

EXACT DIMENSIONALITY OF STATIONARY MEASURES FOR NONUNIFORMLY CONFORMALLY CONTRACTING RANDOM DIFFEOMORPHISMS

SUBHASISH MUKHERJEE

ABSTRACT. We prove exact dimensionality of ergodic stationary measures for random C^1 diffeomorphisms in the single negative Lyapunov scale setting. Let ν be a Borel probability measure on $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ satisfying a logarithmic C^1 moment condition, and let μ be a ν -stationary ergodic probability measure. If $\lambda_{\text{top}} = \lambda_{\text{bot}} = \lambda < 0$, then μ is exact dimensional and $\dim(\mu) = h_\mu^F(\nu)/(-\lambda)$. No discreteness assumption is imposed on the driving measure.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Setup and statement. Let M be a compact smooth Riemannian manifold with induced metric $d : M \times M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and with $d_M := \dim(M) \geq 1$. For a Borel probability measure μ on M and $x \in M$, define respectively the *lower* and *upper pointwise dimensions of μ at x* as

$$\underline{d}_\mu(x) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{d}_\mu(x) := \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r}.$$

In general, we may have $\underline{d}_\mu(x) \neq \bar{d}_\mu(x)$, and both quantities may vary as x varies. We say μ is *exact dimensional* if there is $\delta \in [0, \infty]$ with $\underline{d}_\mu(x) = \bar{d}_\mu(x) = \delta$ for μ -almost every x , and in this case we set $\dim(\mu) := \delta$. When μ is exact dimensional, $\dim(\mu)$ is also equal to the Hausdorff, packing, and several other notions of dimensions of μ (see e.g. [24, Section 4], [7, Chapter 10]).

Dynamically defined measures are often exact dimensional because the masses and radii of dynamical neighborhoods are controlled by additive/subadditive quantities along orbits, so their asymptotic rates are governed by ergodic theorems. We study exact dimensionality of stationary measures on M under random dynamics.

To be more precise, let ν be a Borel probability measure on $G := \text{Diff}^1(M)$, equipped with its C^1 topology. We consider a random composition of i.i.d. diffeomorphisms drawn according to ν and call ν the *driving measure* of the random dynamics. We say a Borel probability measure μ on M is *ν -stationary* if

$$\nu * \mu := \int_G f_* \mu \, d\nu(f) = \mu.$$

Thus ν -stationarity means that the distribution of a μ -distributed point is preserved under one ν -random diffeomorphism. A ν -stationary measure μ is *ergodic* if it is an extreme point of the convex set of all ν -stationary measures.

Let μ be a Borel probability measure on M . We pass to the product space recording both the driving sequence and the point in M . Set $\hat{X} := G^{\mathbb{N}} \times M$ with

measure $\widehat{\mu}_\nu := \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \times \mu$, and define the skew product map $\widehat{F} : \widehat{X} \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ by

$$\widehat{F}((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, x) = ((f_{k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, f_0(x)).$$

Then μ is ν -stationary if and only if $\widehat{\mu}_\nu$ is $\widehat{F}$ -invariant, and, assuming stationarity, μ is ergodic if and only if $\widehat{\mu}_\nu$ is $\widehat{F}$ -ergodic (see e.g. [23, Exercise 5.10]).

We also record the exponential contraction rates of the random derivative cocycle. Let $\|A\|$ and $\mathbf{m}(A)$ respectively denote the largest and smallest singular values of an invertible linear map A , so $\mathbf{m}(A) = \|A^{-1}\|^{-1}$. For $g \in G$, set $[g]_{C^1} := \sup_{x \in M} \|D_x g\|$, and suppose that $f \mapsto \log[f]_{C^1} + \log[f^{-1}]_{C^1}$ belongs to $L^1(\nu)$. When μ is ν -stationary ergodic, Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem [12] shows there are $\lambda_{\text{top}}, \lambda_{\text{bot}} \in \mathbb{R}$ called respectively the *top* and *bottom Lyapunov exponents* of the derivative cocycle, such that for $\widehat{\mu}_\nu$ -almost every $((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, x) \in \widehat{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|D_x(f_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_0)\| &= \lambda_{\text{top}}, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbf{m}(D_x(f_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_0)) &= \lambda_{\text{bot}}. \end{aligned}$$

λ_{top} and λ_{bot} respectively dictate the fastest and slowest exponential rates of infinitesimal expansion.

For Borel probability measures γ_0, γ_1 on M with $\gamma_0 \ll \gamma_1$, set

$$D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1) := \int_M \log \frac{d\gamma_0}{d\gamma_1} d\gamma_0 = \int_M \frac{d\gamma_0}{d\gamma_1} \log \frac{d\gamma_0}{d\gamma_1} d\gamma_1 \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows since $t \log t \geq t - 1$ for all $t > 0$. When $\gamma_0 \not\ll \gamma_1$ we set $D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1) = \infty$. We define the *Furstenberg entropy* of μ with respect to ν as

$$h_\mu^F(\nu) := \int_G D(f_* \mu \| \mu) d\nu(f) \in [0, \infty].$$

For ν -distributed f and μ -distributed x , $h_\mu^F(\nu)$ measures how much information $f(x)$ reveals about f itself.

When the asymptotic dynamics are contracting at a single Lyapunov scale, our main theorem shows any ergodic stationary measure is exact dimensional, with dimension determined by the Furstenberg entropy and the Lyapunov exponent.

Theorem 1. *Let ν be a Borel probability measure on $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ such that $f \mapsto \log[f]_{C^1} + \log[f^{-1}]_{C^1}$ belongs to $L^1(\nu)$. Suppose μ is a ν -stationary ergodic Borel probability measure on M and there is $\lambda < 0$ such that $\lambda_{\text{top}} = \lambda_{\text{bot}} = \lambda$. Then μ is exact dimensional and*

$$\dim(\mu) = \frac{h_\mu^F(\nu)}{-\lambda}.$$

1.2. Discussion. We also note that the proof of the main theorem given here extends to skew-products over arbitrary base dynamics with a generalized definition of Furstenberg entropy as in [3, Section 4.1]; in particular the result extends to the setting where the random diffeomorphisms are not necessarily independent (but still identically distributed). The slightly less general result and proof has been given here for the sake of clarity and brevity, but we give some details in the appendix.

The dimension formula itself has a simple information-theoretic interpretation. If $\mathbf{f} \sim \nu$ and $X \sim \mu$ are independent, then stationarity gives $\mathbf{f}(X) \sim \mu$ and $h_\mu^F(\nu)$ is the mutual information $I(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{f}(X))$. Thus Theorem 1 expresses dimension as the information revealed by one random step per unit of logarithmic spatial contraction.

The relation between entropy, Lyapunov exponents, and dimension goes back to the deterministic theory. Young established the dimension formula for hyperbolic measures on surfaces [24], and Ledrappier–Young developed the general higher-dimensional dimension-entropy formula [16]. Barreira–Pesin–Schmeling subsequently proved exact dimensionality for arbitrary hyperbolic ergodic invariant measures of $C^{1+\alpha}$ diffeomorphisms [1]. For random diffeomorphisms, Ledrappier–Young [17] and Liu–Xie [19] obtained analogous results for sample measures, which are the fiberwise conditional measures associated to specific realizations of the random dynamics. In contrast, a stationary measure is the average over all such realizations. Exact dimensionality of the sample measures does not, in general, imply exact dimensionality of their stationary barycenter.

