

A regularity method for lower bounds on the Lyapunov exponent for stochastic differential equations

Jacob Bedrossian*

Alex Blumenthal†

Sam Punshon-Smith‡

August 3, 2020

Abstract

We put forward a new method for obtaining quantitative lower bounds on the top Lyapunov exponent of stochastic differential equations (SDEs). Our method combines (i) an (apparently new) identity connecting the top Lyapunov exponent to a Fisher information-like functional of the stationary density of the Markov process tracking tangent directions with (ii) a novel, quantitative version of Hörmander’s hypoelliptic regularity theory in an L^1 framework which estimates this (degenerate) Fisher information from below by an $W_{loc}^{1,s}$ Sobolev norm. This method is applicable to a wide range of systems beyond the reach of currently existing mathematically rigorous methods. As an initial application, we prove the positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent for a class of weakly-dissipative, weakly forced SDE; in this paper we prove that this class includes the Lorenz 96 model in any dimension, provided the additive stochastic driving is applied to any consecutive pair of modes.

Contents

1	Introduction and outline	2
1.1	Main results	3
1.2	Application: A class of Euler-like weakly damped SDE on \mathbb{R}^n	8
1.3	Context within prior work	11
2	Preliminaries, Lyapunov exponents, and the Fisher information	13
2.1	Lyapunov exponents for SDE on Riemannian manifolds	13
2.2	The projective process and the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula	14
2.3	Fisher information identity	17
2.4	Relation to Baxendale’s relative entropy formula	18
3	Uniform hypoelliptic regularity via the Fisher information	20
3.1	Preliminaries and outline of Theorem 1.9	20
3.2	Preliminary estimates	23
3.3	Controlling Λ^s with $ \cdot _{X_j, s_j}$	24

2010 *Mathematics subject classification*. Primary: 37H15, 35H10. Secondary: 37D25, 58J65, 35B65

*Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA jacob@math.umd.edu. J.B. was supported by National Science Foundation CAREER grant DMS-1552826 and National Science Foundation RNMS #1107444 (Ki-Net)

†School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA ablumenthal6@gatech.edu. A.B. was supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-2009431

‡Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, RI 02906, USA punshs@brown.edu. This material was based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award No. DMS-1803481.

3.4	Positive X_0 regularity from negative X_0 and positive X_j regularity	25
3.5	Regularization: Lemma 3.10	27
4	Projective spanning	34
4.1	General conditions for projective spanning	34
4.2	Verifying uniform projective spanning for Euler-like, weakly damped SDE on \mathbb{R}^n	35
4.3	Projective spanning for Lorenz 96	36
5	Rigidity of invariant measures of the deterministic, projective process	37
5.1	Preliminaries for Euler-like systems	38
5.2	Rigidity for invariant projective densities: review of general theory	38
5.3	Proof of Proposition 1.15	40
A	Qualitative properties of the projective stationary measure	41
B	Proof of Proposition 4.2	44
	References	46

1 Introduction and outline

Many nonlinear systems of physical origin exhibit chaotic behavior when subjected to external forcing and weak damping. Here, “chaos” refers to sensitivity with respect to the initial conditions, and is often measured by the Lyapunov exponent, a measure of the asymptotic exponential rate at which nearby trajectories diverge; positivity of the Lyapunov exponent is a well-known hallmark of chaos. Despite the ubiquity of chaos in systems of physical interest, and in contrast with the rather well-developed abstract theory for the description of chaotic states and associated statistical properties, it is notoriously challenging to verify, for a given system, whether or not chaotic behavior is actually present in the above sense.

The purpose of this paper is to put forward a method for providing (at least “preliminary”¹) quantitative lower bounds for the Lyapunov exponents of weakly-damped, weakly-driven SDE. Our method combines two new ingredients: (i) an apparently new identity connecting the largest Lyapunov exponent to a Fisher information-type quantity on the stationary statistics of tangent directions; and (ii) a quantitative hypoellipticity argument for showing that this Fisher information-type quantity uniformly controls Sobolev regularity of the tangent-direction stationary statistics, and hence regularity provides a lower bound on the Lyapunov exponent². Our methods can potentially be interpreted as the beginning of a quantitative and more robust à la Furstenberg theory for SDEs. See Section 1.3 for a more in-depth discussion of the previously existing work and how ours fits in.

As a first application of our methods, we study a class of high-dimensional SDE commonly used as finite dimensional models in fluid mechanics and other fields. In [45], Lorenz put forward the following model³, now referred to as Lorenz-96 (L96), for a system of J periodically coupled oscillators $u = (u_1, \dots, u_J) \in \mathbb{R}^J$ written here with a small damping parameter $\hat{\epsilon} > 0$ and subjected to stochastic forcing:

$$du_m = ((u_{m+1} - u_{m-2})u_{m-1} - \hat{\epsilon}u_m)dt + q_m d\hat{W}_t^m, \quad 1 \leq m \leq J \tag{1.1}$$

where $\{\hat{W}_t^m\}$ is a collection of one-dimensional independent standard Brownian motions, $\{q_m\}$ are fixed parameters, and the u_m are J -periodic in m , i.e., $u_{m+kJ} := u_m$. Since its introduction, L96 has come

¹“Preliminary” in the sense that the lower bounds we provide are expected to be sub-optimal for most systems of physical interest.

²More precisely, we provide a lower bound on $n\lambda_1 - 2\lambda_\Sigma$, where λ_Σ is the sum of the Lyapunov exponents.

³Note that L96 is distinct from the “butterfly attractor” model, an ODE on \mathbb{R}^3 , put forward in Lorenz’s seminal 1967 work [44]. For this simple 3D model, positivity of Lyapunov exponents for typical initial conditions in a certain parameter regime follows from the well-known computer-assisted proof carried out in [67].

to be recognized as a prototypical model of chaotic behavior in spatially extended systems such as those arising in fluid mechanics and similar fields, and serves as a remarkably common benchmark for numerical methods adapted to the analysis of chaotic systems (see, e.g., [31, 46, 48–50] and references therein). As the nonlinearity is bilinear, by rescaling u by $\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}u(\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}t)$ and a re-definition of $\epsilon := \hat{\epsilon}^{3/2}$, (1.1) is equivalent to the following system (see Remark 1.2),

$$du_m = ((u_{m+1} - u_{m-2})u_{m-1} - \epsilon u_m)dt + \sqrt{\epsilon}q_m dW_t^m, \quad 1 \leq m \leq J, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\{W_t^m\}$ are equal, in law to $\{\hat{W}_t^m\}$. In this form, the damping and driving are balanced in the sense that the stationary measures of (1.2) are tight as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (see Appendix A) and these stationary measures converge to (absolutely continuous) invariant measures of the deterministic $\epsilon = 0$ problem. There is little known (with mathematical rigor) regarding the dynamics of the $\epsilon = 0$ nor can one make a perturbative treatment from the existing à la Furstenberg methods for random dynamics; see Section 1.3 for more discussion.

For (1.2), our methods yield the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Phi_\omega^t : \mathbb{R}^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$ denote the stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms solving (1.2) for almost every random sample path ω . Assume $J \geq 5$ and that $q_1, q_2 \neq 0$. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the top Lyapunov exponent*

$$\lambda_1^\epsilon = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |D\Phi_\omega^t(u)|$$

exists, is constant over Leb.-a.e. $u \in \mathbb{R}^J$ and a.e. sample path ω , and satisfies

$$\frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{in particular,} \quad \lambda_1^\epsilon > 0 \quad \text{for all } \epsilon \text{ sufficiently small.}$$

Remarkably, the problem of proving $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$ was previously open in spite of overwhelming numerical evidence to support this [19, 31, 50, 57, 59]. In fact, our results apply, in principle, to any model in a wide class including not only Lorenz-96, but also Galerkin truncations of the Navier-Stokes equations, subject to a suitable hypoellipticity condition (Theorem 1.12 below) which currently remains open for Galerkin NSE—this will be the subject of future work. On the other hand, we remark that the scaling $\epsilon^{-1}\lambda_1^\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ is likely to be sub-optimal.

Remark 1.2. Without the the Brownian term and when $\hat{\epsilon} = 0$, equation (1.1) preserves volume on \mathbb{R}^J , and so $0 < \hat{\epsilon} \ll 1$ can be thought of as a weakly dissipative regime (a property shared, e.g., by Galerkin truncations of NSE). However, as we are taking $t \rightarrow \infty$, it is not possible to treat (1.1) directly using a perturbation argument in $\hat{\epsilon}$ since at $\hat{\epsilon} = 0$ all trajectories diverge as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

On the other hand, we can relate the stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms $\hat{\Phi}_\omega^t$ solving the SDE (1.1) with the stochastic flow Φ_ω^t solving (1.2) by $\Phi_\omega^t(u) = \sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}\hat{\Phi}_\omega^{\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}t}(u/\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}})$ (where $\omega_t = \hat{\epsilon}^{-1/4}\hat{\omega}_{\sqrt{\hat{\epsilon}}t}$ a Brownian self-similar rescaling of the noise path $\hat{\omega}$ so equality of the two flows is interpreted as *equality in probabilistic law*). Thus, the Lyapunov exponent $\hat{\lambda}_1^{\hat{\epsilon}}$ of the stochastic flow $\hat{\Phi}_\omega^t$ satisfies $\hat{\epsilon}^{-1}\hat{\lambda}_1^{\hat{\epsilon}} = \epsilon^{-1}\lambda_1^\epsilon$, and in particular $\hat{\lambda}_1^{\hat{\epsilon}} > 0$ if and only if $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$.

1.1 Main results

We first provide our main results relating regularity to the lower bounds on the top Lyapunov exponents for general SDEs. Let (M, g) be a smooth, connected, n -dimensional, orientable Riemannian manifold (not necessarily bounded) with no boundary, and consider the stochastic process $x_t \in M, t \geq 0$ defined by the (Stratonovich) SDE

$$dx_t = X_0(x_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ are a family of smooth vector fields (potentially unbounded) on M and $\{W^k\}_{k=1}^r$ are independent standard Wiener processes with respect to a canonical stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$. Let us list the first of several (relatively mild) standing assumptions to be imposed throughout the paper.

Assumption 1. (i) For each initial data $x \in M$, equation (1.9) has a unique global solution (x_t) with probability 1. The (random) solution maps $x \mapsto x_t =: \Phi_\omega^t(x), t \geq 0$ comprise a (stochastic) flow of C^r diffeomorphisms (Φ_ω^t) on M , $r \geq 2$. Moreover, (ii) (x_t) admits a unique, absolutely continuous stationary probability measure μ on M for which (iii) we have the integrability condition

$$\mathbf{E} \int_M [\log^+ |D\Phi^t(x)| + \log^+ |D\Phi^t(x)^{-1}|] d\mu(x) < \infty.^4$$

Assumption 1(i) is well-studied and follows from mild conditions on (1.9); see, e.g., [5, 37]. When M is compact, item (ii) follows from a parabolic Hörmander condition on the vector fields $\{X_0, \dots, X_r\}$ (see Definition 1.7 below). If M is not compact then some additional constraints are needed to avoid drift to infinity. Given (i) and (ii), item (iii) is standard; see, e.g., [33]. Additional discussion and details are given in Section 2.1.

The following standard result is a corollary of the Kingman subadditive ergodic theorem [35] as well as some basic ergodic theory for random dynamical systems [34]. It provides mathematically rigorous justification for the existence of Lyapunov exponents.

Theorem 1.3. Assume (1.9) satisfies Assumption 1. Then there exist positive, deterministic constants λ_1 and λ_Σ , independent of both the random sample ω as well as $x \in M$, such that for $\mathbf{P} \otimes \mu$ almost every $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times M$ the following limits hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |D\Phi_\omega^t(x)|, \\ \lambda_\Sigma &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |\det D\Phi_\omega^t(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

The value λ_1 is the *top Lyapunov exponent*; the condition $\lambda_1 > 0$ implies sensitivity with respect to initial conditions as well as local moving-frame saddle-type behavior for (random) trajectories for μ -typical initial x for a.e. random sample $\omega \in \Omega$ (see [10, 73]; see also [5, 34, 43] for emphasis on random dynamics). This abstract smooth ergodic theory leans on the Multiplicative Ergodic Theorem [56, 62, 69]; in brief, this result provides a decomposition of the tangent bundle TM into (random) sub-bundles along which various exponential growth rates (a.k.a. Lyapunov exponents) are realized. Similarly value λ_Σ is the *sum Lyapunov exponent* and describes the asymptotic exponential rate at which Lebesgue volume is contracted/expanded by the dynamics. For more information, see, e.g., the expositions [72, 74].

The purpose of this paper is to put forward a new method for obtaining lower bounds on λ_1 . Results are framed in terms of the augmented Markov process (x_t, v_t) tracking a trajectory in phase space (x_t) and the tangent direction

$$v_t := \frac{D\Phi^t(x)v}{|D\Phi^t(x)v|}. \quad (1.4)$$

It is straightforward to see that the top Lyapunov exponent λ_1 is connected to Birkhoff sums of the observable $g_\omega(x, v) := \log \|D\Phi_\omega^1(x)v\|$ on the sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$ (consisting of fibers $\mathbb{S}_x M = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}(T_x M)$), and so there is a clear connection between λ_1 and the “augmented” tangent-direction process (x_t, v_t) ; see, e.g.,

⁴Here, for $a > 0$ we write $\log^+ a := \min\{\log a, 0\}$ for the positive part of log.

[40, 69], or see Theorem III.1.2 of [34] in the specific context of random dynamics (see also [20]). In what follows we refer to $(w_t) = (x_t, v_t)$ as the *projective process* on $\mathbb{S}M$.⁵

It is not hard to check that v_t solves the SDE

$$dv_t = V_{\nabla X_0(x_t)}(v_t)dt + \sum_{k=1}^r V_{\nabla X_k(x_t)}(v_t) \circ dW_t^k,$$

where ∇ denotes the covariant derivative and, for $x \in M$ and $A : T_x M \rightarrow T_x M$ linear, the vector field V_A on $\mathbb{S}_x M$ is defined by

$$V_A(v) := Av - \langle v, Av \rangle v =: \Pi_v Av.$$

Here, and everywhere below unless specified otherwise, we use the notation $\langle a, b \rangle = g(a, b)$ for $a, b \in T_x M$. The full projective process (w_t) evolves according to

$$dw_t = \tilde{X}_0(w_t)dt + \sum_{k=1}^r \tilde{X}_k(w_t) \circ dW_t^k. \quad (1.5)$$

Here, for $w = (x, v)$ we regard $T_w \mathbb{S}M = T_x M \oplus T_v(\mathbb{S}_x M)$ (see Section 2.2) and define $\{\tilde{X}_k\}_{k=0}^r$ by

$$\tilde{X}_k(x, v) := \begin{pmatrix} X_k(x) \\ V_{\nabla X_k(x)}(v) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Throughout, we take on the following assumption regarding (w_t) .

Assumption 2. *The SDE (1.5) defining the process (w_t) satisfies Assumptions 1(i) and (ii). That is, the SDE defining (w_t) is globally well-posed for a.e. random sample and every initial data; and the Markov process (w_t) admits a unique, absolutely continuous stationary measure ν on $\mathbb{S}M$.*

1.1.1 A Fisher-information type formula for Lyapunov exponents

Let dq denote Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}M$, let ν be the stationary measure for the projective process (x_t, v_t) , and let $f = \frac{d\nu}{dq}$ denote the stationary density, similarly let μ be the stationary measure for (x_t) with density $\rho = \frac{d\mu}{dx}$. Our first main result is a new formula (to our knowledge) connecting the stationary density f to the exponent λ_1 through a partial *Fisher information*-type quantity $FI(f)$ defined by

$$FI(f) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \frac{|\tilde{X}_k^* f|^2}{f} dq.$$

Here, the vector fields \tilde{X}_k are regarded as first order differential operators, and \tilde{X}_k^* denotes the formal dual in $L^2(dq)$.

Proposition 1.4 (Fisher Information Identity). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Moreover, assume that (a) the stationary density f satisfies $f \log f \in L^1(dq)$ and (b) $Q \in L^1(\mu)$ and $\tilde{Q} \in L^1(\nu)$, where Q, \tilde{Q} are defined by*

$$Q(x) := \operatorname{div} X_0(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k \operatorname{div} X_k(x),$$

$$\tilde{Q}(w) := \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_0(w) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \tilde{X}_k \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k(w).$$

⁵The distinction between v_t or $-v_t$ is irrelevant for Lyapunov exponents, and so morally we regard (w_t) as evolving on the projective bundle PM consisting of fibers $P_x M = P^{n-1}(T_x M)$, the projectivization of the tangent space $T_x M$. However, in practice we will regard (w_t) as a process on the sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$.

Then the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} FI(\rho) &= - \int_{\mathbb{S}M} Q \, d\mu = -\lambda_\Sigma, \\ FI(f) &= - \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \tilde{Q} \, d\nu = n\lambda_1 - 2\lambda_\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

Equivalently, writing $h_x(v) = f(x, v)/\rho(x)$ for the conditional densities on $\mathbb{S}_x M$ of v with respect to x , we have

$$FI(f) - FI(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_M \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}_x M} \frac{|(X_k - V_{\nabla X_k(x)}^*) h_x(v)|^2}{h_x(v)} \, dv \right) \, d\mu(x) = n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma. \quad (1.7)$$

Remark 1.5. In each line of (1.6), the second equality is a version of the famous Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula (see, e.g., [5]) for the Lyapunov exponents of an SDE satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2 (see Lemma 2.4 for more details). What's new here are the first equalities concerning $FI(\rho), FI(f)$. Equation (1.7) is an equivalent formulation highlighting the relation to the natural quantity $n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma$ and criteria à la Furstenberg for the Lyapunov exponents of stochastic systems. In particular, note that $FI(f) - FI(\rho) \geq 0$ and $n\lambda_1 > \lambda_\Sigma$ if and only if $FI(f) - FI(\rho) > 0$. See Section 1.3 for more information.

Proposition 1.4 is derived in Section 2. In fact, we give two proofs: the first is a combination of the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula [5, 32] with the Kolmogorov equation

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f = \tilde{X}_0^* f + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r (\tilde{X}_j^*)^2 f = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

for f ; the second proof (which we merely sketch, leaving details to the interested reader) connects $FI(f)$ to a certain relative entropy formula for Lyapunov exponents [11, 26] (see also [41]) intimately connected with the Furstenberg-style approach to Lyapunov exponents of random systems. See Sections 1.3 and 2 for additional discussion.

Remark 1.6. The Fisher information is a fundamental quantity in the theory of statistical inference and information geometry (see [2]). Typically used to measure the amount of information a parametrized family of laws (e.g., the law of one variable conditioned on the value of another) carries about the inference parameter. In this case, $(\nu_x)_{x \in M}$ are the family of laws indicating that the Fisher information in (1.7) signifies, on average, how much information about x can be inferred by making observations only in the projective variable v .

1.1.2 The Fisher information and Sobolev regularity of the stationary density

The identity (1.6) will be most useful in a quantitative sense when studying the small-noise limit. Hence we define for $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$

$$dx_t^\epsilon = X_0^\epsilon(x_t) \, dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k^\epsilon(x_t) \circ dW_t^k, \quad (1.9)$$

where note we also are allowing X_j^ϵ to be parameterized by ϵ ; below we assume natural uniformity properties on this dependence. In this case, (1.6) becomes (now parameterizing everything by ϵ):

$$FI(f^\epsilon) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \frac{|(\tilde{X}_k^\epsilon)^* f^\epsilon|^2}{f^\epsilon} \, dq = \frac{n\lambda_1^\epsilon - 2\lambda_\Sigma^\epsilon}{\epsilon}.$$

If $\{\tilde{X}_1^\epsilon, \dots, \tilde{X}_k^\epsilon\}$ spans the tangent space of $\mathbb{S}M$ everywhere, then the identity (1.6) would imply that $n\lambda_1^\epsilon - 2\lambda_\Sigma^\epsilon$ is related in a straightforward manner to the *regularity* of f in the sense of distributional derivatives, i.e., Sobolev norms.

However, in nearly all cases of interest (and especially in the settings we are interested in, such as (1.2)), the collection $\{\tilde{X}_1^\epsilon, \dots, \tilde{X}_k^\epsilon\}$ *fails* to span the tangent space of $\mathbb{S}M$. Our second main result, Theorem 1.9 below, overcomes this complication by adapting ideas from Hörmander’s hypoelliptic regularity theory to show that, in fact, the partial Fisher information $FI(f)$ actually does control at least some Sobolev regularity of f .

In [29], Hörmander isolated the general conditions that guarantee the regularity of solutions to Kolmogorov equations such as the PDE satisfied by f (1.8) when the forcing directions do not span the tangent space. We recall the classical parabolic Hörmander condition, as it is directly important for the next main result. For vector fields X, Y , we write $[X, Y]$ for the usual Lie bracket of X and Y .

