Houston Journal of Mathematics
© University of Houston
Volume , No. ,

ESTIMATES FOR THE STABLE DIMENSION FOR HOLOMORPHIC MAPS

EUGEN MIHAILESCU AND MARIUSZ URBAŃSKI

Communicated by Klaus Kaiser

Abstract. We study the Hausdorff dimension of the intersection between stable manifolds and basic sets for an Axiom A holomorphic endomorphism on the complex projective space $\mathbb{P}^2$. For a map which is at least d'-to-1 on a basic set Λ, we are improving the upper estimate given in [11] by taking into consideration the number of preimages, and thus proving for non-invertible maps results parallel to those of Verjovsky-Wu [17] from the case of Henon diffeomorphisms.

Also a lower estimate for $HD(W^s_\delta(x)\cap\Lambda)$ is given by using a concept of preimage entropy modeled after Bowen. This preimage entropy plays the role of the entropy of f^{-1} from the case of homeomorphisms, but in general, if the map f is an endomorphism like in our situation, the preimage entropy does not coincide with the usual forward entropy. We also show that, given c with $|c|$ small, the perturbation $(z^2+c+\varepsilon w, w^2)$ of (z^2+c, w^2) is injective on its basic set Λ_ε close to $\Lambda := \{p_0(c)\}\times S^1$ (where $p_0(c)$ is the fixed attracting point for z^2+c) and moreover its stable dimension is strictly positive. An interesting consequence of our results is the fact that $HD(W^s_\delta(x)\cap\Lambda_g)$ does not depend continuously on g, (for $x\in\Lambda_g$), which is opposite to the situation of diffeomorphisms. We study also the stable dimension for a large class of quadratic endomorphisms and show that under a mild technical condition it is either zero, or it can be estimated easily using the derivative on the respective basic set.

1. Introduction

We consider Axiom A holomorphic functions $f\colon\ \mathbb{P}^2\to\mathbb{P}^2$ on the 2-dimensional complex projective space. For definitions of hyperbolicity and Axiom A we refer to [5], [16]. We will use the notations from [5], where the nonwandering set Ω of f is partitioned into three invariant subsets S_0, S_1, S_2, according to the dimension of the unstable tangent space at points from these sets.

Let Λ be a basic set of the saddle part S_1 of the nonwandering set Ω. This means that at every point of Λ there exist both stable and unstable directions. According to [5], at a point $x\in\Lambda$ there exist a local stable manifold of size δ, denoted by $W^s_\delta(x)$ and, for every prehistory $\hat{x}$ of x, a local unstable manifold of size δ, $W^u_\delta(\hat{x})$. These local manifolds are analytic disks in our case.

Definition 1. Given a point x of the basic set Λ for an Axiom A map as above, and having fixed a small positive number δ (for instance $0<\delta\le\frac{\mathrm{diam}\Lambda}{4}$), we will call *$\delta$-stable dimension* at x, the Hausdorff dimension $HD(W^s_\delta(x)\cap\Lambda)$. The δ-stable dimension will be denoted by $\delta_s(x)$ or by δ_s when no confusion about the point x is possible.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37D20,37A35,37F35.

Key words and phrases. Hausdorff dimension, stable manifolds, preimage entropy, holomorphic endomorphisms, topological pressure.

The first author is grateful for partial travel support from the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research under the contract CERES 38/2002.

In the sequel we fix a small number δ as in Definition 1 and call the δ-stable dimension (at a point x) simply the *stable dimension* (at x).

If $x \in \Lambda$ and one denotes by $\phi^s(x) := \log |Df|_{E^s_x}|$, where E^s_x is the stable tangent subspace at x, then we have the result of [11]:

Proposition 1.1. *Let f a holomorphic Axiom A endomorphism of $\mathbb{P}^2$ such that $C_f \cap S_1 = \emptyset$, where C_f = critical set of f. Then $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) \leq t^s$, where t^s is the only zero of the function $t \to P(t \cdot \phi^s)$. Hence the estimate does not depend on $x \in \Lambda$.* □

In the case of diffeomorphisms we have $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) = t^s$ as was proved in [10].

In this article, we denote the nonwandering set of f by Ω and we consider the partition of Ω as $S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2$, where the dimension of the unstable spaces over S_i is equal to i, $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. The function $P(\cdot)$ referred to in Proposition 1.1 is the topological pressure. We will now define the topological pressure and give some of its properties, following [18]. Our purpose in doing this is two-fold: first as a convenience for the reader, second because later we shall define a related concept, that of preimage entropy. Parallels between these two notions shall prove very useful.

The general setting is that of (X, d), a compact metric space, and $f\colon X \to X$ a continuous map. For n, a positive integer, $d_n(x, y) := \max\{d(f^i x, f^i y),\ i = 0, ..., n-1\}$ is a metric on X inducing the same topology as the metric d.

Definition 2. A subset $E \subset X$ is called (n, ε)-*separated* (for some $\varepsilon > 0$) if for all $x, y \in E$, $x \neq y$, we have $d_n(x, y) \geq \varepsilon$.

Definition 3. The *topological pressure* of f is the functional $P_f\colon \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R}) \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined on the space of continuous functions by:

$$P_f(\varphi) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \overline{\lim_{n \to \infty}} \frac{1}{n} \log \sup \left\{ \sum_{x \in E} \exp \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^i x) \right), E \subset X, (n, \varepsilon)\text{-separated set} \right\}$$

Definition 4. When considering $\varphi \equiv 0$ in Definition 3, we obtain the notion of *topological entropy* of f, denoted by $h_{top}(f)$ or $h(f)$.

There exists an interesting relationship between Borel invariant measures and P_f, contained in the following:

Theorem (Variational Principle)**.** *In the above setting, $P_f(\varphi) = \sup_\mu \{h_\mu(f) + \int \varphi \, d\mu\}$, where the supremum is taken over all f-invariant Borel probability measures μ, and $h_\mu(f)$ = measure-theoretic entropy of μ.*

For the (long) definition of $h_\mu(f)$ and proofs of all these facts, as we mentioned, a good reference is [18].

Theorem (Properties of Pressure)**.** *If $f\colon X \to X$ is a continuous transformation, and $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})$, then:*

1) $\varphi \leq \psi \Rightarrow P_f(\varphi) \leq P_f(\psi)$
2) *$P_f(\cdot)$ is either finitely valued or constantly ∞*
3) *P_f is convex*
4) *for a strictly negative function φ, the mapping $t \to P_f(t\varphi)$ is strictly decreasing if $P(0) < \infty$.*
5) *P_f is a topological conjugacy invariant.*

In our situation $X = \Lambda$ (with Λ a basic set of S_1); then, because $\phi^s < 0$, it follows that there exists a unique zero of the map $t \to P(t\phi^s)$, since $t \to P(t\phi^s)$ is strictly decreasing. We shall denote this unique zero by t^s. It is true that $t^s \geq 0$ since $P(0) = h(f|_\Lambda) \geq 0$, and $P(t\phi^s) < 0$ for large t.

Define now the inverse limit of X, $\widehat{X} := \{(x_n)_{n\leq 0},\ f(x_{n-1}) = x_n,\ n \leq 0,\ x_n \in X\}$, and call an element $\hat{x} = (x_n)_{n\leq 0}$ of $\widehat{X}$ a prehistory of x_0. The metric on $\widehat{X}$ is the usual metric, i.e

$$d(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) := \sum_{i\leq 0} \frac{d(x_i, y_i)}{2^{|i|}}.$$

The map f induces a homeomorphism $\hat{f}$ of $\widehat{X}$ given by $\hat{f}((x_n)_{n\leq 0}) = (x_{n+1})_{n\leq 0}$, where $x_1 = f(x_0)$. In this case, denoting by $p(\hat{x}) = x_0$ the canonical projection, $p\colon\ \widehat{X} \to X$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{X} & \xrightarrow{\hat{f}} & \widehat{X} \\ {\scriptstyle p}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & X \end{array}$$

It is well-known that, in this case, $h(f) = h(\hat{f})$.

We now come back to $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda)$. In [11] the first author studied the Axiom A maps $f(z, w) = (z^2 + c, w^2 + d)$, $c \neq 0$, $d \neq 0$ and showed that if c is chosen such that $|1 - \sqrt{1 - 4c}| = \frac{4}{5}$, then $P(2\phi^s) > 0$ implies $t^s > 2$. So, the estimate $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) \leq t^s$ is not sharp because $W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda$ consists of only one point. A different estimate for a certain class of maps will be proved in §2 to take this fact into consideration.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume f is Axiom A, holomorphic endomorphism on $\mathbb{P}^2$ of degree d, and Λ is one of the basic sets with unstable index 1. Suppose that $C_f \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$ and that $f|_\Lambda\colon\ \Lambda \to \Lambda$ has the property that each point $x \in \Lambda$ has at least d' preimages in Λ, $d' \leq d$. Then $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) \leq t^s_0$, where t^s_0 is the unique zero of the function $t \to P(t \log |Df|_{E^s_y}| - \log d')$.*

The estimate is independent of $x \in \Lambda$.

