FOURIER TRANSFORM AND EXPANDING MAPS ON CANTOR SETS
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Abstract. We study the Fourier transforms \( \hat{\mu}(\xi) \) of Gibbs measures \( \mu \) for uniformly expanding maps \( T \) of bounded distortions on Cantor sets with strong separation condition. When \( T \) is totally non-linear and Hausdorff dimension of \( \mu \) is large enough, then \( \hat{\mu}(\xi) \) decays at a polynomial rate as \( |\xi| \to \infty \).

1. Introduction

Given a Borel measure \( \mu \) on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and a frequency \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \), then the corresponding Fourier coefficient (or amplitude in frequency \( \xi \)) associated to \( \mu \) is given by the complex number

\[
\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \int e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot x} \, d\mu(x)
\]

for \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \). The Fourier coefficients of \( \mu \) relate closely to various fine structure properties of the measure. For example, the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma states that if \( \mu \) is absolutely continuous with \( L^1 \) density, then \( \hat{\mu}(\xi) \) converges to 0 when the frequencies \( |\xi| \to \infty \). In contrast for atomic measures \( \mu \), Wiener’s theorem says that their Fourier transform \( \hat{\mu}(\xi) \) cannot converge to 0 as \( |\xi| \to \infty \). The intermediate case, namely, fractal measures is a very difficult problem. For middle-third Cantor measure the Fourier transform cannot decay at infinity due to invariance under \( \times 3 \), but some other fractal measures such as random measures (Salem’s work [35] or Kahane’s work on Brownian motion [20, 21]) or measures on badly or well approximable numbers (see Kaufman’s papers [22, 23]) exhibit decay of Fourier coefficients. Hence it is interesting to see if one can find more axiomatic way to explain what is sufficient for Fourier decay of fractal measures.

In a random setting, the conditions usually require certain rapid correlation decay properties of the processes such as independent increments on Brownian motion (see Kahane’s work [20, 21], or other independence or Markov properties (see the works of Shmerkin and Suomala [39]). In the deterministic setting, the known examples are currently suggesting some form of nonlinearity starting from the work of Kaufman [22], where measures were constructed on sets of badly approximable numbers. Such sets are naturally invariant for the Gauss map \( T : [0, 1] \to [0, 1] \), defined by

\[
T : x \mapsto \frac{1}{x} \mod 1, \quad x \in (0, 1], \quad T(0) = 0
\]

The Gauss map forms a crucial dynamical system in the theory of Diophantine approximation as it can be used to generate continued fraction expansions, and the geodesic flow on modular surface can be connected to its evolution by suspension flows [7]. In contrast to the \( \times 3 \) map, which has fully linear inverse branches, the Gauss map exhibits nonlinear inverse branches. Any \( \times 3 \) invariant measure cannot have Fourier decay, but as proven by
Jordan and Sahlsten [19], when assuming certain correlation properties from the invariant measures for the Gauss map (Bernoulli or more generally Gibbs property) and finite Lyapunov exponent, than invariant measures of large enough dimensions exhibit Fourier decay. Hence it would be interesting to see which properties of the results of [19] are really needed for Fourier decay of invariant measures for interval maps, and not just the Gauss map.

In a recent work [4] Bourgain and Dyatlov adapted the discretised sum-product theory from additive combinatorics developed by Bourgain [3] and proved Fourier decay of Patterson-Sullivan measures for convex cocompact Fuchsian groups. This was also proved by Li [26] using different tools from random walks on matrix groups. Patterson-Sullivan measures are self-conformal (Gibbs) measures associated to an iterated function system given by contractive fractional linear transformations

\[ x \mapsto \frac{ax + b}{cx + d}, \quad x \in [0, 1] \]

with \( ad - bc = 1 \) and \( a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R} \) chosen such that the map is a contraction. This reflects the situation of the Gauss map, where the inverse branches of the Gauss map are of the form

\[ x \mapsto \frac{1}{x + a}, \quad x \in [0, 1] \]

and \( a \in \mathbb{N} \) so the work of Bourgain and Dyatlov generalises the work of Jordan and Sahlsten to more general fractional linear transformations but it does not directly include it. The motivation for the results of Bourgain and Dyatlov [4] is to establish a Fractal Uncertainty Principle for the limit sets of Fuchsian groups. Fractal Uncertainty Principle, as introduced by Dyatlov and Zahl [11], is a powerful harmonic analytic tool used in understanding Pollicott-Ruelle resonances in open dynamical systems [5] and delocalisation of semiclassical limits of eigenfunctions for the Laplacian [10].

In the study of dimension theory for equilibrium states of fractional linear transformations, one is often able to generalise the results to more general expanding interval maps \( T \) with enough regularity or distortion assumptions on the inverse branches of \( T \). However, recall that Fourier decay is not possible for fractal invariant measures of the interval map \( T(x) = 3x \mod 1 \) (e.g. for the middle-third Cantor measure), so some conditions are required. The main tool used in the work of Bourgain and Dyatlov [4] is a quite general decay theorem for multiplicative convolutions proved by Bourgain [3] in his seminal paper on discretised sum-product theorem (see Section 4 for details). The decay theorem applies to general Borel measures provided that bound on some type of non-concentration of distortions. Controlling the non-concentration of distortions requires structure from the measure, which is missing from, say, middle-third Cantor measures, but is present for Patterson-Sullivan measures for Fuchsian group actions or Gibbs measures for the Gauss map.

The purpose of this work is to prove polynomial Fourier decay for Gibbs measures associated to expanding maps of bounded distortions on Cantor sets \( K \) with strong separation conditions. Moreover, the non-concentration of distortions is established if we assume \( T \) is totally non-linear: the iterated function system defining \( K \) is not \( C^1 \) conjugated to a self-similar iterated function system. Let us now give our setting and main results more formally. We follow the setting and notations of Naud [31] and use the same notation. Let \( I_1, \ldots, I_N, \quad N \geq 2, \) be closed, disjoint and bounded intervals in \([0, 1]\), and write \( I = \bigcup_{a=1}^{N} I_a \). Let \( T : I \to \mathbb{R} \) be a mapping such that each restriction \( T_a := T|_{I_a} \) is a real analytic map and

...
assume $T$ is conjugated to the full shift on $\mathcal{A}^\mathbb{N}$, where $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Moreover, we need that $T$ also satisfies

1. **Uniform expansion**: There exists $\gamma > 0$ and $D > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in I$ we have
   \[ |(T^n)'(x)| \geq D^{-1}\gamma^n. \]

2. **Markov property**: For all $a, b = 1, \ldots, k$, if $T(I_a) \cap \text{Int}(I_a) = \emptyset$, then $T(I_b) \supset I_a$.

3. **Bounded distortions**: there exists $B > 0$ such that
   \[ |T'(x)| \leq B|T''(x)|, \quad x \in I. \]

4. **Total non-linearity**: Let
   \[ \tau := \log |T'| \]
   be the *distortion function*. Then it is not possible to write
   \[ \tau = \psi_0 + g \circ T - g \]
   where $\psi_0 : I \to \mathbb{R}$ is constant on every $I_a$, $a = 1, \ldots, N$, and $g \in C^1(I)$.

Let $K = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{-n}(I)$ be the $T$-invariant regular Cantor set. Note that $K$ is the attractor to an iterated function system $\Phi := \{f_a : a = 1, \ldots, N\}$, so conditions (1)-(4) are about the properties of the contractions $f_a$. In particular the total-nonlinearity condition (4) means that the IFS $\Phi = \{f_a : a = 1, \ldots, N\}$ is not $C^1$ conjugated to a self-similar iterated function system: there does not exist a $C^1$ diffeomorphism $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the iterated function system $g\Phi = \{gf_a g^{-1} : a = 1, \ldots, N\}$ consists of similitudes.

We can now formulate our main result. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$. For a given negative continuous $\varphi : I \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the variations
   \[ \text{var}_n(\varphi) = \sup\{||\varphi(f_a(x)) - \varphi(f_a(y))|| : x, y \in I, a \in \mathcal{A}^n\} \to 0, \]
   exponentially as $j \to \infty$, we are interested in the $T$-invariant measure $\mu_\varphi$ on $K$ that realises the variational formula for the pressure:
   \[ P(\varphi) = \sup \left\{ \int_K \varphi d\mu : \mu = T\mu \right\} \]
   which is called an *equilibrium measure*, see Section 2.1 for more details and [24]. Note that under the assumptions (1)-(3), Bowen’s formula [24] gives that the Hausdorff dimension of $K$ is given by the unique real solution $s_0$ to $P(-s_0\tau) = 0$ for the distortion function $\tau = \log |T'|$, and we know that the Hausdorff dimension of an equilibrium state $\mu$ is given by $\dim_{H}\mu = h_\mu(T)/\lambda_\mu(T)$, where $\lambda_\mu(T) = \int \tau d\mu$ is the Lyapunov exponent of $\mu$.

We then have the following Fourier decay theorem equilibrium states:

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose $K$ satisfies conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4) and let $\mu$ be an equilibrium state on $K$ associated to a potential $\varphi$ with exponentially vanishing variations. If the Hausdorff dimension $\dim_{H}\mu$ is close enough to $\dim_{H}K$, then the Fourier coefficients of $\mu$ tend to zero with a polynomial rate.

Let us give some remarks on Theorem 1.1 and the assumptions.

**Remark 1.2.**
1. In this work we will use the seminal work of Naud [31] to establish the needed non-concentration properties for a class of Cantor sets that satisfy a condition known as total non-linearity. The non-concentration of distortions will be crucial for the sum-product estimates we use, and we follow the ideas from [4] to do
this reduction. Moreover in order to control the regular parts of the measure, we extend some of the large deviations for ideas for Gibbs measures as in [19] to adapt to our setting.

(2) It would be interesting to see if one could get results also for small Hausdorff dimension \(\dim_H \mu\). The method of our proof relies on the spectral properties of the complex transfer operator associated the distortion function and Hausdorff dimension of \(\mu\). Here we employ the \(C^1\) contraction result by Naud [31], where in our case we need \(\dim_H \mu\) to be close enough to the zero-point \(s_0\) of the pressure \(P(-s_0\tau)\), which is given by \(\dim_H K\). We also highlight the work of Hochman and Shmerkin [14], where normality of orbits of \(\{n^k x\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\), where \(n \geq 2, n \in \mathbb{N}\), was established for \(\mu\) almost every \(x\) under total non-linearity without dimension assumptions. Theorem 1.1, thanks to Davenport-Erdős-LeVeque criterion for equidistribution [8] gives the equidistribution for \(\{s_k x\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) at \(\mu\) almost every \(x\) for any strictly increasing sequence \(s_k \to \infty\), so it would make sense for Theorem 1.1 to hold for any dimensional \(\mu\).

(3) The total non-linearity condition goes back to the uniform non-integrability properties of the unstable and stable foliations of Anosov flows and their symbolic properties, see for example Dolgopyat [9]. Since \(T\) is real analytic, total non-linearity is equivalent to the Non-Local Integrability (NLI) of the distortion function \(\tau\) (see [31] for the definition), which is proved in Avila, Gouëzel and Yoccoz [1, Proposition 7.5] and it goes back to the notion of Anosov alternative by Dolgopyat [9]. See also Magee, Oh, Winter [27] and references there-in and Remark 4.7.

