Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. (1999), **19**, 671–685
Printed in the United Kingdom © *1999 Cambridge University Press*

A probabilistic approach to intermittency

CARLANGELO LIVERANI†, BENOÎT SAUSSOL‡ and SANDRO VAIENTI‡

† *Mathematics Department, University of Rome II, Tor Vergata, 00133 Rome, Italy*
(e-mail: liverani@mat.uniroma2.it)
‡ *Centre de Physique Théorique, CNR's, Luminy Case 907, 13288 Marseilles, France*
and
PhyMat, University of Toulon, BP 132, 83957 La Garde Cedex, France
(e-mail: saussol@cptsg3.univ-mrs.fr; vaienti@cptsg2.univ-mrs.fr)

(*Received* 2 *June* 1997 *and accepted in revised form* 7 *October* 1997)

Abstract. We present an original approach which allows us to investigate the statistical properties of a non-uniformly hyperbolic map on the interval. Based on a stochastic approximation of the deterministic map, this method essentially gives the optimal polynomial bound for the decay of correlations, the degree depending on the order of the tangency at the neutral fixed point.

0. *Introduction*

Recently, the study of convergence to the equilibrium in hyperbolic systems has witnessed several new results ranging from new methods to treat systems with singularities [**Li1, Yo**] or with partially hyperbolic behavior [**BY**], to methods for studying Anosov flows [**Ch2, Do, Li2**].

Thanks to such results we can now regard the study of the decay of correlations for uniformly hyperbolic systems as reasonably well understood (albeit there is much room for improvement, especially as far as flows and dependence on smoothness of observables are concerned). In contrast, the available results on the convergence to the equilibrium in non-uniformly hyperbolic systems are extremely unsatisfactory. The study of such systems provides a challenge. In particular, it is evident that there is a need to develop new strategies to investigate such problems.

This is the focus of the present paper, where we study a one parameter family of intermittent maps. These applications are expanding, except at a neutral fixed point, where hyperbolicity is lost. The local behavior of the map at this point is responsible for various phenomenon. Let us denote by $1 + \alpha$ the order of the tangency at the critical point. For $\alpha = 0$ we have a purely expanding map, which has a unique equilibrium state for the potential $\varphi = -\log DT$, with exponential decay of correlations. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, the map possesses an absolutely continuous probability measure (SRB measure), which is still an

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

equilibrium state (it is no more unique, since the Dirac mass at the origin is invariant and $\delta_0(\varphi) = 0$). For $\alpha \geq 1$, there are no absolutely continuous invariant probability measures, whereas one still has a σ-finite, absolutely invariant measure [**PS**].

We focus here on the second region of the parameter, and propose to find the density of the invariant measure, and the rate of decay of the correlations functions. In this domain, one cannot expect a spectral gap for the Perron–Frobenius operator (see the end of §4), therefore none of the usual strategies in this setting can be followed. Our approach is based on the following philosophy: of course the map is not hyperbolic, but it is the case nearly everywhere; thus, if we perform a random perturbation of the map, the neutral fixed point should be lost in a cloud of hyperbolic points and the intermittent effect could be suppressed. This naive argument, rather surprisingly, works.

An interesting property of such a method is the following. For smooth expanding maps, the same idea can be carried out, but yields a sub-exponential rate of decay, while the decay is well-known to be exponential. On the contrary, in the present case, the power law found appears to be near optimal, as noted in §4.

This is an indication that our crude approach performs better in the non-uniform case than in the uniform one. These considerations are fundamental to our belief that this type of strategy could yield relevant results in more general situations.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In §1 we present our model and discuss some related literature. §2 is devoted to the study of the invariant measure. §2 may have an interest in itself since it gives a very direct approach to obtaining the invariant measure and its properties for such a map (for a comparison with other techniques see [**CF, Th**]). §3 introduces the key idea of the paper, that is, the random perturbation and its instrumental properties. In §4 we collect the facts from the previous sections and obtain the results. In addition, we point out that our results suffice to establish the CLT for $C^{(1)}$ observable, provided that $\alpha < 1/2$ (Remark 4.2(3)). The last section contains a few considerations about how to treat the general problem of expanding maps with neutral fixed points. Since the focus of the present paper is on the method and not on the class of one-dimensional maps to which it can be applied, we content ourselves with a few specific, but more general considerations.

1. *The model*

Let us consider, for $0 < \alpha < 1$, the map $T : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$:

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} x(1 + 2^\alpha x^\alpha), & \forall x \in [0, 1/2) \\ 2x - 1, & \forall x \in [1/2, 1]. \end{cases}$$

The importance of this kind of intermittent map was addressed by Prellberg and Slawny in [**PS**], where the relationship with a statistical model introduced by Fisher [**FF**] and successively studied by Gallavotti [**Ga**] was emphasized. In the papers [**GW, W**], the dynamical behavior of these maps was taken as a model for the intermittency of turbulent flows [**PM**]. In the paper [**PS**] several mathematical results were announced, concerning the ergodic and statistical properties of such maps, notably the presence of phase transitions for the topological pressure (see also [**Lo**]). The paper [**W**] deals with a piecewise linear

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

version of the map and focus especially on the recurrence properties of the orbits. These later properties have been put on a solid mathematical basis by Collet *et al* [**CGS**] in the piecewise linear case, and by Campanino and Isola for the non-linear (σ-finite) case [**CI1–3**]. The problem of the decay of correlations was considered in the piecewise linear case and for the finite absolutely continuous (w.r.t. Lebesgue) measure in [**LSV**] and [**Mo**]. Both papers obtain an algebraic ($n^{-\gamma}$) upper bound for the decay of correlations, the first by using Markov approximations (some results were successively improved by Chernov in [**Ch1**]) and the second by exhibiting the absence of the spectral gap for the Perron–Frobenius operator using the induction procedure already invoked in [**PS**]. (It is interesting to remark that Mori's work follows the analysis of these maps carried out by Takahashi in a series of papers [**Ta1, Ta2**].)

