

HORSESHOES AND LYAPUNOV EXPONENTS FOR BANACH COCYCLES OVER NONUNIFORMLY HYPERBOLIC SYSTEMS

RUI ZOU AND YONGLUO CAO*

ABSTRACT. Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M , preserving an ergodic hyperbolic measure μ with positive entropy, and let \mathcal{A} be a Hölder continuous cocycle of injective bounded linear operators acting on a Banach space X . We prove that there is a sequence of horseshoes for f and dominated splittings for \mathcal{A} on the horseshoes, such that not only the measure theoretic entropy of f but also the Lyapunov exponents of \mathcal{A} with respect to μ can be approximated by the topological entropy of f and the Lyapunov exponents of \mathcal{A} on the horseshoes, respectively.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M , preserving an ergodic hyperbolic measure μ with positive entropy, and let \mathcal{A} be a Hölder continuous cocycle of injective bounded linear operators acting on a Banach space X . If the cocycle satisfies the so called quasi-compactness condition, then there is a sequence of horseshoes for f and dominated splittings for \mathcal{A} on the horseshoes, such that not only the measure theoretic entropy of f but also the Lyapunov exponents of \mathcal{A} with respect to μ can be approximated by the topological entropy of f and the Lyapunov exponents of \mathcal{A} on the horseshoes, respectively. For an explicit statement, see section 2.

This paper is inspired by Katok [10] (or Katok, Mendoza [11, Theorem S.5.9]) and Cao, Pesin, Zhao [4]. The approximation of an ergodic hyperbolic measure by horseshoes was first proved by Katok [10]. In [15], Mendoza showed that, for a C^2 surface diffeomorphism, an ergodic hyperbolic SRB measure can be approximated by a horseshoe with unstable dimension converging to 1. Avila, Crovisier and Wilkinson [1] stated that the horseshoe constructed by Katok [10] also has a dominated splitting (for Df) and the Lyapunov exponents of the hyperbolic measure can be approximated by the exponents on the horseshoe.

In the C^1 setting, if a hyperbolic measure has positive entropy and whose support admits a dominated splitting, Gelfert [7] asserted the approximation of ergodic hyperbolic measures by horseshoes. Wang, Zou and Cao [20] furtherly studied the horseshoe approximation of Lyapunov exponents, which is used to show the arbitrarily large unstable dimension of the horseshoes.

Date: February 18, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 37A20, 37D05, 37D25, 37H15.

Key words and phrases. Cocycles, Lyapunov exponents, horseshoes, dominated splitting, entropy.

* Yongluo Cao is corresponding author. This work was partially supported by NSFC (11771317, 11790274), Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality (18dz22710000).

The case of C^r ($r > 1$) maps was considered by Chung [5], Yang [21] and Gelfert [6]. Cao, Pesin and Zhao [4] constructed repellers such that both the entropy and the Lyapunov exponents can be approximated on the repellers. They also used this result to show the continuity of sub-additive topological pressure, and then give a lower bound estimate of the Hausdorff dimension of a non-conformal repeller.

For infinite-dimensional dynamical systems, Lian and Young [12] generalized Katok's results [10] to mapping of Hilbert spaces. They also proved analogous results for semiflows on Hilbert spaces [13]. Kalinin and Sadovskaya [8] consider the Hölder continuous cocycle \mathcal{A} for invertible bounded linear operators on Banach space of f as above, and prove that the upper and lower Lyapunov exponents of \mathcal{A} with respect to μ can be approximated in term of the norms of the return values of \mathcal{A} on hyperbolic periodic point of f .

The main result of this paper is stated in Section 2, together with some notations and preliminaries. In Section 3, we provide the proof of the main result.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Cocycles and Lyapunov exponents for cocycles. Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M , and $L(X)$ be the space of bounded linear operators on a Banach space X . Assume $A : M \rightarrow L(X)$ is a Hölder continuous map. The *cocycle* over f generated by A is a map $\mathcal{A} : M \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow L(X)$ defined by $\mathcal{A}(x, 0) = Id$, and $\mathcal{A}(x, n) = A(f^{n-1}x) \cdots A(fx)A(x)$. We also denote $\mathcal{A}(x, -n) := A(f^{-n}x)^{-1} \cdots A(f^{-2}x)^{-1}A(f^{-1}x)^{-1}$ for $n > 0$. Note that $\mathcal{A}(x, -n)$ is not a map in general. To be more flexible, we also denote $\mathcal{A}_x^n := \mathcal{A}(x, n)$.

We now study some properties of Lyapunov exponents. The following version of multiplicative ergodic theorem was established by P. Thieullen [19], based on the work of [16, 18, 14]. In order to state the multiplicative ergodic theorem, we introduce some definitions.

Denote by B_1 the unit ball of X . Then for any $T \in L(X)$, We define the *Hausdorff measure of noncompactness* of T by

$$\|T\|_\kappa := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : T(B_1) \text{ can be covered by finite } \varepsilon\text{-balls}\}.$$

Then by the definition, we have $\|T\|_\kappa \leq \|T\|$, and $\|\cdot\|_\kappa$ is sub-multiplicative, that is $\|T_2T_1\|_\kappa \leq \|T_2\|_\kappa \cdot \|T_1\|_\kappa$ for any $T_1, T_2 \in L(X)$. Let μ be an ergodic f -invariant measure on M , then by the sub-additive ergodic theorem, the limits

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathcal{A}, \mu) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int \log \|\mathcal{A}_x^n\| d\mu, \\ \kappa(\mathcal{A}, \mu) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int \log \|\mathcal{A}_x^n\|_\kappa d\mu \end{aligned}$$

exist. We call the cocycle \mathcal{A} is *quasi-compact* with respect to μ , if $\chi(\mathcal{A}, \mu) > \kappa(\mathcal{A}, \mu)$.

Given two topological spaces Y, Z and a Borel measure μ on Y , a map $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ is called *μ -continuous*, if there exists a sequence of pairwise disjoint compact subsets $Y_n \subset Y$, such that $\mu(\cup_{n \geq 1} Y_n) = 1$ and $g|_{Y_n}$ is continuous for every $n \geq 1$. We write $\mathbb{N}_k := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ for $1 \leq k < +\infty$ and $\mathbb{N}_{+\infty} := \mathbb{N}_+$.

For a given f -invariant set Λ , a splitting $X = E_1(x) \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i(x) \oplus F_i(x)$ on Λ is called an *\mathcal{A} -invariant splitting*, if $A(x)E_j(x) = E_j(fx)$ and $A(x)F_i(x) \subset F_i(fx)$ for every $x \in \Lambda, j = 1, \dots, i$.

We now state a version of multiplicative ergodic theorem used in this paper.

Theorem 2.1 ([19]). *Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M , preserving an ergodic measure μ , and let $A : M \rightarrow L(X)$ be a Hölder continuous map such that $A(x)$ is injective for every $x \in M$. If \mathcal{A} is quasi-compact with respect to μ , then there exists an f -invariant set $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{A}} \subset M$ with $\mu(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{A}}) = 1$ such that for every $x \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$:*

- (i) *There exist $k_0 \leq +\infty$, numbers $\lambda(\mathcal{A}, \mu) = \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \kappa(\mathcal{A}, \mu)$, finite dimensional subspaces $E_1(x), E_2(x), \cdots$ and infinite dimensional closed subspaces $F_1(x), F_2(x), \cdots$ indexed in \mathbb{N}_{k_0} .*
- (ii) *For any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, there exists an \mathcal{A} -invariant splitting on $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$:*

$$X = E_1(x) \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i(x) \oplus F_i(x).$$

- (iii) *For any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_x^n(u)\|}{\|u\|} = \lambda_i$, $\forall u \in E_i(x) \setminus \{0\}$;*
 $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{A}_x^n|_{F_i(x)}\| = \lambda_{i+1}$, *where $\lambda_{k_0+1} := \kappa(\mathcal{A}, \mu)$ if $k_0 < +\infty$.*
- (iv) *For any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, $E_i(x), F_i(x)$ are Borel measurable μ -continuous and the norms of the projection operators $\pi_E^i(x), \pi_F^i(x)$ associated with $X = (E_1(x) \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i(x)) \oplus F_i(x)$ are tempered, that is,*

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\pi_\tau^i(f^n x)\| = 0, \quad \forall \tau = E, F.$$

The numbers $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots$ indexed in \mathbb{N}_{k_0} are called the *Lyapunov exponents* of \mathcal{A} with respect to μ , and the decomposition $X = E_1(x) \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i(x) \oplus F_i(x)$ is called the *Oseledets decomposition*. Denote $d_j := \dim(E_j)$.

2.2. Main result. Recall that an ergodic f -invariant measure is called a *hyperbolic measure* if it has no zero Lyapunov exponents for Df . We now state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.2. *Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M , preserving an ergodic hyperbolic measure μ with $h_\mu(f) > 0$. Assume $A : M \rightarrow L(X)$ be a Hölder continuous map such that $A(x)$ is injective for every $x \in M$ and the generated cocycle \mathcal{A} is quasi-compact with respect to μ . Then for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, there exists $\varepsilon_i > 0$, such that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, there exists a hyperbolic horseshoe Λ satisfying the following properties:*

- (i) $|h_{\text{top}}(f|_\Lambda) - h_\mu(f)| < \varepsilon$.
- (ii) Λ is ε -close to $\text{supp}(\mu)$ in the Hausdorff distance.
- (iii) For any f -invariant probability measure ν supported in Λ , $D(\mu, \nu) < \varepsilon$.
- (iv) There exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a continuous \mathcal{A} -invariant splitting of X on Λ

$$X = E_1(x) \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i(x) \oplus F_i(x),$$

with $\dim(E_j(x)) = d_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq i$, such that for any $x \in \Lambda$, we have

$$e^{(\lambda_j - \varepsilon)m} \|u\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_x^m(u)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_j + \varepsilon)m} \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in E_j(x), 1 \leq j \leq i,$$

$$\|\mathcal{A}_x^m(v)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_{i+1} + \varepsilon)m} \|v\|, \quad \forall v \in F_i(x).$$

2.3. Lyapunov norm for cocycles. Fix any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathcal{R}^A$. We define the *Lyapunov norm for \mathcal{A}* $\|\cdot\|_x = \|\cdot\|_{x,i,\varepsilon}$ on X as follows:

For any $u = u_1 + \cdots + u_{i+1} \in X$, where $u_j \in E_j(x)$, $\forall j = 1, \dots, i$, and $u_{i+1} \in F_i(x)$, we define

$$(2.2) \quad \|u\|_x := \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \|u_j\|_x,$$

where

$$\|u_j\|_x = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \|\mathcal{A}_x^n(u_j)\| \cdot e^{-\lambda_j n - \varepsilon|n|}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, i;$$

and

$$(2.3) \quad \|u_{i+1}\|_x = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|\mathcal{A}_x^n(u_{i+1})\| \cdot e^{-(\lambda_{i+1} + \varepsilon)n}.$$

Then the following lemma holds.