(4) Total non-linearity is related to the notion of \(\tau\) being non-lattice: \(\tau\) is called non-lattice if there does not exist \(L : I \to m\mathbb{Z}\) for some \(m > 0\) and \(g \in C^1(I)\) such that \(\tau\) satisfies the cohomological equation

\[
\tau = L + g - g \circ T.
\]

Non-lattice is weaker than total non-linearity. Naud [31] proved NLI implies \(\tau\) is non-lattice, but there are counterexamples to the opposite direction as pointed out by Naud: for example the spectral gap estimates Naud obtain may fail. We also remark of the Diophantine condition used by Pollicott and Sharp [32], which gives weaker contraction theorems for the transfer operators, and it could be considered as a notion between non-lattice and total non-linearity. Hence it would be interesting to see if Theorem 1.1 holds for any of these weaker notions of the non-linearity of \(T\).

(5) In [31], Naud also established total non-linearity for examples arising from quadratic Julia sets and for limit sets of Schottky groups.

(6) If we relax the condition on finite branches to infinite number of inverse branches, then we no longer have the spectral gap theorem of Naud available. It is however likely that using large deviation ideas with an assumption on the tails the distortion functions \(\tau\) with respect to \(\mu\) Naud’s result could be extended to countable Markov maps, see [34, 19].

Our setting considers situations where the IFS defining \(K\) is far from being a self-similar set, when the IFS defining \(K\) is given by similitudes. In the self-similar case the situation has also been evolving from similar angles and has roots in the theory of Bernoulli convolutions since the seminal works of Salem, Zygmund, Erdős et al. [36, 37, 12]. In [17, 18] Fourier decay theorems were proved for self-similar and self-affine measures satisfying suitable irrationality properties for their defining maps. These ideas were based on renewal theorems, which in
turn were inspired by the work on Fourier decay on the stationary measure [15, 16] and establishing rates for these renewal theorems, at least in higher dimensions, one needs to have the similar sum-product bounds available as we have. Further characterisations to these were done by Varjú-Yu [41] and Brémont [2], and also using the Erdős-Kahane method one can obtain polynomial Fourier decay for most parameters by Solomyak [40].

**Strategy and organisation of the proof.** We will begin the proof in Section 2 where we first introduce the needed thermodynamic notation, words and blocks of words, following similar notations as in [19] and [4]. Here we will state the needed large deviation results for Gibbs measures, which allow us to extract a regular part of the measure and decompose eventually the analysis for Fourier transform into regular and irregular components.

Then in Section 3 we follow the strategy of Bourgain and Dyatlov [4] by adapting bounds of bounded distortions of $T$ to reduce the $|\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2$ into a question about the decay of certain exponential sums arising from the distortion function $\tau(x) = \log|T'(x)|$. In Section 4 we see that estimates can be dealt using a consequence of the discretised sum-product estimates Bourgain established in [3], and we use the particular form used by Bourgain and Dyatlov [4] adapted to our setting. We note that here the assumptions require a non-concentration property for the distortions, which is possible thanks to the NLI and an argument using the $C^1$ contraction for transfer operators established by Naud [31].

Finally in Section 5 we complete the proof by carefully choosing the right parameters so that the large deviation estimates, non-concentration estimates and decay theorems for exponential sums are satisfied.

## 2. Regular part of the measure and large deviations

### 2.1. Symbolic and thermodynamic preliminaries.** Let us collect here all the symbolic notations we will use throughout the proof. The notation here is same as in [4]. Write $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and let $\mathcal{A}^*$ the collection of all finite words with alphabet $\mathcal{A}$.

1. Recall that for $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}^n$, we wrote $f_a = T_{a_1}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ T_{a_n}^{-1}$.
2. Given $A = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in (\mathcal{A}^n)^{k+1}$ and $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_k) \in (\mathcal{A}^n)^k$ define the following concatenation operators:

   $$A \ast B := a_0b_1a_1b_2\cdots a_{k-1}b_{k-1}a_k$$

   $$A \# B := a_0b_1a_1b_2\cdots a_{k-1}b_{k-1}b_k.$$

For the rest of this paper, we fix a continuous $\varphi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi < 0$. The **variation** of $\varphi$ at the generation $n$ is defined by

$$\text{var}_n(\varphi) := \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}^n} \sup\{||\varphi(u) - \varphi(v)|| : u, v \in I_a\}.$$  

In this paper we will assume $\varphi$ is regular in the sense that $\text{var}_n(\varphi) \rightarrow 0$ exponentially as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We define the **transfer operator** associated to $\varphi$ as

$$\mathcal{L}_\varphi g(x) = \sum_{y : T(y) = x} e^{\varphi(y)} f(y)$$

for continuous $g : I \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The dual operator $\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*$ acting on the space of measures on $K$ is then defined by the formula

$$\int_K g \, d\mathcal{L}_\varphi^* \mu := \int_K \mathcal{L}_\varphi g \, d\mu.$$
Here we will consider the unique probability measure $\mu = \mu_\varphi$ on $K$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}_\varphi^* \mu = \mu$ maximising the pressure formula

$$P(\varphi) = \sup \left\{ h_\mu(T) + \int_K \varphi \, d\mu : \mu = T\mu \right\}$$

where $h_\mu(T)$ is the entropy of $\mu$ with respect to $\mu$, with pressure $P(\varphi) = 0$ and satisfying the Gibbs condition

$$C^{-1}e^{-S_n\varphi(fa(x))} \leq \mu(I_a) \leq Ce^{-S_n\varphi(fa(x))},$$

for some $C > 0$, where $S_n\varphi(x) := \varphi(x) + \varphi(Tx) + \cdots + \varphi(T^{n-1}x)$ is the Birkhoff sum of $\varphi$. We note that it is known, see for example [19] and the references there-in that one can relax the zero pressure condition but still have the same properties as we claim here.

2.2. Large deviation estimates for Gibbs measures. We need to find a large regular part of the measure $\mu$ in terms of the Lyapunov exponent and Hausdorff dimension, which allow us to prove good estimates on the Fourier transforms. In Bourgain and Dyatlov they dealt with Patterson-Sullivan measures which automatically are Ahlfors-David regular, which is stronger than the Gibbs condition. Large deviations allow us to extract a “large part” of the support with similar Ahlfors-David regular behaviour for $\mu$. Here is also where we need the finite Lyapunov exponent for $\mu$.

**Theorem 2.1** (Large deviations). Let $\mu$ be the equilibrium state associated to $\varphi$ and let

$$\lambda = \lambda_\mu(T) = \int \tau(x) \, d\mu(x) = \int \log |T'(x)| \, d\mu(x) > 0$$

be the Lyapunov exponent of $\mu$ and

$$\delta = \dim_H \mu > 0$$

be the Hausdorff dimension of $\mu$. Write

$$\psi := -\tau < 0.$$

Then we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C(\varepsilon) > 0$, $\delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $n_1(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mu \left( \left\{ x \in [0, 1] : \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n \psi(x) + \lambda \right| \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{or} \quad \left| \frac{S_n \varphi(x)}{S_n \psi(x)} - \delta \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \right) \leq Ce^{-\delta_0(\varepsilon)n}$$

for $n \geq n_1(\varepsilon)$.

The proof of this in this form was given in [19] for countable alphabets, where a tail assumption for $\mu$ is imposed in terms of the behaviour of $\tau$ at the tail. In the finite alphabets we do not have a tail, so we can apply the result in this form.

2.3. Regular words $R_n(\varepsilon)$ and regular blocks $R_n^b(\varepsilon)$. Let us now use the large deviations to construct regular words and blocks of words that we will use in our analysis of the Fourier transform of $\mu$. Fix now $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Write

$$A_n(\varepsilon) := \left\{ x \in [0, 1] : \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n \psi(x) + \lambda \right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{S_n \varphi(x)}{S_n \psi(x)} - \delta \right| < \varepsilon \right\}$$

for $\psi = -\tau = -\log |T'|$.

**Definition 2.1** (Regular words and blocks). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. 

(1) For a generation \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) the set of regular words:

\[
\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0) := \bigcap_{k=[\varepsilon_0n]}^n \{ a \in A^n : I_{a|k} \subset A_k(\varepsilon) \}
\]

Note that unlike [19], we will require \([\varepsilon_0n]\)-regularity as opposed to \([n/2]\). We note that the \( \varepsilon_0 \) is the exponent \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) for the non-concentration for distortions we will eventually find in Lemma 4.8. It does not depend on \( \varepsilon \) so we will suppress it from the notations.

(2) For a generation \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and parameter \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), define a regular block of length \( k \) to be the concatenation of \( k \) regular words of length \( n \). We denote the set of such words by \( \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) \). Note that we can equivalently define this set as

\[
\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) := \{ A \in (A^n)^k : I_{a|k} \subset A_{n}(\varepsilon), \forall i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1 \}
\]

where \( \sigma \) is the shift mapping and \( A_{n}(\varepsilon) \) is the \( n \)-regular set.

We shall consider the corresponding geometric points to be

\[
R_n(\varepsilon) := \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)} I_A \subset [0, 1].
\]

**Lemma 2.2.** Define

\[
C_{\varepsilon, j} := e^{\varepsilon j}
\]

and assume that \( n \) is chosen large enough so that

\[
\frac{\log 4}{\varepsilon_0n} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \frac{\log 4C^2}{\log(\gamma^{2\varepsilon_0n})} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{e^{-\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_0n}}{1 - e^{-\varepsilon_0n}} < e^{-\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_0n/2},
\]

where \( \gamma > 1 \) satisfies \( |(T^n)'(z)| \geq C\gamma^n \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( z \in I \). For some \( n \)-regular word \( a \in \mathcal{R}_n \) and \( j \in \{ [\varepsilon_0n], \ldots, n \} \) we have that the following hold:

(i) the size of the derivative \( |f'_{a|k}| \) satisfies

\[
\frac{1}{16} C_{\varepsilon, j}^{-1} e^{-\lambda j} \leq |f'_{a|k}| \leq C_{\varepsilon, j} e^{-\lambda j}
\]

and hence so does the length \( |I_{a|k}| \);

(ii) The measure satisfies

\[
C^{-1} C_{\varepsilon, j}^{-3\lambda} e^{-s\lambda j} \leq \mu(I_{a|k}) \leq C C_{\varepsilon, j}^{3\lambda} e^{-s\lambda j};
\]

(iii) The Birkhoff weights satisfy

\[
C_{\varepsilon, j}^{-3\lambda} e^{-s\lambda j} \leq w_{a|k}(x) \leq C_{\varepsilon, j}^{3\lambda} e^{-s\lambda j}.
\]

(iv) The cardinality

\[
\frac{1}{2} C^{-1} C_{\varepsilon, n}^{-3\lambda} e^{\lambda sn} \leq \# \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) \leq C C_{\varepsilon, n}^{3\lambda} e^{\lambda sn}
\]

Then for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) we have that if \( n \to \infty \),

\[
\mu([0, 1] \setminus R_n^k(\varepsilon)) = O(e^{-\delta_0(\varepsilon/2)\varepsilon_0n/2})
\]

where \( \delta_0(\varepsilon/2) \) is given to us Theorem 2.1.
Proof. Parts (i), (ii), and (iii) are done in [19] and the part (iv) follows from the bounds for \( \mu(I_A) \) and combining with the measure bound for \( \mu([0,1] \setminus R_n(\varepsilon)) \). For the measure bound for \( \mu([0,1] \setminus R^k_n(\varepsilon)) \), it is sufficient to prove that
\[
\bigcap_{i=0}^{k-1} (T^{-1})^{ni} \left( \bigcap_{j=[\varepsilon_0 n]}^{n} A_j(\varepsilon/2) \right) \subset R^k_n(\varepsilon)
\]
since we have that
\[
\mu([0,1] \setminus R^k_n(\varepsilon)) \leq \mu \left( [0,1] \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} (T^{-1})^{ni} \left( \bigcap_{j=[\varepsilon_0 n]}^{n} A_j(\varepsilon/2) \right) \right)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mu \left( [0,1] \setminus (T^{-1})^{ni} \left( \bigcap_{j=[\varepsilon_0 n]}^{n} A_j(\varepsilon/2) \right) \right)
\]
\[
\leq k \mu \left( [0,1] \left( \bigcap_{j=[\varepsilon_0 n]}^{n} A_j(\varepsilon/2) \right) \right)
\]
\[
\leq k e^{-\delta_0(\varepsilon/2)\varepsilon_0 n/2}
\]
where the details of the last inequality are given in [19].

