

PROXIMALITY, STABILITY, AND CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR RANDOM MAPS ON AN INTERVAL

SANDER C. HILLE, KATARZYNA HORBACZ, HANNA OPPELMAYER,
AND TOMASZ SZAREK

ABSTRACT. Stochastic dynamical systems consisting of non-invertible continuous maps on an interval are studied. It is proved that if they satisfy the recently introduced so-called μ -injectivity and some mild assumptions, then proximality, asymptotic stability and a central limit theorem hold.

1. INTRODUCTION

The behaviour of random maps has been intensively studied recently (see [1, 2, 5, 9, 19, 25, 26]). In the majority of works, however, it was assumed that the maps belong to some group of invertible transformations. The invertibility of maps g_i seemed to be crucial since in proving ergodicity results this allows one to apply probabilistic tools, some martingale convergence theorems for instance, jointly with dynamical systems tools (ergodic theorems). To be precise, the martingale convergence theorem holds for right random walks $R_n = g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n$ but the Birkhoff ergodic theorem is formulated for Césaro's means of left random walks $L_n = g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1$. Due to invertibility we may replace the left random walk with the right random walk taking inverse transformations and using the trivial identity: $g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n = (g_n^{-1} \circ \dots \circ g_1^{-1})^{-1}$. Thus we may use probabilistic and dynamical systems techniques simultaneously (see for instance [5, 9]). This breaks down for non-invertible maps.

In this paper, the considered maps on the interval $[0, 1]$ do not have to be invertible. We will assume that they are continuous and piecewise monotone (with finitely many pieces), which are chosen randomly according to some distribution μ . In the work of S. Brofferio and the last two named authors [6] we introduced the so-called μ -injectivity condition that allows us to adapt the techniques developed in the theory of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism by A. Avila and M. Viana in [3] and subsequently extended by D. Malicet [25] to random homeomorphisms on a circle and an interval. In [6] we also provided a sufficient condition for the existence of a unique ergodic measure.

Ergodicity is the key concept in the theory of dynamical systems and stochastic processes since it captures some nice statistical properties of studied systems (see [22, 27]). In the first part of this paper, we are concerned with

Date: August 15, 2024.

T.S. was supported by the Polish NCN Grant 2022/45/B/ST1/00135.

H.O. was partially supported by Early Stage Funding- Vicerector for research, University of Innsbruck.

unique ergodicity. We provide a general condition for the existence of a unique μ -invariant (also called μ -stationary) Borel probability measure for random systems on an interval which are μ -injective. This condition generalizes some of our previous results given in [6]. Additionally, we show here that under these assumptions the system is asymptotically stable.

The second concept studied in this paper is proximality. Proximal dynamical systems gained special attention due to the monumental works of Furstenberg [13, 14, 15] on the Poisson boundary and its applications to group theory. In general, a μ -stationary system need not be proximal. How to relate general μ -stationary systems to proximal μ -invariant systems was studied by Furstenberg-Glasner [16]. The main result of this part of the paper says that every μ -injective system is proximal under some assumptions. This, in turn, implies that the system is uniquely ergodic and asymptotically stable. We also prove that stability is ensured by proximality for systems consisting of monotone transformations under some mild assumptions.

In the last part of the paper, we are concerned with the quenched central limit theorem. Lately, quenched central limit theorems have been proved for various non-stationary Markov processes in [8, 18, 20, 21, 23]. In this paper, we show this for μ -injective random systems. Our proof is based on the Gordin and Lifšic theorem (see Section IV.8 in [4], see also [11]) and Łuczynska and Szarek recent results (see [24]). In [24] there was given a sufficient condition guaranteeing that an observable is L^2 -coboundary. Combining this fact with asymptotic stability verified before we obtain the quenched central limit theorem.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section 2 contains some notation and definitions from the theory of random maps. In Section 3 we prove that every μ -invariant measure for μ -injective system has no atoms. In Section 4 we study proximality. Here we prove the main result: Theorem 4.6 saying that μ -injective systems are proximal in the sense of Furstenberg. The theorem is preceded by some lemmas. Section 5 is devoted to asymptotic stability. The main theorem of this part of the paper (Theorem 5.5) says that any μ -injective system which is below the diagonal on the left or above the diagonal on the right is asymptotically stable. Finally, in Section 6 we prove the quenched central limit theorem for a Markov chain corresponding to μ -injective systems.

2. PRELIMINARIES

By $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ we denote the space of all Borel subsets of $[0, 1]$. By \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{P} we denote the space of all Borel measures and the space of all Borel probability measures on $[0, 1]$, respectively. By $C([0, 1])$ we denote the family of all bounded continuous functions equipped with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|$. We shall write $\langle \nu, f \rangle$ for $\int_{[0, 1]} f d\nu$.

In the space \mathcal{M} we introduce the Wasserstein metric

$$d_W(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \sup_{f \in F} |\langle \nu_1, f \rangle - \langle \nu_2, f \rangle|,$$

where $F \subset C([0, 1])$ is the set of all $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$. It is well known that the space \mathcal{P} equipped with

the Wasserstein metric is complete and the convergence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(\nu_n, \nu) = 0 \quad \text{for } \nu_n, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$$

is equivalent to the weak convergence of measures:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \nu_n, f \rangle = \langle \nu, f \rangle \quad \text{for all } f \in C([0, 1]).$$

An operator $P : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is called a *Markov operator* if it satisfies the following two conditions:

- $P(\lambda_1 \nu_1 + \lambda_2 \nu_2) = \lambda_1 P\nu_1 + \lambda_2 P\nu_2$ for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{M}$,
- $P\nu \in \mathcal{P}$ for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$.

A Markov operator P is called a *Feller operator* if there is a linear operator $U : C([0, 1]) \rightarrow C([0, 1])$ such that $U^* = P$, i.e.,

$$\langle \nu, Uf \rangle = \langle P\nu, f \rangle \quad \text{for } f \in C([0, 1]), \nu \in \mathcal{M}.$$

A measure ν is called *P-invariant* for a Markov operator P if $P\nu = \nu$. Since $[0, 1]$ is a compact metric space, every Feller operator P has an invariant probability measure. For example, let $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ and define $\hat{\nu} \in C([0, 1])^*$ by $\hat{\nu}(f) = \text{LIM}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \langle P^k \nu_0, f \rangle)$, where LIM denotes a Banach limit. By the Riesz Representation Theorem $\hat{\nu}(f) = \langle \nu, f \rangle$, where $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$ is invariant.

An operator P is called *asymptotically stable* if there exists a P -invariant measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$ such that the sequence $(P^n \eta)$ converges in the weak-* topology to ν for any $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle P^n \eta, f \rangle = \langle \nu, f \rangle \quad \text{for any } f \in C([0, 1]).$$

Necessarily, ν is then unique.

Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. By $\bigvee_0^1 f$ we denote the variation of f over $[0, 1]$, i.e.,

$$\bigvee_0^1 f := \sup \sum_{i=0}^n |f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})|,$$

where the supremum is over all partitions $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = 1$. If $E \subset \mathbb{R}$, then

$$|E| = \text{diam}(E) := \sup \{|x - y| : x, y \in E\}.$$

If E_1, E_2 are subsets of $[0, 1]$, we write $E_1 \leq E_2$ when $x_1 \leq x_2$ for all $x_1 \in E_1$ and $x_2 \in E_2$. Analogously, we use $E_1 < E_2$.

The following observation will be central in estimations later on.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let $B_1, \dots, B_k \subset [0, 1]$ be such that $B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \dots \leq B_k$. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |f(B_i)| \leq \bigvee_0^1 f.$$

Proof. If B_i is a singleton, then $|f(B_i)| = 0$. So, without loss of generality we may assume that each B_i consists of at least two points. Pick $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}$ in B_i , with $x_{i,1} < x_{i,2}$. Since $B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \dots \leq B_k$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |f(x_{i,1}) - f(x_{i,2})| \leq \bigvee_0^1 f.$$

Taking the supremum over all possible choices for $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, gives the result. \square

Let Γ denote a family of continuous and piecewise monotone functions on $[0, 1]$, equipped with the topology induced by $(C([0, 1]), \|\cdot\|)$. Let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ . There is no loss of generality in assuming that $\text{supp } \mu = \Gamma$. Otherwise, we may restrict our consideration to $\text{supp } \mu$. The pair (Γ, μ) will be called a *stochastic dynamical system*.

