

# ON THE VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE FOR A CLASS OF SKEW PRODUCT TRANSFORMATIONS

NIAN LIU AND XUE LIU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish a variational principle, between the fiber Bowen's topological entropy on conditional level sets of Birkhoff average and fiber measure-theoretical entropy, for the skew product transformation driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism system satisfying Anosov and topological mixing on fibers property. We prove it by utilizing a fiber specification property. Moreover, we prove that such skew product transformation has specification property defined by Gundlach and Kifer [16]. Employing their main results, every Hölder continuous potential has a unique equilibrium state, and we also establish a variational principle between the fiber measure-theoretic entropy and the fiber Bowen's topological entropy on conditional level sets of local entropy for such unique equilibrium state. Examples of systems under consideration are given, such as fiber Anosov maps on 2-dimension tori driven by any irrational rotation on circle and random composition of 2x2 area preserving positive matrices driven by uniquely ergodic subshift.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Motivation	2
1.2. Settings of system and fiber specification property	3
1.3. Fiber Bowen's topological entropy	4
1.4. Conditional level sets of Birkhoff average	5
1.5. Main results	6
2. Examples	8
2.1. Fiber Anosov maps on 2-d tori	8
2.2. Random composition of $2 \times 2$ area-preserving positive matrices driven by uniquely ergodic subshift	9
3. Preliminary Definitions and Lemmas	9
3.1. Hyperbolic dynamics	10
3.2. Specification for RDS	10
3.3. Fiber measure theoretic entropy	11
3.4. Measure Approximation	11
3.5. Random Katok entropy theorem	11
3.6. Upper semi-continuity of entropy map and equilibrium states	12
4. Proof of Main results	12
4.1. Proof of Theorem A	12
4.2. Proof of Theorem B	15
4.3. Proof of Theorem C	26
4.4. Proof of Corollary 1	26
4.5. Proof of Corollary 2	28
5. Proof of Lemmas	29
5.1. Proof of Lemmas in section 1	29

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 37D35, 37C45. Second: 37B40.

*Key words and phrases*. fiber specification, fiber Bowen's topological entropy, fiber measure theoretical entropy, variational principle.

5.2. Proof of Lemmas in section 3	30
5.3. Proof of Lemmas in section 4	32
Acknowledgment	54
References	54

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper is devoted to the study of the multifractal structure of Birkhoff averages for skew product transformations.

1.1. **Motivation.** Given a continuous transformation  $f$  on a compact metric space  $M$ , and a continuous observable  $\varphi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , then the space  $M$  has a natural multifractal decomposition

$$M = \cup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} M_{\varphi, \alpha} \cup I_{\varphi},$$

where  $M_{\varphi, \alpha}$  denotes the level sets of Birkhoff average

$$M_{\varphi, \alpha} = \{x \in M : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^i(x)) = \alpha\},$$

and  $I_{\varphi}$  denotes the collection of points for which the Birkhoff average does not exist. The multifractal analysis aims to investigate the dimension complexity of these sets, where the dimension characteristics include Hausdorff dimension, Bowen's topological entropy [5], and topological pressure given by Pesin and Pitskel [29]. These dimension characteristics are all special cases of Carathéodory dimension structure, see [28] or [8]. The Hausdorff dimension and Bowen's topological entropy of  $M_{\varphi, \alpha}$  was extensively studied in past decades, see [3, 4, 6, 13, 19, 25, 27, 32, 38] and reference therein. In particular, for a continuous observable  $\varphi$  and for those  $\alpha$  such that  $M_{\varphi, \alpha} \neq \emptyset$ , one established the following variational principle between  $h_{top}(M_{\varphi, \alpha})$ , the Bowen topological entropy of  $M_{\varphi, \alpha}$ , and the measure-theoretical entropy  $h_{\mu}(f)$

$$h_{top}(M_{\varphi, \alpha}) = \sup\{h_{\mu}(f) : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(M) \text{ and } \int \varphi d\mu = \alpha\},$$

for topological mixing subshift of finite type [12], then for systems with specification property [33], for systems with  $g$ -almost product property [30], and for systems with non-uniform specification property [38]. For Banach valued continuous observable, similar variational principle was also established for system with specification property [11]. As a generalisation of above variational principle, the variational principle regarding topological pressure of  $M_{\varphi, \alpha}$  was also established for systems we mentioned above [26, 34, 40]. Meanwhile, for the above systems, the measure negligible set  $I_{\varphi}$  carries full topological pressure [35–37]. In the proof of above results, specification or “weak” specification property plays a key role, and it is called orbit-gluing approach in some reference [7]. Roughly speaking, the specification property guarantees that any finite collection of arbitrary long orbit segments can be shadowed by the orbit of a point within given precision as long as one allows for enough time gap between segments.

In the scope of skew product transformation or random dynamical systems (which can also be transferred to skew product transformation), the conditional level sets of Birkhoff average has been investigated from Hausdorff dimension point of view for several systems. In [14], for the product of an ergodic transformation on a Lebesgue space and a full shift of finite type, authors relate the Hausdorff dimension of conditional level sets of Birkhoff average and the relative measure-theoretic entropy via a

variational principle. In [31], the author proved that the Hausdorff dimension of conditional level sets of Birkhoff average for random perturbation of mixing smooth conformal repeller is approximating to the Hausdorff dimension of Birkhoff average for the unperturbed system. One of difficulty in studying the conditional level sets of Birkhoff average from topological entropy point of view is the missing of orbits gluing technique. Recently, in [17], for Anosov systems driven by external force satisfying topological mixing on fibers property, authors state a random specification property, which motivate us the fiber specification property. The fiber specification property introduced in this paper provides an orbit-gluing technique along the orbit of external force, which gives possibility to analysis the multifractal structure of conditional level sets of Birkhoff average from the topological entropy point of view for skew product transformation generated by such external forced system.

For the purpose of getting external forced system involved, we introduce the fiber topological entropy on non-compact sets by employing the Carathéodory dimension structure (abbr. C-structure). The fiber Bowen's topological entropy is a generalisation of the topological entropy defined by Bowen [5] or equivalently by Pesin [28] on non-compact sets for deterministic system. While the classical fiber topological entropy resembles the box dimension, the fiber Bowen's topological entropy defined by C-structure resembles the Hausdorff dimension. In following subsections, we will introduce the settings of system, fiber specification property, fiber Bowen's topological entropy and our main results in details.

**1.2. Settings of system and fiber specification property.** Let  $M$  be a connected closed smooth Riemannian manifold, and  $d_M$  be the induced Riemannian metric on  $M$ . Let  $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  be a homeomorphism on a compact metric space  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$ . The product space  $\Omega \times M$  is a compact metric space with distance  $d((\omega_1, x_1), (\omega_2, x_2)) = d_\Omega(\omega_1, \omega_2) + d_M(x_1, x_2)$  for any  $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega$  and  $x_1, x_2 \in M$ . Let  $\mathcal{H} = \text{diff}^2(M)$  be the space of  $C^2$  diffeomorphisms on  $M$  equipped with  $C^2$ -topology, and  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be a continuous map. The skew product  $\Theta : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \Omega \times M$  induced by  $F$  and  $\theta$  is defined by:

$$\Theta(\omega, x) = (\theta\omega, F_\omega x), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega, x \in M.$$

where we rewrite  $F(\omega)$  as  $F_\omega$ . Then inductively:

$$\Theta^n(\omega, x) = (\theta^n \omega, F_\omega^n x) := \begin{cases} (\theta^n \omega, F_{\theta^{n-1}\omega} \circ \cdots \circ F_\omega x), & \text{if } n > 0 \\ (\omega, x), & \text{if } n = 0 \\ (\theta^n \omega, (F_{\theta^n \omega})^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ (F_{\theta^{-1}\omega})^{-1} x), & \text{if } n < 0. \end{cases}$$

In this paper, we consider the target system  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  satisfying:

- (C.1) the driven system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega), P, \theta)$  is a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism equipped with the unique invariant Borel probability measure  $P$  and  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega)$ , which is the completion of Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra with respect to  $P$ ;
- (C.2) Anosov on fibers: for every  $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M$ , there is a splitting of the tangent bundle of  $M_\omega = \{\omega\} \times M$  at  $x$

$$T_x M_\omega = E_{(\omega, x)}^s \oplus E_{(\omega, x)}^u$$

which depends continuously on  $(\omega, x) \in M \times \Omega$  with  $\dim E_{(\omega, x)}^s, \dim E_{(\omega, x)}^u > 0$  and satisfies that

$$D_x F_\omega E_{(\omega, x)}^u = E_{\Theta(\omega, x)}^u, \quad D_x F_\omega E_{(\omega, x)}^s = E_{\Theta(\omega, x)}^s$$

and

$$\begin{cases} |D_x F_\omega \xi| \geq e^{\lambda_0} |\xi|, & \forall \xi \in E_{(\omega, x)}^u, \\ |D_x F_\omega \eta| \leq e^{-\lambda_0} |\eta|, & \forall \eta \in E_{(\omega, x)}^s, \end{cases}$$

where  $\lambda_0 > 0$  is a constant;

**(C.3)** topological mixing on fibers: for any nonempty open sets  $U, V \subset M$ , there exists  $N > 0$  such that for any  $n \geq N$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\Theta^n(\{\omega\} \times U) \cap (\{\theta^n \omega\} \times V) \neq \emptyset.$$

Examples of Anosov and topological mixing on fibers skew product driven by uniquely ergodic homeomorphism are given in Section 2.

By Remark 1.1.8 in [1], we can identify the skew product  $\Theta$  and the corresponding random dynamical system (abbr. RDS), which is  $F : \mathbb{Z} \times \Omega \times M \rightarrow M$  by  $F(n, \omega, x) = F_\omega^n x$ . Here, we still use notation  $F$  by avoiding abuse of notation.

**Definition 1.1.** For any  $\omega \in \Omega$ , an  $\omega$ -specification  $S_\omega = (\omega, \tau, P_\omega)$  consists of a finite collection of intervals  $\tau = \{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$ ,  $I_i = [a_i, b_i] \subset \mathbb{Z}$ , and a map  $P_\omega : \cup_{i=1}^k I_i \rightarrow M$  such that for  $t_1, t_2 \in I \in \tau$ ,

$$F_{\theta^{t_1} \omega}^{t_2 - t_1}(P_\omega(t_1)) = P_\omega(t_2).$$

An  $\omega$ -specification  $S_\omega$  is called  $m$ -spaced if  $a_{i+1} > b_i + m$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ .

The system  $\Theta$  is said to have the fiber specification property if for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $m = m(\epsilon) > 0$  such that for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ , any  $m$ -spaced  $\omega$ -specification  $S_\omega = (\omega, \tau, P_\omega)$ , we can find a point  $x \in M$ , which is  $(\omega, \epsilon)$ -shadowing  $S_\omega$ , i.e.,

$$d_M(P_\omega(t), F_\omega^t x) < \epsilon \text{ for any } t \in I \in \tau.$$

**1.3. Fiber Bowen's topological entropy.** In this section, we introduce the fiber Bowen's topological entropy on noncompact set, which is a special case of Carathéodory dimension structure. The definition of C-structure can be found in Chap. 1 of [28] or Sec. 5 of [8]. We note that for a fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the systems along the orbit of  $\omega$  can be viewed as an non-autonomous systems, whose Bowen's topological entropy is given in [22].

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we denote the fiber Bowen's metric

$$d_\omega^n(x, y) = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \{d_M(F_\omega^i x, F_\omega^i y)\} \text{ for } x, y \in M.$$

Let  $B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon) \subset M$  be the open ball of radius  $\epsilon$  around  $x \in M$  with respect to the metric  $d_\omega^n$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , on the fiber  $\{\omega\} \times M$ , for any nonempty set  $Z \subset M$ , we define

$$(1.1) \quad m(Z, s, \omega, N, \epsilon) = \inf_{\Gamma_\omega^\epsilon} \sum_i e^{-sn_i},$$

where the infimum is taken over all finite or countable collections  $\Gamma_\omega^\epsilon = \{B_{n_i}(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)\}$  with  $Z \subset \cup_i B_{n_i}(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)$  and  $\min\{n_i\} \geq N$ . Note that  $m(Z, s, \omega, N, \epsilon)$  does not decrease as  $N$  increases, the following limit exists

$$(1.2) \quad m(Z, s, \omega, \epsilon) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} m(Z, s, \omega, N, \epsilon).$$

There exists a number  $h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon) \in [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad m(Z, s, \omega, \epsilon) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } s < h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon) \\ 0, & \text{if } s > h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon). \end{cases}$$

Note that  $m(Z, h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon), \omega, \epsilon)$  could be  $+\infty$ , 0 or positive finite number.

**Lemma 1.1.** *The value  $h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon)$  does not decrease as  $\epsilon$  decreases. Therefore, the following limit exists*

$$(1.4) \quad h_{top}(F, Z, \omega) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon) = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon).$$

The proof of Lemma 1.1 is addressed in Sec. 5.1. We call  $h_{top}(F, Z, \omega)$  the fiber Bowen's topological entropy of  $F$  restricted on  $Z$  and the fiber  $\{\omega\} \times M$ . The following lemma is a corollary of [28, Theorem 1.1].

**Lemma 1.2.** *The fiber Bowen's topological entropy has the following properties:*

- (1)  $h_{top}(F, Z_1, \omega) \leq h_{top}(F, Z_2, \omega)$  if  $\emptyset \subsetneq Z_1 \subset Z_2 \subset M$ .
- (2)  $h_{top}(F, Z, \omega) = \sup_i h_{top}(F, Z_i, \omega)$  if  $Z$  is finite or countable union of nonempty sets  $Z_i \subset M$ .

For any subset  $\{\omega\} \times Z \subset \Omega \times M$ , denote  $h_{top}(\Theta, \{\omega\} \times Z)$  to be the Bowen's topological entropy of topological dynamical system  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  on  $\{\omega\} \times Z$  defined by Bowen [5] or equivalently by using  $C$ -structure in [33] on noncompact sets. Note that for any  $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , one has

$$\{\omega\} \times B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon) \subset B_n^\Theta((\omega, x), \epsilon) := \{(\beta, y) \in \Omega \times M : \max_{0 \leq i < n} d(\Theta^i(\omega, x), \Theta^i(\beta, y)) < \epsilon\}.$$

Therefore, any covering  $\{B_{n_i}(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)\}$  of  $Z$  is corresponding to a covering  $\{B_{n_i}^\Theta((\omega, x_i), \epsilon)\}$  of  $\{\omega\} \times Z$ . As a consequence,  $h_{top}(\Theta, \{\omega\} \times Z) \leq h_{top}(F, Z, \omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**1.4. Conditional level sets of Birkhoff average.** In this section, we assume that  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  is Anosov and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega), P, \theta)$ . For any continuous observable  $\varphi : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , denote the classical level set of Birkhoff average

$$K_{\varphi, \alpha} = \{(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) = \alpha\}$$

and conditional level set of Birkhoff average  $K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega) = \{x \in M : (\omega, x) \in K_{\varphi, \alpha}\}$ . The proof of the following two lemmas are addressed in Sec. 5.1.

**Lemma 1.3.** *For each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , it is clear that  $K_{\varphi, \alpha} \subset \Omega \times M$  is a  $\Theta$ -invariant Borel subset. Denote  $\Omega_\alpha = \{\omega \in \Omega : K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega) \neq \emptyset\}$ , then  $\Omega_\alpha$  is a measurable set and either  $P(\Omega_\alpha) = 1$  or  $P(\Omega_\alpha) = 0$ .*

Denote  $L_\varphi := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : P(\Omega_\alpha) = 1\}$ , and denote  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$  and  $I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$  to be the collection of all  $\Theta$ -invariant and  $\Theta$ -invariant ergodic Borel probability measures on  $\Omega \times M$  respectively.

**Lemma 1.4.** *For any  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , the set  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha) := \{\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M) : \int \varphi d\mu = \alpha\}$  is a nonempty, convex and closed subset of  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ . As a consequence,  $L_\varphi \subset \{\int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)\}$ . Moreover,  $L_\varphi$  is nonempty bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

For a topological dynamical system  $(X, T)$  with the specification property, it is pointed out in [34, Lemma 2.5] that for any continuous observable  $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \psi(T^i(x)) = \alpha \right\} \neq \emptyset \right\} = \left\{ \int \psi d\mu : \mu \text{ is } T\text{-invariant} \right\},$$

due to the fact that every  $T$ -invariant probability measure has a generic point. In this paper, it is not sure whether  $\Theta$ -invariant measure has generic points. Moreover, the existence of generic points

is not enough to prove that  $L_\varphi$  coincides  $\{\int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)\}$ , since we need  $P(\Omega_\alpha) = 1$  for  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ . However, our proof of Theorem B indicates that  $L_\varphi = \{\int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)\}$ , see Remark 4.3.

**1.5. Main results.** We state our main results in this section. In the first theorem, the unique ergodicity of the metric dynamical system  $(\Omega, \theta)$  is not necessary.

**Theorem A.** *Assume that  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  is Anosov on fibers and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a homeomorphism  $(\Omega, \theta)$ , then  $\Theta$  has the fiber specification property. Moreover, RDS  $F$  corresponding to  $\Theta$  has the specification property given by Gundlach and Kifer as in Remark 3.1.*

Denote  $Pr(\Omega \times M)$  and  $Pr(M)$  to be the space of Borel probability measures on  $\Omega \times M$  and  $M$  respectively, which are compact spaces with respect to the weak\* topology, and  $Pr_P(\Omega \times M) \subset Pr(\Omega \times M)$  to be the Borel probability measure with marginal  $P$  on  $\Omega$ , i.e. for any  $\mu \in Pr_P(\Omega \times M)$ ,  $\mu \circ \pi_\Omega^{-1} = P$ , where  $\pi_\Omega : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \Omega$  denotes the projection into the first coordinate. For any  $\mu \in Pr_P(\Omega \times M)$ , by the disintegration theorem (see [9, Proposition 3.6]), there exists a measurable mapping called disintegration  $\mu : \Omega \rightarrow Pr(M)$  by  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega$  such that  $\int_{\Omega \times M} h(\omega, x) d\mu = \int_\Omega \int_M h(\omega, x) d\mu_\omega(x) dP(\omega)$  for any continuous function  $h : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, the disintegration is  $P$ -a.s. unique.

When the uniquely ergodicity of  $(\Omega, \theta)$  is present, one must have

$$(1.5) \quad I_\Theta(\Omega \times M) \subset Pr_P(\Omega \times M),$$

since  $\mu \circ \pi_\Omega^{-1}$  is  $\theta$ -invariant for any  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ . Relation (1.5) enable us to use lots of results in ergodic theory of RDS.

For a continuous potential  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ , let  $\pi_F(\varphi)$  be the fiber topological pressure defined in (3.5) by using separated set, which is related to fiber measure theoretic entropy by the following fiber (or relative) variational principle (see [21, Theorem 1.2.13])

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_F(\varphi) &= \sup \left\{ h_\mu(F) + \int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M) \cap Pr_P(\Omega \times M) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(1.5)}{=} \sup \left\{ h_\mu(F) + \int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $h_\mu(F) = h_\mu^{(r)}(\Theta)$  is the fiber measure theoretic entropy of  $F$  or relative measure theoretic entropy of  $\Theta$  (see section 3.3). When  $\varphi = 0$ ,  $h_{top}(F) := \pi_F(0)$  is the classical fiber topological entropy. We also note that the generator of RDS  $F_\omega \in \text{Diff}^2(M)$  and continuous depending on  $\omega$ . By the Margulis-Ruelle inequality for RDS [2, Theorem 1], in the settings of this paper, one has

$$h_{top}(F) < \infty.$$

With the help of fiber specification property in Theorem A, we obtain the following variational principle, which can be viewed as a generalisation of variational principle established in [33].

**Theorem B.** *Assume  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  is Anosov and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega), P, \theta)$ . Let  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ , for  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , then the following holds for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ :*

$$h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega) = \max\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\}.$$

Theorem B and (1.6) imply that the fiber Bowen's topological entropy of  $M$  coincides the classical fiber topological entropy neglecting a  $P$ -zero measure set for systems under consideration, i.e.,

$h_{top}(F, M, \omega) = h_{top}(F)$  for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Theorem B also reveals new phenomenon for hyperbolic toral automorphism, see Sec. 2.1 and Corollary 3.

For  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$  and  $q \in \mathbb{R}$ , define  $\pi_{F, \varphi} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\pi_{F, \varphi}(q) = \pi_F(q\varphi)$ , which is the fiber topological pressure of  $q\varphi$ . The Legendre transform  $\pi_{F, \varphi}^*$  is defined by

$$\pi_{F, \varphi}^*(\alpha) = \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \{\pi_{F, \varphi}(q) - q\alpha\} \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The following theorem is consequence of Theorem B and Lemma 3.9.

**Theorem C.** *Assume  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  is Anosov and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega), P, \theta)$ . Let  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ , then*

(a) *for any  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , one has*

$$(1.7) \quad h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega) \leq \pi_{F, \varphi}^*(\alpha) \text{ for } P - \text{a.s. } \omega \in \Omega.$$

(b) *for  $\alpha \in \text{int}(L_\varphi)$ , one has*

$$(1.8) \quad h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega) = \pi_{F, \varphi}^*(\alpha) \text{ for } P - \text{a.s. } \omega \in \Omega,$$

*where  $\text{int}$  denotes the interior.*

The last result is about the conditional level sets of local entropy for equilibrium states. We recall the local entropy formula, which is a corollary of [42, Theorem 2.1].

**Lemma 1.5.** *Assume  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  is Anosov and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega), P, \theta)$ . For  $\mu \in I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$ , note that  $h_\mu(F) \leq h_{top}(F) < \infty$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(F) &= \underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \\ &= \bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \end{aligned}$$

for  $\mu$ -a.s.  $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M$ , where  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega$  is the disintegration of  $\mu$  with respect to  $P$  by noticing (1.5).

Theorem 3.9 in [16] and Theorem A imply that the target systems has unique equilibrium state for Hölder potentials. Here, we recall the definition of equilibrium state. If there exists a maximizing measure in the fiber variational principle (1.6), then this measure is called an fiber equilibrium state for  $\varphi$ . We note that the fiber equilibrium states in the fiber variational principle also obtain the maximal in the classical variation principle since

$$\sup\{h_\mu(\Theta) + \int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)\} = \sup\{h_\mu(F) + \int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)\} + h_P(\theta),$$

where the equality due to (1.5) and the Abramov-Rohlin formula

$$(1.9) \quad h_\mu(\Theta) = h_\mu(F) + h_P(\theta) \text{ for } \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M).$$

Therefore, we can identify equilibrium states and fiber equilibrium states in this paper.

**Corollary 1.** *Assume that  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  is Anosov on fibers and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega), P, \theta)$ , then for any Hölder continuous potential  $\varphi : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a unique equilibrium state for  $\varphi$ , named  $\mu = \mu_\varphi \in Pr_P(\Omega \times M)$ .*

Moreover, such unique equilibrium state is  $\Theta$ -invariant, ergodic and satisfies the Gibbs property, i.e., for any  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{\eta}{4})$ , there exist positive constants  $A_\epsilon, B_\epsilon$  such that for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$(1.10) \quad A_\epsilon \leq \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \cdot \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) \cdot e^{-\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x))} \leq B_\epsilon \text{ for all } x \in M,$$

where  $\pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n)$  is defined by using separated set in (3.4), and  $\eta > 0$  is a fiber expansive constant in Lemma 3.3.

