = \{-1 = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_d = 1\}$  is weakly covering if there is some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $i$ ,  $\cup_{k=0}^N T^{0(k)}((c_i, c_{i+1})) = I$ .

<sup>9</sup>For notational convenience  $T^0$  will also denote the *random* map  $T^0 : \Omega \times I \rightarrow I$  which satisfies  $T_\omega^0 := T_{\omega_0}^0$  for any  $\omega_0 \in \Omega$ .

<sup>10</sup>In this way, we have a one-to-one correspondence between the critical sets of  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $T^0$  given by  $\mathcal{C}_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\mathcal{C}^0$ , respectively.

Denote by  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  the Perron-Frobenius operator associated with  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  acting on  $(\text{BV}(I), \|\cdot\|_{\text{BV}(I)})$  with weak norm  $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})}$ .

**Remark 3.2.** We impose **(P1)** to ensure the mapping  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous (recall Definition 2.12). This is satisfied through the relaxed condition that  $\omega \mapsto T_\omega^\varepsilon$  has countable range. In our setting, to ensure uniform convergence of certain quantities, we instead require the stricter condition that  $\omega \mapsto T_\omega^\varepsilon$  has finite range (as discussed in [3, Remark 3.10]).

**Remark 3.3.** Thanks to [21, Proposition 3.12] (which follows from [37, Lemma 13]) and [18, Example 5.2], **(P2)** asserts that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}^0\| = 0$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the  $\text{BV} - L^1$  triple norm (see Definition 2.20).

For  $\star \in \{L, R\}$  we define the holes  $H_{\star, \omega}^\varepsilon$  as the set of all points mapping from  $I_\star$  to  $I_\star^c$  under one iteration of  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$ . Namely,  $H_{\star, \omega}^\varepsilon := I_\star \cap (T_\omega^\varepsilon)^{-1}(I_\star^c)$ .

**(P3)** Convergence of holes.

For  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $H_{\star, \omega}^\varepsilon$  is a union of finitely many intervals, and as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $H_{\star, \omega}^\varepsilon$  converges to  $H^0 \cap I_\star$  (in the Hausdorff metric) uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.<sup>11</sup>

Since the holes are themselves functions of  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we place some constraints on how the measures of them behave across each fibre.

**(P4)** Measure of holes.

For  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $\mu_\star(H_{\star, \omega}^\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \beta_{\star, \omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon)$  where  $\beta_\star \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ .<sup>12</sup>

To ensure the system depends continuously on perturbations, we require the perturbed system to admit a hyperbolic Oseledets splitting (see Definition 2.18). For this, we assume the following.

**(P5)** Uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality.

The Perron-Frobenius operator associated with  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$ , denoted  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$ , acting on  $(\text{BV}(I), \|\cdot\|_{\text{BV}(I)})$  with weak norm  $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})}$  satisfies a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality across both  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  (see Definition 2.19).

Further, we require  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  to admit a unique random absolutely continuous invariant measure (see Remark 2.9).

**(P6)** Unique RACIM.

For  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  has only one RACIM  $(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , with density  $(\phi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} := (d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon/d\text{Leb})_{\omega \in \Omega}$ .

Cases in which **(P6)** is satisfied are outlined in [8]. Finally, as discussed in [32, Section 2.4], we enforce a condition that ensures no holes emerge near the boundary.

<sup>11</sup>Recall that the set  $H^0 = (T^0)^{-1}(\{b\}) \setminus \{b\}$  consists of infinitesimal holes.

<sup>12</sup>We emphasise that the error in the measure of the hole is independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**(P7)** Boundary condition.

- (a) If  $b \notin \mathcal{C}_0$ , then  $T^0(b) = b$  and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $T_\omega^\varepsilon(b) = b$ .
- (b) If  $b \in \mathcal{C}_0$ , then  $T^0(b^-) < b < T^0(b^+)$  and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $b \in \mathcal{C}_\omega^\varepsilon$ .<sup>13</sup>

Throughout the remainder of the paper we assume that the conditions of Section 3 are satisfied.

## 4 Continuity of Oseledets Decomposition

In this section, we address whether the Oseledets projections and Lyapunov exponents of Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles of paired metastable maps are continuous with respect to the perturbations described in Section 3. This result relies on Crimmins' random perturbation theory [10], a random analogue of the renowned Keller-Liverani perturbation theory [39]. The main result of this section allows us to express the limiting functions spanning the top two Oseledets spaces for paired metastable systems as linear combinations of the initially invariant densities.

The results of [10] require the Banach space on which the Perron-Frobenius operator is acting to be separable. In our setting, for all  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , we consider the Perron-Frobenius operator acting on BV which is not separable. As described in [1, Appendix 2.B], this separability assumption is used throughout [10] to obtain measurability of certain objects. It is argued in [1] that Crimmins' stability result may be applied to the non-separable Banach space BV under the alternative condition **(P1)**. We are interested in applying [10, Theorem A] to paired metastable systems. As opposed to considering a sequence of separable strongly measurable linear random dynamical systems, as in the statement of [10, Theorem A], **(P1)** allows us to apply [10, Theorem A] to a sequence of  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous random dynamical systems whilst ensuring the conclusions of the result still hold. Therefore, with support of [1, Appendix 2.B], under **(P1)**, [10, Theorem A] asserts that if:

1.  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^0)$  has a hyperbolic Oseledets splitting and is  $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})}$ -bounded (see Definition 2.18);
2. the set  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$  satisfies a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality (see Definition 2.19); and
3.  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}^0\| = 0$  where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the BV  $-L^1$  triple norm (see Definition 2.20),

then  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  has an Oseledets splitting for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon$ , and the Lyapunov exponents and Oseledets projections of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge to those of  $\mathcal{L}^0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

In this paper, we use the above to guarantee that the Oseledets spaces and Lyapunov

---

<sup>13</sup>We denote by  $T^0(b^\mp)$  the left and right limits of  $T^0(x)$  as  $x \rightarrow b$ , respectively.

exponents of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  depend continuously on perturbations. We refer the reader to [10] for the precise statements of relevant results.

**Remark 4.1.** Under **(P1)**, for all  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , if  $\omega \mapsto T_\omega^\varepsilon$  has finite range, then the map  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  becomes  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous. If  $\omega \mapsto T_\omega^\varepsilon$  had an uncountable range for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then there is no way to ensure  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous into  $L(\text{BV})$  since the Perron-Frobenius operators are discrete in the BV operator norm topology, allowing us to force arbitrary sets to be measurable. Consequently, [36] points out that any set in  $\Omega$  could be made measurable if  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is measurable, which is generally untrue.

We aim to prove that the accumulation points of the functions spanning the top and second Oseledets spaces are always the same so that they admit a limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We begin by showing that the Lyapunov exponents and Oseledets projections of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  depend continuously on perturbations.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$  be a sequence of random dynamical systems of paired metastable maps  $T_\omega^\varepsilon : I \rightarrow I$  satisfying **(I1)**-**(I6)** and **(P1)**-**(P7)**. Then the Lyapunov exponents and Oseledets projections of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge to those of  $\mathcal{L}^0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . In particular, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small:*

- (a) *the top Oseledets space of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is one-dimensional, and spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon \in \text{BV}(I)$  with associated Lyapunov exponent  $\lambda_1^\varepsilon = 0$  of multiplicity one; and*
- (b) *the second Oseledets space of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is one-dimensional, and spanned by  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon \in \text{BV}(I)$  with associated Lyapunov exponent  $\lambda_2^\varepsilon < 0$  of multiplicity one.*

Further, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\lambda_2^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and the spaces spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  to the plane spanned by  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. Any accumulation point of the sequences  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$ , denoted  $\phi_\omega^0$  and  $\psi_\omega^0$ , respectively, lie in  $\text{BV}(I)$  and satisfy  $\phi_\omega^0, \psi_\omega^0 \in \text{span}\{\phi_L, \phi_R\}$  where this convergence holds in  $L^1$ , and for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**Remark 4.3.** Due to **(P5)**, the operator  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  satisfies a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality across both  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Further, since BV is compactly embedded in  $L^1$ , for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  one can choose a sequence of values  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  converging to 0 such that the sequences  $\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  and  $\psi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  converge in  $L^1$  to some function  $\phi_\omega^0$  and  $\psi_\omega^0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* Equip the Banach space  $(\text{BV}(I), \|\cdot\|_{\text{BV}(I)})$  with weak norm  $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})}$ . Due to **(P1)**,  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$  is a sequence of  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous random dynamical systems of paired metastable maps satisfying the conditions mentioned in Section 3. Therefore, thanks to Remark 3.1, Remark 3.3, and the above discussion, conditions **(I1)**-**(I6)** and **(P1)**-**(P7)** ensure that [10, Theorem A] applies and asserts that  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  has an Oseledets splitting, and further, the Lyapunov exponents and Oseledets projections of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge to those of  $\mathcal{L}^0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Observe that due to **(I4)**, any accumulation point of the sequences  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$ , denoted  $\phi_\omega^0$  and  $\psi_\omega^0$ , are invariant under  $\mathcal{L}^0$  and therefore may be expressed as a linear combination of  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$ . Thus, by [10, Theorem A], as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\lambda_2^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and the spaces spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  to the plane spanned by  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. Further, any accumulation point of the sequences  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and



$\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  lie in  $BV(I)$ , and satisfy  $\phi_\omega^0, \psi_\omega^0 \in \text{span}\{\phi_L, \phi_R\}$ , where this convergence holds in  $L^1$  and for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small. We now address (a) and (b). By [10, Theorem A],  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon, \psi_\omega^\varepsilon \in BV(I)$ . For (a), the fact that the top Oseledets space spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  is one-dimensional with  $\lambda_1^\varepsilon = 0$  follows from (P6). For (b), when  $\varepsilon = 0$ , the top Oseledets space is two-dimensional and is spanned by the initially invariant densities,  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$ . From (a), since the top Oseledets space of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is one-dimensional for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, and both the top and second Oseledets spaces depend continuously on perturbations, it follows that the Oseledets space spanned by  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  is one-dimensional. Finally, since  $\lambda_2^\varepsilon$  is continuous in  $\varepsilon$ , converging to 0 as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and (P6) ensures that  $\lambda_1^\varepsilon$  has multiplicity one, we may conclude that  $\lambda_2^\varepsilon < 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** If both the top and second Oseledets spaces of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\mathcal{L}^0$  are one-dimensional, then [10, Theorem A] asserts that the sequences  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge in  $L^1$  to  $\phi_\omega^0$  and  $\psi_\omega^0$ , uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. In our setting, since the limiting top Oseledets space is two-dimensional, we may deduce that the spaces spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge in  $L^1$  to the plane spanned by  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. Without any further information, we cannot conclude that any convergent subsequence of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  and  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge uniformly to the precise linear combination lying in  $\text{span}\{\phi_L, \phi_R\}$ . The existence of such convergent subsequences is discussed in Remark 4.3.

## 5 Characterisation of the limiting invariant density

In this section we identify the limiting invariant density for paired metastable systems. Recall that  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  denotes the function spanning the top Oseledets space of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$ . Due to Lemma 4.2, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , any accumulation of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  may be expressed as a linear combination of  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This section is dedicated to further characterising any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$ , say  $\phi_\omega^0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \phi_\omega^\varepsilon$ , by explicitly computing the weights associated with the initially invariant densities,  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$ .<sup>14</sup>

### 5.1 The weights

We begin by computing two auxiliary limits. These are crucial for approximating the limiting invariant density for paired metastable systems. In particular, we will find in the proceeding subsection that such limits describe the weights associated with the linear combination of  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  appearing in the limiting invariant density.

