

# EQUILIBRIUM STATES FOR RANDOM NON-UNIFORMLY EXPANDING MAPS

ALEXANDER ARBIETO, CARLOS MATHEUS AND KREERLEY OLIVEIRA

ABSTRACT. We show that, for a robust ( $C^2$ -open) class of random non-uniformly expanding maps, there exists equilibrium states for a large class of potentials. In particular, these systems have measures of maximal entropy. These results also give a partial answer to a question posed by Liu-Zhao. The proof of the main result uses an extension of techniques in recent works by Alves-Araújo, Alves-Bonatti-Viana and Oliveira.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Particles systems, as they appear in kinetic theory of gases, have been an important model motivating much development in the field of Dynamical Systems and Ergodic Theory. While these are deterministic systems, ruled by Hamiltonian dynamics, the evolution law is too complicated, given the huge number of particles involved. Instead, one uses a stochastic approach to such systems.

More generally, ideas from statistical mechanics have been brought to the setting of dynamical systems, both discrete-time and continuous-time, by Sinai, Ruelle, Bowen, leading to a beautiful and very complete theory of equilibrium states for uniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms and flows. In a few words, equilibrium states are invariant probabilities in the phase space which maximize a certain variational principle (corresponding to the Gibbs free energy in the statistical mechanics context). The theory of Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen gives that for uniformly hyperbolic systems equilibrium states exist, and they are unique if the system is topologically transitive and the potential is Hölder continuous.

Several authors have worked on extending this theory beyond the uniformly hyperbolic case. See e.g. [5], [13], among other important authors. Our present work is more directly motivated by the results of Oliveira [12] where he constructed equilibrium states associated to potentials with not-too-large variation, for a robust ( $C^1$ -open) class of non-uniformly expanding maps introduced by Alves-Bonatti-Viana [2].

On the other hand, corresponding problems have been studied also in the context of the theory of random maps, which was much developed by

---

*Date:* March 12, 2003.

A.A. was partially supported by CNPq-Brazil, C.M. was partially supported by Faperj-Brazil and K.O. was partially supported by CNPq-Brazil.

Kifer [6] and Arnold [3], among other mathematicians. Indeed, Kifer [6] proved the existence of equilibrium states for random uniformly expanding systems, and Liu [8] extended this to uniformly hyperbolic systems.

In the present work, we combine these two approaches to give a construction of equilibrium states for non-uniformly hyperbolic maps. In fact, some attempts to show the existence of equilibrium states beyond uniform hyperbolicity were made by Khanin-Kifer [7]. However, our point of view is quite different. Before stating the main result, we recall that a random map is a continuous map  $f : \Omega \rightarrow C^r(M, M)$  where  $M$  is a compact manifold  $\Omega$  is a Polish space (i.e., a separable complete metric space), and  $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  a measurably invertible continuous map with an invariant ergodic measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . The main result is the following :

*“For a  $C^2$ -open set  $\mathcal{F}$  of non-uniformly expanding local diffeomorphisms, potentials  $\phi$  with low variation and  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , there are equilibrium states for the random system associated to  $f$  and  $T$ . In particular,  $f$  admits measures with maximal entropy.”*

A potential has low variation if it is not far from being constant. See the precise definition in section 3. In particular, constant functions have low variation; their equilibrium states are measures of maximal entropy.

The proof, which we present in the next sections extends ideas from Alves-Araújo [1], Alves-Bonatti-Viana [2] and Oliveira [12].

It is very natural to ask whether these equilibrium states we construct are unique and whether they are (weak) Gibbs states. Another very interesting question is whether existence (and uniqueness) of equilibrium states extends to (random or deterministic) non-uniformly hyperbolic maps with singularities, such as the Viana maps [1]. Although our present methods do not solve these questions, we believe the answers are affirmative.

## 2. DEFINITIONS

### *Random Transformations and Invariant Measures*

Let  $M^l$  be a compact  $l$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold and  $\mathcal{D}$  the space of  $C^2$  local diffeomorphisms of  $M$ . Let  $(\Omega, T, \mathbb{P})$  a measure preserving system, where  $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -invariant ( $\mathbb{P}$  is a Borel measure) and  $\Omega$  is a Polish space, i.e.,  $\Omega$  is a complete separable metric space. By a random transformation we understand a continuous map  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ . Then we define:

$$(1) \quad f^n(w) = f(T^{n-1}(w)) \circ \cdots \circ f(w), \quad f^{-n}(w) = (f^n(w))^{-1}.$$

We also define the skew-product generated by  $f$ :

$$F : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \Omega \times M, \quad F(w, x) = (Tw, f(w)x).$$

We denote  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega \times M)$  the space of probability measures  $\mu$  on  $\Omega \times M$  such that the marginal of  $\mu$  on  $\Omega$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}(\Omega \times M) \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega \times M)$  be the measures  $\mu$  which are  $F$ -invariant.

Because  $M$  is compact, invariant measures always exists and the property of  $\mathbb{P}$  be the marginal on  $\Omega$  of a invariant measures can be characterized by its disintegration:

$$d\mu(w, x) = d\mu_w(x)d\mathbb{P}(w).$$

$\mu_w$  are called *samples measures* of  $\mu$  (see [9], [10]).

An invariant measure is called *ergodic* if  $(F, \mu)$  is ergodic, the set of all ergodic measures is denoted by  $\mathcal{M}_e(\Omega \times M)$ . Furthermore, each invariant measure can be decomposed into its ergodic components by integration when the  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega$  is countably generated and  $\mathbb{P}$  is ergodic.

**In what follows**, as usual, **we always assume**  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  **is a Lebesgue space**,  $(T, \mathbb{P})$  **is ergodic and  $T$  is measurably invertible and continuous**. Observe that these assumptions are satisfied in the canonical case of left-shift operators  $\tau$ ,  $\Omega$  being  $C^r(M, M)^{\mathbb{N}}$  or  $C^r(M, M)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ .

### Entropy

We follow Liu [9] on the definition of the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy for random transformations:

Let  $\mu$  be an  $F$ -invariant measure as above. Let  $\xi$  be a finite Borel partition of  $M$ . We set:

$$(2) \quad h_\mu(f, \xi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int H_{\mu_w}(\bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} f^{-k}(w)\xi) d\mathbb{P}(w),$$

where  $H_\nu(\eta) := -\sum_{C \in \eta} \nu(C) \log \nu(C)$  (and  $0 \log 0 = 0$ ), for a finite partition  $\eta$  and  $\nu$  a probability on  $M$  (and  $\mu_w$  are the sample measures of  $\mu$ ).

**Definition 2.1.** *The entropy of  $(f, \mu)$  is:*

$$h_\mu(f) := \sup_{\xi} h_\mu(f, \xi)$$

*with the supremum taken over all finite Borel partitions of  $M$ .*

**Definition 2.2.** *The topological entropy of  $f$  is  $h_{top}(f) = \sup_{\mu} h_\mu(f)$*

**Theorem 2.3** (“Random” Kolmogorov-Sinai theorem). *If  $\mathcal{B}$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $M$  and  $\xi$  is a generating partition of  $M$ , i.e.,*

$$\bigvee_{k=0}^{+\infty} f^{-k}(w) \xi = \mathcal{B} \quad \text{for } \mathbb{P} - \text{a.e. } w,$$

*then*

$$h_\mu(f) = h_\mu(f, \xi).$$

For a proof of this theorem see [10] or [4].

### Equilibrium States

Let  $L^1(\Omega, C(M))$  the set of all families  $\{\phi = \{\phi_w \in C^0(M)\}\}$  such that the map  $(w, x) \rightarrow \phi_w(x)$  is a measurable map and  $\|\phi\|_1 := \int_{\Omega} |\phi_w|_{\infty} d\mathbb{P}(w) < +\infty$ .

For a  $\phi \in L^1(\Omega, C(M))$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n \geq 1$ , we define:

$$\pi_f(\phi)(w, n, \varepsilon) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{x \in K} e^{S_f(\phi)(w, n, x)}; K \text{ is a } (n, \varepsilon) \text{-separated set} \right\},$$

where  $S_f(\phi)(w, n, x) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi_{T^k(w)}(f^k(w)x)$  and a set  $K$  is called  $(n, \varepsilon)$ -separated if for any  $x, y \in K$ , the distance  $d(f^k(w)(x), f^k(w)(y))$  of the points  $f^k(w)(x)$  and  $f^k(w)(y)$  is at least  $\varepsilon$ , for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ .

**Definition 2.4.** The map  $\pi_f : L^1(\Omega, C(M)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  given by:

$$\pi_f(\phi) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Omega} \log \pi_f(\phi)(w, n, \varepsilon) d\mathbb{P}(w).$$

is called the pressure map.

It is well know that the variational principle occurs (see [9]):

**Theorem 2.5.** If  $\Omega$  is a Lebesgue space, then for any  $\phi \in L^1(\Omega, C(M))$  we have:

$$(3) \quad \pi_f(\phi) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega \times M)} \left\{ h_{\mu}(f) + \int \phi d\mu \right\}$$

*Remark 1.* If  $\mathbb{P}$  is ergodic then we can take the supremum over the set of ergodic measures (see [9]).

**Definition 2.6.** A measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega \times M)$  is an equilibrium state for  $f$ , if  $\mu$  attains the supremum of (3).

### Physical Measures

As in the deterministic case, we follow [1] on the definition of *physical measure* in the context of random transformations :

**Definition 2.7.** A measure  $\mu$  is a physical measure if for positive Lebesgue measure set of points  $x \in M$  (called the basin  $B(\mu)$  of  $\mu$ ),

$$(4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \phi(f^j(w)(x)) = \int \phi d\mu \text{ for all continuous } \phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -ae  $w$ .

## 3. STATEMENT OF THE RESULTS

Before starting abstract definitions, we comment that in next section, it is showed that there are examples of random transformations satisfying our hypothesis below.

We say that a local diffeomorphism  $f$  of  $M$  is in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  if  $f$  is in  $\mathcal{D}$  and satisfies, for positive constants  $\delta_0, \beta, \delta_1, \sigma_1$ , and  $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following properties :

(H1) There exists a covering  $B_1, \dots, B_p, \dots, B_{p+q}$  of  $M$  such that every  $f|_{B_i}$  is injective and

- $f$  is uniformly expanding at every  $x \in B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_p$ :

$$\|Df(x)^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \delta_1)^{-1}.$$

- $f$  is never too contracting:  $\|Df(x)^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \delta_0)$  for every  $x \in M$ .

(H2)  $f$  is everywhere volume-expanding:  $|\det Df(x)| \geq \sigma_1$  with  $\sigma_1 > q$ .  
Define

$$V = \{x \in M; \|Df(x)^{-1}\| > (1 + \delta_1)^{-1}\}.$$

(H3) There exists a set  $W \subset B_{p+1} \cup \dots \cup B_{p+q}$  containing  $V$  such that

$$M_1 > m_2 \quad \text{and} \quad m_2 - m_1 < \beta$$

where  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are the infimum and the supremum of  $|\det Df|$  on  $V$ , respectively, and  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are the infimum and the supremum of  $|\det Df|$  on  $W^c$ , respectively. In particular, this condition means that the volume expansion in the “bad” region  $V$  is not too different from the volume expansion in the “good” region  $W^c$ .

This kind of transformations was considered by [2], [12], [1], where they construct  $C^1$ -open sets of such maps.

We will consider a subset  $\mathcal{F} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  such that :

(C1) There is a uniform constant  $A_0$  s.t.  $|\log \|f\|_{C^2}| \leq A_0$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  and the constants  $m_1, m_2, M_1, M_2$  are uniform on  $\mathcal{F}$  ;

**From now on, our random transformations will be given by a map  $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , and  $f$  satisfies the following condition :**

(C2)  $f$  admits an ergodic absolutely continuous *physical measure*  $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$  (see section 2).

