

# STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GENERALIZED HORSESHOE MAPS

ABBAS FAKHARI AND MOHAMMAD SOUFI

**ABSTRACT.** We apply thermodynamic formalism to a generalized horseshoe map. We prove that a tailored anisotropic Banach space with weighted norms yields a spectral gap for the transfer operator, implying the existence of a unique physical measure. Under the virtually expanding condition, this measure is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, with density in the Sobolev space  $H_\mu$ , for some  $\mu < 1/2$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In chaotic systems, ergodic theory provides powerful tools for analyzing long-term behavior by examining the asymptotic properties of empirical measures derived from orbits. This reveals their convergence to invariant measures and their statistical properties. Hyperbolic dynamics, characterized by stable and unstable manifolds where the dynamics contract and expand, respectively, are central to the theory of chaos. A key class of such systems is the *generalized horseshoe map*, introduced by Jakobson and Newhouse [JN00]. These maps, defined on the unit square, involve a diffeomorphism defined on a countable partition of vertical strips. Jakobson and Newhouse proved the existence of an physical measure for these maps. Actually, it seems that GHM configuration is the main tool to derive the existence of the physical measures (see [CLP22]). It was recently shown in [FKS24] that this measure is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure under some stable conditions. The natural next step, which we undertake in this paper, is to establish finer statistical properties.

Our approach for the existence of physical measure is based on the powerful functional analytic method pioneered by Dolgopyat, Liverani, Baladi, Gouëzel, and others. The core idea is to study the spectral properties of the transfer operator on a carefully constructed Banach space. Because the dynamics exhibit both expansion and contraction, the space must have an *anisotropic structure*, with norms that treat stable and unstable directions differently. The main technical challenge in applying this framework to generalized horseshoes lies in managing the countable partition and ensuring sufficient control over geometric distortion to prove that the transfer operator has a spectral gap on our space.

A classical approach to prove the absolute continuity of an invariant measure is the *transversality* method. Transversality expresses a diverse set of expanding directions, ensuring that cone mappings across preimages avoid tangential obstructions almost everywhere (see [Tsu01, Tsu05]). Building on transversality and using a functional analytic approach, the authors in [BLOR25] define appropriate Banach spaces in which the transfer operator has good spectral properties. The notion of *virtually expanding*, initially defined by Tsujii, extends transversality to non-hyperbolic

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37D35, 37D45.

*Key words and phrases.* Generalized horseshoe map, Thermodynamic formalism, Absolutely continuous invariant measure.

The authors express gratitude to Masato Tsujii and Maisam Hediehloo for their clarifying conversation. The first author is partially supported by IPM grant NO.1404340211.

contexts by encoding directional expansion in a quantitative base-point-dependent manner that does not rely on a global hyperbolic structure. In [Tsu23], the author uses the concept of virtual expansion in Sobolev spaces to prove the absolute continuity of the measures. The regularity of the Sobolev space improves as the degree of virtual expansion increases. We choose this strategy and treat the Tsujii's principal result as a toolbox. A benefit is the higher regularity of the density function than the  $L^2$  regularity.

**1.1. Generalized Horseshoe Map, Statement of the Results.** Let  $S = [0, 1]^2$  be the unit square equipped with the Lebesgue measure  $m$ . We consider a countable collection of closed curvilinear vertical strips  $\{S_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

- (GHM<sub>1</sub>)  $S_i^\circ \cap S_j^\circ = \emptyset$ ,  $i \neq j$ ,  
(GHM<sub>2</sub>)  $\text{Leb}(S \setminus \cup_i S_i^\circ) = 0$ .

For each  $i$ ,  $S_i$  spans the full height of  $S$ , with left and right boundaries given by graphs of smooth functions  $g_{i,j}(y)$  ( $j = l, r$ ) with  $|dg_{i,j}/dy| < k$  where  $k \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $F_i : S_i \rightarrow U_i$  be a  $\mathcal{C}^r$  diffeomorphism,  $r \geq 2$ , where  $U_i = F_i(S_i)$  is a horizontal strip that spans the full width of  $S$  bounded by graphs of smooth functions  $g_{i,j}(x)$  ( $j = t, b$ ) at the top and bottom such that  $|dg_{i,j}/dx| < k$ .

We assume the map  $F$  on  $S$  defined by  $F|_{S_i^\circ} = F_i$  satisfies the following hyperbolicity conditions for constants  $0 < k < 1$  and  $\lambda > 1$ : There exist stable cones  $C_k^s = \{(v_1, v_2) : |v_1| \leq k|v_2|\}$  and unstable cone  $C_k^u = \{(v_1, v_2) : |v_2| \leq k|v_1|\}$  such that for any  $x$  where  $F$  is defined:

- (H1)  $DF(C_k^u) \subseteq C_k^u$  and  $DF^{-1}(C_k^s) \subseteq C_k^s$ .  
(H2)  $\|DFv\| \geq \lambda\|v\|$  for  $v \in C_k^u$ , and  $\|DF^{-1}v\| \geq \lambda\|v\|$  for  $v \in C_k^s$ .

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the maximum norm, i.e.,  $\|v\| = \|(v_1, v_2)\| := \max\{|v_1|, |v_2|\}$ . The map  $F$ , satisfying the aforementioned conditions, is referred to as a  $\mathcal{C}^r$  *generalized horseshoe map*, GHM. In the case of finite strips, we call it a *finite* GHM. From hyperbolic conditions, it follows that

$$\frac{|\partial_y F_{i1}|}{|\partial_x F_{i1}|} \leq k, \quad \frac{|\partial_x F_{i2}|}{|\partial_x F_{i1}|} \leq k, \quad \frac{|\partial_y F_{i2}|}{|\partial_x F_{i1}|} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2} + k^2.$$

Here we make this assumption that

- (RC1)  $\sup_i |D^2 F_i| < \infty$ .