For  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , let  $\beta_\star \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$  (as in (P4)). Consider the sequences of functions  $(\pi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$  where

$$\pi_\omega^\varepsilon := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\varepsilon \beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-1}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon(\beta_{L, \sigma^{-k-1}\omega} + \beta_{R, \sigma^{-k-1}\omega})). \quad (1)$$

<sup>14</sup>By *weights* we mean the coefficients multiplied by  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  appearing in the statements of Theorem A and Theorem B.

For a fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$  then the tail end of (1) decays exponentially with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and thus converges up to order  $o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon)$ . We are interested in determining whether  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi_{\omega}^{\varepsilon}$  exists. To provide a positive answer to this question, we require the following result on moving averages.

**Proposition 5.1** ([51, Theorem 1]). *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. Suppose that  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is as in (P1), and  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable function. If  $a_n = O_{n \rightarrow \infty}(n)$ , then for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=a_n}^{a_n+n-1} f_{\sigma^k \omega} = \int_{\Omega} f_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega).$$

For the sake of presentation, we focus on the limiting behaviour of  $\pi_{\sigma \omega}^{\varepsilon}$  as opposed to  $\pi_{\omega}^{\varepsilon}$  (defined in (1)). Further, when the upper and lower indices of products and summations take non-integer values, we interpret them as the integer part.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. For  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , let  $\beta_{\star} \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})$  satisfy  $\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$ . If  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is as in (P1), then for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi_{\omega}^{\varepsilon} = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}. \quad (2)$$

*Proof.* The argument is divided into several steps. We compute  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi_{\sigma \omega}^{\varepsilon}$  from which we can deduce (2). In what follows we let  $\gamma_{\omega} := \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega}$ .

**Step 1.** *For  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) = e^{(n\varepsilon+t)(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}. \quad (3)$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\gamma \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})$ . Take  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small such that  $\varepsilon \|\gamma\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})} < 1$ . Then, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n\varepsilon+t} \log \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \right) &= \frac{1}{n\varepsilon+t} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} \log(1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( n + \frac{t}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} -\frac{(\varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega})^j}{j} \\ &= \left( n + \frac{t}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} -\frac{\varepsilon^{j-1} \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}^j}{j} \\ &= \left( n + \frac{t}{\varepsilon} \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} -\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega} + O_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\gamma \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ , by Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\frac{1}{n\varepsilon + t} \log \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} (1 - \varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \right) = - \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1).$$

Hence

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} (1 - \varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) = e^{(n\varepsilon+t)(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}.$$

□

**Step 2.** For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (1 - \varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) = e^{(n\varepsilon+\sqrt{t\varepsilon})(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}. \quad (4)$$

*Proof.* In a similar manner to the proof of Step 1, take  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small such that  $\varepsilon\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{P})} < 1$ . Then, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n\varepsilon + \sqrt{t\varepsilon}} \log \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (1 - \varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \right) &= \frac{1}{n\varepsilon + \sqrt{t\varepsilon}} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} \log(1 - \varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( n + \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}} \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} -\frac{(\varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega})^j}{j} \\ &= \left( n + \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}} \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} -\frac{\varepsilon^{j-1} \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}^j}{j} \\ &= \left( n + \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}} \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega} + O_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\gamma \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ , Birkhoff's ergodic theorem asserts that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\frac{1}{n\varepsilon + \sqrt{t\varepsilon}} \log \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (1 - \varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \right) = - \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1).$$

This shows that

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (1 - \varepsilon\gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) = e^{(n\varepsilon+\sqrt{t\varepsilon})(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}.$$

□

Both Step 1 and Step 2 not only tell us that these products decay exponentially for large  $n, t > 0$  or for small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , but further, they contain information regarding the rate at which they converge. This proves to be useful as illustrated in the following steps.

**Step 3.** For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small,  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} B_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon &:= \varepsilon \sum_{n=\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}^{\infty} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\ &\leq (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\varepsilon e^{t(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}{1 - e^{\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Since  $\beta_R \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ , there exists an  $M > 0$  such that  $\beta_{R,\omega} \leq M$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} B_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon &\leq (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \prod_{k=0}^{n+\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\ &= (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{(n\varepsilon+t)(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have utilised Step 1 in the last equality. Therefore we compute the resulting geometric series. We emphasise that this series converges for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  chosen small such that the error in the exponent can be controlled. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} B_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon &\leq (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \varepsilon e^{t(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{n\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \\ &= (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\varepsilon e^{t(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}{1 - e^{\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Step 4.** For any  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} B_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon \leq \frac{2M}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) e^{\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}.$$

*Proof.* Recall that from Step 3 we found that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$B_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon \leq (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\varepsilon e^{t(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}{1 - e^{\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}.$$

For each  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small,  $-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)$  is bounded above by  $-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)$ . Therefore, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} B_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon} &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\varepsilon e^{-\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}{1 - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} \\ &= \frac{2M}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) e^{\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Step 5.** For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small,  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} C_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon} &:= \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the fact that for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small we have for each  $k = 0, \dots, n-1$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $0 \leq (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \leq 1$ . Thus for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$C_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)).$$

□

**Step 6.** For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small,  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon} &:= \varepsilon \sum_{n=\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon e^{\sqrt{t\varepsilon}(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} \left( (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times e^{n\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \right) \\ &=: e^{\sqrt{t\varepsilon}(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} E_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This follows by reindexing the partial sum and applying Step 2. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon &= \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}} - 1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n - \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n + \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}} - 1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\
&\leq \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} - 1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n - \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n + \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}} - 1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\
&= \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} - 1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n - \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) e^{(n\varepsilon + \sqrt{t\varepsilon})(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \\
&= \varepsilon e^{\sqrt{t\varepsilon}(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} - 1} \left( (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n - \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times e^{n\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Letting

$$E_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon := \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} - 1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n - \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) e^{n\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \tag{6}$$

we obtain our result.  $\square$

Finding sharp estimates for  $E_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon$  is crucial in determining the limiting behaviour of  $\pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon$  when  $\varepsilon$  is small. Rather than studying the entire sum (6), we fix some  $\delta > 0$  and split (6) into  $t/\delta$  sums, each containing  $\delta/\varepsilon$  terms, as illustrated in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Splitting of  $E_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon$

In other words, we consider the splitting of the sum in the following way:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} - 1} \bullet = \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} - 1} \bullet + \sum_{n=\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{2\delta}{\varepsilon} - 1} \bullet + \cdots + \sum_{n=\frac{t-\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} - 1} \bullet.$$

With this, we obtain bounds on  $E_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon$  (which may depend on  $\delta$ ) as follows.

**Step 7.** Fix  $t, \delta > 0$  and let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be sufficiently small, then for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$E_{\varepsilon, \omega}^t \leq \varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} e^{j\delta(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \quad (7)$$

$$E_{\varepsilon, \omega}^t \geq \varepsilon e^{(\delta-\varepsilon)(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \left( e^{j\delta(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \right. \\ \left. \times \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \right), \quad (8)$$

where  $E_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon}$  is as in (6).

*Proof.* Observe that for all  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , if  $\alpha \leq n \leq \beta$  then for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$e^{\beta\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \leq e^{n\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \leq e^{\alpha\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}. \quad (9)$$

The result follows by bounding each sum containing  $\delta/\varepsilon$  terms through this estimate. Indeed, following the splitting of the series illustrated in Figure 2

$$E_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) e^{n\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}.$$

Thus, through (9) we have

$$E_{t, \omega}^{\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) e^{\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \\ = \varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} e^{j\delta(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)).$$

For the lower estimate,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon &\geq \varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) e^{\left(\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1\right)\varepsilon \left(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)\right)} \\
&= \varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} e^{((j+1)\delta-\varepsilon)\left(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)\right)} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \\
&= \varepsilon e^{(\delta-\varepsilon)\left(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)\right)} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \left( e^{j\delta\left(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)\right)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The previous steps now provide sharp estimates on  $\pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon$  (defined on a different fibre in (1)) which allow us to compute  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon$  explicitly.

**Step 8.** For all  $t, \delta > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$L_{t,\delta} \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon \leq U_{t,\delta} \quad (10)$$

where

$$L_{t,\delta} := \delta e^{-\delta \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)} \int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,s} d\mathbb{P}(s) \frac{1 - e^{-t \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}{1 - e^{-\delta \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} \quad (11)$$

$$U_{t,\delta} := \delta \int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,s} d\mathbb{P}(s) \frac{1 - e^{-t \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}{1 - e^{-\delta \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} + \frac{2M}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) e^{\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}. \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* Firstly we focus on the upper estimate. Observe that we can express (1) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon &= \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\
&= \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) + \varepsilon \sum_{n=\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} \left( (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \right) + \varepsilon \sum_{n=\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}^{\infty} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\
&= C_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon + D_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon + B_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$



Thus, by Step 3, 5, 6 and 7

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon &\leq \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) + e^{\sqrt{t\varepsilon}(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} E_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon \\
&\quad + (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\varepsilon e^{t(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}{1 - e^{\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{t\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{t}} \sum_{n=0}^{\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) + \varepsilon e^{\sqrt{t\varepsilon}(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \\
&\quad \times \left( \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} e^{j\delta(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \right) \\
&\quad + (M + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\varepsilon e^{t(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}{1 - e^{\varepsilon(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We may now take  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . In doing so we utilise Birkhoff's ergodic theorem on the first term, Proposition 5.1 on the second term and Step 4 on the third term to find that for all  $t, \delta > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon &\leq 0 + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta e^{\sqrt{t\varepsilon}(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \left( e^{j\delta(-\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) + o_{\omega,\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1))} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \right) + \frac{2M}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) e^{\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} \\
&= \delta \int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,s} d\mathbb{P}(s) \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} e^{-j\delta \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)} + \frac{2M}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) e^{\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} \\
&= \delta \int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,s} d\mathbb{P}(s) \frac{1 - e^{-t \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}{1 - e^{-\delta \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} + \frac{2M}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s) e^{\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} \\
&:= U_{t,\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the lower estimate, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon &\geq \varepsilon \sum_{n=\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}} - 1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}) \\
&= \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}}\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1)) \prod_{k=0}^{n+\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}).
\end{aligned}$$

The previous line is precisely the upper bound of  $D_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon$  obtained in Step 6 (see (5)). Therefore, using the lower bound from Step 7

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon &\geq e^{\sqrt{t\varepsilon}(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1))} E_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon \\
&\geq \varepsilon e^{(\sqrt{t\varepsilon}+\delta-\varepsilon)(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \left( e^{j\delta(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1))} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1)) \right) \\
&= \delta e^{(\sqrt{t\varepsilon}+\delta-\varepsilon)(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1))} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{t}{\delta}-1} \left( e^{j\delta(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1))} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} \sum_{n=\frac{j\delta}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(j+1)\delta}{\varepsilon}-1} (\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-\sqrt{\frac{t}{\varepsilon}}\omega}} + o_{\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We emphasise the similarity between the above line and the upper bound of  $D_{t,\omega}^\varepsilon$  obtained from both Step 6 and Step 7. In particular, these bounds are identical up to a factor of  $\exp((\delta-\varepsilon)(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\varepsilon\rightarrow 0}(1)))$ . Therefore, by the same argument as in the derivation of  $U_{t,\delta}$  (applying Proposition 5.1), for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\varepsilon\rightarrow 0} \pi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon &\geq \delta e^{-\delta \int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)} \int_\Omega \beta_{R,s} d\mathbb{P}(s) \frac{1 - e^{-t \int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}}{1 - e^{-\delta \int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)}} \\
&:= L_{t,\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We proceed by taking  $\delta$  sufficiently small and  $t$  sufficiently large. Since  $L_{t,\delta}$  and  $U_{t,\delta}$  (defined in (11) and (12), respectively) are independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we replace the integration variable  $s$  with  $\omega$  in the final step to align with the statement of Lemma 5.2.

