

ROBUST MINIMALITY OF STRONG FOLIATIONS FOR DA DIFFEOMORPHISMS: CU -VOLUME EXPANSION AND NEW EXAMPLES

JANA RODRIGUEZ HERTZ, RAÚL URES AND JIAGANG YANG

ABSTRACT. Let f be a C^2 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{T}^3 (not necessarily volume preserving or transitive) isotopic to a linear Anosov diffeomorphism A with eigenvalues:

$$k_3 < 1 < k_2 < k_1.$$

If the set

$$\{x : |\log \det(Tf|_{E^{cu}(f)})| \leq \log k_1\}$$

has zero volume inside any unstable leaf of f , then the stable foliation of f is C^1 robustly minimal, i.e., the stable foliation of any diffeomorphism C^1 sufficiently close to f is minimal. In particular, f itself is robustly transitive.

We build, with this criterion, a new example of a C^1 open set of derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms, such that the strong stable foliation and the strong unstable foliation of any diffeomorphism in this open set are both minimal. The existence of such an example was unknown in this setting.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Preliminaries | 5 |
| 3. Diffeomorphisms with mostly expanding center | 6 |
| 4. Positive center exponent | 9 |
| 5. Ergodic measures with large entropy | 10 |
| 6. Robustly minimal stable foliation | 12 |
| 7. Examples | 14 |
| References | 24 |

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we will study the dynamics of certain types of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms as well as the properties of their invariant foliations. One of the most classically studied properties is transitivity. A diffeomorphism is *transitive* if it admits a dense orbit. Transitivity is said to be *robust* (or *stable*) if it holds for every diffeomorphism g in a C^1 neighborhood of f .

As a consequence of their structural stability, the first examples of robustly transitive diffeomorphisms were the transitive Anosov diffeomorphisms. It was not until the late 60's that nonhyperbolic robustly transitive examples appeared. First

Date: December 24, 2019.

J.R.H. and R.U. are partially supported by NNSFC 11871262. J.Y. is partially supported by CNPq, FAPERJ, and PRONEX of Brazil and NNSFC 11871487 of China. Most of the research for this paper was made during a visit by J. Y. to SUSTech's Mathematics Department. J.Y. is very grateful for the good working environment during his visit and for the support received from the Department colleagues and authorities, in particular from J.R.H. and R.U. .

it was M. Shub [37] who gave examples on \mathbb{T}^4 and a few years later R. Mañé [31] presented a new class of examples on \mathbb{T}^3 . Mañé's examples are strongly related to the results of this paper. New advances in the study of robustly transitive diffeomorphisms occurred only in the 1990s.

On the one hand, C. Bonatti and L. Díaz [5] developed a new tool, called blender, which made it possible to produce numerous new examples. For example, they showed that some perturbations of certain products on Anosov diffeomorphisms, and certain perturbations of the time one map of transitive Anosov flows are robustly transitive. All of these examples, including those from Shub and Mañé, have a common property: they are partially hyperbolic. Here being partially hyperbolic means that there is a Tf -invariant splitting of the tangent bundle $TM = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$, such that for some suitable Riemannian metric, all $x \in M$ satisfy:

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} e^{\lambda_1(x)} &\leq \|df(x)|_{E^s}\| \leq e^{\lambda_2(x)}, \\ e^{\lambda_3(x)} &\leq \|df(x)|_{E^c}\| \leq e^{\lambda_4(x)}, \\ e^{\lambda_5(x)} &\leq \|df(x)|_{E^u}\| \leq e^{\lambda_6(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_1(x) \leq \lambda_2(x) < \lambda_3(x) \leq \lambda_4(x) < \lambda_5(x) \leq \lambda_6(x)$ and $\lambda_2(x) < 0$, $\lambda_5(x) > 0$. For further use, let us denote $E^{cu} = E^c \oplus E^u$ and $E^{cs} = E^s \oplus E^c$.

On the other hand, L. Díaz, E. Pujals and R. Ures [13] proved that, in three-dimensional manifolds, robust transitivity implies a weak form of partial hyperbolicity (see also [6] for a higher dimensional version).

It is well-known that if the strong stable -or unstable- foliation of a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism is minimal, then this diffeomorphism is transitive. Recall that a foliation is minimal if every leaf is dense in the whole manifold. The dynamical properties of these foliations are of great importance since they are intimately related to the dynamical properties of both the diffeomorphism, and of some of its most relevant invariant measures, such as physical measures, u -Gibbs measures, entropy maximizing measures, etc. There are few results concerning the robustness of the minimality of the strong stable foliation. C. Bonatti, L. Díaz and R. Ures [7] (see [25] for a higher dimensional version) showed that either the strong stable or the strong unstable foliation is robustly minimal for three dimensional robustly transitive diffeomorphisms and E. Pujals and M. Sambarino [35] proved that if each unstable leaf of f contains a point whose ω -limit set is uniformly hyperbolic, and if the diffeomorphism itself admits a minimal strong stable foliation, then the diffeomorphisms in a C^1 neighborhood of f also have this property. Adding an extra technical hypothesis on the dynamics of a periodic compact center leaf, in [7] it is also obtained the robust minimality of both the strong stable and the strong unstable foliation. We emphasize that, up to now, known partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms having both foliations robustly minimal fall into two categories: either they have a compact and periodic central curve as mentioned above, or they are dynamically incoherent and their action on the topology of the ambient manifold is more complicated. Examples of the latter type were obtained by C. Bonatti, A. Gogolev, A. Hammerlindl and R. Potrie [9].

It is also an open question for the hyperbolic automorphisms of the 3-torus with three different real eigenvalues whether the strong foliation is robustly minimal. See [17] for a discussion on this topic. In this work we are going to study the robust minimality of these foliations for certain three-dimensional torus diffeomorphisms that we introduce below. We will also give examples for which both foliations are robustly minimal.

Let A be a linear Anosov diffeomorphism A over \mathbb{T}^3 with eigenvalues

$$k_3 < 1 < k_2 < k_1.$$

We are interested in three-dimensional C^r ($r \geq 1$) partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms in the isotopy class of A , which are called C^r *derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms*. This collection will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}^r(A)$. This definition is a generalization of the classical construction of partially hyperbolic, robustly transitive diffeomorphisms due to R. Mañé [31]. The value k_1 , the largest eigenvalue of the linear Anosov diffeomorphism A , plays a key role in the study of ergodic measures of derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms, as observed by M. Viana and the third author of this article in [39]: for any derived from Anosov diffeomorphism, its ergodic measures with entropy larger than $\log k_1$ have the same structure as those of the linear Anosov diffeomorphism. In this paper, we will further explain how this constant provides topological information about the diffeomorphism.

1.1. Statement of the result. It was shown by C. Bonatti, L. Díaz, E. Pujals and R. Ures [13, 6] that robustly transitive diffeomorphisms always admit a finest dominated splitting, and the extreme bundle is volume hyperbolic. In this paper, we are going to show the converse of this property for certain derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms, but the reader should keep in mind that it is not true in general situations. More precisely, we will show that, for three dimensional derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms, if the volume along the cu -bundle has a non-uniform expansion (with respect to the constant $\log k_1$), then the stable foliation of this diffeomorphism is robustly minimal.

Although this result may seem somewhat unexpected, because we are not assuming the transitivity of the original diffeomorphism, it was already conjectured for all derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms by the second author in [38] (see the Introduction and Question 6.6 therein). In some sense, the extra hypotheses in the previous results on the robust minimality of the stable foliation is replaced here by the diffeomorphisms being in an isotopy class—a rather weaker hypothesis. This implies that every 3-dimensional derived from Anosov diffeomorphism really admits some type of hyperbolic structure, which is mainly related to the constant $\log k_1$. We are able to prove the previous conjecture in case the diffeomorphisms is sufficiently close to one having enough cu -expansion along unstable leaves. Here is our main result:

Theorem A. *Let $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(A)$ and suppose the set $\mathcal{B}(f) = \{x : |\det(Tf|_{E^{cu}(x)})| \leq k_1\}$ has zero leaf volume inside any strong unstable leaf, then the strong stable foliation of f is robustly minimal.*

Remark 1.1. One should observe that although the bound (for the metric entropy of measures) by $\log k_1$ is a sharp constant in [39] (see Proposition 2.7 and 2.8 for what we mean by that), our condition here is not sharp, since the hypothesis above does not hold under perturbation. However, the strong stable foliation remains robustly minimal.

In the volume preserving setting the knowledge about these diffeomorphisms is more complete. Obviously, transitivity in this situation is easier to obtain. In case the derived from Anosov diffeomorphism is conservative, transitivity is a consequence of the results of [21]. There is even a more complete description as Gan and Shi [16] have shown that these diffeomorphisms are ergodic.

1.2. Structure of the proof of Theorem A. Let us recall how a robustly minimal foliation (or robust transitivity) is usually obtained. The proofs, roughly speaking, can be divided into two steps:

- (a) for every open set U , the forward iteration of U contains a set that has uniform size along the center-unstable direction;
- (b) every (strong) stable leaf must intersect this set.

In [7], this is achieved by showing the existence of an s -section, that is, a two-dimensional surface that transversally intersects every stable leave.

In [35], the authors proved the step (a) under the assumption that for every $x \in M$, there is a point y in $\mathcal{F}^u(x)$ whose center bundle is uniformly expanding. In the meantime, f having a minimal strong stable foliation implies that the strong stable foliation for every nearby C^1 diffeomorphism g is ε -dense, thus satisfying the step (b).

The proof in our paper also follows this path, albeit with a completely different technique:

To achieve the step (a), we mainly deal with the cu -bundle. We show that a diffeomorphism under the assumptions of Theorem A has *mostly expanding center* (Section 4), and thus by a general technique for diffeomorphisms with mostly expanding center introduced in Section 3 (for more details, see [42]), for each nearby C^1 diffeomorphism, the forward orbit of Lebesgue almost every point is eventually expanding along the center direction. Moreover, any Cesàro limit of a generic point belongs to a space of probability measures $G(f)$ which is determined by the Pesin formula. By the continuity of the space $G(f)$ in C^1 topology, all the measures in $G(f)$ have positive center exponents and large metric entropy. Using the Pliss Lemma and hyperbolic times, we see that the local unstable manifolds at certain iterations along typical orbits must have uniform size.

