

# EQUILIBRIUM STATES FOR INTERVAL MAPS: THE POTENTIAL $-t \log|Df|$

HENK BRUIN, MIKE TODD

ABSTRACT. Let  $f : I \rightarrow I$  be a  $C^2$  multimodal interval map satisfying polynomial growth of the derivatives along critical orbits. We prove the existence and uniqueness of equilibrium states for the potential  $\varphi_t : x \mapsto -t \log|Df(x)|$  for  $t$  close to 1, and also that the pressure function  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is analytic on an appropriate interval near  $t = 1$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Thermodynamic formalism ties potential functions  $\varphi$  to invariant measures of a dynamical system  $(X, f)$ . The aim is to identify and prove uniqueness of a measure  $\mu_\varphi$  that maximises the *free energy*, *i.e.*, the sum of the entropy and the integral over the potential. In other words

$$h_{\mu_\varphi}(f) + \int_X \varphi d\mu_\varphi = P(\varphi) := \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg}} \left\{ h_\nu(f) + \int_X \varphi d\nu : - \int_X \varphi d\nu < \infty \right\}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{erg}$  is the set of all ergodic  $f$ -invariant Borel probability measures. Such measures are called *equilibrium states*, and  $P(\varphi)$  is the *pressure*. This theory was developed by Sinai, Ruelle and Bowen [Si, Ru2, Bo] in the context of Hölder potentials on hyperbolic dynamical systems, and has been applied to Axiom A systems, Anosov diffeomorphisms and other systems too, see e.g. [Ba, K2] for more recent expositions. Apart from uniqueness, it was shown in this context that the density  $\frac{d\mu_\varphi}{dm_\varphi}$  of the invariant measure with respect to  $\varphi$ -conformal measure  $m_\varphi$  is a fixed point of the transfer operator  $(\mathcal{L}_\varphi h)(x) = \sum_{f(y)=x} e^{\varphi(y)} h(y)$ . Moreover,  $\mu_\varphi$  is a Gibbs measure, *i.e.*, there are constants  $K > 0$  and  $P \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\frac{1}{K} \leq \frac{\mu_\varphi(\mathbf{C}_n)}{e^{\varphi_n(x) - nP}} \leq K$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , all  $n$ -cylinder sets  $\mathbf{C}_n$  and any  $x \in \mathbf{C}_n$ . Here  $\varphi_n(x) := \varphi(f^{n-1}(x)) + \dots + \varphi(x)$ . We refer to  $P$  as the *Gibbs constant*.

In this paper we are interested in interval maps  $(I, f)$  with nonempty set  $\text{Crit}$  of critical points. These maps are, at best, only non-uniformly hyperbolic. We say that  $c$  is a non-flat critical point of  $f$  if there exists a diffeomorphism  $g_c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 37D35, 37D25, 37E05.

*Key words and phrases*. Equilibrium states, thermodynamic formalism, interval maps, non-uniform hyperbolicity.

This research was supported by EPSRC grant GR/S91147/01.

with  $g_c(0) = 0$  and  $1 < \ell_c < \infty$  such that for  $x$  close to  $c$ ,  $f(x) = f(c) \pm |\varphi_c(x - c)|^{\ell_c}$ . The value of  $\ell_c$  is known as the *critical order* of  $c$ . Let  $\ell_{max} = \max\{\ell_c : c \in \text{Crit}\}$ . We define

$$\mathcal{H} := \{f : I \rightarrow I \text{ is } C^2, \#\text{Crit} < \infty \text{ and all critical points are non-flat}\}.$$

For  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ , there is a finite partition  $\mathcal{P}_1$  into maximal intervals on which  $f$  is monotone, called the *branch partition*. We will assume throughout that  $\vee_n \mathcal{P}_n$  generates the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Note that if  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  has no attracting cycles then  $\vee_n \mathcal{P}_n$  generates the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, see [MSt]. (The  $C^2$  assumption precludes wandering sets, which are not very interesting from the measure theoretic point of view anyway.)

Fix  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . The potential of our interest throughout is

$$\varphi_t : x \mapsto -t \log |Df(x)|.$$

The Lyapunov exponent of a measure  $\mu$  is defined as  $\lambda(\mu) := \int_I \log |Df| d\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_{erg} = \mathcal{M}_{erg}(f)$  be the set of all ergodic  $f$ -invariant probability measures, and

$$\mathcal{M}_+ = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg} : \lambda(\mu) > 0, \text{supp}(\mu) \not\subset \text{orb}(\text{Crit})\}.$$

Measures  $\mu$  with  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset \text{orb}(\text{Crit})$  are atomic. Atomic measures in  $\mathcal{M}_{erg}$  must be supported on periodic cycles. So if  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset \text{orb}(\text{Crit})$  and  $\lambda(\mu) > 0$ ,  $\mu$  must be supported on a hyperbolic repelling periodic cycle, and thus the corresponding critical point must be preperiodic. (Note that for  $t \leq 0$  such a situation can produce non-uniqueness of equilibrium states, see [MSm1] and Section 7.)

**1.1. Historical background.** The principal examples of maps in  $\mathcal{H}$  are unimodal maps with non-flat critical point. Equilibrium states (in particular of the potential  $\varphi_t$ ) have been studied in this case by various authors [HK2, KN, St.P, BK], using transfer operators. The transfer operator, in combination with Markov extensions (commonly known as Hofbauer towers), proved a powerful tool for so-called Collet-Eckmann unimodal maps (*i.e.*, the derivatives along the critical orbit grow exponentially, see (3) below) for Keller and Nowicki [KN], who showed that an appropriately weighted version of the transfer operator is quasi-compact. To our knowledge, however, these methods cannot be applied to non-Collet-Eckmann maps.

A less direct approach was taken by Pesin and Senti, results which were announced in [PSe2], with details given in preprint [PSe1] and the final publication [PSe3]. They used an inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$  (where  $\tau$  is the inducing time and  $F = f^\tau$ ), which is a hyperbolic expanding with full, albeit infinitely many, branches, to find a unique equilibrium state  $\mu_{\Phi_t}$  for the lifted potential  $\Phi_t$ . This equilibrium state is then projected to the interval to give a measure  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$ , a candidate equilibrium state for the system  $(I, f, \varphi_t)$ . The down-side for the more general case is that  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$  is only an ‘equilibrium state’ within the class of measures that are *compatible* to the inducing scheme, *i.e.*, the induced map  $F = f^\tau$  is defined for all iterates  $\mu$ -a.e. on  $X$ , and the inducing time  $\tau$  is  $\mu_F$ -integrable (here  $\mu_F$  is the ‘lift’ of  $\mu$ , see (4)). A priori, the ‘equilibrium states’ obtained in this way may not be true equilibrium states for the whole system, and different inducing schemes may lead to different measures  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$ .

In this paper, with preprint versions since 2006, and in a companion paper [BT2], Hofbauer tower techniques are used to

- construct inducing schemes as first return maps on the Hofbauer tower;
- identify the class of compatible measures;
- compare various inducing schemes; and
- establish that candidate equilibrium states emerging from a single inducing scheme, indeed maximise free energy over all measures in  $\mathcal{M}_+$ .

In (versions leading up to) [PSe3], identifying which measures are compatible to an inducing scheme is called the *liftability problem*. Most of the results in [PSe3] apply only to measures compatible to a given inducing scheme. Only for specific unimodal maps, called *strongly regular* [PSe3, Section 7.2], which are close to the Chebyshev polynomial and satisfy the Collet-Eckmann condition, is a genuine equilibrium state established. Strongly regular maps allow an inducing scheme  $(X, F)$  for which the number of branches  $X_i$  of inducing time  $\tau_i = n$  increases at an arbitrarily slow exponential rate. This is used to show that measures with sufficiently large entropy are compatible to the inducing scheme, and hence that the obtained equilibrium state indeed maximises free energy over all of  $\mathcal{M}_{erg}$ .

Branch counting arguments for both Collet-Eckmann and non-Collet-Eckmann maps are given in Section 5 and especially Proposition 4 of this paper. Together with the Hofbauer tower ideas, this allows us to treat a much wider class of maps than [PSe3]. On the other hand, for the strongly regular maps in [PSe3], the control of the branch count for their specific inducing scheme enables Pesin and Senti to establish the existence and uniqueness of an equilibrium state  $\mu_t$  for  $\varphi_t$  and  $t$  in a neighbourhood of  $[0, 1]$ . Such a neighbourhood  $V$  is difficult to obtain for general interval maps where a priori there is no single inducing scheme to rely on for all  $t \in V$ . It should be noted that the results on general multimodal maps in [PSe3, Section 8.1] apply only to Collet-Eckmann maps, as condition (23) of that paper shows, as well as only applying to measures compatible to the inducing scheme.

**1.2. Main results.** In our main theorems we will assume that  $f$  is *transitive*, i.e.,  $f$  has a dense orbit. If transitivity fails and instead the interval decomposes into finitely many transitive cycles of intervals, then our results remain valid for each transitive cycle, but uniqueness of equilibrium states may fail.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  be transitive with negative Schwarzian derivative and let  $\varphi_t := -t \log |Df|$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that for some  $C > 0$  and  $\beta > 2\ell_{max} - 1$ ,*

$$(1) \quad |Df^n(f(c))| \geq Cn^\beta \quad \text{for all } c \in \text{Crit} \text{ and } n \geq 1.$$

*Then there exists  $t_1 < 1$  such that the following hold for all  $t \in (t_1, 1]$ :*

- (a)  $(I, f, \varphi_t)$  has an equilibrium state  $\mu_{\varphi_t} \in \mathcal{M}_+$ ;
- (b) if  $t_1 < t < 1$ , then  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$  is the unique equilibrium state in  $\mathcal{M}_{erg}$  and a compatible inducing scheme with respect to which  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$  has exponential tails;

- (c) if  $t = 1$ , then there may be other equilibrium states in  $\mathcal{M}_{erg} \setminus \mathcal{M}_+$ . However, for  $\mu_{\varphi_1} \in \mathcal{M}_+$  there is a compatible inducing scheme with respect to which  $\mu_{\varphi_1}$  has polynomial tails;
- (d) the map  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is analytic on  $(t_1, 1)$ .

We refer to this situation as the *summable case*. Note that for  $t = 1$  the measure  $\mu_{\varphi_1} \in \mathcal{M}_+$  is an absolutely continuous invariant measure (acip). Therefore this result improves on the polynomial case of [BLS, Proposition 4.1], since in that theorem the polynomial decay of the tails was given under the above conditions, but also assuming that the critical points must all have the same order. Results of [BRSS] enable us to drop this assumption. As was shown in [BLS], this tail decay rate implies that the decay of correlations is at least polynomial.

As in the theorem, for  $t = 1$  equilibrium states with zero Lyapunov exponent are possible, see Section 7 for details. Conversely the following easy lemma shows that for  $t < 1$  this is not the case.

**Lemma 1.** *For  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  satisfying (1) and for  $t < 1$ , any equilibrium state  $\mu$  for  $\varphi_t$  must have  $\lambda(\mu) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* The pressure function  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is convex, continuous and non-increasing. As in [BRSS], condition (1) implies the existence of an acip  $\mu_1$  with  $\lambda(\mu_1) > 0$ , which is also an equilibrium state for the potential  $\varphi_1 = -\log |Df|$ . It follows that

$$(2) \quad P(\varphi_t) \geq (1-t)\lambda(\mu_1) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

so if  $t < 1$  we have  $P(\varphi_t) > 0$ . By [Pr], we have  $\lambda(\mu) \geq 0$  for any invariant measure, so Ruelle's inequality [Ru1] implies that  $h_\mu(f) \leq \lambda(\mu)$ . Thus (for  $t < 1$ ) equilibrium states have positive Lyapunov exponent because  $\lambda(\mu) = 0$  implies  $P(\varphi_t) = 0$ .  $\square$

Notice that for  $t \leq 0$ , the potential  $-t \log |Df|$  is upper semicontinuous, and the entropy function  $\mu \mapsto h_\mu(f)$  is upper semicontinuous, as explained in [K2]. This guarantees the existence of equilibrium states for  $(I, f)$  when  $t \leq 0$ , regardless of whether (1) holds or not.

A stronger condition than (1) is the *Collet-Eckmann condition* which states that there exist  $C, \alpha > 0$  such that

$$(3) \quad |Df^n(f(c))| \geq Ce^{\alpha n} \text{ for all } c \in \text{Crit and } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This condition implies that  $\lambda(\mu) > 0$  for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg}$ , see e.g. [NS] (and [BS] for the proof in the multimodal case). In the unimodal case, the difference between Collet-Eckmann and non-Collet-Eckmann maps can be seen from the behaviour of the pressure function at  $t = 1$ , as follows from [NS]. Indeed, if (1) holds but not (3), then there are periodic orbits with Lyapunov exponents arbitrarily close to 0, and hence  $P(\varphi_t) = 0$  for  $t \geq 1$ . This is regardless of the existence of equilibrium states, which, for  $t > 1$ , can only be measures for which  $\lambda(\mu) = h_\mu(f) = 0$ . This means that the function  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is not differentiable at  $t = 1$ : we say that there is a *phase transition* at 1. See Section 7 for more details on the phase transition, and on maps without equilibrium states.

For unimodal Collet-Eckmann maps, the map  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is analytic in a neighbourhood of 1, as was shown in [BK]. The following theorem (the proof of which introduces many of the ideas used for Theorem 1) generalises this result to all  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  satisfying (3), and gives results on equilibrium states also.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  is transitive with negative Schwarzian derivative and  $\varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$ . If  $f$  is Collet-Eckmann, then there exist  $t_1 < 1 < t_2$  such that for  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$*

- (a)  $(I, f, \varphi_t)$  has a unique equilibrium state  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$ ;
- (b) for  $\mu_{\varphi_t} \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , there is a compatible inducing scheme with respect to which  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$  has exponential tails;
- (c) the map  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is analytic.

A key component of the proof of the analyticity of  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is to ensure that we have inducing schemes which are compatible with the corresponding equilibrium states. As mentioned above, for strongly regular unimodal maps [PSe3] produces an inducing scheme compatible with all equilibrium states for  $\varphi_t$  for all  $t$  in a neighbourhood of  $[0, 1]$ . Therefore our proof in Section 6 of analyticity of  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  also holds for strongly regular unimodal maps for all  $t$  in a neighbourhood of  $[0, 1]$ .

**1.3. Inducing schemes and lifting measures.** We say that  $(X, F, \tau)$  is an *inducing scheme* over  $(I, f)$  if

- $X$  is an interval containing a (countable) collection of disjoint intervals  $X_i$  such that  $F$  maps each  $X_i$  diffeomorphically onto  $X$ , with bounded distortion;
- $F|_{X_i} = f^{\tau_i}$  for some  $\tau_i \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ .

The function  $\tau : \cup_i X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  defined by  $\tau(x) = \tau_i$  if  $x \in X_i$  is called the *inducing time*. It may happen that  $\tau(x)$  is the first return time of  $x$  to  $X$ , but that is certainly not the general case. For ease of notation, we will often suppress the return time  $\tau$ :  $(X, F, \tau) = (X, F)$ .

Let  $(X, F)^\infty := \cap_n F^{-n}(\cup_i X_i)$  be the set of points on which all iterates of  $F$  are defined. We reiterate that we call a measure  $\mu$  *compatible* to the inducing scheme if

- $\mu(X) > 0$  and  $\mu(X \setminus (X, F)^\infty) = 0$ , and
- there exists a measure  $\mu_F$  which projects to  $\mu$  by (4) below, and in particular  $\int_X \tau d\mu_F < \infty$ .

Our main theorems deal with equilibrium states in  $\mathcal{M}_+$ . Although measures in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  may not always be compatible to a specific inducing scheme, they are all compatible to some inducing scheme. Given an inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$ , we say that a measure  $\mu_F$  is a *lift* of  $\mu$  if for all  $\mu$ -measurable subsets  $A \subset I$ ,

$$(4) \quad \mu(A) = \frac{1}{\int_X \tau d\mu_F} \sum_i \sum_{k=0}^{\tau_i-1} \mu_F(X_i \cap f^{-k}(A)).$$

Conversely, given a measure  $\mu_F$  for  $(X, F)$ , we say that  $\mu_F$  *projects* to  $\mu$  if (4) holds.

The following theorem gives us a method for finding inducing schemes, which are naturally related to measures of positive Lyapunov exponent.

**Theorem 3.** *If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , then there is an inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$  and a measure  $\mu_F$  on  $X$  such that  $\int_X \tau d\mu_F < \infty$ . Here  $\mu_F$  is the lifted measure of  $\mu$  (i.e.,  $\mu$  and  $\mu_F$  are related by (4)). Moreover, if  $\Omega$  is the transitive component supporting  $\mu$  then  $(X, F)^\infty = X \cap \Omega$ .*

*Conversely, if  $(X, F, \tau)$  is an inducing scheme and  $\mu_F$  an ergodic  $F$ -invariant measure such that  $\int_X \tau d\mu_F < \infty$ , then  $\mu_F$  projects to a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg}$  with positive Lyapunov exponent.*

We would like to highlight another important set of results in this paper, which will be explained more fully later: We will also show that all ‘relevant measures’ in this paper lift to a fixed inducing scheme, see Propositions 1 and 3 and Lemmas 9.

The potential  $\varphi_t$  (or  $-t \log |Jf|$  in a wider setting, where  $Jf$  is the Jacobian of the map) has geometric importance if  $t$  is the dimension of the phase space, because then the equilibrium state can often be shown to be absolutely continuous with respect to  $t$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. One can also consider other potentials: e.g. the seminal paper by Bowen [Bo] applies to the class of Hölder potentials. In the setting of interval maps, interesting results and examples were given by Hofbauer and Keller [HK2] for potentials with bounded variation. Our methods extend to such potentials as well. We develop this theory in [BT2].

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 gives preliminaries on (Gurevich) pressure, recurrence, and gives an important result on symbolic systems, due to Sarig. Also we review basic results for interval maps. Section 3 explains how to find inducing schemes using the Hofbauer tower, which have the important property of being first return map on this tower, even if the inducing scheme is not the first return on the original system  $(I, f)$ . Theorem 3 is proved here as well. In Section 4 we prove Proposition 2, which gives the basic framework of the existence and uniqueness proofs. Section 5 is devoted to the main part of the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 (using estimates from [BLS]). In Section 6, we show that most equilibrium states in this paper can be obtained from a Young tower with exponential tails (see [Y] for definitions), and discuss several consequences of this remarkable fact, including the concluding part of Theorems 1 and 2: the analyticity of the pressure function. Finally in Section 7, we discuss the hypotheses of our main theorems and give counter-examples that show that these hypotheses cannot be easily relaxed.

*Acknowledgements:* We would like to thank Ian Melbourne, Mariusz Urbański, Peter Raith and Benoît Saussol for fruitful discussions and comments on (earlier) versions of this paper. We are especially grateful to Neil Dobbs whose remarks have led to substantial clarification and strengthening of parts of this paper. We would also like to thank the referees for useful comments.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Measures and pressure.** If  $(X, T)$  is a dynamical system with potential  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , then the measure  $m$  is  $\Phi$ -conformal if

$$m(T(A)) = \int_A e^{-\Phi(x)} dm(x)$$

whenever  $T : A \rightarrow T(A)$  is one-to-one. In other words,  $dm \circ T(x) = e^{-\Phi(x)} dm(x)$ . We define the transfer operator for the potential  $\Phi$  as

$$\mathcal{L}_\Phi g(y) := \sum_{T(y)=x} e^{\Phi(y)} g(x).$$

We want to show that whatever inducing scheme we start with, the invariant measure we get on  $I$  is unique. One of the key tools is the following theorem which is the main result of [Sa3]. Assume that  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{X_i\}$  is a Markov partition of  $X$  such that  $T : X_i \rightarrow X$  is injective for each  $X_i \in \mathcal{S}_1$ . We say that  $(X, T)$  has the *big images and preimages (BIP)* property if, there exist  $X_1, \dots, X_N \in \mathcal{S}_1$  such that for every  $X_k \in \mathcal{S}_1$  there are  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and  $x \in X_i$  such that  $T(x) \in X_k$  and  $T^2(x) \in X_j$ .

