

# STATISTICAL STABILITY AND LINEAR RESPONSE FOR RANDOM HYPERBOLIC DYNAMICS

DAVOR DRAGIČEVIĆ AND JULIEN SEDRO

**ABSTRACT.** We consider families of random products of close-by Anosov diffeomorphisms, and show that statistical stability and linear response hold for the associated families of equivariant and stationary measures. Our analysis relies on the study of the top Oseledets space of a parametrized transfer operator cocycle, as well as ad-hoc abstract perturbation statements. As an application, we show that, when the quenched central limit theorem holds, under the conditions that ensure linear response for our cocycle, the variance in the CLT depends differentiably on the parameter.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to study stability for the families of equivariant and stationary measures associated with a random product of (uniformly) hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. Those stability properties are related to the following question: in the context of non-autonomous dynamics, how does the statistical properties change when one perturbs the dynamics?

More precisely, we will consider here a family of random hyperbolic diffeomorphisms,  $T_{\omega,\varepsilon}$ , acting on some Riemannian manifold  $M$  and indexed by  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon \in I$ , where  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is some probability space, and  $0 \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is some interval. Endowing the probability space with an invertible map  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  that is measure-preserving and ergodic, we may form the *random products over  $\sigma$* , defined by

$$T_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n := T_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon} \circ \cdots \circ T_{\omega, \varepsilon}. \quad (1)$$

Assuming that this random product admits a *physical equivariant measure*, that is a measure  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$  satisfying the equivariance condition

$$T_{\omega,\varepsilon}^* h_\omega^\varepsilon = h_{\sigma \omega}^\varepsilon, \quad (2)$$

and such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s, the ergodic basin of  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$  has positive Riemannian volume<sup>1</sup>, we ask the following questions: is the map  $\varepsilon \in I \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon$  continuous at  $\varepsilon = 0$  in some suitable sense? Is it differentiable? If so, can one derive an explicit formula for its derivative?

The first question is the *statistical stability* problem, the last two are called the *linear response* problem.

Linear response has received extensive attention, in various context: in the deterministic case (which corresponds, in our setting, to the case where  $\Omega$  is reduced to a singleton and one considers a smooth family of maps  $(T_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in I}$ ), expanding maps of the circle [6] or in higher dimension [7, 30], piecewise expanding maps of the interval [5, 9] or more general unimodal maps [10], intermittent maps [2, 11, 27] have been studied. In the setting of hyperbolic dynamics, the problem of linear response was first considered by Ruelle [28] for uniformly hyperbolic maps. A different approach, the so-called weak spectral perturbation (or Gouëzel-Keller-Liverani) theory, was devised by [24] (see also [7]). Finally, we mention the paper [20], where linear response is established for a wide class of partially hyperbolic systems.

The random case may be divided in two different subcases: the annealed case and the quenched one, the latter of which we will focus on in this paper. The annealed case may

<sup>1</sup>meaning that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the set  $\{x \in M, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \delta_{T_{\omega,\varepsilon}^k x} \rightarrow h_\omega^\varepsilon \text{ weakly}\}$  has positive Riemannian volume.

be studied by methods very similar to the deterministic one, namely weak spectral perturbation for the associated family of transfer operators, and often enjoy a convenient “regularization property” (see e.g [23] or [25]). We also mention [3], where the authors deal with annealed perturbation of uniformly and non-uniformly expanding maps. For annealed perturbation of Anosov diffeomorphisms, very general results were obtained in [24].

The study of the quenched case is more recent, and the literature on the subject is sparse. Indeed, in this situation one cannot use the tools devised in the deterministic or annealed case, as the dynamically relevant objects shift from the spectral data of individual transfer operators to the Lyapunov-Oseledets spectra associated with a cocycle of such transfer operators. For the statistical stability problem in this context, we refer to [4, 8, 12, 21]. Recently, the interesting preprint [13] develops an analogue of the Gouëzel-Keller-Liverani theory to study regularity of the exceptional Oseledets spectrum, for quasi-compact cocycles having a dominated splitting, but only up to Lipschitz regularity. This machinery could in principle be applied to our setting, to obtain a result similar to our Theorem 8. We observe that, although our result is less general since it only concerns the top Oseledets space, it has the nice property of giving an explicit modulus of continuity, and to have an elementary proof.

For the response problem, a very general study is presented in [29], in the case of a random products of uniformly expanding maps, with a finite or countable number of branches, and in any finite dimension. The idea is to express the equivariant family of measures of the random product as the fixed point of a family of cone-contracting maps that exhibits suitable regularity properties, and to deduce the wanted smoothness of the equivariant measures by some implicit-function like argument.

We emphasize that the results we present here rely on methods that are quite different from those in the previously discussed paper, as they do not rely on Birkhoff cone contraction techniques. We also remark that, contrary to the expanding case, the use of the Gouëzel-Liverani scale of anisotropic spaces (or, for that matter, any of the available scale of anisotropic spaces) limits us to products of nearby (in the  $C^{r+1}$  topology) diffeomorphisms.

A few months after the present paper was made available as a preprint, the Gouëzel-Keller-Liverani theory for cocycles [13] was further generalized in [14], to cover the case of quenched linear, as well as higher order, response. In particular, [14, Thm 3.6] generalizes our Theorem 12 to higher-order Taylor expansions, as remarked in [14, Rem. 3.8]. The main idea behind this generalization, namely lifting the cocycle to the so-called Mather operator (to which the deterministic G-K-L theory is then applied), is somehow present in our approach (see e.g. the proof of Proposition 7), although the latter is independent on weak spectral perturbation theory. We finally remark that, although it should be possible in principle, [14] does not state any linear response formula.

Before going any further, we would like to point out a subtle issue, that is peculiar to the the quenched case, and related to the “suitable sense” for which the question of statistical stability and linear response may be answered. In the deterministic case, this means finding a suitable topology into which the invariant measure will live (e.g.  $C^r(\mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $r > 1$  for the a.c.i.p of an expanding map of the circle, or as a distribution of order one for smooth deformations of unimodal maps, see [10]). In the quenched case, one also has to take care of the random parameter  $\omega \in \Omega$ . There are several natural possibilities: the *almost sure* sense (i.e, one studies the a.s regularity of  $\varepsilon \in I \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{B}$ , with  $\mathcal{B}$  a suitable Banach space in the range), the *essentially bounded* sense (where one studies the regularity of  $\varepsilon \in I \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ ), the  $L^1$  sense (where the map of interest is  $\varepsilon \in I \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ ). It is easy to see that the  $L^\infty$  sense is the strongest one. Furthermore, given the relation between the equivariant measures and the stationary one, the  $L^1$  sense implies asking the questions of stability and response for the stationary measure of the skew-product. However, an ambiguity arises when one considers the “almost sure” sense : indeed, it may be that the set of random parameters for which certain estimates on the equivariant measure  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$  holds (let us denote it by  $\Omega_\varepsilon$ ) depends on  $\varepsilon$ . In this situation, it is not clear whether a statement like “ $h_\omega^\varepsilon \rightarrow h_\omega^0$  when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.” has any

probabilistic meaning, since it would hold on  $\bigcap_{\varepsilon \in I} \Omega_\varepsilon$ , which may be non-measurable set (as the intersection is taken over an uncountable set). For this reason, we refrain from considering the “almost sure” sense for the regularity results we present, and instead focus on the  $L^\infty$ -sense.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, after recalling useful properties of the Gouëzel-Liverani anisotropic Banach spaces, we present and discuss our set-up (Hypothesis 1), we state our main result (Theorem 1) as well as a *quenched linear response formula* (3), reminiscent of [29, 28], and give explicit examples of systems to which this setting apply (Section 2.3). In Section 3, we present abstract theorems on quenched statistical stability (Theorem 8) and quenched linear response (Theorem 12), applicable in particular to the equivariant measure associated with a (sufficiently) smooth family of Anosov diffeomorphisms cocycles. In Section 4, we give the proof of the main Theorem 1. In Section 5, we give various applications of the previous results: first, we remark in Theorem 15 that Theorem 12 easily imply response for the stationary measure of the skew-product associated to the cocycle, and that this can be used to establish linear response for a class of deterministic, partially hyperbolic systems. In Section 5.2, we prove Theorem 17 which gives the differentiability w.r.t the parameter of the variance in the quenched central limit theorem (satisfied by the Birkhoff sum of random observable satisfying certain conditions).

Finally, in Section 6, we discuss applications of our approach to other type of random hyperbolic systems: random compositions of uniformly expanding maps, or random two-dimensional piecewise hyperbolic maps.

## 2. MAIN THEOREM

**2.1. A class of anisotropic Banach spaces introduced by Gouëzel and Liverani.** The purpose of this subsection is to briefly summarize the main results from [24]. More precisely, we recall the properties of the so-called scale of anisotropic Banach spaces, on which the transfer operator associated to a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism has a spectral gap. The discussion we present here will be relevant when building examples under which the abstract results of the present paper are applicable.

Let  $M$  denote a  $C^\infty$  compact and connected Riemannian manifold. Furthermore, let  $T$  be a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism on  $M$  of class  $C^{r+1}$  for  $r > 1$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_T$  we will denote the transfer operator associated to  $T$ . We recall that the action of  $\mathcal{L}_T$  on smooth functions  $h \in C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$  is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_T h = (h|\det(DT)|^{-1}) \circ T^{-1}.$$

Let us now briefly summarize the main results from [24]. Take  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $p \leq r$  and  $q > 0$  such that  $p + q < r$ . It is proved in [24] that there exist Banach spaces  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q} = (\mathcal{B}^{p,q}, \|\cdot\|_{p,q})$  and  $\mathcal{B}^{p-1,q+1} = (\mathcal{B}^{p-1,q+1}, \|\cdot\|_{p-1,q+1})$  with the following properties:

- By construction,  $C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$  is dense in  $\mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  for  $(i, j) = \{(p, q), (p-1, q+1)\}$ ;
- By [24, Lemma 2.1],  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q}$  can be embedded in  $\mathcal{B}^{p-1,q+1}$  and the unit ball of  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q}$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{B}^{p-1,q+1}$ ;
- By [24, Proposition 4.1], elements of  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q}$  are distributions of order at most  $q$ ;
- By [24, Lemma 3.2], multiplication by a  $C^{k+q}$  function,  $1 \leq k \leq p$ , induces a bounded operator on  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q}$ . Moreover, the action of a  $C^r$  vector field induces a bounded operator from  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q}$  to  $\mathcal{B}^{p-1,q+1}$ .
- $\mathcal{L}_T$  acts as a bounded operator on  $\mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  for  $(i, j) = \{(p, q), (p-1, q+1)\}$ . Moreover, for each  $h \in \mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  and  $\varphi \in C^j(M, \mathbb{R})$ , we have that

$$(\mathcal{L}_T h)(\varphi) = h(\varphi \circ T),$$

where by  $h(\varphi)$  we denote the action of a distribution  $h$  on a test function  $\varphi$ ;

- By [24, Lemma 2.2], there exist  $A > 0$  and  $a \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_T^n h\|_{p-1,q+1} \leq A \|h\|_{p-1,q+1}, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } h \in \mathcal{B}^{p-1,q+1}$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{L}_T^n h\|_{p,q} \leq Aa^n \|h\|_{p,q} + A\|h\|_{p-1,q+1}, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } h \in \mathcal{B}^{p,q};$$

- By [24, Theorem 2.3],  $\mathcal{L}_T$  is a quasi-compact operator on  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q}$  with spectral radius one. Moreover, 1 is the only eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_T$  on the unit circle. Finally, 1 is the simple eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_T$  and the corresponding eigenspace is spanned with the unique SRB measure for  $T$ .

