

# ON THE WORK AND VISION OF DMITRY DOLGOPYAT

CARLANGELO LIVERANI

ABSTRACT. I will present some of the results and techniques due to Dolgopyat. The presentation will be non technical and centered on the basic ideas. Also, I will try to present Dolgopyat's work in the context of a research program aimed at enlightening the relations between Dynamical Systems and Non-Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is in occasion of the awarding of the Brin prize to Dmitry Dolgopyat. I will try to explain not only some of the results for which the prize has been awarded but also the general relevance of Dolgopyat's work for the future development of the field of Dynamical Systems.

The field of Modern Dynamical Systems finds its roots not only in the study of Celestial Mechanics and, most notably, in Poincaré recognition of the phenomenon of dynamical instability [37] but also in the work of Boltzmann concerning the foundation of Statistical Mechanics. Indeed, the very concept of *ergodicity*, a cornerstone in the study of Dynamical Systems, is due to Boltzmann [7].

Yet, if one wants to obtain results relevant for Statistical Mechanics, it is necessary to reckon with systems having a large number of degree of freedom. Up to now, apart very few cases, we are able to deal only with very few degree of freedom (low dimensional dynamics).<sup>1</sup> In spite of this limitation the field of Dynamical Systems has been able to produce some results relevant to Statistical Mechanics<sup>2</sup> but their relevance is limited by the fact that they essentially deal with only few particles or degrees of freedom. Of course, one can consider a system of many *independent* particles, then their behavior is completely determined by the behavior of the one particle system, but this is clearly a too unreasonable idealization to be a realistic model.

While to treat really interacting systems is outside the possibilities of present day technology, it seems now possible to tackle the case of very weakly interacting systems. A success in such an endeavor would constitute a fundamental step in the direction of a rigorous foundation of Non-Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics. Yet, to this end several ingredients are necessary:

---

*Date:* February 23, 2010.

<sup>1</sup>The only real exceptions are, to my knowledge, Coupled Map Lattices (see [28, 29] for the latest results and references). It is true that one can establish exponential decay of correlations for geodesic flows on manifolds of negative curvature in any dimension [33], but since nothing is known concerning the dependence of the rate of decay from the dimensions, this knowledge is not really very useful in higher dimensions.

<sup>2</sup>Few examples are: the Hénon and Lorenz attractors [5, 44], the work on Lorentz gas started by [12] (see [21] for latest results and references), linear response theory [39], entropy production and fluctuations [23].

- a refined understanding of the statistical properties of single systems (*decay of correlations*);
- a detailed understanding of the behavior of such statistical properties under small perturbations (*linear response*);
- a technique to investigate the motion of slow varying quantities under the influence of fast varying degree of freedom (*averaging*).<sup>3</sup>

Dolgopyat has given fundamental contributions to all the above problems and is currently carrying out a monumental research program to harvest the results of such preliminary successes.<sup>4</sup>

In the following I'll describe some of the results and techniques mentioned above.

## 2. STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF FLOWS

One of the most exciting class of examples of Dynamical Systems are Geodesic flows on manifolds of negative curvature. Their hyperbolicity goes back to Hadamard and Cartan (see [30] for details). Ergodicity has been established first by Hopf [25] for special cases and then, in the general setting, by Anosov [1]. The mixing is due to Sinai [42, 2].

Important related systems are the various types of Billiards for which hyperbolicity, ergodicity and (possibly) mixing are understood, starting with the work of Sinai [41].

What was missing till very recently was a *quantitative understanding* of the rate of mixing for the above flows (i.e. *decay of correlations*). Let us be more precise and a bit more general.<sup>5</sup>

Let  $(M, \phi_t)$  be a smooth Anosov flow, that is:  $M$  is a Riemannian manifold,  $\phi_t$  is a one parameter group of  $C^r(M, M)$ ,  $r \geq 5$ ,<sup>6</sup> diffeomorphisms such that the tangent bundle  $TM$  has three invariant continuous sections  $E^s, E^c, E^u$ . In addition,  $E^c$  is one dimensional and tangent to the flow direction. Also, for each  $x \in M$  holds  $T_x M = E^s(x) \oplus E^c(x) \oplus E^u(x)$  and there exists  $C, \lambda > 0$  such that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_-$  and  $v \in E^s$ ,  $\|d\phi_t v\| \geq C e^{-\lambda t} \|v\|$ ; for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $v \in E^c$ ,  $\|d\phi_t v\| \geq C \|v\|$ ; for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $v \in E^u$ ,  $\|d\phi_t v\| \geq C e^{\lambda t} \|v\|$ . Moreover, we require that the flow is topologically transitive.

Then, calling  $m$  the Riemannian volume, it is known that there exists a unique measure  $\mu$  such that for every  $g \in C^0(M, \mathbb{R})$  and  $m$ -almost every  $x \in M$ ,

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g \circ \phi_t(x) dt = \int_M g(z) \mu(dz) = \mu(g).$$

Note that if we consider  $\{g \circ \phi_t\}$  as random variables (the randomness being in the initial conditions, distributed according to  $m$ ), then (2.1) is nothing else than the Law of Large Numbers. A measure with the above property is called a *physical*

---

<sup>3</sup>This situation can either consist of variables moving slowly with respect to others, or variables oscillating very rapidly and of which one wishes to study only the average behavior.

