arXiv:1805.00431v2 [math.DS] 19 Jul 2018

STRONG BIRKHOFF ERGODIC THEOREM FOR SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS WITH IRRATIONAL SHIFT AND ITS APPLICATION TO ANALYTIC QUASI-PERIODIC COCYCLES

KAI TAO

Abstract. In this paper, we first prove the strong Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem for subharmonic functions with the irrational shift on the Torus. Then, it is applied to the analytic quasi-periodic Jacobi cocycles. We show that if the Lyapunov exponent of these cocycles is positive at one point, then it is positive on an interval centered at this point for suitable frequency and coupling numbers. We also prove that the Lyapunov exponent is Hölder continuous in E on this interval and calculate the expression of its length. What's more, if the coupling number of the potential is large, then the Lyapunov exponent is always positive for all irrational frequencies and Hölder continuous in E for all finite Liouville frequencies. We also study the Lyapunov exponent of the Schrödinger cocycles, a special case of the Jacobi ones, and obtain its Hölder continuity in the frequency.

1. Introduction

By the Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem, if $T : X \to X$ is an ergodic transformation on a measurable space (X, Σ, m) and f is an $m-$integrable function, then the time average functions $f_n(x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(T^k x)$ converge to the space average $< f >= \frac{1}{m(X)}\int_X f dm$ for almost every $x \in X$. But it doesn't tell us how fast do they converge? So, we call a theorem the strong Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem, if it gives the convergence rate.

In this paper, we consider the strong Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem for subharmonic functions under the condition that the ergodic transformation is a shift on the Torus, i.e. $T : x \to x + \omega, \forall x \in \mathbb{T} := [0, 1]$. Specifically, assume that $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a subharmonic function on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$, $\partial\Omega$ consists of finitely many piece-wise C^1 curves and $\mathbb{T} \subsetneq \Omega$. Then, the Reisz Decomposition Theorem tells us that there exists a positive measure μ on Ω such that for any $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$ (i.e., Ω_1 is a compactly contained subregion of Ω),

$$u(z) = \int_{\Omega_1} \log|z - \zeta| \, d\mu(\zeta) + h(z), \tag{1.1}$$

where h is harmonic on Ω_1 and μ is unique with this property.

In order to formulate our theorem, some notations about the shift ω, which is always irrational in this paper, should be introduced. For any irrational ω, there exist its continued fraction approximants $\{\frac{p_s}{q_s}\}_{s=1}^{\infty}$, satisfying

$$\frac{1}{q_s(q_{s+1} + q_s)} < |\omega - \frac{p_s}{q_s}| < \frac{1}{q_s q_{s+1}}. \tag{1.2}$$

Define $\bar{\beta}$ as the exponential growth exponent of $\{\frac{p_s}{q_s}\}_{s=1}^{\infty}$ as follows:

$$\bar{\beta}(\omega) := \limsup_s \frac{\log q_{s+1}}{q_s} \in [0, \infty].$$

Thus, if ω is a finite Liouville frequency, which means $\bar{\beta}(\omega) < \infty$, then for any $\kappa > 0$, there exists $s_0 = s_0(\omega, \kappa) \geq 0$ such that for any $s \geq s_0$, $\log q_{s+1} \leq (\bar{\beta} + \kappa) q_s$. Therefore, there exists a constant $\beta(\omega) < \infty$ such that for any $s \geq 0$,

$$\log q_{s+1} \leq \beta q_s.$$

Then, our strong Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem for irrational ω is as follows:

The first author was supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (Grant 11401166).

Theorem 1. *Let $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a subharmonic function on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $\partial\Omega$ consists of finitely many piece-wise C^1 curves and $\mathbb{T}$ is contained in $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$. There exist a constant $C = C(\Omega_1)$ and an absolute constant c such that for any $\delta > 0$ and irrational ω, if $\beta(\omega) < \frac{\delta}{C\mu(\Omega_1)}$, then for any positive n,*

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : |\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} u(x+k\omega) - < u > | > \delta\right\}\right) < \exp(-\frac{c}{\mu(\Omega_1)}\delta n), \tag{1.3}$$

where μ is the unique measure defined in (1.1).

Remark 1.1. It is obvious that $\beta(\omega) \gtrsim \bar{\beta}(\omega)$. If we replace the assumption $\beta(\omega) < \frac{\delta}{C\mu(\Omega_1)}$ by $\bar{\beta}(\omega) < \frac{\delta}{C\mu(\Omega_1)} - \kappa$, then Theorem 1 still holds. But the absolute constant c will depend on ω. See details in Remark 2.5.

Remark 1.2. In [GS], Goldstein and Schlag proved that for any strong Diophantine ω, which satisfies the strong Diophantine condition

$$\|n\omega\| \geq \frac{C_\omega}{n(\log n)^\alpha} \quad \text{for all } n \neq 0, \tag{1.4}$$

(1.3) holds when $\delta > \frac{(\log n)^{\alpha+2}}{n}$.Obviously, this ω satisfies $\bar{\beta}(\omega) = 0$. Thus, we extend their conclusion to the finite Liouville frequency. What's more, [ALSZ] shows that our result is also optimal, as (1.3) can not hold when $\bar{\beta}(\omega) = \infty$.

In this paper, we apply Theorem 1 to the following quasi-periodic analytic Jacobi operators $H_{x,\omega}$ on $l^2(\mathbb{Z})$:

$$(H_{x,\omega}\phi)(n) = -\lambda_a a(x+(n+1)\omega)\phi(n+1) - \lambda_a\overline{a(x+n\omega)}\phi(n-1) + \lambda_v v(x+n\omega)\phi(n),\ n \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{1.5}$$

where $v : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a real analytic function called potential, $a : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a complex analytic function and not identically zero, and λ_a and λ_v are real positive constants called coupling numbers. Then, their characteristic equations $H_{x,\omega}\phi = E\phi$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi(n+1) \\ \phi(n) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\lambda_a a(x+(n+1)\omega)} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_v v(x+n\omega) - E & -\lambda_a\overline{a(x+n\omega)} \\ \lambda_a a(x+(n+1)\omega) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi(n) \\ \phi(n-1) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.6}$$

Define

$$M(x,E,\omega) := \frac{1}{\lambda_a a(x+\omega)} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_v v(x) - E & -\lambda_a\overline{a(x)} \\ \lambda_a a(x+\omega) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.7}$$

and call a map

$$(\omega, M) : (x, \vec{v}) \mapsto (x+\omega, M(x)\vec{v})$$

a Jacobi cocycle. Due to the fact that an analytic function only has finite zeros, $M(x,E,\omega)$ and the n-step transfer matrix $M_n(x,E,\omega) := \prod_{k=n}^{1} M(x+k\omega, E)$ make sense almost everywhere. By the Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem, the Lyapunov exponent

$$L(E,\omega) = \lim_{n\to\infty} L_n(E,\omega) = \inf_{n\to\infty} L_n(E,\omega) \tag{1.8}$$

always exists, where

$$L_n(E,\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\int_{\mathbb{T}} \log\|M_n(x,E,\omega)\|dx.$$

To apply Theorem 1 and the Avalanche Principle(Proposition 5.1), we need to consider the following two matrices associated with M_n:

$$M_n^a(x,E,\omega) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_a a(x+j\omega)\right) M_n(x,E,\omega) \text{ and } M_n^u(x,E,\omega) = \frac{M_n(x,E,\omega)}{|\det M_n(x,E,\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Note that an analytic function $f(x)$ on $\mathbb{T}$ has its complex analytic extension $f(z)$ on the complex strip $\mathbb{T}_\rho = \{z : |\mathrm{Im} z| < \rho\}$ and the complex analytic extension of $\bar{a}(x)$ should be defined on $\mathbb{T}_\rho$ by

$$\tilde{a}(z) := \overline{a(\frac{1}{z})}.$$

Then, the extensions of $M(x,E,\omega)$, $M_n(x,E,\omega)$, $M_n^a(x,E,\omega)$ and $M_n^u(z,\omega,E)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} M(z,E,\omega) &= \frac{1}{\lambda_a a(z+\omega)}\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_v v(z)-E & -\lambda_a\tilde{a}(z) \\ \lambda_a a(z+\omega) & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ M_n(z,E,\omega) = \prod_{k=n}^{1} M(z+k\omega,E), \\ M_n^a(z,E,\omega) &= \left(\prod_{j=1}^{n}\lambda_a a(z+j\omega)\right) M_n(z,E,\omega) \text{ and } M_n^u(z,E,\omega) = \frac{M_n(z,E,\omega)}{|\det M_n(z,E,\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

With fixed ω and E,

$$u_n^a(z,E,\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\log\|M_n^a(z,E,\omega)\| \tag{1.10}$$

is a subharmonic function on $\mathbb{T}_\rho$ such that Theorem 1 can be applied. We also consider the quantities $u_n(z,E,\omega)$, $u_n^u(z,E,\omega)$, $L^a(E,\omega)$, $L_n^a(E,\omega)$, $L^u(E,\omega)$ and $L_n^u(E,\omega)$ which are defined analogously. Based on the definitions, it is straightforward to check that

$$\log\|M_n^u(z,E,\omega)\| = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} d(z+j\omega,\omega) + \log\|M_n^a(z,E,\omega)\|, \tag{1.11}$$

where

$$d(z,\omega) = \log|\lambda_a^2 a(z+\omega)\tilde{a}(z)|. \tag{1.12}$$

It is also easily seen that $L_n^u(E,\omega) = L_n(\omega,E) \geq 0$, $L^u(E,\omega) = L(E,\omega) \geq 0$ and

$$L(E,\omega) = L^a(E,\omega) - D, \tag{1.13}$$

where

$$D = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log|\lambda_a a(x)|dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log|\lambda_a\tilde{a}(x)|dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}} d(x,\omega)dx.$$

It is well known that $L(E,\omega)$ is a C^∞ function of E on the resolvent set. So we only need to consider $E \in \mathscr{E}$, where

$$\mathscr{E} := [-2\lambda_a\|a(x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} - \lambda_v\|v(x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})},\ 2\lambda_a\|a(x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} + \lambda_v\|v(x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}].$$

Simple computations yield that for any irrational ω and $1 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{E\in\mathscr{E},x\in\mathbb{T}} u_n^a(x,E,\omega) \leq M_0,$$

where

$$M_0 := \log\left(3\lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} + 2\lambda_v\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}\right).$$

If $a(x) \equiv 1$, then the Hamiltonian operators (1.5) become the following famous quasi-periodic analytic Schödinger operators $S_{x,\omega}$ on $l^2(\mathbb{Z})$:

$$(S_{x,\omega}\phi)(n) = \phi(n+1) + \phi(n-1) + \lambda_s v(x+n\omega)\phi(n),\ n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{1.14}$$

Then the n-step transfer matrix $M_n^s(x,E,\omega) = \prod_{k=n}^{1} M^s(x+k\omega,E)$, where

$$M^s(x,E,\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_s v(x)-E & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1.15}$$

has the complex analytic extension $M_n^s(z,E,\omega)$ on $\mathbb{T}_\rho$, which is analytic and unimodular such that Theorem 1 and the Avalanche Principle can be applied directly. In 2001, Goldstein and Schlag([GS]) obtained the conclusion which we state in Remark 1.2 to prove the Lyapunov exponent of the Schrödinger operators

$$L^s(E,\omega) := \lim_{n\to\infty} L_n^s(E,\omega) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \|M_n^s(x,E,\omega)\| dx$$

is Hölder continuous in E for the strong Diophantine ω. In that reference, they shew that the keys to prove the continuity of the Lyapunov exponent are two lemmas: the large deviation theorem (LDT for short) and the Avalanche Principle. We say an estimation is a LDT for

$$u_n^s(z,E,\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\log\|M_n^s(z,E,\omega)\| \tag{1.16}$$

if it satisfies

$$\text{mes}\,\{x : |u_n^s(x,E,\omega) - L_n^s(E,\omega)| > \delta\} < f(\delta,n)\,. \tag{1.17}$$

They proved that

$$f(\delta,n) = \exp\left(-c\delta^2 n\right)$$

for strong Diophantine ω, where c depends only on the potential $v(x)$. In 2002 Bourgain and Jitomirskaya shew in [BJ] that for any irrational ω,

$$f(\delta,n) = \exp(-c\delta q), \tag{1.18}$$

where $0<\delta<1$ and q is the a denominator of ω's continued fraction approximants $\{\frac{p_s}{q_s}\}_{s=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying $q \lesssim n$. With the help of (1.18), they proved the joint continuity of $L^s(E,\omega)$ in (E,ω) at every (E,ω_0) if ω_0 is irrational. On the other hand, people always think that the Hölder continuity of $L^s(E,\omega)$ in E can not hold when $\bar{\beta}(\omega) \gtrsim \log\lambda_s$(Recently, Avila et al declared the proof in the preparation reference [ALSZ]). So the question whether the Hölder continuity is true or not in the large coupling regime for the finite Liouville frequency ω is eagerly anticipated in our field. The first answer was [YZ] in 2014. They proved that there exist constants $\lambda_0,\ N_0$ which only depend on v and small absolute constants c' and c'' such that if $\bar{\beta}(\omega) < c'$ and $\lambda_s > \lambda_0$, then for any $n > N_0$

$$f\left(\frac{1}{100}\log\lambda_s, n\right) = \exp\left(-c''n\right)$$

and $L^s(E,\omega)$ is Hölder continuous in E. Very recently, that question was finished by Han and Zhang in [HZ]. They proved that if the coupling number λ_s is large and $\bar{\beta}(\omega) \lesssim \log\lambda_s$, then the sharp LDT, which means

$$f(\delta,n) = \exp(-c\delta n), \tag{1.19}$$

and the Hölder continuity hold.

Compared to the Schrödinger cocycle, one of the distinguishing features of the Jacobi cocycle is that it is not $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$. It causes that Jitomirskaya and Marx proved the week Hölder continuity of the Lyapunov exponent of the analytic $GL(2,\mathbb{C})$ cocycles with Diophantine frequency in [JM]. But in [T], I shew that the continuity of the Lyapunov exponent of the Jacobi cocycles defined in (1.8) can be Hölder in E with the strong Diophantine ω. So far, from a technical perspective, the strong Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem is a necessary condition for applying the Avalanche Principle to the analytic quasi-periodic $GL(2,\mathbb{C})$ cocycles. The reason is that the Avalanche Principle can be applied only to the matrices whose determinants are not larger than 1.

