

BERNOULLI PROPERTY OF SUBADDITIVE EQUILIBRIUM STATES

BENJAMIN CALL, KIHOO PARK

ABSTRACT. Under mild assumptions, we show that the unique subadditive equilibrium states for fiber-bunched cocycles are Bernoulli. We achieve this by showing these equilibrium states are absolutely continuous with respect to a product measure, and then using the Kolmogorov property of these measures.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study the Bernoulli property on a class of subadditive equilibrium states. We say a dynamical system (X, f, μ) is *Bernoulli* if it is measurably isomorphic to a Bernoulli shift; see Definition 2.7. Bernoullicity is the strongest ergodic property associated to complete randomness.

The study of Bernoulli systems was vastly enriched by the celebrated work of Ornstein [Orn70b, Orn73, OW73]. Among other things, he showed that Bernoulli shifts are classified by their entropy up to measurable isomorphism. He also helped introduce many new definitions that imply the Bernoulli property; including the Weak Bernoulli, Very Weak Bernoulli, and finitely determined properties [FO70, OW74, Orn70a]. Some of these, such as the Very Weak Bernoulli property, are easier to verify than others, and we will make use of it in establishing the Bernoullicity of the subadditive equilibrium states.

Thanks to these checkable conditions for Bernoullicity, Ornstein theory has successfully been implemented to show that many natural invariant measures of important dynamical systems are Bernoulli. Ornstein and Weiss [OW73] showed that geodesic flows on negatively curved surfaces are Bernoulli with respect to Liouville measure. This was extended by Pesin [Pes77] for geodesic flows on a more general class of manifolds. More recently, the first-named author and Thompson [CT19] have shown that the measure of maximal entropy for the geodesic flow on non-positively curved rank one manifolds is Bernoulli, and Carrasco and Rodriguez-Hertz [CRH21] have recently shown that some equilibrium states for center isometries are Bernoulli as well. All of these works proceed by first showing that a system is K , and then showing that it is Bernoulli. General arguments can be found to show that smooth K -systems with some amount of hyperbolic structure [CH96, OW98] are Bernoulli. The main content of this paper is of a similar flavor.

From here on, we will now focus on the case where the base dynamical system is a mixing subshift of finite type (Σ_T, σ) . In this setting, Bowen [Bow74b] showed uniqueness of the equilibrium states for Hölder potentials. These are important invariant measures for the underlying dynamical systems that often capture relevant statistical information, and they are also known to be Bernoulli [Bow74a, Bow75].

Recently, there have been great developments in the theory of subadditive thermodynamic formalism and its applications; see [BG11] and [CPZ19]. In particular, due to their connections to the dimension theory of fractals, subadditive potentials arising from matrix

cocycles and their equilibrium states have been extensively studied; see [BM18] and references therein. The norm potentials and singular value potentials are prime examples of such subadditive potentials (see Subsection 2.4). While the equilibrium states for the norm potentials are not necessarily unique in general, there are mild conditions on cocycles that guarantee the uniqueness of the equilibrium states.

In the case of locally constant cocycles, Feng [Fen03, Fen09] showed that irreducibility implies uniqueness of equilibrium states. Morris [Mor18, Mor19] then showed that total ergodicity of these equilibrium states implies mixing and that the failure of mixing can be characterized by certain structures of the cocycle. He recently improved his own result by showing that total ergodicity implies Bernoullicity [Mor20]. Under a different set of assumptions on the cocycle, Piraino [Pir18] showed that the equilibrium states are Bernoulli. While both results amount to establishing the Weak Bernoulli property, their methods of proof differ both from each other, and from the approach we take in this paper.

Similar questions on the ergodic properties of the subadditive equilibrium states were also studied beyond the realm of irreducible locally constant cocycles. Within the class of fiber-bunched cocycles (see Subsection 2.4), under suitable assumptions the second author [Par20] and Bochi and Garibaldi [BG19] established the uniqueness of the equilibrium states for the norm potentials. For such equilibrium states, the authors showed in [CP20] that total ergodicity implies the K -property (see Subsection 2.3 and Proposition 2.4). Our first result shows that these equilibrium states in fact have the stronger ergodic property of being Bernoulli. It extends our previous work and also generalizes existing results on locally constant cocycles to fiber-bunched cocycles.

Theorem A. Let $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be a fiber-bunched cocycle.

- (1) Suppose that \mathcal{A} is strongly bunched and irreducible. If the unique equilibrium state $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ for the norm potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is totally ergodic, then it is Bernoulli.
- (2) Supposing instead that \mathcal{A} is typical, the unique equilibrium state $\mu_{\mathcal{A},s}$ for the singular value potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^s$ is Bernoulli.

After collecting relevant previous results and establishing what we will later refer to as measurable local product structure (see Definition 3.1), Theorem A follows as a consequence of the following theorem; see Remark 2.15.

Theorem B. Let μ be an ergodic measure on Σ_T . If μ satisfies the K -property and furthermore, is absolutely continuous with respect to a non-atomic product measure on the local stable and unstable sets on an open neighborhood, then μ is Bernoulli.

A close variant of this result is possibly expected by experts; in particular, when the measure in question is equivalent to a non-atomic product measure. However, we believe that the proof has not previously been written down. Indeed, this result is similar in flavor to many existing results establishing Bernoullicity from the K -property under various additional assumptions (see also [LLS16, PTV18] for related results on Bernoullicity in different settings, as well as the excellent book [PV19] on settings in which K implies Bernoulli). It is always necessary to have these assumptions, as there are systems that are K but not Bernoulli [Orn73, Kat80, KHV18]. In our work, we will refer to our main additional assumption as *measurable local product structure*. We define this to mean that on an open neighborhood, the measure is absolutely continuous with respect to a non-atomic product measure on local stable and unstable sets; see Definition 3.1 for the precise definition.

Remark 1.1. We stress that in this paper, we only need our measure to be absolutely continuous, not equivalent, to a product measure for us to say it has measurable local product structure. Furthermore, we include the word *measurable* to indicate that the Radon-Nikodym derivative need not be continuous.

Our proof follows the classical approach of Chernov and Haskell [CH96] and Ornstein and Weiss [OW73, OW98] in that we show the existence of Very Weak Bernoulli partitions. The major difference is that we do not require our measure to be smooth. While this approach is not new, applying it to subadditive equilibrium states provides a different perspective in studying ergodic properties of such measures beyond locally constant cocycles. Moreover, we have simplified the relevant parts of the proof according to the fact that the base dynamical system is uniformly hyperbolic, as opposed to non-uniformly hyperbolic in [CH96].

The paper is organized as follows. In §2, we introduce relevant notations and survey preliminary results. In §3, we establish measurable local product structure on subadditive equilibrium states with the Gibbs property, and in §4 we prove an abstract theorem on Bernoullicity which implies Theorem B.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Dan Thompson and Amie Wilkinson for helpful discussion and valuable comments on this paper. B.C. was partially supported NSF grant DMS-1954463, as well as a Presidential Fellowship from The Ohio State University.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Symbolic dynamical systems. Let T be a $q \times q$ square-matrix with entries in $\{0, 1\}$. We define $\Sigma_T \subset \{1, \dots, q\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ to be the set of all bi-infinite sequences $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfying $T_{x_i, x_{i+1}} = 1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. The left shift map $\sigma: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \Sigma_T$ is defined as $(\sigma x)_i = x_{i+1}$ for $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. We denote the corresponding one-sided subshift by $\Sigma_T^+ \subset \{1, \dots, q\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$. The left shift map, again denoted by σ , is defined analogously with $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We denote the one-sided subshift on negative symbols as $\Sigma_T^- \subset \{1, \dots, q\}^{-\mathbb{N}_0}$ with the shift map given by σ^{-1} .

An *admissible word of length n* is a word $i_0 \dots i_{n-1}$ with $i_j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ such that $T_{i_j, i_{j+1}} = 1$ for all $0 \leq j \leq n-2$. Let \mathcal{L} be the collection of all admissible words. For $l \in \mathcal{L}$, we denote its length by $||l||$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{L}(n) \subset \mathcal{L}$ be the set of all admissible words of length n . For any $l = i_0 \dots i_{n-1} \in \mathcal{L}(n)$, we define the associated *cylinder* by

$$[l] = [i_0 \dots i_{n-1}] := \{y \in \Sigma_T : y_j = i_j \text{ for all } 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}.$$

For any $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma_T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $[x]_n := [x_0 \dots x_{n-1}]$ the n -cylinder containing x .

We endow Σ_T with the metric d defined as follows: for $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, y = (y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Sigma_T$, we have

$$d(x, y) = 2^{-k},$$

where k is the largest integer such that $x_i = y_i$ for all $|i| < k$. This makes Σ_T into a compact metric space, and the left shift operator σ becomes a hyperbolic homeomorphism on Σ_T , meaning that σ has stable and unstable sets with uniform exponential rate, which satisfy local product structure.