The stable and unstable manifolds of  $F$  can be described symbolically. For this purpose, let  $\Sigma := \{(a_i)_{i=1}^\infty \mid a_i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . We denote finite words by  $[\mathbf{a}]_n := (a_i)_{i=1}^n$  and  $[\overline{\mathbf{a}}]_n = (a_{n+1-i})_{i=1}^n$  and define the shift map  $\sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  by  $(\sigma(\mathbf{a}))_i = a_{i+1}$  and  $F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} = F_{a_1} \circ F_{a_2} \circ \dots \circ F_{a_n}$ . For any word  $\mathbf{a} \in \sigma$ , we inductively define the nested vertical strips  $S_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} := F_{a_1}^{-1}(S_{[\sigma(\mathbf{a})]_{n-1}})$ , with  $S_{[\mathbf{a}]_1} := S_{a_1}$ . The stable manifold associated to the word  $\mathbf{a}$  is the intersection of above vertical strips,

$$W_{\mathbf{a}}^s := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} S_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}.$$

Similarly, the unstable manifolds  $W_{\mathbf{a}}^u := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} U_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}$  are constructed from the nested horizontal strips

$$U_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} := F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}(S_{[\sigma(\mathbf{a})]_{n-1}}), \quad \text{with } U_{[\mathbf{a}]_1} := U_{a_1}.$$

See Figure 1. If the sets  $U_{[\mathbf{a}]_1}$  are pairwise disjoint, we call  $F$  *non-overlapping*. The set

$$\Lambda := \overline{\bigcup_{\mathbf{a}} (\bigcap_{n \geq 1} U_{[\mathbf{a}]_n})}$$




FIGURE 1. Approximate stable and unstable manifolds

defines a topological attractor for  $F$ , and at any point in  $\Lambda$ , the stable and unstable manifolds are graphs of  $\mathcal{C}^2$  functions. Note that any point of  $\Lambda$  has a unique stable manifold and potentially multiple unstable manifolds. Note that by assuming that the angles between stable and unstable directions are bounded away from 0, there is a constant  $C^1$  which depends on the angle between stable and unstable cones such that for all  $z \in S_{[a]_n}$ ,  $v \in F^{-n+1}(C_k^s)$  and  $w \in C_k^u$ ,

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{C^{-1}}{J_w F^n(z)} \leq \frac{J_v F^n(z)}{J F^n(z)} \leq \frac{C}{J_w F^n(z)},$$

where  $J_v F^n(z) = |D_v F^n(z)|$  and  $J F^n(z) = |\det DF^n(z)|$ . For the uniform hyperbolic  $\mathcal{C}^2$  smooth map we have the following bounded distortion: there is a constant  $C$  such that

$$(1.2) \quad \left| \frac{J_v F^n(z_1)}{J_v F^n(z_2)} - 1 \right| \leq C d_W(z_1, z_2), \quad \left| \frac{J F^n(z_1)}{J F^n(z_2)} - 1 \right| \leq C d_W(z_1, z_2)$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z_1, z_2 \in S_{[a]_n}$  and  $v \in C_k^s$ . Here, the constant  $C$  depends on the hyperbolicity, cone geometry and the uniform  $C^2$  bound, i.e.,  $k, \lambda$  and  $C$ .

We recall that an ergodic invariant measure  $\mu$  is *physical measure* if its basin  $B(\mu)$  consists of those points  $x \in S$  for which  $1/n \sum_i \delta_{F^i(x)}$  tends to  $\mu$ , in the weak topology, has positive Lebesgue measure. In the case that  $F$  is non-overlapping,  $\{W_{[a]}^u\}_a$  defines a foliation for  $\Lambda$ . An *SRB measure* is an invariant measure whose disintegration on each leaf is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

**Theorem 1.1.** *If  $F : S \rightarrow S$  is a  $\mathcal{C}^r$  GHM,  $r > 1$ , satisfying **(RC1)** then it admits a unique physical measure, SRB if  $F$  is non-overlapping.*

To formulate the second result, we assume that  $F$  is a finite GHM. We adopt Tsujii's notion of virtually expanding (see [Tsu23]). Let  $T^1 S := S \times \mathbb{S}^1$ . For  $(x, v) \in T^1 S$  define the projections  $\xi_{(x,v)} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\xi_{(x,v)}(w) := \langle v, w \rangle$ . Assume that for  $x \in S$ ,  $F^{-1}\{x\} := \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$  and put  $\eta(y_i, v) := \xi_{(x,v)}(Df(y_i)(B_1(y_i)))$ , where  $B_1(y_i)$  is the unit ball around  $y_i$ . Define

$$b_\mu := \sup_{(x,v) \in T^1 S} b_\mu(x, v), \text{ where } b_\mu(x, v) := \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{J F(y_i)(\eta(y_i, v))^{2\mu}},$$

<sup>1</sup>After this, we use  $C$  as a universal constant.

Clearly,  $b_\mu(F^{m+n}) \leq b_\mu(F^n) b_\mu(F^m)$  and hence one can define

$$\beta_\mu(F) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (b_\mu(F^n))^{1/n} = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (b_\mu(F^n))^{1/n}.$$

We say that  $F : S \rightarrow S$  is  $\mu$ -virtually expanding if  $\beta_\mu(F) < 1$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *If  $F : S \rightarrow S$  is a finite  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$   $\mu$ -virtually expanding GHM satisfying **(RC1)** then it leaves invariant an absolutely continuous measure whose Radon-Nikodym derivative belongs to the Sobolev space  $H_\mu$ , for some  $\mu < 1/2$ .*