In this paper, in order to extend the conclusion for the strong Diophantine frequency in [T] to the one for the finite Liouville frequency, we need to refer to a surprising discovery by Han and Zhang in [HZ] that the quantity $\mu(\Omega_1)$ in (1.1) for the subharmonic function $u_n^s(\cdot,E,\omega)$ defined in (1.16) does not depend on the large λ_s. With its help, we apply Theorem 1 to obtain the sharp LDT (1.19) and the Hölder continuity of $L(E,\omega)$ in E for any finite Liouville ω when λ_v and $|\log\lambda_a|$ are in the large regimes. We also improve the applications of the Avalanche Principle to get the lengths of the interval I_E where $L(E,\omega)$ satisfies the Hölder condition for E. Moreover, if we consider the quasi-periodic analytic Schrödinger operators (1.14), then we can also obtain the Hölder continuity of the Lyapunov exponent in ω.

Now we begin to state the details of our conclusions. Choose

$$\Omega = \{z : |\mathrm{Re}z| < 1,\ |\mathrm{Im}z| < \rho\} \tag{1.20}$$

and

$$\Omega_1 = \{z : |\mathrm{Re}z| < \frac{2}{3},\ |\mathrm{Im}z| < \frac{\rho}{2}\} \tag{1.21}$$

in Theorem 1. Then, the LDT for the Jacobi cocycles is as follows:

Theorem 2. *There exist $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(v, \lambda_a, a)$ and $c_{v,a} = c_{v,a}(v, a)$ such that for any $\delta > 0$, if $\beta(\omega) < c_{v,a}\min(\delta, |D|)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$, then*

$$\mathrm{mes}\{x : |u_n(x, E, \omega) - L_n(E, \omega)| > \delta\} < \exp(-c_1\delta^2 n) + \exp(-c_2\delta n),\quad \forall n \geq n_1, \tag{1.22}$$

where $n_1 = n_1(\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v)$, $c_1 = c_1(\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v)$ and $c_2 = c_2(\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v)$.

Remark 1.3. We can give the expressions of λ_0 and $c_{v,a}$ as follows:

$$\lambda_0 := \max\left(\frac{\lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}, 2\lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\epsilon_0^{-1}\right) \text{ and } c_{v,a} := \frac{1}{2CC(\Omega, \Omega_1)C_{v,a}},$$

where ϵ_0 defined in Lemma 3.1 depends only on v, C is the constant from Theorem 1, $C(\Omega, \Omega_1)$ is a constant which depends only on Ω and Ω_1, and $C_{v,a} := \max\left(\log\frac{10\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\epsilon_0}, \log\frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}}\right)$.

Remark 1.4. Due to the fact that the Schrödinger operator is a special case of the Jacobi one, from now on to the end of this section, after every theorem for the Jacobi operators we will declare the corresponding conclusions for the Schrödinger ones in the next remark. The reason we do this is that, like the following LDT, we can get better results for the Schrödinger ones: There exist $c_s = c_s(v) := \frac{1}{2CC_v}$ and $\lambda_0^s = \lambda_0^s(v) := 2\epsilon_0^{-1}$ such that for any $\delta > 0$, if $\beta(\omega) < c_s\delta$ and $\lambda_s > \lambda_0^s$, then for any positive n,

$$\mathrm{mes}\{x : |u_n^s(x, E, \omega) - L_n^s(E, \omega)| > \delta\} < \exp(-\bar{c}_s\delta^2 n),$$

where $\bar{c}_s = \bar{c}_s(v, \lambda) := \frac{c}{8M_0^s C_v}$, $C_v := C(\Omega, \Omega_1)\log\frac{10\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\epsilon_0}$, C and c are the absolute constants from Theorem 1, $C(\Omega, \Omega_1)$ and ϵ_0 are from Remark 1.3 and Lemma 3.1 respectively, and $M_0^s := \log(3 + 2\lambda_s\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})})$.

If the Lyapunov exponent $L(E, \omega)$ is positive at one point (E_0, ω_0), then it is also positive on its neighborhood where we can have a better LDT, called the sharp one by Bourgain in [B]:

Theorem 3. *Assume $L(E_0, \omega_0) > 0$. If $\beta(\omega_0) < c_{v,a}\min\left(\frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{15}, |D|\right)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$, where the constants $c_{v,a}$ and λ_0 are defined in Theorem 2, then there exist $r_E = r_E(\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v, E_0, \omega_0)$ and $r_\omega = r_\omega(\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v, E_0, \omega_0)$ such that for any $|E - E_0| \leq r_E$ and $|\omega - \omega_0| \leq r_\omega$,*

$$\frac{3}{4}L(E_0, \omega_0) < L(E, \omega) < \frac{5}{4}L(E_0, \omega_0).$$

Furthermore, if $\beta(\omega) < \frac{1}{100}c_{v,a}L(E_0, \omega_0)$, then there exist $\bar{c}_{v,a} := \frac{c}{C(\Omega,\Omega_1)C_{v,a}}$ and $\check{n} = (\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v, E_0, \omega_0)$ such that

$$\mathrm{mes}\{x : |u_n(x, E, \omega) - L_n(E, \omega)| > \frac{1}{20}L(E, \omega)\} < \exp\left(-\frac{1}{12000}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E, \omega)n\right),\quad \forall n \geq \check{n}, \tag{1.23}$$

where c is the absolute constant from Theorem 1, and $C(\Omega, \Omega_1)$ and $C_{v,a}$ are from Remark 1.3.

Remark 1.5. We apply the LDT (1.22) and the Avalanche Principle, not the continuity of Lyapunov exponent for the complex analytic cocycles with irrational ω proved in [AJS], to prove that $L(E, \omega_0)$ is positive on the interval $[E_0 - r_E, E_0 + r_E]$. The benefit is that we can calculate the expression of r_E:

$$r_E = \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{200\check{n}}\exp((1 - \check{n})M_0 - 2\check{n}|D|), \tag{1.24}$$

where $\check{n}$, which appears in (1.23) and (1.24), is defined in (6.5). Due to the definition, it is easily seen that r_E is a continuous function in E_0. Thus, if $L(E, \omega_0)$ is positive on $\mathcal{E} \times \{\omega_0\}$, then $r_E^i := \inf_{E\in\mathcal{E}} r_E$ exists and is positive.

Remark 1.6. We can not get the expression of r_ω, as it comes from the compactness in E and the joint continuity of $L(E,\omega)$, which was proved in [AJS].

Remark 1.7. The parameters 3/4, 5/4 and 1/20 can be replaced in turn by $1-\kappa_1, 1+\kappa_2$ and κ_3, where $0<\kappa_1,\kappa_2,\kappa_3<1$. Then, the new constants c_3^κ only differs from c_3 by a constant multiple of $400\kappa^{-2}$, $r_E(\kappa_1,\kappa_2)$ and $r_\omega(\kappa_1,\kappa_2)$ depend on κ_1 and κ_2, and $\check{n}_{\kappa_1,\kappa_2,\kappa_3}$ depends on κ_1,κ_2 and κ_3.

Remark 1.8. For the Schrödinger operators, we can calculate the expressions of r_E^s and r_ω^s: Assume $L^s(E_0,\omega_0)>0$. If $\beta(\omega_0)<c_s\frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{15}$ and $\lambda_s>\lambda_0^s$, then there exist $\check{n}_s$ defined in (6.12), $r_E^s=r_E^s(\lambda,v,E_0,\omega_0):=\frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{200\check{n}_s}\exp(-5M_0^s\check{n}_s)$ and $r_\omega^s=r_\omega^s(\lambda,v,E_0,\omega_0):=\frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{400\max_{\mathbb{T}}(v'(x))\check{n}_s^2}\exp(-5M_0^s\check{n}_s)$, where M_0^s comes from Remark 1.4, such that for any $|E-E_0|\le r_E^s$ and $|\omega-\omega_0|\le r_\omega^s$,

$$\frac{4}{5}L^s(E_0,\omega_0)<L^s(E,\omega)<\frac{6}{5}L^s(E_0,\omega_0).$$

Furthermore, if $\beta(\omega)<\frac{1}{100}c_sL(E_0,\omega_0)$, then there exists $c_3^s:=\frac{\bar{c}_s}{4\times10^5}$ such that

$$\operatorname{mes}\{x:|u_n^s(x,E,\omega)-L_n^s(E,\omega)|>\frac{1}{20}L^s(E,\omega)\}<\exp(-c_3^sL^s(E_0,\omega_0)),\quad\forall n\ge\check{n}_s. \tag{1.25}$$

Here c_s and $\bar{c}_s$ are both from Remark 1.4.

Due to the positive Lyapunov exponent and the sharp LDT (1.23), the Avalanche Principle can be applied again to obtain the following Hölder continuity of Lyapunov exponent:

Theorem 4. *Assume $L(E_0,\omega_0)>0$, $\beta(\omega_0)<c_{v,a}\min\left(\frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{15},|D|\right)$ and $\lambda_v>\lambda_0$, where the constants $c_{v,a}$ and λ_0 are defined in Theorem 2. There exists $\tau=\tau(v,a):=\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{2\bar{c}_{v,a}+8\times10^5}$, where $\bar{c}_{v,a}$ is from Theorem 3, such that for any $E_1,E_2\in[E_0-r_E,E_0+r_E]$ and irrational $\omega\in[\omega_0-r_\omega,\omega_0+r_\omega]$ satisfying $\beta(\omega)<\frac{c_{v,a}L(E_0,\omega_0)}{100}$, it has*

$$|L(E_1,\omega)-L(E_2,\omega)|=|L^a(E_1,\omega)-L^a(E_2,\omega)|\le(|E_1-E_2|)^\tau.$$

Remark 1.9. For the Schrödinger cocycles, we can prove the Hölder continuity in ω as follows: Assume $L^s(E_0,\omega_0)>0,\beta(\omega_0)<\frac{c_sL^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{15}$ and $\lambda_s>\lambda_0^s$. There exists $\tau_s=\tau_s(v):=\frac{\bar{c}_s}{2\bar{c}_s+8\times10^5}$ such that for any $E_1,E_2\in[E_0-r_E^s,E_0+r_E^s]$ and $\omega_1,\omega_2\in[\omega_0-r_\omega^s,\omega_0+r_\omega^s]$ satisfying $\max(\beta(\omega_1),\beta(\omega_2))<\frac{c_sL^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{100}$, it has

$$|L^s(E_1,\omega_1)-L^s(E_2,\omega_2)|\le|E_1-E_2|^{\tau_s}+|\omega_1-\omega_2|^{\tau_s}.$$

Here the constants c_s, $\bar{c}_s$ and λ_0^s come from Remark 1.4.

It is well-known that Screts-Spencer [SS] gave a lower bound of the Lyapunov exponents of the Schrödinger operators in the large coupling regime. We prove that the similar result for the Jacobi ones also holds:

Theorem 5. *For any $0<\gamma<1$, $E\in\mathscr{E}$ and irrational ω, there exists $\lambda_p=\lambda_p(\lambda_a,a,v,\gamma)$ such that if $\lambda_v>\lambda_p$, then*

$$L(E,\omega)>(1-\gamma)\log\lambda_v.$$

Remark 1.10. The setting of λ_p can be found in (3.7), which is a nondecreasing function of λ_a. Moreover, if $\lambda_v>\lambda_p$, then

$$\left(1-\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)\log\lambda_v<L^a(E,\omega)<\left(1+\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)\log\lambda_v\text{ and }D<\frac{\gamma}{2}\log\lambda_v.$$

Indeed, the proof of this theorem is obtained directly from the above two properties and (1.13).

Remark 1.11. Of course, we can also give the upper bound of $L(E,\omega)$, although it is useless in this paper. By (1.13), we need to show that $D>-\frac{\gamma}{2}\log\lambda_v$. Define $D_a:=\exp\left(-\int_{\mathbb{T}}\log|a(x)|dx\right)$. Then, if $\lambda_v>\lambda_a^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}}D_a^{-1}$, which is a decreasing function of λ_a, then

$$L(E,\omega)<(1+\gamma)\log\lambda_v.$$

Thus, when $\lambda_v > \lambda_p$, due to Theorem 4, we have that for any irrational ω, if $\beta(\omega) < c_{v,a}\min\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{15}\log\lambda_v, |D|\right)$, then the Hölder continuity holds. Note that $D < \frac{\gamma}{2}\log\lambda_v$ and $L(E,\omega) > (1-\gamma)\log\lambda_v$ at this time. Thus, if D is positive, then $|D| < \frac{1}{15}L(E,\omega)$ with $\gamma = \frac{1}{10}$. Conversely, if D is negative, then we need $\beta(\omega) < -c_{v,a}D$ and $\lambda_v > \max(\lambda_p, \lambda_\omega)$, where $\lambda_\omega := \exp\left(\frac{15\beta(\omega)}{c_{v,a}(1-\gamma)}\right)$. Obviously, due to the definitions, λ_p is a decreasing function of γ with $\lim_{\gamma\to 0}\lambda_p \to \infty$, and λ_ω is an increasing function of γ with $\lim_{\gamma\to 1}\lambda_\omega \to \infty$. Therefore, there exists $0 < \gamma_0 < 1$ such that $\lambda_p(\gamma_0) = \lambda_\omega(\gamma_0)$ and $\max(\lambda_p(\gamma_0), \lambda_\omega(\gamma_0)) \le \max(\lambda_p(\gamma), \lambda_\omega(\gamma))$ for any $0 < \gamma < 1$.

In summary, we prove that for any finite Liouville ω, the Hölder continuity of Lyapunov exponent in E holds with suitable λ_a and λ_v as follows:

Theorem 6. *For any finite Liouville ω, if $\lambda_a > D_a e^{\frac{\beta(\omega)}{c_{v,a}}}$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_p(\lambda_a, a, v, \frac{1}{10})$, or $\lambda_a < D_a e^{-\frac{\beta(\omega)}{c_{v,a}}}$ and $\lambda_v > \exp\left(\frac{15\beta(\omega)}{c_{v,a}(1-\gamma_0)}\right)$, then for any $|E_1 - E_2| < r_E^i$,*

$$|L(E_1,\omega) - L(E_2,\omega)| = |L^a(E_1,\omega) - L^a(E_2,\omega)| \le (|E_1 - E_2|)^\tau,$$

where r_E^i comes from Remark 1.5, $c_{v,a}$ is from Remark 1.3 and τ is defined in Theorem 4.