**Step 9.** *The functions  $L_{t,\delta}$  and  $U_{t,\delta}$  defined in (11) and (12) satisfy*

$$\lim_{(t,\delta)\rightarrow(\infty,0)} L_{t,\delta} = \lim_{(t,\delta)\rightarrow(\infty,0)} U_{t,\delta} = \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}$$

*Proof.* We focus first on taking the appropriate limits of (11). Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{(t,\delta)\rightarrow(\infty,0)} L_{t,\delta} &= \int_\Omega \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \lim_{t\rightarrow\infty} \frac{1 - e^{-t \int_\Omega \gamma_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}}{\int_\Omega \gamma_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\
&= \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by taking limits of (12)

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{(t,\delta)\rightarrow(\infty,0)} U_{t,\delta} &= \lim_{t\rightarrow\infty} \left( \int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \frac{1 - e^{-t \int_{\Omega} \gamma_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} + \frac{2M}{\int_{\Omega} \gamma_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) e^{\frac{t}{2} \int_{\Omega} \gamma_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

The results of Step 1-Step 9 give us (2) for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . □

**Remark 5.3.** Provided that  $\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$  and  $\beta_{\star} \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})$  for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , Lemma 5.2 provides us with the limiting invariant measures (as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) of 2-state Markov chains in random environments driven by  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  (as in (P1)), with transition matrices  $(P_{\omega}^{\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  where

$$P_{\omega}^{\varepsilon} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon \beta_{L,\omega} & \varepsilon \beta_{R,\omega} \\ \varepsilon \beta_{L,\omega} & 1 - \varepsilon \beta_{R,\omega} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Indeed, an inductive argument shows that

$$P_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta_{L,\sigma^{-k-1}\omega} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-i-1}\omega}) & \varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta_{R,\sigma^{-k-1}\omega} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-i-1}\omega}) \\ \varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta_{L,\sigma^{-k-1}\omega} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-i-1}\omega}) & 1 - \varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta_{R,\sigma^{-k-1}\omega} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (1 - \varepsilon \gamma_{\sigma^{-i-1}\omega}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

where we recall that  $\gamma_{\omega} = \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega}$ . For a fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the columns of the matrix  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)}$  give rise to the random invariant measure of  $(P_{\omega}^{\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . We are interested in the behaviour of this measure as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Recalling the similarities between (1) and the elements of the matrix  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)}$ , Lemma 5.2 shows that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} & \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\ \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} & \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

Hence, the columns of the matrix in (14) correspond to the limiting random invariant measure of the matrix cocycle  $(P_{\omega}^{\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We refer the reader to, for example [58, Section 4], for a similar treatment of this problem in the setting of continuous time Markov chains. As we will find in Section 5.2, particularly in the proof of Theorem 5.4, one can show that (14) does not only hold for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , but in fact uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.

## 5.2 The limiting invariant density

Using Lemma 5.2 we can now characterise the limiting random invariant density.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$  be a sequence of random dynamical systems of paired metastable maps  $T_\omega^\varepsilon : I \rightarrow I$  satisfying **(I1)**-**(I6)** and **(P1)**-**(P7)**. If  $\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$  then as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$*

$$\phi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_\omega^0 := \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \phi_L + \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \phi_R$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.

Due to **(I4)**, any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  can be expressed as a (possibly random) convex combination of  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$ . To prove Theorem 5.4 we must first understand the asymptotic behaviour of the measure of the holes created under perturbation. Unless otherwise mentioned, throughout the remainder of this section we assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 5.4 are satisfied.

Thanks to Lemma 4.2 and Remark 4.3, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  we can choose a sequence of values  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  converging to 0 such that  $\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  converges in  $L^1$  to some function, which we denote by  $\phi_\omega^0$ . We first prove that the subsequence  $\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  converges uniformly over the holes away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. This was done in [3, Lemma 3.14] for finite  $\Omega$  and i.i.d. driving. Upon close inspection of the proofs, the condition that  $\Omega$  is finite is used to guarantee that the mapping  $\omega \mapsto T_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  is finite for all  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \geq 0$ . This is satisfied in our setting due to **(P1)**. Adapting [3, Lemma 3.14] to our notation we have the following.

**Lemma 5.5.** *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, let  $\phi_\omega^0$  be an accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ . That is, assume that*

$$\phi_\omega^0 = \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}. \quad (15)$$

Then there exists  $p : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

- (a)  $\phi_\omega^0 = p_\omega \phi_L + (1 - p_\omega) \phi_R$ ,
- (b)  $\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(x) - p_\omega \phi_L(x)| = 0$ ,
- (c)  $\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{x \in H_{R,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(x) - (1 - p_\omega) \phi_R(x)| = 0$ .

*Proof.* Identical to that of [3, Lemma 3.14] replacing the assumption of finite  $\Omega$  with  $\omega \mapsto T_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  being finite. We emphasise that [3] assumes the initial system has minimal expansion greater than 2, which is used to obtain a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for the perturbed system. Thanks to Remark 3.1, this is satisfied in our setting by enforcing **(I1)**, **(I2)** and **(P5)**.  $\square$

With this, we have a better understanding of how the sequence  $\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  behaves over the holes. Further, we know that any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  is a convex combination of the initially invariant densities.

Through Lemma 5.5 we construct a convergent subsequence of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converging in  $L^1$  on  $I_\star$  (for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ), and uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.

**Lemma 5.6.** *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, if  $p_\omega$  is as in Lemma 5.5, then for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$p_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} := \mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(I_L) = p_\omega + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1), \quad (16)$$

$$1 - p_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} := \mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(I_R) = 1 - p_\omega + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1). \quad (17)$$

*Proof.* We prove that (16) holds from which one can obtain (17). For all  $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ , let  $\hat{\phi}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} := \hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \phi_L + (1 - \hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) \phi_R$  be the best approximation of  $\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  in  $\text{span}\{\phi_L, \phi_R\}$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ . That is, let  $\hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  be such that

$$\|\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - \hat{\phi}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})} := \inf_{\theta \in [0,1]} \|\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - \theta \phi_L - (1 - \theta) \phi_R\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})}.$$

By Lemma 4.2,  $\|\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - \hat{\phi}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})} = o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |p_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - \hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}| &= \left| \int_{I_L} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} d\text{Leb}(x) - \hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \int_{I_L} \phi_L d\text{Leb}(x) \right| \\ &\leq \int_{I_L} |\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - \hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \phi_L| d\text{Leb}(x) \\ &= o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\hat{\phi}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(x) - p_\omega \phi_L(x)| &= \sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |(\hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_\omega) \phi_L(x)| \\ &= |\hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_\omega| \sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\phi_L(x)|. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Since  $\hat{\phi}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  is the best approximation of  $\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  in  $\text{span}\{\phi_L, \phi_R\}$ , due to Lemma 5.5(b),

$$\sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\hat{\phi}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(x) - p_\omega \phi_L(x)| = o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1).$$

Recall that by (P3), as  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  converges (in the Hausdorff metric) to the set of infinitesimal holes  $H^0 \cap I_L$  uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. This, together with conditions (I5) and (I6) imply that there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that  $\sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\phi_L(x)| = K + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1)$ . Therefore, from (19),

$$o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1) = \sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\hat{\phi}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(x) - p_\omega \phi_L(x)| = |\hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_\omega| (K + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1)).$$

Thus  $|\hat{p}_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_\omega| = o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1)$ , which due to (18) implies that  $p_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = p_\omega + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.7.** By Lemma 4.2, we know that any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  converges in  $L^1$  to  $\phi_\omega^0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Lemma 5.6 reveals that this convergence is in fact uniform over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.

**Lemma 5.8.** *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, if  $p_\omega$  is as in Lemma 5.5, then for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = p_\omega \mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1) \mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}), \quad (20)$$

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{R,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = (1 - p_\omega) \mu_R(H_{R,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1) \mu_R(H_{R,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}). \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* Due to **(P6)**, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $d\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} d\text{Leb}$ . We establish (20), as (21) follows in an almost identical manner. Observe that for any set  $S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \subseteq I_L$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) &= \int_{S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} d\text{Leb}(x) \\ &= p_\omega \int_{S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} \phi_L d\text{Leb}(x) + \int_{S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_\omega \phi_L d\text{Leb}(x) \\ &= p_\omega \mu_L(S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + O_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \left( \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{x \in S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_\omega \phi_L| \right) \text{Leb}(S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

For (20), take  $S_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  in (22) and consider the set of infinitesimal holes  $H^0 \cap I_L = \{h_L^1, \dots, h_L^J\}$  where  $J \in \mathbb{N}$ .<sup>15</sup> Take  $H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \cup_{i=1}^J H_{L,\omega}^{i,\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ . For each  $i = 1, \dots, J$ , by **(P3)**,  $H_{L,\omega}^{i,\tilde{\varepsilon}} \rightarrow h_L^i$  in the Hausdorff metric uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. Recall that by **(I5)**,  $\phi_L$  is continuous at all points in  $H^0 \cap I_L$ . Thus by Lebesgue's differentiation theorem

$$\frac{\mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})}{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})} = \sum_{i=1}^J \frac{\mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^{i,\tilde{\varepsilon}})}{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{i,\tilde{\varepsilon}})} \frac{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{i,\tilde{\varepsilon}})}{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})} = \sum_{i=1}^J (\phi_L(h_L^i) + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{i,\tilde{\varepsilon}})}{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})}. \quad (23)$$

Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^J \frac{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{i,\tilde{\varepsilon}})}{\text{Leb}(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})} = 1$ . Further, **(I6)** asserts that for each  $i = 1, \dots, J$ ,  $\phi_L(h_L^i) > 0$ , and thus one can bound (23) uniformly above and below over  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Additionally, by Lemma 5.5(b),

$$\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{x \in H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} |\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_\omega \phi_L| = 0.$$

Therefore, utilising (22), for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = p_\omega \mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1) \mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}).$$

□

**Corollary 5.9.** *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, if  $p_\omega$  is as in Lemma 5.5, then for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{L,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = p_\omega \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{L,\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \quad (24)$$

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{R,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = (1 - p_\omega) \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{R,\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \quad (25)$$

<sup>15</sup>Recall that the set of all points belonging to  $H^0 := (T^0)^{-1}(\{b\}) \setminus \{b\}$  are referred to as infinitesimal holes.

*Proof.* We only show that (24) holds since one can show (25) holds in an almost identical manner. By (P4), for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $\mu_\star(H_{\star, \omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = \tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{\star, \omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})$  where  $\beta_\star \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ . Therefore, by (20) from Lemma 5.8

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{L, \omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) &= p_\omega \mu_L(H_{L, \omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1) \mu_L(H_{L, \omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) \\ &= p_\omega (\tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{L, \omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1) (\tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{L, \omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \\ &= p_\omega \tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{L, \omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.4.