## 2. EXISTENCE OF PHYSICAL MEASURE

Our analysis relies on the transfer operator  $\mathcal{L}$  is formally defined by the duality relation  $\int (\mathcal{L}h)\varphi dm = \int h(\varphi \circ F) dm$  for smooth functions  $h, \varphi$ . For a density  $h$ , this corresponds to

$$\mathcal{L}h(x) := \sum_{F(y)=x} \frac{h(y)}{|\mathbf{J}F(y)|}.$$

The transfer operator encodes the evolution of densities under the dynamics. In the hyperbolic setting, it has a regularizing effect: it smooths densities along unstable manifolds. Dually, the Koopman operator acts on observables, improving their regularity along stable manifolds. This differentiated treatment is what make the space of distribution where the operator acts to be anisotropic. Inspired by [DL08], we construct a Banach space whose norm is adapted to the dynamic of a GHM. The space consists of distributions, and its norm measures regularity differently along stable and unstable directions. The norm is designed so that the transfer operator is quasi-compact, which ensures a spectral gap. An alternative approach with the same conceptual flavor is provided by the anisotropic Banach spaces  $H_{s,t}$  defined by Gouëzel and Baladi in [BG09], which encode differential regularity in the unstable direction ( $s > 0$ ) and controlled singularity in the stable direction ( $t < 0$ ) via adapted Fourier charts. While technically distinct, both frameworks exploit the same dynamical principle, strong regularity under expansion, weak regularity under contraction, leading to analogous spectral properties of the transfer operator.

**2.1. Anisotropic Banach Space.** The norms of a distribution will be defined by integrating it against test functions with suitable regularity along stable curves. In order to control the weak norm, the test functions must have higher regularity along stable leaves, since the transfer operator tends to amplify irregularities in this direction. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$\mathcal{C}_n^1(S) := \left\{ \varphi \in L^\infty(S) : \forall [\mathbf{a}]_n \varphi \in \mathcal{C}^1(S_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}, \mathbb{R}) \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{C}^1(S_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}, \mathbb{R})$  denotes the set of all  $\mathcal{C}^1$  maps on the strip  $S_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}$  that admit a  $\mathcal{C}^1$  extension to  $\overline{S}_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}$ .

If  $h$  is a continuous linear functional on  $\mathcal{C}_n^1(S)$  (i.e.  $h \in (\mathcal{C}_n^1(S))^*$ ), then  $\mathcal{L}h$  is an element of  $(\mathcal{C}_{n-1}^1(S))^*$  defined by  $\mathcal{L}h(\varphi) := h(\varphi \circ F)$ . Note that the singular curves of  $F^n$ , where the map is not defined, have measure zero. Hence, each signed measure with density  $h \in L^1(S, \mathbb{R})$  can be viewed as an element of  $(\mathcal{C}_n^1(S))^*$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{L}h(\varphi) = \int \varphi h dm$ , so that  $\mathcal{L}h$  corresponds to a measure whose density is given by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{L}h(z) := \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_1: z \in U_{[\mathbf{a}]_1}} \frac{h(F_{[\mathbf{a}]_1}^{-1}(z))}{|\mathbf{J}F_{[\mathbf{a}]_1}((F_{[\mathbf{a}]_1}^{-1}(z)))|}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(W)$  be the set of Hölder functions on  $W \in \mathcal{W}^s$  with Hölder exponent  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , equipped with the norm  $|\varphi|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(W)} := |\varphi|_\infty + H_W^\alpha(\varphi)$ , where  $\|\varphi\|_\infty := \sup_{y \in W} |\varphi(y)|$  and

$$H_W^\alpha(\varphi) := \sup_{y_1 \neq y_2 \in W} \frac{|\varphi(y_1) - \varphi(y_2)|}{d_W(y_1, y_2)},$$

with  $d_W(\cdot, \cdot)$  the distance along the stable curve  $W$ .

To define the weak and strong norm, we need a bit of notation. First for  $W_i := \text{Im}(\Psi_{x_i}) \in \mathcal{W}^s$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , put  $d_{\mathcal{W}^s}(W_1, W_2) := |x_1 - x_2|$ . Next, note that by [JN00], there is a global straightening chart  $\Psi : S \rightarrow S$  for the stable foliation satisfying the followings. Recall that  $\Psi_x(y) := \Psi(x, y)$  and  $\Psi_y(x) := \Psi(x, y)$ .

- (C1) for any  $x$ ,  $W^s(x) = \text{Im}(\Psi_x)$ ,
- (C2) for any  $x$ ,  $\Psi_x$  is  $\mathcal{C}^1$  smooth and for some  $\delta_0 > 0$ ,  $(1 + \delta_0)^{-1} \leq \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} \|(\Psi_x)'\| < 1 + \delta_0$ ,
- (C3)  $\sup_{0 \leq y \leq 1} H^\alpha(\Psi_y) < (1 + \delta_1)$ , for some  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\delta_1 > 0$ .

For  $W = \text{Im}(\Psi_x)$  and  $\varphi \in C^1(W)$ , define  $\tilde{\varphi}(y) := \varphi \circ \Psi_x(y)$ ,  $y \in [0, 1]$ . For  $\varphi_i \in W_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , put  $d_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) := |\tilde{\varphi}_1 - \tilde{\varphi}_2|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}$ .

**Definition 2.1.** Given  $\mathcal{C}^1$  smooth function (or distribution)  $h$  on  $S$ , we define three norms.

- The **weak norm**,  $|h|_w$ , measures the action of  $h$  on Lipschitz test functions along stable curves.

$$|h|_w := \int_{[0,1]} |h|_{W_x}|_w dx, \text{ where } |h|_{W_x}|_w := \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^1(W) \\ |\varphi|_{\mathcal{C}^1(W)} \leq 1}} \int_W h\varphi d\ell_W.$$

Here,  $d\ell_W$  is the arc length measure on  $W$ .

- The **strong stable norm**,  $\|h\|_s$ , measures Hölder dual regularity of  $h$  along stable curves.

$$\|h\|_s := \int_{[0,1]} \|h|_{W_x}\|_s dx, \text{ where } \|h|_{W_x}\|_s := \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(W) \\ |\varphi|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha(W)} \leq 1}} \int_W h\varphi d\ell_W.$$

The use of a weaker  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha$  space here is crucial, as the dynamic is contracting along stable leaves, which improves regularity in the dual space.

