

Uniqueness and statistical properties of the Gibbs state on general one-dimensional lattices with markovian structure

Victor Vargas*.

September 28, 2022

Abstract Let M be a compact metric space and $X = M^{\mathbb{N}}$, we consider a set of admissible sequences $X_{A,I} \subset X$ determined by a continuous function $A : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a compact set $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. Given a Lipschitz continuous potential $\varphi : X_{A,I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we prove uniqueness of the Gibbs state μ_φ and we show that μ_φ satisfies the so called Gibbs-Bowen property and a central limit theorem.

Keywords: Central limit theorem, decay of correlations, Gibbs-Bowen property, Gibbs state, mixing measures.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 28Dxx, 37A60, 37D35.

1 Introduction

Thermodynamical properties on infinite spin one-dimensional lattices have been widely studied by several authors, both in Bernoulli and Markov systems. Typical problems, like existence of Gibbs states and the relation of them with the so called equilibrium states and maximizing measures, besides some problems of selection and non-selection at zero temperature were deeply understood in some of these contexts (see for instance [3], [6], [12], [13] and [18]). In the seminal works, the main interest of the authors was to characterize the behavior of the so called “free energy” associated to a suitable potential defined on a uncountable spin lattice system at lower temperatures (see [20] and [21] for details). In here, we are concerned with the uniqueness and some statistical properties of the so called Gibbs state associated to a Lipschitz continuous potential satisfying suitable conditions defined on a general one-dimensional lattice with markovian structure (see [6], [12] and [18] for details).

The kind of model which we are dealing with, was presented in [3] for the context of Bernoulli systems. In that work the authors studied some proper-

*Centre for Mathematics of the University of Porto, Porto-Portugal, vavargascu@gmail.co. Supported by FCT through the project UIDP/00144/2020.

ties of the Gibbs states at lower temperatures and the relation between them and the so called DLR Gibbs measures (which are better understood in the context of statistical mechanics). Some time later, was proposed a markovian approach of the models studied in [3] and [13]. In that model with markovian structure, some of the sequences defined on the lattice are forbidden through an admissibility function with finite memory (see [6], [12] and [18] for details). Several thermodynamical properties of this class of models were studied previously. For instance, in [18] was proved existence of Gibbs states using techniques of the so called Perron-Frobenius theory and were presented interesting connections between that class of infinite spin one-dimensional lattices with the so called countable Markov shifts. Moreover, using that connections were studied some problems of non-selection at zero temperature in the context of countable Markov shifts. Besides that, in [12] were studied some interesting properties of the quadratic pressure and the so called cosine potential on this dynamical setting.

In this work, we follow a similar approach to the ones proposed in [8] and [19] to prove uniqueness of the Gibbs state. In fact, we define a suitable metric and, using optimal transportation techniques (see for details [1] and [23]), we guarantee existence of a Wasserstein metric contracting the dual of the transfer operator, which generates the weak* topology on the set of Borel probability measures defined on the lattice system. In addition, we show that the Gibbs state satisfies a Gibbs-Bowen property (which is defined in the same sense to the one proposed in [7]), we prove that the Gibbs state has exponential decay of correlations and satisfies the mixing property. Moreover, adapting some techniques proposed in [22] (see also [4]), we prove that the Gibbs state satisfies a central limit theorem.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we present the notation and the main definitions to be used throughout the paper. In section 3 we prove Theorem 1 which guarantees the uniqueness of the Gibbs state. In section 4 we present the proofs of Theorem 2, Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 which show some interesting statistical properties of the Gibbs state.

2 Preliminaries

Consider a compact metric space (Y, d) , we use the notation $C(Y)$ for the set of **continuous functions** from Y into \mathbb{R} equipped with the **uniform norm** $\|\varphi\|_\infty := \sup\{|\varphi(x)| : x \in Y\}$. Besides that, we define the **Lipschitz constant** of a function $\varphi \in C(Y)$ with respect to the metric d as

$$\text{Lip}_{\varphi,d} := \sup\left\{\frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|}{d(x,y)} : x \neq y\right\}.$$

A function φ is called **Lipschitz continuous** with respect to the metric d , when $\text{Lip}_{\varphi,d} < \infty$. We use the notation $\text{Lip}(Y, d)$ for the set of **Lipschitz continuous functions** from Y into \mathbb{R} equipped with the **Lipschitz norm** given by $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip},d} := \|\varphi\|_\infty + \text{Lip}_{\varphi,d}$.

As usual, we use the notation \mathcal{B}_Y for the collection of **Borel sets** of Y , we denote by $\mathcal{M}(Y)$ the set of **finite Borel measures** on Y , by $\mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ the set of **Borel probability measures** on Y and by $\mathcal{M}_T(Y)$ the set of **T-invariant Borel probability measures** on Y (when $T : Y \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous endomorphism). Since Y is a compact metric space, it is widely known that $C^*(Y) = \mathcal{M}(Y)$. Moreover, under those assumptions we obtain that $\mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ results in a compact space when it is equipped with the weak* topology.

Given $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(Y)$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, we denote by $L^p(\mu)$ the set of all the Borel measurable functions $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\int_Y |\psi|^p d\mu < \infty$, equipped with the **p -norm**

$$\|\psi\|_p := \left(\int_Y |\psi|^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

It is well known that the spaces $C(Y)$, $\text{Lip}(Y, d)$ and $L^p(\mu)$, with $1 \leq p < \infty$, result in Banach spaces when they are equipped with their corresponding norms. Furthermore, it is well known that $\overline{\text{Lip}(Y, d)}^{\|\cdot\|_\infty} = C(Y)$ and $\overline{\text{Lip}(Y, d)}^{\|\cdot\|_p} = \overline{C(Y)}^{\|\cdot\|_p} = L^p(\mu)$ for any $1 \leq p < \infty$. On the other hand, given two Banach spaces V, W and a linear operator $L : V \rightarrow W$, we denote the **operator norm** of L by $\|L\|_{op} := \sup\{\|Lv\|_W : \|v\|_V = 1\}$.