*Remark 2.* We will show in the appendix that (H1), (H2) implies the following property:

(F1) There exists some  $\gamma_0 = \gamma_0(\delta_1, \sigma_1, p, q) < 1$  such that the random orbits of Lebesgue almost every point spends at most a fraction of time  $\gamma_0 < 1$  inside  $B_{p+1} \cup \dots \cup B_{p+q}$ , depending only on  $\sigma_1, p, q$ . I.e., for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $w$  and Lebesgue almost every  $x$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{0 \leq j \leq n-1 : f^j(w)(x) \in B_{p+1} \cup \dots \cup B_{p+q}\}}{n} \leq \gamma_0.$$

Then we analyse the existence of an equilibrium state for low-variation potentials:

**Definition 3.1.** *A potential  $\phi \in L^1(\Omega, C(M))$  has  $\rho_0$ -low variation if*

$$(5) \quad \|\phi\|_1 < \pi_f(\phi) - \rho_0 h_{top}(f).$$

*Remark 3.* We call  $\phi$  above a  $\rho_0$ -low variation potential because in the deterministic case (i.e.,  $\phi(w, x) = \phi(x)$ ), if  $\max \phi - \min \phi < (1 - \rho_0)h_{top}(f)$  then  $\phi$  satisfies (5).

The main result is :

**Theorem A.** *Assume hypotheses (H1), (H2), (H3) hold, with  $\delta_0$  and  $\beta$  sufficiently small and assume also conditions (C1), (C2). Then, there exists  $\rho_0$  such that if  $\phi$  is a continuous potential with  $\rho_0$ -low variation then  $\phi$  has some equilibrium state. Moreover, these equilibrium states are hyperbolic measures, with all Lyapunov exponents bigger than some  $c = c(\delta_1, \sigma_1, p, q) > 0$ .*

For the definition of Lyapounov exponents for random dynamical systems, see [9], for instance.

As pointed out in the introduction, an interesting question related to the theorem A is the uniqueness of equilibrium states, and if they are (weak) Gibbs measures. In the deterministic context, Oliveira [12] obtained this results using the Perron-Frobenius operator, a semi-conjugacy with a shift in a symbolic space and using a weak Gibbs property. Although a work in progress by the authors says that assuming that the partition  $B_i$  is transitive (in some sense), then the equilibrium states are unique, the main difficult is that Oliveira [12] uses the Brin-Katok formula in the proof of uniqueness of equilibrium states for deterministic systems, but this formula still unknown for the random case (see [9, page 1289] for more details).

#### 4. EXAMPLES

In this section we exhibit a  $C^1$ -open class of  $C^2$ -diffeomorphism which are contained in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ . To start the construction, we now follow [12] *ipsis-literis* and construct examples of ‘deterministic’ non-uniformly expanding maps. After this, we construct the desired random non-uniformly expanding maps in  $\mathcal{F}$  a  $C^2$ -neighborhood of a fixed diffeomorphism of  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ .

We observe that the class  $\mathcal{F}$  contains an open set of non-uniformly expanding which *are not uniformly expanding*.

We start by considering any Riemannian manifold that supports an expanding map  $g : M \rightarrow M$ . For simplicity, choose  $M = \mathbb{T}^n$  the  $n$ -dimensional torus, and  $g$  an endomorphism induced from a linear map with eigenvalues  $\lambda_n > \dots > \lambda_1 > 1$ . Denote by  $E_i(x)$  the eigenspace associated to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$  in  $T_x M$ .

Since  $g$  is an expanding map,  $g$  admits a transitive Markov partition  $R_1, \dots, R_d$  with arbitrary small diameter. We may suppose that  $g|_{R_i}$  is injective for every  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Replacing by an iterate if necessary, we may suppose that there exists a fixed point  $p_0$  of  $g$  and, renumbering if necessary, this point is contained in the interior of the rectangle  $R_d$  of the Markov partition.

Considering a small neighborhood  $W \subset R_d$  of  $p_0$  we deform  $g$  inside  $W$  along the direction  $E_1$ . This deformation consists essentially in rescaling the expansion along the invariant manifold associated to  $E_1$  by a real function  $\alpha$ . Let us be more precise:

Considering  $W$  small, we may identify  $W$  with a neighborhood of 0 in  $\mathcal{R}^n$  and  $p_0$  with 0. Without loss of generality, suppose that  $W = (-2\epsilon, 2\epsilon) \times B_{3r}(0)$ , where  $B_{3r}(0)$  is the ball of radius  $3r$  and center 0 in  $\mathcal{R}^{n-1}$ . Consider a function  $\alpha : (-2\epsilon, 2\epsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  such  $\alpha(x) = \lambda_1 x$  for every  $|x| \geq \epsilon$  and for small constants  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ :

- (1)  $(1 + \gamma_1)^{-1} < \alpha'(x) < \lambda_1 + \gamma_2$
- (2)  $\alpha'(x) < 1$  for every  $x \in (-\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{\epsilon}{2})$ ;
- (3)  $\alpha$  is  $C^0$ -close to  $\lambda_1$ :  $\sup_{x \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)} |\alpha(x) - \lambda_1 x| < \gamma_2$ ,

Also, we consider a bump function  $\theta : B_{3r}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  such  $\theta(x) = 0$  for every  $2r \leq |x| \leq 3r$  and  $\theta(x) = 1$  for every  $0 \leq |x| \leq r$ . Suppose that  $\|\theta'(x)\| \leq C$  for every  $x \in B_{3r}(0)$ . Considering coordinates  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  such that  $\partial_{x_i} \in E_i$ , define  $f_0$  by:

$$f_0(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (\lambda_1 x_1 + \theta(x_2, \dots, x_n)(\alpha(x_1) - \lambda_1 x_1), \lambda_2 x_2, \dots, \lambda_n x_n)$$

Observe that by the definition of  $\theta$  and  $\alpha$  we can extend  $f_0$  smoothly to  $\mathbb{T}^n$  as  $f_0 = g$  outside  $W$ . Now, is not difficult to prove that  $f_0$  satisfies the conditions (H1), (H2), (H3) above.