<sup>4</sup>See, for example, the truly impressive [10, 11] whose results are described in Chernov's article in this same issue.

<sup>5</sup>For clarity, I will not state the results in full generality, e.g. I will not discuss Axion-A flows.

<sup>6</sup>The smoothness requirement is not optimal. It is used in Dolgopyat work to simplify some arguments.

*measure* and, in the present case, coincides with the celebrated SRB (Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen) measure, [8].<sup>7</sup> Of course, in the case of geodesic flows  $\mu = m$  and (2.1) corresponds to the above mentioned ergodicity.

The mixing property states that for all  $f, g \in C^0(M, \mathbb{R})$ , holds

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} m(f \cdot g \circ \phi_t) = \mu(f)m(g).$$

The long standing question mentioned above concerns the speed of convergence of such a limit.<sup>8</sup> For more that thirty years no progress whatsoever appeared on such an issue until Chernov restarted the field by obtaining some partial results [9]. Shortly after Dolgopyat entered the field with a series of papers that have changed it forever. Let me explain, from my peculiar point of view, the obstacle removed by Dolgopyat's work.

In the footsteps of Andrey Nikolaevich Kolmogorov let us consider the evolution of the probability measures:

$$\mathcal{L}_t \mu(f) = \mu(f \circ \phi_t).$$

For each fixed  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_t$  is called the *Transfer Operator* associated to the map  $\phi_t$ .

For many reasonable topologies  $\mathcal{L}_t$  is a strongly continuous semigroup, hence it has a generator  $Z$  and its resolvent, at least for  $\Re(z) = a$  large enough, satisfies

$$(2.2) \quad R(z) := (z\mathbb{1} - Z)^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-zt} \mathcal{L}_t dt$$

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_t = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L e^{at+ibt} R(a+ib) db.$$

Clearly the SRB measure of the flow  $\mu$  satisfies  $\mathcal{L}_t \mu = \mu$ . The main difference between the Transfer Operator of a flow and the Transfer Operator of a map is obvious: in the case of an Anosov map in all direction the dynamics is acting non-trivially (either expanding or contracting, one being the dual behavior of the other) but in the case of flows there is a direction (the flow direction) in which the dynamics acts trivially. It is then totally unclear which mechanism could produce a mixing in the flow direction. The advantage of studying the operators  $R(z)$  is that they contain an integration along the flow direction, hence the action in the “bad” direction is *compactified*, i.e. each function gets smoothen out in the flow direction by the application of  $R(z)$ . Thus such operators are morally very similar to the transfer operator of an Anosov map and indeed it is easy to check that they can be studied by the same techniques and enjoys similar properties. In particular, one can prove that for each measure  $\nu$  with smooth density and any smooth function  $\varphi$  holds

$$R(z)\nu(\varphi) = z^{-1}\mu(\varphi)\nu(1) + \hat{R}(z)\nu(\varphi),$$

where  $\hat{R}(z)\nu(\varphi)$  is analytic, as a function of  $z$ , in a neighborhood of zero. Since we are interested in probability measure we assume from now on  $\nu(1) = 1$ .

<sup>7</sup>The SRB measure is a measure whose conditional on unstable manifolds is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue. It is a special case of the so called  $u$ -measures discussed in section 3.1 of Pesin article in this same issue.

<sup>8</sup>Actually, to speak meaningfully of speed of convergence it is necessary to restrict the class of functions under consideration. For example  $f, g \in C^r(M, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $r > 0$ , will do.

Calling  $\gamma_L \subset \mathbb{C}$  the path  $\gamma_L(s) = a + is$ , for  $L \geq |s| \geq a + \alpha$ , and  $\gamma_L(s) = a + (a + \alpha)e^{\frac{\pi}{2}i[3 - (a + \alpha)^{-1}(s + a + \alpha)]}$ , for  $|s| \leq a + \alpha$ , we can choose  $\alpha > 0$  so small that the line  $\{a + is\}_{|s| \leq L}$  can be deformed in  $\gamma_L$  remaining in the analyticity domain of  $\hat{R}(z)$ . Thus, by (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_t \nu(\varphi) &= \mu(\varphi) + \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L e^{(a+ib)t} \hat{R}(a+ib) \nu(\varphi) db \\ &= \mu(\varphi) + \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\gamma_L} e^{zt} \hat{R}(z) \nu(\varphi) dz = \mu(\varphi) + \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\gamma_L} e^{zt} R(z) \nu(\varphi) dz \\ &= \mu(\varphi) + \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\gamma_L} \frac{e^{zt}}{z^r} R(z) Z^r \nu(\varphi) dz. \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the formula  $R(z) = \sum_{k=0}^r z^{-k-1} Z^k + Z^r R(z)$  and the above analyticity property.

In addition, as in the case of Transfer operators of an Anosov map we have a spectral gap for all operators  $\hat{R}(z)$ . That is, for all  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}^r(M, \mathbb{R})$ , setting  $d\nu_\psi = \psi dm$  ( $m$  is Lebesgue),  $m(\psi) = 1$ ,

$$|z^{-n} \hat{R}(z)^n \nu_\psi(\varphi)| \leq C_{\varphi, \psi} e^{-\sigma_z n}$$

More precisely, for each  $M > 0$  there is  $\omega_M > 0$  such that  $\hat{R}(z) \nu_\psi(\varphi)$  is analytic in  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) \geq 0 \text{ or } \Re(z) \geq -\omega_M \text{ and } |\Im(z)| \leq M\}$ .

Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_t \nu_\psi(\varphi) &= \mu(\varphi) + e^{-\omega_M t} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-M}^M e^{ibt} \hat{R}(-\omega_M + ib) \nu_\psi(\varphi) db \\ &\quad + \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{M \leq |\Im(z)| \leq L\}} \frac{e^{at+ibt}}{(a+ib)^r} \hat{R}(a+ib) Z^r \nu_\psi(\varphi) db. \end{aligned}$$

Which means that

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{L}_t \nu_\psi(\varphi) = \mu(\varphi) + \mathcal{O}(M^{-r+1} + e^{-\omega_M t}).$$

Up to now we have just rephrased in a more modern language results known since the eighty, [38]. Yet, in doing so we have made clear the nature of the stumbling block: to make any progress one needs to have a quantitative estimate of the dependence of  $\omega_M$  from  $M$ . The strongest possible result would be that there exists  $\omega_* > 0$  such that  $\inf_{M \in \mathbb{R}} \omega_M \geq \omega_*$ . This, together with (2.4), immediately implies exponential decay of correlations for the flow. We are finally exactly at the core of Dolgopyat work.

**Dolgopyat's inequality.** There exists  $a, \alpha, \beta > 0$  such that, for each  $|b|$  large,

$$(2.5) \quad R(a+ib)^{\beta \ln |b|} \nu_\psi(\varphi) = \mathcal{O}(|b|^{-\alpha} |\varphi|_s |\psi|_u),$$

where  $|\varphi|_s = |\varphi|_\infty + |\partial_s \varphi|_\infty$ ,  $\partial_s \varphi$  being the derivative in the strong stable direction and the analogous definition holds for  $|\psi|_u$  with the strong unstable replacing the strong stable. Although we are skipping over many technical details, it is not surprising that such an inequality can be iterated (the point being that the norms on the right hand side behave well under iteration). Accordingly, by the usual resolvent equalities and the Neumann series for the resolvent we have, for  $0 < \omega < \frac{\alpha a}{\beta}$ ,

$$|R(-\omega + ib) \nu_\psi(\varphi)| = \mathcal{O}(|b|^{\beta \ln(a+\omega)}).$$

and the exponential decay of correlations follows.

The derivations of Dolgopyat's inequality is based on a quantitative version of the *joint non-integrability* of the strong stable and unstable foliations. The actual proof is rather technical, but it unveils a *new (non local)* mechanism responsible for mixing. This discovery has been the basis of many new results in the recent years (e.g. see [4, 3] or the ongoing work of Tsujii started with [43], just to mention very few).

Let me give a rough idea of why (2.5) holds. Note that the present setting is not exactly Dolgopyat's one since he used Markov partitions and the associated twisted transfer operator instead than  $R(z)$ , yet the essence of the argument stays exactly the same.

First of all note that, by direct computation,

$$R(z)^n \nu_\psi = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^{n-1} e^{-zt} \mathcal{L}_t \nu_\psi dt.$$

It is easy to see that the contribution of the integral from zero to  $cn$ , for  $c$  small enough, is negligible. Next, by the expanding and contractive properties of the dynamics one can assume without loss of generality that  $\varphi$  is essentially constant along the stable fibers and  $\nu_\psi$  essentially constant along strong unstable leaves. In addition, one can disintegrate  $\nu_\psi$  along unstable manifolds, thus it suffice to prove the estimate for

$$\frac{1}{(n-1)!} \int_{cn}^{\infty} t^{n-1} e^{-zt} \int_W \varphi \circ \phi_t$$

where  $W$  is a small local strong unstable manifold. By partitioning the time integral one is reduced to considering integrals of the type

$$\int_{W_c} e^{-zt} \varphi \circ \phi_l$$

where now  $W_c$  is a local central unstable manifold and  $l \geq cn$ . By changing variable the above integral can be seen as an integral on  $\phi_l W_c$  which is a very large manifold in the strong unstable direction. Let us partition such a large manifold in manifolds of fixed size  $W_c = \cup_i W_i$ . Hence,

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{W_c} e^{-zt} \varphi \circ \phi_l = \sum_i \int_{W_i} e^{-zt} \varphi J_i$$

where the  $J_i$  are determined by the Jacobian of the change of variables and some partition of unity used to smoothly split the integral.