Consider a pair $\mu, \eta \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$, we define the **transport plan** between μ and η , which we denote by $\Gamma(\mu, \eta)$, as set of measures $\Pi \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y \times Y)$ with marginals μ and η , i.e., $\Pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \eta)$ if, and only if, any $E \in \mathcal{B}_Y$ satisfies $\Pi(E \times Y) = \mu(E)$ and $\Pi(Y \times E) = \eta(E)$. Note that $\Gamma(\mu, \eta) \neq \emptyset$ for any pair $\mu, \eta \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$, because it always contains the **product measure** $\mu \otimes \eta$. Moreover, it is not difficult to check that $\Pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \eta)$ if, and only if, each pair of functions $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C(Y)$ satisfy

$$\int_{Y \times Y} (\psi_1(x) + \psi_2(y)) d\Pi(x, y) = \int_Y \psi_1 d\mu + \int_Y \psi_2 d\eta. \quad (1)$$

Using the above, we define the **Wasserstein metric** on the set $\mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ (with respect to the metric d), as the one satisfying the equation

$$W_d(\mu, \eta) := \inf \left\{ \int_{Y \times Y} d(x, y) d\Pi(x, y) : \Pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \eta) \right\}. \quad (2)$$

It is well known that W_d induces the weak* topology on $\mathcal{M}_1(Y)$ and, thus, $(\mathcal{M}_1(Y), W_d)$ results in a compact metric space. Moreover, by the **Kantorovich duality** (see for details [23]), it follows that

$$W_d(\mu, \eta) = \sup \left\{ \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d(\mu - \eta) : \text{Lip}_{\psi, d} \leq 1 \text{ and } \|\psi\|_\infty \leq \text{diam}(Y, d) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\text{diam}(Y, d) := \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in Y\}$ is the **diameter** of Y with respect to the metric d . Given any pair $\mu, \eta \in \mathcal{M}_1(Y)$, we say that $\tilde{\Pi} \in \Gamma(\mu, \eta)$ is a **d -optimal transport plan** between μ and η , when it attains the infimum in (2). That is, when it satisfies

$$W_d(\mu, \eta) = \int_{Y \times Y} d(x, y) d\tilde{\Pi}(x, y). \quad (4)$$

Throughout the paper, we fix a compact metric space (M, d_M) and we denote by $X := M^{\mathbb{N}}$ the set of sequences taking values into M . It is well known that X also results in a compact metric space when it is equipped with the metric

$$d_X(x, y) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_M(x_n, y_n)}{2^n} .$$

Actually, we can assume without loss of generality $\text{diam}(M, d_M) = 1$ which also implies that $\text{diam}(X, d_X) = 1$.

As usual, the **shift map** is defined as the function $\sigma : X \rightarrow X$ satisfying the equation $\sigma((x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}) := (x_{n+1})_{n=1}^{\infty}$. Here we consider a class of one-dimensional lattices with markovian structure containing the so called one-dimensional XY models on compact metric spaces and the finite Markov shifts. This class of subshifts was presented in [6] and several properties of the Gibbs states in this context were studied in [12] and [18].

Fixing a continuous map $A : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a compact set $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, such that, $A(M \times M) \cap I \neq \emptyset$, we say that a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is **admissible**, when $A(x_n, x_{n+1}) \in I$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Throughout the paper, we denote by $X_{A,I} \subset X$ the set of **admissible sequences** with the shift map acting on it. In fact, it is not difficult to check that $X_{A,I}$ is a closed σ -invariant metric space and, thus, results in a compact subshift of X (see for details [6] and [18]). Besides that, we say that a word $\omega := x_1 \dots x_k \in M^k$ is an **admissible word** when $A(x_n, x_{n+1}) \in I$ for each $n \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$.

On the other hand, given $b \in M$, we define the **section of b in $A^{-1}(I)$** as the set $s(b) := \{a \in M : A(a, b) \in I\}$. It is not difficult to verify that $s(b)$ is a compact subset of M for each $b \in M$. So, taking $\mathcal{K}(M)$ as the set of **compact subsets of M** equipped with the **Hausdorff metric**, we can check that the map $s : M \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(M)$ sending each $b \in M$ into $s(b) \in \mathcal{K}(M)$ is continuous (see for details [18]).

Hereafter, we assume that the map s is **locally constant**, i.e., for any $b \in M$, there is an **open neighborhood** $V_b \subset M$ containing b , such that, $s(b') = s(b)$ for any $b' \in V_b$. By the above, it follows that for any $z \in X_{A,I}$ there is $\epsilon_z > 0$, such that, each $y \in X_{A,I}$ with $y_1 \in (z_1 - \epsilon_z, z_1 + \epsilon_z)$ satisfies $s(y_1) = s(z_1)$. Moreover, for any $z \in X_{A,I}$ the set $V_z := \{y \in X_{A,I} : y_1 \in (z_1 - \epsilon_z, z_1 + \epsilon_z)\}$ is non-empty and an open subset of $X_{A,I}$ satisfying $X_{A,I} \subset \bigcup_{z \in X_{A,I}} V_z$. So, by compactness, there is a finite collection $\{z^1, \dots, z^{n_0}\} \subset X_{A,I}$, such that,

$$X_{A,I} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_0} V_{z^i} . \tag{5}$$

Fixing a potential $\varphi \in C(X_{A,I})$ and an **a priori** measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(M)$, we define the **Ruelle operator** associated to φ , as the map sending each $\psi \in C(X_{A,I})$ into the function $\mathcal{L}_{\varphi}(\psi) \in C(X_{A,I})$ satisfying the expression

$$\mathcal{L}_{\varphi}(\psi)(x) := \int_{s(x_1)} e^{\varphi(ax)} \psi(ax) d\nu(a) ,$$

for any $x \in X_{A,I}$, with $ax := (a, x_1, x_2, \dots)$. Under the above assumptions, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\psi \in C(X_{A,I})$, we define

$$\mathcal{L}_\varphi^{m+1}(\psi) := \mathcal{L}_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)) . \quad (6)$$

Besides that, we define the **dual Ruelle operator** as the one assigning to each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X_{A,I})$ the measure $\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu) \in \mathcal{M}(X_{A,I})$ satisfying for each $\psi \in C(X_{A,I})$ the expression

$$\int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu)) := \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathcal{L}_\varphi(\psi) d\mu .$$

We say that $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$ is a **Gibbs state** for the potential φ when it satisfies $\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu_\varphi) = \mu_\varphi$. Actually, existence and some interesting properties of the so called Gibbs states in this setting were presented in [18] (see also [12]).

On the other hand, we say that $\varphi \in C(X_{A,I})$ is a **normalized potential** when $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$. Some important facts about the behavior of the operator \mathcal{L}_φ can be verified when the potential φ is a normalized one. Among them, maybe the ones which we are more interested in this work, could be that the operator \mathcal{L}_φ^* preserves the set $\mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ and that the value 1 belongs to the spectrum of \mathcal{L}_φ . Furthermore, since $|\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\psi)(x)| \leq \|\psi\|_\infty \|\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\mathbf{1})\|_\infty$ for each $x \in X_{A,I}$, it follows that $\|\mathcal{L}_\varphi\|_{op} = 1$ and, thus, the spectral radius of \mathcal{L}_φ is equal to 1. Actually, those facts imply nice statistical properties on the Gibbs state μ_φ (to be verified below).

Throughout the paper we assume that φ is a normalized potential belonging to $\text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$ and $\sigma : X_{A,I} \rightarrow X_{A,I}$ is a **topologically mixing** subshift, i.e., for any open set $U \subset X_{A,I}$, there is $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma^p(U) = X_{A,I}$.