There are also direct results for stationary measures of nonlinear random dynamics. Feng–Hu prove exact dimensionality for finite C^1 iterated function systems under a similar conformality assumption, with dimension given by projection entropy divided by the common Lyapunov exponent [9]. Their projection entropy agrees with the generalized Furstenberg entropy for the associated skew product, and in the Bernoulli case, this reduces to the usual Furstenberg entropy. Their maps are diffeomorphisms onto their images and the IFS is finitely generated, whereas we consider global diffeomorphisms and allow a non-discrete driving law.

He–Jiao–Xu prove that, for a finitely supported C^2 random walk by orientation-preserving circle diffeomorphisms whose support preserves no common probability measure, every ergodic stationary measure is exact dimensional and satisfies the corresponding Furstenberg entropy–exponent formula [10]. Their argument extends to compactly supported driving measures, but is specific to the circle.

More recently, in an unpublished preprint, Brown–Rodríguez Hertz prove exact dimensionality for contracting stationary measures with a general negative Lyapunov spectrum and establish a Ledrappier–Young-type formula for Furstenberg entropy [3]. Their result assumes $C^{1+\alpha}$ regularity, a discrete driving measure of finite entropy, and corresponding logarithmic moment hypotheses.

Theorem 1 treats a complementary regime. The collapse to a single Lyapunov scale allows lower regularity and a more general driving law: the maps are only C^1 , and ν may be an arbitrary Borel probability measure on $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ satisfying the logarithmic C^1 moment assumption. This also allows non-discrete laws of the sort arising, for example, from time-one maps in stochastic-flow models; see [2] for related entropy and Lyapunov exponent theory for stochastic flows.

Related results are known for stationary measures of random matrix products. Hochman–Solomyak prove exact dimensionality on the projective line under unboundedness and total irreducibility, with dimension given by Furstenberg entropy over the Lyapunov gap [11]. Rapaport proves a Ledrappier–Young formula for finitely supported strongly irreducible and proximal random walks [22], while Lessa and Ledrappier–Lessa obtain analogous entropy–dimension results on flag spaces under discrete finite-moment hypotheses on the driving measure [18, 14, 15]. The projective and flag structures in their works also provide geometric filtrations adapted to distinct Lyapunov exponents. It is therefore natural to ask whether the C^1 , arbitrary driving measure result proved here can be extended to several distinct negative Lyapunov exponents.

1.3. Acknowledgments. Many of the ideas in the proof are inspired by similar arguments given by Ledrappier, Lessa, and Ledrappier–Lessa [13, 18, 14, 15]. The

author also benefited greatly from discussions with Amie Wilkinson, James Marshall Reber, Pablo Lessa, and Aaron Brown.

1.4. LLM Use. The author used an LLM to help with literature search, and in catching mathematical and prosaic errors. The LLM also helped simplify the proof of Lemma 12. The main mathematical arguments and writing are the author's own.

2. PROOF

2.1. Proof Outline. The proof given here is largely self-contained, starting with Crauel's estimate [5] which implies $f_*\mu \ll \mu$ for almost every f , and then using some basic facts from ergodic theory and geometric measure theory. Throughout the proof, we assume the hypotheses in the statement of Theorem 1 and fix the corresponding ν , μ , and λ . We compare the exponential decay of ball masses along backward random trajectories with the exponential contraction of their radii.

Fixing $\varepsilon > 0$, we first replace ν by

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2}\nu^{*N} + \frac{1}{2}\nu^{*(N+1)}$$

for N sufficiently large depending on ε . This gives $h_\mu^F(\eta) = (N + \frac{1}{2})h_\mu^F(\nu)$, preserves ergodicity of μ , and makes the expected upper and lower logarithmic derivative scales arbitrarily close to $(N + \frac{1}{2})\lambda$.

We then pass to the invertible natural extension and consider radii $r_{n,j}^\pm$ that follow the contraction of balls along backward orbits as j ranges from 0 to n . The resulting ball inclusions give telescoping inequalities expressing the change in logarithmic ball mass as a sum of local Radon–Nikodym log-quotients. The terminal radii satisfy

$$\frac{1}{n} \log r_{n,n}^\pm \longrightarrow (N + \frac{1}{2})(\lambda + O(\varepsilon)),$$

whereas the initial radii have subexponential scale and contribute no asymptotic ball mass. A Maker's ergodic theorem argument identifies the averages of local log-quotients with the Furstenberg entropy $h_\mu^F(\eta)$. Putting it together, we have

$$\frac{h_\mu^F(\nu)}{-\lambda + 2\varepsilon} \leq d_\mu(x) \leq \bar{d}_\mu(x) \leq \frac{h_\mu^F(\nu)}{-\lambda - 2\varepsilon}$$

for μ -almost every x , and letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ proves the theorem.

2.2. Change of driving measure. We now proceed to the details of the proof. In Lemmas 2 and 3, we assume that κ is a Borel probability measure on G such that μ is κ -stationary and $f \mapsto \log[f]_{C^1} + \log[f^{-1}]_{C^1}$ is in $L^1(\kappa)$. Recall that the convolution κ^{*n} is defined as the pushforward of $\kappa^{\otimes n}$ under $(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}) \mapsto f_{n-1} \circ f_{n-2} \circ \dots \circ f_0$. Note that convolution is associative, and so $\kappa^{*n} * \mu = \mu$. We first examine how Furstenberg entropy behaves under convolution.

Lemma 2. *We then have $f_*\mu \ll \mu$ for κ -almost every $f \in G$, and $h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*n}) = nh_\mu^F(\kappa)$.*

Proof. By Crauel [5, Theorem 5.1], we have that $h_\mu^F(\kappa) \leq -\lambda_{\text{bot}} \dim M < \infty$. Thus $D(f_*\mu \| \mu) < \infty$ for κ -almost every $f \in G$, and so $f_*\mu \ll \mu$ and $\log \frac{df_*\mu}{d\mu} \in L^1(f_*\mu)$ for all such f . Furthermore, μ is κ^{*n} stationary as discussed.

We show inductively that $h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*n}) = nh_\mu^F(\kappa)$. This is clear when $n = 1$, so suppose $h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*n}) = nh_\mu^F(\kappa)$ for some $n \geq 1$. Then $h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*n}) < \infty$, so $f_*\mu \ll \mu$ for

κ^{*n} -almost every f . Thus for $(\kappa^{*n} \otimes \kappa)$ -almost every (f, g) , we have $g_*(f_*\mu) \ll g_*\mu \ll \mu$, and so the Radon-Nikodym chain rule gives

$$\frac{d(g \circ f)_*\mu}{d\mu}(g(f(x))) = \frac{df_*\mu}{d\mu}(f(x)) \frac{dg_*\mu}{d\mu}(g(f(x)))$$

for μ -almost every x . All terms are integrable by finiteness of $h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*n})$ and $h_\mu^F(\kappa)$, so by Fubini we have as desired

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*(n+1)}) &= \int \log \frac{df_*\mu}{d\mu}(f(x)) \, d\kappa^{*n}(f) \, d\kappa(g) \, d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int \log \frac{dg_*\mu}{d\mu}(g(f(x))) \, d\kappa^{*n}(f) \, d\kappa(g) \, d\mu(x) \\ &= h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*n}) + \int \log \frac{dg_*\mu}{d\mu}(g(y)) \, d(\kappa^{*n} * \mu)(y) \, d\kappa(g) \\ &= h_\mu^F(\kappa^{*n}) + h_\mu^F(\kappa) = (n+1)h_\mu^F(\kappa). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We recall that the *Markov operator* $P_\kappa : L^2(\mu) \rightarrow L^2(\mu)$ is defined by $P_\kappa u(x) := \int_G u(f(x)) \, d\kappa(f)$. For $u \in L^2(\mu)$, Jensen's inequality gives

$$\|P_\kappa u\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq \int_{G \times M} |u(f(x))|^2 \, d\kappa(f) \, d\mu(x) = \|u\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2,$$

where the last equality follows from κ -stationarity. In other words, P_κ is a contraction on L^2 . The next lemma records a useful characterization of stationary ergodic measures using the Markov operator. For a proof, see [23, Proposition 5.13].