Suppose that  $(X, T)$  is topologically mixing. For every  $X_i \in \mathcal{S}_1$  and  $n \geq 1$  let

$$Z_n(\Phi, X_i) := \sum_{T^n x = x} e^{\Phi_n(x)} 1_{X_i}(x),$$

where  $\Phi_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Phi \circ T^j(x)$ . Let

$$Z_n^*(\Phi, X_i) := \sum_{\substack{T^n x = x, \\ T^k x \notin X_i \text{ for } 0 < k < n}} e^{\Phi_n(x)} 1_{X_i}(x).$$

We define the *Gurevich pressure* of  $\Phi$  as

$$(5) \quad P_G(\Phi) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\Phi, X_i).$$

This limit exists, is independent of the choice of  $X_i$  and it is  $> -\infty$ , see [Sa1]. To simplify the notation, we will often suppress the dependence of  $Z_n(\Phi, X_i)$  and  $Z_n^*(\Phi, X_i)$  on  $X_i$ . Furthermore, if  $\|\mathcal{L}_\Phi 1\|_\infty < \infty$  then  $P_G(\Phi) < \infty$ , see Proposition 1 of [Sa1].

The potential  $\Phi$  is said to be *recurrent* if

$$(6) \quad \sum_n \lambda^{-n} Z_n(\Phi) = \infty \text{ for } \lambda = \exp P_G(\Phi).$$

Moreover,  $\Phi$  is called *positive recurrent* if it is recurrent and  $\sum_n n \lambda^{-n} Z_n^*(\Phi) = \infty$ . The  $n$ -th variation of  $\Phi$  is

$$(7) \quad V_n(\Phi) := \sup_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{S}_n} \sup_{x, y \in \mathbf{C}_n} |\Phi(x) - \Phi(y)|,$$

where  $\mathcal{S}_n = \bigvee_{j=0}^{n-1} T^{-j}(\mathcal{S}_1)$  is the  $n$ -joint of the Markov partition  $\mathcal{S}_1$ .

**Theorem 4** ([Sa3]). *If  $(X, T)$  is topologically mixing and  $\sum_{n \geq 1} V_n(\Phi) < \infty$ , then  $\Phi$  has an invariant Gibbs measure (with Gibbs constant  $P_G(\Phi)$ ) if and only if  $A$  has the BIP property and  $P_G(\Phi) < \infty$ . Moreover the Gibbs measure  $\mu_\Phi$  has the following properties:*

- (a) *If  $h_{\mu_\Phi}(T) < \infty$  or  $-\int \Phi d\mu_\Phi < \infty$  then  $\mu_\Phi$  is the unique equilibrium state (in particular,  $P(\Phi) = h_{\mu_\Phi}(T) + \int_X \Phi d\mu_\Phi$ );*
- (b) *If  $\|\mathcal{L}_\Phi 1\|_\infty < \infty$  then the Variational Principle holds, i.e.,  $P_G(\Phi) = P(\Phi) (= h_{\mu_\Phi}(T) + \int_X \Phi d\mu_\Phi)$ ;*
- (c)  *$\mu_\Phi$  is finite and  $\mu_\Phi = \rho_\Phi dm_\Phi$  where  $\mathcal{L}_\Phi \rho_\Phi = \lambda \rho_\Phi$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\Phi^* m_\Phi = \lambda m_\Phi$  for  $\lambda = e^{P_G(\Phi)}$ , i.e.,  $m_\Phi(TA) = \int_A e^{\Phi - \log \lambda} dm_\Phi$ ;*
- (d) *This  $\rho_\Phi$  is unique and  $m_\Phi$  is the unique  $(\Phi - \log \lambda)$ -conformal probability measure.*

Note that because  $\mu_\Phi$  is a Gibbs measure,  $\mu_\Phi(\mathbf{C}_n) > 0$  for every cylinder set  $\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{S}_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In the paper of Mauldin & Urbański [MU] several similar results can be found, although they use a different approach to pressure, taking the supremum of  $\Phi_n$  on cylinder sets rather than the value of  $\Phi_n$  at periodic points.

**2.2. Interval maps.** An interval map  $(I, f)$  is called *piecewise monotone* if there is a finite partition  $\mathcal{P}_1$  into maximal intervals on which  $f$  is diffeomorphic. We call this partition the *branch partition*. We will assume that  $f$  is  $C^2$ ; negative Schwarzian derivative in this  $C^2$  context means that  $1/\sqrt{|Df|}$  is a convex function on each  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{P}_1$ .

**Remark 1.** *The negative Schwarzian derivative condition allows us to use the Koebe Lemma for distortion control of the branches of the induced maps we obtain later. However if  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  is  $C^3$  and there are no neutral periodic cycles, then it is unnecessary to assume negative Schwarzian derivative. This was proved in the unimodal setting by Kozłowski [Ko], and later for  $f \in C^{2+\eta}$  in [T]. In the multimodal setting for  $f \in C^3$  this was proved by van Strien and Vargas [SV].*

Let  $\mathcal{P}_n = \bigvee_{k=0}^{n-1} f^{-k} \mathcal{P}_1$ . Elements  $\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$  are called *n-cylinders*. Similarly to (7), the *n-th variation* of a potential  $\varphi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined as

$$V_n(\varphi) = \sup_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sup_{x, y \in \mathbf{C}_n} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|.$$

The *non-wandering set*  $\Omega$  of  $f$  is the set of points  $x$  having arbitrarily small neighbourhoods  $U$  such that  $f^n(U) \cap U \neq \emptyset$  for some  $n \geq 1$ . Piecewise monotone  $C^2$  maps have non-wandering sets that split into a finite or countable number of *transitive* components  $\Omega_k$  such that each  $\Omega_k$  contains a dense orbit, see [HR] and references therein. A transitive component is one of the following:

- ( $\Omega 1$ ) A finite union of intervals, cyclically permuted by  $f$ . This is the most interesting case, and Lemma 2(a) in Section 3 gives its description on the



Hofbauer tower.

- ( $\Omega 2$ ) A Cantor set if  $f$  is *infinitely renormalisable*, *i.e.*, there is an infinite sequence of periodic intervals  $J_n$  of increasing periods, and  $\Omega = \bigcap_n \text{orb}(J_n)$ . Measures on such components have  $\lambda(\mu) = 0$ , see [MSt] and [SV, Theorem D] for the multimodal case. For maps that are only piecewise  $C^2$ , this is no longer true, see Section 7.
- ( $\Omega 3$ ) If  $f$  is (finitely) renormalisable, say it has a periodic interval  $J \neq I$ , then the set of points that avoid  $\text{orb}(J)$  contains a transitive component as well. This is usually a Cantor set, but it could be a finite set (e.g. if  $f$  is the Feigenbaum map). For infinitely renormalisable maps, there are countably many transitive components of this type. Lemma 2(b) in Section 3 gives its description on the Hofbauer tower.

We will state our results for transitive interval maps, but they can be applied equally well to  $(\Omega_k, f)$  for any component  $\Omega_k$  of the non-wandering set. In all our main theorems we assume that  $(\Omega, f)$  is *topologically mixing* (*i.e.*, every iterate of  $f$  is topologically transitive). This can be achieved by taking a transitive component of an appropriate iterate of  $f$ .

Inducing schemes  $(X, F)$  will perform the role of  $(X, T)$  of the previous section, with  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{X_i\}$ . Since  $F$  maps  $X_i$  onto  $X$ , the BIP property is automatically satisfied provided  $F$  is transitive (if not, we can always select a transitive component). Let us denote the collection of  $n$ -cylinders of the inducing scheme by  $\mathcal{S}_n$ . A priori,  $\mathcal{S}_n$  is not connected to  $\bigcup_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_m$ , *i.e.*, the cylinder sets of the branch partition  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . In this paper, however, we will always take  $X$  to be a subset of  $\bigcup_k \mathcal{P}_k$ , and in that case the  $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_n \subset \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{P}_k$ .

Given a potential  $\varphi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let the *lifted potential*  $\Phi$  be defined by  $\Phi(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\tau_i-1} \varphi \circ f^j(y)$  for  $y \in X_i$ . We say that  $\Phi$  has *summable variations* if  $\sum_{n \geq 1} V_n(\Phi) < \infty$ , and that  $\Phi$  is *weakly Hölder continuous* if there exist  $C_\Phi > 0$  and  $0 < \lambda_\Phi < 1$  such that  $V_n(\Phi) \leq C_\Phi \lambda_\Phi^n$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Clearly if  $\Phi$  is weakly Hölder continuous then  $\Phi$  has summable variations.

We use summability of variations to control distortion of  $\Phi_n(x) = \Phi(x) + \dots + \Phi \circ F^{n-1}(x)$ , but for the potential  $\varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$ , we can also use the Koebe Lemma provided  $f$  has negative Schwarzian derivative: If  $X' \supset X$  such that  $X'$  is a  $\delta$ -scaled neighbourhood of  $X$ , *i.e.*, both components of  $X' \setminus X$  have length  $\geq \delta |X|$ , and  $f^k : X_i \rightarrow X$  extends diffeomorphically to  $f^k : X'_i \rightarrow X'$ , then

$$(8) \quad \frac{|Df^k(y)|}{|Df^k(x)|} < \frac{1 + 2\delta}{\delta^2} + 1$$

for all  $x, y \in X_i$ .

*Notation.* In this paper we say  $A_n \asymp B_n$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_n}{B_n} = 1$ . We will also say that  $A \asymp_{dis} B$  if  $A$  is equal to  $B$  up to some distortion constant. Similarly we write  $A \leq_{dis} B$  if  $A$  is less than or equal to  $B$  up to some distortion constant.

## 3. FINDING INDUCING SCHEMES

In this section we will prove Theorem 3. The idea relies on the construction of the *canonical Markov extension*  $(\hat{I}, \hat{f})$  of the interval map. A measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  can be lifted to  $(\hat{I}, \hat{f})$ , see [K1], and in this space a first return map to a specific subset  $\hat{X} \subset \hat{I}$  gives rise to the inducing scheme.

**3.1. Hofbauer towers.** The canonical Markov extension (commonly called *Hofbauer tower*), was introduced by Hofbauer and Keller, see e.g. [H, K1]; it is a disjoint union of subintervals  $D = f^n(\mathbf{C}_n)$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$ , called *domains*, where  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is the branch partition. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the collection of all such domains. For completeness, let  $\mathcal{P}_0$  denote the partition of  $I$  consisting of the single set  $I$ , and call  $D_0 = f^0(I)$  the *base* of the Hofbauer tower. Then

$$\hat{I} = \sqcup_{n \geq 0} \sqcup_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n} f^n(\mathbf{C}_n) / \sim,$$

where  $f^n(\mathbf{C}_n) \sim f^m(\mathbf{C}_m)$  as members of the disjoint union if  $f^n(\mathbf{C}_n) = f^m(\mathbf{C}_m)$  as subsets of  $I$ . Let  $\pi : \hat{I} \rightarrow I$  be the inclusion map. Points  $\hat{x} \in \hat{I}$  can be written as  $(x, D)$  if  $D$  is the domain that  $\hat{x}$  belongs to and  $x = \pi(\hat{x})$ . The map  $\hat{f} : \hat{I} \rightarrow \hat{I}$  is defined as

$$\hat{f}(\hat{x}) = \hat{f}(x, D) = (f(x), D')$$

if there are cylinder sets  $\mathbf{C}_n \supset \mathbf{C}_{n+1}$  such that  $x \in f^n(\mathbf{C}_{n+1}) \subset f^n(\mathbf{C}_n) = D$  and  $D' = f^{n+1}(\mathbf{C}_{n+1})$ . In this case, we write  $D \rightarrow D'$ , giving  $(\mathcal{D}, \rightarrow)$  the structure of a directed graph. Every  $n$ -cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_n$  defines an  $n$ -path  $D_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow D_n$  starting at the base of the Hofbauer tower so that if  $x \in \mathbf{C}_n$ , then  $\hat{x} := \pi^{-1}(x) \cap D_0$  follows this path and  $f^n(\mathbf{C}_n) = D_n$ . Notice that  $(\hat{I}, \hat{f})$  is a Markov map in the sense that the image of any domain  $D$  is the union of domains of  $\hat{I}$ . Obviously,  $\pi \circ \hat{f} = f \circ \pi$ .

For each  $R \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\hat{I}_R$  be the compact part of the Hofbauer tower defined by

$$\hat{I}_R := \bigcup \{D \in \mathcal{D} : \text{there exists a path } D_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow D \text{ of length } r \leq R\}$$

A subgraph  $(\mathcal{E}, \rightarrow)$  is called *closed* if  $D \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $D \rightarrow D'$  implies that  $D' \in \mathcal{E}$ . It is *primitive* if for every pair  $D, D' \in \mathcal{E}$ , there is a path from  $D$  to  $D'$  within  $\mathcal{E}$ . Clearly any two distinct maximal primitive subgraphs are disjoint.

There are several key differences between the Hofbauer tower and the Rokhlin-Kakutani or Young tower (for details of these towers see Section 6). For example, in contrast to the Hofbauer tower, there are usually points which the latter kind of tower does not ‘see’. On the other hand they usually have some bounded distortion, which Hofbauer towers do not.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $f : I \rightarrow I$  be a multimodal map and  $\Omega$  is a transitive component.*

- (a) *If  $\Omega$  consists of a finite union of intervals, then there is a closed primitive subgraph  $(\mathcal{E}, \rightarrow)$  of  $(\mathcal{D}, \rightarrow)$  containing a dense  $\hat{f}$ -orbit and such that  $\Omega = \pi(\cup_{D \in \mathcal{E}} D)$ .*
- (b) *If  $\Omega$  is a Cantor (or finite) set avoiding a periodic interval of  $J$ , then there is a (non-closed) primitive subgraph  $(\mathcal{E}, \rightarrow)$  of  $(\mathcal{D}, \rightarrow)$  such that  $\Omega \subset \pi(\cup_{D \in \mathcal{E}} D)$ , and there is a dense  $\hat{f}$ -orbit in  $(\cup_{D \in \mathcal{E}} D) \cap \pi^{-1}(\Omega)$ .*

The arguments for this lemma are implicit in [H, HR] combined. We will give a self-contained proof in the appendix.

**3.2. Types of inducing schemes.** We will use first return maps to various well-chosen subsets  $\hat{X} \subset \hat{I}$  to produce inducing scheme for the original system  $(I, f)$ , in accordance with the main message of [B1] that ‘good’ inducing schemes  $(X, F)$  always correspond to first return maps of  $(\hat{I}, \hat{f})$ . Here we need the branches of  $F$  to have uniform distortion bounds, for which we use (a  $C^2$  version of) the Koebe lemma. So fix relative Koebe space  $\delta > 0$  and let  $X \subset I$  be an interval (we will choose  $X$  to be an  $n$ -cylinder for some  $n$ ), and take the interval  $Y$  concentric with  $X$  such that  $|Y| = (1 + 2\delta)|X|$ . The construction of  $F$  will be such that whenever  $X_i$  is a branch domain of  $F$ , say  $F|_{X_i} = f^{\tau_i}$ , then there is a neighbourhood  $Y_i \supset X_i$  such that  $f^{\tau_i}$  maps  $Y_i$  monotonically onto  $Y$ . Inducing schemes with this property are called  $\delta$ -*extendible* or just *extendible*. The Koebe Lemma then ensures that the distortion  $\sup_{x,y \in X_i} \frac{|DF(x)|}{|DF(y)|} \leq K = K(\delta)$  as in (8), and this bound is uniform over all branches of  $F^n$  and  $n \geq 1$ .

There are different choices of sets  $\hat{X}$  with first return map producing an extendible inducing scheme. Theorem 3 deals with the simplest construction, namely where  $\hat{X}$  is an interval within a single domain  $D \in \mathcal{E}$  with  $\pi(\hat{X}) = X$  and  $\pi(D) \supset Y$ . A more involved construction, where  $\hat{X} \subset \pi^{-1}(X)$  is a ‘column’ consisting intervals in (possibly infinitely) many intervals domains, is useful too, as it is shown to correspond to a ‘first  $\delta$ -extendible return map’, see [B1] and Lemma 3. We call an inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$  a *first  $\delta$ -extendible return time to  $X$*  if for each  $x \in X_i$ ,  $\tau(x)$  is the smallest positive iterate such that  $f^j(x) \in X$  and there is a neighbourhood  $Y_i \supset X_i$  such that  $f^j$  maps  $Y_i$  monotonically onto  $Y$ .

We call these two constructions Type A and Type B and the details are as follows:

**Type A inducing scheme (single domain):** Take a domain  $D$  in the transitive part  $\mathcal{E}$  of the Hofbauer tower such that  $\pi(D) \supset Y$ , and let  $\hat{X} := \pi^{-1}(X) \cap D$ . As  $X = \mathbf{C}_n$  is a cylinder set, the boundary points of  $X$  are precritical and will not revisit  $X$  before they reach Crit. This means  $\hat{X}$  is *nice* in the sense that  $\hat{f}^k(\partial\hat{X}) \cap \hat{X} = \emptyset$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  because points in  $\pi^{-1}(\text{Crit})$  map to the boundary of domains, and hence never into the interior of any domain. Let  $\hat{F} : \hat{X} \rightarrow \hat{X}$  be the first return map; let  $\hat{\tau}(x) \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $\hat{F}(x) = \hat{f}^{\hat{\tau}(x)}(\hat{x})$  for each  $\hat{x} \in \hat{X}$  on which  $\hat{F}$  is defined. By the Markov property of  $\hat{f}$ ,  $\hat{x}$  has a neighbourhood  $U$  such that  $\hat{f}^{\hat{\tau}(\hat{x})}$  maps  $U$  monotonically onto  $D$ . Therefore there is a neighbourhood  $V \subset U$  such that  $\hat{f}^{\hat{\tau}(\hat{x})}$  maps  $V$  monotonically onto  $\hat{X}$ . Since  $\pi(\hat{X}) = X$  is a cylinder set,  $\text{orb}(\partial\hat{X}) \cap \hat{X} = \emptyset$ . It follows that  $\hat{\tau}(\hat{y}) = \hat{\tau}(\hat{x})$  for all  $\hat{y} \in V$ .

The inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$  is defined by  $X = \pi(\hat{X})$ ,  $F = \pi \circ \hat{F} \circ \pi^{-1}|_{\hat{X}}$  and  $\tau(x) = \hat{\tau}(\pi^{-1}(x) \cap \hat{X})$ . This means that each branch  $F : X_i \rightarrow X$  extends to  $Y$ , and hence by the Koebe Lemma has bounded distortion as in (8).

**Type B inducing scheme (column of domains):** Choose

$$(9) \quad \hat{X} = \sqcup \{D \cap \pi^{-1}(X) : D \in \mathcal{D}, \pi(D) \supset Y\}, .$$

The same argument as under Type A shows that  $\hat{f}^k(\partial X) \cap \hat{X} = \emptyset$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $r_{\hat{X}}$  denote the first return time to  $\hat{X}$ . In [B1] it is shown that given  $x \in X$ , for any  $\hat{x}, \hat{y} \in \hat{X}$  such that  $\pi(\hat{x}) = \pi(\hat{y})$ ,  $r_{\hat{X}}(\hat{x}) = r_{\hat{X}}(\hat{y})$ . So we can define  $(X, F)$  by  $F(x) = f^{r_{\hat{X}}(\hat{x})}$  for any  $\hat{x}$  such that  $\pi(\hat{x}) = x$ . Again the Koebe Lemma implies that  $(X, F)$  has bounded distortion as in (8). In [B1] it is shown that if  $(X, F, \tau)$  is a first  $\delta$ -extendible return scheme it is also a Type B inducing scheme.

**3.3. Lifting measures to the Hofbauer tower.** Recall that  $D_0 = I = f^0(\mathbf{C}_0)$  is the base of the Hofbauer tower. Let  $i : I \rightarrow D_0$  be the trivial bijection map (inclusion) such that  $i^{-1} = \pi|_{D_0}$ . Given a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg}$ , let  $\hat{\mu}_0 = \mu \circ i^{-1}$ , and

$$(10) \quad \hat{\mu}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \hat{\mu}_0 \circ \hat{f}^{-k}.$$

We say that  $\mu$  is *liftable* to  $(\hat{I}, \hat{f})$  if there exists a weak accumulation point  $\hat{\mu}$  of the sequence  $\{\hat{\mu}_n\}_n$  with  $\hat{\mu} \neq 0$ .

**Remark 2.** *If  $\mu$  is liftable and ergodic, then  $\hat{\mu}$  is an ergodic  $\hat{f}$ -invariant probability measure on  $\hat{I}$ , see [K1]*

*Proof of Theorem 3.* First assume that  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ . Keller [K1] showed that if  $\mu$  is not atomic then it is liftable,  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{I}) = \mu(I) = 1$  and  $\hat{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1} = \mu$ . If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  is atomic, it must be supported on a hyperbolic repelling periodic cycle. It is easy to show that such measures are liftable. In both cases, [K1] shows that  $\hat{\mu}$  is also ergodic.

We suppose that  $X \in \mathcal{P}_n$  is a cylinder,  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  is a domain and  $\hat{X} \subset D$  is a set with  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{X}) > 0$ . We let  $(X, F, \tau)$  be the corresponding Type A inducing scheme.