First, we have that  $\|Df_0(x)^{-1}\|^{-1} \geq \min_{i=1, \dots, n} \|\partial_{x_i} f_0\|$ . Observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1} f_0(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= (\alpha'(x_1)\theta(x_2, \dots, x_n) + (1 - \theta(x_2, \dots, x_n))\lambda_1, 0, \dots, 0) \\ \partial_{x_i} f_0(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= ((\alpha(x_1) - \lambda_1)\partial_{x_i}\theta(x_2, \dots, x_n), 0, \dots, \lambda_i, 0, \dots, 0), \text{ for } i \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since  $\|\partial_{x_i}\theta(x)\| \leq C$  for every  $x \in B_{3r}(0)$ , and  $\alpha(x_1) - \lambda_1 x_1 \leq \gamma_2$  we have that  $\|\partial_{x_i} f_0\| > (\lambda_i - \gamma_2 C)$  for every  $i = 2, \dots, n$ . Moreover, by condition 1,  $\|\partial_{x_1} f_0\| \leq \max\{\alpha'(x_1), \lambda_1\} \leq \lambda_1 + \gamma_2$ , if we choose  $\gamma_2$  small in such way that  $\lambda_2 - \gamma_2 C > \lambda_1 + \gamma_2$  then:

$$\|\partial_{x_i} f_0\| > \|\partial_{x_1} f_0\|, \text{ for every } i \geq 2.$$

Notice also that  $\|\partial_{x_1} f_0\| \geq \min\{\alpha'(x_1), \lambda_1\} \geq (1 + \gamma_1)^{-1}$ . This prove that:

$$\|Df_0(x)^{-1}\|^{-1} \geq \min_{i=1, \dots, n} \|\partial_{x_i} f_0\| (1 + \gamma_1)^{-1}.$$

Since  $f$  coincides with  $g$  outside  $W$ , we have  $\|Df_0(x)^{-1}\| \leq \lambda_1^{-1}$  for every  $x \in W^c$ . Together with the above inequality, this proves condition (H1), with  $\delta_0 = \gamma_1$ .

Choosing  $\gamma_1$  small and  $p = d - 1$ ,  $q = 1$ ,  $B_i = R_i$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , condition (H2) is immediate. Indeed, observe that the Jacobian of  $f_0$  is given by the formula:

$$\det Df_0(x) = (\alpha'(x_1)\theta(x_2, \dots, x_n) + (1 - \theta(x_2, \dots, x_n))\lambda_1) \prod_{i=2}^n \lambda_i.$$

Then, if we choose  $\gamma_1 < \prod_{i=2}^n \lambda_i - 1$ :

$$\det Df_0(x) > (1 + \gamma_1)^{-1} \prod_{i=2}^n \lambda_i > 1.$$

Therefore, we may take  $\sigma_1 = (1 + \gamma_1)^{-1} \prod_{i=2}^n \lambda_i > 1$ .

To verify property (H3) for  $f_0$ , observe that if we denote by

$$V = \{x \in M; \|Df_0(x)^{-1}\| > (1 + \delta_1)^{-1}\},$$

with  $\delta_1 < \lambda_1 - 1$ , then  $V \subset W$ . Indeed, since  $\alpha(x_1)$  is constant equal to  $\lambda_1 x_1$  outside  $W$  we have that  $\|Df_0(x)^{-1}\| \leq \lambda_1^{-1} < (1 + \delta_1)^{-1}$ , for every  $x \in W^c$ . Given  $\gamma_3$  close to 0, we may choose  $\delta_1$  close to 0 and  $\alpha$  satisfying the conditions above in such way that,

$$\sup_{x, y \in V} \alpha'(x_1) - \alpha'(y_1) < \gamma_3.$$

If  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are the infimum and the supremum of  $|\det Df_0|$  on  $V$ , respectively,

$$m_2 - m_1 \leq C \left( \sup_{x, y \in V} \alpha'(x_1) - \alpha'(y_1) \right) < \gamma_3 C,$$

where  $C = \prod_{i=2}^n \lambda_i$ . Then, we may take  $\beta = \gamma_3 C$  in (H3). If  $M_1$  is the infimum of  $|\det Df_0|$  on  $W^c$ ,  $M_1 > m_2$ , since  $\lambda_1 > (1 + \delta_1) \geq \sup_{x \in V} \alpha'(x)$ .

The arguments above show that the hypotheses (H1), (H2), (H3) are satisfied by  $f_0$ . Moreover, if we one takes  $\alpha(0) = 0$ , then  $p_0$  is fixed point for  $f_0$ , which is not a repeller, since  $\alpha'(0) < 1$ . Therefore,  $f_0$  is not a uniformly expanding map.

It is not difficult to see that this construction may be carried out in such way that  $f_0$  does not satisfy the expansiveness property: there is a fixed hyperbolic saddle point  $p_0$  such that the stable manifold of  $p_0$  is contained in the unstable manifold of two other fixed points.

Now, if  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes a small  $C^2$ -neighborhood of  $f_0$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ , and  $H : \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is a continuous map, Alves-Araújo [1] shows that if  $w^* \in \Omega$  is such that  $F(w^*) = f_0$  and  $\theta_\varepsilon$  is a sequence of measures,  $\text{supp}(\theta_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \{w_0\}$  then

for small  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are physical measures for the RDS  $F : \Omega^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ ,  $F(\dots, w_{-k}, \dots, w_0, \dots, w_k, \dots) = H(w_0)$ . This concludes the construction of examples satisfying (H1), (H2), (H3), (C1), (C2).

## 5. NON-UNIFORMLY EXPANDING MEASURES AND HYPERBOLIC TIMES

We now precise the conditions on  $\delta_0$  and  $\beta$ . We consider  $\gamma_0$  given in condition (F1). By condition (C1), there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  s.t. for any  $\eta \in B_{\varepsilon_0}(\xi)$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $w$  holds :

$$\frac{\|Df(w)^{-1}(\xi)\|}{\|Df(w)^{-1}(\eta)\|} \leq e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}},$$

where  $c$  is such that for some  $\alpha > \gamma_0$ , we have  $(1+\delta_0)^\alpha(1+\delta_1)^{-(1-\alpha)} < e^{-2c} < 1$  and  $\alpha m_2 + (1-\alpha)M_2 < \gamma_0 m_1 + (1-\gamma_0)M_1 - l \log(1+\delta_0)$  ( $l := \dim(M)$ ), if  $\delta_0$  and  $\beta$  are sufficiently small. Now, the constants fixed above allows us to prove good properties for the objects defined below, which are of fundamental interest in the proof of theorem A.