Given $x \in \Sigma_T$, the *local stable set* of x is

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(x) = \{y \in \Sigma_T \mid x_i = y_i \text{ for } i \geq 0\}$$

and analogously, the *local unstable set* of x is

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^u(x) = \{y \in \Sigma_T \mid x_i = y_i \text{ for } i \leq 0\}.$$

Finally, we will always assume that the adjacency matrix T is *primitive*, meaning that there exists $N > 0$ such that all entries of T^N are positive. The primitivity of T is equivalent to (Σ_T, σ) being topologically mixing.

2.2. Subadditive thermodynamic formalism. Let $\Phi = \{\log \varphi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of continuous functions Σ_T . We say Φ is *subadditive* if

$$0 \leq \log \varphi_n + \log \varphi_m \circ \sigma^n \leq \log \varphi_{m+n}$$

for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Often we will refer to Φ as a *subadditive potential* on Σ_T .

For every subadditive potential Φ , we can define its pressure $P(\Phi)$, which satisfies the following *subadditive variational principle* [CFH08]:

$$P(\Phi) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\sigma)} \left(h_\mu(\sigma) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int \log \varphi_n d\mu \right)$$

Any invariant measure μ attaining the supremum is called an *equilibrium state*.

We say that a probability measure μ on Σ_T satisfies the *Gibbs property* with respect to Φ if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that for any $x \in \Sigma_T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$C^{-1} \leq \frac{\mu([x]_n)}{e^{-nP(\Phi)} \varphi_n(x)} \leq C.$$

We now introduce properties that will be satisfied by all subadditive potentials considered in this paper. First, we say Φ has *bounded distortion* if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that for any $x \in \Sigma_T$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $y \in [x]_n$, we have

$$C^{-1} \leq \frac{\varphi_n(x)}{\varphi_n(y)} \leq C,$$

which going forward we will write as $\frac{\varphi_n(x)}{\varphi_n(y)} \asymp C$.

Remark 2.1. For each $l \in \mathcal{L}(n)$, we define

$$\varphi(l) := \sup_{x \in [l]} \varphi_n(x).$$

Using this, $\log \varphi$ defines a subadditive potential on \mathcal{L} , which by an abuse of notation we denote again by Φ . Conversely, given a subadditive potential $\Phi := \log \varphi$ on \mathcal{L} , we can induce on Σ_T a subadditive potential, denoted again by Φ , by setting $\varphi_n(x) := \varphi([x]_n)$.

We will identify such potentials (on Σ_T and on \mathcal{L}) with one another; this identification will simplify the presentation of the preliminary results described below. Moreover, relevant objects such as the subadditive pressure and the set of equilibrium states remain unchanged under this identification if the original subadditive potential $\Phi = \{\log \varphi_n\}$ on Σ_T has bounded distortion; see [Par20].

The last property we will make use of is called quasi-multiplicativity. We say a subadditive potential $\Phi = \log \varphi$ on \mathcal{L} is *quasi-multiplicative* if there exist $c > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $I, J \in \mathcal{L}$ there exists $K \in \mathcal{L}$ with $|K| \leq n$ so that

$$\varphi(IKJ) \geq c\varphi(I)\varphi(J).$$

The following proposition whose proof can be found in [Fen11, Theorem 5.5] guarantees that quasi-multiplicativity is a sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the equilibrium state.

Proposition 2.2. *Let Φ be a subadditive potential on \mathcal{L} . If Φ is quasi-multiplicative, then it has a unique equilibrium state $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\sigma)$. Moreover, μ has the Gibbs property with respect to Φ .*

2.3. Ergodic properties of an invariant measure. In this subsection, let (X, f) be a homeomorphism on a compact metric space. We provide a brief introduction to the various mixing properties we use throughout this paper.

Given an invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(f)$, we say μ is *totally ergodic* if it is ergodic with respect to f^n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Total ergodicity is stronger than ergodicity, but weaker than mixing.

A stronger mixing property is the Kolmogorov property (the *K-property*, for short), which is stronger than mixing of all orders but weaker than Bernoulli. It has many equivalent formulations, and the following definition (known as *completely positive entropy*) is an equivalence established by Rokhlin and Sinai.

Definition 2.3. An invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(f)$ has the *K-property* if its Pinsker factor (i.e., maximal zero entropy factor) is trivial.

The authors have shown in a previous paper that under the conditions below, total ergodicity implies the *K-property*:

Proposition 2.4. [CP20] *Let Φ be a subadditive potential on Σ_T , and suppose it is quasi-multiplicative and has bounded distortion. If its unique equilibrium state is totally ergodic, then it has the *K-property*.*

In this paper, the goal is to show that under these hypotheses, the underlying measure is Bernoulli. In order to show this implication, we will make use of another one of the equivalent formulations for the *K-property* as described in the following proposition; see [PV19, Section 2.8]. In order to state it, we first need an additional definition.

Definition 2.5. Given a partition ξ of X and a probability measure μ on X , a property hold *ε -almost everywhere* on ξ if the union of atoms on which the property does not hold has μ -measure at most ε .

Proposition 2.6. *For every finite measurable partition ξ of a *K-system*, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and finite collection of sets $A_i \subset X$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, for ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ and each A_i ,*

$$\left| \frac{\mu(E \cap A_i)}{\mu(E)} - \mu(A_i) \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Finally, we give a formal definition of the Bernoulli property.

Definition 2.7. Given a finite set S equipped with a measure ν , we say the dynamical system $(S^{\mathbb{N}_0}, \sigma, \nu^{\mathbb{N}_0})$ is a *Bernoulli shift*. We say that an invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(f)$ is *Bernoulli* if (X, f, μ) is measurably isomorphic to a Bernoulli shift.

2.4. Matrix cocycles. Let $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an α -Hölder continuous cocycle. For $x \in \Sigma_T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\mathcal{A}^n(x) := \mathcal{A}(\sigma^{n-1}x) \dots \mathcal{A}(x).$$

From the submultiplicativity of the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$, the sequence of functions $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}} := \{\log \varphi_{\mathcal{A},n}\}$ given by

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{A},n}(x) := \|\mathcal{A}^n(x)\|$$

defines a subadditive potential. We call this the *norm potential* of \mathcal{A} .

We denote the singular values of $A \in \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ by $\sigma_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_d(A) > 0$. For $s \in [0, d]$, we define

$$\varphi^s(A) := \sigma_1(A) \dots \sigma_{\lfloor s \rfloor}(A) \sigma_{\lceil s \rceil}(A)^{\{s\}},$$

whereas for $s > d$ we set $\varphi^s(A) := |\det(A)|^{s/d}$. For any $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and $s \geq 0$, we define the *s-singular value potential* as

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^s := \{\log \varphi_{\mathcal{A},n}^s\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ where } \varphi_{\mathcal{A},n}^s := \varphi^s(\mathcal{A}^n(x)).$$

Since $\|A\| = \sigma_1(A)$, the 1-singular value potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^1$ coincides with the norm potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$. Therefore, singular value potentials are generalizations of norm potentials.

When $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ depends only on the zero-th symbol x_0 of $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, we say that it is *locally constant*. When \mathcal{A} is *irreducible*, meaning that there does not exist a proper subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ preserved under the action of \mathcal{A} , its norm potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ has a unique equilibrium state. In this case, Morris has shown in [Mor18, Mor19, Mor20] that for such equilibrium states total ergodicity implies Bernoullicity.

In this paper we expand Morris' result on Bernoullicity to a class of cocycles that are not necessarily locally constant. Moreover, we apply a fundamentally different technique than Morris, relying on an approach pioneered by Ornstein and Weiss [OW73, OW98]; see Section 4 for more details. We will focus on the class of fiber-bunched cocycles, which we define below.

We say an α -Hölder cocycle $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is *fiber-bunched* if

$$\|\mathcal{A}(x)\| \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(x)^{-1}\| < 2^\alpha \tag{2.1}$$

for every $x \in \Sigma_T$. It is clear from the definition that the set of fiber-bunched cocycles forms an open subset of the set of α -Hölder cocycles $C^\alpha(\Sigma_T, \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}))$ and that perturbations of conformal cocycles are fiber-bunched cocycles. In fact, fiber-bunched cocycles may as well be thought of as nearly conformal cocycles.

The fiber-bunching assumption guarantees the convergence of the canonical holonomies: for $y \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^s(x)$, we define

$$H_{x,y}^s := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}^n(y)^{-1} \mathcal{A}^n(x).$$

The collection $\{H_{x,y}^s\} \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is called the *canonical stable holonomy*. The holonomy satisfies the following properties: for any $y, z \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^s(x)$,

- (1) $H_{x,x}^s = \mathrm{id}$ and $H_{y,z}^s H_{x,y}^s = H_{x,z}^s$,
- (2) $\mathcal{A}(y) H_{x,y}^s = H_{\sigma x, \sigma y}^s \mathcal{A}(x)$,
- (3) $(x, y) \mapsto H_{x,y}^s$ is continuous,
- (4) $\|H_{x,y}^s - \mathrm{id}\| \leq C \cdot d(x, y)^\alpha$.