We now prove the claim. Let \( B \in (A^*)^k \) be a word such that \( T^{ni} f_B x \in A_j(\varepsilon/2) \) for all \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1 \) and all \( j = [\varepsilon_0 n], \ldots, n \). We want to prove that \( f_B x \in R^k_n \). By definition of \( R^k_n \), it is enough for us to prove that \( f_B x \in I_A \) for some \( A \in R^k_n(\varepsilon) \). So we can just prove that \( B \in R^k_n(\varepsilon) \). By definition of \( R^k_n(\varepsilon) \), we need to prove that \( I_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} \subset A_j(\varepsilon) \) for all \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1 \) and \( j = [\varepsilon_0 n], \ldots, n \). If we have \( y \in [0,1] \setminus Q \), then \( f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y \) is a general point in \( I_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} \) (we may equivalently consider the point \( T^{ni} f_{B^i} y \)). So we want to prove that \( f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y \in A_j(\varepsilon) \). Using the assumptions on \( B \) we have that
\[
\left| \frac{1}{j} S_j \psi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y) + \lambda \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{j} S_j \psi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y) - \frac{1}{j} S_j \psi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} x) \right| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\]
\[
= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{1}{j} \log \frac{|f'_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} f_{(\sigma^n)^j+1 B^i} y|}{|f'_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} f_{(\sigma^n)^j+1 B^i} x|}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\log 4}{j}
\]
\[
\leq \varepsilon
\]
by choice of \( n \). Now for the second condition we see that
\[
\left| \frac{S_j \varphi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y)}{S_j \psi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y)} - s \right| \leq \left| \frac{S_j \varphi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y)}{S_j \psi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} y)} - \frac{S_j \varphi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} x)}{S_j \psi(f_{(\sigma^n)^j B^i} x)} \right| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\log 4C^2}{\log(c\gamma^{2k})} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\]
\[
< \varepsilon
\]
by following the proof of Lemma 5.2 in [19].
3. Reduction to exponential sums

Given $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, we will now reduce $|\mu(\xi)|^2$ into an estimate using the block notations and regular blocks from Section 2 into an estimate consisting of exponential sums. Given a word $a$, we shall define $x_a \in I_a$ to be the center point of this construction interval. If blocks $A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)$, $B \in \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $b \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)$, we define

$$\zeta_{j, A}(b) := e^{2\lambda_n f_{\mathcal{R}_{n-1}}(x_a)}.$$

**Proposition 3.1.** Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, $\xi, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and write

$$J_n(\varepsilon) := \{\eta \in \mathbb{R} : C^{-1}_\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon_0 n/2} \leq |\eta| \leq C_\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon_0 n}\},$$

where recall $C_{\varepsilon, n} = e^{\varepsilon n}$. Then we can bound

$$|\tilde{\mu}(\xi)|^2 \lesssim e^{-\lambda(2k+1)\varepsilon n} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sup_{\varepsilon \in J_n(\varepsilon)} \left| \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)} e^{2\pi i \varepsilon \xi} \zeta_{\varepsilon, A}(B) \right|$$

$$+ e^{2k} C_{\varepsilon, n} e^{-\varepsilon n} + \mu([0, 1] \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon))^2 + e^{-\varepsilon n} + \mu(I \setminus R_n(\varepsilon)) + C^2_{\varepsilon, n} e^{-\delta_0 n/2}.$$

Let us now proceed to prove Proposition 3.1. First we will first use the $\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*$ invariance of $\mu$ to obtain the following estimate:

**Lemma 3.2.** For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\xi, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$|\tilde{\mu}(\xi)|^2 \lesssim e^{-2\pi i \xi} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)} \int e^{-2\pi i \xi} f_{A \star B}(x) w_{A \star B}(x) \, d\mu(x) + \mu([0, 1] \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon))^2.$$

**Proof.** Given $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, write

$$h(x) := e^{-2\pi i \xi x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

Since $\mu = \mathcal{L}_\varphi^* \mu$, we have

$$\tilde{\mu}(\xi) = \int h(x) \, d\mu(x) = \int (\mathcal{L}_\varphi(2k+1))^n h(x) \, d\mu(x) = \int (\mathcal{L}_\varphi(n))^{2k+1} \, d\mu(x).$$

By the definition of the transfer operator

$$(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^n)^{2k+1} \, d\mu(x) = \sum_{A \in (\mathcal{A}_n)^{2k+1}} w_A(x) h(f_A x) = \sum_{A \in (\mathcal{A}_n)^{k+1}} \sum_{B \in (\mathcal{A}_n)^k} w_{A \star B}(x) h(f_{A \star B} x)$$

using the concatenation notation

$$A \star B = a_0 b_1 a_1 b_2 \ldots a_{k-1} b_k a_k$$

for

$$A = (a_0, ..., a_k) \in (\mathcal{A}_n)^{k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad B = (b_1, ..., b_k) \in (\mathcal{A}_n)^k.$$

This splits using $\mathcal{R}_n^k$ and $(\mathcal{A}_n)^k \setminus \mathcal{R}_n^k$ to

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)} w_{A \star B}(x) h(f_{A \star B} x) + \sum_{A \in (\mathcal{A}_n)^{k+1} \setminus \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in (\mathcal{A}_n)^k \setminus \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)} w_{A \star B}(x) h(f_{A \star B} x).$$
Integrating over $x$, we can bound the modulus of the right-hand side by

$$\left| \int \sum_{A \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+1} \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k} \setminus R_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} w_{A \cdot B}(x) h(f_{A \cdot B} x) \, d\mu \right| \leq \int \sum_{A \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+1} \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k} \setminus R_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} w_{A \cdot B}(x) \, d\mu$$

$$\lesssim \mu \sum_{A \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+1} \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k} \setminus R_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} \mu(I_{A \cdot B})$$

$$\leq \mu([0, 1] \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)) + \mu([0, 1] \setminus R_n^{k}(\varepsilon)).$$

We get the required result by noting that $R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon) \subset R_n^k(\varepsilon)$, which follows by the fact that for any $A \in R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)$ we have that there exists $B \in R_n^k(\varepsilon)$ such that $A = B a_k$ for some $a_k \in R_n(\varepsilon)$. Conclude using $|a + b|^2 \leq 2|a|^2 + 2|b|^2$ for complex numbers.

Next, in the sums obtained in right-hand side of the estimate Lemma 3.2, we will want to transfer the integration into exponential sums. This will be possible by the decaying variations of the potential $\varphi$ defining the Gibbs measure and the bounded distortion assumption on $T$ from the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. We have the following quantitative estimate:

**Lemma 3.3.** There exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{A \in R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in R_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} \int e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \cdot B} x} w_{A \cdot B}(x) \, d\mu(x) \right|^2 \lesssim \mu e^{-(2k+1)\delta n} \sum_{A \in R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in R_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} \left| \int e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \cdot B} x} w_{A k}(x) \, d\mu(x) \right|^2 + e^{-\varepsilon_2 n}.$$

**Proof.** Since $\varphi$ is locally Hölder, we know that there exists a constant $C > 0$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$ such that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\sup_{w \in \mathbb{N}^m} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{N}^m} \{|\varphi(u) - \varphi(v)| : u, v \in I_w\} \leq C \gamma^m.$$

Choose a point $y \in [0, 1]$ such that $x_{a_k} = f_{a_k}(y)$. Then we have that

$$\frac{w_{A \# B}(f_{a_k} x)}{w_{A \# B}(x_{a_k})} = \exp(S_{2kn} \varphi(f_{A \cdot B}(x)) - S_{2kn} \varphi(f_{A \cdot B}(y))).$$

This gives as $|A \ast B| = (2k + 1)n$ that

$$|S_{2kn} \varphi(f_{A \cdot B}(x)) - S_{2kn} \varphi(f_{A \cdot B}(y))| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{2kn-1} C \gamma^{2kn + n - j} \leq \frac{C}{1 - \gamma} \gamma^{n+1} =: C_0 \gamma^{n+1}.$$

Hence

$$\exp(-C_0 \gamma^n) \leq \frac{w_{A \# B}(f_{a_k} x)}{w_{A \# B}(x_{a_k})} \leq \exp(C_0 \gamma^n).$$

Rearranging this result we have that

$$|w_{A \# B}(f_{a_k} x) - w_{A \# B}(x_{a_k})| \leq \max\{\exp(\pm C_0 \gamma^n) - 1\} w_{A \# B}(x_{a_k}).$$

Hence since $|e^{i\theta}| = 1$ we have that

$$|e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \cdot B}(x)} w_{A \cdot B}(x) - w_{A \# B}(x_{a_k}) e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \cdot B}(x)} w_{A k}(x)| \leq C e^{-(2k+1)\delta n} \cdot C_0 \gamma^n.$$
where we use that fact that $w_{A \# B}(x) = w_{A \# B}(f_{a_k}(x)) w_{a_k}(x)$ and that

$$w_{A \# B}(x_k) \leq C e^{-2k\lambda \delta n}$$

by Lemma 2.2.

Thus when summing over $A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)$ and $B \in \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)$ below:

$$\left| \sum_{A,B} e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{A \# B}(x) d\mu(x) - \sum_{A,B} w_{A \# B}(x_k) \int e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{a_k}(x) d\mu(x) \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{A,B} \left| e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{A \# B}(x) - w_{A \# B}(x_k) e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{a_k}(x) \right| d\mu(x)$$

$$\leq \sum_{A,B} C e^{-(2k+1)\lambda \delta n} \cdot C_0 \gamma^n$$

$$\leq C_1 \gamma^n$$

where we use the fact that we have an upper bound on the number of block combinations $A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)$ and $B \in \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)$, which is given by $C e^{(2k+1)\lambda \delta n}$ by Lemma 2.2.