Combining Corollary 1, Theorem B and Theorem C, we give the multifractal analysis of local entropy for equilibrium states.

**Corollary 2.** *Assume  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  is Anosov and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega), P, \theta)$ . Let  $\varphi : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a Hölder potential and  $\mu = \mu_\varphi$  be the equilibrium state given in Corollary 1. For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote*

$$E_\alpha = \{(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M : \bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) = \underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) = \pi_F(\varphi) - \alpha\},$$

where  $\bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x)$  and  $\underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x)$  are local entropy defined in Lemma 1.5. Then

(1) for  $\mu$ -a.s.  $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M$ ,

$$\bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) = \underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) = h_\mu(F) = \pi_F(\varphi) - \int \varphi d\mu;$$

(2) for  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ ,

$$h_{top}(F, E_\alpha(\omega), \omega) = \max\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\} \text{ for } P - \text{a.s. } \omega \in \Omega;$$

(3) for any  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ ,

$$h_{top}(F, E_\alpha(\omega), \omega) \leq \pi_{F, \varphi}^*(\alpha) \text{ for } P - \text{a.s. } \omega \in \Omega;$$

(4) for  $\alpha \in \text{int}(L_\varphi)$ ,

$$h_{top}(F, E_\alpha(\omega), \omega) = \pi_{F, \varphi}^*(\alpha) \text{ for } P - \text{a.s. } \omega \in \Omega.$$

The paper is organised as follows. In Sec. 2, we give several examples under consideration. In Sec. 3, we introduce definitions and state several preliminary lemmas. The proof of our main theorems is addressed in Sec. 4, and we collect all proof of lemmas in Sec. 5.

## 2. EXAMPLES

In this section, we give some examples of Anosov and topological mixing on fibers system driven by a uniquely ergodic homeomorphism system.

**2.1. Fiber Anosov maps on 2-d tori.** In section 8.1.2 of [17], Huang, Lian and Lu proved the following skew product system is Anosov and topological mixing on fibers.

The skew product  $\Theta : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2$  is given by

$$\Theta(\omega, x) = (\theta\omega, F_\omega(x)) := (\omega + \alpha, Tx + h(\omega)),$$

where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $T$  is any hyperbolic toral automorphism, and  $h : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$  is a continuous map. Note that the irrational rotation on circle  $\theta : \omega \mapsto \omega + \alpha$  is a uniquely ergodic system with the unique  $\theta$ -invariant measure  $P = \text{Lebesgue measure}$ . Therefore, this system is one of target systems.



Since that the classical specification property implies topological mixing and the factor system of topological mixing system is also topological mixing, but  $(\mathbb{T}, \theta)$  as factor of  $(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \Theta)$  is not topological mixing. Therefore, the system  $(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \Theta)$  does not have classical specification property. As a consequence, the variational principle in [33] can not apply to  $\Theta$ .

Note that  $T$  is linear map, for any  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the fiber Bowen's metric

$$\begin{aligned} d_\omega^n(x, y) &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} \{d_{\mathbb{T}^2}(F_\omega^i(x), F_\omega^i(y))\} \\ &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} \{d_{\mathbb{T}^2}(T^i(x), T^i(y))\} = d_n^T(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

where  $d_n^T$  is the usual Bowen's metric induced by  $T$  on  $\mathbb{T}^2$ . As a consequence, for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have  $B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon) = B_n^T(x, \epsilon) := \{y \in M : d_n^T(x, y) < \epsilon\}$ , and therefore,

$$h_{top}(F, Z, \omega) = h_{top}(T, Z)$$

for any nonempty subset  $Z \subset \mathbb{T}^2$ , where  $h_{top}(T, Z)$  is the Bowen topological entropy defined on noncompact set for deterministic system  $(\mathbb{T}^2, T)$  (see [5, 28, 33]). Therefore, for such  $\Theta : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2$ ,  $h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega)$  in Theorem B, C and  $h_{top}(F, E_\alpha(\omega), \omega)$  in Corollary 2 can be replace by  $h_{top}(T, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega))$  and  $h_{top}(T, E_\alpha(\omega))$  respectively. For example:

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T})$  and  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ . Then for Lebesgue-a.s.  $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} h_{top}(T, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega)) &= \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \varphi, \alpha)\} \\ &= \sup\{h_\mu(\Theta) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}^2, \varphi, \alpha)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $h_\mu(F) = h_\mu(\Theta)$  is due to the Abramov-Rohlin formula  $h_\mu(\Theta) = h_\mu(F) + h_P(\theta)$  and the fact  $h_P(\theta) = h_{Lcb}(\theta) = 0$ .

**2.2. Random composition of  $2 \times 2$  area-preserving positive matrices driven by uniquely ergodic subshift.** Let

$$\left\{ B_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ c_i & d_i \end{pmatrix} \right\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$$

be  $2 \times 2$  matrices with  $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , and  $|a_i d_i - c_i b_i| = 1$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $\Omega = \{1, \dots, k\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  with the left shift operator  $\theta$  be the symbolic dynamical system with  $k$  symbols. For any  $\omega = (\dots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0, \omega_1, \dots) \in \Omega$ , we define  $F_\omega = B_{\omega_0}$ . Then the skew product  $\tilde{\Theta} : \Omega \times \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathbb{T}^2$  defined by

$$\tilde{\Theta}(\omega, x) = (\theta\omega, F_\omega(x))$$

is an Anosov and topological mixing on fibers system by Proposition 8.2 and Theorem 8.2 in [17].

Now we let  $\Omega_s \subset \Omega$  be any uniquely ergodic subshift. For instance, when  $k \geq 2$ , let  $(\Omega_s, \theta)$  be the Arnoux-Rauzy subshift, which is uniquely ergodic and minimal (see Section 2 in [10]). Especially, when  $k = 2$ , the Arnoux-Rauzy subshift is the Sturmian subshift. Then the following system is one of target system:

$$\Theta : \Omega_s \times \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \Omega_s \times \mathbb{T}^2 \text{ by } \Theta = \tilde{\Theta}|_{\Omega_s \times \mathbb{T}^2}.$$

### 3. PRELIMINARY DEFINITIONS AND LEMMAS

In this section, we introduce some preliminary lemmas for systems  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$  satisfying (C.1) and (C.2). Note that for lemmas in Sec. 3.1-3.2, the uniquely ergodic condition in (C.1) is not needed. When the uniquely ergodic condition (C.1) is present, we will employ the fact (1.5) to apply the ergodic theory of RDS.

**3.1. Hyperbolic dynamics.** The local stable and unstable manifolds are defined as the following:

$$\begin{aligned} W_\epsilon^s(\omega, x) &= \{y \in M \mid d_M(F_\omega^n(x), F_\omega^n(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } n \geq 0\}, \\ W_\epsilon^u(\omega, x) &= \{y \in M \mid d_M(F_\omega^n(x), F_\omega^n(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } n \leq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemmas can be found in [17], and it is special version of Lemmas in [15].

**Lemma 3.1.** [17, Lemma 3.1] *For any  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ , there exists  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ , the followings hold:*

- (1)  $W_\epsilon^\tau(\omega, x)$  are  $C^2$  embedded discs for all  $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M$  with  $T_x W^\tau(\omega, x) = E^\tau(\omega, x)$  for  $\tau = u, s$ .
- (2) For  $n \geq 0$  and  $y \in W_\epsilon^s(\omega, x)$ ,  $d_M(f_\omega^n x, f_\omega^n y) \leq e^{-n\lambda} d_M(x, y)$ , and for  $y \in W_\epsilon^u(\omega, x)$ ,  $d_M(f_\omega^{-n} x, f_\omega^{-n} y) \leq e^{-n\lambda} d_M(x, y)$ .
- (3)  $W_\epsilon^s(\omega, x), W_\epsilon^u(\omega, x)$  vary continuously on  $(\omega, x)$  in  $C^1$  topology.

**Lemma 3.2.** [17, Lemma 3.2] *For any  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ , where  $\epsilon_0$  comes from Lemma 3.1, there is a  $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$  such that for any  $x, y \in M$  with  $d_M(x, y) < \delta$ ,  $W_\epsilon^s(\omega, x) \cap W_\epsilon^u(\omega, y)$  consists of a single point.*

**Lemma 3.3.** [17, Lemma 3.3] *The system  $\Theta$  is fiber-expansive, i.e. there exists a constant  $\eta > 0$  such that for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ , if  $d_M(F_\omega^n(x), F_\omega^n(y)) < \eta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $x = y$ .*

Let  $\eta > 0$  be a fiber expansive constant of the system  $\Theta$ . The following lemma is a corollary of Lemma 3.6 in [17].

**Lemma 3.4.** *For any  $\epsilon \in (0, \eta)$ , there exists  $L(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $x, y \in M$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have*

$$\max_{|n| \leq L(\epsilon)} d_M(F_\omega^n(x), F_\omega^n(y)) \leq \eta \text{ implies } d_M(x, y) < \epsilon.$$

**3.2. Specification for RDS.** We compare the fiber specification property and the specification for RDS  $F$  given by Gundlach and Kifer [16] in this section.

Let us first recall the definition of specification for RDS  $F$  in [16]. Let  $\epsilon_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be the expansive characteristic for RDS  $F$ , i.e., for any  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\text{if } d_M(F_\omega^n(x), F_\omega^n(y)) \leq \epsilon_0(\theta^n \omega) \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{ then } x = y.$$

The RDS  $F$  has  $k$ -specification if for each constant  $c > 0$  and  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists an  $\mathbb{N}$ -valued random variable  $L_c = L_c(\omega) \geq 1$  such that for any points  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^k \in M$  and integers  $-\infty \leq b_0 < a_1 < b_1 < \dots < a_k < b_k < a_{k+1} \leq \infty$  satisfying  $a_{i+1} \geq b_i + L_c(\theta^{b_i} \omega)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$  one can find  $z \in M$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad \max_{a_i \leq j \leq b_i} d_M(F_\omega^j(x_i), F_\omega^j(z)) \leq c\epsilon_0(\theta^j \omega) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, k$$

$$(3.2) \quad d_M(F_\omega^j(x_0), F_\omega^j(z)) \leq c\epsilon_0(\theta^j \omega) \quad \forall j \geq a_{k+1} \text{ and } \forall j \leq b_0.$$

If  $F$  satisfies  $k$ -specification for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$  with  $L_c$  independent of  $k$ , then we say that  $F$  has specification property.

**Remark 3.1.** *In the settings of this present paper, the expansive characteristic for RDS  $F$  is a constant (see Lemma 3.3). If we define  $P_\omega(t) = F_\omega^t(x_i)$  if  $t \in [a_i, b_i]$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , then  $(\omega, \cup_{i=1}^k [a_i, b_i], P_\omega)$  is an  $\omega$ -specification as in Def. 1.1. Therefore, the fiber specification property defined in this paper is equivalent to only (3.1) holds for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , any  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $L_c$  independent of  $k$  and  $\omega$ .*

**3.3. Fiber measure theoretic entropy.** For Lemmas in Sec. 3.3-3.6, the condition **(C.1)** is present, and (1.5) is employed. For any  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ , the classical measure theoretic entropy of dynamical system  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta, \mu)$  is denoted by  $h_\mu(\Theta)$ . Denote  $\pi_\Omega : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \Omega$  to be the projection into the first coordinate. The conditional entropy of a finite measurable partition  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\Omega \times M$  given  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))$  is defined by

$$H_\mu(\mathcal{R}|\pi_\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) = \int H_{\mu_\omega}(\mathcal{R}(\omega))dP(\omega),$$

where  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega$  is the measure disintegration of  $\mu$  with respect to  $P$  and  $H_{\mu_\omega}(\mathcal{A})$  denotes the usual entropy of a finite measurable partition  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $M$ . The fiber entropy of  $F$  (or the relative entropy of  $\Theta$ ) with respect to  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$  is defined by

$$h_\mu(F) = h_\mu^{(r)}(\Theta) = \sup_Q h_\mu(F, Q),$$

where

$$h_\mu(F, Q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} (\Theta)^{-i} Q | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))\right),$$

and the supreme is taken over all finite measurable partitions  $Q$  of  $\Omega \times M$ . Note that  $h_\mu(F)$  remains the same by taking the supreme only over partition of  $\Omega \times M$  into finite measurable partition  $Q_i$  of the form  $Q_i = \Omega \times P_i$ , where  $\{P_i\}$  is a finite measurable partition of  $M$ .

**3.4. Measure Approximation.** The following lemma can be found in [41] p.535.

**Lemma 3.5** (Measure approximation). *For topological dynamical system  $(\Omega \times M, \Theta)$ , given  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ , for any  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ , and  $\delta > 0$ , there exist  $\nu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$  and  $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^k \subset I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$  with the following properties:*

- (1)  $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \nu_i$ , where  $\lambda_i > 0$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = 1$ ;
- (2)  $h_\nu(\Theta) \geq h_\mu(\Theta) - \delta$ , which implies  $h_\nu(F) \geq h_\mu(F) - \delta$  by the Abramov-Rohlin formula  $h_\mu(\Theta) = h_\mu(F) + h_P(\theta)$  and  $h_\nu(\Theta) = h_\nu(F) + h_P(\theta)$ ;
- (3)  $|\int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi d\mu - \int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi d\nu| < \delta$ .

**3.5. Random Katok entropy theorem.** For  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ , denotes

$$S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta) = \min\{S(\omega, n, \epsilon, K) | K \subset M, \mu_\omega(K) \geq 1 - \delta\},$$

where  $S(\omega, n, \epsilon, K)$  denotes the smallest cardinality of any  $(\omega, \epsilon, n)$ -spanning set of  $K$ , and a subset  $G \subset K$  is called an  $(\omega, \epsilon, n)$ -spanning set of  $K$  if for any  $y \in K$ , there exists a  $x \in G$  such that  $d_\omega^n(x, y) \leq \epsilon$ . The following is the random version of Katok entropy theorem. The first two equality can be found in [42, Theorem 3.1] and [24, Theorem A] respectively. The third and fourth equalities are due to the fiber-expansive property, and we supply a proof in Sec. 5.2 for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 3.6.** *For any  $\mu \in I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . The mapping  $\omega \mapsto S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta)$  is measurable. Note that  $h_\mu(F) \leq h_{top}(F) < \infty$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} (3.3) \quad h_\mu(F) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \eta, \delta) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \eta, \delta) \text{ for } P - a.s. \omega \in \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is a fiber-expansive constant as in Lemma 3.3.

**3.6. Upper semi-continuity of entropy map and equilibrium states.** A subset  $Q \subset M$  is called an  $(\omega, \epsilon, n)$ -separated set of  $M$  if for any two different points  $x, y \in Q$ ,  $d_\omega^n(x, y) > \epsilon$ . For any  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M)$ ,  $n \geq 1$  and constant  $\epsilon > 0$ , set

$$(3.4) \quad \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) = \sup\{Z_n(\omega, \varphi, Q) : Q \text{ is an maximal } (\omega, \epsilon, n)\text{-separated set of } M\},$$

where

$$Z_n(\omega, \varphi, Q) = \sum_{x \in Q} \exp(S_n \varphi(\omega, x)) = \sum_{x \in Q} \exp\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x))\right).$$

The fiber topological pressure of  $F$  (or the relative topological pressure of  $\Theta$ ) with respect to  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$  is

$$(3.5) \quad \pi_F(\varphi) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) dP(\omega).$$

The following lemma is a direct corollary of [21, Proposition 1.2.6] by noticing that  $P$  is an ergodic measure with respect to  $\theta$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *For any  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_F(\varphi) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) \text{ for } P\text{-a.s. } \omega \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the system  $\Theta$  is fiber-expansive, see Lemma 3.3, then the following lemma is a corollary of [21, Theorem 1.3.5].

**Lemma 3.8.** *The entropy map*

$$\mu \mapsto h_\mu(F) \text{ for } \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$$

*is upper semi-continuous with respect to the weak\* topology on  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ . In this case, the equilibrium state for any continuous  $\varphi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  exists. We denote  $ES_\varphi$  to be the collection of all equilibrium states for  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ .*

By Lemma 3.8 and the Abramov-Rohlin formula, we obtain the upper semi-continuity of entropy map  $h_\cdot(\Theta) : I_\Theta(\Omega \times M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\mu \mapsto h_\mu(\Theta)$ . The following lemma only needs the upper semi-continuity of entropy map  $\mu \mapsto h_\mu(\Theta)$ , and it is a consequence of [18, Corollary 2].

**Lemma 3.9.** *For any  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ , we have*

$$\text{int} \left\{ \int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M) \right\} \subset \left\{ \int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in \cup_{q \in \mathbb{R}} ES_{q\varphi} \right\},$$

where *int* denotes the interior of subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

## 4. PROOF OF MAIN RESULTS

**4.1. Proof of Theorem A.** In this section, we prove Theorem A. We start with the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** *For any  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ , where  $\epsilon_0$  comes from Lemma 3.1, there exists an integer  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  depending on  $\epsilon$ , such that for any  $x, y \in M$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $n \geq N$ ,*

$$F_\omega^n(W_\epsilon^u(\omega, x)) \cap W_\epsilon^s(\theta^n \omega, y) \neq \emptyset.$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , by Lemma 3.2, there is  $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon/2)$  such that

$$(4.1) \quad W_{\epsilon/2}^s(\omega, x) \cap W_{\epsilon/2}^u(\omega, y) \text{ consists of a single point for all } \omega \in \Omega \text{ whenever } d_M(x, y) < \epsilon_1.$$

Applying Lemma 3.2 again, there is a  $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/2)$  such that

$$(4.2) \quad W_{\epsilon_1/2}^s(\omega, x) \cap W_{\epsilon_1/2}^u(\omega, y) \text{ consists of a single point for all } \omega \in \Omega \text{ whenever } d_M(x, y) < \epsilon_2.$$

Now let  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a  $\frac{\epsilon_2}{4}$ -dense subset of  $M$ . Then by topological mixing on fibers property, there exists a number  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $k \geq N$  and  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$(4.3) \quad F_\omega^k \left( B_M(x_i, \frac{\epsilon_2}{4}) \right) \cap B_M(x_j, \frac{\epsilon_2}{4}) \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega.$$

We fix this  $N$ . Next, we prove this  $N$  is the desired number in the statement of Proposition 4.1.

For any  $k \geq N$ , and  $x, y \in M$ , since  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is  $\frac{\epsilon_2}{4}$ -dense, there exists  $x', y' \in \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  such that  $d_M(x, x') < \frac{\epsilon_2}{4}$  and  $d_M(y, y') < \frac{\epsilon_2}{4}$ . Therefore,  $B_M(x', \frac{\epsilon_2}{4}) \subset B_M(x, \epsilon_2)$  and  $B_M(y', \frac{\epsilon_2}{4}) \subset B_M(y, \epsilon_2)$ . Moreover, equation (4.3) implies  $F_\omega^k(B_M(x, \epsilon_2)) \cap B_M(y, \epsilon_2) \neq \emptyset$ . We pick  $p \in F_\omega^k(B_M(x, \epsilon_2)) \cap B_M(y, \epsilon_2)$ . According to (4.2), there exists a point  $q$  such that

$$(4.4) \quad q \in W_{\epsilon_1/2}^s(\theta^k \omega, y) \cap W_{\epsilon_1/2}^u(\theta^k \omega, p).$$

Since  $q \in W_{\epsilon_1/2}^u(\theta^k \omega, p)$ , we have

$$d_M(F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} p, F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} q) \leq e^{-k\lambda} \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} < \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(x, F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} q) &\leq d_M(x, F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} p) + d_M(F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} p, F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} q) \\ &\leq \epsilon_2 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} < \epsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

According to (4.1),  $z \in W_{\epsilon/2}^u(\omega, x) \cap W_{\epsilon/2}^s(\omega, F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} q)$  exists. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} F_\omega^k(z) &\in F_\omega^k(W_{\epsilon/2}^u(\omega, x)) \cap F_\omega^k(W_{\epsilon/2}^s(\omega, F_{\theta^k \omega}^{-k} q)) \subset F_\omega^k(W_{\epsilon/2}^u(\omega, x)) \cap W_{\epsilon/2}^s(\theta^k \omega, q) \\ &\stackrel{(4.4)}{\subset} F_\omega^k(W_{\epsilon/2}^u(\omega, x)) \cap W_\epsilon^s(\theta^k \omega, y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $F_\omega^k(W_\epsilon^u(\omega, x)) \cap W_\epsilon^s(\theta^k \omega, y) \neq \emptyset$ . □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem A. For any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ , we first define  $N = N(\epsilon)$ , the desired space of the fiber specification property corresponding to  $\epsilon$ . Let  $\beta = \frac{1}{2} \min\{\epsilon/2, \epsilon_0\}$ , where  $\epsilon_0$  comes from Lemma 3.1. Define  $\gamma = \beta/8$ , and let  $N$  be in Proposition 4.1 such that for any  $x, y \in M$ ,  $n \geq N$ ,

$$(4.5) \quad F_\omega^n(W_\gamma^u(\omega, x)) \cap W_\gamma^s(\theta^n \omega, y) \neq \emptyset \text{ for any } \omega \in \Omega.$$

Moreover, we pick  $N$  sufficiently large such that  $e^{-N\lambda_0} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . From now on, we fix this  $N$ .