The decay of correlations for the non-linear case is a more difficult problem. To our knowledge, the following methods have been proposed.

In [**Yu**], Yuri applied Markov approximations, generalizing the works of [**LSV**] and [**Ch1**]; the paper [**Is**] aims to extend the approach of Mori to the non-linear case, still inducing, and gives a description of the *zeta* function, and finally in [**FS**] the authors propose an interesting technique based on Hilbert metrics, yet the implementation of such an idea is still incomplete.

Let us go back to our particular model. In the next section we will prove that there exists† a locally Lipschitz function $h \in C^{(0)}(]0,1]) \cap L^1([0,1])$ such that $Ph = h$.

2. *An invariant cone*

If we define the cone $\mathcal{C}_0 = \{f \in C^{(0)}(]0,1]) \mid f \geq 0 \text{ and } f \text{ is decreasing}\}$ we immediately see that $\mathcal{C}_0$ is left invariant by the P-F operator. To see a bit more let us call X the identity, $X(x) = x$.

LEMMA 2.1. *The cone $C_1 = \{f \in \mathcal{C}_0 \mid X^{\alpha+1} f$ is increasing$\}$, is left invariant by the operator P.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_1$, then

$$x^{\alpha+1} Pf(x) = \sum_{y \in T^{-1}x} \left(\frac{Ty}{y}\right)^{\alpha+1} \frac{y^{\alpha+1} f(y)}{D_y T}.$$

Setting $T^{-1}x = \{y_1, y_2\}$, $y_1 \leq y_2$, and $\xi = 2^\alpha y_1^\alpha$ we can write

$$x^{\alpha+1} Pf(x) = \frac{(1+\xi)^{\alpha+1}}{1+(\alpha+1)\xi} y_1^{\alpha+1} f(y_1) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{2y_2 - 1}{y_2}\right)^{\alpha+1} y_2^{\alpha+1} f(y_2).$$

Hence the result, since $X^{\alpha+1} f$, $x \mapsto y_1$, $x \mapsto \xi$ and $x \mapsto y_2$ are increasing. □

Let us define

$$m(f) = \int_0^1 f(x)\, dx.$$

† Such a result can also be obtained by inducing [**Th**]. The method used here is more direct and provides additional information on the properties of the invariant density, although such extra information will not be essential in the following. See §5 for a more detailed discussion.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Obviously $m(Pf) = m(f)$.

The last interesting property is contained in the following.

LEMMA 2.2. *The cone* $\mathcal{C}_* = \{f \in \mathcal{C}_1 \cap L^1([0,1]) \mid f(x) \le ax^{-\alpha} m(f)\}$ *is invariant with respect to the operator* P*, provided* a *is chosen large enough.*

Proof. For each $f \in \mathcal{C}_*$ both of the following inequalities hold:

$$f(x) \le ax^{-\alpha} m(f)$$

and

$$x^{\alpha+1} f(x) \le f(1) \le \int_0^1 f = m(f).$$

Let us suppose for simplicity that $m(f) = 1$. We have to find a constant a, independent of f, such that $Pf(x) \le ax^{-\alpha}$ since $m(Pf) = m(f) = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} Pf(x) &= \frac{f(y_1)}{D_{y_1}T} + \frac{f(y_2)}{D_{y_2}T} \\ &\le \frac{a y_1^{-\alpha}}{D_{y_1}T} + \frac{y_2^{-\alpha-1}}{D_{y_2}T} \\ &\le \left\{ \left(\frac{x}{y_1}\right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{D_{y_1}T} + \frac{1}{a} \frac{x^{\alpha}}{y_2^{\alpha+1} D_{y_2}T} \right\} a x^{-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The term in the brace is bounded by†

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1+\xi)^{\alpha}}{1+(\alpha+1)\xi} + \frac{2^{\alpha}}{a}\xi &\le \frac{1+\alpha\xi + (2^{\alpha}/a)\xi(1+(\alpha+1)\xi)}{1+(\alpha+1)\xi} \\ &\le \frac{1+(\alpha+(2^{\alpha}(\alpha+2)/a))\xi}{1+(\alpha+1)\xi} \le 1, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $a \ge 2^{\alpha}(\alpha+2)$, and the lemma follows. □

Putting together all the previous estimates yields the following.

LEMMA 2.3. *There exists a locally Lipschitz function* h *such that* $Ph = h$ *and* $h(x) \le ax^{-\alpha}$.

Proof. The operator P leaves invariant the set $K = \{f \in \mathcal{C}_* \mid m(f) = 1\}$. But $X^{\alpha+1}K$ consists of equibounded, equicontinuous functions‡, hence it is compact in $C^{(0)}$. Accordingly, for each $f \in K$ the sequence $X^{\alpha+1}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} P^i f$ has accumulations points in $C^{(0)}$. Let $h_* \in K$ be such an accumulation point. Clearly, $h = X^{-1-\alpha}h_*$ is a fixed point of P, hence the result. The regularity of h is easily obtained by checking that $h \in \mathcal{C}_*$. □

† Since $x^{\alpha}(y_2^{\alpha+1}D_{y_2}T)^{-1} \le y_1^{\alpha}(1+\xi)^{\alpha}(2^{-\alpha-1}2)^{-1} \le \xi(1+\xi)^{\alpha} \le 2^{\alpha}\xi$.

