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Abstract

The dynamically defined measure (DDM) \( \Phi \) arising from a finite measure \( \phi_0 \) on an initial \( \sigma \)-algebra on a set and an invertible map acting on the latter is considered. Several lower bounds for it are obtained and sufficient conditions for its positivity are deduced under the general assumption that there exists an invariant measure \( \Lambda \) such that \( \Lambda \ll \phi_0 \).

In particular, DDMs arising from the Hellinger integral \( J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \geq H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0) \geq H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \) are constructed with \( H_0 (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \Phi(Q) \), \( H_1 (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \Lambda(Q) \), and

\[
\Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^{\alpha} \geq J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)
\]

for all measurable \( Q \) and \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \), and further computable lower bounds for them are obtained and analyzed. It is shown, in particular, that \( (0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \) is completely determined by the \( \Lambda \)-essential supremum of \( d\Lambda/d\phi_0 \) for all measurable \( Q \) if \( \Lambda \) is ergodic, and if also a condition for the continuity at 0 is satisfied, the above inequalities become equalities. In general, for every measurable \( Q \), it is shown that \( [0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \) is log-convex, all one-sided derivatives of \( (0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \) and \( (0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \) are obtained, and some lower bounds for the functions by means of the derivatives are given. Some sufficient conditions for the continuity and a one-sided differentiability of \( (0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \) are provided.
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1 Introduction

This article is concerned with the development of general methods for computation of lower bounds for the dynamically defined measures \cite{4,7,8,10} and thus obtaining conditions for their positivity. The latter became particularly required after the recently discovered error in \cite{4}, see \cite{5}.

Originally, the dynamically defined outer measure $\Phi$ arising from a finite measure $\phi_0$ on an initial $\sigma$-algebra was proposed in \cite{4} as a way to construct the coding map for a contractive Markov system (CMS) \cite{3} almost everywhere with respect to an outer measure which is also obtained constructively (at least on compact sets; in general, it still requires the axiom of choice, but the obtained measure is unique). This outer measure arose in a natural way from the condition of the contraction on average.

Later, the author also could not avoid the routine to define the coding map almost everywhere with respect to a measure which is obtained in the canonical, non-constructive and less descriptive way (via the Krylov-Bogolyubov argument) \cite{9}. However, before the dynamically defined outer measure became redundant, it was shown in \cite{7} and \cite{8} that the restriction of the outer measure on the Borel $\sigma$-algebra is a measure the normalization of which provides a construction for equilibrium states for CMSs (the local energy function of which is given by means of the coding map \cite{6}\cite{9}, which makes it highly irregular, so that no other known method, to the author’s knowledge, is capable to provide a construction).

The normalization is, of course, possible only if the measure is not zero. The discovered error in \cite{4} puts it into serious doubts in a general case. At the time of writing, it has only been shown in \cite{5} that the measure is not zero if all the maps of the CMS are contractions (which does not go far beyond the case accessible by means of a Gibbs measure), with a little comfort that no openness of the Markov partition is required (which makes the local energy function still only measurable in general).

The method which is used in \cite{5} is based on the proof that the logarithm of the supremum of the density function of an invariant measure with respect to the initial one along the trajectories is integrable, which seemed to be a very strong condition in general.

Trying to weaken that led to the introduction of the relative entropy measure in this article (Subsection \ref{sec:4.1}). The proof that it is a measure is based just on a few of its properties, which are weaker than that of an outer measure. It requires a notion of an outer measure approximation and a generalization of the Carathéodory theorem for it. The extension of the Measure Theory on such constructions in a general setting, based on sequences of measurement pairs, which can be called the Dynamical Measure Theory, was developed in \cite{10}. It enables us to compute and analyze all lower bounds for the DDMs in this paper.
All lower bounds for the DDMs in this article are obtained in the case when the measurement pairs are generated by an invertible map from an initial $\sigma$-algebra and a measure on it. Moreover, for the computations of the lower bounds, we will always assume that there exists an invariant measure $\Lambda$ which is absolutely continuous with respect to the initial one, $\phi_0$.

It became clear after the development of the dynamical measure theory in [10] that it is logical, from the point of view of the structure of the theory in this article, and advantageous for the purpose of obtaining the best practical lower bounds, to introduce first an intermediate family of DDMs arising from the Hellinger integral $H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, with $H_0(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \Phi(Q)$, and $H_1(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \Lambda(Q)$, which provide lower bounds for $\Phi$ through

$$\Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^{\alpha} \geq H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$$

for all measurable $Q$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and then to obtain a lower bound for $H_0(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ via the relative entropy measure (Theorem [1]), the local finiteness of which guaranties the positivity of $H_0(\Lambda, \phi_0)$.

Furthermore, this approach allowed us to obtain a practical sufficient condition for the positivity of $[0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ via the limit $\alpha \to 1$ (Corollary [1] (ii)).

In Subsection 4.2, we also provide some natural upper bounds on the relative entropy measure. In particular, in the case of an ergodic $\Lambda$, we show that the finiteness of the relative entropy measure is equivalent to the essential boundedness of $d\Lambda/d\phi_0$ with respect to $\Lambda$ and to the absolute continuity of $\Lambda$ with respect to $H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ (Corollary 2).

Another advantage of this approach is the possibility for obtaining criteria for the positivity of $\Phi$ via the dependence of $H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ on $\alpha$. This led to the study of other DDMs, in particular, another DDM arising from the Hellinger integral

$$\Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^{\alpha} \geq H_{\alpha, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \geq H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$$

(1)

for all measurable $Q$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

Clearly, establishing that the functions $[0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ and $[0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ have different properties on $[0, 1)$ would immediately imply the positivity of $\Phi$. In the case of the first function, we were only able to show that it is positive all the way to the left if is positive at some point in $(0, 1)$ and it is zero all the way to the right in the open interval if it is zero at such a point (Lemma [7] (iv)), but the second is always either zero everywhere on $(0, 1)$ or strictly positive on $[0, 1]$ (Lemma [11] (iv)), due to a certain property of a logarithmic almost convexity of the function. We were not able to establish the continuity of the first function on $(0, 1)$ in general, but it holds true for the second (Lemma [11] (vii)).

The continuity of the first function on $(0, 1)$ could be obtained only under a condition (Proposition [1]), which is, in particular, satisfied if $d\Lambda/d\phi_0$ is $\Lambda$-essentially
bounded away from zero. In this case, it is also right and left differentiable (with the left derivative not smaller than the right) (Theorem 3 and Theorem 4), which implies, by the well-known result going back to Beppo Levi, that it is differentiable everywhere except at most countably many points (Corollary 4). If \( \Lambda \) has a finite ergodic decomposition, we obtained the function explicitly on \((0,1)\) (Theorem 9 (ii)). In this case, it is analytic. In particular, it is completely determined by the \( \Lambda \)-essential supremum of \( d\Lambda/d\phi_0 \) if \( \Lambda \) is ergodic. If, in addition to the ergodicity, \( d\Lambda/d\phi_0 \) is also \( \phi_0 \)-essentially bounded away from zero, the functions are continuous at 0 (Proposition 3), and the inequalities in (1) become equalities (Corollary 9 (ii)).

Also, we obtained a sufficient condition for the continuity of the functions at 1 (Proposition 2) (which is slightly stronger than the weakest obtained sufficient condition for the positivity of \([0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\)).

Due to the Lipschitz continuity of the function \((0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\) on every closed subinterval, it is already differentiable almost everywhere. This all encourages us to investigate other possibly finer regularity (or irregularity) properties of it. To that end, we obtained some (singled) measures which naturally suggest themselves as candidates for the derivatives of it. We showed that the first one is in fact the right derivative (Theorem 5), but the left one still turned out to be something else (Theorem 6), but also not smaller than the right. However, again as a consequence of the Beppo Levi Theorem, there exists an at most countable set such that the function is differentiable everywhere except at the points in it, and the restriction of the function on the complement of it is continuously differentiable (Corollary 6). Moreover, we showed that the logarithmic almost convexity of the function implies that it is strictly smaller than the weighted geometric average in the inequality (1) at the points where its left derivative is greater than the right (Proposition 5).

The latter inspired us to introduce another DDM arising from the Hellinger integral \( \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \geq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \), which is the greatest which still satisfies the first inequality in (1) (Section 5). We showed that \([0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\) is logarithmically convex (which also leads to a general definition of the logarithmic almost convexity for \([0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\)), but its one-sided derivatives seem to be also different in general (Definition 23 and Definition 25).

In any case, the positive derivatives can be used to obtain lower bounds for the functions (Corollary 5 and Corollary 7).

As indicated by the names of the introduced auxiliary measures, we will need some preliminaries from the information theory, which are collected in Subsection 3.2.

Concluding the introduction, a few words on the notation. All considerations in this article will take place on a set \( X \). We will denote the collection of all subsets of \( X \) by \( \mathcal{P}(X) \). As usual, \( \mathbb{N} \) and \( \mathbb{Z} \) will denote the set of all natural numbers (without zero) and the set of all integers respectively. We will use the notation
'\(f|_A\)' to denote the restriction of a function \(f\) on a set \(A\), \(\ll\) to denote the absolute continuity relation for set functions, \(A\Delta B\) to denote the symmetric difference between sets, \(f \lor g\) (\(f \land g\)) to denote the maximum (minimum) of \(f\) and \(g\), and \(x \to^+ y\) (\(x \to^- y\)) to abbreviate the convergence \(x \to y\) and \(x > y\) (\(x < y\)).

2 The setup for the dynamically defined measure (DDM) \(\Phi\)

In this section, we define the main object of the study in this article - a particular case of the dynamically defined measure as specified in Section 5 in [10].

Let \(X\) be a set and \(S : X \to X\) be an invertible map. Let \(A\) be a \(\sigma\)-algebra on \(X\). Let \(A_0\) be the \(\sigma\)-algebra generated by \(\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} S^{-i}A\) and \(B\) be the \(\sigma\)-algebra generated by \(\bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} S^{-i}A\). Define

\[A_m := S^{-m}A_0 \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{N}.\]

It is not difficult to verify that \(A_0 \subset A_{-1} \subset \ldots\), \(B\) is generated by \(\bigcup_{m \leq 0} A_m\), and \(S\) is \(B\)-\(B\) and \(A_0\)-\(A_0\)-measurable (see Section 5 in [10]).

Let \(\phi_0\) be a finite, positive measure on \(A_0\). For \(Q \subset X\), define

\[C(Q) := \left\{ (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \mid A_m \in A_m \ \forall m \leq 0 \text{ and } Q \subset \bigcup_{m \leq 0} A_m \right\}\]

and

\[\Phi(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m).\]

Then \(\Phi(S^i Q) \leq \Phi(S^{i-1} Q)\) for all \(i \leq 0\) (see Sections 4 and 5 in [10]). Define

\[\overline{\Phi}(Q) := \lim_{i \to -\infty} \Phi(S^i Q).\]

Then, by Theorem 16 (i) (Theorem 4 (i) in the arXiv version) in [10], \(\overline{\Phi}(Q) = \Phi(Q)\) for all \(Q \in B\), and \(\Phi\) is a (obviously \(S\)-invariant) measure on \(B\), which we call the dynamically defined measure (DDM) associated with \(\phi_0\).

**Example 1** Let \(P := (p_{ij})_{i,j \leq N}\) be a stochastic \(N \times N\)-matrix. Let \(X := \{1, \ldots, N\}^\mathbb{Z}\) be the set of all \((\ldots, \sigma_{-1}, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots)\), \(\sigma_i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\) and \(S\) be the left shift map on \(X\) (i.e. \((S\sigma)_i = \sigma_{i+1}\) for all \(i \in \mathbb{Z}\)). Let \(0[a]\) denote a cylinder set at time 0 (i.e. the set of all \((\sigma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\) in \(X\) such that \(\sigma_0 = a\) where \(a \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\)). Let \(A\) be the \(\sigma\)-algebra generated by the partition \((0[a])_{a \in \{1, \ldots, N\}}\).
Let $\nu$ be a probability measure on all subsets of $\{1, \ldots, N\}$. Let $\phi_0$ be the probability measures on $A_0$ given by

$$\phi_0(i_1, \ldots, i_n) := \nu\{i_1\}p_{i_1i_2} \cdots p_{i_{n-1}i_n}$$

for all $i_1, \ldots, i_n \subset \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $n \geq 0$. One easily sees that $\Phi(X) > 0$ if $P$ is irreducible and $\nu\{i\} > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ (see Example 2 in [10]).

For an example in which the positivity of $\Phi$ is not that obvious, see [5].

In this note, we will use the measure theory developed in [10] to obtain lower bounds for $\Phi$ in terms of various (signed) measures in the case when there exists $\phi'_0 \ll \phi_0$ such that $\phi'_0 \circ S^{-1} = \phi'_0$, which will allow us not only to obtain sufficient conditions for the positivity of $\Phi$ (which is another important role which is going to be salvaged from the erroneous Lemma 2 (ii) in [4]), but also it will give several necessary and sufficient conditions for $\Phi|_{B} \ll \Phi|_{B}$ in the case when $\phi'_0$ is ergodic. By Proposition 11 (Proposition 1 in the arXiv version) in [10], $\Phi|_{A_0} = \phi'_0 \circ S^{-1}$ for all $m \leq 0$.

In the following, we will denote by $\Lambda$ a positive and finite measure on $A_0$ such that $\Lambda \circ S^{-1} = \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \ll \phi_0$. Its unique extension on $B$, which is, for example, given by Proposition 11 in [10], and the dynamically defined outer measure (in this case, the usual Lebesgue outer measure) will be also denoted by $\Lambda$, since it is always clear what is meant from the set to which it is applied.

Let $Z$ be a measurable version of the Radon-Nikodym derivative $d\Lambda/d\phi_0$.

## 3 Preliminaries

As indicated in the introduction, we will need some preliminaries.

### 3.1 Preliminaries for the derivatives of an exponential function

In this article, we are going to study, in particular, some functions obtained as some infimums and supremums of the functions $[0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto \max_{x \in [0, 1]} x|\log x|^n = \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n$ (it is attained at $e^{-n}$),

$$\max_{x \in [0, \infty)} e^{-(1-\alpha)x}x^n = \left(\frac{n}{e(1-\alpha)}\right)^n \left(\text{it is attained at } \frac{n}{1-\alpha}\right).$$
Proof. The proof is straightforward.

Lemma 2 Let $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $Z \geq 0$ and
\[
D_n^{\alpha, \alpha_0}(Z) := \frac{Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^n - Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^n}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \quad \text{with } x^0 := 1 \text{ for all } -\infty \leq x \leq \infty.
\]
(i) If $n$ is even, then
\[
Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1} \leq D_n^{\alpha, \alpha_0}(Z) \leq Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^{n+1}.
\]
(ii) If $n$ is odd, then
\[
0 \leq D_n^{\alpha, \alpha_0}(Z) \leq 1_{\{Z \leq C\}} \frac{1}{1 - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \log C} Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^{n+1} + 1_{\{Z > C\}} Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1}
\]
for all $C \geq 1$ such that $(\alpha - \alpha_0) \log C < 1$, and, for $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1$,
\[
\max \left\{ Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1} - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n + 2}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n+2} 1_{\{Z \leq 1\}} \right\},
\]
\[
Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^{n+1} - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n + 2}{(1 - \alpha)e} \right)^{n+2} Z 1_{\{Z > 1\}} \right\}
\]
\[
\leq D_n^{\alpha_0}(Z) \leq \min \left\{ Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^{n+1} + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n + 2}{(1 - \alpha)e} \right)^{n+2} 1_{\{Z \leq 1\}} ,
\]
\[
Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1} + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n + 2}{(1 - \alpha)e} \right)^{n+2} Z 1_{\{Z > 1\}} \right\}.
\]

Proof. Obviously, (i) and (ii) are correct if $Z = 0$. Suppose $Z > 0$.

(i) Observe that
\[
Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^n \log Z^{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^n (Z^{\alpha - \alpha_0} - 1).
\]
This implies the first inequality in (i). Also,
\[
Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^{n+1} = - \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^n \log Z^{\alpha_0 - \alpha} \geq - \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^n (Z^{\alpha_0 - \alpha} - 1).
\]
This implies the second inequality in (i).

(ii) The inequality $0 \leq D_n^{\alpha, \alpha_0}(Z)$ is obvious. Furthermore, observe that for $0 \leq Z \leq 1$,
\[
Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^{n+1} = - \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^n \log Z^{\alpha + \alpha_0}
\]
\[
\leq - \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha}(\log Z)^n (Z^{\alpha + \alpha_0} - 1)
\]
\[
= D_n^{\alpha, \alpha_0}(Z).
\]
For \( Z \geq 1 \), as in (i),
\[
Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1} \leq D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z).
\]
Hence, for every \( Z \geq 0 \),
\[
D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z) \geq 1_{\{Z \leq 1\}} Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} + 1_{\{Z > 1\}} Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1}.
\]
(2)

Then on one hand, by (i) and Lemma [1] for \( \alpha_0 > 0 \),
\[
D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z) \geq Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} + 1_{\{Z \leq 1\}} (Z^\alpha - Z^{\alpha_0}) (\log Z)^{n+1}
\]
\[
\geq Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} + 1_{\{Z \leq 1\}} Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+2}(\alpha - \alpha_0)
\]
\[
\geq Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} - 1_{\{Z \leq 1\}} (\frac{n + 2}{\alpha_0 e}) (\alpha - \alpha_0),
\]
(3)

and on the other hand, by (i) and Lemma [1] for \( \alpha < 1 \),
\[
D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z) \geq Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} - 1_{\{Z > 1\}} (Z^\alpha - Z^{\alpha_0}) (\log Z)^{n+1}
\]
\[
\geq Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} - 1_{\{Z > 1\}} Z^\alpha(\log Z)^{n+2}(\alpha - \alpha_0)
\]
\[
= Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} - 1_{\{Z > 1\}} Z \cdot e^{-(1 - \alpha) \log Z}(\log Z)^{n+2}(\alpha - \alpha_0)
\]
\[
\geq Z^\alpha(\log Z)^{n+1} - 1_{\{Z > 1\}} Z \left( \frac{n + 2}{(1 - \alpha) e} \right) (\alpha - \alpha_0).
\]
(4)

Thus (3) and (4) imply the first inequality of the second part in (ii).

Let \( C \geq 1 \) such that \( (\alpha - \alpha_0) \log C < 1 \). If \( Z \leq C \), then, by (i),
\[
Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n-1} \log Z^{\alpha-\alpha_0}
\]
\[
+ Z^{\alpha_0} \log C (\log Z)^{n}
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n-1} \left( \log \frac{Z}{C} \right) (Z^{\alpha-\alpha_0} - 1)
\]
\[
+ Z^{\alpha_0} \log C (\log Z)^{n}
\]
\[
= D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z) + \log C (\log Z)^{n-1} \left( Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z - Z^{\alpha_0} \frac{Z^\alpha - Z^{\alpha_0}}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \right)
\]
\[
\geq D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z) + \log C (\log Z)^{n-1} (Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z - Z^\alpha \log Z)
\]
\[
= D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z) (1 - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \log C).
\]

If \( Z \geq C \), then, as in (i),
\[
Z^\alpha(\log Z)^{n+1} \geq D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z).
\]

Hence, it follows the second inequality of the first part in (ii).

Then, as above, by (i) and Lemma [1] on one hand, for \( \alpha < 1 \),
\[
D_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Z) \leq Z^{\alpha_0}(\log Z)^{n+1} + (\alpha - \alpha_0) 1_{\{Z > 1\}} Z \left( \frac{n + 2}{(1 - \alpha) e} \right)^{n+2},
\]
(5)
and on the other hand, for $\alpha_0 > 0$,

\[
D_n^{\alpha_0}(Z) \leq Z^\alpha (\log Z)^{n+1} + (\alpha - \alpha_0)1_{\{Z \leq 1\}} \left( \frac{n+2}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n+2}.
\] (6)

Thus (5) and (6) imply the second inequality in (ii).

\[\square\]

### 3.2 Information-theoretic preliminaries

In this article, we will also make use of some generalizations and derivations of some relations between measures which were developed in the information theory. We collect the required preliminary material in this subsection.

Let $(X, \mathcal{A}, \Lambda)$ be a finite measure space, i.e. $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\sigma$-algebra, and $\Lambda$ is a positive and finite measure on it.

Let $\phi$ be another positive and finite measure on $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\Lambda \ll \phi$. Let $f$ be a measurable version of the Radon-Nikodym derivative $d\Lambda/d\phi$. (Note that $\Lambda\{f = 0\} = 0$.)

In the following, we will use the definitions $1/\infty := 0$, $x \log(x/y) := 0$ for all $y \geq 0$ and $x = 0$ and $x \log(x/y) := \infty$ for all $x > 0$ and $y = 0$. (As a consequence, $0^0 = 1$, since $y^0 := e^{x \log y}$.)

**Definition 1** Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Define

\[
K(\Lambda|\phi)(A) := \int_A \log f d\Lambda, \quad \text{and} \quad K(\Lambda|\phi) := K(\Lambda|\phi)(X).
\]

The latter is called the Kullback-Leibler divergence of $\Lambda$ with respect to $\phi$. For $\alpha \geq 0$, define

\[
H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi)(A) := \int_A f^\alpha d\phi, \quad \text{and} \quad H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi) := H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi)(X).
\]

The latter is called the Hellinger integral.

Since $x \log x \geq x - 1$ for all $x \geq 0$, $K(\Lambda|\phi)(A) \geq \Lambda(A) - \phi(A)$. In particular, $K(\Lambda|\phi)(A) \geq 0$ if $\Lambda(A) \geq \phi(A)$. Obviously, by the concavity of $x \mapsto x^\alpha$, $0 \leq H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi)(A) \leq \phi(A)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(A)^\alpha$ for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$.

In this article, we are going, in particular, to extend the following relation of the measures to that of the corresponding DDMs which allows to obtain lower bound for the DDM of the main concern.

**Lemma 3** Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\Lambda(A) > 0$. Then

\[
K(\Lambda|\phi)(A) \geq -\frac{\Lambda(A)}{\alpha} \log \frac{H_{1-\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi)(A)}{\Lambda(A)} \quad \text{for all } 0 < \alpha \leq 1, \quad \text{and}
\]
\[ K(\Lambda|\phi)(A) = -\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \frac{\Lambda(A)}{\alpha} \log \frac{H_{1-\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi)(A)}{\Lambda(A)}. \]

**Proof.** First, observe that, by the convexity of \( x \mapsto e^{-x} \),

\[ H_{1-\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi)(A) \geq \int_A e^{-\alpha \log f} d\Lambda \geq \Lambda(A)e^{-\alpha \int_A \log f d\Lambda} = \Lambda(A)e^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}K(\Lambda|\phi)(A)} \]

for all \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1 \). This implies the first part of the assertion.