Next, we prove that any  $N$  spaced  $\omega$ -specification  $S_\omega = (\omega, \tau, P_\omega)$  as in Definition 1.1 is  $(\omega, \epsilon)$ -shadowed by a point in  $M$ . We define

$$(4.6) \quad x_{a_1} = P_\omega(a_1).$$

For  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , we define  $x_{a_k}$  inductively: once  $x_{a_k}$  is defined for  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ , pick

$$(4.7) \quad x_{a_{k+1}} \in F_{\theta^{b_k} \omega}^{a_{k+1}-b_k} \left( W_\gamma^u(\Theta^{b_k-a_k}(\theta^{a_k} \omega, x_{a_k})) \right) \cap W_\gamma^s(\theta^{a_{k+1}} \omega, P_\omega(a_{k+1})),$$

where  $x_{a_{k+1}}$  exists due to  $a_{k+1} - b_k > N$  and (4.5). Define  $x := F_{\theta^{a_m}\omega}^{-a_m}(x_{a_m})$ , and we are going to show  $x$  is  $(\omega, \beta/2)$ -shadowing the  $\omega$ -specification  $S_\omega$ , i.e.,

$$(4.8) \quad d_M(F_\omega^t(x), P_\omega(t)) < \beta/2 \quad \text{for } t \in \cup_{i=1}^m I_i.$$

For any fixed  $t \in \cup_{i=1}^m I_i$ , there exists a  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  such that  $a_j \leq t \leq b_j$ . Then

$$(4.9) \quad d_M(F_\omega^t(x), P_\omega(t)) \leq d_M(F_\omega^t(x), F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{t-a_j}(x_{a_j})) + d_M(F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{t-a_j}(x_{a_j}), P_\omega(t)).$$

By (4.7),  $x_{a_j} \in W_\gamma^s(\theta^{a_j}\omega, P_\omega(a_j))$ , and therefore,

$$(4.10) \quad d_M(F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{t-a_j}(x_{a_j}), P_\omega(t)) = d_M(F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{t-a_j}(x_{a_j}), F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{t-a_j}(P_\omega(a_j))) \leq \gamma < \beta/4.$$

To estimate  $d_M(F_\omega^t(x), F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{t-a_j}(x_{a_j}))$ , we are going to show that

$$(4.11) \quad F_\omega^{b_j}(x) \in W_{2\gamma}^u(\Theta^{b_j-a_j}(\theta^{a_j}\omega, x_{a_j})) = W_{2\gamma}^u(\theta^{b_j}\omega, F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{b_j-a_j}(x_{a_j})).$$

We only consider the case that  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$  since when  $j = m$ , it is clear that

$$F_\omega^{b_m}(x) = F_\omega^{b_m}(F_{\theta^{a_m}\omega}^{-a_m}(x_{a_m})) = F_{\theta^{a_m}\omega}^{b_m-a_m}(x_{a_m}) \in W_{2\gamma}^u(\Theta^{b_m-a_m}(\theta^{a_m}\omega, x_{a_m})).$$

Now for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ , we show that for any  $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-j\}$

$$(4.12) \quad F_\omega^{b_j} \circ F_{\theta^{a_j+p}\omega}^{-a_j+p}(x_{a_j+p}) \in W_{\gamma+\gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda N} + \dots + \gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda(p-1)N}}^u(\Theta^{b_j-a_j}(\theta^{a_j}\omega, x_{a_j})).$$

by using induction. Notice that (4.11) is a corollary of (4.12) when  $p = m-j$ . In fact, for  $p = 1$ , directly by (4.7), we obtain

$$F_\omega^{b_j} \circ F_{\theta^{a_j+1}\omega}^{-a_j+1}(x_{a_j+1}) \in W_\gamma^u(\Theta^{b_j-a_j}(\theta^{a_j}\omega, x_{a_j})).$$

Suppose now (4.12) holds for  $p = l \in \{1, 2, \dots, m-j-1\}$ . By the construction (4.7), we have

$$(4.13) \quad F_\omega^{b_j+l} \circ F_{\theta^{a_j+l+1}\omega}^{-a_j+l+1}(x_{a_j+l+1}) \in W_\gamma^u(\Theta^{b_j+l-a_j+l}(\theta^{a_j+l}\omega, x_{a_j+l})).$$

Equation (4.13) implies that

$$F_{\theta^{b_j+l}\omega}^{b_j-b_j+l} \circ F_\omega^{b_j+l} \circ F_{\theta^{a_j+l+1}\omega}^{-a_j+l+1}(x_{a_j+l+1}) \in W_{\gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda l N}}^u(\Theta^{b_j-a_j+l}(\theta^{a_j+l}\omega, x_{a_j+l})).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} F_\omega^{b_j} \circ F_{\theta^{a_j+l+1}\omega}^{-a_j+l+1}(x_{a_j+l+1}) &\in W_{\gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda l N}}^u(\Theta^{-(a_j+l-b_j)}(\theta^{a_j+l}\omega, x_{a_j+l})) \\ &\subset W_{\gamma+\gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda N} + \dots + \gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda l N}}^u(\Theta^{b_j-a_j}(\theta^{a_j}\omega, x_{a_j})), \end{aligned}$$

where the last subset is due to the induction step

$$F_\omega^{b_j} \circ F_{\theta^{a_j+l}\omega}^{-a_j+l}(x_{a_j+l}) = F_{\theta^{a_j+l}\omega}^{-(a_j+l-b_j)}(x_{a_j+l}) \in W_{\gamma+\gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda N} + \dots + \gamma \cdot e^{-\lambda(l-1)N}}^u(\Theta^{b_j-a_j}(\theta^{a_j}\omega, x_{a_j})).$$

Therefore, equation (4.12) and in particular (4.11) hold. As a consequence of (4.11), we have

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} d_M(F_\omega^t(x), F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{t-a_j}(x_{a_j})) &= d_M(F_{\theta^{b_j}\omega}^{-(b_j-t)} \circ F_\omega^{b_j}(x), F_{\theta^{b_j}\omega}^{-(b_j-t)} \circ F_{\theta^{a_j}\omega}^{b_j-a_j}(x_{a_j})) \\ &< 2\gamma = \beta/4. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.9), (4.10) and (4.14), we conclude

$$d_M(F_\omega^t(x), P_\omega(t)) \leq \beta/4 + \beta/4 = \beta/2 < \epsilon.$$

The proof of the fiber specification property is complete.

Next, let us prove the RDS corresponding to  $\Theta$  has the specification property given by Gundlach and Kifer for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ . By Remark 3.1, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , given point  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^k \subset M$  and integers  $-\infty \leq b_0 < a_1 < b_1 < \dots < a_k < b_k < a_{k+1} \leq \infty$  satisfying  $a_{i+1} \geq b_i + N(\epsilon)$ , where  $N(\epsilon)$  is the

number  $N$  in fiber specification property corresponding to  $\epsilon$ . We need to prove that there exists a point  $z \in M$  satisfying both

$$(4.15) \quad \max_{a_i \leq j \leq b_i} d_M(F_\omega^j(x_i), F_\omega^j(z)) \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, k$$

$$(4.16) \quad d_M(F_\omega^j(x_0), F_\omega^j(z)) \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall j \geq a_{k+1} \text{ and } \forall j \leq b_0.$$

Denote  $a_0 := b_0$  and  $b_{k+1} := a_{k+1}$  and define  $P_\omega : \cup_{i=0}^{k+1} [a_i, b_i] \rightarrow M$  by

$$P_\omega(t) = \begin{cases} F_\omega^{b_0}(x_0), & \text{if } t = a_0 = b_0; \\ F_\omega^j(x_i), & \text{if } j \in [a_i, b_i] \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, k\}; \\ F_\omega^{a_{k+1}}(x_0), & \text{if } t = a_{k+1} = b_{k+1}. \end{cases}$$

Then  $(\omega, \cup_{i=0}^{k+1} [a_i, b_i], P_\omega)$  is a  $N(\epsilon)$ -spaced  $\omega$ -specification. Therefore, by the previous proof, there exists a point  $z \in M$ , which is  $(\omega, \epsilon)$ -shadowing this  $\omega$ -specification. Therefore, (4.15) is proved. Following the construction (4.7), we have

$$F_\omega^{a_{k+1}}(z) = F_\omega^{b_{k+1}}(z) \in W_\gamma^s(\theta^{a_{k+1}}\omega, P_\omega(a_{k+1})) = W_\gamma^s(\theta^{a_{k+1}}\omega, F_\omega^{a_{k+1}}(x_0)) \subset W_\epsilon^s(\theta^{a_{k+1}}\omega, F_\omega^{a_{k+1}}(x_0)).$$

As a consequence, for all  $j \geq a_{k+1}$ , we have

$$d_M(F_\omega^j(x_0), F_\omega^j(z)) \leq e^{-\lambda(j-a_{k+1})} d_M(F_\omega^{a_{k+1}}(x_0), F_\omega^{a_{k+1}}(z)) \leq \epsilon.$$

Similar as (4.11), we have

$$F_\omega^{b_0}(z) \in W_{2\gamma}^u(\Theta^{b_0-a_0}(\theta^{a_0}\omega, P_\omega(a_0))) = W_{2\gamma}^u(\theta^{b_0}\omega, F_\omega^{b_0}(x_0)) \subset W_\epsilon^u(\theta^{b_0}\omega, F_\omega^{b_0}(x_0)).$$

Hence, if  $j \leq b_0$ , we have

$$d_M(F_\omega^j(x_0), F_\omega^j(z)) \leq e^{-\lambda(b_0-j)} d_M(F_\omega^{b_0}(z), F_\omega^{b_0}(x_0)) \leq \epsilon.$$

(4.16) is proved. The proof of Theorem A is complete.

**4.2. Proof of Theorem B.** In this section, we prove Theorem B. In order not to obscure the main structure of the proof, we address the proof of lemmas in Sec. 5.3.

**4.2.1. Upper estimates on fiber Bowen's topological entropy of  $K_{\varphi, \alpha}$ .** To give upper estimates on the fiber Bowen's topological entropy, we need an intermediate value. Given  $\varphi \in C(\Omega \times M, \mathbb{R})$ , for any  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let

$$(4.17) \quad P(\alpha, \delta, n) = \left\{ (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \alpha \right| < \delta \right\},$$

and denote

$$P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega) = \{x \in M : (\omega, x) \in P(\alpha, \delta, n)\}.$$

Clearly, for  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_\alpha$ ,  $P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega) \neq \emptyset$  for sufficiently large  $n$ .

For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we let  $N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  be the minimal number of balls  $B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon) = \{y \in M : d_\omega^n(x, y) < \epsilon\}$  which is necessary for covering the set  $P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega)$ . If  $P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega) = \emptyset$ , we let  $N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) = 1$ . It is clear that  $N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  does not increase as  $\delta$  decreases, and  $N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  does not decrease as  $\epsilon$  decreases. We let  $M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  be the largest cardinality of maximal  $(\omega, \epsilon, n)$ -separated sets of  $P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega)$ . We put  $M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) = 1$  if  $P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega) = \emptyset$ . It is clear that for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) \leq M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) \leq N(\alpha, \delta, n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \omega).$$

Therefore, for  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , the following limit exists

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of fiber topological entropy  $h_{top}(F) = \pi_F(0)$  and Lemma 3.7, we can see that  $\Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega) \leq h_{top}(F) < \infty$  for  $\omega$  in a  $P$ -full measure set, named  $\Omega_\Lambda$ . The next lemma is about the measurability, and its proof is addressed in Sec. 5.3.

**Lemma 4.1.** *For each  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ ,  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  and fixed  $n$ , the mapping  $\omega \mapsto M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  is measurable. As a consequence, the mapping  $\omega \mapsto \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega)$  is measurable.*

In this section, we prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.2.** *For any  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\alpha \cap \Omega_\Lambda$ , one has*

$$h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega), \omega) \leq \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega) \leq \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\}.$$

We note that  $P(\Omega_\alpha) = 1$  by the definition of  $L_\varphi$ .

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* Given  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , we first prove  $h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega), \omega) \leq \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega)$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\alpha \cap \Omega_\Lambda$ . From now on, we fix any  $\omega \in \Omega_\alpha \cap \Omega_\Lambda$ . For any  $\delta > 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote

$$G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega) = \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega) = \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} \left\{ x \in X : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \alpha \right| < \delta \right\}.$$

Recall that  $K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega) = \{x \in M : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) = \alpha\}$ . Therefore, for any  $\delta > 0$ , we have

$$K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega) \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega).$$

If

$$(4.19) \quad h_{top}(F, G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), \omega, \epsilon) \leq \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega)$$

holds true for those  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega) \neq \emptyset$ , for sufficient small  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ , then Lemma 1.4 and Lemma 1.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega), \omega, \epsilon) \\ &\leq h_{top}(F, \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), \omega, \epsilon) \\ &= \sup\{h_{top}(F, G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), \omega, \epsilon) : k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega) \neq \emptyset\} \\ &\leq \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega), \omega) \leq \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega)$ . Now, we are going to prove (4.19).

To prove (4.19), by (1.3), it is sufficient to prove that for any sufficiently small  $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ , and  $s > \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega)$ ,  $m(G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), s, \omega, \epsilon) = 0$  for those  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega) \neq \emptyset$ . Denote  $\gamma(\omega) = \frac{s - \Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega)}{2} > 0$ . Fix any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega) \neq \emptyset$ . Recall that  $N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  is the minimal number of balls  $B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)$  which is necessary for covering the set  $P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega)$ . When  $n \geq k$ , these balls covers  $G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega)$  as well since  $G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega) \subset P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega)$  for  $n \geq k$ . Hence, we have

$$(4.20) \quad m(G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), s, \omega, n, \epsilon) \leq N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) e^{-sn},$$

where  $m(G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), s, \omega, n, \epsilon)$  is defined as in (1.2). Recall that

$$\Lambda_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega).$$



There exists  $\epsilon_0(\omega) > 0$  and  $\delta_0(\omega) > 0$  such that for all  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0(\omega))$  and  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0(\omega))$ , there exists a monotone sequence of integers  $n_l = n_l(\epsilon, \delta, \gamma(\omega)) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$  satisfying

$$(4.21) \quad N(\alpha, \delta, n_l, \epsilon, \omega) \leq \exp(n_l(\Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega) + \gamma(\omega))).$$

We fix any  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0(\omega))$  and  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0(\omega))$ , then (4.20) and (4.21) imply that

$$m(G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), s, \omega, n_l, \epsilon) \leq e^{n_l(\Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega) + \gamma(\omega))} \cdot e^{-sn_l} = e^{-n_l\gamma(\omega)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n_l \rightarrow \infty.$$

By (1.2), we have

$$m(G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), s, \omega, \epsilon) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), s, \omega, n, \epsilon) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} m(G(\alpha, \delta, k, \omega), s, \omega, n_l, \epsilon) = 0.$$

Therefore, (4.19) holds. The proof of the first inequality is complete.

Next, we prove  $\Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega) \leq \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\}$  for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\alpha \cap \Omega_\Lambda$ . Fix any  $\omega^* \in \Omega_\alpha \cap \Omega_\Lambda$ , and we only consider the case that  $\Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*) > 0$ . It is sufficient to show that for any  $r \in (0, \Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*))$ , there exists a measure  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)$  satisfying

$$(4.22) \quad h_\mu(F) \geq \Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*) - r.$$

Fix any  $r \in (0, \Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*))$ . By the definition of  $\Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*)$ , there exists  $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(\omega^*) > 0$  such that for any  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1(\omega^*))$ , one has

$$(4.23) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega^*) \geq \Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*) - \frac{1}{3}r.$$

For any  $k \geq 1$ , we can find a sequence  $\delta_k(\omega^*) > 0$  depending on  $\epsilon_1(\omega^*)$  with  $\delta_k(\omega^*) \searrow 0$  so that

$$(4.24) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), n, \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*) \geq \Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*) - \frac{2}{3}r.$$

For  $k \geq 1$ , we pick a strictly increasing sequence  $m_k(\omega^*) \in \mathbb{N}$  depending on  $\delta_k(\omega^*)$  and  $\epsilon_1(\omega^*)$  such that

$$P(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \omega^*) \neq \emptyset$$

and

$$(4.25) \quad M_k(\omega^*) := M(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*) \geq \exp(m_k(\omega^*) \cdot (\Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*) - r)).$$

Recall  $M(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*)$  is the largest cardinality of a maximal  $(\omega^*, \epsilon_1(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*))$  separated set of  $P(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \omega^*)$ , and pick  $C_k(\omega^*)$  to be one of such  $(\omega^*, \epsilon_1(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*))$ -separated set with  $\#C_k(\omega^*) = M_k(\omega^*)$ . We define a sequence of probability measures  $\sigma_k \in Pr(\Omega \times M)$  by

$$(4.26) \quad \sigma_k = \frac{1}{M_k(\omega^*)} \sum_{x \in C_k(\omega^*)} \delta_{(\omega^*, x)}.$$

Let

$$\sigma_{k, \omega^*} := \frac{1}{M_k(\omega^*)} \sum_{x \in C_k(\omega^*)} \delta_x \in Pr(M).$$

Then  $\sigma_k$  has disintegration

$$(4.27) \quad \sigma_k = \delta_{\omega^*} \times \sigma_{k, \omega^*}.$$

Define  $\mu_k \in Pr(\Omega \times M)$  by

$$(4.28) \quad \mu_k := \frac{1}{M_k(\omega^*)} \sum_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (\Theta^i)_* \sigma_k = \frac{1}{M_k(\omega^*)} \sum_{x \in C_k(\omega^*)} \frac{1}{m_k(\omega^*)} \sum_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} \delta_{\Theta^i(\omega^*, x)}.$$

Keep in mind that this  $\omega^* \in \Omega_\alpha \cap \Omega_\Lambda$  is fixed throughout this proof. By the compactness of  $Pr(\Omega \times M)$  with respect to the weak\* topology, a subsequence of  $\mu_k$  weak\* converges to a limit in  $Pr(\Omega \times M)$ , named  $\mu_{k_l} \rightarrow \mu$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Claim 4.1.** *We claim that  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)$ .*

*Proof of Claim 4.1.* Firstly, by using Krylov-Bogolyubov type argument,  $\mu$  is  $\Theta$ -invariant. It is left to show that  $\int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi(\omega, x) d\mu(\omega, x) = \alpha$ . For every  $l \geq 1$ , one has

$$(4.29) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi(\omega, x) d\mu_{k_l} - \alpha \right| \leq \frac{1}{M_{k_l}(\omega^*)} \sum_{x \in C_{k_l}(\omega^*)} \left| \frac{1}{m_{k_l}(\omega^*)} \sum_{i=0}^{m_{k_l}(\omega^*)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega^*, x)) - \alpha \right| \leq \delta_{k_l}(\omega^*)$$

since  $x \in C_{k_l}(\omega^*) \subset P(\alpha, \delta_{k_l}(\omega^*), m_{k_l}(\omega^*), \omega^*)$ . Therefore,  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi d\mu_{k_l} = \alpha$  since  $\delta_{k_l}(\omega^*) \rightarrow 0$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ . By the weak\* convergence, we also have  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi d\mu_{k_l} = \int \varphi d\mu$ . Hence  $\int \varphi d\mu = \alpha$ .  $\square$

Next, we prove that such  $\mu$  satisfies (4.22) by using the same strategy as the proof of [20, Proposition 2.2]. Note that  $\omega^*$  is fixed, and  $\epsilon_1(\omega^*)$  and  $m_k(\omega^*)$  are positive numbers chosen satisfying (4.24) and (4.25) respectively. We can choose a finite measurable partition  $\mathcal{Q} = \{\Omega \times P_i\}_{i=1}^l$  of  $\Omega \times M$  with  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \text{diam}(P_i) < \epsilon_1(\omega^*)$ , such that

$$(4.30) \quad \mu(\partial \mathcal{Q}) = \sum_{i=1}^l \int_{\Omega} \mu_\omega(\partial P_i) dP(\omega) = 0.$$

We denote  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_i\}_{i=1}^l$ . Due to (4.27), we have the following equation

$$H_{\sigma_k}(\vee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q} | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) = H_{\sigma_{k, \omega^*}}(\vee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (F_{\omega^*}^i)^{-1} \mathcal{P}).$$

We note that the measure  $\sigma_{k, \omega^*}$  is weighted on  $M_k(\omega^*) = M(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*)$  numbers of  $(\omega^*, \epsilon_1(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*))$ -separated points and no member of  $\vee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (F_{\omega^*}^i)^{-1} \mathcal{P}$  contains more than one such point. Therefore, we have

$$(4.31) \quad \begin{aligned} H_{\sigma_k}(\vee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q} | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) &= H_{\sigma_{k, \omega^*}}(\vee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (F_{\omega^*}^i)^{-1} \mathcal{P}) \\ &= \log M(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*). \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1 < q < m_k(\omega^*)$  and  $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ . Let  $a(n)$  be the greatest integer smaller than  $(m_k(\omega^*) - n)q^{-1}$  so that  $m_k(\omega^*) = n + a(n)q + r$  with  $0 \leq r < q$ . Then

$$\bigvee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q} = \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q} \right) \vee \left( \bigvee_{j=0}^{a(n)-1} (\Theta^{n+jq})^{-1} (\vee_{i=0}^{q-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q}) \right) \vee \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{r-1} (\Theta^{i+n+a(n)q})^{-1} \mathcal{Q} \right).$$

Taking into account the subadditivity of conditional entropy (see, e.g., [39, Theorem 4.3]), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\sigma_k}(\vee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q} | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{a(n)-1} H_{(\Theta^{n+jq})_* \sigma_k}(\vee_{i=0}^{q-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q} | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) + (n+r) \log l \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{a(n)-1} H_{(\Theta^{n+jq})_* \sigma_k}(\vee_{i=0}^{q-1} (\Theta^i)^{-1} \mathcal{Q} | \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) + 2q \log l. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over  $n = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} qH_{\sigma_k}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1}(\Theta^i)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m_k(\omega^*)-1} H_{(\Theta^j)_*\sigma_k}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{q-1}(\Theta^i)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) + 2q^2 \log l \\ &\leq m_k(\omega^*)H_{\mu_k}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{q-1}\Theta^i)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) + 2q^2 \log l. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality and (4.31) imply that

$$q \log M(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*) \leq m_k(\omega^*)H_{\mu_k}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{q-1}\Theta^i)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) + 2q^2 \log l.$$

Dividing by  $m_k(\omega^*)$  and sending  $k \rightarrow \infty$  along the subsequence  $k_l \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} q \limsup_{k_l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_{k_l}(\omega^*)} \log M(\alpha, \delta_{k_l}(\omega^*), m_{k_l}(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*) &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} H_{\mu_{k_l}}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{q-1}\Theta^i)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))) \\ (4.32) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq H_{\mu}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{q-1}(\Theta^i)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to [23, Lemma 3.2 (ii)]. To apply Lemma 3.2 (ii) in [23], we are using the equation (4.30) and the assumption that  $\Omega$  is a compact metric space. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*) - r &\stackrel{(4.25)}{\leq} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_k(\omega^*)} \log M(\alpha, \delta_k(\omega^*), m_k(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*) \\ &\leq \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_{k_l}(\omega^*)} \log M(\alpha, \delta_{k_l}(\omega^*), m_{k_l}(\omega^*), \epsilon_1(\omega^*), \omega^*) \\ &\stackrel{(4.32)}{\leq} \frac{1}{q} H_{\mu}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{q-1}(\Theta^i)^{-1}\mathcal{Q}|\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega))). \end{aligned}$$

Sending  $q \rightarrow \infty$ , we arrive

$$\Lambda_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega^*) - r \leq h_{\mu}(F, Q) \leq h_{\mu}(F),$$

i.e., (4.22) is proved. The proof of Proposition 4.2 is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 4.1.** *When the external force space  $(\Omega, \theta)$  is trivial, our method is a modification of method in [33]. As Daniel Thompson in [34] pointed out, the argument in the second part of proof of Theorem 4.1 in [33] need to be corrected. We correct Takens and Verbitskiy's proof by using the following treatments: in (4.23), we pick  $\epsilon_1(\omega)$  instead of picking  $\epsilon_k(\omega) \rightarrow 0$ , and we use the separated set instead of centers of covering set to construct measure  $\sigma_k$  in (4.26).*

4.2.2. *Lower estimates on fiber Bowen's topological entropy of  $K_{\varphi, \alpha}$ .* In this subsection, we are going to show that for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , :

$$(4.33) \qquad h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega) \geq \sup\{h_{\mu}(F) : \mu \in I_{\Theta}(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\}.$$

Note that the fiber entropy mapping  $\mu \mapsto h_{\mu}(F)$  is upper semi-continuous by Lemma 3.8. By Lemma 1.4,  $I_{\Theta}(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)$  is closed. Hence, there exists  $\mu_0 \in I_{\Theta}(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)$  such that

$$(4.34) \qquad h_{\mu_0}(F) = \sup\{h_{\mu}(F) : \mu \in I_{\Theta}(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\} \leq h_{top}(F) < \infty.$$

Inequality (4.33) is trivial true if  $h_{\mu_0}(F) = 0$ , therefore we only consider the case that  $h_{\mu_0}(F) > 0$ .