‡ Let $f \in K$ and define $\phi(x) = x^{1+\alpha} f(x)$. Then, for $x \ge y$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \le \phi(x) - \phi(y) &\le (x^{1+\alpha} - y^{1+\alpha}) f(x) \le a(1+\alpha)x^{-\alpha} \int_y^x \xi^{\alpha}\, d\xi \\ &\le a(1+\alpha)|x-y|. \end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Before introducing the random approximation to our dynamics let us note a property of the functions in $\mathcal{C}_*$ that will be instrumental in what follows.

LEMMA 2.4. *For each function* $f \in \mathcal{C}_*$,

$$\inf_{x\in[0,1]} f(x) = f(1) \geq \min\left\{a, \left[\frac{\alpha(1+\alpha)}{a^\alpha}\right]^{1/(1-\alpha)}\right\} \int_0^1 f.$$

Proof. Clearly , it suffices to consider the case $\int_0^1 f = 1$. We have already seen that

$$f(x) \leq a x^{-\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad f(x) \leq x^{-1-\alpha} f(1).$$

We introduce the point $x_* = a^{-1} f(1)$. The left-hand side of the first inequality is stricter and the opposite holds on the right-hand side. If $x_* > 1$, then $f(1) > a$, otherwise

$$1 = \int_0^1 f = \int_0^{x_*} f + \int_{x_*}^1 f \leq \int_0^{x_*} a\xi^{-\alpha} + \int_{x_*}^1 \xi^{-1-\alpha} f(1) \leq \frac{a^\alpha}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} f(1)^{1-\alpha},$$

from which the lemma follows. □

3. *A random perturbation*

For simplicity let us identify $[0, 1]$ with the circle S^1; on S^1 the map is not smooth but it is continuous (this is not essential but it will make our life a bit easier). Let us define the 'ball' $B_\varepsilon(x) = \{y \in S^1 \mid |x - y| \leq \varepsilon\}$ and the averaging operator†

$$\mathbb{A}_\varepsilon f(x) = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} f(y)\, dy.$$

It is now possible to define the perturbed operator

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon = P^{n_\varepsilon} \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon,$$

where $n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ will be specified later.

The following lemma shows that the perturbed operator is not too different from the original one, provided we consider observables in $\mathcal{C}_*$.

LEMMA 3.1. *For each* $f \in \mathcal{C}_*$,

$$\|P^{n_\varepsilon} f - \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon f\|_1 \leq c_1 \|f\|_1 \varepsilon^{1-\alpha},$$

where $c_1 = 10a/\alpha(1-\alpha)$.

Proof. We assume that $f \in \mathcal{C}_*$ and $\int f = 1$. First, observe that

$$\|P^{n_\varepsilon} f - \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon f\|_1 \leq \|f - \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon f\|_1.$$

† Let us remark that this particular choice of $\mathbb{A}_\varepsilon$ is nothing special; any other 'reasonable' choice would do as well.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Next, we recall the estimates

$$f(x) \le a x^{-\alpha}$$
$$\frac{f(y)}{f(x)} \le \left(\frac{x}{y}\right)^{1+\alpha}, \quad \forall x \ge y.$$

This allows us to bound the L^1 norm of the difference between the function f and its average.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f - \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon f\|_1 &\le \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} dx \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} dy\, |f(y) - f(x)| \\
&\quad + \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} dx \left| f(x) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} dy\, f(y)\right| \\
&\le \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} dx \left\{ \int_{x-\varepsilon}^{x} dy\, [f(y) - f(x)] + \int_x^{x+\varepsilon} dy\, [f(x) - f(y)]\right\} \\
&\quad + \int_{B_\varepsilon(0)} f(x)\, dx + \int_{B_{2\varepsilon}(0)} f(y)\, dy \\
&\le \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} dx \int_{x-\varepsilon}^{x} dy\, f(y)\left[1 - \frac{f(y+\varepsilon)}{f(y)}\right] + 4a\int_0^{2\varepsilon} x^{-\alpha}\, dx \\
&\le \frac{a}{2(1-\alpha)\varepsilon}\int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} dx\, (2x^{1-\alpha} - (x+\varepsilon)^{1-\alpha} - (x-\varepsilon)^{1-\alpha}) \\
&\quad + \frac{a}{2\alpha}\int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} dx\, (x^{-\alpha} - (x+\varepsilon)^{-\alpha}) + \frac{4a}{1-\alpha}(2\varepsilon)^{1-\alpha} \\
&\le \frac{a}{2(1-\alpha)(2-\alpha)\varepsilon}\{(2\varepsilon)^{2-\alpha} - 2\varepsilon^{2-\alpha} - (1-2\varepsilon)^{2-\alpha} - 1 + 2(1-\varepsilon)^{2-\alpha}\} \\
&\quad + \frac{a}{2\alpha(1-\alpha)}\{2^{1-\alpha}\varepsilon^{1-\alpha} - 1 - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} + (1-\varepsilon)^{1-\alpha}\} + \frac{8a}{1-\alpha}\varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \\
&\le \frac{10}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}\varepsilon^{1-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Lemma 3.1 □

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon f(x) &= \sum_{y \in T^{-n_\varepsilon} x} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon D_y T^{n_\varepsilon}} \int_0^1 dz\, \chi_{B_\varepsilon(y)}(z) f(z) \\
&= \sum_{y \in T^{-n_\varepsilon} x} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon D_y T^{n_\varepsilon}} \int_0^1 dz\, \chi_{B_\varepsilon(z)}(y) f(z) \\
&= \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\int_0^1 dz\, P^{n_\varepsilon} \chi_{B_\varepsilon(z)}(x) f(z) \\
&:= \int_0^1 \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon(x,z) f(z)\, dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Our task is to find a lower bound for the kernel $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon(x,z)$. For this purpose, let us define T_1 to be the map T restricted to the interval $[0, 1/2]$ and $a_n = T_1^{-n}1$. We have the following asymptotic bound for the sequence a_n.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEMMA 3.2. *For all integers $n > 0$ the following inequality holds:*

$$a_n \leq 2^{1/\alpha^2+1/\alpha} n^{-1/\alpha}.$$

Proof. The lemma is proved by induction. First, it is clearly satisfied for $n = 1$. Next, let us suppose that $a_n < cn^{-1/\alpha}$ and let us prove that $a_{n+1} < c(n+1)^{-1/\alpha}$. If it is false, then

$$a_n = a_{n+1}(1 + 2^\alpha a_{n+1}^\alpha) \geq c(n+1)^{-1/\alpha}(1 + 2^\alpha c^\alpha (n+1)^{-1}).$$