Remark 1.12. For the Schrödinger operators in the large coupling regime, r_E^s and r_ω^s only depend on λ_s: For any finite Liouville ω, if $\lambda_s > \max\left[\left(\frac{20\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\epsilon_0^2}\right)^{50}, \exp\left(\frac{16}{c_s}\beta(\omega)\right), 5\max_{x\in\mathbb{T}}|v'(x)|\right]$, where ϵ_0 and c_s are from Lemma 3.1 and Remark 1.4 respectively, then for any E, E' and irrational ω' satisfying $|E - E'| < \lambda_s^{-800}$, $|\omega - \omega'| < \lambda_s^{-800}$ and $\beta(\omega') \le \beta(\omega)$, it has

$$|L^s(E,\omega) - L^s(E',\omega')| < |E - E'|^{\tau_s} + |\omega - \omega'|^{\tau_s}, \tag{1.26}$$

where τ_s is defined in Remark 1.9.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the strong Birkhoof Ergodic Theorem for subharmonic functions with irrational shift on the Torus is proved. Then we study the positive Lyapunov exponent of the Jacobi operators in the large potential coupling regimes, and obtain the independences of the quantities $\mu(\Omega_1)$ in (1.1) for two subharmonic functions $u_n^a(\cdot, E, \omega)$ and $d(\cdot,\omega)$, which are defined in (1.10) and (1.12) respectively, on the coupling numbers by Han and Zhang's method to make Theorem 1 applied to the Jacobi operators with suitable frequencies and coupling numbers in Section 3. It help us in getting Theorem 2, the LDT for the Jacobi cocycles, in Section 4. Combining this LDT with the Avalanche Principle, we prove that the positive Lyapunov exponent can be extended from one point to an interval, and calculate its length in Section 5. Finally, the proofs of the rest theorems, Theorem 3, 4 and 6, are presented in the last section. In additional, the results of the Schrödinger operators stated in the remarks are proved under the proofs of the corresponding theorems of the Jacobi ones.

2. The Ergodic Theorem for Subharmonic Functions with Shift

Let $\{x\} = x - [x]$. For any positive integer q, complex number $\zeta = \xi + i\eta$ and $0 \le x < 1$, define

$$f_{q,\zeta}(x) = \sum_{0\le k<q}\log|\{x + \frac{k}{q}\} - \zeta|,\ F_{q,\zeta}(x) = \sum_{0\le k<q}\log|\{x + k\omega\} - \zeta| \text{ and } I(\zeta) = \int_0^1 \log|y - \zeta|dy. \tag{2.1}$$

Also define

$$\|x\| = \min_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}|x + n|,$$

and the distance on $\mathbb{T}$:

$$dist(x,y) = \|x - y\|.$$

Given $x \in [0,1)$ and $q = 1, 2, \cdots$. Set $\mathcal{S} = \{\{x + \frac{k}{q}\} : 0 \le k < q\}$. We enumerate $\mathcal{S}$ as

(1) $0 \le \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \cdots < \theta_{q-1} \le 1$, $\theta_j = \{x + \frac{k_j}{q}\}$;
(2) $\theta_{j+1} = \theta_j + \frac{1}{q}$.

For any $\xi \in [0,1)$, find the integers $j^+(x,q,\xi)$ and $j^-(x,q,\xi)$ such that if $\theta_0 \le \xi < \theta_{q-1}$, then

$$\theta_{j^-(x,q,\xi)} \le \xi < \theta_{j^+(x,q,\xi)} \text{ and } j^+(x,q,\xi) - j^-(x,q,\xi) = 1,$$

else $j^-(x,q,\xi) = q-1$ and $j^+(x,q,\xi) = 0$. Let $k^-(x,q,\xi) = k_{j^-(x,q,\xi)}$ and $k^+(x,q,\xi) = k_{j^+(x,q,\xi)}$. Then, we have

Lemma 2.1. *There exists an absolute constant C such that*

$$\left| \sum_{0\le k<q, k\neq k^\pm(x,q,\xi)} \log|\{x+\frac{k}{q}\} - \zeta| - qI(\zeta) \right| \le C\log q,$$

where C is an absolute constants.

Proof. Using the above notations one has

$$\frac{1}{q} \sum_{0\le k<q, k\neq k^\pm(x,q,\xi)} \log|\{x+\frac{k}{q}\} - \zeta| = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{0\le j<q, j\neq j^\pm(x,q,\xi)} \log|\theta_j - \xi - i\eta|.$$

Also we have for any $0 \le j < j^-(x,q,\xi)$,

$$\left|(\theta_{j^-(x,q,\xi)} - \xi) - (\theta_j - \xi)\right| \le \frac{j^-(x,q,\xi) - j}{q},$$

and for any $j^+(x,q,\xi) < j \le q-1$,

$$\left|(\theta_{j^+(x,q,\xi)} - \xi) - (\theta_j - \xi)\right| \le \frac{j - j^+(x,q,\xi)}{q}.$$

Note that if $1 \le j < j^-(x,q,\xi)$, then

$$\frac{1}{q}\log|\theta_j(x,q) - \xi - i\eta| < \int_{\theta_j(x,q)-1}^{\theta_j(x,q)} \log|y - \xi - i\eta|dy < \frac{1}{q}\log|\theta_{j(x,q)-1} - \xi - i\eta|,$$

and if $j^+(x,q,\xi) < j \le q-2$, then

$$\frac{1}{q}\log|\theta_j(x,q) - \xi - i\eta| < \int_{\theta_j(x,q)}^{\theta_j(x,q)+1} \log|y - \xi - i\eta|dy < \frac{1}{q}\log|\theta_{j(x,q)+1} - \xi - i\eta|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{1}{q}\sum_{0\le j<q, j\neq j^\pm(x,q,\xi)} \log|\theta_j - \xi - i\eta| - I(\zeta)\right| &\le \left|\sum_{0\le j<q, j\neq j^\pm(x,q,\xi)} \frac{1}{q}\log|\theta_j - \xi - i\eta| - \sum_{j=0}^{q-1}\int_{\theta_j}^{\theta_{j+1}} \log|y-\xi-i\eta|dy\right| \\ &\le -4\int_{|y|<\frac{1}{q}} \log|y|dy < \frac{C}{q}\log q.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2.1. Let $|\{x+k_0'/q\} - \xi| = \min_{k=1}^{q_s} |\{x+k/q\} - \xi|$, then $k_0' = k^-(x,q,\xi)$ or $k_0' = k^+(x,q,\xi)$. Note that $|\{x + k^-(x,q,\xi)/q\} - \xi| + |\{x + k^+(x,q,\xi)/q\} - \xi| = \frac{1}{q}$. Then the bigger one of these two numbers is larger than $\frac{1}{2q}$. Thus

$$\left| \sum_{0\le k<q, k\neq k_0'} \log|\{x+\frac{k}{q}\} - \zeta| - qI(\zeta) \right| \le C\log q,$$

where C is an absolute constant.

Let ω be irrational and $\left\{\frac{p_s}{q_s}\right\}_{s=1}^\infty$ be its continued fraction approximants. Then by (1.2), it has

$$\frac{k}{q_s(q_{s+1}+q_s)} < |k\omega - \frac{kp_s}{q_s}| < \frac{k}{q_sq_{s+1}} \le \frac{1}{q_{s+1}}, \quad 0 < k < q_s. \tag{2.2}$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $|\{x+k_0\omega\} - \xi| = \min_{k=1}^{q_s} |\{x+k\omega\} - \xi|$, then*

$$\left|F_{q_s,\xi}(x) - q_sI(\zeta)\right| \le C\log q_s + \left|\log|\{x+k_0\omega\} - \zeta|\right|.$$

Proof. We declare that if there exists $0 \le j < q_s$ such that $|\{x + j\omega\} - \xi| \le \frac{1}{2q_s} - \frac{1}{q_{s+1}}$, then $j = k_0$. Actually, if $|\{x + j\omega\} - \xi| \le \frac{1}{2q_s} - \frac{1}{q_{s+1}}$ and $j \ne k_0$, then $|\{x + k_0\omega\} - \xi| \le |\{x + j\omega\} - \xi| \le \frac{1}{2q_s} - \frac{1}{q_{s+1}}$, which implies

$$|\{x + k_0\omega\} - \{x + j\omega\}| \le \frac{1}{2q_s} - \frac{2}{q_{s+1}}.$$

By (2.2), we have

$$\left|\{x + j\frac{p_s}{q_s}\} - \{x + k_0\frac{p_s}{q_s}\}\right| < \frac{1}{q_s}.$$

It is a contraction. Thus there is at most one integer $0 \le k_0 < q_s$ such that $|\{x + k_0\omega\} - \xi| < \frac{1}{2q_s} - \frac{1}{q_{s+1}}$ and

$$|\{x + k\omega\} - \xi| > \frac{1}{2q_s} - \frac{1}{q_{s+1}} > \frac{1}{4q_s}, \quad k \ne k_0. \tag{2.3}$$

Due to (2.2), we have for any $0 \le k < q_s$,

$$\left||\{x + k\omega\} - \xi| - |\{x + k\frac{p_s}{q_s}\} - \xi|\right| < \frac{1}{q_{s+1}}, \tag{2.4}$$

or there exists only one integer $0 \le m < q_s$ such that

$$\left||\{x + m\omega\} - \xi| + |\{x + m\frac{p_s}{q_s}\} - \xi|\right| > 1 - \frac{1}{q_{s+1}},$$

and the others satisfies (2.4). Notice that $\{\{x + \frac{k}{q_s}\} : 0 \le k < q_s\} = \{\{x + \frac{kp_s}{q_s}\} : 0 \le k < q_s\}$. So, by Remark 2.1 , we have

$$|\{x + k\frac{p_s}{q_s}\} - \xi| > \frac{1}{2q_s}, \quad k \ne k_0',$$

Combining it with (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sum_{0\le k<q_s, k\ne k_0, k_0'} [\log|\{x + k\omega\} - \zeta| - \log|\{x + kp_s/q_s\} - \zeta|]\right| &\le \sum_{0\le k<q_s, k\ne k_0, k_0'} \left|\log\left[1 + \frac{|\{x + k\omega\} - \{x + kp_s/q_s\}|}{|\{x + kp_s/q_s\} - \zeta|}\right]\right| \\ &\le C\sum_{l=1}^{q_s} \frac{q_{s+1}^{-1}}{lq_s^{-1}} \le C\frac{q_s \log q_s}{q_{s+1}} \le C\log q_s.\end{aligned}$$

By Remark 2.1, it implies that

$$\left|\sum_{0\le k<q, k\ne k_0, k_0'} \log|\{x + k\omega\} - \zeta| - q_s I(\zeta)\right| \le C\log q. \tag{2.5}$$

Then, combining it with (2.3), we complete the proof. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let $n = lq_s < q_{s+1}$, then*

$$|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)| < Cl\log q_s + |\log D(x - \xi, -\omega, lq_s)| + 2\beta n. \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Define $x_h = x + hq_s\omega$ and $|\{x_h + k_h\omega\} - \xi| = \min_{k=0}^{q_s-1} |\{x_h + k\omega\} - \xi|$. Then due to Lemma 2.2, we have

$$|F_{lq_s,\zeta}(x) - lq_s I(\zeta)| \le \sum_{h=0}^{l-1} |F_{q_s,\zeta}(x_h) - lq_s I(\zeta)| \le \sum_{h=0}^{l-1} \left|\log|\{x_h + k_h\omega\} - \zeta|\right| + Cl\log q_s.$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{2q_{s+1}} < \frac{1}{q_s + q_{s+1}} < |q_s\omega - p_s| < \frac{1}{q_{s+1}}. \tag{2.7}$$

Define $Q = [\frac{q_{s+1}}{q_s}]$ and let j be the number such that $|\{x_j + k_j\omega\} - \xi| < \frac{1}{4q_{s+1}}$. Then by (2.7) and the declaration in the proof of Lemma 2.2, we have for any $j - 2Q + 1 \le h < j$ and $j < h \le j + 2Q - 1$,

$$|\{x_h + k_h\omega\} - \xi| > \frac{1}{4q_{s+1}}.$$

Thus there are at most one point which is small than $\frac{1}{4q_{s+1}}$. Recall that $n = lq_s$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_{lq_s,\zeta}(x) - lq_sI(\zeta)| &\le \sum_{h=0}^{l-1} \left|\log|\{x_h + k_h\omega\} - \zeta|\right| + Cl\log q_s \\
&\le |\log D(x-\xi, -\omega, lq_s)| + Cl\log q_s + l\left|\log\frac{1}{4q_{s+1}}\right| \\
&\le |\log D(x-\xi, -\omega, lq_s)| + Cl\log q_s + 2l\log q_{s+1} \\
&\le |\log D(x-\xi, -\omega, lq_s)| + Cl\log q_s + 2\frac{n}{q_s}\beta q_s \\
&\le |\log D(x-\xi, -\omega, lq_s)| + Cl\log q_s + 2\beta n.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.4 (Lemma 3.2 in [GS])**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ be an arbitrary finite set. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \exp\left(\sigma|\log dist(x,\Omega)|\right) dx \le \frac{2^\sigma}{1-\sigma}(\sharp\Omega)^\sigma$$

for any $0 < \sigma < 1$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $n = lq_s$. Then for any $0 < \sigma < 1$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \exp\left(\sigma|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)|\right) dx < \exp\left(5\sigma\beta n\right).$$

Proof. Set $\Omega = \{-m\omega : 0 \le m < lq_s\}$. Then $\sharp\Omega = lq_s$ and $dist(x-\xi,\Omega) = D(x-\xi,-\omega,lq_s)$. Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \exp\left(\sigma|\log D(x-\xi,-\omega,lq_s)|\right) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \exp\left(\sigma|\log dist(x,\Omega)|\right) dx \le \frac{2^\sigma}{1-\sigma}(lq_s)^\sigma.$$

By Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \exp\left(\sigma|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)|\right) dx \le \exp(2C\sigma\log(lq_s) + C\sigma l\log q_s + 2\sigma\beta n) < \exp(5\sigma\beta n).$$

□

Remark 2.2. It is easily seen that there exists a constant $\hat{C}(\zeta)$ such that for any $n > 0$ and $0 < \sigma < 1$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \exp\left(\sigma|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)|\right) dx < \exp\left(\sigma\hat{C}(\zeta)n\right).$$

So, the above lemmas show that for any $n = lq_s < q_{s+1}$, the large constant $\hat{C}(\zeta)$ can be changed by 5β. It is also obvious that if $n = lq_s$ is large, then $\hat{C}(\zeta)$ can be changed by $5\bar{\beta}$.