Lemma 3. *μ is κ -ergodic if and only if the only P_κ invariant functions are constant μ -almost everywhere.*

We now use the previous two lemmas to replace ν with a different driving measure better suited to our estimates. The idea is similar to that in [15, Section 8.1] while using extra averaging to recover ergodicity.

Lemma 4. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, -\lambda/4)$. Then there is $N \geq 1$ such that, setting*

$$\eta := \frac{1}{2}\nu^{*N} + \frac{1}{2}\nu^{*(N+1)},$$

μ is ergodic η -stationary, $f_\mu \ll \mu$ for η -a.e. f , $h_\mu^F(\eta) = (N + \frac{1}{2})h_\mu^F(\nu)$, and*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right)(\lambda - \varepsilon) &< \int_{G \times M} \log \mathbf{m}(D_x f) \, d\eta(f) \, d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_{G \times M} \log \|D_x f\| \, d\eta(f) \, d\mu(x) < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right)(\lambda + \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, x) \in \widehat{X}$ and $n \geq 1$, set

$$c_n^\pm((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, x) := \log \left\| (D_x(f_{n-1} \circ \dots \circ f_0))^{\pm 1} \right\|.$$

Note then that $(c_n^\pm)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are both subadditive sequences, and

$$-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log [f_j^{\mp 1}]_{C^1} \leq c_n^\pm((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, x) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log [f_j^{\pm 1}]_{C^1},$$

so $c_n^\pm \in L^1(\widehat{\mu}_\nu)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem then implies $\frac{1}{n} \int_{\widehat{X}} c_n^\pm d\widehat{\mu}_\nu \rightarrow \pm\lambda$. In particular, we have by the definition of ν^{*n} that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \int_{G \times M} \log \|D_x f\| d\nu^{*n}(f) d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{G^n \times M} \log \|D_x (f_{n-1} \circ f_{n-2} \circ \cdots \circ f_0)\| d\nu^{\otimes n}(f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{\widehat{X}} c_n^+ d\widehat{\mu}_\nu \rightarrow \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{1}{n} \int_{G \times M} \log \mathbf{m}(D_x f) d\nu^{*n}(f) d\mu(x) \rightarrow \lambda.$$

Choose N such that both normalized integrals differ from λ by less than ε for $n = N, N+1$. Averaging the bounds then gives the desired inequalities. We also note that h_μ^F is linear in ν and that $h_\mu^F(\nu^{*n}) = nh_\mu^F(\nu)$ by Lemma 2, so we get $h_\mu^F(\eta) = (N + \frac{1}{2})h_\mu^F(\nu)$.

It remains to prove ergodicity. Since $P_\eta = \frac{1}{2}(P_\nu^N + P_\nu^{N+1})$, every $u \in L^2(\mu)$ satisfying $P_\eta u = u$ also satisfies $\|u\|_2 = \|P_\eta u\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|P_\nu^N u\|_2 + \|P_\nu^{N+1} u\|_2) \leq \|u\|_2$ since P_ν is a contraction. Since we have equality, strict convexity of $L^2(\mu)$ gives $P_\nu^N u = P_\nu^{N+1} u = u$, so $P_\nu u = u$. Lemma 3 implies that u is constant, and another application of Lemma 3 shows that μ is η -ergodic. $\square$

The next lemma estimates radii of images of balls under one step of the η -walk.

Lemma 5. *Let ε and η be as in Lemma 4. There is $r_0 > 0$ and there are Borel functions $a^\pm : G \times M \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that, for every $f \in G$, $x \in M$, and $r \in (0, r_0]$,*

$$B(f(x), a^-(f, x)r) \subset f[B(x, r)] \subset B(f(x), a^+(f, x)r).$$

Moreover, $\log a^\pm \in L^1(\eta \otimes \mu)$, and, setting $A^\pm := \int_{G \times M} \log a^\pm(f, x) d\eta(f) d\mu(x)$, we have

$$\left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right)(\lambda - 2\varepsilon) < A^- \leq A^+ < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right)(\lambda + 2\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Note that $\int_G (\log[f]_{C^1} + \log[f^{-1}]_{C^1}) d\eta(f) < \infty$, so there is a compact $K \subseteq G$ such that

$$\int_{K^c} (\log[f]_{C^1} + \log[f^{-1}]_{C^1}) d\eta(f) < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Since $(f, x) \mapsto \log \|D_x f\|$ is uniformly continuous on $K \times M$, there is $r_1 > 0$ such that for every $r < r_1$, $f \in K$, and $x, y \in M$ with $d(x, y) < r$, we have $\|D_y f\| \leq e^{(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \|D_x f\|$. The mean value theorem then implies

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq e^{(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \|D_x f\| d(x, y) < e^{(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \|D_x f\| r$$

for all such r, f, x , and y .

Note $K^{-1} := \{f^{-1} : f \in K\}$ is also compact, so similarly there is $r_2 > 0$ such that for all $r < r_2$, $f \in K$, and $x, y \in M$ with $d(x, y) < r$, we have $d(f^{-1}(x), f^{-1}(y)) \leq e^{(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \|D_x f^{-1}\| d(x, y)$. In particular, if $r \leq r_2 / \sup_{f \in K} [f]_{C^1}$ and

$$d(f(x), y) < e^{-(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \mathbf{m}(D_x f) r,$$

then $d(f(x), y) < r_2$, hence

$$d(x, f^{-1}(y)) \leq e^{(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \|D_{f(x)} f^{-1}\| d(f(x), y) < r.$$

With this in mind, we define $r_0 := \min\{r_1, r_2/\sup_{f \in K} [f]_{C^1}\}$. Then for all $f \in K$, $x \in M$, and $r \in (0, r_0]$, we have

$$B\left(f(x), e^{-(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \mathbf{m}(D_x f) r\right) \subset f[B(x, r)] \subset B\left(f(x), e^{(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \|D_x f\| r\right).$$

For general $f \in G$, $x \in M$, and $r > 0$, we also have the elementary containments

$$B\left(f(x), [f^{-1}]_{C^1}^{-1} r\right) \subset f[B(x, r)] \subset B(f(x), [f]_{C^1} r).$$

Thus define

$$a^-(f, x) := \begin{cases} e^{-(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \mathbf{m}(D_x f), & f \in K, \\ [f^{-1}]_{C^1}^{-1}, & f \notin K, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \\ a^+(f, x) := \begin{cases} e^{(N+\frac{1}{2})\varepsilon/2} \|D_x f\|, & f \in K, \\ [f]_{C^1}, & f \notin K. \end{cases}$$

Note $a^\pm$ are Borel, the required inclusions hold, and $a^- \leq a^+$. Moreover, our initial analysis implies both differences

$$\log \mathbf{m}(D_x f) - \log a^-(f, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \log a^+(f, x) - \log \|D_x f\|$$

are nonnegative and bounded above by

$$\left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \chi_K(f) + (\log[f]_{C^1} + \log[f^{-1}]_{C^1}) \chi_{K^c}(f).$$

Thus $\log a^\pm \in L^1(\eta \otimes \mu)$ and we have

$$0 \leq \int_{G \times M} \log \mathbf{m}(D_x f) \, d\eta(f) \, d\mu(x) - A^- < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) \varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \\ 0 \leq A^+ - \int_{G \times M} \log \|D_x f\| \, d\eta(f) \, d\mu(x) < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) \varepsilon.$$

Combining the above bounds with Lemma 4 gives the desired result. $\square$

2.3. Two-sided extension and backwards telescope. To compare the masses of balls and apply ergodic arguments along backward iterates, we now pass to the two-sided natural extension. Fix ε and the corresponding $N, \eta, r_0, a^\pm$, and $A^\pm$ as in Lemmas 4 and 5. Let $X := G^\mathbb{Z} \times M$ and define $F : X \rightarrow X$ by

$$F((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}, x) := ((f_{k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}, f_0(x)).$$

Let $\pi_M, \pi_{G^\mathbb{Z}}$, and $\pi_{G^\mathbb{N} \times M}$ be the corresponding projection maps from X . Define $\hat{\mu}_\eta := \eta^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \otimes \mu$. We let μ_η be the natural extension measure of $\hat{\mu}_\eta$, i.e. μ_η is the unique F -invariant measure on X such that

$$(\pi_{G^\mathbb{Z}})_* \mu_\eta = \eta^{\otimes \mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{and} \quad (\pi_{G^\mathbb{N} \times M})_* \mu_\eta = \hat{\mu}_\eta.$$

Then (X, μ_η, F) is ergodic (see e.g. [23, Chapter 5.4] for more details).

