

Gibbs measures for contact Anosov flows are all exponentially mixing

Luchezar Stoyanov

Abstract

In this work we study strong spectral properties of Ruelle transfer operators related to Gibbs measures for contact Anosov flows. As a consequence we establish exponential decay of correlations for Hölder observables with respect to any Gibbs measure. The approach invented in 1997 by Dolgopyat, and further developed in our papers in 2011 and 2023, is substantially enhanced here, allowing to deal with the general case of arbitrary contact Anosov flows and arbitrary Gibbs measures. The results obtained here naturally apply to geodesic flows on compact Riemannian manifolds.

The strong spectral estimates for Ruelle operators and a well-established technique by Dolgopyat lead to exponential decay of correlations for Hölder continuous observables.

1 Introduction

About 20 years ago Liverani [L] proved exponential decay of correlations for C^4 contact Anosov flows for the Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle measure determined by the Riemann volume. In this work, as a consequence of the main result, we derive exponential decay of correlations for C^5 contact Anosov flows on compact Riemannian manifolds M with respect to any Gibbs measure on M . In [St4] this was done for Gibbs measures admitting a Pesin set with exponentially small tails¹. Here we succeed to establish exponential decay without any additional assumptions. As a consequence, for geodesic flows on compact Riemannian manifolds every Gibbs measure is exponentially mixing.

As is now well-known, the study of statistical properties of continuous dynamical systems proved to be significantly more difficult than the one for discrete systems. In particular the study of rates of correlation decay for Hölder continuous potentials turned out to be highly non-trivial. After the extensive work of Sinai, Bowen and Ruelle in the 70's on statistical properties of Anosov diffeomorphisms, and the discovery in the 80's by Ruelle [R] and Pollicott [Po] that for Axiom A flows on basic sets the decay of correlations for Hölder potentials could be arbitrarily slow, there was a period of more than 15 years when it appeared no major results in this area had been established. Significant breakthrough was achieved at the end of the 90's. First, it was Chernov [Ch1] who proved sub-exponential decay of correlations for Anosov flows on 3D Riemannian manifolds (with respect to the Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle measure). Then Dolgopyat [D] proved exponential decay of correlations for Hölder continuous potentials in two major cases: (i) geodesic flows on compact surfaces of negative curvature (with respect to any Gibbs measure); (ii) transitive Anosov flows on compact Riemannian manifolds with C^1 jointly non-integrable local stable and unstable foliations (with respect to the Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle measure). The results in [D] on decay of correlations were derived as a consequence of some very strong spectral estimates for Ruelle transfer operators defined by means of a Markov family for the flow. Dolgopyat's paper [D] nowadays is regarded as fundamental, not just for the results that it established but also for the general framework created there. The latter, or parts of it, has been used by various people to establish some very significant results: see e.g. [AGY], [BaV], [PoS], [St1], [N], [OWi], [PeS], [DMS], just to name a few of these. Although Liverani studied a different Ruelle operator in [L], at some stage he used, as he said, "Dolgopyat's cancellation mechanism". In our work [St3] we

¹I.e. a Pesin set whose pre-images along the flow have measures decaying exponentially fast.

developed a modification of Dolgopyat’s approach to establish strong spectral properties for Ruelle transfer operators for Axiom A flows on basic sets satisfying certain regularity conditions, and as a consequence established exponential decay of correlations for arbitrary Gibbs measures for such flows. A much more sophisticated modification of Dolgopyat’s framework was done in [St4], where we proved strong spectral properties for Ruelle transfer operators for C^3 contact Anosov flows with respect to any Gibbs measure admitting a Pesin set with exponentially small tails, and used this to establish exponential decay of correlations for such measures. Recently Tsujii and Zhang [TZ] proved exponential decay of correlations for arbitrary mixing measures for transitive Anosov flows on 3D compact manifolds, also using a modification of Dolgopyat’s approach.

Another significant phase in the study of statistical properties of continuous dynamical systems originated from the works of Young [Y1], [Y2] where she developed her so called ”tower method”. This was also a major event that prompted and facilitated significant research activities and it turned out to be very useful in the study of both uniformly and non-uniformly hyperbolic systems – see e.g. [M] and the references there. Various other approaches in studying decay of correlations, zeta functions, distribution of periodic orbits for hyperbolic flows, etc. have been developed as well – see e.g. [MV] and [GLP] and the references there. Recently very sophisticated tools from PDE’s involving microlocal analysis have been used in studying various properties of hyperbolic flows – decay of correlations, dynamical zeta functions, distribution of Ruelle-Pollicott resonances – see e.g. [NZ], [DyG], [DyZ], [FaSj], [FaT] and the references there, just to mention a few of the large number of publications in this area. And speaking about decay of correlations for hyperbolic systems we have to mention here the major result in [BaDL] about exponential decay of correlations for 2D Sinai billiards.

Let $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ be a C^2 contact Anosov flow on a C^2 compact Riemannian manifold M . Let $\varphi = \phi_1$ be the time-one map of the flow, and let \mathfrak{m} be an φ -invariant probability measure on M . Given $\alpha > 0$ denote by $C^\alpha(M)$ is the space of all α -Hölder complex-valued functions on M , i.e. functions $h : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for which there exists $L \geq 0$ with $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq L(d(x, y))^\alpha$ for all $x, y \in M$. For such h , let $|h|_\alpha$ be the smallest possible choice for L . Set $\|h\|_0 = \sup_{x \in M} |h(x)|$, and $\|h\|_\alpha = \|h\|_0 + |h|_\alpha$.

The main result in this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ be a C^5 contact Anosov flow, let F_0 be a Hölder continuous function on M and let \mathfrak{m} be the Gibbs measure determined by F_0 on M . Then for every $\alpha > 0$ there exist constants $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ and $c = c(\alpha) > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \int_M A(x)B(\phi_t(x))d\mathfrak{m}(x) - \left(\int_M A(x)d\mathfrak{m}(x) \right) \left(\int_M B(x)d\mathfrak{m}(x) \right) \right| \leq Ce^{-ct}\|A\|_\alpha\|B\|_\alpha$$

for any two functions $A, B \in C^\alpha(M)$.

We obtain this as a consequence of Theorem 1.2 below and the procedure described in [D]. The assumption that the flow is C^5 is made so that one can apply the procedure in [D]. In particular this is essential when estimating the Laplace transform of the correlation function

$$\rho(t) = \int_M A(x)B(\phi_t(x)) d\mathfrak{m}(x) - \left(\int_M A(x) d\mathfrak{m}(x) \right) \left(\int_M B(x) d\mathfrak{m}(x) \right)$$

(see part VI in Sect. 4 in [D]).

To our knowledge there are several results known so far on exponential decay of correlations for general Gibbs potentials: that of Dolgopyat [D] for geodesic flows on compact surfaces, the one in [St2] for Axiom A flows on basic sets (under some additional assumptions); the recent

result of Tsujii and Zhang for Anosov flows on 3D manifolds, and the one in [St4] for contact Anosov flows on arbitrary compact manifolds but only for Gibbs measures admitting a Pesin set with exponentially small tails.

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ be a (pseudo-) Markov partition for ϕ_t consisting of rectangles $R_i = [U_i, S_i]$, where U_i (resp. S_i) are (admissible) subsets of $W_\epsilon^u(z_i)$ (resp. $W_\epsilon^s(z_i)$) for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $z_i \in M$ (cf. Sect. 2 for details). The first return time function $\tau : R = \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} R_i \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is essentially α_1 -Hölder continuous on R for some $\alpha_1 > 0$, i.e. there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that if $x, y \in R_i \cap \mathcal{P}^{-1}(R_j)$ for some i, j , where $\mathcal{P} : R \rightarrow R$ is the standard Poincaré map, then $|\tau(x) - \tau(y)| \leq L(d(x, y))^{\alpha_1}$. The *shift map* $\sigma : U = \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} U_i \rightarrow U$ is defined by $\sigma = \pi^{(U)} \circ \mathcal{P}$, where $\pi^{(U)} : R \rightarrow U$ is the projection along the leaves of local stable manifolds. Let \widehat{U} be the set of all $x \in U$ whose orbits do not have common points with the boundary of R . Given $\theta \in (0, 1)$, as in [St4], define the **metric D_θ on \widehat{U}** by $D_\theta(x, y) = 0$ if $x = y$, $D_\theta(x, y) = 1$ if x, y belong to different U_i 's and $D_\theta(x, y) = \theta^N$ if $\mathcal{P}^j(x)$ and $\mathcal{P}^j(y)$ belong to the same rectangle R_{i_j} for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, and N is the largest integer with this property.

Denote by $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ the space of all bounded functions $h : \widehat{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with Lipschitz constants

$$|h|_\theta = \sup \left\{ \frac{|h(x) - h(y)|}{D_\theta(x, y)} : x \neq y; ; x, y \in \widehat{U} \right\} < \infty.$$

Define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\theta, b}$ on $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ by $\|h\|_{\theta, b} = \|h\|_0 + \frac{|h|_\theta}{|b|}$, where $\|h\|_0 = \sup_{x \in \widehat{U}} |h(x)|$.

Given a real-valued function $f \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$, set $g = g_f = f - P_f \tau$, where $P_f \in \mathbb{R}$ is the unique number such that the topological pressure $\text{Pr}_\sigma(g)$ of g with respect to σ is zero (cf. [PP]).

We say that *Ruelle transfer operators related to f are eventually contracting* on $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ if there exist constants $0 < \rho < 1$, $a_0 > 0$, $b_0 \geq 1$, $T \geq 1$ and $C > 0$ such that if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq b_0$, then

$$\|L_{f - (P_f + a + ib)\tau}^m h\|_{\theta, b} \leq C \rho^m \|h\|_{\theta, b}$$

for any integer $m \geq T \log |b|$ and any $h \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$.

This condition implies that the spectral radius of $L_{f - (P_f + a + ib)\tau}$ on $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ does not exceed ρ . It is also easy to see that it implies the following²: for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist constants $0 < \rho < 1$, $a_0 > 0$, $b_0 \geq 1$ and $C > 0$ such that if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq b_0$, then

$$\|L_{f - (P_f + a + ib)\tau}^m h\|_{\theta, b} \leq C \rho^m |b|^\epsilon \|h\|_{\theta, b}$$

for any integer $m \geq 0$ and any $h \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$.

The central result in this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ be a C^2 contact Anosov flow on a C^2 compact Riemannian manifold M , let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ be a (pseudo-) Markov partition for ϕ_t as above and let $\sigma : U \rightarrow U$ be the corresponding shift map. There exist constants $0 < \hat{\theta} < 1$ and $\alpha_2 > 0$ such that for any $\theta \in [\hat{\theta}, 1)$ and any real-valued function $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$, where $\theta_1 = \theta^{1/\alpha_2}$, the Ruelle transfer operators related to f are eventually contracting on $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$.*

Remark. Here $\hat{\theta} \in (0, 1)$ is such that the first-return time function $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_{\hat{\theta}}(\widehat{U})$. A more general result can be established. Namely, one can prove the same result as above for every $f \in \mathcal{F}_\theta$. This

²Which is the way we defined eventual contraction of Ruelle transfer operators in [St2], and it agrees with the way the main result in [D] is stated.

can be done repeating the lengthy approximation procedure in Sect. 8 in [St4]. However the main consequences – Corollary 1.3 below, as well as Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 – will be the same³.

A similar result for Hölder continuous functions (with respect to the Riemannian metric) looks a bit more complicated, since in general Ruelle transfer operators do not preserve any of the spaces $C^\alpha(\widehat{U})$. However, they preserve a certain ‘filtration’ $\cup_{0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0} C^\alpha(\widehat{U})$. For $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \neq 0$, define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha,b}$ on $C^\alpha(\widehat{U})$ by $\|h\|_{\alpha,b} = \|h\|_0 + \frac{|h|_\alpha}{|b|}$.

Corollary 1.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, there exists a constant $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that for any real-valued function $f \in C^{\alpha_0/\alpha_2}(\widehat{U})$ the Ruelle transfer operators related to f are eventually contracting on $\cup_{0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0} C^\alpha(\widehat{U})$. More precisely, there exists a constant $\hat{\beta} \in (0, 1]$ and for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exist constants $0 < \rho < 1$, $a_0 > 0$, $b_0 \geq 1$, $C > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq b_0$, then for every integer $m \geq M \log |b|$ and every $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$ the operator $L_{f-(P_f+a+ib)\tau}^m : C^\alpha(\widehat{U}) \rightarrow C^{\alpha\hat{\beta}}(\widehat{U})$ is well-defined and*

$$\|L_{f-(P_f+a+ib)\tau}^m h\|_{\alpha\hat{\beta},b} \leq C \rho^m \|h\|_{\alpha,b}$$

for every $h \in C^\alpha(\widehat{U})$.

The maximal constant $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$ that one can choose above is related to the regularity of the local stable/unstable foliations. Estimates for this constant can be derived from certain bunching condition concerning the rates of expansion/contraction of the flow along local unstable/stable manifolds (see [Ha1], [Ha2], [PSW]).

The above was first proved by Dolgopyat ([D]) in the case of geodesic flows on compact surfaces of negative curvature with $\alpha_0 = 1$ (then one can choose $\hat{\beta} = 1$ as well). The second main result in [D] concerns transitive Anosov flows on compact Riemannian manifolds with C^1 jointly non-integrable local stable and unstable foliations. For such flows Dolgopyat proved that the conclusion of Corollary 1.3 with $\alpha_0 = 1$ holds for the Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle potential $F_0 = \log \det(d\phi_\tau)|_{E^u}$. More general results were proved in [St3] for mixing Axiom A flows on basic sets (again for $\alpha_0 = 1$) under some additional regularity assumptions⁴, and more recently in [St4] for Gibbs measures for contact Anosov flows admitting a Pesin set with exponentially small tails.

In Sect. 2 we collect some preliminary information used later on. Sect. 3 contains basic facts from Pesin’s theory of Lyapunov exponents, some notation and three lemmas from [St2] and [St4] that we need in subsequent sections. Sect. 4 deals with some technical results concerning cylinders defined by means of Markov families for general Anosov flows. The most important fact in Sect. 4 is Lemma 4.4 where for every unstable cylinder \mathcal{C} intersecting the given Pesin set P_0 we construct two families of sub-cylinders, each with a significant total measure⁵, and a certain pairing between elements of the two families that is used later in Sects. 5 and 6 to develop a cancelations procedure for the so called contraction operators \mathcal{N}_J . The construction in Lemma 4.4 is enhanced in Lemma 5.5, where we use significantly the contact form, and establish a certain very strong non-integrability property of the flow.

In Sect. 6 we define for a given parameter $b \in \mathbb{R}$, a family of cylinders \mathcal{C}_m of lengths $\leq \text{Const} \log |b|$ covering the given Pesin set P_0 , and then use the constructions in Sects. 4 and 5 to define nice families of sub-cylinders of these with appropriate pairings between their elements. The so called contraction operators are then defined in a rather different way to what was done

³Except for a better constant $\alpha_0 > 0$ in Corollary 1.3.

⁴As mentioned earlier, the results apply e.g. to C^2 mixing Axiom A flows on basic sets satisfying a certain pinching condition (similar to the 1/4-pinching condition for geodesic flows on manifolds of negative curvature).

⁵All considerations involve a given Gibbs measure ν on U .

in previous papers. As in [St4], the contraction operators \mathcal{N}_J only contract in the vicinity of the Pesin set P_0 – this is established in Sect. 7. However now we do not have a Pesin set with exponentially small tails, so we use very substantially the families of sub-cylinders of the cylinders \mathcal{C}_m and the particular pairing between these from Lemmas 4.4 and 5.5.

In Sects. 8, 9 we succeed to obtain global contraction properties of the contraction operators. While in [St4] we had the comfort to use the fact that our Pesin set had exponentially small tails, here we do not have this. Instead we use a certain argument of Xing [X] involving Borel-Cantelli sequences. After that, in the rest of Sect. 9 we use an appropriate modification of arguments from [St4] to prove the main results in the paper.

2 Preliminaries

Let M be a C^2 compact Riemannian manifold, and let $\phi_t : M \rightarrow M$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) be a C^2 transitive Anosov flow on M . This means that there exist constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that there exists a $d\phi_t$ -invariant decomposition $T_x M = E^0(x) \oplus E^u(x) \oplus E^s(x)$ of $T_x M$ ($x \in M$) into a direct sum of non-zero linear subspaces, where $E^0(x)$ is the one-dimensional subspace determined by the direction of the flow at x , $\|d\phi_t(u)\| \leq C \lambda^t \|u\|$ for all $u \in E^s(x)$ and $t \geq 0$, and $\|d\phi_t(u)\| \leq C \lambda^{-t} \|u\|$ for all $u \in E^u(x)$ and $t \leq 0$. Throughout we denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the norm determined by the Riemannian metric on M . Transitivity means that the flow has a dense orbit in M .

Given $x \in M$ and a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ the (strong) *stable* and *unstable manifolds* $W_\epsilon^s(x)$ and $W_\epsilon^u(x)$ of size ϵ are defined in the usual way. The corresponding tangent bundles are then $E^u(x) = T_x W_\epsilon^u(x)$ and $E^s(x) = T_x W_\epsilon^s(x)$. Set $E^u(x; \delta) = \{u \in E^u(x) : \|u\| \leq \delta\}$ for any $\delta > 0$ and define $E^s(x; \delta)$ similarly. Let $\exp_x^u : E^u(x; \epsilon) \rightarrow W_\epsilon^u(x)$ and $\exp_x^s : E^s(x; \epsilon) \rightarrow W_\epsilon^s(x)$ be the corresponding *exponential maps*.

The so called *temporal distance function* $\Delta(x, y)$ is defined as follows. Given a sufficiently small $\epsilon_0 > 0$, it follows from the hyperbolicity of the flow on M that there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $x, y \in M$ and $d(x, y) < \epsilon_1$, then there exists a unique point $[x, y] = W_\epsilon^s(x) \cap \phi_{[-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0]}(W_{\epsilon_0}^u(y))$ (cf. [KH]). Hence $\phi_t([x, y]) \in W_{\epsilon_0}^u(y)$ for some $t \in [-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0]$ and we set⁶ $\Delta(x, y) = t$ ([KB], [D], [L]). For $x, y \in M$ with $d(x, y) < \epsilon_1$, define $\pi_y(x) = [x, y]$. In this way for every $y \in M$, on a small open neighbourhood W of y in M we get a *projection* $\pi_y : W \rightarrow \phi_{[-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0]}(W_{\epsilon_0}^u(y))$ along local stable manifolds. The map $\pi_y : \phi_{[-\epsilon_1, \epsilon_1]}(W_{\epsilon_1}^u(x)) \rightarrow \phi_{[-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0]}(W_{\epsilon_0}^u(y))$ is called a *local stable holonomy map*. In a similar way one defines holonomy maps between any two sufficiently close local transversals to stable laminations (see e.g. [PSW]). Combining such a map with a shift along the flow we get another local stable holonomy map $\mathcal{H}_x^y : W_{\epsilon_1}^u(x) \rightarrow W_{\epsilon_0}^u(y)$. In a similar way one defines local holonomy maps along unstable laminations.

For convenience of the reader we will now provide the definition of a Markov family for the flow (see e.g. Sect. 4 in [Ch2] for details). Given a submanifold D of M of codimension one with $\text{diam}(D) \leq \epsilon_0$ which is transversal to the flow, the projection $\text{pr}_D : \phi_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]}(D) \rightarrow D$ along the flow is well-defined and smooth. For $x, y \in D$, set $\langle x, y \rangle_D = \text{pr}_D([x, y])$. A subset \tilde{R} of D is called a *rectangle* if $\langle x, y \rangle_D \in \tilde{R}$ for all $x, y \in \tilde{R}$. A *proper rectangle* is a rectangle \tilde{R} that coincides with the closure of its interior in D . The stable and unstable leaves through $x \in \tilde{R}$ are defined by $W_{\tilde{R}}^s(x) = \phi_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]}(W_\epsilon^s(x)) \cap \tilde{R}$ and $W_{\tilde{R}}^u(x) = \phi_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]}(W_\epsilon^u(x)) \cap \tilde{R}$. By $\text{Int}_D(A)$ we denote the *interior* of a subset A of D in D .

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \{\tilde{R}_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ be a family of proper rectangles, where each \tilde{R}_i is contained in a submanifold

⁶A different definition for Δ is given in [D] and [L], however in the only case considered in this paper when $x \in W_\epsilon^u(z)$ and $y \in W_\epsilon^s(z)$ for some $z \in M$, these definitions coincide with the present one.

D_i of M of codimension one and has the form $\tilde{R}_i = \langle U_i, S_i \rangle_{D_i} = \{\langle x, y \rangle_{D_i} : x \in U_i, y \in S_i\}$, where $U_i \subset W_\epsilon^u(z_i)$ and $S_i \subset W_\epsilon^s(z_i)$, respectively, for some $z_i \in M$. Set $\tilde{R} = \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} \tilde{R}_i$. The family $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ is called *complete* if there exists a constant $\chi > 0$ such that for every $x \in M$, $\phi_t(x) \in \tilde{R}$ for some $t \in (0, \chi]$. The *Poincaré map* $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} : \tilde{R} \rightarrow \tilde{R}$ related to a complete family $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ is defined by $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \phi_{\tilde{\tau}(x)}(x) \in \tilde{R}$, where $\tilde{\tau}(x) > 0$ is the smallest positive time with $\phi_{\tilde{\tau}(x)}(x) \in \tilde{R}$. The function $\tilde{\tau}$ is called the *first return time* associated with $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$. A complete family $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \{\tilde{R}_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ of rectangles in M is called a *Markov family* of size $\chi > 0$ for the flow ϕ_t if:

- (a) $\text{diam}(\tilde{R}_i) < \chi$ for all i ;
- (b) for any $i \neq j$ and any $x \in \text{Int}_D(\tilde{R}_i) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-1}(\text{Int}_D(\tilde{R}_j))$ we have

$$W_{\tilde{R}_i}^s(x) \subset \overline{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-1}(W_{\tilde{R}_j}^s(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(x)))} \quad , \quad \overline{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(W_{\tilde{R}_i}^u(x))} \supset W_{\tilde{R}_j}^u(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(x));$$

- (c) for any $i \neq j$ at least one of the sets $\tilde{R}_i \cap \phi_{[0, \chi]}(\tilde{R}_j)$ and $\tilde{R}_j \cap \phi_{[0, \chi]}(\tilde{R}_i)$ is empty.

The existence of a Markov family $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ of an arbitrarily small size $\chi > 0$ for ϕ_t follows from the construction of Bowen [B1].

As in [R] and [D], we can slightly change the Markov family $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ to a *pseudo-Markov family* $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ of *pseudo-rectangles* $R_i = [U_i, S_i] = \{[x, y] : x \in U_i, y \in S_i\}$, where U_i and S_i are as above. Set $R = \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} R_i$. Notice that $\text{pr}_D(R_i) = \tilde{R}_i$ for all i . For any $\xi = [x, y] \in R_i$ set

$$W_{R_i}^u(\xi) = [U_i, y] = \{[x', y] : x' \in U_i\} \quad , \quad W_{R_i}^s(\xi) = [x, S_i] = \{[x, y'] : y' \in S_i\} \subset W_{\epsilon_0}^s(x).$$

The corresponding *Poincaré map* $\mathcal{P} : R \rightarrow R$ is defined by $\mathcal{P}(x) = \phi_{\tau(x)}(x) \in R$, where $\tau(x) > 0$ is the smallest positive time with $\phi_{\tau(x)}(x) \in R$. The *interior* $\text{Int}(R_i)$ of a rectangle R_i is defined by $\text{pr}_D(\text{Int}(R_i)) = \text{Int}_D(\tilde{R}_i)$. In a similar way one defines $\text{Int}^u(A)$ for a subset A of some $W_{R_i}^u(x)$ and $\text{Int}^s(A)$ for a subset of $W_{R_i}^s(x)$. The family $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ has the same properties as $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$:

- (a') $\text{diam}(R_i) < \chi$ for all i ;
- (b') for any $i \neq j$ and any $x \in \text{Int}(R_i) \cap \mathcal{P}^{-1}(\text{Int}(R_j))$ we have

$$\mathcal{P}(\text{Int}(W_{R_i}^s(x))) \subset \text{Int}^s(W_{R_j}^s(\mathcal{P}(x))) \quad , \quad \mathcal{P}(\text{Int}(W_{R_i}^u(x))) \supset \text{Int}(W_{R_j}^u(\mathcal{P}(x)));$$

- (c') for any $i \neq j$ at least one of the sets $R_i \cap \phi_{[0, \chi]}(R_j)$ and $R_j \cap \phi_{[0, \chi]}(R_i)$ is empty.

Define the matrix $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_{ij})_{i,j=1}^k$ by $\mathcal{A}_{ij} = 1$ if $\mathcal{P}(\text{Int}(R_i)) \cap \text{Int}(R_j) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{A}_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. According to Sect. 2 in [BR], we may assume that \mathcal{R} is chosen in such a way that $\mathcal{A}^{M_0} > 0$ (all entries of the M_0 -fold product of \mathcal{A} by itself are positive) for some integer $M_0 > 0$. In what follows we assume that the matrix \mathcal{A} has this property.

One should remark here that while in general \mathcal{P} and τ are only (essentially) Hölder continuous, the map $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is (essentially) Lipschitz; see (2.1) below.

From now on we will assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \{\tilde{R}_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ is a **fixed Markov family** for ϕ_t of size $\chi < \epsilon_0/2 < 1$ and that $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ is the related pseudo-Markov family. Set $\mathbf{U} = \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} \mathbf{U}_i$ and $\text{Int}^u(\mathbf{U}) = \cup_{j=1}^{k_0} \text{Int}^u(U_j)$. It follows from the hyperbolicity of the flow that there exist constants $c_0 \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma_1 > \gamma > 1$ such that

$$c_0 \gamma^m d(x, y) \leq d(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(x), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(y)) \leq \frac{\gamma_1^m}{c_0} d(x, y) \quad (2.1)$$

for all $x, y \in \tilde{R}$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^j(x), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^j(y)$ belong to the same \tilde{R}_{i_j} for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Fix constants c_0 and $\gamma_1 > \gamma > 1$ with these properties; these will be used throughout the whole paper.

Using the *projection* $\pi^{(U)} : R \rightarrow U$ along stable leaves we define the *shift map* $\sigma : U \rightarrow U$ by $\sigma = \pi^{(U)} \circ \mathcal{P}$. Notice that τ is constant on each stable leaf $W_{R_i}^s(x) = W_{\epsilon_0}^s(x) \cap R_i$. The shift map σ is naturally conjugate to the Bernoulli shift map $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ on the symbol space

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \{(i_j)_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} : 1 \leq i_j \leq k_0, \mathcal{A}_{i_j i_{j+1}} = 1 \text{ for all } j\},$$

given by $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}((i_j)) = ((i'_j))$, where $i'_j = i_{j+1}$ for all j . There exists a natural surjection $\pi : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \tilde{R}$ such that $\pi \circ \sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{P} \circ \pi$ on a residual subset of \tilde{R} (see e.g. [B1] or Sect. 4 in [Ch2]). Denoting by \tilde{R}^* be the set of those $x \in R$ such that $\phi_t(x) \notin \text{Int}(R_j)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and any j , we have $\pi \circ \sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{P} \circ \pi$ on \tilde{R}^* . Moreover π is Lipschitz on \tilde{R}^* if the latter is considered with the *metric* d_{θ} for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$, defined by $d_{\theta}(\xi, \eta) = 0$ if $\xi = \eta$ and $d_{\theta}(\xi, \eta) = \theta^m$ if $\xi_i = \eta_i$ for $|i| \leq m$ and m is maximal with this property. Notice that $\hat{\tau} = \tau \circ \pi$ defines a Lipschitz function on \tilde{R}^* , so it has a Lipschitz extension $\hat{\tau} : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ([B1], [Ch2]). The *space of Lipschitz functions* on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ with respect to the metric d_{θ} will be denoted by $C_{\theta}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$.

The *shift map* $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ on the one-sided subshift of finite type

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ = \{(i_j)_{j=0}^{\infty} : 1 \leq i_j \leq k, \mathcal{A}_{i_j i_{j+1}} = 1 \text{ for all } j \geq 0\},$$

is defined similarly. Notice that $\hat{\tau}(\xi) = \tau(\pi(\xi))$ depends only on the forward coordinates of $\xi \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular we can consider $\hat{\tau}$ as a function on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ such that $\hat{\tau} = \tau \circ \pi$ on a residual subset of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$. The metric d_{θ} on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ and the space of Lipschitz functions $C_{\theta}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+)$ are defined as for $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$. If $\hat{\pi} : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ is the *natural projection*, one shows easily that there exists a continuous surjection $\pi^+ : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \rightarrow U$ such that then $\pi^+ \circ \hat{\pi} = \pi^{(U)} \circ \pi$. Moreover, $\sigma \circ \pi^+ = \pi^+ \circ \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$.

We will denote by \hat{U} the set of those $x \in U$ such that $\mathcal{P}^m(x) \in \text{Int}(R) = \cup_{i=1}^k \text{Int}(R_i)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is a residual subset of U and has full measure with respect to any Gibbs measure on U (see e.g. [B1]). Set $\hat{U}_i = U_i \cap \hat{U}$.

Let $B(U)$ be the *space of bounded functions* $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with its standard norm $\|g\|_0 = \sup_{x \in U} |g(x)|$. Given a function $g \in B(\hat{U})$, the *Ruelle transfer operator* $L_g : B(U) \rightarrow B(U)$ is defined by

$$(L_g h)(u) = \sum_{\sigma(v)=u} e^{g(v)} h(v).$$

Via the natural projection $\pi^+ : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \rightarrow U$, the above corresponds to the well-known definition of a Ruelle transfer operator on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ (see [Ba], [B1] or [PP]).

Throughout this paper $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1]$ denotes a *fixed constant* such that $\tau \in C^{\alpha_1}(\hat{U})$ and the local stable/unstable holonomy maps are uniformly α_1 -Hölder. We assume that α_1 is chosen so that the shift $\tilde{\Psi} : R \rightarrow \tilde{R}$ along the flow is α_1 -Hölder. Fix constants $0 < \tau_0 < \tilde{\tau}_0 \leq 1/3$ so that

$$\tilde{\tau}_0 \leq \tau(x) \leq \tau_0 \quad , \quad x \in R. \tag{2.2}$$

We will assume that $\tilde{\tau}$ satisfies the same estimates, namely $\tilde{\tau}_0 \leq \tilde{\tau}(x) \leq \tau_0$ for all $x \in \tilde{R}$.

3 Lyapunov exponents and Lyapunov regularity functions

Throughout this paper M denotes a C^2 compact Riemannian manifold, ϕ_t is a C^2 Anosov flow on M and $\varphi = \phi_1$. Let F_0 be a Hölder continuous real-valued function on M and let **m be the Gibbs measure generated by F_0 on M** . The *Oseledec's Multiplicative Ergodic Theorem* ([Os]) implies that in the situation considered here there exists a ϕ_t -invariant subset \mathcal{L} of M with $m(\mathcal{L}) = 1$ such that for every $x \in \mathcal{L}$ there exist numbers $0 < \chi_1 < \chi_2 < \dots < \chi_{\tilde{k}}$ and a

$d\phi_t$ -invariant decomposition $E^u(x) = E_1^u(x) \oplus E_2^u(x) \oplus \dots \oplus E_{\tilde{k}}^u(x)$ of $E^u(x)$ into subspaces of constant dimensions such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|d\phi_t(x) \cdot v\| = \chi_i \quad , \quad v \in E_i^u(x) \setminus \{0\}, \quad (3.1)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$ (see [BP], [Ar], [V] or [KH]). Here and in what follows we denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the norm on the tangent spaces $T_x M$ ($x \in M$) induced by the Riemannian metric on M .

The numbers $\chi_i > 0$ are called (the positive) *Lyapunov exponents* of ϕ_t . In our case, the dimension n_i of $E_i^u(x)$ is constant on \mathcal{L} , and clearly $n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_{\tilde{k}} = n^u = \dim(E^u(x))$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$. For $E^s(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{L}$, we have a similar decomposition involving the corresponding negative Lyapunov exponents. For contact flows we have $n^s = \dim(E^s(x)) = n^u$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$, and the negative Lyapunov exponents are $-\chi_i$, $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$.

It follows from (3.1) that for every $\epsilon > 0$, every $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and every $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|d\varphi^n(x)|_{E_i^u(x)}\|}{e^{(\chi_i + \epsilon)n}} = 0$, therefore $R_0(x) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq \tilde{k}} \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{\|d\varphi^n(x)|_{E_i^u(x)}\|}{e^{(\chi_i + \epsilon)n}} < \infty$. The function $R_0(x)$ just defined is an example of a Lyapunov ϵ -regularity function.

More generally, a Borel function $R_\epsilon : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{R_\epsilon(x)} \leq \frac{\|d\varphi^n(x) \cdot v\|}{e^{(\chi_i + \epsilon)n} \|v\|} \leq R_\epsilon(x) \quad , \quad x \in \mathcal{L}, v \in E_i^u(x) \setminus \{0\}, n \geq 0, \quad (3.2)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$, and

$$e^{-\epsilon} \leq \frac{R_\epsilon(\varphi(x))}{R_\epsilon(x)} \leq e^\epsilon \quad , \quad x \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (3.3)$$

is called a *Lyapunov ϵ -regularity function*. As in [PS], by an ϵ -slowly varying radius function we mean a function of the form $r_\epsilon(x) = 1/R_\epsilon(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{L}$, where R_ϵ is a Lyapunov ϵ -regularity function on \mathcal{L} . For such r_ϵ and $x \in \mathcal{L}$, the linear map $d\varphi^n(x)$ behaves on the ball $B^u(x, r_\epsilon(x))$ as in the case of an uniformly hyperbolic flow – see the relations (3.11) - (3.14) below.

In this paper by a **Pesin set** in M we mean a compact subset P of \mathcal{L} with $\mathfrak{m}(P) > 0$ such that there exist constants $\epsilon > 0$ and $C > 0$ and a Lyapunov ϵ -regularity function $R_\epsilon(x)$ on \mathcal{L} with $R_\epsilon(x) \leq C$ for all $x \in P$. In a similar way we define Pesin sets in R (i.e. in $R \cap \mathcal{L}$) with respect to the induced measure μ on R (see Sect. 4.2). Clearly Pesin sets always exist⁷.

Set $\lambda_i = e^{\chi_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$. Fix an arbitrary constant $\beta \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\lambda_j^{1+\beta} < \lambda_{j+1} \quad (3.4)$$

for all $1 \leq j < \tilde{k}$. Take $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$ so small that $e^{8\hat{\epsilon}} < \lambda_1$ and $e^{8\hat{\epsilon}} < \lambda_j/\lambda_{j-1}$ for all $j = 2, \dots, \tilde{k}$. Some further assumptions about $\hat{\epsilon}$ will be made later. Set

$$1 < \nu_0 = \lambda_1 e^{-8\hat{\epsilon}} < \mu_j = \lambda_j e^{-\hat{\epsilon}} < \lambda_j < \nu_j = \lambda_j e^{\hat{\epsilon}} \quad (3.5)$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$. **Fix $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$ with the above properties.**

For $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{k}$ set

$$\hat{E}_j^u(x) = E_1^u(x) \oplus \dots \oplus E_{j-1}^u(x) \quad , \quad \tilde{E}_j^u = E_j^u(x) \oplus \dots \oplus E_{\tilde{k}}^u(x).$$

⁷In [St4] we considered Gibbs measures admitting *Pesin sets with exponentially small tails*, i.e. Pesin sets whose preimages along the flow have measures decaying exponentially fast. Existence of such Pesin sets for a variety of Gibbs measures for hyperbolic diffeomorphisms and flows was established in [GSt]. However, to our knowledge, there are no general results of this kind.

Also set $\widehat{E}_1^u(x) = \{0\}$ and $\widehat{E}_{k+1}^u(x) = E^u(x)$. For any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and any $u \in E^u(x)$ we will write $u = (u^{(1)}, u^{(2)}, \dots, u^{(\tilde{k})})$, where $u^{(i)} \in E_i^u(x)$ for all i .