By the assumption on a_n we obtain

$$n^{-1/\alpha} \geq (n+1)^{-1/\alpha}\left(1 + \frac{2^\alpha c^\alpha}{n+1}\right)$$

or equivalently

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{1/\alpha} \geq 1 + \frac{2^\alpha c^\alpha}{n+1}.$$

By convexity it follows that

$$(2^{1/\alpha} - 1)\frac{1}{n} \geq \frac{2^\alpha c^\alpha}{n+1};$$

that is

$$c^\alpha \leq 2^{-\alpha}(2^{1/\alpha} - 1)\frac{n+1}{n} \leq 2^{-\alpha+1}(2^{1/\alpha} - 1),$$

which gives a contradiction if we choose $c = 2^{1/\alpha^2+1/\alpha}$. □

We define $\Delta_k = [a_k, a_{k-1}]$ for each $k > 0$. We are now able to prove the following.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$, $x, z \in S^1$,*

$$\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon(x, z) \geq \gamma,$$

provided we choose $n_\varepsilon = [2^{2+1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-\alpha}] + 1$†.

Proof. First of all, we choose $k_0 = 3$. Next, notice that for each interval J and integer m,

$$(P^m \chi_J)(x) \geq \chi_{T^m J}(x) \inf_{y \in J} (D_y T^m)^{-1}.$$

Let $\delta_0 = a_{k_0} - a_{k_0+1}$. By Lemma 2.4 it is obvious that there exists n_0 and c_0 such that for all intervals I of size larger than δ_0,

$$P^n \chi_I \geq c_0$$

holds, provided $n \geq n_0$. Thus, the task is to control the $\inf_{y \in J}(D_y T^m)^{-1}$, where m is the time needed for the interval J to become an interval of size δ_0. Let $I_0 = [0, \alpha_{k_0}]$. Let J be an interval, three possibilities can occur:

(1) $J \cap I_0 = \emptyset$;

† Here the square bracket stands for the integer part.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2) $J \cap I_0 \neq \emptyset$ and J contains, at most, one a_k for $k > k_0$;
(3) J contains more than one a_k for $k > k_0$.

We can associate to each J a sequence $n_1, k_1, \dots, k_{p-1}, n_p$ of integers (n_1 may be null), retracting the trajectory of J in the following way. For a time n_1, (1) holds, then the image of J enters the intermittent region I_0 and (2) holds with $k = k_1 + k_0$, so after k_1 interactions it exits from I_0. Then the image of J stays in the hyperbolic region for n_2 interactions, and so on. Finally, we end when the size of the interval becomes larger than δ_0 or if case (3) happens. Let us see what happens in these regimes.

(1) Let $D = \sup_{y\in[a_{k_0+1},1]}(D_y^2 T / D_y T^2)$ and $r = (D_{a_{k_0+1}} T)^{-1} < 1$. For $n \geq n_1$, the usual distortion estimates yield, for each $y \in J$, with $c_2 = D/(1-r)$,

$$\frac{D_y T^n |J|}{|T^n J|} \leq \mathrm{Exp}[c_2 |T^n J|].$$

(2) Let $J_1 = T^{n_1} J$. Let us see what happens in the intermittent region. Suppose that $J_1 \subset]a_{k+1}, a_{k-1}[$, i.e. (2) occurs with $k = k_0 + k_1$. In this case a direct computation for $j \leq k_1$ and $y_1, y_2 \in J_1$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{D_{y_1} T^j}{D_{y_2} T^j} &\leq \mathrm{Exp}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} \frac{\sup_{\xi\in[a_{k-i+2},a_{k-i}]} D_\xi^2 T}{\inf_{\xi\in[a_{k-i+2},a_{k-i}]} D_\xi T} |T^i_{y_2} - T^i_{y_1}| \right] \\
&\leq \mathrm{Exp}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} \alpha(1+\alpha) a_{k-i+2}^{\alpha-1} (D_{a_{k+2-i}} T^{k_1-i})^{-1} |T^{k_1} J_1| \right] \\
&\leq \mathrm{Exp}\left[\alpha(\alpha+1) \sum_{q=k_0+2}^{k_0+k_1+1} a_q^{\alpha-1} (D_{a_q} T^{q-(k_0+2)})^{-1} |T^{k_1} J_1| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since the first branch of the map is convex, we have

$$D_{a_q} T^{q-(k_0+2)} \geq r \frac{a_{k_0+1} - a_{k_0+2}}{a_{q-1} - a_q} = r a_{k_0+2}^{1+\alpha} a_q^{-(1+\alpha)}.$$

Moreover, Lemma 3.2 gives $a_q^{2\alpha} \leq 2^{2+2/\alpha} q^{-2}$. This yields, setting $c_3 = \alpha(1+\alpha) 2^{2+2/\alpha} / r a_{k_0+2}^{1+\alpha}$,

$$\frac{D_{y_1} T^j}{D_{y_2} T^j} \leq \mathrm{Exp}[c_3 |T^{k_1} J_1|].$$

(3) Finally, let us see what happens if (3) holds for some iterate $K = T^j J$. If more than one-third of the size of K is in $[a_1, 1]$, then we consider $K \cap [a_1, 1]$ and case (1) will hold for ever, losing just a factor of one-third. Otherwise we cut K into pieces $\Delta_{k_-}, \dots, \Delta_{k_+}$ such that the union of them is of a bigger size than $|K|/3$. For these Δ_k, the preceding computation yields

$$P^{k-k_0} \chi_{\Delta_k} \geq \chi_{\Delta_{k_0}} \frac{\mathrm{Exp}[-c_3 |\Delta_{k_0}|]}{|\Delta_{k_0}|} |\Delta_k|.$$