Lemma 2.3. *Let f, μ and A be as in Theorem 2.2. Then for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, the Lyapunov norm $\|\cdot\|_x = \|\cdot\|_{x,i,\varepsilon}$ satisfies the following properties.*

(i) *For any $x \in \mathcal{R}^A$, we have*

$$(2.4) \quad e^{\lambda_j - \varepsilon} \|u_j\|_x \leq \|A(x)u_j\|_{fx} \leq e^{\lambda_j + \varepsilon} \|u_j\|_x, \quad \forall u_j \in E_j(x), \quad j = 1, \dots, i,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \|A(x)u_{i+1}\|_{fx} \leq e^{\lambda_{i+1} + \varepsilon} \|u_{i+1}\|_x, \quad \forall u_{i+1} \in F_i(x).$$

(ii) *There exists an f -invariant subset of \mathcal{R}^A with μ -full measure (we may also denote it by \mathcal{R}^A), and a measurable function $K(x) = K_{\varepsilon,i}(x)$ defined on \mathcal{R}^A such that for any $x \in \mathcal{R}^A$, $u \in X$, we have*

$$(2.6) \quad \|u\| \leq \|u\|_x \leq K(x) \|u\|,$$

$$(2.7) \quad K(x)e^{-\varepsilon} \leq K(fx) \leq K(x)e^{\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. (i) We will prove the inequality

$$\|A(x)u_j\|_{fx} \leq e^{\lambda_j + \varepsilon} \|u_j\|_x, \quad \forall u_j \in E_j(x), \quad j = 1, \dots, i,$$

the others can be proved analogously. By the definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(x)u_j\|_{fx} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \|\mathcal{A}_{fx}^n(\mathcal{A}_x^1(u_j))\| \cdot e^{-\lambda_j n - \varepsilon|n|} \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \|\mathcal{A}_x^{n+1}(u_j)\| \cdot e^{-\lambda_j(n+1) - \varepsilon|n+1|} \cdot e^{\lambda_j + \varepsilon(|n+1| - |n|)} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda_j + \varepsilon} \cdot \|u_j\|_x. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For any $u = u_1 + \cdots + u_{i+1} \in X$, by the definition,

$$\|u\| \leq \|u_1\| + \cdots + \|u_{i+1}\| \leq \|u_1\|_x + \cdots + \|u_{i+1}\|_x = \|u\|_x.$$

This estimates the lower bound. To estimate the upper bound, we define

$$M_j(x) := \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_x^n(u_j)\|}{e^{\lambda_j n + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon|n|} \cdot \|u_j\|} : u_j \in E_j(x), n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, i,$$

$$M_{i+1}(x) := \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_x^n(u_{i+1})\|}{e^{(\lambda_{i+1} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)n} \cdot \|u_{i+1}\|} : u_{i+1} \in F_i(x), n \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_x &\leq \sum_{j=1}^i \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} M_j(x) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon|n|} \cdot \|u_j\| + \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} M_{i+1}(x) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon n} \cdot \|u_{i+1}\| \\ (2.8) \quad &\leq c_0 \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^i M_j(x) \cdot \|\pi_E^j(x) - \pi_E^{j-1}(x)\| \cdot \|u\| + M_{i+1}(x) \cdot \|\pi_F^i(x)\| \cdot \|u\| \right) \\ &=: M(x) \cdot \|u\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0 = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon|n|}$ and $\pi_E^0(x) = 0$.

Claim. $M(x)$ is tempered on an f -invariant subset of \mathcal{R}^A with μ -full measure, that is

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M(f^n x) = 0, \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathcal{R}^A.$$

Proof. Since $\|\pi_E^j(x)\|, \|\pi_F^j(x)\|$ are tempered by (2.1), it's enough to prove $M_j(x)$ is tempered for any $1 \leq j \leq i+1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} &M_{i+1}(x) \\ &= \sup_{\substack{u_{i+1} \in F_{i+1}(x) \\ n \geq 1}} \left\{ \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_{f x}^{n-1}(\mathcal{A}_x(u_{i+1}))\|}{e^{\lambda_{i+1}(n-1) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon|n-1|} \cdot \|\mathcal{A}_x(u_{i+1})\|} \cdot \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_x(u_{i+1})\|}{e^{\lambda_{i+1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(|n|-|n-1|)} \cdot \|u_{i+1}\|}, 1 \right\} \\ &\leq \max\{c_1 \cdot M_{i+1}(f x), 1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 = \max_{x \in X} \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_x\|}{e^{\lambda_{i+1} - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon}}$, we obtain

$$(\log M_{i+1}(x) - \log M_{i+1}(f x))^+ \leq \log^+ \max\left\{c_1, \frac{1}{M_{i+1}(f x)}\right\} \leq \log^+ \max\{c_1, 1\},$$

then we conclude $M_{i+1}(x)$ is tempered on a subset of full measure by [14, Lemma III.8]. The result for $1 \leq j \leq i$ is obtained similarly. \square

Let

$$K(x) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} M(f^n x) e^{-\varepsilon|n|}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{R}^A,$$

then by [2, Lemma 3.5.7], $K(x)$ satisfies (2.6) and (2.7). This completes the proof. \square

Fix any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$. Then by Lusin's theorem, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a compact subset $\mathcal{R}_\delta^A \subset \mathcal{R}^A$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{R}_\delta^A) > 1 - \delta$ and $K(x)$ is continuous on \mathcal{R}_δ^A . Denote

$$(2.9) \quad l = l_\delta = \sup\{K(x) : x \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^A\}.$$

Since the Oseledets decomposition is μ -continuous, we may assume the Oseledets decomposition is continuous on \mathcal{R}_δ^A .

Let \tilde{X} be the collection of norms on X which are equivalent to $\|\cdot\|$, then \tilde{X} is a metric space with respect to the metric

$$\tilde{D}(\varphi, \psi) = \sup_{u \in X \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|\varphi(u) - \psi(u)|}{\|u\|}, \quad \forall \varphi, \psi \in \tilde{X}.$$

We claim that the function $x \mapsto \|\cdot\|_x$ is continuous on \mathcal{R}_δ^A . Indeed, for any $x \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^A$, $u = u_1 + \cdots + u_{i+1} \in X$, where $u_j \in E_j(x)$, $\forall j = 1, \dots, i$, and $u_{i+1} \in F_i(x)$, we define

$$\|u\|_{k,x} := \sum_{j=1}^i \sum_{n=-k}^k \|\mathcal{A}_x^n(u_j)\| \cdot e^{-\lambda_j n - \varepsilon|n|} + \sum_{n=0}^k \|\mathcal{A}_x^n(u_{i+1})\| \cdot e^{-(\lambda_{i+1} + \varepsilon)n},$$

then by (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\|u\|_x - \|u\|_{k,x}\| &\leq \sum_{|n|>k} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon|n|} \cdot M(x) \cdot \|u\| \\ &\leq \frac{2e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}k}}{e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} - 1} \cdot K(x) \cdot \|u\| \\ &\leq \frac{2L \cdot e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}k}}{(e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} - 1)} \cdot \|u\|, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\tilde{D}(\|\cdot\|_x, \|\cdot\|_{k,x}) \leq \frac{2L \cdot e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}k}}{(e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} - 1)},$$

which implies $\|\cdot\|_{k,x} \rightarrow \|\cdot\|_x$ uniformly for $x \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^A$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Since $x \mapsto \|\cdot\|_{k,x}$ is continuous, we have $x \mapsto \|\cdot\|_x$ is continuous on \mathcal{R}_δ^A . This proves the claim.

2.4. Regular neighborhoods. Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian d -dimensional manifold M , preserving an ergodic hyperbolic measure μ . Then by Oseledets multiplicative ergodic theorem [16], there exists an f -invariant set \mathcal{R}^{Df} with μ -full measure, a number $\chi > 0$ and a Df -invariant decomposition $TM = E^u \oplus E^s$ on \mathcal{R}^{Df} such that for any $x \in \mathcal{R}^{Df}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|D_x f^n(u)\| &> \chi, \quad \forall u \in E^u(x) \setminus \{0\}, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|D_x f^n(v)\| &< -\chi, \quad \forall v \in E^s(x) \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $d_u = \dim(E^u)$, $d_s = \dim(E^s)$, and denote by $B(0, r)$ the standard Euclidean r -ball in \mathbb{R}^d centered at 0. We now introduce some properties of regular neighborhoods, see [17] for the proofs.

Theorem 2.4 (Pesin). *Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M , μ be an ergodic hyperbolic measure. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the following properties hold.*

- (i) *There exists a measurable function $l' : \mathcal{R}^{Df} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ and a collection of embeddings $\Psi_x : B(0, l'(x)^{-1}) \rightarrow M$ for $x \in \mathcal{R}^{Df}$ such that $\Psi_x(0) = x$, $l'(x)e^{-\varepsilon} \leq l'(fx) \leq l'(x)e^\varepsilon$, and the preimages $\tilde{E}^j(x) = (D_0 \Psi_x)^{-1} E^j(x)$ are orthogonal in \mathbb{R}^d , where $j = u, s$.*
- (ii) *If $\tilde{f}_x = \Psi_{fx}^{-1} \circ f \circ \Psi_x : B(0, l'(x)^{-1}) \rightarrow M$, then there exist $A_u \in GL(d_u, \mathbb{R})$ and $A_s \in GL(d_s, \mathbb{R})$ such that $D_0(\tilde{f}_x) = \text{diag}(A_u, A_s)$ and*

$$\|A_u^{-1}\|^{-1} \geq e^{\chi - \varepsilon}, \quad \|A_s\| \leq e^{-\chi + \varepsilon}.$$

- (iii) *For any $a, b \in B(0, l'(x)^{-1})$,*

$$\|D_a(\tilde{f}_x) - D_b(\tilde{f}_x)\|, \|D_a(\tilde{f}_x^{-1}) - D_b(\tilde{f}_x^{-1})\| \leq l'(x)|a - b|^{r-1}.$$

(iv) *There exists a constant $0 < c_1 < 1$ such that*

$$\|D(\Psi_x)\| \leq c_1^{-1}, \|D(\Psi_x^{-1})\| \leq l'(x).$$

So for any $a, b \in B(0, l'(x)^{-1})$,

$$c_1 \cdot d(\Psi_x(a), \Psi_x(b)) \leq |a - b| \leq l'(x) \cdot d(\Psi_x(a), \Psi_x(b)).$$