By the mixing property the  $W_i$  are filling all  $M$ . Thus, given any ball  $U$  of size comparable to the size of the manifold, it will intersect many such manifold. The basic idea is to group the terms of the sum (2.6) accordingly to some covering of  $M$  and show that the sum restricted to each single group is small. That is, given  $U$  consider the family  $\mathcal{W}_U$  of all the  $W_i$  that intersect  $U$  and let us consider a center unstable manifold  $W_U$  going thru the "center" of  $U$ . We can then use the strong stable holonomy  $\Psi_i$  to write all the integrals on such  $W_i$  as integrals on  $W_U$ . More precisely, let  $(u, t)$  the coordinate along the flow and along the strong unstable direction on  $W_i$  and  $(w, s)$  the corresponding ones on  $W_U$ , then we want to perform the change of variables  $(u, t) = \Psi_i(w, s)$ . Under the *hypothesis that the holonomies are  $\mathcal{C}^1$* , we have  $t \sim s + a_i \cdot w$ . The fact that  $a_i \neq 0$  is exactly the *non integrability* assumption of the foliation: if we start from a point in  $W_U$ , we go to  $W_i$  along

the strong stable (holonomy), then move along the strong unstable direction in  $W_i$ , then along the strong stable back to  $W_U$  and we try to go back to the original point along the strong unstable in  $W_U$ , we fail: we find ourself displaced in the time direction. Note that, in the case of contact flows, hence of geodesic flows, an explicit formula for the  $a_i$  can be obtained [27]. We can then write

$$\sum_{W_i \in \mathcal{W}_U} \int_{W_i} e^{-zt} \varphi J_i = \sum_{W_i \in \mathcal{W}_U} \int_{W_U} e^{-z(s+a_i w)} \varphi \tilde{J}_i + \mathcal{O}(|\partial_s \varphi|_\infty)$$

where  $\tilde{J}_i$  is a  $\mathcal{C}^1$  function taking into account all the Jacobians. By Schwartz inequality it follows

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{W_i \in \mathcal{W}_U} \int_{W_i} e^{-zt} \varphi J_i = |\varphi|_\infty \sqrt{\sum_{W_i, W_j \in \mathcal{W}_U} \int_{W_U} e^{-z(a_i - a_j)w} \tilde{J}_j \tilde{J}_i + \mathcal{O}(|\partial_s \varphi|_\infty)}.$$

It is then clear that the integrals under the square root are all of order  $|\tilde{J}_j \tilde{J}_i|_{\mathcal{C}^1}$  times  $|z|^{-1} |a_i - a_j|^{-1}$ . At this point it is just a matter to estimate how close two manifolds can typically be. This will allow to obtain the wanted result. I do not insist on this last part of the argument as it does not contain new ideas. The turning point is equation (2.7) where the non-joint integrability (embodied in the fact that  $a_j - a_i \neq 0$ ) implies that the integrals are much smaller than previously estimated. In fact, the previous trivial estimates (taking the absolute value inside the integral) were totally unable to take advantage of the presence in the integrals of rapidly oscillating functions.

By the above argument, and thanks to several highly non trivial refinements, Dolgopyat has been able to prove:

- Exponential decay of correlations for mixing Anosov flows with  $\mathcal{C}^1$  foliations, [13]
- Rapid mixing for  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  Axiom A flows with two periodic orbits having periods with a Diophantine ratio, [14]
- Generic exponential mixing for suspension over shifts, [15]
- Decay of correlation for Group extensions (a quantitative version of Brin theory), [16].

### 3. A NEW APPROACH: STANDARD PAIRS

The results described in the previous section are technically amazing but the proofs are still in the path of the traditional approach to the study of statistical properties of Dynamical Systems. Indeed, even if I totally underplayed this aspect, the actual method of proof is based on the introduction of Markov Poincarè sections, and the consequent reduction of the system to a symbolic dynamical one. Hence, Dolgopyat does not deal with the operators described in the previous section but rather with their counterpart for the associated symbolic system. This clouds quite a bit the strategy but the substance is exactly as described above.

Nevertheless, in the 90's many people working on different aspects of Dynamical Systems deeply felt the need to overcome the traditional approach and develop a strategy independent on Markov partitions. Due to such a diffuse feeling a collective effort has taken place starting from the mid ninety to devise alternative approaches to the study of the statistical properties of Dynamical Systems. As a byproduct, today there exist several alternative approaches that can be applied to a manifold

of systems. One of the most powerful and arguably the most flexible is due to Dolgopyat: *standard pairs*. Indeed, I am convinced that we have not seen yet the full extent of applicability of this approach.<sup>9</sup>

The idea of standard pairs first appeared in [17] where Dolgopyat puts forward a unified approach for the study of limit laws in dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity. That work was also the starting point of Dolgopyat later study of systems with slow-fast degrees of freedom that I will mention later on. The standard pairs strategy was then fully developed in [18] in which it was used to prove the *linear response* formula for partially hyperbolic systems. The new element being a new version of *coupling*<sup>10</sup> particularly flexible and adapted to the study of systems with some hyperbolicity.

Let me describe briefly the idea in a very simple setting.

Given a Dynamical Systems  $(M, f)$  with a strong unstable foliation (of dimension  $d_u$ ), one can consider a class  $\mathcal{W}$  of smooth manifolds “close” to the unstable foliation. For example, one can consider  $d_u$ -dimensional manifolds with uniformly bounded curvature, inner and outer size. In addition, one requires the tangent spaces to be uniformly close to the unstable direction. The key property of such a set being that for each  $W \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a set  $\{W_i\} \subset \mathcal{W}$  that is a covering of  $f^n W$  with a uniformly bounded number of overlaps. The *standard pairs* are then the elements of the set

$$\Omega_{\alpha, D} = \left\{ (W, \varphi) : W \in \mathcal{W}, \int_W \varphi = 1, \|\ln \varphi\|_{C^\alpha(W, \mathbb{R})} \leq D \right\}.$$