- The **strong unstable norm**,  $\|h\|_u$ , measures how the action of  $h$  varies between nearby elements of  $\mathcal{W}^s$ . It captures regularity in the unstable direction:

$$\|h\|_u := \sup_{\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0} \sup_{\substack{W_i \in \mathcal{W}^s \\ i=1,2}} \sup_{\substack{\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}^1(W_i) \\ |\varphi_i|_{\mathcal{C}^1(W_i)} \leq 1 \\ d_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) < \varepsilon}} \frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{W}^s}(W_1, W_2)^\beta} \left| \int_{W_1} \varphi_1 h d\ell - \int_{W_2} \varphi_2 h d\ell \right|.$$

The value of  $\varepsilon_0$  will be fixed later. The full norm on our space is  $\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \|h\|_s + \|h\|_u$ . The *strong space*  $\mathcal{B}$  is the completion of  $C^1(S)$  with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ , and the *weak space*  $\mathcal{B}_w$  is its completion with respect to  $|\cdot|_w$ .

**2.2. Spectral Properties of the Transfer Operator.** We record two auxiliary facts.

**Lemma 2.2.**

$$\int_W h\varphi d\ell_W \leq \|h|_W\|_s H_W^\alpha(\varphi) + |h|_W|_w \|\varphi\|_\infty$$

*Proof.* Let  $W$  be a stable leaf with an arclength metric  $d_W$  and let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(W)$ . Pick any point  $z_0 \in W$  and set  $c = \varphi(z_0)$ . Then for every  $z \in W$

$$|\varphi(z) - c| = |\varphi(z) - \varphi(z_0)| \leq H_W^\alpha(\varphi) d_W(z, z_0)^\alpha \leq H_W^\alpha(\varphi) \text{diam}(W)^\alpha \leq H_W^\alpha(\varphi) (1 + \delta_0)^\alpha.$$

Taking the supremum over  $z \in W$  gives

$$\|\varphi - c\|_\infty \leq H_W^\alpha(\varphi) (1 + \delta_0)^\alpha.$$

Now split  $\varphi = (\varphi - c) + c$ , then

$$\int_W h\varphi d\ell = \int_W h(\varphi - c) d\ell + c \int_W h d\ell.$$

set  $\phi = \frac{\varphi - c}{H_W^\alpha(\varphi)}$  if  $H_W^\alpha(\varphi) > 0$  and  $\phi = 0$  if  $H_W^\alpha(\varphi) = 0$ . Then  $H_W^\alpha(\phi) \leq 1$  and  $\|\phi\|_\infty \leq (1 + \delta_0)^\alpha$ . Hence  $\|\phi\|_{C^\alpha(W)} = \|\phi\|_\infty + H_W^\alpha(\phi) \leq (1 + \delta_0)^\alpha + 1$ . By the definition of the strong stable norm

$$\int_W h(\varphi - c) d\ell = H_W^\alpha(\varphi) \int_W h\phi d\ell \leq \|h|_W\|_s ((1 + \delta_0)^\alpha + 1) H_W^\alpha(\varphi).$$

By the definition of weak norm, we have  $\int_W h d\ell \leq \int_W h \cdot 1 d\ell \leq |h|_W|_w$ . Thus  $\int_W ch d\ell \leq c|h|_W|_w \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty |h|_W|_w$ . Finally, we have

$$\int_W h\varphi d\ell \leq \|h|_W\|_s ((1 + \delta_0)^\alpha + 1) H_W^\alpha(\varphi) + |h|_W|_w \|\varphi\|_\infty.$$

By absorbing the constant  $1 + (1 + \delta_0)^\alpha$  into the definition of  $\|h|_W\|_s$  (replace  $\|h|_W\|_s$  by an equivalent norm  $\|h|_W\|'_s = ((1 + \delta_0)^\alpha + 1) \|h|_W\|_s$ ) the inequality holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.3** (Lasota-Yorke Inequality). *There exist constants  $C > 0$ ,  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and for all  $h \in \mathcal{B}$ :*

$$\|\mathcal{L}^n h\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \gamma^n \|h\|_{\mathcal{B}} + C|h|_w.$$

*Proof.* Put  $\kappa_i := \inf_{S_i} |1/J^u F_i|$  and  $\kappa_{[a]_n} := \kappa_{a_1} \cdots \kappa_{a_n}$  and  $\lambda := \sup_{W \in \mathcal{W}^s} J_W F$ . First, note that by (2.1),

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{L}^n h(z) = \sum_{[a]_n: z \in U_{[a]_n}} \frac{h(F_{[a]_n}^{-n}(z))}{JF_{[a]_n}^n(F_{[a]_n}^{-n}(z))}$$

We prove the inequality by estimating the action of  $\mathcal{L}^n$  on each norm component. Let  $h \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $W \in \mathcal{W}^s \cap S_{a_0}$ , and  $\varphi$  be a test function. Using the change of variables formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_W \mathcal{L}^n h \varphi d\ell_W &= \int_W \sum_{[a]_n: z \in U_{[a]_n}} \frac{h(F_{[a]_n}^{-n}(z))}{JF_{[a]_n}^n(F_{[a]_n}^{-n}(z))} \varphi(z) d\ell_W(z) \\ &= \sum_{[a]_n} \int_{W_{[a]_n}} h \frac{J_{W_{[a]_n}} F_{[a]_n}^n}{JF_{[a]_n}^n} \varphi \circ F_{[a]_n}^n d\ell_{[a]_n} \\ &\leq \sum_{[a]_n} \left| \frac{J_{W_{[a]_n}} F_{[a]_n}^n}{JF_{[a]_n}^n} \varphi \circ F_{[a]_n}^n \right|_{C^1(W_{[a]_n})} |h|_{W_{[a]_n}}|_w \\ &\leq \sum_{[a]_n} \left| \frac{J_{W_{[a]_n}} F_{[a]_n}^n}{JF_{[a]_n}^n} \right|_{C^1(W_{[a]_n})} |\varphi \circ F_{[a]_n}^n|_{C^1(W_{[a]_n})} |h|_{W_{[a]_n}}|_w \end{aligned}$$