The proof of the step (b) is more involved. We have to deal with the strong stable foliation without any assumption on minimality or even the transitivity of f . We show that, for any C^1 derived from Anosov diffeomorphism, and any ergodic measure with positive center exponent and with entropy larger than $\log k_1$, the Pesin unstable manifolds at regular points coincide with the (global) center unstable leaves. This part heavily uses the results in [39] on the classification of measures with large entropy for diffeomorphisms derived from Anosov. Then by the global product structure on the universal covering space, the Pesin unstable manifolds are s -sections, intersecting every stable leaf.

1.3. New examples. Let us observe that the previous method only works for the minimality of the strong stable foliation, the minimality of the strong unstable foliation is still an open question, even when the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism is Anosov. But with the criterion we may provide an open set of diffeomorphisms derived from Anosov in the isotopy class of some linear Anosov automorphisms, such that both strong foliations are robustly minimal.

Theorem B. *For a certain linear Anosov diffeomorphism A , there exists a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism g in its isotopy class such that both its strong stable and unstable foliations are robustly minimal.*

The construction is quite different from the one used by Mañé in [31], since he carefully did the perturbation near a fixed point so that the perturbed diffeomorphism remains partially hyperbolic. So the modification is mainly done inside a small ball and the non-hyperbolicity is really local. In our construction, we need to modify the dynamics of the linear Anosov diffeomorphism in a cylindrical neighborhood of a really long center segment which may be quite dense, so we need to carefully choose the linear Anosov diffeomorphism and the analysis is more subtle. Indeed, we will choose the linear Anosov automorphisms so that the center exponent converges to zero. Such a sequence has been firstly considered in [33]. In this manner we obtain a new way of reaching the boundary of the set of Anosov's

diffeomorphisms, at least for the isotopy class of certain hyperbolic automorphisms of the 3-torus.

Does the previous phenomenon happen in the isotopy class of *any* linear Anosov automorphism?

Conjecture 1.2. Let A be a linear Anosov diffeomorphism A of \mathbb{T}^3 with eigenvalues:

$$k_3 < 1 < k_2 < k_1.$$

There is a C^1 open set of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms \mathcal{U} isotopic to A , such that for any diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, both its strong stable and unstable foliation are minimal.

1.4. Structure of the paper. This paper is organized in the following way: In Section 2 we give some necessary background for this paper.

In Section 3 we introduce a general theory for diffeomorphisms with mostly expanding center direction, and provide the main tool for the proof of Theorem A: a special space of probability measures, denoted by $G(f)$, which is defined using the partial entropy along unstable leaves. In Section 4, we verify that the diffeomorphisms we are considering have mostly expanding center.

Section 5 consists of a different theory which only works for diffeomorphisms derived from Anosov: any ergodic probability measure with large entropy should be hyperbolic, and moreover, the unstable manifold of a typical point coincides with the corresponding center-unstable leaf of the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism.

Theorem A is proven in Section 6, and in Section 7 we build the examples in Theorem B.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce the necessary background for the proofs. Throughout this section, we keep the same hypothesis as in the first section, that is, A is a three dimensional linear Anosov diffeomorphism with eigenvalues $k_3 < 1 < k_2 < k_1$.

2.1. Dynamical coherence. A partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism is said to be *dynamically coherent*, if it admits invariant foliations \mathcal{F}^i , $i = s, c, u, cs, cu$, tangent to the corresponding bundles at each point.

By J. Franks [15], for every derived from Anosov diffeomorphism $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$, there exists a continuous surjective map $\phi : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ that semi-conjugates f to A , that is, $\phi \circ f = A \circ \phi$. The following properties of ϕ hold for $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$:

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$. Then f is dynamically coherent, and the Franks' semi-conjugacy ϕ maps the strong stable, center stable, center and center unstable leaves of f into the corresponding leaves of A . Moreover,*

- (a) ϕ restricted to each strong stable leaf is bijective;
- (b) there is $K > 0$ only depending on f , such that for every $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$, $\phi^{-1}(x)$ is either a point, or a connected center segment of f with length bounded by K .
- (c) the strong stable, center, strong unstable foliations of f are quasi-isometric, that is, there exist $a, b > 0$ such that for any two points \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} belonging to the same lifted leaf $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^i$ ($i = s, c, u$) in the universal covering space \mathbb{R}^3 , $d_{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) < ad(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) + b$.

Proof. By R. Potrie [34], f is dynamically coherent. (b) is proven in [38] (see also [39][Proposition 3.1]). Finally, \mathcal{F}^c being quasi-isometric is proved by A. Hammerlindl and R. Potrie [20, Section 3]. \square

As a consequence of (b), by Ledrappier-Walter's formula [28], we have:

Corollary 2.2. *For any $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$, ϕ preserves metric entropy, that is, for any invariant measure μ of f :*

$$h_\mu(f) = h_{\phi_*\mu}(A).$$

Denote by \tilde{f} the lift of f to the universal covering space and by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tilde{f}}^i$ ($i = s, c, u, cs, cu$) the lift of the corresponding foliations of f to the universal covering space \mathbb{R}^3 .

Definition 2.3. We say f (or \tilde{f}) has *global product structure* if for any two points $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tilde{f}}^u(\tilde{x}) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tilde{f}}^{cs}(\tilde{y})$ consists of a unique point, and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tilde{f}}^{cu}(\tilde{x}) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tilde{f}}^s(\tilde{y})$ consists of a unique point.

The following result was proved in [34, Proposition 5.2]:

Proposition 2.4. *Every $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$ has global product structure.*

As a direct corollary, we have that:

Corollary 2.5. *For any $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$, $\mathcal{F}_f^{cu}(x) = \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{F}_f^c(x)} \mathcal{F}_f^u(y)$.*

Moreover, we have a uniform control on the global product structure:

Lemma 2.6. *For any $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$, any $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and any $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^3$ a fundamental domain of the lift of \mathbb{T}^3 , there is $R_x > 0$ such that for any $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}^3$, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s(\tilde{y}) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{R_x}^{cu}(\tilde{x}) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. For any \tilde{y} , there is $R(y)$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s(\tilde{y}) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{R(y)}^{cu}(\tilde{x}) \neq \emptyset$. Because both foliations $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^s$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{cu}$ vary continuously with respect to points, the previous intersection still holds for points in a neighborhood $U_{\tilde{y}}$ of \tilde{y} . Because the closure of $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^3$ is compact, we may take a finite open cover U_i ($i = 1, \dots, k$) of $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}^3$, and take $R_x = \max\{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$. The proof is complete. \square

2.2. Measure-theoretical information. Since ϕ is not injective in general, the map

$$\phi_* : \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(f) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(A)$$

is usually not injective either. Surprisingly, it is proven in [39, Theorem 3.6] that if one restricts ϕ_* to the set of measures with large entropy:

$$\phi_* : \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}} : h_\mu(f) > \log k_1\} \rightarrow \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{erg}}(A) : h_\nu(A) > \log k_1\},$$

then it is bijective. Moreover, the following two properties were proved in [39], showing that the constant $\log k_1$ is important to classify ergodic measures with large entropy. We should note that, as explained in [39], the constant $\log k_1$ is sharp here.

Proposition 2.7. [39, Theorem 3.6] *Let $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$ and μ be an ergodic probability measure μ of f with $h_\mu(f) > \log k_1$. Then for μ almost every x , $\phi^{-1} \circ \phi(x) = \{x\}$, that is, ϕ is almost surely bijective on the support of ergodic measures with entropy larger than $\log k_1$.*

Proposition 2.8. [39, Theorem A] *Let $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$ and μ be an ergodic probability measure μ of f with $h_\mu(f) > \log k_1$. Then every full μ -measure set $Z \subset M$ intersects almost every center leaf on an uncountable subset.*

3. DIFFEOMORPHISMS WITH MOSTLY EXPANDING CENTER

Our proof depends heavily on measure-theoretical arguments. In this section, we are going to introduce several classes of invariant measures that we will use in the following proofs; we will also collect some basic background on diffeomorphisms with mostly expanding center, introduced in [41, 42].

3.1. G^u states. For a C^2 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism, following the work of Pesin and Sinai [32] (see also [8, Chapter 11]), a *Gibbs u -state* is an invariant probability measure whose conditional probabilities (in the sense of Rokhlin [36]) along strong unstable leaves are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the leaves.

The set of Gibbs u -states plays an important role in the study of physical measures for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. More properties for Gibbs u -states can be found in the book of C. Bonatti, L. Díaz and M. Viana [8, Subsection 11.2] (see also D. Dolgopyat [14]).

We are going to define a natural generalization of Gibbs u -states for C^1 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism. We assume f to be a C^1 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism in this subsection.

Given an invariant probability measure μ and an *expanding foliation*¹ \mathcal{F} of f , by taking a measurable partition ξ that is μ -subordinate to the foliation \mathcal{F} (for the precise definition, see [39] and [41]), we may define the *partial entropy of f along \mathcal{F}* , which we denote by $h_\mu(f, \mathcal{F})$, to be:

$$h_\mu(f, \mathcal{F}) = h_\mu(f, \xi).$$

It is well known that the definition above does not depend on the choice of the partition ξ , see for example [29]. With that we are ready to introduce the first subspace of invariant measures that we are going to use:

Definition 3.1. We define:

$$(2) \quad G^u(f) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{inv}(f) : h_\mu(f, \mathcal{F}^u) \geq \int \log(\det(Tf|_{E^u(x)})) d\mu(x)\};$$

Remark 3.2. (a) When f is C^2 , by Ledrappier [27], $G^u(f)$ is the space of Gibbs u -states of f .

(b) By the Ruelle's inequality for partial entropy (see for instance [40]), one can replace the inequality in the definition of G^u by equality:

$$G^u(f) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{inv}(f) : h_\mu(f, \mathcal{F}^u) = \int \log(\det(Tf|_{E^u(x)})) d\mu(x)\}.$$

The following property for $Gibb^u(\cdot)$ also holds for $G^u(\cdot)$.