According to results in the theory of non-uniformly hyperbolic systems (see [P], [BP]) for any $j = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$ the invariant bundle $\{\widehat{E}_j^u(x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{L}}$ is uniquely integrable over \mathcal{L} , i.e. there exists a measurable φ -invariant family $\{\widetilde{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{L}}$ of C^2 submanifolds $\widetilde{W}^{u,j}(x) = \widetilde{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x)$ of M tangent to the bundle \widetilde{E}_j^u for some $\hat{\epsilon}$ -slowly varying radius function $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}_{\hat{\epsilon}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow (0, 1)$. Moreover, with $\beta \in (0, 1]$ as above, it follows from Theorem 6.6 in [PS] and (3.4) that there exists a φ -invariant family $\{\widehat{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{L}}$ of $C^{1+\beta}$ submanifolds $\widehat{W}^{u,j}(x) = \widehat{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x)$ of M tangent to the bundle \widehat{E}_j^u for every $j > 1$. (However this family is not unique in general.) Fix an φ -invariant family $\{\widehat{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{L}}$ with the latter properties for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j = 2, \dots, \tilde{k}$. Then there exist an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -slowly varying radius function $r = r_{\hat{\epsilon}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ and for any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ a $C^{1+\beta}$ diffeomorphism

$$\Phi_x^u : E^u(x; r(x)) \rightarrow \Phi_x(E^u(x; r(x)) \subset W_{\tilde{r}(x)}^u(x)$$

such that

$$\Phi_x^u(\widehat{E}_j^u(x; r(x))) \subset \widehat{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x) \quad , \quad \Phi_x^u(\widetilde{E}_j^u(x; r(x))) \subset \widetilde{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x) \quad (3.6)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j = 2, \dots, \tilde{k}$. Moreover, since the submanifolds $\widehat{W}_{\tilde{r}(x)}^{u,j}(x)$ and $\exp_x^u(\widehat{E}_j^u(x; r(x)))$ of $W_{\tilde{r}(x)}^u(x)$ are tangent at x of order $1 + \beta$ for each $j > 1$, we can choose Φ_x^u so that the diffeomorphism

$$\Psi_x^u = (\exp_x^u)^{-1} \circ \Phi_x^u : E^u(x; r(x)) \rightarrow \Psi_x^u(E^u(x; r(x))) \subset E^u(x; \tilde{r}(x))$$

is $C^{1+\beta}$ -close to identity. So, we can choose a Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity function $R(x) = R_{\hat{\epsilon}}(x)$ such that

$$\|\Psi_x^u(u) - u\| \leq R(x)\|u\|^{1+\beta} \quad , \quad \|(\Psi_x^u)^{-1}(u) - u\| \leq R(x)\|u\|^{1+\beta} \quad (3.7)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and $u \in E^u(x; r(x))$, and also that

$$\|d\Phi_x^u(u)\| \leq R(x) \quad , \quad \|(d\Phi_x^u(u))^{-1}\| \leq R(x) \quad , \quad x \in \mathcal{L} \quad , \quad u \in E^u(x; r(x)). \quad (3.8)$$

More precisely, as in [LY2] (see (v) in (8.1) there), we will assume that there exists a global constant $R_0 > 0$ such that for all $u, v \in E^u(x; r(x))$ we have

$$\frac{1}{R_0} d(\Phi_x^u(u), \Phi_x^u(v)) \leq \|u - v\| \leq R(x) d(\Phi_x^u(u), \Phi_x^u(v)). \quad (3.9)$$

For any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ consider the $C^{1+\beta}$ map

$$\hat{\varphi}_x = (\Phi_{\varphi(x)}^u)^{-1} \circ \varphi \circ \Phi_x^u : E^u(x) \rightarrow E^u(\varphi(x))$$

(defined locally near 0). We then have the relations

$$\hat{\varphi}_x^{-1}(\widehat{E}_j^u(\varphi(x); r(\varphi(x)))) \subset \widehat{E}_j^u(x; r(x)) \quad , \quad \hat{\varphi}_x^{-1}(\widetilde{E}_j^u(\varphi(x); r(\varphi(x)))) \subset \widetilde{E}_j^u(x; r(x))$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j > 1$.

Given $y \in \mathcal{L}$ and any integer $j \geq 1$ we will use the notation

$$\hat{\varphi}_y^j = \hat{\varphi}_{\varphi^{j-1}(y)} \circ \dots \circ \hat{\varphi}_{\varphi(y)} \circ \hat{\varphi}_y \quad , \quad \hat{\varphi}_y^{-j} = (\hat{\varphi}_{\varphi^{-j}(y)})^{-1} \circ \dots \circ (\hat{\varphi}_{\varphi^{-2}(y)})^{-1} \circ (\hat{\varphi}_{\varphi^{-1}(y)})^{-1} \quad ,$$

at any point where these sequences of maps are well-defined.

It follows from well known results (see e.g. the Appendix in [LY1], Sect. 8 in [LY2] or Sect. 3 in [PS]) that there exists a Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity function $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\hat{\epsilon}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ and an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -slowly varying radius function $r = r_{\hat{\epsilon}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ (we will assume that it is the same as the one chosen above) and for each $x \in \mathcal{L}$ a norm $\|\cdot\|'_x$ on $T_x M$ such that

$$\|v\| \leq \|v\|'_x \leq \Gamma(x)\|v\| \quad , \quad x \in \mathcal{L}, v \in T_x M, \quad (3.10)$$

and for any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and any integer $m \geq 0$, assuming $\hat{\varphi}_x^j(u), \hat{\varphi}_x^j(v) \in E^u(\varphi^j(x), r(\varphi^j(x)))$ are well-defined for all $j = 1, \dots, m$, the following hold:

$$\mu_j^m \|u - v\|'_x \leq \|\hat{\varphi}_x^m(u) - \hat{\varphi}_x^m(v)\|'_{\varphi^m(x)} \leq \nu_k^m \|u - v\|'_x \quad , \quad u, v \in \tilde{E}_j^u(x; r(x)), \quad (3.11)$$

$$\mu_1^m \|u - v\|'_x \leq \|\hat{\varphi}_x^m(u) - \hat{\varphi}_x^m(v)\|'_{\varphi^m(x)} \leq \nu_k^m \|u - v\|'_x \quad , \quad u, v \in E^u(x; r(x)), \quad (3.12)$$

$$\mu_1^m \|v\|'_x \leq \|d\hat{\varphi}_x^m(u) \cdot v\|'_{\varphi^m(x)} \leq \nu_k^m \|v\|'_x \quad , \quad u \in E^u(x; r(x)), v \in E^u(x), \quad (3.13)$$

$$\mu_j^m \|v\|'_x \leq \|d\hat{\varphi}_x^m(0) \cdot v\|'_{\varphi^m(x)} \leq \nu_j^m \|v\|'_x \quad , \quad v \in E_j^u(x). \quad (3.14)$$

Another useful norm is given by $|u| = \max\{\|u^{(i)}\| : 1 \leq i \leq \tilde{k}\}$, which is easily related to $\|\cdot\|$. Clearly, $\|u\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{k}} \|u^{(i)}\| \leq \tilde{k}|u|$. Taking the regularity function $\Gamma(x)$ appropriately, we have $|u| \leq \Gamma(x)\|u\|$, so $\frac{1}{\tilde{k}}\|u\| \leq |u| \leq \Gamma(x)\|u\|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and $u \in E^u(x)$.

Taylor's formula (see also Sect. 3 in [PS]) implies that there exists a Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity function $G = G_{\hat{\epsilon}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ such that for any $i = \pm 1$ and any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ we have

$$\|\hat{\varphi}_x^i(v) - \hat{\varphi}_x^i(u) - d\hat{\varphi}_x^i(u) \cdot (v - u)\| \leq G(x) \|v - u\|^{1+\beta} \quad , \quad u, v \in E^u(x; r(x)),$$

and $\|d\hat{\varphi}_x^i(u) - d\hat{\varphi}_x^i(0)\| \leq G(x) \|u\|^\beta$ for all $u \in E^u(x; r(x))$. **Fix a global constant $\beta > 0$** with the above properties. We will assume that β is chosen so that it satisfies (3.4) as well.

Next, for convenience of the reader we state three lemmas from [St3] and [St4] which will be used in Sect. 5 below.

Lemma 3.1. (Lemma 3.3 in [St3]) *There exist a Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity function $L : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ and an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -slowly varying radius function $r : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ such that for any $x \in \mathcal{L}$, any integer $p \geq 1$ and any $v \in E^u(z, r(z))$ with $\|\hat{\varphi}_z^p(v)\| \leq r(x)$, where $z = \varphi^{-p}(x)$, we have $\|w_p^{(1)} - v_p^{(1)}\| \leq L(x)|v_p|^{1+\beta}$, where $v_p = \hat{\varphi}_z^p(v) \in E^u(x)$ and $w_p = d\hat{\varphi}_z^p(0) \cdot v \in E^u(x)$. Moreover, if $|v_p| = \|v_p^{(1)}\| \neq 0$, then $1/2 \leq \|w_p^{(1)}\|/\|v_p^{(1)}\| \leq 2$.*

Remark. Notice that if $v \in E_1^u(z, r(z))$ in the above lemma, then $v_p, w_p \in E_1^u(x)$, so $\|w_p - v_p\| \leq L(x) \|v_p\|^{1+\beta}$.

We will now state some consequences from Sect. 10 in [St4] that apply to every Anosov flow. For any $v = v^{(1)} + v^{(2)} + \dots + v^{(\tilde{k})} \in E^u(x)$ with $v^{(j)} \in E_j^u(x)$, set $\tilde{v}^{(2)} = v^{(2)} + \dots + v^{(\tilde{k})} \in \tilde{E}_2^u(x)$.

Repeating the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [St3] (with the above slightly different choices of $\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\nu}_1, \hat{\mu}_2$ and ν_2 ; see also Lemma 10.1 in [St4]) we get the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Choosing the constant $\hat{\epsilon}' \in (0, \hat{\epsilon})$ sufficiently small, there exists an $\hat{\epsilon}'$ -slowly varying radius function $\hat{r}(x) \leq r(x)$ on \mathcal{L} such that for any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and any $V = V^{(1)} + \tilde{V}^{(2)} \in E^u(x; \hat{r}(x))$, setting $y = \varphi^{-1}(x)$ and $U = \hat{\varphi}_x^{-1}(V)$, we have $\|\tilde{U}^{(2)}\|'_y \leq \frac{\|\tilde{V}^{(2)}\|'_x}{\mu_2}$ and $\|U^{(1)}\|'_y \geq \frac{\|V^{(1)}\|'_x}{\nu_1}$.*

Lemma 3.3. (Lemma 10.7(b) in [St4]) *There exist a $\frac{5\hat{\epsilon}}{\beta}$ -slowly varying radius functions $\hat{r}(x) \leq r(x)$ and a Lyapunov $4\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity function $L(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{L}$, such that for any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ and any integer $p \geq 1$, setting $z = \varphi^{-p}(x)$, the map*

$$F_x^p = d\hat{\varphi}_z^p(0) \circ (\hat{\varphi}_x^p)^{-1} : E^u(x; \hat{r}(x)) \longrightarrow E^u(x; \hat{r}(x))$$

satisfies

$$\left\| \left[(F_x^p(a))^{(1)} - (F_x^p(b))^{(1)} \right] - [a^{(1)} - b^{(1)}] \right\| \leq L(x) \left(\|a - b\|^{1+\beta} + \|b\|^\beta \cdot \|a - b\| \right)$$

for all $a, b \in E^u(x; \hat{r}(x))$. Moreover, $\frac{1}{2}\|a - b\| \leq \|d\hat{\varphi}_z^p(0) \cdot [(\hat{\varphi}_x^p)^{-1}(a) - (\hat{\varphi}_x^p)^{-1}(b)]\| \leq 2\|a - b\|$ for all $a, b \in E_1^u(x; \hat{r}(x))$.

4 Estimates and constructions involving cylinders

4.1 Cylinders defined by the Markov family

Let again M be a C^2 compact Riemannian manifold and let ϕ_t be a C^2 transitive Anosov flow on M . **Here we do not assume that the flow is contact.**

Choose a very small $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$, as in Sect. 3, but we may need to make it smaller later. Throughout we will again assume that $R(x)$, $\Gamma(x)$, $D(x)$ and $L(x)$ are Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity functions, while $r(x)$ is an $\hat{\epsilon}$ -slowly varying radius function so that it satisfies (3.6) – (3.17) and the conclusions of Lemma 3.1. Replacing $r(x)$ with the smaller regularity function $\hat{r}(x)$, without loss of generality we will assume that the conclusions of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 hold with $\hat{r}(x)$ replaced by $r(x)$.

In what follows we assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \{\tilde{R}_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ is a fixed Markov family for ϕ_t on M of size $\chi < 1/2$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ is the related pseudo-Markov family as in Sect. 2. We will use the notation associated with these from Sect. 2, and we will assume that for any $i = 1, \dots, k_0$, z_i is chosen so that $z_i \in \text{Int}^u(W_{R_i}^u(z_i))$. For any $x \in R$, any $y \in \tilde{R}$ and $\delta > 0$ set

$$B^u(x, \delta) = \{y \in W_{R_i}^u(x) : d(x, y) < \delta\} \quad , \quad \tilde{B}^u(y, \delta) = \{z \in W_{\tilde{R}_i}^u(y) : d(y, z) < \delta\}.$$

In a similar way define $B^s(x, \delta)$. The *open ball* with centre x and radius $r > 0$ on M with respect to the Riemannian metric will be denoted simply by $B(x, r)$.

Given an unstable leaf $W = W_{R_i}^u(z)$ in some rectangle R_i and an admissible sequence $\iota = i_0, \dots, i_m$ of integers $i_j \in \{1, \dots, k_0\}$, the set

$$\mathcal{C}_W[\iota] = \{x \in W : \mathcal{P}^j(x) \in R_{i_j}, j = 0, 1, \dots, m\}$$

will be called a *cylinder of length m* in W (or an *unstable cylinder* in R in general). When $W = U_i$ we will simply write $\mathcal{C}[\iota]$. In a similar way one defines cylinders $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_V[\iota]$, where $V = W_{\tilde{R}_i}^u(z)$ is an unstable leaf in some rectangle \tilde{R}_i .

Let $\text{pr}_D : \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} \phi_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]}(D_i) \longrightarrow \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} D_i$ be the *projection along the flow*, i.e. for all $i = 1, \dots, k_0$ and all $x \in \phi_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]}(D_i)$ we have $\text{pr}_D(x) = \text{pr}_{D_i}(x)$ (see Sect. 2). The shift along the flow determines bi-Hölder continuous bijections

$$\mathcal{T}_z : W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z) \longrightarrow \check{U}(z) = \mathcal{T}_z(W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z)) \subset W_{\epsilon_0}^u(z) \quad , \quad \tilde{\Psi} : W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z) \longrightarrow W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z)$$

for all i . These define bi-Hölder continuous bijections

$$\Psi : \tilde{R} \longrightarrow \check{R} = \cup_{i=1}^{k_0} \check{R}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Psi} : R \longrightarrow \tilde{R},$$

where $\tilde{R}_i = \cup_{z \in S_i} \tilde{U}(z)$ and $\Psi|_{W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z)} = (\mathcal{T}_z)|_{W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z)}$ for $z \in S_i$.

Given a cylinder $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_W[z]$ in some R_i we will frequently use the notation $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_W[z] = \tilde{\Psi}(\mathcal{C})$. This is then a cylinder of the same length in \tilde{R}_i . Sometimes it will be more convenient to work with the projection of the cylinders on actual unstable manifolds, and we will use the notation $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{T}_z(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ for any cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ in some \tilde{R}_i and any $z \in W_{\tilde{R}_i}^u$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{C}} \subset W_\epsilon^u(z)$. The map $\mathcal{T}_z : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is uniformly Lipschitz. Clearly there exist global constants $0 < \tilde{c}_1 < \tilde{c}_2$, independent of \mathcal{C} and z such that

$$\tilde{c}_1 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \text{diam}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \tilde{c}_2 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}). \quad (4.1)$$

Although the rectangles \tilde{R}_i could have complicated structure⁸, and could be rather "fragmented", each of them contains a non-empty open subset⁹ of the corresponding submanifold D_i . It is rather easy to show that there exists a constant $r_0 > 0$ such that for every $i = 1, \dots, k_0$ and every $x \in \tilde{R}_i$ there exists $y \in W_{\tilde{R}_i}^u(x)$ such that $\text{dist}(y, \partial\tilde{R}_i) > r_0$ and $\Psi^{-1}(B(y, r_0) \cap \tilde{R}_i) \subset W_{\tilde{R}_i}^u(x)$. From now on we will assume that the constant $r_0 > 0$ is chosen so that it has the property just described. A few more restrictions on r_0 will be imposed later.

4.2 The Gibbs measure ν , the Ruelle operators L_{ab} and the metric D_θ

Let the constants $c_0 > 0$ and $1 < \gamma < \gamma_1$ be as in Sect. 2. **Fix a constant θ** with

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{\gamma^{\alpha_1}} \leq \theta < 1,$$

where $\alpha_1 > 0$ is the constant chosen at the end of Ch. 2.

Let $F_0 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function and let \mathfrak{m} be the *Gibbs measure* determined by F_0 on M defined on the set \mathcal{L} of Lyapunov regular points ([Si], [B2], [Ch2], [PP]). It induces a *Gibbs measure* μ on R (with respect to the Poincaré map \mathcal{P}) for the function $F(x) = \int_0^{\tau(x)} F_0(\phi_s(x)) ds$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The latter is Hölder and, using Sinai's Lemma, it is cohomologous to a Hölder function $f : R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is constant on stable leaves in rectangles R_i in R . Setting $g = f - P_f \tau$, where $P_f \in \mathbb{R}$ is chosen so that the topological pressure of g with respect to the Poincaré map $\mathcal{P} : R \rightarrow R$ is 0, we get a function on R that depends on forward coordinates only, so it can be considered as a function on U , i.e. on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$.

From now on in this paper we will assume that $f \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U})$ is a fixed real-valued function and $g = f - P_f \tau$, where $P_f \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\text{Pr}_\sigma(g) = 0$. Set $F^{(a)} = f - (P_f + a)\tau$. By Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius' Theorem (see e.g. Theorem 2.2 in [PP]) for any real number a with $|a|$ sufficiently small, as an operator on the space $C(U)$ of continuous functions $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the sup-norm (which we identify with $C(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+)$ with the sup-norm), $L_{F^{(a)}}$ has a largest eigenvalue λ_a and there exists a (unique) regular probability measure $\hat{\nu}_a$ on U with $L_{F^{(a)}}^* \hat{\nu}_a = \lambda_a \hat{\nu}_a$, i.e.

$$\int L_{F^{(a)}} H d\hat{\nu}_a = \lambda_a \int H d\hat{\nu}_a$$

for every $H \in C(U)$. The corresponding eigenfunctions belong to $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U})$. Fix a corresponding (positive) eigenfunction $h_a \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U})$ such that $\int h_a d\hat{\nu}_a = 1$. Then $d\nu = h_0 d\hat{\nu}_0$ defines a σ -invariant probability measure ν on U , called the **Gibbs measure** determined by the function $F^{(0)}$. This is the measure on U that we will use throughout this paper. Since $\text{Pr}_\sigma(f - P_f \tau) = 0$, it

⁸They are not connected in general except in 3D, as Chernov points out in Sect. 9 in [Ch1].

⁹In fact \tilde{R}_i is the closure of such an open subset of D_i .

follows from the main properties of pressure (cf. e.g. chapter 3 in [PP]) that $|\text{Pr}_\sigma(F^{(a)})| \leq \|\tau\|_0 |a|$. Moreover, for small $|a|$ the maximal eigenvalue λ_a and the eigenfunction h_a are Lipschitz in a , so there exist constants $a_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that $|h_a - h_0| \leq C|a|$ on \widehat{U} and $|\lambda_a - 1| \leq C|a|$ for $|a| \leq a_0$.

We will frequently identify μ with the measure on \widetilde{R} defined by $\mu(\widetilde{\Psi}(A)) = \mu(A)$ for every Borel subset A of R . Apart from that we will frequently use the measure ν on subsets of $\widetilde{\Psi}(U)$ simply by setting $\nu(\widetilde{\Psi}(A)) = \nu(A)$ for every measurable subset A of U . The same will apply to subsets of $W_{\widetilde{R}}^u(x)$ for $x \in \widetilde{R}$, identifying these with subsets of U using projections along stable leaves in \widetilde{R} .

Fix a Pesin set P_0 in R , that is a compact subset of $R \cap \mathcal{L}$ with $\mu(P_0) > 0$ such that the Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity function $R(x)$ is bounded on P_0 . Then the functions $\Gamma(x)$, $D(x)$ and $L(x)$ are also bounded above by some constants on P_0 . Similarly, the $\hat{\epsilon}$ -slowly varying radius function $r(x)$ is bounded below by some constant on P_0 . Thus, we may assume that

$$R(x) \leq R_0, \quad r(x) \geq r_0, \quad \Gamma(x) \leq \Gamma_0, \quad L(x) \leq L_0, \quad D(x) \leq D_0$$

for all $x \in P_0$ **for some positive constants $R_0, \Gamma_0, L_0, D_0 \geq 1$ and $r_0 > 0$** . We fix $r_0 > 0$ so that $r_0 \leq \frac{1}{R_0}$. We will also use the **Pesin set $\widetilde{P}_0 = \widetilde{\Psi}(P_0)$** in \widetilde{R} , and we will assume that the functions $R(x)$, $r(x)$, etc. satisfy the same bounds as above on \widetilde{P}_0 .

For $|a| \leq a_0$, as in [D], consider the function

$$\mathbf{f}^{(a)}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - (\mathbf{P}_f + \mathbf{a})\tau(\mathbf{u}) + \ln \mathbf{h}_a(\mathbf{u}) - \ln \mathbf{h}_a(\sigma(\mathbf{u})) - \ln \lambda_a$$

and the operators

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{a})} - \mathbf{i}\mathbf{b}\tau} : \mathbf{C}(U) \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}(U), \quad \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{a})}} : \mathbf{C}(U) \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}(U).$$

Then $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}} 1 = 1$. It is easy to see that $|(L_{ab}^m h)(u)| \leq (\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}}^m |h|)(u)$ for all $u \in U$, $h \in C(U)$ and $m \geq 0$. Moreover, $L_{f^{(0)}}^* \nu = \nu$, i.e.

$$\int L_{f^{(0)}} H d\nu = \int H d\nu, \quad H \in C(U).$$

For any integer $m \geq 1$ and any function $h : U \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ define $h_m : U \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$h_m(u) = h(u) + h(\sigma(u)) + \dots + h(\sigma^{m-1}(u)).$$

Since g has zero topological pressure with respect to the shift map $\sigma : U \longrightarrow U$, there exist constants $0 < c_1 \leq c_2$ such that for any cylinder $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^u[i_0, \dots, i_m]$ of length m in U we have

$$\mathbf{c}_1 \leq \frac{\nu(\mathcal{C})}{\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{g}_m(\mathbf{y})}} \leq \mathbf{c}_2, \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (4.2)$$

(see e.g. [PP]). Moreover there exist constants $0 \leq \rho_1 \leq \rho_2 < 1$ such that for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ as above we have

$$\mathbf{c}_1 \rho_1^m \leq \nu(\mathcal{C}) \leq \mathbf{c}_2 \rho_2^m, \quad (4.3)$$

for every cylinder $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^u[i_0, \dots, i_m]$ of length m in U (see e.g. Proposition 2 in [Po] or pp. 54-55 in [Ch2]).

As in [St4], here we will make a substantial use of the *metric D_θ on U* defined in Sect. 1 above. For a non-empty subset A of U (or some $W_{\widetilde{R}}^u(x)$) let $\text{diam}_\theta(A)$ be the *diameter* of A with respect to D_θ .

Lemma 4.1. ([St4]) (a) For any cylinder \mathcal{C} in U the characteristic function $\chi_{\mathcal{C}}$ of \mathcal{C} on U is Lipschitz with respect to D_{θ} and $\text{Lip}_{\theta}(\chi_{\mathcal{C}}) \leq 1/\text{diam}_{\theta}(\mathcal{C})$.

(b) There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that if $x, y \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some i , then $|\tau(x) - \tau(y)| \leq C_1 D_{\theta}(x, y)$. That is, $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta}(\widehat{U})$. Moreover, we can choose $C_1 > 0$ so that

$$|\tau_m(x) - \tau_m(y)| \leq C_1 D_{\theta}(\sigma^m(x), \sigma^m(y))$$

whenever $x, y \in \widehat{U}_i$ belong to the same cylinder of length m .

(c) There exist constants $C_1 > 0$ and $\alpha_2 > 0$ such that for any $z \in R$, any cylinder \mathcal{C} in $W_R^u(z)$ and any $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $d(\tilde{\Psi}(x), \tilde{\Psi}(y)) \leq C_1 D_{\theta}(x, y)$ and $D_{\theta}(x, y) \leq C_1 (d(\tilde{\Psi}(x), \tilde{\Psi}(y)))^{\alpha_2}$. Therefore, for $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \tilde{\Psi}(\mathcal{C})$ we have $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq C_2 \text{diam}_{\theta}(\mathcal{C})$, and $\text{diam}_{\theta}(\mathcal{C}) \leq C_1 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{\alpha_2}$. We can take $\alpha_2 > 0$ so that $1/(\gamma_1)^{\alpha_2} \leq \theta$.

It follows from Lemma 4.1 that $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta}(\widehat{U})$, so assuming $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta}(\widehat{U})$, we have $f^{(a)} \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta}(\widehat{U})$ for all such $|a| \leq a_0$. Moreover, using the analytical dependence of h_a and λ_a on a and assuming that the constant $a_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small, there exists $T_0 = T_0(a_0) > 0$ such that

$$T_0 \geq \max\{\|f^{(a)}\|_0, |f|_{\widehat{U}}^{(a)}|_{\theta}, |\tau|_{\widehat{U}}|_{\theta}\} \quad (4.4)$$

for all $|a| \leq a_0$. Fix $a_0 > 0$ and $T_0 > 0$ and with these properties. Taking the constant $T_0 > 0$ sufficiently large, we have $\|f^{(a)} - f^{(0)}\|_0 \leq T_0 |a|$ on \widehat{U} for $|a| \leq a_0$.

As in [D] we have the following Lasota-Yorke type inequality (see Lemma 5.2 and its proof in the Appendix in [St4]).

Lemma 4.2. There exists a constant $A_0 > 0$, depending on $\|f\|_{\theta}$, such that for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|a| \leq a_0$ the following hold: If the functions h and H on \widehat{U} and the constant $B > 0$ are such that $H > 0$ on \widehat{U} and $|h(v) - h(v')| \leq B H(v') D_{\theta}(v, v')$ for any i and any $v, v' \in \widehat{U}_i$, then for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|b| \geq 1$ and any integer $m \geq 1$ we have

$$|L_{ab}^m h(u) - L_{ab}^m h(u')| \leq A_0 [B \theta^m (\mathcal{M}_a^m H)(u') + |b| (\mathcal{M}_a^m |h|)(u')] D_{\theta}(u, u')$$

whenever $u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some $i = 1, \dots, k_0$.

4.3 Technical lemmas on sizes of cylinders

We continue with the notation and assumptions in Sects. 4.1 and 4.2. In addition we will assume that the Markov family \mathcal{R} is chosen so that $6\tau_0 < \beta$, where τ_0 is the constant from (2.2) and $\beta > 0$ is the constant with (3.4) fixed in Sect. 3.

The following technical lemma will be used significantly later on.

Lemma 4.3. There exist a global constant $C_3 > 0$ and constants $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_2 < \hat{\epsilon}_1$ with $\hat{\epsilon}_i \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ that can be made arbitrarily small with $\hat{\epsilon}$, such that if $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is a cylinder of length m in \tilde{R} with $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) < r_0$ and $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0$, then:

(a) There exists an integer k with $m\hat{\epsilon}_2 \leq k \leq m\hat{\epsilon}_1$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z', r(z'))$, where $z' = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0)$.

(b) For $p = [\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)]$ with k as above, we have $\hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z_p, r(z_p))$, where $z_p = \varphi^p(z_0)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{T}_{z_0}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. Moreover, $\text{diam}(\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})) \leq \frac{3C_3}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}} \leq r_0 e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}} \leq r(z_p)$, where $\alpha_1 > 0$ is the Hölder constant from Sect. 2.

(c) For every unstable cylinder \mathcal{C} of length m in \tilde{R} and $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0$, we have

$$\frac{e^{-m\hat{e}_7/\tilde{\tau}_0}}{C_3\lambda_1^{m\tau_0}} \leq \frac{e^{-q\hat{e}_7}}{C_3\lambda_1^q} \leq \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \frac{C_3 e^{q\hat{e}_7}}{\lambda_1^q} \leq \frac{C_3 e^{m\tau_0 \hat{e}_7}}{\lambda_1^{m\tau_0}}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $q = [\tilde{\tau}_m(z_0)]$ and \hat{e}_7 is a constant with $0 < \hat{e}_7 < \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$. Moreover, there exist $\hat{x}_0 \in \mathcal{T}_{z_0}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ and a constant $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_5 < \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ such that $u_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\hat{x}_0) \in E^u(z_0, \epsilon_1)$ and we have

$$\|u_0^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{e^{-q\hat{e}_7}}{C\lambda_1^q} \quad (4.6)$$

where $C = 2R_0^2\Gamma_0/c > 0$ for some global constant $c > 0$.

Proof of Lemma. 4.3. We use some bits from the proof of Lemma 4.2(a) in [St4], however we need a lot more precision and details.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be a cylinder of length m in \tilde{R} . Fix an arbitrary $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0$. Since m is the length of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ contains a whole unstable leaf of a proper rectangle \tilde{R}_{j_0} . Let $\tilde{z} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(z_0) \in \tilde{R}_{j_0}$. Set $z_j = \varphi^j(z_0)$ for $j \geq 1$. By the choice of the constant $r_0 > 0$ (see Sect. 4.1) there exists $y_0 \in W_{\tilde{R}_{j_0}}^u(z_m)$ such that $\text{dist}(y_0, \partial\tilde{R}_{j_0}) > r_0$ and $B^u(y_0, r_0) \cap \tilde{R}_{j_0} \subset W_{\tilde{R}_{j_0}}^u(\tilde{z})$. In particular, for every point $b' \in B^u(y_0, r_0)$ there exists $b \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(b) = b'$. Also, $\text{diam}(\tilde{R}_{j_0}) \leq \chi$, so $\tilde{R}_{j_0} \subset B^u(y_0, 2\chi)$ and $\tilde{R}_{j_0} \subset B^u(\tilde{z}, 2\chi)$. Thus, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(\tilde{z}, 2\chi)$.

We will now choose k with $0 < k \leq m$ so that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z', r(z')), \quad (4.7)$$

where $z' = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(\tilde{z})$. Since $r(\cdot)$ is a Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}$ -regularity function (see Sect. 3), we have $r(z') \geq r(z_0)e^{-(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \geq r_0e^{-(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}$. For every integer $0 \leq k \leq m$, by (2.1) we have $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(B^u(\tilde{z}, 2\chi))) \leq \frac{2\chi}{c_0\gamma^k}$. Thus, (4.7) will be satisfied if

$$\frac{2\chi}{c_0\gamma^k} \leq r_0 e^{-(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}. \quad (4.8)$$

We have $z' \in \tilde{R}_s$ for some s . Using $B^u(y_0, r_0) \cap \tilde{R}_{j_0} \subset W_{\tilde{R}_{j_0}}^u(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$, we get $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(B^u(y_0, r_0)) \subset W_{\tilde{R}_s}^u(z')$, so we have a non-trivial open subset of the submanifold D_s entirely in \tilde{R}_s "around" $y' = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(y_0)$. More precisely, for $r = \frac{r_0 c_0}{\gamma^k}$ we have $\text{dist}(y', \partial\tilde{R}_s) > r$ and $B^u(y', r) \cap \tilde{R}_s \subset W_{\tilde{R}_s}^u(z')$.

Let $k \geq 0$ be a number with (4.8). Then $\gamma^k e^{-(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \geq \frac{2\chi}{r_0 c_0}$, so $e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}}(\gamma e^{\hat{\epsilon}})^k \geq \text{const}$, i.e. $(\gamma e^{\hat{\epsilon}})^k \geq \text{const } e^{m\hat{\epsilon}}$. Setting $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma e^{\hat{\epsilon}}$, we get $k \log \hat{\gamma} \geq m\hat{\epsilon} + \text{const}$ for some positive global constant const .

It follows from all the above that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(B^u(y_0, r_0)) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(B^u(\tilde{z}, 2\chi)) \subset B^u(z', 2\chi/(c_0\gamma^k)) \subset B^u(z', r(z')). \quad (4.9)$$

Set $T = \tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)$ and $p = [T]$, so that $p \leq T < p + 1$.

It follows from (2.1) and the α_1 -Hölder continuity of weak unstable manifolds of the flow ϕ_t that for every $z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ we have

$$|\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z) - \tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)| \leq \text{Const } d(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0)) \leq \text{Const} \left(\frac{\chi}{c_0\gamma^k} \right)^{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}} \quad (4.10)$$

for some global constant $C > 0$. We will show now that

$$d(\varphi^p(z), \varphi^p(z_0)) \leq \frac{3C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}} \quad (4.11)$$

for all $z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$.

Proof of (4.11): Given $z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, there are two cases to consider for $t = \tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z)$ and $T = \tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)$.

Case 1. $t < p$. Then $t < p \leq T$ and by (4.10), $p - t \leq T - t \leq \frac{C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}}$ and $T - p \leq \frac{C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d(\varphi^p(z), \varphi^p(z_0)) &= d(\phi_p(z), \phi_p(z_0)) \\ &\leq d(\phi_p(z), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z)) + d(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0)) + d(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0), \phi_p(z_0)) \\ &\leq |p - t| + \frac{C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}} + |T - p| \leq \frac{3C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $p \leq t$. First, assume that $t \leq T$. Then, using (4.10),

$$\begin{aligned} d(\varphi^p(z), \varphi^p(z_0)) &= d(\phi_p(z), \phi_p(z_0)) \leq d(\phi_t(z), \phi_t(z_0)) \leq d(\phi_t(z), \phi_T(z_0)) + d(\phi_T(z_0), \phi_t(z_0)) \\ &= d(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0)) + |T - t| \leq \frac{2C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}}. \end{aligned}$$

The other case to consider is $t > T$. Then $t > T \geq p$, and as above we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(\varphi^p(z), \varphi^p(z_0)) &= d(\phi_p(z), \phi_p(z_0)) \leq d(\phi_T(z), \phi_T(z_0)) \leq d(\phi_t(z), \phi_T(z_0)) + d(\phi_t(z), \phi_T(z)) \\ &= d(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0)) + |T - t| \leq \frac{2C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.11). It implies that

$$\text{diam}(\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})) \leq \frac{3C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}}. \quad (4.12)$$

For $z_p = \varphi^p(z_0)$ we have $r_p = r(z_p) \geq r_0 e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}}$. We need to have

$$r(z_p) > \text{diam}(\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})) \quad \text{and} \quad r(z_p) \geq \text{diam}(\hat{\varphi}^p(\hat{\mathcal{C}})). \quad (4.13)$$

By (4.12) and (4.1), for this it would be enough to have $3C_1 \tilde{c}_2 e^{-\alpha_1 k \log \gamma} \leq r_0 e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}}$, that is $-(\alpha_1 \log \gamma)k \leq \log(r_0/(3C\tilde{c}_2)) - p\hat{\epsilon}$ which is equivalent to $p\hat{\epsilon} \leq \log \frac{c_1 r_0}{3C\tilde{c}_2} + (\alpha_1 \log \gamma)k$. Since $p = [\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)] \leq (m-k)\tau_0$, we have $p\hat{\epsilon} \leq (m-k)\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}$, and so the above holds if

$$(m-k)\tau_0\hat{\epsilon} \leq (\alpha_1 \log \gamma)k - 1,$$

assuming $|\log \frac{c_1 r_0}{3C\tilde{c}_2}| < 1$, that is if

$$m\tau_0\hat{\epsilon} \leq (\tau_0\hat{\epsilon} + \alpha_1 \log \gamma)k - 1. \quad (4.14)$$

We will now assume that

$$m\hat{\epsilon}_2 \leq k \leq m\hat{\epsilon}_1, \quad (4.15)$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}_2 = \frac{\hat{\epsilon}\tau_0}{\alpha_1 \log \gamma}$ is a small number (can be made arbitrarily small choosing the initial $\hat{\epsilon}$ small), and (there is a lot freedom in this choice) e.g. $\hat{\epsilon}_1 = 2\hat{\epsilon}_2$. Then for $m \geq m_0$ sufficiently large, $m\hat{\epsilon}_2 \leq k$ implies

$$m\tau_0\hat{\epsilon} \leq (\alpha_1 \log \gamma)k < (\tau_0\hat{\epsilon} + \alpha_1 \log \gamma)k - 1,$$

assuming $k > 1$ is sufficiently large, so (4.14) holds and therefore (4.13) holds as well. The latter yields

$$\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z_p, r(z_p)) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(\hat{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z_p, r(z_p)). \quad (4.16)$$

This completes the proofs of parts (a) and (b).

Proof of part (c). We will continue to use the notation introduced above.

Since $p = [\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)]$, we have $\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0) = p + t$ for some $t \in [0, 1)$. For $y' = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(y_0)$, by (2.1) and (4.9), it follows that

$$B^u(y', c_0 r_0 / \gamma_1^k) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(B^u(y_0, r_0)) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) = \phi_{\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}).$$

Setting $y'' = \phi_{-t}(y')$ and $\hat{y} = \mathcal{T}_{z_0}(y'')$ and using (4.1), we have

$$B^u(y'', c_0 r_0 / \gamma_1^{k+1}) \subset \phi_{\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)-t}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) = \varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \quad \text{and} \quad B^u(\hat{y}, c_0 r_0 \tilde{c}_1 / \gamma_1^{k+1}) \subset \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(\hat{\mathcal{C}}).$$

By (4.15),

$$c_0 r_0 \tilde{c}_1 / \gamma_1^{k+1} = \frac{c_0 r_0 \tilde{c}_1}{\gamma_1} e^{-k \log \gamma_1} \geq \frac{c_0 r_0 \tilde{c}_1}{\gamma_1} e^{-m \hat{e}_2 \log \gamma_1} = c'_3 e^{-m \hat{e}_3},$$

for some global constant $c'_3 > 0$ and $\hat{e}_3 = (\log \gamma_1) \hat{e}_1 > 0$. Hence, taking into account (4.16) as well, we obtain

$$B^u(y'', c'_3 e^{-m \hat{e}_3}) \subset \varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z_p, r(z_p)) \quad (4.17)$$

and

$$B^u(\hat{y}, c'_3 e^{-m \hat{e}_3}) \subset \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(\hat{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z_p, r(z_p)). \quad (4.18)$$

Then for every $b' \in B^u(\hat{y}, c'_3 e^{-m \hat{e}_3})$ there exists $b \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(b) = b'$. Notice also that $r = c'_3 e^{-m \hat{e}_3} \leq r(z_p)$.