Let

$$\Gamma_0 = \{g \in \Gamma : g(0) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_1 = \{g \in \Gamma : g(1) = 1\}.$$

We make the following assumption on Γ :

(\mathfrak{A}) For every $x \in (0, 1]$ there exist $g \in \Gamma_0$ such that $g(x) \in (0, x)$ and for every $x \in [0, 1)$ there exists $h \in \Gamma_1$ such that $h(x) \in (x, 1)$.

Remark 2.2. Note that (\mathfrak{A}) and the assumption that $\text{supp } \mu = \Gamma$ imply that $\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : g(x) \in (0, x)\}) > 0$ for all $x \in (0, 1]$ and $\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : g(x) \in (x, 1)\}) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$.

Further we say that a stochastic system (Γ, μ) is *below the diagonal on the left* if

$$\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : \exists \epsilon_g > 0 \forall x \in (0, \epsilon_g) g(x) < x\}) > 0,$$

and, analogously, *above the diagonal on the right* if

$$\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : \exists \epsilon_g > 0 \forall x \in (1 - \epsilon_g, 1) g(x) > x\}) > 0.$$

Note that by continuity, being below the diagonal on the left is equivalent to $\mu(\{g \in \Gamma_0 : \exists \epsilon_g > 0 \forall x \in (0, \epsilon_g) g(x) < x\}) > 0$ and similarly for Γ_1 for above the diagonal on the right.

Let $n(g, x)$ denote the number of elements in $g^{-1}(x)$. We say that a stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) is μ -*injective* in $x \in [0, 1]$ if

$$\int_{\Gamma} n(g, x) d\mu(g) \leq 1.$$


A stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) will be called μ -*injective* if

$$\int_{\Gamma} n(g, x) d\mu(g) \leq 1 \text{ for all } x \in [0, 1].$$

To illustrate μ -injectivity, let us revisit an example of our paper [6], which is μ -injective for certain choices of μ , but not μ -injective for some other choices of μ .

Example 2.3. Let us consider the following three continuous functions.

$$\phi_1(x) := \begin{cases} 3x & \text{if } x \in [0, \frac{1}{3}], \\ -3x + 2 & \text{if } x \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}], \\ 3x - 2 & \text{if } x \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1], \end{cases} \quad \phi_2(x) := \frac{x}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_3(x) := \frac{x}{3} + \frac{2}{3}.$$



Let us take $\Gamma = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3\}$ and $\mu(\{\phi_2\}) = \mu(\{\phi_3\}) =: p$. Since $n(\phi_1, x) = 3$, we see that the system is μ -injective for the case that $p \geq \frac{2}{5}$ and not μ -injective otherwise. Moreover, note that the system fulfils condition (\mathfrak{A}) and it is below and above the diagonal on the left and right, respectively.

Let a stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) be given. The operator $P : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ defined by the formula

$$(1) \quad P\nu(A) = \int_{\Gamma} \nu(g^{-1}(A)) d\mu(g) \quad \text{for every } A \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) \text{ and } \nu \in \mathcal{M}.$$

is a Feller operator.

A Borel probability measure ν on $[0, 1]$ is called μ -invariant (also known as μ -stationary) if ν is P -invariant, i.e.,

$$\nu(A) = \int_{\Gamma} \nu(g^{-1}A) d\mu(g), \quad \text{for every } A \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]).$$

Moreover, we call the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) *asymptotically stable* if its associated Markov operator P defined by (1) is.

3. MEASURES WITH NO ATOMS

Note that a stochastic dynamical system on $[0, 1]$ has at least one μ -invariant Borel probability measure, because $[0, 1]$ is compact and the associated Markov operator P is Feller, as discussed in the previous section.

Lemma 3.1. *If the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) satisfies condition (\mathfrak{A}) and is μ -injective, then any μ -invariant measure has no atoms in $[0, 1]$, and, in particular, it is concentrated on $(0, 1)$.*

Proof. Let ν be a μ -invariant probability measure on $[0, 1]$. Assume, contrary to our claim, that ν has an atom, and let $\theta := \max_{x \in [0, 1]} \nu(\{x\})$. Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$ be the set of all atoms with maximal value θ . We assume that $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_N$ provided that $N > 1$. Obviously, we have

$$\nu(\{a_i\}) = \int_{\Gamma} \nu(g^{-1}(a_i)) d\mu(g) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

If for a μ -positive set of g we have $g^{-1}(a_i) \not\subseteq \{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$, then we would obtain

$$\theta = \nu(\{a_i\}) = \int_{\Gamma} \nu(g^{-1}(a_i)) d\mu(g) < \theta \int_{\Gamma} n(g, a_i) d\mu(g) \leq \theta,$$

but this is impossible. Thus for μ -a.e. g we have $g^{-1}(a_i) \subset \{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$, and consequently we have

$$\begin{aligned} N\theta &= \sum_{i=1}^N \nu(\{a_i\}) = \int_{\Gamma} \sum_{i=1}^N \nu(g^{-1}(a_i)) \, d\mu(g) \\ &= \int_{\Gamma} \theta \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{a_j\}}(g^{-1}(a_i)) \, d\mu(g) = \int_{\Gamma} \theta \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{a_i\}}(g(a_j)) \, d\mu(g) \\ &= \theta \int_{\Gamma} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{a_1, \dots, a_N\}}(g(a_j)) \, d\mu(g). \end{aligned}$$

This, in turn, implies that $\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{a_1, \dots, a_N\}}(g(a_j)) = N$ for μ -a.e. g . However, this is impossible since $\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : g(a_1) \in (0, a_1)\}) > 0$ if $a_1 > 0$ and $\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : g(a_2) \in (0, a_2)\}) > 0$ if $a_1 = 0$ and $N \geq 2$, due to Remark 2.2. If $a_1 = 0$ and $N = 1$, then $\mathbf{1}_{\{a_1\}}(g(a_1)) = 0$ for some g , by (\mathfrak{A}) . This is also satisfied for all h sufficiently close to g which lie in $\text{supp } \mu$. This completes the proof. \square

The previous lemma implies also the existence of a μ -invariant measure on the open interval $(0, 1)$.

Remark 3.2. Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1 there exists a μ -invariant probability measure on $(0, 1)$. This measure has no atoms.

4. PROXIMALITY

Let ν be a μ -invariant probability measure on $[0, 1]$. The function $h : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the formula

$$h(g) = \int_{[0,1]} f(g(x)) \nu(dx) \quad \text{for } g \in \Gamma$$

is a μ -harmonic function on Γ for any bounded Borel function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., it satisfies the mean value property

$$h(g) = \int_{\Gamma} h(g \circ g') \mu(dg').$$

It is well known that the sequence of measures $(\nu(g_n^{-1} \circ \dots \circ g_1^{-1}(\cdot)))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is weakly convergent for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ (see [12], Corollary p. 20). Let us denote its limit by ν_{ω} . The measures ν will satisfy the barycenter equation

$$\nu(\cdot) = \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \nu_{\omega}(\cdot) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega).$$

Following Furstenberg we say that a μ -invariant measure ν for a given stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) is μ -proximal if there exists a measurable function $\Theta : \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$\nu_{\omega} = \delta_{\Theta(\omega)}$$

for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$.