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\Pi_k : X_{A,I} \rightarrow M^k$ by $\Pi_k(x) = (\pi_1(x), \dots, \pi_k(x))$, where the map $\pi_i : X_{A,I} \rightarrow M$ is the **canonical projection** in the i -th coordinate, i.e. $\pi_i((x_n)_{n=0}^\infty) := x_i$. Using the above, we say that $C_k \subset X_{A,I}$ is a **k -cylindrical set** associated to $B_1 \times \dots \times B_k$, with $B_j \in \mathcal{B}_M$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, when it is of the form

$$C_k := \Pi_k^{-1}(B_1 \times \dots \times B_k) .$$

Besides that, we say that the k -cylindrical set C_k is a **k -cylinder**, when $B_j \subset M$ is an open set for each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Note that the definition of k -cylindrical set presented here is a particular case of the one presented in [17] (see also [16]), and agrees with the definitions of k -cylinders given in the contexts of finite Markov shifts (see for instance [10] [2] and [15]) and the so called XY-models (see [3] and [13] for details).

A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$ satisfies the **Gibbs-Bowen property** for the normalized potential φ , when there is a constant $C > 1$, such that, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, each m -cylinder C_m and all $\tilde{x} \in C_m$, we have

$$C^{-1} \leq \frac{\mu(C_m)}{e^{S_m \varphi(\tilde{x})}} \leq C , \quad (7)$$

where $S_m\varphi := \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \varphi \circ \sigma^j$ is the m -th ergodic sum of φ .

In [18] we prove existence of a Gibbs state associated to a Lipschitz continuous potential φ and we prove that any Gibbs state results in an equilibrium state. In here, we prove uniqueness of the Gibbs state μ_φ and we show that it satisfies the Gibbs-Bowen property and a central limit theorem.

3 Uniqueness of the Gibbs state

Our main goal in this section is to prove Theorem 1, which states that the operator \mathcal{L}_φ^* has a unique fixed point which also belongs to $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$. Following a similar argument to the one proposed in [8] (see also [19]), we define a suitable metric D_X on the space of sequences X which also induces the product topology, such that, the operator \mathcal{L}_φ^* results in a contraction on $\mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ when it is equipped with the metric W_{D_X} .

Throughout the section we fix a finite collection $\{z^1, \dots, z^{n_0}\} \subset X_{A,I}$ satisfying the expression in (5). Consider $\psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, by the Ionescu-Marinescu inequality (see for instance [9] and [11]), it follows that

$$\left| \mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(x) - \mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(y) \right| \leq K_m d_X(x, y), \quad (8)$$

where the constant K_m is given by

$$K_m := \max \left\{ \frac{\text{diam}(X_{A,I}, d_X)}{\kappa}, \frac{1}{2^m} \text{Lip}_{\psi, d_X} + \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{2^k} \right) \text{Lip}_{e^\varphi, d_X} \|\psi\|_\infty \right\}.$$

with

$$\kappa := \min \left\{ \frac{\text{diam}(V_{z^i}, d_X)}{2} : i = 1, \dots, n_0 \right\}.$$

Moreover, when $x, y \in V_{z^i}$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$, we have

$$\left| \mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(x) - \mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(y) \right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2^m} \text{Lip}_{\psi, d_X} + \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{2^k} \right) \text{Lip}_{e^\varphi, d_X} \|\psi\|_\infty \right) d_X(x, y).$$

Assume $\text{Lip}_{e^\varphi, d_X} > 0$, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the values $\alpha_m := \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}$ and $c_m := \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{2^k} \right) \text{Lip}_{e^\varphi, d_X}$. So, fixing $0 < \delta < \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - \alpha_m}{2c_m}$, we obtain a new metric D_X on the space X , given by

$$D_X(x, y) := \min\{1, \delta^{-1} d_X(x, y)\}. \quad (9)$$

It is well known that D_X also induces the product topology on X . So, the Wasserstein metric W_{D_X} induces the weak* topology on the set $\mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$. Hereafter, we assume that $\text{Lip}_{e^\varphi, d_X} \geq 1$ which implies that $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$.

By (6), for each $x \in X_{A,I}$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x) \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ is given by the expression

$$(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x) = \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \delta_{a^m x} e^{S_m \varphi(a^m x)} d\nu^m(a^m),$$

where $\nu^m := \otimes_{j=1}^m \nu$ is the **product measure**, $a^m := a_m \dots a_1$ is an admissible word and $a^m x \in X_{A,I}$.

In the next lemma we show that $(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*$ is a contraction on the set of Dirac measures on X when it is equipped with the metric W_{D_X} . Moreover, we show that the parameter $\alpha < 1$ given by the contraction, depends exclusively on the potential φ .

Lemma 1. *Consider $\alpha := \max\{1 - \frac{e^{-\text{Lip}_\varphi, d_X}}{2}, \frac{3}{4}\}$. Then, there is $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, each $x, y \in X_{A,I}$ and any $m \geq m_1$ satisfy*

$$W_{D_X}((\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x), (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y)) \leq \alpha W_{D_X}(\delta_x, \delta_y) .$$

Proof. First we consider the case $D_X(x, y) < 1$.

By (9), we have $D_X(x, y) = \delta^{-1} d_X(x, y)$ which implies $\text{Lip}_{\psi, D_X} = \delta \text{Lip}_{\psi, d_X}$ for any ψ belonging to $\text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$. By the former assumption we obtain that $d_X(x, y) < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$. In particular, it follows that $x_1 = y_1$ which also implies that $s(x_1) = s(y_1)$. Therefore, by (3), the following expression holds true

$$\begin{aligned} & W_{D_X}((\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x), (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y)) \\ & \leq \sup\{|\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(x) - \mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(y)| : \text{Lip}_{\psi, d_X} \leq \delta^{-1} \text{ and } \|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1\} . \end{aligned}$$

Besides that, since $\delta < \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - \alpha_m}{2c_m}$, there is $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that any $m \geq m_0$ satisfies $\delta < \frac{1 - \alpha_m}{2c_m}$. By the above and (8), we obtain that each $\psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$, with $\text{Lip}_{\psi, d_X} \leq \delta^{-1}$ and $\|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1$, satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(x) - \mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)(y)| & \leq (\alpha_m \text{Lip}_{\psi, d_X} + c_m \|\psi\|_\infty) d_X(x, y) \\ & \leq (\alpha_m \delta^{-1} + c_m) d_X(x, y) \\ & < \left(\alpha_m \delta^{-1} + \frac{1 - \alpha_m}{2} \delta^{-1} \right) d_X(x, y) \\ & \leq \frac{3}{4} \delta^{-1} d_X(x, y) \\ & = \frac{3}{4} D_X(x, y) \\ & \leq \alpha D_X(x, y) . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$W_{D_X}((\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x), (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y)) < \alpha D_X(x, y) ,$$

when $m \geq m_0$, such as we wanted to prove.

Now we consider the case $D_X(x, y) = 1$.

Given an admissible word $a^m := a_m \dots a_1$, we use the notation

$$[a^m] := \{y \in X_{A,I} : y_1 = a_m, \dots, y_m = a_1\} ,$$

for the m -cylindrical set associated to $B_1 \times \dots \times B_k = \{a_m\} \times \dots \times \{a_1\}$.