**Definition 5.1.** *We say that a measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega \times M)$  is non-uniformly expanding with exponent  $c$  if for  $\nu$ -almost every  $(w, x) \in \Omega \times M$  we have:*

$$\lambda(w, x) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df(T^j(w))(f^j(w)(x))^{-1}\| \leq -2c < 0.$$

**Definition 5.2.** *We say that  $n$  is a  $c$ -hyperbolic time for  $(w, x)$ , if for every  $1 \leq k \leq n$ :*

$$\prod_{j=n-k}^{n-1} \|Df(T^{j+1}(w))(f^j(w)(x))^{-1}\| \leq e^{-ck}.$$

As in lemma 3.1 of [2], lemma 4.8 of [12] and lemma 2.2 of [1], we have infinity many hyperbolic times for expanding measures. For this we need a lemma due to Pliss (see [2]).

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $A \geq c_2 > c_1 > 0$  and  $\zeta = \frac{c_2 - c_1}{A - c_1}$ . Given real numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_N$  satisfying:*

$$\sum_{j=1}^N a_j \geq c_2 N \text{ and } a_j \leq H \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq N,$$

*there are  $l > \zeta N$  and  $1 < n_1 < \dots < n_l \leq N$  such that:*

$$\sum_{j=n+1}^{n_i} a_j \geq c_1(n_1 - n) \text{ for each } 0 \leq n < n_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, l.$$

**Lemma 5.4.** *For every invariant measure  $\nu$  with exponent  $c$ , there exists a full  $\nu$ -measure set  $H \subset \Omega \times M$  such that every  $(w, x) \in H$  has infinitely many  $c$ -hyperbolic times  $n_i = n_i(w, x)$  and, in fact, the density of hyperbolic times at infinity is larger than some  $d_0 = d_0(c) > 0$ :*

- (1)  $\prod_{j=n-k}^{n-1} \|Df(T^{j+1}(w))(f^j(w)(x))^{-1}\| \leq e^{-cj}$  for every  $1 \leq k \leq n_i$
- (2)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{0 \leq n_i \leq n\}}{n} \geq d_0 > 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $H \subset \Omega \times M$  with full  $\nu$ -measure. For any  $(w, x) \in H$  and  $n$  large enough, we have:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df(T^j(w))(f^j(w)(x))^{-1}\| \leq -\frac{3c}{2}n$$

Now, by (C1) we can apply lemma 5.3 with  $A = \sup_{(w,x)} (-\log \|Df(w)^{-1}(x)\|)$ ,  $c_1 = c$ ,  $c_2 = \frac{3c}{2}$  and  $a_i = -\log \|Df(T^j(w))(f^j(w)(x))^{-1}\|$  and the statement follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5.**  $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0$  such that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $w$ , if  $n_i$  is a hyperbolic time of  $(w, x)$  and  $f^{n_i}(w)(z) \in B_{\epsilon_0}(f^{n_i}(w)(x))$  then  $d(f^{n_i-j}(w)(z), f^{n_i-j}(w)(x)) \leq e^{-\frac{cj}{2}} d(f^{n_i}(w)(z), f^{n_i}(w)(x))$ ,  $\forall 1 \leq j \leq n_i$ .

*Proof.* By (C1) we know that there exists  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any  $\eta \in B_{\epsilon_0}(\xi)$  we have:

$$\frac{\|Df(w)^{-1}(\xi)\|}{\|Df(w)^{-1}(\eta)\|} \leq e^{\frac{c}{2}} \text{ for } \mathbb{P}\text{-ae } w.$$

In fact, this hold in the  $T$ -orbit of  $w$   $\mathbb{P}$ -ae. Indeed, let  $C = \{w; \frac{\|Df(w)^{-1}(\xi)\|}{\|Df(w)^{-1}(\eta)\|} \leq e^{\frac{c}{2}}\}$  for any  $\xi$  and  $\eta \in B_{\epsilon_0}(\xi)$ , then  $\bigcap T^j(C)$  has full measure and the estimate follows. Because  $f^{n_i}(w)(z) \in B_{\epsilon_0}(f^{n_i}(w)(x))$ , by the estimative above, we have that  $w$   $\mathbb{P}$ -ae if we take the inverse branch of  $f^{n_i}(w)$  which sends  $f^{n_i}(w)(x)$  to  $f^{n_i-1}(w)(x)$  (restricted to  $B_{\epsilon_0}(f^{n_i}(w)(x))$ ) and has derivative with norm less than  $e^{-\frac{c}{2}}$ , then we have  $d(f^{n_i-1}(w)(z), f^{n_i-1}(w)(x)) \leq \epsilon_0$ . Using the estimate along the orbit (and induction), we have:

$$\prod_{j=n-k}^{n-1} \|Df(T^{j+1}(w))(f^j(w)(z))^{-1}\| \leq e^{-\frac{ck}{2}} \text{ for all } 0 \leq k \leq n_i.$$

The statement follows.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM A

Now we define a set of measures where the “bad set”  $V$  has small measure.