Moreover, using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we get that

$$\left| \sum_{A,B} w_{A \# B}(x_k) \int e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{a_k}(x) d\mu(x) \right|^2$$

$$\leq C e^{-(2k-1)\lambda \delta n} \sum_{A,B} \left| \int e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{a_k}(x) d\mu(x) \right|^2$$

Using $|a + b|^2 \leq 2|a|^2 + 2|b|^2$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, we get the result and choosing $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that $\gamma^{2n} = e^{-\varepsilon_2 n}$.

Now we are ready to finish the proof of Lemma 3.1:

**Proof of Lemma 3.1.** Using Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we obtain:

$$|\tilde{\mu}(\xi)|^2 \lesssim \mu e^{-\lambda(2k-1)\delta n} \sum_{A,B} \left| \int e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{a_k}(x) d\mu(x) \right|^2 + \mu([0,1] \setminus \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon))^2 + e^{-\varepsilon_2 n}$$

with the sum over $A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)$ and $B \in \mathcal{R}_n^k(\varepsilon)$.

Consider the term

$$e^{-\lambda(2k-1)\delta n} \sum_{A,B} \left| \int e^{-2\pi i \xi f_{A \# B}(x)} w_{a_k}(x) d\mu(x) \right|^2,$$

which, when opening up, is equal to

$$e^{-\lambda(2k-1)\delta n} \sum_A \int w_{a_k}(x) w_{a_k}(y) \sum_B e^{2\pi i \xi (f_{A \# B}(x) - f_{A \# B}(x))} d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

Taking absolute values, and using the bound for $w_{a_k}(x) w_{a_k}(y) \lesssim C_{\varepsilon,n}^2 e^{-2\lambda \delta n}$, this is bounded from above by

$$\lesssim C_{\varepsilon,n}^2 e^{-\lambda(2k-1)\delta n} \sum_A \int \int e^{2\pi i \xi (f_{A \# B}(x) - f_{A \# B}(x))} d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$
Consider a fixed block $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(c)$. Given $x, y \in I$, define $\hat{x} := f_{\mathbf{a}_k}(x)$ and $\hat{y} := f_{\mathbf{a}_k}(y)$ both of which are in $I_{\mathbf{a}_k}$. We also have that $f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(x) = f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(\hat{x})$ and $f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(y) = f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(\hat{y})$. By the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus we have that
\[
f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(y) - f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(x) = \int_{\hat{x}}^{\hat{y}} f'_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(t) dt.
\]
By applying the chain rule $k$ times, we have that there exists $t_i \in I_{\mathbf{a}_i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ such that
\[
f'_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(t) = f'_{\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{b}_1}(t_1)f'_{\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{b}_2}(t_2) \ldots f'_{\mathbf{a}_{i-1} \mathbf{b}_k}(t_k)
\]
where $t_k = t$.

Let us now invoke the bounded distortion assumption from $T$. We know that there exists $B > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^n$ and for $x, y \in I$ we have
\[
\frac{f'_{\mathbf{a}}(x)}{f'_{\mathbf{a}}(y)} \leq \exp(B|x - y|) \tag{3.1}
\]
Indeed, by the mean value theorem we have that
\[
\exp \left( \log \frac{f'_{\mathbf{a}}(x)}{f'_{\mathbf{a}}(y)} \right) \leq \exp \left| \log f'_{\mathbf{a}}(x) - \log f'_{\mathbf{a}}(y) \right|
\]
\[
= \exp \left( |\log f'_{\mathbf{a}}(z)| \cdot |x - y| \right)
\]
\[
\leq \exp(B|x - y|).
\]
Using (3.1), we obtain
\[
\exp(-B|x_{\mathbf{a}_i} - t_i|) \leq \frac{f'_{\mathbf{a}_{i-1} \mathbf{b}_i}(t_i)}{e^{-2\lambda c^2\lambda n} f'_{\mathbf{a}_{i-1} \mathbf{b}_i}(x_{\mathbf{a}_i})} \leq \exp(B|t_i - x_{\mathbf{a}_i}|)
\]
where the upper bound is direct, but the lower bound is achieved by swapping $x_{\mathbf{a}_i}$ and $t_i$ in the lemma. We also have that $|x_{\mathbf{a}_i} - t_i| \leq C_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}$ because both points are in $I_{\mathbf{a}_i}$. Hence using the definition of $\zeta_{i,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{b}_i)$ we have that
\[
\exp(-BkC_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}) \leq \frac{f'_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(t)}{e^{-2k\lambda n} \zeta_{1,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{b}_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{b}_k)} \leq \exp(BkC_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}).
\]
Write
\[
P_k := e^{-2k\lambda n} \zeta_{1,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{b}_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{b}_k).
\]
Then
\[
[\exp(-BkC_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}) - 1]P_k \leq f'_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(t) - P_k \leq [\exp(BkC_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}) - 1]P_k.
\]
So by integrating between $\hat{y}$ and $\hat{x}$ we get that
\[
[\exp(-BkC_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}) - 1]P_k(\hat{y} - \hat{x}) \leq f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(x) - f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(y) - P_k(\hat{y} - \hat{x}) \leq [\exp(BkC_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}) - 1]P_k(\hat{y} - \hat{x}).
\]
Since $\hat{y}, \hat{x} \in I_{\mathbf{a}_k}$ and $\zeta_{i,\mathbf{A}} \in [C_{\epsilon,n}^{-2}, C_{\epsilon,n}^2]$, we have that
\[
|P_k| \leq C_{\epsilon,n}^k e^{-2k\lambda n}
\]
and so
\[
|f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(x) - f_{\mathbf{A}^\circ \mathbf{B}}(y) - P_k(\hat{y} - \hat{x})| \leq e^{2k} C_{\epsilon,n}^{k+2} e^{-(2k+2)\lambda n}.
\]
Fix $(x, y) \in I \times I$. Define
\[
\eta(x, y) := \xi e^{-2k\lambda n}(\hat{x} - \hat{y}),
\]
where $|\xi| \sim e^{(2k+1)n\lambda}e^{\varepsilon_0 n}$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ is from the non-concentration Lemma 4.8. Then
\[ 2\pi i \xi \int_B (\tilde{y} - \tilde{x}) = 2\pi i \eta(x,y) \zeta_{1,A}(b_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,A}(b_k) \]
which, using $|\xi| \sim e^{(2k+1)n\lambda}e^{\varepsilon_0 n}$, gives us
\[ |2\pi i \xi (f_{A,B}(x) - f_{A,B}(y)) - 2\pi i \eta(x,y) \zeta_{1,A}(b_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,A}(b_k)| \lesssim e^{2kC_{\varepsilon,n}^1 e^{-\lambda n}e^{\varepsilon_0 n}} \]
By the Mean Value Theorem and using the regularity bounds on $|f'_n|$ we get that
\[ C_{\varepsilon,n}^{-1} e^{-\lambda n}|x - y| \leq |\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}| \leq C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n}|x - y| \]
and hence we have that
\[ C_{\varepsilon,n}^{-1} e^{\varepsilon_0 n}|x - y| \leq |\eta(x,y)| \leq C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{\varepsilon_0 n}|x - y|. \]
Splitting the sum we obtain
\[
\left| \sum_\mathcal{B} e^{2\pi i \xi (f_{A,B}(x) - f_{A,B}(x))} \right| \\
\leq \left| \sum_\mathcal{B} e^{2\pi i \eta(x,y) \zeta_{1,a}(b_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,a}(b_k)} \right| + \left| \sum_\mathcal{B} e^{2\pi i \xi (f_{A,B}(x) - f_{A,B}(x)) - e^{2\pi i \eta(x,y) \zeta_{1,a}(b_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,a}(b_k)}} \right|
\]
Here
\[
\left| \sum_\mathcal{B} e^{2\pi i \xi (f_{A,B}(x) - f_{A,B}(x)) - e^{2\pi i \eta(x,y) \zeta_{1,a}(b_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,a}(b_k)}} \right| \\
\leq \sum_\mathcal{B} |2\pi \xi (f_{A,B}(x) - f_{A,B}(x)) - 2\pi \eta(x,y) \zeta_{1,a}(b_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,a}(b_k)| \]
\[ \lesssim \sum_{\mathcal{B}} e^{2kC_{\varepsilon,n}^1 e^{-\lambda n}e^{\varepsilon_0 n}} \]
Combining the above estimates gives us
\[ |\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 \lesssim e^{-\lambda(2k+1)\delta n} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{R}_{\delta n}^{k+1}} \int_{I_{\delta n}(A)} \int_{I_{\delta n}(A)} \left| \sum_\mathcal{B} e^{2\pi i \eta(x,y) \zeta_{1,a}(b_1) \ldots \zeta_{k,a}(b_k)} \right| d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\
+ e^{2kC_{\varepsilon,n}^1 e^{-\lambda n}e^{\varepsilon_0 n} + \mu([0,1] \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon))^2 + e^{-\varepsilon_0 n}} \]
By covering the $n$-regular part of the following set with $[\varepsilon_0 n/2]$-generation parent intervals, for fixed $y \in [0,1]$ we have that
\[ \mu(\{x \in I : |x - y| \leq C_0 e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2}\}) \leq \mu(\{x \in R_n(\varepsilon) : |x - y| \leq C_0 e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2}\}) + \mu(\{x \in R_n(\varepsilon) : |x - y| \leq C_0 e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2}\}), \]
where
\[ \mu(\{x \in R_n(\varepsilon) : |x - y| \leq C_0 e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2}\}) \lesssim C_0 C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\delta \varepsilon_0 n/2}. \]
Hence we have that
\[ \mu \times \mu(\{(x,y) \in I \times I : |x - y| \leq C_0 e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2}\}) \lesssim \mu(I \setminus R_n(\varepsilon)) + C_0 C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\delta \varepsilon_0 n/2}. \]
Choose now $C_0 = C_{\varepsilon,n}$. Now, when $|x - y| > C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2}$, then
\[ C_{\varepsilon,n}^{-1} e^{\varepsilon_0 n/2} = C_{\varepsilon,n}^{-1} e^{\varepsilon_0 n} C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2} \leq |\eta(x,y)| \]
Hence, as when removing this measure and using triangle inequality, and using the fact that the cardinalities of the sums over \( A \) and \( B \) is in total at most \( C e^{\lambda(2k+1)\delta_0} \), we are left with the error

\[
\mu(I \setminus R_n(\varepsilon)) + C_{\varepsilon,n}^2 e^{-\delta_0 n/2}
\]

and the double integral over those pairs \((x, y)\) with \(|x - y| \geq C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\delta_0 n/2}\). Hence when considering the supremum over \( \eta \in J_n(\varepsilon) \), we can bound over those \((x, y)\) with \(|x - y| \geq C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\delta_0 n/2}\). \qed

4. Application of the sum-product estimates

4.1. Controlling exponential sums. To control the exponential sums arising in Lemma 3.1, we will, as Bourgain and Dyatlov used in [4], we will use the following Fourier decay theorem for multiplicative convolutions proved in this form by Bourgain [3, Lemma 8.43] that follows from the discretised sum-product theorem. Recall that the multiplicative convolution of two measures \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) on \( \mathbb{R} \) is defined by

\[
\int f \, d(\mu \otimes \nu) = \iint f(xy) \, d\mu(x) \, d\nu(y), \quad f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}).
\]

**Lemma 4.1** (Bourgain). For all \( \kappa > 0 \), there exist \( \varepsilon_3 > 0 \), \( \varepsilon_4 > 0 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that the following holds.