To apply the map $(\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}$ to (4.18) we will use (3.9) and $R(z_p) \leq R(z_0) e^{\hat{e} p} \leq R_0 e^{\hat{e}(m-k)\tau_0} \leq R_0 e^{\hat{e} m \tau_0}$. Setting $\xi = (\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\hat{y})$, $c_3 = c'_3 / R_0$ and $\hat{e}_4 = \hat{e}_3 + \hat{e} \tau_0$, it follows from (4.18) that

$$(\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(B^u(\hat{y}, c_3 e^{-m \hat{e}_4})) \subset B(\xi, R(z_p) c_3 e^{-m \hat{e}_4}) \subset B(\xi, r) \subset E^u(z_p).$$

An elementary argument shows that in the normed space $E^u(z_p)$ we can always find an element $\hat{\xi}$ in the ball $B(\xi, r)$ in $E^u(z_p)$ such that $\|\hat{\xi}^{(1)}\| \geq r/2$. Indeed, assume e.g. $\xi^{(1)} \geq 0$ in the natural coordinates in $E^u(z_p)$. If $\xi^{(1)} \geq r/2$ just take $\hat{\xi} = \xi$. If $0 \leq \xi^{(1)} < r/2$, take $\hat{\xi} = (\xi^{(1)} + r/2, \xi^{(2)}, \dots, \xi^{(n_u)})$, where $n_u = \dim(E^u(z_p))$. We have

$$v_0 = \Phi_{z_p}^u(\hat{\xi}) \in \Phi_{z_p}^u(B(\xi, r)) \subset B^u(z_p, r(z_p)) \cap \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(\hat{\mathcal{C}}).$$

Set $u_0 = \hat{\varphi}_{z_p}^{-p}(v_0) \in E^u(z_0)$. For v_0 the above gives $\|v_0^{(1)}\|_{z_p} \geq \|\hat{\xi}^{(1)}\| \geq r/2$, while $\hat{x}_0 = \Phi_{z_0}^u(u_0) \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$. Hence $\text{diam}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}) \geq d(z_0, \hat{x}_0) \geq \frac{\|u_0\|}{R_0} \geq \frac{\|u_0^{(1)}\|_{z_0}}{\Gamma_0 R_0}$, and by (4.1), $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_1}{\Gamma_0 R_0} \|u_0^{(1)}\|_{z_0}$. Notice also that for $\hat{x}_0 = \Phi_{z_0}^u(u_0)$ we have $\hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(\hat{x}_0) = v_0 \in \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(\hat{\mathcal{C}})$. Thus, for $x_0 = (\mathcal{T}_{z_0})^{-1}(\hat{x}_0) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ we have $\varphi^p(x_0) \in \varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ and therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(x_0) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$.

It follows from $q = [\tilde{\tau}_m(z_0)]$ that $m \tilde{\tau}_0 - 1 \leq q \leq m \tau_0$, while (4.15) yields

$$q \geq p + [\tilde{\tau}_k(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^p(z_0))] \geq p + k \tilde{\tau}_0 - 1 \geq p + m \tilde{\tau}_0 \hat{e}_2 - 1 \geq p + q \frac{\tilde{\tau}_0 \hat{e}_2}{\tau_0} - 1.$$

Similarly, using (4.15) again, we get $q \leq p + q \frac{\tau_0 \hat{\epsilon}_1}{\tilde{\tau}_0} + \frac{\tau_0 \hat{\epsilon}_1}{\tilde{\tau}_0}$, therefore

$$q(1 - \frac{\tau_0 \hat{\epsilon}_1}{\tilde{\tau}_0}) - \frac{\tau_0 \hat{\epsilon}_1}{\tilde{\tau}_0} \leq p \leq q(1 - \frac{\tilde{\tau}_0 \hat{\epsilon}_2}{\tau_0}) + 1.$$

Thus, for sufficiently large m (then q is also large) we have

$$q(1 - \hat{\epsilon}_6) \leq p \leq q(1 - \hat{\epsilon}_5), \quad (4.19)$$

for some small constants $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_5 \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ and $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_6 \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$.

Now $\nu_1^p = \lambda_1^p e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}$ and $p \leq q(1 - \hat{\epsilon}_5)$ give

$$\|u_0^{(1)}\|'_{z_0} \geq \frac{\|v_0^{(1)}\|'_{z_p}}{\nu_1^p} \geq \frac{r}{2\nu_1^p} \geq \frac{c'_3 e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}_3}}{2\nu_1^{q-q\hat{\epsilon}_5}} \geq \frac{c'_3 e^{-(q+1)\hat{\epsilon}_3/\tilde{\tau}_0}}{2\nu_1^q} \geq \frac{c'_3 e^{-(q+1)\hat{\epsilon}_3/\tilde{\tau}_0 - q\hat{\epsilon}}}{2\lambda_1^q} \geq \frac{c'_3 e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{2\lambda_1^q}, \quad (4.20)$$

for some $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_7 \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$. Hence $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \frac{e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{C_3 \lambda_1^q}$, taking $C_3 \geq 2R_0\Gamma_0/c'_3 > 0$.

This proves the left-hand-side inequality in (4.5).

We will now prove in a similar way the other inequality in (4.5).

It follows from (4.17) and (4.15) and the choice of k and p that $\text{diam}(\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})) \leq r_0 e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}} < r(z_p)$. By (4.16) there exists $\xi \in E^u(z_p)$ with $\|\xi\| \leq r_0 e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}} < r(z_p)$ so that $z = \Phi_{z_p}^u(\xi) \in \varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ and for $y = \varphi^{-p}(z) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ we have $d(y, z_0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. Thus for $\eta = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(y) \in E^u(z_0)$ we have

$$\|\eta\|'_{z_0} \geq \|\eta\| \geq \frac{1}{\Gamma_0} d(y, z_0) \geq \frac{1}{2\Gamma_0} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}).$$

It now follows from (3.12), $R(z_p) \leq R_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}$, $\mu_1 = \lambda_1 e^{-\hat{\epsilon}}$, $q(1 - \hat{\epsilon}_6) \leq p$ and the above that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) &\leq 2\Gamma_0 \|\eta\|'_{z_0} \leq 2\Gamma_0 \frac{\|\xi\|'_{z_p}}{\mu_1^p} \leq 2\Gamma_0 R_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}} \frac{\|\xi\|}{\mu_1^p} \leq 2\Gamma_0 R_0 \frac{r_0 e^{2p\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p} \\ &\leq \frac{2\Gamma_0 R_0 r_0 \lambda_1^{q\hat{\epsilon}_6} e^{2q\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^q} \leq \frac{2\Gamma_0 R_0 r_0 e^{q(\hat{\epsilon}_6 \log \lambda_1 + 2\hat{\epsilon})}}{\lambda_1^q} \leq \frac{2\Gamma_0 R_0 r_0 e^{q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{\lambda_1^q}, \end{aligned}$$

assuming $\hat{\epsilon}_7 \geq 2\hat{\epsilon} + \hat{\epsilon}_6 \log \lambda_1$. This proves the left-hand-side inequality in (4.5).

The existence of ζ with (4.6) follows from (4.20). ■

4.4 Constructing two families of sub-cylinders

As a consequence of some of the considerations in the proof of the above lemma we will now get an important consequence.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $d > 1$ and $C > 1$ be given constants.*

There exist an integer $q_1 \geq 1$ and global constants $d_1 > 0$, $d_2 > 0$ and $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_{12} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$, which can be made arbitrarily small with $\hat{\epsilon}$, such that for every cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ in \tilde{R} containing a point $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0$ there exists a subset $\Gamma = \Gamma(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ which is an union of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of co-length at least q_1 so that

$$\nu(\Gamma') \geq d_1 \nu(\mathcal{C}'), \quad (4.21)$$

where $\Gamma' = \pi^{(U)}(\Gamma)$, and for every $x \in \Gamma$, for $u = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x)) \in E^u(z_0)$ we have

$$\|u^{(1)}\| \geq \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}), \quad (4.22)$$

for $\kappa = d_2 e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}_{12}}$, where m is the length of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$.

Moreover, there exist a global constants $d_3 > 0$ and an integer $q'_1 \geq q_1$ such that there exist a sub-cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of co-length q'_1 with $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and a subset $\Lambda = \Lambda(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ which is an union of cylinders so that

$$\nu(\Lambda') \geq d_1 \nu(\mathcal{D}'), \quad (4.23)$$

where $\Lambda' = \pi^{(U)}(\Lambda)$, and for every $x \in \Lambda$, for $u = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x)) \in E^u(z_0)$ we have $Cu \in (\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(\Gamma)))$. Here $p = [\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)]$ and $k = \frac{4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}{|\log \theta|}$. Finally, we can choose the sub-cylinders in Γ and Λ with lengths not exceeding $r_m = T_1 m\hat{\epsilon} + T_2$ for some global constants $T_i = T_i(C) > 0$, $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. We will use the notation and the assumptions from the beginning of the proof of Lemma 4.3, with some small changes. Set $Z_m = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(z_0)$, and more generally, $Z_j = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^j(z_0)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. As before, let $r_0 > 0$ be a small constant and let y_0 be a point with $B^u(y_0, 4r_0) \subset W_{R_{j_0}}^u(Z_m)$ and now we assume $d(y_0, Z_m) > 4r_0$. Let $\tilde{y}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be the point with $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(\tilde{y}_0) = y_0$.

Again we will assume that the integer k satisfies (4.8), however now we will impose a stronger condition on k . Namely we want something similar to (4.14) but a bit different:

$$|\log \theta| \mathbf{k} = 4d(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{k})\hat{\epsilon}. \quad (4.24)$$

That is $(4d\hat{\epsilon} + |\log \theta|)k = 4dm\hat{\epsilon}$, which implies

$$m\hat{\epsilon}_8 = k \leq m\hat{\epsilon}_9, \quad (4.25)$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}_9 = \frac{4d}{|\log \theta|} \hat{\epsilon} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ and $\hat{\epsilon}_8 = \frac{4d}{4d\hat{\epsilon} + |\log \theta|} \hat{\epsilon} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$.

Notice that, since $1/\gamma^{\alpha_1} \leq \theta < 1$ we have $\alpha_1 \log \gamma \geq |\log \theta|$, so (4.24) implies

$$(\alpha_1 \log \gamma) \mathbf{k} \geq 4d(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{k})\hat{\epsilon}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, set $p = [\tau_{m-k}(z_0)]$. Notice that with our new definition of k and the related p , (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11) in the proof of Lemma 4.3 still hold, and therefore (4.12) holds as well. Also, as in the proof of Lemma 4.3 we show that

$$\mathbf{q}(1 - \hat{\epsilon}'_6) \leq \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{q}(1 - \hat{\epsilon}'_5) \quad (4.26)$$

for some constants $0 < \hat{\epsilon}'_5 \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ and $0 < \hat{\epsilon}'_6 \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$, which is the analogue of (4.19) for our new definition of p .

Next, set $t = \tau_{m-k}(z_0) - p \in [0, 1)$, $Z_{m-k} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(Z_m) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(z_0)$, $z_p = \varphi^p(z_0) = \phi_{-t}(Z_{m-k})$, $y' = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(y_0)$, $y'' = \phi_{-t}(y')$. Consider the map

$$F = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^k \circ \phi_t : \varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \longrightarrow W_{R_{j_0}}^u(Z_m).$$

As before, by (2.1), we have $B^u(y', \frac{4r_0 c_0}{\gamma_1^k}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{-k}(B^u(y_0, 4r_0))$ and $B^u(y'', \frac{4r_0 c_0}{\gamma_1^{k+1}}) \subset F^{-1}(B^u(y_0, 4r_0))$.

Set $\hat{y} = \mathcal{T}_{z_p}(y'') \in W_\epsilon^u(z_p)$ and $\eta = (\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\hat{y}) \in E^u(z_p)$. Since $d(y'', z_p) \geq \frac{4r_0 c_0}{\gamma_1^{k+1}}$, it follows that

$$d(\hat{y}, z_p) \geq \frac{4r_0 c_0}{\tilde{c}_2 \gamma_1^{k+1}} \text{ and therefore } \|\eta\| \geq \frac{d(\hat{y}, z_p)}{R(z_p)} \geq \frac{4r_0 c_0}{\tilde{c}_2 \gamma_1^{k+1} R(z_p)}.$$

In what follows it is more convenient to deal with $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ instead of $\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$, and the space $E^u(Z_{m-k})$, rather than $E^u(z_p)$. As before, for $z_p = \varphi^p(z_0)$ we have $r(z_p) \geq r_0 e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}}$. It follows from (4.12), which holds again with the present choice of k as remarked earlier, we have

$$\text{diam}(\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})) \leq \frac{3C}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 k}} = 3C e^{-k \alpha_1 \log \gamma},$$

therefore $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})) \leq \frac{3C\gamma_1}{c_0} e^{-k \alpha_1 \log \gamma}$, which, combined with (4.24), implies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diam}((\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})))) &\leq \frac{3C\gamma_1 R(Z_{m-k})}{c_0} e^{-k \alpha_1 \log \gamma} \\ &\leq \frac{3C\gamma_1 R_0}{c_0} e^{(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \leq e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}, \end{aligned}$$

since $d > 1$, so $\frac{3C\gamma_1 R_0}{c_0} e^{(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \leq e^{d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}$, assuming k is sufficiently large. Also, $e^{-d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \leq r_0 e^{-(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \leq r(Z_{m-k})$, again for large k .

The above gives

$$(\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))) \subset \mathbf{E} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{E}^u(Z_{m-k}) : \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \right\}. \quad (4.27)$$

Let e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n_u} be an orthonormal basis in $E^u(Z_{m-k})$, so that $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n_1}\}$ is a basis in $E_1^u(Z_{m-k})$. Consider the subsets

$$H = \{u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n_u}) \in E^u(Z_{m-k}) : \|u\| < e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}, u_1 = 0\}$$

and

$$H_1 = \left\{ u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n_u}) \in E^u(Z_{m-k}) : \|u\| < e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}, \|u_1\| < \frac{1}{4} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \right\}$$

of E . Clearly $H \subset H_1$. Set

$$\epsilon = \frac{e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}/\alpha_2}}{4}, \quad (4.28)$$

where $\alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$ is one of the constants from Lemma 4.1(c). Consider a rectangular box Δ contained entirely in $E \setminus H_1$ with sides of length ϵ parallel to the coordinate axes. It is enough to take a point $u \in H$ with $\|u_1\| = \frac{1}{2} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}/\alpha_2}$, and then consider the cube Δ in E with centre u and sides of length ϵ . Then, applying the map $(\hat{\phi}_t)^{-1}$ to the cube Δ , we get that its image is contained in $E(z_p) \setminus H_2$, where

$$H_2 = \left\{ v = (v_1, \dots, v_{n_u}) \in E^u(z_p) : \|v\| < e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}, \|v_1\| < \frac{1}{4\gamma_1} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \right\}.$$

Consider the largest cylinder X in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ such that $\Delta \supset (\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(X)$. Denote by n the length of the cylinder X . From Lemma 4.1(c)

$$(\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}^{-1}(\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u(\Delta))))^{\alpha_2} \geq \frac{1}{C_1} \text{diam}_\theta(X) = \frac{\theta^n}{C_1},$$

and n is the smallest integer with property, so $\theta^{n-1}/C_1 \geq (R_0 \tilde{c}_1 \epsilon)^{\alpha_2} \geq \theta^n/C_1$. So, we have $\theta^{n-1} \geq \text{const } \epsilon^{\alpha_2}$ for some global constant $\text{const} > 0$. This gives $n \log \theta \geq \text{const} + \alpha_2 \log \epsilon$, i.e. $n |\log \theta| \leq c' - \alpha_2 \log \epsilon$, so

$$n \leq \frac{c' - \alpha_2 \log \epsilon}{|\log \theta|} = c'' - \alpha_2 \frac{\log \epsilon}{|\log \theta|}$$

for some global constants $c', c'' \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly the length n of X does not exceed $r'_m = T_1'' m \hat{\epsilon} + T_2''$ for some global constants $T_1'' > 0$ and $T_2'' > 0$.




Figure 1

Recall the point $y' \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. It follows from (4.2) and (4.3) that

$$\frac{\nu(X)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1)} \geq \frac{c_1 e^{g_n(y')}}{c_2 e^{g_k(y')}} = \frac{c_1}{c_2} e^{g_{n-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^k(y'))} = \frac{c_1}{c_2} e^{g_{n-k}(y_0)} \geq \frac{c_1^2}{c_2^2} \rho_1^{n-k} = \frac{c_1^2}{c_2^2} e^{(n-k) \log \rho_1} = \frac{c_1^2}{c_2^2} \left(e^{-n} e^k \right)^{|\log \rho_1|}.$$

From the estimate above, $e^{-n} \geq e^{-c''} e^{\frac{\alpha_2 \log \epsilon}{|\log \theta|}} = c \epsilon^{\alpha_2 / |\log \theta|}$ for some global constant $c > 0$. On the other hand, it follows from (4.24) that $e^k = e^{4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}/|\log \theta|}$. Therefore, using (4.28),

$$\frac{\nu(X)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1)} \geq \frac{c_1^2}{c_2^2} \left(c''' \epsilon^{\alpha_2} e^{4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \right)^{\frac{|\log \rho_1|}{|\log \theta|}} = \frac{c_1^2}{c_2^2} (c/4^{\alpha_2})^{\frac{|\log \rho_1|}{|\log \theta|}} = d'_1.$$

Thus, there exists a global constant $d'_1 > 0$ so that $\nu(X) \geq d'_1 \nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1)$.

In this way we have constructed a cylinder X in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1$ so that $(\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(X) \subset E \setminus H_1$, which implies

$$(\hat{\phi}_t)^{-1} \circ (\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(X) \subset E(z_p) \setminus H_2, \quad (4.29)$$

and $\nu(X) \geq d'_1 \nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1)$.

Let Ω be the sub-cylinder of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\Omega) = X$. Then Ω has a length not exceeding $m - k + r'_m < r_m = m + T_1''m + T_2''$.

To estimate $\nu(\Omega)/\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ we will use (4.2). Let $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be the point with $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(y) = y_0$; then $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(y) = y' \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1 = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. Since n is the length of the cylinder X , the length of Ω is $n + m - k$. It follows from (4.2) that

$$\frac{\nu(\Omega)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})} \geq \frac{c_1 e^{g_{n+m-k}(y)}}{c_2 e^{g_m(y)}} = \frac{c_1}{c_2} e^{g_{n-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(y))} = \frac{c_1}{c_2} e^{g_{n-k}(y_0)}.$$

Then exactly as in the estimate for $\frac{\nu(X)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1)}$ we obtain

$$\nu(\Omega) \geq d'_1 \nu(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}). \quad (4.30)$$

We will now increase the set Ω adding some sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ to it. Set $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})))$. Then by (4.27)

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}} \subset (\hat{\phi}_t)^{-1}(\mathbf{E}) \subset \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{E}^u(z_p) : \|\mathbf{u}\| < e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}\}.$$

It follows from (4.29) and $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\Omega) = X$, that

$$(\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(\Omega))) = (\hat{\phi}_t)^{-1} \circ (\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\Omega)) \subset \widehat{C} \setminus H_2.$$

We now choose arbitrarily a number of sub-cylinders of \widetilde{C} in $\widetilde{C} \setminus \Omega$ and add them to Ω to form a subset of \widetilde{C} which is a union of cylinders of lengths not exceeding r_m (possible by the definition of H_2) with $\Omega \subset \Gamma$ and so that

$$(\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(\Gamma))) = \widehat{C} \setminus H_2, \quad (4.31)$$

Now (4.30) implies $\frac{\nu(\Gamma')}{\nu(\mathcal{C}')} \geq d'_1$ with the same constant $d'_1 > 0$. Thus (4.21) will hold if we choose $0 < d_1 \leq d'_1$.

Proof of (4.22): Consider the map

$$\hat{\phi}_t = (\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \phi_t \circ \Phi_{z_p}^u : E^u(z_p, r(z_p)) \longrightarrow E^u(Z_{m-k}, r(Z_{m-k})).$$

Given $v \in \widehat{\varphi}_{z_0}^{m-k}(\Gamma)$, it follows from (4.31) and the definition of H_2 that $\|v^{(1)}\| \geq \|v_1\| \geq \frac{1}{4\gamma_1} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}$. Let $\xi = \hat{\phi}_t^{-1} \cdot v \in E^u(z_p)$. Then $\|\xi^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{1}{4\gamma_1} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}$. Consequently for $u = \widehat{\varphi}_{z_p}^{-p}(\xi)$, using $\nu_1^p = \lambda_1^p e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}$, $(m-k)\tilde{\tau}_0 \leq p \leq q(1-\hat{\epsilon}'_5)$ and $m \leq q\tau_0$, as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, it follows from (3.12) that

$$\|u^{(1)}\|'_{z_0} \geq \frac{\|\xi^{(1)}\|'_{z_p}}{\nu_1^p} \geq \frac{\|\xi^{(1)}\|}{\lambda_1^p e^{2p\hat{\epsilon}} R_0} \geq \frac{e^{-\frac{4dq\hat{\epsilon}}{(1-\hat{\epsilon}'_5)\tilde{\tau}_0}}}{4\gamma_1 R_0 e^{2q(1-\hat{\epsilon}'_5)\hat{\epsilon}} \lambda_1^{q(1-\hat{\epsilon}'_5)}} \geq \frac{e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_{11}}}{4\gamma_1 R_0 \lambda_1^q},$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}_{11} = \frac{4d\hat{\epsilon}}{(1-\hat{\epsilon}'_5)\tilde{\tau}_0} + 2(1-\hat{\epsilon}'_5)\hat{\epsilon} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$.

On the other hand, (4.5) gives

$$\text{diam}(\widetilde{C}) \leq \frac{C_3 e^{q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{\lambda_1^q} \leq \frac{e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_{11}}}{e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_{11}}} \frac{C_3 e^{q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{\lambda_1^q} \leq \|u_1^{(1)}\|'_{z_0} 4\gamma_1 R_0 C_3 e^{q(\hat{\epsilon}_7 + \hat{\epsilon}_{11})}.$$

Thus, for every $x \in \Gamma'$, for $u = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x)) \in E^u(z_0)$ we have $\|u^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{\|u_1^{(1)}\|'_{z_0}}{R_0} \geq \kappa \text{diam}(\widetilde{C})$, where $\kappa = d_2 e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_{12}}$ for some $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_{12} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$, where $d_2 = d_2(s) = \frac{1}{4\gamma_1 R_0^2 C_3}$. This proves (4.22).

We will now repeat the above for a different set of sub-cylinders of \widetilde{C} . Choose a sufficiently large integer $q_1 \geq 1$ so that the cylinder $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_2$ in $W_{R_{j_0}}^u(Z_m)$ of length q_1 containing the point Z_m is so that $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_2 \subset B^u(Z_m, r_0/C)$ for some large constant $C > 1$. Denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ the sub-cylinder of \widetilde{C} of co-length q_1 so that $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_2$. Then

$$\varphi^p(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}) = F^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_2) \subset F^{-1}(B^u(Z_m, r_0/C)).$$

Set

$$\widetilde{H} = \frac{1}{C} H = \left\{ u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n_u}) \in E^u(Z_{m-k}) : \|u\| < \frac{1}{C} e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}, u_1 = 0 \right\},$$

$$\widetilde{H}_1 = \frac{1}{C} H_1 = \left\{ u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n_u}) \in E^u(Z_{m-k}) : \|u\| < \frac{1}{C} e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}, \|u_1\| \leq \frac{1}{4C} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \right\},$$

$$\widetilde{H}_2 = \frac{1}{C} H_2 = \left\{ v = (v_1, \dots, v_{n_u}) \in E^u(z_p) : \|v\| < \frac{1}{C} e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}, \|v_1\| < \frac{1}{4\gamma_1 C} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \right\},$$

$$\epsilon' = \frac{e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}/\alpha_2}}{4C}.$$

Consider a rectangular box Δ' contained entirely in $E \setminus \tilde{H}_1$ with sides of length ϵ' parallel to the coordinate axes. As before, it is enough to take a point $u \in \tilde{H}$ with $\|u_1\| = \frac{1}{2C}e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}/\alpha_2}$, and then consider the cube Δ' in E with centre u and sides of length ϵ' . Then $(\hat{\phi}_t)^{-1}(\Delta') \subset E(z_p) \setminus \tilde{H}_2$.

Consider the largest cylinder Y in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1 = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ such that $\Delta \supset (\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(Y)$. If \tilde{n} is the length of the cylinder Y , as in the previous case we get

$$\tilde{n} \leq \frac{c' - \alpha_2 \log \epsilon'}{|\log \theta|} = c'' - \frac{\alpha_2 \log \epsilon'}{|\log \theta|}$$

for some global constants $c', c'' \in \mathbb{R}$. Again the length \tilde{n} of Y does not exceed $r'_m = T_1''m\hat{\epsilon} + T_2''$ for some global constants $T_1'' > 0$ and $T_2'' > 0$.

Since $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1 = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ is a sub-cylinder of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1$ of length $k + q_1$ and Y is a sub-cylinder of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1$ of length \tilde{n} , it follows from (4.2) that

$$\frac{\nu(Y)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1)} \geq \frac{c_1 e^{g_{\tilde{n}}(y')}}{c_2 e^{g_{k+q_1}(y')}} = \frac{c_1}{c_2} e^{g_{\tilde{n}-k-q_1}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{k+q_1}(y'))} \geq \frac{c_1^2}{c_2} \rho_1^{\tilde{n}-(k+q_1)} = \frac{c_1^2}{c_2} \left(e^{-\tilde{n}} e^{k+q_1} \right)^{|\log \rho_1|}.$$

As before $e^k = e^{4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}/|\log \theta|}$, and $e^{-\tilde{n}} \geq e^{-c''} e^{\frac{\alpha_2 \log \epsilon'}{|\log \theta|}} = c''' (\epsilon')^{\alpha_2/|\log \theta|}$ for some global constant $c''' > 0$. Since q_1 is a global constant, it follows that

$$\frac{\nu(Y)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1)} \geq \frac{c_1^2}{c_2} \left(\tilde{c}' (\epsilon')^{\alpha_2} e^{4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \right)^{\frac{|\log \rho_1|}{|\log \theta|}} = \frac{c_1^2}{c_2} \left(\frac{\tilde{c}'}{(4C)^{\alpha_2}} \right)^{\frac{|\log \rho_1|}{|\log \theta|}} = d_1''$$

for some constants $\tilde{c}' > 0$ and $d_1'' = d_1''(C) > 0$.

For the cylinder Y in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$ just constructed we have $(\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(Y) \subset E \setminus \tilde{H}_1$, so

$$(\hat{\phi}_t)^{-1} \circ (\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(Y) \subset E(z_p) \setminus \tilde{H}_2, \quad (4.32)$$

and $\nu(Y) \geq d_1'' \nu(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1)$.

Let W be the sub-cylinder of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(W) = Y$; then the length of W is $\tilde{n} + m - k$. Then Ω has a length not exceeding $m - k + r'_m < r_m = m + T_1''m + T_2''$. Using (4.2) again, we get

$$\frac{\nu(W)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})} \geq \frac{c_1 e^{g_{\tilde{n}+m-k}(y)}}{c_2 e^{g_{m+q_1}(y)}} = \frac{c_1}{c_2} e^{g_{\tilde{n}-(k+q_1)}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m+q_1}(y))} \geq \frac{c_1}{c_2} \rho_1^{\tilde{n}-(k+q_1)} \geq d_1'',$$

repeating the argument from the estimate of $\frac{\nu(Y)}{\nu(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2)}$. Thus

$$\nu(W) \geq d_1'' \nu(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}). \quad (4.33)$$

We will now increase the set W adding some sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ to it, similarly to what we did with Ω in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. It follows from (4.32) and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(W) = Y$, that

$$(\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(W))) = (\hat{\phi}_t)^{-1} \circ (\Phi_{Z_{m-k}}^u)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{T}_{Z_{m-k}}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{m-k}(W)) \subset \hat{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \tilde{H}_2.$$

We now choose arbitrarily a number of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \setminus W$ and add them to W to form a subset Λ of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ which is a union of cylinders of lengths not exceeding r_m with $W \subset \Lambda$ and so that

$$(\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(\Lambda))) = \hat{\mathcal{D}} \setminus \tilde{H}_2, \quad (4.34)$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{D}} = (\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(\widehat{\mathcal{D}})))$. Now (4.33) implies $\frac{\nu(\Lambda')}{\nu(\widehat{\mathcal{D}'})} \geq d_1''$ with the same constant $d_1'' = d_1''(C) > 0$. Thus (4.21) and (4.23) hold choosing $d_1 = d_1(C) = \min\{d_1', d_1''\} > 0$.

It follows from (4.34) that if $z \in \Lambda$, then for $w = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(z)) \in E^u(z_0)$ we have $\xi = \widehat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(w) \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \setminus \widetilde{H}_2$, so $\|\xi_1\| \geq \frac{1}{4\gamma_1 C} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}$, and therefore $\|\xi^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{1}{4\gamma_1 C} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}$. This shows that $C\xi \in \widehat{C} \setminus H_2$, so by (4.31) we have $C\xi \in (\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_p}(\varphi^p(\Gamma)))$.

This proves the lemma. ■

5 Contact Anosov flows

5.1 Temporal distance function vs contact form

We continue here with the assumptions and notation from Sect. 4. However now we assume that ϕ_t is a C^2 **contact Anosov flow** on the compact Riemannian manifold M .

For any $x \in \mathcal{L}$ consider the C^2 map

$$\tilde{\varphi}_x = (\exp_{\varphi(x)}^u)^{-1} \circ \varphi \circ \exp_x^u : E^u(x; r(x)) \longrightarrow E^u(\varphi(x), \tilde{r}(\varphi(x))) .$$

It is well-defined assuming that the $\hat{\epsilon}$ -slowly varying radius function $r(x)$ and the $\hat{\epsilon}/2$ -slowly varying radius function $\tilde{r}(x)$ are chosen appropriately as in Sect. 3. As with the maps $\widehat{\varphi}_x$, for $y \in \mathcal{L}$ and an integer $j \geq 1$ we will use the notation

$$\tilde{\varphi}_y^j = \tilde{\varphi}_{\varphi^{j-1}(y)} \circ \dots \circ \tilde{\varphi}_{\varphi(y)} \circ \tilde{\varphi}_y \quad , \quad \tilde{\varphi}_y^{-j} = (\tilde{\varphi}_{\varphi^{-j}(y)})^{-1} \circ \dots \circ (\tilde{\varphi}_{\varphi^{-2}(y)})^{-1} \circ (\tilde{\varphi}_{\varphi^{-1}(y)})^{-1} ,$$

at any point where these sequences of maps are well-defined. In a similar way one defines the maps $\tilde{\varphi}_x$ and their iterations on $E^s(x; r(x))$. It follows from the definitions that $\widehat{\varphi}_x = (\Psi_{\varphi(x)}^u)^{-1} \circ \tilde{\varphi}_x \circ \Psi_x^u$.

Throughout we assume that ϕ_t is a C^2 contact Anosov flow on M with a C^2 invariant contact form ω . Then the two-form $d\omega$ is C^1 , so there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$|d\omega_x(u, v)| \leq C_0 \|u\| \|v\| \quad , \quad u, v \in T_x M \quad , \quad x \in M. \quad (5.1)$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in M$ and any $u \in E^u(x)$ with $\|u\| = 1$ there exists $v \in E^s(x)$ with $\|v\| = 1$ such that $|d\omega_x(u, v)| \geq 2c_0$.

The main ingredient in this section is the following lemma of Liverani (Lemma B.7 in [L]) which significantly strengthens a lemma of Katok and Burns ([KB]).

Lemma 5.1. ([L]) *Let ϕ_t be a C^2 contact Anosov flow on M with a C^2 contact form ω . Then there exist constants $C_0 > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and $\hat{\epsilon}_0 > 0$ such that for any $z \in M$, any $x \in W_{\hat{\epsilon}_0}^u(z)$ and any $y \in W_{\hat{\epsilon}_0}^s(z)$ we have*

$$|\Delta(x, y) - d\omega_z(u, v)| \leq C_0 \left[\|u\|^2 \|v\|^\beta + \|u\|^\beta \|v\|^2 \right] , \quad (5.2)$$

where $u \in E^u(z)$ and $v \in E^s(z)$ are such that $\exp_z^u(u) = x$ and $\exp_z^s(v) = y$.

Replacing the constant $\beta > 0$ from Sect. 3 with a smaller one if necessary, we will assume that the constant $\beta > 0$ above is the same as the one in Sect. 3.

Corollary 5.2. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 5.1, we can choose the constant $C_0 > 0$ so that for any $\hat{z} \in M$, any $x, z \in W_{\hat{\epsilon}_0}^u(\hat{z})$ and any $y \in W_{\hat{\epsilon}_0}^s(z)$ we have*

$$|\Delta(x, y)| \leq C_0 \|\hat{u} - \hat{w}\|^\beta \|v\|^\beta , \quad (5.3)$$

where $\hat{u}, \hat{w} \in E^u(\hat{z})$ and $v \in E^s(z)$ are such that $\exp_z^u(\hat{u}) = x$, $\exp_z^u(\hat{w}) = z$ and $\exp_z^s(v) = y$. Thus, we can choose the constant $C_0 > 0$, β so that $|\Delta(x, y)| \leq C_0 (d(x, z))^\beta (d(z, y))^\beta$ under the above assumptions about x and y .

Proof of Corollary 5.2. From the assumptions about M , $W_{\hat{e}_0}^u(\hat{z})$ is a C^2 local submanifold of M .

Given $\hat{z} \in M$, $x \in W_{\hat{e}_0}^u(\hat{z})$ and $y \in W_{\hat{e}_0}^s(z)$, let $\hat{u}, \hat{w} \in E^u(\hat{z})$ and $v \in E^s(z)$ be such that $\exp_z^u(\hat{u}) = x$, $\exp_z^u(\hat{w}) = z$ and $\exp_z^s(v) = y$. It follows from Lemma 5.1 used for the points $x \in W_{\hat{e}_0}^u(z)$ and $y \in W_{\hat{e}_0}^s(z)$ that if $u' \in E^u(z)$ is such that $\exp_z^u(u') = x$, then

$$|\Delta(x, y) - d\omega_z(u', v)| \leq C_0 \left[\|u'\|^2 \|v\|^\beta + \|u'\|^\beta \|v\|^2 \right]. \quad (5.4)$$

Consider the map $\psi = (\exp_z^u)^{-1} \circ \exp_z^u : E^u(z, \epsilon) \rightarrow E^u(\hat{z}, \hat{e}_0)$, defined for appropriately chosen small $0 < \epsilon \leq \hat{e}_0$. It follows from general properties of normal neighbourhoods on Riemannian manifolds that $\frac{1}{C} \|\xi - \eta\| \leq \|\psi(\xi) - \psi(\eta)\| \leq C \|\xi - \eta\|$ for all $\xi, \eta \in E^u(z, \epsilon)$ for some global constant $C > 0$. Since $x = \exp_z^u(u') = \exp_z^u(\hat{u})$, so $\hat{u} = (\exp_z^u)^{-1}(\exp_z^u(u'))$, and similarly $\hat{w} = (\exp_z^u)^{-1}(z) = (\exp_z^u)^{-1}(\exp_z^u(0))$, we get $\psi(u') - \psi(0) = \hat{u} - \hat{w}$, so $\|u'\| \leq C \|\hat{u} - \hat{w}\|$. Now using (5.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(x, y)| &\leq |d\omega_z(u', v)| + C_0 \left[\|u'\|^2 \|v\|^\beta + \|u'\|^\beta \|v\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq C_0 \|u'\| \|v\| + 2C_0 \|u'\|^\beta \|v\|^\beta \leq 3CC_0 \|\hat{u} - \hat{w}\|^\beta \|v\|^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (5.3) holds, taking an appropriate larger constant $C_0 > 0$. ■

Lemma 5.3. *There exist constants $C_4 > 0$ and $\hat{\beta} \in (0, 1)$ such that:*

(a) *For any unstable cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of length m in \tilde{R} with $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0 \neq \emptyset$, any $x_0, z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and any $y_0, b_0 \in W_{\tilde{R}}^s(z_0)$ we have*

$$|\Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0) - \Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{b}_0)| \leq C_4 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) (\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{b}_0))^\beta. \quad (5.5)$$

In particular,

$$|\Delta(x_0, y_0)| \leq C_4 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) (d(y_0, z_0))^\beta \leq C_4 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}).$$

More precisely we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0) - \Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{b}_0)\| &\leq |\mathbf{d}\omega_{z_0}(\mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})| + \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{L}_0 \|\mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}\| \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \eta_0\| (\|\mathbf{v}_0 - \eta_0\|^\beta + \|\eta_0\|^\beta) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{C}_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$|\Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0)| \leq |\mathbf{d}\omega_{z_0}(\mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}_0^{(1)})| + 2\mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{L}_0 \|\mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}\| \|\mathbf{v}_0\|^{1+\beta} + \mathbf{C}_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}. \quad (5.7)$$

where $u_0 \in E^u(z_0)$ with $\exp_{z_0}^u(u_0) = \hat{x}_0 = \mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x_0)$, and $v_0, \eta_0 \in E^s(z_0)$ with $\exp_{z_0}^s(v_0) = y_0$, $\exp_{z_0}^s(\eta_0) = b_0$.