**2.2. Regularity assumptions.** In this section, we will state precisely our regularity assumptions and our main theorem. We start by fixing, once and for all, the system of  $C^\infty$  coordinates chart to be the  $(\psi_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}$ , where  $\psi_i : (-r_i, r_i)^d \rightarrow M$ , and such that the  $X_i = \psi_i((-r_i/2, r_i/2)^d)$  cover  $M$  are given by the anisotropic norm construction (see [24]). We also let  $\delta$  be the Lebesgue number of the previous cover. Recall the following fact: if  $T$  and  $S$  are  $C^{r+1}$  maps from  $M$  to itself, such that  $\sup_{x \in M} d_M(Tx, Sx) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ , then one has: for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{J}_S(i) := \{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, S(X_i) \cap X_j \neq \emptyset\} = \mathcal{J}_T(i),$$

and one may write

$$d_{C^{r+1}}(T, S) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(i)} \|T_{ij} - S_{ij}\|_{C^{r+1}},$$

where  $\mathcal{J}(i) = \mathcal{J}_S(i) = \mathcal{J}_T(i)$  and  $T_{ij} = \psi_j^{-1} \circ T \circ \psi_i : (-r_i, r_i)^d \rightarrow (-r_j, r_j)^d$  is a map between open sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

For an interval  $0 \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$ , we consider a  $C^s$  mapping  $\mathcal{T} : I \rightarrow C^{r+1}(M, M)$ , such that  $T_0 := \mathcal{T}(0)(\cdot)$  is a  $C^{r+1}$ , transitive Anosov diffeomorphism. Up to shrinking  $I$ , we may and will assume that for all  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $T_\varepsilon := \mathcal{T}(\varepsilon)(\cdot)$  is a  $C^{r+1}$  Anosov diffeomorphism, and that  $\sup_{\varepsilon \in I} d_{C^{r+1}}(T_\varepsilon, T_0) \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$ . In particular, for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , the set

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(i) := \{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, T_\varepsilon(X_i) \cap X_j \neq \emptyset\}$$

is independent of  $\varepsilon$ . We will informally refer to this property by saying that “the maps  $T_\varepsilon$  may be read in the same charts”.

Consider now a  $\Delta > 0$ , and set  $V := B_{C^s(I, C^{r+1}(M, M))}(\mathcal{T}, \Delta)$ , i.e. we consider a small ball, in  $C^s(I, C^{r+1}(M, M))$  topology, centered at  $\mathcal{T}$ . Up to shrinking  $\Delta$ , we may assume that for any  $\mathcal{S} \in V$ , any  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $S_\varepsilon := \mathcal{S}(\varepsilon)(\cdot)$  is an Anosov diffeomorphism, and that  $\sup_{\varepsilon \in I} d_{C^{r+1}}(T_\varepsilon, S_\varepsilon) \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$ . In particular, for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , the sets

$$\mathcal{J}_\mathcal{S}(i) := \{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, S_\varepsilon(X_i) \cap X_j \neq \emptyset\}$$

are independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  both (i.e they only depend on  $V$ ).

We may now describe the type of perturbed cocycle we will consider in the following:

**Hypothesis 1.** *Let  $r > 4$ ,  $s > 1$ , and  $0 \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$  an interval; let  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $V \subset C^s(I, C^{r+1}(M, M))$  be as previously described. Furthermore, let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space,  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  an invertible, ergodic  $\mathbb{P}$ -preserving transformation and consider a measurable mapping*

$$\mathbf{T} : \Omega \rightarrow V$$

Set  $T_{\omega, \varepsilon} := \mathbf{T}(\omega)(\varepsilon)(\cdot)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon \in I$ .

Let us make a few comments on this assumption, based on the previous discussion:

- We choose the neighborhood  $V$  sufficiently small so that for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ , any  $\varepsilon \in I$ , the collection of  $T_{\omega, \varepsilon}$  can all be read in the same coordinate charts and share the same set of admissible leaves. In particular, one may study their transfer operators on the same anisotropic Banach spaces.
- Our assumption is tailored so that for each fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\varepsilon \mapsto T_{\omega, \varepsilon}$  is a smooth curve of Anosov diffeomorphisms, all close-by to a fixed one (namely,  $T_{\omega, 0}$ ).

We are now in position to formulate our main result.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $(T_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega, \varepsilon \in I}$  be a parametrized cocycle of Anosov diffeomorphisms, satisfying Hypothesis 1. Then, by shrinking  $I$  if necessary, there exists a triplet of Banach spaces

$$\mathcal{B}_{ss} \subset \mathcal{B}_s \subset \mathcal{B}_w,$$

and for each  $\varepsilon \in I$  a unique family  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} \subset \mathcal{B}_{ss}$  with the following properties:

- $\omega \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon$  is measurable for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ;
- $h_\omega^\varepsilon$  is a probability measure for  $\varepsilon \in I$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ ;
- $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} h_\omega^\varepsilon = h_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon$  for  $\varepsilon \in I$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  denotes the transfer operator of  $T_{\omega,\varepsilon}$ ;
- the map  $I \ni \varepsilon \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_w)$  is differentiable at 0, and for  $\phi \in C^r(M)$ , we have that

$$\partial_\varepsilon \left[ \int_M \phi dh_\omega^\varepsilon \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_M \partial_\varepsilon \left[ \phi \circ T_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{(n)} \circ T_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega,\varepsilon} \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} dh_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega}, \quad (3)$$

where  $h_\omega := h_\omega^0$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**2.3. Examples.** Here are explicit examples of systems satisfying Hypothesis 1. In all instances,  $r > 4$  and  $s > 1$ .

**Example 2.** Let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Omega = \{1, \dots, q\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , endowed with a Bernoulli measure. Consider a family  $(T_1, \dots, T_q)$  of (close-enough)  $C^{r+1}$  Anosov diffeomorphisms of the  $d$ -dimensional torus  $\mathbb{T}^d$ ,  $p: \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$  be a  $C^{r+1}$  mapping and  $0 \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$  an interval. We set

$$\mathbf{T}(\omega)(\varepsilon, x) := T_i(x) + \varepsilon p(x), \quad \text{if } \omega_0 = i, \quad (4)$$

where  $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ ,  $\varepsilon \in I$  and  $\omega = (\omega_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega$ .

**Example 3.** Let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Omega = \{1, \dots, q\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , endowed with a Bernoulli measure. Consider a  $C^{r+1}$  Anosov diffeomorphism  $T$  of  $\mathbb{T}^d$ . Moreover, consider  $p_1, \dots, p_q$   $C^{r+1}$  mappings of  $\mathbb{T}^d$  and  $0 \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$  an interval. Then we define, for  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$  and  $\omega = (\omega_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega$  the random map

$$\mathbf{T}(\omega)(\varepsilon, x) = T(x) + \varepsilon p_i(x), \quad \text{if } \omega_0 = i. \quad (5)$$

In both Examples 2 and 3, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\mathbf{T}(\omega) \in C^s(I, C^{r+1}(M, M))$ . Furthermore, since for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ , the set  $\{\mathbf{T}(\omega) = T_i + \varepsilon p\}$  (resp.  $\{\mathbf{T}(\omega) = T + \varepsilon p_i\}$ ) is the 1-cylinder  $\{\omega_0 = i\}$ , one easily checks that the map is measurable.

**Example 4.** We now consider the following setting: for  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\omega \in B_{\mathbb{R}^d}(0, \delta)$  (that is randomly chosen w.r.t Lebesgue measure) and  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , we consider a  $C^s$ -smooth curve of Anosov diffeomorphisms

$$I := (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \ni \varepsilon \rightarrow T_\varepsilon \in C^{r+1}(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{T}^d).$$

Finally, set

$$\mathbf{T}(\omega)(\varepsilon, x) := T_\varepsilon(x) + \omega, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

In this last instance, one easily checks that the map  $\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \mathbf{T}(\omega) \in C^s(I, C^{r+1}(M, M))$  is continuous and thus measurable.

### 3. SOME ABSTRACT RESULTS

**3.1. Quenched statistical stability for random systems.** In this section we will formulate an abstract result regarding the statistical stability of certain random dynamical systems that in particular applies to random hyperbolic dynamics.

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space and consider an invertible transformation  $\sigma: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  which preserves  $\mathbb{P}$ . Furthermore, let  $\mathbb{P}$  be ergodic.

Moreover, let  $\mathcal{B}_w = (\mathcal{B}_w, \|\cdot\|_w)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_s = (\mathcal{B}_s, \|\cdot\|_s)$  be two Banach spaces such that  $\mathcal{B}_s$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{B}_w$  and that  $\|\cdot\|_w \leq \|\cdot\|_s$  on  $\mathcal{B}_s$ . Suppose that for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_\omega$  is a bounded operator both on  $\mathcal{B}_w$  and  $\mathcal{B}_s$ . In addition, assume that  $\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\omega$  is strongly measurable on  $\mathcal{B}_s$ , i.e. that the map  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega h$  is measurable for each  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$ . For  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , set

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega^n := \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{L}_{\sigma\omega} \circ \mathcal{L}_\omega.$$

We consider a fixed, nonzero  $\psi \in \mathcal{B}'_s$ , that admits a bounded extension to  $\mathcal{B}_w$  that we still denote by  $\psi$ , and assume that there exist  $D, \lambda > 0$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\omega^n h\|_s \leq D e^{-\lambda n} \|h\|_s, \quad (6)$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s^0$ , where

$$\mathcal{B}_s^0 = \{h \in \mathcal{B}_s : \psi(h) = 0\}. \quad (7)$$

Obviously,  $\mathcal{B}_s^0$  depends on the choice of  $\psi$ . However, this dependence has no bearings on our results (see Remark 5), so we do not make it explicit in the notation itself.