A first observation concerning μ -proximality is the following:

Lemma 4.1. *Let (Γ, μ) be a stochastic dynamical system such that every μ -invariant measure is μ -proximal. Then (Γ, μ) has at most one μ -invariant measure.*

Proof. Assume, contrary to our claim, that there exist two different μ -invariant measures $\nu^1, \nu^2 \in \mathcal{P}$. Then we have $\nu_\omega^i = \delta_{\Theta_i(\omega)}$ for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. ω and some measurable functions $\Theta_1, \Theta_2 : \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Since $\nu^i = \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \nu_\omega^i d\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\nu^1 \neq \nu^2$, we obtain

$$(2) \quad \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\{\omega \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} : \Theta_1(\omega) \neq \Theta_2(\omega)\}) > 0.$$

On the other hand, since $\nu^3 = (\nu^1 + \nu^2)/2$ is μ -invariant, it is μ -proximal by assumption, say $\nu_\omega^3 = \delta_{\Theta^3(\omega)}$. The easy observation that

$$\nu_\omega^3 = \frac{\nu_\omega^1 + \nu_\omega^2}{2} = \frac{\delta_{\Theta^1(\omega)} + \delta_{\Theta^2(\omega)}}{2} \neq \delta_{\Theta^3(\omega)}$$

on some $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -positive subsets of $\omega \in \Gamma^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, by (2), leads to a contradiction and completes the proof. \square

We start the analysis of stochastic dynamical systems that satisfy condition (A) with the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *If the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) satisfies condition (A), is below the diagonal on the left (or over the diagonal on the right) and has a μ -invariant probability measure ν , then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a Borel set $B \subset [0, 1]$ with $\nu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and a sequence $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in \Gamma_0^n$ (or $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in \Gamma_1^n$) for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(B) \subset [0, \varepsilon]$ (or $g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(B) \subset (1 - \varepsilon, 1]$).*

Proof. Assume that the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) is below the diagonal on the left, and let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be such that

$$(3) \quad \mu(\{g \in \Gamma : \forall x \in (0, \varepsilon_0) (g(x) < x)\}) > 0.$$

Let

$$\gamma := \sup\{\nu(B) : B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) \wedge \exists g_1, \dots, g_n \in \Gamma_0 (g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(B) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0])\}.$$

If we prove that $\gamma = 1$, the assertion will follow. In fact, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we may choose $B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ with $\nu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \Gamma_0$ such that $g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(B) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0]$. By (3), in turn, we find $g_0 \in \Gamma_0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g_0^m([0, \varepsilon_0]) \subset [0, \varepsilon]$. Consequently, we obtain $g_0^m \circ g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(B) \subset [0, \varepsilon]$ as desired.

Suppose, contrary to the claim, that $\gamma < 1$. By (A) for every $x \in [0, 1]$ we may choose $h_1, \dots, h_n \in \Gamma_0$ such that $h_1 \circ \dots \circ h_n(x) \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$. Now by continuity we may find an open neighbourhood U_x of x such that $h_1 \circ \dots \circ h_n(w) \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ for $w \in U_x$, and let $\eta_x < \varepsilon_0$ be arbitrary positive constants such that $h_1 \circ \dots \circ h_n([0, \eta_x]) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0]$. Having defined the open sets U_x for $x \in [0, 1]$ we find a finite covering

$$(4) \quad U_{x_1} \cup \dots \cup U_{x_p} \supset [0, 1].$$

Set $\eta := \min_{1 \leq i \leq p} \eta_{x_i}$. Choose $B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ with $\nu(B) > \gamma(1 - 1/(2p))$ and $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \Gamma_0$ such that $g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(B) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0]$, and let $g_0 \in \Gamma_0$ be

such that $g_0(x) < x$ for all $x \in [0, \varepsilon_0)$, by (3). Now take $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g_0^{n_0}([0, \varepsilon_0)) \subset [0, \eta)$. By the definition of γ we must have

$$(5) \quad \nu(\{x \in B' : g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x) \in [\varepsilon_0, 1]\}) > \gamma/2,$$

where $B' = [0, 1] \setminus B$. If not for

$$B_0 := B \cup \{x \in B' : g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x) \in [0, \varepsilon_0)\}$$

we have

$$\nu(B_0) > \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(B_0) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0),$$

and this is contrary to the definition of γ . Further, by (4) and (5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^p \nu(\{x \in B' : g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x) \in U_{x_i}\}) \\ & \geq \nu(\{x \in B' : g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x) \in \bigcup_{i=1}^p U_{x_i}\}) \\ & \geq \nu(\{x \in B' : g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x) \in [\varepsilon_0, 1]\}) > \gamma/2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that

$$\nu(\{x \in B' : g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x) \in U_{x_i}\}) \geq \gamma/(2p).$$

Let

$$\tilde{B} := \{x \in B' : g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x) \in U_{x_i}\}.$$

Choose $h_1, \dots, h_m \in \Gamma_0$ such that $h_1 \circ \cdots \circ h_m(U_{x_i}) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0)$ and observe that $h_1 \circ \cdots \circ h_m([0, \eta)) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0)$. Therefore,

$$h_1 \circ \cdots \circ h_m \circ g_0^{n_0} \circ g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(B \cup \tilde{B}) \subset [0, \varepsilon_0).$$

Moreover, $\nu(B \cup \tilde{B}) > \gamma - \gamma/(2p) + \gamma/(2p) = \gamma$, which is impossible, by the definition of γ . Thus $\gamma = 1$ and the proof for the system (Γ, μ) which is below the diagonal on the left is completed. The case when (Γ, μ) is above the diagonal on the right is proved analogously. \square

Remark 4.3. *In the assertion of Lemma 4.2 we may require that the set B is closed. In fact, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the closure of any set B found for $\varepsilon/2$ will meet the requirement.*

Lemma 4.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.2 for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $(g_{1,1}, \dots, g_{1,i_1}) \in \Gamma^{i_1}, \dots, (g_{n,1}, \dots, g_{n,i_n}) \in \Gamma^{i_n}$ and a closed set $B \subset [0, 1]$ with $\nu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ such that*

$$g_{1,i_1} \circ \cdots \circ g_{1,1}(B) < g_{2,i_2} \circ \cdots \circ g_{2,1}(B) < \cdots < g_{n,i_n} \circ \cdots \circ g_{n,1}(B).$$

Proof. Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$ and assume that the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) is below the diagonal on the left. The case when it is above the diagonal on the right may be done analogously. Therefore we may assume that

$$(6) \quad \mu(\{g \in \Gamma : g(x) < x, \forall x \in (0, \varepsilon)\}) > 0.$$

By Lemma 4.2 (see also Remark 4.3) there exists a closed set $B \subset [0, 1]$ with $\nu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and a sequence $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in \Gamma_0^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(B) \subset [0, \varepsilon)$. By the continuity of the functions in Γ there exists an open neighbourhood $U \subset \Gamma^n$ of (g_1, \dots, g_n) such that $h_1 \circ \cdots \circ h_n(B) \subset [0, \varepsilon)$ for every $(h_1, \dots, h_n) \in U$. Obviously, $\mu^{\otimes n}(U) > 0$. Since $\nu(\{0\}) = P^n \nu(\{0\}) = 0$, by Lemma 3.1, there exists $(\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_n) \in U$ such

that $\nu(\tilde{g}_n^{-1} \circ \dots \circ \tilde{g}_1^{-1}(0) \cap B) = 0$. Therefore, for sufficiently small $\eta > 0$ and $B' = B \setminus \tilde{g}_n^{-1} \circ \dots \circ \tilde{g}_1^{-1}([0, \eta])$ we have $\nu(B') > 1 - \varepsilon$. Taking $h \in \Gamma$ such that $0 < h(x) < x$ for $x \in (0, \varepsilon)$ we will find an increasing sequence $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the sets

$$h^{k_i} \circ \tilde{g}_n \circ \dots \circ \tilde{g}_1(B')$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are pairwise disjoint. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let Γ be a collection of piecewise monotone continuous functions on $[0, 1]$, and let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ with $\text{supp}(\mu) = \Gamma$. If ν is a μ -invariant measure and (Γ, μ) is μ -injective, then for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -almost every $\omega = (g_1, \dots, g_n, \dots)$ we have*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigvee_0^1 g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n < +\infty.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2, \dots$ denote the independent random variables defined on $(\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})$ with values in Γ and distribution μ , i.e., $\mathbf{g}_i(\omega) = g_i$ for $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots)$. We set

$$\mathcal{N}_n(\cdot, x) := \#\{z \in [0, 1] : \mathbf{g}_1(\cdot) \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{g}_n(\cdot)(z) = x\},$$

and let

$$V_n(\omega) = \int_{[0,1]} \mathcal{N}_n(\omega, x) dx \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots).$$