Therefore, with $l = n_0 + k_+ - k_0$,

$$P^l \chi_K \geq \sum_{k=k_-}^{k_+} P^{l+k_0-k} P^{k-k_0} \chi_{\Delta_k} \geq \sum_{k=k_-}^{k_+} c_0 \frac{\mathrm{Exp}[-c_3\delta_0]}{\delta_0} |\Delta_k| \geq c_0 \frac{\mathrm{Exp}[-c_3\delta_0]}{\delta_0} \frac{|K|}{3}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since we control what happens on each region, it is possible to estimate the total distortion after $m = n_1 + k_1 + \cdots + n_p + l$ iterations, where $l = n_0$ if case (3) never happens ($l = n_0 + k_+ - k_0$ if case (3) occurs).

$$\begin{aligned} P^m \chi_J &\geq P^l P^{n_p} P^{k_{p-1}} \cdots P^{n_2} P^{k_1} P^{n_1} \chi_J \\ &\geq |J| \frac{c_0}{3\delta_0} \operatorname{Exp}[-c_3\delta_0 - c_2|T^{n_p+\cdots+k_1+n_1} J| - \cdots - c_3|T^{k_1+n_1} J| - c_2|T^{n_1} J|] \\ &\geq |J| \frac{c_0}{3\delta_0} \operatorname{Exp}[-(c_2+c_3)\delta_0(1 + r^{n_p} + r^{n_p+n_{p-1}} + \cdots + r^{n_p+n_{p-1}+\cdots+n_2})] \\ &\geq |J| \frac{c_0}{3\delta_0} \operatorname{Exp}\left[\frac{-(c_2+c_3)\delta_0 r}{1-r}\right] := \gamma|J|. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we need to fix n_ε. We choose the supremum over all possible values of $m = n_1 + k_1 + \cdots + n_p + l$, associated to intervals J of size 2ε. We immediately see that the worst outcome is when case (3) occurs at the beginning, and $J =]-2\varepsilon/3, 4\varepsilon/3[$. In this case, m is such that $a_{k_0+m} \geq 2\varepsilon/3$. Clearly, $n_\varepsilon = [2^{2+1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-\alpha}] + 1$ is large enough and the lemma is proven. □

4. *Decay of correlations*

Proposition 3.3 allows us to immediately conclude that $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon$ has an invariant density h_ε to which it converges exponentially fast† in L^1. In the following we will call μ the invariance measure $d\mu = h\,dx$. Using all the above facts, we are able to prove our main result.

THEOREM 4.1. *For all $g \in L^\infty$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}([0,1])$ such that $\int f\,d\mu = 0$ the following holds:*

$$\left| \int g \circ T^n \, f\,d\mu \right| \leq c_4 C(\|f\|_{C^{(1)}}) \|g\|_\infty n^{-1/\alpha+1} (\log n)^{1/\alpha},$$

where $C : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is affine.

† Let us briefly recall the argument: set $\Omega = [0,1]$ and consider $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega f = 0$. Remember that $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon 1 = \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^* 1 = 1$ and let $\Omega_\varepsilon^+ = \{x \in \Omega \mid \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon f \geq 0\}$; $\Omega_+ = \{x \in \Omega \mid f \geq 0\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon f\|_1 &= 2\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon^+} dx \int_\Omega dy\, \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon(x,y) f(y) = 2\int_\Omega dy\, f(y) \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon^+} dx\, [\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon(x,y) - \gamma] \\ &\leq 2\int_{\Omega_+} dy\, f(y) \int_\Omega dx\, [\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon(x,y) - \gamma] = 2(1-\gamma) \int_{\Omega_+} dy\, f(y) \\ &= (1-\gamma)\|f\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, for each $f \in L^1(\Omega)$ and defining $\Pi f = \int_\Omega f$, the following holds:

$$\|(\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon - \Pi)^n f\|_1 = \|\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^n (\mathbb{1} - \Pi) f\|_1 \leq (1-\gamma)^n \|f\|_1.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_* + \mathbb{R}$, $\int_0^1 f = 0$ and $g \in L^\infty$, $\|g\|_\infty = 1$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let us write $n = kn_\varepsilon + m$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m < n_\varepsilon$. Remembering Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_0^1 g P^n f\right| &\le \|P^n f - \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^k P^m f\|_1 + \|\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^k P^m f\|_1 \\ &\le \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \|P^{(i+1)n_\varepsilon} P^m f - \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon P^{in_\varepsilon} P^m f\|_1 + \operatorname{Exp}[-\gamma k]\|f\|_1 \\ &\le 2c_1\|f\|_1 \frac{n}{n_\varepsilon}\varepsilon^{1-\alpha} + e^\gamma \operatorname{Exp}\left[-\gamma \frac{n}{n_\varepsilon}\right]\|f\|_1 \\ &\le c_4\|f\|_1 n^{-1/\alpha+1}(\log n)^{1/\alpha}\end{aligned}$$

by choosing $\varepsilon = n^{-1/\alpha}(\log n^{(1-\gamma)^{-1}(1/\alpha-1)2^{2+1\alpha}})^{1/\alpha}$.

