

LIMIT THEOREMS FOR SELF-INTERSECTING TRAJECTORIES IN \mathbb{Z} -EXTENSIONS

PHALEMPIN MAXENCE

ABSTRACT. This paper studies for a class of \mathbb{Z} -extensions of dynamical systems including \mathbb{Z} -periodic Lorentz gas the asymptotic behavior of the number of self-intersections of the trajectory of the flow. It concludes on a functional limit theorem for the auto-intersection process by studying Skorohod convergence of discrete local time of a dynamical random walk toward the local time of a Brownian motion.

1. INTRODUCTION

\mathbb{Z} -periodic Lorentz gas under finite horizon and geodesic flow on \mathbb{Z} -cover of hyperbolic surfaces are examples of \mathbb{Z} -extensions which provide a class of non finitely measured dynamical systems. Ergodic properties of such systems (see [8], [14] and [17]) are closely related to those of their finitely measured fundamental domain such as Sinai Billiards for Lorentz Gas. Ergodicity of Sinai Billiard have been proved by Sinai in [20] whereas Bunimovich, Sinai and Chernov studied central limit theorem (see [6], [7]) and Young stated exponential mixing properties through Young towers in [25]. Similar properties have been proven for geodesic flows on hyperbolic compact surfaces with Liouville measure by Hopf Bowen and Ratner ([4],[18]).

Both models mentioned above can be modeled as a periodic \mathbb{Z} -extension $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, L_0)$ where \mathcal{M}_0 is described by couple position/speed (x, v) , the orbits of the flow $(\varphi_t^0)_t$ generates trajectories $(p \circ \varphi_t^0(x, v))_t$ on the set of positions.

This article focuses on counting the number of self intersections of such trajectories (up to time t).

$$\mathcal{N}_t(x, v) := |\{(u, s), p \circ \varphi_u^0(x, v) = p \circ \varphi_s^0(x, v), 0 \leq u, s \leq t, u \neq s\}|$$

(p denoting the projection on position coordinates). Such a quantity has been studied in hyperbolic compact surfaces by Lalley [12] and a deterministic convergence has been stated for Planar Lorentz gas in [15]. This paper prove a functional limit theorem on some \mathbb{Z} -extensions including the aforementioned examples.

Theorem 1.1. $(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}}\mathcal{N}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ strongly converges in law L_0 toward $e_I' \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{L}_1^2(x) dx$, where e_I denotes the mean number of intersections modulo \mathbb{Z} between two independent trajectories of unit length and where $(\tilde{L}_t)_t$ is a local time associated to a one dimensional brownian motion $(\tilde{B}_t)_t$ characterized by the

following convergence in law

$$\left(\frac{\phi(\varphi_{ts}^0)}{s^{1/2}} \right)_t \rightarrow (\tilde{B}_t)_t,$$

where $\phi(x)$ stands for the label of the cell within the \mathbb{Z} -extension containing x .

System such as Lorentz gas can be seen as suspension flow over a billiard transformation (M, T, μ) , thus one may define on such system the number \mathcal{V}_n of self intersection up to the n -th hit on the Poincaré section.

Theorem 1.2. $(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\mathcal{V}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ strongly converges in law μ toward $e'_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_1^2(x) dx$, where e'_I denotes the mean number of intersections modulo \mathbb{Z} of two randomly chosen independent trajectories generated before hitting the Poincaré section. $(L_t)_t$ is a local time of a brownian motion $(B_t)_t$ limit in law of the process $\left(\frac{\phi(T^{\lfloor tn \rfloor})}{n^{1/2}} \right)_t$, with $\phi(x)$ being the \mathbb{Z} -label of the cell within the \mathbb{Z} -extension containing x .

The behavior of \mathcal{V}_n is itself related through the \mathbb{Z} -extension structure to the behavior of a dynamical random walk on \mathbb{Z} (Birkhoff sum) for which self intersection and local times have been widely studied (see [11], [9]). This along with decorrelation properties on such systems provide the product in the limit given in the theorems.

Section 2 presents and describes the aforementioned dynamical systems and some key decorrelation result they satisfy. The main results are stated under abstract conditions for a general class of dynamical systems in Section 3 and applied in section 4 to the \mathbb{Z} periodic Lorentz gas and geodesic flow. Section 5 is dedicated to the proof of the main results.

2. EXAMPLES

2.1. Lorentz gas with finite horizon. One dimensional Lorentz gas is a \mathbb{Z} -periodic billiard flow $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, L_0)$ describing the behavior of a point particle moving at unit speed on a domain \mathcal{R}_0 corresponding to a cylindrical surface dotted of convex obstacles $(O_m + l)_{1 \leq m \leq I, l \in \mathbb{Z}}$ periodically placed according to $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ (I being a finite set) with C^3 boundary and bouncing against the obstacles according to the Snell-Descartes reflection law.

Formally,

$$\mathcal{R}_0 := (\mathcal{T} \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus \bigcup_{m,l} (O_m + l)$$

where $\mathcal{T} := \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. \mathcal{M}_0 is then the phase space i.e the set of couple positions/unit-speed on \mathcal{R}_0 :

$$\mathcal{M}_0 := \mathcal{R}_0 \times \mathbb{S}^1 / \sim$$

where \sim identifies elements $(q, v) \in \partial\mathcal{R}_0 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ satisfying $\langle v, n(q) \rangle \geq 0$ (outgoing vector) with (q, v') where $v' = v - 2\langle v, n(q) \rangle n(q)$ with $n(q)$ denoting the unit normal vector to $\partial\mathcal{R}_0$ in q directing into \mathcal{R}_0 .

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^0 : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{M} &\rightarrow \mathcal{M} \\ (t, x) &\rightarrow \varphi_t^0(x)\end{aligned}$$

is defined as the flow associating the couple position/unit-speed $(q_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{M}_0$ the new couple (q_t, v_t) after time t . If no obstacle is met before time t then

$$\varphi_t^0(q_0, v_0) = (q_0 + tv_0, v_0).$$

And if $q_0 + tv_0 \in \partial\mathcal{R}_0$ then

$$q_t = q_0 + tv_0$$

and

$$v_t = v_0 - 2\langle v_0, n(q_t) \rangle n(q_t).$$

Where $n(q_t)$ stands for the unit normal vector to $\partial\mathcal{R}_0$ in q_t directed into \mathcal{R}_0 . \mathbb{L}_0 is the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{M}_0 . \mathbb{Z} -periodic Lorentz gas $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, \mathbb{L}_0)$ has finite horizon if the following roof function $\tau^0 : \mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (free flight) is finite on any $x \in \mathcal{M}_0$ where τ^0 is defined by

$$\tau^0(q, v) = \inf\{t > 0, q + tv \in \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(M)\}$$

with $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}$ the projection on position coordinates and

$$M := \bigcup_{i \leq I, l \in \mathbb{Z}} \{(q, v), q \in \partial O_i + l, v \in \mathbb{S}, \langle v, n(q) \rangle \geq 0\}$$

the set of unitary vectors leaving the obstacles.

Such hypothesis allows us to describe $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, \mathbb{L}_0)$ as a suspension flow (formal definition is recalled in section 3) with roof function τ^0 over the billiard map (M, T, μ) defined as follow :

$T : \mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow M$ is defined for $x \in M$ by

$$Tx := \varphi_{\tau^0(x)}^0(x).$$

Denote by $\tilde{T} := (T|_M)^{-1}$ its inverse defined on M .

The measure μ is given by

$$\mu(dr, d\theta) := \cos(\theta) dr d\theta,$$

where r holds for the curvilinear coordinates with direction cosine on the boundary of the obstacles $\partial O_i + l$ and θ the angle $\langle v, n(q) \rangle$.

By construction, \mathbb{Z} acts on M by the translation $\mathcal{D} : M \rightarrow M$ of the position coordinates, Since μ and T are themselves invariant by \mathcal{D} , (M, T, μ) passes itself by quotient into a system $(\overline{M}, \overline{\mu}, \overline{T})$ which may be described as :

- $\overline{M} := \bigcup_{i \leq I} \{(q, v), q \in \partial O_i, v \in \mathbb{S}^1, \langle v, n(q) \rangle \geq 0\}$,
- $\overline{\mu}(dr, d\theta) := \frac{1}{2 \sum_{i=1}^I |\partial O_i|} \cos(\theta) dr d\theta$ is the probability measure on \overline{M} obtained through rescaling.
- For $x = (q, v) \in \overline{M}$, denoting $(q', v') := T(x)$, $\overline{T}(x) = (q' \bmod \mathbb{Z}, v')$.

Sinai shew in [5] that such dynamical system (which bear his name) is ergodic. Note that in finite horizon, any trajectory from \overline{M} hits an obstacle in bounded time. Define on \overline{M} the set $R_0 := \{(q, v) \in \overline{M}, \langle v, n(q) \rangle = 0\}$ of tangent vectors to an obstacle. Also denote $R_i := T^i(R_0)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $R_{i,k} = \bigcup_{l=i}^k R_l$. R_k is a union of curves C^1 . Fix ξ_i^k as the partition of $\overline{M} \setminus R_{i,k}$ into connected components. According to [[16], Lemma A.1], there

are constants $C > 0$ and $0 < a < 1$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any element $A \in \xi_{-k}^k$,

$$\text{diam}(A) \leq Ca^k.$$

One may define the step function $\phi : \overline{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ for all $x \in \overline{M}$ and all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$T \circ \mathcal{D}^l = \mathcal{D}^{l+\phi(x)} \circ \overline{T}.$$

The finite horizon hypothesis imposes the function ϕ to be bounded. In fact ϕ is measurable and constant on elements of ξ_{-1}^0 . In addition, noticing that $T^{-1}(q, v_{reflected}) = T(q, -v_{incident})$, $\phi(q, v_{reflected}) = -\phi(q, -v_{incident})$ and thus ϕ has zero mean on \overline{M} . The following quantity

$$S_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ \overline{T}^i$$

then describes the actual cell containing the particle $T^n x$. We recall here the construction made by L.S Young in [25] of a factor (M_1, T_1, μ_1) of an extension (M_0, T_0, μ_0) called Young towers of $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$. On such factor (M_1, T_1, μ_1) , given $q > 0$, Young defined some Banach space : for any $q > 1$, there are constants $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\beta_1 > 0$ such that there is some Banach space $(\mathcal{V}_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)})$ with $0 < \beta_0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\mathcal{V}_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)} \subset L^q(M_1)$ and there is some constant C_0 satisfying

$$\|\cdot\|_{L^q} \leq C_0 \|\cdot\|_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)}.$$

and for which the following holds true. Recall the transfer operator P is defined on $L^q(M_1)$ as the adjoint of the Koopman operator on $L^{q/(q-1)}$, $f \rightarrow f \circ T_1$.

From now on denote $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)}$.

Recall that given some function $f : \overline{M} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, constant on the elements of the partition ξ_{-1}^0 , there is some function $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)}$ satisfying

$$f \circ \pi_0 = \hat{f} \circ \pi_1.$$

where π_0 is the projection of M_0 onto \overline{M} and π_1 of M_0 onto M_1 .

The transfer operator P is quasi-compact on $\mathcal{V}_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)}$. Since ϕ is constant on elements of ξ_{-1}^1 it can be lifted in a function $\hat{\phi}$ on M_1 . Thus we define the perturbed operator $P_u := P(e^{iu\hat{\phi}} \cdot)$ which satisfies the perturbation theorem stated by Szász and Varjú :

Theorem 2.1. [22] *There is $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for any $\beta \in]0, \beta_0[$ there is $\alpha, C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{V}_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)}$ and all $u \in [-\beta, \beta]$:*

$$P_u^n(f) = \lambda_u^n \Pi_u(f) + N_u^n(f),$$

where

- $\lambda_u \in C^2([-\beta, \beta], \mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\lambda_u = 1 - \Sigma \frac{u^2}{2} + O(u^3)$,
- $u \mapsto \Pi_u \in C^1([-\beta, \beta], L(\mathcal{V}_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)}))$ satisfies $\Pi_0(\cdot) = E_\nu(\cdot)1$, in addition for $u \in [-\beta, \beta]$, Π_u is a projector and thus $\Pi_u^n = \Pi_u$.
- $N_u \in L(\mathcal{V}_{(\beta_0, \epsilon_0)})$ satisfies $\|N_u^n\| \leq C\alpha^n$.

In addition, for all $u \in [-\pi, \pi] \setminus [-\beta, \beta]$, $\|P_u^n\| \leq C\alpha^n$.

This perturbation theorem led to the following local limit theorem with decorrelation, the version given here is an adapted version from [16], obtained replacing \mathbb{Z}^2 -valued by \mathbb{Z} -valued observables.

Theorem 2.2. [16]

Let $p > 1$ be such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $C > 0$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, any set A and B constructed as union of elements of ξ_{-k}^k and any $n > k$,

$$\left| \bar{\mu} \left(A \cap (S_n = N) \cap \bar{T}^{-n}(B) \right) - \frac{e^{-\frac{N^2}{2\Sigma(n-2k)}}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(n-2k)^{1/2}} \bar{\mu}(A)\bar{\mu}(B) \right| \leq C \frac{k\bar{\mu}(B)^{1/p}}{n-2k}.$$

2.2. Geodesic flow over an hyperbolic surface. Geodesic flows on hyperbolic compact surfaces are widely studied and provide typical examples of Anosov flow. We remind here some definitions and notations kept through this section on the notion of geodesic flow and \mathbb{Z} -cover.

Definition 2.3. A geodesic flow over a hyperbolic compact surface is a dynamical system $(\mathcal{M}, \varphi_t, L)$ where $\mathcal{M} := T^1\mathcal{R}$ is the unitary tangent bundle over a negatively curved oriented compact connected surface \mathcal{R} , $\varphi_t : T^1\mathcal{R} \rightarrow T^1\mathcal{R}$ the geodesic flow and L the Liouville measure which is an invariant measure.

In this section the first system considered is a \mathbb{Z} -cover of a C^2 geodesic flow $(\mathcal{M}, \varphi_t, L)$ over an hyperbolic compact surface.

Definition 2.4. An hyperbolic connected surface \mathcal{R}_0 is a \mathbb{Z} -cover of a negatively curved oriented Riemannian surface \mathcal{R} if there is some onto map $p : \mathcal{R}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ such that

- (1) for any $x \in \mathcal{R}$, there is a neighborhood V_x such that on any connected component $C \subset p^{-1}(V_x)$, p is isometric onto its image.
- (2) The group

$$\text{Cell}(\mathcal{R}_0, p) := \{D' : \mathcal{R}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_0, D' \text{ est une isométrie vérifiant } p \circ D' = p\}$$

is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}

- (3) for any $x \in \mathcal{R}$, there is some $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0$ such that

$$p^{-1}(x) = \{D(x_0) : D' \in \text{Cell}(\mathcal{R}_0, p)\}.$$

For the rest of the section, denote by $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, L_0)$ the dynamical system whose $\mathcal{M}_0 := T^1\mathcal{R}_0$ is a \mathbb{Z} -cover of a negatively curved oriented compact connected C^2 surface \mathcal{R} . According to point (2), let $\mathcal{D} \in \text{Cell}(\mathcal{R}_0, p)$ be an element satisfying $\text{Cell}(\mathcal{R}_0, p) := \{\mathcal{D}^n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ which then passes onto an isometry on $T^1\mathcal{R}_0$.

The geodesic flow φ_t^0 on $T^1\mathcal{R}_0$ is characterized by the one on $T^1\mathcal{R}$ via p :

$$dp \circ \varphi_t^0 = \varphi_t \circ dp.$$

And L_0 is still defined as the Liouville measure on the \mathbb{Z} -cover.

Bowen and Ratner's work in [3] and [18] led to the construction of arbitrarily small Markov partitions made from rectangles and Hasselblatt proved in [10] that their boundary are C^1 thus allowing the identification of $(T^1\mathcal{R}, \varphi, L)$ with a suspension flow over a probability preserving dynamical system $(\bar{M}, \bar{T}, \bar{\mu})$ isomorphic to a mixing subshift of finite type whose Poincaré section $\bar{M} := \bigcup_{i=1}^d \Pi_i \subset T^1\mathcal{R}$ satisfies the following properties

- Hypotheses 2.5.**
- Π_i are disjoint and each Π_i is a connected subset of $T^1\mathcal{R}$ whose diameter is less than half of the injectivity radius δ over $T^1\mathcal{R}$ with C^1 boundary and satisfies $\overline{\Pi_i} = \overline{\Pi_i}$.
 - The section of Π_i is transverse to the flow, and there is some $\eta > 0$ such that for all i , in local coordinates, $\{\theta_x, \exp_{x_0}^{-1}(x, \theta_x) \in \Pi_i\}$ is contained within $(\pi/2 - \eta, \pi/2 + \eta)$.
 - For all $x \in \overline{M}$, $\varphi_{]0, \frac{\delta}{2}[}(x) \cap \overline{M} \neq \emptyset$

\overline{T} may be defined on the whole unitary tangent bundle $T^1\mathcal{R}$ by

$$\overline{T}x = \varphi_{\tau(x)}(x)$$

Where τ is the return time map defined by $\tau(x) := \inf\{t > 0, \varphi_t(x) \in \overline{M}\}$. Denoting $R_i := \{x \in T^1\mathcal{R}, T^i x \in \partial\overline{M}\}$. As shown in next proposition, \overline{T} is C^1 on $T^1\mathcal{R} \setminus R_{-1}$ and bijective when restricted to the Poincaré section \overline{M} over itself with reciprocal function given by

$$\tilde{T}x = \varphi_{-\tilde{\tau}(x)}(x)$$

where $\tilde{\tau}(x) := \inf\{t > 0, \varphi_{-t}(x) \in \overline{M}\}$.

Proposition 2.6. \overline{T} as defined above is C^1 on $T^1\mathcal{R} \setminus R_{-1}$ with \overline{M} fixed as in Hypothesis 2.5 .

Proof. Fix $x_0 \in T^1\mathcal{R} \setminus R_{-1}$, by construction of the Poincaré section, the trajectory $(\varphi_t(x_0))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ necessarily crosses the section. The latter being transverse to the flow, $\tau(x)$ is well defined : There is some $y_0 \in \overline{M}$ and $\tau(x_0)$ such that

$$\varphi_{\tau(x_0)}(x_0) = y_0$$

Passing to local coordinates by \exp_{x_0} the above constraint gives

$$\varphi_{\tau(x_0)}(x_0) - y_0 = 0.$$

Then apply the implicit functions theorem : Define $\psi(x, t, y) = \varphi_t(x) - y$ (which is C^1) where locally t and y are described one and two dimensional spaces whereas x is in dimension 3. Since $\partial_3\psi(x_0, t_{x_0}, y_0) = (f(y_0), 1)$ where $f(y_0)$ and v_0 are free vectors (the section being transverse to the flow), denoting $x_0 = (q_0, v_0)$, $\partial_2\psi = \partial_t(q_0 + tv_0, v_0) = (v_0, 0)$ is still invertible. Deduce that $\partial_{2,3}\psi(x_0, t_0, y_0)$ is isomorphic to $\begin{pmatrix} v_0 & f(y_0) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ which is invertible. Implicit function theorem then applies, there is a C^1 function f defined on a neighborhood of x_0 such that $f(x_0) = (\tau(x_0), y_0)$ and

$$\psi(x, f(x)) = 0$$

Thus

$$\varphi_{p_1(f(x))}(x) \in \overline{M}.$$

where p_1 is the projection onto the first coordinate. Thus $\overline{T}(x) = \varphi_{p_1(f(x))}(x)$ is C^1 on $T^1\mathcal{R}$. \square

The invariant measure $\bar{\mu}$ is defined as the renormalized probability measure from the measure μ_0 characterized through Borel sets $A \times [0, s)$ for $s > 0$ and $A \subset \bar{M}$ by the following relation for any measurable f on \mathcal{M}

$$\int_A \int_0^s f \circ \varphi_t(q) d\lambda(s) d\mu_0(q) = \int_{\varphi_{[0,s)}(A)} f(x) dL(x).$$

Here is a following well known property (see chapter 19 from book [19])

Proposition 2.7. *On a compact Riemannian surface \mathcal{R} , Let L be the Liouville measure on the unitary bundle $T^1\mathcal{R}$. Let \bar{M} be as described above, then $T^1\mathcal{R}$ is locally diffeomorphic to an open set in $\bar{M} \times \mathbb{R}$ and L coincides in local coordinates with some measure $\mu_0 \otimes \lambda$ where μ_0 is supported on \bar{M} and given in its local curvilinear coordinates (r, ϕ) by*

$$d\mu_0(r, \phi) = \cos \theta dr d\theta.$$

According to Bowen and Ratner constructions (see [18],[4]), there is some \bar{M} satisfying Hypotheses 2.5 such that $(\bar{M}, \bar{T}, \bar{\mu})$ is isomorphic to a subshift of finite type (Σ, σ, ν) where ν is a Gibbs measure with potential $h \in H(\Sigma)$ ($H(\Sigma)$ being the set of Hölder functions).

For $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \leq j$, define $R_{i,j} := \bigcup_{i \leq n \leq j} R_n$ and $\xi_i^j := \bar{M} \setminus R_{i,j}$. Elements of ξ_i^j make cylinders in Bowen and Ratner constructions and thus satisfy

$$\exists C > 0, 0 < a < 1, s.t \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall A \in \xi_{-k}^k, \text{diam}(A) \leq Ca^k.$$

N. Yassine proved in [24] the following local limit theorem with decorrelation from perturbation theorems from [22] :

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\phi : \bar{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be some zero mean function being constant on elements of ξ_{-1}^0 which is not a co-boundary, denote $S_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T^k$ and*

$$\Sigma = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} E_{\bar{\mu}}(\phi \circ T^k \phi).$$

There is some constant $C > 0$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^$, any elements $A, B \in \xi_{-k}^k$, and all $n > k$,*

$$\left| \bar{\mu}(A \cap (S_n = N) \cap \bar{T}^{-n}(B)) - \frac{e^{-\frac{N^2}{2\Sigma(n-2k)}}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(n-2k)^{1/2}} \bar{\mu}(A) \bar{\mu}(B) \right| \leq C \frac{k \bar{\mu}(B)}{n-2k}.$$

By definition of \mathcal{M}_0 as \mathbb{Z} -cover, \bar{M} may be lifted in a set M within \mathcal{M}_0 . Define the dynamical system (M, T, μ) with T given by

$$Tx := \varphi_{\tau^0(x)}^0(x)$$

and τ^0 standing for $\tau^0(x) := \inf\{t > 0, \varphi_t(x) \in \mathcal{M}\}$. The measure μ_0 on \bar{M} is lifted into a measure μ on M by the following characterization on small enough open sets A in M by $\mu(dp(A)) = \mu_0(A)$. Fix some section $s : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_0$ of the \mathbb{Z} -cover p (i.e $p \circ s = id$) and define the step function $\phi : \bar{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ through the following characterization for $x \in \bar{M}$,

$$\mathcal{D}^{\phi(x)} \circ s(\bar{T}x) = T \circ s(x).$$

As defined, this function ϕ is constant on elements of ξ_{-1}^0 . $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, L_0)$ is then a suspension flow with roof function τ^0 over (M, T, μ) which is itself

a \mathbb{Z} -periodic extension of $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \Gamma \overline{\mu})$ through step function ϕ and rescaling $\Gamma := \mu_0(\overline{M})$ (see next section for formal definition). Such structure along with the invariance of the Liouville measure L_0 under the flow φ_t^0 ensures that $\phi : \overline{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ has zero mean.

3. GENERAL RESULTS.

Let $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ be a probability preserving dynamical system, $\phi : \overline{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ a step function, $\tau : \overline{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ a roof function and $\Gamma > 0$ a normalizing constant. Remind the following definitions.

Definition 3.1. *The \mathbb{Z} -extension of a probability preserving dynamical system $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ by ϕ is the measure preserving dynamical system $(\overline{M} \times \mathbb{Z}, T', \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \overline{\mu} \otimes \delta_n)$ whose transformation T' is defined by*

$$T'(x, n) := (\overline{T}x, n + \phi(x)). \quad (1)$$

We will assume that $(M, T, \mu/\Gamma)$ is the \mathbb{Z} -extension of $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ by ϕ .

Remark 3.2. *Such extension (M, T, μ) implies the existence of some \mathbb{Z} -action \mathcal{D} on it satisfying*

$$T \circ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D} \circ T.$$

Where \mathcal{D} corresponds to the application $(x, k) \mapsto (x, k + 1)$ seen on $\overline{M} \times \mathbb{Z}$. Identifying \overline{M} with $\overline{M} \times \{0\}$ it may be said that $\overline{M} \subset M$, relation (1) can be rewritten as

$$T(x) = \mathcal{D}^{\phi(x)}(\overline{T}(x)) \quad \forall x \in \overline{M}.$$

Definition 3.3. *Given a dynamical system (M, T, μ) and a roof function $\tau : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, a special flow over (M, T, μ) is a system $(M_\tau, \varphi_t, \lambda')$ where*

- $M_\tau := \{(x, s), x \in M, 0 \leq s \leq \tau(x)\}$
- for all $(x, s) \in M_\tau$, $\varphi_t(x, s) := (T^{n_t(x)}, t + s - \sum_{k=0}^{n_t(x)-1} \tau \circ T^k(x))$
where $n_t(x) := \sup\{n, \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \tau \circ T^k(x) \leq t\}$
- $d\lambda'(x, s) = d\mu(x)ds$ for all $(x, s) \in M_\tau$ is an invariant measure.

Remark 3.4. *Here again, M may be identified with $M \times \{0\} \subset \mathcal{M}_0$.*

Along this paper $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi^0, L_0)$ denotes a measure preserving dynamical system isomorphic to a special flow with roof function τ (extended on M by stating $\tau \circ \mathcal{D} = \tau$) over a system (M, T, μ) such that $(M, T, \Gamma^{-1}\mu)$ is a \mathbb{Z} -extension of the probability preserving dynamical system $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ by ϕ (here τ is extended on M by stating $\tau \circ \mathcal{D} = \tau$). Let \mathcal{D} stands for the periodic \mathbb{Z} -action and let also introduce $(\mathcal{M}, \varphi, L)$ which stands for the special flow with roof function τ on $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu}/E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau))$ and denote by π the projection of \mathcal{M} over $\overline{M} \simeq \overline{M} \times \{0\}$ along the second coordinate.

Let \mathcal{R} be a set which stands for the set of positions, and fix a projection $\pi_{\mathcal{R}} : \mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. Denote by \mathcal{N}_t the number of self intersections of the trace of the flow $\pi_{\mathcal{R}} \circ \varphi^0$:

$$\mathcal{N}_t(x) := |\{(s, u) \in [0, t]^2 : \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_s(x)) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_u(x))\}|$$

In the discrete case (M, T, μ) , we also introduce and study the following natural quantity ν_n denoting the number of self-intersection up to the n^{th} crossing of the Poincaré Section :

$$\nu_n(x) := \sum_{k \geq 1} k 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} 1_{V_k^{(T^j(x))} \circ T^i(x)} + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \nu_1(T^i x)$$

where $\nu_1 := |\{(s, t) \in [0, \tau(x)] : s \neq t : \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_s^0(x)) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_t^0(x))\}|$ and $V_k^{(x)}$ is the set

$$V_k^{(x)} := \{y \in M, |[y] \cap [x]| = k\}.$$

with $[x] := \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}(x))$ standing for the set of points in \mathcal{R} within the trajectory from $x \in M$ to Tx .

Let $D > 0$, for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $i < j$, we suppose we have a congruent family $(\xi_i^j)_{i,j}$ of partitions of \overline{M} and thus of M such that $(\xi_i^j)_{i,j}$, ϕ , $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ and D satisfy the following assumptions :

- (a) $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ is an ergodic dynamical system and ϕ is constant along the elements of ξ_{-1}^0 .
- (b) Starting from the Poincaré section, trajectories cross just finitely many times before reaching the Poincaré section again :
for all $x \in M$,

$$\mu(\{y \in M, |[x] \cap [y]| > D\}) = 0$$

and for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\mu(\{y \in M, |[y] \cap [T^k y]| > D\}) = 0.$$

In addition, V_1 satisfies $|V_1| \leq D$ and ϕ satisfies a "finite horizon" hypothesis :

$$\forall x \in \overline{M}, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, |\phi(x)| \leq D \text{ and } V_k^{(x)} \subset \bigcup_{N=-D}^D \mathcal{D}^N \overline{M}.$$

- (c) $\mathcal{D}^{-1} V_k^{(Dx)} = V_k^{(x)}$
- (d) $S_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ \overline{T}^k$ satisfies

$$\|S_n\|_{L^2(\overline{\mu})} = O(n^{1/2})$$

- (e) ϕ satisfies a local limit theorem with decorrelation : For any $\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} > p > 1$, there is some $C > 0$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, and all sets $A, B \subset \overline{M}$ where A is a union of elements from ξ_{-k}^k and B is an union of sets from ξ_{-k}^∞ and for all $n \geq 2k + 1$:

$$\left| \overline{\mu}(A \cap (S_n = N) \cap \overline{T}^{-n}(B)) - \frac{e^{-\frac{N^2}{2\Sigma(n-2k)}}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(n-2k)^{1/2}} \overline{\mu}(A) \overline{\mu}(B) \right| \leq C \frac{k \overline{\mu}(B)^{1/p}}{n-2k}$$

- (f) $\left(\left(\frac{S_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}}{n^{1/2}} \right)_t \right)_n$ converges in distribution toward a Brownian motion $(B_t)_t$ with variance Σ and the local time $N_n(l) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 1_{S_k=l}$ (for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$) associated to S_n satisfies

$$E_{\overline{\mu}}(|N_n(x) - N_n(y)|^2) = O(n^{1/2}|x-y|). \quad (2)$$

Where the upper bound is uniform in $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(g) Denote for $A \subset M$

$$A^{[n]} := \bigcup_{Z \in \xi_{-n}^n, Z \cap A \neq \emptyset} Z,$$

and

$$A^{[n]-} := \bigcup_{Z \in \xi_{-n}^n, Z \subset A} Z.$$

There are some constants $1 > a > 0$, $C > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that for $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a μ -essential partition \mathcal{P}_ϵ of \overline{M} made of at most $C[\frac{1}{\epsilon}]^{2\alpha}$ sets $A \subset \overline{M}$ satisfying

$$\overline{\mu}(A) \leq C\epsilon^{2\alpha}$$

and

$$\mu((\partial A)^{[n]}) \leq C\epsilon^\alpha a^n.$$

In addition, for $A \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$, there is some set $B_A^{[k]}$ described as union of elements of ξ_{-k}^k such that for all $x, y \in A$

$$\bigcup_{m \geq 1} (V_m^{(x)})^{[k]} \Delta V_m^{(y)} \subset B_A^{[k]}$$

and satisfying

$$\mu(B_A^{[k]}) \leq C(\epsilon + a^k)^\alpha.$$

Remark 3.5. Hypothesis (e) is a local limit theorem for S_n with decorrelation. Hypothesis (f) frequently derives from hypothesis (e).

Definition 3.6 (Strong convergence in law). Given a metric space (M, d) and a measure μ with Borel σ -field, a sequence $(\mathcal{V}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of measurable functions on M converge strongly in law to the law of a random variable R if for all probability measure absolutely continuous with respect to μ ($P \ll \mu$),

$$\mathcal{V}_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_P} R.$$

where \mathcal{L}_P stands for the convergence in law with respect to P .

Theorem 3.7. set $T > 0$. Considering the hypotheses above.

$$\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_{[nt]} \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_\mu} \left(e_I \Gamma^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (L_t)^2 dx \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$$

Where L_μ holds for the strong convergence in law μ and $(L_s)_{s \geq 0}$ stands for the local time associated to the brownian motion B from hypothesis (f) which is defined almost surely for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$L_t(a) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_0^t 1_{a-\epsilon \leq B_s \leq a+\epsilon} ds,$$

and

$$e_I := \int_{\overline{M} \times \overline{M}} |[y] \cap [x]| d\mu(y) d\mu(x).$$

Remark 3.8. *Introduce an additional hypothesis,*

(b') for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}([x]) \cap \pi_{\mathcal{R}}([\mathcal{D}^i x]) = \emptyset$,

The function \mathcal{D} defined on M may be extended into a function \mathcal{D}_0 on \mathcal{M}_0 satisfying

$$\mathcal{D}_0(\varphi_t^0(x)) = \varphi_t^0(\mathcal{D}_0(x)).$$

Hypothesis (b') leads to the notion of "projection" modulo \mathbb{Z} $\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}$ on \mathcal{M}_0 given by

$$\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(x) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(x)$$

for $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and satisfying $\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}_0 x) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}_0$. $\Gamma^{-2}e_I$ can then be rewritten

$$\Gamma^{-2}e_I := \int_{\bar{M} \times \bar{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,\tau(x)]}^0(x)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,\tau(x)]}^0(y))| d\bar{\mu}(y) d\bar{\mu}(x).$$

Denote by π the projection of \mathcal{M} onto \bar{M} .

Theorem 3.9. *Set $S > 0$, on $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, L_0)$, adding assertion (b') to the hypotheses of previous theorem then*

$$\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \mathcal{N}_{ts} \right)_{s \in [0, T]} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}_L^L} \left(e'_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{L}_s^2(x) dx \right)_{s \in [0, T]}.$$

with

$$e'_I := \int_{\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}^0(x)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}^0(y))| dL(y) dL(x)$$

standing for the number of intersections between $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}(x))$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}(y))$ for x and y randomly chosen on $(\mathcal{M}, \varphi_t, L)$ and $(\tilde{L}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is defined as the local associated to a Brownian motion \tilde{B} which can be seen as

$$\left(\frac{1}{t^{1/2}} S_{n_{tu}} \circ \pi(\cdot) \right)_{u \in [0, T]} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}_L^L} (\tilde{B}_u)_{u \in [0, T]}.$$

4. APPLICATION : LORENTZ GAS AND GEODESIC FLOWS

Both systems, \mathbb{Z} -periodic Lorentz gas and \mathbb{Z} -covering of geodesic flows on hyperbolic surface presented in introduction satisfy the theorem 3.9 and 3.7 on the self intersection of the trajectories from their associated flow. This section checks the different hypotheses required.

In both cases \mathcal{R} denotes the set of position coordinates and $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}$ the projection along speed vectors $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(q, v) := q$. Only the constant α in the hypotheses differ from one system to another and corresponds to the Hölder regularity of T on connected components of $M \setminus R_{-1,0}$ in each system (i.e $\alpha = 1/2$ on Lorentz gas and 1 on hyperbolic covering).

Hypothesis (a) : Both systems are special flows over an hyperbolic system $(\bar{M}, \bar{T}, \bar{\mu})$ which is then ergodic (see [4] and [18] for hyperbolic flow or [5] for Lorentz gas). ϕ is constant on the respective partition ξ_{-1}^0 as defined for

each system in section 2.

Hypothesis (b): For both systems, since the trajectories are in both cases geodesics the distance between two intersections are bounded below and their length being uniformly bounded above, the number of self intersections $|[x] \cap [y]|$ is uniformly bounded by some $D > 0$. The case of non finite intersections between $[y]$ and $[Ty]$ only occurs for periodic orbits which lay in a set of null measure, $\mu(\{y, |[y] \cap [T^k y]| > D\}) = 0$ for all k . Besides, orbits on the continuous dynamical system $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi_t^0, \mathbb{L}_0)$ always hit the Poincaré section M in bounded time, thus

$$\forall x \in \overline{M}, |\phi(x)| \leq D$$

and $V_k^{(x)}$, the set of elements whose trajectories cross the one from x , is bounded to.

hypothesis (c) : Hypotheses (c) and (b') are satisfied in both cases thanks to the explicit \mathbb{Z} -periodicity of our systems and the projection $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}$ on position coordinates.

Hypothesis (d) holds on both systems and is a straightforward consequence of the perturbation theorem 2.1 from [22].

Hypothesis (e) is a consequence of Theorem 2.1 2.2 and 2.8.

Hypothesis (f) is a known result for both systems but may be seen as a direct consequence of the perturbation Theorem 2.1 and [13].

Let's show hypothesis (g) is satisfied :

First construct a suitable partition of \overline{M} :

In both systems, since \overline{M} can be embedded in some compact set, let \mathcal{U} be a finite atlas of open sets O with diameter lesser than the injectivity radius denoted by R . Denote $P_{\mathcal{U}}$ the $\overline{\mu}$ essential partition made of the interior of the elements of the finite partition $\bigwedge_{O \in \mathcal{U}} O$. To each element $A \in P_{\mathcal{U}}$ one may associate $x_A \in A$ and a chart (O_A, \exp_A) such that $\exp_A(x_A) = 0 \in O_A$. Now, fixing $m > 0$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_m$ be the $\overline{\mu}$ essential partition made of non empty elements

$$\exp_A^{-1}(A \cap]\frac{i-1+\epsilon}{m^\alpha}, \frac{i+1+\epsilon}{m^\alpha}[\times]\frac{j-1+\epsilon}{m^\alpha}, \frac{j+1+\epsilon}{m^\alpha}[)$$

for $|i| \leq \frac{3\delta m^\alpha}{4}$.

Such partition is finite and denoting by N the number of elements in $P_{\mathcal{U}}$,

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_m| \leq N[2R]m^{2\alpha}.$$

From $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_m$ we construct \mathcal{P}_m whose elements are given by the connected components of

$$A \setminus R_{-1,0}$$

for $A \in \mathcal{P}_m$ where $R_{-1,0} := \bigcup_{B \in \xi_{-1}^0} \partial B$. By construction we get

$$\bar{\mu}(A) \leq C \frac{1}{m^{2\alpha}}.$$

ξ_{-1}^0 is delimited by a finite number of C^1 curves of finite length which cut \overline{M} into finitely many connected components which means in one hand that the number of elements in \mathcal{P}_m grows still uniformly in $O(m^{2\alpha})$ and on the other hand the boundary of $A \setminus R_{-1,0}$ is made of uniformly regular curves and so its length can be bounded above by some value of order $\frac{1}{m^\alpha}$.

Remind now that for both systems, there is a constant $0 < a < 1$ such that the elements of $B \in \xi_{-k}^k$ are of diameter

$$\text{diam}(B) = O(a^k), \quad (3)$$

uniformly in k . And so for $A \in \mathcal{P}_m$,

$$\bar{\mu}((\partial A)^{[k]}) = O\left(a^k \frac{1}{m^{2\alpha}}\right).$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{P}_m$, A is a connected component from $B(x_A, \epsilon) \setminus R_{-1,0}$ and x_A a fixed element of A and $\epsilon > 0$. For all $y \in A$,

$$V_k^{(x_A)} \Delta V_k^{(y)} \subset B_A,$$

Where $B_A := \tilde{T}^{-1}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}} A) \cup \tilde{T}^{-1}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(T(A))) \cup \pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}} A \cup \pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(T(A))$. Thanks to the regularity of T and \tilde{T} (1/2-Holder for billiard map and Lipschitz for geodesic flow on connected components of ξ_{-1}^0), such set is included into

$$B_A \subset \tilde{T}^{-1}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(B(T(x_A), C\epsilon^\alpha) \cup B(x_A, \epsilon))) \cup \pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(B(x_A, \epsilon) \cup B(T(x_A), \epsilon^\alpha)))$$

In other words, a trajectory $[z]$ hit $[y]$ as many times as $[x_A]$ except when it passes between y and x_A or between Ty and Tx_A thus giving the shape of B_A .

Check for $y \in A$

$$\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} (V_m^{(x_A)})^{[k]} \Delta V_m^{(y)} \subset (B_A)^{[k]}$$

for any k arbitrarily large.

Noticing $V_m^{(y)} \setminus V_m^{(x_A)} \subset B_A$,

$$V_m^{(y)} \setminus (V_m^{(x_A)})^{[k]} \subset (V_m^{(y)} \setminus V_m^{(x_A)})^{[k]} \subset B_A^{[k]}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} (V_m^{(x_A)})^{[k]} \setminus V_m^{(y)} &\subset (V_m^{(x_A)})^{[k]} \setminus V_m^{(x_A)} \cup V_m^{(x_A)} \setminus V_m^{(y)} \\ &\subset (\partial V_m^{(x_A)})^{[k]} \cup V_m^{(x_A)} \setminus V_m^{(y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Where $\partial V_m^{(x_A)}$ stands for the boundary seen within $\bigcup_{B \in \xi_{-1}^0} B$ which is

$$\partial V_m^{(x_A)} = \tilde{T}^{-1}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(x_A)) \cup \tilde{T}^{-1}(\pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(T(x_A))) \cup \pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(x_A) \cup \pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(T(x_A)) \subset B_A.$$

And so

$$(V_m^{(x_A)})^{[k]} \setminus V_m^{(y)} \subset B_A^{[k]}.$$

Thanks to (3), $B_A^{[k]}$ is bounded above by

$$B_A^{[k]} \subset \tilde{T}^{-1} \left(\pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(B(T(x), C(\epsilon^\alpha + Ca^{\alpha k})) \cup B(x, \epsilon + Ca^k)) \right) \cup \pi_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} \pi_{\mathcal{R}} B(x, \epsilon) \cup B(T(x), \epsilon^\alpha + Ca^{\alpha k}).$$

And thus, since in both systems the measure is absolutely continuous with respect to the lebesgue measure, $\mu(B_A^{[k]}) = O(\epsilon + C_2 a^k)^\alpha$.

Both systems satisfy the hypotheses of 3.7.

Here is given some lemma providing explicit value for the constant e_I in both systems :

Lemma 4.1. *For $x \in M$, recall*

$$e_I := \int_{M \times \overline{M}} |[y] \cap [x]| d\mu(y) d\mu(x) = \int_{\overline{M}} E_\mu \left(\sum_{k=1}^D k 1_{V_k^{(x)}} \right) d\mu(x).$$

e_I satisfies in both systems

$$e_I = 4\Gamma E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau).$$

Where $\Gamma := \mu(\overline{M})$.

Proof. Let's build a dynamical system (M', T', μ') from (M, T, μ) by adding the abstract obstacle $[x] := [\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(x), \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(T(x))] \times \mathbb{S}$ to the Poincaré section. The measure μ' coincides with μ on $M = M' \setminus [x] \times \mathbb{S}$ and is still given in local coordinates by $\mu(dr, d\theta) = \cos(\theta) dr d\theta$.

Denoting for $y \in M$,

$$\phi_M(y) := \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N}^*, T^n x \in M\}$$

then for all $y \in V_k^{(x)}$,

$$\phi_M(y) = k + 1.$$

Kac's formula then gives,

$$\mu'(M') = \int_M \phi_M d\mu' = \int_M \phi_M d\mu = \mu(M) + \int_M \sum_{k=1}^D k 1_{V_k^{(x)}} d\mu.$$

And so

$$E_\mu \left(\sum_{k=1}^D k 1_{V_k^{(x)}} \right) = \mu'(M') - \mu'(M) = \mu'([x] \times \mathbb{S}) = 4\tau(x).$$

□

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.7.

From now on, for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, let $\mathcal{A}_n := \mathcal{P}_{\lfloor n^{1/(20\alpha)} \rfloor}$ and fix for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$ some $x_A \in \overset{\circ}{A}$. Introduce $k_n := \lfloor \log(n)^2 \rfloor$.

Thanks to hypothesis (c), we show there that ν_n is \mathcal{D} invariant (periodic) and so it is enough to study directly ν_n over $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$:

Indeed for $x \in \overline{M}$, the orbit may be rewritten $T^i(x) = \mathcal{D}^{S_i(x)}(\overline{T}^i(x))$. So ν_n may be rewritten as a function in \overline{M} in a way underlying the role of S_n and \overline{T}^n in its behavior : Thanks to hypothesis (b),

$$T^i(x) \in V_k^{(T^j(x))}$$

if and only if

$$T^i(x) \in \bigcup_{N=-D}^D \left(\mathcal{D}^{(N+S_j(x))}(\overline{M}) \cap V_k^{(T^j(x))} \right)$$

if and only if

$$\begin{cases} S_i(x) = S_j(x) + N \\ \overline{T}^i(x) \in \overline{M} \cap \mathcal{D}^{-(N+S_j(x))}(V_k^{(T^j(x))}) \end{cases}$$

in other words, with hypothesis (d),

$$\begin{cases} S_i(x) = S_j(x) + N \\ \overline{T}^i(x) \in \overline{M} \cap \mathcal{D}^{-N}(V_k^{(\overline{T}^j(x))}) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

So ν_n can be fully expressed on $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ with comparisons between $\overline{T}^i, \overline{T}^j$ and S_i, S_j :

$$\nu_n(x) := \sum_{N=-D}^D \sum_{k=1}^D 2k \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} 1_{\{S_i=S_j+N\}} 1_{\mathcal{D}^{-N}(V_k^{(\overline{T}^j(x))}) \cap \overline{M}} \circ \overline{T}^i(x) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \nu_1(\overline{T}^i(x))$$

in order to make our hypothesis of decorrelation (e) working, we adapt ν_n into some approximation according to the partition $\xi_{-k_n}^{k_n}$:

$$\mathcal{V}_n(x) := \sum_{N=-D}^D \sum_{k=1}^D 2k \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} 1_{\{S_i=S_j+N\}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} 1_A \circ \overline{T}^j(x) 1_{\mathcal{D}^{-N}(V_k^{(x_A)}) \cap \overline{M}} \circ \overline{T}^i(x).$$

Let's give here some sketch of the proof : In (4), hypothesis (f) states that the Birkhoff sum S_n acts like a random walk whereas the decorrelation in hypothesis (e) states that $e_{(i,j)} := \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} 1_A \circ \overline{T}^j(x) 1_{\mathcal{D}^{-N}(V_k^{(x_A)}) \cap \overline{M}} \circ \overline{T}^i(x)$ has e_I as asymptotic mean (along with some control on its fluctuations). So separating \mathcal{V}_n into an increasing offset part and its fluctuations we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_n &:= \sum_{N=-D}^D \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} 1_{\{S_i=S_j+N\}} e_I + \sum_{N=-D}^D \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} 1_{\{S_i=S_j+N\}} (e_I - e_{(i,j)}) \\ \mathcal{V}_n &\simeq \sum_{N=-D}^D \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n(N+l) N_n(l) e_I \end{aligned}$$

Where $N_n(N) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{\{S_i=N\}}$ is the local time of the "random walk" S_n . Thanks to known results in probability theory [9] local time of random walks

satisfies convergence in law to the one of a Brownian motion

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}N_{[nt]}(\lfloor \cdot n^{1/2} \rfloor) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} (L_t(\cdot))_t$$

And thus giving that $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}}$ acts like an integral on a process with discrete values,

$$\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\mathcal{V}_{[nt]} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_t^2(x) dx.$$

which should prove the theorem.

Here is the formal proof, we make sure here that \mathcal{V}_n is a good approximation of ν_n :

Proposition 5.1. *Under the hypotheses of theorem 3.7,*

(1)

$$\|\nu_n - \mathcal{V}_n\|_{L^1_{\mu}} = o(n^{3/2})$$

(2)

$$\lim_n \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{k=1}^D k \mu(A^{[k_n]}) \mu(V_k^{(x_A)}) = e_I$$

where $\Gamma := \mu(\overline{M})$ and e_I is a constant given in theorem 3.7. ,

Proof. Denote

$$E_{i,n}^k := \overline{M} \cap T^{-n}(V_k^{(T^i x)}) = \bigcup_{N=-D}^D \left((S_n = N + S_i) \cap \overline{T}^{-n}(\mathcal{D}^{-N}(V_k^{(\overline{T}^i x)}) \cap \overline{M}) \right).$$

for $x \in \overline{M}$ and $n \in \overline{M}$, $\nu_n(x)$ is equivalent to

$$\nu_n(x) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{0 < i < j < n-1} 1_{E_{i,j}^k}(x) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \nu_1(T^i x).$$

From now on, denote, $V_m^{(A)} := V_m^{(x_A)}$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$. $A \cap E_{0,n}^k$ may be approximated by $A^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n}((V_k^{(A)})^{[k_n]})$:

$$\left(A^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n}((V_k^{(A)})^{[k_n]}) \right) \Delta \left(A \cap E_{0,n}^k \right) \subset \left(((A)^{[k_n]} \setminus (A)^-) \cap T^{-n}(B_A^{[k_n]} \cup (V_k^{(A)})^{[k_n]}) \right) \cup A^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n}(B_A^{[k_n]})$$

In order to apply hypothesis (e) on sets with shape $A' \cap T^{-n}B'$, we divide them according to copies $D^N \overline{M}$ of \overline{M}

$$A' \cap T^{-n}B' = \bigcup_{N=-D}^D A' \cap \overline{T}^{-n}(\mathcal{D}^{-N}B' \cap \overline{M}) \cap (S_n = N).$$

when $E \subset \overline{M}$, since $\mu(E) = \Gamma \overline{\mu}(E)$, hypothesis (e) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n} B_A^{[k_n]}) &= \sum_{N=-D}^D \Gamma \bar{\mu} \left((A)^{[k_n]} \cap \{S_n = N\} \cap \overline{T^{-n}(\mathcal{D}^{-N}(B_A^{[k_n]}) \cap \overline{M})} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{N=-D}^D \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{N^2}{2\Sigma(n-2k_n)}}}{(2\pi\Sigma(n-2k_n))^{1/2}} \bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) \mu(B_A^{[k_n]}) + ck_n \bar{\mu}((A^{[k_n]})^{1/p} (n-2k_n)^{-1}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

And according to upper bounds in (g), since $\bar{\mu}((\partial A)^{[k_n]}) = o(n^{-\beta})$ for all $\beta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) &\leq \bar{\mu}(A) + \bar{\mu}(\partial A)^{[k_n]} = O(n^{-1/10}) \\ \mu(B_A^{[k_n]}) &= O(n^{-1/20}). \end{aligned}$$

And so the second term in the above inequalities is in $O(n^{-1+\frac{1}{9p}})$ with $p > 1$ (hypothesis (e)), thus giving an upper bound uniform in the choice of A

$$\mu(A^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n} B_A^{[k_n]}) = O(n^{-13/20}).$$

The same reasoning (limit local theorem with decorrelation in hypothesis (e) and then upper bounds from hypothesis (g)) on $((\partial A)^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n}(B_A^{[k_n]} \cup (V_k^{(A)})^{[k_n]}))$ gives

$$\mu((\partial A)^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n}(B_A^{[k_n]} \cup (V_k^{(A)})^{[k_n]})) = O(n^{-13/20}).$$

with uniform upper bound in the choice of A . And so

$$\mu \left(\left(A^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-n}((V_k^{(A)})^{[k_n]}) \right) \Delta(A \cap E_{0,n}^k) \right) = O(n^{-13/20}) \quad (5)$$

Then the first point of proposition 5.1 holds : Indeed, according to hypothesis (b), $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \nu_1(T^i x) = O(n)$ and since for all $x \in \overline{M}$, $1_{E_{i,j}^k}(x) = 1_{E_{0,j-i}^k} \circ \overline{T}^i(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n(x) &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{i < j=1}^n 1_{E_{i,j}^k}(x) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \nu_1(T^i x) \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{i < j=1}^n 1_{E_{0,j-i}^k} \circ \overline{T}^i(x) + O(n) \\ &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{i < j=1}^n \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} 1_A \circ \overline{T}^j(x) 1_{E_{0,j-i}^k} \circ \overline{T}^i(x) + O(n). \end{aligned}$$

Relation (5), comparisons series-integrals and $|\mathcal{A}_n| = O(n^{1/10})$ then ensure,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu_n - \mathcal{V}_n\|_{L^1} &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{i < j=1}^n \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \mu \left(\left(A^{[k_n]} \cap T^{-(j-i)}((V_k^{(x_A)})^{[k_n]}) \right) \Delta(A \cap E_{0,n}^k) \right) + O(n) \\ &= O(n) + O(n^{29/20}) = o(n^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Let's show second point of the theorem :

Remind that

$$e_I := \int_{\overline{M} \times \overline{M}} |[\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(y), \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(T(y))] \cap [\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(x), \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(T(x))]| d\mu(y) d\mu(x) = \int_{\overline{M}} \sum_{k=1}^D k \mu(V_k^{(x)}) d\mu(x).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^D k \mu(A^{[k_n]}) \mu(V_k^{(x_A)}) - \int_A \sum_{k=1}^D k \mu(V_k^{(x)}) d\mu(x) \right| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^D k \left(\mu((\partial A)^{[k_n]}) + \mu(A^{[k_n]}) \mu(B_A^{[k_n]}) \right) \\ &\leq C \mu(A) n^{-1/20}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Summing over all $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$ the conclusion is reached :

$$e_I := \int_{\overline{M}} \sum_{k=1}^D k \mu(V_k^{(x)}) d\mu(x) = \lim_n \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{k=1}^D k \mu(A^{[k_n]}) \mu(V_k^{(x_A)}).$$

□

5.1. control in L^1 norm. Let's prove the following intermediate result which underlines the role of the discrete local time $N_n(l) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{S_i=l}$:

Proposition 5.2. *Keeping notations and hypotheses from theorem 3.7,*

$$\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \left\| \nu_n - \Gamma^{-2} e_I \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n^2(x) \right\|_{L_{\overline{\mu}}^1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thanks to prop 5.1 it is enough to study the $L_{\overline{\mu}}^1$ convergence of

$$\mathcal{V}_n := \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{k=1}^D 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} k 1_{A^{[k_n]} \circ \overline{T}^i} 1_{C_{A,N}^k} \circ \overline{T}^j 1_{S_{j-i}=N} \circ \overline{T}^i.$$

Where $C_{A,N}^{k,n} := \mathcal{D}^{-N}((V_k^{(A)})^{[k_n]}) \cap \overline{M}$.

Step 1 shows the $L_{\overline{\mu}}^2$ convergence of

$$\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \mathcal{V}_n - \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \overline{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) \overline{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n(x) N_n(x+N) \right) \xrightarrow{L^2} 0.$$

And Step 2 the asymptotic identification in $L_{\overline{\mu}}^1$

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\overline{\mu}} \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq n-1} \overline{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) \overline{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) 1_{\{S_{j-i}=N\}} \circ \overline{T}^i \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \overline{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) \overline{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n(x)^2 \right| \right) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

The probabilistic convergence of the local time $N_n(\cdot)$ would enable us to conclude.

5.2. **Technical Lemma.** Next lemma is required to prove second step :

Lemma 5.3. *Given integers $N, N' \leq D$, and functions f, g, f', g' so that one of them could be written as $1_A - \bar{\mu}(A)$ where A is a union of elements from $\xi_{-k_n}^{k_n}$, the other being linear combination of 1_B with $B \in \xi_{-k_n}^{k_n}$, then*

$$\sum_{0 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n-1} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) = o(n^3).$$

with $o(n^3)$ uniform in $\|f\|_\infty, \|f'\|_\infty, \|g\|_\infty$ and $\|g'\|_\infty$.

In order to prove this, we use the intermediate lemma,

Lemma 5.4. *There is a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for all $a \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{|r| \leq a} e^{-r^2/a} \leq C_0 a^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Comparison series/integrals through Riemann series, give for all $r \geq 1$,

$$e^{-r^2/a} \leq \int_{r-1}^r e^{-t^2/a} dt,$$

summing over r

$$\frac{1}{(\pi a)^{1/2}} \sum_{1 \leq |r| \leq a} e^{-r^2/a} \leq \frac{1}{(\pi a)^{1/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-t^2/a} dt.$$

The change of variable $u = \frac{t}{a^{1/2}}$ gives the conclusion. \square

proof of lemma 5.3. In order to prove the lemma it is enough to consider characteristic functions 1_A where A is a union of elements of $\xi_{-k_n}^{k_n}$ and since one of the function is supposed to have zero mean, to decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n-1} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) = \\ \sum_{0 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n-1} a_{i, j, k, l} \bar{\mu}(g) \bar{\mu}(f) \bar{\mu}(g') \bar{\mu}(f') + o(n^3) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The dominant term would then vanished after recombination thanks to the zero mean of one of the function f, f', g or g' .

In order to obtain this using hypothesis (e) it is necessary to fix an order between the indexes. Since the proof goes roughly the same way for each ordering of the indexes, we only treat the case when $0 \leq i \leq k \leq j \leq l$, the two other cases are done in appendix B.

Here we consider only the indexes such that at most one of the terms $k - i, j - k$ and $l - k$ goes below $2k_n$ other configurations are too scarce to matter in the total sum. First suppose $k - i \geq 2k_n + 1$ and using the \bar{T} -invariance of $\bar{\mu}$ and hypothesis (e),

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\bar{\mu}}((f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}g}) \circ \bar{T}^i (g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}}) \circ \bar{T}^k) \\
&= \sum_{|r| \leq \min(k-i+1, l-k+1, j-l+1)D} E_{\bar{\mu}}(1_{S_{k-i=N-r}g} (g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'-r}f}) \circ \bar{T}^{j-k} 1_{S_{j-k=r}}) \circ \bar{T}^{k-i}) \\
&= \sum_{|r| \leq \min(k-i+1, l-k+1, j-l+1)D} \left(\bar{\mu}(g) \bar{\mu}(A_r) \frac{e^{-(N-r)^2 / ((2\Sigma(k-i-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2} (k-i-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n \bar{\mu}(A_r)^{1/p}}{k-i-2k_n} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Where $A_r := g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} (1_{S_{l-j=N'-r}f}) \circ \bar{T}^{j-k} 1_{S_{j-k=r}}$. When $k-i \leq 2k_n$, the expectancy is bounded above by $\sum_{|r| \leq \min(k-i+1, j-k+1, l-j+1)D} \bar{\mu}(A_r)$.

Passing from first to second line in (8) is due to the following decomposition,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{T}^{-i}(S_{j-i=N}) \cap \bar{T}^{-k}(S_{l-k=N'}) \\
&= \bigsqcup_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \bar{T}^{-i}(\{S_{k-i=N-r}\} \cap \bar{T}^{-(k-i)}\{S_{j-k=r}\}) \cap \bar{T}^{-j}\{S_{l-j=N'-r}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ is bounded above by D ,

$$\|S_n\|_{\infty} \leq nD$$

And thus, $\{S_{k-i=N-r}, S_{j-k=r}, S_{l-k=N'-r}\}$ is non empty if and only if $N-r \leq (k-i)D$, $r \leq (j-k)D$ and $N'-r \leq (l-k)D$ which means

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{T}^{-i}(S_{j-i=N}) \cap \bar{T}^{-k}(S_{l-k=N'}) \\
&= \bigsqcup_{r \leq \min(k-i+1, l-k+1, j-k+1)D} \bar{T}^{-i}(S_{k-i=N-r}) \cap \bar{T}^{-k}(S_{j-k=r}) \cap \bar{T}^{-j}(S_{l-j=N'-r}).
\end{aligned}$$

Giving the sum in r in (8).

Hypothesis (e) also applies on the expression of A_r whenever $j-k \geq 2k_n$

:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mu}(A_r) &= \bar{\mu} \left(g' 1_{S_{j-k=r}} \left(f f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-j} 1_{S_{l-j=N'-r}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{j-k} \right) \\
&= \bar{\mu}(g') \bar{\mu}(B_r) \frac{e^{-r^2 / (2\Sigma(j-k-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2} (j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n \bar{\mu}(B_r)^{1/p}}{j-k-2k_n} \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{(1+ck_n) \bar{\mu}(B)^{1/p}}{(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \tag{10}$$

where $B_r := f f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-j} 1_{S_{l-j=N'-r}}$. When $j-k \leq 2k_n$, $\bar{\mu}(A_r) \leq \bar{\mu}(B_r)$. Then applying again hypothesis (e) on B_r whenever $l-j \geq 2k_n + 1$,

$$\bar{\mu}(B_r) = \frac{\bar{\mu}(f')\bar{\mu}(f)e^{-(N'-r)^2/(2\Sigma(l-j-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(l-j-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n\bar{\mu}(f)^{1/p}}{l-j-2k_n} \quad (11)$$

$$\leq \frac{1+ck_n}{(l-j-2k_n)^{1/2}}. \quad (12)$$

Thus, when $k-i \leq 2k_n$, the next sum is bounded above thanks to inequalities (10) and (12) :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=i}^{i+2k_n} \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \sum_{l=j}^{n-1} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=Ng}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=i}^{i+2k_n} \sum_{j=k}^n \sum_{l=j}^n \bar{\mu}(A_r) \end{aligned}$$

(10) gives $\bar{\mu}(A_r) \leq \frac{(1+ck_n)\bar{\mu}(B)^{1/p}}{(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \leq \frac{(1+ck_n)}{(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}}$ whenever $j-k \geq 2k_n+1$, and thus

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=i}^{i+2k_n} \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \sum_{l=j}^{n-1} \bar{\mu}(A_r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=i}^{i+2k_n} \sum_{j=k+2k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{l=j}^{n-1} \frac{(1+ck_n)}{(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} + 2k_n^2 n^2 = o(n^3).$$

The same reasoning after using (8) when $k \geq i+2k_n$ gives

$$E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=Ng}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) \leq 2D \min(k-i+1, l-k+1, j-l+1) \frac{(1+ck_n)}{(k-i-2k_n)^{1/2}}$$

And so we get the same upper bound for the partial sums

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=i+2k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{j=k}^{k+2k_n} \sum_{l=j}^{n-1} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=Ng}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) = o(n^3)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=i+2k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \sum_{l=j}^{j+2k_n} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=Ng}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) = o(n^3).$$

The only terms left are those for which $k-i > 2k_n$, $j-k > 2k_n$ and $l-k > 2k_n$. (10) in A_r , the decorrelation in (8) and then the upper bound (12) in the first error term from A_r gives the following expansion:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\mu}(g)\overline{\mu}(A_r) \frac{e^{-(N-r)^2/(2\Sigma)(k-i-2k_n)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(k-i-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n\overline{\mu}(A_r)^{1/p}}{k-i-2k_n} \\
&= \overline{\mu}(g) \left(\overline{\mu}(g')\overline{\mu}(B_r) \frac{e^{-r^2/(2\Sigma)(j-k-2k_n)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n\overline{\mu}(B_r)^{1/p}}{j-k-2k_n} \right) \frac{e^{-(N-r)^2/(2\Sigma)(k-i-2k_n)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(k-i-2k_n)^{1/2}} \\
&\pm \frac{ck_n}{k-i-2k_n} \left(\frac{(1+ck_n)\overline{\mu}(B_r)^{1/p}}{(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/p} \\
&= \frac{e^{-(N-r)^2/(2\Sigma)(k-i-2k_n)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(k-i-2k_n)^{1/2}} \overline{\mu}(g) \left(\overline{\mu}(g')\overline{\mu}(f')\overline{\mu}(f) \frac{e^{-r^2/(2\Sigma)(j-k-2k_n)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \frac{e^{-(N'-r)^2/(2\Sigma)(l-j-2k_n)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(l-j-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \pm \frac{ck_n\overline{\mu}(g')\overline{\mu}(f)^{1/p}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}(l-j-2k_n)} \pm \frac{ck_n(1+ck_n)^{1/p}}{(j-k-2k_n)(l-j-2k_n)^{1/(2p)}} \right) \\
&\pm 2 \frac{ck_n}{k-i-2k_n} \left(\frac{(1+ck_n)}{(j-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/p} \left(\frac{\overline{\mu}(f)\overline{\mu}(f')e^{-(N'-r)^2/(2\Sigma)(l-j)}}{(l-j-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/p^2} \pm \left(\frac{ck_n\overline{\mu}(f)^{1/p}}{l-j-2k_n} \right)^{1/p^2} \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

Except for the main term (13) which has the shape wished in (7), all the error terms give an upper bound in $o(n^3)$ when summed over $0 \leq i \leq k \leq j \leq l \leq n-1$ and $r \leq D \min(k-i, j-k, l-j)$. Here the proof is given for the first term (the one with exponential factor) in (14) other terms are treated the same way :

denoting $u = k-i, v = j-k$ and $w = l-j$, and reminding that $p < (\frac{3}{2})^{1/2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{u=k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{v=k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{w=k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{r=0}^w \frac{k_n^2 e^{-(N-r)^2/(2p^2\Sigma w)}}{uv^{1/p}w^{1/(2p^2)}} = \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{u=k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{v=k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{w=k_n}^{n-1} O\left(\frac{k_n^2 w^{1/2}}{uv^{1/p}w^{1/(2p^2)}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{u=k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{v=k_n}^{n-1} \sum_{w=k_n}^{n-1} O\left(\frac{w^{1/2}}{uv^{1/p}w^{1/(2p^2)}} \right) \\
&= O(k_n^2 (\ln n) n^{3/2} n^{1-\frac{1}{2p}} n^{1-\frac{1}{2p^2}}) = o(n^3).
\end{aligned}$$

The error term is in $o(n^3)$ which concludes the lemma □

5.3. Preuve de la proposition 5.2. Step 1:

Lemma 5.5. *Sequence*

$$\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \left(\mathcal{V}_n - \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \overline{\mu}(A^{[kn]}) \overline{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) N_n(x+N) N_n(x) \right) \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$$

converges in $L_{\overline{\mu}}^2$ toward 0.

Proof. Noticing that

$$\sum_{|N| \leq D} N_n(x+N)N_n(x) = n + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \sum_{|N| \leq D} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} \circ \bar{T}^{j-i},$$

and using the inequalities of convexity, enable to approximate the quantity as follow.

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(\mathcal{V}_n - \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) \bar{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) N_n(x+N) N_n(x) \right)^2 \right) \leq \\ & 2E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} \left((1_{A^{[k_n]}} - \bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]})) \circ \bar{T}^i 1_{C_{A,N}^k} \circ \bar{T}^j \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \left. + \bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) (1_{C_{A,N}^k} - \bar{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k)) \circ \bar{T}^j \right) 1_{S_{j-i=N}} \circ \bar{T}^i \right)^2 \right) + o(n^2) \\ & \leq 4(E_1 + E_2). \end{aligned}$$

Where

$$E_1 := E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} \left((1_{A^{[k_n]}} - \bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]})) 1_{C_{A,N}^k} \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} \circ \bar{T}^i \right)^2 \right) \right)$$

and

$$E_2 := E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} 2 \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} \left(\bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) (1_{C_{A,N}^k} - \bar{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k)) \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} \circ \bar{T}^i \right)^2 \right) \right).$$

In both expressions, the terms within the sum may be written as

$$fg \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} \circ \bar{T}^i.$$

with $(f, g) := (1_{C_{A,N}^k} - \bar{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) 1, 1_{C_{A,N}^k})$ for E_1 and $(f, g) := (\bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) 1, (1_{C_{A,N}^k} - \bar{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) 1))$ for E_2 .

So the expression to estimate for N and N' fixed are of the kind of lemma 5.3 :

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j, i \leq k \leq l \leq n-1} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(fg \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} \left(f'g' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{k-i} \right).$$

Since one of the function have zero mean, the conclusion of the lemma hold and the expression is in $o(n^3)$.

$$E_1 = o(n^3),$$

$$E_2 = o(n^3).$$

This shows lemma 5.5. □

Step 2:

Lemma 5.6. For $l \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n^2(x) - N_n(x)N_n(x+l) \right| \right) = o(n^{3/2})$$

Proof. Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the upper bound $E_{\bar{\mu}}(|N_n(x) - N_n(y)|^2) = O(n^{1/2}|x - y|)$ from hypothesis (f) :

$$E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n^2(x) - N_n(x)N_n(x+l) \right| \right) \leq E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |N_n(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |N_n(x) - N_n(x+l)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Show that $E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |N_n(x) - N_n(x+l)|^2 \right) = o(n^{3/2})$ by fixing $a \in [\frac{1}{4}; \frac{1}{2}[$ and applying hypothesis (f),

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |N_n(x) - N_n(x+l)|^2 \right) &\leq n^2 \bar{\mu} \left(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} |S_k| \geq n^{a+1/2} \right) \\ &\quad + E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{-n^{a+1/2} \leq x \leq n^{a+1/2}} |N_n(x) - N_n(x+l)|^2 \right) \\ &\leq n^2 \frac{1}{n^{2a+1}} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} (S_k^2) \right) + O \left(n^{a+1/2} |l| n^{1/2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We apply the following theorem from P.Billingsley ([1] p.102) on S_n which follows the relation from hypothesis (c), $E_{\bar{\mu}}(|S_n|^2) = O(n)$.

Theorem 5.7 ([1]). Given $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of centered random variable such that there are constants $\alpha > 0$ and $v \geq 0$ and there is a sequence $(u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of non negative numbers satisfying for all $a, n \geq 1$

$$E \left(\left| \sum_{i=a+1}^{a+n} X_i \right|^\alpha \right) \leq \left(\sum_{i=a+1}^{a+n} u_i \right)^v,$$

then there is some constant $K > 0$ satisfying

$$E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=a+1}^{a+n} X_i \right|^\alpha \right) \leq \log(4n) \left(\sum_{i=a+1}^{a+n} u_i \right)^v.$$

This theorem gives a constant $K > 0$ such that the following inequality holds for all $n \geq 0$

$$E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} (S_k^2) \right) \leq Kn(\log(n)).$$

Once introduced in the previous inequality, it leads to

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |N_n(x) - N_n(x+l)|^2 \right) &= O(n^2 \frac{1}{n^{2a+1}} n(\ln(n)) + O(n^{a+1/2} |l| n^{1/2})) \\ &= o(n^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

And since the local limit theorem in hypothesis (e) gives

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n(x)^2 \right) &= E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} 1_{S_i=x} 1_{S_j=x} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} 2 \sum_{i < j} E_{\bar{\mu}}(1_{S_{j-i}=0} \circ T^j 1_{S_i=x}) + O(n) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i < j} E_{\bar{\mu}}(1_{S_{j-i}=0}) + O(n) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i < j} C n^{-1/2} + O(n) \\ &= O(n^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

We reach the conclusion

$$E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n^2(x) - N_n(x) N_n(x+l) \right| \right) = o(n^{3/2}).$$

□

proof of proposition 5.2. Propositions 5.1 alongside the above lemmas 5.5 and 5.6 give the following result

$$E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \left| \mathcal{V}_n - \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \mu(A) \mu(C_{A,N}^k) \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_n^2(x) \right| \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Here is shown that hypotheses (e) and (f) ensure the assumptions of the following proposition (proposition 2.1 of [9])

Proposition 5.8. *Let $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random walk on \mathbb{Z} and denote $N_n(a) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1_{S_i=a}$ its local time satisfying*

- (1) *The sequence of processes $\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} S_{[nt]} \right)_{t \geq 0}$ converges in law according to metric J_1 toward some Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with local time $(L_t)_{t \geq 0}$,*
- (2) $\sup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \|n^{-1/2} N_n(n^{1/2}a)\|_{L^2} < \infty$,
- (3) $\limsup_{b \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|n^{-1/2} N_n(n^{1/2}a) - n^{-1/2} N_n(n^{1/2}(a+b))\|_{L^2} = 0$,

Then finite dimensional distributions (f.d.d) of the sequence of processes $(N_{[nt]}(\cdot))_{t \geq 0}$ converge to those of $(L_t(\cdot))_{t \geq 0}$ in the space $(L^p(\mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_{L^p})$, where $(L_t(\cdot))_{t \geq 0}$ stands for a local time of Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

Assumption (1) is stated in Hypothesis (f), which also ensures that assumption (3) holds :

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{b \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|n^{-1/2} N_n(\lfloor n^{1/2} a \rfloor) - n^{-1/2} N_n(\lfloor n^{1/2} (a+b) \rfloor)\|_{L^2}^2 = \\ \limsup_{b \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} O(|n^{-1/2} \lfloor n^{1/2} a \rfloor - n^{-1/2} \lfloor n^{1/2} (a+b) \rfloor|) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Assumption (2) is then satisfied using hypothesis (e) and comparisons series/integrals,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\bar{\mu}}(n^{-1} |N_n(a)|^2) &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1} E_{\bar{\mu}}(1_{S_{j-i}=0} \circ \bar{T}^i 1_{S_i = \lfloor n^{1/2} a \rfloor}) = O\left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{n-1} \sum_{u=0}^{n-1} \frac{\bar{\mu}(S_u = 0)}{(i-k_n)^{1/2}}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{u=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{u^{1/2}} \frac{1}{i^{1/2}}\right) = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Where O is taken uniformly in a and n .

Thus the sequence of processes $\left((N_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}(x))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in f.d.d sens toward the process $(L_t(\cdot))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ where $L_t(\cdot)$ is seen as an element of (L^2) . Since the function $L(\cdot) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} L^2(x) dx$ is continuous on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, we get the following convergence in the f.d.d sense

$$\left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}^2(x)\right)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \xrightarrow{L^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} L_t^2(x) dx\right)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}.$$

To conclude, notice that equation (6) page 18 gives the almost sure convergence of

$$\sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \bar{\mu}(A^{[k_n]}) \bar{\mu}(C_{A,N}^k) = \Gamma^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^D k \sum_{|N| \leq D} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \mu(A^{[k_n]}) \mu(C_{A,N}^k)$$

toward $\Gamma^{-2} e_I$, and thus Slutsky lemma gives the conclusion of the convergence in the f.d.d sense of $\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}\right)_{t \geq 0}$ toward $(\Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_t^2(x) dx)_{t \geq 0}$. \square

5.4. Proof of theorem 3.7 and 3.9. In what follows, $(M_\tau, \varphi^\tau, \mu_\tau)$ is a suspension flow over (M, T, μ) with roof function τ which is isomorphic to $(\mathcal{M}_0, \varphi^0, L_0)$.

Denotes in this subsection, $\mu_0(\cdot) := \bar{\mu}(\cdot \cap \overline{M})$ a probabilistic measure on M .

Remark 5.9. Let f be a bounded continuous function on $(D[0, \infty), J_1)$ the Skorohod space with metric J_1 (see appendix A),

$$E_{\mu_0}(f(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_n)) = \int_{\overline{M}} f(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_n(x) d\bar{\mu}(x)) = E_{\bar{\mu}}(f(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_n)).$$

Denote in what follows $\nu_n^0(t) := (\lfloor nt \rfloor + 1 - nt)\nu_{\lfloor nt \rfloor} + (nt - \lfloor nt \rfloor)\nu_{\lfloor nt \rfloor + 1}$ the continuous process from ν_n . Both processes are close to each other

$$\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \|\nu_n^0(\cdot) - \nu_{\lfloor n \cdot \rfloor}\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \leq \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} (nt - \lfloor nt \rfloor)(2\lfloor nt \rfloor + 1)D,$$

and thus $\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \|\nu_n^0(t) - \nu_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \rightarrow 0$, μ_0 almost surely. Which implies that convergence according to metric J_1 (resp for f.d.ds) of $\left(\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_n^0(t) \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equivalent to the convergence $\left(\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to the same limit according to measure μ_0 .

Studying the continuous process enables the use of the following lemma.

Lemma 5.10. *Let $((\nu_n^0(t))_{t \in [0, T]})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of continuous non decreasing processes on $[0, T]$ converging in f.d.d sense toward some process X continuous on $[0, T]$. Then $((\nu_n^0(t))_{t \in [0, T]})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution on $C^0([0, T], \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. The process $(\nu_n^0(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is non-decreasing, thus it satisfies Skorohod criterion (see theorems 3.1 and 3.2 of [21]) for M_1 metric (see A),

$$w_{\delta, H}(\nu_n^0) = 0$$

with

$$w_{\delta, H}(Z) := \sup_{0 < t < t_1 < t_2 < 1, |t_1 - t_2| \leq \delta} M(Z(t_1), Z(t), Z(t_2)).$$

and M being the oscillation function

$$M(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_2 \in [x_1, x_2] \\ \min(|x_1 - x_2|, |x_3 - x_2|) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Since $(\nu_n^0(\cdot))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies Skorohod criterion and converge in f.d.d sense to X , according to theorems 3.1 and 3.2 from [21] converge in law to X for M_1 metric.

Let f be a bounded uniformly continuous function on $C^0([0, T])$ (space of continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to \mathbb{R}) with supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$. The topology induced by M_1 is equivalent to the induced topology for supremum norm. f is still continuous on this space with M_1 metric. The space $C^0([0, T])$ being dense in the completion of $D([0, T])$ for M_1 metric, f may be uniquely extended into bounded continuous function \tilde{f} on $D([0, T])$ for M_1 . Thus convergence in law of $(\nu_n^0(\cdot))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to X gives

$$E_{\mu}(f(\nu_n^0)) = E_{\mu}(\tilde{f}(\nu_n^0)) \rightarrow E(\tilde{f}(X)) = E(f(X)).$$

Thus $(\nu_n^0(\cdot))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in distribution to X . \square

Theorem 3.7 along with previous lemma gives J_1 -convergence of $\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_n^0(t) \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \nu_{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$ to $(\Gamma^{-2} e_I \int L_t^2(x) dx)_{t \in [0, T]}$ for measure $\bar{\mu}$ on \bar{M} proving theorem 3.7.

proof theorem 3.9. Remind here that n_t is the number of "collisions" on the Poincaré section up to time t :

$$n_t(x) = \sup \left\{ n, \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \tau \circ T^k(x) \leq t \right\}.$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $x \in M$.

Since $(n_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is non decreasing in t and not bounded, Birkhoff theorem on $(\overline{M}, \overline{T}, \overline{\mu})$ gives, for $\overline{\mu}$ -almost every $x \in \overline{M} \subset M$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t}{n_t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{k=0}^{n_t} \tau \circ \overline{T}^k \stackrel{p.s.}{=} E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau). \quad (15)$$

Convergence then holds μ_0 -almost surely on M .

Proposition 5.11. *For any $S \in \mathbb{R}_+$, process $(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \circ \pi)_{s \in [0, S]}$ strongly converges in distribution (J_1) on the suspension flow $(M_\tau, \varphi^\tau, \mu_\tau)$ to $(E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx)_{s \in [0, S]}$ when t goes to infinity.*

Proof. Comparing $(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{[ts]})_{s \in [0, S]}$ and $(\frac{1}{[t]^{3/2}} \nu_{[s[t]]})_{s \in [0, S]}$, the process $(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{[ts]})_{s \in [0, S]}$ still converges when t goes to infinity toward $(\Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx)_{s \in [0, S]}$.

According to theorem 3.9 from [2], the convergence in distribution (J_1) with respect to measure μ_0 of $\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{[t \cdot]}$ along with the μ_0 -almost sure convergence of $(\frac{n_{ts}}{t})_{s \in [0, S]}$ to $(\frac{s}{E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)})_{s \in [0, S]}$ implies the following convergence in law

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}^{\mu_0}}{=} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_{s/E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)}^2(x) dx.$$

Thanks to the occupation time formula, and the self similarity of brownian motion $\int_{\mathbb{R}} L_{s/E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)}^2(x) dx$ satisfies for any measurable function f on \mathbb{R} :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) L_{s/E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)}^2(x) dx &= \int_0^{s/E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)} f(B_t) dt \\ &= E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1} \int_0^s f(B_{t/E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)}) dt \\ &= E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1} \int_0^s f\left(\frac{1}{E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2}} B'_t\right) dt \\ &= E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f\left(\frac{x}{E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2}}\right) L'_s(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u) E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1/2} L'_s(u E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2}) du. \end{aligned}$$

Where B' is a Brownian motion with the same law as B and $(L'_s)_{s \geq 0}$ an associated local time. Thus $L_{s/E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)} = E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1/2} L'_s(u E_{\overline{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2})$ almost

surely. And thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} &\stackrel{\mathcal{L}\mu_0}{=} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_{s/E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)}^2(x) dx \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2}) dx \\ &= E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left\| \left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \right) \circ T - \frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \right\|_{\infty, [0, S]} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

The family of processes $\left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \right)_{s \geq 0} \right)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the assumption of theorem 1 from [26] for probability measure μ_0 , thus it strongly converges in distribution (J_1) on the system (M, T, μ) to the process $E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx$ when t tends to infinity.

Now show the convergence in law for the family of processes $\left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \circ \pi \right)_{s \geq 0} \right)_{t \geq 0}$ on the suspension flow $(M_\tau, \varphi^\tau, \mu_\tau)$:

Let P be a probability measure absolutely continuous according to μ_τ and F a continuous function on \mathbb{R} , denoting $dP(x, u) = g(x, u) d\mu_\tau(x, u)$:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mu_\tau} \left(f \left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \circ \pi \right)_{s \geq 0} \right) \right) &= \int_M \int_0^{\tau(x)} f \left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \circ \pi(x, u) \right)_{s \geq 0} \right) g(x, u) d\lambda d\mu \\ &= \int_M f \left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}}(x, 0) \right)_{s \geq 0} \right) \int_0^{\tau(x)} g(x, u) d\lambda d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_0^{\tau(x)} g(x, u) d\lambda d\mu$ is a probability measure on M absolutely continuous with respect to the measure μ . The strong convergence in law of $\left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}}^0 \right)_{s \geq 0} \right)_{t \geq 0}$ over (M, T, μ) gives the conclusion for $S > 0$,

$$E_{\mu_\tau} \left(f \left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \right)_{s \in [0, S]} \right) \right) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} E_{\mu_\tau} \left(f \left(\left(\Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx \right)_{s \in [0, S]} \right) \right).$$

In other words, the sequence of processes $\left(\left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \right)_{s \in [0, S]} \right)_{t \geq 0}$ strongly converges in law on $(M_\tau, \varphi, \mu_\tau)$ to $\left(E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx \right)_{s \in [0, S]}$. \square

To conclude the proof of theorem 3.9, let just remind that the number of self intersections after the last collision n_t , ν_{n_t} gives a bound over the number \mathcal{N}_t of self intersections up to t :

$$\nu_{n_t}(x) \leq \mathcal{N}_t(x, s) \leq \nu_{n_{t+1}}(Tx) \leq \nu_{n_t}(Tx) + 2(n_t + 1)D. \quad (16)$$

Where the upper bound is given by hypothesis (b). (16) ensures that for any probability measure P absolutely continuous with respect to μ_τ , and any $S > 0$,

$$E_P \left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \left\| \left(\nu_{n_{ts}} \right)_{s \geq 0} - \left(\mathcal{N}_{ts} \right)_{s \geq 0}(x, u) \right\|_{\infty, [0, S]} \right) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Thus, Slutsky theorem and the convergence of $\frac{t}{n_t}$ gives the conclusion,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \mathcal{N}_{ts} \right)_{s \in [0, S]} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \nu_{n_{ts}} \right)_{s \in [0, S]} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}^{\mu_0}}{=} \left(E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx \right)_{s \in [0, S]}.$$

□

5.5. Checking constants. Here is checked that the constant obtained previously coincides with Lalley's constant in 3.9.

Since $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}, \varphi_t, L)$ is isomorphic to the suspension flow $(\bar{M}_\tau, \tilde{\varphi}_t^\tau, \bar{\mu}_\tau / E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau))$ with roof function τ , we use the latest notations in what follows.

Lemma 5.12. *Thanks to hypothesis (b') and remark 3.8, e_I satisfies*

$$e_I = \Gamma^2 \int_{\bar{M}} \int_{\bar{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}^0(x)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(y)]}^0(y))| d\bar{\mu}(x) d\bar{\mu}(y).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} e_I &:= \int_{\bar{M}} \int_{\bar{M}} |[x] \cap [y]| d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= \Gamma^2 \int_{\bar{M}} \int_{\bar{M}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |[x] \cap [\mathcal{D}^k y]| d\bar{\mu}(x) d\bar{\mu}(y) \\ &= \int_{\bar{M}} \int_{\bar{M}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}^0(x)) \cap \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(y)]}^0(\mathcal{D}^k y))| d\bar{\mu}(x) d\bar{\mu}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $x, y \in \bar{M}$, along with hypothesis (b'),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |[x] \cap [\mathcal{D}^k y]| &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\{s \in [0, \tau(y)), \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_s^0(\mathcal{D}^k y)) \in [x]\}| \\ &= |\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \{s \in [0, \tau(y)), \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}_0^k \varphi_s^0(y)) \in [x]\}| \\ &= |\{s \in [0, \tau(y)), \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}, \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}_0^k \varphi_s^0(y)) \in \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}^0(x))\}| \\ &= |\{s \in [0, \tau(y)), \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in \varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}^0(x), \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{D}_0^k \varphi_s^0(y)) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(u)\}| \\ &= |\{s \in [0, \tau(y)), \exists u \in \varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}^0(x), \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_s^0(y)) = \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(u)\}| \\ &= |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}^0(x)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(y)]}^0(y))|. \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$e_I := \Gamma^2 \int_{\bar{M}} \int_{\bar{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(x)]}^0(x)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, \tau(y)]}^0(y))| d\bar{\mu}(x) d\bar{\mu}(y).$$

□

Proposition 5.13. *Assuming hypotheses from theorem 3.9,*

$$E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx = e'_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{L}_s^2(x) dx$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} e'_I &:= \int_{\mathcal{M}_0 \times \mathcal{M}} |\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, 1]}^0(x)) \cap \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, 1]}^0(y))| dL_0(y) dL(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, 1]}^0(x)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0, 1]}^0(y))| dL(y) dL(x) \end{aligned}$$

is the mean number of intersections between $\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}(x))$ and $\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}(y))$ for x and y taken independently according to law L .

$(\tilde{L}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ denotes a local time associated to the Brownian motion \tilde{B} seen as the limit in distribution of $\left(\frac{1}{t^{1/2}} S_{n_{tu}} \circ \pi(\cdot)\right)_{u \in [0, T]}$.

Proof. Birkhoff relation (15) page 28 and hypothesis (f) ensure the convergence in distribution (J_1) of $(n^{-1/2} S_{[nt]})_{t \geq 0}$ to $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with respect to the measure $\bar{\mu}$. Noticing that for $S > 0$, in one hand we have

$$\left\| t^{-1/2} S_{[st]} - t^{-1/2} S_{[s[t]]} \right\|_{\infty, [0, S]} \rightarrow 0$$

and on the other hand

$$\left\| 1 - \frac{[t]}{t} S_{[s[t]]} \right\|_{\infty, [0, S]} \xrightarrow{\text{proba}} 0,$$

Process $(t^{-1/2} S_{[st]})_{s \in [0, S]}$ converges in law to the Brownian motion $(B_s)_{s \in [0, S]}$ whenever $t \rightarrow \infty$. Then for any $S > 0$, theorem (3.9) from [2] provides the convergence in distribution (J_1) with respect to measure $\bar{\mu}$:

$$\left(t^{-1/2} S_{n_{ts}} \right)_{s \in [0, S]} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow \infty} (B_{s/E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)})_{s \in [0, S]}$$

$$(t^{-1/2} S_{n_{ts}})_{s \in [0, S]} \text{ converge to } (\tilde{B}_s)_{s \in [0, S]} := (E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1/2} B_s)_{s \in [0, S]}.$$

Here we study the local time \tilde{L} and its related Brownian motion \tilde{B} : for any measurable function f on \mathbb{R} , the occupation time formula and the self similarity of the Brownian motion give

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^s f(E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-1/2} B_t) dt &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f\left(\frac{x}{E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2}}\right) L_s(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(u) E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2} L_s(E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2} u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tilde{L}_s = E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2} L_s(E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2} u)$ almost surely

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{L}_s^2(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau) L_s^2(E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2} u) du = E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx.$$

And thus

$$E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx = E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{L}_s^2(x) dx.$$

We conclude using next lemma.

Lemma 5.14.

$$E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I = e'_I$$

Proof. Here we show that $\Gamma^{-2} e_I$ coincides with the measure

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_0^{\tau(x)} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_0^{\tau(y)} |\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(x, t)) \cap \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(y, s))| dt d\bar{\mu}(x) ds d\bar{\mu}(y) \\ &= E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^2 \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}(x, t)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}(y, s))| dL dL. \end{aligned}$$

Last equation gives an expression of $\frac{e_t}{\Gamma^2 E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^2}$ as the mean number of intersections between the "trajectories" of two flows running up to time 1 with starting point taken randomly.

Here let B be a measurable set such that for $\bar{\mu}_\tau$ -almost all x

$$|\{s \in [0, 1], \tilde{\varphi}_s^\tau(x, t) \in B\}| \leq D.$$

Denote for any $x \in \overline{M}$,

$$F(x) := |\{s \in [0, \tau(x)], \tilde{\varphi}_s^\tau(x) \in B\}|.$$

and for $(x, t) \in \overline{M}_\tau$,

$$f(x, t) := |\{s \in [0, 1], \tilde{\varphi}_s^\tau(x, t) \in B\}|.$$

Suppose both functions bounded by some constant D , let's show that

$$E_{\bar{\mu}}(F) = E_{\bar{\mu}_\tau}(f).$$

Birkhoff relation (15) page 28 on n_t along with the Birkhoff theorem applied on F ensures that for almost all $x \in \overline{M}$,

$$\frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=0}^{n_t-1} F \circ \overline{T}^k x \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty, \bar{\mu} \text{ ps}} \frac{E_{\bar{\mu}}(F)}{E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)}.$$

Left hand side sum corresponds to

$$\left| \left\{ s \in [0, \sum_{k=0}^{n_t} \tau \circ \overline{T}^k(x)], \tilde{\varphi}_s^\tau(x) \in B \right\} \right|.$$

whereas

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f \circ \tilde{\varphi}_s^\tau(x, t) ds \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty, \bar{\mu} \text{ ps}} \frac{E_{\bar{\mu}_\tau}(f)}{E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)}$$

where left hand side integral means, by definition of f ,

$$\int_0^T f \circ \tilde{\varphi}_s^\tau(x, t) ds = \sum_{s \in [0, \infty], \varphi_s^\tau(x, t) \in B} \lambda([0, T] \cap [s-1, s]) = |\{s \in [1, T], \varphi_s^\tau(x, t) \in B\}| \pm 2D.$$

Thus, for $(x, u) \in \mathcal{M}_\tau$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^t f \circ \tilde{\varphi}_s^\tau(x, u) ds - \sum_{k=0}^{n_t-1} F \circ \overline{T}^k \circ \pi(x, u) \right| \\ & \leq 4D + \left| \left\{ s \in [0, u] \cup \left[\sum_{k=0}^{n_t} \tau \circ \overline{T}^k(x), t+u \right], \varphi_s^\tau(x, u) \in B \right\} \right| \\ & \leq 4D + 2[u]D \\ & \leq 6D. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit when $t \rightarrow \infty$ in the above Birkhoff sum we get

$$\frac{E_{\bar{\mu}}(F)}{E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)} = \frac{E_{\bar{\mu}_\tau}(f)}{E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)}.$$

Thus taking $B := \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1}(\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,\tau(y)]}^{\tau}(y)))$ and applying Fubini's theorem :

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\bar{M}} \int_{\bar{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,\tau(x)]}^{\tau}(x)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,\tau(y)]}^{\tau}(y))| d\bar{\mu}(x) d\bar{\mu}(y) \\ &= \int_{\bar{M}} \int_{\bar{M}} \int_0^{\tau(x)} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(x, s)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,\tau(y)]}^{\tau}(y))| dt d\bar{\mu}(x) d\bar{\mu}(y) \\ &= \int_{\bar{M}} \int_0^{\tau(x)} \int_{\bar{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(x, s)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,\tau(y)]}^{\tau}(y))| d\bar{\mu}(y) dt d\bar{\mu}(x) \end{aligned}$$

Then choosing $B := \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1}(\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\varphi_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(x)))$, the previous reasoning gives :

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\bar{M}} \int_0^{\tau(x)} \int_{\bar{M}} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(x, s)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,\tau(y)]}^{\tau}(y))| d\bar{\mu}(y) dt d\bar{\mu}(x) \\ &= \int_{\bar{M}} \int_0^{\tau(x)} \int_{\bar{M}} \int_0^{\tau(y)} |\bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(x, s)) \cap \bar{\pi}_{\mathcal{R}}(\tilde{\varphi}_{[0,1]}^{\tau}(y, s))| ds d\bar{\mu}(y) dt d\bar{\mu}(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.14 thus gives the identification

$$E_{\bar{\mu}}(\tau)^{-3/2} \Gamma^{-2} e_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} L_s^2(x) dx = e'_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{L}_s^2(x) dx.$$

□

APPENDIX A. METRIC M_1 ET J_1 ON SKOROHOD SPACE

This section gives short definitions on metrics J_1 and M_1 on the Skorohod space $D[0, T)$ (i.e the set of right continuous and left limited functions on $[0, T)$ for $T \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$). Much more details on these metrics may be found in the books [2] or [23].

Definition A.1. Let $T > 0$, J_1 metric on the Skorohod space $D([0, T])$ is the topology defined by the following distance d_J : for all $x, y \in D([0, T])$,

$$d_J(x, y) := \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{ \|x \circ \lambda - y\|_{\infty} \vee \|\lambda - Id_{[0, T]}\|_{\infty} \}.$$

Where Λ is the set of homeomorphisms on $[0, T]$.

Such metric is thinner than metric M_1 defined in what follow :

Definition A.2. For any $x \in D([0, T])$ define the complete graph Γ_x of x by

$$\Gamma_x := \{(\alpha x(t^-) + (1 - \alpha)x(t), t), t \in [0, T], \alpha \in [0, 1]\}.$$

On Γ_x fix an ordering relation by stating that $(g, r) \leq (h, s)$ if and only if $r < s$ or $r = s$ and

$$|x(r^-) - g| \leq |x(r^-) - h|.$$

We call parametric representation Γ_x any non decreasing continuous function (g, r) from $[0, 1]$ into Γ_x . Denote $\Pi(x)$ the set of parametric representation on Γ_x .

Metric M_1 is defined as follow.

Definition A.3. For any $x_1, x_2 \in D([0, T])$, Metric M_1 is defined by the distance d_M built through parametric representations :

$$d_M(x_1, x_2) := \inf_{(g_i, r_i) \in \Pi(x_j), j \in \{1, 2\}} \{\|g_1 - g_2\|_\infty \vee \|r_1 - r_2\|_\infty\}.$$

APPENDIX B. TECHNICAL LEMMA

Let's prove

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n-1} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n-1} a_{i, j, k, l} \bar{\mu}(g) \bar{\mu}(f) \bar{\mu}(g') \bar{\mu}(f') + o(n^3) \end{aligned}$$

when $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq l \leq n-1$ and then when $0 \leq i \leq k \leq l \leq j \leq n-1$.

first case : $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq l$

Suppose first $\min(k-i, j-k, l-j) \geq 3k_n$, and apply the invariance of $\bar{\mu}$ by \bar{T} .

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g \right) \circ \bar{T}^i \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) \tag{17} \\ &= \sum_{|r| \leq (k-j+1)D} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(\left(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g \right) 1_{S_{k-j=r}} \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{k-i} \right) \\ &= \sum_{|r| \leq (k-j+1)D} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(1_{S_{j-i=N}} g \left(f 1_{S_{k-j=r}} \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{k-j} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Since $\|S_n\|_\infty \leq nD$, the sum is done $r \leq (k-j+1)D$. Applying several time (hypothesis (e)) as in the proof of lemma 5.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(1_{S_{j-i=N}} g \left(f 1_{S_{k-j=r}} \left(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{k-j} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} \right) \\ &= \frac{e^{-N^2/(2\Sigma(j-i-2k_n))} \bar{\mu}(g) \bar{\mu}(f_{A_r})}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2} (j-i-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{k_n \bar{\mu}(f_{A_r})^{1/p}}{(j-i-2k_n)}, \end{aligned}$$

with $f_{A_r} := f 1_{S_{k-j=r}} (g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}}) \circ \bar{T}^{k-j}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}(f_{A_r}) &= \bar{\mu}(f) \bar{\mu}(f_{B_r}) \frac{e^{-r^2/(2\Sigma(k-j-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2} (k-j-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n \bar{\mu}(f_{B_r})^{1/p}}{k-j-2k_n} \\ &\leq \frac{(1+ck_n) \bar{\mu}(f_{B_r})^{1/p}}{(k-j-2k_n)^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

With $f_{B_r} := g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}}$. And finally

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}(f_{B_r}) &= \frac{\bar{\mu}(f') \bar{\mu}(g') e^{-N^2/((2\Sigma)(l-k-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2} (l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n \bar{\mu}(f')^{1/p}}{l-k-2k_n} \\ &\leq \frac{1+ck_n}{(l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

injecting these upper bounds in (17)

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\bar{\mu}}(1_{S_{j-i=N}} g(f 1_{S_{k-j=r}}(g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}}) \circ \bar{T}^{k-j}) \circ \bar{T}^{j-i}) \\
&= \frac{e^{-N^2/((2\Sigma(j-i-2k_n))\bar{\mu}(g))\bar{\mu}(f)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-i-2k_n)} \bar{\mu}(f) \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}(f')\bar{\mu}(g')e^{-N^2/(2\Sigma((l-k-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right) \frac{e^{-r^2/(2\Sigma(k-j-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(k-j-2k_n)^{1/2}} \\
&\pm \frac{e^{-N^2/(2\Sigma(j-i-2k_n))\bar{\mu}(g))\bar{\mu}(f)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-i-2k_n)} \bar{\mu}(f) \frac{ck_n\bar{\mu}(f')^{1/p}}{l-k-2k_n} \frac{e^{-r^2/(2\Sigma(k-j-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(k-j-2k_n)^{1/2}} \\
&\pm \frac{e^{-N^2/(2\Sigma(j-i-2k_n))\bar{\mu}(g))\bar{\mu}(f)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-i-2k_n)} \left(\frac{1+ck_n}{(l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/p} \frac{ck_n}{k-j-2k_n} \\
&\pm \left(\frac{1+ck_n}{(l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \bar{\mu}(f) \frac{e^{-r^2/(2\Sigma(k-j-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(k-j-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/p} \frac{k_n}{(j-i-2k_n)} \\
&\pm \left(\left(\frac{1+ck_n}{(l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/p} \frac{ck_n}{k-j-2k_n} \right)^{1/p} \frac{k_n}{(j-i-2k_n)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Treating each term through comparison series/integral we obtain an upper bound in $O(n^3)$.

Denote $u := j - i$, $v := k - j$ and $w := l - k$ and suppose one of them exactly is lower than $2k_n + 1$. Suppose without loss of generality $u \geq 2k_n + 1$ and $w \leq 2k_n + 1$. Then applying hypothesis (e) on $j - i$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |E_{\bar{\mu}}((f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g) \circ \bar{T}^i (g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}}) \circ \bar{T}^k)| \\
&\leq |E_{\bar{\mu}}(f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g)| \\
&\leq \frac{e^{-N^2/((2\Sigma)^{1/2}j-i-2k_n)\bar{\mu}(g)\bar{\mu}(f)}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-i-2k_n)^{1/2}} + \frac{k_n\bar{\mu}(f)^{1/p}}{(j-i-2k_n)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(u-2k_n)^{1/2}} + c \frac{k_n}{(u-2k_n)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then summing over all the permitted indices give an upper bound in $o(n^3)$.

third case : $0 \leq i \leq k \leq l \leq j$

This case is done in the exact same way as the case done in the proof of lemma 5.3 once the following decomposition made :

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\bar{\mu}} \left((f \circ \bar{T}^{j-i} 1_{S_{j-i=N}} g) \circ \bar{T}^i (g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}}) \circ \bar{T}^k \right) \\
&= \sum_{r \leq \min(k-i, l-k, j-l)D} E_{\bar{\mu}} \left(1_{S_{k-i=r}} g (g' f' \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{j-l=N-N'-r}} \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} f \circ \bar{T}^{j-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}}) \circ \bar{T}^{k-i} \right) \\
&= \sum_{r \leq \min(k-i, l-k, j-l)D} \left(\bar{\mu}(g)\bar{\mu}(A_r) \frac{e^{-r^2/(2\Sigma(k-i-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(k-i-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n\bar{\mu}(A_r)^{1/p}}{k-i-2k_n} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

with $A_r := g'(f' 1_{S_{j-l=N-N'-r}}) \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} f \circ \bar{T}^{j-k}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mu}(A_r) &= \bar{\mu} \left(g' 1_{S_{l-k=N'}} \left(f' f \circ \bar{T}^{j-l} 1_{S_{j-l=N-N'-r}} \right) \circ \bar{T}^{l-k} \right) \\
&= \bar{\mu}(g') \bar{\mu}(B_r) \frac{e^{-N'^2/(2\Sigma(l-k-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n \bar{\mu}(B_r)^{1/p}}{l-k-2k_n} \\
&\leq \frac{(1+ck_n) \bar{\mu}(B_r)^{1/p}}{(l-k-2k_n)^{1/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

with $B_r = f' f \circ \bar{T}^{j-l} 1_{S_{j-l=N-N'-r}}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mu}(B_r) &= \frac{\bar{\mu}(f') \bar{\mu}(f) e^{-(N-N'-r)^2/(2\Sigma(j-l-2k_n))}}{(2\pi\Sigma)^{1/2}(j-l-2k_n)^{1/2}} \pm \frac{ck_n \bar{\mu}(f)^{1/p}}{j-l-2k_n} \\
&\leq \frac{1+ck_n}{(j-l-2k_n)^{1/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Introducing these comparisons in (19) and making comparisons series/integral, we obtain an upper bound in $o(n^3)$.

Acknowledgement. This article has been written as part of my PhD thesis under the supervision of Françoise Pène who initiated this work and provided precious advice and editorial support all along.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley, 1968.
- [2] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, 1999.
- [3] R. Bowen. Symbolic dynamics for hyperbolic flows. *American Journal of mathematics*, 1973.
- [4] R. Bowen. *Equilibrium States and the Ergodic Theory of Anosov Diffeomorphisms*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2008.
- [5] L. A. Bunimovich and Ya. G. Sinai. Markov partitions for dispersed billiards. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 1980.
- [6] L. A. Bunimovich and Ya. G. Sinai. Statistical properties of lorentz gas with periodic configuration of scatterers. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 1981.
- [7] L. A. Bunimovich, Ya. G. Sinai, and N. I. Chernov. Markov partitions for two-dimensional hyperbolic billiards. (russian). *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 45, 1990.
- [8] J.-P. Conze. Sur un critère de récurrence en dimension 2 pour les marches stationnaires, applications. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 1999.
- [9] C. Dombry and N. Guillotin-Plantard. A functional approach for random walks in random sceneries. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 2009.
- [10] B. Hasselblatt. Horospheric foliations and relative pinching. *J. Differential Geom.*, 1994.
- [11] H. Kesten and F. Spitzer. A limit theorem related to a new class of self similar processes. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 1979.
- [12] Steven P Lalley. Statistical regularities of self-intersection counts for geodesics on negatively curved surfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 2014.
- [13] Demers M, Pène F, and Zhang H. Local limit theorem for randomly deforming billiards.
- [14] F. Pène. Applications des propriétés stochastiques de billards dispersifs. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 2000.
- [15] F. Pène. Self-intersections of trajectories of the lorentz process. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 2014.
- [16] F. Pène and B. Saussol. Back to balls in billiards. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 2010.

- [17] Françoise Pène. Rates of convergence in the clt for two-dimensional dispersive billiards. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 2002.
- [18] M Ratner. Markov partitions for anosov flows on n-dimensional manifolds. *Israel J. Math.*, 1973.
- [19] L. A. Santalo. *Integral Geometry and Geometric Probability. 2nd ed.* Cambridge Math. Library, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [20] Ya. G. Sinai. Dynamical systems with elastic reflections. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 1970.
- [21] A. V. Skorohod. Limit theorems for stochastic processes. *Theor. Probability Appl.*, 1956.
- [22] D. Szász T. Varjú. Local limit theorem for the lorentz process and its recurrence in the plane. *Erg. Th. and Dynam. Syst.*, 2004.
- [23] W. Whitt. *Stochastic Process Limits*. Springer, 2002.
- [24] N. Yassine. *Quantitative recurrence properties in infinite measure (english)*. PhD thesis, Université de Bretagne occidentale - Brest, 2018.
- [25] L. S. Young. Statistical properties of dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity. *Ann. Math.*, 1998.
- [26] R. Zweimüller. Mixing limit theorems for ergodic transformations. *J. Theor. Probab.*, 2007.

UNIV BREST, CNRS UMR 6205, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BRETAGNE ATLANTIQUE.