This result complements the theorem from [12] stating that the union of all unstable manifolds corresponding to points in S_1, has empty interior. In general, if $f|_\Lambda\colon\ \Lambda \to \Lambda$ is d'-to-1, then $h(f|_\Lambda) \geq \log d'$ (this is proved similarly to the Misiurewicz-Przytycki theorem, [8]). For the example given above, $f(z, w) = (z^2 + c, w^2 + d)$, $h(f|_\Lambda) = \log 2, d' = 2$, hence the above estimate is sharp. In the case of complex hyperbolic Hénon diffeomorphisms, $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) = t^s$ ([17]). However in our case, that proof will not work mainly because the estimates using $h_\mu(f)$ break down due to the non-invertibility of f. The main problem is that the entropy was defined by considering the forward iterates of f, and, if f is not injective, $h(f)$ does not shed any light upon the growth of preimages.

We will encounter several times in the sequel a notion of *preimage (branch) entropy*, introduced by Hurley ([7]). Let us call a *branch* of length ℓ (or *prehistory* of length ℓ) in X, a sequence of preimages, $\beta = (z_0, z_{-1}, \ldots, z_{-\ell})$, with $z_i \in X$, $-\ell \leq i \leq 0$, such that $f(z_{i-1}) = z_i$, $-\ell + 1 \leq i \leq 0$. Given another branch $\beta' = (z'_0, \ldots, z'_{-\ell})$ of same length, define their *branch distance* to be $d^b(\beta, \beta') = \max_{j=\overline{0,\ell}} d(z_{-j}, z'_{-j})$. The reader can notice the similarity between the branch distance and $d_n(\cdot, \cdot)$ introduced earlier. Like $d_n(\cdot, \cdot)$ for forward iterates, d^b measures the growth of inverse iterates. Using this, we now define a *branch metric* on X:

$$d^b_n(x, x') < \varepsilon,$$

if for every branch β of length ℓ with $z_0 = x$, and $0 \leq \ell \leq n$, there exists a branch β' of length ℓ with $z'_0 = x'$ such that $d^b(\beta, \beta') < \varepsilon$, and vice versa.

We shall call a subset F of X, (n,ε)- *spanning* in the metric d_n^b if for any point x of X, there exists a point $y \in F$ such that $d_n^b(x,y) < \varepsilon$. Denote by $N_{\text{span}}(\varepsilon, d_n^b, X)$ the smallest cardinality of an ε-spanning set for X in the d_n^b metric. Hence, if A is an (n,ε)-spanning set with $\#A = N_{\text{span}}(\varepsilon, d_n^b, X)$, then, $\forall x \in X$, $\exists y \in A$ with $d_n^b(x,y) < \varepsilon$. Also, we say that a set A is (n,ε)-*separated* (or ε-*separated* in the d_n^b metric), if for all $x, y \in A$, $x \neq y$, we have $d_n^b(x,y) > \varepsilon$. Let $N_{\text{sep}}(\varepsilon, d_n^b, X)$ be the largest cardinality of an ε-separated set for X in the d_n^b metric.

The following proposition gives the definition of the preimage entropy $h_i(f)$ and two ways to calculate it.

Proposition ([13]). *For $f\colon X \to X$ continuous, (X,d) compact metric space, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \frac{1}{n} \log N_{sep}(\varepsilon, d_n^b, X) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \frac{1}{n} \log N_{\text{span}}(\varepsilon, d_n^b, X)$$

and the common value is called the preimage (branch) entropy, *denoted by $h_i(f)$.* □

In general there is no relation between $h_i(f)$ and $h(f)$. Let us recall now two cases when $h_i(f) = 0$.

a. Forward-expansive coverings

If X is a metric space, then a continuous map $f\colon X \to X$ is called *forward expansive* if there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that whenever $x, y \in X$, $x \neq y$, $\exists m \geq 0$ with

$$d(f^m x, f^m y) \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0.$$

For example, f is forward-expansive on any invariant subset of a Riemannian manifold on which Df is expanding by a constant factor $\lambda > 1$. Denker and Urbański [4] (see also Coven and Reddy [3]) showed that, if X is a compact metric space, then a forward-expansive map is in fact *expanding*, i.e. for some metric d on X (equivalent to the original one), there exists $b > 0$, $\lambda > 1$ constants such that $d(x,y) < b$ implies $d(f(x), f(y)) \geq \lambda d(x,y)$.

We also say that $f\colon X \to X$ is a *covering map* if $(\forall) x \in X, \exists$ a neighborhood U_x of x, such that $f^{-1}(U_x) = \bigcup_i V^i$ with $\{V^i\}$ open disjoint sets, and such that $f : V^i \to U_x$ is a homeomorphism. If f is forward-expansive on the compact metric space X, then we can use Denker-Urbański [4] characterization in connection to $h_i(f)$ because $h_i(f)$ is a topological concept which does not depend on the metric ([13]). This is the idea of the proof for the following:

Proposition ([13]). *If $f\colon X \to X$ is a* forward expansive covering *map, then $h_i(f) = 0$.* □

b. A second situation when $h_i(f) = 0$ is that of graph maps.

A *finite graph* is a compact metric space K with a distinguished finite set of points called *vertices*, whose complement has finitely many connected components, *edges*, homeomorphic to the open interval (0,1). We fix the metric on K by assigning length 1 to each edge and the distance between two points in K is the length of the shortest path connecting them.

Theorem (Nitecki-Przytycki, [13]). *Let K be a finite graph and $f\colon K \to K$ a continuous map. Then $h_i(f) = 0$.* □

Corollary. *For any continuous self-map f of a closed interval $[a,b]$, or of the circle S^1, we have $h_i(f) = 0$.* □

We will start by defining another concept of preimage entropy, modeled after Bowen's covering type entropy ([1]).

Let X a compact metric space, $Y \subset X$, and $f : X \to X$ a continuous surjective map.

Denote by $\mathcal{C}_m(\varepsilon)$ the set of collections of length m of balls of radius ε centered at points of a certain prehistory of x, $C = \{U_0 = B(x_0, \varepsilon), ..., U_{m-1} = B(x_{-m+1}, \varepsilon)\}$, where $f(x_{-1}) = x_0, ..., f(x_{-m+1}) = x_{-m+2}$, with $x = x_0$ an arbitrary point of X. We denote by $n(C)$ the number of elements of C. We shall call C a **branch modeled after** the prehistory $(x_0, ..., x_{-m+1})$.

Now let $C = \{U_0, ..., U_{m-1}\} \in \mathcal{C}_m(\varepsilon)$, and define

$$X(C) := \{y \in U_0, \exists y_{-1} \in f^{-1}(y) \cap U_1, \exists y_{-2} \in f^{-1}(y_{-1}) \cap U_2, ...\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{C}(\varepsilon) := \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_m(\varepsilon)$.

Definition 5. We shall call the set $\underset{C}{\cup} X(C)$, where C ranges over all branches modeled after the n-prehistories of x, the (n, ε)-*inverse ball* centered at x. It will be denoted by $B_n^-(x, \varepsilon)$.

For an arbitrary λ real, $\varepsilon > 0$, integer N and subset $Y \subset X$, we introduce

$$H_-(\lambda, Y, N, \varepsilon) := \inf\{\sum_{x \in F} \exp(-\lambda n_x), \text{where } Y \subset \underset{x \in F}{\cup} B_{n_x}^-(x, \varepsilon), \text{and } n_x \geq N, \forall x \in F\}$$

When N increases, the pool of possible candidate spanning sets F appearing in the definition of $H_-(\lambda, Y, N, \varepsilon)$ decreases, so $H_-(\lambda, Y, N, \varepsilon)$ increases with N. Hence, there exists the limit $\lim_{N \to \infty} H_-(\lambda, Y, N, \varepsilon) =: h_-(\lambda, Y, \varepsilon)$. The notation $h_-(\lambda, Y, \varepsilon)$ emphasizes the nature of the construction in the spirit of Hausdorff outer measure. Now let $h_-(Y, \varepsilon) := \inf\{\lambda, h_-(\lambda, Y, \varepsilon) = 0\}$.

Let us note now that, similar to the case of usual (forward) entropy ([18]), $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} h_-(Y, \varepsilon)$ exists. This limit will be denoted by $h_-(Y)$ and will be called **the inverse entropy of f on Y**. When we will want to emphasize the dependence of h_- on f, we will write $h_-(f, Y)$. In the case $Y = X$, we will often write just $h_-(f)$ or $h_-(X)$, when no confusion about the map f can appear.

We can notice now that the balls used in the definition of h_i are smaller than the ones used for h_-. Indeed if y is a point in X, then the ε-ball around y in the d_n^b metric is given by the intersection $\cap X(C)$, when C ranges over all branches modeled after the n-prehistories of y. On the other hand, the inverse ball $B_n^-(y, \varepsilon)$ is equal to the union $\cup X(C)$ when C ranges over all the n-prehistories of y. Therefore we will need more balls in the d_n^b metric than balls of type B_n^-, in order to cover X. This fact is used to prove the following Proposition:

Proposition 1.3. *If $f: X \to X$ is a continuous map on a compact metric space X, then $0 \leq h_-(f) \leq h_i(f)$. Also, if f is a homeomorphism on X, then $h_-(f) = h(f^{-1}) = h(f) = h_i(f)$.* □

Remark:

In general we do not have the equality $h_-(f) = h_i(f)$. Let us consider as a counterexample the map $f : S^2 \to S^2$, constructed in [9] (where S^2 represents the two dimensional real sphere). f is a smooth map which sends the square $K_1 := [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ on a horseshoe H_1 touching the line $y = 4$ in such a way that the unstable directions are vertical.

f also sends the square $K_2 := [0, 1] \times [2, 3]$ onto a horizontal horseshoe H_2 whose unstable directions are horizontal. The square $[0, 1] \times [1, 2]$ is sent to a connecting image between the two horseshoes H_1 and H_2; this image lies outside the rectangle $[0, 1] \times [0, 4]$. Denote by $\mathcal{B}_1^u$ the unstable lamination of the basic set of the restriction of f to K_1 and by $\mathcal{B}_2^u$ the unstable lamination of the basic set of $f|_{K_2}$. Let K denote the intersection $K_2 \cap \mathcal{B}_1^u \cap \mathcal{B}_2^u$.