To prove (4.33), it is sufficient to show for any sufficiently small  $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{10}h_{\mu_0}(F))$ , there exists a  $P$ -full measure set  $\tilde{\Omega}_{\gamma}$  such that

$$(4.35) \qquad h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega) \geq h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma, \quad \forall \omega \in \tilde{\Omega}_{\gamma}$$

The proof is a 4-step process. We start with the following technical Lemma, whose proof is given in Sec. 5.3.

**Lemma 4.2.** *For any  $\gamma > 0$  and positive number  $\delta < \frac{1}{2}\{\gamma, \eta\}$ , there exists a  $P$ -full measure set  $\Omega_\delta$  such that for any  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a measurable function  $\hat{n} : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  satisfying for all  $\omega \in \Omega_\delta$ ,  $\hat{n}(\omega) \geq N'$ ,  $P(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \omega) \neq \emptyset$  and*

$$(4.36) \quad \frac{1}{\hat{n}(\omega)} \log M(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \omega) \geq h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma,$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is the fiber-expansive constant in Lemma 3.3 and  $M(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \omega)$  is the largest cardinality of maximal  $(\omega, \frac{\eta}{2}, \hat{n}(\omega))$ -separated sets of  $P(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \omega)$ .

**Remark 4.2.** *In fact, the Lemma 4.2 still holds if  $\mu_0$  is replaced by any  $\Theta$ -invariant measure  $\mu$  and  $\alpha$  is replaced by  $\int \varphi d\mu$  correspondingly.*

Given  $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{10}h_{\mu_0}(F))$ , we first construct the desired  $P$ -full measure set  $\tilde{\Omega}_\gamma$  in (4.35) by using Lemma 4.2. For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , by Theorem A, there exists  $m_k = m(\frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}})$  such that any  $m_k$ -spaced  $\omega$ -specification is  $(\omega, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}})$ -shadowed by a point in  $M$ . Let  $\{\delta_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \searrow 0$  be a strictly decreasing sequence of positive numbers with  $\delta_1 < \frac{1}{2} \min\{\gamma, \eta\}$ . By Lemma 4.2, there exist a  $P$ -full measure set  $\Omega_{\delta_k}$ , such that there exists a measurable function  $\hat{n}_k : \Omega_{\delta_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  satisfying for all  $\omega \in \Omega_{\delta_k}$ ,  $\hat{n}_k(\omega) \geq 2^{m_k}$ ,  $P(\alpha, 4\delta_k, \hat{n}_k(\omega), \omega) \neq \emptyset$ , and

$$(4.37) \quad \frac{1}{\hat{n}_k(\omega)} \log M(\alpha, 4\delta_k, \hat{n}_k(\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \omega) \geq h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma.$$

Note that  $\hat{n}_k(\cdot) : \cap_{j \geq 1} \Omega_{\delta_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is measurable and  $P(\cap_{j \geq 1} \Omega_{\delta_j}) = 1$ . Let  $\{\xi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of positive numbers strictly decreasing to 0 with  $\xi_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ . Now for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , by using Lusin's theorem, there exists a compact set  $\Omega_k \subset \cap_{j \geq 1} \Omega_{\delta_j}$  with  $P(\Omega_k) \geq 1 - \frac{\xi_k}{2}$ , such that  $\hat{n}_k(\omega)$  is continuous on  $\Omega_k$ . Denote

$$(4.38) \quad \hat{n}_k^M = \max_{\omega \in \Omega_k} \hat{n}_k(\omega).$$

By Birkhoff's Ergodic theorem, there exists a  $P$ -full measure set  $\Omega'_k$ , such that for any  $\omega \in \Omega'_k$ , we have

$$(4.39) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\Omega_k}(\theta^i \omega) = P(\Omega_k) \geq 1 - \frac{\xi_k}{2}.$$

We define  $\tilde{\Omega}_\gamma := \cap_{k \geq 1} \Omega'_k$ , and in the left of this section, we are going to show (4.35) by constructing Moran-like fractal on each fiber  $\{\omega\} \times M$  for  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}_\gamma$ . From now on, we fix any  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}_\gamma$ .

*Step 1. Construction of intermediate sets.* We start by choosing two sequences of positive integers depending on  $\omega$ , named  $\{L_k(\omega)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{N_k(\omega)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

We define  $\{L_k(\omega)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  inductively. For  $k = 1$ , by (4.39), we can pick  $L_1(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(4.40) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\Omega_1}(\theta^i \omega) \geq 1 - \xi_1, \quad \forall n \geq L_1(\omega).$$

Once  $L_k(\omega)$  is defined, by (4.39), we can pick  $L_{k+1}(\omega)$  satisfying  $L_{k+1}(\omega) > L_k(\omega)$ , and

$$(4.41) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\Omega_{k+1}}(\theta^i \omega) \geq 1 - \xi_{k+1}, \quad \forall n \geq L_{k+1}(\omega).$$

Now, let  $N_1(\omega) = L_2(\omega)$ , and we pick  $N_k(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(4.42) \quad \begin{cases} N_k(\omega) \geq \max\{2^{\hat{n}_{k+1}^M + m_{k+1}}, L_{k+1}(\omega)\}, \forall k \geq 2, \\ N_{k+1}(\omega) \geq 2^{\sum_{j=1}^k (N_j(\omega) \cdot (\hat{n}_j^M + m_j) \cdot \prod_{i=j}^k (1 - \xi_i)^{-1})}, \forall k \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

The (4.42) ensures that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\hat{n}_{k+1}^M + m_{k+1}}{N_k(\omega)} = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k (N_j(\omega) \cdot (\hat{n}_j^M + m_j) \cdot \prod_{i=j}^k (1 - \xi_i)^{-1})}{N_{k+1}(\omega)} = 0.$$

First, we construct intermediate set  $D_1(\omega)$ . Let  $l^{0,1}(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that  $\theta^i \omega \in \Omega_1$ . We denote  $T_0^1(\omega) = l^{0,1}(\omega)$ . Let  $l_1^1(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that

$$\theta^{T_0^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega) + m_1 + i} \omega \in \Omega_1,$$

where  $\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega)$  is well defined and bounded by  $\hat{n}_1^M$  since  $\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega \in \Omega_1$ . Denote  $T_1^1(\omega) = T_0^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega) + m_1 + l_1^1(\omega)$ . For  $k \in \{1, \dots, N_1(\omega) - 2\}$ , suppose  $T_k^1(\omega)$  is already defined and  $\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega \in \Omega_1$ , we let  $l_{k+1}^1(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that

$$\theta^{T_k^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega) + m_1 + i} \in \Omega_1$$

and denote

$$T_{k+1}^1(\omega) = T_k^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega) + m_1 + l_{k+1}^1(\omega).$$

Finally, we define

$$T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega) = T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)} \omega).$$

We point out that in orbit  $\{\omega, \dots, \theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega)} \omega\}$ , there are at least  $T_0^1(\omega) + l_1^1(\omega) + \dots + l_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)$  points not lying in  $\Omega_1$ . We note that  $T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega) \geq N_1(\omega) \geq L_2(\omega) \geq L_1(\omega)$ , therefore, by (4.40),

$$(4.43) \quad T_0^1(\omega) + l_1^1(\omega) + \dots + l_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega) \leq \xi_1 T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega).$$

By our construction, we have  $\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega \in \Omega_1 \subset \bigcap_{j \geq 1} \Omega_{\delta_j}$  for  $k \in \{0, \dots, N_1(\omega) - 1\}$ . Therefore, our construction (4.37),  $\Omega_1 \subset \bigcap_{j \geq 1} \Omega_{\delta_j}$  and (4.38) imply that  $P(\alpha, 4\delta_1, \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega), \theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega) \neq \emptyset$ ;  $2^{m_1} \leq \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega) \leq \hat{n}_1^M$ , and

$$\frac{1}{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega)} \log M(\alpha, 4\delta_1, \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega) \geq h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma.$$

Let  $C_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega) \subset P(\alpha, 4\delta_1, \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega), \theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega)$  be a maximal  $(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega, \frac{\eta}{2}, \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega))$ -separated set with  $\#C_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega) = M(\alpha, 4\delta_1, \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_k^1(\omega)} \omega)$ .

Now for any  $N_1(\omega)$ -tuple  $(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1) \in C_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega) \times \dots \times C_1(\theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)} \omega)$ , by Theorem A, there exists a point  $y = y(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1) \in M$ , which is  $(\omega, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+\Gamma}})$ -shadowing pieces of orbits

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ x_0^1, F_{\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega} (x_0^1), \dots, F_{\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)} \omega) - 1} (x_0^1) \right\}, \\ & \dots, \left\{ x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1, F_{\theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)} \omega} (x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1), \dots, F_{\theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)} \omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)} \omega) - 1} (x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

with gaps  $m_1 + l_1^1(\omega), m_1 + l_2^1(\omega), \dots, m_1 + l_{N_1-1}^1(\omega)$ , i.e., for any  $k \in \{0, \dots, N_1(\omega) - 1\}$ ,

$$(4.44) \quad d_{\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)}\omega)}(x_k^1, F_{\omega}^{T_k^1(\omega)}y) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+1}}.$$

Let  $D_1(\omega) = \{y = y(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1) : x_k^1 \in C(\theta^{T_k^1(\omega)}\omega), k \in \{0, \dots, N_1(\omega) - 1\}\}$ , which is the first intermediate set. The following lemma says that different tuples give different shadowing points, and its proof is given in Sec. 5.3.

**Lemma 4.3.** *If  $(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1), (z_0^1, \dots, z_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1) \in C_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)}\omega) \times \dots \times C_1(\theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)}\omega)$  are different tuples, then*

$$d_{\omega^{T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega)}}^{T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega)}\left(y((x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)), y((z_0^1, \dots, z_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1))\right) > \frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta}{2^{4+1}} \times 2 \geq \frac{3\eta}{8}.$$

Hence  $\#D_1(\omega) = \prod_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} \#C_1(\theta^{T_i^1(\omega)}\omega)$ .

Next, we inductively define  $D_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega)$  for  $k \geq 2$ . Suppose now that  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) > N_k(\omega)$  is already defined for  $k \geq 1$ , let  $l^{k,k+1}(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that

$$(4.45) \quad \theta^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + m_{k+1} + i}\omega \in \Omega_{k+1}.$$

Denote  $T_0^{k+1}(\omega) = T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega)$ . Let  $l_1^{k+1}(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that

$$\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1} + i}\omega \in \Omega_{k+1}$$

and denote

$$T_1^{k+1}(\omega) = T_0^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1} + l_1^{k+1}(\omega).$$

Once  $T_j^{k+1}(\omega)$  is defined for  $j \in \{1, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 2\}$ , we let  $l_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that

$$\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1} + i}\omega \in \Omega_{k+1},$$

and denote

$$T_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega) = T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1} + l_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega).$$

For  $j = N_{k+1}(\omega)$ , we define

$$T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) = T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega).$$

It is clear that  $T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) > N_{k+1}(\omega)$  since  $\hat{n}_{k+1} \geq 1$  and  $m_{k+1} > 0$ . By construction, in the orbit  $\{\theta^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}\omega, \dots, \theta^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega\}$ , there are at least  $l^{k,k+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} l_i^{k+1}(\omega)$  points not lying in  $\Omega_{k+1}$  and  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \geq N_k(\omega) \geq L_{k+1}(\omega)$ . Therefore (4.41) implies

$$(4.46) \quad \left(l^{k,k+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^j l_i^{k+1}(\omega)\right) \leq \xi_{k+1} T_j^{k+1}(\omega), \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}.$$

By our construction,  $\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega \in \Omega_{k+1} \subset \cap_{l \geq 1} \Omega_{\delta_l}$  for  $j \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ , therefore our construction (4.37) and (4.38) implies that  $P(\alpha, 4\delta_{k+1}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega), \theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $2^{m_{k+1}} \leq \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \leq \hat{n}_{k+1}^M$ , and

$$(4.47) \quad \frac{1}{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)} \log M(\alpha, 4\delta_{k+1}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \geq h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma.$$

For  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ , let  $C_{k+1}(\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)$  be a maximal  $(\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega, \frac{\eta}{2}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega))$ -separated set of  $P(\alpha, 4\delta_{k+1}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega), \theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)$  with

$$\#C_{k+1}(\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega) = M(\alpha, 4\delta_{k+1}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega).$$

For any  $N_{k+1}(\omega)$ -tuple  $(x_0^{k+1}, \dots, x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}) \in C_{k+1}(\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega) \times \dots \times C_{k+1}(\theta_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)$ , by Theorem A, there exists a point  $y = y(x_0^{k+1}, \dots, x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}) \in M$ , which is  $(\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}})$ -shadowing the pieces of orbits

$$\left\{ x_0^{k+1}, F_{\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(x_0^{k+1}), \dots, F_{\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)-1}(x_0^{k+1}) \right\}, \dots, \\ \left\{ x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}, F_{\theta_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)}(x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}), \dots, F_{\theta_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)-1}(x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}) \right\}$$

with gaps  $m_{k+1} + l_1^{k+1}(\omega), \dots, m_{k+1} + l_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)$ , respectively, i.e. for any  $j \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ , we have

$$(4.48) \quad d_{\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta_j^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)} \left( x_j^{k+1}, F_{\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} y \right) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}.$$

We collect all such points into

$$D_{k+1}(\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega) = \{y(x_0^{k+1}, \dots, x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}) : x_i^{k+1} \in C_{k+1}(\theta_i^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}.$$

Similar as the proof of Lemma 4.3, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.4.** *If  $(x_0^{k+1}, \dots, x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}), (z_0^{k+1}, \dots, z_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}) \in \prod_{i=0}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} C_{k+1}(\theta_i^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)$  are different tuples, then*

$$d_{\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \left( y(x_0^{k+1}, \dots, x_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}), y(z_0^{k+1}, \dots, z_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}) \right) > \frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \times 2.$$

Hence

$$(4.49) \quad \#D_{k+1}(\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega) = \prod_{i=0}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta_i^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega).$$

In this way, we have constructed intermediate sets  $D_1(\omega)$  and  $D_k(\theta_0^{T_0^k(\omega)} \omega)$  for  $k \geq 2$ .

*Step 2. Construction of  $H_k(\omega)$ , centers of balls forming the  $k$ -th level of fiber Moran-like fractal.* Let  $H_1(\omega) = D_1(\omega)$ . Once  $H_k(\omega)$  for  $k \geq 1$  is constructed, we can construct  $H_{k+1}(\omega)$  inductively as follows. Pick any  $x \in H_k(\omega)$  and  $y \in D_{k+1}(\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega)$ . We note that

$$T_0^{k+1}(\omega) - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) = m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) \geq m_{k+1}$$

by construction (4.45). Therefore, by Theorem A, there exists a point  $z = z(x, y) \in M$ , which is  $(\omega, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}})$ -shadowing pieces of orbits

$$\left\{ x, F_\omega(x), \dots, F_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1}(x) \right\}, \left\{ y, F_{\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}(y), \dots, F_{\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)-1}(y) \right\}$$

with the space  $m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega)$ , i.e.,

$$(4.50) \quad d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x, z) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}, \quad d_{\theta_0^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} \omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(y, F_\omega^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} z) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}.$$

Collect all these points into the set  $H_{k+1}(\omega) = \{z = z(x, y) : x \in H_k(\omega), y \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}} \omega)\}$ . The proof of the following lemma is given in Sec. 5.3.

**Lemma 4.5.** *For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x \in H_k(\omega), y, y' \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}} \omega)$ , if  $y \neq y'$ , one has*

$$(4.51) \quad d_{\omega}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k} (z(x, y), z(x, y')) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \times 2 = \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}},$$

$$(4.52) \quad d_{\omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}} (z(x, y), z(x, y')) > \frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \times 4 \geq \frac{3\eta}{8}.$$

As a consequence of Lemma 4.5, we have

$$(4.53) \quad \#H_{k+1}(\omega) = \#H_k(\omega) \cdot \#D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}} \omega) = \#D_1(\omega) \cdot \prod_{i=2}^{k+1} \#D_i(\theta^{T_0^i} \omega).$$

Note that points in  $H_1(\omega) = D_1(\omega)$  are  $(\omega, \frac{3\eta}{8}, T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega))$ -separated by Lemma 4.3. As a consequence of (4.52), for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , points in  $H_k(\omega)$  are  $(\omega, \frac{3\eta}{8}, T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega))$ -separated, i.e.

$$(4.54) \quad d_{\omega}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k} (z, z') > \frac{3\eta}{8}, \quad \forall z, z' \in H_k(\omega).$$

*Step 3. Construction of fiber Moran-like fractal  $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ .* For any  $k \geq 1$ , we let the  $k$ -th level of Moran-like fractal

$$(4.55) \quad \mathfrak{X}_k(\omega) = \bigcup_{x \in H_k(\omega)} \overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right),$$

where

$$\overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right) = \left\{ y \in M : d_{\omega}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k} (x, y) \leq \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right\}.$$

The structure the  $k$ -th level of Moran-like fractal is given in the next lemma, whose proof is placed in Sec. 5.3.

**Lemma 4.6.** *For every  $k \geq 1$ , the following statements hold*

- (1) *for any  $x, x' \in H_k(\omega), x \neq x'$ , we have  $\overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right) \cap \overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \left( \omega, x', \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right) = \emptyset$ .*
- (2) *if  $z = z(x, y) \in H_{k+1}(\omega)$  for  $x \in H_k(\omega)$  and  $y \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}} \omega)$ , then*

$$\overline{B}_{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)} \left( \omega, z, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \right) \subseteq \overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right).$$

*As a consequence,  $\mathfrak{X}_{k+1}(\omega) \subseteq \mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)$ .*

Finally, we define the Moran-like fractal to be

$$(4.56) \quad \mathfrak{X}(\omega) = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathfrak{X}_k(\omega).$$

By the compactness of  $M$ ,  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega)$  is a nonempty closed subset of  $M$ . The following lemma shows that the Moran-like fractal is a subset of the conditional level set of Birkhoff average, and its proof is given in Sec. 5.3.



**Lemma 4.7.** *The fiber fractal  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega) \subseteq K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega)$ , i.e., for any  $x \in \mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ , one has*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^k(\omega, x)) = \alpha.$$

**Remark 4.3.** *According to Remark 4.2 and the above proof, we can construct a fractal in  $K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega)$  for  $\alpha = \int \varphi d\mu_0$  for any  $\mu_0 \in I_{\Theta}(\Omega \times M)$  and  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . This indicates that  $L_{\varphi}$  coincides  $\{\int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_{\Theta}(\Omega \times M)\}$ .*

*Step 4. Construct probability measure concentrated on  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega)$  to apply the entropy distribution principle type argument.* For every  $k \geq 1$ , we define a probability measure  $\mu_{k, \omega} \in Pr(M)$  by

$$\mu_{k, \omega} = \frac{1}{\#H_k(\omega)} \sum_{x \in H_k(\omega)} \delta_x.$$

Since  $\mu_{k, \omega}$  is concentrated on  $H_k(\omega)$ , we have  $\mu_{k, \omega}(\mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)) = 1$  by construction (4.55). The proof of the following three lemmas are given in Sec. 5.3.

**Lemma 4.8.** *For any continuous function  $\psi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the following limit exists*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_M \psi(x) d\mu_{k, \omega}(x).$$

By the Riesz representation theorem, there exists some  $\mu_{\omega} \in Pr(M)$  such that

$$\int \psi d\mu_{\omega} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int \psi d\mu_{k, \omega}, \forall \psi \in C(M).$$

**Lemma 4.9.**  $\mu_{\omega}(\mathfrak{X}(\omega)) = 1$ .

We note that  $\omega$  is fixed at the beginning of this proof. We use notation  $\mu_{\omega}$  to denote that this measure is concentrated on  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega)$  rather than a random probability measure.

Now, with the help of the following Lemma 4.10, we can apply the entropy distribution principle type argument.

**Lemma 4.10.** *There exists  $N(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for any  $n \geq N(\omega)$ ,*

$$\text{if } B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right) \cap \mathfrak{X}(\omega) \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } \mu_{\omega}\left(B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right) \leq e^{-n(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)}.$$

*Recall that  $\mu_0$  is the measure in (4.34).*

Let  $\Gamma_{\omega}^{\eta/2^4} = \{B_{n_i}(\omega, x_i, \frac{\eta}{2^4})\}_i$  be any finite cover of  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega)$  with  $\min\{n_i\} \geq N(\omega)$  as in Lemma 4.10. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $B_{n_i}(\omega, x_i, \frac{\eta}{2^4}) \cap \mathfrak{X}(\omega) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $i$ . It follows by Lemma 4.10 that

$$\sum_i e^{-n_i(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)} \geq \sum_i \mu_{\omega}\left(B_{n_i}\left(\omega, x_i, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right) \geq \mu_{\omega}(\mathfrak{X}(\omega)) = 1 > 0.$$

Therefore by definition (1.1) and (1.2),

$$m(\mathfrak{X}(\omega), h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma, \omega, \frac{\eta}{2^4}) \geq \inf_{\Gamma_{\omega}^{\eta/2^4}} \sum_i e^{-n_i(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)} \geq 1 > 0.$$

Hence, by definition (1.3), we have

$$h_{top}(F, \mathfrak{X}(\omega), \omega, \frac{\eta}{2^4}) \geq h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma.$$

By Lemma 1.1 and Lemma 4.7, we obtain

$$(4.57) \quad h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma \leq \sup_{\epsilon > 0} h_{top}(F, \mathfrak{X}(\omega), \omega, \epsilon) = h_{top}(F, \mathfrak{X}(\omega), \omega) \leq h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega).$$

We have showed that (4.57) holds for arbitrary  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}_\gamma$ , i.e., (4.35) holds. We note that  $P(\tilde{\Omega}_\gamma) = 1$  since  $\tilde{\Omega}_\gamma$  is the intersection of countable  $P$ -full measure set. Finally, we pick a countable sequence  $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0$ , and let  $\Omega' = \cap_k \tilde{\Omega}_{\gamma_k}$ . It follows that  $P(\Omega') = 1$ , and for any  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,

$$h_{top}(F, K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega), \omega) \geq h_{\mu_0}(F) = \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\}.$$

The proof of Theorem B is complete.

**4.3. Proof of Theorem C.** We first prove (1.7). For any given  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , we notice that for any  $q \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\} \\ &= \sup\{h_\mu(F) + \int q\varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\} - q\alpha \\ &\leq \sup\{h_\mu(F) + \int q\varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)\} - q\alpha \\ &= \pi_{F, \varphi}(q) - q\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$(4.58) \quad \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\} \leq \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}} \{\pi_{F, \varphi}(q) - q\alpha\} = \pi_{F, \varphi}^*(\alpha).$$

Then (1.7) is a consequence of (4.58) and Theorem B.

Now, for any  $\alpha \in \text{int}(L_\varphi) = \text{int}\{\int \varphi d\mu : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)\}$ , by Lemma 3.9, there exists  $q^* \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu^* \in ES_{q^* \varphi}$  such that  $\alpha = \int \varphi d\mu^*$ . Therefore,

$$(4.59) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\} &\geq h_{\mu^*}(F) \\ &= h_{\mu^*}(F) + \int q^* \varphi d\mu^* - q^* \alpha \\ &= \pi_{F, \varphi}(q^*) - q^* \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.59) and (4.58), we obtain for any  $\alpha \in \text{int}(L_\varphi)$ ,

$$(4.60) \quad \sup\{h_\mu(F) : \mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)\} = \pi_{F, \varphi}^*(\alpha).$$

Then (1.8) is a consequence of (4.60) and Theorem B.