Now, one easily checks that \( \frac{1}{\alpha}(x-x^{1-\alpha}) \uparrow x \log x \) as \( \alpha \to 0 \) for all \( x \geq 0 \), and that the approximating functions are equibounded from below. Hence, by the Lebesgue Monotone Convergence Theorem,

\[ -\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \frac{\Lambda(A)}{\alpha} \log \frac{H_{1-\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi)(A)}{\Lambda(A)} \geq \lim_{\alpha \to 0} \frac{1}{\alpha} (\Lambda(A) - H_{1-\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi)(A)) \]

\[ = \lim_{\alpha \to 0} \int_A \frac{1}{\alpha} (f - f^{1-\alpha})d\phi = \int_A f \log f d\phi. \]

\[ \Box \]

**Definition 2** Let \( A \in \mathcal{A} \) such that \( \Lambda(A) > 0 \). Let \( \Lambda_A \) and \( \phi_A \) denote the measures on \( \mathcal{A} \) given by

\[ \Lambda_A(B) := \frac{\Lambda(B \cap A)}{\Lambda(A)} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_A(B) := \frac{\phi(B \cap A)}{\phi(A)} \quad \text{for all} \ B \in \mathcal{A}. \]

Set \( K(\Lambda_A|\phi_A) := 0 \) if \( \Lambda(A) = 0 \).

**Lemma 4** Let \( A \in \mathcal{A} \). Then

(i) \[ \Lambda(A) \log \frac{\Lambda(A)}{\phi(A)} + \Lambda(A)K(\Lambda_A|\phi_A) = K(\Lambda|\phi)(A), \quad (7) \]

(ii) \[ H_\alpha(\Lambda_A, \phi_A) = \frac{H_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi)(A)}{(\Lambda(A))^{\alpha}} \quad \text{for all} \ 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \text{ if} \ \Lambda(A) > 0, \quad \text{and} \]

(iii) \[ \Lambda(A) \log \frac{\Lambda(A)}{\phi(A)} - \Lambda(A)\frac{1}{\alpha} \log H_{1-\alpha}(\Lambda_A, \phi_A) \leq K(\Lambda|\phi)(A) \]

for all \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1 \text{ if} \ \Lambda(A) > 0 \), and in the limit, as \( \alpha \to 0 \), holds true the equality.
(iv) For every \( \beta, \gamma \in [0, 1] \) such that \( \beta > 0 \) if \( \gamma > 0 \) and \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1 \),

\[
\int_A f^\gamma d\phi \log \frac{\int_A f^\gamma d\phi}{\int_A f^\beta d\phi} \leq (\gamma - \beta) \int_A f^\gamma \log f d\phi,
\]

and in the limit, as \( \alpha \to 0 \), holds true the equality.

Proof. (i) Clearly, we can assume that \( \Lambda(A) > 0 \). Let \( f_A \) be a measurable version of the Radon-Nikodym derivative \( d\Lambda_A/d\phi_A \). A straightforward computation, using the uniqueness of the Radon-Nikodym derivative, shows that

\[
f_A = \frac{\phi(A)}{\Lambda(A)} f \quad \phi_A\text{-a.e.}
\]  

Therefore,

\[
\int_A f_A \log f_A d\phi_A = \frac{1}{\Lambda(A)} \int_A f \left( \frac{\log \phi(A)}{\Lambda(A)} + \log f \right) d\phi
\]

\[
= \log \frac{\phi(A)}{\Lambda(A)} + \frac{1}{\Lambda(A)} \int_A f \log f d\phi.
\]

The multiplication by \( \Lambda(A) \) implies (i).

(ii) The assertion follows immediately from (8).

(iii) The assertion follows from (i) and Lemma 3.

(iv) Clearly, we only need to proof the case \( \beta > 0 \). Define \( \phi'(A) := \int_A f^\beta d\phi \) and \( \Lambda'(A) := \int_A f^\gamma d\phi \) for all \( A \in \mathcal{A} \). Then, one easily sees that \( \Lambda' \ll \phi' \), \( \phi'\{f = 0\} = 0 \) and

\[
\frac{d\Lambda'}{d\phi'} = f^{\gamma - \beta} \quad \phi'-\text{a.e.}
\]

Thus the assertion follows from (ii) and (iii) applied to \( \phi' \) and \( \Lambda' \). \( \square \)

Remark 1 Obviously, by Lemma 4 (i) or (iii),

\[
\Lambda(A) \log \frac{\Lambda(A)}{\phi(A)} \leq \int_A \log f d\Lambda.
\]  

Furthermore, recall that the sum \( \sum_m \Lambda(A_m) \log(\Lambda(A_m)/\phi(A_m)) \) converges monotonously to \( \int \log f d\Lambda \) with a converging refinement of the partitions \( (A_m) \) if \( \Lambda \) and \( \phi \) are probability measures (e.g. see Theorem 4.1 in [1]). Hence, in the stationary information theory, the second term in Lemma 4 (i) makes
no contribution in the limit. The contribution of that term in the limit in
the dynamical generalization of it, which we develop in this article, is unknown.
However, despite the fact that, by Lemma 3, the term can be well approximated
in terms of the density function (which makes it easier to estimate), the author
was not able to make any use of it so far.

4 Lower bounds for \( \Phi \) via the DDMs arising from
the Hellinger integral \( \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,\beta} (\Lambda, \phi_0) \)

First, we are going to obtain some inequalities which can be used for inferring a
residual relation between \( \Lambda \) and \( \Phi \) from \( \Lambda \ll \phi_0 \) (or \( K(\Lambda|\phi_0) < \infty \)) which gives
a lower bound for \( \Phi \).

Observe that the sum \( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \log (\Lambda(A_m)/\phi_0(S^m A_m)) \) is well defined for
\( (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q) \) such that \( \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) < \infty \), since
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0, \Lambda(A_m)/\phi_0(S^m A_m) < 1} \Lambda(A_m) \log \frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\phi_0(S^m A_m)}
\]
\[
= \sum_{m \leq 0, \Lambda(A_m)/\phi_0(S^m A_m) < 1} \phi_0(S^m A_m) \frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\phi_0(S^m A_m)} \log \frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\phi_0(S^m A_m)}
\]
\[
\geq -\frac{1}{e} \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) > -\infty.
\]

The following lemma lists a hierarchy of methods which can be used for a de-
duction of the positivity of \( \Phi \).

**Lemma 5** Let \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1, \epsilon > 0, Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \) such that \( \Lambda(Q) > 0 \) and
\( (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q) \).

(i) If \( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) < \infty \) and \( \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) < \infty \), then
\[
\left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right)^{-\epsilon} \sum_{m \leq 0} \frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\phi_0(S^m A_m)} \log \frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\phi_0(S^m A_m)}
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m)^{1-\alpha} \phi_0(S^m A_m)^{\alpha}
\]
\[
\leq \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right)^{1-\alpha} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) \right)^{\alpha}.
\]

(ii) For every \( m \leq 0 \) such that \( \Lambda(A_m) > 0 \),
\[
\Lambda(A_m)^{1-\alpha} \phi_0(S^m A_m)^{\alpha} \geq \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{1-\alpha} d\phi_0 \geq \Lambda(A_m) e^{-\frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{S^m A_m}} \int_{S^m A_m} \log Z d\Lambda
\]
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with the definitions \( \log(0) := -\infty \) and \( e^{-\infty} := 0 \).

\begin{proof}

(i) By the convexity of \( x \mapsto e^{-\alpha x} \) and the concavity of \( x \mapsto x^\alpha \),

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right) e^{-\alpha \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \log \frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\phi_0(S^m A_m)}} \\
&\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m)^{1-\alpha} \phi_0(S^m A_m)^\alpha \\
&= \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right) \sum_{m \leq 0} \frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m)} \left( \phi_0(S^m A_m) \right)^\alpha \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right)^{1-\alpha} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) \right)^\alpha.
\end{align*}
\]

This implies (i).

(ii) By the concavity of \( x \mapsto x^{1-\alpha} \) or the Hölder inequality,

\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{1-\alpha} d\phi_0 \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m)^\alpha \left( \int_{S^m A_m} Z d\phi_0 \right)^{1-\alpha} = \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m)^{1-\alpha} \phi_0(S^m A_m)^\alpha.
\]

Now, by the convexity of \( x \mapsto e^{-x} \),

\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{1-\alpha} d\phi_0 \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} e^{-\alpha \log Z} d\Lambda \\
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0, \Lambda(A_m) > 0} \Lambda(A_m) e^{-\frac{\Lambda(A_m)}{\sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m)}} \int_{S^m A_m} \log Z d\Lambda
\]

This implies (ii). (The last inequality of (ii) follows also from Lemma 4 (iv).) \( \square \)

Guided by Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 we start with the following object for the computation of lower bounds for \( \Phi \), which leads to the best practical estimates which we could obtain so far.

\begin{definition}

Let \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \), \( Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \). Define

\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0.
\]

\end{definition}
Obviously, $\mathcal{H}_0(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \Phi(Q)$, and $\mathcal{H}_1(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \Lambda(Q)$ by Proposition 11 (ii) (Proposition 1 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10]. For general $\alpha$, holds true the following, which provides an approach to computations of lower bounds for $\Phi$ on $B$.

**Lemma 6**  
(i) For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$,
\[ \Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha}\Lambda(Q)^\alpha \geq \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in B. \]

(ii) $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ is a finite, $S$-invariant measure on $B$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

(iii) $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0) \ll \Phi$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, and $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0) \ll \Lambda$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

**Proof.** (i) Let $Q \in B$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$ such that
\[ \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) < \Phi(Q) + \epsilon. \]

Then, by Lemma 5 (i) and (ii),
\[ (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon)^{1-\alpha}\left(\sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m)\right)^\alpha \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \geq \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q). \]

Hence, by the $S$-invariance of $\Lambda$, Proposition 12 (i) (Proposition 2 (i) in the arXiv version) in [10] implies the assertion.

(ii) It follows by (i) and Theorem 16 (ii) (Theorem 4 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10].

(iii) It follows by (i) for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and the case $\alpha = 0$ follows by Lemma 19 (Lemma 10 in the arXiv version) in [10]. \(\square\)

It turns out that one can obtain greater DDMs arising from the Hellinger integral via the construction from Subsection 4.1 in [10]. They generalize $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and also provide lower bounds for $\Phi$, but the main purpose for their introduction is their usefulness for obtaining criteria for the positivity of $\Phi$ via their dependence on the parameter.

**Definition 4** Let $\alpha, \gamma \in [0, 1]$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define
\[ C^\gamma_\epsilon(Q) := \left\{ (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q) \mid \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 < \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon \right\}, \]
\[ \mathcal{H}^{\alpha, \gamma}_\epsilon(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\gamma_\epsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0, \quad \text{and} \]
\[ \mathcal{H}^{\alpha, \gamma}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{H}^{\alpha, \gamma}_\epsilon(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q). \]
Obviously, $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\gamma, \gamma} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha, \gamma \in [0, 1]$. The latter has also the following properties, which, in particular, shed some light on the dependence of $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$ on $\alpha$.

**Lemma 7** Let $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.

(i) For every $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{H}_\gamma^{\epsilon, \gamma} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$, $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \gamma} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \Lambda(Q)$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma^{-1} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$.

(ii) $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \frac{1-\alpha}{1-\alpha_0} \Lambda(Q) \frac{\alpha-\alpha_0}{1-\alpha_0}$

for all $0 \leq \alpha_0 \leq \alpha < 1$.

(iii) For every $0 \leq \alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ is a finite, $S$-invariant measure on $\mathcal{B}$.

(iv) If $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0$ for all $\alpha_0 \in [0, \alpha] \cup \{1\}$. If $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = 0$ for some $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1)$, then $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. If $\Lambda(Q) = 0$, then $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

**Proof.** (i) The first equality follows immediately from the definition. The second follows by Proposition 12 (Proposition 2 (i) in the arXiv version) in [10]. And the third follows by Proposition 13 (Proposition 3 in the arXiv version) in [10].

(ii) Clearly, we can assume that $\alpha_0 < \alpha$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\alpha_0, 1}(Q)$. Then, by the convexity of $x \mapsto x^{(1-\alpha_0)/(1-\alpha)}$,

\[
\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} \left( e^{-(1-\alpha) \log Z} \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_0}{1-\alpha}} d\Lambda
\]

\[
\geq \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_0}{1-\alpha}} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_0}{1-\alpha}}
\]

which implies (ii).

(iii) It follows immediately by (i), (ii) and Theorem 16 (Proposition 4 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10].

(iv) It follows immediately by (ii), the same way as in Lemma [5] (iii).
4.1 A lower bound for $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ via a relative entropy measure

For the purpose of obtaining a lower bound for $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$, first observe that, by Lemma 2, for every $0 \leq \alpha < \gamma \leq 1$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$ such that $\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 < \infty$,

$$
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 < \infty
$$

Therefore, the sum in the following expression is well defined.

**Definition 5** For $0 \leq \alpha < \gamma \leq 1$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$
\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon}^\alpha (Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\gamma \log Z d\phi_0
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\alpha} (Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (Q).
$$

The same way as in the proof of Lemma 5 (Lemma 3 in the arXiv version) in [10], one sees that

$$
\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (Q) \leq \mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (S^{-1}Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \text{ and } \epsilon > 0.
$$

Therefore, we can define

$$
\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (Q) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (S^{-n}Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \text{ and } \epsilon > 0, \text{ and}
$$

$$
\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\alpha} (Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{P}(X).
$$

One easily sees that

$$
\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\alpha} (Q) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\alpha} (S^{-n}Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{P}(X).
$$

Let $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon}^\alpha (Q)$ denote the set of all $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^\alpha (Q)$ such that $A_m$'s are pairwise disjoint. By Lemma 3 (Lemma 2 in the arXiv version) in [10], $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^\alpha (Q)$ is not empty. Define $\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (Q)$ the same way as $\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\epsilon, \alpha} (Q)$ with the infimum taken over $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^\alpha (Q)$ and $\mathcal{D}^\gamma_{\alpha} (Q)$ analogously.

For the important case $\gamma = 1$, we will use the special notation

$$
\mathcal{K}_{\alpha, \epsilon} (\Lambda, \phi_0) := \mathcal{D}^{1, \alpha}_\epsilon \text{ and } \mathcal{K}_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) := \mathcal{D}^{1, \alpha}.
$$
Definition 6 For every $0 \leq \alpha < \gamma \leq 1$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$, define
\[ \kappa_{\gamma,\alpha}(A) := \int_A \left( Z^\gamma \log Z + \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} Z^\alpha \right) d\phi_0, \]
and let $\mathcal{K}_{\gamma,\alpha}^\gamma$, $\mathcal{K}_{\gamma,\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\gamma,\alpha}$ be defined the same way as $\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^\gamma$, $\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^\gamma$ with $\int_A Z^\gamma \log Z d\phi_0$ replaced by $\kappa_{\gamma,\alpha}(A)$.

The obtained set functions have the following properties.

Lemma 8 Let $0 \leq \alpha < \gamma \leq 1$. Then the following holds true.

(i) For every $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$,
\[ \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{K}_{\gamma,\alpha}^\gamma (Q), \]
and for every $Q \in \mathcal{B}$,
\[ \mathcal{K}_{\gamma,\alpha}^\gamma (Q) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} (\Lambda(Q) - \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)) + \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \text{ if } \gamma < 1. \]

(ii) $\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q) = \mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q) - \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.

(iii) $\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q) = \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.

(iv) $\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}$ is a $S$-invariant, signed measure on $\mathcal{B}$.

(v) $\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q) = \mathcal{D}_{\epsilon,\alpha}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ if $\gamma < 1$, and
\[ \mathcal{K}_{\alpha} (\Lambda|\phi_0) (Q) = \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\alpha} (\Lambda|\phi_0) (Q) \text{ for all } Q \in \mathcal{B} \text{ if } \mathcal{K}_{\alpha} (\Lambda|\phi_0) (X) < \infty. \]

(vi) $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha} (\Lambda|\phi_0) (X) = K (\Lambda|\phi_0)$ if $\phi_0 \circ S^{-1} = \phi_0$.

Proof. (i) Let $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^\alpha(Q)$. Then, by Lemma 21(i),
\[ \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\gamma d\phi_0 \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int \left( Z^\gamma \log Z + \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} Z^\alpha \right) d\phi_0 \]
\[ = \sum_{m \leq 0} \kappa_{\gamma,\alpha} (S^m A_m). \]
Thus the first inequality of (i) follows.
Now, let $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\gamma < 1$. By Proposition 12 in [10] (Proposition 2 in the arXiv version), we can choose $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{e}^\alpha(Q)$ such that $\sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(B_m) < \Lambda(Q) + \epsilon$. Then, by Lemma 2 (i),

$$K_{e}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(B_m) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^{m}B_m} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^{m}B_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon - \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)) + \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} (\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon).$$

Thus the second inequality of (i) follows.

(ii) It follows immediately by Lemma 10 (i) (Lemma 6 (i) in the arXiv version) in [10].

(iii) It follows immediately by (ii) and Lemma 10 (ii) (Lemma 6 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10].

(iv) By (ii),

$$\mathcal{D}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q) = \mathcal{K}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q) - \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{B}.$$ 

Thus (iv) follows by Theorem 7 (Theorem 3 in the arXiv version) in [10].

(v) The assertion follows immediately by (i), (ii) and Theorem 16 (Theorem 4 in the arXiv version) in [10].

(vi) Observe that, by the hypothesis, $Z \circ S^{-1} = Z \phi_0$-a.e. Therefore, for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{e}^\alpha(X)$,

$$\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{A_m} \log Z d\Lambda = \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{A_m} \log Z d\Lambda = \int \log Z d\Lambda.$$ 

Thus the assertion follows by (iii).

\[\square\]

Remark 2 Note that $K_{e}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)$ can be infinite. However, by Lemma 17 (Lemma 9 in the arXiv version) in [10], for every $\epsilon > 0$, $K_{e,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)$ is finite for a broad class of topological dynamical systems if $K(\Lambda|\phi_0)$ is finite and $Q$ is compact.

The following theorem gives some lower bounds for $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)$ by capturing some residual of the relation from Lemma 3.

Theorem 1 Let $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ and $0 \leq \alpha < \gamma \leq 1$.

(i) Let $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}_{e}^{\gamma,\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) > 0$. Then

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \geq \mathcal{H}_{e}^{\gamma,\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \min \left\{ e^{-\frac{\gamma - \alpha}{\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}} \mathcal{D}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q), \epsilon \right\} - \epsilon.$$ 
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and
$$\Phi(Q) \geq \Lambda(Q) \min \left\{ e^{-\frac{\Lambda(Q)}{\alpha}} K_{\alpha} (\Lambda | \phi_0)(Q), e^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right\} \text{ if } \Lambda(Q) > 0. $$

(ii)
$$H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \geq \Lambda(Q) e^{-\frac{\Lambda(Q)}{\alpha}} K_{\alpha, \epsilon} (\Lambda | \phi_0)(Q) - \epsilon$$
for all $0 < \epsilon < \Lambda(Q) \left( e - \frac{(H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)/\Lambda(Q))^{(1-\alpha)/(1-\alpha_0)}}{\Lambda(Q)} \right)$ and $0 \leq \alpha_0 \leq \alpha$.

If $H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) < \Lambda(Q)e^{(1-\alpha)/(1-\alpha_0)}$ for some $0 \leq \alpha_0 \leq \alpha$.

Proof. (i) Clearly, we can assume that $K_{\alpha, \epsilon} (\Lambda | \phi_0)(Q) < \infty$ and $H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) < \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) e - \epsilon$.

Suppose $D_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha}(Q) = 0$. Let $\tau > 0$. Then there exists $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_\epsilon(Q)$ such that
$$\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\gamma \log Z d\phi_0 < \tau.$$  
Therefore, by Lemma 2 (i),
$$H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0$$
$$\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} (Z^\gamma - (\gamma - \alpha)Z^\gamma \log Z) d\phi_0$$
$$\geq \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - (\gamma - \alpha)\tau.$$  

Hence,
$$H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon \geq \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).$$

This proves the assertion in the case $D_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha}(Q) = 0$.

Now, suppose $D_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha}(Q) \neq 0$. Let $\tau_0 > 0$ be such that $D_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha}(Q) + \tau$ has the same sign as $D_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha}(Q)$ for all $0 < \tau < \tau_0$. Let $0 < \tau < \tau_0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_\epsilon(Q)$ such that
$$D_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha}(Q) + \tau > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\gamma \log Z d\phi_0.$$  
Then, as in (12), one sees that $\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 < \infty$. Therefore, by Lemma
(iv) and the convexity of $x \mapsto e^{-x}$,

\[ \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m \Lambda} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \]

\[ \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m \Lambda} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \frac{\gamma - \alpha}{m^2 \log m} Z^\gamma \log Z d\phi_0 \]

\[ \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m \Lambda} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \frac{\gamma - \alpha}{m^2 \log m} \left( \mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau \right) \]

That is

\[ \frac{1}{\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m \Lambda} Z^\gamma d\phi_0} \sum_{m \leq 0} \frac{\gamma - \alpha}{m^2 \log m} \left( \mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau \right) > \frac{1}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon}. \quad (13) \]

Observe that by the assumption on $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$, this implies that

\[ \frac{(\gamma - \alpha) \left( \mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau \right)}{\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m \Lambda} Z^\gamma d\phi_0} > \log \frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\gamma, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon} > -1. \]

Hence, since the principal branch of Lambert’s $W$ function is monotonously increasing, (13) implies (regardless of the sign of $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau$) that

\[ \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m \Lambda} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 \leq \frac{(\gamma - \alpha) \left( \mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau \right)}{W \left( \frac{(\gamma - \alpha) \left( \mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau \right)}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon} \right)}. \]

Therefore, since, by the definition of $W$, $x/W(x) = e^{W(x)}$ for all $x \in [-1/e, \infty) \setminus \{0\}$,

\[ \log \frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma^{\gamma, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon} < \log \frac{\mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon} = W \left( \frac{(\gamma - \alpha) \left( \mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau \right)}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon} \right). \]

Hence, applying the inverse of $W$ implies that

\[ \mathcal{H}_\gamma^{\gamma, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \log \frac{\mathcal{H}_\gamma^{\gamma, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon} < (\gamma - \alpha) \left( \mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{\gamma, \alpha} (Q) + \tau \right). \]

Thus letting $\tau \to 0$ proves the first inequality of (i). The second follows immediately from the first, in the case $\gamma = 1$, by Lemma 7 (i) and Lemma 6 (i), after letting $\epsilon \to 0$. 
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(ii) The condition on \( \epsilon \) implies that
\[
H_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \stackrel{1-\alpha}{\longrightarrow} \Lambda(Q) \stackrel{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} e^{-\epsilon} < \Lambda(Q) e - \epsilon.
\]
Hence, by Lemma \( \overline{7} \) (ii), \( H_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < \Lambda(Q) e - \epsilon \), and therefore, the first inequality of (ii) follows from that of (i) in the case \( \gamma = 1 \).