For each $x \in X_{A,I}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\alpha^x(a^m) := \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^m([a^m])}(x) \inf\{e^{S_m\varphi(z)} : z \in X_{A,I}\},$$

and $\beta^x(a^m) := e^{S_m\varphi(a^m x)} - \alpha^x(a^m)$. So, we obtain that $(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x)$ can be expressed of the form

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x) &= \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \delta_{a^m x} e^{S_m\varphi(a^m x)} d\nu^m(a^m) \\ &= \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \delta_{a^m x} (\alpha^x(a^m) + \beta^x(a^m)) d\nu^m(a^m) \\ &= \mu_m^x + \eta_m^x, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mu_m^x := \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \delta_{a^m x} \alpha^x(a^m) d\nu^m(a^m)$$

and

$$\eta_m^x := \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \delta_{a^m x} \beta^x(a^m) d\nu^m(a^m).$$

Given a pair $x, y \in X_{A,I}$, define $R_m^{x,y} \in \mathcal{M}(X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I})$ by the expression

$$\begin{aligned} R_m^{x,y} &:= \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^m([a^m])}(y) \delta_{(a^m x, a^m y)} \alpha^x(a^m) d\nu^m(a^m) \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta_m^x \otimes \eta_m^y}{\max\{\eta_m^x(X_{A,I}), \eta_m^y(X_{A,I})\}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to check that $R_m^{x,y} = R_m^{y,x}$. Moreover, since we are assuming that φ is a normalized potential, it follows that $\alpha^x(a^m) \leq 1$ for each $x \in X_{A,I}$, which implies that $R_m^{x,y}(X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}) \leq 1$.

Besides that, any $E \in \mathcal{B}_{X_{A,I}}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} R_m^{x,y}(E \times X_{A,I}) &\leq \mu_m^x(E) + \frac{\eta_m^x(E) \eta_m^y(X_{A,I})}{\max\{\eta_m^x(X_{A,I}), \eta_m^y(X_{A,I})\}} \\ &\leq \mu_m^x(E) + \eta_m^x(E) \\ &= (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x)(E). \end{aligned}$$

Following a similar procedure, we are able to verify that

$$R_m^{x,y}(X_{A,I} \times E) \leq (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y)(E).$$

By the above, there exists a measure $Q_m^{x,y} \in \mathcal{M}(X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I})$, such that,

$$\Pi_m^{x,y} := R_m^{x,y} + Q_m^{x,y} \in \Gamma((\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x), (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y))$$

On the other hand, given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the set

$$\Delta_k := \{(x', y') \in X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I} : x'_1 = y'_1, \dots, x'_k = y'_k\}.$$

Therefore, any $m \geq k$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_m^{x,y}(\Delta_k) &\geq \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \delta_{(a^m x, a^m y)}(\Delta_k) \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^m([a^m])}(y) \alpha^x(a^m) d\nu^m(a^m) \\
&= \int_{s(a_{m-1})} \cdots \int_{s(x_1)} \inf\{e^{S_m \varphi(y)} : y \in X_{A,I}\} d\nu^m(a^m) \\
&= \inf\{e^{S_m \varphi(y) - S_m \varphi(a^m x)} : y \in X_{A,I}\} \mathcal{L}_\varphi(\mathbf{1})(x) \geq e^{-\text{Lip}_\varphi, d_X} .
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, taking the supremum on $\Gamma((\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x), (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y))$, we obtain that every $m \geq k$ satisfies the expression

$$\sup\{\Pi(\Delta_k) : \Pi \in \Gamma((\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x), (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y))\} \geq e^{-\text{Lip}_\varphi, d_X} .$$

Then, since $d_X(x', y') \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ implies that $D_X(x', y') = \delta^{-1} d_X(x', y') \leq \frac{1}{2}$, fixing $m_1 \geq m_0$, such that, $\frac{1}{2^{m_1}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$, it follows that each $m \geq m_1$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{D_X}((\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_x), (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\delta_y)) &\leq \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} D_X(x', y') d\Pi_m^{x,y}(x', y') \\
&= \int_{\Delta_{m_1}} D_X d\Pi_m^{x,y} + \int_{\Delta_{m_1}^c} D_X d\Pi_m^{x,y} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Delta_{m_1}} d\Pi_m^{x,y} + \left(1 - \int_{\Delta_{m_1}} d\Pi_m^{x,y}\right) \\
&= 1 - \frac{1}{2} \Pi_m^{x,y}(\Delta_{m_1}) \\
&\leq 1 - \frac{e^{-\text{Lip}_\varphi, d_X}}{2} \\
&\leq \alpha = \alpha D_X(x, y) .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we want to prove that \mathcal{L}_φ^* is a contraction on the set $\mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$, with the metric W_{D_X} . Observe that given $\mu, \eta \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$, a measure $Q \in \Gamma(\mu, \eta)$ and $\Pi^{x,y} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_x), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_y))$, with $x, y \in X_{A,I}$, it follows that the measure $S \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I})$ satisfying the expression

$$dS(x', y') := \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} d\Pi^{x,y}(x', y') dQ(x, y) , \quad (10)$$

belongs to the transport plan $\Gamma(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\eta))$. The above, because for any pair of functions $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C(X_{A,I})$, we have

$$\int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} (\psi_1 + \psi_2) dS = \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi_1 d(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu)) + \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi_2 d(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\eta)) .$$

Using the above, we are able to prove that the operator \mathcal{L}_φ^* results in a contraction on $\mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ with the Wasserstein metric induced by D_X .

Lemma 2. *There is $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, such that, any pair $\mu, \eta \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ satisfy*

$$W_{D_X}(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\eta)) \leq \alpha W_{D_X}(\mu, \eta).$$

Proof. Consider a probability measure $S \in \Gamma(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\eta))$ satisfying the expression in (10). Assume that $Q \in \Gamma(\mu, \eta)$ is a D_X -optimal plan and, for any $x, y \in X_{A,I}$, suppose that $\Pi^{x,y} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_x), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_y))$ is a D_X -optimal plan. Then, by (2) and (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{D_X}(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\eta)) &\leq \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} D_X(x', y') dS(x', y') \\ &\leq \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} dS(x', y') \\ &= \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} d\Pi^{x,y}(x', y') dQ(x, y) \\ &= \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} W_{D_X}(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_x), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_y)) dQ(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1, we have that $\alpha := \max\{1 - \frac{e^{-\text{Lip}_\varphi, d_X}}{2}, \frac{3}{4}\}$ satisfies

$$W_{D_X}(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_x), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_y)) \leq \alpha W_{D_X}(\delta_x, \delta_y).$$

Moreover, it is not difficult to check that $W_{D_X}(\delta_x, \delta_y) = D_X(x, y)$ (see for details [23]). So, by (2) and (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{D_X}(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\eta)) &\leq \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} W_{D_X}(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_x), \mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\delta_y)) dQ(x, y) \\ &\leq \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} \alpha W_{D_X}(\delta_x, \delta_y) dQ(x, y) \\ &= \alpha \int_{X_{A,I} \times X_{A,I}} D_X(x, y) dQ(x, y) \\ &= \alpha W_{D_X}(\mu, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

□

The main result of this section guarantees uniqueness of the Gibbs state associated to φ . The statement of the result is the following one.