Consider now an interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  around  $0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and suppose that for  $\varepsilon \in I$ , we have a family  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  of bounded linear operators on spaces  $\mathcal{B}_s$  and  $\mathcal{B}_w$ . Moreover, assume that  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  is strongly measurable on  $\mathcal{B}_s$  for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ . Analogously to  $\mathcal{L}_\omega^n$ , for  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\varepsilon \in I$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n := \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega,\varepsilon} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{L}_{\sigma\omega,\varepsilon} \circ \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}.$$

We set  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,0} = \mathcal{L}_\omega$  and we suppose that there exist  $C > 0$ ,  $\lambda_1 \in (0, 1)$  and a measurable  $\Omega' \subset \Omega$  satisfying  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega') = 1$  such that for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ :

- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n h\|_s \leq C \lambda_1^n \|h\|_s + C \|h\|_w; \quad (8)$$

- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$ ,

$$\|(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_\omega)h\|_w \leq C|\varepsilon| \cdot \|h\|_s; \quad (9)$$

- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n\|_w \leq C; \quad (10)$$

- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , we have that

$$\psi(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} h) = \psi(h) \quad \text{for each } h \in \mathcal{B}_s. \quad (11)$$

We can assume without any loss of generality that  $\Omega'$  is contained in a full measure set on which (6) holds.

**Remark 5.** • Observe that we can assume that  $\Omega'$  is  $\sigma$ -invariant since we can replace  $\Omega'$  with  $\Omega'' = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sigma^k(\Omega')$  which is clearly  $\sigma$ -invariant and also satisfies  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega'') = 1$ . Therefore, from now on we will assume that  $\Omega'$  is  $\sigma$ -invariant.

- We note that we can deal with the more general situation when  $\Omega'$  is allowed to depend on  $\varepsilon$ . However, since the current framework is sufficient for applications we have in mind and for the case of simplicity, we will not explicitly deal with this case.
- The fact that almost every  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  share a left eigenvector is the reason why the dependence on  $\psi$  of the space  $\mathcal{B}_s^0$  has no consequence for us. In our examples,  $\psi$  will be  $\psi(h) := h(1)$  for a finite-order distribution  $h$  (and where 1 denotes the constant test function).

We first show that the above assumptions imply that all the perturbed cocycles  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  also satisfy the condition of the type (6) whenever  $|\varepsilon|$  is sufficiently small. More precisely, we have the following auxiliary result.

**Proposition 6.** *There exist  $\varepsilon_0, D' > 0$  and  $\lambda' > 0$  such that*

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n h\|_s \leq D' e^{-\lambda' n} \|h\|_s, \quad (12)$$

for  $\varepsilon \in I$  satisfying  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s^0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  be such that

$$\frac{C^4}{1 - \lambda_1} \varepsilon_0 < 1/2, \quad (13)$$

and take an arbitrary  $\varepsilon \in I$  satisfying  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ .

Since

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_\omega^n = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega, \varepsilon}^{n-k} (\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}) \mathcal{L}_\omega^{k-1},$$

it follows from (8), (9) and (10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_\omega^n)h\|_w &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega, \varepsilon}^{n-k} (\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}) \mathcal{L}_\omega^{k-1} h\|_w \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^n \|(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}) \mathcal{L}_\omega^{k-1} h\|_w \\ &\leq C^2 |\varepsilon| \sum_{k=1}^n \|\mathcal{L}_\omega^{k-1} h\|_s \\ &\leq C^2 |\varepsilon| \sum_{k=1}^n (C \lambda_1^{k-1} \|h\|_s + C \|h\|_w) \\ &\leq C^3 |\varepsilon| \left( \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_1} \|h\|_s + n \|h\|_w \right), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\|(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_\omega^n)h\|_w \leq C^3 |\varepsilon| \left( \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_1} \|h\|_s + n \|h\|_w \right), \quad (14)$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$ . Thus, (6), (8) and (14) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^{n+m} h\|_s &= \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^m \omega, \varepsilon}^n \mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^m h\|_s \\ &\leq C \lambda_1^n \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^m h\|_s + C \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^m h\|_w \\ &\leq C \lambda_1^n (C \lambda_1^m \|h\|_s + C \|h\|_w) + C (\|\mathcal{L}_\omega^m h\|_w + \|(\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^m - \mathcal{L}_\omega^m) h\|_w) \\ &\leq C^2 \lambda_1^{n+m} \|h\|_s + C^2 \lambda_1^n \|h\|_s + C D e^{-\lambda m} \|h\|_s + C^4 |\varepsilon| \left( \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_1} + m \right) \|h\|_s, \end{aligned}$$

for  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s^0$ . Hence (recall also (13)), we can find (by decreasing  $\varepsilon_0$  if necessary)  $a \in (0, 1)$  and  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  (independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\omega$ ) such that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^{N_0} h\|_s \leq a \|h\|_s, \quad (15)$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s^0$ .

On the other hand, it follows readily from (8) that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n\|_s \leq 2C \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega'. \quad (16)$$

Take now an arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and write it as  $n = mN_0 + k$  for  $m, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ,  $0 \leq k < N_0$ . It follows from (15) and (16) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n h\|_s &= \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^{mN_0+k} h\|_s \leq 2C a^m \|h\|_s \\ &= 2C e^{-m \log a^{-1}} \|h\|_s \\ &= 2C e^{\frac{k}{N_0} \log a^{-1}} e^{-\frac{n}{N_0} \log a^{-1}} \|h\|_s \\ &\leq 2C e^{\log a^{-1}} e^{-\frac{n}{N_0} \log a^{-1}} \|h\|_s, \end{aligned}$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s^0$ . We conclude that (12) holds with

$$\lambda' = \log a^{-1}/N_0 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad D' = 2C e^{\log a^{-1}} > 0,$$

which are independent on  $\varepsilon$ . The proof of the proposition is completed.  $\square$

We are now in position to establish the existence of a random fixed point for the cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  whenever  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ .

**Proposition 7.** For each  $\varepsilon \in I$  satisfying  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ , there exists a unique family  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega'} \subset \mathcal{B}_s$  such that:

- $\omega \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon$  is measurable and bounded, i.e.

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_s < \infty; \quad (17)$$

- for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,

$$\psi(h_\omega^\varepsilon) = 1; \quad (18)$$

- for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon} h_\omega^\varepsilon = h_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon. \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  denote the set of all measurable functions  $v: \Omega' \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_s$  such that

$$\|v\|_\infty = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|v(\omega)\|_s < \infty.$$

Then,  $(\mathcal{Y}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  is a Banach space. Set

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{v \in \mathcal{Y} : \psi(v(\omega)) = 1 \text{ for } \omega \in \Omega'\}.$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is nonempty. Indeed, since  $\psi$  is nonzero, there exists  $g \in \mathcal{B}_s$  such that  $\psi(g) = 1$ . Set  $v_0: \Omega' \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_s$  by  $v_0(\omega) = g$  for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . Then,  $v_0 \in \mathcal{Z}$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Indeed, let  $(v_n)_n$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{Z}$  that converges to some  $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Then, we have that

$$|\psi(v_n(\omega)) - \psi(v(\omega))| \leq \|\psi\|_s \cdot \|v_n(\omega) - v(\omega)\|_s \leq \|\psi\|_s \cdot \|v_n - v\|_\infty,$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , where  $\|\psi\|_s$  denotes the norm of  $\psi \in \mathcal{B}_s$ . Hence,  $\psi(v(\omega)) = 1$  for  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and thus  $v \in \mathcal{Z}$ .

For  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ , we define a linear operator  $\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  by

$$(\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon v)(\omega) = \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-1}\omega, \varepsilon} v(\sigma^{-1}\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega'.$$

It follows from (16) (together with our assumption that  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}$  is strongly measurable on  $\mathcal{B}_s$  for each  $\varepsilon$ ) that  $\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon$  is a well-defined and bounded operator. Moreover,  $\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ . Indeed, for each  $v \in \mathcal{Z}$  we have (using (11)) that

$$\psi((\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon v)(\omega)) = \psi(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-1}\omega, \varepsilon} v(\sigma^{-1}\omega)) = \psi(v(\sigma^{-1}\omega)) = 1,$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon v \in \mathcal{Z}$ .

Let us now choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $D'e^{-\lambda'N} < 1$ . It follows from (12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon)^N v_1 - (\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon)^N v_2\|_\infty &= \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-N}\omega, \varepsilon}^N (v_1(\sigma^{-N}\omega) - v_2(\sigma^{-N}\omega))\|_s \\ &\leq D'e^{-\lambda'N} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|v_1(\sigma^{-N}\omega) - v_2(\sigma^{-N}\omega)\|_s \\ &\leq D'e^{-\lambda'N} \|v_1 - v_2\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

for  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$  and  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{Z}$ . Hence,  $(\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon)^N$  is a contraction on  $\mathcal{Z}$  and therefore,  $\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon$  has a unique fixed point  $v^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{Z}$ . Thus, the family  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega'}$  defined by  $h_\omega^\varepsilon := v^\varepsilon(\omega)$  satisfies (17), (18) and (19).

In order to establish the uniqueness, it is sufficient to note that each family  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega'}$  satisfying (17), (18) and (19) gives rise to a fixed point of  $\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , which is unique. The proof of the proposition is completed.  $\square$

Set

$$h_\omega := h_\omega^0 \quad \omega \in \Omega'.$$

The following is our statistical stability result.

**Theorem 8.** Let  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ . Then

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega\|_w \leq C|\varepsilon| |\log(|\varepsilon|)|, \quad (20)$$

where  $C > 0$  is independent on  $\varepsilon$ .

Before we establish Theorem 8, we need the following auxiliary result. Let  $h^\varepsilon$  denote the family  $(h^\varepsilon_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  given by Proposition 7.

**Lemma 9.** *We have that*

$$\sup_{|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h^\varepsilon_\omega\|_s < \infty. \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* We will use the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 7. Take an arbitrary  $u \in \mathcal{Z}$ . It follows from Banach's contraction principle that

$$h^\varepsilon = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon)^{kN} u,$$

for  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ . Fix now any  $\varepsilon$  such that  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ . There exists  $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\|h^\varepsilon - (\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon)^{k_0 N} u\|_\infty < 1.$$

Hence, using (8) we have that

$$\|h^\varepsilon\|_\infty \leq 1 + \|(\mathbb{L}^\varepsilon)^{k_0 N} u\|_\infty \leq 2C\|u\|_\infty + 1,$$

which readily implies the conclusion of the lemma.  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 8.

*Proof of Theorem 8.* Take an arbitrary  $\varepsilon \in I$  such that  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h^\varepsilon_\omega - h_\omega\|_w &= \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega, \varepsilon}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}\|_w \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega, \varepsilon}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_w + \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^n (h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega})\|_w, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . It follows from (6) and (21) that there exists  $\tilde{D} > 0$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^n (h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega})\|_w \leq \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^n (h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega})\|_s \leq \tilde{D}e^{-\lambda n}, \quad (23)$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega'$ .