The second inequality of (ii) follows from the first, after letting \( \epsilon \to 0 \), by Lemma \( \overline{7} \) (i).

The following corollary can be used to obtain criteria for the positivity of \( \Phi \).

**Corollary 1** Let \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \) such that \( \Lambda(Q) > 0 \).

(i) Suppose there exist \( 0 < \epsilon < e \Lambda(Q) \) and \( \gamma \in [0, 1) \) such that
\[
K_{\gamma, \epsilon} (\Lambda | \phi_0) (Q) < \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{1 - \gamma} \log \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{\epsilon}.
\]
Then \( H_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > 0 \) for all \( \alpha \in [0, \gamma] \).

(ii) Suppose there exists a function \( \tau : (0, 1] \to [0, \infty) \) which is continuous at \( 1 \) such that \( \tau(1) = 0 \), \( \tau(\alpha) > 0 \) for all \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) and
\[
\lim_{\alpha \to 1^-} \inf (1 - \alpha) K_{\alpha, \tau(\alpha)} (\Lambda | \phi_0) (Q) < \infty.
\]
Then \( H_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > 0 \) for all \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \).

**Proof.** (i) By the hypothesis,
\[
\Lambda(Q) e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\Lambda(Q)} K_{\gamma, \epsilon} (\Lambda | \phi_0) (Q)} > \epsilon.
\]
Thus the assertion follows by Theorem \( \overline{1} \) (i) and Lemma \( \overline{7} \) (iv).

(ii) For all \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) large enough,
\[
\tau(\alpha) < \Lambda(Q) \left( e - \left( \frac{\Phi(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right).
\]
Therefore, by Theorem \( \overline{1} \) (ii), \( \limsup_{\alpha \to 1^-} H_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > 0 \). Hence, by Lemma \( \overline{7} \) (iv), \( H_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > 0 \) for all \( \alpha \in [0, 1) \).

### 4.2 Upper bounds for the relative entropy measure

Clearly, choosing a good and easy computable upper bound for \( K_{\alpha} (\Lambda | \phi_0) (Q) \) most likely depends on the particular application. However, there are some natural general upper bounds, which might suggest a direction in a particular case via some weakening or generalization.
4.2.1 Restriction of the set of covers via the invariant measure

A natural way to obtain an upper bound on $K_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)$ is of course by a further restriction of the set of covers of $Q$ over which the infimum is taken.

Since the main approach of this paper is a reduction of the proof of the positivity of $\Phi$ to the fact of the existence of $\Lambda$, via an estimation of an integral expression of $Z$, it suggests itself a further restriction of the set of covers via additional conditions in terms of $\Lambda$.

Recall, that, by Lemma 7 (i),

$$H^{\alpha,1}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$$

for all $Q \in B$ and $\alpha \in [0,1]$, which suggests the following definition, via the inductive construction from Subsection 4.1.2 in [10].

**Definition 7** Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $Q \in P(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define

$$C^{\alpha,1}_\epsilon(Q) := \left\{ (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_1^\epsilon(Q) \mid \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 < \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,1}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon \right\},$$

and for $\alpha \in [0,1)$,

$$K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^{\alpha,1}_\epsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z \log Z d\phi_0.$$

Also, define $K_{\alpha,\Lambda}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$, $\bar{K}_{\alpha,\Lambda}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$, $K_{\alpha,\Lambda}(Q)$ and $\bar{K}_{\alpha,\Lambda}(Q)$ analogously to $K_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$, $\bar{K}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$, $K_{\alpha}(Q)$ and $\bar{K}_\alpha(Q)$.

Then, since, by (14), $C^{\alpha,1}_\epsilon(Q) \subset C_\epsilon(Q)$,

$$K_{\alpha,\epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$$

for all $Q \in B$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

However, it is known from Proposition 13 (Proposition 3 in the arXiv version) in [10], that such an additional condition on the covers does not change $\bar{K}_\alpha$ if it is finite. The next lemma deduces that for $K_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$.

**Lemma 9** Let $\alpha \in [0,1)$ and $Q \in B$.

(i) $$K_{\alpha,\Lambda}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) = K_{\alpha,\Lambda}(Q) - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).$$

(ii) $\bar{K}_{\alpha,\Lambda}(\Lambda|\phi_0)$ is a $S$-invariant, signed measure on $B$.

(iii) If $K_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(X) < \infty$, then

$$K_{\alpha,\Lambda}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) = K_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).$$
Proof. (i) Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^{n,1}(Q)$. Then

$$K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}H_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)$$

$$\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z \log Z d\phi_0 + \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z_\alpha d\phi_0$$

$$= \sum_{m \leq 0} K_\alpha(S^m A_m)$$

$$\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z \log Z d\phi_0 + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left( H_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon \right).$$

Thus taking the infimum and letting $\epsilon \to 0$ implies (i).

(ii) The proof of (ii) is the same as that of Lemma 8 (iv).

(iii) By Lemma 5 (ii), the assumption implies that $\tilde{K}_{\alpha}(X) = K_{\alpha}(X) < \infty$. Hence, by Proposition 13 (Proposition 3 in the arXiv version) in [10] and Theorem 16 (ii) (Theorem 4 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10], $K_{\alpha,\Lambda}(Q) = K_{\alpha}(Q)$. Thus (iii) follows by (i) and Lemma 5 (ii). 

The additional condition on the covers allows us to obtain a slightly more elegant version of Theorem 1, which is also much easier to prove. (By Lemma 17 (Lemma 9 in the arXiv version) in [10], for every $\epsilon > 0$, $K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)$ is also finite for a broad class of topological dynamical systems if $K(\Lambda|\phi_0)$ is finite and $Q$ is compact.)

For $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $Q \in B$, define $\lambda_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) := \Lambda(Q)$ if $K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) > 0$ and $\lambda_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) := \Lambda(Q) + \epsilon$ otherwise. Obviously, $\Lambda(Q) \leq \lambda_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) \leq \Lambda(Q) + \epsilon$.

Theorem 2 Let $Q \in B$ such that $\Lambda(Q) > 0$ and $0 \leq \alpha < 1$.

(i) $$H_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \geq \Lambda(Q) e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha-1}K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)} - \epsilon$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$, and

$$\Phi(Q) \geq \Lambda(Q) e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha-1}K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)}.$$

(ii) If $K_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) < \infty$ and $B$ is generated by a sequence of finite partitions, then

$$\Phi(X) \geq e^{K(\Lambda|\phi_0) - K_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X)}$$

where $\hat{\Phi} := \frac{\Phi}{\Phi(X)}$.

(hence, $K(\Lambda|\hat{\Phi}) \leq K_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X)$ if $\phi_0$ is a probability measure).

Proof. (i) Let $\epsilon > 0$. Clearly, we can assume that $K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) < \infty$. Let $\tau > 0$ such that $K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \tau$ has the same sign as $K_{\alpha,\Lambda,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)$ (we
assign to zero \(i^+\). Let \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,1}_e(Q)\) such that
\[
\mathcal{K}_{\alpha, \Lambda, \epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \tau > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z \log Z d\phi_0.
\]
Then, as in the proof of Theorem 1 (i), by (14),
\[
\mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0
\]
\[
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) e^{1 - \frac{1}{\Lambda(A_m)} \mathcal{K}_{\alpha, \Lambda, \epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \tau}
\]
\[
\geq \Lambda(Q) e^{1 - \frac{1}{\Lambda(Q)} \mathcal{K}_{\alpha, \Lambda, \epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \tau}.
\]
Thus letting \(\tau \to 0\) implies the first inequality of (i).

The second inequality of (i) follows from the first by Lemma 6 (i) after letting \(\epsilon \to 0\).

(ii) By second inequality of (i), Lemma 9 (iii) and Lemma 8 (v),
\[
\sum_{k=1}^n \Lambda(Q_k) \log \frac{\Lambda(Q_k)}{\Phi(Q_k)} - \log \Phi(X) \leq \mathcal{K}_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X)
\]
for every \(\mathcal{B}\)-measurable partition \((Q_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}\) of \(X\). Using the well-know fact that the sum in the inequality converges to \(K(\Lambda|\hat{\Phi})\) if one has a sequence of partitions which is increasing with respect to the refinement and generates the \(\sigma\)-algebra (e.g. Theorem 4.1 in [1]), it follows that
\[
K(\Lambda|\hat{\Phi}) - \mathcal{K}_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) \leq \log \Phi(X),
\]
which proves (ii).

4.2.2 Taking supremum along trajectories

Note that the finiteness of \(K(\Lambda|\phi_0)\) implies only that \(\Lambda\{Z > n\} \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\).
The next corollary shows that the latter does not imply in general that \(\Lambda \ll \Phi\).

Therefore, by Theorem 2, \(K(\Lambda|\phi_0)\) is not an upper bound for \(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X)\) in general.

A straightforward way to obtain an upper bound on \(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X)\), which appears also to be quite practical (see [5], where it was introduced and used), is the following.

**Definition 8** Define
\[
Z^* := \sup_{m \leq 0} Z \circ S^m
\]
\[ K^*(\Lambda|\phi_0) := \int \log Z^* d\Lambda. \]

Since \[ \int \log^* Z d\Lambda \leq \int \log^* Z d\phi_0 < \infty, \] \[ \int \log Z d\Lambda \] is well defined. Obviously, \[ K(\Lambda|\phi_0) \leq K^*(\Lambda|\phi_0), \] and \[ K(\Lambda|\phi_0) = K^*(\Lambda|\phi_0) \] if \( \phi_0 \circ S^{-1} = \phi_0 \).

**Lemma 10**

\[ K_\alpha(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) \leq K^*(\Lambda|\phi_0) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \alpha < 1. \]

**Proof.** Let \( 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \). Let \( (B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^0(X) \). Then, by Lemma 10 (ii) (Lemma 6 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10],

\[
K_{\alpha,\epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) \leq \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^0(X)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m B_m} Z \log Z d\phi_0
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{B_m} \log Z \circ S^m d\Lambda
\]

\[
\leq \int \log Z^* d\Lambda.
\]

Thus the assertion follows. \(\square\)

Though, \( K^*(\Lambda|\phi_0) \) appears to be a very rough upper bound for \( K_\alpha(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) \), the next corollary shows that it is quite adequate in some important cases.

**Corollary 2** Suppose \( \Lambda \) is an ergodic probability measure. Let \( 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \). Then the following are equivalent.

(i) \( \Lambda \ll \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \) on \( \mathcal{B} \).

(ii) \( Z \) is essentially bounded with respect to \( \Lambda \).

(iii) \( K^*(\Lambda|\phi_0) < \infty \).

(iv) \( K_\alpha(\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) < \infty \).

**Proof.** (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii): Suppose (ii) is not true. Then \( \Lambda\{Z > n\} > 0 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). For each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{N} \), define \( B^n_m := S^{-m}\{Z > n\} \). By the ergodicity of \( \Lambda, \Lambda \left( \bigcup_{m \leq 0} B^n_m \right) = 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Set \( B := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \leq 0} B^n_m \). Then

\[
\Lambda(B) = 1. \tag{15}
\]

Set \( A^n_m := B^n_m \) and \( A_m^n := B^n_m \setminus (B^n_{m+1} \cup \ldots \cup B^n_0) \) for all \( m \leq -1 \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Then, for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( A^n_m \)'s are pairwise disjoint, each \( A^n_m \in \mathcal{A}_m \) and \( \bigcup_{m \leq 0} A^n_m \) =
\[ \bigcup_{m \leq 0} B^m_n. \] Therefore,
\[ 1 = \Lambda \left( \bigcup_{m \leq 0} A^m_n \right) = \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda (S^m A^m_n) = \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z d\phi_0 \]
\[ \geq n^{1-\alpha} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \geq n^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (B) \] (16)

for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Hence, \( \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (B) = 0 \), which together with (14) contradicts to (i).

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii) is obvious.

(iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iv) by Lemma 11

(iv) \( \Rightarrow \) (i) follows by Theorem 2 (i), Lemma 8 (ii) and the fact that \( \bar{K}_\alpha \) is a measure on \( B \).

The following corollary covers, in particular, Example 1.

**Corollary 3** Suppose \( X \) is a compact metric space and \( S \) is continuous such that \( B \) is the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra. Suppose \( \Lambda \) is an ergodic Borel probability measure such that \( \phi_0 \ll \Lambda \) (in addition to \( \Lambda \ll \phi_0 \)). Then the following are equivalent.

(i) There exists \( 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \) such that \( K_\alpha (\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) < \infty \).

(ii) For every \( 0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 \), \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) > 0 \) and \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)/\mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) = \Lambda(Q) \) for all \( Q \in B \).

(iii) There exists \( 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \) such that \( \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) > 0 \) and \( \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)/\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) = \Lambda(Q) \) for all \( Q \in B \).

**Proof.** (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii): Let \( 0 \leq \gamma < 1 \). By Corollary 2, \( K_\gamma (\Lambda|\phi_0)(X) < \infty \). Hence, by Theorem 2 (i) and Lemma 8 (ii), \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) > 0 \). By Lemma 19 (Lemma 10 in the arXiv version) in \( [10] \), \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) \ll \Lambda \). Hence, \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) /\mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) \) is a \( S \)-invariant probability measure on \( B \). Since the ergodic measures of continuous transformations on compact metric spaces are minimal with respect to ‘\( \ll \)' on the set of all invariant probability measures, \( \mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) /\mathcal{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) = \Lambda \) on \( B \).

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii) is obvious.

(iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i): It follows by (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (iv) of Corollary 2.

\[ \square \]

### 4.3 The regularity of \( \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \) and \( \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) \)

Now, we turn our attention to the regularity of the dependence of \( \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) \) on \( \alpha \), which is another way to obtain conditions for their positivity.
4.3.1 An almost convexity of $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$

A natural approach to obtain some regularity properties of the functions $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ is to try to deduce them from the convexity of $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$.

This requires another DDM arising from the Hellinger integral via the inductive construction from Subsection 4.1.2 in [10], which also generalizes $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and provides lower bounds for $\Phi$.

By Lemma 7 we can make the following definitions.

**Definition 9**  Let $\alpha, \gamma \in [0, 1]$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define

$$ C_\epsilon^{\gamma, 0}(Q) := \left\{ (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_\epsilon^0 (Q) \left| \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 < \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\alpha, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon \right\} , $$

$$ \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\alpha, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_\epsilon^{\gamma, 0}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\gamma d\phi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\alpha, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\alpha, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q). $$

Obviously, $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\alpha, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$ for all $\alpha, \gamma \in [0, 1]$. Also, one easily sees that $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{0, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \Phi(Q)$, $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\alpha, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{\gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$ and, by Proposition 12 (Proposition 2 in the arXiv version) in [10], $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{1, \gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \Lambda(Q)$ for all $\gamma \in [0, 1]$.

The obtained set functions allow us to formulate the following properties of $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$.

**Lemma 11**  Let $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\beta, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ denote either $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\beta, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ or $\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\beta, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ if $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\beta, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < \infty$.

(i) Let $0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq \gamma \leq 1$. Then

$$ \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)^{1 - \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0}} \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)^{\frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha_0}} , \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\alpha^\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)^{1 - \frac{\alpha_0 - 0}{\alpha_0}} \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\gamma, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)^{\frac{\alpha - 0}{\alpha_0}} $$

$$ \left( \text{in particular, } \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)^{1 - \frac{\alpha_0 - 0}{\alpha_0}} \Lambda(Q)^{\frac{\alpha - 0}{\alpha_0}} \right). \quad (17) $$

(ii) $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \Phi(Q)^{1 - \alpha} \Lambda(Q)^\alpha$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$.

(iii) For every $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ is a finite $S$-invariant measure on $\mathcal{B}$.

(iv) Suppose there exists $0 < \tau < 1$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\tau^\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > 0$. Then $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\alpha, 0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > 0$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.
(v) Let \( 0 \leq \beta < \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq \gamma \leq 1 \). Then
\[
\max \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_0 - \beta} \tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \log_{\tilde{H}^\beta_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q), \frac{\tilde{H}^{\beta_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\alpha - \beta} \left( \frac{\tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\tilde{H}^{\beta_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)} \right)^{\frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha - \beta}} \log_{\tilde{H}^{\beta_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)} \tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \right\}
\leq \tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)
\]

\[
\leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha_0} \tilde{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \log_{\tilde{H}^{\gamma_0, \alpha_0}} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q), \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha_0} \tilde{H}_\gamma (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \log_{\tilde{H}^{\gamma_0, \alpha_0}} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q), \frac{\tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\gamma - \alpha_0} \left( \frac{\tilde{H}^{\gamma_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)} \right)^{\frac{\alpha - \alpha_0}{\gamma - \alpha_0}} \log_{\tilde{H}^{\gamma_0, \alpha_0}} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \right\}.\]

(vi) Let \( 0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq \gamma \leq 1 \). Then
\[
\max \left\{ \frac{\tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}^{\beta_0, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\alpha_0 - \beta} \text{ if } \beta < \alpha_0, \frac{\tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}^{\beta_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\alpha - \beta} \right\}
\leq \tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)
\]

\[
\leq \min \left\{ \frac{\tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \tilde{H}^{\gamma_0, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\gamma - \alpha_0}, \frac{\tilde{H}^{\gamma_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\gamma - \alpha_0}, \frac{\tilde{H}^{\gamma_0, \alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\gamma - \alpha} \text{ if } \alpha < \gamma \right\}.\]

(vii) Let \( 0 \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq 1 \). Then
\[
-\frac{(\alpha - \alpha_0)}{\alpha} \tilde{H}^{\alpha_0, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \tilde{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \frac{\Lambda (Q)}{1 - \alpha_0}
\]

\textbf{Proof.} We will prove the statements involving \( \tilde{H} \) for \( \tilde{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \) and \( \tilde{H}^{\beta_0, \alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) \).
with the assumption $H^{\beta,\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) < \infty$. The proofs of those with $H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and $H^{\beta,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ are analogous.

(i) Let us abbreviate

$$\tau := \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha - \beta}.$$ 

Obviously, $0 \leq \tau < 1$. Then, by the concavity of $[0, \infty) \ni x \mapsto x^\tau$, for every $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$ with $\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\beta d\phi_0 < \infty$,

$$\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 = \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} (Z^{\alpha - \beta})^\tau Z^\beta d\phi_0 \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \left( \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\beta d\phi_0 \right)^{1 - \tau} \left( \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \right)^\tau \leq \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\beta d\phi_0 \right)^{1 - \tau} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \right)^\tau. \ (18)$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\epsilon(Q)$. Then,

$$H^{\alpha_0,\beta}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq (H_{\beta}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon)^{1 - \tau} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \right)^\tau,$$

which implies that

$$H^{\alpha_0,\beta}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq H_{\beta}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)^{1 - \tau} H^{\alpha,\beta}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)^\tau$$

if $\tau > 0$. Thus replacing $\beta \mapsto \alpha_0$, $\alpha_0 \mapsto \alpha$ and $\alpha \mapsto \gamma$ gives the second inequality of (i).

The inequality (18) can also be obtained by taking $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\epsilon(Q)$ and the concavity of $[0, \infty) \ni x \mapsto x^{1 - \tau}$, which gives

$$H^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\beta d\phi_0 \right)^{1 - \tau} (H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon)^\tau,$$

which implies the first inequality of (i).

(ii) It follows by (i) and Lemma 7 (ii).

(iii) It follows immediately by (ii) and Theorem 16 (ii) (Theorem 4 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10].

(iv) If $\tau < \alpha \leq 1$, then $H^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0$ and $H^{0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0$ by the first inequality of (i). If $0 < \alpha < \tau$, then it follows by the second inequality of (i) that $H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0$ and $H^{1,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0$. 
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(v) By (iv) and Lemma 7, the assertion is obviously true, if \( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = 0 \).

Suppose \( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0 \). By (iv), also \( \mathcal{H}_\beta(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0 \) and \( \Phi(Q) > 0 \). By Lemma 2 (i), \( Z^a \leq Z - (1 - a)Z^a \log Z \), which is equivalent to \( Y^{1/a} \geq Y + (1/a - 1)Y \log Y \). Applying the former to the first inequality of (i) implies

\[
\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha - \beta}\right) \mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) 
	imes \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}\right)^{\frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha_0 - \beta}} \log \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}.
\]

Applying the latter to

\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \geq \mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}\right)^{\frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha_0 - \beta}},
\]

implies that

\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \geq \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \left(\frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha_0 - \beta} - 1\right) \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \log \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}.
\]

This proves the first inequality in (v).

By the second inequality of (i),

\[
\frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)} \leq \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma, \alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}\right)^{\frac{\alpha - \alpha_0}{\gamma - \alpha_0}}.
\]

Hence,

\[
\frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)} \leq \frac{\alpha - \alpha_0}{\gamma - \alpha_0} \log \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma, \alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)},
\]

which implies the first part of the second inequality of (v).

Inequality (19) implies

\[
\left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha_0}} \leq \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma, \alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha_0}},
\]

the linearization of the left side of the logarithmic version of which, as above, gives the third part of the second inequality of (v).

By Lemma 2 (i), \( Z^a \leq 1 + aZ^a \log Z \) for all \( 0 < a \leq 1 \). Applying it to the second inequality of (i) implies that of (v).
(vi) In the case $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\alpha} = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}^{0}$, the first part of the first inequality of (vi) follows immediately from that of (v), since $x \log x \geq x - 1$ for all $x \geq 0$. In the case $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\alpha} = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}$, it follows from the inequality $(Z^{\alpha_0} - Z^{\beta})/(\alpha_0 - \beta) \leq (Z^{\alpha} - Z^{\alpha_0})/(\alpha - \alpha_0)$ (which follows from the convexity of $x \mapsto Z^x$ for $x > 0$) the same way as we show it now for the second part.

Let $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon}^{\alpha}(Q)$. Then, by the convexity of $x \mapsto Z^x$ for $x > 0$,

$$
\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^{\beta} d\phi_0}{\alpha - \beta} \leq \frac{\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^{\beta} d\phi_0}{\alpha - \beta} \leq \frac{\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon - \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).
$$

Thus taking the infimum and letting $\epsilon \to 0$ implies the second part of the first inequality of (vi).

The first part of the second inequality of (vi) follows immediately from that of (v), as $\log x \leq x - 1$ for all $x > 0$.