where  $W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} = F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^{-n}(W \cap U_{[\mathbf{a}]_n})$ ,  $U_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} = U_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n)}$  and  $d\ell$  and  $d\ell_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}$  the arc length measures on the curves  $W$  and  $W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}$  respectively. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi(F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n(z_1)) - \varphi(F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n(z_2))| &\leq H_W^\alpha(\varphi) d_W(F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n(z_1), F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n(z_2)) \\ &\leq H_W^\alpha(\varphi) \sup_{z \in W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} |\mathbf{J}_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n(z)| d_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}(z_1, z_2) \\ &\leq H_W^\alpha(\varphi) \lambda^{-n} d_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}(z_1, z_2), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $|\varphi \circ F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n|_{C^1(W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n})} \leq |\varphi|_{C^1(W)}$ , and by bounded distortion condition

$$\left| \frac{\mathbf{J}_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n}{\mathbf{J} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n} \right|_{C^1(W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n})} \leq C \sup_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} \frac{\mathbf{J}_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n}{\mathbf{J} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n} \leq C \inf_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{J}^u F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n} \leq C \kappa_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^{-1}$$

**1. Weak Norm Estimate.** Let  $\varphi \in C^1(W)$  with  $|\varphi|_{C^1(W)} \leq 1$ . Then

$$(2.3) \quad |\mathcal{L}^n h|_W = \int_W (\mathcal{L}^n h) \varphi d\ell_W \leq C \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \kappa_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^{-1} |h|_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}|_w$$

Integrating (2.3), we have

$$|\mathcal{L}^n h|_w = \int_{[0,1]} |\mathcal{L}^n h|_{W_x}|_w dx \leq C \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \kappa_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^{-1} \int_{[0,1]} |h|_{W_{([\mathbf{a}]_n, x)}}|_w dx = (C \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \kappa_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^{-1}) |h|_w.$$

**2. Strong Stable Norm Estimate.** Let  $\varphi \in C^\alpha(W)$  with  $|\varphi|_{C^\alpha(W)} \leq 1$ . From Lemma 2.2

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_W (\mathcal{L}^n h) \varphi d\ell_W \\ &= \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \int_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} h \frac{\mathbf{J}_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n}{\mathbf{J} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n} \varphi \circ F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n d\ell_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \\ &\leq \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} (\|h|_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}\|_s H_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}^\alpha(\varphi \circ F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n) + |h|_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}|_w \|\varphi \circ F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n\|_\infty) \sup_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} \frac{\mathbf{J}_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n}{\mathbf{J} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n} \\ (2.4) \quad &\leq C \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \kappa_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^{-1} (\|h|_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}\|_s \lambda^{-\alpha n} H_W^\alpha(\varphi) + |h|_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}}|_w \|\varphi\|_\infty) \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (2.4), we have

$$\|\mathcal{L}^n h\|_s \leq C \lambda^{-n\alpha} \|h\|_s + C |h|_w.$$

**3. Strong Unstable Norm Estimate.** First, we recall that

$$\|\mathcal{L}^n u\|_u = \sup_{\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0} \sup_{W_i \in \mathcal{W}^s} \sup_{\substack{\varphi_i \in C^1(W_i) \\ |\varphi_i|_{C^1(W_i)} \leq 1 \\ d_{C^\alpha}(\phi_1, \phi_2) < \varepsilon}} d(W_1, W_2)^{-\beta} \left| \int_{W_1} (\mathcal{L}^n h) \varphi_1 d\ell_1 - \int_{W_2} (\mathcal{L}^n h) \varphi_2 d\ell_2 \right|.$$

Thus, by (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{W_1} (\mathcal{L}^n h) \varphi_1 d\ell_1 - \int_{W_2} (\mathcal{L}^n h) \varphi_2 d\ell_2 \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \left| \int_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^1} \frac{\mathbf{J}_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^1} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n}{\mathbf{J} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n} \varphi \circ F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n h d\ell_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} - \int_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^2} \frac{\mathbf{J}_{W_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^2} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n}{\mathbf{J} F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n} \varphi \circ F_{[\mathbf{a}]_n}^n h d\ell_{[\mathbf{a}]_n} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Put

$$\eta_i(y) := \frac{J_{W_{[a]_n}^i} F_{[a]_n}^n(x)}{J F_{[a]_n}^n(x)} \varphi_i(F_{[a]_n}^n(y)),$$

defined on  $W_{[a]_n}^i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now, to estimate  $C^\alpha(\eta_i)$ , we have

(I1)

- By (1.1),

$$\|\eta_i\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi_i\|_\infty \sup_{x \in W_{[a]_n}^i} \left| \frac{C}{J_w F^n(z)} \right| \leq C \kappa_{[a]_n}^{-1}.$$

- By the bounded distortion (1.2),  $H^\alpha(\eta_i) \leq C \kappa_{[a]_n}^{-\alpha}$ .

(I2) A straightforward computation shows that

$$d_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}(\eta_1, \eta_2) \leq C \kappa_{[a]_n}^{-\alpha} (d_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) + \sup_y H^\alpha(\Psi_y) + \sup_x \|(\Psi_x)'\|).$$

$$(I3) d((W_1, W_2)^{-1} \leq \kappa_{[a]_n}^{-1} d(W_{[a]_n}^1, W_{[a]_n}^2)^{-1}.$$

Put  $\varepsilon_0 := C(2 + \delta_1 + \delta_0)(\min_i \kappa_i)^{-1} > 2\delta_0$ , where,  $\delta_0$  and  $\delta_1$  given by (C1) and (C2). Assembling (I1)-(I3), we get

$$(2.5) \quad \|\mathcal{L}^n h\|_u \leq C \sum_{[a]_n} \kappa_{[a]_n}^{-(\alpha+\beta)} \|h\|_u \leq C \left( \sum_i \kappa_i^{-(\alpha+\beta)} \right)^n \|h\|_u.$$