Now for any n, there exist q_s and q_{s+1} such that $q_s \le n < q_{s+1}$. Let $n = l_sq_s + r_s$, where $l_s = [\frac{n}{q_s}]$ and $0 \le r_s = n - l_sq_s < q_s$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 \exp(\sigma|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)|)dx &\le \left[\int_0^1 \exp(2\sigma|F_{l_sq_s,\zeta}(x) - l_sq_sI(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \left[\int_0^1 \exp(2\sigma|F_{r_s,\zeta}(x) - r_sI(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\le \exp(5\sigma\beta n)\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2\sigma|F_{r_s,\zeta}(x) - r_sI(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $r_s = l_{s-1}q_{s-1} + r_{s-1}$, where $l_{s-1} = [\frac{r_s}{q_{s-1}}]$ and $0 \le r_{s-1} = r_s - l_{s-1}q_{s-1} < q_{s-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2\sigma|F_{r_s,\zeta}(x) - r_sI(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} &\le \left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^2\sigma|F_{l_{s-1}q_{s-1},\zeta}(x) - l_{s-1}q_{s-1}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^2}} \\ &\quad\times\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^2\sigma|F_{r_{s-1},\zeta}(x) - r_{s-1}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^2}} \\ &\le \exp(5\sigma\beta r_s)\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^2\sigma|F_{r_{s-1},\zeta}(x) - r_{s-1}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^2}}.\end{aligned}$$

We use induction here. Let $r_{s-i+1} = l_{s-i}q_{s-i} + r_{s-i}$, where $l_{s-i} = [\frac{r_{s-i+1}}{q_{s-i}}]$ and $0 \le r_{s-i} = r_{s-i+1} - l_{s-i}q_{s-i} < q_{s-i}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^i\sigma|F_{r_{s-i+1},\zeta}(x) - r_{s-i+1}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^i}} &\le \left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^{i+1}\sigma|F_{l_{s-i}q_{s-i},\zeta}(x) - l_{s-i}q_{s-i}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^{i+1}}} \\ &\quad\times\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^{i+1}\sigma|F_{r_{s-i},\zeta}(x) - r_{s-i}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^{i+1}}} \\ &\le \exp(5\sigma\beta r_{s-i+1})\times\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^{i+1}\sigma|F_{r_{s-i},\zeta}(x) - r_{s-i}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^{i+1}}}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that for any irrational ω, there exists an absolute constant $\bar{C} > 1$ such that $q_{s+1} > \bar{C}q_s$. Thus, there exists $m \ge 0$ such that $\bar{C}^{-m} \le \beta$. Therefore, if $\zeta \in \Omega'$, where Ω' is a compact subregion of $\mathbb{C}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 \exp(\sigma|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)|)dx &\le \exp\left[5\sigma\beta n + 5\sigma\beta(r_s + r_{s-1} + \cdots + r_{s-m+1})\right] \\ &\quad\times\left[\int_0^1 \exp(2^{m+1}\sigma|F_{r_{s-m},\zeta}(x) - r_{s-m}I(\zeta)|)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}} \\ &\le \exp\left[5\sigma\beta n + 5\sigma\beta(q_s + q_{s-1} + \cdots + q_{s-m+1}) + \hat{C}(\zeta)\sigma r_{s-m}\right] \\ &\le \exp\left[5\sigma\beta n + 5\sigma\beta(q_s + \bar{C}^{-1}q_s + \cdots + \bar{C}^{-m+1}q_s) + \hat{C}(\zeta)\sigma q_{s-m}\right] \\ &\le \exp\left[5\sigma\beta n + \tilde{C}\sigma\beta q_s + \hat{C}(\zeta)\bar{C}^{-m}\sigma q_s\right] \\ &\le \exp\left[5\sigma\beta n + \tilde{C}\sigma\beta q_s + \hat{C}(\zeta)\beta\sigma q_s\right] < \exp(C\sigma\beta n),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\bar{C}^{-k} < \infty$ is an absolute constant and $C = C(\Omega')$. Thus

Lemma 2.6. *There exists $c = c(\omega, \bar{C})$ such that for any positive n and $0 < \sigma \le c$, we have*

$$\int_0^1 \exp(\sigma|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)|)dx < \exp(C\sigma\beta n).$$

Remark 2.3. It is easy to see that the constant $c = 2^{\log_C \beta}$ is an increasing function of β. So, $c_0 := 2^{\log_C \beta_G} \le c(\omega, \bar{C})$ for any irrational ω, where $\beta_G = \beta(\omega_G)$ and $\omega_G = \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}$.

Remark 2.4. Note that $\log|x|$ is a subharmonic function. Thus, if h is a 1-periodic harmonic function defined on a neighborhood of real axis, then for any positive n and $0 < \sigma \le c_0$, we have

$$\int_0^1 \exp(\sigma|\sum_{k=1}^{n} h(\{x + k\omega\}) - n\int_0^1 h(y)dy|)dx < \exp(C\sigma\beta n). \tag{2.8}$$

Now let us recall the following Riesz's theorem proved in [GS1]:

Lemma 2.7. *Let $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a subharmonic function on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $\partial\Omega$ consists of finitely many piece-wise C^1 curves. There exists a positive measure μ on Ω such that for any $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$ (i.e., Ω_1 is a compactly contained subregion of Ω),*

$$u(z) = \int_{\Omega_1} \log|z-\zeta|\, d\mu(\zeta) + h(z), \tag{2.9}$$

where h is harmonic on Ω_1 and μ is unique with this property. Moreover, μ and h satisfy the bounds

$$\mu(\Omega_1) \leq C(\Omega,\Omega_1)\,(\sup_{\Omega} u - \sup_{\Omega_1} u), \tag{2.10}$$

$$\|h - \sup_{\Omega_1} u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} \leq C(\Omega,\Omega_1,\Omega_2)\,(\sup_{\Omega} u - \sup_{\Omega_1} u) \tag{2.11}$$

for any $\Omega_2 \Subset \Omega_1$.

Notice that the ergodic measure for the shift on the Torus is the Lebesgue measure and $m(\mathbb{T}) = 1$. Then, $< u >= \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(x)dx$, and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} u(x+k\omega) - n < u >= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{\Omega_1} \log|\{x+k\omega\} - \zeta| d\mu(\zeta) - n\int_{\Omega_1} I(\zeta)d\mu(\zeta) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} h(\{x+k\omega\}) - n\int_0^1 h(y)dy.$$

Recall that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{\Omega_1} \log|\{x+k\omega\} - \zeta| d\mu(\zeta) = \int_{\Omega_1} F_{n,\zeta}(x) d\mu(\zeta).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 \exp\left(\sigma|\sum_{k=1}^{n} u(x+k\omega) - n < u > |\right)dx &\leq \left[\int_0^1 \exp\left(\sigma\left|\int_{\Omega_1}(F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta))d\mu(\zeta)\right|\right)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad\times\left[\int_0^1 \exp\left(\sigma\left|\sum_{k=1}^{n} h(\{x+k\omega\}) - n\int_0^1 h(y)dy\right|\right)dx\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\exp(\sigma\cdot)$ is a convex function, the Jensen's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 \exp\left(\sigma\left|\int_{\Omega_1}(F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta))d\mu(\zeta)\right|\right)dx &\leq \int_0^1\int_{\Omega_1} \exp\left(\sigma\mu(\Omega_1)\left|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)\right|\right)\frac{d\mu(\zeta)}{\mu(\Omega_1)}dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_1}\int_0^1 \exp\left(\sigma\mu(\Omega_1)\left|F_{n,\zeta}(x) - nI(\zeta)\right|\right)dx\frac{d\mu(\zeta)}{\mu(\Omega_1)} \\ &\leq \int \exp(C\sigma\mu(\Omega_1)\beta n)\frac{d\mu(\zeta)}{\mu(\Omega_1)} \leq \exp(C\sigma\mu(\Omega_1)\beta n).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining it with (2.8), we have for any $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{c_0}{\mu(\Omega_1)}$ and ω,

$$\int_0^1 \exp\left(\sigma|\sum_{k=1}^{n} u(x+k\omega) - n < u > |\right)dx < \exp(C\sigma\mu(\Omega_1)\beta n).$$

Recall the Markov's inequality: For any measurable extended real-valued function $f(x)$ and $\epsilon > 0$,we have

$$\text{mes}\ (\{x \in \mathbb{X} : |f(x)| \geq \epsilon\}) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}\int_{\mathbb{X}} |f|dx.$$

Let $f(x) = \exp\left(\sigma|\sum_{k=1}^{n} u(x+k\omega) - n < u > |\right)$ and $\epsilon = \exp(\sigma\delta n)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{X} : |\sum_{k=1}^{n} u(x+k\omega) - n < u > | > \delta n\right\}\right) &= \text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{X} : \exp\left(\sigma|\sum_{k=1}^{n} u(x+k\omega) - n < u > |\right) \geq \exp(\sigma\delta n)\right\}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-\sigma\delta n + C\sigma\mu(\Omega_1)\beta n)\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Therefore, if $\beta < \frac{\delta}{2C\mu(\Omega_1)}$, then we complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Remark 2.5. In this proof, we use the constant β only to make the inequality $\log q_{s+1} < \beta q_s$ hold for any $s > 0$. Thus, if we change β by $\bar{\beta}$, then for large n, this inequality and Theorem 1 still hold. But in this condition, the integer m and the constant c will depend on $\bar{\beta}$.

3. Positive Lyapunov Exponents and Strong Birkhoof Ergodic Theorem for Jacobi Operators

The fact that the determinant of $M_n^s(x, E, \omega)$, which is the transfer matrix of the Schrödinger operators and analytic in x, is always 1 makes $u_n^s(x, E, \omega) = \frac{1}{n} \log \|M_n^s(x, E, \omega)\|$ have the upper and lower bounds. Correspondingly, $M_n(x, E, \omega)$ is the one of the Jacobi operators. But it is not analytic, and its determinant and the logarithm of its norm have no bounds. Therefore, in the introduction we define the matrix $M_n^a(x, E, \omega)$, which is analytic, so that Theorem 1 can be applied to it in this section. We also define the matrix $M_n^u(x, E, \omega)$, whose determinant is 1, so that the Avalanche Principle can be applied to it in Section 5 and 6. On the other hand, what we want to present in the theorems is the fine properties associated with $M_n(x, E, \omega)$, such as Theorem 2 to 6. Therefore, in the rest of this paper, we need to transform these matrices into each another very often. We hope that these explanations can alleviate readers' confusion caused by these multiple matrices.

Theorem 5 and Lemma 3.2 we prove in this section have similar versions for the Schrödinger operators (1.14) in [SS] and [HZ] and there is no essential difference in their proofs. The reason why we do not omit this part is that the details especially the settings of λ_i are very important to our paper.

Now we start to study the Lyapunov exponents of the analytic quasi-periodic Jacobi cocycles. Choose Ω in Lemma 2.7 as (1.20) and let $\lambda_v > \lambda_1 := \frac{\lambda_a \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}$. Then

$$\sup_{E\in\mathscr{E}, z\in\Omega} u_n^a(z, E, \omega) \le \log(5\lambda_v \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}). \tag{3.1}$$

And if $\lambda_v > \lambda_2 := (5\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$, then

$$L^a(E, \omega) \le \sup_{E\in\mathscr{E}, z\in\Omega} u_n^a(z, E, \omega) \le (1 + \gamma) \log \lambda_v. \tag{3.2}$$

By the way, it is easy to see that if $\lambda_v > \max(\lambda_2, \lambda_D)$, where $\lambda_D = \frac{(\lambda_a \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}}{\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}$, then

$$D \le \log\left(\lambda_a \|a\|_{L^\infty_{\mathbb{T}}}\right) \le \log\left(\lambda_v \|v\|_{L^\infty_{\mathbb{T}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \le \frac{\gamma}{2} \log \lambda_v + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \lambda_v < \gamma \log \lambda_v. \tag{3.3}$$

To estimate the lower bound of $\sup_{z\in\Omega_1} u_n^a(z)$, we need the following lemma for the complex analytic function $v(z)$:

Lemma 3.1 (Lemma 14.5 in [BG]). *For all $0 < \delta < \rho$, there is an $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(v)$ such that*

$$\inf_{E_1} \sup_{\frac{\delta}{2}<y<\delta} \inf_{x\in[0,1]} |v(x + iy) - E_1| > \epsilon_0.$$

Therefore, for any E, λ_v and $0 < \delta < \rho$, there is $\frac{\delta}{2} < y_0 < \delta$ such that

$$\inf_{x\in[0,1]} |\lambda_v v(x + iy_0) - E| > \lambda_v \epsilon_0.$$

Let

$$M_{n-1}^a(x + iy_0, E, \omega) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{n-1} \\ h_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} g_n \\ h_n \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_v v\,(x + iy + (n-1)\omega) - E & -\lambda_a \tilde{a}(x + iy + (n-1)\omega) \\ \lambda_a a(x + iy + n\omega) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g_{n-1} \\ h_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda_v v\,(x + iy + (n-1)\omega) - E)\, g_{n-1} - \lambda_a \tilde{a}(x + iy + (n-1)\omega) h_{n-1} \\ \lambda_a a(x + iy + n\omega) g_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Set $\lambda_3 = \lambda_3(v, \lambda_a, a) = 2\lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}\epsilon_0^{-1}$. If $\lambda_v > \lambda_3$, then for any $E \in \mathscr{E}$, it implies

$$\inf_{x\in[0,1]} |\lambda_v v(x+iy_0) - E| > \lambda_v\epsilon_0 > 2\lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}.$$

Now we use the induction to show that

$$|g_n| \geq |h_n|, \quad \text{and} \quad |g_n| \geq (\lambda_v\epsilon_0 - \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})})|g_{n-1}| \geq (\lambda_v\epsilon_0 - \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})})^n, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Due to (3.4) and (3.5), it has that $g_0 = 1$, $h_0 = 0$ and

$$|g_1| = |\lambda_v v\,(x+iy) - E| > \lambda_v\epsilon_0, \quad |h_1| = |\lambda_a a(x+n\omega)| \leq \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}.$$

Let $|g_t| \geq |h_t|$ and $|g_t| > (\lambda\epsilon - \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})})|g_{t-1}| > (\lambda\epsilon_0 - \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})})^t$. Then, we finish this induction by

$$|g_{t+1}| \geq |(\lambda_v v\,(x+iy+t\omega) - E)\,g_t| - |\lambda_a\tilde{a}(x+iy+t\omega)h_t| > (\lambda_v\epsilon - \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})})^{t+1},$$

and

$$|h_{t+1}| \leq |\lambda_a a(x+iy+n\omega)g_t| < \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}|g_t| \leq |g_{t+1}|.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\|M_n^a(x+iy_0,E,\omega)\| \geq \left|\left\langle M_n^a(x+iy_0,E,\omega)\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix},\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix}\right\rangle\right| = |g_n| > (\lambda_v\epsilon_0 - \lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})})^n \geq \left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_v\epsilon_0\right)^n.$$

It implies that

$$u_n^a(x+iy_0,E,\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\log\|M_n^a(x+iy_0,E,\omega)\| \geq \log\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_v\epsilon_0\right).$$