The second and the third parts of the second inequality of (vi) follow from the convexity of $x \mapsto Z^x$ similarly to the proof of the second part of the first inequality.

(vii) The assertion follows from (vi) and (ii), by setting $\beta = 0$ and $\gamma = 1$.

4.3.2 The continuity of $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$

Obviously, Lemma 11 would also imply some continuity properties of $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ if we knew that $\mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) < \infty$ for all $0 < \beta < \alpha < 1$. This can happen. For example, suppose the exists $c > 0$ such that $Z \geq c$ $\Lambda$-a.e. (as in Example 1). Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon}^{\alpha}(Q)$. Then

$$
\mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 = \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^{\alpha - \beta} Z^{\beta - 1} d\Lambda
$$

$$
\geq c^{\alpha - \beta} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n A_m} Z^\beta d\phi_0 \geq c^{\alpha - \beta} \mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}_{\epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).
$$

Hence,

$$
\mathcal{H}^{\beta, \alpha}_{\epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{c^{\alpha - \beta}}.
$$

Therefore, by Lemma 11 (vi), the function $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ is continuous. This clarifies the behavior of the function in the case of Example 1.
The following lemma lists some criteria for the finiteness of $H$. In order to obtain computable criteria for the latter, we propose the following definitions.

\[ (\alpha - \beta) \sum_{m \leq 0, f_{S^n \Lambda_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0} \int Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0 \leq \sum_{m \leq 0, f_{S^n \Lambda_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0} \int (Z^\alpha - Z^\beta) d\phi_0 \leq \sum_{m \leq 0, f_{S^n \Lambda_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 < \infty. \] (20)

Hence, the sum $\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n \Lambda_m} Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0$ is well defined for all $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\epsilon(Q)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, we can make the following definition.

**Definition 10** Let $0 < \beta < \alpha \leq 1$. For $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, define

\[ \mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}_\epsilon(Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\epsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0, f_{S^n \Lambda_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0} \int Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0 \] and

\[ \mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}_\epsilon(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}_\epsilon(Q), \]

as, obviously, $\mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}_\epsilon(Q) \geq \mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}_\delta(Q)$ for all $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon$.

Obviously, by (20), $\mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}_\epsilon(Q) < \infty$ for all $0 < \beta < \alpha \leq 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}(Q)$. (Also, since, by (20), $-\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n \Lambda_m} Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0 + 1/(\alpha - \beta) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^n \Lambda_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \geq 0$ for all $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\epsilon(Q)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, one can show, similarly to Lemma 9 (iv), that $\lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}(S^{-i})$ is a signed measure on $\mathcal{B}$, but we will not need it.)

The following lemma lists some criteria for the finiteness of $H^{\beta, \alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ for $0 < \beta < \alpha < 1$ via finiteness from below of $\mathcal{E}^{\beta, \alpha}(Q)$.

In order to obtain computable criteria for the latter, we propose the following definitions.

**Definition 11** For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, define

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\epsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0, f_{S^n \Lambda_m} \cap \{Z < 1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda, \]

\[ \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q), \]

\[ \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\epsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0, f_{S^n \Lambda_m} \cap \{Z < 1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \] and

\[ \mathcal{U}_\alpha(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q). \]
Obviously, $\mathcal{L}_\alpha (\Lambda|\phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{U}_\alpha (\Lambda|\phi_0) (Q)$.

**Lemma 12** Let $Q \in B$.

(i) For $0 < \beta < \alpha \leq 1$,

$$\mathcal{H}^{\beta,\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - (\alpha - \beta)\mathcal{E}^{\beta,\alpha}(Q).$$

(ii) $\mathcal{E}^{\beta,\alpha}(Q) \leq \mathcal{E}^{\gamma,\alpha}(Q)$ for all $0 < \beta \leq \gamma < \alpha \leq 1$.

(iii) For $0 < \beta < \alpha \leq 1$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{\beta,\alpha}(Q) \geq - \left( \frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{1 - \beta} \right) \mathcal{L}_\alpha (\Lambda|\phi_0) (Q)^{1 - \beta}.$$

(iv) If there exists $0 < c < 1$ such that $Z \geq c \Lambda$ a.e., then, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$,

$$\mathcal{U}_\alpha (\Lambda|\phi_0) (Q) \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{e^\alpha} \log \frac{1}{c}.$$

**Proof.** Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha(Q)$.

(i) Clearly, we can assume $\mathcal{E}^{\beta,\alpha}(Q) > -\infty$. By Lemma 2 (ii),

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0$$

$$\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\beta d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \beta) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0$$

$$\geq \mathcal{H}^{\beta,\alpha}_\epsilon (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + (\alpha - \beta) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0,$$

which implies (i).

(ii) It follows immediately from Lemma 2 (ii).

(iii) First, observe that, by Lemma 2 (i),

$$\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m \cap \{Z < 1\}} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda$$

$$= - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m \cap \{Z < 1\}} Z \log Z d\phi_0$$

$$\leq - \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m \cap \{Z < 1\}} Z d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m \cap \{Z < 1\}} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} (\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon).$$
Therefore, by the concavity of $x \mapsto x^{1-\beta}$,

\[
\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{\beta,0}(Q) \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0 \\
\geq - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m \cap \{Z<1\}} \left( \frac{1}{Z} \right)^{1-\beta} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \\
\geq - \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m \cap \{Z<1\}} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \right)^\beta \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m \cap \{Z<1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \right)^{1-\beta} \\
\geq - \left( \frac{H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon}{1-\alpha} \right)^\beta \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m \cap \{Z<1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \right)^{1-\beta}, \tag{21}
\]

which implies (iii).

(iv) Observe that

\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m \cap \{Z<1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda = \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m \cap \{c \leq Z<1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \\
\leq \log \frac{1}{c} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m \cap \{c \leq Z<1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \\
\leq \frac{1}{c} \log \frac{1}{c} \left( H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon \right),
\]

which implies the assertion. \qed

Now, we are able to shed some light on the continuity of the function $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$ by means of $\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{\beta,0}(Q)$.

**Proposition 1** Let $0 < b < a \leq 1$ and $Q \in B$.

(i) \[(a-\beta)\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{\beta,0}(Q) \leq H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - H_\beta (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq (a-\beta) \frac{\Lambda(\Lambda) - \Lambda_\beta (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{1-\beta}.
\]

(ii) Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. If there exists $0 < \beta < \alpha$ such that $\mathcal{E}_\beta^{\beta,0}(Q) > -\infty$, then $(0, 1) \ni x \mapsto H_x (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)$ is continuous at $\alpha$ from the left.

**Proof.** (i) It follows by Lemma 11 (vi) and Lemma 12 (i).

(ii) It follows immediately from (i), since $\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{\beta,0}(Q) \leq \mathcal{E}_\beta^{\beta,0}(Q)$ for all $\beta \leq \gamma$. \qed
However, there are no problems with the continuity of $\alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)$ (compare also Lemma 7 (iv) and Lemma 11 (iv)). (Lemma 11 (vii) shows that the function $(0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)$ is continuous for all $Q \in B$). This suggests that the functions are different in general. In such a case, it follows immediately that $H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) > 0$ for all $\alpha \in [0,1]$.

4.3.3 The continuity of $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)$ and $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)$ at 0 and 1

Obviously, the continuity of the function $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)$ at 1 implies, by Lemma 7 (iv), that it is strictly positive if $\Lambda(Q) > 0$. The same argument can be also applied to the function $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)$, by Lemma 11 (iv).

Now, we give a sufficient condition for the continuity at 1 for the functions which follows from Lemma 11 (vii) and Theorem 1. In particular, it immediately clarifies the behavior of the functions at the point 1 in an essentially bounded case, as e.g. in Example 1.

**Proposition 2** Let $Q \in B$. Suppose $K_{\alpha,\tau}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)$ is finite for all $\tau > 0$ and there exists a function $\tau : (0,1) \longrightarrow [0,\infty)$ which is continuous at 1 such that $\tau(1) = 0$, $\tau(\alpha) > 0$ and

$$\lim_{\alpha \to 1^{-}} (1 - \alpha)K_{\alpha,\tau(\alpha)}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) = 0.$$  

Then the functions $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)$ and $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)$ are continuous at 1.

**Proof.** By Lemma 11 (vii),

$$-(1 - \alpha)\Phi(Q) \leq \Lambda(Q) - H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \leq \Lambda(Q) - H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q).$$

If $\Lambda(Q) = 0$, then the continuity holds true by Lemma 7 (iv). Otherwise, for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ large enough,

$$\tau(\alpha) < \Lambda(Q) \left( e - \left( \frac{\Phi(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right).$$

Therefore, by Theorem 1 (ii) and the inequality $e^x \geq x + 1$,

$$\Lambda(Q) - H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \leq (1 - \alpha)K_{\alpha,\tau(\alpha)}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \tau(\alpha)$$

for all such $\alpha \in [0,1)$. Thus the assertion follows. \qed

Now, we turn to the continuity at zero. Observe that, by Lemma 6 (i),

$$\limsup_{\alpha \to 0} H_\alpha(\Lambda,\phi_0)(X) \leq \Phi(X).$$

So, $\Phi(X) > 0$ if the function is discontinuous at 0. We give now a sufficient condition for the continuity, which we will need later.
Proposition 3  Let $Q \in B$. The functions $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ and $[0,1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ are continuous at 0 if $\Phi(Q) = 0$, or $(Z > 0 \text{ a.e.},$ and $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \alpha L(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) = 0$).

Proof. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. By Lemma 7 (ii),

$$H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq (1 - \alpha)\Phi(Q) + \alpha \Lambda(Q).$$

Hence,

$$H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \Phi(Q) \leq H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \Phi(Q) \leq \alpha \Lambda(Q). \quad (22)$$

This implies, in particular the continuity of the functions at 0 if $\Phi(Q) = 0$.

Now, suppose $\Phi(Q) > 0$. Clearly, we can assume that $L_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) < \infty$. Observe that the integral $\int_{A \cap \{Z \geq 1\}} \log Z d\phi_0 = -\int_{A \cap \{Z \geq 1\}} 1/Z \log(1/Z)d\Lambda < \Lambda(A)/\epsilon$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C(A)$ such that $\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{A \cap \{Z < 1\} \cap S^m A_m} 1/Z \log(1/Z)d\Lambda < L_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon$. Then, by proceeding via finite sums and then taking the limit,

$$H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} e^{\alpha \log Z} d\phi_0$$

$$\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) e^{\int_{m \leq 0} \log Z d\phi_0} \sum_{S^m A_m} \int_{A \cap \{Z < 1\} \cap S^m A_m} \log Z d\phi_0$$

$$\geq \Phi(Q) e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\Phi(Q)} (L_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon)}.$$

Hence,

$$H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \geq \Phi(Q) e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\Phi(Q)} L_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)}.$$

Using $e^x \geq x + 1$, it follows that

$$H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \Phi(Q) \geq H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \Phi(Q) \geq -\alpha L_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q),$$

which, together with (22), implies the assertion. 

\[ \square \]

4.3.4 The right differentiability of $(0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$

Clearly, the function cannot be zero everywhere if it is not differentiable at some point.

In this subsection, we will give a sufficient condition for the right differentiability of $(0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ for all $Q \in B$.

By (11), we can make the following definition.
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Definition 12 Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define

$$
D_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{1,\epsilon}^{\beta,1}} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0
$$

and

$$
D_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} D_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q).
$$

Obviously, $D_{1}^{\beta,\alpha}(Q) = K_{\beta,\Lambda}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$. The following lemma indicates that $D_{1}^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q)$ might be a derivative of the function if it is greater than minus infinity.

Lemma 13 (i) Let $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $\epsilon_0, \epsilon > 0$. Then

$$
(\alpha - \alpha_0)D_{1,\epsilon_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) - \epsilon_0 < H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - H_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)
$$

$$
< (\alpha - \alpha_0)D_{1,\epsilon_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) + \epsilon.
$$

(ii) Let $0 < \beta < 1$, $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Then

$$
- \left(\frac{H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon}{1 - \alpha}\right)^{\beta} U_{\alpha}(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q)^{1 - \beta} \leq D_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) \leq \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{e(1 - \beta)}
$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. (i) Let $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon_0}^{\alpha,1}(Q)$. Then, by Lemma 2 (i) and (14),

$$
(\alpha - \alpha_0)D_{1,\epsilon_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0
$$

$$
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0
$$

$$
< H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon_0 - H_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).
$$

This implies the first inequality of (i).

Let $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,1}(Q)$. Then, by Lemma 2 (i) and (14),

$$
H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - H_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \epsilon_0 < \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^{\alpha} d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0
$$

$$
\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^{\alpha} \log Z d\phi_0.
$$

This implies the second inequality (i).
(ii) Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(C_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^c_{\epsilon^{-1}}(Q)$. Then, as in (21) (the restrictions for $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in (21) were determined only by Definition 10), by (14),

$$
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\beta \log Z d\phi_0
\geq - \left( \frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon}{1 - \alpha} \right)^\beta \left( \sum_{m \leq 0, S^m \cap \{Z < 1\}} \frac{1}{Z} \log \frac{1}{Z} d\Lambda \right)^{1 - \beta},
$$

which implies the first inequality of (ii). The second follows by Lemma 1, since $\mathcal{D}_{1,\epsilon}^\alpha,\beta (Q) \leq \mathcal{D}_{1}^\alpha,\beta (Q)$.

The following lemma gives a condition for the continuity of $\mathcal{D}_{1}^\alpha,\beta (Q)$ with respect to the first parameter.

**Lemma 14** Let $0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Suppose there exists $0 < \delta < \alpha_0$ such that $\mathcal{D}_{1}^{\alpha_0 - \delta,\beta} (Q) > -\infty$. Then

$$
0 \leq \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\alpha,\beta} (Q) - \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\alpha_0,\beta} (Q) \\
\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left[ \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\alpha_0 - \delta,\beta} (Q) + \left( \frac{1}{\delta(1 - \alpha_0 + \delta)} + \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon(1 - \alpha)} \right)^2 \right) \Lambda(Q) \right].
$$

**Proof.** By Lemma 2 (ii), $\mathcal{D}_{1}^{\alpha_0 - \delta,\beta} (Q) \leq \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\alpha_0,\beta} (Q) \leq \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\alpha,\beta} (Q)$, which implies the first inequality.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^c_{\epsilon^{-1}}(Q)$. Then, by Lemma 2 (ii) and Lemma 1

$$
\frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0 \right)
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0, S^m \cap \{Z < 1\}} \int Z^{\alpha_0} (\log Z)^2 d\phi_0 + \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon(1 - \alpha)} \right)^2 (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon).
$$
Now, observe that, by Lemma 1,

$$\sum_{m \leq 0} \int S_m A_m \cap \{ Z < 1 \} Z^{\alpha_0} (\log Z)^2 d\phi_0$$

$$= \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int \int S_m A_m \cap \{ Z < 1 \} Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0$$

$$\leq -\frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^{\alpha_0 - \delta} \log Z d\phi_0 + \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0$$

$$\leq -\frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^{\alpha_0 - \delta} \log Z d\phi_0$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int e^{-(1-\alpha_0 + \delta) \log Z} \log Z d\Lambda$$

$$\leq -\frac{1}{\delta} D^{\alpha_0 - \delta, \beta}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) + \frac{1}{\delta e(1 - \alpha_0 + \delta)} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \left( D^{\alpha, \beta}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0 \right)$$

$$\leq -\frac{1}{\delta} D^{\alpha_0 - \delta, \beta}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) + \frac{1}{\delta e(1 - \alpha_0 + \delta)} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon) + \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon(1 - \alpha)} \right)^2 (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon).$$

(23)

Thus the second inequality follows.

Now, we are able to give a sufficient condition for the right differentiability of the function, which, by Lemma 1 (ii) and Lemma 2 (iv), is satisfied in the case of Example 1.

**Theorem 3** Let \( Q \in B \) and \( 0 < \alpha_0 < 1 \). Suppose there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( D^{\alpha_0 - \delta, \alpha_0}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) > -\infty \) and \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon D^{\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + \epsilon}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) = 0 \). Then the function \( (0,1) \ni x \mapsto H_x (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \) is right differentiable at \( \alpha_0 \), and

$$\frac{d}{dx} H_x (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \bigg|_{x = \alpha_0} = D^{\alpha_0, \alpha_0}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) = \lim_{x \to + \alpha_0} D^{\alpha_0, x}_{1, \epsilon} (Q)$$

where \( d_+ / d_+ x \) denotes the right derivative.
Hence, by Lemma 13 (i) and Lemma 14,
\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) + \epsilon \geq \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon
\]
\[
> \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z_\alpha d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Zd\phi_0
\]
\[
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q).
\]
Hence, since, by Lemma 13 (i), \((\alpha - \alpha_0)\mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q)\) + \(\epsilon \geq 0\),
\[(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_0, 1}_{(\alpha - \alpha_0)\mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) - \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) + 2\epsilon} (Q).
\]
That is
\[
\mathcal{C}^{\alpha, 1}_{\epsilon} (Q) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_0, 1}_{(\alpha - \alpha_0)\mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) - \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) + 2\epsilon} (Q).
\]
Therefore, for every \(0 < \beta \leq 1\),
\[
\mathcal{D}^{\beta, \alpha}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) \geq \mathcal{D}^{\beta, \alpha} (Q) \geq \mathcal{D}^{\beta, \alpha}_{1, (\alpha - \alpha_0)\mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) - \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) + 2\epsilon} (Q).
\]
Hence, by Lemma 13 (i) and Lemma 14
\[
\mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1, (\alpha - \alpha_0)\mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) - \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha} (Q) + 2\epsilon} (Q) \leq \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q) \leq \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1, \epsilon} (Q)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1, \epsilon} (Q) \leq \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q)
\]
\[
+ (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left[ -\frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{D}^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q) + \left( \frac{1}{\delta \epsilon (1 - \alpha_0 + \delta)} + \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon (1 - \alpha_0)} \right)^2 \right) \Lambda (Q) \right].
\]
Thus the hypothesis implies the assertion. \(\square\)

4.3.5 The left differentiability of \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)\)

Now, we give a sufficient condition for the left differentiability of \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\) for every measurable \(Q\).

Definition 13 Let \(0 < \alpha \leq 1, 0 \leq \beta \leq 1, Q \in \mathcal{P} (X)\) and \(\epsilon > 0\). Define
\[
\mathcal{E}_{1, \epsilon}^{\alpha, \beta} (Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_0, 1}_{\epsilon}} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Zd\phi_0 \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\mathcal{E}_{1, \epsilon}^{\alpha, \beta} (Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{E}_{1, \epsilon}^{\alpha, \beta} (Q).
\]
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Clearly, $\mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) \leq \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. However, there still might be a problem with its finiteness from below for $\alpha \leq \beta$.

Similarly to $\mathcal{D}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(Q)$, the set function has the following continuity property with respect to the first parameter.

**Lemma 15** Let $0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha < 1$, $0 \leq \beta < 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Suppose there exists $0 < \delta < \alpha_0$ such that $\mathcal{D}_1^{\alpha_0,\delta,\beta}(Q) > -\infty$. Then

$$0 \leq \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) - \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha_0,\beta}(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left[ \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{D}_1^{\alpha_0,\delta,\beta}(Q) + \left( \frac{1}{\delta e(1 - \alpha_0 + \delta)} + \left( \frac{2}{e(1 - \alpha)} \right)^2 \right) \Lambda(Q) \right].$$

**Proof.** By the hypothesis and Lemma 2 (ii), $-\infty < \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha_0,\beta}(Q) \leq \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(Q)$, which implies the first inequality.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_e^{1,1}(Q)$. Then, by (23),

$$\frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S_m A_m Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 - \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha_0,\beta}(Q) \right) \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \mathcal{D}_1^{\alpha_0,\delta,\beta}(Q) + \left( \frac{1}{\delta e(1 - \alpha_0 + \delta)} + \left( \frac{2}{e(1 - \alpha)} \right)^2 \right) \Lambda(Q) + \epsilon,$$

which implies the second inequality. \(\square\)

Also, similarly to Lemma 13 (i), we have the following.

**Lemma 16** (i) Let $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Then

$$(\alpha - \alpha_0) \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) \leq \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q).$$

(ii) Let $0 < \alpha < 1$, $0 \leq \beta < 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Then

$$\mathcal{E}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) \leq \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon}{e(1 - \alpha)}$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$.

**Proof.** (i) Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_e^{1,1}(Q)$. Then, by Lemma 2 (i) and 13,

$$\frac{(\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S_m A_m Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0}{\sum_{m \leq 0} \int S_m A_m Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S_m A_m Z^\alpha d\phi_0} < \mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon - \mathcal{H}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q),$$

which implies the first inequality of (i).
Hence, for every 

\[
0 < \epsilon < 1,
\]
that is 

\[
\frac{d_{-}}{d_{-}x} \mathcal{H}_{x}(x, \phi_{0})(Q) = \mathcal{E}_{1, \epsilon}^{\alpha, x}(Q) = \lim_{x \to -\alpha} \mathcal{E}_{1, \epsilon}^{\alpha, x}(Q)
\]
Therefore, by Lemma 15 and Lemma 16,
\[
E^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) - (\alpha - x) \left[ -\frac{1}{\delta} D_{1,\delta,\alpha}^\alpha(Q) + \left( \frac{1}{\delta e(1 - x + \delta)} + \left( \frac{2}{e(1 - \alpha)} \right)^2 \right) \Lambda(Q) \right] 
\leq E^{\alpha,x}(Q) \leq H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - H_{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) 
\leq E^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q).
\]
Thus setting \( \epsilon = \alpha - x \) and letting \( x \to \alpha \) implies the assertion. \( \Box \)

Remark 3 Observe that the assertion of Theorem 4 remains true also for \( \alpha = 1 \) if also there exists \( C < \infty \) such that \( E^{1,x}(Q) \leq C \) for all \( x < 1 \) sufficiently close to 1 and all sufficiently small \( \epsilon > 0 \), as in the case of Example 1.

4.3.6 The differentiability of \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha}(\Lambda, \phi_0)\)

In this subsection, we shed some light on the differentiability of the function if \( Z \) is \( \Lambda \)-essentially bounded away from zero.

Corollary 4 Let \( Q \in B \). Suppose \( Z \) is \( \Lambda \)-essentially bounded away from zero. Then the function \((0, 1) \ni x \mapsto H_{x}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)\) is left and right differentiable, and
\[
\frac{d}{dx} H_{x}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \bigg|_{x=\alpha} = D_{1,\delta,\alpha}^\alpha(Q) = E^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q)
\]
for all except at most countably many \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \).