Hence, it is enough to choose  $\beta > 0$  such that  $\sum_i \kappa_i^{-(\alpha+\beta)} < 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *The unit ball of  $\mathcal{B}$  is compactly embedded in  $\mathcal{B}_w$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}([0, 1])$  be the unit ball of  $(\mathcal{C}^1([0, 1]), |\cdot|_{\mathcal{C}^1})$ . It is known that  $\mathcal{C}^{1,1}([0, 1])$  is a compact subset of  $(\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0, 1]), |\cdot|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha})$ ,  $\alpha < 1$  ([Bre11]). Let  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0 - 2\delta_0$ . There is a finite family  $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{N(\varepsilon)}\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{1,1}([0, 1])$  such that for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}([0, 1])$ , there is  $1 \leq i \leq N(\varepsilon)$  such that  $d_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}(\varphi_i, \varphi) < \varepsilon$ . For a given  $\eta > 0$ , choose stable leaves  $W_1, \dots, W_{M(\eta)}$  which are  $\eta$ -dense in  $\mathcal{W}^s$  equipped with the metric  $d_{\mathcal{W}^s}$ . Now, let  $W \in \mathcal{W}^s$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^1(W)$  be arbitrary. Put  $\tilde{\varphi} := (1 + \delta_0)^{-1} \varphi \circ \Psi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,1}([0, 1])$ . Choose  $1 \leq i \leq N(\varepsilon)$  such that  $d_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}(\varphi_i, \tilde{\varphi}) < \varepsilon$ . Choose also  $W_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq M(\eta)$ , such that  $d_{\mathcal{W}^s}(W, W_j) < \eta$ . Put  $\varphi_{i,j} := (1 + \delta_0)^{-1} \varphi_i \circ \Psi^{-1}|_{W_j}$ . Then  $\varphi_{i,j} \in \mathcal{C}^1(W_j)$  and it is not difficult to see that

$$d_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}(\varphi, \varphi_{i,j}) = |\tilde{\varphi} - \varphi_{i,j} \circ \Psi|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} < \varepsilon + 2\delta_0 \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

This implies that for  $h \in \mathcal{C}^1(S)$ ,

$$(2.6) \quad \left| \int_W h \varphi \, d\ell - \int_{W_j} h \varphi_{i,j} \, d\ell \right| \leq \eta^\beta \|h\|_u.$$

Put  $\mathbf{M} := \{(i_1, \dots, i_{M(\eta)}), 1 \leq i_j \leq N(\varepsilon)\}$  with  $\#(\mathbf{M}) = \binom{N(\varepsilon)}{M(\eta)}$ . For  $\mathbf{I} := (i_1, \dots, i_{M(\eta)}) \in \mathbf{M}$ , put

$$f_{\mathbf{I}} := \eta \sum_{j=1}^{M(\eta)} \int_{W_j} h \varphi_{i,j}.$$

(2.6) says that  $|h|_w$  can be approximated by finite number of linear functionals  $f_{\mathbf{I}}$ ,  $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbf{M}$ . This concludes the compact embedding of  $\mathcal{B}$  in  $\mathcal{B}_w$  (see Lemma 3.5 in [DL08] and Lemma 3.2 in [Dem18]).  $\square$

**Theorem 2.5.** (I) (Spectral Gap) The transfer operator  $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is quasi-compact. Its essential spectral radius is strictly smaller than its spectral radius  $\rho(\mathcal{L}) = 1$ .

(II) (Simplicity) The eigenvalue 1 is simple, and the corresponding eigenfunction is the density of the physical measure  $\mu$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.5 (I).* The spectral gap is a direct application of Hennion's theorem ([HH01]). It concludes that  $\mathcal{L}$  is quasi-compact, its essential spectral radius is at most  $\gamma$  and 1 is an eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}$ .  $\square$

To prove the simplicity, we need a bit of notions. For any  $x, y \in \Lambda$ , we say that  $x \sim y$  if there is a finite number of segments of unstable manifolds connecting  $x$  to  $y$ . Let  $\text{Acc}(x)$  be the set of all  $y \in \Lambda$  with  $x \sim y$ , called the *accessibility class* of  $x$ . For any  $W \in \mathcal{W}^s$  we denote by  $(\mathcal{C}^1(W))_{\text{acc}}$  the set of all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^1(W)$  such that for each  $x \in W$ ,  $\varphi$  is constant on  $W \cap \text{Acc}(x)$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** If  $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}^s$  are sufficiently close in  $d_{\mathcal{W}^s}$  then for any  $\varphi_1 \in (\mathcal{C}^1(W_1))_{\text{acc}}$  with  $|\varphi_1|_{\mathcal{C}^1(W_1)} \leq 1$ , there is  $\varphi_2 \in (\mathcal{C}^1(W_2))_{\text{acc}}$  such that  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are similar on each accessibility class and  $d_{\mathcal{C}^1}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) < \varepsilon_0$ .

*Proof.* Define  $\varphi_2$  on  $W_2 \cap \Lambda$  as

$$(2.7) \quad \forall \mathbf{a}, \varphi_2(W_{\mathbf{a}}^u \cap W_2) := \varphi_1(W_{\mathbf{a}}^u \cap W_1).$$

Since  $\varphi_1 \in (\mathcal{C}^1(W_1))_{\text{acc}}$ , (2.7) is well defined. For any  $x_2, y_2 \in W_2$  and any  $x_1, y_1 \in W_1$  with  $x_1 \sim x_2$  and  $y_1 \sim y_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_2(x_2) - \varphi_2(y_2)| &= |\varphi_1(x_1) - \varphi_1(y_1)| \leq H_{W_1}^1(\varphi_1)d(x_1, y_1) \\ &\leq CH_{W_1}^1(\varphi_1)\tan(k)d_{\mathcal{W}^s}(W_1, W_2)d(x_2, y_2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is the Lipschitz constant of stable foliation. So,

$$H^1(\varphi_2|_{W_2 \cap \Lambda}) \leq CH^1(\varphi_1|_{W_1 \cap \Lambda})\tan(k)d_{\mathcal{W}^s}(W_1, W_2).$$