If two points ξ and η from K belong to distinct components of $(f|_{K_1})^n(K_1) \cap K_2$, for some n, then their inverse iterates $(f|_{K_1})^{-j}(\xi)$ and $(f|_{K_1})^{-j}(\eta)$ are in different components of $(f|_{K_1})^{-1}(K_1) \cap K_1$ for some j, $1 \leq j \leq n$. It is the same if ξ and η belong to different components of $K_2 \cap (f|_{K_2})^n(K_2)$.

Now, there are 2^n different components of $(f|_{K_1})^n(K_1) \cap K_2$, (called **components of first type of order** n), and 2^n different components of $K_2 \cap (f|_{K_2})^n(K_2)$, called **components of second type of order** n. The components of first type are transversal to the ones of second type.

A given point in K has prehistories in both the components of first type of order n, as well as in the components of second type of order n. Therefore when calculating h_i, one must take into consideration at least 4^n balls in the d_n^b metric, obtained from the intersections of components of first type of order n with the components of second type of order n; these 4^n balls are necessary to cover K. Hence $h_i(K) \geq \log 4$. On the other hand, in order to cover K we need only $2 \cdot 2^n - 1$ inverse balls $B_n^-(x, \varepsilon)$, which are given by the components of first type of order n union with those of second type of order n (if ε is chosen appropriately); hence we conclude that $h_-(K) \leq \log 2$. This implies that in this case h_i and h_- do not coincide. □

From the definition of inverse entropy we obtain easily the following Proposition :

Proposition 1.4. *In the above setting, given a continuous map $f : X \to X$ and a subset $Y \subset X$, we have that:*

a) If $Y = \bigcup_i Y_i$ is a finite or countable union, then $h_-(Y) = \sup_i h_-(Y_i)$.

a') If $Y = \bigcup_i Y_i$ is a finite or countable union, and ε' is some positive number, then $h_-(Y, \varepsilon') = \sup_i h_-(Y_i, \varepsilon')$.

b) If $Y_1 \subset Y_2 \subset X$, then $h_-(Y_1) \leq h_-(Y_2)$.

c) In case f is a homeomorphism of X, the inverse entropy coincides with the usual entropy of f, i.e $h_-(X) = h(X)$.

Remark: Let us note that Proposition 1.3 and the discussion above about h_i, imply that $h_-(f) = 0$ for forward expansive maps and graph maps. □

We are ready now to state Theorem 1.5 which gives a lower estimate for $HD(W_\delta^s(x) \cap \Lambda)$, in terms of h_-:

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that Λ is a basic set of saddle type for an Axiom A holomorphic endomorphism $f\colon\ \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathbb{P}^2$, $C_f \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$. Then for any $x \in \Lambda$,*

$$HD(W_\delta^s(x) \cap \Lambda) \geq \left| \log \inf_{y \in \Lambda} |Df|_{E_y^s}| \right|^{-1} \cdot h_-(f|_\Lambda) \geq 0 \qquad \square$$

Remark:

Consider the map $f(z, w) = (z^2 + c, w^2 + d)$, with complex non-zero parameters c, d, such that $|c|, |d|$ are small. Denote the Julia set of the map $w \to w^2 + d$ by J_d, and let z_0 be an attracting fixed point for $z \to z^2 + c$. Then f is with Axiom A and has a basic set $\Lambda = \{z_0\} \times J_d$. If x is a point in Λ, then $W_\delta^s(x) \cap \Lambda$ consists of a single point, so $\delta_s(x) = 0$ in this case. This is in accordance with the above Corollary, since we know that $h_-(f|_\Lambda) = 0$. (since $0 \leq h_-(f|_\Lambda) \leq h_i(f|_\Lambda)$ and $h_i(f|_\Lambda) = 0$ because Λ is a circle). □

Let us now consider the perturbation $g([z : w : t]) = [z^2 + ct^2 + \varepsilon wt : w^2 : t^2]$ of the function $f([z : w : t]) = [z^2 + ct^2 : w^2 : t^2]$, $|c| \neq 0$ small, and where the expressions of f and g are written in homogeneous coordinates $[z : w : t]$ in $\mathbb{P}^2$. Clearly f is with Axiom A and has a basic set of unstable index 1, $\Lambda := \{p_0(c)\} \times S^1$ (where $p_0(c) \neq 0$ is a fixed attracting point for $z \to z^2 + c$).

Notice also that f has a second basic set in $\mathbb{C}^2$, namely $\Lambda' := J_c \times \{0\}$, where J_c is the Julia set of $z \to z^2 + c$ (if $|c|$ is small enough we can assume that $z \to z^2 + c$ is hyperbolic, hence expanding on J_c,

see [2]). The local unstable manifold of any point in Λ' is contained in the line $(w = 0)$, which is totally invariant, i.e $f((w = 0)) = f^{-1}((w = 0)) = (w = 0)$. Thus the unstable set $W^u(\Lambda')$ (which is the union of forward iterates of all local unstable manifolds of points in Λ') cannot intersect the stable set $W^s(\Lambda)$ ($W^s(\Lambda)$ is defined as the union of inverse iterates of all local stable manifolds of points in Λ). One can notice also that $W^u(\Lambda)$ is contained in the complex line $z = p_0(c)$; since $f(W^u(\Lambda)) = W^u(\Lambda)$ and $p_0(c) \notin J_c$ we see that $W^u(\Lambda) \cap W^s(\Lambda') = \emptyset$. The map f has also a basic set of unstable index 1, Λ'', in the line at infinity $(t = 0)$, and the unstable set of Λ'' is contained in $(t = 0)$, hence $W^u(\Lambda'') \cap (W^s(\Lambda) \cup W^s(\Lambda')) = \emptyset$.

We now refer to [5] for the definition of cycles among basic sets; one defines an order between basic sets, saying that $\Omega_i > \Omega_j$ if $W^u(\Omega_i) \cap W^s(\Omega_j) \neq \emptyset$. Then one says that a collection $(\Omega_{i_1}, ..., \Omega_{i_k})$ is a *cycle* if $\Omega_{i_1} > .... > \Omega_{i_k} > \Omega_{i_1}$.

From the discussion above we see that the map f does not have cycles among its basic sets of unstable index 1. Then for ε small enough, the Stability Theorem for Axiom A endomorphisms without cycles among their basic sets ([14]), implies the existence of a basic set for g, Λ_g, which is close to Λ in the Hausdorff metric and such that $g|_{\Lambda_g}$ is hyperbolic. We will show later that, if $|c|$ and ε are small enough, then $g|_{\Lambda_g} : \Lambda_g \to \Lambda_g$ is a homeomorphism. Then using Theorem 1.5 and the observation that, for the homeomorphism $g|_{\Lambda_g}$, we have $h_-(g|_{\Lambda_g}) = h(g|_{\Lambda_g}) = \log 2$, we will get that the stable dimension of g at every point of Λ_g, is greater than a positive number independent of g. At the same time, it is obvious that the stable dimension of f at any point of Λ is equal to 0, since $W^s_\delta(y) \cap \Lambda = \{y\}, \forall y \in \Lambda$. Since the perturbation g can be taken arbitrarily close to f, it will follow in Section 4 that $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda_g)$ does not depend continuously on the map g, when $x \in \Lambda_g$, which is in contrast with the case of Hénon maps from [17].

In Section 4 we will also study a large class of quadratic maps on $\mathbb{P}^2$ and prove that, if the basic set Λ is connected and we have an additional technical assumption, then one can control the number of preimages and hence, by using Theorems 1.2 and 1.5, the stable dimension. All this will be made precise in the sequel.

2. Upper Estimate for $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda)$

Observation: In the case of diffeomorphisms, $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) = t^s$, where t^s is the unique zero of the function $t \to P(t\phi^s)$, $\phi^s(y) := \log |Df|_{E^s_y}|$; since $\mathcal{C}_f \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$, we know that $-\infty < \phi^s < 0$. Also, it follows from the Variational Principle, that there exists a probability measure μ_s such that $t^s = \frac{h_{\mu_s}}{\lambda_s}$, λ_s being the Lyapunov exponent of μ_s. In the case of endomorphisms, it was shown in [11] that $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) \leq t^s$, but in general, the inequality is strict. For example for the case of a map $f(z, w) = (P(z), Q(w))$, with Q hyperbolic on its Julia set J_Q and $\Lambda := \{z_0\} \times J_Q$, where z_0 is an attracting periodic point for P, we obtain $HD(W^s_\delta(z, w) \cap \Lambda) = 0$, for all $(z, w) \in \Lambda$. So, the formula in Theorem 1.2 explains that the gap between $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda)$ and t^s is due to the number of preimages (indeed the map $f(z, w) = (P(z), Q(w))$ given above is 2-to-1 on Λ).