This is not yet the decay of correlation with respect to the absolutely continuous invariant measure $d\mu = h\,dx$ of our dynamical system. To get such a result, we need to note that if $f \in C^{(1)}$, then we can choose λ, ν, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_{\lambda,\nu,\delta}(x) := (f(x)+\lambda x+\nu)h(x)+\delta \in \mathcal{C}_*$, and $(\lambda x+\nu)h(x)+\delta \in \mathcal{C}_*$, the dependence of the parameters with respect to the $C^{(1)}$ norm of f being affine. Finally, the decay of correlations with respect to μ, for each $f \in C^{(1)}$, $\int f\,d\mu = 0$ and $g \in L^\infty$ can be estimated as

$$\left|\int g \circ T^n f\,d\mu\right| \le c_4 C(\|f\|_{C^{(1)}})n^{-1/\alpha+1}(\log n)^{1/\alpha},$$

where $C : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is affine. □

Remarks.

(1) The proof of Theorem 4.1 allows us to estimate the difference between h_ε and h; namely, to prove the estimate†: $\|h_\varepsilon - h\|_1 \le \text{const.}\varepsilon^{1-\alpha}(\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{1/\alpha}$.

(2) Theorem 4.1 allows us to get an estimate for the rate of decay for Hölder continuous observables. More precisely, given a β-Hölder continuous function f, we can bound the correlations by $n^{-\beta(1/\alpha-1)}$, up to some logarithmic correction‡.

(3) We have obtained a polynomial decay, with a bound comparable to the one found in [**Mo**] for the piecewise linear case and the one stated in [**Is**] for the general case. Moreover, compared with numerical simulations [**LSV**], our bound appears to be extremely close to optimal: the expected one is the same apart from the logarithmic correction.

† It suffices to write

$$\begin{aligned}\|h - h_\varepsilon\|_1 &\le \|P^n 1 - h\|_1 + \|\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^{n/n_\varepsilon} 1 - h_\varepsilon\|_1 + \|\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^{n/n_\varepsilon} 1 - P^n 1\|_1 \\ &\le \text{const.}\{n^{1-1/\alpha}(\log n)^{1/\alpha} + (1-\gamma)^{n\varepsilon^\alpha} + n\varepsilon\}\end{aligned}$$

and to choose $n \sim \varepsilon^{-\alpha}\log \varepsilon^{-1}$.

‡ The result is easily obtained by approximation. If f is a β-Hölder function, then we can approximate it in L^1 by functions $f_\varepsilon \in C^{(1)}$ such that $\|f - f_\varepsilon\|_1 \le \|f\|_\beta \varepsilon^\beta$ and $\|f'\|_\infty \le \|f\|_\beta \varepsilon^{\beta-1}$ (where $\|f\|_\beta$ is the β-Hölder norm). Accordingly,

$$\left|\int f \circ T^n g\right| \le \|g\|_\infty \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_1 + (c_1\|f_\varepsilon'\|_\infty + c_2\|f\|_\infty)n^{-1/\alpha+1},$$

and the result follows by choosing ε judiciously.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(4) As a side consequence of our work we have that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P^n f$ converges in L^1 provided $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. According to [**Li3**] this estimate suffices to prove the central limit theorem. That is, given $f \in \mathcal{C}^{(1)}([0,1])$ such that $\int_0^1 f\,d\mu = 0$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=0}^{n} f \circ T^i$$

converges, in distribution, to a Gaussian variable with variance $\int_0^1 f^2\,d\mu + 2\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_0^1 f \cdot f \circ T^i\,d\mu$.

5. *General considerations*

The reader may be under the impression that the proposed approach is specific to the special maps studied here. In particular, §2 seems to be quite model dependent. In fact, while the estimates made there would certainly apply to similar maps, it is true that some more work is needed to present them in a completely general fashion†.

Nevertheless, §2 was not completely necessary. Its aim was to make the paper self-contained and to emphasize the existence of a very direct method of studying the invariant measure. If one is willing to make some assumptions on the invariant measure (which can eventually be proven separately) §2 can be greatly simplified.

Here, we briefly discuss what is essential in order to apply the present method.

Let us consider a map $T : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ which is expanding everywhere except at the fixed point zero, where $D_0 T = 1$. Assume $D^2 T$ is continuous with the exception of the point zero and

$$\begin{aligned} |D_x^2 T| &\le C x^{\alpha - 1} \\ |D_x T| &= 1 + c x^{\alpha} + o(x^{\alpha}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Furthermore, assume that there exists an invariant probability measure absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue (see the discussion at the end of this section). Letting h be its density, we have $Ph = h$. Then, in analogy with Lemma 2.1 the following holds‡.

LEMMA 5.1. *There exist $a > \alpha$ and $b > 0$ such that the cone*

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ f \in C^{(1)}(]0,1]) \;\middle|\; 0 \le f(x) \le 2h(x) \int_0^1 f;\ |f'(x)| \le \frac{a + bx}{x} f(x) \right\}$$

is invariant with respect to the Perron–Frobenius operator.

† Yet, the results extend immediately to any map of the interval which is $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}$-conjugate to our model. More precisely, suppose that $\tilde{T} : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ and $\Phi \in \mathrm{Diff}^{(1)}([0,1])$ satisfies $\tilde{T} \circ \Phi = \Phi \circ T$. Then, for the absolutely continuous $\tilde{T}$-invariant measure $\tilde{\mu}$ defined by $\tilde{\mu}(f) = \mu(f \circ \Phi)$, it is straightforward to see that the power law decay is the same for T and $\tilde{T}$ for $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}$ observable.