**Definition 6.1.** We define the convex set  $K_\alpha$  by

$$K_\alpha = \{\mu : \mu(\Omega \times V) \leq \alpha\}$$

**Lemma 6.2.**  $K_\alpha \neq \emptyset$  is a compact set.

*Proof.* Let  $\{\mu_n\} \subset K_\alpha$ . By compactity, we can assume that  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ . Since  $V$  is open then  $\mu(\Omega \times V) \leq \liminf(\mu_n)(\Omega \times V) \leq \alpha$ . This implies compactity. The physical measure given by condition (C2) (see equation (4)) is in  $K_\alpha$ , because *Leb*-a.e. random orbit stay at most  $\gamma_0 < \alpha$  inside  $V$  (by (F1)). By definition of physical measure (limit of average of Dirac measures supported on random orbits) and the absolute continuity with respect to the Lebesgue measure,  $\mu_w(V) \leq \alpha$  for  $w$   $\mathbb{P}$ - a.e. holds. In particular,  $\mu(\Omega \times V) \leq \alpha$ .  $\square$

We recall that the ergodic decomposition theorem holds for RDS. With this in mind, we distinguish a set  $\mathcal{K} \subset K_\alpha$  :

**Definition 6.3.**  $\mathcal{K} = \{\mu : \mu_{(w,x)} \in K_\alpha \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e.}(w,x)\}$  ( $\mu_{(w,x)}$  is the ergodic decomposition of  $\mu$ ).

**Lemma 6.4.** Every measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$  is  $f$ -expanding with exponent  $c$  :

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df(T^j(w))(f^j(w)(x))^{-1}\| \leq -2c$$

for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $(w, x) \in M$ .

*Proof.* We assume first that  $\mu$  is ergodic. By definition of  $K_\alpha$ , we have  $\mu(\Omega \times V) \leq \alpha$ . But Birkhoff's Ergodic Theorem applied to  $(F, \mu)$  says that in the random orbit of  $(w, x)$   $\mu$ -a.e. we have:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \chi_V(f^i(w)(x)) \leq \alpha.$$

Now, we use hypothesis (H1):  $\|Df(w, y)^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \delta_0)$  for any  $y \in V$  and  $\|Df(w, y)^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \delta_1)^{-1}$  for any  $y \in V^c$ , obtaining:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df(T^j(w))(f^j(w)(x))^{-1}\| \leq \log[(1 + \delta_0)^\alpha (1 + \delta_1)^{1-\alpha}] \leq -2c < 0$$

$(w, x)$  -  $\mu$ -a.e.

In the general case we use the ergodic decomposition theorem (see [12] and [10]).  $\square$

#### Entropy lemmas

**Definition 6.5.** Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we define :

$$A_\varepsilon(w, x) = \{y : d(f^n(w)(x), f^n(w)(y)) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for every } n \geq 0\}.$$

**Lemma 6.6.** Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$  is ergodic and let  $\varepsilon_0$  given by lemma 5.5. Then, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every  $w$  and any  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ ,

$$A_\varepsilon(w, x) = x.$$

*Proof.* By lemma 5.4 we have infinity hyperbolic times  $n_i = n_i(w, x)$  for  $(w, x) \in H$  (where  $\mu(H) = 1$ ). For each  $w$  set  $H_w = \{x; (w, x) \in H\}$ , then  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $w$  we have  $\mu_w(H_w) = 1$  and infinity hyperbolic times for  $\mu_w$ -a.e.  $x$ . Now, by lemma 5.5, if  $z \in A_\varepsilon(w, x)$  with  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  we have:

$$d(x, z) \leq e^{-\frac{cn_i}{2}} d(f^{n_i}(w)(x), f^{n_i}(w)(z)) \leq e^{-\frac{cn_i}{2}} \varepsilon.$$

The lemma follows.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a partition of  $M$  in measurable sets with diameter less than  $\varepsilon_0$ . From the above lemma, we get :

**Lemma 6.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a partition of  $M$  in measurable sets with diameter less than  $\varepsilon_0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{P}$  is a generating partition for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$ .*

*Proof.* As usual we will write:

$$\mathcal{P}_w^n = \{C_w^n = (\mathcal{P}_w)_{i_0} \cap \dots \cap f^{-(n-1)}(w)(\mathcal{P}_w)_{i_{n-1}}\} \text{ for each } n \geq 1,$$

where  $(\mathcal{P}_w)_{i_k}$  is an element of the partition  $\mathcal{P}$ . By the previous lemma, we know that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $w$ , we have  $A_\varepsilon(w, x) = x$  for  $x$   $\mu_w$ -a.e. Let  $A$  a measurable set of  $M$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Take  $K_1 \subset A$  and  $K_2 \subset A^c$  two compact sets such that  $\mu_w(K_1 \Delta A) \leq \delta$  and  $\mu_w(K_2 \Delta A^c) \leq \delta$ . Now if  $r = d(K_1, K_2)$ , the previous lemma says that if  $n$  is big enough then  $\text{diam} \mathcal{P}_w^n(x) \leq \frac{r}{2}$  for  $x$  in a set of  $\mu_w$ -measure bigger than  $1 - \delta$ . The sets  $(C_w^n)_1, \dots, (C_w^n)_k$  that intersects  $K_1$  satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup (C_w^n)_i \Delta A\right) &= \mu\left(\bigcup (C_w^n)_i - A\right) + \mu\left(A - \bigcup (C_w^n)_i\right) \\ &\leq \mu(A - K_1) + \mu(A^c - K_2) + \delta \leq 3\delta. \end{aligned}$$

This end the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.8.** *For every  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $h_\mu(f) = h_\mu(f, \mathcal{P})$*

*Proof.* The result follows from lemma 6.7 and the theorem 2.3.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.9.** *The map  $\mu \rightarrow h_\mu(f, \mathcal{P})$  is upper semi-continuous at  $\mu_0$  measure s.t.  $(\mu_0)_w(\partial P) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $w$ ,  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .*

*Proof.* In fact, we have :

$$h_\mu(f, \mathcal{P}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int H_{\mu_w}(\mathcal{P}_w^n) d\mathbb{P} = \inf_n \frac{1}{n} \int H_{\mu_w}(\mathcal{P}_w^n) d\mathbb{P}(w).$$