Proposition 3.3. [24, Propositions 3.1, 3.5] *The space $G^u(f)$ is non-empty, convex, compact, and varies in a upper semi-continuous way with respect to the partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms endowed with the C^1 topology. Moreover, for any invariant measure $\mu \in G^u(f)$, almost every ergodic component of its ergodic decomposition still belongs to $G^u(f)$.*

The most important property of G^u is that it contains all the candidates for physical measures of f . An invariant probability measure μ of f is a physical measure if its basin $\mathcal{B}(\mu) = \{x; \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^i(x)} = \mu\}$ has positive volume.

Theorem 3.4. [24, Theorem A] *Let f be a C^1 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism. Then there is a full volume subset Γ such that for any $x \in \Gamma$, any limit of the sequence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^i(x)}$ belongs to $G^u(f)$.*

¹An invariant foliation \mathcal{F} is said to be expanding, if the derivative of f along \mathcal{F} is uniformly expanding. For example, \mathcal{F}_f^u is expanding while \mathcal{F}_f^c not necessarily is. However, note that \mathcal{F}_A^c is also expanding.

3.2. Other invariant measure subspaces. In this subsection we will introduce further restrictions to the candidates for physical measures of f . Recall that f is a C^1 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism and no further regularity is assumed.

Definition 3.5.

$$G^{cu}(f) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(f) : h_\mu(f) \geq \int \log(\det(Tf|_{E^{cu}(x)})) d\mu(x)\}.$$

Note that G^{cu} is defined similarly to G^u , but using the metric entropy $h_\mu(f)$ instead of the partial entropy. Also note that measures in G^{cu} may have negative center exponent. In fact, if $\mu \in G^u$ has negative center exponent, then it must belong to G^{cu} .

Finally, we denote

$$G(f) = G^u(f) \cap G^{cu}(f).$$

We first observe that the spaces are non-empty, and moreover, the space $G(f)$ consists of all candidates to physical measures.

Proposition 3.6. [41, Proposition 2.12] *There is a full volume subset Γ such that for any $x \in \Gamma$, any Cesàro limit of the sequence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^i(x)}$ belongs to $G(f)$.*

In general, the structure of $G(f)$ is not as clear as $G^u(f)$, for instance, it is not always true that the extreme elements of $G(f)$ are all ergodic. This is due to the presence of measures with negative center exponent.

However, in the next section, we are going to show that, for diffeomorphisms C^1 close to a C^2 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism with mostly expanding center, the space $G(f)$ does have good properties. Notice that, by definition, any diffeomorphism with mostly expanding center is always C^2 , but we will consider any C^1 diffeomorphism in a C^1 neighborhood of it.

3.3. Diffeomorphisms with mostly expanding center. In this section we will briefly introduce the background of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms with mostly expanding center. Throughout this section, we assume f to be a C^2 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism.

Diffeomorphisms with mostly expanding center were introduced by J. Alves, C. Bonatti and M. Viana ([3]) using a different, more technical definition. Later, another narrower definition was given by M. Andersson and C. Vásquez [3]. The two definitions are not equivalent and, in this paper, we will follow the definition of [3]:

Definition 3.7. f has mostly expanding center if all the center exponents of every Gibbs u -state of f are positive.

Proposition 3.8. [42, Proposition 5.17] *Suppose f has mostly expanding center, then there is a C^1 neighborhood \mathcal{U} of f , such that for any C^1 diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, $G(g)$ is compact and convex, and every extreme element of $G(g)$ is an ergodic measure. Moreover, the map: $\mathcal{G} : g \mapsto G(g)$ restricted to \mathcal{U} is upper semi-continuous under the C^1 topology.*

Proposition 3.9. [42, Lemma 5.3] *Suppose f has mostly expanding center. Then there is $b > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a C^1 neighborhood \mathcal{U} of f , such that for any C^1 diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, and any invariant probability $\mu \in G^u(g^N)$,*

$$\int \log \|Tg^{-N}|_{E_g^{cu}(x)}\| d\mu(x) < -b < 0.$$

In particular, the center exponents of any $\mu \in G^u(g^N)$ are all positive.

If we combine the definition of the space G^{cu} and Ruelle's inequality, we have that:

Corollary 3.10. *Suppose f has mostly expanding center, then there is a C^1 neighborhood \mathcal{U} of f , such that for any C^1 diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, every probability $\mu \in \mathbb{G}(g)$ satisfies Pesin formula:*

$$h_\mu(g) = \int \log(\det(Tg|_{E_g^{cu}(x)})) d\mu(x) = \sum_{\lambda_i(\mu, g) > 0} \lambda_i(\mu, g).$$

Later, we will use this corollary to obtain a lower bound of the metric entropy for measures in $\mathbb{G}(\cdot)$, which will enable us to apply Propositions 2.7 and 2.8.

4. POSITIVE CENTER EXPONENT

Throughout this section, let f be a C^2 partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism satisfying the assumptions of Theorem A. We are going to show that f has mostly expanding center.

Because the conditional measures of Gibbs u -states along the unstable leaves are equivalent to the Lebesgue measures on the corresponding leaves, by our hypothesis, we have

Lemma 4.1. *For any Gibbs u -state μ of f ,*

$$(3) \quad \lambda^u(\mu, f) + \lambda^c(\mu, f) = \int \log |\det(Tf|_{E^{cu}(x)})| d\mu(x) > \log k_1.$$

More importantly, from [39] we obtain the uniform positivity for the center Lyapunov exponent:

Lemma 4.2. [39, Theorem A] *Suppose f satisfies the assumptions of Theorem A. Then f has mostly expanding center. That is, for any Gibbs u -state μ of f , the center Lyapunov exponent of μ , $\lambda^c(\mu, f)$, is positive:*

$$(4) \quad \lambda^c(\mu, f) = \int \log |\det(Tf|_{E^c(x)})| d\mu(x) > 0.$$

Observe that the integration in (3) and (4) depends continuously on the measures. On the other hand, the space of Gibbs u -states is compact. As a result, there is a uniform $a > 0$ such that for any Gibbs u -state μ of f ,

$$(5) \quad \lambda^u(\mu, f) + \lambda^c(\mu, f) = \int \log |\det(Tf|_{E^{cu}(x)})| d\mu(x) > \log k_1 + 2a.$$

and

$$(6) \quad \lambda^c(\mu, f) = \int \log |\det(Tf|_{E^c(x)})| d\mu(x) > 2a.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 3.10,

Lemma 4.3. *There is a C^1 neighborhood \mathcal{U} of f , such that for any C^1 diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, and any invariant measure $\nu \in \mathbb{G}(g)$,*

$$h_\nu(g) = \lambda^u(\nu, g) + \lambda^c(\nu, g) = \int \log |\det(Tg|_{E^{cu}(x)})| d\nu(x) > \log k_1 + a,$$

$$\text{and} \quad \lambda^c(\nu, g) = \int \log |\det(Tg|_{E^c(x)})| d\nu(x) > a.$$

5. ERGODIC MEASURES WITH LARGE ENTROPY

Our proof not only relies on the fact that the f has mostly expanding center, but also it needs the following characteristic of ergodic measures with high entropy for derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms: as we shall see, its Pesin invariant manifolds occupy the entire leaves given by the dynamical coherence. Furthermore, this property holds for C^1 diffeomorphisms in a neighborhood of f .

Throughout this section let $f \in \mathcal{D}^1(A)$ be a C^1 derived from Anosov diffeomorphism and μ be an ergodic probability measure of f . We take μ to be any ergodic measure of f with positive center exponent, and with large metric entropy, that is, the metric entropy of μ is larger than the constant $\log k_1$:

$$(7) \quad h_\mu(f) > \log k_1.$$

5.1. Local unstable manifold for C^1 diffeomorphisms. We emphasize that, depending on the central exponent, Pesin unstable manifolds may be different from strong unstable manifolds. We will denote the former as either $W_{loc}^u(x)$ or $W^u(x)$ if they are either local or global manifolds respectively.

In this setting the center exponent of μ is positive, then by a C^1 version of the Pesin theory, one can show that:

Lemma 5.1. *For μ almost every x , there is an open set $W_{loc}^u(x) \subset \mathcal{F}^{cu}(x)$ containing x , such that for every $y \in W_{loc}^u(x)$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f^{-n}(y), f^{-n}(x)) = 0$.*

For a proof, see [1].

5.2. Global unstable manifold. Recall that for any point $x \in M$, its global unstable manifold is defined by

$$W^u(x) = \{y; \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f^{-n}(y), f^{-n}(x)) = 0\}.$$

Our main result of this section is the following:

Proposition 5.2. *Let μ be an ergodic probability with entropy larger than $\log k_1$. Then for μ almost every point x , $\mathcal{F}^{cu}(x)$ is contained in the unstable manifold of x .*

Before starting the proof, let us give some informal explanation on how the proof works. The main tool here is Proposition 2.7, which says that the semi-conjugacy ϕ is almost surely bijective. We also need the following proposition borrowed from [39], which is a stronger version of Proposition 2.8:

Proposition 5.3. [39, Proposition 2.7] *Let \mathcal{F} be an expanding foliation, and $\{\mu_x : x \in M\}$ be the disintegration of μ with respect to any measurable partition ξ that is μ -subordinate to \mathcal{F} . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $h_\mu(f, \mathcal{F}) > 0$;
- (2) for μ -almost every point x , the measure μ_x is continuous, that is, it has no atoms.

Moreover, any of these conditions implies that any full μ -measure subset Z intersects almost every leaf of \mathcal{F} in an uncountable set.

We are going to show that for a cu -disk D at μ -almost every point x with uniform size, its image under ϕ contains an open neighborhood of x in $W_A^u(\phi(x))$. Since W_A^u is uniformly expanding, the forward iteration of $\phi(D)$ will eventually become the entire unstable manifold. Because ϕ is a semi-conjugacy, it turns out that the forward iteration of D will eventually cover the whole center-unstable leaf of f .

Proof of Proposition 5.2. By Corollary 2.5, for any point $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$,

$$\mathcal{F}_f^{cu}(x) = \cup_{y \in \mathcal{F}_f^c(x)} \mathcal{F}_f^u(y).$$

Hence, in order to prove the above proposition, we only need to show that for μ almost every point x , $\mathcal{F}_f^c(x)$ is contained in the unstable manifold of x .