(b) *For any unstable cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ in \tilde{R} , any $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0$, any $x_0 \in W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z_0)$ with $\hat{x}_0 = \mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x_0) \in \mathcal{T}_{z_0}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$, and any $y_0, b_0 \in W_{\tilde{e}}^s(z_0)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0) - \Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{b}_0)| &\geq |\mathbf{d}\omega_{z_0}(\mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})| - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{L}_0 \|\mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}\| \|\mathbf{v}_0 - \eta_0\| (\|\mathbf{v}_0 - \eta_0\|^\beta + \|\eta_0\|^\beta) \\ &\quad - \mathbf{C}_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

and

$$|\Delta(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0)| \geq |d\omega_{z_0}(\mathbf{u}_0^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}_0^{(1)})| - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{L}_0 \| \mathbf{u}_0^{(1)} \| \| \mathbf{v}_0 \|^{1+\beta} - \mathbf{C}_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}, \quad (5.9)$$

where u_0, v_0 and η_0 are as in part (a).

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be a cylinder of length m in \tilde{R} and let $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0$. Let $x_0, z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, $y_0, b_0 \in W_R^s(z_0)$. Then $R(z_0) \leq R_0$, $r(z_0) \geq r_0$. We have

$$x_0 = \Phi_{z_0}^u(u_0) = \exp_{z_0}^u(\tilde{u}_0)$$

for some $u_0, \tilde{u}_0 \in E^u(z_0)$ with $\tilde{u}_0 = \Psi_{z_0}^u(u_0)$. Then $\|u_0\|, \|\tilde{u}_0\| \leq R_0 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. Similarly, write

$$y_0 = \exp_{z_0}^s(\tilde{v}_0) = \Phi_{z_0}^s(v_0) \quad \text{and} \quad b_0 = \exp_{z_0}^s(\tilde{\eta}_0) = \Phi_{z_0}^s(\eta_0)$$

for some $v_0, \tilde{v}_0, \eta_0, \tilde{\eta}_0 \in E^s(z_0)$ with $\tilde{v}_0 = \Psi_{z_0}^s(v_0)$ and $\tilde{\eta}_0 = \Psi_{z_0}^s(\eta_0)$. It follows from (3.7) that

$$\|\tilde{v}_0 - v_0\| \leq R_0 \|v_0\|^{1+\beta}, \quad \|\tilde{u}_0 - u_0\| \leq R_0 \|u_0\|^{1+\beta}, \quad \|\tilde{\eta}_0 - \eta_0\| \leq R_0 \|\eta_0\|^{1+\beta}. \quad (5.10)$$

In particular $\|\tilde{v}_0\| \leq 2\|v_0\|$, $\|\tilde{\eta}_0\| \leq 2\|\eta_0\|$ and $\|\tilde{u}_0\| \leq 2\|\xi_0\| \leq 2R_0 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. For $j \geq 0$ define

$$z_j = \varphi^j(z_0) \quad , \quad x_j = \varphi^j(x_0) \quad , \quad y_j = \varphi^j(y_0) \quad , \quad u_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(u_0) \quad , \quad \tilde{u}_j = \tilde{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(\tilde{u}_0),$$

$$\hat{u}_j = d\hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(0) \cdot u_0 \quad , \quad \hat{v}_j = d\hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(0) \cdot v_0 \quad , \quad v_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(v_0) \quad , \quad \tilde{v}_j = \tilde{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(\tilde{v}_0),$$

$$b_j = \varphi^j(b_0) \quad , \quad \hat{\eta}_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(0) \cdot \eta_0 \quad , \quad \eta_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(\eta_0) \quad , \quad \tilde{\eta}_j = \tilde{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(\tilde{\eta}_0).$$

Notice that $\tilde{u}_j = \Psi_{z_j}^u(u_j)$, $\tilde{v}_j = \Psi_{z_j}^s(v_j)$, $\tilde{\eta}_j = \Psi_{z_j}^s(\eta_j)$, so it follows from (3.7) that

$$\|u_j - \tilde{u}_j\| \leq R(z_j) \|u_j\|^{1+\beta}, \quad \|v_j - \tilde{v}_j\| \leq R(z_j) \|v_j\|^{1+\beta}, \quad \|\eta_j - \tilde{\eta}_j\| \leq R(z_j) \|\eta_j\|^{1+\beta}. \quad (5.11)$$

Moreover,

$$\exp_{z_j}^u(\tilde{u}_j) = \varphi^j(\exp_{z_0}^u(\tilde{u}_0)) = \varphi^j(x_0) = x_j \quad , \quad \exp_{z_j}^s(\tilde{v}_j) = y_j \quad , \quad \exp_{z_j}^s(\tilde{\eta}_j) = b_j,$$

so Lemma 5.1 implies

$$|\Delta(x_j, y_j) - d\omega_{z_j}(\tilde{u}_j, \tilde{v}_j)| \leq C_0 \left[\|\tilde{u}_j\|^2 \|\tilde{v}_j\|^\beta + \|\tilde{u}_j\|^\beta \|\tilde{v}_j\|^2 \right] \quad (5.12)$$

and

$$|\Delta(x_j, b_j) - d\omega_{z_j}(\tilde{u}_j, \tilde{\eta}_j)| \leq C_0 \left[\|\tilde{u}_j\|^2 \|\tilde{\eta}_j\|^\beta + \|\tilde{u}_j\|^\beta \|\tilde{\eta}_j\|^2 \right]. \quad (5.13)$$

We will use these a bit later.

Let the constants $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_2 \leq \hat{\epsilon}_1$ be as in Lemma 4.3. By the latter there exists an integer $k < m$ so that (4.8) holds, and moreover for $p = [\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)]$, (4.12) and (4.18) hold, in particular

$$\varphi^p(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \subset B^u(z_p, r(z_p)),$$

so $x_p = \varphi^p(x_0) \in B^u(z_p, r(z_p))$ and $\|u_p\| = \|(\Phi_{z_p}^u)^{-1}(x_p)\| \leq R(z_p)\chi \leq R_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}$. As before, set $q = [\tilde{\tau}_m(z_0)]$. Then, as in the proof of Lemma 4.3 we have (4.19).

We will now use an argument from [St4] with $\ell = p/2$, assuming that p is an even number (the other case is similar). We have $r(z_j) \geq r_0 e^{-j\hat{\epsilon}}$, so for all $0 \leq j \leq p$ it follows from (3.12) that

$$\|u_j\| \leq \|u_j\|'_{z_j} \leq \frac{\|u_p\|'_{z_p}}{\mu_1^{p-j}} \leq \Gamma(z_p) \frac{\|u_p\|}{\mu_1^{p-j}} \leq \Gamma_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}} \frac{R_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_1^{p-j}} = \Gamma_0 R_0 \frac{e^{2p\hat{\epsilon}} e^{(p-j)\hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_1^{p-j}} \leq r(z_j) \quad (5.14)$$

for $j \leq \ell = p/2$. Indeed, for such j we have

$$\Gamma_0 R_0 \frac{e^{2p\hat{\epsilon}} e^{(p-j)\hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_1^{p-j}} e^{j\hat{\epsilon}} \leq \Gamma_0 R_0, \frac{e^{3p\hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_1^{p/2}} = \Gamma_0 R_0 \left(\frac{e^{3\hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_1} \right)^{p/2} \leq r_0,$$

assuming that p is sufficiently large. Thus (5.14) holds for all $0 \leq j \leq \ell$.

The above also shows that $\|u_j\| \leq r_0$ for all $0 \leq j \leq \ell$. Essentially repeating the above estimate, we get

$$\|u_\ell\| \leq \|u_\ell\|'_{z_\ell} \leq \frac{\|u_p\|'_{z_p}}{\mu_1^{p-\ell}} \leq \frac{\Gamma(z_p) e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_p\|}{\lambda_1^\ell} \leq \Gamma_0 R_0 \chi \frac{e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} e^{2p\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^\ell} \leq \frac{R_0 \Gamma_0 e^{5\ell\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^\ell} \leq 1, \quad (5.15)$$

assuming ℓ is sufficiently large. Using (3.12) again (on stable manifolds) and assuming $\|v_0\| < 1$, we get

$$\|v_\ell\| = \|v_\ell\|'_{z_\ell} \leq \frac{\|v_0\|'_{z_0}}{\mu_1^\ell} \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|v_0\|}{\lambda_1^\ell} \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^\ell}. \quad (5.16)$$

Similarly, $\|\eta_\ell\| \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^\ell}$, assuming $\|\eta_0\| < 1$.

It follows from (5.10) and (5.11), repeating yet again some of the above estimates, that for $0 \leq j \leq \ell$ we have $\|\tilde{u}_j\| \leq \|u_j\|(1 + R(z_j)\|u_j\|^\beta) \leq \|u_j\|(1 + R_0 r_0) \leq 2\|u_j\|$. Also, $\|\tilde{v}_j\| \leq 2\|v_j\|$ for all j since the flow is contracting on stable manifolds. Using these, it follows from (5.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(x_j, y_j) - d\omega_{z_j}(u_j, v_j)| &\leq 2C_0 R(z_j) \|u_j\| \|v_j\| (\|u_j\|^\beta + \|v_j\|^\beta) \\ &\quad + 8C_0 \left[\|u_j\|^2 \|v_j\|^\beta + \|u_j\|^\beta \|v_j\|^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

for $0 \leq j \leq \ell$. Similarly (5.13) implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(x_j, b_j) - d\omega_{z_j}(u_j, \eta_j)| &\leq 2C_0 R(z_j) \|u_j\| \|\eta_j\| (\|u_j\|^\beta + \|\eta_j\|^\beta) \\ &\quad + 8C_0 \left[\|u_j\|^2 \|\eta_j\|^\beta + \|u_j\|^\beta \|\eta_j\|^2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

for $0 \leq j \leq \ell$.

Next, we will be estimating $|\Delta(x_0, y_0) - d\omega_{z_0}(u_0, v_0)|$. Since Δ is φ -invariant and $d\omega$ is $d\varphi$ -invariant we have $\Delta(x_0, y_0) = \Delta(x_j, y_j)$ and $d\omega_{z_0}(u_0, v_0) = d\omega_{z_j}(\hat{u}_j, \hat{v}_j)$ for all j . (Notice that $d\hat{\varphi}_x(0) = d\varphi(x)$ for all $x \in M$.) With $j = \ell$, it follows from Lemma 3.1 and $z_0 \in \tilde{P}_0$ that

$$\|\hat{u}_\ell^{(1)} - u_\ell^{(1)}\| \leq L(z_\ell) \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \leq L_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta}. \quad (5.19)$$

Using Lemma 10.7(b) in [St4] (see Lemma 3.3 above), backwards for stable manifolds, with

$$a = d\hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(0) \cdot v_\ell \in E^s(z_0) \quad \text{and} \quad b = d\hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(0) \cdot \eta_\ell \in E^s(z_0),$$

since $v_0 = \hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(v_\ell)$ and $\eta_0 = \hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(\eta_\ell)$, it follows that

$$\|(a^{(1)} - b^{(1)}) - (v_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})\| \leq L_0 \left[\|v_0 - \eta_0\|^{1+\beta} + \|\eta_0\|^\beta \|v_0 - \eta_0\| \right] \leq 2L_0 \|v_0 - \eta_0\|.$$

Thus,

$$\|d\hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(0) \cdot (v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}) - (v_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})\| \leq L_0 \|v_0 - \eta_0\| (\|v_0 - \eta_0\|^\beta + \|\eta_0\|^\beta). \quad (5.20)$$

In what follows we denote by Const a global constant (depending on constants like C_0, L_0, R_0 but independent of the choice of the cylinder \mathcal{C} , the points x_0, z_0, y_0, b_0 , etc.) which may change from line to line.

Proceeding as in Sect. 9 in [St4] and using (5.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, v_\ell - \eta_\ell)| &\leq |d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell^{(1)}, v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)})| + C_0 \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{k}} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| (\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| + \|\eta_\ell^{(i)}\|) \\
&\leq |d\omega_{z_\ell}(\hat{u}_\ell^{(1)}, v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)})| + C_0 L_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}\| \\
&\quad + C_0 \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{k}} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| (\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| + \|\eta_\ell^{(i)}\|) \\
&\leq |d\omega_{z_\ell}(d\hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^\ell(0) \cdot u_0^{(1)}, v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)})| + C_0 L_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}\| \\
&\quad + C_0 \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{k}} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| (\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| + \|\eta_\ell^{(i)}\|) \\
&= |d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, d\hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(0) \cdot (v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}))| + C_0 L_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}\| \\
&\quad + C_0 \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{k}} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| (\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| + \|\eta_\ell^{(i)}\|)
\end{aligned}$$

Now (5.20) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&|d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_0^{(1)}, d\hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(0) \cdot (v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}))| \\
&\leq |d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})| + |d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_0^{(1)}, d\hat{\varphi}_{z_\ell}^{-\ell}(0) \cdot (v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}) - (v_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)}))| \\
&\leq |d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})| + C_0 L_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0 - \eta_0\| (\|v_0 - \eta_0\|^\beta + \|\eta_0\|^\beta).
\end{aligned}$$

The latter and the previous estimate imply

$$\begin{aligned}
|d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, v_\ell - \eta_\ell)| &\leq |d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})| + C_0 L_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0 - \eta_0\| (\|v_0 - \eta_0\|^\beta + \|\eta_0\|^\beta) \\
&\quad + C_0 L_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}\| + C_0 \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{k}} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| (\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| + \|\eta_\ell^{(i)}\|). \quad (5.21)
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
|d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, v_\ell - \eta_\ell)| &\leq \text{Const} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \|v_0 - \eta_0\| + \text{Const} e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}\| \\
&\quad + C_0 \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{k}} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| (\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| + \|\eta_\ell^{(i)}\|). \quad (5.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Using similar estimates from below, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, v_\ell - \eta_\ell)| &\geq |d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)} - \eta_0^{(1)})| - C_0 L_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0 - \eta_0\| (\|v_0 - \eta_0\|^\beta + \|\eta_0\|^\beta) \\
&\quad - C_0 L_0 e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell^{(1)} - \eta_\ell^{(1)}\| - C_0 \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{k}} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| (\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| + \|\eta_\ell^{(i)}\|). \quad (5.23)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, it follows from (4.5) that $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \frac{e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{C_3\lambda_1^q}$ for some global constant $C_3 > 0$, so $\lambda_1^q e^{q\hat{\epsilon}_7} \geq \frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}$, that is $q \log \lambda_1 + q\hat{\epsilon}_7 \geq \log \frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}$. Assuming $\hat{\epsilon}$ and so $\hat{\epsilon}_7$ is sufficiently small and using (4.19), this gives¹⁰ $\frac{p}{1-\hat{\epsilon}_6} \log \lambda_1 \geq \frac{p}{1-\hat{\epsilon}_6} (\log \lambda_1 + \hat{\epsilon}_7) \geq \log \frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}$, therefore for $\ell = p/2$ we get

$$\ell > \frac{1-\hat{\epsilon}_6}{2 \log \lambda_1} \log \frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}. \quad (5.24)$$

Now (5.15) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\ell\| &\leq R_0 \Gamma_0 (\lambda_1 e^{-5\hat{\epsilon}})^{-\ell} = R_0 \Gamma_0 e^{-\ell \log(\lambda_1 e^{-5\hat{\epsilon}})} \leq R_0 \Gamma_0 e^{-\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6) \log(\lambda_1 e^{-5\hat{\epsilon}})}{2 \log \lambda_1} \log \left(\frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})} \right)} \\ &= R_0 \Gamma_0 \left(\frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})} \right)^{-\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1}} \leq R_0 \Gamma_0 C_3 \left(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

(Using here $C_3 > 1$ and $\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1} < 1$.) Similarly, (5.16) yields

$$\|v_\ell\| \leq \Gamma_0 (\lambda_1 e^{-\hat{\epsilon}})^{-\ell} \leq \Gamma_0 e^{-\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6) \log(\lambda_1 e^{-\hat{\epsilon}})}{2 \log \lambda_1} \log \left(\frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})} \right)} \leq \Gamma_0 C_3 \left(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - \hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1}} \quad (5.26)$$

The same estimate holds for $\|\eta_\ell\|$.

Using these we get the following estimates for terms in (5.18) with $j = \ell$:

$$\|u_\ell\| \|v_\ell\| (\|u_\ell\|^\beta + \|v_\ell\|^\beta) \leq C'_3 \left(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{(2+\beta) \frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1}} \leq C'_3 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}},$$

where $C'_3 = 2(\Gamma_0 R_0 C_3)^3$ and we choose

$$0 < \hat{\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \frac{\beta}{4}, \frac{\log \lambda_2 - \log \lambda_1}{2 \log \lambda_1} \right\}. \quad (5.27)$$

Then

$$(2+\beta) \frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1} = (1+\beta/2)(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6) \left(1 - \frac{5\hat{\epsilon}}{\log \lambda_1} \right) \geq 1 + \hat{\beta},$$

assuming $\hat{\epsilon}_6 > 0$ and $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$ are sufficiently small. Similarly, we obtain

$$e^{\ell\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell\| \leq C''_3 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \quad (5.28)$$

for some global constant $C''_3 > 0$. To prove the latter we need an estimate from above similar to (5.24). First, using (4.5) we get $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \frac{C e^{q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{\lambda_1^q}$, so $\lambda_1^q e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_7} \leq \frac{C}{\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}$, that is

$$q \log \lambda_1 - q\hat{\epsilon}_7 \leq \log \frac{C}{\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}.$$

¹⁰ Assuming that $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$ is a small number, we have $\log \frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})} > 0$.

Now (4.19) yields $\frac{p}{1-\hat{\epsilon}_5}(\log \lambda_1 - \hat{\epsilon}_7) \leq \log \frac{C}{\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}$, therefore for $\ell = p/2$ we get

$$\ell \leq \frac{1-\hat{\epsilon}_5}{2(\log \lambda_1 - \hat{\epsilon}_7)} \log \frac{C}{\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})}.$$

This, (5.15) and (5.16) imply

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\ell \hat{\epsilon}} \|u_\ell\|^{1+\beta} \|v_\ell\| &\leq \left(\frac{C}{\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})} \right)^{\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_5)\hat{\epsilon}}{2(\log \lambda_1 - \hat{\epsilon}_7)}} C'_3 \left(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{(2+\beta) \frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1}} \\ &\leq C C'_3 \left(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{(2+\beta) \frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1} - \frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_5)\hat{\epsilon}}{2(\log \lambda_1 - \hat{\epsilon}_7)}} \leq C''_3 \left(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{1+\hat{\beta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C''_3 = C C'_3$, since $\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_5)\hat{\epsilon}}{2(\log \lambda_1 - \hat{\epsilon}_7)} < \frac{\beta}{4}$, assuming $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$ is sufficiently small, and

$$(2+\beta) \frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_1 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{2 \log \lambda_1} - \frac{\beta}{4} \geq (1+\beta/2)(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6) \left(1 - \frac{5\hat{\epsilon}}{\log \lambda_1} \right) - \frac{\beta}{4} \geq 1 + \hat{\beta},$$

assuming that $\hat{\epsilon}_6 > 0$ and $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$ are sufficiently small. This proves (5.28).

Next, for any $u = u^{(1)} + u^{(2)} + \dots + u^{(k)} \in E^u(z)$ or $E^s(z)$, $z \in M$, set $\check{u}^{(2)} = u^{(2)} + \dots + u^{(k)}$, so that $u = u^{(1)} + \check{u}^{(2)}$. Using Lemma 3.5 in [St2] (see Lemma 3.2 above), $p = 2\ell$, $u_p \in E^u(z_p, r(z_p))$ and $\|u_p\| \leq R_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}$, we get

$$\|\check{u}_\ell^{(2)}\|'_{z_\ell} \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}} \|\check{u}_p^{(2)}\|}{\mu_2^\ell} \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}} \|u_p\|}{\mu_2^\ell} \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 R_0 e^{4\ell \hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_2^\ell}.$$

Similarly, using Lemma 3.1 above (backwards for the map φ^{-1} on stable manifolds), $z_0 \in P_0$, $v_0 = v_{j,1}(z_0) \in E^s(z_0, r_0)$ and the fact that $\|v_0\| \leq \epsilon < 1$, we get

$$\|\check{v}_\ell^{(2)}\|'_{z_\ell} \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 \|v_0\| e^{2\ell \hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_2^\ell} \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 e^{2\ell \hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_2^\ell}.$$

Hence for $i \geq 2$ we have

$$\|u_\ell^{(i)}\| \leq |\check{u}_\ell^{(2)}| \leq \|\check{u}_\ell^{(2)}\| \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 R_0 e^{5\ell \hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_2^\ell},$$

where we used $\mu_2 = \lambda_2 e^{-\hat{\epsilon}}$, and similarly $\|v_\ell^{(i)}\| \leq \frac{\Gamma_0 e^{3\ell \hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_2}$. From these estimates, (5.24), and the assumptions about $\hat{\epsilon}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\ell^{(i)}\| \|v_\ell^{(i)}\| &\leq \Gamma_0^2 R_0 (\lambda_2 e^{-5\hat{\epsilon}})^{-2\ell} = \Gamma_0^2 R_0 e^{-2\ell \log(\lambda_2 e^{-5\hat{\epsilon}})} \\ &\leq \Gamma_0^2 R_0 e^{\frac{-(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6) \log(\lambda_2 e^{-5\hat{\epsilon}})}{\log \lambda_1} \log \left(\frac{1}{C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})} \right)} \\ &\leq \Gamma_0^2 R_0 \left(C_3 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_2 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{\log \lambda_1}} \leq C''_3 \left(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{1+\hat{\beta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C''_3 = \Gamma_0^2 R_0 (C_3)^{\log \lambda_2 / \log \lambda_1}$ and we are assuming (5.27) and $\hat{\epsilon}_6 < \frac{\log \lambda_2 - \log \lambda_1}{2 \log \lambda_2}$. With these assumptions we have $(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6) \log \lambda_2 > \frac{\log \lambda_2 + \log \lambda_1}{2}$, so

$$\frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)(\log \lambda_2 - 5\hat{\epsilon})}{\log \lambda_1} = \frac{(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6) \log \lambda_2}{\log \lambda_1} - \frac{5(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)\hat{\epsilon}}{\log \lambda_1} > \frac{\log \lambda_2 + \log \lambda_1}{2 \log \lambda_1} - \frac{5\hat{\epsilon}}{\log \lambda_1} \geq 1 + \hat{\beta},$$

assuming that $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$ is sufficiently small.

Using (5.22), (5.25), (5.26) and the above estimates for $\|u_\ell^{(i)}\|$ and $\|v_\ell^{(i)}\|$, we obtain

$$|d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, v_\ell - \eta_\ell)| \leq \text{Const diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \|v_0 - \eta_0\| + \text{Const} (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}.$$

It now follows from (5.17) and (5.18) with $j = \ell$ and the previous estimates that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Delta(x_0, y_0) - \Delta(x_0, b_0)| = |\Delta(x_\ell, y_\ell) - \Delta(x_\ell, b_\ell)| \\ & \leq |d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, v_\ell) - d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, \eta_\ell)| + 2C_0 R(z_\ell) \|u_\ell\| \|v_\ell\| (\|u_\ell\|^\beta + \|v_\ell\|^\beta) \\ & \quad + 8C_0 \left[\|u_\ell\|^2 \|v_\ell\|^\beta + \|u_\ell\|^\beta \|v_\ell\|^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2C_0 R(z_\ell) \|u_\ell\| \|\eta_\ell\| (\|u_\ell\|^\beta + \|\eta_\ell\|^\beta) + 8C_0 \left[\|u_\ell\|^2 \|\eta_\ell\|^\beta + \|u_\ell\|^\beta \|\eta_\ell\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq |d\omega_{z_\ell}(u_\ell, v_\ell - \eta_\ell)| + \text{Const} (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\ & \leq \text{Const diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \|v_0 - \eta_0\| + \text{Const} (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

The more precise estimate (5.6), for some global constant $C_4 > 0$, follows immediately from (5.21). In particular, with $\eta_0 = 0$, the latter gives (5.7).

In a similar way, this time using (5.23) we obtain (5.8), and with $\eta_0 = 0$ it gives (5.9).

To prove (5.5) we just repeat the argument in Sect. 9.3.3 in [St4].

Case 1. $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \|v_0 - \eta_0\|^{\beta/2}$. Then by (5.29),

$$|\Delta(x_0, y_0) - \Delta(x_0, b_0)| \leq \text{Const diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \|v_0 - \eta_0\|^{\hat{\beta}\beta/2}.$$

So, (5.5) holds with β replaced by $\hat{\beta}\beta/2$.

Case 2. $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \|v_0 - \eta_0\|^{\beta/2}$. Consider the point $X = \phi_{\Delta(x_0, y_0)}([x_0, y_0]) \in W_\epsilon^u(y_0)$. It is easy to see that

$$\Delta(x_0, y_0) - \Delta(x_0, b_0) = \Delta(X, y_0) - \Delta(X, b_0) = -\Delta(X, b_0).$$

We have $X = \exp_{y_0}^u(\tilde{t})$ and $b_0 = \exp_{y_0}^s(\tilde{s})$ for some $\tilde{t} \in E^u(y_0)$ and $\tilde{s} \in E^s(y_0)$. Clearly $\|\tilde{t}\| \leq \text{Const}$. Using Lemma 5.1 we get

$$|\Delta(X, b_0)| \leq C_0 [|d\omega_{y_0}(\tilde{t}, \tilde{s})| + \|\tilde{t}\|^2 \|\tilde{s}\|^\beta + \|\tilde{t}\|^\beta \|\tilde{s}\|^2] \leq \text{Const} \|\tilde{s}\|^\beta.$$

However, $\|\tilde{s}\| \leq \text{Const} d(y_0, b_0) \leq \text{Const} \|v_0 - \eta_0\|$, so

$$|\Delta(X, b_0)| \leq \text{Const} \|v_0 - \eta_0\|^\beta \leq \text{Const diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \|v_0 - \eta_0\|^{\beta/2}.$$

Therefore $|\Delta(x_0, y_0) - \Delta(x_0, b_0)| \leq \text{Const diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \|v_0 - \eta_0\|^{\beta/2}$, so, (5.5) holds with β replaced by $\beta/2$. This proves Lemma 5.3. ■

5.2 Non-integrability of contact Anosov flows

Fix constants $C_4 > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and $\hat{\beta} > 0$ with the properties in Lemma 5.3. Let the small constants $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_1 < \hat{\epsilon}$ be as in Sect. 3.

Recall the projections $\mathcal{T}_z : W_R^u(z) \rightarrow \check{U}(z) \subset W_{\epsilon_0}^u(z)$ for $z \in R$ from Sect. 4.1 and the constants $C_0 > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$ introduced before Lemma 5.1. Set

$$\delta_0 = \left(\frac{c_0}{16C_0 L_0 R_0} \right)^{1/\hat{\beta}}, \tag{5.30}$$

where the constant $\hat{\beta} \in (0, \beta/8)$ is defined in (5.27).

The following lemma is derived from the non-integrability of the flow which stems from the fact that the flow is contact.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\hat{\beta} \in (0, 1)$ be as above. Then there exist global constants $m_0 \geq 1$, $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, $d_2 \in (0, 1)$, $d_4 > 1$, $d_5 \in (0, 1)$, $\hat{\epsilon}_{13} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ and $\hat{\epsilon}_{14} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ which can be made arbitrarily small with $\hat{\epsilon}$ such that for every integer $m \geq m_0$ we have the following:*

(a) *For any $z_0 \in R \cap \tilde{P}_0$ and any cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of length m in $W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z_0)$ with $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ if $x_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is such that*

$$u_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x_0)) \in E^u(z_0) \quad (5.31)$$

and satisfies

$$\|u_0^{(1)}\| \geq \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}), \quad (5.32)$$

where $\kappa = d_2 e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}_{13}}$, then there exist a point $y_0 = y_0(z_0, x_0) \in B^s(z_0, \epsilon_1)$ such that we have

$$6\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq |\Delta(x_0, b_1) - \Delta(x_0, b_2)| \quad (5.33)$$

for any $b_1, b_2 \in W_{\tilde{R}}^s(z_0)$ with $d(z_0, b_1) < \delta'$ and $d(y_0, b_2) < \delta'$. Thus,

$$6\delta_0 \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq |\Delta(x_0, b_1) - \Delta(x_0, b_2)| \quad (5.34)$$

under the above conditions.

(b) *There exists an integer $N_0 \geq 1$ such that for any integer $N \geq N_0$, any $z_0 \in \tilde{R} \cap \tilde{P}_0$, any cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ in \tilde{R} of length $m \geq m_0$ in $W_{\tilde{R}}^u(z_0)$ with $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and any $x_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ such that $u_0 \in E^u(z_0)$ with (5.31) satisfies (5.32), there exist families of points*

$$y_1 = y_1(z_0, x_0), \quad y_2 = y_2(z_0, x_0) \in \mathcal{P}^N(B^u(z_0; \epsilon_1)) \cap B^s(z_0, \epsilon_1),$$

such that (5.34) holds for any $b_1 \in B^s(y_1, \delta')$, any $b_2 \in B^s(y_2, \delta')$.

Proof of Lemma 5.4. (a) Fix for a moment $z_0 \in R \cap \tilde{P}_0$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be a cylinder of length $m \geq m_0$ in \tilde{R} with $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and let x_0, u_0 and κ satisfy (5.31) – (5.32). By the choice of $c_0 > 0$ in Sect. 5.1, there exists a vector $\tilde{v} \in E_1^s(z_0)$ with $\|\tilde{v}\| = 1$ such that

$$d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, \tilde{v}) \geq 2c_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \quad (5.35)$$

Fix a vector \tilde{v} with the above property and set

$$v_0 = 10\delta_0 \tilde{v} \in E_1^s(z_0) \quad , \quad y_0 = \Phi_{z_0}^s(v_0) \in W_{\epsilon_1}^s(z_0), \quad (5.36)$$

assuming that $\delta_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small so that $10\delta_0 < \epsilon_1$. Then $\frac{\|v_0\|}{R_0} \leq d(z_0, y_0) \leq \|v_0\|$, and

$$|d\omega_{z_0}(u_0, v_0)| = |d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0)| \geq 2c_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\| = 20c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|,$$

while (5.31) and (5.32) imply $\kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq \|u_0\| \leq R_0 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. Notice that

$$|d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0)| \leq C_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\| = 10C_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq 10C_0 \delta_0 R_0 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}).$$

We will now prove that

$$|\Delta(x_0, y_0)| \geq 14c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \quad (5.37)$$

In what follows we use the notation from the proof of Lemma 5.3 and also part (b) in Lemma 5.3 (see (5.9) there). Using it with $b_0 = z_0$ (so $\eta_0 = 0$) and using $v_0 \in E_1^s(z_0)$ and (5.36) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta(x_0, y_0)| &\geq |d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0)| - C_0 L_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\|^{1+\beta} - C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&\geq 2c_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\| - C_0 L_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\|^{1+\beta} - C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&= \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\| (2c_0 - C_0 L_0 \|v_0\|^\beta) - C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&= 10\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| (2c_0 - C_0 L_0 (10\delta_0)^\beta) - C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&\geq 15c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| - C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}, \tag{5.38}
\end{aligned}$$

assuming $\delta_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small so that $C_0 L_0 (10\delta_0)^\beta < c_0/2$. Since δ_0 , c_0 and $C_4 > 0$ are global constants, using (4.5) and assuming that $m_0 \geq 1$ is sufficiently large and $m \geq m_0$ we have

$$C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{\hat{\beta}} \leq C_4 \left(\frac{C_1 e^{m\tau_0 \hat{\epsilon}_7}}{\lambda_1^{m\hat{\tau}_0}} \right)^{\hat{\beta}} \leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0 d_2}{8} e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}} = \frac{c_0 \delta_0 \kappa}{8},$$

using $\hat{\epsilon}_7 \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$. Thus,

$$C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0 \kappa}{8} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \tag{5.39}$$

This and the above estimates imply (5.37).

In a similar way, this time using (5.6) with $\eta_0 = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta(x_0, y_0)| &\leq |d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)})| + C_0 L_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\|^{1+\beta} + C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&\leq C_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\| + C_0 L_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\|^{1+\beta} + C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&= \|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\| (C_0 + C_0 L_0 \|v_0\|^\beta) + C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&\leq 20\delta_0 C_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| + C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will use this with y_0 replaced by $b_1 \in W_R^s(z_0)$ with $d(z_0, b_1) < \delta'$ for some small $\delta' > 0$ (to be determined later). Let $b_1 = \Phi_{z_0}^s(v_1)$ for some $v_1 \in E^s(z_0)$. Then $\|v_1\| \leq R_0 d(z_0, b_1) < R_0 \delta'$, and (5.39) give

$$|\Delta(x_0, b_1)| \leq 2C_0 R_0 \delta' \|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{4} \|u_0^{(1)}\|, \tag{5.40}$$

assuming that $2C_0 R_0 \delta' \leq c_0 \delta_0/8$. For this and later use define

$$\delta' = \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{32C_0 L_0 R_0} = \frac{c_0}{32C_0 L_0 R_0} \left(\frac{c_0}{16C_0 L_0 \Gamma_0} \right)^{1/\hat{\beta}}. \tag{5.41}$$

Assume also that $b_2 \in W_R^s(z_0)$ with $d(y_0, b_2) < \delta'$. Using (5.6) with $b_0 = b_2$, so that $\|v_0 - \eta_0\| \leq R_0 d(y_0, b_2) < R_0 \delta'$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta(x_0, y_0) - \Delta(x_0, b_2)| &\leq \|u_0^{(1)}\| R_0 \delta' (1 + 2C_0 L_0) + C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\
&\leq \|u_0^{(1)}\| \delta' 3R_0 C_0 L_0 + \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{4} \|u_0^{(1)}\|,
\end{aligned}$$

using the choice of δ' in (5.41).

Now (5.37) and the above two estimates yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(x_0, b_1) - \Delta(x_0, b_2)| &\geq |\Delta(x_0, y_0)| - |\Delta(x_0, y_0) - \Delta(x_0, \tilde{b}_2)| - |\Delta(x_0, b_1)| \\ &\geq 14c_0\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| - c_0\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| = 13c_0\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.42)$$

Since $\delta_1 \geq 2\delta_0$ by the definitions of δ_0 and v_0 , this proves part (a).

(b) Let $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\delta' > 0$ be as in part (a). Take the integer $m_0 \geq 1$ so large that for every unstable cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ in \tilde{R} of length $m \geq m_0$ we have $\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) < \epsilon' = \frac{\epsilon_1}{2c_2}$; see (4.1).

Using the symbolic coding provided by the Markov family $\{\tilde{R}_i\}$ it is easy to see that there exists an integer $N_0 \geq 1$ such that for any integer $N \geq N_0$ we have $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^N(B_{\epsilon'}^u(z)) \cap B^s(z', \delta') \neq \emptyset$ for any $z, z' \in \tilde{R}$.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be a cylinder of length $m \geq m_0$ in \tilde{R} and let $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap \tilde{P}_0$. Let $x_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ and $u_0 \in E^u(z_0)$ satisfy (5.31), where $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ satisfies (5.32). Define N_0 as above, and let $N \geq N_0$. Choose $y_0 = y_0(z_0, x_0) \in B^s(z_0, \epsilon_1)$ as in part (a).

It follows from the choice of N that for each $i = 1, 2$ there exist

$$y_1(z_0, x_0) \in \mathcal{P}^N(B^u(z_0, \epsilon')) \cap B^s(z_0, \delta'), \quad y_2(z_0, x_0) \in \mathcal{P}^N(B^u(z_0, \epsilon')) \cap B^s(y_0, \delta').$$

Fix points $y_1 = y_1(z_0, x_0)$, $y_2 = y_2(z_0, x_0)$ with these properties; these are then points in $W_{\epsilon_1}^s(z_0)$. Let $b_1, b_2 \in W_{\epsilon}^s(z_0)$ be so that $b_1 \in B^s(y_1, \delta')$ and $b_2 \in B^s(y_2, \delta')$. Then $b_1 \in B^s(z_0, \delta')$ and $b_2 \in B^s(y_0, \delta')$, so (5.34) holds. ■

Assume the integer $m_0 \geq 1$ is chosen so large that for any $z \in R$ and any unstable cylinder \mathcal{C} of length $\geq m_0$ in R we have $\text{diam}(\tilde{\Psi}(\mathcal{C})) \leq r_0$ and $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}_z(\mathcal{C})) \leq r_0$ for any $z \in \mathcal{C}$. We will use the constant δ_0 defined by (5.30).