Definition 1.7. Given a collection of vector fields Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_r on a manifold \mathcal{M} , we define collections of vector fields $\mathcal{X}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{X}_1 \subseteq \dots$ recursively by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X}_0 &= \{Z_j : j \geq 1\}, \\ \mathcal{X}_{k+1} &= \mathcal{X}_k \cup \{[Z_j, Z] : Z \in \mathcal{X}_k, j \geq 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

We say that $\{Z_i\}_{i=0}^r$ satisfies the *parabolic Hörmander condition* if exists k such that for all $w \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\text{span}\{Z(w) : Z \in \mathcal{X}_k\} = T_w\mathcal{M}.$$

Assumption 3 (Projective spanning condition). *The vector fields $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1^\epsilon, \dots, \tilde{X}_r^\epsilon\}$ satisfy the parabolic Hörmander condition on $\mathbb{S}M$ and uniformly in $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ on bounded sets (see Definition 3.1 below for precise statement).*

Remark 1.8. This condition appears routinely in the random dynamics literature: see for example [11, 24]. For SDE systems (1.9) it is the primary sufficient condition used to ensure that (w_t^ϵ) will have at most one absolutely continuous stationary measure as in Assumption 2; indeed, in most practical examples, one will use Assumption 3 to deduce Assumption 2. We also note that Assumption 3 can be shown to imply that $\{X_0^\epsilon, \dots, X_r^\epsilon\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition on M ; see Section 4.

We are now positioned to state our second result, which provides a *quantitative hypoelliptic regularity estimate* turning the partial information $FI(f^\epsilon)$ of f^ϵ into a uniform-in- ϵ estimate of Sobolev regularity in all directions.

Theorem 1.9. *Assume that $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \dots, \tilde{X}_r^\epsilon\}$ are uniformly bounded in $C_{loc}^k \forall k$ and such that Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. Then, there exists $s_* \in (0, 1)$ such that for any bounded, open set $U \subset \mathbb{S}M$, there exists $C = C_U > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$*

$$\|f^\epsilon\|_{W^{s_*, 1}(U)} \leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{FI(f^\epsilon)}\right).$$

Remark 1.10. It might be possible that there is a slightly more refined version of Theorem 1.9 which replaces FI with $\epsilon^\delta FI$ for some $\delta \in (0, s_*)$ in the statement, which would lead to a more precise lower bound on the Lyapunov exponents in the example below. Such a scaling would be more consistent with the results of [14, 61].

Remark 1.11. Above, the value s_* is determined exclusively by the number of ‘generations’ of brackets needed to satisfy Assumption 3 (though note this will generally depend on the dimension of the manifold M itself).

Theorem 1.9 is proved in Section 3. The result is a key aspect of our work and the proof requires some significant effort. It essentially amounts to a quantitative version of Hörmander’s a priori estimate for hypoelliptic regularity in an L^1 framework; in contrast to Hörmander’s original work [29] is based in L^2 for fundamental reasons.

One of Hörmander’s original insights is that, given regularity in the forcing directions, the PDE (1.8) implies a matching, negative regularity-type estimate defined by duality on \tilde{X}_0 (see also discussions in [4]). Using a delicate regularization procedure, the regularity in $\{\tilde{X}_j\}_{j=1}^r$ and the negative regularity in the \tilde{X}_0 are combined in a suitable manner to obtain regularity in all directions. In order to exploit the negative regularity dual to the regularity provided by FI , the regularization procedure we must perform is even more delicate than Hörmander’s. Of course, there is a large literature of works extending Hörmander’s theory in various ways, e.g., to handle rough coefficients: we refer the reader to, e.g., [1, 3, 16, 28, 36, 38, 53] and the references therein. However, as far as the authors are aware, there are no previous works that fundamentally rework the theory into L^1 .

1.2 Application: A class of Euler-like weakly damped SDE on \mathbb{R}^n

As our application, we apply Proposition 1.4 and Theorem 1.9 to a concrete class of dynamical systems posed on \mathbb{R}^n of which L96 in (1.1) and Galerkin truncations of many PDE are special cases. The general class of systems we consider on \mathbb{R}^n are of the following form, modeling a volume-preserving nonlinearity with a weak linear damping and weak noise:

$$dx_t^\epsilon = F(x_t^\epsilon)dt + \epsilon Ax_t^\epsilon + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k dW_t^k. \quad (1.10)$$

Here W_t^k are independent standard Brownian motions, the forcing directions $\{X_k\}_{k=1}^r$ are assumed for simplicity to be constant vector fields (a.k.a. “additive noise”), while the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is negative definite, contributing volume dissipation to the overall system.⁶

We will primarily consider drift terms F of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= B(x, x) \quad \text{for } B : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \text{ bilinear,} \\ &\text{and moreover, } \operatorname{div} F \equiv 0 \quad \text{and} \quad x \cdot F \equiv 0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

The divergence-free condition implies preservation of Liouville measure (Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^n), while the condition $x \cdot F(x) \equiv 0$ ensures that $\dot{x} = F(x)$ preserves the “energy shells” $S_E = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|^2 = E\}$. Systems of this form include the Lorenz-96 model (1.1) as well as Galerkin truncations of several well-known PDE of interest such as the Navier-Stokes equations. A more general class of models for which these methods apply is discussed in Remark 1.16 below.

Regarding our standing assumptions, it is straightforward [5, 37] to show that (1.10) with drift term as in (1.11) generates a unique stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms $\Phi_\omega^t : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ for a.e. Brownian path ω , and so Assumption 1(i) always holds for any $\epsilon > 0$. By standard hypoellipticity theory, Assumption 1(ii) regarding a unique stationary density is valid when $\{F + \epsilon A, X_1, \dots, X_r\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition on \mathbb{R}^n . If this holds, then Assumption 1(iii) is essentially automatic and follows from a combination of results in Appendix A and [33]. As a result, the exponents $\lambda_1^\epsilon, \lambda_\Sigma^\epsilon$ as in Theorem 1.3 exist for (1.10) for any $\epsilon > 0$.

For systems of the form (1.10), it is particularly easy to lift vector fields to $\mathbb{S}M \simeq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ via

$$\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon := \begin{pmatrix} F(x) + \epsilon Ax \\ \Pi_v(\nabla F(x) + \epsilon A)v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{X}_j := \begin{pmatrix} X_k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.12)$$

⁶Note that since the vector fields X_k are constant, the Itô and Stratonovich formulations are identical, hence why we use the Itô notation above.

For the corresponding projective process $(w_t^\epsilon) = (x_t^\epsilon, v_t^\epsilon)$ evolving on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, well-posedness as in Assumption 2 is standard, while the existence and uniqueness of a stationary density f^ϵ follows from the parabolic Hörmander condition for $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ in Assumption 3 and the drift condition provided by the damping (see Appendix A). We emphasize that Assumption 3 generally requires work to check: see the discussion below.

For the class of Euler-like SDE above, our main result is as follows, which shows that Assumption 3 is sufficient to deduce $\epsilon^{-1} \lambda_1^\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.12. *Consider the SDE (1.10) where $F(x) = B(x, x)$ is as in (1.11) and $B(x, x)$ is not identically 0. If $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ as in (1.12) satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition as in Assumption 3, then the top Lyapunov exponent λ_1^ϵ for (1.10) satisfies*

$$\frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Before presenting the proof of Theorem 1.12, let us briefly comment on the verification of Assumption 3. For many systems of interest, it can be significantly harder to verify spanning for $\{\tilde{X}_k\}$ on $\mathbb{S}M$ than to verify spanning for the vector fields $\{X_k\}$ on M : this is already the case for the L96 model with additive noise. As discussed above, the verification of Assumption 3 is the only remaining task to apply Theorem 1.12 to Galerkin truncations of the Navier-Stokes equations. This is being undertaken in ongoing work.

Nevertheless, we emphasize that for a given model of the form (1.10) with *fixed* dimension and parameters, Assumption 3 is (at least in principle) checkable using, e.g., computer algebra software. In Section 4 we prove the following, which reduces the question of projective spanning to a combination of (i) the spanning condition for $\{X_0^\epsilon, X_1, \dots, X_r\}$ on \mathbb{R}^d and (ii) the *purely linear* condition that $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the space of traceless real matrices, is generated by a collection $\{H^i\}$ of *constant-valued* $n \times n$ real matrices (defined explicitly in terms of $B(x, x)$) under the standard matrix Lie bracket.

Lemma 1.13. *Let $\{X_0^\epsilon, X_1, \dots, X_r\}$ be defined by the SDE (4.3) and suppose that the constant vector fields $\{\partial_{x_k}\}_{k=1}^n$ belong to the parabolic Lie algebra $\text{Lie}(X_0^\epsilon; X_1, \dots, X_r)$. Define for each $k = 1, \dots, n$ the following constant matrices ,*

$$H^k := \partial_{x_k} \nabla F \in \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

and let $\text{Lie}(H^1, \dots, H^n)$ be the matrix Lie sub-algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ generated by H^1, \dots, H^n . Then the projective vector fields $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ satisfies Assumption 3 if

$$\text{Lie}(H^1, \dots, H^n) = \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (1.13)$$

Lemma 1.13 is used to prove projective spanning for L96 with additive forcing in Section 4.3. Using Theorem 1.12, Theorem 1.1 above follows as a corollary.

We note that the proof presented there for L96 heavily relies on the ‘‘local’’ coupling of unknowns in the nonlinearity, which greatly simplifies the application of Lemma 1.13 in this case. However, for models which are the Galerkin truncations of PDEs, coupling between unknowns has a more ‘global’ character, and verifying the hypotheses of Lemma 1.13 remains open.

1.2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.12

Throughout, we assume the setting of Theorem 1.12, and in particular, that the collection of projective vector fields $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ as in (1.12) satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition in Assumption 3.

Let us begin by articulating the Fisher information identity (Proposition 1.4) and hypoelliptic regularity estimate (1.9) in the context of Euler-like models. Writing $\lambda_1^\epsilon, \lambda_\Sigma^\epsilon$ for the top and summed Lyapunov

exponents as in Theorem 1.3, the partial Fisher information identity (1.6) reads as follows:

$$\frac{n\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} - 2 \operatorname{tr} A = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{|\tilde{X}_k f^\epsilon|^2}{f^\epsilon} dx dv =: FI(f^\epsilon). \quad (1.14)$$

This is immediate from Proposition 1.4 on noting that (i) $\lambda_\Sigma = \epsilon \operatorname{tr} A$ by Theorem 1.3 and (1.11), while (ii) the condition $f^\epsilon \log f^\epsilon \in L^1(dq)$, with dq the volume element for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n$, follows from the estimates in Appendix A. Turning to the hypoelliptic regularity estimate: Theorem 1.9 implies

$$\|f^\epsilon\|_{W^{s,1}(U \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{FI(f^\epsilon)}\right), \quad (1.15)$$

for any $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ bounded, where $s \in (0, 1)$ and $C = C_U$ are constants independent of ϵ .

In view of the form of (1.14) and (1.15) we see that if $\epsilon^{-1}\lambda_1^\epsilon$ were to remain bounded, then f^ϵ would be bounded in $W^{s,1}$ uniformly in ϵ . This observation leads naturally to the following alternative.

Proposition 1.14. *At least one of the following holds:*

- (a) $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} = \infty$; or
- (b) *the zero-noise flow (x_t^0, v_t^0) admits a stationary density $f^0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ (and moreover $f^0 \in W_{loc}^{s,1}$ on bounded sets).*

Proof. Suppose that (a) fails, i.e.

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda_1^\epsilon}{\epsilon} < \infty.$$

In this case, (1.14) implies that $\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} FI(f^\epsilon) < \infty$ and the hypoelliptic regularity estimate (1.15) provides regularity in the missing directions, i.e., $\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|f^\epsilon\|_{W^{s,1}(U)} < \infty$ for all open, bounded sets. Combined with the uniform tightness of $\{f^\epsilon\}_{\epsilon > 0}$ in (A.1) (coming from the energy identity $x \cdot B(x, x) = 0$ and that A is negative definite) this yields compactness in L^1 for $\{f^\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0,1)}$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Extracting a subsequence $\{\epsilon_j\}$, we see that $\exists f^0 \in L^1$ such that $f^{\epsilon_j} \rightarrow f^0$ in L^1 . Furthermore, passing to the limit $\epsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ pathwise in the SDE and in the Kolmogorov equation (1.8), we see that $f^0 dq$ is an invariant measure of deterministic flow (x_t^0, v_t^0) and hence (b) holds. \square

A crucial feature of our approach is that alternative (b) in Proposition 1.14 is quite rigid and can be ruled out in many cases, even for systems with very complicated deterministic dynamics for which we have access to little information. In our setting, alternative (b) is ruled out by the following proposition, proved in Section 5; this is enough to complete the proof of Theorem 1.12.

Below, we define $\hat{\Phi}^t : \mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n \circlearrowleft$ for the (deterministic) flow corresponding to the $\epsilon = 0$ process (x_t^0, v_t^0) , while $\Phi^t : \mathbb{R}^n \circlearrowleft$ is the flow corresponding to (x_t^0) on \mathbb{R}^n .

Proposition 1.15. *Assume that the bilinear mapping B is not identically 0. Let ν be any invariant probability measure for $\hat{\Phi}^t$ with the property that $\nu(A \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) = \mu(A)$, where $\mu \ll \operatorname{Leb}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$. Then, ν is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure $\operatorname{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n}$ on $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proposition 1.15 is proved in Section 5, using ideas inspired by the classification of invariant projective measures for general linear cocycles [6]. Roughly speaking, this theory implies that if $\nu \ll \operatorname{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n}$ were to hold, then the $\epsilon = 0$ flow must be an isometry with respect to a potentially ‘rough’ (i.e., measurably-varying) Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^n . For systems of the form (1.10) satisfying (1.11), this can be ruled out relatively easily, using the fact that at $\epsilon = 0$, the dynamics of (1.10) induces *shearing* between successive ‘energy shells’ $S_E = \{\|x\|^2 = E\}$, $E > 0$. To wit,

$$D\Phi^t(x)x = \Phi^t(x) + tB(\Phi^t(x), \Phi^t(x)) \quad (1.16)$$

(see Lemma 5.1). In particular, at a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, an infinitesimal perturbation in the “radial” direction x will grow indefinitely at a linear rate t , except at times when $B(\Phi^t(x), \Phi^t(x))$ is very small. Thus, Proposition 1.14(b) can be ruled out by a simple Poincaré recurrence argument, using only the assumption that B is not identically 0 (see Section 5 for details).

Remark 1.16. The above arguments apply, in principle, to a broader class of drift terms $F(x)$ than those given in (1.11). For instance, provided that we start with the weak-damping, constant forcing regime

$$dx_t^\epsilon = F(x_t^\epsilon)dt + \epsilon Ax_t^\epsilon dt + \sum_{k=1}^r X_k dW_t^k,$$

our methods easily extend to treat multilinear $F(x) = \sum_{j=0}^P B_j(x, \dots, x)$ for B_j multilinear of degree p_j with $p_j \geq 2$ for at least one j . Reordering so that $p_0 > p_1 > \dots > p_P$, a rescaling of u, t and a re-definition of ϵ provides the analogue of (1.10):

$$dx_t^\epsilon = \sum_{j=0}^P \epsilon^{\frac{p_j - p_0}{1 + p_0}} B_j(x_t, \dots, x_t) dt + \epsilon Ax_t^\epsilon dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k dW_t^k.$$

Hence, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the leading order nonlinearity dominates and the problem essentially reduces to the homogeneous case, provided of course that the leading nonzero nonlinearity term B_{p_0} satisfies $x \cdot B_{p_0}(x, \dots, x) \equiv 0$ and $\text{div } B_{p_0}(x, \dots, x) \equiv 0$, analogously to (1.11) (and of course, we require Assumption 3).

Remark 1.17. Without much additional work, Proposition 1.14 generalizes to a large class of zero-noise limits of volume-preserving systems on a compact manifold. Of particular interest are parabolic flows, e.g., ‘typical’ completely integrable flows, for which Proposition 1.14(b) is usually impossible due to shearing between invariant tori (analogous to (1.16)). This suggests that the scaling $\epsilon^{-1} \lambda_1^\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ ought to be fairly common among zero-noise limits, even for a large class of decidedly non-chaotic zero-noise dynamics.

Remarkably, when $\epsilon \ll 1$, many Lyapunov times $O((\lambda_1^\epsilon)^{-1})$ elapse before the $O(\epsilon^{-1})$ timescale when the effects of noise become apparent. On the other hand, how long a Lyapunov time actually takes (that is, how long it typically takes a tangent vector to double in length) depends crucially on the rate at which Lyapunov exponents are realized, itself a large-deviations problem. This will be the subject of future work.

1.3 Context within prior work

As remarked earlier, for a given system it can be extremely challenging to estimate its Lyapunov exponents and provide a mathematically rigorous account of its time-asymptotic behavior. Indeed, in principle Lyapunov exponents require infinitely precise information on infinite trajectories, and in practice the convergence of Lyapunov exponents to their ‘true’ values can exhibit long stretches of intermittent behavior. This is especially so for deterministic systems in the absence of stochastic driving, for which one anticipates that “chaotic” and “orderly” regimes coexist in a convoluted way in both phase space as well as ‘parameter space’, i.e., as the underlying dynamical system is varied: we refer the interested reader to, e.g., work on Newhouse phenomena in dissipative systems [54, 55]; the proliferation of elliptic islands in volume-preserving systems [25]; known coexistence of chaotic and ordered regimes for the quadratic map family [47]; and C^1 generic dichotomies [17, 18]. For more background on this rich topic, see, e.g., [23, 60, 72, 74].

Although it still presents significant challenges, the situation for Lyapunov exponents of stochastically forced systems is notably more tractable. To start, let us first address the body of work à la Furstenberg which describes necessary conditions for ‘degeneracy’ of the Lyapunov exponents of a random dynamical system. Consider a stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms Φ_ω^t on an n -dimensional manifold M arising from an SDE satisfying Assumption 1, and let $\lambda_1, \lambda_\Sigma$ be as in Theorem 1.3. Let μ be the (unique) stationary measure for $x_t := \Phi_\omega^t(x_0)$. Note that unconditionally we have $n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma \geq 0$. In this context, and brushing

aside technical details, the criterion à la Furstenberg is due to a variety of authors (e.g., [21, 41, 65, 68]), and can be stated as follow: if $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}M)$ is a stationary measure for the projective process and $d\nu(x, v) = d\nu_x(v)d\mu(x)$ the disintegration of ν , then for all $t > 0$ there holds

$$\mathbf{E} \int_M H(D\Phi^t(x)_* \nu_x | \nu_{\Phi^t(x)}) d\mu(x) \leq t(n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma), \quad (1.17)$$

where H denotes the relative entropy of defined for two measure measures $\eta \ll \lambda$ by

$$H(\eta|\lambda) := \int \log \left(\frac{d\eta}{d\lambda} \right) d\eta.$$

From this we see that either

$$n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma > 0, \quad (1.18)$$

or the probabilistic law governing the stochastic flow admits a strong ‘degeneracy’ in the sense that

$$(D_x \Phi_\omega^t)_* \nu_x = \nu_{\Phi_\omega^t(x)} \quad (1.19)$$

with probability 1 for all $t \geq 0$ and μ -typical x . That this is situation is very ‘degenerate’ follows from the fact that for fixed x and t , the above right-hand side depends only on the time- t position $\Phi_\omega^t(x)$, while the left-hand side depends additionally on the entire noise path $\omega|_{[0,t]}$.

Observe that in the weakly-damped, weakly-driven setting of (1.10), $\lambda_\Sigma^\epsilon = \epsilon \operatorname{tr} A < 0$ and so (1.18) is totally agnostic as to whether $\lambda_1^\epsilon > 0$ or not. Indeed, the techniques in the above-mentioned works are ‘soft’ as the identity (1.19) is non-quantitative in the parameters of the underlying system. Although (1.17) does at least provide some kind of formula for $n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma$, it is unclear how to glean useful quantitative information directly from (1.17).

Interestingly, our Fisher-information identity in Proposition 1.4, specifically (1.7), is in fact essentially the time-infinitesimal analogue of (1.17), as we show below in Section 2.4. Hence, like (1.17), our Proposition 1.4 admits an interpretation in terms of the *rate at which the degeneracy (1.19) fails to hold* for the stochastic flow Φ_ω^t . However, Proposition 1.4 recasts the information in terms of the generator of (w_t) , which is more amenable now to the use of hypoelliptic PDE methods such as those employed in Theorem 1.9. This motivates the claim that the methods in this paper constitute a first step towards a quantitative à la Furstenberg theory. We remark that Fisher information-type quantities also commonly appear as the time derivatives of the relative entropy in the study of gradient flows and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities (see e.g. [9, 39, 63, 66]).