*Proof of Theorem 5.4.* A combination of Lemma 4.2, 5.5(a) and Lemma 5.6 asserts that any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  satisfies  $\phi_\omega^0 = \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  (as in (15)) and

$$\phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_\omega^0 := p_\omega \phi_L + (1 - p_\omega) \phi_R \quad (26)$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. It remains to determine the weights  $p_\omega$  and  $1 - p_\omega$  of any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ . We illustrate that these weights are related to the readily computed limit from Lemma 5.2. We do this by utilising properties of the random absolutely continuous invariant measure  $(\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . Namely, since  $(\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is a RACIM for  $(T_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  (see Definition 2.8 and Remark 2.9)

$$\begin{aligned} p_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} &= \mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(I_L) = \mu_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}((T_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})^{-1}(I_L)) \\ &= \mu_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}((I_L \setminus H_{L, \sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) \cup H_{R, \sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) \\ &= \mu_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(I_L) - \mu_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{L, \sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) + \mu_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{R, \sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) \\ &\stackrel{(\star)}{=} p_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - p_{\sigma^{-1}\omega} \tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{L, \sigma^{-1}\omega} + (1 - p_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}) \tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{R, \sigma^{-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\ &\stackrel{(\star\star)}{=} p_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\beta_{L, \sigma^{-1}\omega} + \beta_{R, \sigma^{-1}\omega})) + \tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{R, \sigma^{-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

At  $(\star)$  we have used (16) and Corollary 5.9, and at  $(\star\star)$  we have used (16) and (17). From (27) we know that for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$p_{\sigma^n \omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = p_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\beta_{L, \sigma^{n-1}\omega} + \beta_{R, \sigma^{n-1}\omega})) + \tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{R, \sigma^{n-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \quad (28)$$

Fix  $t > 0$ . Inductively using (28), we find that for any  $K_t^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \in \mathbb{N}$

$$p_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = p_{\sigma^{-K_t^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}}\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \prod_{k=0}^{K_t^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}-1} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}\gamma_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega}) + \sum_{n=0}^{K_t^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}-1} (\tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{R, \sigma^{-n-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}\gamma_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega}). \quad (29)$$

Choose  $K_t^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \frac{t}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ . We show that by taking  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  arbitrarily small and then  $t$  sufficiently large, (29) converges to the same limit obtained in Lemma 5.2 for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . We recall the

sequences of functions  $(\pi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$  where  $\pi_\omega^\varepsilon$  is given by (1) (replacing  $\varepsilon$  with  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ ). Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi_\omega^\varepsilon - p_\omega^\varepsilon| &\leq \sum_{n=\frac{t}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}}^{\infty} (\tilde{\varepsilon}\beta_{R,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\beta_{L,\sigma^{-k-1}\omega} + \beta_{R,\sigma^{-k-1}\omega})) \\ &\quad + p_{\sigma^{-\frac{t}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}}\omega}^\varepsilon \prod_{k=0}^{\frac{t}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}-1} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}\gamma_{\sigma^{-k-1}}) \\ &\stackrel{(\star\star\star)}{\leq} (M + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0}(1)) \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}e^{t(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0}(1))}}{1 - e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0}(1))}} + p_{\sigma^{-\frac{t}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}}\omega}^\varepsilon e^{t(-\int_\Omega \gamma_s d\mathbb{P}(s)+o_{\omega,\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0}(1))} \end{aligned}$$

where at  $(\star\star\star)$  we have used Step 3 and Step 1 from the proof of Lemma 5.2 on the first and second term, respectively. Using Step 4 from the proof of Lemma 5.2 on the first term, and noting by (16) and Lemma 5.5 that  $p_{\sigma^{-\frac{t}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}}\omega}^\varepsilon \leq 1 + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0}(1)$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , by taking  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  and then  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0} |\pi_\omega^\varepsilon - p_\omega^\varepsilon| = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . By Lemma 5.2, since  $\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$ , we get for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0} \pi_\omega^\varepsilon = \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}. \quad (30)$$

Since  $\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0} |\pi_\omega^\varepsilon - p_\omega^\varepsilon| = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , (30) coincides with  $\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon}\rightarrow 0} p_\omega^\varepsilon = p_\omega$ . Hence, by Lemma 5.6

$$p_\omega := \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}$$

and

$$1 - p_\omega := \frac{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set, as claimed in the statement of Theorem 5.4.  $\square$

**Remark 5.10.** If we consider the case that  $\int_\Omega \beta_{L,\omega} + \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = 0$  in the statement of Theorem 5.4, then  $\beta_{L,\omega} = \beta_{R,\omega} = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Here, one would require finer information regarding the errors appearing in Lemma 5.8 to investigate the accumulation points of the random invariant density.

**Remark 5.11.** An interesting feature of this class of paired metastable systems has been uncovered by Theorem 5.4. That is, the limiting invariant density of such systems depends only on perturbations through averaged quantities (with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ ). Apart from this, it is independent of the driving system  $\sigma$ .

**Remark 5.12.** Comparing Theorem 5.4 to [3, Theorem 3.4], we explicitly compute the weights  $p_\omega$  and  $1 - p_\omega$  associated with the limiting invariant density as opposed to studying the so-called *limiting averaged holes ratio* (*l.a.h.r.*). In the case of paired metastable systems



with driving that is not necessarily i.i.d., we find that the weights  $p_\omega$  and  $1 - p_\omega$  may be computed in a similar way to [3]. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
l.a.h.r. &:= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \mu_R(H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{=} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\
&= \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\
&= \frac{p_\omega}{1 - p_\omega}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that at  $(*)$  we have used **(P4)**. Taking  $\frac{p_\omega}{1-p_\omega} = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{R,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{L,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}$ , solving for  $p_\omega$  and renormalising gives the weights  $p_\omega$  and  $1 - p_\omega$  determined through (2). In our case, this process is redundant since (2) provides us with a readily computed expression for the weights associated with the limiting invariant density.

## 6 Characterisation of the second Oseledets space

In this section we generalise [32, Theorem 2] to the random setting. We show that under the assumptions listed in Section 3 that the asymptotic behaviour of the second Oseledets space can be understood. Further, we show that the limiting function spanning this space can be identified explicitly.

**Lemma 6.1.** *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small there exists a family of functions  $(\psi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  where  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon \in \text{BV}(I)$  satisfies  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon \psi_\omega^\varepsilon = \rho_\omega^\varepsilon \psi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon$ , where  $\int_{\Omega} \log |\rho_\omega^\varepsilon| d\mathbb{P}(\omega) < 0$ ,  $\|\psi_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})} = 1$ , and  $\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the existence of a family of functions  $(\psi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , where  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon \in \text{BV}(I)$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon \psi_\omega^\varepsilon = \rho_\omega^\varepsilon \psi_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon \quad (31)$$

where  $\|\psi_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})} = 1$  is guaranteed by Lemma 4.2. To show that  $\int_{\Omega} \log |\rho_\omega^\varepsilon| d\mathbb{P}(\omega) < 0$  we inductively apply (31) and find that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon \psi_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon = \rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon \psi_\omega^\varepsilon. \quad (32)$$

Since  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon \in \text{BV}(I)$ , and by Lemma 4.2(b), spans the second Oseledets space of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon \psi_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_{\text{BV}} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon| \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{=} \int_{\Omega} \log |\rho_\omega^\varepsilon| d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon \psi_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_{\text{BV}} \\
&= \lambda_2^\varepsilon \\
&< 0
\end{aligned}$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . At  $(\star)$  we have used Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, and at  $(\star\star)$  we have used (32). It remains to show that  $\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Suppose that there exists a set of positive  $\mathbb{P}$ -measure such that  $\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) \neq 0$ . Using (32), the fact that  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  preserves integrals, and since  $\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) \neq 0$ ,

$$\rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} = \frac{\int_I \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} \psi_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x)}{\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x)} = \frac{\int_I \psi_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x)}{\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x)}. \quad (33)$$

Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)}| = \lambda_2^\varepsilon < 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we know that  $\rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} = e^{n(\lambda_2^\varepsilon + o_{n \rightarrow \infty}(1))}$ . Take  $n$  sufficiently large such that  $e^{2n\lambda_2^\varepsilon} \leq \rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} \leq e^{\frac{n}{2}\lambda_2^\varepsilon}$ . Recalling that  $\lambda_2^\varepsilon < 0$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and (33) implies that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{\varepsilon(n)} = \frac{1}{\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_I \psi_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x). \quad (34)$$

Let  $\iota_\omega^\varepsilon := \int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x)$ . Clearly,  $\iota^\varepsilon : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is measurable. By the Poincaré recurrence theorem, since (34) implies that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  then  $\iota_\omega^\varepsilon = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  contradicting the fact that  $\int_I \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) \neq 0$  on a set of positive measure.  $\square$

Using Lemma 6.1 we may now characterise the second Oseledets space.

**Theorem 6.2.** *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, choose the sign of  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  such that  $\int_{I_L} \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) > 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Then as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,*

$$\psi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \psi_\omega^0 := \frac{1}{2}\phi_L - \frac{1}{2}\phi_R$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**Remark 6.3.** In the statement of Theorem 6.2 we assume that one can choose the sign of  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  such that  $\int_{I_L} \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) > 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Observe that this is not possible if  $\int_{I_L} \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . However, since  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converges to a non-trivial linear combination of the initially invariant densities, this case never arises.

*Proof of Theorem 6.2.* By Lemma 4.2, any accumulation point of  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  satisfies  $\psi_\omega^0 = \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \psi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  and may be expressed as a linear combination of  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$ . The existence of a convergent subsequence is discussed in Remark 4.3. It remains to identify the (possibly random) weights associated with  $\psi_\omega^0$ . By Lemma 6.1 we know that for all  $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ ,  $\int_I \psi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} d\text{Leb}(x) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \psi_\omega^0 d\text{Leb}(x) &= \int_I c_{1,\omega} \phi_L + c_{2,\omega} \phi_R d\text{Leb}(x) \\ &= c_{1,\omega} + c_{2,\omega} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

To compute  $c_{1,\omega}$  and therefore  $c_{2,\omega}$ , we recall that by Lemma 6.1, for all  $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ ,  $\|\psi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}\|_{L^1(\text{Leb})} = 1$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I |\psi_\omega^0| d\text{Leb}(x) &= |c_{1,\omega}| \int_I |\phi_L - \phi_R| d\text{Leb}(x) \\ &= |c_{1,\omega}| \left( \int_{I_L} |\phi_L| d\text{Leb}(x) + \int_{I_R} |\phi_R| d\text{Leb}(x) \right) \\ &= 2|c_{1,\omega}| \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we may conclude that  $c_{1,\omega} = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ . By assumption, since  $\int_{I_L} \psi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} d\text{Leb}(x) > 0$  we may identify the unique limiting function corresponding to any accumulation point of  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.4.** We note that the limiting function admitted by Theorem 6.2 is identical to that obtained in [32, Theorem 2]. The only difference between our statement and that given in [32] is that we obtain a family of functions  $(\psi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small as opposed to a family of eigenfunctions. Furthermore, by studying such systems in the random setting we obtain fibrewise convergence for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**Remark 6.5.** As discussed in [32, Remark 3], the result of Theorem 6.2 asserts that for a typical density  $f \in \text{BV}$  and sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the function  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^{\varepsilon(n)} f$  converges to an arbitrary linear combination of  $\phi_L$  and  $\phi_R$  faster than it does to a convex combination.

## 7 The limiting invariant density for multiple initially invariant states

In this section, we consider the setting of Section 3 but rather allow the initial system  $T^0$  to have  $m \geq 2$  invariant sets  $I_1, \dots, I_m$ . Extending (I4), for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $T^0|_{I_i}$  has only one ACIM  $\mu_i$ , whose density is denoted by  $\phi_i := d\mu_i/d\text{Leb}$ . Upon perturbation, this invariance is destroyed, allowing points to randomly switch between the initially invariant subintervals. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and consider  $C^2$ -small perturbations of  $T^0$ , denoted  $T^\varepsilon : \Omega \times I \rightarrow I$ , in the same sense as described in (P2). For  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , let  $H_{i,j,\omega}^\varepsilon$  be the set of all points mapping from  $I_i$  to  $I_j$  under one iteration of  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$ . That is,  $H_{i,j,\omega}^\varepsilon = I_i \cap (T_\omega^\varepsilon)^{-1}(I_j)$ . A similar condition to (P3) is imposed, namely  $H_{i,j,\omega}^\varepsilon$  is a union of finitely many intervals, and as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $H_{i,j,\omega}^\varepsilon$  converges uniformly (in the Hausdorff metric) over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to  $H^0 \cap I_i$ . We naturally extend (P4) by assuming that for  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\mu_i(H_{i,j,\omega}^\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \beta_{i,j,\omega} + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon)$  (where  $\beta_{i,j} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ ), or  $\mu_i(H_{i,j,\omega}^\varepsilon) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . In a similar manner, one can modify the remaining conditions of Section 3 such that they apply to this more general setting. We call these extended conditions  $\overline{\text{(I1)}}$ - $\overline{\text{(I6)}}$  and  $\overline{\text{(P1)}}$ - $\overline{\text{(P7)}}$ .