Fix a constant $d > 1$ such that

$$T = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2d\beta}{\tau_0} - 1 \right) > \frac{1}{\hat{\beta}} \quad (5.43)$$

is a very large constant, to be specified later, where $\beta > 0$ is the constant from Sect. 5.1 and $\hat{\beta} \in (0, \beta/8)$ is defined in (5.27). As before we assume that $\beta > 0$ is sufficiently small so that it satisfies the requirements of Lemma 5.1 and also those in Sect. 3. In what follows **we will use Lemma 4.4 with the choice of the constant d in (5.43)**.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $q_1 \geq 1$ be a fixed integer. There exist global constants $N_0 \geq 1$, $d_2 \in (0, 1)$, $d_4 > 1$, $d_5 \in (0, 1)$, $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2 > 0$, $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_{13} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ and $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_{14} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ which can be made arbitrarily small with $\hat{\epsilon}$ such that for every integer $m \geq \tilde{m}_0$, any point $z_0 \in \tilde{P}_0$, and any cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ in \tilde{R} of length $m \geq \tilde{m}_0$ containing z_0 there exist subsets Γ and Λ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ which are unions of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of co-length at least q_1 so that*

$$\nu(\Gamma') \geq \mathbf{d}_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}') \quad , \quad \nu(\Lambda') \geq \mathbf{d}_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}'), \quad (5.44)$$

where $\Gamma' = \pi^{(U)}(\Gamma)$ and $\Lambda' = \pi^{(U)}(\Lambda)$, and the following hold:

(a) For every $x \in \Gamma$, for $u = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x)) \in E^u(z_0)$ we have

$$\|\mathbf{u}^{(1)}\| \geq \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}), \quad (5.45)$$

where $\kappa = d_2 e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}_{13}}$.

(b) There exist finite families $\{\Gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{j_0}$ and $\{\Lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{j_0}$ of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ for some integer j_0 (depending on $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$) such that $\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Gamma_j = \Gamma$, $\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Lambda_j = \Lambda$, and for all integers $N \geq N_0$, any $j = 1, \dots, j_0$ and any $i = 1, 2$ there exist a (Hölder) continuous map

$$B^u(z_0, \epsilon'') \ni x \mapsto v_i^{(j)}(z_0, x) \in U,$$

such that $\sigma^N(v_i^{(j)}(z_0, x)) = x$ for all $x \in B^u(z_0, \epsilon'')$ and the following property holds:

$$\mathbf{I}_N(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z}') = |\psi(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{x}') - \psi(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}')| \geq 6\delta_0 \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \quad (5.46)$$

for all $z \in \Lambda_j$ and $x \in \Gamma_j$, where $z' = \pi^{(U)}(z)$, $x' = \pi^{(U)}(x) \in U$, and

$$\psi(z_0, x) = \tau_N(v_1^{(j)}(z_0, x)) - \tau_N(v_2^{(j)}(z_0, x)).$$

We can choose all sub-cylinders Γ_j and Λ_j so that their lengths do not exceed $r_m = T_1 m + T_2$, and

$$\frac{1}{\mathbf{d}_4} \leq \frac{\nu(\Gamma_i)}{\nu(\Lambda_j)} \leq \mathbf{d}_4 \quad (5.47)$$

for all $i, j = 1, \dots, j_0$.

Proof. We will now use the results of Lemma 4.4 with the constant $d > 1$ as in (5.43) and some of the set-up in its proof.

Define the global constant $\delta' \in (0, 1)$ by (5.41) and choose the global constant $N_0 \geq 1$ as in the proof of Lemma 5.4(b).

Take an arbitrary constant $C' > 8$, and set $C = \frac{3C'}{c_0 \delta_0 d_2} > 2C'$, where $\delta_0 > 0$ is as in (5.30).

We will use Lemma 4.4 with this particular C . Let the constant $d_1 \in (0, 1)$ be as in Lemma 4.4.

Fix for a moment $z_0 \in \tilde{P}_0$. Assume $z_0 \in \tilde{R}_{i_0}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be a cylinder of length m with $z_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, $\tilde{z} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^m(z_0) \in \tilde{R}_j$ for some j . Then choose k with $0 < k \leq m$ as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 and set $p = \lceil \tau_{m-k}(z_0) \rceil$, $q = \lceil \tilde{\tau}_m(z_0) \rceil$, $z_j = \varphi^j(z)$, $\tilde{z}_j = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^j(z_0)$, etc., as in the proof of Lemma 4.4. Define the sets H_1, H_2, \tilde{H}_1 and \tilde{H}_2 as in the proof of Lemma 4.4, and let Γ and Λ be the unions of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of lengths not exceeding $r_m = T_1 m + T_2$ for some global constant $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2 > 0$, defined as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 so that they satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 4.4.

In what follows we will use arguments from the proofs of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. It follows from the assumptions about Γ in Lemma 4.4 that (5.45) holds for $u = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x))$ for every $x \in \Gamma$.

Next, consider an arbitrary $z \in \Lambda$ so that it belongs to $\varphi^{-p}((\mathcal{T}_{z_p})^{-1}(\Phi_{z_p}^u(\hat{\mathcal{D}} \setminus \tilde{H}_2)))$ and the corresponding $w_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(z))$. Set

$$w_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(w_0) \in E^u(z_j) \quad , \quad \hat{w}_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(0) \cdot w \in E^u(z_j)$$

for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, p$. It follows from our choice of z that $w_p \in \hat{\mathcal{D}} \setminus \tilde{H}_2$, so

$$\|w_p^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{1}{4C\gamma_1} e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}}. \quad (5.48)$$

From the choice of Λ and Γ in Lemma 4.4, $Cw_p \in \hat{\mathcal{C}} \setminus H_2$, so there exists $x \in \Gamma$ so that

$$Cw_p = u_p = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(u_0),$$

where $u_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x))$ satisfies (5.45), i.e. $\|u_0^{(1)}\| \geq \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}})$. Now, as in the proof of Lemma 5.4, choose $\tilde{v} \in E_1^s(z_0)$ with $d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, \tilde{v}) \geq 2c_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|$ and then define $v_0 \in E_1^s(z_0)$ and $y_0 \in W_{\epsilon_1}^s(z_0)$ as in (5.36).

In most of what follows we will deal with the **fixed $z \in \Lambda$ and the corresponding $x = x(z) \in \Gamma$** which is related to z as above; namely we determined successively: $w_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(z))$, $w_p = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(w_0) \in E^u(z_p)$, $u_p = Cw_p = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(u_0)$ for some $u_0 \in E^u(z_0)$ and $u_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x))$ which determines x . Later on we will consider neighbourhoods of z and x which will be corresponding little sub-cylinders of Λ and Γ .

As in the proof of Lemma 5.3 we will use the notation

$$x_j = \varphi^j(x_0) \quad , \quad u_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(u_0) \in E^u(z_j) \quad , \quad \hat{u}_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(0) \cdot u_0 \in E^u(z_j) \quad , \quad v_j = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^j(v_0) \in E^s(z_j).$$

Note. Notice that $z_j = \varphi^j(z_0)$ are the iterates of the fixed point $z_0 \in \tilde{P}_0$, not those of the arbitrary point $z \in \Lambda$.

It follows from $u_p = Cw_p \in \hat{\mathcal{C}} \setminus H_2$, the definition of H_2 (see the proof of Lemma 4.4) and $p = [\tilde{\tau}_{m-k}(z_0)] \in [(m-k)\tilde{\tau}_0, (m-k)\tau_0 + 1)$ that

$$\|u_p\| \leq e^{-3d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \leq e^{-3d(p-1)\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0} \leq e^{-2dp\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0} \quad , \quad \|u_p^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{1}{4}e^{-4d(m-k)\hat{\epsilon}} \geq \frac{1}{4\gamma_1}e^{-4dp\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0}, \quad (5.49)$$

assuming p is sufficiently large. Similarly for w and w_p we have

$$\|w_p\| \leq \frac{1}{C}e^{-2dp\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0} \quad , \quad \|w_p^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{1}{4C\gamma_1}e^{-4dp\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0}. \quad (5.50)$$

Next, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\|u_p^{(1)} - \hat{u}_p^{(1)}\| \leq L(z_p)\|u_p\|^{1+\beta} \leq L_0e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}\|u_p\|^{1+\beta},$$

so $\|\hat{u}_p^{(1)}\| \leq \|u_p\|(1 + L_0e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}\|u_p\|^\beta)$. Now (5.49) and (5.43) yield

$$L_0e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}\|u_p\|^\beta \leq L_0e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}e^{-2d\beta p\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0} \leq L_0e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}(2d\beta/\tau_0 - 1)} < L_0e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}} < 1,$$

since $2d\beta/\tau_0 > 2$. Thus, $\|\hat{u}_p^{(1)}\| \leq 2\|u_p^{(1)}\| \leq 2e^{-2dp\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0}$, and

$$\|u_p^{(1)} - \hat{u}_p^{(1)}\| \leq L_0e^{-p\hat{\epsilon}(2d\beta/\tau_0 - 1)} \leq L_0e^{-2Tp\hat{\epsilon}}. \quad (5.51)$$

Similarly, again by Lemma 3.1,

$$\|w_p^{(1)} - \hat{w}_p^{(1)}\| \leq L(z_p)\|w_p\|^{1+\beta} \leq L_0e^{p\hat{\epsilon}}\|w_p\|^{1+\beta} \leq \frac{L_0}{C}e^{-2Tp\hat{\epsilon}},$$

and as above we derive

$$\|\hat{w}_p^{(1)}\| \leq 2\|w_p^{(1)}\| \leq \frac{2}{C}e^{-2dp\hat{\epsilon}/\tau_0}.$$

Since $u_p = Cw_p$, it follows that

$$\|\hat{u}_p^{(1)} - C\hat{w}_p^{(1)}\| \leq \|\hat{u}_p^{(1)} - u_p^{(1)}\| + \|u_p^{(1)} - C\hat{w}_p^{(1)}\| + \|C\hat{w}_p^{(1)} - \hat{w}_p^{(1)}\| = \|\hat{u}_p^{(1)} - u_p^{(1)}\| + \|C\hat{w}_p^{(1)} - C\hat{w}_p^{(1)}\|,$$

and therefore

$$\|\hat{u}_p^{(1)} - C\hat{w}_p^{(1)}\| \leq 2e^{-2Tp\hat{\epsilon}}.$$

Notice that the above and (3.14) imply

$$\|u_0^{(1)} - Cw_0^{(1)}\| \leq \Gamma_0 e^{p\hat{\epsilon}} \frac{2e^{-2Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\mu_1^p} \leq \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p}, \quad (5.52)$$

assuming that T is sufficiently large.

We will now use (5.52) to get an estimate for $|\Delta(z, y_0)|$ by means of $|\Delta(x, y_0)|$. It follows from (5.49), (5.7) with x_0 replaced by z and $u_0^{(1)}$ replaced by $w_0^{(1)}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(z, y_0)| &\leq |d\omega_{z_0}(w_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)})| + 2C_0L_0\|w_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\|^{1+\beta} + C_4(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C}|d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)})| + \frac{2C_0L_0}{C}\|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\|^{1+\beta} + C_4(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{C} \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p} + \frac{2C_0L_0}{C} \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

Since u satisfies (5.45), as in the proof of Lemma 5.4 we have (5.39), and therefore

$$\mathbf{C}_4(\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\hat{\beta}} < \frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \quad (5.54)$$

For the second term in the right-hand-side of (5.53), it follows from (5.43) and (5.36) that

$$2C_0L_0\|u_0^{(1)}\| \|v_0\|^{1+\beta} \leq 2C_0L_0\|u_0^{(1)}\| 10\delta_0 \left(\frac{c_0}{16C_0L_0\Gamma_0} \right) < c_0\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq c_0\delta_0 \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}). \quad (5.55)$$

Next, notice that if we choose $T > 1$ sufficiently large, then

$$4C_0L_0\Gamma_0 \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p} < \frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \quad (5.56)$$

Indeed, using $q(1 - \hat{\epsilon}'_6) \leq p \leq q(1 - \hat{\epsilon}'_5) + 1$ by (4.27) and $m \leq q\tau_0 + 1 < 2p\tau_0$, we get

$$\kappa = d_2 e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}_{13}} \geq d_2 e^{-2p\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}_{13}}.$$

Now it follows from (4.5) that for some global constant $C_3 > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) &\geq c_0\delta_0 d_2 e^{-2p\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}_{13}} \frac{e^{-q\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{8C_3\lambda_1^q} > c_0\delta_0 d_2 e^{-2p\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}_{13}} \frac{e^{-2p\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{8C_3\lambda_1^{p/(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)}} \\ &= c_0\delta_0 d_2 \frac{e^{-2p(\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}_{13} + \hat{\epsilon}_7)} \lambda_1^{-p\hat{\epsilon}_6/(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6)}}{8C_3\lambda_1^p} \\ &= c_0\delta_0 d_2 \frac{e^{-p(2\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}_{13} + 2\hat{\epsilon}_7 + \hat{\epsilon}_6(\log \lambda_1)/(1-\hat{\epsilon}_6))}}{8C_3\lambda_1^p} > 4C_0L_0\Gamma_0 \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.57)$$

assuming e.g. that $\frac{32C_0L_0\Gamma_0C_3}{c_0\delta_0d_2} < e^{Tp\hat{\epsilon}/2}$ and $T\hat{\epsilon} > 2\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}_{13} + 2\hat{\epsilon}_7 + \hat{\epsilon}_6(\log \lambda_1)/(1 - \hat{\epsilon}_6)$, which will be satisfied if we take T sufficiently large. Thus, (5.56) holds.

Combining (5.53), (5.54), (5.55) and (5.56) implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(z, y_0)| &\leq \frac{1}{C}|d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)})| + \frac{c_0\delta_0}{C} \|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\| + 2\frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \\ &\leq \frac{10C_0\delta_0}{C} \|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{c_0\delta_0}{C} \|u_0^{(1)}\| + 3\frac{c_0\delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq c_0\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

assuming e.g. that $C \geq \frac{20}{c_0 C_0}$.

Before we continue we will derive estimates similar to (5.40) and (5.42) replacing x_0 by z . Assume as before that $b_1, b_2 \in W_R^s(z_0)$ with $d(z_0, b_1) < \delta'$ and $d(y_0, b_2) < \delta'$, where δ' is defined by (5.41). Using (5.6) with x_0 replaced by z and $u_0^{(1)}$ by $w_0^{(1)}$, and taking into account (5.52) and using the argument in the estimate of $|\Delta(x_0, y_0) - \Delta(x_0, b_2)|$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(z, y_0) - \Delta(z, b_2)| &\leq \|w_0^{(1)}\| R_0 \delta' (1 + 2C_0 L_0) + C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\beta} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C} \left(\|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p} \right) \delta' 3R_0 C_0 L_0 + C_4 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1+\beta} \\ &\leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|}{C} + \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{C \lambda_1^p} + \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (5.57), assuming that the constant $T > 0$ is chosen sufficiently large, that

$$\frac{c_0 \delta_0}{4C} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \geq \frac{c_0 \delta_0 \kappa}{4C} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \frac{4C_0 L_0 \Gamma_0}{4C} \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p} > \frac{1}{C} \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p}.$$

Therefore

$$|\Delta(z, y_0) - \Delta(z, b_2)| \leq \frac{\delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|}{C} + \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{4C} \|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{8} \|u_0^{(1)}\| < \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{2} \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \quad (5.59)$$

Similarly, using the estimates in the proof of (5.40), replacing x_0 by z and $u^{(1)}$ by $w^{(1)}$ and using (5.50), we get

$$|\Delta(z, b_1)| \leq 2C_0 R_0 \delta' \|w_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{1}{4} c_0 \|v_0\| \|w_0^{(1)}\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta_0 \|w_0^{(1)}\|.$$

On the other hand, (5.52) and (5.57) yield

$$\|w_0^{(1)}\| \leq \frac{1}{C} \left(\|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{e^{-Tp\hat{\epsilon}}}{\lambda_1^p} \right) \leq \frac{1}{C} \left(\|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{4} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \right) < \frac{2}{C} \|u_0^{(1)}\|.$$

Combining this with the previous estimates, we get

$$|\Delta(z, b_1)| \leq \frac{\delta_0}{C} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{2} \|u_0^{(1)}\|,$$

assuming C is sufficiently large, as before. This, (5.58) and (5.59) now imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta(z, b_1) - \Delta(z, b_2)| &\leq |\Delta(z, b_1)| + |\Delta(z, y_0)| + |\Delta(z, y_0) - \Delta(z, b_2)| \\ &\leq \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{2} \|u_0^{(1)}\| + c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{c_0 \delta_0}{2} \|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.60)$$

Next, we will get estimates similar to (5.42) and (5.60) replacing¹¹ x by $x'' \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ close to x and z by $z'' \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ close to z . Recall that the function $\Delta(x, y_0)$ is uniformly Hölder, so there exist constants $D'_3 > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$|\Delta(x, y_0) - \Delta(x'', y_0)| \leq D'_3 (d(x, x''))^\alpha \quad , \quad |\Delta(z, y_0) - \Delta(z'', y_0)| \leq D'_3 (d(z, z''))^\alpha.$$

¹¹We avoid here the notation x' and z' since these mean something specifically related to projections to U .

Fix for a moment a small constant $\delta > 0$ (we will determine later how small δ should be) and assume

$$d(x, x'') \leq \delta \quad , \quad d(z, z'') \leq \delta$$

for some $x'', z'' \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. It follows from (4.5) that we have the following estimate (in terms of m now):

$$\kappa \operatorname{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq d_2 e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}_{13}} \frac{e^{-m\hat{\epsilon}_7/\hat{\tau}_0}}{C_3 \lambda_1^{m\tau_0}} = \frac{d_2}{C_3} e^{-m(\hat{\epsilon}_{13} + \hat{\epsilon}_7/\hat{\tau}_0 + \tau_0 \log \lambda_1)} \geq \frac{d_2}{C_3} e^{-m(1+1/\hat{\tau}_0 + \log \lambda_1)},$$

where we used the fact that the constant $\hat{\epsilon}_{13}$, $\hat{\epsilon}_7$ and τ_0 are all in $(0, 1)$. We will determine δ so that $c_0 \delta_0 \kappa \operatorname{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq 8D'_3 \delta^\alpha$, that is

$$\delta \leq \left(\frac{c_0 \delta_0}{8D'_3} \kappa \operatorname{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \right)^{1/\alpha}, \quad (5.61)$$

for which it is enough to have $\delta \leq D''_3 e^{-m(1+1/\hat{\tau}_0 + \log \lambda_1)/\alpha}$, where $D''_3 = \left(\frac{c_0 \delta_0 d_2}{8D'_3 C_3} \right)^{1/\alpha} > 0$ is a global constant. It follows from Lemma 4.1(c) that the sub-cylinders $\Gamma(x)$ and $\Lambda(z)$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, containing x and z , respectively, and having lengths not less than

$$\tilde{n} = \frac{1}{|\log \theta|} (-\log \delta + \log C_2)$$

have diameters not exceeding δ . Indeed, if X is a cylinder in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of length $n \geq \tilde{n}$, then by Lemma 4.1(c),

$$\operatorname{diam}(X) \leq C_2 \operatorname{diam}_\theta(X) = C_2 \theta^n = C_2 e^{-n|\log \theta|} \leq C_2 e^{\log \delta - \log C_2} = \delta.$$

Since

$$-\log \delta \geq m(1 + 1/\hat{\tau}_0 + \log \lambda_1)/\alpha - \log D''_3,$$

it is enough to have $\tilde{n} \geq r'_m = T'_1 + T'_2$, where $T'_1 = \frac{1}{\alpha|\log \theta|} (1 + 1/\hat{\tau}_0 + \log \lambda_1) > 0$ and $T'_2 = \frac{\log C_2}{|\log \theta|}$.

In this way we have shown that if the sub-cylinders $\Gamma(x)$ and $\Lambda(z)$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, containing x and z , respectively, having lengths $\geq r'_m$, then they have diameters not exceeding the number δ satisfying (5.61). With such δ it follows from (5.60) that for any $b_1, b_2 \in W_R^s(z_0)$ with $d(z_0, b_1) < \delta'$ and $d(y_0, b_2) < \delta'$ we have

$$|\Delta(z'', b_1) - \Delta(z'', b_2)| \leq 2c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \quad (5.62)$$

for all $z'' \in \Lambda(z)$. Indeed, by the choice of δ , for every $z'' \in \Lambda(z)$ we have

$$|\Delta(z'', b_1) - \Delta(z, b_1)| \leq D'_3 \delta^\alpha \quad , \quad |\Delta(z'', b_2) - \Delta(z, b_2)| \leq D'_3 \delta^\alpha,$$

and now (5.61) implies

$$|\Delta(z'', b_1) - \Delta(z'', b_2)| \leq |\Delta(z, b_1) - \Delta(z, b_2)| + 2D'_3 \delta^\alpha \leq c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| + \frac{1}{4} c_0 \delta_0 \kappa \operatorname{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq 2c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|.$$

In a similar way, for b_1, b_2 as above, we can use (5.42) to derive

$$|\Delta(x'', b_1) - \Delta(x'', b_2)| \geq 12c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \quad (5.63)$$

for all $x'' \in \Gamma(x)$. Indeed, using (5.42) with x_0 replaced by x and

$$|\Delta(x'', b_1) - \Delta(x, b_1)| \leq D'_3 \delta^\alpha \quad , \quad |\Delta(x'', b_2) - \Delta(x, b_2)| \leq D'_3 \delta^\alpha,$$

we get

$$|\Delta(x'', b_1) - \Delta(x'', b_2)| \geq |\Delta(x, b_1) - \Delta(x, b_2)| - 2D'_3 \delta^\alpha \geq 13c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| - \frac{1}{4}c_0 \delta_0 \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq 12c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|.$$

We will now use the above as follows. Take an arbitrary $\hat{z} \in \Lambda$ and fix it. Using the above with $z = \hat{z}$, we construct a corresponding $x_0 = x_0(\hat{z}) \in \Gamma$ as follows: define $w_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(\hat{z}))$, then $w_p = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(w_0) \in E^u(z_p)$. This defines $u_p = Cw_p = \hat{\varphi}_{z_0}^p(u_0)$ for some $u_0 \in E^u(z_0)$. Then define $x_0 = x_0(\hat{z}) = (\mathcal{T}_{z_0})^{-1}(\Phi_{z_0}^u(u_0))$ so that $u_0 = (\Phi_{z_0}^u)^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{z_0}(x_0))$.

We will now use some construction from the proof of Lemma 5.4. Take a unit vector $\tilde{v} \in E_1^s(z_0)$ with $d\omega_{z_0}(u_0^{(1)}, \tilde{v}) \geq 2c_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\|$, and then define $v_0 \in E_1^s(z_0)$ and $y_0 = \Phi_{z_0}^s(v_0) \in W_{\epsilon_1}^s(z_0)$ as in (5.36). Then (5.42) holds for all $b_1, b_2 \in W_R^s(z_0)$ with $d(z_0, b_1) < \delta'$ and $d(y_0, b_2) < \delta'$. Similarly, (5.60) holds with z replaced by \hat{z} for such b_1, b_2 .

We now choose a sub-cylinder $\Gamma(x_0)$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of co-length at least q_1 with $x_0 \in \Gamma(x_0)$ and a sub-cylinder $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of co-length at least q_1 with $\hat{z} \in \Lambda(\hat{z})$ both of length r'_m so that for all $b_1, b_2 \in W_R^s(z_0)$ with $d(z_0, b_1) < \delta'$ and $d(y_0, b_2) < \delta'$, (5.62) holds with z'' replaced by any $z \in \Lambda(\hat{z})$ and (5.63) holds with x'' replaced by any $x \in \Gamma(x_0)$. It then follows that, for such b_1, b_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Delta(x, b_1) - \Delta(x, b_2)| - |\Delta(z, b_1) - \Delta(z, b_2)| \\ & \geq 10c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| - 2c_0 \delta_0 \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq 10c_0 \delta_0 \|u_0^{(1)}\| \geq 10c_0 \delta_0 \kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.64)$$

for all $x \in \Gamma(x_0)$ and all $z \in \Lambda(\hat{z})$.

We can now apply the above construction to the whole of the set Λ obtained from Lemma 4.4, which itself is a union of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. Using the above, for every $\hat{z} \in \Lambda$ will produce a covering of Λ by little sub-cylinders $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ of length r'_m and corresponding sub-cylinders $\Gamma(x_0)$ of Γ , also of length r'_m . Choosing a disjoint set of sub-cylinders, we get a covering of Λ by sub-cylinders of the form $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ for various $\hat{z} \in \Lambda$ and a corresponding covering of Γ by sub-cylinders $\Gamma(x_0)$ for corresponding points $x_0 \in \Gamma$. All sub-cylinders involved have length $\leq r'_m$ but in general this is not enough to make their measures comparable. So, we will need to apply an additional procedure to arrange the condition (5.47).

Consider again an arbitrary $\hat{z} \in \Lambda$ and fix it. Then using the previous argument, construct a corresponding $x_0 = x_0(\hat{z}) \in \Gamma$ so that (5.64) holds for all $x \in \Gamma(x_0)$ and all $z \in \Lambda(\hat{z})$. To such a pair $(\Lambda(\hat{z}), \Gamma(x_0))$ we now apply the following

Procedure:

There are two possible cases to consider.

Case 1. $\nu(\Lambda(\hat{z})) \leq \nu(\Gamma(x_0))$. Denote by $\Gamma_1(x_0)$ the sub-cylinder of $\Gamma(x_0)$ containing x_0 and having maximal possible length so that $\nu(\Lambda(\hat{z})) \leq \nu(\Gamma_1(x_0))$. If t is the length of $\Gamma_1(x_0)$, then its sub-cylinder $\Gamma_2(x_0)$ of length $t + 1$ containing x_0 satisfies $\nu(\Gamma_2(x_0)) < \nu(\Lambda(\hat{z}))$, so using the projection of these cylinders to U via $\pi^{(U)}$ and the point $x'_0 = \pi^{(U)}(x_0)$, (4.2) implies

$$1 \leq \frac{\nu(\Gamma_1(x_0))}{\nu(\Gamma_2(x_0))} \leq \frac{c_2}{c_1} \frac{e^{gt(x'_0)}}{e^{g(t+1)(x'_0)}} = \frac{c_2}{c_1} \frac{1}{e^{g(\sigma(x'_0))}} \leq d_4$$

for some global constant $d_4 > 1$. Moreover it is easy to see, using (4.2), the fact that $\Gamma_1(x_0)$ has maximal possible length with $\nu(\Lambda(\hat{z})) \leq \nu(\Gamma_1(x_0))$, and the fact that the length of $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ is $r'_m = T'_1 m + T'_2$, that the length t of $\Gamma_1(x_0)$ is still bounded above by $\mathbf{r}_m = \mathbf{T}_1 \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{T}_2$ for some

global constants $T_1, T_2 > 0$. We now define $\tilde{\Gamma}(x_0) = \Gamma_1(x_0)$. The pair of cylinders $(\Lambda(\hat{z}), \tilde{\Gamma}(x_0))$ then satisfies

$$\frac{1}{d_4} < 1 \leq \frac{\nu(\tilde{\Gamma}(x_0))}{\nu(\Lambda(\hat{z}))} \leq d_4,$$

the lengths of both $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}(x_0)$ do not exceed r_m , and their co-lengths in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m$ are at least q_1 .

Case 2. $\nu(\Lambda(\hat{z})) > \nu(\Gamma(x_0))$. Repeating the argument in Case 1 above, changing the roles of $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ and $\Gamma(x_0)$, we construct a sub-cylinder $\Lambda_1(\hat{z})$ of $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ containing \hat{z} of length not exceeding r_m and such that

$$\frac{1}{d_4} < 1 \leq \frac{\nu(\Lambda_1(\hat{z}))}{\nu(\Gamma(x_0))} \leq d_4.$$

Then $\Lambda(\hat{z}) \setminus \Lambda_1(\hat{z})$ is a finite disjoint union of sub-cylinders $\Lambda(\hat{z}')$ of lengths $\leq r_m$. For each of those sub-cylinders we construct a corresponding sub-cylinder $\Gamma(x'_0)$ in Γ of length $\leq r_m$ so that (5.64) holds for all $x \in \Gamma(x'_0)$ and all $z \in \Lambda(\hat{z}')$.

Then for each pair $(\Lambda(\hat{z}'), \Gamma(x'_0))$ we repeat the procedure either in Case 1 or Case 2, whichever is applicable. This may require a further partitioning of some of the sub-cylinders $\Lambda(\hat{z}')$, however after finitely many ($\leq r_m$) steps this process will terminate. As a result of it we get a representation¹² $\Lambda(\hat{z}) = \cup_{i=1}^s \Lambda_i(\hat{z}_i)$ of $\Lambda(\hat{z})$ as a finite disjoint union of sub-cylinders of length $\leq r_m$ and for each i we construct a corresponding sub-cylinder $\Gamma(x_0^{(i)})$ in Γ of length $\leq r_m$ so that

$$\frac{1}{d_4} \leq \frac{\nu(\Gamma(x_0^{(i)}))}{\nu(\Lambda(\hat{z}_i))} \leq d_4$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.

Applying the above Procedure to each of the initial pairs $(\Lambda(\hat{z}), \tilde{\Gamma}(x_0))$ of cylinders in Λ and Γ , we construct families $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_{j_0}$ and $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_{j_0}$ of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m$ of lengths $\leq r_m$, where $\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Lambda_j = \Lambda$ is exactly the initially constructed Λ , while $\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Gamma_j = \tilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$, the initially constructed Γ . Importantly, for all $j = 1, \dots, j_0$ the relation (5.64) holds for all $x \in \Gamma_j$ and all $z \in \Lambda_j$. Moreover, $\frac{1}{d_4} \leq \frac{\nu(\Gamma_j)}{\nu(\Lambda_j)} \leq d_4$ for all $j = 1, \dots, j_0$. As a final step, we now replace the initial Γ by $\tilde{\Gamma} = \cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Gamma_j$. Since $\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Lambda_j = \Lambda$ and $\nu(\Lambda') \geq d_1 \nu(\mathcal{C}')$, it follows that $\nu(\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Gamma_j) \geq \frac{d_1}{d_4} \nu(\mathcal{C}')$. Thus, replacing the initial global constant $d_1 > 0$ by $d_5 = d_1/d_4$, we get that for both $\Lambda = \cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Lambda_j$ and newly renamed $\Gamma = \cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Gamma_j$ we have

$$\nu(\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Gamma'_j) \geq d_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}') \quad , \quad \nu(\cup_{j=1}^{j_0} \Lambda'_j) \geq d_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}').$$

In general, the number j_0 will depend on the cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. However $d_4 > 0$ and $d_5 > 0$ are **global constants**, independent of m , $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ and $z_0 \in \tilde{P}_0$. Clearly the construction is so that the co-lengths of all sub-cylinders Γ_j and Λ_j in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m$ are at least q_1 .

Let $N \geq N_0$. Consider now an arbitrary $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_0$. As we remarked earlier, (5.64) holds for every $x \in \Gamma_j$ and every $z \in \Lambda_j$ for some choice of the point $y_0 \in W_{\epsilon_1}^s(z_0)$ which **we will now denote by $y_0^{(j)}$** . As in Lemma 5.4, we construct corresponding points

$$y_1^{(j)} = y_1^{(j)}(z_0), \quad y_2^{(j)} = y_2^{(j)}(z_0) \in \mathcal{P}^N(B^u(z_0; \epsilon_1)) \cap B^s(z_0, \epsilon_1),$$

¹²It may happen that $s = 1$ and we simply have $\hat{z}_1 = \hat{z}$.

so that (5.33) holds for any $b_1, b_2 \in W_R^s(z_0)$ with $d(z_0, b_1) < \delta'$ and $d(y_0^{(j)}, b_2) < \delta'$, where as in Lemma 5.4, δ' is the constant given by (5.41).

Given $i = 1, 2$, there exists a cylinder $L_i^{(j)} = L_i^{(j)}(z_0)$ of length N in $W_{R_{i_0}}^u(z_0)$ so that

$$\mathcal{P}^N : L_i^{(j)} \longrightarrow W_{R_{i_0}}^u(y_i^{(j)})$$

is a bijection; then it is a bi-Hölder homeomorphism. Consider its inverse and its Hölder continuous extension $\mathcal{P}^{-N} : W_{R_{i_0}}^u(y_i^{(j)}) \longrightarrow L_i^{(j)}$ and the cylinder

$$M_i^{(j)} = M_i^{(j)}(z_0) = \pi^{(U)}(L_i^{(j)}(z_0)) \subset U$$

of length N in U_{i_0} . Define the maps

$$\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(z_0, \cdot) : U_{i_0} \longrightarrow L_i^{(j)} \subset B^u(z_0, \epsilon'') \quad , \quad v_i^{(j)}(z_0, \cdot) : U_{i_0} \longrightarrow M_i^{(j)} \subset U$$

by

$$\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(z_0, y) = \mathcal{P}^{-N}(\pi_{y_i^{(j)}}(y)) \quad , \quad v_i^{(j)}(z_0, y) = \pi^{(U)}(\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(z_0, y)).$$

Then

$$\mathcal{P}^N(\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(z_0, y)) = \pi_{y_i^{(j)}}(y) = W_{\epsilon_0}^s(y) \cap W_{R_{i_0}}^u(y_i^{(j)}),$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}^N(v_i^{(j)}(z_0, y)) = W_{\epsilon_0}^s(y) \cap \mathcal{P}^N(M_i^{(j)}) = \pi_{b_i^{(j)}}(y), \quad (5.65)$$

where $b_i^{(j)} = b_i^{(j)}(z_0) \in W_R^s(z_0)$ is such that $\mathcal{P}^N(M_i^{(j)}) = W_R^u(b_i^{(j)})$. Thus, $\sigma^N((v_i^{(j)}(z_0, y)) = y$. Next, there exist $x' \in M_i^{(j)}$ and $y' \in L_i^{(j)}$ with $\mathcal{P}^N(x') = b_i^{(j)}$ and $\mathcal{P}^N(y') = y_i^{(j)}$. Since stable leaves shrink exponentially fast, using (2.1) we get $d(b_i^{(j)}, y_i^{(j)}) \leq \frac{1}{c_0 \gamma^N} d(x', y') \leq \frac{1}{\gamma^N} < \delta''$. **Thus, $b_1 = b_1^{(j)}$ and $b_2 = b_2^{(j)}$ satisfy the assumptions and therefore the conclusions of Lemma 5.4(b).** In particular (5.33) holds with x_0 replaced by $x \in \Gamma_j$, that is

$$6c_0\delta_0\|u_0^{(1)}\| \leq |\Delta(x, b_1^{(j)}) - \Delta(x, b_2^{(j)})| \quad (5.66)$$

for any $x \in \Gamma_j$.

Set $z'_0 = \pi^{(U)}(z_0) \in U_{i_0}$. If $x, z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and $x' = \pi^{(U)}(x)$, $z' = \pi^{(U)}(z)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} I_N(x', z') &= |[\tau_N(v_1^{(j)}(z_0, x)) - \tau_N(v_2^{(j)}(z_0, x))] - [\tau_N(v_1^{(j)}(z_0, z')) - \tau_N(v_2^{(j)}(z_0, z'))]| \\ &= \left| \Delta(\mathcal{P}^N(v_1^{(j)}(z_0, x')), \mathcal{P}^N(v_1^{(j)}(z_0, z'))) - \Delta(\mathcal{P}^N(v_2^{(j)}(z_0, x')), \mathcal{P}^N(v_2^{(j)}(z_0, z'))) \right| \\ &= \left| \Delta(x', \pi_{b_1^{(j)}}(z')) - \Delta(x', \pi_{b_2^{(j)}}(z')) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

In particular when $z = z_0$ and $z' = z'_0$ the latter gives

$$I_N(x', z'_0) = \left| \Delta(x', b_1^{(j)}) - \Delta(x', b_2^{(j)}) \right| = \left| \Delta(x, b_1^{(j)}) - \Delta(x, b_2^{(j)}) \right|.$$

Since $\Delta(x, \pi_y(z)) = \Delta(x, y) - \Delta(z, y)$ for any $y \in W_\epsilon^s(z_0)$, it follows from (5.66) and (5.62) that for any $x \in \Gamma_j$ and any $z \in \Lambda_j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_N(x', z') &= I_N(x', z'_0) - I_N(z', z'_0) \geq \left| \left| \Delta(x, b_1^{(j)}) - \Delta(x, b_2^{(j)}) \right| - \left| \Delta(z, b_1^{(j)}) - \Delta(z, b_2^{(j)}) \right| \right| \\ &\geq \left| 6c_0\delta_0\|u_0^{(1)}\| - 2c_0\delta_0\|u_0^{(1)}\| \right| = 4c_0\delta_0\|u_0^{(1)}\| \geq 4c_0\delta_0\kappa \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (5.46) and thus completes the proof of the lemma. \blacksquare

6 Contraction operators

As in Sect. 5 here we assume that M is a C^2 compact Riemannian manifold and ϕ_t is a C^2 contact Anosov flow on M .