On the other hand, it follows from (8), (9) and (10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega, \varepsilon}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_w &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n+j}\omega}^{n-j} (\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n+j-1}\omega} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n+j-1}\omega, \varepsilon}) \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega, \varepsilon}^{j-1} h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_w \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^n \|(\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n+j-1}\omega} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n+j-1}\omega, \varepsilon}) \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega, \varepsilon}^{j-1} h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_w \\ &\leq C^2 |\varepsilon| \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega, \varepsilon}^{j-1} h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_s \\ &\leq 2nC^3 |\varepsilon| \cdot \|h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_s. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (21) we have that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega, \varepsilon}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^n h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon\|_w \leq 2nC^3 |\varepsilon| \sup_{|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_s, \quad (24)$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We conclude from (22), (23) and (24) that

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega\|_w \leq 2nC^3 |\varepsilon| \sup_{|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_s + \tilde{D}e^{-\lambda n},$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Taking  $n = \lfloor \frac{\log(|\varepsilon|)}{\lambda} \rfloor$ , we conclude that (20) holds.  $\square$

**3.2. Quenched linear response for random dynamics.** Observe that Theorem 8 gives the continuity (in the appropriate sense) of the map  $\varepsilon \mapsto (h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  in  $\varepsilon = 0$ . We are now concerned with formulating sufficient conditions under which the same map is differentiable in  $\varepsilon = 0$ .

Besides requiring the existence of spaces  $\mathcal{B}_w$  and  $\mathcal{B}_s$  as in Subsection 3.1, we also require the existence of a third space  $\mathcal{B}_{ss} = (\mathcal{B}_{ss}, \|\cdot\|_{ss})$  that can be embedded in  $\mathcal{B}_s$  and such that  $\|\cdot\|_s \leq \|\cdot\|_{ss}$  on  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$ . As in Subsection 3.1, we assume that  $\psi$  is a nonzero functional on  $\mathcal{B}_s$ , and we shall also assume that it admits a bounded extension to  $\mathcal{B}_w$ . We still denote its restriction (resp. extension) to  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{B}_w$ ) by  $\psi$ . Furthermore, we let  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega, \varepsilon \in I}$  be a family such that each  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  is a bounded operator on each of those three spaces. In addition, suppose that  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  is strongly measurable on both  $\mathcal{B}_s$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$  for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ .

Besides (6), we also require that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\omega^n h\|_{ss} \leq D e^{-\lambda n} \|h\|_{ss}, \quad (25)$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_{ss}^0$ , where

$$\mathcal{B}_{ss}^0 = \{h \in \mathcal{B}_{ss} : \psi(h) = 0\}.$$

We define  $\mathcal{B}_s^0$  and  $\mathcal{B}_w^0$  in a similar manner. In particular,  $\mathcal{B}_s^0$  is the same as in (7).

In addition, we also assume that there exist  $C > 0$ ,  $\lambda_1 \in (0, 1)$  and a measurable  $\Omega' \subset \Omega$  with the property that  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega') = 1$  and:

- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$ , (8) holds;
- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$ , (9) holds;
- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , (10) holds;
- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_{ss}$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n h\|_{ss} \leq C \lambda_1^n \|h\|_{ss} + C \|h\|_s; \quad (26)$$

- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_{ss}$ ,

$$\|(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_\omega)h\|_s \leq C |\varepsilon| \|h\|_{ss}; \quad (27)$$

- for each  $\varepsilon \in I$  and  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , we have that for  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$  (and thus also for  $h \in \mathcal{B}_{ss}$ )

$$\psi(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} h) = \psi(h). \quad (28)$$

As before we can assume that  $\Omega'$  is contained in a full-measure set on which (6) and (25) hold and that  $\Omega'$  is  $\sigma$ -invariant.

The following is a direct consequence of Proposition 6 (applied for the pairs  $(\mathcal{B}_s, \mathcal{B}_{ss})$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_w, \mathcal{B}_s)$ ).

**Lemma 10.** *There exist  $\varepsilon_0, D' > 0$  and  $\lambda' > 0$  such that for  $\varepsilon \in I$  satisfying  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have that*

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n h\|_{ss} \leq D' e^{-\lambda' n} \|h\|_{ss} \quad \text{for } h \in \mathcal{B}_{ss}^0, \quad (29)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n h\|_s \leq D' e^{-\lambda' n} \|h\|_s \quad \text{for } h \in \mathcal{B}_s^0. \quad (30)$$

By applying Proposition 7 for  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$  instead of  $\mathcal{B}_s$ , we deduce the following result.

**Proposition 11.** *For each  $\varepsilon$  satisfying  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ , there exists a unique family  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega'} \subset \mathcal{B}_{ss}$  such that:*

- $\omega \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon$  is measurable and bounded, i.e.

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{ss} < \infty; \quad (31)$$

- for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,

$$\psi(h_\omega^\varepsilon) = 1; \quad (32)$$

- for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} h_\omega^\varepsilon = h_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon. \quad (33)$$

Let us now introduce some additional assumptions. We will suppose that for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , there exists a bounded linear operator  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega : \mathcal{B}_{ss} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_s$ , admitting a bounded extension (which will also be denoted by  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega$ ) from  $\mathcal{B}_s$  to  $\mathcal{B}_w$ , and such that:

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega\|_{\mathcal{B}_{ss} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_s} < \infty, \\ \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega\|_{\mathcal{B}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_w} < \infty, \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

and we suppose that there is a function  $\alpha : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\varepsilon) = 0$  such that for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_\omega) h - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega h \right\|_w \leq \alpha(\varepsilon) \|h\|_{ss} \quad \text{for } h \in \mathcal{B}_{ss} \text{ and } \varepsilon \in I \setminus \{0\}. \quad (35)$$

We emphasize that the inequality (35) only holds in  $\mathcal{B}_w$ -topology. Obviously,  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega \mathcal{B}_{ss}^0 \subset \mathcal{B}_s^0$ , for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , but it also follows from (35) and boundedness of  $\psi$  on  $\mathcal{B}_w$  that  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega : \mathcal{B}_{ss} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_s^0$ .

Finally, we assume that for  $\omega \in \Omega'$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_\omega^n h\|_w \leq D' e^{-\lambda' n} \|h\|_w \quad \text{for } h \in \mathcal{B}_w^0. \quad (36)$$

We continue to denote  $h_\omega^0$  simply by  $h_\omega$ . For  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , set

$$\hat{h}_\omega := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}. \quad (37)$$

It follows from (6), (31), (34) and the previous discussion that  $\hat{h}_\omega \in \mathcal{B}_s^0$  for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . In addition,

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|\hat{h}_\omega\|_s < \infty. \quad (38)$$

The following is our linear response result.

**Theorem 12.** *We have that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \left\| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega) - \hat{h}_\omega \right\|_w = 0. \quad (39)$$

*Proof.* Let us begin by introducing some auxiliary notation. Set

$$\tilde{h}_\omega^\varepsilon := h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\omega, \varepsilon} := \mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_\omega.$$

It follows easily from (33) that

$$\tilde{h}_\omega^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-1}\omega} \tilde{h}_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-1}\omega, \varepsilon} h_{\sigma^{-1}\omega}^\varepsilon,$$

and thus

$$\tilde{h}_\omega^\varepsilon = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega, \varepsilon} h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^\varepsilon, \quad (40)$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ . By (37) and (40), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{h}_\omega^\varepsilon - \hat{h}_\omega \right\|_w &= \left\| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega, \varepsilon} h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^\varepsilon - \hat{h}_\omega \right\|_w \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega, \varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right) h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^\varepsilon \right\|_w \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \left( h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^\varepsilon - h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right) \right\|_w. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

By applying Lemma 9, we have

$$\sup_{|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{ss} < \infty.$$

This, together with (35) and (36) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega, \varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right) h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^{\varepsilon} \right\|_w \\
& \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} D' e^{-\lambda' j} \left\| \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega, \varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right) h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^{\varepsilon} \right\|_w \\
& \leq \tilde{D} \alpha(\varepsilon) \sup_{|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|h_{\omega}^{\varepsilon}\|_{ss},
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , where  $\tilde{D} > 0$  doesn't depend on  $\omega$  and  $\varepsilon$ . On the other hand, we have by (34) and (36) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \left( h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^{\varepsilon} - h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right) \right\|_w \\
& \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} D' e^{-\lambda' j} \left\| \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \left( h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^{\varepsilon} - h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right) \right\|_w \\
& \leq \sup_{\omega \in \Omega'} \|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\omega}\|_{\mathcal{B}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_w} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} D' e^{-\lambda' j} \left\| h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^{\varepsilon} - h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right\|_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, our assumptions ensure that we may apply Theorem 8 for the pair  $(\mathcal{B}_s, \mathcal{B}_{ss})$ . Hence, we get

$$\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-j}\omega}^j \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \left( h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega}^{\varepsilon} - h_{\sigma^{-(j+1)}\omega} \right) \right\|_w \leq C' |\varepsilon| |\log |\varepsilon|| \tag{43}$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega'$ , where  $C' > 0$  is independent on  $\omega$  and  $\varepsilon$ . It follows readily from (41), (42) and (43) that (39) holds, which completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 13.** *The purpose of this remark is to interpret Theorem 8 (as well as Theorem 12) in the context of the multiplicative ergodic theory. In order to do so, we first need to introduce two additional assumptions. Namely, we require that:*

- $\mathcal{B}_s$  is separable;
- the inclusion  $\mathcal{B}_s \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_w$  is compact.

By  $\Lambda(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ , we will denote the largest Lyapunov exponent of the cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , for  $\varepsilon \in I$ . We stress that the existence of  $\Lambda(\varepsilon)$  is a direct consequence of (8) (applied to  $n = 1$ ) and the subadditive ergodic theorem. Moreover, we recall that

$$\Lambda(\varepsilon) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n\|_s, \quad \text{for } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e } \omega \in \Omega.$$

By using (8) together with Proposition 7, it is easy to show (see the proof of [17, Lemma 3.5.]) that  $\Lambda(\varepsilon) = 0$ , for  $\varepsilon \in I$  with  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ . Moreover, for each such  $\varepsilon$ , the cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is quasi-compact (in the sense of [26, Definition 2.7.]). Hence, it follows from the multiplicative ergodic theorem (see [26, Theorem A.]) that for each  $\varepsilon \in I$  with  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ , there exists:

- $1 \leq l = l(\varepsilon) \leq \infty$  and a sequence of exceptional Lyapunov exponents

$$0 = \Lambda(\varepsilon) = \lambda_1(\varepsilon) > \lambda_2(\varepsilon) > \dots > \lambda_l(\varepsilon) > \kappa(\varepsilon)$$

or in the case  $l = \infty$ ,

$$0 = \Lambda(\varepsilon) = \lambda_1(\varepsilon) > \lambda_2(\varepsilon) > \dots \quad \text{with } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n(\varepsilon) = \kappa(\varepsilon);$$

- a unique measurable Oseledets splitting

$$\mathcal{B}_s = \left( \bigoplus_{j=1}^l Y_j^{\varepsilon}(\omega) \right) \oplus V^{\varepsilon}(\omega),$$

where each component of the splitting is equivariant under  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$ , that is,  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}(Y_j^\varepsilon(\omega)) = Y_j^\varepsilon(\sigma\omega)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}(V^\varepsilon(\omega)) \subset V^\varepsilon(\sigma\omega)$ . The subspaces  $Y_j^\varepsilon(\omega)$  are finite-dimensional and for each  $y \in Y_j^\varepsilon(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n y\| = \lambda_j(\varepsilon).$$

Moreover, for  $y \in V(\omega)$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n y\| \leq \kappa(\varepsilon)$ .