Let \( \mu \) be a probability measure on \([\frac{1}{2}, 1]\) let and \( N \) be a large integer. Assume for all \( 1/N < \varrho < 1/N^{\varepsilon_3} \) that

\[
\max_a \mu(B(a, \varrho)) < \varrho^\kappa.
\]

Then for all \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \), \( |\xi| \sim N \), the Fourier transform

\[
|\widehat{\mu}^{\otimes k}(\xi)| < N^{-\varepsilon_4}.
\]

Here \( |\xi| \sim N \) means that there exists a constant \( c > 0 \) such that \( c^{-1} N \leq |\xi| \leq cN \). In [4] Bourgain and Dyatlov showed that by taking linear combinations of measures \( \mu_j \), one can prove an analogous statement for multiplicative convolutions of several measures \( \mu_j \) with the growth assumption (4.1) on \( \mathbb{R} \) replaced with a growth assumption for \( \mu_j \times \mu_j \) on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Then in the case of discrete measures \( \mu_j \), this implies the following decay theorem for exponential sums:

**Lemma 4.2** (Bourgain-Dyatlov). Fix \( \delta_0 > 0 \). Then there exist \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \varepsilon_2 > 0 \), \( \varepsilon_3 > 0 \) depending only on \( \delta_0 \) such that the following holds. Let \( C_0, N \geq 0 \) and \( \mathcal{Z}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Z}_k \) be finite sets such that \( \sharp \mathcal{Z}_j \leq C_0 N \). Suppose \( \zeta_j, j = 1, \ldots, k \), on the sets \( \mathcal{Z}_j \), satisfy for all \( j = 1, \ldots, k \) that

(a) the range

\[
\zeta_j(\mathcal{Z}_j) \subset [C_0^{-1}, C_0];
\]

(b) for all \( \sigma \in [|\eta|^{-1}, |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_3}] \)

\[
\sharp\{(b, c) \in \mathcal{Z}_j^2 : |\zeta_j(b) - \zeta_j(c)| \leq \sigma\} \leq C_0 N^2 \sigma^{\delta_0}.
\]

Then for some constant \( C_1 \) depending only on \( C_0 \) and \( \delta_0 \) we have for all \( \eta \in \mathbb{R} \), \( |\eta| > 1 \), that

\[
N^{-k} \sum_{b_1 \in \mathcal{Z}_1, \ldots, b_k \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \exp(2\pi i \eta \zeta_1(b_1) \ldots \zeta_k(b_k)) \leq C_1 |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_2}.
\]
However, in our case, due to the fluctuations arising from large deviations of the potential, the maps $ζ_j$ we obtain do not map the sets $Z_j$ into a fixed interval $[C_0^{-1}, C_0]$, but when we increase $|η|$, the $C_0$ will change and will actually blow-up polynomially in $|η|$. Since the constant $C_1$ in Lemma 4.2 depends on $C_0$, it could cause problems when we increase $|η|$. For this reason we will open up the argument of Bourgain and Dyatlov (Proposition 3.2 of [4]) to give a more precise dependence on the constant $C_1$ and $C_0$ and have the following quantitative version:

**Lemma 4.3.** Fix $ε_0 > 0$. Then there exist $k ∈ \mathbb{N}$, $ε_2 > 0$, $ε_3 > 0$ depending only on $ε_0$ such that the following holds. Let $R, N > 1$ and $Z_1, ..., Z_k$ be finite sets such that $\sharp Z_j ≤ RN$. Suppose $ζ_j$, $j = 1, ..., k$, on the sets $Z_j$ satisfy for all $j = 1, ..., k$ that

1. the range $ζ_j(Z_j) ⊂ [R^{-1}, R]$;
2. for all $σ ∈ [R^2|η|^{-1}, |η|^{-ε_3}]$
   \[ \sharp \{(b, c) ∈ Z_j^2 : |ζ_j(b) − ζ_j(c)| ≤ σ\} ≤ N^2σ^{ε_0}. \]

Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ depending only on $k$ such that we have for all $η ∈ \mathbb{R}$ with $|η|$ large enough, that

\[ \left| N^{-k} \sum_{b_1 ∈ Z_1, ..., b_k ∈ Z_k} \exp(2πiηζ_1(b_1) ... ζ_k(b_k)) \right| ≤ cR^k|η|^{-ε_2}. \]

**Proof.** We begin by altering assumption (2). We have that

\[ μ_j([x − σ, x + σ]) ≤ σ^{ε_0/2} \]

for $σ ∈ [R^2|η|^{-1}, |η|^{-ε_2}/2]$ by using (2). Define a measure $μ_j$ on $\mathbb{R}$ by

\[ μ_j(A) = N^{-1}\sharp \{b ∈ Z_j : ζ_j(b) ∈ A\}, \quad A ⊂ \mathbb{R}. \]

Then $μ_j(\mathbb{R}) ≤ R$ and by the assumptions (1) and (2) of the lemma we are about to prove, we have that the measure $μ_j$ is a Borel measure on $[R^{-1}, R]$ and that

\[ (μ_j × μ_j)(\{(x, y) ∈ \mathbb{R}^2 : |x − y| ≤ σ\}) ≤ σ^{ε_0} \]

for all $σ ∈ [R^2|η|^{-1}, |η|^{-ε_2}]$. Then to prove the claim, we just need to check that the Fourier transform of the multiplicative convolutions of $μ_j$ satisfies:

\[ |(μ_1 ⊗ ... ⊗ μ_k)^\sim(η)| ≤ 3^{k+1}\frac{1}{k!}R^kC^*|η|^{-ε_2}. \]

The rate of decay to be found will be given by

\[ ε_2 := \frac{1}{10}\min(ε_4, ε_3) \]

where $ε_3$ and $ε_4$ are given in Lemma 4.1.

Fix $ℓ ∈ \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^ℓ < R ≤ 2^{ℓ+1}$. Then $\text{supp } μ_j ∩ [R^{-1}, R]$ can be covered by intervals of the form $I^{[i]} := [2^{-i-1}, 2^i]$ for $i = −ℓ, ..., ℓ, ℓ + 1$. Let $μ_j^{[i]}$ be $μ_j$ restricted to $I^{[i]}$. Thus writing the re-scaling map

\[ S_i(x) = 2^{-i}x, \quad x ∈ \mathbb{R}, \]
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we have that the measure $\nu_j^{[i]} = S_i(\mu_j^{[i]})$ is supported on $[1/2, 1]$. Moreover, it satisfies
\[
(\nu_j^{[i]} \times \nu_j^{[i]})((x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x - y| \leq \sigma) \leq (\mu_j \times \mu_j)((x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x - y| \leq 2^i \sigma) \\
\leq (2^i \sigma)^{\varepsilon_0} \leq \sigma^{\varepsilon_0/2}
\]
where we consider $\varepsilon$ small with respect to $\varepsilon_0$. We know that the main assumption is satisfied for $\sigma \in [2^i |\eta|^{-1}, 2^i |\eta|^{\varepsilon_3}]$, so for the rescaled measure, we get the main assumption for the required range $\sigma \in [|\eta|^{-1}, |\eta|^{\varepsilon_3}]$ We will use that fact that
\[
(\nu_1^{[i_1]} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu_k^{[i_k]})\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \prod_{j=1}^{k} 2^{-j} \right) = (\mu_1^{[i_1]} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_k^{[i_k]})\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \right).
\]
Each $\mu_j$ is a sum of at most $2l + 2$ of the restricted measures $\mu_j^{[i]}$, so the Fourier transform $(\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_k)\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \right)$ decomposes into at most $(2l + 2)^k$ terms consisting of Fourier transforms $(\mu_1^{[i_1]} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_k^{[i_k]})\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \right)$ going through all the possible restrictions $\mu_j^{[i]}$. Hence if we can prove
\[
| (\nu_1^{[i_1]} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu_k^{[i_k]})\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \right) | \leq C^* |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_2}
\]
for some constant $C^* > 0$ only depending on $k$, the triangle inequality gives
\[
| (\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_k)\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \right) | \leq 2(2^l + 1)^k C^* |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_2} \lesssim R^k C^* |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_2}
\]

Thus let us assume from the start that $\mu_j$ is supported on $[1/2, 1]$. As in [4], let us first argue that it is enough to consider the case $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \cdots = \mu_k$. Given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k) \in [0, 1]^k$, write
\[
G(\lambda) := (\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_k)\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \right) = \mu^{\otimes \lambda}(\eta).
\]
and the linear combination
\[
\mu_\lambda = \lambda_1 \mu_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k \mu_k.
\]
Expanding $\mu^{\otimes \lambda}(\eta)$ using the definition of $\mu_\lambda$ as a weighted sum of $\mu_k$'s, we see that it contains at most $k^k$ terms involving multiplicative convolutions of $\mu_j$ with coefficients given by products of $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$. Then if we know the claim for $\mu_1 = \cdots = \mu_k$, then we can apply it to $\mu_\lambda$ and obtain
\[
\sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1]^k} |G(\lambda)| \leq |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_2}.
\]
From this we see that as the map $G$ is a polynomial of degree $k$, so there is a constant $C^* > 0$ depending on $k$
\[
\frac{1}{k!} |\partial_{\lambda_1} \cdots \partial_{\lambda_k} G(\lambda)|_{\lambda = 0} | \leq C^* |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_2}.
\]
However,
\[
|(\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_k)\hat{\otimes} \left( \eta \right) | = \frac{1}{k!} |\partial_{\lambda_1} \cdots \partial_{\lambda_k} G(\lambda)|_{\lambda = 0} |,
\]
so this gives the claim.

As for the case $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \cdots = \mu_k$, depending on the amount of mass $\mu_1$ has, we have two cases.

If $\mu_1(\mathbb{R}) \geq |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_3 N_0}$, choose an integer $N$ such that $N/2 \leq |\eta| \leq N$. The probability measure
\[
\mu_0 = \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_1(\mathbb{R})}
\]
on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies
\[
\sup_x \mu_0(B(x, \sigma)) < \sigma^{\epsilon_0/2}
\]
for all $\sigma \in [4R^2N^{-1}, N^{-\varepsilon_3}]$. Similarly we have by applying the above for $\sigma := 4R^2 \sigma$ (when $R > 1$), we obtain this for $\sigma \in [N^{-1}, 4R^2N^{-1}]$ by monotonicity of $\mu$, which holds for $|\eta|^{1-\varepsilon_3} \geq 16R^4$. Hence Lemma 4.1 proves the claim. Note that here the constant dependence does not change.

