

DENSITY OF NON-ZERO EXPONENT OF CONTRACTION FOR PINCHING COCYCLES ON $\text{Hom}(S^1)$

CATALINA FREIJO AND KARINA MARIN

ABSTRACT. We consider pinching cocycles taking values in the space of homeomorphisms of the circle over an hyperbolic base. In this set, we prove that the cocycles having non-zero exponent of contraction are dense. This work generalizes the result of Bonatti, Gómez-Mont, Viana about linear cocycles using the Invariance Principle of Malicet.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article we generalize some common notions introduced for linear cocycle and differentiable cocycles, to the non-linear non-differentiable case.

A cocycle over a transformation $f: X \rightarrow X$ is a map $F: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, where \mathcal{E} is a fiber bundle which fibers X are topological spaces, such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F: & \mathcal{E} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{E} \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ f: & X & \rightarrow & X \end{array}$$

commutes and the action on the fibers $F_x: \mathcal{E}_x \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{f(x)}$ is an homeomorphism. In this case its orbit takes the form

$$F_x^n = F_{f^{n-1}(x)} \circ \dots \circ F_x.$$

The theory of cocycles is developed with the purpose of understanding the dynamics for a differentiable f jointly with its differential map taking values on the tangent bundle. Thus, it gets generalized by considering the trivial bundle $X \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and constructing the cocycle with F_x being a linear map acting on \mathbb{R}^d . In this case, we can analyze the exponential growing rate of the orbits of the dynamics over the fibers, which is called Lyapunov exponents

$$\lim \frac{1}{n} \log \|F_x^n v\|, \quad v \in \mathcal{E}_x.$$

Since the space $X \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is non-compact, it is not possible to guarantee the existence of F -invariant measures, therefore it is common to study the projectivization of the cocycle taking values in $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. The action on the fibers for the projective cocycle are always differentiable, which makes possible to apply in this setting the wide bibliography on differentiable cocycles. Our interest in this work is to develop a generalized theory for cocycles which fibers take values in the space $\text{Hom}(S^1)$.

For the differential cocycles, the theory that was developed by Pesin [7] provide us of a big amount of structure over the dynamics of non-vanishing Lyapunov exponents, therefore we are interested in knowing whether this behavior is common in different settings. In the case of random product of matrices, Furstenberg [3]

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37H15 ; Secondary: 37D30, 37D25 .

states that in fact positivity of Lyapunov exponents is dense, and this behavior also maintained in other contexts as for linear cocycles [10].

In this kind of result the idea is to study whether the zero Lyapunov exponents can be perturbed to create non-zero Lyapunov exponents. The principal tool that is used for understanding the structure of zero Lyapunov exponents is the Invariance Principle, originally proved by Ledrappier in [5] for the case of linear cocycles, and adapted to the non-linear context by Avila and Viana in [1], or Malicet [6], between others. This result states that if the Lyapunov exponents vanish, then the fibers carries some structure that remains invariant by a family of homeomorphisms acting between the fibers. The center question is whether this structure can be perturbed.

In our work we generalize the results in [6] for the case of random dynamical system to a more general setting.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND STATEMENTS

Let $Q = (q_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq d}$ be a matrix with $q_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$. The sub-shift of finite type $\hat{\Omega}$ associated to the matrix Q is the subset of the bi-infinite sequences $\{1, \dots, d\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying

$$\hat{\Omega} = \{(\hat{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} : q_{\hat{x}_n \hat{x}_{n+1}} = 1 \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We require that each row and column of Q contains at least one non-zero entry.

Let $\hat{\sigma}: \hat{\Omega} \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}$ be the left-shift map defined by $\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} = (\hat{x}_{n+1})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\hat{\mu}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant probability measure. The map $\hat{\sigma}$ is a hyperbolic homeomorphism such that for every $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$ the local stable and unstable sets are given by

$$\begin{aligned} W_{loc}^s(\hat{x}) &= \{(\hat{y}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \hat{\Omega} : \hat{y}_n = \hat{x}_n \text{ with } n \geq 0\}, \\ W_{loc}^u(\hat{x}) &= \{(\hat{y}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \hat{\Omega} : \hat{y}_n = \hat{x}_n \text{ with } n \leq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We endow $\hat{\Omega}$ with the metric $d_\rho(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \rho^{-N_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}}$ for $\rho > 1$, where $N_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}} = \max\{N \geq 0; x_n = y_n \text{ for every } |n| < N\}$. Since the topologies given by the different constants ρ are equivalent, from now on we consider ρ fixed.

Definition 2.1. *A $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant probability measure has local product structure if there exists a continuous function $\psi: \hat{\Omega} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, if π^+ and π^- are the projection to the positive and negative coordinates respectively, then*

$$\hat{\mu}|_{[0;i]} = \psi \cdot (\mu^s|_{\pi^+([0;i])} \times \mu^u|_{\pi^-([0;i])}),$$

where $\mu^s = \pi_*^+ \hat{\mu}$ and $\mu^u = \pi_*^- \hat{\mu}$.

Given a map $\hat{f}: S^1 \rightarrow S^1$, we say that \hat{f} is β -Hölder if the following supreme is finite

$$H_\beta(\hat{f}) = \sup \left\{ \frac{d(\hat{f}(\hat{p}), \hat{f}(\hat{q}))}{d(\hat{p}, \hat{q})^\beta} : \hat{p}, \hat{q} \in S^1 \text{ and } \hat{p} \neq \hat{q} \right\},$$

where d is the usual distance in S^1 .

For simplifying the notation for the rest of the paper we are going to restrict to the case of Lipschitz maps, that is $\beta = 1$, even though the results are still valid for every value of $\beta > 0$.

Let $\text{Hom}(S^1)$ be the set of homeomorphisms from S^1 to itself. Denote $\text{Lip}(S^1)$ the set formed by $\hat{f} \in \text{Hom}(S^1)$ such that \hat{f} and \hat{f}^{-1} are Lipschitz. We define the

d_0 distance by

$$d_0(\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2) = \sup_{\hat{p} \in S^1} d(\hat{f}_1(\hat{p}), \hat{f}_2(\hat{p})) + |H_1(\hat{f}_1) - H_1(\hat{f}_2)|,$$

and with this we endow $\text{Lip}(S^1)$ with the distance d_1 defined as

$$d_1(\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2) = \max\{d_0(\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2), d_0(\hat{f}_1^{-1}, \hat{f}_2^{-1})\}$$

for $\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2 \in \text{Lip}(S^1)$.

We define the set $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(\hat{\Omega}, \text{Lip}(S^1))$ as the maps $\hat{f}: \hat{\Omega} \rightarrow \text{Lip}(S^1)$ for which the following supreme is finite

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\hat{f}} = \sup \left\{ \frac{d_1(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}, \hat{f}_{\hat{y}})}{d_\rho(\hat{x}, \hat{y})^\alpha} : \hat{x}, \hat{y} \in \hat{\Omega} \text{ and } \hat{x} \neq \hat{y} \right\}.$$

As before, in order to simplify the notation, we assume $\alpha = 1$, nonetheless the results are valid for every value of $\alpha > 0$.

In $\mathcal{H}_1(\hat{\Omega}, \text{Lip}(S^1))$ we consider the metric,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(\hat{f}, \hat{g}) = \sup_{\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}} d_1(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}, \hat{g}_{\hat{x}}) + |\mathcal{H}_{\hat{f}} - \mathcal{H}_{\hat{g}}|.$$

Finally with this concepts we introduce the notion of cocycle induced by \hat{f} , that is a map $\hat{F}_{\hat{f}}: \hat{\Omega} \times S^1 \rightarrow \hat{\Omega} \times S^1$ defined by

$$\hat{F}_{\hat{f}}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) = (\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{p})),$$

where $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{H}_1(\hat{\Omega}, \text{Lip}(S^1))$. For the rest of the work we use the notation \hat{F} when there is not needed to specify the map \hat{f} .

For $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$, we use the notation

$$\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n = \hat{f}_{\hat{\sigma}^{n-1}(\hat{x})} \circ \dots \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{x}},$$

so that the iterates of \hat{F} are given by $\hat{F}^n(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) = (\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{p}))$.

Recall that $\rho > 1$ has been fixed in the definition of the distance d_ρ .

Definition 2.2. *We say that a cocycle \hat{F} is s-dominated if there exists a constant $c < 1$ such that*

$$(2) \quad H_1(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^{-1})\rho^{-1} \leq c < 1 \text{ for all } \hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}.$$

Analogously, \hat{F} is u-dominated if there is $c < 1$ such that

$$(3) \quad H_1(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}})\rho^{-1} \leq c < 1 \text{ for all } \hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}.$$

When \hat{F} satisfies both (2) and (3) we say that it is su-dominated.

In particular, domination is an open condition in $\mathcal{H}_1(\hat{\Omega}, \text{Lip}(S^1))$.

In this context we introduce the notion of contraction exponent due to Malicet [6]. This quantity measures the contracting exponential rate of the action on the fibers.

Definition 2.3. *The exponent of contraction of \hat{F} at the point (\hat{x}, \hat{p}) is the non positive quantity*

$$\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{x}, \hat{p}) = \limsup_{\hat{q} \rightarrow \hat{p}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log(d(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{p}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{q})))}{n}.$$

If \hat{m} is a \hat{F} -invariant probability measure, the exponent of contraction of \hat{m} is defined as

$$\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) = \int_{\hat{\Omega} \times S^1} \lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{x}, \hat{p}) d\hat{m}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}).$$

Note that λ_{con} is \hat{F} -invariant, then λ_{con} is constant \hat{m} -almost everywhere if \hat{m} is ergodic.

Definition 2.4. We say that \hat{F} is a pinching cocycle if there exists a periodic point $\hat{x}_0 \in \hat{\Omega}$ of $\hat{\sigma}$ such that $\hat{f}_{\hat{x}_0}^{per(\hat{x}_0)}$ has two fixed points: one attractor and one repelling.

With this last definition we are in conditions to enunciate the principal result of this work.

Theorem A. Let $\hat{\mu}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant measure with local product structure, fully supported and ergodic. If $\hat{F}_{\hat{f}}$ is a pinching su-dominated cocycle, then for every open neighborhood \mathcal{U} of \hat{f} in $\mathcal{H}_1(\hat{\Omega}, Lip(S^1))$, there exists an open set $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ such that for any $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{V}$ and any $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}}$ -invariant measure \hat{m} projecting to $\hat{\mu}$, we have

$$\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}_{\hat{g}}, \hat{m}) < 0 \text{ or } \lambda_{con}((\hat{F}_{\hat{g}})^{-1}, \hat{m}) < 0.$$

3. INVARIANT HOLONOMIES

Let F be a cocycle over $\hat{\sigma}$ defined by $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{H}_1(\hat{\Omega}, Lip(S^1))$. In this section we introduce the concept of holonomies for \hat{F} . They are maps acting on the fibers and commuting with the dynamics.

Definition 3.1. A stable holonomy for \hat{F} is a collection of β -Hölder homeomorphisms $h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s: S^1 \rightarrow S^1$, with uniform Hölder constant, defined for every $\hat{y} \in W_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$ satisfying

- (a) $h_{\hat{y}, \hat{z}}^s \circ h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s = h_{\hat{x}, \hat{z}}^s$ and $h_{\hat{x}, \hat{x}}^s = Id$;
- (b) $h_{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), \hat{\sigma}(\hat{y})}^s = \hat{f}_{\hat{y}} \circ h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^{-1}$;
- (c) $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \mapsto h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s$ is continuous for every $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$ and $\hat{y} \in W_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$.

A unstable holonomy for \hat{F} is defined analogously for points in the same local unstable set.

The domination conditions in Definition 2.2 allow us to use the classical graph transform methods for obtaining stable laminations for the cocycle \hat{F} , this techniques are developed in [4]. The following proposition is due to Avila and Viana [1].

Proposition 3.2 (Proposition 5.1, [1]). *If the cocycle \hat{F} is s -dominated then there exists a unique partition into stable sets $\mathcal{W}^s = \{\mathcal{W}^s(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) : (\hat{x}, \hat{p}) \in \hat{\Omega} \times S^1\}$ of $\hat{\Omega} \times S^1$ such that*

- (1) Every $\mathcal{W}^s(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$ is a Lipschitz graph over $W_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$, with Lipschitz constant uniform on \hat{x} ;
- (2) $\hat{F}(\mathcal{W}^s(\hat{x}, \hat{p})) \subset \mathcal{W}^s(\hat{F}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}))$ for all $(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) \in \hat{\Omega} \times S^1$;
- (3) the map $h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s: \{\hat{x}\} \times S^1 \rightarrow \{\hat{y}\} \times S^1$ defined by $(\hat{y}, h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s(\hat{p})) \in \mathcal{W}^s(\hat{x}, \hat{p})$, for $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{W}_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$, coincides with the uniform limit of $(\hat{F}_{\hat{y}}^n)^{-1} \hat{F}_{\hat{x}}^n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$;

(4) the family of maps $h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s$ is an stable holonomy for \hat{F} .

Moreover, in Proposition 5.2 of [1], it is proved that the holonomies vary continuously with the cocycle.

4. SU-STATES

Let $\hat{\mu}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant probability measure and \hat{F} be an su-dominated cocycle.

We study the \hat{F} -invariant probability measures \hat{m} projecting to $\hat{\mu}$. Since \hat{F} is a continuous map defined on a compact space, we have that such measures always exist.

In this context, by Rokhlin [8], there exists a disintegration of \hat{m} into conditional probabilities $\{\hat{m}_{\hat{x}}\}_{\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}}$ for the S^1 fibers which is essentially unique, that is, a measurable family of probability measures such that $\hat{m}_{\hat{x}}(\{\hat{x}\} \times S^1) = 1$ for $\hat{\mu}$ -almost every $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$ and

$$\hat{m}(E) = \int \hat{m}_{\hat{x}}(E \cap \{\hat{x}\} \times S^1) d\hat{\mu}$$

for every measurable set $E \subset \hat{\Omega} \times S^1$.

The following notion will allow us to characterize the measures that have exponent of contraction equal to zero. Here h^s and h^u denote the holonomies given by Proposition 3.2.

Definition 4.1. *Let \hat{m} be an \hat{F} -invariant probability measure projecting to $\hat{\mu}$. We say that \hat{m} is an s-state if there exists a $\hat{\mu}$ full measure set E satisfying*

$$\hat{m}_{\hat{y}} = (h_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^s)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{x}},$$

for $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in E$ and $\hat{y} \in W_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$. In this case we say that the disintegration $\{\hat{m}_{\hat{x}}\}$ is s-invariant.

We define u-state and u-invariance analogously using the unstable holonomy. The measure \hat{m} is an su-state if it is simultaneously an s-state and a u-state.

If \hat{m} is an su-state, then it has some disintegration which is s-invariant on a full measure s-saturated set and other disintegration which is u-invariant on a full measure u-saturated set. We are now going to discuss additional conditions under which these two disintegrations can be extended to the whole space.

Proposition 4.2 (Proposition 4.8, [1]). *Let $\hat{\mu}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant probability measure with local product structure, full supported and ergodic and \hat{F} be an su-dominated cocycle. If \hat{m} is an su-state, then it admits a disintegration which is both s-invariant and u-invariant and whose conditional probabilities $\hat{m}_{\hat{x}}$ vary continuously with $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$.*

The continuity of the holonomies as functions of the cocycle established in [1] imply that the condition of being an s-state is closed with respect to the Lipschitz topology. This has been proved for different authors in different contexts, but in our setting is a direct consequence of [9].

Proposition 4.3 (Corollary 2.3, [9]). *Let \hat{F} be an s-dominated cocycle defined by \hat{f} . Let \hat{f}_k be a sequence of maps converging to \hat{f} in $\mathcal{H}_1(\hat{\Omega}, Lip(S^1))$ and denote \hat{F}_k the induced cocycles. If for every k , \hat{m}_k is an s-states for \hat{F}_k and \hat{m}_k converges in the weak* topology to \hat{m} , then \hat{m} is an s-state for \hat{F} .*

5. INVARIANCE PRINCIPLE

Here we introduce a result that relate the exponent of contraction with the dynamics in the fibers given by the holonomies. The following theorem is a key point in the proof of Theorem A.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\hat{\mu}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant measure, \hat{F} an su -dominated cocycle and \hat{m} a \hat{F} -invariant probability measure projecting to $\hat{\mu}$.*

If $\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) = 0$ and $\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}^{-1}, \hat{m}) = 0$, then \hat{m} is an su -state.

The proof of this theorem is an immediate consequence of applying the following result to both \hat{F} and \hat{F}^{-1} .

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\hat{\mu}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant measure, \hat{F} an s -dominated cocycle and \hat{m} a \hat{F} -invariant probability measure projecting to $\hat{\mu}$.*

If $\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) = 0$, then \hat{m} is an s -state.

The idea of the proof is that having zero exponent of contraction together with the existence of the stable holonomies make the dynamics really similar to one acting over a non-invertible shift, dispensing the negative coordinates.

In the following, we state the definitions for the non-invertible case. If $\pi = \pi^+$ is the projection to the positive coordinates of $\hat{\Omega}$, we denote $\Omega = \pi(\hat{\Omega})$ and let $\sigma: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be the unilateral shift satisfying $\sigma \circ \pi = \pi \circ \hat{\sigma}$. If $\hat{\mu}$ is a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant measure, then we consider μ such that $\pi_* \hat{\mu} = \mu$. Observe that μ is a σ -invariant measure.

If $f: \Omega \rightarrow \text{Lip}(S^1)$ is a Lipschitz map, we define the cocycle $F: \Omega \times S^1 \rightarrow \Omega \times S^1$ by

$$F(x, \hat{p}) = (\sigma(x), f_x(\hat{p})).$$

We work with the F -invariant probability measures m projecting to μ .

Let $\{\{x\} \times S^1\}_{x \in \Omega}$ be the partition into fibers of $\Omega \times S^1$, we denote by m_x the Rokhlin disintegration into conditional probabilities of the measure m . The principal technical tool for understanding the dynamics for the non-invertible case is through a measurability criterion of the disintegration m_x which is known by the name of Invariance Principle. The following result due to Malicet [6] is based on the work done by Ledrappier in [5] for the case of linear cocycles.

Theorem 5.3. *(Invariance principle) For every F -invariant probability measure m projecting to μ , we have the following alternative:*

- either $\lambda_{con}(F, m) < 0$,
- or for μ -almost every $x \in \Omega$, $m_{\sigma(x)} = (f_x)_* m_x$.

In order to prove Theorem 5.2, we need to relate the original cocycle \hat{F} with a new cocycle F defined in the unilateral case. This is done in the following results.

Proposition 5.4. *If the cocycle \hat{F} is s -dominated, then there exists a continuous map $\tilde{F}: \hat{\Omega} \times S^1 \rightarrow \hat{\Omega} \times S^1$ which action along the fibers $\{\hat{x}\} \times S^1$ is constant for every $\hat{y} \in W_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$ and it satisfies*

$$(4) \quad \tilde{F} = \tilde{H}^{-1} \circ \hat{F} \circ \tilde{H},$$

where $\tilde{H}: \hat{\Omega} \times S^1 \rightarrow \hat{\Omega} \times S^1$ projects to the identity of $\hat{\Omega}$ on the first coordinate.

Proof. First we define the map \tilde{H} as the projection along the stable manifold to a fixed unstable manifold. That is, in every cylinder $[0; i]$, we fix a \hat{x}_i and define $\varphi: \hat{\Omega} \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}$ where $\varphi(\hat{x})$ is the unique element in $W_{loc}^s(\hat{x}) \cap W_{loc}^u(\hat{x}_i)$. Then, we define \tilde{H} as

$$\tilde{H}(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) = (\hat{x}, h_{\varphi(\hat{x}), \hat{x}}^s(\hat{p})).$$

Let \tilde{F} be the cocycle defined by the equation (4). It is left to prove that action along the fibers $\{\hat{x}\} \times S^1$ is constant for every pair \hat{x} and \hat{y} in $\hat{\Omega}$ with $\hat{y} \in W_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$, for this we observe that the map φ satisfies that $\varphi(\hat{x}) = \varphi(\hat{y})$. Finally, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} H^{-1} \circ \tilde{F} \circ H(\hat{x}, \hat{p}) &= H^{-1}(\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}} h_{\varphi(\hat{x}), \hat{x}}^s(\hat{p})) \\ &= H^{-1}(\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), h_{\hat{\sigma}(\varphi(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}(\hat{x})}^s \hat{f}_{\varphi(\hat{x})}(\hat{p})) \\ &= (\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), h_{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), \varphi(\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}))}^s h_{\hat{\sigma}(\varphi(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}(\hat{x})}^s \hat{f}_{\varphi(\hat{x})}(\hat{p})). \\ &= (\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), h_{\hat{\sigma}(\varphi(\hat{x})), \varphi(\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}))}^s \hat{f}_{\varphi(\hat{x})}(\hat{p})), \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof of Proposition 5.4. \square

Let \hat{m} be an \hat{F} -invariant probability measure, we define \tilde{m} such that its disintegration satisfies

$$(5) \quad \tilde{m}_{\hat{x}} = (h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{x}},$$

for every $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$.

The measure \tilde{m} defined above is an \tilde{F} -invariant measure. In order to prove this, denote as $\tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}$ the action of \tilde{F} on the fibers $\{\hat{x}\} \times S^1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{f}_{\hat{x}})_* \tilde{m}_{\hat{x}} &= \left(h_{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), \varphi(\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}))}^s \circ \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}} \right)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{x}} \\ &= \left(h_{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}), \varphi(\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x}))}^s \right)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x})} \\ &= \tilde{m}_{\hat{\sigma}(\hat{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

The following result states the relation between the exponents of contraction of the cocycle \tilde{F} with the original one \hat{F} , in particular, if $\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) = 0$ this implies that $\lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{m}) = 0$.

Lemma 5.5. *There exists a constant $R > 0$ such that*

$$\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) \leq R \lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{m}) \leq 0.$$

Proof. The fact that $\lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{m}) \leq 0$ comes from the definition. We are left to prove the first inequality.

We want to bound the following distance,

$$d(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{p}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{q})) = d(h_{\varphi(\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})}^s \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s(\hat{p}), h_{\varphi(\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})}^s \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s(\hat{q}))$$

with an expression depending only on $d(\tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{p}), \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{q}))$, for any \hat{p} and \hat{q} in S^1 . Since $h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s$ is an homeomorphism, we can replace by $h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s \hat{p} = \tilde{p}$ and $h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s \hat{q} = \tilde{q}$, and the previous expression gets reduced to

$$(6) \quad d(h_{\varphi(\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})}^s \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{p}), h_{\varphi(\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})}^s \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{q})).$$

As $h_{\varphi(\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})}^s$ are β -Hölder homeomorphism with uniform Hölder constant, we get that there exist $L > 0$ such that

$$d(h_{\varphi(\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})}^s \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{p}), h_{\varphi(\hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})), \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{x})}^s \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{q})) \leq L d(\tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{p}), \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{q}))^\beta.$$

Finally, we get the inequality

$$\frac{\log(d(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{p}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\hat{q})))}{n} \leq \frac{\log(L) + \beta \log(d(\tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{p}), \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}^n(\tilde{q})))}{n},$$

in which by making n going to infinity and \hat{q} approximating to \hat{p} , we obtain

$$\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{x}, \hat{p}) \leq R \lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \hat{x}, \tilde{p}) = R \lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \hat{x}, h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s \hat{p}),$$

with $R = \beta$. When we integrate with respect to the measure \hat{m} , we obtain

$$\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) \leq R \int \lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \hat{x}, h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s \hat{p}) d\hat{m} = R \int \lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \hat{x}, \hat{p}) d\hat{m} = R \lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{m}).$$

□

Proof Theorem 5.2.

Let $\hat{\mu}$ be a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant measure, \hat{F} an s-dominated cocycle and \hat{m} a \hat{F} -invariant probability measure projecting to $\hat{\mu}$ such that $\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) = 0$.

Consider \tilde{F} the cocycle given by Proposition 5.4 and \tilde{m} defined by Equation (5). Since the action on the fibers of \tilde{F} , $\tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}$, are constants along the stable manifold of \hat{x} , we can define a new cocycle $F: \Omega \times S^1 \rightarrow \Omega \times S^1$ such that $F \circ (\pi, Id) = \tilde{F}$, where $\pi: \hat{\Omega} \rightarrow \Omega$ is the projection to the positive coordinates. We denote as f the map $f: \Omega \rightarrow \text{Lip}(S^1)$ satisfying $f_{\pi(\hat{x})} = \tilde{f}_{\hat{x}}$, then $m = (\pi \times Id)_* \tilde{m}$ is F -invariant.

For finishing the proof of Theorem 5.2 we need of the following well known result of convergence of martingale sequences which explanation is detailed in [10].

Lemma 5.6. *The disintegration of $\{\tilde{m}_{\hat{x}}: \hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}\}$ and $\{m_x: x \in \Omega\}$ of \tilde{m} and m respectively are related by*

$$(7) \quad \tilde{m}_{\hat{x}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(f_{\pi(\hat{\sigma}^{-n}(\hat{x}))}^n \right)_* m_{\pi(\hat{\sigma}^{-n}(\hat{x}))},$$

at $\hat{\mu}$ -almost every $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$.

Since $\lambda_{con}(\hat{F}, \hat{m}) = 0$, by Lemma 5.5 we have that $\lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{m}) = 0$. On the other hand the fact that $\lambda_{con}(\tilde{F}, \hat{x}, \hat{p}) = \lambda_{con}(F, x, \hat{p})$ implies that $\lambda_{con}(F, m)$ is also zero. To follow, we apply Theorem 5.3 to (F, m) and conclude that

$$m_{\sigma(x)} = (f_x)_* m_x.$$

Using this fact in equation (7), we get that $\tilde{m}_{\hat{x}} = m_{\pi(\hat{x})} = \tilde{m}_{\hat{z}}$ for $\hat{\mu}$ almost every $\hat{z} \in \pi^{-1}(x) = W_{loc}^s(\hat{x})$. Finally,

$$\left(h_{\hat{x}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s \right)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{x}} = \tilde{m}_{\hat{x}} = \tilde{m}_{\hat{z}} = \left(h_{\hat{z}, \varphi(\hat{z})}^s \right)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{z}},$$

and since $\varphi(\hat{x}) = \varphi(\hat{z})$,

$$\hat{m}_{\hat{x}} = \left(h_{\varphi(\hat{x}), \hat{x}}^s \circ h_{\hat{z}, \varphi(\hat{x})}^s \right)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{z}} = \left(h_{\hat{z}, \hat{x}}^s \right)_* \hat{m}_{\hat{z}}$$

which concludes the proof. □

6. PROOF OF THEOREM A

Fix $\hat{\mu}$, a $\hat{\sigma}$ -invariant measure with local product structure, fully supported and ergodic. Let $\hat{F}_{\hat{f}}$ be a pinching su-dominated cocycle and \mathcal{U} an open neighborhood of \hat{f} in $\mathcal{H}_1(\hat{\Omega}, \text{Lip}(S^1))$.

The pinching condition guarantees that there exists a periodic point \hat{x}_0 such that $\hat{f}_{\hat{x}_0}^{\text{per}(\hat{x}_0)}$ has an attracting point \hat{a} and a repelling point \hat{r} . For simplifying the notation we assume that \hat{x}_0 is fixed. Let $\hat{z} \in W^s(\hat{x}_0) \cap W^u(\hat{x}_0)$ be an homoclinic point of \hat{x}_0 , and since $W^s(\hat{x}_0) \cap W^u(\hat{x}_0)$ is dense, we can assume that \hat{z} is not in the same cylinder than \hat{x}_0 . By definition, there exist two integers $k_1, k_2 > 0$ such that $\hat{\sigma}^{k_1}(\hat{z}) \in W_{loc}^s(\hat{x}_0)$ and $\hat{\sigma}^{-k_2}(\hat{z}) \in W_{loc}^u(\hat{x}_0)$.

For every \hat{g} in \mathcal{U} , define the maps $\varphi_{i,\hat{g}}$, with $i = 1, 2$, as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{1,\hat{g}} &= (\hat{g}_{\hat{z}}^{k_1})^{-1} \circ h_{\hat{x}_0, \hat{\sigma}^{k_1}(\hat{z})}^{s,\hat{g}}, \\ \varphi_{2,\hat{g}} &= \hat{g}_{\hat{\sigma}^{-k_2}(\hat{z})}^{k_2} \circ h_{\hat{x}_0, \hat{\sigma}^{-k_2}(\hat{z})}^{u,\hat{g}}.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that by the continuity of the holonomies, these maps depend continuously on \hat{g} .

In order to prove Theorem A, we need to construct a map $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{U}$ which does not admit su-states. By Theorem 5.2, this would imply that $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}}$ has at least one exponent of contraction different from zero.

Let U denote an open neighborhood of \hat{z} in $\hat{\Omega}$ such that $\hat{x}_0, \hat{\sigma}^n(\hat{z}) \notin U$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and let V be an open neighborhood of \hat{z} such that $V \subset \overline{V} \subsetneq U$. Since $\hat{\Omega}$ is a compact metric space, there exists a Lipschitz bump function, $\phi: \hat{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\phi(\hat{x})| \leq 1$ for every $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}$, $\phi(\hat{x}) = 0$ in U^c and $\phi(\hat{x}) = 1$ in V .

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the $d_{\mathcal{H}}$ ball centered at \hat{f} and with radius ε is contained in \mathcal{U} . Let $\delta > 0$ satisfies the following properties: $0 < \delta < \varepsilon/(2H_1(\phi))$ and if R_δ is the rotation of angle δ , then

$$R_\delta(\{\varphi_{1,\hat{f}}(\hat{a}), \varphi_{1,\hat{f}}(\hat{r})\}) \cap \{\varphi_{2,\hat{f}}(\hat{a}), \varphi_{2,\hat{f}}(\hat{r})\} = \emptyset.$$

Define $\hat{g}_{\hat{x}} = \phi(\hat{x}) \cdot R_\delta \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{x}} + (1 - \phi(\hat{x})) \cdot \hat{f}_{\hat{x}} = \hat{f}_{\hat{x}} + \phi(\hat{x})\delta = R_{\phi(\hat{x})\delta} \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}$.

We need to verify that \hat{g} belongs to the set \mathcal{U} , then it is enough to prove that $d_{\mathcal{H}}(\hat{g}, \hat{f}) < \varepsilon$.

First we prove that $d_1(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}, \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}) \leq \varepsilon/2$. Observe that $H_1(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}) = H_1(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}})$, this is a consequence of the following identities,

$$d(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{p}), \hat{g}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{q})) = d(R_{\phi(\hat{x})\delta} \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{p}), R_{\phi(\hat{x})\delta} \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{q})) = d(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{p}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{q})),$$

since $R_{\phi(\hat{x})\delta}$ is an isometry. We have an analogous result for $\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^{-1}$ and $\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}^{-1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}d_1(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}, \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}) &= \max\{\sup_{\hat{p} \in S^1} d(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{p}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}(\hat{p})), \sup_{\hat{p} \in S^1} d(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}^{-1}(\hat{p}), \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^{-1}(\hat{p}))\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\hat{x} \in \hat{\Omega}} \delta\phi(\hat{x}) < \varepsilon/2.\end{aligned}$$

On the other side, we need to compute $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{g}}$. For this it is enough to observe that

$$\begin{aligned}d_1(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}}, \hat{g}_{\hat{y}}) &= \max\{d_0(R_{\phi(\hat{x})\delta} \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{x}}, R_{\phi(\hat{y})\delta} \circ \hat{f}_{\hat{y}}), d_0(\hat{f}_{\hat{x}}^{-1} \circ R_{-\phi(\hat{x})\delta}, \hat{f}_{\hat{y}}^{-1} \circ R_{-\phi(\hat{y})\delta})\} \\ &\leq \left(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{f}} + \delta H_1(\phi)\right) d_\rho(\hat{x}, \hat{y}),\end{aligned}$$

then, $\mathcal{H}_{\hat{g}} \leq \mathcal{H}_{\hat{f}} + \delta H_1(\phi)$. Exchanging the roles of \hat{f} and \hat{g} , we obtain

$$\left| \mathcal{H}_{\hat{g}} - \mathcal{H}_{\hat{f}} \right| \leq \varepsilon/2,$$

concluding that $d_{\mathcal{H}}(\hat{g}, \hat{f}) < \varepsilon$ and then \hat{g} is in the set \mathcal{U} .

In particular for this construction we have the relations,

$$(8) \quad \varphi_{1,\hat{g}} = R_{\delta} \circ \varphi_{1,\hat{f}} \text{ and } \varphi_{2,\hat{g}} = \varphi_{2,\hat{f}}.$$

Since $\hat{g}_{\hat{x}_0} = \hat{f}_{\hat{x}_0}$, the map $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}}$ also satisfies the pinching condition in Definition 2.4, and it has the same attractor and repelling points, $\{\hat{a}, \hat{r}\}$. Suppose \hat{m} is a $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}}$ -invariant probability measure projecting to $\hat{\mu}$ which is an su-state, then by Proposition 4.2, it satisfies

$$(\hat{g}_{\hat{x}_0})_* \hat{m}_{\hat{x}_0} = \hat{m}_{\hat{x}_0}.$$

This implies that $\hat{m}_{\hat{x}_0}$ is a $\hat{g}_{\hat{x}_0}$ -invariant measure and it must be supported in the non-wandering set of $\hat{g}_{\hat{x}_0}$ which consists in the points $\{\hat{a}, \hat{r}\}$.

Moreover, by the su-invariance, we have that

$$\varphi_{2,\hat{g}}^{-1} \circ \varphi_{1,\hat{g}}(\hat{a}) = \hat{a} \text{ or } \varphi_{2,\hat{g}}^{-1} \circ \varphi_{1,\hat{g}}(\hat{a}) = \hat{r}.$$

Suppose $\varphi_{2,\hat{g}}^{-1} \circ \varphi_{1,\hat{g}}(\hat{a}) = \hat{a}$, the other case is analogous. Then, $\varphi_{1,\hat{g}}(\hat{a}) = \varphi_{2,\hat{g}}(\hat{a})$, and Equation (8) implies

$$R_{\delta} \circ \varphi_{1,\hat{f}}(\hat{a}) = \varphi_{2,\hat{f}}(\hat{a}),$$

which contradicts the choice of the δ . Therefore, we have proved that $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}}$ cannot admit su-states, and by Theorem 5.2 one of its exponents of contraction must be different from zero.

Finally, we have to prove that there exists an open set $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ with $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that for every element $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{V}$, the cocycle $\hat{F}_{\hat{h}}$ does not admit an su-state. By Theorem 5.2, this concludes the proof of Theorem A. The proof is by contradiction, suppose that for every \mathcal{V} there exists an element $\hat{g}_{\mathcal{V}} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}_{\mathcal{V}}}$ admits an su-state. Then, we can find a sequence \hat{g}_k converging to \hat{g} such that every $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}_k}$ admit an su-state \hat{m}_k . Because of the compactness of the weak* topology, we know that there exists \hat{m} a $\hat{F}_{\hat{g}}$ -invariant measure and a subsequence of \hat{m}_k , that we continue to denote \hat{m}_k , such that the sequence \hat{m}_k converges to \hat{m} in the weak* topology. By Theorem 4.3, since every \hat{m}_k is an su-state, then \hat{m} also is an su-state, which contradicts the previous proved fact about \hat{g} .

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Mauricio Poletti for suggesting this problem. C.F. was supported by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia under the project PTDC/MAT-PUR/29126/2017. K.M. has been supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico - CNPq - Brazil.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Avila, M. Viana. Extremal Lyapunov exponents: an invariance principle and applications. *Inventiones mathematicae* **181(1)** (2010), 115-178.
- [2] C. Bonatti, X. Gómez-Mont, M. Viana. Généricité d' exposants de Lyapunov non-nuls pour des produits déterministes de matrices. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse Non Linéaire* **20(4)** (2003), 579-624.
- [3] H. Furstenberg. Non-commuting random products. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **108** (1963), 377-428.
- [4] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh, M. Shub. Invariant Manifolds. *Lecture notes in Math.* **583** Springer-Verlag, 1977.

- [5] F. Ledrappier. Positivity of the exponent for stationary sequences of matrices. *Lyapunov exponents* **1186** (1986), 56-73.
- [6] D. Malicet. Random walks on $\text{Homeo}(S^1)$. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **356(3)** (2017), 1083-1116.
- [7] Ya. Pesin. Characteristic Lyapunov exponents and smooth ergodic theory. *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk* **32** (1977), 55-114.
- [8] V. A. Rokhlin. On the fundamental ideas of measure theory. *Matematicheskii Sbornik* **67(1)** (1949), 107-150.
- [9] A. Tahzibi, J. Yang. Invariance Principle and rigidity of high entropy measures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **371** (2019), 1231-1251.
- [10] M. Viana. Almost all cocycles over any hyperbolic system have non-vanishing exponents. *Annals of mathematics* **167** (2008), 643-680.

FACULDADE DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA, CAMPO GRANDE 016, 1749-016 LISBOA, PORTUGAL.

Email address: cfreijs@fc.ul.pt

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS, AV. ANTÔNIO CARLOS 6627, 31270-901 BELO HORIZONTE MINAS GERAIS, BRAZIL

Email address: kmarin@mat.ufmg.br