It follows easily from Proposition 6 (see the proof of [17, Proposition 3.6.]) that  $Y_1^\varepsilon(\omega)$  is one-dimensional and is spanned by  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$ , for each  $\varepsilon \in I$  such that  $|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0$ .

Hence, Theorem 8 can be interpreted as a regularity result for the top-Oseledets space of  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$ . Namely, it shows that it is continuous in appropriate sense in  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Taking into account that Lyapunov exponents and corresponding Oseledets subspaces represent nonautonomous versions of the classical notions of an eigenvalue and the corresponding eigenspace, we conclude that Theorem 8 is a natural extension of statistical stability results concerned with deterministic systems. In a similar manner, Theorem 12 can be viewed as a nonautonomous version of the linear response results.

#### 4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we prove Theorem 1, by showing that the assumptions of our abstract Theorems 8 and 12 are satisfied.

We place ourselves in the context of Subsection 2.2: we fix a small enough interval  $0 \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$ , and we consider a  $C^s$  mapping  $\mathcal{T} : I \rightarrow C^{r+1}(M, M)$ , such that  $T_0 := \mathcal{T}(0)(\cdot)$  is a  $C^{r+1}$ , transitive Anosov diffeomorphism.

We now let  $\Delta > 0$  and consider  $V := B_{C^s(I, C^{r+1}(M, M))}(\mathcal{T}, \Delta)$ . One has the following lemma:

**Lemma 14.** *There exists  $C > 0$ , depending only on  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\Delta$ , such that for any  $\mathcal{S} \in V$ , any  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,*

$$d_{C^{r+1}}(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{S}_0) \leq C|\varepsilon|. \quad (44)$$

*Proof.* From the discussion in Subsection 2.2, it follows that for any  $\mathcal{S} \in V$ ,

$$d_{C^{r+1}}(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{S}_0) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(i)} \|S_{ij}(\varepsilon, \cdot) - S_{ij}(0, \cdot)\|_{C^{r+1}}.$$

where we denoted  $S_{ij}(\varepsilon, \cdot) = \psi_j^{-1} \circ S_\varepsilon \circ \psi_i$  for  $j \in \mathcal{J}(i)$ . From the mean value theorem, one gets  $S_{ij}(\varepsilon, \cdot) - S_{ij}(0, \cdot) = \int_0^\varepsilon \partial_\varepsilon S_{ij}(\eta, \cdot) d\eta$ , and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{ij}(\varepsilon, \cdot) - S_{ij}(0, \cdot)\|_{C^{r+1}} &\leq \int_0^\varepsilon \|\partial_\varepsilon S_{ij}(\eta, \cdot)\|_{C^{r+1}} d\eta \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{T}, \Delta)|\varepsilon| \end{aligned}$$

from which the conclusion follows.  $\square$

We will consider the following triplet of Banach spaces:

$$\mathcal{B}_{ss} = \mathcal{B}^{3,1}(T_0, M) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_s = \mathcal{B}^{2,2}(T_0, M) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_w = \mathcal{B}^{1,3}(T_0, M). \quad (45)$$

We consider a measurable map  $\mathbf{T} : \Omega \rightarrow V$ , and we write  $T_{\omega,\varepsilon} = \mathbf{T}(\omega)(\varepsilon)(\cdot)$ . Finally, we let  $\psi$  be defined by  $\psi(h) = h(1)$ , which is a bounded functional on all three spaces in (45).

*Proof of Theorem 1.*

1. By Lemma 14 we have, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , that  $d_{C^{r+1}}(T_\omega, T_{\omega,\varepsilon}) \leq C|\varepsilon|$ , with  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\omega$ . Hence, [24, Lemma 7.1] implies that (9) and (27) hold.
2. Since  $T$  is transitive, the deterministic transfer operator associated to  $T$  has a spectral gap on all three spaces  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}, \mathcal{B}_s$  and  $\mathcal{B}_w$ .<sup>2</sup> Consequently, it follows from [15, Proposition 2.10] that by shrinking  $\delta$  is necessary, we have that (6), (25) and (36) hold.

<sup>2</sup>Observe that  $\mathcal{B}_w$  is compactly embedded into  $\mathcal{B}^{0,4}$ .

3. The uniform Lasota-Yorke inequalities (8), (10) and (26) may be established arguing as in [17, Section 3.2] or [24, Section 7].
4. By arguments analogous to those in [17, Subsection 3.1.], one has that the cocycle  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is strongly measurable on  $\mathcal{B}_s$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$ .

The previous argument are enough to apply Proposition 7 and Theorem 8 to our situation, giving us an equivariant family  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} \subset \mathcal{B}_{ss}$ , that satisfies our statistical stability estimate (20) with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{2,2}$ . We note that (see [17, Proposition 3.3.]) that for  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$  is actually a positive probability measure on  $M$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

What is now left to do is to establish the existence and required properties of the “derivative operator”. Following the lines of [24, Section 9], we will systematically abuse notations and ignore coordinates charts.

Denote by  $g_\omega(\varepsilon, \cdot) := \frac{1}{|\det(DT_{\omega,\varepsilon})|}$  the weight of the transfer operator  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$ . Under our assumptions, when viewed in coordinates, the maps  $\varepsilon \mapsto g_\omega(\varepsilon, \cdot) \in C^r(M, \mathbb{R}^*)$  and  $\varepsilon \mapsto T_{\omega,\varepsilon}(\cdot)^{-1}$  are of class  $C^s$ ,  $s > 1$ . In particular, we may, for  $\phi \in C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$ , differentiate  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi$  w.r.t  $\varepsilon$  and obtain:

$$\partial_\varepsilon[\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi] = \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}(J_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi + v_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi) \quad (46)$$

$$\partial_\varepsilon^2[\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi] = \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}(J_{\omega,\varepsilon}^2\phi + J_{\omega,\varepsilon}(v_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi) + v_{\omega,\varepsilon}(J_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi) + v_{\omega,\varepsilon}(v_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi) + [\partial_\varepsilon J_{\omega,\varepsilon}] \cdot \phi + \partial_\varepsilon[v_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi]), \quad (47)$$

where

$$v_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi := -D\phi(\cdot) \cdot [DT_{\omega,\varepsilon}(\cdot)]^{-1} \cdot \partial_\varepsilon T_{\omega,\varepsilon}(\varepsilon, \cdot) \quad (48)$$

$$J_{\omega,\varepsilon} := \frac{\partial_\varepsilon g_\omega(\varepsilon, \cdot) + v_{\omega,\varepsilon}g_\omega(\varepsilon, \cdot)}{g_\omega(\varepsilon, \cdot)}. \quad (49)$$

Note that both of the above expressions are, together with their first  $s$ -derivatives w.r.t.  $\varepsilon$ , in  $C^{r-1}(M, \mathbb{R})$ . We will also denote by  $v_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  the  $C^r$  vector field associated with the operator  $v_{\omega,\varepsilon}$ . As noted in Section 2.1, multiplication by  $J_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  and the action of  $v_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  induce bounded operator from  $\mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  to itself (resp.  $\mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  to  $\mathcal{B}^{i-1,j+1}$ ), where  $i+j < r$ , and the same goes for their derivatives w.r.t.  $\varepsilon$ .

Furthermore, by our Assumption 1,  $J_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  and  $v_{\omega,\varepsilon}$ , as well as their derivatives w.r.t.  $\varepsilon$ , are bounded uniformly in  $\omega$  and  $\varepsilon$ , i.e

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left( \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\varepsilon \in I} \|J_{\omega,\varepsilon}\|_{C^{r-1}}, \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\varepsilon \in I} \|\partial_\varepsilon J_{\omega,\varepsilon}\|_{C^{r-1}} \right) &< \infty \\ \max \left( \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\varepsilon \in I} \|v_{\omega,\varepsilon}\|_{C^r}, \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\varepsilon \in I} \|\partial_\varepsilon v_{\omega,\varepsilon}\|_{C^r} \right) &< \infty \end{aligned}$$

For  $\phi \in C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$ , set

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega \phi := \partial_\varepsilon[\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \mathcal{L}_\omega(J_{\omega,0}\phi + v_{\omega,0}\phi). \quad (50)$$

By our previous discussion, we conclude that (34) holds.

On the other hand, using Taylor’s formula we conclude that for  $|\varepsilon|$  small enough,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi - \mathcal{L}_\omega\phi - \varepsilon \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega\phi = \int_0^\varepsilon \int_0^\eta \partial_\varepsilon^2[\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi] \Big|_{\varepsilon=\xi} d\xi d\eta.$$

By (48) and the discussion below,

$$\|\partial_\varepsilon^2[\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}\phi] \Big|_{\varepsilon=\xi}\|_w \leq C\|\phi\|_{ss},$$

where  $C > 0$  independent of both  $\omega$  and  $\varepsilon$ . Hence (35) is satisfied, and we may apply Theorem 12, which gives us that the map  $\varepsilon \in I \mapsto h_\omega^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_w)$  is differentiable at  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Moreover,

$$\hat{h}_\omega := [\partial_\varepsilon h_\omega^\varepsilon] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{(n)} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} h_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega}. \quad (51)$$

To obtain (3), we notice that, by density of smooth functions in  $\mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  and (35),  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega$ , as a bounded operator from  $\mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  to  $\mathcal{B}^{i-1,j+1}$ , admits the representation<sup>3</sup>

$$(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega f)(\phi) := f(\partial_\varepsilon[\phi \circ T_{\omega,\varepsilon}]|_{\varepsilon=0}),$$

for any  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{i,j}$  and  $\phi \in C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$ . Then, for  $\phi \in C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\varepsilon \left[ \int_M \phi dh_\omega^\varepsilon \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \partial_\varepsilon [h_\omega^\varepsilon(\phi)]|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= \hat{h}_\omega(\phi) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{(n)} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} h_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega}(\phi) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} h_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega}(\phi \circ T_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{(n)}) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} \left( \partial_\varepsilon \left[ \phi \circ T_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{(n)} \circ T_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega,\varepsilon} \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which gives (3). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

## 5. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we will present two applications of our main result. Let us assume that the assumptions in Hypothesis 1 hold. We consider the triplet of spaces given by (45). Furthermore, for  $\varepsilon \in I$  sufficiently close to 0, let  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} \subset \mathcal{B}_{ss}$  be as in Section 4. By shrinking  $I$  if necessary, we can assume that  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$  exists for  $\varepsilon \in I$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Moreover, recall that  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$  is a probability measure on  $M$  for  $\omega \in \Omega$  (see Section 4). As before, we write  $h_\omega$  instead of  $h_\omega^0$ .

**5.1. Annealed linear response for hyperbolic dynamics.** As a first application, we establish a form of an annealed linear response.

For  $F \in L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))$  and  $\varepsilon \in I$ , we set

$$R(\varepsilon, F) = \int_\Omega \int_M F(\omega, x) dh_\omega^\varepsilon(x) d\mathbb{P}(\omega). \quad (52)$$

The following is our annealed linear response result.