If $\mu_1(\mathbb{R}) \leq |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_3\epsilon_0/10}$, then one can use a trivial bound on exponential function in the integral convolution and triangle inequality to obtain the claim. The desired decay can be achieved by noting $k \geq 1$ in this final case. \[\square\]

### 4.2. Total non-linearity and non-concentration

In order to apply Lemma 4.3 in our setting, we will need to verify the non-concentration assumption for the maps $\zeta_j = \zeta_{j,A}$, which, recall are defined by
\[
\zeta_{j,A}(b) = e^{2\lambda_n f'_{a_{j-1}b}(x_{a_j})}
\]
for $b \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)$, $A = a_1 \ldots a_k \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}$ and $x_{a_j}$ is the center point of the interval $I_{a_j}$. Before we do this, we need to fix the parameters $R$ and the range of $\sigma$ we consider needed for Lemma 4.3:

**Remark 4.4.**

1. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ the number

\[
R = R(n, \varepsilon) := 16^2CC_{3 \lambda, \varepsilon,n}^3
\]

where $C > 0$ is the constant satisfying the Gibbs condition of $\mu$, recall (2.1) and recall $\lambda = \int \tau d\mu$ is the Lyapunov exponent of $\mu$. Then for the map
\[
\zeta_{j,A}(b) = e^{2\lambda_n f'_{a_{j-1}b}(x_{a_j})}
\]
we see that
\[
\zeta_{j,A}(b) \in [R^{-1}, R].
\]

Indeed, the chain rule gives
\[
\zeta_{j,A}(b) = e^{2\lambda_n f'_{a_{j-1}}(f_{b}x_{a_j})f'_{b}(x_{a_j})}
\]
so we can apply Lemma 2.2 and the fact that $f'_{a_{j-1}}$ and $f'_{b}$ must both be either positive or negative because they are defined by words of the same length.

2. Let $s_0 > 0$ be the unique solution to $P(-s_0\tau) = 0$ for the distortion function $\tau(x) = \log|T'(x)|$. Suppose $0 < \delta = \dim_H \mu < s_0 = \dim_H K$. Then choose $\Xi \in (0, 1)$ such that $\delta > s_0 - \delta_0(\Xi)$ and that $\delta_0(\Xi)/4 < \lambda/2$, the Lyapunov exponent of $\mu$ and $\delta_0(\Xi)$ is from Theorem 4.6. Such $\Xi$ exists as $0 < \delta = \dim_H \mu < s_0$ is close enough to $s_0$. Define
\[
\varepsilon_0 := \delta_1(\Xi)/4 > 0
\]
Then also $\varepsilon_0 < \lambda$ and now fixes our $\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)$, $\mathcal{R}_n^{k}(\varepsilon)$ and
\[
J_n(\varepsilon) = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R} : C_{-1}^{\varepsilon_n}e^{\varepsilon_0 n/2} \leq |\eta| \leq C_{\varepsilon_n}e^{\varepsilon_0 n}\}
\]
which all implicitly depend on $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. 
Proposition 4.5. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the following holds. Let $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ is from Lemma 4.3. Write $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)$ to be the set of “well-distributed blocked words” $A$ defined such that for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$, $\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)$ and $\sigma \in [R^2|\eta|^{-1}, |\eta|^{-c_3}]$, where we have that $|\{(b, c) \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |\zeta_j(A)(b) - \zeta_j(A)(c)| \leq \sigma\}| \leq |\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^2|\sigma^{c_0/2}$.

Then most blocks are well-distributed, so for some $\kappa > 0$, $e^{-\lambda(k+1)\delta_n} |\mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon) \setminus \mathcal{W}| \leq C_\varepsilon^{2\kappa_0}\sigma^{c_0/4}$.

Let $C^1(I)$ be the set of all complex valued $C^1$ functions $g$ on $I$ with the norm
\[ \|g\|_{C^1} := \|g\|_\infty + \|g'\|_\infty. \]

Given $\psi \in C^1(I)$, define the transfer operator $L_\psi$ on the Banach space $C^1(I)$ by
\[ L_\psi g(x) := \sum_{y : T(y) = x} e^{\psi(y)} g(y) \]

If $s \in \mathbb{C}$, then in the case of the potential $\psi = -s\tau$ for the distortion function $\tau = \log |T'|$, the following was proved by Naud in [31, Theorem 2.3]:

Theorem 4.6 (C1-contraction of transfer operators). Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the following holds. Let $\Xi > 0$. Then there exists $C_\Xi > 0$, $\delta_0(\Xi) > 0$, $\delta_1(\Xi) > 0$, $t_0(\Xi) > 0$ such that for all $\Re s \in (s_0 - \delta(\Xi), s_0]$ and $|\Im s| \geq t_0(\Xi)$ we have for all $f \in C^1(I)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ that
\[ \|L_{s\tau}^m f\|_{C^1} \leq C_\Xi |\Im s|^{1 + \Xi} e^{-\delta_1(\Xi)m} \|f\|_{C^1}, \]

where $s_0 > 0$ is the unique real number satisfying $P(-s_0\tau) = 0$ and $P$ is the topological pressure on $K$.

Remark 4.7. We remark that [31, Theorem 2.3] is given under the assumption of Non-Local Integrability (NLI) of the distortion function $\tau = \log |T'|$, that is, there exists $a \in A$, $v, w \in A^\infty$ with $T(I_{v_1}) \cap T(I_{w_1}) \supset I_a$ and $x_0, y_0 \in K \cap I_a$ such that
\[ \frac{\partial \varphi_{v,w}}{\partial x}(x_0, y_0) \neq 0, \]

where $\varphi_{v,w}(x,y)$ is the temporal distance function associated to $\tau$ (see Dolgopyat [9] and Naud [31]). Temporal distance function is defined for $x, y \in I_a$ for $w, v \in A^\infty$, $a \in A$ with $T(I_{w_1}) \supset I_a, T(I_{v_1}) \supset I_a$ as
\[ \varphi_{w,v}(x,y) := \Delta_w(x,y) - \Delta_v(x,y), \]

where
\[ \Delta_w(x,y) := \sum_{n=1}^\infty \tau(f_{w|n}(x)) - \tau(f_{w|n}(y)). \]

On the other hand, total non-linearity, that is the fact that it is not possible to write $\tau = \psi_0 + g + g \circ T$ for some $g \in C^1(I)$ and $\psi_0 : I \to \mathbb{R}$ constant on each $I_a$, $a \in A$, implies that there exists $c > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$ there exists $a, b \in A^n$ such that
\[ c^{-1} \leq \left| \frac{d}{dx}(S_n\tau(f_a(x)) - S_n\tau(f_b(x))) \right| \leq c. \] (4.3)

This follows from Anosov alternative [9] and in this symbolic form, see Avila, Gouëzel, Yoccoz [1, Proposition 7.5] for a proof. The condition (4.3) is an asymptotic aperiodicity condition, which is implied by NLI, see Proposition [31, Proposition 5.5], but it also implies NLI. Indeed,
if NLI does not hold, then the temporal distance function is identically vanishing, that is, \( \varphi_{w,v}(x,y) \equiv 0 \) for all \( w,v \in \mathcal{A}^\infty \), \( x,y \in I \), since \( T \) and \( \tau \) are real analytic. This is the definition of non-local integrability by Dolgopyat [9] in a symbolic setting as pointed out by Naud [31, Definition 2.1]. However, this means that (4.3) cannot hold: for example using the argument of the proof of [31, Proposition 5.5], we see that the vanishing temporal distance function implies that the central expression in (4.3) is bounded by

\[ D > D' \]

function implies that the central expression in (4.3) is bounded by \( \frac{D}{\gamma^2} \), where \( \gamma > 1 \) and \( D > 0 \) are the constants from the expansion assumption (1) of \( T \) and \( \|\tau'\|_\infty \leq B < \infty \) by the bounded distortions assumption of \( T' \) and \( B \).

We will now give a simple but essential non-concentration estimate for distortions as a consequence of Theorem 4.6 in the following non-concentration estimate for distortions.

**Lemma 4.8** (Non-concentration). Let \( s_0 > 0 \) be the unique solution to \( P(-s_0 \tau) = 0 \) for the distortion function \( \tau(x) = \log |T'(x)| \). Suppose \( 0 < \delta = \dim_H \mu < s_0 \). Then there exists \( c_0 > 0 \) and \( \kappa_0 > 0 \) such that for all \( \varepsilon > 0 \), \( n \in \mathbb{N}, \eta \in J_n(\varepsilon), \sigma \in [R^2|\eta|^{-1},|\eta|^{-\varepsilon}], \in I \) we have

\[ \#\{ (a, b, c) \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^3 : |e^{2\lambda n} f_{ab}(x) - e^{2\lambda n} f_{ac}(x)| \leq \sigma \} \lesssim C^{\kappa_0}_{\varepsilon,n} \sigma^{\kappa_0} \#\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^3, \]

where \( R \) and \( \varepsilon_0 \) are the parameters fixed in Remark 4.4 and \( \varepsilon_3 > 0 \) is from Lemma 4.3.

**Proof.** Choose \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( e^{-\varepsilon_0(m-1)} \leq \sigma \leq e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} \). We will first prove that for all \( y \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( y \pm e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} \in [R^{-1}, R], e \in \mathcal{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon) \) and \( x \in I \) we have

\[ \#\{ d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) : e^{2\lambda n} f_{ed}(x) \in B(y, e^{-\varepsilon_0 m}) \} \lesssim C^{\kappa_0}_{\varepsilon,m} e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} \#\mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon), \tag{4.4} \]

where

\[ \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) := \left\{ d \in \mathcal{A}^m : I_d \subset A_m(2\varepsilon) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon) := \left\{ e \in \mathcal{A}^{2n-m} : I_e \subset A_{2n-m}(2\varepsilon) \right\}. \]

Then up to \( C_{2\varepsilon,n} \) multiplicative error \( \#\mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) \sim \#\mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) \) and \( \#\mathcal{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon) \sim \#\mathcal{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon) \) by Lemma 2.2 for the properties of regular words. Indeed, Lemma 4.8 follows now from (4.4) by first setting \( P \) to be the set of pairs \( (e, y) \) such that \( y \pm e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} \in [R^{-1}, R] \) and \( e \in \mathcal{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon) \), and bounding

\[ \#\{ (a, b, c) \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^3 : |e^{2\lambda n} f_{ab}(x) - e^{2\lambda n} f_{ac}(x)| \leq \sigma \}
\leq \#\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) \sup_{c \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)} \#\{ (a, b) \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |e^{2\lambda n} f_{ab}(x) - e^{2\lambda n} f_{ac}(x)| \leq \sigma \}
\leq \#\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) \#\mathcal{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon) \sup_{(e,y) \in P} \#\{ d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) : e^{2\lambda n} f_{ed}(x) \in B(y, \sigma) \} \]

since every \( ab \), for \( a, b \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) \) splits into a word \( ab = ed \) with \( e := ab|_{2n-m} \in \mathcal{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon) \) and \( d := \sigma^{2n-m}(ab) \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) \) using the quasi-Bernoulli property of the Gibbs measure \( \mu \): since \( ab = ed \), we have

\[ \mu(I_e) \mu(I_d) \lesssim \mu(I_{ab}) \lesssim \mu(I_e) \mu(I_d) \]

and that the lengths

\[ |I_e||I_d| \lesssim |I_{ab}| \lesssim |I_e||I_d|. \]

Then fix \( (e, y) \in P \). Since \( B(y, \sigma) \subset B(y, e^{-\varepsilon_0 m}) \) we have by (4.4) that

\[ \#\{ d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) : e^{2\lambda n} f_{ed}(x) \in B(y, \sigma) \} \lesssim C^{\kappa_0}_{\varepsilon,m} e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} \#\mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) \]
Note that $e^{-c_0m} = e^{-c_0^2/\varepsilon_0} \lesssim \sigma^{c_0/\varepsilon_0}$ so the claim follows by the cardinality bounds of $\tilde{R}_{2n-m}(\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)$ by setting in the statement of the lemma the exponent $c_0 > 0$ as $c_0/\varepsilon_0$.