Let  $\Omega$  be the transitive component supporting  $\mu$ . If  $\Omega$  is an interval as in case (Ω1), then we take  $D$  inside the closed transitive subgraph of  $(\mathcal{D}, \rightarrow)$  as guaranteed by Lemma 2(a). Take any open interval  $U \subset X$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_1$  generates the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra there is an  $n$ -cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_n \subset U$ ; we let  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n = \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{C}_n) \cap D$ . It follows that  $\hat{f}^n(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n) = D'$  for some domain  $D'$  in the same transitive component of the Hofbauer tower as  $D$ . Hence there is an  $m$ -path  $D' \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow D$  and a subcylinder  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n+m} \subset \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n$  such that  $\hat{f}^{n+m}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n+m}) = D$ . Therefore  $\pi(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n+m}) \subset U$  contains a domain  $X_i$ . It follows that  $\cup_i X_i$  is dense in  $X$ . Repeating the argument for  $U \subset X_i$  we find that  $F^{-1}(\cup_i X_i)$  is dense in  $X$ , and by induction,  $(X, F)^\infty$  is dense in  $X$  as well. (Notice that this construction may produce many branches  $X_i$  such that  $\mu(X_i) = 0$ , but this does not affect the result.)

If  $\Omega$  is as in case (Ω2) then  $\mathcal{M}_+ = \emptyset$  so there is nothing to show. This is proved for the unimodal case in [MSt]; the multimodal case is similar, the required ‘real bounds’ follow from [SV]. If  $\Omega$  is Cantor (or finite) set of points avoiding a periodic interval of  $f$  as in case (Ω3), then Lemma 2(b) still provides us with a primitive subgraph, and the same argument as above shows that  $(X, F)^\infty$  is dense in  $X \cap \Omega$ .

Let  $\hat{\mu}_{\hat{X}} := \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}(\hat{X})} \hat{\mu}|_{\hat{X}}$  be the conditional measure on  $\hat{X}$ . The measure  $\mu_F := \hat{\mu}_{\hat{X}} \circ \pi^{-1}|_{\hat{X}}$  is clearly  $F$ -invariant, and by Kac's Lemma,

$$\int_X \tau \, d\mu_F = \int_{\hat{X}} \hat{\tau} \, d\hat{\mu}_{\hat{X}} = \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}(\hat{X})} < \infty.$$

Finally, by the Poincaré Recurrence Theorem,  $\hat{\mu}_{\hat{X}}$ -a.e. point  $\hat{x} \in \hat{X}$  returns infinitely often to  $\hat{X}$ , and because  $\mu_F \ll \mu$  we also get  $\mu((X, F)^\infty) = \mu(X)$  by ergodicity.

Now for the other direction, notice that by assumption, each branch of any iterate  $F^n$  of the induced map has negative Schwarzian derivative. Therefore distortion is bounded uniformly over  $n$  and the branches of  $F^n$ . Hence, by taking an iterate of the induced map  $F$  if necessary, we can assume that  $F$  is uniformly expanding. It follows by  $F$ -invariance of  $\mu_F$  that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \frac{1}{n} \int_{(X, F)^\infty} \log |DF^n| \, d\mu_F \\ &= \int_{(X, F)^\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |DF \circ F^j| \, d\mu_F = \int_{(X, F)^\infty} \log |DF| \, d\mu_F = \lambda(\mu_F). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mu$  be the projected measure of  $\mu_F$ ; both  $\mu_F$  and  $\mu$  are ergodic. Since  $\int \tau \, d\mu_F < \infty$ , we can take a point  $x \in (X, F)^\infty$  which is typical for both  $\mu_F$  and  $\mu$ . Let  $\tau_k = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \tau \circ F^j(x)$ . Then applying the Ergodic Theorem several times, we get  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau_k}{k} = \int \tau \, d\mu_F < \infty$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\mu) &= \int_I \log |Df| \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |Df \circ f^j(x)| \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau_k} \sum_{j=0}^{\tau_k-1} \log |Df \circ f^j(x)| \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{\tau_k} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \log |DF \circ F^j(x)| = \frac{1}{\int \tau \, d\mu_F} \lambda(\mu_F) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** If  $\lambda(\mu) > 0$  but  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset \text{orb}(\text{Crit})$  and  $\mu$  is the equidistribution on a repelling periodic orbit, say  $\text{supp}(\mu) = \text{orb}(p)$  where  $f^n(p) = p$ , then we can still find an inducing scheme compatible to  $\mu$ . Let  $X \ni p$  be an open interval such that the component of  $f^{-n}(X)$  containing  $p$  is compactly contained in  $X$ . Call this component  $X_1$ . Then  $(X, F, \tau)$  with  $F|_{X_1} = f^\tau|_{X_1} = f^n|_{X_1}$  is an inducing scheme compatible to  $\mu$ .

**Remark 4.** If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  then Remark 2 implies that  $\hat{\mu}$  is ergodic. If  $\Omega$  is as in Lemma 2(a) we also have that  $\hat{\mu}$  is supported on  $\mathcal{E}$ . That lemma implies that for any  $\hat{x} \in \hat{I} \setminus \partial\mathcal{D}$  there is  $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{E}$  so that  $\pi(\hat{x}) = \pi(\hat{y})$ . Thus there exists  $n \geq 0$  so that  $\hat{f}^n(\hat{x}) = \hat{f}^n(\hat{y})$ . So  $\hat{\mu}(\mathcal{E}) = 1$  follows by ergodicity.

- Remark 5.** (a)  $\overline{(X, F)^\infty} = X$  implies that given a measure  $\mu_F$  obtained from Theorem 4, the measure  $\mu$ , the projection of  $\mu_F$ , has  $\mu(U) > 0$  for any open set  $U$  in  $\cup_n f^n(X)$ .
- (b) If  $(X, F, \tau)$  comes from Theorem 3, then  $\mu$  is compatible to it if and only if  $\mu((X, F)^\infty) > 0$ ; for more general inducing schemes, this equivalence is false.
- (c) Note that  $\int \tau d\mu < \infty$  does not always imply that  $\int \tau d\mu_F < \infty$ , see [Z].

The following lemma shows that Theorem 3 also holds for Type B inducing schemes.

**Lemma 3.** *If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  then there exists  $\delta > 0$  and an interval  $X \subset I$  such that  $\mu$  is compatible to the corresponding Type B inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$ . Moreover, if  $\Omega$  is the transitive component supporting  $\mu$  then  $\overline{(X, F)^\infty} = X \cap \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* As we noted in the proof of Theorem 3, since  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ ,  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{I}) > 0$ . We choose  $X$  and  $\delta > 0$  so that the set  $\hat{X}$  as in (9) has  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{X}) > 0$ . As in [B1], this can be used to prove that  $\mu$  is compatible to  $(X, F, \tau)$ .

The proof that  $\overline{(X, F)^\infty} = X \cap \Omega$  follows as in the proof of Theorem 3.  $\square$

**3.4. Lifting measures of large free energy.** Theorem 3 exploits the fact that measures with positive Lyapunov exponents are liftable; but their lifts do not, in general, give similar mass to the same parts in the Hofbauer tower. The next result shows that measures with entropy uniformly bounded away from 0 lift, and give mass uniformly to specific compact subsets of the Hofbauer tower. The proof is postponed to the appendix.

**Lemma 4.** *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there are  $R \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\eta > 0$  such that if  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg}$  has entropy  $h_\mu(f) \geq \varepsilon$ , then  $\mu$  is liftable to the Hofbauer tower and  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{I}_R) \geq \eta$ . Furthermore, there is a set  $\hat{E}$ , depending only on  $\varepsilon$ , such that  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{E}) > \eta/2$  and  $\min_{D \in \mathcal{D} \cap \hat{I}_R} d(\hat{E} \cap D, \partial D) > 0$ .*

**Remark 6.** *One consequence of this lemma is that the choice of  $\delta$  in defining Type B inducing schemes depends only on the entropy of  $\mu$ . Another consequence is that given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can choose  $\delta > 0$  and set of  $N = N(\varepsilon) < \infty$  inducing schemes  $(X^1, F^1), \dots, (X^N, F^N)$  so that any measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  with  $h_\mu > \varepsilon$  is compatible to some  $(X^k, F_k)$ . The details of this are as follows.*

*Lemma 4 says that given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon)$  and  $\hat{E} = \hat{E}(\varepsilon)$ , a compact set bounded away from  $\partial \mathcal{D}$ , so that  $h_\mu(f) > \varepsilon$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  implies  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{E}) > \eta$ . So there is a finite collection of cylinder sets  $X^1, \dots, X^N$ , so that if we create the sets  $\hat{X}^k \subset \pi^{-1}(X^k)$  in the same way (i.e., as for Type A or as for Type B), then  $\hat{E} \subset \left( \cup_{1 \leq k \leq N} \hat{X}^k \right)$ . In this case we say that  $\{\hat{X}^k\}_{1 \leq k \leq N}$  satisfies property *Cover*( $\varepsilon$ ). Since  $\min_{D \in \mathcal{D} \cap \hat{I}_R} d(\hat{E} \cap D, \partial D) > 0$ , we can choose these cylinder sets so that the corresponding inducing schemes are all  $\delta$ -extendible for some  $\delta > 0$ .*

Notice that by Remark 4, we can suppose that  $\hat{E} \subset \mathcal{E}$ . We will use this lemma in connection with Case 4 of Proposition 2 in the next section to carry out the proofs of Theorems 2 and 1. In principle, these results deal with measures in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  that possibly have zero entropy. However, the next lemma shows that our equilibrium states need to have both positive Lyapunov exponent and entropy.

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  satisfies (1). Then there exists  $\zeta_1 < 0$  so that for  $t \in (\zeta_1, 1)$ , there exist  $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon > 0$  so that any measure  $\nu$  with  $h_\nu(f) + \int \varphi_t d\nu > P(\varphi_t) - \varepsilon_0$  satisfies  $h_\nu(f) \geq \varepsilon$ . Similarly, if  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  satisfies (3) then there exist  $\zeta_1 < 0 < \zeta_2$  so that for  $t \in (\zeta_1, 1 + \zeta_2)$ , there exist  $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon > 0$  so that any measure  $\nu$  with  $h_\nu(f) + \int \varphi_t d\nu > P(\varphi_t) - \varepsilon_0$  satisfies  $h_\nu(f) \geq \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Any transitive map satisfying (1) has an acip  $\mu$  with  $h_\mu(f) = \lambda(\mu) > 0$ . Applying (2) and Ruelle's inequality [Ru1], we obtain that  $P(\varphi_t) > 0$  for  $t < 1$ . We let  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(t) := P(\varphi_t)/2$ . Therefore, it is easy to see that for all  $t \in [0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(t) > 0$  such that  $h_\nu(f) + \int \varphi_t d\nu > P(\varphi_t)/2$  implies  $h_\nu(f) > \varepsilon$ . For the case  $t < 0$ , let  $\zeta_1 := -\frac{h_{top}(f)}{4 \sup\{\lambda(\nu) : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg}\}}$ . Then  $h_\nu(f) + \int \varphi_t d\nu > P(\varphi_t)/2$  implies  $h_\nu(f) > P(\varphi_t)/2 - t\lambda(\nu)$ . Since  $P(\varphi_t) > h_{top}(f)$ , for  $t \in (\zeta_1, 0)$  we obtain  $h_\nu(f) > h_{top}(f)/4$ .

Next assume that the Collet-Eckmann condition (3) holds. We can choose  $\zeta_1$  as above. Define  $\underline{\lambda} := \inf\{\lambda(\nu) : \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg}\}$ , and let  $\gamma := \underline{\lambda}/\lambda(\mu) \leq 1$ . By [BS, Theorem 1.2] we know that  $\underline{\lambda} > 0$ . Take  $\varepsilon = \underline{\lambda}/2$ . If  $\nu$  is any measure with  $h_\nu(f) < \varepsilon$  then

$$P(\varphi_t) - \left( h_\nu(f) + \int \varphi_t d\nu \right) \geq \left[ (1-t) - \left( \frac{1}{2} - t \right) \gamma \right] \lambda(\mu) = \left[ 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2} + t(\gamma - 1) \right] \lambda(\mu),$$

which is bounded away from 0 for all fixed  $1 \leq t < \frac{1-\gamma/2}{1-\gamma}$  (or all  $t \geq 1$  if  $\gamma = 1$ ). Hence, if  $h_\nu(f) < \varepsilon$ , then the free energy of  $\nu$  cannot be close to  $P(\varphi_t)$ .  $\square$

We are now able to state the following which will show that part (c) of Proposition 2 below is true in the settings of Theorems 1 and 2.

**Corollary 1.** *In the setting of Theorems 1 and 2, there exists  $\eta' > 0$ , a sequence  $\{\mu_n\}_n$  such that  $h_{\mu_n}(f) + \int \varphi_t d\mu_n \rightarrow P(\varphi_t)$  and Type A and Type B inducing schemes  $(X, F)$  such that  $\mu_n$  is compatible to  $(X, F)$  for all  $n$ .*

*Proof.* From the definition of pressure, there exists  $\{\mu_n\}_n \subset \mathcal{M}_{erg}$  so that  $h_{\mu_n}(f) + \int \varphi_t d\mu_n \rightarrow P(\varphi_t)$ . By Lemma 5, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that  $h_{\mu_n}(f) \geq \varepsilon$  for all large  $n$ . By Remark 6 there must exist  $\hat{X}$  and  $\eta' > 0$  as in the construction of Type A, or as in Type B, schemes, and a subsequence  $\{\mu_{n_k}\}_k$  such that all  $\mu_{n_k}$  have  $\hat{\mu}_{n_k}(\hat{X}) > \eta'$ , as required.  $\square$

The following proposition, which will be particularly useful in Section 6, implies that we can fix an inducing scheme so that any measure with large free energy, for some  $\varphi_t$ , must be compatible to this inducing scheme. We prove it in Section 5.

**Proposition 1.** *For any point  $x \in I \setminus \text{orb}(f(Cr))$  there exists a Type B inducing scheme  $(X, F)$  with  $x \in X$  and so that the following hold.*

- *In the case of, and with  $t_1 < 1$  as in Theorem 1 (polynomial growth rate): for any  $t_1 < t_2 < 1$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  so that for all  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ , if  $h_\mu(f) + \int \psi_t d\mu > P_+(\psi_t) - \varepsilon_0$  then  $\mu$  is compatible to  $(X, F)$ .*
- *In the case of, and with  $t_1 < 1 < t_2$  as in Theorem 2 (Collet-Eckmann): there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  so that for all  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ , if  $h_\mu(f) + \int \psi_t d\mu > P_+(\psi_t) - \varepsilon_0$  then  $\mu$  is compatible to  $(X, F)$ .*

#### 4. PRELIMINARY RESULTS FOR EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS

The proof of Theorem 1 is divided into several steps. We use the Hofbauer tower construction given in Section 3 to fix an inducing scheme  $F : \bigcup_j X_j \rightarrow X$  over  $X \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . Let  $\Phi$  be the induced potential. In this section we prove some preliminary results relating potentials  $\varphi$  and measures for the system  $(X, F)$  to the corresponding potentials  $\Phi$  and corresponding measures for appropriate inducing schemes  $(X, F)$ .

The following lemma, the ideas for which go back to Abramov [Ab], relates the free energies of the original and the induced system. See [PSe1] for the proof.

**Lemma 6.** *If  $\mu_F$  is an ergodic measure on  $(X, F)$  with  $\int \tau d\mu_F < \infty$ , and  $\mu$  is the projected measure on  $(X, f)$ , then*

$$h_{\mu_F}(F) = \left( \int_X \tau d\mu_F \right) h_\mu(f) \text{ and } \int_X \Phi d\mu_F = \left( \int_X \tau d\mu_F \right) \int_I \varphi d\mu.$$

where  $\Phi$  is the lifted potential of  $\varphi$ .

It is easy to show that putting  $\varphi := \log |Df|$  into the above lemma proves that for any full-branched inducing scheme with ergodic invariant measure  $\mu_F$  such that  $\int \tau d\mu_F < \infty$ , the measure  $\mu_F$  projects to a measure  $\mu$  with  $\lambda(\mu) > 0$ .

Suppose that  $\varphi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the potential for the original system. We will deal with the shifted potential  $\psi_S := \varphi - S$ . Given an inducing scheme  $(X, F)$  with  $F = f^\tau$ , let  $\Psi_S$  be the induced potential, *i.e.*,  $\Psi_S := \Phi - \tau S$ . The following lemma resembles the argument of [Sa1, Proposition 10]. An important difference here is that we do not require that the original potential has summable variations.

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose that  $P_G(\Psi_{S^*}) < \infty$  and  $\Phi$  has summable variations. Then  $P_G(\Psi_S)$  is decreasing and continuous in  $[S^*, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* We first recall some facts. By definition,  $P_G(\Psi_S) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\Psi_S, X_i)$  where  $Z_n(\Psi_S, X_i) := \sum_{F^n x = x} e^{(\Psi_S)_n(x)} 1_{X_i} = \sum_{F^n x = x} e^{\Phi_n(x) - S\tau^n(x)} 1_{X_i}$ . As in [Sa1], topological mixing implies that  $P_G(\Psi_S)$  is independent of  $X_i$ , and we suppress  $X_i$  in the notation accordingly. Clearly,  $P_G(\Psi_S)$  is decreasing in  $S$ . We also know that since we have summable variations for  $\Phi$ , *i.e.*, there exists  $B < \infty$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} V_n(\Phi) < B$ , we have for any  $S$ ,

$$(11) \quad \log Z_{m_1}(\Psi_S) + \log Z_{m_2}(\Psi_S) \leq \log Z_{m_1+m_2}(\Psi_S) + \log B,$$



see the proof of [Sa1, Proposition 1].

Since  $P_G(\Psi_S)$  is decreasing in  $S$ , it is sufficient to show that for any  $S_0 \geq S^*$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $S > S_0$  such that  $P_G(\Psi_S) > P_G(\Psi_{S_0}) - \varepsilon$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n_0$  so large that  $\frac{\log B}{n_0} < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ . By definition of  $P_G(\Psi_{S_0})$ , for a large enough  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\Psi_{S_0}) \geq P_G(\Psi_{S_0}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Since  $Z_n(\Psi_S)$  is continuous in  $S$ , there exists  $S > S_0$  such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(\Psi_S) > P_G(\Psi_{S_0}) - \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon.$$

Then by (11) and writing  $m = kn + r$  where  $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log Z_m(\Psi_S)}{m} &\geq \frac{k \log Z_n(\Psi_S) + \log Z_r(\Psi_S) - (k+1) \log B}{kn + r} \\ &\xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log Z_n(\Psi_S)}{n} - \frac{\log B}{n} \geq P_G(\Psi_{S_0}) - \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

**4.1. Inducing schemes producing a unique equilibrium state.** The following result is a key tool in proving Theorems 1 and 2. It gives necessary conditions, comparable to the abstract conditions presented in [PSe1], to push equilibrium states through inducing procedures. Notice that Case 4 is reminiscent of the ideas involved in the Discriminant Theorem, [Sa2, Theorem 2]. However, our approach seems more natural in this context.

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose that  $\psi$  is a potential with  $P(\psi) = 0$ . Let  $\hat{X}$  be the set used the construction of either a Type A or Type B inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$ . Suppose that the lifted potential  $\Psi$  has  $\|\mathcal{L}_\Psi 1\|_\infty < \infty$  and  $\sum_{n \geq 1} V_n(\Psi) < \infty$ .*

*Consider the assumptions:*

- (a)  $\sum_i \tau_i e^{\Psi_i} < \infty$  for  $\Psi_i = \sup_{x \in X_i} \Psi(x)$ ;
- (b) *there exists an equilibrium state  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  compatible to  $(X, F, \tau)$ ;*
- (c) *there exist a sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}_n \subset \mathbb{R}^-$  with  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  and measures  $\{\mu_n\}_n \subset \mathcal{M}_+$  such that every  $\mu_n$  is compatible to  $(X, F, \tau)$ ,  $h_{\mu_n}(f) + \int \psi d\mu_n = \varepsilon_n$  and  $P_G(\Psi_{\varepsilon_n}) < \infty$  for all  $n$ ;*
- (d)  $P_G(\Psi) = 0$ .