**Theorem 15.** *The map  $R : I \times L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is differentiable at every  $(0, F)$ ,  $F \in L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))$ . Furthermore, one has*

$$\partial_\varepsilon [R(\varepsilon, F)]|_{\varepsilon=0} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_\Omega \int_M \partial_\varepsilon \left[ F_\omega \circ T_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^{(n)} \circ T_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega,\varepsilon} \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} dh_{\sigma^{-n-1}\omega} d\mathbb{P}(\omega). \quad (53)$$

**Remark 16.** *The previous result can be interpreted as linear response for the stationary measure of the skew-product*

$$S_\varepsilon(\omega, x) := (\sigma\omega, T_{\omega,\varepsilon}x),$$

*acting on  $\Omega \times M$ . Indeed, the stationary measure  $\mu_\varepsilon$  of this skew-product classically admits the disintegration along fibers*

$$\mu_\varepsilon(A \times B) = \int_A h_\omega^\varepsilon(B) d\mathbb{P}(\omega),$$

*for measurable  $A \subset \Omega$ ,  $B \subset M$ . In particular, this justifies the “annealed” terminology, since in the i.i.d case, the measure defined on  $M$  by  $\tilde{\mu}_\varepsilon(\cdot) = \mu_\varepsilon(\Omega \times \cdot)$  corresponds to the invariant measure of the Markov chain associated with our cocycle.*

*We also point out that one may use this interpretation to establish linear response for a class of deterministic partially hyperbolic skew-products: let us set  $\Omega = \mathbb{S}^1$ ,  $\mathbb{P} = \text{Lebesgue}$ , and*

<sup>3</sup>In fact, this formula defines a bounded operator from  $\mathcal{D}'_j$  to  $\mathcal{D}'_{j+1}$ , but we won't need it.

$\sigma(\omega) = \omega + \alpha \pmod{1}$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ . Then, consider a family  $(T_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^1, \varepsilon \in I}$  of Anosov diffeomorphisms of  $\mathbb{T}^2$ , e.g.

$$T_{\omega,\varepsilon}(x_1, x_2) := \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \omega \\ \omega \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\pi x_1 \\ \sin 2\pi x_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

This system clearly satisfies our Hypothesis 1 (notice that it belongs to the class of Examples 4), and the skew-product  $S_\varepsilon$  acting on  $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{T}^2 \simeq \mathbb{T}^3$  is clearly a partially hyperbolic system (with central direction tangent to the first coordinate), exhibiting linear response by Theorem 15 and the previous discussion.

*Proof of Theorem 15.* Fix an arbitrary  $F_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))$ . We claim that the derivative of  $R$  in  $(0, F_0)$  is given by

$$DR(0, F_0)(\varepsilon, H) = \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \hat{h}_\omega(F_0(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) + \int_{\Omega} h_\omega(H(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega), \quad (54)$$

for  $(\varepsilon, H) \in \mathbb{R} \times L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))$ , where  $\hat{h}_\omega$  is given by (51). Indeed, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} R(\varepsilon, F_0 + H) - R(0, F_0) - \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \hat{h}_\omega(F_0(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) - \int_{\Omega} h_\omega(H(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ = \int_{\Omega} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega - \varepsilon \hat{h}_\omega)(F_0(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) + \int_{\Omega} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega)(H(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the continuous embedding  $\mathcal{B}^{p,q} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}'_q$  entails that there is  $C > 0$  (independent on both  $\omega$  and  $\varepsilon$ ) such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega - \varepsilon \hat{h}_\omega)(F_0(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right| \leq C \|F_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))} \cdot \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \left\| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega) - \hat{h}_\omega \right\|_w,$$

and thus Theorem 12 implies that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega - \varepsilon \hat{h}_\omega)(F_0(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = 0.$$

In addition,

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega)(H(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right| \leq C \|H\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))} \cdot \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega\|_w,$$

and consequently by applying Theorem 8 (for the pair  $(\mathcal{B}_s, \mathcal{B}_w)$ ), we obtain that

$$\lim_{(\varepsilon, H) \rightarrow (0,0)} \frac{1}{\|H\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, C^0(M))}} \left| \int_{\Omega} (h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega)(H(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right| = 0.$$

Thus, (54) holds and the proof of the theorem is completed. In order to establish (53), one can argue as in the proof of formula (3).  $\square$

**5.2. Regularity of the variance in the central limit theorem for random hyperbolic dynamics.** In this section, we provide an application of Theorem 12 to the problem of the regularity of the variance (under suitable perturbations) in the quenched version of the central limit theorem for random hyperbolic dynamics.

Let  $F$  be as in the previous subsection. For  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon \in I$ , set

$$f_{\omega,\varepsilon} := F_\omega - h_\omega^\varepsilon(F_\omega) = F_\omega - \int_M F_\omega dh_\omega^\varepsilon.$$

Set

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon^2 := \int_{\Omega} \int_M f_{\omega,\varepsilon}^2(x) dh_\omega^\varepsilon(x) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} \int_M f_{\omega,\varepsilon}(x) f_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon}(T_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n x) dh_\omega^\varepsilon(x) d\mathbb{P}(\omega). \quad (55)$$

Observe that  $\Sigma_\varepsilon^2 \geq 0$  and that  $\Sigma_\varepsilon^2$  doesn't depend on  $\omega$ . It is proved in [17, Theorem B] that if  $\Sigma_\varepsilon^2 > 0$ , the process  $(f_{\omega,\varepsilon} \circ T_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n)$  satisfies  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s a quenched central limit theorem. More precisely, for every bounded and continuous  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \phi \left( \frac{S_n(f_{\omega,\varepsilon})}{\sqrt{n}} \right) dh_\omega^\varepsilon = \int \phi d\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\varepsilon^2),$$

where

$$S_n(f_{\omega,\varepsilon}) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f_{\sigma^k \omega, \varepsilon} \circ T_{\omega, \varepsilon}^k,$$

and  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\varepsilon^2)$  denotes the normal distribution with parameters 0 and  $\Sigma_\varepsilon$ . Our goal is to establish the following result.

**Theorem 17.** *Under the above assumptions, the map  $\varepsilon \mapsto \Sigma_\varepsilon^2$  is differentiable at  $\varepsilon = 0$ .*

We start the proof by making few remarks related to the map  $\varepsilon \mapsto (f_{\omega,\varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega} \in C^r(M)$ :

- For each  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\omega \mapsto f_{\omega,\varepsilon}$  is an element of  $L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))$ . Moreover, by Lemma 9 we have that

$$\sup_{|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f_{\omega,\varepsilon}\|_{C^r} \leq (1 + \sup_{|\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon_0} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_{ss}) \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|F_\omega\|_{C^r}. \quad (56)$$

- it is differentiable at  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Indeed, we have

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} (f_{\omega,\varepsilon} - f_\omega) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (h_\omega - h_\omega^\varepsilon)(F_\omega),$$

which yields

$$\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (f_{\omega,\varepsilon} - f_\omega) + \hat{h}_\omega(F_\omega) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (57)$$

as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , via Theorem 12. Here, we write  $f_\omega$  instead of  $f_{\omega,0}$ .

The above observations together with Theorem 12 easily imply the following lemma.

**Lemma 18.** *The map*

$$\varepsilon \mapsto \int_\Omega \int_M f_{\omega,\varepsilon}^2(x) dh_\omega^\varepsilon(x) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$$

*is differentiable at  $\varepsilon = 0$ .*

*Proof.* For  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently close to 0, let  $H(\varepsilon) \in L^\infty(\Omega, C^r(M))$  be defined by

$$H(\varepsilon)(\omega) = f_{\omega,\varepsilon}^2, \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

Then, the discussion preceding the statement of the lemma implies that the map  $H$  is differentiable at  $\varepsilon = 0$ . Now the conclusion of the lemma follows from Theorem 15 and the simple observation that

$$\int_\Omega \int_M f_{\omega,\varepsilon}^2(x) dh_\omega^\varepsilon(x) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = R(\varepsilon, H(\varepsilon)).$$

with  $R$  given by (52). □

We recall that (see Subsection 2.1) that for  $h \in \mathcal{B}^{p,q}$  and  $f \in C^q(M)$  we can define  $f \cdot h \in \mathcal{B}^{p,q}$  whose action as a distribution is given by

$$(f \cdot h)(\phi) = h(f\phi), \quad \text{for } \phi \in C^q(M).$$

Moreover, there exists  $C > 0$  (depending only on  $M$ ) such that

$$\|f \cdot h\|_{p,q} \leq C \|h\|_{p,q} \cdot \|f\|_{C^q}.$$

The above inequality will be frequently used in what follows and thus we will not explicitly refer to it. Moreover, in what follows,  $C > 0$  will denote a constant which is independent on all parameters ( $\omega$ ,  $n$  etc.) involved.

Observe that

$$(f_{\omega,\varepsilon} \cdot h_\omega^\varepsilon)(f_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon} \circ T_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n) = \mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n(f_{\omega, \varepsilon} \cdot h_\omega^\varepsilon)(f_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon}).$$

In addition,  $(f_{\omega,\varepsilon} \cdot h_{\omega}^{\varepsilon})(1) = h_{\omega}^{\varepsilon}(f_{\omega,\varepsilon}) = 0$ . We now write

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n(f_{\omega,\varepsilon} \cdot h_{\omega}^{\varepsilon})(f_{\sigma^n \omega,\varepsilon}) - \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})(f_{\sigma^n \omega})) = (I)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} + (II)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} + (III)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon}, \quad (58)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (I)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} &:= \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (f_{\sigma^n \omega,\varepsilon} - f_{\sigma^n \omega}) \right), \\ (II)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} &:= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n) (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})(f_{\sigma^n \omega,\varepsilon}), \\ (III)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} &:= \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n \left( \frac{f_{\omega,\varepsilon} \cdot h_{\omega}^{\varepsilon} - f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}}{\varepsilon} \right) (f_{\sigma^n \omega,\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 19.** For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| (I)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} - \hat{h}_{\sigma^n \omega}(F_{\sigma^n \omega}) \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})(1) \right| = 0.$$

In addition, for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently close to 0, we have that

$$\operatorname{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} |(I)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon}| \leq C e^{-\lambda n}.$$

*Proof.* The first assertion follows directly from (25), (56) and (57). In addition, observe that for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently close to 0,

$$\operatorname{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| (I)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} - \hat{h}_{\sigma^n \omega}(F_{\sigma^n \omega}) \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})(1) \right| \leq C e^{-\lambda n}.$$

On the other hand, (25), (38) and (57) imply that

$$\operatorname{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| \hat{h}_{\sigma^n \omega}(F_{\sigma^n \omega}) \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})(1) \right| \leq C e^{-\lambda n}.$$

The above two estimates readily give the second assertion of the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 20.** For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| (II)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n,\omega}(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})(f_{\sigma^n \omega}) \right| = 0, \quad (59)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n,\omega} = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega} \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1}.$$