For each  $\ell = (W, \varphi)$  and  $A \in C^0(M, \mathbb{R})$ , we can write

$$\mathbb{E}_\ell(A) = \int_W A \varphi.$$

Then  $\Omega_{\alpha, D}$  can be naturally viewed as a subset of the probability measures on  $M$ . Also, we require for standard pairs an extension of the covering property asked for  $\mathcal{W}$ . Namely, for each  $\ell \in \Omega_{\alpha, D}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $\{\ell_i\} \subset \Omega_{\alpha, D}$  and  $\alpha_i \geq 0$ ,  $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$  such that, for each  $A \in C^0(M, \mathbb{R})$ ,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{E}_\ell(A \circ f^n) = \sum_i \alpha_i \mathbb{E}_{\ell_i}(A).$$

Essentially, the above means that the dynamics preserves the regularity of the densities of the measures. This is a very natural requirement since the dynamics, restricted to directions close to the strong unstable manifold, is expanding and hence tends to regularize the densities as it happens in expanding maps.

Let  $\overline{\Omega}_{\alpha, D}$  be the weak closure of the convex hull of  $\Omega_{\alpha, D}$ , then (3.1) implies  $f_* \overline{\Omega}_{\alpha, D} \subset \overline{\Omega}_{\alpha, D}$ . Thus any invariant measure obtained by a Krylov-Bogoliubov method starting with a measure in  $\overline{\Omega}_{\alpha, D}$  must belong to  $\overline{\Omega}_{\alpha, D}$ .

This can be used to prove the existence of the SRB measure for the system (and, more generally,  $u$ -measures). Indeed, the above is very similar to the approach used in [36]. Yet, here one does not use directly the unstable manifolds (in the same

<sup>9</sup>Some other relevant approaches are: hyperbolic metrics [32], Young towers [45], random perturbations [34], renewal theory [40], anisotropic Banach spaces [6].

<sup>10</sup>Coupling has been used for some time in abstract ergodic theory under the name of *joining*, it was introduced by Furstenberg [22] (see [24] for an account of recent developments). Its use in the study of quantitative decay of correlations has been pioneered by Lai-Sang Young [46] inspired by its use in the field of interacting particle systems [31]

spirit of [32]). As a consequence, the construction is much more flexible. Although this may seem a small change in point of view the consequences are far reaching. In particular, this approach is well suited to study the statistical properties of the above invariant measures and of their perturbations.

To this effect a further hypothesis is needed: assume that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for each  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $f^{n_\varepsilon}W$  is  $\varepsilon$ -close to every point. For example, this is the case if the system is *topologically mixing*.

Accordingly, given any two standard pairs  $\ell, \ell'$ , for  $n_0$  large, we will have many of the  $W_i, W'_j$  (i.e. a fixed percentage) close together. The basic idea is then to match (couple) the mass in nearby leaves along the weak stable foliation. To see how to proceed, let us consider two manifolds  $W_i, W'_j$  that are  $\varepsilon$ -close. By this we mean that the weak-stable holonomy  $\Psi$  between the two manifolds is well defined on a fixed percentage of their volume and  $\text{dist}(\Psi(x), x) \leq \varepsilon$ .<sup>11</sup> Next, since  $(W_i, \varphi_i), (W'_j, \varphi'_j) \in \Omega_{\alpha, D}$ , it follows that  $\varphi_i, \varphi'_j$  are larger, in absolute value, than  $e^{-D\delta}$ ,  $\delta$  being the uniform size of the elements of  $\Omega_{\alpha, D}$ . Fix  $a \in (0, e^{-D\delta})$  small enough and let  $\phi \in C^\infty(W, \mathbb{R})$  be supported on the domain of  $\Psi$ , then, by change of variables,

$$\int_{W_i} A\phi = \int_{W'_j} A \circ \Psi^{-1} \phi \circ \Psi^{-1} J\Psi,$$

where  $J\Psi$  is the Jacobian associated to the change of variables. Starting with Anosov's work [1] it is well known that in many cases the holonomy and its Jacobian are Hölder [26], thus  $(W_i, z_a(\varphi_i - a\phi)), (W'_j, z_a(\varphi_j - a\phi \circ \Psi^{-1} J\Psi)) \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, D}$  provided that  $a$  is chosen small enough,  $z_a$  being the normalization factor. On the other hand  $(W_i, a\phi), (W'_j, a\phi \circ \Psi^{-1} J\Psi)$  represent measures that may not belong to  $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha, D}$  but are bound to have the same evolution under the dynamics. Indeed, for each  $A \in C^1(M, \mathbb{R})$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , holds

$$\left| \int_{W_i} A \circ f^n \phi - \int_{W'_j} A \circ f^n \cdot \phi \circ \Psi^{-1} J\Psi \right| \leq C\varepsilon \|A\|_{C^1} \sigma^n,$$

where  $\sigma \leq 1$  and is strictly smaller than one if the holonomy is made along the strong stable (e.g., in the case of Anosov diffeomorphisms).