The set $\mathcal{N}(x) := \Psi_x(B(0, l'(x)^{-1}))$ is called a *regular neighborhood* of x . Let $r(x)$ be the radius of maximal ball contained in $\mathcal{N}(x)$, then Theorem 2.4 implies $r(x) \geq l'(x)^{-2}$. By Lusin's theorem, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a compact subset $\mathcal{R}_\delta^{Df} \subset \mathcal{R}^{Df}$ with $\mu(\mathcal{R}_\delta^{Df}) > 1 - \delta$ such that $x \mapsto \Psi_x, l'(x)$ and the Oseledets splitting $T_x M = E_x^u \oplus E_x^s$ vary continuously on \mathcal{R}_δ^{Df} . Denote

$$l' = l'_\delta = \max\{l'(x) : x \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^{Df}\}.$$

For $x \in \mathcal{R}^{Df}$, using chart Ψ_x , we can trivialize the tangent bundle over $\mathcal{N}(x)$ by identifying $T_{\mathcal{N}(x)} M \equiv \mathcal{N}(x) \times \mathbb{R}^d$. For any $y \in \mathcal{N}(x), u \in T_y M$, we can use the identification to *translate* the vector u to a corresponding vector $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, that is, $\bar{u} = D_y(\Psi_x^{-1})u$. We then define

$$\|u\|'_y := \|D_y(\Psi_x^{-1})u\|.$$

This defines a norm on $T_{\mathcal{N}(x)} M$. For $v \in T_x M$, Let $v_y \in T_y M$ be the vector translated from v , that is, $v_y = D_a(\Psi_x)D_x(\Psi_x^{-1})v$, where $a = \Psi_x^{-1}(y)$. Then $\|v\|'_x = \|v_y\|'_y$. Thus without confusion, we may identify

$$(2.10) \quad \|v\|'_x = \|D_x(\Psi_x^{-1})v\| = \|v\|'_y.$$

By translating the splitting $T_x M = E^u(x) \oplus E^s(x)$, we define a new splitting $T_y M = E^u(y) \oplus E^s(y)$, where $E^u(y) = D_a(\Psi_x)\tilde{E}^u(x)$ and $a = \Psi_x^{-1}(y)$ (and similarly for $E^s(y)$).

Using the identification $T_{\mathcal{N}(x)} M \equiv \mathcal{N}(x) \times \mathbb{R}^d$, without confusion, we also identify $D_y f = D_b(\tilde{f}_x)$ (where $b = \Psi_x^{-1}(fy)$) and identify $T_y M = E^u(y) \oplus E^s(y)$ with $\mathbb{R}^d = \tilde{E}^u(x) \oplus \tilde{E}^s(x)$. Then by Theorem 2.4,

$$(2.11) \quad \|D_x f(u)\|'_{fx} \geq e^{\chi - \varepsilon} \|u\|'_x, \quad \forall u \in E^u(x),$$

$$(2.12) \quad \|D_x f(v)\|'_{fx} \leq e^{-\chi + \varepsilon} \|v\|'_x, \quad \forall v \in E^s(x),$$

$$(2.13) \quad c_1 \|u\| \leq \|u\|'_y \leq l'(x) \|u\|, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{N}(x), u \in T_y M.$$

2.5. (ρ, β, γ) -rectangles. Let M, f, μ be as above, let $d_u = \dim(E^u), d_s = \dim(E^s)$, then $d_u + d_s = d$. Let $I = [-1, 1]$, we say $R(x) \subset M$ is a *rectangle* in M if there exists a C^1 embedding $\Phi_x : I^d \rightarrow M$ such that $\Phi_x(I^d) = R(x)$ and $\Phi_x(0) = x$. A set \tilde{H} is called an *admissible u -rectangle in $R(x)$* , if there exist $0 < \lambda < 1, C^1$ maps $\phi_1, \phi_2 : I^{d_u} \rightarrow I^{d_s}$ satisfying $\|\phi_1(u)\| \geq \|\phi_2(u)\|$ for $u \in I^{d_u}$ and $\|D\phi_i\| \leq \lambda$ for $i = 1, 2$, such that $\tilde{H} = \Phi_x(H)$, where

$$H = \{(u, v) \in I^{d_u} \times I^{d_s} : v = t\phi_1(u) + (1-t)\phi_2(u), 0 \leq t \leq 1\}.$$

Similarly define an *admissible s -rectangle in $R(x)$* .

Definition 2.5. *Given $f : M \rightarrow M$ and $\Lambda \subset M$ compact, we say that $R(x)$ is a (ρ, β, γ) -rectangle of Λ for $\rho > \beta > 0, \gamma > 0$, if there exists $\lambda = \lambda(\rho, \beta, \gamma)$ satisfying:*

- (i) $x \in \Lambda, B(x, \beta) \subset \text{int } R(x)$ and $\text{diam}(R(x)) \leq \rho/3$.

- (ii) If $z, f^m z \in \Lambda \cap B(x, \beta)$ for some $m > 0$, then the connected component $C(z, R(x) \cap f^{-m}R(x))$ of $R(x) \cap f^{-m}R(x)$ containing z is an admissible s -rectangle in $R(x)$, and $f^m C(z, R(x) \cap f^{-m}R(x))$ is an admissible u -rectangle in $R(x)$.
- (iii) $\text{diam } f^k C(z, R(x) \cap f^{-m}R(x)) \leq \rho \cdot e^{-\gamma \min\{k, m-k\}}$, for $0 \leq k \leq m$.

The following lemma is a simplified statement of [11, Theorem S.4.16].

Lemma 2.6. *Let f be a C^r ($r > 1$) diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M , μ be an ergodic hyperbolic measure. Then for any $\rho > 0$, $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $\beta = \beta(\rho, \delta) > 0$, such that for any $x \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^{Df}$, there exists a $(\rho, \beta, \frac{\delta}{2})$ -rectangle $R(x)$.*

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

In this section, we will give the proof of Theorem 2.2. We begin with estimating the growth of vectors in certain invariant cones.

3.1. Invariant cones. Let f be a C^r diffeomorphism of a compact Riemannian manifold M with $r > 1$, and μ be an ergodic hyperbolic measure for f with $h_\mu(f) > 0$. Assume $A : M \rightarrow L(X)$ be a Hölder continuous map such that $A(x)$ is injective for every $x \in M$ and $\lambda(\mathcal{A}, \mu) > \kappa(\mathcal{A}, \mu)$. Then by the multiplicative ergodic theorem stated in subsection 2.1, there are Lyapunov exponents $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots$ indexed in \mathbb{N}_{k_0} for some $k_0 \leq +\infty$.

Fix any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, and let $\varepsilon_i := \min\{\frac{1}{2}\chi\alpha, \frac{\chi}{4}, \frac{\chi(r-1)}{2r}, \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{8}, \dots, \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}}{8}\}$. For any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, $x \in \mathcal{R}^A$, let $\|\cdot\|_x = \|\cdot\|_{x, i, \varepsilon}$ be the Lyapunov norm on X defined in (2.2). For any $1 \leq j \leq i$, we have the Oseledets decomposition $X = H_j(x) \oplus F_j(x)$, where $H_j(x) = E_1(x) \oplus \dots \oplus E_j(x)$. For any $u \in X$, let $u = u_H + u_F$, where $u_H \in H_j(x)$, $u_F \in F_j(x)$, we consider two cones:

$$U_j(x, \theta) := \{u \in X : \|u_F\|_x \leq \theta \|u_H\|_x\},$$

$$V_j(x, \theta) := \{u \in X : \|u_H\|_x \leq \theta \|u_F\|_x\}.$$

For any $\delta > 0$, a sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called a ρ -pseudo-orbit of f^m in \mathcal{R}_δ^A for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, if $x_n, f^m(x_n) \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^A$ and $d(f^m x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \rho$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $l = l_\delta$ be as in (2.9). We have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, $\delta > 0$, there exist $\rho_0 > 0$, $\theta_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \rho < \rho_0$, $1 \leq j \leq i$, any ρ -pseudo-orbit $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of f^m in \mathcal{R}_δ^A with $m \geq \frac{2 \log l}{\varepsilon}$, and for any $y \in M$ with $d(f^k x_n, f^k(f^{nm} y)) \leq \rho \cdot e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}}$, $k = 0, \dots, m$, we can find $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon, \delta, m) \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$(i) \mathcal{A}_{f^{nm+k}y}^m U_j(f^k x_n, \theta_0) \subset U_j(f^k x_{n+1}, \eta \theta_0), \text{ and}$$

$$e^{(\lambda_j - 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_{f^{nm+k}y}^m(u)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_1 + 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|, \forall u \in U_j(f^k x_n, \theta_0).$$

$$(ii) \mathcal{A}_{f^{(n-1)m+k}y}^{-m} V_j(f^k x_n, \theta_0) \subset V_j(f^k x_{n-1}, \eta \theta_0), \text{ and}$$

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{(n-1)m+k}y}^m(v)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1} + 4\varepsilon)m} \|v\|, \forall v \in \mathcal{A}_{f^{nm+k}y}^{-m} V_j(f^k x_n, \theta_0).$$

Proof. (i) For simplicity of notations, we prove $\mathcal{A}_y^m U_j(x_0, \theta_0) \subset U_j(x_1, \eta \theta_0)$ and $e^{(\lambda_j - 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_y^m(u)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_1 + 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|, \forall u \in U_j(x_0, \theta_0), 1 \leq j \leq i$.

For any fixed $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, $\delta > 0$, denote $\theta_0 := e^{\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_1} (e^\varepsilon - 1) < e^\varepsilon - 1$, and $\eta_0 := \max\{e^{\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 4\varepsilon} : 1 \leq j \leq i\}$. We have the following claim.