Write $\mathbb{H} = \{z : \mathrm{Im}z > 0\}$ for the upper half-plane and $\mathbb{H}_s$ for the strip $\{z = x+iy : 0 < y < \frac{\rho}{5}\}$. Then denote by $\mu(z,\mathbb{E},\mathbb{H})$ the harmonic measure of $\mathbb{E}$ at $z \in \mathbb{H}$ and $\mu_s(iy_0,\mathbb{E}_s,\mathbb{H}_s)$ the harmonic measure of $\mathbb{E}_s$ at $iy_0 \in \mathbb{H}_s$, where $\mathbb{E} \subset \partial\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{E}_s \subset \partial\mathbb{H}_s = \mathbb{R}\bigcup[y = \frac{\rho}{5}]$. Note that $\psi(z) = \exp\left(\frac{5\pi}{\rho}z\right)$ is a conformal map from $\mathbb{H}_s$ onto $\mathbb{H}$. Due to [GM], we have

$$\mu_s(iy_0,\mathbb{E}_s,\mathbb{H}_s) \equiv \mu(\psi(iy_0),\psi(\mathbb{E}_s),\mathbb{H}),$$

and

$$\mu(z = x+iy,\mathbb{E},\mathbb{H}) = \int_{\mathbb{E}} \frac{y}{(t-x)^2+y^2}\frac{dt}{\pi}.$$

Thus

$$\mu_s[y = \frac{\rho}{5}] = \frac{5\pi y_0}{\pi\rho} < \frac{5\delta}{\rho}.$$

By the subharmonicity and (3.1), it yields that if $\lambda_v > \max(\lambda_1,\lambda_3)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_v\epsilon_0\right) < u_n^a(iy_0,E,\omega) &\leq \int_{[y=0]\bigcup[y=\frac{\rho}{5}]} u_n^a(z,E,\omega)\mu_s(dz)\\
&= \int_{y=0} u_n^a(x,E,\omega)\mu_s(dx) + \int_{y=\frac{\rho}{5}} u_n^a(x+iy,E,\omega)\mu_s(dx)\\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n^a(x,E,\omega)\mu_s(dx) + \frac{5\delta}{\rho}\left[\sup_{y=\frac{\rho}{5}} u_n^a(x+iy,E,\omega)\right]\\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n^a(x,E,\omega)\mu_s(dx) + \frac{5\delta}{\rho}\log\left(5\lambda_v\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

So, if $\delta < \frac{\gamma\rho}{10}$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_4 := 5\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon_0}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n(x,E,\omega)\mu_s(dx) \geq \log\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_v\epsilon_0\right) - \frac{5\delta}{\rho}\log\left(5\lambda_v\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right) > (1-\gamma)\log\lambda_v. \tag{3.6}$$

Set

$$u_n^h(x) = u_n^a(x+h), \quad h \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Then, due to Lemma 3.1, it is obvious that (3.6) also holds for $u_n^h(x)$. So, for any $h \in \mathbb{T}$, it has

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n^a(x+h)\mu_s(dx) > (1-\gamma)\log\lambda_v.$$

Integrating in $h \in \mathbb{T}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} L_n^a(E,\omega) = \int_0^1 u_n^a(x+h,E,\omega)dh &\geq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mu_s(dx)\right)\times\left(\int_0^1 u_n^a(x+h,E,\omega)dh\right) \\ &= \int_0^1\int_{\mathbb{R}} u_n(x+h,E,\omega)\mu_s(dx)dxdh \\ &> (1-\gamma)\log\lambda_v, \quad \forall n \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining it with (3.2) and (3.3), we finish the proof of Theorem 5 with $n \to +\infty$ and

$$\lambda_v > \lambda_p := \max\left(5\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}, 2\lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}, \frac{(\lambda_a\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}}{\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}\right)\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon_0}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}} > \max(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4,\lambda_D). \tag{3.7}$$

Remark 3.1. For the Schrödinger operators, due to Lemma 3.1, $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} > \epsilon_0$. Therefore, there exists $\lambda_p^s := \left(\frac{20\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\epsilon_0^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$ such that if $\lambda_s > \lambda_p^s$, then $L^s(E,\omega)$ is positive for any irrational ω and $E \in \mathcal{E}_s$ as follows:

$$(1-\gamma)\log\lambda_s < L_n^s(E,\omega) < (1+\gamma)\log\lambda_s, \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

where $\mathcal{E}_s := [-2-\lambda\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, 2+\lambda\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}]$. What's more, for any irrational ω , $E \in \mathcal{E}_s$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$u_n^s(x,E,\omega) \leq M_0^s \leq (1+\gamma)\log\lambda.$$

On the other hand, if we choose Ω_1 in Lemma 2.7 as (1.21) and $\delta = \frac{\rho}{2}$ in Lemma 3.1, then

$$\sup_{E\in\mathscr{E},z\in\Omega_1} u_n^a(z,E,\omega) \geq \log\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_v\epsilon_0\right), \quad \lambda_v > \lambda_3.$$

Combining it with (2.10) and (3.1), we have the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *There exist* $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(v,\lambda_a,a) := \max(\lambda_1,\lambda_3)$ *and* $C_v = C_v(v) = C(\Omega,\Omega_1)\log\frac{10\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\epsilon_0}$ *such that for* $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$,

$$\mu_u(\Omega_1) \leq C_v,$$

where μ_u *is the unique measure for* $u_n^a(z,E,\omega)$ *in Lemma 2.7.*

Thus, Theorem 1 can be applied to $u_n^a(x,E,\omega)$ as follows:

Lemma 3.3. *There exists* $c_v = c_v(v) := \frac{1}{2CC_v}$ *such that if* $\beta < c_v\delta$ *and* $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$, *then for any positive* k *and* n,

$$\text{mes}\left\{\left\{x\in\mathbb{T} : |\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^k u_n^a(x+j\omega) - L_n^a(E,\omega)| > \delta\right\}\right\} < \exp(-\bar{c}_v\delta k),$$

where $\bar{c}_v = \frac{c}{C_v}$.

Remark 3.2. For the Schrödinger operators($\lambda_a a \equiv 1$), we have that if $\beta < c_s\delta$ and $\lambda_s > \lambda_0^s(v) := 2\epsilon_0^{-1}$, then for any positive k and n,

$$\text{mes}\left\{\left\{x\in\mathbb{T} : |\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^k u_n^s(x+j\omega) - L_n^s(E,\omega)| > \delta\right\}\right\} < \exp(-\bar{c}_v\delta k).$$

Similar computations show that for any $\lambda_a \neq 0$,

$$\mu_d(\Omega_1) \leq C(\Omega, \Omega_1) \log \frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}} := C_a,$$

where μ_d is the unique measure in Lemma 2.7 for $d(z, \omega)$ defined in (1.12). Correspondingly, the following two strong Birkhoff Ergodic Theorems both hold:

Lemma 3.4. *There exists $c_a = c_a(a) = \frac{1}{2CC_a}$ such that if $\beta < c_a\delta$, then for any positive k,*

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} \log|a(x + j\omega)| - D\right| > \delta\right\}\right) < \exp(-\bar{c}_a\delta k),$$

and

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} d(x + j\omega, \omega) - 2D\right| > \delta\right\}\right) < \exp(-\bar{c}_a\delta k),$$

where $\bar{c}_a = \frac{c}{C_a}$.

Remark 3.3. By (1.11), Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, it implies that if $\beta < \min(c_v\delta, c_a\delta)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$, then

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : |\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_n^u(x + j\omega) - L_n(E, \omega)| > 2\delta\right\}\right) < \exp(-\bar{c}_v\delta k) + \exp(-\bar{c}_a\delta k).$$

Set $C_{v,a} = \max(\log \frac{10\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\epsilon_0}, \log \frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}})$. Then, there exist $c_{v,a} = \frac{1}{2CC(\Omega,\Omega_1)C_{v,a}}$ and $\bar{c}_{v,a} = \frac{c}{C(\Omega,\Omega_1)C_{v,a}}$ such that for any $\delta > 0$, if $\beta < c_{v,a}\delta$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$, then

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : |\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_n^u(x + j\omega) - L_n(E, \omega)| > \delta\right\}\right) < \exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}\delta k). \tag{3.8}$$

And to reduce the plaguing of too many symbols, we can use $c_{v,a}$ and $\bar{c}_{v,a}$ instead of c_v and $\bar{c}_v$ in Lemma 3.3, and of c_a and $\bar{c}_a$ in Lemma 3.4, as $c_{v,a} = \min(c_v, c_a)$ and $\bar{c}_{v,a} = \min(\bar{c}_v, \bar{c}_a)$.

4. The Proof of Theorem 2

Define

$$\mathbb{X}_m = \left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \left|\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} d(x + j\omega) - 2D\right| > \frac{k}{m}D\right\}.$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have that if $\beta < c_{v,a}\delta$, then mes $(\mathbb{X}_m) = \exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}\delta k)$ for any $1 \leq m \leq k$. It implies that

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \left|\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{k-j}{k} d(x + j\omega) - (k+1)D\right| > k\delta\right\}\right) < k\exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}\delta k). \tag{4.1}$$

Corollary 2.3 in [T] proved that

$$-\frac{2Mk}{n} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{k-j}{nk} d(x + j\omega) \leq u_n^a(x, E, \omega) - \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_n^a(x + k\omega, E, \omega) \leq \frac{2Mk}{n} - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{k-j}{nk} d(x + (n + j - 1)\omega). \tag{4.2}$$

So, we define

$$\mathbb{Y}_- = \left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : -\frac{2Mk}{n} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{k-j}{nk} d(x + j\omega) < -\delta\right\}$$

and let $k = C_1\delta n$ and $4C_1M \leq 1$. Then

$$\mathbb{Y}_- \subset \left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{k-j}{k} d(x + j\omega) < -\frac{\delta n}{2} = -\frac{k}{2C_1}\right\}.$$

Assume $6C_1|D| \le 1$ to make $\frac{1}{2C_1} + D = C_2 > 2|D| \ge 0$ and

$$\frac{k}{2C} + (k+1)D = C_2 k + D \ge |D|k.$$

It implies that if $\beta < c_{v,a}|D|$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mes}\,(\mathbb{Y})_- &< \text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{k-j}{k} d(x+j\omega) - (k+1)D < -k|D|\right\}\right) < k\exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|k) \\ &= C_1\delta n \exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}C_1|D|\delta n). \end{aligned}$$

Because $y\exp(-\zeta y) \le \zeta^{-1}$ for any $y, \zeta > 0$,so

$$\begin{aligned} C_1\delta n \exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}C_1|D|\delta n) &= C_1\delta n \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|}{2}C_1\delta n)\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|}{2}C_1\delta n) \le \frac{2}{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|}{2}C_1\delta n) \\ &= \exp(-\bar{c}_1\delta n), \forall n \ge n_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{c}_1 = \bar{c}_1(v,a,|D|,M_0) = \frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|C_1}{4} < \bar{c}_{v,a}$ and $n_1 = n_1(a,v,|D|,M_0,\delta)$ satisfying

$$n_1 = \frac{-4\log\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|}{2}}{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|C_1\delta}. \tag{4.3}$$

Similar calculations show that

$$\text{mes}\,(\mathbb{Y}_+) = \text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \frac{2Mk}{n} - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\frac{k-j}{nk} d(x+(n+j-1)\omega) > \delta\right\}\right) < \exp(-\bar{c}_1\delta n).$$

Therefore, we have the deviation estimation as follows:

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\delta > 0$, if $\beta < c_{v,a}\min(\delta,|D|)$, then*

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : \left|u_n^a(x,E,\omega) - \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_n^a(x+k\omega,E,\omega)\right| > \delta\right\}\right) < 2\exp(-\bar{c}_1\delta n), \quad \forall n \ge n_1.$$

Combining it with Lemma 3.3, we have the following LDT for $u_n^a(x,E,\omega)$:

Lemma 4.2. *For any $\delta > 0$, if $\beta < c_{v,a}\min(\delta,|D|)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$, then*

$$\text{mes}\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{T} : |u_n^a(x,E,\omega) - L_n^a(E,\omega)| > \frac{3\delta}{4}\right\}\right) < \exp(-\bar{c}_{a,v}C_1\left(\frac{\delta}{4}\right)^2 n) + 2\exp(-\bar{c}_1\frac{\delta}{4}n), \quad \forall n \ge n_1.$$

Remark 4.1. For the Schrödinger operators, $d(x) \equiv 1$ and

$$\left|u_n^s(x,E,\omega) - \frac{1}{k}u_n^s(x+k\omega,E,\omega)\right| \le \frac{2M_0^s k}{n}.$$

Then, due to Remark 3.2 and the setting $k = \frac{\delta n}{4M_0^s}$, we have if $\beta < c_v\delta$ and $\lambda_s > \lambda_0^s$, then there exists $\bar{c}_s = \bar{c}_s(\lambda,v) := \frac{1}{8M_0^s}\bar{c}_v$ such that for any positive n,

$$\text{mes}\,(\{x \in \mathbb{T} : |u_n^s(x,E,\omega) - L_n^s(E,\omega)| > \delta\}) < \exp\left(-\bar{c}_v\frac{\delta}{2}\frac{\delta n}{4M_0^s}\right) = \exp(-\bar{c}_s\delta^2 n).$$

Proof of Theorem 2. The theorem is obtained directly by the setting of $\bar{c}_1$, (1.9), Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.2. □

With the similar process by changing (1.9) to (1.11), we have the following LDT for $u_n^u(x,E,\omega)$, which will be applied to satisfy the assumption (5.1) in the Avalanche Principle:

Lemma 4.3. *For any $\delta > 0$ and $E \in \mathscr{E}$, if $\beta < c_{v,a}\min(\delta, |D|)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$, then*

$$\text{mes}\,(\{x \in \mathbb{T} : |u_n^u(x,E,\omega) - L_n(E,\omega)| > \delta\}) < \exp(-\bar{c}_{a,v}C_1\left(\frac{\delta}{4}\right)^2 n) + 3\exp(-\bar{c}_1\frac{\delta}{4}n), \forall n \geq n_1.$$

Remark 4.2. If $\delta < \delta_0 = \frac{8\bar{c}_1}{\bar{c}_{av}C_1}$, then

$$\text{mes}\,(\{x \in \mathbb{T} : |u_n^u(x,E,\omega) - L_n(E,\omega)| > \delta\}) < \exp(-\bar{c}_u\delta^2 n), \quad \forall n \geq n_1, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\bar{c}_u = \frac{\bar{c}_{a,v}C_1}{20}$.