The second property says that the holonomy is \mathcal{A} -equivariant, and using this property we can define *global stable holonomy* $H_{x,y}^s$ for $y \in \mathcal{W}^s(x)$ that does not necessarily lie on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^s(x)$. The fourth property says that the stable holonomies are Hölder continuous with the same exponent as the cocycle.

Using the inverse cocycle \mathcal{A}^{-1} over (Σ_T, σ^{-1}) defined by $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(x) := \mathcal{A}(\sigma^{-1}x)^{-1}$, we define the *canonical unstable holonomy* $\{H_{x,y}^u\}$ as

$$H_{x,y}^u := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}^{-n}(y)^{-1} \mathcal{A}^{-n}(x).$$

The unstable holonomy satisfies the analogous properties as above with s and σ replaced by u and σ^{-1} , respectively. See [KS13] for a more detailed discussion on the canonical holonomies of fiber-bunched cocycles.

Remark 2.8. For any fiber bunched cocycle \mathcal{A} , the Hölder continuity of $H^{s/u}$ implies that the norm potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the singular value potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^s$ for any $s \geq 0$ have bounded distortion; see [Par20]. This justifies the identification assumed in Remark 2.1.

We now introduce the irreducibility and the strong bunching assumptions for fiber-bunched cocycles appearing in the first case of Theorem A. In the following definition, the *bi-holonomy invariance* of a bundle \mathbb{V} over Σ_T means that $\mathbb{V}_y = H_{x,y}^s \mathbb{V}_x$ for any $x \in \mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(x)$, and likewise for the unstable holonomy.

Definition 2.9. We say a fiber-bunched cocycle $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is *irreducible* if there does not exist an \mathcal{A} -invariant and bi-holonomy invariant subbundle.

This definition of irreducibility for fiber-bunched cocycles is compatible with irreducibility for locally constant cocycles: when a fiber-bunched cocycle \mathcal{A} is locally constant, then the canonical holonomies are trivial (i.e., $H^{s/u} \equiv \text{id}$), and hence, the two notions of irreducibility coincide.

Definition 2.10. We say $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is *strongly bunched* if

- (1) $d = 2$ and \mathcal{A} is fiber-bunched as in (2.1), or
- (2) $d \geq 3$ and for every $x \in \Sigma_T$,

$$\|\mathcal{A}(x)\| \cdot \|\mathcal{A}(x)^{-1}\| < 2^{\alpha/3}.$$

Notice that when $d = 2$, strong bunching coincides with fiber-bunching. It is only when $d \geq 3$ the strong bunching requires a more stringent bound compared to (2.1).

Remark 2.11. The strong bunching assumption was first introduced in Bochi and Garibaldi [BG19] in the more general setting of hyperbolic homeomorphisms. The general definition there requires that the product $\|\mathcal{A}(x)\| \|\mathcal{A}(x)^{-1}\|$ is bounded above by a constant depending only on the base dynamical system and the exponent of the cocycle. In the case of a subshift of finite type (Σ_T, σ) equipped with the standard metric defined in Subsection 2.2, they showed that such a bound can be taken to be $2^{\alpha/3}$.

We now introduce the typicality assumption appearing in the second case of Theorem A.

Definition 2.12. Let $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be a fiber-bunched cocycle.

We say \mathcal{A} is *1-typical* if

- (1) there exists a periodic point $p \in \Sigma_T$ such that $P := \mathcal{A}^{\text{per}(p)}(p)$ has simple eigenvalues of distinct moduli, and
- (2) there exists a homoclinic point $z \in \mathcal{W}^s(p) \cap \mathcal{W}^u(p) \setminus \{p\}$ such that the holonomy loop $\psi := H_{z,p}^s H_{p,z}^u$ maps the eigendirections $\{v_1, \dots, v_d\}$ of P into a general position.

Moreover, we say \mathcal{A} is *typical* if the exterior product cocycle $\mathcal{A}^{\wedge t}$ is 1-typical for every $1 \leq t \leq d - 1$.

Typicality was first introduced by Bonatti and Viana [BV04]. They showed that the Lyapunov exponents of typical cocycles with respect to the unique equilibrium states for Hölder potentials are simple. Two assumptions appearing in the definition of typicality are called *pinching* and *twisting*, and their roles parallel those of proximality and strong irreducibility in the classical setting of i.i.d. product of random matrices. We also note that typicality is a stronger assumption which implies irreducibility.

The following proposition summarizes the known results on the singular value potentials of the cocycles considered in Theorem A.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be a fiber-bunched cocycle.*

- (1) If \mathcal{A} is strongly bunched and irreducible, then its norm potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is quasi-multiplicative.
- (2) If \mathcal{A} is typical, then its singular value potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^s$ is quasi-multiplicative for all $s \geq 0$.

In both cases, Proposition 2.2 gives a unique equilibrium state satisfying the Gibbs property.

For the first statement, it was shown by Bochi and Garibaldi [BG19] that \mathcal{A} is spannable. The second author and Butler [BP19] then showed that the norm potentials of spannable cocycles are quasi-multiplicative. The second statement is established by the second author in [Par20]. We also note that 1-typicality implies that the norm potential $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is quasi-multiplicative, and typicality ensures that the same is true for the s -singular value potentials $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^s$ for all $s \geq 0$.

Notice from its definition that if $\mathcal{A}: \Sigma_T \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is typical, then so are its powers \mathcal{A}^n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, Proposition 2.13 has an immediate corollary:

Corollary 2.14. *If \mathcal{A} is typical, then for any $s \geq 0$ the unique equilibrium state $\mu_{\mathcal{A},s}$ for $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}^s$ is totally ergodic.*

This corollary was already observed in the previous paper of the authors [CP20]. This is the reason why we do not have to separately assume the total ergodicity on $\mu_{\mathcal{A},s}$ from the second case of Theorem A because it is already implied by typicality.

Remark 2.15. In view of Propositions 2.4, and 2.13, and Corollary 2.14, we only need to show that the K property implies Bernoullicity of our measures to prove Theorem A. This is the content of the next two sections, which contains the proof of Theorem B.

3. MEASURABLE LOCAL PRODUCT STRUCTURE

Definition 3.1. A measure μ on Σ_T has *measurable local product structure* if almost every $x \in \Sigma_T$ belongs to an open set U of positive μ -measure on which μ is absolutely continuous with respect to a non-atomic product measure on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^s(x) \times \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^u(x)$, where each component of the product measure is a standard probability measure.

When working with an ergodic measure, this definition can be checked on a single open set.

Proposition 3.2. *If μ is ergodic, then μ has measurable local product structure if there exists at least one positive measure open set U on which μ is absolutely continuous with respect to a non-atomic product measure on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^s(x) \times \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^u(x)$ for some $x \in U$.*

Proof. If λ is a product measure on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^s(x) \times \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^u(x)$, then $\sigma_*^n \lambda$ is a product measure on $\sigma^n \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^s(x) \times \sigma^n \mathcal{W}_{\mathrm{loc}}^u(x)$ for all $n \geq 0$, and $\sigma^n x \in \sigma^n U$. Furthermore, we have

$$\mu = \sigma_*^n \mu \ll \sigma_*^n \lambda.$$

Finally, since μ is ergodic, we know that $\mu(\bigcup_{n \geq 0} \sigma^n U) = 1$. As such, for μ -a.e. $x \in \Sigma_T$, x is contained in an open set $\sigma^n U$ on which μ is absolutely continuous with respect to a product measure, completing our proof. \square

In what follows, we show that in the settings considered in this paper, our measures have measurable local product structure.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\Phi = \log \varphi$ be a subadditive potential on \mathcal{L} and μ an ergodic measure on Σ_T satisfying the Gibbs property with respect to Φ . Then μ has measurable local product structure.*

Proof. As μ is ergodic, we may suppose that we are working in the 1-cylinder $[i]$. Let $x \in [i]$ be arbitrary. We now define μ^+ on $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^u(x)$ by $\mu^+(A) := \frac{\mu(\pi_u^{-1}(\pi_u A))}{\mu(\pi_u^{-1}(\pi_u \mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^u(x)))}$ where $\pi_u : \Sigma_T \rightarrow \Sigma_T^+$ is the projection, and define μ^- on $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(x)$ similarly but with Σ_T^- . From its definition, μ^+ also has the Gibbs property with respect to Φ and σ . Likewise, μ^- has the Gibbs property with respect to Φ and σ^{-1} , meaning that for any $x^- = \dots j_{-3}j_{-2}j_{-1}i \in [i]$ we have $\frac{\mu^-([j_{-n} \dots j_{-1}i])}{e^{-(n+1)P(\Phi)}\varphi(j_{-n} \dots j_{-1}i)} \asymp C$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note here that the pressure $P(\Phi)$ is the same when Φ is considered as a subadditive potential over any of (Σ_T, σ) , (Σ_T^+, σ) , and $(\Sigma_T^-, \sigma^{-1})$.