Proof. By Lemma 12 (iv) and Lemma 13 (ii), the hypotheses of Theorem 4 and Theorem 3 are satisfied. Therefore, the function is right and left differentiable. Thus the assertion follows by the well-known Beppo Levi Theorem (e.g. see [2], p. 143).

4.3.7 Candidates for the derivatives of \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)\)

By Lemma 14 (ii) and (vii), the function \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)\) appears to have better continuity properties. We are going now to investigate its differentiability properties. (Clearly, the function cannot be zero everywhere if it has some irregularity at some \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\).)

We will use the inductive construction from Subsection 4.1.2 in [10], to obtain some measures on \( B \) as natural candidates for the derivatives of the function.
Let us abbreviate $\Psi$. The set functions $\bar{\Psi}$ are disjoint. By Lemma 10 (ii) (Lemma 6 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10], $\bar{\Psi}$ denote the set of all $\Psi$'s are pairwise disjoint. By Lemma 10 (ii) (Lemma 6 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10], $\bar{\Psi}$ is not empty. Define

$$\bar{\Psi}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_{n,\epsilon}(Q)} \int_{m \leq 0} Z^\alpha (\log Z)^n d\phi_0$$

and

$$\bar{\Psi}^\alpha(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \bar{\Psi}^\alpha(Q),$$

$$\bar{\Psi}^\alpha_n(Q) := \lim_{i \to \infty} \bar{\Psi}^\alpha_i(Q).$$

Let $\bar{\Psi}$ denote the set of all $\forall_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_{n,\epsilon}(Q)$ such that $\forall_{m}$'s are pairwise disjoint. By Lemma 10 (ii) (Lemma 6 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10], $\bar{\Psi}$ is not empty. Define

$$\bar{\Psi}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_{n,\epsilon}(Q)} \int_{m \leq 0} Z^\alpha (\log Z)^n d\phi_0$$

and

$$\bar{\Psi}^\alpha_n(Q) := \lim_{i \to \infty} \bar{\Psi}^\alpha_i(Q).$$

By Lemma 10 (ii) in [10], $\bar{\Psi}^\alpha_n(Q) = \bar{\Psi}^\alpha_n(Q)$.

The set functions $\bar{\Psi}^\alpha_n(Q)$, $Q \in B$, have the following properties.

Let us abbreviate

$$\Gamma^\alpha_n(Q) := \left( \frac{n}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^n \Phi(Q) + \left( \frac{n}{(1 - \alpha)_e} \right)^n \Lambda(Q)$$

for all $Q \in B$, $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. 
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Lemma 17  Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Let $0 \leq \alpha_0 \leq 1$ if $n = 1$ and $0 < \alpha_0 \leq 1$ otherwise. Then the following holds true.

(i) If $n$ is odd, then
\[-\left(\frac{n}{\alpha e}\right)^n \Phi(Q) \leq \Psi_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \left(\frac{n}{(1-\alpha)e}\right)^n \Lambda(Q)\]
and
\[\frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) - \Phi(Q)\right) \leq \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left(\Lambda(Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)\right).
\]

(ii) If $n$ is even, then
\[0 \leq \Psi_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \Gamma_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q).
\]

(iii) $\Psi_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q) = \Psi_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$, and $\Psi_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}$ is a $S$-invariant (signed) measure on $\mathcal{B}$.

Proof. The proof completes Definition 14 by induction.

(i) Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{n,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0}(Q)$. Since, by Lemma 1
\[-\left(\frac{n}{\alpha e}\right)^n \Phi(Q) + \epsilon \leq -\left(\frac{n}{\alpha e}\right)^n \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^n (\log Z)^n d\phi_0
\]
\[\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m \cap \{Z > 1\}} e^{-(1-\alpha) \log Z} (\log Z)^n d\Lambda \leq \left(\frac{n}{(1-\alpha)e}\right)^n \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m),
\]
the first assertion in (i) follows by Proposition 12 (Proposition 2 in the arXiv version) in [10]. The second and the third assertions in (i) follow by the inequalities $1/\alpha(Z^\alpha - 1) \leq Z^\alpha \log Z \leq 1/(1-\alpha)(Z - Z^\alpha)$.

(ii) The first inequality in (ii) is obvious.

By Lemma 1
\[\Psi_n^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^n (\log Z)^n d\phi_0
\]
\[= \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m \cap \{Z \leq 1\}} Z^n (\log Z)^n d\phi_0
\]
\[+ \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m \cap \{Z > 1\}} e^{-(1-\alpha) \log Z} (\log Z)^n d\Lambda
\]
\[\leq \left(\frac{n}{\alpha e}\right)^n (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) + \left(\frac{n}{(1-\alpha)e}\right)^n \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m).
\]
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Hence, by Proposition 12 in [10],
\[ \Psi_{n,e}^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \left( \frac{n}{\alpha e} \right)^n (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) + \left( \frac{n}{(1-\alpha)e} \right)^n \Lambda(Q). \]
Thus the second inequality in (ii) follows.

(iii) Let \( A \in \mathcal{A} \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \cap \{0\} \). Define (with \((-\infty)^0 := 1\))
\[ c_{\alpha_0,n} := \begin{cases} 
\left( \frac{n}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^n & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\
0 & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases} \]
and
\[ \psi_{\alpha_0,n}(A) := \begin{cases} 
\int_A (Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z)^n + c_{\alpha_0,n}) d\phi_0 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\
\int_A Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z)^n d\phi_0 & \text{otherwise.} 
\end{cases} \]
Then, by Lemma 10, \( \psi_{\alpha_0,n}(A) > 0 \), and
\[ \int_A Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z)^n d\phi_0 = \psi_{\alpha_0,n}(A) - c_{\alpha_0,n} \phi_0(A) \]
for all \( n \). Thus applying Lemma 10 (i) (Lemma 6 (i) in the arXiv version) in [10] to the families \( \psi_{\alpha_0,0},...\psi_{\alpha_0,n},\psi_{\alpha,n+1} \) and \( c_{\alpha_0,0},...c_{\alpha_0,n},c_{\alpha,n+1} \) implies, by Corollary 8 (ii) (Corollary 1 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10], that \( \Psi_{n+1}^{\alpha,\alpha_0} \) is a (signed) \( S \)-invariant measure on \( B \). Since, by (i) or (ii) it is finite, it follows by Theorem 16 (ii) (Theorem 4 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10], that it is equal to \( \bar{\Psi}_{n+1}^{\alpha,\alpha_0} \) on \( B \).

4.3.8 The continuity of the candidates for the derivatives of \( (0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0) \)

Now, we show some continuity properties of the obtained measures with respect to the first parameter.

Lemma 18 Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \), \( 0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha < 1 \), \( \gamma \in [0,1] \) and \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \).

(i) If \( n \) is even, then
\[ -(\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n+1}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n+1} \Phi(Q) \leq \Psi_{n}^{\alpha,\gamma}(Q) - \Psi_{n}^{\alpha_0,\gamma}(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n+1}{(1-\alpha)e} \right)^{n+1} \Lambda(Q). \]
(ii) If \( n \) is odd, then
\[ \Psi_{n}^{\alpha,\gamma}(Q) - \Psi_{n}^{\alpha_0,\gamma}(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n+1}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n+1} (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) + \left( \frac{n+1}{(1-\alpha)e} \right)^{n+1} \Lambda(X) \]
for all $\epsilon > 0$, and
\[
0 \leq \Psi_n^{\alpha,\gamma}(Q) - \Psi_n^{\alpha_0,\gamma}(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Gamma_{n+1}(Q). \tag{26}
\]

**Proof.** Let $\alpha_0 < \alpha$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

(i) Let $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{n,\epsilon}^\gamma(Q)$. Then, by the first inequality of Lemma 2 (i) and Lemma 1,
\[
-(\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n+1}{\alpha_0 \epsilon} \right)^{n+1} (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon)
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^n (\log Z)^n d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} (\log Z)^n d\phi_0
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^n (\log Z)^n d\phi_0 - \Psi_{n,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\gamma}(Q).
\]
Thus it follows the first inequalities of (24).

Now, let $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{n,\epsilon}^\gamma(Q)$ such that
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} (\log Z)^n d\phi_0 < \Psi_n^{\alpha_0,\gamma}(Q) + \epsilon.
\]
Then, by the second inequality of Lemma 2 (i) and Lemma 1,
\[
\Psi_{n,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\gamma}(Q) - \Psi_n^{\alpha_0,\gamma}(Q) - \epsilon
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^n (\log Z)^n d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} (\log Z)^n d\phi_0
\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{n+1}{(1-\alpha)\epsilon} \right)^{n+1} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m).
\]
Hence, by Proposition 12 (Proposition 2 in the arXiv version) in [10], it follows the second inequality of (24).

(ii) Obviously, by Lemma 2 (ii),
\[
0 \leq \Psi_{n,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\gamma}(Q) - \Psi_{n,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\gamma}(Q).
\]
Let $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1,e}(Q)$. Then, by Lemma 2 (ii) and Lemma 1,

$$\dot{\Psi}_{\alpha, \gamma}^\gamma(Q) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\alpha (\log Z)^n d\phi_0$$

$$\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\alpha (\log Z)^n d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^{\alpha_0} (\log Z)^n d\phi_0$$

$$\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \left( \frac{n+1}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n+1} \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0 (S^m A_m) + \left( \frac{n+1}{(1-\alpha)e} \right)^{n+1} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right)$$

$$\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \left( \frac{n+1}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n+1} (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) + \left( \frac{n+1}{(1-\alpha)e} \right)^{n+1} \Lambda(X) \right).$$

Hence,

$$\dot{\Psi}_{\alpha, \gamma}^\gamma(Q) - \dot{\Psi}_{\alpha, \gamma_0}^\gamma(Q)$$

$$\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \left( \frac{n+1}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n+1} (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) + \left( \frac{n+1}{(1-\alpha)e} \right)^{n+1} \Lambda(X) \right).$$

Since $\Psi_{\alpha, \gamma}^\gamma(Q) \leq \dot{\Psi}_{\alpha, \gamma}^\gamma(Q)$ and, by Lemma 10 (ii) (Lemma 6 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10],

$$\dot{\Psi}_{\alpha, \gamma}^{\alpha_0} \gamma(Q) \leq \Psi_{\alpha, \gamma}^{\alpha_0} \gamma(Q) + \epsilon \left( \frac{n}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^{n},$$

it follows (25). (26) follows by Lemma 2 (ii) and Lemma 11 the same way as in the proof of (i).

**Remark 4** In the case $n = 0$, Lemma 18 (i) gives the following continuity property of $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$.

$$-(\alpha - \alpha_0) \frac{\Phi(Q)}{\alpha_0 e} \leq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{(1-\alpha)e}$$

for all $0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$, which is weaker than that of Lemma 11 (vii).

### 4.3.9 The right derivative of $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$

We show now that $\Psi_{\alpha, \alpha}^\gamma(Q)$ is the right derivative of $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Also, as a by-product, we obtain another lower bound for $\Phi$ in terms of $\Psi_{\alpha, \alpha}^\gamma$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha, 0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$.

**Lemma 19** Let $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. 


(i) Let $\epsilon_0, \epsilon > 0$. Let $\delta_0, \delta > 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \epsilon_0$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \epsilon$. Then

$$(\alpha - \alpha_0)\Psi_{\delta_0,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q) - \epsilon_0 - \delta_0 < \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$$

$$< (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Psi_{\delta,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q) + \epsilon + \delta.$$

(ii)

$$\Psi_{\delta,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \Psi_{\delta,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q),$$

$$0 \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \Psi_{\delta,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q) - \Psi_{\delta,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q).$$

Proof. (ii) By Lemma 2(i), for any $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$ with $\sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^m A_m) < \infty$,

$$\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0}d\phi_0 \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0}d\phi_0 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_2} \log Zd\phi_0$$

for all $\alpha_1 \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha_2 \in (0, 1]$. Hence, putting $\alpha_1 = \alpha$, $\alpha_2 = \alpha_0$ and taking $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha_{\delta,\phi_0}(Q)$ implies that

$$\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \delta_0 > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Psi_{\delta_0,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q)$$

$$> \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \epsilon_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Psi_{\delta_0,\phi_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q),$$

which is the first inequality of (i). The same way, putting $\alpha_1 = \alpha_0$, $\alpha_2 = \alpha$ and taking infimum over all $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha_{\delta,\phi_0}(Q)$ implies the second inequality.

(ii) Let $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_0}_{\delta,\phi_0}(Q)$. Substituting $\alpha_1 := \alpha_0$ and $\alpha_2 := \alpha$ in (27) implies that

$$\mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \delta > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}_\delta(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\alpha \log Zd\phi_0.$$

This gives the second inequality of (ii).

Substituting $\alpha_1 := \alpha$ and $\alpha_2 := \alpha_0$ in (27) implies that

$$\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0}_\delta(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Psi_{1,\delta}^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0}(Q).$$

This gives the first inequality of (ii).
If \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_{1,\delta}(Q)\), then
\[
\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \delta > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0,\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Psi^{\alpha,0}_{1,\delta}(Q).
\]
This implies the third inequality in (ii).

The fourth inequality in (ii) follows from (i), since \(\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0,\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)\).

The fifth inequality in (ii) is obvious.

The sixth inequality in (ii) is obvious if \(\alpha = 1\) and \(\Psi^{1,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) = +\infty\). Suppose \(\alpha < 1\) or \(\Psi^{1,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) < +\infty\). Let \(\eta, \tau > 0\). Let \((C_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_{1,\tau}(Q)\) such that
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m C_m} Z^{\alpha} \log Z d\phi_0 < \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) + \eta.
\]
Then, by (i),
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \tau & > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) + \tau \\
& > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m C_m} Z^{\alpha} d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) \\
& > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m C_m} Z^{\alpha} d\phi_0 - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m C_m} Z^{\alpha} \log Z d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) + \eta.
\end{align*}
\]
Hence,
\[
(C_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\alpha_{1,(\alpha - \alpha_0)(\Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) - \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) + \eta) + \tau}(Q).
\]
Therefore,
\[
H^{\alpha,\alpha,0}_\tau(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m C_m} Z^{\alpha} d\phi_0
\]
\[
< \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left(\Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) - \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q) + \eta\right)
\]
\[
+ \tau.
\]
Since \(\eta, \tau > 0\) were arbitrary, this implies the sixth inequality of (ii). \(\square\)

**Proposition 4** For every \(0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq 1\) and \(Q \in \mathcal{B}\),
\[
\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \log \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0,\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\mathcal{H}^{\beta,\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)} \leq (\alpha_0 - \beta)\Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\alpha,0}(Q).
\]
In particular,
\[
\Phi(Q) \geq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)
\]
if \( \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > 0 \).

**Proof.** The assertion follows by the first inequality of Lemma 11 (v) together with the second one of Lemma 19 (i).

It can be also deduced from Lemma 3 (iv).

Now, we are ready to show the right differentiability of \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)\).

In order also to shed some light on the problem for \(\Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)\) being also the left derivative of the function, we need the following definitions.

**Definition 15** Let \( Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \) and \( \tau > 0 \). Define
\[
\delta_r(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) := |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2| \tilde{\tau} \sup \left\{ 0 < \delta < |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2| \tilde{\tau} : \mathcal{H}_\delta^{\alpha_i,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_i,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2| \tilde{\tau} \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \right\}
\]
for all \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [0, 1] \). For \( 0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha < 1 \), define
\[
\epsilon_r(\alpha_0, \alpha) := (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0} (Q) - \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0}_{1,\delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)}(Q) \right) + 2(\alpha - \alpha_0)^2 + 3\delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha).
\]

**Theorem 5** Let \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \). Then the function \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)\) is right differentiable, and
\[
\left. \frac{d_+}{d_+ \alpha} \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \right|_{\alpha = \alpha_0} = \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0}(Q) - \lim_{\alpha \to \alpha_0} \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q)
\]
for all \( 0 < \alpha_0 < 1 \) where \( d_+/d_+\alpha \) denotes the right derivative.

From the left, for every \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) and \( \tau > 0 \),
\[
\lim_{\alpha_0 \to \alpha} \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0}_{1,\epsilon_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)}(Q) = \lim_{\alpha_0 \to \alpha} \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0}_{1,\epsilon_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)}(Q) = \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q), \text{ and}
\]
\[
\Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) \leq \lim_{\alpha_0 \to \alpha} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\alpha_0 - \alpha} \leq \lim_{\alpha_0 \to \alpha} \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha_0}_{1,\epsilon_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)}(Q)
\]
for all \( \tau > 1 \).

**Proof.** Let \( 0 < \gamma_0 < \gamma < 1 \) and \( \tau > 0 \). Observe that \( 0 < \delta_r(\gamma_0, \gamma) \leq (\gamma - \gamma_0)^2 \),
\[
\mathcal{H}_\delta^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \geq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - (\gamma - \gamma_0)^2 \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_\delta^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \geq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - (\gamma - \gamma_0)^2
\]
and
\[
\mathcal{H}_\delta^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \geq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - (\gamma - \gamma_0)^2
\]
for all \( \tau > 1 \).
\( \mathcal{H}^{\gamma,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - (\gamma - \gamma_0)^\gamma \). Let \( (B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)}^\gamma (Q) \). Then, by Lemma 19 (i) and Lemma 2 (i),

\[
\mathcal{H}^{\gamma,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + (\gamma - \gamma_0) \Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) + 2(\gamma - \gamma_0)^\gamma + 3\delta_\tau (\gamma_0, \gamma) \\
> \mathcal{H}^{\gamma,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \delta_\tau (\gamma_0, \gamma) \\
> \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\gamma d\phi_0 \\
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\gamma d\phi_0 + (\gamma - \gamma_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\gamma \log Z d\phi_0 \\
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\gamma d\phi_0 + (\gamma - \gamma_0) \Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q).
\]

Hence, since, by Lemma 19 (i), \( (\gamma - \gamma_0) (\Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) - \Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q)) + 2(\gamma - \gamma_0)^\gamma + 3\delta_\tau (\gamma_0, \gamma) > \delta_\tau (\gamma_0, \gamma), \)

\[
(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)}^\gamma (Q).
\]

That is

\[
C_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)}^\gamma (Q) \subset C_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)}^\gamma (Q). \tag{29}
\]

Therefore, for every \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1, \)

\[
\Psi^{\alpha,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \geq \Psi^{\alpha,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q). \tag{30}
\]

In particular, by setting \( \alpha = \gamma_0 \) and letting \( \gamma \to \gamma_0 \), it follows, since \( \Psi^{\alpha,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \leq \Psi^{\alpha,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q), \)

\[
\Psi^{\gamma_0,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \leq \liminf_{\gamma \to \gamma_0} \Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q).
\]

Since, by Lemma 19 (i),

\[
\Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\gamma_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\gamma - \gamma_0} \leq \Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \tag{31}
\]

and, by Lemma 18 (ii), \( \lim_{\gamma \to \gamma_0} \Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) = \Psi^{\gamma_0,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \), it follows that

\[
\lim_{\gamma \to \gamma_0} \Psi^{\gamma,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) = \frac{d_+ \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{d_+ \alpha} \bigg|_{\alpha = \gamma_0} = \Psi^{\gamma_0,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q). \tag{32}
\]

This proves the right differentiability of \( (0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \). Also, by (20) and (31), for all \( 0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1, \)

\[
\Psi^{\alpha,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma^{2,0,0}_{\alpha} (\alpha_0) \geq \Psi^{\alpha,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \geq \Psi^{\alpha_0,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) \geq \Psi^{\alpha_0,0}_{1, \delta, (\gamma_0, \gamma)} (Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma^{2,0,0}_{\alpha} (\alpha_0).
\]
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Thus, by (32),
\[
\lim_{\alpha \to \gamma_0} \Psi_{1,\alpha}^\gamma (Q) = \Psi_{1,\gamma_0}^\gamma (Q).
\]

Now, let us consider the differentiability from the left. Let \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \((C_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^\gamma_\epsilon(Q)\). By (31), Lemma 17 (i), Lemma 2 (i) and Lemma 1,
\[
\mathcal{H}^{\gamma,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \frac{\gamma_0 - \gamma}{\epsilon} \Phi(Q) + \epsilon \geq \mathcal{H}^{\gamma_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon
\]
and therefore,
\[
(C_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \dot{C}^{\gamma_0,0,1}_\epsilon(Q).
\]

That is
\[
\dot{C}^{\gamma_0}_\epsilon(Q) \subset \dot{C}^{\gamma_0}_\epsilon(Q).
\]

Therefore, for every \(0 < \alpha \leq 1\),
\[
\dot{\Psi}_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\gamma_0}(Q) \geq \dot{\Psi}_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\gamma_0}(Q) + \epsilon \Phi(Q).
\]

Since, by Lemma 10 (ii) (Lemma 6 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10],
\[
\dot{\Psi}_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\gamma_0}(Q) \leq \dot{\Psi}_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\gamma_0}(Q) + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha e},
\]
it follows, by (33) and (34), that
\[
\Psi_{1,\delta_\epsilon}(\gamma, \gamma_0)(Q) + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha e} \geq \Psi_{1,\epsilon}(\gamma, \gamma_0)(Q) + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha e} \geq \Psi_{1,\epsilon}(\gamma, \gamma_0)(Q) + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha e} \Phi(Q) + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha e} \Lambda(X).
\]

Furthermore, by (25),
\[
\Psi_{1,\epsilon}^{\gamma}(Q) \leq \Psi_{1,\epsilon}^{\gamma}(Q) \leq \Psi_{1,\epsilon}^{\gamma}(Q) + c(\gamma_0, \gamma, \epsilon)(\gamma - \gamma_0) + \frac{\epsilon}{\gamma_0 e}
\]
where
\[
c(\gamma_0, \gamma, \epsilon) := \left( \frac{2}{\gamma_0 e} \right)^2 (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) + \left( \frac{2}{(1 - \gamma) e} \right)^2 \Lambda(X).
\]

Therefore, putting \( \alpha = \gamma_0 \) in (35) implies that
\[
\lim_{\gamma_0 \to \gamma} \Psi_{1,\epsilon}^{\gamma_0}(Q) = \Psi_{1}^{\gamma}(Q).
\]

Also, putting \( \alpha = \gamma \) in (35) implies that
\[
\lim_{\gamma_0 \to \gamma} \Psi_{1,\epsilon}(\gamma, \gamma_0)(Q) = \Psi_{1}^{\gamma}(Q).
\]
Suppose $\tau > 1$. Since, by (30) and Lemma 19 (i),

$$
\Psi_{1,\tau,\gamma_0}(Q) - (\gamma - \gamma_0)^{\tau - 1} - \frac{\delta_\tau(\gamma_0, \gamma)}{\gamma_0} 
\leq \Psi_{1,\delta_\tau(\gamma_0, \gamma)}(Q) - (\gamma - \gamma_0)^{\tau - 1} - \frac{\delta_\tau(\gamma_0, \gamma)}{\gamma_0} 
\leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\gamma_0,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\gamma - \gamma_0} 
\leq \Psi_{1,\gamma_0,\delta_\tau(\gamma_0, \gamma)}(Q) + (\gamma - \gamma_0)^{\tau - 1} + \frac{\delta_\tau(\gamma_0, \gamma)}{\gamma - \gamma_0}
$$

it follows (28), by (36).