*If any of the following combinations of assumptions holds:*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1. \quad (b) \text{ and } (d); \\ 2. \quad (a) \text{ and } (d); \\ 3. \quad (a) \text{ and } (b); \\ 4. \quad (a) \text{ and } (c); \end{array} \right.$$

*then there is a unique equilibrium state  $\mu$  for  $(I, f, \psi)$  among all measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  with  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{X}) > 0$ . Moreover,  $\mu$  is obtained by projecting the equilibrium state  $\mu_\Psi$  of the inducing scheme and in all cases we have  $P_G(\Psi) = 0$ .*

**Remark 7.** *As noted in the proof, if  $\mu_\Psi$  is the equilibrium state for  $(X, F, \Psi)$  given by Theorem 4 then the condition  $\sum_i \tau_i e^{\Psi_i} < \infty$  implies that  $\int_X \tau d\mu_\Psi < \infty$  by the Gibbs property of  $\mu_\Psi$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 2.* As in Section 2, Proposition 1 of [Sa1] implies that  $Z_n(\Psi) = O(\|\mathcal{L}_\Psi 1\|_\infty^n)$ . Therefore  $\|\mathcal{L}_\Psi 1\|_\infty < \infty$  implies  $P_G(\Psi) < \infty$ . So in any case we can immediately apply Theorem 4 to obtain a measure  $\mu_\Psi$ , and moreover the Variational Principle holds.

**Case 1. (b) and (d) hold:** By definition of compatibility, we can lift  $\mu$  to  $\mu_F$  where  $\int \tau d\mu_F < \infty$ . By Lemma 6

$$0 = P(\psi) = \left( \int \tau d\mu_F \right) \left( h_\mu(f) + \int \psi d\mu \right) = h_{\mu_F}(F) + \int \Psi d\mu_F.$$

Since also  $P_G(\Psi) = 0$ , the Variational Principle (Theorem 4 part (b)) implies that  $\mu_F$  is an equilibrium state for the inducing scheme. From the uniqueness of the measure given by Theorem 4, we have  $\mu_F = \mu_\Psi$ . So  $\mu$  is the same as the projection of  $\mu_\Psi$  given by Theorem 3, as required. Note that by Lemma 6,  $h_{\mu_\Psi}(F) < \infty$  and  $-\int \Psi d\mu_\Psi < \infty$ .

**Case 2: (a) and (d) hold:** By the Gibbs property of  $\mu_\Psi$  we have

$$\int \tau d\mu_\Psi \asymp_{dis} \sum_i \tau_i e^{\Psi_i - P_G(\Psi)}.$$

Adding the fact that  $P_G(\Psi) > -\infty$  to (a) gives  $\int \tau d\mu_\Psi < \infty$ . This implies that we can use Theorem 3 to project  $\mu_\Psi$  to an  $f$ -invariant measure  $\mu_\psi \in \mathcal{M}_+$ . By Lemma 6,  $h_{\mu_\psi}(F) < \infty$  and  $-\int \Psi d\mu_\psi < \infty$ . So by Theorem 4 part (a),  $\mu_\psi$  is an equilibrium state, and the Variational Principle (*i.e.*, Theorem 4 part (b)) gives  $P_G(\Psi) = P(\Psi) = h_{\mu_\psi}(F) + \int \Psi d\mu_\psi$ .

Now condition (d) gives that  $P_G(\Psi) = P(\Psi) = 0$ . Thus Lemma 6 implies that  $h_{\mu_\psi}(f) + \int \psi d\mu_\psi = 0$ , so  $\mu_\psi$  is an equilibrium state for  $(I, f, \psi)$ . We can then use the argument of Case 1 to show that this is the unique such equilibrium state in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  with  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{X}) = (\int \tau d\hat{\mu})^{-1} > 0$ .

**Case 3: (a) and (b) hold:** Assumption (b) gives an equilibrium state  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  which can be lifted, using Theorem 3, to  $\mu_F$  on  $(X, F, \tau)$ . We wish to show that  $\mu$  is the unique equilibrium state for  $(I, f, \psi)$  which lifts to our inducing scheme. As in Case 2, this will follow if we can show  $P_G(\Psi) = 0$ . Since we also have  $0 = h_\mu(f) + \int \psi d\mu$ , Lemma 6 implies that  $h_{\mu_F}(F) + \int \Psi d\mu_F = 0$ . The Variational Principle thus implies that  $P_G(\Psi) \geq 0$  as well.

Now as in Case 2, condition (a) gives a measure  $\mu_\Psi$  having  $h_{\mu_\Psi}(F) + \int \Psi d\mu_\Psi = P(\Psi) = P_G(\Psi)$ . Again by condition (a), this projects to a measure  $\mu_\psi$ . By Lemma 6, we have

$$h_{\mu_\psi}(f) + \int \psi d\mu_\psi = P_G(\Psi) \left( \int \tau d\mu_\Psi \right)^{-1} \geq 0.$$

Since  $P(\psi) = 0$ , we must have  $P_G(\Psi) = 0$  (this also implies that  $\mu_\psi$  is an equilibrium state for  $(I, f, \psi)$ ). This means that we have  $h_{\mu_F}(F) + \int \Psi d\mu_F = h_{\mu_\Psi}(F) + \int \Psi d\mu_\Psi$  and so, by uniqueness of equilibrium states for  $(X, F, \Psi)$ ,  $\mu_F = \mu_\Psi$  and hence  $\mu = \mu_\psi$ .

**Case 4: (a) and (c) hold:** By (c),  $h_{\mu_n}(f) + \int(\psi - \varepsilon_n) d\mu_n = 0$ . Let  $\mu_{n,F}$  be the corresponding lifted measure obtained from Theorem 3. Then by Lemma 6, and the Variational Principle,  $0 = h_{\mu_{n,F}}(F) + \int_X \Psi_{\varepsilon_n} d\mu_{n,F} \leq P_G(\Psi_{\varepsilon_n})$ . Lemma 7 implies that we can take the limit to get  $P_G(\Psi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_G(\Psi_{\varepsilon_n}) \geq 0$ .

By the argument of Case 2, (a) implies that we have an equilibrium state  $\mu_\Psi$  which projects to a measure  $\mu_\psi$ . The second part of the proof of Case 3 showed that this must imply that  $P_G(\Psi) = 0$ . Hence the argument of Case 2 completes the proof.  $\square$

**4.2. A single inducing scheme suffices.** We next present a technical result, which when applied to the settings of Theorems 1 and 2, shows that any measure with free energy close to our equilibrium states is compatible to a single inducing scheme, see Proposition 1.

As in Remark 6, Lemma 4 implies that given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon)$  and  $\hat{E} = \hat{E}(\varepsilon)$ , a compact set bounded away from  $\partial\mathcal{D}$ , so that  $h_\mu(f) > \varepsilon$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  implies  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{E}) > \eta$ . This implies that for a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$ , in particular an equilibrium state  $\mu_\psi$ , we can choose  $X^0 \in \mathcal{P}_n$  so that for the set  $\hat{X}^0$  as in the construction of a Type A (or Type B if a first extendible return map is preferred) inducing scheme  $\hat{\mu}_\psi(\hat{X}^0 \cap \hat{E}) > 0$ . Next we add a finite collection of cylinder sets  $X^k \in \cup_{j \geq n} \mathcal{P}_j$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N$ , so that  $\{\hat{X}^k\}_{0 \leq k \leq N}$  satisfy property *Cover*( $\varepsilon$ ) in Remark 6. We assume that  $\hat{X}^0, \dots, \hat{X}^N$  are all created in the same way, *i.e.*, either all as in the Type A or all as in the Type B construction. The next proposition shows that there is a single inducing scheme that is compatible to every measure in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  whose free energy is sufficiently close to the pressure.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that  $\psi : I \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$  is a potential with  $P(\psi) = 0$  so that  $\psi(x) > -\infty$  on  $I \setminus \text{Crit}$ . Suppose also that there exist  $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $h_{\mu'}(f) + \int \psi d\mu' > -\varepsilon_0$  implies  $h_{\mu'}(f) > \varepsilon$ . Let  $\{\hat{X}^k\}_{0 \leq k \leq N}$  satisfy *Cover*( $\varepsilon$ ) where  $\mu_\psi$  is compatible to  $(X^0, F_0)$ . Suppose that the induced potentials  $\Psi^k$  and inducing times  $\tau^k$  corresponding to the inducing schemes  $(X^k, F_k)$  satisfy:*

- (a)  $\sum_n V_n(\Psi^k) < \infty$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq N$ ;
- (b)  $\sum_i \tau_i^k e^{\sup\{\Psi^k(x) : x \in X_i^k\}} < \infty$  (*i.e.*, condition (a) of Proposition 2 holds for  $\Psi^k$ ) for all  $0 \leq k \leq N$ .

*Then there exists  $\theta = \theta(\varepsilon, \{\hat{X}^k\}_{0 \leq k \leq N}) > 0$  so that  $h_\mu(f) + \int \psi d\mu > -\theta$  implies  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{X}^0) > 0$ .*

The idea here is that information on the equilibrium state for  $(X^0, F_0, \Psi^0)$  allows us to show that measures with enough free energy must cover a large portion of the Hofbauer tower, in particular they are compatible to  $(X^0, F_0)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  be arbitrary and assume that  $\mu' \in \mathcal{M}_+$  is a measure such that  $\hat{\mu}'(\hat{X}^k) > 0$ , but with  $\hat{\mu}'(\hat{X}^0) = 0$ .

Here we will refer to the components of  $\pi^{-1}(X_i^k) \cap \hat{X}^k$  as 1-cylinders of  $(\hat{X}^k, R_{\hat{X}^k})$ , the first return map to  $\hat{X}^k$ .

**Claim 1.** (i) *There is at least one 1-cylinder mapping into  $\hat{X}^0$  before returning to  $\hat{X}^k$ ;*  
(ii) *There is at least one 1-cylinder which does not map to  $\hat{X}^0$  before returning to  $\hat{X}^k$ .*

Moreover, whether (i) or (ii) holds depends only on  $\pi(\hat{X}_i^k)$ , and not on the domain that  $\hat{X}_i^k$  belongs to.

*Proof.* Property (i) follows by transitivity. (A priori, sets  $\hat{X}_i^k$  satisfying (i) may have  $\hat{\mu}'(\hat{X}_i^k) = 0$  or not; we will show that  $\hat{\mu}'(\hat{X}_i^k) > 0$  for at least one such  $\hat{X}_i^k$ .)

For property (ii), suppose that for any first return domain  $\hat{X}_i^k \subset D \in \mathcal{D}$  there is  $0 \leq s < r_{\hat{X}^k}(\hat{X}_i^k)$  such that  $\hat{f}^s(\hat{X}_i^k) \cap \hat{X}^0 \neq \emptyset$ . By the properties of cylinders we must in fact have  $\hat{f}^s(\hat{X}_i^k) \subset \hat{X}^0$ . This means that  $\hat{\mu}'$ -a.e. point enters  $\hat{X}^0$  with positive frequency. Ergodicity implies that  $\hat{\mu}'(\hat{X}^0) > 0$  which is a contradiction. Hence (ii) holds.

Since  $\hat{X}^k \in \cup_{j \geq n} \mathcal{P}_j$ , if (i) holds for some 1-cylinder  $\hat{X}_i^k$  of  $(\hat{X}^k, R_{\hat{X}^k})$ , say, then this whole cylinder maps into  $\hat{X}^0$ . Moreover, by the proof of Lemma 3, see [B1], if  $\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2 \in \hat{X}^k$  have  $\pi(\hat{y}_1) = \pi(\hat{y}_2)$  and  $\hat{f}^k(\hat{y}_1) \in \hat{X}^0$  then  $\hat{f}^k(\hat{y}_2) \in \hat{X}^0$ . Consequently, for a 1-cylinder  $X_i^k$  of  $(X^k, F_k)$  either every component of  $\pi^{-1}(X_i^k) \cap \hat{X}^k$  has property (i), or every component of  $\pi^{-1}(X_i^k) \cap \hat{X}^k$  has property (ii). This concludes the proof of the first claim.  $\square$

Note that condition (b) implies that  $\|\mathcal{L}_\Psi 1\|_\infty < \infty$  and hence we may apply the ideas of Case 3 of Proposition 2 to get  $P_G(\Psi^0) = 0$ . Since, by the Gibbs property from Theorem 4,  $\mu_\Psi$  gives all cylinders of  $(X^0, F_0)$  positive mass, the same must be true of the  $\hat{\mu}_\psi \circ \pi|_{\hat{X}^0}^{-1}$ -measure of these cylinders. Thus part (i) of the claim implies that  $\hat{\mu}_\psi(\hat{X}^k) > 0$  and hence  $\mu_\psi$  is compatible to  $(X^k, F_k)$ . By Case 3 of Proposition 2, this also implies that  $P_G(\Psi^k) = 0$ .

Let  $(X_b^k, F_k)$  denote the system minus the cylinders satisfying (i). Let  $P_G^b(\Psi^k)$  denote the Gurevich pressure of  $(X_b^k, F_k, \Psi^k)$ , computed from  $Z_n^b(\Psi^k)$ , which is defined in the natural way. (Note that one consequence of part (ii) of the claim is that  $P_G^b(\Psi^k) > -\infty$ .)

**Claim 2.**  $P_G^b(\Psi^k) < P_G(\Psi^k) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Y}^k$  be the union of 1-cylinders of  $(X^k, F_k)$  whose representatives in  $\hat{X}^k$  satisfy property (i). We fix a 1-cylinder  $Y^k$  so that  $Y^k \cap \mathcal{Y}^k = \emptyset$ , i.e., its representatives in  $\hat{X}^k$  satisfy (ii). In each  $\mathbf{C}_j^k \subset Y^k$  there exists a unique periodic point which

contributes to  $Z_j(\Psi^k, Y^k)$ . Thus noting that  $m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k) = \int_{\mathbf{C}_j^k} e^{-\Psi^k(x)} d\mu_{\Psi^k}$  and using the variation properties of  $\Psi_j^k$ , we derive

$$e^{-V_j(\Psi^k)} \sum m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k) \leq Z_j(\Psi^k, Y^k) \leq e^{V_j(\Psi^k)} \sum m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k)$$

where the sum is taken over all  $j$ -cylinders  $\mathbf{C}_j^k$  in  $Y^k$ . Similarly

$$e^{-V_j(\Psi^k)} \sum^b m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k) \leq Z_j^b(\Psi^k, Y^k) \leq e^{V_j(\Psi^k)} \sum^b m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k)$$

where the sum  $\sum^b$  is taken over all  $j$ -cylinders  $\mathbf{C}_j^k$  in  $Y^k$  so that  $F_k^s(\mathbf{C}_j^k) \cap \mathcal{Y}^k = \emptyset$  for  $0 \leq s \leq j-1$ .

For every  $\mathbf{C}_j^k$  in the sum  $\sum^b m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k)$  there exist collection of  $j+1$ -cylinders  $\mathbf{C}_{j+1}^k$  so that  $F_k^j(\cup \mathbf{C}_{j+1}^k) = \mathcal{Y}^k$ . Since  $m_{\Psi^k}$  is conformal and  $\Psi^k$  has summable variations, we have

$$\frac{m_{\Psi^k}(\cup \mathbf{C}_{j+1}^k)}{m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k)} \geq \frac{1}{K} \left( \frac{m_{\Psi^k}(\mathcal{Y}^k)}{m_{\Psi^k}(X^k)} \right)$$

where  $K = e^{\sum_j V_j(\Psi^k)}$ . Hence, since  $m_{\Psi^k}(X^k) = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum^b m_{\Psi^k}(\cup \mathbf{C}_{j+1}^k) &= \sum^b (m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k) - m_{\Psi^k}(\cup \mathbf{C}_{j+1}^k)) \\ &\leq \left( 1 - \frac{m_{\Psi^k}(\mathcal{Y}^k)}{K} \right) \sum^b m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\xi := \frac{m_{\Psi^k}(\mathcal{Y}^k)}{K}$  we have

$$Z_{j+1}^b(\Psi^k, Y^k) \leq e^{V_{j+1}(\Psi^k)} \sum^b m_{\Psi^k}(\mathbf{C}_j^k) \leq e^{V_{j+1}(\Psi^k) + V_j(\Psi^k)} (1 - \xi) Z_j^b(\Psi^k, Y^k).$$

Therefore  $Z_n^b(\Psi^k, Y^k) \leq e^{2 \sum_j V_j(\Psi^k)} (1 - \xi)^n Z_1^b(\Psi^k, Y^k)$ . Since Lemma 8 implies  $\sum_j V_j(\Psi^k) < \infty$ , we have  $P_G^b(\Psi^k) < \log(1 - \xi) < 0$ , as required. This completes the proof of the second claim.  $\square$

Now take  $\theta_k > 0$  so that  $P_G^b(\Psi^k + \theta_k \tau^k) \leq 0$ . If the measure  $\mu'$  from the beginning of the proof satisfies  $h_{\mu'}(f) + \int \psi d\mu' > -\theta_k$ , then  $h_{\mu'}(f) + \int (\psi + \theta_k) d\mu' > 0$ , so Lemma 6 implies that the corresponding induced measure  $\mu'_{F_k}$  has  $h_{\mu'_{F_k}}(F_k) + \int (\Psi^k + \theta_k \tau^k) d\mu'_{F_k} > 0$ . From the Variational Principle for the system  $(X_b^k, F_k, \Psi^k + \theta_k \tau^k)$  we see that  $\mu'_{F_k}$  cannot be supported on type (ii) 1-cylinders of  $(X^k, F_k)$  only. Hence  $\hat{\mu}'(\hat{X}^0) > 0$ .

Finally take  $\theta := \min\{\varepsilon_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N\}$  and let  $\mu$  be such that  $h_\mu(f) + \int \psi d\mu > -\theta$ . Since  $\theta \leq \varepsilon_0$ , we have  $h_\mu(f) > \varepsilon$  by assumption, and therefore  $\mu$  is compatible to  $(X^k, F_k)$  for some  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ . By the choice of  $\theta$  and the argument of the previous paragraph, it follows that  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{X}^0) > 0$  as required.  $\square$

5. PROOFS OF THEOREM 1 AND 2; EXISTENCE, UNIQUENESS AND TAIL ESTIMATES

Let  $\varphi = \varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$ , and  $\Phi$  be the corresponding induced potential. Przytycki [Pr] proves that a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  is either supported on an attracting periodic orbit or  $0 \leq \int \log |Df| d\mu < \infty$ . So when we apply Lemma 6 to this potential, we will get finite integrals for both the measure on  $I$  and for the measure on the inducing scheme with the induced potential.

**Lemma 8.** *Assume that  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  has negative Schwarzian derivative. For inducing schemes obtained in Section 3, the induced potential has summable variations.*

*Proof.* In general,  $\varphi$  has unbounded variations. However, we note that Type A and Type B inducing schemes are maps  $F : \bigcup_j X_j \rightarrow X$  with uniform Koebe space  $\delta$ . Since  $\varphi$  is in general unbounded, it will not have bounded variations, but we only need to check that the induced potential  $\Phi$  has bounded variations. By the Koebe Lemma,  $\frac{|DF(y)|}{|DF(x)|} < \frac{1+2\delta}{\delta^2} + 1$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(x) - \Phi(y)| &= |t| \left| -\log |DF(x)| + \log |DF(y)| \right| = |t| \left| \log \left( \frac{|DF(y)|}{|DF(x)|} \right) \right| \\ &\leq |t| \log \left( 1 + \frac{1+2\delta}{\delta^2} \right) < |t| \left( \frac{1+2\delta}{\delta^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By standard arguments, for any  $\gamma > 1$  there exists  $N = N(\gamma)$  such that we have  $\inf_{x \in X} |DF^N(x)| > \gamma$  (here we use the negative Schwarzian assumption; alternatively a  $C^3$  assumption and the absence of neutral periodic cycles would suffice). Moreover,  $F^N$  satisfies the above distortion estimates. Let  $\gamma > \frac{1}{\delta}$  and let  $G : \bigcup_j Y_j \rightarrow X$  be given by  $G := F^N$  for  $N = N(\gamma)$ . Clearly, proving the lemma for  $\Phi_N$  is sufficient.

We have that  $X$  is a  $\gamma\delta$ -scaled neighbourhood of  $Y_j$  for any  $j$ . Using the Koebe Lemma again for  $x, y$  in the same connected component of  $G^{-1}(Y_j)$ , we have

$$|\Phi_N(x) - \Phi_N(y)| < |t| \left( \frac{1+2\gamma\delta}{(\gamma\delta)^2} \right).$$

Repeating this argument for  $x, y$  in the same connected component of  $G^{-n}(Y_j)$  that

$$|\Phi_N(x) - \Phi_N(y)| < |t| \left( \frac{1+2\gamma^n\delta}{(\gamma^n\delta)^2} \right) = |t|O(\gamma^{-n}).$$

Thus  $\Phi_N$ , and hence  $\Phi$ , has summable variations. □

**5.1. Estimates for Collet-Eckmann maps.** The proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 have roughly the same structure. We start with the Collet-Eckmann case, leaving the additional details for the summable case to the end of the section. For use in both proofs, we define

$$Z_0(\Phi) := \sum_{F(x)=x} e^{\Phi(x)}.$$

As stated in the proof of Proposition 2, we have  $Z_n(\Phi) = O(\|\mathcal{L}_\Phi 1\|_\infty^n)$ . Since our inducing schemes are essentially isomorphic to the full shift on countably many symbols, in our case, bounded distortion gives  $\|\mathcal{L}_\Phi 1\|_\infty \asymp_{dis} Z_0(\Phi)$ . Thus  $Z_n(\Phi) = O([Z_0(\Phi)]^n)$ .