Since a fixed proportion, say  $\rho$ , of the mass can be matched at any  $n_0$  interval of time, we have that

$$|\mathbb{E}_\ell(A \circ f^{2kn_0}) - \mathbb{E}_{\ell'}(A \circ f^{2kn_0})| \leq \varepsilon \sigma^{-kn_0} \|A\|_{C^1} + (1 - \rho)^k \|A\|_{C^0}.$$

In the easiest possible case ( $\sigma < 1$ ) this immediately implies that all the measures associated to standard pairs converge<sup>12</sup> exponentially fast to the same limiting object, call it  $\mu$ , which is clearly an invariant measure.

The above approach, presented here in a nutshell, has been remarkably successful in the study of partially hyperbolic systems (see Pesin's companion paper) and systems with discontinuities (as nicely illustrated in Chernov contribution to this issue).

<sup>11</sup>Remember that given two manifolds  $W, W'$  the weak-stable holonomy  $\Psi : W \rightarrow W'$  is defined as follows: given  $x \in W$  and calling  $W^{cs}(x)$  its local weak-stable manifold,  $\{\Psi(x)\} = W' \cap W^{cs}(x)$ .

<sup>12</sup>By a simple approximation argument one can prove that the convergence takes place also for  $A \in C^0(M, \mathbb{R})$ , yet if one want to have a quantitative results it is necessary to use smoother test functions. In other words we observe exponential decay only if we consider the convergence with respect to the topology of the distributions of order one (or  $\alpha > 0$ ), that is we have to regard the measures as elements of  $C^1(M, \mathbb{R})'$ .



## 4. LIMIT THEOREMS: A UNIFIED POINT OF VIEW

Another important contribution by Dolgopyat is the idea to combine the standard pair technique and the Stroock and Varadhan's *martingale problem* [35], to develop a very general and powerful approach to study *averaging* in Dynamical Systems [19]. Some results that can be obtained by such an approach are detailed and discussed in Chernov's paper in this same issue.

To give a quick idea of the method let us use it to prove something quite obvious: the weak law of large numbers. Let us consider the measure  $\mu$  constructed in the previous section. One would like to prove that it is a physical measure, i.e. for all  $A \in \mathcal{C}^0(M, \mathbb{R})$ , and Lebesgue almost all points  $x \in M$  holds true

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A(f^k(x)) = \mu(A).$$

This is the strong law of large numbers, here we aim at proving the weaker statement: for all  $B \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_M B \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A \circ f^k(x) \right) m(dx) = B(\mu(A)).$$

Clearly, it suffices to prove the statement for smooth  $A, B$ . Let us define

$$S_{N,t} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor tN \rfloor - 1} A \circ f^k + \frac{1}{N} A \circ f^{\lfloor tN \rfloor} (tN - \lfloor tN \rfloor),$$

where  $\lfloor s \rfloor$  is the largest integer smaller or equal than  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, for each  $x \in M$ ,  $S_{N,\cdot}(x) \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$ . Hence  $S_{N,t}$  can be thought as a family of random variables in  $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$  with law defined by the finite dimensional distributions determined, for each function  $B \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ , by

$$\mathbb{E}(B(S_{N_1,t_1}, \dots, S_{N_k,t_k})) = \int_M B(S_{N_1,t_1}(x), \dots, S_{N_k,t_k}(x)) m(dx).$$

Moreover, since for each  $h \ll 1$ ,

$$S_{N,t+h}(x) - S_{N,t}(x) = \mathcal{O}(h)$$

it is immediate that such a family of processes is tight. Hence, there exists accumulation points for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

The goal is then to study such accumulation points and prove that they all coincide, thereby proving that the sequence of random variables converges. To this end let  $\bar{B} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$  and  $h \ll 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}(S_{N,t+h}(x), t+h) - \bar{B}(S_{N,t}(x), t) &= \partial_S \bar{B}(S_{N,t}(x), t) \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=\lfloor (t+h^2)N \rfloor}^{\lfloor (t+h)N \rfloor - 1} A \circ f^k \right] \\ &\quad + \partial_t \bar{B}(S_{N,t}(x), t) h + \mathcal{O}(h^2). \end{aligned}$$

By the mixing properties of the previous section we have<sup>13</sup>

$$\mathbb{E}(\overline{B}(S_{N,t+h}(x), t+h) - \overline{B}(S_{N,t}(x), t)) = \mathbb{E}(\partial_s \overline{B}(S_{N,t}(x), t) \mu(A) + \partial_t \overline{B}(S_{N,t}(x), t)) h + \mathcal{O}(h^2) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha h^2 N}),$$

for some  $\alpha > 0$ . Finally, we chose  $\overline{B}(z, t) = B(z + \mu(A)(s - t))$  in order to kill the term proportional to  $h$ .<sup>14</sup> If  $\hat{S}_t$  is any accumulation point of  $S_{N,t}$ , it follows

$$\mathbb{E}\left(B(\hat{S}_{t+h} + \mu(A)(s - t - h)) - B(\hat{S}_t + \mu(A)(s - t))\right) = \mathcal{O}(h^2).$$

Summing the above for  $t = kh$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, h^{-1}s$  and taking  $h \rightarrow 0$ , yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left(B(\hat{S}_s)\right) = \mathbb{E}(B(\mu(A)s)) = B(\mu(A)s),$$

which, for  $s = 1$ , gives (4.1) ( the Weak Law of Large Numbers) after a trivial density argument.

The above approach is extremely flexible. For example the reader can easily apply it to obtain the Central Limit Theorem, the only change is that now one needs to expand till the third order since the second order in the Taylor expansion gives the main contributions (this is nothing else than Ito's formula).