Furthermore, for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently close to 0, we have that

$$\operatorname{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} |(II)_{n,\omega,\varepsilon}| \leq C n e^{-\lambda' n}.$$

*Proof.* In order to prove (59), we first claim that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n) (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n,\omega}(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \right\|_w \leq \tilde{\alpha}(\varepsilon), \quad (60)$$

with  $\tilde{\alpha}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Observe that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega,\varepsilon}^{n-k} \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1},$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n,\omega} &= \sum_{k=1}^n \left[ \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega,\varepsilon}^{n-k} \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega} \right] \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \left[ \left( \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega,\varepsilon}^{n-k} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \right) \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega} \right) \right] \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By the arguments in the proof of Proposition 6, (25), (27) and (56), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left( \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega, \varepsilon}^{n-k} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \right) \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \right\|_w \\
& \leq C|\varepsilon|(n-k) \left\| \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \right\|_s \\
& \leq C|\varepsilon|(n-k)e^{-\lambda(k-1)} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}\|_{ss} \\
& \leq C|\varepsilon|(n-k)e^{-\lambda k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Similarly, using (25), (31), (35), (36) and (56), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega} \right) \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \right\|_w \\
& \leq Ce^{-\lambda'(n-k)} \left\| \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega} \right) \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \right\|_w \\
& \leq Ce^{-\lambda'(n-k)} \alpha(\varepsilon) \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})\|_{ss} \\
& \leq Ce^{-\lambda' n} \alpha(\varepsilon) \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}\|_{ss} \\
& \leq C\alpha(\varepsilon)e^{-\lambda' n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Then, (61) and (62) imply (60).

Furthermore, (6), (25), (31), (34) and (56) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\omega, n}(f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})\|_w & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega} \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})\|_s \\
& \leq C \sum_{k=1}^n e^{-\lambda(n-k)} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} (\|\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}\|_{B_{ss} \rightarrow B_s} \cdot \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega})\|_{ss}) \\
& \leq C \sum_{k=1}^n e^{-\lambda(n-k)} e^{-\lambda(k-1)} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}\|_{ss} \\
& \leq Cne^{-\lambda n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Using Theorem 8, (56), (60) and (63), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| (II)_{n, \omega, \varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n, \omega} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) (f_{\sigma^n \omega}) \right| \\
& \leq \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n) (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) (f_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon}) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n, \omega} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) (f_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon}) \right| \\
& \quad + \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n, \omega} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) (f_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon} - f_{\sigma^n \omega}) \right| \\
& \leq \tilde{\alpha}(\varepsilon) \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f_{\sigma^n \omega, \varepsilon}\|_{C^r} + Cne^{-\lambda n} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} |(h_{\omega}^{\varepsilon} - h_{\omega})(F_{\omega})| \\
& \leq C\tilde{\alpha}(\varepsilon) + Cne^{-\lambda n} |\varepsilon| |\log(|\varepsilon|)|,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the first assertion of the lemma.

On the other hand, using (36) (which also persists under small perturbations), (31), (34) and (56), we have that for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small,

$$\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left\| \left( \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega, \varepsilon}^{n-k} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \right) \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \right\|_w \leq Ce^{-\lambda' n}. \tag{64}$$

Moreover, from (62) it follows that for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small,

$$\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^k \omega}^{n-k} \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega}}{\varepsilon} - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\sigma^{k-1} \omega} \right) \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{k-1} (f_{\omega} \cdot h_{\omega}) \right\|_w \leq Ce^{-\lambda' n}. \tag{65}$$

By (64) and (65), we have that for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon$ ,

$$\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left\| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}^n - \mathcal{L}_\omega^n) (f_\omega \cdot h_\omega) - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n, \omega} (f_\omega \cdot h_\omega) \right\|_w \leq C n e^{-\lambda' n}.$$

The above estimate together with (63) easily implies that the second assertion of the lemma also holds.  $\square$

By using similar arguments, one can establish the following lemma.

**Lemma 21.** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \left| (III)_{n, \omega, \varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_\omega^n (\hat{h}_\omega(F_\omega) h_\omega + f_\omega \cdot \hat{h}_\omega) (f_{\sigma^n \omega}) \right| = 0.$$

Moreover, for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small, we have that

$$\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} |(III)_{n, \omega, \varepsilon}| \leq C e^{-\lambda' n}.$$

The conclusion of Theorem 17 follows from previous lemmas and the dominated convergence theorem.

**Remark 22.** In [18] the authors have extended the results from [17] to the case of vector-valued observables. In particular, the quenched version of the central limit theorem for vector-valued observables was established. In this setting, the variance is a symmetric matrix which is in general positive semi-definite (for the central limit theorem to hold it needs to be positive-definite). One can easily establish the version of Theorem 17 in this setting, essentially by repeating the arguments in the proof of Theorem 17 for each matrix component.

## 6. APPLICATION TO OTHER TYPE OF RANDOM SYSTEMS.

In this paper, we focused our efforts on studying (quenched) statistical stability and linear response for random compositions of Anosov diffeomorphisms. Nevertheless, our approach, or a slight modification thereof, is applicable to other types of random hyperbolic systems.

**6.1. Random uniformly expanding dynamics.** In this subsection, let us describe the application of Theorems 8 and 12 to a simple class of fiberwise perturbations of random compositions of uniformly expanding maps of the unit circle  $\mathbb{S}^1$ . The setting is close to [25, §6]: consider a family  $(D_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in I}$  of diffeomorphisms of  $\mathbb{S}^1$  (where  $0 \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is an interval), satisfying

$$D_\varepsilon = \text{Id} + \varepsilon S,$$

where  $S : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^4$  map. Letting  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space, endowed with an invertible, measure-preserving and ergodic map  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ . We consider a measurable map  $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto T_\omega \in C^4(\mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{S}^1)$  such that:

1. there exists  $\lambda > 1$  such that for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |T'_\omega(x)| \geq \lambda$ ;
2.  $\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|T_\omega\|_{C^4} \leq \Delta$  for some small  $\Delta > 0$ .

We then set

$$T_{\omega, \varepsilon} := D_\varepsilon \circ T_\omega \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \in I \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega,$$

and we review the assumptions of Theorems 8 and 12 for the spaces  $\mathcal{B}_{ss} = W^{3,1}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_s = W^{2,1}(\mathbb{S}^1)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_w = W^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ :

- (8) and (10) are established in [13, §5].
- (9) follows from [25, Prop. 35]
- By applying [15, Prop. 2.10] (provided that  $\Delta$  is sufficiently small), we conclude that (6) holds on  $(\mathcal{B}_{ss}, \mathcal{B}_s, \mathcal{B}_w)$ .
- To define the derivative operator  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega$ , we start by remarking that since  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon} = \mathcal{L}_{D_\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_\omega$ , one has (see [25, Eq. (51)]) that

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega = \left[ \frac{d\mathcal{L}_{D_\varepsilon}}{d\varepsilon} \right]_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{L}_\omega = -(\mathcal{L}_\omega(\cdot)S)'. \quad 20$$

It is easy to see that  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega$  defines a bounded operator from  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$  to  $\mathcal{B}_s$  (resp. from  $\mathcal{B}_s$  to  $\mathcal{B}_w$ ) and satisfies (34).

As for condition (35), we have for  $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_s$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \varepsilon^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} - \mathcal{L}_\omega)\phi - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\omega\phi \right\|_w &\leq \left\| \varepsilon^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{D_\varepsilon} - \text{Id}) + (\cdot S)' \right\|_{\mathcal{B}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_w} \text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\mathcal{L}_\omega\phi\|_s \\ &\leq C\alpha(\varepsilon)\|\phi\|_s \end{aligned}$$

by using (8), with  $\alpha(\varepsilon) = \left\| \varepsilon^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{D_\varepsilon} - \text{Id}) + (\cdot S)' \right\|_{\mathcal{B}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_w}$ , which goes to 0 as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  by [25, Prop. 36].

**6.2. Random piecewise hyperbolic dynamics.** Let us discuss the application of Theorem 8 to random compositions of close-by piecewise hyperbolic maps, defined on a two-dimensional compact Riemann manifold  $X$ , as described in [17, §10] and [16, §2]. It is noteworthy that one *cannot* directly apply Theorem 8, since, as noted in [17, §10.2.1], the transfer operator map  $\omega \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\omega$  is not strongly measurable. Still, the conclusion of Theorem 8 hold; let us explain why. In [16, §2.4], the set  $\Gamma_A$  of maps  $T$  satisfying the assumptions of [16, §2], with second derivative  $|D^2T| < A$  is introduced, as well as the distance  $\gamma$  between two such maps.

Let us fix a (small enough)  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , a  $T \in \Gamma_A$  and let  $X_{\varepsilon_0} := \{S \in \Gamma_A : \gamma(T, S) < \varepsilon_0\}$ . We let  $\mathcal{B}_s$  and  $\mathcal{B}_w$  be the Banach spaces defined in [16, §2.2] (where  $\mathcal{B}_s$  is denoted  $\mathcal{B}$ ). In particular, we recall that elements of  $\mathcal{B}_s$  are distributions of order at most 1. Letting  $I := [-\varepsilon_0/2, \varepsilon_0/2]$ , we set, for a fixed  $L > 0$ :

$$B_{\varepsilon_0, L} := \{\mathcal{T} : I \rightarrow X_{\varepsilon_0}, \gamma(\mathcal{T}(\varepsilon), \mathcal{T}(\varepsilon')) \leq L|\varepsilon - \varepsilon'|, \forall \varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in I\}.$$

This can be viewed as a ball of Lipschitz (with respect to the distance  $\gamma$ ) curves from  $I$  to  $X_{\varepsilon_0}$ . We now consider a measurable, countably-valued mapping  $\mathbf{T} : \Omega \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0, L}$ . As before,  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is a probability space endowed with an invertible, measure-preserving and ergodic map  $\sigma$  and we will denote  $T_{\omega, \varepsilon} := \mathbf{T}(\omega)(\varepsilon, \cdot)$ .

We claim that for any  $\varepsilon \in I$ , there exists a measurable family  $(h_\omega^\varepsilon)_{\omega \in \Omega} \subset \mathcal{B}_s$  such that  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon} h_\omega^\varepsilon = h_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  and

$$\text{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon - h_\omega\|_w \leq C\varepsilon^\beta |\log(|\varepsilon|)|,$$

for some  $C > 0$ ,  $0 < \beta < 1$  independent on  $\omega$  and  $\varepsilon$ , with  $h_\omega := h_\omega^0$ .

Let us review the assumptions for Theorem 8 in this context:

- (6) holds by [17, Eq (70)], where  $\psi \in \mathcal{B}'_s$  is given by  $\psi(h) = h(1)$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{B}_s$ .
- Up to shrinking  $\varepsilon_0$ , we have (8) and (10) by [17, Eq (71)].
- Up to replacing  $\varepsilon$  by  $\varepsilon^\beta$ , (9) follows from the definition of  $B_{\varepsilon_0, L}$  and [16, Lemma 6.1].
- As usual, (11) holds as  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon}$  is a transfer operator associated to  $T_{\omega, \varepsilon}$ .