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2, although we postpone the proof that  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is analytic to the end of Section 6.

*Proof of parts (a) and (b) of Theorem 2.* We choose  $X$  as in Corollary 1 and get a Type B inducing scheme  $(X, F)$ .

Fixing  $t$ , we define  $\psi_S = \varphi_t - S$ , and let  $\Psi_S$  be the induced potential. The natural candidate for  $S$  is  $P(\varphi_t)$ , but we will want to consider a more general value for this shift in the potential in order for (c) of Proposition 2 to hold.

We continue by showing that the induced system has bounded Gurevich pressure and (a) and (c) of Proposition 2 hold. As above,  $Z_n(\Phi) = O(Z_0^n(\Phi))$ . Therefore it suffices to show that  $Z_0(\Psi_S) < \infty$  to conclude that  $P_G(\Psi_S) < \infty$ .

We wish to count the number of domains  $X_i$  with  $\tau_i = n$ . The number of *laps* of a piecewise continuous function  $g$  is the number of maximal intervals on which  $g$  is monotone. We denote this number by  $\text{laps}(g)$ . By [MSz], one characterisation of the topological entropy is  $h_{top}(f) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{laps}(f^n)$ . Therefore, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $C_\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\#\{\tau_i = n\} \leq \text{laps}(f^n) \leq C_\varepsilon e^{n(h_{top}(f) + \varepsilon)}$$

for each  $n$ , where  $h_{top}(f)$  denotes the topological entropy of  $f$ . Since  $f$  is Collet-Eckmann, the tail behaviour of the inducing scheme is exponential. This was shown for certain inducing schemes in [BLS]. We show in the proof of Proposition 4 that the results on the inducing schemes of [BLS] hold for Type B inducing schemes. We also show there how [BRSS] allows us to strengthen the results of [BLS] to apply to maps with different critical orders, see Lemma 10 below.

For  $t \leq 1$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0(\Psi_S) &:= \sum_{F(x)=x} e^{\Psi_S(x)} = \sum_{i, x=F(x) \in X_i} e^{\Phi_t(x) - \tau_i(x)S} \\ &\asymp_{dis} \sum_i |X_i|^t e^{-\tau_i(x)S} = \sum_n \sum_{\tau_i=n} |X_i|^t e^{-nS} \quad \text{by the Koebe Lemma} \\ &\leq \sum_n \left( \sum_{\tau_i=n} |X_i| \right)^t e^{-nS} (\#\{\tau_i = n\})^{1-t} \quad \text{by the Hölder inequality} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \sum_n e^{-\alpha n t} e^{-nS} e^{n(h_{top}(f) + \varepsilon)(1-t)} < \infty \quad \text{using tail behaviour} \end{aligned}$$

provided  $t$  is sufficiently close to 1 and  $S > h_{top}(f)(1-t) - \alpha t$ . A similar estimate gives

$$(12) \quad \sum_i \tau_i e^{\Psi_S(x)} \asymp_{dis} \sum_i \tau_i |X_i|^t e^{-\tau_i S} < \infty.$$

For  $t \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0(\Psi_S) &\asymp_{dis} \sum_n \sum_{\tau_i=n} |X_i|^t e^{-nS} \leq \sum_n e^{-nS} \left( \sum_{\tau_i=n} |X_i| \right)^t \\ &\leq \sum_n e^{-\alpha n t} e^{-nS} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

provided  $S > -\alpha t$ . Similarly we can show

$$\sum_i \tau_i e^{\Psi_S(x)} \asymp_{dis} \sum_i \tau_i |X_i|^t e^{-\tau_i S} < \infty,$$

provided  $S > -\alpha t$ . When  $t$  is sufficiently close to 1,  $P(\varphi_t)$  is close to 0, and thus if  $S$  is close to  $P(\varphi_t)$  then the above sums are bounded.

Observe that the above estimates prove that condition (a) of Proposition 2 holds. For part (c) of that proposition, the estimates above prove that  $P(\Psi_{P(\varphi_t)+\varepsilon}) < \infty$  for  $\varepsilon < 0$  close to 0. Therefore, Corollary 1 shows that (c) is satisfied. Therefore this inducing scheme gives rise to an equilibrium state  $\mu_\varphi = \mu_\psi$ . Moreover, from the proof of Proposition 2,  $P_G(\Psi) = 0$ .

It remains to show the uniqueness of the equilibrium state in  $\mathcal{M}_+$ , since up to this point we only know that  $\mu_\varphi$  is the unique equilibrium state whose lift to the Hofbauer tower gives  $\hat{X}$  positive mass. This follows from the next lemma. Recall that  $(\mathcal{E}, \rightarrow)$  indicates the transitive graph in the Hofbauer tower.

**Lemma 9.** *If  $\mu_\varphi$  is an equilibrium state, as above, compatible to an inducing scheme  $(X, F)$  then it is also compatible to any other inducing scheme  $(X', F')$  provided  $\hat{X}' \cap \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$ . Here we assume that the inducing schemes are either both Type A or both Type B.*

*Proof.* We will assume that the inducing schemes here are all Type B, since this is the more difficult case. Let  $(\hat{X}, \hat{F})$  be the inducing scheme used above. The proof follows if we can show that  $\hat{\mu}_\varphi(\hat{X}') > 0$ .

Transitivity of  $(\mathcal{E}, \hat{f})$  implies that there exists  $n \geq 0$  so that  $\hat{f}^{-n}(\hat{X}') \cap \hat{X}$  contains an open set. As in Proposition 3, since  $\mu_\Psi$  gives positive mass to cylinders, this implies that there exists  $\hat{U} \subset \hat{X}$  so that  $\hat{\mu}_\varphi(\hat{U}) > 0$  and  $\hat{f}^n(\hat{U}) \subset \hat{X}'$ . Hence,

$$\hat{\mu}_\varphi(\hat{X}') \geq \hat{\mu}_\varphi(\hat{f}^n(\hat{U})) \geq \hat{\mu}_\varphi(\hat{U}) > 0.$$

Therefore,  $\mu_\varphi$  is compatible to  $(X', F')$ .  $\square$

To continue with the Theorem 2, suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+$  is an equilibrium state. By the ideas of Lemma 3 there must exist a first extendible inducing scheme  $(X', F', \Psi')$  which is compatible to  $\mu$  and which corresponds to a first return map to a set  $\hat{X}'$  on the Hofbauer tower. Lemma 9 implies that  $\mu_\varphi$  is compatible to  $(X', F')$  and hence  $\mu = \mu_\varphi$  by the uniqueness of equilibrium states on an inducing scheme.  $\square$



To do the summable case of Theorem 1, parts (a)-(c), we adapt techniques from [BLS]. In that paper, the Bounded Backward Contraction is used for arbitrary neighbourhoods of the critical set, which at the time was only known to hold when all critical orders  $\ell_c$  are the same. Using results from [BRSS], and specifying the neighbourhoods  $U$ , we can improve this in the following lemma.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  be a multimodal map with negative Schwarzian derivative such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |Df^n(f(c))| = \infty$  for each  $c \in \text{Crit}$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\lambda > 1$ , we can find critical neighbourhoods  $U := f^{-1}(B_\varepsilon(f(\text{Crit})))$  that are  $\lambda$ -nice in the sense that*

- $f^n(\partial U) \cap U = \emptyset$  for all  $n \geq 0$ ;
- if  $V \subset U$  is the domain of the first return map to  $U$ , then the interval  $V'$  concentric to  $V$  and of length  $(1 + 2\lambda)|V|$  is contained in  $U$ .

Moreover, there exists  $b > 0$  such that

$$(13) \quad |Df^r(x)| \geq b \text{ for all } x \in I \text{ and } r = \min\{n \geq 0 : f^n(x) \in U\},$$

where the  $\lambda$ -nice critical neighbourhood  $U$  can be chosen arbitrarily small.

*Proof.* The first part follows immediately from [BRSS] which considers  $C^3$  non-flat multimodal maps. Our assumption that  $f$  is  $C^2$  with negative Schwarzian derivative actually gives a slightly stronger version of the Koebe distortion theorem, and hence is sufficient to claim the results from [BRSS]. Lemma 3 in [BRSS] shows the existence of  $\lambda$ -nice neighbourhoods  $U$  of  $\text{Crit}$ . Denote the connected components of  $U$  by  $U^c$ ,  $c \in \text{Crit}$ . If  $r = r(x) \geq 0$  is the first entrance time of  $x$  to  $U$ , then the niceness of  $U$  guarantees that there exists an interval  $J_x$  so that  $f^r$  maps  $J_x$  diffeomorphically onto  $U^c$  for some  $c \in \text{Crit}$ . If  $f^r(x)$  belongs to first return domain  $V$ , then there is  $J_V \subset J_x$  such that  $f^r : J_V \rightarrow V$  is monotone with distortion bound depending only on  $\lambda$ . A special case of this is when  $V := \tilde{U}^c$  is the central return domain in  $U^c$ . Let  $\tilde{U} = \cup_{c \in \text{Crit}} \tilde{U}^c$ . In this case, the first entrance time  $\tilde{r} \geq 0$  of any  $x$  into  $\tilde{U}$  corresponds to a diffeomorphic branch  $f^{\tilde{r}} : \tilde{J} \rightarrow \tilde{U}^c$  with distortion bound depending only on  $\lambda$ .

**Remark 8.** *Note that  $U \subset f^{-1}(B_\varepsilon(f(\text{Crit})))$ , where  $\varepsilon$  can be taken arbitrarily small. As a result, the components  $U^c$  need not have comparable sizes for all  $c \in \text{Crit}$ , but scale as  $\varepsilon^{1/\ell_c}$ . A similar difference in size is true for the components of  $\tilde{U}$ , and this is a major difference with the critical neighbourhoods as used in [BLS]. If all components of  $\tilde{U}$  have the same size, then (13) can fail.*

To prove (13), fix a  $\lambda$ -nice critical neighbourhood  $U_0$ , and let  $U_1 := \tilde{U}_0$  be the union of its central return domains. This set is  $\lambda$ -nice again. There exists  $b = b(U_1) > 0$  such that for every  $x \in I$ ,  $|Df^{r_1}(x)| \geq b$  for  $r_1 = \min\{n \geq 0 : f^n(x) \in U_1\}$ . Continue to construct  $\lambda$ -nice neighbourhoods  $U_i = \tilde{U}_{i-1}$  as the union of the central return domains of the previous stage. These set shrink at least exponentially in  $i$ , so we obtain a  $\lambda$ -nice neighbourhood  $U = U_p$  as small as we want.

Now let  $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_p = r$  be the return times of  $x$  to  $U_1 \supset U_2 \supset \dots \supset U_p$ . There is a neighbourhood  $J \ni x$  such  $f^r$  maps  $J$  diffeomorphically onto a component

of  $U$ . The maps  $f^{r_{i+1}-r_i}|_{f^{r_i}(J)}$  are composition of monotone branches of the first return map to  $U_i$ . If  $\lambda$  is sufficiently large, then these branches are expanding, uniformly in  $x$ . Hence  $|Df^r(x)| \geq |Df^{r_1}(x)| \geq b$ .  $\square$

## 5.2. Estimates for non-Collet-Eckmann maps.

**Proposition 4.** *Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  satisfies (1). There there exists  $t_1 < 1$ , such that on every sufficiently small cylinder set  $X$  there is a first extendible return inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$  such that for all  $t \in (t_1, 1]$  and all potential shifts  $S \geq 0$ :*

$$Z_0(\Psi_S) := \sum_{F(x)=x} e^{\Psi_S(x)} < \infty,$$

where  $\Psi_S$  is the induced potential of the shifted potential  $\psi_S := \varphi_t - S$ . Furthermore for the equilibrium state  $\mu_{\Psi_{P(\varphi_t)}}$ ,  $\mu_{\Psi_{P(\varphi_t)}}\{\tau = n\}$  decays exponentially for  $t \in (t_1, 1)$ , and polynomially for  $t = 1$ .

*Proof.* For the case  $t = 1$ , if the critical points all have the same order then [BLS] gives an inducing scheme with polynomial tails (this is also sufficient to show  $Z_0(\Psi_S) < \infty$  for all  $S \geq 0$ ). Below we show that Type B inducing schemes fit into the framework of [BLS]. We also show that the machinery of [BLS] can also be applied to maps with critical points with different critical orders, by Lemma 10.

Fix  $t_0 < 1$  such that  $\beta = \ell_{\max}(1 + \frac{1}{t_0}) - 1$ , and let  $t_0 < t < 1$ . Fix a single cylinder set  $X \in \mathcal{P}_n$  and  $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  so small that a  $\delta$ -scaled neighbourhood of  $X$  is contained in  $\pi(D)$  for at least one domain  $D$  of the closed primitive subgraph  $\mathcal{E}$  (cf. Lemma 2) of the Hofbauer tower. Let  $(X, F)$  be the corresponding first extendible, *i.e.*, Type B, inducing scheme to  $X$ : for each  $X_i$ , there is an minimal  $\tau_i > 0$  for which there is a neighbourhood  $X'_i$  such that  $f^{\tau_i}$  maps  $X'_i$  diffeomorphically onto a  $\delta$ -scaled neighbourhood  $\hat{X}$ . Let  $\hat{X} \subset \pi^{-1}(X)$  be such that that  $(X, F)$  corresponds to the first return map to  $\hat{X}$ . Since  $X$  is a cylinder set,  $\hat{X}$  is *nice* in the Hofbauer tower, in the sense that for  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\hat{f}^n(\hat{x})$  never intersects the interior of  $\hat{X}$  for each  $\hat{x} \in \partial\hat{X}$ . There is a dense orbit  $\text{orb}(\hat{y})$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ , and for each  $\hat{y}' \in \text{orb}(\hat{y}) \cap \hat{X}$ , there is a neighbourhood  $\hat{X}_i \ni \hat{y}'$  such that  $\hat{f}^{\tau_i} : \hat{X}_i \rightarrow \hat{X}$  is extendible to a  $\delta$ -scaled neighbourhood of a component of  $\hat{X}$ . Therefore, the union  $\cup_i X_i$  (and hence  $(X, F)^\infty$ ) is dense in  $X$ , and the niceness of  $\hat{X}$  guarantees that the sets  $X_i$  are pairwise disjoint.

Note that (1) and our choice of  $t_0$  above implies that

$$(14) \quad \sum_n \left( \gamma_n^{\ell_c - 1} |Df^n(c_1)| \right)^{-t/\ell_c} < \infty,$$

for every  $t \in (t_0, 1]$  and  $c \in \text{Crit}$  and summable sequence  $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\gamma_n \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ .

We use ideas and results of [BLS] extensively. To start with, take a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\text{Crit}$  as in Lemma 10 (so that (13) holds) and so that either  $U \supset X$  or  $U \cap X = \emptyset$ . We can assign to any  $x \in I$  a sequence of *binding periods* along which the orbit of  $x$  shadows a critical orbit, followed by *free period* during which the orbit of  $x$  remains outside  $U$ . During the binding period, the derivative growth of  $x$  is comparable to

derivative growth along the critical orbit that  $x$  shadows. The precise definition of binding period of  $x \in U$  is:

$$p(x) = \min\{k \geq 1 : |f^k(x) - f^k(c)| \geq \gamma_k |f^k(c) - \text{Crit}|\},$$

where  $c$  is the critical point closest to  $x$ . At the end of the binding period, derivatives have recovered from the small derivative incurred close to  $c$ . Indeed, Lemma 2.5 of [BLS] states that there is  $C_0 > 0$ , independent of  $U$ , such that

$$(15) \quad F'_p(x) := \inf\{|Df^p(x)| : x \in U, p(x) = p\} \geq C_0 \left( \gamma_p^{\ell_c - 1} |Df^p(f(c))| \right)^{1/\ell_c}.$$

where  $c$  is the critical point closest to  $x$ . Let  $\zeta = 4C_0^{-1/t_0} C_6^{t_0} \#\text{Crit}$  (see later in the proof) be a fixed number involving a Koebe distortion constant and a constant emerging from the Bounded Backward Contraction Condition (13). If  $U$  is a small neighbourhood, then  $p(x)$  is big. Hence we can take  $U$  so small that the minimal binding period  $p_U := \min\{p(x) : x \in U\}$  is so large that for any  $t \in (t_0, 1]$ ,

$$\sum_{p \geq p_U} \zeta \left( \gamma_p^{\ell_c - 1} |Df^p(f(c))| \right)^{-t/\ell_c} = 1 - \kappa$$

for some  $\kappa = \kappa(t_0, \{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) > 0$ . Summing the powers of the above sum gives

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \left( \sum_{p \geq p_U} \zeta \left( \gamma_p^{\ell_c - 1} |Df^p(f(c))| \right)^{-t/\ell_c} \right)^n \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} (1 - \kappa)^n = \kappa^{-1}$$

Taking an appropriate subset of the terms in this series, we obtain<sup>1</sup> for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$(16) \quad \max_{c \in \text{Crit}} \sum_{s \leq n} \sum_{\substack{(p_1, \dots, p_s) \\ \sum_i p_i \leq n \\ p_i \geq p_U}} \prod_{p_i} \zeta^t \left( \gamma_{p_i}^{\ell_c - 1} |Df^{p_i}(f(c))| \right)^{-t/\ell_c} \leq \kappa^{-1}.$$

During the *free period*, derivatives grow exponentially (Mañé's Theorem, see [MSt, Theorem III.5.1.]), because there exist  $C_1 > 0$  and  $\lambda_1 > 1$ , depending only on  $f$  and  $U$ , such that

$$(17) \quad |Df^k(x)| \geq C_1 \lambda_1^k \quad \text{if } f^i(x) \notin U \text{ for } 0 \leq i < k.$$

Now fix a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\text{Crit}$  as in Lemma 10 with  $\partial U \subset \cup_n f^{-n}(\text{Crit})$  and so small that estimate (16) holds. In fact, parallel to (17), one can derive that sets  $A$  that avoid  $U$  for a long time are exponentially small: there are  $C_2 > 0$  and  $\lambda_2 > 1$  such that

$$(18) \quad |f^n(A)| \leq C_2 \lambda_2^{-k} \quad \text{if } f^i(A) \cap U = \emptyset \text{ for } 0 \leq i < k.$$

We define  $\nu_j = \nu_j(X_i)$  inductively as  $\nu_j := \min\{n : n \geq \nu_{j-1} + p_{j-1} \leq n < \tau_i, f^n(X_i) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$ . The  $j$ -th binding period of  $X_i$  starts at  $\nu_j$  and the  $j$ -th binding period itself is  $p_j = p_j(X_i) = \min\{p_j(x) : x \in X_i\}$ . Since  $f^{\tau_i - n}$  maps  $f^n(X_i)$  to  $X$  in an extendible way for each  $n \leq \tau_i$ , the distortion of  $f^{\tau_i - n}|_{f^n(X_i)}$  is bounded uniformly in  $i$  and  $n$ . In the terminology of [BLS], every return time is a *deep return*,

<sup>1</sup>This is an adaptation of Equation (5) in [BLS] taking into account the typo that there the  $-$  in the exponent is missing.

and there are no *shallow returns*. Let  $\tau'_i$  be the time that the final binding period ends, so  $\tau'_i = \nu_s + p_s \leq \tau_i$  if  $X_i$  has  $s$  binding periods.

Note that the inducing time  $\tau_i$  of  $X_i$  cannot be inside a binding period, unless  $\gamma_{\tau_i} \geq \delta|X|$ . Indeed, during the binding period,  $X_i$  shadows some critical value  $f^k(c)$   $\gamma_k$ -closely, so there will not be the required Koebe-space of  $\delta|X|$  unless  $\gamma_{\tau_i} \geq \delta|X|$ . Take  $k_0 = k_0(|X|)$  such that  $\gamma_k \leq \delta|X|$  for all  $k \geq k_0$ . There is  $C_3 = C_3(|X|) \in (0, 1]$  such that (15) can be replaced by

$$F'_p(x) \geq C_3 C_0 \left( \gamma_p^{\ell_c - 1} |Df^p(f(c))| \right)^{1/\ell_c}.$$

where  $c$  is the closest critical point to  $x$ . We will use this estimate only for those  $X_i$  for which the **final** binding period  $p_j(X_i)$  is cut short because inducing time  $\tau_i$  falls into the proper final binding period.