For any $I, J \in \mathcal{L}$ with $|I| = n$ and $|J| = m$, subadditivity of Φ gives

$$\mu([IJ]) \asymp C e^{-(n+m)P(\Phi)}\varphi(IJ) \leq C^2 e^{-nP(\Phi)}\varphi(I) \cdot e^{-mP(\Phi)}\varphi(J) \asymp \mu^+([I])\mu^-([J]).$$

From this, it follows that $\mu \ll \mu^+ \times \mu^-$. \square

4. BERNOULLI PROPERTY

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem on Bernoulli property, which is a more general version of Theorem B in view of Proposition 3.3. As pointed out in Remark 2.15, Theorem A then also follows from it.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose X is a compact metric space and $f : X \rightarrow X$ is a hyperbolic homeomorphism. If μ is an invariant measure such that μ is everywhere absolutely continuous with respect to a product measure $\rho \times \nu$ on the local stable and unstable sets, then if μ has the K -property, it is Bernoulli.*

4.1. Definitions. For further details about these definitions, we refer the reader to the book by Ponce and Varao [PV19], as well as the paper by Chernov and Haskell [CH96].

Consider two measure spaces (X, μ) and (Y, ν) . A probability measure λ on $X \times Y$ is a *joining* if $(\pi_1)_*\lambda = \mu$ and $(\pi_2)_*\lambda = \nu$ where π_1, π_2 are the canonical projections onto X and Y , respectively. We denote by $J(\mu, \nu)$ the set of all joinings of μ and ν .

We now introduce the notion of \bar{d} -distance between partitions and sequences of partitions. Consider finite partitions $\xi = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ of X and $\eta = \{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$ of Y . For any $x \in X$, we define $\xi(x)$ as the unique index $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $x \in A_j$. Similarly, we define $\eta(y)$ for $y \in Y$. Then their \bar{d} -distance can be defined as follows:

$$\bar{d}(\xi, \eta) := \inf_{\lambda \in J(\mu, \nu)} \lambda\{(x, y) : \xi(x) \neq \eta(y)\}.$$

This definition of the \bar{d} -distance can be extended to measure distance between two sequences of partitions $\{\xi_i\}_1^n$ on X and $\{\eta_i\}_1^n$ on Y . First, for any $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ we set

$$h(x, y) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta\{\xi_i(x) \neq \eta_i(y)\}$$

where δ is the indicator function. Using this function h , we define

$$\bar{d}(\{\xi_i\}_1^n, \{\eta_i\}_1^n) := \inf_{\lambda \in J(\mu, \nu)} \int h(x, y) d\lambda(x, y).$$

Most of the time throughout the section, the space Y will be a subset E of X equipped with the measure $\mu|_E$ conditioned on E defined by

$$\mu|_E(F) := \mu(F)/\mu(E)$$

for any $F \subseteq E$. Moreover, the partition on $E \subset X$ will often be of the form $\xi \upharpoonright E$ where ξ is a partition on X . The partition $\xi \upharpoonright E$ consists of elements $A \cap E$, $A \in \xi$. Using these definitions, we introduce the notion of Very Weak Bernoulli partitions.

Definition 4.2. Let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a μ -measure-preserving transformation on a compact metric space, and let ξ be a finite partition. We say that ξ is *Very Weak Bernoulli* (VWB) if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N_0$, for all $n > 0$, and for ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^k \xi$, we have

$$\bar{d}(\{f^{-i}\xi \upharpoonright E\}_1^n, \{f^{-i}\xi\}_1^n) \leq \varepsilon$$

with respect to $(E, \mu|_E)$ and (X, μ) .

As the name suggests, a Bernoulli partition ξ for (X, μ) is necessarily a Very Weak Bernoulli partition; see [PV19, Theorem 3.1]. What makes Very Weak Bernoulli partitions important is the converse implication developed by Ornstein outlined in the next two propositions: VWB partitions provide a method for establishing the Bernoulli property, which is often difficult via a direct approach. In fact, many results in the literature establishing Bernoulli property follow this general outline [Pes77, OW98, CH96].

Proposition 4.3. *If a partition ξ of X is VWB, then $(X, \mu, f, \bigvee_{-\infty}^{\infty} f^n \xi)$ is Bernoulli.*

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose there exists an increasing sequence of partitions $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} f^n \xi_i$ generates the entire σ -algebra and that $(X, \mu, f, \bigvee_{-\infty}^{\infty} f^n \xi_i)$ is a Bernoulli shift for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then (X, μ, f) is a Bernoulli shift.*

We now describe a mechanism for verifying that a partition is VWB. We will show this by means of the following lemma, which involves constructing maps which, informally, can be thought of as

- (1) Keeping *most* points in the same set of partition elements
- (2) Being *mostly* measure-preserving

To formalize these two concepts we need to introduce one more definition.

Definition 4.5. A map $\theta : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (Y, \nu)$ is ε -measure-preserving if there exists $G \subset X$ with $\mu(G) > 1 - \varepsilon$ such that for $A \subset G$,

$$\left| \frac{\nu(\theta A)}{\mu(A)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Using this, and recalling Definition 2.5 of “ ε -almost everywhere”, we state the following lemma from [CH96].

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\{\xi_i\}_1^n$ and $\{\eta_i\}_1^n$ be finite sequences of partitions of (X, μ) and (Y, ν) respectively. Let $\theta : X \rightarrow Y$ be ε -measure-preserving, and suppose that there exists $G \subset X$ with $\mu(G) > 1 - \varepsilon$ so that for all $x \in G$,*

$$h(x, \theta(x)) < \varepsilon.$$

Then $\bar{d}(\{\xi_i\}_1^n, \{\eta_i\}_1^n) < C\varepsilon$ for a constant C independent of both the partitions and ε .

Applying this to show that a partition is Very Weak Bernoulli, we have the following corollary which we will use to establish Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 4.7. *Let ξ be a finite partition of (X, μ) , and $f : X \rightarrow X$ measure-preserving. Suppose that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for any $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, and for ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$, there exists a map $\theta : (E, \mu|_E) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ satisfying:*

- θ is ε -measure-preserving;
- There exists $D \subset E$ with $\mu|_E(D) > 1 - \varepsilon$ so that for all $n > 0$ and $x \in D$, with respect to the partition sequences $\{f^{-i}\xi|_E\}_1^n$ and $\{f^{-i}\xi\}_1^n$, we have

$$h(x, \theta(x)) < \varepsilon.$$

Then ξ is Very Weak Bernoulli.

4.2. Useful Facts from Measure Theory. We will make repeated use of the following results. Throughout, we will assume that $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{5}$. As we will eventually need our results to hold only for ε arbitrarily close to 0, we can freely make this assumption.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $\mu(B) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and A_1, \dots, A_n are disjoint sets. Then the union of all A_i satisfying $\mu(A_i \cap B) < (1 - \delta)\mu(A_i)$ has measure at most ε/δ .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i \mid \mu(A_i \cap B) < (1 - \delta)\mu(A_i)\}$. Now observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}} A_i\right) &= \sum \mu(A_i \cap B) + \mu(A_i \cap B^c) \\ &\leq (1 - \delta) \sum \mu(A_i) + \mu(B^c) \\ &\leq (1 - \delta)\mu\left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{A}} A_i\right) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mu\left(\bigcup_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}} A_i\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}$. □

We will often work with measures which we must later rescale to probability measures. This result simplifies our calculations in these cases.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $r \geq 2\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2$. Now suppose (X, μ) and (X, ν) are measure spaces, and $A \subset X$. If $\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}|_A \in (r - \varepsilon^2, r + \varepsilon^2)$, then $\frac{d\mu|_A}{d\nu|_A} \in (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Let $B \subset A$ be arbitrary. Then

$$\mu|_A(B) = \frac{\mu(B)}{\mu(A)} \leq \frac{\nu(B)(r + \varepsilon^2)}{\nu(A)(r - \varepsilon^2)} = \nu|_A(B) \frac{r + \varepsilon^2}{r - \varepsilon^2}.$$

Now, observe that

$$\frac{r + \varepsilon^2}{r - \varepsilon^2} = 1 + \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{r - \varepsilon^2} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$$

so long as $r \geq 2\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2$. Similarly, we see that

$$\mu|_A(B) \geq \frac{r - \varepsilon^2}{r + \varepsilon^2} \nu|_A(B) = \left(1 - \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{r + \varepsilon^2}\right) \nu|_A(B).$$

As $\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{r + \varepsilon^2} \leq \varepsilon$, we have the reverse inequality. □

The following proposition shows that if we have a measure-preserving function on most of the space, then we can change the measures slightly and the function will still be ε -measure-preserving.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Suppose X_1, X_2 are metric spaces, and μ_1, ν_1 are probability measures on X_1 , and μ_2, ν_2 are probability measures on X_2 . Now, suppose that we have $Y_1 \subset X_1$ and $Y_2 \subset X_2$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) *On Y_1 , $\frac{d\mu_1}{d\nu_1} \in (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)$;*
- (2) *On Y_2 , $\frac{d\mu_2}{d\nu_2} \in (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)$;*
- (3) *$\mu_1(Y_1) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\mu_2(Y_2) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$.*

Then, if $\theta : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is injective and measure-preserving as a map from (X_1, ν_1) to (X_2, ν_2) , it is 5ε -measure-preserving as a map from (X_1, μ_1) to (X_2, μ_2) .