We shall now give the proof of Theorem 1.2:

Proof. First of all, consider the function $t \to P(t \log |Df|_{E^s_y}| - \log d')$ which is well defined since $C_f \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$. Notice also that $P(t \log |Df|_{E^s_y}| - \log d') = P(t \log |Df|_{E^s_y}|) - \log d'$. It is strictly decreasing and at $t = 0$ takes the value $h(f|_\Lambda) - \log d' \geq 0$ and for t very large, it takes negative values. Henceforth it has exactly one zero denoted by t^s_0, and $t^s_0 \geq 0$. Denote now $W := W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda$ and $\hat{W}$ its lift inside $\hat{\Lambda}$, i.e $\hat{W} := \pi^{-1}(W)$, where $\pi(\hat{x}) = x_0$ is the canonical projection from $\hat{\Lambda}$ to Λ. In this proof we will use the map $\hat{f} : \hat{\Lambda} \to \hat{\Lambda}$.

Also it is well known that $P(\phi) = P(\phi \circ \pi)$, for any continuous real function ϕ on Λ, so the topological pressure does not change by lifting the function to $\hat{\Lambda}$.

Let $\hat{E}$ be an $(n+1, \delta')$-separated set of maximal cardinality inside $\hat{f}^{-n}(\hat{W})$ with $\delta' << \delta$ to be determined in the course of the proof.

Since t_0^s is the unique zero of the pressure function, it follows that if we consider an arbitrary $t > t_0^s$, then there exists $\beta < 0$ such that

$$P(t \log |Df|_{E_y^s}| - \log d') < \beta < 0.$$

Therefore, from the definition of pressure, if n is large enough,

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \log \sum_{\hat{z} \in \hat{E}} e^{S_{n+1}\Phi(\hat{z})} < \beta < 0,$$

where $\Phi(\hat{y}) := t \log |Df|_{E_y^s}| - \log d'$. Hence,

$$\sum_{\hat{z} \in \hat{E}} |Df^n|_{E_z^s}|^t < e^{(n+1)\beta} \cdot (d')^n.$$

But $\hat{E}$ has been taken as a separated set of maximal cardinality, hence it is also $(n+1, \delta')$ - spanning for the compact set $\hat{f}^{-n}(\hat{W})$ in the metric $d(\hat{\cdot}, \hat{\cdot})$ from $\hat{\Lambda}$. This means that the balls $B_{n+1}(\hat{z}, \delta') := \{\hat{w} \in \hat{\Lambda}, d(\hat{f}^k \hat{z}, \hat{f}^k \hat{w}) < \delta', k = 0, .., n\}, \hat{z} \in \hat{E}$, cover the entire set $\hat{f}^{-n}(\hat{W})$. From above, it follows that $\{\hat{f}^n(B_{n+1}(\hat{z}, \delta'))\}_{\hat{z} \in \hat{E}}$ cover the set $\hat{W}$, and for brevity, we will denote this collection of sets by $\{\hat{B}_j\}_{j \in J}$, where $\hat{E} = (\hat{z}^j)_{j \in J}$, J finite.

Let us consider now an arbitrary point y from W and $\hat{y}, \hat{y}'$ two prehistories of y in Λ which are different as n-prehistories, i.e there exists $0 < i \leq n$ such that $y_{-i} \neq y'_{-i}$. Can we have two such prehistories both in the same $\hat{B}_j$?

Assume $i \geq 0$ is the largest integer for which $y_{-i} = y'_{-i}$. Denote by l_0 the constant of injectivity of f near Λ, i.e, if z or z' belong to Λ and $f(z) = f(z')$ with $z \neq z'$, then $d(z, z') > l_0$ (here we use again that the critical set of f does not intersect Λ). Then for the prehistories $\hat{y}, \hat{y}'$ as above, $d(\hat{f}^{-i-1}(\hat{y}), \hat{f}^{-i-1}(\hat{y}')) > l_0 > 2\delta'$, if δ' is small enough. Therefore, the points $\hat{f}^{-n}(\hat{y})$ and $\hat{f}^{-n}(\hat{y}')$ cannot be in the same ball $B_{n+1}(\hat{\xi}, \delta'), \hat{\xi} \in \hat{E}$. Consequently also $\hat{y}, \hat{y}'$ cannot be in the same set $\hat{B}_j$, since $\hat{f}$ is a homeomorphism.

We take now the projections of $\hat{B}_j$ onto W, $B_j := \pi(\hat{B}_j) \cap W$. Let d_j denote the diameter of B_j and for all $j \in J$ take $\tilde{B}_j := B(x_j, d_j)$, where x_j is an arbitrary point in B_j. In general, by $MB(x, r)$ we shall denote the ball $B(x, Mr)$. From the discussion a few lines above, it can be seen easily that the multiplicity of the cover $\{\tilde{B}_j\}_j$ of W, is at least d'^n, if $0 < \delta' < \frac{l_0}{6}$. This is true because every point y from W has at least d'^n different n-prehistories in Λ and since every such n-prehistory of y is contained in a different set $\hat{B}_j$.

We will now extract a subcover of W of multiplicity bounded by some universal constant C, coming from the following version of the Besicovitch Theorem :

Theorem ([6]). *For each positive integer n there exists a positive integer $b(n)$, depending only on n, with the following property:*

Assume that A is an arbitrary bounded set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover suppose that we have some positive constant M, some function $r : A \to (0, \infty)$ and a system of sets $\{H(x)\}_{x \in A}$, satisfying the following two conditions:

(a) *for every $x \in A$, $\bar{B}(x, r(x)) \subset H(x) \subset \bar{B}(x, Mr(x))$; (where $\bar{B}(y, s)$ represents in general the closed Euclidian ball of radius s centered at a point y);*

(b) *for each $x \in A$ and each $z \in H(x)$, the set $H(x)$ contains the convex hull of the set $\{z\} \cup \bar{B}(x, r(x))$.*

Then, out of $\{H(x)\}_{x\in A}$, we can extract a countable subcover of A of multiplicity bounded by $b(n)$. In other words, one can select from among $\{H(x)\}_{x\in A}$ a sequence $\{H_k\}_k$ such that:

(i) *A is covered by $\{H_k\}_k$;*

(ii) *no point of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is in more than $b(n)$ sets H_k.*

As an easy observation, notice that if the sets $H(x)$ are convex, then condition (b) of the theorem above is immediately satisfied.

Based on this theorem, we will prove the following covering theorem which will be useful in our context.

Theorem (Covering Theorem)**.** *Let A be a bounded set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that A is covered by a family of balls $\{B(x_i, r_i)\}_{i\in I}$ centered at some points of A, where $r_i > 0$, for all $i \in I$. Then there exists a cover of A with balls $\{B(x_j, 2r_j)\}_{j\in J}$, where $J \subset I$ and the multiplicity of this cover is bounded by the universal constant $b(n)$.*

For each $x \in A$, choose one ball $B(x_i, r_i)$ containing x. Set $H(x) := B(x_i, 2r_i)$ and denote by $r(x)$ the radius r_i. Obviously the sets $\{H(x)\}_{x\in A}$ will cover A. They are also convex. For every $x \in A$, we have that $B(x, r(x)) \subset H(x) \subset B(x, 3r(x))$. Therefore the assumptions of the previous theorem are satisfied and its direct application ends the proof.

Coming back to the actual proof of Theorem 1.2 we apply the above Covering Theorem for the balls $\tilde{B}_j$, $j \in J$. Hence, we obtain a subcover $2\tilde{B}_k$, where k belongs to a subset $K \subset J$ and such that the multiplicity of this subcover is bounded above by a universal constant $C > 0$ coming from the above Covering Theorem. But the multiplicity of the cover $2\tilde{B}_j$, $j \in J$ is larger than or equal to d'^n, if $\delta < l_0/6$. Therefore, if n is large enough, the remaining sets $\{\tilde{B}_j\}_{j\in J\setminus K}$, still cover W and we can extract again, out of them, a subcover of W of multiplicity bounded by C. Repeating the procedure and applying the Covering Theorem at each step, one can find at least $C^{-1}d'^n$ such subcovers, each with multiplicity bounded by C. But in this case, there will exist a cover $\{2\tilde{B}_s\}_{s\in L}$ of W, $L \subset J$, corresponding to a subset $\hat{F}$ of $\hat{E}$ for which :

$$\sum_{\hat{z}\in\hat{F}} |Df|_{E^s_{\hat{z}}}|^t \leq e^{n\beta} \cdot d'^n \cdot C(d')^{-n} = C \cdot e^{n\beta} \tag{1}$$