Of course, to apply such a strategy to a given system a lot of extra work may be necessary. This is clearly remarked and illustrated in Chernov's paper in this same issue which describes applications to much more general (even non stationary) and physically relevant situations. The above strategy also plays a role in the study of the Lyapunov exponents for some of the systems discussed in Pesin contribution.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Thanks to the above results and ideas Dolgopyat has set the stage for a monumental research program already well underway. Some relevant topics that can be addressed using these techniques are

- study of an heavy particle interacting with light ones.
- limit laws for systems without an invariant probability measure (e.g. Lorentz gas).
- long time behavior of non stationary systems (e.g. particles under the action of an external field).
- systems with weak interactions.

<sup>13</sup>The point here is that  $S_{N,t}$  depends from the trajectory till time  $t$  while in the sum we have created a gap of  $Nh^2$ . Hence we can substitute the average of the product by the product of the averages if we have a control on multiple correlations. But it is possible to show that the technique described in the previous section allows to obtain results on multiple correlations as well. Indeed, one can consider standard pairs at time  $Nt$  obtained by very small manifolds at time zero. Clearly the past history on such standard pairs will be the same for all points so one has a natural way to condition on the past and the same arguments as in the previous chapters imply a decay of correlations due to the gap between  $tN$  and  $N(t + h^2)$ .

<sup>14</sup>This is simply the solution of the equation  $\partial_t \overline{B} = -\mu(A)\partial_z \overline{B}$  with *final* condition  $\overline{B}(z, s) = B(z)$ . Note that such an equation has a  $\mathcal{C}^2$  solution, provided that  $B \in \mathcal{C}^2$ . Of course, if we apply this method to more general situations we will obtain much more complex (non linear) equations and the existence, regularity and uniqueness of the solutions can pose a real challenge. Yet, only quite weak informations are needed. For example, for diffusion equations the uniqueness of the solution of the martingale problem suffices [35].

As already mentioned several times, Chernov's paper discusses some of the results already achieved along these lines. Here I would like only to conclude going back to my initial remarks.

I claimed that to establish once and for all the relevance of Dynamical Systems for Non-equilibrium Statistical Mechanics it is necessary to treat systems of many interacting components (e.g. particles). A first step could be to treat systems with very weakly interacting components. Also, I mentioned some outstanding problems that must be overcome to proceed in such a direction. The techniques and the ideas presented in the previous sections address exactly such obstacles and provide powerful tools to remove them. I believe that Dolgopyat work has cleared the road from many of such difficulties and the path is now open to try to treat non trivial systems relevant for Non-Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics. Dolgopyat is already marching along such a path, I am sure that many people will follow.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Anosov, D. V. *Geodesic flows on closed Riemannian manifolds of negative curvature*. (Russian) Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov. **90** 1967 209 pp.
- [2] D.V. Anosov, Ya.G. Sinai, *Certain smooth ergodic systems*, Russian Math. Surveys 22 (1967), no. 5, 103–167.
- [3] Avila, Artur; Gouzel, Sbastien; Yoccoz, Jean-Christophe, *Exponential mixing for the Teichmüller flow* Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes études Sci. No. **104** (2006), 143–211.
- [4] Baladi, Viviane; Vallée, Brigitte *Euclidean algorithms are Gaussian*. J. Number Theory 110 (2005), no. **2**, 331–386.
- [5] M. Benedicks and L. Carleson, *The dynamics of the Hénon map*. Ann. of Math. **133** (1991) 73–169.
- [6] Blank, Michael; Keller, Gerhard; Liverani, Carlangelo *Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius spectrum for Anosov maps*, Nonlinearity **15** (2002), no. 6, 1905–1973.
- [7] L. Boltzmann, *Über die Eigenschaften monzyklischer und anderer damit verwandter Systeme*, in Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen, ed. F.P. Hasenöhr, vol. III, p. 122-152, Chelsea, New York, 1968 (reprint).
- [8] Bowen, Rufus, *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*. Second revised edition. With a preface by David Ruelle. Edited by Jean-Ren Chazottes. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **470**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.
- [9] Chernov, N. I., *Markov approximations and decay of correlations for Anosov flows*. Ann. of Math. (2) **147** (1998), no. 2, 269–324.
- [10] Nikolai Chernov, Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *Brownian Brownian Motion-1*, Memoirs AMS, vol. **198**, no 927 (2009).
- [11] Nikolai Chernov, Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *Galton board: Limit Theorems and Recurrence*, Journal AMS 22 (2009) 821-858.
- [12] L. A. Bunimovich, Y. G. Sinai, *Statistical properties of Lorentz gas with periodic configuration of scatterers*, Comm. Math. Phys. **78** (1980/81), 479 – 497.
- [13] Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *On decay of correlations in Anosov flows*. Ann. of Math. (2) 147 (1998), no. 2, 357–390.
- [14] Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *Prevalence of rapid mixing in hyperbolic flows*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 18 (1998), no. 5, 1097–1114.
- [15] Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *Prevalence of rapid mixing. II. Topological prevalence*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 20 (2000), no. 4, 1045–1059. (Reviewer: Takehiko Morita)
- [16] Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *On mixing properties of compact group extensions of hyperbolic systems*. Israel J. Math. 130 (2002), 157–205.
- [17] Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *Limit theorems for partially hyperbolic systems*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 356 (2004), no. 4, 1637–1689 (electronic)
- [18] Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *On differentiability of SRB states for partially hyperbolic systems*, Invent. Math. **155** (2004), no. 2, 389–449.
- [19] Dolgopyat, Dmitry, *Averaging and invariant measures*. Mosc. Math. J. **5** (2005), no. 3, 537–576, 742.