Beyond à la Furstenberg, there is by now a large literature on the Lyapunov exponents of particular models for which we cannot do justice in this space. Instead, we will focus on a class of results most closely related to ours (Theorems 1.1 and 1.12): small-noise expansions of Lyapunov exponents for weakly-driven stochastic systems. To frame the discussion, consider the abstract linear SDE

$$dV_t = A_t^\epsilon V_t dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^r B_t^k V_t \circ dW_t^k, \quad (1.20)$$

where A_t^ϵ, B_t^k are, in general, time-varying and/or themselves randomly driven, and A_t^ϵ may or may not exhibit some vanishingly weak damping as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. There are many works studying the scaling behavior of Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_1^\epsilon := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |V_t|$ of such systems, e.g., [8, 30, 52, 58, 61] in the constant coefficient case, and [7, 13, 14] when the when A_t, B_t^k are coupled to some other stochastic flow. To the authors’ best knowledge, however, all of these results are restricted to settings where the $\epsilon = 0$ dynamics

are relatively simple and essentially completely known. In comparison, our results are indifferent to any detailed description of the zero-noise dynamics. On the other hand, the sacrifice for our level of generality is that our estimate $\lambda_1^\epsilon/\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$ is far weaker than an asymptotic expansion, and is likely to be suboptimal for many models of interest.

Of particular interest is that among models of the form (1.20), scaling laws of the form $\lambda_1^\epsilon \sim \epsilon^\gamma, \gamma \geq 1$ tend to be associated with zero-noise dynamics which are *rigid isometries* (exhibiting no shearing) [8, 12, 13, 58]: note that such projectivized zero-noise dynamics preserve an invariant density, namely, Lebesgue measure, c.f. alternative (b) in Proposition 1.14. Meanwhile, laws of the form $\lambda_1^\epsilon \sim \epsilon^\gamma, \gamma < 1$ are associated with zero-noise dynamics exhibiting some shearing mechanism (c.f. shearing between energy shells as in (1.16)). By way of example, [8, 61] derive such scaling laws when A_t as above is given by

$$A_t \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_t \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

corresponding to the constant application of a horizontal shear in conjunction with a small, stochastically driven vertical shear. This analysis was extended to the setting of fluctuation-dissipation zero-noise limits of certain 2d completely integrable Hamiltonian systems in the work [14].

Although the Fisher information identity in Proposition 1.4 and our Proposition 1.14 for zero-noise limits make no direct reference to a specific dynamical motif or behavior, it is clear from our application to the class of Euler-like models (1.10) with bilinear nonlinearity as in (1.11) that *shearing* in the zero-noise, zero-damping dynamics is a very natural way to rule out the rigid isometry alternative in Proposition 1.14(b). Of course, shearing has long been regarded as a potential mechanism for the generation of chaotic behavior. As early as the late 70's it was realized that chaotic attractors could arise from time-periodic driving of a system undergoing a Hopf bifurcation [75], while subsequent mathematically rigorous work has confirmed this mechanism (see, e.g., [71] for an overview of this program). We also point out the work [42], which provides a mix of heuristics, numerics and mathematical analysis demonstrating the shearing mechanism as a source of chaotic behavior.

2 Preliminaries, Lyapunov exponents, and the Fisher information

This section is devoted to a proof of the Fisher information identity Proposition 1.4 for the top Lyapunov exponent in a general setting. We present two proofs: the first, via the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula [5], is carried out in Section 2.2, while the second, via a relative entropy formula related more directly to Furstenberg's work on Lyapunov exponents, is presented in Section 2.4.

2.1 Lyapunov exponents for SDE on Riemannian manifolds

Let (M, g) be a smooth connected Riemannian manifold, and as in (1.9), consider the SDE

$$dx_t = X_0(x_t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^r X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ are a family of smooth vector fields (potentially unbounded) on M , $\{W^k\}_{k=1}^r$ are independent standard Wiener processes and the product is taken in the Stratonovich sense. Recall that (2.1) is defined so that for each $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(M)$ the following \mathbb{R} valued Stratonovich equation holds for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\varphi(x_t) = \varphi(x) + \int_0^t X_0 \varphi(x_s) ds + \sum_{k=1}^r \int_0^t X_k \varphi(x_s) \circ dW_s^k. \quad (2.2)$$

The generator of the Markov semigroup is the following second order differential operator written in Hörmander form

$$\mathcal{L} := X_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k^2,$$

and as such one may convert equation (2.2) to Itô form and obtain a version of Itô's formula on M

$$\varphi(x_t) = \varphi(x) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}\varphi(x_s) ds + \sum_{k=1}^r \int_0^t X_k \varphi(x_s) dW_s^k,$$

Recall that a stationary probability $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ for the SDE (1.9), is any probability measure μ satisfying

$$\int_M \mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu = 0,$$

for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(M)$.

We will only be interested in cases when equation (1.9) gives rise to a unique Markov process (x_t) and a global-in-time stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms Φ^t and has a unique stationary measure μ .

Remark 2.1. Obtaining the existence and uniqueness of a global stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms and the existence of a stationary probability measure μ is not automatic when the manifold M is not compact due to the potential unboundedness of the vector fields $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ and the loss of tightness as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of $\text{Law}(x_t)$. In general, one must obtain a suitable Lyapunov function (also called a drift condition) to control the growth of the process (x_t) (see e.g. [51]) to obtain global solutions and existence of a stationary probability measure.

2.2 The projective process and the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula

In order to deduce our Fisher information identity, we must first derive a formula for the top Lyapunov exponent, commonly referred to as the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula (see, e.g., [5, 32]).

As in Section 1.1, we define the projective process (x_t, v_t) defined on PM as in (1.4) and in particular (1.5). As is commonly done in, we will often conflate the projective bundle PM with the unit sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$ whose fibers are the spheres $\mathbb{S}_x M = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}(T_x M)$ canonically embedded in $T_x M$, and are universal double covers of $P_x M$.

Using the Riemannian structure on M and the Levi-Civita connection ∇ , we equip $\mathbb{S}M$ with a canonical Riemannian metric \tilde{g} (the Sasaki metric), so that the bundle projection $\pi : \mathbb{S}M \rightarrow M$ is a Riemannian submersion. This means that for each $w = (x, v) \in \mathbb{S}M$ we can decompose $T_w \mathbb{S}M$ into a horizontal $H_w \mathbb{S}M$ subspace of directions transverse to the fibers and a vertical $V_w \mathbb{S}M$ subspace of directions along the fibers and each of which can be identified with the spaces $T_x M$ and $T_v(\mathbb{S}_x M)$ respectively. Moreover these spaces are orthogonal with respect to the metric \tilde{g} giving the orthogonal decomposition

$$T_w \mathbb{S}M = T_x M \oplus T_v(\mathbb{S}_x M)$$

which allows us to write the vector fields $\{\tilde{X}_k\}_{k=0}^r$ as

$$\tilde{X}_k(x, v) := \begin{pmatrix} X_k(x) \\ V_{\nabla X_k(x)}(v) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\nabla X_k(x)$ the covariant derivative of the vector field X_k , which for each $x \in M$ we view as a linear endomorphism

$$\nabla X_k(x) : T_x M \rightarrow T_x M,$$

so that for each $v \in T_x M$, $\nabla X_k(x)v := \nabla_v X_k(x)$. Recall that the divergence $\text{div} X$ of a vector field X on Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} is given by the trace of it's covariant derivative (using the Levi-Civita connection)

$$\text{div} X := \text{tr}(\nabla X).$$

The following identity will be useful relating the divergence of \tilde{X}_k to that of X_k .

Lemma 2.2. *The following identity holds for for each $k = 0, \dots, r$ and $v \in S_x M$,*

$$\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k(x, v) = 2 \operatorname{div} X_k(x) - n \langle v, \nabla X_k(x) v \rangle. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. First we note that in light of the orthogonal splitting $T_w S M = T_x M \oplus T_v(\mathbb{S}_x M)$ we have

$$\operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k(x, v) = \operatorname{div} X_k(x) + \operatorname{div} V_{\nabla X_k(x)}(v),$$

where for a fixed $x \in M$ the divergence $\operatorname{div} V_{\nabla X_k(x)}(v)$ is divergence of $V_{\nabla X_k(x)}(v)$ treated as a vector field on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}(T_x M)$. Since $T_x M$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^n , it suffices to show that for any linear operator $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that the following identity holds true

$$\operatorname{div} V_A(v) = \operatorname{tr}(A) - n \langle v, Av \rangle. \quad (2.4)$$

To show this, we first compute the covariant derivative ∇V_A using the embedding of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} in \mathbb{R}^n . Specifically we use that ∇V_A is related to the Euclidean differential $DV_A(v) : T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by projecting it's range onto $T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ via $\Pi_v = I - v \otimes v^\sharp$. Recalling that $V_A(v) = \Pi_v Av$ a simple calculation shows that for each $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the Euclidean differential is

$$DV_A(v) = \Pi_v A - \langle v, Av \rangle I - v \otimes (Av)^\sharp.$$

Projecting onto $T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ eliminates the normal term $v \otimes Av^\sharp$, giving the following formula for the covariant derivative

$$\nabla V_A(v) = \Pi_v A - \langle v, Av \rangle I,$$

which implies

$$\operatorname{div} V_A(v) = \operatorname{tr}(\nabla V_A) = \operatorname{tr}_{T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(A) - (n-1) \langle v, Av \rangle, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\operatorname{tr}_{T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(A)$ denotes the trace of A restricted to the $n-1$ dimensional subspace $T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. To compute this, fix $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and let $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ be an orthonormal basis for $T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1} = v^\perp$ and note that $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n-1}, v\}$ is an orthonormal basis for \mathbb{R}^n . Therefore we have

$$\operatorname{tr}_{T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle e_i, Ae_i \rangle = \operatorname{tr}(A) - \langle v, Av \rangle.$$

Upon substituting this expression into (2.5), we obtain (2.4). \square

We will need the following enhancement of the multiplicative ergodic theorem which says that under some ergodicity assumptions on the projective process w_t , one achieves λ_1 exponential growth in every tangent direction with probability 1. For each $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times M$, let $D\Phi^t(x) : T_x M \rightarrow T_{x_t} M$ be the Jacobian of the stochastic flow Φ_t at $x \in M$. The following is a corollary of, e.g., Theorem III.1.2 in [34].

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let ν be the unique stationary measure for (w_t) . Then, for ν almost every $w = (x, v) \in \mathbb{S}M$ we have*

$$\lambda_1 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |D\Phi^t(x)v| \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

We are now ready to prove the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula for (2.1). A sketch of its proof is included for completeness.

Proposition 2.4 (Furstenberg-Khasminskii). *Define for each $x \in M$*

$$Q(x) := \operatorname{div} X_0(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k \operatorname{div} X_k(x)$$

and each $w \in \mathbb{S}M$

$$\tilde{Q}(w) := \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_0(w) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \tilde{X}_k \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k(w).$$

Suppose that (w_t) has a unique stationary probability measure ν on $\mathbb{S}M$ that projects to μ on M , and that $Q \in L^1(\mu)$ and $\tilde{Q} \in L^1(\nu)$, then the following formulas hold

$$\lambda_\Sigma = \int_M Q \, d\mu, \tag{2.6}$$

$$n\lambda_1 - 2\lambda_\Sigma = - \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \tilde{Q} \, d\nu. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. We begin by proving (2.6). We begin by noting that a standard calculation relating determinants to traces gives

$$\begin{aligned} d \log |\det D\Phi^t(x)| &= \operatorname{tr} \nabla X_0(x_t) \, dt + \sum_{k=1}^r \operatorname{tr} \nabla X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k \\ &= \operatorname{div} X_0(x_t) \, dt + \sum_{k=1}^r \operatorname{div} X_k(x_t) \circ dW_t^k. \end{aligned}$$

Upon converting to Itô and integrating in time, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t} \log |\det D\Phi^t(x)| &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \operatorname{div} X_0(x_s) \, ds + \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} X_k \operatorname{div} X_k(x_s) \, ds + \frac{1}{t} M_t \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t Q(x_s) \, ds + \frac{1}{t} M_t, \end{aligned}$$

where M_t is a mean-zero martingale arising from the Itô integral. We now take $t \rightarrow \infty$: the LHS converges to λ_Σ by Theorem 1.3, while the first term on the RHS converges to $\int Q \, d\mu$ by the ergodic theorem. In particular, $\frac{1}{t} M_t$ must also converge, both pointwise and in $L^1(\mathbf{P} \times \mu)$, hence $\frac{1}{t} M_t \rightarrow 0$ and (2.6) follows.

Likewise, to prove (2.7), we see that a straight forward computation and formula (2.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} d \log(|D\Phi^t(x)v|) &= \langle v_t, \nabla X_0(x_t)v_t \rangle dt + \sum_{k=1}^r \langle v_t, \nabla X_k(x_t)v_t \rangle \circ dW_t^k \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left(2 \operatorname{div} X_0(x_t) - \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_0(w_t) \right) dt + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^r \left(2 \operatorname{div} X_k(x_t) - \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k(w_t) \right) \circ dW_t^k. \end{aligned}$$

Converting to Itô gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t} \log(|D\Phi^t(x)v|) &= \frac{1}{nt} \int_0^t \left(2 \operatorname{div} X_k(x_s) - \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k(w_s) \right) ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{nt} \int_0^t \left(X_k \operatorname{div} X_k(x_s) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{X}_k \operatorname{div} \tilde{X}_k(w_s) \right) ds + \frac{1}{t} \tilde{M}_t \\ &= \frac{1}{nt} \int_0^t 2Q(x_s) \, ds - \frac{1}{nt} \int_0^t \tilde{Q}(w_s) \, ds + \frac{1}{t} \tilde{M}_t, \end{aligned}$$

with \tilde{M}_t another mean-zero martingale. The proof is complete on sending $t \rightarrow \infty$ and applying the ergodic theorem, this time using Theorem 2.3 to ensure the LHS converges to λ_1 . \square

2.3 Fisher information identity

In this section, we prove Proposition 1.4. As discussed in Section 1.1, the Markov process (w_t) on the sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$ has the following generator in Hörmander form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \tilde{X}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \tilde{X}_k^2.$$

As discussed in the intro, we will be working in the setting where the process (w_t) admits a unique stationary probability measure ν on $\mathbb{S}M$ with smooth density $f(w)$ with respect to the volume measure dq on $\mathbb{S}M$ satisfying $\int f dq = 1$. The stationary density f solves the following PDE

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f = \tilde{X}_0^* f + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r (\tilde{X}_k^*)^2 f = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

where for a given vector field \tilde{X} on $\mathbb{S}M$, \tilde{X}^* denotes the formal adjoint operator with respect to $L^2(dq)$. Note that the differential operator \tilde{X}^* can be related to \tilde{X} and $\text{div } \tilde{X}$ through the following relation

$$\tilde{X}^* h = -\tilde{X} h - (\text{div } \tilde{X}) h, \quad h \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{S}M). \quad (2.9)$$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 1.4.

Proof of Proposition 1.4. Formally, the argument is straightforward. Consider first the second equality in (1.6). Pairing (2.8) with $\log f$ and integrating gives

$$-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} (\log f) (\tilde{X}_k^*)^2 f dq = \int_{\mathbb{S}M} (\log f) \tilde{X}_0^* f dq.$$

Ignoring, for the moment, that f is not compactly supported, integrating by parts a few times and using (2.9) gives for the left hand side

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} (\log f) (\tilde{X}_k^*)^2 f dq &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \frac{(\tilde{X}_k f)(\tilde{X}_k^* f)}{f} dq \\ &= FI(f) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} (\tilde{X}_k \text{div } \tilde{X}_k) f dq, \end{aligned}$$

whereas, for the right hand side we have

$$\int (\log f) \tilde{X}_0^* f dq = \int \tilde{X}_0 f dq = - \int (\text{div } \tilde{X}_0) f dq.$$

Putting these two identities together yields $FI(f) = - \int Q d\nu$ and therefore (1.6). The formula for $FI(\rho)$ with $\rho = \frac{d\mu}{dx}$ the stationary density for (x_t) , follows from an identical argument, omitted for brevity, once one observes that ρ solves the Kolmogorov equation

$$X_0^* \rho + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r (X_j^*)^2 \rho = 0.$$

To rigorously justify the above formal calculation, we need to be a little more careful with integration by parts and make use of the $f \log f$ integrability assumption. Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(B(0, R))$ satisfy $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ with

$\chi_R(x) = 1$ in $B(0, R/2)$, where $B(0, R)$ is the geodesic ball of radius R on M . Multiplying both sides by $(\log f)\chi_R$ and following the above procedure gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \frac{|\tilde{X}_k^* f|^2}{f} \chi_R \, dq = - \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \tilde{Q} f \chi_R \, dq + \int_{\mathbb{S}M} (\mathcal{L}\chi_R)(f \log f - f) \, dq.$$

Using the fact that $\chi_R \rightarrow 1$, $|\mathcal{L}\chi_R| \lesssim 1$ uniformly in R , and $\mathcal{L}\chi_R \rightarrow 0$ pointwise as $R \rightarrow \infty$, and the fact that $f \log f - f \in L^1$, we apply the dominated convergence theorem to pass the limit as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

Turn next to (1.7). We give only the formal proof, the rigorous proof by the dominated convergence theorem is analogous given the regularity provided by (1.6). For this we observe that (denoting dv Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}_x M$)

$$\tilde{X}_k^*(h\rho) = ((V_{\nabla X_k}^* h - \tilde{X}_k h)\rho + (X_k^* \rho)h)$$

and therefore since $\int_{\mathbb{S}_x M} h_x(v) \, dv = 1$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} FI(f) - FI(\rho) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \frac{|(V_{\nabla X_k}^* h - \tilde{X}_k h)\rho + (X_k^* \rho)h|^2}{h\rho} \, dq - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \frac{|X_k^* \rho|^2}{\rho} h \, dq \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_M \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}_x M} \frac{|(X_k - V_{\nabla X_k}^*(x))h_x(v)|^2}{h_x(v)} \, dv \right) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}M} (V_{\nabla X_k}^* h - X_k h)(X_k^* \rho) \, dq. \end{aligned}$$

However,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}M} (V_{\nabla X_k}^* h - X_k h)(X_k^* \rho) \, dq = - \int_{\mathbb{S}M} X_k h(X_k^* \rho) \, dq = - \int_{\mathbb{S}M} h(X_k^*)^2 \rho \, dq = 0.$$

□

2.4 Relation to Baxendale's relative entropy formula

In this section we give a formal argument of the Fisher information identity using the proper analogue of the relative entropy formula (1.17), measuring the *degree to which the degeneracy* (1.19) fails to hold. We already have given a complete proof above, this section is simply a way to get some additional intuition regarding the meaning behind Proposition 1.4. Hence, in this section we do not endeavor to give a complete proof, furthermore, for technical simplicity in this section we only consider the case in which M is compact (still with no boundary).

In preparation, recall that given two measures λ, η on $\mathbb{S}M$, $\eta \ll \lambda$, we define the relative entropy of η with respect to λ by

$$H(\eta|\lambda) := \int_{\mathbb{S}M} \log \left(\frac{d\eta}{d\lambda} \right) d\eta.$$

Since we work frequently with absolutely continuous measures, we abuse notation somewhat and also write $H(f|g)$ for the relative entropy of $f \, dq$ with respect to $g \, dq$. Recall that $H(f|g) = 0$ if and only if $f \equiv g$.

In what follows, we let $\hat{\Phi}_t$ be the stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms on $\mathbb{S}M$ induced by the SDE governing the projective process (w_t) . Given a smooth density $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}M)$, let

$$f_t := (\hat{\Phi}_t)_* f = f \circ \hat{\Phi}_t^{-1} |\det D\hat{\Phi}_t^{-1}|$$

be the pushforward of f as a measure on $\mathbb{S}M$. The density f_t can readily be seen to solve the stochastic continuity equation

$$df_t = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f_t dt + \sum_{k=1}^r \tilde{X}_k^* f_t dW_t^k,$$

and satisfies $f_t \rightarrow f$ locally uniformly on $\mathbb{S}M$.

In [11], Baxendale derived the following formula (inspired by one of Furstenberg [26] in the context of IID compositions of random matrices):

Theorem 2.5 (Baxendale [11]). *Under Assumptions 1 & 2, writing $f = \frac{d\nu}{dq}$ for the stationary density of (w_t) and $\rho = \frac{d\mu}{dx}$ for that of (x_t) and denoting*

$$f_t = (\hat{\Phi}_t)_* f, \quad \rho_t = (\Phi_t)_* \rho,$$

one has the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}H(\rho_t|\rho) &= -t\lambda_\Sigma, \\ \mathbf{E}(H(f_t|f) - H(\rho_t|\rho)) &= t(n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

The second line can be rewritten (using, e.g., Lemma 3.2 in [11]) in the following highly suggestive form. Let (ν_x) denote the disintegration measures of ν (as integrands, $d\nu(x, v) = d\nu_x(v)d\mu(x)$; see Section 5.2), one has

$$\mathbf{E} \int H(D\Phi^t(x)_* \nu_x | \nu_{\Phi^t(x)}) d\mu(x) = n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma. \tag{2.11}$$

This form directly encodes the Furstenberg criterion (1.19) for $n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma = 0$: naturally, if $n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma = 0$ then one must have $(D_x\Phi)_* \nu_x = \nu_{x_t}$ for all t . Indeed, one might hope to extract quantitative information about gap $n\lambda_1 - \lambda_\Sigma$ using (2.11), although to our best knowledge this has not been done.