For $z = ((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}, x) \in X$, write $x_n := \pi_M F^n(z)$, so $x_0 = x$ and $x_{n+1} = f_n(x_n)$. It follows that for all bounded Borel $\varphi : G \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$(1) \quad \int_X \varphi(f_{-1}, x_0) \, d\mu_\eta(z) = \int_{G \times M} \varphi(f, f(x)) \, d\mu(x) \, d\eta(f).$$

Set $X_0 := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \{z \in X : x_k \in \text{supp } \mu\}$, and note X_0 is Borel, F -invariant, and $\mu_\eta(X_0) = 1$. For $(z, r) \in X \times (0, r_0]$, define

$$\psi_r(z) := \begin{cases} \log \frac{\mu(f_{-1}^{-1}B(x_0, r))}{\mu(B(x_0, r))}, & z \in X_0, \\ 0, & z \notin X_0. \end{cases}$$

Note the map $(z, r) \mapsto \psi_r(z)$ is Borel, since $(f, x, r) \mapsto \mu(f^{-1}B(x, r))$ is Borel. We then set $\psi(z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{1/n}(z)$, so ψ is also Borel in z .

By Lemma 2 we have $f_*\mu \ll \mu$ and $D(f_*\mu \| \mu) < \infty$ for η -almost every $f \in G$. For all such f and for μ -almost every x , the Besicovitch differentiation theorem implies

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{(f_*\mu)(B(x, r))}{\mu(B(x, r))} = \frac{df_*\mu}{d\mu}(x).$$

In particular, $\psi(z) = \log \frac{d(f_{-1})_*\mu}{d\mu}(x_0)$ for μ_η -almost every z . By (1), we also see

$$\int \psi(z) d\mu_\eta(z) = h_\mu^F(\eta).$$

With this preliminaries out of the way, we now pick our good sequence of radii along the orbit. For $n \geq 1$, $0 \leq j \leq n$, and $z \in X$, define

$$r_{n,j}^\pm(z) := r_0 \exp \left(\sum_{k=-n}^{-n+j-1} \log a^\pm(f_k, x_k) - \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{k=-n}^{-n+i-1} \log a^\pm(f_k, x_k) \right).$$

It then follows that for $1 \leq j \leq n$ we have $0 < r_{n,j}^\pm \leq r_0$ and

$$(2) \quad r_{n,j}^\pm = a^\pm(f_{-n+j-1}, x_{-n+j-1}) r_{n,j-1}^\pm.$$

The following lemma gives us elementary inequalities that naturally split our estimates into three separate terms we can bound individually; the lemma and the radii above are similar to the constructions in [13, Theorem 5.1] and [15, Sections 8.3–8.4].

Lemma 6. *For μ_η -almost every $z \in X$ and every $n \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mu(B(x_0, r_{n,n}^-)) &\leq \log \mu(B(x_{-n}, r_{n,0}^-)) - \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_{r_{n,j}^-}(F^{-n+j}z), \text{ and} \\ \log \mu(B(x_0, r_{n,n}^+)) &\geq \log \mu(B(x_{-n}, r_{n,0}^+)) - \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_{r_{n,j}^+}(F^{-n+j}z). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $1 \leq j \leq n$, by definition we have

$$f_{-n+j-1}^{-1}B(x_{-n+j}, r_{n,j}^-) \subset B(x_{-n+j-1}, r_{n,j-1}^-),$$

so

$$\exp \left(\psi_{r_{n,j}^-}(F^{-n+j}z) \right) \mu(B(x_{-n+j}, r_{n,j}^-)) \leq \mu(B(x_{-n+j-1}, r_{n,j-1}^-)).$$

Multiplying the above inequality over $1 \leq j \leq n$, taking log, and using (2) gives the first desired inequality. The second desired inequality is analogous. $\square$

We also have the following estimates on the growth rate of the radii which will be essential in the final proof.

Lemma 7. *For μ_η -almost every $z \in X$ and for every $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we have as $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\frac{1}{n} \log r_{n,0}^\pm(z) \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{1}{n} \log r_{n,n}^\pm(z) \rightarrow A^\pm, \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\lceil \theta n \rceil \leq j \leq n} r_{n,j}^\pm(z) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. For $m \geq 0$, set $S_m^\pm(z) := \sum_{k=-m}^{-1} \log a^\pm(f_k, x_k)$, Birkhoff's ergodic theorem gives $S_m^\pm(z) = mA^\pm + o(m)$ for μ_η -almost every z . In particular,

$$\max_{0 \leq m \leq n} |S_m^\pm - mA^\pm| = o(n),$$

so uniformly in j we have $\sum_{k=-n}^{-n+j-1} \log a^\pm(f_k, x_k) = S_n^\pm - S_{n-j}^\pm = jA^\pm + o(n)$. Since $A^\pm < 0$, we get

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{k=-n}^{-n+j-1} \log a^\pm(f_k, x_k) = \max \left\{ 0, \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{k=-n}^{-n+j-1} \log a^\pm(f_k, x_k) \right\} = o(n).$$

Thus for all $0 \leq j \leq n$, we have

$$\log r_{n,j}^\pm = \log r_0 + jA^\pm + o(n).$$

Taking $j = n$ and $j = 0$ gives respectively $\frac{1}{n} \log r_{n,n}^\pm \rightarrow A^\pm$ and $\frac{1}{n} \log r_{n,0}^\pm \rightarrow 0$. Also, for $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $\lceil \theta n \rceil \leq j \leq n$, we have $\log r_{n,j}^\pm \leq \log r_0 + \theta n A^\pm + o(n) \rightarrow -\infty$ since $A^\pm < 0$. Therefore, we have $\max_{\lceil \theta n \rceil \leq j \leq n} r_{n,j}^\pm \rightarrow 0$ as desired. $\square$

2.4. Asymptotic estimates. We will use two elementary estimates for computing dimension using balls of varying radii as in the terms appearing in Lemma 6.

Lemma 8. *Let (Y, γ) be a probability space. For every $n \geq 1$, let $g_n : Y \rightarrow M$ and $s_n : Y \rightarrow (0, r_0]$ be measurable, and suppose $(g_n)_* \gamma = \mu$. If $\frac{1}{n} \log s_n(y) \rightarrow 0$ for γ -almost every $y \in Y$, then*

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mu(B(g_n(y), s_n(y))) \rightarrow 0$$

for γ -almost every $y \in Y$.