Claim. *There exist $\tilde{\rho}_0 > 0$, such that for any $\theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \eta_0^{-1}\theta_0^{-1}$, $1 \leq j \leq i$, and for any $x_0, f^m x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^A$, $y \in M$ with $d(f^k x_0, f^k y) \leq \rho \cdot e^{-\frac{\chi}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}}$ for $k = 0, \dots, m$ and $0 < \rho < \tilde{\rho}_0$, we have*

$$(3.1) \quad A(f^k y)U_j(f^k x_0, \theta) \subset U_j(f^{k+1} x_0, \eta_0 \theta), \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m-1.$$

Proof of the Claim. For any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, $u = u_H + u_F \in U_j(f^k x_0, \theta)$, by (2.4) and (2.5), we have

$$(3.2) \quad \|A(f^k x_0)u_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \geq e^{\lambda_j - \varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0},$$

$$(3.3) \quad \|A(f^k x_0)u_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq e^{\lambda_{j+1} + \varepsilon} \|u_F\|_{f^k x_0}.$$

Let $w = (A(f^k y) - A(f^k x_0))u = w_H + w_F$, where $w_H \in H_j(f^{k+1} x_0)$, $w_F \in F_j(f^{k+1} x_0)$, then

$$(3.4) \quad A(f^k y)u = w + A(f^k x_0)u.$$

By (2.6), (2.7) and (2.9),

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|w_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} &\leq \|w\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq K(f^{k+1}x_0) \|A(f^k y) - A(f^k x_0)\| \cdot \|u\| \\ &\leq l e^{\varepsilon \min\{k+1, m-k-1\}} \cdot c_0 \rho^\alpha e^{-\frac{\chi}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}} \|u\| \\ &\leq c_0 l e^\varepsilon \rho^\alpha e^{(\varepsilon - \frac{\chi}{2} \alpha) \min\{k, m-k\}} \|u\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\leq (1 + \theta) c_0 l e^\varepsilon \rho^\alpha \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\varepsilon - \frac{\chi}{2} \alpha < 0$. Similarly,

$$(3.6) \quad \|w_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq (1 + \theta) c_0 l e^\varepsilon \rho^\alpha \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0}.$$

Let

$$A(f^k y)u = (A(f^k y)u)_H + (A(f^k y)u)_F,$$

where $(A(f^k y)u)_H \in H_j(f^{k+1} x_0)$, $(A(f^k y)u)_F \in F_j(f^{k+1} x_0)$. Then by (3.2), (3.4) and (3.5), for any $\theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \eta_0^{-1}\theta_0^{-1}$,

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(A(f^k y)u)_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} &\geq \|A(f^k x_0)u_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} - \|w_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \\ &\geq e^{\lambda_j - \varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0} - (1 + \theta) c_0 l e^\varepsilon \rho^\alpha \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\geq e^{\lambda_j - 2\varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0} \end{aligned}$$

if ρ is small enough. Similarly, by (3.3), (3.4) and (3.6),

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(A(f^k y)u)_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} &\leq \|A(f^k x_0)u_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} + \|w_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda_{j+1} + \varepsilon} \|u_F\|_{f^k x_0} + (1 + \theta) c_0 l e^\varepsilon \rho^\alpha \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\leq \theta e^{\lambda_{j+1} + 2\varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0}, \end{aligned}$$

if ρ is small enough. Thus

$$\|(A(f^k y)u)_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq \eta_0 \theta \|(A(f^k y)u)_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0}, \quad \forall \theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \eta_0^{-1}\theta_0^{-1},$$

that is, $A(f^k y)U_j(f^k x_0, \theta) \subset U_j(f^{k+1} x_0, \eta_0 \theta)$. \square

The Claim implies

$$\mathcal{A}_y^m U_j(x_0, \theta) \subset U_j(f^m x_0, \eta_0 \theta), \quad \forall \theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \eta_0^{-1}\theta_0^{-1}, 1 \leq j \leq i.$$

Since, by subsection 2.3, the Lyapunov norm and the Oseledets decomposition are uniformly continuous on the compact set $\cup_{k=1}^m f^k \mathcal{R}_\delta^A$, there exists $\eta_0 < \eta < 1$ such that

$$(3.9) \quad U_j(f^m x_0, \eta_0 \theta) \subset U_j(x_1, \eta \theta), \quad \forall d(f^m x_0, x_1) \leq \rho, \theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \eta_0^{-1} \theta_0^{-1},$$

if ρ is small enough. Hence for any $1 \leq j \leq i$, we have

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{A}_y^m U_j(x_0, \theta) \subset U_j(x_1, \eta \theta), \quad \forall \theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \eta_0^{-1} \theta_0^{-1}.$$

Moreover, for any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, $u \in U_j(f^k x_0, \theta_0)$, it follows from (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(f^k y)u\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} &\geq \|(A(f^k y)u)_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \\ &\geq e^{\lambda_j - 2\varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\geq (1 + \theta_0)^{-1} e^{\lambda_j - 2\varepsilon} \|u\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\geq e^{\lambda_j - 3\varepsilon} \|u\|_{f^k x_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $1 \leq j \leq i$, $u \in U_j(x_0, \theta_0)$, by (3.1) and (2.6), we conclude

$$\|\mathcal{A}_y^m(u)\| \geq \frac{1}{l} \|\mathcal{A}_y^m(u)\|_{f^m x_0} \geq \frac{1}{l} e^{(\lambda_j - 3\varepsilon)m} \|u\|_{x_0} \geq e^{(\lambda_j - 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|.$$

Similar to (3.7), we can also get

$$\|(A(f^k y)u)_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq \|A(f^k x_0)u_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} + \|w_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq e^{\lambda_1 + 2\varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0}.$$

Thus we obtain by using (3.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(f^k y)u\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} &\leq \|(A(f^k y)u)_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} + \|(A(f^k y)u)_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda_1 + 2\varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0} + \theta_0 e^{\lambda_{j+1} + 2\varepsilon} \|u_H\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda_1 + 3\varepsilon} \|u\|_{f^k x_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any $u \in U_j(x_0, \theta_0)$, by (3.1) and (2.6), we conclude

$$\|\mathcal{A}_y^m(u)\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_y^m(u)\|_{f^m x_0} \leq e^{(\lambda_1 + 3\varepsilon)m} \|u\|_{x_0} \leq l e^{(\lambda_1 + 3\varepsilon)m} \|u\| \leq e^{(\lambda_1 + 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|.$$

This proves the conclusion (i).

(ii) For simplicity, we only prove $\mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m} V_j(x_1, \theta_0) \subset V_j(x_0, \eta \theta_0)$ and $\|\mathcal{A}_y^m(v)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1} + 4\varepsilon)m} \|v\|, \forall v \in \mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m} V_j(x_1, \theta_0), 1 \leq j \leq i$.

Similar to the proof of (3.10), one has

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^k y}^{m-k} U_j(f^k x_0, \theta) \subset U_j(x_1, \eta \theta), \quad \forall \theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \eta_0^{-1} \theta_0^{-1}, 0 \leq k \leq m-1.$$

Let $U_j^\circ(x, \theta) := \{u \in X : \|u_F\|_x < \theta \|u_H\|_x\}$. Then

$$U_j^\circ(x, \theta) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} U_j(x, \frac{n-1}{n} \theta).$$

Therefore, for any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^k y}^{m-k} U_j(f^k x_0, \frac{n-1}{n} \eta^{-1} \theta_0^{-1}) \subset U_j(x_1, \frac{n-1}{n} \theta_0^{-1}), \quad \forall n > 1,$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^k y}^{m-k} U_j^\circ(f^k x_0, \eta^{-1} \theta_0^{-1}) \subset U_j^\circ(x_1, \theta_0^{-1}).$$

Since $A(x)$ is injective for any $x \in M$, we have

$$U_j^\circ(f^k x_0, \eta^{-1} \theta_0^{-1}) \subset (\mathcal{A}_{f^k y}^{m-k})^{-1} U_j^\circ(x_1, \theta_0^{-1}).$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m+k}(X \setminus U_j^\circ(x_1, \theta_0^{-1})) \subset X \setminus U_j^\circ(f^k x_0, \eta^{-1} \theta_0^{-1}),$$

that is,

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m+k} V_j(x_1, \theta_0) \subset V_j(f^k x_0, \eta \theta_0), \forall 0 \leq k \leq m-1.$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m} V_j(x_1, \theta_0) \subset V_j(x_0, \eta \theta_0).$$

Now, for any $w \in \mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m+k} V_j(x_1, \theta_0) \subset V_j(f^k x_0, \eta \theta_0) \subset V_j(f^k x_0, \theta_0)$, Let $w = w_H + w_F$, where $w_H \in H_j(f^k x_0)$, $w_F \in F_j(f^k x_0)$. Then

$$\|A(f^k x_0)w_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq e^{\lambda_1 + \varepsilon} \|w_H\|_{f^k x_0}, \quad \|A(f^k x_0)w_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq e^{\lambda_{j+1} + \varepsilon} \|w_F\|_{f^k x_0}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(f^k x_0)w\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} &\leq \|A(f^k x_0)w_H\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} + \|A(f^k x_0)w_F\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda_1 + \varepsilon} \|w_H\|_{f^k x_0} + e^{\lambda_{j+1} + \varepsilon} \|w_F\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda_{j+1} + 2\varepsilon} \|w\|_{f^k x_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (3.5), we can obtain $\|A(f^k y)w - A(f^k x_0)w\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq c_0 l e^\varepsilon \rho^\alpha \|w\|_{f^k x_0}$. Therefore, for any $w \in \mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m+k} V_j(x_1, \theta_0)$, where $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, one has $A(f^k y)w \in \mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m+k+1} V_j(x_1, \theta_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(f^k y)w\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} &\leq \|A(f^k y)w - A(f^k x_0)w\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} + \|A(f^k x_0)w\|_{f^{k+1}x_0} \\ &\leq c_0 l e^\varepsilon \rho^\alpha \|w\|_{f^k x_0} + e^{\lambda_{j+1} + 2\varepsilon} \|w\|_{f^k x_0} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda_{j+1} + 3\varepsilon} \|w\|_{f^k x_0}, \end{aligned}$$

if ρ is small enough. It implies that for any $v \in \mathcal{A}_{f^m y}^{-m} V_j(x_1, \theta_0)$,

$$\|A_y^m(v)\| \leq \|A_y^m(v)\|_{f^m x_0} \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1} + 3\varepsilon)m} \|v\|_{x_0} \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1} + 4\varepsilon)m} \|v\|.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We now consider the cones for diffeomorphisms. For any $x \in \mathcal{R}^{Df}$, by subsection 2.4, we consider the trivialization $T_{\mathcal{N}(x)}M \equiv \mathcal{N}(x) \times \mathbb{R}^d$. For any $y \in \mathcal{N}(x)$, we have the splitting $T_y M = E^u(y) \oplus E^s(y)$ which is translated from $T_x M = E^u(x) \oplus E^s(x)$. For any $u \in T_y M$, let $u = u_u + u_s$, where $u_u \in E^u(y)$, $u_s \in E^s(y)$. We consider the cones

$$\begin{aligned} U(y, \theta) &:= \{u \in T_y M : \|u_s\|'_y \leq \theta \|u_u\|'_y\}, \\ V(y, \theta) &:= \{u \in T_y M : \|u_u\|'_y \leq \theta \|u_s\|'_y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now for any ρ -pseudo-orbit $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of f^m in \mathcal{R}_δ^{Df} and for any $y \in M$ with $d(f^k x_n, f^k(f^{nm}y)) \leq \rho \cdot e^{-\frac{\delta}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}}$, $k = 0, \dots, m$, we consider the splitting $T_{f^{nm}y} M = E^u(f^{nm}y) \oplus E^s(f^{nm}y)$ translated from $T_{x_n} M = E^u(x_n) \oplus E^s(x_n)$. Then we have the following Lemma, which comes from Katok [10]. We also give a proof here for the completeness.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, $\delta > 0$, let $\theta = e^\varepsilon - 1$, then there exist $\rho_1 > 0$, $0 < \eta' < 1$, such that for any $0 < \rho < \rho_1$, any ρ -pseudo-orbit $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of f^m in \mathcal{R}_δ^{Df} with $m \geq \frac{\log l' - \log c_1}{\varepsilon}$, and for any $y \in M$ with $d(f^k x_n, f^k(f^{nm}y)) \leq \rho \cdot e^{-\frac{\delta}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}}$, $k = 0, \dots, m$, we have*

$$(D_{f^{nm}y} f^m)U(f^{nm}y, \theta) \subset U(f^{(n+1)m}y, \eta'\theta),$$

$$(D_{f^{nm}y}f^{-m})V(f^{nm}y, \theta) \subset V(f^{(n-1)m}y, \eta'\theta),$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, for any $u \in U(f^{nm}y, \theta)$, $v \in V(f^{nm}y, \theta)$, we have

$$\|D_{f^{nm}y}f^m(u)\| \geq e^{(\chi-4\varepsilon)m}\|u\|, \quad \|D_{f^{nm}y}f^{-m}(v)\| \geq e^{-(\chi+4\varepsilon)m}\|v\|.$$

Proof. We will only prove that $D_y f^m U(y, \theta) \subset U(f^m y, \eta'\theta)$, and $\|D_y f^m(u)\| \geq e^{(\chi-4\varepsilon)m}\|u\|$ for $u \in U(y, \theta)$. the other conclusions can be proved analogously.