Now we are going to show that $(V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a positive supermartingale with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Namely, by μ -injectivity and the Fubini theorem for every $\omega \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) &= \int_{[0,1]} \int_{\Gamma} \sum_{z \in g_n^{-1} \circ \dots \circ g_1^{-1}(x)} n(g_{n+1}, z) \mu(dg_{n+1}) dx \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} \sum_{z \in g_n^{-1} \circ \dots \circ g_1^{-1}(x)} \int_{\Gamma} n(g_{n+1}, z) \mu(dg_{n+1}) dx \\ &\leq \int_{[0,1]} \#\{z : z \in g_n^{-1} \circ \dots \circ g_1^{-1}(x)\} dx \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} \mathcal{N}_n(\omega, x) dx = V_n(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

By the Martingale Convergence Theorem the random variables $V_n(\cdot)$ are $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.s. convergent to a finite random variable. Hence for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -almost every $\omega \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have $\sup_{n \geq 1} V_n(\omega) < +\infty$.

On the other hand, by the Banach-Vitali theorem (see [?])

$$V_n(\omega) = \int_{[0,1]} \mathcal{N}_n(\omega, x) dx = \bigvee_0^1 g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n$$

for $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and consequently $\sup_{n \geq 1} \bigvee_0^1 g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n < +\infty$ for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -almost every $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let Γ satisfy condition (\mathfrak{A}) , and let a Borel probability measure μ with $\text{supp } \mu = \Gamma$ be given. Assume that the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) is μ -injective and below the diagonal on the left (or over on the right). If ν is a μ -invariant Borel probability measure, then ν is μ -proximal.*

Proof. Let ν be a μ -invariant probability measure. It is concentrated on $(0, 1)$, according to Lemma 3.1. Let $\Gamma_0^{\mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ be such that $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}(\Gamma_0^{\mathbb{N}}) = 1$ and the sequence of measures $(\nu(g_n^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ g_1^{-1}(\cdot)))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to ν_ω for $\omega \in \Gamma_0^{\mathbb{N}}$, i.e., for $\omega \in \Gamma_0^{\mathbb{N}}$ it holds

$$(7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0,1]} f(g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_n(x)) \nu(dx) = \int_{[0,1]} f(x) \nu_\omega(dx) \quad \text{for every } f \in C([0, 1]).$$

We are going to verify the following claim (see [8, 26]):

Claim: for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\Gamma_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}) > 1 - \varepsilon$ satisfying the following property: for every $\omega \in \Gamma_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists an interval I of length $|I| \leq \varepsilon$ such that $\nu_\omega(I) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Hence we obtain that $\nu_\omega = \delta_{\Theta(\omega)}$ for all ω from some set $\hat{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\hat{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}) = 1$. Here $\Theta(\omega)$ is a point from $[0, 1]$.

To see this take a sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 1}$, $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\Gamma_{\varepsilon_n}^{\mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\Gamma_{\varepsilon_n}^{\mathbb{N}}) > 1 - \varepsilon_n$ and for every $\omega \in \Gamma_{\varepsilon_n}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists an interval I of length $|I| \leq \varepsilon_n$ such that $\nu_\omega(I) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_n$. Set $\hat{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \Gamma_{\varepsilon_n}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and observe that $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\Gamma_0) = 1$. Moreover, for $\omega \in \hat{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists a subsequence ε_{m_n} converging to 0 and a sequence I_n such that $|I_n| \rightarrow 0$ and $\nu_\omega(I_n) \rightarrow 1$. Since $I_n \subset [0, 1]$ and $[0, 1]$ is compact, passing to a subsequence we may assume that there exists $\Theta(\omega) \in [0, 1]$ such that for $I_n \rightarrow \Theta(\omega)$. Then we obtain $\nu_\omega(\{\Theta(\omega)\}) = 1$ and consequently $\nu_\omega = \delta_{\Theta(\omega)}$.

Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ be such that $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\sup_{n \geq 1} V_n(\omega) < M$ for some $M > 0$ and every $\omega \in \tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ using Lemma 4.5. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $M/k < \varepsilon$.

By Lemma 4.4 we find a closed set $B \subset [0, 1]$ with $\nu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $(g_{1,1}, \dots, g_{1,i_1}) \in \Gamma^{i_1}, \dots, (g_{k,1}, \dots, g_{k,i_k}) \in \Gamma^{i_k}$ such that one has

$$g_{1,i_1} \circ \cdots \circ g_{1,1}(B) < g_{2,i_2} \circ \cdots \circ g_{2,1}(B) < \cdots < g_{k,i_k} \circ \cdots \circ g_{k,1}(B).$$

In particular, the sets are pairwise disjoint. By continuity, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ there exists an open neighbourhood $U_j \subset \Gamma^{i_j}$ of $(g_{j,1}, \dots, g_{j,i_j})$ such that $\hat{B}_1, \dots, \hat{B}_k$ are pairwise disjoint, where

$$\hat{B}_i = \bigcup_{(h_{j,1}, \dots, h_{j,i_j}) \in U_j} h_{j,i_j} \circ \cdots \circ h_{j,1}(B) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k,$$

while still $\hat{B}_1 < \hat{B}_2 < \cdots < \hat{B}_k$. We see that $\kappa := \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mu^{\otimes i_j}(U_j) > 0$. According to Lemma 2.1, for every $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m) \in \Gamma^m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$|g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_m(\hat{B}_j)| \leq \bigvee_0^1 g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_m/k.$$

Hence

$$|g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_m \circ h_1 \circ \cdots \circ h_{i_j}(B)| \leq \bigvee_0^1 g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_m/k$$

for $(h_1, \dots, h_{i_j}) \in U_j$.

Let $j_* = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} i_j$. This shows that for any cylinder in $\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$, defined by fixing the first entries (g_1, \dots, g_n) , the conditional probability that $(g_{n+1}, \dots, g_{n+j_*})$ are such that

$$|g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_{n+l}(B)| \geq \bigvee_0^1 g_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ g_{i_n}/k \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, j_*$$

is less than $1 - \kappa$.

Hence for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exist increasing sequences $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\tilde{m}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (depending on ω) such that $0 < m_n - \tilde{m}_n \leq j_*$ and

$$|g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_{m_n}(B)| \leq \bigvee_0^1 g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_{\tilde{m}_n}/k \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

Hence there exists $\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}} \subset \Gamma_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that still $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and for $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists an increasing sequence $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (depending on ω) such that

$$(8) \quad |g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_{m_n}(B)| \leq M/k < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

Now take $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{\mathbb{N}}$. Since there exists a subsequence $(m_n)_{n \geq \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers the such that (8) is satisfied, passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that there exists a closed interval $I \subset [0, 1]$ with $|I| < \varepsilon$ such that

$$g_1 \circ \cdots \circ g_{m_n}(B) \subset I \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

From (7) we know that the sequence of measures $(\nu(g_{m_n}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ g_1^{-1}))_{n \geq \mathbb{N}}$ as a subsequence of $(\nu(g_n^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ g_1^{-1}))_{n \geq \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to ν_ω . Hence, by the Portmanteau Theorem, we obtain $\nu_\omega(I) \geq \nu(g_{m_n}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ g_1^{-1}(I)) \geq \nu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and the proof is complete. \square

Corollary 4.7. *Assume that a stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.6. Then it is uniquely ergodic.*

Proof. From Theorem 4.6 it follows that every μ -invariant measure ν is μ -proximal. Lemma 4.1 yields that the μ -invariant measure is unique. \square

5. STABILITY

When the measure μ is supported on monotonic maps stability of the corresponding random system is easily derived from proximality. In fact we have the following proposition:

Proposition 5.1. *Let Γ consist of strictly monotonic continuous functions and let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ such that $\Gamma = \text{supp } \mu$. Assume that every μ -invariant probability measure of the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) is atomless. If (Γ, μ) has a μ -invariant probability measure ν that is μ -proximal and $\{0, 1\} \subset \text{supp } \nu$, then (Γ, μ) is asymptotically stable.*

Proof. Note that ν is concentrated on $(0, 1)$ and that it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^n \nu_1(dx) - \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^n \nu_2(dx) \right| = 0$$

for every $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ and an arbitrary Lipschitz function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with Lipschitz constant L_f , due to density of the space of all Lipschitz functions in $C([0, 1])$. If $L_f = 0$, the statement is obvious.