Proof. Recall $d_M = \dim M$. By relative volume comparison [21, Lemma 7.1.4] and compactness of M , there is $C_0 > 0$ such that every $r/2$ -separated subset of M has cardinality at most $C_0 r^{-d_M}$ for $r \in (0, r_0]$. Hence, if $\{x_i\}_i$ is a maximal $r/2$ -separated subset of $\{x \in M \mid \mu(B(x, r)) < q\}$, then

$$\{x \in M \mid \mu(B(x, r)) < q\} \subseteq \bigcup_i B(x_i, r/2).$$

We thus get the packing inequality

$$(3) \quad \mu(\{x \in M \mid \mu(B(x, r)) < q\}) \leq \sum_i \mu(B(x_i, r/2)) \leq C_0 q r^{-d_M}.$$

Fix $m \geq 1$. For each $n \geq 1$, set

$$E_n := \left\{ y \in Y \mid s_n(y) \geq e^{-n/(2d_M m)}, \mu(B(g_n(y), s_n(y))) < e^{-n/m} \right\}.$$

For $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$, set $\rho_{n,k} := 2^k e^{-n/(2d_M m)}$. For fixed n , if $y \in E_n$, there is a unique $k \geq 0$ such that $\rho_{n,k} \leq s_n(y) < \rho_{n,k+1}$. Since $s_n(y) \leq r_0$, we have $\rho_{n,k} \leq r_0$ for this k and $\mu(B(g_n(y), \rho_{n,k})) < e^{-n/m}$. On balance, we see

$$E_n \subset \bigcup_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ \rho_{n,k} \leq r_0}} g_n^{-1} \left(\left\{ x \in M \mid \mu(B(x, \rho_{n,k})) < e^{-n/m} \right\} \right).$$

Since $(g_n)_*\gamma = \mu$, it follows using (3) that

$$\gamma(E_n) \leq C_0 e^{-n/m} \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ \rho_{n,k} \leq r_0}} \rho_{n,k}^{-d_M} \leq C_0 e^{-n/m} e^{n/(2m)} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-kd_M} \leq 2C_0 e^{-n/(2m)}.$$

Therefore $\sum_{n \geq 1} \gamma(E_n) < \infty$, and so by Borel–Cantelli, $y \notin E_n$ for large enough n and γ -almost every y .

Furthermore, $\log s_n(y)/n \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere, so $s_n(y) \geq e^{-n/(2d_M m)}$ for large enough n . Consequently $\mu(B(g_n(y), s_n(y))) \geq e^{-n/m}$ for large enough n , so

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu(B(g_n(y), s_n(y))) \geq -\frac{1}{m}.$$

Intersecting the corresponding conull sets over $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ gives the desired lower bound. Since $\log \mu(B(g_n(y), s_n(y))) \leq 0$, the reverse bound is immediate and we have the desired result. $\square$

Lemma 9. *Let $x \in \text{supp } \mu$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $s_n > 0$ and $t < 0$ with $\log s_n/n \rightarrow t$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then we have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, s_n))}{n} = t \underline{d}_\mu(x), \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, s_n))}{n} = t \bar{d}_\mu(x).$$

Proof. We prove the equality for $\underline{d}_\mu(x)$; the proof of the other equality is analogous. Since $s_n \rightarrow 0$ and $1/t < 0$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{d}_\mu(x) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, s_n))}{\log s_n} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\log s_n} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, s_n))}{n} = \frac{1}{t} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, s_n))}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives one inequality. For the other direction, first note if $\underline{d}_\mu(x) = \infty$ then the preceding inequality gives the result, so suppose otherwise. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ choose $r_k > 0$ with $r_k \rightarrow 0$ and $\log \mu(B(x, r_k))/\log r_k \rightarrow \underline{d}_\mu(x)$. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and set $n_k := \lfloor (1 - \delta) \log r_k / t \rfloor$. Then $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\frac{\log s_{n_k}}{\log r_k} = \frac{\log s_{n_k}}{n_k} \frac{n_k}{\log r_k} \rightarrow 1 - \delta < 1.$$

Since $\log r_k < 0$, it follows $s_{n_k} > r_k$ for all sufficiently large k . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, s_n))}{n} &\geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r_k))}{n_k} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log r_k}{n_k} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r_k))}{\log r_k} = \frac{t}{1 - \delta} \underline{d}_\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all $\delta > 0$, we obtain as desired

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, s_n))}{n} = t \underline{d}_\mu(x). \quad \square$$

In order to estimate Furstenberg entropy, we will approximate Radon–Nikodym derivatives by quotients of ball measures, and use a Maker’s theorem-type argument. The next lemma verifies the necessary integrability hypotheses to do so. The proof is a modification of [15, Lemma 8.3] and [18, Lemma 9] from their projective setting.

Lemma 10. *There is $C < \infty$, depending only on M , such that whenever $\gamma_0 \ll \gamma_1$ are Borel probability measures on M with $D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1) := \int \log \frac{d\gamma_0}{d\gamma_1} d\gamma_0 < \infty$, we have $\frac{\gamma_0(B(x,r))}{\gamma_1(B(x,r))} \rightarrow \frac{d\gamma_0}{d\gamma_1}(x)$ for γ_0 -almost every x as $r \rightarrow 0$, and*

$$\int_M \sup_{r>0} \left| \log \frac{\gamma_0(B(x,r))}{\gamma_1(B(x,r))} \right| d\gamma_0(x) \leq C(1 + D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1)).$$

Proof. The first assertion is the Besicovitch differentiation theorem for finite Borel measures (see e.g. Federer [8, 2.8.14–2.8.15]). For the maximal inequality, we first note for γ_0 -almost every x that $\gamma_0(B(x,r))$ and $\gamma_1(B(x,r))$ are both positive for all $r > 0$. Moreover, the suprema below may be restricted to $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, since $\gamma_i(B(x,q)) \rightarrow \gamma_i(B(x,r))$ as $q \rightarrow r$ from below. In particular, the functions

$$W^-(x) := \sup_{r>0} \log \frac{\gamma_1(B(x,r))}{\gamma_0(B(x,r))} \quad \text{and} \quad W^+(x) := \sup_{r>0} \log \frac{\gamma_0(B(x,r))}{\gamma_1(B(x,r))}$$

are Borel and defined γ_0 -almost everywhere. Since $B(x,r) = M$ for $r > \text{diam } M$, we also have $W^\pm \geq 0$. It suffices to show that $\int W^\pm d\gamma_0 \leq C(1 + D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1))$.

Fix $t \geq 0$ and set $E_t := \{x \in M \mid W^-(x) > t\}$. For each $x \in E_t$, pick $s_x > 0$ such that $\gamma_0(B(x, s_x)) < e^{-t} \gamma_1(B(x, s_x))$. Let N_B be the Besicovitch covering constant of M . By the Besicovitch covering theorem, there is a countable subfamily $\{B_i\} \subseteq \{B(x, s_x)\}$ covering E_t with $\sum_i \chi_{B_i} \leq N_B$, so we see

$$\gamma_0(E_t) \leq \sum_i \gamma_0(B_i) < e^{-t} \sum_i \gamma_1(B_i) \leq N_B e^{-t}.$$

The layer-cake theorem then gives $\int_M W^- d\gamma_0 = \int_0^\infty \gamma_0(E_t) dt \leq N_B$.