Fix any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, $\delta > 0$, let $\tilde{\eta}' = e^{-2\chi+4\varepsilon}$. Then we have the following claim.

Claim. *There exists $0 < \tilde{\rho}_1 < l'^{-2}$, such that for any $0 < \rho < \tilde{\rho}_1$, for any $x_0, f^m x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^{Df}$, $y \in M$ with $d(f^k x_0, f^k y) \leq \rho \cdot e^{-\frac{\chi}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}}$ for $k = 0, \dots, m$, we have*

$$D_{f^k y} f U(f^k y, \theta) \subset U(f^{k+1} y, \tilde{\eta}'\theta), \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m-2.$$

Proof of the Claim. For any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, $0 < \rho < l'^{-2} \leq l'(x_0)^{-2}$, by Theorem 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} d(f^k x_0, f^k y) &\leq \rho \cdot e^{-\frac{\chi}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}} \leq l'(x_0)^{-2} \cdot e^{-2\varepsilon \min\{k, m-k\}} \\ &\leq l'(f^k x_0)^{-2} \leq r(f^k x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $f^k y \in \mathcal{N}(f^k x_0)$. Now for any $u = u_u + u_s \in U(f^k y, \theta)$, by subsection 2.4, considering the identification of $D_{f^k x_0} f = D_0(\tilde{f}_{f^k x_0})$ and $T_y M = E^u(y) \oplus E^s(y)$ with $\mathbb{R}^d = \tilde{E}^u(f^k x_0) \oplus \tilde{E}^s(f^k x_0)$, (2.11) and (2.12) give

$$(3.11) \quad \|D_{f^k x_0} f(u_u)\|'_{f^{k+1}x_0} \geq e^{\chi-\varepsilon}\|u_u\|'_{f^k x_0}, \quad \|D_{f^k x_0} f(u_s)\|'_{f^{k+1}x_0} \leq e^{-\chi+\varepsilon}\|u_s\|'_{f^k x_0}.$$

Let $w = (D_{f^k y} f - D_{f^k x_0} f)(u) = w_u + w_s$, where $w_u \in E^u(f^{k+1}y)$ and $w_s \in E^s(f^{k+1}y)$. Since $\tilde{E}^u(f^{k+1}x_0)$ and $\tilde{E}^s(f^{k+1}x_0)$ are orthogonal, we have $\|w_u\|'_{f^{k+1}y} \leq \|w\|'_{f^{k+1}y}$. Then by Theorem 2.4,

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|w_u\|'_{f^{k+1}y} &\leq \|w\|'_{f^{k+1}y} \leq l'(f^{k+1}x_0)\|D_{f^k y} f - D_{f^k x_0} f\| \cdot \|u\| \\ &\leq l' e^{\varepsilon \min\{k+1, n-k-1\}} \cdot cd(f^k x_0, f^k y)^{r-1} \cdot \|u\|'_{f^k y} \\ &\leq (1+\theta)l' e^{\varepsilon} c \rho^{r-1} \cdot e^{(\varepsilon-\frac{\chi}{2}(r-1)) \min\{k, n-k\}} \|u_u\|'_{f^k y} \\ &\leq (1+\theta)l' e^{\varepsilon} c \rho^{r-1} \|u_u\|'_{f^k y}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\varepsilon < \frac{\chi(r-1)}{2r}$ and $u \in U(f^k y, \theta)$. Similarly,

$$(3.13) \quad \|w_s\|'_{f^{k+1}y} \leq (1+\theta)l' e^{\varepsilon} c \rho^{r-1} \|u_u\|'_{f^k y}.$$

Let

$$D_{f^k y} f(u) = (D_{f^k y} f(u))_u + (D_{f^k y} f(u))_s \in E^u(f^{k+1}y) \oplus E^s(f^{k+1}y).$$

Then by (2.10), (3.11) and (3.12)

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(D_{f^k y} f(u))_u\|'_{f^{k+1}y} &\geq \|(D_{f^k x_0} f(u))_u\|'_{f^{k+1}x_0} - \|w_u\|'_{f^{k+1}y} \\ &\geq e^{\chi-\varepsilon}\|u_u\|'_{f^k x_0} - (1+\theta)l' e^{\varepsilon} c \rho^{r-1} \|u_u\|'_{f^k y}, \\ &\geq e^{\chi-2\varepsilon}\|u_u\|'_{f^k y}, \end{aligned}$$

if ρ is taken small enough. Similarly, by (3.11) and (3.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \|(D_{f^k y} f(u))_s\|'_{f^{k+1}y} &\leq \|(D_{f^k x_0} f(u))_s\|'_{f^{k+1}x_0} + \|w_s\|'_{f^{k+1}y} \\ &\leq e^{-\chi+\varepsilon} \|u_s\|'_{f^k x_0} + (1+\theta)cl'e^\varepsilon \rho^{r-1} \|u_u\|'_{f^k y}, \\ &\leq \theta \cdot e^{-\chi+2\varepsilon} \|u_u\|'_{f^k y}, \end{aligned}$$

if ρ is small enough. Thus $\|(D_{f^k y} f(u))_s\|'_{f^{k+1}y} \leq \tilde{\eta}'\theta \|(D_{f^k y} f(u))_u\|'_{f^{k+1}y}$, that is, $D_{f^k y} fU(f^k y, \theta) \subset U(f^{k+1}y, \tilde{\eta}'\theta)$. This proves the claim. \square

The claim gives

$$D_y f^{m-1}U(y, \theta) \subset U(f^{m-1}y, \tilde{\eta}'\theta).$$

Notice that $f^m y \in \mathcal{N}(f^m x_0)$. Let $T_{f^m y} M = \tilde{E}^u(f^m y) \oplus \tilde{E}^s(f^m y)$ be translated from $T_{f^m x_0} M = E^u(f^m x_0) \oplus E^s(f^m x_0)$, $\|u\|''_{f^m y} := \|D_{f^m y}(\Psi_{f^m x_0}^{-1}u)\|$, and $\tilde{U}(f^m y, \theta) := \{u \in T_{f^m y} M : \|\tilde{u}_s\|'_{f^m y} \leq \theta \|\tilde{u}_u\|'_{f^m y}\}$. Then the claim above also gives $D_{f^{m-1}y} fU(f^{m-1}y, \theta) \subset \tilde{U}(f^m y, \tilde{\eta}'\theta)$. Thus we have

$$D_y f^m U(y, \theta) \subset \tilde{U}(f^m y, \tilde{\eta}'\theta).$$

By the definition of \mathcal{R}_δ^{Df} , $x \mapsto \Psi_x$ and the Oseledets splitting $TM = E^u \oplus E^s$ are uniformly continuous on the compact set \mathcal{R}_δ^{Df} . Hence there exists $\tilde{\eta}' < \eta' < 1$, such that

$$\tilde{U}(f^m y, \tilde{\eta}'\theta) \subset U(f^m y, \eta'\theta), \quad \forall d(f^m x_0, x_1) \leq \rho,$$

if ρ is small enough. Therefore,

$$D_y f^m U(y, \theta) \subset U(f^m y, \eta'\theta).$$

To show $\|D_y f^m(u)\|'_{f^m y} \geq e^{(\chi-4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|'_y$ for $u \in U(y, \theta)$, taking any $v \in U(f^k y, \theta)$, $0 \leq k \leq m-2$, it follows from (3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{f^k y} f(v)\|'_{f^{k+1}y} &\geq \|(D_{f^k x} f(v))_u\|'_{f^{k+1}y} \geq e^{\chi-2\varepsilon} \|v_u\|'_{f^k y} \\ &\geq (1+\theta)^{-1} e^{\chi-2\varepsilon} \|v\|'_{f^k y} \\ &= e^{\chi-3\varepsilon} \|v\|'_{f^k y}. \end{aligned}$$

For $v \in U(f^{m-1}y, \theta)$, the same reason gives $\|D_{f^{m-1}y} f(v)\|'_{f^m y} \geq e^{\chi-3\varepsilon} \|v\|'_{f^{m-1}y}$. Hence for any $u \in U(y, \theta)$,

$$\|D_y f^m(u)\|'_{f^m y} \geq e^{(\chi-3\varepsilon)m} \|u\|'_y.$$

Thus by (2.13) and $m \geq \frac{\log l' - \log c_1}{\varepsilon}$, we conclude

$$\|D_y f^m(u)\| \geq \frac{c_1}{l'(f^m x_0)} e^{(\chi-3\varepsilon)m} \|u\| \geq e^{(\chi-4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.2. \square

3.2. Construction of hyperbolic horseshoes. The aim of this subsection is to construct a hyperbolic horseshoe Λ satisfying the properties listed in Theorem 2.2.