Because the center foliation of the linear Anosov diffeomorphism A is orientable, and for every point $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$, by (b) of Proposition 2.1, the pre-image of x under the semi-conjugacy ϕ is either a point or a connected center segment of f , we have that the orientation of the center foliation of A induces an orientation on the center foliation of f . We refer to this orientation as *left* and *right*, and denote by $\mathcal{F}_f^{c,i}(x)$ ($i = \text{right}, \text{left}$) the points of $\mathcal{F}_f^c(x)$ which are located on the right and left of x respectively. In the following, we will show that for μ almost every point x , $\mathcal{F}_f^{c,\text{right}}(x)$ belongs to the unstable manifold of x . The proof for the left direction is similar.

By Proposition 2.7 and Lemma 5.1, we may take a full μ measure subset Λ such that for every $x \in \Lambda$:

- $\phi^{-1}(\phi(x)) = x$;
- $W^u(x)$ contains an open neighborhood of x inside $\mathcal{F}_f^c(x)$.

Next, we take a compact subset $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in \Lambda_0$, $\mathcal{F}_{f,r_0}^c(x) \subset W^u(x)$, where $\mathcal{F}_{f,r_0}^c(x)$ denotes the ball inside the center leaf $\mathcal{F}_f^c(x)$ with center x and radius r_0 . Take r_0 small enough such that $\mu(\Lambda_0) > 0$. We may further assume the set Λ_0 is contained in a compact center foliation box B . In the following, we will prove that there is a positive measure subset of Λ_0 , on which $\phi(\mathcal{F}_{f,r_0}^{c,\text{right}}(x))$ has uniform size in $W_A^u(\phi(x))$.

For this purpose, we write $\Lambda_n \subset \Lambda_0$ the set of points such that for any $x \in \Lambda_n$, $\phi(\mathcal{F}_{f,r_0}^{c,\text{right}}(x))$ contains a segment of $\mathcal{F}_A^c(x)$ with length larger than $\frac{1}{n}$. By the continuity of the center foliation, Λ_n is (relatively) open inside Λ_0 , hence measurable. By the definition, $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2 \subset \dots$, and hence, the complement of $\Lambda_\infty = \cup_{n>0} \Lambda_n$ is a compact set.

Lemma 5.4. $\mu(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_\infty) = 0$.

Proof. In order to prove the lemma, it suffices to show that

$$(\phi)_* \mu(\phi(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_\infty)) = 0.$$

For each point $y \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_\infty$, denote by $l_{\text{right}}(y) \subset \mathcal{F}_f^{c,\text{right}}(y)$ the segment with length r_0 and with y being an end point. Then by the choice of Λ_0 , $l_{\text{right}}(y) \subset W^u(y)$. Moreover, since $y \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_\infty$, the image of $l_{\text{right}}(y)$ under the semi-conjugacy ϕ must be a single point, which is $\phi(y)$.

Now we claim that for any two different points $y_1, y_2 \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_\infty$, $l_{\text{right}}(y_1)$ and $l_{\text{right}}(y_2)$ are disjoint. This is because, if $l_{\text{right}}(y_1) \cap l_{\text{right}}(y_2) \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\phi(l_{\text{right}}(y_1)) = \phi(y_1), \text{ and } \phi(l_{\text{right}}(y_2)) = \phi(y_2)$$

must have non-trivial intersection, which implies that $\phi(y_1) = \phi(y_2)$, a contradiction to the choice of Λ that $\phi|_\Lambda$ is bijective.

Recall that any one-dimensional segment contains at most countable many disjoint non-trivial intervals. By the claim above, we conclude that in the center foliation box B , the intersection of $\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_\infty$ with each center leaf is at most countable. Since the semi-conjugacy maps every center leaf of f to a center leaf of A (Proposition 2.1), $\phi(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_\infty)$ intersects every center leaf of A at countably many point.

Note that ϕ_* preserves metric entropy (Corollary 2.2). By the hypothesis of Proposition 5.2,

$$h_{\phi_* \mu}(A) > \log k_1.$$

By [39, Propositions 2.8], the partial entropy along the center foliation \mathcal{F}_A^c of A is at least $h_{\phi_*\mu}(A) - \log k_1 > 0$.² Then it follows from Proposition 5.3 that the disintegration of $(\phi)_*\mu$ along the center leaf is continuous (in the sense that it contains no atoms), which implies that $(\phi)_*\mu(\phi(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_\infty)) = 0$, as we claimed. The proof of this lemma is complete. \square

Let us continue the proof of Proposition 5.2. Since Λ_∞ has full measure in Λ_0 , we can take m sufficiently large, such that $\mu(\Lambda_m) > 0$. By the definition of Λ_m , we see that for $y \in \Lambda_m$, the image of $l_{right}(y)$ under ϕ has size larger than $1/m$. By the Birkhoff ergodic theorem and the invariance of the center foliation, it suffices for us to show that for μ almost every point $x \in \Lambda_m$, the entire right branch of the center foliation, $\mathcal{F}_{right}^c(x)$, is contained in $W^u(x)$.

The proof of this claim uses the uniformly expansion of W_A^u . By Poincaré recurrence theorem, for μ almost every point $x \in \Lambda_m$, there is a sequence of integers $0 < n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that $f^{-n_i}(x) \in \Lambda_m$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Because $l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x)) \subset W^u(f^{-n_i}(x))$, $f^{n_i}(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x))) \subset W^u(x)$. By the semi-conjugacy,

$$\phi(f^{n_i}(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x)))) = A^{n_i}(\phi(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x))))$$

satisfies

$$\text{length}(A^{n_i}(\phi(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x)))) > k_2^{n_i} \text{length}(\phi(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x)))) \geq k_2^{n_i} \frac{1}{m},$$

which is unbounded in i . Hence

$$\phi\left(\bigcup_i f^{n_i}(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x)))\right) = \bigcup_i \phi(f^{n_i}(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x)))) = \mathcal{F}_{A,right}^c(\phi(x)).$$

This shows that

$$\bigcup_i f^{n_i}(l_{right}(f^{-n_i}(x))) = \mathcal{F}_{f,right}^c(x) \subset W^u(x).$$

The proof of Proposition 5.2 is complete. \square

Remark 5.5. The assumption $h_\mu(f) > \log k_1$ in Proposition 5.2 is likely a sharp condition. See the discussion in [39].

6. ROBUSTLY MINIMAL STABLE FOLIATION

Finally we are ready to prove Theorem A. Due to the non-uniform expansion on \mathcal{F}^{cu} , we need the notion of hyperbolic times, which are the times when sufficient hyperbolicity is achieved along a given orbit. We will prove that for any given open set U , there is always some point $x \in U$ whose forward iteration (up to the hyperbolic times) has large unstable manifold. Then Propositions 5.2 and 2.4 show that under further iteration this unstable manifold will become an s -section, intersecting every stable leaf. Keep in mind that Proposition 5.2 applies to ergodic measures in $G(g)$ (because they have large entropy by Lemma 4.3). As a result, we need to show that when such hyperbolicity is achieved, the point itself must be close to the support of some measure in $G(g)$.

Let \mathcal{U} be the C^1 neighborhood of f provided by Lemma 4.3, and $g \in \mathcal{U}$ be a C^1 diffeomorphism. Let U be any open set of the ambient manifold \mathbb{T}^3 , it suffices for us to show that every stable leaf has non-trivial intersection with U .

²Here the center foliation of A means the (linear) invariant foliation tangent to E_A^c . Note that this is an expanding foliation. As a result, the partial entropy is well defined.

By Proposition 3.8, there is a full volume subset $\Gamma \subset U$ such that for any $x \in \Gamma$, any limit of the sequence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{g^i(x)}$ belongs to $G(g)$. Fix such an x , by Lemma 4.3,

$$\limsup \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \|Tg^{-1}|_{E_g^c(g^i(x))}\| < -a,$$

where $a > 0$ is as in Lemma 4.3. Because all the subbundles E^i ($i = s, c, u$) are one-dimensional, after changing the metric, we may assume that they are orthogonal. This means that

$$(8) \quad \limsup \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \|Tg^{-1}|_{E_g^{cu}(g^i(x))}\| < -a.$$

Definition 6.1. For $b > 0$, we say that n is a b -hyperbolic time for a point x , if

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=n-k+1}^n \log \|Tg^{-1}|_{E^{cu}(h^j(x))}\| \leq -b, \text{ for any } 0 < k \leq n.$$

By the Pliss Lemma (see [8, Lemma 11.5]), one can show that the set of b -hyperbolic times have positive density:

Lemma 6.2. *There is $\rho(a, \mathcal{U}) > 0$ such that for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$ and x satisfying (8), there are integers $0 < n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ which are $\frac{\rho}{2}$ -hyperbolic times for x . Moreover,*

$$\liminf \frac{\#\{i : n_i \leq n\}}{n} \geq \rho.$$

Write $\nu_{n_m} = \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{i=0}^{n_m-1} \delta_{g^i(x)}$. We may assume that

$$\lim_m \nu_{n_m} = \lim_m \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{i=0}^{n_m-1} \delta_{g^i(x)} = \nu.$$

By Proposition 3.6, we have $\nu \in G(g)$.

For each m , define the set

$$\Gamma_m = \{g^i(x); n_m \rho/2 < i < n_m \text{ is a hyperbolic time of } x\}.$$

By Lemma 6.2, $\liminf_m \nu_{n_m}(\Gamma_m) > \rho/2$. Take Γ_0 any Hausdorff limit of the sequence Γ_m . For simplicity, passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $\lim \Gamma_m = \Gamma_0$. Then $\nu(\Gamma_0) \geq \rho/2$. One should note that ν may not be ergodic. To solve this issue, observe that if for almost every component the measure of Γ_0 were smaller than $\rho/2$, we would have that $\nu(\Gamma_0) < \rho/2$. So we take an ergodic component ν' of ν such that $\nu'(\Gamma_0) \geq \rho/2$. Since $\nu \in G(g)$, by Proposition 3.8 we can choose ν' in such a way that $\nu' \in G(g)$.

By Lemma 4.3, $h_{\nu'}(g) > \log k_1$. Then Proposition 5.2 shows that for ν' almost every point $y \in \Gamma_0$, $W_g^u(y) = \mathcal{F}_g^{cu}(y)$. By Poincaré recurrence theorem, we may also assume that the negative orbit of y visits Γ_0 infinitely many times.