5. Applications of Avalanche Principle and the Positive Lyapunov Exponents on an Interval

Avalanche Principle is the following:

Proposition 5.1 (Avalanche Principle)**.** *Let $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ be a sequence of 2×2–matrices whose determinants satisfy*

$$\max_{1\leq j\leq n} |\det A_j| \leq 1. \tag{5.1}$$

Suppose that

$$\min_{1\leq j\leq n} \|A_j\| \geq \gamma > n \quad \textit{and} \tag{5.2}$$

$$\max_{1\leq j<n} [\log\|A_{j+1}\| + \log\|A_j\| - \log\|A_{j+1}A_j\|] < \frac{1}{2}\log\gamma. \tag{5.3}$$

Then

$$\left|\log\|A_n\cdot\ldots\cdot A_1\| + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1}\log\|A_j\| - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\log\|A_{j+1}A_j\|\right| < C\frac{n}{\gamma} \tag{5.4}$$

with some absolute constant C.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume $L_n(E,\omega) > 0$, $\delta = \min\left(1, \delta_0, \frac{1}{15}L_n(E,\omega)\right)$, $L_{2n}(E,\omega) > \frac{9}{10}L_n(E,\omega)$, $\beta < c_{v,a}\min\left(\frac{L_n(E,\omega)}{15}, |D|\right)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$. Let $N = mn$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n) \leq m \leq \exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n) + 1$. There exists $n_2 = n_2(\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v, \delta)$ such that for any $n \geq n_2$,*

$$|L_N(E,\omega) + L_n(E,\omega) - 2L_{2n}(E,\omega)| \leq \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{20}\delta^2 n). \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. By (4.4), we have, for $0 \leq j \leq m-1$ and $\forall x \in \mathbb{G}$,

$$|u_n^u(x + jn\omega, E, \omega) - L_n(E,\omega)| < \frac{L_n(E,\omega)}{15},$$

$$|u_{2n}^u(x + jn\omega, E, \omega) - L_{2n}(E,\omega)| < \frac{L_n(E,\omega)}{15},$$

with

$$\text{mes}\,(\mathbb{T}\backslash\mathbb{G}) \leq 2m \times \exp\left(-\bar{c}_u\delta^2 n\right) < 2\exp(-\frac{2\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n).$$

Thus, when $x \in \mathbb{G}$,

$$\|M_n^u(x + jn\omega, E, \omega)\| > \exp(\frac{14}{15}nL_n(E,\omega)),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\log\|M_n^u(x + jn\omega, E, \omega)\| + \log\|M_n^u(x + (j+1)n\omega, E, \omega)\| - \log\|M_n^u(x + jn\omega, E, \omega)M_n^u(x + (j+1)n\omega, E, \omega)\|\right| \\ &< 4n\frac{L_n(E,\omega)}{100} + 2n|L_n(E,\omega) - L_{2n}(E,\omega)| < \frac{7}{15}nL_n(E,\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Avalanche Principle applies for $\gamma = \exp(\frac{14}{15}nL_n(E))$. Integrating over $\mathbb{G}$, we obtain

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{G}} u_N^u(x,E,\omega)dx + \frac{1}{m}\int_{\mathbb{G}}\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} u_n^u(x+(j-1)n\omega,E,\omega)dx - \frac{2}{m}\int_{\mathbb{G}}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} u_{2n}^u(x+(j-1)n\omega,E,\omega)dx\right| \tag{5.6}$$
$$\leq C\frac{m}{N}\exp(-\frac{14}{15}nL_n(E,\omega)).$$

We want to replace integration over $\mathbb{G}$ by integration over $\mathbb{T}$. By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it has for any E, ω and n,

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}\backslash\mathbb{G}} u_n^u(x,E,\omega)dx\right| \leq \|u_n^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}\Big(\text{mes }(\mathbb{T}\backslash\mathbb{G})\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \|u_n^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n).$$

Thus

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}\backslash\mathbb{G}} u_N^u(x,E,\omega)dx + \frac{1}{m}\int_{\mathbb{T}\backslash\mathbb{G}}\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} u_n^u(x+(j-1)m\omega,E,\omega)dx - \frac{2}{m}\int_{\mathbb{T}\backslash\mathbb{G}}\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} u_{2n}^u(x+(j-1)N\omega,E,\omega)dx\right|$$
$$\leq 4\|u_n^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n).$$

Combining it with (5.6), we have

$$|L_N(E,\omega) + \frac{m-2}{m}L_n(E,\omega) - \frac{2(m-1)}{m}L_{2n}(E,\omega)| \leq 4\|u_n^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n) + C\frac{m}{N}\exp(-\frac{14}{15}nL_n(E,\omega)).$$

Thus, if $\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n) \leq m \leq \exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n) + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&|L_N(E,\omega) + L_n(E,\omega) - 2L_{2n}(E,\omega)| \\
\leq\ & 4\|u_n^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n) + C\frac{m}{N}\exp(-\frac{1}{2}nL_n(E,\omega)) + \frac{2}{m}|L_n(E,\omega) - L_{2n}(E,\omega)| \\
<\ & 4\sup_{E\mathcal{E}}\|M^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 n) + C\frac{m}{N}\exp(-\frac{14}{15}nL_n(E,\omega)) + \frac{1}{5m}L_n(E,\omega) \\
\leq\ & \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 n), \quad \forall n \geq n_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$n_2 = n_2(\lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v, \delta) = \frac{12\log\left(5\sup_{E\in\mathcal{E}}\|M^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}\right)}{\bar{c}_u\delta^2}. \tag{5.7}$$

□

Lemma 5.2. *Assume $L_n(E,\omega) > 0$, $\delta = \min\left(1, \delta_0, \frac{1}{15}L_n(E,\omega)\right)$, $L_{2n}(E,\omega) > \frac{9}{10}L_n(E,\omega)$, $\beta < c_{v,a}\min\left(\frac{L_n(E,\omega)}{15}, |D|\right)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$. Then, for any $n \geq n_2$,*

$$|L(E,\omega) + L_n(E,\omega) - 2L_{2n}(E,\omega)| < \exp\left(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{5}\delta^2 n\right). \tag{5.8}$$

Proof. By lemma 5.1 for $N_0 = n$, $N_1 = mN_0$ and $\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 N_0) \leq m < \exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta^2 N_0) + 1$, we have

$$|L_{N_1}(E,\omega) + L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - 2L_{2N_0}(E,\omega)| < \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 N_0), \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$|L_{2N_1}(E,\omega) + L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - 2L_{2N_0}(E,\omega)| < \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 N_0).$$

In particular

$$|L_{N_1}(E,\omega) - L_{2N_1}(E,\omega)| < 2\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 N_0).$$

Since $0 \leq L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - L_{2N_0}(E,\omega) < \frac{1}{10}L_{N_0}(E,\omega)$ and (5.9), we obtain that

$$L_{N_1}(E,\omega) > L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - 2(L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - L_{2N_0}(E,\omega)) - \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 N_0) > \frac{4}{5}L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 N_0) > 79\delta,$$

and

$$|L_{N_1}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_1}(E,\omega)|\le 2\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{20}\delta^2N_0)<2\delta<\frac{2}{79}L_{N_1}(E,\omega)<\frac{1}{10}L_{N_1}(E,\omega).$$

Set $\delta'=\frac{1}{2}\delta$. Then $L_{N_1}(E,\omega)>15\delta'$, and Lemma 5.1 applies for $N_2=m_1N_1$ and $\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta'^2N_1)\le m_1<\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta'^2N_1)+1$. Therefore,

$$|L_{N_2}(E,\omega)+L_{N_1}(E,\omega)-2L_{2N_1}(E,\omega)|\le\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_1),$$

$$L_{N_2}(E,\omega)>L_{N_1}(E,\omega)-2|L_{N_1}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_1}(E,\omega)|-\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_1)>\frac{4}{5}L_{N_0}(E,\omega)-6\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2N_0)>79\delta>100\delta',$$

$$|L_{2N_2}(E,\omega)+L_{N_1}(E,\omega)-2L_{2N_1}(E,\omega)|\le\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_1),$$

and

$$|L_{N_2}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_2}(E,\omega)|<2\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_1).$$

Since $N_1>8N_0$, we have

$$\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_1)=\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\frac{\delta^2}{4}N_1)<(\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2N_0))^2<(\frac{\delta}{12})^2.$$

This implies in particular that

$$|L_{N_2}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_2}(E,\omega)|<2\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_1)<2\delta<\frac{1}{10}L_{N_2}(E,\omega).$$

Then Lemma 5.1 applies for $N_3=m_2N_2$ and $\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta'^2N_2)\le m_2<\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta'^2N_2)+1$. E.T.C.. We obtain $N_{i+1}=m_iN_i$ and $\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta'^2N_i)\le m_i<\exp(\frac{\bar{c}_u}{3}\delta'^2N_i)+1$. Then

$$|L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)+L_{N_i}(E,\omega)-2L_{2N_i}(E,\omega)|\le\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_i),$$

$$L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)>L_{N_i}(E,\omega)-2|L_{N_i}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_i}(E,\omega)|-\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_i)>\frac{4}{5}L_{N_0}(E,\omega)-\sum_{j=1}^{i}(\frac{1}{2})^j\delta\ge 79\delta>50\delta=100\delta',$$

$$|L_{2N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)+L_{N_i}(E,\omega)-2L_{2N_i}(E,\omega)|\le\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_i),$$

$$|L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)|<2\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_i),$$

$$4\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_i)<(\frac{1}{2})^{i+1}\delta,$$

and

$$|L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)|<2\delta<\frac{1}{10}L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}|L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)-L_{N_i}(E,\omega)| &\le |L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega)+L_{N_i}(E,\omega)-2L_{2N_i}(E,\omega)|+2|L_{N_i}(E,\omega)-L_{2N_i}(E,\omega)|\\ &< \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_i)+4\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_{i-1})<5\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2N_{i-1}),\quad i\ge 2,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$|L_{N_2}(E,\omega)-L_{N_1}(E,\omega)|<5\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2N_0).$$

Since $L_{N_i} \to L(E,\omega)$ with $i \to \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |L(E,\omega) + L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - 2L_{2N_0}(E,\omega)| \\
= & \Big|\sum_{i\geq 1}(L_{N_{i+1}}(E,\omega) - L_{N_i}(E,\omega)) + L_{N_1}(E,\omega) + L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - 2L_{2N_0}(E,\omega)\Big| \\
\leq & \sum_{s\geq 1}|L_{N_{s+1}}(E,\omega) - L_{N_s}(E,\omega)| + |L_{N_1}(E,\omega) + L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - 2L_{2N_0}(E,\omega)| \\
= & \sum_{s\geq 2}|L_{N_{s+1}}(E,\omega) - L_{N_s}(E,\omega)| + |L_{N_2}(E,\omega) - L_{N_1}(E,\omega)| + |L_{N_1}(E,\omega) + L_{N_0}(E,\omega) - 2L_{2N_0}(E,\omega)| \\
< & \sum_{s\geq 2} 5\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta'^2 N_{i-1}) + 5\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 N_0) + \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{4}\delta^2 N_0) \\
< & \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_u}{5}\delta^2 N_0).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Assume $L(E_0,\omega_0) > 0$. There exists $n_3 = n_3(\lambda_a a, \lambda_v v, L(E_0,\omega_0))$ such that for any $n \geq n_3$, if $|E - E_0| < r_E(n) = \frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{200n}\exp(-(n-1)M_0 - 2|D|n)$, then*

$$|L_n(E_0,\omega_0) - L_n(E,\omega_0)| \leq \frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{100}. \tag{5.10}$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Big|\|M_n^a(x,E_0,\omega)\| - \|M_n^a(x,E,\omega)\|\Big| \leq \|M_n^a(x,E_0,\omega) - M_n^a(x,E,\omega)\| \\
\leq & \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\Big(\|M^a(x+(n-1)\omega,E_0,\omega)\times\cdots\times M^a(x+(j+1)\omega,E_0,\omega)\|\times \\
& \quad \|M^a(x+j\omega,E_0,\omega) - M^a(x+j\omega,E,\omega)\|\times\|M^a(x+(j-1)\omega,E,\omega)\times\cdots\times M^a(x,E,\omega)\|\Big) \\
\leq & ne^{(n-1)M_0}|E_0 - E|.
\end{aligned}$$

By (1.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\|M_n^u(x,E_0,\omega)\| - \|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|\Big| &= \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}d(x+j\omega,\omega)\Big)\Big|\|M_n^a(x,E_0,\omega)\| - \|M_n^a(x,E,\omega)\|\Big| \\
&\leq ne^{(n-1)M_0}\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}d(x+j\omega,\omega)\Big)|E_0 - E|.
\end{aligned}$$

Assume, for instance, that $\|M_n^u(x,E_0,\omega)\| \geq \|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\log\|M_n^u(x,E_0,\omega)\| - \log\|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|\Big| &= \log(1 + \frac{\|M_n^u(x,E_0,\omega)\| - \|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|}{\|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|}) \\
&\leq \Big|\frac{\|M_n^u(x,E_0,\omega)\| - \|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|}{\|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|}\Big| \\
&\leq \Big|\|M_n^u(x,E_0,\omega)\| - \|M_n^u(x,E,\omega)\|\Big| \\
&\leq ne^{(n-1)M_0}\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}d(x+j\omega,\omega)\Big)|E_0 - E|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Thus, due to Lemma 3.4, we have that if $\beta \le c_{v,a}|D|$, then there exists $\mathbb{B}_D$ satisfying mes $(\mathbb{B}_D) \le \exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|n)$ such that when $x \notin \mathbb{B}_D$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2} d(x + j\omega) > nD - n|D| \ge -2n|D|.$$

The same estimate holds if $\|M_n^u(x, E_0, \omega)\| \le \|M_n^u(x, E, \omega)\|$. So

$$\left|\log \|M_n^u(x, E_0, \omega)\| - \log \|M_n^u(x, E, \omega)\|\right| \le n \exp\left((n-1)M_0\right) \exp(2|D|n)|E_0 - E|, \tag{5.12}$$

when $x \notin \mathbb{B}_D$. Set $r_E(n) = \frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{200} \left[n \exp\left((n-1)M_0\right) \exp(2|D|n)\right]^{-1}$. Therefore, if $|E - E_0| \le r_E(n)$, then

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}\setminus\mathbb{B}_D} u_n^u(x, E_0, \omega_0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}\setminus\mathbb{B}_D} u_n^u(x, E, \omega_0) \right| < \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{200}.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it has for any E, ω and n,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_D} u_n^u(x, E, \omega) dx \right| \le \|u_n^u(\cdot, E, \omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} \left(\text{mes } (\mathbb{B}_D)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \sup_{E\in\mathcal{E}} \|M^u(\cdot, E, \omega)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} \exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{2}|D|n).$$

Thus, there exists $n_3 = n_3(\lambda_a a, \lambda_v v, L(E_0, \omega_0))$ satisfying

$$n_3 = \frac{2}{\bar{c}_{v,a}|D|} \log\left[\frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{200} \sup_{E\in\mathcal{E}} \|M^u(\cdot, E, \omega_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^{-1} \right] \tag{5.13}$$

such that for any $n \ge n_3$, if $|E - E_0| < r_E(n)$, then

$$|L_n(E_0, \omega_0) - L_n(E, \omega_0)| \le \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100}.$$

□

Now, we can get an interval centered at E_0, where the Lyapunov exponent is always positive.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume $L(E_0, \omega_0) > 0$, $\beta(\omega_0) < c_{v,a} \min\left(\frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{15}, |D|\right)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$. There exists $r_E > 0$ such that for any $|E - E_0| < r_E$,*

$$\frac{6}{5} L(E_0, \omega_0) > L(E, \omega_0) > \frac{4}{5} L(E_0, \omega_0).$$