To estimate  $Z_0(\Psi_S)$ , we first group together domains  $X_i$  into a ‘cluster’ if they have the same binding periods  $p_1, \dots, p_s$  up to their common time  $\tau'_i$  and  $f^j(\text{conv } \tilde{A}) \cap \text{Crit} = \emptyset$  for  $j \leq \tau_i$ , where  $\text{conv } \tilde{A}$  is the convex hull of the cluster. By the Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0(\Psi_S) &\asymp_{dis} \sum_i |X_i|^t e^{-\tau_i S} = \sum_n e^{-nS} \sum_{n' \leq n} \sum_{\substack{\text{cluster } \tilde{A} \\ \tau(\tilde{A})=n, \tau'(\tilde{A})=n'}} \sum_{X_i \subset \tilde{A}} |X_i|^t \\ &\leq \sum_n e^{-nS} \sum_{n' \leq n} \sum_{\substack{\text{cluster } \tilde{A} \\ \tau(\tilde{A})=n, \tau'(\tilde{A})=n'}} (\#\{i : X_i \text{ belongs to } \tilde{A}\})^{1-t} \left( \sum_{X_i \subset \tilde{A}} |X_i| \right)^t \\ &\leq \sum_n e^{-nS} \sum_{n' \leq n} e^{(h_{top}(f) + \varepsilon)(n-n')(1-t)} \sum_{\substack{\text{cluster } \tilde{A} \\ \tau(\tilde{A})=n, \tau'(\tilde{A})=n'}} |\tilde{A}|^t, \end{aligned}$$

where the cardinality  $\#\{i : X_i \text{ belongs to } \tilde{A}\}$  is estimated by  $e^{(h_{top}(f) + \varepsilon)(n-n')}$  for some small  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(t) > 0$ , because the cluster  $\tilde{A}$  has  $n - n'$  iterates left to the inducing time.

To estimate  $\sum_{\tau(\tilde{A})=n, \tau'(\tilde{A})=n'} |\tilde{A}|^t$ , we distinguish two classes of clusters depending on the amount of free time in the first  $\tau'$  iterates. For  $\eta > 0$  to be fixed later, and for given  $n$  and  $n'$ , let

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}'_{n,n'} = \left\{ \tilde{A} : \tau'(\tilde{A}) = n', \tau(\tilde{A}) = n, \sum_{i=1}^s p_i \leq \eta n \right\}$$

and

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}''_{n,n'} = \left\{ \tilde{A} : \tau'(\tilde{A}) = n', \tau(\tilde{A}) = n, \sum_{i=1}^s p_i > \eta n \right\}.$$

The estimates for  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}'_{n,n'}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}''_{n,n'}$  will use Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 of [BLS] respectively. Indeed, Lemma 3.5 of [BLS] gives some  $\eta$  (fixing the definition of  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}'_{n,n'}$ ) and  $\lambda_3 > 1$

depending on  $\lambda_1$  and  $\eta$  such that

$$(19) \quad \sum_{\tilde{A} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}'_{n,n'}} |\tilde{A}|^t \leq \lambda_3^{-\frac{1}{2}n't} \sup_{\tilde{A} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}'_{n,n'}} |f^{n'}(\tilde{A})|^t \leq C_1^{-t} \lambda_3^{-\frac{1}{2}n't} \lambda_1^{-(n-n')t},$$

where the last inequality follows by (17) because  $f^{n'}(\tilde{A})$  is disjoint from  $U$  for the remaining  $n - n'$  iterates.

Continuing with  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}''_{n,n'}$  for this  $\eta$ , define  $d_n(c) := \min_{i < n} (\gamma_i / |Df^i(f(c))|)^{1/\ell_c} |f^i(c) - \text{Crit}| \leq 1$  (formula (2) in [BLS]) and let (following [BLS, page 635])

$$\hat{d}_{n,j}(c) := d_i(c) \text{ for } i = \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{\eta n}{2j^2} \right\rceil, 1 \right\}.$$

Then we will adapt Lemma 3.6 of [BLS] to get a constant  $C_4 > 0$  such that

$$(20) \quad \sum_{\tilde{A} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}''_{n,n'}} |\tilde{A}|^t \leq C_2^{-t} \lambda_2^{-(n-n')t} C_4 \sum_{j=1}^{n'} 2^{-j} \left( \max_{c \in \text{Crit}} \hat{d}_{n',j}(c) \right)^t.$$

Indeed, select the longest binding period among  $(p_1, \dots, p_s)$  of the cluster, and call it  $p_j$ . Note that  $p_j > \eta n / (2j^2)$ , because otherwise  $\sum_{k=1}^s p_k < \eta n$ , contradicting the definition of  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}''_{n,n'}$ . The interval  $[x, y] := f^{\nu_j}(\text{conv } \tilde{A})$  satisfies

$$|x - y| \leq C_5 \max_{p \geq \eta n / 2j^2} d_p(c) \cdot |f^{\nu_j + p_j}(\text{conv } \tilde{A})| = C_5 \hat{d}_{n',j}(c) \cdot |f^{\nu_j + p_j}(\text{conv } \tilde{A})|,$$

where  $C_5$  is a uniform distortion constant. Write  $\tilde{A} = \tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j}$  to indicate that  $p_j$  is the longest binding period of  $\tilde{A}$ . By Lemma 3.2 of [BLS], and recalling that all returns are *deep*, we can find  $C_6$  such that

$$|\tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j}| \leq C_3 C_6^{j-1} |f^{\nu_{j-1} + p_{j-1}}(\text{conv } \tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j})| \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{F'_{p_k}},$$

where the single factor  $C_3$  accounts for the possibility that final binding period is 'cut short' by inducing time  $n$ . Following the proof of Lemma 3.6 of [BLS], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\text{cluster } \tilde{A} \\ \tau(\tilde{A})=n, \tau'(\tilde{A})=n'}} |\tilde{A}|^t &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n'} \sum_{(p_1, \dots, p_j)} |\tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j}|^t \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n'} \left( C_5 \max_{c \in \text{Crit}} \hat{d}_{n',j}(c) \right)^t \\ &\quad \times \sum_{(p_1, \dots, p_j)} C_3^t (2\#\text{Crit})^j \left( C_6^{j-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{F'_{p_k}} \right)^t |f^{\nu_j + p_j}(\text{conv } \tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j})|^t, \end{aligned}$$

where the  $(2\#\text{Crit})^j$  accounts for the different sides of critical points that have intervals with the same binding period.

The maps  $f^{\nu_j+p_j}|_{\text{conv } \tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j}}$  and  $f^{n'-(\nu_j+p_j)}|_{f^{\nu_j+p_j}(\text{conv } \tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j})}$  have bounded distortion. Each set  $f^{n'}(\tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j})$  is disjoint from  $U$  for the remaining  $n - n'$  iterates, so (18) gives

$$|f^{n'}(\text{conv } \tilde{A}_{p_1, \dots, p_j})| \leq C_2 \lambda_2^{-(n-n')}.$$

Using (16) with  $\zeta = 4C_0^{-1/t_0} C_6^{t_0} \#\text{Crit}$ , we can estimate

$$\sum_{(p_1, \dots, p_j)} (2\#\text{Crit})^j \left( C_6^{j-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{F'_{p_k}} \right)^t \leq \frac{C_3^t}{\kappa 2^j}.$$

Combining the previous three displayed formulas, we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{cluster } \tilde{A} \\ \tau(\tilde{A})=n, \tau'(\tilde{A})=n'}} |\tilde{A}|^t \leq C_2^t \lambda_2^{-(n-n')t} C_4 \sum_{j=1}^{n'} 2^{-j} \left( \max_{c \in \text{Crit}} \hat{d}_{n',j}(c) \right)^t,$$

for  $C_4 = (C_3 C_5)^t / \kappa$ . This proves (20). Note that the factor  $\sum_{j=1}^{n'} 2^{-j} \left( \max_{c \in \text{Crit}} \hat{d}_{n',j}(c) \right)^t$  in (20) decays polynomially, as in the proof of [BLS, Proposition 3.1]. This is why for  $t = 1$  (and  $n \approx n'$ ), where there is no exponentially small factor  $\lambda^{-(n-n')t}$ , we still obtain polynomial tails.

Now we obtain (using (19) and (20))

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0(\Psi_S) &\leq_{\text{dis}} \sum_n e^{-nS} \sum_{n' \leq n} e^{(h_{\text{top}}(f) + \varepsilon)(n-n')(1-t)} \left( \sum_{\tilde{A} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}'_{n,n'}} |\tilde{A}|^t + \sum_{\tilde{A} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}''_{n,n'}} |\tilde{A}|^t \right) \\ &\leq \sum_n e^{-nS} \sum_{n' \leq n} e^{(h_{\text{top}}(f) + \varepsilon)(n-n')(1-t)} \times \\ &\quad \left( C_1^{-t} \lambda_2^{-(n-n')t} \lambda_3^{-\frac{1}{2}n't} + C_2^t \lambda_2^{-(n-n')t} C_4 \sum_{j=1}^{n'} 2^{-j} \left( \max_{c \in \text{Crit}} \hat{d}_{n',j}(c) \right)^t \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is finite, provided  $t$  is sufficiently close to 1. The proof that  $\int \tau d\mu_\Psi < \infty$  amounts to showing that  $ne^{-nS} \sum_{n' \leq n} \sum_{\tau_i=n, \tau'_i=n'} |X_i|^t$  is summable in  $n$ , cf. (12). If  $t < 1$ , then  $S = P(\varphi_t) > 0$  by (2), so for  $t \in (t_1, 1)$  where  $t_1 \in (t_0, 1)$  is sufficiently close to 1, the exponential factor  $e^{-nS}$  dominates  $n$  and summability follows. This also implies the required exponential tail property for  $(X, F, \mu_{\Psi_{P(\varphi_t)}})$ .  $\square$

For the case  $t = 1$  we already know by [BRSS] that there is an acip, so the above proposition shows that the acip must have polynomial tails. Hence the proof of Theorem 1 for (except for the proof that  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  is analytic, which is postponed to the end of Section 6) essentially amounts to an application of Proposition 2 (Case 4.) to the case  $t \in (t_1, 1)$ , and is completed in a similar way to the proof of Theorem 2. The rate of decay of the tails follows from Proposition 4.

Proposition 4 and the proof of Theorem 2 parts (a) and (b) now allow us to prove Proposition 1.

*Proof of Proposition 1.* By Lemma 5, there exist  $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon > 0$  such that for any  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ ,  $h_\mu(f) + \int \psi_t d\mu > P_+(\psi_t) - \varepsilon_0$  implies  $h_\mu(f) > \varepsilon$ . We can choose  $\{\hat{X}^k\}_{0 \leq k \leq N}$  as in Proposition 3: we need only select these sets so small that the corresponding inducing scheme is uniformly expanding, in order to satisfy (a) of that proposition, and so that  $x \in \pi(\hat{X}^0)$ . Property (b) of Proposition 3 follows for all  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$  by the computations in the proof of Theorem 2(a) and (b) and in Proposition 4. The fact that for any  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ ,  $\mu_t$  is compatible to our  $(X^0, F_0)$  follows by Lemma 9. Therefore, Proposition 3 implies that the measures  $\mu$  must be compatible to  $(X^0, F_0)$ . Finally take  $(X, F) = (X^0, F_0)$ .  $\square$

## 6. PROOFS OF THEOREM 1 AND 2; EXPONENTIAL TAILS AND POSITIVE DISCRIMINANT

In Theorems 1 and 2 we see that with the exception of non-Collet-Eckmann maps (*i.e.*, satisfying (1) but not (3)) with potential  $\varphi = -\log |Df|$ , all the equilibrium states  $\mu_\varphi$  obtained are compatible to an inducing scheme with exponential tail behaviour:  $\mu_\Psi(\{x \in X : \tau(x) = n\}) \leq C e^{-\alpha n}$  for some  $C, \alpha > 0$ .

The literature gives many consequences; we mention a few:

- The system  $(I, f, \mu_\varphi)$  has exponential decay of correlations and satisfies the Central Limit Theorem. This follows directly from Young's results [Y] relating the decay of correlations to the tail behaviour of the Young tower.
- The system  $(I, f, \mu_\varphi)$  satisfies the Almost Sure Invariance Principle (ASIP), see [MN] or [HK1] for earlier ideas in this direction.
- In [C], Collet proves Gumbel's Law (which is related to exponential return statistics) for the acip provided the Young tower construction has exponential tail behaviour. It seem likely that this result extends to the equilibrium states for  $\varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$  and  $t < 1$ .

Another application of exponential tails pertains to analyticity of the pressure function  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  and the absence of phase transitions (which would be expressed by lack of differentiability of the pressure function). A key result here is phrased by Sarig [Sa2] in terms of directional derivatives

$$\frac{d}{ds} P(\psi + sv)|_{s=0}$$

where  $\psi$  and  $v$  are suitable potentials. To prove analyticity of  $t \mapsto P(t\varphi)$  near  $t = 1$ , we take  $v = \psi = \varphi$ . Sarig obtains his results for Gurevich pressure. For appropriate potentials and inducing scheme, he first introduces the concept of discriminant  $\mathfrak{D}$ , which is positive if and only if the inducing scheme has exponential tails with respect to the equilibrium state of the induced potential. Next it is shown that if the inducing scheme is a first return map, then positive discriminant implies analyticity of  $s \mapsto P_G(\psi + sv)$  near  $s = 0$ . In our case, the inducing scheme is a first return map on the Hofbauer tower, but also a Rokhlin-Kakutani tower can be constructed for which the first return map to the base is isomorphic to the inducing scheme. Currently, in the context of smooth dynamical systems, these towers tend to be

called a Young towers [Y]. In this section we will use the Young tower rather than the Hofbauer tower since its good distortion properties on elements of its natural partition  $\Delta_{i,j}$  (see below) are particularly useful here.

The resulting analyticity of the pressure function on the Young tower then needs to be related to the original system. We will do that using a transition from Gurevich pressure to the following type of pressure:

$$P_+(\psi) := \sup \left\{ h_\mu(f) + \int \psi d\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+ \text{ and } - \int \psi d\mu < \infty \right\}$$

for which we use a result by Fiebig et al. [FFY].

The set-up of the remainder of this section is as follows. We first introduce the Young tower associated with the inducing scheme, and then discuss directional derivatives and discriminants. This gives us the necessary terminology to state the main theorem (Theorem 5). Then we show how this can be applied to prove the remaining analyticity parts of Theorems 1 and 2. Finally, we prove Theorem 5.

Let  $X \subset I$  and  $(X, F, \tau)$  be an inducing scheme on  $X$  where  $F = f^\tau$ . As usual we denote the set of domains of the inducing scheme by  $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ . The *Young tower*, see [Y], is defined as the disjoint union

$$\Delta = \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \bigsqcup_{j=0}^{\tau_i-1} (X_i, j),$$

with dynamics

$$f_\Delta(x, j) = \begin{cases} (x, j+1) & \text{if } x \in X_i, j < \tau_i - 1; \\ (F(x), 0) & \text{if } x \in X_i, j = \tau_i - 1. \end{cases}$$

For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq j < \tau_i$ , let  $\Delta_{i,j} := \{(x, j) : x \in X_i\}$  and  $\Delta_l := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_{i,l}$  is called the  $l$ -th floor. Define the natural projection  $\pi_\Delta : \Delta \rightarrow X$  by  $\pi_\Delta(x, j) = f^j(x)$ , and  $\pi_X : \Delta \rightarrow X$  by  $\pi_X(x, j) = x$ . Note that  $(\Delta, f_\Delta)$  is a Markov system, and the first return map of  $f_\Delta$  to the base  $\Delta_0$  is isomorphic to  $(X, F, \tau)$ .

Also, given  $\psi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let  $\psi_\Delta : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $\psi_\Delta(x, j) = \psi(f^j(x))$ . Then the induced potential of  $\psi_\Delta$  to the first return map to  $\Delta_0$  is exactly the same as the induced potential of  $\psi$  to the inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$ .

The differentiability of the pressure functional can be expressed using directional derivatives  $\left. \frac{d}{ds} P_G(\psi + sv) \right|_{s=0}$ . We will use the method of [Sa2], but will require less stringent conditions on the potentials. Let  $(W, f)$  be a topologically mixing dynamical system with the set of  $n$ -cylinders denoted by  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ . For a potential  $\psi : W \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  we can ask that  $\psi$  satisfies

$$(21) \quad \sup_{C_n \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sup_{x, y \in C_n} |\psi_n(x) - \psi_n(y)| = o(n).$$

As shown in [FFY], this guarantees that  $\psi$  satisfies (11) which means that the Gurevich pressure is well defined and independent of the initial cylinder set  $X_i$ , where  $Z_n(\psi) = Z_n(\psi, X_i)$ ; also Theorem 7 below is satisfied. Moreover, if the



induced potential is weakly Hölder continuous, then (21) is a sufficient condition on the original potential to allow us to use the results of [Sa2, Section 6], see Theorem 6.

For an inducing scheme  $(X, F, \tau)$ , let  $\psi_\Delta$  and  $v_\Delta$  be the lifted potentials to the Young tower. Suppose that  $\psi_\Delta : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies (21). We define the set of *directions* with respect to  $\psi$  as the set

$$Dir_F(\psi) := \left\{ v : \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+} \left| \int v d\mu \right| < \infty, v_\Delta \text{ satisfies (21), } \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} V_n(\Upsilon) < \infty, \text{ and } \right. \\ \left. \exists \varepsilon > 0 \text{ s.t. } P_G(\psi_\Delta + sv_\Delta) < \infty \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \right\},$$

where  $\Upsilon$  is the induced potential of  $v$ . As in previous sections, let  $\psi_S := \psi - S$  (and so  $\Psi_S = \Psi - S\tau$ ). Set  $p_F^*[\psi] := \inf\{S : P_G(\Psi_S) < \infty\}$ .<sup>2</sup> If  $p_F^*[\psi] > -\infty$ , we define the  $X$ -discriminant of  $\psi$  as

$$\mathfrak{D}_F[\psi] := \sup\{P_G(\Psi_S) : S > p_F^*[\psi]\} \leq \infty.$$

Given a dynamical system  $(X, F)$ , we say that a potential  $\Psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *weakly Hölder continuous* if there exist  $C, \gamma > 0$  such that  $V_n(\Psi) \leq C\gamma^n$  for all  $n \geq 0$ .

The main result of this section is as follows:

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  be an interval map with potential  $\varphi : I \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ . Suppose that  $\varphi$  satisfies (21) or is of the form  $\varphi = -t \log |Df|$ . Take  $\psi = \varphi - P(\varphi)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{D}_F[\psi] > 0$  if and only if  $(X, F, \mu_\Psi)$  has exponential tails.*

*Moreover, the inducing scheme can be chosen such that given  $v \in Dir_F(\psi)$  such that  $\psi_\Delta + v_\Delta$  is continuous and the induced potential  $\Upsilon$  is weakly Hölder continuous, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $s \mapsto P_+(\psi + sv)$  is real analytic on  $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ .*

As noted before, the appropriately shifted potential  $\varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$ , gives rise to an equilibrium state with exponential tail for  $t$  in a neighbourhood of 1 if (3) holds, and for  $t \in (t_1, 1)$  if (3) fails but (1) holds. Take  $v = -\log |Df|$ . Any induced system provided in Section 5 is extendible, so by the Koebe lemma the induced potential  $\Upsilon$  has summable variations, and in fact is weakly Hölder. Similarly  $(-\log |Df|)_\Delta$  satisfies (21). Also, since  $P_G(\psi_\Delta + sv_\Delta) \leq P_G(\Psi + s\Upsilon)$  which is clearly bounded for small  $s$ , we have that  $P_G(\psi_\Delta + sv_\Delta) < \infty$  for small  $s$ . Therefore there is an inducing scheme with  $v \in Dir_F(\psi)$ . Thus Theorem 5 can be applied to give the analyticity of  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  for  $t \in (t_1, 0)$ , to complete the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathfrak{D}_F[\psi] > 0$ . This is equivalent to the existence of  $0 > \varepsilon_0 > p_F^*[\psi]$  such that  $P_G(\Psi_{\varepsilon_0}) < \infty$ . By the Gibbs property, for  $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$  we have  $\mu_{\Psi_\varepsilon}(\{\tau = n\}) \asymp \sum_{\tau_i = n} e^{\Psi_i - n\varepsilon}$ . Then

$$\mu_{\Psi_\varepsilon}(\{\tau = n\}) \asymp e^{-n(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)} \sum_{\tau_i = n} e^{\Psi_i - n\varepsilon_0}.$$

<sup>2</sup>Note that we use the opposite sign for  $p_F^*[\psi]$  to Sarig.