**4.4. Proof of Corollary 1.** In this proof, we need to verify that any Hölder potential  $\varphi$  and our system satisfy conditions of [16, Theorem 3.9], and compute positive constants  $A_\epsilon, B_\epsilon$  following [16]. To coincide with the form in [16], we denote  $\epsilon = c\eta$  for some  $c \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ .

For any Hölder continuous function  $\varphi : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we need to verify whether  $\varphi \in V^\pm(F)$  as in the statement of Theorem 3.9 in [16].  $\varphi$  is automatically measurable on  $(\omega, x)$  and continuous on  $x$ , and

$$\int_\Omega \sup_{x \in M} |\varphi(\omega, x)| dP(\omega) \leq \|\varphi\|_{C^0} < \infty.$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^-$ , we define the backward Bowen's metric  $d_\omega^{n-1}(x, y) = \max\{d_M(F_\omega^i(x), F_\omega^i(y)) : n \leq i \leq 0\}$  for  $x, y \in M$ . Now let us estimate

$$K_\varphi^+(\omega) = \sup\left\{\left|\sum_{i=0}^n \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \sum_{i=0}^n \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, y))\right| : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+, d_\omega^{n+1}(x, y) \leq \eta\right\},$$

$$K_\varphi^-(\omega) = \sup\left\{\left|\sum_{i=n}^0 \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \sum_{i=n}^0 \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, y))\right| : n \in \mathbb{Z}^-, d_\omega^{n-1}(x, y) \leq \eta\right\}.$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is a fiber-expansive constant in Lemma 3.3. We estimate  $K_\varphi^+(\omega)$  first, and one can compute  $K_\varphi^-(\omega)$  similarly. For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote

$$\text{var}_m(\varphi, F, \omega) = \sup\{|\varphi(\omega, x) - \varphi(\omega, y)| : d_M(F_\omega^i(x), F_\omega^i(y)) \leq \eta \text{ for all } |i| \leq m\}.$$

Exactly same proof as Lemma 3.6 in [17] implies that there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$(4.61) \quad \text{if } d_M(F_\omega^i(x), F_\omega^i(y)) \leq \eta \text{ for all } |i| \leq m, \text{ then } d_M(x, y) \leq Ce^{-m\lambda}.$$

Therefore,  $\text{var}_m(\varphi, F, \omega) \leq C'e^{-m\lambda r}$  for some positive constant  $C'$  uniformly for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , where  $r > 0$  is the Hölder exponent of  $\varphi$ . Then for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$K := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \text{var}_m(\varphi, F, \omega) < \infty.$$

Now if  $d_\omega^{n+1}(x, y) \leq \eta$ , and  $0 \leq k \leq n$ , then  $d_M(F_{\theta^k \omega}^j(F_\omega^k(x)), F_{\theta^k \omega}^j(F_\omega^k(y))) \leq \eta$  for  $|j| \leq m_k := \min\{k, n - k\}$  and  $|\varphi(\Theta^k(\omega, x)) - \varphi(\Theta^k(\omega, y))| \leq \text{var}_{m_k}(\varphi, F, \theta^k \omega)$ . Thus

$$\left|\sum_{i=0}^n \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \sum_{i=0}^n \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, y))\right| \leq 2 \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \text{var}_m(\varphi, F, \omega) \leq 2K < \infty.$$

As a consequence,

$$(4.62) \quad \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \max\{K_\varphi^+(\omega), K_\varphi^-(\omega)\} \leq 2K < \infty.$$

Therefore,  $\varphi \in V^\pm(F)$  by directly checking the definition of  $V^\pm(F)$  on P.96 of [16].

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define the following metric

$$d_\omega^{\pm n}(x, y) = \max_{-n \leq i < n} \{d_M(F_\omega^i(x), F_\omega^i(y))\} \text{ for } x, y \in M.$$

By (4.61), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \sup\{d_M(x, y) : d_{\theta^n \omega}^{\pm \lfloor \frac{|n|}{2} \rfloor}(x, y) \leq \eta\} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} Ce^{-\lfloor \frac{|n|}{2} \rfloor \lambda} / \eta = 0,$$

which implies the strong expansivity of RDS  $F$  as Definition 2.4 in [16].

Remark 3.1 and Theorem A imply that the RDS  $F$  satisfies specification with  $L_c$  independent of  $k$  and  $\omega$ . Combining with (4.62), we obtain the equation (3.15) in the statement of Theorem 3.9 in [16]. Hence, the unique equilibrium state exists and it has the Gibbs property.

Next, we estimate  $A_\epsilon$  and  $B_\epsilon$  in (1.10). The definition of the following quantity can be found in [16, Section 2]. Define

$$\beta(\omega) = \sup\{\delta > 0 : d_\omega^{\pm L(\frac{1}{2}c\eta)}(x, y) \leq \alpha_{L(\frac{1}{2}c\eta)}^{(2c\eta)} \text{ provided } d_M(x, y) \leq \delta\},$$

where  $L(\frac{1}{2}c\eta)$  is given in Lemma 3.4, and

$$\alpha_{L(\frac{1}{2}c\eta)}^{(2c\eta)} = \inf_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup \{d_M(x, y) : d_\omega^{\pm L(\frac{1}{2}c\eta)}(x, y) \leq 2c\eta\} > 0$$

by the continuity of  $F_\omega$  on  $\omega$ . Again, by the continuity of  $F_\omega$  on  $\omega$ ,  $\beta := \inf_{\omega \in \Omega} \beta(\omega) > 0$ . By Definition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 in [16], the unique equilibrium state has Gibbs property

$$A_\epsilon := e^{-8K}(D_c)^{-2} \leq \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \cdot \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) \cdot e^{-S_n\varphi(\omega, x)} \leq B_\epsilon := e^{8K}(D_c)^2 D^{(1)} D^{(2)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_c &= (N_M(2c\eta))^{2L_c} e^{2K} \exp(2L_c \|\varphi\|_{C^0}); \\ D^{(1)} &= N_M(\beta), \quad D^{(2)} = e^{4K} N_M(\beta), \end{aligned}$$

and  $N_M(\beta)$  (resp.  $N_M(2c\eta)$ ) is the minimal number of open balls of diameter  $\beta$  (resp.  $2c\eta$ ) covering  $M$ .

**4.5. Proof of Corollary 2.** For any Hölder potential  $\varphi$ , let  $\mu = \mu_\varphi$  be the equilibrium state given in Corollary 1. As a consequence of Corollary 1, for any  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ , there exist positive constants  $A_\epsilon, B_\epsilon$  such that for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$(4.63) \quad A_\epsilon \leq \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \cdot \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) \cdot e^{-\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x))} \leq B_\epsilon \text{ for all } x \in M.$$

On the one hand, (4.63) implies that for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$  and any  $x \in M$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) &\geq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) &\leq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)), \end{aligned}$$

Taking Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 1.5 into account, we have

$$\underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) \geq \pi_F(\varphi) - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x));$$

and

$$\bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) \leq \pi_F(\varphi) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)).$$

Therefore,  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x))$  implies  $\underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) = \bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x)$ . On the other hand, (4.63) also implies that for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$  and any  $x \in M$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) &\geq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) + \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) &\leq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) + \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \pi_F(\varphi)(\omega, \epsilon, n) - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mu_\omega(B_n(\omega, x, \epsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

Taking Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 1.5 into account, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) \geq \pi_F(\varphi) - \bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) \leq \pi_F(\varphi) - \underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x).$$

Then  $\underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) = \bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x)$  implies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x))$  exists. In a word, for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , any  $x \in M$

$$(4.64) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) \text{ iff } \underline{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x) = \bar{h}_\mu(F; \omega, x).$$

Notice that  $\mu$  is an ergodic measure by Corollary 1, therefore by Birkhoff ergodic theorem and Lemma 1.5, for  $\mu$ -a.s.  $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M$ , one has

$$h_\mu(F) = \pi_F(\varphi) - \int \varphi d\mu.$$

The left statements are just corollary of (4.64), Theorem B and Theorem C. The proof of Corollary 2 is complete.

## 5. PROOF OF LEMMAS

Proof of all lemmas are collected in this section.

### 5.1. Proof of Lemmas in section 1.

*Proof of Lemma 1.1.* For any  $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2 > 0$ , let  $\Gamma_\omega^{\epsilon_2} = \{B_{n_i}(\omega, x_i, \epsilon_2)\}$  be any finite or countable covering of  $Z$  with  $\min\{n_i\} \geq N$ . By using same  $\{n_i\}$  and  $\{x_i\}$  in  $\Gamma_\omega^{\epsilon_2}$ , then  $\tilde{\Gamma}_\omega^{\epsilon_1} = \{B_{n_i}(\omega, x_i, \epsilon_1)\}$  is also a cover of  $Z$ , which implies  $m(Z, s, \omega, N, \epsilon_1) \leq m(Z, s, \omega, N, \epsilon_2)$ . Let  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain that  $m(Z, s, \omega, \epsilon_1) \leq m(Z, s, \omega, \epsilon_2)$ , which implies  $h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon_1) \leq h_{top}(F, Z, \omega, \epsilon_2)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.3.* Note that  $\Omega_\alpha = \{\omega \in \Omega : K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega) \neq \emptyset\} = \pi_\Omega(K_{\varphi, \alpha})$ , where  $\pi_\Omega : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \Omega$  is the projection to the first coordinate. According to the Projection theorem (see [9, Theorem 2.12]) and the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega)$  on  $\Omega$  is complete with respect to  $P$  (see section 1.2),  $\pi_\Omega(K_{\varphi, \alpha})$  is  $\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega)$ -measurable. Therefore,  $\Omega_\alpha$  is measurable. Since  $K_{\varphi, \alpha}$  is  $\Theta$ -invariant,  $\Omega_\alpha$  is  $\theta$ -invariant. By ergodicity, either  $P(\Omega_\alpha) = 1$  or  $P(\Omega_\alpha) = 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.4.* For  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , then by definition,  $K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega) \neq \emptyset$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_\alpha$  with  $P(\Omega_\alpha) = 1$ . Pick any  $\omega_0 \in \Omega_\alpha$  and  $x_0 \in K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega_0)$ , we consider the following sequence of measures:

$$\delta_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{\Theta^i(\omega_0, x_0)} \in Pr(\Omega \times M).$$

By the compactness of  $Pr(\Omega \times M)$  with respect to the weak\* topology,  $\delta_n$  has a weak\* convergent subsequence  $\{\delta_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converging to a measure in  $Pr(\Omega \times M)$ , named  $\mu$ . It is clear that  $\mu$  is  $\Theta$ -invariant. Hence  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ . On the one hand, by the definition of weak\* topology, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} \int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi(\omega, x) d\delta_{\Theta^i(\omega_0, x_0)} = \int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi(\omega, x) d\mu(\omega, x).$$

On the other hand, notice that  $(\omega_0, x_0) \in K_{\varphi,\alpha}(\omega_0)$ , we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} \int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi(\omega, x) d\delta_{\Theta^i(\omega_0, x_0)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega_0, x_0)) = \alpha.$$

Therefore,  $\mu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)$ . Hence,  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha) \neq \emptyset$  for  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ . It is clear that  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M, \varphi, \alpha)$  is convex and closed.

By Birkhoff ergodic theorem, for any  $\mu \in I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$ , i.e. ergodic  $\Theta$ -invariant measure, we have  $\int \varphi d\mu \in L_\varphi$ . Note that  $I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$  are exactly the extremal points of  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$ . Since  $I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$  is compact,  $I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$  is nonempty, and therefore,  $L_\varphi$  is nonempty. We note that  $L_\varphi \subset [-\|\varphi\|_{C^0}, \|\varphi\|_{C^0}]$ , hence bounded.  $\square$

## 5.2. Proof of Lemmas in section 3.

*Proof of Lemma 3.6.* Given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , we first prove that  $\omega \mapsto S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta)$  is  $\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega)$ -measurable. For any integer  $L \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , we notice that following fact

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta) \leq L\} = Pr_\Omega\{(\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L) : \mu_\omega(\cup_{i=1}^L B_n(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)) \geq 1 - \delta\},$$

where  $Pr_\Omega : \Omega \times M^L \rightarrow \Omega$  is the projection to the first coordinate. Once

$$\{(\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L) : \mu_\omega(\cup_{i=1}^L B_n(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)) \geq 1 - \delta\} \in \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{B}(M^L),$$

then  $\{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta) \leq L\}$  is  $\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega)$ -measurable by the Projection theorem (see, e.g., [9, Theorem 2.12]). Therefore, we need to show the measurability of

$$(5.1) \quad (\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L) \mapsto \mu_\omega(\cup_{i=1}^L B_n(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)) = \int_M 1_{\cup_{i=1}^L B_n(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)}(y) d\mu_\omega(y).$$

We use the same strategy as the proof of Proposition 3.3 (i) in [9]. Put

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ h : \Omega \times M^{L+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : h \text{ bounded and measurable, and } (\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L) \mapsto \int_M h(\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L, y) d\mu_\omega(y) \text{ is measurable} \right\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{H}$  is a vector space. For any set  $D = A \times B_1 \times \dots \times B_{L+1} \in \mathcal{B}_P(\Omega) \times \mathcal{B}(M)^{L+1}$ , we have

$$(5.2) \quad (\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L) \mapsto \int_M 1_D(\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L, y) d\mu_\omega(y) = 1_A(\omega) \cdot 1_{B_1}(x_1) \cdots 1_{B_L}(x_L) \cdot \mu_\omega(B_{L+1}).$$

Note that  $\omega \mapsto \mu_\omega(B_{L+1})$  is measurable by Definition 3.1 and Proposition 3.6 in [9]. Therefore, the mapping (5.2) is measurable. If  $0 \leq h_n \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $h_n \uparrow h$  for some bounded  $h$ , then  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  by monotone convergence theorem. By a monotone class argument,  $\mathcal{H}$  contains all bounded  $\sigma(\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega) \times$

$\mathcal{B}(M)^{L+1}$ -measurable functions, and therefore, the function  $(\omega, x_1, \dots, x_L, y) \mapsto 1_{\cup_{i=1}^L B_n(\omega, x_i, \epsilon)}(y)$  lies in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Hence, (5.1) is measurable.

In the left, we prove the third and fourth equalities of (3.3) for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Since the value  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta)$  do not decrease as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , by the first and second equalities of (3.3), which can be found in [42, Theorem 3.1] and [24, Theorem A] respectively, one has

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(F) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon, \delta) \\ &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \eta, \delta) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \eta, \delta) \end{aligned}$$

for  $P$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Next, we prove another direction. Pick any countable sequence  $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ , then

$$h_\mu(F) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon_k, \delta)$$

$P$ -a.s.. Note that  $\omega \mapsto \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon_k, \delta)$  is measurable for any given  $k$ . By Egorov's theorem, for any  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a measurable set  $\Omega_\zeta \subset \Omega$  with  $P(\Omega_\zeta) > 1 - \zeta$  such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon_k, \delta) \rightarrow h_\mu(F) \text{ uniformly for all } \omega \in \Omega_\zeta \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

By using Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, there exists a  $P$ -full measure set  $\Omega' \subset \Omega$  such that

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\Omega_\zeta}(\theta^i \omega) = P(\Omega_\zeta) \geq 1 - \zeta \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega'.$$

Besides, since  $\mu \in I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$ , then there exists a  $\theta$ -invariant  $P$ -full measure set  $\Omega_\mu \subset \Omega$  such that

$$(5.4) \quad (F_\omega)_* \mu_\omega = \mu_{\theta\omega}, \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega_\mu.$$

It is sufficient to show that for any  $\gamma > 0$ ,

$$(5.5) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega^*, n, \eta, \delta) \geq h_\mu(F) - \gamma, \text{ for all } \omega^* \in \Omega' \cap \Omega_\mu.$$

From now on, we fix any  $\omega^* \in \Omega' \cap \Omega_\mu$ . By uniform convergence on  $\Omega_\zeta$ , we pick  $N$  large enough such that

$$(5.6) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega, n, \epsilon_N, \delta) \geq h_\mu(F) - \gamma \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega_\zeta.$$

By Lemma 3.4, there exists  $L(\epsilon_N) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $k \geq L(\epsilon_N)$ , if  $\max_{|n| \leq k} d_M(F_\omega^n(x), F_\omega^n(y)) \leq \eta$ , then  $d_M(x, y) < \epsilon_N$ . By (5.3), we can pick  $k > L(\epsilon_N)$  such that  $\theta^k \omega^* \in \Omega_\zeta$ , then (5.6) implies that

$$(5.7) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\theta^k \omega^*, n, \epsilon_N, \delta) \geq h_\mu(F) - \gamma.$$

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we pick any Bowen balls  $\{B_{n+2k}(\omega^*, x_i, \eta)\}_{i \in I}$ , which covers a set of  $\mu_{\omega^*}$  measure at least  $1 - \delta$ , i.e., there exists  $A \subset \cup_{i \in I} B_{n+2k}(\omega^*, x_i, \eta)$  and  $\mu_{\omega^*}(A) \geq 1 - \delta$ . Then it must have that  $\{B_n(\theta^k \omega^*, F_{\omega^*}^k(x_i), \epsilon_N)\}_{i \in I}$  covers  $F_{\omega^*}^k A$ . In fact, for any  $y \in A$ , there exists  $x_i$  such that  $d_{\omega^*}^{n+2k}(y, x_i) < \eta$ . Therefore, by the choice of  $k > L(\epsilon_N)$  and Lemma 3.4, one has  $d_{\theta^k \omega^*}^n(F_{\omega^*}^k(y), F_{\omega^*}^k(x_i)) < \epsilon_N$ . Now by (5.4), one has  $\mu_{\theta^k \omega^*}(F_{\omega^*}^k A) = \mu_{\omega^*}(A) \geq 1 - \delta$ . By the definition of  $S(\theta^k \omega^*, n, \epsilon_N, \delta)$ , one has

$$S(\theta^k \omega^*, n, \epsilon_N, \delta) \leq S(\omega^*, n + 2k, \eta, \delta) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Taking log, dividing by  $n$  and sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\omega^*, n, \eta, \delta) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(\theta^k \omega^*, n, \epsilon_N, \delta) \stackrel{(5.7)}{\geq} h_\mu(F) - \gamma,$$

i.e., (5.5) is proved.  $\square$

### 5.3. Proof of Lemmas in section 4.

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* For  $\alpha \in L_\varphi$ , we first show that  $\omega \mapsto M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  is measurable for each fixed  $\delta, \epsilon > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that  $M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) \geq 1$ , we only need to check the measurability of  $\{\omega : M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) \geq l\}$  for  $l \geq 2$ . For any integer  $l \geq 2$ , we let

$$\begin{aligned} P^l(\alpha, \delta, n) &= \{(\omega, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l) \in \Omega \times M^l : x_1, \dots, x_l \in P(\alpha, \delta, n, \omega)\}, \\ &= \left\{ (\omega, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l) \in \Omega \times M^l : \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x_i)) - \alpha \right| \right\} < \delta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $P^l(\alpha, \delta, n)$  is Borel measurable subset of  $\Omega \times M^l$ . It is clear that

$$E_l^{n, \epsilon} := \{(\omega, x_1, \dots, x_l) \in \Omega \times M^l \mid d_\omega^n(x_i, x_j) > \epsilon \text{ if } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq l\}$$

is Borel measurable subset of  $\Omega \times M^l$ . By the definition of  $M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$ , we have

$$\{\omega : M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega) \geq l\} = Pr_\Omega(P^l(\alpha, \delta, n) \cap E_l^{n, \epsilon}),$$

where  $Pr_\Omega : \Omega \times M^l \rightarrow \Omega$  is the projection to the first coordinate. By the Projection theorem (see, e.g., [9, Theorem 2.12]) and the completion of  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_P(\Omega)$ ,  $Pr_\Omega(P^l(\alpha, \delta, n) \cap E_l^{n, \epsilon})$  is measurable. Therefore,  $\omega \mapsto M(\alpha, \delta, n, \epsilon, \omega)$  is measurable.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* Fix any  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$  such that  $0 < \gamma < \min\{1, \frac{1}{10}h_{\mu_0}(F)\}$  and  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2} \min\{\gamma, \eta\}$ .

Step 1, we construct  $\Omega_\delta$  in the statement of Lemma 4.2. By using Lemma 3.5, we can approximate  $\mu_0$  by an  $\Theta$ -invariant measure  $\nu$  in the following sense: there exist  $\nu \in I_\Theta(\Omega \times M)$  satisfying

- (1)  $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \nu_i$ , where  $\lambda_i > 0$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = 1$  and  $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^k \in I_\Theta^e(\Omega \times M)$ ;
- (2)  $h_\nu(f) \geq h_{\mu_0}(f) - \delta$ ;
- (3)  $|\int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi d\mu_0 - \int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi d\nu| = |\alpha - \int_{\Omega \times M} \varphi d\nu| < \delta$ .

Since  $\nu_i$  is ergodic for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , the following set has  $\nu_i$ -full measure

$$\left\{ (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) = \int \varphi d\nu_i \right\}.$$

By measure disintegration, there exists a  $P$ -full measure set  $\Omega_{\nu_i}$  and for  $\omega \in \Omega_{\nu_i}$ , we have

$$(\nu_i)_\omega \left( \left\{ x \in M : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) = \int \varphi d\nu_i \right\} \right) = 1.$$

Therefore, for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , the following sequence of measurable functions

$$g_N^i(\omega) = (\nu_i)_\omega \left( \left\{ x \in M : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \int \varphi d\nu_i \right| < \delta, \forall n \geq N \right\} \right) \rightarrow 1$$

pointwisely for all  $\omega \in \cap_{i=1}^k \Omega_{\nu_i}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . By using Egorov's theorem, for any  $\xi > 0$  sufficiently small such that

$$(5.8) \quad \xi \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\delta}{4(\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 1)}, \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 - \frac{h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma}{h_{\mu_0}(F) - 3\gamma} \right) \right\},$$



there exists a measurable set  $\Omega^1 \subset \cap_{i=1}^k \Omega_{\nu_i}$  satisfying  $P(\Omega^1) \geq 1 - \xi/3$  and  $g_N^i(\omega) \rightarrow 1$  uniformly for all  $\omega \in \Omega^1$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . We pick  $N_i^1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$g_n^i(\omega) \geq 1 - \gamma, \quad \forall n \geq N_i^1 \text{ and } \forall \omega \in \Omega^1.$$

By Lemma 3.6, for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , we have

$$h_{\nu_i}(F) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S_i(\omega, n, \eta, \gamma) \text{ for } P - a.s. \omega \in \Omega,$$

where  $S_i(\omega, n, \eta, \gamma)$  is the minimal cardinality of any  $(\omega, \eta, n)$ -spanning set which covers a set with  $(\nu_i)_\omega$ -measure at least  $1 - \gamma$ . Using Egorov's theorem again, one can find a set  $\Omega^2 \subset \Omega^1$  with  $P(\Omega^2) \geq 1 - 2\xi/3$  and

$$\frac{1}{n} \log S_i(\omega, n, \eta, \gamma) \rightarrow h_{\nu_i}(F) \text{ uniformly for } \omega \in \Omega^2 \text{ and for all } i \in \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

We pick  $N_i^2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(5.9) \quad S_i(\omega, n, \eta, \gamma) \geq e^{n(h_{\nu_i}(F) - \gamma)} \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega^2, i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \text{ and } n \geq N_i^2.$$

We denote  $N_i = \max\{N_i^1, N_i^2\}$ . For  $\omega \in \Omega^2$ , we note that

$$(5.10) \quad g_n^i(\omega) \geq 1 - \gamma, \quad \forall n \geq N_i,$$

therefore

$$(5.11) \quad \left\{ x \in M : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \int \varphi d\nu_i \right| < \delta, \forall n \geq N_i \right\} \neq \emptyset.$$

**Remark 5.1.** For any  $\omega \in \Omega^2$ , as long as  $n \geq N_i$ , let  $C(\omega, n, \eta)$  be some maximal  $(\omega, \eta, n)$ -separated set in  $\{x \in M : |\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \int \varphi d\nu_i| < \delta, \forall n \geq N_i\}$  with largest cardinality, then by (5.10) and the definition of  $S_i(\omega, n, \eta, \gamma)$ , we have

$$(5.12) \quad \#C(\omega, n, \eta) \geq S_i(\omega, n, \eta, \gamma) \stackrel{(5.9)}{\geq} e^{n(h_{\nu_i}(F) - \gamma)}, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega^2.$$

Now by Birkhoff's Ergodic theorem, there exists a  $P$ -full measure set  $\Omega_\delta$ , such that for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\delta$ , we have

$$(5.13) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\Omega^2}(\theta^i \omega) = P(\Omega^2) \geq 1 - \frac{2}{3}\xi.$$

In the following, we show Lemma 4.2 holds for all  $\omega \in \Omega_\delta$ .