The μ -proximality of ν yields a map $\Theta : \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$, the sequence of measures $\nu((g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n)^{-1}(\cdot))$ converges weakly to $\delta_{\Theta(\omega)}$. Since ν is atomless,

$$0 = \nu(\{0\}) = \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \delta_{\Theta(\omega)}(\{0\}) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega).$$

Thus, $\Theta(\omega) \neq 0$ for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. ω . A similar argument applies to $\{1\}$. Thus, $\Theta(\omega) \notin \{0, 1\}$ for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. ω .

Fix $x, y \in (0, 1)$, $x < y$. Since ν has no atoms and $0, 1 \in \text{supp}(\nu)$ we see that $\nu((0, x)) > 0$ and $\nu((y, 1)) > 0$. From proximality it follows that for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots)$ and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that $I_\omega^\varepsilon := (\Theta(\omega) - \varepsilon, \Theta(\omega) + \varepsilon) \subset (0, 1)$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq N$ we may find $x_n \in (0, x)$ and $y_n \in (y, 1)$ such that $g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(x_n), g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(y_n) \in I_\omega^\varepsilon$. In fact, because ν is atomless, weak convergence implies

$$\nu((g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n)^{-1}(I_\omega^\varepsilon)) \rightarrow \delta_{\Theta(\omega)}(I_\omega^\varepsilon) = 1.$$

So, for all n sufficiently large, $(g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n)^{-1}(I_\omega^\varepsilon) \cap (0, x) \neq \emptyset$, and similarly for $(y, 1)$.

Hence, by monotonicity of g_i , we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n([x, y])| \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(x_n) - g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(y_n)| \leq 2\varepsilon$$

for $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. (g_1, g_2, \dots) . Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrarily small, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n([x, y])| = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}\text{-a.e. } (g_1, g_2, \dots).$$

Fix now $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ and let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant $L_f > 0$. Put $\bar{\nu} := (\nu_1 + \nu_2)/2$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. The Césaro averages $(\bar{\nu} + P\bar{\nu} + \dots + P^{n-1}\bar{\nu})/n$ converge weakly to a μ -invariant measure ν_* . By assumption ν_* is atomless. Thus, for some $N' \in \mathbb{N}$, $P^{N'}\bar{\nu}((0, 1)) > 1 - \varepsilon/(8L_f)$. Consequently, $P^{N'}\nu_i((0, 1)) > 1 - \varepsilon/(4L_f)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Put $\nu'_i := P^{N'}\nu_i$.

Then for $n \geq N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^{n+N'} \nu_1(dx) - \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^{n+N'} \nu_2(dx) \right| \\
 &= \left| \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^n \nu'_1(dx) - \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^n \nu'_2(dx) \right| \\
 &\leq L_f \int_{\Gamma^n \times [0,1]^2} |g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(x) - g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n(y)| \mu^{\otimes n}(dg_1, \dots, dg_n) \nu'_1(dx) \nu'_2(dy) \\
 &\leq L_f \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \times (0,1)^2} |g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n([x, y])| \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(dg_1, dg_2, \dots) \nu_1(dx) \nu_2(dy) \\
 &\quad + 2L_f (\nu'_1 \otimes \nu'_2)([0, 1]^2 \setminus (0, 1)^2)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$(\nu'_1 \otimes \nu'_2)([0, 1]^2 \setminus (0, 1)^2) \leq \nu'_1(\{0, 1\}) + \nu'_2(\{0, 1\}) < \varepsilon/(2L_f).$$

By Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^n \nu_1(dx) - \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^n \nu_2(dx) \right| \\
 &\leq L_f \int_{\Gamma^n \times (0,1)^2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |g_1 \circ \dots \circ g_n([x, y])| \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(dg_1, dg_2, \dots) \nu_1(dx) \nu_2(dy) = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

and the proof of stability is completed. \square

Remark 5.2. A particular consequence of Proposition 5.1 is that there is only one μ -invariant measure ν . Moreover for any continuous function $f \in C([0, 1])$ and $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$ we will have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^n \tilde{\nu}(dx) = \int_{[0,1]} f(x) \nu(dx).$$

Remark 5.3. Let Γ consist of strictly monotone functions. For any Borel probability measure μ on Γ the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) is then μ -injective. If Γ also satisfies our key condition (\mathfrak{A}) , then any μ -invariant measure is atomless, according to Lemma 3.1. Thus, a crucial assumption of Proposition 5.1 is satisfied. Assume additionally that $\text{supp } \mu = \Gamma$.

If there exists now a μ -invariant measure ν that is μ -proximal and has $\{0, 1\} \subset \text{supp } \nu$, then Proposition 5.1 implies that (Γ, μ) is asymptotically stable. In particular, ν is the only μ -invariant measure of (Γ, μ) .

In view of Theorem 4.6, if also (Γ, μ) is below the diagonal on the left or above the diagonal on the right, then any μ -invariant Borel probability measure ν is μ -proximal. We cannot conclude that $\{0, 1\} \subset \text{supp } \nu$ though, which would allow us to conclude by means of Proposition 5.1 that (Γ, μ) is asymptotically stable.

In the technique of proof we used crucially the fact that Γ consists of strictly monotonic functions. Now we are going to prove asymptotic stability for some μ -injective stochastic dynamical systems without the necessity for Γ to consist of strictly monotonic functions. A different approach is required.

Lemma 5.4. Let Γ satisfy condition (\mathfrak{A}) , and let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ with $\text{supp } (\mu) = \Gamma$. Assume (Γ, μ) has a unique μ -invariant

Borel probability measure ν . If (Γ, μ) is below the diagonal on the left (or above the diagonal on the right), then for every point $x_0 \in \text{supp } \nu$ and open set $I \ni x_0$ there exists $\alpha > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$P^n \tilde{\nu}(I) \geq \alpha$$

for every probability measure $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$, for P defined by (1).

Proof. Let ν be the unique μ -invariant Borel probability measure. Fix $x \in \text{supp } \nu$ and let I be an open neighbourhood of x . Since

$$\frac{\delta_0 + P\delta_0 + \cdots + P^{n-1}\delta_0}{n}$$

converges weakly to ν , by the Portmanteau Theorem there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$P^{m_0} \delta_0(I) > \nu(I)/2$$

and, consequently, we have for all x sufficiently close to 0

$$(9) \quad P^{m_0} \delta_x(I) > \nu(I)/2 := \gamma,$$

by the weak continuity of the operator P^{m_0} .