It remains to bound $\int_M W^+ d\gamma_0$. Set $J = d\gamma_0/d\gamma_1$ and define

$$M_{\gamma_1} J(x) := \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{\gamma_1(B(x,r))} \int_{B(x,r)} J d\gamma_1,$$

with the convention $0/0 = 0$. Fix $s \geq 1$ and set $E_s = \{M_{\gamma_1} J > s\}$. For each $x \in E_s$, choose $r_x > 0$ such that $\int_{B(x, r_x)} J d\gamma_1 > s \gamma_1(B(x, r_x))$. Since $J \chi_{\{J \leq s/2\}} \leq s/2$, we see

$$\int_{B(x, r_x)} J \chi_{\{J > s/2\}} d\gamma_1 > \frac{s}{2} \gamma_1(B(x, r_x)).$$

By the Besicovitch covering theorem, there is a countable subfamily $\{B_j\}$ of the balls $\{B(x, r_x)\}$ that covers E_s and has multiplicity at most N_B , and so

$$(4) \quad \gamma_1(E_s) \leq \sum_j \gamma_1(B_j) < \frac{2}{s} \sum_j \int_{B_j} J \chi_{\{J > s/2\}} d\gamma_1 \leq \frac{2N_B}{s} \int_{\{J > s/2\}} J d\gamma_1.$$

Since $B(x,r) = M$ for $r > \text{diam } M$, we have $M_{\gamma_1} J \geq 1$. Thus applying the layer-cake theorem, (4), and Tonelli's theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M M_{\gamma_1} J d\gamma_1 &\leq 1 + 2N_B \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{s} \int_{\{J > s/2\}} J d\gamma_1 ds \\ &= 1 + 2N_B \int_M J \log(2J) \chi_{\{J > 1/2\}} d\gamma_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $-t \log t \leq e^{-1}$ on $[0, 1]$ and $\int_M J \, d\gamma_1 = 1$, we can further bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_M J \log(2J) \chi_{\{J > 1/2\}} \, d\gamma_1 \\ &= \int_M J \log J \, d\gamma_1 - \int_M J \log J \chi_{\{J \leq 1/2\}} \, d\gamma_1 + \log 2 \int_M J \chi_{\{J > 1/2\}} \, d\gamma_1 \\ &\leq D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1) + e^{-1} + \log 2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(5) \quad \int_M M_{\gamma_1} J \, d\gamma_1 \leq 1 + 2N_B(D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1) + e^{-1} + \log 2).$$

For every $x \in M$ and $r > 0$ with $\gamma_1(B(x, r)) > 0$, we note $W^+ \leq \log M_{\gamma_1} J$. Since $J > 0$ γ_0 -a.e., Jensen's inequality and (5) give

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M W^+ \, d\gamma_0 &\leq \int_M \log J \, d\gamma_0 + \int_M \log \frac{M_{\gamma_1} J}{J} \, d\gamma_0 \\ &\leq D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1) + \log \int_M \frac{M_{\gamma_1} J}{J} \, d\gamma_0 \\ &\leq D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1) + \log \int_M M_{\gamma_1} J \, d\gamma_1 \leq C(1 + D(\gamma_0 \| \gamma_1)). \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$, which shows the desired result. $\square$

Corollary 11. *Using the notation in Section 2.3, there is some $\Psi \in L^1(\mu_\eta)$ such that $|\psi_r(z)| + |\psi(z)| \leq \Psi(z)$ for all $0 < r \leq r_0$.*

Proof. For $z \in X$, set

$$\Psi(z) := 2 \sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, r_0]} |\psi_q(z)|.$$

Note Ψ is Borel as a countable supremum of Borel functions. For every $r \in (0, r_0]$, choose $q_j \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, r]$ with $q_j \rightarrow r$ monotonically. Continuity from below of the measure gives $\psi_{q_j}(z) \rightarrow \psi_r(z)$ whenever $z \in X_0$, and so $|\psi_r(z)| \leq \Psi(z)/2$. Letting $r \rightarrow 0$ also show $|\psi(z)| \leq \Psi(z)/2$, so $|\psi_r| + |\psi| \leq \Psi$.

Thus using Lemma 10 and (1), we have as desired

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \Psi \, d\mu_\eta &= 2 \int_{G \times M} \sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, r_0]} \left| \log \frac{\mu(f^{-1}B(x, q))}{\mu(B(x, q))} \right| \, d(f_*\mu)(x) \, d\eta(f) \\ &\leq 2C \int_G (1 + D(f_*\mu \| \mu)) \, d\eta(f) = 2C(1 + h_\mu^F(\eta)) < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

As mentioned, we have the following Maker's theorem style argument as in [20].

Lemma 12. *For μ_η -almost every $z \in X$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_{r_{n,j}^\pm}(F^{-n+j}z) \longrightarrow h_\mu^F(\eta).$$

Proof. Let Ψ be as in Corollary 11. For $0 < \delta \leq r_0$, set

$$\Delta_\delta(z) := \sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, \delta]} |\psi_q(z) - \psi(z)|.$$

Since $\psi_r \rightarrow \psi$, $\Delta_\delta(z) \rightarrow 0$, μ_η -almost everywhere, and $0 \leq \Delta_\delta(z) \leq \Psi(z)$ for μ_η -almost every z . By the dominated convergence theorem, $\int_X \Delta_\delta d\mu_\eta \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Continuity from below of the measure also gives $|\psi_r - \psi| \leq \Delta_\delta$ whenever $0 < r \leq \delta$.

Fix $\theta \in (0, 1)$. By Lemma 7, for almost every z and all sufficiently large n , $r_{n,j}^\pm(z) \leq \delta$ whenever $\lceil \theta n \rceil \leq j \leq n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \psi_{r_{n,j}^\pm}(F^{-n+j}z) - \psi(F^{-n+j}z) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{0 \leq j < \lceil \theta n \rceil} \Psi(F^{-n+j}z) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=\lceil \theta n \rceil}^n \Delta_\delta(F^{-n+j}z). \end{aligned}$$

Taking lim sup and applying Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \psi_{r_{n,j}^\pm}(F^{-n+j}z) - \psi(F^{-n+j}z) \right| \leq \theta \int_X \Psi d\mu_\eta + \int_X \Delta_\delta d\mu_\eta,$$

for μ_η -almost every z . Letting first $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and then $\theta \rightarrow 0$ shows that the left hand side above goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So we see again by Birkhoff's theorem that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \psi_{r_{n,j}^\pm}(F^{-n+j}z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \psi(F^{-n+j}z) = \int_X \psi d\mu_\eta = h_\mu^F(\eta),$$

for μ_η -almost every z as desired. $\square$

2.5. Proof of Theorem 1. We again write $z = ((f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}, x)$ and use the same notation as in Section 2.3. For every $n \geq 1$, note $(\pi_M \circ F^{-n})_* \mu_\eta = \mu$ and $\frac{1}{n} \log r_{n,0}^\pm \rightarrow 0$ by Lemma 7, and so applying Lemma 8 with $g_n = \pi_M \circ F^{-n}$ and $s_n = r_{n,0}^\pm$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mu(B(\pi_M \circ F^{-n}(z), r_{n,0}^\pm)) = \frac{1}{n} \log \mu(B(x_{-n}, r_{n,0}^\pm)) \rightarrow 0$$

for μ_η -almost every z . We also see $\frac{1}{n} \log r_{n,n}^\pm \rightarrow A^\pm < 0$ by Lemma 7, so using Lemma 9 with $s_n = r_{n,n}^\pm$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} A^- \underline{d}_\mu(x_0) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x_0, r_{n,n}^-))}{n}, \text{ and} \\ A^+ \bar{d}_\mu(x_0) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(B(x_0, r_{n,n}^+))}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

for μ_η -almost every z . Dividing by n , taking lim sup/lim inf in Lemma 6, and applying Lemma 12 therefore gives

$$A^- \underline{d}_\mu(x_0) \leq -h_\mu^F(\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad A^+ \bar{d}_\mu(x_0) \geq -h_\mu^F(\eta),$$