We make now the connection between the $\mathrm{diam}2\tilde{B}_s$ and $|Df^n|_{E^s_z}|$ using the bounded distortion property. First observe that in general, $B_j = \pi(\hat{f}^n B_{n+1}(\hat{y}, \delta)) = f^n(\pi(B_{n+1}(\hat{y}, \delta)))$. Also, if $\hat{\xi} \in B_{n+1}(\hat{y}, \delta)$, then $d(\hat{f}^k\hat{\xi}, \hat{f}^k\hat{y}) < \delta$, for $0 \leq k \leq n$, hence $d(f^k\xi, f^k y) < \delta$. This implies that $\xi \in W^s_\delta(y)$. In this case, we will be able to apply the property of bounded distortion on stable manifolds (see [11]) to conclude that, for a positive constant A,

$$\mathrm{diam}2\tilde{B}_j \leq A \cdot |Df^n|_{E^s_{x_j}}|.$$

Applying now inequality (1), and remembering that $\beta < 0$, we get that there exists a positive constant C' such that

$$\sum_{s\in L} (\mathrm{diam}2\tilde{B}_s)^t \leq C'\, e^{n\beta} \leq C'.$$

In conclusion, since t has been chosen arbitrarily larger than t^s_0, we obtain $HD(W) \leq t^s_0$. The proof of the last consequence of the statement is then straightforward if one uses the properties of the topological pressure from Section 1 and the fact that $P(\phi + c) = P(\phi) + c$, for any continuous real function ϕ and any constant

c. Indeed, $0 = P(t_0^s \log |Df|_{E^s_y}| - \log d') \leq P(t_0^s \log \sup_{y\in\Lambda} |Df|_{E^s_y}| - \log d') = t_0^s \log \sup_{y\in\Lambda} |Df|_{E^s_y}| - \log d' + h(f|_\Lambda)$ (since $t_0^s \log \sup_{y\in\Lambda} |Df|_{E^s_y}|$ is in fact a constant, and $P(0) = h(f|_\Lambda)$). This implies that:

$$t_0^s \log \sup_{y\in\Lambda} |Df|_{E^s_y}| \geq \log d' - h(f|_\Lambda)$$

But $\log \sup_{y\in\Lambda} |Df|_{E^s_y}| < 0$, therefore we obtain the required inequality:

$$HD(W) \leq t_0^s \leq \frac{h(f|_\Lambda) - \log d'}{|\log \sup_{y\in\Lambda} |Df|_{E^s_y}||}$$

□

3. Lower Estimate for $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda)$

In this section we will first provide the proof of Theorem 1.5:

Proof. Let $W := W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda$ for an arbitrary point $x \in \Lambda$, and consider ℓ a small positive number, $0 < \ell << \delta$. Assume also that $4\ell < d(\Lambda, \mathcal{C}_f)$; this can be done since $\mathcal{C}_f \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$. Cover Λ with a finite number of balls of radius $\frac{\ell}{4}$, whose centers belong to Λ and denote these balls by $B(y_1, \frac{\ell}{4}), ..., B(y_s, \frac{\ell}{4})$.

Let us now take y to be one of the points $y_1, ..., y_s$ of Λ. From the hyperbolicity of f on the compact set Λ it follows that there exists a constant $C > 0$ and a number $0 < \lambda' < 1$ such that, if ω is a point in $W^u_\delta(\hat{Q}), \hat{Q} \in \hat{\Lambda}$ and $\hat{\omega}$ is the prehistory of ω corresponding to this unstable manifold, then $d(\omega_{-k}, Q_{-k}) \leq C \cdot (\lambda')^k, k \geq 0$. This implies that there exists a positive integer m_1 such that, if $\hat{Q} \in \hat{\Lambda}$, $\omega \in W^u_\delta(\hat{Q})$, and $\hat{\omega}$ is the prehistory of ω following $\hat{Q}$, then $d(Q_{-m}, \omega_{-m}) < \frac{\ell}{4}, \forall m \geq m_1$.

Since f is transitive on Λ, there exist an infinite number of integers m such that $f^m(B(y, \frac{\ell}{4}) \cap \Lambda) \cap B(x, \frac{\ell}{2}) \neq \emptyset$. In the sequel we will consider an integer $m > m_1$ for which $f^m(B(y, \frac{\ell}{4}) \cap \Lambda) \cap B(x, \frac{\ell}{2}) \neq \emptyset$, i.e there exists a point $z \in B(y, \frac{\ell}{4}) \cap \Lambda$ with $f^m z \in B(x, \frac{\ell}{2}) \cap \Lambda$; ($f^m z \in \Lambda$ since Λ is f-invariant).

Now consider an unstable local manifold $W^u_{\ell/2}(\hat{y}')$, for $y' \in B(y, \frac{\ell}{4})$; this unstable manifold will intersect the local stable manifold $W^s_\ell(z)$ in a point ξ which belongs to Λ because f has local product structure on Λ. But $\xi \in W^s_\ell(z)$, so if m_1 is large enough, we can assume that $f^m\xi \in B(x, \ell/2)$ and that $W^u_\ell(\widehat{f^m\xi})$ intersects $W^s_\ell(x)$ in a point $\eta \in \Lambda$; ($\widehat{f^m\xi} := \hat{f}^m(\hat{\xi})$, where $\hat{\xi}$ is the prehistory of ξ which is $\ell/2$-shadowed by $\hat{y}'$, and which is given by $\xi \in W^u_{\ell/2}(\hat{y}')$). Now $\eta \in W^u_\ell(\widehat{f^m\xi})$, so η has an m-preimage η_{-m} with $d(\eta_{-m}, \xi) < \ell, ..., d(\eta, f^m\xi) < \ell$; therefore we have $d(\eta_{-m}, \Lambda) < \ell, ..., d(\eta, \Lambda) < \ell$. We may denote the points η_{-j} obtained in this way also by $\eta_{-j}(\hat{y}'), 0 \leq j \leq m$, when we want to emphasize their dependence on $\hat{y}'$.

Denote by Z the set of points η_{-m} obtained as above, for all prehistories $\hat{y}' \in \hat{\Lambda}, y' \in B(y, \ell/4)$. Let us focus attention on how the point η_{-m} was constructed. We have that η_{-m} has a prehistory $(\eta_{-m}, \eta_{-m-1}, ...)$ which is $\ell/2$-shadowed by a prehistory $\hat{y}' \in \hat{\Lambda}$, hence $d(\eta_{-m-k}, \Lambda) < \ell/2, k \geq 0$. Also we have $\xi \in \Lambda, \eta = f^m\eta_{-m}$ and $d(\eta, f^m\xi) < \ell, ..., d(\eta_{-m}, \xi) < \ell$ since $\eta \in W^u_\ell(\widehat{f^m\xi})$; finally, $x \in \Lambda$ and $d(f^j\eta, f^j x) < \ell, j \geq 0$ since $\eta \in W^s_\ell(x)$. Thus we have $\eta_{-m} \in \bigcap_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} f^j B(\Lambda, \ell)$. But due to the local product structure of Λ we have that $\bigcap_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} f^j B(\Lambda, \ell) = \Lambda$ if ℓ is small enough. Hence $\eta_{-m} \in \Lambda$ and similarly $\eta_{-m-k} \in \Lambda, k \geq 0$ and $f^k\eta \in \Lambda, k \geq 0$. This implies that the entire set Z is contained in Λ.

From construction we have $f^m(Z) \subset W$ and $f^j Z \subset \Lambda, \forall j \geq 0$, since the set Λ is f-invariant. But $\Lambda \cap \mathcal{C}_f = \emptyset$, hence $f^j Z \cap \mathcal{C}_f = \emptyset, 0 \leq j \leq m$. This implies that f^m is injective and bi-Lipschitz near Z and hence $HD(Z) \leq HD(W)$.

Notice however that, from construction, $\eta_{-m} \in W^u_{\ell/2}(\hat{y}') \cap f^{-m}(W)$. So we proved that $f^{-m}(W)$ intersects all local unstable manifolds $W^u_{\ell/2}(\hat{y}')$, for all $y' \in B(y, \ell/4)$.

In the sequel, for an arbitrary positive integer k and point $\omega \in \Lambda$, we shall denote $Df^k|_{E^s_\omega}$ by $Df^k_s(\omega)$.

Next, for any (small) positive number ℓ, let us introduce a number $v(\ell) > 1$ depending on $\ell > 0$ such that $v(\ell) \to 1$ when $\ell \to 0$ and

$$d(z''_{-1}, \bar{z}''_{-1}) \leq d(z'', \bar{z}'')|Df_s(z'_{-1})|^{-1} v(\ell), \tag{2}$$

for any points $z' \in \Lambda$ and $z'', \bar{z}'' \in B(z', \ell)$, and preimages $z'_{-1} \in \Lambda \cap f^{-1}(z'), z''_{-1} \in f^{-1}(z''), \bar{z}''_{-1} \in f^{-1}(\bar{z}'')$ with $z''_{-1}, \bar{z}''_{-1} \in B(z'_{-1}, \frac{l_0}{4})$. (recall that l_0 is the injectivity constant of f).

Recall our notation $\delta_s(x) := HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda)$ and let t be an arbitrary number satisfying $t > \delta_s(x)$. We will prove that for the point y chosen above, $t \geq |\log \inf_\Lambda |Df_s||^{-1} \cdot h_-(B(y, \frac{\ell}{4}) \cap \Lambda)$.

We showed that $\delta_s(x) = HD(W) \geq HD(Z)$. Therefore there exists $\mathcal{U} = (U_i)_{i \in I}$ an open cover of Z, with $mesh(\mathcal{U}) < \gamma << \ell$ such that

$$\sum_i (\text{diam} U_i)^t \leq \ell^t \tag{3}$$

We assume that ℓ is small enough such that, if U is an open set with $\text{diam}(U) < 2\ell$, which intersects Λ, and $\xi \in \Lambda$, $z \in U \cap \Lambda$ are arbitrary points satisfying $f(\xi) = z$, then it is possible to define a local inverse $f^{-1} : U \to \mathbb{P}^2$ of f on U, with $f^{-1}(z) = \xi$.