Proof. First, let $A \subset Y_1 \cap \theta^{-1}Y_2$. Then observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_2(\theta A) &= \int_{\theta A} \frac{d\mu_2}{d\nu_2} d\nu_2 \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)\nu_2(\theta A) \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon)\nu_1(A) \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon) \int_A \frac{d\nu_1}{d\mu_1} d\mu_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \mu_1(A) \\ &\leq (1 + 5\varepsilon)\mu_1(A). \end{aligned}$$

The reverse inequality follows similarly.

Now, we will now show that $\mu_1(Y_1 \cap \theta^{-1}(Y_2)) \geq 1 - 5\varepsilon$. First, observe that

$$\nu_1(Y_1) \geq \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon} \mu_1(Y_1) \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon$$

with the same proof showing $\nu_2(Y_2) \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(Y_1 \cap \theta^{-1}(Y_2)) &\geq (1 - \varepsilon)\nu_1(Y_1 \cap \theta^{-1}(Y_2)) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon)(\nu_1(\theta^{-1}(Y_2)) - 2\varepsilon) \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon)(\nu_2(Y_2) - 2\varepsilon) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon)(1 - 4\varepsilon) \\ &\geq 1 - 5\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows because $\nu_1(Y_1^c) \leq 2\varepsilon$. □

4.3. Rectangles. From here on, we will write $\chi \in (0, 1)$ for the hyperbolicity constant of f , that is, local stable (resp. unstable) sets contract by χ under f (resp. f^{-1}). Furthermore, we will assume that ξ is an arbitrary partition of our space X with the property that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mu(B(\partial\xi, \varepsilon)) < C\varepsilon. \tag{4.1}$$

The existence of such partitions with arbitrarily small diameter can be found in [OW98, Lemma 4.1].

We now introduce the notion of rectangles, which will serve as the building blocks when we construct the map θ from Corollary 4.7.

Definition 4.11. A *rectangle* $R \subset X$ is a set such that for $x, y \in R$, $W^s(x) \cap W^u(y) \in R$.

In order to define θ , we need the notion of a layerwise intersection.

Definition 4.12. We say that A intersects a rectangle R *layerwise* if given $x \in A$, the unstable set of x stretches across the entirety of R , i.e.

$$W^u(x) \cap R \subset W^u(x) \cap A.$$

We will now show that “most” E of $\bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ satisfy the necessary properties above.

Proposition 4.13. *Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_1^n$ be a finite set of disjoint rectangles in X . For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, for ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$, there exists $A \subset E$ which intersects each R_i layerwise and satisfies $\mu(A) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(E)$.*

Proof. For $x \in \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R$, let $R(x) \in \mathcal{R}$ be the rectangle which contains x . For any $F \in \xi$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the subset of $f^k F$ consisting of points that do not intersect the rectangles in \mathcal{R} layerwise as

$$A_F^k := \left\{ x \in f^k F \cap \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R \mid W^u(x) \cap R(x) \not\subset f^k F \cap R(x) \right\}.$$

Observe that if $x \in f^{-k} A_F^k$, then $d(x, \partial F) < C\chi^k$ for some constant C , where χ is the hyperbolicity constant for f .

Consequently, defining $B_k = \bigcup_{F \in \xi} A_F^k$ to be the union of all such “bad” parts of our atoms,

by our choice of partition (4.1), it follows that $\mu(B_k) \leq C\chi^k$ for some other constant C .

Now choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $B := \bigcup_{k=N}^{\infty} B_k$ satisfies $\mu(B) < \varepsilon^2$.

Let $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$ be arbitrary. As $\mu(B) < \varepsilon^2$, by Lemma 4.8, for ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$, we have $\mu(E \cap B^c) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(E)$. For such E , we set $A = E \cap B^c$ which intersects each R_i layerwise, as required. \square

4.4. Creating the mapping Rectangles. The following proposition essentially says that if we have two equivalent measures, we can divide most of our space up into “nice” subsets, on which the ratio of our two measures does not change much. Applying this result to dynamical rectangles formalizes the argument that we need only measurable local product structure to apply the classical argument that K implies Bernoulli.

Proposition 4.14. *Suppose that μ and λ are probability measures on a compact metric space X with $\mu \ll \lambda$, and \mathcal{C} is a generating semi-ring. Then for all $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists a pairwise disjoint collection $\{R_i\} \subset \mathcal{C}$ equipped with the measure $\lambda_i := \lambda|_{R_i}$ satisfying the following:*

- (1) $\mu(\bigcup R_i) > 1 - \varepsilon_0$;
- (2) There exists $G_i \subset R_i$ such that $\mu|_{R_i}(G_i) > 1 - \varepsilon_0$ and $\lambda_i(G_i) > 1 - \varepsilon_0$;
- (3) For each R_i , $\frac{d\mu|_{R_i}}{d\lambda_i} \in (1 - \varepsilon_0, 1 + \varepsilon_0)$ restricted to G_i ;
- (4) $\mu(\bigcup_i G_i) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_0$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/4$ which be the scale at which we will carry out the construction below. Now, because $\mu \ll \lambda$, $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda}$ exists and is non-zero on a set $Y_0 \subset X$ of full μ -measure. Now, by regularity of μ and λ , take $Y_1 \subset Y_0$ to be compact, such that $\mu(Y_1) > 1 - \varepsilon^4$ and $\lambda(Y_1) > (1 - \varepsilon^4)\lambda(Y_0)$. Then, applying Lusin’s theorem, there exists a compact set $K \subset Y_1$ on which $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda}|_K$ is continuous, and we have $\mu(K) > 1 - \varepsilon^3$, and $\lambda(K) > (1 - \varepsilon^3)\lambda(Y_0)$.

By continuity of the derivative, compactness of K , and the fact that the derivative is non-zero on K , we have definite upper and lower bounds

$$0 < m \leq \left. \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda} \right|_K \leq M < \infty.$$

Furthermore, take $\gamma < \varepsilon$ small enough so that $m \geq 2\gamma + \gamma^2$ in order to apply Proposition 4.9. Then, by continuity of the derivative, we can choose $\delta > 0$ such that on any set R with diameter at most δ , there exists $r \in [m, M]$ such that $\left. \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda} \right|_{K \cap R} \in (r - \gamma^2, r + \gamma^2)$. In particular, Proposition 4.9 and the choice of γ gives $\left. \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda} \right|_{K \cap R} \in (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)$.

Moving forward, we will fix $0 < \beta < \varepsilon$ so that if $\lambda(A) < \beta^3$, then $\mu(A) < \varepsilon^3$ for all $A \subset X$. Such a β is guaranteed because $\mu \ll \lambda$. Now, since \mathcal{C} is a generating semi-ring, there exists a finite collection of pairwise disjoint sets $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{C}$ of diameter at most δ for which we can approximate K arbitrarily well. We choose \mathcal{R} so that

$$\lambda\left(K \Delta \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R\right) < \beta^4. \quad (4.2)$$

This implies that the union of $R \in \mathcal{R}$ with $\lambda(R \cap K) < (1 - \varepsilon)\lambda(R)$ has very small measure with respect to λ . In particular, letting \mathcal{B}_λ denote this set, the analogous argument of Lemma 4.8 applied using (4.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{B}_\lambda} R\right) &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\mathcal{B}_\lambda} \lambda(R \cap K^c) \\ &\leq \beta^3. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mu\left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{B}_\lambda} R\right) < \varepsilon^3$ from the choice of β .

Furthermore, again by our choice of β and (4.2), we know that $\mu\left(K \Delta \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R\right) < \varepsilon^3$, and so, defining \mathcal{B}_μ analogously as the set of $R \in \mathcal{R}$ with $\mu(R \cap K) < (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(R)$, we have that

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{B}_\mu} R\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\mathcal{B}_\mu} \mu(R \cap K^c) \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

Consequently, $\mu\left(\bigcup_{\mathcal{R} \setminus (\mathcal{B}_\lambda \cup \mathcal{B}_\mu)} R\right) > 1 - 2\varepsilon^2$. Henceforth, we will take our collection $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^n$ to be $\mathcal{R} \setminus (\mathcal{B}_\mu \cup \mathcal{B}_\lambda)$, and we will take

$$G_i := R_i \cap K.$$

In other words, our collection $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^n$ consists of $R \in \mathcal{R}$ whose intersection with K has large relative measure with respect to both μ and λ .