for μ_η -almost every z . The functions $\underline{d}_\mu$ and $\bar{d}_\mu$ are Borel, and $(\pi_M)_* \mu_\eta = \mu$, so the preceding inequalities hold for μ -almost every $x \in M$. Lemma 5 and the fact that $h_\mu^F(\eta) = (N + \frac{1}{2})h_\mu^F(\nu)$ shows

$$\frac{h_\mu^F(\nu)}{-\lambda + 2\varepsilon} \leq \underline{d}_\mu(x) \leq \bar{d}_\mu(x) \leq \frac{h_\mu^F(\nu)}{-\lambda - 2\varepsilon},$$

for μ -almost every x . Applying this to a sequence $\varepsilon_m \rightarrow 0$ and intersecting the corresponding conull sets, we obtain

$$\underline{d}_\mu(x) = \bar{d}_\mu(x) = \frac{h_\mu^F(\nu)}{-\lambda},$$

for μ -almost every x , as desired. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Barreira, Ya. Pesin, and J. Schmeling, *Dimension and product structure of hyperbolic measures*, Ann. of Math. (2) **149** (1999), no. 3, 755–783.
- [2] P. H. Baxendale, *Lyapunov exponents and relative entropy for a stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **81** (1989), 521–554.
- [3] A. Brown and F. Rodriguez Hertz, *Entropy formula for Furstenberg entropy: invariance principle and exact dimensionality of contracting stationary measures*, unpublished manuscript, version dated September 2, 2026, 78 pp.
- [4] H. Crauel, *Extremal exponents of random dynamical systems do not vanish*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations **2** (1990), no. 3, 245–291.
- [5] H. Crauel, *Non-Markovian invariant measures are hyperbolic*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **45** (1993), no. 1, 13–28.
- [6] A. Eskin and E. Lindenstrauss, *Random walks on locally homogeneous spaces*, preprint, 2018.
- [7] K. J. Falconer, *Techniques in Fractal Geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1997.
- [8] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1969.
- [9] D.-J. Feng and H. Hu, *Dimension theory of iterated function systems*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62** (2009), no. 11, 1435–1500.
- [10] W. He, Y. Jiao, and D. Xu, *On the dimension theory of random walks and group actions by circle diffeomorphisms*, preprint, arXiv:2304.08372, 2023.
- [11] M. Hochman and B. Solomyak, *On the dimension of Furstenberg measure for $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ random matrix products*, Invent. Math. **210** (2017), no. 3, 815–875.
- [12] J. F. C. Kingman, *The ergodic theory of subadditive stochastic processes*, J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B **30** (1968), 499–510.
- [13] F. Ledrappier, *Quelques propriétés des exposants caractéristiques*, in *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XII–1982*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1097, Springer, Berlin, 1984, 305–396.
- [14] F. Ledrappier and P. Lessa, *Exact dimension of Furstenberg measures*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **33** (2023), 245–298.
- [15] F. Ledrappier and P. Lessa, *Exact dimension of dynamical stationary measures*, J. Mod. Dyn. **20** (2024), 679–715.
- [16] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young, *The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. Part II. Relations between entropy, exponents and dimension*, Ann. of Math. (2) **122** (1985), no. 3, 540–574.
- [17] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young, *Dimension formula for random transformations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **117** (1988), no. 4, 529–548.
- [18] P. Lessa, *Entropy and dimension of disintegrations of stationary measures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B **8** (2021), no. 4, 105–129.
- [19] P.-D. Liu and J.-S. Xie, *Dimension of hyperbolic measures of random diffeomorphisms*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358** (2006), no. 9, 3751–3780.
- [20] P. T. Maker, *The ergodic theorem for a sequence of functions*, Duke Math. J. **6** (1940), no. 1, 27–30.
- [21] P. Petersen, *Riemannian Geometry*, 3rd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 171, Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [22] A. Rapaport, *Exact dimensionality and Ledrappier–Young formula for the Furstenberg measure*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **374** (2021), no. 7, 5225–5268.
- [23] M. Viana, *Lectures on Lyapunov Exponents*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 145, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [24] L.-S. Young, *Dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponents*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **2** (1982), no. 1, 109–124.

APPENDIX A. SKEW PRODUCTS OVER AN ERGODIC BASE

Let M be as before and following the notation of [3], let $(\widehat{\Omega}, \widehat{\mathcal{B}}, \widehat{\nu})$ be a standard probability space. Suppose $\widehat{\theta} : \widehat{\Omega} \rightarrow \widehat{\Omega}$ is an ergodic $\widehat{\nu}$ -preserving transformation and $\omega \mapsto f_\omega \in G$ is measurable. Set $\widehat{X} := \widehat{\Omega} \times M$ and $\widehat{F}(\omega, x) := (\widehat{\theta}\omega, f_\omega(x))$. Writing $\pi_{\widehat{\Omega}}(\omega, x) = \omega$, let $\widehat{\mu}$ be an ergodic $\widehat{F}$ -invariant probability measure such that $(\pi_{\widehat{\Omega}})_* \widehat{\mu} = \widehat{\nu}$, with disintegration $\widehat{\mu} = \int_{\widehat{\Omega}} \delta_\omega \otimes \widehat{\mu}_\omega \, d\widehat{\nu}(\omega)$.

Assume $\omega \mapsto \log[f_\omega]_{C^1} + \log[f_\omega^{-1}]_{C^1} \in L^1(\widehat{\nu})$. Set $f_\omega^{(n)} = f_{\widehat{\theta}^{n-1}\omega} \circ \cdots \circ f_\omega$ for $n \geq 1$. Similar to the introduction, by Kingman's theorem we know there are λ_{top} and λ_{bot} such that for $\widehat{\mu}$ -almost every $(\omega, x) \in \widehat{X}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|D_x f_\omega^{(n)}\| = \lambda_{\text{top}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbf{m}(D_x f_\omega^{(n)}) = \lambda_{\text{bot}}.$$

Following [3, §3.9], set $h^F(\widehat{\mu}) := \int_{\widehat{\Omega}} D((f_\omega)_* \widehat{\mu}_\omega \| \widehat{\mu}_{\widehat{\theta}\omega}) \, d\widehat{\nu}(\omega)$. In the i.i.d. setting of Theorem 1, $\widehat{\mu}_\omega = \mu$ almost everywhere and $h^F(\widehat{\mu}) = h_\mu^F(\nu)$.

Theorem 13. *Suppose that $\lambda_{\text{top}} = \lambda_{\text{bot}} = \lambda < 0$. Then, for $\widehat{\nu}$ -almost every ω , the measure $\widehat{\mu}_\omega$ is exact dimensional and $\dim(\widehat{\mu}_\omega) = h^F(\widehat{\mu})/(-\lambda)$.*

We give a sketch of the proof, highlighting the changes from the proof of Theorem 1 and leaving the proof details to the reader.