**Remark 7.1.** Without loss of generality we assume that under one iteration of  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$ , for some  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ , points in  $I_i$  can only map to neighbouring sets  $I_{i-1}, I_{i+1}$  or remain in  $I_i$ . When  $i = 1$ , points in  $I_i$  can only map to  $I_{i+1}$  or remain in  $I_i$ , whereas if  $i = m$ , points in  $I_i$  can only map to  $I_{i-1}$  or remain in  $I_i$ . One can guarantee this is satisfied by relabeling the intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_m$ . With this in mind,  $H_{i,j,\omega}^\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$  if and only if

- $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$
- $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$  and  $j = i \pm 1$ , or
- $i = m$  and  $j = m-1$ .

We begin by stating the main result of this section. This characterises the limiting invariant density of  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , given by  $(\phi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and relates it to the system's induced  $m$ -state Markov chain in a random environment driven by  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ .

Consider the  $m$ -state Markov chains in random environments driven by  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ , with transition matrices  $(M_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  where

$$M_\omega^\varepsilon := \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon\beta_{1,2,\omega} & \varepsilon\beta_{2,1,\omega} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \varepsilon\beta_{1,2,\omega} & 1 - \varepsilon(\beta_{2,1,\omega} + \beta_{2,3,\omega}) & \varepsilon\beta_{3,2,\omega} & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \varepsilon\beta_{m-1,m,\omega} & 1 - \varepsilon\beta_{m,m-1,\omega} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

For  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $(M_\omega^\varepsilon)_{ij}$  describes the one-step transition probabilities for the induced  $m$ -state Markov chain in a random environment, driven by  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ , for the map  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  from  $I_j$  to  $I_i$ . For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $\Delta, N : \Omega \rightarrow M_{m \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  be such that

$$\text{diag}(M_\omega^\varepsilon) =: I - \varepsilon\Delta_\omega \quad (36)$$

and

$$M_\omega^\varepsilon =: I - \varepsilon\Delta_\omega + \varepsilon N_\omega. \quad (37)$$

**Theorem 7.2.** *Let  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$  be a sequence of random dynamical systems of metastable maps  $T_\omega^\varepsilon : I \rightarrow I$  satisfying [\(I1\)-\(I6\)](#) and [\(P1\)-\(P7\)](#). Suppose that  $\Delta, N : \Omega \rightarrow M_{m \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  are as in [\(36\)](#) and [\(37\)](#). If  $\int_\Omega \Delta_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$  is invertible, then there exists a vector  $v^0 = (c_1 \ c_2 \ \cdots \ c_m)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $c_i \geq 0$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i = 1$ , such that as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,*

$$\phi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_\omega^0 = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \phi_i$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. Further,  $v^0$  is the solution to

$$\left( I - \left( \int_\Omega \Delta_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right)^{-1} \int_\Omega N_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right) v^0 = 0 \quad (38)$$

that satisfies  $\sum_{i=1}^m (v^0)_i = 1$ .

**Remark 7.3.** In some cases, the assumption that  $\int_\Omega \Delta_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$  is invertible in the statement of Theorem 7.2 may be relaxed. For example, if  $(\int_\Omega \Delta_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega))_{ii} = 0$  for exactly one  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , then the  $i^{\text{th}}$  state of the Markov chain in a random environment driven

by  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  with transition matrices  $(M_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  (as in (35)) is absorbing. In this case, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\phi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_\omega^0 = \phi_i$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. With this in mind, together with Theorem 7.2, for systems with  $m = 2$  initially invariant sets, the statement of Theorem 7.2 reduces to the statement of Theorem 5.4.

The proof of Theorem 7.2 is divided into several lemmata. We first determine whether the Oseledets decomposition of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  depends continuously on perturbations.

**Lemma 7.4.** *In the setting of Theorem 7.2, the Lyapunov exponents and Oseledets projections of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  converge to those of  $\mathcal{L}^0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . In particular, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, the top Oseledets space of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is one-dimensional, and spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon \in \text{BV}(I)$  with associated Lyapunov exponent  $\lambda_1^\varepsilon = 0$  of multiplicity one. Further, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the space spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to the plane spanned by  $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m\}$ . Any accumulation point of the sequence  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$ , denoted  $\phi_\omega^0$ , lies in  $\text{BV}(I)$  and satisfies  $\phi_\omega^0 \in \text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m\}$  where this convergence holds in  $L^1$ , and for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Identical to that of Lemma 4.2 with the inclusion of  $m$  initially invariant states implying that  $\phi_\omega^0 \in \text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m\}$ . Recall that the existence of a convergent subsequence is guaranteed by Remark 4.3.  $\square$

Lemma 7.4 asserts that any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$ , say along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ , satisfies

$$\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \phi_\omega^0 := \sum_{i=1}^m c_{i,\omega} \phi_i \quad (39)$$

in  $L^1$  and for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . We aim to show that the accumulation points of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  are always the same, so that  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  admits a limit as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

We replicate the procedure from Section 5.2 beginning with Lemma 5.6, 5.8 and Corollary 5.9. Recall that by Remark 7.1, for  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ , non-empty holes must be of the form  $H_{1,2,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}, H_{i,i\pm 1,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}, H_{i\pm 1,i,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  and  $H_{m,m-1,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ .

**Lemma 7.5.** *In the setting of Theorem 7.2, if for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $c_{i,\omega}$  is as in (39), then for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$c_{i,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} := \mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(I_i) = c_{i,\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1), \quad (40)$$

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{1,2,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = c_{1,\omega} \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{1,2,\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \quad (41)$$

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{m,m-1,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = c_{m,\omega} \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{m,m-1,\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \quad (42)$$

Further, for  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{i,i\pm 1,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = c_{i,\omega} \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{i,i\pm 1,\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}), \quad (43)$$

$$\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(H_{i\pm 1,i,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}) = c_{i\pm 1,\omega} \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{i\pm 1,i,\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \quad (44)$$

*Proof.* Note that by [\(P6\)](#), for  $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ ,  $(T_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  admits a unique RACIM  $(\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . We first check whether [Lemma 5.5](#) holds. Note that the proof of [Lemma 5.5](#) never directly uses the fact that the system has two initially invariant states. This guarantees that any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  converges over each hole and over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set. Hence, the remainder of the proof is identical to that of [Lemma 5.6](#), [Lemma 5.8](#) and [Corollary 5.9](#). Observe that in the case of two initially invariant states, we could obtain [\(16\)](#) and [\(24\)](#), from which we could derive [\(17\)](#) and [\(25\)](#). In the case of  $m$  initially invariant sets, one could proceed in a similar manner.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove [Theorem 7.2](#). In what follows, let

$$v_\omega^0 := \begin{pmatrix} c_{1,\omega} \\ \vdots \\ c_{m,\omega} \end{pmatrix} \quad (45)$$

be an accumulation point of

$$v_\omega^\varepsilon := \begin{pmatrix} c_{1,\omega}^\varepsilon \\ \vdots \\ c_{m,\omega}^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \quad (46)$$

along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ . We emphasise that the weights associated with any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  in [\(39\)](#) are precisely the weights defined in [\(45\)](#). For  $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  element of  $v_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  is given by [\(40\)](#). Furthermore, [\(40\)](#) asserts that as  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $c_{i,\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to  $c_{i,\omega}$ .

*Proof of [Theorem 7.2](#).* By [Lemma 7.4](#) and [Lemma 7.5](#), any accumulation point of  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon$  along the subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon}' \rightarrow 0$  satisfies  $\phi_\omega^0 = \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon}' \rightarrow 0} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}'}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}'} &\xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_\omega^0 = \sum_{i=1}^m c_{i,\omega} \phi_i \\ &:= v_\omega^0 \cdot \Phi \end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.<sup>16</sup> Here,  $v_\omega^0$  is as in [\(45\)](#) and  $\Phi := (\phi_1 \ \dots \ \phi_m)^T$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , consider the restricted subsequence  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ , along which any accumulation point of  $\phi_{\sigma^k \omega}^\varepsilon$  satisfies  $\phi_{\sigma^k \omega}^0 = \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \phi_{\sigma^k \omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  and

$$\phi_{\sigma^k \omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_{\sigma^k \omega}^0 = v_{\sigma^k \omega}^0 \cdot \Phi \quad (47)$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.<sup>17</sup> We utilise properties of the RACIM for  $(T_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  whose existence is guaranteed by [\(P6\)](#). That is, since  $(\mu_\omega^{\tilde{\varepsilon}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is a RACIM for

<sup>16</sup>As discussed in [Remark 5.7](#) and featured in the proof of [Theorem 5.4](#), [Lemma 7.5](#) (particularly [\(40\)](#)) guarantees this convergence is uniform over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.

<sup>17</sup>The existence of such a convergent subsequence is guaranteed by using the *diagonal sequence trick* (see for example [\[52, Theorem 1.24\]](#)).

$(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , by following a similar calculation completed in the proof of Theorem 5.4, for  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i,\omega}^\varepsilon &= \mu_\omega^\varepsilon(I_i) = \mu_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon((T_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon)^{-1}(I_i)) \\ &= \mu_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon(I_i \setminus (H_{i,i+1,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon \cup H_{i,i-1,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon) \cup (H_{i+1,i,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon \cup H_{i-1,i,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon)) \quad (48) \\ &= c_{i,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon(\beta_{i,i+1,\sigma^{-1}\omega} + \beta_{i,i-1,\sigma^{-1}\omega})) + c_{i+1,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{i+1,i,\sigma^{-1}\omega} \\ &\quad + c_{i-1,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{i-1,i,\sigma^{-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Lemma 7.5 and (40). Similarly, one can obtain an expression for  $c_{1,\omega}^\varepsilon$  and  $c_{m,\omega}^\varepsilon$  with the exception in (48) that  $H_{1,0,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon, H_{0,1,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon = \emptyset$  and  $H_{m,m+1,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon, H_{m+1,m,\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ , respectively. Thus, we may cast  $v_\omega^\varepsilon$  (from (46)) in the form of a matrix equation where for each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$v_{\sigma^n \omega}^\varepsilon = M_{\sigma^n \omega}^\varepsilon v_{\sigma^{n-1} \omega}^\varepsilon + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \quad (49)$$

with the error term applied element-wise and  $M_\omega^\varepsilon$  is as in (35) with  $\varepsilon$  replaced with  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ . Taking  $\Delta, N : \Omega \rightarrow M_{m \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  as in (36) and (37), from (49),

$$\begin{aligned} v_\omega^\varepsilon &= (I - \tilde{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}) v_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon + \tilde{\varepsilon} N_\omega v_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}) \\ &\stackrel{(\star)}{=} (I - \tilde{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}) v_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon + \tilde{\varepsilon} N_{\sigma^{-1}\omega} v_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^0 + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}). \quad (50) \end{aligned}$$

At  $(\star)$  we have used the fact that due to (40) and (47), for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $v_{\sigma^k \omega}^\varepsilon = v_{\sigma^k \omega}^0 + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(1)$ . Furthermore, since the entries of  $N : \Omega \rightarrow M_{m \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  are  $L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$  functions, the uniform error (over  $\omega \in \Omega$ ) can be controlled. Fix  $t > 0$ . Inductively using (50), we find that for any  $K_t^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} v_\omega^\varepsilon &= \left( \prod_{k=0}^{K_t^\varepsilon - 1} (I - \tilde{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega}) \right) v_{\sigma^{-K_t^\varepsilon} \omega}^\varepsilon \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=0}^{K_t^\varepsilon - 1} \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (I - \tilde{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega}) \right) (\tilde{\varepsilon} N_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} v_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega}^0 + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})). \quad (51) \end{aligned}$$