By Lemma 2.6, there is R such that $\mathcal{F}_{g,R}^{cu}(y)$ intersects each stable leaf of g . Because $W_g^u(y) = \mathcal{F}_g^{cu}(y)$, there is s sufficiently large, such that $g^{-s}(y) \in \Gamma_0$, and $g^{-s}(W_{g,R}^u(y))$ has arbitrarily small size, but also intersects every stable leaf of g .

On the other hand, from the construction, there is a sequence n_i of hyperbolic times of x , such that $x_{n_i} := g^{n_i}(x) \rightarrow g^{-s}(y)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Let D be any two-dimensional C^1 disk, we use $d_D(\cdot, \cdot)$ to denote the distance between two points in the disk. And we denote by $1/2$ center-unstable cone the vector fields v such that $\angle(v, E^{cu}) < \frac{1}{2}$. By the dominated splitting between E^s and E^{cu} , the vectors in the sub-bundle E^{cu} are expanding exponentially faster comparing to vectors in the sub-bundle E^s . It then follows that:

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose $g \in \mathcal{U}$ and D is a disk tangent to $1/2$ center-unstable cone, then $g(D)$ is also tangent to $1/2$ center-unstable cone.*

More importantly, one sees sufficient backward contraction on a large size sub-disk of $g^k(D)$ when k is a hyperbolic time:

Lemma 6.4 ([2] Lemma 2.7). *There is $\delta_1 > 0$ depending on \mathcal{U} such that, for any diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, given any C^1 disk D tangent to the $1/2$ center-unstable cone field, $x \in D$ and $n \geq 1$ an $a/2$ -hyperbolic time for x , we have*

$$d_{g^{n-k}(D)}(g^{n-k}(y), g^{n-k}(x)) \leq e^{-ka/2} d_{g^n(D)}(g^n(x), g^n(y)),$$

for any point $y \in D$ with $d_{g^n(D)}(g^n(x), g^n(y)) \leq \delta_1$.

Take $D \subset U$ any two-dimensional disk which is tangent to the $1/2$ center-unstable cone and contains x as an interior point (and recall the choice of $x \in \Gamma$). By Lemma 6.3 and 6.4, for any sufficiently large n_i which is $a/2$ -hyperbolic time for x , $D_{n_i} = g^{n_i}(D)$ is tangent to the $1/2$ center-unstable cone, and contains a sub-disk with center x_{n_i} and radius δ_1 with respect to the distance $d_{g^{n_i}(D)}$.

Since δ_1 only depends on a , one can make s large enough such that $g^{-s}(W_{g,R}^u(y))$ is much smaller than δ_1 . Because x_{n_i} can be made arbitrarily close to $g^{-s}(y)$, the stable foliation induces a holonomy map between $g^{-s}(W_{g,R}^u(y))$ and D_{n_i} in a small neighborhood of $g^{-s}(y)$. Thus D_{n_i} intersects every stable leaf of g , and so does D . The proof of our main result is complete.

7. EXAMPLES

In this section we will build the new examples mentioned in the Theorem B. For this we will first consider the sequence of hyperbolic automorphisms presented in [33] (in fact we take their inverses) Each automorphism in this sequence has three different real eigenvalues. The center eigenvalues are greater than one and, moreover, they tend to one. This means that the central expansion is getting weaker and weaker which will allow us to make a perturbation along a long enough center segment so that the new diffeomorphism is the identity in this segment and has center expansion elsewhere.

We have to make the perturbation taking two precautions: on the one hand, we want the perturbed diffeomorphism to be partially hyperbolic and on the other hand, we want the expansion in the strong unstable direction not to be affected in order to be able to apply the Theorem A. In this way we would obtain that the strong stable foliation is robustly minimal, and particularly, the new diffeomorphism will be robustly transitive.

In addition, we want to obtain examples in which also the strong unstable foliation is robustly minimal. For this we need that the center segments in which the perturbations occur are long enough to be able to apply the arguments of [7]. This is possible thanks to an estimate of the density of these center segments given by Lemma 7.3.

Let's start with the construction of the sequence of examples itself.

For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ define the linear automorphism $A_k : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3$ induced by the integer matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} k-1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For simplicity of the notation, we identify the automorphism and the linear matrix both by A_k .

The inverse of A_k is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & k \end{pmatrix}.$$

which is the matrix discussed in Section 4 of [33]. The characteristic polynomial of A_k is

$$p_k(x) = x^3 - kx^2 + (k+1)x - 1 = 0.$$

Moreover,

Proposition 7.1. [33, Section 4] *For all $k \geq 5$, A_k has real eigenvalues $0 < \lambda_k^s < \frac{1}{k} < 1 < \lambda_k^c < \lambda_k^u$ and $\lambda_k^s \rightarrow 0$, $\lambda_k^c \rightarrow 1$ and $\lambda_k^u \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The eigen-directions are*

$$v_k^\tau = \left(1, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^\tau - 1}, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^\tau}\right), \tau = s, c, u.$$

Remark 7.2. Let $e_k^\tau = \frac{v_k^\tau}{\|v_k^\tau\|}$ where $\tau = s, c, u$. Then we have, as $k \rightarrow \infty$ the following limits:

$$e_k^s \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad e_k^c \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad e_k^u \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that for k sufficiently large, then

- $p_k(0) = -1 < 0$,
- $p_k(\frac{1}{k}) = \frac{1}{k} > 0$,
- $p_k(1) = 1 > 0$,
- $p_k(1 + \frac{1}{k}) = \frac{1}{k^3} + \frac{3}{k^2} + \frac{3}{k} > 0$,
- $p_k(2) = -2k + 9 < 0$,
- $p_k(\frac{k}{2}) = -\frac{k^3}{8} + \frac{k^2}{2} + \frac{k}{2} - 1 < 0$,
- $p_k(k) = k^2 + k - 1 > 0$.

Therefore we have that

$$(9) \quad \lambda_k^s < \frac{1}{k} < 1 + \frac{1}{k} < \lambda_k^c < 2 < \frac{k}{2} < \lambda_k^u < k.$$

7.1. Center leaves of A_k . In this subsection, we provide a density estimation of a long center leaf segment passing through the point $O = (0, 0, 0)$. Let $u_k^c = (\lambda_k^c - 1, 1, \frac{\lambda_k^c - 1}{\lambda_k^c})$. The following estimation is essential for our construction:

Lemma 7.3. *Different local connected components of $\{tu_k^c : |t| \leq \frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}\} \bmod(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ are $\frac{\lambda_k^c - 1}{2}$ away to each other.*


Proof. The first observation is that the distance between components is invariant by translations and then, for the sake of simplicity, we will consider the segment $l = \{tv_k^c\}_{0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}}$. Observe that $u_k^c = (\lambda_k^c - 1)v_k^c$ and recall that $v_k^c = (1, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c - 1}, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c})$. Call P_y the orthogonal projection onto \mathbb{R}^{XZ} . Then the projection of l is

$$l_y = \left\{ P_y(tv_k^c) = t \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c} \end{pmatrix} : \text{with } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} \right\}.$$

If we further consider both coordinates of $l_y \bmod \mathbb{Z}$, we obtain the segments of Figure 1.

For k large enough the slope of l_y is very close to 1 and therefore the distance between any two of these segments is greater than $\frac{\lambda_k^c - 1}{2}$.

Now we consider the three coordinates of the segment $l \bmod \mathbb{Z}$, and represent it as a subset of the three dimensional cube $I^3 = [0, 1]^3$. By abuse of notation, we

FIGURE 1. Orthogonal projection of l to \mathbb{R}^{XZ} .

will also call l this subset of I^3 . Following the same criterion, we will use the same notation for l_y as for $l_y \bmod \mathbb{Z}$.

It is clear that l is contained in $S = \{(x, y, z) \in I^3 : (x, z) \in l_y\}$. Indeed l_y is the image of l under the orthogonal projection. Then S consists of a union of rectangles that are equal to the connected components of l_y times the interval $[0, 1]$. The distance between two of these rectangles is equal to the distance between two connected components of l_y . As we already know that the distance between two connected components of l_y is greater than $\frac{\lambda_k^c - 1}{2}$, we only need to estimate the distance between two components of l located in the same rectangle.

Again, considering the invariance of the distance under translations, it is enough to see what happens in the rectangle

$$S_0 = \{(t, s, \frac{t}{\lambda_k^c}) : s, t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

In order to estimate the distance between two components of l we have to compute at what point l hits the opposite side of the rectangle, see Figure 2.

Recall that $v_k^c = (1, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c - 1}, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c})$, then l hits the opposite side for $t = \lambda_k^c - 1$. Then we get that


$$\frac{(\lambda_k^c - 1)(1, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c - 1}, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c}) \cdot (1, 0, \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c})}{\frac{1}{\lambda_k^c} \sqrt{1 + \lambda_k^{c2}}} = \frac{\lambda_k^c - 1}{\lambda_k^c} \sqrt{1 + \lambda_k^{c2}}.$$

For k large enough the distance between the connected components is very close to $\frac{\lambda_k^c - 1}{\lambda_k^c} \sqrt{1 + \lambda_k^{c2}}$ that is greater than $\lambda_k^c - 1$.

□

We call

$$J_k^c = \{tu_k^c\}_{|t| \leq \frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}} \bmod(\mathbb{Z}^3), \text{ and } I_k^c = A_k^{-1}(J_k^c) = \{tu_k^c\}_{|t| \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda_k^c(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}} \bmod(\mathbb{Z}^3).$$


 FIGURE 2. S_0

A reasoning very similar to that of the previous lemma's proof shows that

$$(10) \quad I_k^c \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{T}^3.$$

7.2. Preparing for modification. In this subsection we will prove a pair of preparatory lemmas that will allow us to construct the diffeomorphisms with the desired properties, that is, partially hyperbolic, equal to the identity in a long center segment, and with center-unstable Jacobian greater than k_1 everywhere except in that center segment.

Our perturbations will be supported in a tube: $\mathcal{T} = [-a, a] \times \mathbb{D}_d^2$ where $a, d > 0$ and \mathbb{D}_d^2 is the 2 dimensional disk with center 0 and radius d .

First we need the following lemma.