Notice that

$$\sum_{\tau_i=n} e^{\Psi_i - n\varepsilon_0} \asymp \mu_{\Psi_{\varepsilon_0}}(\{\tau = n\}) < \mu_{\Psi_{\varepsilon_0}}(X) = 1,$$

so  $\mu_{\Psi_{\varepsilon}}(\{\tau = n\}) < Ce^{-n(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)}$ . Since  $\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0 > 0$ ,  $(X, F, \mu_{\Psi_{\varepsilon}})$  has exponential tails.

Conversely, suppose that  $(X, F, \mu_{\Psi})$  has exponential tails with exponent  $\alpha > 0$ , that is

$$\sum_{\tau_i=n} e^{\Psi_i} \asymp \mu_{\Psi}(\{\tau = n\}) < Ce^{-n\alpha}.$$

Then, for all  $-\alpha < \varepsilon_0$ , and for  $Z_0$  defined on page 22,

$$P_G(\Psi_{\varepsilon_0}) \leq CZ_0(\Psi_{\varepsilon_0}) \leq C \sum_n \sum_{\tau_i=n} e^{\Psi_i - n\varepsilon_0} < C \sum_n e^{-n(\alpha + \varepsilon_0)} < \infty.$$

Therefore  $p_F^*[\psi] \leq -\alpha < 0$  and so  $\mathfrak{D}_F[\psi] > 0$ .

For the second part of the theorem, we use the following result from [Sa2, Theorem 4].

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $(W, f)$  be a topologically mixing dynamical system and  $\psi : W \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a potential satisfying (21), such that  $P_G(\psi) < \infty$  and for  $X \in \mathcal{P}_n$ ,  $\mathfrak{D}_F[\psi] > 0$  and  $\Psi$  is weakly Hölder continuous. Then for all  $v \in \text{Dir}_F(\psi)$  such that  $\Upsilon$  is weakly Hölder continuous, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $s \mapsto P_G(\psi + sv)$  is real analytic on  $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ .*

We can use this to show that  $s \mapsto P_G(\psi + sv)$  is analytic. However, to go from the Gurevich pressure to the usual pressure, we need a Variational Principle. Sarig's theory provides various conditions on potentials which yield a Variational Principle, but they are somewhat restrictive, and in particular for our case, are not satisfied by the potential  $-t \log |Df|$ . One aim of [FFY] is to weaken these conditions. There, the following theorem is proved.

**Theorem 7.** *If  $(W, S)$  be a transitive Markov shift and  $\psi : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous function satisfying (21), then  $P_G(\psi) = P(\psi)$ .*

We now apply Theorem 6 to the symbolic space induced by  $(\Delta, f_{\Delta})$ . In this space, the potential  $(-t \log |Df| - S')_{\Delta}$  satisfies (21) and is continuous in the symbolic metric. Theorem 6 implies that there is  $\varepsilon' > 0$  such that  $s \mapsto P_G(\psi_{\Delta} + sv_{\Delta})$  is analytic on  $(-\varepsilon', \varepsilon')$ . Thus, by Theorem 7,  $s \mapsto P(\psi_{\Delta} + sv_{\Delta})$  is also analytic on  $(-\varepsilon', \varepsilon')$ .

All  $f_{\Delta}$ -invariant probability measures  $\nu$  have positive Lyapunov exponents. This is because the induced map  $(X, F)$  (which is isomorphic to the first return map to  $\Delta_0$ ) is uniformly expanding and the Ergodic Theorem gives

$$\lambda(\nu) := \int \log |Df_{\Delta}| d\nu = \nu(\Delta_0) \int \log |DF_{\Delta}| d\nu \geq \nu(\Delta_0) \inf_x \log |DF(x)| > 0.$$

Therefore  $P(\psi_{\Delta} + sv_{\Delta}) = P_+(\psi_{\Delta} + sv_{\Delta})$  for  $s \in (-\varepsilon', \varepsilon')$ .

Since the inducing scheme  $(X, F)$  is obtained from both  $(I, f)$  and  $(\Delta, f_\Delta)$  with the same inducing time  $\tau = \tau_\Delta$ , Lemma 6 implies that

$$h_{\mu_\Delta}(f_\Delta) = \left( \int \tau d\mu_F \right)^{-1} h_{\mu_F}(F) = h_\mu(f)$$

and

$$\mu_\Delta(\varphi_\Delta) = \left( \int \tau d\mu_F \right)^{-1} \mu_F(\Phi) = \mu(\varphi),$$

whenever  $\mu_\Delta$  and  $\mu_F$  are the induced measures of  $\mu$  to  $(\Delta, f_\Delta)$  and  $(X, F)$  respectively, and  $\varphi$  is any potential. Thus the free energy of  $\mu$  and the lifted version  $\mu_\Delta$  are the same. This implies that  $s \mapsto P_G(\psi + sv)$  is analytic on  $(-\varepsilon', \varepsilon')$  if the definition of pressure involved only those measures which lift to  $\Delta$ . Moreover,  $P_+(\psi_\Delta + sv_\Delta) \leq P_+(\psi + sv)$  for  $s \in (-\varepsilon', \varepsilon')$ .

It remains to prove that there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that for all  $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ ,  $P_+(\psi_\Delta + sv_\Delta) \geq P_+(\psi + sv)$ . The issue is that in principle there might be measures which have high free energy but do not lift to  $\Delta$ . We show how Proposition 1 implies that this is impossible, thus completing the theorem. Since by assumption  $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+} \left| \int v d\mu \right| < \infty$ ,  $P_+(\psi + \varepsilon v) \rightarrow P_+(\psi) = 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore there exists  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon'$  so that for any  $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ , we have  $P_+(\psi + sv) > -\frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$ . Hence for all  $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ , if a measure  $\mu$  has  $h_\mu(f) + \int \psi + sv d\mu > P_+(\psi + sv) - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}$  then Proposition 1 implies  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{X}) > 0$ . Hence  $P_+(\psi_\Delta + sv_\Delta) \geq P_+(\psi + sv)$ . Therefore  $P_+(\psi_\Delta + sv_\Delta) = P_+(\psi + sv)$ , and the analyticity of  $s \mapsto P_+(\psi + sv)$  on  $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  follows.  $\square$

It would be a further step to say that  $t \mapsto \mu_{\varphi_t}$  is analytic (where  $\mu_{\varphi_t}$  indicates the equilibrium state of  $\varphi_t$ ). Using the weak topology we can ask whether  $t \mapsto \int g d\mu_{\varphi_t}$  is analytic for any fixed continuous function  $g$ . We do have the following corollary:

**Corollary 2.** *In the setting of Theorems 1 and 2, let  $(X, F, \tau)$  be any inducing scheme as in Section 3. Fix  $s \in (t_1, 1)$  or  $s$  in a small neighbourhood of 1, according to whether (1) or (3) holds. Take  $\psi_t = \varphi_t - P_+(\varphi_s)$  for  $\varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$ , and let  $\Phi_t$  the induced potential. Then the function  $t \mapsto \int_X \tau d\mu_{\Psi_t}$  is analytic for  $t$  sufficiently close to  $s$ , where  $\mu_{\Psi_t}$  denotes the equilibrium state of  $\Psi_t$ .*

*Proof.* We know that  $t \mapsto P_+(\psi_t)$  and  $t \mapsto P(\Psi_t)$  are analytic. By Lemma 6,  $P(\Psi_t) = \left( \int \tau d\mu_{\Psi_t} \right) P_+(\varphi_t)$ , so analyticity of  $t \mapsto \int \tau d\mu_{\Psi_t}$  follows.  $\square$

## 7. CONCERNING THE HYPOTHESES OF THEOREMS 1 AND 2

In this section, we argue that the hypotheses of Theorems 1 and 2 cannot easily be relaxed. We also discuss some consequences of our proofs.

**The set  $\mathcal{M}_+$ :** The question how large the set  $\mathcal{M}_+$  is in comparison to  $\mathcal{M}_{erg}$  is answered by Hofbauer and Keller [HK3] in certain contexts. For unimodal maps, they prove that any measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{erg} \setminus \mathcal{M}_+$  has entropy 0 and belongs to the convex hull of the set of weak accumulation points of  $\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \delta_{f^k(c)} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $\delta_{f^k(c)}$  indicates the Dirac measure at the  $k$ -th image of the critical point. If we

restrict to the potential  $\varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$  at  $t = 1$ , then the following examples can be given:

- If  $f$  has a neutral fixed point, then the Dirac measure at this fixed point is an equilibrium state.
- There is a quadratic map without equilibrium measure for  $\varphi_1$ , see [BK]. In this case, the summability condition (14) fails.
- For maps such as the Fibonacci map (which satisfies (1) for  $\ell = 2$ ), there is only one measure in  $\mathcal{M}_{erg} \setminus \mathcal{M}_+$ , namely the unique invariant probability measure  $\mu_{\omega(c)}$  supported on the critical omega-limit set  $\omega(c)$ . This gives rise to a phase transition for the pressure function  $t \mapsto P(\varphi_t)$  at  $t = 1$ . The quadratic Fibonacci map has two equilibrium states for  $\varphi_1$ : an absolutely continuous probability measure and  $\mu_{\omega(c)}$ .

Moreover, there is a sequence of periodic points  $p_n$  with Lyapunov exponents  $\lambda(p_n) \searrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , see [NS]. The equidistributions on  $\text{orb}(p_n)$  belong to  $\mathcal{M}_+$ , which shows that  $P_+(\varphi_t) = 0$  for  $t \geq 1$ , but  $\mathcal{M}_+$  contains no equilibrium states if  $t > 1$ . See [BK] for more information on the phase transition.

- It is also possible that  $\mathcal{M}_{erg} \setminus \mathcal{M}_+$  contains several equilibrium states, all supported on  $\omega(c)$ . In [B3] an example is given where  $\omega(c)$  supports at least two ergodic measures, while there is also an acip, as follows from [B2, Theorem A (c)].

**Differentiability of the map  $f$ :** A  $C^{1+\varepsilon}$  assumption is necessary in order to use the result that  $\lambda(\mu) > 0$  implies liftability. This result, proved in [K1], relies on the property that  $\mu$ -typical points have nondegenerate unstable manifolds, see [L]. If  $f$  is only piecewise continuous, this property as well as liftability no longer hold; this is illustrated by an example due to Raith [Ra], see the left-hand graph in Figure 1. This is piecewise continuous map  $f$  with slope 2, having a zero-dimensional set  $H$  on which  $f$  is semiconjugate to a circle rotation. The unique  $f$ -invariant measure  $\mu$  of  $(H, f)$  has  $\lambda(\mu) = \log 2 > 0$ , but cannot be lifted to the Hofbauer tower, described in Section 3. This follows since it can be shown that for each  $x \in H$  and  $\hat{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ ,  $\hat{f}^n(\hat{x})$  belongs to a domain  $D_n \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |D_n| \rightarrow 0$ . As shown in the graph on the right of Figure 1, is easy to adjust this example into a continuous map with slope  $\pm 2$ , but this map is not differentiable at the turning points. Another part where  $C^2$  differentiability is used is Mañé's Theorem in the proof of Proposition 4.

**Measures with  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset \text{orb}(\text{Crit})$ :** Makarov and Smirnov [MSm1, MSm2] discuss specific polynomials  $f$  on the complex plane for which there is a phase transition for the potential  $\varphi_t = -t \log |Df|$  at some  $t < 0$ , and consequently these example would contradict our main theorem. The reason for this is that the Julia set  $J(f)$  has ‘very exposed’ fixed points on which the Dirac measures can become equilibrium states for  $t$  sufficiently small. In the interval setting this applies to the Chebyshev polynomials  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  of any degree  $d \geq 2$ . The set  $\{0, 1\}$  consists of the critically accessible points; each critical point is prefixed, and either (a)  $0 = f(0) = f(1) = f^2(\text{Crit})$ ; or (b)  $0 = f(0)$ ,  $f(1) = 1$  and 0 and 1 are both critical values of critical points. The critical accessibility creates an obstruction in




FIGURE 1. **Left:** Raith's example. For specific choices of  $\alpha$ , the points whose orbits stay in the domains of branches 1 and 4 (bold lines) for ever form a zero-dimensional Cantor set  $H$  on which  $f$  is semi-conjugate to a circle rotation.

**Right:** Rescaling the left bottom square and inserting a new branch gives a continuous example. Again the set of points whose orbits stay in the domains branches 1 and 3 (bold lines) for ever form a zero-dimensional Cantor set  $H$  on which  $f$  is semi-conjugate to a circle rotation.

our strategy of finding an induced scheme in Section 3. Further results on phase transitions for  $t > 1$  are given in [MSm3].

**The Gibbs property:** Although the equilibrium states obtained in  $\mathcal{M}_+$  (*i.e.*, for the original system) are positive on open sets, we cannot expect them to be Gibbs. First, if  $\varphi = -\log |Df|$ , then  $\varphi$  is unbounded near critical points, so it is impossible to have  $e^{\varphi_n(x) - nP(\varphi)} \leq K\mu(\mathbf{C}_n[x])$  uniformly in  $x$ . But also if the number  $K$  is allowed to depend on  $x$ , measures cannot always satisfy this weaker form of the Gibbs property. For example, if  $f(x) = ax(1-x)$  has an acip  $\mu$ , and the potential is  $\varphi = -\log |Df|$ , then the pressure  $P(\varphi) = 0$  and it is well known that  $\frac{d\mu}{dx} > \rho_0 > 0$  on a neighbourhood of  $c$ . Suppose by contradiction that for each  $x \notin \cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f^n(c)$ , there exists  $K = K(x)$  such that

$$\frac{1}{K} \leq \frac{\mu(\mathbf{C}_n[x])}{e^{\varphi_n(x)}} \leq K \text{ for each } n \geq 0.$$

Now  $\mu$ -a.e.  $x$  has an orbit accumulating on  $c$ , so almost surely there exists  $n$  such  $|f^n(x) - c| < \frac{1}{4K^2}$ . But then

$$\mu(\mathbf{C}_{n+1}[x]) \geq \frac{1}{K} e^{\varphi_{n+1}(x)} = \frac{1}{K} e^{\varphi_n(x)} \frac{1}{|Df^n(x)|} \geq \frac{1}{K^2} \mu(\mathbf{C}_n[x]) \frac{4K^2}{2} \geq 2\mu(\mathbf{C}_n[x]),$$

which contradicts that  $\mathbf{C}_{n+1}[x] \subset \mathbf{C}_n[x]$ . Thus  $\mu$  cannot be a Gibbs measure.

In some cases, a weak Gibbs property can be proved. For example, it was shown in [BV] that for unimodal maps with critical order  $\ell$  satisfying a summability condition, and every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $K = K(x)$  for Lebesgue a.e.  $x$  such that

$$\frac{1}{Kn^{3(\ell+1)}} \leq \frac{\mu_\varphi(\mathbf{C}_n[x])}{e^{\varphi_n(x)}} \leq Kn^{2(1+\varepsilon)}.$$

## APPENDIX

In this appendix we give the two remaining proofs. The first is a lemma on the structure of the Hofbauer tower. First let us define a natural partition of  $\hat{I}$ . We let  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 := \mathcal{D} \vee \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_1)$ . We then let  $\mathcal{P}_n := \bigvee_{k=1}^n \hat{f}^{-k}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1)$ . One can show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between  $n$ -paths  $D \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow D'$  in  $\hat{I}$  and elements  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.* We start with case (a), so  $\Omega$  is a finite union of intervals. Let  $x \in \Omega$  be any point with a dense orbit in  $\Omega$ . Suppose that  $(\mathcal{E}, \rightarrow)$  is a maximal primitive subgraph that is not closed, then for any  $\hat{x} \in \pi^{-1}(x) \cap D_0$  for some  $D_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $\text{orb}(\hat{x})$  leaves  $\mathcal{E}$ , i.e.,  $\hat{f}^k(\hat{x}) \notin \mathcal{E}$  for  $k$  sufficiently large. Indeed, since  $\mathcal{E}$  is not closed, there is  $D \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $D' \notin \mathcal{E}$  such that  $D \rightarrow D'$ . There is an  $n$ -path  $D_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow D$  for arbitrarily large  $n$ , corresponding to sets  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ . Each  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n$  has an  $n+1$ -subcylinder  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n+1}$  corresponding to the  $n+1$ -path  $D_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow D \rightarrow D'$ . For  $n$  sufficiently large,  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n+1}$  is compactly contained in  $D$ . Since  $\text{orb}(x)$  is dense in  $\Omega$ , there is  $m$  such that  $f^m(x) \in \pi(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n+1})$ . Therefore  $\hat{f}^m(\hat{x}) \in \pi^{-1} \circ \pi(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n+1})$  and  $\hat{f}^{m+n+1}(\hat{x}) \in D''$  for some domain such that  $\pi(D'') \subset \pi(D')$ . Regardless of whether  $D'' = D'$  or not, there is no path from  $D''$  back into  $\mathcal{E}$ , because if there was, there would be a path from  $D'$  back into  $\mathcal{E}$ , contradicting maximality of  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Consequently,  $\text{orb}(\hat{x})$  will leave every maximal primitive subgraph that is not closed. If there is a closed primitive subgraph  $(\mathcal{E}, \rightarrow)$ , then it is unique,  $\hat{f}^k(\hat{x}) \in \mathcal{E}$  for all sufficiently large  $k$  and necessarily  $\pi(\cup_{D \in \mathcal{E}} D) \supset \Omega$ . Let us also show that there is  $\hat{y}$  with a dense orbit in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Fix  $D_0 \in \mathcal{E}$  and let  $U_n$  be a countable base of  $\sqcup_{D \in \mathcal{E}} D$ . Each  $U_n$  intersects some  $D$  and  $U_n$  contains an  $r_n$ -cylinder  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{r_n} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$  which itself is contained in  $D$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}$  is primitive, there is a path  $D_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow D$  of length  $l_n$  and another path  $D \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow D_0$  of length  $l'_n \geq r_n$  such that if  $\hat{z} \in D$  takes this path, then  $\hat{z} \in \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{r_n}$ . Let  $p_n := l_n + l'_n$ . Because  $(\mathcal{E}, \rightarrow)$  is a Markov graph, for each  $n \geq 1$  we have a cylinder  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{p_n} \subset D_0$  such that  $\hat{f}^{l_n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{p_n}) \subset \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{r_n} \subset U_n$  and  $\hat{f}^{p_n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{p_n}) = D_0$ .

Let  $q_0 = 0$  and  $q_n := \sum_{k=1}^n p_k$ . Let  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{q_1} = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{p_1}$ . By the Markov structure, we can pull back inductively to obtain a nested sequence of cylinder sets  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{q_n} \subset \dots \subset \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{q_1} \subset D_0$  with  $\hat{f}^{q_n+l_{n+1}}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{q_{n+1}}) \subset U_{n+1}$  and  $\hat{f}^{q_n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{q_{n+1}}) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{p_{n+1}}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . The point  $\hat{y} \in \bigcap_n \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{q_n}$  has a dense orbit in  $\mathcal{E}$ . In this case the lemma is proved.

Alternatively, suppose that no closed primitive subgraph exists. Abbreviate  $\hat{\Omega}_R := \pi^{-1}(\Omega) \cap \hat{I}_R$ . If  $\#(\text{orb}(\hat{x}) \cap \hat{\Omega}_R) = \infty$  for some  $R$ , then  $\#(\text{orb}(\hat{x}) \cap D) = \infty$  for some

$D \subset \hat{\Omega}_R$ , and  $\hat{f}^k(\hat{x})$  is in the non-empty maximal primitive subgraph containing  $D$ , for all sufficiently large  $k$ . The above argument shows that this subgraph is closed as well, so we would be in the previous case after all.

Therefore  $\text{orb}(\hat{x})$  has a finite intersection with every compact subset of  $\hat{I}$ . We will show that this contradicts  $\text{orb}(x)$  being dense in  $I$ , by showing that  $\text{orb}(x)$  cannot accumulate on an orientation reversing fixed point  $p$ , leaving the (very similar) argument where  $p$  is orientation preserving and/or where  $p$  has a higher period to the reader.