We begin with producing a separated set with sufficiently large cardinality. For $n \geq 1$, denote by $d_n(x, y) = \max_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} d(f^k x, f^k y)$ the dynamical distance on M , and denote by $B_n(x, \rho) = \{y \in M : d_n(x, y) \leq \rho\}$ the d_n -balls of radius ρ . Let

$N_\mu(n, \rho, \bar{\delta})$ be the minimal numbers of d_n -balls of radius ρ whose union has measure at least $\bar{\delta}$. Then by [10, Theorem 1.1], for any $\bar{\delta} > 0$,

$$h_\mu(f) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N_\mu(n, \rho, \bar{\delta}).$$

Given any $0 < \delta < 1/2$, let $\Lambda_\delta = \mathcal{R}_\delta^{Df} \cap \mathcal{R}_\delta^A \cap \text{supp}(\mu)$. Then $\mu(\Lambda_\delta) > 1 - 2\delta > 0$. Take $\bar{\delta} = \frac{1}{2}\mu(\Lambda_\delta)$, then for any given $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, there exist $0 < \rho_2 < \varepsilon/2, N > 1$, such that for any $0 < \rho < \rho_2, n \geq N$, one has

$$(3.15) \quad N_\mu(n, \rho, \bar{\delta}) \geq e^{(h_\mu(f) - \varepsilon)n}.$$

Fix a dense subset $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of the unit sphere of $C(M)$, then it induces a metric on the set of f -invariant measures $\mathcal{M}_f(M)$:

$$D(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \frac{|\int \varphi_j d\mu - \int \varphi_j d\nu|}{2^j}, \quad \forall \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_f(M).$$

Take J large enough such that $\frac{1}{2^J} < \frac{\varepsilon}{8}$, and take $\rho < \min\{\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2/2\}$ small enough (where ρ_0, ρ_1 are given by 3.1 and 3.2 respectively), such that

$$(3.16) \quad |\varphi_j(x) - \varphi_j(y)| \leq \varepsilon/4, \quad \forall d(x, y) \leq \rho, \quad j = 1, \dots, J.$$

Since $\Lambda_\delta \subset \mathcal{R}_\delta^{Df}$, by Lemma 2.6, there exists $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{3}\rho$ and finite $(\rho, \beta, \frac{\chi}{2})$ -rectangles $R(q_1), \dots, R(q_t)$, such that $\cup_{j=1}^t B(q_j, \beta) \supset \Lambda_\delta$. We consider a partition $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_t\}$ of Λ_δ , where

$$P_1 = B(q_1, \beta) \cap \Lambda_\delta, \quad \text{and} \quad P_k = B(q_k, \beta) \cap \Lambda_\delta \setminus (\cup_{j=1}^{k-1} P_j), \quad \forall 2 \leq k \leq t.$$

Let

$$\Lambda_{\delta, n} := \left\{ x \in \Lambda_\delta : \text{there exists } k \in [n, (1 + \varepsilon)n] \text{ such that } f^k(x) \in \mathcal{P}(x) \text{ and} \right. \\ \left. \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{p=0}^{m-1} \varphi_j(f^p x) - \int \varphi_j d\mu \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \quad \forall m \geq n, 1 \leq j \leq J \right\}.$$

Claim. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\Lambda_{\delta, n}) = \mu(\Lambda_\delta)$.

Proof of the Claim. Let

$$A_n = \{x \in \Lambda_\delta : \text{there exists } k \in [n, (1 + \varepsilon)n] \text{ such that } f^k(x) \in \mathcal{P}(x)\},$$

and $A_{n, j} = \{x \in P_j : \text{there exists } k \in [n, (1 + \varepsilon)n] \text{ such that } f^k(x) \in P_j\}$. Then $A_n = \cup_{j=1}^t A_{n, j}$. Considering P_1 , we may assume $\mu(P_1) > 0$. For any $\tau > 0$, let

$$A_{n, 1}^\tau = \left\{ x \in P_1 : \mu(P_1) - \tau \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \chi_{P_1}(f^j x) \leq \mu(P_1) + \tau, \forall m \geq n \right\}.$$

Then Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem gives $\mu(\cup_{n \geq 1} A_{n, 1}^\tau) = \mu(P_1)$. Since $A_{1, 1}^\tau \subset A_{2, 1}^\tau \subset \dots$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_{n, 1}^\tau) = \mu(P_1).$$

Take $\tau < \frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}\mu(P_1)$, then for any $x \in A_{n,1}^\tau$, by the definition of $A_{n,1}^\tau$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{card}\{k \in [n, n+n\varepsilon] : f^k(x) \in P_1\} &\geq (\mu(P_1) - \tau)(n+n\varepsilon) - (\mu(P_1) + \tau)n \\ &= n(\mu(P_1)\varepsilon - 2\tau - \tau\varepsilon) \\ &\geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

if n is taken large enough. Thus $x \in A_{n,1}$, that is $A_{n,1}^\tau \subset A_{n,1}$. Therefore, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_{n,1}) = \mu(P_1)$. Reproduce the proof above for every P_j , then we conclude

$$(3.17) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n) = \mu(\Lambda_\delta).$$

Let

$$B_n = \left\{ x \in \Lambda_\delta : \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \varphi_j(f^k x) - \int \varphi_j d\mu \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \forall m \geq n, 1 \leq j \leq J \right\}.$$

Then by Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem, $\mu(\cup_{n \geq 1} B_n) = \mu(\Lambda_\delta)$. Since $B_1 \subset B_2 \subset \dots$, one has

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n) = \mu(\Lambda_\delta).$$

Together with (3.17),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\Lambda_{\delta,n}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n \cap B_n) = \mu(\Lambda_\delta).$$

This proves the Claim. \square

Choose $n > \max\{\frac{\log t}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\log t' - \log c_1}{\varepsilon}, N, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log t\}$ large enough such that $\mu(\Lambda_{\delta,n}) > \frac{1}{2}\mu(\Lambda_\delta) = \bar{\delta}$, and $n\varepsilon + 1 < e^{\varepsilon n}$. Denote by E an $(n, 2\rho)$ -separated set of $\Lambda_{\delta,n}$ of maximum cardinality. Then $\cup_{x \in E} B_n(x, 2\rho) \supset \Lambda_{\delta,n}$. By (3.15),

$$\text{card}(E) \geq N_\mu(n, 2\rho, \mu(\Lambda_{\delta,n})) \geq N_\mu(n, 2\rho, \bar{\delta}) \geq e^{(h_\mu(f) - \varepsilon)n}.$$

For $k \in [n, n(1+\varepsilon)]$, let $F_k = \{x \in E : f^k(x) \in \mathcal{P}(x)\}$. And take $m \in [n, n(1+\varepsilon)]$ satisfying $\text{card}(F_m) = \max\{\text{card}(F_k) : n \leq k \leq n(1+\varepsilon)\}$. Then

$$\text{card}(F_m) \geq \frac{1}{n\varepsilon + 1} \text{card}(E) \geq \frac{1}{n\varepsilon + 1} e^{(h_\mu(f) - \varepsilon)n} \geq e^{(h_\mu(f) - 2\varepsilon)n}.$$

Choose $P \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying $\text{card}(F_m \cap P) = \max\{\text{card}(F_m \cap P_k) : 1 \leq k \leq t\}$. Then

$$\text{card}(F_m \cap P) \geq \frac{1}{t} \text{card}(F_m) \geq \frac{1}{t} e^{(h_\mu(f) - 2\varepsilon)n}.$$

By getting rid of some points in $F_m \cap P$, we may assume

$$(3.18) \quad \frac{1}{t} e^{(h_\mu(f) - 2\varepsilon)n} \leq \text{card}(F_m \cap P) \leq \frac{1}{t} e^{(h_\mu(f) + 2\varepsilon)n}.$$

By the definition of the partition \mathcal{P} , there exists $q \in \{q_1, \dots, q_t\}$, such that $P \subset B(q, \beta) \cap \Lambda_\delta$. Thus for any $x \in F_m \cap P$, since $x, f^m(x) \in B(q, \beta) \cap \Lambda_\delta$, by Definition 2.5, the connected component $C(x, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q))$ of $R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q)$ containing x is an admissible s -rectangle in $R(q)$, and $f^m C(x, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q))$ is an admissible u -rectangle in $R(q)$.

We claim that if $x_1, x_2 \in F_m \cap P$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$, then $C(x_1, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q)) \cap C(x_2, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q)) = \emptyset$. Indeed, if there is $y \in C(x_1, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q)) \cap C(x_2, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q))$, by Definition 2.5, one sees $d(f^k x_j, f^k y) \leq \rho$ for any $0 \leq k \leq m$ and $j = 1, 2$. Thus $d_m(x_1, x_2) \leq 2\rho$. However, since $F_m \cap P$ is an $(n, 2\rho)$ -separated set, we obtain $d_m(x_1, x_2) \geq d_n(x_1, x_2) > 2\rho$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore, there are at least $\text{card}(F_m \cap P)$ disjoint s-rectangles in $R(q)$, mapped by f^m to $\text{card}(F_m \cap P)$ disjoint admissible u-rectangles in $R(q)$.

Let

$$\Lambda^* = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f^{-mn} \left(\bigcup_{x \in F_m \cap P} C(x, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q)) \right).$$

Then $f^m|_{\Lambda^*}$ is conjugate to a full shift in $\text{card}(F_m \cap P)$ -symbols. And for any $y \in \Lambda^*$, any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists $x_n \in F_m \cap P$ such that $f^{mn}(y) \in C(x_n, R(q) \cap f^{-m}R(q))$. It follows that y and $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.2. Thus by Lemma 3.2 and [2, Theorem 6.1.2], Λ^* is hyperbolic for f^m . Let

$$\Lambda = \Lambda^* \cup f(\Lambda^*) \cup \dots \cup f^{m-1}(\Lambda^*).$$

Then Λ is a hyperbolic horseshoe.

It remains to show the conclusions (i) – (iv) of Theorem 2.2 hold for this Λ .

(i) Since

$$h_{\text{top}}(f|_{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{m} h_{\text{top}}(f^m|_{\Lambda^*}) = \frac{1}{m} \log \text{card}(F_m \cap P),$$

by (3.18), $h_{\text{top}}(f|_{\Lambda}) \geq -\frac{1}{m} \log t + \frac{n}{m} (h_{\mu}(f) - 2\varepsilon)$. Since $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log t < n \leq m \leq n(1 + \varepsilon)$,

$$h_{\text{top}}(f|_{\Lambda}) \geq -\varepsilon + \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon} (h_{\mu}(f) - 2\varepsilon) \geq h_{\mu}(f) - (h_{\mu}(f) + 3)\varepsilon.$$

By (3.18), we also have

$$h_{\text{top}}(f|_{\Lambda}) \leq -\frac{1}{m} \log t + \frac{n}{m} (h_{\mu}(f) + 2\varepsilon) \leq h_{\mu}(f) + 2\varepsilon \leq h_{\mu}(f) + (h_{\mu}(f) + 3)\varepsilon.$$

(ii) By the construction of Λ and the definition of $R(q)$, for any $y \in \Lambda$, there exist $x \in F_m \cap P$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$ such that $d(y, f^k x) \leq \rho < \varepsilon/2$. Since $x \in \Lambda_{\delta} \subset \text{supp}(\mu)$, We conclude Λ is contained in an $\varepsilon/2$ -neighborhood of $\text{supp}(\mu)$.

(iii) For any f -invariant measure ν supported on Λ , we may assume ν is ergodic first. Since

$$D(\mu, \nu) \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{|\int \varphi_j d\mu - \int \varphi_j d\nu|}{2^j} + \frac{1}{2^{J-1}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{|\int \varphi_j d\mu - \int \varphi_j d\nu|}{2^j} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4},$$

it's enough to show: $|\int \varphi_j d\mu - \int \varphi_j d\nu| \leq \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon$, $\forall 1 \leq j \leq J$. Take $y \in \Lambda^*$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{ms} \sum_{k=0}^{ms-1} \varphi_j(f^k y) - \int \varphi_j d\nu \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq J.$$

Then there exist $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{s-1} \in F_m \cap P$ such that

$$d(f^{mk+t} y, f^t x_k) \leq \rho, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq s-1, 0 \leq t \leq m-1.$$

By (3.16) and the construction of $\Lambda_{\delta, m}$, we obtain $|\int \varphi_j d\mu - \int \varphi_j d\nu| \leq \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon$, $1 \leq j \leq J$, which implies $D(\mu, \nu) \leq \varepsilon$.