4.3.10 The left derivative of $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$

Now, we show that $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ is also left differentiable for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$, but its left derivative seems to be, in general, a different function.

**Definition 16** Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Define

$$
\mathcal{H}^{\beta,0,1}_\varepsilon(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,1}_\varepsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m} Z^\beta \, d\phi_0
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{H}^{\beta,0,1}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{H}^{\beta,0,1}_\varepsilon(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).
$$

As in Lemma 27 (ii), one sees that $\mathcal{H}^{\beta,0,1}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) < \infty$, and, by Proposition 13 (Proposition 3 in the arXiv version) in [10],

$$
\mathcal{H}^{\beta,0,1}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \mathcal{H}^{\beta,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \quad \text{for all} \quad Q \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (37)
$$

Now, define

$$
\mathcal{C}^{\beta,0,1}_\varepsilon(Q) := \left\{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,1}_\varepsilon(Q) \mid \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m} Z^\beta \, d\phi_0 < \mathcal{H}^{\beta,0,1}_\varepsilon(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \varepsilon \right\},
$$

$$
\Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_1(Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta,0,1}_\varepsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m} Z^\alpha \log Z \, d\phi_0
$$

and

$$
\Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_1(Q) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_1(Q).
$$

Obviously, by (14) and (37), for every $Q \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$
\Psi^{\alpha,\beta}_1(Q) \leq \Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_1(Q). \quad (38)
$$
However, as the next two lemmas show, the latter shares with the former some of the properties.

In order to show that it is also a measure, we need the following definition.

**Definition 17** Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. For $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$, let

$$\omega_\alpha(A) := \int_A \left(-e^{-(1-\alpha)\log Z} \log Z\right) d\Lambda + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)\epsilon} \Lambda(A).$$

Define

$$\Omega_{\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon}^{\beta,\alpha,1}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \omega_\alpha(S^m A_m)$$

and

$$\Omega^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Omega_{\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q).$$

Let us abbreviate

$$\Gamma_{2,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) := \Gamma_2^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) + \frac{4\epsilon}{\epsilon^2} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_0^2} + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2}\right).$$

**Lemma 20** Let $0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha < 1$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)$.

(i) 

$$-\frac{\Phi(Q)}{\alpha \epsilon} \leq \Xi_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) \leq \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{(1-\alpha)\epsilon}.$$

(ii) 

$$0 \leq \Omega_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) = -\Xi_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)\epsilon} \Lambda(Q).$$

(iii) $\Xi_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is a $S$-invariant, signed measure on $\mathcal{B}$.

(iv) For every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$0 \leq \Xi_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) - \Xi_{0,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Gamma_{2,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q).$$

**Proof.** Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon}^{\beta,\alpha,1}(Q)$.

(i) Since $Z^\alpha \log Z \geq -1/(\alpha \epsilon)$,

$$\Xi_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) > -\frac{1}{\alpha \epsilon} (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon).$$

This implies the first inequality of (i).
On the other hand, by Lemma \[1\]
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 = \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} e^{-(1-\alpha) \log Z} \log Z d\Lambda \\
\leq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \leq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon). 
\]

Thus taking the supremum implies the second inequality of (i).

(ii) Observe that, by Lemma \[1\] \( \omega_\alpha(A) \geq 0 \) for all \( A \in \mathcal{A}_0 \). Thus the inequality of (ii) is obvious.

Clearly,
\[
\Omega^{\alpha,\beta}_\epsilon(Q) < - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon). 
\]

Hence,
\[
\Omega^{\alpha,\beta}_\epsilon(Q) \leq - \Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_{1,\epsilon}(Q) + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon). 
\]

On the other hand, one readily sees that
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \omega_\alpha(S^m A_m) \geq - \Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_{1,\epsilon}(Q) + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \Lambda(Q). 
\]

Hence,
\[
\Omega^{\alpha,\beta}_\epsilon(Q) \geq - \Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_{1,\epsilon}(Q) + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \Lambda(Q). 
\]

Thus the equality of (ii) follows.

(iii) Since \( \omega_\alpha(A) \geq 0 \) for all \( A \in \mathcal{A}_0 \), it follows, by (i), (ii) and Theorem 16 (ii)
(Chapter 4 (ii) in the arXiv version) in \[10\], that \( \Omega^{\alpha,\beta} \) is a finite, \( S \)-invariant measure on \( \mathcal{B} \), and therefore, \( \Xi^{\alpha,\beta}_{1,\epsilon} \) is a \( S \)-invariant, signed measure on \( \mathcal{B} \).

(iv) The first inequality of (iv) is obvious, by the first inequality of Lemma \[2\] (ii).
Now, observe that, by the second inequality of Lemma \(2 (ii)\),
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m A_m Z \log Z d\phi_0 - \Xi_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\beta} (Q)
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m A_m Z \log Z d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m A_m Z \log Z d\phi_0
\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{2}{\alpha_0 \epsilon} \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0 (S^m A_m) + \frac{2}{(1 - \alpha) \epsilon} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) \right)
< (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma_{2,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\alpha} (Q).
\]
Thus taking the supremum and letting \(\epsilon \to 0\) implies the second inequality of \((iv)\). \(\square\)

Also, analogously to Lemma \(19 (i)\), we have the following.

**Lemma 21** Let \(0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq 1\), \(Q \in B\) and \(\epsilon_0, \epsilon > 0\). Let \(\delta_0, \delta > 0\) such that \(\mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon_0\) and \(\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) > \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon\). Then
\[
(\alpha - \alpha_0) \Xi_{1,\delta_0}^{\alpha_0,\alpha} (Q) - \epsilon_0 - \delta_0 < \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Xi_{1,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\alpha} (Q) + \epsilon + \delta.
\]

**Proof.** Let \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_0^{\alpha_0,1} (Q)\). Then, by Lemma \(2 (i)\), \((\ref{H01})\) and \((\ref{H02})\),
\[
(\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m A_m Z \log Z d\phi_0
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m A_m Z \log Z d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m A_m Z \log Z d\phi_0
< \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \delta_0 - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon_0.
\]
Thus taking the supremum implies the first inequality.

Now, let \((B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_0^{\alpha_0,0} (Q)\). Then, by \((\ref{H00})\), \((\ref{H02})\) and Lemma \(2 (i)\),
\[
\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon - \mathcal{H}^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \delta
< \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m B^m Z \log Z d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m B^m Z \log Z d\phi_0
\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int S^m B^m Z \log Z d\phi_0
\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Xi_{1,\delta}^{\alpha,\alpha_0} (Q).
\]
This proves the second inequality.

Finally, similarly to \( \Psi^\alpha_{\alpha,0}(Q) \), we are only able to show that the introduced set function is a derivative of \((0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)\) from one side, but this time the left one.

In order to clarify the behavior of the left derivative from the right, we need the following definition.

**Definition 18** Let \( Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \), \( 0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha < 1 \) and \( \tau > 0 \). Define

\[
\epsilon'_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha) := (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \Xi_1^\alpha_{1,\delta_\tau(\alpha_0,\alpha)}(Q) - \Xi_1^{\alpha_0,\alpha}_{1,\delta_\tau(\alpha_0,\alpha)}(Q) \right) + 2(\alpha - \alpha_0)^\tau + 3\delta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha).
\]

**Theorem 6** Let \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \). Then the function \((0,1) \ni \beta \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\beta,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)\) is left differentiable, and

\[
\left. \frac{d_-}{d_- \beta} \mathcal{H}^{\beta,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \right|_{\beta=\alpha} = \Xi_1^\alpha(\alpha, Q) = \lim_{\beta \to \alpha} \Xi_1^{\alpha,\beta}(\alpha, Q) = \lim_{\beta \to \alpha} \Xi_1^{\beta,\beta}(\alpha, Q) = \lim_{\beta \to \alpha} \Psi_1^{\alpha,\beta}(\alpha, Q) = \lim_{\beta \to \alpha} \Psi_1^{\beta,\beta}(\alpha, Q)
\]

for all \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) and \( \tau > 1 \) where \( d_- / d_- \beta \) denotes the left derivative.

From the right, for every \( 0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1 \) and \( \tau > 0 \),

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\epsilon'_\tau(\alpha_0,\alpha)}(Q) = \lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha_0,\alpha}_{1,\epsilon'_\tau(\alpha_0,\alpha)}(Q) = \Xi_1^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q),
\]

and, for every \( \tau > 1 \),

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}_{1,\delta_\tau(\alpha_0,\alpha)}(Q) = \lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha_0,\alpha}_{1,\delta_\tau(\alpha_0,\alpha)}(Q)
\]

\[
= \lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) = \lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) = \Psi_1^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q).
\]

**Proof.** Let \( 0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1 \), \( \tau > 0 \) and \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_0,0,1}_{\delta_\tau(\alpha_0,\alpha)}(Q)\). Then, by
Lemma 21 and Lemma 2 (i),

\[ H^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1, \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q) + 2 \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha) + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \gamma \]

\[
\geq H^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1, \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q).
\]

Therefore, since, by Lemma 21, \((\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1, \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q) - \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1, \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q) \right) + 2(\alpha - \alpha_0)^\gamma + 3 \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha) > \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha),\)

\[
(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^{\alpha_0, 0.1} \alpha_0 \varepsilon (\alpha_0, \alpha) (Q).
\]

That is

\[
C^{\alpha_0, 0.1}_{\delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q) \subset C^{\alpha_0, 0.1}_{\varepsilon (\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q).
\]

Hence, for every \(0 < \beta \leq 1,\)

\[
\Xi^{\beta, \alpha_0}_{1} (Q) \leq \Xi^{\beta, \alpha_0}_{1, \delta_r(\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q) \leq \Xi^{\beta, \alpha_0}_{1, \varepsilon (\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q).
\]

(39)

Therefore, by Lemma 20 (iv) and Lemma 21 in the case \(\beta = \alpha,\)

\[
\Xi^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{2} (Q) \leq \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1} (Q)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{H^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - H^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0}
\]

\[
\leq \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1} (Q)
\]

\[
\leq \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1, \varepsilon (\alpha_0, \alpha)} (Q).
\]

Thus

\[
\lim_{\alpha_0 \to -\alpha} \frac{H^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - H^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} = \Xi^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q),
\]

and

\[
\lim_{\alpha_0 \to -\alpha} \Xi^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q) = \Xi^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q).
\]

Since, by Lemma 20 (iv),

\[
\Xi^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{2} (Q) \leq \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1} (Q) \leq \Xi^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q),
\]

it follows also that

\[
\lim_{\alpha_0 \to -\alpha} \Xi^{\alpha_0, \alpha}_{1} (Q) = \Xi^{\alpha, \alpha}_{1} (Q).
\]
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Let $\tau > 1$. Let us abbreviate

$$
\eta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha) := (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{2}{\alpha_0 e} \right)^2 (\Phi(Q) + \delta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha)) + \left( \frac{2}{(1 - \alpha)e} \right)^2 \Lambda(X)
$$

$$+ \delta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha) \frac{1}{\alpha_0 e}.
$$

Then, by Lemma 19 (i) and Lemma 18 (ii),

$$
\frac{H^\alpha,0(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - H^\alpha,0(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0}
$$

$$\leq \Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0)^{-1} + \frac{\delta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha)}{\alpha - \alpha_0}
$$

$$\leq \Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) + \eta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha) + (\alpha - \alpha_0)^{-1} + \frac{\delta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha)}{\alpha - \alpha_0}.
$$

Thus, since $\Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)$, this implies the remaining equalities from the left.

Now, let us consider the behavior of the function from the right. Let $\tau > 0$. Putting $\beta = \alpha_0$ in (39) implies that

$$\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q).$$

(40)

Let $\delta > 0$. Then, similarly to the proof of (29), one verifies, by (14), (37), Lemma 17 (i) and Lemma 20 that

$$C_0^{\alpha,0,1}(Q) \subset C_0^{\alpha,0,1}(1, (\alpha - \alpha_0) \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \Phi(Q) + \delta}{\alpha_0^2} + \delta(Q),$$

and therefore, for every $0 < \beta < 1$,

$$\Xi_1^{\beta,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\beta,0}(1, (\alpha - \alpha_0) \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \Phi(Q) + \delta}{\alpha_0^2} + \delta(Q),$$

which combined with (40) implies that

$$\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(1, (\alpha - \alpha_0) \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \Phi(Q) + \delta}{\alpha_0^2} + \delta(Q).
$$

Thus

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q, \phi_0) = \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q),
\]

and, by Lemma 20 (iv), also

\[
\lim_{\alpha \to +\alpha_0} \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q, \phi_0) = \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q).
\]

Finally, let $\tau > 1$. Then, by Lemma 18 (i) and Lemma 21

$$\Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma_2^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Psi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q),$$

$$\leq \frac{H^\alpha,0(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - H^\alpha,0(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} + \frac{\delta_\tau(\alpha_0, \alpha)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} + (\alpha - \alpha_0)^{-1}.$$
Thus, by Theorem 5
\[
\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) = \lim_{\alpha \to 1} \Xi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) = \Psi_1^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q),
\]
which, by Lemma 20 (iv), implies the final assertion. □

Now, we are able to give a lower bound for \( H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \) in terms of \( \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \).

**Corollary 5** Let \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) and \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \) such that \( \Lambda(Q) > 0 \) and \( \Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) > 0 \). Then
\[
\Lambda(Q)e^{W_1\left(-\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)}\right)} \leq H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \Lambda(Q)e^{W\left(-\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)}\right)},
\]
where \( W \) and \( W_1 \) denote the principal and the lower branch of the Lambert function respectively.

**Proof.** By Lemma 11 (iv), \( H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0 \). By Theorem 6 and the second inequality of Lemma 11 (v),
\[
\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq -\frac{1}{1-\alpha} H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \log \frac{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)},
\]
which is equivalent to
\[
\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)} \geq \frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)} e^{-\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}}.
\]
That is
\[
W_1\left(-\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)}\right) \leq \frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)} \leq W\left(-\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)}\right),
\]
which is equivalent to
\[
\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{W_1\left(-\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)}\right)} \leq H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{W\left(-\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Xi_1^{\alpha,0}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)}\right)},
\]
which is the assertion, since \( x/W(x) = e^{W(x)} \) and \( x/W_{1}(x) = e^{W_{1}(x)} \). □

It appears that the construction of the (signed) measure \( \Xi_1^{\alpha,0} \) is measure-theoretically new. We show now that, for \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \), it can be also obtained in the standard way of the dynamical measure theory, given by the inductive construction in Subsection 4.1.2 in [10].

**Definition 19** Let \( 0 < \alpha < 1, 0 \leq \beta \leq 1, Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \). Define
\[
C^{\alpha,\beta,0,1}(Q) := \left\{ (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C^{\beta,0,1}(Q) \mid \sum_{m \leq 0} \omega_{A_m}(S^m A_m) < \Omega^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) + \epsilon \right\},
\]
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\[
\Upsilon_{1,\varepsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m\leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}^{\alpha,\beta,0,1}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0
\]

and
\[
\Upsilon_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \Upsilon_{1,\varepsilon}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q).
\]

**Lemma 22** Let \(Q \in \mathcal{P}(X), 0 < \alpha < 1\) and \(0 \leq \beta \leq 1\). Then
\[
\Xi_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) = \Upsilon_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q).
\]

**Proof.** Obviously,
\[
\Xi_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) \geq \Upsilon_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q).
\]

Let \(\varepsilon > 0\) and \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}^{\alpha,\beta,0,1}(Q)\). Then
\[
\Omega_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) + \varepsilon > - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 + \frac{1}{(1 - \alpha) e} \Lambda(Q).
\]

Hence, taking the infimum and letting \(\varepsilon \to 0\) implies that
\[
\Omega_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) \geq - \Xi_{1}^{\alpha,\beta}(Q) + \frac{1}{(1 - \alpha) e} \Lambda(Q).
\]

Thus the assertion follows by Lemma 20 (ii). \(\square\)

**4.3.11 The differentiability of \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,0}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)\)**

We have seen, by Lemma 11 (vii), that the function \((0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,0}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)\) is Lipschitz on every closed subinterval, and therefore, it is differentiable almost everywhere. Using the well-known Beppo Levi Theorem for both-sided differentiable functions, as in Subsection 4.3.6, one can conclude from our results much more.

Let us consider the set of exceptional points.

**Definition 20** For \(Q \in \mathcal{B}\), define
\[
\mathcal{H}_Q := \{ \alpha \in (0, 1) \mid \Psi_{1}^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) < \Xi_{1}^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) \}.
\]

It has the following properties.

**Lemma 23** (i) \(\mathcal{H}_Q = \emptyset\) for all \(Q \in \mathcal{B}\) such that there exists \(\alpha \in [0, 1]\) with \(\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,0}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = 0\).

(ii) \(\mathcal{H}_A \subset \mathcal{H}_B\) for all \(A, B \in \mathcal{B}\) with \(A \subset B\).

(iii) \(\mathcal{H}_Q = \mathcal{H}_{S^{-1}Q}\) for all \(Q \in \mathcal{B}\).

(iv) \(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}_{Q_n} = \mathcal{H}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n}\) for all \((Q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{B}\).

(v) \(\mathcal{H}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S^n Q} = \mathcal{H}_Q\) for all \(Q \in \mathcal{B}\).
\( H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = 0 \) for all \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) for such \( Q \).

(ii) Let \( A, B \in \mathcal{B} \) with \( A \subset B \). Let \( \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_A \). Then, since \( \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1 \) and \( \Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1 \) are
finite signed measures on \( B \), by [38],
\[
\Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(B) = \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(B \setminus A) + \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(A) < \Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(B \setminus A) + \Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(A) = \Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(B).
\]
Hence, \( \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_B \).

(iii) It is obvious, since \( \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1 \) and \( \Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1 \) are \( S \)-invariant.

(iv) Let \( (Q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{B} \). By (ii), we only need to show that \( \mathcal{H}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n} \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}_{Q_n} \). Set \( Q'_1 := Q_1 \) and \( Q'_n := Q_n \setminus (Q_{n-1} \cup \ldots \cup Q_1) \) for all \( n \geq 2 \).
Let \( \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n} \). Then
\[
0 < \Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1 \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n \right) - \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1 \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q'_n \right) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q'_n) - \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q'_n) \right).
\]
Hence, by [38], there exists \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{Q'_n} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n} \), by (ii).

(v) It follows immediately by (iii) and (iv).

Corollary 6 The set \( \mathcal{H}_X \) is at most countable, and \((0, 1) \setminus \mathcal{H}_Q \ni \alpha \mapsto\n\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)\) is continuously differentiable for all \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \).

Proof. The assertion follows from Theorem[5] and Theorem[6] by the Beppo Levi Theorem (e.g. see [2], p. 143).

Also, by Lemma[11] the function \([0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)\) is almost convex. Since the left derivative of a convex function can not exceed the right, it is necessary to test whether the almost convexity also reverses inequality [38].

It turns out, as the next proposition shows, that it seems only to impose a restriction on the difference of the derivatives.

Another important conclusion of the next proposition is that, even at the points where the left derivative is greater than the right, the function does not provide the best lower bound for \( \Phi(Q) \) by Lemma[4] (ii).

Proposition 5 Let \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \) and \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \). Suppose \( \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) > 0 \). Then

(i)
\[
\Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q) - \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q) \leq - \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} \log \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^\alpha},
\]

(ii)
\[
e^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \left( \frac{\Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q) - \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q)}{\Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^\alpha} \right)} \Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^\alpha \leq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)
\]
\[
e^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \left( \frac{\Xi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q) - \Psi^{\alpha,\alpha}_1(Q)}{\Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^\alpha} \right)} \Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^\alpha
\]
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where $W_{-1}$ and $W$ denote the lower and the principal branch of the Lambert function respectively with $W_{-1}(0):=-\infty$.

Proof. Note that, by Lemma 11 (iv), the hypothesis implies that $H^{x,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) > 0$ for all $x \in [0,1]$.

(i) Let $0 \leq \beta < \alpha < \gamma < 1$. Then, by Lemma 11 (v),

\[
\frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \log \frac{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{H^{\beta,y,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)} \leq \frac{H^{y,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) - H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{y - \alpha}.
\]

Hence, by Theorem 5,

\[
\frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \log \frac{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{\liminf_{y \to +\alpha} H^{\beta,y,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)} \leq \Psi^{\alpha,0}(Q).
\]

That is

\[
\log H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \frac{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)} \Psi^{\alpha,0}(Q) + \log \liminf_{y \to +\alpha} H^{\beta,y,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q).
\]

Now, let $0 < x < \alpha$. Then, by Lemma 11 (v),

\[
\frac{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) - H^{x,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - x} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - x} \frac{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{H^{\gamma,x,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)} \log \frac{H^{\gamma,x,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}.
\]

Therefore, by Theorem 6

\[
\Xi^{\alpha,0}(Q) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha} H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \log \frac{\liminf_{x \to -\alpha} H^{\gamma,x,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}.
\]

That is

\[
\log H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \leq \log \liminf_{x \to -\alpha} H^{\gamma,x,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) - \frac{\gamma - \alpha}{H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)} \Xi^{\alpha,0}(Q).
\]

Therefore, for $\tau := (\alpha - \beta)/(\gamma - \beta)$,

\[
\log H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \leq \frac{(\alpha - \beta)(\gamma - \alpha)}{(\gamma - \beta)H^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)} (\Psi^{\alpha,0}(Q) - \Xi^{\alpha,0}(Q)) + \log \left( \liminf_{x \to -\alpha} H^{\gamma,x,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \right) \liminf_{y \to +\alpha} H^{\beta,y,0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)^{1-\tau}.
\]
Hence,
\[ \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq e^{-(\gamma - \beta)(\gamma - \alpha)}(\Psi_{\gamma,0}^{\alpha}(Q)) \liminf_{x \to -\alpha} \mathcal{H}^{\gamma,x,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \liminf_{y \to \alpha} \mathcal{H}^{\beta,y,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)^{1-\tau}. \]

Thus setting \( \beta = 0 \) and \( \gamma = 1 \) gives
\[ \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq e^{\alpha(1-\alpha)}(\Psi_{1,0}^{\alpha}(Q) - \Xi_{1,0}^{\alpha}(Q)) \Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^{\alpha}, \]
which is equivalent to (i).

(ii) Obviously, it only needs to be proved when \( \Psi_{1,0}^{\alpha}(Q) < \Xi_{1,0}^{\alpha}(Q) \), in which case it follows the same way as Corollary 5.

5 Lower bounds for \( \Phi \) via the DDMs arising from the Hellinger integral \( J_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0) \)

Motivated by Proposition 5 (ii), we now introduce another DDM arising from the Hellinger integral which naturally suggests itself as the greatest one for the purpose of obtaining a lower bound for \( \Phi \) by means of the logic of Lemma 6 (i).

**Definition 21** Let \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \), \( Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \). Define
\[ J_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon,1}^{\alpha}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad J_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} J_{\alpha, \epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q). \]

Obviously, by (14), \( J_0(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \Phi(Q), J_1(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \Lambda(Q) \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq J_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \) for all \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \). In order to prove that the latter is also a measure, we need the following definition.

**Definition 22** Let \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1 \), \( Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \). Define
\[ N_{\alpha, \epsilon}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon,1}^{\alpha}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S_m} (\alpha Z + 1 - \alpha - Z^\alpha) d\phi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad N_\alpha(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} N_{\alpha, \epsilon}(Q). \]

Since \( Z^\alpha \leq 1 + \alpha(Z - 1) \), it follows, by Theorem 16 (ii) (Theorem 4 (ii) in the arXiv version) in [10], that \( N_\alpha \) is a \( S \)-invariant measure on \( \mathcal{B} \).
Lemma 24 (i) For every \(0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\),
\[
\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^{\alpha} \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{B}.
\]

(ii) Let \(0 < \alpha \leq 1\). Then
\[
\mathcal{N}_\alpha(Q) = \alpha \Lambda(Q) + (1 - \alpha) \Phi(Q) - \mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{B}.
\]

(iii) \(\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)\) is a finite, \(S\)-invariant measure on \(\mathcal{B}\) for all \(\alpha \in [0,1]\).

Proof. Let \(Q \in \mathcal{B}, \epsilon > 0\) and \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,1}_\epsilon(Q)\).

(i) Observe that, by (14), the same way as in Lemma 6 (i),
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \leq (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon)^{1-\alpha} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon)^\alpha.
\]
Thus the assertion follows.

(ii) Now, by (14),
\[
\mathcal{N}_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) \leq \alpha \Lambda(Q) + (1 - \alpha) (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0.
\]
Hence,
\[
\mathcal{N}_\alpha(Q) \leq \alpha \Lambda(Q) + (1 - \alpha) \Phi(Q) - \mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).
\]
On the other hand,
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} (\alpha Z + 1 - \alpha - Z^\alpha) \phi_0 \geq \alpha \Lambda(Q) + (1 - \alpha) \Phi(Q) - \mathcal{J}_{\alpha,\epsilon}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q).
\]
Thus (ii) follows.

(iii) It follows immediately from (i) and (ii).

\[\square\]

Remark 5 Observe that, by Lemma 24 (ii), \(\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)\) can be also obtained as a limit of an outer measure approximation by imposing an additional condition on the set of covers, the same way as in Lemma 22.

5.1 The regularity of \(\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)\)

Having observed an improvement of the regularity of the dependence of a DDM arising from the Hellinger integral on the parameter after the restriction of the set of covers with an additional condition (Lemma 11), one might expect a further improvement of the regularity of \(\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)\) in view of Remark 5.
5.1.1 The log-convexity of \([0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)\)

We show now that in fact, in contrast to \([0, 1] \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)\) (compare with Lemma 11 (i)), the new function has a very strong regularity property - it is logarithmically convex. (Recall that a convex function on a closed interval always has its one-sided derivatives in the interior, which are non-decreasing and can disagree only on at most countable set (which still can be dense though).)

The logarithmic almost convexity of the function \(\alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)\) can also be expressed in terms of \(J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)\).

**Lemma 25** Let \(Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)\) and \(0 \leq \beta \leq \alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\) such that \(\alpha \neq \beta\).

(i) \(J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq J_\beta (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \left\{ 1 - \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} \right\} \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\).

(ii) \(H^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq H_\beta (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \left\{ 1 - \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} \right\} \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} H_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\), and

\(H^{\alpha_0,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq H^{\beta,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \left\{ 1 - \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} \right\} \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)\).

**Proof.** Let \(\epsilon > 0\) and \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon,1}^0 (Q)\). Let \(\tau := (\alpha_0 - \beta)/(\alpha - \beta)\).

(i) By (11) and (15),

\[ \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0 \leq J_{\alpha,\epsilon} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \left\{ 1 - \tau \right\} J_{\alpha,\epsilon} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)^\tau. \]

Thus taking the supremum and letting \(\epsilon \to 0\) implies (i).

(ii) It follows the same way as (i) by (37). \(\square\)

**Remark 6** Lemma 25 clearly, suggests the following definition. A function \(f : [a, b] \to [0, \infty)\) is **logarithmically almost convex** iff there exists a logarithmically convex function \(g : [a, b] \to [0, \infty)\) with \(g(a) = f(a)\) and \(g(b) = f(b)\) such that

\[ f(\alpha_0) \leq \min \left\{ g(\beta)^\frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} f(\alpha)^\frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0}, f(\beta)^\frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} g(\alpha)^\frac{\alpha_0 - \beta}{\alpha_0} \right\} \]

for all \(a \leq \beta \leq \alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq b\) such that \(\alpha \neq \beta\). This raises many questions on properties of such functions and the relation to other notions of almost, approximate and quasi convexity appearing in literature. In particular, the open questions related to this article are the following. Suppose \(f\) is logarithmically almost convex with a corresponding logarithmically convex function \(g\). Does \(f\) always have the one-sided derivatives? Is there a relation of its non-differentiability points to those of \(g\)? Of course, clarifying them first would have been helpful, but it, probably, would lead us too far aside from our current goal.
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5.1.2 The left derivative of \((0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)\)

Now, we are going to show that the following defines the left derivative of the function (compare with the left derivative of \((0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)\), Definition 16).

**Definition 23** Let \(0 < \alpha \leq 1, Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)\) and \(\epsilon > 0\). Define

\[
F_{\epsilon}^{\alpha,0.1}(Q) := \left\{ (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon}^{0,1}(Q) \mid \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 > J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon \right\}.
\]

\[
\Theta_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F_{\epsilon}^{\alpha,0.1}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_\alpha(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Theta_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q).
\]

Despite the fact that the construction of \(\Theta_\alpha\) is new, we show now that it is still in the realm of the dynamical measure theory developed in [10].

**Definition 24** Let \(0 < \alpha \leq 1, Q \in \mathcal{P}(X)\) and \(\epsilon > 0\). Let \(F_{\epsilon}^{\alpha,0.1}(Q)\) be the set of all \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon}^{0,1}(Q)\) such that

\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} (\alpha Z + 1 - \alpha - Z^\alpha) d\phi_0 < N_\alpha(Q) + \epsilon.
\]

Define

\[
\Theta'_\alpha(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F_{\epsilon}^{\alpha,0.1}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta'_\alpha(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Theta'_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q).
\]

Then the construction of \(\Theta'_\alpha\) is a standard one in the dynamical measure theory (elaborated in Subsection 4.1.2 in [10]). Therefore, the same way as in the proof of Lemma 8 (iv) and (v), one sees that \(\Theta'_\alpha\) is a \(S\)-invariant, signed measure on \(B\) for all \(0 < \alpha < 1\). We show now that it coincides with \(\Theta_\alpha\) on \(B\).

**Lemma 26** Let \(Q \in B\).

(i) For every \(0 < \alpha < 1\),

\[
\frac{J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \Phi(Q)}{1 - \alpha} \leq \Theta_\alpha(Q) \leq \frac{\Lambda(Q) - J_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q)}{1 - \alpha}.
\]

(ii) For every \(0 < \alpha \leq 1\),

\[
\Theta_\alpha(Q) = \Theta'_\alpha(Q).
\]

(iii) \(\Theta_\alpha\) is a \(S\)-invariant, signed measure on \(B\) for all \(0 < \alpha < 1\).
Proof. Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q)$.

(i) Let $\alpha < 1$. Since $(Z^\alpha - 1)/\alpha \leq Z^\alpha \log Z \leq (Z - Z^\alpha)/(1 - \alpha)$,
\[
\mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \Phi(Q) - 2\epsilon \leq \sum_{m \leq \bar{s}_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 < \frac{\Lambda(Q) - \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + 2\epsilon}{1 - \alpha}.
\]
This implies the assertion of (i).

(ii) Let $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q)$. Then
\[
N_\alpha (Q) + \epsilon > \alpha \Lambda(Q) + (1 - \alpha) \Phi(Q) - \sum_{m \leq \bar{s}_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0.
\]
Hence, by Lemma 24 (ii), $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q)$. That is
\[
F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q) \subset F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q).
\]
Therefore,
\[
\Theta_\alpha (Q) \geq \Theta_\alpha (Q).
\]
Now, let $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q)$. Then, by Lemma 24 (ii),
\[
\sum_{m \leq \bar{s}_m} \int (\alpha Z + 1 - \alpha - Z^\alpha) d\phi_0 < \alpha (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon) + (1 - \alpha) (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon) - \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon
\]
\[= N_\alpha (Q) + 2\epsilon.
\]
Hence, $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q)$, i.e.
\[
F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q) \subset F^{\alpha, 0.1}_\epsilon (Q).
\]
Therefore,
\[
\Theta_{\alpha, \epsilon} (Q) \geq \Theta_{\alpha, 2\epsilon} (Q).
\]
Thus
\[
\Theta_\alpha (Q) \geq \Theta_\alpha (Q),
\]
which remained to prove in (ii).

(iii) It follows immediately from (ii). $\square$

The next lemma shows that $\Theta_\alpha$ is a good candidate for a derivative of $\mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)$.

**Lemma 27** Let $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\epsilon_0, \epsilon > 0$. Let $\delta_0, \delta > 0$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0, \delta_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < \mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon_0$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \delta} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < \mathcal{J}_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon$. Then
\[
(\alpha - \alpha_0) \Theta_{\alpha_0, \delta_0} (Q) - \epsilon - \delta < \mathcal{J}_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Theta_{\alpha, \delta_0} (Q) + \epsilon_0 + \delta_0.
\]
Theorem 7 Let $J \Theta$. Finally, we are only able to show that $\dashv$. Hence, taking the infimum gives the second inequality.

Lemma 2 (i) and Lemma 26 (i),

\begin{align*}
\int Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0
\leq \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon - \mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \delta.
\end{align*}

This gives the first inequality.

Let $(B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}_{\delta_0}^a(Q)$. Then

\begin{align*}
\mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \delta_0 - \mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon_0
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0
\leq \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon - \mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \delta.
\end{align*}

Hence, taking the infimum gives the second inequality.

Finally, we are only able to show that $\Theta_\alpha$ is in fact the left derivative of $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$. 

**Theorem 7** Let $Q \in B$. Then

\begin{align*}
\left. \frac{d}{d_- x} \mathcal{J}_x (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \right|_{x=\alpha} = \Theta_\alpha (Q) = \lim_{x \to -\alpha} \Theta_x (Q)
\end{align*}

for all $0 < \alpha < 1$ where $d_-/d_- x$ denotes the left derivative.

**Proof.** Let $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,1}(Q)$. By Lemma 27, Lemma 2 (i) and Lemma 20 (i),

\begin{align*}
\mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon
\leq \mathcal{J}_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Theta_{\alpha} (Q) - \epsilon
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Theta_{\alpha} (Q)
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \Theta_{\alpha} (Q) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 \right)
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\Phi(Q) + \epsilon}{\alpha_0} \right).
\end{align*}

Hence, $(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,1}(\Lambda(Q)/(1 - \alpha) + (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon)/\alpha_0 + \epsilon)$. That is

\begin{align*}
\mathcal{F}_{\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,1}(Q) \subset \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,1}(\Lambda(Q)/(1 - \alpha) + (\Phi(Q) + \epsilon)/\alpha_0 + \epsilon)(Q).
\end{align*}
Therefore, by Lemma 2 (ii) and Lemma 1,
\[ \Theta_{\alpha - \alpha_0} \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\Phi(Q) + \epsilon}{\alpha_0} \right) + \epsilon(Q) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0 \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma_{2,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q). \]

Hence,
\[ \Theta_{\alpha - \alpha_0} \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\Phi(Q) + \epsilon}{\alpha_0} \right) + \epsilon(Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma_{2,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) \leq \Theta_{\alpha_0,\epsilon}(Q) \leq \Theta_{\alpha_0}(Q). \]

Therefore, by Lemma 27,
\[ \Theta_{\alpha - \alpha_0} \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q)}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\Phi(Q) + \epsilon}{\alpha_0} \right) + \epsilon(Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Gamma_{2,\epsilon}^{\alpha_0,\alpha}(Q) \leq \Theta_{\alpha_0}(Q) \]
\[ \leq \frac{\mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \mathcal{J}_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \Theta_{\alpha}(Q). \]

Thus setting \( \epsilon := \alpha - \alpha_0 \) and letting \( \alpha_0 \to \alpha \) implies the assertion. \( \square \)

5.1.3 The right derivative of \( (0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) \)

Next, we are going to obtain the right derivative of the function, following the recipe from Subsection 4.3.10.

**Definition 25** Let \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1, Q \in \mathcal{P}(X) \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \). Define
\[ \Pi_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}^{\alpha,0,1}_\epsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0 \quad \text{and} \]
\[ \Pi_\alpha(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Pi_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q). \]

We will show that this construction is still covered by the dynamical measure theory [10] for all \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \).

**Lemma 28** Let \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) and \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \).

(i) \[ \frac{\mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) - \Phi(Q)}{\alpha} \leq \Pi_\alpha(Q) \leq \frac{\Lambda(Q) - \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{1 - \alpha}. \]

(ii) \( \Pi_\alpha \) is a \( S \)-invariant, signed measure on \( \mathcal{B} \).

**Proof.** (i) The proof is the same as that of Lemma 26 (i).

(ii) Let \( \epsilon > 0 \). Define
\[ \Omega'_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}^{\alpha,0,1}_\epsilon(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \omega_\alpha (S^m A_m) \]
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and
\[ \Omega'_\alpha(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Omega'_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q). \]

Then, as in the proof of Lemma 20(ii), \( \Omega'_\alpha \) is a finite measure on \( B \).

Now, observe that, by (42),
\[ \Omega'_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) \geq \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F^\alpha_{0,1}(Q)} \left\{ \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 \right\} \]
\[ \geq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \Lambda(Q) - \Pi_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q). \]

Hence,
\[ \Omega'_\alpha(Q) \geq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \Lambda(Q) - \Pi_\alpha(Q). \]

On the other hand, by (43),
\[ \Omega'_{\alpha,2\epsilon}(Q) \]
\[ \leq \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in F^\alpha_{0,1}(Q)} \left\{ \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(A_m) - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 \right\} \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} (\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon) - \Pi_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q). \]

This implies the converse inequality, and therefore,
\[ \Omega'_\alpha(Q) = \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)e} \Lambda(Q) - \Pi_\alpha(Q), \quad (44) \]

which implies the assertion. \( \square \)

Observe that, by (44), one can obtain \( \Pi_\alpha \) also via an outer measure approximation for all \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \), the same way as in Definition 19.

Similarly to Lemma 27, we have the following.

**Lemma 29** Let \( 0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1 \), \( Q \in B \) and \( \epsilon_0, \epsilon > 0 \). Let \( \delta_0, \delta > 0 \) such that \( J_{\alpha_0,\delta_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon_0 \) and \( J_{\alpha,\delta} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon \). Then
\[ (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Pi_{\alpha_0,\delta}(Q) - \epsilon - \delta < J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) < (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Pi_{\alpha,\delta_0}(Q) + \epsilon_0 + \delta_0. \]
Proof. Let \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}_{\delta}^{0,0.1}(Q)\). Then
\[
(\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} \log Z d\phi_0 \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0 < J_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \epsilon - J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) + \delta.
\]
Thus taking the supremum gives the first inequality.

Let \((B_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}_{\delta}^{0,0.1}(Q)\). Then
\[
J_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \delta_0 - J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon_0 
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0 \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m B_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 
\leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Pi_{\alpha, \delta_0} (Q),
\]
which is the second inequality.

And again, we are only able to show that \(\Pi_x\) is the one-sided derivative of \(J_x (\Lambda, \phi_0)\).

**Theorem 8** Let \(Q \in \mathcal{B}\) and \(0 < \alpha < 1\). Then
\[
\lim_{x \to -\alpha} \frac{d}{d_+ x} J_x (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \bigg|_{x=\alpha} = \Pi_{\alpha} (Q) = \lim_{x \to -\alpha} \Pi_x (Q) = \lim_{x \to -\alpha} \Theta_x (Q)
\]
where \(d_+/d_+ x\) denotes the right derivative. Also,
\[
\lim_{x \to -\alpha} \Pi_x (Q) = \Theta_\alpha (Q).
\]

Proof. Let \(0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha < 1\), \(\epsilon > 0\) and \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}_{\epsilon}^{0,0.1}(Q)\). Then, by Lemma 29 Lemma 2 (i) and Lemma 28 (i),
\[
J_{\alpha_0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - \epsilon 
\leq J_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Pi_{\alpha_0} (Q) - \epsilon 
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\phi_0 - (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Pi_{\alpha_0} (Q) 
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 - \Pi_{\alpha_0} (Q) \right) 
\leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^{\alpha_0} d\phi_0 + (\alpha - \alpha_0) \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\Phi(Q)}{\alpha_0} \right).
\]
Hence, \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{F}_{(\alpha - \alpha_0)((\Lambda(Q)+\epsilon)/(1-\alpha)+\Phi(Q)/\alpha_0)+\epsilon}(Q)\). Therefore, by Lemma 2 (ii) and Lemma 1
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha \log Z d\phi_0 - \Pi_{\alpha_0, (\alpha - \alpha_0)} \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \epsilon}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\Phi(Q)}{\alpha_0} \right) (Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0) \Pi_{2, \epsilon}^{\alpha_0, \alpha} (Q).
\]
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Hence,
\[ \Pi_{\alpha}(Q) \leq \Pi_{\alpha,\epsilon}(Q) \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Gamma_{2,e}^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) + \Pi_{\alpha_0,(\alpha-\alpha_0)} \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \phi(Q)}{\alpha_0} + \epsilon(Q) \right). \]

Therefore, by Lemma 29
\[ \Pi_{\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \frac{J_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) - J_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \Pi_{\alpha}(Q) \]
\[ \leq (\alpha - \alpha_0)\Gamma_{2,e}^{\alpha,\alpha}(Q) + \Pi_{\alpha_0,(\alpha-\alpha_0)} \left( \frac{\Lambda(Q) + \phi(Q)}{\alpha_0} + \epsilon(Q) \right). \]

Thus setting \( \epsilon := \alpha - \alpha_0 \) and letting \( \alpha \to \alpha_0 \) implies the first two equalities of the assertion.

Now, let us consider the behavior of the right derivative from the left and the left derivative from the right. By the definitions of \( \Theta_{\alpha_0}(Q) \) and \( \Pi_{\alpha_0}(Q) \), Lemma 27 and Lemma 29
\[ \Theta_{\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \Pi_{\alpha_0}(Q) \leq \frac{J_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) - J_{\alpha_0}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q)}{\alpha - \alpha_0} \leq \Theta_{\alpha}(Q) \leq \Pi_{\alpha}(Q). \]

Thus the remaining two equalities follow by the above and Theorem 7.  

Corollary 7 Let \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) and \( Q \in B \) such that \( \Lambda(Q) > 0 \) and \( \Pi_{\alpha}(Q) > 0 \). Then
\[ \Lambda(Q)e^{W-1(\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Pi_{\alpha}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)})} \leq J_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \leq \Lambda(Q)e^{W(\frac{-(1-\alpha)\Pi_{\alpha}(Q)}{\Lambda(Q)})} \]
where \( W \) and \( W_{-1} \) denote the principal and the lower branch of the Lambert function respectively.

Proof. The proof is the same as that of Corollary 5 (where, instead of Lemma 11 and Theorem 6, one should refer to Lemma 25 and Theorem 8).  

5.1.4 The set of non-differentiability points of \( (0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto J_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0) \)

Now, let us state the properties of the set of non-differentiability points of \( (0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto J_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \).

Definition 26 For \( Q \in B \), define
\[ J_Q := \{ \alpha \in (0,1) \mid \Theta_{\alpha}(Q) < \Pi_{\alpha}(Q) \} \]

We already know that \( J_Q \) is at most countable, since \( (0,1) \ni \alpha \mapsto J_{\alpha}(\Lambda,\phi_0)(Q) \) is convex, by Lemma 25. Analogously to Lemma 23 it has also the following properties.
Lemma 30  (i) $\mathcal{J}_Q = \emptyset$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ such that there exists $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ with $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = 0$.

(ii) $\mathcal{J}_A \subset \mathcal{J}_B$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $A \subset B$.

(iii) $\mathcal{J}_Q = \mathcal{J}_{S^{-1}Q}$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.

(iv) $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{J}_{Q_n} = \mathcal{J}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n}$ for all $(Q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{B}$.

(v) $\mathcal{J}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} S^n Q} = \mathcal{J}_Q$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 23. $\square$

Clearly, as in Remark 6, arises the question on the relation between $\mathcal{J}_Q$ and $\mathcal{H}_Q$, which we leave open here.

6  The ergodic case for $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ and $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)$

We continue the analysis of the case of an ergodic $\Lambda$ started in Subsection 4.2.2, in terms of the absolute continuity relations.

Proposition 6  Suppose $\Lambda$ is an ergodic probability measure. Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. Then the following are equivalent.

(i) $\Lambda \ll \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ on $\mathcal{B}$,

(ii) $\Lambda \ll \mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ on $\mathcal{B}$, and

(iii) $Z$ is essentially bounded with respect to $\Lambda$.

Proof. The implications (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) follow by Corollary 2 since $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \leq \mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): Suppose (iii) is false. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$ as constructed in the proof of Corollary 2. Then, by Lemma 21 (i), $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(B) = 0$, since $\Phi(B) = 0$, but this contradicts to (ii), since $\Lambda(B) = 1$. $\square$

Similarly to Corollary 3, we have the following.

Corollary 8  Suppose the hypothesis of Corollary 3 is satisfied. Let $Y_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ denote $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0}(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ or $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)$ for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Then the following are equivalent.

(i) $Z$ is essentially bounded with respect to $\Lambda$.

(ii) For every $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, $Y_\gamma(\Lambda, \phi_0)(X) > 0$ and $Y_\gamma(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)/Y_\gamma(\Lambda, \phi_0)(X) = \Lambda(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.