Since the system is above/below the diagonal on the left/right, we may choose $b > 0$ such that $\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : g([0, b]) \subset [0, b]\}) > 0$. Further, by (2) for every $y \in [0, 1]$ we may find $m(y) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $\mathbf{g}_y = (g_1, \dots, g_{m(y)}) \in \Gamma^{m(y)}$ such that $g_{m(y)} \circ \cdots \circ g_1(y) \in [0, b]$. Hence, by continuity, there exist open neighbourhood U_y of y and $V_{\mathbf{g}_y} \subset \Gamma^{m(y)}$ of \mathbf{g}_y such that for all $z \in U_y$ and $(h_1, \dots, h_{m(y)}) \in V_{\mathbf{g}_y}$ we have $h_{m(y)} \circ \cdots \circ h_1(z) \in [0, b]$. Obviously $\mu^{\otimes m}(V_{\mathbf{g}_y}) > 0$. By compactness of $[0, 1]$ we choose $x_1, \dots, x_k \in [0, 1]$ such that $[0, 1] \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_{x_i}$, and let $m = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} m(x_i)$. Let $\hat{\Gamma} := \{g \in \Gamma : g([0, b]) \subset [0, b]\}$. Set $V_y := \hat{\Gamma}^{m-m(y)} \times V_{\mathbf{g}_y}$ and note that $\mu^{\otimes m}(V_y) > 0$. We have also $h_m \circ \cdots \circ h_1(U_y) \subset [0, b]$ for every $(h_1, \dots, h_m) \in V_y$. Put

$$\kappa := \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \mu^{\otimes m}(V_{x_i})$$

and observe that

$$P^m \delta_y([0, b]) \geq \int \cdots \int_{V_{x_i}} \mathbf{1}_{[0, b]}(g_m \circ \cdots \circ g_1(y)) \mu^{\otimes m}(d(g_1, \dots, g_m)) \geq \kappa,$$

where x_i is such that $y \in U_{x_i}$. Hence for every $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$ we have

$$P^m \tilde{\nu}([0, b]) = \int_{\text{supp } \tilde{\nu}} P^m \delta_y([0, b]) \tilde{\nu}(dy) \geq \kappa.$$

Finally, from the Markov property we obtain

$$P^{m+m_0} \tilde{\nu}(I) \geq \int_{[0, b]} P^{m_0} \delta_y(I) P^m \tilde{\nu}(dy) \geq \gamma \kappa := \alpha$$

for every probability measure $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 5.5. *Let Γ satisfy condition (2), and let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ with $\text{supp}(\mu) = \Gamma$. If (Γ, μ) is μ -injective and below the diagonal on the left (or above the diagonal on the right), then it is asymptotically stable.*

Proof. Since there exists a μ -invariant probability measure ν , to prove stability it is enough to show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and any two Borel probability measures $\tilde{\nu}_1, \tilde{\nu}_2$ on $[0, 1]$, we have

$$(10) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(P^n \tilde{\nu}_1, P^n \tilde{\nu}_2) < \varepsilon.$$

Since (Γ, μ) is below the diagonal on the left, $0 \in \text{supp } \nu$ and ν is atomless (see Lemma 3.1), there exists an interval $J \subset [0, 1]$ such that

$$\mu(g \in \Gamma : g|_J \text{ is monotone and } \nu \circ g|_J \neq \nu|_J) > 0.$$

In fact, if g and $x \in (0, 1)$ are such that $(g^n(x))$ is a decreasing sequence and it tends to 0 with $g(x) < x$ and g is monotone on $[0, x]$, we easily see that

$$\nu(g^{m+1}((0, x))) \neq \nu(g^m((0, x)))$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Consequently, by Proposition 2.3 with Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.3 in [6] there exists $x_0 \in \text{supp } \nu \cap (0, 1)$ such that for $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. $\omega = (g_1, \dots, g_n, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ there is $\theta > 0$ and $\tilde{h} > 0$ such that for any interval I with x_0 in the interior of I and $|I| < \theta$ we have

$$|g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1(I)| \leq \exp(-n \cdot \tilde{h}).$$

Now fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\theta > 0$ such that the set of all $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ for which

$$(11) \quad |g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1((x_0 - \theta/2, x_0 + \theta/2))| \leq \exp(-n \cdot \tilde{h})$$

has the measure $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}$ greater than $1 - \varepsilon/4$. Denote this set by $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $\tilde{\Gamma}^n$ be its projection on Γ^n , for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

At the beginning we prove condition (10) for any two measures ν_1 and ν_2 supported on the set I . To do this take a 1-Lipschitz function f . Taking if necessary the function $f - f(0)$, we may assume additionally that $f(0) = 0$. Therefore, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^m \nu_1(dx) - \int_{[0,1]} f(x) P^m \nu_2(dx) \right| \\ & \leq \int \dots \int_{\Gamma^m \times [0,1]^2} |f(g_m \circ \dots \circ g_1(x)) - f(g_m \circ \dots \circ g_1(y))| \mu^{\otimes m}(d(g_1, \dots, g_m)) \nu_1(dx) \nu_2(dy) \\ & \leq \int \dots \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}^m \times [0,1]^2} |g_m \circ \dots \circ g_1(x) - g_m \circ \dots \circ g_1(y)| \mu^{\otimes m}(d(g_1, \dots, g_m)) \nu_1(dx) \nu_2(dy) \\ & + \int \dots \int_{(\Gamma^m \setminus \tilde{\Gamma}^m) \times [0,1]^2} 2 \mu^{\otimes m}(d(g_1, \dots, g_m)) \nu_1(dx) \nu_2(dy) \leq \exp(-m \cdot \tilde{h}) + 2\varepsilon/4, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by (11).

By Lemma 5.4 there exists n_0 and $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$P^{n_0} \tilde{\nu}(I) \geq \alpha$$

for every $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$. Consequently for any measure $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$ we have two probability measures $\tilde{\nu}^+$ and $\tilde{\nu}^-$ such that $\tilde{\nu}^+$ is supported on I and

$$(13) \quad P^{n_0} \tilde{\nu} = \alpha \tilde{\nu}^+ + (1 - \alpha) \tilde{\nu}^-.$$

In fact, we define

$$\tilde{\nu}^+(\cdot) = \frac{P^{n_0}\tilde{\nu}(\cdot \cap I)}{P^{n_0}\tilde{\nu}(I)}$$

and

$$\tilde{\nu}^-(\cdot) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left(P^{n_0}\tilde{\nu}(\cdot) - \alpha\tilde{\nu}^+(\cdot) \right).$$

Now equation (13) leads for $n \geq n_0$ to:

$$\begin{aligned} d_W(P^n\tilde{\nu}_1, P^n\tilde{\nu}_2) &\leq \alpha d_W(P^{n-n_0}\tilde{\nu}_1^+, P^{n-n_0}\tilde{\nu}_2^+) \\ &\quad + (1-\alpha)d_W(P^{n-n_0}\tilde{\nu}_1^-, P^{n-n_0}\tilde{\nu}_2^-). \end{aligned}$$

By (12) for any $\tilde{\nu}_1, \tilde{\nu}_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ we have

$$(14) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(P^n\tilde{\nu}_1, P^n\tilde{\nu}_2) \leq (1-\alpha) \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(P^n\tilde{\nu}_1^-, P^n\tilde{\nu}_2^-) + \alpha\varepsilon.$$

Set $\Delta := \sup_{\tilde{\nu}_1, \tilde{\nu}_2 \in \mathcal{P}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(P^n\tilde{\nu}_1, P^n\tilde{\nu}_2) \leq 2$ and note that (14) gives

$$\Delta \leq (1-\alpha)\Delta + \alpha\varepsilon$$

and consequently $\Delta \leq \varepsilon$. Hence

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(P^n\nu_1, P^n\nu_2) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for every } \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P},$$

and since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we finally obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(P^n\tilde{\nu}_1, P^n\tilde{\nu}_2) = 0$$

for arbitrary measures $\tilde{\nu}_1, \tilde{\nu}_2 \in \mathcal{P}$. This completes the proof. \square

6. CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM

In the last section we are concerned with central limit theorem for the corresponding Markov chain. Having the stochastic dynamical system (Γ, μ) and the Markov operator P and its pre-dual U we define the Markov chain $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in the following way: the law of $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ with initial distribution ν_0 is the probability measure \mathbb{P}_{ν_0} on $([0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{B}([0, 1])^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_0}(X_{n+1} \in A | X_n = x) = P\delta_x(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_{\nu_0}(X_0 \in A) = \nu_0(A),$$

where $x \in [0, 1]$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$. The existence of \mathbb{P}_{ν_0} follows from the Kolmogorov extension theorem. When an initial distribution ν is equal to a μ -invariant measure, the Markov chain is called stationary. We shall also write $g_\omega^n(x) = g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1(x)$ for $\omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$.