If ν is not ergodic, by the ergodic decomposition theorem, ν -almost every ergodic component is supported on Λ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mu, \nu) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\int \varphi_j d\mu - \int \varphi_j d\nu|}{2^j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\int (\int \varphi_j d\mu - \int \varphi_j d\nu_x) d\nu(x)|}{2^j} \\ &\leq \int D(\mu, \nu_x) d\nu(x) \\ &\leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

3.3. Dominated splitting for cocycles. The conclusion (iv) of Theorem 2.2 is contained in the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.2, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$, let Λ be constructed as above. Then there exists a continuous \mathcal{A} -invariant splitting on Λ*

$$X = E_1(y) \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i(y) \oplus F_i(y),$$

with $\dim(E_j) = d_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq i$, such that for any $y \in \Lambda$, one has

$$e^{(\lambda_j - 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_y^m(u)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_j + 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in E_j(y), 1 \leq j \leq i,$$

$$\|\mathcal{A}_y^m(v)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_{i+1} + 4\varepsilon)m} \|v\|, \quad \forall v \in F_i(y).$$

In order to prove this Proposition, we require the following definitions. Let $\mathcal{G}(X)$ denote the Grassmannian of closed subspaces of X , endowed with the Hausdorff metric d_H , defined by:

$$d_H(E, F) = \max\left\{ \sup_{u \in S_E} \text{dist}(u, S_F), \sup_{v \in S_F} \text{dist}(v, S_E) \right\}, \quad \forall E, F \in \mathcal{G}(X),$$

where $S_F = \{v \in F : \|v\| = 1\}$, $\text{dist}(u, S_F) = \inf\{\|u - v\| : v \in S_F\}$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_j(X)$, $\mathcal{G}^j(X)$ the Grassmannian of j -dimensional and j -codimensional closed subspaces, respectively. Then by [9, chapter IV, §2.1], $(\mathcal{G}(X), d_H)$ is a complete metric space, and $\mathcal{G}_j(X)$, $\mathcal{G}^j(X)$ are closed in $\mathcal{G}(X)$. In order to compute d_H conveniently, we introduce the gap $\hat{\delta}$, defined by

$$\hat{\delta}(E, F) = \max\left\{ \sup_{u \in S_E} \text{dist}(u, F), \sup_{v \in S_F} \text{dist}(v, E) \right\}, \quad \forall E, F \in \mathcal{G}(X).$$

Note that the gap is not a metric on $\mathcal{G}(X)$, but

$$\hat{\delta}(E, F) \leq d_H(E, F) \leq 2\hat{\delta}(E, F).$$

See [9, chapter IV, §2.1] for a proof.

We now prove Proposition 3.3.

Proof. Fix any $i \in \mathbb{N}_{k_0}$, $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$ and $1 \leq j \leq i$. We first assume $y \in \Lambda^*$, then by the definition of Λ^* , there exist $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset F_m$, such that

$$d(f^k x_n, f^k(f^{nm} y)) \leq \rho \cdot e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2} \min\{k, m-k\}}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, k = 0, \dots, m.$$

We first prove $\{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-m}y}^{mn} H_j(x_{-n})\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequences in $\mathcal{G}(X)$. Denote $\tilde{H}_j(x_{-n}) = \mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)y}}^m H_j(x_{-n-1})$. Then

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^{-m}y}^{mn} \tilde{H}_j(x_{-n}) = \mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)y}}^{m(n+1)} H_j(x_{-n-1}).$$

By Lemma 3.1, $\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}\tilde{H}_j(x_{-n}) \subset U_j(x_0, \theta_0)$. Since $A(x)$ is injective for every $x \in M$, we have

$$(3.19) \quad X = \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}\tilde{H}_j(x_{-n}) \oplus F_j(x_0).$$

Now for any $u \in H_j(x_{-n})$,

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{dist} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)\|}, \mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)}y}^{m(n+1)}H_j(x_{-n-1}) \right) \\ &= \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}_j(x_{-n})} \left\{ \left\| \frac{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)\|} - \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(v) \right\| \right\} \\ &= \frac{\|u\|}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)\|} \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}_j(x_{-n})} \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}\left(\frac{u}{\|u\|}\right) - v \right\| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.19), for $\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}\frac{u}{\|u\|} \in X$, there exists $v_n \in \tilde{H}_j(x_{-n})$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}\left(\frac{u}{\|u\|}\right) - \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(v_n) \in F_j(x_0) \subset V_j(x_0, \theta_0).$$

Then it follows from (3.20) and Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)\|}, \mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)}y}^{m(n+1)}H_j(x_{-n-1}) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\|u\|}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)\|} \cdot \left\| \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}\left(\frac{u}{\|u\|}\right) - v_n \right\| \\ & \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 8\varepsilon)mn} \cdot \left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} - v_n \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Claim. *There exists $c = c(\delta) > 0$, such that $\left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} - v_n \right\| \leq c$.*

Proof of the Claim. Using (3.19), we obtain

$$(3.21) \quad X = \tilde{H}_j(x_{-n}) \oplus \mathcal{A}_y^{-mn}F_j(x_0).$$

Indeed, define $T : X \rightarrow X$ by $T = (\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}|_{\tilde{H}_j(x_{-n})})^{-1} \circ \pi_1 \circ \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}$, where π_1 is the projection associated with (3.19) onto $\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}\tilde{H}_j(x_{-n})$ parallel to $F_j(x_0)$.

Then T has image $\tilde{H}_j(x_{-n})$ and kernel $\mathcal{A}_y^{-mn}F_j(x_0)$, which implies (3.21).

Let π_2 be the projection operator associated with (3.21) onto $\mathcal{A}_y^{-mn}F_j(x_0)$ parallel to $\tilde{H}_j(x_{-n})$. Then

$$\frac{u}{\|u\|} - v_n = \pi_2\left(\frac{u}{\|u\|}\right) \in \mathcal{A}_y^{-mn}F_j(x_0).$$

Since the splitting $X = H_j(x) \oplus F_j(x)$ is uniformly continuous on \mathcal{R}_δ^A , there exists $c = c(\delta) > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathcal{R}_\delta^A$ and any $H \subset U_j(x, \theta_0)$, $F \subset V_j(x, \theta_0)$ with $\mathfrak{X} = H \oplus F$, one has

$$(3.22) \quad \|\pi^H(x)\| \leq c, \|\pi^F(x)\| \leq c,$$

where π^H, π^F are the projections associated with the splitting $X = H_j(x) \oplus F_j(x)$. Therefore,

$$\left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} - v_n \right\| = \left\| \pi_2\left(\frac{u}{\|u\|}\right) \right\| \leq c.$$

This proves the claim. \square

The Claim gives

$$\text{dist} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn}(u)\|}, \mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)}y}^{m(n+1)} H_j(x_{-n-1}) \right) \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1}-\lambda_j+8\varepsilon)mn} \cdot c.$$

Similarly, for any $v \in H_j(x_{-n-1})$, we have

$$\text{dist} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)}y}^{m(n+1)}(v)}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)}y}^{m(n+1)}(v)\|}, \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn} H_j(x_{-n}) \right) \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1}-\lambda_j+8\varepsilon)mn} \cdot c.$$

Thus

$$\hat{\delta}(\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn} H_j(x_{-n}), \mathcal{A}_{f^{-m(n+1)}y}^{m(n+1)} H_j(x_{-n-1})) \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1}-\lambda_j+8\varepsilon)mn} \cdot c,$$

which implies $\{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn} H_j(x_{-n})\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{G}(X), d_H)$. Similarly, $\{\mathcal{A}_{f^{mn}y}^{-mn} F_j(x_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{G}(X), d_H)$. Let

$$H_j(y) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn} H_j(x_{-n}), \quad F_j(y) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{f^{mn}y}^{-mn} F_j(x_n).$$

Since $X = \mathcal{A}_y^{mn} H_j(x_0) \oplus F_j(x_n)$, similar to the proof of (3.21), one sees $X = H_j(x_0) \oplus \mathcal{A}_{f^{mn}y}^{-mn} F_j(x_n)$. Thus

$$\text{codim}(\mathcal{A}_{f^{mn}y}^{-mn} F_j(x_n)) = D_j = \dim(\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}y}^{mn} H_j(x_{-n})),$$

where $D_j = d_1 + \dots + d_j$. It follows $H_j(y) \in \mathcal{G}_{D_j}(X)$, $F_j(y) \in \mathcal{G}^{D_j}(X)$, since $\mathcal{G}_{D_j}(X)$ and $\mathcal{G}^{D_j}(X)$ are closed subset of $\mathcal{G}(X)$. Notice that $H_j(y) \subset U_j(x_0, \theta_0)$, and $F_j(y) \subset \mathcal{A}_{f^{m}y}^{-m} V_j(x_1, \theta_0) \subset V_j(x_0, \theta_0)$, we conclude

$$X = H_j(y) \oplus F_j(y).$$

And by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$e^{(\lambda_j-4\varepsilon)m} \|u\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_y^m(u)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_1+4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in H_j(y),$$

$$\|\mathcal{A}_y^m(v)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1}+4\varepsilon)m} \|v\|, \quad \forall v \in F_j(y).$$

In general, for any $z \in \Lambda$, there exists $0 \leq k \leq m-1, y \in \Lambda^*$ such that $z = f^k y$. similar to the proof above, we can also get

$$H_j(z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} H_j(f^k x_{-n}),$$

$$F_j(z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{f^{mn}(f^k y)}^{-mn} F_j(f^k x_n),$$

satisfying $X = H_j(z) \oplus F_j(z)$, $H_j(z) \in \mathcal{G}_{D_j}(X)$, $F_j(z) \in \mathcal{G}^{D_j}(X)$, and

$$(3.23) \quad e^{(\lambda_j-4\varepsilon)m} \|u\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_z^m(u)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_1+4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in H_j(z),$$

$$(3.24) \quad \|\mathcal{A}_z^m(v)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1}+4\varepsilon)m} \|v\|, \quad \forall v \in F_j(z).$$

Claim. *The splitting $X = H_j(z) \oplus F_j(z)$ is \mathcal{A} -invariant on Λ .*