Theorem 1. *There exists a unique Gibbs state $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$ for the potential φ . Furthermore, any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ satisfies $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\mu) = \mu_\varphi$ in the weak* topology.*

Proof. First note that $\mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ is a compact metric space when it is equipped with the metric W_{D_X} . So, by Lemma 2 and the Banach contraction principle (see for details [5]), we can guarantee existence of a unique fixed point $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$ for the operator \mathcal{L}_φ^* satisfying $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)^*(\mu) = \mu_\varphi$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_{A,I})$, where the limit is taken in the weak* topology. Besides that, since we are assuming $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$, it follows that any fixed point of \mathcal{L}_φ^* belongs to $\mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$ (see [13] for details), which implies $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$. □

4 Statistical properties of the Gibbs state

In this section we present some results about the statistical behavior of the Gibbs state $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$ whose existence was guaranteed in [18] and whose uniqueness is given by Theorem 1 of this paper.

The first one of the properties that we show in this paper is that μ_φ satisfies the so called Gibbs-Bowen property. In addition, we prove that μ_φ satisfy exponential decay of correlations, which also implies that μ_φ is a mixing invariant probability measure and, at the end of the section, we show that μ_φ satisfies a central limit theorem.

Theorem 2. *The Gibbs state μ_φ satisfies the Gibbs-Bowen property.*

Proof. First note that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any pair $x, y \in X_{A,I}$, we have

$$|S_m\varphi(x) - S_m\varphi(y)| \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{2^j} \right) \text{Lip}_{\varphi, d_X} d_X(x, y) \leq \text{Lip}_{\varphi, d_X} .$$

Fixing $m \in \mathbb{N}$, a m -cylinder C_m and a $(m+1)$ -cylinder C_{m+1} , by compactness of $X_{A,I}$, there exists $\phi_m \in C(X_{A,I})$ satisfying $\mathbf{1}_{C_{m+1}} \leq \phi_m \leq \mathbf{1}_{C_m}$ (see for details [14]).

Therefore, given any $\tilde{x} \in C_m$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\varphi(C_{m+1}) &= \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathbf{1}_{C_{m+1}} d\mu_\varphi \\ &\leq \int_{X_{A,I}} \phi_m d\mu_\varphi \\ &= \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathcal{L}_\varphi^{m+1}(\phi_m) d\mu_\varphi \\ &\leq \int_{X_{A,I}} \int_{s(a_m)} \dots \int_{s(x_1)} e^{S_{m+1}\varphi(a^{m+1}x)} \mathbf{1}_{C_m}(a^{m+1}x) d\nu^{m+1}(a^{m+1}) d\mu_\varphi(x) \\ &\leq e^{S_{m+1}\varphi(\tilde{x}) + \text{Lip}_{\varphi, d_X}} \int_{X_{A,I}} \int_{s(a_m)} \dots \int_{s(x_1)} d\nu^{m+1}(a^{m+1}) d\mu_\varphi(x) \\ &\leq e^{S_{m+1}\varphi(\tilde{x}) + \text{Lip}_{\varphi, d_X}} . \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, given $x \in X_{A,I}$, and an admissible word a^{m+p} with $a^{m+p}x \in X_{A,I}$, we have that $\mathbf{1}_{C_{m+1}}(a^{m+p}x) = 0$ implies $\mathbf{1}_{\sigma^{m+p}(C_{m+1})}(x) = 0$. By the above, we can assure that $\mathbf{1}_{C_{m+1}}(a^{m+p}x) \geq \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^{m+p}(C_{m+1})}(x)$ for each $x \in X_{A,I}$. Denote by

$$I := \inf\{e^{\varphi(x)} : x \in X_{A,I}\} > 0 .$$

Since $X_{A,I}$ is topologically mixing, there exists $p = p(m) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma^{m+p}(\mathbf{1}_{C_{m+1}}) = X_{A,I}$.

Then, for any $\tilde{x} \in C_{m+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\varphi(C_m) &= \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathbf{1}_{C_m} d\mu_\varphi \\
&\geq \int_{X_{A,I}} \phi_m d\mu_\varphi \\
&= \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathcal{L}_\varphi^{m+p}(\phi_m) d\mu_\varphi \\
&\geq \int_{X_{A,I}} \int_{s(a_{m+p-1})} \dots \int_{s(x_1)} e^{S_{m+p}\varphi(a^{m+p}x)} \mathbf{1}_{C_{m+1}}(a^{m+p}x) d\nu^{m+p}(a^{m+p}) d\mu_\varphi(x) \\
&\geq I^p e^{S_m\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \text{Lip}_{\varphi,d_X}} \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma^{m+p}(C_{m+1})}(x) d\mu_\varphi(x) \\
&\geq I^p e^{S_m\varphi(\tilde{x}) - \text{Lip}_{\varphi,d_X}},
\end{aligned}$$

So, taking $C := \max\{e^{\text{Lip}_{\varphi,d_X}}, e^{\text{Lip}_{\varphi,d_X} I^{-p}}\}$ we obtain that the expression in (7) holds true for μ_φ , such as we wanted to prove. \square

Our next goal is to prove that the Gibbs state μ_φ has exponential decay of correlations between any pair of potentials $\phi \circ \sigma^m, \psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The statement of the result is the following one.

Lemma 3. *There exists $\Lambda \in (0, 1)$, such that, for any pair $\phi, \psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\left| \int_{X_{A,I}} (\phi \circ \sigma^m) \psi d\mu_\varphi - \int_{X_{A,I}} \phi d\mu_\varphi \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi \right| \leq C_{\phi,\psi} \Lambda^m.$$

Proof. Consider the set $V := \{\psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X) : \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi = 0\}$. Since we are assuming that $\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$, it is not difficult to check that V is a closed subspace of $\text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$ satisfying $\text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\} \cap V = \mathbf{0}$, which also implies that $\text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\} \oplus V$. Moreover, given any $\psi \in V$, we have

$$\int_{X_{A,I}} \mathcal{L}_\varphi(\psi) d\mu_\varphi = \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^*(\mu_\varphi)) = \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi = 0.$$

Therefore, the subspace V is invariant by the action of the operator \mathcal{L}_φ . Besides that, we know that for any $\psi \in V$ the sequence $(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi))_{m=1}^\infty$ converges to $\mathbf{0}$ uniformly in the norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ (see for details [18]). Furthermore, considering the set

$$S_V := \{\psi \in V : \|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1, \text{Lip}_{\psi,d_X} \leq 1\},$$

it follows that any $\psi \in S_V$ satisfies $|\psi(x) - \psi(y)| \leq d_X(x, y)$. By the above, we obtain that the set S_V is equicontinuous and uniformly bounded. So, by the Arzela-Ascoli's Theorem, we obtain that S_V is a compact subset of $C(X_{A,I})$.