Step 2, we construct  $\hat{n} : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . For any  $\omega \in \Omega_\delta$ , let  $N_3(\omega) \geq 1$  be the first integer such that for any  $n \geq N_3(\omega)$

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\Omega^2}(\theta^i \omega) \geq 1 - \xi.$$

Then  $N_3 : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is measurable by noticing the following fact that for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : N_3(\omega) = j\} \\ &= \left( \bigcap_{n \geq j} \left\{ \omega \in \Omega_\delta : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\Omega^2}(\theta^i \omega) \geq 1 - \xi \right\} \right) \cap \left\{ \omega \in \Omega_\delta : \frac{1}{j-1} \sum_{i=0}^{j-2} 1_{\Omega^2}(\theta^i \omega) < 1 - \xi \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By continuity of  $\varphi : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we can pick  $\epsilon \in (0, \delta/2)$  such that

$$(5.15) \quad \text{if } d_M(x, y) < \epsilon, \text{ then } |\varphi(\omega, x) - \varphi(\omega, y)| < \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

By Theorem A, let  $m = m(\epsilon/4)$  to be the space in the fiber specification property corresponding to  $\epsilon/4$ , i.e., one can find a point  $(\omega, \epsilon/4)$ -shadowing any  $m(\epsilon/4)$ -spaced  $\omega$ -specification. Besides, we can choose a sufficiently large integer  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for any  $n \geq N_0$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,

$$(5.16) \quad n_i = [\lambda_i n] \geq N_i, \text{ and } \frac{(k-1)m(\frac{\epsilon}{4})}{n} \leq \xi.$$

where  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^k$  are given at the beginning of proof and  $[\lambda_i n]$  denotes the largest integer less than or equal to  $\lambda_i n$ .

Pick  $N_4(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $n \geq N_4(\delta)$ , one has

$$(5.17) \quad \left| n - \sum_{i=1}^k [\lambda_i n] \right| \leq \frac{\delta}{2(\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 1)} n.$$

We let

$$(5.18) \quad \bar{n}(\omega) = \max\{N_3(\omega), N_0, N_4(\delta)\} \text{ for } \omega \in \Omega_\delta.$$

Then  $\bar{n} : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is measurable since  $N_3(\omega)$  is measurable. Denote  $\bar{n}_i(\cdot) = [\lambda_i \bar{n}(\cdot)] : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  for  $i = \{1, \dots, k\}$ , which is also measurable.

For any  $\omega \in \Omega_\delta$ , let  $l_1(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that

$$\theta^i \omega \in \Omega^2,$$

such  $i$  exists due to (5.13). Denote  $l'_0(\omega) = 0$ , and let

$$l'_1(\omega) = l'_0(\omega) + l_1(\omega) + \bar{n}_1(\omega) + m(\epsilon/4).$$

For  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-2\}$ , once  $l'_j(\omega)$  is defined, let  $l_{j+1}(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that  $\theta^{l'_j(\omega)+i} \omega \in \Omega^2$ , and denote

$$l'_{j+1}(\omega) = l'_j(\omega) + l_{j+1}(\omega) + \bar{n}_{j+1}(\omega) + m(\epsilon/4).$$

Finally, let  $l_k(\omega)$  be the first integer  $i \geq 0$  such that  $\theta^{l'_{k-1}(\omega)+i} \omega \in \Omega^2$ , and denote

$$(5.19) \quad \hat{n}(\omega) = l'_{k-1}(\omega) + l_k(\omega) + \bar{n}_k(\omega).$$

We note that  $\hat{n}(\omega) \geq \bar{n}(\omega)$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_\delta$  by construction. Note that in orbits  $\{\omega, \theta\omega, \dots, \theta^{\hat{n}(\omega)-1}\omega\}$ , there are at least  $l_1(\omega) + \dots + l_k(\omega)$  points not lying in  $\Omega^2$ . By (5.14) and (5.18), we have

$$(5.20) \quad \frac{l_1(\omega) + \dots + l_k(\omega)}{\hat{n}(\omega)} \leq \xi.$$

Last step, for any  $\omega \in \Omega_\delta$ , we construct  $(\omega, \eta/2, \hat{n}(\omega))$ -separated set in  $P(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \omega)$  satisfying (4.36) by using orbit gluing technique. By the construction of  $l_i(\omega)$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)} \omega \in \Omega^2$ . By Remark 5.1 and  $\bar{n}_i(\omega) \geq N_i$ ,  $C(\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)} \omega, \bar{n}_i(\omega), \eta)$  is a maximal  $(\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)} \omega, \eta, \bar{n}_i(\omega))$ -separated set in the deviation set

$$\left\{ x \in M : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)} \omega, x)) - \int \varphi d\nu_i \right| < \delta, \forall n \geq N_i \right\}$$

satisfying that  $\#C(\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega, \bar{n}_i(\omega), \eta) \geq e^{\bar{n}_i(\omega)(h_{\nu_i}(F)-\gamma)}$ . For every  $k$ -tuple  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  with  $x_i \in C(\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega, \bar{n}_i(\omega), \eta)$ , by Theorem A, there is a point  $y = y(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in M$ , which is  $(\omega, \epsilon/4)$ -shadowing the pieces of orbits

$$\{x_1, F_{\theta^{l_1(\omega)}\omega}(x_1), \dots, F_{\theta^{l_1(\omega)}\omega}^{\bar{n}_1(\omega)-1}(x_1)\}, \dots, \{x_k, F_{\theta^{l'_{k-1}(\omega)+l_k(\omega)}\omega}(x_k), \dots, F_{\theta^{l'_{k-1}(\omega)+l_k(\omega)}\omega}^{\bar{n}_k(\omega)-1}(x_k)\}$$

with gaps  $m(\epsilon/4) + l_2(\omega), \dots, m(\epsilon/4) + l_k(\omega)$ , i.e.,

$$(5.21) \quad d_{\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega}^{\bar{n}_i(\omega)}(x_i, F_{\omega}^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}(y)) < \frac{\epsilon}{4} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k.$$

For different tuples  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ ,  $(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$  with  $x_i, x'_i \in C(\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega, \bar{n}_i(\omega), \eta)$ , we claim that

$$(5.22) \quad d_{\omega}^{\hat{n}(\omega)}(y(x_1, \dots, x_k), y(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)) > \eta - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \times 2 = \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

In fact, if  $x_i \neq x'_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , and denote  $y_1 = y(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ ,  $y_2 = y(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\omega}^{\hat{n}(\omega)}(y(x_1, \dots, x_k), y(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)) \\ & \geq d_{\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega}^{\bar{n}_i(\omega)}(x_i, x'_i) - d_{\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega}^{\bar{n}_i(\omega)}(x_i, F_{\omega}^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}(y_1)) - d_{\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega}^{\bar{n}_i(\omega)}(x'_i, F_{\omega}^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}(y_2)) \\ & \stackrel{(5.21)}{>} \eta - \frac{\epsilon}{4} - \frac{\epsilon}{4} = \frac{\eta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

We also claim that

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{y = y(x_1, \dots, x_k) : x_i \in C(\theta^{l'_{i-1}(\omega)+l_i(\omega)}\omega, \bar{n}_i(\omega), \eta), i = 1, \dots, k\} \\ & \subset P(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \omega) = \left\{ x \in M : \left| \frac{1}{\hat{n}(\omega)} \sum_{i=0}^{\hat{n}(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \alpha \right| < 4\delta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we prove (5.23) for any fixed  $\omega \in \Omega_{\delta}$ . Since  $\omega$  is fixed, we omit  $\omega$  in  $l_i(\omega)$ ,  $l'_i(\omega)$ ,  $\hat{n}(\omega)$  and  $\bar{n}_i(\omega)$  for short. On interval  $\cup_{i=1}^k [l'_{i-1} + l_i, l'_{i-1} + l_i + \bar{n}_i - 1]$ , we use shadowing property (5.21) and triangle inequality; while on other intervals, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \# \left( [0, \hat{n} - 1] \setminus \cup_{i=1}^k [l'_{i-1} + l_i, l'_{i-1} + l_i + \bar{n}_i - 1] \right) \\ & = \# \left( \left( \cup_{i=1}^k [l'_{i-1}, l'_{i-1} + l_i - 1] \right) \cup \left( \cup_{i=1}^{k-1} [l'_{i-1} + l_i + \bar{n}_i, l'_{i-1} + l_i + \bar{n}_i + m(\frac{\epsilon}{4}) - 1] \right) \right) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^k l_i + (k-1)m(\frac{\epsilon}{4}), \end{aligned}$$

and we use inequality  $|\varphi - \alpha| \leq 2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{p=0}^{\hat{n}-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \hat{n}\alpha \right| \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \sum_{p=l'_{i-1}+l_i}^{l'_{i-1}+l_i+\bar{n}_i-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \bar{n}_i\alpha \right) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \sum_{p \in [0, \hat{n}-1] \setminus \cup_{i=1}^k [l'_{i-1}+l_i, l'_{i-1}+l_i+\bar{n}_i-1]} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \left( \sum_{i=1}^k l_i + (k-1)m(\frac{\epsilon}{4}) \right) \alpha \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \sum_{p=l'_{i-1}+l_i}^{l'_{i-1}+l_i+\bar{n}_i-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_i-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l'_{i-1}+l_i}\omega, x_i)) + \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_i-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l'_{i-1}+l_i}\omega, x_i)) - \bar{n}_i \int \varphi d\nu_i \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \bar{n}_i \int \varphi d\nu_i - \bar{n}_i \alpha \right) \right| + 2 \left( (l_1 + \dots + l_k) + (k-1)m\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
&\leq \left| \sum_{p=l_1}^{l_1+\bar{n}_1-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_1-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l_1}\omega, x_1)) \right| + \left| \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_1-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l_1}\omega, x_1)) - \bar{n}_1 \int \varphi d\nu_1 \right| + \dots \\
&+ \left| \sum_{p=l'_{k-1}+l_k}^{l'_{k-1}+l_k+\bar{n}_k-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_k-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l'_{k-1}+l_k}\omega, x_k)) \right| + \left| \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_k-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l'_{k-1}+l_k}\omega, x_k)) - \bar{n}_k \int \varphi d\nu_k \right| \\
&+ \left| \bar{n}_1 \int \varphi d\nu_1 + \dots + \bar{n}_k \int \varphi d\nu_k - (\bar{n}_1 + \dots + \bar{n}_k)\alpha \right| + 2 \left( (l_1 + \dots + l_k) + (k-1)m\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the shadowing property and (5.15), we have

$$(5.24) \quad \left| \sum_{p=l'_{j-1}+l_j}^{l'_{j-1}+l_j+\bar{n}_j-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_j-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l'_{j-1}+l_j}\omega, x_j)) \right| \leq \bar{n}_j \cdot \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

Besides, since  $\theta^{l'_{j-1}+l_j}\omega \in \Omega^2$  and  $x_j \in C(\theta^{l'_{j-1}+l_j}\omega, \bar{n}_j(\omega), \eta)$ , we have

$$(5.25) \quad \left| \sum_{p=0}^{\bar{n}_j-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\theta^{l'_{j-1}+l_j}\omega, x_j)) - \bar{n}_j \int \varphi d\nu_j \right| \leq \bar{n}_j \delta, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.26) \quad \left| \bar{n}_1 \int \varphi d\nu_1 + \dots + \bar{n}_k \int \varphi d\nu_k - (\bar{n}_1 + \dots + \bar{n}_k)\alpha \right| &\leq \left| \bar{n} \int \varphi d\nu - \bar{n}\alpha \right| + 2(\bar{n} - \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{n}_i) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
&\leq \bar{n}\delta + 2(\bar{n} - \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{n}_i) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
&\stackrel{(5.17)}{\leq} 2\bar{n}\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.20), (5.24), (5.25) and (5.26) together, we have

$$\left| \sum_{p=0}^{\hat{n}-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \hat{n}\alpha \right| \leq \hat{n} \cdot \frac{7\delta}{2} + 2\xi\hat{n}\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2(k-1)m\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right)\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$$

We conclude that

$$(5.27) \quad \frac{1}{\hat{n}} \left| \sum_{p=0}^{\hat{n}-1} \varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, y)) - \hat{n}\alpha \right| \leq \frac{7\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{4} + \frac{2(k-1)m\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right)}{\hat{n}} \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \leq 4\delta,$$

provided (5.8) and  $N_0$  in (5.18) sufficiently large satisfying

$$\frac{2(k-1)m\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right)}{n} \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}, \quad \forall n \geq N_0.$$

Therefore, (5.23) is proved.

Note that by (5.22), different  $y = y(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  are  $(\omega, \eta/2, \hat{n}(\omega))$  separated. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} M(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \omega) &\geq \#C(\theta''_0(\omega)+l_1(\omega)\omega, \bar{n}_1(\omega), \eta) \times \cdots \times \#C(\theta''_{k-1}(\omega)+l_k(\omega)\omega, \bar{n}_k(\omega), \eta) \\ &\stackrel{(5.12)}{\geq} \exp([\lambda_1 \bar{n}(\omega)](h_{\nu_1}(F) - \gamma) + \cdots + [\lambda_k \bar{n}(\omega)](h_{\nu_k}(F) - \gamma)) \\ &\geq \exp(\bar{n}(\omega)(h_\nu(F) - 2\gamma)) \\ &\geq \exp(\bar{n}(\omega)(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 3\gamma)), \end{aligned}$$

provided  $N_0$  in (5.18) sufficiently large satisfying

$$[\lambda_1 n](h_{\nu_1}(F) - \gamma) + \cdots + [\lambda_k n](h_{\nu_k}(F) - \gamma) \geq n(h_\nu(F) - 2\gamma), \quad \forall n \geq N_0.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\hat{n}(\omega)} \log M(\alpha, 4\delta, \hat{n}(\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \omega) &\geq \frac{\bar{n}(\omega)(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 3\gamma)}{\bar{n}_1(\omega) + \cdots + \bar{n}_k(\omega)} \cdot \frac{\bar{n}_1(\omega) + \cdots + \bar{n}_k(\omega)}{\hat{n}(\omega)} \\ &= \frac{\bar{n}(\omega)(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 3\gamma)}{\bar{n}_1(\omega) + \cdots + \bar{n}_k(\omega)} \cdot \frac{\hat{n}(\omega) - (l_1(\omega) + \cdots + l_k(\omega)) - (k-1)m(\frac{\epsilon}{4})}{\hat{n}(\omega)} \\ &\geq (h_{\mu_0}(F) - 3\gamma) \cdot \left( \frac{\hat{n}(\omega) - (l_1(\omega) + \cdots + l_k(\omega))}{\hat{n}(\omega)} - \frac{(k-1)m(\frac{\epsilon}{4})}{\hat{n}(\omega)} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(5.16), (5.20)}{\geq} (1 - 2\xi)(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 3\gamma) \\ &\stackrel{(5.8)}{\geq} h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., (4.36) is proved. It remains to show that  $\hat{n} = \hat{n}(\omega) : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is measurable. Notice that

$$\hat{n}(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^k l_i(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{n}_i(\omega) + (k-1)m\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right),$$

and we already showed the measurability of  $\bar{n}_i : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, it suffices to prove that  $l_i : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is measurable. For  $i = 1$ , notice that for any  $k \geq 1$ , we have

$$\{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : l_1(\omega) = k\} = \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^k \omega \in \Omega^2\} \cap (\cap_{i=0}^{k-1} \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^i \omega \notin \Omega^2\})$$

hence  $l_1 : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is measurable. It follows that  $l'_1 = l_1 + \bar{n}_1 + m(\frac{\epsilon}{4}) : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is measurable. Once the measurability of  $l_j$  and  $l'_j$  is proven, for any  $p \geq 1$ , we have

$$\{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : l_{j+1}(\omega) = p\} = \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^{l'_j(\omega)+p} \omega \in \Omega^2\} \cap \cap_{i=0}^{p-1} \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^{l'_j(\omega)+i} \omega \notin \Omega^2\}.$$

In fact, we have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^{l'_j(\omega)+p} \omega \in \Omega^2\} &= \bigcup_{m \geq 0} \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : l'_j(\omega) = m, \theta^{p+m}(\omega) \in \Omega^2\} \\ &= \bigcup_{m \geq 0} (\{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : l'_j(\omega) = m\} \cap \{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^{p+m} \omega \in \Omega^2\}), \end{aligned}$$

hence  $\{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^{l'_j(\omega)+p} \omega \in \Omega^2\}$  is measurable due to the measurability of  $l'_j$ . Similarly, one can prove that  $\{\omega \in \Omega_\delta : \theta^{l'_j(\omega)+i} \omega \notin \Omega^2\}$  is also measurable for  $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ . Therefore,  $l_{j+1} : \Omega_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is measurable and  $l'_{j+1} = l'_j + l_{j+1} + \bar{n}_{j+1} + m(\frac{\epsilon}{4})$  is also measurable as a sum of measurable functions. By induction,  $l_i$  is measurable for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . The proof of Lemma 4.2 is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.3.* Since  $(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1) \neq (z_0^1, \dots, z_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)$ , there exists  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_1(\omega)-1\}$ , such that  $x_j^1 \neq z_j^1$ . By (4.44), one has

$$d_{\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)}\left(x_j^1, F_{\omega}^{T_j^1(\omega)}y(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)\right) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+1}},$$

and

$$d_{\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)}\left(z_j^1, F_{\omega}^{T_j^1(\omega)}y(z_0^1, \dots, z_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)\right) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+1}}.$$

Note that  $x_j^1, z_j^1 \in C_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)$  are  $(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega, \frac{\eta}{2}, \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega))$ -separated, hence

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\omega^{T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega)}}(y(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1), y(z_0^1, \dots, z_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)) \\ & \geq d_{\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)}\left(F_{\omega}^{T_j^1(\omega)}y(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1), F_{\omega}^{T_j^1(\omega)}y(z_0^1, \dots, z_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)\right) \\ & \geq d_{\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)}(x_j^1, z_j^1) - d_{\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)}\left(x_j^1, F_{\omega}^{T_j^1(\omega)}y(x_0^1, \dots, x_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)\right) \\ & \quad - d_{\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)}\left(z_j^1, F_{\omega}^{T_j^1(\omega)}y(z_0^1, \dots, z_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1)\right) \\ & > \frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta}{2^4+1} \times 2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 4.3 is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.5.* For any  $x \in H_k(\omega), y, y' \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ , by (4.50), one has

$$d_{\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}}(z(x, y), z(x, y')) \leq d_{\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}}(z(x, y), x) + d_{\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}}(x, z(x, y')) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \times 2,$$

i.e., (4.51) holds. If  $y \neq y'$ , again by (4.50) and Lemma 4.4, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\omega^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)}}(z(x, y), z(x, y')) \\ & \geq d_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(y, y') - d_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(y', F_{\omega}^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}z(x, y')) \\ & \quad - d_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(y, F_{\omega}^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}z(x, y)) \\ & > \frac{\eta}{2} - \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \times 2 - \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} - \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \geq \frac{3\eta}{8}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., (4.52) holds. The proof of Lemma 4.5 is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.6.* (1) By (4.54), for any  $x \neq x' \in H_k(\omega)$ , one has  $d_{\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}}(x, x') > \frac{3\eta}{8}$ , hence

$$\overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}\right) \cap \overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}\left(\omega, x', \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}\right) = \emptyset.$$

(2) Let  $z = z(x, y) \in H_{k+1}(\omega)$  for  $x \in H_k(\omega)$  and  $y \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ . Pick any point  $t \in \overline{B}_{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)}\left(\omega, z, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}\right)$ , we have

$$d_{\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}}(t, x) \leq d_{\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}}(t, z) + d_{\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}}(z, x) \stackrel{(4.50)}{<} \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} = \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}},$$

Therefore,  $\overline{B}_{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}}(\omega, z, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}) \subseteq \overline{B}_{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k}(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}})$ . The proof of Lemma 4.6 is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.7.* For any  $x \in \mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ , we need to show  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) = \alpha$ . So we have to estimate  $|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - n\alpha|$  for  $x \in \mathfrak{X}(\omega)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We are going to employ the shadowing property, triangle inequality and the estimation for points in  $C_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega)$ ,  $D_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega)$  and  $H_k(\omega)$ . The estimation is a 4-step process.

*Step1, estimation on  $D_1(\omega) = H_1(\omega)$ .* For any  $y \in D_1(\omega)$ , there exists some  $x_j^1$  in  $C_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)$  for  $j \in \{0, \dots, N_1(\omega) - 1\}$ , such that

$$(5.28) \quad d_{\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)}(x_j^1, F_{\omega}^{T_j^1(\omega)} y) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+1}}.$$

we break the interval  $[0, T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega) - 1]$  into

$$\begin{aligned} & [0, T_0^1(\omega) - 1] \cup [T_0^1(\omega), T_0^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)}\omega) - 1] \cup [T_0^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_0^1(\omega)}\omega), T_1^1(\omega) - 1] \\ & \cup \dots \cup [T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega), T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_{N_1(\omega)-1}^1(\omega)}\omega) - 1]. \end{aligned}$$

On intervals  $\cup_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} [T_j^1(\omega), T_j^1(\omega) + \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) - 1]$ , we use triangle inequality, shadowing property (5.28) and notice  $x_j^1 \in C_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) \subset P(\alpha, 4\delta_1, \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega), \theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)$ , while on other intervals we use inequality  $|\varphi - \alpha| \leq 2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, y)) - T_{N_1(\omega)}^1(\omega)\alpha \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} \left| \sum_{i=T_j^1(\omega)}^{T_j^1(\omega)+\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)-1} \left( \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, y)) - \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_j^1(\omega)}(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega, x_j^1)) \right) \right| \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} \left| \sum_{i=T_j^1(\omega)}^{T_j^1(\omega)+\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_j^1(\omega)}(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega, x_j^1)) - \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega)\alpha \right| \\ (5.29) \quad & + 2 \left( T_0^1(\omega) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (m_1 + l_j^1(\omega)) \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+1}}\right) + 4 \sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) \delta_1 \\ & \quad + 2 \left( T_0^1(\omega) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (m_1 + l_j^1(\omega)) \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{var}(\varphi, c) = \sup\{|\varphi(\omega, x) - \varphi(\omega', x')| : d((\omega, x), (\omega', x')) < c\}$  for some  $c > 0$ .