Proof. By the subadditive property, there exists $n_4 = n_4(\lambda_a a, \lambda_v v, \omega_0, E_0)$ such that for any $n \ge n_4$,

$$L_n(E_0, \omega_0) - L(E_0, \omega_0) < \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100} \text{ and } L_n(E_0, \omega_0) - L_{2n}(E_0, \omega_0) < \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100}.$$

Thus, for any $|E - E_0| \le r_E(2n_4)$, it has

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(E, \omega_0) &\ge L(E_0, \omega_0) - |L_n(E, \omega_0) - L_n(E_0, \omega_0)| - |L_n(E_0, \omega_0) - L(E_0, \omega_0)| \\ &> L(E_0, \omega_0) - \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100} - \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100} = \frac{49}{50} L(E_0, \omega_0) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |L_n(E, \omega_0) - L_{2n}(E, \omega_0)| &\le |L_n(E, \omega_0) - L_n(E_0, \omega_0)| + |L_n(E_0, \omega_0) - L_{2n}(E_0, \omega_0)| + |L_{2n}(E_0, \omega_0) - L_{2n}(E, \omega_0)| \\ &< \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100} + \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100} + \frac{L(E_0, \omega_0)}{100} = \frac{3}{100} L(E_0, \omega_0) < \frac{1}{10} L_n(E, \omega_0). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Lemma 5.2 applies for $L_n(E, \omega_0)$. It implies that if $n > n_2$, then

$$L(E, \omega_0) > L_n(E, \omega_0) - |L_n(E, \omega_0) - L_{2n}(E, \omega_0)| - \exp(-\bar{c}_u \delta^2 n) > \frac{441}{500} L(E_0) - \exp(-\bar{c}_u \delta^2 n) > \frac{4}{5} L(E_0, \omega_0).$$

Let $r_E = r_E(\max(n_2, n_3, 2n_4))$ and $L(E, \omega_0) < \frac{6}{5} L(E_0, \omega_0)$ by similar computations. □

Remark 5.1. Due to the compactness in E and the joint continuity of $L(E, \omega)$, there exists r_ω such that for any $|\omega - \omega_0| \le r_\omega$ and $|E - E_0| \le r_E$,

$$\frac{5}{4} L(E_0, \omega_0) > L(E, \omega) > \frac{3}{4} L(E_0, \omega_0).$$

When we consider the Schröndinger operators, we can calculate the expression of r_ω:

Lemma 5.5. *Assume $L^s(E_0,\omega_0) > 0$, $\beta(\omega_0) < \frac{c_s}{100}L^s(E_0,\omega_0)$ and $\lambda_s > \lambda_0^s$. There exist $r_E^s = r_E^s(\lambda_s, v, E_0, \omega_0)$ and $r_\omega^s = r_\omega^s(\lambda_s, v, E_0, \omega_0)$ such that for any $|\omega-\omega_0| < r_\omega^s$, $|E-E_0| < r_E^s$ and $\beta(\omega) < \frac{c_s}{100}L^s(E_0,\omega_0)$,*

$$\frac{6}{5}L^s(E_0,\omega_0) > L^s(E,\omega) > \frac{4}{5}L^s(E_0,\omega_0).$$

Proof.

$$\left|\|M_n^s(x,E,\omega_0)\| - \|M_n^s(x,E,\omega)\|\right| \le \|M_n^s(x,E,\omega_0) - M_n^s(x,E,\omega)\| \tag{5.14}$$

$$\le \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\Big(\|M^s(x+(n-1)\omega_0,E,\omega_0)\times\cdots\times M^s(x+(j+1)\omega_0,E,\omega_0)\|\times$$

$$\|M^s(x+j\omega_0),E,\omega_0) - M^s(x+j\omega,E,\omega)\|\times\|M^s(x+(j-1)\omega,E,\omega)\times\cdots\times M^s(x,E,\omega)\|\Big)$$

$$\le n^2\lambda_s V\exp\Big((n-1)M_0^s\Big)|\omega_0-\omega|,$$

where $V = \max_{\mathbb{T}}(v'(x))$. Like the proof of Lemma 5.3, similar computations show that for any $n \ge n_4^s$, it has

$$|L_n^s(E_0,\omega) - L_n^s(E_0,\omega_0)| \le \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{100},$$

when $|\omega-\omega_0| \le r_\omega^s(n)$, where $r_\omega^s(n) = \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{400n\lambda_s V}\exp(-nM_0^s)$. Similarly,

$$|L_n^s(E_0,\omega_0) - L_n^s(E,\omega_0)| \le \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{100},$$

when $|E-E_0| \le r_E^s(n)$, where $r_E^s = \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{200n}\exp(-nM_0^s)$. Combining them with (5.10), we have

$$|L_n^s(E,\omega) - L_n^s(E_0,\omega_0)| \le \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{50},$$

when $|\omega-\omega_0| \le r_\omega(n)$ and $|E-E_0| \le r_E(n)$. Thus, Lemma 5.2 holds for $L_n^s(E,\omega)$ and this lemma is proved similarly as Lemma 5.4 with the settings $r_\omega^s = r_\omega^s(\max(n_2^s, 2n_4^s))$ and $r_E^s = r_E^s(\max(n_2^s, 2n_4^s))$, where

$$n_2^s := \frac{60M_0^s}{\bar{c}_s\min^2\left(1, \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{100}\right)} \tag{5.15}$$

and n_4^s is the integer which makes $L_n^s(E_0,\omega_0) - L^s(E_0,\omega_0) < \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{100}$ for any $n \ge n_4^s$. □

6. Proofs of the rest Theorems

Before showing the proofs, we first need the following Lemma (Theorem 1.5 in [AJS]) to get the uniform convergence of $u_n^u(x,E,\omega)$:

Lemma 6.1. *The functions $\mathbb{R}\times C^\omega(\mathbb{T},\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d,\mathbb{C}^d)) \ni (\omega,A) \mapsto L_k(\omega,A) \in [-\infty,\infty)$ are continuous at any (ω',A') with $\omega' \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}$. Here $C^\omega(\mathbb{T},\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d,\mathbb{C}^d))$ means the set of the functions which are complex analytic from $\mathbb{T}$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d,\mathbb{C}^d)$.*

Lemma 6.2. *Assume $L(E_0,\omega_0) > 0$, $\beta(\omega_0) < c_{v,a}\min\left(\frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{15}, |D|\right)$ and $\lambda_v > \lambda_0$. Then there exists $n_5 = n_5(\omega_0, E_0, r_E, r_\omega, \lambda_a, a, \lambda_v, v)$ such that for any $n > n_5$, $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $E \in [E_0 - r_E, E_0 + r_E]$ and irrational $\omega \in [\omega_0 - r_\omega, \omega_0 + r_\omega]$,*

$$u_n^u(x,E,\omega) \le \frac{6}{5}L(E,\omega). \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. Furman [F] proved the uniformity in x for any continuous cocycle on a uniquely ergodic system. Then, due to the continuity of L^a in E by Lemma 6.1 and the compactness, we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} u_n^a(x,E,\omega) \le L^a(E,\omega).$$

uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{T}$ and $E \in [E_0 - r_E, E_0 + r_E]$. Similarly,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} d(z + j\omega, \omega) \le D$$

uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{T}$. Thus, this lemma follows directly from (1.11). □

Remark 6.1. By Theorem 5, if $\lambda_v > \lambda_p$, then $L(E, \omega)$ is always positive. Thus, (6.1) holds for any $E \in \mathcal{E}$ and irrational ω.

Remark 6.2. For the Schrödinger operators, due to the joint continuity of Lyapunov exponent in (E, ω), we have that if $L^s(E_0, \omega_0) > 0, \beta(\omega_0) < \frac{c_s}{15} L^s(E_0, \omega_0)$ and $\lambda_s > \lambda_0^s$, then for any $n > n_5^s$, $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $|E - E_0| \le r_E^s$ and $|\omega - \omega_0| \le r_\omega^s$, it has

$$u_n^s(x, E, \omega) \le \frac{6}{5} L^s(E, \omega). \tag{6.2}$$

What's more, by Remark 3.1, if $\lambda > \lambda_p^s(\frac{1}{50})$, then for any $n \ge 1$, $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $E \in \mathcal{E}_s$ and irrational ω,

$$u_n^s(x, E, \omega) < \frac{51}{50} \log \lambda \text{ and } L_{2n}^s(E, \omega) > \frac{9}{10} L_n^s(E, \omega). \tag{6.3}$$

Proof of Theorem 3. Remark 5.1 proves the property that $L(E, \omega)$ is positive in the neighborhood of (E_0, ω_0). Now we start the proofs of the sharp LDTs for $u_n^u(x, E, \omega)$ and $u_n(x, E, \omega)$.

Because

$$M_n^u(x + k\omega, E, \omega) M_k^u(x, E, \omega) = M_k^u(x + n\omega, E, \omega) M_n^u(x, E, \omega)$$

and $\|A^{-1}\| = \|A\| \ge 1$ if $\det A = 1$, so

$$\left|\log \|M_n^u(x + k\omega, E, \omega)\| - \log \|M_n^u(x, E, \omega)\|\right| \le \log \|M_k^u(x, E, \omega)\| + \log \|M_k^u(x + n\omega, E, \omega)\|.$$

Due to (6.1), if $k^2 > \frac{2n_5^2(M_0 - D)}{L(E_0, \omega_0)} \ge n_5^2$, $|E - E_0| \le r_E$ and $|\omega - \omega_0| \le r_\omega$, then

$$\left|u_n^u(x + k\omega, E, \omega) - u_n^u(x, E, \omega)\right| \le \frac{12k}{5n} L(E, \omega).$$

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|u_n^u(x, E, \omega) - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} u_n^u(x + j\omega, E, \omega)\right| &\le \frac{1}{k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_5} + \sum_{j=n_5+1}^{k}\right) [u_n^u(x, E, \omega) - u_n^u(x + j\omega, E, \omega)] \\
&\le \frac{1}{nk} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_5} 2jM_0 + \sum_{j=n_5+1}^{k} \frac{12}{5} jL(E, \omega)\right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2nk} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_5} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{j-1} d(x + m\omega) - 2jD\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_5} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{j-1} d(x + (m + n)\omega) - 2jD\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

If

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_5} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{j-1} d(x + m\omega) - 2jD\right) < -\frac{nk}{4} \kappa L(E, \omega),$$

then there exists $1 \le j \le n_5$ such that

$$\sum_{m=0}^{j-1} d(x + m\omega) - 2jD < -\frac{n}{4} \kappa L(E, \omega).$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have that if $\beta(\omega) < \frac{c_{a,v}}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega)$, then

$$\mathrm{mes}\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{T}:\sum_{m=0}^{j-1}d(x+m\omega)-2jD<-\frac{n}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega)\right\}\right)\le\exp\left(-\bar{c}_{v,a}\frac{n}{4j}\kappa L(E,\omega)j\right)=\exp\left(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega)n\right).$$

Thus, there exist

$$n_6 := \frac{16\log\frac{32}{\bar{c}_{v,a}\kappa L(E_0,\omega_0)}}{\bar{c}_{v,a}\kappa L(E_0,\omega_0)} \tag{6.4}$$

and $\mathbb{B}$ satisfying

$$\mathrm{mes}\,(\mathbb{B})\le 2n_5\exp\left(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega)n\right)\le\exp\left(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{8}\kappa L(E,\omega)n\right),$$

such that if $x\notin\mathbb{B}$ and $n=\frac{4k}{\kappa}>n_6$, then

$$-\frac{1}{2nk}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}\left(\sum_{m=0}^{j-1}d(x+m\omega)-2jD\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}\left(\sum_{m=0}^{j-1}d(x+(m+n)\omega)-2jD\right)\right]\le\frac{1}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|u_n^u(x,E,\omega)-\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}u_n^u(x+j\omega,E,\omega)\right| &\le \frac{1}{nk}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}2j(M_0-D)+\sum_{j=n_5+1}^{k}\frac{12}{5}jL(E,\omega)\right]+\frac{1}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega)\\ &\le \frac{n_5^2(M_0-D)}{nk}+\frac{6k}{5n}L(E,\omega)+\frac{1}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega)\\ &\le \frac{\kappa}{8}L(E_0,\omega_0)+\frac{11}{20}\kappa L(E,\omega)<\frac{3}{4}\kappa L(E,\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta=\frac{\kappa}{4}L(E,\omega)$ in Remark 3.3 and

$$\check{n}=\max(n_1,n_2,n_3,2n_4,n_5,n_6), \tag{6.5}$$

where n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5 and n_6 are defined in (4.3), (5.7), (5.13), the proof of Lemma 5.4, the proof of Lemma 6.2 and (6.4), respectively. Then, redefine r_E as

$$r_E=r_E(\check{n})=\frac{L(E_0,\omega_0)}{200\check{n}}\exp\left((1-\check{n})M_0-2|D|\check{n}\right).$$

Therefore, if $\beta<c_{v,a}\min\left(\frac{\kappa}{4}L(E,\omega),\frac{L(E_0,\omega)}{15},|D|\right)$, $\lambda_v>\lambda_0$ and $n>\check{n}$, then for any $|E-E_0|\le r_E$ and $|\omega-\omega_0|\le r_\omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{mes}\left\{x:\left|u_n^u(x,E,\omega)-L_n(E,\omega)\right|<\kappa L(E,\omega)\right\} &< \exp\left(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{8}\kappa L(E,\omega)n\right)+\exp\left(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{25}\kappa^2L(E,\omega)n\right)\\ &< \exp\left(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{30}\kappa^2L(E,\omega)n\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Similarly, we can get the sharp LDT for $u_n(x,E,\omega)$ by the following relationship between $u_n(x,E,\omega)$ and $u_n^u(x,E,\omega)$:

$$u_n(x,E,\omega)=u_n^u(x,E,\omega)+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\log|\lambda_a\tilde{a}(x+j\omega)|-\log|\lambda_a a(x+(j+1)\omega)|\right).$$

□

Remark 6.3. It is easily seen that if $\lambda_v>\lambda_p$, then the sharp LDT (1.23) holds for any $E\in\mathcal{E}$ and irrational ω.