We will use the notation in Sects. 2, 3 and 4. In particular, $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{k_0}$ will be a fixed pseudo-Markov family for the flow and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ will be the related Markov family as in Sect. 2.

As in Sect. 4, we assume that $0 < \hat{\epsilon}_1 < \hat{\epsilon}$ are small constants as in Sect. 3 (that can be taken smaller if necessary), and we will again assume that $R(x)$, $\Gamma(x)$, $D(x)$ and $L(x)$ are Lyapunov $\hat{\epsilon}_1$ -regularity functions, while $\hat{r}(x)$ and $r(x)$ are $\hat{\epsilon}_1$ -slowly varying radius function so that they satisfy (3.7) – (3.19) and the conclusions of Lemma 3.1 with $\hat{\epsilon}$ replaced by $\hat{\epsilon}_1$. Replacing $r(x)$ with the smaller $\hat{\epsilon}_1$ -regularity function $\hat{r}(x)$, without loss of generality we will assume that the conclusions of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 hold with $\hat{r}(x)$ replaced by $r(x)$.

6.1 Main definitions – cylinders and contraction operators

As in Sect. 4.2, we will assume that $F_0 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a **fixed Hölder continuous function** and **m is the Gibbs measure determined by F_0 on M** , while **μ is the related Gibbs measure on R** with respect to the Poincaré map $\mathcal{P} : R \rightarrow R$. We will identify μ with a measure on \tilde{R} so that $\tilde{\Psi} : R \rightarrow \tilde{R}$ is an isomorphism. As in Sect. 4.2, **ν will be the Gibbs measure on U determined by the function F_0** .

In this section, and the next one as well, we assume that the **Anosov flow ϕ_t is contact** and we will use some constructions from Sect. 5.

Next, **fix a compact subset P_0 of $\mathcal{L} \cap R$ with $\mu(P_0) > 0$** so that there exist constants $r_0 > 0$, $R_0 > 0$, $\Gamma_0 > 0$, $L_0 > 0$ with $r(x) \geq r_0$ and $R(x) \leq R_0$, $\Gamma(x) \leq \Gamma_0$, $L(x) \leq L_0$ for all $x \in P_0$. Then P_0 is a **Pesin set for \mathcal{P} on R** . Consequently $\tilde{P}_0 = \tilde{\Psi}(P_0)$ is a Pesin set for $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$. Moreover, shrinking the compact set P_0 slightly and replacing r_0 with a smaller positive constant, we may assume that for every $x \in \tilde{P}_0 \cap \tilde{R}_j$ for some rectangle \tilde{R}_j in $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ we have $B^u(x, r_0) \subset \text{Int}(\tilde{R}_j)$.

From now on we will assume that **$b \in \mathbb{R}$ is a fixed parameter such that $|b| \geq 1$** .

Recall the constants $C_3 > 0$ and $\hat{\epsilon}_7 > 0$ from Lemma 4.3 and the constant $\hat{\epsilon}_{13}$ from Lemma 5.5. Set

$$\hat{\epsilon}_{14} = \hat{\epsilon}_7 + \hat{\epsilon}_{13}/\hat{\tau}_0. \quad (6.1)$$

This is still a constant with $\hat{\epsilon}_{14} \leq \text{const } \hat{\epsilon}$ that can be made arbitrarily small with $\hat{\epsilon}$.

Let $\hat{q} \geq 1$ be the smallest integer so that

$$\frac{C_3 e^{-2\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}}} \leq \frac{1}{|b|}.$$

Then $\frac{1}{|b|} < \frac{C_3 e^{-2(\hat{q}-1)\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}-1}}$, so $\frac{\epsilon'_2}{|b|} < \frac{e^{-2\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}}}$, for some constant $\epsilon'_2 = \frac{e^{-2\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{C_3 \lambda_1} > 0$. Thus, our choice of \hat{q} is so that

$$\frac{\epsilon'_2}{|b|} < \frac{e^{-2\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}}} \leq \frac{\epsilon'_1}{|b|} \quad (6.2)$$

for some constants $\epsilon'_1 = \frac{1}{C_3} > \epsilon'_2 > 0$. **Notice that \hat{q} depends on b .**

Next, for any $z \in P_0$ denote by $m = m(z)$ the length of the cylinder $C(z)$ in R containing z so that $q(z) = [\tau_m(z)] \leq \hat{q}$ and m is maximal with this property, i.e. $\hat{q} < \tau_{m+1}(z)$, so $\hat{q} < \tau_{m+1}(z) \leq q(z) + \tau_0$. Thus (for later use) we have

$$q(z) \leq \hat{q} < q(z) + \tau_0. \quad (6.3)$$

Now $\tau_{m+1}(z) > \hat{q}$ implies $(m+1)\tau_0 > \hat{q}$. Then $m\tilde{\tau}_0 \leq \hat{q} \leq (m+1)\tau_0$, so

$$\hat{m}_1 = [\hat{q}/\tau_0 - 1] \leq \hat{q}/\tau_0 - 1 \leq m(z) \leq \hat{m}_2 = [\hat{q}/\tilde{\tau}_0].$$

In what follows we will be considering cylinders in R intersecting P_0 that have lengths in the interval $[\hat{m}_1, \hat{m}_2]$. **Notice that \hat{m}_1 and \hat{m}_2 depend on b .**

Set

$$\mathbf{K}_0 = \pi^{(U)}(\mathbf{P}_0).$$

This is then a compact subset of U with $\nu(K_0) > 0$.

Given $z \in P_0$, let now $C(z)$ be the cylinder of length $m(z)$ in R containing z . Then (6.2), (6.3), (4.5) and $\hat{\epsilon}_7 < \hat{\epsilon}_{14}$ imply

$$\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(z)) \geq \frac{e^{-q(z)\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{\lambda_1^{q(z)}} \geq \frac{e^{-\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}}} = e^{\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}} \frac{e^{-2\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}}} \geq e^{\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}} \frac{\epsilon'_2}{|b|} \geq e^{q(z)\hat{\epsilon}_{14}} \frac{\epsilon'_2}{|b|}.$$

Similarly, again by (6.2), (6.3) and (4.5),

$$\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(z)) \leq \frac{C_3 e^{q(z)\hat{\epsilon}_7}}{\lambda_1^{q(z)}} \leq \frac{C_3 e^{\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}-\tau_0}} \leq C_3 \lambda_1^{\tau_0} \frac{e^{-2\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{\lambda_1^{\hat{q}}} e^{3\hat{q}\hat{\epsilon}_{14}} \leq C_3 \lambda_1^{\tau_0} \frac{\epsilon'_1}{|b|} e^{3(q(z)+\tau_0)\hat{\epsilon}_{14}} \leq \frac{C'_6 e^{3q(z)\hat{\epsilon}_{14}}}{|b|},$$

where $C'_6 = C_3 \lambda_1^{\tau_0} e^{3\tau_0\hat{\epsilon}_{14}} > 0$ is a global constant.

Let $\mathcal{C}'(z) = \pi^{(U)}(\mathcal{C}(z))$ be the corresponding projection of $\mathcal{C}(z)$ in U . Choose a finite set of points Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{m_0} in P_0 such that the projections $\mathcal{C}'(Z_m)$ cover completely K_0 . If $\mathcal{C}'(Z_m)$ and $\mathcal{C}'(Z_{m'})$ for some $m, m' \leq m_0$ have common interior points (in the topology of U), then one of these cylinders contains the other. So, omitting some of the cylinders, we may assume the points Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{m_0} in P_0 are chosen so that $\mathcal{C}'(Z_m) \cap \mathcal{C}'(Z_{m'}) \cap \hat{U} = \emptyset$ for all $m \neq m'$, and we still have $K_0 \subset \cup_{m=1}^{m_0} \mathcal{C}'(Z_m)$. Then for each $m = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, **$\mathcal{C}_m = \mathcal{C}(Z_m)$ is a cylinder in R containing $Z_m \in P_0$ with $\pi^{(U)}(\mathcal{C}_m) = \mathcal{C}'_m$.** Denote by s_m **the length of the cylinder \mathcal{C}_m .** It follows from the above discussion, the construction of the cylinders \mathcal{C}_m and $s_m \tilde{\tau}_0 \leq \hat{q}(Z_m) \leq s_m \tau_0 + 1$ that there exists a global constant $C_6 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\epsilon_2}{|b|} e^{s_m \hat{\epsilon}_{15}} \leq \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m) \leq \frac{C_6 e^{s_m \hat{\epsilon}_{16}}}{|b|} \quad (6.4)$$

for all $m = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, where $\hat{\epsilon}_{15} = \hat{\epsilon}_{14} \tilde{\tau}_0$ and $\hat{\epsilon}_{16} = 3\hat{\epsilon}_{14} > 3\hat{\epsilon}_{15}$. It follows from (6.1) that **$\hat{\epsilon}_{15} > \hat{\epsilon}_{13}$, the constant from Lemma 5.5.**

For later use, let us mention that (4.5) and the above imply easy estimates for s_m by means of the parameter $|b|$. Indeed, by (6.4) and (4.5) we get

$$-\log |b| + \log \epsilon_2 + s_m \hat{\epsilon}_{15} \leq \log C_3 + s_m \tau_0 \hat{\epsilon}_7 - s_m \tilde{\tau}_0 \log \lambda_1,$$

therefore $s_m(\tilde{\tau}_0 \log \lambda_1 + \hat{\epsilon}_{15} - \tau_0 \hat{\epsilon}_7) < \log |b| - \log \epsilon_2 + \log C_3$, i.e. $s_m < D_1 \log |b|$ for some global constant $D_1 > 0$. In a similar way from the other sides of (6.4) and (4.5) we get

$$-\log |b| + \log C_6 + s_m \hat{\epsilon}_{16} \geq -\log C_3 - s_m \hat{\epsilon}_7 / \tilde{\tau}_0 - s_m \tau_0 \log \lambda_1,$$

so $s_m(\tau_0 \log \lambda_1 + \hat{\epsilon}_7 / \tilde{\tau}_0 + \hat{\epsilon}_{16}) > \log |b| - \log C_3 - \log C_6$, that is there exists a global constant $D_2 > 0$ so that (for sufficiently large $|b|$ and s_m) we have $s_m \geq \frac{1}{D_2} \log |b|$. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{D_2} \log |b| \leq s_m \leq D_1 \log |b|. \quad (6.5)$$

Set

$$\mathbf{V}_b = \cup_{m=1}^{m_0} \mathcal{C}'_m \subset \mathbf{U}. \quad (6.6)$$

It follows from the construction that $K_0 \subset V_b$, so $\nu(V_b) \geq 2\gamma_2$, where

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}\nu(\mathbf{K}_0) > 0$$

is a **constant independent of b** .

Let $N_0 \geq 1$ be the global constant from Lemma 5.5. **Fix an arbitrary integer $N \geq N_0$** . For every cylinder $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m$ ($1 \leq m \leq m_0$) we will now use the fixed point $Z_m \in \tilde{P}_0$ and Lemma 5.5. It follows from the latter that there exist finite families $\{\Gamma_m^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{j_m}$ and $\{\Lambda_m^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{j_m}$ of sub-cylinders of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m$ for some integer j_m (depending on m) such that

$$\cup_{j=1}^{j_m} \Gamma_m^{(j)} = \Gamma_m \quad , \quad \cup_{j=1}^{j_m} \Lambda_m^{(j)} = \Lambda_m,$$

where Γ_m and Λ_m are disjoint subsets of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m$ with

$$\nu(\pi^{(U)}(\Gamma_m)) \geq d_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m) \quad , \quad \nu(\pi^{(U)}(\Lambda_m)) \geq d_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$$

for some global constant $d_5 \in (0, 1)$, and for any $j = 1, \dots, j_m$ and any $i = 1, 2$ there exist a (Hölder) continuous map

$$B^u(Z_m, \epsilon'') \ni x \mapsto v_{i,j}^{(m)}(x) = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(Z_m, x) \in U,$$

where $z' = \pi^{(U)}(z) \in U$, such that $\sigma^N(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(x)) = x$ for all $x \in B^u(Z_m, \epsilon'')$ and the following property holds:

$$\mathbf{I}_N(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z}') = |\psi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}') - \psi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{z}')| \geq \delta_1 \mathbf{e}^{-s_{\mathbf{m}} \hat{\epsilon}_{13}} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{m}}) \quad (6.7)$$

for all $z \in \Lambda_j^{(m)}$ and $x \in \Gamma_j^{(m)}$, where $z' = \pi^{(U)}(z)$, $x' = \pi^{(U)}(x) \in U$,

$$\psi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) = \tau_N(\mathbf{v}_{1,j}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{x})) - \tau_N(\mathbf{v}_{2,j}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{x})).$$

In the above we use the constant

$$\delta_1 = 4\mathbf{c}_0 \delta_0 \mathbf{d}_2 > 0,$$

where δ_0 and d_2 are as in Lemma 5.5.

For later convenience we will now slightly change the notation involving the sub-cylinders $\Gamma_j^{(m)}$ and $\Lambda_j^{(m)}$. Namely, set

$$\Gamma_{1,j}^{(m)} = \Gamma_j^{(m)} \quad , \quad \Gamma_{2,j}^{(m)} = \Lambda_j^{(m)}$$

for all $m = 1, \dots, m_0$ and all $j = 1, \dots, j_m$. We will also use the notation

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)} = \pi^{(U)}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}) \subset U.$$

According to Lemma 5.5 again, the sub-cylinders $\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ can be chosen to have **lengths not exceeding $T_1 s_m + T_2$** for some global constants $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and moreover satisfy the following condition

$$\frac{1}{d_4} \leq \frac{\nu(\hat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)})}{\nu(\Gamma_{i',j'}^{(m)})} \leq d_4 \quad (6.8)$$

for all $i, i' = 1, 2$ and $j, j' = 1, \dots, j_m$, where $d_4 > 1$ is a global constant as in Lemma 5.5.

Set $\alpha_3 = \alpha_1 \beta \in (0, 1)$, where $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is the constant from Sect. 5. As a final step concerning the construction and properties of the sub-cylinders $\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$, observe that by replacing each $\Gamma_{1,j}^{(m)}$ by a family of sub-cylinders of its by a similar family of sub-cylinders (one-to-one with the family in $\Gamma_{1,j}^{(m)}$), we can arrange so that

$$\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}) \leq \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{b}|} \right)^{1/\alpha_3} \quad (6.9)$$

for all i and all j , and still have the condition (6.8).

In what follows we assume that our sub-cylinders $\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ satisfy both (6.8) and (6.9) for all $i, i' = 1, 2$ and all $j, j' = 1, \dots, j_m$.

Set $\mathcal{D}_m = \Gamma_m \cup \Lambda_m$. This is then a subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m$ which is a union of sub-cylinders and has $\nu(\mathcal{D}'_m) \geq 2d_5\nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$, where $\mathcal{D}'_m = \pi^{(U)}(\mathcal{D}_m) \subset U$.

For every $m = 1, \dots, m_0$ using the point $Z'_m \in U$ fix maps $v_{i,j}^{(m)}(Z'_m, \cdot)$ with the properties described above. For any $i = 1, 2$, $m = 1, \dots, m_0$, and $j = 1, \dots, j_m$ set

$$v_{i,j}^{(m)} = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(Z'_m, \cdot) \quad , \quad X_{i,j}^{(m)} = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}) \subset U.$$

By Lemma 4.1(a), the *characteristic function* $\omega_{i,j}^{(m)} = \chi_{X_{i,j}^{(m)}} : \hat{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of $X_{i,j}^{(m)}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U})$ and $\text{Lip}_\theta(\omega_{i,j}^{(m)}) \leq 1/\text{diam}_\theta(X_{i,j}^{(m)})$.

Fix an arbitrary constant μ_0 with

$$0 < \mu_0 \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1 - \cos \epsilon_3}{20} \right\}, \quad (6.10)$$

where $\epsilon_3 = \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_0 \delta_0 \epsilon_2 / 16, \pi / 32\}$.

The so called contraction operators are now defined similarly to what was done in [St4]. A subset J of the set

$$\Pi(b) = \{ (i, m, j) : 1 \leq i \leq 2, 1 \leq m \leq m_0, 1 \leq j \leq j_m \}$$

will be called *representative* if for every $m = 1, \dots, m_0$ and every $j = 1, \dots, j_m$ there exists at most one $i = 1, 2$ such that $(i, m, j) \in J$, and for any $m = 1, \dots, m_0$ we have

$$\sum_{(i,m,j) \in J} \nu(\hat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4d_4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m), \quad (6.11)$$

where $d_4 > 1$ and $d_5 \in (0, 1)$ are the global constants from Lemma 5.5. Let $\mathcal{J}(b)$ be the *family of all representative subsets* J of $\Pi(b)$.

Given $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$, define the function $\omega_J : \hat{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$\omega_J = 1 - \mu_0 \sum_{(i,m,j) \in J} \omega_{i,j}^{(m)}.$$

Then $\omega_J \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U})$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq 1 - \mu_0 \leq \omega_J(u) \leq 1$ for all $u \in \hat{U}$. Define the **contraction operator**

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_J(a, b) : \mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U}) \quad \text{by} \quad \mathcal{N}h = \mathcal{M}_a^N(\omega_J \cdot h),$$

where $\mathcal{M}_a = L_{f(a)}$ is as in Sect. 4.2.

Remark. The contraction operators \mathcal{N}_J resemble the operators defined and studied by Dolgopyat in Sect. 7 in [D], although here the construction is necessarily much more complicated. In fact it is significantly more complicated than the constructions used in [St2] and [St4] for rather obvious reasons – before we were dealing with sub-cylinders \mathcal{D}_j of the cylinders \mathcal{C}_m having a fixed co-length q_1 . The sizes and measures of such sub-cylinders \mathcal{D}_j were easily comparable with these of the cylinders \mathcal{C}_m . Here we deal with a variety of sub-cylinders $\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ of the cylinders \mathcal{C}_m whose individual sizes and measures are not clearly comparable with these of the cylinders \mathcal{C}_m . What matters is the 'size' of the whole family of these and in particular the condition (6.11) above.

We will now prove some basic properties of the contraction operators. Our exposition here is similar to that in Sect. 6.2 in [St4], however there are some substantial differences.

Recall the constant $1/\gamma^{\alpha_1} \leq \theta < 1$ from Sect. 4.2. Fix a constant $\theta_1 \in (0, \theta)$ with

$$0 < \theta_1 = \theta^{1/\alpha_2} < \theta. \quad (6.12)$$

Set $\alpha_3 = \alpha_1\beta$ as before, where $\beta > 0$ is the constant from Sect. 5, and

$$\theta_2 = \max\{\theta, 1/\gamma^{\alpha_3}\}.$$

Clearly $1 > \theta_2 \geq \theta > \theta_1$.

If \mathcal{C} is a cylinder of length k in U , then by Lemma 4.1(c) we have

$$\text{diam}_{\theta_1}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) = \theta_1^k = \theta^{k/\alpha_2} = (\text{diam}_{\theta}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{1/\alpha_2} \leq (C_1 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{\alpha_2})^{1/\alpha_2} = C_1^{1/\alpha_2} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}).$$

Taking the constant $C_7 \geq C_1^{1/\alpha_2}$, we get

$$\text{diam}_{\theta_1}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq C_7 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \leq C_7 (\text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}))^{\alpha_3} \quad (6.13)$$

for every cylinder \mathcal{C} in U .

Fix a large constant $E > 0$ and another global constant $\epsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ so that

$$E \geq \frac{3T_0 e^{T_0/(1-\theta)}}{1-\theta}, \quad 0 < \epsilon_1 \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{32C_0R_0}, \frac{1}{4EC_1R_0^2}\right\}. \quad (6.14)$$

Throughout the rest of this section **we assume that $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$** . Then $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta}(\widehat{U})$ as well, since $0 < \theta_1 < \theta < 1$ implies $\mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U}) \subset \mathcal{F}_{\theta}(\widehat{U})$.

For any $u, u' \in \widehat{U}$, we will denote by $\ell(u, u') \geq 0$ the length of the smallest cylinder $Y(u, u')$ in \widehat{U} containing u and u' . Notice that for every $p \geq 1$, $\sigma^p(Y(u, u'))$ is the smallest cylinder $Y(\sigma^p(u), \sigma^p(u'))$ in U containing both $\sigma^p(u)$ and $\sigma^p(u')$. Indeed, let X be a cylinder in U containing both $\sigma^p(u)$ and $\sigma^p(u')$ and let $X \subset \sigma^p(Y(u, u'))$. Then every $x \in X$ has the form $x = \sigma^p(y)$ for some $y \in Y(u, u')$. Let $Y' = \{y \in Y(u, u') : \sigma^p(y) \in X\}$. Since X is a cylinder in U , Y' is a cylinder in U , too. Now $u, u' \in Y'$ imply $Y(u, u') \subset Y'$, therefore $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset X$. This proves that $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) = Y(\sigma^p(u), \sigma^p(u'))$.

Now, similarly to what we did in [St4] we define a special distance \mathcal{D} on U that depends on the cylinders \mathcal{C}_m and therefore on the parameter b as well.

Definition 6.1. Define the **distance $\mathcal{D}(u, u')$** for $u, u' \in \widehat{U}$ by:

- (i) $\mathcal{D}(u, u') = 0$ if $u = u'$;

(ii) Let $u \neq u'$, and let there exist $p \geq 0$ with $\ell(u, u') \geq p$ and $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some $(i, m, j) \in J$. Take the maximal p with this property and the corresponding (i, m, j) and set

$$\mathcal{D}(u, u') = \frac{D_\theta(u, u')}{\text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)})}.$$

(iii) Assume $u \neq u'$, however there is no $p \geq 0$ with the property described in (ii). Then set $\mathcal{D}(u, u') = 1$.

Notice that $\mathcal{D}(u, u') \leq 1$ always. Indeed, in the case (ii), $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$, so

$$D_\theta(u, u') = \theta^p D_\theta(\sigma^p(u), \sigma^p(u')) \leq \theta^p \text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}) \leq \text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}).$$

Also, if $u, u' \in \mathcal{C}'_m$ for some m , then clearly $D_\theta(u, u') \leq \mathcal{D}(u, u')$.

Before we continue, notice that it follows from (6.8) and (4.2) that there exists a global constant $d_6 > 0$ such that for every $m = 1, \dots, m_0$ and all $i, i' = 1, 2$ and $j, j' = 1, \dots, j_m$ we have

$$|\text{length}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}) - \text{length}(\Gamma_{i',j'}^{(m)})| \leq \mathbf{d}_6. \quad (6.15)$$

Some basic properties of \mathcal{D} are contained in the following, which is similar to Lemma 6.4 in [St4].

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that $u, u' \in \widehat{U}$, $u \neq u'$, and $\sigma^N(v) = u$, $\sigma^N(v') = u'$ for some $v, v' \in \widehat{U}$ with $\ell(v, v') \geq N$.*

(a) *We have $\mathcal{D}(v, v') \leq \theta^N \mathcal{D}(u, u')$.*

(b) *Assume in addition that $\omega_J(v) < 1$ and $\omega_J(v') = 1$ for some $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$. Then*

$$|\omega_J(v) - \omega_J(v')| \leq \frac{\mu_0}{\theta^{d_6}} \mathcal{D}(u, u').$$

Proof. (a) If there is no $p \geq 0$ with $\ell(u, u') \geq p$ and $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some $(i, m, j) \in J$, then by definition $\mathcal{D}(u, u') = 1$, so $\mathcal{D}(v, v') \leq D_\theta(v, v') = \theta^N D_\theta(u, u') \leq \theta^N \mathcal{D}(u, u')$.

Assume that there exists $p \geq 0$ with $\ell(u, u') \geq p$ and $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some $(i, m, j) \in J$. Let p be the maximal integer with the given property. Consider the corresponding (i, m, j) . Then $\sigma^{p+N}(Y(v, v')) \subset \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$, $\ell(v, v') \geq p + N$, and $p + N$ is the maximal integer with this property. Thus,

$$\mathcal{D}(v, v') = \frac{D_\theta(v, v')}{\text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)})} = \theta^N \frac{D_\theta(u, u')}{\text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)})} = \theta^N \mathcal{D}(u, u').$$

(b) If there is no $p \geq 0$ with $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_m$, $\ell(u, u') \geq p$, for some $m = 1, \dots, m_0$, then by definition $\mathcal{D}(u, u') = 1$, so $|\omega_J(v) - \omega_J(v')| \leq \mu_0 \leq \mu_0 \mathcal{D}(u, u')$.

Next, assume that there exists $p \geq 0$ with $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_m$, $\ell(u, u') \geq p$, for some $m = 1, \dots, m_0$. Let $p \geq 0$ be the maximal number with $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_m$ for some $m = 1, \dots, m_0$, and let $\sigma^p(Y(u, u')) \subset \Gamma_{i',j'}^{(m)}$ for some $(i', m, j') \in J$ so that $\mathcal{D}(u, u') = \frac{D_\theta(u, u')}{\text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i',j'}^{(m)})}$.

Let $\omega_J(v) < 1$; then $v \in X_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some $(i, m, j) \in J$, so $u = \sigma^N(v) \in \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$. However $u' = \sigma^N(v') \notin \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$, so $D_\theta(u, u') \geq \text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)})$ and $Y(u, u') \supset \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$. If ℓ is the length of $\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ and ℓ' that of $\Gamma_{i',j'}^{(m)}$, then by (6.15), $|\ell - \ell'| \leq d_6$, therefore $\text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}) \geq \theta^{d_6} \text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i',j'}^{(m)})$. Thus,

$$|\omega(v) - \omega(v')| = \mu_0 = \mu_0 \frac{D_\theta(u, u')}{D_\theta(u, u')} \leq \mu_0 \frac{D_\theta(u, u')}{\text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)})} \leq \frac{\mu_0 D_\theta(u, u')}{\theta^{d_6} \text{diam}_\theta(\Gamma_{i',j'}^{(m)})} = \frac{\mu_0}{\theta^{d_6}} \mathcal{D}(u, u').$$

This proves the lemma. ■

Recall the large constant E with (6.14). Denote by \mathcal{K}_E be the set of all functions $H \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ such that $H > 0$ on \widehat{U} and

$$\frac{|H(u) - H(u')|}{H(u')} \leq E \mathcal{D}(u, u')$$

for all $u, u' \in \widehat{U}$ such that $u, u' \in \mathcal{C}_m$ for some $m \leq m_0$.

We can now derive a Lasota-Yorke type inequality for functions in \mathcal{K}_E . Its proof is the same as that of Lemma 6.5 in [St4].

Lemma 6.3. *For any $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ we have $\mathcal{N}_J(\mathcal{K}_E) \subset \mathcal{K}_E$.*

6.2 Estimates for the eigenfunctions h_a

Let again $N \geq N_0$ be a fixed integer. In this section we will frequently work under the following

Assumption: for points $u, u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)} = \pi^{(U)}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)})$ for some $m = 1, \dots, m_0$, $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1, \dots, j_m$, an integer $p \geq 0$ and points $v, v' \in U$ we have:

$$\sigma^p(v) = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u), \quad \sigma^p(v') = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'), \quad \ell(v, v') \geq p. \quad (6.16)$$

Notice that the latter implies $\ell(v, v') \geq N + p$, $\sigma^{N+p}(v) = u$ and $\sigma^{N+p}(v') = u'$.

The first of the following estimates is similar to the one in Lemma 6.6 in [St4].

Lemma 6.4. *There exists a global constant $C_8 > 0$ independent of b and N such that if the points $u, u' \in U$, the cylinder \mathcal{C}_m , the integer $p \geq 0$ and the points $v, v' \in U$ satisfy (6.16) for some $j = 1, \dots, j_m$ and $i = 1, 2$, and $w, w' \in U$ are such that $\sigma^N w = v$, $\sigma^N w' = v'$ and $\ell(w, w') \geq N$, then*

$$|\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w')| \leq C_8 \theta_2^{p+N} \text{diam}(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_m).$$

If we assume in addition that $u, u' \in \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1, \dots, j_m$, then

$$|\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w')| \leq C_8 \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3}.$$

Proof. Assume that the points u, u', v, v', w, w' and the cylinder \mathcal{C} satisfy the assumptions in the lemma. Clearly, $\ell(w, w') \geq p + 2N$ and

$$\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w') = [\tau_{p+2N}(w) - \tau_{p+2N}(w')] - [\tau_{p+N}(v) - \tau_{p+N}(v')]. \quad (6.17)$$

Consider now some fixed $j = 1, \dots, j_m$ and $i = 1, 2$. Recall the construction of the map $v_{i,j}^{(m)}$ from the proof of Lemma 5.5. In particular by (5.65), $\mathcal{P}^N(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)) = \pi_{b_i^{(j)}}(u)$, where we set $b_i^{(j)} = b_i^{(j)}(Z_m) \in W_R^s(Z_m)$ for brevity. Since $\sigma^p(v) = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)$ and $\sigma^p(v') = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u')$, we have $\sigma^{p+2N}(w) = \sigma^{p+N}(v) = u$ and $\sigma^{p+2N}(w') = \sigma^{p+N}(v') = u'$, so both $x' = \mathcal{P}^{p+N}(v)$ and $z' = \mathcal{P}^{p+N}(v')$ belong to $W_R^u(b')$ for some $b' \in W_R^s(Z_m)$. Then $\pi^{(U)}(x') = u$ and $\pi^{(U)}(z') = u'$. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}^p(v) \in W_R^s(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))$ and the choice of N imply (as in the proof of Lemma 5.5) that $d(b_i^{(j)}, b') < \delta'$, the constant with (5.41) from Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5. Similarly, $x'' = \mathcal{P}^{p+2N}(w)$ and $z'' = \mathcal{P}^{p+2N}(w')$ belong to $W_R^u(b'')$ for some $b'' \in W_R^s(Z_m)$ with $d(b_i^{(j)}, b'') < \delta'$, and $\pi^{(U)}(x'') = u$, $\pi^{(U)}(z'') = u'$. Thus, $x', x'' \in W_R^s(u)$ and $z', z'' \in W_R^s(u')$. Moreover, since the

local stable/unstable holonomy maps are uniformly α_1 -Hölder (by the choice of α_1), there exists a global constant $C'_8 > 0$ such that

$$d(b', b'') \leq C'_8 (d(\mathcal{P}^{p+N}(v), \mathcal{P}^{p+2N}(w)))^{\alpha_1}.$$

Using this and (2.1) for points on local stable manifolds, i.e. going backwards along the flow, we get

$$d(b', b'') \leq C'_8 (d(\mathcal{P}^{p+N}(v), \mathcal{P}^{p+2N}(w)))^{\alpha_1} \leq C'_8 \left(\frac{d(v, \mathcal{P}^N(w))}{c_0 \gamma^{p+N}} \right)^{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{C'_8}{c_0^{\alpha_1} \gamma^{\alpha_1 N}}. \quad (6.18)$$

Hence, by the definition of θ_2 ,

$$(d(b', b''))^\beta \leq (C'_8/c_0^{\alpha_1})^\beta (1/\gamma^{p+N})^{\alpha_1 \beta} \leq C''_8 \theta_2^{p+N}.$$

We are preparing to use Lemma 5.3. Let $\check{u} \in R$ and $\check{u}' \in R$ be the shifts along the flow of the points $\pi_{Z_m}(u)$ and $\pi_{Z_m}(u')$. Then we have $\check{u} = \phi_{t(u)}(\pi_{Z_m}(u))$ and $\check{u}' = \phi_{t(u')}(\pi_{Z_m}(u'))$ for some small $t(u), t(u') \in \mathbb{R}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{p+N}(v) - \tau_{p+N}(v') &= \Delta(\mathcal{P}^{p+N}(v), \mathcal{P}^{p+N}(v')) = \Delta(x', z') = \Delta(u, \pi_{b'}(u')) \\ &= \Delta(\pi_{Z_m}(u), \pi_{b'}(\pi_{Z_m}(u'))) = \Delta(\check{u}, \pi_{b'}(\check{u}')) - t(u) + t(u'), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\tau_{p+2N}(w) - \tau_{p+2N}(w') = \Delta(\mathcal{P}^{p+2N}(w), \mathcal{P}^{p+2N}(w')) = \Delta(\check{u}, \pi_{b''}(\check{u}')) - t(u) + t(u').$$

The above and (6.17) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w')| &= |[\Delta(\check{u}, \pi_{b'}(\check{u}')) - t(u) + t(u')] - [\Delta(\check{u}, \pi_{b''}(\check{u}')) - t(u) + t(u')]| \\ &= |\Delta(\check{u}, \pi_{b'}(\check{u}')) - \Delta(\check{u}, \pi_{b''}(\check{u}'))|. \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, denoting by $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{R}$ and $\tilde{u}' \in \tilde{R}$ the shifts along the flow of the points \check{u} and \check{u}' , respectively, we get $|\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w')| = |\Delta(\tilde{u}, \pi_{b'}(\tilde{u}')) - \Delta(\tilde{u}, \pi_{b''}(\tilde{u}'))|$. This, the above estimate and Lemma 5.3 yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w')| &= |\Delta(\tilde{u}, \pi_{b'}(\tilde{u}')) - \Delta(\tilde{u}, \pi_{b''}(\tilde{u}'))| \leq C_4 \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m) (d(b', b''))^\beta \\ &\leq C_4 C''_8 \theta_2^{p+N} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m). \end{aligned}$$

Next, assume that $u, u' \in \Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some i, j . We will now use Corollary 5.2 and some relatively rough estimates. It follows from the above that

$$|\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w')| = |\Delta(\tilde{u}, \pi_{a'}(\tilde{u}')) - \Delta(\tilde{u}, \pi_{a''}(\tilde{u}'))| = |\Delta(\hat{u}, \pi_{b'}(\hat{u}')) - \Delta(\hat{u}, \pi_{b''}(\hat{u}'))|, \quad (6.19)$$

where $\hat{u} = \mathcal{T}_{Z_m}(\pi_{Z_m}(u))$ and $\hat{u}' = \mathcal{T}_{Z_m}(\pi_{Z_m}(u'))$ are the corresponding shifts along the flow in $W_{e_0}^u(Z_m)$. Corollary 5.2 now implies

$$|\Delta(\hat{u}, \pi_{b'}(\hat{u}'))| \leq C_0 (d(\hat{u}, \hat{u}'))^\beta (d(b_1, b'))^\beta, \quad |\Delta(\hat{u}, \pi_{b''}(\hat{u}'))| \leq C_0 (d(\hat{u}, \hat{u}'))^\beta (d(b_1, b''))^\beta.$$

Now the α_1 -Hölder continuity of the local holonomy maps (both stable and unstable) implies

$$d(\hat{u}, \hat{u}') \leq \text{Const} (d(\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}'))^{\alpha_1} \leq \text{Const} (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_1}.$$

On the other hand, similarly to the derivation of (6.18) we get

$$d(b_i^{(j)}, b') \leq C'_8 (d(\mathcal{P}^N(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)), \mathcal{P}^{2N}(w)))^{\alpha_1} \leq C'_8 \left(\frac{d(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u), \mathcal{P}^N(w))}{c_0 \gamma^N} \right)^{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{C'_8}{c_0^{\alpha_1} \gamma^{\alpha_1 N}},$$

and $d(b_i^{(j)}, b'') \leq d(b_i^{(j)}, b') + d(b', b'') \leq \frac{2C'_8}{c_0^{\alpha_1} \gamma^{\alpha_1 N}}$. Thus, $(d(b_i^{(j)}, b'))^\beta \leq C''_8 \frac{1}{\gamma^{\alpha_1 \beta N}} \leq C''_8 \theta_2^N$, and similarly $(d(b_i^{(j)}, b''))^\beta \leq C''_8 \theta_2^N$.

Combing the above estimates with (6.19) and using $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_3$, we now obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_N(w) - \tau_N(w')| &\leq |\Delta(\hat{u}, \pi_{d'}(\hat{u}'))| + |\Delta(\hat{u}, \pi_{d''}(\hat{u}''))| \\ &\leq C_0 (d(\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}'))^{\beta \alpha_1} C_8''' \theta_2^N \leq C_8 \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. ■

Set $M_1 = M_0 + a_0$ (see Sect. 2 for the choice of M_0). Let T_0 be as in (4.4), and let $E_1 = 2C_9 e^{C_9}$, where $C_9 = \frac{T_0 C'_2}{1 - \theta} + M_1 C_8$, and $C_8 > 0$ is the constant from Lemma 6.4. Assume the fixed number N is so large that $\theta_2^N e^{C_9} \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Denote by \mathcal{K}_0 the set of all $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(U)$ such that $h \geq 0$ on U and for any $u, u' \in U$ contained in some cylinder $\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)} = \pi^{(U)}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)})$ ($1 \leq m \leq m_0$, $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1, \dots, j_m$), any integer $p \geq 0$ and any points $v, v' \in U$ satisfying (6.16) we have

$$|\mathbf{h}(v) - \mathbf{h}(v')| \leq \mathbf{E}_1 \theta_2^N \mathbf{h}(v') (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3}. \quad (6.20)$$

It turns out that the eigenfunctions $h_a \in \mathcal{K}_0$ for $|a| \leq a_0$ (see Sect. 4.2). This follows from the following lemma whose proof (omitted here) is almost identical, modulo the different assumption in (6.16), with that of Lemma 6.7 in [St4].