Lemma 7.4. *Given $0 < c < 1$ and $a > b > 0$, there is $\phi_{a,b,c} : [-a, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a C^∞ function such that*

- (a1) $\phi_{a,b,c}(t) = ct$ for $t \in [-b, b]$;
- (a2) $\phi_{a,b,c}(a) = a, \phi_{a,b,c}(-a) = -a$ and $\phi'_{a,b,c}(a) = \phi'_{a,b,c}(-a) = 1$;
- (a3) $c \leq \phi'_{a,b,c}(t) < 2\frac{a-bc}{a-b}, \forall t \in [-a, a]$, and $\phi_{a,b,c}(t)' = c$ if and only if $t \in [-b, b]$.

Remark 7.5. It follows that

$$(11) \quad |t - \phi_{a,b,c}(t)| \leq (1-c)|t| \leq (1-c)a.$$

Proof. Consider the following three points $P_1 = (b, cb), P_3 = (a, a), P_2 = \frac{P_1 + P_3}{2} = (\frac{a+b}{2}, \frac{a+cb}{2})$.

Denote by l the line through P_2 with slope $\frac{a-bc}{a-b} + \varepsilon$. We can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small.

Consider a small curve $(\cdot, \alpha(\cdot))$, where $\alpha : [b, b + \varepsilon] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha(b) = cb, \alpha'(b) = c$, and $c < \alpha'(t) < c + \varepsilon$ for $t \in (b, b + \varepsilon]$.

Denote

- $P_4 = \alpha(b + \varepsilon)$,
- A_1 the point of intersection between l and the line $P_4 + t(1, \alpha'(b + \varepsilon))$, and




FIGURE 3.

- A_2 the point of intersection between l and the diagonal.

See Figure 3.

We have a piecewise differentiable curve: segment OP_1 , curve $(t, \alpha(t))$, and segments P_4A_1 , A_1A_2 , A_2P_3 . This curve is smooth except only at two points A_1 and A_2 . We take pieces of circles which are tangent to the curve close to A_1, A_2 .

We obtain a smooth curve, with derivative larger than c but smaller than $\frac{a-bc}{a-b} + \varepsilon$. Since ε can be taken arbitrarily small, the proof is complete. \square

We also need for $d > 0$ a C^∞ bump function $\rho_d : [0, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (b1) $\rho(0) = 1$ and $\rho'(0) = 0$;
- (b2) $\rho(d) = 0$ and $\rho'(d) = 0$;
- (b3) $\rho(x)$ is decreasing;
- (b4) $-\frac{4}{d} < \rho' < 0$ for $0 < x \leq 1$.

For any $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{T}$, $y \in [-a, a]$, $(x, z) \in \mathbb{D}_d^2$, consider C^∞ map $\Psi_{a,b,c,d} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that:

$$\Psi_{a,b,c,d}((x, y, z)) = (x, y + \rho_d(\sqrt{x^2 + z^2})(\phi_{a,b,c}(y) - y), z).$$

Lemma 7.6. *For any $0 < c < 1$, $a > b > 0$ and $d > 0$, $\Psi_{a,b,c,d}$ is a C^∞ diffeomorphism that preserves any line parallel to the y -axis, and $\Psi_{a,b,c,d} |_{\partial\mathcal{T}} = id$. In particular, $T\Psi_{a,b,c,d}$ preserves any 2-dimensional linear subspace which is parallel with y -axis. The Jacobian is larger than or equal to c and the equality holds if and only if $(x, y, z) \in \{0\} \times [-b, b] \times \{0\}$. Moreover,*

$$T\Psi_{a,b,c,d} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ (\phi_{a,b,c}(y) - y)\rho'_d(r)\frac{x}{r} & 1 + \rho_d(r)(\phi'_{a,b,c}(y) - 1) & (\phi_{a,b,c}(y) - y)\rho'_d(r)\frac{z}{r} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} c &\leq |\phi'_{a,b,c}(x)| < 2\frac{a-bc}{a-b}; \\ \max\{\|(\phi_{a,b,c}(y) - y)\rho'_d(r)\frac{x}{r}\|, \|(\phi_{a,b,c}(y) - y)\rho'_d(r)\frac{z}{r}\|\} &\leq \frac{8a(1-c)}{d}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. One only need verify (12), which follows from Lemma 7.4, Remark 7.5. \square

7.3. New coordinates and modification. To simplify our computations, we will make a change of coordinates in the universal covering space \mathbb{R}^3 . By Remark 7.2, we may take a linear transformation B_k with $\det(B_k) \rightarrow 1$ and $\|B_k - Id\| \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$B_k(e_k^s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}; B_k(e_k^c) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}; B_k(e_k^u) = \mu_k \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The constant μ_k is chosen in such a way $\det(B_k|_{e_k^c \oplus e_k^u}) = 1$. We choose μ_k this way because we will focus on the dynamics on the center foliation, and the determinant of the tangent map along the center-unstable bundle, which will remain unchanged after this change of coordinates.

Moreover, in the new chart, the representation of the matrix A_k will be

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_k^u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_k^c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_k^s \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, in the new coordinates, I_k^c, J_k^c are identified with $0 \times [-\frac{1}{2\lambda_k^c(\lambda_k^c-1)^2}, \frac{1}{2\lambda_k^c(\lambda_k^c-1)^2}] \times 0$ and $0 \times [-\frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c-1)^2}, \frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c-1)^2}] \times 0$ respectively.

Denote by $\mathcal{B}_k = \cup_{x \in J_k^c} B_{\frac{r}{4(\lambda_k^c-1)^2}}^{XZ}(y)$, where $B_r^{XZ}(y)$ denotes the ball inside $\mathbb{R}_X \oplus \mathbb{R}_Z(y)$ with center y and radius r . By Lemma 7.3, the projection of \mathcal{B}_k on the manifold \mathbb{T}^3 is injective and its image is a long but quite slim tube. We will modify A_k inside this tube.

From now on, we will only consider the new chart in the universal space.

Lemma 7.7. *For any $k > 0$ sufficiently large, there is a diffeomorphism ϕ_k isotopic to the identity such that :*

- (a) $\phi_k(x) = x$ for $x \notin \mathcal{B}_k$;
- (b) ϕ_k fixes the center leaf of A_k , i.e., $\phi_k(\mathcal{F}_{A_k}^c(x)) = \mathcal{F}_{A_k}^c(x)$;
- (c) $\phi_k(x) = \frac{x}{(\lambda_k^c)^2}$ for $x \in I_k^c$ and for $x \notin I_k^c$, $T\phi_k|_{E_k^c(x)} > \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c)^2}$;
- (d) $T\phi_k$ preserves the tangent bundle $E_{A_k}^{cu}$ and $\det(T\phi_k|_{E_{A_k}^{cu}}) \geq \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c)^2}$ and the equality holds if and only if when $x \in I_k^c$;
- (e)

$$T\phi_k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ A(x) & B(x) & C(x) \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

moreover,

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c)^2} &\leq \|B(x)\| < 5; \\ \max\{\|A(x)\|, \|C(x)\|\} &\leq \frac{16}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We apply Lemma 7.6 with $a = \frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}$, $b = \frac{1}{2\lambda_k^c(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}$, $c = \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c)^2}$ and $d = \frac{\lambda_k^c - 1}{2}$, and take $\phi_k = \Psi_{a,b,c,d}$. Then items (a), (b), (c) and (d) follow from Lemma 7.6. Because $\lambda_k^c \rightarrow 1$, $\|B(x)\| \leq 1 + 2\frac{a-bc}{a-b} + 1 = 2 + 2\frac{1 - (\frac{1}{\lambda_k^c})^3}{1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c}} < 5$, and

$$\max\{\|A(x)\|, \|C(x)\|\} \leq \frac{8a(1-c)}{d} = \frac{8}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^3} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_k^c}\right) < \frac{16}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}.$$

□

7.4. Partial hyperbolicity. In this subsection we are going to show that for k sufficiently large, $f_k = A_k \circ \phi_k \circ A_k$ remains partially hyperbolic and satisfies the properties we need.

In order to prove that f_k is partially hyperbolic we will recall several well-known facts about partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. We first generalize the definition of partial hyperbolicity in (1). The equivalence of these two definitions, maybe changing the metric, was shown by N. Gourmelon [18]. We say a diffeomorphism $f \in \text{Diff}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ admits a *dominated splitting* $TM = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ if there are $C > 0$ and $\lambda_2 < \lambda_3 \leq \lambda_4 < \lambda_5$ such that for any $x \in M$ and any $n > 0$:

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \|df^n|_{E_x^s}\| &\leq Ce^{\lambda_2 n}, \\ Ce^{\lambda_3 n} &\leq \|df^n|_{E_x^c}\| \leq Ce^{\lambda_4 n}, \\ Ce^{\lambda_5 n} &\leq \|df^n|_{E_x^u}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, f is *partially hyperbolic* if $\lambda_2 < 0$ and $\lambda_5 > 0$.

The following criterion is classical for a diffeomorphism to admit dominated splitting.

Lemma 7.8. *Suppose $f \in \text{Diff}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ admits two invariant two-dimensional subbundles E and G which are transverse to each other at any point. Denote by $F = E \cap G$ the one-dimensional invariant subbundle. Suppose f admits closed cones $\mathcal{C}^E \subset E$ and $\mathcal{C}^G \subset G$ both transverse to F and such that $Tf(\mathcal{C}^G) \subset \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}^G)$ and $Tf^{-1}(\mathcal{C}^E) \subset \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}^E)$ then f admits a dominated splitting $TM = E' \oplus F \oplus G'$, where $E' = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} Tf^{-n}(\mathcal{C}^E)$ and $G' = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} Tf^n(\mathcal{C}^G)$. Moreover, f is partially hyperbolic if for any $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$:*

$$(15) \quad |\det Tf|_{E(x)}| < |\det Tf|_{F(x)}| \text{ and } |\det Tf|_{G(x)}| > |\det Tf|_{F(x)}|.$$

Proof. The part about the domination is standard, see for instance [4, Theorem B] and [12, Theorem 2.6].