On the other hand, since $\|\mathcal{L}_\varphi^{m+1}(\psi)\|_\infty \leq \|\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\psi)\|_\infty$ for each $\psi \in S_V$, by Dini's Theorem, it follows that the sequence of operators $(\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m)_{m=1}^\infty$ converges

uniformly to the operator $\mathbf{0}$ with the operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ on the set S_V . The above implies existence of $0 < \rho < 1$, such that, $\|\mathcal{L}_\varphi|_V\|_{op} \leq \rho < 1$.

Given $\psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$, define $\tilde{\psi} = \psi - \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi$, it is not difficult to check that $\tilde{\psi} \in V$. Then, using that $\|\mathcal{L}_\varphi^m|_V\|_{op} = \|(\mathcal{L}_\varphi|_V)^m\|_{op} = \|\mathcal{L}_\varphi|_V\|_{op}^m$ and $\text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X) \subset L^1(\mu_\varphi)$, it follows that any pair $\phi, \psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$ satisfies

$$\left| \int_{X_{A,I}} (\phi \circ \sigma^m) \tilde{\psi} d\mu_\varphi \right| = \left| \int_{X_{A,I}} \phi \mathcal{L}_\varphi^m(\tilde{\psi}) d\mu_\varphi \right| \leq \|\mathcal{L}_\varphi|_V\|_{op}^m \|\phi\|_1 \|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty.$$

Moreover, since $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$, we obtain that

$$\left| \int_{X_{A,I}} (\phi \circ \sigma^m) \psi d\mu_\varphi - \int_{X_{A,I}} \phi d\mu_\varphi \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi \right| \leq \|\mathcal{L}_\varphi|_V\|_{op}^m \|\phi\|_1 \|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty.$$

Therefore, taking $\Lambda := \|\mathcal{L}_\varphi|_V\|_{op}$ and $C_{\phi,\psi} = \|\phi\|_1 \|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty$, we obtain the desired result. \square

Now we are able to prove that $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$ results in a mixing probability measure, i.e., the random variables induced by any pair of Lipschitz continuous potentials $\phi \circ \sigma^m$ and ψ are asymptotically independent when m goes to ∞ .

Theorem 3. *Any pair of functions $\phi, \psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$ satisfy*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_{A,I}} (\phi \circ \sigma^m) \psi d\mu_\varphi = \int_{X_{A,I}} \phi d\mu_\varphi \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3, we have that any pair $\phi, \psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy

$$\left| \int_{X_{A,I}} (\phi \circ \sigma^m) \psi d\mu_\varphi - \int_{X_{A,I}} \phi d\mu_\varphi \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi \right| \leq C_{\phi,\psi} \Lambda^m,$$

where $\Lambda := \|\mathcal{L}_\varphi|_V\|_{op}$ and $C_{\phi,\psi} = \|\phi\|_1 \|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty$. Since $\Lambda \leq \rho < 1$, it follows that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda^m = 0$, which proves our claim. \square

The last part of this paper is dedicated to prove a central limit theorem for the Gibbs state $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$. In order to get that, we consider the space $L^2(\mu_\varphi)$ and the **Koopman operator** $\mathcal{U} : L^2(\mu_\varphi) \rightarrow L^2(\mu_\varphi)$ given by $\mathcal{U}(\psi) := \psi \circ \sigma$. Note that any pair $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X) \subset L^2(\mu_\varphi)$ satisfy

$$\int_{X_{A,I}} \psi_1 \mathcal{U}(\psi_2) d\mu_\varphi = \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathcal{L}_\varphi(\psi_1) \psi_2 d\mu_\varphi.$$

Actually, hereafter we consider the adjoint \mathcal{U}^* of the Koopman operator, which is an extension of the Ruelle operator \mathcal{L}_φ to the space $L^2(\mu_\varphi)$. That is, for each pair of functions $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$, we have

$$\int_{X_{A,I}} \psi_1 \mathcal{U}(\psi_2) d\mu_\varphi = \int_{X_{A,I}} \mathcal{U}^*(\psi_1) \psi_2 d\mu_\varphi.$$

We define the **expected value** of $\psi \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$ by the equation

$$\mathbb{E}(\psi) := \int_{X_{A,I}} \psi d\mu_\varphi .$$

Given an algebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}_{X_{A,I}}$, we let $L^2(\mathcal{A})$ be the set of \mathcal{A} -**measurable** functions in $L^2(\mu_\varphi)$ and, for any potential $\psi \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$, we define the **conditional expectation** of ψ with respect to the algebra \mathcal{A} , as the map $\mathbb{E}(\psi|\mathcal{A}) : X_{A,I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that, each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies

$$\int_A \mathbb{E}(\psi|\mathcal{A}) d\mu_\varphi = \int_A \psi d\mu_\varphi . \quad (11)$$

It is not difficult to check that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(\psi|\mathcal{A})|\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{E}(\psi|\mathcal{A})$. Therefore, the map $\mathbb{E}(\psi|\mathcal{A})$ results in an orthogonal projection of ψ into $L^2(\mathcal{A})$. Consider $\psi \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$ and $\tilde{\psi} := \psi - \mathbb{E}(\psi)$, we define the **variance** of ψ by the equation

$$S^2(\psi) := \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}^2) = \mathbb{E}(\psi^2) - \mathbb{E}(\psi)^2 \geq 0 .$$

In fact, the value $\sqrt{S^2(\psi)}$ is well known as the **standard deviation** of the potential $\psi \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$. Hereafter, given $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$, we say that $\psi_1 = \psi_2$ when $\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_2 = 0$. Now we are able to state the last one of the results presented in this paper, which is well-known in the mathematical literature as the central limit theorem.