Remark 6.4. For the Schrödinger operators, we have similarly that if $k=\frac{\kappa}{4}n>n_5^s\left(\frac{2M_0^s}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $|E-E_0|\le r_E^s$ and $|\omega-\omega_0|\le r_\omega^s$, then

$$\left|u_n^s(x+k\omega,E,\omega)-u_n^s(x,E,\omega)\right|\le\frac{12k}{5n}L^s(E,\omega)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(6.7)\qquad \left|u_n^s(x,E,\omega)-\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k}u_n^s(x+j\omega,E,\omega)\right| &\le \frac{1}{k}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}+\sum_{j=n_5+1}^{k}\right)[u_n^s(x,E,\omega)-u_n^s(x+j\omega,E,\omega)]\\ &\le \frac{1}{nk}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}2jM_0^s+\sum_{j=n_5+1}^{k}\frac{12}{5}jL^s(E,\omega)\right]\\ &\le \frac{n_5^2M_0^s}{nk}+\frac{6k}{5n}L^s(E,\omega)\le\frac{3}{5}\kappa L^s(E,\omega).\end{aligned}$$

Combining it with Remark 3.2, we have that if $\beta(\omega)<\frac{1}{5}c_s\kappa L^s(E,\omega)$ and $\lambda>2\epsilon_0^{-1}$, then

$$(6.8)\qquad \text{mes}\left\{x:\left|u_n^s(x,E,\omega)-L_n^s(E,\omega)\right|<\kappa L^s(E,\omega)\right\}<\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_s}{10}\kappa^2L^s(E,\omega)).$$

Proof of Theorem 4. Similar to the proofs of Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2, by the sharp LDT (6.6) with $\kappa=\frac{1}{20}$, the Avalanche Principle can be applied again, and we have

$$(6.9)\qquad |L(E,\omega)+L_n(E,\omega)-2L_{2n}(E,\omega)|<\exp(-\frac{1}{48000}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E,\omega)n)\le\exp(-10^{-5}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E_0,\omega_0)n).$$

On the other hand, by (5.10), (5.11) and Lemma 6.1, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\log\|M_n^u(x,E_1,\omega)\|-\log\|M_n^u(x,E_2,\omega)\|\right|\le\frac{\left|\|M_n^a(x,E_1,\omega)\|-\|M_n^a(x,E_2,\omega)\|\right|}{\prod_{j=0}^{n-1}|d(x+j\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}\\
\le&\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\|\prod_{m=1}^{n-j}M^a(x+(n-m)\omega,E_1,\omega)\|\times\|\prod_{m=j-1}^{0}M^a(x+m\omega,E_2,\omega)\|\right)\times\exp(-nD)\\
&\times\exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{2}b(x+j\omega)+nD\right)\times|E_1-E_2|\\
=&\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}+\sum_{j=n_5+1}^{n-n_5}+\sum_{j=n-n_5+1}^{n}\right)\left(\|\prod_{m=1}^{n-j}M^a(x+(n-m)\omega,E_1,\omega)\|\times\|\prod_{m=j-1}^{0}M^a(x+m\omega,E_2,\omega)\|\right)\times\exp(-nD)\\
&\times\exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{2}b(x+j\omega)+nD\right)\times|E-E_0|\\
\le&\left\{2\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}\exp\left((M_0-D)n_5+\frac{6}{5}\max_{i=1,2}(L(E_i,\omega))\,n\right)+\sum_{j=n_5+1}^{n-n_5}\exp\left(\frac{6}{5}\max_{i=1,2}(L(E_i,\omega))\,n\right)\right\}\\
&\times\exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{2}b(x+j\omega)+nD\right)\times|E_1-E_2|\\
\le&\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\exp\left(\frac{3}{2}L(E_0,\omega_0)n\right)\times\exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{2}b(x+j\omega)+nD\right)\times|E_1-E_2|.\end{aligned}$$

Due to Lemma 3.4, we have that there exists $\mathbb{B}'$ satisfying mes $\mathbb{B}'<\exp(-\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E_0,\omega_0)n)$ such that if $x\notin\mathbb{B}'$, then

$$\left|\log\|M_n^u(x,E_1,\omega)\|-\log\|M_n^u(x,E_2,\omega)\|\right|\le n\exp(2L(E_0,\omega_0)n)\,|E_1-E_2|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}|L_n(E_1,\omega)-L_n(E_2,\omega)| &= \int_{\mathbb{T}\setminus\mathbb{B}'}|u_n^u(x,E_1,\omega)-u_n^u(x,E_2,\omega)|dx+\int_{\mathbb{B}'}|u_n^u(x,E_1,\omega)-u_n^u(x,E_2,\omega)|dx\\ &< \exp(2L(E_0,\omega_0)n)|E_1-E_2|+2\sup_{E\in\mathcal{E}}\|M^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{2}L(E_0,\omega_0)n).\end{aligned}$$

Combining it with (6.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|L(E_1,\omega)-L(E_2,\omega)| &\le |L(E_1,\omega)+L_n(E_1,\omega)-2L_{2n}(E_1,\omega)|+|L(E_2,\omega)+L_n(E_2,\omega)-2L_{2n}(E_2,\omega)|\\ &\quad +|L_n(E_1,\omega)-L_n(E_2,\omega)|+2|L_{2n}(E_1,\omega)-L_{2n}(E_2,\omega)|\\ &< 2\exp(-10^{-5}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E_0,\omega_0)n)+2\exp(4L(E_0,\omega_0)n)|E_1-E_2|\\ &\quad +4\sup_{E\in\mathcal{E}}\|M^u(\cdot,E,\omega)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\exp(-\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{2}L(E_0,\omega_0)n)\\ &< 3\exp(-10^{-5}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E_0,\omega_0))+2\exp(4L(E_0,\omega_0)n)|E_1-E_2|.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $M_0-D\ge L(E_0,\omega_0)$. Thus, if $|E_1-E_2|<2r_E$, then there exists an integral $n>\check{n}$ such that

$$\exp\left(-(10^{-5}\bar{c}_{v,a}+4)L(E_0,\omega_0)(n+1)\right)\le|E_1-E_2|\le\exp\left(-(10^{-5}\bar{c}_{v,a}+4)L(E_0,\omega_0)n\right).$$

Then

$$|L(E,\omega_0)-L(E_0,\omega_0)|\le 5\exp(-10^{-5}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E_0,\omega_0)n)<\exp(-(2\times10^5)^{-1}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E,\omega)(n+1))\le|E-E_0|^\tau,$$

where $\tau=\frac{\bar{c}_{v,a}}{2\bar{c}_{v,a}+8\times10^5}$. □

Remark 6.5. Let us outline the proof of Remark 1.9. If $n>\frac{10M_0^s}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}n_5^s$, then

$$\begin{aligned}(6.10)\quad &\left|\log\|M_n^s(x,E,\omega_1)\|-\log\|M_n^s(x,E,\omega_2)\|\right|\le\|M_n^s(x,E,\omega_1)-M_n^s(x,E,\omega_2)\|\\ &\le\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}+\sum_{j=n_5+1}^{n-n_5}+\sum_{j=n-n_5+1}^{n}\right)\left(\|\prod_{m=1}^{n-j}M^s(x+(n-m)\omega_1,E,\omega_1)\|\times\|\prod_{m=j-1}^{0}M^s(x+m\omega_2,E,\omega_2)\|\times(j\lambda V|\omega_1-\omega_2|)\right)\\ &\le\left\{2\sum_{j=1}^{n_5}\exp\left(n_5M_0^s+\frac{6}{5}\max_{i=1,2}(L^s(E,\omega_i))(n-n_5)\right)+\sum_{j=n_5+1}^{n-n_5}\exp\left(\frac{6}{5}\max_{i=1,2}(L^s(E,\omega_i))n\right)\right\}\times\lambda_snV|\omega_1-\omega_2|\\ &\le\sum_{j=1}^{n}\exp\left(\frac{7}{5}L^s(E_0,\omega_0)n\right)\times\lambda_snV|\omega_1-\omega_2|.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, there exists

$$(6.11)\qquad n_7^s:=-\frac{5\log\frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{5\lambda_sV}}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}$$

such that for any $n\ge n_7^s$,

$$\left|L_n^s(E,\omega_1)-L_n^s(E,\omega_2)\right|\le\lambda nV\exp\left(\frac{7}{5}L^s(E_0,\omega_0)n\right)\times|\omega_1-\omega_2|<\exp(2L^s(E_0,\omega_0)n)\times|\omega_1-\omega_2|.$$

Similarly, for any $n>\frac{10M_0^s}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}n_5^s$,

$$\left|L_n^s(E_1,\omega)-L_n^s(E_2,\omega)\right|\le\exp\left(\frac{7}{5}L^s(E_0,\omega_0)n\right)\times|E_1-E_2|.$$

On the other hand, applying (6.8) with $\kappa=\frac{1}{20}$ to the Avalanche Principle, we have

$$\left|L^s(E,\omega)+L_n^s(E,\omega)-2L_{2n}^s(E,\omega)\right|\le\exp\left(-10^{-5}\bar{c}_sL^s(E_0,\omega_0)n\right).$$

Let

$$\check{n}_s := \max\left(n_2^s, 2n_4^s, 80\left(\frac{2M_0^s}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} n_5^s, \frac{10M_0^s}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}n_5^s, n_7^s\right), \tag{6.12}$$

where n_2^s is defined in (5.15), n_4^s in Lemma 5.5, n_5^s in Remark 6.2 and n_7^s in (6.11). Then, we redefine r_E^s and r_ω^s as follows:

$$r_E^s = \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{200\check{n}_s}\exp(-5M_0^s\check{n}_s),\ r_\omega^s = \frac{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}{400\max_{\mathbb{T}}(v'(x))\check{n}_s^2}\exp(-5M_0^s\check{n}_s).$$

Note that $5M_0^s > (10^{-5}\bar{c}_v+4)L^s(E_0,\omega_0)$. Thus, for any $E_1, E_2 \in [E_0-r_E^s, E_0+r_E^s]$, $\omega_1,\omega_2 \in [\omega_0-r_\omega^s, \omega_0+r_\omega^s]$ satisfying $\max(\beta(\omega_1),\beta(\omega_2)) < \frac{1}{15}L^s(E_0,\omega_0)$, there exist n_E^s and n_ω^s such that

$$|E_1-E_2| \sim \exp\left(-(10^{-5}\bar{c}_v+4)L^s(E_0,\omega_0)n_E\right),\ |\omega_1-\omega_2| \sim \exp\left(-(10^{-5}\bar{c}_v+4)L^s(E_0,\omega_0)n_\omega\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|L^s(E_1,\omega_1)-L^s(E_1,\omega_2)| &\le |L^s(E_1,\omega_1)+L^s_{n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_1)-2L^s_{2n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_1)| + |L^s(E_1,\omega_2)+L^s_{n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_2)-2L^s_{2n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_2)|\\
&\quad +|L^s_{n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_1)-L^s_{n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_2)| + 2|L^s_{2n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_1)-L^s_{2n_\omega^s}(E_1,\omega_2)|\\
&< 2\exp(-10^{-5}\bar{c}_vL(E_0,\omega_0)n_\omega^s) + 2\exp\left(4L(E_0,\omega_0)n_\omega^s\right)|\omega_1-\omega_2|\\
&< 4\exp(-10^{-5}\bar{c}_{v,a}L(E_0,\omega_0)n_\omega^s) < |\omega_1-\omega_2|^{\tau_s},
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$|L^s(E_1,\omega_2)-L^s(E_2,\omega_2)| < |E_1-E_2|^{\tau_s}.$$

Remark 6.6. If $\lambda_s > \max\left(\lambda_p^s\left(\frac{1}{50}\right), 5V\right)$, then $L^s(E,\omega)$ is always positive for any $E\in\mathcal{E}_s$ and irrational ω. Thus, we do not need to apply the LDT and the Avalanche Principle to obtain the interval where the Lyapunov exponent is positive. Furthermore, due to Remark 6.2, we have

$$n_5^s = 1,\ 80\left(\frac{2M_0^s}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} n_5^s < 160,\ \frac{10M_0^s}{L^s(E_0,\omega_0)}n_5^s < 20,\ n_7^s < 20.$$

Overall, the integers n_E^s and n_ω^s only need to be larger than 160. Therefore, (1.26) holds for any $|E_1-E_2| < \lambda_s^{-800}$ and $|\omega_1-\omega_2| < \lambda_s^{-800}$ satisfying $\max(\beta(\omega_1),\beta(\omega_2)) < \frac{c_s}{16}\log\lambda_s$.

References

[AJS] A.Avila,S.Jitomirskaya and C.Sadel, *Complex One-frequency Cocycles.* J. of Euro. Math. Soc. , **9**(2013),1915-1935.

[ALSZ] A.Avila, Y.Last, M.Shamis and Q.Zhou, *On the abominable properties of the almost Mathieu operators with well approximated frequencies.* In preparation.

[B] J. Bourgain, *Green's Function Estimates for Lattice Schrödinger operators and applications.* Princeton University Press, 2004.

[BG] J.Bourgain and M.Goldstein, *On nonperturbative localization with quasi-periodic potential.* Ann. of Math. 152 (2000), no. 3, 835-879.

[BJ] J.Bourgain and S.Jitomirskaya, *Continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for quasiperiodic operators with analytic potential.* J. Stat. Phys. **108**(2002) 1028-1218.

[F] A. Furman, *On the multiplicative ergodic theorem for uniquely ergodic systems.* Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare, **33**(1997), 797-815.

[HZ] R.Han and S.Zhang, *Optimal Large Deviation Estimates and Hölder Regularity of the Lyapunov Exponents for Quasi-periodic Schrödinger Cocycles.* arXiv:1803.02035v1.

[GM] J.Garnett and D.Marshall, *Harmonic Measure.* Cambridge University Press, 2005.

[GS] M.Goldstein and W.Schlag, *Hölder continuity of the integrated density of states for quasiperiodic Schrödinger equations and averages of shifts of subharmonic functions.* Ann. of Math. **2** 154 (2001), no. 1, 155–203.

[GS1] W. Goldstein and W.Schlag, *Fine properties of the integrated density of states and a quantitative separation property of the Dirichlet eigenvalues.* Geom. Funct. Analysis. **18**, (2008), 755-869.

[JM] S.Jitomirskaya and C.A.Marx, *Continuity of the Lyapunov Exponent for analytic quasi-perodic cocycles with singularities.* Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications. **10**, (2011),129-146.

[S] W.Schlag, *Regularity and Convergence Rates for the Lyapunov Exponents of Linear Cocycles.* preprint (2012), 1 - 21.

[SS] E.Sorets and T.Spencer, *Positive Lyapunov exponents for Schrödinger operators with quasi-periodic potentials.* Comm. Math. Phys. **142**(1991),543-566.

[T] K. Tao, *Hölder continuity of Lyapunov exponent for quasi-periodic Jacobi operators.* Bulletin de la SMF , **142**, (2014), 635-671.

[YZ] J.You and S.Zhang, *Hölder continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for analytic quasiperiodic Schrödinger cocycles with week Liouville frequency.* Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. , **34**, (2014), 1395 - 1408.

College of Sciences, Hohai University, 1 Xikang Road Nanjing Jiangsu 210098 P.R.China
E-mail address: ktao@hhu.edu.cn, tao.nju@gmail.com