In particular, Proposition 6 (uniform in  $\varepsilon$  and  $\omega$  exponential decay of correlations) holds in the present setting. We cannot use here the fixed-point construction of Proposition 7, since we do not know whether the cocycle of transfer operators  $(\mathcal{L}_{\omega, \varepsilon})_{\omega \in \Omega}$  is strongly measurable. However, we can use (8), (10) and that, for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,  $T_{\omega, \varepsilon}$  is countably-valued to apply the version of the MET for the so-called  $\mathbb{P}$ -continuous cocycles (see [22, Theorem 17]): this gives us, as in Remark 13, that for each  $\varepsilon \in I$  there exists:

- $1 \leq l = l(\varepsilon) \leq \infty$  and a sequence of *exceptional Lyapunov exponents*

$$0 = \Lambda(\varepsilon) = \lambda_1(\varepsilon) > \lambda_2(\varepsilon) > \dots > \lambda_l(\varepsilon) > \kappa(\varepsilon)$$

or in the case  $l = \infty$ ,

$$0 = \Lambda(\varepsilon) = \lambda_1(\varepsilon) > \lambda_2(\varepsilon) > \dots \quad \text{with} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n(\varepsilon) = \kappa(\varepsilon);$$

- a full-measure set  $\Omega_\varepsilon$  such that for each  $\omega \in \Omega_\varepsilon$ , there is a unique measurable Oseledets splitting

$$\mathcal{B}_s = \left( \bigoplus_{j=1}^l Y_j^\varepsilon(\omega) \right) \oplus V^\varepsilon(\omega),$$

where each component of the splitting is equivariant under  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}$ , that is,  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}(Y_j^\varepsilon(\omega)) = Y_j^\varepsilon(\sigma\omega)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}(V^\varepsilon(\omega)) \subset V^\varepsilon(\sigma\omega)$ . The subspaces  $Y_j^\varepsilon(\omega)$  are finite-dimensional and for each  $y \in Y_j^\varepsilon(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n y\|_s = \lambda_j(\varepsilon).$$

Moreover, for  $y \in V(\omega)$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon}^n y\|_s \leq \kappa(\varepsilon)$ .

It follows easily from Proposition 6 (see the proof of [17, Proposition 3.6.]) that  $Y_1^\varepsilon(\omega)$  is one-dimensional: for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ , we may thus consider a generator  $h_\omega^\varepsilon$ , normalized by  $\psi(h_\omega^\varepsilon) = 1$ , which satisfies  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\varepsilon} h_\omega^\varepsilon = h_{\sigma\omega}^\varepsilon$ . We now claim that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in I} \operatorname{esssup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_s < +\infty. \quad (66)$$

In order to establish (66), we start by observing that using (12) we have that

$$\|h_\omega^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega,\varepsilon}^n 1\|_s = \|\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega,\varepsilon}^n (h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - 1)\|_s \leq D' e^{-\lambda'_n} \|h_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}^\varepsilon - 1\|_s, \quad (67)$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon \in I$ . Furthermore, since  $\lambda_1(\varepsilon) = 0$ , we have that the random variable  $\omega \mapsto \|h_\omega^\varepsilon\|_s$  is tempered<sup>4</sup> for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ . Hence, by [1, Proposition 4.3.3] for each  $\varepsilon \in I$ , there exists a random variable  $K_\varepsilon: \Omega \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  such that

$$\|h_\omega^\varepsilon - 1\|_s \leq K_\varepsilon(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad K_\varepsilon(\sigma^n \omega) \leq e^{\frac{\lambda'_n}{2}} K_\varepsilon(\omega), \quad (68)$$

for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . By (67) and (68), we obtain that

$$\|h_\omega^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega,\varepsilon}^n 1\|_s \leq D' K_\varepsilon(\omega) e^{-\frac{\lambda'_n}{2}} \quad \text{for } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies that for  $\varepsilon \in I$ ,

$$h_\omega^\varepsilon = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^{-n}\omega,\varepsilon}^n 1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}_s, \text{ for } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega. \quad (69)$$

Clearly, (66) follows readily from (8) and (69). From there, we can reproduce the proof of Theorem 8, to get the announced result.

**Remark 23.** *It is natural to ask whether Theorem 12 can be applied in the piecewise hyperbolic setting described above. First, we note that there is no natural candidate for a  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$  space. Indeed, as noticed in the introduction of [16] (and in contrast with the situation in [24]), considering a (piecewise)  $C^r$  or a (piecewise)  $C^s$ ,  $r > s > 2$  system yields the same couple  $(\mathcal{B}_w \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_s)$  of Banach spaces. In other words, the degree of the smoothness of maps doesn't influence the construction of the anisotropic spaces, which makes unclear whether this line of reasoning can produce a space  $\mathcal{B}_{ss}$  satisfying our requirements. In fact, to the best of our knowledge there are currently no results dealing with the linear response for classes of piecewise hyperbolic dynamics described above even in the deterministic setting (i.e. when we take  $\Omega$  to be a singleton).*

*Secondly, the case of deterministic, one-dimensional piecewise expanding maps [5, 9] suggests that, in general, linear response does not hold in a piecewise smooth setting.*

*Finally, we notice that for random compositions of billiard maps such as described, e.g. in [19] do not fall under the setup of Theorem 8, as they do not satisfy Lasota-Yorke inequalities of the type (8) and (10) (the  $\|\cdot\|_w$  carries a factor  $\eta^n$  for some  $\eta \geq 1$ ).*

## 7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the anonymous referee for his/hers constructive comments.

D.D. was supported in part by Croatian Science Foundation under the project IP-2019-04-1239 and by the University of Rijeka under the projects uniri-prirod-18-9 and uniri-pr-prirod-19-16.

J.S. was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 787304).

---

<sup>4</sup>We recall that a random variable  $K: \Omega \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  is tempered if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log K(\sigma^n \omega) = 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

## REFERENCES

1. L. Arnold, *Random dynamical systems*, Springer Monogr. Math., Springer, Berlin, 1998.
2. W. Bahsoun and B. Saussol, *Linear response in the intermittent family: differentiation in a weighted  $C^0$ -norm*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **36** (2016), 6657–6668.
3. W. Bahsoun, M. Ruziboev and B. Saussol, *Linear response for random dynamical systems*, Adv. Math. **364** (2020), 107011, 44pp.
4. V. Baladi, *Correlation spectrum of quenched and annealed equilibrium states for random expanding maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **186** (1997), 671–700.
5. V. Baladi, *On the susceptibility function of piecewise expanding interval maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **275** (2007), 839–859.
6. V. Baladi, *Linear response, or else*, ICM Seoul. In: Proceedings, Volume III, 525–545 (2014).
7. V. Baladi, *Dynamical zeta functions and dynamical determinants for hyperbolic maps. A functional approach*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], 68. Springer, Cham, 2018. xv+291.
8. V. Baladi, A. Kondah and B. Schmitt *Random correlations for small perturbations of expanding maps*, Random and Computational Dynamics **4** (1996), 179–204.
9. V. Baladi and D. Smania, *Linear response formula for piecewise expanding unimodal maps*, Nonlinearity **21**, 677–711 (2008) (Corrigendum: Nonlinearity **25**, 2203–2205 (2012)).
10. V. Baladi and D. Smania, *Linear response for smooth deformations of generic nonuniformly hyperbolic unimodal maps*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. **45** (2012), 861–926.
11. V. Baladi and M. Todd, *Linear response for intermittent maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **347** (2016), 857–874.
12. T. Bogenschütz, *Stochastic stability of invariant subspaces*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **20** (2000), 663–680.
13. H. Crimmins, *Stability of hyperbolic Oseledets splittings for quasi-compact operator cocycles*, arXiv e-prints (2019), arXiv:1912.03008.
14. H. Crimmins and Y. Nakano, *A spectral approach to quenched linear and higher-order response for partially hyperbolic dynamics*, arXiv e-prints (2021), arXiv:2105.11188.
15. J.P. Conze and A. Raugi, *Limit theorems for sequential expanding dynamical systems on  $[0, 1]$* , Ergodic theory and related fields, Contemp. Math. **430** (2007), 89–121.
16. M. Demers and C. Liverani, *Stability of statistical properties in two-dimensional piecewise hyperbolic maps*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008), 4777–4814.
17. D. Dragičević, G. Froyland, C. Gonzalez-Tokman and S. Vaienti, *A spectral approach for quenched limit theorems for random hyperbolic dynamical systems*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **373** (2020), 629–664.
18. D. Dragičević and Y. Hafouta, *Limit Theorems for Random Expanding or Anosov Dynamical Systems and Vector-Valued Observables*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **21** (2020), 3869–3917.
19. M. Demers, H.K. Zhang, *A Functional Analytic Approach to Perturbations of the Lorentz Gas*, Commun. Math. Phys. **324**, 767–830 (2013).
20. D. Dolgopyat, *On differentiability of SRB states for partially hyperbolic systems*, Invent. Math. **155** (2004), 389–449.
21. G. Froyland, C. Gonzalez-Tokman and A. Quas, *Stability and approximation of random invariant densities for Lasota-Yorke map cocycles*, Nonlinearity **27** (2014), 647–660.
22. G. Froyland, S. Lloyd, and A. Quas, *A semi-invertible Oseledets theorem with applications to transfer operator cocycles*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, Series A, **33(9)** (2013), 3835–3860.
23. S. Galatolo and P. Giulietti, *A linear response for dynamical systems with additive noise*, Nonlinearity **32** (2019), 2269–2301.
24. S. Gouëzel and C. Liverani, *Banach spaces adapted to Anosov systems*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **26** (2006), 123–151.
25. S. Galatolo and J. Sedro, *Quadratic response of random and deterministic dynamical systems*, Chaos **30** (2020), 023113, 15 pp.
26. C. Gonzalez-Tokman and A. Quas, *A semi-invertible operator Oseledets theorem*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **34** (2014), 1230–1272.
27. A. Korepanov, *Linear response for intermittent maps with summable and nonsummable decay of correlations*, Nonlinearity **29** (2016), 1735–1754.
28. D. Ruelle, *Differentiation of SRB states*, Comm. Math. Phys. **187** (1997), 227–241.
29. J. Sedro and H.H. Rugh, *Regularity of characteristic exponents and linear response for transfer operator cocycles*, Comm. Math. Phys. **383**, 1243–1289 (2021).
30. J. Sedro, *A regularity result for fixed points, with applications to linear response*, Nonlinearity **31** (2018), 1417–1440.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA, CROATIA

*Email address:* **ddragicevic@math.uniri.hr**

LABORATOIRE DE PROBABILITÉS, STATISTIQUE ET MODÉLISATION (LPSM), SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ, UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS, 4 PLACE JUSSIEU, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE

*Email address:* **sedro@lpsm.paris**