On the other hand, our Fisher information identity can be thought of as the time-infinitesimal analogue of (2.10), as the following shows.

Lemma 2.6.

$$\begin{aligned} FI(\rho) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E}H(\rho_t|\rho), \\ FI(f) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E}H(f_t|f). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $FI(f) = n\lambda_1 - 2\lambda_\Sigma$.

In view of (2.10), we see that $FI(f) - FI(\rho)$ measures the *rate* at which the projective dynamics $\hat{\Phi}^t$ distorts the stationary fiber measures $(\nu_x)_{x \in M}$.

Proof. We include a sketch of the proof, ignoring technical details related to localization and convergence of $\rho_t \rightarrow \rho, f_t \rightarrow f$. We present here the proof for f_t ; the proof for ρ_t largely follows the same lines and is omitted.

Using the formula for f_t , we can apply Itô's lemma to obtain the following stochastic equation that holds pointwise on $\mathbb{S}M$:

$$d \left[f_t \log \left(\frac{f_t}{f} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|X_k^* f_t|^2}{f_t} dt + \left[\log \left(\frac{f_t}{f} \right) - 1 \right] (df_t).$$

Therefore we find

$$f_t \log \left(\frac{f_t}{f} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r \int_0^t \frac{|X_k^* f_s|^2}{f_s} ds + \int_0^t (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f_s) \left[\log \left(\frac{f_s}{f} \right) - 1 \right] ds + \frac{1}{t} M_t$$

where M_t is a mean-zero Martingale whose exact form is not important. Integrating over $\mathbb{S}M$, using Fubini, and averaging with respect to \mathbf{E} gives

$$\frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E} H(f_t | f) = \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E} \int_0^t FI(f_s) ds + \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}M} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f_s) \log \left(\frac{f_s}{f} \right) dq ds,$$

where we used the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{S}M} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f_s dq = 0$. Sending $t \rightarrow 0$ and assuming that we can pass the limit $f_t \rightarrow f$ in both terms on the right-hand side gives the result since $\log \left(\frac{f_t}{f} \right) \rightarrow 0$. \square

3 Uniform hypoelliptic regularity via the Fisher information

3.1 Preliminaries and outline of Theorem 1.9

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.9. We start with some notation and conventions to set up our main result, the statement of the quantitative hypoelliptic regularity estimate in Theorem 3.2.

The proof we present has little directly to do with $\mathbb{S}M$, and so throughout Section 3 we replace $\mathbb{S}M$ with an arbitrary, connected, orientable Riemannian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) with volume element dq . Some notation: in what follows we denote $d = \dim \mathcal{M}$, and write $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ for the set of smooth vector fields on \mathcal{M} . Elements $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ are regarded in the usual way as first-order differential operators acting on observables $w : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Throughout, $\{X_0^\epsilon, X_1^\epsilon, \dots, X_r^\epsilon\} \subset \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ is a fixed collection of smooth vector fields (note that since this section is not specific to $\mathbb{S}M$, we will drop the tildes for notational simplicity). We are interested in studying the regularity of the family $\{f^\epsilon dq\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ of smooth, absolutely continuous probability densities solving the stationary forward Kolmogorov equation

$$(X_0^\epsilon)^* f^\epsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r ((X_j^\epsilon)^*)^2 f^\epsilon = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

In what follows we will drop the ϵ superscript on the vector fields for notational simplicity.

Regularity is estimated using the following ‘fractional’ norms, which arise naturally in our analysis. To define these, let $\{\mathbf{x}_j\}$ be a countable family of smooth injective mappings $\mathbf{x}_j : B_{4\delta}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, $B_{4\delta}(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that both $\tilde{U}_j := \mathbf{x}_j(B_{4\delta}(0))$ and $U_j := \mathbf{x}_j(B_\delta(0))$ are covers of \mathcal{M} for which $\text{diam } \tilde{U}_j < \infty$ and every $q \in \mathcal{M}$ is in at most finitely many \tilde{U}_j . Let $\{\chi_j\}$ be a smooth partition of unity on \mathcal{M} subordinate to the cover $\{U_j\}$, i.e., (i) $0 \leq \chi_j \leq 1$ everywhere, (ii) $\chi_j|_{U_j} \equiv 1$, and (iii) χ_j is supported in \tilde{U}_j .

Fractional L^1 Sobolev spaces $W^{s,1}$ with $s \in (0, 1)$ are defined by

$$\|w\|_{W^{s,1}} = \|w\|_{L^1} + \sum_j \int_{|h|<\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|\tilde{w}(x+h) - \tilde{w}(x)|}{|h|^{d+s}} J_j(x) dx dh. \quad (3.2)$$

In practice, though, is easier to work with the following L^1 Hölder-type regularity class (essentially the Besov space $B_{1,\infty}^s$): for $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda^s} = \|w\|_{L^1} + \sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^d: |h|<\delta} \sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\tilde{w}(x+h) - \tilde{w}(x)|}{|h|^s} J_j(x) dx, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\tilde{w}_j = (\chi_j w) \circ \mathbf{x}_j$ and $J = J_j : B_\delta(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the coordinate representation of the volume element in the chart (U_j, \mathbf{x}_j) . The following embedding is clear: for all $0 < s < s' < 1$, for any $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$ with $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ open and bounded, we have

$$\|w\|_{W^{s,1}} \lesssim \|w\|_{\Lambda^{s'}}.$$

Given $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$, the adjoint action of X on Y is defined through the Lie bracket

$$\text{ad}(X)Y = [X, Y].$$

For a multi-index $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k), i_j \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ for each $1 \leq j \leq k$, we denote

$$X_I = \text{ad}(X_{i_1}) \dots \text{ad}(X_{i_{k-1}})X_{i_k}.$$

In what follows, set $s_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, $s_j = 1, 1 \leq j \leq r$ and for a multi-index $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ we write,

$$m(I) := \frac{1}{s(I)} := \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{s_{i_j}}.$$

Note that $m(I)$ provides a measure of how ‘‘deep’’ a bracket is (i.e. the larger $m(I)$ the more brackets that were taken), weighted in a way that will be consistent with available regularity.

We denote by $\mathfrak{X}^s(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ the $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ -submodule of vector fields generated from successive brackets with $s \leq s(I)$, that is,

$$\mathfrak{X}^s(\mathcal{M}) = \left\{ Z \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M}) : Z = \sum_{j=1}^N h_j X_{I_j}, \quad s(I_j) \geq s, h_j \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \right\}.$$

Recall that $\{X_j\}_{j=0}^r = \{X_j^\epsilon\}_{j=0}^r \subset \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ depend in a general manner on a parameter $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, hence $\mathfrak{X}^s(\mathcal{M})$ also depends on ϵ . This dependence is constrained only by the following ‘uniform’ version of the parabolic Hörmander condition:

Definition 3.1 (Uniform parabolic Hörmander). Let $\{Z_0^\epsilon, Z_1^\epsilon, \dots, Z_r^\epsilon\} \subset \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ be a set of vector fields parameterized by $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$. With \mathcal{X}_k defined as in Definition 1.7 we say $\{Z_0^\epsilon, Z_1^\epsilon, \dots, Z_r^\epsilon\}$ satisfies the uniform parabolic Hörmander condition on \mathcal{M} if $\exists k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any open, bounded set $U \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ there exists constants $\{K_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and all $x \in U$, there is a subset $V(x) \subset \mathcal{X}_k$ such that $\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|\xi| \leq K_0 \sum_{Z \in V(x)} |Z(x) \cdot \xi| \quad \sum_{Z \in V(x)} \|Z\|_{C^n} \leq K_n.$$

Assuming, as we do, that $\{X_j^\epsilon\}$ satisfies the uniform parabolic Hörmander condition, a simple consequence is that $\exists s > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\mathfrak{X}^s(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ ⁷. Once and for all, fix $s_* > 0$ so that $\mathfrak{X}^{s_*}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$.

We now prove the following variant of Theorem 1.9.

⁷Indeed, if $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_m\}$ span $T_w \mathcal{M}$ then $\exists \delta > 0$ such that $\forall v \in B_\delta(w) = \{v \in \mathcal{M} : d(w, v) < \delta\}$ the same vector fields span, and so for $V \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$, $\exists c_j \in C^\infty$ such that $V = \sum c_j Z_j$ on B_δ . The result then follows by a suitable partition of unity.

Theorem 3.2. *We assume that for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ the PDE (3.1) admits a unique, smooth probability measure solution which satisfies $f^\epsilon \log f^\epsilon \in L^1(dq)$. Assume $\{X_0^\epsilon, X_1^\epsilon, \dots, X_r^\epsilon\}$ satisfies the uniform parabolic Hörmander condition as in Definition 3.1. Then, $\forall U \subset \mathcal{M}$ open, bounded, $\exists C > 0$ such that for all $\forall \epsilon \in (0, 1]$ there holds,*

$$\|f^\epsilon\|_{\Lambda^{s*}(U)} \leq C \left(1 + \sqrt{FI}(f^\epsilon)\right).$$

Moreover, the constant C can be chosen to depend only on U , d and the constants k and $\{K_n\}_{n=0}^J$ (for a J depending only on k and d) in Definition 3.1.

Remark 3.3. One can check from the proof that $\frac{1}{2k} < s \leq \frac{1}{k}$ where k is as in Definition 3.1.

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 3.2. The following is a brief outline of what is to come in the remainder of Section 3.

Outline of the proof of Theorem 3.2

Crucial to both Hörmander’s original approach and our own is the ability to measure *partial* regularity of a function along some given set of directions. To make sense of this, for a vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ and $s > 0$, we define below the norm $|\cdot|_{Y,s}$ which measures L^1 Hölder regularity along the direction Y .

Let us make this more precise. Throughout, we fix an open bounded set $U \subset \mathcal{M}$. Given $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$, let Y^* denotes its formal adjoint and let e^{tY^*} denote the linear propagator solving the partial differential equation $\partial_t - Y^* = 0$ (this makes sense as long as $t > 0$ is taken sufficiently small depending on Y and U). For $s > 0$, we define the family of ‘partial’ L^1 Hölder seminorms⁸

$$|w|_{Y,s} = \sup_{|t| \leq \delta_0} |t|^{-s} \left\| e^{-tY^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1}.$$

Note the dependence on the parameter $\delta_0 > 0$: in practice, given U , this parameter is fixed and depends only on the regularity of $\{X_I\}$ as I ranges over the multi-indices with $s(I) \geq s_*$. We may choose this parameter thus as the vector fields in the proof vary in a uniformly bounded set in C^J for a J depending only the constants in Definition 3.1.

Turning back to the proof of Theorem 3.2: ultimately, for $f = f^\epsilon$ solving the Kolmogorov equation (3.1), we seek to control $\|f^\epsilon\|_{\Lambda^{s*}(U)}$ from above in terms of $FI(f^\epsilon)$. Starting from the latter, it is straightforward (Lemma 3.4) to obtain the general functional inequality

$$\sum_{j=1}^r |w|_{X_j,1} \lesssim \|w\|_1^{1/2} \sqrt{FI(w)}. \quad (3.4)$$

for any $w \in C_0^\infty(U)$. Hence, for all intents and purposes it suffices to control the regularity $\|f\|_{\Lambda^{s*}}$ from above in terms of $\sum_{j \geq 1} |f|_{X_j,1}$.

For this, we turn to the ideas laid out by Hörmander. First, the spanning condition $\mathfrak{X}^{s*} = \mathfrak{X}$ allows to “fill in” the missing directions not spanned by the original $\{X_0, \dots, X_r\}$, leading to the general functional inequality

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda^{s*}} \lesssim_U \|w\|_{L^1} + \sum_{j=0}^r |w|_{X_j,s_j} \quad (3.5)$$

⁸Note that these seminorms are slightly different from those used in [29], where the linear propagator e^{tY} solving $\partial_t - Y = 0$ is used directly. Note, though, that the regularity defined is essentially the same in the sense that

$$\|w\|_{L^1} + \sup_{|t| \leq \delta_0} |t|^{-s} \left\| e^{-tY^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1} \approx_{\delta_0, U, H} \|w\|_{L^1} + \sup_{|t| \leq \delta_0} |t|^{-s} \left\| e^{tY} w - w \right\|_{L^1}.$$

for $w \in C_0^\infty(U)$. This is a straightforward adaptation of [Section 4; [29]]– see Lemma 3.7 below.

While (3.4) controls $|w|_{X_{j,1}}, 1 \leq j \leq r$ in terms of the Fisher information $FI(w)$, it remains (as in [29]) to obtain an upper estimate on $|f^\epsilon|_{X_{0,1/2}}$. The starting point is the derivation of an a priori estimate on f^ϵ from (3.1). In [29], Hörmander observed that one naturally obtains an a priori regularity estimate on $X_0 f$ in a *negative* regularity L^2 space in terms of $X_j f \in L^2$ (see also discussions in [4]). In our case, we cannot work in L^2 , and instead have to work in a negative-type regularity which is essentially the dual to that in (3.4)– this is the only a priori estimate available that will be useful. Pairing (3.1) with a test function $v \in C_0^\infty$ we obtain the following, which is essentially the $W^{-1,\infty}$ norm with respect to the X_j^* directions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(f^\epsilon) &:= \sup_{v \in C_0^\infty: \|v\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{j=1}^r \|X_j v\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1} \left| \int f^\epsilon X_0^\epsilon v \right| \\ &\leq \epsilon \sum_{j=1}^r \|X_j^* f^\epsilon\|_{L^1} \lesssim \epsilon \sqrt{FI}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Using this, the missing X_0 regularity is recovered by the following, which is the main difficulty in the proof: for any $0 < \sigma < s_*$, $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ bounded, open set and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$, we show that

$$|w|_{X_{0,1/2}} \lesssim_U \sum_{j=1}^r |w|_{X_{j,1}} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(w) + \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}. \quad (3.7)$$

That is, we recover the $|w|_{X_{0,1/2}}$ regularity by a combination of the negative \mathfrak{D}_ϵ regularity in conjunction with the positive $|w|_{X_{j,1}}$ regularity, accruing only a remainder term $\|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}$. Combining with (3.5) (along with interpolation of Λ^σ between Λ^{s_*} and L^1), we obtain the following: $\forall U \subset \mathcal{M}$ open, bounded, $\exists C > 0$ such that for all $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$, there holds

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda^{s_*}(U)} \leq C \left(\|w\|_{L^1} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(w) + \sum_{j=1}^r |w|_{X_{j,1}} \right). \quad (3.8)$$

From here, our estimate on $\|f^\epsilon\|_{\Lambda^{s_*}(U)}$ in Theorem 3.2 is an easy consequence of the functional inequality (3.4) and the a priori estimate in (3.6).

In Section 3.2 we review the available a priori estimates and basic functional inequalities that are used in the proof. In Section 3.3 we briefly recall (3.5) and a closely related inequality which are straightforward adaptations of estimates in [Section 4; [29]]. In Section 3.4 we give the proof of (3.7), leaving the main lemma to be proved in Section 3.5. As in the corresponding step in [29], (3.7) is based on a careful regularization procedure, though it is more subtle to perform this procedure in the $W^{-1,\infty}$ -type framework we work with here. Section 3.5 is dedicated to the details of this regularization.

3.2 Preliminary estimates

To start, we record some useful estimates for the L^1 Hölder-type seminorms $|\cdot|_{Y,s}$. Let $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and let e^{tY} be the linear propagator of the partial differential operator $\partial_t - Y$. By the method of characteristics, the smooth family of diffeomorphisms $h_Y(t) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ solving the initial value problem $\dot{x} = Y(x)$ satisfies the identity

$$e^{tY} w = w \circ h_Y(t).$$

With Y^* the formal adjoint of Y , again by the method of characteristics there is a smooth family of strictly positive densities $H_Y(t) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$e^{-tY^*} w = H_Y(t) w \circ h_Y(t) = H_Y(t) e^{tY} w. \quad (3.9)$$

In particular, for $|t| \lesssim 1$,

$$|H_Y - 1| \lesssim |t|, \quad (3.10)$$

with similar estimates on higher derivatives.

Next, we prove (3.4): that $\|X_j^* w\|_{L^1}$ controls one derivative in the L^1 -Hölder norms.

Lemma 3.4. *Let U be a bounded, open set $U \subset \mathcal{M}$. Then, $\forall w \in C_c^\infty(U)$ there holds,*

$$\|w\|_{X_{j,1}} \lesssim_U \|X_j^* w\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^1}^{1/2} \sqrt{FI(w)}.$$

Proof. Let $v \in L^\infty$, then

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} v(e^{-tX_j^*} w - w) dq \right| = \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{M}} v e^{-sX_j^*} X_j^* w dq ds \right| \leq |t| \|v\|_{L^\infty} \|X_j^* w\|_{L^1}.$$

Taking the supremum over $\|v\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$ and dividing by $|t|$ gives the first inequality whereas the second follows by Cauchy-Schwarz. \square

Lastly, we record the simple observation that the negative regularity \mathfrak{D}_ϵ can be localized.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $U \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be an open, bounded set and $\chi \in C_c^\infty(U)$. Then, for any $h \in L^1(\mathcal{M})$, we have*

$$\mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(\chi h) \lesssim_U \|h\|_{L^1} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(h).$$

Proof. Set $w = \chi h$. For test functions $v \in C_0^\infty(U)$, we estimate

$$\left| \int (X_0 v) w dq \right| \leq \left| \int v (X_0 \chi) h \right| + \left| \int X_0 (\chi v) h \right| \lesssim \|h\|_{L^1} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(h).$$

Note that the estimate is uniform in $\|X_0\|_{C^1(U)}$. \square

3.3 Controlling Λ^s with $|\cdot|_{X_j, s_j}$

The first steps to Theorem 3.2 are several lemmas that are nearly the same as those in [Section 4; [29]], except (A) we need them in L^1 , (B) we need them uniform in the parameter ϵ hidden in X_0 , (C) we need to generalize the proof to compact manifolds (\mathcal{M}, g) . However, these small changes are straightforward on a careful reading of [29] and are omitted for the sake of brevity; see [16] for more discussion on the uniformity.

Lemma 3.6. *Let U be an open, bounded set and $0 < \sigma < s_*$ with $\mathfrak{X}^{s_*}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$. For all $\delta > 0$, $\exists C_\delta > 0$ such that for all multi-indices I such that least one index is zero, the following holds $\forall w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,*

$$|w|_{X_I, s(I)} \leq \delta |w|_{X_0, \frac{1}{2}} + C_\delta \left(\sum_{j=1}^r |w|_{X_j, 1} + \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \right).$$

Moreover, C_δ depends on $\{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_r\}$ only in the manner stated in Theorem 3.2.

The next lemma shows that one can control regularity in Λ^s by controlling the original vector fields.

Lemma 3.7. *Let U be an open, bounded set and s_* be such that $\mathfrak{X}^{s_*}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$. Then, for $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$ there holds*

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda^{s_*}} \lesssim_U \|w\|_{L^1} + \sum_{j=0}^r |w|_{X_j, s_j}.$$

Moreover, C_δ depends on $\{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_r\}$ only in the manner stated in Theorem 3.2.

3.4 Positive X_0 regularity from negative X_0 and positive X_j regularity

In this subsection, we prove the a priori estimate (3.7) and then use it to complete the proof of Theorem 3.2. Fix $0 < \sigma < s_*$ arbitrary. Having fixed U we may, by rescaling $\{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_r\}$, assume that e^{tX_I} (and hence $e^{-tX_I^*}$) is well-posed for $w \in C_0^\infty(U)$ for $t \in [-1, 1]$ for $\sigma \leq s(I)$ (and hence we may choose $\delta_0 = 1$).

Analogous to [Section 5; [29]], the primary intermediate step is to first deduce the estimate assuming the natural control on essentially all other vector fields in \mathfrak{X}^σ .

Definition 3.8. Denote by \mathcal{J} the set of all multi-indices I with $\sigma \leq s(I)$ *except* for the singleton $\{0\}$.

Note this definition is slightly different from that in [29]. Define the following semi-norm

$$|w|_M := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{J}} |w|_{X_I, s(I)}.$$

The main step in the proof of (3.7) (and hence Theorem 3.2 as a whole) is to prove the following.

Lemma 3.9. *For any bounded, open set $U \subset \mathcal{M}$, and $w \in C_0^\infty(U)$, the following holds uniformly in ϵ*

$$|w|_{X_0, \frac{1}{2}} \lesssim_U |w|_M + \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(w).$$

As in the corresponding [Section 5; [29]] (and in [4]), we use an approach based on a carefully selected regularization, but our choice is even a little more delicate than [29]. As the regularization procedure is quite technically subtle, we first give the proof of Lemma 3.9 assuming the existence of a regularizer satisfying the desired properties.