Proof of the claim. Before proving the invariance of the splitting, we show that: for any $y \in \Lambda^*$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, any $H_{n,k} \in \mathcal{G}_{D_j}(X)$ satisfying $H_{n,k} \subset U_j(f^k x_{-n}, \theta_0)$, one has

$$H_j(f^k y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} H_{n,k}.$$

Indeed, since $X = \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} H_{n,k} \oplus F_j(x_0)$. Thus for any $u \in H_j(f^k x_{-n})$, similar to the estimation above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn}(u)}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn}(u)\|}, \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} H_{n,k} \right) \\ &= \frac{\|u\|}{\|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn}(u)\|} \cdot \inf_{v \in H_{n,k}} \|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} \left(\frac{u}{\|u\|} - v \right)\| \\ &\leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 8\varepsilon)mn} \cdot c, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $d_H \left(\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} H_j(x_{-n}), \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} H_{n,k} \right) \rightarrow 0$. Hence,

$$(3.25) \quad H_j(f^k y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(f^k y)}^{mn} H_{n,k}, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq m-1.$$

Now for any $z = f^k y \in \Lambda$, where $y \in \Lambda^*$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. If $0 \leq k \leq m-2$, then by (3.1), $A(f^{-mn}z)H_j(f^k x_{-n}) \in U_j(f^{k+1}x_{-n}, \theta_0)$; if $k = m-1$, then by (3.9), $A(f^{-mn}z)H_j(f^{m-1}x_{-n}) \in U_j(x_{-n+1}, \theta_0)$, thus (3.25) gives

$$H_j(fz) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(fz)}^{mn} (A(f^{-mn}z)H_j(f^k x_{-n})).$$

Therefore, for any $u \in H_j(z)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist} \left(A(z)u, \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(fz)}^{mn} A(f^{-mn}z)H_j(f^k x_{-n}) \right) \\ &\leq \|A(z)\| \cdot \text{dist} \left(u, \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(fz)}^{mn} H_j(f^k x_{-n}) \right) \\ &\leq \|A(z)\| \cdot d_H \left(H_j(z), \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}(fz)}^{mn} H_j(f^k x_{-n}) \right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $A(z)u \in H_j(fz)$. Thus $A(z)H_j(z) \subset H_j(fz)$. It can be proved analogously that $A(z)F_j(z) \subset F_j(fz)$. Since $\dim(A(z)H_j(z)) = \dim(H_j(fz))$, we have $A(z)H_j(z) = H_j(fz)$. \square

Claim. *The splitting $X = H_j(z) \oplus F_j(z)$ is continuous on Λ .*

Proof of the Claim. Let $\pi_z^{H_j}, \pi_z^{F_j}$ be the projection operators associated with $X = H_j(z) \oplus F_j(z)$. Then for any $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda, u \in H_j(\tilde{z})$, let $w = \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{-mn}(u) \in H_j(f^{-mn}\tilde{z})$, by the invariance of the splitting and (3.22), (3.23), (3.24), we may estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_z^{F_j} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}z}^{mn}(w)\| &= \|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}z}^{mn} \pi_{f^{-mn}z}^{F_j}(w)\| \\ &\leq e^{(\lambda_{j+1} + 4\varepsilon)mn} \|\pi_{f^{-mn}z}^{F_j}(w)\| \\ &\leq c \cdot e^{(\lambda_{j+1} + 4\varepsilon)mn} \|w\| \\ &\leq c \cdot e^{(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 8\varepsilon)mn} \|u\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_z^{F_j}(u)\| &= \|\pi_z^{F_j} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}\tilde{z}}^{mn}(w)\| \\ &\leq \|\pi_z^{F_j} \left(\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}\tilde{z}}^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}z}^{mn} \right)(w)\| + \|\pi_z^{F_j} \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}z}^{mn}(w)\| \\ &\leq c \cdot \left(e^{(4\varepsilon - \lambda_j)mn} \|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}\tilde{z}}^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}z}^{mn}\| + e^{(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 8\varepsilon)mn} \right) \|u\|, \end{aligned}$$

Which gives

$$\|\pi_z^{F_j}|_{H_j(\tilde{z})}\| \leq c \cdot e^{(4\varepsilon - \lambda_j)mn} \|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}\tilde{z}}^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}z}^{mn}\| + c \cdot e^{(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 8\varepsilon)mn}.$$

Similarly, for $v \in F_j(\tilde{z})$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{(\lambda_j - 4\varepsilon)mn} \|\pi_z^{H_j}(v)\| &\leq \|\mathcal{A}_z^{mn} \circ \pi_z^{H_j}(v)\| \\ &= \|\pi_{f^{mn}z}^{H_j} \circ \mathcal{A}_z^{mn}(v)\| \\ &\leq \|\pi_{f^{mn}z}^{H_j}\| \cdot (\|\mathcal{A}_z^{mn}(v) - \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{mn}(v)\| + \|\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{mn}(v)\|) \\ &\leq c \cdot (\|\mathcal{A}_z^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{mn}\| + e^{(\lambda_{j+1} + 4\varepsilon)mn}) \|v\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\pi_z^{H_j}|_{F_j(\tilde{z})}\| \leq c \cdot e^{(4\varepsilon - \lambda_j)mn} \|\mathcal{A}_z^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{mn}\| + c \cdot e^{(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 8\varepsilon)mn}.$$

Now for any $\tau > 0$, take n large enough such that $c \cdot e^{(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j + 8\varepsilon)mn} < \tau$, and then take $\delta > 0$ small enough such that for any $\tilde{z} \in B(z, \delta)$,

$$c \cdot e^{(4\varepsilon - \lambda_j)mn} \cdot \max \left\{ \|\mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}\tilde{z}}^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{f^{-mn}z}^{mn}\|, \|\mathcal{A}_z^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{z}}^{mn}\| \right\} < \tau.$$

Then we have $\|\pi_z^{H_j}|_{F_j(\tilde{z})}\| \leq 2\tau$, $\|\pi_z^{F_j}|_{H_j(\tilde{z})}\| \leq 2\tau$. Thus by [3, Remark 10],

$$d_H(F_j(z), F_j(\tilde{z})) \leq 4D_j \|\pi_z^{H_j}|_{F_j(\tilde{z})}\| \leq 8D_j\tau,$$

$$d_H(H_j(z), H_j(\tilde{z})) \leq 4D_j \|\pi_z^{F_j}|_{H_j(\tilde{z})}\| \leq 8D_j\tau,$$

which gives the continuity of $F_j(z)$ and $H_j(z)$. \square

At last, for any $z \in \Lambda$, $1 \leq j \leq i$, let $E_j(z) := H_j(z) \cap F_{j-1}(z)$, where $F_0(z) := X$. Then $\dim(E_j) = d_j$. Since

$$A(z)E_j(z) \subset A(z)H_j(z) \cap A(z)F_{j-1}(z) \subset H_j(fz) \cap F_{j-1}(fz) = E_j(fz),$$

and $\dim(A(z)E_j(z)) = d_j = \dim(E_j(fz))$, we have $A(z)E_j(z) = E_j(fz)$. Therefore, we obtain a continuous \mathcal{A} -invariant splitting on Λ :

$$X = E_1(z) \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i(z) \oplus F_i(z),$$

with $\dim(E_j) = d_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq i$. And by (3.23), (3.24), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} e^{(\lambda_j - 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\| &\leq \|\mathcal{A}_z^m(u)\| \leq e^{(\lambda_j + 4\varepsilon)m} \|u\|, \quad \forall u \in E_j(z), 1 \leq j \leq i, \\ \|\mathcal{A}_z^m(v)\| &\leq e^{(\lambda_{i+1} + 4\varepsilon)m} \|v\|, \quad \forall v \in F_i(z). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

1. A. Avila, S. Crovisier and A. Wilkinson, *C¹ density of stable ergodicity*, Preprint arXiv:1709.04983.
2. L. Barrira and Y. Pesin, *Nonuniform hyperbolicity: Dynamics of systems with nonzero Lyapunov exponents*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 115, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
3. A. Blumenthal and Ian D. Morris, *Characterization of dominated splittings for operator cocycles acting on Banach spaces*, Preprint arXiv:1512.07602v1.
4. Y. Cao, Y. Pesin and Y. Zhao, *Dimension estimates of non-conformal repellers and continuity of sub-additive topological pressure*, preprint, 2017.
5. Y. M. Chung, *Shadowing properties of non-invertible maps with hyperbolic measures*, Tokyo J. Math, 22(1999), 145-166.
6. K. Gelfert, *Repellers for non-uniformly expanding maps with singular or critical points*, Bulletin of the Brazilian Mathematical Society, New Series 41 (2010), no. 2, 237-257.
7. K. Gelfert, *Horseshoes for diffeomorphisms preserving hyperbolic measures*, Math. Z. 283 (2016), no. 3-4, 685-701.

8. B. Kalinin and V. Sadovskaya, *Lyapunov exponents of cocycles over non-uniformly hyperbolic systems*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 38 (2018), no. 10, 5105-5118.
9. T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995, Reprint of the 1980 edition.
10. A. Katok, *Lyapunov exponents, entropy and periodic orbits for diffeomorphisms*, Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques 51 (1980), no. 1, 137-173.
11. A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 54, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
12. Z. Lian and L-S. Young, *Lyapunov exponents, periodic orbits and horseshoes for mappings of Hilbert spaces*, Annales Henri Poincaré 12 (2011), no. 6, 1081.
13. Z. Lian and L-S. Young, *Lyapunov exponents, periodic orbits, and horseshoes for semiflows on Hilbert spaces*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society 25 (2012), no. 3, 637-665.
14. R. Mañé, *Lyapunov exponents and stable manifolds for compact transformations*, Geometric dynamics (Rio de Janeiro, 1981), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1007, Springer, Berlin, 1983, pp. 522-577.
15. L. Mendoza, *Ergodic attractors for diffeomorphisms of surfaces*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 37 (1988), no. 2, 362-374.
16. V. I. Oseledec, *A multiplicative ergodic theorem. Characteristic Lyapunov exponents of dynamical systems*, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč. 19 (1968), 179-210.
17. Y. Pesin, *Families of invariant manifolds that correspond to nonzero characteristic exponents*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. 40 (1976), no. 6, 1332-1379, 1440.
18. D. Ruelle, *Characteristic exponents and invariant manifolds in Hilbert space*, Ann. of Math. (2) 115 (1982), no. 2, 243-290.
19. P. Thieullen, *Fibrés dynamiques asymptotiquement compacts. Exposants de Lyapunov. Entropie. Dimension*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 4 (1987), no. 1, 49-97.
20. J. Wang, Y. Cao and R. Zou, *The approximation of Lyapunov exponents by horseshoes for C^1 -diffeomorphisms with dominated splitting*, Preprint arXiv:1901.03013.
21. Y. Yang, *Horseshoes for $C^{1+\alpha}$ mappings with hyperbolic measures*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 35 (2015), no. 10, 5133-5152.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY OF INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, NANJING 210044, P.R. CHINA
E-mail address: zourui@nuist.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI KEY LABORATORY OF PMMP, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200062, P.R. CHINA
E-mail address: ylcao@suda.edu.cn