Let us now verify the non-concentration estimate (4.4) we need.

**Step 1.** Write $r := e^{-\varepsilon_0m}$. Since $y - r \geq R^{-1} > 0$, we know that $e^{2\lambda n} \ell(x) \in B(y, r)$ if and only if
\[- \log |\ell(x)| \in J := [2\lambda n - \log(y + r), 2\lambda n - \log(y - r)].\]
Note that the interval $J$ has length $|J| = \log \frac{y + r}{y - r}$. By the mean value theorem, we have
\[2R^{-1}r \leq \frac{2r}{y + r} \leq |J| \leq \frac{2r}{y - r} \leq 2Rr. \tag{4.5}\]

Hence
\[^{\sharp}\{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon) : e^{2\lambda n} \ell(x) \in B(y, e^{-\varepsilon_0n})\} = ^{\sharp}\{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon) : -\log |\ell(x)| \in J\}\]

**Step 2.** Now let us approximate the indicator of $\chi_J$ by a mollifier with some good Fourier analytic properties. Translating and re-scaling the Gaussian function $x \mapsto e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$, we may construct $h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ in $C^4(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying
\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \quad & \chi_J \lesssim h \\
(2) \quad & \|h\|_1 \lesssim |J| \\
(3) \quad & \|h''''\|_{L^1} \lesssim \frac{1}{|J^r|}.
\end{align*}
\]

Since $\chi_J \leq h$, we have
\[^{\sharp}\{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon) : -\log |\ell(x)| \in J\} \leq \sum_{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)} h(-\log |\ell(x)|)^{1/2}\]

We use Cauchy-Schwartz here, that is
\[
\left( \sum_{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)} h(-\log |\ell(x)|)^{1/2} \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |\ell(x)|^\delta h(-\log |\ell(x)|) \right) \left( \sum_{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)} \frac{1}{|\ell(x)|^\delta} \right)\]

**Step 3.** Taking the inverse Fourier transform of $\hat{h}$ gives us for all $x \in I$, $d \in A^m$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ that
\[h(-\log |\ell(x)|) = \int e^{-2\pi i \xi \log |\ell(x)|} \hat{h}(\xi) \, d\xi\]

Therefore
\[
\sum_{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |\ell(x)|^\delta h(-\log |\ell(x)|) = \sum_{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |\ell(x)|^\delta \int \hat{h}(\xi) e^{-2\pi i \xi \log |\ell(x)|} \, d\xi
\]
\[
= \int \hat{h}(\xi) \sum_{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |\ell(x)|^\delta e^{-2\pi i \xi \log |\ell(x)|} \, d\xi\]

Split the integration now over $|\xi| > t_0/2\pi$ and $|\xi| \leq t_0/2\pi$. 
Step 4. If $|\xi| > t_0/2\pi$, we will estimate as follows. Inside the integral, use the estimate
\[
\sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\epsilon)} |f'_d(x)|^\delta h(-\log |f'_d(x)|) \leq \sum_{d \in \mathcal{A}_m} |f'_d(x)|^\delta h(-\log |f'_d(x)|)
\]
We can iterate the definition of the complex transfer operator applied for $g \in C^1(I)$ defined by
\[
g_\epsilon(z) := |f'_\epsilon(z)|^s, \quad z \in I
\]
to obtain with $s = \delta - 2\pi \xi i$ that
\[
\mathcal{L}_{-s} g_\epsilon(x) = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{A}_m} g_\epsilon(f_d(x))e^{s \log |f'_d(x)|} = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{A}_m} |f'_d(x)|^\delta e^{-2\pi \xi \log |f'_d(x)|}
\]
whenever $x \in I$ since $|f'_\epsilon(z)|^s = |f'_\epsilon(z)|^\delta e^{-2\pi \xi \log |f'_\epsilon(z)|}$ and using the chain rule. Here we will employ the $C^1$ contraction, Theorem 4.6 with first a fixed $\Xi \in (0,1)$ to obtain
\[
\Re s = \delta \in (s_0 - \delta_0(\Xi), s_0]
\]
as long as $\delta = \dim \mu_s \geq s_0 - \delta_0(\Xi)$ and
\[
|\Im s| = 2\pi |\xi| \geq t_0(\Xi)
\]
by the choice of $\xi$. Thus we have for some $\delta_1(\Xi) > 0$ that
\[
\int_{|\xi| > t_0/2\pi} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \sum_{d \in \mathcal{A}_m} |f'_d(x)|^\delta e^{-2\pi \xi \log |f'_d(x)|} d\xi \leq \int_{|\xi| > t_0/2\pi} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \cdot \|\mathcal{L}_{-s} g_\epsilon\|_{C^1} d\xi
\]
\[
\leq \int_{|\xi| > t_0/2\pi} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \cdot C_{\Xi} |\Im s|^{1+\Xi} e^{-\delta_1(\Xi) n} \|g_\epsilon\|_{C^1} d\xi
\]
\[
\lesssim_{\Xi} C_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda \delta (2n-m)} e^{-\delta_1(\Xi) n} \int_{|\xi| > t_0/2\pi} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \cdot |\xi|^{2+\Xi} d\xi
\]
where $\chi_I$ is the constant function on $I$. Here we used the bounded distortion for $T$ to bound the $C^1$ norm of $g_\epsilon$. First of all, we have
\[
|g_\epsilon(z)| = |f_\epsilon(z)|^\delta \leq C_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda \delta (2n-m)} \quad \text{and} \quad |g_\epsilon(z)| \lesssim |\xi| |f_\epsilon(z)|^\delta \leq C_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda \delta (2n-m)} |\xi|
\]
so
\[
\|g_\epsilon\|_{C^1} \lesssim C_{\epsilon,n} e^{-\lambda \delta (2n-m)} |\xi|.
\]
Indeed, after fixing a branch of the logarithm, using bounded distortion $|f''_\epsilon(z)| \leq C |f'_\epsilon(z)|$, and $|s| \lesssim |\xi|$, we obtain that
\[
|g_\epsilon(z)| = \frac{|s|}{|f'_\epsilon(z)|} \exp(s \log |f'_\epsilon(z)|) |f''_\epsilon(z)| = \frac{|s| |f''_\epsilon(z)|}{|f'_\epsilon(z)|} |g_\epsilon(z)| \lesssim |\xi| |g_\epsilon(z)|.
\]
Since $h \in C^4(\mathbb{R})$ and has compact support, we have for the Fourier transform $\hat{\mu}$ that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ the following estimate holds:
\[
|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \frac{1}{1 + |\xi|^2} (\|h\|_{L^1} + \|h'''\|_{L^1}).
\]
Then in particular
\[ \int_{|\xi| > t_0/2\pi} |\hat{h}(\xi)| \cdot |\xi|^{2+\Xi} \, d\xi \leq \int \frac{\xi^{2+\Xi}}{1+|\xi|^4} (\|h\|_{L^1} + \|h''\|_{L^1}) \, d\xi = C(\|h\|_{L^1} + \|h''\|_{L^1}). \]

**Step 5.** We are left with the case $|\xi| \leq t_0/2\pi$, that is, an estimation for
\[ \int_{|\xi| \leq t_0/2\pi} |\hat{h}(\xi)| \cdot \sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |f'_{ed}(x)|^\delta e^{-2\pi i \xi \log |f'_{ed}(x)|} \, d\xi \]
Let us bound
\[ \sup_{|\xi| \leq t_0/2\pi} \hat{h}(\xi) \cdot \sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |f'_{ed}(x)|^\delta e^{-2\pi i \xi \log |f'_{ed}(x)|} \leq \sup_{|\xi| \leq t_0/2\pi} \hat{h}(\xi) \cdot \sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |f'_{ed}(x)|^\delta \]
\[ \leq C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m} e^{-\lambda \delta(2n-m)} |J| \]
since $|\hat{h}(\xi)| \leq \|h\|_{L^1} \leq 3|J|$ and by the chain rule
\[ \sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |f'_{ed}(x)|^\delta = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |f'_{d}(x)|^\delta |f_{d}(x)|^\delta \]
\[ \lesssim C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m} e^{-\lambda \delta(2n-m)} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)} |f_{d}(x)|^\delta \]
\[ \lesssim C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m} e^{-\lambda \delta(2n-m)}. \]

by the properties of $\mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)$.

**Step 6.** Combining Step 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 gives us
\[ \sharp \{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) : e^{2\lambda n} f'_{ed}(x) \in B(y, e^{-\varepsilon_0 m}) \}^2 \]
\[ \lesssim \varepsilon C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m} e^{-\lambda \delta(2n-m)} E_{\varepsilon}(x) \lesssim \lambda \delta(2n-m) (\|h\|_{L^1} + \|h''\|_{L^1}) + |J|, \]
where
\[ E_{\varepsilon}(x) := \sum_{d \in \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)} \frac{1}{|f'_{ed}(x)|^\delta}. \]

Finally, let us now analyse all the quantities we have. Lemma 2.2 gives that
\[ E_{\varepsilon}(x) \lesssim C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m} e^{2\lambda n} \# \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon) \]
so for some $\kappa > 0$
\[ C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m} e^{-\lambda \delta(2n-m)} E_{\varepsilon}(x) \lesssim C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m} \# \mathcal{R}_m(\varepsilon)^2 \]
Moreover, recall that (4.5) gives
\[ |J| \leq 2Rr \]
and
\[ \frac{1}{|J|^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} R^2 r^{-2} \]
and when inputting $r = e^{-\varepsilon_0 m}$ and $R = 16^2 C_{\varepsilon, 2n-m}^{\lambda \delta}$ we obtain
\[ |J| \lesssim C_{\varepsilon, m}^{\lambda \delta} e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} \]
and
\[ \frac{1}{|J|^3} \lesssim C_{\varepsilon, m}^{9 \lambda} e^{3\varepsilon_0 m} \]
Then by the choice of \( h \), we have
\[
\|h\|_{L^1} + \|h''\|_{L^1} \leq |J| + \frac{1}{|J|^2} \lesssim C_{\varepsilon,m}^A e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} + C_{\varepsilon,m}^A e^{3\varepsilon_0 m}.
\]
Thus we obtain
\[
\#\{d \in \tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon) : e^{2\lambda n} f_{ed}(x) \in B(y, e^{-\varepsilon_0 m})\}^2 \\
\lesssim C_{\varepsilon,n}^k \#\tilde{R}_m(\varepsilon)^2 [e^{-\delta_1(\Xi)m}(C_{\varepsilon,m}^A e^{-\varepsilon_0 m} + C_{\varepsilon,m}^A e^{3\varepsilon_0 m}) + C_{\varepsilon,m}^A e^{-\varepsilon_0 m}]
\]
Here we see that the possible obstacle to the decay would come from the term
\[
e^{-\delta_1(\Xi)m} e^{3\varepsilon_0 m} = \epsilon^{-(\delta_1(\Xi) - 3\varepsilon_0)m}.
\]
But since we defined \( \varepsilon_0 = \delta_1(\Xi)/4 \), we obtain \( \varepsilon_0 := \delta_1(\Xi) - 3\varepsilon_0 > 0 \). This completes the proof of the estimate (4.4) and thus the whole lemma. \( \square \)

Now we can prove Proposition 4.5.

