SPECTRAL GAP AND QUANTITATIVE STATISTICAL STABILITY FOR SYSTEMS WITH CONTRACTING FIBERS AND LORENZ-LIKE MAPS.
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Abstract. We consider transformations preserving a contracting foliation, such that the associated quotient map satisfies a Lasota-Yorke inequality. We prove that the associated transfer operator, acting on suitable normed spaces, has a spectral gap (on which we have quantitative estimation).

As an application we consider Lorenz-like two dimensional maps (piecewise hyperbolic with unbounded contraction and expansion rate): we prove that those systems have a spectral gap and we show a quantitative estimate for their statistical stability. Under deterministic perturbations of the system of size $\delta$, the physical measure varies continuously, with a modulus of continuity $O(\delta \log \delta)$, which is asymptotically optimal for this kind of piecewise smooth maps.

1. Introduction

The study of the behaviour of the transfer operator restricted to a suitable functional space has proven to be a powerful tool for the understanding of the statistical properties of a dynamical system. This approach gave first results in the study of the dynamics of piecewise expanding maps where the involved spaces are made of regular, absolutely continuous measures (see [6], [24], [30], [15] for some introductory text). In recent years the approach was extended to piecewise hyperbolic systems by the use of suitable anisotropic norms (the expanding and contracting directions are managed differently), leading to suitable distribution spaces on which the transfer operator has good spectral properties (see e.g. [8], [7], [11], [19]). From these properties, several limit theorems or stability statements can be deduced. This approach has proven to be successful in non-trivial classes of systems like geodesic flows (see [24], [10]) or billiard maps (ess e.g. [13] [14] where a relatively simple and unified approach to many limit and perturbative results is given for the Lorentz gas). We remark that in these approaches, usually some condition of boundedness of the derivatives or transversality between the map’s singular set and the contracting directions is supposed.
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In this work, we consider skew product maps preserving an uniformly contracting foliation. We show how it is possible, in a simple way, to define suitable spaces of signed measures (with an anisotropic norm) such that, under small regularity assumptions, the transfer operator associated to the dynamics has a spectral gap (in the sense given in Theorem 6.1). This shows an exponential convergence to 0 in a certain norm for the iteration of a large class of zero average measures by the transfer operator. We remark that in this approach the speed of this convergence can be quantitatively estimated, and depends on the rate of contraction of the stable foliation, the coefficients of the Lasota-Yorke inequality and the rate of convergence to equilibrium of the induced quotient map (see Remark 6.3). We also remark that in our approach we can deal with maps having $C^{1+\alpha}$ regularity, having unbounded derivatives, and where the singular set is parallel to the contracting direction, as it happens in the Lorenz-like maps we consider in Section 7. These results allows to obtain in the second part of the paper a quantitative statistical stability estimate for deterministic perturbations of the system. This result applies to deterministic perturbations of skew product maps with a piecewise expanding map on the base with $C^2$ branches and contracting behaviour on the fibers. Essentially the main theorem of the section states (see Theorem 8.3) that the physical measure of the system varies with a modulus of continuity of the type $\delta \log(\delta)$ under perturbations of size $\delta$ (see Section 8 for precise statements and definitions) in a strong topology determined by a certain anisotropic space of signed measures which will be described below. We remark that this bound is asymptotically optimal (see Remark 8.4).

The function spaces we consider are defined by disintegrating signed measures on the phase space along the contracting foliation. The signed measure itself is then seen as a family of measures on the contracting leaves. We can then consider some notion of regularity for this family to define suitable spaces of more or less “regular” measures where to apply our transfer operator. To give an idea of these function spaces (see section 3), in the case of skew product maps of the unit square $I \times I$ to itself, the disintegration gives rise to a one dimensional family (a path) of measures defined on the contracting leaves, each leaf is isomorphic to the unit interval $I$, hence a measure on $I \times I$ is seen as a path of measures on $I$: a path in a metric space. The function spaces are defined by suitable notions of regularity for these paths. In the case $I \times I$ for example, the spaces which arise are included in $L^1(I,Lip(I)^\prime)$ (the space of $L^1$ functions from the interval to the dual of the space of Lipschitz functions on the interval), imposing some kind of further regularity. We remark that this is a space of distribution valued functions. For simplicity we will only use normed vector spaces of signed measures in this paper, we do not need to consider the completion of the space of signed measure, which would lead to distribution spaces. Similar strong a weak function spaces have been used in [16] to investigate quantitatively the statistical stability of slowly mixing toral extensions.

Plan of the paper. The paper is structured as follows:
• in Section 2 we introduce the kind of systems we consider in the paper. Essentially, these are skew product maps, with a base map satisfying a Lasota-Yorke inequality with respect to suitable spaces (piecewise expanding maps etc.) and the fibers are contracted;
• in Section 3 we introduce the functional spaces used in the paper and discussed in the previous paragraphs;
• in Section 4 we show the basic properties of the transfer operator when applied to these spaces. In particular we see that there is an useful “Perron-Frobenius”-like formula (see Proposition 4.2).
• In Section 5 we see the basic properties of the iteration of the transfer operator on the spaces we consider. In particular we see Lasota-Yorke inequalities and a convergence to equilibrium statement (see Propositions 5.3 and 5.7).
• In Section 6 we use the convergence to equilibrium and the Lasota-Yorke inequalities to prove the spectral gap for the transfer operator associated to the system restricted to a suitable strong space (see Theorems 6.1 and 6.2).
• In Section 7 we present an application of our construction, showing a spectral gap for 2-dimensional Lorenz-like maps (piecewise $C^{1+\alpha}$ hyperbolic maps with unbounded expansion and contraction rates).
• In Section 8 we consider similar systems with some more regularity. We apply our construction to a class of piecewise $C^2$, two-dimensional Lorenz-like maps. We prove stronger (bounded variation like) regularity results for the iteration of probability measures on that systems, and use this to prove a quantitative statistical stability statement with respect to deterministic perturbations: we establish a modulus of continuity $\delta \log \delta$ for the stability of the physical measure in weak space ($L^1(I, \text{Lip}(I))$) after a “size $\delta$” perturbation (see Theorem 8.3). We remark that qualitative statements, for classes of similar maps were shown in [1] and very recently in [5].
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2. Contracting Fiber Maps

In this section we introduce the kind of systems we are considering in this paper and show some of its basic properties. Consider $\Sigma = N_1 \times N_2$, where $N_1$ and $N_2$ are compact and finite dimensional Riemannian manifolds such that $\text{diam}(N_2) = 1$, where $\text{diam}(N_2)$ denotes the diameter of $N_2$ with respect to its Riemannian metric, $d_2$. This is not restrictive but will avoid some multiplicative constants. Denote by $m_1$ and $m_2$ the Lebesgue measures
on \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) respectively, generated by their corresponding Riemannian volumes, normalized so that \(m_1(N_1) = m_2(N_2) = 1\) and \(m = m_1 \times m_2\). Consider a map \(F : (\Sigma, m) \rightarrow (\Sigma, m)\),
\[
F(x, y) = (T(x), G(x, y)),
\]
where \(T : N_1 \rightarrow N_1\) and \(G : \Sigma \rightarrow N_2\) are measurable maps. Suppose that these maps satisfy the following conditions

2.0.1. Properties of \(G\).

\textbf{G1:} Consider the \(F\)-invariant foliation
\[
F^s := \{\{x\} \times N_2\}_{x \in N_1}.
\]
We suppose that \(F^s\) is contracted: there exists \(0 < \alpha < 1\) such that for all \(x \in N_1\) it holds
\[
d_2(G(x, y_1), G(x, y_2)) \leq \alpha d_2(y_1, y_2), \text{ for all } y_1, y_2 \in N_2.
\]

2.0.2. Properties of \(T\) and of its associated transfer operator. Suppose that:

\textbf{T1:} \(T\) is non-singular with respect to \(m_1\) \((m_1(A) = 0 \Rightarrow m_1(T^{-1}(A)) = 0)\);

\textbf{T2:} There exists a disjoint collection of open sets \(\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \cdots, P_q\}\) of \(N_1\), such that \(m_1(\bigcup_{i=1}^q P_i) = 1\) and \(T_i := T|_{P_i}\) is a diffeomorphism \(T_i : P_i \rightarrow T_i(P_i) \subseteq N_1\), with \(\det DT_i(x) \neq 0\) for all \(x \in P_i\) and for all \(i\), where \(DT_i\) is the Jacobian matrix of \(T_i\) with respect to the Riemannian metric of \(N_1\);

\textbf{T3:} Let us consider the Perron-Frobenius Operator associated to \(T\), \(P_T\). We will now make some assumptions on the existence of a suitable functional analytic setting adapted to \(P_T\). Let us hence denote the \(L^1_{m_1}\) norm\(^1\) by \(|\cdot|_1\) and suppose that there exists a Banach space \((S_*, |\cdot|_s)\) such that

\textbf{T3.1:} \(S_* \subset L^1_{m_1}\) is \(P_T\)-invariant, \(|\cdot|_1 \leq |\cdot|_s\) and \(P_T : S_* \rightarrow S_*\) is bounded;

\textbf{T3.2:} The unit ball of \((S_*|\cdot|_s)\) is relatively compact in \((L^1_{m_1}, |\cdot|_1)\);

\textbf{T3.3:} (Lasota-Yorke inequality) There exists \(k \in \mathbb{N}, 0 < \beta_0 < 1\) and \(C > 0\) such that, for all \(f \in S_*\), it holds
\[
|P_T^k f|_s \leq \beta_0 |f|_s + C |f|_1;
\]

\(^1\)The unique operator \(P_T : L^1_{m_1} \rightarrow L^1_{m_1}\) such that
\[
\forall \phi \in L^1_{m_1} \text{ and } \forall \psi \in L^\infty \int \psi \cdot P_T(\phi) \, dm_1 = \int (\psi \circ T) \cdot \phi \, dm_1.
\]

\(^2\)Notation: In the following we use \(|\cdot|\) to indicate the usual absolute value or norms for signed measures on the basis space \(N_1\). We will use \(||\cdot||\) for norms defined for signed measures on \(\Sigma\).
**Theorem 2.1.** If $T$ satisfy T3.1, ..., T3.4 then there exist $0 < r < 1$ and $D > 0$ such that for all $\phi \in S$ with $\int \phi \, dm = 0$ and for all $n \geq 0$, it holds

$$|P^n_T(\phi)|_s \leq Dr^n|\phi|_s.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

In order to obtain spectral gap on $L^\infty$ like spaces, the following additional property on $|\cdot|_s$ will be supposed at some point in the paper.

**N1:** There is $H_N \geq 0$ such that $|\cdot|_\infty \leq H_N |\cdot|_s$ (where $|\cdot|_\infty$ is the usual $L^\infty$ norm on $N_1$).

The following is a standard consequence of item T3.3, allowing to estimate the behaviour of any given power of the transfer operator.

**Corollary 2.2.** There exist constants $B_3 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$ and $0 < \beta_2 < 1$, such that for all $f \in S$, and all $n \geq 1$, it holds

$$|P^n_T f|_s \leq B_3\beta_2^n|f|_s + C_2|f|_1.$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)

**Proof.** The proof is a simple computation. Iterating the inequality (4) and since $|P_T(h)|_1 \leq |h|_1$, for all $h \in L^1$, we have

$$|P^{nk}_T f|_s \leq \beta_0^n|f|_s + \frac{C}{1-\beta_0}|f|_1,$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)

for all $f \in S$ and for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. For a given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $n = q_nk + r_n$, where $0 \leq r_n \leq k$. Since $P_T : S \to S$ is bounded, there exists $M_1 > 0$ such that $|P^n_T f|_s \leq M_1$ for all $n$, where $|P^n_T f|_s = \sup_{f \in S, f \neq 0} \frac{|P^n_T(f)|_s}{|f|_s}$. Thus, we have

$$|P^n_T f|_s = |P^{q_nk+r_n}_T f|_s = |P^{q_nk}_T (P^{r_n}_T f)|_s \leq \beta_0^{q_n} |P^{r_n}_T f|_s + \frac{C}{1-\beta_0}|f|_1 \leq \beta_0^{q_n} M_1 |f|_s + \frac{C}{1-\beta_0}|f|_1 \leq \beta_0^{q_n} M_1 |f|_s + \frac{C}{1-\beta_0}|f|_1 \leq \left(\beta_0^\frac{1}{\beta_0}\right)^n \frac{M_1}{\beta_0^n} |f|_s + \frac{C}{1-\beta_0}|f|_1,$$

and the proof is done by setting

---

3This assumption ensures that from our point of view the system is indecomposable. For piecewise expanding maps e.g., the assumption follows from topological mixing.
\[
B_3 = \frac{M_1}{\beta_0}, \quad \beta_2 = \frac{1}{\beta_0} \text{ and } C_2 = \frac{C}{1 - \beta_0},
\]  
(8)

3. Weak and strong spaces

3.1. \(L^1\)-like spaces. Through this section we construct some function spaces which are suitable for the systems defined in section 2. The idea is to define spaces of signed measures, where the norms are provided by disintegrating measures along the stable foliation. Thus, a signed measure will be seen as a family of measures on each leaf. For instance, a measure on the square with a vertical foliation will be seen as a one parameter family (a path) of measures on the interval (a stable leaf), where this identification will be done by means of the Rokhlin’s Disintegration Theorem. Finally, in the vertical direction (on the leaves), we will consider a norm which is the dual of the Lipschitz norm and in the “horizontal” direction we will consider essentially the \(L^1_{\text{m}}\) norm.

Rokhlin’s Disintegration Theorem. Now we present a brief recall about disintegration of measures.

Consider a probability space \((\Sigma, \mathcal{B}, \mu)\) and a partition \(\Gamma\) of \(\Sigma\) by measurable sets \(\gamma \in \mathcal{B}\). Denote by \(\pi: \Sigma \to \Gamma\) the projection that associates to each point \(x \in \Sigma\) the element \(\gamma_x\) of \(\Gamma\) which contains \(x\), i.e. \(\pi(x) = \gamma_x\). Let \(\mathcal{B}\) be the \(\sigma\)-algebra of \(\Gamma\) provided by \(\pi\). Precisely, a subset \(Q \subset \Gamma\) is measurable if, and only if, \(\pi^{-1}(Q) \in \mathcal{B}\). We define the quotient measure \(\mu_x\) on \(\Gamma\) by \(\mu_x(Q) = \mu(\pi^{-1}(Q))\).

The proof of the following theorem can be found in [26], Theorem 5.1.11.

**Theorem 3.1.** (Rokhlin’s Disintegration Theorem) Suppose that \(\Sigma\) is a complete and separable metric space, \(\Gamma\) is a measurable partition\(^4\) of \(\Sigma\) and \(\mu\) is a probability on \(\Sigma\). Then, \(\mu\) admits a disintegration relative to \(\Gamma\), i.e. a family \(\{\mu_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}\) of probabilities on \(\Sigma\) and a quotient measure \(\mu_x = \pi^*\mu\) such that:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(a)] \(\mu_\gamma(\gamma) = 1\) for \(\mu_x\)-a.e. \(\gamma \in \Gamma\);
  \item[(b)] the function \(\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}\), defined by \(\gamma \mapsto \mu_\gamma(E)\) is measurable;
  \item[(c)] for all measurable set \(E \subset \Sigma\), it holds \(\mu(E) = \int \mu_\gamma(E) d\mu_x(\gamma)\).
\end{enumerate}

The proof of the following lemma can be found in [26], proposition 5.1.7.

**Lemma 3.2.** Suppose the \(\sigma\)-algebra \(\mathcal{B}\), of \(\Sigma\), has a countable generator. If \((\{\mu_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}, \mu_x)\) and \((\{\mu'_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}, \mu'_x)\) are disintegrations of the measure \(\mu\) relative to \(\Gamma\), then \(\mu_\gamma = \mu'_\gamma\), \(\mu_x\)-almost every \(\gamma \in \Gamma\).

---

\(^4\)We say that a partition \(\Gamma\) is measurable if there exists a full measure set \(M_0 \subset \Sigma\) s.t. restricted to \(M_0\), \(\Gamma = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \Gamma_n\), for some increasing sequence \(\Gamma_1 \prec \Gamma_2 \prec \cdots \prec \Gamma_n \prec \cdots\) of countable partitions of \(\Sigma\). Furthermore, \(\Gamma_1 \prec \Gamma_{i+1}\) means that each element of \(\mathcal{P}_{i+1}\) is a subset of some element of \(\Gamma_1\).
3.1.1. The $\mathcal{L}^1$ and $S^1$ spaces. Let $SB(\Sigma)$ be the space of Borel signed measures on $\Sigma$. Given $\mu \in SB(\Sigma)$ denote by $\mu^+$ and $\mu^-$ the positive and the negative parts of its Jordan decomposition, $\mu = \mu^+ - \mu^-$ (see remark 3.1.1). Denote by $AB$ the set of signed measures $\mu \in SB(\Sigma)$ such that its associated positive and negative marginal measures, $\pi_x^\gamma \mu^+$ and $\pi_x^\gamma \mu^-$ are absolutely continuous with respect to the volume measure $m_1$, i.e.

$$AB = \{ \mu \in SB(\Sigma) : \pi_x^\gamma \mu^+ \ll m_1 \text { and } \pi_x^\gamma \mu^- \ll m_1 \},$$

where $\pi_x : \Sigma \to N_1$ is the projection defined by $\pi(x, y) = x$.

Given a probability measure $\mu \in AB$ on $\Sigma$, theorem 3.1 describes a disintegration $\{\{\mu_x^\gamma\}_\gamma, \mu_x\}$ along $\mathcal{F}^s$ (see equation (2)) by a family $\{\mu_x^\gamma\}_\gamma$ of probability measures on the stable leaves and, since $\mu \in AB$, $\mu_x^\gamma$ can be identified with a non negative marginal density $\phi_x : N_1 \to \mathbb{R}$, defined almost everywhere, with $|\phi_x|_1 = 1$. For a positive measure $\mu \in AB$ we define its disintegration by disintegrating the normalization of $\mu$. In this case, it holds $|\phi_x|_1 = m(\Sigma)$.

**Definition 3.3.** Let $\pi_y : \Sigma \to N_2$ be the projection defined by $\pi_y(x, y) = y$. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s$, let us consider $\pi_{\gamma, y} : \gamma \to N_2$, the restriction of the map $\pi_y : \Sigma \to N_2$ to the vertical leaf $\gamma$. Given a positive measure $\mu \in AB$ and its disintegration along the stable leaves $\mathcal{F}^s$, $\{\{\mu_x^\gamma\}_\gamma, \mu_x = \phi_x m_1\}$, we define the restriction of $\mu$ on $\gamma$ and denote it by $\mu|_\gamma$ as the positive measure on $N_2$ (not on the leaf $\gamma$) defined, for all measurable set $A \subset N_2$, as

$$\mu|_\gamma(A) = \pi_x^\gamma(\phi_x(\gamma)\mu_x)(A).$$

For a given signed measure $\mu \in AB$ and its Jordan decomposition $\mu = \mu^+ - \mu^-$, define the restriction of $\mu$ on $\gamma$ by

$$\mu|_\gamma = \mu^+|_\gamma - \mu^-|_\gamma. \quad (11)$$

**Remark 3.4.** As we will prove in Corollary 10.7 the restriction $\mu|_\gamma$ does not depend on the decomposition. Precisely, if $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$, where $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are any positive measures, then $\mu|_\gamma = \mu_1|_\gamma - \mu_2|_\gamma$ m1-a.e. $\gamma \in N_1$.

Let $(X, d)$ be a compact metric space, $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function and let $L(g)$ be its best Lipschitz constant, i.e.

$$L(g) = \sup_{x,y \in X} \left\{ \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|}{d(x, y)} \right\}.$$ 

5By lemma 3.2 the disintegration of a measure $\mu$ is the $\mu_x$-unique ($\mu_x = \phi_x m_1$) measurable family $\{\{\mu_x^\gamma\}_\gamma, \phi_x m_1\}$ such that, for every measurable set $E \subset \Sigma$ it holds

$$\mu(E) = \int_{N_1} \mu_x^\gamma (E \cap \gamma) d(\phi_x m_1)(\gamma). \quad (10)$$

We also remark that, in our context, $\Gamma$ and $\pi$ of theorem 3.1 are respectively equal to $\mathcal{F}^s$ and $\pi_x$, defined by $\pi(x, y) = x$, where $x \in N_1$ and $y \in N_2$.

6In the following to simplify notations, when no confusion is possible we will indicate the generic leaf or its coordinate with $\gamma$. 

\footnotetext[5]{By lemma 3.2 the disintegration of a measure $\mu$ is the $\mu_x$-unique ($\mu_x = \phi_x m_1$) measurable family $\{\{\mu_x^\gamma\}_\gamma, \phi_x m_1\}$ such that, for every measurable set $E \subset \Sigma$ it holds

$$\mu(E) = \int_{N_1} \mu_x^\gamma (E \cap \gamma) d(\phi_x m_1)(\gamma). \quad (10)$$

We also remark that, in our context, $\Gamma$ and $\pi$ of theorem 3.1 are respectively equal to $\mathcal{F}^s$ and $\pi_x$, defined by $\pi(x, y) = x$, where $x \in N_1$ and $y \in N_2$.}
Definition 3.5. Given two signed measures $\mu$ and $\nu$ on $X$, we define a Wasserstein-Kantorovich Like distance between $\mu$ and $\nu$ by

$$W_1^0(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{L(g) \leq 1, ||g||_\infty \leq 1} \left| \int gd\mu - \int gd\nu \right|.$$  \hfill (12)

From now, we denote

$$||\mu||_W := W_1^0(0, \mu).$$  \hfill (13)

As a matter of fact, $|| \cdot ||_W$ defines a norm on the vector space of signed measures defined on a compact metric space. We remark that this norm is equivalent to the dual of the Lipschitz norm.

Definition 3.6. Let $L^1 \subseteq AB$ be defined as

$$L^1 = \left\{ \mu \in AB : \int_{N_1} W_1^0(\mu^+_\gamma, \mu^-|\gamma)dm_1(\gamma) < \infty \right\}$$  \hfill (14)

and define a norm on it, $|| \cdot ||_1 : L^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by

$$||\mu||_1 = \int_{N_1} W_1^0(\mu^+_\gamma, \mu^-|\gamma)dm_1(\gamma).$$  \hfill (15)

Now, we define the following set of signed measures on $\Sigma$,

$$S^1 = \{ \mu \in L^1 ; \phi_\mu \in S \}.$$  \hfill (16)

Consider the function $|| \cdot ||_{S^1} : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$||\mu||_{S^1} = ||\phi_\mu||_s + ||\mu||_1,$$  \hfill (17)

where we denote $\phi_\mu = \phi_\mu^+ - \phi_\mu^-$ with $\phi_\mu^{\pm}$ being the marginals of $\mu^{\pm}$ as explained before. Moreover, $\phi_\mu$ is the marginal density of the disintegration of $\mu$ and we remark that $\phi_\mu^+$ is not necessarily equal to the positive part of $\phi_\mu$.

The proof of the next proposition is straightforward. Details can be found in [25].

Proposition 3.7. $(L^1, || \cdot ||_1)$ and $(S^1, || \cdot ||_{S^1})$ are normed vector spaces.

3.2. $L^\infty$ like spaces.

Definition 3.8. Let $L^\infty \subseteq AB(\Sigma)$ be defined as

$$L^\infty = \{ \mu \in AB : \text{ess sup}(W_1^0(\mu^+_\gamma, \mu^-|\gamma)) < \infty \},$$  \hfill (18)

where the essential supremum is taken over $N_1$ with respect to $m_1$. Define the function $|| \cdot ||_\infty : L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$||\mu||_\infty = \text{ess sup}(W_1^0(\mu^+_\gamma, \mu^-|\gamma)).$$  \hfill (19)
Lemma 4.1. For all probability \((F, \mu)\) and \(\gamma\) for each signed measure \((F, \mu)\) for one-dimensional maps. A kind of Perron-Frobenius formula, which is somewhat similar to the one used defined in Section 3. For such transfer operators and measures we prove a structure maps as defined in Section 2, acting on our disintegrated measures spaces.

Proposition 3.9. \((L^\infty, || \cdot ||_\infty)\) and \((S^\infty, || \cdot ||_{S^\infty})\) are normed vector spaces.

4. THE TRANSFER OPERATOR ASSOCIATED TO \(F\)

In this section we consider the transfer operator associated to skew product maps as defined in Section 2, acting on our disintegrated measures spaces defined in Section 3. For such transfer operators and measures we prove a kind of Perron-Frobenius formula, which is somewhat similar to the one used for one-dimensional maps.

Consider the transfer operator \(F^*\) associated with \(F\), defined by

\[ [F^* \mu](E) = \mu(F^{-1}(E)), \]

for each signed measure \(\mu \in SB(\Sigma)\) and for each measurable set \(E \subset \Sigma\).

Lemma 4.1. For all probability \(\mu \in AB\) disintegrated by \((\{\mu_i\}, \gamma, \phi_x)\), the disintegration \(((F^* \mu)_\gamma, (F^* \mu)_x)\) of \(F^* \mu\) is given by

\[ (F^* \mu)_x = P_T(\phi_x)m_1 \]

(22)

and

\[ (F^* \mu)_\gamma = \nu_\gamma := \frac{1}{P_T(\phi_x)(\gamma)} \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\phi_x}{| \det DT_i |} \circ T_i^{-1}(\gamma) \cdot \chi_{T_i(P_1)}(\gamma) \cdot F^* \mu_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} \]

(23)

when \(P_T(\phi_x)(\gamma) \neq 0\). Otherwise, if \(P_T(\phi_x)(\gamma) = 0\), then \(\nu_\gamma\) is the Lebesgue measure on \(\gamma\) (the expression \(\frac{\phi_x}{| \det DT_i |} \circ T_i^{-1}(\gamma) \cdot \chi_{T_i(P_1)}(\gamma) \cdot F^* \mu_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}\) is understood to be zero outside \(T_i(P_1)\) for all \(i = 1, \ldots, q\)). Here and above, \(\chi_A\) is the characteristic function of the set \(A\).

Proof. By the uniqueness of the disintegration (see Lemma 3.2) to prove Lemma 4.1 is enough to prove the following equation

\[ F^* \mu(E) = \int_{N_1} \nu_\gamma(E \cap \gamma) P_T(\phi_x)(\gamma) d\gamma, \]

(24)

for a measurable set \(E \subset \Sigma\). To do it, let us define the sets \(B_1 = \{ \gamma \in N_1; T_i^{-1}(\gamma) = \emptyset \}\), \(B_2 = \{ \gamma \in B_i^c; P_T(\phi_x)(\gamma) = 0 \}\) and \(B_3 = (B_1 \cup B_2)^c\). The following properties can be easily proven:

1. \(B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset, T_i^{-1}(B_i) \cap T_j^{-1}(B_j) = \emptyset\), for all \(1 \leq i, j \leq 3\) such that \(i \neq j\) and \(\bigcup_{i=1}^3 B_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^3 T_i^{-1}(B_i) = N_1\);
2. \( m_1(T^{-1}(B_1)) = m_1(T^{-1}(B_2)) = 0; \)

Using the change of variables \( \gamma = T_i(\beta) \) and the definition of \( \nu_\gamma \) (see [23]), we have

\[
\int_{N_1} \nu_\gamma(E \cap \gamma) P_T(\phi_x)(\gamma)d\gamma = \int_{B_3} \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\phi_x}{|\det DT_i|} \circ T_i^{-1}(\gamma) F^* \mu_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}(E) \chi_{T_i(P_i)}(\gamma) dm_1(\gamma)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^q \int_{T_i(P_i) \cap B_3} \frac{\phi_x}{|\det DT_i|} \circ T_i^{-1}(\gamma) F^* \mu_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}(E) dm_1(\gamma)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^q \int_{P_i \cap T_i^{-1}(B_3)} \phi_x(\beta) \mu_\beta(F^{-1}(E)) dm_1(\beta)
\]

\[
= \int_{T^{-1}(B_3)} \phi_x(\beta) \mu_\beta(F^{-1}(E)) dm_1(\beta)
\]

\[
= \int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^q T^{-1}(B_i)} \phi_x(\beta) \mu_\beta(F^{-1}(E)) dm_1(\beta)
\]

\[
= \int_{N_1} \mu_\beta(F^{-1}(E)) dm_1(\beta)
\]

\[
= \mu(F^{-1}(E))
\]

And the proof is done. \( \square \)

As said in Remark 3.1.1, Corollary 10.7 yields that the restriction \( \mu|_\gamma \) does not depend on the decomposition. Thus, for each \( \mu \in L^1 \), since \( F^* \mu \) can be decomposed as \( F^* \mu = F^*(\mu^+) - F^*(\mu^-) \), we can apply the above Lemma to \( F^*(\mu^+) \) and \( F^*(\mu^-) \) to get the following

**Proposition 4.2.** Let \( \gamma \in F^* \) be a stable leaf. Let us define the map \( F_\gamma : N_2 \rightarrow N_2 \) by

\[
F_\gamma = \pi_y \circ F|_\gamma \circ \pi_{\gamma,y}^{-1}.
\]

Then, for each \( \mu \in L^1 \) and for almost all \( \gamma \in N_1 \) (interpreted as the quotient space of leaves) it holds

\[
(F^* \mu)|_\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{F^*_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} \mu|_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}}{|\det DT_i \circ T_i^{-1}(\gamma)|} \chi_{T_i(P_i)}(\gamma) \text{ m}_1 \text{-a.e. } \gamma \in N_1. \tag{25}
\]

5. Basic properties of the norms and convergence to equilibrium

In this section, we show important properties of the norms and their behaviour with respect to the transfer operator. In particular, we prove that the \( L^1 \) norm is weakly contracted. We prove Lasota-Yorke like inequalities for the strong norms and exponential convergence to equilibrium statements.
All these properties will be used in next section to prove spectral gap for the transfer operator associated to the system $F: \Sigma \to \Sigma$.

**Proposition 5.1** (The weak norm is weakly contracted by $F^*$). If $\mu \in \mathcal{L}^1$ then

$$||F^* \mu||_1 \leq ||\mu||_1. \quad (26)$$

In the proof of the proposition we will use the following lemma about the behaviour of the $|| \cdot ||_W$ norm (see equation (13)) which says that a contraction cannot increase the $|| \cdot ||_W$ norm.

**Lemma 5.2.** For every $\mu \in \mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}$ and a stable leaf $\gamma \in F^s$, it holds

$$||F^\gamma_\mu||_W \leq ||\mu||_W, \quad (27)$$

where $F_\gamma : N_2 \to N_2$ is defined in Proposition 4.2. Moreover, if $\mu$ is a probability measure on $N_2$, it holds

$$||F^\gamma_\mu||_W = ||\mu||_W = 1, \quad \forall \ n \geq 1. \quad (28)$$

**Proof.** (of Lemma 5.2) Indeed, since $F_\gamma$ is an $\alpha$-contraction, if $|g|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\text{Lip}(g) \leq 1$ the same holds for $g \circ F_\gamma$. Since

$$\left| \int g \, dF^\gamma_\mu \right|_\gamma = \left| \int g(F_\gamma) \, d\mu \right|_\gamma,$$

taking the supremum over $|g|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\text{Lip}(g) \leq 1$ we finish the proof of the inequality.

In order to prove equation (28), consider a probability measure $\mu$ on $N_2$ and a Lipschitz function $g : N_2 \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $|g|_\infty \leq 1$ and $L(g) \leq 1$. Therefore, $|\int g \, d\mu| \leq |g|_\infty \leq 1$, which yields $||\mu||_W \leq 1$. Reciprocally, consider the constant function $g \equiv 1$. Then $1 = |\int g \, d\mu| \leq ||\mu||_W$. These two facts proves equation (28).

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 5.1.

**Proof.** (of Proposition 5.1)
In the following, we consider for all $i$, the change of variable $\gamma = T_i(\alpha)$. Thus, Lemma 5.2 and equation (25) yield
\[
||F^* \mu||_1 = \int_{N_1} ||(F^* \mu)|_\gamma||_W dm_1(\gamma)
\leq \sum_{i=1}^q \int_{T(P_i)} \left| \frac{F^*_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} \mu|_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}}{|\det DT_i(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))|} \right|_W dm_1(\gamma)
= \sum_{i=1}^q \int_{P_i} ||F^* \mu|_\alpha||_W dm_1(\alpha)
= \sum_{i=1}^q \int_{P_i} ||\mu|_\alpha||_W dm_1(\alpha)
= ||\mu||_1.
\]

The following proposition shows a regularizing action of the transfer operator with respect to the strong norm. Such inequalities are usually called Lasota-Yorke or Doeblin-Fortet inequality.

**Proposition 5.3** (Lasota-Yorke inequality for $S^1$). Let $F: \Sigma \to \Sigma$ be a map satisfying $T1$, $T2$ and $T3$. Then, there exist $A, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda < 1$ such that, for all $\mu \in S^1$, it holds
\[
||F^n \mu||_{S^1} \leq A\lambda^n ||\mu||_{S^1} + B_2||\mu||_1, \ \forall n \geq 1.
\]  
(29)

**Proof.** Firstly, we recall that $\phi_x$ is the marginal density of the disintegration of $\mu$. Precisely, $\phi_x = \phi_x^+ - \phi_x^-$, where $\phi_x^+ = \frac{d\pi_x^+ \mu}{dm_1}$ and $\phi_x^- = \frac{d\pi_x^- \mu}{dm_1}$.

By equation (6), Proposition 5.1 and since $|\phi_x| \leq ||\mu||_1$, we have
\[
||F^n \mu||_{S^1} = ||P^n_t \phi_x||_s + ||F^n \mu||_1
\leq B_3 \beta_2^n ||\phi_x||_s + C_2 ||\phi_x||_1 + ||\mu||_1
\leq B_3 \beta_2^n ||\mu||_{S^1} + (C_2 + 1)||\mu||_1.
\]

We finish the proof by setting $\lambda = \beta_2$, $A = B_3$ and $B_2 = C_2 + 1$.

5.1. **Convergence to equilibrium.** In general, we say that the a transfer operator $L$ has convergence to equilibrium with at least speed $\Phi$ and with respect to the norms $|| \cdot ||_s$ and $|| \cdot ||_w$, if for each $f \in V_s$ where
\[
V_s = \{ f \in B_s, f(X) = 0 \}
\]  
(30)
is the space of zero-average measures, it holds
\[
||L^n f||_w \leq \Phi(n)||f||_s,
\]  
(31)
where \( \Phi(n) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \).

In this chapter, we prove that \( F \) has exponential convergence to equilibrium. This is weaker with respect to spectral gap. However, the spectral gap follows from the above Lasota-Yorke inequality and the convergence to equilibrium. To do it, we need some preliminary lemma and the following is somewhat similar to Lemma 5.2 considering the behaviour of the \( \| \cdot \|_W \) norm after a contraction. It gives a finer estimate for zero average measures.

The following Lemma is useful to estimate the behaviour of our \( W \) norms under contractions.

**Lemma 5.4.** For all signed measures \( \mu \) on \( N_2 \) and for all \( \gamma \in F^s \), it holds

\[
\| F^*_\gamma \mu \|_W \leq \alpha \| \mu \|_W + \mu(N_2)
\]

(\( \alpha \) is the rate of contraction of \( G \), see (3)). In particular, if \( \mu(N_2) = 0 \) then

\[
\| F^*_\gamma \mu \|_W \leq \alpha \| \mu \|_W.
\]

**Proof.** If \( \text{Lip}(g) \leq 1 \) and \( \| g \|_\infty \leq 1 \), then \( g \circ F_\gamma \) is \( \alpha \)-Lipschitz. Moreover, since \( \| g \|_\infty \leq 1 \), then \( \| g \circ F_\gamma - \theta \|_\infty \leq \alpha \), for some \( \theta \leq 1 \). Indeed, let \( z \in N_2 \) be such that \( |g \circ F_\gamma(z)| \leq 1 \), set \( \theta = g \circ F_\gamma(z) \) and let \( d_2 \) be the Riemannian metric of \( N_2 \). Since \( \text{diam}(N_2) = 1 \), we have

\[
|g \circ F_\gamma(y) - \theta| \leq \alpha d_2(y, z) \leq \alpha
\]

and consequently \( \| g \circ F_\gamma - \theta \|_\infty \leq \alpha \).

This implies,

\[
\left| \int_{N_2} g d F^*_\gamma \mu \right| = \left| \int_{N_2} g \circ F_\gamma d \mu \right|
\leq \left| \int_{N_2} g \circ F_\gamma - \theta d \mu \right| + \left| \int_{N_2} \theta d \mu \right|
= \alpha \left| \int_{N_2} \frac{g \circ F_\gamma - \theta}{\alpha} d \mu \right| + \theta \| \mu(N_2) \|.
\]

And taking the supremum over \( |g|_\infty \leq 1 \) and \( \text{Lip}(g) \leq 1 \), we have \( \| F^*_\gamma \mu \|_W \leq \alpha \| \mu \|_W + \mu(N_2) \). In particular, if \( \mu(N_2) = 0 \), we get the second part. \( \square \)

Now we are ready to show a key estimate regarding the behaviour of our weak \( \| \cdot \|_1 \) norm in Lorenz-like systems, as defined at beginning of Section 2.

**Proposition 5.5.** For all signed measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{L}^1 \), it holds

\[
\| F^* \mu \|_1 \leq \alpha \| \mu \|_1 + (\alpha + 1)|\phi_x|_1.
\]

**Proof.** Consider a signed measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{L}^1 \) and its restriction on the leaf \( \gamma \), \( \mu|_\gamma = \pi^*_\gamma \mu|_\gamma \). Set \( \mathcal{P}|_\gamma = \pi^*_\gamma \mu|_\gamma \).
If $\mu$ is a positive measure then $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}$ is a probability on $N_2$ and $\mu|_{\gamma} = \phi_{x}(\gamma)\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}$. Then, the expression given by Proposition 1.2 yields

$$
\|F^* \mu\|_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T(P_i)} \left| \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^+ |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^+ (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^- |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^- (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm_1(\gamma)
$$

$$
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T(P_i)} \left| \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^+ |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^+ (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^+ |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^- (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm_1(\gamma)
$$

$$
+ \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T(P_i)} \left| \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^- |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^- (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^- |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^- (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm_1(\gamma)
$$

where

$$
I_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T(P_i)} \left| \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^+ |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^+ (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^- |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^- (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm_1(\gamma)
$$

and

$$
I_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T(P_i)} \left| \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^- |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^- (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^- |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)} \phi_{x}^- (T^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm_1(\gamma)
$$

Let us estimate $I_1$ and $I_2$.

By Lemma 5.2 and a change of variable we have

$$
I_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T(N_i)} \left| \frac{F^*_i T^{-1}(\gamma) \mu^+ |_{T^{-1}(\gamma)}}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, |\phi_{x}^+ - \phi_{x}^-| \, dm_1(\beta)
$$

$$
\leq \int_{N_1} \left| \frac{F^*_i \mu^+ |_{\beta}}{|\det DT_i \circ T^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, |\phi_{x}^+ - \phi_{x}^-| \, dm_1(\beta)
$$

$$
= \int_{N_1} |\phi_{x}^+ - \phi_{x}^-| \, dm_1(\beta)
$$

and by Lemma 5.4 we have
\[ I_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T(P_i)} \left\| F^*_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} \left( \mu^+_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} - \mu^-_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} \right) \right\|_W \left( T^{-1}_i(\gamma) \right) dm_1(\gamma) \]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{P_i} \left\| F^*_\beta \left( \mu^+_{|\beta} - \mu^-_{|\beta} \right) \right\|_W \phi^-_x(\beta) dm_1(\beta) \\
\leq \alpha \int_{N_1} \left\| \mu^+_{|\beta} - \mu^-_{|\beta} \right\|_W \phi^-_x(\beta) dm_1(\beta) \\
\leq \alpha \int_{N_1} \left\| \mu^+_{|\beta} \phi^-_x(\beta) - \mu^+_{|\beta} \phi^+_x(\beta) \right\|_W dm_1(\beta) \\
\leq \alpha \int_{N_1} \left\| \mu^+_{|\beta} \phi^-_x(\beta) - \mu^+_{|\beta} \phi^+_x(\beta) \right\|_W dm_1(\beta) + \alpha \int_{N_1} \left\| \mu^+_{|\beta} \phi^+_x(\beta) - \mu^-_{|\beta} \phi^-_x(\beta) \right\|_W dm_1(\beta) \\
= \alpha |\phi^-_x| + \alpha ||\mu||_1. \\
\]

Summing the above estimates we finish the proof.

\[\square\]

Iterating (32) we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.6.** For all signed measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{L}^1 \) it holds

\[ ||F^*n \mu||_1 \leq \alpha^n ||\mu||_1 + \overline{\alpha} ||\mu||_1, \]

where \( \overline{\alpha} = \frac{1+\alpha}{1-\alpha} \).

Let us consider the set of zero average measures in \( S^1 \) defined by

\[ \mathcal{V}_s = \{ \mu \in S^1 : \mu(\Sigma) = 0 \}. \]

Note that, for all \( \mu \in \mathcal{V}_s \) we have \( \pi^*_x \mu(N_1) = 0 \). Moreover, since \( \pi^*_x \mu = \phi_x dm_1 \) (\( \phi_x = \phi^+_x - \phi^-_x \)), we have \( \int_{N_1} \phi_x dm_1 = 0 \). This allows us to apply Theorem 2.1 in the proof of the next proposition.

**Proposition 5.7** (Exponential convergence to equilibrium). There exist \( D_2 \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( 0 < \beta_1 < 1 \) such that for every signed measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{V}_s \), it holds

\[ ||F^*n \mu||_1 \leq D_2 \beta_1^n ||\mu||_{S^1}, \]

for all \( n \geq 1 \).

**Proof.** Given \( \mu \in \mathcal{V}_s \) and denoting \( \phi_x = \phi^+_x - \phi^-_x \), it holds that \( \int \phi_x dm_1 = 0 \). Moreover, Theorem 2.1 yields \( |P^*_T(\phi_x)|_s \leq D r^n |\phi_x|_s \) for all \( n \geq 1 \), then \( |P^*_T(\phi_x)|_s \leq D r^n ||\mu||_{S^1} \) for all \( n \geq 1 \).

Let \( l \) and \( 0 \leq d \leq 1 \) be the coefficients of the division of \( n \) by \( 2 \), i.e. \( n = 2l + d \). Thus, \( l = \frac{2d}{d} \) (by Proposition 5.1) we have \( ||F^*s \mu||_1 \leq ||\mu||_1 \), for all \( s \), and \( ||\mu||_1 \leq ||\mu||_{S^1} \) and by Corollary 5.6 it holds (below, set \( \beta_1 = \max\{\sqrt{r}, \sqrt{d}\} \).
\| F^s \mu \|_1 \leq \| F^{s+l} \mu \|_1 \\
\leq \alpha l \| F^{s+l} \mu \|_1 + \alpha \frac{d(\pi_s(F^{s+l} \mu))}{d \mu} \|_1 \\
\leq \alpha l \| \mu \|_1 + \alpha |P^T(\phi_x)\|_1 \\
\leq (1 + \alpha \beta_1) \beta_1^{-1} \beta_1^l \mu \|_S^l \\
\leq D_2 \beta_1^l \mu \|_S^l ,

where \( D_2 = \frac{1 + \alpha \beta_1}{\beta_1} \).

**Remark 5.8.** We remark that the rate of convergence to equilibrium, \( \beta_1 \), for the map \( F \) found above, is directly related to the rate of contraction, \( \alpha \), of the stable foliation, and to the rate of convergence to equilibrium, \( r \), of the induced basis map \( T \) (see equation 5). More precisely, \( \beta_1 = \max\{\sqrt{\alpha}, \sqrt{r}\} \). Similarly, we have an explicit estimate for the constant \( D_2 \), provided we have an estimate for \( D \) in the basis map \( T \).

Now recall we denoted by \( \psi_x \) the unique \( T \)-invariant density in \( S_\cdot \) (see T3.4). Let \( \mu_0 \) be the \( F \)-invariant probability measure constructed from \( \psi_x \) according to the construction in [31] (subsection 7.3.4.1). By construction, \( d(\pi_s^* \mu_0)/d \mu_1 = \psi_x \in S_\cdot \). This motivates the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.9.** The unique invariant probability for the system \( F : N_1 \times N_2 \to N_1 \times N_2 \) in \( S^1 \) is \( \mu_0 \). Moreover, if \( N1 \) is satisfied, \( \mu_0 \) is the unique \( F \)-invariant probability in \( S^\infty \).

**Proof.** Let \( \mu_0 \) be the \( F \)-invariant measure such that \( \frac{d(\pi_s^* \mu_0)}{d \mu_1} = \psi_x \in S_\cdot \), where \( \psi_x \) is the unique \( T \)-invariant density (see T3.4) in \( S_\cdot \). Define the probability \( \pi_0 \|_\gamma = \pi_y \mu_0 \|_\gamma \). Since \( \| \mu_0 \|_W = 1 \) (it is a probability), we have \( \| \mu_0 \|_W = \| \psi_x \|_W \). So if \( \| \mu_0 \|_W \mu_1(\gamma) = \| \psi_x(\gamma) \| \mu_1(\gamma) = \psi_x, 1 \in \infty \). Then \( \mu_0 \in \mathcal{L}^1 \). By construction, \( \psi_x \in S \cdot \). Then \( \mu_0 \in S^1 \). And we are done.

If \( N1 \) is satisfied, we have \( | \cdot | \infty \leq | \cdot |_s \). Suppose that \( g : N_2 \to \mathbb{R} \) is a Lipschitz function such that \( |g|_\infty \leq 1 \) and \( L(g) \leq 1 \). Then, it holds \( | \int g d(\mu_0) \|_W \leq \| g \| \psi_x, \| \psi_x \| \leq \| \psi_x \|_s \). Hence, \( \mu_0 \in S^\infty \).

For the uniqueness, if \( \mu_0, \mu_1 \in S^1 \) are \( F \)-invariant probabilities, i.e. \( \mu_0(\Sigma) = \mu_1(\Sigma) = 1 \), then \( \mu_0 - \mu_1 \in \mathcal{V}_s \). By Proposition 5.7, \( F^s(\mu_0 - \mu_1) \to 0 \) in \( \mathcal{L}^1 \). Therefore, \( \mu_0 - \mu_1 = 0 \). \( \square \)

---

Footnote: It can be difficult to find a sharp estimate for \( D \). An approach allowing to find some useful upper estimates is shown in [17].
5.2. $L^\infty$ norms. In this section we consider an $L^\infty$ like anisotropic norm. We show how a Lasota Yorke inequality can be proved for this norm too.

Lemma 5.10. Under the assumptions G1, T1, ..., T3.3, for all signed measure $\mu \in S^\infty$ with marginal density $\phi_x$, it holds

$$||F^* \mu||_\infty \leq \alpha ||P_T 1||_\infty ||\mu||_\infty + ||P_T \phi_x||_\infty.$$ 

Proof. Let $T_i$ be the branches of $T$, for all $i = 1 \cdots q$. Applying Lemma 5.3 on the third line below, we have

$$||(|F^* \mu|_\gamma||_W = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} \mu_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}}{|\det DT_i(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))|} \chi_T(P_i(\gamma)) \right|_{W}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{||F^*_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)} \mu_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}||W}{{|\det DT_i(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))|}} \chi_T(P_i(\gamma))$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{\alpha ||\mu||_{T_i^{-1}(\gamma)}||W + \phi_x(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))|} \chi_T(P_i(\gamma))$$

$$\leq \alpha ||\mu||_\infty \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{\chi_T(P_i(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))|} + \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{\phi_x(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))}{|\det DT_i(T_i^{-1}(\gamma))|} \chi_T(P_i(\gamma)).$$

Hence, taking the supremum on $\gamma$, we finish the proof of the statement.

Applying the last lemma to $F^n$ instead of $F$ one obtains.

Lemma 5.11. Under the assumptions G1, T1, ..., T3.4, for all signed measure $\mu \in S^\infty$ it holds

$$||F^n \mu||_\infty \leq \alpha^n ||P^n_T 1||_\infty ||\mu||_\infty + ||P^n_T \phi_x||_\infty,$$

where $\phi_x$ is the marginal density of $\mu$.

Proposition 5.12 (Lasota-Yorke inequality for $S^\infty$). Suppose $F$ satisfies the assumptions G1, T1, ..., T3.4 and N1. Then, there are $0 < \alpha_1 < 1$ and $A_1, B_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $\mu \in S^\infty$, it holds

$$||F^n \mu||_{S^\infty} \leq A_1 \alpha_1^n ||\mu||_{S^\infty} + B_4 ||\mu||_1.$$ 

Proof. We remark that, by equation (6) and (N1) it follows $||P^n_T 1||_\infty \leq H_N(B_3 + C_2)$, for each $n$. Then,

$$||F^n \mu||_{S^\infty} = ||P^n_T \phi_x||_s + ||F^n \mu||_\infty$$

$$\leq [B_3 \beta_2^n |\phi_x|_s + C_2 |\phi_x|_1] + [\alpha^n ||P^n_T 1||_\infty ||\mu||_\infty + ||P^n_T \phi_x||_\infty]$$

$$\leq [B_3 \beta_2^n |\phi_x|_s + C_2 |\phi_x|_1] + [\alpha^n H_N(B_3 + C_2)||\mu||_{S^\infty} + H_N(B_3 \beta_2^n |\phi_x|_s + C_2 |\phi_x|_1)].$$

$$\leq \max(\alpha, \beta_2)^n [B_3(1 + 2H_N) + H_NC_2] ||\mu||_{S^\infty} + C_2(1 + H_N)||\mu||_1,$$

where $|\phi_x|_1 \leq ||\mu||_1$ and $|\phi_x|_s \leq ||\mu||_{S^\infty}$. We finish the proof, setting $\alpha_1 = \max(\alpha, \beta_2)$, $A_1 = [B_3(1 + 2H_N) + H_NC_2]$ and $B_4 = C_2(1 + H_N)$. 

$\square$
6. Spectral gap

In this section, we prove a spectral gap statement for the transfer operator applied to our strong spaces. For this, we will directly use the properties proved in the previous section, and this will give a kind of constructive proof. We remark that, we cannot apply the traditional Hennion, or Ionescu-Tulcea and Marinescu’s approach to our function spaces because there is no compact immersion of the strong space into the weak one. This comes from the fact that we are considering the same “dual of Lipschitz” distance (see Definition 3.5) in the contracting direction for both spaces.

**Theorem 6.1** (Spectral gap on \( S^1 \)). If \( F \) satisfies \( G1, T1, ..., T3.4 \) given at beginning of section 2, then the operator \( F^* : S^1 \rightarrow S^1 \) (see (16)) can be written as

\[
F^* = P + N,
\]

where

a) \( P \) is a projection i.e. \( P^2 = P \) and \( \dim \text{Im}(P) = 1 \);

b) there are \( 0 < \xi < 1 \) and \( K > 0 \) such that \( \forall \mu \in S^1 \)

\[
\|N^n(\mu)\|_{S^1} \leq \|\mu\|_{S^1} \xi^n K;
\]

c) \( PN = NP = 0 \).

**Proof.** First, let us show there exist \( 0 < \xi < 1 \) and \( K_1 > 0 \) such that, for all \( n \geq 1 \), it holds

\[
\|F^* n\|_{V_s \rightarrow V_s} \leq \xi^n K_1
\]

where \( V_s \) is the zero average space defined in (30). Indeed, consider \( \mu \in V_s \) (see (33)) s.t. \( \|\mu\|_{S^1} \leq 1 \) and for a given \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) let \( m \) and \( 0 \leq d \leq 1 \) be the coefficients of the division of \( n \) by 2, i.e. \( n = 2m + d \). Thus \( m = \frac{n - d}{2} \). By the Lasota-Yorke inequality (Proposition 5.3) we have the uniform bound \( \|F^* n\|_{S^1} \leq B_2 + A \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). Moreover, by Propositions 5.7 and 5.1 there is some \( D_2 \) such that it holds (below, let \( \lambda_0 \) be defined by \( \lambda_0 = \max\{\beta_1, \lambda\} \))

\[
\|F^* n\|_{S^1} \leq A\lambda^n \|F^{*m+d} \mu\|_{S^1} + B_2 \|F^{*m+d} \mu\|_1 \\
\leq \lambda^n A(A + B_2) + B_2 \|F^{*m} \mu\|_1 \\
\leq \lambda^n A(A + B_2) + B_2 D_2 \beta_1^n \\
\leq \lambda_0^n [A(A + B_2) + B_2D_2] \\
\leq \lambda_0^{\frac{n-d}{2}} [A(A + B_2) + B_2D_2] \\
\leq \left( \sqrt{\lambda_0} \right)^n \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_0} \right)^{\frac{d}{2}} [A(A + B_2) + B_2D_2] \\
= \xi^n K_1,
\]

\(8\) We remark that, the spectral radius of \( N \) satisfies \( \rho(N) < 1 \), where \( N \) is the extension of \( \bar{N} \) to \( \overline{S^1} \) (the completion of \( S^1 \)). This gives us spectral gap, in the usual sense, for the operator \( \bar{F} : \overline{S^1} \longrightarrow \overline{S^1} \). The same remark holds for Theorem 6.2.
where $\xi = \sqrt{\lambda_0}$ and $K_1 = \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} [A(A + B_2) + B_2 D_2]$. Thus, we arrive at
\[
\| (F^*|_{V^n})^n \|_{S^1 \to S^1} \leq \xi^n K_1. \tag{35}
\]

Now, recall that $F^*: S^1 \to S^1$ has an unique fixed point $\mu_0 \in S^1$, which is a probability (see Proposition 5.9). Consider the operator $P: S^1 \to [\mu_0]$ ($[\mu_0]$ is the space spanned by $\mu_0$), defined by $P(\mu) = \mu(\Sigma) \mu_0$. By definition, $P$ is a projection and $\dim \text{Im}(P) = 1$. Define the operator
\[ S: S^1 \to V_s, \]
by
\[ S(\mu) = \mu - P(\mu), \quad \forall \ \mu \in S^1. \]

Thus, we set $N = F^* \circ S$ and observe that, by definition, $PN = NP = 0$ and $F^* = P + N$. Moreover, $N^n(\mu) = F^{n*}(S(\mu))$ for all $n \geq 1$. Since $S$ is bounded and $S(\mu) \in V_s$, we get by (35), $\| N^n(\mu) \|_{S^1} \leq \xi^n K_1 \| \mu \|_{S^1}$, for all $n \geq 1$, where $K = K_1 \| S \|_{S^1 \to S^1}$.

In the same way, using the $L^\infty$ Lasota-Yorke inequality of Proposition 5.12, it is possible to obtain spectral gap on the $L^\infty$ like space, we omit the proof which is essentially the same as above:

**Theorem 6.2** (Spectral gap on $S^\infty$). If $F$ satisfies the assumptions $G_1$, $T_1, ..., T_3$ and $N_1$, then the operator $F^*: S^\infty \to S^\infty$ can be written as
\[ F^* = P + N, \]
where
\begin{enumerate}
  \item $P$ is a projection i.e. $P^2 = P$ and $\dim \text{Im}(P) = 1$;
  \item there are $0 < \xi_1 < 1$ and $K_2 > 0$ such that $\| N^n(\mu) \|_{S^\infty} \leq \| \mu \|_{S^\infty} \xi^n K_2$ \quad $\forall \ \mu \in S^\infty$;
  \item $PN = NP = 0$.
\end{enumerate}

**Remark 6.3.** We remark, the constant $\xi$ for the map $F$, found in Theorem 6.1, is directly related to the coefficients of the Lasota-Yorke inequality and the rate of convergence to equilibrium of $F$ found before (see Remark 5.8). More precisely, $\xi = \max\{\sqrt{\lambda}, \sqrt{\beta_1}\}$. We remark that, from the above proof we also have an explicit estimate for $K$ in the exponential convergence, while many classical approaches are not suitable for this.

7. Application to Lorenz-like maps

In this section, we apply Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 to a large class of maps which are Poincaré maps for suitable sections of Lorenz-like flows. In these systems (see e.g [4]), it can be proved that there is a two dimensional Poincaré section $\Sigma$ which can be supposed to be a rectangle $I^2$, where $I = [0, 1]$, whose return map $F_L: I^2 \to I^2$, after a suitable change of coordinates, has the form $F_L(x, y) = (T_L(x), G_L(x, y))$, satisfying the properties, $G_1$ and $T_1$-$T_3$, of section 2. The map $T_L: I \to I$, in this case, can be supposed to be piecewise expanding with $C^{1+\alpha}$ branches.
Hence, we consider a class of skew product maps $F_L : I^2 \to I^2$, where $I = [0, 1]$, satisfying (G1), (T1), (T2), and the following properties on $T_L$:

7.0.1. Properties of $T_L$ in Lorenz-like systems.

(P’1) $\frac{1}{|T_L|}$ is of universal bounded $p$-variation, i.e. for $p \geq 1$

$$\var_p \left( \frac{1}{|T_L|} \right) := \sup_{0 \leq x_0 < \ldots < x_n \leq 1} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{1}{|T_L(x_i)|} - \frac{1}{|T_L(x_{i-1})|} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty; \quad (36)$$

(P’2) $\inf |T_L^{n_0}| \geq \lambda_1 > 1$, for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$.

We remark that, the universal bounded $p$-variation, $\var_p$, is a generalization of the usual bounded variation. It is a weaker notion, allowing piecewise H"older functions. Indeed, for $p \geq 1$, a $1/p$-Holder function is of universal bounded $p$-variation. This definition is adapted to maps having $C^{1+\alpha}$ regularity.

From properties P’1 and P’2, it follows (see [20]) that there exists a suitable strong space (the space $S_-$ in T3.1) for the Perron-Frobenius operator $P_T$ associated to such a $T_L$, in a way that it satisfies the assumptions $T1, \ldots, T3.3$ and $N1$. In this case, supposing a property like $T3.4$ then we can apply our results. Therefore, let us introduce the space of generalized bounded variation functions with respect to the Lebesgue measure: $BV^{1,\frac{1}{p}}_I$.

The functions of universal bounded $p$-variation are included in this space (for more details and results see [20], in particular Lemma 2.7 for a comparison of the two spaces).

A piecewise expanding map satisfying assumptions (P’1) and (P’2) has an invariant measure with density in $BV^{1,\frac{1}{p}}_I$, moreover the transfer operator restricted to this space satisfies a Lasota-Yorke inequality and other interesting properties, as we will see in the following.

**Definition 7.1.** Let $m$ be the Lebesgue measure on $I = [0, 1]$. For an arbitrary function $h : I \to \mathbb{C}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ define $\text{osc}(h, B_\epsilon(x)) : I \to [0, \infty]$ by

$$\text{osc}(h, B_\epsilon(x)) = \text{ess sup}\{|h(y_1) - h(y_2)|; y_1, y_2 \in B_\epsilon(x)\}, \quad (37)$$

where $B_\epsilon(x)$ denotes the open ball of center $x$ and radius $\epsilon$ and the essential supremum is taken with respect to the product measure $m^2$ on $I^2$. Also define the real function $\text{osc}_1(h, \epsilon)$, on the variable $\epsilon$, by

$$\text{osc}_1(h, \epsilon) = \int \text{osc}(h, B_\epsilon(x)) dm(x).$$

**Definition 7.2.** Fix $A_1 > 0$ and denote by $\Phi$ the class of all isotonic maps $\phi : (0, A_1) \to [0, \infty]$, i.e. such that $x \leq y \implies \phi(x) \leq \phi(y)$ and $\phi(x) \to 0$ if $x \to 0$. Set

- $R_1 = \{ h : I \to \mathbb{C}; \text{osc}_1(h, \cdot) \in \Phi \}$;

- For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $R_{1,n,p} = \{ h \in R_1; \text{osc}_1(h, \epsilon) \leq n \cdot \epsilon^p \ \forall \epsilon \in (0, A_1) \}$. 

• And set \( S_{1,p} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} R_{1,n,p} \).

**Definition 7.3.** Let us consider the following spaces and semi-norms:

1. \( BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \) is the space of \( m \)-equivalence classes of functions in \( S_{1,p} \);
2. Let \( h : I \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \) be a measurable function. Set
   \[
   \text{var}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}(h) = \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon \leq A_1} \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon p} \text{osc}_{1}(h, \epsilon) \right). \tag{38}
   \]
   Since \( BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \) was defined using a probability measure, \( m \), then \( \text{var}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}(h) \leq 2^{1/p} \text{var}_p(h) \).

   Let us consider \( \cdot |_{1,\frac{1}{p}} : BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) defined by
   \[
   |f|_{1,\frac{1}{p}} = \text{var}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}(f) + |f|_1, \tag{39}
   \]
   it holds the following (see [20])

**Proposition 7.4.** \( \left( BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}}, | \cdot |_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \right) \) is a Banach space.

In the above setting, G. Keller has shown (see [20]) that there is an \( A_1 > 0 \) (we recall that definition 7.2 depends on \( A_1 \)) such that:

(a) \( BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \subset L^1 \) is \( P_T \)-invariant, \( P_T : BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \rightarrow BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \) is continuous and it holds \( \cdot |_{1} \leq \cdot |_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \);

(b) The unit ball of \( (BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}}, | \cdot |_{1,\frac{1}{p}}) \) is relatively compact in \( (L^1, | \cdot |_1) \);

(c) There exists \( k \in \mathbb{N}, 0 < \beta_0 < 1 \) and \( C > 0 \) such that
   \[
   |P_k^T f|_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \leq \beta_0 |f|_{1,\frac{1}{p}} + C |f|_1. \tag{40}
   \]

Analogously to the proof of inequality (6), we have
   \[
   |P_n^T f|_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \leq B_3 \beta_n^2 |f|_{1,\frac{1}{p}} + C_2 |f|_1, \quad \forall n, \quad \forall f \in BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{41}
   \]
   for \( B_3, C_2 > 0 \) and \( 0 < \beta_2 < 1 \).

Moreover, in [21] (Lemma 2), it was shown that

(d) \[ | \cdot |_{\infty} \leq A_1^{\frac{1}{p}-1} | \cdot |_{1,\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{42}\]

Therefore, the properties \( T1, T2, T3.1, \ldots, T3.3, N1 \) of section [2] are satisfied with \( S_{\infty} = BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \), and we can apply our construction to such maps.

Thus, for \( 1 \leq p < \infty \), we set
   \[
   BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{L}^1; \text{var}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}(\phi_x) < \infty, \text{ where } \phi_x = \frac{d\mu_x}{dm} \right\} \tag{43}
   \]
   and consider \( || \cdot ||_{1,\frac{1}{p}} : BV_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), defined by
   \[
   ||\mu||_{1,\frac{1}{p}} = |\phi_x|_{1,\frac{1}{p}} + ||\mu||_1. \tag{44}
   \]
Clearly, \( (\mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}, || \cdot ||_{1,\frac{1}{p}}) \) is a normed space. If we suppose that the system, \( T_L : I \rightarrow I \), satisfies \( T^{3.4} \), then it has an unique absolutely continuous invariant probability with density \( \varphi_x \in \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \).

As defined in equation (33), for \( 1 \leq p < \infty \), consider the set of zero average measures in \( \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \),
\[
\mathcal{V}_s = \{ \mu \in \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} : \mu(\Sigma) = 0 \}.
\] (45)

Directly from the above settings, Proposition 5.7 and from Theorem 6.1 it follows convergence to equilibrium and spectral gap for these kind of maps.

**Proposition 7.5** (Exponential convergence to equilibrium). If \( F_L \) satisfies assumptions \( G_1, T_1, T_2, T_3, 4, P'1 \) and \( P'2 \), then there exist \( D_2 > 0 \) and \( 0 < \beta_2 < 1 \) such that, for every signed measure \( \mu \in \mathcal{V}_s \subset \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \), it holds
\[
|| F^n_L \mu ||_1 \leq D_2 \beta^n_1 || \mu ||_{1,\frac{1}{p}},
\]
for all \( n \geq 1 \).

**Theorem 7.6** (Spectral gap for \( \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \)). If \( F_L \) satisfies the satisfies assumptions \( G_1, T_1, T_2, T_3, 4, P'1 \) and \( P'2 \), then the operator \( F^*_L : \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \rightarrow \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \) can be written as
\[
F^*_L = P + N
\]
where
a) \( P \) is a projection i.e. \( P^2 = P \) and \( \dim \text{Im}(P) = 1 \);

b) there are \( 0 < \xi < 1 \) and \( K > 0 \) such that for all \( \mu \in \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \)
\[
|| N^n(\mu)||_{\mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}} \leq \xi^n K || \mu ||_{\mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}};
\]

c) \( P N = N P = 0 \).

We can get the same kind of results for stronger \( L^\infty \) like norms. Let us consider
\[
\mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}^\infty := \left\{ \mu \in L^\infty ; \frac{d(\pi^*_x \mu)}{dm} \in \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}} \right\}
\] (46)
and the function, \( || \cdot ||_{1,\frac{1}{p}}^\infty : \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), defined by
\[
|| \mu ||_{1,\frac{1}{p}}^\infty = |\phi_x|_{1,\frac{1}{p}} + || \mu ||_\infty.
\] (47)

Applying Theorem 6.2 we get

**Theorem 7.7** (Spectral gap for \( \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}^\infty \)). If \( F_L \) satisfies the satisfies assumptions \( G_1, T_1, T_2, T_3, 4, P'1 \) and \( P'2 \), then the operator \( F^*_L : \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{BV}_{1,\frac{1}{p}}^\infty \) can be written as
\[
F^*_L = P + N,
\]
where
a) \( P \) is a projection i.e. \( P^2 = P \) and \( \dim \text{Im}(P) = 1 \);

b) there are \( 0 < \xi_1 < 1 \) and \( K_2 > 0 \) such that for all \( \mu \in BV_{1/p}^{\infty} \)

\[ || N^n(\mu) ||_{1/p}^\infty \leq \xi_1^n K_2 || \mu ||_{1/p}^\infty. \]

c) \( P N = N P = 0 \).

By Proposition [5.9] we immediately get

**Proposition 7.8.** The unique invariant probability for the system \( F_L \) in \( BV_{1/p}^{\infty} \) is \( \mu_0 \). Moreover, since \( N1 \) is satisfied (equation (42)), \( \mu_0 \) is the unique \( F_L \)-invariant probability in \( BV_{1/p}^{\infty} \).

# 8. Quantitative Statistical Stability

Throughout this section, we consider small perturbations of the transfer operator of a particular system of the kind described in the previous sections and study the dependence of the physical invariant measure with respect to the perturbation. A classical tool that can be applied for this type of problems is the Keller-Liverani stability theorem [21]. Since in our setting the strong space is not compactly immersed in the weak one, we cannot directly apply it. We will use another approach giving us precise bounds on the statistical stability. In this section, this approach will be applied to a class of Lorenz-like maps with slightly stronger regularity assumptions than used in Section 7. We call such a system by \( BV \) Lorenz-like map (see Definition 8.5) and precisely, we need the additional property stated in item (1) of Definition 8.5.

## 8.0.1. Uniform Family of Operators

In this subsection we present a general quantitative result relating the stability of the invariant measure of an uniform family of operators (Definition 8.1) and convergence to equilibrium.

In the following definition, for all \( \delta \in [0, 1) \), let \( L_\delta \) be a Markov operator acting on two vector subspaces of signed measures on \( X \), \( L_\delta : (B_s, || \cdot ||_s) \rightarrow (B_s, || \cdot ||_s) \) and \( L_\delta : (B_w, || \cdot ||_w) \rightarrow (B_w, || \cdot ||_w) \), endowed with two norms, the strong norm \( || \cdot ||_s \) on \( B_s \), and the weak norm \( || \cdot ||_w \) on \( B_w \), such that \( || \cdot ||_s \gtrless || \cdot ||_w \). Suppose that,

\[ B_s \subseteq B_w \subseteq SB(X), \]

where \( SB(X) \) denotes the space of Borel signed measures on \( X \).

**Definition 8.1.** A one parameter family of transfer operators \( \{ L_\delta \}_{\delta \in [0, 1)} \) is said to be an uniform family of operators with respect to the weak space \( (B_w, || \cdot ||_w) \) and the strong space \( (B_s, || \cdot ||_s) \) if \( || \cdot ||_s \gtrless || \cdot ||_w \) and it satisfies

**UF1** Let \( f_\delta \in B_s \) be a probability measure fixed under the operator \( L_\delta \).

Suppose there is \( M > 0 \) such that for all \( \delta \in [0, 1), \) it holds

\[ ||f_\delta||_s \leq M; \]
UF2 $L_\delta$ approximates $L_0$ when $\delta$ is small in the following sense: there is $C \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that:

\[ ||(L_0 - L_\delta)f||_w \leq \delta C; \]  

(48)

UF3 $L_0$ has exponential convergence to equilibrium with respect to the norms $\| \cdot \|_s$ and $\| \cdot \|_w$: there exists $0 < \rho_2 < 1$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that:

\[ \forall f \in V_s := \{ f \in B_s : f(X) = 0 \} \]

it holds

\[ \| L_0^n f \|_w \leq \rho_2^n C_2 \| f \|_s; \]

UF4 The iterates of the operators are uniformly bounded for the weak norm: there exists $M_2 > 0$ such that

\[ \forall \delta, n, g \in B_s \text{ it holds } \| L_\delta^n g \|_w \leq M_2 \| g \|_w. \]

Under these assumptions we can ensure that the invariant measure of the system varies continuously (in the weak norm) when $L_0$ is perturbed to $L_\delta$, for small values of $\delta$. Moreover, the modulus of continuity can be estimated. We postpone the proof of Proposition 8.2 to the Appendix 3 (section 11).

Proposition 8.2. Suppose $\{L_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$ is an uniform family of operators as in Definition 8.1, where $f_0$ is the unique fixed point of $L_0$ in $B_w$ and $f_\delta$ is a fixed point of $L_\delta$. Then, there exists $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ such that for all $\delta \in [0,\delta_0)$, it holds

\[ ||f_\delta - f_0||_w = O(\delta \log \delta). \]

8.1. Quantitative stability of Lorenz-like maps. In this subsection we apply the above general result on uniform family of operators (Proposition 8.2) to a suitable family of bounded variation Lorenz-like maps. We consider families of maps as defined in Section 7, with some further regularity assumptions defining uniform families of Bounded Variation Lorenz-like maps (see Definitions 8.5 and 8.9). For these families we prove that the invariant measures associated to a size $\delta$ perturbation varies continuously as the map is perturbed, with modulus of continuity $\delta \log \delta$. Precisely, the aim of this section is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 8.3 (Quantitative stability for deterministic perturbations). Let $\{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$ be an uniform BV Lorenz-like family (see definition 8.9). Denote by $f_\delta$ the fixed point of $F_\delta$ in $BV_{1,1}$ (also in $BV_{1,1}^\infty$), for all $\delta$. Then, there exists $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ such that for all $\delta \in [0,\delta_0)$, it holds

\[ ||f_\delta - f_0||_1 = O(\delta \log \delta). \]

The proof will be postponed at the end of the section. By a matter of completeness, the result is stated again (and finally proved) as Theorem 8.24.
Remark 8.4. It is well known (see [15] e.g) that the modulus of continuity $\delta \log(\delta)$ is optimal for perturbations of piecewise expanding maps (which are the basis maps of our piecewise hyperbolic system) by this, the estimate given in Theorem 8.3 is optimal too. To realize this, consider a sequence of piecewise expanding maps $T_n$ with unique a.c.i.m $\mu_n$ such that $d_{S,n}(T_n,T_0) = \delta_n$ and $|\mu_n - \mu_0|_1 \geq A\delta_n \log(\delta_n)$. Consider $F_n : I^2 \to I^2$ given by $F_n(x,y) = (T_n(x), \frac{1}{2})$ (the second component contracts everything to $\frac{1}{2}$). The sequence $F_m$ has a sequence of invariant measures $\nu_n$ of the kind $\nu_n = \mu_n \times \delta_{\frac{1}{2}}$ for which is easy to see that $||\nu_n - \nu_0||_1 \geq A\delta_n \log(\delta_n)$.

We now precise the definition of BV Lorenz-like map and BV Lorenz-like family considered in the Theorem 8.3.

Definition 8.5. A map $F_L : [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]^2$, $F_L(x,y) = (T_L(x), G_L(x,y))$, is said to be a **BV Lorenz-like map** if it satisfies

1. There are $H \geq 0$ and a partition $\mathcal{P}' = \{ J_i := [b_{i-1}, b_i), i = 1, \cdots, d \}$ of $I$ such that for all $x_1, x_2 \in J_i$ and for all $y \in I$ the following inequality holds
   \[ |G_L(x_1, y) - G_L(x_2, y)| \leq H \cdot |x_1 - x_2|; \tag{49} \]

2. $F_L$ satisfy property $G1$ (hence is uniformly contracting on each leaf $\gamma$ with rate of contraction $\alpha$);

3. $T_L : I \to I$ is a piecewise expanding map satisfying the assumptions given in the following definition 8.6.

The following definition characterizes a class of piecewise expanding maps of the interval with bounded variation derivative $T_L : I \to I$ which is a subclass of the ones considered in section 7.0.1.

Definition 8.6 (Piecewise expanding functions with bounded variation inverse of the derivative). Suppose there exists a partition $\mathcal{P} = \{ P_i := [a_{i-1}, a_i), i = 1, \cdots, q \}$ of $I$ s.t. $T_L : I \to I$ satisfies the following conditions. For all $i$

1. $T_{L_i} = T_L|_{P_i}$ is of class $C^1$ and $g_i = \frac{1}{|T_{L_i}|}$ satisfies (P’1) of section 7 for $p = 1$.
2. $T_L$ satisfies (P’2) of section 7, $\inf |T_L^{n_0}| \geq \lambda_1 > 1$ for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$.
3. $T_L$ satisfies T3.4;

In particular we assume that $T_{L_i}$ and $g_i$ admit a continuous extension to $\mathcal{P}_i = [a_{i-1}, a_i]$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, q$.

Remark 8.7. The definition 8.6 allows infinite derivative for $T_L$ at the extreme points of its regularity intervals.

Definition 8.8. Let $T_1$ and $T_2$ be to piecewise expanding maps of definition 8.6. Define the set $Int_n$, by

$Int_n = \{ A \subset [0,1], s.t. A = I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_n, \text{ where } I_i \text{ are intervals} \}$
the set of subsets of $[0,1]$ which is the union of at most $n$ intervals. Set 

$$
\mathcal{C}(n,T_1,T_2) = \left\{ \epsilon : \exists A_1 \in \text{Int}_n \text{ and } \exists \sigma : I \to I \text{ a diffeomorphism s.t. } m(A_1) = 1 - \epsilon, \quad T_{1|A_1} = T_2 \circ \sigma|_{A_1} \text{ and } \forall x \in A_1, |\sigma(x) - x| \leq \epsilon, \frac{1}{|\sigma'(x)|} - 1 \leq \epsilon \right\}
$$

and define a distance from $T_1$ to $T_2$ as:

$$
d_{S,n}(T_1,T_2) = \inf \{ \epsilon | \epsilon \in \mathcal{C}(n,T_1,T_2) \}. \tag{50}
$$

If we denote by $d_S$ the classical notion of Skorokhod distance (see [30] e.g.), it is obvious that $\forall n d_{S,n} \geq d_S$. By [30], Lemma 11.2.1, it follows that $\forall n$:

$$
|P_{T_0} - P_{T_3}|_{BV-\to L^1} \leq 14d_{S,n}(T_1,T_2). \tag{51}
$$

**Definition 8.9.** A family of maps $\{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1]}$ is said to be a **Uniform BV Lorenz-like family** if $F_\delta$ is a BV Lorenz-like map (see definition 8.5) for all $\delta \in [0,1]$ and $\{F_\delta\}_\delta$ satisfies the following assumptions:

(UBV1): there exist $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $D > 0$ s.t. for all $f \in BV_{1,1}$ and for all $\delta \in [0,1)$ it holds $|P^n_{T_3} f|_{1,1} \leq D \lambda^n |f|_{1,1} + D|f|_{1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, where $P_{T_3}$ is the Perron-Frobenius operators of $T_3$.

When $\delta$ is small

(UBV2): $T_0$ and $T_3$ are near for the above Shorokod-like distance. For some $n$ independent of $\delta$ it holds $\forall \delta$

$$
d_{S,n}(T_0,T_3) \leq \delta.
$$

(UBV3): For each $\delta$ there is a set $A_2$ (depending on $\delta$) such that $A_2 \in \text{Int}_{n_3}$ for some $n_3$ (depending on $\delta$) furthermore $m(A_2) \geq 1 - \delta$ and for all $x \in A_2, y \in I$:

$$
|G_0(x,y) - G_\delta(x,y)| \leq \delta.
$$

Let us furthermore suppose that the number of such intervals during the perturbation remains uniformly bounded: $\sup_\delta n_3 < \infty$.

For all $\delta \in [0,1)$, let $n_0 = n_0(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the first integer such that there exists $\lambda_1(\delta) > 0$ satisfying $|T^n_{\delta,i} f|_{1,1} \geq \lambda_1(\delta) > 1$ for all $x \in P_{\delta,i}$ and for each $i = 1, \cdots, q$, where $T^n_{\delta,i} := T^n_{\delta,i} P_{\delta,i}$. Also set $g_{i,\delta} = \frac{1}{|T^n_{\delta,i}|}$ and denote by $H_\delta > 0$ and $P_{\delta,i}'$ the “Lipschitz”constant and the regularity partition associated to $G_\delta$, see item (1) of Definition 8.5 and Definition 8.6.

(UBV4): Suppose that:

1. $\inf_\delta \lambda_1(\delta) > 1$, $\sup_\delta \lambda_1(\delta) < \infty$ and $\sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} \{ n_0(\delta) \} < \infty$;
2. there exists $C_4 > 0$ such that $\sup g_{\delta,i} \leq C_4$ and $\var g_{\delta,i} \leq C_4$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, q$ and all $\delta \in [0,1)$;
3. $\inf_{\delta \in [0,1]} \min_{i=1,\cdots,q(\delta)} \{ m(P_{\delta,i}) \} > 0$;
4. $\sup_{\delta \in [0,1]} H_\delta < \infty$, $\sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} \# P_{\delta} < \infty$
8.1.1. Measures with bounded variation. Here we introduce a space of measures having bounded variation in some stronger sense, and prove that the invariant measure of a BV Lorenz-like map is in it. We use this fact in the proof of Proposition 8.23, where we prove that the family of transfer operators \( \{ F_\delta \}_{\delta \in [0,1)} \) induced by an Uniform BV Lorenz-like family \( \{ F_\delta \}_{\delta \in [0,1)} \) satisfies UF2.

We have seen that a positive measure on the square, \([0,1]^2\), can be disintegrated along the stable leaves \( F^s \) in a way that we can see it as a family of positive measures on the interval, \( \{ \mu|_\gamma \}_{\gamma \in F^s} \). Since there is a one-to-one correspondence between \( F^s \) and \([0,1]\), this defines a path in the metric space of positive measures, \([0,1] \mapsto SB(I)\), where \( SB(I) \) is endowed with the Wasserstein-Kantorovich like metric (see definition 3.5). It will be convenient to use a functional notation and denote such a path by \( \Gamma_\mu : I \mapsto SB(I) \) defined almost everywhere by \( \Gamma_\mu(\gamma) = \mu|_\gamma \), where \( \{ \mu|_\gamma \}_{\gamma \in I} \) is some disintegration for \( \mu \). However, since such a disintegration is defined \( \mu \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in [0,1] \), the path \( \Gamma_\mu \) is not unique. For this reason we define more precisely \( \Gamma_\mu \) as the class of almost everywhere equivalent paths corresponding to \( \mu \).

Definition 8.10. Consider a positive Borel measure \( \mu \) and a disintegration \( \omega = \{ \{ \mu|_\gamma \}_{\gamma \in I_\omega} \} \), where \( \{ \mu|_\gamma \}_{\gamma \in I_\omega} \) is a family of probabilities on \( \Sigma \) defined for all \( \gamma \in I_\omega \) (where \( \mu_x = \phi_x \mu \)), \( \mu_x(I_\omega) = 1 \), and \( \phi_x : I_\omega \mapsto \mathbb{R} \) is a non-negative marginal density. Denote by \( \Gamma_\mu \) the class of equivalent paths associated to \( \mu \)

\[ \Gamma_\mu = \{ \Gamma_\mu^\omega \}_{\omega}, \]

where \( \omega \) ranges on all the possible disintegrations of \( \mu \) on the stable foliation and \( \Gamma_\mu^\omega : I_\omega \mapsto SB(I) \) is the path associated to a given disintegration, \( \omega \):

\[ \Gamma_\mu^\omega(\gamma) = \mu|_\gamma = \pi_{\gamma,y}^* \phi_y(\gamma) \mu_y. \]

Definition 8.11. Let \( \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\Gamma_\mu^\omega) \) be a finite sequence \( \mathcal{P} = \{ x_i \}_{i=1}^n \subset I_\omega \) and define the **variation of** \( \Gamma_\mu^\omega \) **with respect to** \( \mathcal{P} \) as (denote \( \gamma_i := \gamma_{x_i} \))

\[ \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu^\omega, \mathcal{P}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \|\| \Gamma_\mu^\omega(\gamma_j) - \Gamma_\mu^\omega(\gamma_{j-1}) \|_W \|, \]

where we recall \( \| \cdot \|_W \) is the Wasserstein-like norm defined by equation (13).

Finally, we define the **variation of** \( \Gamma_\mu^\omega \) by taking the supremum over the set of finite sequences of any length, as

\[ \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu^\omega) := \sup_{\mathcal{P}} \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu^\omega, \mathcal{P}). \]

Remark 8.12. For an interval \( \eta \subset I \), we define

\[ \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_\mu^\omega) := \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu^\omega|\eta), \]

where \( \eta \) is the closure of \( \eta \). We also remark that \( \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_\mu^\omega) = \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu^\omega \cdot \chi_\eta) \), where \( \chi_\eta \) is the characteristic function of \( \eta \).
Remark 8.13. When no confusion can be done, to simplify the notation, we denote $\Gamma^\omega_\mu(\gamma)$ just by $\mu|_\gamma$.

Definition 8.14. Define the variation of a positive measure $\mu$ by
\[ \operatorname{Var}(\mu) = \inf_{\Gamma^\omega_\mu \in \Gamma_\mu} \{ \operatorname{Var}(\Gamma^\omega_\mu) \} . \]

We remark that,
\[ ||\mu||_1 = \int W^0_1(0, \Gamma^\omega_\mu(\gamma)) dm(\gamma), \quad \text{for any } \Gamma^\omega_\mu \in \Gamma_\mu. \]

Definition 8.15. From the definition 8.11 we define the set of bounded variation positive measures $BV^+$ as
\[ BV^+ = \{ \mu \in AB : \mu \geq 0, \operatorname{Var}(\mu) < \infty \}. \tag{52} \]

Now we are ready to state a lemma estimating the regularity of the iterates $F^*_{m}(m)$. Next result is a Lasota-Yorke like inequality where the variation $\operatorname{Var}(\Gamma^\omega_\mu)$, defined in 8.11, plays the role of the the strong semi-norm. This is our main tool to estimate the regularity of the invariant measure of a BV Lorenz-like map (Proposition 8.19). Since it is an immediate consequence of Theorem 9.2 and Remark 9.3 (see Appendix 1), we omit its proof.

Proposition 8.16. Let $F_L(x, y) = (T_L(x), G_L(x, y))$ be a BV Lorenz-like map. Then, there are $C_0$ and $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$ such that for all $\mu \in BV^+$ and all $n \geq 1$ it holds
\[ \operatorname{Var}(\Gamma_{F^n*\mu}) \leq K_0 \lambda_0^n \operatorname{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + K_0 |\phi_\mu|_{1,1}. \tag{53} \]

Remark 8.17. Taking the infimum on both sides of equation (53) we get
\[ \operatorname{Var}(F_{m}^* \mu) \leq K_0 \lambda_0^n \operatorname{Var}(\mu) + K_0 |\phi_\mu|_{1,1}. \tag{54} \]

A precise estimate for $K_0$ can be found in equation (83). Remember that, by Proposition 5.9 a Lorenz-like map has an invariant measure $\mu_0 \in S^\infty$.

Remark 8.18. Let $m$ be the Lebesgue measure on $\Sigma = I \times I$, i.e. $m = m_1 \times m_1$, where $m_1$ is the Lebesgue measure on $I = [0, 1]$. Besides that, consider its trivial disintegration $\omega_0 = \{ (\gamma, \delta, \phi_\delta) \}$, given by $m_\gamma = \pi_{y, \gamma}^{-1} * m_1$, for all $\gamma$ and $\phi_\delta \equiv 1$. According to this definition, it holds that
\[ m|_\gamma = m_1, \quad \forall \gamma. \tag{55} \]

In other words, the path $\Gamma^\omega_m$ is constant $\Gamma^\omega_m(\gamma) = m_1$ for all $\gamma$. Moreover, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\omega_n$ be the particular disintegration for the measure $F^{*n} m$, defined from $\omega_0$ as an application of Lemma 4.4 and consider the path $\Gamma^\omega_{F^{*n} m}$ associated with this disintegration. By Proposition 4.2 we have
\[ \Gamma^\omega_{F^{*n} m}(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^n_{\Gamma^i \gamma}(\gamma) * m_1}{|\det DT^n_i \circ T^{-n}_i(\gamma)|} \chi_{T^n_i(\gamma)}(\gamma) \quad \forall \gamma \in N_1, \tag{56} \]
where $P_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, q = q(n)$, ranges over the partition $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ defined in the following way: for all $n \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ be the partition of $I$ s.t. $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(x) = \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(y)$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(T^j(x)) = \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(T^j(y))$ for all $j = 0, \ldots, n - 1$, where $\mathcal{P}^{(1)} = \mathcal{P}$ (see definition 8.6). This path will be used in the proof of the next proposition.

**Proposition 8.19.** Let $F_L(x, y) = (T_L(x), G_L(x, y))$ be BV Lorenz-like map and suppose that $F_L$ has an unique invariant probability measure $\mu_0 \in BV_{1,1}^\infty$. Then $\mu_0 \in BV^+$ and

$$\text{Var}(\mu_0) \leq 2K_0.$$

**Proof.** Consider the path $\Gamma_{\hat{I} n}^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m}$, defined in Remark 8.18 which represents the measure $F^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m}$.

According to Proposition 7.7, let $\mu_0 \in BV_{1,1}^\infty$ be the unique $F_L$-invariant probability measure in $BV_{1,1}^\infty$. Consider the Lebesgue measure $m$ and the iterates $F^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m}$. By Theorem 7.7, these iterates converge to $\mu_0$ in $L^\infty$. It means that the sequence $\{\Gamma_{\hat{I} n}^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m}\}_n$ converges m-a.e. to $\Gamma_{\hat{I} n}^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m} \in \Gamma_{\mu_0}$ in $SB(I)$ with respect to the metric defined in definition 3.5, where $\Gamma_{\mu_0}$ is a path given by the Rokhlin Disintegration Theorem and $\{\Gamma_{\hat{I} n}^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m}\}_n$ is given by equation 5.2. It implies that $\{\Gamma_{\hat{I} n}^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m}\}_n$ converges pointwise to $\Gamma_{\mu_0}$ on a full measure set $\hat{I} \subset I$. Let us denote $\Gamma_n := \Gamma_{\hat{I} n}^{\alpha_{\hat{I} n} m}|_{\hat{I}}$ and $\Gamma := \Gamma_{\mu_0}|_{\hat{I}}$. Since $\Gamma_n$ converges pointwise to $\Gamma$ it holds $\text{Var}(\Gamma_n, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \text{Var}(\Gamma, \mathcal{P})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all finite sequences $\mathcal{P} \subset \hat{I}$. Indeed, let $\mathcal{P} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \subset \hat{I}$ be a finite sequence. Then,

$$\text{Var}(\Gamma_n, \mathcal{P}) = \sum_{j=1}^k ||\Gamma_n(x_j) - \Gamma_n(x_{j-1})||W,$$

taking the limit, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\Gamma_n, \mathcal{P}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^k ||\Gamma_n(x_j) - \Gamma_n(x_{j-1})||W$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^k ||\Gamma(x_j) - \Gamma(x_{j-1})||W$$

$$= \text{Var}(\Gamma, \mathcal{P}).$$

On the other hand, $\text{Var}(\Gamma_n, \mathcal{P}) \leq \text{Var}(\Gamma_n) \leq 2K_0$ for all $n \geq 1$, where $K_0$ comes from Proposition 8.16. Then $\text{Var}(\Gamma_{\mu_0}, \mathcal{P}) \leq 2K_0$ for all partition $\mathcal{P}$. Thus, $\text{Var}(\Gamma_{\mu_0}) \leq 2K_0$ and hence $\text{Var}(\mu_0) \leq 2K_0$. 

$\square$
Remark 8.20. We remark that, Proposition 8.19 is an estimation of the regularity of the disintegration of $\mu_0$. Similar results are presented in [18] and [12].

The proof of the following proposition is postponed to the appendix (see Proposition 9.19).

**Proposition 8.21.** Let $\{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$ be an Uniform BV Lorenz-like family (definition (8.9)) and let $f_\delta$ be the unique $F_\delta$-invariant probability in $\mathcal{B}V_{1,1}$ (also in $\mathcal{B}V_{1,1}^\infty$). Then, there exists $B_u > 0$ such that

$$\text{Var}(f_\delta) \leq 2B_u,$$

(57)

for all $\delta \in [0,1)$.

For the next proposition we will use the following notation. Given a probability measure $f_\delta$ on $I^2$ and a measurable set $E \subset I$, we define the measure $1_E f_\delta$ on $I^2$, by

$$1_E f_\delta(A) := f_\delta(A \cap \pi_\gamma^{-1}(E))$$

for all measurable set $A \subset I^2$. (58)

We remark that, if $\{\{f_\delta, \gamma\}, \phi_{x, \delta}\}$ is a disintegration of $f_\delta$, then

$$\{\{f_\delta, \gamma\}, \chi_E \phi_{x, \delta}\},$$

(59)

is a disintegration of $1_E f_\delta(A)$.

**Proposition 8.22** (to obtain UF2). Let $\{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$ be a family of BV Lorenz-like maps which satisfies UBV2, UBV3 and UBV4 of definition 8.9. Denote by $F_\delta^+$ their transfer operators and by $f_\delta$ their fixed points (probabilities) in $\mathcal{B}V_{1,1}$ (also in $\mathcal{B}V_{1,1}^\infty$). Suppose that $f_\delta$ has uniformly bounded variation,

$$\text{Var}(f_\delta) \leq M_2, \ \forall \delta.$$ Then, there is a constant $C_1$ such that for $\delta$ small enough, it holds

$$\|F_0^+ - F_\delta^+\|_{f_\delta} \leq C_1 \delta (M_2 + 1).$$

**Proof.** Set $A = A_1 \cap A_2$ where $A_1$ comes from de definition of $d_{S,n}$ (see equation (50)) and $A_2$ is from (UBV3) (see definition 8.9). Remark that this sets depend on $\delta$. Let us estimate

$$\|(F_0^+ - F_\delta^+)\|_{f_\delta} \leq \int_I |F_0^+(1_A f_\delta)| - |F_\delta^+(1_A f_\delta)| \|_{\gamma} dm(\gamma) + \int_I |F_0^+(1_A f_\delta)| - |F_\delta^+(1_A f_\delta)| \|_{\gamma} dm(\gamma).$$

(60)

By the assumptions, for a.e. $\gamma$, $\|f_\delta\|_{W} \leq (M_2 + 1)$ and $\|1_{A polynomial}\|_{1} \leq (M_2 + 1)\delta$. Indeed, since $\text{Var}(f_\delta) \leq M_2, \ \forall \delta$, we have (below, we denote $\phi_{x, \delta} = \frac{d\pi_x^* f_\delta}{dm}$)

$$\|f_\delta\|_{W} \leq \|f_\delta\|_{\gamma} - \|f_\delta\|_{\gamma_2} \|W + \|f_\delta\|_{\gamma_2} \|W$$

$$= \|f_\delta\|_{\gamma} - \|f_\delta\|_{\gamma_2} \|W + |\phi_{x, \delta}(\gamma_2)|.$$


Integrating with respect to $\gamma_2$ we get

$$
\|f_\delta\|_W \leq (M_2 + 1).
$$

(61)

To prove the inequality $\|1_Af_\delta\|_1 \leq (M_2 + 1)\delta$ we use the previous equation, $m(A^c) \leq \delta$ and the fact that (see equation [55])

$$
\|1_Af_\delta\|_1 = \int_A \|f_\delta\|_W dm.
$$

Since $F^*$ is a contraction for the weak norm, we have

$$
\int_I \|(F^*_0\mu - F^*_\delta\mu)\|_W dm(\gamma) \leq 2(M_2 + 1)\delta.
$$

Now, let us estimate the first summand of [60] by estimating the integral

$$
\int \|(F^*_0\mu - F^*_\delta\mu)\|_W dm(\gamma),
$$

where $\mu = 1_Af_\delta$. Denote by $T_{0,i}$, with $0 \leq i \leq q$, the branches of $T_0$ defined in the sets $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ and set $T_{\delta,i} = T_\delta|P_i \cap A$. These functions will play the role of the branches for $T_\delta$. Since in $A$, $T_0 = T_\delta \circ \sigma_\delta$ (where $\sigma_\delta$ is the diffeomorphism in the definition of the Skorokhod distance), then $T_{\delta,i}$ are invertible. Then

$$
(F^*_0\mu - F^*_\delta\mu) \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\mu_{T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\chi_{T_0(P_i \cap A)}}{|T_{0,i}'(T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} - \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\chi_{T_\delta(P_i \cap A)}}{|T_{\delta,i}'(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} \mu_x \text{ a.e. } \gamma \in I.
$$

Let us now consider $T_0(P_i \cap A)$, $T_\delta(P_i \cap A)$ and remark that $T_0(P_i \cap A) = \sigma_\delta(T_\delta(P_i \cap A))$ where $\sigma_\delta$ is a diffeomorphism near to the identity. Let us denote $B_i = T_0(P_i \cap A) \cap T_\delta(P_i \cap A)$ and $C_i = T_0(P_i \cap A) \triangle T_\delta(P_i \cap A)$. Then, we have

$$
\int_I \|(F^*_0\mu - F^*_\delta\mu)\|_W dm(\gamma) \leq O_1 + O_2,
$$

(62)

where

$$
O_1 = \int_I \left\| \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\mu_{T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,i}'(T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} - \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}'(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} \right\|_W dm
$$

and

$$
O_2 = \int_I \left\| \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\mu_{T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\chi_{T_0(P_i \cap A) - B_i}}{|T_{0,i}'(T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} - \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}\chi_{T_\delta(P_i \cap A) - B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}'(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} \right\|_W dm.
$$

And since $m(C_i) = O(\delta)$, we get that there is $K_1 \geq 0$ such that $O_2 \leq qK_1(M_2 + 1)\delta$. In order to estimate $O_1$, we note that

---

Remark that $m(T_\delta(P_i \cap A) \triangle T_0(P_i \cap A)) = O(\delta)$ because $T_0(P_i \cap A) = \sigma(T_\delta(P_i \cap A))$ where $\sigma$ is a diffeomorphism near to the identity as in the definition of the Skorokhod distance and $P_i \cap A$ is a finite union of intervals whose number is uniformly bounded with respect to $\delta$. 

---
\[
O_1 = \int \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm \bigg|_{W} \\
\leq \int \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm \bigg|_{W} \\
+ \int \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm \bigg|_{W} \\
= \int I(\gamma) \, dm(\gamma) + \int II(\gamma) \, dm(\gamma).
\]

The two summands will be treated separately. Let us denote \(\overline{\mu}|_{\gamma} = \pi^*_{\gamma,\delta}\mu_{\gamma}\) (note that \(\mu|_{\gamma} = \phi^\gamma(\pi)|_{\gamma}\) and \(\pi|_{\gamma}\) is a probability measure).

\[
I(\gamma) = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm(\gamma) \\
\leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm(\gamma) \\
+ \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm(\gamma) = I_\alpha(\gamma) + I_\beta(\gamma).
\]

Since \(f_\delta\) is a probability measure it holds, posing \(\beta = T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\)

\[
\int I_\alpha(\gamma) \, dm = \int \left| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm(\gamma) \\
\leq \int \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left| \frac{F^*_{0,T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm(\gamma) \\
\leq \int \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left| \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} - \frac{F^*_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\mu|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)\chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)|} \right| \, dm(\gamma). \\
\]

We remark \(T_{0,i}^{-1}(B_i) \subseteq P_i \cap A\) and \(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(T_{0,i}^{-1}(B_i)) \subseteq P_i \cap A\). Since \(|T_{\delta,i}(\beta) - T_{0,i}(\delta)| \leq \delta\) and \(T_{0,i}^{-1}\) is a contraction, then \(|T_{0,i}^{-1} \circ T_{\delta,i}(\beta) - \beta| \leq \delta\).
Therefore
\[
\left\| F^*_{0,\beta} \mu |_\beta - F^*_{\delta, T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \mu |_\beta \right\|_W \leq \left\| F^*_{0,\beta} \mu |_\beta - F^*_{\delta, \beta} \mu |_\beta \right\|_W + \left\| F^*_{\delta, \beta} \mu |_\beta - F^*_{\delta, T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \mu |_\beta \right\|_W.
\]

By (UBV3) and equation \([61]\),
\[
\left\| F^*_{0,\beta} \mu |_\beta - F^*_{\delta, \beta} \mu |_\beta \right\|_W \leq \delta(M_2 + 1).
\]

Since \(|T_{0,\beta}(\beta) - T_{0,\beta}(\beta)| \leq \delta\) and \(T^{-1}_{0,\beta}\) is a contraction, we have \(|T^{-1}_{0,\beta} \circ T_{0,\beta}(\beta) - \beta| \leq \delta\). Then,
\[
\left\| F^*_{\delta, \beta} \mu |_\beta - F^*_{\delta, T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \mu |_\beta \right\|_W \leq H_\delta \delta(M_2 + 1)
\]

when \(d(\beta, \cup_i \partial J_i) \geq \delta\). For the other values of \(\beta\) we remark that the set of points \(\{x \text{ s.t. } d(x, \cup_i \partial J_i) \leq \delta\}\) is of measure bounded by \(\delta(\sup_{\delta} \# \mathcal{P}_\delta)\), thus
\[
\int I_\delta \, dm = O(\delta).
\]

To estimate \(I_\beta(\gamma)\), we have
\[
I_\beta(\gamma) = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta, T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \mu |_{T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,\beta}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta, T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \mu |_{T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,\beta}(\gamma)|} \right\|_W
\]
and
\[
\int I_\beta(\gamma) \, dm(\gamma) \leq \|(P_{T_0} - P_{T_3}) (1)\|(M_2 + 1).
\]

By \([30]\), Lemma 11.2.1,
\[
\int_{A_1} I_\beta(\gamma) \, dm(\gamma) \leq 14(M_2 + 1)\delta.
\]

Now, let us estimate the integral of the second summand
\[
II(\gamma) = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta, T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \mu |_{T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,\beta}(\gamma)|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F^*_{\delta, T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \mu |_{T^{-1}_{0,\beta}(T_{0,\beta}(\beta))} \chi_{B_i}}{|T_{0,\beta}(\gamma)|} \right\|_W.
\]
Let us make the change of variable \( \gamma = T_{\delta,i}(\beta) \).

\[
\int_I \, II(\gamma) \, d\mu(\gamma) = \int_I \left( \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}^* \mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)} \chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} - \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{F_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}^* \mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)} \chi_{B_i}}{|T_{\delta,i}(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} \right) \, d\mu(\gamma)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{B_i} \frac{1}{|T_{\delta,i}(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} \left| F_{\delta,T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}^* (\mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)} - \mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)}) \right| \, d\mu(\gamma)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{B_i} \frac{1}{|T_{\delta,i}(T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma))|} \left| \mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)} - \mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)} \right| \, d\mu(\gamma)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \int_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(B_i)} \left| \mu_{T_{\delta,i}^{-1}(\gamma)} - \mu_{\beta} \right| \, d\mu(\beta).
\]

Since \( |T_{\delta,i}(\beta) - T_{\delta,i}(\beta)| \leq \delta \) and \( T_{\delta,i}^{-1} \) is a contraction, we have \( |T_{\delta,i}^{-1} \circ T_{\delta,i}(\beta) - \beta| \leq \delta \). Hence,

\[
\int_I \, II(\gamma) \, d\mu(\gamma) \leq \int \sup_{x,y \in B(\beta,\delta)} (|\mu_x - \mu_y|) \, d\mu(\beta)
\]

and then

\[
\int_I \, II(\gamma) \, d\mu(\gamma) \leq 2\delta(M_2 + 1).
\]

Summing all, the statement is proved.

\[\Box\]

8.1.2. Proof of Theorem 8.23. We are ready to prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 8.23.** Let \( \{F_{\delta}\}_{\delta \in [0,1]} \) be an Uniform BV Lorenz-like family and let \( \{F_{\delta}^n\}_{\delta \in [0,1]} \) be the induced family of transfer operators. Then, \( \{F_{\delta}^n\}_{\delta \in [0,1]} \) is an uniform family of operators with weak space \( (L^1, \| \cdot \|_1) \) and strong space \( (BV,1, \| \cdot \|_1) \).

**Proof.** To prove UF1, note that, by (UBV1) there exist 0 < \( \alpha_1 < 1 \) and \( D > 0 \) s.t. for all \( \mu \in BV_1 \) and for all \( \delta \) it holds \( \| F_{\delta}^n \mu \|_1,1 \leq D \alpha_1^n \| \mu \|_1 \), for all \( n \geq 1 \). Indeed, by Lemma 5.1 we have

\[
\| F_{\delta}^n \mu \|_1 = \| P_{\delta}^n \phi_x \|_1,1 + \| F_{\delta}^n \mu \|_1
\]

\[
\leq D \alpha_1^n \| \phi_x \|_1,1 + D \| \phi_x \|_1 + \| \mu \|_1
\]

\[
\leq D \alpha_1^n \| \mu \|_1,1 + (D + 1) \| \mu \|_1
\]

Therefore, if \( f_{\delta} \) is a fixed probability measure for the operator \( F_{\delta}^* \), by the above inequality we get UF1 with \( M = D + 1 \).

Proposition 8.22 and Proposition 8.24 immediately give UF2. The items UF3 and UF4 follow, respectively, from Proposition 7.5 and Lemma 5.1 applied to each \( F_{\delta} \).

\[\Box\]

Once this is done, we apply the above result together with Proposition 8.2 to get the quantitative estimation:
Theorem 8.24 (Quantitative stability for deterministic perturbations). Let \( \{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)} \) be an uniform BV Lorenz-like family (see definition 8.9). Denote by \( f_\delta \) the fixed point of \( F_\delta^* \) in \( BV_{1,1} \) (also in \( BV_{1,1}^\infty \)), for all \( \delta \). Then, there exists \( \delta_0 \in (0,1) \) such that for all \( \delta \in [0,\delta_0) \), it holds

\[
||f_\delta - f_0||_1 = O(\delta \log \delta).
\]

9. Appendix 1: Proof of Propositions 8.16 and 8.21

In this section, we obtain Proposition 8.16 as a particular case of Theorem 9.2. We also prove Proposition 8.21 stated again as Proposition 9.19.

Note that, for all \( \mu \in BV^+ \) it holds

\[
||\mu||_1 = |\phi_x|_1 \text{ and } ||\mu||_\infty = |\phi_x|_\infty,
\]

where \( \phi_x = \frac{d\pi^*\mu}{dm} \). We also remark, for each \( \mu \in BV^+ \) we have \( \phi_x \in BV_{1,1} \).

For a measurable map \( F : [0,1]^2 \rightarrow [0,1]^2 \), of the type \( F(x,y) = (T(x),G(x,y)) \), and a given \( \gamma \in F^s(\gamma = \{x\} \times [0,1]) \), we denote by \( F_\gamma : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1] \), the function defined by

\[
F_\gamma = \pi_y \circ F \circ \pi_{\gamma,y}^{-1},
\]

where \( \pi_{\gamma,y} \) is the restriction on \( \gamma \) of the projection \( \pi(x,y) = y \).

Definition 9.1. Consider a function \( f : [0,1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) and let \( x_1 \leq \cdots \leq x_n \) and \( y_1 \leq \cdots \leq y_n \) be such that \( (x_i)_{i=1}^n \subset I \) and \( (y_i)_{i=1}^n \subset I \). We define \( \text{var}^\diamond(f,(x_i)_{i=1}^n,(y_i)_{i=1}^n) \) by

\[
\text{var}^\diamond(f,(x_i)_{i=1}^n,(y_i)_{i=1}^n) := \sum_{i=1}^n |f(x_{i+1},y_i) - f(x_i,y_i)|,
\]

and

\[
\text{var}^\diamond(f) := \sup_{(x_i)_{i=1}^n,(y_i)_{i=1}^n} \text{var}^\diamond(f,(x_i)_{i=1}^n,(y_i)_{i=1}^n). \quad (64)
\]

If \( \eta \subset I \) is an interval, we define \( \text{var}^\diamond_\eta(f) = \text{var}^\diamond(f|_{\eta \times I}) \), where \( \overline{\eta} \) is the closure of \( \eta \).

Since preliminaries results are necessary, we postponed the proof of the next theorem to the end of the section.

Theorem 9.2. Let \( F(x,y) = (T(x),G(x,y)) \) be a measurable transformation such that

1. \( \text{var}^\diamond(G) < \infty \)
2. \( F \) satisfy property G1 (hence is uniformly contracting on each leaf \( \gamma \) with rate of contraction \( \alpha \));
3. \( T : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1] \) is a piecewise expanding map satisfying the assumptions given in the definition 8.6.
Then, there are $K_0$ and $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$ such that for all path $\Gamma_\mu$, where $\mu \in BV^+$, and all $n \geq 1$ it holds
\[
\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^n*\mu}) \leq K_0 \lambda_0^n \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + K_0 |\varphi_x|_{1,1}.
\]
(65)

**Remark 9.3.** If $F_L$ is a BV Lorenz-like map (definition 8.5), a straightforward computation yields
\[\text{var}^\circ(G_L) \leq H,
\]
where $H$ comes from equation (49). This shows that Proposition 8.16 is a direct consequence of Theorem 9.2.

9.1. **Lasota-Yorke Inequality for positive measures.** Henceforth, we fix a positive measure $\mu \in BV^+ \subset AB$ and a path which represents $\mu$ (i.e. a pair $\{\mu_\gamma, \varphi_x\}$ s.t. $\Gamma_\mu(\gamma) := \mu_\gamma$). To simplify, we will denote the path $\Gamma_\omega \mu \in \Gamma_\mu$, just by $\Gamma_\mu$.

**Remark 9.4.** Consider $T : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ a piecewise expanding map from definition 8.6 and $g_i = \frac{1}{|T_i'|}$. For all $n \geq 1$, let $P^{(n)}$ be the partition of $I$ s.t. $P^{(n)}(x) = P^{(n)}(y)$ if and only if $P^{(1)}(T^j(x)) = P^{(1)}(T^j(y))$ for all $j = 0, \ldots, n - 1$, where $P^{(1)} = P$ (see definition 8.6). Given $P \in P^{(n)}$, define $g_P^{(n)} = \frac{1}{|P^{(n)}|}$. Item 2) implies that there exists $C_1 > 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ s.t.
\[
\sup \{g_P^{(n)}\} \leq C_1 \theta^n, \text{ for all } P \in P^{(n)} \text{ and all } n \geq 1.
\]
(66)
Moreover, equation (66) and some basic properties of real valued BV functions imply (see [29], page 41, equation (3.1)) there exists $\lambda_2 \in (\theta, 1)$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that
\[
\text{var}(g_P^{(n)}) \leq C_2 \lambda_2^n, \text{ for all } P \in P^{(n)} \text{ and all } n \geq 1.
\]
Then, there is an iterate of $F$, $\bar{F} := F^k$, such that $T^k$ satisfies
\[
\beta_k := \text{var}(g_P^{(k)}) + 3 \sup g_P^{(k)} < 1, \forall P \in P^{(k)}.
\]
(67)
We also remark that $G^k := \pi_y \circ F^k$ also satisfies
\[
\text{var}^\circ(G^k) < \infty.
\]
(68)
Next lemma provides equation (68) and its proof can be found in [2].

**Lemma 9.5.** If $F$ satisfy definition 8.3, then for all $n \geq 1$ it holds
\[
\text{var}^\circ(f \circ F^n) \leq q^n \text{var}^\circ(f) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} q^i \left(\text{var}^\circ(G)|f|_{lip'} + 2q|f|_{\infty}\right),
\]
where $q$ is the number of branches of $T$ ($q := \#P$).
Recalling equation (63), set
\[ \Gamma_{\mu_F}(\gamma) := F^\mu \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma). \] (69)

With the above notation and following the strategy of the proof of Lemma 4.1 we have that the path \( \Gamma_{F^\mu} \), defined on a full measure set by
\[ \Gamma_{F^\mu}(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^{q} (g_i \cdot \Gamma_{\mu_F}) \circ T_{L_i}^{-1}(\gamma) \cdot \chi_{T_{L_i}(P)}(\gamma), \] where \( g_i = \frac{1}{|T_{L_i}|} \). (70)

represents the measure \( F^\mu \).

By Lemma 27 and equation (63) it holds
\[ ||F^\mu \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma)||_W \leq ||\Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma)||_W, \]
for \( m \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in I \). Then we have the following

**Lemma 9.6.** Let \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) be two leaves such that \( G(\gamma_i, \cdot) : I \to I \) is a contraction, \( i = 1, 2 \). Then for every path \( \Gamma_{\mu} \), where \( \mu \in AB \), it holds
\[ ||F^\mu \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - F^\mu \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2)||_W \leq ||\Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2)||_W + |G(\gamma_1, y_0) - G(\gamma_2, y_0)||\phi_x|_\infty, \] (71)

for some \( y_0 \in I \).

**Proof.** Consider \( g \) such that \( |g|_\infty \leq 1 \) and \( Lip(g) \leq 1 \), and observe that since \( G_{\gamma_1} - G_{\gamma_2} : I \to I \) is continuous, it holds
\[ \sup_I |G(\gamma_1, y) - G(\gamma_2, y)| = |G(\gamma_1, y_0) - G(\gamma_2, y_0)|, \]
for some \( y_0 \in I \). Moreover, by equation (27) we have
\[
\left| \int gd\Gamma_{\mu_F}(\gamma_1) - \int gd\Gamma_{\mu_F}(\gamma_2) \right| = \left| \int gd F^\mu_{\gamma_1} \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - \int gd F^\mu_{\gamma_2} \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2) \right|
\leq \left| \int gd F^\mu_{\gamma_1} \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - \int gd F^\mu_{\gamma_1} \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2) \right|
+ \left| \int gd F^\mu_{\gamma_1} \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2) - \int gd F^\mu_{\gamma_2} \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2) \right|
\leq \left| F^\mu_{\gamma_1} (\Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2)) \right|_W
+ \int |g(F_{\gamma_1}) - g(F_{\gamma_2})|d\mu|_{\gamma_2}
\leq ||\Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2)||_W
+ \int |G(\gamma_1, y) - G(\gamma_2, y)|d\mu|_{\gamma_2(y)}
\leq ||\Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2)||_W
+ \sup_I |G(\gamma_1, y) - G(\gamma_2, y)| \int 1d\mu|_{\gamma_2(y)}
= ||\Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_1) - \Gamma_{\mu}(\gamma_2)||_W + |G(\gamma_1, y_0) - G(\gamma_2, y_0)||\phi_x|_\infty.
\]
Taking the supremum over \( g \) such that \( |g|_{\infty} \leq 1 \) and \( L(g) \leq 1 \), we finish the proof.

The proofs of the next two lemmas are straightforward and analogous to the one dimensional \( BV \) functions. So, we omit them (details can be found in [25]).

**Lemma 9.7.** Given paths \( \Gamma_{\mu_0}, \Gamma_{\mu_1} \) and \( \Gamma_{\mu_2} \) (where \( \Gamma_{\mu_i}(\gamma) = \mu_i|_\gamma \)) representing the positive measures \( \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in BV^+ \) respectively, a function \( \varphi : I \to \mathbb{R} \), a homeomorphism \( h : \eta \subset I \to h(\eta) \subset I \) and a subinterval \( \eta \subset I \), then the following properties hold

P1) If \( \mathcal{P} \) is a partition of \( I \) by intervals \( \eta \), then

\[
\text{Var}(\Gamma_{\mu_0}) = \sum_{\eta} \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_{\mu_0});
\]

P2) \( \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_{\mu_1} + \Gamma_{\mu_2}) \leq \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_{\mu_1}) + \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_{\mu_2}) \)

P3) \( \text{Var}_\eta(\varphi \cdot \Gamma_{\mu_0}) \leq (\sup_{\eta} |\varphi|) \cdot (\text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_{\mu_0})) + \left( \sup_{\gamma \in \eta} ||\Gamma_{\mu_0}(\gamma)||W \right) \cdot \text{var}_\eta(\varphi) \)

P4) \( \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_{\mu_0} \circ h) = \text{Var}_{\eta(h(\eta))}(\Gamma_{\mu_0}) \).

**Remark 9.8.** For every path \( \Gamma_\mu, \mu \in AB \) and an interval \( \eta \subset I \), it holds

\[
\sup_{\gamma \in \eta} ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma)||W \leq \text{Var}_\eta(\Gamma_\mu) + \frac{1}{m(\eta)} \int_\eta ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma)||W \, dm(\gamma),
\]

where \( \eta \) is the closure of \( \eta \).

**Lemma 9.9.** For all \( \Gamma_\mu \), where \( \mu \in BV^+ \), and all \( P \in \mathcal{P} \) it holds

\[
\text{Var}_\mathcal{P}(\Gamma_\mu) \leq \text{Var}_\mathcal{P}(\Gamma_\mu) + \text{var}_\mathcal{P}(G)|\phi|_{\infty}.
\]

**Proof.** Consider \( (\gamma_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{P} \) such that \( \gamma_1 \leq \cdots \leq \gamma_n \). By Lemma 9.6 for every \( i \) there is \( y_i \) such that

\[
\sum_{i=1}^n ||F^*_{\gamma_{i+1}} \Gamma_\mu(\gamma_{i+1}) - F^*_{\gamma_i} \Gamma_\mu(\gamma_i)||W \leq \sum_{i=1}^n ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma_{i+1}) - \Gamma_\mu(\gamma_i)||W + \sum_{i=1}^n |G(\gamma_{i+1}, y_i) - G(\gamma_i, y_i)||\phi|_{\infty} \cdot \text{var}_\mathcal{P}(G).
\]

Then,

\[
\sum_{i=1}^n ||F^*_{\gamma_{i+1}} \Gamma_\mu(\gamma_{i+1}) - F^*_{\gamma_i} \Gamma_\mu(\gamma_i)||W \leq \text{Var}_\mathcal{P}(\Gamma_\mu) + |\phi|_{\infty} \text{var}_\mathcal{P}(G).
\]

We finish the proof taking the supremum over \( (\gamma_i)_{i}^n \). \( \Box \)
Lemma 9.10. For all path $\Gamma_\mu$, where $\mu \in \mathcal{BV}^+$, it holds

$$\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^\mu}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left[ \text{var}_{P_i}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i} g_i \right] \cdot \sup_{\gamma \in P_i} ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma)||_W + \sup_{P_i} g_i \cdot \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu_P}),$$

where $\Gamma_{\mu_P}$ is defined by equation (69).

Proof. Using the properties $P2$, $P3$, $P4$, $\sup_{\gamma \in P_i} ||\Gamma_{\mu_P}(\gamma)||_W \leq \sup_{\gamma \in P_i} ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma)||_W$ and $\sup_{\gamma \in P_i} |g_i| = \sup_{\gamma \in P_i} g_i$, we have

$$\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^\mu}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \text{Var}_{T_i(P_i)} \left[ (g_i \cdot \Gamma_{\mu_P}) \circ T_i^{-1} \cdot \chi_{T_i(P_i)} \right]$$

\begin{align*}
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \text{Var}_{T_i(P_i)} \left[ (g_i \cdot \Gamma_{\mu_P}) \circ T_i^{-1} \right] \cdot \sup_{T_i(P_i)} |\chi_{T_i(P_i)}| \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{q} \sup_{T_i(P_i)} \| (g_i \cdot \Gamma_{\mu_P}) \circ T_i^{-1} \|_W \cdot \text{var}(\chi_{T_i(P_i)}) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \text{Var}_{P_i} (g_i \cdot \Gamma_{\mu_P}) + 2 \cdot \sup_{T_i(P_i)} \| (g_i \cdot \Gamma_{\mu_P}) \circ T_i^{-1} \|_W \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \text{var}_{P_i}(g_i) \cdot \sup_{P_i} ||\Gamma_{\mu_P}||_W + \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu_P}) \cdot \sup_{P_i} |g_i| \\
&\quad + 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{q} \sup_{P_i} |g_i| \sup_{P_i} ||\Gamma_{\mu_P}||_W \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \text{var}_{P_i}(g_i) \cdot \sup_{\gamma \in P_i} ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma)||_W + \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu_P}) \cdot \sup_{P_i} |g_i| \\
&\quad + 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{q} \sup_{\gamma \in P_i} ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma)||_W \cdot \sup_{P_i} |g_i| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left[ \text{var}_{P_i}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i} g_i \right] \cdot \sup_{\gamma \in P_i} ||\Gamma_\mu(\gamma)||_W + \sup_{P_i} g_i \cdot \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu_P}).
\end{align*}

Lemma 9.11. For all path $\Gamma_\mu$, where $\mu \in \mathcal{BV}^+$, it holds

$$\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^\mu}) \leq \beta \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + K_3|\phi_x|_{1,1}.$$  \hfill (72)

Where

$$\beta := \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \{ \text{var}_{P_i}(g_i) + 3 \sup_{P_i} g_i \}$$
and

\[ K_3 = \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \{ \sup_{P_i} g_i \} \, \varnothing(G) + \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \left\{ \frac{\varnothing_{P_i}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i} g_i}{m(P_i)} \right\}. \]

**Proof.** By lemma 9.9, remark 9.8, lemma 9.10, P1, equation (67) of remark 9.4 and by \( \sum_{i=1}^q \varnothing_{P_i} G = \varnothing(G) \), we get

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^*\mu}) & \leq \sum_{i=1}^q \left[ \varnothing_{P_i}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i} g_i \right] \sup_{\gamma \in P_i} ||\mu|_{\gamma}||_W + \sup_{P_i} g_i \cdot \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu_F}) \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^q \left[ \varnothing_{P_i}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i} g_i \right] \left( \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu}) + \frac{1}{m(P_i)} \int_{P_i} ||\mu|_{\gamma}||_W dm(\gamma) \right) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^q \sup_{P_i} g_i \left( \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu}) + \varnothing_{P_i}(G) |\phi_x|_1 \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^q \left[ \varnothing_{P_i}(g_i) + 3 \sup_{P_i} g_i \right] \text{Var}_{P_i}(\Gamma_{\mu}) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^q \left[ \varnothing_{P_i}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i} g_i \right] \frac{1}{m(P_i)} \int_{P_i} ||\mu|_{\gamma}||_W dm(\gamma) \\
& + |\phi_x|_1 \max_{i=1,\ldots,q} \{ \sup_{P_i} g_i \} \varnothing(G) \\
& \leq \beta \varnothing(\Gamma_{\mu}) + K_3 |\phi_x|_1,1. \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[ \square \]

**Remark 9.12.** Remember that, the coefficients of inequality (72) are given by the formulas

\[ \beta = \max_i \{ \varnothing_{P_i}(g_i) + 3 \sup_{P_i} g_i \} \]

and

\[ K_3 = \max_i \{ \sup_{P_i} g_i \} \, \varnothing(G) + \max_i \left\{ \frac{\varnothing_{P_i}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i} g_i}{m(P_i)} \right\}. \]

We will use these expressions in the next result and later on.
Proposition 9.13. If $F : [0, 1]^2 \to [0, 1]^2$ satisfies all the hypothesis of Theorem 9.2. Then, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \beta_k < 1$ and $C_k > 0$ such that for all path $\Gamma_\mu$, where $\mu \in BV^+$, it holds

$$\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^k \mu}) \leq \beta_k \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + C_k |\phi_x|_{1,1}. \quad (75)$$

Proof. The proof is a straightforward consequence of the above Remark 9.12 and Remark 9.4, where $\beta_k$ was defined by equation (67). \hfill \square

Proposition 9.14. If $F : [0, 1]^2 \to [0, 1]^2$ satisfies all the hypothesis of Theorem 9.2. Then, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $C_0$ and $0 < \beta_k < 1$ such that for all path $\Gamma_\mu$, where $\mu \in BV^+$, and all $n \geq 1$ it holds

$$\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^{kn} \mu}) \leq C_0 \beta_k^n \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + C_0 |\phi_x|_{1,1}. \quad (76)$$

Proof. Inequality (71) gives us

$$|P^n_T f|_{1,1} \leq B_3 \beta_2^n |f|_{1,1} + C_2 |f|_{1,1}, \quad \forall n, \forall f \in BV_{1,1}, \quad (77)$$

for $B_3, C_2 > 0$ and $0 < \beta_2 < 1$. Then, since $|f|_1 \leq |f|_{1,1}$, it holds

$$|P^n_T f|_{1,1} \leq K_2 |f|_{1,1}, \quad \forall n, \forall f \in BV_{1,1}, \quad (78)$$

where

$$K_2 = B_3 + C_2. \quad (79)$$

In particular, inequality (78) holds if we replace $f$ by $\phi_x = \frac{d(\pi_x^* \mu)}{dm}$ for each $\mu \in BV^+$.

By inequality (78), Proposition 9.13 and a straightforward induction we have

$$\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F^{kn} \mu}) \leq \beta_k^n \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + C_k \max\{K_2, 1\} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \beta_k^i |\phi_x|_{1,1}, \quad \forall n \geq 0. \quad (80)$$

We finish the proof by setting

$$C_0 := \max\left\{1, \frac{C_k \max\{K_2, 1\}}{1 - \beta_k}\right\}. \quad (81)$$

Now we present the proof of Theorem 9.2.

Proof. (of Theorem 9.2)

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be from Proposition 9.14. For a given $n$, we set $n = kq_n + r_n$, where $0 \leq r_n < k$. Applying Proposition 9.11 and iterating $r_n$ times the inequality (72) we have
\[
\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F_n^* \mu}) \leq \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{ \beta_i \} \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + K_2 K_3 \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j |\phi_x|_{1,1}, \tag{82}
\]

where \( K_2 \) was defined in equation (78). Thus, by Proposition \( 9.14 \) and the above inequality (82), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Var}(\Gamma_{F_n^* \mu}) &= \text{Var}(\Gamma_{F_{3n}^n \mu}^n) \\
&\leq C_0 \beta_n^n \text{Var}(\Gamma_{F_n^* \mu}) + C_0 |\phi_x|_{1,1} \\
&\leq C_0 \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{ \beta_i \} \beta_n^n \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + \left[ C_0 \beta_n^n K_2 \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j + C_0 \right] |\phi_x|_{1,1} \\
&\leq C_0 \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{ \beta_i \} \beta_n^n \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + \left[ C_0 K_3 K_2 \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j + C_0 \right] |\phi_x|_{1,1} \\
&\leq K_0 \lambda_0^n \text{Var}(\Gamma_\mu) + K_0 |\phi_x|_{1,1},
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
K_0 = \max \left\{ \frac{C_0 \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{ \beta_i \}}{\beta_k}, C_0 K_3 K_2 \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j + C_0 \right\} \tag{83}
\]

and

\[
\lambda_0 = (\beta_k)^{\frac{1}{n}}. \tag{84}
\]


**Proposition 9.15.** If \( \{ F_\delta \}_{\delta \in [0,1]} \) is a BV Lorenz-like family. Then, there exist uniform constants \( \beta_u > 0 \) and \( K_u > 0 \) such that for every \( \mu \in BV^+ \), it holds

\[
\text{Var}(F_\delta^* \mu) \leq \beta_u \text{Var}(\mu) + K_u |\phi_x|_{1,1}, \forall \delta \in [0,1). \tag{85}
\]

**Proof.** Since \( \text{var}^\phi(G_\delta) \leq H_\delta \), we can apply Proposition ?? to each \( F_\delta \) to get (see Remark 9.12)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Var}(F_\delta^* \mu) &\leq \beta_\delta \text{Var}(\mu) + K_{3,\delta} |\phi_x|_{1,1}, \forall \delta \in [0,1), \tag{86}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\beta_\delta = \max_{i=1, \ldots, q} \left\{ \text{var}_{P_i^\delta}(g_i) + 3 \sup_{P_i^\delta} g_i \right\} \tag{87}
\]

and

\[
K_{3,\delta} = \max_i \left\{ \sup_{P_i^\delta} g_i \right\} \text{var}^\phi(G_\delta) + \max_i \left\{ \frac{\text{var}_{P_i^\delta}(g_i) + 2 \sup_{P_i^\delta} g_i}{m(P_i)} \right\}. \tag{88}
\]
Since \( \varphi(G_\delta) \leq H_\delta \), UBV4 ((2), (3), (4)) yields the existence of uniforms constants \( \beta_u := \sup_{\delta \in [0, 1]} \beta_\delta < \infty \) and \( K_u := \sup_{\delta \in [0, 1]} K_{3, \delta} < \infty \). \( \square \)

Note that, we do not necessarily have \( \beta_u < 1 \). In what follows, we will prove that there exists an uniform \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that this property is satisfied for the map \( F_\delta \), for all \( \delta \in [0, 1] \). We also remark that, if \( \{ F_\delta \}_{\delta \in [0, 1]} \) is a BV Lorenz-like family, then \( F_\delta \) also satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 9.2 for all \( n \geq 1 \) and all \( \delta \), in a way that we can apply Lemma 9.11 to \( F_\delta \), for all \( n \geq 1 \).

**Lemma 9.16.** Let \( \{ T_{\delta} \}_{\delta \in [0, 1]} \) be a family of piecewise expanding maps satisfying Definition 8.6, item (1), item (2), item (3) and item (4) of UBV4 (see Definition 8.9). Then, there is \( k \) (which does not depends on \( \delta \)) such that

\[
\sup_{\delta \in [0, 1]} \max \{ \varphi g_{i, \delta}^{(k)} + 3 \sup \varphi g_{i, \delta}^{(k)} \} < 1.
\]

**Proof.** (of the Lemma)

First of all, consider a piecewise expanding map, \( T : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \) satisfying Definition 8.6. For all \( n \geq 1 \), let \( \mathcal{P}^{(n)} \) be the partition of \( I \) s.t. \( \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(x) = \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(y) \) if and only if \( \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(T^j(x)) = \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(T^j(y)) \) for all \( j = 0, \ldots, n-1 \), where \( \mathcal{P}^{(1)} = \mathcal{P} \). For each \( n \) define \( T_i^n = T^n | P_i \) and \( g_i^{(n)} = \frac{1}{|T_i^n|} \), for all \( P_i \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)} \).

Let us consider \( n_0 \) and \( \lambda_1 \) from item 2) of Definition 8.6 \( \inf |T_{i}^{n_0}| \geq \lambda_1 > 1 \). For a given \( n \geq 1 \), we write \( n = n_0 q_n + r_n \), where \( 0 \leq r_n < n_0 \). Thus, for all \( x \in P_i \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)} = \{ P_1, \ldots, P_{q(n)} \} \), we have

\[
|T_i^{n_0'}(x)| = |(T_i^{n_0 q_n + r_n})'(x)|
\]

\[
= |(T_i^{n_0 q_n + r_n})'(x)|
\]

\[
= |(T_i^{n_0 q_n})'(T_i^{r_n}(x))||T_i^{r_n}'(x)|
\]

\[
\geq (\lambda_1)^{q_n} |(T_i^{r_n})'(x)|.
\]

Then,

\[
g_i^{(n)}(x) \leq \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right)^{q_n} \frac{1}{\max \sup \{g_i\} j}
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right)^{n_0 - 1} \max \sup \{g_i\} j
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right)^{n_0 - 1} \max \sup \{g_i\} j
\]

\[
\leq \lambda_1^n C_5,
\]
where $\lambda_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt[n_0]{\lambda_1}} < 1$ and $C_5 = \lambda_1 \max_{0 \leq i \leq q} \{\max_{0 \leq j \leq n_0} \sup \{g_i\}^j\}$. Therefore,

$$\sup \{g_i^{(n)}\} \leq \lambda_4^n C_5,$$  \hspace{1cm} (89)

for all $n \geq 1$ and all $i$.

Now, set $C_6 := \max\{C_5, \max_i \{\var\{g_i\}\}\}$. Thus, for all $n \geq 1$ it holds (see [29], page 41, equation (3.1))

$$\var g_i^{(n)} \leq \frac{n C_6^3}{\lambda_4^4} \lambda_4^n \forall \delta \in [0,1) \text{ and } \forall i = 1, \ldots q.$$  \hspace{1cm} (90)

Then,

$$\var g_i^{(n)} \leq C_7 \lambda_5^n \forall \delta, \forall n \geq 1, \forall i,$$  \hspace{1cm} (91)

where $\lambda_5 \in (\lambda_4, 1)$ and $C_7 := \sup_{n \geq 1} \left\{ \frac{C_6^3}{\lambda_4^4} \lambda_4^n \left( \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5} \right)^n \right\}$.

Now, let us consider a family of piecewise expanding maps, $\{T_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$, satisfying Definition 8.6, item (1), item (2), item (3) and item (4) of UBV4 (see Definition 8.9). Applying the above equations to $T_\delta$ we get, for all $i$ and all $\delta$

$$\sup \{g_i^{(n)}\} \leq \lambda_4^n C_{5,\delta},$$

where $\lambda_4,\delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt[n_0]{\lambda_1(\delta)}}$ and $C_{5,\delta} = \lambda_1(\delta) \max_i \{\max_{0 \leq j \leq n_0(\delta)} \sup \{g_{i,\delta}\}^j\}$.

By item (1) of UBV4, we get

$$\lambda_{4,u} := \sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} \{\lambda_4,\delta\} = \sup_{\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt[n_0]{\lambda_1(\delta)}} < 1$$

and by items (1) and (2) of UBV4 it holds

$$C_{5,u} := \sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} C_{5,\delta} < \infty.$$  \hspace{1cm} (92)

Then, we get the uniform estimate

$$\sup \{g_i^{(n)}\} \leq \lambda_4^n C_{5,u},$$

for all $\delta$, all $i$ and all $n \geq 1$.

By item (2) of UBV4, set $C_{6,u} := \max_{\delta \in [0,1)} \{C_{5,u}, \sup_i \max_i \{\var\{g_{i,\delta}\}\}\}$. Thus, for all $n \geq 1$ it holds

$$\var g_{i,\delta}^{(n)} \leq \frac{n C_{6,u}^3}{\lambda_4^n} \lambda_4^n \forall i \text{ and } \forall \delta \in [0,1).$$  \hspace{1cm} (93)

Then,

$$\var g_{i,\delta}^{(n)} \leq C_{7,u} \lambda_5^n \forall n \geq 1, \forall i, \forall \delta$$  \hspace{1cm} (94)
where $\lambda_{5,u} \in (\lambda_{4,u}, 1)$ and $C_{7,u} := \sup_{n \geq 1} \left\{ \frac{C_{6,u}}{\lambda_{4,u}} n \left( \frac{\lambda_{4,u}}{\lambda_{5,u}} \right)^n \right\}$.

□

**Proposition 9.17.** If $\{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$ is a BV Lorenz-like family. Then, there exist uniform constants $0 < \lambda_u < 1$, $C_u > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\mu \in BV^+$, it holds

\[
\text{Var}(F_\delta^k \mu) \leq \lambda_u \text{Var}(\mu) + C_u |\phi_x|_{1,1}, \ \forall \delta \in [0,1). \tag{95}
\]

**Proof.** Consider the iterate $F_\delta^k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is from Lemma 9.16. Applying Proposition 9.16, we get

\[
\text{Var}(F_\delta^k \mu) \leq \beta_\delta \text{Var}(\mu) + K_{3,\delta} |\phi_x|_{1,1}
\]

where

\[
\beta_\delta := \max_i \{ \text{var} g^{(k)}_{i,\delta} + 3 \sup g^{(k)}_{i,\delta} \}, \tag{96}
\]

and

\[
K_{3,\delta} := \max_i \{ \sup g^{(k)}_{i,\delta} \} \text{var}^\circ (G_{\delta}^k) + \max_i \left\{ \frac{\text{var} \pi_i (g^{(k)}_{i,\delta}) + 2 \sup g^{(k)}_{i,\delta}}{m(P_i)} \right\}. \tag{97}
\]

By Lemma 9.5, replacing $f$ by $\pi_y$, we have

\[
\text{var}^\circ (G_{\delta}^k) \leq q^k \sum_{j=1}^k q^j \{ 2 \text{var}^\circ (G_{\delta}) + 2q \}
\]

\[
\leq q^k \sum_{j=1}^k q^j \{ 2H_\delta + 2q \}.
\]

Since by item (4) of UBV4 we have $\sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} H_\delta < \infty$, we get $\sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} \text{var}^\circ (G_{\delta}^k) < \infty$. By the previous comments, item (2) and item (3) of UBV4, we define

\[
C_u := \sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} \{ K_{3,\delta} \} < \infty.
\]

We also set

\[
\lambda_u := \sup_{\delta \in [0,1)} \{ \beta_\delta \},
\]

where, by Lemma 9.5, it holds $\lambda_u < 1$. With these definitions we arrive at inequality (95).

□
Proposition 9.18. If $\{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$ is a BV Lorenz-like family. Then, there exist uniform constants $0 < \xi_u < 1$, $B_u > 0$ such that for every $\mu \in BV^+$, all $\delta \in [0,1)$ and all $n \geq 1$, it holds

$$\text{Var}(F_\delta^n \mu) \leq \xi_u^n B_u \text{Var}(\mu) + B_u |\phi_x|_{1,1}. \quad (98)$$

By UBV1 we have gives us

$$|P^n_{T_\delta} f|_{1,1} \leq D\lambda^n |f|_{1,1} + D|f|_1, \quad \forall n, \forall f \in BV_{1,1}, \quad (99)$$

where $D > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$. Then, since $|f|_1 \leq |f|_{1,1}$, it holds

$$|P^n_{T_\delta} f|_{1,1} \leq 2D|f|_{1,1}, \quad \forall n, \forall f \in BV_{1,1}, \quad (100)$$

where $2D \geq 1$. In particular, inequality (100) holds if we replace $f$ by $\phi_x = \frac{d(\pi x \mu)}{dm}$ for each $\mu \in BV^+$.

By Proposition 9.17 and a straightforward induction we have

$$\text{Var}(F_\delta^{*n_k} \mu) \leq \lambda_u^n \text{Var}(\mu) + 2DC_u \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_u^i |\phi_x|_{1,1}, \quad \forall n \geq 0. \quad (101)$$

Then,

$$\text{Var}(F_\delta^{*n_k} \mu) \leq \lambda_u^n \text{Var}(\mu) + \frac{2DC_u}{1-\lambda_u} |\phi_x|_{1,1}, \quad \forall n \geq 0. \quad (102)$$

Consider $D$ ($2D \geq 1$) from equation (100) and set $n = kq_n + r_n$, where $0 \leq r_n < k$. Applying Proposition 9.17 iterating $r_n$ times the inequality (101) we get

$$\text{Var}(F_\delta^{*r_n} \mu) \leq \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{\beta_u^i\} \text{Var}(\mu) + 2DK_u \sum_{j=0}^{k} \beta_u^j |\phi_x|_{1,1}. \quad (102)$$

Thus,
\[
\text{Var}(F_\delta^n \mu) \leq \lambda_u^n \text{Var}(F_\delta^n \mu) + \frac{2DC_u}{1 - \lambda_u} |\text{Pr}_{T_u^n}(\phi_x)|_{1,1}
\]
\[
\leq \lambda_u^n \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{\beta_i^u\} \text{Var}(\mu) + 2DK_u \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j^u |\phi_x|_{1,1} + \frac{4D^2C_u}{1 - \lambda_u} |\phi_x|_{1,1}
\]
\[
\leq \lambda_u^n \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{\beta_i^u\} \text{Var}(\mu) + 2DK_u \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j^u |\phi_x|_{1,1} + \frac{4D^2C_u}{1 - \lambda_u} |\phi_x|_{1,1}
\]
\[
\leq \left(\sqrt[\lambda_u]{\lambda_u}\right)^n \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{\beta_i^u\} \text{Var}(\mu) + 2DK_u \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j^u |\phi_x|_{1,1} + \frac{4D^2C_u}{1 - \lambda_u} |\phi_x|_{1,1}
\]
\[
\leq \xi_u^n B_u \text{Var}(\mu) + B_u |\phi_x|_{1,1},
\]

where \(B_u := \max \left\{ \frac{\max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \{\beta_i^u\}}{\lambda_u}, 2DK_u \sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j^u |\phi_x|_{1,1} + \frac{4D^2C_u}{1 - \lambda_u} \right\} \) and \(\xi_u := \sqrt[\lambda_u]{\lambda_u}\).

The proof of the next proposition is similar to the proof of Proposition 8.19.

**Proposition 9.19.** Let \(\{F_\delta\}_{\delta \in (0, 1)}\) be an Uniform BV Lorenz-like family (definition (8.3)) and let \(f_\delta\) be the unique \(F_\delta\)-invariant probability in \(BV_{1,1}\) (also in \(BV_{\infty}^{1,1}\)). Then, there exists \(B_u > 0\) such that

\[
\text{Var}(f_\delta) \leq 2B_u,
\]

for all \(\delta \in [0, 1)\).

**Proof.** Let \(f_\delta \in BV_{\infty}^{1,1}\) be the unique \(F_\delta\)-invariant probability measure in \(BV_{1,1}\). Consider the Lebesgue measure \(m\) and the iterates \(F_\delta^n(m)\). By Theorem 7.7, these iterates converge to \(f_\delta\) in \(L^\infty\). It means that the sequence \(\{\Gamma_{F_\delta^n}^{\omega}(m)\}_n\) converges \(m\)-a.e. to \(\Gamma_{f_\delta}^{\omega} \in \Gamma_{f_\delta}\) (in \(SB(I)\)) with respect to the metric defined in definition 3.5, where \(\Gamma_{f_\delta}^{\omega}\) is a path given by the Rokhlin Disintegration Theorem and \(\{\Gamma_{F_\delta^n}^{\omega}(m)\}_n\) is given by Remark 4.2. It implies that \(\{\Gamma_{F_\delta^n}^{\omega}(m)\}_n\) converges pointwise to \(\Gamma_{f_\delta}^{\omega}\) on a full measure set \(\tilde{I} \subset I\). Let us denote \(\Gamma_{\tilde{n}}^{\omega} = \Gamma_{F_{\delta^n}(m)}^{\omega}\) and \(\Gamma_{f_\delta}^{\omega} = \Gamma_{f_\delta}^{\omega}\). Since \(\{\Gamma_{\tilde{n}}^{\omega}\}_n\) converges pointwise to \(\Gamma_{f_\delta}^{\omega}\), it holds \(\text{Var}(\Gamma_{\tilde{n}}^{\omega}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \text{Var}(\Gamma_{f_\delta}^{\omega}, \mathcal{P})\) as \(n \rightarrow \infty\) for all finite sequences \(\mathcal{P} \subset \tilde{I}\). Indeed, let \(\mathcal{P} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \subset \tilde{I}\) be a finite sequence. Then,
\[
\text{Var}(\hat{\gamma}_n, \mathcal{P}) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} ||\hat{\gamma}_n(x_j) - \hat{\gamma}_n(x_{j-1})||_W,
\]

taking the limit, we get

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \text{Var}(\hat{\gamma}_n, \mathcal{P}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k} ||\hat{\gamma}_n(x_j) - \hat{\gamma}_n(x_{j-1})||_W
= \sum_{j=1}^{k} ||\hat{\gamma}_{f_{\delta}}(x_j) - \hat{\gamma}_{f_{\delta}}(x_{j-1})||_W
= \text{Var}(\hat{\gamma}_{f_{\delta}}, \mathcal{P}).
\]

On the other hand, \(\text{Var}(\hat{\gamma}_n, \mathcal{P}) \leq \text{Var}(F_{\delta}^{\ast n}(m)) \leq 2B_u\) for all \(n \geq 1\), where \(B_u\) comes from Proposition 9.18. Then \(\text{Var}(\hat{\gamma}_{f_{\delta}}, \mathcal{P}) \leq 2B_u\) for all partition \(\mathcal{P}\). Thus, \(\text{Var}(\hat{\gamma}_{f_{\delta}}) \leq 2B_u\) and hence \(\text{Var}(f_{\delta}) \leq 2B_u\). \(\square\)

### 10. Appendix 2: Linearity of the restriction

Let us consider the measurable spaces \((N_1, \mathcal{N}_1)\) and \((N_2, \mathcal{N}_2)\), where \(\mathcal{N}_1\) and \(\mathcal{N}_2\) are the Borel’s \(\sigma\)-algebra of \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) respectively. Let \(\mu \in \mathcal{AB}\) be a positive measure on the measurable space \((\Sigma, \mathcal{B})\), where \(\Sigma = N_1 \times N_2\) and \(\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2\) and consider its disintegration \(\{\mu_{\gamma}\}_{\gamma} \times \{\mu_{x}\}\) along \(\mathcal{F}^s\), where \(\mu_{x} = \pi_x^{\ast} \mu\) and \(d(\pi_x^{\ast} \mu) = \phi_x \mu dm_1\), for some \(\phi_x \in L^1(N_1, m_1)\). We will suppose that the \(\sigma\)-algebra \(\mathcal{B}\) has a countable generator.

**Proposition 10.1.** Suppose that \(\mathcal{B}\) has a countable generator, \(\Gamma\). If \(\{\mu_{\gamma}\}_{\gamma}\) and \(\{\mu'_{\gamma}\}_{\gamma}\) are disintegrations of a positive measure \(\mu\) relative to \(\mathcal{F}^s\), then \(\phi_x(\gamma)\mu_{\gamma} = \phi_x(\gamma)\mu'_{\gamma}\) \(m_1\)-a.e. \(\gamma \in N_1\).

**Proof.** Let \(\mathcal{A}\) be the algebra generated by \(\Gamma\). \(\mathcal{A}\) is countable and \(\mathcal{A}\) generates \(\mathcal{B}\). For each \(A \in \mathcal{A}\) define the sets

\[G_A = \{\gamma \in N_1 | \phi_x(\gamma)\mu_{\gamma}(A) < \phi_x(\gamma)\mu'_{\gamma}(A)\}\]
and

\[R_A = \{\gamma \in N_1 | \phi_x(\gamma)\mu_{\gamma}(A) > \phi_x(\gamma)\mu'_{\gamma}(A)\}\].

If \(\gamma \in G_A\) then \(\gamma \subset \pi_x^{-1}(G_A)\) and \(\mu_{\gamma}(A) = \mu_{\gamma}(A \cap \pi_x^{-1}(G_A))\). Otherwise, if \(\gamma \notin G_A\) then \(\gamma \cap \pi_x^{-1}(G_A) = \emptyset\) and \(\mu_{\gamma}(A \cap \pi_x^{-1}(G_A)) = 0\). The same holds for \(\mu'_{\gamma}\). Then, it holds

\[\mu(A \cap \pi_x^{-1}(G_A)) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\int \mu_{\gamma}(A \cap \pi_x^{-1}(Q_A))\phi_x(\gamma)dm_1 = \int_{Q_A} \mu_{\gamma}(A)\phi_x(\gamma)dm_1 \\
\int \mu'_{\gamma}(A \cap \pi_x^{-1}(Q_A))\phi_x(\gamma)dm_1 = \int_{Q_A} \mu'_{\gamma}(A)\phi_x(\gamma)dm_1.
\end{array} \right.\]
Proof. Suppose \( \mu_\gamma(A) < \mu'_\gamma(A) \phi_\gamma(A) \) for all \( \gamma \in G_A \), we get \( m_1(G_A) = 0 \). The same holds for \( R_A \). Thus

\[
m_1 \left( \bigcup_{A \in A} R_A \cup G_A \right) = 0.
\]

It means that, \( m_1 \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in N_1 \) the positive measures \( \phi_\gamma(\gamma) \mu_\gamma \) and \( \mu'_\gamma \phi_\gamma(\gamma) \) coincide for all measurable set \( A \) of an algebra which generates \( B \). Therefore \( \phi_\gamma(\gamma) \mu_\gamma = \mu'_\gamma \phi_\gamma(\gamma) \) for \( m_1 \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in N_1 \).

\[\square\]

**Proposition 10.2.** Let \( \mu_1, \mu_2 \in AB \) be two positive measures and denote their marginal densities by \( d(\mu_1) = \phi_x dm_1 \) and \( d(\mu_2) = \psi_x dm_1 \), where \( \phi_x, \psi_x \in L^1(m_1) \) respectively. Then \( (\mu_1 + \mu_2)|_\gamma = \mu_1|_\gamma + \mu_2|_\gamma \) \( m_1 \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in N_1 \).

**Proof.** Note that \( d(\mu_1 + \mu_2) = (\phi_x + \psi_x) dm_1 \). Moreover, consider the disintegration of \( \mu_1 + \mu_2 \) given by

\[
((\mu_1 + \mu_2)|_\gamma, (\phi_x + \psi_x)m_1),
\]

where

\[
(\mu_1 + \mu_2)|_\gamma = \begin{cases} 
\phi_x(\gamma) + \psi_x(\gamma) \mu_1|_\gamma + \psi_x(\gamma) \mu_2|_\gamma, & \text{if } \phi_x(\gamma) + \psi_x(\gamma) \neq 0 \\
0, & \text{if } \phi_x(\gamma) + \psi_x(\gamma) = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Then, by Proposition [10.1] for \( m_1 \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in N_1 \), it holds

\[(\phi_x + \psi_x)(\gamma)(\mu_1 + \mu_2)|_\gamma = \phi_x(\gamma)(\mu_1|_\gamma, \mu_2|_\gamma).
\]

Therefore, \( (\mu_1 + \mu_2)|_\gamma = \mu_1|_\gamma + \mu_2|_\gamma \) \( m_1 \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in N_1 \).

\[\square\]

**Definition 10.3.** We say that a positive measure \( \lambda_1 \) is disjoint from a positive measure \( \lambda_2 \) if \( (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^+ = \lambda_1 \) and \( (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^- = \lambda_2 \).

**Remark 10.4.** A straightforward computations yields that if \( \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \) is disjoint from \( \lambda_3 \), then both \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are disjoint from \( \lambda_3 \), where \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \) and \( \lambda_3 \) are all positive measures.

**Lemma 10.5.** Suppose that \( \mu = \mu^+ - \mu^- \) and \( \nu = \nu^+ - \nu^- \) are the Jordan decompositions of the signed measures \( \mu \) and \( \nu \). Then, there exist positive measures \( \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu^{++}, \mu^{--}, \nu^{++}, \) and \( \nu^{--} \) such that \( \mu^+ = \mu^{++} + \mu^1 \mu^- = \mu^{--} + \mu_2 \) and \( \nu^+ = \nu^{++} + \mu_2, \nu^- = \nu^{--} + \mu_1 \).

**Proof.** Suppose \( \mu = \nu_1 - \nu_2 \) with \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_2 \) positive measures. Let \( \mu^+ \) and \( \mu^- \) be the Jordan decomposition of \( \mu \). Let \( \mu' = \nu_1 - \mu^+ \), then \( \nu_1 = \mu^- + \mu' \). Indeed \( \mu^+ - \mu^- = \nu_1 - \nu_2 \) which implies that \( \mu^+ - \nu_1 = \mu^- - \nu_2 \). Thus if \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \) is a decomposition of \( \mu \), then \( \nu_1 = \mu^+ + \mu' \) and \( \nu_2 = \mu^- + \mu' \) for some positive measure \( \mu' \). Now, consider \( \mu = \mu^+ - \mu^- \) and \( \nu = \nu^+ - \nu^- \). Since the pairs of positive measures \( \mu^+, \nu^- \) and \( (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^+, (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^- \) are both decompositions of \( \mu^+ - \nu^- \), by the above comments, we get that
\[ \mu^+ = (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^+ + \mu_1 \text{ and } \nu^- = (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^- + \mu_1, \text{ for some positive measure } \mu_1. \]

Analogously, since the pairs of positive measures \( \mu^-, \nu^+ \) and \( (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^+, (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^- \) are both decompositions of \( \nu^+ - \mu^- \), by the above comments, we get that \( \nu^+ = (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^+ + \mu_2 \) and \( \mu^- = (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^- + \mu_2 \), for some positive measure \( \mu_2 \). By definition \([10.3]\), \( \mu^+ \) and \( \mu^- \) are disjoint, and so are \( (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^+ \) and \( (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^- \). Analogously, \( \nu^+ \) and \( \nu^- \) are disjoint, and so are \( (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^- \) and \( (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^+ \). Moreover, since \( (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^+ \) and \( (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^- \) are disjoint, so are \( (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^+ \) and \( (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^- \). This gives that, the pair 

\[ (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^+ + (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^+, (\nu^+ - \mu^-)^- + (\mu^+ - \nu^-)^- \]

is a Jordan decomposition of \( \mu + \nu \) and we are done.

\[ \Box \]

**Proposition 10.6.** Let \( \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{AB} \) be two signed measures. Then \( (\mu + \nu)|_\gamma = \mu|_\gamma + \nu|_\gamma \) \( m_1 \)-a.e. \( \gamma \in N_1 \).

**Proof.** Suppose that \( \mu = \mu^+ - \mu^- \) and \( \nu = \nu^+ - \nu^- \) are the Jordan decompositions of \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) respectively. By definition, \( \mu|_\gamma = \mu^+|_\gamma - \mu^-|_\gamma \), \( \nu|_\gamma = \nu^+|_\gamma - \nu^-|_\gamma \).

By Lemma \([10.5]\), suppose that \( \mu^+ = \mu^{++} + \mu_1, \mu^- = \mu^{--} + \mu_2 \) and \( \nu^+ = \nu^{++} + \mu_2, \nu^- = \nu^{--} + \mu_1 \). In a way that \( (\mu + \nu)^+ = \mu^{++} + \nu^{++} \) and \( (\mu + \nu)^- = \mu^{--} + \nu^{--} \). By Proposition \([10.2]\), it holds \( \mu^{++}|_\gamma = \mu^{++}|_\gamma + \mu_1|_\gamma \), \( \mu^{--}|_\gamma = \mu^{--}|_\gamma + \mu_2|_\gamma \), \( \nu^{++}|_\gamma = \nu^{++}|_\gamma + \mu_2|_\gamma \) and \( \nu^{--}|_\gamma = \nu^{--}|_\gamma + \mu_1|_\gamma \).

Moreover,

\[
(\mu + \nu)^+|_\gamma = \mu^{++}|_\gamma + \nu^{++}|_\gamma \\
(\mu + \nu)^-|_\gamma = \mu^{--}|_\gamma + \nu^{--}|_\gamma
\]

Putting all together, we get:

\[
(\mu + \nu)|_\gamma = (\mu + \nu)^+|_\gamma - (\mu + \nu)^-|_\gamma \\
= \mu^{++}|_\gamma + \nu^{++}|_\gamma - (\mu^{--}|_\gamma + \nu^{--}|_\gamma) \\
= \mu^{++}|_\gamma + \mu_1|_\gamma + \nu^{++}|_\gamma + \mu_2|_\gamma - (\mu^{--}|_\gamma + \mu_2|_\gamma + \nu^{--}|_\gamma + \mu_1|_\gamma) \\
= \mu^{++}|_\gamma + \mu^-|_\gamma + \nu^{++}|_\gamma - \nu^-|_\gamma \\
= \mu|_\gamma + \nu|_\gamma.
\]

\[ \Box \]

We immediately arrive at the following

**Corollary 10.7.** Let \( \mu \in \mathcal{AB} \) be a signed measure and \( \mu = \mu^+ - \mu^- \) its Jordan decomposition. If \( \mu_1 \) and \( \mu_2 \) are positive measures such that \( \mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2 \), then \( \mu|_\gamma = \mu_1|_\gamma - \mu_2|_\gamma \). It means that, the restriction does not depends on the decomposition of \( \mu \).

11. **Appendix 3: Uniform Family of Operators**

In this section, we prove the main results on uniform families of operators stated in Section \([8.0.1]\). We state a general lemma on the stability of fixed points satisfying certain assumptions. Consider two operators \( L_0 \) and \( L_\delta \).
preserving a normed space of signed measures $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(X)$ with norm $|.|_{\mathcal{B}}$. Suppose that $f_0, f_\delta \in \mathcal{B}$ are fixed points of $L_0$ and $L_\delta$, respectively.

**Lemma 11.1.** Suppose that:

a) $|L_\delta f_\delta - L_0 f_\delta|_{\mathcal{B}} < \infty$;

b) For all $i \geq 1$, $L_0^i$ is continuous on $\mathcal{B}$: for each $i \geq 1$, $\exists C_i$ s.t. $\forall g \in \mathcal{B}$, $|L_0^i g|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C_i |g|_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Then, for each $N \geq 1$, it holds

$$||f_\delta - f_0||_{\mathcal{B}} \leq ||L_0^N (f_\delta - f_0)||_{\mathcal{B}} + ||L_\delta f_\delta - L_0 f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{i \in [0,N-1]} C_i.$$ (104)

**Proof.** The proof is a direct computation. First note that,

$$||f_\delta - f_0||_{\mathcal{B}} \leq ||L_0^N f_\delta - L_0^N f_0||_{\mathcal{B}}$$

$$\leq ||L_0^N f_0 - L_0^N f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}} + ||L_0^N f_\delta - L_\delta^N f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}}$$

$$\leq ||L_0^N (f_0 - f_\delta)||_{\mathcal{B}} + ||L_0^N f_\delta - L_\delta^N f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}}.$$ 

Moreover,

$$L_0^N - L_\delta^N = \sum_{k=1}^{N} L_0^{N-k} (L_0 - L_\delta) L_\delta^{(k-1)}$$

hence

$$(L_0^N - L_\delta^N) f_\delta = \sum_{k=1}^{N} L_0^{N-k} (L_0 - L_\delta) L_\delta^{(k-1)} f_\delta$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{N} L_0^{N-k} (L_0 - L_\delta) f_\delta$$

by item b), we have

$$||(L_0^N - L_\delta^N) f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N} C_{N-k} ||(L_0 - L_\delta) f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}}$$

$$\leq ||(L_0 - L_\delta) f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{i \in [0,N-1]} C_i$$

and then

$$||f_\delta - f_0||_{\mathcal{B}} \leq ||L_0^N (f_0 - f_\delta)||_{\mathcal{B}} + ||(L_0 - L_\delta) f_\delta||_{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{i \in [0,N-1]} C_i.$$ 

□

Now, let us apply the statement to our family of operators satisfying assumptions UF1–UF4, supposing $B_w = B$. We have the following

**Proposition 11.2.** Suppose $\{L_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,1)}$ is an uniform family of operators as in Definition [8.7], where $f_0$ is the unique fixed point of $L_0$ in $B_w$ and $f_\delta$
is a fixed point of \( L_\delta \). Then, there is a \( \delta_0 \in (0,1) \) such that for all \( \delta \in (0,\delta_0] \) it holds
\[
\| f_\delta - f_0 \|_w = O(\delta \log \delta).
\]

**Proof.** First note that, if \( \delta \geq 0 \) is small enough, then \( \delta \leq -\delta \log \delta \). Moreover, \( x - 1 \leq |x| \), for all \( x \in \mathbb{R} \).

By UF2,
\[
\| L_\delta f_\delta - L_0 f_\delta \|_w \leq \delta C
\]
(see Lemma 11.1 item a) and UF4 yields \( C_i \leq M_2 \).

Hence, by Lemma 11.1 we have
\[
\| f_\delta - f_0 \|_w \leq \delta CM_2 N + \| L_0^N (f_0 - f_\delta) \|_w.
\]
By the exponential convergence to equilibrium of \( L_0 \) (UF3), there exists \( 0 < \rho_2 < 1 \) and \( C_2 > 0 \) such that (recalling that by UF1 \( \|(f_\delta - f_0)\|_s \leq 2M)\)
\[
\| L_0^N (f_\delta - f_0) \|_w \leq C_2 \rho_2^N \| (f_\delta - f_0) \|_s
\]
\[
\leq 2C_2 \rho_2^N M
\]
hence
\[
\| f_\delta - f_0 \|_w \leq \delta CM_2 N + 2C_2 \rho_2^N M.
\]
Choosing \( N = \left\lfloor \frac{\log \delta}{\log \rho_2} \right\rfloor \), we have
\[
\| f_\delta - f_0 \|_w \leq \delta CM_2 \frac{\log \delta}{\log \rho_2} + 2C_2 \rho_2^N M
\]
\[
\leq \delta \log \delta CM_2 \frac{1}{\log \rho_2} + 2C_2 \rho_2^{\frac{\log \delta}{\log \rho_2}} M
\]
\[
\leq \delta \log \delta CM_2 \frac{1}{\log \rho_2} + 2C_2 \rho_2^{\frac{\log \delta}{\log \rho_2}} \rho_2
\]
\[
\leq \delta \log \delta CM_2 \frac{1}{\log \rho_2} + \frac{2C_2 \delta M}{\rho_2}
\]
\[
\leq \delta \log \delta CM_2 \frac{1}{\log \rho_2} - \frac{2C_2 \delta M}{\rho_2}
\]
\[
\leq \delta \log \delta \left( CM_2 \frac{1}{\log \rho_2} - \frac{2C_2 M}{\rho_2} \right).
\]
\[\square\]

**References**


(Rafael Lucena) Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro - UFRJ and Università di Pisa - UNIPI
E-mail address: rafael.lucena@im.ufal.br
URL: www.mathlucena.blogspot.com

(Stefano Galatolo) Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa - UNIPI
E-mail address: stefano.galatolo@unipi.it
URL: http://users.dma.unipi.it/galatolo/