‡ Such a result should extend easily to maps which are expanding everywhere except at some fixed points $\{p_j\}$, where $D_{p_j} T = 1$. We can define $\theta(x) = \min_j |x - p_j|$ and assume $D^2 T$ is continuous everywhere except at the points $\{p_j\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |D_x^2 T| &\le C \theta(x)^{\alpha - 1} \\ |D_x T| &= 1 + c_j \theta(x)^{\alpha} + o(\theta(x)^{\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the same cone with $(a + b\theta(x))/\theta(x)$ instead of $(a + bx)/x$ should be invariant.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Obviously, the first condition is invariant under P. If f belongs to the cone

$$\begin{aligned}|(Pf)'(x)| &= \left| \sum_{y\in T^{-1}x} \frac{D_y^2 T}{|D_y T|^3} f(y) + \frac{1}{|D_y T|^2} f'(y) \right| \\ &\le \sum_{y\in T^{-1}x} \left(\frac{2Cy^{\alpha-1}}{|D_y T|^2} + \frac{a+by}{y|D_y T|} \right) \frac{f(y)}{|D_y T|} \\ &\le \frac{a+bx}{x} p f(x) \sup_{y\in[0,1]} \left[\frac{2C}{|D_y T|^2} \frac{y^{\alpha-1} T(y)}{a+bT(y)} + \frac{T(y)}{y|D_y T|} \frac{a+by}{a+bT(y)} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Let $\Omega(y)$ be the term in brackets. We have

$$T(y) = \int_0^y D_t T \, dt = \int_0^y (1 + ct^\alpha + o(t^\alpha))\, dt = y + \frac{c}{\alpha+1} y^{\alpha+1} + o(y^{\alpha+1}),$$

which shows that $\Omega(y) \le 1 + (2C/a + c(1/(\alpha+1) - 1))y^\alpha + o(y^\alpha)$. Therefore, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\Omega(y) \le 1$ on $[0, \delta]$ provided a is big enough. Next, outside this neighborhood, we have $y > \delta$ and $|D_y T| > \gamma > 1$, so

$$\Omega(y) \le \frac{1}{a} \frac{2C\delta^{\alpha-1}}{\gamma^2} + \frac{a}{b} \frac{1}{\delta\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma} < 1$$

provided a and b/a are big enough. □

In addition, we assume that for some $0 < \beta < 1$, $0 < \gamma_0 < 1$ and $c_* > 0$,

$$\gamma_0 \le h(x) \le c_* x^{-\beta}. \tag{5.2}$$

It follows that a sharper cone is invariant. Note that in the process of proving the next lemma we will establish the analogue of Lemma 2.4.

LEMMA 5.2. *There exists $\delta > 0$ and $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{C}_* = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C} \mid f(x) \ge \gamma \int_0^1 f, \text{ for } x \le \delta \right\}$$

is invariant with respect to the Perron–Frobenius operator.

Proof. The proof starts by establishing the analogue of Lemma 2.4.

SUB-LEMMA 5.3. *If $f \in \mathcal{C}$, then*

$$\min_{[\delta,1]} f \ge \frac{\delta^a}{2e^b} \int_0^1 f,$$

provided δ is chosen small enough.

Proof. The bounds

$$f(x) \le 2c_* x^{-\beta} \int_0^1 f \qquad \text{and} \quad |f'(x)| \le (ax^{-1} + b) f(x)$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

follow from the cone and the assumed estimate on the invariant measure. For $x \geq y > \delta$ the second bound yields

$$\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^a e^{-b(x-y)} \leq \frac{f(x)}{f(y)} \leq \left(\frac{x}{y}\right)^a e^{b(x-y)}.$$

Accordingly, normalizing $\int f = 1$,

$$1 = \int f = \int_0^\delta f + \int_\delta^1 f \leq \frac{2c_*}{1-\beta}\delta^{1-\beta} + \delta^{-a}e^b \min_{x\in[\delta,1]} f.$$

Next, by choosing δ sufficiently small, we have $(2c_*/(1-\beta))/\delta^{1-\beta} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ from which the result follows. □

Let $\mu = \|DT\|_\infty$. We choose δ so small so that for all $y \leq \delta$, it follows that $|D_yT|^{-1} \geq 1 - 2c\delta^\alpha$ and Sub-Lemma 5.3 together with $1 - 2c\delta^\alpha + \mu^{-1} > 1$ holds. Let $x \leq \delta$, then $T^{-1}x$ will consist of, at least, two points $y_1 \leq \delta$ and $y_2 \geq \delta$. By choosing γ small, the following holds:

$$Pf(x) \geq |D_{y_1}T|^{-1} f(y_1) + \mu^{-1} f(y_2) \geq \left[(1-2c\delta^\alpha)\gamma + \mu^{-1}\min\left\{\gamma, \frac{\delta^a}{2e^b}\right\}\right]\int_0^1 Pf$$
$$\geq \gamma \int_0^1 Pf. \qquad \square$$

This is enough to show that $\inf f \geq \gamma \int f$ whenever $f \in \mathcal{C}_*$, which implies (since the constant function 1 belongs to the cone $\mathcal{C}_*$) that

$$\inf_{n\geq 0}\inf_{[0,1]} P^n 1 \geq \gamma > 0. \tag{5.3}$$

We have generalized the two ingredients of §2 used in the paper: the existence of an invariant cone for P that allows us to obtain the estimates used to prove Lemma 3.1 and the analogue of Lemma 2.4, necessary for proving Proposition 3.3.

The reader can then easily generalize §3, since the distortion estimates depend only on the behavior of the neutral fixed point which is ensured by our assumption on D^2T. §4 follows exactly in the same way, yielding a polynomial decay depending on α and β.

In conclusion, the following more general result holds.