So, it remains to show that $T_M = E' \oplus F \oplus G'$ is a partially hyperbolic splitting. We need to prove the first item and third item of (14). We will only show the first item, since the other case is similar. Suppose by contradiction that the first item of (14) is false, it implies that there is $x \in M$ such that for any $n \geq 0$, $\log \|Tf^n|_{E'_x}\| \geq 0$. Let μ be an invariant measure of any converging limit of the sequence of probability measures: $\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^i(x)}\}$. By the hypothesis on x ,

$$(16) \quad \int \log \|Tf^n|_{E'(\cdot)}\| d\mu(\cdot) \geq 0.$$

Since the bundles of domination are always continuous, by Oseledec's theorem, the splitting $E' \oplus F \oplus G'$ is the corresponding Oseledec's splitting for the measure μ . Moreover, μ admits three integral Lyapunov exponents $k_1 < k_2 < k_3$, $k_1 = \int \log \|Tf^n|_{E'(\cdot)}\| d\mu(\cdot)$, $k_2 = \int \log \|Tf^n|_{F(\cdot)}\| d\mu(\cdot)$ and $k_1 + k_2 = \int \log \|Tf^n|_{E(\cdot)}\| d\mu(\cdot)$. By (15), $k_1 + k_2 < k_2$, which implies $k_1 < 0$. But by (16), $k_1 \geq 0$, a contradiction. □

Let us now return to our examples. We first apply Lemma 7.8 to verify that f_k is partially hyperbolic provided k is sufficiently large.

Since ϕ_k fixes the center leaf of A_k , that is, it maps every straight line parallel to x to itself, it follows that f_k preserves the center-stable and center-unstable foliation of A_k . Recall that in our new chart of \mathbb{R}^3 , these two foliations are exactly planes which are parallel to the XY plane and the YZ plane, respectively.

$$\text{Moreover, } Tf_k = \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda_k^u)^2 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^u A(x) & (\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x) & \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^s C(x) \\ 0 & 0 & (\lambda_k^s)^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

We first build the cone family transverse to E^Y inside the fiber bundle E^{XY} . Because

$$Tf_k|_{E^{XY}} = \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda_k^u)^2 & 0 \\ \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^u C(x) & (\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

For $K^u > 0$, we take a cone $\mathcal{C}_{K^u} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \mid u, v \neq 0, \text{ such that } \frac{\|v\|}{\|u\|} \leq K^u \right\}$.

For any $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_{K^u}$,

$$Tf_k \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda_k^u)^2 \\ (\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x)v + \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^u C(x) \end{pmatrix}$$

To show that the cone is invariant, we only need to see that for any $|v| \leq K^u$, we have $(\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x)v + \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^u C(x) < K^u (\lambda_k^u)^2$.

The above inequality is equivalent to $\frac{(\lambda_k^c)^2}{(\lambda_k^u)^2} B(x)v + \frac{\lambda_k^c}{\lambda_k^u} C(x) < K^u$. With the estimation of $B(x), C(x)$ of Lemma 7.7, the lefthand side is bounded by

$$\frac{(\lambda_k^c)^2}{(\lambda_k^u)^2} B(x)v + \frac{\lambda_k^c}{\lambda_k^u} C(x) \leq \frac{(\lambda_k^c)^2}{(\lambda_k^u)^2} 5K^u + \frac{\lambda_k^c}{\lambda_k^u} \frac{16}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}.$$

We solve the inequality $\frac{(\lambda_k^c)^2}{(\lambda_k^u)^2} 5K^u + \frac{\lambda_k^c}{\lambda_k^u} \frac{16}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} < K^u$ for K^u and obtain,

$$K^u > \frac{\lambda_k^c}{\lambda_k^u} \frac{16}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} \frac{1}{1 - 5\left(\frac{\lambda_k^c}{\lambda_k^u}\right)^2}.$$

Recall that $1 + \frac{1}{k} < \lambda_k^c < \frac{k}{2} < \lambda_k^u$ (see (9)) and $\lambda_k^c \rightarrow 1^+$. Therefore, to let K^u satisfy the above inequality, we may take $K^u > \frac{32}{\lambda_k^u (\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}$. Also, as $\lambda_k^u (\lambda_k^c - 1) > \frac{k}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{k} = \frac{1}{2}$, we may take $K^u = \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1}$, then

$$Tf(\mathcal{C}_{K^u}) \subset \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}_{K^u}).$$

Because $\lambda_k^u > 1$,

$$(17) \quad \det Tf_k|_{E^{XY}} > \det Tf_k|_{E^Y}.$$

Now let us build the cone family transverse to E^Y inside the fiber bundle $E_{A_k}^{cs} = E^{YZ}$. Because

$$Tf_k|_{E^{YZ}} = \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x) & \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^s A(x) \\ 0 & (\lambda_k^s)^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Tf_k^{-1}|_{E^{YZ}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x)} & -\frac{A(x)}{\lambda_k^c \lambda_k^s B(x)} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^s)^2} \end{pmatrix},$$

For $K^s > 0$, we take a cone $\mathcal{C}_{K^s} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \mid u, v \neq 0, \text{ such that } \frac{\|u\|}{\|v\|} \leq K^s \right\}$. For any $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_{K^s}$,

$$Tf_k^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{u}{(\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x)} - \frac{A(x)}{\lambda_k^c \lambda_k^s B(x)} \\ \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^s)^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

To show that the cone is invariant, we only need to find K^s such that for any $|u| \leq K^s$, we have $\frac{u}{(\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x)} - \frac{A(x)}{\lambda_k^c \lambda_k^s B(x)} < \frac{K^s}{(\lambda_k^s)^2}$.

The above inequality is equivalent to $\frac{(\lambda_k^s)^2 u}{(\lambda_k^c)^2 B(x)} - \frac{\lambda_k^s A(x)}{\lambda_k^c B(x)} < K^s$.

Using the estimations of $A(x), B(x)$ given in Lemma 7.7, the lefthand side is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{B(x)} \left[\frac{(\lambda_k^s)^2 u}{(\lambda_k^c)^2} - \frac{\lambda_k^s A(x)}{\lambda_k^c} \right] \leq (\lambda_k^c)^2 \left[\frac{(\lambda_k^s)^2 K^s}{(\lambda_k^c)^2} + \frac{\lambda_k^s 16}{\lambda_k^c (\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} \right] < (\lambda_k^s)^2 K^s + \frac{\lambda^c \lambda_k^s 16}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}.$$

Then we solve the inequality $(\lambda_k^s)^2 K^s + \frac{\lambda^c \lambda_k^s 16}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} < K^s$ for K^s ,

$$K^s > \frac{16 \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^s}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2 (1 - (\lambda_k^s)^2)}$$

By (9), $\lambda_k^s < \frac{1}{k} < 1 + \frac{1}{k} < \lambda_k^c < \frac{k}{2}$, and taking into account that $\lambda_k^c \rightarrow 1$ we get

$$\frac{16 \lambda_k^c \lambda_k^s}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2 (1 - (\lambda_k^s)^2)} < \frac{16 \lambda_k^c \frac{1}{k}}{\frac{1}{k} (\lambda_k^c - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}} < \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1}.$$

Thus if we take $K^s = \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1}$, we have $Tf^{-1}(\mathcal{C}^s) \subset \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}^s)$. And moreover, because $\lambda_k^s < 1$,

$$(18) \quad \det Tf_k |_{E^{YZ}} < \det Tf_k |_{E^Y}.$$

The cone families $\mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^s$ and the inequalities (17), (18) between the determinants satisfy the conditions of Lemma 7.8. Then f_k is partially hyperbolic provided that k is large enough.

7.5. Proof of Theorem B. Let us consider the linear Anosov diffeomorphism $B_k = A_k^2$ for k sufficiently large, and $f_k = A_k \circ \phi_k \circ A_k$. By the discussion of the last section, f_k is partially hyperbolic, and thus it is derived from Anosov diffeomorphism in the isotopy class of B_k .

We shall prove the proposition below, which implies Theorem B:

Proposition 7.9. *There is a linear Anosov diffeomorphism B , and a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism f derived from Anosov in the isotopy class of B such that:*

- (a) *there is a center segment $I^c(f)$ of f , such that $\|Tf |_{E^{c(\cdot)}}\|_{I^c} = 1$ and $\|Tf |_{E^{c(\cdot)}}\|_{\mathbb{T}^3 \setminus I^c} > 1$;*
- (b) *$I^c = \mathcal{B}(f) = \{x : |\det(Tf |_{E^{cu}(x)})| \leq k_1\}$;*
- (c) *there is an open set \mathcal{U} such that $f \in \text{Cl}(\mathcal{U})$, and for any diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, both the strong stable and strong unstable foliations of g are minimal.*

Moreover, we may take B_k and f_k such that the center segment $I^c(f_k)$ has arbitrarily large length and approaches the whole ambient manifold when $k \rightarrow \infty$.

By (b) and (d) of Lemma 7.7, the center bundle and the center-unstable bundle of f_k both coincide with those of B_k . Then (a) and (b) of Proposition 7.9 follow from (c) and (d) of Lemma 7.7, if we choose the center segment I_c to be I_k^c of Lemma 7.7. Moreover, from the choice of I_k^c (see (10)),

$$I_k^c \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^3.$$

Then by Theorem A, there is a C^1 open set \mathcal{U} of f such that for any diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, the stable foliation of g is minimal. Which implies in particular that, every $g \in \mathcal{U}$ is transitive, that is, f is robustly transitive.

But our goal is to prove that there is a diffeomorphism in \mathcal{U} for which the strong unstable foliation is also robustly minimal. To this end, we will prove that f satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.9 in [7] (see Theorem 7.10 below) We need to show that f has a complete u -section, that is, a compact surface T with boundary such that $\omega(T) := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} f^n(T)$ is a finite union of center segments, and the interior of T intersects each strong unstable leaf transversely at least at one point. Clearly the set of diffeomorphisms having a complete u -section is C^1 open. In the following we enunciate the theorem of C. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz and R. Ures.

Theorem 7.10 ([7]). *Let M be a 3-dimensional compact Riemannian manifold and let \mathcal{V} be an open subset of $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ such that for every $g \in \mathcal{V}$*

- g is strong partially hyperbolic, that is, the three bundles E^s , E^c , and E^u are nontrivial,
- g is transitive,
- g has a complete u -section.

Then there a C^1 open and dense subset $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{V}$ such that for every diffeomorphism in \mathcal{W} the strong unstable foliation is minimal.

As we already proved that f_k for k large enough is robustly transitive, the only thing left for us to prove is that it has a complete u -section.