Let us take now a set U_i such that $Card(U_i \cap Z) > 1$ and denote by U^*_i the set of points $y' \in \Lambda \cap B(y, \ell/4)$ for which there is some prehistory $\hat{y}' \in \hat{\Lambda}$ so that the point $\eta_{-m}(\hat{y}')$, (obtained from $\hat{y}'$ in the construction of Z), belongs to U_i. Denote by Γ_i the set of these prehistories $\hat{y}'$ giving U^*_i. For such a point η_{-m}, let us denote by $(\eta_{-m}, \eta_{-m-1}, ...)$ the prehistory which is $\ell/2$-shadowed by $\hat{y}'$. Let us consider f^{-1}_* the inverse iterate of f on $B(\eta_{-m}, \ell)$ with $f^{-1}_*(\eta_{-m}) = \eta_{-m-1}$. If the diameter of $f^{-1}_*(U_i)$ remains smaller than ℓ, then we can repeat the procedure with the local inverse iterate f^{-2}_* given by $f^{-2}_*(\eta_{-m}) = \eta_{-m-2}$, etc. However, in the course of this process the diameters of the inverse iterates of U_i may increase. Therefore, let us denote by $n_i(\hat{y}')$ the largest positive integer such that $\text{diam} f^{-k}_* U_i < \ell, 0 \leq k < n_i(\hat{y}')$. This implies that $\text{diam} f^{-n_i(\hat{y}')}_* U_i \geq \ell$.

Clearly we can do this for all the prehistories $\hat{y}' \in \Gamma_i$; denote by n_i the smallest integer of the form $n_i(\hat{y}')$, where $\hat{y}' \in \Gamma_i$. Assume now that n_i is attained as $n_i(\hat{y}')$, for some prehistory $\hat{y}' \in \Gamma_i$ and let ζ_i denote the point $\eta_{-m}(\hat{y}') \in U_i \cap Z$ corresponding to this special prehistory $\hat{y}'$. Then we have $U^*_i \subset B^-_{n_i}(\zeta_i, \ell)$. (recall the definition of the inverse ball $B^-_{n_i}(\zeta_i, \ell)$ from Definition 5; here this inverse ball is considered with respect to the map $f|_\Lambda$).

However, this construction of n_i can be done for all $i \in I$. Remark that the sets $U^*_i, i \in I$, cover the intersection $B(y, \ell/4) \cap \Lambda$, since we proved that any local unstable manifold $W^u_{\ell/2}(\hat{y}')$ intersects Z, for all prehistories $\hat{y}' \in \hat{\Lambda}$ and $y' \in B(y, \ell/4)$.

Therefore, since we showed that $U^*_i \subset B^-_{n_i}(\zeta_i, \ell), i \in I$, we get that $B(y, \ell/4) \cap \Lambda \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} B^-_{n_i}(\zeta_i, \ell)$. Using the Mean Value Inequality and the definition of $v(\ell)$ from (2), we can estimate $\text{diam} U_i$ as follows:

$$\text{diam} U_i \geq \ell |Df^{n_i}_s(y'_{-n_i})| v(\ell)^{-n_i} \geq \ell \cdot \inf_\Lambda |Df_s|^{n_i} v(\ell)^{-n_i}, i \in I.$$

This, together with (3) imply:

$$\ell^t \geq \sum_i (\text{diam} U_i)^t \geq \ell^t \sum_i \exp(-t n_i (|\log \inf_\Lambda |Df_s|| + \log v(\ell))), \text{ so}$$

$$\sum_i \exp(-tn_i(|\log \inf_{\Lambda} |Df_s|| + \log v(\ell))) \leq 1 \tag{4}$$

Recall now the definition of the quantity $h_-(\lambda, Y, \varepsilon)$ which was given after Definition 5. Remember also that $B(y, \ell/4) \cap \Lambda \subset \bigcup_{i\in I} B^-_{n_i}(\zeta_i, \ell)$ and $\zeta_i \in Z \subset \Lambda, i \in I$. Then, inequality (4) shows that, by taking $\lambda = t(|\log \inf_{\Lambda} |Df_s|| + \log v(\ell)), Y = B(y, \frac{\ell}{4}) \cap \Lambda$, and $\varepsilon = \ell$, we obtain $h_-(\lambda, Y, \varepsilon) = 0$. ($t$ is just a fixed positive number here, chosen arbitrarily larger than $\delta_s(x)$, so it is viewed as a constant in the previous expression of h_-). Hence $t(|\log \inf_{\Lambda} |Df_s|| + \log v(\ell)) \geq h_-(B(y, \frac{\ell}{4}) \cap \Lambda, \ell)$. Recall however that y was chosen arbitrarily from among the points $y_1, ..., y_s$, so the above inequalities imply

$$t(|\log \inf_{\Lambda} |Df_s|| + \log v(\ell)) \geq \sup_{1\leq j\leq s} h_-(B(y_j, \frac{\ell}{4}) \cap \Lambda, \ell) = h_-(\Lambda, \ell) \tag{5}$$

The last equality in (5) comes from Proposition 1.4a') applied to the map $f|_\Lambda$ and the covering of Λ with the balls $B(y_j, \frac{\ell}{4}), 1 \leq j \leq s$. Now, $\ell > 0$ can be chosen as small as we want; recall also that, if $\ell \to 0$, then $v(\ell) \to 1$ and $h_-(\Lambda, \ell) \to h_-(\Lambda)$. Hence inequality (5) implies that:

$$t|\log \inf_{\Lambda} |Df_s|| \geq h_-(\Lambda),$$

where t was taken arbitrarily larger than $\delta_s(x)$. This shows that $\delta_s(x) \geq |\log \inf_{\Lambda} |Df_s||^{-1} \cdot h_-(\Lambda)$.

□

Remark:

Let us notice that both Theorems 1.2 and 1.5 work for the case of an open, surjective, Axiom A, conformal map f on a real compact manifold M. They also hold if we require f to be $\mathcal{C}^{1+\varepsilon}$, open, surjective, Axiom A, and its stable tangent spaces to have real dimension 1 over the basic set Λ. The proofs in these more general cases follow closely the ones already displayed.

We preffered to state and prove the theorems in the case of a holomorphic map on the complex projective space $\mathbb{P}^2$ since the question first appeared to us in this setting, vis-a-vis the papers by Fornaess-Sibony ([5]) and Verjovsky-Wu ([17]). □

Remark:

We conclude this section with the remark that $h_-(f|_\Lambda) \neq h_-(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}})$ and that the value of h_- is not stable under perturbations.

Indeed $h_-(f|_\Lambda) \neq h_-(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}})$ in general. For example when $f(z, w) = (z^2 + c, w^2), 0 \neq |c|$ small, and $\Lambda = \{z_0\} \times J_{w^2} = \{z_0\} \times S^1$, (z_0 being a fixed attracting point of $z \to z^2 + c$), then we have $h_i(f|_\Lambda) = 0$ as we showed in the Remark from §1 (since Λ is a circle); Proposition 1.3 implies then that $h_-(f|_\Lambda) = 0$. But at the same time Proposition 1.3 implies also that $h_-(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}}) = h(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}})$ since $\hat{f}\colon\ \hat{\Lambda} \to \hat{\Lambda}$ is a homeomorphism. Combining this with $h(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}}) = h(f|_\Lambda) = \log 2$ shows that $0 = h_-(f|_\Lambda) \neq h_-(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}}) = \log 2$.

Now, let us take Λ, a basic set for an Axiom A endomorphism f without cycles among the basic sets of its saddle part S_1. Then, if f_ε is sufficiently close to f, f_ε will have a basic set Λ_ε close to Λ in the Hausdorff metric. And we know from the Stability Theorem ([14]) that there exists a homeomorphism $\hat{g}\colon\ \hat{\Lambda} \to \hat{\Lambda}_\varepsilon$ which commutes with a continuous surjection $g\colon\ \hat{\Lambda} \to \Lambda_\varepsilon$, i.e $p \circ \hat{g} = g$, where p represents the canonical projection $p : \hat{\Lambda}_\varepsilon \to \Lambda_\varepsilon$.

We know that $h(f|_\Lambda) = h(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}}) = h(\hat{f}_\varepsilon|_{\hat{\Lambda}_\varepsilon}) = h(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon})$, so the value of the entropy remains constant under small perturbations.

However we will show that the value of h_- is not stable under perturbations. We will consider the example discussed in Section 4 of a perturbation f_ε of f such that $f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}$ is a homeomorphism; in this case we see that $h_-(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = h(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = \log 2$. But $h_-(f|_\Lambda) = 0$ since Λ is a circle, hence the value of h_- is not stable under perturbations. □

4. Examples and applications

First we study a large class of maps obtained as perturbations of $(z^2 + c, w^2)$ ($0 \neq |c|$ small) and identify a set of elements of this class which are injective on their respective basic sets.

Theorem 4.1. *Given the map $f_\varepsilon(z, w) = (z^2 + a\varepsilon z + b\varepsilon w + c + d\varepsilon zw + e\varepsilon w^2, w^2)$, there exist small positive constants $c(a, b, d, e)$ and $\varepsilon(a, b, c, d, e)$ such that, for $b \neq 0$, $0 \neq |c| < c(a, b, d, e)$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon(a, b, c, d, e)$ we have that f_ε is injective on its basic set Λ_ε close to $\{p_0(c)\} \times S^1$ (where $p_0(c)$ is the attracting fixed point for $z^2 + c$).*

Proof. First, the existence of the basic sets Λ_ε for these perturbations f_ε follows from the Stability Theorem for Endomorphisms ([14]).