We have

$$(15) \quad \text{if } X_0 = x \quad \text{then} \quad X_n(\omega) = g_\omega^n(x) \quad \text{for } \omega \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$$

The expectation with respect to \mathbb{P}_{ν_0} is denoted by \mathbb{E}_{ν_0} . For $\nu_0 = \delta_x$, the Dirac measure at $x \in [0, 1]$, we write just \mathbb{P}_x and \mathbb{E}_x . Obviously $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_0}(\cdot) =$

$\int_{[0,1]} \mathbb{P}_x(\cdot) \nu_0(dx)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}(\cdot) = \int_{[0,1]} \mathbb{E}_x(\cdot) \nu_0(dx)$. Observe that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_0, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}_x((X_0, \dots, X_n) \in A_0 \times \dots \times A_n) \\
 &= \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \mathbf{1}_{A_0 \times \dots \times A_n}(g_\omega^0(x), \dots, g_\omega^n(x)) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) \\
 (16) \quad &= (\delta_x \otimes \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})((y, \omega) : (g_\omega^0(y), \dots, g_\omega^n(y)) \in A_0 \times \dots \times A_n) \\
 &= \int \dots \int_{\Gamma^n} \mathbf{1}_{A_0 \times \dots \times A_n}(g_1(x), \dots, g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1(x)) \mu(dg_1) \dots \mu(dg_n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(17) \quad \mathbb{E}_x(H(X_0, \dots, X_n)) = \int \dots \int_{G^n} H(g_1(x), \dots, g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1(x)) \mu(dg_1) \dots \mu(dg_n)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (18) \quad & \mathbb{E}_{\nu_0}(H(X_0, \dots, X_n)) \\
 &= \int_{[0,1]} \int \dots \int_{\Gamma^n} H(g_1(x), \dots, g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1(x)) \mu(dg_1) \dots \mu(dg_n) \nu_0(dx)
 \end{aligned}$$

for an arbitrary bounded Borel-measurable function $H : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

We will prove that the random process $(\varphi(X_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes the corresponding stationary Markov chain with the initial distribution ν and φ is a *centered Lipschitz function* on $[0, 1]$, i.e. $\int_{[0,1]} \varphi(x) \nu(dx) = 0$, satisfies the central limit theorem, i.e.

$$\sigma^2 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\nu \left(\frac{\varphi(X_0) + \dots + \varphi(X_n)}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2$$

exists and

$$\frac{\varphi(X_0) + \dots + \varphi(X_n)}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where \Rightarrow denotes convergence in distribution. Moreover, we will be able to show that $(\varphi(X_n^x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $(X_n^x)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the corresponding Markov chain starting from an arbitrary point $x \in [0, 1]$, satisfies the central limit theorem from every point, i.e.

$$\frac{\varphi(X_0^x) + \dots + \varphi(X_n^x)}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, if $\sigma^2 > 0$ we have

$$(19) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \left(\left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \frac{\varphi(g_\omega^n(x)) + \dots + \varphi(g_\omega^1(x))}{\sqrt{n}} < a \right\} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \int_{-\infty}^a e^{-\frac{y^2}{2\sigma^2}} dy$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in [0, 1]$. If $\sigma = 0$ the sequence

$$\frac{\varphi(g_\omega^n(x)) + \dots + \varphi(g_\omega^1(x))}{\sqrt{n}}$$

converges in distribution to 0.

Set

$$S_n(\varphi, \omega, x) := \frac{\varphi(g_\omega^n(x)) + \cdots + \varphi(g_\omega^1(x))}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

The following proposition is a slight modification of the similar proposition proved for Markov chains corresponding to random walks on the circle in [24]. Here we extract some assumptions that are needed therein and check that they are also satisfied in our setting.

Proposition 6.1. *Let Γ satisfy condition (\mathfrak{A}) , and let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ with $\text{supp}(\mu) = \Gamma$. Let $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function. If (Γ, μ) is μ -injective and below the diagonal on the left (or above the diagonal on the right), then there exists a constant C such that for any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n U^i \varphi(x) - \sum_{i=1}^n U^i \varphi(y) \right| < C.$$

Proof. The proof goes word for word like the proof of Lemma 6 in [24]. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$ be the unique μ -invariant measure, by Corollary 4.7 (see also Theorem 4.6). In [24] random maps on the circle are considered, however, in the proof only two conditions were used. First, that for some $x_* \in \text{supp} \nu$ and $q \in (0, 1)$ there exists an open set $I \ni x_*$ such that for some $\Gamma_{x_*} \subset \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\Gamma_{x_*}) > 0$ we have

$$|g_n \circ \cdots \circ g_1(I)| \leq q^n \quad \text{for } \omega = (g_1, g_2, \dots) \in \Gamma_{x_*}.$$

In our setting this condition follows from Proposition 2.3 with Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.3 in [6] and the fact that

$$\mu(\{g \in \Gamma : g|_J \text{ is monotone and } \nu \circ g|_J \neq \nu|_J\}) > 0$$

(see also proof of Theorem 5.5).

The second condition required in the proof of Lemma 6 in [24] is the property verified in Lemma 5.4. Namely, there exists $\alpha > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$P^n \tilde{\nu}(I) \geq \alpha$$

for every probability measure $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$. Therefore, the proof follows from Lemma 6 in [24]. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let Γ satisfy condition (\mathfrak{A}) , and let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ with $\text{supp}(\mu) = \Gamma$. Assume that (Γ, μ) is μ -injective and below the diagonal on the left (or above the diagonal on the right), and let ν be its unique μ -invariant measure. If $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a centered Lipschitz function, then φ is $L^2(\nu)$ -coboundary ($\varphi \in (I - U)L^2(\nu)$).*

Proof. Fix a Lipschitz function $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. There is no loss of generality in assuming that the Lipschitz constant of φ is equal to 1. Let $C > 0$ be such that $|\sum_{i=0}^n U^i \varphi(x) - \sum_{i=0}^n U^i \varphi(y)| \leq C$ for any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and any

$n \in \mathbb{N}$, by Proposition 6.1. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=0}^n U^i \varphi(x) \right| &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^n \left(U^i \varphi(x) - \int_{[0,1]} U^i \varphi(z) \nu(dz) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \int_{[0,1]} \left| \sum_{i=0}^n U^i \varphi(x) - \sum_{i=0}^n U^i \varphi(z) \right| \nu(dz) \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi \in L^2(\nu)$ Lemma 5 in [7] implies that there exists $\psi \in L^2(\nu)$ with $\varphi = \psi - U\psi$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 6.3. *Let Γ satisfy condition (A), and let μ be a Borel probability measure on Γ with $\text{supp}(\mu) = \Gamma$. Moreover, assume that (Γ, μ) is μ -injective. Let $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the corresponding stationary Markov chain with the initial distribution ν . Then for any centered Lipschitz function $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the random process $(\varphi(X_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the central limit theorem. Moreover, the same is true for the process $(\varphi(X_n^x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $(X_n^x)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the corresponding Markov chain starting from an arbitrary point $x \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. Fix a centered Lipschitz function $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since φ is an $L^2(\nu)$ -coboundary of U , by Lemma 6.2, σ^2 exists and is finite, by [17]. Moreover, condition (19) holds for ν -a. e. $x \in [0, 1]$, by Gordin and Lifšic (see Section IV.8 in [4], see also [11]). In particular, for ν -a. e. $x \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$(20) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, x)) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\sigma^2\right) \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and take a measurable subset E_0 of the interval $[0, 1]$ such that $\nu(E_0) > 1 - \varepsilon/2$ and for every $x \in E_0$ condition (20) holds and for $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}$ -a.e. $\omega = (g_1, \dots, g_n, \dots) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ there is $\theta > 0$ and $\tilde{h} > 0$ such that for any interval I with $x_0 \in \text{int}(I)$ and $|I| < \theta$ we have

$$|g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1(I)| \leq \exp(-n \cdot \tilde{h}),$$

by Proposition 2.3 with Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.3 in [6]. For every $x \in E_0$ take an open interval I_x such that $x \in I_x$ and $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\Gamma_x^{\mathbb{N}}) > 1 - \varepsilon/3$, where

$$\Gamma_x^{\mathbb{N}} := \{(g_1, g_2, \dots) : |g_n \circ \dots \circ g_1(I_x)| \leq \exp(-n \cdot \tilde{h}) \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Let $\hat{I} = \bigcup_{x \in E_0} I_x$. Since \hat{I} is open, P is asymptotically stable and $\nu(\hat{I}) \geq \nu(I_0) > 1 - \varepsilon/3$, the Portmanteau Theorem yields that for every $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(21) \quad P^N \tilde{\nu}(\hat{I}) \geq \nu(\hat{I}) - \varepsilon/6 > 1 - \varepsilon/2.$$