Lemma 6.5. *For any real constant s with $|s| \leq M_1$ we have $L_{f-s\tau}^{qN}(\mathcal{K}_0) \subset \mathcal{K}_0$ for all integers $q \geq 1$.*

Corollary 6.6. *For any real constant a with $|a| \leq a_0$ we have $h_a \in \mathcal{K}_0$.*

Proof. Let $|a| \leq a_0$. Since the constant function $h = 1 \in \mathcal{K}_0$, it follows from Lemma 6.5 that $L_{f-(P+a)\tau}^{qN} 1 \in \mathcal{K}_0$ for all $q \geq 1$. Now the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius Theorem (see e.g. [PP]) and the fact that \mathcal{K}_0 is closed in $\mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$ imply $h_a \in \mathcal{K}_0$. ■

7 Iteration procedure – the role of the contact structure

We continue here with the notation and the assumptions in Sect. 6. Let the fixed constant $E > 1$ be as in (6.14). Set

$$\epsilon_4 = \min \left\{ \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_2}{16}, \frac{\pi}{32}, \ln \frac{19}{16} \right\},$$

where $\delta_1 = 4c_0 \delta_0 d_2 > 0$ as defined in Sect. 6.1.

Denote by \mathcal{K}_b the set of all pairs (h, H) such that $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$, $H \in \mathcal{K}_E$, and the following two conditions are satisfied:

(T1) $|h| \leq H$ on \widehat{U} ,

(T2) for any $u, u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some $m = 1, \dots, m_0$, $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, \dots, j_m$, any integer $p \geq 0$ and any points $v, v' \in \widehat{U}$ satisfying (6.16) for (i, m, j) we have

$$|\mathbf{h}(v) - \mathbf{h}(v')| \leq \mathbf{E} |b| \theta_2^N \mathbf{H}(v') (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3}. \quad (7.1)$$

Notice that the above and (6.9) imply

$$E |b| \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} \leq E \theta_2^N < \frac{\epsilon_4}{32}, \quad (7.2)$$

assuming $N \geq N_0$ and N_0 is sufficiently large.

The following lemma is fundamental for the iteration procedure that will be used in Sect. 9 which will show that the so called contraction operators are "eventually" contracting. The idea behind all this is in Lemma 10'' in [D] (see Sects. 6, 7 and 8 in [D]) although here we do everything in much higher generality.

Lemma 7.1. *Choosing $E > 1$ as above, for any $|a| \leq a_0$, any $|b| \geq 1$, any $N \geq N_0$ and any $(h, H) \in \mathcal{K}_b$ there exists $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ such that $(L_{ab}^N h, \mathcal{N}_J H) \in \mathcal{K}_b$.*

To prove this we need the following lemma, whose proof is very similar to that of Lemma 14 in [D] (and essentially the same as that of Lemma 6.10 proved in the Appendix in [St4]).

Lemma 7.2. *Let $(h, H) \in \mathcal{K}_b$. Then for any $m = 1, \dots, m_0$, any $j = 1, \dots, j_m$ and any $i = 1, 2$ we have:*

(a) $\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{H(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))}{H(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u''))} \leq 2$ for all $u', u'' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$;

(b) *Either $H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) \geq H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))/4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ or $H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)) \geq H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))/4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$.*

(c) *Either for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ we have $|h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))| \leq \frac{3}{4}H(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))$, or $|h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))| \geq \frac{1}{4}H(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$.*

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Let $|a| \leq a_0$, $|b| \geq 1$ and $(h, H) \in \mathcal{K}_b$. We will construct a representative set $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ such that $(L_{ab}^N h, \mathcal{N}_J H) \in \mathcal{K}_b$.

Consider for a moment an arbitrary (at this stage) representative set J . We will first show that $(L_{ab}^N h, \mathcal{N}_J H)$ has property (T2). This is done exactly as in the proof of Lemma 6.9 in [St4].

Assume that the points u, u' , the cylinder C'_m in U , the integer $p \geq 0$ and the points $v, v' \in \widehat{U}$ satisfy (7.1) for some $i = 1, 2$, $m = 1, \dots, m_0$ and $j = 1, \dots, j_m$.

From the definition of $f^{(a)}$, for any w, w' with $\sigma^N w = v$, $\sigma^N(w') = v'$ and $\ell(w, w') \geq N$ we have

$$f_N^{(a)}(w) = f_N(w) - (P + a)\tau_N(w) + \ln h_a(w) - \ln h_a(v) - N\lambda_a.$$

Since $h_a \in \mathcal{K}_0$ by Corollary 6.6,

$$|\ln h_a(w) - \ln h_a(w')| \leq \frac{|h_a(w) - h_a(w')|}{\min\{|h_a(w)|, |h_a(w')|\}} \leq E_1 \theta_2^{2N} (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3},$$

and similarly, $|\ln h_a(v) - \ln h_a(v')| \leq E_1 \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3}$. Using this, Lemma 6.4 and (6.13) and assuming $|f|_{\theta_1} \leq T_0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |f_N(w) - f_N(w')| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |f(\sigma^j(w)) - f(\sigma^j(w'))| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |f|_{\theta_1} \theta_1^{N-j} D_{\theta_1}(v, v') \leq \frac{T_0 D_{\theta_1}(v, v')}{1 - \theta_1} \\ &\leq \frac{T_0}{1 - \theta_1} \theta_1^{p+N} C_7 (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} \leq C'_{10} \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C'_{10} = \frac{T_0 C_7}{1 - \theta_1}$, and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} |f_N^{(a)}(w) - f_N^{(a)}(w')| &\leq C_7 \theta_2^{2N} (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} + 2E_1 \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} \\ &\leq (C_7 + 2E_1) \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} \leq \epsilon_4, \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

assuming $N \geq N_0$ and N_0 is sufficiently large.

Hence for any a and b with $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq 1$, using (7.1), (7.3) and Lemma 6.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(L_{ab}^N h)(v) - (L_{ab}^N h)(v')| &= \left| \sum_{\sigma^N w=v} e^{(f_N^{(a)} - \mathbf{i}b\tau_N)(w)} h(w) - \sum_{\sigma^N w=v} e^{(f_N^{(a)} - \mathbf{i}b\tau_N)(w'(w))} h(w'(w)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{\sigma^N w=v} e^{(f_N^{(a)} - \mathbf{i}b\tau_N)(w)} [h(w) - h(w')] \right| + \sum_{\sigma^N w=v} \left| e^{(f_N^{(a)} - \mathbf{i}b\tau_N)(w)} - e^{(f_N^{(a)} - \mathbf{i}b\tau_N)(w')} \right| |h(w')| \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma^N w=v} e^{(f_N^{(a)}(w) - f_N^{(a)}(w'))} e^{f_N^{(a)}(w')} E|b| \theta_2^{2N} (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} H(w') \\ &\quad + \sum_{\sigma^N w=v} \left| e^{(f_N^{(a)} - \mathbf{i}b\tau_N)(w)} - e^{(f_N^{(a)} - \mathbf{i}b\tau_N)(w')} \right| e^{f_N^{(a)}(w')} H(w') \\ &\leq e E|b| \theta_2^{2N} (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)(v') + e (C_7 + 2E_1 + C_8 |b|) \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)(v') \\ &\leq [2e E \theta_2^N + 2e(C'_{10} + 2E_1 + C_8)] |b| \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} (\mathcal{N}_J H)(v') \\ &\leq E|b| \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} (\mathcal{N}_J H)(v'), \end{aligned}$$

assuming $2e\theta_2^N \leq 1/2$ and $2e(C'_{10} + 2E_1 + C_8) \leq E/2$. Thus, $(L_{ab}^N h, \mathcal{N}_J H)$ has property (T2).

So far the choice of J was not important. We will now construct a representative set J so that $(L_{ab}^N h, \mathcal{N}_J H)$ has property (T1), namely

$$|L_{ab}^N h|(u) \leq (\mathcal{N}_J H)(u) \quad (7.4)$$

for all $u \in \widehat{U}$.

Notice that (7.4) is trivially satisfied for $u \notin V_b$ for any choice of $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$. So we need to deal with those u that belong to \mathcal{C}'_m for some $m = 1, \dots, m_0$.

Fix an arbitrary $m = 1, \dots, m_0$. We will construct a family of pairs (i, j) with $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, \dots, j_m$ so that (i, m, j) will be included in J , namely a family which satisfies (6.11). That is, for the given m , we need to construct a family

$$\mathcal{F}_m \subset \{(i, j) : i = 1, 2 ; 1 \leq j \leq j_m\}$$

so that

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{F}_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4d_4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m), \quad (7.5)$$

and (7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ whenever $(i, j) \in \mathcal{F}_m$.

Define the functions $\tilde{\psi}_m, \gamma_m^{(1)}, \gamma_m^{(2)} : \widehat{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\tilde{\psi}_m(u) = e^{(f_N^{(a)} + ib\tau_N)(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} h(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) + e^{(f_N^{(a)} + ib\tau_N)(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))} h(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)),$$

$$\gamma_m^{(1)}(u) = (1 - \mu_0) e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) + e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))} H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)),$$

while $\gamma_m^{(2)}(u)$ is defined similarly with a coefficient $(1 - \mu_0)$ in front of the second term.

Recall the functions

$$\psi_m(u) = \tau_N(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) - \tau_N(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)) \quad , \quad u \in U$$

that appear in (6.7).

Next, denote by \mathcal{F}'_m the set of those $(i, j) \in \mathcal{F}_m$ so that the first alternative in Lemma 7.2(c) holds for i, j , and by \mathcal{F}''_m the set of those $(i, j) \in \mathcal{F}_m$ so that the second alternative in Lemma 7.2(c) holds for i, j .

Case 1. Assume that $\sum_{(1,j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$. Consider an arbitrary $(1, j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m$. Given $u \in \Gamma_{1,j}^{(m)}$, $\mu_0 \leq 1/4$ and $|h(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))| \leq \frac{3}{4} H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))$ imply $|\tilde{\psi}_m(u)| \leq \gamma_m^{(1)}(u)$, so if $(1, m, j) \in J$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |(L_{ab}^N h)(u)| &\leq \left| \sum_{\sigma^N v=u, v \neq v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u), v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)} e^{(f_N^{(a)} + ib\tau_N)(v)} h(v) \right| + |\tilde{\psi}_m(u)| \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma^N v=u, v \neq v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u), v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)} e^{f_N^{(a)}(v)} |h(v)| + \gamma_m^{(1)}(u) \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma^N v=u, v \neq v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u), v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)} e^{f_N^{(a)}(v)} \omega_J(v) H(v) \\ &\quad + \left[e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} \omega_J(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) + e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))} \omega_J(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)) H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)) \right] \leq (\mathcal{N}_J H)(u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in this case we can simply take $\mathcal{F}_m = \{(1, j) : (1, j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m\}$ and then (7.5) will be satisfied.

Case 2. Assume that $\sum_{(1,j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) < \frac{d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$. Since $\nu(\cup_{j \in J_m} \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) \geq d_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$ and $(1, j) \notin \mathcal{F}'_m$ is equivalent to $(1, j) \in \mathcal{F}''_m$, it follows that

$$\sum_{(1,j) \in \mathcal{F}''_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) > \frac{3d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m). \quad (7.6)$$

Sub-case 2.1. Assume that

$$\sum_{(2,j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4d_4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m). \quad (7.7)$$

As in Case 1 one shows that for all j with $(2, j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m$, assuming $(2, m, j) \in J$, then we have $|(L_{ab}^N h)(u)| \leq (\mathcal{N}_J H)(u)$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$. Thus, setting $\mathcal{F}_m = \{(2, j) : (2, j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m\}$, (7.5) will be satisfied.

Sub-case 2.2. Assume that (7.7) does not hold, that is $\sum_{(2,j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}) \leq \frac{d_5}{4d_4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$. It now

follows from (6.8) that $\sum_{(2,j) \in \mathcal{F}'_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) \leq \frac{d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$, and using again $\nu(\cup_{j=1}^{j_m} \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) \geq d_5 \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$ we get

$$\sum_{(2,j) \in \mathcal{F}''_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) > \frac{3d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m).$$

Denote by J'_m the set of those $j \in J_m$ such that both $(1, j) \in \mathcal{F}''_m$ and $(2, j) \in \mathcal{F}''_m$. Then the above and (7.6) imply

$$\sum_{j \in J'_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) > \frac{d_5}{2} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m). \quad (7.8)$$

Fix now an arbitrary $j \in J'_m$. We will prove the following

Claim: Either (7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$ or (7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$.

Proof of Claim. Since $(1, j) \in \mathcal{F}''_m$ and $(2, j) \in \mathcal{F}''_m$ the second alternative in Lemma 7.2(c) holds for $(1, j)$ and $(2, j)$, that is

$$|h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))| \geq \frac{1}{4} H(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)) > 0 \quad (7.9)$$

for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)} \cup \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$.

Let $u, u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1, \dots, j_m$. Using the assumption $(h, H) \in \mathcal{K}_b$, and in particular property (T2) with $p = 0$, $v = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)$ and $v' = v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u')$, and assuming e.g.

$$\min\{|h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))|, |h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))|\} = |h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))|,$$

it follows from (7.1), (7.2) and (7.9) that

$$\frac{|h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)) - h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))|}{\min\{|h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))|, |h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))|\}} \leq \frac{E|b|\theta_2^N H(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))}{|h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))|} (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} \leq 4E|b|\theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} < \frac{\epsilon_4}{8}.$$

So, the difference between the arguments of the complex numbers $h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))$ and $h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u'))$ (regarded as vectors in \mathbb{R}^2) is $< \frac{\epsilon_4}{8} < \frac{\pi}{8}$. In particular, for each $i = 1, 2$ we can choose a real continuous function $\theta_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)$, $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$, with values in $[0, \epsilon_4/8]$ and $\lambda_{i,j}^{(m)} \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that

$$h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u)) = e^{i(\lambda_{i,j}^{(m)} + \theta_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))} |h(v_{i,j}^{(m)}(u))|, \quad u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}. \quad (7.10)$$

Using the above, $\theta \leq 2 \sin \theta$ for $\theta \in [0, \pi/3]$, and some elementary geometry yields

$$|\theta_{i,j}^{(m)}(u) - \theta_{i,j}^{(m)}(u')| \leq 2 \sin |\theta_{i,j}^{(m)}(u) - \theta_{i,j}^{(m)}(u')| < \frac{\epsilon_4}{4} < \frac{\pi}{4} \quad (7.11)$$

for all $u, u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$.

Choose an arbitrary point $u_{i,j}^{(m)} \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$, and set $\tilde{\lambda}_j^{(m)} = |b|\psi_m(u_{i,j}^{(m)}) + 2k\pi$, where we choose $k = k(m, i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that

$$|\lambda_{2,j}^{(m)} - \lambda_{1,j}^{(m)} + \tilde{\lambda}_j^{(m)}| < \pi. \quad (7.12)$$

By (7.10), the difference between the arguments of the complex numbers $e^{ib\tau_N(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))}h(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))$ and $e^{ib\tau_N(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))}h(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))$ is given by the function

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_j^{(m)}(u) &= [b\tau_N(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)) + \theta_{2,j}^{(m)}(u) + \lambda_{2,j}^{(m)}] - [b\tau_N(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) + \theta_{1,j}^{(m)}(u) + \lambda_{1,j}^{(m)}] \\ &= (\lambda_{2,j}^{(m)} - \lambda_{1,j}^{(m)}) - |b|\psi_m(u) + (\theta_{2,j}^{(m)}(u) - \theta_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the properties of the cylinders $\Gamma_{1,j}^{(m)}$ and $\Gamma_{2,j}^{(m)}$ in (6.7) that for $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$ and $u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$ we have

$$|\psi_m(u) - \psi_m(u')| \geq \delta_1 e^{-s_m \hat{\epsilon}_{13}} \text{diam}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_m).$$

This, (6.4) and $\hat{\epsilon}_{15} \geq \hat{\epsilon}_{13}$ imply

$$|b||\psi_m(u) - \psi_m(u')| \geq \delta_1 \epsilon_2$$

for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$ and $u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$. Then for such u and u' we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Omega_j^{(m)}(u) - \Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| &\geq |b||\psi_m(u) - \psi_m(u')| - |\theta_{1,j}^{(m)}(u) - \theta_{1,j}^{(m)}(u')| - |\theta_{2,j}^{(m)}(u) - \theta_{2,j}^{(m)}(u')| \\ &\geq \delta_1 \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4 > 2\epsilon_4, \end{aligned}$$

by the choice of ϵ_4 .

Thus, $|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u) - \Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| \geq 2\epsilon_4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$ and all $u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$. Hence either $|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| \geq \epsilon_4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$ or $|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| \geq \epsilon_4$ for all $u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$. Indeed, if $|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| < \epsilon_4$ for some $u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$, then for every $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$ we get

$$|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| = |(\Omega_j^{(m)}(u) - \Omega_j^{(m)}(u')) + \Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| \geq |\Omega_j^{(m)}(u) - \Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| - |\Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| > \epsilon_4.$$

Similarly, if $|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| < \epsilon_4$ for some $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$, then $|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| \geq \epsilon_4$ for every $u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$.

Hence we either have

$$\mathbf{A}: |\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| \geq \epsilon_4 \text{ for all } u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)},$$

or

$$\mathbf{B}: |\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| \geq \epsilon_4 \text{ for all } u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}.$$

Assume for example that we have \mathbf{A} : $|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| \geq \epsilon_4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$.

It follows from Lemma 6.4 (or rather its proof) and (7.2) that for all $u, u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |b||\psi_m(u) - \psi_m(u')| &= |b| \left| [\tau_N(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) - \tau_N(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))] - [\tau_N(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u')) - \tau_N(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u'))] \right| \\ &\leq |b| C_8 \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3} \leq 2C_8 \frac{\epsilon_4}{32E} < \frac{\epsilon_4}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

From this and (7.11) we get

$$|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u) - \Omega_j^{(m)}(u')| \leq |b||\psi_m(u) - \psi_m(u')| + 2\frac{\epsilon_4}{4} < \epsilon_4$$

for all $u, u' \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$. The latter, (7.12) and the choice of ϵ_4 imply that for any $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ we have

$$|\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| \leq |\lambda_{2,j}^{(m)} - \lambda_{1,j}^{(m)} + \tilde{\lambda}_{i,j}^{(m)}| + |b| |\psi_m(u) - \psi_m(u_{i,j}^{(m)})| + |\theta_{2,j}^{(m)}(u) - \theta_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)| \leq \pi + \frac{\epsilon_3}{16} + \epsilon_4 < \frac{3\pi}{2}.$$

Thus, $\epsilon_4 \leq |\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)| < \frac{3\pi}{2}$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$.

Hence, we see that for $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$ the difference $\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)$ between the arguments of the complex numbers $e^{ib\tau_N(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} h(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))$ and $e^{ib\tau_N(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))} h(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))$, defined as a number in the interval $[0, 2\pi)$, satisfies $\Omega_j^{(m)}(u) \geq \epsilon_4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$.

It follows from Lemma 7.2(b) that either $H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) \geq H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))/4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$ or $H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u)) \geq H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))/4$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$. Assume e.g. that $H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))/4 \leq H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$. As in [D] (see also [St4]) we will show that $|\tilde{\psi}_m(u)| \leq \gamma_m^{(1)}(u)$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$. Given such u , consider the points

$$z_1 = e^{(f_N^{(a)} + ib\tau_N)(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} h(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) \quad , \quad z_2 = e^{(f_N^{(a)} + ib\tau_N)(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))} h(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))$$

in the complex plane \mathbb{C} , and let φ be the smaller angle between the arguments of z_1 and z_2 . It then follows from the above estimate for $\Omega_j^{(m)}(u)$ that $\epsilon_4 \leq \varphi \leq 3\pi/2$. Moreover, (7.3), $|h| \leq H$ and (7.9) imply

$$\frac{|z_1|}{|z_2|} = e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) - f_N^{(a)}(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))} \frac{|h(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))|}{|h(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))|} \leq e^{\epsilon_4} \frac{H(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))}{H(v_{2,j}^{(m)}(u))/4} \leq 16e^{\epsilon_4} < 19,$$

by the choice of ϵ_4 . This yields

$$|z_1 + z_2| \leq (1-t)|z_1| + |z_2|, \tag{7.13}$$

where we can take e.g. $t = \frac{1 - \cos(\epsilon_3)}{20}$. Indeed, we have

$$|z_1 + z_2|^2 = |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + 2\langle z_1, z_2 \rangle \leq |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + 2|z_1||z_2|(1-s),$$

where $s = 1 - \cos \epsilon_3$. Thus, (7.13) will hold if

$$|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + 2|z_1||z_2|(1-s) \leq (1-t)^2|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + 2(1-t)|z_1||z_2|,$$

that is if $(1 - (1-t)^2)|z_1| + 2|z_2|(1-s) \leq 2(1-t)|z_2|$, which equivalent to $|z_1| \leq 2\frac{s-t}{t(2-t)}|z_2|$.

Since $t = s/20$, we have $19 < 2\frac{s-t}{t(2-t)} = \frac{38}{2-s/20}$, so the above inequality holds. This proves (7.13) with the given choice of t .

Since $\mu_0 \leq t$ by (6.10), it now follows that $|\tilde{\psi}_m(u)| \leq \gamma_m^{(1)}(u)$ for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$. Now the argument from Case 1 proves that (7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$.

Thus, in the case **A**, (7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$. In a similar way we prove that in the case **B**, (7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$. **This proves the Claim.**

We will now define the set \mathcal{F}_m in the Sub-case 2.2. Consider the set J_m'' of all $j \in J_m'$ so that (7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}$. Recall that $j \in J_m'$ means that both $(1, j) \in \mathcal{F}_m''$ and $(2, j) \in \mathcal{F}_m''$.

If $\sum_{j \in J''_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$, we set $\mathcal{F}_m = \{(1, j) : j \in J''_m\}$ and then (7.5) follows immediately.

If $\sum_{j \in J''_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) < \frac{d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$, then (7.8) implies $\sum_{j \in J'_m \setminus J''_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{1,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$. Combining the latter

with (6.8) gives $\sum_{j \in J'_m \setminus J''_m} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4d_4} \nu(\mathcal{C}'_m)$. Clearly for $j \in J'_m \setminus J''_m$ we have the case **B**, so

(7.4) holds for all $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,j}^{(m)}$. Now we set $\mathcal{F}_m = \{(2, j) : j \in J'_m \setminus J''_m\}$ and then (7.5) holds again.

This completes the construction of the set \mathcal{F}_m in all possible cases. Now define

$$J = \{(i, m, j) : m = 1, \dots, m_0, (i, j) \in \mathcal{F}_m\}.$$

Clearly $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ and (7.4) holds for all $u \in V_b$. As we mentioned in the beginning of the proof, (7.4) always holds for $u \in \widehat{U} \setminus V_b$. ■

8 Borel-Cantelli sequences for Gibbs measures

We are preparing now to prove that iterating sufficiently many contraction operators provides an L^1 -contraction on U . This will be done in the next section using what was done in Sects. 6 and 7. In this section we use some arguments from the paper [X] of V. Xing concerning Borel-Cantelli sequences for invariant measures on probability spaces. What we do here can possibly be derived from the paper [ChK] of Chernov and Kleinbock as well.

As in Sects. 6 and 7, assume again that $N \geq N_0$ is a fixed integer. We consider the set U with the Gibbs measure ν on it. Notice that $\sigma : U \rightarrow U$ is naturally isomorphic to the shift $\sigma : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ on the one-sided Bernoulli symbol space $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ – see Sect. 2. Namely, for every $x \in U$ define $\Xi(x) = \xi = (\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$, where $\sigma^j(x) \in U_{\xi_j}$ for all $j \geq 0$ (see Sect. 2). Then $\Xi : U \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ is one-to-one on \widehat{U} and defines an isomorphism between U with the Gibbs measure ν and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ with the corresponding measure on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$, which we denote by ν again. The map $\sigma^N : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ is naturally isomorphic to a Bernoulli shift over another one-sided symbol space. More precisely, set

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+ = \{\eta = (\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_m, \dots) : \eta_j = (\eta_j^{(0)}, \eta_j^{(1)}, \dots, \eta_j^{(N-1)}) \in \Omega_N, \mathcal{B}_{\eta_j, \eta_{j+1}} = 1 \forall j \geq 0\},$$

where

$$\Omega_N = \{(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1}) : \mathcal{A}_{\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}} = 1, \forall i = 0, 1, \dots, N-2\},$$

and the matrix $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_{\eta, \zeta}\}_{\eta, \zeta \in \Omega_N}$ is defined by $\mathcal{B}_{\eta, \zeta} = \mathcal{A}_{\eta^{(N-1)}, \zeta^{(0)}}$. Let $\tilde{\sigma} : \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+ \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$ be the standard Bernoulli shift: $\tilde{\sigma}(\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_m, \dots) = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m, \dots)$, and let $\Gamma : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$ be defined by

$$\Gamma(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n, \dots) = (\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_m, \dots),$$

where $\eta_j = (\xi_{Nj}, \xi_{Nj+1}, \dots, \xi_{Nj+N-1})$. Then $\tilde{\sigma} \circ \Gamma = \Gamma \circ \sigma^N$, that is the diagram in Figure 2 is commutative.

Recall the function $g = f - P_f \tau$ from Sect. 4.2, which we naturally identify with a function $g : \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The Gibbs measure ν on U (identified with a measure on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$) satisfies (4.2).

Consider the function $\tilde{g} : \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$\tilde{g}(\eta) = g_N(\Gamma^{-1}(\eta)) = g(\xi) + g(\sigma(\xi)) + \dots + g(\sigma^{N-1}(\xi)),$$

where $\Gamma(\xi) = \eta$. Then $\tilde{g}_m(\eta) = g_{mN}(\xi) = g_{mN}(\Gamma^{-1}(\eta))$ for all $\eta \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$ and all integers $m \geq 0$. Denote by $\tilde{\nu}$ the probability measure on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$ which satisfies $\tilde{\nu}(\Gamma(A)) = \nu(A)$ for every ν -measurable subset A of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$. Given a cylinder $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}[\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{m-1}]$ of length m in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}[\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{mN-1}]$ be the corresponding cylinder of length mN in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ such that $\Gamma(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}$. Then for any $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}$ we have $\eta = \Gamma(\xi) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and by (4.2),

$$\frac{\tilde{\nu}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}})}{e^{\tilde{g}_m(\eta)}} = \frac{\nu(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}})}{e^{g_{mN}(\xi)}} \leq c_2.$$

In a similar way, using the other side of (4.2) we get $\frac{\tilde{\nu}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}})}{e^{\tilde{g}_m(\eta)}} \geq c_1$. Thus, $\tilde{\nu}$ is the **Gibbs measure on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$ defined by \tilde{g}** .

Let $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $|b| \geq 1$. Notice that for every cylinder \mathcal{C} in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$, $\Gamma(\mathcal{C})$ is a finite union of cylinders in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$. Indeed, if the length of \mathcal{C} is $\leq kN$, then \mathcal{C} is a union of cylinders of length kN in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ and the image of each of those under Γ is a cylinder of length k in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$. Since by its definition in (6.6), V_b is a finite union of cylinders in U (identified with $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+$), it follows that $\tilde{V}_b = \Gamma(\Delta(V_b))$ is a finite union of cylinders in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$.

Consider $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$ with the Gibbs measure $\tilde{\nu}$. For brevity we set $A = \tilde{V}_b$, and we also set $A_j = A = \tilde{V}_b$ for all $j \geq 1$; this will be our Borell-Cantelli sequence. Notice that $\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{V}_b) = \nu(V_b) \geq 2\gamma_2$, where

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}\nu(\mathbf{K}_0) > 0 \quad (8.1)$$

is a constant independent of b . Thus, $\tilde{\nu}(A) \geq 2\gamma_2$. However $\|\chi_A\|_\theta$ could be relatively large. According to (6.5) all cylinders involved in V_b have length $\leq D_1 \log |b|$, so each cylinder in \tilde{V}_b has length $\leq \ell = D_1 \log |b|$. By the so called "Exponential Cluster Property" for cylinders (see e.g. [B2] or Sect. 2.3 in [Ch2]), there exist global constants $\tilde{D} > 0$ and $\beta = e^{-r}$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$|\mu(\tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A) \cap A) - \mu(A)^2| \leq \tilde{D} \mu(A)^2 \beta^{n-\ell}$$

for all integers $n \geq \ell$. Notice that $\beta^{-\ell} = e^{rD_1 \log |b|} = |b|^{rD_1}$. Thus, the above implies

$$|\mu(\tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A) \cap A) - \mu(A)^2| \leq \tilde{D} \mu(A)^2 \beta^n |b|^{rD_1} \quad (8.2)$$

for all $n > D_1 \log |b|$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ & \xrightarrow{\sigma^N} & \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \\ \Gamma \downarrow & & \downarrow \Gamma \\ \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+ & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\sigma}} & \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+ \end{array}$$

Figure 2

Given an integer $M > 1$ set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_M(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^M \chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-j}(A)}(\mathbf{x}) \quad , \quad \mathbf{E}_M = M \tilde{\nu}(A).$$

Fix an integer $k \geq 1$ and set

$$\mathbf{M}_1 = k \log |b|. \quad (8.3)$$

This number will stay fixed for now; later we will choose an appropriate value for $k > D_1$.

We are going to use some arguments from Sect. 2.2 in [X] with $X = \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+$, $T = \tilde{\sigma}$, the probability measure $\tilde{\nu}$ and $A_n = A = \tilde{V}_b$ for all $n \geq 1$. We will involve the condition $\Delta_{3/2}$ with $\alpha = 3/2$ in [X]. However we will change it slightly.

Lemma 8.1. *There exists a global constant $D_3 > 0$ such that for every integer $M > M_1$, the constant*

$$C_M = \frac{D_3 M_1}{(M \tilde{\nu}(A))^{1/2} |b|^{r(k-D_1)}} \quad (8.4)$$

satisfies

$$\Sigma_M = \sum_{m,n=1}^M (\tilde{\nu}(T^{-m}(A) \cap T^{-n}(A)) - \tilde{\nu}(A)^2) \leq C_M (M \tilde{\nu}(A))^{3/2} \quad (8.5)$$

for all integers $M > M_1$.

Proof. Set $\Omega_{m,n} = \tilde{\nu}(T^{-m}(A) \cap T^{-n}(A)) - \tilde{\nu}(A)^2$. First consider $\Sigma'_M = \sum_{1 \leq m \leq n \leq M} \Omega_{m,n}$. We have

$$\Sigma'_M = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{\substack{n=m+i \\ 0 \leq i \leq M_1-1}} \Omega_{m,n} + \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{\substack{n=m+j \\ M_1 \leq j \leq M-m}} \Omega_{m,n}.$$

For the first sum above we will use the trivial estimate $\Omega_{m,n} \leq \tilde{\nu}(A)$ for all m, n . For $n = m + j$, it follows from (8.2) that

$$\Omega_{m,n} = \tilde{\nu}(T^{-j}(A) \cap A) - \tilde{\nu}(A)^2 \leq \tilde{D} \tilde{\nu}(A)^2 |b|^{rD_1} \beta^j.$$

Thus, using $M_1 = k \log |b|$ and $\beta = e^{-r}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n=m+j \\ M_1 \leq j \leq M-m}} \Omega_{m,n} &\leq \tilde{D} \tilde{\nu}(A)^2 |b|^{rD_1} \sum_{j=M_1+1}^{M-m} \beta^j < \tilde{D} \tilde{\nu}(A)^2 |b|^{rD_1} \frac{\beta^{M_1}}{1-\beta} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{D} \tilde{\nu}(A)^2 |b|^{rD_1}}{1-\beta} e^{-rk \log |b|} = \frac{\tilde{D} \tilde{\nu}(A)^2}{1-\beta} \frac{1}{|b|^{r(k-D_1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\Sigma'_M \leq M M_1 \tilde{\nu}(A) + \frac{M \tilde{D} \tilde{\nu}(A)^2}{1-\beta} \frac{1}{|b|^{r(k-D_1)}}.$$

We get the same estimate for $\Sigma''_M = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq m \leq M} \Omega_{m,n}$. Hence there exists a global constant $D_3 > 0$ such that

$$\Sigma_M \leq \frac{D_3 M M_1 \tilde{\nu}(A)}{|b|^{r(k-D_1)}}$$

for all $M > M_1$. This shows that (8.5) holds with C_M as in (8.4). ■

We will now use part of the calculation in the proof of Theorem 2.3 in Sect. 2.2 in [X] to prove the following.

Lemma 8.2. *Let C_M be defined by (8.4). Then*

$$\int_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+} \left(\frac{\tilde{S}_M(x)}{M \tilde{\nu}(A)} - 1 \right)^2 d\tilde{\nu} \leq \frac{C_M}{(M \tilde{\nu}(A))^{1/2}} = \frac{D_3 M_1}{M \tilde{\nu}(A) |b|^{r(k-D_1)}} \quad (8.6)$$

for all integers $M > M_1$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+} \left(\sum_{n=1}^M [\chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A)}(x) - \tilde{\nu}(A)] \right)^2 d\tilde{\nu} \\ &= \int_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+} \left(\sum_{m=1}^M [\chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-m}(A)}(x) - \tilde{\nu}(A)] \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^M [\chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A)}(x) - \tilde{\nu}(A)] \right) d\tilde{\nu} \\ &= \sum_{m,n=1}^M \int_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+} [\chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-m}(A)}(x) - \tilde{\nu}(A)] [\chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A)}(x) - \tilde{\nu}(A)] d\tilde{\nu} \\ &= \sum_{m,n=1}^M \int_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+} \chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-m}(A)}(x) \chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A)}(x) d\tilde{\nu} \\ &\quad - \sum_{m,n=1}^M \int_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}^+} (\chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-m}(A)}(x) \tilde{\nu}(A) + \chi_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A)}(x) \tilde{\nu}(A) - \tilde{\nu}(A)^2) d\tilde{\nu} \\ &= \sum_{m,n=1}^M (\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{\sigma}^{-m}(A) \cap \tilde{\sigma}^{-n}(A)) - \tilde{\nu}(A)^2) d\tilde{\nu} = \Sigma_M. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by $(M\tilde{\nu}(A))^2$ both sides in the above estimate and using Lemma 8.1 proves (8.6). ■

We will use the above for the transformation $\sigma : U \rightarrow U$, the measure ν on U and the set V_b . For any $x \in U$ set

$$\mathbf{S}_M(\mathbf{x}) = \#\{\mathbf{j} : \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{j} \leq \mathbf{M}, \sigma^{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{N}}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{V}_b\}. \quad (8.7)$$

Then $S_M(x) = \tilde{S}_M(\Gamma(\Xi(x)))$ for all $x \in U$ and $\nu(V_b) = \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{V}_b) \geq 2\gamma_2$, with γ_2 as in (8.1).

Assume $M > M_1/\gamma_2^2$ and set

$$\epsilon = \epsilon(M, M_1) = \frac{D_3 M_1 \nu(V_b)}{M \gamma_2^2 |b|^{r(k-D_1)}} \quad (8.8)$$

and

$$U_\epsilon = U_\epsilon(M) = \left\{ x \in U : \frac{S_M(x)}{M} < \gamma_2 \right\}. \quad (8.9)$$

Now Lemma 8.2 implies the following

Proposition 8.3. *Under the above notation, for M_1 with (8.3) and every $M > M_1/\gamma_2^2$ we have*

$$\mu(U_\epsilon) < \epsilon. \quad (8.10)$$

Proof. Let $M > M_1/\gamma_2^2$. It follows from (8.6) that

$$\int_U \left(\frac{S_M(x)}{M} - \nu(V_b) \right)^2 d\nu \leq \frac{D_3 M_1 \nu(V_b)}{M |b|^{r(k-D_1)}} = \gamma_2^2 \epsilon.$$

For $x \in U_\epsilon$ we have $\frac{S_M(x)}{M} < \gamma_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\nu(V_b)$, so $\nu(V_b) - \frac{S_M(x)}{M} > \gamma_2$. Thus,

$$\gamma_2^2 \epsilon \geq \int_{U_\epsilon} \left(\nu(V_b) - \frac{S_M(x)}{M} \right)^2 d\nu \geq \int_{U_\epsilon} \gamma_2^2 d\nu \geq \gamma_2^2 \mu(U_\epsilon),$$

and therefore (8.10) holds. ■

The above will play an important role in the next section, where $\epsilon > 0$ will be very small.

9 L^1 contraction estimates

Here we obtain L^1 -contraction estimates for large powers of the contraction operators \mathcal{N}_J . We continue to use the notation from Sections 5 and 6. As in Sects. 6 and 7, here **we assume that** $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\hat{U})$ and $N \geq N_0$ is a fixed integer.