We can now proceed to check our desired conditions. First, observe that

$$\mu\left(K \setminus \bigcup_{\mathcal{R}} R_i\right) \leq \mu\left(K \setminus \bigcup_{\mathcal{R}} R\right) + 2\varepsilon^2 \leq \varepsilon^3 + 2\varepsilon^2 \leq 3\varepsilon^2.$$

Therefore, since $\mu(K) > 1 - \varepsilon^3$, we have that

$$\mu\left(\bigcup R_i\right) \geq \mu(K) - \mu(K \setminus \bigcup R_i) > 1 - \varepsilon^3 - 3\varepsilon^2 > 1 - \varepsilon_0.$$

The second condition, that $\mu(G_i) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(R_i)$, follows because $R_i \notin \mathcal{B}_\mu$, and similarly for λ using \mathcal{B}_λ . The fourth condition also readily follows from the first two:

$$\mu(G) = \sum_i \mu(G_i) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_i \mu(R_i) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon.$$

We are left with the third condition. First, recall G_i has relatively large μ and λ measure in R_i , so we have

$$1 - \varepsilon < \frac{d\mu|_R}{d\mu|_G} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \frac{d\lambda|_G}{d\lambda|_R} < \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \leq 1 + 2\varepsilon.$$

Additionally, recall from the construction that elements of \mathcal{R} have small enough diameter so that $\frac{d\mu|_G}{d\lambda|_G} \in (1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)$. Therefore, on G we have

$$\frac{d\mu|_R}{d\lambda|_R} = \left(\frac{d\mu|_R}{d\mu|_G}\right) \left(\frac{d\mu|_G}{d\lambda|_G}\right) \left(\frac{d\lambda|_G}{d\lambda|_R}\right) \in ((1 - \varepsilon)^2, (1 + \varepsilon)(1 + 2\varepsilon)) \subset (1 - 2\varepsilon, 1 + 4\varepsilon).$$

Recalling that $\varepsilon_0 = 4\varepsilon$, we are done. \square

Remark 4.15. Note that we could have chosen δ , which served as the maximum diameter of $\{R_i\}$, as small as we desired. In particular, given any prescribed $\delta > 0$, we could have ensured that the diameter of each element of $\{R_i\}$ is bounded above by δ . This fact will be used in Proposition 4.20.

This proposition can almost be interpreted as saying that there is an ε -regular covering as defined by Chernov and Haskell [CH96]. This follows because we can take our generating semi-ring to be the set of rectangles. The only missing component is that we do not make any claims regarding stable or unstable manifolds.

4.5. Defining our map θ . For the rest of the section, we will suppose that for any scale $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, the collection $\{R_i\}$ obtained from Proposition 4.14 at scale ε_0 satisfies the following assumptions:

- Each R_i is a rectangle;
- Each measure $\lambda_i := \lambda|_{R_i}$ is a non-atomic product measure $\rho_i \times \nu_i$ on R_i , where ρ_i is a measure on $W^s(z)$ and ν_i is a measure on $W^u(z)$ for some $z \in R_i$.

As rectangles are a generating semi-ring, the first assumption provides no additional restrictions in our setting. The second assumption is the content of measurable local product structure.

We now begin the proof of Theorem 4.1 by using Corollary 4.7. Given a partition ξ of X , recall that we want to build an ε_0 -measure preserving map $\theta : E \rightarrow X$ for ε_0 -almost every atom $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ satisfying extra properties listed in Corollary 4.7. We do this by using the rectangles $\{R_i\}$ created in the previous subsection in the order of scale ε_0^2 . In particular, we will find a suitable subset $A \subset E$ and construct $\theta : A \cap R_i \rightarrow R_i$ for each i . Putting these maps together (over all i) and extending it to E will be our desired map.

The following proposition is the most technical part of the proof. We will use an auxiliary measure λ_0 built out of $\lambda_i = \lambda|_{R_i}$ where $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is the collection of rectangles at certain scale.

Proposition 4.16. *For any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, let $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $G_i \subset R_i$ be the rectangles and their designated subsets created from Proposition 4.14 at scale $(\varepsilon_0/4)^2$. Setting $G := \bigcup_{i=1}^n G_i$ and*

$$\lambda_0 := \left(\sum_i \mu(R_i) \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mu(R_i) \lambda_i \right), \quad (4.3)$$

there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, for ε_0 -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ with respect to μ , there exists a subset $A \subset E$ such that

- (a) A intersects each R_i layerwise;
- (b) $\mu(A) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)\mu(E)$;
- (c) $\mu(A \cap G) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)\mu(A)$;
- (d) $\lambda_0(A \cap G) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)\lambda_0(A)$.

Moreover, there exists a $10\varepsilon_0$ -measure-preserving map $\theta : (A, \mu|_A) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ where $\theta(x) \in W^s(x)$ for all $x \in A$.

We will split the proof into two parts: Lemma 4.18 and 4.19. First, we will show that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (a)-(d) hold on A . Then, we will show that conditions (a)-(d) on A imply the existence of the map θ with the claimed properties. In both proofs, we will need the following short lemma to compare λ_0 and μ .

Lemma 4.17. *Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/4$. For any $B \subseteq X$, we have*

$$(1 - 2\varepsilon^2)\lambda_0(B \cap G) \leq \mu(B \cap G) \leq (1 + \varepsilon^2)\lambda_0(B \cap G).$$

Proof. Note that we have $\mu(B \cap G) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(B \cap G_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(R_i) \cdot \mu|_{R_i}(B \cap G_i)$. Since

$\varepsilon^2 = (\varepsilon_0/4)^2$ is the scale of the rectangles $\{R_i\}_1^n$, from Proposition 4.14 (3) we have $\frac{d\mu|_{R_i}}{d\lambda_i} \in (1 - \varepsilon^2, 1 + \varepsilon^2)$ on G_i , and it follows from the definition (4.3) of λ_0 that

$$(1 - \varepsilon^2) \left(\sum_i \mu(R_i) \right) \lambda_0(B \cap G) \leq \mu(B \cap G) \leq (1 + \varepsilon^2) \left(\sum_i \mu(R_i) \right) \lambda_0(B \cap G).$$

As $\sum_i \mu(R_i) \in (1 - \varepsilon^2, 1)$ from Proposition 4.14 (1), we have the desired inequalities. \square

Now, we will show that ε_0 -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ has a subset $A \subset E$ satisfying conditions (a)-(d).

Lemma 4.18. *In the setting of Proposition 4.16, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, for ε_0 -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^j \xi$, we have $A \subset E$ satisfying (a)-(d).*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/4$ as done in the lemma above.

Take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that Proposition 4.13 holds at scale $\varepsilon/2$ with respect to $\{R_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Because μ has the K -property, from Proposition 2.6 we may increase N if necessary so that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, we can ensure that for $\varepsilon/2$ -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^j \xi$ and for each i , we have

$$\left| \frac{\mu(E \cap G_i)}{\mu(E)} - \mu(G_i) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \quad (4.4)$$

where n is the number of rectangles R_i .

Therefore, for ε -almost every E in our partition, both this property and the results of Proposition 4.13 hold; namely, there exists of a subset $A \subset E$ layerwise intersecting each R_i and satisfying

$$\mu(A) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2)\mu(E). \quad (4.5)$$

This verifies (a) and (b).

Recall that we have chosen our rectangles $\{R_i\}$ to be built at scale $(\varepsilon_0/4)^2 = \varepsilon^2$ from Proposition 4.14. Therefore, we have

$$\mu(G) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2. \quad (4.6)$$

In particular, for all such E , summing (4.4) over all i gives

$$\mu(E \cap G) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E \cap G_i) \geq \mu(E)(\mu(G) - \varepsilon/2) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(E). \quad (4.7)$$

Now, combined the fact (4.5) that A has large μ -measure in E , we verify (c):

$$\mu(A \cap G) \geq \mu(E \cap G) - \mu(E \setminus A) \geq (1 - 3\varepsilon/2)\mu(E) \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)\mu(A).$$

The more difficult estimate to check is the fourth condition (d) on λ_0 . While conditions (a)-(c) are relatively easy to check because $A \subset E$ has been constructed to satisfy relevant properties with respect to μ , a priori we cannot compare $\lambda_0(A)$ to $\lambda_0(E)$ or $\lambda_0(A \cap G)$ to $\lambda_0(E \cap G)$ as we did for μ . So, we make use of Lemma 4.17. The other difficulty is that we must further restrict the elements of $\bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ with which we work. Henceforth, we will assume that we are working with partition elements E which satisfy properties (a)-(c) (which we have already shown to be ε -almost every partition element), in addition to the following extra assumption:

$$\lambda_0(E \cap G) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\lambda_0(E).$$

Now, Lemma 4.17 and (4.7) give

$$\mu(E) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \mu(E \cap G) \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon^2}{1 - \varepsilon} \lambda_0(E \cap G) \leq (1 + 2\varepsilon)\lambda_0(E).$$

In the reverse direction, Lemma 4.17 and (4.5) show

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \mu(E) \geq \mu(E \setminus A) \geq \mu(G \cap (E \setminus A)) \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon^2)\lambda_0(G \cap (E \setminus A)).$$

Combining the two gives $\lambda_0(G \cap (E \setminus A)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon(1 + 2\varepsilon)}{2(1 - 2\varepsilon^2)} \lambda_0(E) \leq \varepsilon \lambda_0(E)$.