Assume that $f_\varepsilon(z, w) = f_\varepsilon(z', w')$ for two points $(z, w), (z', w') \in \Lambda_\varepsilon$

$$\Rightarrow z^2 + a\varepsilon z + b\varepsilon w + c + d\varepsilon zw + e\varepsilon w^2 = z'^2 + a\varepsilon z' + b\varepsilon w' + c + d\varepsilon z'w' + e\varepsilon w'^2$$
$$\Rightarrow (z^2 - z'^2) + \varepsilon[a(z - z') + b(w - w') + d(zw - z'w') + e(w^2 - w'^2)] = 0.$$

Assume $w \neq w'$. Then, $w' = -w$ since $w^2 = w'^2$

$$\Rightarrow (z - z')(z + z' + \varepsilon a) + \varepsilon[2bw + dw(z + z')] = 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow (z - z')(z + z' + \varepsilon a) = -\varepsilon[2bw + dw(z + z')]. \tag{6}$$

Let $p_0(c)$ be the fixed attracting point for $z \to z^2 + c$, $0 \neq |c|$ small. Consider $\alpha := \sup_{(z,w)\in\Lambda_\varepsilon} |z - p_0(c)|$ and let (z_0, w_0) a point where this supremum is attained on Λ_ε. Hence $\alpha = |z_0 - p_0(c)|$, and $p_0^2(c) + c = p_0(c)$. Now, we can find a point $(z, w) \in \Lambda_\varepsilon$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varepsilon(z, w) = (z_0, w_0) &\Rightarrow z_0 = z^2 + a\varepsilon z + b\varepsilon w + c + d\varepsilon zw + e\varepsilon w^2 \\ &\Rightarrow z_0 - p_0(c) = z^2 - p_0^2(c) + a\varepsilon z + b\varepsilon w + d\varepsilon zw + e\varepsilon w^2 \\ &= (z - p_0(c))^2 + 2zp_0(c) - 2p_0^2(c) + a\varepsilon z + b\varepsilon w + d\varepsilon zw + e\varepsilon w^2 \Rightarrow \\ &\alpha \leq \alpha^2 + 2|p_0(c)|\alpha + K\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

with K, a positive constant depending on the parameters of the map. This last inequality implies $\alpha^2 + \alpha(2|p_0(c)| - 1) + K\varepsilon \geq 0$, and since $\alpha \ll 1$ (since Λ_ε is very close to $\{p_0(c)\} \times S^1$), we obtain (for some constant $K' > 0$):

$$0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2K\varepsilon}{1 - 2|p_0(c)| + \sqrt{(1 - 2|p_0(c)|)^2 - 4K\varepsilon}} \leq K' \cdot \varepsilon \tag{7}$$

Let us notice now that $|z - z'| = |z - p_0(c) + p_0(c) - z'| \leq |z - p_0(c)| + |z' - p_0(c)| \leq 2\alpha$, for z, z' first coordinates of some points from Λ_ε.

Then, by taking absolute values in (6) and using that $|z - z'| \leq 2\alpha$, one obtains

$$2\alpha(3|p_0(c)| + \varepsilon|a|) > \varepsilon|2bw + dw(z + z')|, \tag{8}$$

for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(a, b, c, d, e)$, since z, z' are both ε-close to $p_0(c)$.

But for $(z, w) \in \Lambda_\varepsilon$, one has $|w| = 1$, and $|z + z'|$ is ε-close to $2|p_0(c)|$. Therefore, if $b \neq 0$, and $|c|$ is small enough in comparison to $|b|$, then $|p_0(c)|$ becomes so small that $|2bw + dw(z + z')| > |b| > 0$.

Hence, from (7) and (8), we get $2K'\varepsilon(3|p_0(c)| + \varepsilon|a|) \geq \varepsilon|b| > 0$, which gives a contradiction if $|c| < c(a, b, d, e)$ for some convenient positive number $c(a, b, d, e) << 1$. (indeed, if $|c|$ is small in comparison to $|b|$, then $|p_0(c)|$ is also small in comparison to $|b|$, and we can always reduce ε accordingly).

Hence, we proved that $w' = w$. Then, from $f_\varepsilon(z, w) = f_\varepsilon(z', w')$ it follows that $z^2 - z'^2 = -\varepsilon[a(z - z') + dw(z - z')]$. If $z \neq z'$, we would then get $z + z' = -\varepsilon(a + dw)$.

But z, z' are both ε -close to $p_0(c) \neq 0$, so if we choose $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(a, b, c, d, e)$ appropiately, then $|z + z'| > |p_0(c)| > 0$. On the other hand, if $|a + dw| \neq 0$, we can take ε small enough such that $\varepsilon|a + dw| < |p_0(c)|$, which gives a contradiction. If $|a + dw| = 0$, then we get a contradiction again since $p_0(c) \neq 0$.

In conclusion $z = z', w = w'$ and consequently $f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon} : \Lambda_\varepsilon \to \Lambda_\varepsilon$ is an injective map. □

Corollary 4.2. *In the setting of Theorem 4.1, if $f_\varepsilon(z, w)$ is injective on Λ_ε and $|c|$ is small enough, then $h_-(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = h(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = \log 2$ and $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda_\varepsilon) > \frac{\log 2}{\log|\frac{1+\sqrt{1-4c}}{2c}|}$.*

In addition, in this case Λ_ε is not a finite graph and, in particular, Λ_ε is not a Jordan curve.

Proof. If $f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}$ is injective, then f_ε induces a homeomorphism of Λ_ε, therefore $h_-(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = h_i(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = h(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon})$. But

$$h(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = h(\hat{f}_\varepsilon|_{\hat{\Lambda}_\varepsilon}) = h(\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}}) = h(f|_\Lambda) = \log 2$$

In the above, $\hat{f}$ represents the lifting of f to a homeomorphism of $\hat{\Lambda}$ and we can use the conjugacy between $\hat{f}$ and $\hat{f}_\varepsilon$ coming from the Stability Theorem ([14]); also the last equality is due to the fact that $f|_\Lambda$ is just the map $w \to w^2$ whose entropy is $\log 2$.

The estimate for the stable dimension in our claim is proved by using Theorem 2 and the fact that $\left|\inf_{y\in\Lambda}|Df|_{E^s_y}|\right| > |p_0(c)|$, where $p_0(c) = \frac{2c}{1+\sqrt{1-4c}}$ is the unique fixed attracting point of the map $z^2 + c$, for $|c|$ small.

The last consequence to show is that the basic set Λ_ε is not a finite graph.

Indeed, if Λ_ε were a finite graph, the Nitecki-Przytycki Theorem in Section 1 would imply that $h_i(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon})$ is zero, but as we saw above, $h_i(f_\varepsilon|_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}) = \log 2$.

□

In the case of diffeomorphisms the stable dimension depends continuously on the map, even real analytically in the case of Hénon maps ([17]). However this property is not present anymore for holomorphic endomorphisms.

Indeed, from Corollary 4.2, if f_ε is a perturbation of $f(z, w) = (z^2 + c, w^2)$, such that f_ε is injective on its basic set Λ_ε, then $HD(W^s_\delta(x_\varepsilon) \cap \Lambda_\varepsilon)$ is bounded below by a constant which does not depend on small ε, where x_ε is a point in Λ_ε.

On the other hand $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda) = 0$, if Λ is the basic set $\{p_0(c)\} \times S^1$ of f, and $x \in \Lambda$. Therefore we get a contradiction, since in any neighbourhood of f we were able to find a map having stable dimension bounded below by a constant not depending on ε. This will be formulated in the following:

Corollary 4.3. *There exist Axiom A holomorphic maps f on $\mathbb{P}^2$ which have basic sets Λ, such that there exists f_ε an ε- perturbation of f and Λ_ε a basic set of f_ε close to Λ, such that $HD(W^s_\delta(x_\varepsilon)\cap\Lambda_\varepsilon)$ does not converge to $HD(W^s_\delta(x)\cap\Lambda)$, when $\varepsilon\to 0$ and $x_\varepsilon\in\Lambda_\varepsilon, x\in\Lambda, x_\varepsilon\to x$. Hence the dependence of the stable dimension on the map is not continuous in general.*

Now we ask what can be said about the number of preimages that a point in the basic set Λ can have in Λ, in order to shed more light on the upper estimate from Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 4.4. *Let f be a holomorphic map on $\mathbb{P}^2$, and Λ one of its basic sets of infinite cardinality, such that $C_f\cap\Lambda=\emptyset$, where C_f is the critical set of f. Then the set $\{x\in\Lambda, Card\{f^{-1}(x)\cap\Lambda\}=1\}$ is open with respect to the induced topology on Λ.*

Proof. If $C_f\cap\Lambda=\emptyset$, then there exists a constant $l_0>0$ such that, if $f(z_1)=f(z_2), z_1,z_2\in\Lambda, z_1\neq z_2$, then $d(z_1,z_2)>l_0$.