Consider the constants

$$\rho_3 = \frac{e^{a_0 N T_0}}{1 + \frac{\mu_0 e^{-N T_0}}{C_{10}}} < 1, \quad S_0 = e^{a_0 N T_0} > 1,$$

where we choose the global constant $C_{10} \geq \max\{8, 16d_4 E^2/d_5\}$. We assume that $a_0 = a_0(N) > 0$ is so small that $\rho_3 < 1$, i.e. $a_0 N T_0 < \log(1 + \frac{\mu_0 e^{-N T_0}}{C_{10}})$. For later use, we will make this requirement a bit stronger, namely we will assume that

$$0 < \mathbf{a}_0 < \mathbf{a}_0(\mathbf{N}) = \frac{\mu_0 \gamma_2 e^{-N \mathbf{T}_0}}{32 C_{10} \mathbf{D}_1 N \mathbf{T}_0}, \quad (9.1)$$

where $D_1 > 1$ is one of the constants from (6.5). Since $\log(1+y) > y/2$ for $y \in (0, 1)$, it follows that $\log(1 + \frac{\mu_0 e^{-NT_0}}{C_{10}}) > \frac{\mu_0 e^{-NT_0}}{2C_{10}} > 32a_0 NT_0$, so $\rho_3 < e^{-31a_0 NT_0} < 1$.

Given a representative set $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ set

$$W_J = \cup_{(i,m,j) \in J} \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)} \subset V_b.$$

The following lemma is the analogue of Lemma 12 in [D]. It is similar to Lemma 7.1 in [St4] and its proof is similar to the proof in [St4].

Lemma 9.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$.*

(a) *There exists a global constant $C_{10} > 0$, independent of b and N , such that for any $H \in \mathcal{K}_E$, any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|b| \geq 1$ and any $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ we have*

$$\int_{V_b} H^2 d\nu \leq C_{10} \int_{W_J} H^2 d\nu. \quad (9.2)$$

(b) *Assuming that $a_0 = a_0(N) > 0$ is sufficiently small, for any $H \in \mathcal{K}_E$, any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|b| \geq 1$, any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|a| < a_0$ and any $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ we have*

$$\int_{V_b} (\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 d\nu \leq \rho_3 \int_{V_b} L_{f(0)}^N(H^2) d\nu. \quad (9.3)$$

Proofs. Throughout we assume that $H \in \mathcal{K}_E$ and $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$.

(a) Consider an arbitrary $m = 1, \dots, m_0$. By (6.11), $\sum_{(i,m,j) \in J} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}) \geq \frac{d_5}{4d_4} \nu(C'_m)$. Since $H \in \mathcal{K}_E$, for any $u, u' \in C'_m$ we have $\frac{|H(u) - H(u')|}{H(u')} \leq ED(u, u') \leq E$, so $H(u)/H(u') \leq 1 + E \leq 2E$. Thus, for $L_1 = \max_{C'_m} H$ and $L_2 = \min_{C'_m} H$, we have $1 \leq L_1/L_2 \leq 2E$. This gives

$$\int_{C'_m} H^2 d\nu \leq L_1^2 \nu(C'_m) \leq \frac{4d_4 L_1^2}{d_5} \sum_{(i,m,j) \in J} \nu(\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}) \leq \frac{4d_4 L_1^2}{d_5 L_2^2} \sum_{(i,m,j) \in J} \int_{\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}} H^2 d\nu.$$

Hence

$$\int_{V_b} H^2 d\nu \leq \sum_{m=1}^{m_0} \int_{C'_m} H^2 d\nu \leq \frac{16d_4 E^2}{d_5} \sum_{(i,m,j) \in J} \int_{\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}} H^2 d\nu \leq C_{10} \int_{W_J} H^2 d\nu,$$

with $C_{10} = \frac{16d_4 E^2}{d_5}$. This proves (9.2).

(b) The proof of this part is the same as the proof of Lemma 7.1(b) in [St4]. We provide some details since they will be used later.

Let again $H \in \mathcal{K}_E$ and $J \in \mathcal{J}(b)$. By Lemma 6.3, $\mathcal{N}_J H \in \mathcal{K}_E$, while the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality implies

$$(\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 = (\mathcal{M}_a^N \omega H)^2 \leq (\mathcal{M}_a^N \omega_J^2) (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2) \leq (\mathcal{M}_a^N \omega_J) (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2) \leq \mathcal{M}_a^N H^2. \quad (9.4)$$

If $u \notin W_J$, then $\omega_J(u) = 1$. Let $u \in W_J$; then $u \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ for some (unique) $(i, m, j) \in J$.

Assuming e.g. $i = 1$ so that $v = v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{M}_a^N \omega_J)(u) &= \sum_{\sigma^N v=u, v \neq v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)} e^{f_N^{(a)}(v)} + e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} \omega_J(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma^N v=u, v \neq v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u)} e^{f_N^{(a)}(v)} + (1 - \mu_0) e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} \\
&= \sum_{\sigma^N v=u} e^{f_N^{(a)}(v)} - \mu_0 e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_{1,j}^{(m)}(u))} \leq (\mathcal{M}_a^N 1)(u) - \mu_0 e^{-NT_0} = 1 - \mu_0 e^{-NT_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

This holds for all $u \in W_J$, so by (9.4), $(\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 \leq (1 - \mu_0 e^{-NT_0}) (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2)$ on W_J . Using this and part (a) with H replaced by $\mathcal{N}_J H$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{V_b} (\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 d\nu &= \int_{V_b \setminus W_J} (\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 d\nu + \int_{W_J} (\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 d\nu \\
&\leq \int_{V_b \setminus W_J} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)^2 d\nu + (1 - \mu_0 e^{-NT_0}) \int_{W_J} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)^2 d\nu \\
&= \int_{V_b} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)^2 d\nu - \mu_0 e^{-NT_0} \int_{W_J} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)^2 d\nu \\
&\leq \int_{V_b} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)^2 d\nu - \frac{\mu_0 e^{-NT_0}}{C_{10}} \int_{V_b} (\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 d\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

From this and

$$(\mathcal{M}_a^N H)^2 \leq (\mathcal{M}_a^N 1)^2 (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2) \leq \mathcal{M}_a^N H^2 = L_{f^{(0)}}^N (e^{f_N^{(a)} - f_N^{(0)}} H^2) \leq e^{a_0 NT_0} (L_{f^{(0)}}^N H^2), \quad (9.5)$$

we get $(1 + \mu_0 e^{-NT_0}/C_{10}) \int_{V_b} (\mathcal{N}_J H)^2 d\nu \leq \int_{V_b} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H)^2 d\nu \leq e^{a_0 NT_0} \int_{V_b} L_{f^{(0)}}^N H^2 d\nu$. Thus, (9.3) holds. ■

We can now prove that iterating sufficiently many contraction operators provides an L^1 -contraction on U .

Define the function \hat{h} by

$$\hat{h} = \rho_3 \chi_{V_b} + \mathbf{S}_0 \chi_{U \setminus V_b}.$$

Since V_b and $U \setminus V_b$ are unions of finitely many cylinders, we have $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\hat{U})$ and also $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\hat{U})$.

Fix an arbitrary constant $s > 1$, and consider an integer $M_1 = k \log |b|$ as in (8.3), where we now set

$$\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}(s) = \frac{2s C_{10}}{r} + \mathbf{D}_1. \quad (9.6)$$

In what follows we will consider integers

$$\mathbf{M} \geq 2 \frac{\mathbf{D}_3 \mathbf{M}_1}{\gamma_2^2} = 2 \frac{\mathbf{D}_3 \mathbf{k} \log |b|}{\gamma_2^2}. \quad (9.7)$$

Then for $\epsilon = \epsilon(M, M_1)$ in (8.8) we have

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{r(k-D_1)}} \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{2s C_{10}}}. \quad (9.8)$$

At some stage later on we will need the **Perron-Ruelle-Frobenius Theorem** (see e.g. [PP]): there exist global constants $C_{11} \geq 1$ and $\rho_4 \in (0, 1)$, independent of b and N , such that

$$\|L_{f^{(0)}}^n h - h_0 \int_U h d\nu\| \leq C_{11} \rho_4^n \|h\|_\theta \quad (9.9)$$

for all $h \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ and all integers $n \geq 0$, where $h_0 > 0$ is the normalised eigenfunction of $L_{f-P_f\tau}$ in $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ (see Sect. 4.2). Fix such constants $C_{11} > 0$ and ρ_4 and write $\rho_4 = e^{-\beta_3}$ for some global constant $\beta_3 \in (0, 1)$.

The following lemma is the main result in this section. It is similar to Lemma 7.3 in [St4] and its proof is very similar, although the proof now relies on something rather different¹³.

In what follows for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote $\hat{b} = \lceil \log |b| \rceil$.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$ and let $s > 1$ be a constant. There exists a global constant $C_{12} > 0$ such that for any $N \geq N_0$ there exist constants $\tilde{k} = \tilde{k}(N, s) \geq 1$ and $a_0 = a_0(N) > 0$ such that for any $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq e^2$ we have the following:*

(a) *For any sequence $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_r \dots$ of elements of $\mathcal{J}(b)$, setting $M = \tilde{k} \lceil \log |b| \rceil$, $H^{(0)} = 1$ and $H^{(r+1)} = \mathcal{N}_{J_r}(H^{(r)})$ ($r \geq 0$) we have*

$$\int_U (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{8s}}. \quad (9.10)$$

(b) *For any $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(U)$ we have*

$$\|L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}} h\|_0 \leq \frac{C_{12}}{|b|^s} \|h\|_{\theta_1, b}. \quad (9.11)$$

Remark. As remarked in [St4], in general the operator L_{ab} does not have to preserve the space $\mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$. Indeed, the function $f^{(a)}$ involves τ which is in $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$, however not necessarily in $\mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$. So, in the left-hand-side of (9.11) we just have the sup-norm of a function in $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$.

Proof of Lemma 9.2. (a) Set $\omega_r = \omega_{J_r}$, $W_r = W_{J_r}$ and $\mathcal{N}_r = \mathcal{N}_{J_r}$. Since $H^{(0)} = 1 \in \mathcal{K}_E$, it follows from Lemma 6.3 that $H^{(r)} \in \mathcal{K}_E$ for all $r \geq 1$.

Let $m \geq 1$ be an arbitrary integer. Using $L_{f^{(0)}}^N((\hat{h} \circ \sigma^N) H) = \hat{h}(L_{f^{(0)}}^N H)$, Lemma 9.1(b) and (9.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu &= \int_{V_b} (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu + \int_{U \setminus V_b} (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu \\ &\leq \rho_3 \int_{V_b} L_{f^{(0)}}^N (H^{(M-1)})^2 d\nu + e^{a_0 N T} \int_{U \setminus V_b} L_{f^{(0)}}^N (H^{(M-1)})^2 d\nu \\ &= \int_U \hat{h}(L_{f^{(0)}}^N (H^{(M-1)})^2) d\nu = \int_U L_{f^{(0)}}^N((\hat{h} \circ \sigma^N) (H^{(M-1)})^2) d\nu \\ &= \int_U (\hat{h} \circ \sigma^N) (H^{(M-1)})^2 d\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing by induction and using $H^{(0)} = 1$, we get

$$\int_U (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu \leq \int_U (\hat{h} \circ \sigma^{MN}) (\hat{h} \circ \sigma^{(M-1)N}) \dots (\hat{h} \circ \sigma^{2N}) (\hat{h} \circ \sigma^N) d\nu. \quad (9.12)$$

¹³In the proof of Lemma 7.3 in [St4] we significantly used the existence of a Pesin set with exponentially small tails, which we do not assume here.

Given the constant $s > 1$, consider the constant k with (9.6) and M with (9.7). Define $\epsilon = \epsilon(M, M_1)$ by (8.8); now it satisfies (9.8). By Proposition 8.3, the set $U_\epsilon = U_\epsilon(M)$ defined by (8.9) satisfies (8.10).

Given M with (9.7), using the rough estimate $\hat{h} \leq S_0$ on U_ϵ , it follows from (9.12) and (8.10) that

$$\int_{U_\epsilon} (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu \leq S_0^M \nu(U_\epsilon) < \epsilon S_0^M \leq \frac{S_0^M}{|b|^{2s} C_{10}}. \quad (9.13)$$

On the other hand when $x \in U \setminus U_\epsilon$, (8.9) and (8.7) imply $\sigma^{jN}(x) \in V_b$ for at least $M\gamma_2$ values of $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$. For such j the definition of \hat{h} gives $\hat{h}(\sigma^{jN}(x)) = \rho_3$. For all other j we can still use $\hat{h}(\sigma^{jN}(x)) \leq S_0$. Thus, from (9.12) (or rather the analogous estimate we get for the integral over $U \setminus U_\epsilon$) we derive

$$\int_{U \setminus U_\epsilon} (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu \leq \int_{U'} \rho_3^{S_M(x)} S_0^{M-S_M(x)} d\nu(x) \leq \rho_3^{M\gamma_2} S_0^{M-M\gamma_2} \nu(U \setminus U_\epsilon) \leq (\rho_3^{\gamma_2} S_0^{1-\gamma_2})^M.$$

This and (9.13) yield

$$\int_U (H^{(M)})^2 d\nu \leq (\rho_3^{\gamma_2} S_0^{1-\gamma_2})^M + \frac{S_0^M}{|b|^{2s} C_{10}}. \quad (9.14)$$

The latter holds for all integers M with (9.7).

Next, write $\rho_3^{\gamma_2} S_0^{1-\gamma_2} = e^{-w}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} w &= -\log(\rho_3^{\gamma_2} S_0^{1-\gamma_2}) = -\gamma_2 \log \rho_3 - (1 - \gamma_2) \log S_0 = -\gamma_2 \log \rho_3 - (1 - \gamma_2) a_0 N T_0 \\ &= -\gamma_2 a_0 N T_0 + \gamma_2 \log \left(1 + \frac{\mu_0 e^{-N T_0}}{C_{10}} \right) - a_0 N T_0 + \gamma_2 a_0 N T_0 \\ &= \gamma_2 \log \left(1 + \frac{\mu_0 e^{-N T_0}}{C_{10}} \right) - a_0 N T_0 > \gamma_2 \frac{\mu_0 e^{-N T_0}}{2C_{10}} - a_0 N T_0 > w_0 = \frac{\mu_0 \gamma_2 e^{-N T_0}}{4C_{10}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption (9.1) about a_0 .

Now assume that $M = \tilde{k} \lceil \log |b| \rceil$, where we choose the integer $\tilde{k} = \tilde{k}(N, s)$ so that

$$\tilde{k} \geq \frac{8s}{w_0} \geq \frac{32s C_{10} e^{N T_0}}{\mu_0 \gamma_2}.$$

We also need

$$M > M_1 / \gamma_2^2 = \frac{k \log |b|}{\gamma_2^2} = \frac{1}{\gamma_2^2} \left(\frac{2s C_{10}}{r} + D_1 \right) \log |b|,$$

using here (9.6) as well. For this and for later use we choose

$$\tilde{k} = 32s \frac{C_{10} D_1 e^{N T_0}}{\mu_0 \gamma_2^2 r \beta_3}, \quad (9.15)$$

where β_3 was chosen earlier with $\rho_4 = e^{-\beta_3}$, assuming that the constant $C_{10} > 1$ is sufficiently large. Notice that we have $\mathbf{N}\tilde{k}\beta_3 > \mathbf{10s}$, which is something we will use later.

Then for the first term in (9.14) it now follows that

$$(\rho_3^{\gamma_2} S_0^{1-\gamma_2})^M = e^{-Mw} \leq e^{-Mw_0} < e^{-w_0 \tilde{k} \log |b|} < e^{-8s \log |b|} = \frac{1}{|b|^{8s}}.$$

The second term in (9.14) is

$$\frac{S_0^M}{|b|^{2s} C_{10}} = \frac{e^{Ma_0 NT_0}}{|b|^{2s} C_{10}} = \frac{e^{a_0 NT_0 \tilde{k} \log |b|}}{|b|^{2s} C_{10}} = \frac{1}{|b|^{2s} C_{10} - a_0 NT_0 \tilde{k}}.$$

Combining (9.15) and (9.5) we get

$$a_0 NT_0 \tilde{k} < \frac{\mu_0 \gamma_2 e^{-NT_0}}{32 C_{10} D_1} \cdot 32s \frac{C_{10} D_1 e^{NT_0}}{\mu_0 \gamma_2^2 r \beta_3} = \frac{s}{\gamma_2 r \beta_3} < s. \quad (9.16)$$

Hence for the second term in (9.14) we have $\frac{S_0^M}{|b|^{2s} C_{10}} \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{8s}}$. This, $C_{10} > 8$ and the above imply that with \tilde{k} defined by (9.15) we have $\int_U (H^{(m)})^2 d\nu \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{8s}}$. This proves part (a).

(b) Let $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$ be such that $\|h\|_{\theta_1, b} \leq 1$. Then $|h(u)| \leq 1$ for all $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $|h|_{\theta_1} \leq |b|$.

Fix an integer $N \geq N_0$ and let $a_0 > 0$ be as in (9.1). In what follows we assume that $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq e^2$.

Assume that the points u, u' , the cylinder $\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}$ in U , the integer $p \geq 0$ and the points $v, v' \in U$ satisfy (6.16) for some $i = 1, 2, j = 1, \dots, j_m$. Then, using (6.13) and $|h|_{\theta_1} \leq |b|$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |h(v) - h(v')| &\leq |b| D_{\theta_1}(v, v') = |b| \theta_1^{p+N} D_{\theta_1}(u, u') \leq |b| \theta_1^{p+N} \text{diam}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}) \\ &\leq |b| \theta_1^{p+N} C_7 \text{diam}(\Gamma_{i,j}^{(m)}) \leq E |b| \theta_2^N (\text{diam}(\widehat{\Gamma}_{i,j}^{(m)}))^{\alpha_3}, \end{aligned}$$

since $C_7 \leq E$. Thus, $(h, 1) \in \mathcal{K}_b$. Set $h^{(m)} = L_{ab}^{mN} h$ for $m \geq 0$. Define the sequence of functions $\{H^{(m)}\}$ recursively by $H^{(0)} = 1$ and $H^{(m+1)} = \mathcal{N}_{J_m} H^{(m)}$, where $J_m \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ is chosen by induction as follows. Since $(h^{(0)}, H^{(0)}) \in \mathcal{K}_b$, using Lemma 7.1 we find $J_0 \in \mathcal{J}(b)$ such that for $h^{(1)} = L_{ab}^N h^{(0)}$ and $H^{(1)} = \mathcal{N}_{J_0} H^{(0)}$ we have $(h^{(1)}, H^{(1)}) \in \mathcal{K}_b$. Continuing in this way we construct by induction an infinite sequence of functions $\{H^{(m)}\}$ with $H^{(0)} = 1$, $H^{(m+1)} = \mathcal{N}_{J_m} H^{(m)}$ for all $m \geq 0$, such that $(h^{(m)}, H^{(m)}) \in \mathcal{K}_b$.

Define $\tilde{k} = \tilde{k}(N, s) \geq 1$ by (9.15) and set $m = M = \tilde{k} \lceil \log |b| \rceil$. Then part (a) implies $\int_U (H^{(m)})^2 d\nu \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{8s}}$. Hence

$$\int_U |L_{ab}^{mN} h|^2 d\nu = \int_U |h^{(m)}|^2 d\nu \leq \int_U (H^{(m)})^2 d\nu \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{8s}}.$$

From this it follows that for any $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$ we have $\int_U |L_{ab}^{mN} h|^2 d\nu \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{8s}} \|h\|_{\theta_1, b}^2$, and so

$$\int_U |L_{ab}^{mN} h| d\nu \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{|b|^{4s}} \|h\|_{\theta_1, b} \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{4s}} \|h\|_{\theta_1, b}. \quad (9.17)$$

We will now use a **standard procedure** (see [D]) to derive an estimates of the form (9.11) from (9.17). This essentially repeats Sect. 7.4 in [St4], so here we just sketch the main steps.

Given $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$ with $\|h\|_{\theta_1, b} \leq 1$, we have $\|h\|_0 \leq 1$ and $|h|_{\theta} \leq |h|_{\theta_1} \leq |b|$, so using Lemma 4.2 with $H = 1$ yields

$$|L_{ab}^r h|_{\theta} \leq A_0 [|b|^{\theta r} + |b|] \leq 2A_0 |b| \quad (9.18)$$

for any integer $r \geq 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{ab}^{2mN} h| &= |L_{ab}^{mN} (|L_{ab}^{mN} h|)| \leq \mathcal{M}_a^{mN} |L_{ab}^{mN} h| = L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} \left(e^{f_{mN}^{(a)} - f_{mN}^{(0)}} |L_{ab}^{mN} h| \right) \\ &\leq \left(L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} \left(e^{f_{mN}^{(a)} - f_{mN}^{(0)}} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} |L_{ab}^{mN} h|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.19)$$

For the first term in this product (4.4) implies

$$\left(L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} \left(e^{f_{mN}^{(a)} - f_{mN}^{(0)}} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq e^{a_0 N T_0 m} \leq e^{a_0 N T_0 \tilde{k} \log |b|} = |b|^{a_0 N T_0 \tilde{k}} \leq |b|^s,$$

since $a_0 N T_0 \tilde{k} \leq s$ by (9.16).

For the second term in (9.19), using (9.9) replacing h by $|L_{ab}^{mN} h|$ and n by mN , we get

$$L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} |L_{ab}^{mN} h|^2 \leq L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} |L_{ab}^{mN} h| \leq \|h_0\| \int_U |L_{ab}^{mN} h| d\nu + C_{11} \rho_4^{mN} \|L_{ab}^{mN} h\|_\theta.$$

By (9.18), $\|L_{ab}^{mN} h\|_\theta \leq 2A_0 |b|$, so the above and (9.17) imply

$$L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} |L_{ab}^{mN} h|^2 \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{4s}} + 2A_0 C_{11} |b| \rho_4^{mN}.$$

Assuming $|b| > e^2$ and $N\tilde{k}\beta_3 > 10s$, we have

$$\rho_4^{mN} \leq e^{-\beta_3 N (\tilde{k} \log |b| - \tilde{k})} = \frac{e^{\beta_3 N \tilde{k}}}{|b|^{\beta_3 N \tilde{k}}} \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{\beta_3 N \tilde{k}/2}} \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{5s}},$$

Thus,

$$L_{f^{(0)}}^{mN} |L_{ab}^{mN} h|^2 \leq \frac{2}{|b|^{4s}} + 2A_0 C_{11} |b| \frac{1}{|b|^{5s}} \leq \frac{C'_{12}}{|b|^{4s}}$$

for some constant $C'_{12} > 0$. Combining the estimates of the two terms in (9.19) and using $s \geq 1$, it follows that $|L_{ab}^{2mN} h| \leq (C'_{12}/|b|^{4s})^{1/2} |b|^s \leq \frac{C_{12}}{|b|^s}$ for some global constant $C_{12} \geq 1$. This proves (9.11). ■

Proof of Theorem 1.2. This is essentially the same as the proof of Theorem 1.3 in Sect. 8 in [St4] under the assumption $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$. We sketch the argument here for completeness.

Let again $\hat{\theta} = 1/\gamma^{\alpha_1} \leq \theta < 1$. Set $\mathbf{s} = \frac{2}{\alpha_2}$, where $\alpha_2 > 0$ is the constant from Lemma 4.1(c), and recall that $\theta_1^{\alpha_2} = \theta$. Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$.

Let $N \geq N_0$ be a fixed integer and let $a_0 > 0$ be as in (9.1). Choose $\tilde{k} = \tilde{k}(N, s)$ and C_{12} as in Lemma 9.2. In what follows we assume that $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq e^2$, so (9.11) holds for all $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(U)$.

Consider an arbitrary $h \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ with $\|h\|_{\theta, b} \leq 1$. Then $|h(u)| \leq 1$ for all $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $|h|_\theta \leq |b|$.

Take the smallest integer p so that $\theta^p \leq 1/|b|^2$; then $\theta^{p-1} > 1/|b|^2$. It is known (see e.g. the end of Ch. 1 in [PP]) that there exists $h' \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta_1}(\widehat{U})$ which is constant on cylinders of length p so that $\|h - h'\|_0 \leq |h|_\theta \theta^p$. Then $\|h - h'\|_0 \leq 1/|b|$ and so $\|h'\|_0 \leq 2$. As in [St4] we now observe that $|h'|_{\theta_1} \leq \frac{4}{\theta^{p-1}} = \frac{4}{\theta^{(p-1)/\alpha_2}} \leq 4|b|^{2/\alpha_2}$, so $\|h'\|_{\theta_1, b} \leq 4|b|^{2/\alpha_2-1}$, and now (9.11) gives

$$\|L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N} h'\|_0 \leq \frac{C_{12}}{|b|^s} 4|b|^{2/\alpha_2-1} \leq \frac{4C_{12}}{|b|^{2/\alpha_2-2/\alpha_2+1}} = \frac{4C_{12}}{|b|}.$$

This and (9.11) for $h-h'$ imply $\|L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h\|_0 \leq \|L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h'\|_0 + \|L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}(h-h')\|_0 \leq \frac{4C_{12}}{|b|} + \frac{1}{|b|} \leq \frac{5C_{12}}{|b|}$.

Set $\theta = e^{-\beta_5}$ for some constant $\beta_5 > 0$. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that $|L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h|_\theta \leq 2A_0|b|$. Assuming $N \geq N_0$ and $N_0\beta_5 \geq 1$ and using Lemma 4.2 again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{ab}^{4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h|_\theta &= |L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}(L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h)|_\theta \leq A_0 \left[2A_0|b|\theta^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}} + |b|\|L_{ab}^{2\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h\|_0 \right] \\ &\leq A_0 \left[2A_0|b| \frac{1}{|b|^{2\tilde{k}N\beta_5}} + |b| \frac{5C_{12}}{|b|} \right] \leq C'_{13}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C'_{13} > 0$. Thus $\|L_{ab}^{4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h\|_{\theta,b} \leq \frac{C_{13}}{|b|} \|h\|_{\theta,b}$ for some global constant $C_{13} > 0$.

Assuming $|b| \geq b_0 \geq \max\{e^2, C_{13}^2\}$, we get $\|L_{ab}^{4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h\|_{\theta,b} \leq \frac{C_{13}}{|b|} \|h\|_{\theta,b} \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{1/2}} \|h\|_{\theta,b}$ for all $h \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$.

Let $n \geq 4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}$ be an arbitrary integer. Writing $n = r(4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}) + \ell$ for some $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, 4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}-1$, and using the above r times we get

$$\|L_{ab}^{r4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h\|_{\theta,b} \leq \left(\frac{C_{13}}{|b|} \right)^r \|h\|_{\theta,b} \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{r/2}} \|h\|_{\theta,b}.$$

As before, using Lemma 4.2 with $H = 1$ and $B = |L_{ab}^{r4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h|_\theta$, implies

$$|L_{ab}^n h|_\theta = |L_{ab}^\ell (L_{ab}^{r4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h)|_\theta \leq A_0 \left[|L_{ab}^{r4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h|_\theta \theta^\ell + |b| \|L_{ab}^{r4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h\|_0 \right],$$

so $\frac{1}{|b|} |L_{ab}^n h|_\theta \leq \frac{2A_0}{|b|^{r/2}} \|h\|_{\theta,b}$. This and $\|L_{ab}^n h\|_0 \leq \|L_{ab}^{r4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}h\|_0 \leq \frac{1}{|b|^{r/2}} \|h\|_{\theta,b}$ imply

$$\|L_{ab}^n h\|_{\theta,b} \leq \frac{3A_0}{|b|^r} \|h\|_{\theta,b} = 3A_0 e^{-(r/2) \log |b|} \|h\|_{\theta,b}.$$

We have $r \geq (r+1)/2$ for all $r \geq 1$, so the above and $n < (r+1)4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}$ yield

$$\|L_{ab}^n h\|_{\theta,b} \leq 3A_0 e^{-\frac{(r+1)\log |b|}{4}} \|h\|_{\theta,b} \leq 3A_0 e^{-\frac{(r+1)4\tilde{k}N\hat{b}}{16\tilde{k}N}} \|h\|_{\theta,b} \leq 3A_0 \rho_6^n \|h\|_{\theta,b}, \quad (9.20)$$

where $\rho_6 = \rho_6(N, s) = e^{-1/(16\tilde{k}N)} \in (0, 1)$.

Thus, (9.20) holds for all $h \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ and all integers $n \geq 4\tilde{k}N\hat{b} = 4\tilde{k}N \lceil \log |b| \rceil$. Finally, recall the eigenfunction $h_a \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$ for the operator $L_{f-(P_f+a)\tau}$ from Sect. 4.2. It is known that $\|h_a\|_\theta \leq \text{Const}$ for bounded a , e.g. for $|a| \leq a_0$. For $|a| \leq a_0$ and $a_0 > 0$ sufficiently small we have $\lambda_a \rho_6 \leq \rho$ for some global constant $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Now $L_{ab}^n (h/h_a) = \frac{1}{\lambda_a^n h_a} L_{f-(P+a+ib)\tau}^n h$ and the above estimate show that there exist constants $0 < \rho < 1$, $a_0 > 0$, and $C > 0$ such that if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq b_0$, then $\|L_{f-(P_f+a+ib)\tau}^n h\|_{\theta,b} \leq C \rho^n \|h\|_{\theta,b}$ for any integer $n \geq 4\tilde{k}N \log |b|$ and any $h \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\widehat{U})$. So, we can just set $T = T(s, N) = 4\tilde{k}N$, where \tilde{k} is as in (9.15) and $s = 2/\alpha_2$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. ■

Proof of Theorem 1.1. This follows from the procedure described in [D] (see Sect. 4 and Appendix 1 there). ■

Proof of Corollary 1.3. This is essentially the same as the proof of Corollary 1.4 in Sect. 8 in [St4]. ■

Department of Mathematics,
University of Western Australia,
35 Stirling Hwy, Crawley WA 6009, Australia
e-mail: luchezar.stoyanov@uwa.edu.au

References

- [Ar] L. Arnold, *Random Dynamical Systems*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin 1998.
- [AGY] A. Avila, S. Gouëzel and J.-C. Yoccoz, *Exponential mixing for the Teichmüller flow*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. **104** (2006), 143-211.
- [Ba] V. Baladi, *Positive transfer operators and decay of correlations*, World Scientific, Singapore 2000.
- [BaDL] V. Baladi, M. Demers and C. Liverani, *Exponential Decay of Correlations for Finite Horizon Sinai Billiard Flows*, Invent. Math. **211** (2018), 39-177.
- [BaV] V. Baladi and B. Vallée, *Exponential decay of correlations for surface semiflows without finite Markov partitions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (2005), 865-874.
- [BP] L. Barreira and Ya. Pesin, *Lyapunov exponents and smooth ergodic theory*, Univ. Lect. Series 23, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [B1] R. Bowen, *Symbolic dynamics for hyperbolic flows*, Amer. J. Math. **95** (1973), 429-460.
- [B2] R. Bowen, *Equilibrium States and the Ergodic Theory of Anosov Diffeomorphisms*, Lect. Notes in Maths. **470**, 1975.
- [BR] R. Bowen and D. Ruelle, *The ergodic theory of Axiom A flows*, Invent. Math. **29** (1975), 181-202.
- [Ch1] N. Chernov, *Markov approximations and decay of correlations for Anosov flows*, Ann. of Math. **147** (1998), 269-324.
- [Ch2] N. Chernov, *Invariant measures for hyperbolic dynamical systems*, In: *Handbook of Dynamical Systems*, Ed. by A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, Vol. 1A, pp. 321-407, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.
- [ChK] N. Chernov and D. Kleinbock, *Dynamical Borel-Cantelli lemmas for Gibbs measures*, Israel J. of Math. **122** (2001), 1-27.
- [DMS] B. DeLarue, D. Monclair and A. Sanders, *Locally homogeneous Axiom A flows I: Projective Anosov subgroups and exponential mixing*, arXiv:2403.14257.
- [D] D. Dolgopyat, *On decay of correlations in Anosov flows*, Ann. of Math. **147** (1998), 357-390.
- [DyG] S. Dyatlov and C. Guillarmou, *Pollicott-Ruelle resonances for open systems*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **17** (2016), 3089-3146.
- [DyZ] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski, *Dynamical zeta functions for Anosov flows via microlocal analysis*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. **49** (2016), 543-577.
- [FaSj] F. Faure and J. Sjöstrand, *Upper bound on the density of Ruelle resonances for Anosov flows*, Comm. Math. Phys. **308** (2011), 325-364.
- [FaT] F. Faure and M. Tsujii, *The semiclassical zeta function for geodesic flows on negatively curved manifolds*, Invent. Math. **208** (2017), 85-998.
- [FMT] M. Field, I. Melbourne and A. Török, *Stability of mixing and rapid mixing for hyperbolic flows*, Ann. of Math. **166** (2007), 269-291.
- [GLP] P. Giulietti, C. Liverani and M. Pollicott, *Anosov flows and dynamical zeta functions*, Ann. of Math. **178** (2013), 687-773.
- [GSt] S. Gouëzel and L. Stoyanov, *Quantitative Pesin theory for Anosov diffeomorphisms and flows*, Ergodic Th. & Dynam. Sys. **39** (2019), 159-200.
- [Ha1] B. Hasselblatt, *Regularity of the Anosov splitting and horospheric foliations*, Ergod. Th.& Dynam. Sys. **14** (1994), 645-666.
- [Ha2] B. Hasselblatt, *Regularity of the Anosov splitting II*, Ergod. Th.& Dynam. Sys. **17** (1997), 169-172.

- [KB] A. Katok and Burns, *Infinitesimal Lyapunov functions, invariant cone families and stochastic properties of smooth dynamical systems*, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. **14** (1994), 757-785.
- [KH] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1995.
- [LY1] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young, *The metric theory of diffeomorphisms: Part I: Characterization of measures satisfying Pesin's entropy formula*, Ann. of Math. **122** (1985), 540-574.
- [LY2] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young, *The metric theory of diffeomorphisms: Part II: Relations between entropy, exponents and dimension*, Ann. of Math. **122** (1985), 509-539.
- [L] C. Liverani, *On contact Anosov flows*, Ann. of Math. **159** (2004), 1275-1312.
- [M] I. Melbourne, *Rapid decay of correlations for nonuniformly hyperbolic flows*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), 2421-2441.
- [MV] I. Melbourne and P. Varandas, *Good inducing schemes for uniformly hyperbolic flows, and applications to exponential decay of correlations*, Ann. Henri Poincaré, to appear.
- [N] F. Naud, *Expanding maps on Cantor sets and analytic continuation of zeta functions*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **38** (2005), 116-153.
- [NZ] S. Nonnenmacher and M. Zworski, *Decay of correlations for normally hyperbolic trapping*, Invent. Math. **200** (2015), 345-438.
- [OWi] H. Oh and D. Winter, *Uniform exponential mixing and resonance free regions for convex cocompact congruence subgroups of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$* , Journal of the Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (2016), 1069-1115.
- [Os] V. I. Oseledets, *A multiplicative ergodic theorem. Lyapunov characteristic numbers for dynamical systems*, Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **19** (1968), 197-221.
- [P] Ya. Pesin, *Characteristic exponents and smooth ergodic theory*, Russian Mathematical Surveys **32** (1977), 55-114.
- [PeS] V. Petkov and L. Stoyanov, *Ruelle transfer operators with two complex parameters and applications*, Discr. Cont. Dyn. Sys. A **36** (2016), 6413-6451.
- [Po] M. Pollicott, *On the rate of mixing for Axiom A flows*, Invent. Math. **81** (1985), 413-426.
- [PoS] M. Pollicott and R. Sharp, *Exponential error terms for growth functions of negatively curved surfaces*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), 1019-1042.
- [PS] C. Pugh and M. Shub, *Ergodic attractors*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **312** (1989), 1-54.
- [PSW] C. Pugh, M. Shub and A. Wilkinson, *Hölder foliations*, Duke Math. J. **86** (1997), 517-546; Correction: **105** (2000), 105-106.
- [PP] W. Parry and M. Pollicott, *Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics*, Astérisque **187-188**, (1990).
- [R] D. Ruelle, *Flows which do not mix exponentially*, C.R.Acad. Sci. Paris **296** (1983), 191-193.
- [Si] Ya. Sinai, *Gibbs measures in ergodic theory*, Russ. Math. Surveys **27** (1972), 21-69.
- [St1] L. Stoyanov, *Spectrum of the Ruelle operator and exponential decay of correlations for open billiard flows*, Amer. J. Math. **123** (2001), 715-759.
- [St2] L. Stoyanov, *Spectra of Ruelle transfer operators for Axiom A flows*, Nonlinearity **24** (2011), 1089-1120.
- [St3] L. Stoyanov, *Regular decay of ball diameters and spectra of Ruelle operators for contact Anosov flows*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140** (2012), 3463-3478.
- [St4] L. Stoyanov, *Spectral properties of Ruelle transfer operators for regular Gibbs measures and decay of correlations for contact Anosov flows*. Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. vol. **283**, No. 1404 (2023); arXiv:1712.03103.
- [TZ] M. Tsujii and Z. Zhang, *Smooth mixing Anosov flows in dimension three are exponentially mixing*, Ann. Math. **197** (2023), 65 - 158.
- [V] M. Viana, *Lectures on Lyapunov exponents*, Cambridge Studies in Adv. Math. vol.145, Cambridge Univ. Press 2014.
- [X] V. Xing, *Dynamical Borel-Cantelli lemmas*, Discr. Cont. Dyn. Sys. A **41** (2021), 1737 - 1754.
- [Y1] L.-S. Young, *Statistical properties of systems with some hyperbolicity including certain billiards*, Ann. Math. **147** (1998), 585-650.
- [Y2] L.-S. Young, *Recurrence times and rates of mixing*, Israel J. Math. **110** (1999), 153-188.