Using the extra assumption on $\lambda_0(E \cap G)$, we establish (d):

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0(A \cap G) &\geq \lambda_0(E \cap G) - \lambda_0(G \cap (E \setminus A)) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon)\lambda_0(E) - \varepsilon\lambda_0(E) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)\lambda_0(A). \end{aligned}$$

In order to complete our proof, we need to justify our assumption that $\lambda_0(E \cap G) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\lambda_0(E)$ by showing that the set of such partition elements has large μ -measure. Hence, recalling that we have already shown that ε -almost every partition element $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ satisfies (a) through (c), we only need to show that our assumption of $\lambda_0(E \cap G) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\lambda_0(E)$ is justified on most such E .

Observe that $\lambda_0(G^c) < \varepsilon^2$, as we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_0(G^c) &= \left(\sum_i \mu(R_i) \right)^{-1} \sum_i \mu(R_i) \lambda_i(R_i \setminus G_i) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_i \mu(R_i) \right)^{-1} \sum_i \mu(R_i) \varepsilon^2 = \varepsilon^2\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma 4.8 applies and the λ_0 -measure of the union of all partition elements $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ with $\lambda_0(E \cap G) < (1 - \varepsilon) \lambda_0(E)$ is at most ε . Among such partition elements, we denote by \mathcal{B} the set of all E which also satisfy properties (a)-(c). In particular, $E \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies $\mu(E \cap G^c) \leq \varepsilon \mu(E)$ which corresponds to (4.7). Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\left(\bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{B}} E\right) &= \sum_{\mathcal{B}} \mu(E \cap G) + \mu(E \cap G^c) \\ &\leq \sum (1 + \varepsilon^2) \lambda_0(E \cap G) + \varepsilon \mu(E) \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon^2) \lambda_0\left(\bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{B}} E\right) + \varepsilon \mu\left(\bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{B}} E\right) \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon^2) \varepsilon + \varepsilon \mu\left(\bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{B}} E\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses Lemma 4.17. Consequently,

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{B}} E\right) < \frac{1 + \varepsilon^2}{1 - \varepsilon} \varepsilon < 2\varepsilon.$$

As we have already shown that ε -almost every element of $\bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ satisfies properties (a)-(c), by further excluding the elements of \mathcal{B} , it follows that 3ε -almost every element satisfies (a)-(d). As $\varepsilon_0 = 4\varepsilon$, our proof is complete. \square

We now construct the desired map θ using the properties (a), (c), and (d) on A and the fact that $\{R_i\}$ is constructed at scale $(\varepsilon_0/4)^2$. The standing assumption that λ_i is a product measure allows us to first build θ in a *measure-preserving* way with respect to the auxiliary measure λ_0 . Using this, θ can be shown to be an ε_0 -measure preserving map with respect to μ .

Lemma 4.19. *For each $A \subset E$ from Lemma 4.18, there exists a $10\varepsilon_0$ -measure-preserving map $\theta : (A, \mu|_A) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ where $\theta(x) \in W^s(x)$ for all $x \in A$.*

Proof. We will continue to work with the scale $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/4$ as in the above lemma. Recall also that each rectangle R_i can be written as a product $W^s(z) \times W^u(z)$ for some $z \in R_i$ and is equipped with the product measure $\rho_i \times \nu_i$.

We begin by defining $\theta : A \cap R_i \rightarrow R_i$. As ρ_i is non-atomic, there is a measure-preserving mapping θ_i from $(A \cap W^s(z), \rho_i|_A) \rightarrow (R_i \cap W^s(z), \rho_i)$. Because A intersects each R_i layerwise from (a), this mapping extends to $A \cap R_i$ along the W^u -direction according to ν_i . In particular, such a mapping

$$\theta : (A \cap R_i, \lambda_i|_A) \rightarrow (R_i, \lambda_i)$$

is still measure-preserving, and satisfies the property that $\theta(x) \in W^s(x)$. Moreover, the map $\theta : (A \cap \bigsqcup R_i, \lambda_0|_A) \rightarrow (\bigsqcup R_i, \lambda_0)$ is measure-preserving since $\lambda_i|_A$ is a scalar multiple

of $\lambda_0|_A$ on each R_i . Therefore,

$$\theta : (A, \lambda_0|_A) \rightarrow (X, \lambda_0)$$

is measure-preserving as well, because $\lambda_0(X \setminus \bigsqcup R_i) = 0$ from its construction (4.3).

We will now proceed to show that Proposition 4.10 can be applied at scale $2\varepsilon_0$ to $X_1 = A$, $X_2 = X$, $Y_1 = A \cap G$, and $Y_2 = G$ where our auxiliary measures will be $\nu_1 = \lambda_0|_A$ and $\nu_2 = \lambda_0$. In particular, we will show how properties (c) and (d) of A and the scale ε^2 of $\{R_i\}$ can be used to verify the three conditions in Proposition 4.10.

First, at scale $2\varepsilon_0 = 8\varepsilon$, condition (3) of Proposition 4.10 corresponds to $\mu|_A(A \cap G) \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon_0$ and $\mu(G) \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon_0$ directly follows from (c) and (4.6). From Lemma 4.17, on G we have

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda_0} \in (1 - 2\varepsilon^2, 1 + \varepsilon^2),$$

which shows condition (2). Using Proposition 4.9,

it also shows that $\frac{d\mu|_{A \cap G}}{d\lambda_0|_{A \cap G}}$ is between $1 - 2\varepsilon$ and $1 + 2\varepsilon$. Hence, to check condition (1) of Proposition 4.10, we observe that on $A \cap G$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mu|_A}{d\lambda_0|_A} &= \frac{d\mu|_A}{d\mu|_{A \cap G}} \frac{d\lambda_0|_{A \cap G}}{d\lambda_0|_A} \frac{d\mu|_{A \cap G}}{d\lambda_0|_{A \cap G}} \\ &= \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(A \cap G)} \frac{\lambda_0(A \cap G)}{\lambda_0(A)} \frac{d\mu|_{A \cap G}}{d\lambda_0|_{A \cap G}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - 4\varepsilon} \cdot 1 \cdot (1 + 2\varepsilon) \\ &\leq 1 + 7\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the third line uses property (c). A similar argument using (d) instead yields the reverse inequality, verifying condition (1).

Consequently, we have shown the necessary conditions of Proposition 4.10 with constant $8\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon_0$, and so $\theta : (A, \mu|_A) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ is $10\varepsilon_0$ -measure-preserving. This completes the proof of the lemma, and also of Proposition 4.16. \square

4.6. Putting it all together. Recall that $\chi \in (0, 1)$ is the hyperbolicity constant for f introduced in the beginning of Subsection 4.2.

Proposition 4.20. *For an arbitrary suitably nice partition ξ , for any $\delta > 0$, and for all $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists N such that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, for ε_0 -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$, there exists an ε_0 -measure-preserving map $\theta : (E, \mu|_E) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ such that for all $n \geq 0$,*

$$d(f^n x, f^n \theta(x)) \leq \chi^n \delta. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/2$. From Proposition 4.16 at scale ε , we have shown that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N such that for all $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$, for ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$, there exists $A \subset E$ intersecting each R_i layerwise such that $\mu|_E(A) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and that the map $\theta : (A, \mu|_A) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ is ε -measure-preserving.

Furthermore, because $\theta(x)$ belongs to the local stable set of x and we can choose our rectangles with arbitrarily small diameter (see Remark 4.15), we have the additional required condition on θ . Now, extend $\theta : (E, \mu|_E) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ by setting $\theta(x) = x$ for $x \notin A$. This clearly preserves the distance condition on θ , so all that we need to check is that the map is ε -measure-preserving.