We easily check that for every $z \in \hat{I}$ we have

$$(22) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\sigma^2\right) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Indeed, fix $z \in \hat{I}$ and let $x \in I_0$ be such that $z \in I_x$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\sigma^2\right) \right| \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) - \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, x)) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) \right| \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Gamma_x^{\mathbb{N}}} |\exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) - \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, x))| \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) \\ &+ 2\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} - \Gamma_x^{\mathbb{N}}) < 2\varepsilon/3 < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

the penultimate inequality by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and the fact that for $\omega \in \Gamma_x^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) - \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, x))| \\ &\leq \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} L_\varphi (|g_\omega^1(x) - g_\omega^1(z)| + \cdots + |g_\omega^n(x) - g_\omega^n(z)|) \\ &\leq \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} L_\varphi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp(-n \cdot \tilde{h}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

since x is chosen in such a way that $z \in I_x$.

Again because of asymptotic stability, it is easy to see that for any $u \in [0, 1]$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(23) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, u)) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) - \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \int_{[0,1]} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) P^N \delta_u(dz) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) \right| = 0$$

and

$$(24) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \int_{[0,1]} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) P^N \delta_u(dz) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) - \int_{\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}} \int_{\hat{I}} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, z)) P^N \delta_u(dz) \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\omega) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Taking $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough to have $P^N \delta_u(\hat{I}) > 1 - \varepsilon/3$ and combining (22), (23) and (24) we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Omega} \exp(itS_n(\varphi, \omega, u)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\sigma^2\right) \right| < 2\varepsilon.$$

Since $u \in [0, 1]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ were arbitrary, the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

Remark 6.4. There are plenty of examples which fulfil the conditions of the foregoing theorems. To illustrate that the choice of the distribution μ is crucial, consider Example 2.3. Condition (21) is satisfied and the system is below the diagonal on the left and above the diagonal on the right. If $p \geq \frac{2}{5}$, then the system is μ -injective, thus there exists a unique μ -invariant Borel probability measure (Corollary 4.7). This measure is μ -proximal (Theorem 4.6) and atomless (Lemma 3.1). Moreover, the system is asymptotically stable (Theorem 5.5) and the central limit theorem described in Theorem 6.3 holds. But if on the other hand $0 < p < \frac{1}{4}$, then there are at least two different

ergodic μ -invariant Borel probability measures on $[0, 1]$ by Proposition 4.4 in [6].

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Alsedá and M. Misiurewicz, *Random interval homeomorphisms*, Publ. Mat. **58**, 15–36, 2014.
- [2] G. Alsmeyer, S. Brofferio, and D. Buraczewski, *Asymptotically linear iterated function systems on the real line*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **33**, no. 1, 161–199, 2023.
- [3] A. Avila and M. Viana, *Extremal Lyapunov exponents: an invariance principle and applications*, Invent. Math. **181** (1): 115–189, 2010.
- [4] A.N. Borodin and I.A. Ibragimov, *Limit theorems for functionals of random walks*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. (**195**) no. 2, viii + 259 pp., 1985.
- [5] S. Brofferio, D. Buraczewski, and T. Szarek, *On uniqueness of invariant measures for random walks on HOMEO(\mathbb{R})*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **42** (7), 2207–2238 (2022).
- [6] S. Brofferio, H. Oppelmayr, and T. Szarek, *Unique ergodicity for random noninvertible maps on an interval*, arXiv: 2401.12361v2
- [7] F. Browder, *On the iteration of transformations in noncompact minimal dynamical systems*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **9**, 773–780, 1958.
- [8] K. Czudek and T. Szarek, *Ergodicity and central limit theorem for random interval homeomorphisms*, Israel J. Math. **239** (1): 75–98, 2020.
- [9] B. Deroin, V. Kleptsyn, A. Navas, and K. Parwani, *Symmetric random walk on HOMEO(\mathbb{R})*, Ann. Probab. **41** (3B), 2066–2089, 2013.
- [10] B. Deroin, V. Kleptsyn, and A. Navas, *Sur la dynamique unidimensionnelle en régularité intermédiaire*, Acta Math., **199** (2): 199–262, 2007.
- [11] Y. Derrienc and M. Lin, *The central limit theorem for Markov chains started at a point*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **125**: 73–76, 2003.
- [12] H. Furstenberg, *Boundary theory and stochastic processes on homogeneous spaces. Harmonic analysis on homogeneous spaces*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XXVI, 193–229, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1973.
- [13] H. Furstenberg, *Noncommuting random products*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **108**: 377–428 1963.
- [14] H. Furstenberg, *A Poisson formula for semi-simple Lie groups*, Annals of Mathematics, **77** (2): 335–386, 1963.
- [15] H. Furstenberg, *Poisson boundaries and envelopes of discrete groups*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **73**: 350–356, 1967.
- [16] H. Furstenberg and E. Glasner, *Stationary dynamical systems. Dynamical numbers—interplay between dynamical systems and number theory*, Contemp. Math., **532**: 1–28, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [17] M.I. Gordin and B.A. Lifšic, *The central limit theorem for stationary Markov processes*, Soviet Math. Dokl., **19**: 392–394, 1978.
- [18] J. Gulgowski, S. Hille, T. Szarek, and M. Ziemiańska, *Central limit theorem for some non-stationary Markov chains*, Studia Math., **246** (2): 109–131, 2019.
- [19] A.J. Homburg, C. Kalle, M. Ruziboev, E. Verbitskiy, and B. Zeegers, *Critical intermittency in random interval maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **394** no. 1: 1–37, 2022.
- [20] T. Komorowski, C. Landim, and S. Olla, *Fluctuations in Markov processes. Time symmetry and martingale approximation*, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [21] T. Komorowski and A. Walczuk, *Central limit theorem for Markov processes with spectral gap in the Wasserstein metric*, Stochastic Processes and Appl., **122**: 2155–2184, 2012.
- [22] A. Lasota and M.C. Mackey, *Chaos, fractals, and noise. Stochastic aspects of dynamics*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, 97. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [23] A. N. Lagerås and Ö. Stenflo, *Central limit theorem for contractive Markov chains*, Nonlinearity, **18**: 1955–1965, 2005.
- [24] G. Luczyńska and T. Szarek, *Limits theorems for random walks on HOMEO(S^1)*, J. Stat. Phys. **187** (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 7, 13 pp.

- [25] D. Malicet, *Random walks on $\text{Homeo}(S^1)$* . *Comm. Math. Phys.* **356**: 1083–1116, 2017.
- [26] A. Navas, *Groups of circle diffeomorphisms*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- [27] K. Oliveira and M. Viana, *Foundations of ergodic theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 151. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, P.O. BOX 9512, 2300 RA LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS (SH)

Email address: `shille@math.leidenuniv.nl`

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA, BANKOWA 14, 40-007 KATOWICE, POLAND (KH)

Email address: `katarzyna.horbacz@us.edu.pl`

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK UND GEOMETRIE, UNIVERSITÄT INNSBRUCK, TECHNIKERSTRASSE 13, A-6020 INNSBRUCK, AUSTRIA (HO)

Email address: `Hanna.Oppelmayer@uibk.ac.at`

FACULTY OF PHYSICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, GDAŃSK UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, UL. GABRIELA NARUTOWICZA 11/12, 80-233 GDAŃSK, POLAND (TS)

Email address: `tszarek@impan.pl`