But, if  $(\mu_0)_w(\partial P) = 0$  for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $w$ , then the function  $H(\mu, n)$  given by  $\mu \rightarrow \int H_{\mu_w}(\mathcal{P}_w^n) d\mathbb{P}$  is upper semi-continuous at  $\mu_0$ . Indeed, since we are assuming that  $T$  is continuous, the same argument in the proof of theorem 1.1 of [11] shows this result. In particular, because the infimum of a sequence of upper semi-continuous functions is itself upper semi-continuous, this proves the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.10.** *All ergodic measures  $\eta$  outside  $\mathcal{K}$  have small entropy : there exists  $\rho_0 < 1$  such that*

$$h_\eta(f) \leq \rho_0 h_{top}(f).$$

*Proof.* By the random versions of Oseledet's theorem and Ruelle's inequality (see [9]), we have:

$$h_\eta(f) \leq \int \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda^{(i)}(w, x) m^{(i)}(w, x) d\eta.$$

where  $\lambda^{(1)}(w, x), \dots, \lambda^{(s)}(w, x)$  are the positive Lyapunov exponents of  $f$  at  $(w, x)$  and  $m^{(1)}(w, x), \dots, m^{(s)}(w, x)$  their multiplicity respectively. Furthermore, by hypothesis the measure is ergodic, then these objects are constant a.e. then  $h_\eta(f) \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda^{(i)}$  and  $\int \log \|\det Df(w)(x)\| d\eta = \sum_i \lambda^{(i)}$ . Since  $\|Df(w)(x)^{-1}\| \leq (1 + \delta_0)$  we have  $\lambda_i > -\log(1 + \delta_0)$ . By the definitions of  $m_2, M_2$  and the above estimates, we have by (C1):

$$\begin{aligned} h_\eta(f) &\leq \int \log \|Df(w)(x)\| d\eta - \sum_{i=s+1}^l \lambda^i \\ &\leq \eta(\Omega \times V) m_2 + (1 - \eta(\Omega \times V)) M_2 + (l - s)(1 + \delta_0) \\ &\leq \alpha m_2 + (1 - \alpha) M_2 + l \log(1 + \delta_0) \end{aligned}$$

Now the physical measure  $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$  given by condition (C2) satisfy  $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(W) < \gamma_0$  (by (F1)). The Random Pesin's formulae gives:

$$h_{\mu_{\mathbb{P}}}(f) = \int \log \|\det Df\| d\mu_{\mathbb{P}} \geq \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(W) m_1 + (1 - \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(W)) M_1.$$

But  $m_1 < M_1$  then  $\gamma_0 m_1 + (1 - \gamma_0) M_1 \leq h_{\mu_{\mathbb{P}}}(f)$ . Using that  $\eta \notin \mathcal{K}$ ,  $m_2 < M_2$  and (C1) we have:

$$\alpha m_2 + (1 - \alpha) M_2 < \gamma_0 m_1 + (1 - \gamma_0) M_1 - l \log(1 + \delta_0).$$

Then, we can choose  $\rho_0 < 1$  such that

$$\alpha m_2 + (1 - \alpha) M_2 + l \log(1 + \delta_0) < \rho_0 (\gamma_0 m_1 + (1 - \gamma_0) M_1) < \rho_0 h_{\mu_{\mathbb{P}}}(f)$$

This gives:  $h_\eta(f) \leq \rho_0 h_{top}(f)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.11.**  $\pi_f(\phi) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}} \{h_\mu(f) + \int \phi d\mu\}$ .

*Proof.* By remark 1, we need to show that:

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{K}} \{h_\mu(f) + \int \phi d\mu\} = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_e(\Omega \times M)} \{h_\mu(f) + \int \phi d\mu\}$$

By the previous lemma, if  $\eta \notin \mathcal{K}$  then:

$$h_\eta(f) + \int \phi d\eta \leq \rho_0 h_{top}(f) + \|\phi\|_1 < \pi_f(\phi)$$

$\square$

*Proof of theorem A.* We will use the following notation:  $\Psi(\mu) = h_\mu(f) + \int \phi d\mu$ . Let  $\{\mu_k\} \subset \mathcal{K}$  such that  $\Psi(\mu_k) \rightarrow \pi_f(\phi)$ , by compactity we can suppose that  $\mu_k$  converge to  $\mu$  weakly.

Fix  $\mathcal{P}$  a partition with diameter less than  $\varepsilon_0$ , and for  $w$ -a.e.,  $\mu_w(\partial P) = 0$ , for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ . By corollary 6.8 we have  $h_{\mu_k}(f) = h_{\mu_k}(f, \mathcal{P})$ . Then  $\pi_f(\phi) = \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{K}} \Psi(\eta) = \limsup \Psi(\mu_k)$ . By the comments after corollary 6.8 we know

that  $\eta \rightarrow h_\eta(f, \mathcal{P})$  is upper semicontinuous in  $\eta$  over  $\mathcal{K}$ , then:

$$\limsup \Psi(\mu_k) \leq h_\mu(f, \mathcal{P}) + \int \phi d\mu \leq \Psi(\mu).$$

But,  $\Psi(\mu) \leq \pi_f(\phi)$ . This implies that  $\mu$  is an equilibrium state.

In the other hand, if  $\eta$  is a measure which attain the supremum in (3) then let  $\eta_{(w,x)}$  the ergodic decomposition of  $\eta$ . Then the entropy of  $\eta$  is equal to the integral of entropies of its ergodic components (see [9], page 1289 and references there in), of course the same occurs with the  $\Psi(\eta)$  (\*). If  $(x, w) \notin \{(x, w); \eta_{(x,w)} \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha\}$  then by lemma 6.10:

$$\Psi(\eta_x) = h_{\eta_{(x,w)}}(f) + \int \phi d\eta_{(x,w)} \leq \rho_0 h_{top}(f) + \|\phi\|_1 < \pi_f(\phi).$$

Then if  $\eta(\{(x, w); \eta_{(x,w)} \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha\}^c) > 0$ , (\*) says that  $\Psi(\eta) < \pi_f(\eta)$  a contradiction, so every equilibrium state is in  $\mathcal{K}$ . The proof of the theorem is now complete.  $\square$

*Remark 4.* Liu-Zhao [11] show the semi-continuity of the entropy under the hypothesis that  $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is *continuous* and  $f$  is expansive *at every point of*  $M$ . From this result, a natural question is : “What about the semi-continuity without topological assumptions (e.g., continuity) ? And the case of weak expansiveness assumptions ?”. We point out that the proof of theorem A shows the semicontinuity of the entropy map *in the set*  $\mathcal{K}$ . This partially answers the question since, although we need to assume continuity, only a weak expansion at Lebesgue a.e. point of  $M$  is required (*this assumption is the sole reason of the restriction to the set of measures*  $\mathcal{K}$ ). Indeed, non-uniform expansion on Lebesgue a.e. point obligates us to restrict the proof of our lemmas on semicontinuity to the set  $\mathcal{K}$ .