Proof. In Lemma 2, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ be the natural extension of $(\widehat{\Omega}, \widehat{\mathcal{B}}, \widehat{\nu})$ with factor map $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \widehat{\Omega}$. For every $n \geq 1$, we see $\log[(f_\omega^{(n)})^{\pm 1}]_{C^1} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log[f_{\widehat{\theta}^j \omega}^{\pm 1}]_{C^1}$. We then again get $h^F(\widehat{\mu}) \leq -d_M \lambda < \infty$ by [5, Theorem 5.1], this time applied $\tau^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ on the natural extension, and so $(f_\omega)_* \widehat{\mu}_\omega \ll \widehat{\mu}_{\widehat{\theta}\omega}$ for $\widehat{\nu}$ -almost every ω . An analogous Radon–Nikodym chain rule argument shows

$$(6) \quad h^F(\widehat{\mu}, n) := \int_{\widehat{\Omega}} D((f_\omega^{(n)})_* \widehat{\mu}_\omega \| \widehat{\mu}_{\widehat{\theta}^n \omega}) \, d\widehat{\nu}(\omega) = n h^F(\widehat{\mu}).$$

Fix $0 < \varepsilon < -\lambda/4$. In the Kingman argument of Lemma 4, we see analogously

$$\frac{1}{n} \int_{\widehat{X}} \log \mathbf{m}(D_x f_\omega^{(n)}) \, d\widehat{\mu} \rightarrow \lambda, \quad \frac{1}{n} \int_{\widehat{X}} \log \|D_x f_\omega^{(n)}\| \, d\widehat{\mu} \rightarrow \lambda.$$

Choose N so both normalized integrals differ from λ by less than ε for $n = N, N+1$. Similar to the argument in [6, §11.2], set $\Sigma := \{N, N+1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\beta := (\frac{1}{2}\delta_N + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{N+1})^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, and write $\zeta = (\zeta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma$. On $\widehat{\Omega}_N := \Sigma \times \widehat{\Omega}$, define $\widehat{\theta}_N(\zeta, \omega) := (\sigma(\zeta), \widehat{\theta}^{\zeta_0}(\omega))$, where σ is the shift on Σ . Also define $\widehat{F}_N(\zeta, \omega, x) := (\widehat{\theta}_N(\zeta, \omega), f_\omega^{(\zeta_0)}(x))$ and set $\widehat{\nu}_N := \beta \otimes \widehat{\nu}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_N := \beta \otimes \widehat{\mu}$. We then see

$$(\widehat{F}_N)_* \widehat{\mu}_N = \beta \otimes \frac{1}{2} (h^F(\widehat{\mu}, N) + h^F(\widehat{\mu}, N+1)) = \widehat{\mu}_N.$$

The desired bounds then follow just as in Lemma 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) (\lambda - \varepsilon) &< \int \log \mathbf{m}(D_x f_\omega^{(\zeta_0)}) \, d\widehat{\mu}_N(\zeta, \omega, x) \\ &\leq \int \log \|D_x f_\omega^{(\zeta_0)}\| \, d\widehat{\mu}_N(\zeta, \omega, x) < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) (\lambda + \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

The fiber measure of $\widehat{\mu}_N$ over (ζ, ω) is $\widehat{\mu}_\omega$, so we see using (6)

$$h^F(\widehat{\mu}_N) = \frac{1}{2} (h^F(\widehat{\mu}, N) + h^F(\widehat{\mu}, N+1)) = \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) h^F(\widehat{\mu}).$$

For ergodicity, let $u \in L^2(\hat{\mu}_N)$ be $\hat{F}_N$ -invariant. For $z \in \hat{X}$, set $\bar{u}(z) := \int_{\Sigma} u(\zeta, z) d\beta(\zeta)$. Then we see $\bar{u} = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u} \circ \hat{F}^N + \bar{u} \circ \hat{F}^{N+1})$. The same strict-convexity argument as in Lemma 4 shows that $\bar{u}$ is $\hat{F}$ -invariant and hence constant. Writing $s_m := \zeta_0 + \dots + \zeta_{m-1}$, we see $u(\zeta, z) = u(\sigma^m \zeta, \hat{F}^{s_m} z)$, and so, conditioning with respect to the coordinate maps, we get $\mathbb{E}[u \mid z, \zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_{m-1}] = \bar{u}(\hat{F}^{s_m} z)$. Sending $m \rightarrow \infty$ and using the martingale convergence then shows that u is also constant almost everywhere, proving ergodicity.

In Lemma 5, we replace integration of functions of (f, x) against $\eta \otimes \mu$ by integration of functions of $(f_{\omega}^{(\zeta_0)}, x)$ against $\hat{\mu}_N$. In choosing the compact set $K \subseteq G$, we replace η by the pushforward of $\hat{\nu}_N$ under $(\zeta, \omega) \mapsto f_{\omega}^{(\zeta_0)}$. The rest of the proof proceeds as before, giving analogous $a^{\pm}$ and $A^{\pm} := \int \log a^{\pm}(f_{\omega}^{(\zeta_0)}, x) d\hat{\mu}_N(\zeta, \omega, x)$, and we obtain

$$(7) \quad \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) (\lambda - 2\varepsilon) < A^- \leq A^+ < \left(N + \frac{1}{2}\right) (\lambda + 2\varepsilon) < 0.$$

We then pass to the natural extension (X_N, μ_N, F_N) of $(\hat{\Omega}_N \times M, \hat{\mu}_N, \hat{F}_N)$, with factor map $\pi : X_N \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}_N \times M$. For $z \in X_N$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, write

$$\pi F_N^k(z) = \left(\zeta^{(k)}, \omega_k, x_k\right), \quad f_k := f_{\omega_k}^{(\zeta_0^{(k)})}.$$

Thus $\zeta^{(k)} \in \Sigma$ is the auxiliary Bernoulli sequence at time k , and we also get $\omega_{k+1} = \hat{\theta}_{\zeta_0}^{(k)}(\omega_k)$ and $x_{k+1} = f_k(x_k)$. We replace (1) by

$$(8) \quad \int_{X_N} \varphi(\zeta^{(-1)}, \omega_{-1}, x_0) d\mu_N = \int_{\hat{\Omega}_N} \int_M \varphi(\zeta, \omega, y) d\left((f_{\omega}^{(\zeta_0)})_* \hat{\mu}_{\omega}\right)(y) d\hat{\nu}_N(\zeta, \omega)$$

for nonnegative Borel φ . We then set

$$\psi_r(z) := \log \frac{\hat{\mu}_{\omega_{-1}}(f_{-1}^{-1} B(x_0, r))}{\hat{\mu}_{\omega_0}(B(x_0, r))}.$$

The definitions of ψ and Ψ are otherwise unchanged. Applying Lemma 10 to $(f_{\omega}^{(\zeta_0)})_* \hat{\mu}_{\omega}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\hat{\theta}_{\zeta_0} \omega}$ and using (8), we similarly see $\psi_r \rightarrow \psi$ almost everywhere and, as in Corollary 11,

$$\int \psi d\mu_N = h^F(\hat{\mu}_N), \quad \int \Psi d\mu_N \leq 2C(1 + h^F(\hat{\mu}_N)).$$

We keep the definition of $r_{n,j}^{\pm}$ from Section 2.3, using the f_k and x_k above. In Lemma 6, we replace $\mu(B(x_k, r))$ by $\hat{\mu}_{\omega_k}(B(x_k, r))$. The proofs of Lemmas 7 and 12 are unchanged, with (X, μ_{η}, F) replaced by (X_N, μ_N, F_N) and $h_{\mu}^F(\eta)$ by $h^F(\hat{\mu}_N)$.

For Lemma 8, we integrate the uniform packing bound (3) over the base to obtain

$$\hat{\mu}_N(\{(\zeta, \omega, x) \mid \hat{\mu}_{\omega}(B(x, r)) < q\}) \leq C_0 q r^{-d_M}.$$

Using $(\pi_N F_N^{-n})_* \mu_N = \hat{\mu}_N$ in place of $(g_n)_* \gamma = \mu$, the same Borel–Cantelli argument gives $\frac{1}{n} \log \hat{\mu}_{\omega_{-n}}(B(x_{-n}, r_{n,0}^{\pm})) \rightarrow$ for μ_N -almost every z .

Finally, we apply Lemma 9 to $\hat{\mu}_{\omega_0}$. The concluding argument of Theorem 1 gives the same dimension bounds and since $(z \mapsto (\omega_0, x_0))_* \mu_N = \hat{\mu}$, these bounds hold $\hat{\mu}$ -almost everywhere. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and disintegrating over ω proves the theorem. $\square$