This can be verified from the fact that original map $\theta : (A, \mu|_A) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ is ε -measure preserving. Denoting by B the subset of A on which θ is ε -measure preserving (see Definition

4.5), the same set B can be used for verifying the ε -measure preserving property for the extended map $\theta : (E, \mu|_E) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$. Indeed, from its definition we have

$$\left| \frac{\mu(\theta C)}{\mu(C)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$$

for any $C \subseteq B$. Moreover, the set B still has large μ -measure in E because A does:

$$\mu(B) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(A) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)\mu(E) \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)\mu(E).$$

Consequently, we see that $\theta : (E, \mu|_E) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ is 2ε -measure-preserving. Recalling that $\varepsilon_0 = 2\varepsilon$, we are done. \square

Proposition 4.21. *The partition ξ is Very Weak Bernoulli.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We will apply Proposition 4.20 to ε and $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon^2/C)$, where C is the constant from (4.1) so that $\mu(B(\partial\xi, \delta)) \leq \varepsilon^2$. This gives $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$ with $m_2 \geq m_1 \geq N$ has an ε -measure-preserving map $\theta : E \rightarrow X$ satisfying the distance condition (4.8). For reference later, we denote by \mathscr{D} the set of all such E .

For any such $E \in \mathscr{D}$, consider the partitions $\{f^{-i}\xi|_E\}_1^n$ and $\{f^{-i}\xi\}_1^n$. If

$$h(x, \theta(x)) > \varepsilon$$

for some $x \in E$ (we are just using $h(x, \theta(x)) \neq 0$ here), this means that there exists $1 \leq m \leq n$ so that $f^{-m}\xi|_E(x) \neq f^{-m}\xi(\theta(x))$; that is, x and $\theta(x)$ belong to different partition elements of $f^{-m}\xi$. Therefore, $f^m x \in B(\partial\xi, \chi^m \delta) \subset B(\partial\xi, \delta)$ from (4.8). Hence

$$B_E := \{x \in E \mid h(x, \theta(x)) > \varepsilon\} \subset B(\partial\xi, \delta).$$

Setting $B = \bigcup_{E \in \mathscr{D}} B_E$, we then have $\mu(B) \leq \varepsilon^2$.

Therefore, applying Lemma 4.8 which amounts to further excluding some elements from \mathscr{D} whose union has μ -measure at most ε , we now have that for 2ε -almost every $E \in \bigvee_{m_1}^{m_2} f^i \xi$, the subset $D := E \cap B^c$ satisfies $\mu|_E(D) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $h(x, \theta(x)) < \varepsilon$ for $x \in D$. Thus, ξ is Very Weak Bernoulli from Corollary 4.7, and our proof is complete. \square

Corollary 4.22. *The system (X, f, μ) is Bernoulli.*

Proof. We can find a generating sequence of Very Weak Bernoulli partitions, because we can choose ξ above to have arbitrarily small diameter. From the above proposition and Corollary 4.7, the system (X, f, μ) is Bernoulli, completing the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

REFERENCES

- [BG11] Luis Barreira and Katrin Gelfert, *Dimension estimates in smooth dynamics: a survey of recent results*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **31** (2011), no. 3, 641–671.
- [BG19] Jairo Bochi and Eduardo Garibaldi, *Extremal norms for fiber-bunched cocycles*, Journal de l'École polytechnique—Mathématiques **6** (2019), 947–1004.
- [BM18] Jairo Bochi and Ian D. Morris, *Equilibrium states of generalised singular value potentials and applications to affine iterated function systems*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **28** (2018), no. 4, 995–1028. MR 3820437
- [Bow74a] Rufus Bowen, *Bernoulli equilibrium states for axiom A diffeomorphisms*, Mathematical systems theory **8** (1974), no. 4, 289–294.
- [Bow74b] ———, *Some systems with unique equilibrium states*, Theory of computing systems **8** (1974), no. 3, 193–202.
- [Bow75] ———, *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of anosov diffeomorphisms*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 470, Springer-Verlag, 1975.
- [BP19] Clark Butler and Kiho Park, *Thermodynamic formalism of $GL_2(\mathbb{R})$ -cocycles with canonical holonomies*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A (2019), 0.

- [BV04] Christian Bonatti and Marcelo Viana, *Lyapunov exponents with multiplicity 1 for deterministic products of matrices*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **24** (2004), no. 5, 1295–1330.
- [CFH08] Yongluo Cao, De-Jun Feng, and Wen Huang, *The thermodynamic formalism for sub-additive potentials*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A **20** (2008), no. 3, 639–657.
- [CH96] NI Chernov and Cymra Haskell, *Nonuniformly hyperbolic k -systems are bernoulli*, Ergodic theory and dynamical systems **16** (1996), no. 1, 19–44.
- [CP20] Benjamin Call and Kiho Park, *The k -property for subadditive equilibrium states*, Dynamical Systems (2020), 1–24.
- [CPZ19] Yongluo Cao, Yakov Pesin, and Yun Zhao, *Dimension estimates for non-conformal repellers and continuity of sub-additive topological pressure*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **29** (2019), no. 5, 1325–1368.
- [CRH21] Pablo D Carrasco and Federico Rodriguez-Hertz, *Equilibrium states for center isometries*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07323 (2021).
- [CT19] Benjamin Call and Daniel J Thompson, *Equilibrium states for products of flows and the mixing properties of rank 1 geodesic flows*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.09315 (2019).
- [Fen03] De-Jun Feng, *Lyapunov exponents for products of matrices and multifractal analysis. part i: Positive matrices*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **138** (2003), no. 1, 353–376.
- [Fen09] ———, *Lyapunov exponents for products of matrices and multifractal analysis. part ii: General matrices*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **170** (2009), no. 1, 355–394.
- [Fen11] ———, *Equilibrium states for factor maps between subshifts*, Advances in Mathematics **226** (2011), no. 3, 2470–2502.
- [FO70] N. A. Friedman and D. S. Ornstein, *On isomorphism of weak Bernoulli transformations*, Advances in Math. **5** (1970), 365–394 (1970). MR 274718
- [Kat80] Anatole Katok, *Smooth non-bernoullik-automorphisms*, Inventiones mathematicae **61** (1980), no. 3, 291–299.
- [KHV18] Adam Kanigowski, Federico Rodriguez Hertz, and Kurt Vinhage, *On the non-equivalence of the bernoulli and k properties in dimension four*, Journal of Modern Dynamics **13** (2018), no. 1, 221–250.
- [KS13] Boris Kalinin and Victoria Sadovskaya, *Cocycles with one exponent over partially hyperbolic systems*, Geometriae Dedicata **167** (2013), no. 1, 167–188.
- [LLS16] François Ledrappier, Yuri Lima, and Omri M Sarig, *Ergodic properties of equilibrium measures for smooth three dimensional flows*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **91** (2016), no. 1, 65–106.
- [Mor18] Ian D Morris, *Ergodic properties of matrix equilibrium states*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **38** (2018), no. 6, 2295–2320.
- [Mor19] ———, *A necessary and sufficient condition for a matrix equilibrium state to be mixing*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **39** (2019), no. 8, 2223–2234.
- [Mor20] ———, *Totally ergodic generalised matrix equilibrium states have the bernoulli property*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.11497 (2020).
- [Orn70a] D. S. Ornstein, *Imbedding Bernoulli shifts in flows*, Contributions to Ergodic Theory and Probability (Proc. Conf., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio, 1970), Springer, Berlin, 1970, pp. 178–218. MR 0272985
- [Orn70b] Donald Ornstein, *Bernoulli shifts with the same entropy are isomorphic*, Advances in Math. **4** (1970), 337–352. MR 257322
- [Orn73] Donald S. Ornstein, *An example of a Kolmogorov automorphism that is not a Bernoulli shift*, Advances in Math. **10** (1973), 49–62. MR 316682
- [OW73] Donald Ornstein and Benjamin Weiss, *Geodesic flows are bernoullian*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **14** (1973), no. 2, 184–198.
- [OW74] Donald S. Ornstein and Benjamin Weiss, *Finitely determined implies very weak Bernoulli*, Israel J. Math. **17** (1974), 94–104. MR 346132
- [OW98] Donald Ornstein and Benjamin Weiss, *On the bernoulli nature of systems with some hyperbolic structure*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **18** (1998), no. 2, 441–456.
- [Par20] Kiho Park, *Quasi-multiplicativity of typical cocycles*, Commun. Math. Phys. (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-020-03701-8>.
- [Pes77] Yakov Pesin, *Characteristic lyapunov exponents and smooth ergodic theory*, Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk **32** (1977), no. 4, 55–112.
- [Pir18] Mark Piraino, *The weak bernoulli property for matrix gibbs states*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems (2018), 1–20.

- [PTV18] Gabriel Ponce, Ali Tahzibi, and Régis Varão, *On the bernoulli property for certain partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms*, *Advances in Mathematics* **329** (2018), 329–360.
- [PV19] Gabriel Ponce and Régis Varão, *An introduction to the kolmogorov-bernoulli equivalence*, Springer, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OH 43210, USA
Email address: `call.119@osu.edu`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, KIAS, 85 HOEGIRO, DONGDAEMUN-GU, SEOUL, 02455, KOREA
Email address: `kihopark12@kias.re.kr`