Take a fundamental domain D of \mathbb{T}^3 in its universal covering. Recall that our change of coordinates is close to the identity and then we can assume that $D \subset [-\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

We claim that $\bigcup_{x \in I_k^c} \mathcal{F}^s(x)$ is a u -section, which means, for any $\zeta \in D$, $\mathcal{F}^u(\zeta) \cap \bigcup_{x \in I_k^c} \mathcal{F}_{f_k}^s(x) \neq \emptyset$. Let's assume the claim is true. Therefore it is not difficult to see that f_k has a complete u -section. Indeed, the map that sends $\zeta \in [-\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]^3$ to the intersection between ζ and $\bigcup_{x \in I_k^c} \mathcal{F}_{f_k}^s(x)$ is continuous (this map is well defined because we have global product structure) This means that the projection of $T = \bigcup_{x \in I_k^c} \mathcal{F}_R^s(x)$ to \mathbb{T}^3 is a complete u -section for R large enough. The proof of Theorem B is complete.

It remains to prove the claim. Firstly note that since f_k preserves E^c , it preserves both E_A^{cs} and E_A^{cu} .

Secondly recall our change of coordinates is as close to the identity as we want. Since $|I_k^c| = \frac{1}{(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}$ we have that $I_k^c \supset 0 \times [-\frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}, \frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}] \times 0$.

In our coordinates of \mathbb{R}^3 , the stable bundle is contained in the cone $\mathcal{C}^s = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ u \\ v \end{pmatrix} : u \neq 0 \text{ and } \frac{|u|}{|v|} \leq \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1} \right\}$. Since \mathcal{F}^s is tangent to this cone, $\bigcup_{x \in I_k^c} \mathcal{F}_{f_k}^s(x) \supset 0 \times [-\frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} + \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1}, \frac{1}{2(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} - \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1}] \times [-1, 1]$. Since $\lambda_k^c \rightarrow 1^+$, for k sufficiently large,

$$(19) \quad \bigcup_{x \in I_k^c} \mathcal{F}_{f_k}^s(x) \supset 0 \times \left[-\frac{1}{4(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}, \frac{1}{4(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} \right] \times [-1, 1].$$

On the other hand, the unstable bundle is contained in the cone $\mathcal{C}^u = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : v \neq 0 \text{ and } \frac{|v|}{|u|} \leq \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1} \right\}$. For any $\zeta = (\zeta_x, \zeta_y, \zeta_z) \in D$,

$$\mathcal{F}^u(y) \cap \mathbb{R}^{YZ} \in 0 \times \left[\zeta_y - \frac{2}{3} \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1}, \zeta_y + \frac{2}{3} \frac{64}{\lambda_k^c - 1} \right] \times \zeta_z.$$

For k sufficiently large, taking into account that $|\zeta_y| \leq \frac{2}{3}$ and $\lambda_k^c \rightarrow 1^+$,

$$(20) \quad \mathcal{F}^u(y) \cap \mathbb{R}^{YZ} \subset 0 \times \left[-\frac{1}{8(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2}, \frac{1}{8(\lambda_k^c - 1)^2} \right] \times \zeta_z.$$

The claim follows from (19), (20) and the fact that $|\zeta_x| \leq \frac{2}{3} < 1$.

This finishes the proof of Proposition 7.9 and hence, of Theorem B.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Abdenur, C. Bonatti and S. Crovisier. Nonuniform hyperbolicity for C^1 -generic diffeomorphisms *Israel Journal of Mathematics*. 183: 1–60, 2011.
- [2] J. F. Alves, C. Bonatti, M. Viana, SRB measures for partially hyperbolic systems whose central direction is mostly expanding, *Invent. Math.* 140: 351–398, 2000.
- [3] M. Andersson and C. H. Vásquez. On mostly expanding diffeomorphisms. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 38: 2838–2859, 2018.
- [4] J. Bochi and N. Gourmelon. Some characterizations of domination. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 263: 221–231, 2009.
- [5] C. Bonatti, and L. J. Díaz. Persistent nonhyperbolic transitive diffeomorphisms. *Ann. of Math.* 143:357–396, 1996.
- [6] C. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz, and E. R. Pujals. A C^1 -generic dichotomy for diffeomorphisms: weak forms of hyperbolicity or infinitely many sinks or sources. *Ann. of Math.* 158:355–418, 2003.
- [7] C. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz and R. Ures. Minimality of strong stable and unstable foliations for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* 1: 513–541, 2002.
- [8] C. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz, and M. Viana. Dynamics Beyond Uniform Hyperbolicity, *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.* vol. 102, Springer–Verlag, 2005.
- [9] C. Bonatti, A. Gogolev, A. Hammerlindl, and R. Potrie. Anomalous partially hyperbolic systems III: abundance and incoherence. to appear in *Geometry & Topology*.
- [10] C. Bonatti, M. Viana. SRB measures for partially hyperbolic systems whose central direction is mostly contracting, *Israel J. Math.* 115:157–193, 2000.
- [11] K. Cogswell. Entropy and volume growth. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 20:77–84, 2000.
- [12] S. Crovisier and R. Potrie, Introduction to partially hyperbolic dynamics, Lecture notes for a minicourse in School and Conference in Dynamical Systems (ICTP, Trieste, July 2015).
- [13] L. J. Díaz, E. R. Pujals, and R. Ures. Partial hyperbolicity and robust transitivity. *Acta Math.* 183:1–43, 1999.
- [14] D. Dolgopyat. Limit theorems for partially hyperbolic systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 356(4):1637–1689 (electronic), 2004.
- [15] J. Franks. Anosov diffeomorphisms. In *Global Analysis (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XIV, Berkeley, Calif., 1968)*, pp. 61–93. Amer. Math. Soc., 1970.
- [16] S. Gan, and Y. Shi. Rigidity of center Lyapunov exponents and su -integrability. www.arxiv.org
- [17] A. Gogolev, A. Kolmogorov, and I. Maimon. A numerical study of Gibbs u -measures for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on \mathbb{T}^3 . *Experimental Mathematics*, 28: 271–283, 2019.
- [18] N. Gourmelon. Adapted metrics for dominated splitting. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical systems* 27: 1839–1849, 2007.
- [19] A. Hammerlindl. Leaf conjugacies on the torus. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 33:896–933, 2013.
- [20] A. Hammerlindl and R. Potrie. Pointwise partial hyperbolicity in three-dimensional nilmanifolds. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 89:853–875, 2014.
- [21] A. Hammerlindl and R. Ures. Ergodicity and partial hyperbolicity on the 3-torus. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 16:1350038, 22 pages, 2014.
- [22] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh, and M. Shub. Invariant manifolds. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 76:1015–1019, 1970.
- [23] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh, and M. Shub. *Invariant manifolds*, volume 583 of *Lect. Notes in Math.* Springer Verlag, 1977.
- [24] Y. Hua, F. Yang and J. Yang. New criterion of physical measures for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. *To appear in Transaction of AMS*.
- [25] F. Rodriguez Hertz, M. A. Rodriguez Hertz, and R. Ures. Some results on the integrability of the center bundle for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. *Partially hyperbolic dynamics, laminations, and Teichmüller flow*, pp. 103–109, *Fields Inst. Commun.*, 51, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [26] F. Rodriguez Hertz, M. A. Rodriguez Hertz, and R. Ures. A non-dynamically coherent example on \mathbb{T}^3 . *Annales Inst. Henri Poincaré-Analyse Non-Linéaire*, 33: 1023–1032, 2016.

- [27] F. Ledrappier. Propriétés ergodiques des mesures de Sinai, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.*, 59: 163–188, 1984.
- [28] F. Ledrappier and P. Walters. A relativised variational principle for continuous transformations. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 16:568–576, 1977.
- [29] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young. The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. I. Characterization of measures satisfying Pesin’s entropy formula, *Ann. of Math.* 122 509–539, 1985.
- [30] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young. The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. II. Relations between entropy, exponents and dimension, *Ann. of Math.* 122 540–574, 1985.
- [31] R. Mañé. Contributions to the stability conjecture. *Topology*, 17:383–396, 1978.
- [32] Ya. Pesin, Ya. Sinai, Gibbs measures for partially hyperbolic attractors, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 2:417–438, 1982.
- [33] G. Ponce and A. Tahzibi. Central Lyapunov exponent of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{T}^3 . *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142:3193–3205, 2014.
- [34] R. Potrie. Partial hyperbolicity and foliations in \mathbb{T}^3 . *J. Mod. Dyn.*, 9:81–121, 2015.
- [35] E. Pujals and M. Sambarino. A sufficient condition for robustly minimal foliations *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 26:281–289, 2006.
- [36] V. A. Rokhlin. On the fundamental ideas of measure theory, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* 10 (1952) 1–52; Translation from *Mat. Sbornik* 25 (1949) 107–150.
- [37] M. Shub. Topologically transitive diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{T}^4 . in *Symposium on Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems* (University of Warwick, 1968/1969), pp. 39–40. Lecture notes in *Math.*, 206. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1971.
- [38] R. Ures. Intrinsic ergodicity of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms with a hyperbolic linear part. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 140:1973–1985, 2012.
- [39] M. Viana and J. Yang. Measure-theoretical properties of center foliations. *Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems: A Tribute to Dmitry Victorovich Anosov*, *Contemporary Mathematics* Volume 692, pp. 291–320, 2017.
- [40] X. Wang, L. Wang and Y. Zhu. Formula of entropy along unstable foliations for C^1 diffeomorphisms with dominated splitting. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 38: 2125–2140, 2018.
- [41] J. Yang. Partial entropy along expanding foliations. *Preprint, www.arxiv.org*, 2015.
- [42] J. Yang. Geometrical and measure-theoretic structures of maps with mostly expanding center. *Preprint, www.arxiv.org*, 2019.

1. DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SHENZHEN, GUANGDONG, CHINA

2. SUSTECH INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICS, SHENZHEN, GUANGDONG, CHINA
E-mail address: rhertz@sustc.edu.cn

1. DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SHENZHEN, GUANGDONG, CHINA

2. SUSTECH INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICS, SHENZHEN, GUANGDONG, CHINA
E-mail address: ures@sustc.edu.cn

DEPARTAMENTO DE GEOMETRIA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE, NITERÓI, BRAZIL

E-mail address: yangjg@impa.br