

# Decay of Correlations for Unbounded Observables

Fang Wang <sup>\*</sup>      Hong-Kun Zhang <sup>†</sup>      Pengfei Zhang <sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

In this article, we study the decay rates of the correlation functions for a hyperbolic system  $T : M \rightarrow M$  with singularities that preserves a unique mixing SRB measure  $\mu$ . We prove that, under some general assumptions, the correlations  $\text{Cov}(f, g)$  decay exponentially as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each pair of piecewise Hölder observables  $f, g \in L^p(\mu)$  and for each  $p > 1$ . As an application, we prove that the autocorrelations of the first return time functions decay exponentially for the induced maps of various billiard systems, which include the semi-dispersing billiards on a rectangle, billiards with cusps, and Bunimovich stadia (for the truncated first return time functions). These estimates of the decay rates of autocorrelations of the first return time functions for the induced maps have an essential importance in the study of the statistical properties of nonuniformly hyperbolic systems (with singularities).

**Keywords:** Decay of correlations, unbounded observables, infinite variance, hyperbolic systems, singularity, coupling method, first return time.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $M$  be a smooth, compact Riemannian surface (possibly with boundary),  $S_0 \subset M$  be a compact subset consisting of at most countably many connected smooth curves,  $T$  be a smooth diffeomorphism from  $M \setminus S_0$  onto its image. Let  $\mu$  be a  $T$ -invariant probability measure on  $M$ . Given a pair of integrable functions  $f, g \in L^1(\mu)$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the *correlation function*  $\text{Cov}_n(f, g)$  of  $f$  and  $g$  at time  $n$  is defined as

$$\text{Cov}_n(f, g) = \int_M f \circ T^n \cdot g d\mu - \int_M f d\mu \cdot \int_M g d\mu,$$

provided  $\int_M f \circ T^n \cdot g d\mu < \infty$ . Then the dynamical system  $(T, \mu)$  is said to be *mixing* if the correlations

$$\text{Cov}_n(f, g) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \tag{1.1}$$

for all pairs of  $f, g \in L^2(\mu)$ . The mixing rate of the system  $(T, \mu)$  is characterized by the *decay rate of correlations*, i.e., by the speed of convergence of (1.1) for “regular enough” and bounded functions.

---

<sup>\*</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing, 100048, P.R. China. Email: fang-wang@cnu.edu.cn.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA 01003. Email: hongkun@math.umass.edu.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019. Email: pengfei.zhang@ou.edu.

If  $\partial M = \emptyset$  and  $T$  is a diffeomorphism on  $M$ , then the term “regular enough” usually means Hölder continuity, see [3]. For systems with singularities, even if we start with a smooth observable  $f$  on  $M$ , after  $n$  iterations, for some  $n \geq 1$ ,  $f \circ T^n$  may be smooth only on each connected component of  $M \setminus (S_0 \cup \dots \cup T^{1-n}S_0)$ . This gives us a hint that a natural observable that is suitable for the study of the decay rates of correlations for systems with singularities needs only to be Hölder continuous on regions such that  $T^n$  is smooth, for some  $n \geq 1$ . Recent work on characterizing decay rates of correlations for pairs of piecewise Hölder observables for hyperbolic systems can be found in [8, 9, 10, 22, 29, 30, 18, 19, 20], and the references therein. However, all these results only apply to bounded observables, and there are no general results about the rates of decay of correlations for  $L^p(\mu)$  functions, with  $p \in (1, \infty)$ .

Many important observables for the dynamical system, being piecewise Hölder continuous on  $M$ , are indeed *unbounded*, and the decay rates of correlations for the unbounded observables play a key role in the study of statistical properties of dynamical systems. One important example is the free path function for the Sinai billiards with infinite horizon [12], which is not even an  $L^2(\mu)$  function. Another example is the index function

$$R(x) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \cdot \chi_{D_n}(x), \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\{D_n, n \geq 1\}$  is the collection of components in  $M \setminus (S_0 \cup T^{-1}S_0)$ . This function is unbounded whenever  $M \setminus (S_0 \cup T^{-1}S_0)$  has infinitely many of connected components. Moreover,  $R \notin L^2(\mu)$  if there exists  $c > 0$  such that  $\mu(D_n) \geq cn^{-3}$  for all  $n$  large enough.

More generally, in the study of nonuniformly hyperbolic system with singularities  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F}, \hat{\mu})$ , we usually apply the following *inducing scheme* to obtain a *uniformly hyperbolic* map (with singularities)  $(M, T, \mu)$ , see [26, 14]. One first locates a nice subset  $M \subset \mathcal{M}$ , then defines the first return time function  $R : M \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  of the original system  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $M$ . Let  $\mu$  be the conditional measure on  $M$  of the measure  $\hat{\mu}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , which is preserved by the first return map  $T(x) := \mathcal{F}^{R(x)}(x)$ . In studying various probability limiting theorems such as the Central Limit Theorem, Law of Large Deviations and the Almost Sure Invariance Principle, etc., for  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F}, \hat{\mu})$ , it is usually sufficient to investigate the unbounded process  $R \circ T^n$ . Although there are some available estimations based on individual systems, cf. [2], the question of estimating decay rates of correlations for the first return time function is still open for most nonuniformly hyperbolic systems.

Our goal in this work is to investigate the decay rates of correlations for the unbounded observables on general systems with singularities. We prove the exponential decay of correlations for *a large class of unbounded*, piecewise Hölder continuous observables (under fairly general assumptions, see Section 2). Indeed our result is *new* even for many smooth hyperbolic systems (by adding finitely many, connected, smooth fake singular curves). Moreover, the investigations of the limiting theorems using the results proved in this paper is currently under way.

In proving the exponential decay of correlations, the existence of singularities aggravates the analysis, and makes the standard approaches hard to apply. In [29], Young developed a novel method, now known as *Young’s tower construction*. She successfully applied this construction to Sinai billiards with finite horizon, and proved the exponential mixing property of these billiards. This method was later extended by Chernov (cf. [8]) to Sinai billiards with infinite horizon. Another approach, the so-called *coupling method*, was also introduced by Young in [30], and later

improved by Chernov and Dolgopyat in [10, 22] through the tools of standard pairs. The coupling method is designed to geometrically control the dependence between the past and the future. Recently, Demers and Zhang were able to prove the exponential decay of correlations for rather general hyperbolic systems with singularities using the *spectral gap method* for the dynamical transfer operators (cf. [19, 20, 21]). All these methods have been verified to be very efficient, and have led to many deep results.

In this paper, we continue the investigation of the system  $(M, T, \mu)$  studied in [18] under a similar setting. We obtain the exponential decay of correlations for unbounded observables using the coupling scheme. One of the main tools in our proof is the innovated Chernov's  $\mathcal{L}$ -function introduced in [12, 8, 9] (see Eq. (3.8) for definition). We use a dedicated analysis on properties of this  $\mathcal{L}$ -function, which is closely related to the *Growth Lemma*. This enables us to overcome the difficulty in obtaining the decay rates on general piecewise Hölder continuous observables in  $L^p(\mu)$ , for  $p > 1$ . We also construct a hyperbolic set  $\mathcal{R}^*$  with product structure, such that the dynamical system  $(M, T)$  can be identified as a suspension based on  $\mathcal{R}^*$ . The coupling method is our main approach, which has been extensively used in the recent studies of systems with singularities (cf. [10, 12, 22, 23, 18, 30]).

One of our main achievements in this paper is the discovery of the condition (2.11) for the exponential decay of unbounded functions. We also provide **(H6)** in §2.1, which is a sufficient condition for (2.11) applying to billiard systems. It provides a simple criterion and is easy to be verified for a broad class of nonuniformly hyperbolic systems. Future researchers in this area can start their work on the limiting theory and other statistical properties from this criterion. As straightforward examples, we show that  $\text{Cov}_n(R, R)$  decay exponentially for several classical billiard systems, such as billiards with cusps, semi-dispersing billiards on a rectangle, billiards with flat point, Bunimovich flower billiards, Bunimovich stadia and the Skewed stadia.

This paper is organized in the following way. In §2, we list the standard hypotheses **(H1)–(H5)** and a new hypothesis **(H6)** for the system  $(M, T, \mu)$ , and then state our main results on the decay rates of correlations of unbounded observables. In §3, we introduce the concepts of standard pairs and standard families. The growth lemma is also introduced in this section, which plays an important role when we analyze the decay rates of the correlations for unbounded observables. In §4 we construct a hyperbolic magnet, which serves as the base of the coupling scheme. The coupling lemma is also introduced in this section. In §5, we first establish an equidistribution result for unbounded observables, and then give the proof of exponential decay property for unbounded observables. In §7, the decay rates of autocorrelations for the first return time functions are studied. We establish the criterion and discuss several billiard models as examples, such as semi-dispersing billiards, Bunimovich billiards, and billiards with flat points, which all have special importance in the modern theory of billiards.

NOTATION: Throughout the paper we will use the following convention: positive global constants whose exact values are unimportant, will be denoted by  $c, c_1, c_2, \dots$  or  $C, C_1, C_2, \dots$ . These letters may be assigned to different values in different equations throughout the paper. On the other hand, we use the symbols:  $s_0, s_1, b, c_A, C_A, C_{r,p}, \theta, \gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_1, \dots$  to denote those constants whose values are fixed in the whole paper. Most of these constants are defined in § 2.1, and  $C_r$  are defined in § 3.1.

## 2 Main results

### 2.1 List of assumptions

Let  $M$  be a smooth, compact Riemannian surface (possibly with boundary),  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  be the geodesic distance between two points on  $M$ . Given a compact smooth curve  $W \subset M$ , we let  $|W|$  be the length of  $W$ , and  $m_W$  be the conditional Lebesgue measure on  $W$ . Let  $S_0 \subset M$  be a compact subset consisting of at most countably many connected smooth curves,  $T$  be a smooth diffeomorphism from  $M \setminus S_0$  onto its image. Let  $S_1 = S_0 \cup T^{-1}S_0$ , which is called the *singularity set* of  $T$ . In the following we list and briefly explain the assumptions for our main results.

**(H1)** Hyperbolicity of  $T$ . There exist two families of continuous cones  $C_x^u$  (unstable) and  $C_x^s$  (stable) in the tangent spaces  $\mathcal{T}_x M$  for all  $x \in M \setminus S_1$  with the following properties:

- (i) The angle between  $C_x^u$  and  $C_x^s$  is uniformly bounded away from zero;
- (ii)  $D_x T(C_x^u) \subset C_{T_x}^u$  and  $D_x T(C_x^s) \supset C_{T_x}^s$  (whenever  $D_x T$  exists);
- (iii) There exists a constant  $\Lambda > 1$ , such that

$$\|D_x T(v)\| \geq \Lambda \|v\|, \text{ for all } v \in C_x^u; \quad \|D_x T^{-1}(v)\| \geq \Lambda \|v\|, \text{ for all } v \in C_x^s.$$

**DEFINITION 1.** A smooth curve  $W \subset M$  is said to be an *unstable curve*, if the tangent line  $T_x W$  belongs to the unstable cone  $C_x^u$  at every point  $x \in W$ . An unstable curve  $W$  is called an *unstable manifold* if  $T^{-n}(W)$  is an unstable curve for each  $n \geq 0$ . We use  $W^u$  to denote an unstable manifold, and use  $\mathcal{W}^u$  to denote the collection of all unstable manifolds.

For convenience, we denote  $S_{-1} = S_0 \cup T S_0$ . Stable curves and stable manifolds are defined similarly by considering  $T^{-1}$ .

**(H2)** Singularities and smoothness. Curves in  $S_{\pm 1}$  terminate on each other, i.e. the endpoints of each curve  $W \in S_{\pm 1}$  must lie on other curves in  $S_{\pm 1}$ . Moreover,

- (i) curves in  $S_0$  are uniformly transverse to both stable and unstable cones, and smooth curves in  $T^{-1}S_0$  ( $T S_0$ , respectively) are stable (unstable, respectively) curves.
- (ii) the numbers of smooth components of  $\partial D$ , where  $D$  runs over the connected components of  $M \setminus S_1$ , are uniformly bounded.
- (iii) there exists  $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1]$  such that the map  $T$  is a  $C^{1+\gamma_1}$  diffeomorphism on each component  $D$  and can be extended continuously<sup>1</sup> to the closure  $\bar{D}$ .
- (iv) there exist constants  $s_1 \in (0, 1)$  and  $C_1 > 0$ , such that for any  $x \in M \setminus S_{\pm 1}$ ,

$$\|D_x T\| \leq C_1 \cdot d(x, S_{\pm 1})^{-s_1}. \tag{2.1}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that the extensions of  $T$  to the closures of two neighboring components  $D$  and  $D'$  could be different.

Note that for Sinai billiards, the last condition holds for  $\mathbf{s}_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ , see [13, 24].

For any  $n \geq 1$ , let  $S_n = \cup_{m=0}^{n-1} T^{-m} S_1$  be the singularity set of  $T^n$ , and  $S_\infty = \cup_{m \geq 0} S_m$ . Similarly, we define  $S_{-n}$  and  $S_{-\infty}$ . Note that for every stable/unstable manifold  $W$ , the end points of  $W$  are on the singular curves  $S_{\pm\infty}$ . Thus the assumption **(H2)** implies that the angles between both stable and unstable manifolds with the singular curves in  $S_{\pm 1}$  is greater than some constant  $\alpha_0 > 0$  at their intersection points.

**DEFINITION 2.** Given two points  $x, y \in M$ . Let  $\mathbf{s}_+(x, y)$  be the smallest integer  $n \geq 0$  such that  $x$  and  $y$  belong to distinct elements of  $M \setminus S_n$ , which is called the forward *separation time* of  $x, y$ . The backward separation time  $\mathbf{s}_-(x, y)$  is defined by reversing the direction.

**(H3)** Regularity of stable/unstable curves. Any unstable (and stable) curve  $W$  is regular in the following sense:

- (i) *Bounded curvature.* There exists a constant  $\mathbf{k}_0 > 0$ , such that the curvature of  $W$  is bounded from above by  $\mathbf{k}_0$ .
- (ii) *Bounded distortion.* There exist two constants  $C_{\mathbf{J}} > 1$  and  $\gamma_0 \in (0, 1]$ , such that for each unstable curve  $W \subset M$ , and each pair of points  $x, y \in W$ ,

$$|\ln J_W T^{-1}(x) - \ln J_W T^{-1}(y)| \leq C_{\mathbf{J}} d(x, y)^{\gamma_0}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $J_W T^{-1}(x)$  is the Jacobian of  $T^{-1}$  at  $x \in W$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the unstable manifold. (the subscript  $\mathbf{J}$  in the constant  $C_{\mathbf{J}}$  stands for Jacobian.)

- (iii) *Absolute continuity.* For each pair of regular unstable curves  $W^1$  and  $W^2$ , which are close enough, we define

$$W_*^i := \{x \in W^i : W^s(x) \cap W^{3-i} \neq \emptyset\},$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . The stable holonomy map  $\mathbf{h} : W_*^1 \rightarrow W_*^2$  along stable manifolds is absolutely continuous with uniformly bounded Jacobian  $J_{W_*^1} \mathbf{h}$ . Furthermore, there exists  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  such that for each  $x, y \in W_*^1$ ,

$$|\ln J_{W_*^1} \mathbf{h}(y) - \ln J_{W_*^1} \mathbf{h}(x)| \leq C_{\mathbf{J}} \cdot \theta^{\mathbf{s}_+(x, y)}. \quad (2.3)$$

A  $T$ -invariant probability Borel measure  $\mu$  is said to be an *SRB* measure (short for Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen), if its basin is of positive Lebesgue measure, and the conditional measures of  $\mu$  on unstable manifolds are absolutely continuous with respect to the leaf volume (see for example [31, 23]). It provides a way to visualize the equilibrium state for physicists, by averaging the atomic measures along typical trajectories. The *existence* and *finiteness* of mixing SRB measures for hyperbolic systems with singularities have been studied by Chernov, Dolgopyat, Pesin, Sinai, Young and many others, see [1, 10, 27, 29, 19, 20].

**(H4)** SRB measure. The map  $T$  preserves a unique, mixing SRB measure  $\mu$ . Moreover, there exists  $\mathbf{s}_0 \in (0, 1]$ , such that

$$\mu(\{x \in M : d(x, S_{\pm 1}) \leq \varepsilon\}) \leq C_0 \cdot \varepsilon^{\mathbf{s}_0} \quad (2.4)$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Since  $S_1$  may consists of countably many singular curves, some of the stable/unstable curves may be quite short. The following condition ensures that, on average, forward iterations of these unstable curves are generally long enough. See Lemma 4.1 and its following remark for a quantitative estimate.

**(H5)** One-step expansion. Let  $s_0 \in (0, 1]$  be given as in (2.4). Then

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{W: |W| < \delta} \sum_{V_\alpha} \left( \frac{|W|}{|V_\alpha|} \right)^{s_0} \cdot \frac{|T^{-1}V_\alpha|}{|W|} < 1, \quad (2.5)$$

where the supremum is taken over all unstable curves  $W$  of length  $|W| < \delta$ , and the summation is over the set of connected components of  $TW \setminus S_{-1}$ .

REMARK 1. Note that we may assume that the lengths of unstable/stable curves  $W \subset M$  are uniformly bounded by a small constant  $\mathbf{c}_M \in (0, 1)$ . That is,  $|W| < \mathbf{c}_M$  for any unstable/stable manifold  $W$ . One can always guarantee this by adding a finite number of grid lines to  $S_{\pm 1}$  satisfying **(H2)**.

**(H6)** There exists an enumeration  $\{D_n : n \geq 1\}$  of the set of connected components of  $M \setminus S_1$  such that the following holds:

(i) there exist  $s > 0$  and  $C_0 > 0$  such that

$$\mu(D_n) \leq C_0 n^{-2-s}, \quad \text{for every } n \geq 1. \quad (2.6)$$

(ii) There exist two constants  $C_A > 0$  and a measurable partition of  $D_n$  into unstable curves  $\{W_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$  for each  $n \geq 1$  that satisfies

$$|W_\alpha| \leq C_A n^{-s-b}, \quad |TW_\alpha| \leq C_A n^{-d} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(D_n)/|TW_\alpha| \leq C_A n^{-s-b}, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n, \quad (2.7)$$

for some positive constants  $d \in [0, 1]$  and  $b \geq 1$ , such that

$$b + s > \frac{1}{s_0}; \quad \text{and } s \geq s_0(2 - b) \text{ if } b \in [1, 2). \quad (2.8)$$

A natural enumeration of  $M \setminus S_1$  exists if  $T$  is the first return map of some nonuniformly hyperbolic system (with singularity), see §2.3. Moreover,  $T^{-1}$  is well defined on  $TD_n$ , and can be extended by continuity to the closure  $\overline{TD_n}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $\{TW_\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$  is a partition of  $TD_n, n \geq 1$ .

Note that **(H6)** is a new assumption, which is not needed in our general Theorem 1. Indeed the condition (2.7) is only used in prove (6.6); and the condition (2.8) is only needed in Proposition 6.3. These are used in the proof of Theorem 2. We will verify the condition **(H6)** for all billiards considered in this paper in §7.2.

## 2.2 Main results

Now we consider any  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1]$ , where  $\gamma_0$  is the constant in (2.2) in the assumption of bounded distortion. For any  $p \in (1, \infty]$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$  be the set of all real-valued functions  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which is Hölder continuous on each component of  $D_n \subset M \setminus S_1$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , with

$$\|f\|_{C^\gamma} := \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x, y \in D_n} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{d(x, y)^\gamma} < \infty; \quad (2.9)$$

$$\|f\|_{p, u} := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u} \sup_{x \in W_\alpha} |f(x)| |W_\alpha|^{s_0/p} < \infty. \quad (2.10)$$

One can check that the  $\|f\|_{p, u} < \infty$  if and only if  $\|f\|_p := \left( \int |f(x)|^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} < \infty$ , by using the Hölder continuity of  $f$  on each unstable curve  $W_\alpha$  and the regularity of the density of conditional measures of the SRB measure  $\mu$ . We choose  $\|f\|_{p, u}$  over  $\|f\|_p$  since it is slightly more convenient for our discussion. Moreover, it is easy to see that it induces a norm for functions  $f \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ , where

$$\|f\|_{p, \gamma} := \|f\|_{p, u} + \|f\|_{C^\gamma}.$$

We give a sufficient condition under which the correlation decays exponentially for  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ . Let  $C_p$  and  $C_c$  be two constants given by (3.11) and (4.6), respectively, and  $C(\gamma, s) = \frac{1}{1-\lambda^{-\gamma}} + \frac{1}{1-\lambda^{-s}}$ , where  $s$  is given by Lemma 4.3.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume (H1)-(H5) hold. Let  $p \in (1, \infty]$ , and  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ . Suppose that there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$C_{g, \varepsilon}(f) := \sup_{n \geq 1} \int_M |f \circ T^n|^{1+\varepsilon} \cdot |g| d\mu < \infty. \quad (2.11)$$

*Then there exists a constant  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$  depending on  $\varepsilon, \gamma, p$  such that*

$$|\text{Cov}_n(f, g)| \leq [2C_{g, \varepsilon}(f) + 4(2C(\gamma, s)C_c + c_M + C_p)] \|f\|_{p, \gamma} \|g\|_{p, \gamma} \vartheta^n, \quad (2.12)$$

*for any  $n \geq 1$ .*

The assumption (2.11) is rather crucial here. The key point is that  $g$  is in the same space as  $f \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ , instead of the dual space  $\mathcal{H}_q(\gamma)$ , where  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ . This is important for us to tackle the case  $g = f$  in the study of the decay rates of autocorrelations.

Next we define a smaller class of observables. For each  $p > 1$ , any  $\kappa \in [0, p]$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma)$  be the collection of piecewise Hölder functions  $f \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ , such that

$$K_f := \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in D_n} |f(x)| \cdot n^{-\kappa/p} < \infty. \quad (2.13)$$

If  $p = \infty$ , set  $K_f = \|f\|_\infty$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_\infty(\gamma)$ .

One can check easily that under assumption (H6),  $K_f < \infty$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{p, u} &= \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u} \sup_{x \in W_\alpha} |f(x)| |W_\alpha|^{s_0/p} \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in TD_n} |f(x)| |TW_\alpha|^{s_0/p} \\ &\leq C_A^{s_0/p} \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in TD_n} |f(x)| n^{-d \cdot s_0/p} = C_A^{s_0/p} K_f, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $ds_0 \leq 1 < p$ , by **(H6)**. Thus  $\mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ .

Our next theorem shows that assumption (2.11) holds for the class of observables in  $\mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(\gamma)$ . Recall  $\log_a^+ b = \max\{0, \log_a b\}$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Assume **(H1)**–**(H6)** hold. Let  $p > 1$ ,  $0 < \kappa \leq p$ , and  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(\gamma)$ . Then there exist a constant  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$  depending on  $p$  and  $\gamma$ , such that*

$$|\text{Cov}_n(f, g)| \leq [2C_{g, \varepsilon_p}(f) + 4(2C(\gamma, s)C_{\mathbf{c}} + c_M + C_{\mathbf{p}})\|f\|_{p, \gamma}\|g\|_{p, \gamma}]\vartheta^n, \quad (2.14)$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ , where the constant  $C_{g, \varepsilon_p}(f)$  is defined as in (6.9).

In particular, there exists a uniform constant  $C > 0$  such that for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_{\infty}(\gamma)$ , we have

$$\left| \int_M f \circ T^n \cdot g d\mu - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(g) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{\infty, \gamma} \|g\|_{\infty, \gamma} \vartheta^n \quad (2.15)$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ .

**REMARK 2.** The advantage of our result is that  $f$  and  $g$  are both in  $L^p(\mu)$ , comparing to the results on  $f \in L^p(\mu)$  and  $g \in L^q(\mu)$ , with  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ . This is important for us to tackle the case  $g = f$  in the study of the decay rates of autocorrelations for some functions  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(\gamma)$  for  $p \in (1, 2)$ . Note that  $C_0(f, f) = \mu(f^2) - \mu(f)^2$  may diverge since such functions may have infinite variance.

Next we consider a special observable – the index function  $R : M \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  defined as in (1.2), where  $R(x) = n$  for any  $x \in D_n$  and  $n \geq 1$ . Then we have the following theorem. For convenience, we set  $C_0 = 2\varepsilon_p^{-1}C_{\mathbf{p}}(r_0)C_A^{r_0}$ , using (6.9).

**Theorem 3.** *Assume **(H1)**–**(H6)** hold. Then the index function  $R \in L^p(\mu)$  for any  $p \in (0, s + 1)$ . Moreover, for any  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$|\text{Cov}_n(R, R)| \leq C \|R\|_p^2 \vartheta^n, \quad (2.16)$$

where  $C$  and  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$  are uniform constants independent of the choices of  $n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $p \in (0, s + 1)$ . Note that

$$\mu(R^p) = \sum_{n \geq 1} n^p \mu(D_n) \leq C_0 \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{p-2-s},$$

where we have used (2.6) in the last step. Thus  $R \in L^p(\mu)$ . It follows that  $R \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(1)$ , with  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $\kappa = p$ ,  $K_R = 1$  in (2.13). Moreover,  $\|R\|_{p, \gamma} = \|R\|_p$ , and  $N_R = 1$ . Theorem 2 implies that then there exist a constant  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$|\text{Cov}_n(R, R)| \leq [2C_{R, \varepsilon_p}(R) + 4(2C(1, s)C_{\mathbf{c}} + c_M + C_{\mathbf{p}})\|R\|_p^2]\vartheta^n,$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$



### 2.3 Applications to induced maps

Let  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a nonuniformly hyperbolic system which preserves a smooth measure  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$ . Assume that there exists a subset  $M \subset \mathcal{M}$  such that the induced system  $(M, T, \mu)$  satisfies the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H5)**, where  $\mu$  is the conditional measure of  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$  on  $M$ , and  $T = \mathcal{F}^R$  is the first return map on  $M$ . Recall that the first return time function  $R : M \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$  is defined by

$$R(x) = \inf\{n \geq 1 : \mathcal{F}^n(x) \in M\}. \quad (2.17)$$

Suppose that there exists  $n_0 \geq 1$  such that for each  $n \geq 1$ , the subset  $M_n = \{x \in M : R(x) = n\}$  has at most  $n_0$  connected components. Let  $\{D_{n_0(n-1)+j} : 1 \leq j \leq n_0\}$  be an enumeration of the connected components of  $M_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Here some of the sets  $D_n$  can be empty. We will call  $\{D_m : m \geq 1\}$  the derived enumeration of the dynamical system  $(M, T)$ . Suppose **(H6)** holds for the derived enumeration  $\{D_m : m \geq 1\}$ . Then for any Hölder continuous (hence bounded) function  $\hat{f}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , it induces a function  $f$  on  $M$  via

$$f(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{R(x)} \hat{f}(\mathcal{F}^m x).$$

Generally speaking, the function  $f$  is unbounded, since  $R$  is. This inducing scheme is an important strategy in the study of the dynamics of the nonuniformly hyperbolic systems. Note that  $f(x) \leq \|\hat{f}\|_{\infty} n$  for any  $x \in R^{-1}(n)$  and  $n \geq 1$ . Therefore,  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma_0)$  with  $\kappa = p$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $M \subset \mathcal{M}$ , and  $T = \mathcal{F}^R$  be the first return map on  $M$ ,  $\mu$  be the conditional measure of  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$  on  $M$ , and  $\{D_n\}$  be the derived enumeration of the system  $(M, T)$ . Suppose **(H1)**–**(H6)** hold, and the first return time function  $R \in L^p(\mu)$  for some  $p > 1$ . Then for any  $\hat{f}, \hat{g} \in C^\gamma(\mathcal{M})$  with  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1]$ , we have*

$$|\text{Cov}_n(f, g)| \leq C \|\hat{f}\|_{\infty, \gamma} \|\hat{g}\|_{\infty, \gamma} \vartheta^n,$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ , where  $C > 0$  and  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$  are uniform constants independent of the choices of  $n$ .

Note that Theorem 4 follows directly from Theorem 2, with  $\kappa = p$  in (2.13). The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3, thus we omit it here.

We also obtain the following results by taking  $\hat{f} = \hat{g} = 1$  in the above theorem 4.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F})$  be a nonuniformly hyperbolic dynamical system and  $(M, T, \mu)$  be the induced system on  $M$  discussed in the above, which satisfies the Assumptions **(H1)**–**(H6)**. Then there exist constants  $C > 0$  and  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$  such that*

$$\left| \int R \circ T^n \cdot R d\mu - \mu(R)^2 \right| \leq C \vartheta^n$$

for every  $n \geq 1$ .

As primary examples of the nonuniformly hyperbolic systems, we will discuss several important billiard systems, including two types of billiards:

#### I. Type A billiards:

(A1) billiards with cusps, see [13, 12, 17].

(A2) semi-dispersing billiards on a rectangle, billiards with flat points, see [15, 17].

## II. Type B billiards:

(B1) Bunimovich stadium, see [4, 5, 26, 17];

(B2) Bunimovich skewed stadium, Bunimovich flower billiard, see [14, 17].

All of these models mentioned in the above have been proved to have only polynomial mixing rates. However, we can show that the autocorrelations  $\text{Cov}_n(R, R)$  for these systems decay exponentially. Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F})$  be the billiard map related to any of the above models, and  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}} = C \cos \varphi dr d\varphi$  be the smooth measure preserved by  $\mathcal{F}$ . It was proved in above references that there exists a subset  $M \subset \mathcal{M}$  such that the induced system  $(M, T, \mu)$  satisfies the conditions **(H1)**–**(H6)**. It follows that the autocorrelations  $\text{Cov}_n(R, R)$ ,  $n \geq 1$  decay exponentially for all these billiard systems:

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F})$  be one of the type A or type B billiard systems. Let  $(M, T, \mu)$  be the induced system on the corresponding subset  $M$ . Assume the first return time function  $R \in L^p(\mu)$  for some  $p > 1$ . Given two functions  $\hat{f}, \hat{g} \in C^\gamma(\mathcal{M})$  with  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1]$ , then for any  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$|\text{Cov}_n(f, g)| \leq C \|\hat{f}\|_{\infty, \gamma} \|\hat{g}\|_{\infty, \gamma} \vartheta^n,$$

where  $C > 0$  and  $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$  are uniform constants independent of the choices of  $n$ .

## 3 Preliminaries

In this section we first introduce the concepts of standard pairs and standard families, then give a brief review of the growth lemma for hyperbolic systems with singularities.

### 3.1 Standard pairs and $\mathcal{L}$ functions

For any unstable manifold  $W \in \mathcal{W}^u$ , the  $u$ -SRB density  $\rho_W$  is the unique probability density function on  $W$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $m_W$  satisfying the following relation

$$\frac{\rho_W(y)}{\rho_W(x)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J_W T^{-n}(y)}{J_W T^{-n}(x)}. \quad (3.1)$$

Then the corresponding probability measure  $\mu_W := \rho_W \cdot m_W$  is called the  $u$ -SRB measure of  $T$  on  $W$ . The formula (3.1) is standard in hyperbolic dynamics, see [12, page 105]. It follows from the distortion bound (2.2) that  $\rho_W \sim |W|^{-1}$  on  $W$ . More precisely, we have

$$\frac{1}{|W|} e^{-C_J |W|^{\gamma_0}} \leq \rho_W(x) \leq \frac{1}{|W|} e^{C_J |W|^{\gamma_0}}. \quad (3.2)$$

**DEFINITION 3.** (Standard Pair) Let  $C_r > C_J$  be a fixed large constant, where  $C_J$  is the constant in Eq. (2.2) in the assumption of the distortion bounds. For any unstable curve  $W$  and a probability

measure  $\nu$  on  $W$ , the pair  $(W, \nu)$  is said to be a *standard pair*, if  $\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the u-SRB measure  $\mu_W$  whose density function  $g(x) := d\nu/d\mu_W(x) > 0$  satisfies

$$|\ln g(x) - \ln g(y)| \leq C_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot d_W(x, y)^{\gamma_0}, \quad (3.3)$$

for any  $x, y \in W$ , where  $\gamma_0 \in (0, 1)$  is given in the distortion bounds (2.2). We also call the density function  $g$  to be a *dynamically Hölder function* on  $W$ .

One advantage of utilizing the standard pair is that, the probability measure on any unstable manifold  $W$  is indeed equivalent to the u-SRB measure  $\mu_W$ .

The idea of standard pairs was first brought up by Dolgopyat in [22], and then extended to more general systems by Chernov and Dolgopyat in [9, 10]. Note that for any standard pair  $(W, \nu)$ , the push-forward measure  $T_*\nu$  is a measure supported on countably many unstable curves  $TW = \cup_{n \geq 1} V_n$ . Thus the image  $T(W, \nu) := (TW, T_*\nu)$  can be viewed as a family of standard pairs  $(V_n, \nu_n)$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , with  $\nu_n = \frac{T_*\nu|_{V_n}}{T_*\nu(V_n)}$ , such that for any measurable set  $B \subset M$ ,

$$T_*\nu(B) = \sum_n T_*\nu(V_n) \cdot \nu_n(V_n \cap B).$$

This observation leads to the concept of the so called *standard family*, whose precise definition is given in the following.

DEFINITION 4. Let  $\mathcal{W} = \{(W_\alpha, \nu_\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  be a family of standard pairs,  $\lambda$  be a Borel measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \lambda)$  is said to be a *standard family*, if the following conditions hold:

- (a) Either  $\mathcal{A}$  is countable, or  $\mathcal{A} \subset [0, 1]$  is measurable, and  $\{W_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is a measurable partition of a measurable set  $E \subset M$ ;
- (b) The measure  $\lambda$  induces a positive measure  $\nu$  on  $M$  by

$$\nu(B) = \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \nu_\alpha(B \cap W_\alpha) d\lambda(\alpha),$$

for all measurable sets  $B \subset M$ .

In the following, instead of the notion  $(\mathcal{W}, \lambda)$ , we also denote a standard family  $\mathcal{G}$  by  $(\mathcal{W}, \nu)$ , or  $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{A}, \lambda, \nu)$ , since we use the measure  $\nu$  more often. An intuitive way to look at the standard family is to view it as a decomposition of the measure  $\nu$  along leaves of a measurable partition  $\mathcal{W} = \{W_\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of the set  $E$  into standard pairs.

It follows from [18, Lemma 12] that  $\mathcal{E} := (\mathcal{W}^u, \mu)$  can be viewed as a standard family, where  $\mu$  is the SRB measure of  $T$ . More precisely, there exists a factor measure  $\lambda^u$  on the index set  $\mathcal{A}^u$ , such that for any measurable set  $A \subset M$ ,

$$\mu(A) = \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u} \mu_\alpha(A \cap W_\alpha) d\lambda^u(\alpha), \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\mu_\alpha = \mu_{W_\alpha}$  is the  $u$ -SRB measure on the unstable manifold  $W_\alpha$ . From now on we always take  $\mu_\alpha$  to be the reference measure on the unstable manifold  $W_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^u$ . Sometime we also denote it as  $\mu_W$  for a general unstable manifold  $W \in \mathcal{W}^u$ . Note that a probability measure  $\nu$  with  $\nu \ll \mu$  is

uniquely specified by its density  $g := d\nu/d\mu \geq 0$ . Then comparing with (3.4) for  $\mu$ , we know that for any standard family  $(\mathcal{W}^u, \nu)$  with  $\nu \ll \mu$ ,

$$\nu(A) = \int_A g d\mu = \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u} \int_{W_\alpha \cap A} g d\mu_\alpha d\lambda^u(\alpha) = \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u} \int_{W_\alpha \cap A} d\nu_\alpha d\lambda(\alpha), \quad (3.5)$$

for any measurable set  $A \subset \mathcal{M}$ , where

$$d\nu_\alpha = g_\alpha d\mu_\alpha \quad \text{with} \quad g_\alpha = \frac{g}{\mu_\alpha(g)} \quad \text{and} \quad d\lambda(\alpha) = \mu_\alpha(g) d\lambda^u(\alpha). \quad (3.6)$$

This is called a *canonical representation* of  $(\mathcal{W}^u, \nu)$ .

On the other hand, consider a nonnegative function  $g : M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , with  $\mu(g) < \infty$ , such that it is *dynamically Hölder continuous on  $\mathcal{W}^u$* , i.e.:

$$|\ln g(x) - \ln g(y)| \leq C_r \cdot d_W(x, y)^{\gamma_0}, \quad (3.7)$$

for any  $W \in \mathcal{W}^u$ , and any  $x, y \in W$ , with  $g(x), g(y) > 0$ . We call  $(\mathcal{W}^u, \nu_g)$  *the standard family generated by  $g = d\nu_g/d\mu$* , such that (3.6) holds.

The assumption **(H3)** on the distortion bound implies that, if  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$  is a standard family with a factor measure  $\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $T^n \mathcal{G} := (T^n \mathcal{W}, T^n \nu)$  also induces a standard family, for any  $n \geq 0$  (cf. [18]). More precisely, for any measurable set  $B \subset M$ ,

$$T^n \nu(B) = \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T^n \nu_\alpha(B \cap T^n W_\alpha) d\lambda(\alpha).$$

Note that the (uniform) hyperbolicity of  $T$  only guarantees the exponential growth of unstable manifolds in a local sense. The singularity curves will cut any *relatively long* unstable manifold into many short pieces, which might undo the uniform growth of the unstable manifold completely. However, under the one-step expansion assumption **(H5)**, one can show that, despite odds, typical smooth components of  $T^n W$  for every short unstable manifold  $W$  grow monotonically and exponentially in  $n$ , until they reach the size of order one. This fundamental fact follows from the *Growth Lemma*, which was first proved by Chernov for dispersing billiards (cf. [8]), and then for general hyperbolic systems under the assumption **(H1)–(H5)** in [18] (see Lemma 5, Lemma 6 and Lemma 12 therein). To state the growth lemma, we need to introduce a characteristic function of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**DEFINITION 5.** The  $\mathcal{L}_r$ -function  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G})$  of a standard family  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$  is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) := \frac{1}{\nu(M)} \int_{\mathcal{A}} |W_\alpha|^{-r} d\lambda(\alpha), \quad r \in (0, s_0]. \quad (3.8)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G})$  can be viewed as an average of the inverse of the  $r$ -power of the length of the unstable manifolds. This  $\mathcal{L}_r$ -function plays an important role in estimating the distribution of short unstable manifolds in a standard family, and the growth lemma characterizes how  $\mathcal{L}_r(T^n \mathcal{G})$  changes under iterations of the map  $T$ .

A standard family  $\mathcal{G}$  is said to be  *$r$ -standard* if  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) < \infty$ . The following is a collection of Growth Lemmas from [18].

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $r \in (0, s_0]$ , and  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$  be an  $r$ -standard family. Then the following statements hold.*

(1) There exist constants  $c > 0$ ,  $C_z > 0$ , and  $\gamma_1 \in (0, \gamma_0]$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}_r(T^n \mathcal{G}) \leq c \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) \cdot \Lambda^{-\gamma_1 n} + C_z. \quad (3.9)$$

(2) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\nu\{W \in \mathcal{W} : |W| < \varepsilon\} \leq c\nu(M) \cdot \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) \cdot \varepsilon^r. \quad (3.10)$$

(3) The standard family  $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{W}^u, \mu)$  induced by the SRB measure  $\mu$  is  $r$ -standard for any  $r < s_0$ .

For more details, see Lemma 7, Lemma 8 and Lemma 12 in [18]. Note that  $s_0$  from (2.5) plays the same as  $q$  from [18]. The letter  $q$  has been reserved for later use.

Let  $r \in (0, s_0)$  be fixed. Pick a large number<sup>2</sup>

$$C_{\mathbf{p}} > \frac{C_z}{1-c} + \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}). \quad (3.11)$$

Then an  $r$ -standard family  $\mathcal{G}$  is said to be  $r$ -proper if  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) < C_{\mathbf{p}}$ . It follows from this definition that:

**Lemma 3.2.** (1) The standard family  $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{W}^u, \mu)$  is  $r$ -proper for any  $r < s_0$ .

(2) The forward iterations of  $r$ -proper families are  $r$ -proper.

(3) For any  $r$ -standard family  $\mathcal{G}$ , the family  $T^n \mathcal{G}$  is  $r$ -proper for each  $n \geq N_{r, \mathcal{G}} := \lceil \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \log_{\Lambda}^+ \frac{\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G})}{C_{\mathbf{p}}} \rceil$ .

*Proof.* (1) Let  $r < s_0$  be given. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $r$ -standard and

$$\mathcal{L}_r(T^n \mathcal{E}) \leq c \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}) \cdot \Lambda^{-\gamma_1 n} + C_z < \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}) + C_z < C_{\mathbf{p}}$$

for each  $n \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{W}^u, \mu)$  is  $r$ -proper.

(2) Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an  $r$ -proper family and  $n \geq 1$ . Then by (3.9),

$$\mathcal{L}_r(T^n \mathcal{G}) \leq c \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) \cdot \Lambda^{-\gamma_1 n} + C_z < c \cdot C_{\mathbf{p}} + C_z < C_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

Therefore,  $T^n \mathcal{G}$  is  $r$ -proper.

(3) Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an  $r$ -standard family and  $n \geq \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \log_{\Lambda}^+ \frac{\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G})}{C_{\mathbf{p}}}$  be an integer. Then by (3.9),

$$\mathcal{L}_r(T^n \mathcal{G}) \leq c \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) \cdot \Lambda^{-\gamma_1 n} + C_z < C_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

Therefore,  $T^n \mathcal{G}$  is  $r$ -proper. □

---

<sup>2</sup>The choice of the constant  $C_{\mathbf{p}}$  does not matter as long as it is large enough. A stronger condition is given in (6.1) using the constant in Lemma 6.1.

### 3.2 The standard family associated to a density function in $\mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ .

In this section, we assume  $p \in (1, \infty]$  and  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1]$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$  is a nonnegative, dynamically Hölder function with  $0 < \mu(g) < \infty$ . We have showed that  $g$  induces a standard family  $\mathcal{G}_g = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$ , with  $d\nu = g d\mu$ . Now we will investigate the  $\mathcal{L}$ -function of  $\mathcal{G}_g$ , and show that  $g$  leads to an  $r$ -standard family with  $r \leq \mathbf{s}_0$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $p > 1$ , and  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$  be a probability density function. Define  $\bar{g}(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}(g|W_\alpha)$  for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u$ . Then for any  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0 - \frac{\mathbf{s}_0}{p})$ ,*

- (1)  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}$  is  $r$ -standard and  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}} \|g\|_{p,u}$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r$ -standard and  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_g) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}} (\|g\|_{p,u} + \|g\|_\gamma)$ .
- (3)  $T^n \mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r$ -proper for  $n \geq N_g := \lceil \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \log_\Lambda^+(\|g\|_{p,u} + \|g\|_\gamma) \rceil$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r$ -proper if  $\|g\|_{p,u} + \|g\|_\gamma \leq 1$ .

*Proof.* (1). Note that if  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu_{\bar{g}})$  is generated by the conditional expectation of a probability density function  $\bar{g}$ , then (3.5) implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}) = \int_{\mathcal{A}^u} \frac{\bar{g}}{|W_\alpha|^r} d\lambda^u(\alpha), \quad r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0], \quad (3.12)$$

The fact that  $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{W}^u, \mu)$  is  $r_1$ -proper, for any  $r_1 \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0)$ , implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_{r_1}(\mathcal{E}) = \int_{\mathcal{A}^u} \frac{1}{|W_\alpha|^{r_1}} d\lambda^u(\alpha) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

By definition, we have

$$\|g\|_{p,u} = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u} |g(x)| |W_\alpha|^{\mathbf{s}_0/p} < \infty.$$

For any  $r < \mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{s}_0/p = \mathbf{s}_0/q$ , there exists  $r_1 < \mathbf{s}_0$ , such that  $r \leq r_1 - \mathbf{s}_0/p$ . It implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}) = \int_{\mathcal{A}^u} \frac{1}{|W_\alpha|^{r_1}} \bar{g}(\alpha) |W_\alpha|^{r_1-r} \cdot d\lambda^u(\alpha) < \|g\|_{p,u} C_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

(2). For any  $x \in W_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u$ ,

$$|g(x) - \bar{g}(\alpha)| \leq \|g\|_\gamma \cdot |W_\alpha|^\gamma. \quad (3.13)$$

Then (3.5) implies that

$$|\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_g) - \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}})| \leq \|g\|_\gamma \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \frac{|W_\alpha|^\gamma}{|W_\alpha|^r} d\lambda(\alpha) \leq \|g\|_\gamma \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}). \quad (3.14)$$

Combining with item (1), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{G}_g) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}} (\|g\|_{p,u} + \|g\|_\gamma).$$

In the case  $g \in \mathcal{H}_\infty(\gamma)$ , it is evident that  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}) \leq \|g\|_\infty \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}) < \infty$ . Thus  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $r$ -standard, for any  $r < \mathbf{s}_0$ .

(3). The statement directly follows from (3.9). □

Note that above lemma implies that for any  $p > 1$  and for any dynamically Hölder function  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$  with  $\mu(g) < \infty$ , the associated standard family  $\mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r$ -standard for any  $r < \mathbf{s}_0 - \mathbf{s}_0/p$ .

## 4 The Coupling Lemma and the hyperbolic magnet

In this section, we will construct a hyperbolic set  $\mathcal{R}^*$ , the so called *magnet* (see [12]), and build a hyperbolic suspension structure for  $(T, \mu)$ . The hyperbolic set  $\mathcal{R}^*$  will be used later as the base for our coupling algorithm.

### 4.1 The construction of a hyperbolic magnet

Given a family of aligned stable manifolds  $\Gamma^s$  and a family of aligned unstable manifolds  $\Gamma^u$  that fully across each other, their intersection  $\mathcal{R} = \Gamma^u \cap \Gamma^s$  is said to have a *hyperbolic product structure*. A subset  $\mathcal{R}_1 \subset \mathcal{R}$  is said to be a *u-subset* of  $\mathcal{R}$ , if there exists a subfamily of unstable manifolds  $\Gamma_1^u \subset \Gamma^u$ , such that  $\mathcal{R}_1 = \Gamma_1^u \cap \Gamma^s$ . Similarly we can define the *s-subsets* of  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Now we begin to construct this hyperbolic set  $\mathcal{R}^*$ . We first define the radius of an invariant manifold:

**DEFINITION 6.** For any  $x \in M$ , let  $r^{s/u}(x) = d_{W^{s/u}(x)}(x, \partial W^{s/u}(x))$ , where  $W^{s/u}(x)$  is the stable/unstable manifold that contains  $x$ . Set  $r^{s/u}(x) = 0$  if the stable/unstable manifold at  $x$  degenerates.

For every  $\delta > 0$ , we introduce the following set

$$N_\delta^\pm = \{x \in M : d(T^{\pm n}x, S_{\pm 1}) \geq \delta \Lambda^{-n} \text{ for all } n \geq 0\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Note that the complement of the set  $N_\delta^\pm$  contains points whose orbits approach  $S_{\pm 1}$  under  $T^{\pm n}$  faster than the  $\delta \cdot \Lambda^{-n}$  for some  $n$ . It is well known that a point  $x$  can not have long stable/unstable manifold if the orbit of  $x$  approaches to the singularity set  $S_{\pm 1}$  too fast under  $T^{\pm n}$ . The following lemma states that the stable manifolds (resp. unstable manifolds) of points in  $N_\delta^+$  (resp.  $N_\delta^-$ ) have a uniform length.

**Lemma 4.1** ([18]). *Assume (H1)–(H5) hold. There exists a uniform constant  $c > 0$ , such that for any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $r^s(x) > c\delta$  for every point  $x \in N_\delta^+$  and  $r^u(x) > c\delta$  for every  $x \in N_\delta^-$ .*

It follows from Lemma 4.1 that for any point  $x \in N_\delta := N_\delta \cap N_\delta$ , both  $W^s(x)$  and  $W^u(x)$  exist with  $r^s(x) \geq c\delta$  and  $r^u(x) \geq c\delta$ . Note that  $x$  may not belong to  $N_\delta^\pm$  even if  $r^{s/u}(x) \geq c\delta$ , since  $\Lambda^{-n}$  is just an upper bound, and  $T^n x$  may approach to  $S_{\pm 1}$  faster than that.

The next result is also proved in [18], whose proof depends strongly on **(H4)**.

**Lemma 4.2.** *There exists  $\delta_0 > 0$ , such that for any unstable manifold  $W^u$  with  $|W^u| > \delta_0$ ,*

$$\mu_{W^u}(r^s(x) < \varepsilon) < C\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{S}_0}, \text{ for any } \varepsilon > 0, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $C > 0$  is some uniform constant depending only on  $\delta_0$ .

**REMARK 3.** The relation in (4.2) has a ‘time reversal’ counterpart, see the remark after [12, Theorem 5.66]. These two equations guarantee that there are plenty of ‘long’ stable (resp. unstable) manifolds along any unstable (resp. stable) manifolds, which is essential for the construction of the hyperbolic magnet.

REMARK 4. Using (3.10) and the fact that the SRB measure  $\mu$  is  $s_0$ -proper, we know that  $\mu(M \setminus N_\delta^\pm) \leq C\delta^{s_0}$ . Therefore, the set of points with short stable/unstable manifolds satisfies the following estimate: there exists  $\tilde{c} > 0$  such that  $\mu(r^{s/u}(x) < \delta) \leq \tilde{c}\delta^{s_0}$  for all  $\delta > 0$ .

Now let  $d \in (0, 1)$ , pick  $\delta_0$  small enough such that  $\mu(N_{10\delta_0/c}) > d$ . Pick an unstable manifold  $W$  with  $\mu_W(W \cap N_{10\delta_0/c}) > d$ , and a  $\mu_W$ -density point  $x_0 \in W \cap N_{10\delta_0/c}$ . Define

$$\hat{\Gamma}^s = \{W^s(y) \mid y \in W^u(x_0) \cap N_{10\delta_0/c}\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that  $\hat{\Gamma}^s$  is the collection of all maximal stable manifolds along  $W^u(x_0) \cap N_{\delta_0}$ , which stick out both sides of  $W^u(x_0)$  by at least  $5\delta_0$ . As the length of stable manifolds in  $\hat{\Gamma}^s$  may be very irregular, we need to chop off a portion to get our magnet.

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a *rectangular* shaped region such that  $x_0$  is almost the geometric center of  $\mathcal{U}$ , and the boundary  $\partial\mathcal{U}$  consists of two unstable manifolds with length  $6\delta_0$  and two stable manifolds with length  $6\delta_0$ . Accordingly, the region  $\mathcal{U}$  can be viewed as a rectangle centered at  $x_0$  with dimensions  $6\delta_0 \times 6\delta_0$ .

We say that an unstable manifold  $W^u$  *fully  $u$ -crosses*  $\hat{\Gamma}^s$ , if  $W^u$  meets every stable manifold in  $\hat{\Gamma}^s$ . Let  $\hat{\Gamma}^u$  be the collection of all maximal unstable manifolds  $W^u(y)$  that fully  $u$ -cross  $\hat{\Gamma}^s$ , with  $y \in W^s(x_0) \cap \mathcal{U}$ . Let  $\Gamma^{u/s} = \hat{\Gamma}^{s/u} \cap \mathcal{U}$ , and then set  $\mathcal{R}^* = \hat{\Gamma}^s \cap \hat{\Gamma}^u$ . By the bounded distortion property of the stable holonomy map  $\mathbf{h}$ , we get that there exists  $d_0 > 0$  such that

$$\mu_W(W \cap \mathcal{R}^*) > d_0, \quad (4.4)$$

for any  $W \in \Gamma^u$ . Moreover, we have  $\mu(\mathcal{R}^*) > d_0^2$ .

## 4.2 The Coupling Lemma

Next we review the *Coupling Lemma*, which was originally proved by Chernov and Dolgopyat (cf. [9, 10, 22]) for dispersing billiards, see also [12, §7.12–7.15]. The coupling lemma was generalized in [18] to systems under the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H5)** on proper families, and then in [28] to time-dependent billiards.

When performing the coupling algorithm on a given magnet  $\mathcal{R}^*$ , one may not couple the entire measure crossing the magnet at each return time. To implement the idea, we use the concept of the *generalized standard family*.

DEFINITION 7. Let  $(\mathcal{W}, \nu)$  be a standard family, where  $\mathcal{W} \subset \Gamma^u$  is a measurable collection of unstable manifolds in  $\Gamma^u$ . Then we define  $(\mathcal{W}, \nu)|_{\mathcal{R}^*} := (\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R}^*, \nu|_{\mathcal{R}^*})$ . For any  $n \geq 0$ , we call  $(\mathcal{W}_n, \nu_n) := T^{-n}((\mathcal{W}, \nu)|_{\mathcal{R}^*})$  as a generalized standard family with index  $n$ .

Next we state the Coupling Lemma [10, 12] for the induced system  $(F, \mu_M)$  using the concept of generalized standard families.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}^i = (\mathcal{W}^i, \nu^i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , be two  $r$ -proper families on  $M$ , for some  $r \in (0, s_0]$ . For any  $n \geq 1$ , there exist two sequences of generalized standard families  $\{(\mathcal{W}_n^i, \nu_n^i), n \geq 0\}$ , such that*

$$\mathcal{G}^i = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{W}_n^i, \nu_n^i) := \left( \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{W}_n^i, \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \nu_n^i \right). \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover, they satisfy the following properties that for each  $n \geq 0$ :



(i) **Proper return to  $\mathcal{R}^*$  at  $n$ .**

Both  $(\mathcal{W}_n^1, \nu_n^1)$  and  $(\mathcal{W}_n^2, \nu_n^2)$  are generalized standard families of index  $n$ ;

(ii) **Coupling  $T_*^n \nu_n^1$  and  $T_*^n \nu_n^2$  along stable manifolds in  $\Gamma^s$ .**

For any measurable collection of stable manifolds  $A \subset \Gamma^s$ , we have

$$T_*^n \nu_n^1(A) = T_*^n \nu_n^2(A).$$

(iii) **Exponential tail bound for uncoupled measure at  $n$ .**

There exist  $C_c > 0$  and  $s \in (0, s_0]$  such that, for any  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\bar{\nu}_n^i(M) < C_c \Lambda^{-sn}, \text{ for all } n \geq 1, \quad (4.6)$$

where  $\bar{\nu}_n^i := \sum_{k \geq n} \nu_k^i$  is the uncoupled measure at  $n$ -th step.

*Proof.* Given two  $r$ -proper families  $\mathcal{G}^i = (\mathcal{W}^i, \nu^i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , on  $M$ , let  $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}^i = \mathcal{W}^i \times [0, 1]$ , on which the map  $T$  can be extended by  $T(x, t) = (Tx, t)$ . Let  $\widehat{\nu}^i = \nu^i \times dt$  be the corresponding product measure. By Lemma 15 in [18], there exist a coupling map  $\Theta : \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^1 \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^2$  and a coupling time function  $\Upsilon : \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^1 \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$  such that

1.  $\Theta_*(\widehat{\nu}^1) = \widehat{\nu}^2$ ,

2. for any  $(x, t) \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}^1$ ,  $T^n y \in \Gamma^s(T^n x)$ , where  $(y, s) = \Theta(x, t)$  and  $n = \Upsilon(x, t)$ .

For each  $n \geq 1$ , let  $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^1 = \Theta^{-1}(n)$ ,  $\widehat{\nu}_n^1$  be the restriction of  $\widehat{\nu}^1$  on  $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^1$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_n^1$  be the projection of  $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^1$  and  $\nu_n^1$  be the projection of  $\widehat{\nu}_n^1$  on  $\mathcal{W}_n^1$ . Then  $(\mathcal{W}_n^1, \nu_n^1)$  is a generalized standard family for each  $n \geq 1$ . Similarly we define  $\mathcal{W}_n^2$  and  $\nu_n^2$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $T_*^n \nu_n^1$  and  $T_*^n \nu_n^2$  are coupled by the stable manifolds in  $\Gamma^s$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $\bar{\nu}_n^i := \sum_{k \geq n} \nu_k^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Then (4.6) follows from [18, Eq. (7.2)]. This completes the proof.  $\square$

REMARK 5. Each part  $(\mathcal{W}_n^i, \nu_n^i)$  is supported on some Cantor set of the unstable manifolds, instead of the whole manifolds. However, note that the measure  $\nu_n^i$  is the restriction of some standard family to that Cantor set. This is why we call such a family a *generalized* standard family.

The lemma in the following tells us that, under that assumptions **(H1)–(H5)**, the system admits a hyperbolic set with a generalized Markov structure.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose the map  $T : M \rightarrow M$  satisfies the assumptions **(H1)–(H5)**. Then the hyperbolic set  $\mathcal{R}^*$  is the base of a generalized Markov partition with exponential small tails:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{R}^*$  has a decomposition into  $s$ -subsets  $\mathcal{R}^* = \cup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{R}_n^*$  such that  $T^n \mathcal{R}_n^* \subset \mathcal{R}^*$  is a  $u$ -subset of  $\mathcal{R}^*$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .

- (2) There exist  $C > 0$  and  $s \in (0, s_0]$  such that the following holds for each  $n \geq 1$ :

$$\sum_{k \geq n} \mu(\mathcal{R}_k^*) \leq C \Lambda^{-sn}. \quad (4.7)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.4.* We apply Lemma 4.3 to two identical copies of the standard family induced by the SRB measure, and then construct the generalized Young tower based on this coupling process. That is, let  $\nu$  be the restriction of the SRB measure  $\mu$  on  $\bigcup \Gamma^u$ ,  $\lambda^u$  be the factor measure of  $\nu$  on  $\Gamma^u$ , and  $\mathcal{G}^i := (\Gamma^u, \nu) = \{(W, \mu_W)_{W \in \Gamma^u}, \lambda^u\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , be two identical copies of the induced standard family. By Lemma 4.3, for each  $n \geq 1$ , we couple *everything*<sup>3</sup> in  $T^n \mathcal{G}^i$  that properly return to  $\mathcal{R}^*$ , and get a decomposition of  $(\Gamma^u, \nu)$  into *generalized* standard families  $\{(\mathcal{W}_n, \nu_n), n \geq 1\}$ , such that  $T^n \mathcal{W}_n$  is a  $u$ -subset of  $\mathcal{R}^*$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Define  $\mathcal{R}_n = \mathcal{W}_n^s \cap \Gamma^s$ , where  $\mathcal{W}_n^s = \{W^s(x) : T^n x \in \Gamma^s \cap \mathcal{F}^k \mathcal{W}_n\}$ . Then we can check that

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_n \pmod{0},$$

and it satisfies the following properties:

- (1)  $T^n(\mathcal{R}_n)$  is a  $u$ -subset of  $\mathcal{U}^*$  and  $\{\mathcal{R}_n, n \geq 1\}$  are almost surely disjoint  $s$ -subsets of  $\mathcal{U}^*$  in the following sense:  $\mu(\mathcal{R}_m \cap \mathcal{R}_n) = 0$  for any  $m \neq n$ ;
- (2) Furthermore

$$\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mu(\mathcal{R}_k) < C_c \Lambda^{-sn}, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $C_c$  and  $s > 0$  are from (4.6).

This completes the proof. □

Note that the singularity sets  $S_{\pm 1}$  may contain countably many smooth curves. Thus there can exist countably many  $s$ -subsets  $\mathcal{R}_{n,i}$ ,  $i \geq 1$ , such that  $\mathcal{R}_n = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{R}_{n,i}$ , and  $T^n W^u(x) \in \Gamma^u$  properly crosses  $\mathcal{U}^*$  for any  $x \in \hat{\Gamma}_{n,i}^s$ . Moreover,  $T^n y$  and  $T^n x$  belong to the same unstable manifold in  $\Gamma^u$  for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{R}_{n,i} \cap W^u$ .

One can build a partition of  $M$  by taking the union of all forward iterates  $T^k \mathcal{R}^*$ , and extend the return time function on  $\mathcal{R}^*$  to the whole space  $M$ . That is,  $\tau(x) = n - k$  as the time needed to *enter* the base  $\mathcal{R}^*$  of the tower for any  $x \in T^k \mathcal{R}_n^*$ ,  $0 \leq k < n$  and  $n \geq 1$ . It follows from (4.7) that

$$\mu(\tau > n) \leq C_1 \Lambda^{-sn},$$

for some uniform constant  $C_1 = C/(\Lambda^s - 1)$ . This generalized Markov tower based on the partition  $\mathcal{R}^* = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{R}_n$  is in the same spirit of [29, 30]. One improvement here is that we allow the minimal solid  $s$ -rectangle containing  $\mathcal{R}_n$  to consist of countably many minimal  $s$ -rectangles  $\mathcal{U}_{n,i}^*$ . This property is due to the fact that we allow the singular set of system to contain countably many singular curves, since one unstable manifold may be cut into infinitely many small pieces, many of which may return to the rectangle  $\mathcal{U}^*$  simultaneously. So from this point of view, our construction covers more classes of dynamical systems than those [29, 30], including dispersing billiards with infinite horizon.

## 5 Decay of Correlations

In this section we will study the decay rates of correlations for the system  $(T, M, \mu)$  using the coupling method.

---

<sup>3</sup>This is due to the fact that the two families are the same.

## 5.1 Equidistribution properties

The following lemma describes the equidistribution property of the system. Namely, for any two probability measures  $\nu^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , associated with proper families  $\mathcal{G}^i = (\mathcal{W}^i, \nu^i)$ , the images  $T^n \nu^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  approach each other exponentially (in the weak topology for a large set of observables). As explained in [10], the equidistribution property effectively describes the asymptotic independence between the present and the future of the system.

Recall the constants  $s = s(\mu, \nu)$  and  $C_c > 0$  given by Lemma 4.3.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $p > 1$ ,  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1]$ , and  $(\mathcal{W}, \nu)$  be an  $r$ -proper family with density  $d\nu/d\mu \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ . Under condition (2.11), then for any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ ,*

$$\left| \int_M f \circ T^n d\nu - \int_M f d\mu \right| \leq (2C_c C(\gamma, s) \|f\|_{p, \gamma} + C_{g, \varepsilon}(f)) \Lambda^{-\xi n},$$

where  $\xi = \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{s}{2}, \frac{s}{q}, \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} s \right\}$ , and  $C(\gamma, s) = \frac{1}{1-\Lambda^{-\gamma}} + \frac{1}{1-\Lambda^{-s}}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{W}, \nu)$  be the  $r$ -proper family, We first unify the notations by denoting  $(\mathcal{W}^1, \nu^1) := (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$ , and  $(\mathcal{W}^2, \nu^2) := (\mathcal{W}^u, \mu)$ . By the Coupling Lemma 4.3, we have a decomposition  $\nu^i = \sum_{m=1}^n \nu_m^i + \bar{\nu}_n^i$  with support  $\text{supp}(\nu_m^i) = \mathcal{W}_m^i$ , such that  $T^m \mathcal{W}_m^i$  is a  $u$ -subset of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Note that the uncoupled measures satisfy  $\bar{\nu}_n^1(M) = \bar{\nu}_n^2(M) < C_c \Lambda^{-sn}$ .

Now for any  $x \in W^u \subset \Gamma^u$ , we choose  $\bar{x} \in W^s(x)$ , such that  $f(\bar{x}) = \max_{y \in W^s(x)} f(y)$  be the maximum value of  $f$  along stable manifold  $W^s(x)$ .

We first consider the coupled portions  $\nu_m^1$  and  $\nu_m^2$  when  $m \leq n$ . In this case the Hölder continuity of  $f$  implies that for  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x \in M$ ,

$$|f \circ T^{n-m}(x) - f \circ T^{n-m}(\bar{x})| \leq \|f\|_{C\gamma} \Lambda^{-\gamma(n-m)}.$$

Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{W}_m^1} f \circ T^n(x) d\nu_m^1(x) - \int_{\mathcal{W}_m^2} f \circ T^n(y) d\nu_m^2(y) \right| \leq \left| \int_{T^m \mathcal{W}_m^1} (f \circ T^{n-m}(x) - f \circ T^{n-m}(\bar{x})) dT_*^m \nu_m^1(x) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \int_{T^m \mathcal{W}_m^2} (f \circ T^{n-m}(y) - f \circ T^{n-m}(\bar{x})) dT_*^m \nu_m^2(y) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \int_{T^m \mathcal{W}_m^1} f \circ T^{n-m}(\bar{x}) dT_*^m \nu_m^1(x) - \int_{T^m \mathcal{W}_m^2} f \circ T^{n-m}(\bar{x}) dT_*^m \nu_m^2(y) \right| \\ & \leq 2C \|f\|_{C\gamma} \cdot \Lambda^{-\gamma(n-m)} \cdot \mu_m(M) \leq 2C_c \|f\|_{C\gamma} \Lambda^{-\gamma(n-m) - sm}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact that  $(T^m \mathcal{W}_m^1, T_*^m \nu_m^1)$  and  $(T^m \mathcal{W}_m^2, T_*^m \nu_m^2)$  are coupled at time  $m$  and have the same measure. In particular, the choices of  $\bar{x}$  works for both families.

Recall that  $\bar{\nu}_n^2$  is the remaining measure of  $\nu^2 = \mu$  after time  $n$ . Then by Hölder inequality and Lemma 4.3, and Lemma 4.3 (ii), we have for  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{W}_n^i} f \circ T^n d\bar{\nu}_n^i \right| = \left| \int_{T^n \mathcal{W}_n^i} f dT^n \bar{\nu}_n^i \right| \leq \left( \int_M |f|^p dT^n \bar{\nu}_n^i \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot (T^n \bar{\nu}_n^i(M))^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \|f\|_p \cdot C_c \Lambda^{-sn/q},$$

where  $q > 1$  satisfies  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ . Here we use the assumptions that the measure  $\nu^2 = \mu$  is  $T$ -invariant and the function  $f \in \mathcal{H}_p^+(\gamma)$ .

For the counterpart  $\bar{\nu}_n^1$  of  $\nu^1 = \nu$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{W}_n^1} f \circ T^n d\bar{\nu}_n^1 \right| &\leq \left( \int_M |f \circ T^n|^{1+\varepsilon} d\bar{\nu}_n^1 \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}} \cdot (\bar{\nu}_n^1(M))^{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq \left( \int_M |f \circ T^n|^{1+\varepsilon} d\nu \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}} \cdot (\bar{\nu}_n^1(M))^{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq C_{g,\varepsilon}(f) \cdot (\bar{\mu}_n(M))^{\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)} \leq C_{g,\varepsilon}(f) \cdot C_{\mathbf{c}} \Lambda^{-sn\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Combining the three estimations in the above, we get that for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_M f \circ T^n d\nu - \int_M f d\mu \right| &= \left| \int_M f \circ T^n d\nu^1 - \int_M f \circ T^n d\nu^2 \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^n \left| \left( \int_{\mathcal{W}_m^1} f \circ T^n d\nu_m^1 - \int_{\mathcal{W}_m^2} f \circ T^n d\nu_m^2 \right) \right| + \left| \int_{\mathcal{W}_n^1} f \circ T^n d\bar{\nu}_n^1 \right| + \left| \int_{\mathcal{W}_n^2} f \circ T^n d\bar{\nu}_n^2 \right| \\ &\leq 2C_{\mathbf{c}} \|f\|_{C^\gamma} \cdot \left( \sum_{m=1}^n \Lambda^{-\gamma(n-m)-sm} \right) + \|f\|_p \cdot C_{\mathbf{c}} \Lambda^{-sn/q} + C_{g,\varepsilon}(f) \cdot C_{\mathbf{c}} \Lambda^{-sn\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq 2C_{\mathbf{c}} \|f\|_{C^\gamma} \left( \frac{\Lambda^{-n\gamma/2}}{1-\Lambda^{-\gamma}} + \frac{\Lambda^{-ns/2}}{1-\Lambda^{-\gamma}} \right) + \|f\|_p \cdot C_{\mathbf{c}} \Lambda^{-sn/q} + C_{g,\varepsilon}(f) \cdot C_{\mathbf{c}} \Lambda^{-sn\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\xi = \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{s}{2}, \frac{s}{q}, \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} s \right\}$  and  $C(\gamma, s) = \frac{1}{1-\Lambda^{-\gamma}} + \frac{1}{1-\Lambda^{-\gamma}}$ , we get that

$$\left| \int_M f \circ T^{n+\bar{n}} d\nu - \int_M f d\mu \right| \leq 2(C_{\mathbf{c}} C(\gamma, s) \|f\|_{p,\gamma} + C_{g,\varepsilon}(f)) \Lambda^{-\xi n},$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ . This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

## 5.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Let  $p, q \in (1, \infty]$ , with  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ , and  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$ . We start with the case when  $g$  is non-negative, and  $\mu(g) > 0$ . Consider the standard family  $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{W}^u, \mu)$ . Let  $n \geq 1$ . In the following we make a partition of  $n$  into two subintervals of length  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  and  $n - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ . Let  $\bar{g}_n(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}(g \circ T^{-n} | W_\alpha)$  be the conditional expectation of  $g \circ T^{-n}$  on  $W_\alpha$  with respect to  $\mu$ . By the Hölder continuity of  $g$ , we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u} \sup_{x \in W_\alpha} |g \circ T^{-n}(x) - \bar{g}_n(\alpha)| \leq c_M \|g\|_{C^\gamma} \Lambda^{-n\gamma}.$$

Here the constant  $c_M > 0$  is the upper bound of the length of all the unstable manifolds that is introduced at the end of §2.1 (see Remark 1). This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Cov}_n(f, g)| &= |\text{Cov}_{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}(f, g \circ T^{-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, T)| \\ &= |\text{Cov}_{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}(f, \bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, T) + \text{Cov}_{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}(f, (g \circ T^{-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} - \bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}), T)| \\ &\leq |\text{Cov}_{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}(f, \bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, T)| + c_M \mu(|f|) \cdot \|g\|_{C^\gamma} \Lambda^{-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we consider  $\text{Cov}_{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}(f, \bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, T)$ . For any  $r \in [s_0/2, s_0]$ , Let  $\chi = \frac{\gamma_0 \ln \Lambda}{r}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}'_n = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u : |W_\alpha| \geq e^{-n\chi/2}\}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}'_n = \{T^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} W_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}'_n\}$ . Then the compliment of  $\mathcal{A}'_n$  satisfies

$$\lambda^u((\mathcal{A}'_n)^c) = \mu(|W_\alpha| < e^{-n\chi}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}^u) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}} e^{-rn\chi} = C_{\mathbf{p}} \Lambda^{-n\gamma_0}, \quad (5.2)$$

since  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $r$ -proper.

For any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}'_n$ , we have  $\mathcal{L}_r(W_\alpha, \mu_\alpha) \leq e^{rn\chi/2}$  since  $|W_\alpha| \geq e^{-n\chi/2}$ . Then Lemma 3.2 implies that  $T^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}(W_\alpha, \mu_\alpha)$  is an  $r$ -proper family for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}'_n$ . Let  $\mathbf{v}'_n = \int_{\mathcal{A}'_n} \bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} T_*^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \mu_\alpha d\lambda^u(\alpha)$ . Note that the function  $\bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$  is constant on  $T^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} W_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}'_n$ . It follows that  $(T^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \mathcal{W}'_n, \mathbf{v}'_n)$  is  $r$ -proper. Applying Lemma 5.1 to the  $r$ -proper family  $(T^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \mathcal{W}'_n, \mathbf{v}'_n)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{W}'_n} f \circ T^{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\mathbf{v}'_n - \mu(f) \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathcal{W}'_n} f \circ T^{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\mathbf{v}'_n - \mu(f) \cdot \mathbf{v}'_n(M) \right| + C\mu(f) \cdot \mu(g) \cdot \Lambda^{-n\gamma_0} \\ &\leq [2C_{\mathbf{c}}C(\gamma, s)\mu(g)\|f\|_{p, \gamma} + C_{g, \varepsilon}(f) + C\mu(f)\mu(g)]\Lambda^{-\frac{\xi n}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ .

We define  $d\lambda_g(\alpha) := \bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\lambda^u(\alpha)$ , for any  $\alpha \in (\mathcal{A}'_n)^c$ . Thus by (2.11), we get for  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\alpha \in (\mathcal{A}'_n)^c} \int_{W_\alpha} \bar{g}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}(\alpha) f \circ T^{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} d\mu_\alpha d\lambda^u(\alpha) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{W_\alpha} f \circ T^{n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \cdot \chi_{(\mathcal{A}'_n)^c}(\alpha) d\mu_\alpha d\lambda_g(\alpha) \right| \\ &\leq \left( \int_M |f|^{1+\varepsilon} \circ T^n \cdot g(x) d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}} \lambda_g((\mathcal{A}'_n)^c)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq C_{g, \varepsilon}(f) \Lambda^{-\frac{qn\varepsilon\gamma_0}{1+\varepsilon}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where we used  $\chi = \frac{\gamma_0 \ln \Lambda}{r}$  in the last step.

Combining the above estimations, we get for  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Cov}_n(f, g)| &\leq C_{\varepsilon, \kappa} K_f \Lambda^{-\frac{qn\varepsilon\gamma_0}{1+\varepsilon}} + c_M \mu(|f|) \cdot \|g\|_{C^\gamma} \Lambda^{-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \gamma} \\ &\quad + [2C_{\mathbf{c}}C(\gamma, s)\mu(g)\|f\|_{p, \gamma} + C_{g, \varepsilon}(f) + C\mu(f)\mu(g)]\Lambda^{-\frac{\xi n}{2}} \\ &\leq [2C_{g, \varepsilon}(f) + (2C(\gamma, s)C_{\mathbf{c}} + c_M + C_{\mathbf{p}})(\mu(|f|) + \|f\|_{p, \gamma})(\mu(g) + \|g\|_{C^\gamma})] \vartheta^n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\vartheta = \max\{\Lambda^{-\frac{qn\varepsilon\gamma_0}{1+\varepsilon}}, \Lambda^{-\frac{\xi}{2}}, \Lambda^{-\gamma/2}\}$ .

In the case that  $g$  is not non-negative, we let  $g = g^+ - g^-$  be the decomposition of  $g$  into its positive and negative parts. Then the above estimation holds for both  $g^+$  and  $g^-$ . Therefore we have for  $n \geq N_g$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_M f \circ T^n \cdot g d\mu - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(g) \right| = \left| \int_M f \circ T^n \cdot (g^+ - g^-) d\mu - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(g^+ - g^-) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_M f \circ T^n \cdot g^+ d\mu - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(g^+) \right| + \left| \int_M f \circ T^n \cdot g^- d\mu - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(g^-) \right| \\ &\leq [2C_{g, \varepsilon}(f) + 4(2C(\gamma, s)C_{\mathbf{c}} + c_M + C_{\mathbf{p}})\|f\|_{p, \gamma}\|g\|_{p, \gamma}] \vartheta^n. \end{aligned}$$

For  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_\infty(\gamma)$ , one can check that (5.3) holds for  $n \geq 1$ . Thus we have

$$\left| \int_M f \circ T^n \cdot g d\mu - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(g) \right| \leq C(\gamma) \|f\|_{\infty, \gamma} \|g\|_{\infty, \gamma} \vartheta^n,$$

for some constant  $C(\gamma) > 0$ , and  $n \geq 1$ . This completes the proof.

## 6 Proof of Theorem 2

In this section our dynamical system  $(M, T, \mu)$  satisfies the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H6)**.

### 6.1 The standard family associated to a density function in $\mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma)$ .

In this subsection, we assume  $p \in (1, \infty]$  and  $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, 1]$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma)$  is a nonnegative, dynamically Hölder function with  $0 < \mu(g) < \infty$ . We have shown that  $g$  induces a standard family  $\mathcal{G}_g = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$ , with  $d\nu = g d\mu$ . Moreover  $g \circ T^{-1}$  generates  $T\mathcal{G}_g = (T\mathcal{W}, T_*\nu)$ . Now we will investigate the  $\mathcal{L}$ -function of  $T\mathcal{G}_g$ , and show that  $g \circ T^{-1}$  leads to an  $r$ -standard family with  $r \leq \mathbf{s}_0$ . The main reason we consider  $T\mathcal{G}_g$  instead of  $\mathcal{G}_g$  is that the former can be  $r$ -proper even the latter is not, mainly because of the one-step expansion property. We start with a technical lemma that is useful later when defining the constant  $C_{\mathbf{p}}$  in (6.1) and when estimating  $\mathcal{L}$ -functions in Eq. 6.4. Recall the constants  $b$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  given in **(H6)**.

**Lemma 6.1.** *The series  $A(r) := \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-(\mathbf{s}+2)+r(2-b)+\kappa/p}$  is convergent for every  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0]$  when  $b \geq 2$ , and for every  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0)$  when  $b \in [1, 2)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $h(r) = (\mathbf{s} + 2) - r(2 - b) - \kappa/p$ . We divide the proof into two cases:

(1). when  $b \geq 2$ : then for any  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0]$ ,

$$h(r) \geq h(0) = \mathbf{s} + 2 - \kappa/p \geq \mathbf{s} + 1 > 1,$$

since  $\kappa/p \leq 1$ . Therefore, the series  $A(r) := \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-h(r)}$  converges for  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0]$ .

(2). when  $b \in [1, 2)$ : then for any  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0)$ , Then we have

$$h(r) > h(\mathbf{s}_0) = 1 + \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}_0(2 - b) \geq 1,$$

since  $\mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_0(2 - b)$  by (2.8). Therefore, the series  $A(r) := \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-h(r)}$  converges for  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0)$ .

Collecting terms, we complete the proof.  $\square$

Next we reintroduce our definition of  $r$ -proper families for systems satisfying the new hypothesis **(H6)**. Let  $c > 0$ ,  $C_z > 0$  be the constants given by Lemma 3.1. We now define<sup>4</sup>

$$C_{\mathbf{p}}(r) = \max \left\{ \frac{C_z}{1 - c\Lambda^{-\gamma_0}} + \frac{C_A}{\mathbf{s} + 1 - \mathbf{s}_0(2 - b)}, C_A(1 + A(r)) \right\} \quad (6.1)$$

<sup>4</sup>The reason for this choice will be clear when estimating  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}_0}(\mathcal{E})$  in (6.8).

for each  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0]$ . Note that the term  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E})$  is left out intentionally from (6.1).

A potential problem is that it is possible to have  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \mathbf{s}_0} C_{\mathbf{p}}(r) = \infty$ . To have a uniform control of standard families, we need to fix an  $r_0 \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0]$  by

$$r_0 = \begin{cases} \mathbf{s}_0, & \text{when } b \geq 2; \\ \frac{1}{2(b+s)} + \frac{\mathbf{s}_0}{2}, & \text{when } b \in [1, 2). \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

It follows from (2.8) that  $r_0 < \mathbf{s}_0$  when  $b \in [1, 2)$ . Therefore,  $C_{\mathbf{p}} := C_{\mathbf{p}}(r_0) < \infty$  by Lemma 6.1. An  $r$ -standard family  $\mathcal{G}$  is called  $r$ -proper if  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) < C_{\mathbf{p}}$ .

It follows from the definition that  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}) \leq \mathcal{L}_{r_0}(\mathcal{G})$  for any  $0 < r \leq r_0$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{G}$  being  $r_0$ -proper implies that it is  $r$ -proper for all  $0 < r \leq r_0$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $p > 1$ , and  $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma)$  be a probability density function. Define  $\bar{g}(x) = \mathbb{E}(g|D_n)$  for any  $x \in D_n$  and  $n \geq 1$ . Then for  $r \in (0, \mathbf{s}_0)$ :*

- (1)  $T\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}$  is  $r$ -standard and  $\mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}}(r)K_g$ .
- (2)  $T\mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r$ -standard and  $\mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{G}_g) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}}(r)(K_g + \|g\|_{\gamma})$ .
- (3)  $T^{n+1}\mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r_0$ -proper for  $n \geq N_g := \lceil \frac{1}{\gamma} \log_{\Lambda}^+(K_g + \|g\|_{\gamma}) \rceil$ . In particular,  $T\mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r_0$ -proper if  $K_g + \|g\|_{\gamma} \leq 1$ .
- (4)  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $\mathbf{s}_0$ -proper.

*Proof.* (1). Note that  $K_g < \infty$  since  $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}$ . It follows the definition of  $\bar{g}$  that

$$|\bar{g}(T^{-1}x)| \leq K_g n^{\kappa/p}, \quad (6.3)$$

for any  $x \in TD_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . According to (2.7),  $D_n$  has an unstable foliation such that each leaf  $W_{\alpha}$  in this foliation satisfies:

$$\mu(D_n)/|TW_{\alpha}| \leq C_A n^{-s-b}.$$

Then by Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}}) &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \frac{|\bar{g}(T^{-1}x_n)|}{|TW_{\alpha}|^r} \cdot d\lambda(\alpha) \leq C_A K_g \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{\kappa/p} |TW_{\alpha}|^{-r} \mu(D_n) \\ &\leq C_A K_g \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{\kappa/p} |TW_{\alpha}|^{-r} \mu(D_n)^r \mu(D_n)^{1-r} \leq C_A K_g \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-(s+2)(1-r) - (s+b)r + \kappa/p} \\ &= C_A K_g \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-(s+2)+r(2-b)+\kappa/p} \leq C_{\mathbf{p}}(r)K_g, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

where  $x_n \in TW_{\alpha}$ . This completes the proof of (1).

(2). For any  $x \in TD_n$ ,

$$|g(T^{-1}x) - \bar{g}(T^{-1}x)| \leq \|g\|_{\gamma} \cdot \text{diam}(D_n)^{\gamma}. \quad (6.5)$$

Then (3.5) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{G}_g) - \mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{G}_{\bar{g}})| \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \frac{|g \circ T^{-1} - \bar{g} \circ T^{-1}|}{|W_\alpha|^r} d\lambda^u(\alpha) \\ & \leq \|g\|_\gamma \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \frac{\text{diam}(D_n)^\gamma}{|TW_\alpha|^r} d\lambda(\alpha) \leq \|g\|_\gamma \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

Combining with item (1), we get

$$\mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{G}_g) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}}(r)(K_g + \|g\|_\gamma).$$

In the case  $g \in \mathcal{H}_\infty(\gamma)$ , we have  $\mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{G}_g) \leq \|g\|_\infty \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}) < \infty$ .

(3). The statement directly follows from (3.9).

(4) In the estimation (6.4), we take  $g \equiv 1$ . Then  $\kappa = 0$ ,  $K_g = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_r(\mathcal{E}) &= \mathcal{L}_r(T\mathcal{E}) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n} \frac{1}{|TW_\alpha|^r} \cdot d\lambda(\alpha) \\ &\leq C_A \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-(s+2)+r(2-b)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Note that for  $b \geq 2$ , we have  $s+1 - s_0(2-b) > 0$ . On the other hand, for  $b \in [1, 2)$ , **(H6)** implies that  $s+b > 1/s_0$ . Thus  $s > 1-b = 2-b-1 > s_0(2-b) - 1$ . This implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_{s_0}(\mathcal{E}) \leq C_A \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-(s+2)+s_0(2-b)} \leq \frac{C_A}{s+1 - s_0(2-b)} \leq C_{\mathbf{p}}. \quad (6.8)$$

Combining above facts, we have shown that  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $s_0$ -proper.  $\square$

Note that above lemma implies that for any  $p > 1$  and for any dynamically Hölder function  $g \in \mathcal{H}_p(\gamma)$  with  $\mu(g) < \infty$ , the associated standard family  $T\mathcal{G}_g$  is  $r_0$ -standard.

To prove Theorem 2, it is enough to verify condition (2.11) under assumption **(H6)**.

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma)$ , and  $g$  induces an  $r$ -standard family  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$ , with  $r \in [r_0, s_0]$ . Then the following holds:*

$$|T_*^n \nu(|f|^{1+\varepsilon_p})| \leq C_{g, \varepsilon_p}(f) := 2\varepsilon_p^{-1} C_{\mathbf{p}} C_A^{r_0} K_f^{1+\varepsilon_p} (K_g + \|g\|_\gamma), \quad (6.9)$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ , with  $\varepsilon_p = ((s+b)s_0 - 1)/4$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$  be the  $r$ -standard family generated by  $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma)$ , according to Lemma 6.2. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Note that for  $k \geq 1$ ,  $k^{1+\varepsilon} \leq \sum_{l=1}^k 2l^\varepsilon$  (by induction on  $k$ ). Since  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa, p}(\gamma)$ ,  $|f(x)| \leq K_f k^{\kappa/p}$  for any  $x \in D_k$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_*^n \nu(|f|^{1+\varepsilon}) &\leq K_f^{1+\varepsilon} \sum_{k \geq 1} k^{(1+\varepsilon)\kappa/p} \cdot T_*^n \nu(D_k) \leq 2K_f^{1+\varepsilon} \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{l=1}^k l^{(1+\varepsilon)\kappa/p-1} \cdot T_*^n \nu(D_k) \\ &\leq 2K_f^{1+\varepsilon} \sum_{l \geq 1} l^{(1+\varepsilon)\kappa/p-1} \cdot T_*^n \nu(\cup_{k \geq l} D_k). \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$



Now we need to estimate the measures  $T_*^n \nu(\cup_{k \geq l} D_k)$  for each  $l \geq 1$ .

By (2.7), there exist  $C_A > 0$  and  $b > 0$  such that  $r^u(x) \leq C_A \cdot m^{-b-s}$  for all  $x \in TD_m$ . Lemma 6.2 and Eq. (3.10) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} T_*^n \nu(\cup_{m \geq l} D_k) &\leq \sum_{m \geq l} T_*^n \nu(D_m) = \sum_{m \geq l} T_*^{n-1}(T_* \nu)(TD_m) \\ &\leq T_*^{n-1}(T_* \nu)(r^u < C_A \cdot l^{-(b+s)}) \leq C_{\mathbf{p}}(r) C_A^r (K_g + \|g\|_\gamma) \cdot l^{-(b+s)r}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

Combining above facts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_*^n \nu(|f|^{1+\varepsilon}) &\leq 2K_f^{1+\varepsilon} C_{\mathbf{p}}(r) C_A^r \sum_{l \geq 1} l^{(1+\varepsilon)r/p - (b+s)r-1} \\ &\leq 2K_f^{1+\varepsilon} C_{\mathbf{p}}(r) C_A^r (K_g + \|g\|_\gamma) \sum_{l \geq 1} l^{-1 - ((b+s)r-1-\varepsilon)} \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

It follows from (2.8) that  $(s+b)s_0 - 1 > 0$ . Let

$$\varepsilon_p := \frac{1}{4}((s+b)s_0 - 1) > 0. \quad (6.13)$$

It is easy to see  $(b+s)s_0 - 1 - \varepsilon_p = 3\varepsilon_p$ . When  $b \in [1, 2)$ ,  $(b+s)r_0 - 1 - \varepsilon_p = \varepsilon_p$ , where  $r_0 = \frac{1}{2(b+s)} + \frac{s_0}{2}$  is defined in (6.2). This implies that  $(b+s)r - 1 - \varepsilon_p \geq \varepsilon_p$  for any  $r \in [r_0, s_0]$ .

Combining with (6.12) and setting  $r = r_0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_*^n \nu(|f|^{1+\varepsilon_p}) &\leq 2K_f^{1+\varepsilon_p} C_{\mathbf{p}}(r_0) C_A^{r_0} (K_g + \|g\|_\gamma) \sum_{l \geq 1} l^{-1 - ((b+s)r_0 - 1 - \varepsilon_0)} \\ &= 2K_f^{1+\varepsilon_p} C_{\mathbf{p}}(r_0) C_A^{r_0} \sum_{l \geq 1} l^{-1 - \varepsilon_p} \leq 2\varepsilon_p^{-1} K_f^{1+\varepsilon_p} C_{\mathbf{p}}(r_0) C_A^{r_0} (K_g + \|g\|_\gamma), \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

where the last constant is exactly  $C_{g, \varepsilon_p}(f)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now Theorem 1 follows from the proof of Theorem 2.

## 7 Return time function for the induced maps of billiards

The specific billiard systems considered here include semi-dispersing billiards, billiards with cusps, and Bunimovich Stadia, whose basic properties have been studied in [26, 14, 15, 16, 17, 13]. Let  $Q$  be a billiard table and  $\mathcal{M} = \partial Q \times [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$  be the phase space of the billiard map  $\mathcal{F}$  induced on  $Q$ , which preserves a smooth measure  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}} = |\partial Q|^{-1} \cdot \cos \varphi dr d\varphi$ . The reduced phase space  $M$  consists of all/some collisions on dispersing parts of  $\partial Q$  and all/some first collisions on the focusing parts of  $\partial Q$ . The conditional measure obtained by restriction of  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$  on  $M$  is denoted by  $\mu$ , which is a smooth invariant measure (certainly an SRB measure). Let  $T$  be the first return map of  $\mathcal{F}$  from  $M$  to  $M$ . Then it was proved in the above references that the induced system  $(T, M, \mu)$  satisfies the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H5)**. In fact, the one-step expansion estimate **(H5)** actually holds for  $s_0 = 1$ . Note that the discontinuities of  $R$  can only occur at the singularities of  $T$ . We define  $\{D_m\}$  as in **(H6)**, to be an enumeration of level sets of  $R$ .

Since for large  $m$ , the set  $D_m$  is bounded by two stable curves and two unstable curves. One can foliate  $D_n$  into relatively long unstable curves  $W_\alpha$ , with length satisfying

$$c_A m^{-b-s} \leq |W_\alpha| \leq C_A m^{-b-s}$$

Where  $b$  and  $s$  will be determined for each billiard system below. By time-reversibility of billiard system, the set  $TD_m$  is symmetric with respect to  $\varphi$  coordinate about  $D_m$ . Thus the stable dimension of  $TD_m$  is bounded above by  $C_A m^{-b-s}$ . Moreover, by the absolute continuity of the stable foliation, for any  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n$ , the length of  $TW_\alpha$  is comparable to the length of the unstable dimension of  $TD_m$ . Also using the fact that  $\mu$  has probability density bounded by  $(|\partial Q| \mu_{\mathcal{M}}(M))^{-1}$ , we get

$$\mu(D_m)/|TW_\alpha| \leq C m^{-b-s}$$

This verifies the second inequality in **(H6(ii))**. Thus it is enough to verify (2.8) for each billiard system.

Note that the return time function  $R$  is always in  $L^1(\mu)$ . In fact, the Kac's formula gives that  $\mu(R) = \mu_{\mathcal{M}}(M)^{-1}$ . Moreover,  $\mu(D_n) \asymp n^{-3}$  for the above billiard systems, see §7.1 for more details. The return time function  $R$  satisfies  $R \in L^p(\mu)$ , for any  $1 \leq p < 2$ , while  $R \notin L^2(\mu)$ . Therefore, the classical results on the decay of correlations are not applicable in the study of the autocorrelations of the function  $R$ . One needs some finer characterizations of the geometric feature of the components  $D_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ .

## 7.1 Type A billiard systems.

**Case I. Semi-dispersing billiards.** Billiards in a square with a small fixed circular obstacle removed are known as semi-dispersing billiards. Chernov and Zhang proved in [17] that this system has a decay rate of correlations bounded by  $\text{const} \cdot n^{-1}$ . For this billiard system, the reduced phase space  $M$  is comprised of collisions with the circular obstacle only. The induced map  $T : M \rightarrow M$  is then equivalent to the well studied Lorentz gas billiard map (cf. [14]), which is known to have exponential decay of correlations (see [13], for instance). The properties **(H1)**–**(H6)** were verified in [6, 7, 12, 14]. according to [12], the measure of each  $m$ -cell is  $\mu(M_m) \asymp m^{-3}$ , with  $\mathbf{s} = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_0 = 1$ . As a result, we see that the return time map  $R \notin L^2(\mu)$ , while  $R \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(1)$  for any  $p < 2$ , and  $\kappa = p$ . Moreover, each  $m$ -cell  $M_m$  has unstable-dimension  $\leq C_A m^{-2}$ ; which implies  $b = 1$ . Thus the condition (2.8) is also verified, as  $b > 1 - \mathbf{s} = 0$ , and  $1 = \mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_0(2 - b) = 1$ . Therefore, the standard family  $(\mathcal{E}, \nu)$  with  $d\nu = R \circ T^{-1} d\mu$  is  $r_0$ -proper with  $r_0 = \frac{1}{2(b+\mathbf{s})} + \frac{\mathbf{s}_0}{2} = 3/4$ .

**Case II. Billiards with cusps.** The billiards with cusps were first studied by Machta (cf. [25]). It is known that the billiard maps on these tables are hyperbolic and ergodic. However, the hyperbolicity is non-uniform due to the collisions *deep down the cusps*, where the particle experiences a large number of rapid collisions in a short amount of time. It is proved in [14, 17, 13] that the system enjoys correlations decay of order  $n^{-1}$ . Moreover, it was proved that that all properties of **(H1)**–**(H6)** hold for the induced map  $(T, M, \mu)$ .

For this billiard system, the reduced subspace  $M \subset \mathcal{M}$  consists of collisions whose free paths are *not that short*. Let  $R$  be the first return time function and  $D_m$  be the cell induced by  $R$  for

each  $m \geq 1$ . Then each  $m$ -cell  $TD_m$  has measure  $\mu(D_m) \asymp m^{-3}$ , stable-diameter  $\asymp m^{-7/3}$  and unstable-diameter  $\asymp m^{-2/3}$ . So we can set  $\mathbf{s} = 1$ ,  $b = 2$ . Thus the condition (2.8) is also verified, as  $b > 1 - \mathbf{s} = 0$ , and  $1 = \mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_0(2 - b) = 0$ . Therefore, the standard family  $(\mathcal{E}, \nu)$  with  $d\nu = R \circ T^{-1}d\mu$  is  $r_0$ -proper with  $r_0 = \mathbf{s}_0 = 1$ .

**Case III. Dispersing billiards with flat points.** A family of dispersing billiards with finite number of flat points (of zero curvature) were first studied in [15], where they proved that the correlations decay at rate of  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\alpha})$ , where  $\alpha = \frac{\beta+2}{\beta-2}$  depends on the *flatness* parameter  $\beta > 2$  of the billiard tables. Moreover, it was proved that that all properties of **(H1)**–**(H6)** hold for the induced map  $(T, M, \mu)$ .

Let  $R$  be the first return time function of the billiard map with respect to  $M$  and  $D_m$ ,  $m \geq 1$ , be the level sets of  $R$ . The measure of each  $m$ -cell satisfies  $\mu(D_m) \asymp m^{-3-\frac{4}{\beta-2}}$ . In this case, the return time function  $R \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(1)$  for any  $p < 2 + \frac{4}{\beta-2}$ , and  $\kappa = p$ . Moreover,  $TD_m$  has unstable-dimension of order  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ , and stable-dimension of order  $m^{-3-\frac{4}{\beta-2}}$ , which implies that  $\mathbf{s} = \frac{\beta+2}{\beta-2}$  and  $b = \mathbf{s} + 1 > 2$ . Thus the condition (2.8) is also verified, as  $b > 1 - \mathbf{s} = 0$ , and  $1 = \mathbf{s} > 0 > \mathbf{s}_0(2 - b)$ . Therefore, the standard family  $(\mathcal{E}, \nu)$  with  $d\nu = R \circ T^{-1}d\mu$  is  $r_0$ -proper with  $r_0 = \mathbf{s}_0 = 1$ .

## 7.2 Type B billiards

Now we consider the type B billiard systems. For this type of billiards, we assume:

- (h1) Each cell  $D_m$  has measure  $\mu(D_m) \asymp m^{-3}$ .
- (h2) The set  $TD_m$  has stable-diameter  $\asymp m^{-2}$  and unstable-diameter  $\asymp m^{-1}$ .

The Bunimovich stadium and the skewed stadium are two typical examples of this type of systems. The stadium billiard table, introduced by Bunimovich in [4], is comprised of two equal semicircles which are connected by two parallel lines. The boundary of the skewed stadium consists two equal circular arcs (with different radius), which are connected by two tangential lines. It has been shown that both stadia are nonuniformly hyperbolic, ergodic, and mixing (cf. [4, 5, 13] for discussions and results). Let  $M$  be the set of first collisions on the arcs of the billiard table,  $R$  be the first return time function on  $M$ , and  $T$  be the induced first return map. All assumptions in **(H1)**–**(H5)** were checked in [5, 12, 13, 17],. It is enough that we check the assumption (2.8). It was shown in [5, 12] that each cell  $D_m$  has measure  $\mu(D_m) \asymp m^{-3}$ . The set  $TD_m$  has stable-diameter  $\asymp m^{-2}$  and unstable-diameter  $\asymp m^{-1}$ . So the return time function  $R \in \mathcal{H}_{\kappa,p}(1)$ , with  $1 \leq p < 2$ ,  $\kappa = p$ . Moreover, we have  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}_1 = \mathbf{s}_0 = 1$ , and  $b = 1$ . Thus the condition (2.8) is also verified, as  $b > 1 - \mathbf{s} = 0$ , and  $1 = \mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_0(2 - b) = 1$ . Therefore, the standard family  $(\mathcal{E}, \nu)$  with  $d\nu = R \circ T^{-1}d\mu$  is  $r_0$ -proper with  $r_0 = \frac{1}{2(b+\mathbf{s})} + \frac{\mathbf{s}_0}{2} = 3/4$ .

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the anonymous referees for careful reading and constructive comments, which helped substantially improving presentation of the manuscript. F. Wang is partially supported by the NSFC Grant (11101294), the State Scholarship Fund from China Scholarship Coun-

cil (CSC), and "Youxiu Rencai Peiyang Zizhu" (Class A) from the Beijing City. H. Zhang is partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation.

## References

- [1] A. Alves, C. Bonatti, and M. Viana. *SRB measures for partially hyperbolic systems whose central direction is mostly expanding*, Invent. Math. **140** (2000), 351–398.
- [2] P. Balint, N. Chernov, and D. Dolgopyat. *Limit theorems for dispersing billiards with cusps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **308** (2011), 479–510.
- [3] R. Bowen. *Equilibrium States and the Ergodic Theory of Axiom A Diffeomorphisms*, Lect. Notes in Math. **470**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975.
- [4] L. A. Bunimovich. *On billiards close to dispersing*, Math. USSR Sbornik, **23** (1974), 45–67.
- [5] L.A. Bunimovich. *On the ergodic properties of nowhere dispersing billiards*, Commun. Math. Phys. **65** (1979), 295–312.
- [6] L. A. Bunimovich, Ya. G. Sinai and N. I. Chernov. *Markov partitions for two-dimensional hyperbolic billiards*, Russian Math. Surveys **45** (1990), 105–152.
- [7] L. A. Bunimovich, Ya. G. Sinai and N. I. Chernov. *Statistical properties of two-dimensional hyperbolic billiards*, Russian Math. Surveys. **46** (1991), 47–106.
- [8] N. I. Chernov. *Decay of correlations in dispersing billiards*, J. Statist. Phys. **94** (1999), 513–556.
- [9] N. I. Chernov. *Advanced statistical properties of dispersing billiards*, J. Statist. Phys. **122** (2006), 1061–1094.
- [10] N. I. Chernov and D. Dolgopyat. *Brownian Brownian Motion-I*, Memoirs of AMS. **198** (2009).
- [11] N. I. Chernov and D. Dolgopyat. *Anomalous current in periodic Lorentz gases with infinite horizon*, Russian Math. Surveys, **64** (2009), 651–699.
- [12] N. Chernov, and R. Markarian. *Chaotic Billiards*, Math. Surveys Monographs **127**, AMS, Providence, 2006.
- [13] N. Chernov, and R. Markarian. *Dispersing billiards with cusps: slow decay of correlations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **270**, 2007, 727–758.
- [14] N. Chernov and H.-K. Zhang. *Billiards with polynomial mixing rates*, Nonlinearity **4** (2005), 1527–1553.
- [15] N. Chernov and H.-K. Zhang. *A family of chaotic billiards with variable mixing rates*, Stochast. Dynam. **5** (2005), 535–553.

- [16] N. Chernov and H.-K. Zhang. *Regularity of Bunimovich's stadia*, Regular and Chaotic Dynamics **3** (2007), 335–356.
- [17] N. Chernov and H.-K. Zhang. *Improved estimate for correlations in billiards*, Comm. Math. Phys. **277** (2008), 305–321.
- [18] N. Chernov and H.-K. Zhang. *On statistical properties of hyperbolic systems with singularities*, J. Statist. Phys. **136** (2009), 615–642.
- [19] M. Demers and H.-K. Zhang. *Spectral analysis of the transfer operator for the Lorentz gas*, J. Modern Dynamics **5** (2011), 665–709.
- [20] M. Demers and H.-K. Zhang. *A functional analytic approach to perturbations of the Lorentz gas*, Comm. Math. Phys. **324** (2013), 767–830.
- [21] M. Demers and H.-K. Zhang. *Spectral analysis of hyperbolic systems with singularities*, Nonlinearity **27** (2014), 379–433.
- [22] D. Dolgopyat. *On dynamics of mostly contracting diffeomorphisms*, Comm. Math. Phys. **213** (2001), 181–201.
- [23] D. Dolgopyat. *On differentiability of SRB states for partially hyperbolic systems*, Invent. Math. **155** (2004), 389–449.
- [24] A. Katok and J.-M. Strelcyn. *Invariant Manifolds, Entropy and Billiards; Smooth Maps with Singularities*, Lect. Notes Math. **1222**, Springer, New York 1986.
- [25] J. Machta. *Power law decay of correlations in a billiard problem*, J. Stat. Phys. **32** (1983), 555–564.
- [26] R. Markarian. *Billiards with polynomial decay of correlations*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Syst. **24** (2004), 177–197.
- [27] Ya. Pesin. *Dynamical systems with generalized hyperbolic attractors: hyperbolic, ergodic and topological properties*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Syst. **12** (1992), 123–152.
- [28] M. Stenlund, L.S. Young, and H.-K. Zhang. *Dispersing billiards with moving scatterers*, Comm. Math. Phys. **322** (2013) 909–955.
- [29] L.S. Young. *Statistical properties of systems with some hyperbolicity including certain billiards*, Ann. Math. **147** (1998), 585–650.
- [30] L.S. Young. *Recurrence times and rates of mixing*, Israel J. Math. **110** (1999), 153–188.
- [31] L.-S. Young. *What are SRB measures, and which dynamical systems have them?* J. Statist. Phys. **108** (2002), 733–751.
- [32] H.-K. Zhang. *Current in periodic Lorentz gases with twists*. Commun. Math. Phys. **306** (2011), 747–776.