*Remark 5.* Our theorem A holds in the context of *RDS bundles* (see [9] or [11]) with the extra assumption that  $T$  and the skew-product  $F$  are continuous.

## 7. APPENDIX

We now prove that (F1) follows from (H1) and (H2), in fact, this is a well known argument (see for example [1]), but for sake of completeness we give the proof.

Fix  $(w, x)$ , if  $i = (i_0, \dots, i_{n-1}) \in \{1, \dots, p+q\}^n$  let  $[i] = B_{i_0} \cap f^{-1}(w)(B_{i_1}) \cap \dots \cap f^{-n+1}(w)(B_{i_{n-1}})$  and  $g(i) = \#\{0 \leq j < n; I_j \leq p\}$ .

If  $\gamma > 0$  then  $\#\{i; g(i) < \gamma n\} \leq \sum_{k \leq \gamma n} \binom{n}{k} p^{\gamma n} q^n$ . By Stirling's formula this is bounded by  $(e^\xi p^\gamma q)^n$  (here  $\xi$  depends of  $\gamma$ ) and  $\xi(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$  if  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ .

Now (H1) and (H2) says that  $m([i]) \leq \sigma_1^{-n} \sigma_1^{\gamma n}$ . If we set  $I(n, w) = \bigcup \{[i]; g([i]) < \gamma n\}$  then  $m(I(n, w)) \leq \sigma_1^{-(1-\gamma)n} (e^\xi p^\gamma q)^n$  and since  $\sigma_1 > q$  there is a  $\gamma_0$  (small) such that  $(e^\xi p^\gamma q)^n < \sigma_1^{(1-\gamma_0)n}$ . Then there is a  $\tau = \tau(\gamma_0) < 1$  and  $N = N(\gamma_0)$  such that if  $n \geq N$  then  $m(I(n, w)) \leq \tau^n$

Let  $I_n = \bigcup_{w \in \mathbb{P}} (\{w\} \times I(n, w))$  and by Fubini's theorem  $\mathbb{P} \times \text{Leb}(I_n) \leq \tau^n$  if  $n \geq N$ . But  $\sum_n \mathbb{P} \times \text{Leb}(I_n) < \infty$  then Borel-Cantelli's lemma implies:

$$\mathbb{P} \times \text{Leb}\left(\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{n \geq k} I_k\right) = 0$$

Using Birkhoff's theorem we have that the set:

$$\{(w, x); \exists n \geq 1, \forall k \geq n, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{0 \leq j < n; f^j(w)(x) \in B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_p\}}{n} > \gamma_0\}$$

has  $\mathbb{P} \times \text{Leb}$ -measure at least  $\gamma_0$ . Now by Fubini's theorem again, we have (F1).

**Acknowledgements.** The authors are indebted to Professor Marcelo Viana for useful conversations, suggestions and advices. Also to Professor Pei-Dong Liu for give us helpful references (including the preprint [11]), for communicated to us some entropy results and for some corrections on old versions of the paper, to Professor Yuri Kifer for some other references and to the two referees of this paper for the necessary corrections in order to improve the presentation of our article. Finally, we are grateful to IMPA and his staff for the remarkable research ambient.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. ALVES AND V. ARAÚJO. Random perturbations of non-uniformly expanding maps. *preprint*, 2000.
- [2] J. ALVES, C. BONNATI, M. VIANA. SRB measures for partially hyperbolic systems whose central direction is mostly expanding. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 140: 298–351, 2000.
- [3] L. ARNOLD. *Random Dynamical Systems*. Springer, 1998.
- [4] T. BOGENSCHUTZ. Equilibrium states for random dynamical systems. *Ph.D. thesis-Universität Bremen*, Institut für Dynamische Systeme, 1993.
- [5] J. BUZZI. Thermodynamical formalism for piecewise invertible maps: absolutely continuous invariant measures as equilibrium states. *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, 69, 749–783, 2001.
- [6] Y. KIFER. Equilibrium states for random expanding transformations. *Random Comput. Dynam.*, 1, 1–31, 1992.
- [7] K. KHANIN, Y. KIFER. Thermodynamic Formalism for Random Transformations and Statistical Mechanics. *Amer. Math. Soc. transl.*, 171, 107–140, 1996.
- [8] P.D. LIU. Random Perturbations of Axiom A Basic Sets. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 90, 467–490, 1998.
- [9] P.D. LIU. Dynamics of random transformations smooth ergodic-theory. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 21: 1279–1319, 2001.

- [10] P.D. LIU AND M. QIAN. Smooth Ergodic of Random Dynamical Systems. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, no. 1606, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [11] P.D. LIU AND Y. ZHAO. Large Deviations in Random Perturbations of Axiom A Basic Sets, *to appear in J. of the London Math. Soc.*.
- [12] K. OLIVEIRA. Equilibrium States for non-uniformly expanding maps. *Ph.D. thesis- IMPA, preprint*, [www.preprint.impa.br/Shadows/SERIE.C/2002/12.html](http://www.preprint.impa.br/Shadows/SERIE.C/2002/12.html), 2002.
- [13] O. SARIG Thermodynamic formalism for countable Markov shifts. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19, no. 6, 1565–1593, 1999.

Alexander Arbieto ([alexande@impa.br](mailto:alexande@impa.br))

Carlos Matheus ([cmateus@impa.br](mailto:cmateus@impa.br))

Krerley Oliveira ([krerley@mat.ufal.br](mailto:krerley@mat.ufal.br))

IMPA, Estrada D. Castorina 110, Jardim Botânico, 22460-320 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil