LIFT AND SYNCHRONIZATION

V PINHEIRO

ABSTRACT. We study the problem of lifting a measure to an induced map. In particular, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a measure to be liftable as well as a condition for the lift to be an ergodic measure. We introduce the concept of a coherent schedule of events and relate it to the lift problem. As a consequence, we prove that we can always synchronize coherent schedules at almost every point with respect to a given invariant probability \( \mu \), showing that we can synchronize “Pliss times” \( \mu \) almost everywhere. We also provide a version of this synchronization to non-invariant measures and from that we obtain some results related to Viana’s conjecture on the existence of SRB measures for maps with non-zero Lyapunov exponents for Lebesgue almost every point.
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1. Introduction and statement of main results

Let \( f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \) be a measurable map defined on a metric space \( \mathcal{X} \). In the study of the forward evolution of the orbit of a point \( p \in \mathcal{X} \), it is a common strategy to analyze its orbit at special moments \( U(p) \subset \mathbb{N} \). These moments can be selected in order to condense information (for instance, when one is using a Poincaré map on a cross section of a flow) or to emphasize some particular property that we are interested in. A concrete example of the last situation are the hyperbolic times on the study of non-uniformly hyperbolic dynamics. Hyperbolic times are a particular case of Pliss times defined as follows. Consider an additive \( f \)-cocycle \( \varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), i.e., \( \varphi \) is measurable and \( \varphi(n + m, p) = \varphi(n, f^m(p)) + \varphi(m, p) \).

Given \( \gamma \in \mathbb{R} \), we say that \( n \geq 1 \) is a \((\gamma, \varphi)\)-Pliss time for \( p \in \mathcal{X} \), with respect to \( f \), if

\[
\frac{1}{n-k} \varphi(n-k, f^k(p)) \geq \gamma \quad \text{for every } 0 \leq k < n.
\]

According to Pliss Lemma (see Lemma 5.7), if \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, p) > \lambda \) then \( f \) has positive frequency of \((\lambda, \varphi)\)-Pliss times. That is, if \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, p) > \lambda \) then the upper natural density of moments with Pliss time is positive, where the upper natural density of \( U \subset \mathbb{N} \) is

\[
d_N(U) := \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \#\{1, 2, \ldots, n \cap U\}.
\]

To formalize the idea of selected times, define a schedule of events as a measurable map \( U : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow 2^\mathbb{N} \), where \( 2^\mathbb{N} \) is the power set of the natural numbers \( \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \) with the metric dist\((A, B) = 2^{-\min(A \Delta B)}\), see Section 5 for more details. Suppose that one have two collections of selected moments, that is, two schedule of events \( U \) and \( V \), each one representing good moments of different properties that we need to analyze simultaneously. Given a point \( p \in \mathcal{X} \), the central problem of the present paper is to know if the intersection of the two schedules at \( p \) is a statistical significant subset of \( \mathbb{N} \), that is, if the upper natural density of \( U(p) \cap V(p) \) is nonzero.

In many problems, it is possible to have good information about the state of a point \( p \) at time \( t \) by knowing the state of \( p \) at a time \( t + \ell \) for a finite fixed \( \ell \geq 0 \). That is, a fixed displacement \( \ell \) on one of the schedules may be acceptable. Thus, we can consider the problem of finding a \( \ell \geq 0 \) such that

\[
d_N^+(\{j \in \mathbb{N}; (j, j + \ell) \in U(p) \times V(p)\}) > 0. \tag{1}
\]

We say that \( U(p) \) and \( V(p) \) are synchronizable if (1) is true for some \( \ell \geq 0 \). Clearly, each schedule having positive upper natural density is a necessary condition to (1), but it is not a sufficient one, as can be seen in Example 5.3. Because of that, we introduce the idea of coherence. A coherent schedule of events is a measurable map \( U : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow 2^\mathbb{N} \) such that

1. \( n \in U(x) \implies n - j \in U(f^j(x)) \) for every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( n > j \geq 0 \);
2. \( n \in U(x) \) and \( m \in U(f^n(x)) \implies n + m \in U(x) \) for every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( n, m \geq 1 \).

Note that, if we define \( U(x) \) as the set of \((\lambda, \varphi)\)-Pliss times for \( x \), then \( U(x) \) satisfies both conditions above. Furthermore, by Pliss Lemma, \( d_N^+(U(x)) > 0 \) whenever \( \limsup \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) > \lambda \). That is, Pliss times generates coherent schedule of events with
positive upper natural density. In Section 5, we show that it is easy to produce coherent schedule of events, even without using Pliss times.

A coherent schedule of events \( \mathcal{U} \) yields to an induced map \( F(x) = f_{\min \mathcal{U}(x)}(x) \) with special properties. In particular, \( F \) is orbit-coherent (see Definition 2.5). Hence, in order to obtain the synchronization, in the presence of an invariant probability, we study induced maps (Section 2 and 3) and obtain a suitable characterization of liftable measures (Section 4).

In Theorem A below, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition to lift an ergodic \( f \) invariant probability to an induced map \( F \). Furthermore, this condition is automatically satisfied for many induced maps generated in the context of non-uniformly hyperbolic dynamics. In addition, if the induced map is orbit-coherent then the lift is unique and ergodic.

**Theorem A.** Suppose that \( \mathcal{X} \) is a separable metric space, \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \) a (Borel) measurable map, \( A \subset \mathcal{X} \) measurable, \( F : A \to \mathcal{X} \) a measurable induced map, \( F(x) = f^R(x) \), with induced time \( R : A \to \mathbb{N} \). If \( \mu \) is an ergodic \( f \)-invariant Borel probability and \( A_0 := \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \), then the four condition below are equivalent.

1. \( \mu \) is \( F \)-liftable.
2. \( \mu\left(\left\{ x \in A_0 ; \mathcal{O}^+_n \{ j \geq 0 ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}^+_F(x) \} > 0 \right\}\right) > 0. \)
3. \( \mu\left(\left\{ x \in A_0 ; \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) < +\infty \right\}\right) > 0. \)
4. There is a \( F \)-invariant probability \( \nu \) and \( 1 \leq C < +\infty \) such that \( \nu \leq C \mu \) and \( \int \nu \mathcal{X} < +\infty. \)

Furthermore, if \( F \) is orbit-coherent then there is one and only one probability that is the \( F \)-lift of \( \mu \) (and this probability is \( F \)-ergodic).

**Definition 1.1** (Coherent block). Let \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \) be an injective map and \( \mathcal{U} \) a \( f \)-coherent schedule on \( \mathcal{X} \). Define the \( f \)-coherent block for \( \mathcal{U} \) or, for short, the \( \mathcal{U} \)-block, as

\[
B_\mathcal{U} = \left\{ x \in \bigcap_{n \geq 0} f^n(\mathcal{X}) ; j \in \mathcal{U}(f^{-j}(x)) \forall j \geq 0 \right\}.
\]

**Theorem B.** Suppose that \( \mathcal{X} \) is a separable metric space. Let \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \) be an injective bimeasurable map and \( \mathcal{U} \) a \( f \)-coherent schedule. Let \( \mathcal{X}^+_{\mathcal{U}} := \{ x \in \mathcal{X} ; \mathcal{O}^+_n(\mathcal{U}(x)) > 0 \} \). If \( \mu \) is a \( f \)-invariant probability, then the following statements are true.

1. \( \mathcal{O}^+_n(\mathcal{U}(x)) := \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \# \{ j < n ; j \in \mathcal{U}(x) \} \) exists for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \).
2. \( \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{O}^+_n(\mathcal{U}(x)) \ d\mu = \mu(B_\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{X}^+_{\mathcal{U}}). \)
(3) $\mu(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(B_U)) = \mu(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(B_U)) = 0$.
(4) If $\mu$ is an ergodic $f$-invariant probability with $\mu(\mathcal{X}_U^+) > 0$, then
- $\phi_0(U(x)) = \mu(B_U) > 0$ for $\mu$-almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$;
- $\frac{1}{\mu(B_U)}\mu|_{B_U}$ is an ergodic $F$-invariant probability and it is the unique $F$-invariant probability that is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu$, where $F$ is the first $U$-time map, i.e., $F(x) = f_{\min U}(x)$ and $R_U(x) = \min U(x)$ is the first $U$-time.

**Remark 1.2.** If one assumes that $\mathcal{X}$ is also complete then, in Theorem B, $f$ can be taken only injective and measurable (not necessarily bimeasurable). Indeed, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a complete separable metric space, it follows from Theorem 4.16 that a countable-to-one measurable map must be bimeasurable.

Given any bimeasurable map $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ and $f$-coherent schedule $U$ define the $U$-absorbing set as

$$\mathcal{A}_U = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^n \left( \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \right),$$

where $F(x) = f_{\min U}(x)$ is the first $U$-time map. Using the absorbing set instead of the coherent block, we can extend the result above to non-injective maps.

**Corollary C.** Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is a separable metric space. If $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ is a bimeasurable map, $U$ a $f$-coherent schedule and $\mathcal{X}_U^+ = \{ x \in \mathcal{X} ; a^+_n(U(x)) > 0 \}$, then the following statements are true for any given $f$-invariant probability $\mu$.

1. $\phi_0(U(x)) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ j < n ; j \in U(x) \}$ exists for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
2. $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \phi_0(U(x)) d\mu = \mu(\mathcal{A}_U \cap \mathcal{X}_U^+)$.
3. $\mu(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(\mathcal{A}_U)) = \mu(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(\mathcal{A}_U)) = 0$.
4. If $\mu$ is ergodic and $\mu(\mathcal{X}_U^+) > 0$, then
   - $\phi_0(U(x)) = \mu(\mathcal{A}_U) > 0$ for $\mu$-almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$;
   - $\phi_0(\{ j \geq 1 ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{A}_U \text{ and } j \notin U(x) \}) = 0$, for $\mu$-almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$;
   - $\frac{1}{\mu(\mathcal{A}_U)}\mu|_{\mathcal{A}_U}$ is an ergodic $F$-invariant probability and it is the unique $F$-invariant probability that is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu$, where $F$ is the first $U$-time map, i.e., $F(x) = f_{\min U}(x)$ and $R_U(x) = \min U(x)$ is the first $U$-time.
   - $\int_{ \mathcal{A}_U } R_U d\mu = 1$.

As a consequence of Theorem [B] Theorem [D] shows that, in the presence of an invariant measure, the synchronization (up to a fixed displacement) of two coherent schedules of events with positive upper natural density is always possible at almost every point.

**Theorem D** (Synchronization for invariant measures). Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is a separable metric space and $f$ is bimeasurable. Let $\mu$ be an ergodic $f$-invariant probability and $\mathcal{U}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{U}_m : \mathcal{X} \to 2^\mathcal{X}$ a finite collection of coherent schedules for $f$. If $a^+_N(U_j(x)) > 0$ for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and every $0 \leq j \leq m$, then there are $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_m \geq 0$ and $\theta > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; (j, j + \ell_1, \ldots, j + \ell_m) \in \mathcal{U}_0(x) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_m(x) \} = \theta,$$

for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
This paper has two goals. The first one is to synchronize coherent schedules for typical points with respect to an invariant probability. The second goal is more specific, it is to obtain some advance on the synchronization of Pliss times associated to Lyapunov exponents, but not assuming the existence of an invariant measure. The first goal was motivated by problems on ergodic theory and thermodynamical formalism associated to non-uniformly hyperbolic dynamics. In Section 8 we give some applications of the results above: we want to mention here an extension of Kac result (Theorem 8.6), an induced scheme to non-uniformly expanding probabilities (Theorem 8.10) and the existence of Hyperbolic Blocks of Pesin Theory for $C^1$ diffeomorphisms (Theorem 8.11). The second goal mentioned above was motivated by Viana’s conjecture about non-zero Lyapunov exponents.

**Conjecture 1** (Viana [24]). If a smooth map $f$ has only non-zero Lyapunov exponents at Lebesgue almost every point, then it admits some SRB measure.

Here we are focused on the case when $f$ has only positive Lyapunov exponents at Lebesgue almost every point. Assume also that $f : M \to M$ is a $C^1$ local diffeomorphism on a compact Riemannian manifold $M$.

According to Oseledets Theorem, there is a set $U \subset M$ with total probability (i.e., $\mu(U) = 1$ for every invariant probability $\mu$) such that $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \log |Df^n(x)v|$ exists for every $v \in T_xM \setminus \{0\}$ and $x \in U$. The limit $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \log |Df^n(x)v|$ is called the **Lyapunov exponent** of $x$ on the direction $v$.

If $x \notin U$ and $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \log |Df^n(x)v|$ does not exist, then one can use $\limsup$ or $\liminf$ to define the Lyapunov exponents. As we are interested in positive Lyapunov exponents, the convenient assumption is $\liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \log |Df^n(x)v| > 0$. It follows from the continuity of the map $T^1_xM := \{v \in T_xM; |v| = 1\}$ $\ni v \mapsto \frac{1}{n} \log |Df^n(x)v|$ and the compactness of $T^1_xM$ that

$$\liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |Df^n(x)v| > 0 \quad \forall v \in T^1_xM \implies \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n(x)^{-1}\|^{-1} > 0.$$  

Therefore, we say that $x$ **has only positive Lyapunov exponents** when

$$\limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n(x)^{-1}\|^{-1} > 0. \quad (3)$$

Hence, a version of Viana’s conjecture for a local diffeomorphism on a compact manifold having only positive Lyapunov exponents is the following.

**Conjecture 2** (Viana). Let $M$ be a compact Riemannian manifold and $f : M \to M$ a $C^1+$ local diffeomorphism. If (3) holds for Lebesgue almost every $x \in M$ then $f$ admits some absolutely continuous invariant measure (in particular, a SRB measure).

One year after publishing his conjecture, Viana, in a joined work with J. Alves and C. Bonatti [2], instead of using the Lyapunov exponents condition (3), assumed that

$$\liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df(f^j(x))^{-1}\|^{-1} > 0 \quad (4)$$
for Lebesgue almost and they proved that Conjecture 2 is true when (3) is replaced by (4).
In [17], the author was able to weaken condition (4) to
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \| (Df(f^j(x)))^{-1} \|^{-1} > 0
\]
and still obtain the existence of an absolutely continuous invariant measure. Notice that (4) ⇒ (5) ⇒ (3), as \( \log \| (Df^n(x))^{-1} \|^{-1} \geq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \| (Df(f^j(x)))^{-1} \|^{-1} \). The condition (4), and a posteriori (5), came to be known as \textbf{NUE} (non-uniformly expanding) condition and the dynamical systems satisfying (4) or (5) on a set of points with positive Lebesgue measure came to be known as Non-uniformly Expanding Dynamics. Nevertheless, there are many authors that refers to non-uniformly expanding dynamics when there is a set of points with positive Lebesgue measure to be the unit tangent bundle.

We observe that \textbf{synchronized NUE} would be a more appropriate name to conditions (4) or (5), letting “NUE” for the condition (3). To see that, let \( T^1M = \bigcup_{x \in M} T^1_x M \subset TM \) be the unit tangent bundle. Note that \( \log |Df^n(x)v| \) is an additive cocycle for the auxiliary skew-product \( F : T^1M \to T^1M \) given by
\[
F(x,v) = \left( f(x), \frac{Df(x)v}{|Df(x)v|} \right).
\]
Indeed, as \( F^n(x,v) = (f^n(x), \frac{A^n(x)v}{|A^n(x)v|}) \), taking \( h(x,v) = \log |Df(x)v| \), we get that
\[
h(F^j(x,v)) = h\left( f^j(x), \frac{Df^j(x)v}{|Df^j(x)v|} \right) = \log \left| Df(f^j(x)) \frac{Df^j(x)v}{|Df^j(x)v|} \right| = \log |Df^{j+1}(x)v| - \log |Df^j(x)v|
\]
and so, we conclude that \( \psi : \mathbb{N} \times T^1M \to \mathbb{R} \), defined by
\[
\psi(n, (x,v)) := \log |Df^n(x)v| = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} h \circ F^j(x,v),
\]
is an additive \( F \)-cocycle. Thus, if \( \gamma = \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log \| (Df^n(x))^{-1} \|^{-1} > 0 \), define \( \mathcal{L}(x,v) \) as the set of all \( (\gamma/2, \psi) \)-Pliss times for \( (x,v) \in T^1M \). Note that, for \( v \neq u \in T^1_x M \), we don’t know if there exists some \( \ell \geq 0 \) such that
\[
\mathfrak{d}_N^+(\{ j \in \mathbb{N} ; (j,j+\ell) \in \mathcal{L}(x,v) \times \mathcal{L}(x,u) \}) > 0.
\]
Nevertheless, assuming that \( \gamma = \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \| (Df(f^j(x)))^{-1} \|^{-1} > 0 \), it follows from Pliss Lemma that there exists \( \theta > 0 \) such that \( \mathfrak{d}_N^+(\mathcal{Q}(x)) \geq \theta \), where \( \mathcal{Q}(x) \) is the set of all \( (\gamma/2, \Psi) \)-Pliss times with \( \Psi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) being the \( f \) additive cocycle
\[
\Psi(n,x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \| (Df(f^j(x)))^{-1} \|^{-1}.
\]
Thus, it follows from the fact that \( \psi(n, (x,v)) \geq \Psi(n,x) \) for every \( (x,v) \in T^1M \) that \( \mathcal{Q}(x) \subset \bigcap_{v \in T^1_x M} \mathcal{L}(x,v) \). In particular,
\[
\mathfrak{d}_N^+(\mathcal{L}(x,v) \cap \mathcal{L}(x,u)) \geq \theta > 0
\]
for every $v, u \in T^1_x M$. This means that condition (4) or (5) implies the synchronization (with $\ell = 0$) of the Pliss times associated to the Lyapunov exponents of a point $x \in M$ on any given pair of directions $v, u \in T^1_x M$, as we had claimed.

In Section 7, we study conditions to obtain a pointwise synchronization of sup-additive cocycles. In particular, letting $\psi, \mathcal{L}, \Psi$ and $Q$ be as above, we study conditions on the orbit of a point $p$, $O^+_f(p)$, to assure that we can synchronize all the $\mathcal{L}(p, v)$ with $v \in T^1_x M$. That is, a condition on $O^+_f(p)$ to obtain $\limsup N^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^N \log \|Df^j(x)\|^{-1} = 0$, without assuming $\limsup N^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^N \log \|Df^j(x)\|^{-1} > 0$. With the results of Section 7, for a map having only positive Lyapunov exponents $O$ is, a condition on $p$ of a point $x$, for almost every $x$ in a set $U$ with full Lebesgue measure, i.e., $\text{Leb}(M \setminus U) = 0$. Define Lyapunov residue of $x \in U$ as

$$\text{Res}(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} d^+_N(\{j \geq 0 ; R \circ f^j(x) \geq n\}),$$

where

$$R(x) = \min \left\{ j \geq 1 ; \frac{1}{j} \log \|Df^j(x)\|^{-1} > \frac{1}{2} \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n(x)\|^{-1} \right\}$$

is the first time that $x$ “reaches half of its limit.”

Note that $\text{Res}(x) = 0$ for every ergodic invariant probability $\mu$ with $\mu(U) > 0$. Indeed, as $\mu$ is ergodic, $\mu(U) > 0$ implies that (3) holds for almost every $x$. Hence, $\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \mu(\{R = j\}) = 1$. By Birkhoff,

$$d^+_N(\{j \geq 0 ; R \circ f^j(x) \geq n\}) = \mu(\{R \geq n\})$$

for almost every $x$ and so,

$$\text{Res}(x) = \lim_n \mu(\{R \geq n\}) = \lim_n \sum_{j=n}^{+\infty} \mu(\{R = j\}) = 0.$$

Therefore, the Lyapunov residue being zero on a set of positive Lebesgue measure is a necessary condition to the existence of a SRB measure for $f$. In Theorem E below, we show that Lyapunov residue being zero on a set of positive Lebesgue measure is also a sufficient condition to the existence of a SRB measure.

**Theorem E.** Let $M$ be a compact Riemannian manifold and $f : M \to M$ be a $C^1$ local diffeomorphism such that Lebesgue almost every point of $M$ has only positive Lyapunov exponents. Then, there exists an ergodic absolute continuous invariant measure if and only if the Lyapunov residue is zero on a set of positive measure.

In Theorem E below, we have a version of the result of Theorem E for partially hyperbolic systems. Nevertheless, we note that in Theorem E we ask a stronger hypothesis over the Lyapunov exponents along the unstable direction (as well as on the stable direction). That is, we ask $\liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n|_{E^u(x)}\|^{-1}$, instead of $\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n|_{E^u(x)}\|^{-1}$, to be bigger than zero.

Given a $C^1$ diffeomorphism $f : M \to M$, we say that a forward invariant set $U$ (i.e., $f(U) \subset U$) is partially hyperbolic if there exist a $Df$-invariant splitting $T_x M = \mathbb{R}^n$. This means that condition (4) or (5) implies the synchronization almost everywhere, we can give a necessary and sufficient condition to the existence of SRB measures (see Theorem E below).

As in Conjecture 2, suppose that $f : M \to M$ is a $C^1$ local diffeomorphism, $M$ is a compact Riemannian manifold and that (3) holds for every point $x$. In Theorem E, we show that Lyapunov residue being zero on a set of positive Lebesgue measure is almost everywhere, we can give a necessary and sufficient condition to the existence of SRB measures (see Theorem E below).

Let $\mathcal{L}_f$, $\mathcal{C}_f$ and $\mathcal{Q}_f$ be as above, we study conditions on the orbit of a point $p$, $O^+_f(p)$, to assure that we can synchronize all the $\mathcal{L}(p, v)$ with $v \in T^1_x M$. That is, a condition on $O^+_f(p)$ to obtain $\limsup N^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^N \log \|Df^j(x)\|^{-1} = 0$, without assuming $\limsup N^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^N \log \|Df^j(x)\|^{-1} > 0$. With the results of Section 7, for a map having only positive Lyapunov exponents almost everywhere, we can give a necessary and sufficient condition to the existence of SRB measures (see Theorem E below).
Lemma 2.1. If \( f \) is some sequence \( n \) accumulating points of the orbit \( O \) as \( n \to \infty \), then almost every point in \( U \) belongs to the basin of some SRB supported on \( \sigma \), as respectively, the Lyapunov residue and the unstable Lyapunov residue as, respectively,

\[
\text{Res}^u(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} d^+_N(\{j \geq 0 \mid R_n \circ f^j(x) \geq n\})
\]

and

\[
\text{Res}^s(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} d^+_N(\{j \geq 0 \mid R_n \circ f^j(x) \geq n\}),
\]

where

\[
R^u(x) = \min \left\{ n \geq 1 \mid \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^j|_{E^u(x)}^{-1}\|^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n|_{E^u(x)}^{-1}\|^{-1} \forall j \geq n \right\}
\]

and

\[
R^s(x) = \min \left\{ n \geq 1 \mid \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^j|_{E^s(x)}\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n|_{E^s(x)}\| \forall j \geq n \right\}.
\]

Theorem F. Let \( f : M \to M \) be a \( C^2 \) diffeomorphism having a partially hyperbolic set \( U \). If \( \text{Res}^u(x) = \text{Res}^s(x) = 0 \) for almost every \( x \in \bar{U} \), then almost every point in \( U \) belongs to the basin of some SRB supported on \( \bigcap_{j=0}^\infty f^j(\bar{U}) \).

2. Induced Maps and Coherence

Consider a map \( f : X \to X \) defined in a set \( X \). The \( f \)-induced map defined on \( A \subset X \) with an induced time \( R : A \to \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \) is the map \( F : A \to X \) defined by \( F(x) = f^R(x) \).

The forward orbit of a point \( x \) (for instance, with respect to \( f \)) is \( \mathcal{O}^+_f(x) = \{f^j(x) \mid j \geq 0\} \), the backward orbit (or pre-orbit) of \( x \) is \( \mathcal{O}^-_f(x) = \{y \in X \mid x \in \mathcal{O}^+_f(y)\} \) and the orbit is \( \mathcal{O}_f(x) = \mathcal{O}^+_f(x) \cup \mathcal{O}^-_f(x) \). The omega limit set of \( x \), \( \omega_f(x) \), is the set of accumulating points of \( \mathcal{O}^+_f(x) \), that is, the set of \( y \in X \) such that \( y = \lim_{j \to \infty} f^{n_j}(x) \) for some sequence \( n_j \to +\infty \). The alpha limit set of \( x \), \( \alpha_f(x) \), is the set of accumulating points of \( \mathcal{O}^-_f(x) \), i.e., the set of \( y \in X \) such that \( y = \lim_{j \to \infty} y_j \) for some sequence \( y_j \) such that \( f^{n_j}(y_j) = x \) and \( n_j \to +\infty \).

Given a set \( U \subset A \), we define the \((f, R)\)-spreading of \( U \) (for short, the spreading of \( U \)) as

\[
\tilde{U} = \bigcup_{x \in U} \bigcup_{j=0}^{R(x)-1} f^j(x) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} f^j(U \cap \{R = n\}) = \bigcup_{j \geq 0} f^j(U \cap \{R > j\}).
\]

Lemma 2.1. If \( F(U) \subset U \subset A \) then \( f(\tilde{U}) \subset \tilde{U} \). Also, if \( F(U) = U \subset A \), then \( f(\tilde{U}) = \tilde{U} \).
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Proof. Given a set $U \subset A$, it is easy to see that

$$f^\left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} f^j(U \cap \{R = n\})\right) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} f^j(U \cap \{R = n\}) \subset \tilde{U}.$$

(8)

If $F(U) \subset U$ then

$$f^\left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} f^{n-1}(U \cup \{R = n\})\right) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} f^n(U \cup \{R = n\}) = F(U) \subset U \subset \tilde{U}.$$

And so, $f(\tilde{U}) \subset \tilde{U}$. Similarly, $f(\tilde{U}) = \tilde{U}$ whenever $F(U) = U$. \hfill \Box

In the example below one can see that, in general, $F$-invariance (i.e., backward invariance) is not preserved by the spreading.

Example 2.2 ($F^{-1}(U) = U \subset A \Rightarrow (f|_\mathcal{X})^{-1}(\tilde{U}) = \tilde{U}$). Consider $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ given by $f(1) = f(4) = 2$, $f(2) = 3$ and $f(3) = 1$. Let $A = \mathcal{X}$ and $R : A \to \mathbb{N}$ given by $R(1) = 2$, $R(2) = 3$ and $R(3) = R(4) = 1$. Thus, $F : A \to X$ is given by $F(1) = f^2(1) = 3$, $F(2) = f^3(2) = 2$, $F(3) = f(3) = 1$ and $F(4) = f(4) = 2$, see Figure 1.

In this example, $\tilde{A} = A = \mathcal{X}$ and so, $(f|_\mathcal{X})^{-1}(x) = f^{-1}(x)$ $\forall x$. As $F^{-1}(1) = \{3\}$ and $F^{-1}(3) = \{1\}$, $U = \{1, 3\}$ is a $F$-invariant. As $\tilde{U} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, we get that $(f|_\mathcal{X})^{-1}(\tilde{U}) = f^{-1}(\tilde{U}) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \neq \tilde{U}$.

Definition 2.3 (Coherent and exact induced times). We say that an induced time $R$ is coherent if $R(x) \geq R \circ f^j(x) + j$ whenever $x \in A$, $0 \leq j < R(x)$ and $f^j(x) \in A$. The induced time $R$ is called exact if $R(x) = R \circ f^j(x) + j$ for every $0 \leq j < R(x)$ and every $x \in A$.

Note that the class of the exact induced times contains all the first entry times. That is, given a set $U \subset X$ such that $O^+_x(U) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for every $x \in A$, the map $R(x) = \min\{j \geq 1; f^j(x) \in U\}$ is called the first entry time to $U$ and $F(x) = f^{R(x)}(x)$ is called the first entry map to $U$. A particular case of a first entry map is when $A = U$, in this case $F$ and $R$ are called, respectively, the first return map and the first return time to $A$. 
Suppose that theory of non-uniformly hyperbolic dynamics.

Lemma 2.4. Suppose that $R$ is a coherent induced time and let $x \in A_0 := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(X)$. If $0 \leq a < R(x)$ and $f^a(x) \in A_0$ then there exists $1 \leq b \leq \#\{a \leq j < R(x) ; f^j(x) \in A_0\}$ such that

$$R(x) = a + \sum_{j=0}^{b} R(F^j(f^a(x))).$$

In particular, $F(x) = F^b(f^a(x))$.

Proof. As $f^a(x) \in A_0$, it follows from the coherence that $a < a + R(p_0) \leq R(x)$, where $p_0 := f^a(x)$. If $a + R(p_0) = R(x)$ then the proof is done. If not, as $p_1 := f^{a + R(p_0)}(x) = F(f^a(x)) \in A_0$, by coherence we get that $a + R(p_0) + R(p_1) \leq R(x)$. Again, if $a + R(p_0) + R(p_1) = R(x)$, the proof is done. If not, we take $p_2 := f^{a + R(p_0) + R(p_1)}(x) = F^2(f^a(x))$ and repeat the process. As $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R(p_j) \geq n$ and $R(x) < +\infty$ the process will stop. That is, there exists $b \geq 0$ such that $R(x) = a + \sum_{j=0}^{b-1} R(p_j) = a + \sum_{j=0}^{b-1} R(F^j(f^a(x)))$. As $f^{a + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R(p_j)}(x) \in A_0$ \(\forall 0 \leq n \leq b\), we get that $b \leq \#\{a \leq j < R(x) ; f^j(x) \in A_0\}$.

Definition 2.5 (Orbit-coherence). The induced map $F$ is called orbit-coherent if

$$\mathcal{O}_f^+(x) \cap \mathcal{O}_f^+(y) \neq \emptyset \iff \mathcal{O}_F^+(x) \cap \mathcal{O}_F^+(y) \neq \emptyset$$

for every $x, y \in \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(X)$.

Lemma 2.6. If $R$ is a coherent induced time then $F$ is orbit-coherent.

Proof. Set $R_n(p) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(p)$ any $p \in \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(X)$ and $n \geq 0$. Note that $F^n(p) = f^{R_n(p)}(p)$. Let $n, m \geq 0$ be such that $\alpha := f^{n+1}(x) = f^{n+1}(y)$ and $m, \ell \geq 0$ be the integers satisfying $R_m(x) \leq n < R_{m+1}(x)$ and $R_m(y) \leq n < R_{m+1}(y)$. Letting $p = f^{n+1}(x) = f^{n+1}(x)$ and $a = R_m(x) - n$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that there exists $b \geq 1$ such that $F^{b+1}(x) = F(p) = F^b(f^a(p)) = F^b(\alpha)$. Similarly, there exists $b' \geq 1$ so that $F^{b'+1}(y) = F(q) = F^{b'+1}(f^q(g)) = F^{b'+1}(\alpha)$, where $q = F^{n+1}(y) = f^{R_m(y)+1}(y)$ and $\alpha' = R_{m+1}(y) - n$. Thus, $\mathcal{O}_F^+(x) \cap \mathcal{O}_F^+(y) \subset \mathcal{O}_F^+(F\alpha)$, where $\ell = \max\{a, a'\}$.

Example 2.7 (Orbit-coherence ⇒ coherence). Let $A = X = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $f : X \to X$ given by $f(1) = 2$, $f(2) = 3$ and $f(3) = 1$. Let $R(x) = 2 \forall x$, that is, $F = f^2$, see Figure 2. Note that $\mathcal{O}_F^+(x) = \mathcal{O}_F^+(x) = X$ for every $x$ and so, $F$ is orbit-coherent. Nevertheless, as $R(x) = 2 < 3 = R(f^1(x)) + 1 \forall x$, $R$ is not coherent.

3. Measurable induced maps and ergodicity

In this section $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is a finite measure space, that is, $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\sigma$-algebra of subsets of $X$ and $\mu$ is a measure on $\mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(X) < +\infty$. Consider a measurable map $f : X \to X$, a measurable set $A \subset X$ and a $f$-induced map $F : A \to X$ given by a measurable induced time $R : A \to \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$. 
Definition 3.1. A map $g : X \to X$ is called $\mu$-ergodic if $g$ is measurable and $\mu(V)$ or $\mu(X \setminus V) = 0$ for every $g$-invariant measurable set $V \subset X$. Conversely, we say that $\mu$ is $f$-ergodic whenever $f$ is $\mu$-ergodic.

Note that we are not assuming in the definition above that $f$ preserves $\mu$. That is, $\mu$ does not need to be $f$-invariant to be $f$-ergodic.

A measurable map $g : U \to X$, $U \in \mathcal{A}$, is called non-singular (with respect to $\mu$) if $g_* \mu \ll \mu$, that is, if $\mu \circ f^{-1} \ll \mu$.

Is this section we study the connection between ergodicity and coherence. In particular, we show in Proposition 3.8 that if $f$ is a non-singular ergodic map then $F$ is also non-singular and ergodic, whenever $F$ is orbit coherent. Although orbit-coherent induced maps have a well behavior with respect to the ergodicity, this is not true for the transitivity, as one can see in Example 3.2 below.

Example 3.2 ($f$ transitivity and coherence $\nRightarrow$ $F$ transitivity). Let $A = X = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $f : X \to X$ given by $f(1) = 2$, $f(2) = 3$ and $f(3) = 1$. Let $R(1) = 2$ and $R(2) = R(3) = 1$. Thus, $F(1) = F(2) = 3$ and $F(3) = 1$, see Figure 3. Note that $f$ is transitive and $R$ is coherent (in particular $F$ is orbit-coherent), but $F$ is not transitive as $\bigcup_{j \geq 0} F^j(\{1\}) = \{1, 3\}$ and so, $\bigcup_{j \geq 0} F^j(\{1\}) \cap \{2\} = \emptyset$. 
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Lemma 3.3. If $F$ is orbit-coherent and $F^{-1}(U) = U \subset A_0$, where $A_0 = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(\mathcal{X})$, then $\tilde{U} \cap A_0 = U$ and $(f|_{\tilde{A}_0})^{-1}(\tilde{U}) = \tilde{U}$.

Proof. If $p \in \tilde{U} \cap A_0$ then $\exists x_p \in U$ and $0 \leq a < R(x_p)$ such that $p = f^a(x_p) \in A_0$. As $O_f^+(x_p) \supset O_f^+(p)$, it follows from the orbit-coherence that $\exists n, m \geq 0$ such that $F^n(p) = F^m(x_p)$. As $U$ is $F$-invariant, we get that $F^m(x_p) \in U$ and so, $p \in F^{-n}(U) = U$, proving that $\tilde{U} \cap A_0 = U$.

Suppose that $F^{-1}(U) = U$. As $f(\tilde{U}) \subset \tilde{U}$ (see Lemma 2.1), we only need to show that $(f|_{\tilde{A}_0})^{-1}(\tilde{U}) \subset \tilde{U}$. So, consider $p \in \tilde{U}$ and $x_p \in U$ and $0 \leq j < R(x_p)$ be such that $p = f^j(x_p)$. Let $q$ be any pre-image of $p$ by $(f|_{\tilde{A}_0})^{-1}$. That is, $q \in (f|_{\tilde{A}_0})^{-1}(p) = f^{-1}(p)\cap \tilde{A}_0$. Let $x_q \in A_0$ and $0 \leq \ell < R(x_q)$ such that $f^\ell(x_q) = q$. As $p \in O_f^+(x_p) \cap O_f^+(x_q)$, it follows from Lemma 2.6 that there exist $n, m \geq 1$ so that $F^n(x_p) = F^m(x_q)$. As $x_p \in U$ and $U$ is $F$-invariant, we get that $x_q \in F^{-m}(U) = U$, proving the lemma. □

Lemma 3.4. If $f$ is non-singular with respect to $\mu$, then

1. $F$ is non-singular with respect to $\mu$;
2. $f$ is non-singular with respect to $\mu|_U$, for every forward invariant set $U \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(U) > 0$.

Proof. As $F^{-1}(V) = \bigcup_n (f^n|_{R=n})^{-1}(V)$, if $\mu(V) = 0$, it follows from $\mu \circ f^{-1} \ll \mu$ that $\mu(f^{-n}(V)) = \mu(V) = 0 \forall n \geq 1$ and so, $\mu(F^{-1}(V)) = 0$, proving that $F$ is non-singular with respect to $\mu$.

As $\mu \circ f^{-1} \ll \mu$, if $\mu(V) = \mu(V \cap U) = 0$, then $\mu(f^{-1}(V \cap U)) = 0$. By the forward invariance of $U$, we get that $U \subset f^{-1}(f(U)) \subset f^{-1}(U)$ and so $\mu(f^{-1}(V \cap f^{-1}(U))) = \mu(f^{-1}(V \cap U)) = 0$, proving that $f$ is non-singular with respect to $\mu|_U$. □

Lemma 3.5. If $f$ is $\mu$-ergodic and $U \subset X$ a measurable set with positive measure, then $\nu := \frac{1}{\mu(U)}\mu|_U$ is a $f$-ergodic probability.

Proof. Consider a $f$ invariant measurable set $V$ with $\nu(V) > 0$. Thus, $\mu(V) \geq \nu(V) > 0$. As a consequence, it follows from the ergodicity of $\mu$ that $\mu(V) = 1$. So, $\nu(V) = \frac{1}{\mu(U)}\mu(V \cap U) = \frac{1}{\mu(U)}\mu(U) = 1$, proving that $\nu$ is ergodic. □

Lemma 3.6. Suppose that $f$ is non-singular with respect to $\mu$. If $U \subset \mathcal{X}$ is a $\mu$-almost $f$-invariant measurable set, i.e., $\mu(f^{-1}(U)\Delta U) = 0$, then there is a $f$-invariant measurable set $U' \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mu(U \Delta U') = 0$.

Proof. Recall that $\mu(A \Delta C) \leq \mu(A \Delta B) + \mu(B \Delta C)$, for every measurable set $A, B$ and $C$. Thus, as $\mu(f^{-1}(U)\Delta U) = 0$ and $\mu \circ f^{-1} \ll \mu$, we get that $\mu(f^{-j}(U)\Delta f^{-j-1}(U)) = \mu(f^{-j-1}(f^{-1}(U)\Delta U)) = 0$ for every $j \geq 1$. So,

$$\mu(f^{-j}(U)\Delta U) \leq \mu(f^{-j}(U)\Delta f^{-j-1}(U)) + \cdots + \mu(f^{-1}(U)\Delta U) = 0.$$ 

As a consequence, $\mu(f^{-j}(U) \cap U) \leq \mu(U) \leq \mu(f^{-j}(U) \cap U) + \mu(f^{-j}(U)\Delta U) = \mu(f^{-j}(U) \cap U)$. That is, $\mu(f^{-j}(U) \cap U) = \mu(U) \forall j \geq 0$. So, $\mu(U_0) = \mu(U)$, where $U_0 := \bigcap_{j \geq 0} f^{-j}(U)$. As $f(U_0) \subset U_0$, we get that $f^{-1}(U') = U'$, where $U' = \bigcup_{j \geq 0} f^{-j}(U_0)$. Note that

$$\mu(U' \Delta U) \leq \mu(U' \Delta U_0) \leq \sum_{j \geq 0} \mu(f^{-j}(U_0)\Delta U_0) = 0,$$
as it is easy to see that \( \mu(f^{-j}(U_0) \cap U_0) = 0 \).

**Corollary 3.7.** If \( f \) is non-singular with respect to \( \mu \), then \( f \) is \( \mu \)-ergodic if and only if \( \mu(U) = \mu(\mathcal{X} \setminus U) = 0 \) for every measurable set \( U \) such that \( \mu(f^{-1}(U) \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0 \).

**Proposition 3.8.** Suppose that \( f \) is non-singular with respect to \( \mu \) and \( \mu(A_0) > 0 \), where \( A_0 := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(\mathcal{X}) \). If \( F \) is orbit-coherent and \( \mu \) is \( f \)-ergodic then \( \mu \) is \( F \)-ergodic.

**Proof.** As \( \mu(\tilde{A}_0) > 0 \) and \( f \) is \( \mu \)-ergodic and non-singular, it follows from Lemma 3.4 and 3.5 that \( f \) is ergodic and non-singular with respect to the probability \( \nu := \frac{1}{\mu(A_0)} \mu(\tilde{A}_0) \).

Let \( U \subset A_0 \) be a measurable set that is \( F \)-invariant and such that \( \mu(U) > 0 \). Thus, \( \nu(\tilde{U}) = \mu(\tilde{U})/\mu(\tilde{A}_0) > 0 \). It follows by Lemma 3.3 that

\[
\nu(f^{-1}(\tilde{U}) \cap \tilde{A}_0) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_0)} \mu(f^{-1}(\tilde{U}) \cap \tilde{A}_0) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_0)} \mu((f^{-1}(\tilde{U}) \cap \tilde{A}_0) \cap \tilde{A}_0) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_0)} \mu(f^{-1}(\tilde{U}) \cap \tilde{A}_0) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_0)} \mu(\tilde{U} \cap \tilde{A}_0) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_0)} \mu(\tilde{U} \cap \tilde{A}_0) = 0.
\]

As \( f \) is ergodic and non-singular with respect to \( \nu \), it follows from Corollary 3.7 that \( \nu(\tilde{U}) = 1 \). That is, \( \mu(\tilde{U}) = \mu(\tilde{A}_0) \). Thus, using again Lemma 3.3 we have that \( \mu(U) = \mu(U \cap A_0) = \mu(A_0) \), proving the \( F \)-ergodicity of \( \mu \).

**4. Lift results**

In this section we consider a metric space \((\mathcal{X}, d)\) and a (Borel) measurable map \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \). Consider also a measurable set \( A \subset \mathcal{X} \) and an \( f \)-induced map \( F : A \to \mathcal{X} \) given by a measurable induced time \( R : A \to \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \). The set of all Borel finite measures of \( \mathcal{X} \) with the weak* topology is denoted by \( \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) \) and let \( \mathcal{M}^1(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) \) denote the set of all Borel probabilities of \( \mathcal{X} \). The open ball of radius \( r > 0 \) and center \( p \in \mathcal{X} \) is the set \( B_r(p) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, p) < r\} \). Similarly, given \( Y \subset \mathcal{X} \), we define the ball of center \( Y \) and radius \( r > 0 \) as \( B_r(Y) = \bigcup_{y \in Y} B_r(y) \). We denote the boundary of a set \( U \) by \( \partial U \), that is, \( \partial U \) is the set of all points \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) such that \( x = \lim_n u_n = \lim_n v_n \) for some sequence \( u_n \in U \) and \( v_n \in \mathcal{X} \setminus U \). Note that \( \partial B_r(Y) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, Y) = r\} \). Thus, although we may have \( B_r(Y) = B_{r'}(Y) \) for some \( r \neq r' \), we always have \( \partial B_r(Y) = \partial B_{r'}(Y) = \emptyset \) when \( r \neq r' \). This implies the following remark.

**Remark 4.1.** If \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) \) and \( Y \subset \mathcal{X} \) then there is at most a countable set \( L \subset (0, +\infty) \), \( L \) may be empty, such that \( \mu(\partial B_r(Y)) = 0 \) for every \( r \in (0, +\infty) \setminus L \).

**Lemma 4.2** (Folklore result I). If \( \nu \) is a \( f \) invariant probability then

\[
\mu := \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_{*}^j(\nu|_{\{R=n\}}) = \sum_{j \geq 0} f_{*}^j(\nu|_{\{R>j\}})
\]

is a \( f \) invariant measure with \( \mu(\mathcal{X}) = \int Rd\nu \).

**Lemma 4.3** (Folklore result II). If \( F : A \to B \) is the first return map by \( f \) to a measurable set \( B \) and \( \mu(A_0) > 0 \), where \( A_0 = \{x \in B : O_{f}(f(x)) \cap B = \emptyset\} \) and \( A_0 = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(\mathcal{X}) \), then \( \frac{1}{\mu(A_0)} \mu|_{A_0} \) is a \( F \)-invariant probability.
Before going further, we state Kac’s theorem (for the ergodic case). It is easy to see that statement below is equivalent to the usual one.

**Theorem 4.4 (Kac).** Suppose that \( A = \{ x \in B ; O^+_f(x) \cap B \neq \emptyset \} \) for some measurable set \( B \subset \mathcal{X} \). If \( F \) is the first return map to \( B \) and \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathcal{X}) \) is an ergodic \( f \)-invariant probability such that

\[
\mu \left( \bigcap_{j \geq 1} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \right) > 0,
\]

then \( \int_A R d\mu = 1 \), where \( R : A \to \mathbb{N} \) is the induced time of \( F \) (i.e., the first return time to \( B \)).

The **tower** associated to the induced map \( F \) is the set

\[
\hat{A} = A \cup \{ (x, n) ; x \in A \text{ and } 1 \leq n < R(x) \}.
\]

The **tower map** associated to \( F \) is the map \( \hat{F} : \hat{A} \to \hat{\mathcal{X}} \), where \( \hat{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{X} \cup \mathbb{X} \times \{1, 2, 3, \cdots \} \supset \hat{A} \) and \( \hat{F} \) is defined by

\[
\hat{F}(x) = \begin{cases} F(x) & \text{if } x \in A \text{ and } R(x) = 1 \\ (x, 1) & \text{if } x \in A \text{ and } R(x) > 1 \end{cases}
\]

and, for \( x \in A \) and \( 1 \neq n < R(x) \),

\[
\hat{F}(x, n) = \begin{cases} (x, n + 1) & \text{if } n < R(x) - 1 \\ F(x) & \text{if } n = R(x) - 1 \end{cases}.
\]

Let \( \pi : \hat{\mathcal{X}} \to \mathcal{X} \) be the **tower projection** given by \( \pi(x) = x \), if \( x \in \mathcal{X} \), and \( \pi(x, n) = f^n(x) \) when \( (x, n) \in \mathcal{X} \times \{1, 2, 3, \cdots \} \). Considering on \( \hat{\mathcal{X}} \) the topology induced by \( \mathcal{X} \), the projection is a measurable map. Furthermore, as \( \pi \circ \hat{F} = f \circ \pi \), if \( \eta \) is a \( \hat{F} \)-invariant probability then the push-forward \( \pi_* \eta := \eta \circ \pi^{-1} \) is a \( f \) invariant probability. Thus, a \( f \)-invariant probability \( \mu \) is called **liftable by \( \hat{F} \)** if \( \mu = \pi_* \eta \) for some \( \hat{F} \)-invariant probability \( \eta \) (\( \eta \) is called the **\( \hat{F} \)-lift of \( \mu \)** and \( \mu \) is the **tower projection of \( \mu \)**).

Observing that \( F \) is the first return map to \( A \) by \( \hat{F} \) and as \( O^+_f(p) \cap A \neq \emptyset \) for every \( p \in \bigcap_{j \geq 0} \hat{F}^{-j}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}) \), it follows from Lemma 4.2 that \( \nu := 1_{\eta(A)} \eta |_A \) if a \( F \)-invariant probability, whenever \( \eta \) is a \( \hat{F} \)-invariant probability.

Conversely, given \( \eta \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathcal{X}) \), define the **tower measure** associated to \( \eta \) as \( \hat{\eta}(U) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \eta(U_n) \), where \( U_0 = U \cap A \) and \( U_n \subset A \) is defined by \( U_n \times \{n\} = U \cap (A \times \{n\}) \) for \( n \geq 1 \). It is well known that if \( \nu \) is a \( F \)-invariant probability then \( \nu \) is a \( \hat{F} \)-invariant measure. Nevertheless \( \nu \) is a finite measure only if \( \nu(\hat{\mathcal{X}}) = \int R d\nu < \infty \). So, if \( \nu \) is a \( F \) invariant probability with \( \int R d\nu < +\infty \) then

\[
\nu := \pi_* \left( \frac{1}{\nu(\hat{\mathcal{X}})} \hat{\nu} \right) = \frac{1}{\int R d\nu} \pi_* \hat{\nu} = \frac{1}{\int R d\nu} \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f^j_n(\nu|_{R=n}) = \frac{1}{\int R d\nu} \sum_{j \geq 0} f^j_n(\nu|_{R>n}) \quad (11)
\]

is a \( f \)-invariant probability. Because of that, we say that a \( f \)-invariant probability \( \mu \) is **\( F \)-liftable** if there is a \( F \)-invariant probability \( \nu \), with \( \int R d\nu < +\infty \), such that \( \nu \ll \mu \).
The probability \( \nu \) is called a \textit{F-lift} of \( \mu \). Note that \( \mu \) is \( F \)-liftable if and only if \( \mu \) is \( \widehat{F} \)-liftable.

Given \( x \in A_0 := \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(A) \), let
\[
\theta_F(x) := \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \}.
\]

**Lemma 4.5.** \( \liminf_n \frac{1}{i_x(n)} \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) \leq \frac{1}{\theta_F(x)} \) for every \( x \in A_0 \), where \( i_x(n) = \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \} \). In particular, \( \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) \leq \frac{1}{\theta_F(x)} \) for every \( x \in A_0 \). Furthermore, if \( \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) \) exists, then
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \} = \frac{1}{\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x)}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( x \in A_0 \) be such that \( \theta_F(x) > 0 \). As \( \{ j \geq 0 ; \sum_{k=0}^{i_x(n)-1} R \circ F^k(x) < n \} = \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \} \), we get that
\[
i_x(n) = \max \left\{ j \geq 0 ; \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} R \circ F^k(x) < n \right\} = \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \}.
\]

It follows from the definition of \( i_x(n) \) that \( \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) < n \leq \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)} R \circ F^j(x) \) for every \( x \in A_0 \) and \( n \geq 1 \). Thus,
\[
\frac{1}{i_x(n)} \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) < \frac{n}{i_x(n)} = \left( \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \} \right)^{-1} \leq \frac{i_x(n) + 1}{i_x(n)} \left( \frac{1}{i_x(n)} + \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)} R \circ F^j(x) \right),
\]

for every \( n > R(x) \) (note that \( n > R(x) \implies i_x(n) \geq 1 \)). That is, if \( x \in A_0 \) and \( n > R(x) \),
\[
\frac{1}{i_x(n)} \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) < \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \} \leq \frac{\alpha(n)}{i_x(n) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)} R \circ F^j(x), \tag{12}
\]

with \( \lim_n \alpha(x) = 1 \). So, taking “\( \liminf \)” in the first inequality of \( \tag{12} \), we get that
\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{i_x(n)} \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) \leq \frac{\alpha(n)}{i_x(n) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{i_x(n)} R \circ F^j(x), \tag{12}
\]

If \( \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) \) exists, then \( \tag{12} \) implies that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x) \} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x).
\]
abilities, then (Prokhorov. See, for instance, [22])

\[ \text{Theorem 4.9} \]

set

\[ \text{Borel measure } \mu \]

complete then \( K \)

By the first item of this lemma, we know that \( \phi \)

\[ \mu \]

1

and so, \( \limsup \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) \), concluding the proof. \( \Box \)

To prove Theorem [A], we need some preliminary measure-theoretical results. Given a Borel measure \( \mu \), let

\[ \mathbb{B}(\mu) = \{ U \subset X; U \text{ is open and } \mu(\partial U) = 0 \}. \]

\[ \text{Lemma 4.6 (Urysohn). Suppose that } (X, d) \text{ is a metric space. If } A \text{ and } B \text{ are closed sets with } A \cap B = \emptyset \text{ then there is a continuous function } \phi : X \to [0, 1] \text{ such that } \phi(A) = 0 \text{ and } \phi(B) = 1 \text{ and } \phi(X \setminus (A \cup B)) \subset (0, 1). \]

\[ \text{Proposition 4.7 (See Proposition A.3.2. in [14]). If } (X, d) \text{ is a metric space then every } \] Borel probability \( \mu \) on \( X \) is regular, i.e., given a Borel set \( B \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there are a closed set \( C \subset B \) and an open set \( A \supset B \) such that \( \mu(A \setminus C) < \varepsilon. \)

\[ \text{Lemma 4.8. Let } (X, d) \text{ be a metric space and } \mathcal{M}(X) \text{ the set of all finite Borel measures on } X. \]

1. If \( \mu_n \in \mathcal{M}(X) \) converges to \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \), then \( \mu(S) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mu_n(S) \) for every open set \( S \).
2. \( \mu_n \in \mathcal{M}(X) \) converges to \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \) if and only if \( \limsup_n \mu_n(V) = \mu(V) \) for every open set \( V \) such that \( \mu(\partial V) = 0. \)

Proof. As \( \mu \) is a Borel finite measure on a metric space, it follows from Proposition 4.7 that \( \mu \) is a regular measure. Thus, given an open set \( S \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is a closed set \( K_\varepsilon \subset S \) such that \( \mu(K_\varepsilon) = \mu(S) - \varepsilon. \) By Urysohn’ Lemma, there is a continuous function \( \varphi_\varepsilon : X \to [0, 1] \) such that \( \varphi_\varepsilon(K_\varepsilon) = 1 \) and \( \varphi_\varepsilon(X \setminus S) = 0. \) As \( \mu(K_\varepsilon) \leq \int \varphi_\varepsilon d\mu = \lim_n \int \varphi_\varepsilon d\mu_n \leq \liminf_n \mu_n(S), \) we can take \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) and so \( \mu(S) \leq \liminf_n \mu_n(S), \) proving the first item.

We can use Remark 4.1 to show that \( \mathbb{B}(\mu) \) is a base for the topology of \( X. \) Because of that, we only need to show that if \( \mu_n \) converges to \( \mu \) then \( \lim_n |\mu_n(V) - \mu(V)| = 0 \) for every \( V \in \mathbb{B}(\mu). \) As \( \mu \) is a regular measure, given \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is an open set \( U_\varepsilon \supset V \) such that \( \mu(U_\varepsilon) < \mu(V) + \varepsilon. \) Let \( \varphi_\varepsilon : X \to [0, 1] \) be a continuous function such that \( \varphi_\varepsilon(V) = 1 \) and \( \varphi_\varepsilon(X \setminus U_\varepsilon) = 0. \) So, \( \mu_n(V) \leq \int \varphi_\varepsilon d\mu_n \to \int \varphi_\varepsilon d\mu \leq \mu(U_\varepsilon) < \mu(V) + \varepsilon. \) This implies that \( \limsup_n \mu_n(V) \leq \mu(V) + \varepsilon \) for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and so, \( \limsup_n \mu_n(V) \leq \limsup_n \mu_n(V) \leq \mu(V). \) By the first item of this lemma, we know that \( \mu(V) \leq \liminf_n \mu_n(V), \) proving that \( \lim_n \mu_n(V) = \mu(V). \)

Recall that a set \( K \subset \mathcal{M}^1(X) \) is called tight if for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a compact set \( K \subset X \) such that \( \mu(X \setminus K) < \varepsilon \) for every measure \( \mu \in K. \)

\[ \text{Theorem 4.9 (Prokhorov. See, for instance, [22]). If } K \subset \mathcal{M}^1(X) \text{ is tight set of probabilities, then } K \text{ is sequentially compact on } \mathcal{M}^1(X), \text{ i.e., every sequence } \mu_n \in K \text{ has a subsequence } \mu_{n_k} \text{ converging to some } \mu \in \mathcal{M}^1(X). \text{ Furthermore, is } (X, d) \text{ is separable and complete then } K \text{ is tight if and only if } K \text{ is sequentially compact on } \mathcal{M}^1(X). \]
Theorem 4.10 (Lusin. See, for instance, Theorem A.3.5 in [14]). Consider two metric spaces $\mathbb{Y}$ and $\mathbb{X}$. Let $\mu$ be a Borel probability on $\mathbb{Y}$ and $f : \mathbb{Y} \to \mathbb{X}$ a Borel map. If $\mathbb{X}$ is separable then, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a closed set $C \subset \mathbb{Y}$ and a continuous map $g : \mathbb{Y} \to \mathbb{X}$ such that $\mu(\mathbb{Y} \setminus C) < \varepsilon$ and $f|_C = g|_C$.

Definition 4.11 (Asymptotically bounded sequence of measures). We say that a sequence $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$ is asymptotically bounded by $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$ if for any given measurable set $U \subset \mathbb{X}$, there is a $n_0 = n_0(U)$ such that $\nu_n(U) \leq \mu(U)$ for every $n \geq n_0$.

Lemma 4.12. If $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{X})$ is asymptotically bounded by $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$, then $\nu_n$ has an accumulating point $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{X})$. Moreover, $\eta \leq \mu$ for every accumulating point $\eta$ of $\nu_n$.

Proof. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ let $K_0 \subset \mathbb{X}$ be a closed set such that $\mu(\mathbb{X} \setminus K_0) < \varepsilon$. Let $n_0 \geq 1$ be such that $\nu_n(\mathbb{X} \setminus K_0) \leq \mu(\mathbb{X} \setminus K_0)$ for every $n \geq n_0$. Taking, for $1 \leq j < n_0$, $K_j$ as a compact set such that $\nu_j(\mathbb{X} \setminus K_j) < \varepsilon$, we get that $\nu_j(\mathbb{X} \setminus K) < \varepsilon$ for every $n \geq 1$, where $K = K_0 \cup K_1 \cup \cdots \cup K_{n_0-1}$. This means that $T = \{\nu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a tight collection of probabilities and so, by Prokhorov’s theorem, $\nu_n$ has a subsequence $\nu_{n_j}$ converging to some $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{X})$.

As $\nu_{n_j}$ is asymptotically bounded by $\mu$, given an open set $V \subset \mathbb{X}$, there is $j_0 \geq 1$ such that $\nu_{n_j}(V) \leq \mu(V)$ for every $j \geq j_0$. Hence, it follows from Lemma 4.8 that $\nu(V) \leq \liminf \nu_{n_j}(V) \leq \mu(V)$ for every open set $V \subset \mathbb{X}$. As a consequence, $\nu \leq \mu$. \hfill \Box

Lemma 4.13. Let $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{X})$ a sequence of probabilities that is asymptotically bounded by some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$. If $\lim_n \nu_n = \nu$ for some $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$, then $\lim_n |\nu(S \cap K) - \nu_n(S \cap K)| = 0$ for every closed set $K \subset \mathbb{X}$ and every open set $S$ such that $\mu(\partial S) = 0$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.12 that $\nu \leq \mu$. Let $K \subset \mathbb{X}$ be a closed set and $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$. Let $n_0 \geq 1$ be so that $\nu_n(\partial S) \leq \mu(\partial S) = 0$ for every $n \geq n_0$. Note that

$$\nu_n(\overline{S \cap K}) = \nu_n(S \cap K) = \nu_n((\partial S \cup S) \cap K) = \nu_n(\partial S \cap K) + \nu_n(S \cap K) = \nu_n(S \cap K),$$

for every $n \geq n_0$. As $\nu \leq \mu$, we get from the same argument that $\nu(\overline{S \cap K}) = \nu(S \cap K)$.

By Remark 4.1, we can chose an arbitrarily small $r > 0$ such that $\mu(\partial B_r(S \cap K)) = \nu(\partial B_r(S \cap K)) = \nu_n(\partial B_r(S \cap K)) = 0$ for every $n \geq 1$. As $B_r(S \cap K) \setminus (S \cap K) \setminus \emptyset, \lim_{r \to 0} 2\mu(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}) = 0$ and so, given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $r > 0$ such that $2\mu(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}) < \varepsilon/2$. Let $n_1 \geq n_0$ be so that $\nu_n(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}) \leq \mu(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K})$ for every $n \geq n_1$.

Therefore,

$$|\nu(S \cap K) - \nu_n(S \cap K)| = |\nu(\overline{S \cap K}) - \nu_n(\overline{S \cap K})| =$$

$$= |\nu(B_r(S \cap K)) - \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}) - (\nu_n(B_r(S \cap K)) - \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}))| \leq$$

$$\leq |\nu(B_r(S \cap K)) - \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K))| + \nu(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}) + \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}) \leq$$

$$\leq |\nu(B_r(S \cap K)) - \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K))| + 2\mu(B_r(S \cap K) \setminus \overline{S \cap K}) \leq$$

$$\leq |\nu(B_r(S \cap K)) - \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K))| + \varepsilon/2$$

for every $n \geq n_1$. 


As $B_r(S \cap K) \in \mathbb{B} (\mu)$, $\lim_n |\nu(B_r(S \cap K)) - \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K))| = 0$, and so, there is $n_2 \geq n_1$ such that $|\nu(B_r(S \cap K)) - \nu_n(B_r(S \cap K))| < \varepsilon/2$ for every $n \geq n_2$. Hence,

$$|\nu(S \cap K) - \nu_n(S \cap K)| < \varepsilon$$

for every $n \geq n_2$, proving the lemma.

The **total variation** of two given measures $\mu$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = \sup \{ |\mu(V) - \nu(V)| ; V \text{ is a Borel subset of } \mathcal{X} \}.$$

**Proposition 4.14.** Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is a separable metric space. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ be a $f$ non-singular finite measure and $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathcal{X})$ a sequence of probabilities converging to a probability $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathcal{X})$. If $\nu_n$ is asymptotically bounded by $\mu$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} \|f_* \nu_n - \nu_n\|_{TV} = 0$, then $f_* \nu = \nu \leq \mu$.

**Proof.** The fact that $\nu \leq \mu$ comes from Lemma 4.12, so we need to show that $\nu$ is $f$-invariant. Given $U \in \mathbb{B} (\mu)$, note that

$$|f_* \nu(U) - \nu(U)| \leq |\nu(f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(f^{-1}(U))| + |\nu_n(f^{-1}(U)) - \nu(U)| + |\nu(U) - \nu(U)| \leq |\nu(f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(f^{-1}(U))| + \|f_* \nu_n - \nu_n\|_{TV} + |\nu(U) - \nu(U)|.$$

By hypothesis, $\|f_* \nu_n - \nu_n\|_{TV} \to 0$ and, as $U \in \mathbb{B}(\mu)$, $|\nu_n(U) - \nu(U)| \to 0$ when $n \to \infty$. Hence, to prove the proposition, we only need to show that $\lim_n |\nu(f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(f^{-1}(U))| = 0$. For this, recall that, by Lusin’s theorem, there is a sequence of closed subsets $K_\ell \subset \mathcal{X}$, $\ell \geq 1$, such that $\mu(\mathcal{X} \setminus K_\ell) < 1/\ell$ and $f|_{K_\ell}$ is continuous.

**Claim 1.** Given $\ell \geq 1$, there is an open set $V \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(\partial V) = 0$ and such that $K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U) = K_\ell \cap V$.

**Proof of the claim.** As $f|_{K_\ell}$ is continuous, $(f|_{K_\ell})^{-1}(U) = K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U)$ is an open subset of $K_\ell$. So, there is an open set $S \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U) = K_\ell \cap S$. As $\mu(\partial U) = 0$ and $\mu$ is non-singular, $\mu(f^{-1}(\partial U)) = 0$. Furthermore, as $(\partial S) \cap K_\ell \subset f^{-1}(\partial U) \cap K_\ell$, we get that $\mu((\partial S) \cap K_\ell) = 0$. Given $p \in \partial S \cap K_\ell$, let $\delta(p) = \operatorname{dist}(p, K_\ell)$. Note that $\delta(p) > 0$ for every $p \in \partial S \cap K_\ell$. Given $r \in (0, 1)$, set

$$S_r = S \setminus \bigcup_{p \in \partial S \cap K_\ell} B_r \delta(p)(p).$$

Note that $K_\ell \cap S \subset S$ and so, $K_\ell \cap S = K_\ell \cap S_r$. Furthermore, as

$$\bigcup_{p \in \partial S \setminus K_\ell} B_r \delta(p)(p) \supset \bigcup_{p \in \partial S \setminus K_\ell} B_{r'} \delta(p)(p) \setminus K_\ell$$

for every $1 > r > r' > 0$, we get that

$$(\partial S_r \setminus K_\ell) \cap (\partial S_{r'} \setminus K_\ell) = \emptyset$$

whenever $r \neq r'$. Hence, as $\mu$ is a finite measure, there is at most a countable set of $r \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mu(\partial S_r \setminus K_\ell) \neq 0$. So, we can choose $r \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mu(\partial S_r) = 0$. That is, taking $V = S_r$, we have that $V$ is an open set such that $\mu(\partial V) = 0$ and $K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U) = K_\ell \cap V$. 

□
Given $\varepsilon > 0$, consider $\ell \geq 1$ satisfying $0 < 1/\ell < \varepsilon/3$. Hence,

$$|\nu(f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(f^{-1}(U))| =$$

$$= |\nu(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U)) + \nu(f^{-1}(U) \setminus K_\ell) - \nu_n(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(f^{-1}(U) \setminus K_\ell)| \leq$$

$$\leq |\nu(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U))| + |\nu(f^{-1}(U) \setminus K_\ell) + \nu_n(f^{-1}(U) \setminus K_\ell)| \leq$$

$$\leq |\nu(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U))| + 2\mu(\mathbb{X} \setminus K_\ell) <$$

$$< |\nu(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U)) - \nu_n(K_\ell \cap f^{-1}(U))| + 2\varepsilon/3 =$$

$$= |\nu(K_\ell \cap V) - \nu_n(K_\ell \cap V)| + 2\varepsilon/3,$$

where $V$ is given by Claim 1. As, by Lemma 4.13, $\lim n |\nu(K_\ell \cap V) - \nu_n(K_\ell \cap V)| = 0$, the proposition is proved.  

$\square$

4.1. Proof of Theorem A

Proof. (4) $\implies$ (1) follows from definition of $\mu$ being $F$-liftable.

(1) $\implies$ (2) Suppose that $\nu$ is a $F$-lift of $\mu$. In this case, $\nu$ is $F$-invariant and $\int R\,d\nu < +\infty$. By Birkhoff Theorem, the limit $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x)$ exists and belongs to $[1, +\infty)$, for $\nu$ almost every $x \in A_0$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that $\theta_F(x) = \left( \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) \right)^{-1} > 0$ for $\nu$ almost every $x \in A_0$. As $\nu \ll \mu$, we get (2).

(2) $\implies$ (3) This implication follows from Lemma 4.5.

(3) $\implies$ (4) As $\mu(\{x \in A_0; \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) < +\infty\}) > 0$, there is $1 \leq \gamma < +\infty$ such that $\mu(A(\gamma)) > 0$, where

$$A(\gamma) = \left\{ x \in A_0; \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x) \leq \gamma \right\}.$$

By Birkhoff’s Theorem, we may assume that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{F^j(x)}$ converges to $\mu$ in the weak*-topology for every $x \in A(\gamma)$. Given $x \in A(\gamma)$ and $n \geq 1$, let

$$\nu_{x,n} = \frac{1}{r(x,n)} \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} \delta_{F^j(x)},$$

where

$$r(n,x) = \min \left\{ j \geq n; \frac{1}{j} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} R \circ F^i(x) < \gamma \right\}.$$

Given a measurable set $V$, we have that

$$\nu_{x,n}(V) = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x)}{r(x,n)} \frac{\#\{0 \leq j < r(x,n); F^j(x) \in V\}}{\sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x)} \leq$$

$$\leq 2\gamma \frac{\#\{0 \leq j < r(x,n); F^j(x) \in V\}}{\sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x)} =$$

$$= 2\gamma \frac{\#\{0 \leq j < \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x); F^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_F^+(x) \cap V\}}{\sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x)} \leq$$
\[
\begin{align*}
&2\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x), \\
&\leq 2\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) \\
&\leq 2\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x), \\
&\leq 2\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x) = 2\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{r(x,n)-1} R \circ F^j(x),
\end{align*}
\]

where \([2\gamma r(x,n)]\) is the integer part of \(2\gamma r(x,n)\). That is,

\[
\nu_{x,n} \leq 2\gamma^2 \frac{1}{[2\gamma r(x,n)]} \sum_{j=0}^{[2\gamma r(x,n)]-1} \delta_{f^j(x)} \text{ for every } x \in A(\gamma) \text{ and } n \geq 1. \quad (13)
\]

Define

\[
\nu_n := \frac{1}{\mu(A(\gamma))} \int_{x \in A(\gamma)} \nu_{x,n} d\mu.
\]

That is,

\[
\nu_n(V) = \frac{1}{\mu(A(\gamma))} \int_{x \in A(\gamma)} \nu_{x,n}(V) d\mu
\]

for every measurable set \(V\).

Given \(V \subset \mathcal{X}\) measurable and \(n \geq 1\), let

\[
A(n, V, \gamma) = \left\{x \in A(\gamma) ; \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^j(x)}(V) < 2\mu(V)\right\}.
\]

Hence, it follows from (13) that

\[
\nu_n(V) \leq 4\gamma^2 \mu(V) \frac{\mu(A(n, V, \gamma))}{\mu(A(\gamma))} \left(1 - \frac{\mu(A(n, V, \gamma))}{\mu(A(\gamma))}\right)
\]

and, as \(\lim_n \mu(A(\gamma) \setminus A(n, V, \gamma)) = 0\) by Birkhoff’s theorem, there is a \(n_0 = n_0(V)\), such that \(\nu_n(V) \leq 5\gamma^2 \mu(V)\), for every \(n \geq n_0\). Indeed, as \(F(A(\gamma)) \subset A(\gamma)\) and \(\nu_n(\mathcal{X} \setminus A(\gamma)) = 0\), we have that

\[
\nu_n(V) \leq 5\gamma^2 \mu(V \cap A(\gamma)),
\]

for every \(n \geq n_0\). That is, \(\nu_n\) is asymptotically bounded by \(5\gamma^2 \mu|A(\gamma) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})\). Therefore, it follows from Lemma 4.12 that there is a sequence \(n_j \to \infty\) and a probability \(\eta_\gamma \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathcal{X})\) such that \(\eta_\gamma \leq 5\gamma^2 \mu|A(\gamma)\) and that \(\eta_\gamma = \lim_j \nu_{n_j}\). As

\[
|F^* \nu_{n_j}(V) - \nu_{n_j}(V)| \leq \frac{1}{\mu(A(\gamma))} \int |F^* \nu_{x,n_j}(V) - \nu_{x,n_j}(V)| d\mu \leq \frac{1/n_j}{\mu(A(\gamma))}
\]

for every measurable set \(V\), we have that \(\lim_j \|F^* \nu_{n_j} - \nu_{n_j}\|_{TV} = 0\). Thus, it follows from Proposition 4.14 that \(F^* \eta_\gamma = \eta_\gamma \leq 5\gamma^2 \mu|A(\gamma)\). As \(\eta_\gamma(\mathcal{X} \setminus A(\gamma)) = 0\), it follows from Birkhoff theorem that

\[
\int Rd\eta_\gamma = \int \left(\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R \circ F^j(x)\right) d\eta_\gamma \leq \gamma < +\infty.
\]
Taking \( \nu = \eta \), we conclude that (3) \( \implies \) (4), finishing the proof of (1), (2), (3) and (4) being equivalent.

Now, assume that \( F \) is orbit-coherent and that there exists a \( F \)-lift \( \nu \) of \( \mu \). If \( \nu \) is not ergodic, then there is a measurable set \( U \subset A_0 \) such that \( F^{-1}(U) = U \) and \( 0 < \nu(U) < 1 \). As \( \nu \ll \mu \) and \( \nu(A_0 \setminus U) > 0 \), we get that
\[
\mu(A_0 \setminus U) > 0. \tag{14}
\]
It follows from Lemma 3.3 that \( \tilde{U} \) is a \( f \)-lift invariant set. As \( \mu(\tilde{A}_0) = 1 \), we get that \( \tilde{U} \) is a \( \mu \)-almost invariant set (i.e., \( \mu(f^{-1}(\tilde{U} \triangle U)) = 0 \)). Thus, it follows from the ergodicity of \( \mu \) (see Corollary 3.7) that \( \mu(U) = 1 \), but this contradicts (14). Indeed, by Lemma 3.3, \( \tilde{U} \cap A_0 = U \) and so, \( 1 = \mu(\tilde{U}) \leq 1 - \mu(A_0 \setminus U) < 1 \). Thus, we must have that \( \nu \) is \( F \)-ergodic.

It is well known that, if \( \eta \) is any \( F \)-invariant probability, then either \( \eta = \nu \) or \( \eta \) is singular with respect to \( \nu \), i.e., there is \( U \subset A_0 \) such that \( \nu(U) = 1 \) and \( \eta(A_0 \setminus U) = 1 \). Suppose that \( \nu \neq \eta \ll \mu \). Let \( U \subset A_0 \) be so that \( \nu(U) = 1 \) and \( \eta(A_0 \setminus U) = 1 \). As \( \nu \) and \( \eta \ll \mu \), we get that \( U \) and \( A_0 \setminus U \) are sets with \( \mu \) positive measures. Furthermore, as \( \nu(F^{-1}(U) \triangle U) = 0 \), we get that \( U \) is a \( \mu \)-almost invariant set with \( \mu(U) \) and \( \mu(A_0 \setminus U) > 0 \). As before, we get form Lemma 3.3 and the ergodicity of \( \mu \) that \( \mu(\tilde{U}) = 1 \), contradicting that \( \mu(A_0 \setminus U) > 0 \). As a consequence, we must have \( \eta = \nu \) for every \( F \)-invariant probability \( \eta \ll \mu \). In particular, \( \nu \) is the unique \( F \)-lift of \( \mu \).

**Lemma 4.15** (Continuity at the empty set. See, for instance, Theorem A.1.14 in [14]). If \( A_1 \supset A_2 \supset A_3 \supset \cdots \) is a sequence of measurable sets, then \( \mu(\bigcap_{n \geq 1} A_n) = \lim_n \mu(A_n) \).

**Proof.** Set \( r = \lim_n \mu(A_n) \), \( A_0 = \emptyset \) and \( L = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} A_n \). Let \( \triangle_n = A_n \setminus A_{n-1} \) and \( a_n = \mu(\triangle_n) \) for \( n \geq 1 \). As \( \triangle_i \cap \triangle_j = \emptyset \) for \( i \neq j \), we get that \( \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j \leq 1 \) is a convergent series of nonnegative numbers. So, \( \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} a_j \to 0 \) when \( n \to \infty \). As \( r \leq \mu(L) + \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} a_j = \mu(A_n) \to r \), we get that \( \mu(L) = r \).

**Theorem 4.16** ([20], see also [11]). Let \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( \mathcal{Y} \) be complete separable metric spaces. Let \( A \subset \mathcal{X} \) be a Borel set of \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( T : A \to \mathcal{Y} \) be a (Borel) measurable map. Then, \( T \) is bimeasurable if and only if \( \{y \in \mathcal{Y} : T^{-1}(y) \text{ is uncountable}\} \) is a countable set.

**Theorem 4.17** (Half lifting). Suppose that \( \mathcal{X} \) is a complete separable metric space. If \( f \) is injective then, \( \mathcal{A}_F := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} F^n(\bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X})) \) is a measurable set such that \( F(\mathcal{A}_F) \subset \mathcal{A}_F \) and \( \mu(\mathcal{A}_F \setminus F(\mathcal{A}_F)) = 0 \) for every \( f \)-invariant probability \( \mu \). Furthermore, given a \( f \)-invariant probability \( \mu \), the following statements are equivalent.

1. \( \mu(\mathcal{A}_F) > 0 \).
2. \( \mu(\mathcal{A}_F) > 0 \) and \( \nu := \frac{1}{\mu(\mathcal{A}_F)} \mu|_{\mathcal{A}_F} \) is a \( F \)-invariant probability.
3. There exists a \( F \)-invariant probability \( \nu \ll \mu \).

**Proof.** It follows from Theorem 4.16 that \( f \) is a bimeasurable injective map. Let \( R : A \to \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\} \) be the induced time for \( F \), i.e., \( F(x) = f^{R(x)}(x) \) for every \( x \in A \). Consider a measurable set \( U \subset A_0 := \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \) and \( n \geq 1 \). As \( f \) is bimeasurable and injective, we get that \( f^n(U \cap \{R = n\}) \) is measurable and so, \( F(U) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} f^n(U \cap \{R = n\}) \) is a measurable set. This implies that \( \mathcal{A}_F = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} F^n(A_0) \) is measurable, as \( A_0 \) is a measurable
set. Furthermore, by the invariance of \( \mu \), \( \mu(F(U \cap \{ R = n \})) = \mu(F(U \cap \{ R = n \})) = \mu(U \cap \{ R = n \}) \). Hence,

\[
\mu(F(U)) = \mu\left( \bigcup_{n \geq 1} f^n(U \cap \{ R = n \}) \right) \leq \\
\sum_{n \geq 1} \mu(f^n(U \cap \{ R = n \})) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \mu(U \cap \{ R = n \}) = \mu(U)
\]

for every measurable set \( U \subset A_0 \).

As \( A_0 \supset F(A_0) \supset \cdots \supset F^n(A_0) \supset A_F = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^n(A_0) \subset A_0 \), it follows from Lemma 4.15 that \( \mu(A_F) = \lim_n(F^n(A_0)) \). Furthermore,

\[
F(A_F) = F\left( \bigcap_{n \geq 1} F^n(A_0) \right) \subset \bigcap_{n \geq 2} F^n(A_0) = F(A_0) \cap \bigcap_{n \geq 2} F^n(A_0) = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} F^n(A_0) = A_F.
\]

As \( F^n(A_0) = (F^n(A_0) \setminus A_F) \cup A_F \), we get that

\[
\mu(A_F) \geq \mu(F(A_F)) \geq \mu(F^n(A_0)) - \mu(F^n(A_0) \setminus A_F) \geq \\
\geq \mu(F^n(A_0)) - \mu(F^n(A_0) \setminus A_F) \rightarrow \mu(A_F),
\]

proving that \( \mu(F(A_F)) = \mu(A_F) \).

(1) \( \Rightarrow \) (2). Suppose that \( \mu(A_F) > 0 \). As \( \mu(A_F \Delta F(A_F)) = 0 \), given \( U \subset A_F \) consider a measurable set \( V \subset A_F \) such that \( U = F(V) \mod \mu \), i.e., \( V \subset A_F \cap F^{-1}(U) \mod \mu \). Thus, \( \mu(A_F \cap U) = \mu(U) = \mu(F(V)) \leq \mu(V) \leq \mu(A_F \cap F^{-1}(U)) \). As a consequence,

\[
\mu|_{A_F}(U) \leq \mu|_{A_F}(F^{-1}(U)).
\]

for every measurable set \( U \subset \mathcal{X} \) and this implies that \( \nu := \mu|_{A_F} \) is a \( F \) invariant finite measure. Indeed, we already have that \( \nu(F^{-1}(U)) \geq \nu(U) \) for every measurable set \( U \subset \mathcal{X} \) and so, we only need to show the reverse inequality. For that, given a measurable set \( U \subset \mathcal{X} \), note that

\[
\nu(\mathcal{X}) - \nu(F^{-1}(U)) = \nu(F^{-1}(\mathcal{X} \setminus U)) \geq \mu(\mathcal{X} \setminus U) = \nu(\mathcal{X}) - \nu(U)
\]

and so, \( \nu(U) \geq \nu(F^{-1}(U)) \), proving that \( \nu(U) = \nu(F^{-1}(U)) \) for every measurable set \( U \subset \mathcal{X} \).

(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (3). There is nothing to prove.

(3) \( \Rightarrow \) (1). If \( \nu \) is a \( F \)-invariant probability, then \( \nu(A_0) = 1 \). Indeed, as \( F^{-1}(F(A_0)) \supset A_0 \), we get \( 1 \geq \nu(F(A_0)) = \mu(\overline{F^{-1}(F(A_0))}) \geq \nu(A_0) = 1 \). So, if a \( F \)-invariant probability \( \nu \) is absolutely continuous with \( \mu \), then \( \mu(A_0) > 0 \).

\( \square \)

5. Coherent schedules and Pliss times

In all this section, \( (\mathcal{X}, d) \) is a metric space and \( f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \) is a (Borel) measurable map. For ease of reading, we rewrite here some of the definitions already presented in the introduction (Section II). Let \( 2^\mathbb{N} \) be the power set of the natural numbers, i.e., the set of all subsets of \( \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \cdots \} \). Consider \( 2^\mathbb{N} \) with the following metric

\[
\text{dist}(U, V) = \begin{cases} 
2^{-\min(U \triangle V)} & \text{if } A \neq B \\
0 & \text{if } A = B
\end{cases}
\]
where $A \Delta B = (\mathbb{N} \setminus A) \cap (\mathbb{N} \setminus B)$ is the symmetric difference of the sets $A$ and $B$. Note that $i : 2^\mathbb{N} \to \Sigma_2^+ = \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$ given by

$$i(U)(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \in U \\ 0 & \text{if } n \notin U \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

is an isomorphism between $(2^\mathbb{N}, \text{dist})$ and $(\Sigma_2^+, \delta)$, where the distance $\delta$ on $\Sigma_2^+$ is the usual one, that is, $\delta(x, y) = 2^{-\min\{j \geq 1 : x(j) \neq y(j)\}}$. In particular, $(2^\mathbb{N}, \text{dist})$ is a compact metric space. We define the shift one, that is, $A$ necessarily an invariant one, there is a compact set $U$ that $A$ is called a measurable map $\sigma U = (U - 1) \cap \mathbb{N} = \{j - 1; 2 \leq j \in U\}$.

Given $U \subset \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$, the upper density of $U$ is defined as

$$d_+^\mathbb{N}(U) = \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \#\{1 \leq j \leq n; j \in U\}.$$ 

The lower density of $U$ is

$$d_-^\mathbb{N}(U) = \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \#\{1 \leq j \leq n; j \in U\}.$$ 

If $\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \#\{1 \leq j \leq n; j \in U\}$ exists, then we say that

$$d_0^\mathbb{N}(U) := \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \#\{1 \leq j \leq n; j \in U\}$$

is the natural density of $U$.

**Definition 5.1** (Schedule of events). A schedule of events or, for short, a schedule, on $\mathcal{X}$ is a measurable map $\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{X} \to 2^\mathbb{N}$. A schedule $\mathcal{U}$ is called $f$ asymptotically invariant if for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\exists a_x > b_x \geq 0$ such that $\sigma^{a_x} \mathcal{U}(x) = \sigma^{b_x} \mathcal{U}(f(x))$. An element $\ell$ of $\mathcal{U}(x)$ is called a $\mathcal{U}$-event or a $\mathcal{U}$-time for $x$.

One can ask many questions about the behavior of the map $f$ at “$\mathcal{U}$-times”, i.e., $f^n(x)$ with $n \in \mathcal{U}(x)$. In particular, to ask about the existence of attractors and statistical attractors in $\mathcal{U}$-times. For instance, in the presence of an ergodic probability $\mu$ (not necessarily an invariant one), there is a compact set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{X}$, the attractor at $\mathcal{U}$-times, such that $\mathcal{A} = \omega_{\mathcal{U}}(x)$ for $\mu$-almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $\omega_{\mathcal{U}}(x)$ is the set of accumulating points of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}}(x) := \{f^n(x); n \in \mathcal{U}(x)\}$. In [18], $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}}(x)$ is called an asymptotically invariant collection and one can find the proof of the existence of those attractors in Lemma 3.9 of [18]. Here, we are more concerned with the problem of synchronizing two schedules, as defined below.

**Definition 5.2** (Synchronization). Given two schedules $\mathcal{U}_0$ and $\mathcal{U}_1$ on $\mathcal{X}$, we say that $\mathcal{U}_0$ and $\mathcal{U}_1$ are (statistically) synchronizable at a point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ if there is $\ell \geq 0$ such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \#\{1 \leq j \leq n; (j, j + \ell) \in \mathcal{U}_0(x) \times \mathcal{U}_1(x)\} = d_0^\mathbb{N}(\mathcal{U}_0(x) \cap \sigma^\ell \mathcal{U}_1(x)) > 0.$$ 

If there exist such a $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\ell$, we say that $\mathcal{U}_0$ and $\mathcal{U}_1$ are $\ell$-synchronized at $x$.

If $d_0^\mathbb{N}(\mathcal{U}_0(x)) + d_0^\mathbb{N}(\mathcal{U}_1(x)) > 1$, we always have that $\mathcal{U}_0(x)$ and $\mathcal{U}_1(x)$ are $\ell$-synchronized for every $\ell \geq 0$. On the other hand, in general, we cannot expect that $\mathcal{U}_0(x)$ and $\mathcal{U}_1(x)$ are synchronizable when $d_0^\mathbb{N}(\mathcal{U}_0(x)) + d_0^\mathbb{N}(\mathcal{U}_1(x)) \leq 1$ or even when $d_0^\mathbb{N}(\mathcal{U}_0(x)) + d_0^\mathbb{N}(\mathcal{U}_1(x)) = 1$. In
Example 5.3 below we have two continuous schedules $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}_1$ that are not synchronizable at any point and such that $d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(x)) = d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}_1(x)) = 1/2$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{0\}$.

Example 5.3. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{2^{-n}; n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0,1\}$ and set $f(x) = x/2$. Set $x_0$ and $y_0$ in $\mathbb{N}$ by

$$x_0 = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \ldots)$$

and

$$y_0 = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, \ldots)$$

and 2 times 3 times 4 times 5 times 5 times

Let, for $\ell \geq 1$, $x_\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ be given by $i(\ell + i^{-1}(x_0))$, where $\ell + U = \{u + \ell; u \in U\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ for any $U \subset \mathbb{N}$. That is,

$$x_\ell(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \leq \ell \\ x_0(n - \ell) & \text{if } n > \ell \end{cases}$$

Set also $y_\ell = i(\ell + i^{-1}(y_0))$ for every $\ell \geq 1$. Set $\mathcal{U}(0) = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{U}(1) = i^{-1}(x_0)$ and $\mathcal{U}(2^\ell) = \mathcal{U}(1) = i^{-1}(y_0)$ for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{U}_1(0) = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{U}_1(1) = i^{-1}(y_0)$ and $\mathcal{U}_1(2^\ell) = \mathcal{U}(1)$ for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note that $d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(p)) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \# \{1 \leq j \leq n; j \in \mathcal{U}(p)\} = \frac{1}{2} = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \# \{1 \leq j \leq n; j \in \mathcal{U}(p)\} = d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}_1(p))$ for every $p \neq 0$. Nevertheless, $d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(p) \cap \sigma^i \mathcal{U}_1(p)) = 0$ for every $\ell \geq 1$ and $p \in \mathcal{X}$. Indeed, $d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(0), \sigma^i \mathcal{U}_1(0)) = 0$, because $\mathcal{U}(0) = \emptyset$. So assume that $p \neq 0$. Define the product $\cdot : \mathbb{N}^\times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $(x \cdot y)(n) = x(n) \cdot y(n)$. Note that $i(U \cap V) = i(U) \cdot i(V)$ for every $U, V \subset \mathbb{N}$. As, for $n > \ell$, we have

$$z := x_0 \cdot \sigma^i y_0 = (z(1), \ldots, z(n(n - 1)))$$

we can conclude that $d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(1) \cap \sigma^i \mathcal{U}(1)) = \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n z(j) = 0$ for every $\ell \geq 1$. Thus, $d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(2^\ell) \cap \sigma^i \mathcal{U}_1(2^\ell)) = d_{n}^{-}(\sigma^i \mathcal{U}(1) \cap \sigma^i \mathcal{U}_1(1)) = d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(1) \cap \sigma^i \mathcal{U}_1(1)) = 0$, proving that $d_{n}^{-}(\mathcal{U}(p) \cap \sigma^i \mathcal{U}_1(p)) = 0$ for every $\ell \geq 1$ and $p \in \mathcal{X}$.

As $(2^\mathbb{N}, \text{dist})$ is a (perfect) totally disconnected compact metric space, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a connect space, then any continuous schedule of events on $\mathcal{X}$ must be a constant. A large class of schedules having a mild continuity is the class of partially continuous schedules of events defined below.

Definition 5.4. We say that a schedule of events $\mathcal{U}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is partially continuous if

$$\ell \in \mathcal{U}(x_n) \forall n \implies \ell \in \mathcal{U}(\lim_n x_n),$$

for any convergent sequence $x_n \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.
Note that any continuous schedule is partially continuous. An example of non constant partially continuous schedule is the following. Consider a closed set $K \neq \emptyset$ and define $\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{X} \to 2^\mathbb{N}$ by

$$\mathcal{U}(x) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } x \notin K \\ \mathbb{N} & \text{if } x \in K \end{cases}$$

If $K$ is forward invariant then $\mathcal{U}$ above is also an asymptotically invariant schedule. One way to produces partially continuous schedules, whenever $f$ is continuous, is by using Birkhoff’s averages. Given a continuous function $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$\mathcal{U}(x) = \left\{ n \geq 1; \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi \circ f^j(x) \geq \gamma \right\}.$$  

Note that $\mathcal{U}$ is partially continuous and if $f$ has some complexity (i.e., positive topological entropy), one can find $\varphi$ and $\gamma$ to obtain a non constant schedule $\mathcal{U}$ using (16).

**Definition 5.5** (Coherent schedule). A schedule of events $\mathcal{U}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is called $f$-coherent if

(P1) $n \in \mathcal{U}(x) \implies n - j \in \mathcal{U}(f^j(x))$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n > j \geq 0$;

(P2) $n \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ and $m \in \mathcal{U}(f^n(x)) \implies n + m \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n, m \geq 1$.

Note that a $f$-coherent schedule of events is always asymptotically invariant.

There are many examples of coherent schedules. For instance, if $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ is measurable and $A = \{ x \in \mathcal{X}; \mathcal{O}_f^+(f(x)) \in B \}$, then

$$\mathcal{U}(x) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } x \notin A \\ \{ j \geq 1; f^j(x) \in B \} & \text{if } x \in A \end{cases}$$

is a $f$-coherent schedule. It is easy to check that the intersection of two coherent schedules satisfies (P1) and (P2). that is, if $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ are $f$-coherent schedules, then $\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ is a $f$-coherent schedule, where $(\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2)(x) = \mathcal{U}_1(x) \cap \mathcal{U}_2(x)$. The translation to the left $\sigma^t \mathcal{U}$ of a coherent schedule $\mathcal{U}$ is a coherent schedule. In general the union $\mathcal{U}_1 \cup \mathcal{U}_2$ of two coherent schedules is not coherent, where $(\mathcal{U}_1 \cup \mathcal{U}_2)(x) = \mathcal{U}_1(x) \cup \mathcal{U}_2(x)$. Nevertheless, the union of a finite number of translations to the left of a coherent schedule is coherent, as one can see in Lemma 5.6 below.

**Lemma 5.6.** If $\mathcal{U}$ is a $f$-coherent schedule then $\sigma^{t_1} \mathcal{U} \cup \cdots \cup \sigma^{t_m} \mathcal{U}$ is coherent for any $0 \leq t_1, \cdots, t_m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

*Proof.* First we claim that if $\mathcal{V}$ is a coherent schedule then $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{V} \cup \sigma^t \mathcal{V}$ is coherent for any $\ell \geq 1$. Indeed, suppose that $j \in \mathcal{W}(x)$ and $t \in \mathcal{W}(f^t(x))$. If $j \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ and $t \in \mathcal{V}(f^t(x))$ we get $j + t \in \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{W}(x)$ from the coherence of $\mathcal{V}$. For the same reasoning, $j + t \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{W}(x)$ if $j \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(x)$ and $t \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(f^t(x))$. If $j \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ and $t \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(f^t(x))$, we have that $j \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ and $t + \ell \in \mathcal{V}(f^\ell(x))$ and so, by the coherence of $\mathcal{V}$, $j + t + \ell \in \mathcal{V}(x)$. Hence, $j + t \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{W}(x)$. Similarly, one can show that $j + t \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{W}(x)$ when $j \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(x)$ and $t \in \mathcal{V}(f^t(x))$, proving that $\mathcal{W}$ satisfies (P2). Let $n \in \mathcal{W}(x)$ and $0 \leq j < n$. If $n \in \mathcal{V}(x)$, by the coherence of $\mathcal{V}$, we have that $n - j \in \mathcal{W}(f^j(x)) \subset \mathcal{W}(f^j(x))$. If $n \in \sigma^t \mathcal{V}(x)$, then $n + \ell \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ and again, by the coherence of $\mathcal{V}$, $n + \ell - j \in \mathcal{W}(f^j(x))$. If
Thus, \( n - j \in \sigma^k(f^j(x)) \subset \mathcal{W}(f^j(x)) \), proving that \( \mathcal{W} \) satisfies (P1) and concluding the proof of the claim.

**Proof that \( \mathcal{W} := \sigma^{k_1}U \cup \cdots \cup \sigma^{k_m}U \) satisfies (P2).** If \( j \in \mathcal{W}(x) \) and \( t \in \mathcal{W}(f^j(x)) \) then there are \( k \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \) such that \( j \in \sigma^{k_i}U(x) \) and \( t \in \sigma^{k_i}U(f^j(x)) \). Suppose that \( k \leq i \), the proof for the other case is similar. In this case writing \( \mathcal{V} := \sigma^{k_i}U \) and \( \ell = \ell_i - \ell_k \), we get that \( j \in \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathcal{V} \cup \sigma^j \mathcal{V}(x) \) and \( t \in \sigma^j \mathcal{V}(f^j(x)) \subset \mathcal{V} \cup \sigma^j \mathcal{V}(f^j(x)) \). As, by the claim, \( \mathcal{V} \cup \sigma^j \mathcal{V} \) is coherent, we get that \( j + t \in \mathcal{V} \cup \sigma^j \mathcal{V}(x) = \sigma^{k_i}U(x) \cup \sigma^{k_i}U(x) \subset \mathcal{W}(x) \). Thus, \( \mathcal{W} \) satisfies (P2).

**Proof that \( \mathcal{W} \) satisfies (P1).** Let \( n \in \mathcal{W}(x) \) and \( 0 \leq j < n \). We have that \( n \in \sigma^{k_i}U(x) \) for some \( 1 \leq k \leq m \). The proof of \( n - j \in \sigma^{k_i}U \subset \mathcal{W}(x) \) is similar to the proof of (P1) in the claim.

Lemma 5.7 below, known as Pliss’s Lemma (see [16]), nevertheless of simple proof, turns out to be a useful tool in many problems in Dynamics. In particular, one can use it to give examples of coherent sequences.

A sequence of real numbers \( a_n \) is called **subadditive** if \( a_{n+m} \leq a_n + a_m \) for every \( n \) and \( m \geq 1 \).

**Lemma 5.7 ((Subadditive) Pliss Lemma).** Given \( 0 < c_0 < c_1 \leq C \), let \( 0 < \theta = \frac{c_1 - c_0}{C - c_0} < 1 \). Let \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \in (-\infty, C] \) be a subadditive sequence of real numbers, i.e., \( a_{i+j} \leq a_i + a_j \). If \( \frac{1}{n} a_n \geq c_1 \), then there is \( \ell \geq \theta n \) and a sequence \( 1 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_\ell \) such that \( \frac{1}{n_j - k} a_{n_j - k} \geq c_0 \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq \ell \) and \( 0 \leq k < n_j \).

**Proof.** The proof below follows the proof of Lemma 11.8 in [10] and Lemma 3.1 in [2].

Let, for \( 1 \leq j \leq n \), \( s(j) = a_j - j c_0 \) and set \( s(0) = 0 \). Let \( 1 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots n_\ell \leq n \) be the maximal sequence such that \( s(j) \leq s(n_i) \) for every \( 0 \leq j < n_i \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell \). As \( s(n) = c_1 n > 0 = s(0) \), we get that \( \ell \geq 1 \). By definition, \( s(n_i) \geq s(j) \) for \( 0 \leq j < n_i \) and so, \( a_{n_i - n_i c_0} \geq a_j - j c_0 \). That is, \( a_{n_i} - a_j \geq (n_i - j) c_0 \) for every \( 0 \leq j < n_i \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell \). As \( a_j \) is subadditive, we have that \( a_{n_i} = a_{n_i-j+j} \leq a_{n_i-j} + a_j \) and so, \( a_{n_i} - a_j \geq a_{n_i-j} \). Hence,

\[
a_{n_i-j} \geq (n_i - j) c_0,
\]

for every \( 0 \leq j < n_i \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell \).

Therefore, we only need to show that \( \ell \geq \theta n \). It follows from the maximality of the sequence \( n_1, \ldots, n_\ell \) that \( s(n_i - 1) < s(n_i - 1) \) for every \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell \). Thus, \( s(n_i) < s(n_i - 1) + (C - c_0) \) for every \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell \). Indeed, \( s(n_i) = a_{n_i} - n_i c_0 \leq a_{n_i-1} + a_1 - n_i c_0 = a_{n_i-1} - (n_i - 1) c_0 + (a_1 - c_0) \). By the maximality of \( n_1, \ldots, n_\ell \), we get that \( s(n_\ell) \geq s(n) \). Hence, \( n(c_1 - c_0) \leq s(n_\ell) = (s(n_\ell) - s(n_{\ell-1})) + (s(n_{\ell-1}) - s(n_{\ell-2})) + \cdots + (s(n_2) - s(n_1)) + s(n_1) \leq (C - c_0)(\ell - 1) + s(n_1) \). Noting that \( s(n_1) = a_{n_1} - c_0 \), we get that

\[
n(c_1 - c_0) \leq s(n_\ell) \leq (C - c_0) \ell.
\]

That is, \( \ell \geq \frac{c_1 - c_0}{C - c_0} n \), which concludes the proof. □
Definition 5.8 (Pliss times). Given $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and a map $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$, we say that $n \geq 1$ is a $(\gamma, \varphi)$-Pliss time for $x \in \mathbb{X}$, with respect to $f$, if
\[
\frac{1}{n-k}\varphi(n-k, f^k(x)) \geq \gamma \text{ for every } 0 \leq k < n. \tag{17}
\]

Lemma 5.9. Let $\gamma > 0$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ a measurable map. Given $x \in \mathbb{X}$, let $\mathcal{U}(x) \subset 2^\mathbb{N}$ be the set of all $(\gamma, \varphi)$-Pliss times for $x$. If $f$ and $\varphi$ are continuous then $\mathcal{U} : \mathbb{X} \to 2^\mathbb{N}$ is a partially continuous schedule of events.

Proof. Let $p_\ell \in \mathbb{X}$ be a sequence converging to $p \in \mathbb{X}$ and suppose that $n \in \mathcal{U}(p_\ell)$ for every $\ell \geq 1$. Suppose by contradiction that $n \notin \mathcal{U}(p)$. So, there exists $0 \leq k < n$ such that
\[
\frac{1}{n-k}\varphi(n-k, f^k(p)) < \gamma. \tag{18}
\]
Nevertheless, as $n \in \mathcal{U}(p_\ell)$ for every $\ell \geq 1$, we get $\varphi(n-k, f^k(p_\ell)) \geq \gamma \forall \ell \geq 1$, which implies that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \varphi(n-k, f^k(p_\ell)) \geq \gamma$ and leads to a contradiction with (18). □

A measurable function $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a $f$ subadditive cocycle, a $f$ additive cocycle or a $f$ sup-additive cocycle if it satisfies, respectively, (1), (2) or (3) below.

1. $\varphi(n + m, x) \leq \varphi(n, x) + \varphi(m, f^n(x))$ for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$.
2. $\varphi(n + m, x) = \varphi(n, x) + \varphi(m, f^n(x))$ for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$.
3. $\varphi(n + m, x) \geq \varphi(n, x) + \varphi(m, f^n(x))$ for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

Lemma 5.10. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a sup-additive cocycle. If $\gamma > 0$ and $\mathcal{U}(x)$ is the set of all $(\gamma, \varphi)$-Pliss time to $x$, then $\mathcal{U} : \mathbb{X} \to 2^\mathbb{N}$ is a $f$-coherent schedule of events.

Proof. Suppose that $n \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ and $m \in \mathcal{U}(f^n(x))$. Let $0 \leq k < n + m$. If $k < n$ then, as $n \in \mathcal{U}(x)$, it follows from (17) that $\varphi(n-k, f^k(x)) \geq (n-k)\gamma$. As $m \in \mathcal{U}(f^n(x))$, we also get from (17) that $\varphi(m, f^n(x)) \geq m\gamma$. Hence, as $\varphi$ is a sup-additive cocycle,
\[
\varphi(m + n - k, f^k(x)) \geq \varphi(n-k, f^k(x)) + \varphi(m + n - k - (n-k), f^{n-k}(f^k(x))) = \varphi(n-k, f^k(x)) + \varphi(m, f^n(x)) \geq (n + m - k)\gamma.
\]
Similarly, we get that $\varphi(m + n - k, f^k(x)) \geq (n + m - k)\gamma$ when $n \leq k < n + m$. Thus, $\mathcal{U}(x)$ satisfies (P2). As the proof of (P1) follows straightforward from (17), we conclude that $\mathcal{U}$ is a $f$-coherent schedule. □

Lemma 5.11. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a subadditive cocycle with $\sup \varphi < +\infty$. If $\gamma > 0$ and $\mathcal{U}(x)$ is the set of all $(\gamma/2, \varphi)$-Pliss times to $x$, then

1. $\limsup \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi \circ f^j(x) \geq \gamma \implies d^+_n(\mathcal{U}(x)) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2(\sup \varphi - \gamma)} > 0$;
2. $\liminf \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi \circ f^j(x) \geq \gamma \implies d^-_n(\mathcal{U}(x)) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2(\sup \varphi - \gamma)} > 0$.

Proof. Taking $0 < c_0 := \gamma/2 < c_1 := \gamma < C := \sup \varphi$, we get that $\theta = \frac{c_1-c_0}{C-c_0} = \frac{\gamma-\gamma/2}{\sup \varphi - \gamma/2} = \frac{\gamma}{2(\sup \varphi - \gamma)} > 0$ and so, items (1) and (2) follow directly from the subadditive Pliss Lemma. □
Furthermore, using (P1) inductively, we get that
\[ X \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{ +\infty \} \] by
\[ R_U(x) = \begin{cases} \min U(x) & \text{if } U(x) \neq \emptyset \\ +\infty & \text{if } U(x) = \emptyset \end{cases} \]

**Lemma 5.13.** If \( U \) is a partially continuous schedule of events to \( f \), then \( R_U : X \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{ +\infty \} \) is lower semicontinuous, i.e., \( \liminf_{x \to p} R_U(x) \geq R_U(p) \) for every \( p \in X \).

**Proof.** If \( \liminf_{x \to p} R_U(x) < R_U(p) \) for some \( p \in X \), then there is a sequence \( p_\ell \in X \) with \( \lim_{\ell \to \infty} p_\ell = p \) such that \( \lim_{\ell \to \infty} R_U(p_\ell) < R_U(p) \). As a consequence, \( \lim_{\ell \to \infty} R_U(p_\ell) = \infty \), even if \( R_U(p) = +\infty \). Taking \( \ell_0 \geq 1 \) so that \( |R_U(p_\ell) - n| < 1/2 \), we get that \( R_U(p_\ell) = n \) for every \( \ell \geq \ell_0 \). This implies, as \( U \) is partially continuous, that \( U(p) \geq n < R_U(p) = \min U(p) \) which is a contradiction. \( \square \)

Given a \( f \)-coherent schedule \( U : X \rightarrow 2^\mathbb{N} \) and \( j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{ \infty \} \), denote
\[ X_j(U) = \{ x \in X ; \#U(x) \geq j \} \]

The Lemmas below connect coherent induced times (Definition 2.3) and coherent schedules (Definition 5.5).

**Lemma 5.14.** If \( U : X \rightarrow 2^\mathbb{N} \) is \( f \)-coherent, then \( F(X_{\infty}(U)) \subset f(X_{\infty}(U)) \subset X_{\infty}(U) = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(X) \), where \( F(x) = f_{R_U(x)}(x) \) is the first \( U \)-time map.

**Proof.** Let \( x \in X_{\infty}(U) \). It follows from (P1) that \( U(f(x)) \supset \{ n - 1 ; 2 \geq n \in U(x) \} \). So, \( \#(U(f(x))) \geq \#U(x) - 1 = \infty \), proving that \( f(X_{\infty}(U)) \subset X_{\infty}(U) \). As \( F^n(X_{\infty}(U)) \subset X_{\infty}(U) \) \( \forall n \geq 1 \), if \( x \in X_{\infty}(U) \) then \( F(x) = f_{R_U(x)}(x) \in X_{\infty}(U) \). Thus, \( F(X_{\infty}(U)) \subset X_{\infty}(U) \) and so, \( X_{\infty}(U) \subset F^{-1}(X_{\infty}(U)) \subset F^{-1}(X_{\infty}(U)) \). Inductively, we get that \( X_{\infty}(U) \subset F^{-n}(X_{\infty}(U)) \) \( \forall n \geq 0 \), showing that \( X_{\infty}(U) \subset \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(X_{\infty}(U)) \). On the other hand, if \( x \in \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(X_{\infty}(U)) \), then \( F^n(x) = f_{R_U(x)}(x) \) is well defined for every \( n \geq 1 \). Furthermore, using (P1) inductively, we get that \( \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R_U \circ F^j(x) \in U(x) \) \( \forall n \geq 1 \) which proves that \( \#U(x) = \infty \), i.e., that \( x \in X_{\infty}(U) \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.15.** If \( U : X \rightarrow 2^\mathbb{N} \) is \( f \)-coherent, then \( R_U \) is a coherent induced time. Furthermore, \( U(x) = \{ j \in \mathbb{N} ; f^j(x) \in Y_{f,U}(x) \} \forall x \in X(U) \) such that \( f|_{Y_{f,U}(x)} \) is injective, where \( F(x) = f_{R_U(x)}(x) \). Conversely, if \( R : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \) is a coherent induced time defined on a measurable set \( A \) and \( A_0 = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(A) \), then \( U_R : X \rightarrow 2^\mathbb{N} \), given by
\[ U_R(x) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } r(x) = +\infty \\ \{ \sum_{j=0}^{n} R \circ F^j(x) ; j \geq 0 \} & \text{if } r(x) = 0 \\ \{ r(x) \} \cup \{ r(x) + \sum_{j=0}^{n} R \circ F^j(f^{r(x)}(x)) ; j \geq 0 \} & \text{if } 1 \leq r(x) < +\infty \end{cases} \]

is a coherent schedule, where \( F(x) = f_{R(x)}(x) \) and
\[ r(x) = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } O_j^+(x) \cap A_0 = \emptyset \\ \min \{ \ell \geq 0 ; f^{\ell}(x) \in A_0 \} & \text{if } O_j^+(x) \cap A_0 \neq \emptyset \end{cases} \]

Moreover, \( R(x) = R_{U_R}(x) \) for every \( x \in A_0 \), i.e., the first \( U_R \)-time for a point \( x \in A_0 \) is \( R(x) \).
Proof. Suppose that $x$ and $f^j(x) \in X_1(U)$ and that $n := R_\ell(x) > j \geq 0$. By the coherence of $U$, $n - j \in U(f^j(x))$ and so, $R_\ell(f^j(x)) = \min U(f^j(x)) \leq n - j$, proving that $R$ is a coherent induced time.

Let $x \in X_1(U)$ such that $f|_{\mathcal{O}^+_j}(x)$. If $f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}^+_F(x)$, for $j \geq 1$, then $f^j(x) = F^s(x) = f^{\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} R_\ell \circ F^i(x)}(x)$ for some $s \geq 1$. As $r_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-j} R_\ell \circ F^j(x)$ is a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers and $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \ni n \mapsto f^n(x) \in \mathcal{O}^+_F(x)$ is a bijection, we get that $j = \varphi^{-1}(F^s(x)) = r_s$. This implies, using (P2), that $j \in U(x)$. On the other hand, if $m \in U(x)$, set $s = \max\{j \geq 1; \sum_{i=0}^{j} R \circ F^i(x) \leq m\}$ and $r = \sum_{i=0}^{s} R \circ F^i(x)$. If $r = m$, we get that $f^r(x) = F^s(x) \in \mathcal{O}^+_F(x)$. So, suppose that $m \neq s$. In this case, setting $y = F^s(x)$, we must have $n - r < R_\ell(y) = \min U(y)$. Thus, it follows from P1 that $m - r \in U(y)$ and this implies that $m - r \geq \min U(y) = R_\ell(y)$, a contradiction, proving that $r = m$ and so, $f^r(x) \in \mathcal{O}^+_F(x)$.

Now assume that $R : A \to \mathbb{N}$ is a coherent induced time and that $U_R$ is defined by [19]. Let $A_1 := \{x \in X; \mathcal{O}^+_j(x) \cap A_0 \neq \emptyset\}$ and consider the extension $\overline{R} : A_1 \to \mathbb{N}$ of $R|_{A_0}$ given by

$$\overline{R}(x) = \begin{cases} r(x) & \text{if } x \in A_1 \setminus A_0 \\ R(x) & \text{if } x \in A_0 \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$U_R(x) = \begin{cases} \{ \sum_{j=0}^{n} \overline{R} \circ F^j(x) ; n \geq 0 \} & \text{if } x \in A_1 \\ \emptyset & \text{if } x \notin A_1 \end{cases},$$

where $F = f^{\overline{R}(x)}(x)$. It is easy to check that $\overline{R}$ is a coherent induced time and that

$$\overline{A}_0 := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(x) = \{x \in A_1 ; F^j(x) \in A_1 \forall j \geq 0\} = A_1 \cap f(A_1).$$

As $\overline{R}$ is a coherent induced time and $f(A_1) \subset A_1 = \overline{A}_0$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that, if $x \in \overline{A}_0$ and $0 \leq j < \overline{R}(x)$, then $\overline{R}(x) = j + \sum_{k=0}^{b} \overline{R} \circ F^k(f^j(x))$. Thus, $\overline{R}(x) - j = \sum_{k=0}^{b} \overline{R} \circ F^k(f^j(x)) \in U_R(f^j(x))$, proving P1 to $U_R$. If $n \in U_R(x)$ and $m \in U_R(f^n(x)) \text{ then } n = \sum_{j=0}^{a} \overline{R} \circ F^j(x) \text{ and } m = \sum_{j=0}^{b} \overline{R} \circ F^j(f^n(x)) = \sum_{j=0}^{b} \overline{R} \circ F^j(F^n(x)).$ Thus, $n + m = \sum_{j=0}^{a+b} \overline{R} \circ F^j(x) \in U_R(x)$, proving P2. Finally, it follows from the definition of $U_R(x)$ that $\min U_R(x) = \overline{R}(x)$. Hence, as $R(x) = \overline{R}(x)$ for every $x \in A_0$, we conclude the proof. \[\square\]

6. COHERENT BLOCKS AND SYNCHRONIZATION RESULTS

Lemma 6.1. If $f : X \to X$ is an injective map and $U$ a $f$-coherent schedule, then $A_\ell \subset B_\ell$.

Proof. Let $A_0 := \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(x)$. Consider any $x \in A_\ell$. Given $j \geq 1$, choose $y \in A_0$ such that $F^{j+1}(y) = x$. By (P2), $t := \sum_{i=0}^{j} R_\ell \circ F^i(y) \in U(y)$. As $t > j$, it follows from (P1) that $j \in U(f^{t-j}(y))$. So, because $f$ is injective and $f^j(f^{t-j}(y)) = f^t(y) = x$, we get that $f^j(x) = f^{t-j}(y)$, proving that $f^j(x)$ is well defined for every given $j \geq 1$ and $j \in U(f^{t-j}(y)) = U(f^{j}(x))$. That is, $x \in B_\ell$. \[\square\]
Lemma 6.2. Suppose that \( \mathcal{X} \) is a separable metric space. Let \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \) be an injective bimeasurable map and \( \mathcal{U} \) a measurable \( f \) coherent schedule. If \( F : \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \to \mathcal{X} \) is the first \( \mathcal{U} \)-time map, then the following statements are true.

1. \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \) is a measurable set, \( F(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U})) \subset B_{\mathcal{U}} \), \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U})} \) is injective and it is the first return map, by \( f \), to \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \).
2. \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \) is a measurable set, \( F(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) \subset B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \) and \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})} \) is injective and it is the first return map, by \( f \), to \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \).
3. \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) = A_{\mathcal{U}} \mod \mu \), for every \( f \) invariant probability \( \mu \).

Proof. Item (1). As \( f \) is bimeasurable and \( F \) is measurable map, we get that \( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \) and \( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} f^{j}(\mathcal{X}) \) are also measurable. On the other hand, note that \( j \in U(f^{-j}(x)) \iff x \in (\pi_j \circ i \circ \mathcal{U} \circ f^{-j})^{-1}(1) \), where \( \pi_j : \Sigma^+ \to \{0,1\} \) is the projection \( \pi_j(z) = z(j) \) and \( i : 2^n \to \Sigma^+ \) is the bijection given by (15). As a composition of measurable maps is measurable, \( \pi_j \circ i \circ \mathcal{U} \circ f^{-j} \) is measurable and so,

\[
B_{\mathcal{U}} = \left( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} f^{j}(\mathcal{X}) \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} (\pi_j \circ i \circ \mathcal{U} \circ f^{-j})^{-1}(1) \right)
\]

is measurable.

Let \( x \in B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \) and \( j \geq 1. \) If \( 0 < j < R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \), it follows from (P1) that \( j = R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) - (R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) - j) \in \mathcal{U}(f^{R_{\mathcal{U}}-j}(x)) = \mathcal{U}(f^j(F(x))) \). Of course that \( R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \in \mathcal{U}(x) = \mathcal{U}(f^{-R_{\mathcal{U}}}(F(x))) \). If \( j > R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \) set \( y = f^j(F(x)) = f^{-(j-R_{\mathcal{U}}(x))}(x) \). As \( j \geq R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \in \mathcal{U}(f^{-(j-R_{\mathcal{U}}(x))}(x)) = \mathcal{U}(y) \) (because \( x \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{U}) \)) and as \( R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \in \mathcal{U}(x) = \mathcal{U}(f^{-(j-R_{\mathcal{U}}(x))}(y)) \), it follows from (P2) that \( j = (j - R_{\mathcal{U}}(x)) + R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \in \mathcal{U}(y) \). Thus, we conclude that \( F(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U})) \subset B_{\mathcal{U}} \).

As \( f \) is injective, the injectiveness of \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}}} \) follows from the fact that \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U})} \) is the first return map to \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \) by \( f \). So, to complete the prove of item (1), we only need to show this fact. Therefore, suppose that \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U})} \) is not the first return map to \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \). So, there is \( x \in B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \) and \( 0 < j < R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \) such that \( f^j(x) \in B_{\mathcal{U}} \). As \( y := f^j(x) \in B_{\mathcal{U}} \), it follows from item (2) that \( j \in U(f^{-j}(y)) = U(x) \). This implies that \( R_{\mathcal{U}}(x) = \min \mathcal{U}(x) \leq j \), which is a contradiction.

Item (2). As, by Lemma, \( F(\mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) \subset \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \) and \( \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \), we conclude that \( \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \) is a \( F \)-forward invariant measurable set. Thus, \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \) is measurable and, as \( \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \subset \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \), we get from item (1) that \( F(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) = F(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) \subset F(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U})) \cap F(\mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) \subset B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \). As \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \) is a \( F \)-forward invariant contained in \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \), we get from the injectivity of \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U})} \) that \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})} \) is injective. From the same reasoning, it follows that \( F|_{B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})} \) is the first return map by \( f \) to \( B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \).

Item (3). As \( A_{\mathcal{U}} \subset B_{\mathcal{U}} \) (Lemma 6.1), if \( \mu(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) = \mu((B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) \setminus A_{\mathcal{U}}) = 0 \), then \( \mu(A_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) > 0 \). So, suppose that \( \mu(B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) > 0 \). Set \( U = B_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \). As \( F|_{U} \) is the first return map to \( U = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-j}(U) \), it follows from Lemma 4.3 that \( \nu := \frac{1}{\mu(U)} \mu|_{U} \) is a \( F \)-invariant probability absolutely continuous with respect to \( \mu \) (as \( f \) is injective, one can also use Theorem 4.17). As \( F \) is orbit-coherent and \( \mu \) \( f \)-ergodic, it follows from Proposition 3.8 that \( \mu \) is \( F \)-ergodic. Using Lemma 3.4, we can conclude that \( \mu|_{U} \), as well as \( \nu \), is \( F \)-ergodic. That is, \( \nu \) is an ergodic \( F \)-invariant probability. On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 4.17 that \( A_{\mathcal{U}} \) is a \( F \)-forward invariant set with \( \nu(A_{\mathcal{U}}) = \mu(A_{\mathcal{U}})/\mu(U) > 0 \). Thus, by the
Lemma 5.15, that \( \bigcap \) for \( \mu \) induced time and so, by Lemma 2.6, \( F \) orbit-coherent. Indeed, it follows from Lemma 5.15 that proof.

**Proof.** First of all, let us point out two facts. The first one is that \( F : \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \to \mathcal{X} \) is orbit-coherent. Indeed, it follows from Lemma 5.15 that \( R_\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \to \mathbb{N} \) is a coherent induced time and so, by Lemma 2.6, \( F \) is orbit-coherent. The second fact is that \( \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \) (see Lemma 5.14).

**Item (4).** As \( f \) is injective, \( f|_{\mathcal{O}_F^+} \) is injective for every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). Thus, it follows from Lemma 5.15 that \( \mathcal{U}(x) = \{ j \in \mathbb{N} ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_F^+(x) \} \) for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \subset \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \). So,

\[
\frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_F^+(x) \} = \frac{1}{n} \# \{ \{1, \ldots, n\} \cap \mathcal{U}(x) \} \tag{20}
\]

for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \). In particular,

\[
\theta_F(x) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_F^+(x) \} = d_\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{U}(x)) > 0
\]

for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \). So, it follows from Lemma 4.5, that \( \lim \inf n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R_\mathcal{U} \circ F^j(x) < +\infty \) for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \). As \( F \) is orbit-coherent, it follows from Theorem A that there exists one and only one probability \( \nu \) that is the \( F \)-lift of \( \mu \). Moreover, \( \nu \) is \( F \)-ergodic and \( \nu(\mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) = 1 \). By the \( F \) invariance of \( \nu \) we get that \( \nu(\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U}) = 1 \). Therefore, using item (3) of Lemma 6.2, we get that \( \nu(\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) = 1 \), as \( 1 \geq \nu(\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) \geq \nu(\mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \cap \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U}) = 1 \). As a consequence, \( \mu(\mathcal{U}) > 0 \), where \( \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U}) \).

This implies, by the \( f \)-invariance and ergodicity of \( \mu \), that \( \mu(\bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(\mathcal{U})) = 1 \). Hence, if \( r(x) = \min \{ n \geq 0 ; f^n(x) \in \mathcal{U} \} \) for \( x \in \bigcup_{j \geq 0} f^{-j}(\mathcal{U}) \), we get that \( \{ r(x) + j ; j \in \mathcal{U}(f^{r(x)}(x)) \} \subset \mathcal{U}(x) \) and so, \( \# \mathcal{U}(x) = +\infty \forall x \in \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(\mathcal{U}) \). As a consequence,

\[
\mu(\mathcal{X}_\infty(\mathcal{U})) = 1.
\]
Because $F$ is the first return map by $f$ to $U$, $F(U) \subset U$ and $\mu(U) > 0$, it follows from Lemma 4.2 and from the unicity of the $F$-lift of $\mu$ that
\[ \nu = \frac{1}{\mu(U)} \mu|_U = \frac{1}{\mu(B_U)} \mu|_{B_U}, \]
proving that $\frac{1}{\mu(B_U)} \mu|_{B_U}$ is ergodic, $F$-invariant and the unique probability $F$-invariant absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu$. Using Kac’s result (Theorem 4.4), we get that $\int_{B_U} R_Ud\mu = 1$ and so, $\int R_Ud\nu = \frac{1}{\mu(B_U)} = \frac{1}{\mu(U)}$. By Birkhoff $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R_U \circ F^j(x) = \int R_Ud\nu$ for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}_\infty(U)$. So, using Lemma 4.5 and (20), we get that
\[ \mu(B_U) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R_U \circ F^j(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{0 \leq j < n; f^j(x) \in O_F^+(x)\} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{\mathcal{U}(x) \cap \mathcal{U}(0)\} = 1 \quad (\text{for } \mu) \]
for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}_\infty(U) = \mathcal{X}$ mod $\mu$.

**Items (1), (2) and (3).** First suppose that $\mu(\mathcal{X}_U) = 1$. It follows from the Ergodic decomposition theorem that there exists a measurable set $X \subset \mathcal{X}$ and a measurable partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $X$ and a collection of ergodic $f$ invariant probabilities $\{\mu_P; P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ such that $\mu_P(P) = 1$ and $\mu = \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mu_P d\mu$, where $\mu = \mu \circ \pi^{-1}$ and $\pi : X \to \mathcal{P}$ with $\pi(x)$ being the element of $\mathcal{P}$ containing $x$. As $f(\mathcal{X}_U^+) \subset \mathcal{X}_U^+$, we get that either $\mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+) = 0$ or $1$ (here, we are using that $\mu_P$ is ergodic and invariant). Let, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{P}_i = \{P \in \mathcal{P}; \mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+) = i\}$ and $X_i = \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_i} P$. Thus,
\[ \mu(X_0 \setminus \mathcal{X}_U^+) = \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}_0} \mu_P(X_0 \setminus \mathcal{X}_U^+) \, d\mu = \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}_0} (1 - \mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+)) \, d\mu = \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}_0} \, d\mu = \mu(X_0). \]

As $\mathcal{U}(x) = 0$ $\implies$ $\lim_{n \to \infty} \#(\mathcal{U}(x)) = 0$, if $\mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+) = 0$, then $\lim_{n \to \infty} \#(\mathcal{U}(x)) = 0 = \mu(B_U \cap \mathcal{X}_U^+)$ for $\mu_P$ almost every $x$. On the other hand, if $\mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+) = 1$, it follows from item (4) that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \#(\mathcal{U}(x)) = \mu(B_U) = \mu(B_U \cap \mathcal{X}_U^+)$ for $\mu_P$ almost every $x$. Thus, $\lim_{n \to \infty} \#(\mathcal{U}(x)) = \mu(B_U \cap \mathcal{X}_U^+)$ for $\mu_P$ almost every $x$ and every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. This implies that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \#(\mathcal{U}(x))$ exists for $\mu$ almost every $x$ and also that $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \lim_{n \to \infty} \#(\mathcal{U}(x)) \, d\mu = \mu(B_U \cap \mathcal{X}_U^+)$, proving items (1) and (2).

As $\mu_P(B_U) > 0$ when $\mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+) = 1$, we get by the ergodicity that $\mu_P(\bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(B_U)) = 1$ and so, $\mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(B_U)) = 0$. Now, using the ergodicity and the invariance of $\mu_P$, if $\mu_P(B_U) > 0$, then $\mu_P(\bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(B_U)) = 1$ and again, $\mu_P(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(B_U)) = 0$. Thus,
\[ \mu\left(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(B_U)\right) = \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}_0} \mu_P\left(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(B_U)\right) \, d\mu + \int_{P \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mu_P\left(\mathcal{X}_U^+ \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(B_U)\right) \, d\mu = 0, \]
proving item (3) and concluding the proof of the theorem. \(\square\)
Figure 5. In this picture, the black dots represent the (total) orbit of a point \( p \). The arrows labeled with \( f \) (or \( F \)) indicate how a point moves under the action of \( f \) (or \( F \)). The induced map \( F \) is the first \( U \)-time for a coherent schedule of events \( U \). The dot, say \( p \), at the extreme right is a fixed point to \( f \). Although \( p \) belongs to \( B_U \cap X_\infty(U) \), we have that \( F^{-1}(p) \cap B_U = \emptyset \).

Remark 6.3. We may have that \( F(B_U \cap X_\infty(U)) \subseteq B_U \cap X_\infty(U) \), as one can see in the example illustrated by Figure 5.

The proof of Corollary C follows from applying Theorem B to the natural extension of \( f \). As the natural extension will be needed in other proofs in this section, let us set its notation.

6.2. Natural extension. Let \( X_\infty \) be the set of all maps \( \pi : \{0, 1, 2, 3, \cdots\} \to X \) endowed with the product topology. Let \( \pi_n : X_\infty \to X, n \geq 0, \) be the projection \( \pi_n(\pi) = \pi(n) \) and write also \( \pi = \pi_0|_{X_f} \). The domain of the natural extension of \( f \) is the set

\[ X_f = \{ \pi : \{0, 1, 2, 3, \cdots\} \to X; f(\pi(j + 1)) = \pi(j), \forall j \geq 0 \} \subset X_\infty, \]

with its topology induced by the topology of \( X_\infty \). As a consequence of the definition of \( X_f \), if \( A \subset X_f \) then

\[ f^j(\pi_{n+j}(A)) = \pi_n(A) \text{ for every } n, j \geq 0. \]

In particular,

\[ \pi_{n+j}(A) \subset f^{-j}(\pi_n(A)) \text{ for every } n, j \geq 0. \]

The natural extension of \( f \) is the map \( \overline{f} : X_f \to X_f \) given by

\[ \overline{f}((\pi(0), \pi(1), \pi(2), \cdots)) = (f(\pi(0)), \pi(0), \pi(1), \pi(2), \cdots). \]

It is easy to check that \( \overline{f} \) is injective and that \( f \circ \pi = \pi \circ \overline{f} \). Furthermore, \( \overline{f} \) is measurable, as \( f \) is measurable and, if \( f \) is bimeasurable then \( \overline{f} \), as well as \( \pi \), is bimeasurable.

We give a proof of Rokhlin result (Proposition 6.4) about “lifting” an invariant measure to \( \overline{f} \) in Appendix.

Proposition 6.4 (Rokhlin). If \( \mu \) is a \( f \)-invariant probability, then the probability \( \overline{\mu} \in M^1(X_f) \) defined by \( \overline{\mu}(U) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu(\pi_n(U)), \forall U \subset X_f \) measurable, is the unique \( \overline{f} \)-invariant probability \( \overline{\mu} \) such that \( \mu = \pi_* \overline{\mu} \). Furthermore, if \( \mu \) is ergodic then \( \mu \) is also ergodic.
6.3. Proof of Corollary [C]

Proof. Let \( \overline{\mu} \) be the ergodic \( \overline{f} \)-invariant probability given by Proposition [6.4]. Note that \( \overline{f} \) is an injective bimeasurable map, as required by Theorem [B]. Furthermore, \( \mu = \pi_* \overline{\mu} = \overline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1} \) and \( f \circ \pi = \pi \circ \overline{f} \).

Define \( \overline{U} : X_f \to 2^{\mathbb{N}} \) by \( \overline{U} = U \circ \pi \). Note that \( R_{\overline{\tau}}(\overline{x}) = R_{U}(\pi(\overline{x})) = R_{\overline{\tau}}(\overline{x}(0)) \), where \( R_{\overline{\tau}} \) is the first \( \overline{U} \)-time. Let \( F(\overline{x}) = \overline{f}^{R_{\overline{\tau}}(\overline{x})} \) and note that \( F \circ \pi = \pi \circ F \).

As \( \overline{f} \) is injective, the coherent block for \( \overline{U} \), \( B_{\overline{\tau}} \), is well defined and, by Lemma [6.2],

\[
B_{\overline{\tau}} \cap X_{f,\infty}(\overline{U}) = A_{\overline{\tau}} \quad \text{mod } \overline{\mu},
\]

where \( X_{f,\infty}(\overline{U}) = \{ \overline{x} \in X_f \; ; \; \# \overline{U}(\overline{x}) = +\infty \} \). Note that

\[
A_{\overline{\tau}} = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} \overline{F}^j \left( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \overline{F}^{-n}(X_f) \right) = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} \overline{F}^j \left( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \overline{F}^{-n} (\pi^{-1}(X)) \right) = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} \overline{F}^j \left( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \pi^{-1} (\overline{F}^{-n}(X)) \right) = \pi^{-1} \left( \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^j \left( \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(X) \right) \right) = \pi^{-1}(A_U).
\]

It follows from Theorem [B] that the natural density \( d_n(\overline{U}(\overline{x})) \) exists for \( \overline{\mu} \) almost every \( \overline{x} \). As \( \mu = \overline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1} \), for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in X \) there is a \( \overline{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x) \) such that \( d_n(\overline{U}(\overline{x})) \) exists. Thus, \( d_n(U(x)) = d_n(\overline{U}(\overline{x})) \) exists, proving item (1). For the same reason, noting that \( X_{f,\overline{\tau}}^+ := \{ \overline{x} ; d_n(\overline{U}(\overline{x})) > 0 \} = \pi^{-1}(X_{U}^+) \) and that \( X_{f,\overline{\tau}}^+ \subset X_{f,\infty}(\overline{U}) \), we get from (21) that

\[
\int_{x \in X} d_n(U(x))d\mu = \int_{\overline{x} \in X_f} d_n(U(\overline{x}))d\overline{\mu} = \overline{\mu}(B_{\overline{\tau}} \cap X_{f,\overline{\tau}}^+) = \overline{\mu}(A_{\overline{\tau}} \cap X_{f,\overline{\tau}}^+) = \mu(A_{U} \cap X_{U}^+),
\]

proving item (2).

As in the proof of item (3) of Theorem [B], the proof of item (3) follows straightforward from the Ergodic decomposition theorem and item (4). Thus, we only need to show item (4).

Assume that \( \mu \) is ergodic and \( \mu(X_{U}^+) > 0 \). In this case \( \overline{\mu} \) is also ergodic. As \( \overline{\mu}(X_{f,\overline{\tau}}^+) = \mu(X_U^+) > 0 \), it follows from item (4) of Theorem [B] that

\[
\mu(X_{\infty}(U)) = \mu(X_{f,\infty}(\overline{U})) = 1,
\]

and that

\[
d_n(U(x)) = \overline{\mu}(B_{\overline{\tau}}) = \overline{\mu}(B_{\overline{\tau}} \cap X_{f,\overline{\tau}}(\overline{U})) = \overline{\mu}(A_{\overline{\tau}}) = \mu(A_U)
\]

for \( \overline{\mu} \) almost every \( \overline{x} \in X_f \). As, for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in X \), there is a \( \overline{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x) \) such that \( d_n(U(x)) = d_n(U(\overline{x})) = \overline{\mu}(B_{\overline{\tau}} \cap X_{f,\infty}(\overline{U})) = \mu(A_U) \), we have that

\[
d_n(U(x)) = \mu(A_U) > 0 \quad \text{for } \mu \text{-almost every } x \in X.
\]
If \( \mu \) is a periodic probability (i.e., \( \mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^j(p)} \) for some periodic point \( p \) with period \( n \geq 1 \)) we can consider \( \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{O}_f^+ (p) \) and the bijective map \( f|_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y} \) and apply Theorem [B] to conclude the proof.

Thus, we may assume that \( \mu (\text{Per}(f)) = 0 \). This implies that \( f|_{\mathcal{O}_f^+(p)} \) is injective for almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). So, it follows from Lemma [5.15] that \( \mathcal{U}(x) = \{ \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_{\mathcal{U}} \circ F^j(x) ; n \geq 1 \} \) for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \). As \( F(\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U}) \subset \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \), we get that \( \mathcal{U}(x) \subset \{ n \geq 1 ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \} \) for every \( x \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \). In particular,

\[
\{ 0 \leq j < n ; j \in \mathcal{U}(x) \text{ and } f^j(x) \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \} = \{ 0 \leq j < n ; j \in \mathcal{U}(x) \}
\]

for every \( x \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \). Hence, using Birkhoff together with (22) and (23), we get that

\[
\mu(\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \}}{n} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \frac{\# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; j \in \mathcal{U}(x) \}}{n} + \frac{\# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; j \in \mathcal{U}(x) \text{ and } f^j(x) \notin \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \}}{n} \right) = \mu(\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U}) + \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; j \in \mathcal{U}(x) \text{ and } f^j(x) \notin \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \}
\]

for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \) and so,

\[
\varphi(x) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n ; j \in \mathcal{U}(x) \text{ and } f^j(x) \notin \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \} = 0
\]

for \( \mu \)-almost every \( x \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \). As \( \varphi(f(x)) = \varphi(x) \) for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \) (i.e., \( \varphi \) is almost constant), it follows from the ergodicity of \( \mu \) that \( \varphi(x) = 0 \) for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). This implies that

\[
d_n(\{ j \geq 1 ; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{U} \text{ and } j \notin \mathcal{U}(x) \}) = 0
\]

for almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \).

As \( B_\mathcal{T} = A_\mathcal{T} \mod \mathcal{T} \), by Theorem [B] \( \mathcal{V} := \frac{1}{\mu(B_\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{V}|_{B_\mathcal{T}} = \frac{1}{\mu(A_\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{V}|_{A_\mathcal{T}} \) is \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariant, we get that

\[
\nu(M) := \frac{1}{\mu(A_\mathcal{T})} \mu|_{A_\mathcal{T}} (M) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_\mathcal{T})} \mu(\pi^{-1}(A_\mathcal{T} \cap M)) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_\mathcal{T})} \mu(A_\mathcal{T} \cap \pi^{-1}(M)) = \nu(\pi^{-1}(M)) = \nu(F^{-1}(\pi^{-1}(M))) = \nu(F^{-1}(\pi^{-1}(M))) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_\mathcal{T})} \mu(A_\mathcal{T} \cap \pi^{-1}(F^{-1}(M))) = \frac{1}{\mu(A_\mathcal{T})} \mu(A_\mathcal{T} \cap F^{-1}(M)) = \nu(F^{-1}(M)),
\]

for any given measurable set \( M \subset \mathcal{X} \), proving the \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariance of \( \nu \). As \( \mathcal{F} \) is orbit-coherent and \( \mu \)-\( f \)-ergodic, it follows Theorem [A] that \( \nu \) is \( \mathcal{F} \)-ergodic and it is the unique \( \mathcal{F} \)-invariant probability that is absolutely continuous with respect to \( \mu \).

Finally, as \( R_{\mathcal{T}}|_{A_\mathcal{T}} \) is the first return time to \( A_\mathcal{T} \) by \( f \), it follows from Kac (Theorem [4.4]) that \( \int_{A_\mathcal{T}} R_{\mathcal{T}}d\mu = \int_{A_\mathcal{T}} R_{\mathcal{T}}d\mathcal{V} = 1 \). \( \square \)
6.4. Proof of Theorem [D]

Proof. For $j = 0, \cdots, m$, write $R_j(x) = R_{U_j}(x)$ and $F_j(x) = f^{R_j(x)}(x)$ for every $x \in A_j := \mathcal{X}_1(U_j) = \{x; \#U_j(x) \geq 1\}$.

If $f$ is an injective bimeasurable map, the coherent block $B_{U_j}$ is well defined for each $j \in \{0, \cdots, m\}$. Write $B_j = B_{U_j} \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq m$. It follows from Theorem [B] that $\mu(B_j) > 0$ for every $0 \leq j \leq m$. Define $\ell_0 = 0$ and, as $\mu$ is ergodic, define $\ell_1 = \min\{j \geq n_1; \mu(B_0 \cap f^{-j}(B_1)) > 0\}$ and inductively define, for every $2 \leq k \leq m$,

$$\ell_k = \min\{j \geq 0; \mu(B_0 \cap f^{-\ell_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-\ell_{k-1}}(B_{k-1}) \cap f^{-j}(B_k)) > 0\}.$$

Taking $\mathcal{B} = B_0 \cap f^{-\ell_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-\ell_m}(B_m)$, we get that $\theta := \mu(\mathcal{B}) > 0$. As $\mu$ is ergodic \(\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \#\{0 \leq j \leq n; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{B}\} = \theta\) for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Furthermore, if $f^j(x) \in \mathcal{B} \subset B_0$ then $f^{\ell_1 + \ell_k}(x) \in B_k$ for every $0 \leq k \leq m$. Thus, $(j, j + \ell_1, \cdots, j + \ell_m) \in \mathcal{U}_0(x) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_m(x)$ for $\mu$ almost every $x$ and any $j \geq 1$ such $f^j(x) \in \mathcal{B}$, which concludes the proof of the theorem when $f$ is an injective map.

If $f$ is bimeasurable but not injective, consider the natural extension $\overline{f}: \mathcal{X}_f \to \mathcal{X}_f$ of $f$ and let $\overline{\mu}$ be the ergodic $\overline{f}$ invariant probability given by Proposition 6.4. Note that $\overline{f}$ is an injective bimeasurable map, as required by Theorem [B]. Furthermore, $\mu = \pi_*\overline{\mu} = \overline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ and $f \circ \pi = \pi \circ \overline{f}$.

Let $\overline{U}_k : \overline{A}_k \to \mathbb{N}$ and $\overline{R}_k : \overline{A}_k \to \mathbb{N}$ be given by $\overline{U}_k = U_k \circ \pi$ and $\overline{R}_k = R_k \circ \pi$, where $\overline{A}_k = \pi^{-1}(A_k)$. Let $\overline{F}_k : \overline{A} \to \overline{A}$ be given by $\overline{F}_k(\overline{x}) = \overline{f}^{\overline{R}_k(\overline{x})}(\overline{x})$. Note that $F_k \circ \pi = \pi \circ \overline{F}_k$.

As $\overline{f}$ is injective, let $\overline{B}_k$ be the coherent block for $\overline{U}_k$. Thus, it follows from the injective case that there are $\ell_1, \cdots, \ell_m \geq 0$ such that $\overline{B} := B_0 \cap \overline{f}^{-\ell_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap \overline{f}^{-\ell_m}(B_m)$ has $\overline{\mu}$ positive measure and $(j, j + \ell_1, \cdots, j + \ell_m) \in \mathcal{U}_0(x) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_m(x)$ whenever $\overline{f}^j(\overline{x}) \in \overline{B}$.

As $\mu = \overline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$, for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there is a $\overline{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ such that $\lim \frac{1}{n} \#\{0 \leq j < n; \overline{f}^j(\overline{x}) \in \overline{B}\} = \overline{\mu}(\overline{B})$. Moreover, as $\overline{f}^j(\overline{x}) \in \overline{B} \iff (j, j + \ell_1, \cdots, j + \ell_m) \in \mathcal{U}_0(\overline{x}) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_m(\overline{x})$, we get that

$$\lim \frac{1}{n} \#\{0 \leq j < n; (j, j + \ell_1, \cdots, j + \ell_m) \in \mathcal{U}_0(\overline{x}) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_m(\overline{x})\} = \lim \frac{1}{n} \#\{0 \leq j < n; (j, j + \ell_1, \cdots, j + \ell_m) \in \mathcal{U}_0(x) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}_m(x)\} = \overline{\mu}(\overline{B}) > 0$$

for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus, taking $\theta = \overline{\mu}(\overline{B})$, we conclude the proof.

7. Pointwise synchronization

In order to study the synchronization of coherent schedule with respect to a non invariant probability, define the **weak-omega set** of $x$, $\mathcal{U}_f(x) \subset \mathcal{M}^1(\mathcal{X})$, as the set of all accumulating points of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^j(x)}$.

Lemma 7.1. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a metric space, $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ a measurable map and $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{X} \to [-\infty, +\infty]$ a $f$ sup-additive cocycle. If $\mu$ is a $f$ invariant Borel probability, $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\varphi(1, x)| d\mu < +\infty$ and $\lim \inf_{n} \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) \geq \lambda \in (0, +\infty)$ for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then there is a $\ell_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(\ell, x) d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda}{4} \ell$$
for all $\ell \geq \ell_0$.

**Proof.** The proof of this lemma was based on the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [13]. Let $\mathcal{X}' = \{x \in \mathcal{X}; \liminf_n 1/n \varphi(n, x) \geq \lambda > 0\}$.

Define, for $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $n_x = \min\{n \geq 1; 1/n \varphi(j, x) > \lambda/2 \forall j \geq n\}$ and let $C_j = \{x \in \mathcal{X}; n_x \leq j\}$, for $j \geq 1$. As $\varphi$ is sup-additive, $\varphi(j, x) \geq \varphi(1, x) + \varphi(j-1, f(x)) \geq \varphi(1, x) + \varphi(1, f(x)) + \varphi(j-2, f^2(x)) = \cdots = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \varphi(1, f^i(x))$. Thus,

$$
\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{j} \varphi(j, x) d\mu = \int_{x \in C_j} \frac{1}{j} \varphi(j, x) d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \mu(C_j) + \int_{x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus C_j} \frac{1}{j} \varphi(j, x) d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \mu(C_j) + \int_{x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus C_j} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \varphi(1, f^i(x)) d\mu.
$$

Let $\psi_n(x) := 1/n \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(1, f^i(x))$. As $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\varphi(1, x)| d\mu < +\infty$, it follows from Birkhoff that $\psi \in L^1(\mu)$, where $\psi(x) := \lim_n \psi_n(x)$ for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. By Birkhoff (indeed, by a corollary of it, see Corollary 1.14.1 in [25]), $\lim_n \int_x |\psi_n - \psi| d\mu = 0$. So, given any $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda/12$ there is a $m_0 \geq 1$ such that $\int_{\mathcal{X}} |\psi_\ell - \psi| d\mu < \varepsilon/2$ for every $\ell \geq m_0$. As $\int |\psi| d\mu < +\infty$ and $\lim \mu(\mathcal{X} \setminus C_j) = 0$, there is $\ell_0 \geq m_0$ such that $\mu(C_\ell) > 2/3$ and $\int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus C_\ell} |\psi| d\mu < \varepsilon/2$ for every $\ell \geq \ell_0$. Thus,

$$
\int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus C_\ell} |\psi_\ell| d\mu \leq \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus C_\ell} |\psi_\ell - \psi| d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus C_\ell} |\psi - \psi| d\mu \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\psi_\ell - \psi| d\mu + \int_{\mathcal{X} \setminus C_\ell} |\psi| d\mu < \varepsilon < \lambda/12,
$$

for every $\ell \geq \ell_0$. Therefore,

$$
\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\ell} \varphi(\ell, x) d\mu > \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{2}{3} - \frac{\lambda}{12} = \lambda/4,
$$

for every $\ell \geq \ell_0$. \hfill \square

**Lemma 7.2.** If $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function and $\mu$ is an ergodic $f$ invariant probability then

$$
\int |\varphi| d\mu = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_\varphi^{-1}(\{j \geq 0; |\varphi \circ f^j(x)| \geq r\}) d\mu(r)
$$

for $\mu$ almost every $x$.

**Proof.** Consider $\psi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, 1]$ given by $\psi(r) = \mu(\{|\varphi| \geq r\})$. We claim that $\psi$ is continuous. Indeed, given $r > 0$, let $U_\varepsilon = \{|\varphi| < r + \varepsilon\}$. Given $0 < a_n \to 0$, we get that $U_{a_1} \supset U_{a_2} \supset U_{a_3} \supset \cdots$ and that $\bigcap_n U_{a_n} = \{|\varphi| \leq r\}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.15, $\lim_n (1 - \psi(r + a_n)) = \lim_n \mu(U_{a_n}) = \mu(\{|\varphi| \leq r\}) = 1 - \mu(\{|\varphi| > r\}) = 1 - \psi(r)$ for every $0 < a_n \to 0$. That is, $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varphi(r + \varepsilon) = \varphi(r)$, the right-hand limit is equal to $\varphi(r)$. Similarly, taking $V_\varepsilon = \{|\varphi| \geq r - \varepsilon\}$ and a sequence $0 < a_n \to 0$, we get that $V_{a_1} \supset V_{a_2} \supset V_{a_3} \supset \cdots$ and $\bigcap_n V_{a_n} = \{|\varphi| \geq r\}$. So, by Lemma 4.15, $\lim_n \psi(r - a_n) = \lim_n \mu(V_{a_n}) = \mu(\{|\varphi| \geq r\}) = \psi(r)$, proving that $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varphi(r + \varepsilon) = \varphi(r) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varphi(r + \varepsilon)$ which implies the continuity of $\psi$. Now, as $\psi$ is continuous, we get that its Riemann integral $\int_{r = 0}^{r = a} \psi(r) dr = \int_{r = 0}^{r = \infty} \mu(\{|\varphi| \geq r\}) dr$ is well defined. As

$$
\int_{r = 0}^{r = \infty} \mu(\{x \in \mathcal{X}; |\varphi(x)| \geq r\}) dr = \int_{r \in [0, +\infty)} \mu(\{x \in \mathcal{X}; |\varphi(x)| \geq r\}) d\text{Leb} =
$$
\[
= (\mu \times \operatorname{Leb})(\{(x, r) \in \mathcal{X} \times [0, +\infty) ; \varphi(x) \geq r\}) = \\
= \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \operatorname{Leb}\{r \in [0, +\infty) ; |\varphi(x)| \geq r\} \, d\mu = \int |\varphi| \, d\mu.
\]

That is, \(\int_0^\infty \psi(r) \, dr = \int |\varphi| \, d\mu\) and so, using Birkhoff, we get that

\[
d_n^+(\{j \geq 0 ; |\varphi \circ f^j(x)| \geq r\}) = \lim 1_n \#\{0 \leq j < n ; f^j(x) \in \{|\varphi| \geq r\}\} = \\
= \mu(\{|\varphi| \geq r\}) = \psi(r),
\]

showing that \(\int_0^\infty d_n^+(\{j \geq 0 ; |\varphi \circ f^j(x)| \geq r\}) = \int |\varphi| \, d\mu\). \(\square\)

Motivated by Lemma 7.2 above, we consider the following definition.

**Definition 7.3.** The **f-tail sum** of a function \(R : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}\) at a point \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) is defined as

\[
I_f(R)(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} d_n^+(\{j \geq 0 ; R \circ f^j(x) \geq n\}).
\]

If \(I_f(R)(x) < +\infty\), then we say that \(R\) has a **summable f-tail** at \(x\). As \(a_n \in [0, 1]\) is a decreasing and bounded sequence, \(\lim_{n} a_n\) always exists. Thus, define the **\(R\)-residue** at the orbit of \(x\) as

\[
\operatorname{Res}_f(R, x) := \lim_{n \to +\infty} d_n^+(\{j \geq 0 ; R \circ f^j(x) \geq n\}).
\]

**Lemma 7.4.** If \(\mathcal{X}\) is a metric space, \(f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}\) is measurable and \(R : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}\) is lower semicontinuous and \(x \in \mathcal{X}\), then

\[
\mu(\{R \geq n\}) \leq d_n^+(\{j \geq 0 ; R \circ f^j(x) \geq n\})
\]

for every \(\mu \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_f(x)\) and \(n \geq 1\). In particular, \(\int_\mathcal{X} R \, d\mu \leq I_f(R)(x)\) for every \(\mu \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_f(x)\). Furthermore, if \(\operatorname{Res}_f(R, x) = 0\) then \(\mu(\{R = +\infty\}) = 0\) \(\forall \mu \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_f(x)\).

**Proof.** Given \(\mu \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_f(x)\), let \(n_i \to \infty\) be such that \(\mu = \lim_i \mu_i\), where \(\mu_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=0}^{n_i-1} \delta_{f^j(x)} \in \mathcal{M}^1(A)\). As \(R\) is lower semicontinuous, \(\{R \geq n\} = \{R > n - 1\}\) is an open subset of \(\mathcal{X}\). Applying Lemma 4.8, we get that

\[
\mu(\{R \geq n\}) \leq \lim \inf_{i} \mu_i(\{R > n\}) = \\
= \lim \inf_{i} \frac{1}{n_i} \#\{0 \leq j < n_i ; f^j(x) \in \{R \geq n\}\} \leq d_n^+(\{j \geq 0 ; R \circ f^j(x) \geq n\}).
\]

Thus, as \(\int_\mathcal{X} R \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \mu(\{R \geq n\})\), we get that \(\int_\mathcal{X} R \, d\mu \leq I_f(R)(x)\).

Suppose that \(\mu \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_f(x)\) and \(\operatorname{Res}_f(R, x) = 0\). By Lemma 4.15, we have

\[
\mu(\{R = \infty\}) = \mu\left( \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \{R \geq n\} \right) = \lim \mu(\{R \geq n\}) \leq \lim d_n^+(\{j \geq 0 ; R \circ f^j(x) \geq n\}) = 0,
\]

concluding the proof. \(\square\)
Lemma 7.5. Let $\mu$ be a $f$-nonsingular probability (not necessarily an invariant one), $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \to [-\infty, +\infty]$ sup-additive cocycle, $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} ; \varphi(n, x) \geq n\gamma \}$ and

$$R(x) = \begin{cases} \min \mathcal{U}(x) & \text{if } \mathcal{U}(x) \neq \emptyset \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathcal{U}(x) = \emptyset \end{cases}.$$ 

If $\mu(\{R = +\infty\}) = 0$, then $\limsup_{n} \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) \geq \gamma$ for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mu(\{R = +\infty\}) = 0$. As $\mu$ is $f$-nonsingular, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $\mu$ is also $F$-nonsingular. Thus, $\bigcup_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\{R = +\infty\}) = 0$. Hence, $\mu(U) = 1$, where $U = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\{R < +\infty\})$. Let $F(x) := f^{R(x)}(x)$ for every $x \in U$. Given $n \geq 1$, $j \geq 0$ and $x \in U$, let $a_j = R(F^j(x))$ and $s(n) = a_0 + \cdots + a_{n-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R(F^j(x))$. As $\varphi$ is sup-additive,

$$\varphi(s(n), x) \geq \varphi(a_0, x) + \varphi(a_1, f^{a_0}(x)) + \cdots + \varphi(a_{n-1}, f^{a_0, \cdots + a_{n-1}}(x)) =$$

$$= \varphi(R(x), x) + \varphi(R(F(x)), F(x)) + \cdots + \varphi(R(F^{n-1}(x)), F^{n-1}(x)) =$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(R(F^j(x)), F^j(x)).$$

By the definition of $R$, $\varphi(R(y), y) \geq \gamma R(y)$ for every $y \in \{R < +\infty\}$. Thus,

$$\varphi(s(n), x) \geq \gamma \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} R(F^j(x)) = \gamma s(n)$$

for every $n \geq 1$. Hence $\limsup_{n} \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) \geq \gamma$ for every $x \in U$. \hfill \Box

Theorem 7.6 (Pointwise synchronization). Let $\mathbb{X}$ be a compact metric space, $f : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{X}$ a continuous map, $\lambda > 0$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ a continuous sup-additive $f$-cocycle. Given $x \in \mathbb{X}$, let $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} ; \varphi(n, x) \geq n\lambda \}$ and

$$R(x) = \begin{cases} \min \mathcal{U}(x) & \text{if } \mathcal{U}(x) \neq \emptyset \\ +\infty & \text{if } \mathcal{U}(x) = \emptyset \end{cases}.$$ 

If $\text{Res}_f(R, p) = 0$ for some $p \in \mathbb{X}$, then there is a $\ell_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(2^\ell, f^j(p)) \geq \frac{\lambda}{3} 2^\ell \ \forall \ell \geq \ell_0.$$ 

Proof. As $f$ is continuous and $\mathbb{X}$ compact, $\mathcal{M}_{f}(\mathbb{X}) \supset \mathcal{U}_{f}(p) \neq \emptyset$. Given any $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_{f}(p)$, consider a sequence $n_i \nearrow \infty$ such that $\mu := \lim_{i} \mu_i \in \mathcal{U}_{f}(p)$, where $\mu_i := \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=0}^{n_i-1} \delta_{f^j(p)}$.

It follows from the continuity of $f$ and $\varphi$ that $\mathcal{U}$ is partially continuous and so, by Lemma 5.13, $R$ is lower semicontinuous. Using Lemma 7.4 we get that $\mu(\{R = +\infty\}) = 0$. Thus, by Lemma 7.5 $\limsup_{n} \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) \geq \lambda$ for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

As $\psi := -\varphi$ is a subadditive $f$-cocycle and $\int_{\mathbb{X}} |\psi(1, x)| d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{X}} |\varphi(1, x)| d\mu < +\infty$, it follows from Kingman’s Subadditive Ergodic Theorem that $\lim_{n} \frac{1}{n} \psi(n, x)$ exists for $\mu$
almost every $x$. Thus, \( \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) = -\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \psi(n, x) \) also exists for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. As
\[
- \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \psi(n, x) = \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \psi(n, x) = -\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) \leq -\lambda,
\]
we get that
\[
\lim_n \frac{1}{n} \varphi(n, x) \geq \lambda \text{ for } \mu \text{ almost every } x \in \mathcal{X}. \tag{24}
\]
As $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\varphi(1, x)| d\mu < +\infty$, it follows from Lemma 7.1 that there is a $\ell_0 \geq 1$ such that
\[
\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(\ell, x) d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda}{4} \ell \text{ for all } \ell \geq \ell_0. \tag{25}
\]
As $\mu$ is $f$-invariant and $\varphi(2n+1, x) \geq \varphi(2^n, f^n x) + \varphi(2^n, x) \ \forall \ n \geq 0$, we get that
\[
\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2n+1, x) d\mu \geq \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^n, f^n x) d\mu + \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^n, x) d\mu =
\]
\[
= 2 \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^n, x) d\mu
\]
for every $n \geq 0$. Thus,
\[
\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^n, x) d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda}{5} 2^n \implies \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^\ell, x) d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda}{5} 2^\ell, \tag{26}
\]
for every $\ell \geq n$. As a consequence, it follows from (25) and (26) that, for each $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_f(p)$, there exists a unique $n_0(\mu) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots \}$ such that
\[
\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^n, x) d\mu \begin{cases} \leq \frac{\lambda}{5} 2^n & \text{if } n < n_0(\mu) \\ \geq \frac{\lambda}{5} 2^n & \text{if } n \geq n_0(\mu) \end{cases}
\]
Suppose that $\liminf \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(2^a, f^j(p)) < \lambda 2^a / 5$ for every $a \geq 1$. In this case, for each $a \geq 1$, there is a sequence $m_i \equiv m_i(a) \to \infty$ such that $\lim \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \varphi(2^a, f^j(p)) < \lambda 2^a / 5$. Taking a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $\lim \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \delta_{f^j(p)} = \eta_a$, for some $\eta_a \in \mathcal{U}_f(p)$. As $\mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto \varphi(2^a, x)$ is continuous, we get that
\[
\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^a, x) d\eta_a = \lim_i \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^a, x) d\left( \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \delta_{f^j(p)} \right) =
\]
\[
= \lim_i \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=0}^{m_i-1} \varphi(2^a, f^j(p)) < \lambda 2^a / 5.
\]
Therefore, \( n_0(\eta_a) > a \) for every $a \geq 1$. \tag{27}
As $\mathcal{U}_f(p)$ is compact, there is a sequence $a_i \to \infty$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{U}_f(p)$ such that $\eta = \lim_i \eta_{a_i}$. Using (25), we can choose $\ell \geq 1$ such that $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^\ell, x) d\eta \geq \frac{\lambda}{4} 2^\ell$. As $\mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto \varphi(2^\ell, x)$ is continuous, $\lim_i \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(\ell, x) d\eta_{a_i} = \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(\ell, x) d\eta \geq \lambda 2^\ell / 4$. Thus, $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(2^\ell, x) d\eta_{a_i} > \frac{\lambda}{5} 2^\ell$ for any big $i$ and so $n_0(\eta_{a_i}) \leq \ell$ for every $i \geq 1$ big enough, contradicting (27). \hfill \Box
8. Examples of applications

In this section we give some examples of how to apply the results of the previous sections. Our first application is associated to the problem of studying the Thermodynamic Formalism using induced schemes. Here, we give an example of a simple induced map for the lateral shift $\sigma : \Sigma^+_2 \to \Sigma^+_2$ such that every ergodic $\sigma$-invariant probability $\mu \neq \delta_{\overline{0}}$ is $F$-liftable (Lemma \[5.1\], where $\overline{0} := (0,0,0,\ldots)$). In contrast, we will show the existence of an uncountable set $M$ of ergodic $\sigma$-invariant probability such that $\int Rd\mu = +\infty$. Furthermore, every $\mu \in M$ has positive entropy, $h_\mu(\sigma) > 0$, and full support, i.e., $\text{supp} \mu = \Sigma^+_2$ (Proposition \[8.2\]). We also show that $\sup \{ h_\mu(\sigma) : \mu \in M \} = \log 2 = h_{\text{top}}(\sigma)$. This means that, when studying equilibrium states with induced schemes, the criterium of integrability of the induced time \[20\] may leave out a relevant set of liftable invariant measures.

Consider the lateral shift of two symbols $\sigma : \Sigma^+_2 \to \Sigma^+_2$, where $\Sigma^+_2 = \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ with the product topology and the usual metric $d(x,y) = 2^{-\min(j\geq 1; x(j)\neq y(j))}$, $x = (x(0),x(1),x(2),\ldots)$, $y = (y(0),y(1),y(2),\ldots)$, $x(j)$ and $y(j) \in \{0,1\}$ $\forall j \geq 0$. Given a $(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}) \in \{0,1\}^n$, define the cylinder
\[
C_+(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}) = \{ (x(0),x(1),x(2),\ldots) \in \Sigma^+_2 : x(0) = a_0,\ldots,x(n-1) = a_{n-1} \}.
\]
Let $F : \Sigma^+_2 \setminus \{\overline{0}\} \to \Sigma^+_2$ be the induced map $F(x) = \sigma^{R(x)}(x)$ with induced time $R(x) = n$ for any $x \in C_+(0,\ldots,0,1)$ and $n \geq 1$. \[(28)\]

Let $U : \Sigma^+_2 \to 2^\mathbb{N}$ be the schedule of events given by $U(x) = \{ j \geq 1 ; x(j) = 1 \}$ for every $x = (x(0),x(1),\ldots) \in \Sigma^+_2$. One can see that $R = R_U$ (i.e., $R(x) = \min U(x)$) and that $j \in U(x) \iff \sigma^{j-1}(x) \in C_+(1)$. Thus, if we set $R' : \Sigma^+_2 \setminus \{\overline{0}\} \to \mathbb{N}$ as the first entry time to $C_+(1)$ (see the comments about first entry time just below Definition \[2.3\]), we get that $R(x) = R'(x) + 1$. As $R$ is an exact induced time, we get that $R(x)$ is also exact (in particular, a coherent one). So, $F(x) = \sigma^{R(x)}(x)$ is orbit-coherent (Lemma \[2.6\]) and $U : \Sigma^+_2 \to 2^\mathbb{N}$ is a coherent schedule of events (Lemma \[5.15\]).

The natural extension of $\Sigma^+_2$, $(\Sigma^+_2)_\sigma$, is homeomorphic to the bilateral shift of two symbols with $\Sigma_2 = \{0,1\}^\mathbb{Z}$. Indeed, given $\overline{x} \in (\Sigma^+_2)_\sigma \subset (\Sigma^+_2)^\mathbb{N}$, that is, $\overline{x} = (x_0,x_1,x_2,\ldots)$ with $\sigma x_{j+1} = x_j$, define
\[
\psi(\overline{x})(k) = \begin{cases} x_{-k}(0) & \text{if } k < 0 \\ x_k(0) & \text{if } k \geq 0 \end{cases}
\]
where $x_j = (x_j(0),x_j(1),x_j(2),\ldots)$ and $x_j(n) \in \{0,1\}$ for every $j,n \geq 0$. One can show that $\psi : (\Sigma^+_2)_\sigma \to \Sigma_2$ is a homeomorphism between $(\Sigma^+_2)_\sigma$ and $\Sigma_2$. Therefore, instead of $(\Sigma^+_2)_\sigma$, we will consider the natural extension of $\Sigma^+_2$ as $\Sigma_2$.

Let $\pi : \Sigma_2 \to \Sigma^+_2$ be the projection $\pi(\overline{x})(n) = \overline{x}(n)$ for every $n \geq 0$. Given $\overline{x} \in \Sigma_2$, define $\overline{U}(\overline{x}) = U(\pi(\overline{x}))$. Thus, $\overline{U} : \Sigma_2 \to 2^\mathbb{N}$ is a coherent schedule of events for $\overline{\sigma} := \sigma : \Sigma_2 \to \Sigma_2$. As $\overline{\sigma}$ is a homeomorphism, the $\overline{U}$-block $B_{\overline{U}}$ is well defined. Furthermore, it is not difficult to check that $B_{\overline{U}}$ is the set of all $\overline{x} \in \Sigma_2$ such that $\overline{x}(-1) = 1$ and $\# \{ j < 0 ; \overline{x}(j) = 1 \} = \infty$.

As $\# \{ j < 0 ; \overline{x}(j) = 1 \} < \infty \iff \lim_{n \to +\infty} \overline{\sigma}^{-n}(\overline{x}) = \overline{0}$, we get that $\overline{\pi}(\{ \overline{x} \in \Sigma_2 ; \# \{ j < 0 ; \overline{x}(j) = 1 \} < \infty \}) = 0$ for every ergodic $\overline{\sigma}$ invariant probability with $\overline{\pi} \neq \delta_{\overline{0}}$ (we are also using $\overline{0}$ to denote the point $\overline{x} \in \Sigma_2$ such that $\overline{x}(j) = 0$ for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$). As a consequence,
taking \( U := \{ \pi \in \Sigma_2 ; \pi(-1) = 1 \} \), \( \mu(B_\pi U) = \bar{\mu}(U) \) for every ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probability \( \mu \neq \delta_\pi \). Moreover, as \( \mathcal{O}_\sigma(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset \) for every \( \pi \neq 0 \), we get that \( \bar{\mu}(U) > 0 \) for every ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probability \( \mu \neq \delta_\pi \), here \( \mathcal{O}_\sigma(x) = \{ \sigma^j(x) ; j \in \mathbb{Z} \} \).

On the other hand, \( \#U(\pi) < +\infty \) if and only if \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu^n(\pi) = 0 \). So, \( \#U(x) = +\infty \) for \( \bar{\mu} \) almost every \( x \) and every ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probability \( \mu \neq \delta_\pi \). Hence, it follows from Theorem [3] that

\[
d_n(U(\pi)) = \mu(B_\pi \cap (\Sigma_2)_\infty) = \mu(U) > 0
\]

for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \Sigma_2 \) and every ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probability \( \mu \neq \delta_\pi \). This implies that

\[
d_n(U(x)) = \mu(V) > 0 \tag{29}
\]

for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \Sigma_2^+ \) and every ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probability \( \mu \neq \delta_\pi \), where \( V = \pi(B_\pi \cap (\Sigma_2)_\infty) (= \pi(U) \ mod \ \mu) \) is the \( \mathcal{U} \)-pseudo-block that appear in Corollary [C].

**Lemma 8.1.** Let \( F : \Sigma_2^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \Sigma_2^+ \) be the induced map \( F(x) = \sigma^R(x)(x) \), where \( R \) is given by (28). Every ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probability \( \mu \neq \delta_\pi \) is \( F \)-liftable.

**Proof.** The claim is trivial if \( \mu(\text{Per}(\sigma)) > 0 \). Thus, we may assume that \( \mu(\text{Per}(\sigma)) = 0 \). In this case, \( \sigma|_{\Sigma_2^+(x)} \) is injective for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \Sigma_2^+ \). So, it follows from Lemma 5.15 that \( U(x) = \{ j \geq 1 ; \sigma^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x) \} \). Thus, by (29),

\[
\mu\left( \left\{ x \in A_0 ; \lim sup_n \frac{1}{n} \#\{ 0 \leq j < n ; \sigma^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x) \} > 0 \right\} \right) = \\
= \mu\left( \left\{ x \in A_0 ; d_n(U(x)) > 0 \right\} \right) = 1,
\]

where \( A_0 = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\Sigma_2^+) = \Sigma_2^+ \mod \mu \). Hence, by Theorem [A], we conclude that \( \mu \) is \( F \)-liftable. \( \square \)

Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a metric space and \( \{ U_n \}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) a countable collection of two by two disjoint open sets. A map \( f : \bigcup_n U_n \to \mathcal{X} \) is called a full Markov map if

1. \( f|_{U_n} \) is a homeomorphism between \( U_n \) and \( \mathcal{X} \) for every \( n \geq 1 \);
2. \( \lim_n \text{diameter}(\mathcal{P}_n(x)) = 0 \) for every \( x \in \bigcap_j F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \),

where \( \mathcal{P} = \{ U_n \}, \mathcal{P}_n = \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} f^{-j}\mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{P}_n(x) \) is the element of \( \mathcal{P}_n \) containing \( x \). A mass distribution on \( \{ U_n \}_{n} \) is a map \( m : \{ U_n \}_{n} \to [0,1] \) such that \( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m(U_n) = 1 \). The \( f \)-invariant probability \( \mu \) generated by the mass distribution \( m \) is the ergodic \( f \) invariant probability \( \mu \) defined by

\[
\mu(U_{k_1} \cap f^{-1}(U_{k_2}) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-n-1}(U_{k_n})) = m(U_{k_1})m(U_{k_2}) \cdots m(U_{k_n}),
\]

where \( U_{k_1} \cap f^{-1}(U_{k_2}) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-n-1}(U_{k_n}) \in \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} f^{-j}(\mathcal{P}) \).

**Proposition 8.2.** Let \( F : \Sigma_2^+ \setminus \{0\} \to \Sigma_2^+ \) be the induced map \( F(x) = \sigma^R(x)(x) \), where \( R \) is given by (28). Then, there is an uncountable set \( M \) of ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probabilities such that \( h_\mu(\sigma) > 0 \), \( \sup \mu = \Sigma_2^+ \) and \( \int Rd\mu = +\infty \). Furthermore, every \( \mu \) is \( F \)-liftable and \( \sup \{ h_\mu(\sigma) ; \mu \in M \} = \log 2 \).
Proof. Let $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-s}$ be the Riemann zeta function, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and consider the mass distribution

$$m(P_j) = \begin{cases} 2^{-j} & \text{if } j \leq \ell \\ \frac{2^{-j}/\zeta(2+\alpha)}{(j-\ell)^{2+\alpha}} & \text{if } j > \ell \end{cases}$$

where, as before, $P_j = C_+((0, \ldots, 0, 1))$. Note that $\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} m(P_j) = 1$,

$$\sum_{j>\ell} j \, m(P_j) = \frac{1}{2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha)} \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{j}{(j-\ell)^{2+\alpha}} \leq \frac{1}{2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha)} \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{j+\ell}{j^{2+\alpha}} \leq \frac{\ell}{2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha)} \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{j^{1+\alpha}} = \frac{\ell + 1}{2^\ell} \zeta(1+\alpha) \zeta(2+\alpha)$$

and

$$\sum_{j>\ell} m(P_j) \log(1/m(P_j)) = \sum_{j>\ell} \log(\frac{2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha)(j-\ell)^{2+\alpha}}{2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha)(j-\ell)^{2+\alpha}}) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{\log(2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha)) j^{2+\alpha}}{j^{2+\alpha}} = \frac{\log(2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha))}{2^\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{j^{2+\alpha}} \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{(2+\alpha) \log(j)}{j^{2+\alpha}} \leq \frac{\log(2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha))}{2^\ell} + \frac{(2+\alpha) \zeta(1+\alpha)}{2^\ell \zeta(2+\alpha)}.$$

Hence, there is $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j>\ell} j \, m(P_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j>\ell} m(P_j) \log(1/m(P_j)) \leq \frac{C \ell}{2^\ell}.$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\ell \geq 1$ be big enough so that $\log 2 \left( \frac{2-\varepsilon}{2+2\ell} \right) - \frac{C \ell}{2^{\ell+1}} > \log 2 - \varepsilon$. Noting that $\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, 2^{-j} = 2$, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} m(P_j) \log(1/m(P_j))}{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, m(P_j)} \leq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} m(P_j) \log(1/m(P_j))}{C \ell 2^{-\ell} + \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, m(P_j)} - \frac{C \ell 2^{-\ell}}{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, m(P_j)} = \log 2 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, 2^{-j}}{C \ell 2^{-\ell} + \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, 2^{-j}} - \frac{C \ell 2^{-\ell}}{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, 2^{-j}} \geq \log 2 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, 2^{-j}}{C \ell 2^{-\ell} + \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, 2^{-j}} - \frac{C \ell 2^{-\ell}}{2^{\ell+1}} \geq \log 2 \left( \frac{2-\varepsilon}{2+2\ell} \right) - \frac{C \ell}{2^{\ell+1}} > \log 2 - \varepsilon.$$

Thus, taking $\nu_{\alpha, \ell}$ as the ergodic $F$-invariant probability generated by the mass distribution $m$, we get that

$$\frac{h_{\nu_{\alpha, \ell}}(F)}{\int \mathcal{R} d\nu_{\alpha, \ell}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} m(P_j) \log(1/m(P_j))}{\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} j \, m(P_j)} \geq \log 2 - \varepsilon.$$
As \( \int Rd\nu_{\alpha,\ell} \leq 2 + C\ell 2^{-\ell} < 2 + C < +\infty \), it follows from Lemma 4.2 that
\[
\mu_{\alpha,\ell} = \frac{1}{\int Rd\nu_{\alpha,\ell}} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sigma_j^\ell (\nu_{\alpha,\ell}|_{(R>j)})
\]
is an ergodic \( \sigma \) invariant probability. As \( \nu_{\alpha,\ell}(P_j) > 0 \) for every \( j \geq 1 \), we have that \( \text{supp} \nu_{\alpha,\ell} = \Sigma_2^+ \) and, as a consequence, \( \text{supp} \mu_{\alpha,\ell} = \Sigma_2^+ \). As \( \int Rd\nu_{\alpha,\ell} < +\infty \), \( h_{\mu_{\alpha,\ell}}(\sigma) = \frac{\log 2}{\int Rd\nu_{\alpha,\ell}} > \log 2 - \varepsilon \). Finally, it follows from Lemma 8.3 that
\[
\int Rd\mu_{\alpha,\ell} \geq \frac{1}{2} \int (R)^2d\nu_{\alpha,\ell} > \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \geq \ell} j^2 m(P_j) = \frac{1}{2^{\ell+1}\zeta(2+\alpha)} \sum_{j \geq \ell} \frac{j^2}{(j-\ell)^{2+\alpha}} = \frac{1}{2^{\ell+1}\zeta(2+\alpha)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j^{2+\alpha}} = +\infty.
\]
Note that, if \( 0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < 1 \), then \( \nu_{\alpha_0,\ell}(P_j) \neq \nu_{\alpha_1,\ell}(P_j) \) for any \( j > \ell \). In particular, \( \nu_{\alpha_0,\ell} \neq \nu_{\alpha_1,\ell} \). As \( F \) is orbit-coherent, it follows from Theorem [A] that \( \nu_{\alpha_0,\ell} \) is the unique \( F \)-lift of \( \mu_{\alpha_0,\ell} \). Therefore, \( \mu_{\alpha_0,\ell} \neq \mu_{\alpha_1,\ell} \). This implies that \( M = \{ \mu_{\alpha,\ell} : \alpha \in (0,1) \text{ and } \ell \geq 1 \} \) is uncountable and it concludes the proof, since we also have that \( \text{supp} \{ h_\mu(\sigma) : \mu \in M \} = \log 2 \). □

**Lemma 8.3.** Let \( (\mathcal{X},A,\mu) \) be a probability space, \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \) a measurable map and \( F : A \subset \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \) a measurable induced map with an exact induced time \( R : A \to \mathbb{N} \). If \( \mu \) is \( f \)-invariant and \( \nu \) is a \( F \)-lift of \( \mu \), then
\[
\frac{1}{2} \int Rd\mu \leq \int (R)^2d\nu \leq 2 \int Rd\mu.
\]

**Proof.** As \( R \) is exact,
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{R(x)-1} R \circ f^j(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{R(x)-1} (R(x) - j) = \sum_{j=1}^{R(x)} j = R(x)(R(x) + 1)/2 \geq \frac{1}{2} (R(x))^2,
\]
for every \( x \in A \). Therefore,
\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{r_n(x)-1} (R \circ F^j(x))^2 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{r_n(x)-1} R \circ f^j(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{r_n(x)-1} R \circ F^j(x)(R \circ F^j(x) + 1) \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{r_n(x)-1} (R \circ F^j(x))^2.
\]
or
\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{r_n(x)-1} R \circ f^j(x) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r_n(x)-1} (R \circ F^j(x))^2 \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{r_n(x)-1} R \circ f^j(x),
\]
for every \( x \in A \). As \( \mu \) is ergodic and \( f \)-invariant, it follows from Birkhoff that
\[
\frac{1}{2} \int Rd\mu \leq \liminf_{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (R \circ F^j(x))^2 \leq \limsup_{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (R \circ F^j(x))^2 \leq 2 \int Rd\mu.
\]
for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). As \( R \) is coherent (because \( R \) is exact), it follows from Lemma 2.6 that \( F \) is orbit coherent. Thus, \( \nu \) is also ergodic (see Theorem [A]). Thus, using Birkhoff again, there is a measurable set \( U \subset \mathcal{X} \) with \( \nu(U) = 1 \), such that \( \int (R)^2d\mu = \int (R)^2d\nu \).
\[
\lim \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (R) \circ F^j(x) \text{ for every } x \in U. \quad \text{As } \nu \ll \mu, \text{ we get that } \mu(U) > 0 \text{ and so, it follows from (30) that}
\]
\[
\frac{1}{2} \int R d\mu \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (R \circ F^j(x))^2 = \int (R)^2 d\nu \leq 2 \int R d\mu,
\]
for \( \mu \) almost every \( x \in U \), proving the lemma. \( \square \)

In Example 8.4 below, we use our previous results to construct an induced map \( F \) that works like a filter on the set of all \( f \) invariant probabilities \( \mathcal{M}_f^1(\mathcal{X}) \). That is, given a function \( \varphi \) and a number \( \gamma \), an ergodic invariant probability \( \mu \) is \( F \)-liftable if and only if \( \int \varphi d\mu > \gamma \).

**Example 8.4.** Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a compact metric space and \( f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X} \) a bimeasurable map. Given \( \varphi : \mathcal{X} \to [-1, 1] \) and a \( \gamma \in (-1, 1) \) let \( \mathcal{U}(x) \) the set of all \( (\gamma, \Phi) \)-Pliss time for \( x \in \mathcal{X} \), where \( \Phi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R} \) is given by \( \Phi(n, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi \circ f^j(x) \). As \( \Phi \) is an additive cocycle, i.e., \( \Phi \) is both a subadditive and a sup-additive cocycle, we can use Lemma 5.10 above to conclude that \( \mathcal{U} \) is a coherent schedule of events and use Lemma 8.5 below to assure that \( \mathcal{O}_f^+(\mathcal{U}(x)) > 0 \) whenever \( \limsup_{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi \circ f^j(x) > \gamma \). So, if we set \( F : \mathcal{X}_1(\mathcal{U}) \to \mathcal{X} \) as the first \( \mathcal{U} \)-map (i.e., \( F(x) = f^{\min(\mathcal{U}(x))}(x) \)), it follows from Corollary C that an ergodic \( f \)-invariant probability \( \mu \) is \( F \)-liftable if and only if \( \int \varphi d\mu > \gamma \).

**Lemma 8.5 (Corollary of Pliss Lemma).** Given \( -C \leq c_0 < c_1 \leq C \), let \( 0 < \theta = \frac{c_1 - c_0}{C - c_0} < 1 \). Let \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \in [-C, C] \) be a subadditive sequence of real numbers. If \( \frac{1}{n} a_n \geq c_1 \), then there is \( \ell \geq \theta n \) and a sequence \( 1 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < a_\ell \) such that \( \frac{1}{n_j - \ell} a_{n_j - k} \geq c_0 \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq \ell \) and \( 0 \leq k < n_j \).

**Proof.** Taking \( b_j = a_j + 2Cj \), we get that \( \frac{1}{n} b_n = \frac{1}{n} a_n + 2C \geq c_1 + 2C \). As \( 0 < C \leq c_0 + 2C < c_1 + 2C < 3C \), it follows from Lemma 5.10 that, taking \( \theta = \frac{(c_1 + 2C) - (c_0 + 2C)}{3C - (c_0 + 2C)} = \frac{c_1 - c_0}{C - c_0} \), there is \( \ell \geq \theta n \) and a sequence \( 1 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < a_\ell \) such that \( \frac{1}{n_j - \ell} b_{n_j - k} \geq c_0 + 2C \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq \ell \) and \( 0 \leq k < n_j \). As \( \frac{1}{n_j - \ell} b_{n_j - k} = 2C + \frac{1}{n_j - \ell} a_{n_j - k} \), we get that \( \frac{1}{n_j - \ell} a_{n_j - k} \geq c_0 \) for every \( 1 \leq j \leq \ell \) and \( 0 \leq k < n_j \). \( \square \)

Below (Theorem 8.6), we present an extension of Kac’s result (Theorem 4.4). Indeed, Kac’s result says that if \( F \) is the first return map by \( f \) to a set \( B \) with \( \mu(B) > 0 \) and \( \mu \) is an ergodic \( f \)-invariant probability then \( \int_A R d\mu = 1 \), where \( R \) is the first return time to \( B \) and \( A = \{ x \in B; \mathcal{O}_f^+(f(x)) \cap B \neq \emptyset \} \). As \( \mu \) is \( f \)-invariant, we know that \( \mu \) almost every point \( x \in B \) will return to \( B \) infinitely many times. This means that \( \mu(\bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X})) = \mu(A) = \mu(B) > 0 \). As \( \mu \) is ergodic and \( f \)-invariant, we conclude that

\[
B = A = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^n \left( \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \right) \quad \text{mod } \mu.
\]

Moreover, by Birkhoff, \( \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n; f^j(x) \in B \} = \mu(B) > 0 \) for almost every \( x \in B \).

Note that, if \( x \in B \) then \( f^j(x) \in B \iff f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_f^+(x) \). Thus,

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n; f^j(x) \in B \} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \# \{ 0 \leq j < n; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_f^+(x) \} = \mu(B) > 0.
\]
for every \( x \in B \). As a consequence,
\[
\mu(\{ x \in \bigcap_{j\geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) : \Phi_{j}^{+}(\{ j \geq 1 ; f^{j}(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{F}^{+}(x) \}) > 0 \}) = \mu(B) > 0.
\]

Finally, we recall that a first return map always has a coherent induced time. Thus, Theorem \[8.6\] below is an extension of Kac’s results to induced maps with coherent induced times.

**Theorem 8.6.** Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a metric space, \( f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \) a bimeasurable map, \( F : A \subset \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \) a measurable \( f \)-induced map and \( \mu \) an ergodic \( f \) invariant probability. If the induced time of \( F \), \( R : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \), is coherent and
\[
\mu(\{ x \in A_{0} ; \Phi_{j}^{+}(\{ j \geq 1 ; f^{j}(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{F}^{+}(x) \}) > 0 \}) > 0
\]
then \( \int_{A} Rd\mu = 1 \), where \( A_{0} = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathcal{X}) \) and \( A = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{n}(A_{0}) \). Furthermore, \( \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \mu|_{A} \) is an ergodic \( F \)-invariant probability and it is the unique \( F \)-invariant probability that is absolutely continuous with respect to \( \mu \).

**Proof.** Let \( \mathcal{U}_{R} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}} \) be the coherent schedule of events given by \([19]\). By Lemma \[5.15\], \( R(x) = \min \mathcal{U}_{R}(x) \) for every \( x \in A_{0} \). Hence, the proof follows from item \([4]\) of Corollary \[C\].

8.1. **Expanding/hyperbolic invariant measures.** Let \( M \) be a Riemannian manifold \( M \). We say that \( f : M \rightarrow M \) has a **non-degenerate critical/singular set** \( C \subset M \) if \( f \) is a local \( C^{1+} \) (i.e., \( C^{1+} \) with \( \alpha > 0 \)) diffeomorphism in the whole manifold except in \( C \) and \( \exists \beta, B > 0 \) such that the following conditions hold.

\[
\text{(C.1)} \quad (1/B) \log |Df(x)|^{\beta} \leq |Df(x)v| \leq B \log |Df(x)|^{-\beta} \quad \text{for all } v \in T_{x}M.
\]

For every \( x, y \in M \setminus C \) with \( \log |Df(x)| < \log \), we have

\[
\text{(C.2)} \quad \log |Df(x)|^{-1} - \log |Df(y)|^{-1} \leq (B/\log |Df(x)|^{\beta}) \log |Df(x)|^{\beta} \quad \text{dist}(x,y).
\]

\[
\text{(C.3)} \quad \log |\det Df(x)| - \log |\det Df(y)| \leq (B/\log |Df(x)|^{\beta}) \log |Df(x)|^{\beta} \quad \text{dist}(x,y).
\]

A critical/singular set \( C \) is called **purely critical** if \( \lim_{x \rightarrow p} |\det Df(x)| = 0 \) for every \( p \in C \). On the other hand, if \( \lim_{x \rightarrow p} |\det Df(x)| = +\infty \) for every \( p \in C \), we say that \( C \) is **purely singular**.

A set \( \Lambda \subset M \) satisfies the **slow approximation condition** (to the critical/singular set) if for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is a \( \delta > 0 \) such that

\[
\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} -\log \text{dist}_{\delta}(f^{j}(x), C) \leq \varepsilon
\]

for every \( x \in \Lambda \), where \( \text{dist}_{\delta}(x,C) \) denotes the \( \delta \)-truncated distance from \( x \) to \( C \) defined as \( \text{dist}_{\delta}(x,C) = \text{dist}(x,C) \) if \( \text{dist}(x,C) \leq \delta \) and \( \text{dist}_{\delta}(x,C) = 1 \) otherwise.

An ergodic \( f \) invariant probability \( \mu \) **satisfies slow approximation condition** if there is a set \( \Lambda \) satisfying the slow approximation condition such that \( \mu(\Lambda) = 1 \) (see Section \[\square\] for the definition of slow approximation condition).

**Lemma 8.7.** Let \( f : M \rightarrow M \) be a local \( C^{1+} \) diffeomorphism in the whole manifold except on a non-degenerated critical/singular set \( C \subset M \). Suppose that \( C \) is either purely critical or purely singular. If \( \mu \) is a \( f \)-invariant ergodic probability with all of its Lyapunov exponent
Thus, we get

\[ \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\log |Df^n(x)|} \leq \pm \infty \quad \text{for } \mu \text{ almost every } x \text{ and every } v \in T_x M \setminus \{0\}, \]

then \( \mu \) satisfies the slow approximation condition.

**Proof.** Consider the function \( \varphi : M \to [0, +\infty) \) defined as

\[
\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } x \in C \\
\det Df(x) & \text{if } x \notin C \text{ and } C \text{ is purely critical} \\
\frac{1}{\det Df(x)} & \text{if } x \notin C \text{ and } C \text{ is purely singular}
\end{cases}
\]

As \( f \) is \( C^1 \), we get that \( \varphi \) is a Hölder function and so, \( C = \varphi^{-1}(0) \) is a compact subset of \( M \). We may assume that \( C \neq \emptyset \). As \( \varphi \) is Holder, \( \exists \, k_0, k_1 > 0 \) such that \( |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq k_0 \text{dist}(x, y)^{k_1} \) \( \forall \, x, y \in M \). Given \( x \in M \) there is \( y_x \in C \) such that \( \text{dist}(x, y_x) = \text{dist}(x, C) \).

Thus, we get \( |\varphi(x)| = |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y_x)| \leq k_0 \text{dist}(x, y_x)^{k_1} = k_0 \text{dist}(x, C)^{k_1} \). That is,

\[
\log |\varphi(x)| \leq k_0 + k_1 \log \text{dist}(x, C) \quad \forall \, x \in M. \tag{33}
\]

Let \( m = \text{dimension}(M) \) and note that \( \|A^{-1}\|^{-m} \leq |\det A| \leq \|A\|^m \) for every \( A \in GL(m, \mathbb{R}) \). That is,

\[
m \log (\|A^{-1}\|^{-1}) \leq \log |\det A| \quad \text{and} \quad m \log \|A\| \leq \log \left| \frac{1}{\det A} \right|.
\]

Thus, if \( \int \log |\varphi| \, d\mu = -\infty \), it follows from Birkhoff that either

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|(Df^n(x))^{-1}\|^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{m} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\det Df^n(x)| = \infty
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{m} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |\det Df(f^j(x))| = \frac{1}{m} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |\varphi \circ f^j(x)| = -\infty
\]

for \( \mu \)-almost every \( x \) (when \( C \) is purely critical) or, when \( C \) is purely singular,

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|(Df^n(x))\| \leq \frac{1}{m} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left| \frac{1}{\det Df^n(x)} \right| = \infty
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{m} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \left| \frac{1}{\det Df(f^j(x))} \right| = \frac{1}{m} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |\varphi \circ f^j(x)| = -\infty
\]

for \( \mu \)-almost every \( x \). In any case, we have a contradiction to our hypothesis. So, \( \int \log |\varphi| d\mu > -\infty \) and, by (33), we get that

\[
-\infty < \int \log |\varphi| \, d\mu - \log k_0 \leq k_1 \int_{x \in M} \log \text{dist}(x, C) \, d\mu \leq k_1 \log \text{diameter}(M).
\]

As the logarithm of the distance to the critical set is integrable, it follows that

\[
\int \log \text{dist}_{x^n}(x, C) \, d\mu(x) = \int_{\{x; \log \text{dist}(x, C) < -n\}} \log \text{dist}(x, C) \, d\mu \to 0
\]

when \( n \to \infty \). This implies (by Birkhoff) the slow approximation condition. \( \square \)
Definition 8.8. We say that an ergodic $f$-invariant probability $\mu$ is a **synchronized expanding measure** if

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \log \left\| (Df^i(x))^{-1} \right\|^{-1} \geq \lambda,$$

holds for $\mu$ almost every $x \in M$. If a synchronized expanding measure $\mu$ satisfies the slow approximation condition, then $\mu$ is called a **geometric expanding measure**.

The main property of a geometric expanding measure $\mu$ is the existence, for almost every $x$, of infinity many hyperbolic pre-balls that are very useful in many applications, in particular, in the construction of induced Markov maps (see Lemma 2.7 in [2] and Lemma 2.1 in [3]).

Proposition 8.9. Let $f : M \to M$ be a local $C^{1+}$ diffeomorphism in the whole manifold except on a non-degenerated critical/singular set $C \subset M$. Suppose that $C$ is either purely critical or purely singular. If $\mu$ is a $f$-invariant ergodic probability with

$$\int |\log \left\| (Df(x))^{-1} \right\|| d\mu < +\infty$$

and having only positive and finite Lyapunov exponent, i.e.,

$$0 \leq \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left\| (Df^n(x))^{-1} \right\|^{-1} \leq \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \| Df^n(x) \| < +\infty$$

for $\mu$-almost every $x$, then $\mu$ is a geometric expanding measure.

Proof. As $C$ is either purely critical or purely singular, we get that either

$$\sup \log \left\| (Df)^{-1} \right\|^{-1} \leq \sup \log \| Df \| < +\infty$$

or

$$-\infty < \inf \log \| (Df)^{-1} \|^{-1} \leq \inf \log \| Df \|.$$

Thus, it follows from Furstenberg-Kesten Theorem [8], together with the ergodicity of $\mu$ and the hypothesis of the exponents being positive and finite, there exists $0 < \lambda < +\infty$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left\| (Df^n(x))^{-1} \right\|^{-1} = \lambda$$

for $\mu$ almost every $x$. So, as $\int |\log \left\| (Df(x))^{-1} \right\|| d\mu < +\infty$, we can apply Lemma 7.1 and get that there exists $\ell \geq 1$ such that

$$\int \log \left(\| (Df^\ell)^{-1} \|^{-1} \right) d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda}{4} \ell.$$

As $\mu$ is $f^\ell$-invariant and $\mu$ has at most $\ell$ ergodic components, it follows from Birkhoff’s Theorem that there exists $\mathcal{H}_0$ with $\mu(\mathcal{H}_0) = 1$ and $f^{-\ell}(\mathcal{H}_0) = \mathcal{H}_0 \mod \mu$ such that every $x \in \mathcal{H}_0$ satisfies (34). As $\mu(C) = 0$ and $\mu(\bigcup_{j=0}^{\ell-1} f^j(\mathcal{H}_0)) = 1$, we get that there exists $\mathcal{H}_1$, with $\mu(\mathcal{H}_1) = 1$, such that (34) is true for every $x \in \mathcal{H}_1$. From Lemma 8.7 we get also that there exists $\mathcal{H}_2$, with $\mu(\mathcal{H}_2) = 1$, such that $\mathcal{H}_2$ satisfies the slow approximation condition. Hence, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2$ is an expanding set with $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = 1$, proving that $\mu$ is an expanding measure. \qed
All induced maps constructed in \[18\] are orbit-coherent. In particular, in the theorem about lift in \[18\] (Theorem 1), it was assumed explicitly the hypothesis of orbit-coherence and this result is used to lift the invariant probabilities in all induced maps there. Below we give examples of results that can be obtained mixing the results in \[18\] with the those in the present paper.

**Theorem 8.10.** Let \(f : M \to M\) be a local \(C^1\) diffeomorphism in the whole manifold except on a non-degenerated critical/singular set \(C \subset M\). Suppose that \(C\) is either purely critical or purely singular. If \(\mu\) is a \(f\)-invariant ergodic probability with \(\int \log \|DF(x)\|^{-1}\|d\mu < +\infty\) and having only positive and finite Lyapunov exponent, then there are open sets \(B_j \subset B \subset M, j \in \mathbb{N}\), and an induced map \(F : A := \bigcup_j B_j \to B\) such that

1. \(B_j \cap B_k = \emptyset\) whenever \(j \neq k\);
2. \(R\) is constant on each \(B_j\), where \(R\) is the induced time of \(F\);
3. for every \(j \geq 1\), \(F|_{B_j}\) is a diffeomorphism between \(B_j\) and \(B\);
4. there is \(\lambda > 1\) such that \(\|(DF(x))^{-1}\|^{-1} \geq \lambda\) for every \(x \in \bigcup_j B_j\);
5. \(\mu(\bigcup_j B_j) = \mu(B) > 0\);
6. \(F\) is orbit-coherent;
7. \(\nu := \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \mu|_A\) is an ergodic \(F\)-invariant probability and it is the unique \(F\)-lift of \(\mu\), where \(A = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^n(\bigcap_{j \geq 0} F^{-j}(\mathbb{X}))\).

Furthermore, if \(\mu\) is absolute continuous with respect to Lebesgue then \(B = A \mod \mu\). That is, \(\nu := \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \mu|_B\) is the \(F\)-lift of \(\mu\).

**Proof.** Using Proposition \[8.9\], we get that \(\mu\) is an expanding measure. Thus, by Theorem B in \[18\], we get that there exists an induced map \(F\) satisfying all the first six items of the Theorem \[8.10\]. Furthermore, \(\mu\) is \(F\)-liftable. Thus, by Theorem A in \[18\], \(\mu\left(\{x \in A_0; \phi^n_\mu(\{j \geq 1; f^j(x) \in \mathcal{O}(x)\}) > 0\}\right) > 0\), where \(A_0 = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^{-n}(\mathbb{X})\). Finally, by Theorem 8.6, we get item (7). To conclude the proof, assume that \(f\) is non-flat and \(\mu \ll \text{Leb}\). We can use Theorem D in \[18\]. Indeed, every expanding measure is a zooming one with exponential contraction (see Section 8 of \[18\]). As \(\mu \ll \text{Leb}\) and \(\mu\) is non-flat, it follows from item (3) of Theorem D in \[18\] that there exist \(K > 0\) and a \(F\) forward invariant set \(U \subset B\) with \(\mu(U) = 1\) and \(\text{Leb}(U) > 0\) such that

\[
\log \left| \frac{J_{\text{Leb}}F(x)}{J_{\text{Leb}}F(y)} \right| \leq K \text{dist}(F(x), F(y))
\]

for every \(x, y \in B_j\) and every \(j\). Hence, by the bounded distortion we get that \(\text{Leb}(U \cap A) = \text{Leb}(B)\) and so, \(\mu|_B = \mu|_A\), completing the proof. \(\square\)

Given a \(C^1\) diffeomorphism \(f : M \to M\) defined on a compact Riemannian manifold \(M\) and \(\ell \geq 1\), define the equivalent Riemannian metric \(\langle .. \rangle_\ell\) by

\[
\langle u, v \rangle_\ell = \langle Df^{\ell-1}(x)u, Df^{\ell-1}(x)v \rangle
\]

for every \(u, v \in T_xM\). Given a vector bundle morphism \(A : TM \to TM\) and \(x \in M\), define \(\|A(x)\|_\ell = \max\{|A(x)v|_\ell; v \in T_xM\text{ and }|v|_\ell = 1\}\). In Theorem \[8.11\] below, given an ergodic invariant probability without zero Lyapunov exponents, we use the coherent blocks to produce the Hyperbolic Blocks of Pesin theory with \(\mu\) positive measure. Nevertheless,
here, we use the metric $\langle \ldots \rangle_\ell$ instead of the induced Finsler metric (see [19]). Because of that, we do not need the $C^{1+\alpha}$ regularity, it suffices $f$ to be $C^1$.

**Theorem 8.11 (Hyperbolic Blocs).** Let $f : M \to M$ be a $C^1$ diffeomorphism. If $\mu$ is a $f$-invariant ergodic probability without zero Lyapunov exponents, then there are integers $\ell \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$, measurable sets $B^u$ and $B^s$ with $\mu(B^u), \mu(B^s) > 0$, $0 < \sigma < 1$, $C > 0$ and a measurable $f$-invariant splitting $TM = E^s \oplus E^u$ such that

1. $\|Df^{-n}|_{E^u(x)}\|_\ell \leq \sigma^n$ for every $x \in B^u$ and $n \geq 1$;
2. $\|Df^n|_{E^s(x)}\|_\ell \leq \sigma^n$ for every $x \in B^s$ and $n \geq 1$;
3. $\mathcal{H}(\mu) := B^u \cap f^{-m}(B^s)$ has $\mu$ positive measure and

$$\|Df^{-n}|_{E^s(x)}\| \leq \sigma^n \quad \text{and} \quad \|Df^n|_{E^s(x)}\|_\ell \leq C\sigma^n$$

for every $n \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathcal{H}(\mu)$.

**Proof.** As $\mu$ is ergodic, it follows from Oseledets Theorem that there exist $U \subset M$, $\lambda > 0$ and a measurable splitting $E^u \oplus E^s$ such that $\mu(U) = 1$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n|_{E^s(x)}\|^{-1}_\ell \geq \lambda$$

and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|Df^n|_{E^u(x)}\| \leq -\lambda$$

for every $x \in U$. Let $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{N} \times M \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\varphi(n, x) = \begin{cases} \log \|Df^n|_{E^s(x)}\|^{-1}_\ell & \text{if } x \in U \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin U \end{cases}$$

and

$$\psi(n, x) = \begin{cases} \log \|Df^{-n}|_{E^s(x)}\|^{-1}_\ell & \text{if } x \in U \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin U \end{cases}$$

As $f$ is a diffeomorphism and $M$ is compact, we get that $\int_{x \in M} |\varphi(1, x)|d\mu$ and $\int_{x \in M} |\psi(1, x)|d\mu < +\infty$. As $\varphi$ is a sup-additive cocycle for $f$, $\psi$ is a sup-additive cocycle for $f^{-1}$ and $\mu$ is invariant for both $f$ and $f^{-1}$, it follows from Lemma 7.1 that there exists $\ell \geq 1$ such that

$$\int_{x \in M} \varphi(\ell, x)d\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{x \in M} \psi(\ell, x)d\mu \geq \frac{\lambda \ell}{4}.$$

By Birkhoff, we can take $\ell \geq 1$ so that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\ell, f^j(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \psi(\ell, f^{-j}(x)) \geq 2\lambda$$

for $\mu$ almost every $x \in M$.

Let $\Phi, \Psi : \mathbb{N} \times M \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\Phi(n, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\ell, f^j(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(n, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \psi(\ell, f^{-j}(x)).$$

Hence, $\Phi$ is a $f$-additive cocycle and $\Psi$ is a $f^{-1}$-additive cocycle.
Given $x \in M$, let $\mathcal{U}^n$ be the set of all $(\lambda, \Phi)$-Pliss time for $x$ with respect to $f$ and $\mathcal{U}^s$ be the set of all $(\lambda, \Psi)$-Pliss time for $x$ with respect to $f^{-1}$. It follows from Lemma 5.10 that $\mathcal{U}^n$ is a $f$-coherent schedule of events and $\mathcal{U}^s$ is a $f^{-1}$-coherent schedule of events. By Lemma 5.11, both $\mathcal{U}^n$ and $\mathcal{U}^s$ have positive upper density for $\mu$ almost every $x$. Indeed, $d^{+}_n(\mathcal{U}^n(x))$ and $d^{+}_s(\mathcal{U}^s(x)) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}$ for $\mu$ almost every $x$, where $\gamma = \ell \max\{|\log \|Df\||, |\log \|Df^{-1}\||\}$.

Let $B^n = B_{\mu^n}$ be the $f$-coherent block for $\mathcal{U}^n$ and $B^s = B_{\mu^s}$ be the $f^{-1}$-coherent block for $\mathcal{U}^s$. It follows from Theorem B that $\mu(B^s)$ and $\mu(B^n) \geq \frac{1}{2\gamma} > 0$. By the definition of $\mathcal{U}^n$-block, given $x \in M$, $1 \geq n \in \mathcal{U}^n(x)$ whenever $f^n(x) \in B^u$. Thus, if $f^n(x) \in B^u$ and $v \in \mathbb{E}^u(x)$ with $|v|_\ell = 1$, then

$$
\log |Df^n(x)v|_\ell = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |Df^j(x)v_j|_\ell = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |Df^{\ell-1}(f^{j+1}(x)) Df(f^j(x))v_j| =
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |Df^\ell(f^j(x))v_j| \geq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df^\ell|_{\mathbb{E}^u(f^j(x))}\|^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \psi(\ell, f^j(x)) = \Phi(n, x) \geq n\lambda,
$$

where $v_j = \frac{Df^j(x)v}{|Df^j(x)v|_\ell}$.

On the other hand, if $f^{-n}(x) \in B^s$ and $v \in \mathbb{E}^s(f^{-n}(x))$ with $|v|_\ell = 1$, we get that

$$
\log |Df^n(f^{-n}(x))v|_\ell = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |Df^{j-n}(x)v_{j-n}|_\ell =
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |Df^{\ell-1}(f^{j-n+1}(x)) Df(f^{j-n}(x))v_{j-n}| =
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |Df^\ell(f^{j-n}(x))v_{j-n}| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df^\ell|_{\mathbb{E}^s(f^{j-n}(x))}\| = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \|Df^{-\ell}|_{\mathbb{E}^s(f^{j-n+\ell}(x))}\|^{-1} =
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \log \|Df^{-\ell}|_{\mathbb{E}^s(f^{j-n}(x))}\| = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \psi(\ell, f^{-j}(x)) = -\Psi(n, x) \leq -n\lambda,
$$

where $v_{j-n} = \frac{Df^{j-n}(x)v}{|Df^{j-n}(x)v|_\ell}$. Thus, taking $\sigma = e^{-\lambda}$, we get $0 < \sigma < 1$ and

$$
\|Df^{-n}|_{\mathbb{E}^u(p)}\| \text{ and } \|Df^n|_{\mathbb{E}^s(q)}\|_\ell \leq \sigma^n
$$

for every $n \geq 1$, $p \in B^n$ and $q \in B^s$. As $\mu$ is ergodic, there is $m \geq 0$ such that $\mu(B^u \cap f^{-m}(B^s)) > 0$. Finally, using that $\langle \ldots \rangle_\ell$ is equivalent to the Riemannian metric and $f$ is $C^1$, there is $C > 0$ such that $\|Df^n|_{\mathbb{E}^s(p)}\|_\ell \leq C\sigma^n$ for every $p \in \mathcal{H}(\mu) = B^u \cap f^{-m}(B^s)$. \(\square\)
8.2. Proofs of Theorems $E$ and $F$. The statement and notations of Theorems $E$ and $F$ can be found in Section 1.

Proof of Theorem $E$. The proof of Theorem $E$ is a direct consequence of Theorem 8.12 below and the fact already observed in Section 1 that, under the hypothesis of Lebesgue almost every point having only positive Lyapunov exponents, the residue to be zero on a set of positive Lebesgue measure is a necessary condition for the existence of an absolutely continuous invariant measure.

Theorem 8.12. Let $f : M \rightarrow M$ be a $C^{1+}$ local diffeomorphism. If $H \subset M$ is a measurable set such that every $x \in H$ has only positive Lyapunov exponents and zero Lyapunov residue, that is,

$$\text{Res}(x) = 0 < \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \| (Df^n(x))^{-1} \|^{-1} \quad \forall x \in H; \quad (35)$$

then Lebesgue almost every $x \in H$ belongs to the basin of some ergodic absolute continuous invariant measure. In particular, $f$ admits a SRB measure.

Proof. As $(35)$ is an asymptotic condition, taking $\bigcup_{n \geq 0} f^n(H)$ instead of $H$ if necessary, we may assume that $f(H) \subset H$. Let

$$H_n = \{ x \in H; \limsup_{j \to +\infty} \frac{1}{j} \log \| (Df^j(x))^{-1} \|^{-1} \geq 2/n \}. \quad (36)$$

Given $n, \ell \geq 1$, let $H_{n,\ell} = \{ x \in H_n; \ell_0(n, x) = \ell \}$. Thus, for each $x \in H_{n,\ell}$ there is at least one $0 \leq \alpha(x) < 2^\ell$ such that

$$\liminf_{i \to \infty} \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \varphi(2^\ell, f^j(x)) \geq \frac{1}{5} \cdot \frac{1}{2^\ell} \quad \forall \ell \geq \ell_0(n, x). \quad (37)$$

Given $n, \ell \geq 1$, let $H_{n,\ell} = \{ x \in H_n; \ell_0(n, x) = \ell \}$. Thus, for each $x \in H_{n,\ell}$ there is at least one $0 \leq \alpha(x) < 2^\ell$ such that

$$\liminf_{i \to \infty} \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \varphi(2^\ell, f^{j2^\ell}(f^{\ell_0(x)}(x))) \geq \frac{1}{5}. \quad (37)$$
Taking \( m := 2^\ell \) and \( H_n(\ell, j) = \{ f^j(x) ; x \in H_n(\ell) \text{ and } \alpha(x) = j \} \), we get that \( H_n(\ell) \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}(H_n(\ell, j)) \) with \( f^m(H_n(\ell, j)) \subset H_n(\ell, j) \) and

\[
\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \log \| (Df^m \circ f^{mj}(x))^{-1} \|^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{5n}
\]

for every \( x \in H_n(\ell, j) \). Thus, it follows from Theorem A of [18] that Lebesgue almost every \( x \in H_n(\ell, j) \) belongs to the basin of some ergodic absolute continuous \( f^m \)-invariant measure (if \( f \) is \( C^2 \) one can use Theorem C of [2] instead of [18]). As \( \tilde{\mu} := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mu \circ f^{-i} \) is an ergodic absolute continuous \( f \)-invariant measure whenever \( \mu \) is an ergodic absolute continuous \( f^m \)-invariant measure, we get that Lebesgue almost every \( x \in H_n(\ell, j) \) belongs to the basin of some ergodic absolute continuous \( f \)-invariant measure. Finally, as \( H \subset \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{\ell \geq 1} \bigcup_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}(H_n(\ell, j)) \), we conclude the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 7.6.** As \( T \sigma \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{E}^u \oplus \mathcal{E}^s \) is a dominated splitting, it is continuous and extends uniquely and continuously to a splitting of \( T \sigma \mathcal{M} \) to \( \mathcal{U} \) (see for instance Lemma 14 of [5]). Thus, we get that \( \varphi^u \) and \( \varphi^s : \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{R} \) given respectively by \( \varphi^u(n, x) = \log \| (Df^n)_{\mathcal{E}^u(x)} \|^{-1} \) and \( \varphi^s(n, x) = -\log \| Df^n \|_{\mathcal{E}^s(x)} \) are continuous sup-additive \( f \sigma \mathcal{U} \)-cocycles. By compactness of \( \mathcal{U} \), we get that \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |\varphi^u,s(1, f^j(x))| \leq \sup_{p \in \mathcal{U}} |\varphi^u,s(1, p)| < +\infty \) for every \( x \in \mathcal{U} \).

Define \( H_n \) as the set of all \( x \in H \) such that

\[
\lim_{j \to +\infty} \frac{1}{j} \varphi^u(j, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \to +\infty} \frac{1}{j} \varphi^s(j, x) \geq 2/n.
\]

Setting \( \Phi(i, x) = \min \{ \varphi^u(i, x), \varphi^s(i, x) \} \), we get that \( \Phi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{R} \) is also a continuous sup-additive \( f \sigma \mathcal{U} \)-cycocycle. Let \( \mathcal{U}_n(x) = \{ n \in \mathbb{N} ; \Phi(i, x) \geq i/n \} \) and

\[
R_n(x) = \begin{cases} 
\min \mathcal{U}_n(x) & \text{if } \mathcal{U}_n(x) \neq \emptyset \\
+\infty & \text{if } \mathcal{U}_n(x) = \emptyset 
\end{cases}
\]

for any \( x \in H_n \). As \( R_n(x) \leq \max \{ \text{Res}^u(x), \text{Res}^s(x) \} \) and \( \text{Res}^u(x) = \text{Res}^s(x) = 0 \) for every \( x \in H_n \), we get that

\[
\lim_{k \to +\infty} d_n^+(\{ j \geq 0 ; R_n \circ f^j(x) \geq k \}) = 0
\]

for every \( x \in H_n \).

It follows from Theorem 7.6 that, for each \( n \geq 1 \) and \( x \in H_n \), there is \( \ell_0(n, x) \geq 1 \) such that

\[
\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi(2^\ell, f^j(x)) \geq \frac{1/n}{5} \quad \forall \ell \geq \ell_0(n, x).
\]  

(38)

Given \( n, \ell \geq 1 \), let \( H_n(\ell) = \{ x \in H_n ; \ell_0(n, x) = \ell \} \). Thus, for each \( x \in H_n(\ell) \) there is at least one \( 0 \leq \alpha(x) < 2^\ell \) such that

\[
\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi(2^\ell, f^{j2^\ell}(f^{\alpha(x)}(x))) \geq \frac{1}{5n}.
\]
Letting $H_n(\ell, j) = \{f^j(x); x \in H_n(\ell) \text{ and } \alpha(x) = j \}$ and writing $m := 2^\ell$, we get that $H_n(\ell) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}(H_n(\ell, j))$ with $f^m(H_n(\ell, j)) \subset H_n(\ell, j)$ and

$$
\liminf_{i \to \infty} \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi(m, f^{jm}(x)) \geq \frac{1}{5n}.
$$

(39)

for every $x \in H_n(\ell, j)$. It follows from Pliss Lemma that the additive $f^m$ cocycle $\varphi(i, x) := \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi(m, f^{jm}(x))$ has positive lower natural density of Pliss times. That is, taking $V(x)$ as the set of all $x \in V$ such that $\varphi(i, x)$ is a SRB measure for $f$ belongs to the basin of some SRB measure for $f$. Moreover, we can conclude that Lebesgue almost every $x \in H_n(\ell, j)$ belongs to the basin of some SRB measure for $f$ every $x$ with respect to $f^m$, then $\Psi(x) \geq 1/(10n) \sup \varphi - 1 > 0$ (see Lemma 5.11). As $\Phi(i, x) = \min\{\varphi^u(i, x), \varphi^s(i, x)\}$, we have that every $n \in V(x)$ is a simultaneous hyperbolic time as asked in Proposition 6.4 of [2], we get that Lebesgue almost every $x \in H_n(\ell, j)$ belongs to the basin of some SRB measure for $f$ with support contained in $\bigcap_{j=0}^{i=\infty} f^j(V(x)) \subset \bigcap_{j=0}^{i=\infty} f^j(V)$. Furthermore, as $H = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}(H_n(\ell, j))$ and $\mu := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mu \circ f^{-j}$ is a SRB measure measure for $f$ whenever $\mu$ is a SRB measure for $f^m$, we can conclude that Leb almost every $x \in H$ belongs to the basin of some SRB measure for $f$ with supported on $\bigcap_{j=0}^{i=\infty} f^j(V)$, which finish the proof.

9. Appendix

**Natural extension.** Define the cylinder on $\mathcal{X}_f$ generated by the open sets $A_0, \cdots, A_n \subset \mathcal{X}$, $n \geq 0$, as the set

$$
[A_0, \cdots, A_n] := \{\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}_f; (\bar{x}(0), \cdots, \bar{x}(n)) \in A_0 \times \cdots \times A_n \}.
$$

Denote the set of all cylinders of $\mathcal{X}_f$ by $\text{Cyl}(\mathcal{X}_f)$. Note that

$$
\pi_{n+j}([A_0, \cdots, A_n]) = f^{-j}(A_n) \quad \forall \ j \geq 0
$$

(40)

and that

$$
[A_0, A_1, \cdots, A_n] = \left[A_0, f^{-1}(A_0) \cap A_1, f^{-2}(A_0) \cap f^{-1}(A_1) \cap A_2, \cdots, \bigcap_{j=0}^{n-1} f^{-(n-j)}(A_j) \right].
$$

(41)

**Proof of Proposition 6.4.** If $A \subset \mathcal{X}_f$ then $f^{-1}(\pi_n(A)) \supset \pi_{n+1}(A), \forall n \geq 0$, and so, $0 \leq \mu(\pi_n(A)) \leq 1$ is a monotonous non-increasing sequence for every measurable $A$. Thus, $\overline{\mu}(A) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu(\pi_n(A))$ is well defined whenever $\pi_n(A)$ is a measurable subset of $\mathcal{X}$ for every $n \geq 0$.

Let $A = [A_0, \cdots, A_n]$ and $B = [B_0, \cdots, B_\ell]$ be two cylinders such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$. In this case, $\pi_j(A) = f^{-(j-n)}(A_n) \forall j \geq n$ and $\pi_j(B) = f^{-(j-\ell)}(B_\ell) \forall j \geq \ell$. Thus, $\overline{\mu}(A) = \mu(A_n)$ and $\overline{\mu}(B) = \mu(B_\ell)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\ell \leq n$. As $A \cap B = \emptyset$, we get that $A_n \cap f^{-(n-\ell)}(B_\ell) = \emptyset$ and so,

$$
\lim_j \mu(\pi_j(A \cup B)) = \lim_j \mu \left(f^{-(j-n)}(\pi_n(A)) \cup f^{-(j-\ell)}(\pi_\ell(B)) \right) = 
$$

$$
= \lim_j \mu \left(f^{-(j-n)}(\pi_n(A) \cup f^{-(n-\ell)}(\pi_\ell(B))) \right) = \mu(\pi_n(A)) + \mu(\pi_\ell(B)) = \overline{\mu}(A) + \overline{\mu}(B).
$$
As the set of all open cylinders generates the topology of $X$, we conclude that $\mu$ is a well defined Borel probability on $X$. Furthermore, if $A = [A_0, \ldots, A_n]$ is a cylinder, then

$$\bar{f}^{-1}(A) = [f^{-1}(A_0) \cap A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n].$$  (42)

Indeed, $\bar{x} \in \bar{f}^{-1}([A_0, \ldots, A_n]) \iff \bar{f}(\bar{x}) = (f(\bar{x}(0)), \bar{x}(1), \bar{x}(2), \ldots) \in [A_0, \ldots, A_n] \iff (f(\bar{x}(0)), \bar{x}(1), \bar{x}(1), \ldots, \bar{x}(n-1)) \in A_0 \times A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_n \iff \bar{x}(0) \in f^{-1}(A_0) \cap A_1, \bar{x}(1) \in A_2, \bar{x}(2) \in A_3, \ldots, \bar{x}(n-1) \in A_n \iff \bar{x} \in \bar{f}^{-1}(A_0) \cap A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n].$

As a consequence of (40), (42) and the invariance of $\mu$, we get that $\mu(\bar{f}^{-1}(A)) = \mu(A_n) = \bar{\mu}(A)$ for every cylinder $A = [A_0, \ldots, A_n]$, proving that $\bar{\mu}$ is $\bar{f}$ invariant. Furthermore, it is easy to check that $\mu = \pi_* \bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$.

Applying (42) recursively, we get that

$$\bar{f}^{-n}([A_0, \ldots, A_n]) = [f^{-n}(A_0) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-(n-1)}(A_1) \cap \cdots \cap A_n]$$

and this implies the unicity of the lift. Indeed, if $\mu = \pi_* \nu$ for a $\bar{f}$-invariant probability $\nu$ then

$$\nu([A_0, \ldots, A_n]) = \nu(\bar{f}^{-n}([A_0, \ldots, A_n])) = \nu([f^{-n}(A_0) \cap \cdots \cap A_n]) = 
\nu(\pi^{-1}(f^{-n}(A_0) \cap \cdots \cap A_n)) = \mu(f^{-n}(A_0) \cap \cdots \cap A_n) = 
\mu(\pi^{-1}(f^{-n}(A_0) \cap \cdots \cap A_n)) = 
\bar{\mu}(\bar{f}^{-n}([A_0, \ldots, A_n])) = \bar{\mu}([A_0, \ldots, A_n]).$$

Now we will verify that $\bar{\mu}$ is ergodic with respect to $\bar{f}$. Suppose that $A$ is a $\bar{f}$-invariant measurable set with $\bar{\mu}(A) > 0$. As $\bar{f}^{-1}(A) = A$, we get that $\pi_n(\bar{f}^{-1}(A)) = \pi_n(A) \forall n \geq 0$. So, $\pi_n(A) = \pi_{n+1}(A)$ for every $n \geq 0$, as

$$\bar{f}^{-1}(A) = \{ \bar{x} \in X : \pi(n) \in \pi_{n+1}(A) \forall n \geq 0 \}.$$

Thus, $\bar{\mu}(A) = \mu(\pi(A)) = \mu_\pi(A) \forall n \geq 0$. Moreover, using that $\pi_0(A) = f(\pi_1(A))$, we have that $\pi(A) = f(\pi(A))$. This implies that $U := \cup_{j \geq 0} f^{-j}(\pi(A))$ is an invariant set, i.e., $f^{-1}(U) = (U)$. As $\mu(U) \geq \mu(\pi(A)) = \bar{\mu}(A) > 0$, it follows from the ergodicity of $\mu$ that $\mu(U) = 1$. On the other hand, as $\pi(A) \subset f^{-1}(\pi(A)) \subset f^{-2}(\pi(A)) \subset \cdots \subset f^{-j}(\pi(A)) \not\supset U$ and $\mu(\pi(A)) = \mu(\pi(A))$, we conclude that $\mu(U) = \mu(\pi(A))$. Thus, $\bar{\mu}(A) = \mu(\pi(A)) = 1$, proving the ergodicity of $\bar{\mu}$.
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