Lemma 3.10. *There exists a family of uniformly bounded smoothing operators $S_\tau : L^p \rightarrow L^p$ for $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$ with the following properties: for all $w \in C_0^\infty(U)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\tau^* w - w\|_{L^1} &\lesssim \tau |w|_M \\ \sum_{j=1}^r \|X_j S_\tau w\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\tau} \|w\|_{L^\infty} \\ \| [X_0, S_\tau]^* w \|_{L^1} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\tau} (|w|_M + \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}). \end{aligned}$$

Assuming this lemma for now, we proceed.

Proof of Lemma 3.9 assuming Lemma 3.10. We will first obtain regularity estimates by evaluating the fractional time derivative of $e^{tX_0^*} w$ (omitting the ϵ for notational simplicity). Observe that for any $t, \tau > 0$,

$$\left\| e^{-tX_0^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1} \leq \left\| e^{-tX_0^*} (S_\tau^* w - w) \right\|_{L^1} + \|S_\tau^* w - w\|_{L^1} + \left\| e^{-tX_0^*} S_\tau^* w - S_\tau^* w \right\|_{L^1}. \quad (3.11)$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.10 and L^1 boundedness of the group $e^{-tX_0^*}$ on U ,

$$\sup_{|t| \leq 1} \left\| e^{-tX_0^*} (S_\tau^* w - w) \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|S_\tau^* w - w\|_{L^1} \lesssim \tau |w|_M. \quad (3.12)$$

This will suffice for the first two terms in (3.11). Next, we estimate the last term in (3.11). We will do this using the fact that

$$\left\| e^{-tX_0^*} S_\tau^* w - S_\tau^* w \right\|_{L^1} \leq \sup_{\|v\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{M}} (e^{sX_0} v) X_0^* S_\tau^* w \, dq ds \right|. \quad (3.13)$$

For a fixed $v \in L^\infty$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} (e^{sX_0} v) X_0^* S_\tau^* w \, dq \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} (e^{sX_0} v) [X_0, S_\tau]^* w \, dq \right| + \left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} (S_\tau e^{sX_0} v) X_0^* w \, dq \right| \\ &\leq \|e^{sX_0} v\|_{L^\infty} \|[X_0, S_\tau]^* w\|_{L^1} + \left(\|S_\tau e^{sX_0} v\|_\infty + \sum_{j=1}^r \|X_j S_\tau e^{sX_0} v\|_{L^\infty} \right) \mathfrak{D}(w). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.10 and the boundedness of e^{tX_0} in $L^\infty(U)$, we conclude that

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{M}} (e^{sX_0} v) X_0^* S_\tau^* w \, dq \right| \lesssim_U \frac{1}{\tau} \|v\|_{L^\infty} (|w|_M + \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} + \mathfrak{D}(w))$$

and from (3.13) we deduce

$$\left\| e^{-tX_0^*} S_\tau^* w - S_\tau^* w \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim_U \frac{|t|}{\tau} (|w|_M + \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} + \mathfrak{D}(w)).$$

Therefore, setting $\tau = \sqrt{|t|}$ and using (3.12) implies

$$\left\| e^{-tX_0^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sqrt{|t|} (|w|_M + \mathfrak{D}(w)).$$

By (3.9), (3.10), and the boundedness of U , this implies the desired result. \square

To complete the section, we explain in more detail how Lemma 3.9 implies Theorem 3.2

Proof of Theorem 3.2. By Lemma 3.9 followed by Lemma 3.6 to absorb the effect of the higher order brackets by choosing δ sufficiently small, implies (3.7), that is for any $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,

$$\|w\|_{X_0, \frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} + \sum_{j=1}^r |w|_{X_{j,1}} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(w).$$

Applying Lemma 3.7 then implies

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda^{s*}} \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^r |w|_{X_{j,1}} + \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(w). \quad (3.14)$$

Next, note the interpolation (from Hölder's inequality and Definition 3.3): $\forall \sigma \in (0, s)$ and all $\delta > 0$, $\exists C_\delta$ such that

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \leq \delta \|w\|_{\Lambda^{s*}} + C_\delta \|w\|_{L^1},$$

which by (3.14) implies Hörmander inequality (3.8). Let $U \subset\subset U' \subset \mathcal{M}$ where U' is another open and bounded set and let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(U')$ with $\chi(x) = 1$ for all $x \in U$. Then, Lemma 3.5 implies

$$\|\chi f^\epsilon\|_{\Lambda^s} \lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^r |\chi f^\epsilon|_{X_{j,1}} + \mathfrak{D}_\epsilon(f^\epsilon). \quad (3.15)$$

Putting Lemma 3.4 together with (3.15) and (3.6), completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. \square

3.5 Regularization: Lemma 3.10

In this subsection we prove Lemma 3.10. First, we define a suitable ‘‘isotropic’’ mollifier via the parameterization. Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty((-1, 1))$ with $\varphi \geq 0$, $\int_{-1}^1 \varphi(t) dt = 1$, and $\varphi(-t) = \varphi(t)$, denoting $\tilde{w}_j = \chi_j w \circ \mathbf{x}_j$, and for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ let $\phi_\tau(x) = \frac{1}{\tau^d} \phi(|x|/\tau)$. We define the regularization of $\chi_j w$ as follows for $|\tau| \leq \delta$,

$$\Phi_\tau^{(j)} w \circ \mathbf{x}_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_\tau(|x - y|) \tilde{w}_j(y) J_j(y) dy,$$

where as above we write $J_j = (\det \tilde{g})^{1/2}$, the volume element on \mathcal{M} in local coordinates. We write

$$\Phi_\tau w(q) = \sum_{j: j \in \tilde{U}_j} \Phi_\tau^{(j)} w(q). \quad (3.16)$$

Note that by definition, $\Phi_\tau = \Phi_\tau^*$ for the adjoint in $L^2(dq)$. The basic properties of these kinds of mollifiers are classical, however, we include sketches for completeness. Due to the compatibility between definitions (3.3) and (3.16), and the fact that the properties we are interested in are purely local, the results follow from the corresponding statements on \mathbb{R}^d . We sketch the details of this in the first lemma for the readers’ convenience.

Lemma 3.11. *For all $\sigma \in [0, 1)$, $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ open and bounded, there holds the following uniformly in $\tau \in (0, \delta)$ and uniformly in C^3 bounded sets of $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$, for all $w \in C_0^\infty(U)$ (identifying $\Lambda^0 = L^1$),*

$$\| [Y, \Phi_\tau] w \|_{L^1} \lesssim_U \tau^\sigma \| w \|_{\Lambda^\sigma}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that the lemma holds for all $\Phi^{(j)}$. By the definition of the parameterization we have, writing $a_k(x) \partial_x^k$ (using Einstein notation summation) as the parameterization of the vector field Y ,

$$\| [Y, \Phi_\tau^j] w \|_{L^1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_j(y) a_k(x) \partial_x^k \phi_\tau(|x - y|) \tilde{w}_j(y) - \phi_\tau(|x - y|) a_k(y) \partial_y^k \tilde{w}_j(y) dy \right| J_j(x) dx.$$

Integrating by parts and using the average zero property, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \| [Y, \Phi_\tau^j] w \|_{L^1} &\lesssim \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(J_j(y) a_k(x) \partial_x^k \phi_\tau(|x - y|) + \partial_y^k (J_j(y) \phi_\tau(|x - y|) a_k(y)) \right) (\tilde{w}_j(y) - \tilde{w}_j(x)) dy \right| J_j(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $|a_k(x) - a_k(y)| \lesssim |x - y|$, and $\partial_y^k (J_j(y) a_k(y)) \leq 1$ gives

$$\| [Y, \Phi_\tau^j] w \|_{L^1} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{1}{\tau^d} \phi \left(\frac{|x - y|}{\tau} \right) + \frac{|x - y|}{\tau^{d+1}} \phi' \left(\frac{|x - y|}{\tau} \right) \right| |\tilde{w}_j(x) - \tilde{w}_j(y)| dy J_j(x) dx.$$

Then, making the change of variables $y = x + h$, we obtain from (3.3),

$$\| [Y, \Phi_\tau^j] w \|_{L^1} \lesssim \tau^\sigma \| w \|_{\Lambda^\sigma}.$$

□

Next we prove the following regularization estimate.

Lemma 3.12. *For all $\sigma \in [0, 1)$, for all $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ open and bounded, there holds uniformly over $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and uniformly over bounded C^2 sets of $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(K)$, for all $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$,*

$$\|\tau Y \Phi_\tau w\|_{L^p} \lesssim_U \|w\|_{L^p} \quad (3.17)$$

$$\|\tau Y \Phi_\tau w\|_{L^1} \lesssim_U \tau^\sigma \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}. \quad (3.18)$$

$$\|\Phi_\tau \tau Y w\|_{L^1} \lesssim_U \tau^\sigma \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}. \quad (3.19)$$

Proof. We proceed with a proof similar to that used in Lemma 3.11. We consider only (3.18); the proofs of (3.17) and (3.19) follow from similar arguments. As above, we have,

$$\left\| \tau Y \Phi_\tau^{(j)} w_j \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tau a_k \partial_x^k \phi_\tau(|x-y|) (\tilde{w}_j(y) - \tilde{w}_j(x)) dy \right| dx \lesssim \tau^\sigma \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}.$$

□

Next, we introduce directional regularizations with respect to a given vector field $Y \in \mathfrak{X}$, as done in [Section 5; [29]]. Accordingly, for each $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([-1, 1])$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$ define

$$\varphi_{\tau Y} w := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{tY} w) \varphi_\tau(t) dt,$$

where $\varphi_\tau(t) := \frac{1}{\tau} \varphi(\tau^{-1}t)$. Note that,

$$(\varphi_{\tau Y})^* w = \varphi_{-\tau Y^*} w = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{-tY^*} w) \varphi_\tau(t) dt,$$

a property that will be used repeatedly in the sequel.

First we record the basic property that these regularizers are bounded on L^p . The proof is straightforward and is omitted for brevity.

Lemma 3.13. *For any $Y \in \mathfrak{X}$, for any open bounded set $U \subset \mathcal{M}$, and $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([-1, 1])$ there holds for all $p \in [1, \infty]$, and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\varphi_{\tau Y})^* w\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|w\|_{L^p} \\ \|\Phi_\tau w\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|w\|_{L^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that the regularizations, the adjoint regularizations, and vector field exponentials are bounded in the Λ^s space.

Lemma 3.14. *For $|t| \leq 1$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $\sigma \in [0, 1)$, for all open, bounded sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{tY} w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} &\lesssim \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \\ \|e^{tY^*} w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} &\lesssim \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \\ \|(\varphi_{\tau Y})^* w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} &\lesssim \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \\ \|\Phi_\tau w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} &\lesssim \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The latter three estimates follow easily from the first estimate. After applying parameterization to reduce to the case of \mathbb{R}^d , the first estimate follows from a straightforward L^1 adaptation of [Lemma 4.2; [29]]. The details are omitted for the sake of brevity. □

In a similar vein, the chain rule implies the following estimates.

Lemma 3.15. *For all open, bounded $U \subset \mathcal{M}$, for all $|\tau| \leq 1$ and $\forall k \geq 2$, the following holds $\forall w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,*

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^k} \leq 1} \|Z e^{\tau Y} w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^k} \leq 1} \|Z w\|_{L^\infty} \quad (3.20)$$

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^k} \leq 1} \|Z^* e^{\tau Y^*} w\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^k} \leq 1} \|Z^* w\|_{L^1} \quad (3.21)$$

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^k} \leq 1} \|Z^*(\varphi_{\tau Y})^* w\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^k} \leq 1} \|Z^* w\|_{L^1}. \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. Estimates (3.20), (3.21) follow from the chain rule and (3.22) then follows from the definition of the regularizers. \square

The next lemma characterizes the regularization property of the regularizers.

Lemma 3.16. *For all open, bounded sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,*

$$\|(Y \varphi_{\tau Y})^* w\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sup_{|t| \leq \tau} \|e^{-tY^*} w - w\|_{L^1}.$$

Proof. We have

$$(\varphi_{\tau Y})^* Y^* w = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{-tY^*} Y^* w) \varphi_\tau(t) dt = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d}{dt} (e^{-tY^*} w - w) \varphi_\tau(t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{-tY^*} w - w) \varphi'_\tau(t) dt.$$

The result then follows by Minkowski's inequality. \square

We will also need the L^∞ regularization property.

Lemma 3.17. *For all open bounded sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,*

$$\|Y \varphi_{\tau Y} w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{1}{\tau} \|w\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Proof. This follows by a straightforward variant of the proof of Lemma 3.16. \square

Next, we show that the Hölder-type regularity classes are natural for controlling convergence of the operators. It is natural to specialize to the specific form in which we are using it.

Lemma 3.18. *For all open bounded sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$, there holds for $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([-1, 1])$, $\varphi \geq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(t) dt = 1$,*

$$\|(\varphi_{\tau X_I})^* w - w\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sup_{|t| \leq \tau} \|e^{-tX_I^*} w - w\|_{L^1}.$$

Proof. By Minkowski's inequality,

$$\|(\varphi_{\tau X_I}^\nu)^* w - w\|_{L^1} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|e^{-tX_I^*} w - w\|_{L^1} \varphi_\tau(t) dt \leq \sup_{|t| \leq \tau} \|e^{-tX_I^*} w - w\|_{L^1}.$$

\square

The following Lemma will be useful when measuring regularity of $\varphi_{\tau X_I}$ with respect to X_J

Lemma 3.19. *For all open bounded sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$, for $I, J \in \mathcal{J}$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(J)}} \left\| e^{-tX_J^*} (\varphi_{\tau^{m(I)} X_I})^* w - (\varphi_{\tau^{m(I)} X_I})^* w \right\|_{L^1} &\leq \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(J)}} \left\| e^{-tX_J^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1} \\ &+ \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(I)}} \left\| e^{-tX_I^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to define the regularizer S_t . Let us now give \mathcal{J} a total ordering so that $m(I)$ is an increasing function of $I \in \mathcal{J}$ and we denote $\mathcal{J}_\infty = \mathcal{J} \cup \{\infty\}$. We define S_t in terms of an *ascending*, ordered composition of regularizing operators

$$S_\tau w := \left(\prod_{I \in \mathcal{J}} \varphi_{\tau^{m(I)} X_I} \right) \Phi_{\tau^{1/\sigma}} w.$$

This regularizer is similar, but not quite exactly the same as that defined in [29] due to the inclusion of more regularization operators. We will ultimately use S_t^* as the regularizer, which is a little more subtle to work with. Analogous to [29], we also define the truncated regularizer, for all $J \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$S_\tau^J := \left(\prod_{I \in \mathcal{J}: I \geq J} \varphi_{\tau^{m(I)} X_I} \right) \Phi_{\tau^{1/\sigma}}$$

The remainder of the subsection is dedicated to proving Lemma 3.10. The first step is to obtain the L^1 convergence.

Lemma 3.20. *For all open bounded sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,*

$$\|S_\eta^* w - w\|_{L^1} \lesssim t \|w\|_M$$

Proof. For any finite family of $L^1 \rightarrow L^1$ bounded linear operators Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_k we have

$$\|Z_1 Z_2 \dots Z_k w - w\|_{L^1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \|(Z^1 \dots Z^{j-1})(Z_j w - w)\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^k \|Z_j w - w\|_{L^1}.$$

The result then follows from Lemma 3.18. \square

The next Lemma is crucial for characterizing the regularization properties of $(S_t^J)^*$ in L^1 . This is the adjoint analogue of [Lemma 5.2; [29]], which is a little more technical.

Lemma 3.21. *For all open bounded sets $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $w \in C_c^\infty(U)$, there holds for any multi-indices $J \leq I$,*

$$\left\| (\tau^{1/\sigma} Y S_\tau^J)^* w \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \tau \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \quad (3.23)$$

$$\left\| (\tau^{m(I)} X_I S_\tau^J)^* w \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sum_{I' \in \mathcal{J}: I' \geq J} \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(I')}} \left\| e^{-tX_{I'}^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1} + \tau \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}. \quad (3.24)$$

Before we continue, we define for two vector fields X and Y

$$e^{t \operatorname{ad}(X)} Y := e^{tX} Y e^{-tX},$$

which is the adjoint representation of e^{tX} on the Lie algebra of vector fields. It will be useful to expand $e^{t \operatorname{ad}(X)} Y$ in a Taylor expansion.

Lemma 3.22. For two smooth vector fields X, Y , $t \in [-1, 1]$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a smooth bounded vector field $Y_{N,t}$ locally uniformly bounded in C^k ($\forall k$) on $t \in [-1, 1]$,

$$(e^{t \operatorname{ad}(X)} Y) = \sum_{0 \leq k < N} \frac{t^k}{k!} (\operatorname{ad}(X)^k Y) + \frac{t^N}{N!} Y_{N,t}$$

The adjoint representation gives the following commutator representation for the smoothing operators

$$Y \varphi_{\tau X} w = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{tX} (e^{-t \operatorname{ad}(X)} Y) w \right) \varphi_{\tau}(t) dt.$$

Lemma 3.22 then gives the following formula for $Y \varphi_{\tau X}$ (used also in [29]).

Lemma 3.23. For each $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((-1, 1))$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and vector field X define

$$(\hat{\varphi}_{\tau X}^k) g := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{tX} g) \hat{\varphi}_{\tau}^k(t) dt, \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\varphi}_{\tau}^k(t) := \frac{t^k}{k!} \varphi(t) \in C_c^\infty((-1, 1)). \quad (3.25)$$

For two smooth vector fields X, Y , $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the following holds

$$Y \varphi_{\tau X} = \sum_{0 \leq k < N} \tau^k \left(\hat{\varphi}_{\tau X}^k (\operatorname{ad}(-X)^k Y) \right) + \tau^N R_{\tau X}^N,$$

where

$$R_{\tau X}^N w := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{tX} Y_{N,t} w) \hat{\varphi}_{\tau}^N(t) dt. \quad (3.26)$$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 3.21.

Proof of Lemma 3.21. Proof of (3.23). We proceed by induction. For $J = \infty$ the result follows from (3.19). Hence, we next assume that the result holds for all J' with $J' > J$ and prove that it also holds for J . We begin with the decomposition

$$(S_{\tau}^J)^* = (S_{\tau}^{J'})^* (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^*.$$

By a trivial application of Lemma 3.23 with $N = 1$ and $X_I = Y$, there exists a smooth bounded vector field $Y_{1,t}$ such that (recall Definition (3.26)),

$$(\tau^{1/\sigma} Y S_{\tau}^J)^* = (\tau^{1/\sigma} Y S_{\tau}^{J'})^* (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* + \tau^{m(J)+1/\sigma} (S_{\tau}^{J'})^* (R_{\tau^{m(J)} X}^1)^*.$$

By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3.14 we have for the first term above

$$\|(\tau^{1/\sigma} Y S_{\tau}^{J'})^* (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* g\|_{L^1} \lesssim \tau \|(\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* g\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \lesssim \tau \|g\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}.$$

A similar estimate holds for the second term using Minkowski's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tau^{1/\sigma} S_{\tau}^{J'})^* (R_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^1)^* g\|_{L^1} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|(\tau^{1/\sigma} Y_{1,t} S_{\tau}^{J'})^* e^{-tX} g\|_{L^1} \hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)}}^1(t) dt \\ &\lesssim \tau \|e^{-tX} g\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \lesssim \tau \|g\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

and the estimate (3.23) now follows.

Proof of (3.24). First we note that if $I = J$ then we have for J' the smallest element such that $J' > J$ by Lemma 3.16 and the L^1 boundedness of $(S_\tau^J)^*$

$$\|(X_J S_\tau^J)^* g\|_{L^1} = \|(S_\tau^{J'})^* (X_J \varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* g\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(J)}} \|e^{-tX_J^*} g - g\|_{L^1}.$$

When $I > J$, we proceed by induction. First of all, the result follows by definition of (3.16) if $J = \infty$. Hence, we next assume that the result holds for all J' with $J' > J$ and prove that it also holds for J the largest element less than J' . Again writing

$$(S_\tau^J)^* = (S_\tau^{J'}) (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^*$$

and using Lemma 3.23 we obtain, $\forall N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau^{m(I)} X_I S_\tau^J)^* &= \sum_{0 \leq k < N} (\tau^{m(I'_k)} X_{I'_k} S_\tau^{J'})^* (\hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^k)^* + (\tau^{m(I) + Nm(J)} S_\tau^{J'})^* (R_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^N)^* \\ &=: T_1 + T_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$X_{I'_k} := \text{ad}(-X_J)^k X_I, \quad \text{and} \quad m(I'_k) = m(I) + km(J).$$

If we choose N large enough so that

$$m(I) + Nm(J) \geq \frac{1}{\sigma},$$

we can treat the “error” term T_2 by applying Minkowski’s inequality and (3.23),

$$\|T_2 w\|_{L^1} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|(\tau^{1/\sigma} Y_{N,t} S_\tau^{J'})^* e^{-tX_J^*} w\|_{L^1} \hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^N(t) dt \lesssim \tau \|e^{-tX_J^*} w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \lesssim \tau \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}.$$

Since $I'_k \geq J'$ for all $k \geq 0$, we can use the induction hypothesis and Lemmas 3.19, 3.13 (it is straightforward to check that $\hat{\varphi}^k$ satisfies the same) to treat the first term

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_1 w\|_{L^1} &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq k < N} \sum_{I' \geq J'} \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(I')}} \left\| e^{-tX_{I'}^*} (\hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^k)^* w - (\hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^k)^* w \right\|_{L^1} + \tau \left\| (\hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^k)^* w \right\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{I' \geq J} \|e^{-tX_{I'}^*} w - w\|_{L^1} + \tau \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

The main commutator estimate is a consequence of the following.