*Step 2, estimation on  $D_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega)$  for  $k \geq 2$ .* Suppose  $y \in D_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega)$ , let us estimate the following difference

$$\left| \sum_{i=T_0^k(\omega)}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_0^k(\omega)}(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega, y)) - (T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) - T_0^k(\omega))\alpha \right|.$$

By the construction of  $D_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega)$ , there exists  $x_j^k \in C_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega)$  for  $j = \{0, \dots, N_k(\omega) - 1\}$ , such that

$$(5.30) \quad d_{\frac{\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega}{\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega}}^{\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega)} \left( x_j^k, F_{\frac{\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega}{\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega}}^{T_j^k(\omega)-T_0^k(\omega)} y \right) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}.$$

we break the interval  $[T_0^k(\omega), T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) - 1]$  into

$$\begin{aligned} & [T_0^k(\omega), T_0^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega) - 1] \cup [T_0^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega), T_1^k(\omega) - 1] \\ & \cup [T_1^k(\omega), T_1^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_1^k(\omega)}\omega) - 1] \cup [T_1^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_1^k(\omega)}\omega), T_2^k(\omega) - 1] \\ & \cup \dots \cup [T_{N_k(\omega)-1}^k(\omega), T_{N_k(\omega)-1}^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_{N_k(\omega)-1}^k(\omega)}\omega) - 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Similar as the estimation (5.29), on intervals  $\cup_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} [T_j^k(\omega), T_j^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) - 1]$ , we use triangle inequality, shadowing property (5.30) and notice  $x_j^k \in C_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) \subset P(\alpha, 4\delta_k, \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega), \theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega)$ , while on other intervals we use  $|\varphi - \alpha| \leq 2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=T_0^k(\omega)}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_0^k(\omega)}(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega, y)) - (T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) - T_0^k(\omega))\alpha \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} \left| \sum_{i=T_j^k(\omega)}^{T_j^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) - 1} \left( \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_0^k(\omega)}(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega, y)) - \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_j^k(\omega)}(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega, x_j^k)) \right) \right| \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} \left| \sum_{i=T_j^k(\omega)}^{T_j^k(\omega) + \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) - 1} \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_j^k(\omega)}(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega, x_j^k)) - \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega)\alpha \right| \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (m_k + l_j^k(\omega)) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) \text{var} \left( \varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right) + 4 \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) \delta_k + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (m_k + l_j^k(\omega)) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}. \end{aligned}$$

*Step 3, estimation on  $H_k(\omega)$ .* Denote

$$(5.31) \quad R_k(\omega) = \max_{z \in H_k(\omega)} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, z)) - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)\alpha \right|.$$



We show

$$(5.32) \quad \begin{aligned} R_k(\omega) &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^k T_{N_i(\omega)}^i(\omega) \left( \text{var} \left( \varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+i}} \right) + 2\delta_i \right) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^k N_i(\omega) m_i \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\ &\quad + 2 \left( \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} l^{i,i+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{N_i-1} l_j^i(\omega) \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}, \end{aligned}$$

by induction on  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . When  $k = 1$ , inequality (5.29) gives the desired estimation. Suppose now we have an upper estimation on  $R_k(\omega)$ , let us estimation  $R_{k+1}(\omega)$ . For any  $z \in H_{k+1}(\omega)$ , by (4.50), there exist  $x \in H_k(\omega)$  and  $y \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ , such that

$$(5.33) \quad d_{\omega}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k} (x, z) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}, \text{ and } d_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) - T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} (y, F_{\omega}^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} z) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}.$$

We break  $[0, T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) - 1]$  into

$$[0, T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) - 1] \cup [T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega), T_0^{k+1}(\omega) - 1] \cup [T_0^{k+1}(\omega), T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) - 1].$$

On interval  $[0, T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) - 1]$ , we use triangle inequality, the first inequality of (5.33), and  $R_k(\omega)$ . On interval  $[T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega), T_0^{k+1}(\omega) - 1] = [T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega), T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) - 1]$ , we use estimate  $|\varphi - \alpha| \leq 2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$ . On interval  $[T_0^{k+1}(\omega), T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) - 1]$ , we use triangle inequality, the second

inequality of (5.33) and estimate on  $D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{k+1}(\omega) &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, z)) - T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)\alpha \right| \\
&\leq \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} (\varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, z)) - \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x))) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)\alpha \right| \\
&\quad + 2(m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega))\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + \left| \sum_{i=T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-1} (\varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, z)) - \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega, y))) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \sum_{i=T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^{i-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega, y)) - (T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) - T_0^{k+1}(\omega))\alpha \right| \\
&\leq T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)\text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}\right) + R_k(\omega) + 2(m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega))\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
&\quad + \left(T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega) - T_0^{k+1}(\omega)\right)\text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}\right) + \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)\text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}\right) \\
&\quad + 4 \sum_{j=0}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)\delta_{k+1} + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} (m_{k+1} + l_j^{k+1}(\omega))\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
&\leq R_k(\omega) + 2T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)\text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}\right) + 2\left(N_{k+1}(\omega)m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} l_j^{k+1}(\omega)\right)\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
&\quad + 4T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)\delta_{k+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the induction step, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{k+1}(\omega) &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} T_{N_i(\omega)}^i(\omega) \left( \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+i}}\right) + 2\delta_i \right) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} N_i(\omega)m_i\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
&\quad + 2 \left( \sum_{i=0}^k l^{i,i+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i-1} l_j^i(\omega) \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}.
\end{aligned}$$

By induction, we obtain (5.32). Next, we claim that

$$(5.34) \quad R_k(\omega)/T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

In fact, by (4.43) and (4.46), one can inductively estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) &\leq N_1(\omega)(\hat{n}_1^M + m_1) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - \xi_i)^{-1} + N_2(\omega)(\hat{n}_2^M + m_2) \prod_{i=2}^{k-1} (1 - \xi_i)^{-1} + \\
&\quad \cdots + N_{k-1}(\omega)(\hat{n}_{k-1}^M + m_{k-1})(1 - \xi_{k-1})^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By using (4.42), we have

$$(5.35) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (N_j(\omega) \cdot (\hat{n}_j^M + m_j) \cdot \prod_{i=j}^{k-1} (1 - \xi_i)^{-1})}{N_k(\omega)} = 0.$$

Using Stolz's theorem, since the sequence  $\{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)\}_k$  is strictly increasing and  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^k T_{N_i(\omega)}^i(\omega) (\text{var}(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+i}}) + 2\delta_i)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) (\text{var}(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}) + 2\delta_k)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) - T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)} = 0.$$

Noticing that  $\hat{n}_k(\omega) \geq 2^{m_k}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , so by construction of  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)$ , we have  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k N_i(\omega) \cdot 2^{m_i}$ . Hence, by using Stolz's theorem again, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^k N_i(\omega) m_i \|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^k N_i(\omega) m_i \|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{\sum_{i=1}^k N_i(\omega) \cdot 2^{m_i}} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2N_k(\omega) m_k \|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{N_k(\omega) \cdot 2^{m_k}} = 0.$$

Finally, using (4.46) and (5.35), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} l^{i,i+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{N_i-1} l_j^i(\omega)) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \\ &= \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2(\sum_{i=0}^{k-2} l^{i,i+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i-1} l_j^i(\omega)) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2(l^{k-1,k}(\omega) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_k-1} l_j^k(\omega)) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2(l^{k-1,k}(\omega) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_k-1} l_j^k(\omega)) \|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2 \left( \frac{T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} + \xi_{k+1} \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all above together, we arrive  $R_k(\omega)/T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Last step, estimation on  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ .* Given  $x \in \mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ , we are going to estimate  $|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^k(\omega, x)) - \alpha|$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough by using previous estimates. Note that for any  $n \geq T_0^2(\omega)$ , there exists a unique  $k \geq 1$ , such that

$$T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) < n \leq T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega).$$

More precisely, there are two cases:

Case 1.  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) < n \leq T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) + m_{k+1} = T_0^{k+1}(\omega)$ ;

Case 2.  $T_0^{k+1}(\omega) < n \leq T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)$ .

In case 1: One has

$$n - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \leq m_{k+1} + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) \stackrel{(4.46)}{\leq} m_{k+1} + \xi_{k+1} n.$$

Since  $x \in \mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ , by the construction of  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ , there exists some  $z \in H_k(\omega)$  such that  $d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z, x) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}$ . Now by using triangle inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \alpha \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, z)) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, z)) - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \alpha \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left| \sum_{i=T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - (n - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)) \alpha \right| \right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \text{var} \left( \varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right) + R_k(\omega) + 2(\xi_{k+1}n + m_{k+1}) \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \right) \\
& \leq \text{var} \left( \varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \right) + R_k(\omega) / T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + 2(\xi_{k+1} + \frac{m_{k+1}}{N_k}) \|\varphi\|_{C^0},
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by (5.34) and (4.42).

In case 2: there exists some  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$  such that  $T_j^{k+1}(\omega) < n \leq T_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega)$ . Since  $x \in \mathfrak{X}(\omega)$ , by construction of  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega)$  (4.56), there exists some  $z \in H_{k+1}(\omega)$  such that

$$(5.36) \quad d_\omega^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)}(z, x) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}.$$

For such  $z \in H_{k+1}(\omega)$ , by (4.50), there exist some  $\bar{x} \in H_k(\omega)$  and  $y \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  such that

$$(5.37) \quad d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z, \bar{x}) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}, \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}(y, F_\omega^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}z) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}.$$

Combining (5.36) and (5.37) together, we have

$$(5.38) \quad d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x, \bar{x}) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}.$$

On the other hand, since  $y \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ , there exists some  $x_i^{k+1} \in C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  such that

$$(5.39) \quad d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(x_i^{k+1}, F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}y) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}, \quad \text{for } i \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1} - 1\}.$$

For  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, j-1\}$ , combining (5.36), (5.37) and (5.39) together gives

$$(5.40) \quad d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(F_\omega^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}x, x_i^{k+1}) < \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} < \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}}.$$

In case  $T_j^{k+1}(\omega) < n \leq T_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega)$ , then either

$$(5.41) \quad T_j^{k+1}(\omega) < n \leq T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$$

or

$$(5.42) \quad T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) < n \leq T_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega) = T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1} + l_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega).$$

In subcases (5.41): on interval  $[0, T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) - 1]$ , we use shadowing (5.38) and estimate on  $R_k(\omega)$ ; on interval  $\cup_{i=0}^{j-1} [T_i^{k+1}(\omega), T_i^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) - 1]$  (with the convention that  $\cup_{i=0}^{-1} = \emptyset$ ), we use

shadowing (5.40) and the fact  $x_i^{k+1} \in C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \subset P(\alpha, 4\delta_{k+1}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega), \theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ ; on other intervals, we use inequality  $|\varphi - \alpha| \leq 2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - n\alpha \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, \bar{x})) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, \bar{x})) - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)\alpha \right| \right. \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \left| \sum_{p=T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)+\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)-1} (\varphi(\Theta^p(\omega, x)) - \varphi(\Theta^{p-T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega, x_i^{k+1}))) \right| \\
& \quad \left. + 2l^{k,k+1}(\omega)\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^j l_i^{k+1}(\omega)\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2(j+1)m_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2(n - T_j^{k+1}(\omega))\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, \bar{x})) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, \bar{x})) - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)\alpha \right| \right. \\
& \quad + 2l^{k,k+1}(\omega)\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^j l_i^{k+1}(\omega)\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2(j+1)m_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \left[ \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}}\right) + 4\delta_{k+1} \right] + 2\hat{n}_{k+1}^M \|\varphi\|_{C^0} \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \left\{ T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}\right) + R_k(\omega) + 2\xi_{k+1}n\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + n \left[ \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}}\right) + 4\delta_{k+1} \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2(\hat{n}_{k+1}^M + (j+1)m_{k+1})\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \right\} \\
& \leq \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}\right) + \frac{R_k(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} + \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}}\right) + 4\delta_{k+1} + 2(\xi_{k+1} + \frac{\hat{n}_{k+1}^M}{N_k(\omega)} + \frac{(j+1)m_{k+1}}{N_k(\omega) + j2^{m_{k+1}}})\|\varphi\|_{C^0},
\end{aligned}$$

with the convention that  $\sum_{i=0}^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^0 = 0$ . Hence  $|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \alpha| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by using previous estimates.

In subcase (5.42), the estimate (5.40) holds for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, j\}$ . Moreover, we notice  $n - T_j^{k+1}(\omega) - \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \leq m_{k+1} + \xi_{k+1}n$ . Use the same strategy as in subcase (5.41), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - n\alpha \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, \bar{x})) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=0}^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, \bar{x})) - T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)\alpha \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2l^{k,k+1}(\omega)\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^j l_i^{k+1}(\omega)\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2\xi_{k+1}n\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + 2(\hat{n}_{k+1}^M + m_{k+1})\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +2(j+1)m_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + \sum_{i=0}^j \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \left[ \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}}\right) + 4\delta_{k+1} \right] \Big\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \left\{ T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}}\right) + R_k(\omega) + 4\xi_{k+1}n\|\varphi\|_{C^0} + n \left[ \text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}}\right) + 4\delta_{k+1} \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2(\hat{n}_{k+1}^M + (j+2)m_{k+1})\|\varphi\|_{C^0} \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{R_k(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} + 2\text{var}\left(\varphi, \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}}\right) + 4\delta_{k+1} + 2 \left( 2\xi_{k+1} + \frac{\hat{n}_{k+1}^M}{N_k(\omega)} + \frac{(j+2)m_{k+1}}{N_k(\omega) + j2^{m_{k+1}}} \right) \|\varphi\|_{C^0},
\end{aligned}$$

with the convention that  $\sum_{i=1}^0 = 0$ . Hence  $|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\Theta^i(\omega, x)) - \alpha| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by using previous estimates. Combining Case 1 and Case 2, we obtain  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega) \subset K_{\varphi, \alpha}(\omega)$ . The proof of lemma 4.7 is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.8.* It's sufficient to show that  $\{\int_M \psi d\mu_{k, \omega}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  is a Cauchy sequence. Given  $\delta > 0$ , for any sufficiently large  $K$  such that  $\text{var}(\psi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+K}}) < \delta$ , let  $k_2 > k_1 \geq K$  be any numbers, then

$$\int_M \psi d\mu_{k_i, \omega} = \frac{1}{\#H_{k_i}(\omega)} \sum_{x \in H_{k_i}(\omega)} \psi(x) \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

For any  $x \in H_{k_1}(\omega)$ , denote  $Z(x)$  to be the collection of points  $z$  in  $H_{k_2}(\omega)$  such that  $z$  descends from  $x$ , i.e., there is a sequence  $z_{k_1+1} \in H_{k_1+1}(\omega), \dots, z_{k_2-1} \in H_{k_2-1}(\omega)$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.43) \quad & z = z(z_{k_2-1}, y_{k_2}), \exists y_{k_2} \in D_{k_2}(\theta^{T_0^{k_2}(\omega)}\omega), \\
& z_{k_2-1} = z(z_{k_2-2}, y_{k_2-1}), \exists y_{k_2-1} \in D_{k_2}(\theta^{T_0^{k_2-1}(\omega)}\omega), \\
& \dots \\
& z_{k_1+1} = z(x, y_{k_1+1}), \exists y_{k_1+1} \in D_{k_1+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k_1+1}(\omega)}\omega).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $\#Z(x) = \#D_{k_1+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k_1+1}(\omega)}\omega) \dots \#D_{k_2}(\theta^{T_0^{k_2}(\omega)}\omega)$ , and by (4.53),

$$(5.44) \quad \#H_{k_2}(\omega) = \#H_{k_1}(\omega) \cdot \#Z(x), \forall x \in H_{k_1}(\omega).$$

By (4.50), for any  $z \in Z(x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.45) \quad & d_M(x, z) \leq d_\omega^{T_{N_{k_1}(\omega)}^{k_1}}(x, z) \\
& \leq d_\omega^{T_{N_{k_1}(\omega)}^{k_1}}(x, z_{k_1+1}) + d_\omega^{T_{N_{k_1+1}(\omega)}^{k_1+1}}(z_{k_1+1}, z_{k_1+2}) + \dots + d_\omega^{T_{N_{k_2-1}(\omega)}^{k_2-1}}(z_{k_2-1}, z) \\
& \leq \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k_1+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k_1+2}} + \dots + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k_2}} \\
& \leq \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_M \psi d\mu_{k_1, \omega} - \int_M \psi d\mu_{k_2, \omega} \right| & \stackrel{(5.44)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\#H_{k_2}(\omega)} \sum_{x \in H_{k_1}(\omega)} \sum_{z \in Z(x)} |\psi(x) - \psi(z)| \\
& \stackrel{(5.45)}{\leq} \text{var}\left(\psi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k_1}}\right) \leq \text{var}\left(\psi, \frac{\eta}{2^{4+K}}\right) < \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,  $\{\int_M \psi d\mu_{k, \omega}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  is a Cauchy sequence. The proof of Lemma 4.8 is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.9.* For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}, p \geq 0$ , since  $\mathfrak{X}_{k+p}(\omega) \subseteq \mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)$  and  $\mu_{k+p,\omega}(\mathfrak{X}_{k+p}(\omega)) = 1$ , therefore,  $\mu_{k+p,\omega}(\mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)) = 1$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)$  is a closed set, by the Portmanteau theorem, we have

$$\mu_\omega(\mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)) \geq \limsup_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{k+p,\omega}(\mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)) = 1.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{X}(\omega) = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathfrak{X}_k(\omega)$ , it follows that  $\mu_\omega(\mathfrak{X}(\omega)) = 1$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.10.* We first define  $N(\omega)$  in the statement of Lemma 4.10.

*Pick of  $N(\omega)$ .* For  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}_\gamma$ , any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $j = \{0, \dots, N_k(\omega) - 1\}$ , by the previous construction, we have  $2^{m_k} \leq \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) \leq \hat{n}_k^M$  and  $N_k(\omega) \geq 2^{N_1(\omega)(\hat{n}_1^M + m_1) + \dots + N_{k-1}(\omega)(\hat{n}_{k-1}^M + m_{k-1})}$ . Then for any  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}_\gamma$ , there exists some  $k_1(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for any  $k \geq k_1(\omega)$ , and any  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_{k+1} - 1\}$ , one has

$$(5.46) \quad \begin{aligned} & \exp \left( (h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma) \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) + \dots + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) + \sum_{j=0}^i \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \right) \right) \\ & \geq \exp \left( \left( h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9\gamma}{2} \right) \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) + m_1) + \dots + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) + m_k) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{j=0}^i (\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1}) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note also that by (5.35), we have  $T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)/T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , hence there exists some  $k_2(\omega) > k_1(\omega)$ , such that for any  $k \geq k_2(\omega)$ , we have

$$(5.47) \quad \frac{T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} + \xi_k + \xi_{k+1} + \frac{\hat{n}_{k+1}^M + m_{k+1}}{N_k(\omega)} < \frac{\gamma/2}{(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma) - \gamma/2}.$$

Define  $N(\omega) = T_{N_{k_2(\omega)}(\omega)}^{k_2(\omega)}(\omega) + 1$ .

Now, we start proving lemma 4.10 for  $n \geq N(\omega)$ . Note that  $n \geq N(\omega)$ , then there exists some  $k \geq k_2(\omega)$  such that  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) < n \leq T_{N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{k+1}(\omega)$ . For any open set  $B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})$ , by the weak\* convergence of measure, we have

$$\mu_\omega \left( B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right) \leq \liminf_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{k+p,\omega} \left( B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right).$$

Next, we wish to estimate

$$(5.48) \quad \mu_{k+p,\omega} \left( B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right) = \frac{1}{\#H_{k+p}(\omega)} \cdot \# \left\{ z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) : z \in B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right\}.$$

As in the proof of lemma 4.7, there are 3 cases:

Case 1.  $T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) < n \leq T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) + m_{k+1} = T_0^{k+1}(\omega)$ ;

Case 2. There exists  $j \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ , such that  $T_j^{k+1}(\omega) < n \leq T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ ;

Case 3. There exists  $j \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ , such that

$$T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) < n \leq T_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega) = T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1} + l_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega).$$

In Case 1. We divide the proof into 3 steps. Firstly, we show  $\#\{z \in H_k(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})\} \leq 1$ . If there are  $z_1 \neq z_2 \in H_k(\omega)$ , such that  $z_1, z_2 \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})$ , then

$$d_\omega^n(z_1, z_2) < \frac{\eta}{2^4} \times 2 = \frac{\eta}{2^3}.$$

However, we have  $d_\omega^n(z_1, z_2) \geq d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z_1, z_2) > \frac{3\eta}{8}$  by (4.54), which leads to a contradiction.

Secondly, we show for any  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$(5.49) \quad \#\{z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})\} \leq \#D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}}\omega) \cdots \#D_{k+p}(\theta^{T_0^{k+p}}\omega).$$

If there are different points  $z_1, z_2 \in H_{k+p}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})$  such that  $z_1$  descends from  $x_1 \in H_k(\omega)$  and  $z_2$  descends from  $x_2 \in H_k(\omega)$  defined as (5.43), then we claim that  $x_1 = x_2$ . In fact, if  $x_1 \neq x_2$ , by (4.54), we have  $d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x_1, x_2) > \frac{3\eta}{8}$ . But, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x_1, x_2) &\leq d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x_1, z_1) + d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z_1, x) + d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x, z_2) + d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z_2, x_2) \\ &\stackrel{(5.45)}{<} \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} + \frac{\eta}{2^4} + \frac{\eta}{2^4} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k}} \\ &\leq \frac{\eta}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction. As a consequence of (5.48) and (5.49), we have

$$\mu_{k+p, \omega}\left(B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right) \leq \frac{\#D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}}\omega) \cdots \#D_{k+p}(\theta^{T_0^{k+p}}\omega)}{\#H_{k+p}(\omega)} = \frac{1}{\#H_k(\omega)}.$$

Thirdly, we claim  $\#H_k(\omega) \geq \exp((h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)n)$ . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \#H_k(\omega) &= \#D_1(\omega) \cdot \#D_2(\theta^{T_0^2(\omega)}\omega) \cdots \#D_k(\theta^{T_0^k(\omega)}\omega) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=0}^{N_i(\omega)-1} \#C_i(\theta^{T_j^i(\omega)}\omega) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=0}^{N_i-1} M(\alpha, 4\delta_i, \hat{n}_i(\theta^{T_j^i(\omega)}\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_j^i(\omega)}\omega) \stackrel{(4.47)}{\geq} \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=0}^{N_i-1} \exp(\hat{n}_i(\theta^{T_j^i(\omega)}\omega)(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma)) \\ &\stackrel{(5.46)}{\geq} \exp\left(\left(h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9\gamma}{2}\right)\left(\sum_{j=0}^{N_1-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) + m_k)\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We notice the following fact

$$\begin{aligned} &n - \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) + m_k)\right) \\ &\leq T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) + \xi_k T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + m_{k+1} + \xi_{k+1}n, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{n - \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) + m_k)\right)}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) + \xi_k T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega) + m_{k+1} + \xi_{k+1}n}{n} \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} + \xi_k + \xi_{k+1} + \frac{m_{k+1}}{N_k(\omega)} \\
&\stackrel{(5.47)}{\leq} \frac{\gamma/2}{h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9}{2}\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\left(h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9\gamma}{2}\right) \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N_1-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_j^1(\omega)}\omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{j=0}^{N_k-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_j^k(\omega)}\omega) + m_k) \right) \geq n(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma).$$

As a consequence, we obtain  $\#H_k(\omega) \geq \exp(n(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma))$ . Hence, in case 1, we have

$$\mu_{k+p,\omega} \left( B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right) \leq \exp(-n(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)).$$

*In Case 2.* i.e.,  $\exists j \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$  such that  $T_j^{k+1}(\omega) < n \leq T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ . We divide the proof into 4 steps. Firstly, we show  $\#\{z \in H_k(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})\} \leq 1$ . If there are  $z_1 \neq z_2 \in H_k(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})$ , then

$$d_\omega^n(z_1, z_2) < 2 \times \frac{\eta}{2^3} = \frac{\eta}{4}.$$

But by (4.54), we have  $d_\omega^n(z_1, z_2) \geq d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z_1, z_2) > \frac{3\eta}{8}$ , which leads to a contradiction.