Set  $K_t^\varepsilon = \frac{t}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ . For  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , observe that the  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry of (51) is in the form of (29) (with  $\beta_R, \gamma \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$  replaced with functions, say  $u_i, s_i \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ ). Thus, by a similar argument to that made in the proof of Theorem 5.4,  $v_\omega^\varepsilon$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to the same limit as

$$q_\omega^\varepsilon := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (I - \tilde{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega}) \right) (\tilde{\varepsilon} N_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} v_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega}^0 + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \quad (52)$$

as  $\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\Delta_\omega$  is a diagonal matrix and  $N_\omega$  is as in (37) for  $\omega \in \Omega$ , expanding (52) we find that

$$q_\omega^\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{2,1,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} c_{2,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon} (\Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega})_{11}) \\ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\tilde{\varepsilon} (\beta_{1,2,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} c_{1,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} + \beta_{3,2,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} c_{3,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega}) + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon} (\Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega})_{22}) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\tilde{\varepsilon} \beta_{m-1,m,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} c_{m-1,\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon} (\Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega})_{mm}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (53)$$

where for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $c_{i,\omega}$  are as in (45). Thus, by Lemma 5.2, since  $(\int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega))_{ii} \neq 0$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  (since  $\int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$  is invertible), for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} q_{\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{2,1,\omega} c_{2,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{1,2,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\ \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{1,2,\omega} c_{1,\omega} + \beta_{3,2,\omega} c_{3,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{2,1,\omega} + \beta_{2,3,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{m-1,m,\omega} c_{m-1,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_{\Omega} \beta_{m,m-1,\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore,  $v_{\omega}^0 = \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} q_{\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} := v^0$  is independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Using (52) and noting that for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $(\int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega))_{ii} \neq 0$ , for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} v^0 &= \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (I - \tilde{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega}) \right) (\tilde{\varepsilon} N_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} v^0 + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon})) \\ &\stackrel{(\star\star)}{=} \left( \int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right)^{-1} \int_{\Omega} N_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) v^0. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

At  $(\star\star)$  we have used Lemma 5.2, since the entries of the matrix

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (I - \tilde{\varepsilon} \Delta_{\sigma^{-k-1}\omega}) \right) (\tilde{\varepsilon} N_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} + o_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0}(\tilde{\varepsilon}))$$

are in the form of (1) with  $(\int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega))_{ii} \neq 0$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Due to (40),  $v_{\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to the same limit as  $q_{\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ , we may conclude that  $v_{\omega}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to the non-trivial solution of (54).  $\square$

**Remark 7.6.** Similar to the discussion in Remark 5.3, if  $\int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$  is invertible, and  $\beta_{i,j} \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{P})$ , then Theorem 7.2 provides us with the limiting invariant measures of the  $m$ -state Markov chains in random environments driven by  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  (as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ), with transition matrices  $(M_{\omega}^{\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  given by (35) for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ .<sup>18</sup> Namely, if  $\int_{\Omega} \Delta_{\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$  is invertible, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the random invariant measure of  $(M_{\omega}^{\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to the non-trivial solution,  $v^0$ , of (38). This follows from the proof of Theorem 7.2 by setting the errors appearing in (41), (42), (43) and (44) to zero.

**Remark 7.7.** In the setting that  $T^0$  admits  $m \geq 2$  initially invariant sets, the results of Section 6 assert that the functions spanning the subsequent Oseledets spaces of  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{\varepsilon}$  with Lyapunov exponents approaching zero (as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) converge in  $L^1$  to a linear combination of the initially invariant densities for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Furthermore, the limiting function has integral zero.

<sup>18</sup>Refer to Remark 7.3 as to how this invertibility assumption may be relaxed.



## 8 Example: Random paired tent maps

In this section, we show that our results may be used to approximate the limiting random invariant density, and the second Oseledets space for Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles associated with random paired tent maps depending on a parameter  $\varepsilon$ . This class of random dynamical systems was introduced by Horan in [35, 36] and has been used as a primary candidate of a non-autonomous system that admits metastability [33]. For this reason, we benchmark our results against such a model.

### 8.1 The system of concern

Let  $I = [-1, 1]$  and for  $0 \leq a, b \leq 1$  consider the paired tent map  $T_{a,b} : I \rightarrow I$  given by

$$T_{a,b}(x) := \begin{cases} 2(1+b)(x+1) - 1, & x \in [-1, -1/2] \\ -2(1+b)x - 1, & x \in [-1/2, 0] \\ 0, & x = 0 \\ -2(1+a)x + 1, & x \in (0, 1/2] \\ 2(1+a)(x-1) + 1, & x \in [1/2, 1] \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

This map satisfies  $T_{a,b}(-1) = -1$ ,  $T_{a,b}(-1/2) = b$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^-} T(x) = -1$ ;  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} T_{a,b}(x) = 1$ ,  $T_{a,b}(1/2) = -a$  and  $T_{a,b}(1) = 1$ . The map  $T_{0,0}$  comprises of tent maps on disjoint subintervals  $I_L = [-1, 0]$  and  $I_R = [0, 1]$ . For small positive  $a$  and  $b$ , there is a small amount of leakage between these subintervals: points near  $-1/2$  are mapped to  $I_R$  whilst points near  $1/2$  are mapped to  $I_L$ . This behaviour may be seen in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Paired tent map  $T_{a,b}$  on  $I = [-1, 1]$  with  $a = b = 0$  (left) and  $a = b = \frac{1}{10}$  (right)

Now consider a cocycle of paired tent maps driven by an ergodic, measure-preserving and invertible transformation  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ . The  $\omega$ -dependence is introduced in this system by making the leakage between intervals  $I_L$  and  $I_R$  random. This is guaranteed by considering the evolution of a point  $x \in I$  under the dynamics  $T_\omega := T_{a_\omega, b_\omega}$  where  $a, b : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  are measurable functions, and thus  $a, b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ . Since we are interested in the behaviour of such a system when small amounts of leakage can occur, we consider for sufficiently small

$\varepsilon > 0$  the map  $T_\omega^\varepsilon := T_{\varepsilon a_\omega, \varepsilon b_\omega}$ .<sup>19</sup> Here, there is a low probability that a point will be mapped from  $I_L$  to  $I_R$  in one step and vice-versa. When  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,  $T^0 := T_{0,0}$  and the map consists of tent maps on disjoint subintervals. Furthermore, the dynamics is entirely deterministic with the  $\varepsilon = 0$  perturbation, removing the randomness of the system.

The random maps  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} := (T_{\varepsilon a_\omega, \varepsilon b_\omega})_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , driven by  $\sigma$ , are the primary focus of this section. We verify the conditions outlined in Section 3 in order to apply Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 6.2 to this random paired metastable system. The main results of this section are the following.

**Theorem 8.1.** *Let  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$  be a sequence of random dynamical systems of paired tent maps  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} := (T_{\varepsilon a_\omega, \varepsilon b_\omega})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  satisfying **(P1)** where  $a, b : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  are measurable, and  $\int_\Omega a_\omega + b_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \neq 0$ . If  $(\phi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  denotes the random invariant density of  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , then as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$*

$$\phi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \phi_\omega^0 := \frac{\int_\Omega a_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega a_\omega + b_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \mathbb{1}_{I_L} + \frac{\int_\Omega b_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\int_\Omega a_\omega + b_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)} \mathbb{1}_{I_R}$$

uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.

**Theorem 8.2.** *In the setting of Theorem 8.1, let  $(\psi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  denote the functions spanning the second Oseledets spaces of  $(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . Choose the sign of  $\psi_\omega^\varepsilon$  such that  $\int_{I_L} \psi_\omega^\varepsilon d\text{Leb}(x) > 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Then as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,*

$$\psi_\omega^\varepsilon \xrightarrow{L^1} \psi_\omega^0 := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{I_L} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{I_R}$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**Remark 8.3.** For  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , we know that  $\phi_\star = \mathbb{1}_{I_\star}$  in the statements of Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 6.2 since the unique ACIMs of the unperturbed system supported on the initially invariant intervals are given by  $\mu_\star = \text{Leb}|_{I_\star}$ .

The proof of Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 8.2 are direct consequences of Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 6.2, respectively. The remainder of this section is dedicated to verifying the conditions outlined in Section 3, allowing us to apply Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 6.2 to random paired tent maps.

## 8.2 Conditions for the unperturbed map

We begin by showing conditions **(I1)**-**(I6)** hold. Suppose that  $\mathcal{L}^0$  is the Perron-Frobenius operator associated with the map  $T^0 := T_{0,0}$  defined in (55) acting on  $\text{BV}(I)$ . One can show that **(I1)** is satisfied with critical set  $\mathcal{C}^0 = \{-1, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ . Furthermore, since  $\inf_{x \in I \setminus \mathcal{C}^0} |(T^0)'(x)| = 2 > 1$ , **(I2)** holds. For **(I3)**, we note that there exists a boundary

<sup>19</sup>One can interpret the parameter  $\varepsilon$  as a leakage controller. The larger you take  $\varepsilon$ , the more likely it is for points to map to and from the initially invariant subintervals.

point  $b = 0$  that splits  $I = [-1, 1]$  into subintervals  $I_L = [-1, 0]$  and  $I_R = [0, 1]$  which are invariant under  $T^0$ .<sup>20</sup> On each of these invariant subintervals, the dynamics is given by the tent map. By [44] and [45], for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $T^0|_{I_\star}$  has a unique ACIM given by  $\text{Leb}|_{I_\star}$  with density  $\mathbb{1}|_{I_\star}$  and thus (I4) is satisfied.

To verify (I5), we note that the infinitesimal holes for  $T^0$  are  $H^0 = (T^0)^{-1}(\{b\}) \setminus \{b\} = \{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$ . Since  $-1, 0, 1$  are both fixed points of  $T^0$  and elements of  $\mathcal{C}^0$ , and  $x = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  are mapped to 0 under  $T^0$ , we have that for each  $k > 0$  that  $T^{0(k)}(\mathcal{C}^0) = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ . Thus for each  $k > 0$ ,  $T^{0(k)}(\mathcal{C}^0) \cap H^0 = \emptyset$ .

**Remark 8.4.** We remind the reader that (I5) is used to ensure that for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ , the density  $\phi_\star$  is continuous at all points in  $H^0$ . Verification of this condition may not be necessary if we know precisely what  $\phi_\star$  is. Namely, in our case since  $\phi_\star = \mathbb{1}|_{I_\star}$ , we know that  $\phi_\star$  is continuous on  $I_\star$  and hence on  $H^0$ .

For (I6), since  $H^0 \cap I_L = \{-\frac{1}{2}\}$  and  $H^0 \cap I_R = \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ , we know that since  $\phi_\star = \mathbb{1}|_{I_\star}$  for  $\star \in \{L, R\}$ ,  $\phi_\star$  is positive at each of the points in  $H^0 \cap I_L$  and  $H^0 \cap I_R$ .

### 8.3 Conditions for the perturbed map

Upon perturbing the initial system, we now consider the paired tent map cocycle  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . It remains to verify conditions (P2)-(P7), from which, by enforcing (P1), Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 8.2 hold.

One can show that (P2) is satisfied. This follows primarily from the fact that the critical set for  $T^\varepsilon : \Omega \times I \rightarrow I$  is identical to that of  $T^0 : I \rightarrow I$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{C}_\omega^\varepsilon = \{-1, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ . Conditions (P3) and (P7) hold due to the following.

**Lemma 8.5.** *In the setting of Theorem 8.1, let  $H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon$  and  $H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon$  denote the set of all points mapped by  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  from  $I_L$  to  $I_R$  and from  $I_R$  to  $I_L$ , respectively. Then*

$$H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon = \left[ -1 + \frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon b_\omega)}, -\frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon b_\omega)} \right]$$

$$H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon = \left[ \frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon a_\omega)}, 1 - \frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon a_\omega)} \right].$$

Furthermore, conditions (P3) and (P7) are satisfied.