Theorem 4. *Consider a function $\psi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$. Then, the variance $S^2(\psi) < \infty$. Furthermore:*

i) *When $S^2(\psi) > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})(x) \in (a, b) \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi S^2(\psi)}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{t^2}{2S^2(\psi)}} dt ;$$

ii) *$S^2(\psi) = 0$ if, and only if, $\psi = u - \mathcal{U}(u)$ for some $u \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$.*

Proof. In here we use a similar argument to the one presented in [22] (see also [4]). For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the algebra $\mathcal{B}_m := \sigma^{-m}(\mathcal{B}_{X_{A,I}})$. So, it is not difficult to check that

$$\mathcal{B}_{X_{A,I}} := \mathcal{B}_0 \supset \mathcal{B}_1 \supset \cdots \supset \mathcal{B}_m \supset \cdots . \quad (12)$$

We also consider the algebra $\mathcal{B}_\infty := \bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_m$. Actually, by (12), it follows that

$$L^2(\mu_\varphi) := L^2(\mathcal{B}_0) \supset L^2(\mathcal{B}_1) \supset \cdots \supset L^2(\mathcal{B}_m) \supset \cdots \supset L^2(\mathcal{B}_\infty) . \quad (13)$$

Observe that $\mathcal{U}(L^2(\mathcal{B}_m)) = L^2(\mathcal{B}_{m+1})$ and $\mathcal{U}^*(L^2(\mathcal{B}_{m+1})) = L^2(\mathcal{B}_m)$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Since the operator \mathcal{U} is an isometry, it follows that \mathcal{U}^* is an isometry as well. Then, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\|(\mathcal{U}^*)^m(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m))\|_2 = \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)\|_2 , \quad (14)$$

Moreover, by the Riesz representation theorem, for any algebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}_{X_{A,I}}$ and each function $f \in L^2(\mathcal{A})$, we have

$$\|f\|_2 = \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}(\phi f) : \phi \in L^2(\mathcal{A}), \|\phi\|_2 \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Then, since $\overline{\text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)}^{\|\cdot\|_2} = L^2(\mu_\varphi) \subset L^1(\mu_\varphi)$ and $\|\phi\|_1 \leq \|\phi\|_2$ for any function $\phi \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X)$, by (11), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)\|_2 &= \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}(\phi \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)) : \phi \in L^2(\mathcal{B}_m), \|\phi\|_2 \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}(\phi \tilde{\psi}) : \phi \in L^2(\mathcal{B}_m), \|\phi\|_2 \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^m(\phi_m) \tilde{\psi}) : \phi_m \in L^2(\mu_\varphi), \|\phi_m\|_2 \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^m(\phi_m) \tilde{\psi}) : \phi_m \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X), \|\phi_m\|_2 \leq 1 \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^m(\phi_m) \tilde{\psi}) : \phi_m \in \text{Lip}(X_{A,I}, d_X), \|\phi_m\|_1 \leq 1 \right\} \\ &\leq C_{\phi_m, \psi} \Lambda^m, \end{aligned}$$

where the last one of the inequalities follows from Lemma 3, with $\Lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $C_{\phi_m, \psi} = \|\phi_m\|_1 \|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty \leq \|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

By the above, we have that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} C_{\phi_m, \psi} \Lambda^m \leq \frac{\|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty}{1 - \Lambda}. \quad (15)$$

On the other hand, a simple argument shows that $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m) - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_{m+1})$ is the projection of $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)$ on $L^2(\mathcal{B}_{m+1})^\perp$. The above, because $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)$ is the projection of $\tilde{\psi}$ on $L^2(\mathcal{B}_m) \supset L^2(\mathcal{B}_{m+1})$.

Then, by (14), we obtain the following expression

$$\|(\mathcal{U}^*)^m(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m) - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_{m+1}))\|_2 \leq \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)\|_2.$$

So, by (15), it follows that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|(\mathcal{U}^*)^m(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m) - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_{m+1}))\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty}{1 - \Lambda}. \quad (16)$$

Using the above, we are able to define the maps

$$\zeta := - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{U}^*)^m(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)),$$

and

$$\rho := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{U}^*)^m(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m) - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_{m+1})). \quad (17)$$

Observe that, by (14) and (15), we can guarantee that $\zeta \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$. Besides that, by (16), it follows that $\rho \in L^2(\mu_\varphi)$. So, using that $(\mathcal{U}^*)^{m-1} = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{U}^*)^m$ and reordering the series in (17), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \tilde{\psi} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{U}^*)^m (\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)) - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{U}^*)^m (\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)) \\ &= \tilde{\psi} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{U}^*)^m (\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m)) - \mathcal{U}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{U}^*)^m (\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m))\right) = \tilde{\psi} - \zeta + \mathcal{U}(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \|\zeta - \mathcal{U}^m(\zeta)\|_2 &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} (\|\zeta\|_2 + \|\mathcal{U}^m(\zeta)\|_2) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\sqrt{m}} \|\zeta\|_2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the sequence $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|\zeta - \mathcal{U}^m(\zeta)|)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges in μ_φ -measure, i.e., for any $\delta > 0$ the following limit holds true

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\varphi\left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|\zeta - \mathcal{U}^m(\zeta)| > \delta\right) = 0. \quad (19)$$

Besides that, since $\rho = \tilde{\psi} - \zeta + \mathcal{U}(\zeta)$, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}(\zeta - \mathcal{U}^m(\zeta)), \quad (20)$$

Given $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, we have $(\mathcal{U}^*)^m (\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_m) - \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_{m+1})) \in L^2(\mathcal{B}_1)^\perp$ which also implies that $\rho \in L^2(\mathcal{B}_1)^\perp$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}(\rho|\mathcal{B}_1) = 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^m(\rho)|\mathcal{B}_{m+1}) = \mathcal{U}^m(\mathbb{E}(\rho|\mathcal{B}_1)) = 0, \quad (21)$$

By the above, the sequence of random variables $(\mathcal{U}^m(\rho))_{m=0}^{\infty}$ results in a Martingale for the nested sequence of algebras $(\mathcal{B}_m)_{m=0}^{\infty}$. So, the central limit theorem holds true (see [4] for details). That is,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\varphi\left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho)(x) \in (a, b)\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi S^2(\rho)}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{t^2}{2S^2(\rho)}} dt,$$

when $0 < S^2(\rho) < \infty$.

Besides that, since $\mathcal{U}^m(\rho) \in L^2(\mathcal{B}_m)$, by the expression in (13), it follows that $\mathcal{U}^k(\rho) \in L^2(\mathcal{B}_{m+1})$ for any $k > m$. Then, by (21), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^k(\rho)\mathcal{U}^m(\rho)) = 0. \quad (22)$$

The above implies that

$$\|\rho\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|\mathcal{U}^j(\rho)\|_2^2 = \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho) \right\|_2^2.$$

Moreover, by (18) and (20), we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho) \right\|_2^2 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi}) \right\|_2^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho\|_2^2 &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi}) \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})^2) + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{0 \leq j < k \leq m-1} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})\mathcal{U}^k(\tilde{\psi})) \right) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})^2) d\mu_\varphi + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{j}{m} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}^2) + 2 \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{j}{m} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The above implies that $S^2(\psi) = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}^2) < \infty$. Besides that, since we have $\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi}) \in L^2(\mathcal{B}_j)$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})) \leq \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\|_2 \|\tilde{\psi}\|_2.$$

By the above, we obtain that any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \geq k$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{j}{m} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})) \right\|_2 &\leq \|\tilde{\psi}\|_2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{j}{m} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\|_2 + \sum_{j=k}^{m-1} \frac{j}{m} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\|_2 \right) \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\psi}\|_2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{j}{m} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\|_2 + \sum_{j=k}^{m-1} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\|_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