Clearly  $\|\varphi_2|_{W_2 \cap \Lambda}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\varphi_1\|_{\infty}$ . This implies that for sufficiently small  $d_{\mathcal{W}^s}(W_1, W_2)$  we have  $|\varphi_2|_{W_2 \cap \Lambda}|_{\mathcal{C}^1(W_1)} \leq 1$ . Now, let  $U$  be an open subset of  $W_2$  such that

$$(\Psi_{x_2} \circ \Psi_{x_1}^{-1}(W_1 \cap \Lambda)) \cup (W_2 \cap \Lambda) \subset U$$

and define  $\varphi_2$  on  $U^c$  as  $\varphi_2|_{U^c} = \varphi_1 \circ (\Psi_{x_1} \circ \Psi_{x_2}^{-1})|_{U^c}$ . On the set  $U \setminus (W_2 \cap \Lambda)$ , we define  $\varphi_2$  as a linear interpolation. It is not difficult to see that if  $d_{\mathcal{W}^s}(W_1, W_2)$  is small enough then  $d_{\mathcal{C}^1}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) < \varepsilon_0$ . Note that by the definition,  $\varphi_2$  and  $\varphi_1$  are similar on each accessibility class.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** There is an absolutely continuous invariant measure  $\nu$  on  $[0, 1]$  such that

$$\mu = \int_{[0,1]} \mu_{W_x} d\nu(x).$$

where  $W_x = \Psi_x([0, 1])$  and  $\mu_{W_x}$  is the disintegration along the stable foliation. Furthermore, for any  $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}^s$ , and  $A \subset W_2$ ,

$$(2.8) \quad \mu_{W_2}(A) = \mu_{W_1}(\text{Acc}(A) \cap W_1),$$

where  $\text{Acc}(A) := \bigcup_{x \in A} \text{Acc}(x)$ .

*Proof.* Defined the induced map  $F$  on  $[0, 1]$  as  $\widehat{F}(x) = \pi^s(F(x))$  where  $\pi^s$  is the projection along the stable manifolds. The absolute continuity of the induced measure  $\nu$  for  $\widehat{F}$  is followed by the fact that (2.1) defines the usual  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}^1}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BV}} + \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}^1}$  on the set of all Lipschitz functions on  $[0, 1]$  (see [GR24]). This means that  $\nu$  is the unique absolutely continuous invariant measure for

$\widehat{F}$ . By inequality (2.5),  $\|\mu\|_u = 0$ . Hence, for  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  given by Lemma (2.6),  $\int_{W_1} \varphi_1 d\mu_{W_1} = \int_{W_2} \varphi_2 d\mu_{W_2}$ . This proves (2.8).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.5 (II).* By Corollary (2.7), the physical measure  $\mu$  has full measure in  $S$ . This leads to the simplicity of the eigenvalue 1.  $\square$

*Remark 2.8.* There are no other eigenvalues with modulus 1. The absence of other peripheral eigenvalues than 1 can be deduced following sub section 4.2 in [Dem18] (see also Theorem 2.9 in [DL08]).

It is known that the invariant measure  $\mu$  is mixing and exhibits exponential decay of correlations for potentials in  $\mathcal{C}^1(S)$ , and that the Central Limit Theorem holds. We do not state these results here, since our method does not appear to provide any additional insight into these issues. See [DKL21] for a complete description of the limit theorems.

### 3. VIRTUALLY EXPANDING AND EXISTENCE OF ACIP

For  $\mu > 0$ , the Sobolev space  $H_\mu$  is defined by  $H_\mu := \{u \in \mathcal{L}^2, (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\mu/2} \widehat{u}(\xi) \in \mathcal{L}^2\}$  and equipped with the uniform norm  $\|\cdot\|_\mu$  defined by  $\|\cdot\|_\mu := \|\cdot\|_u + \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$  where,

$$|u|_\mu := \int (1 + |\xi|^2)^\mu |\widehat{u}|^2 d\xi,$$

and  $\widehat{u}$  is the Fourier transformation of  $u$ .

Here, we suppose the infinite smoothness of the branch maps  $F_i$ . Let us outline the proof, which closely follows the strategy of Tsujii [Tsu23]. In [Tsu23], the author proves the Lasota–Yorke inequality in the Sobolev space  $H_\mu$  with  $\mu > 0$  first by proving it for smooth functions supported in small open sets and then extending the result globally via a partition of unity. For our local version, we adopt the same initial step; however, for globalization, we require the Sobolev space to be close under the multiplication by characteristic functions. This holds in  $H_\mu$  only for  $\mu < 1/2$ , thus determining our choice of space.




FIGURE 2. Local Mechanism for Lasota–Yorke Inequality

For the local version, we need some notation. Suppose that  $N$  strips and put  $U := \bigcup_{i=1}^N U_i$ . Then, there is a natural number  $\mathbf{N} \leq 2^N$  such that  $U$  can be partitioned as  $U := \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathbf{N}} \widetilde{U}_j$  such that for each  $j$ ,  $\widetilde{U}_j$  is an open subset of  $U_i$ , for some  $i$ , and there is a finite set  $\Theta_j$  of natural

numbers such that for any  $k \in \Theta_j$ , there are open sets  $\tilde{V}_k \subset S_k$  with  $F_k : \tilde{V}_k \rightarrow \tilde{U}_j$  is a  $C^\infty$  smooth diffeomorphism (see Figure 2). For any  $j$ , put  $\tilde{W}_j := \bigcup_{k \in \Theta_j} \tilde{V}_k$ . In Theorem 3.1, below, we state the local version of the main theorem in [Tsu23] in our context.