*Proof.* By (55), the left and right endpoints of the interval  $H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon$  are determined by the solutions  $x$  to the equations

$$2(1 + \varepsilon b_\omega)(x + 1) - 1 = 0$$

$$-2(1 + \varepsilon b_\omega)x - 1 = 0,$$

<sup>20</sup>We remind the reader of why this is the case. Without loss of generality suppose  $x \in I_L$ , then  $T_{0,0}(x) \in [-1, 0] = I_L$  meaning  $T_{0,0}^{-1}(I_L) \subset I_L$ . An almost identical argument can be made for  $I_R$ .

respectively. Similarly the left and right endpoints of the interval  $H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon$  are determined by the solutions  $x$  to the equations

$$\begin{aligned} -2(1 + \varepsilon a_\omega)x + 1 &= 0 \\ 2(1 + \varepsilon a_\omega)(x - 1) + 1 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Upon solving these systems of linear equations we obtain  $H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon$  and  $H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon$  as claimed. Since  $a, b : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  are measurable, one can show that **(P3)** holds. Finally, since  $H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon$  and  $H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon$  emerge away from the boundary point  $b = 0$ , **(P7)** holds.  $\square$

Lemma 8.5 allows us to verify **(P4)**.

**Lemma 8.6.** *In the setting of Theorem 8.1*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon b_\omega + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon), \\ \mu_R(H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon) &= \varepsilon a_\omega + o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where  $a, b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ . Hence **(P4)** is satisfied.

*Proof.* We establish (56) as the computation for  $\mu_R(H_{R,\omega}^\varepsilon)$  follows in an almost identical manner. Since  $\mu_L = \text{Leb}|_{I_L}$ , by Lemma 8.5, for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_L(H_{L,\omega}^\varepsilon) &= \text{Leb}|_{I_L} \left( \left[ -1 + \frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon b_\omega)}, -\frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon b_\omega)} \right] \right) \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon b_\omega} \\ &= \varepsilon b_\omega - \varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon b_\omega^2}{1 + \varepsilon b_\omega} \\ &= \varepsilon b_\omega + \varepsilon \cdot o_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the error term in the last line is independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$  since the function  $\chi_\omega^\varepsilon := \frac{\varepsilon b_\omega^2}{1 + \varepsilon b_\omega}$  converges uniformly over  $\omega \in \Omega$  away from a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set to 0 as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $b : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is measurable and uniformly bounded, then  $b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$  and **(P4)** is satisfied.  $\square$

We now determine whether **(P5)** is satisfied. Establishing a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is rather technical due to the creation of small monotonic branches of the second iterate map when  $\varepsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small. This issue can be avoided by utilising the so-called balanced Lasota-Yorke inequality developed by Horan in [36]. To apply the results presented in [36], we record for the reader's convenience relevant definitions.

**Definition 8.7.** Let  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $I = [a, b]$ , and let  $\overline{\text{Leb}}$  denote the normalised Lebesgue measure on  $I$ . A map  $T : I \rightarrow I$  satisfies the collection of assumptions  $(\mathcal{M})$  when:

- There exists a countable cover of  $I$  by closed intervals  $\{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $I_n = [a_n, b_n]$ , where  $a_n < b_n$ . Here  $N$  may be finite or countably infinite.

- $(a_n, b_n) \cap (a_m, b_m) = \emptyset$  for all  $n \neq m$ .
- $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (a_n, b_n)$  is dense in  $I$  and has measure 1.
- $T|_{(a_n, b_n)}$  is continuous and extends to a homeomorphism  $T_n : I_n \rightarrow T_n(I_n)$ .
- There exists a bounded measurable function  $g : I \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(f)(x) := \sum_{y \in T^{-1}(x)} g(y) f(y)$  defines an operator that preserves  $\overline{\text{Leb}}$  (that is,  $\overline{\text{Leb}}(\mathcal{L}(f)) = \overline{\text{Leb}}(f)$  for all integrable functions  $f$ ),  $g$  has finite variation on each  $I_n$ , and  $g$  is 0 at the endpoints of each  $I_n$ .

Horan shows in [36] that for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , random paired tent maps satisfy the conditions of Definition 8.7 when  $g_\omega^\varepsilon(x) := |(T_\omega^\varepsilon)'(x)|^{-1}$ . For the sake of notation, let  $\mathring{I}_n = (a_n, b_n)$  and  $f(x^s) := \lim_{t \rightarrow x^s} f(t)$  for  $s \in \{+, -\}$ . To formally state the balanced Lasota-Yorke inequality we also require the definition of *hanging points* from Eslami and Góra [18].

**Definition 8.8.** Let  $I = [a, b]$  and  $T : I \rightarrow I$  satisfy the assumptions  $(\mathcal{M})$ . For pairs  $(x, s)$  of the form  $(a_n, +)$  or  $(b_n, -)$ , we say that the pair  $(x, s)$  is a *hanging point* for  $T$  when  $T(x^s) \notin \{a, b\}$ , or alternatively  $\mathbb{1}_{\{a, b\}}(T(x^s)) = 0$ . We say that a hanging point  $(x, s)$  is contained in an interval  $[c, d] \subset I$  when  $x \in [c, d]$  and  $s = +$  or when  $x \in (c, d]$  and  $s = -$ , so that limits of the form  $f(x^s)$  make sense in  $[c, d]$ .

**Example 8.9.** The random paired tent map  $T_\omega^\varepsilon : I \rightarrow I$  has 4 hanging points

$$H = \{(-0.5, -), (-0.5, +), (0.5, -), (0.5, +)\}.$$

The remaining endpoints of the branches of monotonicity of  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  are not hanging points since  $T_\omega^\varepsilon(-1^+) = -1$ ,  $T_\omega^\varepsilon(0^+) = 1$ ,  $T_\omega^\varepsilon(0^-) = -1$ , and  $T_\omega^\varepsilon(1^-) = 1$ .

With the above definitions and examples, we may now state Horan's balanced Lasota-Yorke inequality.

**Proposition 8.10** ([36, Proposition 3.6]). *Let  $I = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $T : I \rightarrow I$  satisfy the assumptions  $(\mathcal{M})$ . Let  $H$  be the collection of hanging points for  $T$ . Suppose further that*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \frac{\text{var}_\circ^{I_n}(g)}{\overline{\text{Leb}}(I_n)} \right\} < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{(z, s) \in H} g(z^s) < \infty.$$

*Then for any  $f \in \text{BV}(I)$  and any finite collection of closed intervals  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_m\}_{m=1}^M$  with disjoint non-empty interiors such that each hanging point of  $T$  is contained in some  $J_m$  (hence, in only one  $J_m$ ), we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(\mathcal{L}(f)) &\leq \left( \sup_n \left\{ \|g|_{\mathring{I}_n}\|_\infty + \text{var}_{\mathring{I}_n}(g) \right\} + \max_m \{h_{\mathcal{J}}(m)\} \right) \text{var}(f) \\ &\quad + \left( \sup_n \left\{ \frac{\text{var}_\circ^{I_n}(g)}{\overline{\text{Leb}}(I_n)} \right\} + \max_m \left\{ \frac{h_{\mathcal{J}}(m)}{\overline{\text{Leb}}(J_m)} \right\} \right) \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $h_{\mathcal{J}}(m) := \sum_{(z, s) \in H \cap J_m} g(z^s)$ .

For the paired tent map  $T_{a_\omega, b_\omega}$  we have a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for the second iterate map.

**Proposition 8.11** ([36, Proposition 4.4]). *For any paired tent map cocycle  $(T_{a_\omega, b_\omega})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  over  $\sigma$  and associated second-iterate Perron-Frobenius operator  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(2)}$ , we have that for any  $f \in \text{BV}(I)$ :*

$$\text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^{(2)} f) \leq \frac{3}{4} \text{var}(f) + 6 \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}. \quad (57)$$

A combination of Proposition 8.10 and Proposition 8.11 reveals a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for the set  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \sigma, \text{BV}(I), \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon \geq 0}$ . By iterating the inequality obtained in Proposition 8.11 we obtain a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for the even iterates of the Perron-Frobenius operator  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 8.12.** *In the setting of Theorem 8.1, for any  $f \in \text{BV}(I)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^{\varepsilon(2n)} f) \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 26 \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}.$$

Hence, (P5) is satisfied.

*Proof.* The proof is divided into several steps.

**Step 1.** *For any  $f \in \text{BV}(I)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^{\varepsilon(2n)}(f)) \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 24 \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}.$$

*Proof.* This follows immediately by iterating (57) from Proposition 8.11 and recalling that  $\|\mathcal{L}_\omega^{\varepsilon(n)} f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^{\varepsilon(4)}(f)) &\leq \frac{3}{4} \text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^{\varepsilon(2)}(f)) + 6 \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{4} \left( \frac{3}{4} \text{var}(f) + 6 \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \right) + 6 \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^2 \text{var}(f) + 6 \left(1 + \frac{3}{4}\right) \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}. \end{aligned}$$

By inductively continuing this procedure we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^{\varepsilon(2n)}(f)) &\leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 6 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^k \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 24 \left(1 - \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n\right) \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 24 \|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now obtain a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for the odd iterates of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$ . This requires us to estimate  $\text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon(f))$ .

**Step 2.** For any  $f \in \text{BV}(I)$

$$\text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon(f)) \leq \text{var}(f) + 2\|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}$$

*Proof.* As verified in [36],  $I$  and  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  satisfy  $(\mathcal{M})$  (see Definition 8.7) for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ . It suffices to compute the relevant quantities in the statement of Proposition 8.10. Take  $I_1 = [-1, -0.5]$ ,  $I_2 = [-0.5, 0]$ ,  $I_3 = [0, 0.5]$ ,  $I_4 = [0.5, 1]$  and  $J_m = I_m$ . As demonstrated in Example 8.9, the collection of hanging points for the paired-tent map is

$$H = \{(-0.5, -), (-0.5, +), (0.5, -), (0.5, +)\}.$$

Furthermore,  $g_\omega^\varepsilon(x) = |(T_\omega^\varepsilon)'(x)|^{-1}$ . Each  $J_m$  contains at most one element of  $H$  and thus

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathcal{J}}(1) &= g_\omega^\varepsilon((-0.5)^-) = \frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon b_\omega)} = g_\omega^\varepsilon((-0.5)^+) = h_{\mathcal{J}}(2) \\ h_{\mathcal{J}}(3) &= g_\omega^\varepsilon((0.5)^-) = \frac{1}{2(1 + \varepsilon a_\omega)} = g_\omega^\varepsilon((0.5)^+) = h_{\mathcal{J}}(4) \end{aligned}$$

suggesting that for each  $m = 1, 2, 3, 4$  we have that  $h_{\mathcal{J}}(m) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Furthermore, recalling that  $\overline{\text{Leb}}$  denotes the normalised Lebesgue measure on  $I = [-1, 1]$  and  $I_m = J_m$ , we have that for each  $m$ ,  $\overline{\text{Leb}}(I_m) = \overline{\text{Leb}}(J_m) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$ . With this, we can compute the relevant quantities appearing in the statement of Proposition 8.10. Indeed, since  $g_\omega^\varepsilon$  is constant on each branch

$$\text{var}_{I_n}^\circ(g_\omega^\varepsilon) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n \left\{ \left\| g_\omega^\varepsilon|_{I_n} \right\|_\infty + \text{var}_{I_n}^\circ(g_\omega^\varepsilon) \right\} + \max_m \{h_{\mathcal{J}}(m)\} &\leq \sup_n \left\{ \left\| g_\omega^\varepsilon|_{I_n} \right\|_\infty \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

And,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n \left\{ \frac{\text{var}_{I_n}^\circ(g_\omega^\varepsilon)}{\overline{\text{Leb}}(I_n)} \right\} + \max_m \left\{ \frac{h_{\mathcal{J}}(m)}{\overline{\text{Leb}}(J_m)} \right\} &\leq 0 + 2 \\ &= 2. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these two together we obtain our result.  $\square$

Combining Step 1 and Step 2 we can now control the variation for the odd iterates of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$ . This gives a uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality for every iterate of the Perron-Frobenius operator  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  over both  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Step 3.** For any  $f \in \text{BV}(I)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon(2n+1)f) \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 26\|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}.$$

*Proof.* Indeed, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , by Step 1 we have that

$$\text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon(2n+1)(f)) \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon f) + 24\|\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}.$$

Thus, using Step 2 to control the variation term,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon(2n+1)(f)) &\leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \left(\text{var}(f) + 2\|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}\right) + 24\|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 2\|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} + 24\|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})} \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \text{var}(f) + 26\|f\|_{L^1(\overline{\text{Leb}})}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Comparing the estimates from Step 1 and Step 3 the result follows. □

It remains to show that **(P6)** holds for paired tent map cocycles.