**Proof of Proposition 4.5.** Recall that
\[
J_n(\varepsilon) = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R} : C_{\varepsilon,n}^{-1} e^{\varepsilon_0 n/2} \leq |\eta| \leq C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{\varepsilon_0 n}\}
\]
Fixing \( \eta \in J_n(\varepsilon) \) and \( \sigma \in [R^2|\eta|^{-1}, |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_0}] \), there is a unique \( l \) such that \( 2^{-l-1} \leq \sigma \leq 2^{-l} \).
Define \( R_l^* \) to be the set of \( n \)-regular pairs \( (a, d) \in R_n(\varepsilon)^2 \) such that
\[
e^{-2\lambda n} \{(b, c) \in R_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |f_{ab}'(x_d) - f_{ac}'(x_d)| \leq e^{-2\lambda n 2^{-l}}\} \leq 2^{-(l+1)c_0/2}.
\]
In this setting, if we have a block \( A \) such that \( (a_{j-1}, a_j) \in R_l^* \) for every \( j = 1, ..., k \) and every \( l \), then by definition of \( R_l^* \) and by definition of \( \zeta_{j,a}(b) \) we have that
\[
e^{-2\lambda n} \{(b, c) \in R_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |\zeta_{j,a}(b) - \zeta_{j,a}(c)| \leq \sigma\} \\
\leq e^{-2\lambda n} \{(b, c) \in R_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |f_{a_{j-1}b}'(a_j) - f_{a_{j-1}c}'(a_j)| \leq e^{-2\lambda n 2^{-l}}\} \\
\leq 2^{-(l+1)c_0/2} \\
\leq \sigma^{c_0/2}.
\]
This therefore tells us that
\[
\bigcap_j \bigcap_l \{A : (a_{j-1}, a_j) \in R_l^*\} \subset \mathcal{W}.
\]
From this containment, we can say that a \( k + 1 \) block \( A \) is not in \( \mathcal{W} \) if there exists at least one position \( j \) in the block and a scale \( l \) such that the pair \( (a_{j-1}, a_j) \notin R_l^* \). So to prove the lemma, it is enough to show that
\[
e^{-2\lambda n} |\{R_n(\varepsilon)^2 \setminus R_l^*\}| \lesssim C_{\varepsilon,n}^{\kappa_0} \sigma^{c_0/2}.
\]
We achieve this bound by considering the counting measure \( \# \) on pairs in \( R_n(\varepsilon)^2 \) and use Chebychev’s inequality to get an upper bound on \( |R_n(\varepsilon)^2 \setminus R_l^*| \). We apply Chebychev’s inequality to the counting function defined by
\[
f(a, d) = \#R_n(\varepsilon)^2 \{(b, c) \in R_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |f_{ab}'(x_d) - f_{ac}'(x_d)| \leq e^{-2\lambda n 2^{-l}}\}.
\]
which gives us that
\[ |\{R_n(\varepsilon)^2 \setminus R_n^1\}| = \mathbb{E}\{(a, d) \in R_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |f(a, d)| \geq 2^{-(l+1)c_0/2} \} \leq 2^{(l+1)c_0/2} \sum_{(a, d) \in R_n(\varepsilon)^2} |f(a, d)| \]
\[ = e^{-2\lambda n} 2^{(l+1)c_0/2} \#\{(a, b, c, d) \in R_n : \|f_n'(x_d) - f_n'(a_n(x_d))\| \leq e^{2\lambda n} 2^{-l} \} \]

Then by Lemma 4.8 with \( \sigma = 2^{-l} \), we have
\[ e^{-2\lambda n} 2^{(l+1)c_0/2} \#\{(a, b, c, d) \in R_n^1(\varepsilon) : \|f_n'(x_d) - f_n'(a_n(x_d))\| \leq e^{2\lambda n} 2^{-l} \} \leq C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2} \]
which gives the claim since \( e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2} \leq \sigma^{c_0/2} \).

\[ \square \]

5. Completion of the proof

We begin the proof by fixing first \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough that \( C_{\varepsilon,n} = e^{\kappa \varepsilon} \) have the exponent \( \kappa \varepsilon \) small enough in terms of \( \lambda, s, \varepsilon_0 \) and \( c_0 \). To be able to apply relevant large deviation results, we need to make sure that the values of \( n \) that we consider are sufficiently large. We begin by choosing \( n_0(\varepsilon) \)

1. If \( n_1 \) is the generation that arises from the main large deviation theorem, then we require
   \[ n_0(\varepsilon) \varepsilon_0 > n_1 \]
to ensure we have valid regularity at each scale that we need.

2. If \( \gamma \) is the rate of expansion of \( (T^n)^l \) with respect to \( n \), and \( C \) is the Gibbs constant for \( \mu \), we require
   \[ \frac{\log 4}{\varepsilon_0 n_0} < \varepsilon_2, \quad \frac{\log 4 C^2}{\log(\gamma^{2\varepsilon_0 n_0})} < \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{e^{-\delta_0 n_0}}{1-e^{-\delta}} < e^{-\delta_0 n_0/2} \]
to ensure that we get decay on multiregular blocks of words.

Let \( s = \dim \mu \) and \( \lambda \) the Lyapunov exponent of \( \mu \). Let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \varepsilon_2 > 0 \) from Lemma 4.2.

Fix a frequency \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( |\xi| \) is large enough. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) be the number such that
\[ |\xi| \sim_k e^{(2k+1)n_\lambda} e^{2\varepsilon_0 n}. \]
Recall that
\[ |R_n(\varepsilon)| \lesssim C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{-\lambda n} \]
and if \( a \in R_n(\varepsilon) \), we have
\[ w(a) \leq C_{\varepsilon,n}^{3\lambda} e^{-\lambda n} \]
for all \( x \in I \).

We begin by recalling the estimate from Proposition 3.1. Recall that there we have
\[ J_n(\varepsilon) = \{ \eta \in \mathbb{R} : C_{\varepsilon,n}^{-1} e^{2\varepsilon_0 n/2} \leq |\eta| \leq C_{\varepsilon,n} e^{2\varepsilon_0 n} \} \]
and we have the following estimate in terms of exponential sums and error terms:
\[ |\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 \lesssim_k e^{-\lambda(2k+1)\delta n} \sum_{A \in R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sum_{\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)} |e^{2\pi i \eta \xi A(b_1) \ldots b_k} \sum_{B \in R_n^k(\varepsilon)} e^{2\pi i \eta \xi A(b_1) \ldots b_k} | + e^{2k C_{\varepsilon,n}^{k+1} e^{-\lambda n} e^{2\varepsilon_0 n} + \mu([0, 1] \setminus R_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon))^2} + e^{-\varepsilon_2 n} + \mu(I \setminus R_n(\varepsilon)) + C_{\varepsilon,n}^{2\lambda} e^{-\delta_0 n/2}, \]
where if blocks $A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon), B \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k}(\varepsilon), j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $b \in \mathcal{R}_n$, we defined

$$\zeta_j,\lambda (b) = e^{2\lambda n} j_{A_{j-1}b}(x_{a_j}).$$

Now, recall that in Proposition 4.5, we defined the well-distributed blocks of words $A \in \mathcal{W}$ as follows: for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$, $\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)$ and $\sigma \in [R^2|\eta|^{-1}, |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_3}]$, where we have that

$$|\{(b, c) \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |\zeta_j,\lambda (b) - \zeta_j,\lambda (c)| \leq \sigma\}| \leq \#\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^2\sigma^{c_0/2}.$$ 

Proposition 4.5 said most blocks are well-distributed: there exists $\kappa_0 > 0$, 

$$e^{-\lambda(k+1)\delta n} \left| \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon) \setminus \mathcal{W} \right| \leq C_{c_0,\delta}^{2\kappa_0} \sigma^{c_0/4}.$$ 

For the exponential sum term

$$e^{-\lambda(2k+1)\delta n} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sup_{\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)} \left| \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} e^{2\pi i \eta \zeta_1,\lambda (b_1) \cdots \zeta_k,\lambda (b_k)} \right|$$

in the estimate for $|\hat{\mu}(\xi)|$ we begin by removing not well-distributed blocks, which gives

$$e^{-(2k+1)\lambda n} \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sup_{\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)} \left| \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} e^{2\pi i \eta \zeta_1,\lambda (b_1) \cdots \zeta_k,\lambda (b_k)} \right|$$

$$\leq e^{-(2k+1)\lambda n} \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} \sup_{\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} 1$$

$$\leq e^{-(2k+1)\lambda n} \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon)} C_k \mathcal{C}_0 \varepsilon^{c_0/4}$$

$$\lesssim e^{-(2k+1)\lambda n} C_k \mathcal{C}_0 \varepsilon^{c_0/4}$$

and

$$|\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 \lesssim e^{-k\lambda n} \max_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{W}, \eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)} \left| \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} e^{2\pi i \eta \zeta_1,\lambda (b_1) \cdots \zeta_k,\lambda (b_k)} \right|$$

$$+ C_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{\kappa_0} \sigma^{c_0/4} + e^{2k\mathcal{C}_0/\varepsilon n} e^{-\lambda n} \varepsilon^{c_0} + \mu([0, 1] \setminus \mathcal{R}_n^{k+1}(\varepsilon))^2$$

$$+ e^{\varepsilon_2 n} + \mu(I \setminus J_n(\varepsilon)) + C_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{\kappa_0} e^{-\delta n/2}.$$ 

Recall Remark 4.4, where we defined $R := 16^2 \mathcal{C}_0^{3\lambda}$. Thus $\zeta_j,\lambda (b) \in [R^{-1}, R]$. Moreover, if we fix $\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)$, $A \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\sigma \in [R^2|\eta|^{-1}, |\eta|^{-\varepsilon_3}]$, we have by the definition of $\mathcal{W}$ that

$$\#\{(b, c) \in \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^2 : |\zeta_j,\lambda (b) - \zeta_j,\lambda (c)| \leq \sigma\} \leq \#\mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon)^2\sigma^{c_0/2}.$$ 

Thus we may apply Lemma 4.3 to the maps $\zeta_j,\lambda : \mathcal{R}_n(\varepsilon) \to [R^{-1}, R]$ with $N = e^{\lambda n}$. It implies that for all $A \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)$ that

$$e^{-k\lambda n} \left| \sum_{B \in \mathcal{R}_n^{k}(\varepsilon)} e^{2\pi i \eta \zeta_1,\lambda (b_1) \cdots \zeta_k,\lambda (b_k)} \right| \lesssim R_k \left| \eta \right|^{-\varepsilon_2} \lesssim C_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{3k\lambda + 1} e^{-\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_2 n/2}$$

since $|\eta| \geq C_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{-1} e^{-\varepsilon_0 n/2}$ by the definition of $J_n(\varepsilon)$ as $\eta \in J_n(\varepsilon)$. By making sure that $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen small enough and as $\varepsilon_0 < \lambda$, recall Remark 4.4 for the choice of $\varepsilon_0$ using the spectral gap of the transfer operator, which is independent of $\xi$, we have proved

$$|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| = O(|\xi|^\alpha).$$
as $|\xi| \to \infty$ for some $\alpha > 0$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.
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