Lemma 3.24. *For all $J \in \mathcal{J}$, $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ open and bounded, there holds $\forall w \in C_c^\infty(U)$ and $\tau \in (-1, 1)$,*

$$\|[\tau^2 X_0, S_\tau^J]^* w\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{J}: I \geq J} \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(I)}} \left\| e^{-tX_I^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1} + \tau \|w\|_{\Lambda^s}.$$

Proof. As in the proof of (3.24) above, we proceed by induction. Firstly, the estimate holds for $J = \infty$ due to the commutator estimate Lemma 3.11. As above, assume the result holds for all J' with $J' > J$ and prove that it also holds for J , writing

$$(S_t^J)^* = (S_t^{J'})^* (\varphi_{t^{m(J)} X_J})^*.$$

Then,

$$[\tau^2 X_0, (S_\tau^J)]^* = [\tau^2 X_0, S_\tau^{J'}]^* (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* + (S_\tau^{J'})^* [\tau^2 X_0, \varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}]^*. \quad (3.27)$$

By the inductive hypothesis and Lemmas 3.19 and Lemmas 3.13 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| [\tau^2 X_0, S_\tau^{J'}]^* (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* w \right\|_{L^1} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{I' \geq J'} \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(I')}} \left\| e^{-tX_{I'}^*} (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* w - (\varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J})^* w \right\|_{L^1} + \tau \left\| \varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J} w \right\|_{\Lambda^\sigma} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{I' \geq J} \sup_{|t| \leq \tau^{m(I')}} \left\| e^{-tX_{I'}^*} w - w \right\|_{L^1} + \tau \|w\|_{\Lambda^\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

This term in (3.27) is consistent with the desired result.

For the second term in (3.27), by Lemma 3.23 we have (note the cancellation which eliminates the $k = 0$ term)

$$(S_\tau^{J'})^* [\tau^2 X_0, \varphi_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}]^* = \sum_{0 < k < N} (\tau^{m(I'_k)} X_{I'_k} S_\tau^{J'})^* (\hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^k)^* + (\tau^{2+Nm(J)} S_\tau^{J'})^* (R_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^N)^*$$

where

$$X_{I'_k} := \text{ad}(-X_J)^k X_0, \quad \text{and} \quad m(I'_k) = 2 + km(J).$$

The treatment of these terms is exactly the same as in the proof of (3.24) upon taking $2 + Nm(J) \geq \frac{1}{\sigma}$. We omit the repetitive details for the sake of brevity. \square

Finally, we prove the required L^∞ regularization estimate.

Lemma 3.25. *Let $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ be open and bounded. Let I be any multi-index and $J \leq I$. Then, $\forall w \in C_c^\infty(U)$,*

$$\left\| t^{m(I)} X_I S_t^J w \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim_U \|w\|_{L^\infty}$$

Proof. This is done by induction as in previous lemmas. The case $J = \infty$ follows from (3.17). Assume that the result holds for all J' with $J' > J$ and write

$$S_t^J = \varphi_{t^{m(J)} X_J} S_t^{J'}.$$

Case 1: $I > J$. We apply the Taylor expansion of Lemma 3.23 (recalling definitions (3.25) and (3.26))

$$\tau^{m(I)} X_I S_\tau^J = \sum_{0 \leq k < N} \hat{\varphi}_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^k \tau^{m(I'_k)} X_{I'_k} S_\tau^{J'} + \tau^{m(I)+Nm(J)} R_{\tau^{m(J)} X_J}^N S_\tau^{J'},$$

where

$$X_{I'_k} := \text{ad}(-X_J)^k X_I, \quad \text{and} \quad m(I'_k) = m(I) + km(J).$$

Then we have,

$$\left\| \tau^{m(I)} X_I S_\tau^J w \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq \nu < N} \left\| \tau^{m(I'_k)} X_{I'_k} S_\tau^{J'} w \right\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^3} \leq 1} \left\| \tau^{m(I)+Nm(J)} Z S_\tau^{J'} w \right\|_{L^\infty}.$$

For N chosen sufficiently large, the latter term is estimated by Lemma 3.15 an (3.17) to produce

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathfrak{X}: \|Z\|_{C^3} \leq 1} \left\| \tau^{m(I)+Nm(J)} Z S_\tau^{J'} w \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Since $I'_k \geq J'$ and hence the first N terms in the summation are estimated by induction.

Case 2: $I = J$. In this case, the desired result follows immediately from Lemma 3.17. \square

4 Projective spanning

In this section, we discuss tools for verifying the parabolic Hörmander conditions on the projective process (w_t) on the sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$ in general (Section 4.1) as well as specific criteria for the class of Euler-like models introduced in Section 1.2 (Section 4.2). This projective spanning condition is proved for the Lorenz 96 model in Section 4.3

4.1 General conditions for projective spanning

We work in this section at the same level of generality as we did in Section 2. As before, let M be a smooth, connected, orientable Riemannian manifold without boundary. Given a vector field X on M we denote the associated “lifted” vector field \tilde{X} on the sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$ by

$$\tilde{X}(x, v) := \begin{pmatrix} X(x) \\ V_{\nabla X(x)}(v) \end{pmatrix}$$

where each of the components in the block vector above are with respect to the orthogonal splitting $T_w\mathbb{S}M = T_xM \oplus T_v\mathbb{S}_xM$, $V_{\nabla X(x)}(v) = \Pi_v \nabla X(x)v$ is the projective vector field on \mathbb{S}_xM and $\nabla X(x)$ denotes the total covariant derivative with respect to the Levi-Civita connections, viewed as a linear endomorphism on T_xM .

Here we give general necessary and sufficient conditions on a collection of vector fields $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ so that their lifts $\{\tilde{X}_k\}_{k=0}^r$ satisfy the parabolic Hörmander condition on $\mathbb{S}M$.

Definition 4.1. Let $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ be a collection of smooth vector fields on a connected manifold \mathcal{M} , and let $\mathcal{X}_k \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M})$ be as in Definition 1.7. Define the *parabolic Lie algebra* generated by $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ to be the Lie-algebra of vector fields spanned by these collections

$$\text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r) := \left\{ Z \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{M}) : Z = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i Z_i, c_i \in \mathbb{R}, \{Z_i\} \subset \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{X}_k \right\}.$$

It follows that $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ satisfies the *parabolic Hörmander condition* if for each $x \in M$

$$\{X(x) : X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)\} = T_xM,$$

and similarly for $\{\tilde{X}_k\}_{k=0}^r$.

Since the vector fields $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ may not be volume preserving, it is convenient to define for each $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ the following traceless linear operator on T_xM :

$$M_X(x) := \nabla X(x) - \frac{1}{n} \text{div} X(x)I,$$

which we view as an element of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(T_xM)$ (the space of traceless linear operators on T_xM). Since the projective vector field $V_{\nabla X}(v)$ includes a projection orthogonal to v , we always have $V_{\nabla X} \equiv V_{M_X}$.

An important role will be played by the following Lie sub-algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(T_xM)$:

$$\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r) := \{M_X(x) : X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r), X(x) = 0\}. \quad (4.1)$$

It is a simple matter to check that $\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ is indeed a Lie sub-algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(T_xM)$ with respect to the matrix commutator $[A, B] = AB - BA$. It was observed by Baxendale in [11] that the parabolic Hörmander condition on lifted vector fields $\{\tilde{X}_k\}_{k=0}^r$ on $\mathbb{S}M$ can be related to properties of the matrix Lie algebra $\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$. However, as there does not seem to be a proof of this fact anywhere in the literature, a self-contained proof is included in the Appendix B.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ be a collection of smooth vector fields on M . Their lifts $\{\tilde{X}_k\}_{k=0}^r$ satisfy the parabolic Hörmander condition on $\mathbb{S}M$ if and only if $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ satisfy the parabolic Hörmander condition on M and for each $(x, v) \in \mathbb{S}M$ we have*

$$\{V_A(v) : A \in \mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)\} = T_v \mathbb{S}_x M. \quad (4.2)$$

Remark 4.3. The theory of Lie algebra actions on manifolds, the condition (4.2) means that \mathfrak{m}_x acts transitively on $\mathbb{S}_x M$ through the Lie algebra action $A \mapsto V_A$. It is straight forward to show that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(T_x M)$ of skew-symmetric linear operators (depending on the metric) acts transitively on $\mathbb{S}_x M$ and therefore a sufficient condition for transitive action of $\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ on $\mathbb{S}_x M$ is

$$\mathfrak{so}(T_x M) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r).$$

4.2 Verifying uniform projective spanning for Euler-like, weakly damped SDE on \mathbb{R}^n

In this section we introduce useful sufficient conditions for verifying the parabolic Hörmander condition for the projective process arising from a certain class of SDE on $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ of the form

$$dx_t^\epsilon = (F(x_t^\epsilon) + \epsilon A x_t^\epsilon) dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k dW_t^k, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\{X_k\}_{k=1}^r$ are assumed for simplicity to be constant vector fields while the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is negative definite, contributing volume dissipation to the overall system, and $F(x) = B(x, x)$ is bilinear as in (1.11).

As previously, $\epsilon > 0$ denotes a parameter that should be thought of as small. Our goal will be to verify that $\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition uniformly in ϵ on bounded sets in the sense of Definition 3.1,

On \mathbb{R}^n , the sphere bundle trivializes to $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and the lifts $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ to $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ are given by

$$\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} X_0^\epsilon \\ V_{\nabla X_0^\epsilon}(v) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{X}_k = \begin{pmatrix} X_k \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $k = 1, \dots, r$ and $X_0^\epsilon(x) = F(x) + \epsilon A x$.

By Proposition 4.2, we know that verifying the parabolic Hörmander condition for $\{\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is equivalent to checking that $\{X_0^\epsilon, X_1, \dots, X_r\}$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition on \mathbb{R}^n and that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0^\epsilon; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ defined by (4.1) satisfies

$$\{V_A(v) : A \in \mathfrak{m}_x(X_0^\epsilon; X_1, \dots, X_r)\} = T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$$

for each $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. In general it is a challenge to directly work with $\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0^\epsilon; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ as it is not a simple task to classify all vector fields in $\text{Lie}(X_0^\epsilon; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ that vanish at each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. However, in \mathbb{R}^n it is often the case that the parabolic Lie algebra generated by $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ contains a spanning collection of constant vector fields. In this case \mathfrak{m}_x can be described more explicitly.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and suppose that $\text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ contains the constant vector fields $\{\partial_{x_k}\}_{k=1}^n$. Then*

$$\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r) = \{M_X(x) : X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)\}.$$

Proof. Our hypothesis $\{\partial_{x_k}\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ implies that for each $X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the vector field $\hat{X} = X - X(x)$ also belongs to $\text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ and satisfies $\hat{X}(x) = 0$. Since $\nabla \hat{X} = \nabla X$, we have $M_{\hat{X}}(x) = M_X(x)$, hence $M_X(x) \in \mathfrak{m}_x$. \square

Furthermore, the assumptions that $F(x) = B(x, x)$ is bilinear and Ax is linear allow us to deduce a convenient sufficient condition for verifying (4.2) on the vector fields $X_0^\epsilon, X_1, \dots, X_r$ uniformly in ϵ . To make this precise, we define for each $k = 1, \dots, n$ the linear operator

$$H^k := \nabla[\partial_{x_k}, X_0^\epsilon] = \partial_{x_k} \nabla F \in \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Note that H^k is independent of both $x \in M$ and ϵ . Below, $\text{Lie}(H^1, \dots, H^n)$ denotes the matrix Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ generated by $\{H^1, \dots, H^n\}$.

Lemma 4.5. *Assume (i) $\{\partial_{x_k}\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \text{Lie}(X_0^\epsilon; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ and (ii) that*

$$\text{Lie}(H^1, \dots, H^n) = \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (4.4)$$

Then, $\tilde{X}_0^\epsilon, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r$ satisfies the uniform parabolic Hörmander condition in the sense of Definition 3.1 as ϵ is varied in $(0, 1]$.

Remark 4.6. By Remark 4.3, we can replace (4.4) with the weaker condition

$$\mathfrak{so}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subseteq \text{Lie}(H^1, \dots, H^n).$$

Remark 4.7. Let us comment briefly on how one might verify (4.4). Since $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is $n^2 - 1$ dimensional, it is clear that one must use commutators that go several generations deep if one has any hope of generating $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. However, it can simplify things to instead look to build a suitable generating set for $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ out of brackets of H^i 's. A particularly useful generating set for $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the collection of elementary matrices

$$E^{1,2}, E^{2,3}, \dots, E^{n,1},$$

where $E^{i,j}$ is the matrix with 1 in (i, j) entry and 0 elsewhere. For these, we have the commutation relation

$$[E^{i,j}, E^{k,\ell}] = E^{i,\ell} \delta_{j,k} - E^{k,j} \delta_{\ell,i},$$

so that, e.g.,

$$[E^{1,2}, E^{2,3}] = E^{1,3} \quad \text{and} \quad [E^{1,2}, E^{2,1}] = E^{1,1} - E^{2,2}.$$

Continuing like this allows to generate the off-diagonal matrices $\{E^{i,j}\}_{i \neq j}$ as well as the directions $E^{1,1} - E^{2,2}, \dots, E^{n,n} - E^{n-1,n-1}$ needed to complete a basis for $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, $\{E^{1,2}, E^{2,3}, \dots, E^{n,1}\}$ generates $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

4.3 Projective spanning for Lorenz 96

Now we turn to verifying the uniform projective spanning for stochastically forced Lorenz 96 (1.1). Recall the stochastic Lorenz 96 is an SDE on \mathbb{R}^J defined by

$$du_\ell = (u_{\ell+1} - u_{\ell-2})u_{\ell-1}dt - \epsilon u_\ell dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} q_\ell dW_t^\ell. \quad (4.5)$$

Here, we assume a periodic ensemble of coupled oscillators, i.e., $u_{i+kJ} := u_i$. Naturally we can write (4.5) in the general form (4.3), by defining

$$F_\ell(u) = u_{\ell+1}u_{\ell-1} - u_{\ell-2}u_{\ell-1}, \quad (Au)_\ell = u, \quad X_\ell(u) = q_\ell \partial_{u_\ell},$$

where $F(u)$ satisfies assumption 1.11.

First, we verify uniform hypoellipticity of (u_t) .

Lemma 4.8. *Let $J < \infty$ be arbitrary, suppose that at least $q_2, q_1 \neq 0$, then $\text{Lie}(F, q_1 \partial_{u_1}, q_2 \partial_{u_2})$ contains $\{\partial_{u_j}\}_{j=1}^J$ and spans \mathbb{R}^n uniformly in ϵ on compact sets.*

Proof. Since the nonlinearity is bilinear, we readily observe that

$$[\partial_{u_2}, [\partial_{u_1}, F]] = -\partial_{u_3}.$$

Iterating this observation allows to generate all brackets of the form $[\partial_{u_{i+1}}, [\partial_{u_i}, F]] = -\partial_{u_{i+2}}$. \square

In order to prove uniform projective spanning we first observe that

$$(\nabla F(u))_{\ell m} = DF_{\ell}(u)_m = u_{\ell-1}\delta_{m=\ell+1} + u_{\ell+1}\delta_{m=\ell} - u_{\ell-1}\delta_{m=\ell-2} - u_{\ell-2}\delta_{m=\ell-1},$$

hence it follows that for each $k \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ we have

$$H^k = \partial_{u_k} DF(u) = E^{k+1, k+2} + E^{k-1, k-2} - E^{k+1, k-2} - E^{k+2, k+1}.$$

The following lemma now implies projective spanning for Lorenz-96 when combined Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.9. *The following holds*

$$\text{Lie}(H^1, \dots, H^J) = \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^J)$$

Proof. Throughout, we regard the indices in $E^{i,j}$ modulo J , so that $E^{i+kJ, j+\ell J} = E^{i,j}$ for all i, j, k, ℓ .

Let \mathfrak{g} denote the smallest Lie algebra containing $\{H^k\}$. To start, let $1 \leq k \leq J$. We compute

$$[H^k, H^{k+4}] = E^{k+3, k+1},$$

hence $E^{k, k-2} \in \mathfrak{g}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq J$. Continuing,

$$[H^k, E^{k-2, k-4}] = E^{k-1, k-4},$$

hence $E^{k, k-3} \in \mathfrak{g}$ for all k . Inductively, assuming $E^{k, k-\ell} \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have that

$$[H^k, E^{k-2, k-(\ell+2)}] = E^{k-1, k-1-(\ell+1)}, \quad (4.6)$$

hence $E^{k, k-(\ell+1)} \in \mathfrak{g}$ for all k . The induction step in (4.6) continues to hold as long as $k - (\ell + 2)$ is disjoint from $\{k - 1, k + 1, k + 2\}$ modulo J , which is assured so long as $\ell < J - 4$.

Fix $\ell_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, J-5\}$ so that $J - \ell_0$ is co-prime to J . In particular, $\{1 - \ell_0, 1 - 2\ell_0, \dots, 1 - (J-1)\ell_0\}$ coincides with the complete set of residue classes $\{0, 1, \dots, J-1\}$ in $\mathbb{Z}/J\mathbb{Z}$. Since

$$\left\{ E^{1, 1-\ell_0}, E^{1-\ell_0, 1-2\ell_0}, \dots, E^{1-(J-2)\ell_0, 1-(J-1)\ell_0}, E^{1-(J-1)\ell_0, 1} \right\} \subset \mathfrak{g}$$

is really just a re-ordering of the generating set identified in Remark 4.7, we conclude $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^J)$. \square

5 Rigidity of invariant measures of the deterministic, projective process

The goal of this section is to complete the proof of Proposition 1.15 described in Section 1. Denote by $\Phi^t : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, t \geq 0$ the (deterministic) flow of diffeomorphisms solving the Euler-like initial value problem

$$\dot{x}_t = B(x_t, x_t), \quad x_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5.1)$$

where $B : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bilinear mapping for which $x \cdot B(x, x) = 0$ and $\text{div } B(x, x) = 0$. As in Section 1 let $\hat{\Phi}^t : \mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n$ be the associated projective flow defined by

$$\hat{\Phi}^t(x, v) = \left(\Phi^t(x), \frac{D_x \Phi^t v}{|D_x \Phi^t v|} \right).$$

To start, in Section 5.1 we collect preliminaries regarding the Euler-like class (5.1). In Section 5.2 we then recall some general linear cocycle theory ruling out the existence of absolutely continuous invariant probabilities for generalized projective actions. Finally, Section 5.3 completes the proof of Proposition 1.15.

5.1 Preliminaries for Euler-like systems

For our use, we record below the following simple consequences of the special Euler-like structure imposed by (5.1). Some notation: for $E > 0$ let us write $S_E := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x|^2 = E\}$ for the “energy shells” preserved by the flow Φ^t , i.e., $\Phi^t(S_E) = S_E$ for all $t \geq 0, E > 0$. Write $E(x) = |x|^2$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ then the following identity holds*

$$D\Phi^t(x)x = \Phi^t(x) + tB(\Phi^t(x), \Phi^t(x)). \quad (5.2)$$

Moreover, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \geq 0$, we have that

$$|D\Phi^t(x)| \geq t \frac{|B(\Phi^t(x), \Phi^t(x))|}{|x|}. \quad (5.3)$$

Proof of Lemma. For a given $\alpha > 0$, note that the rescaled flow $\alpha\Phi^{\alpha t}(x)$ also solves (5.1) with initial data αx . Therefore by uniqueness, we have

$$\Phi^t(\alpha x) = \alpha\Phi^{\alpha t}(x) \quad (5.4)$$

Taking the derivative with respect to α on both sides of (5.4) yields

$$D\Phi_t(\alpha x)x = \Phi^{\alpha t}(x) + \alpha tB(\Phi^{\alpha t}(x), \Phi^{\alpha t}(x)).$$

Setting $\alpha = 1$ gives (5.2).