**Lemma 8.13.** *In the setting of Theorem 8.1, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $(T_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  has a unique RACIM  $(\mu_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  with density  $(\phi_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} = (\frac{d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon}{d\text{Leb}})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  and hence **(P6)** is satisfied.*

*Proof.* This follows from [36, Theorem 4.13]. In particular, if  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  denotes the Perron-Frobenius operator associated with the paired tent map  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$ , then for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the top Oseledets space of  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon$  is one-dimensional, and is spanned by  $\phi_\omega^\varepsilon = d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon/d\text{Leb}$ . □

**Remark 8.14.** Lemma 8.13 also follows from the main theorem in [8], noting that for small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the map  $T_\omega^\varepsilon$  satisfies the random covering property. That is, for each non-trivial subinterval  $J \subset [-1, 1]$ , for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists  $n_c := n_c(\omega, J) < \infty$  such that

$$\text{ess inf}_{x \in [-1, 1]} (\mathcal{L}_\omega^\varepsilon(n) \mathbf{1}_J) > 0$$

for all  $n \geq n_c$ . Covering properties for cocycles of paired tent maps were also addressed in [36].

Since the initial system satisfies **(I1)-(I6)**, and Lemma 8.5, 8.6, 8.12 and Lemma 8.13 ensure that **(P3)-(P7)** hold, by noting that **(P2)** is satisfied for  $T^\varepsilon : \Omega \times I \rightarrow I$  and enforcing **(P1)**, we have verified that all conditions outlined in Section 3 are satisfied for paired tent map cocycles. By Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 6.2, Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 8.2 follow.



## Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge support from the Australian Research Council (DP220102216). JP acknowledges the Australian Government Research Training Program for financial support. The authors thank Jason Atnip for helpful conversations.

## References

- [1] J. Atnip, G. Froyland, C. Gonzalez-Tokman, and S. Vaienti. Thermodynamic formalism and perturbation formulae for quenched random open dynamical systems, 2023.
- [2] W. Bahsoun and S. Vaienti. Metastability of certain intermittent maps. *Nonlinearity*, 25(1):107–124, 2012.
- [3] W. Bahsoun and S. Vaienti. Escape rates formulae and metastability for randomly perturbed maps. *Nonlinearity*, 26(5):1415–1438, 2013.
- [4] J. Beltrán and C. Landim. Tunneling and metastability of continuous time Markov chains. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 140(6):1065–1114, 2010.
- [5] J. Beltrán and C. Landim. Tunneling and metastability of continuous time Markov chains II, the nonreversible case. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 149(4):598–618, 2012.
- [6] A. Bovier and F. den Hollander. *Metastability*, volume 351 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Cham, 2015. A potential-theoretic approach.
- [7] A. Bovier, M. Eckhoff, V. Gayrard, and M. Klein. Metastability in stochastic dynamics of disordered mean-field models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 119(1):99–161, 2001.
- [8] J. Buzzi. Exponential decay of correlations for random Lasota-Yorke maps. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 208(1):25–54, 1999.
- [9] M. Cassandro, A. Galves, E. Olivieri, and M. E. Vares. Metastable behavior of stochastic dynamics: a pathwise approach. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 35(5-6):603–634, 1984.
- [10] H. Crimmins. Stability of hyperbolic Oseledets splittings for quasi-compact operator cocycles. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(6):2795–2857, 2022.
- [11] E. B. Davies. Dynamical stability of metastable states. *J. Functional Analysis*, 46(3):373–386, 1982.
- [12] E. B. Davies. Metastability and the Ising model. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 27(4):657–675, 1982.
- [13] E. B. Davies. Metastable states of symmetric Markov semigroups. I. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 45(1):133–150, 1982.
- [14] E. B. Davies. Metastable states of symmetric Markov semigroups. II. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 26(3):541–556, 1982.
- [15] E. B. Davies. Spectral properties of metastable Markov semigroups. *J. Functional Analysis*, 52(3):315–329, 1983.
- [16] M. Dellnitz, G. Froyland, C. Horenkamp, K. Padberg-Gehle, and A. S. Gupta. Seasonal variability of the subpolar gyres in the Southern Ocean: a numerical investigation based on transfer operators. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, 16(6):655–663, 2009.
- [17] D. Dolgopyat and P. Wright. The diffusion coefficient for piecewise expanding maps of the interval with metastable states. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 12(1):1150005, 13, 2012.
- [18] P. Eslami and P. Góra. Stronger Lasota-Yorke inequality for one-dimensional piecewise expanding transformations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 141(12):4249–4260, 2013.
- [19] A. Ferguson and M. Pollicott. Escape rates for Gibbs measures. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 32(3):961–988, 2012.

- [20] M. I. Freidlin and A. D. Wentzell. *Random perturbations of dynamical systems*, volume 260 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, third edition, 2012. Translated from the 1979 Russian original by Joseph Szücs.
- [21] G. Froyland, C. González-Tokman, and A. Quas. Stability and approximation of random invariant densities for Lasota-Yorke map cocycles. *Nonlinearity*, 27(4):647–660, 2014.
- [22] G. Froyland, S. Lloyd, and A. Quas. Coherent structures and isolated spectrum for Perron-Frobenius cocycles. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 30(3):729–756, 2010.
- [23] G. Froyland, S. Lloyd, and A. Quas. A semi-invertible Oseledets theorem with applications to transfer operator cocycles. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 33(9):3835–3860, 2013.
- [24] G. Froyland, K. Padberg, M. H. England, and A. M. Treguier. Detection of coherent oceanic structures via transfer operators. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:224503, 2007.
- [25] G. Froyland, N. Santitissadeekorn, and A. Monahan. Optimally coherent sets in geophysical flows: A transfer-operator approach to delimiting the stratospheric polar vortex. *Phys. Rev. E*, 82:056311, 2010.
- [26] G. Froyland, N. Santitissadeekorn, and A. Monahan. Transport in time-dependent dynamical systems: finite-time coherent sets. *Chaos*, 20(4):043116, 10, 2010.
- [27] G. Froyland and O. Stancevic. Escape rates and Perron-Frobenius operators: Open and closed dynamical systems. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - B*, 14(2):457–472, 2010.
- [28] G. Froyland and O. Stancevic. Metastability, Lyapunov exponents, escape rates, and topological entropy in random dynamical systems. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 13(4):1350004, 26, 2013.
- [29] G. Froyland, R. M. Stuart, and E. van Sebille. How well-connected is the surface of the global ocean? *Chaos*, 24(3):033126, 10, 2014.
- [30] B. Gaveau and M. Moreau. Metastable relaxation times and absorption probabilities for multidimensional stochastic systems. *J. Phys. A*, 33(27):4837–4850, 2000.
- [31] B. Gaveau and L. S. Schulman. Theory of nonequilibrium first-order phase transitions for stochastic dynamics. *J. Math. Phys.*, 39(3):1517–1533, 1998.
- [32] C. González-Tokman, B. R. Hunt, and P. Wright. Approximating invariant densities of metastable systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 31(5):1345–1361, 2011.
- [33] C. González-Tokman and A. Quas. Lyapunov exponents for transfer operator cocycles of metastable maps: a quarantine approach. *Trans. Moscow Math. Soc.*, 82:65–76, 2021.
- [34] C. González-Tokman and A. Quas. Stability and collapse of the Lyapunov spectrum for Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 23(10):3419–3457, 2021.
- [35] J. Horan. Dynamical spectrum via determinant-free linear algebra, 2020.
- [36] J. Horan. Asymptotics for the second-largest Lyapunov exponent for some Perron-Frobenius operator cocycles. *Nonlinearity*, 34(4):2563–2610, 2021.
- [37] G. Keller. Stochastic stability in some chaotic dynamical systems. *Monatsh. Math.*, 94(4):313–333, 1982.
- [38] G. Keller. Rare events, exponential hitting times and extremal indices via spectral perturbation. *Dyn. Syst.*, 27(1):11–27, 2012.
- [39] G. Keller and C. Liverani. Stability of the spectrum for transfer operators. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 28(1):141–152, 1999.
- [40] G. Keller and C. Liverani. Rare events, escape rates and quasistationarity: some exact formulae. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 135(3):519–534, 2009.
- [41] J. F. C. Kingman. Subadditive ergodic theory. *Ann. Probability*, 1:883–909, 1973.
- [42] H. A. Kramers. Brownian motion in a field of force and the diffusion model of chemical reactions. *Physica*, 7:284–304, 1940.
- [43] C. Landim. Metastable Markov chains. *Probab. Surv.*, 16:143–227, 2019.

- 
- [44] A. Lasota and J. A. Yorke. On the existence of invariant measures for piecewise monotonic transformations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 186:481–488 (1974), 1973.
- [45] T. Y. Li and J. A. Yorke. Ergodic transformations from an interval into itself. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 235:183–192, 1978.
- [46] C. Liverani. Decay of correlations for piecewise expanding maps. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 78(3-4):1111–1129, 1995.
- [47] C. Liverani. Central limit theorem for deterministic systems. In *International Conference on Dynamical Systems (Montevideo, 1995)*, volume 362 of *Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser.*, pages 56–75. Longman, Harlow, 1996.
- [48] E. Olivieri and M. E. Vares. *Large deviations and metastability*, volume 100 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [49] V. I. Oseledec. A multiplicative ergodic theorem. Characteristic Ljapunov, exponents of dynamical systems. *Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč.*, 19:179–210, 1968.
- [50] O. Penrose and J. L. Lebowitz. Rigorous treatment of metastable states in the van der Waals-Maxwell theory. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 3:211–236, 1971.
- [51] E. Pfaffelhuber. Moving shift averages for ergodic transformations. *Metrika*, 22:97–101, 1975.
- [52] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I. Functional analysis*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972.
- [53] C. Schütte, W. Huisinga, and P. Deuffhard. Transfer operator approach to conformational dynamics in biomolecular systems. In *Ergodic theory, analysis, and efficient simulation of dynamical systems*, pages 191–223. Springer, Berlin, 2001.
- [54] C. Schütte and M. Sarich. *Metastability and Markov state models in molecular dynamics*, volume 24 of *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013. Modeling, analysis, algorithmic approaches.
- [55] G. L. Sewell. *Quantum theory of collective phenomena*. Monographs on the Physics and Chemistry of Materials. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1986. Oxford Science Publications.
- [56] P. Thieullen. Fibrés dynamiques asymptotiquement compacts. Exposants de Lyapounov. Entropie. Dimension. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 4(1):49–97, 1987.
- [57] J. H. van 't Hoff. *Études de dynamique chimique*. F. Muller, Amsterdam, 1884.
- [58] G. G. Yin and Q. Zhang. *Continuous-time Markov chains and applications*, volume 37 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2013. A two-time-scale approach.