**Theorem 3.1** (Tsujii). *Let  $F$  be  $\mu$ -virtually expanding,  $\max\{0, \mu - 1/2\} < \mu' < \mu$  and  $u$  a  $C^\infty$  map supported on  $\tilde{W}_j$ . For  $\beta_\mu(F) < \lambda < 1$ , there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\|\mathcal{L}(u)\|_\mu \leq \lambda \|u\|_\mu + C \|u\|_{\mu'}.$$

Now, suppose that for  $0 < \mu' < \mu < 1/2$  and a smooth function  $u$  defined on  $S$ . Put  $u = \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{\tilde{W}_j} u$ , where  $\chi_{\tilde{W}_j}$  is the characteristic function of  $\tilde{W}_j$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}(u)\|_\mu &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{L}(\chi_{\tilde{W}_j} u) \right\|_\mu \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda \|\chi_{\tilde{W}_j} u\|_\mu + C \|\chi_{\tilde{W}_j} u\|_{\mu'} \\ &\leq NC\lambda \|u\|_\mu + NC \|u\|_{\mu'}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing a higher iteration of  $F$ , the Lasota-York inequality will be followed for  $u$ . Now, since  $H_\mu$  is compactly embedded in  $H_{\mu'}$ , by Theorem 3.1 and Henon's theorem ([HH01]), there exists a unique invariant absolutely continuous probability measure  $\mu$  with  $d\mu/dx \in H_\mu$ .

**Example 3.2.** Although the notion of virtually expanding is flexible enough to accommodate a wide variety of examples, we construct a simple affine GHM on  $S$  with constant horizontal expansion and vertical contraction. Let  $0 < \lambda < 1$  be sufficiently close to 1. Choose  $2 < n = [2/\lambda^2] + 1$  and put  $a_i := i/n$ ,  $\alpha_i := a_i \sin^{-1}(1 - \lambda)$  and  $v_i := e^{2\pi\alpha_i}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Divide the square  $S$  into  $n$  equal vertical strips  $S_i := (i/n, (i+1)/n) \times [0, 1]$ . Let the action  $F_i$  on  $S_i$  be as described in Figure 3. Put  $\gamma := \tan^{-1}(\lambda/n)$  and  $C_i := C^\gamma(\pm v_i^\perp)$ , where  $v_i^\perp$  is the orthogonal vector of  $v_i$ . In this case,

$$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x} = n \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial y} = \lambda.$$




FIGURE 3. Three vertical strips  $S_1 := (0, 1/3) \times [0, 1]$ ,  $S_2 := (1/3, 2/3) \times [0, 1]$  and  $S_3 := (2/3, 1) \times [0, 1]$ , left frame. The first iteration, the middle frame and the fifteenth iteration, right frame. The expansion rate is 3 and the contraction is 0.35. The dynamic of  $10^6$  points are displayed.

Now, we consider two cases:

(I) If  $v \in C_{i_0}$ , for some  $i_0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} b_1(x, v) &\leq \frac{1}{n\lambda^2} + \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{1}{(n\lambda)(n \sin \alpha_i)} = \frac{1}{n\lambda^2} + \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{1}{(n\lambda)(n \sin a_n)(\sin^{-1}(1 - \lambda))} \\ &= \frac{1}{n\lambda^2} + \frac{1}{n\lambda(1 - \lambda)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}\lambda} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

(II) If  $v \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^n C_i$ , then

$$b_1(x, v) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(n\lambda)(n \sin \gamma)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\lambda(\lambda + \frac{2}{\lambda^2})} < 1.$$

## REFERENCES

- [BG09] Viviane Baladi and Sébastien Gouëzel, *Good Banach spaces for piecewise hyperbolic maps via interpolation*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire **26** (2009), no. 4, 1453–1481. MR 2542733
- [BLOR25] Aaron Brown, Homin Lee, Davi Obata, and Yuping Ruan, *Absolute continuity of stationary measures for surface dynamics*, arXiv: 2510.26194v1 (2025).
- [Bre11] Haim Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011. MR 2759829
- [CLP22] Vaughn Climenhaga, Stefano Luzzatto, and Yakov Pesin, *SRB measures and Young towers for surface diffeomorphisms*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **23** (2022), no. 3, 973–1059. MR 4396671
- [Dem18] Mark F. Demers, *A gentle introduction to anisotropic banach spaces*, Chaos Solitons Fractals **116** (2018), 29–42. MR 3887006
- [DKL21] Mark F. Demers, Niloofar Kiamari, and Carlangelo Liverani, *Transfer operators in hyperbolic dynamics—an introduction*, 33º Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática, Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA), Rio de Janeiro, 2021. MR 4472820
- [DL08] Mark F. Demers and Carlangelo Liverani, *Stability of statistical properties in two-dimensional piecewise hyperbolic maps*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008), no. 9, 4777–4814. MR 2403704
- [FKS24] Abbas Fakhari, Maryam Khalaj, and Mohammad Soufi, *Absolutely continuous invariant measure for generalized horseshoe maps*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **55** (2024), no. 2, Paper No. 27, 20. MR 4752992
- [GR24] Paweł Gora and Aperna Rajput, *Quasi-compactness of frobenius-perron operator for piecewise convex maps with countable branches*, arXiv:2406.19929 (2024).
- [HH01] Hubert Hennion and Loïc Hervé, *Limit theorems for Markov chains and stochastic properties of dynamical systems by quasi-compactness*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1766, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. MR 1862393
- [JN00] Michael Jakobson and Sheldon Newhouse, *Asymptotic measures for hyperbolic piecewise smooth mappings of a rectangle*, Astérisque (2000), no. 261, xii, 103–159, Géométrie complexe et systèmes dynamiques (Orsay, 1995). MR 1755439
- [Tsu01] Masato Tsujii, *Fat solenoidal attractors*, Nonlinearity **14** (2001), no. 5, 1011–1027. MR 1862809

- [Tsu05] ———, *Physical measures for partially hyperbolic surface endomorphisms*, Acta Math. **194** (2005), no. 1, 37–132. MR 2231338
- [Tsu23] ———, *Virtually expanding dynamics*, Kyushu J. Math. **77** (2023), no. 2, 291–298. MR 4665182

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHAHID BEHESHTI UNIVERSITY, 19839 TEHRAN, IRAN.  
*a-fakhari@sbu.ac.ir*

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DO ESTADO DO RIO DE JANEIRO, RIO DE JANEIRO,  
BRAZIL, *mohammad@ime.uerj.br*