(iii) There exists $0 \leq \gamma < 1$ such that $Y_\gamma(\Lambda, \phi_0)(X) > 0$ and $Y_\gamma(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)/Y_\gamma(\Lambda, \phi_0)(X) = \Lambda(Q)$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$.
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Proof. We prove the case $Y_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) = H^{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$, the proof in the case $Y_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0) = J_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ is the same.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Let $0 \leq \gamma < 1$. By Corollary 2, $H^{\gamma} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (X) > 0$. The relation $H^{\gamma} (\Lambda, \phi_0) \ll \Lambda$ follows by Lemma 7 (iv). Hence, (ii) follows the same way as that of Corollary 8.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) is obvious.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) follows by the implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) of Proposition 6. \qed

7 Explicit computations

In this section, in particular, we compute the function $(0, 1) \ni \alpha \mapsto H_{\alpha} (\Lambda, \phi_0)$ explicitly in the case when $\Lambda$ has a finite ergodic decomposition. It shows, in particular, that an irregularity of the function can occur only in the case of an infinite ergodic decomposition of $\Lambda$.

Suppose $\Lambda (X) = 1$. Let $I$ be an at most countable set, $(\Lambda_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of distinct ergodic probability measures on $B$, and $(\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \subset (0, 1]$ such that

$$\Lambda (Q) = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \Lambda_i (Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in B.$$ 

For each $i \in I$, let $Z_i$ be a measurable version of the Radon-Nikodym derivative $d\Lambda_i / d\phi_0$. One easily sees that

$$Z = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i Z_i \quad \phi_0 \text{-a.e.}$$

We will need the following well-known lemma, which we give here with a proof for the purpose of completeness.

Lemma 31 Let $Q \in B$ such that $\Lambda (Q \Delta S^{-1} Q) = 0$. Then there exists $A \in A_0$ such that $\Lambda (Q \Delta A) = 0$.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(A_m^n)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{2^{-n}} (Q)$. Choose $m_n \leq 0$ such that

$$\Lambda \left( \bigcup_{m \leq 0} A_m^n \setminus \bigcup_{m_n \leq m \leq 0} A_m^n \right) < 2^{-n}.$$ 

\[77\]
Set $A_n := S^{m_n}(\bigcup_{m_n \leq m \leq 0} A^n_m)$. Obviously, $A_n \in A_0$. Also, by the hypothesis,
\[
\Lambda(Q \Delta A_n) = \Lambda(Q \setminus \bigcup_{m_n \leq m \leq 0} A^n_m) + \Lambda(\bigcup_{m_n \leq m \leq 0} A^n_m \setminus Q) \\
\leq \Lambda \left( \bigcup_{m \leq 0} A^n_m \setminus Q \right) + \Lambda \left( \bigcup_{m \leq 0} A^n_m \setminus Q \right) < 2^{-n+1}.
\]
Now, define $A := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n \geq k} A_n$. Then $A \in A_0$, and
\[
\Lambda(Q \Delta A) = \Lambda \left( \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \geq k} Q \setminus A_n \right) + \Lambda \left( \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n \geq k} Q \setminus A_n \right) \\
= \lim_{k \to \infty} \Lambda \left( \bigcup_{n \geq k} Q \setminus A_n \right) + \lim_{k \to \infty} \Lambda \left( \bigcap_{n \geq k} Q \setminus A_n \right) \\
\leq \lim_{k \to \infty} \sum_{n \geq k} 2^{-n+1} + \lim_{k \to \infty} 2^{1-k+1} = 0.
\]
In the case of an infinite $\mathcal{I}$, we will need the following definition.

**Definition 27** Define
\[
\alpha(\Lambda) := \inf \left\{ 0 < \alpha \leq 1 \mid \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i^\alpha < \infty \right\}.
\]
Obviously, $\alpha(\Lambda) = 0$ if $\mathcal{I}$ is finite (or e.g. $\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda_i = 2^{-i}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$).

Also, we would like to remind that we are using the definitions $1/\infty := 0$ and $0^0 := 1$ (i.e. $0 \log 0 := 0$).

**Theorem 9** For each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, let $M_i$ be the $\Lambda_i$-essential supremum of $Z_i$. Let $Q \in B$. Then
\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i^\alpha \left( \frac{1}{M_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda_i(Q)$ for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, and
  \item[(ii)] if $\alpha(\Lambda) < 1/2$, then $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i^\alpha \left( \frac{1}{M_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda_i(Q)$ for all $2 \alpha(\Lambda) < \alpha \leq 1$.
\end{itemize}
Proof. (i) Observe that, since \((\Lambda_i)_{i \in I}\) are mutually singular, \(Z = \lambda_i\Lambda_i\) \(\Lambda_i\)-a.e. for all \(i \in I\). Let \(0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\), \(\epsilon > 0\) and \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha(\mathcal{Q})\). Then

\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) + \epsilon > \sum_{m \leq 0} \int Z^\alpha d\phi_0
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \int \left( \frac{1}{Z} \right)^{1-\alpha} d\Lambda = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \sum_{m \leq 0} \int \left( \frac{1}{Z} \right)^{1-\alpha} d\Lambda_i
\]

\[
= \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \sum_{m \leq 0} \int \left( \frac{1}{Z} \right)^{1-\alpha} d\Lambda_i \geq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \left( \frac{1}{M_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda_i(Q). \quad (45)
\]

This implies (i).

(ii) Let \(2\alpha(\Lambda) < \alpha < 1\). Then \(\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^\alpha < \infty\). By (i), we only need to prove the inequality \('<\).

Observe that, by the mutual singularity of ergodic measures and Lemma \(31\), there exists \((\Omega_j)_{j \in I} \subset \mathcal{A}_0\) such that \(\Lambda_i(\Omega_i) = 1\) and \(\Lambda_i(\Omega_j) = 0\) for all \(i \neq j \in I\). Also, note that, since \(1 = \Lambda_i(Z_i \leq M_i) = \int_{Z_i \leq M_i} \Lambda_i d\phi_0 \leq M_i \phi_0(X)\), \(M_i \geq 1/\phi_0(X)\) for all \(i \in I\).

Let \(0 < c < 1/(1 + \phi_0(X))\). For each \(i \in I\), define

\[
\tau_i(c) := \begin{cases} M_i(1-c) & \text{if } M_i < \infty \\ \frac{1}{c} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

\(A_{i,c} := \{c < Z_i \leq \tau_i(c)\} \cap \Omega_i\) and \(B_{i,c} := \{Z_i \leq c\} \cap \Omega_i\). Also, define

\[
\psi_{\alpha,c}(A) := \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^\alpha \left( \frac{1}{c} \right)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda_i(A_{i,c} \cap A) + c^\alpha \phi_0(B_{i,c} \cap A)
\]

for all \(A \in \mathcal{A}_0\), and

\[
\Psi_{\alpha,c}(Q') := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q')} \sum_{m \leq 0} \psi_{\alpha,c}(S^m A_m) \quad \text{for all } Q' \in \mathcal{P}(X).
\]

Let \(\alpha(\Lambda) < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha/2\). Then \(\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^{\alpha_0} < \infty\), and, since \(\alpha_0 \leq \alpha - \alpha_0\), also \(\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^{\alpha_0} \alpha_{-\alpha_0} < \infty\). Define

\[
\Lambda_{\alpha_0}(Q') := \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^{\alpha_0} \Lambda_i(Q') \quad \text{for all } Q' \in \mathcal{B}.
\]

Then, obviously, \(\Lambda_{\alpha_0}\) is a finite, \(S\)-invariant measure on \(\mathcal{B}\). For \(Q' \in \mathcal{B}\) and \(\epsilon > 0\), define

\[
\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\Lambda_{\alpha_0}}(Q') := \left\{ (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q') \mid \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda_{\alpha_0}(A_m) < \Lambda_{\alpha_0}(Q') + \epsilon \right\}, \quad \text{and}
\]
\[ \psi_{\alpha, c}^\alpha (Q') := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon, \alpha}^\lambda} \sum_{m \leq 0} \psi_{\alpha, c} (S^m A_m). \]

Let \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \((A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C_{\epsilon, \alpha}^\lambda(Q)\). Let \( j \in I \). Then
\[
\Lambda_{\alpha_0}(Q) + \epsilon \geq \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda_{\alpha_0}(A_m) - \lambda_j^\alpha \sum_{m \leq 0} A_j(A_m) = \lambda_j^\alpha \sum_{m \leq 0} A_j(A_m) + \Lambda_{\alpha_0}(Q) - \lambda_j^\alpha A_j(Q).
\]

Hence,
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} A_j(A_m) < A_j(Q) + \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda_j^\alpha} \text{ for all } j \in I.
\]

Similarly to (45),
\[
\sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} Z^\alpha d\psi_0 = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^\alpha \sum_{m \leq 0} \int_{S^m A_m} \left( \frac{1}{\tau_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} d\lambda_i.
\]

Therefore,
\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^\alpha \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\tau_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda_i (S^m A_m) \right. \\
+ \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{m \leq 0} A_j (A_i \cap S^m A_m) + c^\alpha \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0 (B_{i,c} \cap S^m A_m) \right] \\
\leq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^\alpha \left( \frac{1}{\tau_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} A_i (Q) + \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda_i^\alpha} \right) + \sum_{m \leq 0} \psi_{\alpha, c} (S^m A_m) \\
\leq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^\alpha \left( \frac{1}{\tau_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} A_i (Q) + \epsilon (1 + \phi_0(X))^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^{1-\alpha_0} \\
+ \sum_{m \leq 0} \psi_{\alpha, c} (S^m A_m).
\]

Hence, since \( \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^{1-\alpha_0} < \infty \),
\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) \leq \left( \frac{1}{1 - c} \right)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i \in I, M_i < \infty} \lambda_i^\alpha \left( \frac{1}{M_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} A_j (Q) \\
+ \epsilon^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i \in I, M_i = \infty} \lambda_i^\alpha A_i (Q) + \psi_{\alpha, c}^\alpha (Q). \tag{46}
\]

Now, for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), define \( A_{n, m} := X \setminus S^{-m}(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,c} \cup B_{i,c}) \) for all \( m \leq 0 \) such that \( m \neq -n \), and \( A_{n, -n} := (X \setminus S^n(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,c} \cup B_{i,c})) \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty S^j(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,c} \cup B_{i,c}). \)
Observe that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A^n_m \in \mathcal{A}_m$ for all $m \leq 0$, and

$$
\bigcup_{m \leq 0} A^n_m = \bigcap_{i=0}^n S^i \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,c} \cup B_{i,c} \right) \cup \bigcup_{m \leq 0} X \setminus S^{-m} \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,c} \cup B_{i,c} \right) = X.
$$

Hence, $(A^n_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C(Q)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and therefore,

$$
\Psi_{\alpha,c}(Q) \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \sum_{i \in I} \lambda^\alpha_i \left( \frac{1}{e} \right)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda_i \left( A_{i,c} \cap S^m A^n_m \right) + e^\alpha \phi_0 \left( B_{i,c} \cap S^m A^n_m \right)
$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus, by the Lebesgue Monoton Convergence Theorem and the $S$-invariance of the measures,

$$
\Psi_{\alpha,c}(Q) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda^\alpha_i \left( \frac{1}{e} \right)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda_i \left( \bigcap_{j=-n}^\infty S^j \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,c} \cup B_{i,c} \right) \right) + e^\alpha \phi_0 \left( X \right).
$$

Since $\Lambda_j \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,c} \cup B_{i,c} \right) \leq \Lambda_j \left( A_{j,c} \cup B_{j,c} \right) < 1$ for all $j \in I$, it follows by the ergodicity of the measures that

$$
\Psi_{\alpha,c}(Q) \leq e^\alpha \phi_0 \left( X \right) \sum_{i \in I} \lambda^\alpha_i.
$$

Hence, by Proposition 13 (Proposition 3 in the arXiv version) in [10],

$$
\Psi^{\Lambda,\alpha}_{\alpha,c}(Q) = \Psi_{\alpha,c}(Q).
$$

Thus (ii) follows from (i), since $c$ can be chosen arbitrarily small. \qed

**Corollary 9** Suppose $\alpha(\Lambda) = 0$. Let $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Suppose $\Phi(Q) = 0$, or $(Z > 0 \phi_0 \cdot a.e.,$ and $\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \alpha \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) = 0)$.

(i) For each $i \in I$, let $M_i$ be the $\Lambda_i$-essential supremum of $Z_i$. Then

$$
\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda^\alpha_i \left( \frac{1}{M_i} \right)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda_i (Q) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1.
$$

(ii) If $\Lambda$ is ergodic, then

$$
\mathcal{H}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \mathcal{H}^{\alpha,0} (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \mathcal{J}_\alpha (\Lambda, \phi_0) (Q) = \Phi(Q)^{1-\alpha} \Lambda(Q)^\alpha
$$

for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$.

**Proof.** (i) It follows by Theorem 9 (ii) and Proposition 3.

(ii) It follows from (i), by Lemma 24 (i). \qed
Corollary 10 Suppose \( \Lambda \) is an ergodic probability measure. If the \( \Lambda \)-essential supremum of \( Z \) is infinite, then, for every \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \),
\[
K_\alpha(\Lambda|\phi_0)(Q) = \infty \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } \Lambda(Q) > 0.
\]

Proof. It follows from Theorem 1(ii) and Theorem 9(ii). \( \square \)

7.1 An example

Now, we will give an example which enables us to learn more about the dynamical measure theory.

Example 2 Consider Example 1 in the case \( N = 2 \). Let \( P \) be irreducible with the invariant probability measure \( \mu := (\mu\{1\} := \mu_1, \mu\{2\} := \mu_2) \), and \( \Lambda \) be given by
\[
\Lambda(0[i_1, ..., i_n]) := \mu\{i_1\} p_{i_1i_2} ... p_{i_{n-1}i_n}
\]
for all \( 0[i_1, ..., i_n] \subset X = \{1, 2\}^\mathbb{Z} \) and \( n \geq 0 \). Let \( \nu\{1\} := \nu_1 > 0 \) and \( \nu\{2\} := \nu_2 > 0 \) such that \( \nu_1 \neq \mu_1 \). Observe that, in this case,
\[
Z(\sigma) = \frac{\mu\sigma_0}{\nu\sigma_0} \quad \text{for } \phi_0\text{-a.e. } \sigma \in X.
\]
Let \( Q \in \mathcal{B} \) and \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \). For \( i \in \{1, 2\} \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \), define
\[
\overline{\Lambda}_i^{\alpha,1}(Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,1}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(0[i] \cap S^m A_m), \quad \overline{\Lambda}_i^{\alpha,1}(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \overline{\Lambda}_i^{\alpha,1}(Q),
\]
\[
\underline{\Lambda}_i^{\alpha,1}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,1}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda(0[i] \cap S^m A_m) \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\Lambda}_i^{\alpha,1}(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \underline{\Lambda}_i^{\alpha,1}(Q).
\]
One easily sees, by (14), that
\[
\Lambda(Q) = \overline{\Lambda}_1^{\alpha,1}(Q) + \underline{\Lambda}_2^{\alpha,1}(Q), \quad \Lambda(Q) = \underline{\Lambda}_1^{\alpha,1}(Q) + \overline{\Lambda}_2^{\alpha,1}(Q),
\]
\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \left( \frac{\nu_1}{\mu_1} \right)^{1-\alpha} \overline{\Lambda}_1^{\alpha,1}(Q) + \left( \frac{\nu_2}{\mu_2} \right)^{1-\alpha} \underline{\Lambda}_2^{\alpha,1}(Q), \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q) = \left( \frac{\nu_1}{\mu_1} \right)^{1-\alpha} \underline{\Lambda}_1^{\alpha,1}(Q) + \left( \frac{\nu_2}{\mu_2} \right)^{1-\alpha} \overline{\Lambda}_2^{\alpha,1}(Q).
\]
This implies that, for \( \alpha < 1 \),
\[
\overline{\Lambda}_1^{\alpha,1}(Q) = \frac{\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\Lambda, \phi_0)(Q)}{\left( \frac{\nu_2}{\mu_2} \right)^{1-\alpha} - \left( \frac{\nu_1}{\mu_1} \right)^{1-\alpha}}, \quad \text{and}
\]
82
Thus, by Corollary 9 (i),

\[ \Lambda_1^{-1}(Q) = \begin{cases} 
\Lambda(Q) & \text{if } \nu_1 < \mu_1 \\
0 & \text{if } \nu_1 > \mu_1 
\end{cases} \]

for all \( 0 \leq \alpha < 1 \).

This illustrates, in particular, the dependence of a DDM on the conditions which determine the set of covers in its definition (compare with Lemma 32 (below)).

We can use this example also to answer the open question whether \( \Phi \) remains the same if one takes \( \phi_0 \circ S^{-1} \) for the initial measure on \( A_0 \), instead of \( \phi_0 \), which is equivalent, in our example, to taking for the construction of \( \phi_0 \) the initial measure on \( \{1,2\} \) corresponding to the next step of the Markov process (open question (1) in [7], p. 17 (p. 22 in the arXiv version)). Let \( \Phi' \) denote \( \Phi \) with the initial measure \( \nu P \), instead of \( \nu \). (By Lemma 4 in [7], \( \Phi' \geq \Phi \).) By Corollary 9 (i),

\[ \Phi'(X) = \min \left\{ \frac{\nu_1 p_{11} + \nu_2 p_{21}}{\mu_1}, \frac{\nu_1 p_{12} + \nu_2 p_{22}}{\mu_2} \right\} \]

Suppose \( \Phi(X) = \nu_2/\mu_2 \), i.e. \( \nu_1/\mu_1 > \nu_2/\mu_2 \). A simple computation shows that

\[ \frac{\nu_1 p_{11} + \nu_2 p_{21}}{\mu_1} - \frac{\nu_2}{\mu_2} = p_{11} \left( \frac{\nu_1}{\mu_1} - \frac{\nu_2}{\mu_2} \right) \]

and

\[ \frac{\nu_1 p_{12} + \nu_2 p_{22}}{\mu_2} - \frac{\nu_2}{\mu_2} = p_{21} \left( \frac{\nu_1}{\mu_1} - \frac{\nu_2}{\mu_2} \right) . \]

Thus

\[ \Phi'(X) > \Phi(X) \]

if all entries of \( P \) are positive.

### 7.2 On the initial measure of the shifted covers

There is something else which we can learn about the dynamical measure theory at this point. One might have the temptation, in the search for a lower bound for \( \Phi \), to proceed straightforward through \( \sum_{m \leq 0} \phi_0(S^n A_m) \geq \phi_0(\bigcup_{m \leq 0} S^n A_m) \), particularly because of the well-known Chung-Erdös inequality. (In fact, it is difficult to find a partition \( (A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in C(\{0,1\})^\mathbb{Z} \) with pen and paper such that the \( \{1/2, 1/2\} \)-Bernoulli measure of the union at the right-hand side is less than \( 1/2 \).) We show now that this would not work even if \( \phi_0 \) is a Bernoulli measure. Consider the following set functions.
Definition 28 Let $C \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define

$$
\Lambda_{C,\epsilon}(Q) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_1} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda (C \cap S^m A_m), \quad \Lambda_C(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Lambda_{C,\epsilon}(Q),
$$

$$
\overline{\Lambda}_{C,\epsilon}(Q) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_1} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda (C \cap S^m A_m) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Lambda}_C(Q) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \overline{\Lambda}_{C,\epsilon}(Q).
$$

One easily sees that, for every $C \in \mathcal{A}_0$,

$$
\Lambda(Q) = \overline{\Lambda}_C(Q) + \Delta_{X \setminus C}(Q) \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (47)
$$

Also, they have the following property.

Lemma 32 Suppose $\Lambda$ is an ergodic probability measure. Let $C \in \mathcal{A}_0$ such that $0 < \Lambda(C) < 1$. Then, for every $Q \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\Delta_C(Q) &= 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Lambda}_C(Q) = \Lambda(Q).
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. Let $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Observe that, by Proposition 13 (Proposition 3 in the arXiv version) in [10],

$$
\Lambda_C(Q) = \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q)} \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda (C \cap S^m A_m).
$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define $E_{-k} := \bigcap_{i=0}^k S^i C$, $A^k_m := X \setminus S^{-m} C$ for all $m \leq 0$ such that $m \neq -k$, and $A^k_{-k} := E_{-k} \cup (X \setminus S^k C)$. Then, as in the proof of Theorem 9 (ii), $(A^k_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and therefore,

$$
\Delta_C(Q) \leq \sum_{m \leq 0} \Lambda (C \cap S^m A^k_m) = \Lambda (S^{-k} E_{-k}) \leq \Lambda \left( \bigcap_{i=\lceil k/2 \rceil}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} S^i C \right)
$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ where $[k/2]$ denotes the integer such that $k/2 - 1 < [k/2] \leq k/2$. Hence,

$$
\Delta_C(Q) \leq \Lambda \left( \bigcap_{i=\lceil k/2 \rceil}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} S^i C \right).
$$

Since $\Lambda(C) < 1$, it follows by the ergodicity of $\Lambda$, as in the proof of Theorem 9 (ii), that

$$
\Delta_C(Q) = 0.
$$

Replacing $C$ with $X \setminus C$ implies that also $\Delta_{X \setminus C}(Q) = 0$. Thus (47) gives the second equality. \hfill \Box

As a consequence of Lemma 32 we obtain the following.
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Proposition 7 Suppose $\Lambda$ is a non-atomic, ergodic probability measure. Then

$$\inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}(X)} \Lambda \left( \bigcup_{m \leq 0} S^m A_m \right) = 0.$$ 

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $C \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Define

$$\Delta_{C,\epsilon}(X) := \inf_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_1^*(X)} \Lambda \left( C \cap \bigcup_{m \leq 0} S^m A_m \right), \quad \Delta_C(X) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Delta_{C,\epsilon}(X),$$

$$\Lambda_{C,\epsilon}(X) := \sup_{(A_m)_{m \leq 0} \in \mathcal{C}_1^*(X)} \Lambda \left( C \cap \bigcup_{m \leq 0} S^m A_m \right), \quad \Lambda_C(X) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \Lambda_{C,\epsilon}(X).$$

Then, obviously,

$$\Delta_C(X) \leq \Lambda_C(X), \quad \Lambda_C(X) \leq \Lambda(C).$$

Also, one readily sees that

$$\Lambda_C(X) \leq \Delta_{C \setminus C}(X) + \Lambda_C(X).$$

Then, by Lemma 32 for every $C \in \mathcal{A}_0$ such that $0 < \Lambda(C) < 1$,

$$\Delta_C(X) \leq \Lambda(C).$$

Thus, since $\Lambda$ is non-atomic, $\Lambda_C(X) = 0$, which implies the assertion. □
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