Inequality (5.3) follows from part (5.2) and the fact that $\Phi^t(x) \cdot B(\Phi^t(x), \Phi^t(x)) = 0$ for all x , by assumption. \square

The following emphasizes the shearing between energy surfaces used in the sequel:

5.2 Rigidity for invariant projective densities: review of general theory

In this section, we will state everything in the following *abstract linear cocycle* setting. Throughout, $T : (X, \mathcal{B}, m) \circlearrowleft$ is a (discrete-time) continuous transformation of a compact metric space X , with \mathcal{B} the Borel σ -algebra. Let $A : (X, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow SL_d(\mathbb{R}), x \mapsto A_x$ be a measurable mapping⁹. This generates the *cocycle* of linear operators $\mathcal{A} : X \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{A}(n, x) = \mathcal{A}_x^n := A_{T^{n-1}x}A_{T^{n-2}x} \cdots A_{Tx}A_x.$$

Note that \mathcal{A} satisfies the *cocycle identity*¹⁰ $\mathcal{A}_x^{m+n} = \mathcal{A}_{T^m x}^m \mathcal{A}_x^n$ for all $m, n \geq 0, x \in X$. Associated to T, \mathcal{A} is the *projective action* $\hat{T} : X \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \circlearrowleft$ defined by

$$(x, v) \mapsto \left(Tx, \frac{A_x v}{|A_x v|} \right), \quad x \in X, v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1},$$

which we regard as a dynamical system on $X \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ in its own right.

Let \hat{m} be any \hat{T} -invariant measure on $X \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ projecting to m (i.e., $\hat{m}(K \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = m(K)$ for all measurable $K \subset X$), and consider its disintegration

$$d\hat{m}(u, v) = d\hat{m}_x(v)dm(x).$$

⁹Here, $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ is the group of $d \times d$ real matrices of determinant 1.

¹⁰When T is a smooth mapping of a manifold and $\mathcal{A}_x^n := D_x(T^n)$ is the so-called *derivative cocycle*, the cocycle identity is merely the chain rule for T^n .

In this context, it is well-known [22, 64] that disintegrations $(\hat{m}_x)_{x \in X}$ exist and are essentially unique (up to m -measure zero modifications) and $x \mapsto \hat{m}_x$ is weak-* measurably varying. Note that invariance of \hat{m} implies that

$$(A_x)_* \hat{m}_x = \hat{m}_{Tx} \quad \text{for } m\text{-a.e. } x \in X,$$

where for a $d \times d$ matrix A we write A_* for the action of A on probability measures on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} .

The following result (more-or-less Theorem 3.23 of [6], up to a technical issue-see below) involves the rigidity of absolute continuity of the disintegration measures \hat{m}_x with respect to $\text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that $\hat{m}_x \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ for m -almost every $x \in X$. Then, there exists a measurable family of inner products $X \ni x \mapsto g_x(\cdot, \cdot)$ on \mathbb{R}^d and a T -invariant set $\Gamma \subset X$ of full m -measure such that for all $x \in \Gamma$ and $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that*

$$g_{Tx}(A_x v, A_x w) = g_x(v, w).$$

That is, $A_x : (\mathbb{R}^d, g_x) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^d, g_{Tx})$ is an isometry.

This is slightly different from the form in Theorem 3.23 of [6]: there, it is supposed that $\hat{m}_x \sim \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$, whereas for our purposes we need the version with “ \ll ”. For this reason, as well as for the sake of completeness, we sketch the proof of Theorem 5.2 here.

Proof sketch. To start, let us assume for now that $T : (X, \mathcal{B}, m) \circlearrowleft$ is ergodic (note that we do not assume \hat{m} is ergodic). We require the following Lemma:

Lemma 5.3 (Corollary 3.7 in [6]; Lemma 6.2 in [27]). *Assume (X, \mathcal{B}, m, T) is ergodic. Then, there is a full m -measure set of $x_0 \in X$ with the following property: there exists a measurable mapping $G : X \rightarrow SL_d(\mathbb{R})$, depending on the choice of x_0 , such that*

$$G(x)_* \hat{m}_{x_0} = \hat{m}_x \quad \text{for } m\text{-almost every } x \in X.$$

This version is slightly different from those appearing in [6, 27], so we briefly recall the proof below.

Proof sketch of Lemma. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ denote the space of probability measures on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} with the weak* topology. Consider the quotient $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})/SL_d(\mathbb{R})$, i.e., for $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ we set $\xi \sim \eta$ iff $\exists B \in SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ so that $B_* \xi = \eta$. Writing $[\eta]$ for the equivalence class of $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$, note that $[\hat{m}_x] = [\hat{m}_{T^k x}]$ for all k , i.e., $x \mapsto [\hat{m}_x]$ is constant along orbits. By Corollary 3.2.12 in [76], the Borel σ -algebra on the quotient space $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})/SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ is countably generated. Using this along with the fact that $T : (X, \mu) \circlearrowleft$ is ergodic, it follows from a standard argument that $[\hat{m}_x]$ is constant μ -almost surely. In particular, for μ -a.e. $x_0, x \in X$, the measures \hat{m}_x and \hat{m}_{x_0} are related by the application of a matrix in $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$. It is now straightforward to construct a measurable selection $G : X \rightarrow SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ as above. \square

Fix x_0 so that $\hat{m}_{x_0} \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ and let G be as in Lemma 5.3. Observe that for any $n \geq 0$ and m -a.e. $x \in X$ we have that $G(T^n x)^{-1} A_x^n G(x) \in H_{x_0}$, where

$$H_{x_0} := \{B \in SL_d(\mathbb{R}) : B_* \hat{m}_{x_0} = \hat{m}_{x_0}\}.$$

Observe that H_{x_0} is a subgroup of $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$, which we claim to be compact. If not, then a lemma of Furstenberg (see, e.g., Claim 4.8 in [15]) would imply the existence of proper subspaces $V^1, V^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a sequence $\{B_n\} \subset H_{x_0}$ so that $\text{dist}(B_n v, V^2) \rightarrow 0$ for all $v \notin V^1$, which would contradict $\hat{m}_{x_0} \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$.

Since H_{x_0} is compact, there exists an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on \mathbb{R}^d with respect to which all members of H_{x_0} are isometries (Lemma 4.6 in [15]). The proof is complete on defining g_x through

$$g_x(v, w) = \langle G(x)^{-1} v, G(x)^{-1} w \rangle. \tag{5.5}$$

To handle the case when m is not ergodic, we use the ergodic decomposition [70]

$$m(\cdot) = \int_{\xi \in \mathcal{E}_T(X)} \xi(\cdot) d\tau_m(\xi),$$

where $\mathcal{E}_T(X)$ is the space of T -ergodic measures on X and τ_m a Borel measure (w.r.t. the weak* topology) on $\mathcal{E}_T(X)$. For each component ξ , we define $\hat{\xi}$ through the formula

$$d\hat{\xi}(x, v) = d\hat{m}_x(v) d\xi(x),$$

noting that $\hat{m}_x \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ for ξ -a.e. $x \in X$ and τ_m -a.e. $\xi \in \mathcal{E}_T(X)$. The proof now goes through the same as before, the only difference being that the measurable inner product (5.5) is defined along each $\xi \in \mathcal{E}_T(X)$ one at a time. \square

5.3 Proof of Proposition 1.15

To start, let ν be $\hat{\Phi}^t$ -invariant, projecting to an absolutely continuous measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n , and assume that

$$\nu = \nu^{ac} + \nu^\perp$$

where $\nu^{ac} \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^n}$ is not identically zero (our contradiction hypothesis), while ν^\perp is singular. Since $\hat{\Phi}^t$ sends absolutely continuous measures to absolutely continuous measures and singular to singular, it follows that ν^{ac} is $\hat{\Phi}^t$ -invariant. Since $\nu^{ac} \leq \nu$, the measure $\mu^{ac}(K) := \nu^{ac}(K \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ satisfies $\mu^{ac} \ll \mu \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ and is likewise $\hat{\Phi}^t$ -invariant. On replacing ν with the normalization of ν^{ac} , going forward we may assume without loss that $\nu \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^n}$. Finally, since the energy shells $S_E = \{|x|^2 = E\}$ are invariant, we may replace ν with the normalization of its restriction to $B(0, R) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ for some large, fixed $R > 0$.

Continuing, let $d\nu(x, v) = d\nu_x(v) d\mu(x)$ denote the disintegration measures of ν and note that $\nu_x \ll \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ for μ -a.e. x . By Theorem 5.2, there exists a measurable family of inner products $g_x, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ so that

$$D\Phi^1(x) : (\mathbb{R}^n, g_x) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^n, g_{\Phi^1 x}) \quad (5.6)$$

is an isometry for μ -a.e. x . By a standard procedure, we may assume that (5.6) holds for $x \in \Gamma$, where $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $\mu(\Gamma) = 1$ and $\Phi^1(\Gamma) = \Gamma$.

For $L > 0$, define

$$\Gamma_L = \left\{ x \in \Gamma : L^{-1} \leq \frac{\sqrt{g_x(v, v)}}{|v|} \leq L \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \right\} \cap \{x \in \Gamma : |B(x, x)| \geq L^{-1}\}.$$

and note that if $x, \Phi^n x \in \Gamma_L$ for some $n \geq 0$, then $|D_x \Phi^n| \leq L^2$ must hold by (5.6). Moreover, we have that $\mu(\Gamma_L) \nearrow \mu(\Gamma) = 1$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that this relies on the assumption that B is not identically 0, hence $|B(x, x)| > 0$ Lebesgue-a.e. (here, we use the standard fact that $\{B(x, x) = 0\}$ is a proper variety in \mathbb{R}^n , hence must have zero volume).

Fix L such that $\mu(\Gamma_L) \geq 1/2 > 0$. By the Poincaré Recurrence Theorem, μ -a.e. $x \in \Gamma_L$ visits Γ_L infinitely many times. Fix such an $x \in \Gamma_L \setminus \{0\}$ and let $0 := n_0 < n_1 < n_2 < \dots, \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} n_\ell = \infty$, so that $\Phi^{n_\ell}(x) \in \Gamma_L$ for all n_ℓ , hence

$$|D\Phi^{n_\ell}(x)| \leq L^2$$

for all such n_ℓ . On the other hand, (5.3) implies

$$|D\Phi^{n_\ell}(x)| \geq \frac{n_\ell}{L|x|}$$

as $n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Proposition 1.15.

A Qualitative properties of the projective stationary measure

In this section we record basic properties of the SDE (1.10).

Theorem A.1. *Suppose that $\{\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ satisfies the uniform parabolic Hörmander condition on $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n$ as in Definition 3.1. For all $\epsilon > 0$, the SDE (1.10) satisfies Assumptions 1 and 2. Moreover, the stationary measure of the (w_t) process f^ϵ has a smooth density with respect to Lebesgue measure $f^\epsilon \in L^1 \cap L^2 \cap C^\infty$ with $f^\epsilon \log f^\epsilon \in L^1$, the marginal*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f^\epsilon(x, v) dv = \rho^\epsilon(x)$$

and $\exists C, \gamma > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon \in (0, 1]$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}M} f^\epsilon e^{\gamma|x|^2} dq < C. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Furthermore, the estimate in Assumption 1 (iii) holds for all $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof of Theorem A.1. Claims (i) and (ii) of Assumption 1 are standard or proved in [16]. The proof of Assumption 1 (iii) follows by providing suitable moment estimates on $\log |\det D\Phi^t|$ and $\log |D\Phi^t|$ using the SDE derived in the proof of Proposition 2.4. The results of Assumption 2 follow from similar methods (including (A.1), though see below)

However, we are not aware of any proof of $f^\epsilon \in L^2$ or $f^\epsilon \log f^\epsilon \in L^1$ in the literature and we therefore include the proof. For this we use some ideas that appear in [16]. As in [16], a convenient method to justify many formal calculations begins by first regularizing the problem by adding elliptic Brownian motions. Recall that the generator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ for the projective process (w_t) is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \tilde{X}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r X_k^2.$$

We then regularize this by the perturbing the generator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\delta = \tilde{\mathcal{L}} + \frac{\delta}{2} \Delta_{x,v},$$

where $\Delta_{x,v} = \Delta_x + \Delta_v$ with Δ_x the usual Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^n and Δ_v the Laplace-Beltrami operator on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . This corresponds to perturbing the SDE (1.10) by a non-degenerate $\sqrt{\delta}$ Brownian motion on $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n$. It is not hard to show that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\delta$ satisfies a drift condition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} e^{\gamma|x|^2} \leq -\alpha e^{\gamma|x|^2} + K$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $K \geq 1$ (uniformly in ϵ, δ). This gives rise to a globally defined Markov process (w_t^δ) . Moreover for a given initial density $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\int f dq = 1$ and $f \geq 0$, such that $\text{Law}(w_0^\delta) = f$ we denote $f_t = \text{Law}(w_t^\delta)$, which solves the forward Kolmogorov equation

$$\partial_t f_t = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* f_t + \frac{1}{2} \delta \Delta_{x,v} f_t = 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

From the drift condition we have, $\forall \gamma$ sufficiently small, $\exists \alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that (uniformly in ϵ, δ),

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d} f_t e^{\gamma|x|^2} dq \lesssim 1 + e^{-\alpha t} \int_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d} f e^{\gamma|x|^2} dq. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Let $\bar{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 1))$ with $0 \leq \bar{\chi} \leq 1$, and $\bar{\chi} = 1$ for $x \leq 1/2$ and define $\chi(x) = \chi(x/2) - \chi(x)$. Define $\chi_j = \chi(2^{-j}x)$, which defines the partition of unity $1 = \bar{\chi} + \sum_{j=0}^\infty \chi_j(x)$. From energy estimates on (A.2) we have the following,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|f_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} f_t \right\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|(1 + |x|)f\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|\bar{\chi}f\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{2j} \|\chi_j f\|_{L^2}^2,$$

(in order to justify such estimates one may apply smooth, v -independent radially symmetric cut-offs to the nonlinearity and pass to the limit). By the Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality, $\exists \theta \in (0, 1)$ (that such an inequality holds is verified through the local coordinates and the fact that the estimates on the metric are uniform over the manifold),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|f_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} f_t \right\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \|\bar{\chi}f_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{2j} \|\chi_j f_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\lesssim \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} \bar{\chi}f_t \right\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} \|\bar{\chi}f_t\|_{L^1}^{1-2\theta} + \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{2j} \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} \chi_j f_t \right\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} \|\chi_j f_t\|_{L^1}^{1-2\theta} \\ &\lesssim \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} f_t \right\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} + \|\nabla_x \bar{\chi}f_t\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} + \sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{2j} \left(\left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} f_t \right\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} + \|\nabla_x \chi_j f_t\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} \right) \|\chi_j f_t\|_{L^1}^{1-2\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|f_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} f_t \right\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim_\delta \|f_t\|_{L^1}^{1-2\theta} \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} f_t \right\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} + \int_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d} f_t e^{\gamma|x|^2} dq.$$

Hence, from (A.3), there holds for some $q > 2$,

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} f_\tau \right\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \lesssim \delta^{-q} \int_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d} f e^{\gamma|x|^2} dq.$$

Combined with the uniform drift condition, this allows to pass to the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ and conclude that the unique stationary measure, denoted below as $f^{\epsilon, \delta}$ is in $H^1(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d)$; we note that $f^{\epsilon, \delta}$ is a smooth solution of the Kolmogorov equation

$$\left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^* + \frac{\delta}{2} \Delta_{x,v} \right) f^{\epsilon, \delta} = 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Next, we obtain an L^2 estimate that is uniform in δ in order to pass to the $\delta \rightarrow 0$ limit. For this, we clearly need to depend on hypoelliptic regularity. Define the regularized Hörmander norm pair (see discussions in [4, 16, 29] for motivations),

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} &:= \|w\|_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^r \|X_k w\|_{L^2} + \delta \left\| (-\Delta_{x,v})^{1/2} w \right\|_{L^2} \\ \|w\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta^*} &:= \sup_{\varphi: \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n} (\tilde{X}_0 \varphi) w dq \right| \end{aligned}$$

The proof is similar to [Lemma 2.3; [16]] provided we have the following quantification of Hörmander's inequality.

Lemma A.2 (Quantitative Hörmander inequality for the projective process). *Suppose that $\{\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r\}$ satisfies the uniform parabolic Hörmander condition on $B(0, 2) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ as in Definition 3.1. There exists $s > 0$ and $q > 0$, such that for any $R \geq 1$, $w \in C_0^\infty(B_R \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$ there holds*

$$\|w\|_{H^s} \lesssim R^q (\|w\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|w\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta^*}), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where both $s > 0$ and the implicit constant do not depend on ϵ , δ , or R , where here we denote in analogy with (3.2) (for $\dim \mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d = m$), for $\tilde{w}_j = \chi_j w \circ \mathbf{x}_j$ as defined therein,

$$\|w\|_{H^s} = \|w\|_{L^2} + \left(\sum_j \int_{|h| < \delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{|\tilde{w}_j(q+h) - \tilde{w}_j(q)|^2}{|h|^{m+2s}} J_j(q) dq dh \right)^{1/2}$$

Proof. The proof begins with a re-scaling as in [Lemma 3.2; [16]]. Define $h(x, v) = w(Rx, v)$ which solves a PDE of the following form for suitable vector fields N, V, Y , (denoting $\Delta_{x,v}$ as the Laplace-Beltrami operator, which note is invariant under this scaling)

$$\frac{1}{2} \epsilon \delta \Delta_{x,v} h + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \epsilon (\tilde{X}_j^*)^2 h - Nh + R^{-1} V^* h - \frac{\epsilon}{R} Y^* h = 0.$$

where $N(x) = B(x, x)$, $Y(x) = Ax$ and $V(x, v) = \Pi_v \nabla F(x)v$, and their action on h is interpreted as a differential operator. We see that the proof here is more subtle than in the corresponding [Lemma 3.2; [16]] as $R^{-1}V$ is required to span the directions in projective space. From Proposition 4.2, we see that the spanning in x and v can be considered essentially separately, first choosing brackets to span in x and then correcting by choosing suitable brackets in $\mathfrak{m}_x(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r)$ to span in v . Using this structure we see that given a vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $q_0 \in B(0, 1) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, there exists $p_j < \dots < p_2 < p_1 \leq k$ (with k as in Definition 3.1) such that for q in a neighborhood of q_0 , there are finitely many smooth coefficients c_j and vectors $Z_j \in \mathcal{X}_k$ with

$$Z(q) = \sum_j R^{p_j} c_j(q) Z_j(q),$$

where if Z varies in a bounded set in C^m , then $\{c_j\}_j$ varies in a similarly bounded set as well. A careful reading of [29] shows that this introduces powers of R matching the powers of t into all of the estimates in [Sections 4 and 5; [29]], the maximal power arising being R^k . In particular, the error estimates come in the form $\mathcal{O}(R^{k/\sigma})$, provided that $R^k t < 1$ and $0 < \sigma < s^*$ as in [29]. This restriction on t in the estimates further introduces only polynomial dependence on R , as for any $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\sup_{|t| \leq 1} |t|^{-\sigma} \|e^{tZ} g - g\|_{L^2} \lesssim R^{k\sigma} \|g\|_{L^2} + \sup_{|t| \leq R^{-k}} |t|^{-\sigma} \|e^{tZ} g - g\|_{L^2}.$$

Combining the above observations with those of [29] implies that the constant in (A.5) remains polynomial in R (exponential would also be sufficient for our purposes, as we only use that the constant is bounded above by $e^{\eta R^2}$ for $\eta < \gamma$). \square

Once one has Lemma A.2, the proof of Theorem A.1 follows easily, given that we are not seeking ϵ -independent bounds, as these such bounds will be false for all but the most degenerate models (see [Lemma 2.4; [16]] for the corresponding argument on ρ^ϵ , which does yield ϵ -independent estimates). Let $\bar{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 1))$ with $0 \leq \bar{\chi} \leq 1$, and $\bar{\chi} = 1$ for $x \leq 1/2$ and define $\chi(x) = \bar{\chi}(x/2) - \bar{\chi}(x)$. Define $\chi_j = \chi(2^{-j}x)$, which defines the partition of unity $1 = \bar{\chi} + \sum_{j=0}^\infty \chi_j(x)$.