Assume (for the moment) that all critical points are turning points (and not inflection points). Call  $\zeta$  a *precritical point of order  $k$*  if  $f^k(\zeta) \in \text{Crit}$  and  $f^i(\zeta) \notin \text{Crit}$




FIGURE 2. The  $\pi$ -images of domains  $D = D_k$  and  $D'$ , their positions with respect to  $\zeta_n$  and a sketch how this leads to a path from  $D_{k-l}$  back into  $\hat{\Omega}_R$ .

for  $i < k$ . Let  $p$  be an orientation reversing fixed point and  $\zeta_0$  be a precritical point such that  $(\zeta_0, p)$  contains no precritical point of lower order. Then there is a point  $\zeta_1 \in f^{-1}(\zeta_0)$  at the other side of  $p$  with no precritical point of lower order in  $(p, \zeta_1)$ . Continue iterating backwards to find a sequence  $\zeta_0 < \zeta_2 < \zeta_4 < \dots < p < \dots < \zeta_5 < \zeta_3 < \zeta_1$ , such that  $(\zeta_n, p)$  (or  $(p, \zeta_{n+1})$ ) contains no precritical point of lower order. Let  $R$  be such that  $(\zeta_0, \zeta_2)$  compactly contains an  $R$ -cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_R^*$ . It follows that if  $D$  is a domain such that  $\pi(D) \supset (\zeta_0, \zeta_2)$ , then there is an  $R$ -path from  $D$  leading to  $D^* \subset \hat{\Omega}_R$ , see Figure 2. To continue the argument, we need the following claim which is proved at the end of this proof.

**Claim.** Take  $\varepsilon := \min\{|c - c'| : c \neq c' \in \text{Crit}\}$ , fix  $l \geq 0$  and let  $J$  be any interval such that  $|f^i(J)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $i \leq l$ . Then for any pair of  $l$ -cylinders  $\mathbf{C}_l, \mathbf{C}'_l \subset J$ , there is an  $l$ -cylinder  $\mathbf{C}''_l$  in the convex hull of  $\mathbf{C}_l$  and  $\mathbf{C}'_l$  such that the images  $f^l(\mathbf{C}_l), f^l(\mathbf{C}'_l) \subset f^l(\mathbf{C}''_l)$ .

Let  $D_k$  be the domain containing  $\hat{f}^k(\hat{x})$ . Recall that for every maximal primitive non-closed subgraph  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $D_k \in \mathcal{E}$  for at most finitely many  $k$ . So let  $k_0$  be such that  $D_{k_0}$  does not belong to any maximal primitive subgraph that intersects  $\hat{\Omega}_R$ . It follows that for each  $k \geq k_0$ , there is no path from  $D_k$  leading back into  $\hat{\Omega}_R$ . Furthermore, if  $\limsup_k |D_k| \geq \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is as in the claim, then for arbitrarily large  $k$ , there are paths  $D_k$  leading back into  $\hat{\Omega}_R$ . Therefore we can take  $k_0$  so large that  $|D_k| < \varepsilon$  for all  $k \geq k_0$ .

Assume by contradiction that  $p \in \overline{\text{orb}(x)}$ . Then there are arbitrarily large  $n$  such that if  $k = k(n)$  is the first integer such that  $f^k(x) \in (\zeta_n, \zeta_{n+1})$ , then  $k > k_0$ . Now if  $\pi(D_k) \supset (\zeta_n, \zeta_{n+2})$ , then there is an  $n$ -path from  $D_k \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow D$  where  $\pi(D) \supset (\zeta_0, \zeta_2)$ , and hence an  $n + R$ -path leading back into  $\hat{\Omega}_R$  (as in Figure 2). This contradicts the definition of  $k_0$ .

Otherwise, *i.e.*, if  $\pi(D_k) \not\supset (\zeta_n, \zeta_{n+2})$ , then the claim implies that there exist  $l$  and  $l$ -cylinders  $\mathbf{C}_l, \mathbf{C}_l'' \subset \pi(D_{k-l})$  such that  $f^l(\mathbf{C}_l) = \pi(D_k)$  while  $D''$  is such that  $\pi(D'') = f^l(\mathbf{C}_l'') \supset \pi(D_k)$  and  $\pi(D'') \supset (\zeta_n, \zeta_{n+2})$ , see Figure 2. Take  $l$  minimal with this property. As before, this gives an  $l + n + R$ -path leading from  $D_{k-l}$  to  $\hat{\Omega}_R$ . If  $k - l > k_0$ , then we have a contradiction again with the choice of  $k_0$ . However, we can repeat the argument for infinitely many  $n$ , and hence infinitely many  $k$ . If  $D_{k-l}$  has been used for one value of  $k$ , then at least one domain in  $\hat{f}(D_{k-l})$  is the starting domain of a path leading into  $\hat{\Omega}_R$ . Minimality of  $l$  implies that the same  $D_{k-l}$  no longer serves for the next value of  $k$ . This proves that for  $n$  sufficiently large,  $k - l > k_0$ , and this contradicts the choice of  $k_0$ , proving the lemma.

Finally, if there are critical inflection points, then we can repeat the argument with a branch partition and Hofbauer tower that disregards the inflection points. Indeed, the above arguments made use only of the topological structure of  $f$ , so whether  $f|_{\mathbf{C}_1}$  is diffeomorphic or only homeomorphic on  $\mathbf{C}_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1$  makes no difference.

*Proof of the Claim.* Let  $J$  be an interval such that  $|J| < \varepsilon$ . We argue by induction. For  $l = 1$ , the claim is true, since  $J$  can contain at most one 1-cylinder. Suppose now the claim holds for all integers  $< l$  and  $|f^i(J)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $i \leq l - 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}_l, \mathbf{C}_l' \subset J$  be  $l$ -cylinders, contained in  $l - 1$ -cylinders  $\mathbf{C}_{l-1}, \mathbf{C}_{l-1}'$ . By induction, we can find an  $l - 1$ -cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_{l-1}''$  in the convex hull  $[\mathbf{C}_{l-1}, \mathbf{C}_{l-1}']$  such that  $f^{l-1}(\mathbf{C}_{l-1}), f^{l-1}(\mathbf{C}_{l-1}') \subset f^{l-1}(\mathbf{C}_{l-1}'')$ . If  $\text{Crit} \cap f^{l-1}(\mathbf{C}_{l-1}'') = \emptyset$  then  $\mathbf{C}_{l-1}''$  is also an  $l$ -cylinder and  $f^l(\mathbf{C}_l), f^l(\mathbf{C}_l') \subset f^l(\mathbf{C}_{l-1}'')$ , proving the induction hypothesis for  $l$ . Otherwise, by definition of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $f^{l-1}(\mathbf{C}_{l-1}'')$  contains a single critical point, and the  $f^l$ -image of one  $l$ -subcylinder of  $\mathbf{C}_{l-1}''$  contains the  $f^l$ -image of the other. It is easy to see that this  $l$ -subcylinder satisfies the claim.  $\square$

This completes the proof of the claim and hence of part (a) of Lemma 2. Part (b) deals with renormalisable maps, so assume that  $J \neq I$  is a  $p$ -periodic interval which is minimal in the sense that no proper subinterval of  $J$  has period  $p$ . We claim that  $J$  is associated with an absorbing subgraph  $(\mathcal{E}_{\text{absorb}}, \rightarrow)$  of  $(\mathcal{D}, \rightarrow)$ . Indeed, by minimality of  $J$ ,  $f^p : J \rightarrow J$  is onto, and for any  $x \in \text{orb}(J)$  and  $n \geq 0$ , there is  $x_n \in \text{orb}(J)$  such that  $f^n(x_n) = x$ . Let  $\hat{J} = \bigcap_k \hat{f}^k(\pi^{-1}(\text{orb}(J)))$ . This set has the following properties:

- $\hat{J} \neq \emptyset$ : Since  $J$  contains an (interior)  $p$ -periodic point, it lifts to a  $p$ -periodic point in  $\hat{J}$ .
- If  $\hat{x} \in \hat{J}$  and  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  is the domain containing  $\hat{x}$ , then  $D \subset \hat{J}$ . This follows from the Markov property. Let  $x = \pi(\hat{x})$ , take  $x_n \in \text{orb}(J)$  as above and



$\hat{x}_n \in \pi^{-1}(\text{orb}(J))$  such that  $\hat{f}^n(\hat{x}_n) = \hat{x}$ . For  $\hat{y} \in D$  arbitrary, we can find  $\hat{y}_n \in \hat{Z}_n[\hat{x}_n]$  such that  $\hat{f}^n(\hat{y}_n) = \hat{y}$ . Since this holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\hat{y} \in \hat{J}$ .

- $\hat{J}$  is  $\hat{f}$ -invariant. This is immediate from the  $f$ -invariance of  $\text{orb}(J)$  and the definition of  $\hat{J}$ .

Take  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{absorb}} := \{D \in \mathcal{D} : D \cap \hat{J} \neq \emptyset\}$ . Then the  $\hat{f}$ -invariance of  $\hat{J}$  implies that  $(\mathcal{E}_{\text{absorb}}, \rightarrow)$  is indeed absorbing. Now apply part (a) to the subgraph  $(\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\text{absorb}}, \rightarrow)$  to find the required (non-closed) primitive subgraph.  $\square$

The next proof shows that measures of positive entropy must lift to cover a large portion of the Hofbauer tower.

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Liftability of  $\mu$  was shown by Keller [K1], so it remains to show that  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{I}_R) > \eta$  uniformly over all measures with  $h_\mu(f) \geq \varepsilon$ .

Fix  $R \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that  $(\delta + \frac{2}{R}) \log(1 + \#\text{Crit}) < \varepsilon/2$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_n^u$  be the collection of  $n$ -cylinders such that  $\frac{1}{n} \#\{k < n : \hat{f}^k \circ i(\mathbf{C}_n) \subset \hat{I}_R\} < \delta$ , where as before  $i^{-1} = \pi|_{D_0}$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}_n^l$  be the remaining  $n$ -cylinders.

If  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{I}_R)$  is small, then  $\mu(\cup_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n^l} \mathbf{C}_n)$  is small as well. Hence, if the lemma was false, then for any  $\eta > 0$  we could find a measure  $\mu$  with  $h_\mu(f) \geq \varepsilon$  and  $\mu(\cup_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n^l} \mathbf{C}_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2 \log(1 + \#\text{Crit})}$ . So assume by contradiction that there is such a measure  $\mu$ .

If  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  is any domain outside  $\hat{I}_R$ , then only the two outermost cylinder sets in  $\mathcal{P}_R \cap D$  can map under  $\hat{f}^R$  to domains of level  $> R$ . The  $\hat{f}^R$ -images of the other cylinder sets  $J'$  have both endpoints of level  $\leq R$ , so they have  $\text{level}(\hat{f}^R(J')) \leq R$ . Repeating this argument for  $\hat{f}^R(J')$  of those outermost cylinder sets, we can derive that for infinitely many  $n$ :

$$\lambda_u^n := \#\mathcal{P}_n^u \leq (1 + \#\text{Crit})^{\delta n} (1 + \#\text{Crit})^{(1-\delta)2n/R} \text{ and } \lambda_l^n := \#\mathcal{P}_n^l \leq (1 + \#\text{Crit})^n,$$

so  $\log \lambda_u \leq (\delta + \frac{2}{R}) \log(1 + \#\text{Crit}) < \varepsilon/2$  and  $\log \lambda_l \leq \log(1 + \#\text{Crit})$ . For any finite set of nonnegative numbers  $a_k$  such that  $\sum_k a_k = a \leq 1$ , Jensen's inequality gives  $-\sum_k a_k \log a_k \leq a \log \#\{a_k\}$ . Since the branch partition  $\mathcal{P}$  is assumed to generate the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, the entropy of  $\mu$  can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(f) &= \inf_n -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mu(\mathbf{C}_n) \log \mu(\mathbf{C}_n) \\ &= \inf_n -\frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n^l} \mu(\mathbf{C}_n) \log \mu(\mathbf{C}_n) + \sum_{\mathbf{C}_n \in \mathcal{P}_n^u} \mu(\mathbf{C}_n) \log \mu(\mathbf{C}_n) \right) \\ &\leq \inf_n \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1 + \#\text{Crit})} \log \lambda_l^n + \log \lambda_u^n \right) < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction establishes the required  $\eta > 0$ .

Now to prove the second statement, for each  $D \subset \hat{I}_R$ , we can find  $\kappa_D > 0$  such that if  $\hat{x} \in D$  and  $d(\hat{x}, \partial D) < \kappa_D$ , then  $\hat{f}^k(\hat{x}) \notin \hat{I}_R$  for  $R < k \leq 3R/\eta$ . Obviously

the set  $\hat{E} := \cup_{D \subset \hat{I}_R} \{\hat{x} \in D : d(\hat{x}, D) > \kappa_D\}$  is compactly contained in  $\hat{I}_R$ . If  $\hat{x}$  is a typical point for  $\hat{\mu}$ , then the relative time of  $\text{orb}(\hat{x})$  spent outside  $\hat{I}_R$  is at least  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{I}_R \setminus \hat{E})(\frac{3}{\eta} - 1) \leq 1$ , so  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{I}_R \setminus \hat{E}) < \eta/2$ , whence  $\hat{\mu}(\hat{E}) > \eta/2$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [Ab] L. M. Abramov, *The entropy of a derived automorphism*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **128** (1959) 647–650.
- [Ba] V. Baladi, *Positive transfer operators and decay of correlations*, Advanced Series in Non-linear Dynamics, **16** World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2000.
- [Bo] R. Bowen, *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 470. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975.
- [B1] H. Bruin, *Induced maps, Markov extensions and invariant measures in one-dimensional dynamics*, Commun. Math. Phys., **168** (1995) 571–580.
- [B2] H. Bruin, *Topological conditions for the existence of absorbing Cantor sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998) 2229–2263.
- [B3] H. Bruin, *Minimal Cantor systems and unimodal maps*, J. Difference Equ. Appl. **9** (2003) 305–318.
- [BK] H. Bruin, G. Keller, *Equilibrium states for  $S$ -unimodal maps*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **18** (1998) 765–789.
- [BLS] H. Bruin, S. Luzzatto, S. van Strien, *Decay of correlations in one-dimensional dynamics*, Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup. **36** (2003) 621–646.
- [BRSS] H. Bruin, J. Rivera-Letelier, W. Shen, S. van Strien, *Large derivatives, backward contraction and invariant densities for interval maps*, Invent. Math. **172** (2008) 509–533.
- [BS] H. Bruin, S. van Strien, *Expansion of derivatives in one-dimensional dynamics*, Isr. J. Math. **137** (2003) 223–263.
- [BT1] H. Bruin, M. Todd, *Markov Extensions and Lifting Measures for Complex Polynomials*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **27** (2007) 743–768.
- [BT2] H. Bruin, M. Todd, *Equilibrium states for potentials with  $\sup \varphi - \inf \varphi < h_{\text{top}}(f)$* , Commun. Math. Phys. **283** (2008) 579–611.
- [BV] H. Bruin, S. Vaienti, *Return time statistics for unimodal maps*, Fund. Math. **176** (2003) 77–94.
- [C] P. Collet, *Statistics of closest return times for some non uniformly hyperbolic systems*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **21** (2001) 401–420.
- [FFY] D. Fiebig, U.-R. Fiebig, M. Yuri, *Pressure and equilibrium states for countable state Markov shifts*, Israel J. Math. **131** (2002) 221–257.
- [H] F. Hofbauer, *The topological entropy of a transformation  $x \mapsto ax(1-x)$* , Monatsh. Math. **90** (1980) 117–141.
- [HK1] F. Hofbauer, G. Keller, *Ergodic properties of invariant measures for piecewise monotonic transformations*, Math. Z. **180** (1982) 119–140.
- [HK2] F. Hofbauer, G. Keller, *Equilibrium states for piecewise monotonic transformations*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **2** (1982) 23–43.
- [HK3] F. Hofbauer, G. Keller, *Quadratic maps without asymptotic measure*, Commun. Math. Phys. **127** (1990) 319–337.
- [HR] F. Hofbauer, P. Raith, *Topologically transitive subsets of piecewise monotonic maps which contain no periodic points*, Monatsh. Math. **107** (1989) 217–239.
- [K1] G. Keller, *Lifting measures to Markov extensions*, Monatsh. Math. **108** (1989) 183–200.
- [K2] G. Keller, *Equilibrium states in ergodic theory*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 42. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [KN] G. Keller, T. Nowicki, *Spectral theory, zeta functions and the distribution of periodic points for Collet–Eckmann maps*, Commun. Math. Phys. **149** (1992) 31–69.
- [Ko] O. S. Kozlovski, *Getting rid of the negative Schwarzian derivative condition*, Ann. of Math. **152** (2000) 743–762.

- [L] F. Ledrappier, *Some properties of absolutely continuous invariant measures on an interval*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **1** (1981) 77–93.
- [MSm1] N. Makarov, S. Smirnov, *Phase transition in subhyperbolic Julia sets*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **16** (1996) 125–157.
- [MSm2] N. Makarov, S. Smirnov, *On "thermodynamics" of rational maps. I. Negative spectrum*, Commun. Math. Phys. **211** (2000) 705–743.
- [MSm3] N. Makarov, S. Smirnov, *On thermodynamics of rational maps. II. Non-recurrent maps*, J. London Math. Soc. **67** (2003) 417–432.
- [MU] D. Mauldin, M. Urbański, *Gibbs states on the symbolic space over an infinite alphabet*, Israel J. Math. **125** (2001) 93–130.
- [MN] I. Melbourne, M. Nicol, *Almost sure invariance principle for nonuniformly hyperbolic systems*, Commun. Math. Phys. **260** (2005) 131–146.
- [MSt] W. de Melo, S. van Strien, *One dimensional dynamics*, Ergebnisse Series **25**, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [MSz] M. Misiurewicz and W. Szlenk, *Entropy of piecewise monotone mappings*, Studia Math. **67** (1980) 45–63.
- [NS] T. Nowicki, D. Sands, *Non-uniform hyperbolicity and universal bounds for  $S$ -unimodal maps*, Invent. Math. **132** (1998) 633–680.
- [PSe1] Y. Pesin, S. Senti, *Equilibrium measures for some one dimensional maps*, Preprint 2004 (<http://www.math.psu.edu/pesin/publications.html>).
- [PSe2] Y. Pesin, S. Senti, *Thermodynamical formalism associated with inducing schemes for one-dimensional maps*, Moscow Journal of Mathematics, **5:3** (2005).
- [PSe3] Y. Pesin, S. Senti, *Equilibrium measures for maps with inducing schemes*, J. Mod. Dyn. **2** (2008), no. 3, 397–430.
- [Pr] F. Przytycki, *Lyapunov characteristic exponents are nonnegative*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **119** (1993) 309–317.
- [Ra] P. Raith, *Hausdorff-dimension für stückweise monotone Abbildungen*, PhD. thesis (English), Universität Wien, 1987.
- [Ru1] D. Ruelle, *An inequality for the entropy of differentiable maps*, Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. **9** (1978) 83–87.
- [Ru2] D. Ruelle, *Thermodynamic formalism*, Addison Wesley, Reading MA, 1978.
- [St.P] M. St.Pierre, *Zur Hausdorff-Dimension spezieller invarianter Maße für Collet-Eckmann Abbildungen*, Diplomarbeit, Erlangen (1994).
- [Sa1] O. Sarig, *Thermodynamic formalism for Markov shifts*, PhD. thesis, Tel-Aviv, 2000.
- [Sa2] O. Sarig, *Phase transitions for countable Markov shifts*, Commun. Math. Phys. **217** (2001) 555–577.
- [Sa3] O. Sarig, *Existence of Gibbs measures for countable Markov shifts*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131** (2003) 1751–1758.
- [Se] S. Senti, *Dimension of weakly expanding points for quadratic maps*, Bull. Soc. Math. Fr. **131** 399–420 (2003).
- [Si] Y. Sinai, *Gibbs measures in ergodic theory*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk **27** (1972), no. 4 (166) 21–64.
- [SV] S. van Strien, E. Vargas, *Real bounds, ergodicity and negative Schwarzian for multimodal maps*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (2004) 749–782.
- [T] M. Todd, *Distortion bounds for  $C^{2+\eta}$  unimodal maps*, Fund. Math. **193** (2007) 37–77.
- [Y] L.-S. Young, *Recurrence times and rates of mixing*, Israel. J. Math. **110** (1999) 153–188.
- [Z] R. Zweimüller, *Invariant measures for general(ized) induced transformations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (2005) 2283–2295.

Department of Mathematics  
University of Surrey  
Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH  
UK  
h.bruin@surrey.ac.uk  
<http://www.maths.surrey.ac.uk/>

Department of Mathematics  
University of Surrey  
Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH  
UK<sup>3</sup>  
mtodd@fc.up.pt  
<http://www.fc.up.pt/pessoas/mtodd/>

---

<sup>3</sup>**Current address:**

Departamento de Matemática Pura  
Rua do Campo Alegre, 687  
4169-007 Porto  
Portugal