So, fixing $\epsilon > 0$, by (15), we can choose $k = k(\epsilon)$ large enough, such that, $\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\|_2 < \epsilon$ and $m > k$, such that, $\epsilon > \frac{k-1}{m} > 0$. Then, for that values of k and m we have

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{j}{m} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}\mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})) \right\|_2 \leq \|\tilde{\psi}\|_2 \left(\epsilon \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \|\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}|\mathcal{B}_j)\|_2 + \epsilon \right) < \epsilon \|\tilde{\psi}\|_2 \left(\frac{\|\tilde{\psi}\|_\infty}{1-\Lambda} + 1 \right).$$

Then, taking the limit when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{j}{m} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})) \right\|_2 = 0.$$

which implies that

$$\|\rho\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}^2) = S^2(\psi)$$

Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi} - \zeta + \mathcal{U}(\zeta)) = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}) = 0$ because $\mu_\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma(X_{A,I})$, it follows that

$$S^2(\rho) = \mathbb{E}(\rho^2) = \|\rho\|_2^2 = S^2(\psi),$$

which guarantees that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho)(x) \in (a, b) \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi S^2(\psi)}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{t^2}{2S^2(\psi)}} dt,$$

when $0 < S^2(\psi) < \infty$.

Assume that $S^2(\psi) > 0$. For any pair $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, with $a < b$, define

$$\Phi(a, b) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi S^2(\psi)}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{t^2}{2S^2(\psi)}} dt.$$

Observe that the map $(a, b) \mapsto \Phi(a, b)$ is continuous. That is, fixing $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$, such that,

$$|\Phi(a - \delta, b + \delta) - \Phi(a, b)| < \epsilon.$$

Using (19), we choose $m_0 = m_0(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, any $m \geq m_0$ satisfies

$$\mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} |\zeta - \mathcal{U}^m(\zeta)| > \delta \right) < \epsilon$$

By the Martingale central limit theorem (see [4] for details), there is $m_1 \geq m_0$, such that, for any $m \geq m_1$, we have

$$\mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho)(x) \in (a - \delta, b + \delta) \right) \leq \Phi(a - \delta, b + \delta) + \epsilon.$$

Since we are assuming that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})(x) \in (a, b)$, we should have either

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho)(x) \in (a - \delta, b + \delta),$$

or

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} |\zeta - \mathcal{U}^m(\zeta)| > \delta.$$

The above implies that each $m \geq m_1$ satisfies

$$\mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})(x) \in (a, b) \right) \leq \Phi(a - \delta, b + \delta) + 2\epsilon < \Phi(a, b) + 3\epsilon .$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})(x) \in (a, b) \right) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi S^2(\psi)}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{t^2}{2S^2(\psi)}} dt .$$

On the other hand, again by Martingale central limit theorem, there exists $m_2 \geq m_0$, such that, for any $m \geq m_2$, we have

$$\mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\rho)(x) \in (a - \delta, b + \delta) \right) \geq \Phi(a - \delta, b + \delta) - \epsilon ,$$

So, following a similar procedure to the one above, we obtain that

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_\varphi \left(x \in X_{A,I} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{U}^j(\tilde{\psi})(x) \in (a, b) \right) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi S^2(\psi)}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{t^2}{2S^2(\psi)}} dt .$$

The former expression concludes the proof of the item *i*) of the theorem. On the other hand, assuming that $S^2(\psi) = 0$, we obtain $\rho = 0$ which implies $\tilde{\psi} = \zeta - \mathcal{U}(\zeta)$. Conversely, when $\tilde{\psi} = u - \mathcal{U}(u)$, it follows that $\zeta = u$ and $\rho = 0$, which implies $S^2(\psi) = 0$. The above proves item *ii*) of the theorem. \square

Acknowledgments

The author would to thank to the University of Porto for the hospitality during the development of this paper and to the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) Project UIDP/00144/2020 for the financial support.

References

- [1] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.
- [2] A. Baraviera, R. Leplaideur, and A. Lopes. *Ergodic optimization, zero temperature limits and the max-plus algebra*. Publicações Matemáticas do IMPA. [IMPA Mathematical Publications]. Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA), Rio de Janeiro, 2013. 29o Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática. [29th Brazilian Mathematics Colloquium].

- [3] A. T. Baraviera, L. M. Cioletti, A. O. Lopes, J. Mohr, and R. R. Souza. On the general one-dimensional XY model: positive and zero temperature, selection and non-selection. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 23(10):1063–1113, 2011.
- [4] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [5] H. Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [6] E. A. da Silva, R. R. da Silva, and R. R. Souza. The analyticity of a generalized Ruelle’s operator. *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 45(1):53–72, 2014.
- [7] A. Fan and Y. Jiang. On Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operators. I. Ruelle theorem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 223(1):125–141, 2001.
- [8] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. Spectral gaps in Wasserstein distances and the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(6):2050–2091, 2008.
- [9] C. T. Ionescu Tulcea and G. Marinescu. Théorie ergodique pour des classes d’opérations non complètement continues. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 52:140–147, 1950.
- [10] B. P. Kitchens. *Symbolic dynamics*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. One-sided, two-sided and countable state Markov shifts.
- [11] A. Lasota and J. A. Yorke. On the existence of invariant measures for piecewise monotonic transformations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 186:481–488 (1974), 1973.
- [12] R. Leplaideur and F. Watbled. Curie-Weiss type models for general spin spaces and quadratic pressure in ergodic theory. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 181(1):263–292, 2020.
- [13] A. O. Lopes, J. K. Mengue, J. Mohr, and R. R. Souza. Entropy and variational principle for one-dimensional lattice systems with a general *a priori* probability: positive and zero temperature. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 35(6):1925–1961, 2015.
- [14] J. R. Munkres. *Topology*. Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2000. Second edition of [MR0464128].
- [15] W. Parry and M. Pollicott. Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics. *Astérisque*, (187-188):268, 1990.
- [16] Y. V. Prokhorov. Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 1:177–238, 1956.

- [17] Y. V. Prokhorov. The method of characteristic functionals. In *Proc. 4th Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Prob., Vol. II*, pages 403–419. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1961.
- [18] R. R. Souza and V. Vargas. Existence of Gibbs states and maximizing measures on a general one-dimensional lattice system with Markovian structure. *Qual. Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 21(1:5):28, 2022.
- [19] M. Stadlbauer. Coupling methods for random topological Markov chains. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 37(3):971–994, 2017.
- [20] C. J. Thompson. Infinite-spin Ising model in one dimension. *J. Math. Phys.*, 9:241–245, 1968.
- [21] A. C. D. van Enter and W. M. Ruszel. Chaotic temperature dependence at zero temperature. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 127(3):567–573, 2007.
- [22] M. Viana. *Stochastic dynamics of deterministic systems*. Publicações Matemáticas do IMPA. [IMPA Mathematical Publications]. Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA), Rio de Janeiro, 1997. 21o Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática. [21th Brazilian Mathematics Colloquium].
- [23] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.