For s as in Lemma A.2, let $\theta \in (0, 1)$ be such that for any $g \in C_c^\infty$ (that such an inequality holds on $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^d$ is verified again through the local coordinates and the fact that the estimates on the metric are uniform over the manifold),

$$\|g\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^1}^\theta \|g\|_{H^s}^{1-\theta}.$$

We now obtain a uniform-in- δ L^2 estimate. By Lemma A.2,

$$\|f^{\epsilon, \delta}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left\| \bar{\chi} f^{\epsilon, \delta} \right\|_{H_{\text{Hyp}, \delta}^1}^{1-\theta} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jq(1-\theta)} \left\| \chi_j f^{\epsilon, \delta} \right\|_{H_{\text{Hyp}, \delta}^1}^{1-\theta},$$

where we have denoted $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\text{Hyp}, \delta}^1} = \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta^*}$. Pairing (A.4) with $\bar{\chi} f^{\epsilon, \delta}$ and $\chi_j f^{\epsilon, \delta}$ followed by standard manipulations gives

$$\left\| \bar{\chi} f^{\epsilon, \delta} \right\|_{H_{\text{Hyp}, \delta}^1} + \sup_j \left\| \chi_j f^{\epsilon, \delta} \right\|_{H_{\text{Hyp}, \delta}^1} \lesssim_\epsilon \|f^{\epsilon, \delta}\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\|f^{\epsilon, \delta}\|_{L^2}^\theta \lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jq(1-\theta)} \left\| \chi_j f^{\epsilon, \delta} \right\|_{L^1}^\theta \lesssim 1 + \left\| e^{|x|} f^{\epsilon, \delta} \right\|_{L^1}^\theta \lesssim 1.$$

Hence, we have a uniform-in- δ estimate on the L^2 norm. Note that the estimate still depends badly on ϵ . Passing to the $\delta \rightarrow 0$ limit shows that $f^\epsilon \in L^2$ for each $\epsilon > 0$. Finally, observe that $f^\epsilon \log f^\epsilon \in L^1$, indeed,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n} f^\epsilon |\log f^\epsilon| \, dq \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{R}^n} \sqrt{f^\epsilon} + (f^\epsilon)^2 \, dq \lesssim \left\| f^\epsilon e^{\gamma|x|^2} \right\|_{L^1} + \|f^\epsilon\|_{L^2}^2.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem A.1. \square

B Proof of Proposition 4.2

Before we prove Proposition 4.2, we will need some preliminary results. As we will be taking commutators of the above vector fields it is important to record how projective vector fields behave under the Lie bracket.

Lemma B.1. *Let $A, B \in \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then the following identity holds*

$$[V_A, V_B](v) = -V_{[A, B]}(v),$$

where $[A, B] := AB - BA$ denotes the usual commutator on linear operators.

Proof. Let ∇ denote the Levi-Civita connection on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , then since ∇ is torsion-free, we have the following formula for the Lie bracket in terms of the the covariant derivative

$$[V_A, V_B] = \nabla_{V_A} V_B - \nabla_{V_B} V_A.$$

Recall from the proof of Lemma 2.3 that using the embedding of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} into \mathbb{R}^n , we have the following formula for the total covariant derivative of V_A (viewed as a linear operator on $T_v \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$)

$$\nabla V_A(v) = \Pi_v A - \langle v, Av \rangle I.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [V_A, V_B](v) &= \nabla V_B(v) V_A(v) - \nabla V_A(v) V_B(v) \\ &= \Pi_v B \Pi_v A v - \Pi_v A \Pi_v B v - \langle v, Bv \rangle V_A(v) + \langle v, Av \rangle V_B(v) \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\Pi_v u = u - \langle u, v \rangle v$ for $u \in T_x M$, we find

$$\Pi_v B \Pi_v A v + \langle v, A v \rangle V_B(v) = \Pi_v B A v$$

and

$$\Pi_v A \Pi_v B v + \langle v, B v \rangle V_A(v) = \Pi_v A B v,$$

hence

$$[V_A, V_B] = V_{BA} - V_{AB} = -V_{[A, B]}. \quad \square$$

Of fundamental importance is the following observation for the lifting operation $X \mapsto \tilde{X}$.

Lemma B.2. *Any two vector fields $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ satisfy the identity*

$$[\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}] = \widetilde{[X, Y]}.$$

Thus the lifting operation $X \mapsto \tilde{X}$ is a Lie algebra isomorphism onto its range.

Proof. Denote by

$$\hat{X}(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} X(x) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{V}_{\nabla X}(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ V_{\nabla X(x)}(v) \end{pmatrix}$$

the extensions of the vector fields X and $V_{\nabla X}$ to vector fields on the sphere bundle $\mathbb{S}M$ and let

$$U(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

be the ‘canonical’ vector field on $\mathbb{S}M$. Note that U is parallel to \hat{X} in the sense that $\tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} U = 0$. Let $\tilde{\nabla}$ denote the Levi-Civita connection on $\mathbb{S}M$ induced by the Sasaki metric \tilde{g} , and define a projection $\tilde{\Pi}$ on $T_{(x,v)}\mathbb{S}M = T_x M \oplus T_v \mathbb{S}_x M$ by

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{(x,v)} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \Pi_v u_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Note that for any ‘horizontal’ vector field \hat{X} , $\tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \tilde{\Pi} = 0$ holds since ∇ preserves the metric g .

Using the above notation, we can write $\hat{V}_{\nabla X} = \tilde{\Pi} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{X}$. Since we can now split any lifted vector field \tilde{X} as $\tilde{X} = \hat{X} + \hat{V}_{\nabla X}$, the commutator of \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} is

$$[\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}] = [\hat{X}, \hat{Y}] + [\hat{X}, \hat{V}_{\nabla Y}] - [\hat{Y}, \hat{V}_{\nabla X}] + [\hat{V}_{\nabla X}, \hat{V}_{\nabla Y}]. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Naturally we find that

$$[\hat{X}, \hat{Y}] = \begin{pmatrix} [X, Y] \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \widetilde{[X, Y]}.$$

Likewise, a simple consequence of Lemma B.1 implies

$$[\hat{V}_{\nabla X}, \hat{V}_{\nabla Y}] = -\tilde{\Pi}[\tilde{\nabla} \hat{X}, \tilde{\nabla} \hat{Y}]U = \tilde{\Pi} \left(\tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{X}]} \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{Y}]} \hat{X} \right),$$

where above $[\tilde{\nabla} \hat{X}, \tilde{\nabla} \hat{Y}]$ denotes the commutator of $\tilde{\nabla} \hat{X}, \tilde{\nabla} \hat{Y}$ as linear endomorphisms on a fixed tangent space $T_{(x,v)}\mathbb{S}M$. The remaining terms in (B.1) can be computed as

$$[\hat{X}, \hat{V}_{\nabla Y}] - [\hat{Y}, \hat{V}_{\nabla X}] = \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \hat{V}_{\nabla Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{Y}} \hat{V}_{\nabla X} = \tilde{\Pi} \left(\tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{Y}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{X} \right).$$

Therefore, putting everything together, we find

$$[\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}] = \widehat{[X, Y]} + \tilde{\Pi} \left(\tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{Y}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{X} + \tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{X}]} \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{Y}]} \hat{X} \right)$$

The proof will be complete once we show the identity

$$\tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{Y}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{X} + \tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{X}]} \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{Y}]} \hat{X} = \tilde{\nabla}_U \widehat{[X, Y]}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For this, we can use the Riemann curvature tensor on $\mathbb{S}M$

$$\tilde{R}(X, Y)Z := \tilde{\nabla}_X \tilde{\nabla}_Y Z - \tilde{\nabla}_Y \tilde{\nabla}_X Z - \tilde{\nabla}_{[X, Y]} Z$$

to change the order of covariant derivatives, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{Y}} \tilde{\nabla}_U \hat{X} + \tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{X}]} \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_{[U, \hat{Y}]} \hat{X} &= \tilde{R}(\hat{X}, U)\hat{Y} - \tilde{R}(\hat{Y}, U)\hat{X} + \tilde{\nabla}_U \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \hat{Y} - \tilde{\nabla}_U \tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{Y}} \hat{X} \\ &= \tilde{R}(\hat{X}, U)\hat{Y} + \tilde{R}(U, \hat{Y})\hat{X} + \nabla_U [\hat{X}, \hat{Y}]. \end{aligned}$$

The first Bianchi identity implies that

$$\tilde{R}(\hat{X}, U)\hat{Y} + \tilde{R}(U, \hat{Y})\hat{X} = \tilde{R}(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})U,$$

and therefore identity (B.2) follows from the fact that $R(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})U = 0$ since, for any vector field $Z \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, we have that $\tilde{\nabla}_{\hat{Z}} U = 0$. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. A simple consequence of Lemma B.2 that for any collection of vector fields $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ on M we have the following identification

$$\text{Lie}(\tilde{X}_0; \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_r) = \left\{ \tilde{X} : X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r) \right\}.$$

Therefore the parabolic Hörmander condition for $\{\tilde{X}_k\}_{k=0}^r$ is equivalent to

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} X(x) \\ V_{M_X(x)}(v) \end{pmatrix} : X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r) \right\} = T_x M \oplus T_v \mathbb{S}_x M.$$

Clearly if the above condition is satisfied then $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^r$ satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition and 4.2 holds. The converse follows from the fact that (4.2)

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} X(x) \\ V_{M_X(x)}(v) \end{pmatrix} : X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r), X(x) = 0 \right\} = \{0\} \oplus T_v \mathbb{S}_x M.$$

and

$$\{X(x) : X \in \text{Lie}(X_0; X_1, \dots, X_r), X(x) \neq 0\} = T_x M \setminus \{0\}.$$

\square

References

- [1] F. Abedin and G. Tralli, *Harnack inequality for a class of Kolmogorov–Fokker–Planck equations in non-divergence form*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **233** (2019), no. 2, 867–900.
- [2] S. Amari and H. Nagaoka, *Methods of information geometry*, American Mathematical Society, 2000 (en).
- [3] F. Anceschi, S. Polidoro, and M. A. Ragusa, *Moser’s estimates for degenerate Kolmogorov equations with non-negative divergence lower order coefficients*, Nonlinear Analysis **189** (2019), 111568.
- [4] S. Armstrong and J.-C. Mourrat, *Variational methods for the kinetic Fokker-Planck equation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04037 (2019).
- [5] L. Arnold, *Random dynamical systems*, Dynamical systems, 1995, pp. 1–43.
- [6] L. Arnold, D. C. Nguyen, and V. Oseledets, *Jordan normal form for linear cocycles*, Random Operators and Stochastic Equations **7** (1999), no. 4, 303–358.
- [7] L. Arnold, G. Papanicolaou, and V. Wihstutz, *Asymptotic analysis of the Lyapunov exponent and rotation number of the random oscillator and applications*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics **46** (1986), no. 3, 427–450.
- [8] E. I. Auslender and G. N. Milstein, *Asymptotic expansion of Lyapunov exponent for linear stochastic systems with small noises*, Prikl. Mat. i Mekh. **46** (1982), 358–365 (In Russ.)
- [9] D. Bakry and M. Émery, *Diffusions hypercontractives*, Séminaire de probabilités xix 1983/84, 1985, pp. 177–206.
- [10] L. Barreira and Y. Pesin, *Smooth ergodic theory and nonuniformly hyperbolic dynamics*, Handbook of dynamical systems **1** (2006), 57–263.
- [11] P. H Baxendale, *Lyapunov exponents and relative entropy for a stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **81** (1989), no. 4, 521–554.
- [12] P. H Baxendale, *Lyapunov exponents and stability for the stochastic Duffing-van der Pol oscillator*, Iutam symposium on nonlinear stochastic dynamics, 2003, pp. 125–135.
- [13] P. H Baxendale, *Stochastic averaging and asymptotic behavior of the stochastic duffing–van der pol equation*, Stochastic processes and their applications **113** (2004), no. 2, 235–272.
- [14] P. H Baxendale and L. Goukasian, *Lyapunov exponents for small random perturbations of Hamiltonian systems*, Annals of probability (2002), 101–134.
- [15] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith, *Lagrangian chaos and scalar advection in stochastic fluid mechanics*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.06484 (2018).
- [16] J. Bedrossian and K. Liss, *Quantitative spectral gaps and uniform lower bounds in the small noise limit for Markov semigroups generated by hypoelliptic stochastic differential equations*, arXiv:2007.13297 (2020).
- [17] J. Bochi, *Genericity of zero Lyapunov exponents*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **22** (2002), no. 6, 1667–1696.
- [18] J. Bochi and M. Viana, *The Lyapunov exponents of generic volume-preserving and symplectic maps*, Annals of mathematics (2005), 1423–1485.
- [19] G. Boffetta, M. Cencini, M. Falcioni, and A. Vulpiani, *Predictability: a way to characterize complexity*, Physics reports **356** (2002), no. 6, 367–474.
- [20] A. Carverhill, *A nonrandom Lyapunov spectrum for nonlinear stochastic dynamical systems*, Stochastics: an international journal of probability and stochastic processes **17** (1986), no. 4, 253–287.
- [21] A. Carverhill, *Furstenberg’s theorem for nonlinear stochastic systems*, Probability theory and related fields **74** (1987), no. 4, 529–534.
- [22] J. T Chang and D. Pollard, *Conditioning as disintegration*, Statistica Neerlandica **51** (1997), no. 3, 287–317.
- [23] S. Crovisier and S. Senti, *Un problème pour le xxi(i)ème siècle*, La Gazette des mathématiciens **156** (2018).
- [24] D. Dolgopyat, V. Kaloshin, L. Korolov, et al., *Sample path properties of the stochastic flows*, The Annals of Probability **32** (2004), no. 1A, 1–27.
- [25] P. Duarte, *Abundance of elliptic isles at conservative bifurcations*, Dynamics and Stability of Systems **14** (1999), no. 4, 339–356.
- [26] H. Furstenberg, *Noncommuting random products*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **108** (1963), no. 3, 377–428.
- [27] H. Furstenberg, *Rigidity and cocycles for ergodic actions of semi-simple lie groups*, Séminaire bourbaki vol. 1979/80 exposés 543–560, 1981, pp. 273–292.

- [28] F Golse, C. Imbert, C. Mouhot, and A Vasseur, *Harnack inequality for kinetic fokker-planck equations with rough coefficients and application to the landau equation*, to appear in *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* (2016).
- [29] L. Hörmander, *Hypoelliptic second order differential equations*, *Acta Mathematica* **119** (1967), no. 1, 147–171.
- [30] P. Imkeller and C. Lederer, *An explicit description of the Lyapunov exponents of the noisy damped harmonic oscillator*, *Dynamics and Stability of Systems* **14** (1999), no. 4, 385–405.
- [31] A. Karimi and M. R Paul, *Extensive chaos in the Lorenz-96 model*, *Chaos: An interdisciplinary journal of nonlinear science* **20** (2010), no. 4, 043105.
- [32] R. Khasminskii, *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, Vol. 66, Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [33] Y. Kifer, *A note on integrability of C^T -norms of stochastic flows and applications*, *Stochastic mechanics and stochastic processes*, 1988, pp. 125–131.
- [34] Y. Kifer, *Ergodic theory of random transformations*, Vol. 10, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [35] J. F. C. Kingman, *Subadditive ergodic theory*, *The annals of Probability* **1** (1973), no. 6, 883–899.
- [36] A. E. Kogoj and S. Polidoro, *Harnack inequality for hypoelliptic second order partial differential operators*, *Potential Anal.* **45** (2016), no. 14, 545–555.
- [37] H. Kunita, *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*, Vol. 24, Cambridge university press, 1997.
- [38] A. Lanconelli, A. Pascucci, and S. Polidoro, *Gaussian lower bounds for non-homogeneous kolmogorov equations with measurable coefficients*, *Journal of Evolution Equations* (2020), 1–19.
- [39] M. Ledoux, I. Nourdin, and G. Peccati, *Steins method, logarithmic sobolev and transport inequalities*, *Geometric and Functional Analysis* **25** (2015), no. 1, 256–306.
- [40] F. Ledrappier, *Quelques propriétés des exposants caractéristiques*, *École d’été de probabilités de saint-flour xii-1982*, 1984, pp. 305–396.
- [41] F. Ledrappier, *Positivity of the exponent for stationary sequences of matrices*, *Lyapunov exponents*, 1986, pp. 56–73.
- [42] K. K Lin and L.-S. Young, *Shear-induced chaos*, *Nonlinearity* **21** (2008), no. 5, 899.
- [43] P.-D. Liu and M. Qian, *Smooth ergodic theory of random dynamical systems*, Springer, 2006.
- [44] E. N Lorenz, *The nature and theory of the general circulation of the atmosphere*, Vol. 218, World Meteorological Organization Geneva, 1967.
- [45] E. N Lorenz, *Predictability: A problem partly solved*, *Proc. seminar on predictability*, 1996.
- [46] E. N Lorenz and K. A Emanuel, *Optimal sites for supplementary weather observations: Simulation with a small model*, *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* **55** (1998), no. 3, 399–414.
- [47] M. Lyubich, *Almost every real quadratic map is either regular or stochastic*, *Annals of Mathematics* (2002), 1–78.
- [48] A. Majda, R. V Abramov, and M. J Grote, *Information theory and stochastics for multiscale nonlinear systems*, Vol. 25, American Mathematical Soc., 2005.
- [49] A. Majda and X. Wang, *Nonlinear dynamics and statistical theories for basic geophysical flows*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [50] A. J Majda, *Introduction to turbulent dynamical systems in complex systems*, Springer, 2016.
- [51] S. P Meyn and R. L Tweedie, *Markov chains and stochastic stability*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [52] N. Moshchuk and R Khasminskii, *Moment Lyapunov exponent and stability index for linear conservative system with small random perturbation*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **58** (1998), no. 1, 245–256.
- [53] C. Mouhot, *De Giorgi–Nash–Moser and Hörmander theories: new interplays*, *Proceedings of the international congress of mathematicians rio de*, 2018, pp. 2467–2493.
- [54] S. E Newhouse, *Diffeomorphisms with infinitely many sinks*, *Topology* **13** (1974), no. 1, 9–18.
- [55] S. E Newhouse, *The abundance of wild hyperbolic sets and non-smooth stable sets for diffeomorphisms*, *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS* **50** (1979), 101–151.
- [56] V. I. Oseledets, *A multiplicative ergodic theorem. characteristic Ljapunov exponents of dynamical systems*, *Trudy Moskovskogo Matematicheskogo Obshchestva* **19** (1968), 179–210.
- [57] E. Ott, B. R Hunt, I. Szunyogh, A. V Zimin, E. J Kostelich, M. Corazza, E. Kalnay, D. Patil, and J. A Yorke, *A local ensemble Kalman filter for atmospheric data assimilation*, *Tellus A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography* **56** (2004), no. 5, 415–428.

- [58] E. Pardoux and V. Wihstutz, *Lyapunov exponent and rotation number of two-dimensional linear stochastic systems with small diffusion*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics **48** (1988), no. 2, 442–457.
- [59] D. Pazó, I. G Szendro, J. M López, and M. A Rodríguez, *Structure of characteristic Lyapunov vectors in spatiotemporal chaos*, Physical Review E **78** (2008), no. 1, 016209.
- [60] Y. Pesin and V. Climenhaga, *Open problems in the theory of non-uniform hyperbolicity*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst **27** (2010), no. 2, 589–607.
- [61] M. A Pinsky and V. Wihstutz, *Lyapunov exponents of nilpotent Itô systems*, Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes **25** (1988), no. 1, 43–57.
- [62] M. S Raghunathan, *A proof of Oseledec's multiplicative ergodic theorem*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **32** (1979), no. 4, 356–362.
- [63] F. Rezakhanlou, C. Villani, and F. Golse, *Entropy methods for the Boltzmann equation: lectures from a special semester at the Centre Émile Borel, Institut H. Poincaré, Paris, 2001*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [64] V. A. Rokhlin, *On the fundamental ideas of measure theory*, Matematicheskii Sbornik **67** (1949), no. 1, 107–150.
- [65] G. Royer, *Croissance exponentielle de produits Markoviens de matrices aléatoires*, Annales de l'ihp probabilités et statistiques, 1980, pp. 49–62.
- [66] G. Toscani, *Entropy production and the rate of convergence to equilibrium for the fokker-planck equation*, Quarterly of Applied Mathematics **57** (1999), no. 3, 521–541.
- [67] W. Tucker, *The Lorenz attractor exists*, Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics **328** (1999), no. 12, 1197–1202.
- [68] A. Virtser, *On products of random matrices and operators*, Theory of Probability & Its Applications **24** (1980), no. 2, 367–377.
- [69] P. Walters, *A dynamical proof of the multiplicative ergodic theorem*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **335** (1993), no. 1, 245–257.
- [70] P. Walters, *An introduction to ergodic theory*, Vol. 79, Springer Science & Business Media, 2000.
- [71] Q. Wang and L.-S. Young, *Toward a theory of rank one attractors*, Annals of Mathematics **167** (2008), no. 2, 349–480.
- [72] A. Wilkinson, *What are Lyapunov exponents, and why are they interesting?*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **54** (2017), no. 1, 79–105.
- [73] L.-S. Young, *Ergodic theory of differentiable dynamical systems*, Real and complex dynamical systems, 1995, pp. 293–336.
- [74] L.-S. Young, *Mathematical theory of Lyapunov exponents*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **46** (2013), no. 25, 254001.
- [75] G. Zaslavsky, *The simplest case of a strange attractor*, Physics Letters A **69** (1978), no. 3, 145–147.
- [76] R. J Zimmer, *Ergodic theory and semisimple groups*, Vol. 81, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.