Now assume that the statement of our lemma is not true; we can assume also that all the points we are working with are not isolated (as a matter of fact Λ cannot have any isolated points since $f|_\Lambda$ is transitive and Λ is infinite, but this is not necessary here). Then there would exist $x\in\Lambda$ such that $f^{-1}(x)\cap\Lambda=\{z\}$ and there would exist a sequence $y_n\in\Lambda$, $y_n\to x$, with $\{z_n^1,z_n^2\}\subset f^{-1}(y_n)\cap\Lambda, z_n^1\neq z_n^2,\forall n$. From the discussion above, it follows that $d(z_n^1,z_n^2)>l_0$. But since Λ is compact, there exists a subsequence of $(z_n^1)_n$, denoted also by $(z_n^1)_n$ such that $z_n^1\to\xi^1\in\Lambda$.

By taking yet another subsequence, one can assume also that $z_n^2\to\xi^2\in\Lambda$.

Since $f(z_n^1)=y_n$ and $y_n\to x$, we have $f(\xi^1)=x$ and similarly $f(\xi^2)=x$. But $d(z_n^1,z_n^2)>l_0$, hence $d(\xi^1,\xi^2)\geq l_0>0$. Therefore we get a contradiction with the fact that the set $f^{-1}(x)\cap\Lambda$ has only one element. So the set of points $x\in\Lambda$ having only one preimage in Λ, is open in the induced topology. □

Lemma 4.5. *In the same setting as in Lemma 4.4 and assuming also that there exists a neighbourhood U of Λ such that $f^{-1}(\Lambda)\cap U=\Lambda$, it follows that the set $\{x\in\Lambda, Card\{f^{-1}(x)\cap\Lambda\}=1\}$ is closed.*

Proof. Assume that the set of points with only one preimage in Λ is not closed. Then, there would exist $x\in\Lambda$ having two preimages y_1,y_2 in Λ and a sequence $x_n\in\Lambda, x_n\to x$ with $f^{-1}(x_n)\cap\Lambda=\{z_n\}$. By taking eventually a subsequence, one can suppose that $d(y_1,z_n)>\delta_0,\forall n$, for some positive constant δ_0. As observed before, the set Λ does not have any isolated points since $f|_\Lambda$ is transitive and Λ was assumed infinite (otherwise the problem would be trivial if Λ finite). Let now $V\subset U$ be the open ball around y_1 of radius $\frac{\delta_0}{2}$. Since f is open, we get that $f(V)$ is an open set in $\mathbb{P}^2$, containing x. Hence, since Λ has no isolated points, it follows that $x_n\in f(V)\cap\Lambda$, for n large enough. So there exists $\xi_n\in V$ with $f(\xi_n)=x_n$. But then $\xi_n\in f^{-1}(\Lambda)\cap U=\Lambda$ according to our assumption; hence $\xi_n\in\Lambda$.

Also, since we assumed $d(y_1,z_n)>\delta_0$, it is clear that $z_n\neq\xi_n$. Hence, this implies that $\{\xi_n,z_n\}\subset f^{-1}(x_n)\cap\Lambda$, which is a contradiction with our assumption. Therefore the set $\{x\in\Lambda,\ Card\{f^{-1}(x)\cap\Lambda\}=1\}$ is closed in Λ. We are done. □

Lemmas 4.4, 4.5 imply the following corollary:

Corollary 4.6. *In the same setting as in Lemma 4.5, and assuming also that Λ is connected, the number of preimages that a point from Λ has in Λ is constant.*

As can be seen from the proofs of Lemmas 4.4, 4.5, this statement is true in a more general setting: f does not have to be necessarily holomorphic for example. A natural question is how we can check which

basic sets are connected. In fact it turns out that it is enough to perturb a map with a basic set which we do know to be connected in order to obtain other such examples.

Lemma 4.7. *In the same setting as in Lemma 4.4, if Λ is connected and g is sufficiently close to f, with its corresponding basic set Λ_g (close to Λ), then Λ_g is connected as well.*

PROOF. We know from a result of Przytycki ([14]) that there exists a conjugacy at the level of inverse limits, between $\hat{\Lambda}$ and $\widehat{\Lambda_g}$ if g is close enough to f. Also an easy result from topology shows that Λ is connected if and only if $\hat{\Lambda}$ is connected. Hence if we assumed Λ to be connected, it follows also that $\hat{\Lambda}$, $\widehat{\Lambda_g}$, and Λ_g are all connected. □

Corollary 4.6 and Lemma 4.7, together with Theorems 1.2 and 1.5, give now information about the stable dimension of perturbations of the map $(z^2 + c, w^2)$.

Corollary 4.8. *Let g be a perturbation of the map $(z^2 + c, w^2)$, where $0 \neq |c|$ small, and consider the basic set Λ_g, close to $\{p_0(c)\} \times S^1$. Assume also that either $g|_{\Lambda_g}$ is a homeomorphism, or else, that there exists a neighbourhood U of $\{p_0(c)\} \times S^1$ such that $g^{-1}(\Lambda_g) \cap U = \Lambda_g$. Then we are in one of the following two cases:*

(a) *If $g|_{\Lambda_g}$ is a homeomorphism, then we have the following inequality*

$$\frac{\log 2}{|\log \inf\limits_{y \in \Lambda_g} |Df|_{E^s_y}||} \leq HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda_g) \leq \frac{\log 2}{|\log \sup\limits_{\xi \in \Lambda_g} |Df|_{E^s_\xi}||},$$

(b) *Or if $g|_{\Lambda_g}$ is not a homeomorphism, then $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda_g) = 0$.*

PROOF. Let us prove first item (a). Since g is a homeomorphism on Λ_g, the Theorems 1 and 2 imply the required inequalities for $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda_g)$.

We prove now item (b). Since the basic set $\Lambda = \{p_0(c)\} \times S^1$ is connected, Lemma 4.7 implies that Λ_g is also connected if g is a small perturbation of the map $(z^2 + c, w^2)$. Hence, from Corollary 4.6, the number of preimages that a point can have in Λ_g is constant and will be denoted by d'. To find this constant we notice that, since $h(g|_{\Lambda_g}) = \log 2$ and $h(g|_{\Lambda_g}) \geq \log d'$ (from §1), we get $1 \leq d' \leq 2$. So, either every point of Λ_g has exactly one preimage in Λ_g, or else every point from Λ_g has exactly two different preimages in this set. But, if $d' = 1$, then g is a homeomorphism on Λ_g, contradiction with the assumption of this case. Therefore, every point in Λ_g has exactly two preimages in Λ_g. Thus, Theorem 1 gives that $HD(W^s_\delta(x) \cap \Lambda_g) = 0$. □

Obviously the same reasoning can be applied to other perturbations of maps f on $\mathbb{P}^2$ for which $C_f \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$, (see for instance [5] for more examples, like product maps, solenoids, etc.)

REFERENCES

[1] R. Bowen, Topological entropy for non-compact sets, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **184** (1973), 125–136.

[2] L. Carleson and T. Gamelin, Complex Dynamics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1993.

[3] E. Coven and W. Reddy, Positively expansive maps of compact manifolds, in Global Theory of Dynamical Systems, Lecture Notes in Math. 819, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.

[4] M. Denker and M. Urbański, Absolutely continuous invariant measures for expansive rational map with rationally indifferent periodic points, Forum Mathematicum **3**, (1991), 561–579.

[5] J.E. Fornaess and N. Sibony, Hyperbolic maps on $\mathbb{P}^2$, Math. Ann. **311** (1998), 305–333.

[6] M. Guzmán, Differentiation of integrals in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Lect. Notes in Math. **481**, Springer Verlag.

[7] M. Hurley, On topological entropy of maps, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **15** (1995), 557–568.

[8] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems, Cambridge Univ. Press, London-New York, 1995.

[9] R. Langevin and F. Przytycki, Entropie de l'image inverse d' une application, Bull Soc. Math. France **120** (1992), 237–250.

[10] A. Manning, A relation between Lyapunov exponents, Hausdorff dimension and entropy, Ergod. Th. and Dyn. Syst. **1** (1981), 451–459.

[11] E. Mihailescu, Applications of thermodynamic formalism in complex dynamics on $\mathbb{P}^2$, Discrete and Cont. Dyn. Syst., **vol 7**, no 4, October 2001, 821-836.

[12] E. Mihailescu, The set K^- for hyperbolic non-invertible maps, Ergodic Th. and Dyn. Syst. **22** (2002), 873-887

[13] Z. Nitecki and F. Przytycki, Preimage entropy for maps, Inter. J. Bifur. Class Appl. Sci. Engr. **9**, (1999), no. 9, 1815–1843.

[14] F. Przytycki, Ω-stability and structural stability of endomorphisms, Studia Mathematica **60** (1977), 61-77.

[15] C. Robinson, Stability, symbolic dynamics and chaos, CRC Press, 1995.

[16] D. Ruelle, Elements of differentiable dynamics and bifurcation theory, Academic Press, New York, 1989.

[17] A. Verjovsky and H. Wu, Hausdorff dimension of Julia sets of complex Hénon mappings, Ergod. Th. & Dyn. Syst. **16** (1996), 849–861.

[18] P. Walters, An introduction to ergodic theory, Springer-Verlag, New York,-Berlin, 1982.

(Eugen Mihailescu) Department of Mathematics, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203-1430, and Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, P. O. Box 1-764, Ro 70700, Bucharest, Romania

E-mail address: Eugen.Mihailescu@imar.ro

(Mariusz Urbański) Department of Mathematics, University of North Texas, P.O. Box 311430, Denton, TX 76203-1430, USA

E-mail address: urbanski@unt.edu