PROPOSITION 5.4. *Given a map T satisfying (5.1), if it has an absolutely continuous invariant probability measure with density satisfying (5.2), then for all $g \in L^\infty$, $f \in C^{(1)}$, $\int f = 0$ and $0 < \gamma < 1/\alpha - \beta/\alpha$, the following holds:*

$$\left|\int fg \circ T^n\right| \leq c_4 C(\|f\|_{C^{(1)}})\|g\|_\infty n^{-\gamma}$$

for some constants c_4 and $C(\|f\|_{C^{(1)}})$.

Here, we do not address how to obtain the required estimate on the invariant density, although several approaches (besides the ones in the style used in §2) are possible (see, for example, [**Th**] where a result of the type (5.2) is obtained by induction).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Acknowledgements. We gratefully acknowledge many interesting discussions with V. Baladi, X. Bressaud, V. Maume, B. Schmitt and G. Keller. One of us (B.S.) acknowledges partial support of CEE grant CHRX-CT94-0460. Finally, it is a pleasure to thank the ESI, Vien, and the Institute for Advanced Studies, Jerusalem, where part of this work was done.

Note added in proof. After this paper was submitted two other relevant works appeared on this subject [**Yo2, Hu**], obtaining similar results with different techniques.

References

[BY] M. Benedicks and L.-S. Young. Markov extensions and decay of correlations for certain Henon maps. *Asterisque* (1999), to appear.

[CGS] P. Collet, A. Galves and B. Schmitt. Unpredictability of the occurrence time of a long laminar period in a model of temporal intermittency. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.* **57**(3) (1992), 319–331.

[CF] P. Collet and P. Ferrero. Some limit ratio theorem related to a real endomorphism with a neutral fixed point. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré* **52** (1990), 283.

[CI1] M. Campanino and S. Isola. Statistical properties of long return times in type I intermittency. *Forum Math.* **7** (1995), 331–348.

[CI2] M. Campanino and S. Isola. Infinite invariant measures for non-uniformly expanding transformations of [0, 1]: Weak law of large numbers with anomalous scaling. *Forum Math.* **8**(1) (1996).

[CI3] M. Campanino and S. Isola. On the invariance principle for non-uniformity expanding transformations of [0, 1]. *Forum. Math.* **8**(4), (1996) 475–484.

[Ch1] N. Chernov. Limit theorem and Markov approximations for chaotic dynamical systems. *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields* **101** (1995), 321–362.

[Ch2] N. Chernov. Markov approximations and decay of correlations for Anosov flows. *Ann. Math.* **147**(2) (1998), 269–324.

[Do] D. Dolgopiat. Decay of correlations for Anosov flows. *Ann. Math.* **147**(2) (1998), 357–390.

[FF] B. U. Felderhof and M. E. Fisher. Phase transitions in one-dimensional cluster-interaction fluids. I IA. Thermodynamics. *Ann. Phys. N.Y.* **58** (1970), 176.

[FS] P. Ferrero and B. Schmitt. On the rate of convergence for some limit ratio theorem related to endomorphisms with a non regular invariant density. *Preprint*.

[Ga] G. Gallavotti. Funzioni zeta e insiemi basilari. *Acad. Lincei Rend. Sc. fis. mat. e nat.* **61** (1976), 309–317.

[GW] P. Gaspard and X.J. Wang. Sporadicity between periodic and chaotic dynamical behaviors. *Proc. Math. Acad. Sci. USA* **85**(13) (1988), 4591–4595.

[Hu] H. Hu. Decay of correlations for piecewise smooth maps with indifferent fixed points. *Preprint.*

[Is] S. Isola. Dynamical zeta functions and correlation functions for intermittent interval map. *Preprint*.

[Li1] C. Liverani. Decay of correlations. *Ann. Math.* **142** (1995), 239–301.

[Li2] C. Liverani. Flows, random perturbations and rate of mixing. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, to appear.

[Li3] C. Liverani. Central limit theorem for deterministic systems. *International Congress on Dynamical Systems, Montevideo 95 (Proceedings, Research Notes in Mathematics Series).* Pitman, 1996, pp. 56–75.

[Lo] A. O. Lopez. The zeta function, non-differentiability of the pressure and the critical exponent of transition. *Adv. Math.* **101** (1993), 133–165.

[LSV] A. Lambert, S. Siboni and S. Vaienti. Statistical properties of a non-uniformly hyperbolic map of the interval. *J. Stat. Phys.* **71**(5/6) (1993), 1305–1330.

[Mo] M. Mori. On the intermittency of a piecewise linear map (Takahashi model). *Tokyo J. Math.* **16** (1993), 411–428.

[PM] Y. Pomeau and P. Manneville. Intermittent transition to turbulence in dissipative dynamical systems. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **74** (1980), 189–197.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[PS] T. Prellberg and J. Slawny. Maps of intervals with indifferent fixed points: thermodynamic formalism and phase transitions *J. Stat. Phys.* **66**(1/2) (1992), 503–514.

[Ta1] V. Takahashi. Fredholm determinant of unimodal linear maps. *Sci. Papers College Gen. Ed. Univ. Tokyo* **31**(2) (1981), 61–87.

[Ta2] V. Takahashi. *One Dimensional Maps and Power Spectrum (Recent Studies on Turbulent Phenomena)*. 1985, pp 61–87.

[Th] M. Thaler. Estimates of the invariant densities of endomorphisms with indifferent fixed points. *Israel J. Math.* **37**(4) (1980), 303–314.

[W] X. J. Wang. Statistical physics of temporal intermittency. *Phys. Rev.* **A40** (1989), 6647.

[Yo] L.-S. Young. Statistical properties of dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity. *Ann. Math.* **147** (1998), 585–650.

[Yo2] L.-S. Young. Recurrence times and rate of mixing. *Israel J. Math.* to appear.

[Yu] M. Yuri. Decay of correlations for certain multi-dimensional maps. *Nonlinearity* **9**(6) (1996), 1439–1461.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385799133856 Published online by Cambridge University Press