Secondly, we show  $\#\{z \in H_{k+1}(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})\} \leq \prod_{i=j}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$ . If there are  $z_1 \neq z_2 \in H_{k+1}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})$ , with

$$\begin{aligned}
z_1 &= z(x_1, y_1), x_1 \in H_k(\omega), y_1 \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega), y_1 = y(a_0^{k+1}, \dots, a_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}), \\
z_2 &= z(x_2, y_2), x_2 \in H_k(\omega), y_2 \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega), y_2 = y(b_0^{k+1}, \dots, b_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $a_i^{k+1}, b_i^{k+1} \in C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ . We claim that  $x_1 = x_2$  and  $a_i^{k+1} = b_i^{k+1}$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, j-1\}$ . If  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in H_k(\omega)$ , by (4.54), we have  $d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x_1, x_2) > \frac{3\eta}{8}$ . But

$$\begin{aligned}
d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x_1, x_2) &\leq d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x_1, z_1) + d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z_1, x) + d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(x, z_2) + d_\omega^{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)}(z_2, x_2) \\
&\stackrel{(4.50)}{\leq} \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^3} + \frac{\eta}{2^3} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \\
&\leq \frac{5\eta}{16},
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction. Hence  $x_1 = x_2$ . Next, we prove that  $a_i^{k+1} = b_i^{k+1}$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, j-1\}$ . If  $j = 0$ , there is nothing to prove. Suppose  $j \geq 1$  and there exists  $i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq j-1$  such that

$a_i^{k+1} \neq b_i^{k+1}$ . On the one hand, by (4.48) and (4.50), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(a_i^{k+1}, b_i^{k+1}) \\
& \leq d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}\left(a_i^{k+1}, F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}y_1\right) + d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}\left(F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}y_1, F_{\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}z_1\right) \\
& \quad + d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}\left(F_{\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}z_1, F_{\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}z_2\right) + d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}\left(F_{\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}z_2, F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}y_2\right) \\
& \quad + d_{\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}\left(F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}y_2, b_i^{k+1}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^3} \times 2 + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \leq \frac{\eta}{2^2} + \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}} < \frac{3\eta}{8}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,  $a_i^{k+1} \neq b_i^{k+1} \in C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  are  $(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega, \frac{\eta}{2}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega))$ -separated, which leads to a contradiction. Hence, there are at most  $\prod_{i=j}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  points lying in  $H_{k+1}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})$ .

Thirdly, we show for any  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\#\{z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})\} \leq \left( \prod_{i=j}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{i=2}^p \#D_{k+i}(\theta^{T_0^{k+i}(\omega)}\omega) \right).$$

We prove it by showing that  $z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})$  must descend from the points of  $H_{k+1}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})$ . Suppose that we have  $z_1 \in H_{k+1}(\omega)$  and  $z_p \in H_{k+p}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})$ , where  $z_p$  descends from  $z_1$ . Denote  $z_p = z(z_{p-1}, y_p)$  for  $z_{p-1} \in H_{k+p-1}(\omega)$ ,  $y_p \in D_{k+p}(\theta^{T_0^{k+p}(\omega)}\omega)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $z_2 = z(z_1, y_2)$  for  $y_2 \in D_{k+2}(\theta^{T_0^{k+2}(\omega)}\omega)$ . Then by (4.50), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{\omega}^n(z_1, z_p) & \leq d_{\omega}^{T^{k+1}(\omega)}(z_1, z_2) + d_{\omega}^{T^{k+2}(\omega)}(z_2, z_3) + \dots + d_{\omega}^{T^{k+p-1}(\omega)}(z_{p-1}, z_p) \\
& \leq \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+2}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+3}} + \dots + \frac{\eta}{2^{k+p}} \\
& \leq \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $d_{\omega}^n(x, z_1) \leq d_{\omega}^n(x, z_p) + d_{\omega}^n(z_1, z_p) < \frac{\eta}{2^4} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} < \frac{\eta}{2^3}$ , which implies that  $z_1 \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \#\left\{z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) : z \in B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right\} \\
& \leq \#H_{k+1}(\omega) \cap B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3}\right) \#D_{k+2}(\theta^{T_0^{k+2}(\omega)}\omega) \dots \#D_{k+p}(\theta^{T_0^{k+p}(\omega)}\omega) \\
& \leq \left( \prod_{i=j}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \right) \cdot \prod_{i=2}^p D_{k+i}(\theta^{T_0^{k+i}(\omega)}\omega),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is given by the second step. It follows by (4.53) and (4.49) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.50) \quad \mu_{k+p, \omega}\left(B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right) & \leq \frac{\left(\prod_{i=j}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)\right) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=2}^p D_{k+i}(\theta^{T_0^{k+i}(\omega)}\omega)\right)}{\#H_{k+p}(\omega)} \\
& = \frac{1}{\#H_k(\omega) \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

with the convention that  $\prod_{i=0}^{-1} = 1$ .

Fourthly, we show

$$(5.51) \quad \#H_k(\omega) \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) \geq \exp((h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)n).$$

In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \#H_k(\omega) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) &= \left( \prod_{t=1}^k \prod_{i=0}^{N_t(\omega)-1} \#C_t(\theta^{T_i^t} \omega) \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) \right) \\ &= \prod_{t=1}^k \prod_{i=0}^{N_t(\omega)-1} M(\alpha, 4\delta_t, \hat{n}_t(\theta^{T_i^t} \omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_i^t} \omega) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} M(\alpha, 4\delta_{k+1}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) \\ &\geq \exp\left((h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N_1-1} \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1} \omega) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k-1} \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k} \omega) + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) \right)\right) \\ &\stackrel{(5.46)}{\geq} \exp\left(\left(h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9\gamma}{2}\right) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1} \omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k} \omega) + m_k) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) + m_{k+1}) \right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We notice the following fact

$$\begin{aligned} n - \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1} \omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k} \omega) + m_k) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) + m_{k+1}) \right) \\ \leq T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) + l^{k-1,k}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_k(\omega)-1} l_i^k(\omega) + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^j l_i^{k+1}(\omega) + n - T_j^{k+1}(\omega) \\ \leq T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) + \xi_k n + \xi_{k+1} n + \hat{n}_{k+1}^M \leq \left( \frac{T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} + \xi_k + \xi_{k+1} + \frac{\hat{n}_{k+1}^M}{N_k(\omega)} \right) n \\ \stackrel{(5.47)}{\leq} \frac{\gamma/2}{h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9\gamma}{2}} \cdot n \end{aligned}$$

with the convention that  $\sum_{i=1}^0 = 0$ . As a consequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9\gamma}{2} \right) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1} \omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k} \omega) + m_k) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}} \omega) + m_{k+1}) \right) \\ \geq (h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)n \end{aligned}$$

and (5.51) is proved. Therefore, in case 2, by (5.50) and (5.51), we have

$$\mu_{k+p,\omega}\left(B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right) \leq \exp(-n(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)).$$

In Case 3. i.e., there exists  $j \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ , such that

$$T_j^{k+1}(\omega) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) < n \leq T_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega) = T_j^{k+1} + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1} + l_{j+1}^{k+1}(\omega).$$

We also divide our proof into 4 steps. Firstly, same as the proof of step 1 in case 2, we can show that  $\#\{z \in H_k(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})\} \leq 1$ .

Secondly, we show that  $\#\{z \in H_{k+1}(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})\} \leq \prod_{i=j+1}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  with the convention that  $\prod_{i=N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} = 1$ . If there are  $z_1 \neq z_2 \in H_{k+1}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &= z(x_1, y_1), x_1 \in H_k(\omega), y_1 \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega), y_1 = y(a_0^{k+1}, \dots, a_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}), \\ z_2 &= z(x_2, y_2), x_2 \in H_k(\omega), y_2 \in D_{k+1}(\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega), y_2 = y(b_0^{k+1}, \dots, b_{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1}^{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $a_i^{k+1}, b_i^{k+1} \in C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, N_{k+1}(\omega) - 1\}$ . We claim that  $x_1 = x_2$  and  $a_i^{k+1} = b_i^{k+1}$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, j\}$ . In fact, the same proof as in step 2 of case 2 indicates that  $x_1 = x_2$  and  $a_i^{k+1} = b_i^{k+1}$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, j-1\}$ . It remains to show that  $a_j^{k+1} = b_j^{k+1}$ . If  $a_j^{k+1} \neq b_j^{k+1}$ , on the one hand, by (4.48) and (4.50), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(a_j^{k+1}, b_j^{k+1}) \\ & \leq d_{\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(a_j^{k+1}, F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} y_1) + d_{\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} y_1, F_{\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} z_1) \\ & \quad + d_{\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(F_{\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} z_1, F_{\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} z_2) + d_{\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(F_{\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)} z_2, F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} y_2) \\ & \quad + d_{\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)}(F_{\theta^{T_0^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega}^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)-T_0^{k+1}(\omega)} y_2, b_j^{k+1}) \\ & \leq \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^3} \times 2 + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} + \frac{\eta}{2^{4+k+1}} \leq \frac{\eta}{2^2} + \frac{\eta}{2^{3+k}} < \frac{3\eta}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,  $a_j^{k+1} \neq b_j^{k+1} \in C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)$  are  $(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega, \frac{\eta}{2}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega))$ -separated, which leads to a contradiction.

Thirdly, we show that for any  $p \geq 2$ ,

$$\#\{z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) : z \in B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})\} \leq \left( \prod_{i=j+1}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{i=2}^p \#D_{k+i}(\theta^{T_0^{k+i}(\omega)}\omega) \right),$$

with the convention that  $\prod_{i=N_{k+1}(\omega)}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} = 1$ . Exactly same proof as in step 3 of cases 2 indicates that  $z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4})$  must descend from some point in  $H_{k+1}(\omega) \cap B_n(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3})$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \#\left\{z \in H_{k+p}(\omega) : z \in B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right\} \\ & \leq \#H_{k+1}(\omega) \cap B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^3}\right) \#D_{k+2}(\theta^{T_0^{k+2}}(\omega)\omega) \cdots \#D_{k+p}(\theta^{T_0^{k+p}}(\omega)\omega) \\ & \leq \left(\prod_{i=j+1}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega)\right) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=2}^p D_{k+i}(\theta^{T_0^{k+i}}(\omega)\omega)\right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(5.52) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_{k+p,\omega}\left(B_n\left(\omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4}\right)\right) & \leq \frac{\prod_{i=j+1}^{N_{k+1}(\omega)-1} \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega) \cdot \prod_{i=2}^p D_{k+i}(\theta^{T_0^{k+i}}(\omega)\omega)}{\#H_{k+p}(\omega)} \\ & = \frac{1}{\#H_k(\omega) \prod_{i=0}^j \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Fourthly, we show  $\#H_k(\omega) \prod_{i=0}^j \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega) \geq \exp((h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)n)$ . Using (5.46), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \#H_k(\omega) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^j C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega) = \prod_{t=1}^k \prod_{i=0}^{N_t(\omega)-1} \#C_t(\theta^{T_i^t}(\omega)\omega) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^j \#C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega) \\ & = \prod_{t=1}^k \prod_{i=0}^{N_t(\omega)-1} M(\alpha, 4\delta_t, \hat{n}_t(\theta^{T_i^t}(\omega)\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_i^t}(\omega)\omega) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^j M(\alpha, 4\delta_{k+1}, \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega), \frac{\eta}{2}, \theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega) \\ & \geq \exp\left(\left(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma\right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1}(\omega)\omega) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} \hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k}(\omega)\omega) + \sum_{i=0}^j \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega)\right)\right) \\ & \geq \exp\left(\left(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma - \frac{\gamma}{2}\right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1}(\omega)\omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k}(\omega)\omega) + m_k) \right.\right. \\ & \quad \left.\left. + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega) + m_{k+1}) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}}(\omega)\omega)\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We notice the following fact that in Case 3

$$\begin{aligned}
& n - \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1(\omega)}\omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k(\omega)}\omega) + m_k) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1}) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \right) \\
& \leq T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) + l^{k-1,k}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_k(\omega)-1} l_i^k(\omega) + l^{k,k+1}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^j l_i^{k+1}(\omega) \\
& \quad + (n - T_j^{k+1}(\omega) - \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega)) \\
& \leq T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega) + \xi_k n + \xi_{k+1} n + m_{k+1} \\
& \leq \left( \frac{T_{N_{k-1}(\omega)}^{k-1}(\omega)}{T_{N_k(\omega)}^k(\omega)} + \xi_k + \xi_{k+1} + \frac{m_{k+1}}{N_k(\omega)} \right) \cdot n \\
& \stackrel{(5.47)}{\leq} \frac{\gamma/2}{h_{\mu_0}(F) - \frac{9\gamma}{2}} \cdot n.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( h_{\mu_0}(F) - 4\gamma - \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N_1(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_1(\theta^{T_i^1(\omega)}\omega) + m_1) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{N_k(\omega)-1} (\hat{n}_k(\theta^{T_i^k(\omega)}\omega) + m_k) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (\hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) + m_{k+1}) + \hat{n}_{k+1}(\theta^{T_j^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \right) \\
& \geq (h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)n,
\end{aligned}$$

and  $\#H_k(\omega) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^j C_{k+1}(\theta^{T_i^{k+1}(\omega)}\omega) \geq \exp((h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)n)$ . Therefore,

$$\mu_{k+p,\omega} \left( B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right) \leq \exp(-n(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)).$$

In all three cases, we conclude

$$\mu_\omega \left( B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right) \leq \liminf_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{k+p,\omega} \left( B_n \left( \omega, x, \frac{\eta}{2^4} \right) \right) \leq \exp(-n(h_{\mu_0}(F) - 5\gamma)).$$

The proof of Lemma 4.10 is complete.  $\square$

**Acknowledgment.** The authors would like to thank Wen Huang for many valuable comments. Partial work was finished at the Brigham Young University and constitutes part of the second author's PhD thesis. The second author would like to thank Kening Lu for many useful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ARNOLD, L. *Random dynamical systems*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. (Cited on Section 1.2.)
- [2] BAHNMÜLLER, J., AND BOGENSCHÜTZ, T. A Margulis-Ruelle inequality for random dynamical systems. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 64, 3 (1995), 246–253. (Cited on Section 1.5.)
- [3] BARREIRA, L., AND SAUSSOL, B. Variational principles and mixed multifractal spectra. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 353, 10 (2001), 3919–3944. (Cited on Section 1.1.)

- [4] BARREIRA, L., SAUSSOL, B., AND SCHMELING, J. Higher-dimensional multifractal analysis. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* 81, 1 (2002), 67–91. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [5] BOWEN, R. Topological entropy for noncompact sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 184 (1973), 125–136. (Cited on Section 1.1, 1.3, and 2.1.)
- [6] CLIMENHAGA, V. Topological pressure of simultaneous level sets. *Nonlinearity* 26, 1 (2013), 241–268. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [7] CLIMENHAGA, V. The thermodynamic approach to multifractal analysis. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 34, 5 (2014), 1409–1450. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [8] CLIMENHAGA, V., PESIN, Y., AND ZELEROWICZ, A. Equilibrium states in dynamical systems via geometric measure theory. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 56, 4 (2019), 569–610. (Cited on Section 1.1 and 1.3.)
- [9] CRAUEL, H. *Random probability measures on Polish spaces*, vol. 11 of *Stochastics Monographs*. Taylor & Francis, London, 2002. (Cited on Section 1.5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.2, 5.2, and 5.3.)
- [10] DAMANIK, D. Strictly ergodic subshifts and associated operators. In *Spectral theory and mathematical physics: a Festschrift in honor of Barry Simon's 60th birthday*, vol. 76 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 76, Part 2*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007, pp. 505–538. (Cited on Section 2.2.)
- [11] FAN, A., LIAO, L., AND PEYRIÈRE, J. Generic points in systems of specification and Banach valued Birkhoff ergodic average. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 21, 4 (2008), 1103–1128. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [12] FAN, A.-H., FENG, D.-J., AND WU, J. Recurrence, dimension and entropy. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* 64, 1 (2001), 229–244. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [13] FENG, D.-J., LAU, K.-S., AND WU, J. Ergodic limits on the conformal repellers. *Adv. Math.* 169, 1 (2002), 58–91. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [14] FENG, D.-J., AND SHU, L. Multifractal analysis for disintegrations of Gibbs measures and conditional Birkhoff averages. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 29, 3 (2009), 885–918. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [15] GUNDLACH, V. M., AND KIFER, Y. Random hyperbolic systems. In *Stochastic dynamics*. Springer, 1999, pp. 117–145. (Cited on Section 3.1.)
- [16] GUNDLACH, V. M., AND KIFER, Y. Expansiveness, specification, and equilibrium states for random bundle transformations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 6, 1 (2000), 89–120. (Cited on Section (document), 1.5, 3.2, 4.4, and 4.4.)
- [17] HUANG, W., LIAN, Z., AND LU, K. Ergodic theory of random anosov systems mixing on fibers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.08394* (2019). (Cited on Section 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.1, and 4.4.)
- [18] JENKINSON, O. Rotation, entropy, and equilibrium states. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 353, 9 (2001), 3713–3739. (Cited on Section 3.6.)
- [19] JOHANSSON, A., JORDAN, T. M., ÖBERG, A., AND POLLICOTT, M. Multifractal analysis of non-uniformly hyperbolic systems. *Israel J. Math.* 177 (2010), 125–144. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [20] KIFER, Y. On the topological pressure for random bundle transformations. In *Topology, ergodic theory, real algebraic geometry*, vol. 202 of *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001, pp. 197–214. (Cited on Section 4.2.1.)
- [21] KIFER, Y., AND LIU, P. Random dynamics. In *Handbook of dynamical systems. Vol. 1B*. Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam, 2006, pp. 379–499.
- [22] KOLYADA, S., AND SNOHA, V. Topological entropy of nonautonomous dynamical systems. *Random Comput. Dynam.* 4, 2-3 (1996), 205–233. (Cited on Section 1.5, 3.6, and 3.6.)
- [23] LEDRAPPIER, F., AND WALTERS, P. A relativised variational principle for continuous transformations. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* 16, 3 (1977), 568–576. (Cited on Section 1.3.)
- [24] LI, Z., AND TANG, D. Entropies of random transformations on a non-compact space. *Results Math.* 74, 3 (2019), Paper No. 120, 15. (Cited on Section 4.2.1.)
- [25] OLSEN, L. Multifractal analysis of divergence points of deformed measure theoretical Birkhoff averages. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* 82, 12 (2003), 1591–1649. (Cited on Section 3.5 and 5.2.)
- [26] PEI, Y., AND CHEN, E. On the variational principle for the topological pressure for certain non-compact sets. *Sci. China Math.* 53, 4 (2010), 1117–1128. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [27] PESIN, Y. B., AND WEISS, H. The multifractal analysis of Gibbs measures: motivation, mathematical foundation, and examples. *Chaos* 7, 1 (1997), 89–106. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [28] PESIN, Y. B. *Dimension theory in dynamical systems*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1997. Contemporary views and applications. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [29] PESIN, Y. B., AND PITSKEL, B. S. Topological pressure and the variational principle for noncompact sets. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 18, 4 (1984), 50–63, 96. (Cited on Section 1.1, 1.3, 1.3, and 2.1.)
- [30] PFISTER, C.-E., AND SULLIVAN, W. G. On the topological entropy of saturated sets. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 27, 3 (2007), 929–956. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [31] SHU, L. The multifractal analysis of Birkhoff averages for conformal repellers under random perturbations. *Monatsh. Math.* 159, 1-2 (2010), 81–113. (Cited on Section 1.1.)

- [32] TAKENS, F., AND VERBITSKI, E. Multifractal analysis of local entropies for expansive homeomorphisms with specification. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 203, 3 (1999), 593–612. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [33] TAKENS, F., AND VERBITSKIY, E. On the variational principle for the topological entropy of certain non-compact sets. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 23, 1 (2003), 317–348. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [34] THOMPSON, D. A variational principle for topological pressure for certain non-compact sets. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* 80, 3 (2009), 585–602. (Cited on Section 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 2.1, and 4.1.)
- [35] THOMPSON, D. The irregular set for maps with the specification property has full topological pressure. *Dyn. Syst.* 25, 1 (2010), 25–51. (Cited on Section 1.1, 1.4, and 4.1.)
- [36] THOMPSON, D. Irregular sets, the  $\beta$ -transformation and the almost specification property. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 364, 10 (2012), 5395–5414. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [37] TIAN, X. Topological pressure for the completely irregular set of Birkhoff averages. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 37, 5 (2017), 2745–2763. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [38] TIAN, X., AND VARANDAS, P. Topological entropy of level sets of empirical measures for non-uniformly expanding maps. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 37, 10 (2017), 5407–5431. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [39] WALTERS, P. *An introduction to ergodic theory*, vol. 79 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [40] YIN, Z., CHEN, E., AND ZHOU, X. Multifractal analysis of ergodic averages in some non-uniformly hyperbolic systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 36, 7 (2016), 2334–2350. (Cited on Section 4.2.1.)
- [41] YOUNG, L.-S. Large deviations in dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 318, 2 (1990), 525–543. (Cited on Section 1.1.)
- [42] ZHU, Y. J. Two notes on measure-theoretic entropy of random dynamical systems. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 25, 6 (2009), 961–970.

(Nian Liu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STATE COLLEGE, PA 16801, USA

*Email address*, N. Liu: [nk15330@psu.edu](mailto:nk15330@psu.edu)

(Xue Liu) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHEAST UNIVERSITY, NANJING 211189, PR CHINA

*Email address*, X. Liu: [xueliuseu@seu.edu.cn](mailto:xueliuseu@seu.edu.cn)