- [20] Dolgopyat, Dmitry; Liverani, Carlangelo, *Non-perturbative approach to random walk in Markovian environment*. Electron. Commun. Probab. **14** (2009), 245–251.
- [21] Dolgopyat, Dmitry; Szász, Domokos; Varjú, Tamás *Recurrence properties of planar Lorentz process*. Duke Math. J. **142** (2008), no. 2, 241–281.
- [22] Furstenberg, Harry *Disjointness in ergodic theory, minimal sets, and a problem in Diophantine approximation*. Math. Systems Theory **1** 1967 1–49.
- [23] Gallavotti, Giovanni, *Entropy, thermostats, and chaotic hypothesis*. Chaos **16** (2006), no. 4, 043114, 6 pp.
- [24] Glasner, Eli *Ergodic theory via joinings*. *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, **101**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [25] E. Hopf, *Statistik der geodetischen Linien in Mannigfaltigkeiten negativer Krümmung*, Ber. Verh. Sechs. Akad. Wiss. Leipzig 91, (1939). 261–304.
- [26] Katok, Anatole; Hasselblatt, Boris *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*. With a supplementary chapter by Katok and Leonardo Mendoza. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, **54**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [27] A. Katok, *Infinitesimal Lyapunov functions, invariant cone families and stochastic properties of smooth dynamical systems*, with the collaboration of Keith Burns, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **14** (1994), 757–785.
- [28] Keller, Gerhard; Liverani, Carlangelo, *Uniqueness of the SRB measure for piecewise expanding weakly coupled map lattices in any dimension*. Comm. Math. Phys. **262** (2006), no. 1, 33–50.
- [29] Keller, Gerhard; Liverani, Carlangelo, *Map lattices coupled by collisions*. Comm. Math. Phys. **291** (2009), no. 2, 591–597.
- [30] W.P.A.Klingenberg, *Riemannian Geometry*, second edition, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York (1995).
- [31] Liggett, Thomas M. *Interacting particle systems*. Reprint of the 1985 original. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [32] Liverani, Carlangelo *Decay of correlations*. Ann. of Math. (2) **142** (1995), no. 2, 239–301.
- [33] Liverani, Carlangelo, *On contact Anosov flows*. Ann. of Math. (2) **159** (2004), no. 3, 1275–1312.
- [34] Liverani, Carlangelo; Saussol, Benoit; Vaienti, Sandro *A probabilistic approach to intermittency*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **19** (1999), no. 3, 671–685.
- [35] Papanicolaou, G. C.; Stroock, D.; Varadhan, S. R. S., *Martingale approach to some limit theorems*. Papers from the Duke Turbulence Conference (Duke Univ., Durham, N.C., 1976), Paper No. 6, ii+120 pp. Duke Univ. Math. Ser., Vol. III, Duke Univ., Durham, N.C., 1977.
- [36] Pesin, Ya. B.; Sinai, Ya. G. *Gibbs measures for partially hyperbolic attractors*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **2** (1982), no. 3-4, 417–438 (1983).
- [37] Henri Poincaré. *Le Méthodes Nouvelles de la Mécanique Céleste, Tome I,II, III*. le grand clasiques Gauthier-Villards. Blanchard, Paris, 1987.
- [38] Pollicott, Mark, *On the rate of mixing of Axiom A flows*. Invent. Math. **81** (1985), no. 3, 413–426.
- [39] Ruelle, David, *A review of linear response theory for general differentiable dynamical systems*. Nonlinearity **22** (2009), no. 4, 855–870.
- [40] Sarig, Omri *Subexponential decay of correlations*. Invent. Math. **150** (2002), no. 3, 629–653.
- [41] Y. G. Sinai, *Dynamical systems with elastic reflections: Ergodic properties of dispersing billiards* (in Russian), Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **25**, no. 2 (1970), 141 – 192; English translation in Russ. Math. Surv. **25** (1970), 137 – 189.
- [42] Ya.G.Sinai, *Geodesic flows on compact surfaces of negative curvature*, Soviet Math. Dokl. **2** (1961) 106–109.
- [43] Tsujii, Masato *Decay of correlations in suspension semi-flows of angle-multiplying maps*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **28** (2008), no. 1, 291–317.
- [44] W. Tucker, *The Lorenz attractor exists*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **328** (1999) 1197–1202.
- [45] Young, Lai-Sang *Statistical properties of dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity*. Ann. of Math. (2) **147** (1998), no. 3, 585–650.
- [46] Young, Lai-Sang *Recurrence times and rates of mixing*. Israel J. Math. **110** (1999), 153–188.

CARLANGELO LIVERANI, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, II UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA (TOR VERGATA), VIA DELLA RICERCA SCIENTIFICA, 00133 ROMA, ITALY.

*E-mail address:* `liverani@mat.uniroma2.it`